APR 24 1944

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 89—PART 9

JANUARY 6, 1943, TO MARCH 27, 1943
(PAGES A1 TO A1456)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1943

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

The Arrival of the Battle Cruiser "San Francisco"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, Friday, December 11, 1942, will always be remembered in the annals of the United States. But nowhere will it mean quite so much as to the people of my city. For it was on December 11 that the battered and scarred United States battle cruiser *San Francisco* came home. As she steamed in through the Golden Gate and later came to dock, everyone paid homage to ship and gallant crew. It is doubtful if in the Nation's history a similar reception has ever taken place. Visualize, if you will, a ship returning from a titanic sea battle, overcoming superior odds, winning victoriously, and then, under her own steam, returning for repairs to the port for which she was named and which is also the place where she was built.

Mr. Speaker, it grips one. I shall never forget my visit aboard the *San Francisco* on that memorable occasion. I was the guest of Admiral Greenslade, commandant of the Twelfth Naval District. Amongst those aboard was C. W. Callaghan, father of the daring Admiral Dan Callaghan, who led the *San Francisco* into battle, and who paid the supreme sacrifice in the service of our country. Aboard also were Mrs. Bruce McCandless and Capt. and Mrs. Byron McCandless, wife and parents of Commodore Bruce McCandless. It was Commodore McCandless who assumed command after both Admiral Callaghan and the ship's captain, Cassin Young, were killed by enemy fire. Admiral Callaghan's last words, "We want to get the big ones first," will be remembered along with John Paul Jones' immortal "We have just begun to fight," and Commodore Perry's "We have met the enemy and they are ours."

The Daily Commercial News, of San Francisco, published an editorial on December 14, 1942, entitled "She Had a Rendezvous," which reads as follows:

SHE HAD A RENDEZVOUS

Our *San Francisco* had a rendezvous—with death, with victory, with undying glory.

"Fight on, my men," sir Andrew sayes,
"A little Ime hurt, but yett not slaine;
Ile but lye downe and bleede a while;
And then Ile rise and fight againe."

She is hurt but not slain; she is bleeding, but she'll fight again, never fear.

"Uncle Dan" Callaghan and Cassin Young and the rest of the heroic dead will be revenged. When her wounds are healed she'll sally out once more to get the big ones first.

Her boys proved that the teen age is a fighting age, and that the thirties are the years for command. Yes; it was a young man's work (McCandless is only 31), young man's work, and therefore it was excellently done.

"At the foot of her streets are spars," George Sterling sang of his beloved city. It has been so since '48; it will be so forever. The port is the heart of San Francisco, the source of most of our blessings, the center of many of our most inspiring traditions.

The homecoming of the *San Francisco* would seem to be the climax for our harbor, yet you never can tell about San Francisco, Bret Harte's "warder of two continents."

The city is rising to this occasion with nobility and dignity. You may always trust San Francisco for that; the higher the cause, the steadier and more unerring is the spirit in which we signalize it.

The *San Francisco* is sacred ground—a cruiser rebaptized in the blood of heroes. The President was the first to know that the ship, as well as its living and its dead, should be uniquely honored.

Sacred ground!

"In a larger sense, we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or to detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here."

Mr. Speaker, I also present herewith complete text of the radio program broadcast from the deck of the *San Francisco*. Future generations will be interested in reading about this soul-stirring event:

U. S. S. "SAN FRANCISCO" COMES HOME

Lieutenant VENTER. This morning San Franciscans saw coming through the Golden Gate a cruiser which had very obviously been in a battle somewhere in the South Pacific. Steaming bravely through the gate, she passed beneath the Golden Gate bridge and into the quiet waters of San Francisco Bay. She was battered and torn, her decks were ripped by Jap steel, her bridge was patched—but at the gaff she proudly flew the ensign of the United States Navy. A flutter of signal flags from the foremast announced her name, and immediately the news spread over the city that the cruiser U. S. S. *San Francisco* had come home.

Under her own steam, she had sailed all the way from the Solomon Islands, where she had so gallantly led the American task force into battle with the enemy in one of the most decisive naval actions of the war.

She came into dock a short distance from the well-known Ferry Building on the Embarcadero.

This is Lt. Mel Venter, United States Coast Guard, speaking to you from the quarterdeck of the cruiser *San Francisco*.

This is the first time that a broadcast from the decks of a fighting ship of the Navy which has seen action in the South Pacific has been permitted by the Navy Department. For the first time, members of the ship's company are to be interviewed and the public is to be allowed to view the vessel.

She lies here, battered but not broken, secured to pier 16. Close to our microphone are officers and enlisted men of the gallant crew of the *San Francisco* and other high-ranking naval officers are due aboard.

Sound: Bugle blows "Attention"; trill of boatswain's pipe.

Lieutenant VENTER. Here comes Vice Admiral John Wills Greenslade, Commandant, Twelfth Naval District, and Commander of the Western Sea Frontier, and his official parties. They are coming aboard to greet the *San Francisco's* new commanding officer and her officers and men.

You have just heard the ship's bugler blowing "Attention." All the men of the cruiser *San Francisco* have come to attention and are facing the quarterdeck.

The official party stops almost at the head of the gangway, faces aft, and all salute the national ensign flying at the stern of the cruiser. And as Admiral Greenslade steps aboard you can hear the bosun piping him over the side.

The official party is now passing between eight sideboys who are members of the *San Francisco's* crew as the side honors are rendered. Everyone is standing perfectly still as the official party accepts the honors.

In peacetime the official party would be accorded a 15-gun salute, but this custom has been done away with in time of war.

The officers of the *San Francisco* are now welcoming the official party aboard.

Yes, she's San Francisco's own, this cruiser from which this broadcast is coming today. Her keel was laid at Mare Island on Admission Day in 1931. She was launched in 1933 and commissioned on February 10, 1934. Yes, she's San Francisco's own—and the city, to a man, is proud of her. Present at her commissioning was the one person empowered to speak for the city by the Golden Gate, the Honorable Angelo J. Rossi, mayor of San Francisco. He is here today to welcome her home again from the South Pacific. Mayor Rossi.

Mayor ROSSI. I am honored to be a guest aboard this ship today. It is a happy day for San Francisco that she has returned home. This city is faced with the difficult but gladly accepted task of living up to the glorious name of our ship. In the future I promise that San Francisco will wear her honors proudly, proud of the record this cruiser has made, proud of the officers and men who served aboard her. We will never forget Admiral Daniel J. Callaghan, Ensign Jean Carter Witter, Jr., and other brave sons of the city who gave their lives in the fight for freedom.

I cannot tell you the spirit of pride and joy which swept through San Francisco this morning when we learned that the cruiser *San Francisco* had come home. Each citizen feels a personal pride in and responsibility for this vessel. She is the city's own—and in the name of all San Franciscans, wherever they may be, I extend greetings to ship and crew and a right hearty welcome to you.

Lieutenant VENTER. Admiral Greenslade is now approaching the captain, Albert F. France, Jr., and the next voice you will hear will be that of Admiral Greenslade.

Admiral GREENSLADE. Captain France, I welcome you and the officers and men of the United States cruiser *San Francisco* to your home port. The Navy is proud of the fighting record this vessel has made in her recent action in the Solomons.

We know that this ship will soon be back in action against the enemy. I am pleased to be the bearer of these greetings from brother officers and men of the fighting forces.

In one of the most daring of naval maneuvers, the *San Francisco*, with true American spirit, led the attack between columns of enemy vessels, blasting away with her guns. She engaged a Japanese battleship of three times her size and armament at point-blank range and so deadly was her fire that the battleship's guns were silenced and she became a target for our guns and torpedoes.

That dash through the enemy's fleet won immortality for the cruiser *San Francisco* and for her gallant officers and men.

She will take her place in naval history along with the *Constitution* and the *Oregon*. I should like to pay my tribute to Rear Admiral Callaghan and Capt. Cassin Young, whose decisive action is exemplary of American fighting spirit. It is the spirit of John Paul Jones, of Farragut, Perry, and Admiral Dewey.

The ship was built at the Mare Island Navy Yard, and it is not too much to state that the sweat and sinews of the sturdy workmen who built her were a genuine factor in her recent victory.

We in the Twelfth Naval District are proud that the *San Francisco* proved herself worthy of her name.

Lieutenant Commander SCHONLAND. Thank you, Admiral, in behalf of the officers and men who were aboard the *San Francisco* when she went into action. I am happy to be serving aboard such a famous vessel.

Lieutenant VENTER. A few days ago the President awarded a special citation to the *San Francisco*. This is the first time in the history of the United States that a ship has been so decorated for outstanding service. The only other comparable citation was that given the Island of Malta by King George.

Repair parties aboard our fighting ships are of vast importance and function even while a ship is in action against the enemy. They are on the job, all over the vessel, in the engine room and holds, ready to repair damage on the spot. That is why our ships can keep on fighting, even though hit many times by enemy shells and torpedoes.

At no time has the importance of this repair work been better exemplified than in the dogged battle put on by the *San Francisco*. Sister ships thought she was lost, sunk, but she came right back with guns roaring.

The man mainly responsible for keeping her afloat during the fight and for bringing her safely back to her home port is here beside me. He is Lt. Comdr. Herbert E. Schonland, of Portland, Maine, and New London, Conn., who, by the way, was the senior uninjured officer aboard the ship after the death of Captain Young. Commander Schonland, where were you when you were informed of Captain Young's death?

Lieutenant Commander SCHONLAND. Below decks with the repair party.

Lieutenant VENTER. Then you were the commanding officer of the ship?

Lieutenant Commander SCHONLAND. Yes; but when I heard that Bruce McCandless took charge on the bridge, I sent word that he was to carry on and if he needed assistance to let me know.

Lieutenant VENTER. And you remained below?

Lieutenant Commander SCHONLAND. Yes. My job is to keep the ship afloat for fighting. Down below, we knew that we had been in a terrific battle. We had heard our own batteries in action and we knew that we had been hit. But we were much too busy repairing damage to think about what was going on topside. We were fully prepared for any form of attack or damage by the enemy. And I must say that while we had our hands full every man did his job and stuck to it right through the fight.

Lieutenant VENTER. Thank you, Commander. Ladies and gentlemen, a moment ago Commander Schonland mentioned Bruce McCandless, who was on the bridge of the flagship on that historic morning of November 13. He has been awarded by the President and Congress and will soon receive the Navy Congressional Medal of Honor.

This medal is awarded to any person who, while in the naval service of the United States, shall in action involving actual conflict with the enemy or in the line of his profession distinguish himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty and without detriment to the mission of his command or the command to which attached.

Commander McCandless is standing beside our microphones now. Commander, what were your observations during the battle with the Jap ships off the Solomons?

Commander MCCANDLESS. Admiral Callaghan seized the opportunity of engaging the enemy and stood into the Japanese formation to really get at them. As his flagship, we occupied the leading position.

Night operations are very difficult to describe—something like a dogfight at night—but during the action we engaged several Jap ships, including one battleship which we severely damaged and which subsequently was sunk.

We were hit repeatedly about the bridges and superstructure and I was left as the only officer on the bridges capable of performing duty. I had been on watch as officer of the deck for some time previous to the action and was somewhat familiar with the situation, and tried to carry out the general plan, when I found that Captain Young and Admiral Callaghan had been struck down.

The personnel of this ship have lived together, trained together, and recently fought together, over a period of several years. All hands turned in a sterling performance and through the efforts of over a thousand men—some of whom didn't come back—the *San Francisco* fought through to victory.

Lieutenant VENTER. Thank you, Commander. We understand that, beside your promotion from lieutenant commander to commander and the Navy Congressional Medal of Honor awarded you, Admiral William F. Halsey, Commander in Chief of the South Pacific Force, has awarded 29 Navy Crosses and 23 Silver Stars to the living and dead heroes aboard this ship. He must have thought that you people had earned them—and so does the American public. Are you glad to be back in California, Commander McCandless?

Commander MCCANDLESS. Indeed, I am. I've got a family out here you know—my wife and children—down in Long Beach. And I know that every man in the crew is pleased to be here again.

Lieutenant VENTER. Can you tell us anything about your trip back, Commander?

Commander MCCANDLESS. Only that we were under quite a strain bringing the ship back across the Pacific.

Lieutenant VENTER. It must have been quite a trip. I can imagine how you and your men felt when the Golden Gate came into view.

Commander MCCANDLESS. Did you hear the cheer that went up? We were anxious to get the ship into a yard where she could be repaired because we want to get back into action. And now, I think I've said enough. Just to give you an idea of the spirit of the men on this ship, I want you to talk to Chief Machinist's Mate McCan. He was aboard during the action off the Solomons and can give you the crew's viewpoint of what went on.

Lieutenant VENTER. How do you do, McCan. Commander McCandless tells me you saw plenty of action down there.

Mr. MCCAN. Yes, sir; that's right. My battle station is topside patrol.

Lieutenant VENTER. When did the action begin?

Mr. MCCAN. The action began early in the morning while it was still dark. Star shells and flares lit up the sea in all directions. The Jap battleships came in to pave the way for an invasion. We caught them off Savo Island near Guadalcanal, and we gave 'em the works.

Lieutenant VENTER. Could you tell us something about what happened—I mean, do you know any incidents which might interest the public—individual acts of bravery—things like that?

Mr. MCCAN. Well, sir, there were so many individual acts of bravery aboard the ship, I wouldn't know where to begin. I'll tell you one, and I think this has been published so I can talk about it, and that's what happened to the gun crew of an ack-ack.

They were shooting at Jap planes and a torpedo plane came over and they hit it. It caught on fire and, like the Japs always try to do, it turned and headed right for our ship. These men could see it coming, like a big torch falling out of the sky. It was headed right for them, but they stuck to their guns and fired to the very last. All 17 men died. All of them have been decorated since. That's only one of the many examples

of loyalty and courage that occurred all over the ship.

Lieutenant VENTER. It must have been pretty rough when that Jap battleship fired on you with 14-inch guns.

Mr. McCAN. Yes, sir; it didn't feel so good. The *San Francisco* bucked and quivered all over when she was hit. The men down in the engine room and the men at battle stations below deck knew what was going on but every one of them stuck by his post.

Lieutenant VENTER. It sounds to me as if you were mighty proud of your ship.

Mr. McCAN. Believe me, we are. Every man aboard her is proud of the record she has made and the part he had in the fight. Our officers don't do any bragging but I can brag for them. We are proud of the way they handled the ship all the way through the fight. Admiral Callaghan was a brave man and so was Captain Young. We are proud of the way Commander McCandless took charge. I have talked to men from other ships which were with us that night, and they said they thought we were gone. They could see flame pouring out of us and a lot of smoke, and they said to themselves, "There goes the *San Francisco.*" They were certainly surprised when we pulled into position at the head of the column, right where we belonged.

Lieutenant VENTER. It must have been a lot of work to keep the ship from sinking and to bring her home.

Mr. McCAN. Yes, sir; but we are all trained for our jobs and we knew what to do. We weren't going to let the Japs brag that they sank the *San Francisco.* She'll be back in the fight before long, and most of us will be aboard her. All we ask is another chance at the Jap fleet because we know now what we can do and we know that we can lick 'em. American-built ships and guns and ammunition and American men can beat the Japs any time.

Lieutenant VENTER. Well, thank you very much, Chief Machinist's Mate McCan. You have given us a fine picture of the bravery of the crew of the *San Francisco.*

Now we would like to tell you of the radio audience something of the appearance of the ship. Military security prevents us from giving you an exact description of the damage she has suffered but we can tell you that she is battered and pitted and that Japanese shells have smashed her superstructure and cut ragged holes in her plate. You get a shock when you first see her—but it's a breathless sort of shock—a feeling of admiration that an American ship could take such punishment and still come back to her home port to be repaired. It makes you proud to be an American just to look at her.

Thousands upon thousands of San Franciscans are coming down today to the dock to have a look at their favorite ship. She is lying on one side of a great pier and the public is being admitted to the pier opposite. They can't come aboard the *San Francisco* but they can look across about 50 yards of water and see her. There is not much cheering and very little laughter in that crowd across the way. Their faces are solemn but there is a proud look in their eyes as they gaze at this once beautiful cruiser and realize what she's been through.

It's a great day here in San Francisco and many receptions and celebrations are being planned. The city is going to show these men back from the Solomons on the *San Francisco* what they think of them.

We have been speaking to you from the quarter-deck of the cruiser *San Francisco* from which vantage point you have heard official ceremonies and interviews with the men who brought this great ship back to her home port. This was an official Navy broadcast narrated by Lt. Mel Venter, United States Coast Guard, and came to you through the united efforts of network and independent stations.

The Yanks Are Coming!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, "The Yanks Are Coming" is the title of a very striking editorial that appeared in the December issue of the Eagle magazine, the publication of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. This editorial, from the pen of the gifted editor, Frank E. Hering, has been widely commented on and approved as a notable and inspiring contribution to the war effort. Because of its high patriotic tone, the inspirational message it brings, and its general excellence, I ask unanimous consent of the House that it be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

THE YANKS ARE COMING

Eleven months to the day after Pearl Harbor, the air waves beamed this radio message to the world: "The Yanks[1] Are Coming." The Yanks, convoyed by warships and protected by an umbrella of airplanes, had landed on the Atlantic and Mediterranean coasts of North Africa.

"The Yanks are coming"—coming not in thousands nor in hundreds of thousands, but in millions. Coming with airplanes, tanks, and guns. Coming with hearts of courage to fight, if necessary to die, for men's right to think, to worship, and to be governed as free men.

"The Yanks are coming!" Enslaved nations heard. And hearing, they turned their faces to the East whence, 2,000 years ago, came a heavenly chorus proclaiming "peace on earth, good will to men." Yes, once more a star had appeared, and conquered peoples everywhere quickened with hope and renewed faith.

"The Yanks are coming!" Starved but unconquerable Greece heard, and hearing, scanned the horizon for the figure of the Greek runner who centuries ago brought the news of victory over another barbarian horde—the Persian.

"The Yanks are coming!" Norway and Denmark, captured but unbeaten, heard and saw the doors of their Valhalla of freedom open wide.

"The Yanks are coming!" Poland, bleeding but unbowed, heard, and Christian and Jew knew that the promised land, rich with the milk and honey of liberty, was just beyond the desert of their ignominious suffering.

"The Yanks are coming!" Betrayed Belgium heard, and Rotterdam's dead arose to testify that truth again is marching on.

"The Yanks are coming!" The message ran through the ghostly streets of Lidice, and the murdered men of that village smiled in their graves, happy in the knowledge that they had not died in vain, and that their womenfolk and children, now scattered over an alien nation, would come home again.

"The Yanks are coming!" The message resounded through the mountain passes of Yugoslavia, and the valorous Mikhailovitch knew that Freedom's great putsch was at hand.

"The Yanks are coming!" China, Java, and the Philippines heard it. And hearing, they knew that the white man was coming, not as master but as "His brother's keeper," inspired by a new understanding of the democratic proposition that men are created equal.

"The Yanks are coming!" Americans in enemy prison camps—the "expendable" men and women of Bataan, Corregidor, and Wake—heard, and hearing, knew that they had not been expended in vain. Perhaps more than any other group, these sons and daughters of the Star and Stripes know the real significance of "The Yanks are coming."

Free Americans heard, and hearing, resolved to keep the Yanks coming. There will be dark days ahead—days of defeat, with thousands of our own flesh and blood dying on our far-flung battle fronts. But through the ebb and flow of battle, through the heartbreak of personal loss, we shall remain one—130,000,000 Americans with one mind and heart for victory.

Listen, this is America's song of victory:

Trees falling in the great Northwest for victory ships. Fires roaring in furnaces to make steel for the armor of democracy. Ships splashing down the ways to sail the seven seas. Assembly lines turning out bombers to darken the enemies' skies. Locomotives screaming in the night, rushing troops, guns, and tanks to embarkation points. Tractors breaking the sod to grow food for America and her allies. Our savings pouring into Uncle Sam's war chest to buy weapons for the Yanks over there. Fathers saying, "Good-bye, son." Mothers praying, "God, keep him safe."

An Eagle Yank wrote to his aerie at Endicott, N. Y.: "Has the lodge bought any bonds lately? I need some more fighting equipment, and if bonds are not bought, I don't get it. Don't let me down, and when I am over there, I'll do my damndest for you."

To him and to the other 51,000 Eagles and sons of Eagles everywhere—in the sky, on the sea, under the sea, on the land, we say: "Yes, we're behind you. We'll build the ships and submarines to keep the sea lanes open between you and home. We'll give you airplanes, tanks, and guns to destroy the powers of evil that have wrought misery upon peace-loving peoples of the world. We'll work, save, and pray for you and victory."

Of that Supreme Power that shapes the destinies of men, we humbly ask that, on this Christmas Day, there may come to free and enslaved nations alike the determination and courage to carry on the struggle until the horrible wrongs are righted. Today, the world knows that beyond the clouds of war that darken the Christmas sky, the bright sun of victory is shining—because the Yanks are coming.

[1] Every fighting man from America—whether he comes from the North or East or West or South—is known in Europe and in Africa as a Yank.

The British Colonial Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article recently published in Life magazine by Jan Christiaan Smuts, whose reputation is world-wide, and whose thoughts on post-war problems command the respect of the world. General Smuts is a soldier, scholar, and statesman, and personifies

the capacity of the British Commonwealth of Nations to convert its bitterest enemies into its most respected advocates. Smuts, though born a British subject on a South African farm 72 years ago, was a Boer by inheritance, and, as such, took a distinguished part in the Boer War against the English. Yet in the peaceful years that followed he not only had a major hand in the organization of the Union of South Africa, but contributed a vast amount of creative statesmanship to the whole British Empire.

As a soldier, Boer Smuts led a sensational "commando" raid against the British. In World War No. 1 he commanded British imperial troops in German East Africa. Today he is field marshal of the British Army—the only field marshal in the dominions.

As a statesman, he sat with Lloyd George's inner war cabinet—1917–18—supplied Wilson with original ideas for his League of Nations, and helped to make his British Commonwealth of Nations phrase—1917—a worldwide reality—1926.

As senior Prime Minister in that Commonwealth, Smuts has broken a long ministerial precedent to write for publication. But the editors of Life persuaded this scholar of government that his views should be known in America as thoroughly as they are known and respected in Great Britain and the dominions.

The article follows:

THE BRITISH COLONIAL EMPIRE

(By Jan Christiaan Smuts, Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa)

I have followed with interest the recent discussions in the American press on the British Empire and its colonies. These discussions have received an added importance from the intervention of Mr. Wendell Willkie. Anything from a public man of such high standing and so friendly a critic is certain to attract one as of the first importance not only as a domestic issue of the British Empire but also in its international aspects and not least in its possible bearing on the future of Anglo-American relations. A few remarks by me addressed to the American public may, therefore, not be out of place.

It is in fact not only the British system but the whole world-wide colonial issue which is raised with all its implications for the peace and for the post-war international order. This interest of America in the colonial question is heartily welcomed as evidence of its larger outlook on the international situation and the growing realization of its responsibilities reaching beyond "these states" and the Western Hemisphere. This interest may become the basis of new fruitful contacts and collaboration.

Coming now to the British Empire and its colonial system, it is first of all necessary to get rid of ancient prejudice about the subject. The name of the British Empire stirs up memories of George III in Americans while in a Boer like myself it may conjure up visions of a dark page in British history. The fact, however, is that when today we talk about the British Empire it is not the same thing as the British Empire of bygone times. That old empire is dead. It died at the end of the nineteenth century. It found its grave in the Boer War. The Boers thus rendered the British people a priceless service, which they repaid by the return service of restoring free self-governing institutions to the conquered people within a few years after the British victory, and within 8 years thereafter South Africa was a united country with full self-government and in due course with sovereign status in the world. This surely does not look like the old British Empire but like an entirely new thing animated by a new attitude toward human liberty. And indeed today it is the widest system of organized human freedom which has ever existed in history.

EMPIRE'S GOAL: FULL FREEDOM FOR ALL

Twenty-five years ago in a wartime address to members of both Houses of the British Parliament, I pointed out that the term "British Empire" was misleading, that the British system was not an empire like Rome or Germany or many others of the past, that it consisted of a vast congeries of states and territories in all stages of development, some free and fully self-governing, some in process of attaining full freedom and others in various stages along the road to freedom. I added that I preferred for it the name of the British Commonwealth of Nations, a name which was subsequently endorsed by the imperial conferences and thus became the official name for Britain plus the free dominions. The entire Empire consists of a great forward movement of states and territories which have either reached, or are still marching forward to, the goal of full freedom and independent status.

The inner dynamic, the motive force of this movement, is the principle of constitutional freedom. A great variety of political institutions are in operation all over the British world but all progressively planned for the attainment sooner or later of full freedom and self-government. In a recent able speech in the House of Lords, Lord Cranborne reviewed at length the details of the British colonial system and its progressive experiments, all working toward final freedom in the colonies. I need only mention that authoritative statement. That it is a system of political freedom and ever closer approximation to freedom is beyond question. The idea that the British colonial system is based on keeping people in subjection and exploiting them for Britain is, today at any rate, wildly and demonstrably preposterous.

WHAT ABOUT INDIA?

But, it is retorted, what about India? Why is India not given her freedom? Why is she kept in political subjection against the wish of her peoples if it were not for British imperialism? The answer is even simpler than the question. India, if she wills, can be free in the same way and by the same means as Canada, Australia, and New Zealand are today free sovereign states. In all these states their peoples, through their representatives, came together, worked out a constitution for themselves, and asked Britain to ratify the result, and in no case in vain. In Canada, French Canadians and British Canadians, in South Africa, Dutch and English, after a century of struggle came together and made those grand compromises which are always the expression of the highest political wisdom.

The same course is open to India if the peoples of India will agree about the terms of a free constitution. Hitherto, it has been the bitter misfortune of India that her peoples or their leaders will not agree to do the thing which is their own clear responsibility and nobody else's. They cannot or will not make the grand compromise or national pact which will give them their freedom and secure their future, and they blame their failure on Britain. "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars but in ourselves that we are underlings." Freedom is not a thing that can be imposed from without. It can only be created from within. Its very essence is that it is a free self-creation. It must be the free expression of India's own wise political soul.

INDIA'S FREEDOM IS INDIA'S JOB

Next to the winning of the war, the emancipation of India without internal disruption is today perhaps the greatest prize in the world. God give that India's peoples and their leaders may win this prize. God grant wisdom to experienced British statesmanship to help India out in this almost too heavy task before her. But in the last resort it is India's job and India's responsibility to herself and her future.

I have also heard the fall of Singapore given as an instance of the failure of the British colonial policy. But how so? Did not Siam, in full possession of national sovereignty, also succumb to Japan; did not Indochina, a French colony, also succumb; did not the Dutch East Indies under the exemplary colonial government of the Netherlands also fall as they all fell because France fell, and Japan thus slipped through Indochina, the defenseless back door of that world, and all the rest followed by the remorseless logic of war? Didn't the Philippines also fall in spite of their freedom and American protection? To use all this series of disasters as an argument against British or Dutch or French colonial policy is quite absurd and beside the mark.

So much for the past, the past of the colonies and the colonial system which has been such an important phase in the development of modern Europe. What of the future, the future of the colonies after this war?

COLONIES IN A DIFFERENT WORLD

They grew up haphazard in the past. It was a mere matter of chance who among the competing nations happened to arrive first and first hoisted the flag. And their subsequent fate and rate of progress have depended largely on the qualities and the resources of the power to which they happened to belong. The question is how far they will fit into the new world that will emerge after the war. For it will in many important respects be a different world from that which the war overwhelmed. For one thing, it will be a world governed by the Atlantic Charter and similar international instruments, the world of international collaboration as distinct from the old competitive order, the world where colonies situated on the strategic routes of the world will become important items in the program of general security against war, the world of security bases for the United Nations, of controlled war materials, and of equal supply of necessary raw materials for the economic needs of the world. I mention only a few matters obviously coming within the scope of the Atlantic Charter which will have a bearing on the future of colonies. Here, too, the laissez-faire policies of the past will have to make way for the necessary controls of the future. And to that extent the colonial individualism of the past will have to adjust itself to the collectivist requirements of general defense and security against war in the future.

I mention a few other points on the future of the colonies which appear to me important to consider.

In the first place, it would be unwise to disturb the existing administrative relationship between mother countries and their colonies. Mother countries should remain exclusively responsible for the administration of their colonies and interference by others should be avoided.

LITTLE COLONIES GROUPED INTO BIG UNITS

In the second place, wherever possible, isolated colonies belonging to a mother country should be grouped into larger units both for more efficient and economical administration, and for larger scale development policies common to all. Thus British colonies in the West Indies or in the Far East or on the African Continent could be grouped with larger powers assigned to the group, and corresponding decrease of power exercised in London. Such a change, involving decentralization so far as the mother country is concerned and centralization with larger powers

so far as the colonies are concerned, would be a welcome advance in the direction of colonial freedom and responsibility, which is the general trend of colonial development.

As a further stimulus to the development of such an enlarged colonial unit, its general development policy should be entrusted to a council on which not only the British Government as the parent state but also the unit itself and any interested neighboring British Commonwealth, such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, could prove beneficial in the advance of their less-developed neighbors and colonial areas be enabled to make the best progress.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD HAVE A DIRECT SAY

In the third place, there should be a system of regional grouping of colonies to whatever mother countries they happen to belong. Thus colonies in the West Indies or in the Far East or on the African Continent could be grouped to whatever powers they may belong for purposes of ultimate control of defense or economic policy under the Atlantic Charter or for other purposes. While the mother countries will be exclusively responsible for the administration of their colonies, the ultimate control of general or common policy would come under a regional commission or council on which will be represented not only the mother countries but also others regionally interested for security or economic reasons. Thus the United States of America, although no colonial power, could be on the regional control council of the West Indies or of Africa or elsewhere. It appears to me essential that the United States of America should in the future have a direct say with the mother countries in the settlement of general colonial policies and some such organization as is here suggested that would give her the necessary status with the rights and responsibilities implied. I have no doubt that such a partnership of the United States of America in overhead colonial controls would be cordially welcomed so far as the British Commonwealth of Nations is concerned.

I have briefly indicated a few directions in which this war is likely to affect existing colonial arrangements. But I am aware that the whole subject is more complicated than would appear from this brief statement. And I hope that it will receive the careful attention and objective discussion which both its importance and its difficulties call for.

The peace conference, if and when it comes, should find public opinion prepared for a notable advance in the colonial development of less-advanced regions of the world.

Climax of Blunders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the American people are passing from a feeling of irritation to anger in their resentment over the bungling manner in which the various governmental departments and bureaus function during these war days. They strongly resent the alleged shortages in food that have been created by heedless and needless governmental buying, also by unnecessary warnings of impending shortages which have led to frantic hoarding and actual shortages.

The American people are a long-suffering race. They will make any sacrifices necessary to promote our war efforts, but they strongly resent being treated like minor children.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I desire to insert an editorial from the Minneapolis Daily Times entitled "Climax of Blunders," which appeared in the issue for December 18, 1942:

CLIMAX OF BLUNDERS

The mess of incompetence and blunders and lack of foresight which preceded and involved so many of our shortages and the resulting rationing programs has come to a head.

Leon Henderson has quit as Office of Production Administration chief, the czar of price fixing and rationing. The East is virtually running out of gasoline. In New York, canned milk is being sold on doctor's prescription for babies.

Here in Minneapolis, shortages of many kinds are beginning to appear somewhat later than elsewhere, but just as inexorably they are coming as the inevitable results, not alone of the war but also of mishandling of our resources before and after Pearl Harbor.

Hardly a shortage exists which cannot be traced, at least in part, to ill planning by eager makers-over of the world and their fellow bureaucrats.

The rubber fiascos are too well known to merit repetition. Mouthy microphones of Washington have repeatedly rushed to broadcast warnings of rationing in order to create unnecessary splurges of hoarding, with their artificial shortages, in order to bring commodities and the people's daily lives more quickly and firmly under bureaucratic control.

Meanwhile, we have seen the spectacles of tank cars used to carry wine instead of essential gasoline and fuel oil, read dispatches about Government offices stuffy at 76 degrees while householders are told to be comfortable at 65; and see all kinds of unnecessary complications, ridiculously involved formulas, and reams upon reams of time-wasting and unintelligible questionnaires injected into phases of American life from home heating to business administration.

Mr. Henderson's friends say the resignation was forced by politics.

If that is so, it was politics based on indignation of a public which will sacrifice anything necessary to the war but gets coldly furious at the blunders which have brought the situation to its present pass, and wants assurance that the necessary wartime controls will be handled on a basis of intelligence and foresight.

Greater Love Hath No Man Than This, That a Man Lay Down His Life For His Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, Pvt. Paul E. Taylor, of Indianapolis, one of the fine young men of our community whom everybody loved, was killed in action in the far-away Solomons before he had a chance to celebrate his first Christmas in the Army, but his parents believe he had experienced something more important than the joy of Christmas—a knowledge of what it was for which he gave his life.

All of Christmas Day Mr. and Mrs. Burt S. Taylor, of 45 Gladstone Avenue, Indianapolis, waited for word from their 23-year-old son, word which would tell them he had received his Christmas gifts and that he was well and happy. The next day they received the following telegram from The Adjutant General:

The Secretary of War desires me to express his deep regrets that your son, Pvt. Paul E. Taylor, was killed in action in defense of his country in the Southwest Pacific area on December 6.

And so the sorrowing parents and the soldier's heart-broken fiancee, Miss Miriam Neiman, turned for solace to his last letter, dated October 1.

That letter deserves to be enshrined in the permanent literature of this tragic age.

Every so often the question comes up as to what we are fighting for—

He wrote—

and the usual points of profiteers, democracy, and their subtitles, but even this large question seems clearer now. If there is hope for a peaceful settlement, if there is hope for a steady advance for mankind, certainly that hope will be found in a nation and government whose responsibility and aim is education for all, and where the responsibility of decision is the people's. What could come closer to the recognition of the value of the individual? What hope of fair treatment of conquered nations can be found in any other philosophy? Or perhaps it is better said in this way: What form can offer more respect for the rights of advancement of these peoples?

Of course, our interests are not entirely unselfish. Many interests seek wealth and commercial strength from the struggle, but what nation would be more apt to be unselfish than one which already possesses nearly all of the essentials? We are fighting for what appears to be the strongest hope for advancing the status of the individual man the world over.

IF YOU REALLY KNOW A MAN, YOU CANNOT HATE HIM

Knowledge is an immense force. Even God's judgment is according to knowledge. To really know a man, a country, or a people, is to be more sympathetic—more tolerant—toward them. Someone said, "If you really know a man, you cannot hate him."

Why this long, drawn-out discourse? Well, it was partly due to a Boake Carter article sometime back which either Mimi or one of you sent me, in which he attempted to prove an eye-for-an-eye, tooth-for-a-tooth philosophy by Biblical quotation. Much as I generally like him, he couldn't push that one down my throat.

Christ was pretty definite on that subject, and retaliated with, "But I say unto you"—in short, we fight not because we hate.

Tell the folks who sent their regards thanks. Loads of love to all.

PAUL.

This Indianapolis boy knew why he was willing to die. His message shall be an inspiration to all right-thinking people on this sorrow-laden earth. Christ, the blessed Saviour of mankind, must have had such as he in mind when He said:

Greater love hath no man than this: that a man lay down his life for his friends.

With Hope, Confidence, and Courage, We March to Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, this year will be marked with grimness, relieved by promise of eventual better days. We must face it fearlessly, courageously, and steadfastly.

This new year brings a hope and a promise. It also brings a test of our determination, our sincerity, our integrity. Now is the time to rededicate ourselves to the task before us—to contribute of our ideas, our energies, and our worldly goods toward the speediest possible victory. Above all, we must remember that the needs of our armed forces come first but not lose sight of the fact that the products of the farm and factory are essential not only to our armed forces but our civilian economy as well.

Hopeful? Yes. Confident? Of course. Courageous? Certainly. Our new year must be all of these, for everything we have and everything we stand for is pitted in this struggle for survival. But happiness itself depends on human rights, so today America must meet the challenge of a brave new year and not a happy one.

We must ask for courage that we may make our sacrifices gladly.

We ask for confidence that we may give our toil and sweat unstintingly to final victory, with full conviction that our cause is just and that our efforts will be crowned with triumph over evil.

We ask for hope that we may live to see a world reborn; where every nation on the globe will guarantee the sanctity of human rights, the dignity of man.

We ask for bravery that, when it becomes necessary, we may give our lives and our loved ones to the cause of liberty, without faltering, without flinching, but with the solemn pride of patriots who love their country and their God.

To America the dawn of 1943 presents a mighty challenge, one that will require all of the fortitude and strength that we can muster. We shall meet the challenge, as we march forward on the road to victory, with hope and confidence and courage into a brave new year.

Freedom's Textbook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, Fred C. Christopherson, distinguished and widely read editorial writer of the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus Leader, has made a highly meritorious suggestion in proposing that Americans generally turn to their Bibles as a textbook of freedom during this trying period. I take pleasure of calling to the attention of the Congress and the country Mr. Christopherson's timely and talented editorial:

FREEDOM'S TEXTBOOK

The most important books in a nation's life are its textbooks. The nation of tomorrow is determined by what it is studying today, for textbooks do more than impart information. They mold the very spirit of the nation for the years to come. America's passion for freedom was born out of a century of colonial education centering in one book—the Bible. The simple social structure of those days was reared upon three institutions: The home, the school, and the church, in all of which the Bible was supreme.

The political structure of the United States Government designed by men trained in colonial concepts reflects the teachings of the Bible. There it is in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. The attitude of the United States toward her neighbor nations has always been more like that of the good Samaritan than it has like that of the robber. Today our Nation faces not only her responsibility for ridding the world of international gangsters but the next task of rebuilding the world on the patterns of her own national structure. No day in any of these war years is therefore any more important than Universal Bible Sunday, which may serve to remind the American people of the source of their Nation's strength.

The American Bible Society has suggested the slogan "Watch your scripture reading" for this year's observance. We suggest that among the other wholesome habits of life to which we are now being summoned as contributing to the winning of the war, that every citizen add the regular reading and study of the textbook of American freedom.

Calvin Coolidge once said: "The foundations of our Government rest so much on the teachings of the Bible, that it would be difficult to support them if faith in these teachings should cease to be practically universal in our country." How can we have faith in them unless we know them? Let every American turn to his textbook of freedom.

The Pope's Christmas Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on Christmas Eve the great leader of Christianity addressed the world on the burning topics of the day, and expressed the official views of his church on the problems of war and peace.

He condemned racial intolerance, totalitarianism, and atheism.

I addressed a letter to the Apostolic Delegate at Washington, D. C., requesting him to furnish me with the official copy of the Pope's address. The letter is as follows:

DECEMBER 24, 1942.

Most Rev. AMLETO GIOVANNI CICOGNANI,
Apostolic Delegate, Washington. D. C.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: I was thrilled with the message of His Holiness Pope Pius XII, which appears in today's press.

May I request you to send me the official text of the Pope's message as soon as available, so that I may have the honor of having the same published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Reverently yours,

SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

I was unable to obtain the official copy of the Pope's address, but a rather authentic version of it appears in the New York Times of December 25, 1942. I, therefore, wish to insert this message in the form published in the New York Times in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

My dear children of the whole world, as the Holy Christmas season comes round each year, the message of Jesus, who is light in the midst of darkness, echoes once more from the crib of Bethlehem in the ears of Christians and reechoes in their hearts with an ever-new freshness of joy and piety.

It is a message that lights up with heavenly truth a world that is plunged in darkness by fatal errors. It infuses exuberant and trustful joy into mankind, torn by the anxiety of deep and bitter sorrow. It proclaims liberty to the sons of Adam, shackled with the chains of sin and guilt. It promises mercy, love, peace to the countless hosts of those in suffering and tribulation who see their happiness shattered and their efforts broken in the tempestuous strife and hate of our stormy days.

The watchword, "I have compassion on the multitude," is for us a sacred trust which may not be abused, and it remains strong and intelligent at all times and in all human situations, as it was the distinguishing word of Jesus.

The church would be untrue to herself, would cease to be a mother, if she turned deaf ears to her children's anguished cries that reach her from every class of the human family.

She does not intend to take sides for either of the particular forms in which several peoples or states try to solve the gigantic problem of domestic order or international collaboration, as long as these forms conform to the law of God.

But, on the other hand, as the pillar and ground of truth and guardian by the will of God of the mandate of Christ, and of the natural and supernatural order, the church cannot renounce her rights to proclaim to her sons and the whole world the unchanging basic laws, saving them from every perversion or frustration, corruption, false interpretation, and error.

This is all the more necessary for the fact that some exact maintenance of these laws, not merely by the efforts of the noble and courageous will, depends in the last analysis on the solidity of any national quality of courage and sacrifice of all peoples.

We know the qualities of courage and sacrifice of those peoples, and we also know their straitened conditions and their sorrows; and in this hour of unspeakable trial and strife we feel ourselves bound to each other, and every one of them without exception, by a deep, all-embracing, unmovable affection, and by an immense desire to bring them every solace and help which is in any way at our command.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND ORDER WITHIN THE NATIONS

In our last Christmas message we expounded the principles which Christian thought suggests for the establishment of an international order of friendly relations

and collaboration such as to conform to the demands of God's law. Today we shall, with the consent, we feel, and the interested attention of all upright men, pause to consider very carefully and with especial impartiality, the fundamental laws of the internal order of states and peoples.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND INTERNAL ORDER ARE INTIMATELY RELATED

International equilibrium and harmony depend on the internal equilibrium and development of the individual states and in the material, social, and intellectual spheres. A firm and steady peace policy toward other nations is, in fact, impossible without a spirit of peace within the nation which inspires trust.

It is only, then, by striving for an internal peace, a peace in both fields, that people will be freed from the cruel nightmare of war, and the material and psychological causes of further discord and disorder will be diminished and gradually eliminated.

Every society worthy of the name has originated in a desire for peace, and hence aims at attaining peace, that "tranquil living together in order" in which St. Thomas finds the essence of peace.

Two primary elements, then, regulate social life: A living together in order and a living together in tranquillity.

LIVING TOGETHER IN ORDER

Order, which is fundamental in an association of men (that is, who strive to attain an end appropriate to their nature) is not a merely external linking up of such parts which are numerically distinct.

It is rather, and must be, a tendency and an evermore perfect approach to an internal union; and this does not exclude differences founded in fact and sanctioned by the will of God or by supernatural standards.

The origin and the primary scope of social life in the conservation, development, and perfection of the human person, helping him to realize accurately the demand and values of religion and culture set by the Creator to every man and to all mankind, both in the whole and in its natural ramifications.

This social life comprises unity between the people. And not at the same time does it exclude differences which are founded in fact and nature. But when one holds fast to God, the Supreme Controller of all that relates to men, then the similarities, no less than the differences of men, find their allotted place in the fixed order of things, of values, and henceforth of morality.

When, however, this foundation is removed there is a dangerous lack of cohesion in the various spheres of culture; the frontier of true values becomes uncertain and shifting, even to the point where mere external factors and often blind instincts come to determine, according to the prevalent fashion of the day, who is to have control of this or that direction.

After the fateful economy of the past decades, during which the lives of all citizens were subordinated to the stimulus of gain, there now succeeds another and no less fateful policy which, while it considers everybody and everything with reference to the state, excludes all thought of ethics or religion. This is a fatal masquerade—a fatal error. It is calculated to bring about incalculable consequences for social life, which is never nearer to losing its noblest prerogatives than when it thinks it can deny or forget with impunity the eternal source of its own dignity—God.

JURIDICAL ORDER OF SOCIETY AND ITS AIMS

That social life, as God willed it, may attain its scope it needs a juridical order to support it from without—to defend and protect it; the function of this juridical order is not to dominate but to serve—to help the development and increase of society's vitality in the rich multiplicity of its ends, leading all the individual energies to their perfection in peaceful competition and defending them with appropriate and honest means against all that may militate against their full evolution.

Such an order, that it may safeguard the equilibrium, the safety, and the harmony of society, has also the power of coercion against those who only by this means can be held within the noble discipline of social life.

But in the just fulfillment of this right an authority which is truly worthy of the name will always be painfully conscious of its responsibility in the sight of the Eternal Judge, before whose tribunal every wrong judgment, and especially every revolt against the order established by God, will receive, without fail, its sanction and its condemnation.

The juridical order has, besides, the high and difficult scope of insuring harmonious relations, both between individuals and between societies, and within these. This scope will be reached if legislators will abstain from following those perilous theories and practices, so harmful to communities and to their spirit of union, which derive their origin and promulgation from false postulates.

Among such postulates we must count the juridical positivism which attributes a deceptive majesty to the setting up of purely human laws, and which leaves the way open for a fateful divorce of law from morality.

There is, besides, the conception which claims for particular nations, or races, or classes the juridical instinct as the final imperative and the norm from which there is no appeal. Finally, there are those various theories which, differing among themselves and deriving from opposite ideologies, agree in considering the state or a group which represents it, as an absolute and supreme entity exempt from control and from criticism even when its theoretical and practical postulates result in and offend by their open denial of essential tenets of the human and Christian conscience.

Anyone who considers with an open and penetrating mind the vital connection between social order and a genuine juridical order will realize at once the urgent need of a return to a conception of law which is spiritual and ethical, serious and profound, vivified by the warmth of true humanity and illumined by the splendor of the Christian faith which bids us seek in the juridical order an outward refraction of the social order willed by God, a luminous product of the spirit of man which is in turn the image of the spirit of God.

On this organic conception which alone is living, in which the noblest humanity and the most genuine Christian spirit flourish in harmony, there is marked the scripture thought, expounded by the great Aquinas: "Opus justitiae pax—the work of justice shall be peace," a thought which is as applicable to the internal as to the external aspect of social life. It admits of neither contrast nor alternative such as expressed in the disjunction, "love or right," but the fruitful synthesis, "love and right."

LIVING TOGETHER IN TRANQUILLITY

The second fundamental element of peace, toward which every human society tends almost instinctively, is tranquillity.

Tranquillity and feverish activity are not opposed but rather form a well-balanced pair for him who is inspired by the beauty and the urgency of the spiritual foundations of society, and of the nobility of its ideals.

To you young people who are wont to turn your backs on the past and to rely on the future for your aspirations and your hopes, we address ourselves with ardent love and fatherly anxiety. Enthusiasm and courage do not of themselves suffice, if they be not, as they should be, placed in the service of good and of a spotless cause.

It is vain to agitate, to weary yourselves, to bustle about without ever resting in God and his eternal law.

You must be inspired with the conviction that you are fighting for truth; that you are sacrificing in the cause of truth your own tastes and energies, wishes, and sacrifices; that you are fighting for the eternal laws of God, for the dignity of the human person, and for the attainment of its destiny.

When mature men and young men, while remaining always at anchor in the sea of the eternally active tranquillity of God, coordinate their differences of temperament and activity in a genuine Christian spirit, then if the propelling element is joined to the refraining element, the natural differences between the generations will never become dangerous and will even conduce vigorously to the enforcement of the eternal laws of God in the changing course of times and of conditions of life.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

In one field of social life, where for a whole century there was agitation and bitter conflict, there is today a calm, at least on the surface. We speak of the vast and evergrowing world of labor, of the immense army of workers, of breadwinners, and dependents.

If we consider the present with its wartime exigencies, as an admitted fact, then this calm may be called a necessary and reasonable demand; but if we look at the present situation in the light of justice, and with reference to a legitimately regulated labor movement, then the tranquillity will remain only apparent, until the scope of such a movement be attained.

Always moved by religious motives, the church has condemned the various forms of Marxist socialism, and she condemns them today, because it is her permanent right and duty to safeguard men from the currents of thought and influences that jeopardize their external salvation. But the church cannot ignore or overlook the fact that the worker, in his efforts to better his lot, is opposed by a machinery which is not only not in accordance with nature but is at variance with God's plan and with the purpose He had in creating the goods of earth.

In spite of the fact that the ways they followed were and are false and to be condemned, what man, and especially what priest or Christian, could remain deaf to the cries that rise from the depths and call for justice and a spirit of brotherly collaboration in a world ruled by a just God?

Such silence would be culpable and unjustifiable before God, and contrary to the inspired teaching of the Apostle, who, while he inculcates the need of resolution in the fight against error, also knows that we must be full of sympathy for those who err, and open-minded in our understanding of their aspirations, hopes, and motives.

When He blessed our first parents, God said: "Increase and multiply and fill the earth, and subdue it." And to the first father of a family he said later: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." The dignity of the human person, then, requires normally as a natural foundation of life the right to the use of the goods of the earth.

To this right corresponds the fundamental obligation to grant private ownership of property, if possible, to all. Positive legislation, regulating private ownership, may change and more or less restrict its use. But if legislation is to play a part in the pacification of the community, it must prevent the worker, who is or will be a father of a family, from being condemned to an economic dependence and slavery which is irreconcilable with his rights as a person.

Whether this slavery arises from the exploitation of private capital or from the power of the state, the result is the same. Indeed, under the pressure of a state which

dominates all the controls of the whole field of public and private life, even going into the realm of ideas and beliefs and of conscience, this lack of liberty can have the more serious consequences, as experience shows and proves.

FIVE FUNDAMENTAL POINTS FOR THE ORDER AND PACIFICATION OF HUMAN SOCIETY

Anyone who considers in the light of reason and of faith the foundations and the aims of social life, which we have traced in broad outline, and contemplates them in their purity and moral sublimity, and in their benefits in every sphere of life, cannot but be convinced of the powerful contribution to order and pacification, which efforts, directed toward great ideals and resolved to face difficulties, could present, or better, could restore to a world which is internally unhinged, when once they had thrown down the intellectual and juridical barriers, created by prejudice, errors, indifference, and by a long tradition of secularization of thought, feeling, action which succeeded in detaching and subtracting the earthly city from the light and force of the city of God.

The call of the moment is not lamentation but action; not lamentation over what has been, but reconstruction of what is to arise and must arise for the good of society. It is for the best and most distinguished members of the Christian family, filled with the enthusiasm of crusaders, to unite in the spirit of truth, justice and love to the call: "God wills it"—ready to serve, to sacrifice themselves, like the crusaders of old.

If the issue was then the liberation of the land hallowed by the life of the incarnate word of God, the call today is, if we may so express ourselves, to traverse the sea of errors of our day and to march on to free the "holy land" of the spirit, which is destined to sustain in its foundations the unchangeable norms and laws on which will arise a social construction of solid internal consistency.

With this lofty purpose before us, we turn from the crib of the Prince of Peace, confident that His grace is diffused in all hearts, to you, beloved children, who recognize and adore in Christ your Saviour; we turn to all those who are united with us at least by the bond of faith in God; we turn to all those who would be free of doubt and error, and who desire light and guidance; and we exhort you with suppliant, paternal insistence not only to realize fully the dreadful gravity of this hour, but also to meditate upon the vistas of good and supernatural benefit which it opens up, and to unite and collaborate toward the renewal of society in spirit and truth.

The essential aim of this necessary and holy crusade is that the star of peace, the star of Bethlehem, may shine out again over the whole of mankind in all its brilliant splendor and reassuring consolation as a pledge and augury of a better, more fruitful, and happier future. It is true that the road from night to full day will be long; but of decisive importance are the first steps on the path because the first five milestones bear chiseled the following maxims:

1. Dignity and rights of the human person: He who would have the star of peace shine out and stand guard over society should cooperate for his part in giving back to the human person the dignity given to it by God from the very beginning; he should oppose the excessive herding of men, as if they were a mass without a soul; their economic, social, political, intellectual, and moral inconsistency; their dearth of solid principles and strong convictions, their surfeit of instinctive sensible excitement, and their fickleness.

He should favor, by every lawful means, in every sphere of life, social institutions in which a full personal responsibility is assured and guaranteed both in the earthly and the eternal order of things.

He should uphold respect for the practical realization of the following fundamental personal rights: The right to maintain and develop one's corporeal, intellectual, and moral life and especially the right to religious formation and education; the right to the worship of God in private and public and to carry on religious works of charity; the right and principle to marry and to achieve the aim of married life, the right to conjugal and domestic society; the right to work as the indispensable means toward the maintenance of family life; the right to free choice of a state of life, and, hence, too, of the priesthood or religious life; the right to the use of material goods, in keeping with his duties and social limitations.

2. Defense of social unity and especially of the family: He who would have the star of peace shine out and stand over society should reject every form of materialism which sees in the people only a herd of individuals who, divided and without any internal cohesion, are considered as a mass to be lorded over and threatened arbitrarily; he should strive to understand society as an intrinsic unity, which has grown up and matured under the guidance of Providence, a unity which, within the bounds assigned to it and according to its own peculiar gifts, tends, with the collaboration of the various classes and professions, toward the eternal and ever new aims of culture and religion.

He should defend the indissolubility of matrimony; he should give to the family, that unique cell of the people, space, light, and air so that it may attend to its mission of perpetuating new life and of educating children in a spirit corresponding to its own true religious convictions, and that it may preserve, fortify, and reconstitute, according to its powers, its proper economic, spiritual, moral, and juridic unity.

He should take care that the material and spiritual advantages of the family be shared by the domestic servants; he should strive to secure for every family a dwelling where a materially and morally healthy family life may be seen in all its vigor and worth; he should take care that the place of work be not so separated from the home as to make the head of the family and educator of the children a virtual stranger to his own household. He should take care, above all, that the bond of trust and mutual help should be reestablished between the family and the public school, that bond which in other times gave such happy results, but which now has been replaced by mistrust where the school, influenced and controlled by the spirit of materialism, corrupts and destroys what the parents have instilled into the minds of the children.

3. Dignity and prerogatives of labor: He who would have the star of peace shine out and stand guard over society should give to work the place assigned to it by God from the beginning.

As an indispensable means toward gaining over the world that mastery which God wishes, for His glory, all work has an inherent dignity and at the same time a close connection with the perfection of the person; this is the noble dignity and privilege of work, which is not in any way cheapened by the fatigue and the burden, which have to be borne as the effect of original sin, in obedience and submission to the will of God.

Those who are familiar with the great encyclicals of our predecessors and our own previous messages know well that the church does not hesitate to draw the practical conclusions which are derived from the moral nobility of work, and to give them all the support of her authority.

These exigencies include, besides a just wage which covers the needs of the worker and his family, the conservation and perfection of a social order which will make possible an assured, even if modest, private property for all classes of society, which will promote higher education for the children of the working class who are especially endowed with intelligence and good will, will promote the care and the practice of the social spirit in one's immediate neighborhood, in the district, the province, the people, and the Nation, a spirit which by smoothing over friction arising from privilege or class interests, removes from the workers the sense of isolation through the assuring experience of a genuinely human, and fraternally Christian solidarity.

The progress and the extent of urgent reforms depend on the economic possibilities of single nations.

It is only through an intelligent and generous sharing of forces between the strong and the weak that it will be possible to effect a universal pacification in such wise as not to leave behind centers of conflagration and infection from which new disasters may come.

There are evident signs which go to show that, in the ferment of all the prejudices and feelings of hate, those inevitable but lamentable offspring of the war psychosis, there is still aflame in the peoples the consciousness of their intimate mutual dependence for good or for evil, nay, that this consciousness is more alive and active.

Is it not true that deep thinkers see ever more clearly in the renunciation of egoism and national isolation, the way to general salvation, ready as they are to demand of their peoples a heavy participation in the sacrifices necessary for social well-being in other peoples?

May this Christmas message of ours, addressed to all those who are animated by a good will and a generous heart, encourage and increase the legions of these social crusades in every nation. And may God deign to give to their peaceful cause the victory, of which their noble enterprise is worthy.

The rehabilitation of juridic order: He who would have the star of peace shine out and stand guard over social life should collaborate toward a complete rehabilitation of the juridical order. The juridic sense of today is often altered and overturned by the profession and the practice of a positivism and a utilitarianism which are subjected and bound to the service of determined groups, classes, and movements whose programs direct and determine the course of legislation and practices of the courts.

The cure for this situation becomes feasible when we awaken again the consciousness of a juridical order resting on the supreme dominion of God and safeguarded from all human whims; a consciousness of an order which stretches forth its arm in protection or punishment over the unforgettable rights of man and protects them against the attacks of every human power.

From the juridic order, as willed by God, flows man's inalienable right to juridical security, and by this very fact to a definite sphere of rights immune from all arbitrary attack.

The relations of man to man, of the individual to society, to authority, to civil duties, the relations of society and of authority to the individual should be placed on a firm juridic footing and be guarded, when the need arises, by the authority of the courts. This supposes:

Firstly. A tribunal and a judge who take their directions from a clearly formulated and defined right;

Secondly. Clear juridical norms which may not be overturned by unwarranted appeals to a supposed popular sentiment or by merely utilitarian considerations; and

Thirdly. The recognition of the principle that even the State and the functionaries and organizations dependent on it are obliged to repair and to withdraw measures which are harmful to the liberty, property, honor, progress, or health of the individuals.

5. Conception of the state according to the Christian spirit: He who would have the star of peace shine out and stand guard over human society should cooperate toward the

setting up of a state conception and practice founded on reasonable discipline, exalted kindliness, and a responsible Christian spirit. He should help to restore the state and its power to the service of human society, to the full recognition of the respect due to the human person and his efforts to attain his eternal destiny. He should apply and devote himself to dispelling the errors which aim at deviating the state and its authority from the path of morality, at severing them from the eminently ethical bond which links them to individual and social life, and at making them deny or in practice ignore their essential dependence on the will of the Creator. He should work for the recognition and diffusion of the truth which teaches, even in matters of this world, that the deepest meaning, the ultimate moral basis and the universal validity of "reigning" lies in "serving."

CONSIDERATIONS OF THE WORLD WAR AND THE RENOVATION OF SOCIETY

Beloved children, may God grant that while you listen to our voice your heart may be profoundly stirred and moved by the deeply felt seriousness, the loving solicitude, the unremitting insistence with which we drive home these thoughts, which are meant as an appeal to the conscience of the world, and a rallying cry to all those who are ready to ponder and weigh the grandeur of their mission and responsibility by the vastness of this universal disaster.

A great part of mankind, and, let us not shirk from saying it, not a few who call themselves Christians, have to some extent their share in the collective responsibility for the growth of error and for the harm and the lack of moral fiber in the society of today.

What is this world war, with all its attendant circumstances, whether they be remote or proximate causes, its progress and material, legal and moral effects—what is it but the crumbling process, not expected, perhaps, by the thoughtless, but seen and deprecated by those whose gaze penetrated into the realities of a social order which, behind a deceptive exterior or the mask of conventional shibboleths, hid its mortal weakness and its unbridled lust for gain and power?

That which in peacetime lay coiled up, broke loose at the outbreak of war in a sad succession of acts at variance with the human and Christian sense.

International agreements to make war less inhuman by confining it to the combatants, to regulate the procedure of occupation and the imprisonment of the conquered, remained in various places and a dead letter; and who can see the end of this progressive demoralization of the people; who can wish to watch impotently this disastrous progress?

Should they not rather, over the ruins of a social order which has given such tragic proof of its ineptitude as a factor for the good of the people, gather together the hearts of all those who are magnanimous and upright in the solemn vow not to rest until in all peoples and all nations of the earth, a vast legion shall be formed of those handfuls of men who, bent on bringing back society to its center of gravity which is the law of God, aspire to the service of the human person and of his common life ennobled in God?

Mankind owes that vow to the countless dead who lie buried on the field of battle. The sacrifice of their life in the fulfillment of their duty is a holocaust offered for a new and better social order.

Mankind owes that vow to the innumerable sorrowing host of mothers, widows, and orphans who have seen the light, the solace, and the support of their lives wrenched from them.

Mankind owes that vow to those numberless exiles whom the hurricane of war has torn from their native land and scattered in the land of the stranger, who can make their own the lament of the prophet: "Our inheritance is turned to aliens, our house to strangers."

Mankind owes that vow to the hundreds of thousands of persons who, without any fault on their part, sometimes only because of their nationality or race, have been consigned to death or to a slow decline.

Mankind owes that vow to the many thousands of noncombatants, women, children, sick, and aged from whom aerial warfare, whose horrors we have from the beginning frequently denounced, has, without discrimination or through inadequate precautions, taken life, goods, health, home, charitable refuge, or house of prayer.

Mankind owes that vow to the flood of tears and bitterness, to the accumulation of sorrow and suffering, emanating from the murderous ruin of the dreadful conflict, and crying to heaven to send down the Holy Spirit to liberate the world from the inundation of violence and terror.

And where could you with quieter assurance and trust, and with more efficacious faith, place this vow for the renewal of society than at the feet of the "Desired of All Nations" who lies before us in the crib with all the charm of His sweet humanity as a babe, but also in the dynamic attraction of His incipient mission as Redeemer?

Where could this noble and holy crusade for the cleansing and renewal of society have a more significant consecration or find a more potent inspiration than at Bethlehem, where the new Adam appears in the adorable mystery of the incarnation.

For it is at His fountains of truth and grace that mankind should find the water of life if it is not to perish in the desert of this life. "Of His fulness we all have received." His fulness of grace and truth flows as freely today as it has for 20 centuries on the world.

His light can overcome the darkness, the rays of His love can conquer the icy egoism which holds so many back from becoming great and conspicuous in their higher life.

To you, crusader volunteers of a distinguished new society, lift up the new alarm of moral and Christian rebirth, declare war on the darkness which comes from deserting God, on the coldness that comes from strife between brothers.

It is a fight for the human race that is gravely ill and must be healed in the name of conscience ennobled by Christianity.

May our blessing and paternal good wishes and encouragement go with your generous enterprise, and may they remain with all those who do not shirk hard sacrifices—those weapons which are more potent than any steel to combat the evil from which society suffers.

Over your crusade for a social, human and Christian ideal may there shine out as a consolation and an inspiration the star that stands over the grotto of Bethlehem, the first and the perennial star of the Christian era.

From the sign of it every faithful heart drew, draws and ever will draw strength: "If armies in camp should stand against me, my heart shall not fear."

Where that star shines, there is Christ. "With Him for leader we shall not wander; through Him let us go to Him, that with the Child that is born today we may rejoice forever."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the words of His Holiness will be heeded by the world at war and that the new society which will arise after the war will be built on the principles of justice, unity and the brotherhood of man.

Freetown, Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I append hereto a poem composed by Col. Floyd E. Evans, United States Army. Colonel Evans, who fought in the last war in the skies over France, for many years was director of the Department of Aeronautics of the State of Michigan. He organized the original air unit of the Michigan National Guard, serving as its commanding officer for some time and then becoming air officer of the National Guard division of which the Michigan National Guard was a unit. He is at present on duty in Freetown, Sierra Leone, Africa, being assigned to the Royal Air Force as a military intelligence officer. Closely associated with him is Lt. Comdr. Jack McFall, United States Navy, who, many of our Members will pleasantly recall, served as clerk of the Appropriations Committee of this House.

Colonel Evans composed this little poem to be read at a New Year's party being sponsored by himself, McFall, and United States consular agent, Chris Neilsen. I think you will find it of factual interest not only because of the many wild stories we hear about the conditions in Africa, as exemplified by the predictions of the Atlantic skipper, but also it will be of interest as setting forth the true spirit of comradery existing between the officers of our armed forces and our allies.

FREETOWN ON THE COAST OF SIERRA LEONE

Oh, they shipped me on to Freetown on the coast of Sierra Leone,
For no other possible reason than my earthly sins to atone.
Now this city from a distance is a beauty to behold
With its harbor, trees, and mountains, with its structures clear and bold.
As you pass into this harbor and float gently past the boom,
You get a closer picture of the famous White Man's Tomb.
You're then told by the skippper he ain't envious of your post—
He's discharged too many a laddie for the last time on this coast.
He says "That malaria will get you, and you fall to the dysentery,
Blackwater fever, eczema, or even water on the knee.
The bugs they'll bite by day and night,
Scorpions will give you constant fright.
The snakes'll rattle and they'll hiss,
And lions and tigers that seldom miss.
Hyenas and leopards by the fleet,
Who dearly relish white man's meat.
Crocks and 'gators are in the bay,
Ready to eat your appendages away.
Boa constrictors are here by the score,
They hug you once, then there ain't no more.
Baboons with a grin and full of fun
Will tear you apart 'fore your work's begun.
There's scores and scores of driver ants

Who'll eat you up without removing your pants.
The jiggers, too, have a terrible bite,
A few nibbles from them and you'll never be right."
Now, this is the story you get from the skipper,
And you go ashore with mind blank and bitter.
You've sailed far and long and tried to be brave,
You're finally landed at the White Man's Grave.
On shore you are met by an amiable guy,
Who surely doesn't look like he's come here to die.
"Chris Neilsen's the name," he says with a grin,
"I've come here to greet you and welcome you in."
He's tall, blond, and healthy, and full of good cheer.
You'd swear by the Bible he ain't been here a year.
"Sixteen years on the coast," he says with a smile,
From Lagos to Bathurst, and it's many a mile.
Now, Freetown to me is a mighty fine place
In spite of that skipper and its alleged disgrace.
There's health, vim, and vigor, and a fine place to swim,
This malaria stuff is only a whim.
Just five grains of quinine and much very good whisky,
You'll live long and happily and always be frisky.
Now take it from me—but I won't tell you the best
Till you've come and had a drink at Refugees' Rest.
"I'm consular agent," he says as we dine,
"And representative, too, of a U. S. boat line.
My neighbor above—his name is McFall,
An observer by title, but I'll not tell you all.
He's tall and he's handsome and a very swell guy,
We'll give him a ring and have him drop by."
"It's four months last Tuesday that I've been here," says Jack,
"And I like it much better when I'm flat on my back.
I've been bitten by 'skeeters and I've broken a leg,
And been in every hospital I can loan, hire, or beg.
I've had boils and large blisters and bedbug bites too,
They've stuck me with everything. I hope that they're through."
"Luck to you, friend," says Mac with a shrug,
"Keep hitting the quinine; keep away from the bug."
There's romance and art in this historical place,
There's sisters and nurses—ah, heavenly grace!
There's an admiral named Pegram, a swell guy to know.
And a general named Woolner, who runs well the land show.
Cole-Hamilton is a dandy, and an admiral too,
Piloting the R. A. F. better'n most others could do.
And high up on the hill behind the big gun
The big shot of all—Sir Hubert Stevenson.
Now Hubert, my friend, is another swell person;
He governs this place with love and devotion.
He's commander in chief and speaks for the Crown;
A more popular person will never be found.
Now there's English and Welsh and Irish a few,
There are Scotsmen and Aussies and New Zealanders, too.
There's South Africans, Canadians, and if further you seek,
You'll find Indians, Egyptians, and even a Greek.
The Free French are courteous, always cheerful, never chagrined.
A tough road they've had, but most determined to win.
They'll wine you and dine you and show you much fun;
Your hitch will be over 'fore it's hardly begun.
Now let's drink to our Allies, their spirits to cheer
And to all here assembled—a Happy New Year.

New Congress Must Halt Bureaucratic Waste and Bungling and Restore Confidence in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I am certain every Member assembling here for this new Congress feels the solemnity of the obligation resting upon us to do all within our power to expedite the efficient prosecution of the war.

An early and complete victory, won with the sacrifice of a minimum of lives, is the goal of all, regardless of party. I know that the House approaches its task in that spirit.

That does not mean that there will not be differences of opinion. It does not mean that there will be unanimous acceptance of everything that is proposed. It does not mean that we will accept blindly and without debate whatever ideas and projects may be placed before us.

But it does mean, I believe, a minimum of acrid debate and a total absence of criticism for the sake of criticism. It does mean, I believe, a total absence of partisan and personal feeling in the consideration of the momentous problems which confront us.

This new Congress will serve no useful purpose if it degenerates into a political debating society, with its Members more impressed by what may happen at the polls two years from now than they are with what is currently happening on the battlefields of the world and what is happening, as a result, in our domestic affairs.

If ever in our history as a Nation there were a time when individual Members and the Congress as a whole must rise to the full level of statesmanship, this is the time. And there is no doubt that our Members assemble today with that thought in mind.

It is an encouraging sign that there is no fundamental difference among the Members as to the necessity of winning this war as quickly and as efficiently and as economically as it can be won. Any differences as to that died on the day of Pearl Harbor and they were buried in the last election.

In order to do our part in the winning of the war it is essential that the Congress exercise fully the rights and obligations imposed upon it by the Constitution and by the traditions of our history.

We cannot be blind to the unrest and discontent that exists among our people today. That unrest and discontent does not arise from the manner in which our uniformed forces are conducting themselves on the battlefields and on the seas and in the skies of the world.

It arises from a lack of confidence in the manner in which our domestic affairs are being conducted.

It is the obligation of this Congress to restore that confidence, and the way to restore it is to improve the administration of our affairs. The bungling, waste, and bureaucratic whims which have marked and marred many of the Government's domestic activities is the concern of this House. If we do not do our full duty in correcting the errors which have been made and which are continuing to be made, I fear, as do the people of my district, for the future of our country.

It is a war obligation which we will meet when we tackle the domestic problems plaguing our people. It is just as much a war obligation as is the proper supplying of our armed forces wherever they may be.

Unless the confidence of our people at home in their Government is restored, the discontent will become so great that it will be impossible to give to our armed forces the tremendous volume of support which they must have if they are to go on to the victory which they are so valiantly pursuing.

I realize that the difficulties which our domestic economy is bound to encounter under the impact of war cannot be made easy. But that is no reason why they should be made unnecessarily hard.

Yet that is what our people, many of them, believe is being done.

Either some of the hardships must be removed by this Congress or there must be an effective method found of educating the public to the necessities of the situation.

If these things that the public is undergoing are necessary, then the public must be told frankly and freely why they are necessary. They cannot be convinced that they are necessary in the United States simply because they are necessary in some other country where vastly different conditions prevail.

I hope and I believe that this Congress can go into this problem of restoring public confidence in the Government in a thorough manner and without the name calling and aspersions that so often mar attempts to get at the root of things.

New Year's Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on New Year's Day:

Men and women of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, I take this opportunity to extend my very best wishes to you for a most successful, victorious New Year. Upon one point, I am sure we are all in agreement, that the year 1943 has a brighter, surer outlook for America and her allies than had the beginning of the year we are leaving behind.

Although I am proud and happy to be starting upon my third term as your Representative in Congress, I cannot escape the feeling of a tremendous responsibility which you people have placed on my shoulders as the Seventy-eighth Congress convenes. For while it is the duty of millions of our splendid American manhood to conquer the dictators and overlords on our far-flung battlefronts all over the globe, it is likewise incumbent upon the American Congress to guarantee a balance of power for the people of the United States here at home. Unless the Congress is vigilant on behalf of the people who elected its Members, the Nation may not always be protected by its magnificent Constitution and the Bill of Rights which have kept our citizens free in the midst of a world bent down by tyranny and oppression.

It is safe to say, I am sure, that the year 1943 will see the course of this ghastly war turn definitely in favor of the Allied cause. For 2½ years, American industry and labor have worked as never before to turn out the grim weapons of war which our armed forces must have to win. The results of this gigantic effort are already beginning to show. A steel ring of destiny is forming around the Axis countries of Europe and even now is tightening as the United Nations advance on many fronts. Another steel ring is being forged in the Pacific where the treacherous Japanese seem to have reached an end to their ability to saturate the peaceful islands and nations they have conquered. The British and MacArthur's men have held them at bay until enough equipment and supplies could be brought to turn their advance to a rout.

Yes; with the triumphant events that have transpired during the latter part of 1942, ultimate victory seems certain and the road to victory seems shorter.

Yet before we will have arrived at the end of our hard journey the realization of countless unpleasant and dire happenings will make our road difficult indeed. The American people have only begun to sacrifice. Their sons have only begun to fight. Yet their unity and determination to win the war are glorious to see. Their undying patriotism deserves the admiration of the whole world.

Your Government in Washington owes it to you to guarantee the effectiveness of the patriotic and sincere effort which you are putting into this fight. By that I mean you folks back home should not be shackled down and hindered by endless red tape, by complex regulations, or by confusing orders. Your hands and hearts and minds must be free to do the one job all of us are dedicated to accomplish—to win the war. You must not be irritated and annoyed by unnecessary orders from an army of overseers. A free people dedicated to wage war will do so thoroughly and completely by their own loyal patriotism. I cannot condone forcing them to accept the very regimentation which they are striving against.

Of course, all of us are agreed that drastic steps have had to be taken on the home front which never before were dreamed necessary. Whoever thought a year ago that pleasure driving and excessive use of the American automobile would now be at an end? Yet we are learning to accept these inconveniences as incumbent upon winning the war. Who ever believed a year ago that practically all foods would be rationed in the near future? Yet in order to facilitate the tremendous task which those in authority have taken upon themselves of meeting lend-lease orders, of feeding the armed forces, and of preparing for anticipated shortages of foodstuffs, the American people have accepted the rationing of their daily diet as something inevitable. You don't like it; I don't like it. Yet we are agreed this equitable division of our groceries and edibles is wise and farsighted if it is carried out on a fair, sensible basis. At no time should our people go hungry as long as there is available food produced within our borders.

It is my opinion that American industry has reached its stride. The millions of patriots laboring in the factories and plants of this great land are backing up the Army and Navy with everything they need in ever-increasing numbers. The year 1943 will see their output of planes and tanks and guns stepped up to proportions never before imagined by the rest of the world. I believe American labor is working hand in hand with American industry for a common purpose in a manner which we all applaud.

A few months ago the industrial labor outlook was not one bit encouraging. We had sustained damaging strife in defense plants all over the country. There were misunderstandings between the Government, the entrepreneur, and the workingman. Now, however, this situation has vastly improved. I believe that present relationships, arrangements, and orders are working to the advantage of everyone in the war-production set-up. I believe that if the Government had exercised the same care, the same diplomacy, and the desire for cooperation in connection with agriculture and other pursuits that it has with the American labor situation, we would not now be faced with the serious problems which exist on the home front.

Probably the most dislocated part of all our national economy is agriculture. There is no point in trying to hide the time and actual picture of the farmer's unhappy plight. At the same time the prices he receives for his own production have been frozen, the prices he must pay for consumers' goods, farm machinery, and certain of feeds for his stock have risen unheeded in most instances. His older sons have been drafted in spite of the will of Congress to do otherwise. The farmer himself, discouraged with his inability to do several men's work by himself, and his wife's help, has often abandoned his farm and entered the nearest defense plant to earn a more lucrative and less precarious living. Add to all this the growing list of regulations and red tape he must go through in order to purchase necessary machinery, report his simple inventories, and be in constant dread of violating bureaucratic dictation and you do not see a cheerful outlook for the American farmer for 1943.

I believe the new Congress owes it to the people it represents to give the farmer a real break. This can be done by demanding of those with delegated authority to proceed along the principle that the best government is the government which has the fewest laws to enforce. We are asking our farmers to produce enough to feed ourselves, our armed forces, and our allies. The farmers are only too anxious to do this. Let's back them up by insisting that as little hampering and hindering regulation be placed upon them as possible. Let's make it so they can produce and keep on producing in accordance with the natural law of supply and demand. We can win the war this way.

Thus, with industry and labor and the American farmer all pulling together, and guided, not driven, by reasonable intelligent supervision from the Nation's Capital, 1943 may even prove to be the final and decisive one in this terrible struggle.

Lastly, as your Representative in Washington, I want to see everything possible done for the benefit of the men in service, and for the well-being of their wives, children, and parents at home. Shortly after the new Congress opens I plan to reintroduce the Hall free-furlough transportation bill, which will assure every soldier and sailor, regardless of the smallness of his income, the opportunity to ride home without cost when he has been granted a furlough.

I believe the new Congress owes it to the men at the front to study the present inadequacies of the dependency allotment program and make such improvement and increases for dependent parents and children as is possible to accomplish.

To those mothers and fathers, wives and dependents of our boys who are so gallantly fighting all over the world, I will say at this time: Please feel free to call on your Congressman if any problem arises which you may have. I may be able to help you to locate your boy; I will be glad to assist you in getting your allotment money. Perhaps there is some unfortunate family who does not know how to make application for dependency money which they should be receiving. To all of you I say, get in touch with me, I will help you.

Statement and Action Program Presented to the Republican Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 5, 1943, with the approval of and by direction of the Republican delegation of Illinois, I presented the following statement and action program to the Republican Conference:

I share the felicity which has been expressed here today as we survey the increased strength of our party in the 78th Congress.

I recall those disconcerting days when there were but 89 Republican Members in this body. It dropped from 220 in 1931 to 89 in 1937 and has since risen to 208 in the 78th Congress in 1943. I remember also that the Illinois Republican delegation consisted of but 6 Members; today we rejoice in the fact that we have 19 to participate in the deliberations of this body and lend vote and voice to a program of constructive national good.

Lord Stanley once observed that "the duty of an opposition was very simple—it was to oppose everything and propose nothing." We believe however that on November 3rd 1942, we were mandated to purposeful action and that there must be a blueprint for such action.

Republican strength in the 78th Congress by popular decree brings opportunity and responsibility.

The people expect action with objective and design.

Our first task is victory.

Our second task is peace—a people's peace. The dogs of war will not again be so easily unleashed if the people have a voice in the peace.

In a world where legislative power is in eclipse or retreat, we must sit in judgment on ourselves and restore legislative power and prestige by overhauling our methods and techniques to make them effective.

There must be unrelenting war on waste.

What shall it profit us to achieve freedom for all the world and lose it at home.

We need more freedom, not less.

Labor is entitled to freedom from oppressive leaders; farmers are entitled to freedom from Federal promotion and pressure; business is entitled to freedom from threats; little business is entitled to live; the middle class is entitled to freedom from paternalism.

Between the extremes of the turgid twenties, the tempestuous thirties, and the furious forties, there is a middle ground of sense and sanity where we can take our stand in seeking complete victory, lasting peace, balanced government, improved public service, reduction of waste, preparation for post-war problems, and a full partnership between people and government.

That middle course suggests a program of action which embraces the following proposals:

*1. A unified congressional high command to better serve the war effort.

*2. A joint committee aided by a technical staff to study peace proposals, that peace makers might not become prisoners of public opinion.

*3. A staff of congressional commandos to explore Government and aid in a scientific attack on waste, overstaffing, and nonessential functions.

*4. Bold action on the economy front by liquidating nonessential agencies such as the Farm Security and National Youth Administrations.

*5. A joint committee equipped with a staff of experts to study post-war reconstruction to avoid superboondoggling.

6. Elimination of subsidies as instruments of complete economic control and the restoration of free markets.

7. Curtailment of camouflage on the home front by removing the defense label from activities not essential to the victory effort.

8. Supervision of powers delegated by Congress by means of a joint committee to cooperate with executive agencies and review the formulation and administration of rules and regulations.

9. Protection of the public through judicial review of administrative decisions.

10. Complete and immediate review of our entire tax system at Federal, State, and local levels and prompt consideration of a pay-as-you-earn revenue program.

11. A Baruch-type committee to study and recommend further reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

12. A frank statement of war aims in terms which people of the United States and the world will understand.

13. Rationing of war contracts to aid small business.

14. Abolition of all regional organizations for war and nonwar agencies to eliminate waste, lost motion, and unnecessary personnel.

15. Complete revision of patent laws and procedures for full utilization of American genius and enterprise in the post-war period.

16. Overhauling the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to make it an effective, and democratic adjustment agency for agriculture by eliminating Federal domination and promotion, the elimination of promotional literature and pressure procedures, elimination of unnecessary regional organization and personnel, limitation of per diem services of county and community committeemen, and restoration of farm freedoms.

17. Establishment of a Bureau of Negotiation as an independent agency under the immediate direction of Congress for the renegotiation of war contracts.

*18. Repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934.

*19. Creation of a Committee on Congressional Reorganization.

20. A review of all labor legislation and agencies administering such legislation together with a survey of the manpower problem for more effective integration in the victory effort.

*Denotes bills which have been prepared and are ready for introduction by Representative EVERETT M. DIRKSEN.

Work of the Seventy-seventh Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over station KRMD, Shreveport, La., on December 30, 1942:

Only a few days ago, the Seventy-seventh Congress came to an end in the city of Washington, and its Members dispersed to their homes in all parts of the Nation. This Congress had been in continuous session longer than any other Congress in the entire history of this Republic, and this adjournment marked the end of almost 4 years of continuous session. When the history of the Seventy-seventh Congress is written, it will be remembered as one which courageously faced the Herculean task of preparing a great people to face the hardest war in all history. It will likewise be remembered as the Congress which faced the kaleidoscopic task of converting a peace-loving people into the well organized, compact, all-out striking force of total war.

For, my friends, it was at the very midpoint of the session of the Seventy-seventh Congress that the high crime of the age was committed against our people in the unprovoked and dastardly attack of the Japs at Pearl Harbor. Congress promptly recognized a state of war to exist and with equal promptness proceeded about the business of placing our Nation on a war footing. A self-respecting and liberty-loving people could do no less.

Our first act was to pass a resolution pledging the entire resources of the Nation to the winning of the war. The Congress then proceeded to take up, one after another, the vital pieces of legislation which were needed to prosecute the war. It made mistakes; yes. Any Congress or any other body of men faced with a program as varied and as difficult as that which faced the Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress would make mistakes; but my friends, they were mistakes of the hand and not the heart.

As the smoke of the bursting Jap bombs lifted from a wrecked navy at Pearl Harbor and from a blackened city at Honolulu, our people looked about to find out just where we were and what we had on hand in the way of defenses. We found that Congress had, with rare foresight, developed in time of peace an army of 1,800,000 men, well trained and fully equipped men. It found your Congress had also built a navy which in spite of the staggering losses at Pearl Harbor, the full import of which was not realized until the last few weeks, was feared by Japan and Germany. Our Air Corps, which in 1937 possessed only 11,400 men, your Congress had expanded with thousands upon thousands of our American boys trained as pilots in the Civil Aeronautics Administration and Army pilot-training schools throughout the Nation. They were ready, waiting, and eager to defend this Nation; and this is the real reason no Jap army of invasion was ever sent or contemplated sent to our continental shores.

In the 12 months which have passed since that fatal December 7 day, the Seventy-seventh Congress has expanded our armies and rebuilt our navies. Only the other day, you will recall the Secretary of the Navy made the statement that we had almost fully repaired our Pearl Harbor ship losses and that our Navy was far stronger today than it had ever been before. We have expanded our Army until by the end of 1943 it will have reached the goal of 7,500,000 men in contrast with the pitiful number of 168,000 which we had when I went to Washington to represent you in Congress. Our Air Corps alone has passed the 1,000,000 mark and is planned to be expanded to 2,000,000 men by the end of 1943. Our armed forces—Army, Navy, Marine, and Coast Guards—will have passed the figure of 10,000,000 men in 1943.

I can recall during the course of the year a bitter controversy arose as to the relative merits of our aircraft with those of the Japs and the Germans. As we look back on this controversy some of us now smile to think how much we were worked up over this matter. A committee of which I am a member—the aviation committee of the Military Affairs—was called upon to make a thorough probe of this matter and to issue a report to allay the fears of our people. In this report we showed, in fact, our planes had on the average—and this was during the month of September of this year—knocked down seven Jap planes in the Pacific to one of our own brought down, and for the entire war the box score in our report proved that the enemy on all fronts was losing two and one-half planes to our one plane lost. This report, which speaks for itself, has set the public mind at rest and has shown that our mechanics and our workmen in America are the equal and even superior to those of any other nation in the world, and that our combat planes can hold their own against any foe.

One of the real struggles of the Seventy-seventh Congress was to pass legislation to put the Nation's industries on a war footing, so that they could manufacture equipment in huge quantities for our armies and our navies. We are now producing at the rate of almost 50,000 planes a year and at the rate of thousands upon thousands of tanks, guns, and shells. In fact, our production of bullets is counted in terms of billions rather than in terms of millions as we formerly counted.

To build the factories and make the equipment necessary to win the war costs money and this Congress was presented with the problem of appropriating unheard of sums for the prosecution of the war and then to provide for raising these sums by taxation. We have appropriated in bill after bill since December 7, 1941, sums totaling almost $100,000,000,000. Since the beginning of our preparations for the defense of the Nation, we have appropriated sums exceeding two hundred and twenty billions of dollars—an astronomical sum so large that it dwarfs the human imagination.

A year ago, we may have had, my friends, some misgivings. Our preparedness program had been completed. Our war program had not yet started. The future lay ahead, mysterious and unrevealing; and we who had made a study of the situation knew the might and the fury of the Axis forces. Today, our armies and our navies on every field of battle and in every sea are on the offensive. The full rising might of our arms is beginning to tell. In the Far East, in New Guinea and the Solomon Islands, our forces are slowly pushing the Japs from their bases into the sea. In Russia, the worst that the Germans were able to hurl against our allies has been received and an unconquered and heroic people are still fighting the Nazis. The second front which was opened in north Africa is being pushed with all possible vigor and we confidently look forward to the time when the Axis will have been pushed completely out of Africa. A long, bitter war still

lies ahead; but this, in the words of Churchill, is "the end of the beginning." In other words, we have done the ground work for ultimate victory; and it is on these foundations that we will build during the next 12 months, as we continue to battle the Axis on every front.

Turning now to the internal programs, the Congress which has just passed into history has been faced with many baffling problems. The one great danger which everyone dreads and for the solution of which almost everyone had a remedy is that of inflation. This alone has been the cause of much worry and considerable legislation. The Committee on Military Affairs of which I am a member has made a careful study of the excessive profits which some industries were making out of the industrial war program. I had early adopted the slogan of the American Legion that "no man should be permitted to profit on the blood or tears of his fellowman." With this in mind, some of us started to work to develop a renegotiation provision for all war contracts. A contract with the renegotiation stipulation is now being extensively used by both the Army and the Navy.

I was glad to learn last week that the Secretary of War had calculated, the War Department has recovered for the taxpayers of America, a sum of a little less than $1,000,000,000 in moneys which were excess profits and which certain firms had to kick back into the Treasury to be further used in the prosecution of the war. I am further informed in 7 months of operations of this type of contract, all departments using this renegotiation stipulation in their contracts have saved to our people in excess of $3,000,000,000 in moneys which would have been otherwise termed unconscionable profits to war industry.

The last few months have shown many of us that little business is being smothered under the avalanche of too many questionnaires and too much red tape. It has shown many of us that incompetency and inefficiency too often prevail in governmental departments rapidly thrown together during times of stress and of war. Too many employees on the Government pay roll in Washington are like too many cooks that spoil the broth. We will get along better with fewer employees and more efficiency and competence in those who remain in the Government bureaus throughout the Nation, especially in Washington. It was a congressional investigating committee, headed by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, which recently reported to the country that our Government could be run with one-third fewer employees. I am glad to report the weeding-out process in Washington has already begun, and I believe if continued, more efficiency will develop in many of our agencies of Government.

To eliminate some of the numerous questionnaires and some of the red tape which vexes our people and impairs the efficiency of our war effort, only 2 weeks ago Congress passed a bill to abolish all useless questionnaires and to require the Bureau of the Budget to pass upon each printed form to be sent out to the Nation before it can be used.

Little business is facing the fight of its existence within the next 12 months. It faces the rationing of materials, the critical shortages of even the ordinary supplies of the day, the loss of a normal supply of labor, and the thousands and one rules and regulations which the fortunes of war have thrown about our society. Many of the rules and regulations are necessary; and to those which are needed and necessary to win the war, our people made no complaint. If we are to save our little grocery man and our little businessman from extinction in America, we must be prepared to render aid to him in this emergency; and I am one who believes that the little cross-road general merchandise store and the little corner grocery store has an indispensable place in our society. I believe that the little industry and the little factory are needed to win this war as well as the large mail-order store and the tremendous factory employing thousands upon thousands of workmen. I am supporting with active effort the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives in its effort to preserve our small business institutions for necessary use during the war and for the period of peace following its close.

We, your Representatives in Washington, feel that the time of large-scale additional employment in Washington in the war effort is largely passed. We look forward to the months ahead as a time of consolidating the agencies already flushed with a mushroom growth, weeding out the inefficiencies in these agencies and eliminating red tape and unnecessary forms and questionnaires.

In conclusion, let me say that one phase of the work of the Seventy-seventh Congress has interested me very much. It is the effort of your Congress to relieve distress among the population, which distress is the direct outgrowth of taking men into the armed service. One bill which in my opinion is a landmark in legislation is the serviceman's allotment bill. By means of this law the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I am a member, sought to eliminate hardship and want by providing Government payments to dependents of those who enter the armed service. The War Department makes a direct contribution to these dependents ranging from $10 per month to over $150 per month in certain cases, depending upon the facts in each individual case.

The other law to which I refer is the Sailors' and Soldiers' Civil Relief Act, which has been the subject of study by the Canadian and other governments. This law provides generally that no one shall use our courts to take advantage of or to deprive our men in service of any property or rights during their absence while defending the Nation.

Both of these laws are of the type which any Congress might well be proud. They are based upon the humanitarian principles of justice and fair play. They are based upon the idea of relieving the mind of the soldier and the sailor from worry as he faces the hostile gun and the lethal bullet, and of removing want and misery from the ranks of the loved ones he leaves at home.

My friends, we stand on the threshold of the new year. We gaze steadfastly into the future—cloudy and unrevealing. Louisianans have courage in the present and have confidence in our future. We have a big job to do, and we are prepared to see it through. Somewhere in the future—we know not just where, but we fervently hope perhaps during 1943 or 1944—the bright sun will break through the clouds of an embattled world, and in the words of the poet, Tennyson:

"The war drums throb no longer;
And the battle flags are furled,
In the parliament of man,
The federation of the world."

Until this time we will carry on.

Mr. Six-Foot-Six Goes to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to welcome as one of the new Members in our distinguished body the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. LOWELL STOCKMAN, who was sworn in today as the Representative in Congress from the Second Oregon District. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] is a native Oregonian, has spent all of his life in our State, and comes to the Congress well equipped to represent our State in the House of Representatives. A short article appeared in the Sunday Oregonian in its issue of December 20, 1942, giving some of the background, education, and qualifications of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN], which article I include as a part of my remarks:

MR. SIX-FOOT-SIX GOES TO WASHINGTON—IN A CITY OF POMPOUS FIGURES OREGON'S BIG LOWELL STOCKMAN WILL BE A REFRESHING CHANGE—NEW CONGRESSMAN, OF COURSE, WILL BE VICTIM OF GAGS ABOUT "MAN THE CAPITAL LOOKS UP TO"

(By Melvin Arnold)

The West has never experienced a shortage of colorful, and even bizarre, political figures. But it has just produced one of the most picturesque of them all.

He's the author of the greeting that has been heard repeatedly on every main street in eastern Oregon: "I'm LOWELL STOCKMAN, of Pendleton."

This week-end LOWELL STOCKMAN is arriving in Washington, D. C., with his schoolteacher wife and their three children. Next month he will be escorted into the hall of the House of Representatives and there take his place at a desk on the Republican side of the aisle.

Congressmen who survived the November upsets will identify him as "the man who beat Walter Pierce"—for in Washington, as well as in Oregon, a legend of invincibility had been built up around Mr. Pierce, the eloquent spokesman for "the land of white-faced cattle," as he described it.

And it is a safe bet that Washington will not be able to resist the temptation to make puns about "the biggest man in Congress" and about "the man all Washington looks up to."

These will be variations of the chestnuts that have long made the rounds of his home State, inspired by the six-feet-six height and 270-pound heft, and the stevedore's muscular development of this Paul Bunyan of Oregon politics.

It's another safe bet that LOWELL STOCKMAN will be as welcome a political newcomer back in Washington as he was to the voters of Oregon's Second Congressional District. In a city that has more than its quota of pompous would-be statesmen, breast-beating world-savers and leather-lunged appealers to prejudices, LOWELL STOCKMAN should prove a refreshing addition.

CAPITOL WON'T ECHO WITH SOUND OF STOCKMAN'S VOICE

The even-tempered Umatilla rancher scarcely ever raises his voice in private circles; he's not the type to make the Washington welkin ring. Fellow legislators can expect to wait a long time before they hear the Oregonian speak at all. LOWELL STOCKMAN is not going back to Washington to listen to the sound of his voice.

Neither is he going to ride any legislative hobbies, except governmental economy. But he isn't rushing back with a pocket full of Budget-slashing measures. He has a definite conviction that "there's too much bureaucracy, and I've seen plenty evidence of that right in eastern Oregon."

STOCKMAN doesn't fit into the pattern of a "party man." He's not an Old Guard Republican; he's not a new dealer. His public admission that he doesn't try to vote a straight party ticket is enough to make an

old-line politician furious. Back in Washington the party whip can't count on eastern Oregon's pride swinging behind any particular legislation just because it's "party policy."

In fact, Washington will find it difficult to pigeonhole this stranger from Oregon. LOWELL STOCKMAN himself doesn't tend to be self-analytical, but the other day he was caught in an introspective mood. Here is STOCKMAN on STOCKMAN:

"It has never been my forte to take the long look. I just work my way through. As Congressman, I don't have any fancy schemes up my sleeve for saving the world. I'm just going to tackle things one at a time as they come up."

In going to Congress, STOCKMAN leaves the farm 23 miles north of Pendleton on which he was born—on April 12, 1901. It was a wheat ranch settled 30 years earlier by his parents, who came to Oregon from the Middle West. When son Lowell was 2 the elder Stockmans decided to retire and moved to town.

CAREER AS FARMER CHOSEN WHEN HE WAS BOY

Almost from cradle days, STOCKMAN has known his own mind. "When I was 8," he recalls, "I made up my mind I was going to Oregon Agricultural College; that I was going to get my degree in agriculture, and that I was going back to live on the family ranch. One of my half brothers had been to the university and frequently argued with me about going to his school and learning a profession. But my mind was set."

After majoring in agriculture in the Pendleton High School, Lowell entered the college of his choosing at the age of 17. He was the butt of much twitting—because he towered to his present height, but was exactly 105 pounds lighter than he is today. Life magazine embarrassed the Congressman slightly a few weeks ago by reporting STOCKMAN'S alleged prowess as a football player at Oregon State College. "But there was no room for a human beanpole on the varsity," he explains.

In college the Pendletonian was "just one of the boys," graduating with an average grade of 82 percent and without distinguishing himself in any field. His lowest grades were in typing and French—"I studied a whole term and all I learned was how to say 's'il vous plait.'"

Each summer the lanky student worked as a farm hand, accumulating $300 or $400 toward his schooling. In his junior year at Corvallis he cut loose with a model T roadster, and began rating "two or three dates every week-end."

The new legislator chuckles when he recalls: "I got along without studying by working on the psychology of each professor. I paid strict attention in class, and then about once a week, I'd go up and say, 'Prof, I don't quite agree with you on that last point,' or 'Prof, I want to be sure to get your line of reasoning straight.' Each professor would then figure I was concentrating on his subject and help me over the bumps."

By curious coincidence, STOCKMAN, while a schoolboy, encountered HARRIS ELLSWORTH, who later was to become a Roseburg newspaperman and was to win an election as Congressman from Oregon's new fourth district on the same day as STOCKMAN'S victory. Young Lowell went to Eugene to spend junior week end, and by chance was assigned to room with ELLSWORTH in the Kappa Sigma house. The two have been close friends ever since.

When Lowell was handed the State college sheepskin that he had set out at the age of 8 to get, he promptly returned to Pendleton. On a shoestring basis, the graduate floated a bank loan of several thousands and bought the equipment of a cousin, Carl Engdahl—a State legislator—who was renting the ranch from the elder Stockmans.

The first year the earnest, ambitious farmer "batched it," doing his own cooking and all the plowing and summer fallowing on the 480-acre dry-farm ranch. The second year he leased 500 acres adjoining and hired a man and wife to help. "I felt like a big shot," he admits.

After another year, "I married mamma." She was Dorcas Conklin, a Monmouth girl who had graduated from the University of Oregon in physical education and was teaching in the Pendleton High School.

The energetic youth kept expanding every year, buying up the outfits—horses, mules, combines, drills and other facilities—of other farmers. He was forward-looking and pioneered bulking of wheat in his district, building the first bulk elevator on a railroad in the locality. This was a great advance over sacking of wheat, and was soon adopted throughout the region.

"I happened to start farming at the tail end of the old era," STOCKMAN points out. "The first 6 years I used wagons and horses and mules, with 27 head of horses on a combine. Then we switched to trucks and tractors. The first year I vitrioled the seed wheat for smut; the second year, the vastly superior copper carbonate treatment came in—a major landmark in wheat growing."

The Stockmans have had their share of economic trials. For example, there was the depression year of 1941. All spring and summer Lowell worked on a day-and-night schedule and brought in a crop with the help of only one hired man. Autumn came, and "wheat was going begging at two-bits a bushel." The Stockmans sold what they could and finally scraped together $300—and this had to carry themselves and their children through the winter and spring.

Dorcas Stockman chuckles now when she tells of it: "We didn't know where to put the money for safekeeping. The banks were closing. And if we kept the money in the house, it might be stolen or lost in a fire. So finally Lowell put the $300 in bills into a coffee can and buried it several feet deep under the locust tree in the front yard."

FAMILY CONSUMED WHEAT IN MANY GUISES

"Periodically through the winter Lowell would dig up the can, take out a few dollars, and buy a few groceries. Meantime, I taxed my ingenuity thinking of new ways to prepare wheat for the family. We ate many a pot of boiled wheat kernels. And our standard breakfast cereal was cracked wheat, which I ground in my kitchen coffee grinder. We learned to like it; in fact, it's still our favorite breakfast cereal.

"In the dead of winter, when fuel ran low, we burned wheat in the heating stove.

"I wouldn't want to go through such a year, with youngsters, again. But we did pull through."

Currently STOCKMAN is growing two specialty crops, along with wheat. He is one of the largest growers in the Northwest of crested wheat grass seed, a Siberian importation used for reseeding grass on range land. He is also raising several hundred acres of alfalfa for seed, and is doing this on the hilly wheat country and not in the bottom lands usually devoted to this crop.

How did STOCKMAN get interested in politics?

"Well, it was like this. I had been farming for 20 years and it had lost its glamor. I wanted to do something new. First I figured on serving a term in the legislature, to get my feet wet in politics. But when the congressional election approached and the field was wide open for a Republican candidate, I decided to plunge in. I had never believed the talk about Pierce being unbeatable, and thought I should make a try for it."

CANDIDATE WAS METHODICAL IN HIS CAMPAIGN

Methodically STOCKMAN started out to become known in every portion of eastern Oregon. His system was simple. In every town he got a list of business, professional, and civic leaders. In the morning he would start at one end of Main Street and drop in at nearly every store and office. His greeting was, "I'm LOWELL STOCKMAN, from Pendleton. I want to make your acquaintance."

Here his size was a conspicuous asset. Ambling down any Main Street, STOCKMAN was so noticeable that the queries were heard on all sides: "Who's that huge fellow?" By the time he had finished his day's calls in a typical town, nearly every man, woman, and child knew about "that feller STOCKMAN from Pendleton."

In his only campaign speech, delivered at Hood River, STOCKMAN referred to his opponent merely as "a fine old man." He talked about carrying out the President's war legislation program, about cutting down on the bureaus, and about working out some world-wide set-up after the war to keep peace. When the votes were counted, he had carried every county but Morrow and had run up a margin of better than 3 to 2.

As Oregon's political colossus prepared to leave for Washington, he mentioned to some friends the time, 2 years ago, he made a first-hand check-up on Congress.

The late Joe Singer, Doorkeeper of the Senate, escorted the visitor around the Capitol. He met numerous Senators and Congressmen and asked them questions such as "How does this Congress business suit you?" He sat in the galleries and "watched 'em perform."

There he decided: "It looked all right; yes, sir; it looked mighty all right, being there on the floor of the House, right in the middle of things."

So now, next January 6, when the Speaker raps the House of the Seventy-eighth Congress to order, there will be a new and picturesque figure on the floor—and the "biggest man in Congress."

Army-Navy E Award to Union Iron Works Plant at San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the Union Iron Works, of San Francisco, has been in continuous operation since "the days of old, the days of gold, the days of '49." The founders were James and Peter Donahue, who started business in a small tent on the beach. The plant now is part of the great Bethlehem Steel Co., one of America's outstanding industrial enterprises. Whereas the pay roll under the Donahues listed but 2 or 3 employees, today those who report for work at the Union plant number approximately 30,000. The cruiser *Olympia*, flagship of Admiral George Dewey at the Battle of Manila Bay, as well as the famous battleship *Oregon*, forever enshrined in the hearts of the people of this country for her remarkable service in the Spanish-American War, were both built at the Union Iron Works.

The present management is carrying on in the same devoted, patriotic, energetic manner as did those of former years. Best evidence is the Army-Navy

E award, presented in San Francisco on December 11, 1942.

As Representative in Congress from the district in which the Union Iron Works is located, I include herewith and make part of this permanent record, addresses of Hon. Earl Warren, Governor-elect of California; Vice Admiral John W. Greenslade, United States Navy; General Manager A. S. Gunn, Bethlehem Steel Co.; Lt. Col. John R. Reilly, United States Army; and Secretary Perry Orr, war-production committee, of the Union Iron Works, at the Army-Navy E award ceremonies, San Francisco shipyard, at Bethlehem Steel Co., Friday, December 11, 1942:

ADDRESS OF GOVERNOR-ELECT EARL WARREN, OF CALIFORNIA

I am happy to join with you in this ceremony, because your accomplishment is a worthy cause for celebration.

Everything that represents unusual effort, efficiency, sacrifice, and accomplishment for the war effort merits public recognition whether it is done on the field of battle or in the industrial establishments on the home front. Loyal service to the cause, wherever performed, is of equal importance in winning the war.

However, it is not just for being loyal or for merely working or for building that we are entitled to acclaim either in battle or in production, because that is just plain everyday American duty. It is only for added effort and unusual accomplishment that we are singled out for public recognition. You have earned the right to this public honor because you have done much better than a workaday job. By your efficiency you have helped greatly to compensate for our losses at Pearl Harbor, in the Philippines, and in the Solomons. You have added strength to our armed forces throughout the world. You have hastened the day of victory. You have made America more secure.

Your accomplishment emphasizes the fact that the job abroad and at home is but one job—that what we do here is reflected in the outcome of battles.

This presentation of the E award to the Bethlehem Steel Co. at the San Francisco plant stands as a very deserved tribute to both workers and management for a job well done. It demonstrates what can be accomplished when we subordinate ourselves to the common cause of all freemen.

It must be apparent to every thoughtful citizen that the only way we can win this war completely and quickly is to gear everything—Government, business, industry, and our daily lives—to the war effort. And in order that the price might not be too great, we must win it as quickly as possible.

Those who have been clamoring for a second front surely must now realize that our Government and our armed forces have been more anxious than anyone else to take the offensive against the Axis just as soon as it could be done with reasonable assurance of success, just as soon as we could train men, produce munitions, and build ships. The day of one front or two has now passed. We must prepare ourselves for a dozen fronts on every ocean and every continent on the face of the globe. We must prepare to carry offensive warfare to our enemies in all parts of the world. It is apparent that we will require all of the warships and merchant vessels we can build and muster together if we are to supply our brave men on these fronts with an ever-increasing amount of war material. It is in plants like this upon which the burden of this job will rest. It is in plants like this that the war will be won.

Let this award stand not only for the excellent achievement in production but also as a constant reminder of the task that lies ahead that we may be faithful to the trust given us by our fighting men. Hearty congratulations to you all.

ADDRESS OF VICE ADMIRAL JOHN WILLS GREENSLADE, UNITED STATES NAVY

Thank you, Mr. Joy, Mr. Gunn, Colonel Reilly, and men and women of Bethlehem Steel. I am pleased to be present today and to take part in the ceremony of awarding the Army-Navy E to this company. The work you have accomplished here has earned you this symbol of approval from both the Army and Navy. This E pennant is not casually handed out to every plant engaged in war industry. It is awarded only after careful consideration of accomplishment by the Navy Board for Production Awards in Washington.

The ships and other war materials constructed here are of vital importance to our forces which are at grips with the enemy on distant fronts. Destroyers from this yard have already proved themselves in battle in the Coral Sea and at Midway and in the fight now being so fiercely waged in the Solomons. They have seen action—plenty of it—and have delivered crushing blows to our enemies in the Atlantic and the Pacific. We need these ships. We must have them to protect our merchant fleet and our extended supply lines.

You've done a fine job here at Bethlehem Steel. Both management and labor are to be congratulated. At the beginning of the war emergency, a few short months ago, a total of slightly over 3,000 workers were employed here. Now six times that number are engaged in the construction of ships for the Navy. And from your ranks have already gone 2,700 men into the armed forces.

The combatant ships you are building here cannot be constructed on assembly line methods. You cannot prefabricate their intricate sections as you can the comparatively simple sections of merchant vessels. Each ship is an individual problem and must be met with individual effort. Designs are constantly being changed to meet demanded improvements and the shifting conditions and problems of war. Other yards may hurriedly deliver standard-type ships in record-breaking time. That is their function and duty. Here, sober purpose and determined skill are of greater value in the production of our needed fighting craft. The Navy already knows this and the public will come to know of the fine workmanship, the serious accomplishment for which this yard is justly famous in maritime circles.

I am informed by competent authority that workmanship here is indeed excellent and that leadership is of the highest type. The last three ships constructed at this yard were delivered ahead of schedule—with no sacrifice in your high standards of workmanship.

I should also like to compliment you on the training program carried on here at this yard. The older employees of the yard have handed on their time and energy and the skill of experience to thousands of new men and women who have entered this industry from other fields. Your training program has proved its efficiency in the high quality of workmanship which this yard maintains.

It has come to me from the commanding officers of ships of the Navy which have been repaired here that the work was carried out with dispatch and efficiency. You know the importance of getting our fighting ships back at sea and into the battle where they are needed. You have extended every effort toward that end. For this you have won the wholehearted approval of the Navy.

This is the first yard to cooperate in the complete fitting out of ships before they are turned over to the service, thus speeding by weeks the delivery of vessels to the fleet. Management here has willingly accepted changes in construction—in fact has insisted that construction and design keep pace with the latest developments in modern warfare.

There prevails here a fine attitude of cooperation and initiative in your supervisory force which is transmitted to the mechanical force and all personnel in the yard. This spirit is illustrated in the energy and planning which in less than 18 months cut away an entire hill, constructed shops and ways, and built a ship which is now at sea and in the fighting.

The men of the building trades which carried out the new construction here have contributed their share to this speed-up program and are to be commended.

Each officer and employee of the Bethlehem Steel Co. plant here will receive a distinctive emblem suitable for wearing in a buttonhole or on a pin displaying the Army-Navy E. The Army-Navy E burgee will be hoisted over the plant so that all may become aware of the results of your industry and skill.

You have earned this award, earned it with your sweat and energy, your skill and patience, your will to do the job well and speedily.

In the Navy we have a tradition of long standing. When a job has been well done, we believe in saying so. Recognition of exceptional group performance has become a firmly fixed part of our tradition. Back in 1906 the Navy established a policy of recognizing merit with the Navy E for excellence or outstanding performance.

In the Navy this award is highly prized and highly respected. That is why we have chosen this symbol to express our appreciation to you for the outstanding job you have done here.

It is a rare pleasure for me to be the instrument through which the Army-Navy E burgee is delivered to this plant. Every employee of Bethlehem Steel Co. can take special pride in his individual part in the production record you have made for the Navy.

And so, Mr. Gunn, it is my proud and happy privilege on behalf of the Secretary of the Navy to present to you, representing the management of this company, the highest recognition the Navy can bestow upon you—our prized E. May it fly from your flagstaff with the same pride that accompanies its bestowal. May your E be not only a source of pride but spur you on to greater and greater success. Let the E stand for effort as well as for excellence, for energy, for enthusiasm, and finally for entire exhaustion and extermination of our enemies.

ADDRESS OF A. S. GUNN, GENERAL MANAGER, BETHLEHEM STEEL CO.

Vice Admiral Greenslade, Lieutenant Colonel Reilly, Governor-elect Warren, honored guests, and fellow employees, it is with great pleasure that I accept for the Bethlehem Steel Co.'s San Francisco yard, and for all its employees, the Army-Navy award for excellence in production.

This is a high honor that the representatives of our fighting forces have bestowed upon us. It means that we have been working together with a fine spirit of cooperation. It means that we have been building ships better and faster than ever before. And it means that our fighting forces know they can depend on us to produce the ships they need so urgently.

In accepting this award we are, by inference, promising to continue this good work. We must do more than promise—we must perform. More and more ships must be built in shorter and shorter time.

It is not the American way to leave unfinished the kind of job we're working on now. We will drive through to victory. And so, speaking as one voice for all the people of

this yard, I say to the Navy and the Army, "We will not fail you. We'll build your ships."

ADDRESS OF LT. COL. JOHN R. REILLY, UNITED STATES ARMY

Ninety-three years ago, not far from the spot on which we stand, James and Peter Donahue established the pioneer iron foundry on the Pacific coast, later known as the Union Iron Works. This company has grown from a small foundry sheltered by a tent on the beach and equipped only with hand tools to the great industry we know today.

Probably the first major Government contract obtained by this concern was for building the engines of the United States sloop of war *Saginaw*, in 1859. Since that time, in war and in peace, your shipyard has done its part in filling our country's needs for ships, and during all this time, almost a century, your yard has been known as builders of good ships and only good ships. That reputation was not lightly earned, but it can be quickly lost—it is in the keeping of the employees of the company. It is yours, each one of you to guard that reputation well, for yours is a company and yours is a product in which you can all take real pride.

It is my purpose here today to present the individual Army and Navy E award pins to three of your senior employees, in recognition of their personal contributions to your company's splendid record. These pins should mean much to you, for they are a visible symbol of distinguished service to your country.

ADDRESS OF PERRY ORR, SECRETARY, WAR PRODUCTION COMMITTEE, SAN FRANCISCO YARD

Vice Admiral Greenslade, Lieutenant Colonel Reilly, Governor-elect Warren, Mr. Gunn, honored guests, and fellow workers:

The award of the Army-Navy E to the San Francisco yard is both an honor and a challenge to every employee.

We are proud indeed to receive these symbols of excellence. They stand for a job well done, for hard work by all of us, for fine cooperation all along the line between labor and management.

While we are justly proud of this award now, we must work to be even more proud of it 6 months, or a year from now. Look across the world and you see American soldiers and sailors by the thousands, yes, by the hundreds of thousands, fighting or about to go into battle. Those are the men we are working for.

The issue in this war is simple and clear. It is, Will we be slaves or will we be freemen? In plain terms, it means that in defeat, labor will lose all—everything. Only in victory can you retain your free and independent American way of life. And we have a definite responsibility in making that victory possible. We must build ships to support those fighting men. More and better ships, built faster and faster. This E award is a straight-out challenge to us to do better than we have ever done. Can we meet that challenge? Can we show the world that free American workmen can build better and faster than enslaved Europe or imperial-ridden Japan? Each of you knows, deep down in your heart and soul, that we can do it. So let each one of us give more and serious thought to our jobs here. Let's do a real American job at building these ships. Then, in 6 months' time, we may be honored with a service star to place upon this E flag. It will tell the world that labor stands shoulder to shoulder with the men in the Army and Navy in one resolve—and this is, to win the war.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that this famous shipyard is in my district, and I wish the management and employees continued success and achievement.

Address of Wendell L. Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, although it is unwise to devote too much time to consideration of post-war problems until we are certain of complete victory, I feel it is necessary that some consideration be given these serious and complicated issues and the thoughts of the leading statesmen of the world receive our careful deliberation. Accordingly, I am including an address delivered by Wendell L. Willkie on November 25, 1942, in the Maple Leaf Gardens, Toronto, Canada, at a rally of the Canadian Aid to Russia Fund:

Everything I want to say to you tonight is summed up more dramatically and more effectively than I can hope to state it, by the simple fact of this great meeting. You are here as citizens of the British Commonwealth of Free Nations—one of history's most exciting and magnificent achievements in the self-government of free peoples.

You are here to pay tribute to your Russian allies. Those allies have shown by the skill and by the fortitude with which they have been fighting the Nazis, that their own system of government, whether we like it or not, has the tough and sinewy strength which comes not from leaders but only from the people.

Finally, you have invited me to talk to you tonight, a private citizen, a representative of no government, but one of the American people who are your allies, and Russia's allies, in this fateful war.

So this meeting symbolizes the essential nature of the war we are fighting today. For this war is either a "grand coalition" of peoples, fighting a common war for liberation, or it is nothing. It must be either a great pooling of all our energies, inspired by a united strategy, planned and fought on a global scale, or it will be lost.

Finally, as we are doing here tonight, we must talk about this war as united peoples; we must discuss its issues; we must declare the common purpose which drives us all; or we run the risk of having worked and sacrificed and suffered to win a war for no purpose.

People of Canada, I say to you this war is all or nothing. There is no halfway house to victory where we can stop and rest. And there is no halfway alliance possible between us and any of our allies. We are fighting this war for keeps in the United States and Canada; we are fighting it for keeps in Britain, in Russia, in China, in Australia, and New Zealand, and in Africa. We must win it for keeps.

Five weeks ago I returned to New York from a flight around the world. I had seen the war on several of the fighting fronts. And everywhere I had seen what lies behind the front, in the minds and hearts of people who are our allies.

I came back hopeful and encouraged by what I say on the fronts themselves. In Egypt, General Montgomery showed me in September what he showed to General Rommel a month later. It was plain then, and I said so, that the days of the Afrika Korps were numbered, even though they were at the deepest point they ever reached in Egypt, literally a few miles from Alexandria and Cairo. The gallant and hard-fighting men of the Eighth Army have proved that General Montgomery was right in what he told me.

In Russia, at Rzhev, I saw Soviet soldiers pushing the Germans back on one small sector of the front. After I had talked to these soldiers, had seen their equipment, had sensed the spirit of the civilians behind the lines, and had interviewed German prisoners, I was convinced the Russians were not going to lose. And I said so. Stalingrad stands today, in the fourth month of siege, and her enemies are broken, in retreat. Winter has come across the north Caucasian steppe. Hitler has not taken Russian oil. Hitler has not taken Moscow. Hitler has not taken the Red Army. And I say to you tonight on the basis of what I saw with my own eyes: he will not take them.

In China I saw a nation already 5 years at war. The front I saw there was a stable front. The Chinese were not retreating there or anywhere else on their vast battlefield against Japan. In places they were advancing in a military sense. And everywhere they were advancing in the sense that they were building with incredible industry, ingenuity, and patience, the very sinews of war which they need and which we cannot give them.

In Africa, I saw a combination of the skill and resources of Great Britain, Canada, Australia, the Free French, and the United States. I naturally was proud of the performance of our planes and pilots and I shared the eager anticipation with which officers and men alike awaited the arrival of the new General Sherman tanks, only a few days before unloaded at the Suez. I visited General Brereton's camp of intrepid American aviators. These were our vanguard; men who were contributing daily to the sinking of German transports bringing aid and comfort to Rommel across the Mediterranean.

And then on the last lap of my journey I crossed Alaska and Canada. There, too, was a front. For there I saw the fine cooperation of American and Canadian engineers laying out airfields for vital air supply lines. There I saw them together building the Alaskan highway, the great war artery which will make possible the further encirclement of both the Japanese and the Germans.

I found encouragement and hope on all the fighting fronts. And I found the resolution to win in the minds and hearts of the people behind those fronts. But I also found—and this troubled me greatly—I also found worry and doubt in the hearts and minds of the people behind those fronts. They were searching for a common purpose. This was plain in the questions they asked about America after the war, about Great Britain, about Russia. The whole world seemed to me in an eager, demanding, hungry, ambitious mood ready for incredible sacrifice if only to justify the sacrifices already made.

Europe in 1917 was probably in much the same mood. It is an inevitable corollary of blood and war-weariness. Then, in 1917, Lenin gave the world one set of answers. A little later Wilson gave it another. Neither set of answers ever became blood-and-bone part of the war, but were superimposed on it, in the peace. So neither set of answers redeemed the war or made it anything more than a costly fight for power. It ended with an armistice, not a real peace.

I do not believe this war need be the same. There are now, during the war, common purposes in the minds of men living as far apart as the citizens of Great Britain and the Free Commonwealth of Nations, the Americans, the Russians, and the Chinese. But we shall have to make articulate and real our common purposes.

I am saying to you in Canada—as I have said all over the world—that the people must define their purposes during the war. I am quite deliberately trying to provoke discus-

sion of those purposes between the peoples of the various countries of the world. For I live in a constant dread that this war may end before the people of the world have come to a common understanding of what they fight for and what they hope for after the war is over. I was a soldier in the last war, and after that war was over I saw our bright dreams disappear, our stirring slogans become the jests of the cynical, and all because the fighting peoples did not arrive at any common post-war purpose while they fought. It must be our resolve to see that that does not happen again.

Millions have already died in this war and thousands more will go before it is over. Unless Britons and Canadians and Russians and Chinese and Americans and all our fighting allies, in the common cooperation of war, find the instrumentalities and the methods of cooperative effort after the war, we, the people, have failed our time and our generation.

Our leaders, jointly and singly, have expressed some of our common aspirations. One of the finest expressions came only the other day from Chiang Kai-shek in a message to the western world, delivered through the Herald Tribune Forum in New York City. He concluded:

"China has no desire to replace western imperialism in Asia with an oriental imperialism or isolationism of its own or of anyone else. We hold that we must advance from the narrow idea of exclusive alliances and regional blocs, which in the end make for bigger and better wars, to effective organization of world unity. Unless real world cooperation replaces both isolationism and imperialism of whatever form in the new interdependent world of free nations, there will be no lasting security for you or for us."

Let me read you another statement of purpose, singularly explicit and exact:

"Abolition of racial exclusiveness, equality of nations and integrity of their territories, liberation of enslaved nations and restoration of their sovereign rights, the right of every nation to arrange its affairs as it wishes, economic aid to nations that have suffered and assistance to them in attaining their material welfare, restoration of democratic liberties, the destruction of the Hitlerite regime."

Is that a statement by Winston Churchill or is it a statement by President Roosevelt? It might well have been written by the authors of the Atlantic Charter. It happens to be Stalin's definition of the objectives for which we fight. So he defined them on November 6, 1942, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the October revolution.

Other statements of purpose by our leaders have been phrased as hopes or intentions. This Mr. Stalin calls a "program of action." A program for Britain and the British commonwealth of nations, for the United States and for Russia.

Now I am going to read it to you again, each phrase and clause in it and ask you whether any citizen of any of the great democracies could find anything in it to which to object:

"Abolition of racial exclusiveness, equality of nations and integrity of their territories, liberation of enslaved nations and restoration of their sovereign rights, the right of every nation to arrange its affairs as it wishes, economic aid to nations that have suffered and assistance to them in attaining their material welfare, restoration of democratic liberties, the destruction of the Hitlerite regime."

I, for my part, find one objection: Mr. Stalin limits his program of action to the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. It should be applied to the world.

We may ask: Does Stalin mean what he says? Some will point out that only 2 years ago Russia was in alliance of expediency with Germany. I make no defense of expediency, military, political, temporary or otherwise. For I believe the moral losses of expediency always far outweigh the temporary gains. And I believe that every drop of blood saved through expediency will be paid for by 20 drawn with the sword. But a Russian, feeling that by the German alliance his country was buying time, might well remind the democracies of Munich and of the 7,000,000 tons of the best grade of scrap iron my country shipped to Japan between 1937 and 1940.

Perhaps we can better measure the good faith of Stalin's statement in the light of the millions of Russians who have already died defending their fatherland and of the 70,000,000 who have become slaves of the Nazis; in those other millions of Russian men and women who are working feverishly 66 hours a week in factories and mines to forge and produce instruments of war for the fighters at the front; in the effort that went into the almost miraculous movement of great factories, hundreds of miles, that they might operate, uninterrupted, beyond Nazi reach. For it is in the attitude of the people that we may find the best interpretation of Stalin's purpose.

And while we are questioning Russia's good faith, we might well ask ourselves—are we prepared to carry out our avowed programs? Are we willing to give our declared purposes reality? To do so will undoubtedly mean different methods for each of us. You in Canada know your own problems. We in the United States have ours. We must guard against the recurrence of dollar and pragmatic diplomacy. We must guard against the use of the great moral force of our country not for the liberation of mankind but for the maintenance of the old international order—the spawning ground of the present struggle. We must educate ourselves to accept the economic changes which must take place in the world. But most important, it remains for us to convince those people to whom we are promising freedom and opportunity, that we really believe what we declared to be self-evident truth in our own Declaration of Independence: That all men are created equal. If we are to convince others of our good faith, we must see to it that racial and cultural and economic exclusiveness belong to the past, within, as well as without, our borders.

Our leaders have tried to state our purposes. Those purposes will not be accomplished merely by statements from leaders.

It is the people who must bring them about—not after the war, but while we fight.

The people of the world must win this war. The people of the world must win the peace. And so I come to you tonight, not to plead for help for Mr. Stalin, or help for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I ask you, as men and women, to give aid to the men and women of Russia. We are here to honor and to help a brave people who are our allies. For however much men may disagree with Russia's political economy, all men must recognize the superb fight her people have made in defense of their homeland.

Many among the democracies have feared and mistrusted Soviet Russia. They have dreaded the inroads of an economic order that would be destructive of their own. Such fear is weakness. Russia is neither going to eat us nor seduce us. That is—and this is something for us to think about—that is, unless our democratic institutions and our free economy become so frail through abuse and failure in practice as to make us soft and weak. The best answer to Communism is a living, vibrant, fearless democracy—economic, social, and political. All we need to do is to stand up and perform according to our professed ideals. Then those ideals will be safe.

No, we do not need to fear Russia. We need to learn to work with her against our common enemy, Hitler. We need to learn to work with her in the world after the war. For Russia is a dynamic country, a vital new society, a force that cannot be bypassed in any future world.

But today she needs our help. Five million Russians have been killed, wounded, or are missing. The great fertile farm lands of southwestern Russia are largely in Nazi hands. Their products are now feeding the enemy and their men and women are forced to be his slaves. Thousands of Russia's villages have been destroyed and their people are homeless. Her transportation system is overloaded; her factories, producing to the very limit, require the full output of her remaining oil fields and coal mines.

Food in Russia this winter will be scarce—perhaps worse than scarce. Fuel will be little known this winter in Russian homes. Even when I was in Moscow, women and children were gathering wood from 50 miles around to make a little warmth against the coming cold. Clothing, except for the Army and essential war workers, is nearly gone. Many vital medical supplies just don't exist. Russian women by the millions, side by side with their children, some of them as young as 8 or 10, are manning war machines and running farms. Every able-bodied man is in the Army or giving the maximum hours of hard work in war factories.

Such is Russia today, with the bitter long winter just ahead. We can help by sending food there this winter to fill shrinking stomachs. We can help by sending medical supplies to ease pain and suffering. We can help by sending clothes to cover shivering bodies. We can show through our giving, the warm admiration we feel for such gallant fighters. That, too, will help.

The Russian people are turning to the democracies of the west for hope and aid. We must not fail them. For just as the African front is Russia's front, so Stalingrad and Moscow are our fronts. And the Russian people behind those fronts, who are our Allies today, must be our friends tomorrow.

It is with them that we must work to make this war what their leader has called it: "A great war of liberation."

Build Flood-Control Projects After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I here insert the address I delivered at the annual convention of the Mississippi Valley flood-control convention held in New Orleans, La., December 18 and 19, 1942:

I am glad you invited me down here.

I like your country, I like your people, and I feel that I am one of the Mississippi Valley Association, because we have common interests and are working together to provide effective protection for those of our citizens whose families, whose homes, and whose businesses are subject to the ravages of floods.

My familiarity with the flood problem did not begin with my responsibility in connection with the appropriation of public funds looking to ultimate freedom from the damage that floods entail. I was born and reared right next to Johnstown, Pa. I live in the heart of an area which is the source of much

of your difficulties along the great Mississippi from Cairo to the Gulf.

Having witnessed and experienced the devastation of many floods, it was with peculiar satisfaction that I became a member of, and later the chairman of, the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, whose responsibility it is, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned, to effectuate the authorizations which are sponsored, by reason of his chairmanship of the Flood Control Committee, by the distinguished and learned gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON.

I know it is wholly unnecessary for me to tell you good people of your great good fortune in having Judge WHITTINGTON at the helm of the legislative committee having jurisdiction of flood-control legislation.

He is generally acknowledged by his colleagues to be the best-informed man in the Congress upon that subject, and, I might add, a guiding light on many national questions.

I should be remiss, speaking of Judge WHITTINGTON, if I did not speak of your further good fortune and my good fortune in having on the Senate side my good friend the distinguished and much beloved Senator OVERTON from this great State of Louisiana.

The Senator, among his many committee assignments, is a member of the Senate committee which passes upon river and harbor and flood-control appropriations. The action my committee takes, and the House takes, is reviewed and independently acted upon by Senator OVERTON'S committee, and then our two committees meet in conference and reconcile any differences that might have developed. I am sure the Senator will agree that we have had mighty fine teamwork.

We probably could have done better, though, if just the Senator and I had had free rein.

I want to say to you, my friends, that the Senator knows his subject, and I can assure you that no better or stronger champion of your cause than he sits in the National Legislature.

We have made remarkable strides in the past few years toward the control of floods generally and toward the control of floods in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River.

Under the leadership of Judge WHITTINGTON, authorizations totaling more than $930,000,000 have been enacted for the construction of 485 projects, scattered, as you know, all over this broad land, but a very great percentage in areas where the ultimate objective is the protection of those expanses flanking the Father of Waters from Cairo south, an area into which have rolled the crests of so many heart-sickening floods, magnified by the floods of tributaries, reaching out into the back country for hundreds of miles.

In my judgment, those of us in the Congress at Washington can point to no piece of legislative action of greater good to more potential beneficiaries than the General Flood Control Act of 1936 and its later supplementation.

Of course, as far as the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River is concerned, general flood-control legislation in large measure very properly may be viewed as supplemental to the much earlier project embracing that particular flood-control problem, which very wisely was the initial movement. It is needless for me to tell you of the authorizations that have been enacted touching flood control in such area. The projects are many, and it is the earnest hope of all of us that when completely accomplished "Ol' Man River" will roll along without disturbance to the normal pursuits of those to whom normally it is such a rich blessing. Here, too, acknowledgment must be given to the fine handiwork of Judge WHITTINGTON.

My friends, when we were well launched upon the vast newly authorized corrective measures, our Nation, because it had no other decent or honorable alternative, became involved in war—a war of undreamed-of dimensions; a war that is taxing to the utmost our resources of manpower and materials; a war, God willing, that permanently will efface war from the face of the earth.

The demands of this all-out war have made it compulsory for the Nation to channel all of its means into its prosecution; to lay aside for the present many undertakings and to postpone the commencement of many undertakings that look to the public good. Some of these deferments may not have seemed wise when made, but I think all of us have come to see the light and fully recognize that our paramount job today is to crush Hitler, and Mussolini, and Tojo, and their satellites, despite whatever sacrifices that job may entail, and crush them, my friends, we shall. You need have no doubt on that score.

Our principal job today, as I see it, so far as flood control and many other authorized Federal projects are concerned, is to do everything we can to see that the proper agencies do everything they can to be in immediate readiness to go forward with such projects when our energies and our resources may be freed from the war effort.

You gentlemen can do much to make that possible.

All of us can visualize the Herculean readjustment problems following immediately upon the conclusion of peace. Plain, common sense, in my judgment, dictates the building up of a backlog of useful projects that may be proceeded with at once for providing employment to cushion the impact of the great industrial change that will need to be effected.

The Chief of Engineers, General Reybold, is an advocate of such preparatory measures, and the appropriation bill for the current fiscal year, thanks to Senator OVERTON'S help, includes an amount for such advance measures. That seems to me to be the only logical course for us to pursue at this time or as long as war demands must be served first.

In conclusion, permit me to compliment you upon the fine work you have done in the past. The gains that have been made are largely in consequence of your untiring efforts spread over many years.

You may be sure that as long as I am in a position to help in the good work, I shall esteem it a privilege to cooperate with in every consistent and practicable way, and I wish each of you to know that there awaits you a ready welcome at my office in Washington at any time.

I thank you.

Inaugural Address of Hon. Thomas E. Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I think it is peculiarly appropriate that there be included in the RECORD the inaugural address of Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, the Governor of New York.

His is a call to unity of spirit and work in the prosecution of the war that is truly inspiring.

The address follows:

No man could take up the duties of Governor of the State of New York without a profound sense of responsibility, even in ordinary times. To assume those duties in this hour of grave national peril brings a deep and humble sense of the great trust imposed by the office.

We are engaged in a savage war for survival. It is a war not merely of men and materials, but also a war of human faith. It is a war between those, on the one hand, who believe in the principles of liberal self-government and in the way of life that has developed under free institutions, and those, on the other hand, who believe that way of life is ended. In the final analysis, it is a war by malignant, reactionary forces against the dignity and strength of the individual—a war against mankind itself.

In all things needed for the winning of the war we are united in unswerving loyalty to our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. We are united in our faith in freedom, in the ultimate triumph of justice and in the triumph of free men under God. Shoulder to shoulder, with every resource at our command, we shall carry on the fight to total and lasting victory.

In the winning of that victory our State, with its 13,500,000 people, is called upon to play a vital role.

The primary task of our State government during the war is to lead the way in translating into productive effort the indomitable will to victory among our people.

The wartime tasks of the State include the fullest utilization of our industry in war production; every assistance to our farmers in the maximum production of food; maintenance, and improvement of transportation facilities necessary in the movement of war goods, workers, and farm products; adjustments of our tax procedures so far as possible to ease the staggering burdens of Federal taxation upon our citizens; improvement of housing and sanitation facilities in defense areas; revision of the State's system of vocational and general education to meet the requirements of war; coordination of police, fire and air-raid protection; continuous improvement in the relations between labor and management; and above all, vigorous leadership in work and sacrifice to make ever stronger the unity of our people.

MUST WIN IN CONFLICT OF IDEAS

In this way we shall put our real strength into the struggle for national survival. But while so doing, we must remember that force alone cannot decide the contest now going on in the world.

Victory will not be secured the moment fighting stops. It will not be enough to put down by force of arms the military aggression that has been loosed against mankind. We need also to put down by force of ideas the reaction against liberal society which our enemies represent. To win the conflict of ideas is the greater end and the ultimate victory. To win that victory we shall need to recognize and constantly amend the shortcomings of our own society.

Seldom have the minds of men been more confused over the specific means of obtaining the objectives we are seeking. But behind all the surface arguments, deeper and more compelling than anything that may be said by any individual, we sense clearly and unmistakably the overwhelming aspirations of the masses of people everywhere. We want a society which combines political and economic freedom with an ever-greater measure of security.

The new administration of your State is committed to the proposition that our society must provide full employment through full production. We know that these objectives are attainable at a price, for twice within

our generation they have been attained at the price of war. They must also be achieved in peace.

We must achieve them by methods which do not destroy, but rather strengthen the ideals of political, religious, civil, and economic freedom. For material things are not in themselves the all-sufficient end. They are rather the means which assure men the opportunity to possess spiritual and intellectual values which are the essentials to a rich and happy life.

These are not partisan objectives. Nor will they be achieved by partisan action. It is a part of the genius of the American people that they can contest political elections with vigor and intensity. But once the decision has been fairly made, they can unite wisely and generously behind the parties and individuals who have been given the responsibility of government.

PEACE TASKS ARE AHEAD

Your State administration which takes office today will be, God willing, not only a wartime but also a peacetime administration. Its responsibilities in the period of readjustment after the war, will be no less than its responsibilities in war.

To meet these obligations our State government must emerge from the war with unimpaired strength. But it can do this only as the strength of its citizens and its institutions is maintained against the ravages of war. We shall find a State geared to great war production; and much of industry, commerce and small business will face grave problems of conversion to peace. At the same time the members of the armed forces will be triumphantly returning home expecting to enjoy the benefits of the free system they have successfully defended.

I state it as a cardinal principle of your new State administration that these young men and women are entitled to expect something better than the hopeless period of government-made work and relief, of which they have seen so much in the past decade. They are entitled to a fruitful, productive place in a free economic society, dependent on the favor of no man or political party for their livelihood or for their security. They are entitled to come home to a State in which employment can freely be found and in which a man can work and look forward to a future limited only by his own skill and ability.

To achieve these ends there must be a sound economic structure in this State. We must prepare for the prompt and full utilization of technological advances in commerce, agriculture, and industry; we must prepare to carry the staggering peacetime burdens we will be assuming.

Beyond this, the State will have a duty constantly to adjust its social welfare agencies and educational facilities to meet the special needs of a post-war community.

The readjustment of family and social relationships torn apart by war is a problem which will call for wise and sympathetic handling.

Just as we achieve unity in war, we must sustain unity in peace. In that unity there shall and must be no place for distinctions among us by reason of race, creed, or color.

PROBLEMS OF RECONSTRUCTION

In addition to these human objectives we will face a problem of civic reconstruction. Three-fourths of our population live in cities which are deteriorating. Industry and population have been moving out of the central cities into expanding suburbs, leaving behind them vacant structures and blighted areas.

To make our economy more efficient and life happier and healthier, we face the need of rebuilding our cities. Whole obsolete business and residential districts will, in time, be torn down. There will be reserved to industry locations permitting efficient operation, together with the development of neighborhoods with their own civic, recreational, and religious centers, and the preservation of broad spaces for parks and playgrounds.

Business and industry must once again be attracted to our State. We shall, indeed, need the genius and productivity of private enterprise on a large scale. Full employment must be achieved in peace, and the State of New York must maintain its prime position in the Nation.

In meeting the problems of the future, Federal, State, and local authorities must develop the practice of fair and intelligent cooperation. Each branch of government should be free from domination or encroachment by the others. This country was founded upon the principle of federalism, a principle devised to maintain the balance between Nation and State, State and locality, Government and the individual. It is in accordance with this principle that the affairs of your State will be administered in the years immediately ahead.

We have seen within the past decade an altogether unprecedented expansion of Federal activities on the economic and social welfare fronts. Some of this expansion was expressly temporary in nature, some permanent.

FOR RECOVERING STATE CONTROL

The war, being total in character, has led to still further extension of Federal controls far beyond anything contemplated before the conflict.

In the post-war period the Federal Government will be called upon to abandon its sweeping wartime controls over the freedom of the individual. Still, its field of operations is bound to be very broad. At the same time a large area of responsibility for domestic reconstruction will fall upon the State and local governments.

There has already developed in recent years a considerable degree of such joint action in the fields of highway construction and maintenance, organization of public works, planning, unemployment relief, and certain aspects of social security. In recognizing the need for joint action, your State will neither evade nor surrender its responsibilities.

We are fighting this war for our form of liberal society—the only form of society anywhere in which men are free to differ among themselves, to later achieve improvement, and then to achieve change peacefully. If we are to fulfill the aspirations of the peoples of the democracies we must have a society that can grow. We must have the kind of society that gains in strength, not by drawing solely upon the ideas of the past but by moving boldly into the future.

We seek security from the economic hazards of large-scale industrialization. But we cannot rely solely upon government for that security. For free government can never be stronger than the sum total of the individuals who are its ultimate masters. So, also, can its resources be no more than the total of the productivity of all its people. Only in a society which gives scope and opportunity to individual initiative can we expect to continue the economic progress that has made this country unique. Only in a society which provides economic freedom can we preserve other freedoms.

To the cause of human freedom we again dedicate ourselves today. It is not for any man to say that any single freedom is our principal objective or that some freedoms may be permanently sacrificed to preserve others.

No man can be part slave and part free. Freedom is indivisible.

Americans are fighting for our whole free system, and it is our high duty as Americans to preserve and build meanwhile every part of that free system for the present and for the future. As we approach our tasks, let us humbly, and with the help of God, dedicate ourselves unreservedly to that end.

Things To Be Considered First in 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article by one of the outstanding Baptist leaders of our Nation, Dr. L. L. Gwaltney, editor of the Alabama Baptist, which appeared in that paper on December 31, 1942. Dr. Gwaltney is one of the most profound and progressive thinkers of this age. He is a Christian philosopher; a religious writer of international note, and one of the best informed men in America. Dr. Gwaltney should be a member of the peace conference. I wish that every person who is interested in permanent peace could read his articles every week. The editorial follows:

THINGS TO BE CONSIDERED FIRST IN 1943—A HOMILY RELATED TO THE WAR, TO THE PEACE, TO ISOLATIONISM, TO THE ADMINISTRATION, TO THE KINGDOM OF GOD

It will be agreed that the first things during 1943 to claim the attention of the people of this Nation is to go as far toward winning the war as possible. It is not hard to believe that the morale of the German people and the German Army will crack up during 1943. But if it does not at that time it certainly will do so before 1944 expires. Of course, we have no inside information with reference to the matter, but it is permissible for anyone to put two and two together.

The case, however, is different with the Japanese. They are never going to surrender and they are never going to oust their little Emperor-god. This means that not only Singapore, Malaya, Burma, Indochina, the Dutch Indies, and the Philippine Islands will have to be retaken, but the Japanese mainland including Tokyo, will have to be annihilated as when one pours boiling water over a yellow-jacket's nest. And to use the language of the street there is a plenty of "hot stuff" coming to them. One shudders to think of it, but it is hard to forget Pearl Harbor.

Much is being said about winning the war and losing the peace. That is a catch sentence which may easily muddle the thinking of men. There are those who say that World War No. 1 was won but the peace was lost, which is not the whole truth. The winning of that war prevented German "kultur," which was based upon the philosophy of Nietzsche and his school of thought, from overrunning the world at that time. Had not that war been won by the Allies all that is best in our civilization would have then been doomed. Meantime, it is true that the fullest fruits of the peace were lost and this largely because the isolationists prevented the United States from taking a worthy part among the nations which won the war.

While the war is being won the Allied Nations should agree that they will stick together after the war is over as well as now when the war is being fought. This is a thought of Walter Lippmann and it is right. Let all of those nations which are going to win this war—the British Empire, the United States, Russia, and China—firmly resolve now that they are going to remain united after the war is won and unless they do that the peace may be lost. And should the others fail to remain in the coalition, then, Britain and America must at least stick together and they should have an air force and surface

fleet sufficient to wholly control all the seven seas. This force should exist not to harm any people or nation but merely to maintain order under law and to forever protect the small nations against national gangsters.

Mr. Churchill has said that peace came so suddenly following the other war the Allies were not prepared for it. That could happen again. Hence, the United Nations should now give themselves to a serious and purposeful determination to formulate a just peace after the war; that is, a peace based neither upon national aggrandizement nor upon vindictiveness to the enemy, but a peace of absolute justice to all men. This would mean that all national boundaries should be settled by plebiscite and that all the oppressed nations of Europe should be restored to their original status and this should even include Germany, Italy, and Japan, after their rulers have been overthrown.

The Axis Powers will certainly be disarmed and the United Nations will doubtless put armies of occupation in all of those countries at the close of the war just as our Federal Government put armies of occupation in the Southern States following the War between the States, and as France at the close of the first World War put an army of occupation in the Rhineland (the rich industrial district of Germany).

The armies of occupation in Europe will probably remain from 5 to 10 years and while that is going on there must be brought into being a federation of nations with an international court to adjudicate the differences which may arise between the nations and said federation must have an international police force with powers, if need be, to enforce by blockade or by force of arms the decisions of the court. Either that or something else like it simply must be done or else this dirt ball of ours which we call the earth is doomed to perpetual wars. In all of this there will be found a thousand difficulties to be overcome but the main thing in the way will be found that of national selfishness.

In America there is the possibility of a resurgence of the isolationists at the close of this war. Should they again come into control as they did at the close of the other war and start the same propaganda that the two oceans are sufficient to protect us, hence let America mend its own fences and withdraw from having any part in formulating the policies looking to permanent peace—should that happen again all the sacrifice of this Nation in winning the war will have been in vain.

And do not forget that there have been some inklings of this attitude already. The elections in November suggested it. The perpetual criticism on the part of some corporations of the present administration suggests the same attitude. And there was reason to believe that some of the financially big boys were willing to let both Germany and England shoot themselves to pieces while they sold American goods to both sides and built their own private fortunes even if half the world died. And think of a speech recently made by the president of the National Association of Manufacturers who, in addressing that body, said: "I am not making guns or tanks to win a people's revolution. I am not fighting for a quart of milk for every Hottentot, or for a Tennessee Valley Authority on the Danube, or for governmental hand-outs of free Utopias." That is a return to isolationism and bourbonism with a vim. If that view gains the ascendancy, there will be another war in 10 years, no matter who wins the present one. And if the writer's two sons, who are offering their lives, die for the reactionism implied in that statement, they will die in vain.

As to the New Deal, we suppose there are few men who would endorse all of its measures. But those who have kept up a perpetual tirade against it should be mindful of the fact that in the New Deal this Government was simply bending to a world revolution. This revolution broke out in actual war in Germany and Italy, and the war now being waged by Hitler and Mussolini at its deepest, has been and is now against the plutocrats of the democratic system. And in both England and America, government bent to this revolution instead of being broken by it.

A great shock absorber against a revolution in America which was certainly brewing in 1933 and 1934 was Mr. Roosevelt. He boldly stated that he proposed to put "human rights ahead of property rights" and "no one in America," he said, "should starve so long as the Nation had power to tax." Now, there are some industrialists who have not quit "cussing" him yet on account of those things. But they forget that something could easily have happened to this country at that time which could have been worse than the things which the President proposed and actually accomplished. Many bankers are now dead set against the man who in 1933 saved the whole banking system and financial structure of the Nation.

Thus the matter of greatest importance to this Nation next to winning the war and next to the United Nations remaining united after the war is over—next to these is a matter already seething. This relates itself to isolationism and rugged individualism on one hand and on the other to a controlled and unified national economy and as to how far governmental controls over the national economy shall go. Many have not seen this yet but it is going to enter into Congress and in the next Presidential election and the whole Nation is to be shaken by it.

Finally, all thoughtful men must see that such matters affect in one way or in another the cause of religion and the progress of the Kingdom of God. Christianity, which, if genuine, is the life of Christ and His teaching transmitted to and imbibed by His followers, can never be contained in an airtight compartment but must be related to every cause of both right and wrong in the world.

Keeping Hapsburg Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over the Atlantic Coast Network over station WNEW on Sunday, December 20, 1942:

Article III of the Atlantic Charter reads: "They (the signatories) respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

This declaration is in line with President Woodrow Wilson's insistence upon self-determination of the peoples of Europe. It is a thoroughgoing democratic principle and the fighting of this second World War will have been abortive unless it is carried out. It was deliberately inserted in the Atlantic Charter by President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill for the benefit of Poland, Czechoslavakia, Yugoslavia, and many other countries which governments are now in exile with accredited ministers in Washington. The nationals of these nations now under the heel of Nazi oppression wish to maintain themselves as citizens of a government of their own choosing. The Atlantic Charter renewed their hopes for the reestablishment of their homelands. That provision quickened and sharpened their efforts against the Nazi jackals.

Unfortunately at the present time in our own country there are those who would upset the calculations of Churchill and Roosevelt as announced in the Atlantic Charter and would destroy the democratic aims and aspirations of Poles, Czechs, and Yugoslavs to reestablish their democratic homelands after the war shall have been won and the Nazis shall have been banished to limbo. Attempts are being made by certain groups to set up Archduke Otto von Hapsburg as emperor in a sort of reconstructed Austro-Hungarian Empire, which would comprise Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

This dastardly plot is being hatched at our doorstep. Few Americans realize it. These monarchists are making of the United States a political arena in which they develop their intrigues and schemes to restore this charming and handsome young man, Otto von Hapsburg, to a throne in Austria. Most, if not all, of these monarchist conspirators are refugees. We have given them a hospitality and a refuge which they are daily misusing. When a visiting alien receives an American visa on his passport, he is cautioned against engaging in political activity while in the United States. These so-called royal refugees are no exception. They are daily violating the terms upon which their visas were issued. Assuredly our country cannot be made a stamping ground for agitations and propaganda campaigns to set up empires or monarchies. Our citizens should give neither aid nor comfort in such schemes. Unfortunately, there are in New York and in Washington some of our denizens who like the idea of playing the role of courtiers and flunkies to a would-be king and are lending this pretender, Otto, considerable support. They little realize the harm they are doing. Herbert Hoover, in a recent address in Chicago on New Approach to Peace said, among other things: "Our first necessity is to provide a stage for peacemaking that will favor the spiritual forces, good will, and idealism, rather than the old-time diplomacy. We must prevent nests of intrigue that can again do evil."

Otto von Hapsburg has surrounded himself by a committee abetted by certain socialite Americans that are duplicating the old-time diplomacy and the nests of intrigue against which Herbert Hoover has properly inveighed. The old Austrian Empire was a feudal aristocracy supported by an imperial army. It was the very antithesis of democracy. Its restablishment, in any form, would be tearing the Atlantic Charter into scraps of paper.

Recently the War Department authorized the setting up of an Austrian battalion in the United States Army. This followed the familiar pattern of establishing foreign battalions whereby aliens in our midst are encouraged to join our armed forces in the fight against nazi-ism, fascism, and nipponism. We have already established a Japanese battalion and a Norwegian battalion and the other day there was established a Greek battalion. The formation of other battalions may be in the offing.

When the War Department announced the formation of the Austrian battalion, Otto von Hapsburg and his puppets sought to capitalize this Austrian regiment or cadre. They claimed credit for its formation and the committee surrounding Otto proclaimed itself an official recruiting agency. They cannot under the statute act as recruiting agents in any sense of the word. Enrollment in any of these battalions by aliens must be

through the draft boards. The alien appears before the draft board for so-called voluntary induction. The battalion must be officered by American citizens. Neither this pretender Otto nor his lickspittles can become officers as they are not citizens. Incidentally, Otto is an alien refugee who entered the United States on a Belgian diplomatic passport. How he can presume to act as a Belgian diplomat and at the same time seek the Austrian throne is beyond my comprehension. This is a matter worthy of investigation by our State Department.

Secretary of War Stimson wrote a letter to Otto, thanking him for any aid he might render in inducing Austrian nationals in our midst to join this battalion. The letter was perfectly in order but it has been horribly misused and abused by Otto and his stooges. It has been made to appear that the Secretary of War has given the imprimatur of his approval to Otto and his committee in their ridiculous pretensions to have some authority over this battalion. They try to create the impression that the War Department has, in some way, espoused Otto and his cause. These false impressions which emanate from the offices of Otto's committee, which he has ironically named the Military Committee for the Liberation of Austria, have stunned our Central European allies—the Czechs, Yugoslavs, and Poles, as well as liberal anti-Nazi Austrians, Italians, and Hungarians. They have sent word of protest to Secretary of State Hull and Secretary of War Stimson. A number of false notions and write-ups appeared in the public prints concerning Otto and this Austrian battalion. The writers of these articles and other Americans in high places are unaware of the game that this young man and his sycophants are playing.

Otto von Hapsburg, being here on a Belgian diplomatic passport, is immune from our draft laws. He thus operates from a safe distance. He is free to come and go and cannot be questioned. That, in and of itself, is a damnable outrage. He confers upon himself the title of a sovereign in exile.

He permits himself to be addressed as "Your Majesty" by his entourage; he confers titles and decorations, and, I am informed, accepts oaths of allegiance from his followers.

He claims to be extremely democratic and liberal. If democracy consists of shaking hands and making speeches which extol democracy, Otto of Hapsburg certainly is a democrat. Yet, queerly enough, that democrat surrounds himself with people who are anything but democrats. They have Otto as a smoke screen to hide their schemes.

At present he goes under the name of Otto of Austria, while but a year ago he, with equal conviction, played the role of King of Hungary in exile.

Let us first examine what his Austrian set-up is in this country. Who are his Austrian advisers? On whose back does he think he will be able to ride back into Vienna? There is first of all Mr. Guido Zernatto. Guido Zernatto was a prominent figure in Austria—not in the Austrian democratic republic, where he was completely unknown, but in the authoritarian state of Kanzler Schuschnigg, after the Social Democrats had been bombed out of existence. Mr. Zernatto was then the head of the Fatherland Front, an organization set up along strictly totalitarian lines in a state modeled after the corporate state of Mr. Benito Mussolini. Zernatto, incidentally, was a great and trusted friend of Signor Mussolini.

Another one of the archduke's advisers is a Mr. Hans Rott, member of that more authoritarian government which was imposed upon the Austrian people.

Never have either of these two politicians other than by lip service proved their love for democracy and all their acts speak of complete contempt and hatred of democratic institutions.

These are Otto's Austrian advisers; vainly do we look for representatives of all those liberal and democratic forces which have made the name of Austria an honored name in the world.

But Otto is not only pretender to the throne of Austria. He is also pretender to the Hungarian throne, and he has therefore, of course, also provided himself with a Hungarian set-up in the United States. And there the democratic and liberal Otto has found no one better than the infamous Tibor von Eckhardt. Tibor von Eckhardt is a gentleman who, as early as 20 years ago, founded the Awakening Hungarians, a terrorist group who for years terrorized the Hungarian countryside, indulged in orgies of anti-Semitism, and by the hundreds murdered Hungarian Jews and liberals. Today Tibor von Eckhardt is an ardent liberal. Not so liberal though that the present Hungarian Government with which, incidentally, the United States is at war, did not provide him with a passport to come to this country, to be its second iron in the fire, just in case Adolf Hitler were beaten.

Just about a year ago, Otto of Hapsburg toured the United States and Canada, inviting all Hungarians to jump on the band wagon of Tibor von Eckhardt, but that band wagon was upset, as even our State Department considered Mr. Tibor von Eckhardt too unpalatable a dish to swallow. Mr. Eckhardt resigned from the Free Hungarian movement which he had founded, and today lives in "retirement" in Washington, waiting for the time to come when he may step into leadership again.

But not satisfied with building up the Austro-Hungarian Fascist forces in the United States, Otto who also claims the Czechoslovakian throne, has begun interfering with the affairs of our Central European allies.

There is a certain Dr. Milan Hodza in this country, a former Prime Minister of the Czechoslovakian Republic, a man whose opposition to the present Government in exile of the Czechoslovakian Republic is well known and whose closest affiliation is with the Slovakian League. The Slovakian League again is headed by a Dr. P. P. Hlesko, a partisan of that Nazi puppet state of Slovakia, which Adolf Hitler has created.

Mr. Hodza is in close connection with Otto of Hapsburg, and his one-time private secretary is today adjutant to the pretender.

All that is quite a nice little set-up for the Hapsburgs. They hope that when the war is over they will have acquired sufficient American backing to be able to return to the countries from which they have been ousted by the peoples, as liberators from nazidom.

These schemes and machinations of Otto and his gang are greatly disturbing those of the Allied Nations in exile. They are especially annoyed at so-called Americans who want to wear the trappings of royalty and who have become cohorts of this "chocolate soldier."

The very name "Hapsburg" is anathema to Czechs, Poles, and Slavs. They have never forgotten that it was the Hapsburg regime that fired the first shot of the first World War. They are not unmindful that it was the Emperor Franz Josef of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, in cahoots with the Emperor Wilhelm of Germany that planned that world conflagration and intended perpetual slavery for the non-Germanic nationals that composed the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

The Hapsburgs have forfeited for all time the right to rule anywhere in Central Europe. Theirs was a regime of torture of minorities, of the stifling of every democratic effort.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America, in a release dated December 7, 1942, states:

"The Hapsburgs have such a record of broken promises and most solemn oaths as rivals that of Hitler himself. They are not trusted by the Czechoslovaks, Poles, Yugoslavs, democratic Hungarians, and even their own Austrians. The Hapsburg regime in Austria proper was eliminated unanimously by the Austrian Parliament in 1918. The Hapsburgs may speak for only a very small minority of the Austrians, a minority which overthrew the democratic regime in Austria only with the aid of Mussolini. Even in this country they are opposed by the Austrian bourgeois refugees as well as by the representatives of Austrian labor.

"The necessity of a close cooperation of the nations in Central Europe is recognized by every politically minded person. But it would be the height of folly to create in that region a federation headed by a prince of German blood at a time when we are confronted with the task of taming the warlike Germans and preventing aggression."

Some misguided Americans make a comparison between Admiral Darlan and Otto von Hapsburg, saying we have used Darlan and, therefore, we should use Otto. I am realistic enough to appreciate the old Balkan proverb, "In order to cross a bridge, it may some times be necessary to walk with the devil." Recognition of Darlan has been a matter of military strategy. Thousands of lives have been saved and the conquest of North Africa is thereby more expeditiously accomplished. It was worth while taking the chance with Darlan, but Otto von Hapsburg serves no military purpose. On the contrary, aid to him is equal to giving aid and comfort to our enemies. It means a reversal to feudalism and the turning back of the clock.

Mr. Speaker, since making the above statement on the radio, President Roosevelt has very properly stated that Otto has no official standing as far as this Austrian battalion is concerned. He or any Austrian national is free to join. His two brothers have signed up. That is creditable.

Finally this is all important: The purpose of the Austrian battalion cannot, shall not, directly or indirectly, be prostituted in furtherance of Pretender Otto's ambitions to ascend any throne.

Why Work on a Plan for Peace Is Necessary Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Hon. WARREN R. AUSTIN, United States Senator from Vermont, on National Radio Forum, arranged by the Washington Evening Star, broadcast over the Nation-wide Blue Network Co., Wednesday, December 30, 1942:

One reason is enough, namely: It is necessary to win the war. Winning the war is not limited to beating the enemy. Moreover, winning the war would not be accomplished by causing an armistice. A peace must be dictated to the Axis by the United Nations which will guarantee, by all of the force that is necessary, that the children of the men

who now give their lives shall not be obliged to repeat that sacrifice in periodic, barbarous aggressions by Axis forces.

The triumph of arms must insure the triumph of the cause for which these boys fight. Here at home the dangers to us individually are less, but the responsibility is at least as great. We owe the millions of men in the field of battle the contribution of all that it takes to assure the permanent establishment in the world of the principle of freedom.

This involves wise planning on our part and patient negotiation with our allies for a structure of peace having those bastions of security, of justice, of economics, and of law enforcement which will maintain freedom as the prevailing principle throughout the world.

The performance of this obligation could not be accomplished by people who had not prepared themselves for it during the hostilities. Among ourselves, as Americans, it will take time and conscious effort to coordinate our ideas. From the experience of the last World War we know that the necessary advance in civilization through international convention and the structure for enduring peace is utterly impossible if public opinion is not ready for the progressive principles and theories essential to the peace treaty. We can attribute the failure of the United States in 1920 to recognize her responsibility largely to lack of information during the period of negotiation. This lesson is so impressive that I need not labor the point by argument.

The President, the State Department, the Senate, all of whom participate in the plans for peace, need and desire the views of the people of the United States. This is a people's war, and the peace shall be a people's peace. It takes time to obtain their views. Indeed, it takes time for the people to formulate them. Therefore, we should be at work upon such plans immediately and continuously.

Let me illustrate the nature of the problems involved in our study:

The commerce of the world will be carried on in ever-growing ratio by the great air lines of the world. Practically every great treaty power, excepting the United States, has determined its policy. Our commercial international carriers by air are being used by the Government under nothing but a war policy. The location of bases on the islands of all of the oceans, and the control of them in peace after the war, will be important from the point of view of both military strategy and civilian service to mankind.

We Americans have not determined, for example, the question whether our air lines shall be consolidated into a Government monopoly, or whether they shall be owned partly by the Government and partly by individual citizens; or, thirdly, whether they shall be wholly owned by private individuals, and kept operated under vigorous Government regulations. In the absence of a decision determining the policy of the United States with respect to air commerce following hostilities we would be handicapped to such an extent that the competing foreign powers who have well established policies already in operation would occupy much of the field and perform the service which America ought to perform.

I have not closed the door upon any new thought regarding the precise policy which Congress ought to adopt respecting international air commerce. I point to the three possible solutions solely to illustrate why it is necessary for the people of this country to be at work now on the determination of a plan.

The questions involved in our American policies of tariff and immigration already press upon us for consideration. Men and women are asking the question: To what extent shall we let down the protective walls of these venerable institutions in response to benevolent instincts toward the downtrodden and suffering of the earth, or as the net remainder of keen conflict of negotiation respecting trade?

What would be your answer to the question whether immigration should be made more free and easy? Are you prepared to give the answer now? I know that I am not. And I point out that this is another illustration of the truth that it is necessary to be at work now for the post-war world.

Have you formed an idea of which type of government is better for humanity, and particularly for the orderly conduct of international relations, a union, a federation, a league, or a council?

Have you an idea whether the institution of peace should be one central world government, or whether it should be multiform with reference to geographical regions and ethnic considerations.

But we know that we must have a position on these questions, and does it not take time and work to formulate the ideas?

Even the most humble contribution will have this value, namely: That the individual who has expressed it has become a part of this great whole army that is doing its utmost to win the war through winning the peace.

Justice concerns us. We have always cherished our form of maintenance of justice. In this we are not a unique Nation. Others, too, are devoted to their own forms of administration of justice. Can we at once, and without preparation, come to an agreement with the United Nations upon the form of administration of justice? The answer is "No." For this reason it is important that we begin to formulate the plan, taking under consideration the views of our allies.

We are aware of special problems relating to small States, and we know that the determination of the future of those States will affect the permanency of our peace and the stability of the institutions of freedom. Can we leave this problem untouched until hostilities are over? The end of hostilities might come suddenly.

What form of protection is the United Nations to give to small nations aspiring to independence during the period of their probation? Shall it be like that benevolent government of the Philippine Islands? Shall it be like the mandates which followed World War No. 1? Or shall it be some form of international trusteeship in which no one nation shall be able to exploit such a country through the trusteeship intended for its protection? This is another illustration of the kind of problem upon which there should be a well-informed, vigorous, and earnest public opinion.

Who shall maintain the armed forces required for supremacy over any aggressor? Do you have an opinion whether collective security could be best maintained by regional unions in agreement to fight jointly against aggression? Shall the policing of the ensuing peace be done by an international military organization, or shall we provide for policing an individual country by the armed forces of its opponent which may have an interest in the political or ideological future of that country?

I repeat: Much thought must be given to such subjects; and it requires time.

It is my conviction that the United States should feel encouraged to undertake the great and difficult service of leadership in the negotiations among the Allies. The relations which have been established thus far during this war through basic agreements under the Lend-Lease Act, through the joint proclamation of Britain and the United States known as the Atlantic Charter, and through the agreement of union itself among the 29 members of the United Nations have already formalized a union. Does anyone doubt that the progress made is directly due to the common danger and mutual interest which the operations of war create?

I believe that it is important for us to conduct further negotiations while this interest is such an impelling cause for harmony.

War is a solvent of those elements which normally cause division among great treaty powers, and prevent agreement. Its Promethean fire now consumes the selfishness and the unworthy motives of the largest number of people in all history. Therefore, the present hour offers an opportunity which we shall not neglect.

We have advanced toward victory of our arms and toward winning of the peace. In the theaters of combat the armies of the United Nations on land and sea and in the air have the initiative, and direct the strategy. In the United States, whose vast area has been touched by invasion only on the outer rim, a miracle of production and transportation has occurred. In the realm of education for war, no country ever produced so great a military force of well-trained men and women in so short a time.

Our contemplation of what this means has already lifted us to certain heights, namely: The determination that—We will not make peace until after victory; we will establish an organization of world peace; we will disarm the aggressor nations and disable them to provoke war; we will administer stern and exact justice toward them; and that we will provide adequate enforcement of the peace.

We must be determined that our sons shall come back to a country of opportunity; that there shall be the incentive for high achievement which will create a future world transcending any vision ever beheld.

We have already begun organization of means to encourage and to help practically all other nations who are willing to cooperate in making the world a better place to live in.

Believing that the present war cannot end by an agreement between totalitarian nations constituting the Axis, and the United Nations, I hold that one of the most important reasons for advancing to a firm position intellectually, economically, politically, and spiritually, is that a grave test of the morale of our American people is coming. For the day will come when our death losses will be reported in mounting numbers, and our people will become sad and weary. Before that time is upon us, the faith and resolution of our people must become firmly established. We must, as a people, have strengthened our character and have made the cause for which our boys are fighting a cherished objective, from which no sorrow, no suffering, no sacrifice, can cause us to retreat.

Such devotion and stamina cannot be developed without knowledge and understanding. This understanding must be achieved through the contributions of numerous men and women whose thoughts are not uniform, but who have different ideas, and yet through whose thoughts there runs the golden thread of unity in objective.

The leadership which logically will develop in the total war service of this numerous and energetic people must be of the highest aim. It must be inspired. It must be zealous. It must be guided from on high. It must champion a far better world than mankind has yet envisaged. It must surmount the obstacles of doubt and faint-heartedness thrown into its way by those on the roadside doing nothing but scout the idea as utopian—those who protest that it cannot be done.

This opportunity to serve magnificently in the reformation of civilization is being seized and used to fulfill the divine purpose. This purpose is being unfolded through the thoughts and prayers and expressions of people in rapidly growing numbers. This is, indeed, the evolution of public opinion—the strongest, the most effective element of our free Republic.

This is the necessary basis for that advice and consent by the Senate, which represents the voice of a free people.

These principles are the spiritual foundations on which our Republic was erected.

As our sons meet and overwhelm "the fury of the oppressor," we on the home front must awake and put on strength, that we may experience the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy:

"And I have put my words in thy mouth, and I have covered thee in the shadow of mine hand, that I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth, and say unto Zion, 'Thou art my people.' "—Isaiah 51, 16.

They Eat, Drink, and Make Merry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Belshazzarlike $40-a-plate dinner given to entertain the bride of Harry Hopkins, the irresponsible spender of the taxpayers' money, at which 60 New Deal officials feasted, drank, and danced, is typical of the New Deal attitude toward the war.

While our men are fighting and dying, the new dealers dine, dance, drink wine, and make merry. Before the grass has grown on the graves of the young men who have died to preserve this Nation; before some of their nearest relatives have received word of their death, these irresponsible merrymakers in the Nation's Capital show a callousness toward the Nation's problems that was not exceeded by that of Nero himself.

The farmer of the North, the Northwest, and the Middle West is bucking snowdrifts, and his wife—yes, and the townspeople—are figuring ways and means to obtain fuel to not only keep production and transportation going, but the homes warm enough to keep off colds and pneumonia.

Meanwhile, Henderson, who had no difficulty in finding high-test gasoline for the plane which took him from Washington to his home in New Jersey to vote on election day, is reported to have danced with every woman at the party and so to have won the prize. For the moment at least, Henderson must have forgotten the illness, the physical exhaustion, the lame back (that interferes with dancing), which he assigned as his reason for resigning as O. P. A. Administrator.

There were only 35 items on the menu, which indicates that rationing in its severest form has not yet reached official Washington. Among those items was caviar, which, you will recall, the President, when telling the people that we must all make additional sacrifices, said he was willing to go without as one of the sacrifices on his part.

'Tis said every cloud has its silver lining. This merrymaking in wartime, while so many sacrifices are being made by our people throughout the Nation, has its amusing as well as its beneficial side. Barney Baruch, who is reported to have paid for the party, shortly thereafter and apparently as a result of the publicity given it, made a donation of a million dollars' worth of War bonds for a charitable purpose and so sought to spread over the whole painful scene a cold-cream coating of apparent generous giving.

The party in itself, which, for the 60 guests, is reported to have cost $3,000, is not vitally important, but as a symbol of New Deal indifference to the fate of the country, as a symbol of waste and extravagance, of thoughtlessness, it is astounding. It is typical of the New Deal attitude toward the war.

The children are asked to give their pennies to buy War stamps. The people are admonished morning, noon, and night to deprive themselves of things they need to buy War bonds and, when they do, the new dealers appear to forget the sources from which the money comes, the purposes for which it should be spent.

The New Deal, instead of devoting itself to the winning of the war in the shortest possible space of time and with the least possible cost in suffering and in lives, continues to make merry in the Nation's Capital. The theaters, the dance halls, and the places which dispense liquor and cater to entertainment cannot take care of the more than capacity crowds. The new dealers continue to talk about remaking America and feeding, clothing, and housing the world with money none of which they have earned; none of which they will earn.

From the day when the King and Queen of England visited the Nation's Capital down to the present moment, there has been a succession of visits by so-called royal guests, some representing nations still in existence, more coming from countries whose governments have been destroyed.

While the new dealers play politics, while they keep in force domestic policies which some figure are doubling the cost of the war, while they spend and waste and waste and spend, while the crowds in Washington eat and drink and dance and pat each other on the back, and while official Washington turns over to the representatives of other nations billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, our own people, who are the foundation rock upon which the whole world is now depending for the preservation of civilization, are not only made to suffer and to sacrifice but are hindered in their efforts to maintain the superstructure.

Belshazzar in his banquet hall saw the handwriting on the wall, and sought the meaning. The new dealers, the Communists, and those who have no faith in our Government are blind to the handwriting written across America's skies by the people on November 3. They pretend to be unable to understand the overwhelming repudiation of their policies as registered by the people at that election:

Which have eyes to see, and see not; they have ears to hear, and hear not.

There is no reason for any misunderstanding about the meaning of the November election. There is no reason why the new dealers or the Communists should be bewildered, as they claim to be, at the result of the election. It meant for them what the handwriting on the banquet hall of Belshazzar meant to him, and the interpretation of that handwriting on Belshazzar's banquet hall, as given by the prophet Daniel, was:

This is the interpretation of the thing: "God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it. Thou art weighed in the balance and art found wanting."

That may be the correct interpretation of the November election.

The American's War Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. U. S. GUYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the American's War Creed, written by Mr. Paul H. Ditzen, a member of the Wyandotte County, Kans., bar.

THE AMERICAN'S WAR CREED

What are we fighting for? For America and Americanism. For the American way of life—for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. For the Constitution and the Bill of Rights; for freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of speech and the right to vote; for a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

We are fighting for the land we love; for treasures more precious than silver or gold; for Plymouth Rock and Mount Vernon; for Niagara Falls and the Grand Canyon; for the glories of the Yellowstone and the mighty Father of Waters. For these and the Statue of Liberty we stand ready to defend our country to the death against European aggressors. For these and the Golden Gate our armies and our navies challenge the treacherous hosts of Japan.

We are fighting for the flag unfurled and flying high with 13 stripes and 48 stars; for the indestructible United States of America, a nation united, independent, unshackled, and free.

We are fighting for the future; for a world in which all men may have work, food, and happiness; for children whose hopes and opportunities will be secure; for happy homes in every nation; for international commerce on the seven seas, and for the perpetual peace of all mankind.

To attain these sacred ends we dedicate ourselves and all we have; with the help of Almighty God we shall win the victory.

PAUL H. DITZEN.

DECEMBER 4, 1942.

"Scratch My Back and I'll Scratch Yours"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, "scratch my back and I'll scratch yours," if not considered vulgar, would at least be characterized as provincial by titled nobility—Lord Beaverbrook. However, the average working American knows

what it means and no doubt even those in court circles are not unaware of the practice it describes.

Republicans had a similar procedure, which they called reciprocity. When they used it, however, the one giving something, expecting something in return, gave it to the one who was to make return. That is to say, if you and I had a deal on and I expected to get some special concession from you, I made a gift, but I made it to you—not to your wife, unless, perchance, making it to you would be a little too obvious.

Lord Beaverbrook is an accomplished diplomat. He expects results from his activities. So, when he recently gave the wife of Harry Hopkins, special assistant to President Roosevelt in charge of lend-lease operations, a lavish bridal gift of a parure of emeralds, consisting of a bracelet, ear-drops, a necklace, and a brooch, presumably he sent his gift to the right person to secure the greatest returns.

To a suspicious, hard-headed Yankee, quite naturally occurs the thought, Who paid for the jewels and why were they given to the wife of Harry Hopkins? Why not to Harry—or would that have been too raw? Was it just a gesture or does the good Lord Beaverbrook expect some substantial return to his country? Did he pay for the jewels or did his country? Or did the cost come out of lend-lease funds?

Harry Hopkins, as we know, has not a little to say about who gets lend-lease funds and how much of the lend-lease fund is allocated to the respective seekers. Beaverbrook's England is a persistent seeker after lend-lease. Naturally, England wants all it can get of the fifty-odd billion dollars which are to be poured out to other people. Just as naturally Beaverbrook wants those funds or the goods, whichever it may be, turned over in the greatest possible amount, at the earliest possible moment.

Can it be that Lord Beaverbrook figured that an expensive gift of jewels to the wife of the man who controlled the purse strings would open the money bags a little wider, a little quicker?

The law makes it a criminal offense for a corporation to contribute to a political campaign fund. A candidate who accepted a substantial gift of money or jewels from an admirer who was seeking special favors would be regarded with suspicion, but it probably would be offensive to royalty to suggest there is evidence of a lack of propriety, if not a lack of political morality, in the act of one seeking largesse making expensive gifts to the wife of the man who is to determine the amount of the loan, or more accurately, of the gift.

Described in the language of the common man, was not Lord Beaverbrook just greasing the skids down which Hopkins is expected to slide another chunk of lend-lease?

Administration spokesmen have urged the appropriateness of War bonds as gifts. Maybe Beaverbrook did not hear them.

Or, if Beaverbrook has jewels of fabulous value to give away, why not convert them into cash and give the cash to one of England's many agencies contributing toward the relief of the dependents of the fighting men?

And, did the jewels come in duty free?

Another thought, What was the actual value of these jewels? And was the gift tax paid on the transaction?

America's Part in World Reconstruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "America's Part in World Reconstruction," delivered by the Vice President of the United States on the occasion of the eighty-sixth anniversary of the birthday of Woodrow Wilson, December 28, 1942.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For the people of the United States, the war is entering its grimmest phase. At home, we are beginning at last to learn what war privations mean. Abroad, our boys in ever greater numbers are coming to grips with the enemy. Yet, even while warfare rages on, and we of the United Nations are redoubling our great drive for victory, there is dawning the hope of that day of peace, however distant, when the lights will go on again, all over the world.

Adolf Hitler's desperate bid for a Nazi world order has reached and passed its highest point, and is on its way to its ultimate downfall. The equally sinister threat of world domination by the Japanese is doomed eventually to fail. When the Hitler regime finally collapses and the Japanese war lords are smashed, an entirely new phase of world history will be ushered in. The task of our generation—the generation which President Roosevelt once said has a "rendezvous with destiny"—is so to organize human affairs that no Adolf Hitler, no power-hungry warmongers, whatever their nationality, can ever again plunge the whole world into war and bloodshed.

The situation in the world today is parallel in some ways to that in the United States just before the adoption of the Constitution, when it was realized that the Articles of Confederation had failed and that some stronger union was needed.

Today, measured by travel time, the whole world is actually smaller than was our little country then. When George Washington was inaugurated, it took 7 days to go by horse-drawn vehicle from Mount Vernon to New York. Now Army bombers are flown from the United States to China and India in less than 3 days.

It is in this suddenly-shrunken world that the United Nations, like our Thirteen American States in 1787, soon will be faced with a fundamental choice. We know now that the League of Nations, like our own union under the Articles of Confederation, was not strong enough. The league never had American support, and at critical moments it lacked the support of some of its own members. The league finally disintegrated under the successive blows of world-wide economic depression and a Second World War. Soon the nations of the world will have to face this question: Shall the world's affairs be so organized as to prevent a repetition of these twin disasters—the bitter woe of depression and the holocaust of war?

It is especially appropriate to discuss this subject on this particular date, because it is the birthday of Woodrow Wilson, who gave up his health and eventually his life in the first attempt, a generation ago, to preserve the world's peace through united world action. At that time, there were many who said that Wilson had failed. Now we know that it was the world that failed, and the suffering and war of the last few years is the penalty it is paying for its failure.

When we think of Woodrow Wilson, we know him not only for his effort to build a permanent peace but for the progressive leadership he gave our country in the years before that first World War. The "New Freedom" for which Wilson fought was the forerunner of the Roosevelt "New Deal" of 1933 and of the worldwide new democracy which is the goal of the United Nations in this present struggle.

Wilson, like Jefferson and Lincoln before him, was interested first and always in the welfare of the common man. And so the ideals of Wilson and the fight he made for them are an inspiration to us today as we take up the torch he laid down.

Resolved as we are to fight on to final victory in this worldwide people's war, we are justified in looking ahead to the peace that will inevitably come. Indeed, it would be the height of folly not to prepare for peace, just as in the years prior to December 7, 1941, it would have been the height of folly not to prepare for war.

As territory previously overrun by the Germans and the Japs is reoccupied by the forces of the United Nations, measures of relief and rehabilitation will have to be undertaken. Later, out of the experience of these temporary measures of relief, there will emerge the possibilities and the practicalities of more permanent reconstruction.

We cannot now blueprint all the details, but we can begin now to think about some of the guiding principles of this worldwide new democracy we of the United Nations hope to build.

Two of these principles must be liberty and unity, or in other words, home rule and centralized authority, which for more than 150 years have been foundation stones of our American democracy and our American Union.

When Woodrow Wilson proposed the League of Nations, it became apparent that these same principles of liberty and unity, of home rule and centralized authority, needed to be applied among the nations if a repetition of the First World War was to be prevented. Unfortunately the people of the United States were not ready. They believed in the doctrine of liberty in international affairs, but they were not willing to give up certain of their international rights and to shoulder certain international duties, even though other nations were ready to take such steps. They were in the position of a strong, well-armed pioneer citizen who thought he could defend himself against robbers without going to the expense and bother of joining with his neighbors in setting up a police force to uphold civil law. They stood for decency in international affairs, but in the world of practical international politics the net effect of their action or lack of action was anarchy and the loss of millions of lives and hundreds of billions of dollars in a second world war.

The sturdy pioneer citizen, proud of his own strength and independence, needed to be robbed and beaten only once by bandits to be ready to cooperate with his law-abiding neighbors. I believe the United States also has learned her lesson and that she is willing to assume a responsibility proportionate to

her strength. England, Russia, China, and most of the other United Nations are perhaps even more eager than the United States to go beyond the charter which they have signed as a declaration of principles. The United Nations, like the United States 155 years ago, are groping for a formula which will give the greatest possible liberty without producing anarchy and at the same time will not give so many rights to each member nation as to jeopardize the security of all.

Obviously, the United Nations must first have machinery which can disarm and keep disarmed those parts of the world which would break the peace. Also, there must be machinery for preventing economic warfare and enhancing economic peace between nations. Probably there will have to be an international court to make decisions in cases of dispute. And an international court presupposes some kind of world council, so that whatever world system evolves will have enough flexibility to meet changing circumstances as they arise.

As a practical matter, we may find that the regional principle is of considerable value in international affairs. For example, European countries, while concerned with the problems of pan America, should not have to be preoccupied with them, and likewise pan America, while concerned, should not have to be preoccupied with the problems of Europe. Purely regional problems ought to be left in regional hands. This would leave to any federated world organization problems involving broad principles and those practical matters which affect countries of different regions or which affect the whole world.

The aim would be to preserve the liberty, equality, security, and unity of the United Nations—liberty in a political sense, equality of opportunity in international trade, security against war and business depression due to international causes, and unity of purpose in promoting the general welfare of the world.

In other words, the aim would be the maximum of home rule that can be maintained along with the minimum of centralized authority that must come into existence to give the necessary protection. We in the United States must remember this: If we are to expect guaranties against military or economic aggression from other nations, we must be willing to give guaranties that we will not be guilty of such aggression ourselves. We must recognize, for example, that it is perfectly justifiable for a debtor, pioneer nation to build up its infant industries behind a protective tariff, but a creditor nation can be justified in such policies only from the standpoint of making itself secure in case of war.

A special problem that will face the United Nations immediately upon the attainment of victory over either Germany or Japan will be what to do with the defeated nation. Revenge for the sake of revenge would be a sign of barbarism—but this time we must make absolutely sure that the guilty leaders are punished, that the defeated nation realizes its defeat and is not permitted to rearm. The United Nations must back up military disarmament with psychological disarmament—supervision, or at least inspection, of the school systems of Germany and Japan, to undo so far as possible the diabolical work of Hitler and the Japanese war lords in poisoning the minds of the young.

Without doubt, in the building of a new and enduring peace, economic reconstruction will play an all-important role. Unless there is careful planning in advance, the return of peace can in a few years bring a shock even worse than the shock of war.

The magnitude of the problem here in the United States, for example, is indicated by the probability that in the peak year of the war we shall be spending something like $90,000,000,000 of public funds in the war effort, whereas 2 years later we may be spending less than $20,000,000,000 for military purposes. In the peak year of the war effort it is probable that we shall have around 10,000,000 men in the armed services and 20,000,000 additional men and women producing war goods for the armed services. It would seem that within the first 2 years after the peace at least 15,000,000 of those 30,000,000 men and women will be seeking for jobs different from those which they had when peace came.

Our expenditures have been going at a rate fully seven times as great as in World War No. 1, and the conversion of our industry to wartime uses has been far more complete. Thousands of thoughtful businessmen and economists, remembering what happened after the last war, being familiar with the fantastic figures of this war, and knowing the severity of the shock to come, have been greatly disturbed. Some have concerned themselves with plans to get over the first year. Others have given thought to the more distant future.

It should be obvious to practically everyone that, without well-planned and vigorous action, a series of economic storms will follow this war. These will take the form of inflation and temporary scarcities, followed by surpluses, crashing prices, unemployment, bankruptcy, and in some cases violent revolution. If there is lack of well-planned and vigorous action, it is quite conceivable that the human misery in certain countries after the war may be even greater than during the war.

It is true that in the long run any nation, like any individual, must follow the principle of self-help, must look to its own efforts to raise its own living standards. But it is also true that stronger nations, like our own, can provide guidance, technical advice, and in some cases capital investment to help those nations which are just starting on the path of industrialization. Our experience with the Philippines is a case in point.

The suggestions I have made with a view to promoting development and encouraging higher standards of living are necessarily fragmentary at this time. But in some quarters, either knowingly or unknowingly, they have been grossly distorted and misrepresented. During the recent political campaign one Member of Congress seeking reelection made the flat statement that I was in favor of having American farmers give away a quart of milk a day to every inhabitant of the world. In other quarters these suggestions have been referred to by such terms as "utopian," "soggy sentimentality," and the "dispensing of milk and honey." But is it utopian to foresee that South America, Asia, and Africa will in the future experience a development of industry and agriculture comparable to what has been experienced in the past in Europe and North America? Is it soggy sentimentality to hold out hope to those millions in Europe and Asia fighting for the cause of human freedom—our freedom? Is it the "dispensing of milk and honey" to picture to their minds the possible blessings of a higher standard of living when the war is over and their own productivity has increased?

Among the self-styled realists who are trying to scare the American people by spreading worry about "misguided idealists" giving away United States products are some whose policies caused us to give away billions of dollars of stuff in the decade of the twenties. Their high tariff prevented exchange of our surplus for goods. And so we exchanged our surplus for bonds of very doubtful value. Our surplus will be far greater than ever within a few years after this war comes to an end. We can be decently human and really hard-headed if we exchange our post-war surplus for goods, for peace, and for improving the standard of living of so-called backward peoples. We can get more for our surplus production in this way than by any high-tariff, penny-pinching, isolationist policies which hide under the cloak of 100-percent Americanism.

Self-interest alone should be sufficient to make the United States deeply concerned with the contentment and well-being of the other peoples of the world. For, as President Roosevelt has pointed out, such contentment will be an important contribution to world peace, and it is only when other peoples are prosperous and economically productive that we can find export markets among them for the products of our factories and our farms.

A world family of nations cannot be really healthy unless the various nations in that family are getting along well in their own internal affairs. The first concern of each nation must be the well-being of its own people. That is as true of the United States as of any other nation.

During the war we have full employment here in the United States, and the problem is not to find jobs for the workers but to find workers for the jobs. After the war it will be vital to make sure that another period of unemployment does not come on. With this end in view the suggestion has been made that Congress should formally recognize the maintenance of full employment as a declared national policy, just as it now recognizes as national policies the right of farmers to parity of income with other groups and the right of workers to unemployment insurance and old-age annuities.

Full employment is vital, not only to city prosperity but to farm prosperity as well. Nothing contributes more to stable farm prosperity than the maintenance of full employment in the cities and the assurance that purchasing power for both farm and factory products will always be adequate.

Maintenance of full employment and the highest possible level of national income should be the joint responsibility of private business and of Government. It is reassuring to know that business groups in contact with Government agencies already are assembling facts, ideas, and plans that will speed up to shift from a Government-financed war program to a privately financed program of peacetime activity.

This shift must be made as secure against mischance as if it were a wartime campaign against the enemy. We cannot afford either a speculative boon or its inevitable bust. In the war we use tanks, planes, guns, and ships in great volume and of most effective design. Their equivalents in the defense against post-war economic chaos will be less spectacular but equally essential. We must keep prices in control. We must have continuity in the flow of incomes to consumers and from consumers to the industries of city and farm. We must have a national system of job placement. We must have definite plans for the conversion of key industries to peacetime work.

When the war is over, the more quickly private enterprise gets back into peacetime production and sells its goods to peacetime markets here and abroad the more quickly will the level of Government wartime expenditures be reduced. No country needs deficit spending when private enterprise, either through its own efforts or in cooperation with Government, is able to maintain full employment. Let us hope that the best thought of both business and Government can be focused on this problem which lies at the heart of our American democracy and our American way of life.

The war has brought forth a new type of industrialist who gives much promise for the future. The type of business leader I have in mind has caught a new vision of opportunities in national and international projects. He is willing to cooperate with the people's government in carrying out socially

desirable programs. He conducts these programs on the basis of private enterprise, and for private profit, while putting into effect the people's standards as to wages and working conditions. We shall need the best efforts of such men as we tackle the economic problem of the peace.

This problem is well recognized by the average man on the street, who sums it up in a nutshell like this: If everybody can be given a job in war work now, why can't everybody have a job in peacetime production later on? He will demand an answer, and the returning soldier and sailor will demand an answer—and this will be the test of statesmanship on the home front, just as ability to cooperate with other nations for peace and improved living standards will be the test of statesmanship on the international front.

How thrilling it will be when the world can move ahead into a new day of peaceful work, developing its resources and translating them as never before into goods that can be consumed and enjoyed! But this new day will not come to pass unless the people of the United Nations give whole-hearted support to an effective program of action. The war will have been fought in vain if we in the United States, for example, are plunged into bitter arguments over our part in the peace, or over such fictitious questions as government versus business. Such bitterness would only confuse us and cloud our path. How much more sensible it would be if our people could be supplied with the facts and then, through orderly discussion, could arrive at a common understanding of what needs to be done!

I have heard the fear expressed that after the war the spirit of self-sacrifice which now animates so many of our people will disappear, that cold and blind selfishness will supplant the spirit which makes our young men willing to go thousands of miles from home to fight—and die if need be—for freedom. Those who have this fear think that a return of blind selfishness will keep the nations of the world from joining to prevent a repetition of this disaster.

We should approach the whole question, not emotionally from the standpoint of either sacrifice or selfishness, but objectively from the standpoint of finding the common meeting ground on which the people of the world can stand. This meeting ground, after all, should not be hard to find—it is the security of the plain folks against depression and against war. To unite against these two evils is not really a sacrifice at all, but only a common-sense facing of the facts of the world in which we live.

Now at last the nations of the world have a second chance to erect a lasting structure of peace—a structure such as that which Woodrow Wilson sought to build but which crumbled away because the world was not yet ready. Wilson himself foresaw that it was certain to be rebuilt some day. This is related by Josephus Daniels in his book, The Life of Woodrow Wilson, as follows:

"Wilson never knew defeat, for defeat never comes to any man until he admits it. Not long before the close of his life Woodrow Wilson said to a friend: 'Do not trouble about the things we have fought for. They are sure to prevail. They are only delayed.' With the quaintness which gave charm to his sayings he added: 'And I will make this concession to Providence—it may come in a better way than we propose.'"

And now we of this generation, trusting in Providence to guide our steps, go forward to meet the challenge of our day. For the challenge we all face is the challenge of the new democracy. In the new democracy, there will be a place for everyone—the worker, the farmer, the businessman, the housewife, the doctor, the salesman, the teacher, the student, the store clerk, the taxi driver, the preacher, the engineer—all the millions who make up our modern world. This new democracy will give us freedom such as we have never known, but only if as individuals we perform our duties with willing hearts. It will be an adventure in sharing—sharing of duties and responsibilities, and sharing of the joy that can come from the give-and-take of human contacts and fruitful daily living. Out of it, if we all do our part, there will be new opportunity and new security for the common man—that blend of liberty and unity which is the bright goal of millions who are bravely offering up their lives on the battle fronts of the world.

Resolutions of and Addresses Delivered at Meeting of Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, on Saturday, December 19, 1942, the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, of which I have the honor to be the president, held an annual meeting in the city of New Orleans, La. This was the first meeting of the association since our country's entrance into the war.

The meeting was attended by representatives of the levee, drainage, and navigation districts of Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana; by Senators and Representatives of our National Congress, and by Army engineers charged with the responsibility of improving and maintaining Mississippi River flood control and navigation. Speakers on the program included the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. Truman]; Representative Will M. Whittington, of Mississippi, chairman of the House Committee on Flood Control; Representative J. Buell Snyder, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Army and National Defense and Civil Functions Appropriations Subcommittee of the House; Representative Dewey Short, of Missouri, member of the House Committee on Military Affairs, and president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress; Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, chief, Services of Supply, United States Army; Brig. Gen. Max C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission; Hon. Chester C. Thompson, president of the Inland Waterways Corporation, and Hon. Sam H. Jones, Governor of Louisiana.

In the resolutions adopted by the association it was specifically declared that the association recommends that—

The Congress of the United States appropriate annually adequate funds to provide for the maximum progress on raising and broadening main-line levees to grade and section as provided by act of August 18, 1941, consistent with successful prosecution of the war, as well as to maintain the works that have been completed.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the resolutions adopted by the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the very able, eloquent, and inspiring address delivered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I further ask that unanimous consent be given to print in the Appendix to the RECORD the very informative address made to the association by Gen. Max C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission. I desire to make the observation that General Tyler recommended a plan of flood control of the lower Mississippi Valley modifying the original project, which modification has been authorized by the Congress and is now being put into execution under the supervision of General Tyler with the general approval and to the gratification of all interested in flood protection in the lower Mississippi Valley; and I hope, Mr. President, that General Tyler will be retained in his present position on the expiration of his present term, in order that he may complete the great work he is so ably executing.

There being no objection, the resolutions and addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS

I

Resolved, That the project for flood control of the Mississippi River in its alluvial valley and for its improvement, from the Head of Passes to Cape Girardeau, adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by the acts of June 15, 1936, June 28, 1938, and August 18, 1941, owes its present excellence in design and construction to the practical and efficient manner in which it is being planned and executed by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. The Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association is of the opinion that the step by step improvement of the authorized project for the lower Mississippi Valley has been the only practical method of prosecuting a plan of such magnitude and it urges that this practice be continued in the future in order that this important undertaking may be improved and extended from time to time as warranted and required by changes in national and local conditions.

II

Resolved, That since flood control and navigation of the lower Mississippi River are most important to orderly and efficient progress of the national war-emergency program, we recommend that the Congress of the United States appropriate annually adequate funds to provide for the maximum progress on raising and broadening main-line levees to grade and section as provided by act of August 18, 1941, consistent with successful prosecution of the war, as well as to maintain the works that have been completed. Maximum efficiency and economy in the prosecution of this flood-control project will be attained by maintaining, as nearly as practicable, a steady rate of adequate appropriations, in order to avoid the delays and difficulties resulting from alternate cessations and reinitiations of activities.

III

Resolved, That since adequate allocations by the War Production Board are as essential as adequate appropriations by Congress for the efficient prosecution of the flood-control project for the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River, we respectfully request that such allocations be assigned for the relatively small amount of supplies, materials, and equipment needed. We can ill-afford to relax our determination to prevent an uncontrolled flood that would jeopardize the lives and working conditions of our people. Since Mississippi River levees protect important trans-

portation lines, highways, communications, and military establishments, an uncontrolled flood in wartime would be a national calamity of the greatest magnitude.

IV

Resolved, That since the project for Mississippi River flood-control projects the most efficient food- and cotton-producing area in the country and since the benefits of this protection accrue to the Nation as a whole, its neglect would be tantamount to neglecting provisions for the protection and welfare of the majority of our population. Of the sixty-odd million productive men, women, boys, and girls in the United States, less than 50 percent can be engaged directly in our war effort at its maximum. The more than 50 percent engaged in civilian industry and the 70,000,000 of nonproductive men, women, boys, and girls constitute three-fourths of the population of this Nation. They require food to eat, clothes to wear, and employment. They include the families of our fighting men, the civilian workers, the doctors, and the leaders of Government. Provisions for their continued existence contribute more to the morale of our soldiers than all other activities designed for that purpose. Without this portion of the population, there would be no country to fight for.

V

Resolved, That as pioneers in flood control and the conservation of water resources in the United States it is our firm conviction that the Federal planning, execution, operation, and maintenance of public improvements for flood control and allied purposes are being administered to the best interests of the public and the National Government by the existing departments of the Government. We reaffirm our recommendation that the work now established under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers of the War Department, that under the Department of Agriculture, and that under the Department of Interior continue to be administered in this manner and we repeat our opposition to the creation or extension of valley authorities. We hereby reaffirm our faith and confidence in the Corps of Engineers, who are exceptionally qualified to handle skillfully large administrative organizations without permitting waste, inefficiency or questionable practices of any kind, and who are amply prepared and fully capable of prosecuting any civil program that the Congress and the President may assign to them as well as carrying out their military functions in the existing war emergency.

VI

Resolved, That with thankful recognition of the human happiness and freedom enjoyed in America as compared with the sorrow, despair, and oppression suffered elsewhere in the world and with the firm conviction that the fundamental duty of citizenship is defense of our beloved America, the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association pledges its full support to the President of the United States in this war emergency and offers to serve the national cause in every way possible.

DeWitt L. Pyburn, chairman; Arkansas: George Blackburn, W. F. Craggs, A. C. Zellner, F. N. Burke; Kentucky: W. B. Amberg, H. C. Helm, Henry Sanger; Missouri: C. F. Bloker, T. P. Russell; Louisiana: George S. Yerger, William G. Zetzmann, Henry G. Norris, Claudius M. Dickson; Mississippi: E. M. Barry, Felix Nicholson, G. F. Bennett, E. M. Holmes; Tennessee: C. B. Rhodes, R. C. Donaldson.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR HARRY S. TRUMAN, OF MISSOURI

Mr. Chairman, it is an honor to address the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association. You have given me the real pleasure of being once again with my friends in the Mississippi Valley. Your organization was formed to battle against the needless waste of our natural resources and wealth. This waste has cost us too much in the past. We have never been able to afford it. We certainly cannot now afford it.

Your conservation work is of paramount importance, especially in these days when the costs of carrying on global warfare are so staggering. The Special Committee of the United States Senate to Investigate the National Defense Program, of which I have the honor to be the chairman, has as one of its paramount objectives a job of conservation.

We will win this war. We know that we cannot win it without expending huge sums of money. From your own experience in flood control you know that money must be spent now to keep the forces of evil from destroying us. As you also know, unnecessary expenditures defeat their own purpose. The larger the sums involved, the greater the danger of reckless extravagance.

The committee is a watchdog for the people, and an organized expression of the common desire that every necessary military need and every necessary service of Government be adequately supported, but that not one cent be spent needlessly.

It is easy to appropriate billions of dollars, but it is not so easy to obtain those billions of dollars. There is a limit to the amount by which we can safely increase our national debt.

Every dollar that is appropriated and spent must some day be paid back and paid back with interest. Any suggestion that it will not is malicious rumor mongering. The only way it can be paid back is through taxation.

New plans for increasing tax revenues are constantly being made. New sources of additional tax revenues are continually being sought, but the tax burden is becoming increasingly harder to bear. We must always bear in mind that taxation when made too severe destroys the subject upon which it is sought to be levied. If we keep on piling tax upon tax there will come a time when we pile on the last straw that will break the camel's back.

It is unfortunately inevitable that part of the burden of paying for this war must be passed on to the next generation. We ought not to saddle the next generation, however, with a burden so great that it will spoil the fruits of the hard-won victory. Our duty to posterity is not merely to beget them and forget them.

In the midst of a war for our very existence we cannot flinch at paying the cost of obtaining equipment and supplies necessary to win the war, but we can insist that the taxpayers' money be carefully expended now so as to reduce to a minimum the future tax burden. Wasteful expenditures of money not only require needless taxation but also demonstrate that wasteful methods of production have been used. The result is that scarce materials and sorely needed manpower are frittered away. The American people are willing to make every sacrifice and to incur every burden necessary to win this war, but they are not willing, and must not be asked, to suffer unnecessary burdens of waste, carelessness, and confusion.

The Senate Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program was organized early in 1941 to prevent such waste and was authorized and directed by the United States Senate to investigate the operation of the program for the procurement and construction of all supplies, materials, munitions, vehicles, aircraft, vessels, plants, camps, and other articles and facilities connected with the war program. The committee was directed to examine into the types and terms of all contracts awarded, the methods by which they were awarded, and the contractors selected, the utilization of small business concerns through subcontracts or otherwise, geographical distribution of contracts and location of plants and facilities, the effect of such program with respect to labor and the migration of labor, the practices of management or labor, and the benefits accruing to contractors with respect to amortization for purposes of taxation or otherwise. In other words, the committee was directed to examine into every phase of the entire war program.

The committee was not organized to tell the war agencies what to do or how to do it. The purpose of the committee is not to substitute its judgment for their judgment. Its function is to insure that intelligent consideration is given to the important and difficult problems presented by the war program for the purpose of making certain that the sure victory to be won is won with the least cost in human lives and property.

The membership of the committee is both nonsectional and nonpartisan. The committee has never had a minority report. I hope that it never will. Its members constitute 10 percent of the Senate, and both parties are represented. Members come from every section of the country. The South is represented by Senator CONNALLY, of Texas; the Southwest by Senator HATCH, of New Mexico; and the west coast by Senator WALLGREN, of Washington. The New England States are represented by Senator BREWSTER, of Maine; the Middle Atlantic States by Senator MEAD, of New York; the Ohio Valley by Senator KILGORE, of West Virginia, and Senator BURTON, of Ohio; the North by Senator BALL, of Minnesota; the Middle West by Senator HERRING, of Iowa, and myself.

The committee was organized to do a job, and its members have no preconceived notions, no partisan views to promote, and no beliefs to prove. It is determined to have neither a whitewash nor a smear. It wants to build and not to destroy.

In the last war, investigations were postponed until the end of the conflict. Then we witnessed a spectacle of literally scores of congressional committees investigating after it was too late to do anything except to apportion the blame, with the aid of hindsight. It was not remarkable that in almost every instance those committees wrote majority and minority reports which reached opposite conclusions.

We are determined that this time the investigation will take place while the war program is in progress. In this way there will be ample opportunity to correct, not merely to find fault. Experience has shown that post mortem investigations usually are futile. We did not even profit in this war by the experience of the last war.

During this war the investigation must and will be carried on simultaneously with the war program, so that mistakes, discovered by focusing public attention upon actions of the war agencies, can be remedied before irretrievable damage is done. Responsibility for such mistakes can be assessed now in the light of the facts as they occur and repetition prevented.

In short, we are doing a surgeon's job to cure and not performing an autopsy to find out why the patient died.

People usually think of investigators as long-nosed snoopers perpetually pointing an accusing finger and broadcasting carping criticism. As we all know, fair investigation and intelligent criticism are most valuable. The threat of exposing arbitrary or capricious action is the one way to make bureaucrats, not elected by the people, responsible to them. The bare possibility of such exposure constitutes a most salutary check.

The committee has been critical of many things. But it has tried to be both restrained and constructive in its criticism. More important even than its restrained and

constructive criticism is the work of the committee in compelling consideration and intelligent decision on numerous matters which never became the subject of public criticism by the committee, but which without attention and investigation might have resulted in great injury to the war program. Things are seldom all white or all black. Most of our appointed public officials are not arbitrary or capricious, but many are often jealous and stubborn. They often have problems which are difficult to solve and with respect to which intelligent men hold different views. The more energetically a capable administrator functions in his particular field, the less is he likely to take, or be able to take, an over-all view of the war effort as a whole.

Administrators must be brought together and induced to agree upon some workable conclusion so that we can get on with the job. The committee has frequently found it possible to assist in such matters. There is a tendency for each agency and for each subdivision of each agency to overemphasize the particular portion of the war program for which it is responsible. This results in our having 20 or 30 separate programs which are competing with each other for scarce materials and manpower and which in the aggregate are making demands upon our economy greater than our ability to produce. These agencies conscientiously tried to keep each other informed, but direction was necessary. Mere coordination was not sufficient.

The job of providing that direction was given to Mr. Donald Nelson, the Chairman of the War Production Board. He has the difficult task of allotting too little among too many and scaling war agencies' requests down to a point that can be met with the materials available. The disputes which arose between the contending groups were many and loud, and often important questions remained undecided for many months. The committee has assisted in breaking these log jams by investigations, both public and private. Frequently, disputes that have continued for months have been resolved almost overnight, after the committee began an investigation into the matters involved.

Materials are so scarce that Mr. Nelson has had the job not only of parceling out the materials among the various agencies, but of making certain that they are efficiently utilized without waste of manpower.

To win this war mass production is essential. This requires efficient planning so that there will be an uninterrupted flow of materials from the mines and quarries, forests, and farms, on through to the finished product. Such problems can be resolved only by civilians with mass-production experience. They are not military problems.

The soldier's job is to determine where he is going to fight, what he will need to fight with and how to use it after it is produced. There has been a natural tendency on the part of the armed services to want complete control over everything that is to be produced for them—a tendency which has led to many disputes with the trained civilian businessmen who were retained by the War Production Board for the purpose of making available their production experience. This situation is dangerous. The Army and Navy can use only the finished products. Each of their officers is intent on procuring the material under his direction. The raw materials are everybody's business, and everybody's business is likely to become nobody's business. Their natural insistence on obtaining finished articles has had a tendency to lead them to build unnecessary new plants to assemble finished goods with an aggregate capacity far in excess of the raw materials and semifinished goods available.

Realizing this, the committee almost from its inception urged the expansion of facilities to produce basic raw materials, such as aluminum, steel, and copper, and the conversion of facilities for civilian production, such as automobiles, to war production so as to reduce the over-all need for basic commodities. Such changes have been made, although belatedly.

Notwithstanding this, our ever-increasing demands for additional military equipment have reached the point where they exceed the quantities which can be made available to the armed forces consistent with our lend-lease commitments to our allies and with the preservation of an essential civilian economy. For example, the total amount of steel for which the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission had issued priorities for a recent month exceeded the entire amount of steel to be produced that month. The committee insisted that this amazing situation be corrected by evolving a system of allocations whereby each essential user of steel would be allocated the tonnage it could expect to receive. Such a system has recently been put into effect.

Since we cannot now expect to receive appreciable benefits for many months from new facilities to be erected to produce basic commodities, and since manpower is so scarce, we must now give attention to the problem of whether the Army and Navy in the sizes planned are in balance with the ships to transport them and the supplies for their maintenance.

Under the present program, an army of 7,500,000 men is contemplated. Brigadier General Littlejohn, of the Army Quartermaster Corps, said in London recently that 10½ tons of shipping must be used to transport 1 soldier to Great Britain and 1½ tons each month to maintain him there. The Brookings Institute has estimated that four and six-tenths million tons of shipping in continual operation are required to maintain an army of 1,000,000 men abroad for the first year.

It will do little good to raise a huge army unless, consistently with supplying our allies with the weapons they need, we can transport and supply our own Army overseas. It is even more futile to raise so large an army that its attempted supply and maintenance will destroy the essential civilian economy. We must retain the essentials of a sound civilian economy so that after we have won the war we will have a foundation on which to rebuild and make secure the American way of life.

We must not forget that war today is total war. In order to win the war we must not only outfight our enemies but we must outproduce them in all important fields. It is not enough to have airplanes and bullets. We must also have food for our armed forces, for our war workers, and for our allies. The farmers, in producing that food, are engaged in a vital war effort. We cannot expect them to make bricks without straw, and we must take steps now to insure maintenance of their labor supply and to equip them with the farm machinery and other things that they require to maintain their production.

Similarly, war workers and essential civilian workers alike must be fed and clothed and kept reasonably warm. To that end we should make available for civilian use as many of the necessities as can be spared, without endangering the success of our armed effort. This means, first, that everyone should produce to the limit of his ability; second, that the armed forces and other war agencies should make certain that they do not use any materials that do not directly contribute some military advantage; third, that the methods for rationing materials to the civilian population should be fair and easily understandable.

The broad, general principles as to how much manpower and how much material can be made available for the various uses must be determined nationally by national officers, but the actual application of those general principles should be made locally by local boards composed of persons familiar with local problems, who are given sufficient authority and discretion to make a fair and equitable distribution.

We can solve these problems. We can outproduce and outfight the Axis, but we must do so in the American way within the framework of our Constitution. As a militant people we can show the Axis that the democratic way of life is the only way and ever renews its vitality from the vigor of a united people. If it is believed that we cannot win this war without aping the totalitarian practices of our enemy, we have lost the peace before we have won the war. This, it is my unalterable conviction, we do not have to do. This it is the work of the committee to prevent.

The Mississippi River in War

(By Brig. Gen. Max C. Tyler, president, Mississippi River Commission)

It seems impossible to discuss the Mississippi River's place in this war without first talking about the Mississippi River war. The Mississippi River war has been going on now for 200 years. It is the war which the American people have waged against the river for the purpose of possessing and working the rich bottom lands constituting the alluvial valley and of developing a stable, prosperous, high-order civilization thereon. The Mississippi River war is not over. True, great progress has been made and victory seems in sight. But before it can be won, there is much yet to be done. When victory has been achieved the price of peace will be eternal vigilance. The enemy can never be destroyed. He is powerful. He never sleeps and he will never stop his attack against your defenses.

To understand the Mississippi River war one must appreciate the strength of the enemy. The modern Mississippi River flows in alluvial deposits laid down in a deeper valley at the end of the last ice period. Down through this alluvial valley must come the run-off from 41 percent of the United States and parts of two Canadian provinces. Recorded flows below the Arkansas vary from a low of about 100,000 cubic feet per second to a high of about 2,500,000 cubic feet per second. High-water levels are some 60 feet above low water. Velocities of flow of 10 feet per second are not uncommon. The combination of great volumes of water, high velocities, great depths, and easily erodible beds and banks produces an extremely unstable river. In recent times the river and all its tributaries have occupied many different locations through the valley. To mention some, the Mississippi has occupied the courses of the St. Francis, the Yazoo, the Sunflower, Walnut Bayou, and the Black. At one time it reached the Gulf down the course of Bayou Teche; at another time down the course of Bayou Lafourche.

The present meander belt is the third of a series which the modern river has followed. In each meander belt the river has swung back and forth, caving its banks, building bars and cutting off bends. Every year, on the average, it caves 750,000,000 cubic yards of material from its banks into the river, a large portion of which is deposited in bars which force the current against the opposite bank, causing it to cave, and so on down the river. When DeSoto first saw the river 400 years ago, it had been occupying its present meander belt for some time. The river was out of banks and some 80 miles wide at the latitude of Greenville. The alluvial valley was a wilderness of forest and swamp and a hunting ground for the Indian. Two hundred years ago our pioneer predecessors began their war against the river to keep it off these rich bottom lands.

The alluvial valley is divided into a number of great basins. In each basin the highest land is along the river front. Drainage is away from the river into streams which flow

generally parallel to the main river, and enter it at points where the Mississippi approaches a valley wall or at the confluence of the main river and a major tributary. In erecting flood defenses against the river the early settlers of the valley had only a limited choice of location for a defensive line. The result is that each basin from the beginning was protected by a single line of levee located on the highest ground close to the river. At first, these levees were of such height and section as to keep out only the smaller overbank high waters. As the country was cleared up and settled and more money became available from taxation, these levee lines were strengthened and raised to keep out larger floods. Time after time the river has broken these defenses and flooded the bottom lands behind them. The local people in this valley have spent $230,000,000 of their own money on the levee system. Necessity demanded the adoption of the single line system of defense against the river for each basin. For example, a single line runs from St. Johns Bayou to the mouth of the St. Francis, 228 miles. A single line 270 miles long protects the Yazoo Basin. The line from Pine Bluff, Ark., to Point Breeze, La., extends for 306 miles. Tactically a single line system of defense assumes great risks and entails great difficulties. The fight must be made on this single front line. There are no switch positions and there are no second lines to which to retreat. A break at the upper end of a basin means the flooding of the entire basin. A break in the middle means flooding most of the basin, and a break at the lower end means flooding of a large portion of the basin.

Now, breaks in the levee line during high water occur from several causes: From underseepage, causing sand boils and piping; from through-seepage, causing sloughs; from wave wash, causing loss of section; and from overtopping. Any one of these occurrences may result in a crevasse which, once started, often enlarges to a width of several thousand feet. So to hold these long levee lines in high water they must be patrolled and guarded. Low sections must be built up, incipient sloughs must be drained or weighted down, protection against wave wash must be placed and said boils ringed. All these operations take men and money.

But in addition to the high water dangers, the river may at any time decide to change its direction and go through a main line levee. There are but three ways of dealing with such an attack. One is to fall back, that is, to prepare a retired position, a setback levee loop. The construction of such a loop may take from several months to 2 years, depending upon its length, height, and foundation conditions and, of course, such a setback is expensive. Or the caving bank may be held by bank protection work, willow mats loaded with stone, articulated concrete mattress or asphalt mattress. This method also is expensive, costing upwards of $500,000 per mile of bank protected. Or in some cases the river may be diverted from its purpose of changing its course by extensive channel dredging. None of these operations can be carried on during high water.

A great flood in the alluvial valley causes conditions closely approximating those existing in a theater of operations in war. There are the same mud and rain, confusion, panic, and difficulties of transportation that are found in a military campaign. A recent flood on the Potomac caused considerable excitement and anxiety in the Capital City. Imagine that condition magnified a thousand times and you have some idea of the situation that exists during a great flood in this valley. The 1927 flood caused such widespread disaster and suffering in this valley that the whole country was aroused. The damage was estimated at from $200,000,000 to $400,000,000. All east and west rail lines south of Cairo except one, the Southern Pacific at New Orleans, were interrupted. Towns were under water for weeks. The existing project is the outgrowth of that flood.

The project provides for levees along the main river to take care of an estimated discharge of 2,450,000 cubic feet a second at Cairo, 3,000,000 cubic feet a second at the latitude of the Arkansas River, and 3,000,000 cubic feet a second at the latitude of Red River; for floodways, namely, the New Madrid, the Morganza, the West Atchafalaya, the Atchafalaya, and the Bonnet Carre floodways, and the Wax Lake Outlet, to take care of flows in excess of the main channel capacity; for channel improvement and stabilization on the main river to provide for navigation and to increase discharge capacity; for headwater projects on the Yazoo and St. Francis Rivers to protect the St. Francis and Yazoo Basins from headwater floods by the construction of reservoirs, levees, and channel improvements; for the protection of the Yazoo and Red River backwater areas by levees; for the improvement of Bayous Rapides, Boeuf, and Cocodrie, La., and the construction of a lock through the east guide levee of the Atchafalaya floodway at Bayou Sorrell. The Federal Government has spent $430,000,000 toward the completion of this project, so we are talking about an investment of some $660,000,000, $230,000,000 of which was put up by the local people. This investment is in earthworks, revetments, channels, reservoirs, floodways. It is not like having money in Government bonds with nothing to do but cut the coupons. This investment is in works which must be constantly maintained, or the river will destroy them. Neither the people in this valley nor the Government can afford to allow this investment to be lost or even jeopardized for lack of adequate funds for constant and first-class maintenance.

Now, let us take stock of what has been accomplished in this Mississippi River war. Substantial defenses have been raised against the river. Over 3,000,000 people now live behind those defenses. There are 35 States in the Union, each of which has a population less than that of the alluvial valley. On the basis of the present strength of the armed forces, the alluvial valley has furnished them 135,000 men, and that number will increase to 170,000 when the proposed strength of the armed forces is realized. The alluvial valley, then, has furnished to the armed forces the equivalent of 8 dvisions. That is more men than the combined forces of Grant and Pemberton in the decisive siege of Vicksburg and almost as many men as Meade and Lee together commanded in the battle of Gettysburg.

The existing levee system affords substantial protection to 2,500 miles of main-line railways and to 2,000 miles of main-line highways. It protects a large proportion of the country's cotton acreage and the sugar industry of Louisiana, and oil and sulfur developments in that State. Behind the levees are Air Corps school and tactical installations and other Army plants.

The defensive system is not completed. There remains $232,000,000 worth of work to do. The need for additional work on the main-line levees is greater now than it was before the enactment of the Flood Control Act of 1941. The straightening of the river accomplished in the last 10 years and the readjustment of levee grades is to compensate for the abandonment of the Eudora floodway. The river will not stay straight unless it is controlled by revetments and dredging. Some $70,000,000 must be expended to bring main-line levees throughout the system to project grade and section.

We may hope that we have finally learned from our reverses so far in this war that the time to prepare for war is during peace. Preparations made after war starts are expensive in lives and money. The same is true of flood defenses. They cannot be built during a flood. They must be built between floods. The last great flood was in 1937. A break in the front-line levees in any of the basins of this valley during this emergency would prove a national disaster in the interruption of transportation facilities and general confusion in the very center of the country. It unquestionably would divert from our military operations much strength which could not well be spared. Fortunately, a minimum of critical materials is required for the strengthening of the levee system. The levees are built of earth and the earth is secured immediately adjacent to the levee. All that is needed to continue to prosecute the work are funds and repair parts for earth-moving equipment. We who know what the river can do believe that our highest executive authorities will recommend and that our statesmen in Congress will see to it that the strengthening of the flood defenses of this valley is continued at this time.

While the river has been an implacable enemy to the development of the alluvial valley, it has loomed large in our national history as a great route of trade and travel by water. The need for the development and safeguarding of navigation on the river has been one of the firm convictions of the American people since the early days of the Republic.

Trade on the river began with flat boats for down-stream traffic. Later, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the steamboat made its appearance. The Louisiana Purchase was dictated largely by the necessity to control trade on the river. The Battle of New Orleans was fought by the British to get possession of the mouth of the river, and the strategy of the Federal Government during the war between the States was largely based on the importance of controlling the Mississippi River and cutting the Confederacy in two. When the Navy captured New Orleans and Grant captured Vicksburg, the river was open from Cairo to the Gulf and the ultimate collapse of the Confederacy was inevitable.

The great era of railroad building after the War between the States saw the trade gradually leave the river packets for the rails. By the time of the last World War the old romantic packets were practically gone, and a large down-stream coal trade was on the way out due to the discovery and development of extensive oil and gas fields in Louisiana and Texas.

Those who believed in water transportation were active just prior to the last World War in attempting to establish barge lines on the Mississippi, and the congestion on the railroads in the east and at eastern ports and their almost complete breakdown during the severe winter of 1917 and 1918 gave impetus to this movement. Some shipments of equipment and supplies for our armies overseas were attempted by barge to New Orleans during 1918. With the completion of the canalization of the Ohio River, the upper Mississippi and the Illinois and the provision of better channels on the Mississippi south of Cairo and the completion of the Intracoastal Canal along the Gulf coast, barge transportation on the great inland waterway system has grown by leaps and bounds. There are now operating on this system a large number of well-equipped barge lines connecting Texas and Louisiana with the upper Ohio, the Great Lakes at Chicago, and with St. Louis and St. Paul on the upper Mississippi. Individual tows carry from 3,000 tons to as high as 13,000 tons of net cargo. The principal war commodities moved are gasoline, lubricating oils, sulphur, and scrap metal to the industrial areas. In addition to the heavy movements of war materials, the river is performing another great service for the country at this

time. All the inland boatbuilding yards are working to capacity to turn out assault boats, patrol boats, net tenders, mine planters, and submarines for the Navy. These vessels in large numbers are reaching the sea by way of the Ohio, the Illinois, the upper Mississippi, and the lower Mississippi Rivers.

It is peculiar how history repeats itself. The railroads were unable to carry the freight, passenger, and troop-movement load in the last war without most serious delay and congestion. The Association of American Railroads now states that rail transportation has already reached the saturation point in the southeastern territory. The association further says that the railroad freight traffic next year is expected to surpass that of the peak year of the First World War by 75 percent. The railroads are now operating with approximately 500,000 fewer freight cars and about 22,000 less locomotives than they had in 1918. The Mississippi River between Cairo and Baton Rouge is now handling over 10,000,000 tons of long-haul freight per annum over the well-lighted and buoyed channel. The amount of freight which can be carried on the Mississippi south of Cairo is limited only by the floating equipment available. The river could carry 100,000,000 tons as easily as it can carry 10,000,000 tons. It would seem to be the part of wisdom to make greater and greater use of this efficient transportation route in order to relieve the congestion and overloading of the railroads, particularly in the southeastern territory, which has already become apparent.

The maintenance of the river channels requires the operation of a fleet of dredges. Without constant channel work, navigation will become impossible. It is unthinkable that this great artery of commerce be obstructed at this time.

Labor's Share in Winning the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech on Labor's Share in Winning of the War, recently delivered by me at the convention of the American Federation of Labor organization in New Jersey. This article appeared in the Perth Amboy Evening News of December 31, 1942.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BARBOUR SAYS LABOR'S SHARE IN WINNING WAR SECOND ONLY TO MEN ON THE FIGHTING LINES

(By W. WARREN BARBOUR, United States Senator)

Labor's share in the winning of the war will be second to none, excepting only the men on the firing lines, but its responsibilities in the winning of the peace will be even greater, so declared United States Senator W. WARREN BARBOUR in reviewing labor activity during 1942.

"The winning of the peace," Senator BARBOUR said, "is a task that cannot be postponed until military victory is won. It runs on a parallel track with the winning of the war. While our Government is studying the problems of that post-war period now, and the research workers of the labor organizations struggle for their solution, organized labor of itself must start to look ahead now, and to prepare for the greater national responsibility that will belong to its members as American citizens in the days of reconstruction ahead."

The Senator predicted that organized labor would have a very major voice in formulating the peace and in organizing the world after the Axis has been crushed. "Victory over our enemies calls for physical courage and stamina such as America has never before summoned, in the shops and mills as on the seas and battlefields," the Senator continued. "But we could still win the war and lose what we are fighting for, unless we match physical courage with as magnificent a display of character and soul, so that what we have come to call the American way of life may be preserved and magnified."

Uncontrollable inflation and paralyzing depression, BARBOUR said, could make military victory meaningless. Labor, he declared, has as great a responsibility toward preventing such national disaster as any other element in American society.

"There is no use hoping for a return of the so-called good old days of self-sufficiency," the Senator said. "But unless we are criminally negligent now in taking courageous precautions against economic and social and political collapse, it is wholly probable that we may conceivably emerge from this period of blood, sweat, and tears into better days, morally and socially, than our country has even seen. It means, however, harder work than we have been performing—all of us; less selfishness, more cooperation, more foresight, less regard for the momentary advantage so we can insure the greater advantage of the future."

The basis of the American way of life, Senator BARBOUR said, was free initiative and free enterprise, which is just as vital to labor as to capital. "I feel, however, that the phrase 'capitalistic system' is unfortunate, because it carries the implication that money of itself is the chief ingredient in an industry, when in reality the workers' skill is just as important an investment and must actually be more jealously protected than the stocks and bonds which are only a part of management's contribution to the whole. But neither can exist prosperously without the other, and labor's injustice to the capital structure would be just as suicidal as management's injustice to the workers. The very basis of democracy is the realization that the protection of one's own rights is guaranteed by one's willingness to protect the rights of others."

Consequently labor must share the responsibility in avoiding disastrous inflation and in preparing itself for the inevitable post-war period of conversion and adjustment from a military to a civil economy, the Senator declared. Inflation, even more than depression, would jeopardize, if not destroy, union organization, union income, and would wipe out labor's reserves both in money and in technical skill.

That there will be drastic adjustments in kinds of work and scales of income, while the Nation struggles back to a peacetime economy, must be realized by labor, by management, and by all elements in America, the Senator explained. Any group's insistence upon special privilege at this crucial time will foster evils which can be prevented by intelligent, cooperative planning. As one of the largest elements in the human structure of the Nation, labor has a very great responsibility toward preserving our democracy and thereby consolidating and increasing its hard-won gains, the Senator said. By the same evidence, he said, labor deserves a very major voice in defining the peace and administering the rules by which a war-free world will operate.

"But of this I am certain in discharging its responsibilities, labor will be guided by what is democracy's good. Labor will demand, and shall receive, the share in victory that it is investing in the war. It will shoulder, in turn, the grave responsibilities that are also labor's share—labor's share as Americans. Labor, agriculture, capital, the sciences and the professions—these are but parts of the great entity which is America, and only as they work with and for each other can America remain great and become greater."

We Need a Courageous and Independent Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "We Need a Courageous and Independent Congress," delivered by me at Aberdeen, S. Dak., on October 12, 1942.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends and fellow Americans, it is a tremendous pleasure to get away from the pressure and confusion of Washington and meet the people who, together with their sons in the armed forces, are really carrying on this war. It is refreshing to learn something at first hand of their thoughts about the war and the work in which they are engaged.

This is a peculiar campaign from a national standpoint. Politics must take a back seat because the first thought of everyone must be to do the work which is necessary for the war. But that very fact makes the election a more solemn undertaking to which the people must turn with an even greater sense of responsibility. They must quietly exercise the same kind of judgment in selecting Congressmen that the President must exercise when he appoints a director of production like Mr. Nelson, or a director of economic stabilization like Justice Byrnes. The result of the Congressional and Senatorial elections must be decided this year not on party lines, but on the character, ability, and independence of the individual candidates for the Senate and for the House of Representatives.

We are engaged in the greatest war in history. We face the most powerful military nations which the world has ever seen. There can be no stopping short of complete victory. Anything else would subject this country to constant insult, harassment, and attack. Whatever you may read of confusion in Washington, you can be certain of one thing: There, as throughout the United States, there is a unanimous determination to carry the war through to its necessary and victorious conclusion. Furthermore, whatever criticism there may be of the conduct of the war, everyone, Republican and Democrat alike, is in favor of giving full and complete power to the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy to carry on the military operations. Whatever else you may ask Congress to do you cannot ask a body of 531 men to carry on a military and naval campaign. No one with any intelligence is disposed to interfere with decisions on military and naval matters made by those whose whole life has been spent in studying the

extremely technical and complicated subject. There never has been a war extending to so many corners of the earth, none with so many complications, none whose success depends so much on expert and technical knowledge. The universal disapproval which has met Mr. Willkie's attempt to interfere with the judgment of our military authorities on a second front shows that you need have no concern with any such interference, whether Republicans or Democrats control Congress. I hope that even the President himself will not interfere with their judgment.

Congress has refused the President no appropriation. It has refused no men deemed necessary for active service. It has approved the appointments of the President without question. Of course, there is criticism and justified criticism. Of course, suggestions are made and should be made. But the only way to run the military end of a war is to let some man run it, and the only possible choice is President Roosevelt.

Furthermore, I disagree strenuously with those who have gone out announcing that we are losing the war. I have complete confidence in our ultimate victory, in spite of Washington confusion and delay. The people are naturally impatient, but to conquer two great military nations across the great oceans of the world is no simple task. Two or three years of preparation would not be unreasonable for that task. The war must be a long war—we should have realized that when we went in it—but we are not losing it now, and we will not lose it in the future.

The second field of war preparation, however, is not so exclusively the task of the President. That is the field of production for military purposes. The amount and the character of guns, tanks, planes, and ships which are necessary is again a military problem, and we cannot easily question the decision of the President and his advisors. But when we come to the method in which these munitions are to be produced we must turn to the civilian population itself. Congress can judge their reaction as easily as the President. In the field of production there are many men outside of the Government who are fully as experienced as those in charge, and constructive criticism is of real value to the progress of the war.

Take the question of the organization necessary for the production of munitions. As long ago as May 29, 1940, Senator AUSTIN, of Vermont, Senator VANDENBERG, and I urged the creation of an agency with a single head to take charge of the production of munitions. On June 15, 1940, and again in November 1940, I introduced a bill to set up a War Resources Administration composed of a single administrator and an advisory council. Such an administration had been provided for in the industrial mobilization plan approved for years by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. But it took nearly 2 years of steady criticism before that result was finally reached by the appointment of Mr. Nelson. First the President created a board of seven, called the National Defense Advisory Commission, which did not even have a chairman. Then we went through the double-headed Office of Production Management, under Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Hillman, with all the confusion and futility which delayed so long our productive effort. In each case the administration insisted that they were doing a perfect job. If independent criticism has accomplished nothing else, it has finally put on a sound basis the organization of production. Modern war depends entirely for its success on that production. It can be made much shorter by constructive criticism.

Furthermore, intelligent investigation by the Truman committee has eliminated many serious faults and abuses in various production and constructive projects. Excessive profiteering and excessive costs in many construction projects have been brought to light, and I hope have had some effect in the correction of abuses. Every day, however, I still hear of vast waste in construction projects. The payment of wages is so high that it is draining men from essential agriculture and from essential mining. Undoubtedly when billions are available there will be waste, but I venture to think that if Congress were just a trifle more independent and investigating committees were not so friendly to the administration, they would crack down on these criminal inefficiencies. I venture to think that American citizens might not have to pay from $50 to $120 for the privilege of working on projects of their own Government, essential for the conduct of the war. Here is a field in which independent and intelligent Congressmen are of far more use to the people than those who blindly follow some party line.

But there is a third field in which intelligence and independence are still more essential. We have never seen a war in which so many economic controls over the daily life of the people have been proposed. We are moving rapidly toward a condition in which every essential article will be rationed. Every price will be fixed, and every wage and salary dictated from Washington. Except in the field of rubber, and in the East in the field of petroleum products, I doubt very much whether conditions are really essentially different from what they were in past wars, but the spirit of the times, or of the New Deal, prefers detailed Government control over everything and everybody.

The greatest difference between this war and the last is in the spirit in which the Government approaches these controls. In the last war the whole Food Administration and many other controls were based almost entirely on an appeal for patriotic cooperation. The people were told what they were expected to do, and the reasons why. Every town in America and every rural community knows how to organize itself for patriotic work. We are a self-organizing nation. We can't meet without forming committees and electing chairmen. Today the people are only asking for a clear statement of the manner by which they can cooperate in the war. True, in the last war we had a little compulsion in the background, a few paddles in the closet, but after 90 percent of the people had been sold on the job to be done it was hardly ever necessary to use those paddles to spank the other 10 percent.

Now, the whole control is based on threats, threats to crack down, threats of shortages and rationing. Instead of being asked to save sugar for the Army and foreign shipment, wild statements and threats of a complete disappearance of sugar produced a rush to every grocery store in the United States. Except for the methods of the Government I don't believe sugar rationing would ever have been necessary. Instead of rationing meat, if there is a shortage, why not try a few meatless days, and appeal to patriotism? Instead of threatening to confiscate tires, why not go out and offer to buy the extras? There is a crowd in Washington who think they know what the people want, and ought to have, better than the people themselves.

They prefer to issue directives (a good Fascist term now becoming fashionable in Washington), regulations, and threats of prosecution. In the Price Control Act we provided for volunteer industry committees to cooperate with the Price Administrator. If they have been appointed at all, their advice is utterly ignored. The Price Administration is full of professors and theorists with hardly a practical businessman in the crowd. To many of them it is the accomplishment of the ideal planned economy to which the New Deal has long looked forward. They revel in directing the daily life of 130,000,000 people.

I recognize the necessity temporarily during the war of certain Fascist controls. I supported the Price Control Act and the recent anti-inflation bill. I recognize the seriousness of the rubber situation, and I have long urged that gas rationing be extended throughout the country to save rubber, without waiting until after the election. But outside of the gasoline, I think we can get along without rationing if we will try a little cooperation.

We have now before Congress the tremendous difficult manpower problem. By taking 10,000,000 men for the armed forces we are creating shortages in every walk of life. It is particularly difficult for the farmer. But here again I doubt if compulsion directed from Washington is going to solve the problem. I don't believe that in this great democratic country we need any plan for forced labor. Apart from the principle of the thing, I don't believe that men ordered to work on particular farms or for particular manufacturers are going to be efficient workers.

You cannot order Americans around like sheep, the way some of our bureaucrats would like to do. I introduced a bill last week providing for the making of a master plan to provide the necessary men not only for the armed forces but also for agriculture, for war industry, and for other essential activities. If we tell any man where he can be most useful in the war effort, the chances are 10 to 1 he is going to accept that judgment voluntarily. We can recruit both men and women for the necessary services if the Government will undertake to pay the cost of moving, if that is necessary, and even take their homes and farms off their hands where the move appears to be permanent. A plan of compulsory labor will certainly not work without intelligent planning and supervision. If we have that intelligent planning and supervision, the whole question can be solved on a volunteer basis. And nothing is more important today than the question of agricultural labor. Already herds of milk cattle are being sold, and unless we keep farm labor on the farm, we're going to find a real need of rationing milk and butter and other food essential to ourselves and our allies.

In any event, I should like to see a Congress which would only come to compulsory controls when it is forced by circumstances to do so. I would like to see a Congress that would not accept blindly every idea urged on the President by some professor of economics who enjoys the opportunity of telling the people where to get off.

Furthermore, in this field of economic control there is nothing in the fact that we are at war to justify turning over arbitrary power to the President. Regardless of the attitude of some newspapers, the war is not going to be won or lost by a small amount of inflation. We can take enough time in deciding what the controls shall be to be sure we are right. So far the cost of living has increased about 20 percent, compared with 120 percent in the World War. It is important to control, but it should be controlled fairly and equitably between the different groups, and there is no reason to freeze every existing inequity.

In short, the Constitution makes the President Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. It does not make him Commander in Chief of the civilian population. He has no more right to set aside the laws of Congress relating to the civilian population in time of war than he has in time of peace. His threat to do so on September 7 only created disunity and dissension in the United States.

I have seen various statements in newspaper editorials and elsewhere justifying the

President's position on the ground that Lincoln stretched the executive power far in times of crisis. That is true, but I know of nothing he did which did not have a close relation to the actual operations of the Army. His were individual acts made necessary by some great emergency in the conduct of the war itself. But the President's claim today that he can fix wages and prices throughout the entire United States and set aside a law of the United States, is a claim of legislative power over the civilian population which no other President has ever even asserted. There is no constitutional authority for such a position, and if it should be acquiesced in, there would be no democratic government remaining in this country. If that power were admitted to exist today it would necessarily extend until the making of the treaty of peace, which might be 5 years after the cessation of hostilities under the present plan for a waiting period.

The division of authority today is very clear in my mind. The President is in full charge of all military and naval operation. By congressional action, he has been placed in full charge of production of war materials. In the economic field, however, while he has been given wide power, his discretion is much more limited, and Congress, under the Constitution, has the right and duty to determine how the burden of this war shall be distributed among the civilian population. Congress determines what our tax system shall be and how much each person shall pay. It determines how farm prices and wages shall be regulated. It must determine how manpower shall be distributed and men asked to serve the country. Of course, even in these fields, much more power must be delegated to the administrative agencies than in time of peace, but Congress must fix the standards and the methods that are to be pursued. Having determined those standards, it seems to me that the administrative agencies must actually fix the prices on each commodity and the wages to be paid in each industry. The administrative agencies, like the draft boards, must pass on the individual capacity of each man, but they should do so under clear rules laid down by law according to principles established by Congress. Any attempt by the Executive to seize such power breaks down the very democratic system for which we are fighting throughout all the continents of the world to preserve. That system depends on the making of the people's laws by the people's representatives.

Certainly we should have a Congress determined to assert the right of the people to pass on those matters which affect their daily life, the prices they pay, the wages they receive, and the manner in which the members of the family are enlisted for war service. We don't want Congressmen who follow blindly the orders of anyone and acquiesce in every claim of arbitrary power.

Finally, we want a Congress to deal constructively with the problems of post-war reorganization. I am much less confident of success in that field than I am of victory in the war. We will face the most difficult domestic and foreign problems this country has ever seen. Surely those problems should be decided by a Congress anxious to carry out the people's will instead of being subservient to a group of "braintrusters" in Washington whose ideas are nearly all of European origin. We don't want Congressmen who haven't got the intelligence to criticize the plans which this crowd makes for the administration; and haven't got the courage to oppose them. And I might say that nothing has impressed me so much in Washington as the cleverness with which New Deal plans are prepared and presented in the most innocuous-appearing measures. Sometimes even the reputed authors of those measures wake up to find a vast bureaucratic organization of which they had never conceived, carrying out an ambitious and expensive plan which they had not understood.

There are plenty of people in Washington today looking forward to the post-war period as a time for completing the socialization of the United States. Because no large nation has ever been socialized successfully without some kind of limited dictatorship they hope to center all possible power in the President. Thus the press quoted Attorney General Biddle as follows: "Turning to the United States after the war," Biddle said, "thought must be given to the extent war controls will continue after peace comes. It has been recognized generally that the Government will be slow to release the vast powers under which industry and people are being regimented in the war period.

"We are now in a noncompetitive economy which is becoming a completely integrated Government-controlled economy, and cannot be abandoned instantly when peace comes." About the same time Mr. Biddle urged new dealers to keep up the political fight regardless of the war. He said that the New Deal had succeeded as a liberal movement because it was a political party allied with the labor movement.

Mrs. Roosevelt stated in her July magazine article entitled "What Are We Fighting For?" that—

"When we look over the past few years we discover that the war as we know it now is only a phase of something which has been going on ever since the last war, a kind of world revolution. * * *

"Once people as a whole understand that these are the objectives of the leaders of the United Nations there will be sorrow at the young lives that are sacrificed, but not bitterness. All will be willing to accept civilian hardships and sacrifice, for there will be full understanding that failure to win the revolution in the way of democracy will bring only unbearable disaster. The war is but a step in the revolution. After the war must come the realization of the things for which we have fought, the dream of a new world."

One of the most influential economic advisors of the Government is Dr. Alvin H. Hansen. He is a special advisor to the board of governors of the Federal Reserve System, and connected with the Naval Resources Planning Board, which is engaged in making our plans for us. He sets out his idea of what conditions should be in the post-war period. He said on June 27, "Congress will surrender to the administration the power to tax, keeping to itself the right only to establish broad limits within which the administration may move. Congress will appropriate huge sums of money, surrender its power of directing when and how the money shall be spent. Other extraordinary powers such as, for instance, the power to effect wholesale social reforms, will be delegated to the administration which will retain most, if not all, of the extraordinary wartime powers.

Now, if you want that kind of a post-war United States, vote for those men who say that they are 100 percent for President Roosevelt and will do exactly as he says. If you want the people after the war to have something to say about their own daily lives, then vote for that Congressman who will do his own thinking. No one can overestimate the difficulty of our post-war problem. Nine-tenths of the people want to go back to a system of free enterprise subject to proper regulation of the abuses which that system develops, and above all a system in which they can direct their own lives and not be bossed from Washington.

The time has hardly come to discuss in detail the international problem which will arise after the war. Undoubtedly we cannot march to Tokyo and Berlin without assuming some responsibility for reestablishing the world on a peace basis. Exactly what that system should be we cannot now be sure. I believe that everyone will desire to set up an economic and political world system which will insure as far as humanly possible that the great tragedy of the World War will not recur. I believe we should adopt any plan which is practical enough to promise success. But again I believe that the people of this country and their representatives in Congress ought to determine what our course shall be. I am a good deal disturbed by the apparent tendency of the President to determine the post-war foreign policy without consulting the people. It is suggested that there should be a waiting period of 5 years before the treaty of peace is made. I agree that that may be desirable, but the country's foreign policy during that period ought to be that which the people of America wish it to be.

The Constitution wisely provides that treaties must be approved by the Senate, but more and more the President is whittling away that provision of the Constitution. The Atlantic Charter was never submitted to the Senate for ratification. It is "a joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom." They "deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries." Then follow various clauses expressing hopes and beliefs. In the fourth clause, however, the President purports to speak for the entire Nation, and to establish a policy extending many years into the future. That clause reads:

"Fourth. They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

If this clause means what it says, it commits the United States to give every other nation access to our domestic trade. Apparently this access is to be on equal terms with our own citizens which would mean an abandonment of the entire tariff policy. It may be noted that this clause promises an endeavor by the United States rather than by the President himself, and gives the impression to the world that the United States is assuming this obligation. Since the President did not submit it to Congress, however, it is clearly not a treaty, and I believe can do no more than express the policy of the President and his administration. It is unfortunate, however, to give to foreign peoples who do not understand our system, the impression that the United States has entered into some kind of a binding obligation.

On January 2, 1942, the President entered into the Twenty-six Nation Agreement, which he executed in the name of the United States of America, by Franklin D. Roosevelt. I assumed that this agreement would be submitted to the Senate for ratification, but no such action has ever been taken. It is a simple agreement, one which no doubt the Senate would promptly approve, for it contains only the following undertakings:

"(1) Each government pledges itself to employ its full resources, military or economic, against those members of the tripartite pact and its adherents with which such government is at war.

"(2) Each government pledges itself to cooperate with the governments signatory hereto, and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies."

The Constitution clearly gives Congress only the power to declare war. It gives Con-

gress only the power to make a treaty of peace. It is hard to see how the United States of America can be pledged by the President alone not to make peace without some other nation's consent. In my opinion this agreement should be promptly submitted to the Senate for ratification. Many of the other nations signing it have been authorized to act by their legislatures. I notice that even Russia's Supreme Soviet met in extraordinary session on June 18 for the first time since March 1941 to ratify the later pact with Great Britain, and the understanding, whatever it was, that Commissar Molotov arrived at with President Roosevelt. Apparently Mr. Stalin thought it was an agreement for a second front. But Congress has never seen it.

In the various lend-lease agreements made by the Secretary of State there is also an attempt to give legal sanction to the various provisions of the Atlantic Charter and provide for the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce and the reduction of tariffs. The form of these agreements seems to indicate a deliberate intention on the part of the Government to commit this country to a world wide economic policy intimately affecting our own domestic structure, without any authority by or from Congress.

This new economic policy may be good, or may be bad, but it is one which under our form of government should require the assent of Congress.

If we have a rubber-stamp Congress there is little doubt that we will find a complete revision of our entire tariff policy, and possibly extensive international commitments, undertaken by the Executive while Congress remains silent and supine.

What is the lesson of all this in the congressional elections? It does not point necessarily to Republicans or Democrats. It does point to the election of men who are not rubber stamps. Men who do their own thinking. Men of courage, independence, and experience. It is my judgment that other things being equal, Republican candidates are more likely today to meet that test than Democratic candidates. There are many new dealers who speak out bravely at home, but when they get to Washington they vote with the President. The pressure from administration sources is tremendous on members of the party. Of course, there are many independent Democrats and many independent new dealers, but even these, after making a fight on some important issue, perhaps will go along with the administration on the next 10 issues in order to restore themselves to good standing in the party. Then, of course, when the New Deal majority is as large as it is today in Congress the administration can lose a fair proportion of independent Democrats and still command a majority of both Houses.

In short, the very fact that a man is not looking to the administration for patronage or support in the next election leaves him much more free to exercise his independent judgment. Problem after problem will arise during the next 2 years, many of which we cannot foresee today. For each of those problems the new deal will have a solution based on a system of compulsion directed from Washington. I am very much afraid that if a subservient House and a subservient Senate should be elected those solutions will ride easily along until we find a completely totalitarian government running our daily lives. I should be very much afraid that the people would have little to say about their own affairs in time of war, and even less to say about the reconstruction of the country when the war comes to an end. If you wish to preserve the kind of America under which you have grown up, elect those Congressmen who will represent you, and who won't take orders from anybody.

The Fifth Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "The Fifth Freedom," which I delivered in Milwaukee on December 17, 1942.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, fellow Americans, this is a happy occasion for me. I always like to get back to Milwaukee and Wisconsin. It is good to be with old friends. I am happy to meet Senator-elect WHERRY.

These are days which expand men's souls. The doubter, the defeatist, will have his say, but the man with hope and faith will see through the storms of the present to a glorious triumph of our arms, and after that he will see a glorious page in world history where his country plays a gallant and a just role.

Quo vadis America (America, whither goest thou)?

We who are living will provide the answer. Pray God we find the correct answer—victory first; then the right kind of a peace treaty and the right kind of a post-war world, including, of course, the right kind of an America.

It is well for us to think not only of America's responsibility but of our own individual responsibility as citizens of the Republic.

It is no time to let the world down or to let America down. Truly you and I are living in a challenging period. We were born for a purpose, and the grander the purpose, the grander life will be, providing we measure up to our responsibility.

Of course, it is no time to lose our heads and become soft thinkers. There is much to criticize. There are many mistakes made, but we must place first things first. We must have the vision to see the right way and then have the courage and the strength to take that way.

Every citizen in America expects of the Government the utmost efforts and efficiency to win through to victory. On the anniversary of Pearl Harbor a spokesman of Japan said, "America must be destroyed." We know Hitler is doing that very thing to every natien he has occupied, so the first job for each of us is to make our contribution toward a decisive victory. Victory is a bigger job than most of us realize. We must tend to that job. Nothing must interfere with the full performance of that responsibility.

America didn't want war. Her people didn't want war, but we got war. The Axis Powers intervened in our affairs, in our lives, and threatened our liberties. Therefore, we stand now as one people, fighting shoulder to shoulder with our allies, to down the oppressor.

The last election in the Nation indicated a trend of public opinion that 1944 may sweep into a tidal wave, placing the National Government in the hands of the present minority party.

Will we Republicans be ready and equipped to meet that responsibility? We can't sidestep the job. It is upon us.

These times, my friends, call for statescraft of the highest degree—not petty minds, but minds capable of sensing America's responsibility and America's opportunity to contribute toward a better world and to become a better America—such minds we must have to head this great party.

Let us digress a moment and ask, Why this swing in the Nation to the Republican Party? I can only give you my interpretation of the causes.

1. The people remembered something President Roosevelt said in 1932 when he was campaigning. Let me quote it to you [President Roosevelt quoting former President Coolidge]:

"For one reason or another even a wisely led political party, given a long enough tenure of office, finally fails to express any longer the will of the people; and when it does so fail to express the will of the people, it ceases to be an effective instrument of government. It is far better for such a political party—and certainly better for the state—that it should be relegated to the role of the critic and that the opposing political party should assume the reins of government. This condition appears to have arrived in America."

2. The people didn't like the way the Executive was centralizing everything in his hands—too much control over civilian rights of our people.

3. They didn't like the vast bureaucratic mushroom growth in Government—over 2,500,000 civilian employees.

4. They didn't like the waste in Government and the lack of common sense in the administration of the overgrown bureaus.

5. I believe, too, the people wanted more practical and realistic brains representing America in the coming peace. They didn't want America "sold short."

The people know now, after the failure of the Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war, that you can't by legislation or international convention change human nature and make wars cease any more than you can by the mere passage of a law make a bad man into a good man.

We were caught napping at Pearl Harbor. The people do not want us to be caught napping in the peace conference or any time thereafter. Eternal vigilance—alertness—is the price we must pay to maintain and retain our liberty.

Yes; the people want level heads, unprejudiced minds, not mere experimenters, theorists, and impractical idealists to look after America's interest at the peace table.

The results of the recent election not only exemplified a great people in action, but a people who by their decisive action at the polls, told the world in no uncertain terms that this was still a government by the people. The election was a mandate to their servants to make this a government for the people and not a government for a class or a group or a party. It was a direction to the administration to stop copying Europe.

America has the most intelligent electorate in the world. The people know that the New Dealers have controlled Congress and that every piece of legislation, before it could be passed, had to have the stamp of the administration.

They know, too, that every policy-maker in the executive and administrative branches of government has reflected the ideology and the thought of the New Deal branch of the Democratic Party.

The people are sick and tired of mere "yes" men. They are sick and tired of unnecessary administrative interference, and the people do not like the way that the Federal Government has been taking control of everything.

In the recent election, they exercised their American right in a secret ballot. They revived our two-party system. When Senator WHERRY comes to Washington, instead of only 29 Republicans out of a total of 96 Senators, we will have 38 out of a total of 96.

The people realize a war is on. They are doing the greatest job in history in production, on the farm, in the factory. They are not against necessary inconveniences, but they are resentful of the bungling of the bureaucrats.

The American citizen is a realist. He wants America to achieve, to grow. He knows that in the days which are up ahead, we are going to have a tremendous problem on our hands—the world having been contracted—but he does not believe that it is our function or our duty to try to achieve a lot of social reforms all over the world and follow the mistaken steps of other nations and other periods in world history.

Our people are against careless and reckless spending of the people's money. They see clearly that many so-called planners are not experienced men, but rather they are often mere theorists with little experience.

And so, the people registered their disapproval.

Now, fellow Republicans, that was just the beginning of a great tremendous sweep that will inundate this country in 1944. So we, who have been Republicans all through the years, will, I am sure, sense the responsibility of the occasion.

A Republican administration may have to finish the job of winning the war.

Armies, ships, planes, and nations are clashing all over the world. Everywhere ideas are tearing into the souls and hearts and minds of men as never before. Old ramparts in every field of human activity are being tested and battered and shattered—but thank God, some are being repaired and rebuilt to withstand the shocks of another day.

On our shores the bastion of freedom for free men still remains intact.

We in America fight not to extend our geographical borders, but to extend freedom's borders—to set a world free from Nazi and Jap slavery, and to do our part toward bringing about a world that is free from the scourge of war.

A Republican administration may have the responsibility of achieving a just and enduring peace. How a post-war world is to be established and maintained will depend in a large measure on the thought and leadership of America. Here are a few problems we can begin to think about:

1. Will the peace treaty create a new balance of power, a federation of democracies, a league of nations, regional arrangements, an American-British alliance, or will America go it alone?

2. What will America's position be in relation to the pivotal air bases of the world—are we to own and control them singly or jointly?

3. What about the strategic and commanding sea bases on the sea lanes of the world—who is to control them?

4. What will America do in relation to the policing of the world?

5. What will be America's position in relation to the islands of the Caribbean?

6. What will be done to and with the Axis Powers—their leaders, their people, their economy, and their colonies?

7. What about the rehabilitation of the world—is it a joint problem?

Recently I spoke on the floor of the Senate in relation to a resolution I had introduced, and in that speech I stated we were in this war to see that the "five freedoms" were retained in America. You will remember the President in a speech heralded all over the world spoke of the "four freedoms." Someone asked me if I hadn't made a mistake, and I said, "No." I said that I thought the President had omitted a great freedom—the freedom of enterprise. I think it is up to every sane thinking person to think about this matter of whether or not after the war is over we shall have freedom of enterprise. I think it is the obligation of the Republican Party to pledge to the people that this fifth freedom—freedom of enterprise—shall not perish from American soil.

We know that our republican form of government has been the breeding ground and the place of refuge for democratic thinking and living. People here have learned that freedom of speech, freedom of press, equality before the law, freedom of conscience, and freedom of enterprise constitute democracy.

I can readily understand why the President and many of his advisers, when his great speech was composed, did not include freedom of enterprise. They don't think that freedom of enterprise is necessary. In my opinion, if freedom of enterprise in peacetime America should go out of existence it will be the greatest blow which could be struck against the "four freedoms."

What is freedom of enterprise? Is it the right of any man to become a buccaneer, a racketeer? Of course not. It is the right of every American in peacetime to strike out for himself, to build his own economic home and business, to take the risks that are necessary and to reap the rewards that come from his enterprise—subject to the payment of taxes, and subject always, of course, to the law of the land, and to the moral law, and the rights of his neighbor.

No one wants to return to the jungle when we speak about freedom of enterprise. Freedom of enterprise was a great factor in raising man out of the jungle. Man wants to retain his right to accumulate property, to order his own life subject to the rights of society. Deny any man this most important fifth freedom and you have taken the first step toward the tyranny that created the Nazi state, the first step backward toward the destruction of those principles upon which our fathers built this Government.

Of course, when a great war strikes or a great emergency arises, enterprise cannot be as free as it would be in peacetime, but let us not use wartime as an excuse for the exercise of wartime controls in peace. I believe the experience of our people in this period has definitely determined them to see to it that government is in the picture as little as possible when peace comes.

All history is full of examples where peoples have surrendered their right to free enterprise or activity, with the thought that they could improve their economic conditions, and the results have spoken for themselves. Rome tried it and Rome collapsed.

There are various ways that an insidious approach to the curtailing of freedom of enterprises can be brought about. One way is for Government to compete with its citizens, to take over bodily the business of the country. Of course, if the Government owned all the business, there would be left no freedom of enterprise. When you take away economic liberty from your citizens, civil liberty disappears. In Rome the emperor who deprived the citizens of freedom of enterprise took the next step and deprived the citizens of freedom of speech, of equality before the law. Hitler was not an originator—he was a copyist, but he copied old Rome so well that civil liberty went out the window in Germany.

Let us remember, eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, economic, social, religious and political. Bad men make bad conditions, whether they are in business, in labor, in church, or in government. Through the centuries we have learned that power is safest when it is lodged in many. Our forefathers knew that when they built this Government. We cannot cure economic ills by restricting freedom of enterprise. We cannot by unfurling a banner called social progress, or by passing a law, change bad men into good men, or impractical men into realists, or sluggards into ambitious men of industry and courage. We must see to it that under the guise of that much-used phrase "social progress" we do not get State socialism.

Yes; the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. That is true also of freedom of enterprise. Man didn't have this freedom under feudalism, autocracy, or absolutism. He won this freedom on this continent by banding together with his fellows and forming a republican form of government—a government of checks and balances (the last 10 years have been mostly checks and no balances).

Let no one say that I am not in favor of social betterment, economic betterment, political betterment, but that will come only, not by dissipating our freedoms but by improving our vision.

I repeat that economic liberty and political liberty are twins—lose one and you lose both.

The Republic and what it stands for is our birthright. Under its beneficent flag more people have enjoyed the better life than ever before under any other flag. That doesn't mean that there can't be an improvement in the standard of living of our people, but it will never be accomplished through what is known as "economic planning," which submerges freedom of enterprise.

What is "economic planning" by government? It means generally some book-learned but inexperienced theorist getting a throttle-hold on the economic life of the country. It simply means that some folks believe that if they are given authority, they can evolve a new order. Hitler had the same idea. In this country we followed that suggestion for awhile and every third row of cotton was plowed under and we lost much of our export market. We saw the little pigs destroyed and the average man couldn't buy pork because of the price. The farmer was given certain aids in order that he would not produce and he was fined if he produced too much. This wasn't new. Germany and Italy tried the same thing. How much of this misplanning was really a cause of war only the historian a hundred years from now will be able to tell, when he weighs the regimentation and destruction of free enterprise in the Axis countries.

We in America are the envy of all the world. Free enterprise was permitted to flower here. Under free enterprise we followed out the old idea of Franklin that every man should strive to make a living and lay something aside. That implied that a man would work; that he would render service and get paid therefor. Society got the benefit of what he produced.

Under free enterprise the spirit of invention flowered and all the great inventions of the last 50 years came forth as the result of free men going into action to discover new wonders.

Now, because I argue for free enterprise, I want no one to say that I do not recognize that there are ills in society to be cured. But they are not the result of free enterprise. There are plenty of things for us to tend to during this war period and during the post-war period, but they will never be properly looked after except by free men—men of initiative, industry, engaged in free enterprise.

Economic freedom should be the slogan of every American—not regimentation and governmental restrictions. Where there are economic captives, free them by giving them an opportunity, an incentive, a mark at which to shoot. Any other course stops the development of the individual. Our problems here will be solved if we put freedom of enterprise into action. We will increase our productivity. We will work out a better plan for redistribution of wealth.

The American will not agree to give up freedom of enterprise for this false concept of social security. Why? Because that would mean complete loss of freedom and no social security. There can be no social security when freedom itself is not in evidence.

We have laid aside freedom of enterprise to a large degree during this war period. We have done this that victory may be certain.

We are resolved to win the war. We are resolved to achieve a real and enduring peace. And we are resolved that the five freedoms of the Republic—which includes freedom of enterprise—shall remain inviolate.

Founders of Protected Home Circle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me on the subject of the founders of Protected Home Circle, at the third annual graduation of junior members of Sharon Circle No. 1 to the Senior Circle, Protected Home Circle, on December 14, 1942.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are all inspired to act more worthily by the contemplation of noble deeds and great ideals. We are kept in the paths of duty and good citizenship through the respect and devotion which we feel for the men and women of thought and of character, and who are and were responsible for the institutions of which we are a part.

Then followed extemporaneous remarks about the founders of the society who were the leading men of Sharon.

Their motive in organizing was to be helpful to others. While they lived at a time when an organization like the Protected Home Circle was needed, it is more than doubly needed now.

We need not follow slavishly every word that was uttered by those men, but we should always try to catch the spirit of those outstanding men and women and strive to do for our time what they did for theirs. We should, like they, study the conditions of our time and find the road to progress. Their thoughts of that day were brotherhood. Brotherhood means helping one another, or "One for all and all for one."

Fraternity came into the world with liberty. When all men were declared equal, fraternity was exemplified in its fullest and broadest sense, and to this day history records nothing more beautiful, more inspiring, than the untiring efforts, through all the changes of the centuries, of those men who have lifted the human race out of ignorance and vice into a higher and nobler existence and united them into the bond of brotherhood.

We, as members of the Protected Home Circle, are justly proud of our fraternity which has done so much to provide for those who have been accepted as members. We are also proud of the teachings of our fraternity. To have a real job of living we must barter our talents, no matter what they are, as a medium of exchange with which to purchase the gratitude of others and that the Golden Rule is more than a mere bit of sentimental rhetoric—that is the true way of life.

Always strive for unity. Unity cannot be had for the asking—it can only be had by striving. It can only be achieved if its exponents are profoundly sincere. It will never succeed if it is used by a small group for the selfish furtherance of the interests of that group.

The founders were not selfish people because they established the basis of what is now a society that all of us are proud of, and those who are leading now are carrying that spirit forward because they are the type of people that follow the poet when he said:

"Those who bring sunshine into the lives of others cannot keep it from themselves."

All of us are fortunate in having these splendid men who are now at the head of the Protected Home Circle managing the affairs of our order.

In discussing work, he said:

"Make it your living sentiment to work and, with the blessing of God, make it your dying one."

The Samoan and Other Islands of the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, Mr. Breckenridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State, has been recently given credit for his foresight regarding preparedness in 1919. There is an interesting document just made public regarding the Samoan group of islands, and I ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD along with an editorial from the Washington Star covering this subject.

There being no objection, the extract and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Extract from Foreign Relations of the United States, 1919, the Paris Peace Conference, vol. II, p. 512 et seq.]

UNDER BRITISH OCCUPATION

The British took possession in 1914 of all the German-owned islands in the Pacific Ocean south of the Equator. These islands lie in two localities:

(A) Between the one hundred and fortieth and one hundred and sixtieth degrees of latitude, and between the Equator and 5° S., and the island of Nauru just east of this section and north of the Equator.

(B) The Samoan group.

Referring to these in order, the United States has little or no interest in the ownership of those designated as being in group (A) above. As regards the Samoan group, (B), the United States has considerable interest. Part of the Samoan group are in the possession of the United States, including the island of Tutuila and its harbors. Great Britain has a great number of islands lying to the west, southwest, south, and southeast of the Samoan group, including the Fijis, Palmerstons, Tongas, and Cooks. North of the Samoan group, it has only Fanning and Washington Islands, the former being its cable station. Also north of the Samoan group and between it and the Hawaiian group, are the Palmyra Islands and a small island just west of due north of Palmyra (United States possessions). The only other islands lying between the Samoan and the Hawaiian groups are the Guano Islands, of which there are quite a number, some of them of doubtful existence, some certainly existent, and some certainly nonexistent. (The existence or nonexistence of these islands is shown by a map delivered to Mr. Harrison for the Secretary.) These Guano Islands—some of them have been claimed by the United States, some by Great Britain, some by both, and some today are of doubtful sovereignty. Generally they are not valuable. From a naval or strategic standpoint, they are not very valuable, except insofar as they might be fortified or used, some of them, for naval bases. In them the United States has an interest. Their possession will not be very strongly contested by Great Britain, and because of their very close juxtaposition to the Samoan group and their interposition between the Samoan and Hawaiian groups, they become of strategic importance to the United States. It is recommended that an effort be made to have ownership of these islands transferred from Great Britain to the United States.

UNDER JAPANESE OCCUPATION

The ex-German islands lying north of the Equator were taken possession of and are now held by Japan. These islands consist of three principal groups: The Marianas, the Carolines, and the Marshalls, and a few scattered outlying islands in the same vicinity, and all lying between the one hundred and thirtieth and the one hundred and seventy-tieth degrees east latitude, and between the first and the twenty-first degrees north longitude. Principal among the outlying islands not connected with any of the groups is the island of Yap, which is the southeastern terminus of the cable connecting Yap with Shanghai, and which was once a German cable now in possession of the Japanese. Yap is also connected by cable now with Guam. Guam lies between the Marianas on the north and the Carolines on the south, with Yap to the southeast. It is practically surrounded by islands now under occupation by the Japanese. Guam is a cable station of great importance to the United States. Our Pacific cable runs from Manila to Guam, and from Guam to San Francisco, touching at Midway and the Hawaiian group. The cable line runs from Guam north to Yokohama, emerging, however, at Bonin Island, which is the extent to which the United States owns the cable northward. Notwithstanding the fact that the United States owns the cable to that point, landing is there made upon Japanese soil and operators other than Japanese are not allowed on that island. Consequently, Japan is in control at that point of the American cable. As has been stated, Guam is also connected with Yap, and, consequently, can communicate through Yap directly with Shanghai over the German cable. This makes Guam the principal cable station in the Pacific Ocean. The cables from Manila, Shanghai, Yokohama, and San Francisco center there. Its utility to the United States as a cable station is jeopardized by the fact that it is practically surrounded by islands under foreign jurisdiction and control. The ex-German islands now under Japanese occupation have been closed to foreign trade. Vessels flying the American flag and belonging to American interests which formerly did a large copra business in these islands have been precluded from landing and from continuing their business (except that permission has been granted for one specified steamer to call at two specified islands—one in each group—to collect copra there deposited). So that because of the fact that American vessels have been denied the privilege of coasting between and stopping at the islands in these three groups, we are without information as to what has been done by way of defense and fortification in those islands. It has been rumored that the Japanese have fortified to a considerable extent a few of them. This may

and may not be true. If it is true, our cable station is already jeopardized. If it is not true, it can easily be true, and the utility of our station is thereby jeopardized.

So that in these islands the United States has a very material interest. In time of war the cable could be very easily cut by ships operating from any one of the islands lying north, south, southeast, or southwest of Guam. If the cable were cut at that point, our communication with the Philippines would be not only interrupted, but prevented. Besides serving as a menace to the continuity of our cable communication with the Philippines, these islands also form a screen separating the Philippines from the Hawaiian group and from the United States. Any boat going to the Philippines, unless it passes through Japanese waters, must pass either through or close to the islands on the north or south of Guam (all now under Japanese occupation). It would be impossible to send any military forces to the Philippines with any safety, if the convoy were directed through the usual channels. Also, they would be a constant menace to naval ships moving through the Pacific and between the Philippines and the United States.

SUGGESTIONS

Japan will undoubtedly claim possession of the islands she now occupies, formerly German. England will undoubtedly do the same as regards those islands which she now occupies. While the United States has an interest, and while it would be greatly to the advantage of the United States to own Samoa and the Carolines and the Marianas, the United States cannot make a direct claim to them or to any of them. Immediately that a claim is made, we admit the right of both England and Japan to claim.

It is conceivable that if the United States took the position that some or all of the Pacific islands should be returned to Germany, the United States could, after the peace conference adjourns, come to some arrangement with Germany which would transfer the Marianas, the Carolines, and the Samoan group to the sovereignty of the United States. If a war indemnity is demanded and obtained from Germany, the payment of the indemnity, or a part of it, might be offset by a transfer of these islands to the sovereignty of the United States. Of course, this could not be done morally while the peace conference sits. The insistence of the United States upon the return of the islands to Germany would be unpopular and would not be understood in this country. (Let us hope not in Japan or in England.) No other procedure which would insure to the United States the possession of those islands which are so material to our present possessions and future safety appears at the present time.

It is therefore recommended:

First. That the United States take the position that the Carolines, Marshalls, Marianas, Yap, and the Pelew Islands and the Samoan group be returned to Germany by the peace conference.

Second. That after the peace conference adjourns, the United States immediately enter into negotiations with Germany to obtain possession of the Marianas, Carolines, Yap, and the Samoan group, and such others as may be desirable or obtainable.

Third. That the Guano Islands lying between the Samoan and Hawaiian groups be arranged for transfer from Great Britain to the United States, or that such of them as are claimed by Great Britain shall be assigned by her to the United States.

Since Germany, under the terms of the armistice, has surrendered practically her whole Navy to the Allied command, she is no longer a naval power and for many, many years cannot hope to be. England and Japan are great naval powers. The possession by England and Japan of many islands throughout the Pacific which can be used for naval bases and which are situated at strategic points is a constant menace to the United States and to its dominant position in the Pacific. The argument that the return of the islands to Germany will place her in a position to disturb the peace of the Pacific has now no foundation and fails utterly.

NOTE.—In connection with this memorandum please see map showing the sovereignty of the Pacific islands in colors and map showing the existence and nonexistence of the Guano Islands of the Pacific, and two volumes confidentially printed as follows: Notes on the Sovereignty of the Islands of the Pacific and Notes on the Guano Islands of the Pacific, all of which were delivered to Mr. Harrison for the Secretary of State.

B(RECKINRIDGE) L(ONG).

To the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, December 14, 1918.

[From the Washington Evening Star of December 29, 1942]

ISLANDS LOST IN 1919

No nation justly can complain about being penalized for its faults, but it sometimes has happened that the American people have been obliged to suffer for their virtues. An interesting case in point recently was disclosed by the State Department. It refers to an effort to prevent certain German possessions in the Pacific falling into Japanese hands in 1919—an endeavor which unfortunately failed with results now sadly apparent.

To understand the strategic values involved in the matter it is necessary merely to glance at the map showing the expanse of water lying between Hawaii and the Philippines. Scattered over the chart there are three groups of islands bearing the names Caroline, Marshall, and Marianas or Ladrones. Those tiny dots upon the surface of the ocean, as Breckinridge Long, then Third Assistant Secretary of State and now Assistant Secretary, realized, "formed a screen" which might menace communications between Honolulu and Manila. Germany owned all three archipelagoes at the outbreak of hostilities in 1914. Mr. Long advocated temporary restoration to the Reich in 1919—as a preliminary to acquisition by the United States.

But traditional American idealism interferred with the plan. In harmony with the policies of 1883 and 1908, President Woodrow Wilson on January 8, 1918, told the world that "we demand * * * nothing peculiar to ourselves." Public opinion supported his disavowal of compensations. At Versailles, indemnities were required for Belgium and France, but the delegates of the United States, acting in line with the pattern of prevailing sentiment at home, refused to accept anything. The League of Nations then mandated the Carolines, Marshalls, and Marianas to Japan, and the arrangement was confirmed at the Washington conference in 1922.

Of course, the Japanese Government solemnly covenanted not to fortify the former German islands. Even after it was known that Tokio had broken its pledge, Congress still declined to take steps to protect adjacent Guam. The romantic transcendentalism of the American mind continued until Pearl Harbor. How seriously it handicapped the defense forces of the United States now is obvious. No wonder, then, that the State Department, releasing the story of Mr. Long's frustration, says: "Any intelligent approach to another world settlement must take into consideration the errors * * * of the last."

Eighty-sixth Anniversary of Birth of Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on Woodrow Wilson, written by the Honorable Josephus Daniels, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer]

WILSON ANNIVERSARY FINDS MEN TURNING TO HIS VISION—JOSEPHUS DANIELS REVIEWS UNITED STATES REJECTION OF PEACE PROGRAM

(By Josephus Daniels)

The eighty-sixth anniversary today of the birth of Woodrow Wilson finds a distraught world feverishly seeking a way to secure and undergird the world peace which Wilson envisioned and which the United States Senate rejected. That generation demonstrated willingness to do and dare and die in war, but put away the peace that was within its grasp.

A score and 3 years later men who were blind then, and millions more, are looking back to glory to Wilson's vision splendid. In their hearts they now are enshrining the one man who never doubted that the fate of the world was wrapped up in the covenant he brought to his people from the peace conference.

At Paris there were those who wished a separate peace treaty which would have made the Treaty of Versailles as unworthy and sordid as that of Vienna. Wilson stood immovably for the incorporation of the covenant in the terms of peace. No deferred plan then or now would insure permanent peace.

FIRST AND ONLY

The League of Nations was the first and only plan of nearly all nations ever devised by the hand of man to fulfill the long-cherished hope of peace on earth. Its imperfections were remediable. The great body of people hailed it as the fulfillment of the shibboleth, "A war against war," which carried America into the World War.

Wilson had promised the youth he summoned into battle that their sacrifice would insure a warless world. That goal was in his heart when he said in his war message to Congress:

"The right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free."

HIS ONE ASPIRATION

During the long struggle, that pledge was Wilson's pillar of cloud by day and pillar of fire by night. To him a treaty of permanent peace was his heavenly vision. He was not disobedient to it. Woodrow Wilson went to Paris with but one aspiration and aim—to garner the fruits of victory by a world organized for peace. He returned crowned with success in his holy quest.

In addition to this wholehearted consecration, Wilson felt he could not face the mothers who had lost their sons if he did not make certain that their sacrifice would be the guaranty that those who came after them would be freed from the fate of those who had given their lives.

A PROPHECY

Returning home with the precious covenant, he found the great body of the people in sympathy with the noble instrument he submitted for ratification. In advocacy of the League, at St. Louis, September 25, 1919, Wilson said that if the treaty were rejected or impaired he felt he ought to stand up before the youths whose devotion had bought victory, and say:

"Boys, I told you before you went across the seas that this was a war against wars, and I did my best to fulfill the promise, but I am obliged to come to you in mortification and shame and say I have not been able to fulfill the promise. You are betrayed. You fought for something you did not get. And the glory of the armies and the navies of the United States is gone like a dream of the night, and there ensues upon it, in the suitable darkness of the night, the nightmare of dread which lay upon the nations before this war came; and there will come sometime in the vengeful providence of God, another struggle in which not a few hundred thousand fine men from America will have to die, but as many millions as are necessary to accomplish the final freedom of the peoples of the world."

There grimly spoke the true prophet who saw further into the future than most of his contemporaries. We have lived to see the prophecy fulfilled in the terrible losses which Wilson foretold. This war would never have cursed the world if the dominant minority in the Senate had not rejected mankind's most inspired civilian prophet.

"THE GREAT CASUALTY"

Wilson was the great casualty of the World War. The doctors did not diagnose the disease that ended his life. Those who were admitted into intimate relations know that he died of a broken heart—seeing that his "great deed was too great."

Until the blow struck, Wilson could not be persuaded that enough Senators would vote to scrap the instrument which was the sure chart of world peace. When the door to a new world in safety was closed his heart was broken.

When his noble dream seemed to have been laid aside, Wilson never lost faith that his countrymen some day would come to a realization that a world agreement for peace was essential to prevent the destruction of civilization. He died in that faith. We have lived to see men belatedly adopting the creed they rejected.

LAST TALK WITH CHIEF

Why do I say that, in his disillusionment after the covenant was rejected, Wilson never lost faith that his inspired dream would come true? Not long before his passing—the last time I saw my old chief—he asked of my reactions to the world of that hour.

When I confessed to depression over the lapse following the rejection of the peace treaty, he made this confession of his indomitable faith, saying:

"Do not be overanxious about the things we have carried in our hearts and for which we have fought. They are sure to prevail. They are only delayed," and, leaning heavily upon his cane, putting one hand on my shoulder, he said with that quaintness which gave charm to his sayings: "And I will make their concession to Providence—it may come in a better way than we proposed."

He—

"Never doubted clouds would break.
Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong would triumph.
Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,
Sleep to wake."

AND TODAY

Today, fighting on land and sea and air, millions in our armed forces have their purpose steeled to win a victory that will provide a substitute for the inhumanity of war. And at home more than a hundred million civilians fully enlisted for victory have highly resolved that never again shall free men lack the machinery to prevent a return of the present-day tragedy.

Faith in the coming of the day of a world covenant of peace gave satisfaction to Woodrow Wilson as his ship sailed west. It is to us, the living, cursed by the lack of wisdom nearly a quarter of a century ago, to translate the Wilson covenant into a compact that will insure peace on earth and good will to men.

It may not come in the exact terms of the instrument Wilson brought from Paris. Indeed, as he prophesied, the lasting peace may come in a better way than Wilson conceived.

DAY OF DEDICATION

December 28, 1942, coming as his dire prophecy is being fulfilled in blood and sacrifice, should be a day of consecration to the ideals for which Wilson gave his life as well as of full dedication to winning the war and winning the peace.

Mileage Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, there is no subject today of greater interest on our home front than mileage rationing. The program for limiting automobile use to the end that all cars may be kept in operation until synthetic rubber is produced in large quantities was originally recommended by the Baruch committee. It has been translated into action through the Office of Rubber Director Jeffers, the Office of Price Administration, and the Office of Defense Transportation. However, there is widespread concern over rationing methods and procedures. It is evident that rigid regulations drafted in Washington cannot meet special local conditions. While rationing boards have done a patriotic job under trying times, it is fast becoming evident that rationing is too important to be handled by boards without sufficient personnel, equipment, and operating expenses. I am confident that this whole problem must be faced by the present Congress.

One of the organizations which has from the very first supported the mileage-rationing plan and given full cooperation to Federal agencies is the American Automobile Association, of which I am a vice president. Through its network of affiliated motor clubs, the A. A. A. has made a very constructive survey of rationing. It finds that there is an imperative need for overhauling rationing machinery and procedures, and has so reported to Rubber Director Jeffers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report on mileage rationing by the American Automobile Association as submitted to the Rubber Director.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON MILEAGE RATIONING BY AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION—IMMEDIATE OVERHAULING OF RATIONING MACHINERY AND PROCEDURES FOUND IMPERATIVE

The mileage rationing program is based on the report of the Baruch committee. The objective of the program is to keep in operation during the period of rubber stringency, on a limited mileage, all the automobiles that are mechanically fit. In putting the program into effect, the Government recognized once and for all that passenger-car transportation is of vital importance to the war effort and to the civilian economy of the country.

Because of the broad objectives of the program and the urgency of the rubber situation, the American Automobile Association endorsed the program at its inception and has consistently supported it. We have kept in close touch with the operation of rationing since the beginning of the gasoline shortage along the Atlantic seaboard and in the country as a whole since December 1, when Nation-wide mileage rationing went into effect. Our affiliated motor clubs in every section of the country have worked closely with their local rationing boards in an effort to make the program successful in its practical application. This and our own close cooperation with the Office of Price Administration nationally has made this study possible.

We have just completed a check with our clubs on their experience. Our findings clearly indicate that if the program is to fulfill the objectives of the Baruch committee, if it is to be successful and not bog down and forfeit public confidence, immediate steps must be taken to overhaul the program, particularly from the standpoint of administrative set-up and procedures.

The corrections suggested in this memorandum are in every instance based on actual experience of our affiliated motor clubs. In addition, the more important corrections advanced definitely reflect the views of the rationing boards themselves.

1. The mileage rationing program affects some 42,000,000 drivers. In its over-all results it reaches a very large segment of the population of the United States. We strongly believe that Government agencies responsible for the program should take it for granted that the overwhelming majority of these people are willing and anxious to cooperate with the Government in rubber conservation during the emergency. As a matter of fact, the Baruch committee itself recognized that voluntary cooperation on the part of the motorists had brought about substantial reduction of driving between Pearl Harbor and the date on which the report was issued. No one can doubt that there would have been more cooperation and a larger degree of voluntary conservation had the motorists clearly understood what was expected of them. The confusion and the conflict in Washington made such a clear understanding impossible.

We therefore suggest that from now on more stress be placed on voluntary cooperation by motorists and by communities throughout the United States; that such cooperation be taken for granted by all those

charged with the administration of the program. Intimations that motorists are chiselers who must be policed at every step serve only to create mass resentment and resistance.

2. There are indications that millions of motorists are not yet convinced that the mileage-rationing program is necessary. Clearly a big educational job still remains to be done. Hence we suggest—

(a) That in dealing with this problem of mileage rationing in the future, the responsible officials give to the public the facts and the real reasons for rationing actions in a manner similar to that recently followed by the Department of Agriculture and the Office of War Information in explaining the reasons and the objectives of the food rationing program. Nothing comparable to that was done in connection with mileage rationing.

(b) That specially equipped and trained employees of the Office of Price Administration, of the regional offices and of the district offices be assigned to telling the story behind mileage rationing and that they tell a consistent story on the basis of the facts in the situation. There is room for more emphasis on the training of all personnel employed to deal with the public in the rationing set-up. In addition, whenever possible, local people with knowledge of local conditions should be selected to fill important positions in regional and district offices.

(c) That before announcing new programs through the press, the local rationing boards be fully informed as to what is coming and thoroughly instructed in the new procedures that are to be established. One of the most demoralizing things to date has been the lag between press announcement and the receipt of information, instructions, and forms by the rationing boards. The boards could not do an adequate job of explaining or servicing if, as so often happened, they themselves did not know what it was all about.

(d) That there should be brought about a degree of simplification that is now entirely lacking. There should be a minimum of forms to decipher, understand, sign, file, and check back on. It is not necessary to dwell at length on the most unfortunate consequences that have resulted from complicated and highly technical rationing forms emanating from Washington. Instructions going to local boards should be stripped of legal verbiage and technicalities to the end that laymen serving on these boards may understand them.

(e) That rationing programs should be timed far enough apart to enable the boards to understand thoroughly the procedures governing one program or a phase of a program before a new project is given to them for administration. For example, the rationing boards in 30 States were struggling with the intricacies and the processing demands under the mileage rationing program when the fuel-rationing program was thrown in their laps.

3. The local boards are definitely breaking down under the burden of the rationing tasks that they are being asked to perform. No praise is too high for the thousands of men and women who have worked on these boards without compensation. But the job has now far out-stripped volunteer help and the paid help that has been made available. It is not too much to say that if mileage rationing is to succeed, the maximum efficiency and courtesy must be established in the local rationing set-up. It is imperative that more paid and adequately trained personnel be assigned to the local boards without delay.

To date Congress has appropriated $140,000,000 for the Office of Price Administration. It is our understanding that $100,000,000 of that money has been allocated to the national offices in Washington, the 9 regional offices, and the district offices; and $40,000,000 to the 5,500 local rationing boards. In other words, less than 30 percent of the money is being expended in the offices to which the public has to look for service. There are 900 paid employees in the regional office of the Office of Price Administration in New York, as compared with 1,000 paid employees for all the local boards in the State of Pennsylvania. Presumably, from the standpoint of balance, a similar situation pertains throughout the country.

It is not our contention that too much money is being spent on national, regional, and district Office of Price Administration offices. We have not gone into that phase of the set-up But what we do contend and cannot overemphasize is that not enough is being spent on local offices. The result is that demoralization is proceeding apace with long lines of motorists left waiting outside rationing boards day after day and with unending delays in securing the services implied in the program, be it supplementary gasoline rations, tires, or what have you. If the funds to do a proper job locally are not available then Congress should be asked to make them available at the earliest possible moment.

4. Any program for streamlining procedures should aim at reducing the number of personal appearances that the present system makes obligatory. The fact that, generally speaking, the boards meet only infrequently to pass on supplementary applications means that many applications go over from week to week. A more adequate set-up should make possible the delegation of authority by the board to individual members to pass on applications. There should be a review of present procedures in regard to "B" and "C" coupons to determine whether or not they can be issued for longer periods, thus requiring fewer personal appearances on the part of applicants. We feel that it is entirely possible to bring this about.

Under present operating practices the boards are inundated with paper work incident to filing this or that form. The filing systems are wholly inadequate. Many of our clubs feel that a good deal of this paper work and filing can be dispensed with. Manifestly, with employees already overworked, there should be no paper work that is not absolutely necessary.

Local boards should be supplied with enough of the necessary forms to meet the service demands of the public. Too often we get the story of no forms available at the local boards. Even admitting printing difficulties, it should not be impossible to keep the rationing boards supplied with forms and to get these forms to the boards in ample time.

There should be a review of the relationship between local boards and the regional offices. Boards in large centers of population resent the fact that they are operating under long-distance control. For example, Philadelphia, with a population of 2,000,000, gets instructions from a regional office in New York City rather than from a point in Pennsylvania. Washington, at stone's throw from the national Office of Price Administration offices, gets its instructions from New York City. Detroit, with its tremendous accumulation of war industries and its great dependence on automobile transportation, gets rationing instructions from Cleveland.

5. Mileage rationing is essentially different from any other form of rationing that we have had to date or are likely to have. It is predicated, not on absolute equality as between all citizens but is designed to assign every individual owner of an automobile a mileage based on his needs. These needs vary from person to person—so much so that regulations must be extremely flexible in order to achieve the over-all purpose. Hence, in administering the mileage rationing program it is necessary that the local boards be granted a much greater measure of autonomy than they have been able to exercise to date. It would be all to the good, therefore, if we could proceed on the assumption that the board's job is to interpret and act on the spirit of the mileage rationing regulations rather than on the strict form, and that the boards are not violating this or that law or regulation when they act counter to a regulation or make a decision in a situation for which no provision has been made.

Rubber Director William M. Jeffers and Leon Henderson, who recently resigned as Director of the Office of Price Administration, appeared before the Truman committee on November 27, just a few days before the mileage rationing program went into effect. These officials vehemently proclaimed their belief in local autonomy for the rationing boards and in common-sense administration. Said Mr. Jeffers:

"It must be common-sense administration; and if I continue to handle it, it will be common-sense administration."

Said Mr. Henderson:

"Common sense will be exercised, and we will be able to take care of any situation that develops in which essentiality is involved."

And yet the reports we get are uniformly to the effect that this declaration of faith has not reached the field force of the Office of Price Administration; that, on the contrary, the Office of Price Administration employees to whom the boards look for advice are insisting on the strict letter of the law and the last comma of the regulations; that they are, in fact, urging the boards to be tough. The local boards must be trusted to deal fairly with their neighbors, to protect the social and economic structure of their communities, and, at the same time, to safeguard the national interest from the standpoint of making the rubber-conservation program successful.

Many cases arise every day that are not covered in any regulation. In a structure as complicated as ours such cases will arise no matter how many regulations are issued. Take two examples out of many. Wounded service men are returning every week from the battle fronts. Their condition precludes the use of mass transportation. They need fresh air and they want to visit relatives. The family is operating on an A-coupon book. As the regulations stand today, the boards cannot give any gasoline for the benefit of the service men home on sick leave. But common sense would indicate that some gasoline should be granted in these cases and the boards would grant it if they understood that it is not the purpose of the Government to put them in a strait jacket. An automobile is stolen and is found 150 miles from the owner's home with the tank empty, of course. The local board, under present regulations, can provide enough gas to take this stolen car to the nearest storage garage but not enough to take it home. Here you have a case where common sense either is rationed or has abrogated. Cases like those instanced may not be very important in themselves. The point is that thousands of such instances would be handled smoothly if the boards were able to proceed more under their own power and act on their own discretion. The common sense and the good judgment of the citizen boards can, in our judgment, be relied upon to prevent such violent departures from the regulations as would endanger the program itself.

6. More emphasis must be placed on occupational driving—that is, the providing of adequate mileage for persons outside the strictly preferred categories who depend on the automobile for carrying on their normal business activity. Here is a case where discretion in the boards and the application of common sense would take care of many thousands of persons who will have to give up either their homes or their business, or both, if they are restricted to the B mileage ceiling. The provision of additional mileage for salesmen as recently announced is a step in

the right direction but it is more important that there be established a liberal and sane approach to the needs of occupational mileage as such.

7. There is considerable criticism of the great lack of uniformity in mileage allowances granted by the boards on the basis of applications involving the same set of conditions. Today it would be entirely possible to submit three identical applications to the same board and get three different decisions. If this can happen to persons dealing with the same board, it is easy to understand the wide variations in different localities, different States, and different regions of the country. The situation is in part due to the difficulties that the boards have in interpreting regulations and to the lack of a competent staff to do the spadework. With the field force at its disposal, the Office of Price Administration should be able to do a better job in helping the boards in developing methods and classifications that would to some extent alleviate this continuing irritation.

8. There is much dissatisfaction with the mileage rationing program on the ground that the gasoline allowance is based on an average of 15 miles per gallon. This assumed mileage does not, of course, apply to millions of cars. As a result, the cars in the latter class do not get the mileage that they are supposed to get under the program. There is also some criticism of the failure to make any allowance for climate (such as winter conditions in the northern sections of the country) and terrain (such as mountainous country) that render it impossible to get anything like the mileage permitted to motorists under A and B cards in the mileage rationing program.

We appreciate that the Office of Price Administration is perfectly aware of the existence of the problem created by the differential in the operation of vehicles of different sizes and operated under different conditions. The Office, in fact, has given serious consideration to the problem. We realize the difficulties involved in reaching an equitable solution. We have in the East a gasoline shortage as well as a rubber shortage to contend with. We know that individual car performance depends upon many factors, including mechanical efficiency, manner of driving, and climatic conditions, the result being that large cars in some instances get more miles to the gallon than do small cars. We realize the large amount of work involved in further differentiation as between vehicles. However, there is, broadly speaking, a definite discrimination in favor of the smaller cars. Perhaps consideration should be given to the division of all cars into three or four categories, depending on weight and horsepower, and gasoline awarded on some rough average mile-per-gallon basis for the type as a whole.

9. It is too early to suggest modifications in the basic mileage rationing program itself. We do recommend, however, that there be an early appraisal of that part of the program dealing with tire inspection. It is based on the well-founded principle that tire casings must not be injured beyond the point where they can be repaired and recapped. It should be kept in mind that the Baruch report simply recommended "periodic" inspections and did not indicate the frequency of inspections. Now, from a practical standpoint, the job involved in carrying out the schedule of inspections ordered by the Office of Price Administration is a gigantic task. It would cost the motorists approximately $60,000,000 a year. But far more important, these inspections would require the full time of some 30,000 mechanics at a time when the shortage of mechanics has reached alarming proportions. The manpower available to the garages of the country today is not sufficient even to handle the functional repairs incident to maintaining our cars in operation.

We certainly believe that the requirement of three inspections a year for holders of A mileage books—that is, every 720 miles (every 540 miles in the area where A coupon book value has been reduced)—involves far too much work and expense for the benefits accruing. One inspection a year for this class of car should meet all reasonable requirements, bearing in mind, of course, that there must be a special inspection before a certificate for a tire or a recapping is secured from the local boards, and that this requirement in itself can be made to carry a lot of moral suasion from the standpoint of the importance of tire care. Under the tire-inspection program, holders of B coupon books must have their tires inspected six times a year, or every 940 miles. This requirement could very properly be reduced to not more than three inspections without bringing material harm to the program and with an enormous saving of money and manpower. This is the time to face the fact that the garages are not equipped today to handle this part of the program on the extensive basis on which it is now projected.

In submitting these suggestions, we desire to make it clear that they are not intended in any sense as a criticism or an indictment of those officials who pioneered this gigantic program of mileage rationing. The job itself was immense, the time was short, the difficulties and complexities were overwhelming. It was inevitable that experience should demonstrate weaknesses in the structure. We hope, however, that the suggestions we are making herewith will be helpful in bringing about a smoother administration, a greater degree of motorists' acceptance and understanding, the success of the mileage rationing program itself—all to the end that essential car use may be maintained as a necessary part of our war effort and that the period of drastic restrictions on automobile operation may be made as short as possible.

These Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, each day brings new evidence of the magnificent contribution to the Allied war effort being made by Norwegian men of the sea. The cruel and devastating blows that have been directed at the Norwegian people have aroused the sympathy of free people throughout the world. On December 5, 1942, the New York Sun carried an article written by Mr. George E. Sokolsky, which I believe should challenge the attention of the people of America. The article is entitled "These Days," and I am pleased to incorporate it herein as part of these remarks:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

THE NORWEGIAN FLEET

I sat down to herring and ptarmigan on a Norwegian freighter recently with very good company, and they told me the story of Norway in the war. It was a stirring tale of courage and pride and the efficient operation of ships through dangerous oceans. Americans rarely grasp the significance of the Norwegian Fleet, which, before the war, was fourth in all the world and now is reduced by the loss of 1,000,000 deadweight tons, and the Norwegians take that in their stride. From Vikings to their battles with German U-boats, the Norwegians have remained the greatest seamen in the world, and that ceases to be surprising when one is told that three-quarters of this people live within 20 miles of the seacoast.

LITTLE LAND FOR FOOD

I was also told by these Norwegians that only 3 percent of their land is arable, which means that they have to import nearly all of their food. Japan is only 20 percent arable and the Japanese have always used that as an excuse for their absolute necessity to expand on the continent of Asia. The Norwegians have not attempted to expand by military force nor even by colonization. They took their chances with trade and the traffic of the sea, and they did exceedingly well, keeping up with all the world in the modernization of their fleet.

Now, of course, they are losing ships constantly. About 40 percent of their fleet has gone to Davy Jones' locker and there is no telling how much more will disappear before this war is over. So far the Norwegians have received no aid from the United States, through lease-lend or otherwise, to replace their lost shipping. They carry what is needed to wherever the United States or Great Britain wants the cargoes carried; they are paid for their services; and if a ship is gone, they take it without complaining.

The fact remains, however, that if Norway, when peace comes again, lacks a fleet, the Norwegians will not eat any better than they do today—which is nothing to get excited about. They cannot grow their own food on their own soil. They cannot earn a living except by shipping and fishing. Unless they can restore their fleet, they must either become a dependent people or starve.

I make this point about Norway because so many of our serious thinkers who are planning for the perfect world forget that the human race lives by diverse means. To an Iowa farmer it might seem tremendously important that corn and pigs should have priority in the interest of the nations, and the late Senator Pittman used to believe that nothing could be wrong in the world if silver were protected, but a Norwegian is concerned with shipping and fishing because that is the way he lives. Even if a perfect new world were designed by some ecstatic rearranger of human destiny, it would still not matter if the Norwegians lacked ships. And even money does not matter if they cannot use it to build ships, as they are unable to build them now because the Germans hold their shipyards and the British and American yards are too occupied with their own affairs. Therefore the prospects for Norway are very poor indeed, no matter who wins this war, unless they can lay their hands on ships to replace their losses.

THE UNHAPPY SMALL NATIONS

What folks call the United Nations is a complex of many small countries. In the days before the new orders of various kinds struck at human sanity these small nations were among the happiest on this earth. They lived modestly but well; they were thrifty peoples who worked hard at their particular specialties; they met their obligations and paid their debts. They asked no other favors of the great powers than to be let alone to work out their simple destinies. Today these small nations are conquered countries, held by a raging bitterness against their will; their governments are fictitious institutions living on the hope that, after the war, things will go back to where they were. Norway saved her fleet—or most of it—and put it to service in the war. If somewhat of that fleet can be saved for peace, there will be a Norway again. And what the Norwegians did not say was that they thought we might do something about that.

A Mutual Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, the new Congress assumes serious obligations. It will share with the President the responsibility of proving a faith—the faith of a free people in themselves and in their institutions. Upon the shoulders of both the Congress and the President falls the duty of challenging America to an all-out service and to a restoration of faith in the Government itself.

For the high purposes to which they are jointly committed they might well adopt a creed embodying the articles of their faith. They might declare:

We believe that the war must be won by the devotion of the people; that devotion cannot be commanded but must be challenged; and that common honesty and common sense will provide a challenge for such devotion.

We believe that a demand for courage should not be confined to the conflict of a battlefield but that an even greater courage is called for on the part of those who assume the responsibility of leadership.

We believe that the trusteeship of a promise made carries the accountability of a strict and faithful performance, and that excuses for failure in the line of duty are no more tenable in Washington than on the battle front.

We believe that the people have fortitude to accept heroically the sufferings of real sacrifice, if candor rather than cunning be the Government's standard in its every activity.

We believe that the war has not changed the traditional philosophy of a free people—that the Government is the servant and not the master of men.

We believe that the Government should set the example to a people who are called upon to do without, by cutting to the bone every nonessential activity and by eliminating every extravagance no matter how politically valuable.

We believe that the rights acquired by the Government from the people for the prosecution of the war are merely temporary grants of power and that their prompt return after the cessation of hostilities is a part of the obligation incident to their exercise.

We believe that the formation of plans and the adoption of policies carries the responsibility of a practical appraisal of the possible successful execution of such plans and policies.

We believe in the capacity and the willingness of free men to work harder and longer and better than regimented men and that political serfdom is more dangerous than economic slavery.

We believe that the primary obligation of the Congress and the President is the preservation of America's distinctive characteristics and that they can be perpetuated by keeping the fires of freedom burning brightly in every American heart despite the darkness of prevailing despotism.

An Independent Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the views contained in the following editorial, but, under leave to extend my remarks, I think it well for the membership of the Congress to have the opinion of the New York Times in an editorial of January 7, 1943.

The editorial follows:

AN INDEPENDENT CONGRESS

The speech made in the Democratic caucus by Representative RAYBURN, reelected yesterday as Speaker of the House, was made behind closed doors and has not been textually reported. But it is described by hearers as "a declaration of independence" from the executive branch of the Government, particularly of its departments and bureaus. At one point in his address the Speaker is quoted as asserting that "this Congress won't take legislation written by men who not only never were elected to office but never ran for office." This remark is reported to have been received by the Democratic caucus with enthusiasm.

It is a good thing to have Congress reassert its intention of becoming a coordinate and coequal branch of the Government in its relationships with the administration. But it is of the first importance for Congress to recognize now, rather than later, that it cannot assume this role unless it is willing to reorganize itself. Most Congressmen are realistic enough to recognize that sound legislation cannot be written on the floor of Congress. But few Congressmen yet seem willing to admit that neither can a sound, positive program of legislation be framed by Congress as at present organized.

Congress today is ruled by some 80 standing committees and by nearly a hundred committees of all kinds. The heads of nearly all these committees are chosen not for their ability or because they most nearly represent the sentiment of Congress on their special subject, but on grounds of seniority. These hundred committees operate in watertight compartments, like a hundred little Congresses, each passing legislation in its special field. It is obvious that Congress will never have a coherent legislative program of its own until all these committees are subordinated to one central committee; until, instead of reporting their findings or proposals directly to Congress, they funnel them through such a single central committee.

Unless Congress is willing to do this, unless committee heads with vested interests are willing in the national interest to waive some of their traditional prerogatives and submit themselves to such a discipline, unless Congress improves its secretariat and its facilities for guidance by its own experts, it can have no legislative program worth the name; and it must find itself forced to continue to accept legislation drafted by the bureaucrats. Congress cannot achieve independence, in brief, until it accepts responsibility. If it hopes to adopt its own positive program, it must begin by reforming itself.

Point Rationing of Foods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the announcement on last Sunday, December 27, by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, that point rationing of foods would begin in February has created a vast amount of understandable controversy. Elmer Davis, head of O. W. I., stated frankly—and his frankness was refreshing—that this announcement of rationing to come next February in additional food lines would give the chiselers, the hoarders, and especially the food speculators a chance to operate against the best interests of the armed forces and the Nation at large, themselves included.

The controversy has arisen over the fact that there are black markets; that food speculators are at work in the United States; that the so-called "10 percent" who are chiselers can take advantage of the 90 percent of decent, patriotic, cooperative citizens, under circumstances where announcements of future rationing regulations are made sufficiently in advance for the food speculators and chiselers to get in their dirty work.

There is much logic, perhaps, in the reason assigned by the Secretary of Agriculture and the head of O. W. I. for thus announcing, more than a month in advance, the contemplated rationing program. The Point System will be complicated and difficult to operate. On the other hand, unless some effective remedy is found to prevent the inevitable "10 percent" of pocket-book patriots, profiteers, speculators, chiselers, and hoarders, from penalizing the real patriotism, the decency, the honesty, and the cooperative spirit of the 90 percent of the people, any rationing program must fail.

It would seem to the average man that the remedy is at hand, that it is perfectly clear, and somewhat simple. The remedy lies in pitiless publicity and relentless prosecution for the gougers and chiselers and the speculators wherever they may be found.

Mr. Speaker, great care must be exercised by the governmental officials to prevent innocent persons from being unfairly publicized or prosecuted as violators of rationing regulations. On the other hand, there are rumors of black markets that have grown to such proportions as to indicate that such black markets do exist, and perhaps extensively, throughout the United States. If

the governmental officials have not the power, the means of apprehension, and the attorneys to seek out and prosecute the black marketeers, the big food speculators, and the big hoarders, then our chance of winning this war is mighty slim. It would be incredible if the governmental officials, with all the power and all the billions they have at their command should be unable to wipe out the black markets and stop the food speculators in their tracks.

It is not the housewife who may take on an extra pound of sugar, or an extra pound of coffee or an extra can of beans, or an extra can of tomatoes, who is going to do the damage. It will be the food speculators and the black-market operators who go into the markets and buy up carloads of provisions, fuel oil, gasoline, tires, and what not, who will do the greatest damage. It is true that a million cans of tomatoes hoarded by a million housewives is just as much a million cans of tomatoes as the million cans bought and hidden away by food speculators; but there is this difference: Where food speculators and black-market operators are allowed to carry on their nefarious activities, such operations break down the morale of the private citizens and lead a million housewives to hoard a million cans of tomatoes or a million pounds of sugar. On the other hand, if pitiless publicity and relentless and certain prosecution became the portion of the black marketeers and the food speculators, not only would private citizens be deterred from small hoarding—great in the aggregate—but their patriotic sense of fair play would be satisfied and their innate and natural patriotism would do the rest.

There is no shadow of excuse for any governmental official to close his eyes, or to look the other way when violations of rationing regulations are being carried on, even though the unpatriotic traitorous violators may be friends of those in high governmental service.

We are at war. Our boys are dying on the far-flung battlefields across the seven seas. Whatever else we do, we ought to demonstrate in the United States of America that black marketeers, food profiteers, food speculators, and big hoarders cannot get away with their shameful and indefensible operations while good citizens suffer penalties for being patriotic.

Let us turn the light and the heat on the black markets, their operators, the food speculators, and the profiteers.

Work and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the column by Walter Lippmann, which I include here with my remarks, is one of the most penetrating and significant statements regarding the basic future policies of our country.

The conception that the foundation of peace, of peace that can be lasting, must be "coordinate national policies designed to guarantee the right to work" is to me the conception on which our best hopes must be founded.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post of January 2, 1943]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

WORK AND PEACE

Much has been made out of the differences among those who like Messrs. Wallace, Hull, Welles, Hoover, Willkie, and Stassen are hammering out on the anvil of debate the next phase of American policy. But in fact the differences are small, often merely verbal, whereas the amount of common understanding and common purpose is remarkable. Certainly among the authors of the Constitution there were far deeper conflicts of opinion, ideological conflicts we now call them, in the years immediately preceding the Philadelphia Convention, than there are today among representative Americans.

What differences are there today, for example, which are as radical as those which separated the men of 1787 who thought they preferred a centralized monarchy from those who thought they preferred not one union but two confederacies? Mr. WALLACE'S speech of May 8 and Mr. Hull's of July 23 are supposed to represent some kind of profound conflict but, if we reread them both today, where is this profound conflict? Mr. WALLACE, if I understand him, puts rather more emphasis on Government-sponsored private capital investment abroad, and Mr. Hull puts a little more emphasis on the lowering of tariff barriers to promote international trade. But the differences are in emphasis rather than in principle or purpose, and they have been needlessly exaggerated. Nor is there any very great difference between Mr. Welles' effort to reach basic agreements prior to the armistice and Mr. Hoover's proposal for a conditional peace at the time of the armistice. They are both talking about essentially the same thing and seeking the same end.

In this debate which has now been going on for 7 months—coinciding we may note with the development of the offensive phase of the war—the President has held himself somewhat aloof. Unlike President Wilson, who made all the great pronouncements himself, Mr. Roosevelt has been careful not to get himself irrevocably committed to any one formulation of policy. This is most sagacious. For the true line of American policy cannot be invented by a single brain. What is in the making is the constitutional order of the twentieth century, and the place of America in that order. In an undertaking of this size there will be needed, as John Adams put it in 1787 when he was writing to Rufus King: "The greatest single effort of human understanding, the greatest single effort of national deliberation that the world has ever seen."

In that exertion and in that effort the President has the deciding part to play. But he will play it most effectively if he continues to preside over the debate until each phase of it is ripe for decision. Mr. Wilson suffered greatly from the fact that as the foremost advocate of specific measures, he very soon lost his power to judge and modify measures which were not altogether workable or acceptable. President Wilson could not alter what Mr. Wilson as advocate or negotiator had done. It is evident that Mr. Roosevelt has learned the lesson of that experience and is making sure that he retains the power to correct what his own spokesmen or emissaries do.

Mr. WALLACE'S speech this past week must be looked upon, then, as the latest but not the last of a series. As such it is much the best—best precisely because it sums up and elucidates what he and Mr. Hull and the others have said before, and takes honestly into account what has been learned from the critical discussion of the past 7 months. In fact, reading this speech one has the feeling of having found a simple statement of what so many have been groping for—of having come through a maze of high-sounding generalities (which are always a sign of immature ideas) to something which is self-evident and true.

What men want, said Mr. WALLACE, is work and peace. That is exactly what they really want. And if they have work and peace, they will have the four freedoms, five freedoms, six freedoms, indeed all the freedom that is practicable, and they will have all that the Atlantic Charter promises. But what is more, and this point marks the great advance in our thinking since Wilson's day, work and peace are inseparable. For there can be no peace in which men do not have the full opportunity to work for their own welfare; nor can men have the full opportunity to work for their own welfare unless they are sure of peace.

In this conception of peace the foundation on which the whole structure would be built is not, as in the past, on the arrangement of frontiers and on diplomatic agreements and on covenants like that of the League, but upon coordinate national policies designed to guarantee the right to work. Thus the enormous problems of demobilization, relief, rehabilitation, and of the development of new wealth and new opportunity would become the central and primary concern, and not, as in previous wars, be left to chance. Around them, auxiliary to them, the political and constitutional problems of the post-war world would fall into their proper perspective.

This approach is as human and practicable as it is sound in principle. To see this we have only to ask ourselves this question: What will the 15,000,000 Allied soldiers be thinking about when hostilities end, and what will their families be thinking about, and what will the countless millions of individuals who have been dislocated by the war be thinking about? Will it be peace in the abstract, or how to constitute a world court, or how many votes each nation is to have on a world council, or what is to be the disposition of colonial territory? Not at all. It will be how to resume their lives, how to reestablish their homes, how to repair their enterprises, how to find jobs that they like to do. If this is not made possible for them, then nothing that statesmen decide at a diplomatic conference will be worth the paper it is written on. But if it is made possible to them, then the statesmen will stand upon solid ground when they seek to build a new order of things to preserve the peace of the world.

The approach to peace through the development of the opportunity to work could, I believe, be initiated only here. For, as it happens, only the United States today will have the reserves of power and of wealth which, in its first beginnings, it requires.

Moreover, this policy answers not only the primary American post-war problems, which is how to find jobs for at least 15,000,000 American soldiers and war workers. It answers also the profound effect on the minds of Americans made by the war itself. For in this war Americans have discovered their own power, and what they can do when they put together all their energies in a great effort.

Woe to the politicians, then, who fail to see that Americans will not be satisfied unless they can find ways to do in peace what they have learned that they are capable of doing in war. For Americans will not be satisfied with a peace which is a mere cessation of hostilities and a return to the status quo ante. The momentum of the war effort will continue, and it will run hog wild when military discipline is relaxed unless the gigantic energy that has been unloosed is enlisted in great undertakings.

The Lady of the Fans, Caroline O'Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, those who served in Congress with Mrs. Caroline O'Day were grieved to hear of her death. We know that the world made richer for her having lived in it, is made poorer today by reason of her passing.

We know her as a persuasive, persistent partisan; an energetic proponent, and an ardent defender of those causes in which she believed so genuinely, and to the advancement of which she gave the best that could be given.

An outspoken pacifist during the World War and later, Mrs. O'Day admitted the need of a defense program when Hitler's aims became clear. She had said frequently that if the United States should become embroiled in a war, "I would just kiss my children good-by and start off for Leavenworth." Presented with many difficult decisions in 1940, Mrs. O'Day voted for bills to strengthen the Nation's defenses, but opposed the draft.

Born in Perry, Ga., in 1875, she was a member of an old southern family. She attended Lucy Cobb Institute at Athens, Ga., and was later sent abroad to study art. She spent 8 years at art schools in Paris, Munich, and Holland and later exhibited her paintings in this country and in Europe.

In 1923 Mrs. O'Day succeeded Miss Harriet May Mills as associate chairman of the State Democratic Committee of New York and later became acting chairman of the committee. Mrs. O'Day was a member of the State board of social welfare, State director of the National Recovery Administration—N. R. A.—and president of the Rye school board.

In 1936, when a group of women carried a petition for peace to the International Conference for the Maintenance of Peace at Buenos Aires, Mrs. O'Day represented the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

ACTIVE SOCIAL WELFARE LEADER

As a member of the New York State Board of Social Welfare, Mrs. O'Day headed many major social surveys.

As a Member of Congress, Mrs. O'Day backed bills for humanizing deportation laws, sought passage of a national anti-lynching law, and in 1940 she sponsored a bill to provide for "talking" books for the blind.

One who knew her well has well said that, to comprehend Mrs. O'Day, it is necessary to regard her as an artist all her life. She made creative use of many faculties. Her voice was an instrument which she employed as notably as an opera singer might a similar endowment. She dressed with exquisite taste. Her style of penmanship was richly beautiful. She was generous to a fault. She was an aristocrat in the best meaning of the word, preferring all that is noblest in the universe and devoting her own personal gifts to the advancement of ideal ends.

She made an indelible and a lasting mark on those of us with whom she worked. Her graciousness, kindliness, backed by an intense enthusiasm, which made her finer qualities only the more apparent; her forceful but gentle fearlessness, marked her as always the lady whose aristocratic, yet democratic attributes and complements of ability generously qualified her for her work and duties which she discharged with great loyalty and to the satisfaction of her constituents and with credit to herself.

I differed with her in respect to many of the causes she espoused.

We shall miss her, "the lady of the fans." Her passing was "like to the falling of a star."

The Late Philip A. Bennett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the funeral sermon of the late Honorable Philip A. Bennett, by Rev. Barton A. Johnson, of Springfield, Mo., and eulogy of the late Honorable Philip A. Bennett by my colleague the gentleman from Missouri, Hon. DEWEY SHORT:

INVOCATION

Most holy God, our loving heavenly Father, in whose spiritual likeness we are all created: Thou art our refuge and our strength, a very present help in time of great trouble. Thou hast surrounded us all the days of our life with Thy mercy and loving kindness. Look with pity now upon Thy servants who are overwhelmed with grief. Replenish their failing strength from the reservoir of Thy abounding grace. Comfort and sustain them through the visible and the hidden channels through which Thy grace operates. Increase their faith, we beseech Thee. Grant that they, as countless generations before them, may obtain light for their darkness and healing for their wounded hearts from Thy holy word. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord, we pray. Amen.

(Psalm 23: John 14 (portions); Romans 8 (portions).)

I. OBITUARY

Phil A. Bennett was born on a farm in Dallas County, Mo., March 5, 1881. He was the ninth child of Marion Francis and Mary Jane O'Bannon Bennett.

He graduated from the old Springfield Normal and Business College. He thought of education as a continuing process. He had a wide and varied experience. Upon graduating from college he began working as a stenographer for the Frisco Railroad in St. Louis. Then he returned to Buffalo, where for 18 years he served as a progressive newspaperman. His newspaper experience was followed by services as State senator, as lieutenant governor, and finally as Congressman from the Sixth District of Missouri. He survived both success and defeat. He must have been a man who made most of his own way, for, being a member of a family of 14 children, his parents could not have coddled him. He continued his education in the school of experience; and he learned as he earned.

Mr. Bennett married Bertha Tinsley, of Buffalo, May 16, 1912. Two children were born to them: Marion, an attorney and his father's secretary; and Mary Edith, a teacher in the Phelps School in Springfield.

Mr. Bennett was a member of the Odd Fellows and of all the Masonic bodies of the York rite. He was also a member of the Abou Ben Adhem Shrine of Springfield. He was an active member of the South Street Christian Church. He and Mrs. Bennett joined the church April 20, 1924.

His untimely passing is mourned by all kinds of friends from various walks of life. The House of Representatives adjourned out of respect to his memory Monday. I hold in my hand pages from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, December 7, paying tribute to Mr. Bennett. Friends have been sending telegrams, flowers, letters, and making calls, trying in a sincere way to express sympathy with his stricken wife and children. Besides his wife, his son and wife, and his daughter, he is mourned by five brothers: George W. Bennett, Elkland; James L. Bennett, of Springfield; Gordon Bennett, of Buffalo; Paul Bennett, near Elkland; and Arthur Bennett; and two sisters: Mrs. R. T. Lemons, Halfway; and Mrs. R. H. Williams, Elkland.

II. PERSONAL APPRECIATION

We wish to consider the life of Congressman Bennett from three points of view: As a Christian man, as a husband and father, and as a worthy citizen.

First. He was a Christian man. He was regular in attendance at worship. He was a regular member of the men's bible class of the South Street Christian Church, and one of its teachers for a number of years. He served until his death as an elder of the church, and also as a member of the official board. Moreover, when he was in Washington he was just as regular in attending the Ninth Street Christian Church. Some men would have excused themselves from their religious duties because of the pressure of business in the Capitol. But he continued steadfastly in the fellowship of the church.

The sweet old hymns of the church were a vital part of his faith. The Golden Rule commanded him deeply, and he sought, as best he could, to live by it.

Second, we are moved to think of him as a husband and father. That man has lived well who has won and held the respect of his family. Mr. Bennett's family rise up to do honor to his memory.

This husband and wife loved each other dearly. They trusted each other. They had a splendid home life. The postman handed Mrs. Bennett a letter this Tuesday morning. It was written at 6 p. m. last Saturday night, shortly before her husband was stricken. It was, of course, her last message from him. The arrival of that dear letter broke open the wound in her heart. Yet this last personal message, written in the pattern of their deep mutual understanding and affection is precious beyond words to her. There are hosts of people who would give all they possess for a few fleeting moments of the domes-

tic felicity this man and wife regularly enjoyed.

This family enjoyed being together. We know, unfortunately, that there are families who put up a pas ably good front together in public, but who quarrel bitterly behind closed doors. Quite to the contrary, this family enjoyed being together. That man has lived well who wins and holds the trust and the love of his family.

Third, we think of Mr. Bennett as a citizen. It was in the course of discharging his obligations as a citizen that he became a Congressman.

He had personal convictions, and acted upon them. We are obliged to respect the man with personal convictions, whether we agree with him or not; the man who struggles to inform himself upon the issues before us, and who comes forth to make any enduring contribution. He lives up to the high privileges of his manhood and his citizenship. Mr. Bennett spoke his mind freely on the issues before us. Because of his outspokenness he made many enemies, but also he made many fast friends.

He took his responsibility as the Representative of his constituency seriously. He regarded his office as a trust. He was a tireless worker. His physicians believe his untimely death came as the result of overwork and worry. He tried to do his duty honestly as he saw it.

Mr. Bennett believed passionately in the democratic processes. He was a member of "the loyal opposition." He understood democracy to make a place specifically for the free expression of the minority point of view. He thought that a strong, alert minority had not only a right but also a duty to perform as the critic of the majority. He loved his country sincerely. No one who knew him ever questioned that.

He took an active part in the life of his community. It is most refreshing to find those noble persons who feel an obligation to help build a better community, rather than to live off of it.

III. COMFORT FROM GOD'S WORD

When all human words have been spoken, the enduring comfort comes from God's Holy Word. We read in Romans 8: 28 these noble words: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called in terms of His purpose."

Does it seem almost impossible to believe the truth of this passage in the face of this unexpected, bitter loss? If this passage should be made to crawl on all fours it would be repulsive.

What, then, does this passage mean? Certainly it does not mean that all the things we experience are good in themselves. All of us have repeatedly had experiences which can only be described as bitter and exceedingly hard to endure.

This statement is to be understood as a mighty affirmation of faith. This affirmation covers Paul's attitude toward the entire span of life. He is not thinking in terms of isolated moments but in terms of the direction, the ultimate outcome of life. He affirmed that God means good for those who live lives of trust and obedience. He affirmed that in spite of many, many trials and bitter losses, that God intends life itself, the sum total of our living, to be good, and to lead us into closer fellowship with the Father. Two cooperating factors joined together to enable the apostle to make this affirmation of great faith.

First, Paul was sustained by a profound conception of God. A man's conception of God is the most valuable insight he possesses, for as he thinks of God, so will his courage be, so will his morals be, so will his service be.

Paul's conception of God was based upon the insight he got into God's nature through the life and death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. The prophet Isaiah had an exceedingly high conception of God. He said, "I saw the Lord, high and lifted up, and His glory filled the whole temple." By these words he meant to convey the sublime truth that he had an exalted vision of God—far higher than any had had previously. It was so high that it filled him with a sense of personal unworthiness. Higher, far higher yet was Paul's conception of God. Not only was He holy and merciful, but He was a loving Father, working in all the ways open to Him for our good. Paul saw God in the character and life of Jesus. He saw God sometimes temporarily defeated but never abandoning the flight for right. He saw God running the risks love has to run. He saw God as the moral hero of the universe. He experienced God as a sustaining power within his own soul. He found that through living as Christ had lived he was brought into a saving, satisfying relationship with the Creator, the eternal moral hero, the judge of all the earth, the loving Father. Paul had a very high conception of God.

Second, the most distinguishing fact about Paul is the fact that he lived a life of trust and obedience. He was a "surrendered man," by which he meant that he kept his thoughts, his acts, his life in harmony with the holy purposes of God. He sought sincerely to discover and do God's holy will. He walked closely with Christ, and Christ led him to God. The tactics of the German army have been characterized by the old strategy of "divide and conquer." They like to drive a wedge into the lines of their enemy in order to split them up into little groups, to disrupt their lines of communication and supply, and then decimate them separately. Paul allowed no enemy, however powerful, to drive a wedge between him and Christ Jesus. He was a "surrendered man," he was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision.

In the third place, his noble conception of God and his unswerving obedience to God joined together to produce a sustaining power, a spring of inexhaustible power within him. His power to live came from his religion.

How did Paul behave in the most trying situations? He was arrested in Jerusalem while on an errand of Christian reconciliation. Finally he was taken as a prisoner to Rome where he had longed to go as a missionary. Any man without Paul's faith would have been utterly discouraged. Most of us would have concluded that our hope was groundless. We would have felt that God did not care. Still other men would become sullen and remorseful. But not Paul. In spite of the shattering of his long-cherished dream to go to Rome and on to Spain, in spite of the violent termination of his public ministry, he maintained his unflagging interest in life, his sense of responsibility for the welfare of the churches, and his unshakable faith in God. He wrote glorious letters from his Roman prison which defy prison walls, which turned those very walls into a sounding board which made them echo and reecho down the lengthening corridors of the generations. He had nothing external upon which to depend. Nevertheless, inexhaustible power welled up within him. That power sprang from his faith, and it enabled him to make the best of an exceedingly difficult situation.

Let us then, sustained by a life-forming conception of the goodness of God, living a life of trust in God and obedience to Him, rely upon our faith in God. Such faith will sanctify and sweeten even our sorrows. Let us, like the Apostle, face every crushing blow and soaring triumph with the determination to meet each in the very best manner possible. If we love God sincerely and yield ourselves unreservedly to His holy purposes, if we do our very best in every situation, let us have faith to believe that God will yet bless us with the crown of a good life. He does not intend to crush us with wrath, but to bless us with His loving kindness. His mercy endureth forever.

Such a faith is both a possibility and a reality. Robert Browning knew what faith meant when he wrote of the dauntless disciple:

"One who never turned his back but marched breast forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed that though right were worsted, wrong would triumph,
Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,
Sleep to wake.

"No! at noonday in the bustle of a man's worktime
Greet the unseen with a cheer:
Bid him forward, breast and back as either should be,
'Strive and thrive!' cry, 'Speed—fight on, fare ever There as here!'"

—From the Epilogue, by Robert Browning.

PRAYER

Our Father and our God: Grant unto Thy bereaved servants a splendid and nobler vision of Thee, that knowing Thee in all the plentitude of Thy goodness they may more fully trust Thee, "Whom to know is life eternal." May they confidently trust Thee even where they cannot see; and be instant in obedience to Thy holy will. Thus like the great apostle, and all the faithful, they will be sustained inwardly by Thy grace, strengthened through faith, and comforted by the Holy Spirit. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

HON. DEWEY SHORT'S EULOGY OF PHIL A. BENNETT, DECEMBER 10, 1942, AT SPRINGFIELD, MO.

"Sunset and evening star, and one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar when I put out to sea,
But such a tide as moving seems asleep, too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew from out the boundless deep turns again home.
Twilight and evening bell—and after that the dark!
And may there be no sadness of farewell when I embark;
For, though from out our bourne of time and place the flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face when I have crossed the bar."

Friends, we all feel things at this moment which no one can say and we discover that language, after all, is a rather weak and impotent vehicle to give utterance to the deep emotions that well up in our hearts when those dear and beloved ones whom we love as much as life itself are suddenly taken away. On such a sad and solemn occasion as this, silence—perhaps a sacred silence—is the most eloquent tribute we could pay to the one whom we have known, many of us most of our lives, for whom we had the highest respect, and whom we held in dear and fond affection. When I look over this vast throng and the many who are outside unable to get into these many different rooms, and see faces of old friends, and faces of new ones, men and women who have traveled long distances and many miles, who have come not only out of the district that our departed friend so faithfully and well represented in the Congress of the United States but who have come from regions outside and beyond the borders of the great District he represented, it convinces me that Phil Bennett's life was not lived in vain. And these many beautiful floral offerings here today are a silent but a beautiful and convincing tribute to a mind that was honest, to a heart that

was good, to a soul that was dedicated to the service of God and his fellowmen. Death is no respecter of persons. It levels our differences. Sometimes it strikes with sudden fury; at other times over long periods it exacts through bitter pain and great suffering the final toll that each and every one of us must pay.

"Death comes with a crawl, it comes with a pounce,
But whether slow or spry, it is not the fact you are dead that counts, but only, How did you die?"

Our friend whom we are here today to pay tribute to had a long and distinguished political career, starting when he was a very young man. He was born and reared in one of the counties of my district. He was one of a large family of pioneer, patriotic ancestors. Going back to the American Revolution and down through all the years, his forefathers fought not only to establish this Republic, but to save this Union. After graduating from school he taught school. He taught in a country school, where he learned to know human nature as it actually is. For many years he edited a country newspaper making it one of the outstanding periodicals of its kind in the State. He served as chairman of his county committee, on the State committee, was chairman of his congressional committee; he was elected to the State senate and he was a faithful worker. Later he was elected Lieutenant Governor, then defeated for the nomination for Governor of this great Commonwealth. Phil Bennett knew both victory and defeat. He felt the glory of triumph at times and he tasted also the bitterness of defeat and disillusionment. But, he could win without crowing and could lose without crabbing. He was strong in adversity and he was humble in victory. Later when many people thought he was through politically speaking, because of severe reverses—he had lost and suffered as many of us did during the long years of the depression—because of his strength of character and his word as a man, more than his cunning as a politician, he was elected to the Congress of the United States, and again elected, which proves the high confidence that the people of this great district had in him, the respect and love they had for him.

Yes; character counts. He knew the fleeting, passing character of temporal fame; he was a strong partisan, but he loved his party only as an instrument, an agency, or a vehicle through which he could serve his country. He believed in party government and strong partisan though he was, he had honest respect for those who differed with him and were as loyal to their party as he was to his. He believed in party government and party responsibility because he thought that kind of government best served the welfare of all.

After this irresistible onslaught of death that cuts indiscriminately through our ranks, Vice President HENRY WALLACE, and the Speaker of the House, named the Senior United States Senator, BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, and Representatives BELL, PLOESER, and myself, colleagues of this worthy man, to come here from the Nation's Capital—we who have served in the same body with him and who testify that since coming to Congress in the past years, few men have spent more hours on the floor of the House, worked more diligently, or spent longer, more tedious hours in the office answering the mail and correspondence that comes to us in these trying days and times than did Phil Bennett. He was faithful to his task. He was a good, loyal servant. He was a great warrior, and he died on the front line of battle. He gave his life for his country as much as young men in the line of combat, whether it be in the far-off Solomons, the Aleutians, or on the desert sands of Africa.

Friends, it was never very easy to serve in public life even in normal times and in these days of uncertainty and of trial, in this hour when our Nation is being given a baptism with fire, when all that we have or own or ever hope to be is at stake, we must be big enough to put the welfare of our country above our own little personal political fortunes, forget partisanship, and realize we are all Americans and join hands, heads, and hearts, to put out the flame, else we will all be consumed. The onerous burdens are multiplied today, the heavy responsibility resting upon the shoulders of the heads of the Nation, I can testify, regardless of party, is exacting a toll among our membership that is terrific.

Phil Bennett died in the harness, and God bless him, that is the way he would have chosen to go. After all, he had much to be grateful for. His people had honored him; God had given him one of the finest pioneer families that ever was born, and then he was blessed with a lovely wife, a fine son, and a beautiful daughter. He had a lot to be thankful for. And he was so sincere, so honest, so earnest, so devoted to duty, with a patriotism that burned with a passion, if you please, because he loved his God and he loved his country, and he loved his family. But these great increasing duties in recent months told upon him. I told him he was working too hard in Congress and in the campaign, and Phil was inclined to worry.

He was not thick-skinned but he was a sensitive soul and, of course, anyone who has ever gone through the fire knows how deeply he was cut at times, perhaps by harsh words and unfair words that were spoken not in a spirit of malice but in a way that told upon him. Well, he is gone; we could ill afford to lose such a man. Sixty-one years is not long. To our little finite minds it seems a life was cut short. He did not live as long as some men but he lived a full, rich, and rounded life. He had received honors. God had blessed him and with that religious conviction that was his he gained solace and comfort from a source greater than any human well of inspiration and comfort could give.

"Let me live out my years in heat of blood!
Let me die drunken with the dreamer's wine!
Let me not see this soul-house built of mud
Go toppling to the dust—a vacant shrine.

Let me go quickly, like a candlelight
Snuffed out just at the heyday of its glow.
Give me high noon—and let it then be night!
Thus would I go.

And grant that when I face the grisly thing,
My song may trumpet down the gray perhaps.
Oh, let me be a tune-swept fiddlestring
That feels the master melody—and snaps!"

Phil Bennett went like a candlelight snuffed out just at the heyday of its glow. He escaped long suffering and bitter pain, hard work, worry and concern over the Nation, and sharing the anxiety of those fathers and mothers of boys who are out there fighting and dying in this hour. He lived long enough to know and to feel like a tune-swept fiddlestring, the master melody, and then he snapped. But, his spirit lives on. And we who have been fortunate enough to have known him, to have been associated with him, who have worked with him and worried with him, are thanking God for the rich legacy of his precious memory, stronger than iron, than bands and hoops of steel, that welded our hearts together as we worked and toiled and fought, and as we must sometime die, in the harness we hope. He went, trying earnestly to serve both God and country well. May God's richest blessing and the faith that was in Phil Bennett comfort and sustain his widow and children, even unto the perfect day.

Republican Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., minority leader of the House of Representatives, delivered at the caucus of the Republican Members of the House of Representatives, Tuesday, January 5, 1943:

It is the purpose of the Republicans in Congress to help win the war and to buttress the faith of the American people in their Government and to restore the prerogatives of the Congress. We will be a militant force for the preservation of constitutional government. We will battle to save private enterprise from destruction. We will fight for the protection of our free press.

We shall cooperate fully in the winning of the war. There must be no partisan politics in the war effort, and as far as we Republicans are concerned there will be none. We demand this war to be fought vigorously and efficiently to achieve the earliest possible victory and to bring our boys back home. We are determined the war effort shall be in charge of administrators selected solely for their ability and capacity to do the job, and not because of partisan or personal favoritism. Victory can come much earlier if this is made the war of all the people and conducted as such.

The people of this country want every citizen to have an equal chance. They are opposed to special privileges for any group which will work to the disadvantage of our Nation. It shall be the objective of Republicans to bring equality of opportunity and equality of effort for all, and to drive the special privilege seekers from entrenched positions in government.

In our effort to restore the prerogatives of the Congress we believe the first important step should be to curb the reckless granting of blanket powers and blank checks. Congress will be in session practically all the time throughout the war. Congress has given and is ready and willing to give any money essential for the war effort or for our domestic affairs. The great expenditures must be authorized by the people's representatives rather than by some bureaucratic chief. Bureaucratic spending must be carefully checked. Promiscuous granting of blank checks and blanket powers leads to arrogant bureaucracy, inflation, higher taxes, and eventual destruction of our American system of government.

We shall insist that any necessary laws which tax, regulate, and regiment the American people shall come from their Congress and not from the bureaucrats. When Congress, representing the people, turns down a proposal, it is a direct defiance of constitutional government if some appointed bureaucrat puts it into effect by decree.

We will not tolerate this way of destroying constitutional government.

We pledge ourselves to battle for the elimination of some of the bureaus which have grown up like Topsy until they have reached such proportions and power as to menace our American way of life. The people want less unnecessary meddling by the bureaucrats; they want less unnecessary inquisitions. It has come to be that we can well say: "Count that day lost whose low descending sun" does not bring some new

questionnaire or some needless regulation which results in waste of time, money, and manpower and accomplishes nothing except to give work to the vast army of bureaucrats in Washington. The war effort has been seriously retarded by the meddlers seeking an excuse to keep on the Federal pay roll.

We shall seek to bring to this country a better planned and more equitable tax program. High taxes are necessary but they must not be punitive. They must not destroy initiative or business expansion. The chief purposes of Government after the war must be to bring more prosperity to the people; more production at lower costs; better jobs at better wages. This can be accomplished only through a wise tax system, which will promote our fixed policy of building a better civilization on the foundation of an ever-expanding private enterprise system. The job of collecting taxes due makes it imperative for us to have some system of pay-as-we-go. It is not necessary to delay tax reform. The sooner we get a better system the earlier will the people reap the benefits.

We shall insist upon a radical reduction of unnecessary Government expenses. Some nonwar bureaus must be eliminated; many others can be sharply reduced, and their overgrown personnel put into war work. There is no place in our Nation for political straphangers and the granting of vast partisan patronage.

The heavily burdened taxpayers are demanding action, and so far as we Republicans are concerned they are going to get it.

The services of everybody are needed in the war effort, and all unnecessary employees should be put at work in some part of the war program. We might well release every third Federal employee in the regular establishments for war work. Better wages could be paid those who remained, and all service would be improved.

While we shall respond promptly to every request for money needed for the prosecution of the war, we Republicans will insist that the war shall not be the excuse for unnecessary appropriations or a subterfuge for waste and extravagance.

Aviation will be an important factor in the winning of the war. It will be an important factor in maintaining the future peace of the world. It looms large in our future national prosperity. The country which is strongest in the air will be most secure.

We believe that while we concentrate on our war aviation needs, we must also plan the place America must occupy in air transportation in the post-war world. It shall be our purpose to demand a standing committee of the House of Representatives to deal with our aviation problems and development. America must rule the air, and to do this it is necessary for the Congress to plan intelligently for this air supremacy following the war.

Obviously the future of our country needs careful study. The bureaucrats and their thousands of employees are preparing their plans for this "new day" after the war. Congress, responsive to the needs of the country and the welfare of our people, must have a committee of its own to study these problems and be prepared with its own carefully considered program.

The small businessman has become the "orphan child" of our Government. His relief up to date has been chiefly glowing promises and the spending of propaganda money to make him believe something was to be done in his behalf.

If small business perishes it will be a national disaster, and we Republicans shall direct our efforts to fighting for the survival of the "little" businessman. We intend to see that small business gets a fair deal and an opportunity to survive. These small business enterprises constitute the very foundation of America. They must be kept alive to give jobs to the millions of our men and women when the war is over. If we permit the ruin of the small business structure of this Nation, some form of state socialism will rule all business.

Broadly speaking, these are some of our outstanding objectives. This program will be expanded, and adapted to any changes in conditions. We have been given a definite job by the American people—the job of saving the American way of life and of being a compelling force for the efficient conduct of the war and for sound government. We shall not fail the Nation which has put its trust in us. We are sure we will find others in the Congress not of our political faith who will unite with us in these American objectives for the common good.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, one refreshing thing about the two new charming women Members is that both gave their exact ages in their biographies.

A soldier boy writes me that he has been in six widely separated Army camps since September. Most of his training has been under a conductor.

An inspiring and encouraging example for the ambitious is the life of the late George Washington Carver, the noted scientist, a colored man born in slavery.

"We cannot make America an island in either a military or an economic sense." Neither can we make her strong by bleeding her to resuscitate an ungrateful world.

The first day of the new Congress was adjourned on a motion of the new WILL ROGERS, who was serving his first day on the floor. Of course, the majority leaders arranged this.

The chairman of the Committee on Flood Control in the House comes from the Delta land of Mississippi—made by the black soil from the great Northwest States and brought to him in overflows.

While presenting Speaker RAYBURN to the new House, JOE MARTIN referred to the fact that it was his birthday. Instantly the House interrupted to sing, Happy Birthday to You. It is little things like this that help to relieve the tension at times.

The only Cabinet member missing at the joint session Thursday was the Secretary of the Treasury. He probably knew what was in the message and was a little bewildered at how we would pay for this new exposition of carrying the four freedoms to the world.

The one main weakness in the victorious Allies' guaranteeing the permanent peace by keeping militarized themselves and denying arms to the Axis is that new alinements are inevitable, just as there have been new ones since this war began. Permanent peace is a beautiful ideal but an iridescent dream.

In the last week, with the opening of the new year, we have heard several high-powered, paid columnists make predictions. Let me make two: First, I forecast that Franklin Delano Roosevelt intends to be President of the United States as long as he can; second, as long as he is President the national emergency will last, regardless of military victory.

A Letter From a Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I have received and which I deem to be a very interesting and illuminating report from one who is presently serving in our armed forces and whom I have known personally for a number of years. It impresses me such that I deem it useful to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD.

It is as follows:

NOVEMBER 30, 1942.

DEAR GENE: I have now been in the Army of the United States for 7 months and can truthfully say that it is the best-lived 7 months of my life. The clean living and thorough training we have been put through shall not only insure victory for us on the battlefields of the world but also insure a stronger and longer-lived generation to come. I believe that can be the opinion of any fellow who has joined the ranks of the best-trained and equipped soldiers in the world, bar none.

Here in the Thirty-fifth Infantry Training Battalion, Camp Croft, S. C., we seemed to have been blessed with competent and capable officers and noncommissioned officers who not only have a thorough knowledge of the subjects they teach but also the most humane and certain manner of handling men taken from civilian life and trained to be soldiers as soon as they arrive here.

At the head of the battalion we have Maj. Raymond S. Stripling, who has had many years' service in the Army. He can be seen every minute of the day with the four companies he commands on the drill fields and firing ranges, seeing that the men are instructed correctly and that no man goes out without proper training. He is an idol among us, and we look up to him for that quality of leadership which is inherent in American Army commanders.

Our second in command is Maj. Arthur L. Woodside who acts as aide to Major Stripling and as executive officer of the battalion. He is one of the remaining officers who helped to activate this battalion back in January of 1941 when he arrived here as a lieutenant. He plans the training schedules for the men and sees to it that the men are well cared for at all times. He is also our summary court officer. In this capacity he is known for his fairness in meting out punishment. Next to him we have our beloved adjutant. First Lt. Ralph K. Lee, who takes care of all administration and personnel. He has charge of all records of enlisted men and officers.

It is his painstaking job to see that every communication, transfer, etc., goes out from this office correct and on time. I happen to be directly under his supervision and he is the kind of man we all dream about working for in some position.

Our company commander is First Lt. William E. Carpenter who recently took over the reins. He is a well-drilled soldier for whom the men put out. He has the respect of all his noncoms and privates. He has to see as to our comfort and work. When you consider that he has to handle absolutely raw recruits and make them happy as well as work you can see the personification of patience of which he has an overabundance. He has a thorough knowledge of all our training right through from right face to night marches with rifle firing, bayonet, grenades, bivouacs, field fortifications, gas, and compass teaching thrown in for good measure. In his work he is ably assisted by a corps of lieutenants whom the men look up to instead of griping about. Here we have Lts. Thomas W. Day, Maurice K. Goddard, Francis E. Lord, John E. Packer, Schoenfeld, and Munro.

In the "noncom" ranks, the sergeants and corporals are all boys who received their training here at this Company C of the Thirty-fifth Battalion. They are the boys that were selected from their boards to fight the fight for freedom and democracy. To say they have done a good job is short measure, for they have accomplished what Hitler thought was impossible here—cooperation. All four platoon sergeants, John W. Evans, Lawrence J. Zampogna, Harry C. Shutt, and William F. Bordasch, come from selective-service ranks, and that system can salute itself on the performance these boys put on in training recruits. They are all well versed and capably assisted by corporals, any one of whom could lead his own platoon and is given every opportunity right here.

Last, but not least, is the much abused first sergeant, Johnnie Sutphin. Here we work in reverse; we always look for the chance to meet our first sergeant, as he is well liked and has a very pleasing manner. He is a soldier of the old Army and can find an answer for anything you ask him. He has to hear all the gripes and deal with it accordingly. He is the commanding officer's right arm and does a splendid job by just applying common sense to everything. I have worked very closely with him for 6 months and would have to go far to meet a man in his position who has a greater love for his Army and the men in it.

All in all, Gene, these are the men that are fighting for the things that they inherited at Lexington, Valley Forge, Gettysburg, San Juan Hill, Belleau Wood, and Bataan—freedom. That we shall win is obvious, but this time we shall win for all time and show the world at large that a common people can band together from all nations of the earth and conceive and keep alive a nation where there is equality of justice and freedom for all.

Respectfully,

———.

The Late Dr. Abbott Lawrence Lowell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a biographical statement concerning Dr. Abbott Lawrence Lowell, president emeritus of Harvard University, who died on January 6 at his home at Boston, Mass. His life is a wonderful example of fine accomplishments. I hope many persons may have an opportunity to read this most inspiring statement:

A. LAWRENCE LOWELL, PRESIDENT EMERITUS OF HARVARD, DIES—HEAD OF UNIVERSITY FOR 24 YEARS ORIGINATED COLLEGE "HOUSE PLAN"

BOSTON, January 6.—Dr. Abbott Lawrence Lowell, 86, president emeritus of Harvard University, died today at his Boston home.

The aged educator, who presided over the destinies of the three-century-old university for 24 years, died after a short illness.

His family announced that funeral services would be held at the Harvard Memorial Church in Cambridge at 11 a. m. Saturday. Dr. Willard Learoyd Sperry, dean of the Harvard Divinity School, will officiate.

After becoming president emeritus in 1933, he retained an active interest in Massachusetts civic affairs, but more recently, with declining health in the past year, had withdrawn a great deal from public activities.

STRICKEN 10 DAYS AGO

He was stricken ill 10 days ago at his Back Bay home and gradually failed until his death this morning.

His nearest surviving relatives were three nephews, George Putnam, Augustus L. Putnam, and Roger Putnam, who has served as mayor of Springfield and was the unsuccessful Democratic candidate for Governor of Massachusetts last November. His wife died in 1930.

Dr. Lowell was a Unitarian.

Dr. Lowell virtually remade Harvard University.

He became the twenty-fourth president of the country's oldest school of higher learning in 1909, when it had an enrollment of 3,800 students and an endowment of $22,716,000.

When he announced his resignation in the fall of 1932 there were more than 8,000 students, despite increasingly severe standards of admission, and the university's endowment, $123,415,000, was the greatest of any in the country.

Dr. Lowell started his career as successor of the scholarly Charles Eliot with the conviction that Harvard's famous system of electives had failed in many cases to work for systematic education. He changed this almost overnight with a requirement that every student must concentrate in some one field of education while still utilizing electives to obtain a liberal acquaintance in many.

STARTED "HOUSE PLAN"

He established the far-reaching tutorial system and the general examinations, both new to American college life in their applicability to the student body as a whole.

Finally, as a capstone to Dr. Lowell's many accomplishments, came the celebrated house plan, one of the most revolutionary experiments ever attempted by an American college.

This plan, first outlined in 1926, realined the social life of undergraduates by subdividing Harvard College, the university's school of liberal arts as distinct from its graduate and professional departments, into seven units or houses.

The plan was brought to fruition in 1930 through the generosity of Edward Harkness, New York capitalist and philanthropist, who gave Harvard nearly $15,000,000 to make the houses possible.

To Dr. Lowell it marked the crowning achievement of a long career and when, 2 years after the last house was opened, he announced his decision to retire to the quiet of private life, he felt he had accomplished what he had set out to do.

Dr. Lowell was born in Boston, December 13, 1856, son of wealthy parents and the grandson of the two men whose names are perpetuated by the great textile cities of Lowell and Lawrence.

He was graduated from Harvard in 1877 with highest honors in mathematics and subsequently attended the law school from which he was graduated in 1880. For 17 years thereafter he practiced law until he accepted an offer to lecture on government at Harvard.

Shortly afterward he was appointed Eaton professor of government and assumed direction of "government 1," one of the largest introductory courses at the university.

In the next few years he came gradually to take over many of the administrative duties of President Eliot, while at the same time he was building up a reputation as one of the leading experts in this country on the science of government.

His most notable book, "The Government of England," published a year before he was voted the presidency, brought him into international prominence and was regarded as having done much to obtain him that coveted post.

Anyone who had visited Cambridge, Mass., in 1909 and returned again at the close of Dr. Lowell's regime, would have marveled at the transformation of the university.

New groups of dormitories, in the classic Georgian style, which has distinguished Harvard in recent years, had sprung up. Across the Charles River stood the magnificent group of Harvard Business School, presented to the university by the late George F. Baker, New York financier, at a cost of nearly $6,000,000.

In other directions, both in Cambridge and Boston, new buildings, immense laboratories and museums and, finally, the vast Widener Library, third largest in the country, testified to the growth of the university and its many scientific schools in less than a quarter of a century.

GAVE SUNDAY RECEPTIONS

But to the educational world, the internal reforms and innovations of President Lowell were more important.

Dr. Lowell was for years a striking figure about the Harvard yard. Slightly stooped, but alert of manner, the only infirmity he carried into retirement was a touch of deafness.

His appearance had become almost traditional. His suit coat was buttoned only at the top; a heavy gold watch chain almost invariably spanned his trim waist; he carried his 5 feet 10 inches well, and his penetrating blue eyes regarded the world and the university with serenity. And by his side there trotted a spaniel.

To the undergraduates, Dr. Lowell was one of the most accessible of university heads and his Sunday afternoon teas, to which students and members of the faculty needed no special invitation, were always well attended.

Dr. Lowell had no hobbies. In his youth he was a member of the Crimson track team and, in age, he took his recreation mainly by walking. He read extensively and, like his conversation with intimates, his reading was cosmopolitan and many sided.

NEVER GAVE AN INTERVIEW

His New England breeding was reflected in his intense dislike of personal publicity. He never gave a newspaper interview despite the fact that his views were sought as were those of few other men.

Dr. Lowell took little part in the various controversies which periodically raged concerning overemphasis of sports and kindred subjects, but his actions were frequently more emphatic than words.

He refused to sanction a proposed expansion of the Harvard stadium at a time when other universities were building stadia twice as large as Harvard's and, with two exceptions, he refused to allow the Harvard football team to play more than one game away from Cambridge in a single season.

On the other hand, he lent warm approval to development of intramural sports and during his administration the Harvard

athletic plant was enormously enlarged. Dr. Lowell married a distant cousin, Miss Anna Parker Lowell, in Boston, on June 19, 1879. She died March 23, 1930. They had no children.

Dr. Lowell's list of honorary degrees read almost like a catalog of the leading institutions of America and Europe. He held LL. D.'s from Illinois, Williams, Columbia, Princeton, Yale, Dartmouth, Bowdoin, Brown, and Missouri, and from Louvain University, Belgium.

The degree of doctor of philosophy was bestowed on him by Friedrich Wilhelm University, Berlin; Strasbourg, Germany; McGill University, Montreal; Cambridge, England; and Victoria University, Manchester, England.

Oxford made him a doctor of literature. Leyden, Holland, and the University of Paris bestowed the degree of doctor of political science.

He was a past president of the League to Enforce Peace and sole trustee after 1900 of Lowell Institute, Boston. He was an active member of many cultural sccieties in this country and a corresponding or honorary member of several European "academies." France made him a commander of its Legion of Honor, and Belgium gave him that rank in its Order of the Crown.

Status of Married Men Under Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I have received several inquiries as to the proper classification of men who have been married since September 16, 1940, and into whose family children have been born up to September 1942. The inquiries indicated that draft boards in my congressional district have used different dates and different factors in classifying such men. I, therefore, believe that a letter which I sent to Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, on December 1, 1942, on this subject and his reply under date of December 21, 1942, may be of interest to members of the draft boards throughout the country. For that reason, I wish to bring the letters to the attention of the Members of the House. They are as follows:

DECEMBER 1, 1942.

Brig. Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Selective Service System,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have had considerable correspondence lately with local draft boards and constituents concerning the position under the draft of men who have been married at various dates since September 16, 1940, and who are now the fathers of young children. Some draft boards appear to be taking one date as determining whether or not they shall consider such a person as a married man; other boards are taking a different date. Likewise some boards are treating these men as if they had no children while others are deferring them because of the children, assuming that the child has been born before September 1942, 9 months after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

The Draft Act became law on September 16, 1940, and there is logic to the position of some of the boards that anybody who did anything after that date did it with full knowledge that he might be subject to its terms and application. Then came the emergency proclamation of May 27, 1941, and some boards apparently used that date for fixing the rights of registrants.

It seems to me that in fairness to all registrants, and in order that there may not be confusion and lack of harmony in the action of the various boards in a single congressional district, the headquarters of the Selective Service System should issue some directive or statement indicating the views of those in charge of the draft on this subject.

I will, therefore, appreciate it if you will be kind enough to indicate to me which date should be treated as the date for determining whether or not a marriage shall be considered as effective in determining the rights of a registrant, and also I would like a statement as to the effect of the birth of a child in a registrant's family prior to September 1942.

I have had this matter brought to my attention by local draft boards in my district and I will appreciate it if you will advise me of the position taken by you on this increasingly important matter.

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. CLASON.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., December 21, 1942.

Subject: Imminence of induction.

The Honorable CHARLES R. CLASON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CLASON: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of December 1, 1942, concerning the above subject.

It is impossible to set any specific date between September 16, 1940, and December 8, 1941, and say that any marriage or other acquisition of dependency accomplished after that date constitutes acquisition of dependency in the face of imminent selection; there are too many factors which influence the decision relative to imminence of selection. As a general rule, we can take the date of October 16, 1940 (the date of the first national registration), and May 27, 1941 (the President's declaration of unlimited emergency), and state that those two events, particularly the latter, should have placed the registrant on notice that the country was likely soon to require his services. After those dates, therefore, his case must be extremely good to warrant a finding of no imminence of selection. The other factors, however, must be taken into consideration. The board must determine whether or not the registrant had a high order number; whether he was already classified in 1-A, or at least had received his questionnaire; and whether he had already been classified into such classes as 4-F or 4-A, which would lead him to believe that he was more or less permanently disqualified for military service. Since these factors must be taken into account, I think you can readily see that it might be possible for one man with a rather low order number to have been married, say in November of 1940, at a time when selection was imminent, whereas another man with an extremely high order number or with a classification of 4-F might have married at the same time and yet be found to have married when selection was not imminent.

In short, the circumstances peculiar to each individual's case affect the board in its determination of classification, and no absolute date can be permitted to govern exclusively in the making of these determinations of imminence.

On the matter of children born after December 8, 1941, the situation is somewhat different. Regulations now provide that no dependency acquired after that date can be considered as a basis for classification in Class 3-A or 3-B. An unborn child becomes a dependent from the moment of conception. Therefore, in order to determine whether or not a child born after December 8, 1941, can be made the basis for dependency classification, the approximate date of conception must be determined. Our Medical Division has advised us that, since the normal period of gestation in human beings is 280 days, we may presume (1) in case of mature infants born before September 14, 1942, conception occurred before December 8, 1941. The father of such a child may, therefore, claim dependency classification on the basis of the support of the child, provided always that his marriage occurred when selection was not imminent, and before December 8, 1941. (2) In cases of mature infants born after September 14, 1942, it may be assumed that conception occurred after December 8, 1941, in which instance the birth of the child cannot in any way affect the registrant's classification insofar as it pertains to dependency.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY, *Director.*

The Late Caroline O'Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. KERR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to print in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in yesterday's Evening Star paying a deserved tribute to Mrs. Caroline O'Day, recently a Member of this House. This is a true and beautiful tribute to a great and good woman and is worthy to be treasured in the records of this great body.

Mrs. O'Day was gentle and courageous, patient and sympathetic, approached every question with a keen and intellectual mind and was faithful to every obligation submitted to her by God or man. She possessed the charm and aristocratic air of her own Southland, the place of her birth, and all who knew her were impelled to admire and love her. It has been well said, that "What surrounds us reflects more or less that which is within us." She loved the beautiful things in life and surrounded herself with those things which appealed to her superb character and made others happy. Mrs. O'Day's spirit has gone back to the Great Author of the beautiful. Back of the lily and the rose, back of the landscape, back of all beautiful things that enchant us there must be a great lover of the beauty principle. Every star that twinkles in the sky, every flower bids us look behind it for its source and points us to that Great Author—who is God.

MRS. O'DAY

Mrs. Caroline O'Day was one of the truly great women of her time. It was by the exercise of her own natural genius that she rose to fame, and none of her contemporaries was more deservedly celebrated. Born on her grandfather's plantation at Perry, Ga., June 28, 1875, she was educated at the Lucy Cobb Institute and abroad. For 8 years she studied in the ateliers of Paris, Munich, and the old cities of the Netherlands. Her paintings and etchings were exhibited in several important salons in Europe and later in America. If she had chosen to continue her professional career she easily might have won very high distinction.

But other interests intervened. From the date of her marriage in 1902 until her husband's death in 1916, she was preoccupied with her home and her children. Then, beginning with participation in the equal-franchise campaign, she became increasingly concerned about social issues of many different kinds. Opposing the entrance of the United States into the First World War, she contributed to the Emergency Peace Federation and other pacifist organizations of 1917. Her liberal enthusiasms gradually led her into political activity. Without being skilled or experienced in the social sciences, she developed a good practical understanding of reform procedures. The Democrats welcomed her help and gave her opportunities to be of constructive service in Westchester County beginning in 1920. She was chosen associate chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee in 1923. The election of Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Presidency brought her into national prominence. Washington saw her first as an intimate friend of Mrs. Roosevelt, subsequently as New York State director of the National Recovery Administration. She was elected to Congress as a Representative at large in 1934 and was reelected almost automatically in 1936, 1938, and 1940. At the Capitol she was popular with all classes of people.

To comprehend Mrs. O'Day it is necessary to regard her as an artist all her life. She made creative use of many facilities. Her voice was an instrument which she employed as notably as an opera singer might a similar endowment. She dressed with exquisite taste. Her style of penmanship was richly beautiful. She was generous to a fault. Even when her health was failing, she still put thought for strangers above convenience for herself. She was an aristocrat in the best meaning of the word, preferring all that is noblest in the universe and devoting her own personal gifts to the advancement of ideal ends. Bidding her farewell, those who were privileged to know her will mourn her loss especially because humanity just now has poignant need for vision such as she possessed.

Addresses Sixth Congressional District of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station KWTO, Springfield, Mo., on January 4, 1943:

My fellow Missourians and fellow countrymen, 2 months ago the voters of the Sixth Congressional District of Missouri, by a majority of more than 10,000, reelected Hon. Phil Bennett as their Representative in the Congress of the United States. They voted not only for a man who was a fine Christian gentleman, but they also voted for the ideas, ideals, and principles for which he stood.

For more than 20 years I have known Phil Bennett personally and intimately. After teaching school he edited for 17 years a newspaper at Buffalo, in Dallas County, in my district. At an early age he became intensely interested in civic, church, and political activities. He served as county chairman, congressional chairman, and on the State committee. He was elected as State senator from my own district. Later he served as lieutenant governor of Missouri, and because of his sterling qualities as a man and his demonstrated ability as a legislator, he was twice elected as Representative in the Congress of the United States. It was my privilege to serve with him during the past 2 years in the House. In time of peace and in time of war I had the opportunity of observing him working under great pressure for the interests of the people who had so highly honored him. Last November I was elected to serve my sixth term in Congress, and during the years I have spent in Washington I can truthfully say that I have met no man who has been more diligent or courageous in the performance of his duties, more loyal or patriotic in the service of his country, than was Phil Bennett.

Last month, with other colleagues of his in the House and Senate, I returned on the sad mission to Missouri to speak at Phil Bennett's funeral. Suddenly and unexpectedly, only 1 month after his reelection to Congress, Phil Bennett was stricken and in a few hours was dead. He died at his post of duty. Because of hard work and much worry over the fate of our Nation in this crucial hour he fell victim to this war as much as any man on the field of battle. The large gathering of representative citizens of all religious faiths and political creeds who attended his funeral was a silent but glorious tribute to this great American for whom they had such high admiration and fond affection.

Though Phil Bennett died shortly before the expiration of his first term in Congress, it became necessary under the constitution and the laws of our State and Nation, for the Governor to call a special election for the citizens and voters of the Sixth District to name Phil Bennett's successor. That election will be held on January 12. The Republican Party which Phil Bennett served so faithfully and well all during his long and distinguished political career, after much deliberation, decided at its congressional committee meeting, to name his son, Marion T. Bennett, as our candidate to succeed his illustrious father.

Marion Bennett I have known since he was a small boy. He is no longer a kid, but a young man, 28 years of age, older than several present Members of Congress, and nearly 4 years past the constitutional age requirement for Representatives in Congress. He is a graduate not only of the Southwest Missouri State Teachers College in Springfield, but of the law school of Washington University in St. Louis, one of the best of its kind in this country. He has practiced his profession, won the State oratorical contest as a student, and has assumed responsibilities of leadership unusual to a young man. His youth is an asset and not a liability. He is young, energetic, ambitious, and is a tireless worker.

After all it must not be forgotten that youth has accomplished much in this world. Lord Byron was famous as a poet at 24. William Cullen Bryant wrote Thanatopsis at the age of 17, and John Keats was 26 years old at death. At the age of 25 Alexander Hamilton was a member of the Continental Congress, at 29 a New York delegate to the Annapolis convention, at 30 a member of the legislature, and at 32 the first Secretary of the United States Treasury. Henry Clay at the age of 29 was elected to the United States Senate; at the age of 32 he was reelected to the Senate, and at 33 he was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives. William Henry Harrison at the age of 26 was a Representative in Congress, and at the age of 27 he was Governor of Indiana. At 28 Patrick Henry was a member of the House of Burgesses, and shortly afterward made the speech that made him immortal. Andrew Jackson at the age of 29 framed the constitution of Tennessee and represented that State in the House of Representatives. At the age of 30 he became United States Senator. William Pitt, the younger, entered Parliament at the age of 21 and at 22 became Chancelor of the Exchequer. The Great Teacher of all times was crucified when He was only 33 years of age. Today Uncle Sam is drafting 18- and 19-year-old boys to fight and die for their country on the battlefields of every continent and on the waters of every ocean.

Weak and futile indeed is the silly argument of the opposition that Marion Bennett is too young to go to Congress. The thing that counts is not how long a man lives, but how much he has lived. In addition to his splendid education in college and university, besides being 4 years past the constitutional age requirement, and older than several of the New Deal Members of Congress, Marion Bennett has had the invaluable practical experience of having served as his father's first secretary for the past 2 years. Marion Bennett is no stranger to Washington. He knows the ropes. He is acquainted with the scene. He has run his father's office and written not a few of his speeches. He is acquainted with the various departments and bureaus. He knows the people of the Sixth Congressional District in Missouri and their needs.

Marion Bennett is no greenhorn who will have to learn the alphabet. He now knows his A-B-C's and his way around Washington. Any other man, new to the job, regardless of his ability or experience outside of Washington, would require at least a year or two before he could learn the war needs and problems of the sixth district and the Nation.

Earlier in this broadcast I said that the voters of the sixth district voted for Phil Bennett because they approved the things for which Phil Bennett stood. Phil Bennett was a friend of the farmer. He worked and voted for farm parity prices. His son, Marion Bennett, will do the same. This fine young man, of clean habits, of unimpeachable integrity, of fine education and much native ability, because of his character, background, training and experience, is qualified to render the farmers of the sixth district a great service.

Phil Bennett was a friend of the old people, who worked for their interests, and who lamented the fact that the Social Security Act has been badly administered. We want the old people to receive more than the miserable pittance they are now getting, and we want to see the money which the taxpayers voted for old-age pensions to be used for that specific purpose. Marion Bennett will fight for the old people as did his father.

Phil Bennett was a friend of the veteran and ex-service man. He voted for the increase in pay for our soldiers, for benefits and allotments to be paid their dependent wives, children and parents, and we greatly deplore the fact that interminable delays have caused serious hardships to these dependents who have not yet received their allotment checks. I know that Marion Bennett will join with me in insisting that the War Department and that the Bureau for Benefits and Allotments speedily take care of these dependents of the men who are fighting and dying on remote fields and in distant waters.

Phil Bennett was also a friend of the small businessman who is overtaxed, ra-

tioned and regimented, denied priorities, and forced to spend most of his time in filling out forms and filing endless reports with the bungling bureaus sending out orders from Washington.

Phil Bennett also believed in union labor, the right of men to organize and to enjoy the fruits of their own toil. He did not, however, sanction some of the evil practices of labor racketeers.

In all sincerity and seriousness, I want to ask you voters of the Sixth District, whether Republican or Democrat, who knows the policies of Phil Bennett better than his son who has worked so intimately with him? Who will more faithfully carry out these policies which were so overwhelmingly endorsed by you in November? Marion Bennett will not hesitate to oppose unnecessary rationing, regimentation, waste, and extravagance in Government spending, but he will at the same time favor in every way all our efforts to win the war quickly. He will not be a rubber stamp. He will not favor a fourth term, and he will not consider intelligent, just, and constructive criticism as treasonable. He believes with Woodrow Wilson that "We do not need less criticism in time of war, but more. It is hoped that criticism will be constructive, but better unfair attack than autocratic repression. Honesty and competency require no shield of secrecy."

Partisan New Deal newspapers recently asked "Why Marion Bennett is not in our armed services?" This is an unfair and unjust question, which is maliciously asked in order to embarrass him. The fact is Marion Bennett volunteered his services to the Navy last August, but was physically rejected. These same newspapers have not asked why it is that the several husky New Deal Congressmen in Washington today, younger than Marion Bennett, are not in the Army. No fair-minded person who knows Marion Bennett, his father, or any of their people, ever for one moment questioned their patriotism. You good Americans of the Sixth District will not allow such a smear campaign to mislead or prejudice you, when Marion Bennett couldn't meet the physical requirements for combat service. In my own humble but honest judgment, Marion Bennett will be of vastly more service to his country at this critical hour in the Halls of Congress than he would be in the front line of battle. The young men who are fighting this war need a few young men of their own age back home fighting for them. My friends, Marion Bennett belongs to no faction. He is a stranger to machine politics, and his only political boss as your Representative in Congress will be the will of the people who elect him and his own good conscience with which the Lord has endowed him.

Vote for Marion Bennett on Tuesday, January 12, thereby assuring the perpetuity of our Republic and the preservation of our liberties.

May God bless you all and protect your boys wherever they may be.

Norwalk Acts Out 1943 Victory Book Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the National Campaign Board, 1943 Victory Book Campaign, New York City:

A complete specimen of democracy in action was placed under a microscope in Norwalk, Conn., this month when the strategy of the forthcoming 1943 victory book campaign was given a 1-week's intensive try-out in that typical New England city of 46,000 population.

The preview, which lasted from Monday, December 7, to Tuesday, December 15, resulted in the highly successful collection of 18,300 books, of which less than 3 percent had to be discarded either because of bad physical condition or reading matter unsuitable to the tastes of servicemen, such as cookbooks, children's stories, or ladies' novels of Victorian vintage.

The 1943 victory book campaign, sponsored jointly by the American Library Association, the American Red Cross, and the United Service Organizations, will open nationally on Tuesday, January 5, and continue through Friday, March 5, 1943. During that period, every organized group and every interested individual in the country will be asked to donate and collect books—as many as possible, but with emphasis on quality of condition and content—for men in all branches of the service, the Army, Navy, Marine, Coast Guard, and merchant seaman services.

Last year's drive netted a total of more than 10,000,000 books, of which approximately 50 percent were suitable for distribution. To insure the gathering of a much greater percentage of worth-while books in the second annual drive, a plan was devised by the National Campaign Board, of which Franklin P. Adams, Edward L. Bernays, and Norman Cousins are cochairmen. The plan involves calling in the cooperative action of every able group in the entire country, such as women's organizations, educational and trade associations, social service and youth groups, and labor organizations.

Norwalk, Conn., of average population size, part residential, part manufacturing, part urban, part rural, was chosen because it was believed typical proving grounds for bringing together widely divergent groups in a common undertaking.

Howard Gorham, head of the Gorham Press, a job-printing company, and former police and fire commissioner of Norwalk, was appointed chairman of the campaign. Gorham went into action immediately and called into consultation the leaders of Norwalk's office of civilian defense: Capt. Walter R. Sollings, chief air-raid warden; Jeremiah F. Dorney, chief of police and director of civilian defense; Herbert J. Stursberg and Postmaster James J. Slattery, coordinators of civilian defense; and George S. Richards, assistant chief air-raid warden.

Using the defense map of Norwalk, with the whole area subdivided into sectors—each sector with a sector post—an advance plan was worked out for having book donations flow from home shelves to sector posts and then to central headquarters.

With this good beginning as a basis, a dinner was held at the General Putnam Inn, in Norwalk, on Wednesday, December 2. Odell Shephard, lieutenant governor of Connecticut, author and littérateur, made a presentation of his latest book. Mr. Gorham, Mayor Frank Stack, of Norwalk, and the members of the national campaign board were hosts. Guests included leaders of all Norwalk's important organizations: The American Red Cross; the Boy Scouts; the Girl Scouts; the American Legion; the Women's City Club; the League of Women Voters; the Council of Jewish Women; the Young Men's Christian Association; the Daughters of the American Revolution; the American Legion Auxiliary; the Council of Catholic Women; the heads of the police, fire, and postal departments; the chamber of commerce; the board of education; the public library system; the religious leaders of the community; representatives of the State's press.

Each attendant was called upon to bring the group they represented into the full picture of acquainting the public with the aims and needs of the drive and of accomplishing the actual collection, sorting, and packing of the books for distribution.

Immediately, all these separate groups got to work on a single idea. A store on the main thoroughfare was donated by Russell J. Frost, prominent real estate man, for use as victory book headquarters. A telephone was donated by an anonymous donor. The Young Men's Christian Association furnished headquarters by lending chairs, tables, and desks.

Through the newspapers, residents of Norwalk were asked to have their book donations stacked and tied, ready to be picked up by the first volunteer to come along. They were also advised to knot a white handkerchief around the outside doorknob in order to notify collectors that there were books within. The newspapers also kept reminding residents that the book drive was not a scrap drive—good books in good condition were wanted.

Air raid wardens canvassed their sector neighborhoods, asking residents to make their selections and bring them to sector headquarters. Reports of incoming books were telephoned to victory book headquarters by the wardens. The Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts made door-to-door collections after school hours. The motor corps of the American Red Cross, under the direction of Mrs. Mary Frost, was dispatched to gather in books from sector posts and convey them to headquarters. Boy and Girl Scouts assisted the motor corps drivers in the task. Schools placed collection containers in their main halls and students brought books from home to swell the total. Upperclass students volunteered to convey school collections to headquarters.

Activities at victory book headquarters were under the direction of Mr. Marion Hamilton Diller, chairman of the Norwalk Symphony Orchestra, and a member of several community boards and organizations. Thousands of books came in to headquarters on the first day of the campaign. As they arrived, they were stamped with a Norwalk identification and counted. The receiving committee, headed by Mrs. Philip Jakob, wife of the superintendent of schools, then passed the books on to separate tables in the center of the store where women volunteers inspected, sorted, and placed the books in large cartons. A different women's organization each day supplied the volunteer workers. These included the American Legion Auxiliary, the League of Women Voters, the Council of Jewish Women, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Council of Catholic Women, and the Women's City Club.

Inspection and sorting was under the supervision of Miss Ella C. Lindeberg, librarian. Donated volumes were emptied of any envelopes, pressed flowers, or similar mementos that might have been left in by the giver. One volume turned up a check for $100, made out to a local doctor. Upon investigation, it was learned that the check was a down payment on a resident's baby daughter.

Unsuitable volumes, such as those in bad physical condition, or those with inappropriate content, like children's stories, cookbooks, and the like, were put aside for future distribution in more acceptable channels. (Less than 3 percent were found unsuitable, however.) Then the accepted books were packed in cartons donated by several local manufacturers. Statistics were also kept as to the percentage of fiction, nonfiction, historical books, biographies, etc., turned in to the collectors.

Large-muscled firemen, volunteering their help, moved the packed cartons from the center of the store to a back room where

they were sealed and plastered with mailing stickers. The American Legion functioned in the shipping department, moving the cartons on for shipment. Under the direction of Commander George Wetmore, the American Legion workers set a record of packing 6,000 books in one afternoon.

When plans were projected, a quota of 10,000 books was announced as the goal of the full preview campaign. The final total of over 18,300 excellent, higher-type books, collected despite heavy snow, low temperatures, gas rationing, and nightly black-outs, proved the practicability of following the same general plan in securing the full cooperation of the Nation's many large organized groups. By molding them into one huge cooperating mass with a single purpose in mind, in the 2-month period of the forthcoming national campaign, the largest possible amount of excellent books will be collected.

Suspension of Gasoline Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, with the latest news from the gasoline and fuel fronts still being very depressing as this is written, the mystery of the sudden suspension of all gasoline sales on Friday, December 18, lasting until midnight of Monday, December 20, still remains one of the unsolved mysteries. The circumstances surrounding the sudden suspension order have not been explained on any satisfactory basis by the officials concerned.

The newspapers of Friday, December 18, carried the story that the threatened suspension of all gasoline sales had leaked out and lines of motorists were storming oil stations nearly 24 hours before the official announcement of the ban was made. The newspapers of that date further stated that the suspension would have been made effective as of Thursday night at midnight instead of Friday noon except for the fact that Petroleum Coordinator Harold Ickes and the retiring O. P. A. Director, Leon Henderson, were in disagreement for 12 hours over what reason should be given the public for this sudden, and in some cases disastrous, suspension of gasoline sales.

This 12-hour delay makes it obvious that the alleged reason given the public for the sudden suspension must not have been the real reason. The newspapers of last Friday and Saturday carried information to the effect that a shortage of fuel oil resulting from failure of the O. P. A. to heed the advice of eastern retail and wholesale fuel-oil dealers had caused the suspension. Later it was said by some newspapers that a gasoline shortage in large cities like New York and Boston had necessitated the suspension of gasoline sales. Still later President Roosevelt announced to his press conference that the suspension had been necessitated by a sudden military demand from Africa.

The latter explanation still remains an incredible performance because if it were true that the Government officials were shipping oil from the North Atlantic seaboard to our military forces in Africa, the President's statement to this effect amounted to due notice to the Axis submarines that our tankers would be exceedingly busy carrying this gasoline on the journey of 11 to 15 days from the United States to our military forces in Africa. Naturally this would make good hunting for enemy submarines. Under such circumstances it is difficult to understand why the ban could have been lifted so suddenly in 48 hours if the gasoline supplies were depleted by military necessities in Africa. It is also difficult to understand why the shipment of this gasoline in tankers to our military forces in Africa would not be considered military information—which it should have been.

Mr. Speaker, it is also very difficult to understand why, if the emergency could be met, as apparently it was met by a reduction in the gallon value in the B and C coupons of 1 gallon each within 48 hours, the O. P. A. could not have announced such a reduction in the first instance, as they originally did and later rescinded on the A cards without any complete suspension. Instead, as the country now knows, millions of citizens were caught, unwarned, away from home in bitter winter weather, in many cases, with not enough gasoline to get their cars back to their homes.

Whatever may have been the reason for this sudden startling suspension of all gasoline sales in the 17 Eastern States, it is now obvious that the whole thing was badly bungled, that it was so atrociously handled as to have created not only tremendous consternation among the people, but a vast amount of unnecessary hardship and suffering as well. There undoubtedly resulted a very considerable loss of war manpower in those 48 gasless hours. The very fact that no explanation has been given of these glaring discrepancies and contradictions in the original reasons assigned for the drastic and sudden action indicates very strongly that it was another bureaucratic blunder to be charged up to the administration.

Whatever sacrifices the people must make in the war effort, they are, of course, ready and willing to make, but certainly such performances as this sudden gasoline ban add nothing to the public morale, lend nothing to the war effort, and do not strengthen the people's confidence in the efficiency of the executive department of the Government. It is obvious to any thinking person that gasoline consumption can be reduced to only a certain point, after which it begins gravely to interfere with the production of machines and munitions of war so desperately needed by our forces on the fighting front.

Certainly the administration owes some adequate explanation to the country concerning this latest inexplicable performance which has such distinguishing earmarks of bureaucratic blundering.

The way to get the people to cooperate fully and willingly in rationing and restrictions is to give them at least reasonable reasons for some of these strange and apparently needless performances.

Eight in Service and Four in Defense Plant From One Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to read a letter from a typical patriotic Oklahoma family which has eight sons in the armed service, each of whom volunteered, and one daughter and three sons-in-law who are employed in defense industries furthering the war effort. You can readily understand why Oklahoma has for many months ranked No. 1 in percentage of voluntary enlistment in the United States:

GOTEBO, OKLA., *December 14, 1942.*

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: I received the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which you sent me recently mentioning our boys in the service. We thank you and you will be interested to know that we now have eight boys in the Army and Navy. We also have two sons-in-law in the Army. Our other son-in-law and his wife are in defense work in Oklahoma City.

Mr. Hershel L. Ward, seaman, second class, United States Naval Reserve Aviation Base, Barracks 7–F, Norman, Okla.

Stanley J. Ward, apprentice seaman, Company 1566, United States Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.

Donald W. Ward, United States Navy (address unknown at present).

Glenn Price Ward, carpenter's mate, first class, Navy 8035, Fleet Post Office, San Francisco, Calif.

Lt. Jack Ward, 516 Quartermaster Regiment (truck), Camp Van Dorn, Miss.

Lt. Jesse R. Ward, 629 Tank Destroyer Battalion, Camp Hood, Tex.

Leo D. Ward, section 126, United States Maritime Service Training Station, Sheepshead Bay, Brooklyn, N. Y.

W. D. Ward, Jr., radio technician, second class, U. S. S. *Pike*, care postmaster, San Francisco, Calif.

Mrs. Bob Witcher (daughter), 706 Northeast Sixth Street, Oklahoma City, Okla. (Defense worker in aircraft factory.)

Bob Witcher (son-in-law), 706 Northeast Sixth Street, Oklahoma City, Okla. (Defense worker in air depot.)

Pvt. Maurice L. Holman (son-in-law), Company A, Reception Center, Fort Sill, Okla.

Pvt. William H. Vickers (son-in-law), Headquarters and Headquarters Company, Third Battalion, Fifty-fourth Armored Infantry Regiment, Tenth Armored Division, A. P. O. 260, Fort Benning, Ga.

We are thankful that we have one Member of Congress who can take time off from his other duties to notice the humble folks back home. My family and I believe the winning of this war is the most important job there is for all of us. We hear too much griping about what we are having to do without, but if it is necessary to win this war we are

willing to sacrifice more. My wife and I will carry on as best we can as long as we can.

Mr. WICKERSHAM, we are proud of the way our boys entered the service. Every one of them volunteered. There were no deferments. We believe every man between the ages of 18 and 38 should get in just as soon as possible because if these boys that are in ever were needed it is now.

We have always been proud of the people of Washita County. This is not my war, it is our war, and we have got to fight to win, fight on the battle front or at home and we don't have gall enough to want someone else to fight our battles for us. All those who can't fight should be willing to work, sacrifice, and buy bonds to support the boys who are doing the fighting.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. W. D. WARD.

Membership Rolls of the Democratic Steering Committee From Its Inauguration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in response to inquiries from several delegations I include as a part of my remarks the membership rolls of the Democratic Steering Committee from its inauguration:

DEMOCRATIC STEERING COMMITTEE

Seventy-third Congress

William P. Connery, Massachusetts; John F. Boylan, New York; Patrick J. Boland, Pennsylvania; Patrick H. Drewry, Virginia; E. E. Cox, Georgia; Lister Hill, Alabama; William V. Gregory, Kentucky; Robert Crosser, Ohio; William H. Larrabee, Indiana; Adolph J. Sabath, Illinois; Ralph F. Lozier, Missouri; W. W. Hastings, Oklahoma; Sam Rayburn, Texas; Edward T. Taylor, Colorado; Sam B. Hill, Washington.

Ex officio: Henry T. Rainey, Illinois, Speaker; Joseph W. Byrns, Tennessee, floor leader; Clarence F. Lea, California, caucus chairman; Edward W. Pou, North Carolina, chairman, Rules Committee; Patrick J. Boland, Pennsylvania, chairman, whip.

Seventy-fourth Congress

William P. Connery, Massachusetts; John J. Boylan, New York; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Zebulon Weaver, North Carolina; Hampton J. Fulmer, South Carolina; Lister Hill, Alabama; W. V. Gregory, Kentucky; Robert Crosser, Ohio; William H. Larrabee, Indiana; Adolph J. Sabath, Illinois; Clarence Cannon, Missouri; Jed Johnson, Oklahoma; Luther Johnson, Texas; James G. Scrugham, Nevada; Clarence F. Lea, California.

Ex officio: Joseph W. Byrns, Tennessee, Speaker; William B. Bankhead, Alabama, floor leader; Edward T. Taylor, Colorado, caucus chairman; John J. O'Connor, New York, chairman, Rules Committee; Patrick J. Boland, Pennsylvania, whip.

Seventy-fifth Congress

William P. Connery, Massachusetts; John T. Boylan, New York; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; T. Alan Goldsborough, Maryland; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; Lister Hill, Alabama; John E. Miller, Arkansas; Robert Crosser, Ohio; William H. Larrabee, Indiana; Adolph J. Sabath, Illinois; Clarence Cannon, Missouri; Jed Johnson, Oklahoma; Luther Johnson, Texas; James G. Scrugham, Nevada; Walter M. Pierce, Oregon.

Ex officio: William B. Bankhead, Alabama, Speaker; Sam Rayburn, Texas, floor leader; Robert L. Doughton, North Carolina, caucus chairman; John J. O'Connor, New York, chairman, Rules Committee; Patrick J. Boland, Pennsylvania, whip.

Seventy-sixth Congress

Joseph E. Casey, Massachusetts; William T. Byrne, New York; Charles I. Faddis, Pennsylvania; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; Malcolm C. Tarver, Georgia; Wall Doxey, Mississippi; Jere Cooper, Tennessee; Robert Crosser, Ohio; William H. Larrabee, Indiana; Harry P. Beam, Illinois; Clarence Cannon, Missouri; Jed Johnson, Oklahoma; Marvin Jones, Texas; James G. Scrugham, Nevada; Charles Kramer, California.

Ex officio: William B. Bankhead, Alabama, Speaker; Sam Rayburn, Texas, floor leader; John W. McCormack, Massachusetts, caucus chairman; Robert L. Doughton, North Carolina, chairman, Ways and Means Committee; Edward T. Taylor, Colorado, chairman, Appropriations Committee; Adolph J. Sabath, Illinois, chairman, Rules Committee; Patrick J. Boland, Pennsylvania, whip.

Seventy-seventh Congress

Le Roy D. Downs, Connecticut; William T. Byrne, New York; Francis J. Myers, Pennsylvania; John H. Kerr, North Carolina; James P. Richards, South Carolina; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; Jere Cooper, Tennessee; Robert Crosser, Ohio; William L. Larrabee, Indiana; Harry P. Beam, Illinois; John J. Cochran, Missouri; Jed Johnson, Oklahoma; Luther A. Johnson, Texas; James G. Scrugham, Nevada; Harry R. Sheppard, California.

Ex officio: Sam Rayburn, Texas, Speaker; John W. McCormack, Massachusetts, floor leader; Richard M. Duncan, Missouri, chairman, caucus; Robert L. Doughton, North Carolina, chairman, Ways and Means Committee; Clarence Cannon, Missouri, chairman, Appropriations Committee; Adolph J. Sabath, Illinois, chairman, Rules Committee; Patrick J. Boland, Pennsylvania, whip.

Mr. Speaker, I also include the available list of chairmen who have presided over the Democratic caucus. Unfortunately the list is fragmentary as no known record remains of the proceedings of any session prior to the Thirty-first Congress:

Chairman of Democratic caucus

Congress	Chairman
31st (1849–51)	James Thompson (Pennsylvania).
32d (1851–53)	
33d (1853–55)	Edson B. Olds (Ohio).
34th (1855–57)	George W. Jones (Tennessee).
35th (1857–59)	
36th (1859–61)	George S. Houston (Alabama).
37th (1861–63)	
38th (1863–65)	
39th (1865–67)	
40th (1867–69)	
41st (1869–71)	Samuel J. Randall (Pennsylvania). William E. Niblack (Indiana).
42d (1871–73)	
43d (1873–75)	William E. Niblack (Ind).
44th (1875–77)	L. Q. C. Lamar (Mississippi).
45th (1877–79)	Hiester Clymer (Pennsylvania).
46th (1879–81)	John F. House (Tennessee).
47th (1881–83)	
48th (1883–85)	George W. Geddes (Ohio).
49th (1885–87)	J. Randolph Tucker (Virginia).
50th (1887–89)	Samuel S. Cox (New York). James B. McCreary (Kentucky).
51st (1889–91)	William S. Holman (Indiana).
52d (1891–93)	Do.
53d (1893–95)	Do.
54th (1895–97)	David B. Culberson (Texas).
55th (1897–99)	James D. Richardson (Tennessee).
56th (1899–1901)	James Hay (Virginia).
57th (1901–03)	Do.
58th (1903–05)	Do.
59th (1905–07)	Robert L. Henry (Texas).
60th (1907–09)	Henry D. Clayton (Alabama).
61st (1909–11)	Do.
62d (1911–13)	James Hay (Virginia). Albert S. Burleson (Texas).
63d (1913–15)	A. Mitchell Palmer (Pennsylvania).

Chairman of Democratic caucus—Continued

Congress	Chairman
64th (1915–17)	E. W. Saunders (Virginia).
65th (1917–19)	Do.
66th (1919–21)	Arthur G. Dewalt (Pennsylvania).
67th (1921–23)	Sam Rayburn (Texas).
68th (1923–25)	Henry T. Rainey (Illinois).
69th (1925–27)	Charles D. Carter (Oklahoma).
70th (1927–29)	Arthur H. Greenwood (Indiana).
71st (1929–31)	David H. Kincheloe (Kentucky).
72d (1931–33)	William W. Arnold (Illinois).
73d (1933–35)	Clarence F. Lea (California).
74th (1935–37)	Edward T. Taylor (Colorado).
75th (1937–39)	Robert L. Doughton (North Carolina).
76th (1939–41)	John W. McCormack (Massachusetts).
77th (1941–43)	Richard M. Duncan (Missouri).
78th (1943–45)	Harry R. Sheppard (California).

The Great North Road to Alaska

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, we of the West appreciate deeply the successful completion of the great highway leading from continental United States north to our Alaskan possessions. The Army engineers, with their usual efficiency, have, in a remarkably short time, made possible this great accomplishment. The strategic importance of this major highway, I am sure, is realized by all of us. Aside from its value as a part of our national defense equipment, when peace comes it will cement more closely the common interests of ourselves and our neighbors to the north.

There has recently come to my attention three short poems descriptive of this great north road, officially known as the Alcan Highway. Pursuant to permission heretofore given, I am including these as a part of my remarks. The first, entitled "The Canalaska Highway," was written by Miss Hazel A. McEwan, of Toronto. Miss McEwan, a school teacher who has been ill, wrote the poem from her sickbed.

The second poem, "The Building of the Alcan Highway," was written by Maj. Willis Bergen, chaplain of the Northwest Service Command. In civilian life Chaplain Bergen is pastor of the Piedmont Presbyterian Church in Portland, Oreg., in my congressional district. The third poem, "Great North Road," is by First Lt. Richard L. Neuberger, now stationed in Alaska. Lieutenant Neuberger is also a resident of Portland, Oreg., and is a member of the Oregon Legislature.

The poems are as follows:

THE CANALASKA HIGHWAY

(By Hazel A. McEwan)

Canalaska, Athabaska, Dawson City, Nome!
Do they thrill you as they thrill me, and call
your feet to roam?
Athabaska, Canalaska, Dawson City, Nome!
They stir longings in my very heart for ways
I've never known.

Canalaska, Athabaska, Peace and Yukon, too!
The new road shows to heathen men what
Christian men can do;
It's a symbol and a warning to that black-
hearted race
That drives a dagger in your heart while
smiling in your face.

Oh, the Canalaska Highway leads to far Attu
To Dutch Harbor and the Aleutians in a sea
more gray than blue.
For sixteen hundred mountain miles, from
the prairie to the sea
It's the road that Freedom travels that the
helpless may be free.

Canalaska, Athabaska, White Horse and Great
Bear;
Mackenzie and the Yellowknife—they're all
up there!
There's music in those lovely names—can't
you hear them call?
But the Canalaska Highway is the loveliest
of all.

THE BUILDERS OF THE ALCAN

(By Willis Bergen)

The test of your heart and the test of your
pluck
Isn't skies that are sunny and fair,
But how do you stick by the truck that is
stuck
And how do you battle despair?

It's the way you hold out against odds that
are great
That stands when your courage is all,
Remember Pearl Harbor, Bataan, and you'll
rate
What we've done on this road to be small.

For our buddies are taking the rap from the
Jap
And the fight is as tough as hell,
So we'll keep on digging until the last lap
And build this highway well.

Oh, the road to the North is the road to the
East
To where you and I are bound,
As knights on an errand to tackle the beast
And bury his fangs in the ground.

We'll sweat, we'll freeze—a long trail indeed
That will never fade from our dreams,
For it's woven into the very fabric of our
creed
And up and down the seams.

For victory is naught but sign of your skill
Veneered with a glory that's thin,
Unless it be proof of your faith and your will
And unless you have struggle to win.

GREAT NORTH ROAD

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

"Wilderness ahead?" they asked and looked
into the Northland's ominous stare.
"Wilderness," the Mounties said, "until
neither man nor beast can fare."
"We've a job to do," they replied, "a rough,
tough job which cannot wait,
"For with those who struck us in the back
we must keep a particular date."
So off into the Arctic they plunged, into the
frowning polar barricade.
What manner of men was this, who waited
not even for winter's grip to fade?
"Why, we're American soldiers, sir, soldiers
from the U. S. A.
"We're O'Brien from Boston, Jackson from
Georgia, and Slocum from Iowa.
"We're just ordinary guys, Rosenberg from
the Bronx and Kennedy from L. A.
"We're the same kind who did all this before,
in the crisis of another day."
Across rivers that snapped and snarled they
built bridges from dawn to freezing
dawn.
Waist deep in water from the icefields, they
matched courage with sinews and
brawn.
Negroes bridged the Sikanni, and their white
comrades put timbers over Morley
Bay.
So that all men across the world could live
again in a civilized sort of way.
"A road to Alaska in a year? It couldn't be
done in five," the scoffers said.
Yet in seven months the trucks crossed the
Tanana, and there was Fairbanks
right ahead.
Who did this job that couldn't be done?
Who hewed this road that couldn't
be hewed?
"American soldiers, sir, soldiers from Omaha
and Chicago and Birmingham and
Butte.
"We were with Lewis and Clark, and Fremont
and Custer and all their gallant com-
pany,
"Wilderness tasks are tasks for us; we do
them so that mankind can be free."
Through the forests and the mountains the
Great North Road now twists and
thrusts,
A symbol to all the earth that American
soldiers are worthy of a thousand
trusts.
Men around tables heaped and plentiful
snorted and voiced their truculent
doubt,
But hungry men in the wilderness had the
courage to put their scoffing to rout.
Mail was late, bread was stale, meat was
spoiled, clothes were shot, beds were
cold;
Yet through the fastnesses they shoved and
forged, brave and defiant, grim and
bold;
"We're American soldiers, sir, soldiers from
Valdez, and Oswego, and Denver, and
Salt Lake.
"Those other scores we'll settle later, right
now we've historic things to under-
take.
"We've never failed our trust before. In our
lexicon there's no such word as fail.
"We've reached Alaska overland, the first of
all men in history to blaze the trail."
From the Yukon barrens the Mounties in
scarlet and gold came to look and see.
Over the Rockies and Selkirks they saw how
their American comrades had struck a
blow for liberty.
In a long red line they stood at salute, as
the Arctic sun crossed the skies.
"Well done, Yankee soldiers," they said, "We
are proud to be your Allies."
The trucks roll through to Fairbanks now, in
a column dusty and dirty and gray.
And their motors sound a paean of tribute
to the men whose toil cleared the way.
"We're American soldiers, sir, soldiers from
'Frisco and Mobile and North Banks.
"Flannigan cut the timber, Russo drove the
truck, and Cohen sawed up the planks.
"We'd never met before, but we're frontier
comrades now, along a 1,600-mile line,
"The road we built for our fighting men to
bring the aggressor to time."

He Is Just One of Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the administration persists in kicking the foundation out from under the war effort, in making it impossible for us to fight a war to the best advantage or to preserve the "four freedoms" here at home.

The people now know that the New Dealers are worse than incompetent and they should know that, if they continue to follow the policy of feeding the whole world first and of first supplying those who are fighting our enemies, while refusing to recognize the fact that we must first have an efficient machine here at home, they are headed straight for disaster.

A letter printed herewith, published in the December 25, 1942, issue of the United States News, accurately describes the condition of one Indiana farmer, which is typical of more than a million other farmers. The farmer who wrote that letter is courageous. He is determined; he is willing to make any sacrifice. But, if I read his letter correctly, he is blankety-blank mad at those who make it impossible for him to perform his duty as a patriotic American.

There are millions in the same frame of mind, and this administration and the Congress are sitting on dynamite, with a none too long sputtering fuse. Are we going to awaken and act?

Read this letter, and then, as your feelings may move you, swear or pray. But, if you are in Congress, act before it is too late:

A FARMER AND HIS TROUBLES—HOW LABOR SHORTAGE, GOVERNMENT RESTRICTIONS ARE CUTTING OUTPUT—INADEQUATE GASOLINE, LACK OF MACHINERY PARTS AMONG CHIEF COMPLAINTS

(By an Indiana Farmer)

As a practical farmer, I write in the hope that I may throw some light on the reasons for the impending food shortage, just as I see them developing on our 350-acre Central Indiana farm.

Our normal labor force was two hired men, my two sons and myself. My unmarried son, aged 23, was taken by the draft over a year ago. Our hired men long ago left for factory work, though we normally paid them each $70 a month and furnished a good house, electricity, fuel, meat, milk, and garden stuf for themselves and families. Our present force is my married son, aged 25, and myself, aged 59, and such help as our wives and my daughters can give. We cannot hire help of the kind we need, in competition with the 8-hour day and over a dollar an hour and overtime in the factories.

Normally, we fed around 300 head of cattle a year, or about 350,000 pounds of corn-fed beef. To feed this many cattle, with grinding, shelling, and unavoidable rehandling of roughage, bedding, etc., it is necessary to handle about 14 tons of material every day, rain or shine. In addition comes manure hauling, which on this farm ran around 900 loads a year, all of which had to be forked.

Then came ceiling prices which removed all chance for a reasonable profit. Obviously, two men could not do all this work as only a part of the necessary work of the farm, and since, under the ceiling, there was no profit in it anyway, our feed lots are empty, and beef will soon be rationed.

We have always raised a good many hogs to follow the cattle, but, since we could not feed cattle, we planned to increase our hog production to around a thousand head a year. In spite of ceiling prices on pork, the farmer has all the best end of the hog business. However, we ran into difficulties. We could not get sufficient metal water tanks, self-feeders, or posts and fencing for temporary lots, and hogs cannot be kept in the same lot two years in succession without inviting disease. The manufacturers are restricted by the Government to save material for allegedly more necessary use and we cannot produce hogs in volume without them.

We have even had difficulty in getting material for hog houses, to say nothing of nails to put them together. We are makeshifting with wooden feeders, which require frequent inspection to avoid clogging, and our production under these conditions will hardly reach 500 head this year. Even that makes a lot of work for 2 men, though we are both trained down as hard as nails.

Also, we find plenty else to do. This year we produced and delivered 260 tons of tomatoes. To get this crop in, 2 of my daughters rode the tomato planter and a third drove the tractor. My wife and I separated some 80,000 plants and I kept water and plants up to the planter with the truck.

We hired a crew of 10 pickers out of Arkansas and furnished them housing and about everything they needed. They agreed to pick the crop for 7 cents a hamper. Later we raised to 8 cents, then to 9 cents, and then they all struck and walked out because we would not pay 10 cents. A good picker will average close to 150 hampers a day, so what they wanted was about $15 a day for their individual work.

We had to haul these tomatoes about a mile to the tomato station. My wife drove the truck in the field, my son stacked the hampers on the truck, and I handed them up from the ground. That was over a half million pounds of tomatoes, or about 14,850 hampers of 35 pounds each, and they all had to be handled again in unloading, so the two of us lifted over 1,000,000 pounds in handling the crop. Incidentally, we received eight-tenths of a cent per pound gross for our tomatoes. At the same time they were selling in the Indianapolis supermarkets at 7 cents per pound. Next year, if we have to abide by present restrictions on the use of our farm truck, we cannot raise any tomatoes at all.

Last September 28 a freeze chopped off the tomato business and we started immediately to combining soybeans, of which we had 70 acres. It requires a highly skilled man to handle and service a combine and tractor, to avoid cracking the beans or tearing up the combine. It cannot be done by high-school boys at odd times or by a pretty farmerette in slacks with a rake over her shoulder. My son did it all, unloading the combine into the truck standing in the field. A soon as the truck was loaded, he would stop and drive the truckload to an elevator I own some 8 miles away.

We hauled less than a thousand bushels this way, and then our own and all the other elevators were filled up and remained that way because we could not get permits from the Government to ship out cars. The result was that we had to fill the downstairs of a big old house on the place, scooping the beans in through the windows. Some time this winter the two of us will have to scoop several thousand bushels of beans back out through the same windows and onto the truck again, because the Government wanted a big crop of beans and took no thought as to how the crop was to be handled. All this extra labor is pure loss.

During combining, my wife made three emergency trips to Indianapolis, or, in total, drove our car 150 miles, to get repair parts. If a belt breaks, the combine, tractor, and all sit there till you get a new belt. The nearby smaller towns no longer have a stock of parts except in a very limited way. These break-downs cannot be anticipated, and it would do no good if they could be foreseen, for mostly you have to take the broken part with you, under present Federal regulations, in order to have it to show so you can get the replacement, so you have to wait till something actually goes bad and let your equipment set and the crop wait till you get the repair.

During silo filling, I had to drive 400 miles to Chicago and back to replace a broken casting that could not be welded. Since gasoline now is rationed for our cars, we may even have to wait till we build up a reserve of gasoline sufficient to go get a necessary repair. Meantime, nature, which the Government has not yet regulated, will not wait.

As soon as combining of beans ended, we jumped right in on picking corn, of which we had 60 acres. It all ran heavy, from 100 to 110 bushels per acre. We are fully mechanized and equipped except that we do need a corn elevator, but have not had time to try to unravel all the red tape the Government has wound around trying to get this piece of equipment since they rationed farm machinery. We used a two-row picker and my son and I scooped from 900 to 1,000 bushels of corn a day till the crop was in. One job like that would kill any two men not trained down to it, and yet it is proposed that women, and the tag end of the Works Progress Administration, and such, can fill the gap in farm labor.

Earlier in the season, we put up 60 acres of our own alfalfa, besides 30 acres for a neighbor whose help went to the factory and left him stranded. We have hay making down to a one-man job, but that one man has to use approximately $5,000 worth of equipment: A truck, three tractors, a side-sweep rake, a buck rake, a hay chopper, and a blower. My son put up the 30 acres for our neighbor that way and turned out over a ton an hour, including hauling it a mile and blowing it into the mow of the barn.

We just bought all his sows from another neighbor who is past 60 and has heart trouble and lost all three of his sons to the draft. His farm is out of business next year and is a good blackland farm of 280 acres. In the hope of getting some needed things, I went to a sell-out sale of another 580-acre farm last week. They sold out a dairy herd and everything else. Most of the cattle went for beef.

We may have to quit or greatly curtail our production next year, for now comes the Government, under the authority given to Joseph B. Eastman by the President, and requires us to have a certificate of war necessity to use our farm truck, which is at the center of almost every operation on the farm. I am a college graduate and reasonably intelligent, but it took me several hours of needed time to unravel the pamphlet of rules we received from Detroit to find out what applied to us, and what did not, and fill out the application.

We just received the certificate, and what do you think? A bureaucrat sitting in an office in Detroit, who never saw our farm, decided that we could drive our truck exactly 717 miles per year or be liable to fine and imprisonment. It requires some 25 trips of 50 miles each just to market our hogs alone, if we used the truck for nothing else at all, so how can we deliver 260 tons of tomatoes next year as we did this year, or a crop of canning peas which we produced this year, to say nothing of soybeans, wheat, etc., besides distributing feed on the place and bringing in supplement feeds, fertilizer, etc.? By what process of logic or alchemy the odd figure of 717 miles could be arrived at as our needed use is a mystery to me.

This final regulation will cost hundreds of tons of food, which we could otherwise produce in the next 2 years, if we have to abide by it. This would be the price it would cost to have a few extra miles left in our truck tires 2 years from now when synthetic rubber should be available. But the worst of it is that the regulation assumes, in effect, that we have no personal patriotic interest in winning the war and that, unless restrained, we will spend our time joy riding in the truck. It is an insult to both our intelligence and our patriotism.

Working as hard as we do, and worrying about the boy in service, this is just about the last straw of Government stupidity to break our back. On the one hand we are urged to produce and told that "food will win the war" and now we are told that we are criminals and liable to fine and imprisonment unless we let our crop rot in the field in case we run out of allotted truck-miles to deliver it to market.

The whole trouble seems to keep boiling down to the fact that the rules and Government regulations are being made by persons, from the top down, who never produced anything themselves but politics and pussyfoot words. If anybody goes hungry, that is the reason of it all.

Under the duplicating authority of Mr. Jeffers, we may get some relief on the use of our truck; that is, in case we do not have to go to jail for violating the orders of one Federal authority while obeying the rules of the other. We will hope for the best and hope that our city friends will not get too hungry in the meantime.

Congress Passed the So-Called Price Fixing Bill, But Congress Did Not Appoint Mr. Henderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting herewith an address delivered by me over WOL through WNA, New York, on the evening of December 18, 1942:

The Seventy-seventh Congress, with its magnificent record, has passed into history.

Not only have we been very busy but we have had a history-making Congress.

I am sure that historians will record the Seventy-seventh Congress as having shaped one of the greatest military programs in the world's history.

I wish I had the time to give to you, step by step, month by month, the prompt and efficient action of Congress in the passage of many important bills and appropriations dealing with our domestic economy and our war program.

It is pitiful to me, however, as well as to all well-thinking Americans, to note the selfishness and uncooperative spirit on the part of millions of our citizens, based purely on what they read at the hands of many columnists, editorials, and items carried in the newspapers, especially the large metropolitan papers, as well as statements made by many commentators over the radio, all of which, in a great many instances, are for the purpose of creating headline news, and which frequently are the handiwork of the selfish groups of the country.

Why have we had so many bottlenecks in connection with our war program—for instance, the shortage of rubber, sugar, critical materials, and proper distribution of gasoline and oil?

The real answer in every instance is because of the operations of the selfish, monopolistic groups of this country, in a great many instances being tied in with foreign groups prior to this war.

Why has there been so much confusion, fumbling, and the changing from month to month of various programs?

The answer is these same groups, their representatives and their technical advisers, are in control of all the key places, as well as the important committees connected therewith.

Keep a watch on the press of the country, thousands of magazines, and listen in on the radio, and you will find that these groups and their paid representatives are doing much advertising, costing millions, much of which is propaganda in a great many instances, used for the purpose of diverting the attention of the public and the covering up of what is going on.

These millions, thus expended, are considered a part of the cost under the plus profit contract, with a profit thereon, as well as allowable in making out income-tax returns.

In the meantime, if you will read between the lines, you will be able to observe that they are not only determined to control our war program—that is, controlling contracts, distribution, and getting profits, as usual—but they are determined to be in a position to take a leading part in writing the peace, so as to be able to continue their selfish, monopolistic operations after the war, apparently being more interested in getting the money than they are in suffering humanity.

It is true that the Congress has given to the President various necessary powers in order to carry on promptly and efficiently our war efforts. However, all of this adds up to very little in comparison with the powers given the President, our Commander in Chief in this great emergency, by the Constitution of the United States.

I do not hold the President—and I do not believe that the great majority of the American people hold the President—altogether responsible for what is going on in connection with the operations of our war agencies.

The President is just one human being, perhaps doing his very best in selecting advisers, as well as those at the head of our various agencies engaged in our war program.

It is true that Congress may be helpful by earmarking certain appropriations to be expended under certain limitations.

I have every reason to believe that in the coming Congress every effort will be made to be helpful without, I hope, attempting to pass drastic legislation, which would tend to take over the administration of the war program by Congress.

What about our unorganized farmers?

Under the price-control program they have to accept whatever is left in the way of prices for their products, all of which is subject to the manipulation of thousands of useless middlemen and speculation on the futures exchanges, with a tremendous shortage of labor, all because of unlimited wages paid by industrial and contractual groups, to say nothing about the shortage of farm implements and fertilizer.

Small businessmen, small industrial groups, as well as small contractors, are on the outside looking in, all, as previously stated, on account of selfishness.

In the meantime, there are millions of our constituents blaming Congress for not solving all of these problems.

It is true that Congress passes all legislation and makes all appropriations, but Congress does not appoint those who administer these laws or those who spend the money. For instance, Congress passed the so-called price-fixing bill, which is administered by Mr. Henderson; but Congress did not appoint Mr. Henderson. Yet Congress gets the cussing for the manner in which the Price Control Act is administered.

I can assure you that there is nothing in this act authorizing Mr. Henderson to appoint hundreds of theorists who apparently are staying awake late at night for the purpose of seeing how many thousands of blanks, contracts, and questionnaires they can force upon the people in connection with the rationing and price-fixing program.

The pitiful thing is that because of this attitude on the part of many of our people toward Congress, when an individual Congressman returns to his district, although his record of service to his people and to his country, as well as his voting record, may be 99 percent perfect, he is held responsible for what Congress has done or for what Congress has failed to do.

We have thousands of constituents visiting Washington and the galleries of the House from year to year. From what they see in the performance of Congress, much of which they do not understand, in a great many instances they leave the Capitol with a grave misunderstanding of the workings of the House.

Sometimes they find only 25 or 50 Members out of the 435 on the floor of the House.

It may be at a time immediately after the reading of the Journal of the previous day's work.

Perhaps you will see 25 Members standing, awaiting recognition by the Speaker. This may seem more or less confusing. This, however, is the regular, orderly procedure under the rules governing unanimous-consent requests for 1-minute speeches or for the purpose of extending remarks in the RECORD.

Look in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from day to day, and you will find these speeches and extensions of remarks. Some of these are for home consumption and others pertain to pending bills and on important subjects in which Members, as well as the public, are interested.

Sometimes you may observe a Congressman down in the well of the House making a speech, while the few Members present are, apparently, unconcerned. Some of the Members may be reading newspapers, and others holding small conferences on the floor of the House. This speech may be for the RECORD, or to be mailed to the Member's constituents.

If you will make a thorough investigation you may find your Congressman, as well as two or three hundred other Congressmen, either doing overtime committee work, looking after departmental work, or in their offices giving their usual careful attention to the thousands of letters received from their constituents.

It takes time for a Congressman to gain congressional experience, make friends, and secure good committee assignments.

Twenty-two years ago, when I came to Congress, I was assigned to the Indian Affairs Committee, and there is not an Indian in my State.

At the beginning of my second term I was given an appointment on the Agricultural Committee, and 2 years ago I became chairman of this great committee.

When I came to Congress 104 other new Members came in. Today there are only 2 of us remaining—the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable JOHN E. RANKIN, and myself.

I have witnessed the coming and going of many Congressmen, but I have never been able to understand why many capable and useful Congressmen, Members who were interested in their constituents and their country, perhaps with good committee appointments, were defeated.

For instance, in the recent election, many outstanding Members on both sides of the aisle were defeated, men whose experience and whose outstanding ability will be missed in the Seventy-eighth and future Congresses, at a time when we are engaged in one of the greatest struggles ever in the history of the world, as well as facing important post-war planning.

Let me call to your attention two or three Members, examples of the type of men about whom I am talking—Senator Norris, of Nebraska; Congressman Pierce, of Oregon; Congressman Nelson, of Missouri—men who have given their very lives in the interest of their people and their country, and there are many others.

Never in the history of this great country of ours do we need more than at this time to select and keep in Congress strong men, men with practical experience, men endowed with common sense, giving to them the hearty cooperation of the citizens of this great Republic.

The magnificent record of the Seventy-seventh Congress will be extended to the Seventy-eighth Congress, in that we are only in the beginning of the winning of this war.

The great task confronting the Congress, the American people, and our allies is not only winning the war, but a world peace, a peace which will eliminate selfishness and which will bring about freedom, happiness, and equal justice and opportunity to all the people of all the world.

Certainly, there are conditions ahead of us which tend to cause you and me uneasiness. For instance, we may come out of this war with a national debt of $250,000,000,000 or more. Yet, if we eliminate selfishness and keep our thinking straight, we need not be disturbed in our post-war planning.

We know we shall win this war, and in so doing we shall emerge with our national resources, the greatest in the world, unimpaired.

We shall have in this country unlimited industrial plants, the largest and best trained millions of factory workers in the world.

If we can produce the necessary goods and create full employment to satisfy our wartime needs, the American people will demand that our economic system shall function equally well with the return of peace.

Most assuredly our farmers will have the opportunity of furnishing food and clothing for 130,000,000 Americans, as well as for export for the purpose of serving, on a friendly and profitable basis, millions of our allies and other hungry and naked people in Europe.

The problem is human, religious, moral, social, and political as well. There must be a renewal of that true spiritual courage which inspired our Pilgrim Fathers to work together for the common good.

The thing that I am interested in, and which you should be interested in, is the hope that our people, including those millions who have offered themselves as a living sacrifice, to save a democracy, which should be made to work in the interest of all the people, putting humanity above selfishness, will see to it that we maintain an administration and a Congress which will function to the end that we may have a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The Constitution and the Affairs of Our Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have a tremendous job to do administering the affairs of our Government in the most serious war in its history, and will want to function with minimum friction and for maximum results. I recommend that we keep always in mind the November election returns, and reread that ancient charter, the Constitution, especially section 8, which says, in part:

Congress shall have power—

To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

To borrow money on the credit of the United States.

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States.

To establish a uniform rule of naturalization and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies.

To coin money, regulate the value thereof.

To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.

To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal.

To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

To provide and maintain a navy.

To make rules for the government and regulation of land and naval forces.

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

The Results of the Washington Naval Treaty of February 6, 1922

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, recently the question arose as to the number of United States warships which were scrapped during the administration of President Harding under the terms of the Washington Naval Treaty of February 6, 1922.

I thought that this might be of interest to the Members of the House in order that they might know how many ships were scrapped, the cost of these ships, and the salvage of same.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent compilation from the November 20, 1941, issue of the New York Times:

SHIPS SCRAPPED BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE WASHINGTON NAVAL TREATY OF FEBRUARY 6, 1922

According to H. R. 11214 of July 1, 1922, in Statutes at Large, volume 42, page 814, the President was empowered in fulfillment of the Washington Naval Treaty entered into by the United States, British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan on February 6, 1922, to order the destruction of 7 first-class battleships and 6 battle cruisers as authorized to be built on August 29, 1916. Two battle cruisers were converted into the aircraft carriers *Saratoga* and *Lexington*. Thus 11 new ships were scrapped. In addition 17 old ships of from 12 to 20 years old were also discarded to fulfill treaty obligations.

The total cost of these 11 new ships was to be $426,000,000. At the time the treaty was ratified, $153,814,000 had been spent on these.

The 11 partially completed ships were sold for $616,262.37; expense of scrapping was $86,543.32; balance for salvage, $529,719.05.

Hence on the 11 new ships the total loss was $153,284,281.

The disposal of the 11 new vessels was as follows:

Battleships: *Washington*, to be sunk by bombing; *South Dakota*, sold for $266,996; *Indiana*, scrapping cost $59,317; *Montana*, $47,110; *North Carolina*, $12,365; *Iowa*, $55,666; *Massachusetts*, sold for $26,043, scrapping cost $3,606.

Battle cruisers: *Constellation* sold for $46,666; *Ranger*, $10,666; *Constitution* sold for $181,747; *United States*, scrapping cost, $23,619.

Total displacement of 11 vessels was 465,000 tons.

The disposal of the 17 old ships was as follows. All were becoming obsolete.

Maine sold for $44,556; *Missouri*, $44,556; *Nebraska*, $37,110; *Georgia*, $58,666; *Rhode Island*, $47,666; *Connecticut*, $42,750; *Louisiana*, $66,560; *Vermont*, $41,110; *New Hampshire*, $66,560; *Kansas*, *Minnesota*, *South Carolina*, *Michigan*, $1,089,391; *Delaware*, for bombing; *Virginia*, *New Jersey*, *North Dakota*, as target ships.

Seventeen old ships sold for $1,538,905.80; expense of scrapping, $584,598.34; balance for old ships, $954,307.46.

Total displacement of 17 old ships was 267,000 tons; balance for new ships of 465,000 tons, $529,719.05; balance for 17 old ships of 267,000 tons, $954,307.46; balance for 28 ships of 732,000 tons, $1,484,026.51; additional expense for scrapping, $73,267.22; total junk income for 28 vessels, $410,759.29.

Tax Time Is Coming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of January 3, 1943:

TAX TIME IS COMING

We are now in 1943. This means that the victory tax deductions from pay checks are starting.

The man who earns $20 a week will now find 40 cents deducted from his pay check, that being 5 percent of the amount beyond the $12 a week which is exempt. The man who earns $40 will find his check $1.40 short. The man who earns $60 will find $2.40 deducted.

These deductions, which may not in themselves be too painful, should serve as a warning to all of us that, come next March, income tax payments will also be expected.

The man who has been earning $20 a week since the beginning of 1942 will, if unmarried, have to pay a Federal income tax of about $90 and a State income tax of about $3. Between now and March 15 he should, if possible, lay aside $93, or nearly 5 weeks' pay. He must have at least $25 even if he pays only the minimum installment.

The man who has had a steady income of $40 a week will, if married but without dependents, have to pay a Federal tax of about $140 and a State tax of about $8. Between now and March 15 he should lay aside about 4 weeks' pay and must have at least $40.

The man who has been earning $60 a week will, if married and having two dependents, have to pay a Federal and State tax totaling about $210. His tax will amount to 3½ weeks' pay, of which nearly a third will have to be available by March 15.

A married man without dependents earning this $60 a week will, of course, find his tax much heavier—more than $350. A single man earning this $60 will find his tax about $520, or nearly 9 weeks' pay.

It may be feared that most working men and women, accustomed to viewing the income tax as only for the rich, have not so far made much preparation to meet these tax bills when they become due. Those who have not had best begin to think right now.

Today many a workman is making $1.50 an hour. This, on a 48-hour basis, means $78 a week. This $78 a week will call for a victory tax deduction of $3.30. From the remaining $74.70, money will have to be saved for a combined Federal and State income tax amounting to from five and a half to ten times the net weekly earnings.

The single man working 48 hours a week at $1.50 an hour will pay a tax of about $760. For the married man with the same pay the tax will be nearly $600. For the married man with two dependents the tax will be about $430.

The variation is, of course, considerable, but the tax is heavy for all three groups. The tax this year "ain't hay." Anybody who fancies it may be, had best wake up.

Gasoline Rationing and the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in order to give Congress some idea of the hardships that are being imposed upon the American farmer by gasoline rationing, I desire to insert in the RECORD at this time a letter from a constituent which describes the situation rather fully. It is not with the thought of criticizing the local officials that the letter is inserted but rather with the hope that those who promulgate the general policy of rationing will be as lenient with the farmers as the supply of gasoline and our war needs will permit. I may say that the letter which follows is being inserted with the knowledge and approval of the writer:

GEORGEVILLE, MINN., *December 14, 1942.*
OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION.

DEAR SIR: The card of recent date marked "rejected" to my request for more gas has been received.

I wonder if our local gas rationing board knows what 4 gallons of gas will do on a farm. The following statements of last week's happenings on this farm will give you some idea, as one week is very much like another and one farm's problems is similar to another farm's problems.

On Monday I used the car to haul the cream to town. Arriving home, I found that our pump engine was out of order. Our water system consists of an overhead tank from which water is supplied to all of our needs both for our household and our 50 head of stock. Unable to repair the engine, I put it on the trailer and went to New London, 12 miles away. Nobody in that town could fix it, so I went home to do more chores and get dinner. I then went to Belgrade, but no one could fix it there either.

On Wednesday I delivered my cream. A gear wheel on my manure spreader broke in five places. This machine is almost new. Our blacksmith informed me that this gear was made so weak in the first place that it could not hold, hence would not stand up if welded, but new and heavier wheels were bought this fall for $6. A farmer verified this statement. The dealer could not get me a

wheel now for less than $10. The Price Administrator must have put some very high ceiling prices on machinery repairs.

On Thursday evening our young folks went to a 4–H Club meeting 9 miles away and had car trouble. After wasting some gas they had somebody push the car part of the way home. On Friday we tried to fix the car at home. To save gas, I hauled the cream to town with the horses. By this time I had found out that in another town they had a new wheel for my spreader for sale at $5 and I started for that point to get it, but the car started trouble again and I had to give up the trip. I took the car to a garage for repairs. I then brought home a boar pig that I had borrowed from a neighbor 7 miles away. I had to pull a trailer behind the car.

Friday night I was called to our church for song practice, but could not go because there was no more gas. I also ran out of feed and having no grinding facilities on the farm, I take the car and trailer and haul the grain to the nearest mill, 6 miles away, to get it ground; now there was no gas, so I just had to be without feed and try to inform my stock that feed is rejected. Without ground feed I will have to ship my hogs to market unfinished. My neighbors with grinding facilities on the farm are allowed gas for feed grinding. In my case gas was rejected for this purpose.

I am allowed 19 gallons of gas for 3 months for pumping water and for the washing machine. I do not know if this will be enough. I do not think it will. We wash clothes for two families and our only source of water is the pump in the barn run by a gas engine. If I have to pump water by hand, I will have to reduce my stock.

On Sunday I would have liked to take my family to church, but there is no gas and our church is 8 miles away. You may tell me to use horses. This could be done, yet the extra horses and rig and the barn by the church are a thing of the past and cannot be had overnight. Farmers have been informed by radio and newspapers from higher authorities that we shall get all the gas we need to carry on the war effort, but if the local rationing board just sends us cards marked "rejected," we will not get any more gas than those living in town who can use their 4 gallons of gas a week just for pleasure driving.

Should the Agricultural Adjustment Administration Program Be Continued During the War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable discussion throughout the country at this time concerning the advisability of continuing the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program during the war. The farmers themselves are not agreed. This is especially true of organized farmer groups. There seems to be a general feeling among our people that payment of benefits and subsidies, the purpose of which is to control production, is not in keeping with our war economy.

Mr. Speaker, it is most regrettable that the farmers themselves cannot agree as to just what policy should be pursued in connection with agriculture at this time. This is no time for pride of organization to assert itself. Unity of action, especially among the producers of food, is presently essential. None of these organizations can have its own way and dominate the picture in this hour of the Nation's crisis. All should be willing to sit around the conference table and agree on some general course, and then unitedly fight for the objective. It will be soon enough, after the war is won and our liberties guaranteed, to think about the advancement of any farm organization as such. It seems to me that this is not only sound reasoning but practical patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a petition, addressed to the Congress, numerously signed by Monroe County, Mich., farmers, members of the Michigan Farmers' Guild, protesting against the continuation of the A. A. A. program at this time. I have been asked to present this petition to the Congress and, pursuant to the permission granted me, I am including that petition in these remarks. The petition is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Gentlemen: We, the undersigned, join the Michigan Farmers' Guild in petitioning the Congress to repeal the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program, as an unnecessary waste of public funds and a hindrance in the production of an adequate food supply for our armed forces, the Allies, and our own Nation; to cancel all penalties on wheat or any other farm commodities, all surplus, if any, of such farm crops having been used on the farm for the production of meat, milk, and eggs, thereby rendering a great patriotic service to our country.

Every dollar paid out by the Government for subsidies through the Agricultural Adjustment Administration is money diverted from the war effort. Therefore, we ask no subsidies—just a fair price based on reasonable compensation plus cost of production. The farmer is not entitled to more. He should not be asked to accept less.

In conclusion, we must not forget that there is no money in the Federal Treasury today; that the tax gatherer has scraped the bottom of the barrel; and that the actual national debt as of December 31, 1942, not including contingent liabilities, was $108,000,000,000. Every dollar paid out by the Federal Government for subsidies or benefits to agriculture or other industry at this time must either be taken from the pockets of the taxpayers or borrowed from the taxpayers. Our whole economy and financial structure is quivering under the strain. How this indebtedness is to be liquidated is a real problem. Certainly official repudiation will never be countenanced by the Congress. The promiscuous printing of money would be just as bad.

In the final analysis, the answer must be found in thrift and economy on the part of the Government itself. This can only be accomplished when a majority of our people are willing to sit around the table and work out our problems without greedy self-interest. Indeed, these are times of give and take. These are times when industrial, political, and group advantages must yield to the common good of all. There must be sacrifice, and that sacrifice must be universal.

(Signatures omitted.)

Railroads and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, comparatively few Americans realize the fine work that the American railroads are performing in the war emergency. What they have done and are doing should forever silence those who clamor for Government ownership and operation, more especially when we compare such operation with what we had to contend with during the brief period following the last war when the railroads were operated by the Federal Government. Those whose memories go back that far will recall that the operation was most inefficient and that the Federal Government lost about two thousand million dollars as a result of engaging in that venture.

There can be no operation of the railroads as efficient as the present method. It is free from favoritism and waste and it is significant that when we take taxes, wages, and quality of service into consideration freight and passenger rates are lower in the United States than in any other country in the world.

A very good résumé of the fine service being rendered by the American railways is contained in an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on January 4, 1943, which I urge the Members of the House to read. The editorial follows:

RAILROADS AND THE WAR

The people of the United States owe a debt to the Nation's railroads that will be most difficult to repay. After virtually relegating them to the status of a stepchild, they called upon the railroads immediately after the attack on Pearl Harbor to supply most of their transport needs. Accepting the task, the railroads last year did the greatest transportation job in the history of this or any nation.

Having emerged from a 10-year period of poor business, the railroads were not well prepared for such a gigantic job. After reporting net deficits for 4 of those years, many were in bankruptcy proceedings. The fact, however, that the volume of freight handled last year was one and one-half times that moved in the First World War year 1918 showed that, despite their lean period, they had maintained their fixed plant and equipment in excellent condition.

In their poverty of the 1930's, the statement that the railroads were "through" as the mainstay of the Nation's transport facilities generally was accepted as an accomplished fact. Interest was centered in the development of other transportation methods. The rubber-borne vehicle and the vast network of highways would be the Nation's mainstay in a crisis. Inland waterways and coastwise and intercoastal water routes would be the other principal methods.

Under the impact of war these methods of transport did not meet the test. With the Japanese soon in possession of the source of 90 percent of the world's crude rubber, the effectiveness of the rubber-borne vehicle in meeting the increased transport needs was

greatly reduced. Submarine sinkings and the diversion of ships to war services overseas soon resulted in coastwise shipping dropping to a fraction of its former importance. Intercoastal freight traffic through the Panama Canal was suspended.

These traffic disruptions made the Nation more dependent on rail transportation than at any other period. To the railroads fell the job of maintaining a steady flow of materials to war industries and then moving the weapons they produced to ports and training centers. Millions of men in the armed services had to be transported and essential civilian transport needs had to be met. The railroads have handled this enormous volume of traffic with remarkable efficiency.

Billions of dollars are being spent by the Government to expand other industries, but the railroads have done their war job well without any outside assistance. Furthermore, they have contributed liberally, through taxes, to Government expenditures. John J. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads, recently estimated that railroad taxes in the 12 months ended with October amounted to the unprecedented sum of $1,077,000,000, the equivalent of revenues derived from 56 days of operation.

Let Us Have a Show-down in Connection With the Major Problem Confronting Farmers and Consumers Under the Old Wasteful and Disgraceful Marketing and Distributing System Wherein We Have Thousands of Useless Middlemen Sapping the Very Lifeblood Out of Producers and Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a copy of a House resolution which I am introducing today, which has for its purpose making a thorough investigation of the marketing and distributing of farm products from the rural areas on through to the actual consumer in the large cities of the country.

Under the present marketing system consumers are called upon to pay unreasonably high prices, which, in a great many instances, they believe are being received by farmers, while, as a matter of fact, the many additions between the producer and the consumer going to various types of middlemen, including overlapping, improper grading, and waste, are coming out of either the producer or the consumer, or both.

I am hoping that the farm organizations, the consumer organizations, as well as legitimate wholesalers and retailers, will become interested, so that we may be able to secure the real facts, out of which we will be able to set up a real up-to-date marketing and distributing system from the county on through State and National agencies.

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by a subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation of the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products from rural areas through the various marketing agencies to the ultimate consumer, as it affects farmers, the various types of middlemen, wholesalers, retailers, and consumers, with a view to ascertaining, among other things:

(a) The effectiveness of the present system of marketing, and the adequacy of present marketing facilities, with particular regard to the protection of farmers and consumers.

(b) The effect of transactions on the futures grain and cotton exchanges upon such system and upon farmers and consumers.

(c) The existence of any practices in connection with the grading, storing, processing, transporting, distributing, or marketing of farm products, which adversely affect farmers and consumers.

(d) The present and prospective development of the types and methods of transportation for farm products, and the existence, if any, of discrimination in railway freight or in motor carrier rates on farm products in the various areas.

(e) The feasibility of establishing an up-to-date marketing and distributing system from the rural areas through local, State, and National marketing agencies under a farm cooperative program that would provide facilities for proper grading and distribution, necessary storage, and for other essential activities of an orderly marketing program.

The committee shall make a report to the House as soon as practicable after its study and investigation has been concluded, and in its report the committee shall make such recommendations as it may deem proper, including recommendations with respect to any legislative action necessary to effectuate its recommendations.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary. Subpena shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman. Oaths or affirmations may be administered by the chairman or any member of the committee designated by him.

Oil Alibis Leave Voter Cold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star:

OIL ALIBIS LEAVE VOTER COLD—INTERESTED IN SUPPLY, NOT BUCK PASSING ON FAILURES

(By David Lawrence)

Washington ought to be known as the alibi capital of the world. As the citizen tries to discover what agency is the one to which he must go for a particular problem, he is just as likely to be sent to two or three others.

The most flagrant example of the alibi practice is in connection with the rationing. The Office of Price Administration claims it isn't responsible for the delays that made it difficult to get rationing of fuel oil under way before the cold season started. The Office of Price Administration also claims that it isn't responsible for the matter of supply and that this is a question wholly within the jurisdiction of the petroleum administrator. Then there is the Office of Defense Transportation, which issues rules and regulations relating to the use of trucks and rail carriers that transport oil.

Again, governmental agencies urge the public to convert to coal. The citizen is assured that the cut might be as much as 25 percent, but he isn't told it might be as much as 70 percent. The citizen, meanwhile, tries to get equipment to convert his furnace to coal. Maybe he is fortunate in being able to find the right equipment. Or maybe he runs up against the fact that priorities have to be obtained—then the War Production Board comes into the picture.

ONE GOVERNMENT TO CITIZEN

But the citizen isn't interested in all the ramifications of jurisdiction that seem to enmesh the bureaus here. He looks to the Government—his Government—to make out his ration and tell him what it wants done. He isn't concerned with the jealousies or frictions between bureaus or departments. He knows only that his Government is a single entity in the imposition of its restrictive power.

Under a system of responsible government such as exists in what are known as parliamentary system countries, the administration in power can be turned out of office overnight because of the acts of any of its constituent groups, whether legislative or administrative. In the United States there is a sort of irresponsible set-up whereby no one agency can be held to account and, as a consequence, each agency can point to another in an alibi as to authority and jurisdiction.

Price Administrator Henderson says he wasn't tough enough and that if he had it to do over again he would be even tougher. But the place where he ought to have gotten tough was with some of his official brethren or mayhap with his theoretical boss—the Chief Executive.

If Mr. Henderson was right about his program, he didn't get the proper support at the top. This, by the way, is the customary complaint among the bureaucrats—namely, that they are not helped as against other agencies whose authority overlaps or whose powers have not been made clear.

ESSENTIALS FORGOTTEN

The persons who thought up all the curious questionnaires and complicated ration systems, for the farmer to get gas for his trucks, for instance, try to shift the blame. They can always say they consulted someone in industry. But industry has its inefficient planners, too. And the citizen isn't interested so much in who was consulted but who thought up all the queer ways to ration and then forgot that there was a simple matter of transportation and supply involved.

People who have coupons and find it hard to get oil because deliveries have broken down or because there has been a maldistribution aren't interested in the fact that one agency didn't get busy soon enough or that someone else held up the regulations because of a complexity of legal or other obstacles. The citizen expects his Government to have known as early as last summer what its probable oil supply problem would be and to have taken measures to meet it, telling the public the facts forthrightly and preparing for the restrictions in a sensible and candid way.

NO BATTLE ALIBIS

The Army and Navy have similar matters of organization and supply and delivery and these armed services cannot make alibis to the effect that the weapons didn't arrive on time. It is always somebody's business to see that supplies reach the front in time for the fight.

In this war there is no over-all commander on the civilian front. The President has delegated all sorts of tasks to different individuals, but he hasn't cleared up the duplications and overlappings. That's why the alibis are so numerous. In truth, the President is to blame for the mistake of his subordinates, and yet he can't supervise them in person. Maybe if the parliamentary system were in vogue there would be more care in selecting the so-called administrators in the first place.

End the Silver Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of January 3, 1943:

END THE SILVER SCANDAL

Silver is needed today in the making of ships, airplanes, tanks, trucks, guns, shells, bombs, and torpedoes. The faster we make these and the better they are made the fewer lives of Americans and their allies will be sacrificed. But silver can't go to war; it is more valuable than lives. Though the Government has 113,000 tons of it, most of it bought at a scandalous price; though only 14,000 tons are in use as coin, Government must not say how the rest of it shall be used.

It all grows out of a deal with the silver bloc in 1934—that is, a purchase of the votes of Senators for support of administration policies. The law said Government was to buy domestic silver, at a fictitious price, and foreign silver until either the price of silver had reached $1.29 an ounce in the world market or the value of silver in our Treasury was one-third of the value of our gold holdings. The price never did reach the subsidy price paid by the United States for domestic silver, now 71.11 cents an ounce.

The silver bloc—that is, the Senators from the six States, Colorado, Utah, Idaho, Montana, Arizona, and Nevada—had in mind a permanent fictitious value for silver as a money base—a revamping of the old Bryan creed. It didn't work; the rest of the world wasn't using silver for a money base.

With the grab went a good deal of loose theory about how we were going to help China, which had money backed by silver. Very soon we had produced panic in China by our purchases of silver and forced it off silver. Incidentally this helped Japan, which drained off silver from conquered Chinese provinces.

All this chicanery, pretense, and failure of the silver laws has been realized by the administration. Secretary Morgenthau said again and again that the silver legislation ought to be wiped off the books. But the votes of 12 or 14 Senators were still attractive to the Roosevelt administration.

A compromise was fixed up. The Treasury could lease-lend unpledged silver for uses which would permit its later return. But it must keep its silver pledged as backing for notes which already had more gold backing than they needed.

Recently five silver Senators—JOHNSON and MILLIKIN, Colorado; CLARK and THOMAS, Idaho; WHEELER, Montana—saw a bit of handwriting on the wall. They said they didn't consider silver a "sacred cow," too good to go to war. They would therefore favor allowing their Government to dispose of its unpledged silver at 71.1 cents an ounce and to use the pledged silver for nonconsumptive purposes.

The price of everything else could be set by Government. Everybody must tighten his belt—everybody except the Harry Hopkins crowd, anyway. But six States, or at most eight, will still tell us how much silver can be used in the war and on what terms.

Have the Democrats in Congress enough patriotism and guts to wipe out this silver pretense that was trickery from the start and now is a scandal? Or will they add it to the mounting indictment to be brought against them in 1944?

Blue Star Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure on February 6, 1942, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article pertaining to the organization of the Blue Star Mothers of America. The Flint News-Advertiser, of Flint, Mich., has been very enthusiastic in sponsoring the organization of this group, and as a result thereof, the organization has spread throughout the country with an ever-increasing membership.

The Blue Star Mothers organization has had phenomenal growth because the mothers of our boys in service, now numbering approximately 7,000,000, appreciate the opportunity of joining a patriotic organization such as this.

The Blue Star Mothers organization demonstrates to the public of the United States and to the Government itself that while their sons are in service helping to protect our Constitution and flag and preserving liberty throughout the world, they, the mothers, are devoting their patriotic efforts on the home front in building up the morale of our people and in cooperating with the boys in service.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include certain extracts from the Flint News-Advertiser of January 1, 1943, containing data and information of this organization:

BLUE STAR MOTHERS OF AMERICA FOUNDED IN FLINT AND SPONSORED AS A NEWS-ADVERTISER PROJECT—MOTHERS OF SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN ORGANIZED NATIONALLY

Probably the outstanding contribution to the war effort of the Flint News-Advertiser has been the sponsorship of the Blue Star Mothers of America, which has become a nationally known organization in its first year of life.

Founded in Flint by the News-Advertiser's defense and military editor, Capt. George H. Maines, this newspaper financed its early growth until a State and National association was formed last summer.

Timely was the explanation many newspaper editors have given for the extension of the order and its rapid growth which has carried Blue Star Mothers from coast to coast to add new chapters spontaneously.

Mrs. Adda Harris, of Flint, was chosen to be the first local president and the first national president. Mrs. Lena Mosher, of Flint, has been treasurer and secretary-treasurer of the local and national association, with Mrs. Len Benison as first national vice president, and Mrs. Iva Cole second national vice president.

HEADQUARTERS OPENED

A national headquarters was opened in the Industrial Bank Building in the middle of 1942. This winter a service-men's lounge and recreation center has been added, completely furnished. Service men and women, together with their wives or mothers, have the use of the center to rest, write letters, or be served home-cooked sweetmeats. Sewing of the button-mending variety is also provided.

Different groups have charge of the center at stated times.

Similar centers have been opened in other cities.

Blue Star Mothers have participated in Defense bond sales, have cooperated with the chambers of commerce, with the Red Cross, and in patriotic parades and ceremonies. At Christmas every service man and woman from Flint was sent a box packed with gifts. This was done by the Blue Star Mothers in many communities, the reports show.

A register is kept at the Center where the name and address of a visiting service man's mother or relative is recorded. A letter follows to the service man or woman's mother relating something about her soldier, sailor, or marine son.

OPERATE CANTEEN

The Blue Star Mothers have cooperated in the war efforts of the National Youth Administration, and expect to be more closely associated in the youth-morale work of that splendid program, which offers industrial training to young people for the war effort and a job in private industry after the war.

In many cities throughout the Nation canteens have been opened in railroad stations for the benefit of traveling service men and women. In Toledo recently the Negro Blue Star Mothers entertained and fed 500 Negro troops en route to duty.

Prayers and services have been held in churches, temples, and synagogues throughout the country in observance of some special occasion, or on Blue Star Mothers' Day, the anniversary of Pearl Harbor.

Governor Van Wagoner, Michigan, and Gov. John W. Bricker, of Ohio, among others, officially set aside and issued proclamations dedicating and memorializing December 7 as Blue Star Mothers' Day.

NATION-WIDE MOVEMENT

The Cleveland Plain Dealer, among other newspapers, has sponsored Blue Star Mothers, and editorially the movement has been commended and thus called to the attention of a community.

In California, Texas, Oklahoma, Florida, Wisconsin, Arkansas, New York, Ohio, New Jersey, Massachusetts, North Carolina, West Virginia, Virginia, Georgia, and other States, the Blue Star Mothers' banner is seen in the windows of thousands of homes.

Representative W. W. BLACKNEY, of Flint, has had a history of the movement spread on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Senator Vandenberg, Senator Brown, Senator James W. Davis, of Pennsylvania, Representative JESSE WOLCOTT, and many Senators and Representatives have commended the organization and its sponsorship.

The mayor of Cleveland, Frank J. Lausche; Mayor Edward J. Jeffers, of Detroit; Mayor W. Osmund Kelly, of Flint; and the mayors of several cities have appeared at Blue Star Mothers' meetings and have praised the mothers' activities.

NATIONAL OFFICERS HERE

Groups and chapters have sprung up, almost overnight, and the Flint mothers who have been elected to national leadership for the first year are busy day and night answering the mail and the requests that come daily to Flint with word about the Blue Star Mothers' organization.

A typical newspaper editorial is reprinted from the De Land (Fla.) Sun-News of December 8, 1942. The editorial follows:

"We wonder how many people in De Land have any real idea of the morale-building task being carried on by the local chapter of the Blue Star Mothers?

"The organization bolsters the spirits, not only of soldiers, sailors, and marines or others in the services, but the parents of those boys who may be hundreds, perhaps thousands of miles from home.

"They have a register in the Blue Star quarters on the Boulevard. When a service man enters he is asked to sign that register, giving the name and address of his parents. Later a Blue Star Mother writes the parents of the boy, telling them that they have seen him, and that he is looking well.

"Many, many letters of thanks have been received from mothers of boys who have dropped into Blue Star quarters here, an example of which is the following from a mother in Baltimore, Md.:

"'Your card received this morning and I cannot tell you in words how happy you made me. This is the day before Thanksgiving and it is the first time in 22 years my son and myself have been separated, and I miss him so very much.

"'He has always been a wonderful son. I do thank God and all the Blue Star Mothers for their wonderful care of our boys who are so far from home and all their loved ones, and I am sure that when we think of women like you it gives us courage to go on.

"'So when I kneel in prayer tomorrow morning to pray that all our boys will return to us well and victorious, I won't forget to ask God to bless all the Blue Star Mothers who have helped our boys and sent comfort to their mothers.'

"The Blue Star Mothers attempt to have their quarters homelike—a place where the soldier, sailor, or marine may write, play the victrola, listen to the radio, or raid the ice box.

"And it isn't always a simple matter to keep that ice box stocked with food. Several of the Blue Star Mothers are kept pretty busy cooking foodstuffs in order that the soldier boy may find something in addition to empty space when he opens the ice box door.

"Of late somebody has been generously donating a considerable number of oranges each week end, and it is said that the men in the service, especially those from the Northern States, are particularly pleased with it.

"This isn't an appeal for aid for the Blue Star Mothers. It is written simply to give you some idea of the work they are carrying on. However, if you've got an excess of foodstuffs, fruit, etc., around the house they'd no doubt welcome the donation."

GOVERNOR-ELECT SENDS MESSAGE

The following telegram has been received by the Flint News-Advertiser from Gov.-elect Harry F. Kelly, a World War veteran, who was a speaker at the Flint meeting last spring when the Blue Star Mothers national organization was perfected. The message read:

"Keeping alive in the hearts of our fighting sons the knowledge that they are not forgotten, and that loved ones at home are carrying on bravely on the home front, has been so valiantly exemplified by the Blue Star Mothers of Michigan.

"Their work is a paramount inspiration which will speed the day of victory when the boys will come home again.

"HARRY F. KELLY."

BLUE STAR MOTHERS DEVOTE MUCH TIME TO WAR EFFORT

During 1942 the Blue Star Mothers of America was incorporated under the laws of Michigan, in the District of Columbia, in Ohio, and in several other States.

Officially commended to the citizens by the Governors of States.

The anniversary of Pearl Harbor, December 7, was memorialized by Gov. Van Wagoner, of Michigan, by Gov. John W. Bricker, of Ohio, among others, as official Blue Star Mothers' Day.

Service and mending centers were opened in Flint, Cleveland, Brooklyn, and throughout the country, sponsored by Blue Star Mother groups.

Canteens opened in Jackson, Mich., Milwaukee, Wis., San Angelo, Tex., DeLand, Fla., Guthrie, Okla., Toledo, Ohio, and in other centers.

Ohio led in total membership with more than 56,000 Blue Star Mothers, sponsored by the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Michigan led with 67 communities organized, and contributing to the war effort, with 10 more towns forming new chapters.

Genesee County, Mich., is leading in county membership with 14 active groups, or units, with a total of more than 3,500 families receiving the Blue Star Mother window emblem and membership card.

Among activities have been visits to hospitals and institutions, and to homeless and motherless service men and women. These are always remembered by kits, gifts, and letters written to patients regularly by a Blue Star Mother.

Each group is urged to buy one or more defense bonds.

Each group has a correspondence secretary whose duties are to write letters to the mothers of service men and women in their respective communities, who are away from home, informing the distant mother about her son.

Mending uniforms and sewing on buttons where equipped in the Blue Star Mother service centers, being regularly opened across the Nation.

Attending patriotic functions, cooperating with the Red Cross, and encouraging mothers and daughters to complete a Red Cross training course

A Blue Star Mother "pie brigade" makes regular trips to training centers.

Cooperating with air-raid wardens, and preparing to aid them in cases of emergency.

Aiding the recruiting of naval aviation cadets for the United States Navy and Marine Corps. Flint mothers set a Nation-wide record according to the Navy Department.

Started a rehabilitation fund for use after victory for needy war mothers, and their sons and daughters.

Packed and shipped thousands of birthday gifts during year, and many thousands of special Christmas packages, especially to motherless boys and girls, and to wounded men in hospitals across the Nation, to Alaska and abroad.

A Part of a Country Journal Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting herewith a portion of a broadcast for Country Journal, a farm paper, over WJSV, 1 p. m., Saturday, December 19, 1942, at which time Mr. Joseph B. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation, took part with Mr. Worcester and myself:

Mr. WORCESTER. Without exception the greatest problem on the farms of the country these days is one of getting enough help. Besides the regular call of farm men and boys to the armed forces, many, many more have left the farm to take better paying jobs in war industries. Farmers cannot possibly afford to pay the wage level offered by industry. But in order to keep all the help they can, farmers have been forced to pay increasingly higher wages to their workers. This increased labor cost means more expenses for a farmer to meet in producing crops and livestock—and this additional labor expense is just what our next Country Journal guest is going to discuss. With us today is Representative HAMPTON P. FULMER, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, who will explain the current legislation to include farm labor costs in the determination of farm parity prices. Mr. FULMER, I wonder if first you'd briefly state the purpose of this measure.

Mr. FULMER. Well, as you know, parity is a farm price level designed to give the farmer the same buying power he had just before the last war. If prices for things the farmer has to buy are higher now than before World War No. 1, then the price for farm products should be advanced on a parity basis. The only catch to this farm parity is that farm labor costs are not included. And since the cost of farm labor has gone up considerably since the last war, the purpose of the current legislation is to figure these increased labor costs into the parity formula and thus correct the injustice.

Mr. WORCESTER. If the measure is finally approved and becomes law, what are the chances of farmers actually getting higher prices for their products?

Mr. FULMER. The chances are very good; though, I might say, better on some products than on others. The Government is helping to support the price of some farm products by loans, subsidies, and outright purchasing. These supports are usually based on parity. If the parity level goes up, prices on these particular products would likely go up soon after. And then there's the group of farm products affected by price controls. The price control level is, also, based on parity, you know, so these products should see a prompt rise in price on a just basis.

Mr. WORCESTER. Well, I suppose the main objection to this measure—or any legislation for that matter that would raise farm prices—is that it would increase the cost of living and we'd be on the road to inflation. What's your answer to that argument?

Mr. FULMER. The most direct answer I can think of, Mr. Worcester, is: Is the farm group, representing only 22 percent of the total population, receiving only about 12 percent of a total annual income of over

$100,000,000,000, most of which is used in debt paying, responsible for inflation? Farm after farm is being sold these days because farmers are not getting enough for their products to enable them to pay the rapidly rising cost of farm help. When a farmer can't afford to pay the money a hired man demands, and he can't possibly do all the work himself, he just has to quit. And when anyone begins to worry about the cost of living going up a few cents, they ought to remember that if enough farmers quit farming, some of us may go hungry.

Mr. WORCESTER. I've always felt that the farmer is blamed unfairly for the so-called high cost of living anyway.

Mr. FULMER. It isn't fair to blame the farmer. And I could give you figures to prove the point. Right down in my home community in South Carolina farmers are getting 2 cents and less a pound for their sweetpotatoes while the consumer pays 6 cents in the store. The average price on eggs in the South and Midwest is somewhere around 25 to 35 cents, and they retail as high as 65 and 70 cents in many places. In New York City the farmer gets around 5 or 6 cents a quart for his milk, but the housewife pays up to 17 cents delivered at the door.

Mr. WORCESTER. Would you say, then, that cutting down food distribution costs would be a better way to control the cost of living than trying to keep farm prices at an unreasonably low level?

Mr. FULMER. I think that's the logical way to do it. In peacetime we've built up some very expensive methods of food distribution. Milk deliveries are still made to individual homes. Not only that, but frequently two or three different milk companies deliver to the same apartment house. We buy many foods that have been shipped from some far corner of the country. Potatoes we get at the grocery store often have been bought from the farmer by a truckman, broker, or commission salesman, who, in turn, sells to a wholesale or commission merchant. The wholesaler ships to another commission merchant at some market center, who sells to a retailer, who sells to the consumer. After all these middlemen take out their fees for handling, plus a profit, the potatoes cost two, three, or four times what the farmer receives for them.

Mr. WORCESTER. Sounds like it might be the middleman instead of the farmer that's pushing the cost of living up in many cases.

Mr. FULMER. That's the situation exactly. The cost of processing and distribution, with thousands of useless middlemen operating between the producer and the consumer, is more of a problem than the cost of farm products. When price ceilings are placed on retail products, I've heard many consumers say, "Ah, now farm prices can't go any higher." That's a big joke, because frequently what happens is that farm prices go lower, but this does not help the consumer. When a fixed ceiling is placed on retail products, increased costs of processing and distribution are taken away from the farmer's price. It's the old story of everyone getting a fair price plus a profit, except the farmer; he gets whatever he's offered or whatever is left.

Mr. WORCESTER. And if the cost of labor on the farm goes up, he still gets what he's offered——

Mr. FULMER. Not only that but he has to pay fixed prices for the things he buys. We hope through this new measure that calls for including the cost of farm labor in the determination of the parity price level to make it possible for farmers to receive a fair price for their products, and we hope to make it possible for more farmers to continue their vital job of producing food. Those who are wrongly blaming the farmer for everything that happens, high cost of living as well as inflation, should realize we can't keep them rolling or flying unless we can keep them eating.

Food Situation Critical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the year just ended saw the greatest agricultural production in our history. Crop production was 14 percent higher than in 1941 and 12 percent higher than the previous high year of 1937. Yet, in spite of this enormous production, the year 1943 bids fair to be one in which the entire Nation is going to be confronted with the problem of securing a sufficient supply of nourishing food. This is true in spite of increased production because the demand is the greatest ever known. Aside from what goes for lend-lease purposes we have no more mouths to feed than we ever had, but men in the Army consume more food than they do as civilians and it is a sad but true fact that a large part of our population has never had enough nourishing food. With increased incomes millions of people are for the first time securing adequate amounts of food. Since even our increased supply of food is not going to be sufficient to go around if everyone purchases all he desires, rationing in a constantly increasing degree is going to become necessary in order to assure a fair distribution.

A short time ago the Secretary of Agriculture announced the food-production goals for 1943. With two or three exceptions these goals call for greater production than during the record-breaking year of 1942. Unless these goals are met it would seem that even more severe rationing than is now contemplated will be required.

What is the prospect for meeting our food requirements in 1943? I should say it is hopeless unless there is a sharp reversal in the governmental policies which have prevailed during the past 2 years. The year 1942 was as nearly perfect from a climatic standpoint as could be imagined. Although our supply of farm labor dwindled rapidly in 1942, yet during most of the year longer hours on the farm and increased work by women and children resulted in an adequate, although not plentiful, supply of labor. This, in spite of the fact that it was estimated that 2,000,000 persons have been withdrawn from the farm-labor supply since April 1940. Supplies of farm machinery were generally available this year. Fuel supplies for trucks, tractors, and other farm vehicles were not curtailed except in a few areas.

We do not know what Providence will give us in the way of weather in the coming year but we do know that in every other respect the capacity of farmers to produce will be seriously curtailed if present policies are followed. The supply of gasoline, distillate and other farm fuels is being rationed and so confusing is the rationing system that farmers generally have no idea at this time as to whether they will be able to secure sufficient tractor and truck fuel to carry on their operations. Instead of farm-machinery supplies being adequate, the War Production Board has limited the production of farm machinery to an amount which is about 20 percent of 1940 or 1941 production, whichever year the manufacturer wishes to use. The drain upon farm labor still continues and it is estimated that a million more persons will be withdrawn from farm labor before October 1, 1943, recent legislation designed to freeze labor on the farm notwithstanding. Farmers cannot work longer hours nor can farm women and children do more than they did in 1942. We cannot expect the deficit in farm labor to again be made up that way.

Farmers are also confronted with the uncertainty that they will be able to secure a price which will enable them to pay the cost of production. Expenses of farm operations are constantly increasing, wages have doubled, the price of second-hand machinery has gone skyhigh, and taxes and other costs are increasing. There are no ceilings on these items with the exception of some second-hand machinery just now imposed. We are confronted with the fact also that many thousands of farm units devoted to the production of the most essential foods, such as meats and dairy products, have gone out of existence during recent months. In addition to all these handicaps many farmers are sincerely and honestly afraid to go ahead and plan their farming operations for the coming year for the simple reason that they do not know what further restrictions and regulations will come out of Washington. Many feel that they are at the mercy of men in authority in Washington who know nothing of their problems.

What can be done to save the situation? The appointment of Secretary Wickard as Food Administrator will help a great deal. The only trouble is it comes about a year too late. Just what a Food Administrator can do now will depend very largely on how much real authority he has been given. If the serious situation confronting our consumers of food is to be met, the Food Administrator or someone must put into effect a minimum program embracing at least the following:

The drain on farm labor and management by the armed forces and war industries must be stopped immediately. In addition there should be released from military service thousands of farm operators who should never have been inducted in the first place. The needs for seasonal and hand labor can be partially met by the use of women, children, and imported unskilled labor, but these groups cannot replace the shortage of skilled year-round labor.

The allocation of materials for the production of farm machinery must be increased immediately. We need more machinery than usual to make up for labor shortages.

Order must be brought out of chaos in connection with the rationing of motor fuels, which has upset and disturbed

farming operations more than any other one thing.

Governmental agencies must find some way of reducing the time, energy, fuel, and tires which farmers are required to use in complying with rationing and other governmental programs.

Assurance must be given that those imposing price ceilings will take into consideration increased expenses in connection with farm production.

The emphasis in the administration of the food program must be on increased production rather than on the rationing and distribution of reduced production, important as that may be.

Finally, the confidence of farmers in their Government must be restored. Conflicting orders and incomprehensible and foolish regulations in connection with rationing and other programs administered out of Detroit and Washington must be done away with.

I think most farmers have confidence in the Secretary of Agriculture. They feel he understands their problems. They are glad he has been appointed as Food Administrator. They likewise have confidence in their neighbors who are serving as members of the United States Department of Agriculture county war boards. I think the greatest stimulus which could possibly be given agricultural production at the present time would be an assurance on the part of Secretary Wickard as Food Administrator that he had been given ample authority to see that farmers receive adequate labor, adequate equipment and supplies, and that farm prices will be such that farmers can produce without running the risk of financial loss. If he can give the further assurance that these programs will be administered as far as possible locally and through the county war boards, I am sure that it will do a great deal toward inspiring the farmers of this country to meet the almost impossible goals which have been set up for agricultural production. Without such a program and such assurances, the consumers of food in this country will face a serious situation in 1943.

Iron Men of Bataan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the Allingham-Golding Post, No. 18, of the American Legion, at Silver City, N. Mex., decided to draw up a suitable resolution to be sent to parents and others in Grant County, N. Mex., who have near relatives in the Philippines, Wake, Guam, and Pearl Harbor, or who had near relatives on Navy ships which were lost.

The officers of this post have drawn up a very fine and inspiring resolution and I am happy to include it in my remarks. It is as follows:

At a meeting of the Allingham Golding Post, No. 18, of the American Legion, department of New Mexico, held at Silver City, N. Mex., on the 1st day of June 1942, a motion was made by Col. W. C. Porterfield that Comrade Michael A. J. Doty be designated to formulate an appropriate resolution to be sent to parents and others in Grant County, N. Mex., who have near relatives in the Philippines, Wake, Guam, Pearl Harbor, and Navy ships lost, said resolution to be mailed to these relatives. The motion was unanimously carried, and on the 6th day of July 1942 this resolution was presented and adopted, the same being on the following pages:

"On December 7, 1941, America was challenged by a hideous monster which swept over Pearl Harbor, leaving the horizon convulsed in tragedy, desolation, and ruin. Not content with the insidious attack upon a nation with whom she was at peace, this black nightmare pushed her armies toward the riches of the East Indies, attacked our own Philippine Islands, and is now knocking at the doors of Australia.

"For 5 years this deceitful nation attacked the Chinese and sought to enslave that nation. She would be master of Asia.

"In her lust for power, she has thrown in with Germany's and Italy's gangsters and murderers. They call themselves the 'Axis,' upon which falls the duty of creating a new order.

"They failed to take into consideration that America would rise with just indignation and turn our land into an arsenal for the democracies. They did not foresee that we could turn our factories into an ever-rising tide of production for war needs; neither did they believe that our fields would be turned into 'food baskets' to feed the people throughout the world who are fighting for their right to live unmolested.

"America accepted the challenge and is training armies of great strength, building fleets that will sail the seven seas carrying death in their holds, trapping and smashing the missionaries of hate. Our armies have embarked on the five continents and on distant islands with Old Glory flying defiantly, bringing hope to the world.

"We shall repossess our rightful heritage. The Philippines will be restored and the nations that drew the sword to conquer the world shall perish. We will drive the Japs into the sea, bomb their cities, villages, and hamlets, destroy their brazen images, and break the chains that have enslaved these people for centuries. Yes; America accepts the challenge. A new order shall come, but it will be the order of freemen and free people everywhere.

"Bear witness, ye spirits of the men of Pearl Harbor and Bataan, your sacrifices shall not be in vain. We have taken up the torch and will carry it forth over the dead bodies of those who slew you in the night and carry it on to victory.

"You men of Pearl Harbor, lie in peace; your comrades will not forget you. They will not forget how a treacherous foe stole upon you in the dark of night and slew you; we shall not forget your valor and courage—your deeds will live as long as America is America.

"You men of Wake, of Midway, of Cebu, of Guam, and of our armed forces on the high seas, we give you our word that your long hours of suffering, your thirst, your hunger shall be avenged. You who have given your lives will always have the fondest place in our hearts. We will not think of you in those tragic hours, but we shall remember you smiling and happy and as loyal sons of America.

"And to you daughters and sons of America who have given your firstborn and others to the cause, mourn not—grieve not. The ground your sons traveled is hallowed ground. Wherever they spilled their blood, they made it a holy place. We shall not let the barbarians desecrate it. Wherever American blood is spilled the place becomes a part of the sanctuary.

"Grieve not. You have given that others might live. We shall erect a shrine to them, and it shall become a consecrated altar, with the inscription 'Greater love hath no man than he who layeth down his life for his friend.'

"And another epitaph shall we write to you, loyal sons and daughters of America, to you who have given this great measure of devotion. Of you we shall say: 'These were the spirits of a greater America.' For eternity we shall remember."

Whereupon Comrade Arthur E. Gill paid the following tribute to the Two Hundredth Coast Artillery, Antiaircraft:

"Comrades, I wish to speak very briefly as one of those whose households was saddened by personal grief at the fall of Bataan, to pay a tribute to our own Two Hundredth Regiment of Coast Artillery, Antiaircraft, of New Mexico, probably the most complete all-American regiment that ever followed our flag.

"In the muster rolls of that regiment are names of men who came to the United States in search of our way of life; there are names of men whose ancestors fought for our independence; there are descendants of men who marched with Grant or Lee; men whose personal and family names are inscribed in the yellow parchments of colonial Spain. Men of patient fortitude and love of sun and sky, handed down to them out of the ageless mystery of ancient America.

"With blood and suffering they consecrated the soil of B..taan to give token of our promise to the Philippine Commonwealth, a promise, which, in God's name, must and shall be fulfilled.

"With indomitable courage they stayed the vandal's advance for 4 cruel months, until sickness and hunger laid them low, and history will record that by that stubborn defense they frustrated completely the ultimate plan of the enemy.

"Those iron men of Bataan, in advancing the banners of freedom, added another name to our most sacred traditions and memories, and enriched the mighty drama of New World destiny."

The above tribute was incorporated in and made a part of the resolution.

Dr. George Washington Carver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of January 7, 1943, on the life of Dr. George Washington Carver:

DR. CARVER

No other people in the history of the world has achieved more notable progress than has the Negro race in the United States, and Dr. George Washington Carver of Tuskegee Institute was the living symbol of that tremendous advancement. Concerning him, the Star on June 7, 1937, was proud to say: "Both an artist and a scientist, (he) is

predominantly a personality. A natural capacity distinguishes him. He feels and he thinks with an efficiency rarely excelled in modern times. Those who knew him best speak of him as being possessed of a rationalized energy like disciplined electricity. He conceives an objective, then moves straight toward it without deviation and without compromise—until it has been attained. The inventions he has perfected, the discoveries he has made are freely given to humanity. He does not regard them as his personal property. Most of them * * * have been developed from values created by God—such humble materials as trees, peanuts, and sweetpotatoes."

The logic of such a life, obviously, is that it, too, comes from a providential source. Dr. Carver was born a slave and once was traded for a horse. He grew to manhood without schooling, had no instruction until he had reached adult estate, then earned his way through an agricultural college by hard labor. A profound determination sustained him through poverty and illness. He made religion a creative force to a degree unsurpassed by any contemporary. During four and a half decades he directed the endeavors of the research and experimental laboratory at Tuskegee, literally bringing the world to his door. His major purpose from first to last was to find new and more helpful uses for common things. In a long succession he produced plastics and lubricants, medicines, substitutes for wood and stone, foodstuffs, and such homely commodities as soaps and shoe polishes. His methods were chemical; his objectives entirely idealistic.

But honors were showered upon him. It would have been an indictment of civilization had he been neglected. His pictures were accepted for the Luxembourg Gallery in Paris; he was elected a member of the Royal Society of Arts in London; he received the Spingarn medal in 1923 and the Roosevelt medal in 1939. A bronze portrait bust of him stands on a pink Georgia marble shaft on the campus of the institute with which his name is immortally associated. No one knew his age. It was supposed that he was born about 1864. Time, however, meant little to such a spirit. He always was old, yet he always was young. His countrymen esteemed him, admired him, loved him, and even now will not let him go.

Scrap Metal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article from the Wichita Eagle under date of January 2, entitled "Finds Scrap 'Mine' in Forsaken Camp." I think it is very unfortunate that Federal funds and property should be so extravagantly wasted, as indicated in this article. The whole situation ought to be examined.

The article follows:

FINDS SCRAP "MINE" IN FORSAKEN CAMP—IOWA EDITOR UNCOVERS OLD TRUCKS, OTHER MATERIALS AT OLD CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS SITE

DECORAH, IOWA, January 2.—If the abandoned Civilian Conservation Corps camp here is typical, there still is an untapped source of scrap metal in the United States.

Dale Ahern, editor of the Decorah Public Opinion, investigated the local Civilian Conservation Corps camp while school children and citizens of Winneshiek County were scouring farms and towns for scrap recently.

Nestled in the weeds, he found: 25 trucks of varied kinds, more than 100 tires, a $1,925 air compressor, a caterpillar tractor, shower and lavatory fixtures and piping, a boiler with fittings and a 500-gallon hot-water tank, 2 road scrapers with 3 heavy blades, 41 coal heaters, an all-metal portable restaurant sink, 3 Army range cook stoves, a large bake oven, 3 lots of steel drums, a large hot-air heater, several large barracks heaters, thousands of feet of electrical wiring and hundreds of electrical fixtures, 3 automobiles, and a metal building.

Wallace and Our National Tariff Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Journal-American of January 4, 1943, there appeared an article by George Rothwell Brown entitled "WALLACE and Our National Tariff Policy."

Mr. Speaker, I have read no article which more concisely or more completely discloses the wishful thinking of Vice President WALLACE, or which more accurately characterizes the same, than this article. It should be read carefully by every Member of the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States. It is unfortunate that every thinking American throughout the country cannot be given this privilege.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WALLACE AND OUR NATIONAL TARIFF POLICY

WASHINGTON, January 4.—Vice President WALLACE is a heart-thinker and in no sense a brain-thinker, and since in persons of this type a sort of ecstatic emotionalism takes the place of intellectuality, it is often dangerous to accept their leadership.

Great Britain and, thus far in its history, the United States of America have won out to national greatness because nearly always they have been guided by hard-headed men and women of practical common sense.

Winston Churchill, when he said in the House of Commons that it was no part of his job to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire, was following realistically in the footsteps of Queen Elizabeth, who—apparently callously—risked no part of England to aid the oppressed Protestants of the Low Countries until England herself was menaced by Philip of Spain.

In the closing days of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln, meeting the Confederate Commissioners, said to them:

"Gentlemen, if you will write Union at the top of this sheet of paper, you may write anything else you like."

Lincoln's heart was set on preserving the Union, not on freeing the slaves. The sentimentalists of the sixties would have sacrificed the Union to abolish slavery.

When public men in high places like HENRY WALLACE undertake to condition the American mind, it is the part of wisdom not to permit their sentimentality and emotionalism to run away with the facts of life.

One of the great economic facts of the American way of life has been the protection of American industries by tariff laws. Some of these particular laws have been in themselves indefensible, but the general principle has been sound, and but for the industrial strength they nourished and developed, the United States today would not be in a position—as it is in a position—to arm, feed, clothe, and finance virtually the whole world.

In Mr. WALLACE'S latest speech are several disquieting thoughts which seem to reflect a purpose concealed within the idea to which he gives expression. He hints that, in the after-war world, the American tariff policy cannot be justified.

This does not stand alone in this particular speech of the Vice President. Not long ago he said in another address that after the war our synthetic rubber industry must be scrapped, except for a bare laboratory nucleus, in order that we might continue to buy imported rubber.

This is a striking example of heart thinking. The clear meaning of today's tremendous effort to supply our rubber needs for war from synthetic processes is that after this war is over we shall never again have to go back to obtaining rubber from the juice of trees halfway across the world. We shall have learned how to get rubber more cheaply and more easily—and without ever again placing ourselves at the mercy of an unconscionable alien rubber cartel.

The impediment offered by our national tariff policy to the altruism flickering through the rosy dreams of Mr. WALLACE is understandable.

It is disquieting, moreover, because we have at the head of our State Department a very distinguished and otherwise able American gentleman who unfortunately happens to be a convinced free-trader. Thus our foreign affairs are in the hands of one who is intellectually hostile to the whole protective theory.

What Mr. WALLACE is driving at naturally causes one to wonder. It causes one to recall the recent request of Congress by the President for power to suspend at pleasure all tariff laws, a request which the Congress, in its hard-headed—if belated—wisdom, refused to grant.

Those tariff principles, behind whose walls American industry has grown to the stature of a giant and American labor has become the wealthiest in the world, stand in the way of the far-flung philanthropies of the visionary and the internationalist.

Mr. Churchill is the British exponent of a policy of enlightened national self-interest.

We probably shall not look in vain, when the time comes, for a Yankee of the same hard-headed breed.

Study of Peace Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSIE SUMNER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I

submit the following informal comment on the President's message of January 7 because it relates to the House resolution for a special investigating committee which I have introduced today:

Every American takes off his hat to American heroism and accomplishment in this war. Every American will welcome the President's hint that victory may come before the 1944 election. The President's description of his peace aims were as vague as his promise of a prosperous permanent job for each and every person. What has he in mind? I do not know anybody who does not believe in keeping enough Army and Navy to defend the Western Hemisphere. I don't know of anybody since Columbus who thinks of America as an island.

New Dealers have been sending up so many trial balloons concerning their post-war plans that they have created a barrage balloon which prevents our getting down to their real intentions. Anyway, I'm for having a special congressional committee investigate the kind of peace terms America needs to announce in order to hasten the day when our enemies shall surrender and we can bring the boys home.

The Senate alone, to be sure, has jurisdiction under the Constitution over peace treaties, but some of the suggested peace plans are more important than treaties. They are as significant as a counterrevolution against the American War for Independence. I shall introduce at once a resolution for an investigation by a special committee of the House. I want to be a member of that committee. I want the chance to cross-examine the New Dealers who are saying that joining the League of Nations would have kept us out of this dreadful war. And those who are saying that America was isolationist during the 1920's when American money was running wild all over the world building up competitive foreign industries and even financing foreign rearmament. I want to find out if America hasn't been running hog wild ever since we fell off the wagon in 1917.

We should not abandon the foreign policy laid down by George Washington which a century full of American statesmen of both parties were wise enough to follow, without at least knowing what we are doing. Our traditional American foreign policy consisted of letting European nations find out that when they went to war America stayed out and developed while they lost their resources and the flower of their manhood. That traditional American foreign policy brought more peace, freedom, prosperity, and civilization to the world than it had ever known before. The American people have the right to know whether it was our traditional foreign policy which failed us in 1917 and again in 1941 or whether the fault was with the leadership which failed to follow our sterling policy.

It looks suspicious that the very same people who were so red hot to get into both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 should be leading the fight for some vague law or plan which, they say, will keep us out of the next scrap. Maybe there is no law, tradition, alliance, or Keeley cure which will break us of the war habit we seem to have acquired since 1914; maybe there is a legislative solution. Since the question involves life or death for the next generation of American manhood, however, it deserves a scientific and exhaustive investigation. Permanent union with foreign nations is not a question which should be decided in one small, smoke-filled brain or group of brains. To each and every American citizen it is at least as important as his marriage contract.

The United States as a Basis for a New World Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] at the Institute of World Affairs, Riverside, Calif., on December 14, 1942.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The subject which our chairman has said I selected for tonight was in reality selected for me. I realize that such a subject is a challenge, but I felt that if I could meet the challenge here under the inspiration of the Institute of World Affairs that I might be able to think the problem through and thus see if the history and governmental habit of the United States offer constructive contributions toward a new world order.

Whenever we talk about America to Americans, the temptation is to revert to the spirit of the old college song whose words ran, "Of course, you can never be like us, but be just as like us as you are able to be." If the whole world could be like us, we assume it would be a perfect world. Now, for fear you might think I am going to answer the challenge by assuming that we have the answer to all problems in world organization, let me say first of all that if we do not win this war there is nothing in American political experience or American political history which will contribute toward the world order that will be thrust upon us. If those things which we call American are good, then this war which we are fighting is in every sense a war against wickedness. All that America stands for is found on the side of the Allies, for very little American theory or practice is represented in fascism, nazi-ism, or in the theories of a dominated Asia. The notion of bringing about a forced world unity is not consistent with American traditions. Therefore, before we can contribute to the new world order, victory must be ours. That victory I assume, and with it I assume that the victors want to bring about a world of peace where peace-maintaining institutions will prevail.

There is a phase of this world struggle, spoken of as global, which we have never had before. Of this phase we are forgetful. It is the most important of all phases because in this struggle which is now going on we not only have democracy fighting for its very life, but we have at the same time coming to a fruition the three greatest revolutions that the world has ever experienced. These revolutions, separate and different as we imagine they are, are a unity in fundamental problems, and the success of these revolutions is linked to the success of the American cause in this war. The three great revolutions are the Russian, the Chinese, and the Indian. All of them must be settled constructively if those great peoples are to contribute to the new world. Without those great peoples we cannot have a new world; and, what is more, without them we cannot even have victory. In many characteristics these revolutions are complements and outgrowths of the American Revolution. In a realization of this fact we may find the key to their contribution toward a new world order.

Another point we must keep constantly in mind is that our allies, natural as they now seem to us, were in fact allies by chance. The big four—Great Britain, China, Russia, and the United States—are not allies from choice; they were forced into unity by attack from without, just as China was forced into a unit by the Japanese invasion. Each of the great revolutions presents problems that seem insurmountable. These are our problems because they are those of our allies and we cannot separate the revolution from China, India, and Russia. Add to the problems of the victorious those of the vanquished, and all, I hope, must see that the peace is not to be an easy one. It is, in fact, very much more difficult and complex than the winning of the war itself.

We are not going to have a happy time in making the peace. I will cite but one problem: Of Russia's 180,000,000 people, 90 percent are small agriculturists, and until lately many faced sure starvation every year. In India, with 380,000,000, 95 percent are small farming people, and they face the same sort of privation. Then we turn to China, with her 400,000,000, made up of simple farm people almost all of whom have had their troubles in gaining the minimum supplies for life. Thus one unity found in the revolutions of three of our great allies is a unity of stress and economic want. Relieving such conditions is one of our greatest hopes. Here also is the key to our own future prosperity. With the new wealth created by the activity of these hundreds of millions of people in redeeming themselves from economic misery will come demands for our surpluses and the subsequent promotion of our own prosperity.

There is another unity which is, indeed, a culmination of the American Revolution. One hundred and fifty years after our Revolution, we find the peoples of these three great countries thinking in terms of welfare—welfare for human life, welfare for all the people—and the genius of that spirit has borne fruit, especially in Russia, greatly in China, and will become more and more evident in the Indian revolution. Therefore, America has offered much toward the new world, and her ideals have been an incentive to action and thought.

Now to our theme. With the background presented, it is not difficult to see why the theme given me is a challenge. America should contribute much because the American Constitution represents the oldest of all living governments. Our Constitution is now the father of many. We have been able to bring about stability because we have not expected perfection at any time in our constitutional rights or in our behavior. There are many questions still unsolved. We have not reached absolute justice. There are differences of opinion in our different States, but we do get along with one another and we do not do much harm to one another. We have learned how to be restrained by law. The glory of America is not entirely in her accomplishments, for America today is still a great hope and a wonderful promise more than she is an accomplished fact.

Still, there is much in our Constitution upon which the new world order may build. First of all, there is our Federal system. I know of no contribution that in any way ranks with that. The Federal system has not been worked out perfectly. There is not an equality of opportunity in all the States—the citizen in one State is not quite so well off as in other States. Still, the notion

that the local community shall take care of local affairs and the national community general, is a theory which will hold for a community as wide and complex as the world. It may become the key to a just, honest, and equitable world order. And the Federal system can be expanded in bringing about that world order. Every organization that has been suggested, every organization that has been obtained looking to a broader world organization, whether on a regional scale or on a whole world scale, has always accepted some elements of the Federal system. So America can offer that contribution.

If we are going to have a lasting world society which can and will control the wrongdoer among nations, we must be able to conceive of the whole world as a unit. A smaller unit will no longer suffice. The League of Nations is just what it is called, a league of nations. It is not world-wide in its aspects. It was never thought of as a world society. It was assumed to be a league of nations where nations dealt with one another. It did not extend itself in taking care of men within a nation, excepting as it acted as an agent for the various nations in that regard. Another thing, it was organized for the benefit of Europeans primarily. It was not assumed that it would be universal in the sense that the Atlantic Charter has been made out to be universal. The new world order must think of the world as an entity. That is possible not only to conceive, but also possible to attain if we will build it upon the theory which the founders of our Government had in mind when they provided for a Union made from smaller entities, wherein the smaller entities controlled matters of particular or local interests while the Union was established to control things common to all and of general interest.

The problem of peace and war was recognized then as being of general interest, so the right to make war and maintain the peace was left with the Union. Since war and peace are now proved beyond question to be matters of universal concern, there can be no doubt in anyone's mind that the United Nations must maintain a peace force. That force must be directed from that center where the United Nations' power has been and is now being directed in the war.

If we are going to have a world entity—social, political, economic, geographic, physical—the biggest entity that we can conceive, the world as it is; if we are going to think of a government of people and a world organized for the benefit of world people we must some way or another work into that scheme the place for the individual in the world. That is the greatest problem facing any government and it is multiplied hundreds of times when we think of the place of a person in any kind of world organization. The key to the individual and his place in world society can be found within the structure of the American Constitution, and that is a very, very important contribution. It took us in America until after the Civil War to write into the Constitution a definition of citizenship, and when we wrote it in we wrote in larger terms than we thought. I am sure, too, that citizenship aspects of the fourteenth amendment have never been thought through, because we did something which in the history of governments must be considered as epochal. It came after the Civil War, after a war between the States, after a war that occurred because both sides accepted a concept and definition of the Government that does not have great meaning today. Thus when Webster and Calhoun debated, Mr. Webster said that sovereignty is indivisible, therefore must be vested in the Nation. Calhoun accepted the same definition, and argued that since sovereignty was indivisible it must be vested in the States. Since a logical deduction is always worth fighting over, we fought, but out of the fight came better understanding and now we see that the old definition did not amount to very much. We smashed that definition by creating a new definition of citizenship, growing out of our Federal experiences, which pledged that "all persons born in the United States or under its jurisdiction are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside." A duality of citizenship was set up. It worked. It worked better than we imagined, and we here tonight are citizens not only of the United States but also of the State wherein we reside. We owe responsibility to both of those sovereignties.

Thus we have worked out a technique which can be expanded if we want to expand, a technique which may go so far as to bring out all of the characteristics of sovereignty and individuality and thus bring about a multiplicity of personality as we have it in our lives. Of course, we do not admit that there is such a thing, but the American citizen is, indeed, a very complex individual.

The American theory of dual citizenship does not permit of duality where obligations are in conflict. The duality does not work horizontally; it only is possible vertically. By that I mean there cannot be two State citizenships or two national citizenships. But a person can be a citizen of many political entities without conflict. It is that American experience which can contribute to the future world organization without in any way marring the obligations or detracting from the privileges of American citizenship. The present Allied air force, which is made up of citizens of many nations, not only shows us how easy it will be to form a United Nations peace force but it also shows us how citizenship in many nations does not detract from ability to display general loyalties. There are many fine things in the making, all of which will contribute to a better order if we but have wit and common sense to use them. The finest things in life are those we share with others. As with love, the more we give the more we get; so with liberty and freedom. The more we allow, the surer our own becomes. I cannot refrain quoting here what I wrote about France nearly 3 years ago: "I wonder if the thoughtful in France today are not looking with a new hope to their goddess left with us here in the West? Surely this symbol of a better world, placed with us for safekeeping, must shine with greater meaning than ever it has before. Perhaps some future poet of France, with that French subtlety which took our liberty from the battlefield and made her the goddess of culture, will say, 'We gave her to you to keep for us so that, when we wandered from the way, we could be guided back again. That which was sweet and dear in life we did not appreciate when it was ours. Now that it is lost we know its worth. If you will help us to get it back, we promise we will not withhold it from others.' The French, like some Americans, thought freedom was for them alone. No; freedom is for all. Like the greatest of all the gifts of the gods, if we are selfish with it, we lose it."[1]

When we are thoughtful we discover that our American citizenship is so complex that another responsibility, another duty, another obligation, or another right will in no sense destroy its greatness. This then is another key in our American scheme to which we may turn.

But the greatest of all contributions is one written in our Constitution, to which few call our attention. It is the simple guaranty that the Federal Government will see that a republican form of government is maintained in all the States. Every State government is built on the basis of that Constitution, and every State Governor takes an oath to abide by that Constitution in addition to his State constitution. It is probably the greatest guaranty of any political document in the world and a most effective one. Now, if the future world is to grow up or if it is to be built, if it is going to be lasting, if it is going to mean anything in peace as in war, we must first of all have a United Nations peace force to see that the wrongdoers among nations are brought to order and that no nation shall fall into the state into which some have fallen during the last few years. The United Nations organization must be something besides a body to pass judgment on the aggressor and put him down—to pass judgment on the nations and stop at that point. It must have some authority in its document of organization to maintain the republican form of government, in the sense that we understand it, in all countries. Now, I do not mean that we are to jerk kings from their thrones. But if this war is to be what we think it is—a people's war against those forces which will destroy people's rights—if it is to be a war to take care of the people's interest against those single-willed statesmen who believe that all ideas should come from a dictator, if this war is for the people against a totalitarian dominated community, then some idea closely related to what we call the republican form of government is necessary. We cannot have a world organization unless it is based upon some type of democratic process if we are going to keep it controlled and keep it working for the benefit of the people of the world. If we are not fighting for the benefit of men, women, and children, then it seems to me that all that we are doing is definitely in vain. If we do not want to take the stand that America has decided to take in this regard, we must turn our backs upon these American ideals.

We should look to the efficiency of Admiral Yamamato, who knows exactly what he is doing and does it. If we do not like the principles of American Government, let us turn to the glorious efficiency of Hitler and Goebbels. They have a single purpose and are going to thrust upon the men, women, and children of the earth a world order in accordance with their ideas. If we do not like the American way the United Nations' way, let us turn to these gentlemen. I ought to mention Mr. Mussolini, I suppose. We ought to bring him in, and when we bring him in along with the others we come to the biggest of all the problems we have facing us at the present time, and that is the problem of war guilt and punishment afterwards. My hope tonight is that you and I will face not only this problem, but also the others I have stated tonight, intellectually and not emotionally. These men may have to be punished, but don't let us talk about "hanging the Kaiser" and then not do anything about it!

And that brings me to the place where I started. We have got to win the war, and we have got to win it in such a way that the war leaders of our enemies know that we have beaten them. We must never do what we did before, let the German armies go home intact and organize the "steel helmets" against the people back home who, according to the soldiers, deceived them and led them into defeat. That is the greatest shortcoming of all that we did before. Let us not be sentimental; let us do what was done when Washington took the sword from Cornwallis. By that act we got an admission from the soldier in the field that he had been defeated. That admission must come from all our enemy generals and admirals before a peace built around the philosophy of the United Nations is possible. There is no other way to teach the lesson this world needs most: First, that war is of concern to the whole world; and second, that the United Nations will see to it that wrongdoers among nations are taught that war does not pay!

[1] See my Thomas Jefferson, World Citizen, p. 9.

Functions of the New Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me over short-wave radio to Latin America, on January 7, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Translation from the Spanish)

Friends and fellow Americans, it is indeed a pleasure for me to speak this evening over short wave for the purpose of directing to Latin America a few ideas related to the functions of the new North American Congress during the days that lie ahead.

God willing, the year 1943 will see the banners of the Allied Nations waving victoriously in the vanguard of our military units. In order to attain this goal, it will be necessary that every American face the many and complex problems which have arisen as a result of the war effort. Recent experience has proved that we cannot avail ourselves of measures that are anything other than complete and efficient. It is equally necessary, therefore, that we work together, making like sacrifices. During the critical times in which we live, this is imperative.

It is manifest that the role played by the Congress of the United States, and the role which it must continue to play, is one of singular importance, in view of the fact that this legislative body represents one of the three branches of government in our democracy. In spite of the fact that the functions of the legislative branch are expressed with all clarity in our Constitution, the tension incident to the present crisis has created the necessity of affording the President powers much more extensive than have ever been extended to any other Chief Executive. As we have already said, this action was necessary as a result of the great emergency in which we found ourselves. Before commenting upon what we should expect of the new North American Congress, let us rapidly survey recent world happenings, which in their turn have engendered the problems which the new Congress must solve.

During the past few years there have developed in this world of ours military forces whose powers are nothing less than formidable, and whose ambitions are nothing other than diabolical. There is no need for me to mention the names of the nations to which I refer. The results which they expect to attain do not, in any wise, constitute elements of mystery, considering that the Axis chiefs have expressed them both through the medium of print, and also by means of the conquests of vast geographic areas. The suppression and the suffering of unfortunate peoples permits us to visualize with great facility what could happen to us were we not to dedicate ourselves without reserve to the task of national defense. The brutality incident to the recent conquests of the Axis powers was born of an infernal determination to dominate the earth. Now that the Axis is beginning to suffer defeat we may expect a still more extensive and intensive application of this same brutality, considering that this is always what happens with an aggressive people in the throes of desperation.

In my opinion, there is no doubt whatever that the Allied Nations will be the victors, but at the same time I am convinced that the task which we face is tremendous, and involves a great deal of difficulty. From the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor until the present date, the North American people have performed miracles in the field of the production of materials of war, and this production of only 1 year is a sample of what can be expected later. We North Americans are beginning to feel the effects of an all-out war effort. There are some commodities which can no longer be secured, and there are others which can be acquired only in small quantities. The pleasure car (is there anything more American!) is disappearing from the streets and highways of the Nation. Our brothers are in trenches of Guadalcanal, and on the uncomfortable sands of Africa. American mothers weep over the departure of their sons to distant lands, perhaps never to return. Yes, gentlemen, we fully understand that we are in the midst of a total war!

The Congress of the United States was, is, and always will be an integral part of the North American political system. But there are moments, my friends, during which the slow pace of the democratic process must be modified in favor of the common weal, giving to the Executive extraordinary, but temporary, powers. The task of the new Congress will be difficult; it will have to modify normal legislative procedures in order to adapt them to the exigencies of the hour, and at the same time function within the contents of the Constitution. It must, however, maintain a constant vigil over those special and exclusive privileges which that great document has granted to the American Congress.

There are many who say, and doubtless will continue to say, that the American Congress is losing its importance, transferring its prerogatives to the executive branch of government. This notion is the fruit of superficial minds. Although our Constitution is written in words which do not permit of false interpretations, nevertheless the practical mentality of the North American will not fail to find means of utilizing the provisions of the Constitution in view of a great emergency. The Congress of the United States has never failed the Nation, and will continue to fulfill its duties without losing an iota of its constitutional privileges. The Congress will not permit a time of crisis to permanently disturb our democratic edifice. Similarly, it will never permit the loss of that liberty and independence which we all enjoy. The North American way of life is not perfect, but it is so superior to that which the Axis wishes to impose upon us that the very notion of trying to compare them is little short of sickening.

The new Congress of the United States, the same as the recent Congress, is composed of individuals who, in spite of belonging to one or another political party, are first, last, and always American, with a capital A. I am confident, therefore, that the new Congress will dedicate itself to the war effort with the same American spirit demonstrated by those who work in the factories and the soldiers and sailors who daily expose themselves to the enemy. It cannot be otherwise. Whether we realize it or not, we are all in uniform.

During the past year our President, as everyone who understands and recognizes the nature of the present struggle, saw the necessity of asking special powers of the Congress. The Congress not only gave him these powers, but also carried out with care every wish of the Commander in Chief, toward the end of defending and perpetuating the dignity, the sovereignty, the liberty, and security of America. Our task will be long and arduous, and until such time as the defeat of our enemies be complete, the new Congress will not cease to dedicate itself to the protection of those ideas which are the lifeblood of our democratic institutions.

As soon as we are able once more to enjoy the beautiful music of peace, the President and the Congress will return to their executive and legislative duties respectively and exclusively. At the present moment we have grave problems to solve, and we are determined to solve them.

Output of Vessels During the Past Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I offer for publication in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, and War Shipping Administrator, on the subject of the output of vessels during the past year. Let me take a moment to say that the achievement in the building of over 8,000,000 deadweight tons of shipping in the past 12 months is, without any extravagance of statement whatever, in the nature of an industrial marvel.

I wish to commend the Maritime Commission and every member of it, the Shipping Administrator, Admiral Land, the workers, and the shipyards in the heartiest and most enthusiastic way.

There have been some criticisms. Let me say that I have looked into them. I do not intend to bring them forward now, but I am prepared to say that every complaint which has been made regarding any transaction may be justly and satisfactorily answered on the floor of the Senate. In the meantime I wish to express grateful appreciation to the leader in this great achievement, Admiral Land.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Roosevelt, in his annual message to Congress on the state of the Union last January, issued directives for the war effort, which included the construction of 8,000,000 tons of merchant shipping to be delivered in 1942.

It is a privilege to report that American shipbuilders have not only met the President's wartime directive, but have exceeded it. We have put into service 746 ships of 8,090,800 deadweight tons in the 12 months just concluded. The total does not include a number of vessels built for the armed forces nor 800 small craft.

As the year closed, four ships were being delivered every day, a schedule reached a month in advance. We are now building ships at the rate of 14,400,000 tons per year. We should reach our peak in May when we will begin to put ships in service at the rate of five a day. Our original goal for 1943, set last February 1942, was 16,000,000 tons. This goal will be passed if our shipbuilders are given the materials and equipment needed.

The Victory fleet of 746 vessels delivered into service in 1942 included 542 Liberty ships, 62 tankers, 62 of the Commission's long-range standard C-types, 55 cargo ships for the British, 5 coastal freighters, 5 ore carriers, and 15 special types.

Every world record for merchant-ship construction was broken in 1942. At no time in history—not even during the peak of the great shipbuilding program of the last war, when 5,500,000 tons were delivered in 12 months—has any country ever built as much merchant tonnage in a single year.

The record year of 1942 was climaxed by a record month in December when 121 ships of 1,199,300 deadweight tons were placed into service. The best previous month's total was September's of 93 ships of 1,016,112 deadweight tons. It is interesting to recall that during the entire year of 1941, 95 ships of 1,088,000 tons were completed, less than the month of December. Thus, in the space of a year construction has increased more than 700 percent.

The ships that were built in 1942 are part of our answer to the never-ending battle against Axis submarines. This steady stream of new ships, better and larger than many that were sunk, carries supplies to our fighting forces all over the world. Many of the merchant ships in the huge convoy that made possible the invasion of North Africa were Liberty ships, recently delivered from shipyards and rapidly manned and loaded for their first voyages.

Several factors have made possible the production records of American shipyards. Most important is the close cooperation between labor and management, and their willingness not only to adopt new methods and ideas but also to pledge themselves to eliminate work slow-downs or stoppages. The morale in most of our shipyards has been excellent and has had an important part in attaining great production.

Other contributory items to the great records are:

Extensive prefabrication, or the building of large sections of a ship before they are carried to the shipways;

Adaptation of assembly line methods, supported by a flow of materials procured through central purchasing;

Increased use of welding instead of riveting which results in conserving manpower, faster construction, a saving in steel, and a stronger ship structure; and

Standardization of design and no changes.

The achievements in most of our shipyards have been sensational. America can be proud of the more than half million men and women employed in building craft for the merchant marine. In addition, there are approximately a million working in factories throughout the country, producing parts, materials, and supplies for ships.

Another most important factor in the maritime program is the maintenance and repair of this vast merchant fleet; keeping our vessels in service, installing guns and other defense equipment and repairing damage incurred through enemy action and other causes. Our repair yards employ many thousands and are taxed to their capacity. They are doing a job that has attracted too little public attention. During the past year they have serviced over 15,000 vessels owned by this country and the United Nations. Ships have been blown in half, sunk and raised and repaired and returned to service. Whenever possible, we have salvaged every available derelict and put it into use.

The shipbuilding record is all the more remarkable when it is considered that more than 90 percent of the workers have had to be trained for the jobs they are now doing in the shipyards. The training systems sponsored by the Maritime Commission, and in which the various shipyards cooperate, have aided us in our labor problem. Thousands of the men and women working in our yards had never seen a shipyard until the day of their employment. Our manpower problems have been difficult and will continue to trouble us in 1943.

Another serious problem encountered in our rapidly expanding shipbuilding program was the procurement of adequate managerial talent for all the new yards set up. Shipbuilding had become a minor industry until revived by the Maritime Commission's initial construction program begun in the latter part of 1937. Every shipbuilder was pressed into service along with many others from other fields.

During 1942 many crackpot ideas, plans, schemes, and "sure answers" to all troubles were dumped at our door. Many were conscientious and sincere—many pure buncombe and promotion. We waded through the deluge and have reached this new year with a magnificent, dynamic shipbuilding industry.

It has not been easy to plan, organize, and carry out this huge program in such a short time. Mistakes have been made by us and by the yards. Some of our plans have not met our expectations. We still have problems. New ones will develop. But, in face of all the problems attendant upon such an undertaking, it can be fairly said that all hands have done a grand job.

That we have been able to expand our shipbuilding program again and again is primarily due to the farsighted action by President Roosevelt and the Congress in 1936 when the present Merchant Marine Act was passed and approved. It provided that the Commission should take steps to reestablish the American merchant marine and to see that ample auxiliary vessels were made available for our armed forces in event of an emergency or war. More than 300 such ships have already been turned over directly to our Army and Navy, and each month this number is steadily increasing.

In the latter part of 1937, the Commission began its long-range building program. It called for 50 new ships a year for 10 years. At that time there were but 10 yards with 46 shipways in the United States capable of building 400-foot oceangoing vessels. Much of that capacity was used by the Navy. Today the Maritime Commission's program is employing more than 60 yards with more than 300 ways for the construction of large merchant ships. This increase of more than 600 percent in our shipbuilding capacity would not have been possible if the ground work had not been laid in 1937.

Upon the inauguration of the accelerated building program in 1941, the Commission adopted the Liberty ship as a type of simplified design for an emergency cargo ship. The Commission's program was viewed as a mass production assembly project. Mindful of the congestion caused during the last war by heavy concentration of shipbuilding in such large yards as Hog Island, the Commission undertook the distribution of construction geographically and to small concerns throughout the country long before there was general acceptance of a spread-the-work policy.

The Maritime Commission has shipyards in 24 States on the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts and the Great Lakes, and more than 1,200 factories in 32 States are producing material for ships. The Commission set up a central purchasing plan so as to avoid highly competitive buying and undue congestion in one area while another is short of work. The efficient procurement of steel, engines, gear, and auxiliary equipment played an important part in the shipbuilding production record as at all times it was necessary to have an orderly flow of materials delivered at the right time at the right places.

It may be difficult for many to appreciate the great job being done by our shipyards unless it is compared to the last war, the only other time when such war pressure conditions existed. In the last war, we did not reach our peak until 10 months after the armistice, in September 1919, when 814,886 deadweight tons of ships of all types—steel, wood, concrete, and composite—were delivered. Very few ships were completed in time for war service.

Now, although we have yet to reach our peak, we are almost 400,000 tons per month ahead of the 1919 highest mark. We have already delivered ships that are playing a most vital part in delivering men and munitions throughout the world on voyages 3,000 to 14,000 miles to the battlefronts. More new yards and new ways about to come into production within the next few months will help us attain our peak in May, when we will begin to deliver ships at the rate of five a day. Today our ships are 30 to 40 percent larger than those built during the last war. During the last war the average deliveries took about 7 months per ship. During this December 82 Liberty ships, a record number, were delivered—the average time from keel laying to delivery being only 55 days. Last January, when the 3 Liberty ships were completed, they required about 280 days each.

Some yards have turned in notable performances by delivering ships in particularly fast time, such as 7 days in a special demonstration job to illustrate what could be accomplished through prefabrication. However, the Commission has been more interested in attaining a general reduction in the building time for all ships by all yards.

The progress made by the Liberty shipyards is one of the most amazing aspects of the entire program. With about 65 percent of our program devoted to this 10,500-ton cargo carrier, it has been necessary to set up 18 yards to build the 1,500 Liberty ships contracted for 1942 and 1943. Practically all the Liberty-ship yards started from scratch and have converted what was barren waterfront, often swamps, into throbbing plants employing many thousands.

With the exception of Bethlehem-Fairfield and Oregon Shipbuilding, which each delivered one ship late in December 1941, the Liberty shipyards did not come into production until 1942, having first had the task of building shops and shipways and training workers. The great volume of their production can be seen from the following table.

Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, Portland, Oreg., led the Nation with the deliverey of 113 Liberty ships representing 1,219,300 deadweight tons. Not far behind was California Shipbuilding Corporation, Wilmington, Calif., with 109 Liberty ships of 1,175,900 deadweight tons.

In the East Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., Baltimore, Md., was the leading producer with 77 Liberty ships of 830,400 tons. This yard would have delivered over 100 ships also but as it was reaching its peak, a considerable portion of its facilities was diverted to a special type of construction for the armed services. The North Carolina Shipbuilding Co., Wilmington, N. C., delivered 51 Liberty ships of 549,600 tons.

In the Gulf area Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, Houston, Tex., with 32 Liberty ships of 345,300 tons and Delta Shipbuilding Co., Inc., New Orleans, La., with 28 Liberties of 302,200 tons were the most productive.

Tanker construction also set records with the delivery of 62 during the year. December set a new monthly high—10 tankers. Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa., which turned out seven in December, was the leader in the tanker field with 41 ships of 673,400 tons. Bethlehem-Sparrows Point Shipyard, Inc., Sparrows Point, Md., delivered 13 of 197,400 tons. The first large tanker to be built by a West coast yard was delivered by the Kaiser Co., Inc., yard at Swan Island, Portland, Oreg.

Grouping the yards geographically West coast yards built 368 vessels of 3,688,400 tons or 48.06 percent of the national tonnage total; East coast, 272 ships, 3,089,500 tons, 38.18 percent; Gulf coast, 97 ships, 1,010,400 tons, 12.49 percent; and Great Lakes, 9 ships, 102,500 tons, 1.27 percent.

The complete record of each yard follows:

Shipyard	Number of vessels	Type of vessel	Deadweight tons
Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., Mobile, Ala	18	Liberty	194,200
American Shipbuilding Co., Cleveland, Ohio	2	Ore carrier	36,800
Bath Iron Works, Bath, Maine	2	C2 cargo	15,100
Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., Baltimore, Md	77	Liberty	830,400
	11	Special type	25,300
Bethlehem-Fore River Yard, Quincy, Mass	3	Tankers	45,400
	1	C3	9,900
Bethlehem-Sparrows Point Shipyard, Inc., Sparrows Point, Md.	13	Tanker	197,400
	3	P and C	27,100
California Shipbuilding Corporation, Wilmington, Calif	109	Liberty	1,176,000
Consolidated Steel Corporation, Ltd., Wilmington, Calif	5	C1 cargo	46,300
Delta Shipbuilding Co., Inc., New Orleans, La	28	Liberty	302,200
Federal Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Kearny, N. J	2	Tankers	33,800
	11	C2 cargo	102,000
Great Lakes Engineering Works, River Rouge, Mich	3	Ore carrier	54,500
Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, Mobile, Ala	4	C2 cargo	41,400
Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, Houston, Tex	32	Liberty	345,300
Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation, Pascagoula, Miss	5	C3 cargo and P and C	53,200
Kaiser Co., Inc., Swan Island, Portland, Oreg	1	Tanker	16,600
Kaiser Co., Inc., Vancouver, Wash	2	Liberty	21,600
	4	Special type	9,200
Leathem D. Smith Shipbuilding Co., Sturgeon Bay, Wis	3	Coastal cargo	8,400
Marin Shipbuilding Division, W. A. Bechtel Co., Sausalito, Calif.	5	Liberty	54,000
Moore Dry Dock Co., Oakland, Calif	3	C2 cargo	20,100
North Carolina Shipbuilding Co., Wilmington, N. C	51	Liberty	549,600
Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, Portland, Oreg	113	do	1,219,400
Pacific Bridge Co., San Francisco, Calif	1	Coastal cargo	2,800
Pennsylvania Shipyards, Inc., Beaumont, Tex	10	C1 cargo	74,100
Pusey & Jones Corporation, Wilmington, Del	5	do	37,500
Richmond No. 1 (formerly Todd-California), Richmond, Calif.	25	British	252,500
	30	Liberty	323,800
Richmond No. 2, Richmond, Calif	63	Liberty	679,400
Seattle-Tacoma Shipbuilding Corporation, Tacoma, Wash	3	C3 cargo	27,000
South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation, South Portland, Maine.	12	Liberty	129,500
Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa	41	Tanker	673,400
	6	C2 cargo	57,200
Todd-Bath Iron Shipbuilding Corporation, South Portland, Maine.	30	British	303,000
	2	Liberty	21,600
Walter Butler Shipbuilders, Inc., Superior, Wis	1	Coastal cargo	2,800
Welding Shipyards, Inc., Norfolk, Va	2	Tanker	31,300
Western Pipe & Steel Co., San Francisco, Calif	4	C3 cargo	39,700
Total	746		8,090,800

What the Army Drinks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What the Army Drinks," written by the Honorable JAMES W. WADSWORTH, now a Member of the House of Representatives and formerly a Member of this body. He was a Senator of the United States during World War No. 1, and was ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs at that time. His article appeared in Collier's magazine of December 19, 1942. I ask that it be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have had an estimate made of the cost to print the article in the RECORD. The cost will be $101.25.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE ARMY DRINKS

(By JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Representative Thirty-ninth District, New York)

If there was the slightest chance of the Army being improved by military prohibition, even I would be for it. But it would not only bring no improvement, it would actually weaken—perhaps ruin—the healthiest, cleanest, best-behaved military organization the world has ever seen. These are not intangibles. They can be measured mathematically.

The conduct of American soldiers began improving with repeal and it has continued to improve in the 9 so-called wet years since, until it is now three or four times better than in the holy years of prohibition. This is not coincidence. The figures are too substantial to be accidental. The speak-easy and the bootlegger were largely responsible for the misbehavior of the past, and repeal is responsible for the improvement. The mildest prohibition will bring the bootlegger back to power and will again degrade our Army.

Furthermore, our modern soldiers drink very little liquor, whatever lurid stories you may have heard to the contrary. They are healthier than they were in the last war—so much healthier that the figures seem fantastic—they have higher religious standards than civilians, they are well-educated, well trained, and self-respecting.

I am convinced that the effort to impose prohibition on our troops is not an end in itself, but only another step toward making the whole country dry. It has been taken concurrently with the creeping paralysis of local-option elections that now have almost a fifth of the United States population living in dry areas, and is nothing more than a part of the same program that culminated in 1918 in the destructive eighteenth amendment.

Let's get down to figures. Tales of drunken soldiers are common in all towns in military areas and are used most convincingly in whispering campaigns organized by the drys. Few of them are true. But no one or dozen such instances is an accurate index to the behavior of the entire Army, and as a matter of fact, the figures show decisively that the occasional spree is not typical, and that there is less soldier rowdyism than during the frightful days of prohibition. The only key to the Army's manners are the courts-martial rate. Three different types of courts-martial are used—summary, special, and general. Summary court deals with trivial offenses, as in a civilian police court; special court with more serious offenders, and general court with the gravest crimes.

The number of cases tried has declined steadily since repeal, with one or two minor breaks. In 1932, the last full year of prohibition, the Army had 103 summary courts-martial for every 1,000 enlisted men; in 1941, with liquor legally available to 80 percent of our population, it had only 31, less than a third as many. In 1932 it had 41 special courts-martial per 1,000 men; in 1941 it had only 13, again less than a third. In 1932 it had 24 general courts martial per 1,000 men; in 1942 it had just 3, one-eighth as many.

If our soldiers were as riotous as prohibitionists' propaganda would make us believe, Army discipline must have been disgracefully relaxed to bring so few punishments. But Army discipline is too standardized by tradition and experience to change appreciably.

How much drinking do our soldiers do? Most of them don't drink alcohol at all. Those who do get into the alcoholic field confine themselves so thoroughly to beer that the distillers would be in the direst financial straits if they had to depend on soldiers for their profit.

The Army recently made a survey of the drinking habits of two combat divisions of ground troops, and the results surprised even the Army itself. Fifty-seven out of every hundred men drank nothing alcoholic even on Saturday nights, the traditional time for sprees. Thirty-four men drank only beer, nine had a few nips of hard liquor.

In a similar study of two Army Air Forces units, 58 out of every hundred men confined themselves to nothing more violent than sarsaparilla, 31 quaffed beer, and 11 turned to liquor.

On Sunday nights, 75 out of a hundred in both groups were completely abstemious, 21 had beer, four had liquor. Weekday nights were about the same, with two or three more boys drinking beer, but only four touching liquor.

These are the figures, and any honest man who has been in close touch with Army camps knows they are true. I have been in more camps than I can remember, from Fort Devens, Mass., to Fort Riley, Kans., and if whisky drinking were an accurate indication of a man's strength and virility, we would have a feeble Army indeed. The men whom I saw consume remarkable quantities of everything but alcohol. Milk, soft drinks, and coffee are best sellers in post canteens, while near-by liquor-selling taverns are half empty.

The work of the military police impressed me, also. Most of the taverns cooperate willingly with Army authorities around the camps I have seen, but when one becomes too shoddy, it becomes "off limits" with a speed that shakes the proprietor to his senses.

Once "off limits," it is guarded by two military police, who see to it most effectively that the offending establishment's soldier business vanishes. When a tavern totters a bit in its standards, it may suffer nothing more serious than a few visits by veteran sergeants. The sergeants simply watch what's going on, but the expression on their faces—only sergeants can get those looks—usually reminds the bartender to change the tavern's policy.

In all my traveling around the country, I saw not one widespread soldier debauch.

The nearest thing was pathetically inoffensive. On one train, a group of sailors gathered at one end of a car and sang, discordantly, but soberly. Compare this with the sights we saw during prohibition, and with the official Army statistics, and you must come to the conclusion that the prohibition of liquor to men in uniform would be catastrophic.

The little drinking that goes on among our soldiers definitely does not make the imbibers less adaptable to Army life. In another careful Army survey, 26 percent of the well-adjusted soldiers turned out to be beer drinkers, while only 22 percent of the badly adjusted men had the habit. Which doesn't mean that drinking beer makes a better soldier, but it does mean that the better soldiers drink a little more beer.

If our young soldiers were the gin-soaked creatures they are sometimes rumored to be, they would get the conventional wages—sickness and death. Yet they are inspiringly sturdy, healthier by far than anyone expected them to be.

In 1917, for instance, admissions to military hospitals ran at the rate of 1,332 admissions for every thousand men in the Army. The apparently impossible figure is explained by the fact that a man with a broken foot, a chest cold, or a venereal disease must return to a hospital several times for treatment, and each visit is recorded as a new admission. But in August of 1942 (a representative month) the rate was only 761 admissions for every thousand enlisted men, little more than half what it was in the last war. The death rate for the same age group was 3.35 per 1,000 in 1917; in August 1942 it's 1.39.

In most other age groups, the drop in sickness and death rates has been just as dramatic. Only among men between 30 and 50 has illness increased, and only among those over 40 has the death rate gone up slightly, a minor phenomenon probably due to the heavier pressure of this swift war on older men. In 1917 we had a stagnant war of attrition. Now we have fast, fierce battles and superspeed movement, too strenuous for the elderly warrior—a powerhouse argument, incidentally, for getting younger men into the service as quickly as possible.

Rather than being an Army of dissipation, our soldiers are religious to an extent the civilian would rarely suspect. Our survey found 56 out of every 100 enlisted men attended church, and that a big majority of the well-adjusted soldiers were in the group. Twelve out of every 100 covered by the survey had consulted their chaplains for personal advice, a remarkable degree of reliance on religion for guidance.

RELIGION ON A LARGE SCALE

The Army began an unprecedented program of religious development, one of the soundest safeguards against bad living, long before Pearl Harbor. On May 4, 1941, it broke ground for a chapel at what was then the Arlington cantonment near Washington. It was the first of 900 such chapels which carry active religion to every man in service, the biggest single church-building program in the history of the world. At the same time, Protestant and Catholic clergymen and Jewish rabbis were recruited in such numbers that there is now one chaplain for every 1,200 enlisted men. Each is highly recommended by his church, and each endorsement must be renewed every year. If the renewal fails to come, the chaplain is released by the Army. So he doesn't relax. At the same time, steps were taken to "humanize" these chaplains. They were given training to enable them to match the physical condition of the enlisted men, proving they asked no special considerations. They were literally "men of God."

These chaplains have extremely close contact with the soldiers. They penetrate the lives of their wards much more deeply than the average clergyman can ever hope to reach his civilian congregation.

The Army's thoughtfulness went into such detail that the breast pocket of the regular Army blouse was designed to accommodate the special volumes of Jewish Holy Scriptures and New Testaments issued by chaplains.

These two good books themselves are an indication of the religious attitudes of our soldiers. They are issued only when directly requested by a soldier—yet last July alone more than 95,000 were given out.

Other figures for July, the latest on which compilation has been made, prove the usefulness and influence of the chaplains. More than 52,000 services were held, with a total attendance of almost 2,700,000 soldiers.

Is that an army of shame and degradation? Does it indicate that our "Fundamental strategy seems to be for us to drink our way to victory," to borrow the words of George Barton Cutten, president of Colgate University? Somebody's wrong.

Every responsible Army officer I have talked with says drinking among his men is an insignificant problem. And every available report shows it seldom becomes a major worry except in dry parts of the country. Senator BILBO gave evidence of this sort when he let out a tremendous blast about deplorable conditions around camps in his home State, bone-dry Mississippi. I know such conditions don't exist in the States where liquor is legal.

The local-option system, under which any area has the right to vote itself dry, is a menace to the Army, although no one questions the justice of the system. The dry areas now are simply small duplicates of the entire Nation during prohibition. Soldiers are strictly human, and the eighteenth amendment proved completely that humans will drink some, whether the law says they can or cannot. Where liquor is available openly, the military police have little difficulty keeping watch over the men, steering them away from intoxication and vice. In dry areas, liquor will be available somehow, and since the soldier usually can't get fancy liquor through prescription, he crawls into hidden speakeasies, out of reach of reasonable authority, rubbing up against every conceivable sort of wickedness; and he will drink more when it is forbidden. That's one big lesson we got from Volsteadism.

No place is dry simply because it votes that way. The Texas Legislature, for instance, a year ago this spring passed a law stipulating that doctors could write only 100 liquor prescriptions every 90 days. The law became effective July 31, 1941, and here's what happened that August, as compared with August 1940, according to the Texas Liquor Control Board (43 percent of the State is now dry, based on population):

The number of drug stores licensed to fill liquor prescriptions suddenly dropped from 484 to 121; the number of physicians holding permits to prescribe liquor fell from 1,184 to 95; the number of liquor prescriptions filled was cut from 449,288 to 3,592; the number of gallons sold on prescription skidded from 43,147 to 445.

Coincidentally, the control board reported that in September, the second month of limited prescription sales, the fines assessed in liquor cases and the number of seizures of stills were the highest of any month in years.

Yet the local-option privilege spreads dry laws through individual States with the relentlessness and thoroughness of a flourishing cancer. The strategy is simple. Prohibitionists concentrate on one county—let's call it A—preferably in the center of a State. In a ferocious campaign they get it to vote itself dry.

HOW PROHIBITION SPREADS

Business promptly starts deserting the dry county. Restaurants, hotels, legitimate night clubs, and other enterprises just across the line, in adjoining county B, prosper with trade that has left the now-dry neighboring county. So county A joins with the prohibitionists of county B in another whooping campaign, and county B is hypnotized into going dry. Then the two dry counties open up on the counties surrounding the two of them. Pressure is put on State politicians for help, funds are solicited from unhappy businessmen who don't want prohibition but who do want all the business they can get, and the bootleggers fatten the ante.

A list of recent local-option votes in Kentucky intrigues me. In the far western end of the State, Carlisle County voted dry on April 12, 1942. The next September, Ballard County, bordering Carlisle on the north, likewise went dry, along with 25 precincts of McCracken County, another Carlisle neighbor.

Butler County, in the southwest center of the State, voted dry April 11. Seven days later, Muhlenberg, Butler's western neighbor, followed suit, and the next September, Hopkins County, on Muhlenberg's western border, also fell in line. Other Kentucky votes on the issue show a similar pattern, with prohibition crawling slowly but surely from one county to the next and the next.

In some cases, we have found retail liquor dealers, usually most helpful in encouraging temperance and wisdom in the handling of alcohol, contributing to dry campaigns in nearby counties, deliberately trying to get their neighbors' business, which shows how much it can mean in dollar terms. Usually such fools find they have thrown a murderous boomerang.

No matter how far it spreads, this crawling disease never reaches a point satisfactory to the drys. I recall a statement made by the general superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League shortly after prohibition was adopted in 1918.

"When we had township option, we could do little with wet townships around us," he said sourly. "When we had municipal local option, we could do little with wet cities about us. When we had county option, we could do but little with wet States about us. And now what does it mean to have wet counties around us with the system of transportation now in the world?"

So whatever the drys say in their efforts to keep legal liquor from a town or State or soldier, they have only one objective—world-wide prohibition.

Prohibition is destructive in direct proportion to the size of the territory dried up. Every area containing a military establishment weakens that establishment when it sets itself up as dry. But the prohibitionists have never been particularly concerned about such destruction. Their whispering campaigns alone have hampered the Army in its sincere efforts to keep morale at a peak. Statements printed repeatedly in dry publications fed the grossly false whispers that large-scale drunkenness was responsible for our December 7 tragedy at Pearl Harbor; that liquor was being sold inside Army camps, and that acute alcoholism was widespread among troops.

Yet even a casual study of the truth demonstrates that the last thing we need worry about is the moral, mental, and muscular fitness of our soldiers, so long as we leave them alone. The surest way to change that happy state is to forbid them the basic civilian privilege of buying a drink openly and unashamedly on the infrequent occasions they want one.

The Army Reports to Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City, on the evening of November 12, 1942, Mr. Thomas H. Beck, president of the Crowell-Collier Publishing Co., gave a dinner to several hundred eminent guests in honor of the Under Secretary of War, Judge Robert P. Patterson. Because of the general public interest in the addresses delivered on that occasion, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Judge Patterson and the remarks of Thomas H. Beck be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR PATTERSON

For Americans the offensive phase of the war opened with the landing of our forces in North Africa.

The Sunday morning attack on Pearl Harbor took us into the war in a manner and at a time not to our choosing. The Japanese lost no time in attacking our other outposts in the Pacific—Guam, Wake, and the Philippines—always with superior numbers. These we lost after making heroic stands. But they were defensive stands, and in this huge global war we were at the start forced to fight on the defensive.

We bent every effort to strengthen our defenses in Alaska, Hawaii, Panama, and elsewhere. We turned back the Japanese fleet in the Coral Sea and at Midway with heavy losses, thus thwarting major Japanese offensive moves. We reinforced the Australians and with them have given a severe check to the Japanese forces in the Australian area by operations on New Guinea and the Solomons. The Japanese know by now that they are not fighting a decadent democracy, whatever the Japanese radio broadcasters at Tokyo may say. But most of our fighting thus far has been of a defensive character.

It is generally that way when the other side starts the fighting. The force that takes the offensive, that carries the war to the enemy, has great advantages. It can choose the time and the place for combat and can frequently concentrate strong striking power against a weak point in the defensive line. It can force the fighting. In war it is the nation that can take the offensive and maintain it without undue losses that comes out on top.

We are now passing from the defensive phase of the war to the offensive. That is the chief significance of our landings on North Africa.

Our expedition in North Africa is the largest force ever landed in one operation by the American Army and Navy. It is one of the largest, if not the largest, operation of its kind in the world's history. All elements in that force, land, water, and air, including the British elements that accompanied the force, are under a single commander, General Eisenhower. The landings made at the same time at many points on a coast line 1,000 miles long were made with remarkable precision, hitting almost to the second the scheduled times.

Our force has attained the set objectives thus far well ahead of schedule. The resistance which has been encountered was less than was expected, was the result of surprise and confusion, and clearly shows that the French are with us in our war on the Axis. French Morocco and Algeria are now firmly within our control, and it is becoming evident that the French Army in those areas will fight at our side as an ally.

This operation was timed with the attack of the British Eighth Army on Rommel's Afrika Korps. The two operations are one and were planned as one. A large measure of the credit for the joint operation must be given to the British Eighth Army. After two successful drives, both failing decisively to defeat Rommel, both followed by counterdrives which forced the Eighth Army back with heavy losses, after 2 years of hard fighting, the British Eighth Army has gained a notable victory. Rommel's force is broken and its elements routed or captured. The British Eighth Army has marked up the first smashing victory for the United Nations on land.

From Algeria our task lies east. One of our objectives will be in conjunction with the British Eighth Army to close with the Axis Army in North Africa and to force the fighting on ground and air. Another objective is the occupation of Tunisia, into which Hitler and Mussolini are now sending troops and planes. As Mussolini is well aware, Tunisia is not far from Italy. Within 400 miles of Tunisia lies the heart of Italy. Sicily is less than half of this distance. These points are all within range of our heavy, medium, and light bombers and our heavier fighter planes. Mussolini will soon have many more reasons to regret that fateful day when he stabbed fallen France in the back.

A further objective of our expedition to North Africa is to obtain military control of the Mediterranean and to cut down the supply lines to Egypt to one-fifth of the present distance. It will also shorten the supply lines to our valiant ally Russia, so we may deliver greatly increased quantities of munitions to the Russian front. Control of North Africa also is part of the encirclement of Hitler, an encirclement of hemispheric proportions, which will give us and our allies many more jumping-off places to carry the war to where it will be won—on German soil.

I want to turn for a minute from strategy and the job being done by our combat troops, to mention of the logistics of the African operation. The supply of armies seldom receives the plaudits of the crowd. It lacks the glamour, the dramatics of action on the battlefield. Great quartermasters die almost unnoticed; none of us, I suppose, could say who Napoleon's chief of supply was. Yet an army can never be better than its supply system. On that its whole operations depend.

One doesn't merely load soldiers with rifles on ships and send them off. Long months of careful planning for the task force are necessary. Workers on the production front know what it is to plan production. You know the vast amount of detailed planning that must go on before the first weapon comes off the line. It is that way in planning the dispatch of a task force in the Army, only much more so.

First, the force itself has to be decided on. How many troops are to be employed to carry on the mission? What will be the proportion of air troops and ground troops, and of the ground troops, how many will be armored units? Once these questions are answered, it becomes necessary to plan for the service troops required to maintain the combat troops in a high state of efficiency. The providing of service troops is a complex planning operation in itself. We must have port units to unload vessels, railway units to operate railroads, engineer units to build roads, bakery units to provide bread, medical units to care for the wounded and the sick, and many other units of specialists to see to it that the men at the fighting front are supplied with their needs.

When it has been decided which troops are to be employed, plans are made as to their equipment and supply and transportation.

Seven hundred thousand different items of equipment and supplies were required for the North African operation. There are more than 390 different items of clothing and individual equipment; more than 10,000 different Signal Corps items; 68,000 items of medical supplies and drugs; 100,000 Engineer Corps articles, including such things as bridges, bulldozers, well-digging equipment, storage tanks, railroad locomotives. There are 250,000 different ordnance items alone; these include tanks, guns, ammunition, and spare parts.

Not only must the initial supplies be shipped but the maintenance of troops in the field in combat must be assured. Take an item as simple as shoes. Each soldier on the North African expedition carried with him or in his barracks bag 3 pairs of shoes. To maintain these troops in the field, for every 100 men in the force 17 pairs of shoes must be shipped each month.

Ammunition requirements of a task force are tremendous. An infantry division in a normal day of combat would be expected to expend 300 tons of ammunition. One hundred 37 mm. antiaircraft guns in a normal day require 127.5 tons of ammunition. Gasoline on the basis of a planned requirement of 10 gallons per day per vehicle is also a matter of great concern to the supply services of the Army. There are few filling stations in North Africa.

Then there is the shipping, the escorting warcraft, and the loading of the ships so the troops can come off the boats fighting. In the North African expedition, 7 tons of shipping per man were required for the necessary initial equipment. And 1½ ship tons per man per month will be required to maintain the supply of this force.

These statistics give some insight into the logistics of large task-force operations. From them we also gain an appreciation of the reasons why second fronts cannot be established overnight.

The North African expeditionary force has commenced its task. We know that it will give an excellent account of itself in the fighting that will follow. We know that Hitler and his Italian satellite will react as violently as they have the means for, and their means are not spent by a long shot. While we have firm confidence in the fighting strength of our troops and in their success, we must be prepared for the temporary setbacks and reverses that are the fortunes of war.

We still have a long, hard war before us, a war that will be won by defeating the Nazis and the Japanese on the field of battle, a war that will be won by our fighting men in the air, on the ground, and on the water. We have passed from the defensive to the offensive, and that is great progress. We have made a successful landing and have opened up a new theater for fighting. We have also won the support of a French Army. That Army, inactive for 2 years, will fight on our side, with the knowledge that we have no territorial ambitions, no desire to profit at their expense. But we have not yet won a decisive victory over our adversaries in the Mediterranean area, and it would be a mistake to suppose that the road from now on will be easy. It will be hard.

We will reinforce that Army in North Africa. We will keep the supply lines open. We will redouble our production of weapons of war. Our hopes tonight are with those brave young

soldiers of ours who are in Morocco and Algiers, who will soon be in Tunis and Tripoli.

There is a sign posted in Russian factories which says "All for the front." A sign like that should be in our industrial plants, in our homes and in our hearts.

We now come to the less formal part of the program. I would like to tell you something of the purchase policies of the War Department, our pricing procedure and our program on the renegotiation of contracts. [Applause.] I didn't know that renegotiation was such a popular procedure.

The basic principle of our purchase procedure is to keep, so far as prices are concerned, the cost to the Government on a reasonable basis. We cannot rely upon the competitive forces that would in ordinary times keep prices down to a reasonable basis; so we have to rely, because of lack of competition, on administrative control.

The form of contract the War Department prefers, so far as price is concerned, is the fixed-price contract or the lump-sum contract, it being only fair, however, in view of the unsettlement of some conditions, for the Government to assume the risks that cannot be calculated.

We have the right, under the War Powers Act, to step a price up—we have had the right since last December—in case the contractor has made miscalculations as to what his figures are going to be or is caught short in a rise of costs. Those things do not deter us at all from the fixed-price contract.

We have now been developing a modified fixed-price contract. At first that took the form of introducing escalator clauses. They have not worked out well. They get very complex, and they are very hard to calculate and lead to many misunderstandings.

But we believe that by a modified fixed-price form of contract, which we are trying to develop now, we can arrange for short-term price fixing, with the price to be readjusted at stated intervals, agreed upon in the contract, from time to time; the price for the first period to be firm, and then, after experience has shown what conditions amounted to, we can arrive at negotiated prices for the remaining units of the term. The contract will be for the same quantity as at present and will read at the same price. There would be an apportunity for readjustment after, say the first 6 months, or whatever the appropriate period might be.

As you know, we resorted in many cases, at the outset, to cost-plus contracts. We are making fewer and fewer of them. They are not liked by the War Department. There is no control of costs under them, and they are entered into only where we have had no experience of any kind to go on and where it is only fair to the contractor in undertaking some item brand new to him, perhaps brand new to anybody in the country, to award him a cost-plus contract.

We will have to do more careful work than we have done heretofore on price supervision. That will involve the maintenance of more careful price records than we have had, more careful cost analysis and particularly a study of price trends. Take the contracts we were making in January of this year—take that as a base and arrive at trends from that point forward.

A good many of you, I know, have been troubled by the reconversion problem. I am sorry to say that I can't give you any definite light on that issue. I dare say that for current contracts, contracts now in operation, the problem of reconversion and the problem of termination, which goes along with it, will not be a pressing problem, because, as I said a few minutes ago, we are in for a fairly long pull, and those contracts will, in the main, be performed before there is any pressing problem of reconversion.

Let me now say a few words on that popular subject of renegotiation. The renegotiation move had its beginning last March. There were a series of cases presented to the Naval Affairs Committee of the House where certain contractors had made exorbitant profits and had indulged in wasteful items of costs. Bills were introduced in Congress providing for a flat profit limitation.

The War Department along with the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission opposed those measures for flat profit limitation, and we tendered Congress instead a renegotiation act. Congress acceded to that, but wrote the language a little differently from what we presented; in substance providing that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy should have power to renegotiate contracts, that contracts from that time on should have a renegotiation clause in them, and gave the Secretaries power to declare what profits were unreasonable in the course of the renegotiation.

I believe that that form of statute was much better than a flat profit limitation. With the great variety of weapons and munitions that we have to buy, I don't think any flat profit limitation could have been worked out that would have been fairly applicable to all kinds of producers.

Then, you had the problem of after taxes and before taxes, whether the profit limitations applied before or after. I myself have never been a believer in a flat profit limitation, applicable to contractors who deal with the Government but not to industry generally.

We had, as you know, 2 years ago a problem of getting some producers to take contracts for the War Department, and it always seemed to me that they had a fair kick in saying that they had plenty enough in their civilian business and why should they be subjected to a flat profit limitation if they dealt with the War Department when their competitors and others in the same line of business were allowed to continue in their civilian lines and make any profit they saw fit.

Excess-profits tax, on the other hand, deals with all alike, and is a ceiling upon the producer in civilian lines as well as on the producer who produces for the War Department.

Well, we organized to carry out our duties under the Renegotiation Act, where we have an extremely able man, Mr. Maurice Karker, chairman of the Price Adjustment Board for the War Department. I believe the Navy and Maritime Commission are effectively organized, too, although I don't know as much about their work. We ran into a great deal of criticism. I read a horrifying account a while ago of the amount of red tape that would be involved; that swarms of locusts and clouds of accountants and all that kind of thing were descending on people right and left.

I know that to be untrue so far as the War Department is concerned, because in our whole price adjustment work, in central headquarters at any rate, we have less than 50 people. Someone just drew on his imagination for that whole story, unless he confused price adjustment people with the people that we have out doing auditing on cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. There is a great deal of that going on, and necessarily so, and there may have been some confusion between people engaged in that activity, which, of course, has been going on for a couple of years, and people engaged in price renegotiation.

Another criticism is that there are no standards to go by. That is a fairly good criticism, I believe. Yet there are no standards to go by when we make original negotiations with a prospective contractor, and it is true, unfortunately, that some get better bargains than others. That is part of the social contract, I guess. But it has always been the case and it doubtless will be the case, no matter what our efforts may be on contract renegotiation.

Then our critics said that the contract for renegotiation procedure amounted to a penalty on efficiency. That is not true. The more efficient producer is allowed a larger margin of profit on contract renegotiation than the less efficient, and that is the settled policy that we follow.

We had a series of amendments that were added to the Price Renegotiation Act in October. Several of them, I think, are important enough to deserve mention. The amendments passed in October cover these things. In the first place they permit renegotiation by an over-all time basis rather than contract by contract. That has the advantage, of course, of not requiring private contractors to allocate costs between contracts. It also has the advantage of allowing the producer to set off loss on one contract against profit on a concurrent contract. There are also amendments putting time limits on renegotiation. It is now provided that unless renegotiation is commenced within 1 year after the close of the fiscal year in which the contract is completed, there will be no renegotiation, which I think ought to allay the fears of those who believe that 5 or 6 years from now they will be hauled up and the whole business gone over and analyzed.

Another provision of the new amendments is that the Secretary of War may make final settlements which are not the subject of renegotiation. Once renegotiated, that is the end of it. There is also a provision that the Secretary may exempt contracts from renegotiation and omit the renegotiation clause where the profits may be determined with reasonable certainty, or where other provisions are adequate to prevent undue profits. That may be done either for the contract as a whole or for the first period of the contract.

I mentioned a few moments ago that we have in mind a unit system whereby we will say the price will be firm for the period during which the costs are being ascertained in the light of the experience of the contract. I believe that the act as now amended and the practice under the act will prove successful.

Bear this in mind, that the War Department is interested, the same as you are, in keeping prices at a reasonable level. Our prices are made up by costs and profits. We are interested the same as you are in keeping the cost to the contractors on a reasonable level, and we are interested, and I know the bulk of American business is intrested, in keeping profits on a reasonable level. If we don't, we will have uncontrolled inflation, and if we don't have the War Department keeping a firm control over its prices, and you have the Office of Price Administration in the field with an elaborate pricing formula. That very nearly happened last summer.

We have now come to an agreement with the Office of Price Administration whereby they will keep out of the military-equipment field. [Applause.] That puts upon us the responsibility and the obligation of policing our own back yard, because if the volume of production in the military field were allowed to run wild so far as prices are concerned, it would be enough to wreck the economy. So it is up to the War Department and the Navy Department to make sure that their costs and prices are kept on a reasonable basis and on a reasonable level.

I want to point out one other thing, that since we have had the price-renegotiation procedure, I don't know whether it is accident or whether it is design, but we haven't had any more cases of the character that was presented last March before the Naval Affairs Committee, and I am sure that American business in general does not want those cases presented as if they were samples of what was going on all over the land. [Applause.]

Well, I will lay off that subject. I might speak a few words about the Army's manpower problem. As you know, we now have an army of four and a half million men. It

is rather curious that when they count the men they never count the officers, and yet, over the years, I guess it goes back to the beginning of our military history, the ratio of men to officers seems to be about 15 to 1. That doesn't mean that every 15 men are marched around by an officer. But we have so many officers behind desks and things like that, that it brings the ratio up about like that.

Next year we expect to have in the Army 7,500,000 men, and that, of course, does not cover what the Navy and the marines and the Coast Guard expect to have.

I have heard many people say they thought that was too high. Well, I assure you that our land forces today of the United Nations are far inferior in numbers to the land forces of the Axis Powers. There is nothing like a parity. The war must be won, and it must be won by large forces. I am not talking of mass armies, but, nevertheless, in the air and on the water and on the ground, it will call for forces the like of which this Nation has never raised. The Axis Powers are believed to have over 500 divisions. The United Nations have nothing like that.

So I don't think anybody who is informed on the subject at all can dispute the need of the Army for forces of that size.

Now, of course, we have the shipping problem. I think we will all grant that there is no use in raising an army of that size if there is no prospect of using it overseas. The shipping situation has been taken into account. We have to take it into account, of course, upon a rather sanguine basis. We could not have a situation develop where there is need of the men in the fighting theaters overseas and where it turned out that there was plenty of shipping but we didn't have the soldiers or the munitions to send on the ships. So I take it that it is sound to say, that the size of the Army should be predicated upon shipping calculated upon an optimistic basis.

And you have another factor to take into account, and that is the lag in time due to the necessity of training. It is the Army's policy to train units, in the main, a year at least. Not every man in the unit, because if you have a division, we will say, of 13,000 men, and the full strength is 15,000, you can very well put 2,000 men into that division who have not had a year's training, and the unit will be a fully trained unit. When you take into account the time factor due to the necessity of training, and training for a considerable time all of your combat units, we believe that the figure we have set down as the goal for the end of next year is the goal that the Army must strive for.

Now, there is discussion as to whether the country can stand that many men in the Army, particularly in view of the commitments we have to produce munitions for the other United Nations, Russia, Britain, China, etc. We believe that that is possible. We believe that an army of that size, along with the Navy, marines, and Coast Guard, will not diminish or impair the ability of the country to produce the necessary weapons for that army and the armies of our allies, and at the same time keep up the essential civilian supplies.

ADDRESS BY THOMAS H. BECK, PRESIDENT, THE CROWELL-COLLIER PUBLISHING CO.

Mr. Secretary, I should like to take a very few moments on behalf of this distinguished audience; first, to thank you for a very attractive evening and important information you have conveyed here. I would like, also, that you should know that we have in this audience leaders in industry, in nearly every line.

We have presidents of great railroads whose lines have done an outstanding job, as you well know, under the most difficult circumstances and with enormous increases in freight, passenger, and military traffic.

We also have great shipping men and shipbuilders, bus and truck men who have done their part. We have men here from the principal raw material industries—metals, copper, steel, aluminum. We have fabricators of all these things. We also have a great number of aircraft manufacturers who are deeply interested; munition manufacturers; heads of great businesses who have taken these contracts and regardless of renegotiation, regardless of profits, have gone on with increased production to win Army and Navy E awards; some of them as many as three times successively. And we have men who are engaged in the distribution of civilian products, who are trying their utmost to observe governmental ceilings, governmental priorities and controls.

In fact, I think I am utterly safe in assuring you that you have before you here an audience devoted to one cause only, and that is, the winning of this great war.

A hundred and sixty-six years ago, in the history of this Nation, a much smaller group of men sat around a table and wrote what we now know to be a Declaration of Independence, one of the world's greatest documents. Most of us, nearly all of us know how it starts: "When in the course of human events." Not so many of us remember how it ends, and I think the ending of that great document is a fitting end for this dinner, because those men said to one another: "* * *. With a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Address of Dr. Paul J. Raver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Paul J. Raver, the Bonneville Administrator, on October 27, 1942, delivered an address before the Inland Empire Waterway Association, at Lewiston, Idaho, which contains much factual information of interest to the Members of the Congress. In it he sets forth some of the accomplishments of hydroelectric development in the Columbia River area and shows the great contribution that is being made to our war effort by this industry, so essential to the prosecution of the war. As a part of my remarks I include Dr. Raver's address, which is as follows:

A little over a year ago, about 6 months prior to Pearl Harbor, it was my privilege to attend a meeting in Portland—a luncheon meeting of the chamber of commerce. The principal speaker of that meeting was Mr. Louis Marlio, former head of the aluminum cartel of Europe and leading aluminum manufacturer and industrialist of France. When Hitler moved in, Marlio moved out. He came to this country with his family and has, since that time, devoted his knowledge and his energy and his brilliant industrial ability to an analysis of the war-production facilities and abilities of this country. His speech on this particular occasion was directed to the question of whether or not the United States could stop Hitler.

I remember the significant conclusion of this man in his brilliant, analytical address. He said, "If America awakes in time—and that means now—the resources of this country, if properly and quickly mobilized, are sufficient to stop Hitler's machine. If you wait, however, it will be too late." But he added, "I think the United States can do it. I have analyzed the production facilities, and I think you can do it. One of the reasons that I feel so confident that you can is because you have Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams. If you did not have those great power facilities, it would take you too long to develop the necessary power capacity to build the kind of a war-production machine that is going to be necessary to lick Hitler."

About 6 months later I was on an automobile trip with my family to the town of Corvallis, Oreg., to visit my daughter, a student at the college there. We were spending the early Sunday afternoon in a family gathering, and had not turned on our radio or paid any particular attention to the discussions of other people, inasmuch as it was a family gathering, and we decided to go to a moving-picture show. While at the theater I was called to the telephone. My executive assistant told me that we were at war. It was Sunday afternoon, December 7.

He said, "I wanted to tell you that if you were hearing the radio reports and were disturbed about what was going on at Bonneville that I could relieve your mind, because we have things under control." The organization had responded to that news almost to a man. The many executives and supervisory personnel of that organization assembled at the J. D. Ross substation at Vancouver and prepared an organization for voluntary patrolling of the substation and towers and other important electrical facilities until such time as more permanent protection devices could be developed.

The spirit of that organization was typical of what happened, I think, to all of us when Pearl Harbor occurred. While up to that time we had been engaged in a lend-lease program, and we were the so-called arsenal of democracy, we were really not in this war until Pearl Harbor was hit. Then, regardless of our prior occupations, or what our programs may have been or what our aims, our purposes, our aspirations may have been, we all realized that we had one big job to do—to organize ourselves and our equipment and our facilities, whatever they might be, for the purpose of saving our democracy through an all-out fighting war.

That kind of spirit dominated the Bonneville organization, and I think you ought to know that the power facilities of the Bonneville Dam and of the Grand Coulee Dam are practically 100 percent devoted to war effort. With the splendid facilities and cooperation of the three agencies of the Federal Government involved in this development—the United States Army engineers, straining every effort and using every resource to develop Bonneville Dam and get all of the 10 generators in and functioning, and with a similar attitude and spirit in the Bureau of Reclamation in the development of the facilities of the Grand Coulee Dam, the Bonneville Power Administration has had the finest kind of cooperation and coordination that you can find any place among Government agencies; and it has not taken a lot of detailed paper work or red tape or conferences either.

We have all realized the tremendous problem and importance of developing the great power supply of the Columbia River and making it available where it was needed in the quickest possible time for use in war plants. As a result, I can report to you that by July of this coming year, if existing schedules are maintained, these two dams will be turning out about 8,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year for war production purposes. That is more power than is needed or used for supplying the entire metropolitan area of New York City with its 7,000,000 inhabitants.

That is fire power, if you please, for winning this war.

When I was here as your guest about a year ago and, previous to that, 2 years ago, I had a story to tell about the development of the Columbia River. Two years ago it was something of a dream, a vision of things to come of the possibilities of industrial development, agricultural development, and general improvement of the economic status of the region through the widespread use of large quantities of cheap electricity.

It was hard for us to visualize what was meant by large quantities of electricity, but this 8,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year, representing almost 1,000,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric generating capacity utilized almost continuously throughout a year's time, represents as much capacity as the combined hydroelectric and steam capacity of all of the privately owned and publicly owned utilities of the States of Washington and Oregon, and while we are talking about that, we have seen the near completion of the installation of that tremendous capacity in the short period of a little more than 3 years.

In my second appearance before you I repeated that story with some variations, and I haven't a different story to tell today. It is still the story of the Columbia River, and all I want to do today is to report on the tremendous progress of this year, during which the facilities which have been designed and constructed and installed for peacetime purposes have been turned to the purposes of winning a war, and, in my opinion, turned effectively and quickly to that purpose in such a way as to make the difference between winning and losing that war.

The other night in preparation for my appearance here I looked over the notes of the talk before you on October 30, 1941. On that occasion I reported that Bonneville and Grand Coulee dams were producing 358,000 kilowatts of electricity each hour. I told you that the United States Army Engineers had placed 5 generators in action at Bonneville, and the United States Bureau of Reclamation had one generator turning over at Grand Coulee. As of today I can report to you that there are 6 generators producing at Bonneville and a great addition to the generating plant has been practically completed there and the foundations installed there awaiting the installation now of the 4 remaining generators, which the Army engineers soon will begin to assemble. At Grand Coulee dam three generators are producing power.

The combined rated generating capacity at these two dams is now 626,000 kilowatts as contrasted to 358,000 kilowatts 1 year ago. Furthermore, I can report that as of today all of these generators are operating at approximately 10 to 15 percent overload capacity; that is, while we have installed listed capacity in those machines of 626,000 kilowatts, the daily reports that come across my desk show thase generators carrying from 695,000 to 700,500 kilowatts every day. That means an additional 75,000 kilowatts of capacity over and above that for which the generators are rated. So you can see from these figures that the production at Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams today is practically twice what it was when I reported to you a year ago.

Here is another contrast. In my talk last year I told you that more than 325,000 kilowatts of power had been contracted for sale to new industries coming into the region and that the sale of 200,000 kilowatts of additional industrial power was being negotiated, making a grand total of 525,000 kilowatts of power going to new enterprise. Today I can report that this total of 525,000 kilowatts of contracts has grown up to 908,960 kilowatts, practically all of it for new industrial enterprises for war purposes.

Thus, in addition to nearly doubling our generating capacity, we have nearly doubled our market in a 12-month period. That means much to a sales agency. Entirely aside from the importance of this development for war-production purposes it means dollars in the cash register. We are currently running about $10,000,000 per year revenue. This will reach approximately $18,000,000 per year revenue by July of next year. This is important to all of you who are interested in the financial success of these great projects, because on their demonstrated need and usefulness financially rest the possibilities for future developments on this great river. We know this power development is a pay-out project.

I think I mentioned, in the first talk that I gave before this group that our program was a pay-out program, and this war development is assisting us, of course, tremendously for the time being at least, in demonstrating that it is a pay-out program. Thus our job as a marketing agency at Bonneville becomes laying our plans and using the energy of our engineers and economists and executives insofar as we possibly can to develop a peacetime program that will hold these industries as a part of the permanent economy of this region. Our job is to expand these industries through the development of fabrication and processing plants to the benefit of all of the communities of the region and to develop the region's agricultural economy, insofar as these new industries provide greater population and thus new markets, for the progress of the farmers at home.

Last October I reported to you that the capital investment in new industrial plants was approaching a total of $100,000,000. Today I can tell you that this plant investment has approached a total of more than $200,000,000.

I told you last October that within a few months the Pacific Northwest would be producing well in excess of 200,000,000 pounds of aluminum a year, and that it looked as though this might be raised to 400,000,000 pounds. There are five huge aluminum plants in this region now operating, some of them still uncompleted; and Bonneville is committed to deliver to them power enough to produce close to 600,000,000 pounds of aluminum annually, almost three times as much as the production prior to our lend-lease activities, and about one-third of the aluminum for the total airplane production program of this country.

Finally, as an entirely new development in the past year, I can report to you that the existence of Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams has forestalled a power shortage in this area in one of the worst drought periods of Northwest history. This has come about through interconnections which we have made with the major utilities systems throughout the region. I doubt if many people have realized that during the present autumn months stream flows in the Northwest have been the lowest on record. Let me quote to you the actual statistics:

"Stream flows west of the Cascade Mountains in the Puget Sound region are approximately 7 percent less than the minimum of record for the month of August, 13 percent less than the minimum of record for September, and 14 percent less for the first half of October. East of the Cascade Mountains they are approximately 6 percent less than the minimum of record in August, 42 percent less than the minimum of record in September, and 14 percent in the first half of October."

In contrast to this, the Columbia River flow was 22 percent above the minimum in August, 10 percent above the minimum in September, and 15 percent above the minimum for the first half of October.

This great resource of yours has kept rolling along during this drought period and has supplied the necessary water to keep these generators rolling and turning day after day at an overload capacity to save the Northwest from what would have been a worse power shortage than was experienced in the Tennessee Valley Authority last year.

Last year the shortage of water in the Tennessee Valley Authority and the resulting power shortage in that region resulted in severe curtailment of the use of power, and was the subject of political and other kinds of comment throughout this Nation. When another great Government project situated in a region which has experienced a similar drought as one existing in the Tennessee Valley Authority last year, through the foresight of the people who built that project and had it in working order, comes to the rescue of a region with a power supply that prevents that shortage occurring, not a word is said about it in our daily press.

The result of studies made by Bonneville engineers shows that the combined power resources of the Seattle and Tacoma systems and Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams have been ample to meet the power requirements of war production industries without the use of reservoirs owned by other utilities, either privately or publicly owned, and with a minimum use of oil for fuel for the generation of power. The surplus from Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams above that required to meet the total demands of their own consumers has been sufficient to delay the withdrawal of water from private utilities' reservoirs some 2 months later than otherwise possible, and thus has conserved the power for use in October, November, and December at the time when the stream flows are the lowest on record for September and October.

Because of this fact, utilities systems throughout the region must now depend upon the water in their storage reservoirs. If they had no water the power supply in this region would be most critically short, and precious fuel oil and hogged fuel would be consumed. The presence of these dams has prevented that from happening. The Bonneville administration has been dropping millions of kilowatt-hours into these public-utilities systems since the last of July.

This story may be reversed this spring. If our load grows as anticipated and our generator schedules remain where they are, we will have a shortage of about 190,000 kilowatts at the Bonneville administration next spring. We expect these private-utility companies to take water from their reservoirs next spring when their reservoirs will be full because of the heavy rains which ordinarily come in the spring and our loads are going down at the same time, and supply power for the Bonneville customers through that spring period until the additional generators, which Colonel Park spoke about, are brought in at Bonneville Dam and additional generators are brought in at Grand Coulee. So this interconnection can be mutually beneficial and, I am convinced, will be if we need it.

During the months of July, August, and September Bonneville's deliveries have totaled almost 352,000,000 kilowatt-hours delivered to municipal and utility company systems for transfer to customers of those companies. Of these 352,000,000 kilowatt-hours, 142,000,000 were delivered to the Portland General Electric Co., 19,000,000 to the Seattle City Light plant, 81,000,000 to the city of Tacoma plant, and 110,000,000 kilowatts to the Washington Water Power and Pacific Power & Light Co. systems, all exclusive of energy delivered for transfer. These deliveries of power by Bonneville are net deliveries over and above any amounts of power which these systems have delivered to us. This tremendous volume of power has enabled these companies to meet demands of the war, and the very rapidly increasing normal use of electricity throughout the region, and to meet

other customer demands without any power rationing.

What is the significance of these contrasts which I have just been reciting and this year's developments? It is simply this—last year and the year before last and the year before that when we talked about the future we were talking about 5 years hence or 10 years hence or 15 years hence.

But the events of the past few months have changed all that. That future is no longer a decade away or 5 years away or even 1 year away. We are no longer jogging along in pursuit of our economic destiny. That destiny has suddenly turned upon us and charged straight into our faces. If we expect to shape it to our purposes we must be prepared to act quickly at the proper time through our representatives in Congress and on our own initiative through organizations such as yours, or the opportunity to turn this great development to peacetime advantage to this region may be lost. Because of the war situation we all realize that this is not the time to act on those programs. I am convinced, however, that this is the time to be thinking about it, know what the program should be, and make such plans as we can to be ready to act when the time comes.

What must we do? We must expand and insure the permanence of this great new Northwest industry. There will be a tendency to let down on this great development of the river on the assumption that, having constructed two dams and secured this tremendous addition of power supply, we have done enough for the next 20 or 30 years.

But that is not enough. By developing local sources of raw material to forward this industry economically, we can make it permanent and make it grow. We must develop the alumina from which aluminum is made from our own clays, which exist in great abundance in the Northwest. We must develop our own phosphates from our own phosphate rock, which exists so abundantly in Idaho; and this development will require tremendous quantities of electricity.

We must continue the fight for the establishment of fabrication in consumers' goods industries—the wealth-creating activities which grow out of basic industrial developments that are already here. It is one thing to make an aluminum pig. It takes 11 kilowatt-hours to make 1 pound of aluminum—that's 3 days' supply of electricity for the normal home. And after you have made that 1 pound of aluminum you have possibly a paper weight. It has no commercial value, because it has no use, any more than a piece of pig iron. It must be processed into something useful, and that processing constitutes the wealth-creating activity that makes an economy self-sufficient. We must fight for these wealth-creating, labor-using activities, to follow up and be supported upon the basic pig aluminum industrial development.

This is true of the other basic electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries already completed in the Northwest. Forging and casting plants to make truck and trailer parts, other heavy transportation equipment, machine tools, airplane parts; new plants for the construction of planes, new types of planes for commercial use—all these are possible developments which will put our Northwest economy on a sound competitive basis. We must see that the possibility of securing this maximum production is not hampered by a price policy on the part of any single control group that will prevent those wealth-creating activities from coming into being.

A skilled-labor supply is vital to any growing industrial economy. The labor shortage is already acute in Portland, Seattle, Tacoma, Spokane, and points of principal shipbuilding activity of the country's war-production effort. Labor has been drained out of these regions and it needs to be restored and trained to be skilled in the use of tools. We are going to have to work more with our hands, to use these tremendous natural resources that are avilable to us. By fighting for lower freight costs for the products of Northwest industry we can improve this industrial economy and the possibilities for its permanence in peace. The freight-rate problem is peculiarly of interest to you. It is my belief that the products from the manufacture and processing of aluminum can be competitive commercially as far east as the Dakotas, but only if the freight-rates structure is properly adjusted to the Northwest industrial economy.

Finally we must keep our low-cost power supply ahead of the demand. I think this was one of the things I mentioned in the first talk that I made before this group: That power in large quantities needs to be on the shelves waiting for a buyer, if you are going to develop this kind of a power industrial economy.

When an industry wants to locate it cannot wait 2 years for a power supply. The great advantage that the Northwest has had in this war effort, of course, has been that its power supply was available when needed. That was true even before the war started. It brought the first great aluminum industry to this region, fortunately in time to be in production of aluminum before the war started. Such massive industrial developments as these require a Government project such as Bonneville in order to get strated. To risk the capital investment necessary to install tremendously expensive generators and transformation and transmission-line facilities; to have the resulting power available so that when the industry knocks at your door you can say, "There is the power supply needed. All you have to do is set in your plant and go to work." That is a tremendous advantage to you. That is one of the subsidies your Government is giving you people in providing this investment in advance of the market. It is a Government development program, a program designed to develop the resources of this region, and every Government program of this kind risks capital in advance of the development in order to bring the development about.

We must keep that kind of a program before us. In the peacetime program that follows this war keep an extra white elephant or two on the shelf, if you please.

Of these various problems, power and freight rates perhaps are the most important. The power problem is particularly difficult because of the difficulty of making plans in sufficient time to make those plans effective. Our planning engineers in cooperation with the United States Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation engineers are making plans continuously for 6 years ahead. We are keeping that up so far as we possibly can with the limited facilities left to us.

The presently scheduled generator installations at Bonneville and Grand Coulee will take care of the immediate needs as scheduled by the War Production Board. It might turn out that a year from now additional supplies of power will be needed for the war effort, supplies which could only be provided by the construction of, say, Umatilla Dam or some of the other projects which we at Bonneville in cooperation with the United States Army engineers have laid out and proposed as the next steps in power development.

We have recommended that construction of the Umatilla Dam should start. Now, as I say, that is practically out of the question with the present critical material shortage. But we ought to be ready for immediate construction whenever that great site is given to us. It might take a minimum of 3 years to bring this dam into production. I can see the possibility of such a sudden need for additional power; I believe, also, that the present acuteness of the material shortage may be licked at a not too distant date. I believe the practical policy for us out here must be one of extreme watchfulness; and when we see proof that the Nation's supply of critical materials has been stabilized, we should call for action on the 5,000,000-kilowatt program enunciated last February by the Bonneville Advisory Board, composed of Colonel Park of the United States Army engineers, a representative of the Federal Power Commission, a representative of the Department of the Interior, and of Bonneville.

This program which was suggested at that time involves the complete installation of the generators at Grand Coulee Dam. It involves the construction of Umatilla Dam with 630,000 kilowatts of capacity; of Five-Mile Rapids Dam with from 90,000 to 210,000 kilowatts; Nez Perce Dam, 50 miles south of Lewiston, 1,000,000 kilowatts on that development. It calls for other dams on the upper Columbia and the expansion of projects in western Oregon and Washington containing more than 2,000,000 kilowatts of capacity.

These are your great resources out here. When we speak of electrochemical and electrometallurgical developments as being the basic industrial development for the economy of the future of this region we are speaking of power as one of the ingredients, one of the natural resources for that kind of a development. Power is a part of an electrochemical and an electrometallurgical development just as much as are the chemicals and materials that go into it. You have to mine those metals and chemicals and you have to mine your power, but when you mine your power by building your dams you have a permanent resource—an oil well that never runs dry. That is the reason it is the greatest resource that you have in this region for your future economic and social welfare.

As I have been naming those projects, I am sure they have reminded you that the solution of the power problem can bring about the solution of the Northwest's freight-rate problem. I do not need to dwell upon the savings in freight rates, savings which will be reflected in lower manufacturing costs for the Northwest products. Problem No. 21, the report of the Columbia Basin Joint Investigations, is already familiar to you. That report with its estimates of 5 mills per ton-mile as a probable future water rate, shows the tremendous possibilities of river navigation, both in direct savings and in its effect upon rail rates. As I say, you know these details better than I. The point I want to make now is that here we have a cause for common action. When the time comes to fight for the expansion of our power supply, which is necessary to assure the permanence and expansion of our new industrial economy, we must be ready. That expansion when it comes will key in, it seems to me, with the development of the great Columbia Basin project; the development of that new land through water supply from the Columbia River, to take care of new populations which will come into this area, as well as those already here. The products from that additional land will key in well with an industrial program which has already been established, which is providing new jobs and which will provide through those new jobs the new markets for the agricultural products from this additional land.

We must be ready to do our part in carrying on an integrated program of river development, power development, and land development because those projects are multipurpose in their nature. I think, however, that now is the time to fight for the reduction of freight rates, or at least get your facilities organized for that purpose so that the

products of that industry can compete in the markets of the world when this war is over.

It will take blitzkrieg tactics to jar our friends in the East into the realization that in the Pacific Northwest they have a powerful tool which they have only half sharpened; and that the way to sharpen it is through the ultimate, complete development of power and navigation in the Columbia River watershed.

The Prince of Peace and a World at War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Montana Standard, of Butte, Mont., for December 25, 1942.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRINCE OF PEACE AND A WORLD AT WAR

On this anniversary of the birth of the Prince of Peace, 132,000,000 Americans are entrenched in a world at war.

We have dedicated ourselves to sacrifice, to danger, to sorrow, and misery. We have girded ourselves in the stern habiliments of war. We have gone out to meet our enemies and have accepted the gage of battle.

All of this we have done for a single all-encompassing purpose—to win the victory of peace, to make God's word a reality on the earth.

It was from the throne of God, ruler of the universe, that word came down to mankind at the birth of Christ in these sayings: "Fear not; for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the City of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord."

And thereupon a multitude of the heavenly host appeared, praising God and saying: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men."

Our enemies have denied the word of God. They have flouted the teachings of God. They have willfully and selfishly sown the seeds of war upon all the earth. They have desecrated the temples of God and sought to enslave his children. They have set their leaders up as equal with God. They have practiced hate rather than good will. They have undertaken to eradicate from the earth whole races of men. They are ruthless and cruel.

Our purpose in this war is to bring peace on earth and good will toward men, not only for our own sake but for the sake of all suffering humanity everywhere and for our children and our children's children.

Much has been said in recent months, as our war effort has been intensified day by day, about the hate which we have for our enemies.

It is not the hate for individuals or nations; it is hate for their works and their purposes. Theirs is an evil design for the world. We hate that design.

Our enemies have lived by the sword, and by the word of God they shall perish by the sword.

Our leaders have pledged, first, peace on earth; then, security for all; then, justice to all mankind. That is our creed.

It is to achieve that great desire for the whole world that we have sent our young men into the seething cauldron of war and destruction. It is to accomplish peace, security, and justice that we have set aside so much that is near and dear in our way of life.

But the flesh is weak and we are prone to selfish purpose.

Let us be sure on this anniversary of Christ's birth that we are worthy—worthy of the cause in which we fight; worthy of the white knights of Christianity whom we have sent forth to battle throughout the whole world against the forces of evil.

Let us wash from our minds the complexity of detail in the multitude of our modern needs and aspirations.

Let us remember, first of all, that we are men, created in the image of God, to do God's work.

Let us put aside selfish design and rededicate ourselves on this holy day to the difficult problems, the heavy sacrifice, the blood and tears and sorrows, the sweat and toil, as we perform God's work in the service of ourselves and all mankind.

Let us be worthy of the fight which our youth is so valiantly making.

Salary and Income Limitations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, before the American Forum of the Air, delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting System, on Sunday evening, January 10, 1943.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Roosevelt's proposal to limit not only salaries but also incomes must be supported as a simple matter of fair play. On April 27, 8 months ago, he pointed out that the indivisible seven-point anti-inflation program was interlocked and that all its parts had to be put into effect if the rest of them were to be effective.

Today six of these seven points are in effect. The seventh, which was No. 1 on the list, is not in effect; it is resisted by powerful interests representing less than one-half of 1 percent of the American people.

Today we have price and rent ceilings, wage stabilization, farm price stabilization, rationing, cuts in installment buying and people's savings—nonspending—at the rate of four billion the first quarter, six billion the second quarter, seven billion the third quarter, and nine billion the fourth quarter of 1942, a total of $26,000,000,000, including the purchase of nine billion in war bonds.

Only point, No. 1, remains unacted on, the limitation of personal and corporate profits at a low reasonable rate. It is estimated that 1942 profits of all manufacturing industries will show about a 40 percent rise over the 1941 level. Congress not only refused to limit all incomes to $67,200 a year, or $25,000 a year net after taxes, but passed the worst tax measures in our history. Today low-income families are taxed 5 percent on every dollar over $12.50 a week, while millionaires lie in the Florida sun peeling calluses off their thumbs after the quarterly chore of counting and cashing tax-exempt coupons.

Everyone in America, except the very wealthy, has joined in the battle against inflation. We have responded to the call of our President and wartime Commander in Chief.

Talk of the hardships of living on only $25,000 just can't be taken seriously by farm people, 40 to 50 percent of whom work and sweat and worry, marry, raise children, educate them, live, and die on an average income of $500 net a year—that is, an income of $0 to $1,000 a year—which is cut by various taxes, direct and indirect, to a net of approximately $450 a year. They can't believe that the proposed limitation will kill ambition and enterprise among high-income persons. I do not think they believe that high incomes necessarily make the recipients less patriotic and energetic than the average run of American citizens who are prepared to do whatever is necessary for complete victory and a decent peace.

If privates in our armed services risk and give their lives at wages of $50 a month, if American factory workers meet their family bills for rent, food, clothing, transportation, and taxes out of the present average weekly wage of $38.86, if Generals Marshall, Eisenhower and MacArthur can be relied upon to do their utmost for $9,699.96 before taxes, I think that Hedy Lamarr should be expected to get along for the duration on not more than $67,200 instead of the $80,000 for which she contracted.

This limitation of income—and I think that instead of limiting it to salaries it should be extended to all incomes, as the President recommended—is not primarily a matter of increasing the tax yield to the Federal Treasury; it is simply a question of making a small token payment toward parity of sacrifice.

Beveridge Social Security Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a very well written and informative article by Howard M. Norton, appearing in the Baltimore Sun for yesterday, January 10, entitled "Sir William Beveridge's Social Security Proposals Had Roots in System Established in New Zealand."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIR WILLIAM BEVERIDGE'S SOCIAL SECURITY PROPOSALS HAD ROOTS IN SYSTEM ESTABLISHED IN NEW ZEALAND—PLAN WAS PILOTED THROUGH PARLIAMENT AND ADMINISTERED BY DOMINION'S PRESENT WASHINGTON ENVOY

(By Howard M. Norton)

WASHINGTON, January 9.—When Sir William Beveridge doffed his hat to New Zealand's social-security system last month, he turned the world spotlight for a moment on a

nation that has just come through social revolution as complete as the one Beveridge proposes to launch in England.

By inference, Sir William doffed his hat also to the man who fathered New Zealand's "revolution" and guided it through its early months.

That man is Walter Nash, now a member of the Pacific War Council and New Zealand's Minister to Washington.

GUIDED ACT THROUGH PARLIAMENT

With the support of the late Prime Minister of New Zealand, Michael Joseph Savage, Nash piloted the social security act through Parliament and then became New Zealand's first minister of social security.

Today, in his panelled office in the Legation building at 27 Observatory Circle, here, Minister Nash described his nation's social-security set-up—a set-up that Beveridge singled out as the only one in any way similar to his own plan in comprehensiveness and method.

The program costs New Zealand 5 percent of her national income from all sources, individual and corporation, Mr. Nash said.

GENERAL REVENUE AVAILABLE

If it happens to cost more in any one year, the deficit comes out of the general Government revenue.

For their money, the New Zealanders get immediate benefits as well as promise of security in the future. They get—

1. Free hospitalization.
2. Free medical treatment.
3. Free medicine.
4. Free maternity care and consultation.
5. Miscellaneous free medical services.
6. Superannuation payments to every man and woman who reaches the age of 65—rich and poor alike.
7. An old-age pension for persons 60 years and older.
8. Cash payments to families in the lower-income brackets—the payments based on the number of children and size of income.
9. Widows' benefits.
10. Orphans' benefits.
11. Invalids' benefits.
12. Benefits for disabled miners.
13. Sickness benefits.
14. Unemployment benefits.

Aside from these, every New Zealand school child gets a half pint of milk free, daily, and an apple a day when apples are in season (this helps do away with New Zealand's surplus apple crop). In addition, every 3 months each child's teeth are examined free of charge.

OPERATION COST ABOVE COLLECTION

Last year (the year ended March 31, 1942), the social-security collections amounted to $55,000,000, but the operation of the system cost $73,500,000. The deficit was made up out of ordinary revenue.

That year, New Zealand's total national income from all sources was $1,100,000,000. (Population: 1,641,000.)

[In these computations the New Zealand pound is figured at the old standard—£1 equals $5. This is used rather than the present, lower exchange rate, because it gives a truer picture of the actual value of New Zealand's income in terms of our money.]

This year all benefits under the social-security plan were increased by 5 percent except the family benefits, which were increased by 50 percent—from $1 to $1.50 a child. The over-all increase took the form of a cost-of-living bonus, because the cost of living had risen by that much.

NO DEDUCTIONS ARE MADE

The social-security levy is a flat tax of 5 percent on everybody—with no deductions.

This money is put into a special account known as the social-security fund. The benefits themselves and military pay and allowances and certain income of persons under the age of 16 years are the only classes of income exempt from the payment of this tax.

The tax is deducted at its source in the case of incomes derived from wages and salaries, and in other cases is paid quarterly on the basis of an annual declaration of income received.

SUBSIDY IS PROVIDED

Into the social-security fund each year there is also put a subsidy from general taxation revenue sufficient to meet the fund's annual budgetary requirements.

For the present financial year the social-security expenditure is expected to reach $80,990,000, toward which sum social-security taxation will yield $55,750,000.

About $18,000,000 will have to be paid as a subsidy out of the general tax fund. The rest will be taken from cash balances.

Another flat tax—7.5 percent, with no exemptions—is levied for national security.

INCOME TAX STARTS AT 12.5 PERCENT

Over and above all this, New Zealand's regular income-tax rates start at 12.5 percent of the first $500 over the allowable deductions and exemptions, and reach a maximum of 90 percent.

(For the single man the maximum tax is reached at $12,700.)

New Zealand's social theories—which are the theories of the Labor Party and the present labor government—are summed up thus by Mr. Nash:

"The first charge on all wealth created is the care of the aged, the young, the ailing, and all those engaged in the production of essential utilities."

MAIN OBJECT OF PLAN

"One of the main objects of the New Zealand scheme," he continued, "is to do away with the stigma of charity which had attached previously to various schemes for pensions, such as old-age and unemployment allowances, and to recognize that there should be a first charge on the wealth of the country to provide for those people who are unable to provide for themselves."

The Social Security Act provides free medical and hospital service for all persons ordinarily resident in New Zealand, without regard to economic status, race, or nationality.

All maternity attention is free. The physician is paid by the Government for attention given to all mothers.

When the mother does not go into a hospital, a nurse is provided free for 14 days just before childbirth and for a period after the child has been delivered.

MEDICINE IS PROVIDED

All medicines are free, provided they are prescribed by a doctor and come on the pharmaceutical list.

All general practitioner treatment is free, the doctor being paid later by the state.

If the patient pays him direct, the fee (up to a certain figure) can be received from the state.

Service in all public hospitals is entirely free.

If a person desires to go to a private hospital, he may do so, and the average cost of maintenance is paid to the owner of the private hospital, the patient then paying any difference.

SOME TREATMENTS NOT COVERED

Except in public hospitals, certain types of treatment are not provided under the Social Security Act, which is primarily concerned with that given by general practitioners.

The services of recognized specialists are outside the scope of medical benefits, and some other services are excluded. Principal of these are—

1. Administering of anesthetics.
2. Medical examination for the obtaining of a medical certificate.
3. Treatment of venereal disease.
4. Extraction of teeth by a doctor.

The medical-benefits portion of the Social Security Act operates like this:

A would-be patient names on a special form the doctor of his choice.

The doctor then signs the form and forwards to the social-security authorities a list of his patients.

RECEIVES "CAPITATION" FEE

For these patients he either receives a "capitation" fee of $3.75 a year a name, plus mileage fees if the patient lives outside the area he would normally be expected to serve, or a fee of $1.87 for any occasion on which medical services were provided.

The fee is raised to $3.12 if he is required to provide services at night or on Sundays.

The doctor, instead of claiming the amount to which he is entitled under social security, may receive a direct payment from the patient, in which case the patient then, in turn, can recover the amount of the fee from the State.

This, of course, leaves it open for the patient to pay more for the services if he wishes, but the doctor is prevented by law from claiming more than the sum prescribed.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED HOSPITALS

Ninety percent of New Zealand's hospitals are government-owned and most of those that are not owned by the government have contracted with the government to accept patients whose medical care is underwritten by the social security system.

For hospital care during the confinement period, the social-security fund normally pays $55 a patient to the private hospitals. For any hospital treatment given prior to or subsequent to the confinement period, the fund pays $1.50 a day.

Lists of hospitals which have entered into contracts with the social-security system are displayed in postoffices and district offices of the health department. Lists of obstetric nurses under contract to the government also are published.

FLAT RATE FOR NURSE

The fund pays the nurse a flat rate of $55.50 for her care of the patient during the days of labor and the 14 days following. If she did not act as midwife, she receives $50.50.

A part-time visiting nurse is paid $27.50, or $22.50, depending upon the capacity in which she attends the patient.

Only six doctors in all New Zealand have refused to sign contracts with the Government under the maternity-benefit plan.

The contract provides that the doctor will receive from the social-security fund a standard fee of $26.25 for attending a normal confinement and giving antenatal advice. Additional fees are paid if he provides special services.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Under this part of the plan the resident of New Zealand receives, free of charge, full hospitalization. This includes medical and surgical treatment and nursing care in and out of the hospital, isolation under medical supervision, and medical observation.

The fund pays the hospital boards for these services at the rate of $1.50 a day for each patient (except in a Karitane hospital, where a mother accompanies her infant, in which case the payment is $2.25 a day). The balance of the cost of maintenance is shared equally by the State and local authorities.

X-ray diagnostic services also have been available to New Zealanders under the Social Security Act since August 11, 1941, free of charge. These services do not include X-ray photographs made for dental purposes.

UNIVERSAL SUPERANNUATION

"An entirely new principle embodied in our Social Security Act is that of universal superannuation," Mr. Nash said.

"The idea behind it is that the qualification for age benefits should not be determined by the amount of money saved, but should be paid to the individual because it is his right to receive it.

"The payment is made because the individual has reached the age of 65 and has done a share of work in that time that entitles him to the payments. It is not paid because he is poor."

This plan, Mr. Nash added, helps to remove the stigma of charity from all the other kinds of benefit payments.

Payments of this sort, he asserted, involve a lot of money and must be increased gradually. Therefore, the New Zealand Government began by paying $50 in 1939 to each person eligible for superannuation. The payment is being increased by $12.50 yearly until 1968, when it will reach the maximum of $390 yearly a person.

AGE BENEFITS

To receive age benefits—which are apart from the universal superannuation payments—the applicant must be at least 60 years old and fulfill prescribed residence and other residence requirements.

He then receives a pension of $7.50 a week.

But he is not prohibited from working. He may earn up to $5 a week on the side and still receive his pension, if he is single or if his wife also is receiving a pension, and as much as $12.50 a week if his wife is not eligible for a pension. Or he may have investment income in these amounts.

But if his income exceeds the amounts allowed, his pension is reduced in accordance with the amount of the excess.

"We are not at present paying benefits to old people to permit them to leave capital to others," Mr. Nash explains.

WIDOW'S BENEFITS

A widow with dependent children receives $6.25 a week, plus $2.50 a week for each dependent child, with a limit of $22.50 a week.

She may also have additional income without disqualifying for the pension, but there is a fixed limit to this additional income. If she exceeds the limit, the pension is reduced in proportion to the excess.

The widow without children receives a benefit of $5 a week, and may have an additional income of $5 from other sources without losing any part of the benefit.

When the widow reaches 60 years of age the yearly benefit is reducible by $5 for every $50 of accumulated property in excess of $2,500, as if she were an applicant for age benefits.

ORPHAN'S BENEFITS

An orphan's benefit is paid in respect of any orphan born in New Zealand, or whose last surviving parent lived in New Zealand for the 3 years before his or her death, provided the child is not maintained in a state institution.

The benefit must not exceed $3.75 a week, or $195 a year and is reducible if other income is received for the benefit of the orphan The money is paid to the guardian.

FAMILY BENEFITS

If the income of any eligible New Zealand family is not more than $26.25 a week, the father or mother may apply for a family benefit payment of $1.50 a week for each child in the family under 16 years of age (18 if the child is in school).

The law requires that the family benefit be paid to the mother—not to the father—regardless of whether the mother or father applies for the benefit.

INVALID'S BENEFITS

Invalids over 16, but not old enough to qualify for age benefits, are qualified to receive invalid's benefits. The invalid must be permanently incapacitated for work through accident, illness, or congenital defect, or be totally blind, and the incapacity for which the benefit is claimed must not be self-inflicted or self-induced.

Benefits start at $5 a week for single persons under 21 years of age. A married man or widower with dependent children would receive $7.50 a week, his wife (if eligible under the law) would receive an additional $2.50 a week, and he would receive $2.50 a week for each dependent child.

Small incomes apart from the invalid's benefits do not disqualify the invalid under the social security law so long as the outside income does not exceed amounts prescribed by law.

MINER'S BENEFITS

This is for miners who have become disabled at their work. The rates are $7.50 a week for the miner, plus $2.50 a week for his wife and $2.50 a week for each child under 16. The maximum payable in any one case is $22.50 a week.

MAORI WAR BENEFITS

Maori war benefit is payable to any person who served in any of the Maori wars and was awarded a medal for active service in such wars.

The rate is $7.50 a week, and it is not reducible on account of income and property.

SICKNESS BENEFITS

Every person over 16 years of age who has lived in New Zealand not less than a year is entitled to receive a sickness benefit if he is temporarily incapacitated for work through sickness or accident and has thereby suffered a loss of salary or wages or other earnings.

Persons 16 to 20 years old without dependents get $2.50 a week. All others get $5. An additional $3.25 is paid to the applicant who is married, to cover living expenses of his wife. For each dependent child he gets an additional $2.50. The maximum payable in any one case is $20 a week.

The Government reserves the right to reduce the rate if the applicant has other income.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Every person over 16 years of age who has resided in New Zealand not less than 12 months is entitled to receive an unemployment benefit if he is capable and willing to work and is unable to find work.

Persons 16 to 20 years old, without dependents, receive $2.50 a week, all others $5 a week. For his wife the applicant receives an additional $3.25 and for each dependent child $1.25 weekly. Not more than $20 a week is payable in any one case. The payments are subject to reduction at the discretion of the authorities if the applicant or his wife or children receive other income or own property considered sufficient to care for at least part of their needs.

EMERGENCY BENEFITS

An emergency benefit may be granted by the Social Security Commission on the grounds of hardship to any person who, by reason of age, physical or mental disability, domestic circumstance, or any other reason, is unable to earn enough to take care of himself and dependents yet is unable to qualify for any other monetary benefit under the Social Security Act.

New Zealand was one of the first nations to adopt a system of social benefits.

The history of the movement in New Zealand goes back 50 years to a system of age benefits adopted in the 1890's.

Then followed a system of widows' benefits and still later a system of benefits for miners.

It was not until the Labor Party came into power in 1935 that the social security system was revised, unified, and broadened to its present scope. The present law came into effect in April 1939.

How To Face a World at War and Still Believe in the Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon by Rev. Clifford E. Barbour, of Knoxville, Tenn.:

The subject this morning is, How Can We Face a World at War and Still Believe in the Church? and for the background of our thinking I take several verses from the Book of Joshua, chapter 24:

"And if it seems evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell: but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.

"And the people answered and said, God forbid that we should forsake the Lord, to serve other gods."

I say the subject is, How Can You Face a World at War and Still Believe in the Church? I know something about war, and—I don't like it. As a matter of fact, I know a good deal about it. I was in the last one as much as anyone can be who isn't carrying a gun, and I was in it a good deal more than many who did carry guns. I was on the French front for 6 months—I mean on the front, I don't mean in France—I mean in the trenches, when there were trenches, and right behind the enemy after they had been driven out of their trenches. I was with the Young Men's Christian Association. It wasn't a very much-loved organization. Yet my division made us honorary members of their association. There were 33 of us. The man who was at the head of us would have been a general in anybody's army. We had to work. There wasn't any choice and we had to work where it needed to be done, when it needed to be done, whatever the conditions might be. Five out of our number received physical wounds. One little preacher had his ear shot off. Now that wasn't an accident—that happened where the bullets were flying. And that's fairly close to being serious, if you would like to know. Another had his shoulder blown open with shrapnel. Another had both legs shot up. Then there were two other casualties I don't remember. There were 11 gassed. I was gassed. I was gassed with phosgene gas. It doesn't happen very far from the fighting. For 5 years I suffered succeeding fits of depression. About every 3 weeks for about 3 or 4 days I went through a period of deep depression. It wasn't very enjoyable.

I say I don't like war. I don't like it for what it means to our physical life. I don't like it for all the ghastliness of living in an

area of conflict—the mud, and the filth, and the cooties, which ordinarily aren't anything to be laughed off. And flies—flies are almost the worst thing that happens living at the front!

I don't like it for what it does to boys' bodies. One night in Chateau-Thierry 1,100 boys went through our field hospital. There weren't enough men in the medical corps to care for them so those of us who were able worked both day and night as long as we could, caring for boys in various stages of serious wounds.

I say I don't like war. I speak as one who knows. I don't like it also, because generally it doesn't get what you are after. The world certainly was not saved for democracy. However, I still contend with anybody that it was saved from something pretty bad. Maybe not for what we would have liked, but from a world that would have been far worse had we lost.

I don't like war but I think there are some things worse than war. Defeat is worse than war. The loss of the things that mean more than life is worse than war—the things that are spiritual. If we lose this present war on the fields of battle, we will see a society supported by a government controlled by materialists; a society in which ideals—the ideals of honor, and integrity, and honesty, and kindness, and love, and God—will be denied expression.

I am not speaking out of my imagination. Two years ago an edict was sent from Hitler to the gauleiter of Poland. The order said: "There shall be no religious organizations permitted." Fellowships may be allowed to exist, but fellowships only for adults. No one under 21 shall belong to any such fellowship. No fellowship shall have as its leader anyone who is giving his full time to it and supported by the offerings of the people who belong to it. No such fellowship shall have any relationship with similar fellowships in other countries. This dictum is verifiable. It is not a statement growing out of my imagination. It was printed in several of our newspapers and given space in Time Magazine. If a military victory should be won by the enemy—God forbid—those things for which the church has stood for 2,000 years will find it difficult, if not impossible, to secure expression, maybe for centuries. Goering says the new order will persist for a thousand years. Because I believe that the church is the only agency qualified to give adequate expression to those ideals which mean more to me than life itself, and that military defeat would mean the death of the church, I will support in any way that I am permitted, the program of war. Because I believe in the church as the only channel, I support the war.

II

But make no mistake, the war is only the symptom of a disease. Two books have influenced my thinking more than any others this last year. Both of them were written by Russians. One, a book spoken of here many times, is The Crisis of Our Age, by Sorokin. The other, The End of Our Times, is by a man named Berdyaev, who was a leader in the Bolshevist revolution but who was run out of Russia in 1922 because he was a Christian. He was, the last known of him, in Paris directing the Academy of the Philosophy of Religion. Both of these are convinced that we are watching a disease attacking our society—materialism. A disease that has captured certain countries almost entirely and which leads men to believe that there is no reality except that which is known to the senses; that the only real things are the things that can be measured; that man is only bones and brain and muscles—a purely materialistic concept. For those who have such a concept there is no place for kindness; there is no place for brotherly love; there is no place for honor and honesty; there is no place for sacrifice; there is no place for integrity of character; there is no place for God. These things are not real because they can't be measured. The church says they are real. The church says that integrity of character has more to do with a satisfactory society than all the wealth of the world. The church says that honor is more important than money. The church says that honesty is more important than success. The church says that "God so loved the world that He gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." The church says man is a spirit—not bones and brains and muscle; the church says he is a child of God.

The disease has captured certain countries, but, make no mistake, the disease has been active in America. Many Americans giving lip service to the church still believe in materialism. Many Americans entering superficial fellowship with the church believe that success is more important than honesty and money more important than honor and earthly achievement better than eternal life. So it is a disease that will have to be attacked also in America. And unless we maintain the church through the crisis, whatever be the outcome of our conflict, we will have lost the war.

Consequently, because I believe that honor and honesty and integrity and brotherly kindness and God are more important than all the material things in the world, because I believe in that, as long as I am minister of this church, we are going to function. There will be great temptations in the next year for us to let down here in our own church; to let down in our financial support; to let down in the program. I am not going to let it down. I believe that we not only must win a military victory, we must conserve those things for which we are fighting. If we don't conserve them, whether we win or not on the battlefields of the world, we will lose at home and our children and their children will come into a society in which honor is not a virtue and honesty is not a virtue and integrity is not a virtue and money and success and power are the things to be sought for, and God will be forgotten. If you want to live in a society like that, then "choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your father served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell; but, as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord."

III

Now there is one other reason why I can believe in the church in a time of war. As of today there are 98 boys out of this church in the armed services. Ninety-eight! Out of the 98 I suppose there are 75 that I call by their first names. They are boys that I have watched grow up through high school and college. Many of them I have brought into the church. Some of them I have married. I have baptized some of their children. My boys! I am not going to let them down. If I can influence you, you are not going to let them down. When they come back they are going to come back into a church that is functioning. They left one that was functioning, and to which they lent their efforts. When they come back they are going to find one functioning. The things they have taken with them—the things that are giving them courage and strength in the face of many temptations, are the things that they got through their homes and the church; through homes influenced by the church. When they come back they are going to find this church alive.

Listen to what they say to their minister:

"I get a sort of warm feeling just knowing that I have a minister I can write to and tell my troubles to and my happier moments."

Don't think that doesn't make me warm too. I am not going to let that boy down.

Here's one written Armistice Day:

"We got out of bed at 4:15 so you can readily see this is going to be a long day. It is now almost 7, so I will close and prepare for the day's festivities. Please continue to remember me in your prayers and I will continue trying to do my best for God and country."

I won't let that boy down.

Another one sent his letter—a V-mail letter—half way around the world. It ends:

"Look after the folks. Your pal."

I am not going to let him down.

This one from a member of the Coast Guard:

"DR. BARBOUR: I don't know if I am different from most of the sailors I have run into or not, but I don't find many that like the same things I do for relaxation."

Where did he get his guidance? Out of the church. He tells me what goes on Saturday nights among the Coast Guardsmen. I know what goes on on Saturday nights. I was in Paris on a Saturday night. But he looks for some other form of relaxation, and he was guided in his tastes by the church.

Here's another one:

"Is it all right with you if I have my service record and dog tags changed so that you will be notified in case anything serious should happen to me?"

I won't let that boy down, either.

"DEAR DR. BARBOUR: I have just finished reading your sermon on Life Is a Unit. I found it very stimulating and in reading I could hear your voice speaking the words, and even look up to see the quotation, 'God is love,' inscribed between the buttresses to the roof. That really helps.

"The Bible that the church sent also helps a great deal. While I feel that in general I'm doing what is right, i. e., serving here, I need His guidance constantly in order to do better—my life must be a unit."

We will help him to make it so.

"DEAR DR. BARBOUR: I have today witnessed a very impressive ceremony the like of which I doubt if I shall ever have the opportunity of seeing again. It was so impressive that I felt that I would just have to write and tell you about it."

Then he tells of 3,000 boys at communion service. They were boys who had learned of the significance of communion in churches like this, and when far away from home the influence of the church led them to express their faith in fellowship at the Lord's table. We must keep that influence functioning.

For the first time in history men are taking Christianity seriously into battle. For those who have gone from us we will maintain our Christianity back home so that when they return they will know we have not let them down. The church is in a crisis. We are going to be faced with a lot of temptations to give up the church. It is going to be very easy to give up attendance on church services, particularly when we are going to be on the air in 2 weeks and when gasoline rationing limits us in the use of our cars. It is going to be easy to give up supporting the church financially, when heavier taxes and urgent war demands are made upon us. It is going to be easy to give up supporting the church's program, because it is going to be easier to answer the call of more specific appeals in the war effort. But if we let the church down, no matter what happens in the war, we will have lost what we are fighting for.

How can we face a world at war and still believe in the church? It makes me believe

in the church much, much more, and in the need of the church. "Choose you this day whom ye will serve; * * * as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." I am not going to let my boys down. No.

Hon. Charles Evans Hughes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Justice D. Lawrence Groner, Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals, Washington, D. C., in appreciation of Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice of the United States from 1930 to 1941:

CHARLES EVANS HUGHES

AN APPRECIATION

Intellectual greatness has been said to consist not alone in clearness of apprehension or in vigor of expression, but in equal degree, also, in the grasp and comprehension of ideas in their relation to other ideas with wisdom to appraise them at their proper worth, that the true be winnowed from the false.

If this is an accurate definition, then measured by its standard, Charles Evans Hughes must be classed among those who are demonstrated great. Born in upper New York in the most critical period of the Nation's history, he reached manhood's estate amid the first rumblings of popular discontent at the greed and venality which in the aftermath of a great fratricidal struggle had gripped the industrial and public life of the Republic. With no other advantage than impeccable character, great moral courage, and capacity beyond his years, he began that splendid career of public service which has made his name a household word.

The limited compass of this sketch affords no opportunity to speak of the career of the great Chief Justice except in the most general outline. His admitted and admired leadership at the bar, his election twice as Governor of New York State, and the record of promises fulfilled over nearly insuperable obstacles, his first 6 years' service in the Supreme Court, his nomination for the Presidency in spite of his efforts to head it off, his defeat at the polls, and the reasons for it, his return to the practice, and his recall to high public office in the administrations of Presidents Harding and Coolidge, will some day be written to the satisfaction of a grateful people whom he served so well. But great as he was in these different relationships, he was greater still in the Chief Justiceship which he is now surrendering in wise deference to his health and age.

For 11 years he sat as the presiding judge of the Supreme Court and as such the head of the American judiciary. In the whole of this period he wrote approximately 300 opinions for the Court which, considered in the mass, may, I think, be regarded as embodying as much of erudition, statesmanship, breadth of view, and sound legal principles as the work of any previous member of that great Court. Confronted in the earlier period of his service by a world-wide depression resulting in general unemployment, prostration of trade and commerce, and a general impatience with constitutional limitations, he saw with the vision of statesmanship the necessity of adapting the great charter of American freedom, in its scope and application, to the impending crisis. In this spirit, he was not afraid to advocate such readjustments as he believed to be necessary to meet definite and permanent changes in the social and economic life of the Nation, and he sustained his views in this respect with a ripeness of research, a mastery of logic, and an accumulation of historical knowledge and political lore that left nothing to be said. Today, as he leaves the Court, the Constitution stands unimpaired, the foundation still on which Government rests, the unchanging means through which every individual right is preserved, the guarantor to all, rich and poor, strong and weak, of liberty in the full sense of that term. Within its ample folds are yet garnered and stored, as in a common repository, the hopes of labor, the security of business, the stability of agriculture, the peace of the home, and the protection of the fireside. The young Athenian was made to swear that he would adhere constantly to the faith of his fathers. The fathers of our Constitution claim the same fidelity of their posterity. Chief Justice Hughes exemplified in his long career as lawyer, judge, patriot, and statesman, an abiding appreciation of this obligation.

A brief view into the administrative side of his headship of the Court may not be inappropriate. In this respect he regarded himself as discharging a sacred trust, and the preservation of the esteem and confidence of the people in the Court he looked upon as vital to the safety of the Republic. Hence he was ever watchful that it should not be lessened nor destroyed. As the head of the whole Federal judiciary, he was impelled by the same sentiment of obligation and duty. And when it became apparent to him that Congress had failed to provide adequate administrative machinery for the proper functioning of the inferior Federal courts, resulting in delays in the trial of cases and resentment on the part of the public, he advocated the bill to create the administrative office of the courts to afford a sane mode of dealing with the affairs of the Federal system and at the same time assuring judicial independence and placing the responsibility for judicial work under judicial supervision. These and other like services in behalf of the better administration of justice attest his foresight and his wisdom.

But great as he was in the chair of justice, sound as were his judgments, wise as was his administration—it was in the conference room that he most strongly impressed himself upon his brethren. The power of his exposition, the clarity of his statement, the fruitfulness of his advice, endeared him to the members of the Court, and I have heard from the lips of the judges who served with him, that all regarded him as the ablest Chief Justice in the history of the Court. Primus not only inter pares—but inter omnes.

To the members of the Judicial Conference—the 11 senior circuit judges—over which he annually presided the guiding hand of the Chief Justice was universally recognized, and the severance of the relationship which his retirement makes necessary will be deeply felt as an insuperable loss.

The historian Gibbon has said that it was the great fortune of the Emperor Justinian that his greatest work had been in the administration of law and justice by the great code which he provided, and that his memory was committed to a permanent body of men who profess and execute the law and maintain justice. I have no manner of doubt that, in the same sense, the memory of Chief Justice Hughes will be preserved so long as truth and justice have sway to vindicate the right and subdue the wrong.

D. LAWRENCE GRONER,
Chief Justice, United States Court of Appeals.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 1, 1941.*

Gasoline and Tire Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered on December 15, 1942, by Fulton Lewis, Jr.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is Fulton Lewis, Jr., speaking from the studios of radio station WOL, in Washington, D. C., but before we get around to the news here's a word from your announcer.

Well, I think I'm ready to give you a final roundup tonight on these problems of rationing in general and gasoline-tire rationing in particular, and farm gasoline rationing in very particular, about which I've been reporting to you from all over the Nation for the past 3 weeks.

As I told you in the very beginning, there's not much use in doing a job of this kind if you're going to be merely destructive, and say that what's been done is bad, without any substitute that's an improvement, and I wanted to talk to all of the agencies and individuals here in Washington who are involved in this rather bad scramble, before I gave you any final summary.

But I have talked to those people now. I've gotten the point of view of the Office of Defense Transportation, which was responsible for these fantastic questionnaires to the farmers. I've gotten the story of the Office of Price Administration, on their problems about general rationing. I spent last evening in conference with Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, who needs no identification to you, and I spent some hours today with Mr. William Jeffers, the Rubber Administrator, who is immediately responsible for the rubber problem.

And after doing all that I've tried to boil everything down to simple terms. I hope you'll listen carefully, because this is a tremendous problem—one of the most critical we have in the whole country—and I hope that the gentlemen here in Washington who are involved will realize that I'm not indulging in any personalities. I'm merely trying to be constructive.

To begin with, you've heard most of the reports I've made from various parts of the country, farmers bewildered and hamstrung in their operations because of long, legalistic, highly complicated questionnaires they were required to fill out, in order to get gasoline for their farm operations, and then being cut, arbitrarily, to such drastic extents that they simply couldn't continue their farm operations; ration boards, all over the Nation, paralyzed by their inability to handle the flood of gasoline rationing demands; and the public partially paralyzed because the ration boards just can't issue the ration

books fast enough. And in all of that rush and turmoil, the local ration boards—which are trying very hard, admirably, to do a good job—being swamped by a deluge of new regulations every day, giving detailed instructions and revising and rerevising existing regulations, until the board members are almost crazy.

There are six high points, in all this information I've gathered for you—and for what they're worth, I want to give them to you one by one, with just a bit of explanation and background, and perhaps a suggestion as to what should be done to cure them.

In the first place, there's one general weakness, that seems to stand out like a sore thumb, all through this whole picture, and that is the efforts by a bureau in Washington, or in one case a bureau of Detroit, to handle all of the tiny little details of each individual situation in every city and hamlet and country crossroads in the United States.

That was very noticeable, in the case of the Office of Defense Transportation in Detroit, trying to issue individual ration allowances for each individual farm truck in the United States. It's also equally noticeable in the case of the general rationing regulations which the Office of Price Administration is sending to the individual ration boards all over the Nation. The smart executive is always the man who issues general policies, and gives that policy to assistants to carry out. He doesn't follow every detail down to the chore boy who is carrying out the actual work, to supervise every move that the chore boy makes. And in the case of a Nation-wide governmental program, that becomes more important than ever.

I can understand how all these detailed regulations have built up. The top officials, here in Washington, in their enthusiasm for setting up a perfect rationing system in gasoline, for example, have tried to make it airtight—they've tried to demonstrate what perfect planners they are, by thinking of every little detail, and leaving not the tiniest loophole by which anyone could cheat on the system. But from a practical standpoint, that's an impossible thing to do and the impossibility of it is showing up every day. In the tire rationing, for example, in order to prevent the public from using bootleg gasoline and thereby using their tires more than they're allowed to use them, Mr. Leon Henderson has put in this system of having tires checked every three months, or every two months, according to whether you have an A card, or a B or C card. And as a check against that, is the speedometer reading. The difficulty is that from a practical standpoint, it's impossible for any tire inspector—certainly a tire inspector who is made merely by pinning a Government badge on him—to really tell whether tires have been 8,000 or 12,000 miles, because road conditions are different, and previous driving may have been different, and different makes of tires wear differently, and how is the inspector going to remember what the tires looked like the last time, so as to compare them with how they look this time? And it's easy enough to disconnect a speedometer or to break the thing and forget to have it fixed for a few thousand miles. And so, even with all your carefully planned checks, it's impossible to prevent cheating by those who are going to cheat, and the cheating probably is going to amount to more in the long run than if you didn't try to make all these checks that don't work anyway, and instituted a simple system in which the public was taken into the Government's confidence and asked to help as a patriotic duty. From my observations, I can't help believe that this mere punitive approach by the Government—telling the public, in effect, that "we know you're going to cheat and steal, and we're going to stop you"—only antagonizes the average citizen, who never would cheat ordinarily, and removes the whole thing from the plane of patriotism and cooperation, to one of a contest between whether they or the rationing board regulation-writers in Washington are the smartest.

It would seem that the wisest thing to do would be to cut out some of these Philadelphia-lawyer regulations, and stop all these intricate tire inspections—beyond the mere matter of checking to see whether tires need repairs * * * after all, the public hasn't cheated in Red Cross work, or civilian defense work, or in buying bonds, or in serving in canteens, or in any of the thousands of other things that are done every day—all of which require plenty of sacrifice * * * and it's unfortunate that the regulation-writers have to still be suspicious of them.

So there are the first two points:

Stop this business of trying to handle every little detail of rationing from Washington, and let the local ration boards, which are perfectly honorable and capable—ration boards who know the people and the needs of the local community—use their own discretion within reasonable, broad grounds.

Mr. Baruch told me last night, that the worst disaster that can come to any program of this kind, is to tie it up in red tape and complications, by trying to handle everything from Washington. He said that the only way it can be done fairly and equitably is for Washington to lay down general policies, and let it be handled by the local boards, who know local problems and conditions.

And specifically, in the case of gasoline rationing to the public at large—stop all of this ineffectual, impossible business of checking tires and speedometers to see whether the evidences of travel are in keeping with the gasoline allowance to the individual.

Now, as for the farm rationing situation, it seems painfully apparent that the Office of Defense Transportation ought to be removed from the picture completely, and permanently. It has been removed, temporarily, you know * * * the impossible questionnaires which that agency sent out to the farmers so gummed up the whole national farm situation, that the questionnaires had to be disregarded, and Mr. Leon Henderson had to instruct all local ration boards to grant farmers whatever they ask for—short of the ridiculous—until the end of January, when a new plan will go into effect. So at the moment the problem is temporarily cured * * * but what happens at the end of January? The Office of Defense Transportation wants to take over again, at that time, with a modified system.

Let's look that over. The Office of Defense Transportation was given authority by the President to conserve the actual transportation equipment of the country—the physical, metal trucks themselves—and it's from that standpoint that they took control of farm trucks. But all they have ever done was to issue regulations about the conservation of tires, which is the field which has been given to the rubber administrator, Mr. Jeffers. That transportation agency has never issued any regulations or taken any official steps about keeping the trucks in working operation * * * they have taken no steps to see to it that continuous supplies of repair parts are available from factories, to keep the trucks running, and in the light of that it does seem that they are totally superfluous in this picture; they're not performing any function that Mr. Jeffers' Rubber Administration is not already performing, and why complicate a situation that already is much too complicated, by having them take over this one little field of farm trucks, while the farmers' other cars, and all private cars, are handled in the usual way by the regulation rationing boards. The simple thing to do is to let the county war boards, made up of responsible neighbors of the farmer in his own community—who know him, and know how much he really needs—decide what he's to get, and let the ration board issue the coupons. That seems only common sense.

And as point four, it seems only common sense, too, that the farmer should have one single questionnaire to make out for all of the gasoline and kerosene and fuel oil he needs on the farm—that whole questionnaire to be handled by the local County War Board. He uses gasoline for the tractor, for the water pump, as well as for the truck. He uses kerosene for a brooder, and for heating the house, and for lighting, and there's no reason in the world why one simple form—listing his needs for 1 year—shouldn't be enough to cover all of those points. If he's found to be cheating later, he can be punished. But his neighbors will know a lot better than the Office of Defense Transportation in Washington or Detroit how much kerosene he really needs to operate his brooder for a thousand chickens in that particular neighborhood, and how much he'll need for his truck.

Now, finally, the most important thing seems to be to try to get the rubber shortage cured, and get over all of the confusion and complication that's entailed by this rationing as soon as possible. Mr. Jeffers pointed out to me today, that if we can only get the machinery necessary for these plants, that's the end of it, that gets the rubber program out of the way so far as other government war projects are concerned, and the synthetic rubber equipment won't compete any longer.

Somebody, somewhere, is going to have to have the courage to make a decision, between the needs of the Army and Navy in getting immediate delivery of ships and guns and tanks and such things, and—on the other hand—the necessity of getting this equipment for making rubber to keep the Nation on wheels, because you can have all of the ships and guns and tanks in the world and if the farmer at home can't produce his food, and the worker in the plant can't get to his job of making ammunition, you still lose the war.

That machinery, Mr. Jeffers tells me, is about 30 days behind.

The Tolan Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because there is contained therein well-merited praise and an earnest appeal to the membership of the House of Representatives for the continuance of the House Select Committee on Defense Migration, praise in which I can heartily concur, a recommendation which I sincerely trust the membership will approve, under unanimous consent, I ask that three editorials, the first from the December 25, 1942, issue of The Commonweal, the second from the January 1942 issue of The Sign, and the third from the December 26, 1942, issue of America, be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is but proper that I should express the congratulations of the Congress to Representative JOHN

TOLAN, the very able chairman of this splendid select committee, as well as to the earnest gentlemen who have so faithfully collaborated with him in the committee's work, on the excellence of the service that he and they have rendered to our common country during this critical period. Theirs has indeed been an invaluable service at a time when the Nation was most in need thereof.

The editorials referred to follow:

[From The Commonweal of December 25, 1942]

CONTINUE THE TOLAN COMMITTEE

Unless a new and modest appropriation is made for the purpose at an early session of the new Congress which meets directly after the first of the year, the Tolan congressional committee is due to go out of existence. Not as highly publicized as the Dies committee for examining foreign isms, or as Thurman Arnold's forays against the trusts, this group has to its credit the discovering and compiling of the most invaluable data of all. After bringing home unmistakably the evils characteristic of the widely prevalent American system of exploiting destitute migratory farm labor, the Tolan committee tackled the problem of directing the migration of defense workers so that it would not impede the growing national war effort in the summer of 1941. After thorough first-hand investigation it issued that October a report on such key factors as housing, education, health, and recreation in defense plant areas. It recommended as a result restriction of further migration through ending discrimination against hiring, training of local workers in the necessary skills, and greater cooperation with the United States Employment Service. It also called for the widest possible distribution of defense contracts and the maximum use of subcontracting.

Since then the committee has issued five additional reports on the immediately essential question of more efficient prosecution of the war. They have dealt with such topics as the conversion of normal industry to wartime use, regional decentralization of industry, and the importance of utilizing to the full the Nation's assets in smaller shops and factories, the evacuation of Japanese aliens, and the national manpower problem. Their recommendations have considerably furthered the successful prosecution of the war—at the moment the Nation's basic need.

It is the angle from which the Tolan committee approaches all these problems which cannot be emphasized often enough. Their primary interest is the well-being of the American family, the protection of the "little man," the human side of each of these national problems. Representative TOLAN himself long knew poverty at first hand, for he is the eleventh son of an impoverished Minnesota farmer. At the various committee hearings in 25 different cities, not once was a witness subpenaed or subjected to cross-examination. The testimony of more than 400 witnesses now compiled in 34 volumes is straight and uninduced. Such valuable first-hand evidence cannot be procured in any other way. In the periods of all-out war, and then general demobilization, that lie ahead, the country needs an instrument with the experience, zeal, and vision of the Tolan committee. It is one Government agency we cannot afford to do without.

[From The Sign, Union City, N. J., of January 1943]

THE TOLAN COMMITTEE

Unless it is given a new lease on life by Congress, the Tolan committee will go out of existence on January 6, 1943. During a session in which Congress was accused of making but minor contributions toward the war effort, the Tolan committee was outstanding for its remarkable accomplishments. The reports on its investigations offer the best source of information available both to Congress and the country on migration and its impact on the community; the conversion of industry to war and priority unemployment; utilization of smaller and medium-sized businesses for the war effort; problems of enemy-alien control; manpower mobilization; and mobilization for total war. The ground covered is vast, but the investigations were intelligent and painstaking.

The problem of migration will be with us during and after the war, and it is perhaps in this field that the Tolan committee has performed its greatest service. It has held hearings in over 25 cities, traveling some 70,000 miles in its search for the facts. The vision of the members of the committee can be understood when one realizes that they saw as well as heard. It is quite different sitting in a resplendent committee room on Capitol Hill listening to an academic interpretation of an array of statistics reeled out by some bureaucrat, and seeing some of the human wrecks which are hidden behind "percentages." Defense housing becomes important when you hear a nervous, skinny man tell you how he thought he was going to make a better life for his wife and five children by taking a job in one of the Nation's big shipyards, but instead found landlords who "won't take kids" and had to journey 4 hours daily back and forth to work from a deserted house at the edge of the city. When the same witness pulls out a fistfull of dollar bills and tells you they won't buy a bed in any maternity ward in the city for his wife, who is about to bear him another child, hospitals and medical care cease being matters of politics and become matters of humanity.

We hope that the new Congress will do itself and the country the great service of providing for the continuance of the work of the Tolan committee.

[From America, New York, N. Y., of December 26, 1942]

Out of Washington comes word that the House committee investigating defense migration, popularly called the Tolan committee, will be allowed to expire with the Seventy-seventh Congress which created it. On the face of it, it is difficult to lend credence to this report, but inquiries of responsible people have elicited nothing that would contradict it. The moment is, therefore, opportune to insist as vigorously as possible that the Tolan committee be permitted to continue its constructive work. It is not a "flashy" commitee; its chairman and the members who work with him are not publicity hounds. But anyone who has read their balanced, factual reports on several critical aspects of the war program, knows that here is a group which has consistently placed the national welfare above sectional and political considerations. Through their studies of defense migration, they have been able to make recommendations on housing, on the use of farm labor, on the war-production program, on the mobilization of manpower, which have forced badly needed changes and resulted in a more efficient and unified direction of our war economy. If the little manufacturer has not been squeezed out of business, if the little farmer has been encouraged to produce the food we need so badly, if the dislocations of war have not more seriously interfered with family life, if the "business-as-usual" mentality is being gradually exorcized—a good share in these achievements belongs to the Tolan committee. To discontinue it now would be a serious blow to the efficiency of the war effort and the whole national welfare.

Electricity Is Manpower

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we all sympathize with the people along the Ohio River who have suffered as a result of the disastrous floods to which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] has just referred. Similar floods have occurred on other rivers throughout the country, and in many instances they were attended by the loss of human lives, as well as the destruction of property amounting in value to tens of millions, if not hundreds of millions, of dollars.

If our policy of controlling floods, improving navigation and generating hydroelectric power for distribution to the people of the country had been carried out on a national scale, those devastating floods would have been controlled—just as they have been controlled on the Tennessee River. Instead of the great devastation these floods have wrought, they would have been transformed into electric power which is so badly needed at this time.

We hear so much about the manpower question in America that I sometimes fear it may leave the impression on our enemies that we are without ability to produce or transport the materials of war.

During the last few years we have been developing the water power in several of our navigable streams and distributed it to the people of the Nation at rates they could afford to pay. Measured in terms of manpower, it has more than doubled the Nation's strength.

The electricity generated at the Muscle Shoals Dam on the Tennessee River exceeds the combined physical strength of all the slaves freed by the Civil War.

The power generated by the T. V. A. on the Tennessee River, working 24 hours a day, exceeds the combined physical strength of the entire manpower of the United States east of the Mississippi River, working 8 hours a day.

The power generated at Boulder Dam, on the Colorado River, working 24 hours a day, exceeds the combined physical strength of the entire manpower of the United States west of the Mississippi River, working 8 hours a day.

The power generated on the Columbia River at Bonneville and Grand Coulee, working 24 hours a day, exceeds the combined physical strength of the entire manpower of the United States, working 8 hours a day.

If the water power on the St. Lawrence River were fully developed, every 24 hours it would exceed the combined physical strength of the entire manpower of the Nation living north of the Potomac and east of the Mississippi Rivers.

The undeveloped water power of this Nation that is now going to waste and wanton to the sea, if developed and put into operation, working 24 hours a day,

would exceed the combined physical manpower of the entire world, working 8 hours a day.

These are staggering statements, but they are extremely conservative. They show, in a way, what the water power of this Nation means, and what it will mean when it is fully developed and distributed at rates the people can afford to pay.

If we had the water power on every river from the Potomac to the St. Lawrence fully developed, there would be no shivering for want of heat along the Atlantic seaboard, and hundreds of thousands of barrels of oil could be released every day to be sent to our fighting forces beyond the seas and to our allies in this war—to say nothing of the protection of human life and property which these floods are now destroying.

Already, in the last few years, we have built something like half a million miles of rural power lines, and extended the service to more than 1,500,000 farm homes throughout the Nation, taking to those homes light and life, and hope, and relief from drudgery.

It is the greatest helper that could be provided to the American farmer, and the greatest servant the housewife has ever known.

We are just in the beginning of the electric age. When this war is over, this program will take on new life and grow in speed and proportion until we shall have a completely electrified America.

Address of Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered on December 18, 1942, in Boston, Mass., by the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, at the dedication of a service flag for the 168 men of Temple Israel, in Boston, who are in the armed services:

It gives me great pleasure to share with you the patriotic gratification that comes with the unfurling of a service flag of 168 stars representing the American Jewish young men of Temple Israel now serving in the armed forces of the United States. Like their fellow citizens, Catholic and Protestant, white and black, native born and foreign born, these boys have given vivid testimony as to their loyalty to the United States. In the Army and the Navy, on land and in the air, in continental United States and on the seven seas of the world, the young men in the armed services of the United States are dramatic symbols of the strength of this great democracy. As the standard bearers of democracy, they are dedicated to the ideal of a free Nation, "indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

That 168 young men from Temple Israel should go forth to fight for their country is a commendable record, but one which does not surprise me. The American Jews of this city and Commonwealth—of this Nation—have always been among the first to assume their responsibilities. As Americans, they have always made their contributions to the land of their allegiance. Your people have always been good Americans. You are better Americans for being men of faith. Your faith has never diluted your Americanism.

It is unnecessary to call the roll of outstanding Americans of Jewish blood who have responded to the call of our country for service in time of war. In the Indian wars preceding the Revolutionary War—in the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, the first World War—Americans of Jewish blood responded. And in the present conflict they have responded, fighting shoulder to shoulder with Americans of other racial origins and of other religions to preserve the democratic way of life, which has its origin in God Himself.

Just to mention a few outstanding heroes of this war to date:

Sgt. Meyer Levin, then a corporal, was Colin Kelley's bombardier when they sank the Japanese cruiser *Haruna* in the early days of the war.

Ensign Ira Jeffrey, who was killed in the treacherous assault on Pearl Harbor, will be honored when a new destroyer, now being built in Hingham, is named for him. Previously, his family received a posthumous commendation of valor from the Secretary of the Navy Knox.

Lt. Max Silverstein was killed while in command of the destroyer *Sims*, which was sunk in the Coral Sea engagement.

Capt. Irving Maddelson, since promoted, was severely injured while serving with General MacArthur on Bataan.

I could continue on with this honor roll, but it is unnecessary. Let no man cast aspersions on the valor and courage of any of our racial groups in this time of great crisis. The record of American heroism and sacrifice in this greatest of wars is being written daily in our newspapers, and there you will find the stories of the Cohens as well as the Kelleys, the Levys as well as the Joneses, and the Bergs as well as the Cabots.

Despite all of the insinuations of people among us who are attempting to do advance work for Hitler, or unconsciously doing so, there is no evidence that American Jews have been any less appreciative of what America has offered or any less willing to fight for American principles than any other strain among the American people.

When the poison gas of prejudice is spread among us, let us remember that Americans of this generation who happen to be born of Jewish parents have not lagged behind their comrades in arms in the magnificent record already established by young America at the front. I know that intelligent American Jews would not have me place undue emphasis upon this service record in a war now but 1 year old. I know that patriotic American Jews would not wish to be singled out ahead of other elements in the population of American people. Nevertheless, the proud record of American Jews in this war is something in which all of us who deeply believe in American principles and who are not American Jews take much satisfaction. We know that the enemies of civilization rely upon the development and deliberate increase of tension among races, classes, creeds, and colors in America today, and the dedication of this service flag is further disproof of half-whispered insinuations reflecting upon the place of the Jews in American life, so furtively, yet persistently, being spread among us.

A ceremony such as this permits us all to gather strength and faith to help us meet whatever may lie ahead. A guide for future conduct may be found in ceremonies such as these. Is there within the sound of my voice an American who has succumbed to the attempts of Hitler's people to create hatred of, distrust in, and suspicion of any of our people? Is there an American man or woman within the sound of my voice who perhaps half-wittingly and half secretly has furthered the boasted effort of Hitler's man servant, Goebbels, to play on the many strings in America, first and most relied on of which is anti-Semitism?

America is unified in this war, and every American is doing his or her part. Those who say otherwise are, wittingly or unwittingly, stooges for Nazi propaganda. There may have been some differences of opinion before Pearl Harbor, but there are none now. We are all resolved that we must win this war as soon as possible.

We must have unity, both on the war front and on the home front. We must all do our part in the ranks of civilian defense, with the Red Cross auxiliaries, in buying Defense Bonds, in salvaging scrap, in conserving fuel and gasoline, and in doing the hundreds of other little things that loom so large in this total global war.

We, on the home front, have a responsibility to our sons on the war front. We must back them up with everything they need. So that they shall have plenty, we must deprive ourselves when necessary. That is the moral of this service flag dedication this evening.

We are a people—not a race. The intent and spirit of the Constitution of the United States calls for tolerance and understanding. We are welded together—not as a race but as a people—by one compelling common love from a worldly angle, our love of America and the great ideals of mankind for which our country stands.

This is a war of survival. If we lose this war, we lose our country. If we lose our country, we lose everything that God has given to us and which decent men and women throughout the world believe in.

A little over 1 year has elapsed since Pearl Harbor. A great deal, so to speak, has gone over the dam since that day. On that day and for many months thereafter gloom existed, but not despair, and there also existed in the minds of our people a grim determination to avenge that dastardly act and to win the war.

That determination on the part of our people has played an important part in the history of the past year, when, from a nation fighting a defensive war, we are changing to the affirmative and starting to wage an offensive war.

The Nazi blitzkrieg is over. Its first failure was when it failed to conquer Britain from the air. Last year, and again this year, it failed in its attempt to remove Russia from the war by destroying the Russian Armies.

Those failures enabled our beloved country to gear itself to a wartime economy; to step up our production of weapons of war as well as England's; to build up our Navy, our Army, our air troops; and now Nazi Germany and war-crazed Japan are faced by an opposition developed sufficiently to compel the enemy to adopt defensive tactics.

A year ago, time—the instrument of defensive warfare—was our ally. Today, the situation has changed so that Hitler and his vicious cohorts admit that time is their ally.

We have gradually taken the offensive, and, as time passes, our offensive attacks will become greater and greater. The enemy is strong, but the outlook for our success is far brighter than it was 1 year ago.

We on the civilian front have our part to play in this conflict. The enemy, in bombing cities, will hurl his bombs on homes, churches, hospitals, not military objectives alone.

The boys of the service are playing this serious game hard and fast, true to the traditions of the past. The youth of this generation have risen to the heights of heroism and glory in their response to our country's call. They are willing to give up their lives, if necessary, that freedom might exist in this world, and that you and I—Americans

of today—and of generations to come—might continue to enjoy the blessings of liberty.

It is up to all of us on the civilian front to play the game in the same way—to make every sacrifice possible, and to do everything we can to help our country win this war.

Our first job is to win the war and save our country. And after the war is over, with victory to our cause, I hope and pray that in America and in other countries men occupying high places who will decide the peace will act as statesmen—with vision and courage—and take those steps based on justice that will assure permanent peace—that will save the next generation—your children and your children's children—from being cannon fodder—20, 25, or 30 years from now.

Gentile and Jew—Catholic, Protestant, and Jew—let us lay all differences on the table and, as Americans, unite with grim determination to win the war and save our country—to serve and fight for God and country.

The Late Lt. Col. Boyd D. Wagner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in the Johnstown Tribune paying a deserved tribute to Lt. Col. Boyd D. Wagner. This is a real tribute to a great hero.

The tragic death of Lt. Col. Boyd D. Wagner, of Johnstown, Pa., was not only a shock to his native city but to the country as well. The aerial hero, missing since November 29 on a routine flight out of Eglin Field, Fla., was found on January 6 crushed in the wreckage of his P-40 pursuit plane 25 miles east of Eglin Field and 4 miles north of Freeport, Fla.

Colonel Wagner's accomplishments are almost legendary. He fought in the Philippines, Java, New Guinea, and proved himself a one-man scourge to the Japanese.

Colonel Wagner dealt more in action than words. He would never discuss his personal achievements. There is no official record of the Japanese planes he destroyed, but comrades say he destroyed between 15 and 50 enemy planes in the early weeks of the war.

The flier was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for extraordinary heroism and the Order of the Purple Heart for being wounded and for coolness under action.

Colonel Wagner, called by his fellow pilots the hottest and best pursuit fighter in the American Air Force, poured it on to the Japs with everything possible. In the early days of the war, he flew with bombs and hand grenades in his lap. He skimmed Jap plane formations on the ground, blasted them out of the skies and poured machine-gun bullets into small transports at water level.

On one occasion, it was related, three Zeros chased him around a volcano. His fighter plane was faster on level flight but slower as a climber, so he kept going around the volcano until he was chasing the Japs.

He was a first lieutenant when the war broke out, just about a year after he was sent to the Philippines. He was a captain by January, a lieutenant colonel by April, skipping the rank of major.

In Australia, to which point he escaped from the Philippines, he was put to work instructing green pilots while an eye injury healed. He refused to stay grounded, however, and personally bagged 3 of 13 Jap planes wiped out by his squadron in his first combat flying mission from the Australian base.

The editorial follows:

FALCON COMES TO EARTH

"Buzz" Wagner, Johnstown's great war hero, is coming home to stay. He would not have had it so, for he loved the career in which he had served his country with such high courage and daring. But Fate intervened to cut short that career and the falcon has returned to earth.

Much has been said and written about the sensational exploits of "Buzz" Wagner since he first thrilled Americans by shooting down two Japanese planes and destroying a dozen others grounded on an enemy air field in the Philippines. He crowded a lifetime of experience into the few short months that he served in the Philippines and in Australia, and his rapid advancement in rank was a fitting recognition of his service to the country he loved.

His sobriquet, "The Flying Fool," was applied to him by his fellow fliers as a term of endearment and admiration. It was, in a sense, a misnomer, for the daring of this great war ace was unmarked by recklessness or sensationalism. It was a daring marked by coolness and careful calculation, and his success against the best men the Japanese could send against him was at once a tribute to his superior intelligence and undaunted courage.

When this war is over and the list of heroes of the United States Air Force is compiled, no name on the list will be more generally revered by Americans than that of "Buzz" Wagner. It was he who provided the first example of the superiority of our flying men over those of the enemy and the inspiration that has made them supreme in the air over all of our battle fronts.

If "Buzz" could speak today, it would be to urge his comrades in arms to "Carry on" and uphold the fine tradition they have established to guide the defenders of democracy throughout the world.

Rationing in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I am inserting excerpts from a letter received by me from Mr. Ralph G. Carlile, of Perry, Iowa:

I have been thinking for some time about writing and passing on to you my observations of the reaction of the voters in this vicinity to the present rationing set-up, especially the reaction of the farmers. I don't claim to be an expert observer or a political analyst, but I do come in contact with a great many farmers who live in all directions within a radius of 20 miles of Perry. I have also assisted a great many of these farmers in preparing their applications for supplemental gasoline rations for their automobiles and for their tractors, gasoline engines, lamps, lanterns, and brooders.

The farmers are not opposed to the rationing system as a whole, but nearly everyone of them is very much opposed to the rationing system as it affects their tractors, gasoline engines, lamps, lanterns, and brooders. They can't see any sense in this part of the program. If they can't have all the gasoline or tractor fuel, or fuel for their lamps, lanterns, and brooders that they need to finish their work, they don't need any, because it would be useless to attempt to raise a crop if you couldn't have the means with which to finish its production. If the farmers are going to have all the fuel they need, as the Government says they shall, they can't see any need of being forced to run around wearing out their tires and burning up their gasoline to obtain a permit for that purpose. Anyone who knows anything at all about a farmer knows that he will not buy 800 gallons of gas for his tractor when 500 gallons will do his work, nor he will not buy 20 gallons of coal oil for his brooder and lamps when he can operate them on 10. In fact, if the farmer could get a tractor and a brooder that would run on nothing every farmer would have one.

Another thing about this part of the rationing program, there is hardly a pertinent question on any of the blanks the farmer has to fill out to make application for his tractor, gasoline engine, lamp, lantern, or brooder fuel. "How many hours per day and how many days per month do you operate your tractor?" Such a question as that leads the farmer to believe that those who drew up the blank form knew nothing at all about farming, or didn't give a damn. Anyone who has the slightest knowledge of farming knows that a farmer does not operate his tractor so many hours per day nor so many days per month. If a farmer operates on such a basis about all he will produce is weeds. Many farmers, as you no doubt know, begin their farming operations as soon as the weather will permit and continue them night and day continuously until the job is done or the weather stops their operations. Any good farmer will do this, and they don't like the idea of having to go through with all this seemingly useless and unreasonable red tape.

If some of the farmers may be inclined to snitch a little gasoline from their tank into their automobile, they'll do that in spite of the rationing program. I find most of the farmers in a cooperative mood concerning anything that seems reasonable to them, and the only way such snitching could be prevented, if there is any, is through persuasion and the fostering of a cooperative attitude. It can never be done by making the farmers do something that they think is absolutely unnecessary. I have heard very little, if any, objection from the farmers about rationing gasoline for their automobiles. They all seem to realize that there is a rubber shortage and that anything that can be done to cut down unnecessary operation of their car will help conserve rubber, and they all seem willing to do whatever they can in this respect.

Another thing that the farmers are very much opposed to, is the requirement that they must obtain a priority order to buy a repair part for their machinery and equipment. The farmer knows enough not to spend his money for a repair that he may never need. Anyone should know that the farmer will not buy a repair for any piece of his machinery unless and until he absolutely needs it. All the Government would need to do would

be to put a rigid price ceiling on these repair parts so that no dealer or anyone so inclined might buy up the same with the idea of making an exorbitant profit thereon. If they could make no profit in this manner, no dealer would want to buy any more of these parts than he was reasonably sure he would sell.

To give you an example of the inconvenience and unnecessary red tape in this connection, I will tell you of an instance that recently came to my attention. My brother-in-law, who lives in the southwest corner of Boone County, about 5 miles northwest of Perry, a short time ago had some part of his milking machine break. He went to Perry to obtain the repair part, and the dealer had it in stock, but my brother-in-law could not buy it because he didn't have a priority order. He needed the part right away, of course, so it was necessary for him to drive to Boone, Iowa, 30 miles up and 30 miles back, to get the priority order, and then make another trip to Perry. Eighty miles of wearing out tires and burning up gas, when a 10-mile trip should have been sufficient. Another farmer, just yesterday, told me of his having to make three trips to Des Moines and two to Adel, a total of about 200 miles, in order to replace his old corn sheller with a new one. Many of the farmers in discussing their opposition to these matters express the hope that the new Congress will do something about it. They expect the new Congress to do this. Another feeling prevalent among the farmers and many others is that a great part of the rationing set-up is not really necessary but just another attempt by the New Deal to create jobs for political patrons.

Ruml Pay-As-You-Go Income-Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a very excellent analysis of the Ruml tax plan, written by Mr. Ernest K. Lindley and appearing in the Washington Post under date of January 11, 1943. I want to urge every Member of the House to study this statement.

On the opening day of Congress I introduced House Joint Resolution 17, which, if enacted into law, would carry into effect the Ruml plan. Certainly no one who has studied our tax structure can condone the income-tax debt liability that continually confronts our citizens.

The article follows:

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAXES

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

NO LOSS TO THE TREASURY

The President favors pay-as-you-go taxes, but thinks, or thought, that the Ruml plan would mean a loss of revenue to the Treasury. It does seem incredible, at first glance, that a year's taxes can be skipped without loss of revenue to the Treasury.

Under the Ruml plan there is no interruption in the flow of money into the Treasury. The personal income-tax clock simply is moved ahead 1 year. You pay the tax due on your income for last year, but it counts as payment against your tax on 1943 income. At the end of the year, or next March, the adjustment will be made for over or underpayment. In 1944, you will pay the tax calculated on your 1943 income, but it will count as payment on your 1944 income, and at the end of 1944 or in March 1945 the adjustment will be made for under or overpayment.

As long as tax collections are kept on a current basis, there is no loss, or none that is substantial, to the Treasury. There would be substantial loss if, at some future date, we went back to the present system of paying our income taxes a year late. But there would be no point in going back to the present system. Paying as you go is preferable at all times.

There are ways in which the Treasury might lose some money under the Ruml plan. It would get less from persons whose income in 1943 is smaller than in 1942. They would be chiefly men going into the armed services; and some tax relief for them is only fair. It might lose some revenue from taxes on capital gains; but this loss can be avoided by separating capital gains from income from other sources. Mr. Ruml has proposed that that be done. Taxes on capital gains would continue to be paid a year late, just as the taxes on corporation profits would continue to be paid a year late.

The Treasury might lose a little when a man dies, since he would have paid 1 year's less taxes. But this loss would be recovered in large part from estate and inheritance taxes.

The Treasury might lose some money when, or if, income taxes are reduced after the war. But it need lose none. For Congress will determine when and by how much income taxes shall be reduced. In the same way, all the small losses which the Treasury might suffer in the long run from adoption of the Ruml plan can be offset easily by slight adjustments of the tax rates. And most taxpayers, certainly, would be willing to pay a little more, if necessary, if taxes were put on a pay-as-you-go basis.

The Ruml plan is the way of putting personal income taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis without double taxation. Some persons whose incomes have increased substantially but on whom the income tax still falls lightly can pay the tax for 2 years in 1 year without hardship. Persons with accumulated capital can pay the tax for 2 years in 1 by drawing on their capital. But for many persons in the middle brackets, who have not accumulated substantial savings, paying 2 years' tax in 1 is impossible at present rates of taxation. They would have little, or nothing, left for living expenses.

Various proposals have been made for spreading or postponing the second year's tax, incident to switching to pay-as-you-go. The tax on 1942 incomes might be spread over 5 years or postponed until after the war, as Senator GEORGE has suggested. These alternatives are feasible, but you would get the same result by increasing the tax rates somewhat or by maintaining the high war rates a year or two longer after the war.

The Treasury's opposition to the Ruml plan is hard to fathom, since no Treasury spokesman has made a convincing factual rebuttal to the claims made for it. It is impossible to believe that the Treasury's opposition reflects the best tax thought in the Treasury, or that the statement of Chairman DOUGHTON of the House Ways and Means Committee that the Ruml plan would impair the credit of the Government, came from careful study.

The Treasury's attitude probably is influenced by its difficulty in obtaining adequate taxation from Congress. It is against anything that even looks like tax relief. The Ruml plan would give actual relief to persons who suffer a sudden decline in income. The relief to other taxpayers would be chiefly psychological—altogether so if capital gains were separated and other tax rates adjusted slightly to cover the small longer range losses. And this is without assuming any tax defaults under the present system of paying a year late. The Treasury does not expect much trouble on that score, but it may be overly optimistic. The Ruml plan might actually increase tax revenues by eliminating defaults.

The advantages of getting the income tax on a pay-as-you-go basis, both psychologically and for purposes of better fiscal management, are so great that they would be worth probably some slight loss in revenue. But the Ruml plan can be put into effect without the loss of a dollar to the Treasury, now or in the long run.

Independent Oil Companies—Oil Production—Revenue and Cost for Year 1942—Oil Essential in War—Reserves Being Depleted—Government Subsidy Is Not the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith a letter to me, written by Mr. W. W. Lechner, of Dallas, Tex.; also a brief, which was attached to the letter, on 1942 development and exploration expenditures on oil.

They are as follows:

DALLAS, TEX., *December 10, 1942.*

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Congressman, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: Referring to our conversation while you were in Dallas on November 19, with reference to statement pertaining to the oil industry and why we should have a substantial increase in the price of crude:

The compilation of this data has taken more time than I anticipated, but it has been compiled from official records of representative oil operators in sufficient numbers to reflect a true and accurate picture of the industry at present.

Quoting Mr. J. P. Coleman, of the firm of McCarty & Coleman, of Wichita Falls, Tex., before the Subcommittee on Mineral Resources, he said that: "The firm of McCarty & Coleman owns 225 of the 15,000 small wells in north Texas and that the average production per day of wells owned by this firm is 1.2 barrels. At the present price of oil, and if the present rate of production continues, it will take 15 years to recover even the salvage value of these wells. Right now we would be better off to pull the casing on these 225 wells and put the money in Government bonds. For the good of the war effort, this should not be done. Independents, under the present price conditions, do not have the money with which to explore for new reserves. In fact, our business is in the process of liquidation. When the producer stops looking for new reserves he is liquidating his company. In the long run, the way to obtain the greatest

amount of oil at the lowest price is to have fair and reasonable crude prices that will encourage orderly exploratory drilling on a constantly increasing scale. If 3,000 wildcats per year do not find enough oil, then 6,000 or more must be drilled per year. It is better to have a price that will bring forth a sufficient amount of oil so that we will not have abnormally low prices at one time and abnormally high prices at another."

East Texas production problems and costs are already on the increase; this field is taking the inevitable path of all other fields as salt water encroaches and cuts production. This field has been an abnormal field from the start and cannot be used as a yardstick. Already an expenditure of $2,000,000 has been made to prevent premature abandonment because of salt water encroachment. Four thousand of these wells have been placed on pump in order to get the oil lifted, and from here out it will be almost a continuous proposition of wells going on the pump (if pumping equipment can be obtained, due to priorities, etc.), and increasing cost of handling the salt water and injecting it back into the sands. With the installation of pumping equipment and its cost, and vast increase in labor costs, the decline in revenue will be more appreciable than heretofore.

Oil is as essential to the war effort as guns and ammunition. There is no weapon of modern warfare that does not require petroleum; it can be considered one of the prime factors we will need throughout the present conflict, and after peace is won, we will no doubt be called upon to supply sufficient oil to keep the wheels of commerce moving, not only in our own Nation, but others as well, or until the destroyed foreign fields and refineries can be rehabilitated.

At the present rate we are depleting our reserves at an alarming rate, as has been shown by various members of Mr. Ickes' staff, especially Mr. R. E. Allen, on his various appearances before House and Senate committees, and Mr. Don R. Knowlton, Director of Production. In an address before the annual meeting of the American Association of Oil Well Drilling Contractors at Tulsa, Mr. Knowlton gives a vivid picture of our present depletion of reserves. During the first half of 1942 new discoveries for the Nation added only an estimated 150,000,000 barrels to our reserves; we produced 680,000,000 barrels, showing a ratio of 4.533 to 1. During the same period Texas produced 236,000,000 barrels, and new discoveries amounted to an estimated 79,000,000 barrels, showing a ratio of 2.987 to 1. We know the number of barrels produced, but the reserves are only estimated.

A Government subsidy has been suggested as a way to handle future exploration. This method of discovering new reserves would be impractical and fraught with dangers from the start. The principal reason is that it would necessitate the Government setting up a geological department and a land and leasing department to operate this strategic part of our war program. It would be necessary for private enterprise to surrender the heads of these departments to this organization, and it would take a year to integrate this organization, and the war would not wait to train a new crop of technical men for these positions, those presently doing this work would be the only men available for these duties. This procedure would wreck what remains of the oil-producing industry, which has, under natural operation, up to now, provided a constantly increasing visible reserve.

Hon. William P. Cole, Jr., in his report to the President under date of October 22, 1942, states that Government drilling is "most inefficient, uncertain, and expensive," and further states that "subsidy" is subject to endless delays and the hazards of favoritism. I know of no one better qualified than Mr. Cole to reach this decision, as it has been his responsibility to make long and careful study of the oil business.

In closing, I might add the oil industry certainly got a break when the Honorable Harold L. Ickes was made Director of Petroleum as he has demonstrated his ability to cope with the situation in an unbiased manner.

What we, as independents and small operators need, is sufficient increase in price to enable us to continue in business and endeavor to discover new reserves in the future as in the past. Eighty-five percent of new discoveries have been made by independent wildcatters, so you can readily understand why it is so vitally important to keep him going. Sooner or later the bankers are going to be unable to carry the loans they are called upon to make to the small or independent operator, the only thing being left for him to do is foreclose, thereby entering into a business about which he knows practically nothing, or turn the recovered property over to some major company at a discount.

Yours very truly,

WALTER W. LECHNER.

1942 DEVELOPMENT AND EXPLORATION EXPENDITURES

Drilling 4,643 oil wells and dry holes at $26,800	$124,443,125
Cost of acquiring and carrying leases	62,644,991
Geophysical and geological expense	13,800,000
Total	200,888,116

This total is more than $50,000,000 less than the average expenditure for the past 8 years for these basic costs in the development of oil production in Texas.

It must be recognized that 1942 expenditures represent a subnormal year for both development and exploration due to war-restricted operations.

An examination of the returns from production operations this year shows that the Texas oil industry has expended much more than it received for its oil. Oil loans to operators aggregate $160,000,000 used to help carry on operations and exploration. Any profits which may accrue to pay back such loans are in the ground in the form of expected recoverable oil. The hazards of production are such that it may never be realized.

TEXAS OIL PRODUCTION REVENUE AND COST, YEAR 1942

Seventy percent of all producing oil wells in Texas show a gross profit on their operations, before interest on investment and Federal taxes, of only $603 a year per well.

It is generally recognized that conditions in the East Texas oil field, which represents 30 percent of the State's producing wells, cannot be accepted as reflecting the experience of the average Texas oil operator. While at the present time, operating costs in the East Texas area are lower than the general average, it should be recognized that this situation will not continue to prevail by reason of the growing salt water disposal problem. Already millions of dollars are being invested in facilities necessary for salt water disposal, which will add materially to the cost of producing oil in this field.

In all producing areas of the State the average annual gross income per well is $5,016, while the cost of production is $3,919, which leaves $1,097 a year before interest on investment and Federal taxes.

If Texas oil producers did not continue to explore and develop new sources of oil supply, their business would evolve itself into liquidation. Under such conditions, the amortization and pro rata charges for all of the expenditures incurred by past development and exploration would gradually be absorbed in the cost of producing the oil now under these properties. Yet, if the oil industry is to continue as it has in the past, it is necessary that returns from operations provide sufficient capital to permit continued exploration and development of new sources of oil supply for immediate and future needs.

ANALYSIS OF STRIPPER WELLS IN TEXAS

At the close of 1941, Texas has 98,802 producing oil wells with proven underground oil reserves of 10,975,641,000 barrels. Analysis of wells and reserves shows the following classification of producing properties in Texas as of January 1, 1942:

	Number of wells	Estimated reserves (barrels)
Flowing wells	39,625	9,603,335,500
Pumping wells	28,051	986,379,000
Stripper wells	31,126	385,926,500
All wells	98,802	10,975,641,000

An exhaustive study of stripper-well operations in Texas, based upon questionnaire data supplied by stripper-well operators and supplemented by detailed analysis of Railroad Commission well records, shows that there are 31,126 stripper wells in the State and the producing properties upon which these wells are located have estimated underground reserves aggregating 385,926,500 barrels of crude oil. Returns from stripper well operators showed that 67 percent, or 258,570,085 barrels of this reserve oil supply may be recovered by primary methods and 33 percent, or 127,356,415 barrels of the remaining reserve, may ultimately be produced by secondary recovery methods.

Sixty percent of all Texas oil wells are on the pump and nearly 53 percent of the State's pumping wells are stripper wells which produce an average of only three barrels of oil a day. A study of the rate at which Texas' flowing oil wells pass into the pumping stage, based upon 7 years' experience, shows that an average of 4,350 flowing wells become pumpers each year, while an average of 1,686 stripper wells pass out of existence each year. Over the past 7 years 30,440 flowing oil wells in Texas were placed on the pump and 11,802 stripper wells were abandoned.

A factual study of the Texas oil well situation, covering a period of the past 7 years, is of interest in this connection.

	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941
Flowing wells, Jan. 1	19,277	23,349	27,571	31,011	34,737	36,942	40,524
Flowing wells completed	7,371	7,980	9,650	7,781	5,836	5,812	6,358
Total	26,648	31,329	37,221	38,792	40,573	42,754	46,882
Flowing wells, Dec. 31	23,349	27,571	31,011	34,737	36,942	40,524	39,625
Flowing wells to pump	3,299	3,758	6,210	4,055	3,631	2,230	7,257
Pumping wells, Jan. 1	33,392	36,112	40,483	46,554	50,400	52,972	54,690
Pumping wells completed	1,050	1,140	1,380	1,111	835	830	900
Total	37,642	41,010	48,073	51,720	54,866	56,032	62,847
Pumping wells, Dec. 31	36,112	40,483	46,554	50,400	52,982	54,690	59,177
Wells abandoned	1,530	527	1,519	1,320	1,894	1,342	3,670

SUMMARY OF WELLS—7 YEARS

	Flowing	Pumping	Total
Number of wells, Jan. 1, 1935	19,277	33,293	52,570
Wells completed 1935-41, inclusive	50,788	7,246	58,034
Transfers 1935-41, inclusive	−30,440	+30,440	
Total	39,625	70,979	110,604
Number of wells, Dec. 31, 1941	39,625	59,177	98,802
Wells abandoned, 1935-41, inclusive		11,802	11,802

The effect of premature abandonment of stripper wells may readily be appreciated by the fact that the average stripper well abandoned within the past 4 years still had a reserve of 10,407 barrels of unproduced oil. On the basis of reports received from stripper well operators in every section of the State it was found that premature abandonment of 8,226 stripper wells over the past 4 years resulted in the loss of over 85,000,000 barrels of unproduced oil remaining in the underground reservoir.

This study of stripper well operations in Texas showed further that the average operating stripper well represents reserves of approximately 12,399 barrels and the average unproduced oil reserve of all pumping oil wells in the State, including stripper wells, amounts to about 21,500 barrels. Since 3,670 stripper wells were abandoned in 1941, the highest rate recorded in many years, it is apparent that such abandonments resulted in the loss of over 38,000,000 barrels of recoverable oil.

The stripper wells of Texas produced in the year 1941 a total of 33,753,962 barrels of crude oil, which was valued at $35,959,156. While the average price of crude oil in Texas during 1941 was $1.13 per barrel production of stripper wells returned to the operators an average price of $1.07 per barrel. Based upon reports received from stripper well operators, the average total cost of producing oil from this class of wells was $1.03. This left an average profit margin on stripper well production of only 4 cents per barrel.

In the transition of flowing well to pumping well and from pumping to stripper operation, the average revenue per well shows a precipitous decline. Inversely, the unit cost of operation moves sharply upward and in the case of stripper wells the cost frequently equals or exceeds the posted price of crude oil at the well.

The three stages of production and gross revenue, from flowing well to pumping well and thence to stripper operation, are shown as follows:

	Total annual production (barrels)	Annual production per well (barrels)	Annual revenue per well
Flowing wells	356,386,765	8,994	$10,163
Pumping wells	117,443,273	4,187	4,731
Stripper wells	33,753,962	1,084	1,160
All wells	507,584,000	5,137	5,805

The salvage value of equipment in stripper wells of Texas at the close of 1941 aggregated $27,611,500, an average of $887 per well. The total salvage value of equipment recovered from stripper wells abandoned in the past 4 years amounted to $9,057,700, with salvage values per well ranging from $800 to $1,350. Salvage value is often the determining factor in the abandonment of stripper wells. When profit margins are reduced to the point where it would take longer than the equipment would last to recover its salvageable value, it becomes prudent for the operator to abandon his well and recover the value of its equipment, even though he leaves over 10,000 barrels of oil in the ground.

While the abandonment of 8,226 stripper wells in the past 4 years left over 85,000,000 barrels of oil in the ground, it is evident that the ultimate profit on this oil at 4 cents per barrel would have amounted to only $3,425,320 against the total salvage value of equipment in these wells of $9,057,700. Since this study shows that 67 percent of the oil remaining underground on stripper properties of Texas is available by primary recovery methods, it is apparent that less than 57,000,000 barrels of these reserves could have been recovered by primary methods. At a profit of 4 cents per barrel, this would have returned a total net income of $2,280,000 against an immediate salvage value of equipment which was reported to aggregate over $9,000,000.

On the basis of reports received directly from stripper-well operators in Texas, the itemized cost of producing oil from stripper wells in 1941 was as follows:

	Total cost	Cost per barrel
Wages and salaries	$10,875,129	$0.3222
Royalty payments	4,494,895	.1332
Office and administrative expense	4,007,941	.1187
State and local taxes	3,240,465	.0960
Federal taxes	349,736	.0104
All other expenses	11,798,415	.3495
Total cost	34,766,581	1.0300

The survey reveals the fact that the average stripper well in Texas had a gross income in 1941 of $1,160 while the total cost of producing oil from such wells averaged $1,117, leaving an average net profit per stripper well of $43. State, local, and Federal taxes levied against production and properties of stripper wells in Texas averaged $115 per well, which is nearly three times the net profit left to the producer after all expenses, including taxes.

Sale of Alcoholic Liquor at Army Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from members of Hopewell United Presbyterian Missionary Society Church, of Laurel, Pa.:

DECEMBER 17, 1942.

Congressman CHESTER H. GROSS,
Manchester, Pa.

DEAR MR. GROSS: Mothers have worked and prayed that their boys might be kept from evil since we are in the war, and our boys are called to serve their country. We think they should be protected from evil influences while in the service of our country.

Realizing the great harm alcoholic drinks are doing the people of our country, and especially to the boys in the Army camps, we beg of you to urge President Franklin D. Roosevelt to give us wartime prohibition as Woodrow Wilson did in World War No. 1.

Members of Hopewell United Presbyterian Missionary Society Church of Laurel, Pa.: Mabel E. Kinard, Bridgeton, Pa.; Florance E. Hyson, Stewartstown, Pa.; Carrie A. Leffler, Laurel, Pa.; Mary Belle Keesey, Stewartstown, Pa.; Mrs. Retta McConaughy, Laurel, Pa.; Verna M. Cross, Laurel, Pa.; Sara M. Hyson, Felton, Pa.; Melva L. Collins, Stewartstown, Pa.; Jennie M. Cross, Laurel, Pa.; Ethel V. Leffler, Laurel, Pa.; Emma Cross, Laurel, Pa.; Mrs. Maggie R. P. Hyson, Stewartstown, Pa.; Mrs. Mary M. Hyson, Stewartstown, Pa.; Mrs. Edith H. McAllister, Felton, Pa.; Mrs. Margaret J. Cross, Laurel, Pa.; Mrs. Wilbur Kinard, Felton, Pa.; Mrs. J. Webster Keesey, Highrock, Pa.; Mrs. Maggie B. Wallace, Highrock, Pa.; Nellie Hyson Keesey, Stewartstown, Pa.; Mabel L. C. Keesey, Stewartstown, Pa.; Mrs. Arthur Schnetzka, Stewartstown; Mrs. Jesse C. Trout, Stewartstown, Pa.; Mrs. Walter Keesey, Stewartstown, Pa.; Laura I. M. Hyson, Stewartstown, Pa.; Mrs. Edgar E. Fix, Stewartstown, Pa.; Mrs. Barbara L. Hyson; Mrs. Fergus Wallace, Stewartstown, Pa.

Relief for Naturalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to July 1, 1924.

This bill provides that any alien eligible for citizenship who is 50 years of age or more, and who made a declaration of intention or filed a petition for naturalization prior to the enactment of the Social Security Act of 1935, and who was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence prior to 1924 and has ever since said lawful entry maintained a bona fide residence in the United States may file a petition for naturalization without regard for the 7-year limitation on the declaration of intention and be exempt from all educational requirements.

This bill gives relief from the stringent naturalization laws, to the real forgotten people of our Nation.

Some of these people came to this great America in the 1890's, young, honest, industrious people, who never really had the time or the opportunity to learn how to read and write. They married, had large families, and have given their best years in honest labor. Many are property owners and taxpayers. Many had sons and daughters who served our great country in the World War and are today giving their lives in the great battle in which we are now engaged, for the preservation of our free institutions. The sons and daughters of others are today in the vanguard of America's progress. Yet these same clean-living people of America cannot become citizens unless they pass an examination that would probably "flunk" a high-school graduate or perhaps a college graduate. If the only requirements for citizenship were contributions to national wealth through honest labor and love for democracy, almost all of our noncitizens could easily become citizens.

There are thousands of people in the United States who have made application for their first and second papers but who failed to pass the examination. In making application they renounced allegiance to their native countries, and yet they are not citizens of the United States. They love America, they belong to America, they are willing to fight to defend America and keep it democratic and free, so why deny them citizenship?

This bill was included in a committee bill at the last Congress, passed the House and the Senate Immigration Committees but Congress adjourned before action was taken by the Senate.

I feel that this is a very necessary and vital piece of legislation at this time, and I ask for favorable consideration of it when it comes before the House.

I Knew Beveridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Boston Sunday Globe of December 13, 1942, entitled "I Knew Beveridge," by John McLaren, former labor leader in Manchester, England, and now president of the stone masons' union in Massachusetts. The article deals with the Beveridge social-security plan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I KNEW BEVERIDGE"—ONE-TIME BRITISH LABOR LEADER TELLS OF PART WINSTON CHURCHILL PLAYED IN GIVING BEVERIDGE A START

(By John McLaren, former labor leader in Manchester, England)

Away back in the 1890's, there was quite a ferment over all Europe and in Great Britain caused by the growing dissatisfaction of all workers with low wages and poor working conditions. Irregularity of employment marked every industry, dockworkers especially suffering, as that industry was hard to organize or control, and this brought about the drafting of many labor programs looking to the greater security of workers in their jobs.

Amongst those in the thick of the social-reform fight of those days was William (now Sir William) Beveridge, of Toynbee Hall, London. In general, he was an unknown, but after many years of quiet educative work among the dockers of London, he came to share the limelight with so prodigious (at that time) a labor personality as John Burns, the first labor Member of Parliament in Great Britain.

There was nothing striking about the William Beveridge of those days; nothing marking him off from the run of the mill academic specialists except perhaps his earnestness and precise logical mannerisms, easily explained when one learns that he is a Scot, "aw' the wey frae Fife." On closer acquaintance, though, one soon discovered that he was a man with a mission in life.

In effect, Beveridge claims that business efficiency can only be attained by continuous employment of all help at good wages, under good conditions, plus reserves of labor to meet trade vacillations—the reserves to be maintained under first-class conditions.

In his study of unemployment he found that practically all labor was casual, from the most highly skilled down to the least, and maintained that such a condition of labor was a source of great economic waste and dangerous inefficiency. The meat of his whole philosophy he put into a small pamphlet entitled "The De-Casualization of Labor." Those interested in the development of his theory will find a good, comprehensive study in any public library, titled "The Problem of Unemployment."

MEETING WITH BEVERIDGE

It was this writer's good fortune to meet William Beveridge at the Glasgow University, Scotland, when he made a talk there on the question, and overnight became a convert to his idea.

The labor-exchange idea was unpopular with labor at this time because from bitter experience they knew that a complete register of all unemployed would mean a reduction of wages commensurate with the percentage of those unemployed. In passing, it should be noted that labor here takes the same view.

Perhaps labor here is correct in its viewpoint, but in Great Britain it is different, because there problems laid bare statistically become immediately a concern of government—while the opposite is true here in America. This was amply proved of government in Great Britain in this particular case, because it was statistically proven beyond doubt that vast bodies of men and women were out of work through no fault of their own. It also pricked the bubble that character was the primary cause of unemployment and not lack of jobs.

The results of the survey were such that the Government was forced to put through its social insurance program in less than a year after the establishment of the National Labor Exchanges. Beveridge was put in charge of the whole undertaking of social security and has held the position right down to the present time.

Such, in brief, is the story about the drafter of the "Atlantic Chart" for Great Britain, but it could never have been written had there not been a brilliant young man and close friend of William Beveridge, called Winston Churchill, and a great body of unemployed men and women meeting and parading daily throughout the country, especially in Manchester, England, where the unemployed were led by a 1-legged cobbler called Arthur Smith.

In orderly fashion, all they demanded was work as against charity and the removal of the Distress Committee (the equivalent of welfare departments here) from the police authority which was done through the establishment of labor exchanges throughout the country under the local government board.

WORK AS AGITATOR

This writer was put in charge of the whole agitation by the trade unions and the Labor Party of the Manchester District and for a month an orderly educational campaign was kept up which resulted in the passage of the first unemployment bill in the House of Commons. When the agitation was at its height the man for the occasion appeared on the scene in the person of Winston Churchill, the present Prime Minister of Great Britain.

Mr. Churchill was a Liberal then, with Cabinet rank in the Lloyd George administration, seeking the suffrages of the Manchester electorate, and at the same time he married the most beautiful woman in England.

On his wedding day in the reception hall of the Midlands Hotel at Manchester, Mr. Churchill received a committee of the unemployed, who submitted a five-point program, the chief of which was that asking for a national system of labor exchanges.

In reply, he said, "Gentlemen, I do not agree with your entire program, but your request that a bill be introduced for labor exchanges has great merit, and while it is a matter which comes under the local government board which is headed by John Burns, I promise you, gentlemen, that I will bring in a bill for that purpose." He kept his word, and saw to it, as already noted, that his friend, Mr. Beveridge, was made director.

That's how the British revolution began and Winston Churchill will see it through, as charted by Sir William Beveridge.

Law on Depletion Allowances for Certain Minerals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the law, as amended, with respect to depletion allowances for oil, gas, coal, fluorspar, ball and sagger clay, rock asphalt, metal mines, and sulfur.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERCENTAGE DEPLETION FOR OIL AND GAS WELLS

In the case of oil and gas wells the allowance for depletion under section 23 (m) shall be 27½ percent of the gross income from the property during the taxable year, excluding from such gross income an amount equal to any rents or royalties paid or incurred by the taxpayer in respect of the property. Such allowance shall not exceed 50 percent of the net income of the taxpayer (computed without allowance for depletion) from the property, except that in no case shall the depletion allowance under section 23 (m) be less than it would if computed without reference to this paragraph.

* * * * *

PERCENTAGE DEPLETION FOR COAL, FLUOSPAR, BALL AND SAGGER CLAY, ROCK ASPHALT, AND METAL MINES AND SULFUR

(a) Percentage depletion: Section 114 (b) (4) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Percentage depletion for coal, fluorspar, ball and sagger clay, rock asphalt, and metal mines and sulfur: The allowance for depletion under section 23 (m) shall be, in the case of coal mines, 5 percent, in the case of metal mines, fluorspar, ball and sagger clay or rock asphalt mines, 15 percent, and, in the case of sulfur mines or deposits, 23 percent, of the gross income from the property during the taxable year, excluding from such gross income an amount equal to any rents or royalties paid or incurred by the taxpayer in respect of the property. Such allowance shall not exceed 50 percent of the net income of the taxpayer (computed without allowance for depletion) from the property, except that in no case shall the depletion allowance under section 23 (m)

be less than it would be if computed without reference to this paragraph."

(b) Discovery depletion not applicable to fluorspar, ball and sagger clay or rock asphalt mines: Section 114 (b) (2) is amended by striking out "metal, coal, or sulfur mines" and inserting in lieu thereof "metal, coal, fluorspar, ball and sagger clay, rock asphalt, or sulfur mines."

Drainage of Natural Resources in United States Is Causing Anxiety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard L. Stokes from the Washington Star of January 10, 1943:

DRAINAGE OF NATURAL RESOURCES IN UNITED STATES IS CAUSING ANXIETY—BELIEF PERSISTS, HOWEVER, THAT UNITED NATIONS HAVE ENOUGH RAW MATERIALS TO WIN WAR IF EMPLOYED EFFICIENTLY

(By Richard L. Stokes)

Another legend exploded since Pearl Harbor was the belief that Providence had blessed the United States with inexhaustible natural resources. The country has been at war for only 13 months, but the fury with which its material wealth is being ransacked has already perturbed the Government scientific agencies. In contrast to military and political departments, these branches do not think in terms of wishful specifications or diplomatic deals. By profession, to quote W. S. Gilbert, they are men of "taste exact for faultless fact."

Inured to long-range vistas, such experts are alarmed over the drainage of metallic and mineral stores which is reflected by multiplying expenditures. In 1941 the outgo for defense was $13,800,000,000. War disbursements soared to $52,500,000,000 in 1942. The estimate for 1943 is in excess of $90,000,000,000. Chairman Donald M. Nelson, of the War Production Board, predicted recently that manufacture of armament goods in the current 12 months will surpass that of 1942 by two-thirds. He defined 1942 as the year of the battle of facilities, which was won; and promised that 1943 would bring victory likewise in the battle of materials.

If so, the triumph may be a Pyrrhic one, it is declared, because of the head-long greed with which Mars is rifling the Nation's material stocks and rummaging into elements formerly despised, like clay and even sand. On the presumption that World War II will continue several years and that depletion of this country's natural reserves will accelerate rather than decline, the following questions, of portentous significance for the destiny of the American people, are now being raised:

Is the United States headed toward an economy of scarcity which will replace its historic economy of abundance?

Must regimentation of materials become national policy in time of peace as well as war?

Will there be a leveling down of American wage and living standards, with a proportionate leveling up of such standards in countries from which essential supplies are imported?

Is a revolution in our trade and tariff systems bound to follow?

Will the United States, out of its own resources, ever again be able to fight a big-time war?

Rather than accept a have-not status, would the American people turn to imperialism?

VITAL METALS NEAR EXHAUSTION

On the verge of exhaustion or serious impoverishment, according to scientists in the Department of the Interior, are the domestic stores of materials having such ultra-vital combatant importance as lead, zinc, mercury, and iron, for which there are no substitutes; as well as copper, bauxite, and petroleum. Alternatives for the last three are known, but they are either at a primitive stage of development, exorbitant in cost, or relatively inefficient.

Zinc is indispensable in die casting, for electrical batteries, for galvanizing iron and steel against rust and as a component of brass. Smelting facilities are adequate, but the Nation's zinc deposits have attained what mineralogists describe as "old age." Because of ore depletion, output is expected to begin tapering off in 1944. In the hope of stimulating production, a price premium of 2¾ cents a pound was instituted last February. No increase of output resulted, but probably a decline.

Pronounced also to be approaching decrepitude are American deposits of lead, found chiefly in the tri-State area which centers about Joplin, Mo. At current rates of consumption, supplies are thought to be available for no more than 5 years. It is regarded as doubtful whether lead production in the United States will ever again equal that of pre-war figures. In fact, despite a price premium of 2¾ cents a pound, the rate of output in 1942 fell below that of 1941. Recoveries from scrap decreased 10 percent.

However, lead was the one important metal in which a critical shortage did not exist at the end of 1942. Thanks to increased imports, but mainly to restrictions on civilian use, the Government has been able to accumulate a sizable stockpile, which is considered adequate at the moment for military needs. In November the favorable outlook brought a slight easing of restrictions on the employment of lead in building and other products. The chief military uses of this metal are for ballast and storage batteries in submarines, projectiles for small arms ammunition, tetra-ethyl lead in gasoline, babbitt metal, pigments and cable coverings used in Signal Corps communications.

Mercury, an essential component of detonating powders, attained its peak of domestic production 60 years ago, and is expected to begin its ultimate decline during the present year. Output has been quickened, and eventual exhaustion hastened, by a price of $192 a flask which was set by the Metals Reserve Company. Before 1939, the figure ranged from $40 to $70 a flask. The world's principal sources of mercury are Spain and Italy, the latter an enemy country. The United States has stood third. During its opening war year, this country disbursed $7,521,000 for mercury in Canada, Mexico and South America.

In 1942 the United States mined approximately 100,000,000 tons of iron ore, of which 93,000,000 tons came from the Lake Superior region alone. The total volume is to be pushed up to 110,000,000 tons during 1943. It is estimated that the country's deposits of high-grade iron will be able to support this maximum volume for only 3 years, and will be exhausted in 5. Then the Nation will have to fall back on its low-grade ores.

COPPER DEPOSITS DWINDLE

It used to be said that the United States had reserves of copper for 40 years of consumption. Today 10 years would be regarded as an optimistic figure. Except for the Butte area, virtually all of the country's high-grade copper deposits have been exhausted.

United States supply of copper reached a record high of 3,000,000 tons in 1942, including 700,000 tons imported from South America and 600,000 tons recovered from scrap. This was still considered not enough, and 500,000 tons in addition are demanded for 1943.

Apparently the compliment is paid to enemy countries of supposing that they can be defeated only with three times as much equipment as their own. At any rate, Chairman Nelson has announced that attainment of present goals "would mean that by the end of 1943 the United States alone would be outproducing the Axis two to one, and with its Allies would be outproducing the Axis three to one.

Copper is one of the principal deficiency metals in Germany, which has commonly used aluminum, of which it has plenty, as a substitute. Aluminum is as precious as copper in the United States, and the only available substitute in this country is the so-called "slacker metal," silver. The Treasury owns 2,900,000,000 ounces of silver, most of which is buried in the ground at West Point, but has thus far made only 552,000,000 ounces available for war purposes—and this under lease-lend arrangements by which every gram must be restored.

Therefore, the use of Government-owned silver has been restricted mostly to bus bars in aluminum and magnesium plants. Bus bars are main conductors of electricity on distribution boards. They can be removed intact when their service is ended.

The demand for bus bars is limited. It appears certain that war industries would absorb another billion ounces of "free" silver held by the Treasury, in addition to its monetary reserve, if only it were permissible by law to dispose of Government stocks for other than nonconsumptive uses. War agencies are permitted to purchase foreign silver at 45 cents an ounce, or 10 cents above the level maintained by the Treasury. But the supply, about 100,000,000 ounces a year from Canada and Mexico, is inadequate for the demand.

Silver has qualities vesting it with high potential value in war production. It is noncorrosive. It is superior to copper as a conductor of electricity and to tin in binding power for alloy solders.

Silver solder could be used by the aircraft industry in the manufacture of oil coolers, radiators, ignition systems, pipe connections, instruments and fuselage parts, and in the armament field, in recoil chambers of anti-aircraft cannon, aerial and incendiary bombs, torpedo tubes and the jackets of machine guns. In the construction, maintenance, and repair of ships, silver brazing alloys would be suitable for joining pipes and in refrigerator and air-conditioning equipment.

THE SILVER PARADOX

There exist at once a large surplus and an acute shortage of silver. This paradox is due to a small clan of Senators who are known as the silver bloc and who have exhausted every device for keeping their pet metal out of the war.

Sinkings of bauxite ships from Dutch Guiana and Brazil by enemy submarines have compelled the United States to become self-sufficient in supplies of this material, the basic source of aluminum, which is the one essential metal of aircraft production. It is promised by Chairman Nelson that by May the United States will be completely independent of foreign bauxite imports, and that by September it will be able to supply Canada's needs as well.

Self-sufficiency has been gained at a cost of so frantic a pillage of the country's sole bauxite resources that they can last only 2

or 3 years at present and prospective rates of consumption, according to official estimates.

The situation would be desperate if it were not for the fact that aluminum is the most abundant metal in the earth's crust, of which it forms 8 percent. It occurs in boundless volume in common clay. The Bureau of Mines has made laboratory experiments for the economical extraction of aluminum from clay, but its experiments are described as being little more than "nebulous." The Tennessee Valley Authority has developed one small pilot plant for this process, and is said to have proved it to be commercially practicable. The catch is that aluminum made from clay requires four times as much equipment as that extracted from bauxite.

Known reserves of petroleum in the ground throughout the United States total approximately 20,000,000,000 barrels. Since production is in the neighborhood of 3,900,000 barrels a day, it is calculated that national petroleum resources will be exhausted in another 14 years unless they are replenished by the discovery of adequate new fields.

That the domestic petroleum industry confronts a problem of mounting gravity is shown by the fact that demand has been multiplied by aircraft, tanks, motorized equipment, and the synthetic rubber program, while production has been on a downward curve since 1937–38, the latest 2 years in which discoveries of new supplies exceeded withdrawals. Records of the 75 biggest American fields disclose that aggregate production, taking 1936 as a base at 100 percent, rose to 107 in 1938, but fell to 81 in 1939 and to 75 in 1941. Present and future decline is estimated roughly at 10 percent a year.

The number of new wells brought in since 1938 is probably greater than that of the 4 years preceding, but the average size has fallen off more than half.

The fact that no oil shortage has been indicated in the Soviet Union is ascribed by some observers to its Socialist regime, under which petroleum could be withheld from consumption indefinitely, either underground or in reserve tanks. In the capitalistic United States, it is argued, the profit motive during pre-war years impelled producers and dealers to whip up maximum volume and speed in both output and consumption.

According to the War Production Board annual report for 1942, "not one mineral escaped the pressures of war during our first year of the conflict." Shortage materials may be divided into two classes, depending on whether the principal supplies are available at home or must be imported. High in the second category are rubber, tin, and five of the six alloying metals—nickel, chromium, manganese, tungsten, and vanadium.

Whether the United States and Great Britain will be able to carry on effectively with the war hangs literally on the success of the American synthetic rubber program, which is not due to reach adequate operation for another year or more. Tin is essential to the war effort as a component of bronze.

The only sources remaining to the United States are Bolivia and the national stock pile, which is not expected to provide more than 5,000 tons a year. Japanese purchasers of tin plate clippings bid up the market during the appeasement era to such an extent that the American de-tinning industry was put out of business. From these clippings the Japs recovered both tin and iron. They now command above 70 percent of the world's supply of tin.

In 1941 the United States imported 141,000 tons of this metal, of which more than 90 percent came from the Far East. The Long Horn Tin Smelter in Texas, the first plant of the kind in the Western Hemisphere, is being expanded to an annual capacity of 100,000 tons, which will be able to handle all the tin available to the United Nations, including Bolivian output. The country faces a long-term shortage of tin.

The sixth steel alloying metal is molybdenum, of which the United States in 1942 produced 85 percent of the world's supply, with an increase of one-seventh promised for 1943. But molybdenum has become a deficiency rather than a surplus material because of the necessity of substituting it for scarcer alloy metals.

Among these is nickel, with a permanent shortage in prospect. Canada's output of some 100,000 tons a year is far from satisfying war demands, which quadrupled in 1942 and will be multiplied by five in 1943. The American scrap pile yields no more than 2,000 or 3,000 tons annually. Resort is being made to low-grade deposits in Cuba.

CHROMIUM PRODUCTION INCREASED

Thanks to development of low-grade chromite ores in Montana, California, and Oregon, the United States boosted domestic production of chromium, vital for stainless steel, from 269 tons in 1936 to more than 300,000 tons in 1942. But the war will demand something in excess of 1,000,000 tons this year. Strenuous efforts are afoot to make up the difference through imports from South Africa, Cuba, and, if possible, Turkey. In the meantime, civilian supplies have been cut to 3 percent of their former total.

Last year witnessed a greater than 10 percent shortage of tungsten, without which, in the form of cemented carbides with a hardness rivaling that of the diamond, machine tools and armament itself would be impossible. The United States imported 3,600 tons of tungsten concentrates in 1939. The demand doubled in 1942 and will be doubled again this year. With Oriental supplies cut off and the pre-war stockpile dwindling, the country is feverishly developing tungsten deposits in California and Nevada, and stimulating other sources in Mexico, Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, and Peru.

The situation is somewhat better in respect to vanadium. Domestic production in 1943 is expected to double that of 1942, as a result of subsidized exploitation of extremely low-grade ores. But the chief supplies will continue to come from South Africa and Mexico.

Manganese holds the most favorable position of all the alloying metals. Without the increase of a single pound, it is declared, the American stockpile could supply military needs for 2 years to come. Manganese, a purifying agent, is an absolute requirement for every bit of steel produced.

Magnesium, an essential partner of aluminum in aircraft manufacture, represents one of the triumphs of American industry. Its domestic production sprang from 6,000,000 pounds in 1939 to 42,000,000 in 1941, and 260,000,000 in 1942. Operations are well advanced for increasing the figure to 600,000,000 pounds annually. It was formerly derived from seawater and brine wells. A process for extracting this light metal from dolomite, a plentiful raw material, is declared to have been the outstanding technological achievement of 1942.

For the relief of shortages, it has been proposed that the Government should adopt a general policy of subsidies on war materials.

If the situation as to raw materials is alarming in many respects for the United Nations, it is still believed that Allied superiority of mineral resources and industrial capacity remains adequate for winning the war, if they are employed with efficiency and expedition. But the margin of advantage has shrunk incredibly since 1939. The following table illustrates the vast changes with which 3 years of conquest have strengthened the enemy. The figures represent advances in control of world-wide material resources:

Mineral resources as a whole, 5 to 33 percent; tin, 1 to 72 percent; iron ore, 6 to 46 percent; steel output capacity, 20 to 34 percent; petroleum, 1 to 7 percent; coal, 27 to 53 percent; copper, 5 to 10 percent; lead, 7 to 22 percent; zinc, 16 to 27 percent; manganese, 2 to 30 percent; chrome, 3 to 30 percent, and tungsten, 6 to 60 percent.

At the same time, the United Nations are cut off almost completely from tin, crude rubber, and hard fibers, and in large part from Asiatic sources of tungsten, antimony, manganese, chromite, and other essential materials. Russia has lost a major proportion of the manganese, iron, and coal industries of the Ukraine.

Libeling Our Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Birmingham News of December 31, 1942:

LIBELING OUR SOLDIERS

For a long time there has been a lot of loose talk going the rounds to the effect that there is heavy drinking among the soldiers in our Army camps. Such talk has been widely used as propaganda for prohibition, as almost anyone who keeps his ears open can testify.

Rumors of this nature gained such wide currency that the Office of War Information decided to make an investigation, "to provide the American people with honest and accurate information about the millions of men who are doing their patriotic duty in the armed services."

As this newspaper has pointed out before, it is plain to anyone who observed conditions in the First World War, when there was prohibition in camp zones, that there is much less drinking among the soldiers now than there was then. That statement is verified by the investigation made by the Office of War Information. Its report says the fact that there is vastly less drinking among soldiers in this war than in the last is almost universally agreed to by commanders and civilian authorities alike.

In a coast-to-coast survey of drinking conditions around Army camps, Office of War Information investigators traveled more than 12,000 miles, making first-hand observations and obtaining the testimony of commanding officers, provost marshals, chaplains, community leaders, mayors, United Service Organizations directors, newspaper editors, and others. As a result of its extensive investigations and inquiries, the Office of War Information was able to make this gratifying and reassuring report to the American people:

"There is not excessive drinking among troops, and drinking does not constitute a serious problem."

The Office of War Information report says, furthermore, that no American Army in all history has been so orderly. "In this survey," says the report, "the weight of evidence, collected from many sources and in all sections, tips the scales inescapably—this American Army may not be the best in the history of armies, but it is certainly the best behaved."

That is a tribute which is all the more to be appreciated by the fathers and mothers and other relatives and friends of the men

in the service, as well as by the men themselves, because of the fact that it is based upon an official, impartial, and thorough investigation by a Government agency whose purpose is to keep the public accurately informed about matters relating to the war, and whose integrity and reliability cannot be questioned.

The report concludes that the sale of 3.2 beer in Army camps is a "healthy and sensible arrangement," which may be partly responsible for the fact that there is less drinking among soldiers in this war than in the last one. In the First World War the camps were "bone dry," and as a consequence bootleggers did a big volume of business.

Even now, in States that have prohibition or local option, the Army "faces the problem of bootleg liquor." It is extremely significant that the Army, thinking of its own disciplinary problem, usually prefers wet communities to dry communities, because "bootleggers cannot be regulated; legal dispensers can be regulated." That testimony of the Army speaks volumes in support of a policy of legalized regulation, rather than prohibition, in dealing with the liquor problem.

Several examples are cited in the report of experiences around Army camps at pay day. In one camp in Missouri about $1,000,000 was paid out to troops there on the October 31 pay day, and that night the number of soldiers arrested in the adjoining city for drunkenness was 16, representing much less than 1 arrest for every 1,000 soldiers stationed there. This and similar records "plainly show that Army pay night is rarely the Klondike brawl and blow-off that rumor makes it."

On the contrary, coffee, milk, malted milk, and bottled soft drinks are the biggest selling beverages around Army camps, the Office of War Information found. "Experienced commanding officers all over the country," its report says, "agreed that considerably more than half of the troops under them drank nothing stronger than beer by choice, and that many even abstained from beer. Chaplains, with one exception, concurred in the opinion."

The sale of beer on posts provides soldiers "with a mild relaxation without impairing their efficiency," the Office of War Information reports, and "there is no indication that sale of beer lowers the number of total abstainers." Soft drinks outsell beer by 33 percent in the canteens at one Army post, described as fairly typical.

Five chaplains at Fort Devens, Mass., signed the following statement:

"While there are and will continue to be isolated cases of the abuse of liquor privilege among service men, drinking in the areas outside Fort Devens is not to excess.

"Working during duty hours and adequate recreational facilities efficiently counteract any possibility of the abuse of the liquor privilege on the post itself.

"Experience has proven that many men coming into the Army who were excessive drinkers as civilians have discontinued drinking entirely or at least become temperate in the use of alcoholic beverages.

"There is no liquor problem at this post."

Of course, there is some drinking among soldiers, and there will continue to be. As the Office of War Information says, it is legal for a civilian to take a drink, and it would be discriminatory to deny the same right to the soldier who already has relinquished many privileges. But it is indisputable that this is by far the soberest Army in the history of our country, and the best behaved.

As the Office of War Information report concludes:

"The American soldier needs neither curtain lecture nor apology. He behaves well, he trains well, and in the far-flung places of the earth he is fighting well. He is intelligent; he is able; he is a hard worker. He is serious of purpose because he fully understands the gravity of war. His commanding officers believe in him, and his chaplains are proud of him."

That tribute is as fine as it is factual, and all Americans should be cheered by it. Our soldiers are neither saints nor sinners, but ordinary human beings who are doing their duty well and living reasonably decent lives. And anyone who continues to spread these ugly, untrue rumors to the contrary is libeling the men in our armed forces and should not be tolerated.

Government Cars for Private Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under Mr. Roosevelt's administration the use of Government cars for private use has become a national disgrace. Let one take a walk in the early hours of the morning, or in the evening, in any part of Washington and he will see scores of Government-owned cars parked along the curb, to all intents and purposes the property of the Government official who lives in the house or apartment building in front of which the car is parked. These cars are of all makes and sizes. In the humbler parts of the city the car is driven by the official himself. There one finds Chevrolets, Fords, Plymouths, and other makes within the same price range. How different in swanky northwest Washington. It is there that Cabinet members and overstuffed bureaucrats have their habitat and every Government car has its liveried chauffeur who is paid by the Government.

Several years ago I caused an investigation to be made of the number of Government-owned cars in the United States. We found they were in excess of 50,000, and I dare say the number has greatly increased since then. Many of these cars are probably necessary, especially to men working in the field, but here in Washington, where we have the lowest taxi rates in all the country and Government officials are well paid, there is little or no excuse or need for them. I feel most strongly that it is up to the Appropriations Committee of the House to create a subcommittee to look into this shameless waste of the taxpayers' money. The committee is not wholly blameless for this inexcusable and wasteful situation.

The ordinary American citizen is being urged to forego the needless use of cars to help out on the rubber and gas shortages, but official Washington continues to ride blithely and carefree in Government-owned cars and to hell with the poor sap who pays the bills.

Just why should Congress provide pleasure cars for Cabinet members and bureau chiefs? They are well paid and can afford to furnish their own cars. Members of Congress must furnish their own cars although they are frequently called upon to handle some departmental matter that requires a personal visit. When it is necessary for us to make a departmental call we either use our own car, which is propelled by gasoline that is paid for by ourselves, or we hire a taxi out of our own pocket and I have yet to hear the first man to complain over this arrangement. Where Government officials need transportation for official business they should use a taxicab and receive an allowance for such expenditure.

We hear a great deal about a shortage of manpower. Why not transfer these liveried chauffeurs of Government-owned pleasure cars into the war effort and sell the cars?

The well-known commentator Fulton Lewis, Jr., had something to say on this abuse of Government property in his broadcast over station WOL, Mutual Broadcasting System, on December 18. Let him continue the very good and necessary work of showing up these chiselers who are so lacking in patriotism, good taste, and ordinary decency. If the President will not act an outraged country will force action through Congress. The time has come to call a halt on this graft, and that is what it is. Let Mr. Lewis call the roll and I will see that the names are inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The broadcast by Mr. Lewis follows:

We've had plenty of excitement in Washington today concerning the gasoline situation on the eastern seaboard. It really began late last night when news reports were circulated that A ration cards for gasoline in all of the Eastern States would be suspended sometime this morning because of a sudden and unexpected emergency shortage that had developed as a result of military needs.

By this morning there was a major run on all gasoline stations throughout the East. Holders of A cards rushed to cash in their tickets while the cashing was still good, and holders of B and C cards did the same thing, figuring that they'd get what A gasoline they could get and use their B or C coupons after that was gone. Even if the story about a shortage had been untrue, it very suddenly came true as a result of that run.

The President at his news conference explained what it was all about. He said that there had been an emergency call for gasoline from the American forces in North Africa. They had to have motor fuel in a hurry, and it was much quicker to ship it from the eastern seaboard across the Atlantic than it was to ship it from Texas. Therefore the Army and Navy had temporarily "borrowed" from the reserves in the eastern-seaboard States which resulted in the shortage until—from Texas—that borrowed gasoline can be replaced.

At the time of that news conference the expectation was that the A cards would be the ones suspended, but when the order came out it went much further than that. All ration books of every kind were suspended—A, B, and C cards, and the so-called nonhighway ration books—E books and R books—everything except the T books, which are the strictly commercial ration allowances, used by trucks and taxicabs and such things.

The effect of that, of course, is to completely shut down all operations of any kind in the Eastern States, including farming, getting to and from offices and places of

business, everything—except for the gasoline that's in individual tanks, and except for those commercial transportation operations. It unquestionably is the most drastic civilian move that has yet been taken in this war, or the last one.

The President said this morning that he expects the emergency to be over very shortly. He said that it will last only a very, very few days, and later this afternoon the information here was that it might even be only a matter of hours.

But in New York City, Petroleum Coordinator Ickes—in whose lap the whole thing was tossed, he being in complete control of the whole petroleum picture—seemed to indicate otherwise, certainly as far as the A ration holders are concerned.

He said that there is little chance of pleasure-car drivers getting back their ration allowances which is somewhat puzzling, because presumably he meant that the suspension of the A ration books is going to be allowed to stand, after the B and C and E and R ration books are restored to good standing. If that is the case, it indicates that Mr. Ickes is confused about the whole rationing setup. The A ration books are not necessarily pleasure driving at all—quite the contrary—they are the basic ration to which the B or the C ration allowance is added, to make up the total amount of gasoline which a ration board decides that the individual needs. That has been a hard and fast rule. Furthermore, in cases where the ordinary business driving of the individual is not more than the mileage that would be gotten out of the A ration, the ration boards have had a policy of issuing no additional ration at all.

So, in reality, only a comparatively small part of the A ration books are for actual pleasure driving. A very large part of them represent the basic portion of the total allowance for necessary driving.

Now, as for the public acceptance of this very drastic and almost staggering development today—that was superb. There was no grumbling, no complaining. It was received with the same equanimity and philosophy that greeted the closing of the banks, back in 1933. Once the lid had been clamped on, today, there was complete public cooperation * * * the attitude was: "Well, it's just too bad. If we can't get gasoline, we can't get gasoline, and if the boys in North Africa need it, that's all there is to it. We'll walk."

I regret to say that I have to make one exception, about that complete public cooperation, and a rather shocking exception it is. Shocking, because the exception was on the part of Government officials, right here in Washington.

I told you, ladies and gentlemen, night before last, that official United States Government cars—which by law are absolutely forbidden to be used for anything other than strictly Government business—were being used for all sorts of personal pleasure driving by the privileged people in the Government here. I told you that wives were using those cars to go shopping. That they were being used to take officials to football games, and dinner parties, and evening affairs, and luncheons. And I gave very fair warning, on that occasion, that unless it was stopped, I was going to undertake a personal investigation, and give you numbers and cases, publicly over this coast to coast network.

Apparently, they thought that was just an empty gesture, because I regret to say that in spite of newspaper stories published here yesterday and today, telling about that warning, it continued yesterday and today, without apparent improvement.

Ordinarily, I wouldn't bother with a thing of this kind, but the present circumstances—the fact that the entire population of the eastern seaboard of the United States is gladly and courageously and patriotically giving up not only pleasure driving, but necessary business driving as well—workers who have to get to shipyards, and mechanics who have to get to war production plants, and farmers who have to get their milk or eggs or produce to market—that makes it a pretty sorry spectacle for Government officials here to still be driving around Washington, using Government cars and a Government chauffeur and Government tires and Government gasoline in absolute, specific violation of the law, to go to luncheon parties, Christmas shopping, and what not.

And so tonight I'm going to read out a list of cases, with the numbers and a description of the people involved, and exactly what they were doing. This time I'll omit the names. Next time, if this doesn't stop this practice, I'm going to read the names too.

I might add that these are all instances which I myself observed, in the course of a little more than an hour today, and these are only the selected few of the cases in which I saw, with my own eyes, what appeared to be evidence that the official cars were being illegally used.

I might say also, before I begin, that the law that covers these cases is the Treasury Department appropriation bill of last March 10, title 3, section 302. It says that all cars owned by the Government shall be used exclusively for official purposes and that official purposes shall not even include the transportation of officers and employees between their homes and their Government offices—except in the case of the President and the actual members of the President's cabinet.

Now, let's go ahead!

At 1:55 p. m. this afternoon, a large black sedan with license A-2198, picked up a middle-aged lady in a fur coat at the east door of Woodward and Lothrop's Department Store. She had a number of Christmas shopping bundles with her, and she went on to an unknown destination.

At 2:10 p. m. a large black sedan with United States license 508 circled the block in which the same department store is located four times, slowing down each time it passed an entrance to the store, obviously waiting to pick up a passenger. It must have been at a door on the other side of the building, however, because after the fourth circle, he failed to return.

A little later a Plymouth sedan, painted in Army drab, bearing the painted black numbers W-12388, and carrying United States license 929, after circling the same block four times, picked up two passengers who came out of the main door of the store. Both were civilians. One was a swarthy, stout man in his late fifties, the other was a slender young lady in her twenties, with an imitation fur coat on, and they both carried packages purchased inside the store.

Shortly thereafter a large, dark-blue Buick sedan (and I might add that all of these cars were driven by Government-liveried chauffeurs) rolled up to the main entrance. It had United States Navy license 13752, but carried no United States license plate. In it were two young girls in the teens, one with a gray-green tweed coat, the other with a plain gray tweed coat, both blond and wearing no hats; also an elderly lady in black; also a middle-aged lady, handsomely dressed in a mustard-colored coat; also a naval officer who looked like a captain, but I couldn't tell for sure, because the collar of his coat was overlapping his shoulder pieces. The visor of his cap did have gold embroidery, however, which leads me to believe he was a captain.

They stopped, let out the elderly lady who went into the store and began doing some shopping, then they piled back in the car and went on their way.

A large black sedan, which appeared to be a Cadillac sedan, began circling the block at about quarter before four this afternoon, and one of my assistants who remainder on watch until after 5:30 said it was still circling when he left. The number of that one was U. S. 129.

A large black Buick sedan, U. S. 140, began circling the block—all this at the same department store—at about 3:45 p. m. and after several loops, a tall very handsome woman, in a mink coat, came out of a side door of the store, and put a large pile of shopping bundles in the front seat next to the chauffeur, then went back into the store again. Incidentally, that U. S. 140 had a very busy day, today. One of my assistants reported that it stood in front of a famous grocery store on Connecticut Avenue from 12:30 to 12:45 today, while a lady in a fur coat was inside—motor running all the while. She was reported as having a red hat, by the way; and another of my assistants reported that U. S. 140 came to the Mayflower Hotel at about 2:45, and left a tall lady in a fur coat and red hat, who proceeded to go into the hotel.

There it is, for what it's worth to you. Let's see whether the Government departments do anything to stop this practice now, or whether we'll have to go further.

Pay-As-You-Go Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received scores of letters during the past months from people in my district favoring a pay-as-you-go tax plan. These letters have come from people in all walks of life—bankers, merchants, manufacturers, farmers, laborers, clerks, stenographers, and employees in defense industries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all realize a great hardship will be imposed on millions of our American citizens to pay their income taxes unless this Congress takes immediate steps to amend our tax laws so as to enable our people to pay as they earn, instead of us trying to make them pay a year after they earn, when their income might be considerably reduced.

Here are quotes from a letter I just received this morning from one of my good friends, in which he points out some very good reasons why he favors a pay-as-you-go plan of paying income taxes:

DEAR MR. JENSEN: Of late I have been reading some very interesting items in the newspapers about a Ruml plan concerning the payment of income taxes. I have talked this idea over with many other working people like myself, and so far have found everyone in favor of a pay-as-you-go plan of paying income taxes. The main reasons being the increase in taxes, increase in wages, and increase in prices one has to pay when buying. The average working person I have talked to just hasn't enough money together at the end of the year to meet the taxes. Taking myself, for example, I have a number of doctor bills, repair bills on my home, and, of course, the Iowa State income tax.

Now, Mr. JENSEN, I want you to understand that we are very anxious to pay the income taxes, mainly to help win this war, but are up against it for the money, and a pay-as-you-go

plan would work out so conveniently to us and the Government would get their money, which they undoubtedly need.

For the past year I have had deducted from my wages 10 percent for the buying of War bonds, have a 19-year-old son somewhere in the United States Marines, served in the last war myself, and will certainly feel like a heel to have to cash in on the War bonds to meet the payment of income taxes in 1943 on the 1942 income; something I will most certainly have to do, as will thousands of others, according to what I hear.

And if some arrangement is not made to take care of situations like mine and thousands of others, apparently the atmosphere will be that it is lawmakers like you that will make us lose our self-respect.

Therefore, Mr. JENSEN, I believe that you can be sure of the appreciation of people of all politics, faiths, and religions if you can see it to support with all your might a move of a nature similar as proposed in the Ruml plan.

Mr. Speaker, there are millions of Americans in a similar situation with this gentleman, and I for one certainly want to give this very necessary and important matter my fullest attention, and I trust the Ways and Means Committee will work out a well-considered pay-as-you-go tax plan within the next 30 days.

O. P. A. Regulations Affecting Hotel and Restaurant Supply Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, received by me from Mr. Phillip S. Lavine, of New York City:

NEW YORK CITY, *December 26, 1942.*

Hon. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am writing you for the purpose of calling to your attention a situation which is a matter of sincere concern to everyone in the hotel and restaurant supply meat and poultry business.

Existing Office of Price Administration regulations covering this industry are so difficult of interpretation that the industry is in a state of confusion; and where these restrictions are capable of interpretation, it becomes clearly apparent that the margin of profit permitted is so small that the only course of action to pursue is to liquidate, for every sale will mean an actual net loss.

The hotel supply houses are certainly a vital link in the chain from producer to consumer, and we cannot understand what purpose would be served in eliminating us as an industry. It has been estimated that from twelve to fifteen million Americans must eat at least 1 meal a day out of their homes; we service these purveyors who feed these millions of Americans, and they depend upon us for their supplies. The city of New York has close to 10,000 dining places, according to permits issued by the department of health. These places cannot come to get their supplies, for that would mean that each restaurant and hotel would require its own trucking equipment, with wear and tear on tires, additional gasoline consumption—the very things the Office of Defense Transportation is trying to conserve.

While I must agree that stabilization and control over prices is, in times like these, necessary, due consideration should be given to the industries that must operate under these controls; I cannot believe that it is the intent of the Government to eliminate the small businessman who is not able to "tread water" financially—who cannot survive months of red ink in his ledgers, as can the large operators.

I know of many boys in this industry now in the service, who had expected to return to this industry when they could resume normal peacetime pursuits; where will they look for employment when they return? Many fathers have boys in the service; how will these boys feel when they learn that their fathers have been put out of employment by contrary and indifferent theorists employed by some agencies of the Government? These men—and I include myself—are over the draft age, and it is very questionable whether they can secure employment elsewhere for they are certainly not fitted by training or experience for defense work, particularly in this section of the country. Are they then to seek new fields, and start all over again, on the very bottom rung of the ladder?

We in this industry have been buying our War bonds—paying our taxes—participating in every possible manner with the war effort. We know what our country is fighting for, and will continue to bend every effort to assist in hastening the day of ultimate victory. But we cannot help but feel that our survival as an industry is bound up, in some manner, with the survival of the American way of life—the spirit of free enterprise.

Will you, as my Representative, give this matter your consideration?

Very respectfully yours,

PHILLIP S. LAVANE.

A Message of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following inspirational message from the Fort Wayne, Indiana, News-Sentinel of December 5, 1942, by one of the religious leaders of my district—the Rt. Rev. Msgr. D. Lawrence Monahan, pastor of the St. Patrick Church, Fort Wayne, Ind.:

In times of great stress the spirits of many people are disturbed, and sometimes panic-stricken, by forebodings about the outcome, and the future which lies beyond. It is a curious fact that even to souls who are plainly earmarked for heaven eternal salvation seems impossible. Danger is ever present, and the proven power of the enemy seems too much to expect to conquer.

For nearly a year now we have been faced with the tremendous task of winning the most devastating war which the world has ever known. In the process of our hastening preparation we hear the recurring phrase, "We can lose this war." Much as we dislike to think of such an outcome, after all our expenditure of life and wealth, it is true. We can lose this war, if in this dark day of need, we do not combine our united activity and intensive training with a steadfast confidence in the strength of Almighty God.

At this time we must remember that it is our Saviour's pleasure to show love by doing for us what never could be done without His help. As St. Hilary has said, "For what was so possible to the power of God as the impossible thing of saving men by faith, or of regenerating them by water, or of conquering them by the cross; or that we should be the adopted sons of God by the Gospel, or that men should be made alive by death?"

We are a Christian Nation. In spite of all our wantonness and waywardness we still deserve this title. Our hope is in the Lord. Though it be His will that we now suffer chastisement under the affliction of a cruel, unwanted war, we may well turn to Him in the spirit of confidence, and beg His favor upon our cause. Out of our travail, which we are just beginning to know, should come the aroused spirit of humility and contrition, as we plan to go on to better things than we have pursued in the piping days of peace. More deeply must we realize the truth of the psalmist's words when he cries out, "Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it. Unless the Lord keep the city, he watcheth in vain that keepeth it." Psalm 126.

Too great a part of our Nation has found satiety in the things that have taken them away from God. Patiently He has suffered it, as He has from the day of the deluge. But today He calls to us through the din of war, and bids us turn to Him with living faith and abiding hope. If only America can join the power of prayer to the skillful use of all her resources, her tremendous production of the needed instruments of this war, her steadily increasing power on land, sea, and in the air, we may confidently expect to arrive at last at the victorious peace which we desire.

On your knees then, America, before the God in whose divine providence our victory must be won. In the wisdom of our leaders, the shaping of our strategy, the effectiveness of our armed forces, in the unity of our national effort, let us hold fast to the hand of God. We shall set up a second front of prayer, through which even the legions of Hitler and Hirohito can never penetrate. And we shall not ask for the smooth way (of which we have known too much), but only for the elation of conscious courage. We feel that we are indeed on God's side, and valiantly we shall go forth to battle and to conquer. In the words of the palmist Uncle Sam can say, "For Thou hast been my hope: a tower of strength against the face of the enemy." Psalm 60, 4.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. D. LAWRENCE MONAHAN,
Pastor of St. Patrick's Church.

A Pay-as-You-Go Plan for Income-Tax Payers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a suggestion, which comes to me from Mr. O. W. Boswell, president of the First Federal Savings and Loan Association of Paris, Paris, Tex., relative to the pay-as-you go proposal in income taxes. The suggestion appears to be one worthy of the consideration of the Committee on Ways and

Means, and I hope this statement is given consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means when the question to which it relates is being given consideration.

It is as follows:

FIRST FEDERAL SAVINGS AND
LOAN ASSOCIATION OF PARIS,
Paris, Tex., January 7, 1943.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR WRIGHT: The present income-tax system, particularly with reference to taxes accrued in 1942 to be paid in 1943, will show the greatest amount of delinquents or percentage of taxes unpaid to taxes payable in the history of our country.

The lowered income tax to groups never paying before and having no idea as to what they would be required to pay has thrown a burden on them which they are unprepared to meet.

There is a way around this difficulty and that is through increased exemptions for 1942 only.

I would be absolutely opposed to allowing any of the war contractors or any other large business concern making extra profits being allowed to get by the payment of the tax through any such plan as the Ruml plan, which as I understand it, forgives the 1942 tax. To forgive a man who cannot pay is one thing and to forgive a man who has made a nice, fat, juicy profit is another.

If we were to increase our exemptions by $5,000 this year only, individuals and corporations alike, that would allow the salaried group and the white-collared group an opportunity to get their breath and at the same time require the large war contractor or for that matter any big individual earner to pay, should we authorize the above exemptions.

A married man in that case now having an exemption of $1,200 would be increased to $6,200, and the unmarried person from $700 to $5,700.

This exemption would be extended for the year 1942 only. Then effective with the 1943 income-tax period, pay each month from the source on the same plan as the Victory tax, the amount of the income tax. There should be no changes in exemptions unless the Congress passed a law providing for the payment of the income tax at the source of income.

As soon as the 1943 tax is determined the payment would be made at the source for one-twelfth each month from the source, and at the end of 1943 the Government would receive as much tax income as it would receive under the present plan and everybody would be paid up for the current year instead of being a year behind, as under the present plan, and at the same time collect the large tax from the large profits of large war contractors and others.

I have discussed this method with a number of influential people throughout the country and they think well of the plan. It is no original thought of my own. I got the idea from Ben H. Wooten, President of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Little Rock, in which bank I am a director. The present income tax plan is just simply not understood by the people and those unable to pay will reach into the millions.

I would be glad to see you introduce a bill containing a plan along this order.

I know that you understand the financial operation of the Government as well as any man in Congress and I have been strong for a number of bills you have introduced in Congress, which were at the time supposed to "bust" the country.

I recall your first soldiers' "bonus" bill. I also recall when you introduced a bill to pay the soldiers' adjusted service certificates in full which were long past due, in currency, which would have cost the Government nothing, in interest, as a feasible plan, but many economists rose up to say that it would be "wild inflation," which of course it wouldn't have been.

I am for the plan you are now presenting which you mentioned, I believe, in your 504th weekly letter on non-interest-bearing obligations of the Government, or at least bearing a very small rate of interest. The Government can issue obligations at any rate it chooses. It can finance $200,000,000,000 at the present time as cheap as it could finance fifty billion 20 years ago.

I heard the President's address to Congress today and think it was a masterpiece.

Sincerely yours,

O. W. BOSWELL, *President.*

I Know, for I Was There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a poem written by Lt. Phil M. Canale, Jr., Army Air Corps. Lieutenant Canale, whose home is in Memphis, Tenn., wrote this poem when he was a private in training at Maxwell Field, Ala. Our soldiers were fighting on Bataan and on Corregidor at that time. The poem is as follows:

That's not much news. But look between
Those barren lines just read.
You'll find it there in volumes and
It's etched in deep, blood red.

It tells you of the darkened homes,
The dreams of men defiled;
How mothers wept, and lovers' worlds
Were conquered on that isle.

Those lines unwritten tell you of
The deeds of men who bear
The pledge of freedom in their hearts.
I know, for I was there.

I saw what happened yesterday.
Yes, I can see it yet!
Could I but shun it from my mind.
O God! Could I forget?

I saw Death stalk across the earth
And wield his sharpened sword;
I felt his breath upon my neck,
And trudged through blood he poured.

He came by night, and no one knew
That he had come to shorn
The earth of all its beauty e'er
Another day was born.

The moon had faded from the sky;
The sun held brilliant sway.
It rimmed the world in glowing red,
A portent of the day.

It climbed 'til it had caught the earth
Within its golden noose.
It filled the land with warmth and light
And then, all hell broke loose!

Midst shouts and guns and leaden death
We manned our posts and fought
The staunch and cunning creatures that
The devil's mind had wrought.

They came in hordes, with crimson lust;
We moved into the fray.
We met them with a deafening crash
Which echoed through the day.

It's mortal combat! Life and Death!
I'm dreaming. 'Tis not true!
This can't be me, who oft has knelt
And prayed in peace with you!

"Get down, you fool!" a buddy yells;
His voice is far away.
It hardly clears the motley roar
That filled the air that day.

Roaring planes and tanks and guns,
The shouts and moans of men.
The clash of steel, the whine of shells,
The last cry of a friend.

Gushing blood and stench and filth,
And flesh blown from the bone.
A boy beside me stumbles, falls,
Then sharp steel chokes his groan.

Gaping wounds, and arms and legs
That once belonged to men.
And bodies crushed into the ground
Where monster tanks have been.

Hearts which once slaved gallantly
That bodies might be fed
Now pump in dying agony,
For all their blood is shed.

Men were killed like fettered sheep,
And I must take my share.
I blow a Jap to Kingdom Come,
And offer him a prayer.

And then, when flesh can take no more
And spirit prods in vain,
The foe falls back and grants surcease
Before he strikes again.

By now the sun is setting in
The caverns of the west.
And drawing all the reddened soil
Unto its burnished breast.

We fall exhausted to the ground.
I dream of far-off things;
The girl I love, the folks at home,
The green grass by the springs.

Our captain walks among his men
And does not try to hide
The tears he sheds in memory of
His comrades who have died.

I want to weep myself, because
I'd like the dead to share
The thrill I feel when I behold
The flag still waving there.

Perhaps there's not much headline news
That papers care to tell;
But they can say to folks back home
Their boys sure fought like hell.

And gave their lives without regret,
To save a country where
The humble man can live in peace.
I know, for I was there.

Traveling Salesmen's Troubles Not Settled by Recent Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Mr. E. W. Jackson, vice president of the Steck Co., Austin, Tex., relative to the problem of traveling salesmen, who depend upon automobile transportation, that contains such a comprehensive statement of the present situation, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the purpose of calling it to the attention of the executive department, and especially the Office of Price Administration.

The letter is as follows:

THE STECK CO.,
Austin, Tex., January 5, 1943.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: It looks as if the traveling salesman's troubles have been buried with a cunning publicity trick on the part of the Office of Price Administration. I'm speaking particularly of traveling salesmen of the Southwest.

The complaint regarding the discrimination against traveling salesmen was widespread, and the public generally supported the position of these men because it believed that their cause is just and that they are performing a vital service, both to the civilian and the war economy. The public viewpoint was so universally and strongly expressed that it appears the Office of Price Administration felt it was necessary to make a feint at doing something for the salesmen. Accordingly, it did this:

1. It gave a lot of publicity to the proposition that it was going to do something for the salesmen. The publicity got headlines.

2. Way down in the bottom of the release it said what it would do for the salesmen.

3. And what would it do? Give them 65 percent of 15,000 miles, which is purported to be the last year's average number of miles traveled per salesman in the United States. You might as well give the householders of Boston the average amount of fuel oil used in the United States per person for last year and average in the entire South, where little fuel is needed. The majority of the traveling men of the United States live along the Atlantic seaboard, and many of their whole States are no larger than one county in Texas or New Mexico. The density of population is such that there can be 25 or 30 prospects in 1 short day's travel, whereas in the Southwest a man may have to travel all day to serve 5 or 6 customers. Under these circumstances I can understand why the average for the Nation will suit the eastern traveling salesman very well, but what does it do to the man in the Southwest? He ordinarily travels 35,000 to 40,000 miles per year. If you give him 65 percent of that, he'll make the best of it for the balance of his traveling, even though every other bus passes him up, or he has to stand up all night on a night train to get from one town to another.

4. Then the Office of Price Administration limited this liberalization only to drug and food salesmen—the two classes of salesmen who need it least, and whose product will more nearly dispense itself, because the deliverymen usually act as salesmen, anyway.

The cunning was in giving wide publicity to the statement that the salesmen were getting relief. The average member of the public read the headlines and said, "That's fine—I was sure they would do something for salesmen," but didn't know that actually nothing was done for those who really need it. Now if the salesmen continue to complain about their plight, the public will be inclined to say, "Well, what do the salesmen want, anyway? They howled at first, and we were for them. They've had relief, and now they keep howling, and we have little sympathy for them"—not realizing that relief was never granted, and that the salesmen have been made victims of a publicity subterfuge.

It is surprising how many merchants rely on traveling salesmen for merchandising counsel and advice, and it would be amazing to the members of the Office of Price Administration to know how valuable the services of traveling salesmen are in channeling the purchases of merchants to noncritical and plentiful goods. The public knows this, and that is the reason the public was so sympathetic with the protest registered by salesmen during late November and early December of 1942.

But the public has been fooled—by a slick publicity trick that is characteristic of so much of the bureaucratic bad faith that has been coming out of Washington the last few years.

Only two classes of salesmen were given any relief at all—the two classes needing it least. The relief offered to these two classes was substantial in the thickly populated eastern States, but is inconsequential even to those two classes in the West and Southwest.

I hope you will continue this fight in behalf of traveling men, and use the prestige your office gives you to expose this cheap trick the Office of Price Administration has played on one of the strongest economic forces in this country for the prevention of inflation, and for stimulating the even distribution of merchandise to civilian uses, and to that end, assisting materially in winning the war.

Sincerely yours.

E. W. JACKSON,
Vice President.

Toast to Victory in 1943—What South Carolina Is Doing in the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio recently:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is with pleasure that I participate in this toast-to-victory program so generously provided for by your excellent radio station, WWDC.

Speaking for my own historic State of South Carolina, pointing briefly to some of her major contributions to the war effort, I am pleased to give you the following information which will indicate that although our State is one of the smaller States it is rendering substantial service in winning the war.

More than 100 firms in South Carolina are making war goods worth billions of dollars. Our textile mills predominate, followed closely by lumber plants. A large prefabricating plant is making parts for ships which are launched at the main Charleston harbor. Plywood is being manufactured in large quantities for the manufacture of airplanes and gliders.

Our State has already contributed 46,540 men to the armed forces, of which 36,191 are white. Volunteers of both races aggregate 13,964, those entering service through the selective process total 32,576.

Our folks are gladly investing their earnings in Government securities, $58,000,000 worth of War bonds having been purchased since May 1941, which is an average of more than $30 for every man, woman, and child.

Our farmers, although confronted with acute labor shortage due to the siphoning away of their needed workers, made an all-time record crop in 1942, consisting of wheat, oats, rye, barley, hay, peanuts, lespedeza, cotton, potatoes, tobacco, etc. Our agricultural crops for 1942 amounted to $68,032,000 as compared with $36,300,000 in 1941.

All branches of the service are represented in their training programs in South Carolina; the Army has its largest infantry training center near our State capital at Fort Jackson; in my own district at Spartanburg is Camp Croft, another large training center. There are 11 important air bases and flying schools in our State. The marines have one of their largest training bases at Parris Island, near Charleston. The historic navy yard of Charleston employs tens of thousands of efficient, patriotic workers launching at regular intervals various sorts of seagoing vessels.

No less than seven of our higher educational institutions are engaged in the training of officers for our armed forces.

Thus it will be seen that our State is gladly cooperating toward winning a complete victory and a lasting peace for the world.

A Proposal of a Definite United Nations Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN J. MAAS
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Gov. Harold E. Stassen delivered at a joint session of the St. Paul and Minneapolis branches of the Foreign Policy Association, January 7, 1943, at the Coffman Memorial Union at the University of Minnesota:

Dr. Turck, members and guests of the Foreign Policy Association: In responding to your invitation to speak to you this evening on the subject, World Affairs, I realize that you are all familiar with the consistent position that Senator BALL and I have taken upon foreign policy throughout these past years.

Thus, rather than spending our time in general statements about the advisability of world cooperation, I will proceed to discuss with you a very specific pattern for international action.

I will present these definite suggestions, not with the attitude that these are the answers, but rather to stimulate a search for the best answers, to encourage a frank discussion of means and methods, and to expose my own tentative thoughts to helpful criticism and clarification.

It is important that we be specific. Perhaps the greatest present deterrent to increasing world cooperation is a tendency on the part of many people to admit its desirability, to acknowledge the correctness of general statements of the subject, but to say it is impossible to work out.

History also tells us that the very successful organization structure of our own United States of America came about through a very forthright discussion of many different suggestions and proposals. This was carried on even during the War for Independence and extended through the years of the early association of the Thirteen Colonies. The varied ideas were finally fitted together in the Constitutional Convention, in a very earnest session of men of many viewpoints.

It is my proposal that we should contemplate, and begin to plan now, for a definite continuing organization of the United Nations of the World. China, Russia, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the United States of America, and all of the smaller United Nations should participate in this governmental structure.

On this basis the citizens in this room, the citizens of this State in the years ahead would be not only citizens of Minnesota, not

only citizens of the United States of America, but also citizens of the United Nations of the world.

The key governmental device should be a single-house parliament. Representation and voting power in this single-house parliament could be based upon a formula which would take into consideration the numbers of the literate population of the respective nations, the amount of the contribution of the respective members to the expenses of the joint government, and the resources of the member nations. The representatives in the parliament would be selected in each nation in general accordance with the means by which the people select the members of their own legislative body. In the case of this country some could be elected on the Federal basis throughout the country and some could be elected within groups of States, to represent the States of the Union. In case of the British Commonwealth of Nations, some could be selected on a basis to represent His Majesty's Government and others on a basis to represent the individual members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, such as the Dominion of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

This United Nations parliament would then select a chairman of the United Nations council, who will in turn select seven members for his council from the parliament and submit them to the parliament for approval.

The council would thereupon become the executive side of the United Nations government and the parliament, of course, the legislative branch, with a close interrelationship and continuing responsibility and accountability of the executive to the parliament.

This United Nations government should then function in seven major categories, each under one of the United Nations councilmen.

1. To establish temporary governments over the Axis Nations, preferably using citizens of the United Nations whose ancestry goes back to the particular Axis nation. Under these temporary governments, the Axis Nations should be entirely disarmed, their criminal leadership punished for their acts of horror and betrayal of civilization. But no wholesale reprisals against innocent civilian populations should be countenanced.

2. To administer the great international airports and airways of the future. We all recognize the significant development in the air that will follow this war. Wendell Willkie's trip around the world, 30,000 miles, all in one airplane and with one crew, leaving this country from New York in one direction and arriving back in Minneapolis from another direction right on schedule, dramatically emphasized these potentialities. The extreme advances taking place in designing and building aircraft, and the thousands and thousands of skilled young fliers and navigators in many nations, will bring about a very unusual development in the air. The establishment of the right of flight, rules of the air, air-traffic controls, elevation channels for flight in different directions, with various types of planes, the coordination of weather data, radio beams and communications, and the maintenance of safe and stable airports, all should be a major activity of the United Nations of the World.

3. To administer the gateways to the seven seas. This likewise should be a vital function of United Nations government. Shipping, and the use of the seas, will be of tremendous importance. The development in the air will not lessen its importance. Rather, this merely adds another factor in a widening range of total travel, transport, and communication.

4. To increase trade between the peoples of the world. Only in this way can the general standards of living throughout the world be gradually improved. Only in this way can those countries with high standards of living maintain high standards of living without war. This does not contemplate a sudden change to universal free trade, but it does contemplate embarking upon a definite trend toward increased world trade. It will involve assurances by our Government to agriculture, that the total percentage of agricultural export and import will be maintained at approximately the same percentage in the increased total trade. Important factors in the world balance of trade would be increased tourist trade and increased capital investments in undeveloped countries, from this and other countries with large capital resources. Stifling obstructions or heavy dumping of goods should both be avoided, as both break down economic systems and cause world distress.

5. To increase the literacy of the people of the world. This should be approached, not as any utopian, grandiose idea, but with the definite realization that the ability to read and write is the key to much of the progress of man.

6. To establish a world code of justice and a United Nations court to administer that code. The code of justice should obviously include provisions protecting minorities, preventing religious persecution, and abolishing slavery. The court should be named by the supreme courts of the member nations. The attorney general or counsel general would be one of the United Nations councilmen.

7. To establish a United Nations Legion, consisting of units of air strength, efficient modern naval forces, and highly mobilized, mechanized land divisions. The United Nations Legion would enforce the code of justice, support the administration of international airports, airways, sea gateways, and insure the continued disarmament of the Axis nations and of outlaw areas. It would be backed by the armed strength maintained by the individual members of the United Nations including our own country.

The seat of administration of many of these functions might well be some point like Panama, readily accessible by sea and air to all continents, world-wide in its very atmosphere, and yet readily defended from attack.

Some question may be raised as to the justice of having a United Nations government administer so many of these activities on a world-wide basis, including thereby administration of these matters over nations that are not members of the United Nations group.

It seems to me that this will be basically no different from the fact that we have in our midst many individual men and women who are not citizens of our country. Hence they have no voice in the decisions as to our Government or our laws, or our courts. Yet they are under the jurisdiction of our Government, our laws, and our courts. They have certain rights, duties, responsibilities. In fact, we even take away many of the rights of citizenship for the serious violation of our criminal laws.

Why, then, should there not be nations who in the world sphere must abide by the decisions, rules, justice of a United Nations of the world, even though they are not members.

Furthermore, the course should always be as clearly defined as possible, through which nonmember nations may ultimately become members of the United Nations group.

To those who scoff that efforts to establish a governmental organization of some such nature and purpose are idealistic and impossible, might we point out that the alternative is recurring wars of increasing tragedy and horror.

It can also be well said that when the founding fathers of our own United States of America were struggling to devise a new method of government, the same cry of the defeatists—idealistic, impractical, impossible—were heard.

Permit me to quote from a statement of the Dean of Gloucester, Josiah Tucker, in 1786, just 1 year before the Constitution of these United States, which we have taken for granted for a century and a half, was drafted:

"As to the future grandeur of America, and its being a rising empire under one head, whether republican or monarchial in its form, it is one of the idlest and most visionary notions that ever was conceived even by writers of romance. The mutual antipathies and clashing interests of the Americans, their differences of governments, habitudes, and manners, indicate that they will have no center of union and no common interest. They never can be united into one compact empire under any species of government, whatever; a disunited people till the end of time, suspicious and distrustful of each other, they will be divided and subdivided into little commonwealths or principalities, according to natural boundaries, by great bays of the sea, and by vast rivers, lakes, and ridges of mountains."

So stated the Dean of Gloucester 1 year before the Constitution of this country was drafted.

We now have a world-wide vision to win the war. We must keep our sights high and maintain a world-wide vision to win an enduring peoples' peace.

America, people by the sons and daughters of every nation in the world, living and working side by side in 48 different States, can and must furnish leadership in meeting this challenge.

I do not propose that we enter into the systems of devious diplomacy and international intrigue, of relation between countries, but rather that we bring to those relations some of the forthright and direct dealing that has characterized the relations between the 48 States of the Union.

We should start moving now definitely in the direction of some such organization.

The Food and Supply Office now under former Gov. Herbert Lehman could well become a definite United Nations agency as a forerunner of the United Nations Government.

I understand that as to many of the airports and harbors we are building, we are renouncing post-war rights. This may be just, but we ought to be reserving rights on behalf of the United Nations as a whole.

We could well create now a United Nations Legion, a division of volunteers with varied nationality backgrounds, capable of speaking more than one language and willing to fight side by side for the United Nations cause, as a forerunner of the police force of the future.

The recent addresses of Winston Churchill, of President Roosevelt, of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek, of Vice President WALLACE, are encouraging in their reference to the problems of peace.

We must say over and over again that men can die upon the battlefields in vain because of what happens after a war as well as because of what happens during a war. During the battle of independence we began to plan to win that peace. We followed through at the Constitutional Convention and won the peace.

During the War Between the States Lincoln began to plan the winning of that peace. We reverted from those plans to that shameful period of carpetbagging and almost lost the peace. Then we worked out the means of again accepting the Southern States, in keeping with human dignity, as a part of our Union, and the Nation progressed.

Our men upon the field of battle in 1917 and 1918 acquitted themselves well. They won a heroic, decisive victory, but—we all know—we lost that peace.

The winning of this war must come first. It must be uppermost in our minds and thoughts and deeds. Each of us must add to the total strength of America until victory comes to the United Nations.

But, pray God, we begin now to definitely think, and plan, and criticize, and propose,

and amend, and devise, and follow through to initiate the means of winning this peace, an enduring peoples' peace, for the sake of the future welfare and progress of men, and women and little children in this Nation and in the other nations of the world.

National Commander Roane Waring Denounces Harvard Armistice Day Speech of Harry Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my approval of the timely and vigorous criticism of Roane Waring, national commander of the American Legion, of the action of Harvard University in permitting Harry Bridges, under a deportation order as a Communist, to speak at an Armistice Day exercise at Emerson Hall on November 16, 1942.

Commander Waring spoke recently before the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce and cited the Bridges case as illustrative of the tide of strange philosophies and alien ideologies within the country, against which the American Legion must remain vigilantly on guard in order to preserve our free American institutions. Commander Waring minced no words when he called the presence of the west coast alien Communist at the Harvard Armistice Day exercises an insult to the memory of our war dead.

He spoke as follows:

Speaking of these false ideologies it is difficult to believe that on the twenty-fourth of Armistice Day, on November 11, just 5 days ago, Harvard University permitted Harry Bridges, that west coast alien, now under order of deportation as a Communist, to speak at Armistice Day exercises in Emerson Hall.

This is a day that is dedicated to the memory of the brave men and women who gave their all in the last great war to perpetuate our way of life. It is an insult to their memory and an insult to every member of the American Legion and to every true, honest American citizen, that a man who has been notorious in his efforts to undermine our form of government, is allowed by a supposedly great university to speak at Armistice Day exercises commemorating the services of American patriots. Such action by Harvard University is a slap in the face of every man who wears the uniform of America today. Our fighting men are bleeding and dying in all parts of the world to defend our flag and what it stands for. Yet here at home a so-called institution of learning openly collaborates with a known enemy of our flag, and invites him and lets him speak on Armistice Day. It has the rotten taste to make this ignoble obeisance to this exponent of alien ideology on a day sacred to our hero dead.

SCORES A PROFESSOR

When this action was challenged by the Massachusetts American Legion, Prof. Kirtley F. Mather, a professor of geology, replied:

"The appearance of Harry Bridges on Armistice Day was merely coincidental and his political views and alien status are irrelevant."

It may have been coincidental to this exponent of Harvard superculture, but it is not coincidental to decent American citizens. No decent American would try to get by with such an excuse.

The national commander's remarks were loudly applauded by the assembly that jammed every nook of a large banquet hall in a downtown hotel.

Mr. Speaker, I also include herewith the following exchange of telegrams between Dr. James B. Conant, the president of Harvard University, and National Commander Waring regarding Bridges' speech:

PRESIDENT OF HARVARD EXPLAINS

Dr. James B. Conant, the president of Harvard University, wired an explanation of the appearance of Harry Bridges at the institution on Armistice Day and insisted that the talk of the west coast stormy petrel was in no way related to the armistice observance. The telegram of President Conant, together with the reply sent by National Commander Waring, was read to the national executive committee, then in session.

The text of President Conant's telegram to National Commander Waring follows:

"Feel sure you would wish it called to your attention that if newspapers quoted you correctly, your statement that Harvard University included Harry Bridges as a speaker at Armistice Day exercises in Emerson Hall was made in misapprehension of the facts. The university's official observance of Armistice Day, 1942, was the one which has been customary since 1919, namely, a special morning service in the memorial chapel, a building created to the memory of those who died in the last war. This service is traditionally open to the public as well as the student body in honor of the day. Mr. Bridges' talk was unrelated to Armistice Day, permission being granted to him to speak at the request of the Harvard teachers' union in accordance with general university policy that Harvard buildings shall be available for meetings sponsored by recognized groups of the faculty. In short, the occasion on which Mr. Bridges spoke had no connection with Armistice Day, and he came as one of many speakers who from time to time express their views freely in Harvard halls."

WARING'S REPLY

National Commander Waring's reply to President Conant follows:

"I have your telegram. In my speech before the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, November 16, I said in part: 'It is difficult to believe that on the twenty-fourth anniversary of Armistice Day on November 11, just 5 days ago, Harvard University permitted Harry Bridges, that West coast alien, now under order of deportation as a Communist, to speak at Armistice Day exercises in Emerson Hall.'

"This will correct you on the false assumption on which your telegram is based.

"I further said: 'Such action by Harvard University is a slap in the face of every man who wears the uniform of America in this war.'

"To keep the record straight, may I inform you that on May 28, 1942, the Honorable Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, ordered: "That the alien Harry Bridges be deported to Australia at the expense of the Government' on five charges duly set forth.

"That the American people may not be misled I further want the record to show that on November 5, the Department of Masschusetts of the American Legion protested against this alien's appearance on your campus on Armistice Day, and that on November 8, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and Disabled American Veterans also registered protest, and that these protests were pending at the time Kirtley F. Mather, professor of geology, stated that 'Bridges' political views and alien status are irrelevant.'

"I desire the record further to show that in the newspapers of Boston this alien was billed as an Armistice Day speaker.

"The issue of free speech is not the issue here. The American Legion recognizes the difference between liberty and license, and challenges, and will continue to challenge, the right to exercise license under the guise of free speech by anyone who has sought to sabotage America's war effort.

"There are many alumni of Harvard University who are members of the American Legion who join with the other members of the American Legion and with the great body of American public opinion in regretting that the name of a venerable seat of learning has been prostituted by its association with an undesirable alien."

RANDOLPH BIDDLE IS COMMENDED

On the motion of National Vice Commander Arthur J. Connell, Harvard '21, the national executive committee of the American Legion here, November 19, approved the sending of a congratulatory telegram to Randolph Biddle, son of the Attorney General, who is a junior at Harvard. Young Biddle challenged statements made by Harry Bridges when the west coast alien appeared as an Armistice Day speaker at Emerson Hall on the campus of Harvard University.

The telegram, signed by National Commander Roane Waring, follows:

"Members of the American Legion executive committee assembled here at Indianapolis, November 19, 1942, salute your fine spirit of Americanism as demonstrated on Armistice Day.

"We believe that your attitude reflects the true spirit of Harvard, many of whose sons were comrades of ours in World War I and others of whom are so gallantly serving today in all branches of the armed forces.

"We believe your action may well inspire your fellow students to divorce for all time those subversive groups which under the cloak of free speech have done much harm not only to Harvard and her loyal sons but all America as well."

Mr. Speaker, the following is a copy of a letter I sent to the national commander commending his action, and his reply:

DECEMBER 26, 1942.

Mr. ROANE WARING,
National Commander, The American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR COMMANDER: I read with much interest in the Legionnaire your correspondence with President Conant of Harvard University regarding the Armistice Day speech at Emerson Hall by Harry Bridges, Communist agitator under deportation orders.

As a Harvard graduate, a Legionnaire, and as chairman of the committee of three that wrote the preamble to the American Legion constitution, I desire to commend your position in this matter, which I am sure represents the views of practically all Legionnaires whether from Harvard or elsewhere.

Wishing you and the Legion every success, and assuring you of my cooperation, I am

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 4, 1943.

Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FISH: I appreciate very much your letter of December 26 agreeing with the statement of the position I took

with President Conant of Harvard on the Bridges matter. Of course, they were entirely out of line.

You might be interested in knowing that National Vice Commander Arthur J. Connell, of Connecticut, and Maurice Devine, the chairman of our national legislative committee, both Harvard men, were very pronounced in their views at the national executive committee meeting, which was in session at the time the Bridges matter occurred.

Thank you for your wishes for success for the Legion and of the assurance of your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

ROANE WARING,
National Commander.

Lucretia Mott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. U. S. GUYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1943

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interpretations of Lucretia Mott by Jeannette Marks, given without notes at the ceremony in honor of sesquicentennial anniversary of the birth of Lucretia Mott, arranged by the World Woman's Party for Equal Rights and the National Woman's Party, Crypt of the Capitol, Saturday, January 2, 1943, 2:15 p. m., Washington, D. C.:

LUCRETIA MOTT

I

The place is the island of Nantucket, the town is Nantucket town; the time is the close of the eighteenth century; the house is the Quaker Capt. Thomas Coffin's and Anne Folger Coffin's new house, built in 1797, its frame solid hand-hewn oak, its chimney pieces paneled up to the ceiling. It is still there, on the street in Nantucket which is called Fair Street.

Inside this house in the parlor on that cold day so long ago is a little girl arranging chairs in a circle about her father's and mother's new fireplace, where a fire of heavy driftwood is burning. Counting the chairs as she places them in a circle around the fire, Lucretia Coffin is oblivious to everything else in the world. Even for a seventh year, the child is tiny, and quick and birdlike in her steps. She does not hear the clink of plates being taken out of the cupboard by her mother in the adjoining dining room, or the heavier steps moving about as rapidly as her own, or the low humming of the clear, sweet voice of her mother.

The humming of her mother ceases altogether as she says with satisfaction, "There, that will do."

Then Lucretia hears her mother begin to sing aloud Isaac Watts' lullabye:

Soft and easy is thy cradle
Coarse and hard thy Saviour lay.

Now the child sings with her. But it is not with the voice of angels, for her little treble is definitely and cheerfully off key:

When his birthplace was a stable,
And his softest bed was hay.

Anna Coffin stops abruptly and comes into the parlor. Leaning over Lucretia, laughingly she gathers her up in her young, strong arms, saying: "Oh, Lucretia, if thee was as far out of town as thee is out of tune, thee wouldn't get home tonight."

They are laughing together when, as her mother sets her down, comes the sound of footsteps and a knock on the door.

"They are here. Run, Lucretia, and open the door!"

As Lucretia opens the door, beyond the cheerful, familiar sounds of many greetings, an immense resonance envelops all other sound: the wideness of the sea, cold, visible, and gray beyond the houses of Nantucket. To these guests, little Lucretia, who welcomed them at the door, is not just any child. A woman very famous in the earliest life of Nantucket, Mary Starbuck, is this child's great grandaunt, for Mary Starbuck was the mother of the first white child born in Nantucket. They all know Mary Starbuck as the "great woman." They know, too, that due to her influence Nantucket has become second only to Philadelphia, the Quaker center of the country. Lingering on unobtrusively the child watches the results of her work, while her mother welcomes and seats these salt-water aristocrats of Nantucket, the Folgers, the Starbucks, the Mayhews, the Macys, and many others, who have come for a dish of tea, and to discuss certain concerns connected with their Quaker responsibilities in Nantucket.

Again and again, before she slips away, Lucretia hears her mother say to the guests as she seats them in the circle of chairs the child has made: "Move up—come forward—do come more into a circle!"

* * * * *

Seven years later Lucretia and her younger sister, Elizabeth, boarding pupils in the Friends' School at Nine Partners, N. Y., are seen on their knees before a locked closet door. Lucretia looks indignant as she takes the bread and butter from her sister's hands and pushes the buttered slices beneath the crack of the door.

From the other side of the door comes the muffled voice of a boy: "I do thank thee, Lusy and Eliza. If it were manna from heaven it could not taste any better!"

But Lucretia goes on soberly: "Thou art a foolish boy to get thyself in such a fix, yet to be locked in a dark closet without food I do think unreasonable severity to thee. If James Mott, thy cousin,—"

Unobserved, a tall, sandy-haired youth of about 19 years of age with kind, blue eyes and a shy, grave manner has entered the room.

He repeats: "'If James Mott, thy cousin!' Lucretia, what art thou doing on this side of the school, and why art thou here?"

"Why am I here, James Mott? I could bear this punishment myself, but to see thy cousin punished with such unreasonable severity I was—I am—not able to bear."

James Mott's eyes twinkle: "So I see from the butter on the bottom of the door. But thou art rash, and thy known kindness has softened like the butter into indulgence. The boy did that which he acknowledged he should not have done."

Lucretia stands her ground: "What thou sayest is true, yet I beg thee to set him free!"

"Thou and little Eliza and my cousin will grow older every day," comments James Mott, "and soon will know for yourselves that what has been done on this day should not have been done. But it is my intention to consider well before I say 'no' to any request of thine or of others. It is my wish to say 'yes' as often as I can."

He unlocks the door gently: "Come out!"

Two years later Lucretia was teaching in the same school with James Mott. The young people, between whom there was a difference of 5 years of age, realizing that they have become deeply attached to each other, have entered upon an engagement to be married. They were happy, yet it was then that Lucretia began to think about the discriminations against women. Her salary told her all too often that although board and tuition for the boys and girls cost the same, when they became teachers the men received salaries twice as large as those of the women. In her own words, she "early resolved to claim for (herself) all that an impartial Creator had bestowed." The stimulus for such thinking lay not only in the experience of half pay for women but also in the tenets of the Society of Friends. To be a birthright Quaker is to be a member of the first Christian body to recognize the equality of men and women—the great Christian doctrine that there is no sex in souls.

II

It is sad to record that many groups in the Society of Friends were averse, then, to agitation about the abolition of slavery. Lucretia Mott's opponents used to say that she "lugged in" these disagreeable subjects. As it was not uncommon for her to be away from home 70 days, besides traveling some 2,400 miles by stagecoach and speaking 70 or more times, the "lugging in" amounted to an irritating sum total. It was not alone the Society of Friends which would have preferred less agitation. In the Capitol of the United States because Lucretia Mott wouldn't promise not to mention the antislavery issue, then rocking the Nation, she was denied the right to deliver a scheduled lecture in the Hall of Congress at Washington, D. C.

By 1830 James and Lucretia Mott had decided that they could no longer profit by any of the advantages of slave goods. This decision meant laying the axe to James' buying and selling, for he was in the cotton-commission business. Giving it up he entered the wool business. For a time they were poor and for a while James and Lucretia walked alone, but they walked erect. Not in any line of the records which remain is there the shadow of a suggestion that either James or Lucretia was ever tempted by the arts of creeping and crawling. They were by nature peace makers, but not of the appeasement variety, standing upright for human freedom, for justice, and for peace. No tyranny of custom compelled either of them against their consciences—and in conscience, as in life and in love, they were united.

It was in that year of 1830 when they made the decision so momentous for them, that the new antislavery society in Philadelphia attempted to find an influential presiding officer. James was active in the work of this organization which had turned to Thomas Wistar and to Roberts Vaux. For prudential reasons both declined to preside at the Convention. Up in the gallery were five or six women who had been invited to be present. Lucretia Mott, a young woman in her thirties, was knitting.

On the floor, the men, discouraged and unsuccessful in securing prominent leadership, were on the point of abandoning their plans for a convention, when in her clear, sweet voice Lucretia Mott said: "Right principles are stronger than great names. If our principles are right, why should we be cowards? Why should we wait for those who never have had the courage to maintain the inalienable rights of the slave?"

After that she sat down quietly and went on with her knitting and the men went on with their plans for the convention.

Her work for the Female Anti-Slavery Society began about 3 years later, in 1833. The women of the Female Anti-Slavery Society were often surrounded by howling mobs, not infrequently struck by the flying glass from smashed windows, or obliged to hold their ground as vitriol was thrown at them. At one antislavery meeting a group of rowdies stormed the building. Lucretia asked the gentleman who was escorting her to leave her and go to the rescue of some of her friends who were being roughly handled by the rowdies.

"But who will take care of you?" he asked.

"This man," she replied, quietly laying her hand on the arm of one of the roughest of the group. "He will see me safely through."

He did, taking her to a place of safety.

It was against this background of training and experience in the antislavery movement that Lucretia Mott entered organized work for the freedom of women. * * * The best written record of her own thoughts on the status of women is that to be found in her Discourse on Woman delivered as a reply to a wretched piece of derogation of women by a man who should have used his great ability and his fame as a newspaper editor for better purposes. Not once did Lucretia Mott in her lecture refer to him either directly or indirectly. Rising above all personal issues, this discourse is great enough to place side by side with John Stuart Mill's On the Subjection of Women. In passage after passage she pleads for freedom for women and affirms their right to equality of opportunity with men and before the law. She wrote of woman:

"She asks nothing as favor, but as right; she wants to be acknowledged a moral, responsible being. She is seeking not to be governed by laws, in the making of which she has no voice."

Again and again in this Discourse on Woman that which she spoke sounds as if it had been said today, as, for example this:

"Who knows, but that if woman acted her part in governmental affairs, there might be an entire change in the turmoil of political life. It becomes man to speak modestly of his ability to act without her."

Hers was an unfailing protest against injustice to race or to woman. Those of us who knew the streetcars of long ago in Philadelphia, either through pictures or a child's memory, have quaint recollections. Jingle, jingle! Jingle, jingle! Jingle, jingle! The streetcar is coming, bravely drawn by one, two, or more horses. "Whoa-a!" calls the driver from his open-front platform, and the car comes to a stop on the heels of the horses. The passenger steps in. If it is a cold day, the floor of the unheated horse car is bedded down with straw in which many feet are gratefully burying themselves. On one cold, rainy day Lucretia Mott was on such a car. Whoa-a! and the horse car came to a stop. A respectable colored woman, looking wretchedly ill, entered the car and was, according to the law, sent by the conductor to stand on the front platform in the cold and the falling drizzle. Lucretia Mott gazed at the woman standing out on the open-front platform, then back at the conductor. She rose and went to speak to him, asking him to permit the woman to stand inside out of the rain. He said it was the law that colored people should stand outside. Thereupon Lucretia went out to the front platform and in the rain stood beside the woman. Seeing this elderly frail little Quaker standing in the rain, and cherishing Quakers as Philadelphia always has and always will, other occupants in the car began to take a hand in it and to remonstrate with the conductor who, eventually, was obliged by them to go out to ask his white passenger to come back in.

But to the conductor, Lucretia Mott replied: "I cannot go in without this woman."

Tossed helplessly to and fro between this outside white Scylla and black Charybdis and the inside straw-warmed passengers, the conductor said crossly, "Oh, well, bring her in then."

Once she and James were off on a Quaker mission in the northwestern part of Pennsylvania. They were staying over night at the house of a member of the Society of Friends, a man who recently had come on the death of his father, into possession of a comfortable property and an old homestead. They congratulated him on his fine prospects.

"But," objected the man, "I have to keep my mother."

"Was she an active woman in early life?" asked Lucretia.

"Oh, yes, very," came his answer. "She brought up a large family of children, attended to the house and the dairy, and seldom kept any help; she was a very saving woman."

"And yet," Mrs. Mott said, "and yet I understand thee to say, thou hast to 'keep' her. Did not her industry and frugality in her department entitle her to an equal ownership with her husband in homestead and farm? Should it not be said that she allows thee to live with her?"

It will be recalled that at the World's Antislavery Convention in 1840 in London the women delegates were refused admission because they were women. Although refused admission and obliged to sit screened in the gallery, a reporter wrote of Mrs. Mott as the lioness of the convention. No doubt she was the lioness of the occasion, but a lioness caged with other lionesses—Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Ann Phillips—and with one loyal lion—William Lloyd Garrison—behind railings and curtains—facts of imprisonment or subjection not to the liking of any of them there in the gallery.

It was in London Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton met, and there, in the year 1840—not 1848—the women's rights movement was born. As Lucretia and Elizabeth Stanton at the close of their first day's session in the gallery of the world convention walked slowly back to their lodgings together, they made their plans for calling a women's rights meeting on their return home. This was to be the first step toward a general movement on behalf of freedom for women. Repeatedly Elizabeth was warned to beware of the influence of Mrs. Mott, but she knew that she had found the great woman of her times.

It was only, however, after several years had passed that they met together in Waterloo, N. Y., four Quakers, Lucretia, her sister Martha Wright, Jane Hunt, Mary McClintock, and the young and stylishly dressed Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Their plan was to hold a women's rights convention the following week on Wednesday and Thursday, July 19 and 20, in Seneca Falls. Together in the home of the McClintocks they worked out their declaration of rights, based on Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men and women are created equal * * *."

It continues in words familiar to us all, and then goes on:

"The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world."

The declaration lists the injustices to women, and then concludes:

"Now in view of this entire disfranchisement of one-half of the people of this country, their social and religious degradation—in view of the unjust laws above mentioned, and because women do feel themselves aggrieved, oppressed, and fraudulently deprived of their most sacred rights, we insist that they have immediate admission to all the rights and privileges which belong to them as citizens of the United States."

III

At 338 Arch Street, Philadelphia, with the families of two of their married children living with them, the Motts made up a big household. Life in that spacious house was of the strictest simplicity, but they gave welcome to all who came, whether rich or poor, known or unknown, white or black. Lucretia was among the best of housekeepers. Neither her wide interests nor her prominence as a Quaker ever made her neglect the home duties. She rose early and worked hard. She never asked anyone to do work which she herself was not willing to do. She thought nothing of making the mince for 40 mince pies and then crowning that achievement by making the pies themselves. Records of 15 and 20 and even more guests sitting down to the Mott table together are not uncommon. James said of Lucretia:

"Lucretia has numerous calls almost daily from all sorts of folks, high and low, rich and poor. * * * I am sometimes amused to hear the object of some of the calls, it seems as though some people thought she could do any and everything. It is true that she does a great deal; no one out of the family knows one-half, and no one in the family knows the whole."

In 1856 they decided to sell 338 Arch Street, for the demands on Lucretia were wearing her out. They moved into the country to a house opposite Oak Farm where some of their children were already living. This home, the last they were to have, the Motts called Roadside. There Lucretia had a garden. On the borders of the garden were cherry and apple and pear trees. At dawn, long before the others were up, she found new energy, sometimes in picking peas, sometimes in working over the vegetables. After breakfast came the time of day to which all members of the family looked forward. Lucretia had helped to clear the breakfast table. A well-scrubbed little cedar tub was brought in, filled with steaming water, and set down at Mrs. Mott's end of the table. With her daughters and sometimes her guests helping, she washed and burnished the silver, china, and glass while the news of their world was discussed, letters read and talked about, and the plans for the day arranged. Friends on their way to business dropped in at this breakfast hour, adding their news to the general liveliness. In friendliness and in peace their day began and ended, and in the midst of it all the presence of James Mott was a benediction.

At the close of the day, when after supper the members of their family and their guests were soon to gather about the Mott fireplace in the parlor, Lucretia left the dining room to arrange the chairs in a circle before the fire. As the guests were seating themselves in the parlor Lucretia could be heard saying, "Move up—come forward—do come more into a circle." When she became invalided in her room and was no longer strong enough to be with them, she would slip out just before the family and their guests assembled, set the chairs about the fireplace in their symbolic circle of love and welcome, and slip back upstairs before she could be detected by anything except by the symbol. And even today in the hearts of those who love and reverence her memory echo the words, "Move up—come forward—do come more into a circle."

Increasingly frail since the death of their daughter Elizabeth and then of her husband 4 years later, she was seen less and less in public. With the tragic inconsistency of public opinion, the public which had condemned her now gave her one ovation after another. In 1863, 33 years after she and her beloved James had taken their stand, she attended an anniversary meeting of the antislavery forces. Neither physical nor mental brickbats were thrown at her. The great convocation respectfully parted so that this brave little woman, who had given all that she had for the cause, might pass through their ranks to the platform. * * * In 1880, on the Fourth of July, the National Woman's Suffrage Association held a meeting in Dr. Furness' church in Philadelphia for the purpose of reading the Woman's Declaration of Rights. Elizabeth Cady Stanton was presiding.

As Lucretia Mott stood up to speak from her place in the audience, voices called out, "Go up into the pulpit!"

Modestly rebelling, nevertheless she started for the pulpit. Just as she began to ascend the steps, a single, clear voice took up the hymn Nearer My God To Thee and the entire audience joined in:

There let the way appear,
Steps unto heaven;
All that thou sendest me
In mercy given!
Angels to beckon me
Nearer, my God, to Thee
Nearer to Thee.

Unconscious of the personal implication of this singing, she waited until the hymn was finished, quietly ascending the steps still unaware of the tribute to her. * * *

Some time before her death her daughter was reading aloud to her an editorial about her increasing physical weakness and the valuable lessons of her long life. At the close she said quizzically, "It's better not to be in a hurry with obituaries." Then in an undertone, she added, as if it pained her, "I'm a much overrated woman—it is humiliating." The time had come when 'great-hearted rebellion was physically no longer possible. She could not leave her bed. Patiently, quietly, without fear she saw the end approaching. During those last weeks Lucretia's room became the center of the family life. When they asked her if their conversation disturbed her she would say, "O! no; it's pleasant." Even her little great-grandson who had a room adjoining hers contributed to her contentment, for she had made an arrangement with him whereby every morning as he dressed he sang to her in his high sweet voice, Old Folks at Home. If in those moments of the child's singing she recalled her mother's laughing words, "Oh Lucretia! if thee was as far out of town as thee is out of tune, thee wouldn't get home tonight!" here was compensation enough for her own lack in the child of her children singing so sweetly.

Before the end, suffering, her mind began its flight over the wide spaces of eternal life.

They heard her speaking detached sentences: "Wherever you may be led, you will find all the ways pleasant, and the paths peace. * * * Now thee lead, Maria, and the rest will follow * * * follow as truth may open the way."

Then as if in pain came the cry, "Take me now, this little standard bearer!"

At half past seven o'clock in the evening of the eleventh day of the eleventh month, 1880, Lucretia Mott, stopped breathing. On First Day following she was taken in the afternoon to rest beside her husband and two daughters. No invitations had been given but thousands stood around that open grave. As they stood there, everything was done in the simplicity and order and silence Lucretia loved.

Suddenly a low voice said, "Will no one say anything?" And another voice replied, "Who can speak? The preacher is dead!"

As a little child Lucretia Coffin Mott had lived upon Fair Street in Nantucket. She was buried near the city of Philadelphia in the Quaker burying ground at Fair Hill.

The object of these interpretations and pictures is not any recording of dates or enumeration of facts, although both are present. The object is rather to show the profound unity from first to last in one great human life; to suggest that in the Society of Friends, as well as in the lives of its members—Lucretia Mott, Susan B. Anthony, Alice Paul, and others—is to be found a forward-looking, projective leadership for the freedom of women; and finally to repeat here the Lucretia Mott amendment; men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.

Address of National Commander Roane Waring, of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of National Commander Roane Waring, of the American Legion, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., before the Senate and House Military and Naval Affairs Committees, the Senate Finance Committee, the House World War Veterans' Committee, and key Legionnaires from many States assembled for annual committee meetings. This address was broadcast by the National Broadcasting Co. from station WRC, 10:30 to 11 p. m., eastern war time, Monday, January 11, 1943:

Members of Congress, Legionnaires, and fellow Americans, we here in Washington have just witnessed a motion picture that dramatizes the tragedy of this war and the crisis now confronting America. There was no scenery effect in this picture, no Hollywood camouflage, no deception of photographic art. The death throes were real. The treachery was complete. Portions of this picture, prepared by the Army under the title "Prelude to War" came from archives of the Axis Nations. It is their own story of their infamy.

All of us in America share the feeling of utter horror and the realization of what we face. I know you share with me the determination to put an end forever, not only to the leaders, but to all the peoples of these countries who foster and seek to perpetuate their predatory and damnable purposes.

The enemy portions of these pictures were filmed for two purposes. The first was to demonstrate to their own people the power of their military machines and to bolster their morale. The second was to palsy and to terrify other nations into submitting to Axis domination. Little did they realize the effect these pictures would have upon a free, a brave, and a resolute people. These pictures have taught us to appraise correctly the seriousness of our situation and to buckle down to a determined all-out effort to win this war.

I welcome this opportunity to speak here tonight at this dinner, tendered by the national defense and legislative committees of the American Legion, and to join them in greeting you, the members of the Military Affairs and Naval Affairs Committees of both Houses of Congress, of the Senate Finance Committee, and of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. You hear the burden of the responsibility of preparing and putting into effect the legislative power and directive of America's war effort.

Over the years we Legionnaires have labored to put into force the American Legion's mandates on national defense and Americanism, to preserve the ideals of our American Government, and to make and keep our country strong and prepared.

I shall speak frankly to you upon some of the questions that face our country in this, the most serious time in its history. I speak for more than 1,135,000 men who in time of war proved their devotion, and by their service earned the right to speak with authority and with a knowledge gained in war. The men of the American Legion are now a vital part of this country. They represent a cross section of America. Many of them have assumed their rightful places as leaders in business, professional, military, and public life. More than 150,000 Legionnaires again are wearing the uniform. Hundreds of thousands of their sons are fighting on every battle front.

As we face this war, the American Legion's obligation is the same as that of every good American citizen. It is to bend every effort to the supplying of our military forces with every necessary resource, with every battle weapon, and with the maximum manpower in the armed conflict with the enemy. Our objective is to kill, to destroy, and to wipe the Axis governments from the face of the earth. This must be done in the quickest time possible. We must realize that every minute, every hour, and every day this war is prolonged will be paid for with the blood of American fighting men.

We of the American Legion are practical in our approach as to what is necessary now.

Our sole aim must be to devote our every effort, our every thought, our every resource, to the victorious conclusion of this war. Until this war is over and victory is won, we must not weaken our efforts by vain and premature planning for a new and never to be attained world-wide Utopia.

We must meet the challenge of this hour with the needs of the hour—we must make war. We must not busy ourselves with the terms of a peace not yet won, except to make the single resolution that it must be a peace of absolute military victory, a dictated peace, and never a negotiated peace.

The American Legion is critical of some of the proposed changes in our war policy. We have some very definite views on them. One of these concerns the size of the Army. Who is to determine the number of men who shall be put in the fighting ranks? The American Legion believes all decisions of this kind should be left solely to the General Staff. The strategy of military effort is a military question always to be determined by the group best qualified to consider it—the High Command. It is the Army's responsibility to give the orders as to where to fight, when to fight, and how to fight. With this responsibility they must also control the number and composition of troops with which to fight. The High Command has definitely determined its needs. Its judgment is based upon a mass of factual statistics which are not available, and properly so, to us civilians. The American Legion stands on the Army's judgment. The number of men necessary to constitute the Army has been stated by the High Command. Certainly the Army should know how many troops it can equip, train, transport to the battle lines, and maintain there successfully. Curtailment in the size of the Army is advocated by some who argue that the formation of the Army as called for by the General Staff will take from the home front some of the manpower necessary for war production, and that such an Army will reduce the man-hour pool below the point necessary for efficient war production. If they are correct in this, there is merit to their contention.

But before we change the Army's plans for fighting this war, let us on the home front put our house in order. Let us effectively organize and augment existing man-hour pools by checking on the work slackers and bringing them into the field of war production. This can and should be done by closing gaps that now exist, by stepping up the tempo of production. Let us first exhaust every effort to increase the civilian pool of man-hours by eliminating all civilian construction and production not essential to the war effort and by substituting more woman-power for manpower. Let us first break down and do away with the age-limit restrictions which are now in effect in many war plants. Most important of all, let us increase civilian hour production by taking steps necessary to decrease absenteeism in war work.

For example, in the Lake Washington Shipyards on Saturday, November 21, the management announced that 1,146 men were absent from work, which I understand represented 15 percent of the total workers employed. A survey announced January 6 showed that in 8 representative war plants, employing 40,000 workers, there was an average daily absence of 2,400 workers. This absenteeism was restricted mainly to 15 percent of the workers.

By a little more energy and work and toil and sweat at home we can produce what the Army needs, and still not have to take men who are needed as soldiers on the fighting line. Just a little less folderol and trimmings, a little less concern about the world of the future, more concentration on the job of winning the war, and we will achieve our goal.

We are all painfully aware of the disastrous slow-down and unjustifiable strikes still occurring in war industries. I say this with the full realization that accusations of this kind are publicly ridiculed in some high places, and those who make them are labeled as labor baiters. Nevertheless, we know that strikes and slow-down and absenteeism from work are occurring.

The American Legion is proud to count within its ranks many veterans who are splendid representatives of organized labor. The vast majority of American labor is as true, patriotic, and devoted to the ideals of this country as is any other group of American citizens. Many a soldier has died on Guadalcanal with a bullet through his union card. I yield to no one in admiration for the honest, patriotic, hard-working American labor man. Nevertheless, the American Legion knows that we have reached a crisis in this country when the American people must plainly distinguish between an honest and patriotic union worker and the selfish, subversive racketeer who has put his personal gain before the security of his country. Regardless of the merits of any labor dispute, the American Legion places the life and security of the fighting men at the front above all other considerations. No strike and no shut-down and no slow-down, regardless of the number of civilians involved, is worth the life and blood of one soldier on the battle line.

When slow-downs, work stoppages, and strikes cease, when industry realizes that there are plenty of man-hours of labor left in the hearts and muscles and brains of older men who, while too old to fight, beg the opportunity to do their part in production; when we discard for the duration the perfectly ridiculous theory of limiting hours of work in wartime; when women are given a greater part in production; and, yes, when at least the thousands upon thousands of Government employees and bureau attachés, entirely unnecessary in the war effort and who serve only the purpose of harassing, delaying, and impeding American industry and the armed forces by unnecessary questionnaires and investigations, are released for labor and are shown their places on the production line, then our manpower problem will be solved, and there will be no necessity to hamper the armed forces and lessen their effectiveness.

Another problem that is disturbing the American Legion is the effort upon the part of some, and they have some support in the Halls of Congress, to take the procurement of military and naval supplies from the hands of those services and place them in a civilian munitions board. The American Legion recognizes the importance and necessity for the proper division and allocation of the necessary raw materials between civilian war requirements and the needs of the Military Establishment. But when once these raw materials are designated for and allocated to the military service for the production of war implements, the American Legion insists that the development of these munitions be left to the respective military services.

The American Legion demands that the military services retain the final authority in the selection of the weapons, their models and their type, and the number in which they shall be provided, and the place where they shall be used. The procurement and production of the munitions of war must be left in the hands of the armed services. They must retain the right to change, at any time, the model or type of equipment used in combat, the right to say what, where, and when it shall be used. The American Legion holds that the prime civilian obligation is to supply the Army with the new materials necessary for the munitions of war.

Our fighting men are doing a magnificent job. No man can question their courage, their ability, or the leadership of their command. The Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps and their respective air services, are working as members of a common team—there are no jealousies or race for unfair advantage there. No juggling for position. Why cannot their example be followed by those in the civilian effort? It is one of the tragedies of this war that the situation exists in this capital today that justifies, or at least gives lodgment for the writers in our daily press, and for news commentators to constantly discuss the feuds existing between Government departments and between the different agencies of Government and their respective heads, and the maneuvering that is going on upon the part of one branch of government to grab a plum from another department. This is tragic and can serve only to disorganize a united effort. When these attacks are leveled at the armed forces they can only serve to endanger our war effort.

Let us develop a little more hatred for our enemies abroad and curb a little more our interdepartmental and bureau jealousies at home. There is glory enough in this war for every man who does his duty. There should be no place and no glory for the man who seeks to build his prestige and erect his future on the travail and agonies of his country fighting for its very life.

There is too much time lost on the industrial production front by investigations and bureaucratic interference from governmental departments that can have no rightful place in the efforts of a nation at war. The American Legion recognizes and would be the first to defend the rights and the importance of proper and necessary Government inquiry and investigation, whether by the Executive or by committees of Congress, into the conduct of the war, wherever important policy matters are at stake. But it also recognizes that every minute taken up by frivolous and inconsequential investigations can only result in taking away from their war efforts the leaders and others responsible for the conduct of the war. This prolongs the war and the costs are paid in the lives of the fighting men at the front. The Commander in Chief and his General Staff cannot successfully lead us to victory if their time is unnecessarily consumed in fighting the battle of Washington.

By the same token the hands of industry and management charged with war production must not be manacled and palsied through governmental red tape and bureaucratic paper-work requirements. Let's fire more bullets and ammunition at the enemy and fewer questionnaires at our business executives. Let's use more machine guns and fewer mimeograph machines. Let's win the war first, study its history later, and then ask questions.

The American Legion is proud of the integrity and independence and of the work that has been done in the war effort by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as now constituted. The American Legion holds that this Bureau is the strong right arm of the people. It has proven itself a barrier between pacifism on the right and communism on the left. The American Legion is cognizant of the many efforts to eliminate this agency in the affairs of government, but the Legion has the fullest confidence in the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

If the civilian population is willing to work as hard and as many hours as the soldier works, if it is willing to do without as the soldier does without, if it is willing to put its all into the war production as the soldier bares his breast to the enemy, then victory can be achieved.

Reduced to its simplest equation, this means that the supplies, the equipment must reach the men at the fighting front not only in sufficient quantities but when they are needed. Failure to get them there may be paid for with the lives of our fighting men.

Our only aim is to win this war; nothing else can matter now. We must not slacken our war effort by stopping to plan the division of the world in the future. We cannot pause in the midst of battle to decide sociological questions nor to determine how we can bring the idealistic freedoms to the people of all the world. We will be unnecessarily wasting too much of our time and vital efforts on these idealistic and perhaps impractical theories. Such theories have no place in a war to the death and can serve only to distract us from our wartime objectives of killing the Japs and the Germans and in killing as many of them in the shortest time possible.

Let us be brutally frank about this. Let us cast aside the trimming and scrape off the varnish and ask ourselves plainly, What are we fighting for? We are fighting to preserve this country of ours, to preserve its ideals and its material wealth; to preserve its ideals because these ideals guarantee to us our individual rights to speak our thoughts, to worship the God of our choice in our own way, and to live our lives as free Americans. So much for the ideals. Now let's consider the material wealth. We are fighting for that, too, as we fight for our ideals, because we must have material wealth in order to live, prosper, and enjoy the freedoms that our ideals give to us. That is why we are fighting this war. That is why every patriotic nation has ever fought—to protect its ideals and to protect its material wealth. Do not let's delude ourselves. We are not fighting this war primarily to preserve the British Commonwealth of Nations, nor are we fighting it to restore freedom for the oppressed peoples of Europe. We admire the British and their courage. We sympathize with the oppressed peoples of Europe. We fight to aid them; yes; but we always must remember that we fight because it fits into our picture of self-preservation. This being true, let's not divert our efforts at this critical stage of the war with what kind of settlement we will have and what planning will be necessary to restore all of the world to peace and happiness. Too much attention centered on the peace of the future means too little attention centered on winning the war of the present.

Let us be realistic. We of the American Legion are more interested now in pints of nitroglycerine that go into bombs than in quarts of milk for the rest of the world. We are more interested in armor for our tanks than in silk linings for Eskimo coats. We are interested in a rope with which to hang Mussolini and a strait jacket for Hitler more than in starched collars and shirts and fancy pants for the people of India. Let us be more practical. This war must be won with bullets, with guns, with tanks, and with planes and ships. It cannot be won with hybrid corn and social reforms. Let us plan the future for Timbuktu and Patagonia after we have destroyed the military might of the Germans and the Japs.

"Then conquer we must
For our cause it is just
And this be our motto
In God is our trust."

Representative Ellsworth for the New Fourth Oregon District on the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, with the redistricting following the new census, Oregon gained one additional Congressman, and the last legislature of the State of Oregon established the Fourth Congressional District, which was a portion of the district heretofore represented by our colleague, Representative JAMES W. MOTT.

HARRIS ELLSWORTH was selected by the voters of the district to be the new Representative, and he is now actively engaged here representing this new district. Representative ELLSWORTH has spent most of his life in Oregon and has been engaged as a newspaper editor and has kept in close touch with the development of our State and is particularly well fitted to represent this new congressional district. A biographical sketch of Mr. ELLSWORTH appeared in the Portland Oregonian in its issue of January 3, a portion of which I am including in the extension of these remarks, as follows:

A NEW CHAPTER FOR ELLSWORTH—ROSEBURG EDITOR SAYS HE ISN'T GOING TO CONGRESS "TO GET"—HIS DISTRICT WANTS "TO GIVE"

(By Mel Arnold)

If southern Oregon's new Congressman "tells off" the Roosevelt administration the way he delivers verbal kayoes to publicity seekers in his home State, he will help make the Seventy-eighth Congress one lively place.

Heading for Washington, HARRIS ELLSWORTH is leaving a long-suffering typewriter which rests on a scarred little table standing between a packing-case waste basket and a desk that is always piled high.

As editor of the Roseburg News-Review, ELLSWORTH has always kept an editorial cudgel handy for a vigorous defense of the sanctity of the columns of the press. Let a hapless press agent send a "puff" story to the News-Review, and he could expect to receive by return mail a caustic letter pointing out any errors of fact, taste, or punctuation—and sarcastically offering to print the corrected version in the advertising columns at standard space rates.

This will be fair warning to Washington bureaucrats in the National Capital that the newcomer from Oregon is likely to bring the same suspicious eye to bear on the pages of the next Federal Budget.

The outspoken Mr. ELLSWORTH treks to Washington as the recipient of a singular honor—that of being the first man to represent Oregon's new Fourth Congressional District, which was created after the 1940 census showed Oregon entitled to additional representation. The editor-Congressman is the spokesman for seven southwestern counties—Coos, Curry, Douglas, Jackson, Josephine, Lane, and Linn.

SHIRT LOST IN VENTURE IN LUMBER GAME

Taking his seat on the Republican side of the House of Representatives, ELLSWORTH is beginning a new chapter in his journalistic career—a career that has been interrupted only once before by a nonpublishing venture. That was the time he went into the lumber business. Fortunately for Oregon journalism, "I lost my shirt in lumber." He went back into the field he knew best.

The lumber episode, which occurred soon after his graduation from college, had interesting psychological repercussions. Until that time, his signature was M. HARRIS ELLSWORTH (the initial standing for Matthew). After the bitter business experience, the chastened young hopeful became, more forthrightly, just HARRIS ELLSWORTH.

He inherited the interest in lumber from his father, Elmer E. Ellsworth, who followed the timber industry from northern California to Grays Harbor. The elder Ellsworth acted as operating superintendent for several large companies, and designed several mills. In the harbor city of Hoquiam, MATTHEW HARRIS was born on September 17, 1899. While he was still less than a year old the family moved to Oregon, where they stayed. His mother was Eva Katherine Forbes, daughter of a pioneer California farmer who founded a Sacramento Valley village known as Forbestown.

Attending the university during World War No. 1, ELLSWORTH enlisted in the Army in the autumn of 1918 as a member of the S. A. T. C.

Immediately after graduating in 1922 the industrious ELLSWORTH went to work for the Morning Register in Eugene as advertising manager. He left that paper to take the flyer in the lumber business, as mentioned above. This was followed by 3 years as advertising manager of the 4-L Lumber News in Portland.

Meantime, he had married Helen Dougherty of San Jose, Calif., who also came from a pioneer lumber-manufacturing family. The two graduated in the same class.

Later ELLSWORTH became the first field manager and secretary of the Oregon State Editorial Association, now known as the Oregon Newspaper Publishers' Association. In addition to this work, he served as assistant professor in journalism at the University of Oregon.

When the Eugene Register Publishing Co., whose principal owners were Frank Jenkins and Ernest Gilstrap, bought the Roseburg News-Review, they sent ELLSWORTH south as editor. In the intervening years he has acquired a substantial ownership interest in the paper.

RADIO PIONEERED AMONG SMALLER PAPERS

In 1935 the editor made a study of radio broadcasting and decided it was due for expansion into smaller cities. He prepared and filed for the News-Review an application for a radio station, which was granted by the Federal radio authorities. Station KRNR became the first newspaper-owned radio station in Oregon outside Portland.

After moving to Roseburg, ELLSWORTH acquired his first hobby—fishing. He now admits, "I'm a nut about it—and I'll miss the Oregon fishing streams terribly when I get back to Washington, D. C."

ELLSWORTH makes it clear: "I have never before taken part in politics as a candidate for public office. Late in the 1941 session of the legislature, however, I was appointed to the State senate to take the place of Senator Charles W. Clark, who died during the session. My actual term of service in the session was too brief to mention. The Douglas County court wanted me to go down for the end of the session, which I did purely as a service to the county and with no thought at that time of entering politics."

On the eve of his departure for the National Capital, the Fourth Oregon District's first Congressman emphasized: "I am not going back with the thought of 'getting' for this district. The saddle is very definitely on the other horse. We have in these seven counties a great deal to give our Nation.

"Our war effort needs the product of our forests. Our district contains more than one-half of all the Douglas fir in the United States. Some 60 percent of the timber is publicly owned. I want to do my part toward helping to place this timber at the disposal of our Army and our Navy and, after the war, to use it for the rebuilding of our country and the world.

"In our district is enough coal—almost totally undeveloped—to supply a large portion of the western United States with coal. I know about that coal. I have heated my house with it. It should be made available to the people.

"There is a goodly store of nickel in the mountains of our district. There are chrome deposits as yet unexplored and not mined. There is a sizable deposit of copper in Douglas County. There are some really important gold mines here. There is a vein of cinnabar ore south of Eugene that is considered the best in the world. There is an abundance of undeveloped water power."

COOPERATION SOUGHT TO DEVELOP NATURAL RESOURCES

"In seeking the development of these resources we are asking no gifts, only reasonable cooperation and the right to develop them in the American way—under free competitive enterprise and not under Government dictatorship."

ELLSWORTH is convinced that Federal bureaus, boards, and commissions have usurped dangerous powers, and "I want to have a voice toward bringing back the business of lawmaking to Congress, where it belongs. Congress, dominated hopelessly by the New Deal, has drifted into a state of indifference, a condition born of fear and fed by political demagoguery. I feel strongly on this subject and am straining at the leash to do what I can toward correcting it."

And if the Roseburg editor is as energetic in "working over" these bureaucrats as he is in dealing with Oregon publicity seekers, certain Washingtonians will probably feel an urge to declare unconstitutional the 1940 census, which showed southern Oregon entitled to a congressional district of its own.

The Enactment of H. R. 1 Will Save Taxpayers Billions of Dollars in Interest on Government Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, House bill 1, introduced the first day of the Seventy-eighth Congress, provides for the issuance of nonnegotiable United States Government bonds to Federal Reserve banks and terminates the authority of the Treasury to issue interest-bearing obligations of the United States to commercial banks.

In the President's Budget message delivered to Congress on yesterday, January 11, 1943, it is disclosed that next year our Government will be paying $3,000,000,000 a year in interest on the Government debt. If the debt continues to rise, the total amount of interest to be paid will also increase.

ENCOURAGE SALE OF UNITED STATES BONDS TO PUBLIC

I do not object to the Treasury selling United States Government bonds that

are interest bearing to individuals and corporations that have the money to purchase the bonds with, since such transactions tend to retard inflation by using up available purchasing power. However, I do object to the Treasury selling Government bonds to commercial banks that create the money or credit with which to purchase them; this is highly inflationary, and, in addition, causes the taxpayers to pay commercial banks for the use of money that is created upon the Government's own credit; it pays the commercial banks for money that the commercial banks do not have and, in effect and in practice, pays the commercial banks interest annually thereafter for the use of funds that are created by a bookkeeping or a pencil-mark transaction.

Almost one-half of the bonds that were sold during December 1942 were sold to commercial banks that created the money to purchase them through the fountain-pen method. I believe in the private banking system and do not want it destroyed. Anyone who has given the subject thought must realize that the American taxpayers are not going to stand for the commercial banks of this country creating the money, or any substantial part of it, with which successfully to prosecute this war and then require them to pay interest on it for generations to come. The taxpayers today are paying interest on money that was borrowed to prosecute the War between the States. On $1,000,000 that was borrowed for the War between the States, our taxpayers have already paid three or four million dollars in interest and still owe the $1,000,000 originally borrowed.

By the time United States Government bonds are paid, the taxpayers normally pay as much in interest as the amount of the bonds, or $2 for every $1 that is borowed. In the case of a huge national debt under the same system, the taxpayers will be compelled to pay several times as much in interest as the amount borrowed.

HOUSE BILL 1

This must be changed. H. R. 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, is authorized to issue from time to time United States bonds, the proceeds of which shall be available to meet any public expenditures authorized by law and to retire any outstanding obligations of the United States bearing interest or issued on a discount or on a combination interest-bearing and discount basis. Such bonds shall be issued in such form or forms and in such denominations, and mature at such times (not in excess of 40 years from the date of issue) as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. Such bonds shall not bear interest or be issued on a discount basis, and shall not be negotiable or transferable.

SEC. 2. Bonds issued under the provisions of this act shall be issued solely to Federal Reserve banks and shall be subscribed for by the various Federal Reserve banks in such proportions of the entire issue as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay, out of any funds hereafter appropriated for such purpose, to each Federal Reserve bank subscribing to bonds issued under this act, such amounts as he deems necessary to reimburse such bank for any expenses incurred by it in connection with such bonds.

SEC. 3. The authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to issue any interest-bearing obligations of the United States (including obligations issued on a discount basis or on a combination discount and interest-bearing basis) under any other provisions of law is hereby terminated insofar as the issuance of United States bonds to any bank receiving demand deposits is authorized thereby. Except in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe in order to provide for the orderly disposition of United States bonds held by any bank receiving demand deposits on the date of the enactment of this act, no such bank shall at any time hold any amount of United States bonds in excess of the amount held by it on December 31, 1941.

SEC. 4. The first two paragraphs of section 7 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. After all necessary expenses of a Federal Reserve bank have been paid or provided for and a surplus equal to the paid-in capital stock of such bank accumulated, the annual net earnings of such bank shall be paid into the general fund of the Treasury.

"Should a Federal Reserve bank be dissolved or go into liquidation, any surplus remaining, after the payment of all debts and the par value of all stock, shall be paid to and become the property of the United States."

Section 1 of the bill will permit the Secretary of the Treasury, instead of selling Government interest-bearing bonds, to receive the money necessary to meet any public expenditure by issuing and depositing with the 12 Federal Reserve banks bonds that provide for no interest. These bonds will not be sold to the public, as the public generally would probably not be interested in buying them since they will not draw interest, but the Federal Reserve banks can keep them, and each year the Government can make a payment on the bonds to the Federal Reserve banks.

Under our present system the Treasury, when it needs money, sells bonds that provide for interest through the Federal Reserve banks, and in that way the Treasury receives credit at the Federal Reserve banks, which is checked upon in order to pay the debts of the Government. This proposal will permit the Treasury to receive the same amount of credit as on interest-bearing bonds and the Treasury may check upon this credit in the same manner that it is checked upon today when interest-bearing bonds are sold. In other words, when this proposal is enacted, the Treasury will give the same kind of checks to the same people for the same service, or in payment of the same debts. The people receiving these checks under the new proposal will deposit them or receive the money on them in the same way and manner that they now receive credit at the local banks, or receive the money in return for their checks.

This will not cause the distribution or circulation of one extra dollar of actual currency. Therefore, it cannot be considered a greenback, or printing-press, proposal. It is strictly an orthodox banking method, which will permit the Government to finance the war debt without paying tribute to a few people, who are using the Government's credit and idle gold absolutely free.

HOW NON-INTEREST-BEARING BONDS DISTRIBUTED

Section 2 of the bill provides the method by which the bonds, which will be noninterest bearing, will be distributed among the 12 Federal Reserve banks. The method that will be agreed upon will doubtless be according to the capital stock or resources of the particular bank. If the Treasury needs a million dollars, it will distribute the bonds among the 12 Federal Reserve banks, which will aggregate a million dollars. The largest Federal Reserve bank, of course, will take much more of the bonds than the smallest Federal Reserve bank.

The distribution will be made by the Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

BANKS WILL BE PAID FOR SERVICE

This section also provides that the Federal Reserve banks will not lose any money by reason of servicing these loans to the Government without interest since the bill provides that each bank shall be reimbursed for any expenses incurred in connection with the bonds. The expenses, of course, will be practically nothing—not as much as one-twentieth of 1 percent interest—compared with the huge amount of interest that would normally be paid on the bonds that will necessarily be issued to finance the war debt.

IF MONEY IS TO BE CREATED IT SHOULD BE CREATED BY THE GOVERNMENT AND NO INTEREST PAID ON IT

Section 3, the first sentence, provides that no more interest-bearing obligations of the United States shall be issued and sold to commercial banks, or banks receiving demand deposits. The reason for that is that such a bank does not have anything to give the Government in return for its bonds. It merely receives the bonds and gives the Government credit in bookkeeping transactions, or pencil-mark or fountain-pen money. Every informed person admits that under such circumstances, the commercial banks create the money outright. If money is to be created outright, it should be created by the Government and no interest paid on it.

BANKS GET MONEY FOR 1 PERCENT ON BONDS DRAWING MUCH MORE

If a bank purchases bonds under existing rules, laws, and regulations that provide for interest payments, and the bank should need money to pay its depositors or for any other purpose, it can deposit the same bonds with the Federal Reserve banks as collateral security and receive funds for one-half of 1 percent interest on the bonds. In other words, the bank will continue to receive interest provided for on the bonds, but will only be required to pay one-half of 1 percent from the local Federal Reserve banks on loans using the bonds as collateral.

During the first week in December 1941, Gov. Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman

of the Federal Reserve Board, stated in a letter to all banks:

Continuing the policy which was announced following the outbreak of war in Europe, Federal Reserve banks stand ready to advance funds on United States Government securities at par to all banks.

All banks in the country are notified that they can buy all the Government bonds that they desire to buy, although they do not have the money to purchase them, and if they should need the money the Federal Reserve banks will furnish it, and, of course, the discount rate is one-half of 1 percent.

BANKS CANNOT FURTHER INCREASE HOLDINGS OF GOVERNMENT BONDS

Section 3, in the second and last sentence, provides that no bank which receives deposits—in other words, a bank that must create the money in order to buy bonds—shall at any time hold any amount of United States bonds in excess of the amount held by it on December 31, 1941. In other words, if a bank held $2,000,000 in Government securities on the date mentioned, it can sell any amount of those bonds that it desires to sell, and may in turn purchase other United States Government securities up to, but not in excess of the $2,000,000, which was the amount held December 31, 1941.

GOVERNMENT CREDIT FARMED OUT

The Government of the United States, under the Constitution, has the power, and it is the duty of the Government, to create all money. The Treasury Department issues both money and bonds. Under the present system it sells the bonds to a bank that creates the money, and then if the bank needs the actual money, the actual printed greenbacks to pay the depositors, the Treasury will furnish that money to the banks to pay the depositors. In that way the Government farms out the use of its own credit absolutely free.

BACKING FOR NON-INTEREST-BEARING BONDS

If the Federal Reserve banks provide the credit to finance the war, as proposed in the bill, inserted herewith, these bonds will be backed by the credit of the Nation, which includes the taxing power of the Nation, and also the $23,000,000,000 in gold that is now idle and unused, except that portion that is used free by the private banking system of this country.

BONDS BACKED BY TAXING POWER, TOO

A bond issued by the Government carries with it an obligation that Congress will pass laws levying taxes which will be sufficient to cause the taxpayers to pay money in taxes to pay the interest on the bonds, and to eventually retire them when due. The history of the issuance of long-term bonds by our Government is conclusive that the Government invariably pays $2 to every $1 that it borrows. In other words, it pays $1 in interest and $1 in principal.

GOVERNMENT TO PAY DOUBLE

A $200,000,000,000 debt means, under the present system, that the taxpayers will eventually have to pay $400,000,000,000. With a huge debt of $300,000,000,000, which is estimated by many Government authorities as being the amount that the public debt will reach before the war is over, it will probably be impossible for the taxpayers to pay enough money each year to liquidate any part of the principal of the bonds. Therefore they will remain in bondage for centuries because they will be unable to pay any more each year than is sufficient to provide for the interest on the bonds.

ONE DOLLAR PAID MONEY CHANGERS FOR EVERY DOLLAR PAID A SOLDIER

Viewing the situation from the most optimistic viewpoint, the taxpayers will be compelled to pay at least $2 for every $1 borrowed. For every $1 that is paid to a soldier the money creators who have nothing to offer except the Government's credit, which has been given to them free, will also receive $1. For every $1 that is paid to every person for materials furnished, the money creators will receive $1 in interest for no service whatsoever in the form of interest for furnishing the Government's credit, which has been furnished to the money creators free. For every $1 that is paid out for any purpose, in this war or for peacetime pursuit, the interest will amount to at least $1, and the result will be that the taxpayer must pay $2 in order to liquidate every $1 debt.

I cannot understand why anyone should insist that the credit of this Nation and the use of the Government's gold should be farmed out absolutely free to the private commercial banking corporations of this country, and require the taxpayers to pay at least $2 in order to obtain $1 in our war preparation.

REPAIR HOPELESSNESS OF PEOPLE

Let us repair the hopelessness that is now being felt by the people on account of what they think will probably happen after the war with a $300,000,000,000 public debt by changing the system so that the Government can use its own credit and its own gold and not pay $2 for every $1 that is borrowed.

WAR DEBT CAN BE PAID IN 40 YEARS

If our national debt for the war is $300,000,000,000, it can be paid over a period of 40 years without an unbearable burden on the taxpayers by the Government borrowing money from the Federal Reserve banks and paying it back 2½ percent each year. This 2½ percent will be no more than interest that is being charged today, and the amount will be sufficient to entirely pay off the bonds in 40 years. Whereas if we continue the present system of paying interest on these bonds, at the end of 40 years, after paying 2½ percent each year, we will still owe the principal amount of the bonds, and the debt will be just as large at the end of 40 years as it is today or when the debt is the largest.

WILL REDUCE CHANCES OF INFLATION

If we borrow $300,000,000,000, or the part that cannot be raised from individuals and corporations having money, to finance the war from the Federal Reserve banks and it is paid 2½ percent each year and entirely paid off and liquidated in 40 years, there will be no likelihood of inflation during that time. Whereas, if we continue paying tribute to a few for the use of the Government's own credit, we will in all probability have inflation unless it is possible to prevent it by price control and other methods.

DUTY OF CONGRESS TO MAKE CHANGE

It occurs to me that the duty of making this change is on Congress. It is not on the executive, the judiciary, or any department of our Government. It rests solely and alone upon the Congress of the United States to change the system that causes our credit to be farmed out and enormous interest burden paid unnecessarily and uselessly on its credit.

AEUSE OF POWER TO TAX

If Congress continues to require the people to pay billions of dollars a year unnecessarily as interest on Government bonds it occurs to me that it is an abuse on the part of Congress of the power to tax. Congress has the power to tax and is exercising that power to the limit, but certainly Congress should not abuse the power by levying taxes to pay a debt that is extravagant, wasteful, and unnecessary in every way.

NOW TIME TO MAKE THE CHANGE

One of these days, the American people are going to wake up and realize the situation, and they will blame this very Congress for not making the change at this time, when we are entering upon a $300,000,000,000 war program. Now is the time to make the change. It is not a change that will involve unorthodox banking methods. It is a change that will save the Government interest on the public debt hereafter contracted, but will not be in any way dangerous to the general welfare of the country. On the other hand, it will be greatly in the interest of the general welfare of the country because the war debt will cost the taxpayers only 50 percent, at least, of what it will cost under the present system.

BOND SALES TO PUBLIC SHOULD CONTINUE

I am not proposing that bond sales to the public be stopped or impeded in any way. It is my belief that bond sales to the public should be encouraged because they are calculated to prevent or stop inflation to a certain extent. At the same time we know that the bonds that the public are buying at this time will, when this emergency is over, be in the market one way or another and, that being true, the money creators will be in a position to purchase them by using the Government's credit free and the idle gold free, and receive interest from the Government for no service whatsoever.

NINE HUNDRED DOLLARS INTEREST PER CAPITA TO BE PAID ON THIS YEAR'S BUDGET

The Budget for the next year is $109,000,000,000. This means that it will cost the American taxpayers by the time the $109,000,000,000 debt is paid, under our present system of farming out our credit free, twice that amount, or $218,000,000,000. This means that every man, woman, and child in America, on this $109,000,000,000 debt, will have to pay at least $900 in interest and $900 on the principal, presuming that the debt can be paid in 40 or 50 years. It is not right for Congress to make the people pay that $900 for every man, woman, and child in America as interest for the use of the

Government's own credit and for the use of the Government's own idle gold by farming out the Government's great privilege and right to create money to private banking interests of the Nation.

PERPETUAL DEBT

The current estimate of what the war, whole war, is going to cost us is $300,000,000,000. If we spend $300,000,000,000 on this war, it will cost about nine or ten billion dollars a year to pay the interest on the $300,000,000,000. In all probability, that is all the taxpayers of this country will be able to pay, and will, therefore, be unable to make any payment on the principal of the debt each year. That being true, money that will be raised in taxes to pay on the national debt will go to the people who are using the credit of the Nation absolutely free, and who have had farmed out to them the use of the idle gold free, and the people will thereby be caused to pay a debt that is useless, wasteful, extravagant, and unnecessary.

THE GREATEST BACKING BEHIND OUR MONEY AND BONDS IS THE TAXING POWER OF CONGRESS; THE DUTY OF CONGRESS TO TAX THE PEOPLE TO PAY ALL THE OBLIGATIONS OF OUR GOVERNMENT—HOW SUCH A SYSTEM BUILT UP

Who created such a system that is costing the taxpayers billions of dollars a year?

The answer is that such a system was built up over a long period of time. Congress passed monetary laws without giving a great deal of attention to them, being told that money was a mystery and very few people understood it, and those understanding it were the ones wanting the monetary laws. It was smart for a Member of Congress to say "All I know about money is that I do not have enough of it," or some similar crack that invariably drew laughter and applause, and the bill was passed. If some person who had given the subject thought and consideration attempted to show how the credit of the Nation was being farmed out free to privately owned commercial banks he could very quickly be silenced by a whispering campaign that he was a monetary nut, a crackpot, or a greenbacker, who wanted to flood the country with worthless printing-press money. Then with a few references to continental currency, fiat money, and German inflation, the bill was sent on its way. All such bills were referred to as a bill to further strengthen our sound monetary system.

LOGICAL REASONS WERE PRESENTED

In the beginning of our country there were logical reasons why the Government should issue interest-bearing bonds to pay its expenditures instead of obtaining the use of its own credit without interest.

At that time gold and silver represented practically all of our medium of exchange. When a miner went out into the mountains and, by laboring with his hands, through the hardest kind of manual labor, produced some gold or silver, it was right that the Government pay him interest for its use if the Government desired to borrow it.

Further, if money were borrowed from a foreign country, it was right that our Government pay interest for its use.

EXTRAVAGANT CONGRESS RETARDED

In addition, if the Government paid interest for the money or credit it used, it would have a retarding effect on an extravagant Congress. For the reason that if Congress appropriated too much money, no one would buy the bonds. In other words, as more bonds were sold, they would be worth less and less, and Congress would either have to cause bonds to be sold at a great discount or not be able to sell them at all, or quit appropriating so much money. This had a retarding influence on Congress.

NEITHER REASON GOOD NOW

Neither of these three reasons justify the Government in paying interest on its own credit now. Silver in our exchange represents an infinitesimal part of our money. Gold is not used as money. Our Government does not borrow from a foreign country. United States Government bonds are no longer permitted to be sold for less than par since the banks can always put up their Government bonds as collateral and obtain money for them dollar for dollar—no discount.

The interest paid by our Government amounted to such a small sum each year for the first 125 years of our country's existence it presented no problem. Now it presents one of our most serious problems.

MONEY NOW CREATED ON GOVERNMENT CREDIT

Our money now is created upon the Government's credit, as all money is guaranteed by the United States Government. Although Federal Reserve banks have had the great privilege of issuing and paying out money, it is the Government's money that is paid out. Every bill, note, or piece of currency bears the obligating clause of our Government in the language "The United States Government promises to pay on demand — dollars." This is printed on every piece of paper currency.

POWER OF CONGRESS TO TAX BACKING BEHIND BONDS AND MONEY; ALSO GOLD BACKING

We have an additional backing which is not absolutely needed and a commodity that is used by other countries only to a very limited extent, and that is $23,000,000,000 in gold that is idle and unused. Every dollar of it belongs to the United States Government. There are those who contend that this gold is mortgaged to the 12 Federal Reserve banks or that these banks have some kind of claim against it notwithstanding the law that places all right, title, and interest in and to the gold in the United States. This contention can be eliminated by the Government reimbursing the private banks for the $140,000,000 they have invested in stock in these 12 Federal Reserve banks. It is this comparatively small investment that permits the owners of the stock of the Federal Reserve banks to place a cloud on the title to this gold.

If something is not done to prevent it, the money creators will make as much out of this war, and more, as the entire cost of the war. By money creators I mean those who use our Government credit free and not the patriotic citizen who buys bonds with money he has worked for to prevent inflation.

Liberal Arts Should Have Place in Education Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an article by Dr. Alexander Guerry, vice chancelor and president of the University of the South, as printed in the Chattanooga Times of December 7, 1942. Dr. Guerry makes a very forceful argument for giving the teaching of liberal arts a place in the war program. I feel that his presentation deserves consideration.

The article follows:

The University of the South is ready and willing to close its doors or to make any sacrifice necessary to help win the war. So are the colleges and universities of America. With the colleges and universities, country comes first and preservation of the Nation comes before preservation of self.

Furthermore, the University of the South and all colleges and universities realize that victory for the Allied cause is essential. We know full well that the triumph of the Axis Powers would bring tyranny to the world and the end of freedom everywhere. We know also that the Nation must be free if colleges and universities are to be free, for free institutions can exist only in a free nation.

In the time of crisis, in the hour of battle there must be unity among the people of a nation. This we know full well also. In unity of purpose, plan, and effort and only in unity of purpose, plan, and effort lies the strength for victory. Not for anything would the colleges and universities draw apart from the war effort or impair the might and power of America or the unity on which this might and power must rest. We pledge our allegiance to our Government and our loyalty to our country.

HARMFUL TO WAR EFFORT

Out of that very loyalty, however, and because of our deep concern for the effectiveness of the war effort and the welfare of our Nation, we feel compelled to state our conviction that the contemplated policy of our Government toward liberal arts education is wrong and will be harmful to the war effort and to the Nation. As we interpret the present situation and the proposed plans, only those young men of 18 years and older will be in college after June whom the Federal Government will send to college and these young men will take, for the most part, technical courses or courses in science or engineering or concentrated premedical work. Liberal arts studies will be practically eliminated or will have a very subordinate place in the student's schedule. The colleges which these young men will attend will be selected by the Government, and the number will not be more than several hundred.

This will mean, of course, that some or many colleges will be closed after June 1943, until after the war is over and that in the other colleges, the liberal-arts curriculum will be almost abandoned or tremendously curtailed. This will be in our opinion a great misfortune.

We believe that a man is a leader because of certain essential qualities of mind and

character. We believe that military leadership as well as leadership in any field depends upon these qualities. Among these qualities of mind and character are intellectual resourcefulness, power, and versatility of mind, comprehension, insight, understanding, resolution, initiative, imagination, and creative ability. We believe that liberal-arts education more than any other means endows a man with these qualities.

We realize clearly the value of special training and special military training. But special training in itself is not sufficient. The effectiveness of special training rests upon the foundation of general education, liberal-arts education. In the words of General De Gaulle, "The real school of leadership is general culture."

BEST LEADERSHIP MATERIAL

If the Army and Navy are to deprive all or most young men of a liberal-arts education, they will deprive themselves of the best material for leadership, the best material for officers and noncommissioned officers. This will be a draw-back even in a short war. If the war is not a short war, this course will be disastrous for the war effort. In either case it will be a calamity for the Nation.

For this reason the new Army and Navy program for sending students to college for special training should include 100,000 young men and more for liberal-arts education, thus increasing whatever will be the total number of men in college by at least 100,000 liberal-arts students. There is no valid argument against this proposal. As a matter of fact there is every reason for such consideration of the value, importance and necessity of the liberal-arts curriculum for the war effort as well as for the period after the war. It is a very great misfortune that the announced details make provision for the most part only for technical, scientific, engineering, and premedical training and, with the exception of the Navy deck service and preaviation course, no provision for a group of men in the liberal-arts field.

Such a program for an additional 100,000 or even 200,000 men for liberal arts studies would not deprive the armed forces of the immediate use of young men 18 and 19 years old for active service. Only about one out of six or seven men of college age are in college. The armed forces can secure all the men 18 and 19 years old they can accept and train this coming year outside of those in or to be in college. At the end of that time the college men would be coming into active service in a regular, uninterrupted stream.

And this is not special privilege for the college men, but a wise policy for the country. After all, college education is not a trade, a business, an occupation, or a profession. College education is training and preparation for a finer and more useful service to the Nation in war and in peace.

In and for a great war, in and for a sustained war effort, the philosophy of life to which the men and officers and the people of a nation hold is as important as competent leadership or adequate preparation and training for military leadership. The liberal arts college, the liberal arts curriculum, study in the great fields of knowledge does give a man a philosophy of life, does give him an understanding of the meaning and purpose of life, does bring to him a sense of values, does give him an appreciation of spiritual ideals.

He knows the meaning of freedom, liberty, justice, equality of opportunity, the dignity of life, and other great concepts because through history, literature, philosophy and like subjects he has seen something of the struggle of the human race since the beginning of time to achieve freedom, liberty, justice, equality of opportunity, and the dignity of life.

He knows the reality and significance of spiritual ideals because he has seen that these are the most enduring things in human history and in human life and that the spiritual depth of a people is their one indestructible fortress, the source of their ultimate strength.

He knows that there are such things as good and evil, not because someone has stated this fact, but because in his liberal arts studies he has perceived the eternal conflict between good and evil in the world for the mastery of man. And he perceives also the necessity for an individual and for a people to resist evil, cruelty, selfishness, deceit, and aggression.

A LESSON FROM COLLEGE

He knows that there are such things as beauty and truth, not because someone has declared this to be so, but because he has read the story time and again in history, in literature, in philosophy, in science, in mathematics, in economics, in poetry, in music, and in art of the aspiration of man since his creation toward the realization of truth and beauty in his life on this earth.

He can comprehend, therefore, in a war like the present conflict the issues at stake and for this reason he will persevere to the end for victory. He will never surrender, never despair. In a short war this is important. In a long war this is the most vital and essential quality in the armed forces and in the people of a nation. The determination to win, an unfaltering stoutheartedness built on understanding, is the chief component of victory in a long, hard conflict.

If an educational program and ideal are fundamentally sound and right, they are right for war and for peace. If an educational program and ideal are to be abandoned in time of war or peace, then the program and ideal cannot be sound and right, for to forsake the program and ideal will be a grievous error. The liberal arts ideal and program of education are basically sound and right. They cannot be abandoned without harmful consequences. And yet it seems that liberal arts education will be abandoned or tremendously restricted.

If the war should end soon, the harm will be severe in the impairment of liberal arts education. If the war should continue for a considerable length of time, the harm will be incalculable for the young men of several college generations and for America. If the study of the humanities is discontinued for 5 or 6 years in all colleges, the result of a purely materialistic educational procedure will be a major calamity.

EXAMPLE OF GERMANY

The people of a country are the result in part of their system of education. Education is an experience as well as a process and procedure. We cut from the educational process the experience in a sense of values, in an appreciation of goodness, beauty, truth, and justice, in spiritual ideals if we take from the educational program study in the fields of knowledge and human history, which constitutes an experience in values and ideals. We in America cannot possibly escape a materialistic attitude and concept of life if our educational process is to become materialistic.

Germany ought to be an example for us. She is in part the fruit of her own educational system and her own educational philosophy. The thoroughness of German scholarship and German technical and scientific training without motivation and control by spiritual idealism turned from every spiritual and cultural concept of life and, on a materialistic foundation, built a philosophy of might, cruelty, and oppression.

An education shackled to this program chained the people to the same concept of life. And we have been witnessing the most amazing spectacle of all time, the return of an apparently educated and enlightened people to barbarism.

That is just what has taken place in Germany. The whole phenomenon shows that triumphs in the material world, that miraculous inventions of every sort, that material wealth and progress, are external to the soul of man or enslave the soul of man unless the world of science and invention, unless the world of transportation, trade, and commerce is ruled by spiritual and cultural concepts of life or by men who are governed by spiritual idealism and by the cultural traditions and experiences of liberal arts education.

FRUITS OF VICTORY

Everyone knows full well that the all-important end and objective for America and every American is the winning of the war. No one possessed of common sense or of love of country could possibly advocate any course that would jeopardize the course of the war or postpone victory.

At the same time we do not want to win the war in such a way that we lose the fruits of victory, that we surrender the very values for the preservation of which we fight. And as a nation and as a people we can lose a great deal for which we now wage war if we lose, or impair seriously, liberal arts education in America. There will come an end of the war. There will come the honorable peace, which we seek to secure for ourselves and the world. There will come the opportunity to rebuild our civilization as well as our country. For that purpose we must have men educated in the liberal arts with knowledge of the whole stream of human history, with an understanding of the precious values of life, and with an appreciation of spiritual ideals.

South Carolina Dictator Gave President War Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a news item carried in The State, published in Columbia, S. C., January 10, 1943, I submit the following:

SOUTH CAROLINA DICTATOR CAVE PRESIDENT WAR POWER

The powers-of-the-President clause in the Constitution of the United States is in a very real sense the lengthened shadow of John Rutledge, the first President of the first Republic in America, the Republic of South Carolina.

The President of the United States in wartime can do practically what he pleases. The powers-of-the-President clause is so written that, without violating the written covenant, any Chief Executive in wartime is restrained only by his conscience and his political sense of expediency.

Richard Barry, in his definitive biography of John Rutledge, makes an excellent contribution, not only to the history of South Carolina, but to the historical knowledge of America. In it he tells, among many other things, how the Presidential clause came about.

Rutledge was a Delegate to the Constitutional Convention from South Carolina in 1787 and was chosen chairman of the drafting committee. He assigned the preparation of the first draft of the Constitution to Edmund Randolph, former Governor of Virginia, who had worked with James Madison on his plans for a constitution.

Randolph reported back with an executive clause severely limiting the Presidential power at all times. It was not the clause John Rutledge (in the light of his experience

as a wartime executive in South Carolina) thought should bind a President of the United States in wartime, so he struck it out and inserted the succinct words now in the Constitution. These designated the President "Commander in Chief of the land and naval forces of the Union, and the militia of the several States."

Mrs. Caroline O'Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial published in the Daily Times of Mamaroneck, N. Y., of January 6, 1943, eulogizing the late gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. Caroline O'Day:

MRS. CAROLINE O'DAY

In the person of Mrs. Caroline O'Day, of Rye, Westchester had its first woman Member of Congress; in fact, its only woman Member of that legislative body to date. As such, although elected as a Representative at large from the State and not from either Westchester congressional district, Mrs. O'Day naturally brought to this county through her widespread activities a considerable prestige.

Foremost in her admiration for the social-service reforms of Alfred E. Smith and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Mrs. O'Day displayed ingenuity and skill in rallying the women of this State, and later of the Nation, to a backing of these pieces of legislation. She did more, perhaps, than any other woman of her political career to knit together the Democratic women of this county and of this State into a hard-working force which made its strength felt time and again at the polls.

It is only fair to add what is well known, that in her congressional votes Mrs. O'Day frequently found herself at odds with the views of a large majority of her neighbors in Westchester. An ardent pacifist, she had opposed selective service and was one of 41 Representatives who did not vote on the declarations of war in December 1941. Yet it must be stressed that she stuck to her convictions courageously and despite embarrassments in her contacts with Westchester neighbors, retained to the end their respect and keen friendship.

Above all, Mrs. O'Day was a worker for women; she believed in their value as a civic force, and she saw to it that this force was exerted vigorously. She will be missed sorely in these trying times.

The Seventy-eighth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast over stations WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, and WMAM, Menominee, Mich., on Sunday, January 10, 1943:

The Seventy-eighth Congress began to function on Tuesday, when both major parties held their party conferences or caucuses. Both parties exhibited a considerable degree of harmony in these party meetings. Reports from the Democratic side were highlighted by Speaker RAYBURN'S blunt warning to the bureaucrats that, in this the Seventy-eighth Congress, it will be the Congress and not the bureaucrats which will run the country and write the laws for this great Nation. That is a hopeful determination, and the Speaker meant what he said.

In our Republican conference we had the opportunity for the first time to meet the incoming Members, and they are certainly a splendid group; which gives me increased confidence that they will be responsive to the demands of the people as expressed at the polls last November 3.

As our leader, JOE MARTIN, pointed out, we Republicans are no longer the minority party in this country. True, we are still the minority party in the Congress, but the fact remains, as Mr. MARTIN stated, that in the election last November 3—and aside from the Democratic solid South—the Republican Party cast over one and one-half million more votes for Republican Members of Congress than did the Democrats.

Now we in the Republican minority in the House are attacking our job in the Seventy-eighth Congress not only with a spirit of enthusiasm and a full sense of our grave responsibilities but with a very definite purpose and with a very definite program for constructive action planned in advance by our leadership.

Lord Stanley once observed that "the duty of an opposition party was very simple; it was to oppose everything and propose nothing." We in the Republican Party, entering upon our duties in the Seventy-eighth Congress repudiate that statement. The people of this Nation on November 3 last demanded that we repudiate any implication of such a statement. We recognize that purposeful action demands a blueprint, carefully prepared in advance. Representative EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, leader of the Illinois delegation, has prepared one such blueprint, which I think is a bit more comprehensive and a bit more all inclusive than several other blueprints considered by our leadership; and I want to read to you at this time Mr. DIRKSEN'S statement read to our Republican conference last Tuesday.

"Republican strength in the Seventy-eighth Congress by popular decree brings opportunity and responsibility.

"The people expect action with objective and design.

"Our second task is peace—a people's peace. The dogs of war will not be so easily unleashed if the people have a voice in the peace.

"In a world where legislative power is in eclipse or retreat, we must sit on judgment on ourselves and restore legislative power and prestige by overhauling our methods and techniques to make them effective.

"There must be unrelenting war on waste.

"What shall it profit us to achieve freedom for all the world and lose it at home. We need more freedom, not less. Labor is entitled to freedom from oppressive leaders, farmers are entitled to freedom from Federal promotion and pressure, business is entitled to freedom from threats, little business is entitled to live, the middle class is entitled to freedom from paternalism.

"Between the extremes of the turgid twenties, the tempestuous thirties, and the furious forties, there is a middle ground of sense and sanity where we can take our stand in seeking complete victory, lasting peace, balanced government, improved public service, reduction of waste, preparation for post-war problems, and a full partnership between people and government. Here is what we Republicans propose:

"1. A unified congressional high command to better serve the war effort.

"2. A joint committee aided by a technical staff to study peace proposals, that peace makers might not become prisoners of public opinion.

"3. A staff of congressional commandos to explore government and aid in a scientific attack upon waste, overstaffing, and nonessential functions.

"4. Bold action on the economy front by liquidating nonessential agencies, such as Farm Security and National Youth Administrations.

"5. A joint committee equipped with a staff of experts to study post-war reconstruction to avoid superboondoggling.

"6. Elimination of subsidies as instruments of complete economic control and the restoration of free markets.

"7. Curtailment of camouflage on the home front by removing the defense label from activities not essential to the victory effort.

"8. Supervision of powers delegated by Congress by means of a joint committee to cooperate with Executive agencies and review the formulation and administration of rules and regulations.

"9. Protection of the public through judicial review of administrative decisions.

"10. Complete and immediate review of our entire tax system at Federal, State, and local levels and prompt consideration of a pay-as-you-earn revenue program.

"11. A Baruch-type committee to study and recommend further reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

"12. A frank statement of war aims in terms which people of the United States and the world will understand.

"13. Rationing of war contracts to aid small business.

"14. Abolition of all regional organizations for war and nonwar agencies to eliminate waste, lost motion, and unnecessary personnel.

"15. Complete revision of patent laws and procedures for full utilization of American genius and enterprise in the post-war period.

"16. Overhauling the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to make it an effective, and democratic adjustment agency for agriculture by eliminating Federal domination and promotion, the elimination of promotional literature and pressure procedures, elimination of unnecessary regional organizations and personnel, limitation of per diem services of county and community committeemen, and restoration of farm freedoms.

"17. Establishment of a Bureau of Negotiation as an independent agency under immediate direction of Congress for the renegotiation of war contracts.

"18. Repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934.

"19. Creation of a Committee on Congressional Reorganization.

"20. A review of all labor legislation and agencies administering such legislation, together with a survey of the manpower problem for more effective integration in the victory effort.

"21. Establishment of a Committee of Congress on Civil Aeronautics."

From time to time other items will be added to this action program.

As usual I made this transcription on Thursday afternoon, not long after I had heard the President deliver his annual message on the state of the Union. I do not intend to comment at any great length on that message because by this time you have doubtless all read the speech very carefully and have read many of the various comments

thereon given by political experts, both in and out of Congress.

Several features of the speech in general, however, did make a considerable impression upon me.

The President seemed very definitely on the defensive from a political viewpoint. Of course, it is true that after a very careful build-up throughout the entire speech, he advocated a broader social-security system—or, perhaps, I should say advocated a complete overhaul of our present social-security program. This had been previously forecast in the newspapers and in those same forecasts it was said that the President doubtless will submit his own ideas to the Congress later and that his program for the reformation will follow closely that advanced in England. I hesitate to predict just what the attitude of the Congress may be in this matter, but certain it is that the President's suggestion in his speech that a broad social-security reform be instituted at this time met a very chilly reception on both sides of the aisle.

It is, of course, true that a certain amount of applause was undoubtedly heard over the radio, but to one observing closely on the floor of the House you could see that that applause emanated only from the comparatively few New Dealers still retaining their seats in the House. The overwhelming sentiment seems to be that while it is perfectly proper to study this as well as other postwar measures at present, that this is not the time, however, to subordinate an all-out war effort to social reform.

Another observation is that everyone in the House seemed overjoyed, and accepted with warm approval, the President's recital of our recent war victories on the several fronts, and his prediction for a European offensive on one or more fronts in the near future. We were all cheered at his official accounts of the remarkable achievements of American industry and American labor in meeting the challenge of all-out war production. The one thought the President did not stress, however, is the fact that American industry and American labor had accomplished these miracles despite the bungling and the idiotic handicaps continually imposed upon the war effort by autocratic bureaucrats here in Washington. The President did allude to the so-called Washington madhouse and in his very allusion to this present hubbub in Washington, he showed that apparently public criticism is getting under his skin and apparently he has seen the light of day and realizes that it is up to his own executive department to stop this nonsense down here and get their feet on the ground so that we can proceed in a more orderly and sensible manner in bringing about the earliest possible and most complete victory.

One thought frequently expressed in his speech brought warm approval from all of us, and more especially those who have been following the developments in the Pacific war theater and that was the overwhelming and spontaneous applause every time the President alluded to the magnificent battle being fought by our proven true friends, the Chinese. The warmth and unanimity of the applause was greater at the mention of China and at the mention of Chiang Kai-shek than was noticed when other of our allies and their leaders' names were mentioned. This applause must have meant a great deal to the Chinese who may have been listening to their radios back in their own country, because observers who have recently returned from the China sector have brought back reports that China is not getting her fair share of the lend-lease arms and munitions, and that there is grave danger that the Chinese people, to say nothing of Chiang Kai-shek and his valiant armies, were becoming discouraged and were losing heart and faith in our promises to give them the proper support to which they are entitled, and it must not be forgotten—and is not forgotten by the American Congress at least—that after all China has been fighting this war longer than anyone else and against greater odds.

And lastly as you listened closely to his speech, you noted a marked change in the President's attitude. No longer was it "I" this and "I" that, but rather—and for the better let us say—was it "we" did this and "we" did that, and let us take hope from that changed attitude that henceforth the President will team with the Congress so that we, all of us, and we, the people, can proceed in a constructive manner to win this war at the earliest possible date and with the least expenditure of American blood.

Continuation of Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letters from Donald M. Nelson, Chairman, War Production Board; Elmer Davis, Director, Office of War Information; and Claude R. Wickard, Secretary, Department of Agriculture, urging the continuation of the Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration:

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION,
Washington, January 9, 1943.

Hon. JOHN H. TOLAN,
Chairman, Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TOLAN: At the outset of a new Congress, I want to express my hope that your Committee Investigating National Defense Migration will be able to continue the fine work it has done in the past. I can think of nothing more conducive to public confidence in the Government than the knowledge that a select committee of the Congress is constantly at work on the critical war problems with which the committee deals.

Cordially,

ELMER DAVIS, *Director.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, December 30, 1942.

Hon. JOHN H. TOLAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TOLAN: I want to express to you and your fellow members of the Select Committee to Investigate Defense Migration the appreciation of myself and of the Department of Agriculture for the contribution your committee has made to the welfare of American agriculture and the work of this Department.

During the 2½ years that your committee has been in existence, it has produced a greatly needed body of constructive information about agricultural labor, the least explored and one of the most vital phases of our farm economy. Your committee has built up through its painstaking hearings and research throughout the country the most thorough and timely body of facts and opinion that we have today on the problem of farm manpower and its relationship to our agricultural and National economy.

I know, as do others who have followed your work, of the impartial devotion that the members of your committee have given to this investigation. You have been free to criticize, but you have also contributed knowledge that has been and long will continue to be a primary source of governmental action and public understanding.

While all considerations for the present must be bent toward victory in this war, I am well aware of the importance of the committee's work in restoring the Nation to peace and order when the war is won. When farm workers come back to the land and we again face the need of adjusting our economy to the reemployment of millions now engaged in military or war activities, the findings and recommendations of your committee will without doubt be an indispensable source of guidance in carrying out the postwar job.

Will you please convey to the other members of the committee and to your staff our appreciation in the Department of Agriculture for the important and useful work they have done.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1942.

Hon. JOHN H. TOLAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TOLAN: As the Seventy-seventh Congress draws to a close, I am moved to communicate to you my appreciation of the work of your Committee on National Defense Migration.

It is now many months since, as Director of Purchases of the Office of Production Management, I first appeared before your committee to discuss the effects of national defense procurement on the migration of labor. Since that time I have had a number of opportunities to discuss with you and the members of your committee the problems of war mobilization as they have developed in all their complexity. These discussions have been very helpful to us, both in stimulating thought and in clarifying problems requiring policy decision.

One of the most import and practical forces in making democracy work is the congressional committee. It is right and proper that, however the chips may fall, the people, through their duly elected representatives working in committees, should persistently seek to get the right answers to how government should operate and should persistently seek to appraise the caliber of the people to whom administration is entrusted and the quality of their administration.

As the administrator of the war-production program, I can testify from my own experience to the usefulness of such committees as yours. Naturally, I have not necessarily agreed with all testimony before congressional committees nor with all conclusions of such committees, but your activities have been a constant stimulus to me and to my organization.

The problems of migration and dislocation of our population arising against the background of the entire war program are with us yet; the best brains and hearts of all of us must be applied to solving them continuously through this period and for some time after the war is over. I hope we may continue to have the benefit of your committee's aid and guidance in this difficult field.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman.

A Local Hero Comes Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, there is a young townsman of mine home from the war on a furlough who has such a distinguished record that I would like to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to insert an editorial which appeared in the Daily News, published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., on December 12, 1942. He is 23 years of age, is a captain in the Air Corps, and has thrice been decorated.

The editorial follows:

A LOCAL HERO COMES HOME

Not so long ago Rob Roy Carruthers, son of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Carruthers, was just another of our high-school boys. Today he is Capt. Rob Roy Carruthers, a full-fledged hero, who has not only played an important role on the war stage but who has now come home on a 30-day furlough—the possessor of three decorations awarded him for his exploits since he went overseas a little more than a year ago.

He won his promotion from lieutenant by acts of bravery in the battle of Solomon Islands, acts which also brought him the Silver Star medal. He received the Distinguished Cross and the Oak Leaf Cluster after his Bataan flights. One of these flights was for the removal of General MacArthur from a southwest Pacific island to a place of safety in Australia. A second flight was to deliver President Quezon's family to Australia.

Naturally enough, many local organizations are besieging Captain Carruthers with invitations to speak on his war experiences. He is generously consenting to make several appearances, and it is to be hoped that before he leaves us everyone will have the opportunity of hearing him speak. No young man has ever given this community better reason to be proud of him, and we are proud of him. As long as he remains with us we shall feel that a truly great guest is in our midst.

Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. W. T. Roberts, a member of the Unemployment Compensation Commission of Ohio:

Since January 1, 1939, 1,045,499 initial claims for benefits have been filed and 10,546,864 claims continued. Benefits paid amount to $74,13'/,625, and at the present time the fund has a surplus of approximately $270,000,000.

In a few short years, the unemployment compensation law has accomplished, in a great degree, the things labor claimed for it. It has softened the harsh results of unemployment and preserved the dignity of unemployed workers who formerly, during unemployment, were subject to poor relief—often going hungry—and exhausting their savings which left many of them heavily encumbered with debts.

The law is not perfect, but, in time, it will be improved and its objectives will be increased. Unemployment compensation in America is still in its infancy, and many changes will be made both legislatively and administratively to increase the scope and efficiency in meeting the problems of the worker and assist in the stabilization of employment. Through past legislation the plan for determining weekly benefit rates has been changed increasing the average weekly benefit amount approximately $2.50 per week. The waiting period has been reduced from 3 weeks to 2 weeks and the duration increased from 16 weeks to 18 weeks, and the method of payment for partial unemployment has been simplified. Then too, the machinery for appeals has been improved increasing the powers of the Board of Review and giving the Board autonomy. The decisions of the Board now become a precedent for administration in similar cases. While not bound by the ordinary rules of evidence in the hearing of appeals, the Board of Review is, nevertheless, required by law to provide procedure given a fair hearing to the parties and all parties must be duly notified of hearings or any final action of the Board. Transcripts of testimony must be taken—all of which delays the payment of benefits in appeal cases. This delay will apparently prevail to some extent, as the records must be complete in anticipation of the appeal eventually reaching the courts even though a very small percentage of appeals get to the courts

A great deal of effort and study has been made to decrease the lapse of time in appeal cases between the filing of the claim and the payment of benefits. In the main, we have made progress, but there will always be a few cases suffer inevitable delays. For instance, the appeal arising out of the determination of claims for unemployment through a stoppage of work pending the negotiation of the 1941 contract by the Appalachian conference has suffered unusual delay which the Board tried to avert. Following the filing of the appeal in an attempt to set down a hearing, we found that many of the miners and operators who would be required to give testimony in the case were busy in district conferences or tied up with the Coal Commission in Washington. Some of the division agreements in this district were not closed up until September or October 1941. Also, during a part of that time, the attorney for operators was interested in a settlement and appeared with the attorneys for the miners before the board of review in an attempt to work out a settlement but the effort failed. We then held preliminary hearings in an attempt to consolidate the 29 appeals affecting about 8,000 claims. The miners, through Attorney John Cinque, Jr. (who, incidentally, has very ably handled this case), were willing to consolidate but the attorney for the operators encountered some difficulty and this caused further delay. After several days elapsed in hearings it was learned that President Owens was ill and hearings were postponed for an indefinite date awaiting President Owens' recovery, since it was important to the miners that his testimony be made a part of the record. This case has been warmly contested and the records comprise several hundred pages of testimony, briefs, and reply briefs. Following a study of this voluminous record, the board of review has not yet arrived at a decision. May I, without more, say briefly that I am still hopeful for a favorable decision.

The board of review has rendered decisions affecting the rights of claimants to compensation in many different types of cases. Some of these decisions have been carried to the courts and the courts have reversed the board in several instances.

Time does not permit a discussion of the cases involving important policies. However, I would like to call your attention to one decision of the board of review reversed by the appellate court of this district and which the State supreme court refused to certify. In this particualar case, the board held that a claimant who was unable to follow his usual occupation because it affected his health and who had refused an offer of such work would be entitled to benefits for ensuing unemployment if capable and available for other work. (It has always been the board's contention that the law intended compensation should be paid in such cases.) If the court had reversed the board on a question of fact, namely, that the claimant was able to continue in his former work, the case would lose some of its importance. But the court has held, in effect, that a worker, because of injury or the effect of the work upon his health, is unable to continue in the performance of the same work offered by the employer, then no benefits shall be paid even though claimant was available for other work.

The board and the court differ on the meaning of the term "reasonably fitted." The court holds the term "reasonably fitted" applies to the training and experience of the claimant. The board has held the term not only applies to the experience and training of the worker but also to the effect the work has upon the morals, safety, and health of the worker. For instance, shortly after we began to pay benefits under this law a similar case arose at a mine in Unionvale near Cadiz. A miner had an infection near his eye, and his doctor advised him not to work where there was coal dust. The claimant quit his work inside the mine, filed a claim, and sought other work. The employer offered him work in the tipple, which the worker refused on the ground that the dust in the tipple would prevent the infected area from healing. The board held that the term "reasonably fitted" applied not only to training and experience but also to the effect of dust upon this worker in the offered employment, which endangered the health of the worker and that the worker was not "reasonably fitted" for such work. Further finding that claimant was able and available for other work, the board allowed benefits.

There are quite a number of cases similar in issue, and it would probably be better to correct this situation through legislation rather than through costly litigation in the courts.

In the development of decisions labor anticipated the law would be liberally construed to accomplish the purposes thereof, but we have two schools of thought on this topic. One school holds that unemployment should only be compensable when the usual employer was unable to provide work; the other school holds that unemployment is the important problem and does not look so much to the cause.

There are still many problems to be considered in this unemployment compensation program. For the instance, weekly benefit amounts and the duration of benefits should be increased; waiting period shortened; coverage broadened; and seasonal employment should be deleted or amended to apply only to agricultural products. The provision for a predetermination of claims and the promoting of federalization are further problems to be considered. A few of the problems can be corrected by legislation. For instance, the provision freezing the rights of workers who have entered the military service will expire this coming year—not much if any opposition will face the reenactment of this measure. Just what consideration the Legislature will give to the controversial issues remains a question.

Now, I should like to talk for a few minutes on a subject of serious concern to those interested in social security; namely, what are

we doing about the post-war period and what are we going to do with the victory that is to be ours?

Any attempt to visualize the conditions facing our Nation and the nations of the world in the post-war period will require that our perspective be adjusted to a point from which we must view it. The importance of our unemployment-compensation program will no doubt reach new heights in the post-war period. And even though we have a sizable reserve, will it be sufficient to meet the test? One group proclaims that social reform is not in keeping with the times. Then we have another group proclaiming that now is the time to determine how the unemployment-compensation program can be strengthened to meet the impact of unemployment when our economy system changes from war to peace. What kind of benefits will be best suited to the post-war period? What funds will be required at that time? How should these funds be raised? What additional workers should be covered? How long a period should benefits be forthcoming? And many more questions which indicate the wisdom of being prepared to cope with a situation presenting serious problems.

At the present time the Federal unemployment trust fund, held in trust to all the States, contains approximately $3,000,000,000. The State of Ohio has a reserve of approximately $270,000,000 in the fund as of December 1, 1942. The average contribution rate for 1942, due to merit rating, will be about 1.21 percent of pay rolls. This will produce about $41,000,000 in contributions for the year 1942. It is contemplated that about $15,000,000 in benefits will be paid during 1942. This will result in an increase in the reserve of about $25,000,000 for this year. However, the rate for 1943 will no doubt be lower because more employers will qualify for merit rating and the increase of employment in 1942 will lower the average rate for 1943. Merit rating should be waived until after the war or the maximum rates should apply to the pay rolls in defense plants.

Let us assume that we will receive $40,000,000 in 1943 and that the rate of benefits paid in 1943 will equal the amount paid in 1942. Now let us further assume that the war will end in September 1943 (a date that is inspired by more wishful thinking, no doubt) and at which time we will have approximately $290,000,000 in the fund. There are approximately 2,400,000 workers covered by the Ohio unemployment compensation law at the present time. The trend of increasing employment indicates this number may be increased to 2,500,000 in covered employment. If 40 percent (1,000,000) of these covered workers in Ohio were to become unemployed sufficiently to draw the maximum benefits of 18 weeks for 1 year, receiving the average weekly benefit amount of approximately $13, it would reduce the fund by $234,000,000. This would decrease the reserve to about $56,000,000, which, plus the estimated contributions of $25,000,000, would bring the total reserve balance to about $81,000,000. Now, if in the second year of the post-war period 30 percent qualify for the maximum benefits, $178,000,000 would be needed to pay benefits, wiping out the reserve and leaving a deficit of about $75,000,000. We must not forget that when unemployment is at its peak contributions are much lower because of reduced pay rolls. These figures are based on the theory that the demobilization and reconstruction period will bring unemployment to a high peak.

Many individuals and groups (on a national scale) are concerned about the post-war period. Some are asking questions. Some are trying to find the answers. A workman in a defense plant wants to know what he and about 24,000,000 others engaged in producing the munitions of war are going to do when peace comes and munitions are no longer a necessity.

Peace is what we are striving and praying for. But, mark well, my friends, the preservation of the principles of democracy will not of itself prevent the appearance of unemployment and its companions—hunger, nakedness, and suffering. The principles of democracy are only a means to an end—a means the majority has not always used wisely.

The demobilization of several millions of our boys, including several hundred thousand from Ohio, will swell the number of men who must either find work or become the recipients of unemployment compensation or some governmental subsidy to meet their needs in the post-war period. How can we answer these millions returning and expecting to find work when peace comes?

Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE envisions peace will bring a new world order that will establish economic guaranties of future peace as included in the Atlantic Charter by such measures as an international bank and an international system of public works.

On November 5, 1942, President Roosevelt sent to Congress a report of the National Resources Planning Board. The report was the result of a 2-year study by an advisory committee under the chairmanship of Owen D. Young. They recommended a new declaration of rights comprising eight points and the post-war modernization of the transportation facilities of the Nation under a national transportation agency with emphasis on air travel, regional consolidation of railroads, and Federal financing of railroad improvements as public works projects. The survey is one of a series of six special reports analyzing America's post-war problems by the National Resources Planning Board and proposes social security from unemployment, sickness, disability, old age, or death.

Stuart Chase, economist, in a report, states: "With productive capacity geared to the highest level in history, the United States will emerge from this war equipped to meet the minimum living standards for everyone in this country 'with ease.'"

The National Planning Association, a research organization headed by Charles E. Wilson, President of the General Electric Co. and composed of representatives from government, business, labor, the sciences, and professions, has proposed the creation of a national development authority, through which the benefits of modern technology and modern capital equipment could be spread throughout the world after the war.

State aid in financing plans for municipal construction projects to employ post-war jobless will be proposed in the 1943 New York Legislature. The New York State Commission for Post-war Public Works Planning will recommend that sufficient funds be provided so that the State might contribute 50 percent toward the cost of such plans.

I would like to quote a paragraph from an article titled "Plan for Post-war Tomorrow," by Charles E. Wilson, president of the General Electric Co.:

"After the war, if we follow a policy of drifting, we shall have our pre-war headaches plus new ones. We shall be faced by a vicious spiral; men laid off in defense factories; hence, less purchasing powers; hence, other factories closing; hence, even greater unemployment rolls, greater relief burdens, and less taxable income to support them. We know how deadly such a spiral is and how hard it is to stop."

I submit these reports and statements in support of those who hold that the post-war period will bring new heights in unemployment rolls.

Just recently, another school of thought presented a picture of the post-war period. They contend the post-war period will bring an unprecedented era of prosperity. They cannot see the need of providing large reserves to meet the impact of unemployment because they hold there will be jobs for all. There are others who say that the plants must all be kept operating, otherwise how can we keep our national income high enough to produce taxes necessary to retire our national debt, predicting the country will be in dire straits if the debt cannot be met. The national debt in the post-war period will be a matter of grave concern then. But no one should be heard to protest now for we desire to preserve our democratic institutions; furthermore, to accomplish these principles we have the utmost desire that our sons who are fighting this war be properly equipped to carry on regardless of any increase in the national debt. We cannot anticipate that factories will operate in the post-war period just because the country is in debt. They will operate only when they can market their products.

It is well to plan public-work projects to provide work for the unemployed in the post-war period. But what assurance can be given now that legislative bodies, both Federal and State, will appropriate funds for public-works projects and increase our national debt which at that time may exceed $200,000,000,000. You all recall, no doubt, that it was almost impossible to obtain appropriations for public-works projects in the midst of a depression when the national debt was only a few billion dollars. Can we expect the solons in peacetimes, except in the direst emergency to provide additional money in the face of a $200,000,000,000 debt? I'm not saying that plans for providing public-works projects for the post-war period are not made in good faith. I believe they arise from the best of intentions; but, one group may propose and another group may choose to dispose.

Great Britain has repaid all the money borrowed during the last depression to help finance unemployment insurance and has accumulated a balance in its fund. It is expected, if the war continues, their fund will double by the end of the year. Suggestions of organized employers that a reduction be made in contribution rates and labor proposals for increased benefits were met with the answer that the first obligation of the British Unemployment Compensation Committee is to conserve funds. Personally, I believe benefit rates should keep pace with the rising cost of living. Now, if Great Britain, facing a life-and-death struggle, can evaluate its whole social-security program, we certainly are capable of doing likewise. Therefore, it seems to me, in this preamble on post-war conditions, it would be wise to predicate our program on the theory that it will bring an unprecedented period of unemployment—a condition requiring large reserves in our unemployment-compensation fund.

It is highly important we do not forget that the unemployment compensation law in America was the blessed event that followed World War No. 1. The law emanated from the experiences of those who suffered from lack of food, clothing, and shelter, because we failed to provide a reserve in time of plenty.

In emphasizing the importance of sufficient reserves, it would be like carrying coals to Newcastle for me to draw the attention of this convention to the fact that large numbers of unemployed workers suffering from the pangs of hunger in the post-war period would become a threat to the standards erected by our unions because they lacked income maintenance provided by unemployment compensation.

One thing is certain. A difficult period of rehabilitation will follow the peace. During that period soldiers who have waged war and workers who have produced food, clothes, and weapons will need a bridge over which they may walk with dignity above the chasm of unemployment and deprivation. Unemployment compensation, more than any other policy, can and should build that bridge.

While the first order of business will be to win the war, the several nations of the Allies should be planning what they will do with

this victory when it is won. There should be an understanding between the Allied Nations that the Atlantic Charter shall not be forgotten with the achievement of victory. Further, the voices of those brave men who are doing the fighting, and the voices of the men and women who are providing arms and equipment, shall be heard at the peace table. Let our plans be so constructed that the power of victory shall not create seed for further wars—nor be used to sate the appetite of those on the winning side who may have a lust for conquest. Let the plans for peace be that all nations of the world, both the victors and the vanquished, shall be compelled by a world court to abide by the principles of the "four freedoms": (1) Freedom of speech and expression; (2) freedom of religion and worship; (3) freedom from want; (4) freedom from fear. Whether this world court be set up in a league of nations, a confederation of all nations, or a united states of the world is not so important as the fact that in the enforcement of rules to recognize the just rights of states it is far better that police powers be controlled by the forces of justice than to permit the forces of evil to menace and endanger democratic institutions.

We tried living in isolation with the hope that as a nation we could continue to live in peace with the rest of the world. We observed the Fascists pillage Ethiopia, the Japs ravish Manchukuo and China, the Nazis invade Austria and rape Czechoslovakia. We were wholly sympathetic. We deluded ourselves into thinking that such acts of warlords were no concern of ours. We thought our peace was not endangered. Today millions of our sons are facing the dangers and horrors of these same warlords, as they battle the ruthless enemy. Yes; the breasts of our sons are bared to those who would make conquest with the sword. Our sons, the sons of your generation and mine, are facing modern death-dealing weapons because our generation did not face its responsibilities in the past. It was our responsibility, but we left it to our children.

Yes; the time to plan an approach for a more permanent peace and new world order is now. It will give incentive and impetus toward winning the war. It will brighten the beacon lighting the pathway to victory.

It is inspiring to note that labor fully realizes that victory is dependent upon production. The mines, mills, factories, farms, and workers are doing their utmost to exceed the estimated quota of planes, ships, tanks, guns, and munitions vitally necessary to equip our military forces fighting the enemy on many fronts. Labor is willing to sacrifice and eager to cooperate, for, as a group, labor has more at stake in this war than any other group in our land. Let us not forget that here in this representative democracy labor enjoys many rights and privileges obtained through the exercise and freedom that peoples of nations conquered by Hitler can never hope to enjoy until dictators are destroyed and peace reigns throughout the world.

An Open Letter to Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article printed in the Farm Journal of January 1943:

Gentlemen, you are heartily welcomed to your duties by the farmers, and by the whole people, of the United States.

We rejoice that two-party government is restored to the extent that a numerous minority can again be heard in our national legislature. We expect that Congress shall again debate and write our laws, and the bureaucrats shall no longer have their wishes rubber-stamped. You are our nearest part of the Government. You are the equal of the executive and of the judiciary.

Our whole interest now is in two things. The first is victory over our foreign enemies. The second is that the powers of us, the people, shall not be destroyed, either directly or by indirection.

In total war we expect to lend to our Government a good many of our normal prerogatives; we must center all necessary power where it can be exerted in the common cause.

But for every power we lend, we want a demand note providing for its prompt return at the earliest proper time. See to that for us.

Events of the past year prove that censorship has been used to cover up blunders that you and we should be told the truth about, as soon as the enemy knows. Will you have that stopped? Tell us the bad news so we can then believe the good news.

Washington and the whole country are overrun with paper patriots and plain payrollers. Can't you cut out and off enough appropriations to get rid of several billion dollars' worth of these? War is our only job, probably for years. After we figure up our new taxes we are going to be pretty mad whenever we see or hear of a single paper-pusher or payroller who isn't absolutely needed. How about contributing a few hundred whole boards, bureaus, and all the other dead timber to the scrap pile?

We can't always tell, from out here, which bills are intended to help win the war and which are calculated to slip over, under the cover of war, schemes that have no good intentions. We're depending on you to use a fine-tooth comb on anything suspicious.

We want to do everything to win the war. But we don't want to waste any time on wild goose chases, and we resent any needless pushing around.

Further, we want to be trusted and we want our home people to be trusted. Tell the bureaucrats that if they'll let us know what is to be done, we can often figure out the details here lots better than their city boys can do it for us.

Tell them they can count on us. Our initiative will get more done, quicker and better, than their regimentation.

Free people can do anything, even fight a total war, better than regimented people.

We have hired you to do some work that has been rather neglected at times lately. That is to represent us.

Hope you do all right.

Sincerely,

THE HOME FOLKS.

Twenty-five-Thousand-Dollar Salary Limitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the plan to confiscate all income, including salaries, in the United States, above $25,000 is an idea taken from the party platform of the Communist Party of 1928. It has many sponsors among the Communists occupying key positions in the Government, not because it will produce income, but because it will weaken the educational, charitable, and religious institutions of this Republic. Notwithstanding that, this program of confiscation has the approval and support of the President and Mrs. Roosevelt. I feel those who have the welfare of our free institutions at heart should read the article, reprinted from the Cornell Alumni News of December 10, 1942, which I am including as a part of my remarks:

SALARY LIMIT AFFECTS UNIVERSITY—GOVERNMENT RESTRICTION TO $25,000 MAY SERIOUSLY CUT GIFTS TO CORNELL

(By Provost H. W. Peters, 1914)

Passage of the anti-inflation law by Congress in October was followed immediately by a Presidential directive and a series of regulations from James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization, on the general subject of wages and salaries. One of these regulations, the so-called $25,000 salary-limitation decree, is causing great concern among those interested in the welfare of charitable institutions which depend on private philanthropy. Studies made by qualified representatives of such institutions—churches, hospitals, charitable foundations, the Red Cross, the United Service Organizations, community chests and councils, privately supported colleges and universities—all indicate that if this regulation is allowed to stand it will seriously curtail gifts from large donors during the next 2 years and may, if continued beyond 1944, eventually force affected institutions to limit their services or to appeal for direct Federal subsidies.

REGULATION LIMITS GIFTS

Section 4010.10 of the regulations specifies, in brief, that after January 1, 1943, no employee may be paid or may accept salaries which will leave him more than $25,000 after paying his Federal income taxes. Under certain circumstances, however, an employee may be paid or may accept additional sums for specific purposes, such as life insurance commitments and other fixed debt obligations, provided that he establishes that he cannot meet these obligations "after resorting to his income from all sources * * * without disposing of assets at a substantial financial loss resulting in undue hardship."

With regard to charitable contributions, the regulations provide that "In any case in which an employee establishes that his income from all sources is insufficient to meet payments customarily made to charitable, educational, or other organizations described in section 23 (C) of the code, without resulting in undue hardship, then an additional amount sufficient to meet such payments may be paid or authorized to be paid to or accrued to the account of any employee or received by him during the taxable year even though it exceeds the amount otherwise computed under paragraph (A)."

It is evident that the word "customarily" is subject to varying interpretations and will have to be clarified before a man of large salary can know how much he may be permitted to give to a charitable organization.

The interpretation of "undue hardship" also makes it impossible for an individual taxpayer coming under the directive to make charitable gifts in advance of a special ruling on his case from the Treasury Department through his employer, who must complete the arrangement between the Treasury Department and the taxpayer. If the taxpayer and the employer should make in advance an arrangement subsequently overruled by the Treasury Department, both would be subject to criminal prosecution and fines.

HITS IMPORTANT INSTITUTIONS

Certainly these regulations remove the incentive to charitable giving which has been incorporated in every tax bill passed by Congress in recent years, because, to make a gift from salary above the $25,000 limit, the taxpayer must not only establish that the amount is "customary" but must also prove that he could not, without "undue hardship," make the gift from other income or from capital.

If the regulation is narrowly interpreted by the Treasury Department, as indicated by recent statements, several results seem inevitable: (1) Annual gifts from donors who receive large salaries will be materially cut down or eliminated; (2) as present large donors drop out, there will be no new ones to take their places so long as salaries are frozen and there is no incentive to make donations larger than "customary" amounts. Even if, on the most optimistic basis possible, it were assumed that the amounts of gifts from donors with large salaries remained stationary, the result would be harmful to such organizations as the United Service Organizations, the Red Cross, and the community chests and councils, all of which are asking for increased gifts because of the expansion of their activities demanded by the war. It may well prove disastrous to many small colleges, which, with decreased enrollments because of the drafting of students for military service, must seek additional gifts to carry them through the crisis.

CORNELL WILL SUFFER

Cornell has a number of donors with large incomes, some of whom receive very high salaries. Their substantial gifts in recent years have been used for such valuable university purposes as much-needed buildings, faculty salaries, scholarships, research, and important future university developments. These donors believe in Cornell and its future, but it is difficult to see how they can continue to carry out their benevolent intentions in the light of these new restrictions. It is reasonable to suggest that all Cornellians immediately make known to their Congressmen and Senators the serious effects of this situation on their university.

Even such harmful consequences might be accepted without widespread and determined protest if it were clear that the $25,000 salary-limitation regulation would raise considerable sums to aid the Federal Government in the war effort. The regulation seems not to have been designed, however, to produce that result. A previous Treasury proposal, which would have levied a 100 percent supertax on all incomes over $25,000, was disapproved by Congress. Under the present rule, as Chairman WALTER F. GEORGE of the Senate Finance Committee has pointed out, the amounts above the salary limit do not go to the Treasury but are retained by the employer. Senator GEORGE has publicly expressed the opinion that the $25,000 limitation will therefore cost the Treasury revenue instead of increasing its receipts, since the companies will pay lower income tax rates on the amounts retained than the taxpayers would have paid on them under the present income tax law.

The same point was made by Joseph H. Choate, Jr., in a recent letter to the New York Times. "The salary limitation," he said, "makes nobody contribute anything. On the contrary, it takes from the high-salaried man most of his power to contribute in taxes and probably all his power to contribute by gift or bond purchase. Not a cent of the money of which it deprives him goes to Uncle Sam. It benefits only the employing corporations if (and it is a big if) they can get the same services at a reduced rate."

There is evidence that the directive will come under congressional scrutiny in the near future, for numerous other reasons besides those cited here. In the meantime, the United Service Organizations and the Community Chests and Councils, Inc., have asked the Director of Economic Stabilization for a liberal interpretation of the present regulation. They have suggested that "customary" contributions be interpreted to mean 15 percent of the donor's net income, even though in former years he may not have given away the full percentage. Such a ruling would be in line with the permissive provisions of the present income-tax law and would be an immediate stimulus to generous giving to charitable and educational institutions pending a final decision on the principles involved.

FURTHER RESTRICTIONS PROPHESIED

The executive branch of the Government seems, at the moment, however, to contemplate still further restrictions. It has been strongly suggested that the President may ask Congress to apply the $25,000 limitation to income from all other sources as well as salaries. Passage of such an act would immediately bring additional curtailments of philanthropic gifts from the affected taxpayers, and would be another serious blow to charitable and educational institutions throughout the country.

Experts who have made a special study of philanthropic gifts as reported in Federal income-tax returns estimate that between 10 and 20 percent of the total amount given annually for charitable and educational purposes by individual taxpayers comes from those having net taxable incomes of $50,000 or more. Most of these taxpayers will be affected by any regulations limiting net income, after Federal taxes, to $25,000. Colleges and universities are especially dependent on these donors, because, unlike the Red Cross, the community funds, and similar organizations, they cannot make widespread appeals to large numbers of persons in the lower income groups.

It is not necessary to delve into the social and political implications of the $25,000 income-limitation program, significant as those are, to indicate that here is a problem calling for keen scrutiny and thorough discussion by Congress and the people it represents. Any program which tends to dry up so important a source of philanthropy at a time when philanthropic institutions are already hard pressed to finance essential services will have repercussions in every community throughout the Nation.

Sees Demand for Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert L. Norton, from the Boston Post of December 27, 1942:

SEES DEMAND FOR KENNEDY—HOUSE LEADER MCCORMACK FINDS MOVEMENT TO DRAFT HIS GENIUS TO AMERICA'S WAR EFFORT

(By Robert L. Norton)

In his discussion of national affairs and the problems which will face the next Congress, majority leader of the House, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, took occasion to express the hope that the talents and genius of Joseph P. Kennedy will be used in the war effort. It has been a source of considerable wonderment why the President has not drafted the former Ambassador to Great Britain. Recently Mr. Kennedy was a White House guest, but what came out of his meeting with the President was never revealed.

It is interesting, because of the intimate personal relations which Congressman MCCORMACK enjoys with the President as the leader of the Democratic Party in the House, that he urges the drafting of Joe Kennedy in the war effort.

Said Mr. MCCORMACK: "Joe Kennedy is one of my personal friends. I consider him one of the outstanding Americans of this generation. He is a man of extraordinary ability, dynamic personality, a real leader, and one who gets results. What we need in this war effort is men in all spheres of war activity who are real leaders, and Joe Kennedy is one of the outstanding leaders in our Nation. He is a great organizer. He is able to pick up the loose ends of an uncertain activity, piece them together, make a cohesive organization out of them, and get the best results possible in the quickest time possible. The availability of Joe Kennedy to the President is certain and definite, and I hope his services will be utilized quickly."

There has been a suggestion in Washington that Mr. Kennedy be named as special envoy of the President to the Irish Republic. Back of this suggestion is the thought that the former Ambassador to Great Britain might be able to effect the transfer of bases in Southern Ireland to the American armed forces.

MIGHT GET IRISH BASES

It has been intimated to the President by men high up in the Government of Eire that Kennedy is the one American who might be able to negotiate the use of these bases by our armed forces. It is emphasized from these responsible sources at the same time that under no consideration would the Government of Eire consent to the use of these bases by Great Britain.

A leading member of the Government of the Irish Republic has sent word to Mr. Roosevelt that former Ambassador Kennedy is the one American in whom De Valera and the Free State Government places implicit confidence.

With the likelihood of a great expeditionary force being landed in western Europe during 1943, the importance of the acquisition of these bases by the American Army is apparent.

The spearhead of our attack will, of course, be launched from the British Isles, and we have huge forces of men and equipment in northern Ireland today. It would be of extraordinary advantage if these bases could be used by the American Army.

AIDS MAINTAINING SUPPLY LINE

If they were turned over to our armed forces, their use would also help to solve the problem of maintaining a constant source of supply from the United States to our armed forces which will occupy Europe and eventually march to Berlin. With these bases, the fighting forces of the United States would be in a much better position to dominate the northern Atlantic and to meet the menace of the German submarines. They would also be invaluable should Hitler invade Spain.

It is expected that some announcement as to the use of Mr. Kennedy in the war effort may be announced from Washington within a short time. It is a fact that some of the most powerful men in the executive branches of government, as well as in Congress, are urging that Mr. Kennedy be drafted.

VAST TASK FOR CONGRESS

The new Congress will assemble January 6. The make-up of the House will be 222 Democrats, 209 Republicans, 1 Farm-Labor, 2 Progressives, and 1 American Laborite. In the Senate there are 57 Democrats, 38 Republicans, and 1 Progressive. This Congress

bids fair to be one of the most important in our history. It is clear, as a result of the election, that it will be far less amenable to the influence of Mr. Roosevelt than was the preceding Congress. It is therefore expected to show a contrasting degree of independence. It is quite within the realms of possibility that this Congress will participate in the settlement of the terms of the peace. Also, it will have before it the tremendous problem of post-war planning and the readjustment of our national economy, so that chaotic conditions shall not persist in the world, following the end of the war.

CLOSE TO WAR PROGRAM

No man in public life is better acquainted with the problems of government, or the inner working of Congress, than Mr. McCORMACK. He has the confidence and warm personal regard of the President.

No other Member of Congress is more closely informed as to our war program, and particularly the program of the Commander in Chief of our armed forces. Of necessity, as one of the major leaders of the Democratic Party, Mr. McCORMACK is, of course, committed to the administration program. He is, in effect, the right hand of the President on Capitol Hill.

However, Mr. McCORMACK is realistic enough to view the situation confronting the next Congress and the many problems which will be encountered from an independent standpoint. In his contact with the President, Mr. McCORMACK is not a "yes" man. He has the established reputation in Washington of calling things as he sees them and of being utterly frank with the President.

FACES GRAVE PROBLEMS

This likely accounts for the confidence which Mr. Roosevelt has imposed in him. The Boston Congressman has one of the best-trained political and analytical minds of any Member of the National Legislature.

In our discussion with Mr. McCORMACK we took up categorically some of the problems which will confront this historical session of Congress. Thus:

1. What is the outstanding job of the new Congress?

"To do everything from a legislative angle in cooperation with the Commander in Chief and our military and naval leaders in the winning of the war as quickly as possible. This is no time for partisan or obstructive criticism. At a time when this generation is on trial, when we are charged with the duty of winning the war and preserving our country and the ideals for which it stands, we should utilize every ounce of strength in that direction.

CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM WELCOMED

"No one for an instant objects to constructive criticism. In my opinion, it would be a serious mistake at a time like this for the press and individuals to cease all criticism of Government acts and policies. It would be a mistake for men in public life to cease to make proper and constructive criticism. But picayune utterances, sniping statements, half truths and falsehoods, the dividing of our people, are destructive and not constructive. The one big question that should address itself to all of us in our actions and expressions is 'whether or not the best interests of America will be served.'"

2. In your opinion, what will be the disposition of Congress in according further arbitrary powers to the President and the war agencies.

CHIEF AIM TO WIN WAR

"I think that the next Congress will be more independent than the one which preceded it in the consideration of war legislation. I have no hesitancy, however, in expressing the opinion that in connection with the war efforts the next Congress will do everything within its power to pass quickly necessary legislation to win the war. If there is one thing that Members of Congress are united on without regard to party affiliation, it is to quickly win the war.

"There has been a great deal of talk about the advisability of setting up a general committee of Congress made up of members of both parties to conduct the war. This sounds all right in theory, but it would be unwise in practice. Lincoln had such an experience during the Civil War and he encountered the utmost difficulty. In fact his conflict with this committee nearly resulted in losing the Civil War.

DIVISION OF LEADERSHIP

"I do not mean to assert that the organizational setup of committees of Congress to consult and cooperate with the President should not be improved upon when experience shows that it is necessary, but for a committee to be established to have anything to do with the conduct of the war would be an unwise move for the best interest of our country. It would tend to create a division of leadership and would serve to disunite Congress in its single purpose of doing everything possible to win the war."

3. What is your disposition toward according the Republicans larger representation on the important committees of Congress as a result of their increased membership?

INCREASED G. O. P. REPRESENTATION

"Of course, the Republicans should have increased representation on practically all of the committees and they will. Speaker Rayburn and I have conferred with Republican Leader Joe Martin and have come to a reasonably amicable arrangement and I am satisfied that the matter of arrangement on important committees of the House will work out to the satisfaction of the minority party, since it is our disposition to be entirely fair in this matter. I have never had any difficulty on House organization matters with the Republican leadership. My relations with Joe Martin have been of the most friendly nature. I have insisted at all times that the minority be respected and given every opportunity to establish its record for the country. The great game of American politics must be played fairly."

SEATS FOR CABINET MEMBERS

4. What do you think of the proposal that members of the Cabinet, as well as heads of the war agencies, be given seats on the Floor of Congress so that they may answer questions and also be permitted to make statements?

"I think it is an excellent idea. We have got to change the procedure of Congress from time to time to fit the change of conditions. I have always been impressed with this proposal. It has had the support in the past of two Presidents of the United States and many outstanding men, such as former Chief Justice Hughes, John W. Davis, and numerous outstanding figures in both parties. It has worked out with great efficiency in the English parliamentary system and is a practice which we might profitably adopt in Congress.

WOULD GIVE DIRECT ACTION

"While a member of the British cabinet is also a member of the House of Commons, nevertheless this proposal could be put into practical operation under our constitutional setup. It would bring Congress and the executive branches closer together, create better understanding as a result of direct action, and would be conducive to the best interest of the public. It would result in providing Congress and citizens with accurate information as to the purpose of the war agencies.

"Had such a system been in operation during the last Congress, much of the conflict which developed over gasoline rationing, establishment of food prices, and other war measures could have been avoided. As has frequently been the case, Congress has been no more familiar with some war activities than has the average American citizen."

POST-WAR PEACE FORMULAS

5. Do you think there is any disposition on the part of Congress to set up a definite post-war peace formula?

"There are several resolutions pending to establish a special committee to study post-war conditions and recommendations in relation to the same. There is considerable sentiment in and out of Congress for such a committee. In my opinion, something is likely to happen during the next Congress in this direction, but the powers of a special committee should be confined to post-war conditions. I do not think it is possible at this particular juncture of the war for our Government, whether it be the executive or the legislative branch, to determine upon just what circumstances we will be confronted with when the war ends. It is, however, the part of good judgment to keep pace with the war developments as they may affect the determination of the kind of peace upon which we may agree."

ALL SORTS OF SCHEMES

"All sorts of schemes have been advanced by various groups of citizens in this country as to what the United States should do when the war ends. Some of them appear to be highly fantastical. However, I am thoroughly in favor of public debate and giving the utmost consideration to many sincere proposals which will advance the cause of world peace after the war and prevent a repetition of this horrible nightmare through which we are now passing. It must be perfectly obvious that today no man living can foresee the conditions which will confront us when the great victory is won.

"In the meanwhile, Congress can do many things in a practical fashion toward building up the peace structure. It is perfectly apparent that our chief responsibility will be to feed the starving millions of the world as a preliminary to any peace agreement, and in this program for feeding these millions, we must have the cooperation of the United Nations.

MUST FEED STARVING FIRST

"You can't discuss peace with starving peoples until they are first fed. Also, it is patent that our entire internal economy must be readjusted to chaotic post-war conditions, but at all times preserve the essentials of our system of free enterprise. Obviously, the matter of tariffs and the protection of our own industries must be decided upon by Congress. Just how far we can go in the direction of the free economy, which some advocate, is not to be determined at this time.

"However important our international status will be after this war is won, our first duty to the American people will be the readjustment of our own economy. It would be idle to attempt to impose the terms of the Atlantic Charter or the Four Freedoms upon other peoples unless and until we have furnished an example of a democracy successfully conducted in America.

AMERICA'S INTERESTS FIRST

"We will be required, first, to ask ourselves in this post-war program as to what is to the best interest of America. Congress must and will look at the matter practically. One of our main objectives will be to provide employment for our people so that we may not encounter the frightful experiences of the last war. Our entire national economy today is geared to war. When peace comes, it will be necessary to return this gigantic industrial power into the manufacture of things for our people.

"So, therefore, preeminent in the consideration of post-war problems is the setting up of a program for a return to peacetime

economy. If industry shows the same genius which it has demonstrated in transforming all its tremendous emergencies into making things for war by making things for peacetime, all will be well with America and we will be in a better position to help the peoples of the world and to contribute toward permanent peace.

STAND ON MANPOWER

6. Do you favor a manpower bill, which will require that all able-bodied persons should do something in the war or should the Government depend upon voluntary action from the citizens?

"My personal reaction is that voluntary effort should be resorted to and then, if that fails, everyone will willingly accept the necessity of mandatory action, not only on this, but on any other matter which is connected with war."

7. What do you think of the proposed extension of the Social Security Act?

"This is connected in the main with postwar conditions. The present Social Security Act brings a feeling of security to millions of our people and that is a very important question in the life of all of us—security.

WIN THE WAR FIRST

"While the furtherance of necessary social-security legislation should not be overlooked, it is my opinion that the next Congress first will act on those matters that are connected with the conduct and the winning of the war. I do not look for the loss of any social gains. As to extension, the probabilities are that the time of Congress will be taken up so much on war measures that the consideration of further social-security legislation is doubtful. In connection with this we have to consider the extraordinary tax burdens which are imposed upon our people as well as the possibility of an additional burden of taxation placed upon both employer and employee. There is a limit to which taxes can be imposed."

8. What action should Congress take toward the protection of women in industry since it is apparent that millions will be employed to take the place of men?

GREATER DEMANDS ON WOMEN

"Of course, in wartime the woman is the reserve manpower of a nation. As our young men enter the armed forces, the demand becomes greater and greater upon this reserve power. Every step should be taken by Federal and State Governments to safeguard all persons employed in industry and particularly our womenfolk. Sanitary conditions must exist. Every effort should be made to reduce as far as possible injuries arising out of employment. Many of our womenfolk who will be called upon to work and assist in winning the war through the production of weapons of war will be married women. At all times and under any circumstances we must protect the American home, and the health of the mother and of the child."

SEES CONTROVERSY ON LABOR

"If the local authorities are unable to adequately protect mothers in industry and their children it will become necessary for the Federal Government to step in. In any event the Federal Government should cooperate with the local government as fully as possible. The supervision must be local in character."

Mr. McCORMACK looks for a great controversy in Congress over labor, but is of the opinion that the leaders of organized labor will be wise enough to appreciate the conditions which confront the country during this war period. Otherwise, it will face the loss of the great gains which labor has made during the past decade, an outcome which in the opinion of the Congressman would be highly unfortunate.

All-Out War Program in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I am herewith inserting excerpts from an editorial which appeared in the Evening Journal, of Washington, Iowa, under date of November 13, 1942:

And speaking of the all-out war program, Harry Hopkins, who is so close to the center of the administration inner circle that he lives at the White House, writes for the American Magazine this month under the caption, You and Your Family Will Be Mobilized. Mr. Hopkins is a firm believer in regimentation, only he calls it "democratic mobilization." He believes it is necessary to concentrate all manpower upon three vital efforts—sending men to war, supplying their needs, and maintaining families at home. To do this he says no man or woman, without good cause, will leave a war job for one that pays more. Through forced savings and taxes our spending will be limited. No man should have more than five automobile tires. We should not be permitted to ride on a train, make a long-distance telephone call, or send a telegram without evidence that these are necessary. Every college and university should be turned completely into an Army and Navy training center. Thousands of women now in nonessential work must change their jobs. Millions not now in jobs must go to work. Those women who cannot work in the factories and shops will perform such essential tasks as caring for children whose mothers are working in munitions plants. These and many other suggestions are laid down by Mr. Hopkins as the proper pattern for America at war. Without question there is an inclination on the part of the public to do everything possible to win this war. No sacrifice is too great for that. But knowing something of the background of Mr. Hopkins, the uneasy question arises—are these wartime measures he advocates intended also as peacetime measures? Has voluntary cooperation with the war effort actually fallen down? Do you know of anyone who is refusing to turn in his extra tires? Has anyone heard of anybody in this section who isn't going along wholeheartedly on all the rationing programs? Is there any reason why the Government must cudgel everybody into obedience? Must we have gestapo methods in America while our boys are fighting against that same thing on all the battle fronts? The high-powered planners in Washington, D. C., continue to think of the American people as dumb, driven cattle, to be directed and regimented as our ordained leaders see fit.

We are sorry Mr. Hopkins couldn't have been here the other day to participate in our scrap-metal drive. He could have seen America at war in a different light than he apparently sees it from the White House window. He could have witnessed the spectacle of a hundred trucks and 500 people—men, women, and children—working on the project together, not because the Government ordered them to do it but because the Government made it known scrap metal was essential for our war industries. And if Mr. Hopkins came to Washington, Iowa, he would see men and women devoting much of their time to various war activities, many without compensation. Those people don't have to be ordered about. They serve voluntarily.

In this community there are hundreds of able-bodied citizens just waiting to make themselves useful in the war program. Businessmen will close their stores if necessary. Farmers will contribute their time and their equipment. Women will leave their household duties at a moment's notice to serve in some war-work activity. It's the same in every other Iowa community.

Why then must the powers-that-be get tough with the American people, and in the name of the grand emergency lay out an endless program of rules and regulations? Is it not enough to tell us in simple, understandable terms just what is needed in the way of cooperation and show us why? Has the American spirit degenerated to the point where it can't be trusted with this war job?

We are inclined to think there is more real patriotism out here on the prairies of Iowa, more real desire to win the war at any cost, more sincere cooperation in any reasonable war effort, than you'll find among these same bureaucratic planners, planners who insist upon "cracking down."

In a land that prides itself on its freedom our appointed managers can think only in terms of fascistic control.

Purchases of War Bonds in Harris County, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, permit me to bring to the attention of Congress and the country what the people of the great seacoast county of Harris, Tex., which I have the honor to represent, are doing in the way of bond purchases.

The quota of Harris County for War bonds and stamps for the year 1942 was $39,185,790; $46,357,094.25 was subscribed, leaving $7,171,304.25 over our quota.

In addition to that fine record, the citizens of the county set out to raise $36,000,000 to cover the cost of another cruiser *Houston*. They did not stop at the $36,000,000, but raised $85,749,884.24.

I am sure everyone will agree that Harris County is in the war 100 percent. Too much credit cannot be given to the entire citizenship and to the bond committee, composed of Charles I. Francis, general chairman; Claud B. Hamill, chairman of the Harris County War Bond Committee; B. D. Harris, George V. Rotan, L. R. Bryan, Jr., R. E. Moroney, Thomas W. Gregory, L. S. Adams, John R. Suman, H. O. Clarke, Jr., Otis Massey, Gordon Richmond, K. L. Simons, Sterling Evans, W. W. Strong, W. D. Gentry, George N. Allen, Robert Dundas, and David Ritchie.

Pay-As-You-Go Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Samuel E. Robison, of London, Ohio:

LONDON, OHIO, *December 30, 1942.*

Hon. CLARENCE BROWN,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLARENCE: You are probably receiving bushels of free advice from constituents and I realize that one more letter cannot make much difference, but I am deeply concerned about one matter which will no doubt be before Congress in January.

Various proposals for putting taxpayers on a current basis are said to have been offered during the past few months but nothing tangible seems to have come of any of them. So far I have not been able to think of a single sound reason why such a proposal should not be approved and I have thought of a great many reasons why such approval should be given without any delay whatsoever. Without attempting to state all of these reasons, I want to mention a few of them.

In my 29 years and 10 months of business experience I have learned that some few people always have enough money saved to pay cash for what they must have; a larger group of people can be given unsecured credit, the obligations of which they will meet as they use the article purchased, or within a reasonable time thereafter; a very large number of buyers can be given credit only when properly secured and at a charge for the credit, approximately four times as great as the second group—the finance-company borrower; another group cannot be given credit under any circumstances if you wish to collect the debt. When a depression strikes the country the second group pay although it frequently takes the shirts off their backs and as a result they are now very careful about creating indebtedness; the third group pays if possible in order to save an automobile or household goods but frequently default; the fourth group merely go their way, pay cash if they have it and are compelled to or look for another sucker to impose on.

The broad base and higher rates of the new tax bill will make the Government a creditor of practically all of the above groups and will be equivalent to granting credit indiscriminately to all of them for articles which are used up and vanished. It is sheer nonsense for any person or Government agency to believe that credit granted under such circumstances will be liquidated and inevitably great injury will be done to many responsible taxpayers upon whom collection can be enforced. Possibly this injury will not be disastrous until depression strikes again but in that year literally thousands of taxpayers will suffer a collapse in their income and the debt for the previous year's taxes will be ruinous. You who come from a rural community must remember the farm foreclosures and general wreckage of the early twenties and after 1929, the men who lost their farms, businesses, and savings because values fell while debts remained the same, hence there is no need to dramatize the situation. You likewise remember previous wartime earnings and recognize the wisdom of the merchant and banker who made people pay up currently.

After this war is over there will doubtless be a strong Veterans' lobby and I expect to see them demand a forgiveness of accrued taxes charged against the ex-soldier. The amount involved will be small and the demand will have much merit, hence will probably be granted. As soon as that is done, organized labor will likewise demand a forgiveness of accrued taxes against war workers and labor generally, and while this demand will be without merit, considering the great disparity between a soldier's pay and a war worker's pay, Congress will probably bow to it likewise and write off hundreds of millions in tax claims. The rest of the taxpayers will be pursued relentlessly for such action fits in with the ideas of those who believe themselves to be socially minded.

We are just coming into the period when our law offices will be jammed with people having their tax returns prepared and the prospect has become a nightmare to me. If you can make yourself a one-man committee to press for immediate action on some bill to put the taxpayer on a current basis you will do for your constituents more than has ever been accomplished by any one representing them. The taxpayer himself is commencing to stir with uneasiness and dread of what he faces and will more than appreciate your efforts along this line.

With best wishes for the New Year, I am,

Very truly yours,

SAMUEL E. ROBISON.

Hitler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Webster P. Huntington:

HITLER

Maker of autocrats and slaves,
Chief of red-handed, blinded knaves,
Dictator of the law of force,
Devoid of feeling or remorse;
Usurper of each right divine,
Pretender that "the world is mine,"
If that philosophy be right,
That justice rests alone with might,
Then Heaven is Hell and virtue vice,
Then hate for love may well suffice;
Then honesty is so uncouth
That foul corruption mocks at truth!

Were tortured Europe's bloody soil
In travail with maternal toil,
Like some huge monster giving birth
To monsters, from the depths of earth
Each long drawn out and labored groan
Would find an echo in thine own,
Thou perjurer! From filthy mines
Where imps erect their grimy shrines
To worship Satan from afar;
In dungeon cells that peep of star
Or ray of sun has never blest,
Thy victims' souls would break their rest
And fly from every slimy lair
To catch thee in a gruesome snare!
From silent tombs and depths remote
The bones of those thy anger smote—
To such misshapen forms restored
As most to fight thee—would arise
To rend thy heart, to blast thine eyes!

O evil mockery! O shame
Of all mankind! A fuehrer's name
Is greater than all human life!
An armed host prepared for strife,
A name by slavery upheld
The forces of Damnation weld,
And over all thou seek'st to rule,
O ruthless tyrant, gibbering fool!

Speed, tardy Justice, speed the hour
When Vengeance may his prey devour!
Let tyrants' blood in torrents pour,
So Hitlerism reign no more!

—*Webster P. Huntington.*

Dr. George Washington Carver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial on the life and works of the late Dr. George Washington Carver, taken from the columns of the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of January 8, 1943:

HE POINTED THE WAY

It was on Tuesday evening, January 5, 1943, that the sad news first came over the air that Dr. George Washington Carver, venerable son of a slave, had died.

The spirit of this great Negro scientist, whom many had regarded as America's most saintly citizen, had slipped away from this still so-very-wicked world, leaving all humanity a great host of blessings for which he personally had firmly declined payment or acclaim.

He always said: "I did nothing," explaining that the Creator (to whom he talked daily as he walked in the woods at sunrise, and to whom he humbly took all his questions) had merely "used" him and taught him all that he knew, and directed all that he did.

Close friends who knew Dr. Carver's humility before his Creator have likened him to St. Francis of Assisi.

And even his critics acknowledged that he had been touched by some mystical genius of creation.

While Grover Cleveland was in the White House, Dr. Carver went to Tuskegee, Ala., to work among his own people.

He taught them many things about plants and food, clothing, and shelter; and he even taught them much about the arts, for he was an accomplished pianist and painter (making his own canvases, pigments, and oils).

One of his paintings, incidentally, was so highly regarded that it was bought for the Luxembourg Gallery in Paris; and in 1916, he received a fellowship in the Royal Society of Arts in London. But it was as a scientist, rather than as an artist, that he was principally known to fame.

When the boll weevil was threatening the cotton crop, Dr. Carver cried out to his people: "Plant acres and acres of goobers (peanuts), and acres and acres of sweetpotatoes."

In response to this appeal, the yield was so great that there seemed to be an overabundance; and Dr. Carver was worried by the prospect of waste, and was fearful that he had committed a serious error.

And so, he walked in the woods and, looking up, addressed his Great Teacher, saying:

"Mr. Creator, please, why did You make the peanut, and why did You make the sweetpotato?"

Then Dr. Carver hid himself in his laboratory to work, and his questions were answered as the mysteries began to unfold.

From sweetpotatoes he made starch, vinegar, shoeblacking, ink, library paste, dyes, candies, tapioca, veneer glue, ginger, coconut, chocolate, compound, stock feeds, coffee substitutes, molasses, and rubber—and a flour that was used in time of World War No. 1, when cereal flours were scarce. All these things he made, and others—to a total of 118.

From peanuts, Dr. Carver brought forth milk, butter, cheese, coffee, shaving lotion, breakfast food, soap, cosmetics, salad oils, wood stains, soft drinks, axle grease, tan remover, insulating boards, dyes, and an ever-expanding list of other things, to total more than 300.

This was changing waste to wealth. This was changing an economy of scarcity to one of plenty. This was chemurgy—or chemistry at work.

Christy Borth, in his extremely interesting book entitled "Pioneers of Plenty," calls George Washington Carver "the first and greatest chemurgist." He certainly was the first great "pioneer of plenty."

Born a slave, he had been freed by the Emancipation Proclamation and the victory of the Union Armies. But the great emancipation, as applied to Dr. Carver, was the emancipation of the mind.

He came literally to walk with the kings and lords of this industrial and agricultural world. Yet always his mind and spirit were free of pride and avarice and greed.

He gave all his "mysteries" away, refusing personal payment for all his good works. He served his Creator and all of God's creatures entirely without personal reward.

Sometimes he aroused the ire of more formal, or "classical," academics by his humble insistence that all his products were the work of God, rather than of science.

And even his most friendly associates were often exasperated because others made fortunes from his discoveries and inventions, which he gave freely to everyone who manifested a desire to learn about them, rather than make the least effort to capitalize on them personally.

But Dr. Carver could not be shaken from his whole-souled altruism. In his singularly musical voice, he explained his unique scientific methods in this way:

"What I am creating is not in any book. I have to become my own bookmaker. When I get an inspiration, I go into the woods and fields, and then into the laboratory, and God tells me what to do. What I have done with the peanut and the sweetpotato can be done with all the things of earth. God has said that every herb and every plant that He has created can be made of use to mankind."

He was named George Washington as a very small child, because the Carver family who raised him thought him such a nice, honest child.

His entire name was an appropriate one.

For, he was destined to "carve" out new ways of living and of making livings which are potent to draw this, our country, back to the national philosophy of its first President and of his distinguished Negro namesake.

Born during a bloody civil war, George Washington Carver has now left this mundane life during a great chemical revolution, the full import of which is not yet sufficiently sensed by the millions which it has affected and will long continue to affect.

These United States of America have been richly blessed by the life work of this great man. Let us not forget him.

If the implications of his brilliant work had only been heeded by more selfish and greedy men—men less wise but more powerful in a material sense—this world today would be less wicked and less bloody and more happily blessed with bountiful living and Christian justice.

Now the great man is gone from us. But his work and his message inspire us to live and strive and carry on to even greater achievements, because, through his enlightened trust in "Mr. Creator," Dr. George Washington Carver has shown us the way.

No Brass Above Shoulders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege for the last 6 years to visit and inspect most of the Army camps, Army posts, and Army installations, airplane factories, tank factories, and munition factories in the United States. It always sounds very empty to hear some swivel-chair diplomat casting reflections on the armed forces.

I do not know the reporter or columnist Walter Stone who writes for the Washington Daily News, but his article on page 24 in the News of January 8, 1943, is a real tonic for the brass hats of the Army, so I take pleasure in inserting it.

The article I refer to is as follows:

Stay in Washington months on end. Witness the confusion, the petty squabbling of bureaucrats grabbing for power with one hand and passing the buck with the other. Observe this month after month and you can hardly help wondering how this Nation can ever win this war.

Get out of this town a few days. Leave behind this mumble-jumble. Talk with real men who are doing real work in perfecting, producing, and supplying munitions to our fighting troops. Watch them demonstrate the terrible effectiveness of this fighting equipment. Note the abundance in which it is being produced. Look at the newer designs for still deadlier weapons to come. Do this, and you realize that this Nation cannot possibly lose this war.

The writer, with other Washington newspapermen, went last week on an inspection tour to Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, the matériel center and experimental and testing laboratories of the Army Air Forces; to Aberdeen, Md., the proving grounds of Army ordnance; to Edgewood, Md., the "pilot plant" arsenal of the Chemical Warfare Service.

JOB IS BEING DONE

The chief impression gained is the job is being done in a big way by big men who know what they are doing. These Army officers and technicians are long on action and decision—not words. They are thinking only of furnishing the tools with which our fighters can finish the job. They're not currying favor with political pressure blocs. They're not concerned with who's going to get the nomination in 1944 or who's going to win the election. They're wasting no time in blab about ideologies, social gains, or blueprints of a utopian peace to follow. They're interested only in ways and means of saving the lives of our troops and taking the lives of the enemy's.

These tough-minded, single-purposed men who are so at home in laboratories and workshops and on the proving grounds, who are showing such determination and resourcefulness—and results—would probably feel ill at ease in Washington salons and cocktail lounges. They haven't had the training to fit them for the "Battle of Washington." They probably have never read Veblen or Mordecai Ezekiel. The only mandate they know is to win the war as speedily as possible.

NO ARMCHAIR STRATEGISTS

It was quite a relief to go a week without once running across an arm-chair strategist or a social economist.

The "Battle of Washington" is largely a battle of dialectics, where they lay down a smoke screen of social objectives and pass the ammunition in the form of erudite phrases culled from economic treatises in triplicate. And it's largely a sham battle.

Take, for instance, the issue of "the civilian versus the military"—such a big issue in Washington. Get out where the tools of war are being tested, produced, procured. Scratch most any uniform, and you'll probably find that the man sporting a captain's bars or a major's gold leaf, and living on a captain's or a major's pay, was a chemist, a physicist or an industrialist in civilian life only a few months ago, and now wants nothing more than to get this war finished and back to his civilian job with its greater comforts and much higher pay.

Or the issue of government versus business—over which so many political bonfires are built in Washington. You get the impression around here that most businessmen filling orders for the Government are trying to gouge and profiteer. But you learn otherwise when you talk with the Army officers who are actually letting the contracts, scheduling the flow of materials, inspecting deliveries and policing the profits.

CREDIT TO INDUSTRY

Listen to Chief of Ordnance, proudly telling of the achievements of the industry ordnance team, gratefully giving the major credit to industry. Hear Chief of Army Air Forces matériel, say how well plane manufacturers cooperate in feeding new improvements into production schedules. Or Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service, tell of a chemical engineer in private industry who came forth with an idea for a gigantic smoke machine, and how those machines were in quantity production 2 months later.

You learn that Government and industry are not in a tug-of-war, but are pulling together.

All of the above are, as they say in Washington, "brass hats." But watch them in action, and while you may easily believe they have plenty of brass or some other tough metal in their make-up, you decide there is none above the shoulders.

We Must Save the Small Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, American colleges, particularly the small colleges, are feeling the impact of the war. There are about 1,700 colleges in this country; 50 have already closed their doors. How many more will have to fold up in the ensuing months is difficult to state.

These smaller colleges take care of the higher educational needs of the far-flung communities of the Nation. It would be catastrophic to have hundreds of communities suffer an educational black-out. There is the old adage that

the wheel that makes the most noise gets the most grease. The larger universities through accredited representatives in and out of Washington have been most importunate in their demands upon the War Manpower Commission, the War and Navy Departments for aid. As a result, there seems to be a disposition on the part of the authorities to accord relief only to such institutions and colleges that—first, have facilities for 1,000 or more students; and, second, that emphasize technical and scientific courses; and, third, have dormitories for large numbers of students. In other words, the large universities are getting the most "grease."

These drastic requirements will preclude scores and scores of small colleges from receiving aid. They cannot maintain themselves with their dwindling number of students. Endowments and legacies are few and far between. High personal taxes will emphasize their difficulty.

As a result of the Army emphasis on technical and scientific curricula, these small liberal arts colleges will be hit the hardest. Their closing will bring about a practical cessation of the teaching of the humanities in an era of inhumanity. Without Government help they cannot carry their expense loads; their doors must be shut.

Engineering schools, medical colleges, schools specializing in chemistry, physics, geography, navigation, political economy, and Government are the white-haired boys in the college world.

In a way, we might say our colleges are becoming regimented and studies are being channelized along technical and military lines. Literature, poetry, fine arts are being consigned to limbo.

Our colleges have always been a symbol of our advancing civilization. Assuredly, all are worth saving. Every effort should be made by the War Manpower Commission and the armed forces to protect small colleges and to preserve the teaching of the humanities.

It is very significant that the selective service boards were compelled to defer over 450,000 men because of illiteracy. This is a terrible indictment. It emphasizes greater need for college men. Our educational system should be bolstered up rather than knocked down through our failure to nurture the growth of the smaller liberal arts colleges.

It is likewise significant that only 12 percent of the men already inducted into the armed forces have had college training. Eighty percent of the men selected for officer training have been chosen from this group of college men. The Army thus recognizes the essentiality of college training. It should therefore seek to maintain in good condition as many colleges as possible.

The present plans of the Army and Navy and of the War Manpower Commission apparently lean too much upon the materialistic and military concepts of education.

I am willing to have all colleges closed if that will mean the winning of the war. But we can win the war without loss of teaching the liberal humanities. Dormitories and large enrollments should not be the determining factors. Our camps, training centers, and cantonments are spread all over the Nation, as are the smaller colleges. There should be no hard, fast rule for the appointment of small colleges to receive subsidies. They should be based upon their nearness to our training centers.

We need the colleges more than ever, all of them, not only for officer training during the present emergency but also for post-war leadership.

Of the 1,700 colleges, it is contemplated to give the green light to only 200. We must never lose sight of the fact that we must not only train leaders for the war but for the peace as well. The Nazi form of government needs technically trained men; they eschew educated men. Democracy needs both.

Many small colleges remain small because they deem that the best way to educate the young men of the sparsely populated communities. They should not be penalized.

Finally, liberal arts colleges should not be abandoned in favor of colleges teaching only the technical and scientific subjects such as dentistry, medicine, engineer, and kindred professions. Liberal education should not be taboo for the duration. It should not be a war casualty.

Blinding the nation as to the humanities and liberal arts is the Nazi way. In the totalitarian college, science and technology are in the saddle, and, as Henry R. Luce, editor of Time, Life, and Fortune, stated:

> Science has marched right on, helpless and ignorant, right on to chaos.

Seventy-eighth Congress Should Enact a Pay-As-You-Go Income-Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are imbued with a win-the-war spirit. They realize that it will take billions to pay for the cost of this war, and they are willing to accept burdensome taxes in order to remain free. They realize that money is needed now to pay for the cost of the war, and American public opinion, with little exception, favors the pay-as-you-go income-tax plan, better known as the Ruml plan. In a brief personal survey among 83 laboring men, businessmen, and professional men, 82 of them favored the so-called Ruml pay-as-you-go income-tax plan. I feel that my district, being a cross section of the type of people representative of the Nation, expresses the sentiment of the Nation.

This is the opportune time for the Seventy-eighth Congress to get in step with the American people—who are far ahead of us—by enacting into law a pay-as-you-go income-tax plan. It is simple in its application. It proposes to lift the tax load of the ordinary taxpayer by the simple process of forgiving everybody 1 year's taxes. This gives the taxpayer the opportunity to get himself set on a current pay-as-you-go basis. In other words, it provides for the payment of current taxes out of current income, and by the authorized collection of the taxes at the source. This will eliminate bookkeeping, budgeting, and the usual taxpayers' neurasthenia every March 15—the principal reason for its almost unanimous endorsement by the taxpayers of the Nation. The adoption of a pay-as-you-go plan will replace the present antiquated, cumbersome, and complicated system of paying income taxes on taxes owed and for the previous year. In substituting the pay-as-you-go plan, the United States Treasury would not lose an entire year's cash, as some authorities state, because current taxes would begin to roll into the Treasury coffers immediately. The advantages are readily apparent. The taxpayer by paying his current taxes from current income would be relieved of the danger of confronting a year in which his income might be sharply reduced while he faced the necessity of paying a punishing tax bill due for the year before. With constant economic readjustments confronting a taxpayer, such a situation is certain to occur.

The pay-as-you-go plan would benefit the United States Treasury because if $10,000,000,000 were due, $10,000,000,000 would be collected by the Government under the Ruml plan, while under the present system millions of taxpayers are indebted to their country and millions of dollars are uncollected liens on the Federal dockets. If the war ends this October or November—and we all hope and pray it will—it is my humble opinion that, under the present system, over a billion dollars will be lost to the Treasury when March 15, 1944, rolls around in view of the fact that millions of war workers will be displaced. Leaders throughout the Nation favor the pay-as-you-go plan. Just last week, the President of the United States endorsed the pay-as-you-go system of income tax collection, but he did not favor the outright cancelation of 1942 taxes. If this is the only obstacle, the 1942 taxes—as suggested by Senator GEORGE—could be amortized over a 3-to-5-year period in order to ease the burden of the taxpayers of America during this war period.

The only organized opposition to the Ruml plan comes from the United States Treasury Department. This opposition is difficult to understand in view of the fact that no revenue will be lost to the Treasury this year. In fact, there will be a constant flow of current revenue to the United States Treasury. This should be the Treasury's chief and only concern.

It is my opinion that Congress erred in placing on the statute books the present system of income tax collection. This Congress—already called the Victory Congress—can rectify this error and can start victory on the march by enacting into law House Joint Resolution 30, the pay-as-you-go income tax plan which I introduced on January 6, 1943, the opening day of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Labor's Victory Pledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the highly encouraging report on production figures given by the President in his annual message last Thursday originated in the shops and mills of America where men and women, with great devotion to duty, are working long hours to forge the implements of war.

Typical of the spirit of those workers who are keeping our fighting men supplied with the sinews of war is a pledge signed by the 1,500 employees of the Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co., of Muskegon, Mich. That pledge is as follows:

I solemnly pledge to devote every working moment to the task given me by the united fighting forces. I pledge to extend my efforts to do my job well, so that I may never have it on my conscience that I caused one soldier, sailor, marine, or coast guardman to die.

Mr. Speaker, that pledge was accepted in behalf of the President by Rear Admiral Clark H. Woodward, U. S. Navy, and Lt. Col. Charles Kerwold, U. S. Army. It was presented in behalf of the Brunswick employees by Mr. Earl Snyder, president, Local No. 824, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Mr. Jacob Andree of Federal Local No. 19635 and Mr. Charles Newman, president, Local No. 83, International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, all of Muskegon, Mich.

It may be thousands of miles from the lathe and drill press to the fighting fronts but here, in these few words, are enunciated the principle and the purpose that link us through love and devotion to the brave men who bear our cause in battle.

How To Write to Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that the Seventy-eighth Congress will be as arduous as the historic Seventy-seventh Congress. There is no reason to believe that the Representatives in this Congress will be less deluged with mail from home than we were in the last Congress.

We all appreciate short letters that are to the point. Unfortunately, some people are not able to be brief. The longest letter that I ever received since I came to Congress was sent me in three sections, two sections each consisting of 50 and one of 42 pages of foolscap paper, written on both sides. I have not yet completed my reading of it.

It was, therefore, with real pleasure that I read an article in a recent issue of Good Housekeeping entitled "How To Write to Your Congressman." The authoress was Miss Mary Jane Gallagher, the secretary to our former colleague, Representative Michael J. Kennedy, who has just terminated his legislative career in Washington in order to devote himself to the task of rebuilding that historic political organization in New York known throughout the Nation as Tammany Hall. Miss Gallagher is presently the secretary to the gentleman from New York, Representative THOMAS F. BURCHILL.

The article is as follows:

WHAT TO DO

1. Write your congressional representative about any piece of controversial legislation in which you may be interested. If he is in a quandary about the effect on the folks back home, your letter—expressing the views of a particular class affected—may represent the will of the people. If you are affiliated with a club or organization, have the secretary convey the views of the membership as a unit.

2. Be brief. Confine your letter to one page. The psychological effect of a letter of more than one page is extremely bad. Your Congressman receives hundreds of letters daily. If you do not express your conviction or problem within one page, he simply will not read it. Probably his secretary will not even present it to him.

3. Be gracious. Written charm is just as effective as any other brand. It will get you added courtesies and efforts.

4. Write your Congressman about any matter you may have pending in any department or agency of the Government in Washington or in the field offices. That's what he's there for, and this privilege is one of the many advantages of your vote. Every Congressman prides himself on the prompt action of his office. Give him all pertinent facts on the subject, such as file reference or number and a brief outline of the facts in the case to date. When requesting copies of legislation, give number of bill if you know it; if not, identify the subject matter, as there are thousands of bills pending. The same rule applies when requesting copies of speeches. Give title and approximate date, if possible; if not, the general subject matter generally will suffice.

5. If you are writing about legislation, give a clear statement of your views and—most important of all—your reasons. Your Congressman is interested in knowing how a pending bill would affect your home, your job, your pocketbook—in general, your economic and social welfare. In considering his vote on the bill he is concerned with how to create the greatest benefit and least hardship to you.

6. Send him any constructive suggestion that may occur to you with regard to the war effort. That is one cause for which all of us are working. Your suggestion may present an excellent basis for legislation to correct an existing abuse or weakness.

7. Ask him to help you with your victory garden. He has a quota of publications issued by the Department of Agriculture on this and allied subjects which he will be happy to send you. If you are interested, he also will forward a list of available publications on various other subjects. Seeds have not been available for distribution for many years.

8. Send him any inquiry you may have on any of the following subjects: Regulations issued by Selective Service; War Production Board; rationing by the Office of Price Administration; civilian defense; immigration; citizenship; members of your family in the service; veterans' claims; procedure with respect to commissions in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps; census information; available positions in the civil service. He will expedite the handling of any matter you may have pending in any of these agencies, or obtain the information you seek.

9. If you telegraph, be sure to give your full address, in order to receive an answer. However, telegrams receive no more consideration and carry no greater weight than ordinary letters. Buy a war stamp with the difference.

10. When extending an invitation to make a speech or be guest of honor, tender it at least 1 month in advance. Also, give the name and location of your club or organization, the purpose of the function, and if possible the names of other speakers.

11. When asking your Congressman's assistance in obtaining a position in the Government or some defense industry, enclose an outline of your qualifications, training, and background, so that he will know where you would fit in best and can place your entire record before the appropriate department.

12. If you wish your Congressman to make an appointment for you with some official in Washington, be sure to write at least a week in advance, specifying the exact date. You also should check transportation reservations to make sure you can be there. The same rule applies if you are making an appointment with your own Congressman or Senator, who are subject to unexpected appointments and trips out of town on official business. If you follow this procedure, you allow time for confirmation and perhaps will save yourself the expense of a trip in vain.

WHAT NOT TO DO

1. Don't become involved in any campaign of organized mail. This mail can be spotted at 10 paces and usually receives no acknowledgment—or at the most a form letter—and even less consideration. Such correspondence usually originates in highly organized pressure groups and consists of identical form letters, mimeographed and distributed ready for signature. Such letters have absolutely no effect; if anything, their anonymity militates against them, since the sponsoring organization never is revealed.

2. Don't write emotional or antagonistic letters. This apparently is a failing more common to the female of the species than to the male. Men seem to have a more objective approach to their correspondence. Enumerating the number of votes in your family, and warning your Congressman that his fate in the next election will be a sad one if he fails to vote as you say, is not an effective way to insure his cooperation.

3. Don't send important papers or documents. Or, if you must, have photostatic copies made, for your own protection. In most cases your Congressman has to forward documents to the department where your matter is pending, and he cannot be responsible for their safe return.

4. Don't pester your Congressman with endless letters on the same subject. This places him in an embarrassing position and also casts an additional burden on the office staff, which will christen you a "chronic correspondent."

5. Don't ask your Congressman to decide whether you should go to Washington about a business matter or a position. This must be your own decision. He cannot possibly assume the responsibility of putting you to that expense without any assurance of success. And he shudders when he thinks of the acute lack of hotel accommodations or any accommodations. If you do go, it is to your great advantage to arrange to transact all your business in one day, since obtaining a hotel room is virtually an impossibility.

6. Don't give your Congressman's name as a reference unless he knows you personally or knows someone who will vouch for you. If you do give him as a reference, advise him to whom you have given it and bring him up to date on pertinent data.

7. Don't ask, any time later than the first 2 months of each new Congress, to have your name placed on his mailing list to receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD daily. He is allowed only about 50 copies for a constituency of several hundred thousand, and the demand is always much greater than the supply.

8. Don't discuss your political affiliations when making a request. Your Congressman represents the entire district in which you live. He will not quiz you about your political creed, and, particularly if you belong to the opposite party, why make an issue of it?

9. Don't write to more than one Member of the delegation from your State. It is never necessary to write to more than your own Congressman and your two Senators. If you write to the other Representatives from your State, congressional courtesy demands that these letters be referred for acknowledgment and consideration to your own Congressman. So duplication is just wasted effort.

10. Do not direct a letter to your Congressman unless you are sure of his full name and the correct spelling. There are 435 Members of the House of Representatives, and some duplication of names exists. Check with the nearest post office or political organization if you are not sure.

Analysis of the Political Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio talk by the able commentator, John B. Hughes, given some time after the election over the Mutual network:

The witty observation of Economic Director James Byrnes that elections should have been postponed a week is beginning to backfire in the fact that the African campaign has quelled American political chatter as effectively as political pull in a lower court sometimes squashes charges against public personages. It has yet to develop, but the first national elections of World War No. 2 seem to have brought the United States to a political crossroads, and the fate of this Nation hangs on which trail the Seventy-eighth Congress chooses as its rightful pathway toward the future, or perhaps the past.

Unfortunately, the elections of last week were pushed off the front pages before the politicians had finished a series of amazing outbursts, and before the American public could properly judge and balance those outbursts against the realities of the times. Rather than postpone the elections a week, as Mr. Byrnes suggested, the President might have put off the African front for another week or two in order to let the American political situation solidify a bit more. There is basic sense in either direction, regardless of the humorous aspects of the case.

As a matter of fact, the wine of victory went to Republican heads for the most part, but it also had its effect on the Democratic dissidents who oppose the administration. Whether by accident or intent, the voices raised loudest in a victory chant are the same voices which a year ago were loudest in opposing the administration's foreign policy were loudest in demanding that we stay out of a war which came to us anyhow at a time and place selected by the Axis.

Because neither President Roosevelt nor Wendell Willkie have yet spoken outright about the elections, there is both significance and inconsistency in the sound of the voices which have spoken. By some unclarified reasoning these voices claim vicarious credit for the fact that the elections reaffirmed and strengthened the two-party system—but there is never a word for President Roosevelt who affirmed his own belief in the two-party system by staying out of the national political arena, and while they talk of a two-party system they also talk about a coalition of parties in and out of Congress. The President has indicated his willingness to forget politics for the duration—he has appointed two members of his Cabinet out of the ranks of the opposition, and he has retained these Cabinet members in the face of growing public criticism of the abilities of the men involved. The President has also indicated his willingness to see established a joint congressional committee to oversee the war effort—but the letter by which he expressed such willingness was not brought forth until 10 months after it was written.

Other suggestions go beyond mere political armistice. Senator VANDENBERG, a Republican, proposes a coalition of Republicans and Democrats to demand that the administration pigeonhole the New Deal and politics for the duration. Former Democratic Congressman John J. O'Connor, of New York, urges James Farley to lead what O'Connor calls the real Democrats out of the New Deal Party. In such statements the America of the past decade is face to face with its own conscience. It is face to face with the fact that the Seventy-eighth Congress might find the Republicans and the dissident Democrats dropping party lines to defeat administration legislation. Yes; the voices call for the elimination of politics—but the underlying intentions of all the exclamations are political.

The voices list what they consider the faults and failures of the administration in pursuing the war. Among the faults and failures they list the lack of vigorous and forceful leadership—the lack of a definite program and the blaming of Congress for inadequate legislation—they speak of bickering and political maneuvering within the administration's agencies—those same wartime agencies that are as full of Republicans as they are Democrats, as full of old-guard capitalists and managers as they are labor leaders and progressives—and they say the American people went to the polls to express their dissatisfaction and resentment with the management of the war effort.

They overlook the fact that if the administration had been doing as poor a job of it as they paint, there would have been forty or fifty million Americans voting, not just 26,000,000. The fact that so small a proportion of the electorate went to the polls indicated that dissatisfaction with the administration is not as widespread as the chanters of victory would have us believe. And as Vice President WALLACE points out, there is still a margin of Democratic power in both Houses for the sixth straight election hand-running.

Still, time and again in the victory chant the phrase is repeated that the elections were a mandate of the people against New Deal social reforms. The bipartisan critics emphasize the fact that what they call the faults in the war program are due to social experimentation and New Dealism. They call for the pigeonholing of the New Deal and the end of politics—but will they, in turn, stop their own political attacks on social reforms already established once the Seventy-eighth Congress convenes? Will they agree to stop such attacks which would only raise domestic issues, start the bickering and political maneuvering going full blast, with the resultant ill effects on the whole war effort?

They speak of political peace, but already they are discussing the bill of W. LEE "Pass-the-Biscuits-Pappy" O'DANIEL to abolish the 40-hour week. There's a lot of talk about getting the full and efficient use of our manpower resources, but there is some doubt as to whether abolition of the 40-hour week will accomplish the purpose as long as other factors are out of joint. Our shipbuilding fell off, but that wasn't the fault of manpower; that was due to the weaknesses in our raw material supplies system—or lack of system—which has not yet provided all the war plants in the Nation with all the material they can use in keeping with the 40-hour week. One reporter in Washington even went so far as to write that the abolitionists would write in clauses making the abolition of the 40-hour week stand for the duration only, but that such clauses would only be a sop to labor.

They talk about unity in the war effort, but the Washington reporters speak of the possibility that the Republicans and dissident Democrats will not only try to shelve the New Deal but will try to do away with some of its accomplished reforms. There is reason to wonder whether the talkers, the voices we have heard so far, will use their claimed election mandate to put the war effort on a more efficient footing or to backpedal on social progress, whether they are out to win the war or to wreck reform. They overlook, perhaps, the fact that the New Deal program tended in the same direction taken by the Atlantic Charter. Those reforms were meant to increase the security of the common man, to implement what we now call freedom from want—the right of men to have shelter and food in adequate, comfortable proportions. The projection of what is often called derisively the New Deal to an international scope is entirely American, basically American, early American. If the voices of reaction start now to tear down the foundations, what will they do to the house most Americans want to build when the war has ended?

Those voices say they will demand efficiency in the war effort—they gather strength for the formation of a joint House-Senate committee to oversee the war effort. Nearly a year ago the President thought such a committee would be a fine thing—but because the idea is now proposed by the men who speak of political victory, there is reason to wonder whether such a committee would really fulfill its duty—whether it would get down to the task of straightening out the weaknesses in our raw material supply system—or would play politics with the men who now make that system a muddle. Would they straighten out the political maneuverings and jealousies existing in some ranks of the armed forces—or set right the shameful silver situation created by just 12 Senators who make up the silver bloc—and set right the farm bloc, which has a marriage of convenience with the silver bloc by which they both wield power far beyond the influence of their actual numbers? Would there be a demand for a unified command to set the strategy and goal for a United Nations war, instead of a war of the Russians and the Chinese and the Anglo-Americans each fighting a separate war against the Axis? Would there be a congressional demand for the establishment of post-war policy and the pursuance of that policy through logical, definite planning?

Well, these are the questions only the Seventy-eighth Congress can answer. Naturally the Republicans are most pleased with the outcome of the elections—they will now be able to criticize the administration more

freely than they felt like doing before, and in the Seventy-eighth Congress they can wield the power by appealing to dissident Democrats. Only Republican Senator VANDENBERG has given recognition to the tremendous responsibility this power entails, and the recognition of Senator VANDENBERG may be dimmed by his record. Nevertheless, while Republicans could oppose the administration war plans, they would not be blamed for war failures—the defeats would be blamed on the Democrat majority. That very fact makes it all the more imperative that the House Republicans examine their future actions carefully in the light of the efficiency and elimination of politics they now call their goal.

If the American people have given the Republican Party more than 40 new seats in the House of Representatives, they have also charged the Republican Congressmen with a greater responsibility than the Republicans have held in their history. Now that the second front is underway, now that we're getting shoulder-deep into this thing, the question is whether the Seventy-eighth Congress will measure up to the demands of the times—whether the men elected will recognize and appreciate the forces of freedom at work in the world and will give the United States the opportunity of bending those forces to the will of man. Not as superleaders, but within the realm of possibility as it is preached to our fighting men at the front, and as it is recognized and worked for by our allies, the Chinese and Russians and the British people, all of whom see the future within the clean, round moment of equality—the clear, large era of possible post-war organization and peace.

Dedicated to the Boys of Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Miss Maureen Elkins, daughter of former Senator Davis Elkins:

DEDICATED TO THE BOYS OF PEARL HARBOR

(By Maureen Elkins, age 12, of Washington, D. C., December 8, 1942)

Across the mighty ocean, beyond the setting sun,
T'was the roaring of the cannons, and the blasting of the guns
That gave the warning, our Nation to beware.
For the sons of Nippon, with vengeance in their hearts,
Planned to destroy and tear us apart.

Soaring aloft, their challenge we met,
But, deep in our hearts, our sorrow we kept,
Like our fathers before us, whose bravery we cherish,
Gave us their promise our flag would not perish.

And so, with voices raised in silent prayer, and with a firm trust in God,
We salute our boys on land, sea, and in the air,
And give them our promise their burden to share,
"And this be our motto, in God is our trust"
For victory we must.

Economic Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interview between the Vice President and Mr. Raymond Clapper which was broadcast over the Mutual Network on December 31 last.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows

Mr. WALLACE. Ray, you were asking me some questions about my speech of the other night.

Mr. CLAPPER. Mr. WALLACE, in your Woodrow Wilson anniversary address this week you discussed the necessity of enforcing peace at the end of this war.

Mr. WALLACE. It seems to me four out of five Americans are convinced that it is a good thing to use power to enforce peace.

Mr. CLAPPER. You mean on the military side. How about economic warfare, Mr. WALLACE?

Mr. WALLACE. When it comes to cooperation between the nations to prevent economic war and to enhance economic peace, there are thousands of ideas. Some people say that we should talk now only about those matters on which the American people are most agreed—in other words, that we should talk only about preventing military war and say nothing about preventing economic war.

Mr. CLAPPER. How do you feel about it, Mr. WALLACE?

Mr. WALLACE. I am sure that, unless continuous, strenuous, and united efforts are made to attain economic justice, it will be impossible to prevent military war by any type of force. Force is important, but it is not enough. Force without justice would sooner or later make us into the image of that which we have hated in the Nazis. In my opinion, the first round in the battle for a just peace will come during the next 2 or 3 months when Congress again is asked to extend the reciprocal trade program—the program of sanity in international trade which was begun under an act of Congress in 1934 and which Congress has since extended twice. The present Trade Agreements Act expires June 30.

Mr. CLAPPER. How is the reciprocal trade program related to preventing war?

Mr. WALLACE. The trade agreements legislation enables the United States to act as a creditor nation must act, if it is not to play the part of a bully toward debtor nations. A creditor nation which insists by its high-tariff policies on debtor nations paying not in goods but in money is like a man who takes a boy by the back of his neck and pulls the boy toward him, but at the same time he pokes a stick in his stomach and pushes him away. When the United States as a creditor nation played this game in the decade of the 1920's with the debtor nations, some of them in their exasperation used totalitarian methods of economic warfare and then at the same time prepared themselves to back up the economic war with military aggression.

Mr. CLAPPER. Then you think it is especially important at this time to extend the trade-agreements program?

Mr. WALLACE. It will be enormously reassuring to all those who are interested in an enduring peace, based on economic justice, if the trade-agreement program can be renewed by decisive vote, and doubly so if the majority of the members of both parties vote for the program.

Mr. CLAPPER. Mr. WALLACE, surely you don't think renewing the reciprocal trade agreements program will by itself be enough to give real economic peace in the world?

Mr. WALLACE. I think more will have to be done.

Mr. CLAPPER. It seems to me you have said something about the need of an international program to develop resources and prevent unemployment.

Mr. WALLACE. I have suggested that in some of my speeches.

Mr. CLAPPER. Do you really think it is the duty of the United States to finance, for instance, a combined highway and airway all the way from Buenos Aires to Moscow by way of Alaska and Siberia?

Mr. WALLACE. Of course not. But I do think there is need of a United Nations financial agency to handle certain types of international projects, including perhaps the one you have just mentioned.

Mr. CAPPER. Such as what, Mr. WALLACE, in addition?

Mr. WALLACE. The most important one is to build the international airports which are absolutely vital if the international air force is to safeguard the peace cheaply and efficiently. There is no reason why the international airports used for police-enforcement purposes cannot also be used for peaceful commerce. International authorities can be set up in somewhat the same way as the New York Port Authority or the Tennessee Valley Authority. Such international authorities would, of course, be confined to activities which are international in character and which should be supervised by the United Nations in order that their actions may prompt peace and not cause war.

Mr. CLAPPER. Can you suggest types of international economic action other than those concerning public works or transportation?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, within a few years after the war ends it is almost certain that farm-product prices will fall very greatly. At the same time it will be apparent that the farmer is able to produce larger quantities of farm produce than ever before. Millions of farmers will probably be facing bankruptcy in all parts of the world.

Mr. CLAPPER. How are you going to get at that sort of a problem?

Mr. WALLACE. Several of the United Nations have set a pattern for meeting this problem in the international wheat agreement which has already been signed. This international wheat agreement protects both farmers and consumers. If the same principle were applied to certain other raw materials that move in world trade, much might be done to prevent depression. The soldiers and sailors that come home after this war will not permit the paradox of bursting abundance on the farms and empty stomachs in the cities. A United Nations commodity agency can do much to prevent bankruptcy on the farms, unemployment in the mines, and hunger in the cities.

Mr. CLAPPER. A United Nations commodity agency would be a rather technical operation, I should think.

Mr. WALLACE. The farmers now have the technical ability to prevent hunger. The only question is whether the United Nations have the technical ability to put this productive power efficiently to use in serving the needs of hungry people.

Mr. CLAPPER. Mr. WALLACE, you don't think it is the duty of the American farmers to feed the world?

Mr WALLACE. Of course not. But I do think the American farmer is mightily interested in getting a market for his surplus pro-

duction. I think he will want to cooperate with other farmers in the world in some sensible scheme whereby the surplus of the farms can be exchanged for the surplus that can be turned out by the enormous factories which will have been built. We just don't begin to realize the extent of the productive power both on the farms and in the cities that will be ours soon after this war ends. The only things that can prevent this productive power from giving a higher standard of living are individual selfishness, class selfishness, national selfishness, and plain dumbness.

Mr. CLAPPER. Do you think, Mr. WALLACE, that we have as good a chance to win the peace as we have to win the war?

Mr. WALLACE. There are many in high positions in the Axis today who know that military defeat is certain for Germany and Japan. Therefore, as soon as defeated, the Axis will turn its attention to winning the peace and laying the foundation for World War No. 3. Germany and Japan will win the peace and also World War No. 3 if we follow the same methods as we did last time. Even if Hitler and the top criminals are all blotted out, the competent brains down the line in the German Army would still remain ready to plan economic and fifth-column war as a preliminary to the next military aggression under a new, less crazy, and therefore more dangerous Hitler.

One of the fifth-column objectives will be to drive a wedge between the United States and England and between the United States and Russia. We can tell Americans not to fall for propaganda against Russia and England. But the important thing is to build for a peace in which the United Nations will cooperate in developing a new frontier, not on an imperialistic basis but on the basis of the welfare of the common man everywhere. An informed American public must not let the Axis fifth column stir us up against the other United Nations, either during the war or in the peace to come.

Wastefulness of Cost-Plus Contract System Cries to High Heaven

REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, when we are looking for opportunities to save money, in accordance with a public mandate that is calling for the most rigid economy in the cost of government, I would like to direct attention to the glaring wastefulness and injustices of the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee form of contract, a system of luxuriant growth which is being made use of extensively by many departments and bureaus. There is no doubt that millions upon millions of dollars can be saved by relegating that form of contract to oblivion, where it belongs.

The new Congress now beginning has been heralded as an economy Congress. If we do what the people are expecting us to do we will be looking around for leaks that can be plugged so that at least some measure of relief may be brought to the taxpayers, who are heavily enough burdened at best, heaven knows.

A good place to begin would be to reexamine the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system of Government contracts with a view either to reducing the application of that system to a very limited number of situations that cannot be handled advantageously otherwise, or abolishing the system altogether.

Under the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system all of the costs involved in a contract are saddled on the United States Government—that is to say on the taxpayers of America.

Last spring, when I first addressed the House on this subject, I submitted 28 typewritten pages of names of company officials and employees whose salaries were increased 30 percent and more the moment cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts became effective. These increases ranged as high as 700 percent. It is difficult to understand why the services of an official or employee suddenly and in the twinkling of an eye increase in value three or four times the instant he switches from private to Government employment.

The 28 typewritten pages of sudden increases of emolument when the shift was made from private to Government pay rolls were furnished to me from the records of the Comptroller General's Office.

Today I have in my possession from the records of the same office 10 additional single-spaced typewritten pages of sudden increases of salaries that became effective when contractors came under the wing of cost-plus contracts. Sample increases noted in this list include:

A cashier from $125 to $310 a month.

A draftsman from $110 to $240 a month.

A comptroller and acting general manager from $18,000 to $24,000 a year.

A factory manager from $7,200 to $12,000 a year.

A construction engineer from $175 to $400 a month.

A rodman from $80 to $175 a month.

An instrumentman from $75 to $225 a month.

A stakedriver from $30 to $105 a month.

A typist from $60 to $150 a month.

A rodman from $30 to $125 a month.

A timekeeper from $600 to $2,080 a year.

A junior engineer from $900 to $2,340 a year.

A timekeeper from $750 to $2,080 a year.

A superintendent from $3,000 to $7,800 a year.

Seventeen officials in one company whose salaries had previously ranged from $125 to $300 a month were all boosted to $450 a month.

On one cost-plus contract in the Midwest an assistant general superintendent who had been receiving $3,000 a year was immediately raised to $4,200 a year, and an assistant superintendent from $3,150 to $3,900 a year. On a Kentucky cost-plus contract 80 employees received a windfall in the shape of salaries ranging from 30 percent to several hundred percent. Sample increases in that set-up were: A principal assistant engineer from $400 to $750 a month; an assistant chief designing engineer from $200 to $400 a month; a construction engineer from $175 to $400 a month; an aide from $75 to $175 a month; an instrumentman from $75 to $225 a month; a rodman from $35 to $125 a month; a field clerk from $25 to $125 a month; a designer from $185 to $400 a month; a construction engineer from $200 to $350 a month; a designing engineer from $260 to $400 a month.

And so on.

I repeat that there must be something wrong with the picture when an employee who is brought under the umbrella of a cost-plus contract suddenly finds himself drawing a salary from two to four times as great as he ever drew before in all of his life. Such examples naturally raise a question as to the reasonableness of many other items which may be figured into the basis of cost of these contracts. They show that the system fairly reeks with possibilities of swollen cost accounts and extravagances at the expense of the taxpayers.

At this time when the United States Government is entering into almost innumerable contracts the interest of the taxpayers should be properly and adequately protected. The War Department alone now has contract offices all over the world. It is of the highest importance that a new policy shall be adopted that will practically eliminate the application of the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system to the rare instances when it is possible that because of necessary haste or some other unusual reason no other form of contract will suffice. I have had this matter up with the War Department and am pleased to learn from Judge Robert P. Patterson, sound administrator and able Under Secretary of War, that the Department is taking initial steps to wash out cost-plus contracts in the supply services. I hope this reform will flourish until this iniquitous form of contract is wiped out in the construction branch and all other services.

In opposing the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system and recommending its eradication, I am privileged to quote no less an authority than Lindsay C. Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States and chief among Government accountants. Mr. Warren's long service among us in the House endeared him to every Member of this body. As an official he is noted as a sound thinker and second to none in ability. His great establishment audits all of the cost-plus contracts and he is brought into daily contact with their operation.

Recently I asked Mr. Warren to give me his opinion of cost-plus contracts in the light of his experience and his reply should be read by all taxpayers and officials of the United States, for it certainly

is illuminating. He sums up his views as follows:

It may be that under certain conditions the use of the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system of contracting is necessary, but my view is that it should never be used when the procedure of awarding fixed-price contracts—particularly on the basis of competitive bidding—is available, even though the anticipated profits under such fixed-price contracts may seem to be exorbitant.

The wise counsel of the Comptroller General ought to prevail and the various services that award contracts should conform to his suggestions just as soon as possible.

VIEWS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

By unanimous consent of the House, I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD letters I have received from Comptroller General Warren, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, December 29, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: With further reference to your letter of December 7, 1942, acknowledged December 9, I am pleased to submit the following comments relative to what I regard as some of the defects of and objections to the "cost plus" system of Government contracting now being so extensively employed.

As you no doubt are aware, in negotiating a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract, the Government agency desiring supplies, services, or construction work—through its representatives—selects the contractor deemed most capable of effectively and efficiently performing the required work. The estimated cost of the work, the estimated completion date, the fixed fee to be paid the contractor, and the items of expenditures to be considered as "costs"—including, generally, in addition to certain specific items mentioned, such other expenditures as, in the opinion of the contracting officer, should be included in the cost of the work—are arrived at by mutual agreement and set forth in the contract provisions. In the operation thereunder, the Government currently reimburses the contractor for such of his actual expenditures in the performance of the work as may be approved or ratified by the contracting officer and as are included in the items of reimbursable costs as defined in the contract.

The cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract basically contemplates that the actual cost of the whole work and the risks thereof are to be assumed by the Government—that is, regardless of contingencies, the contractor is to receive reimbursement of the costs incurred in performing the work in accordance with the contract and the directions and instructions of the authorized Government representative, plus a fixed fee presumably to cover compensation for certain services, general overhead expenses, and profit. The theory, of course, is that by thus assuming the risks and, in effect, guaranteeing the contractor against loss, an incentive will be provided for doing the work as promptly and efficiently as possible and with a minimum of cost to the Government. Such objectives of the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract are, of course, laudable, but I seriously doubt that, in actual practice, these objectives have been achieved.

The contractors are well aware of the vital importance in the general mobilization scheme of the work which they are requested to perform and realize that the bargaining position of the Government is considerably weakened by the pressure and dire necessity of obtaining essential war supplies as quickly as possible. Further, where the subject matter of the contract is intricate and specialized, the Government's representatives may not be expected to have the detailed information and knowledge necessary to deal on equal terms with the private contractors. Consequently, such contracts usually are most favorable to the contractor not only in the amount of the fixed fee to be paid but also in the items to be reimbursed as costs. In fact, in many of the contracts the definition of the reimbursable costs is so comprehensive that in some instances I am inclined to wonder whether the greater portion of the initial amount of the fixed fee—which may be as much as 6 percent of the estimated cost of the project—is not clear profit.

Many of these cost-plus contracts contain a provision as follows:

"For purposes of determining the amounts payable to the contractor under this contract, allowable items of cost will be determined by the contracting officer in accordance with regulations for the determination of the cost of performing a contract as promulgated by the Treasury Department in section 26.9 of chapter I of title 26 of Code of Federal Regulations, as contained in T. D. 5000."

This T. D. (Treasury Decision) 5000 was issued as a rule or regulation to be followed in connection with the enforcement of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), providing for the recoupment of excess profits on contracts for naval vessels and Army or Navy aircraft. The generously inclusive formula therein set forth for determining costs—including such items as repair and depreciation of office equipment, contributions to local charities or community chests, fees and dues for memberships in trade associations, etc., expenditures in connection with employees' welfare activities, and other expenditures connected only indirectly with the actual work under the contract may be entirely proper in the determination of excess profits, but I seriously doubt the wisdom or propriety of adopting it by reference in these contracts as a yardstick for use by the contracting officer in determining what items are to be reimbursed as costs under the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract. I have no doubt that many expenditures are made by some cost-plus contractors which could have been avoided without detriment to the contract performance and which would have been avoided but for the fact that the contractor knew they were reimbursable under the contract.

Another objectionable feature of the system is that some of the cost-plus contracts do not define with particularity the part or parts of the work to be performed by the contractor's own organization and what part or parts are to be subcontracted. This may result in a pyramiding of profits—at the expense of the Government—and in the cost-plus contractor receiving a substantial fixed fee for doing little or nothing.

Also the cost-plus contract presents at least a temptation to the contractor to attempt to further augment his profits by entering into arrangements with suppliers for a sharing of the profits derived from the sale of materials and supplies procured for use in the performance of the contract work.

Even if it be conceded that the amount which a contractor would include in his bid on a fixed-price contract to cover profit, overhead, and unforeseeable contingencies would be in excess of the amount of the fixed fee if the same contract were awarded on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis, I have no doubt that such difference would be largely exceeded by the enormous accounting costs—those reimbursable to the contractor as well as those incurred by the Government—necessary to the establishment and verification of the actual costs under a cost-plus contract. Under such contracts the Government must have proof of the expenditure of every dollar for which the contractor claims reimbursement, whether for labor, materials, incidentals, overhead, or whatnot. This requires the keeping and the examination of tons and tons of records, which would not have to be kept and examined if the work were performed under a fixed-price contract.

In view of the authority and discretion which these cost-plus contracts vest in the contracting officer in the matter of determining what expenditures are reimbursable, there is presented an opportunity for collusion and favoritism at the expense of the Government; and even though the opportunity may never be availed of, the situation may nevertheless give rise to suspicions or charges of collusion or favoritism—a condition which should not be permitted to exist in the performance of Government contracts when it can be avoided.

There might be mentioned, also, the objection—from the standpoint of appropriation or budgetary control—that under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract it is impossible to determine in advance the final cost of a project.

It may be that under certain conditions the use of the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system of contracting is necessary, but my view is that it should never be used when the procedure of awarding fixed-price contracts, particularly on the basis of competitive bidding, is available, even though the anticipated profits under such fixed-price contracts may seem to be exorbitant.

Respectfully,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, December 14, 1942.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: With further reference to your letter of November 26, 1942, acknowledged December 1, requesting any available information supplemental to the reports heretofore furnished to you relating to increases in salaries paid to employees of contractors engaged in the performance of war contracts on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis, I am enclosing an additional list of such cases which have come to the attention of this office since my letter of April 13 to you.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

[Enclosure.]

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractor's employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year

SUPPLEMENTAL LIST

Triangular Division Camp, Augusta, Ga. Contractor, J. B. McCrary Engineering Corporation. W-7029-qm-5

Name of employee and title	Previous salary	Present salary
Fogarty, R. T., Sr., office manager	[1] $300.00	[1] $450.00
Mitchell, Mary E., cashier	125.00 to 200.00	310.00
Pattillo, Frank, Jr., draftsman	110.00 to 150.00	240.00
Lacey, E. P., Jr., assistant engineer	230.00	300.00

[1] Per month.

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractor's employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year— **Continued**

Name of employee and title	Previous salary	Present salary
Simmon, Gordon, designing engineer	$325.00	$450.00
Smith, Charles H., assistant engineer	320.00	435.00
Wood, Horace, instrumentman	120.00	240.00
Hall, M. W., party chief	200.00	285.00
Richardson, David L., instrumentman	160.00	240.00
Dominy, C. L., instrumentman	120.00	240.00
Serls, A. W., party chief	135.60	285.00
Thomas, Wayt, office engineer	260.00	450.00
Runyan, George, electrical engineer	248.75	375.00
Barton, John H., assistant engineer	275.00	400.00
Wright, J. K., instrumentman	120.00	240.00
Foster, Hal, party chief	200.00	285.00
Pratt, R. B., assistant engineer	310.00	435.00
Loeffal, J. L., instrumentman	160.00	240.00
Kelly, L. E., party chief	160.00	285.00
Collins, Rob. M., instrumentman	140.00	240.00
Stafford, M. C., instrumentman	120.00	240.00
Vinson, G. R., assistant engineer	325.00	435.00
Cannafax, Clarence, instrumentman	180.00	240.00
Freeman, A. M., chief surveyor	240.00	435.00
Davis, C. Lamar, party chief	200.00	285.00
Jenkins, Basil M., instrumentman	[2] 40.00	240.00
Clegg, Jack H., instrumentman	[1] 160.00	240.00
Childress, F. B., party chief	[1] 216.66	285.00
Henderson, C. N., party chief	185.00	285.00
Cantrell, Clyde T., instrumentman	120.00	240.00
Edwards, C. W., party chief	200.00	285.00
Knighton, J. H., laboratory engineer	325.00	435.00
Rainsford, J. C., party chief	160.00	285.00
Tuten, Allen V., instrumentman	100.00	240.00
Fowler, Robert E., instrumentman	180.00	240.00
Harris, W. A., party chief	[2] 42.50	285.00
Austin, E. W., instrumentman	[1] 150.00	240.00
Blackwell, W. A., party chief	[2] 45.00	285.00

Propeller assemblies and spare parts, Lansing, Mich. Contractor, Nash Kelvinator Corporation DA-W-535-ac-149

Crosett, W. R., comptroller and acting general manager	[3] $18,000.00	[3] $24,000.00
Keller, E. F., Jr., factory manager	7,200.00	12,000.00
Ball, B. E., production manager	7,500.00	12,000.00

Construction of port facilities and Quartermaster General Depot, Oakland, Calif. Contractor, Army Post Contractors. W-7052-qm-2

Wright, Noble A., electrical superintendent	[1] $300.00	[1] $400.00
Hall, Carroll F., master mechanic-superintendent	250.00	400.00
Taylor, Hugh, plumbing superintendent	300.00	400.00
Neass, Lawrence, reinforced steel superintendent	300.00	400.00

Construction of replacement center, Macon, Ga. Contractor, Beers Construction Co. and W. L. Cobb Construction Co. W-6128-qm-2

Townsend, M., auditor	[3] $50.00	[3] $95.00
Hanig, William, plumbing superintendent	70.00	100.00
Rock, H., heating superintendent	65.00	95.00
Dowdy, Earl, warm air superintendent	55.00	95.00

[1] Per month.
[2] Per week.
[3] Per year.

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractor's employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year— **Continued**

Arkansas ordnance plant, Jacksonville, Ark. Contractor, Ford, Bacon & Davis. W-Ord-519

Name of employee and title	Previous salary	Present salary
Bermecke, C. P., mechanical engineer	$70.00	$104.00
Galligher, A. A., assistant project controller	65.00	100.00
Nelson, C. F., office engineer	58.00	94.50

Ordnance plant, St. Paul, Minn. Contractor, Foley Bros. Inc., and Walbridge, Aldinger Co. W-Ord-527. Subcontract No. 2

Ames, T. H., general superintendent	[2] $125.00	[2] $173.07
Cashen, Leo, assistant general superintendent	75.00	115.00

Airport, Tallahassee, Fla. Contractor, Ivy H. Smith and S. S. Jacobs Co. W-569-eng-2368. W-6971-qm-2

Hansen, Harry John, purchasing agent	[2] $50.00	[2] $75.00
Brinn, J. W., building superintendent	65.00	90.00
Wallace, J. V., superintendent, water	50.00	75.00
Davis, John B., electrical superintendent	60.00	90.00

Chemical warfare plant, Fostoria, Ohio. Contractor, Gillmore, Carmichael, Olson Co. W-7037-qm-1

Marsh, John M., office manager	$54.00	$80.00
Walker, Harold F., job engineer	55.00	85.00
Wilson, Chas F., timekeeper	40.00	65.00
Schottin, Carl H., labor foreman	45.00	60.00

Construction of cantonment camp, Camp Edwards, Mass. Contractor, Walsh Construction Co. W-6863-qm-1

Batchelder, C. H., engineer assistant	[3] $4,000.00	[3] $100.00
Boyd, H. L., design draftsman	3,500.00	100.00
Coleman, E. F., superintendent roads	3,000.00	150.00
Coughlan, H. J., general superintendent	5,000.00	173.00
Creedon, D. J., construction superintendent	3,000.00	85.00
Deutschbein, H. D., civil engineer	4,000.00	125.00
Feeney, L. W., chief warehouseman	3,500.00	95.00
Grafflin, C., general carpenter superintendent	4,000.00	150.00
Galdner, R. E., personnel manager	4,000.00	100.00
Hough, M. C., assistant paymaster	3,000.00	80.00
LaDuke, J. H., group superintendent	6,000.00	150.00
LaMorte, group superintendent	4,500.00	150.00
Napoli, J. J., general labor superintendent	3,600.00	150.00
Polhamus, H. F., group superintendent	4,500.00	150.00
Richards, S. C., chief field engineer	3,600.00	125.00
Torrello, Jos., carpenter superintendent	[3] 4,000.00	[3] 150.00
Sherlock, R. S., progress engineer	3,000.00	75.00
Stark, L., concrete superintendent	3,000.00	85.00
Heber, E., labor superintendent	5,000.00	125.00
Whitmore, R., mill superintendent	4,000.00	150.00
Wild, J. A., carpenter superintendent	3,500.00	150.00
Wild, W. J., group superintendent	3,500.00	125.00

[1] Per month.
[2] Per week.
[3] Per year.

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractor's employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year— **Continued**

New Orleans Municipal Airport, New Orleans, La. Contractor, Lional F. Favret and Boh Bros. Construction Co. W-1096-eng-7388

Name of employee and title	Previous salary	Present salary
Elan, E. E., project manager	[1] $450.00	[3] $150.00
Ewing, V. L., assistant project manager	[4] 3,000.00	125.00
Montague, C. C., assistant superintendent	[2] 60.00	90.00
Meyn, J. M., assistant building superintendent	[1] 250.00	90.00
DiCarlo, J. E., miscellaneous superintendent	200.00	75.00
Wheeler, D. F., miscellaneous superintendent	130.00	60.00
Fissette, J. N., assistant superintendent	[5] .65	60.00
Baker, A. B., assistant general superintendent	[2] 35.00	65.00
King, H. D., assistant superintendent	50.00	65.00
Fishman, M. M., director of planning	[1] 250.00	80.00
Castaing, H. J., accountant	225.00	80.00
Manning, P. E., assistant director of equipment rental	150.00	50.00
Scariano, S. J., assistant director of material	130.00	50.00
Lane, J. L., assistant director of material	[5] .36	50.00
Scariano, F., Jr., director of trucking	[2] 39.00	60.00
Korndorffer, E. L., assistant director of trucking	[5] .55	50.00
Lizana, J. M., assistant building superintendent	[3] 2,000.00	75.00
Krewitz, W. D., assistant superintendent	2,100.00	90.00

Hoosier ordnance plant, Charlestown, Ind. Contractor, Shreve, Anderson & Walker. W-7013-qm-1

Wells, Dalton R., assistant general superintendent	[3] $3,000.00	[3] $4,200.00
Wernette, Claude E., assistant superintendent of survey	3,150.00	3,900.00

Architectural engineering services for cantonment camp, Fort Knox, Ky. Contractor, Havens & Emerson. W-6313-qm-244

Kimberly, A. Elliott, principal assistant engineer	[1] $400.00	[1] $750.00
Leach, W. L., chief design engineer	300.00	500.00
Morrow, O. J., designing engineer	250.00	400.00
Palocsay, F. S., assistant chief design engineer	200.00	400.00
Savoldi, J., construction engineer	250.00	400.00
Adams, C. W., construction engineer	175.00	400.00
Broestl, A. J., chief of party	200.00	300.00
Bodfish, Ed H., chief of party	200.00	300.00
Bonner, Robert L., chief of party	150.00	300.00
Lees, T. Leslie, instrumentman	200.00	330.25
Brenan, Carl, rodman	100.00	175.00
Jones, Woodbury, aide	75.00	175.00
Morris, Eugene B., draftsman	125.00	250.00
Hartman, Arthur, instrumentman	200.00	267.75
Rowley, P. Mells, computer	200.00	275.00
Dawson, N. D., construction engineer	(6)	400.00
Fuller, Jack H., construction engineer	250.00	430.50
Hill, Arthur, rodman	80.00	175.00
Jenkins, William, instrumentman	150.00	250.00
Pignelet, Glenn, rodman	125.00	175.00
Tate, Claude E., instrumentman	150.00	225.00
Kopf, John B., instrumentman	80.00	175.00
Clausz I. C., construction engineer	250.00	350.00
Highland, John J., rodman	100.00	150.00
Downard, Robert, chief of party	175.00	250.00

[1] Per month.
[2] Per week.
[3] Per year.
[4] Per year and bonus.
[5] Per hour.

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractor's employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year— Continued

Name of employee and title	Previous salary	Present salary
Wise, James, instrumentman	$100.00	$175.00
Fisher, B. C., crafting aide	100.00	200.00
Correll, Guy W., instrumentman	150.00	250.00
Wyatt, DeWitt H., designing engineer	150.00	400.00
Longfellow, Robert, designing engineer	250.00	350.00
Richardson, Robert, stakedriver	70.00	105.00
Browne, Ben, designing engineer	200.00	300.00
Clark, Sue, stenographer-typist	70.00	150.00
Trusty, Maurice A., construction engineer	175.00	350.00
James, Cebert, instrumentman	150.00	225.00
Tinker, Keith D., instrumentman	150.00	250.00
Worley, Chester, rodman	125.00	175.00
Williams, Haynes, draftsman	170.00	250.00
Baker, Thomas H., construction engineer	200.00	350.00
Williamson, R. L., instrumentman	100.00	250.00
Miller, R. C., chief clerk	150.00	275.00
Bailey, Ramon, rodman	80.00	125.00
Finlayson, A. J., instrumentman	75.00	225.00
Cross, W. C., draftsman aide	120.00	200.00
Long, George S., designer	210.00	400.00
Stansell, Samuel E., instrumentman	100.00	225.00
Cunningham, B. A., designer	200.00	350.00
Schneider, Walter, instrumentman	175.00	250.00
Latham, James K., designer	150.00	400.00
Gaither, C Gordon, designer	185.00	400.00
Small, James H., chief construction engineer	(1)	550.00
Haney, Carl, rodman	75.00	150.00
Vickrey, James C., rodman	75.00	125.00
Palo, John E., chief of party	210.00	300.00
Chinn, Arthur, stakedriver	30.00	105.00
Love, Lawrence, rodman	55.00	125.00
Coleman, Joe, rodman	35.00	125.00
White, John B., construction engineer	200.00	350.00
McIntyre, Cornelia, typist	60.00	150.00
Martin, D. T., rodman	90.00	150.00
Crossfield, Willie, field clerk	25.00	125.00
Royalty, Elmo, field clerk	60.00	125.00
Martin, Robert E., designer	250.00	350.00
Smith, William O., instrumentman	150.00	200.00
Knight, Neal W., cost engineer	300.00	400.00
Day, Edward F., estimator	175.00	250.00
Davis Peyton M., architect	175.00	300.00
Harper, Edward D., stakedriver	30.00	105.00
Wolfe, Varney G., rodman	30.00	125.00
McCune, R., structural designer	300.00	400.00
Lovell, Lewis W., stakedriver	30.00	105.00
Strader, Virginia, secretary	100.00	135.00
Wait, Nelson P., record clerk	80.00	150.00
King, E. T., electrical designer	250.00	350.00
Hesse, Gilbert, inspector	150.00	200.00
Adams, W. L., inspector	130.00	200.00
Moseley, Harry H., designing engineer	260.00	400.00
Alexander, Paul E., structural engineer	250.00	350.00
Kathary, Russell, inspector	150.00	250.00
Brown, Howard G., chief of party	175.00	300.00

La Garde General Hospital, New Orleans, La. Contractor, George J. Glover, Inc. W-6998-qm-2

Vincent, W. H., assistant engineer	[2] $3,200.00	[4] $4,200.00
Hummel, A. F., chief timekeeper	2,400.00	3,900.00
Flynn, W., office manager	3,500.00	4,680.00
Branch, W. G., superintendent of roads	2,500.00	4,160.00

Ordnance training center, Aberdeen, Md. Contractor, Irwin & Leighton. W-6265-qm-134

Morrison, Frank, general superintendent	[3] $90.00	[3] $120.00

[2] Per week. [3] Per year. [4] Indefinite.

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractor's employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year— Continued.

Construction of cantonment camp, Fort Knox, Ky. Contractor, Whittenberg Construction Co., Struck Construction Co., Inc., George M. Eady Co., Inc., Highland Co., Inc. W-6313-qm-245

Name of employee	Previous annual salary	Present annual salary
Pouchot, Walter, general superintendent	$4,680.00	$7,800.00
Hillard, G. W., assistant general superintendent	3,640.00	6,760.00
Shaffer, Roy E., general manager	3,120.00	5,720.00
DeLeuil, F. J., comptroller	3,380.00	5,200.00
Reihlman, Karl S., purchasing agent	3,380.00	4,680.00
Scott, Walter, auditor	1,560.00	3,900.00
Neb, Theo. H., draftsman	2,080.00	3,640.00
Davis, Cal T., paymaster	2,080.00	3,640.00
Fuhrman, J. M., Jr., equipment auditor	1,560.00	2,860.00
Pflumm, Walter, assistant purchasing	2,080.00	3,380.00
Ash, Robert, assistant office manager	1,820.00	3,120.00
Neb, C. K., traffic manager	2,600.00	3,900.00
Gutermuth, J. W., road superintendent	3,900.00	5,980.00
Schoettler, F. W., draftsman	1,820.00	3,380.00
Smith, J. G., assistant road superintendent	2,080.00	3,900.00
Isert, Wilson, draftsman	1,500.00	3,120.00
Whitehouse, Edgar R., employment clerk	880.00	2,080.00
Henley, Ora, assistant superintendent	2,080.00	3,900.00
Roth, Lee, secretary	1,320.00	1,820.00
Graf, Catherine, employment record clerk	936.00	1,820.00
Kremer, Harold P., engineer	2,400.00	3,640.00
Clay, Roby, Jr., expediter	1,196.00	1,820.00
Duiguid, Will Ed., utility superintendent	2,600.00	5,980.00
Greer, S. M., assistant superintendent	3,120.00	5,200.00
Schaeffer, Laverne, assistant division superintendent	2,860.00	4,680.00
Whittenberg, H. C. Jr., assistant superintendent	2,500.00	3,900.00
Bumgardner, James, auditor	1,800.00	2,600.00
Smith, Gertrude, bookkeeping machine operator	810.00	1,820.00
Hoten, Dana, assistant paymaster	1,560.00	2,600.00
Sullivan, Edw. T., estimator	2,080.00	3,640.00
Best, Harrie, superintendent of materials	3,000.00	5,200.00
Harris, James, comptometer operator	1,040.00	2,080.00
Feierabend, George, chief material clerk	1,200.00	2,600.00
Allen, J. E., timekeeper	600.00	2,080.00
Meyers, Flora, secretary	936.00	1,820.00
Welch, James, assistant utility superintendent	2,184.00	2,900.00
Russell, Robert, timekeeper	1,250.00	2,080.00
Dugan, Jos. T., auditor	2,340.00	3,380.00
Mulhall, Chas. A., timekeeper	960.00	2,080.00
Bond, R. S., timekeeper	1,040.00	2,080.00
Fitch, Chas. F., roofing superintendent	2,400.00	4,680.00
Kiefer, Lillian, secretary	1,200.00	2,080.00
Maddox, Clyde P., timekeeper	780.00	2,080.00
Balke, Wm. H., assistant road superintendent	2,080.00	3,900.00
Bush, Earl G., mechanical clerk	780.00	1,820.00
Bennett, Lindsey L., clerk	1,200.00	1,820.00
DeLeuil, P. B., dwelling superintendent	3,120.00	5,200.00
Smith, Delza B., field clerk	1,150.00	2,080.00
Edwards, Billie, timekeeper	1,200.00	2,080.00
Shane, Robert, assistant chief timekeeper	1,500.00	2,340.00
Curry, James B., timekeeper	960.00	2,080.00
Salyer, Arthur, assistant superintendent	2,400.00	3,900.00
King, Earl W., tool clerk	780.00	1,820.00
Freyer, Randell G., scale clerk	1,200.00	1,820.00
Speckman, Ernest J., timekeeper	1,400.00	2,080.00
Mason, James F., timekeeper	1,500.00	2,080.00
Metcalfe, Wm. E., timekeeper	1,300.00	2,080.00
Nelson, Louis C., assistant division superintendent	1,560.00	2,340.00
Krause, E. A., clerk	1,560.00	2,080.00
Faith, Maurice R., timekeeper	1,150.00	2,080.00
Nay, Ben F., timekeeper	1,000.00	2,080.00
Baker, Clay, assistant division superintendent	3,000.00	4,680.00
Brooks, Russell G., junior engineer	900.00	2,340.00

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractor's employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year— Continued

Name of employee	Previous annual salary	Present annual salary
Groves, Mike, quarry superintendent	$1,960.00	$3,900.00
Simms, Wm. E., timekeeper	1,440.00	2,080.00
Vandiver, Wm. J., timekeeper	1,080.00	2,080.00
Hinton, B. J., timekeeper	1,320.00	2,080.00
Mitchell, Gary L., field clerk	1,500.00	2,080.00
Teague, James, timekeeper	975.00	2,080.00
Farmer, Fulton, chief timekeeper	1,800.00	2,600.00
Miller, George E., assistant road superintendent	1,500.00	3,900.00
Elder, Francis, timekeeper	750.00	2,080.00
Smoot, Paul, timekeeper	960.00	2,080.00
Culbertson, B. E., division superintendent	3,500.00	5,200.00
Ruhkamp, N. J., timekeeper	1,430.00	2,080.00
Arvin, Deroy C., assistant superintendent	2,400.00	4,680.00
Houston, Allen, warehouse foreman	1,500.00	2,340.00
Johnson, A. M., assistant unit superintendent	3,000.00	4,420.00
Hollis, Cletus A., assistant division superintendent	3,120.00	4,680.00
Staats, B. R. W., chief of watchmen	1,440.00	2,600.00
Arnold, Chester L., assistant division superintendent	2,340.00	4,420.00
Huesman, Edwin J., assistant painter superintendent	936.00	3,900.00
Connely, Jame W., Jr., chief watchman	1,092.00	2,600.00
Frazee, G. J., assistant division superintendent	2,500.00	3,640.00

Construction of cantonment, Fort Devens, Mass. Contractor, Coleman Bros. Corporation and John Bowen Co. W-6101-qm-148

	Previous weekly	Present weekly
King, John, general superintendent	$125.00	$173.00
O'Loughlin, Jos., comptroller	67.31	150.00
Bowen, John Jr., assistant superintendent	100.00	150.00
Callahan, Edward, assistant superintendent	100.00	150.00
Apset, John, assistant superintendent	96.00	150.00
Langille, Oliver, assistant superintendent	96.00	150.00
Morrison, Ralph, assistant superintendent	87.00	150.00
Morrison, Jack, assistant superintendent	100.00	150.00
Moore, Lawrence, assistant superintendent	75.00	150.00
Cassidy, John F., chief engineer	67.00	110.00
Finlay, George, chief timekeeper, heavy equipment	50.00	100.00
Donohue, Joseph, chief timekeeper	25.00	110.00

Peace and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made on the 3d day of January by the Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, with reference to the document issued by the State Department entitled "Peace and War."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are issuing today a publication entitled "Peace and War," prepared in the Department of State. It is an introduction to a collection of documents concerning the foreign relations of the United States during the fateful decade 1931–41. This book and the collection of documents which is in the process of publication present a record of policies and acts by which the United States sought to promote conditions of peace and world order and to meet the world-wide dangers resulting from Japanese, German, and Italian aggression as those dangers arose.

That record shows, I think, that throughout this period our Government consistently advocated, practiced, and urged upon other countries principles of international conduct on the basis of which the nations of the world could attain security, confidence, and progress. Much was accomplished in the face of immense difficulties. It is for the establishment of those principles that we and our associates are fighting today.

I am convinced that, had those principles been adopted and applied by the nations of the world, all legitimate grievances and controversies between nations could have been satisfactorily adjusted by peaceful processes and without resort to force. We and all mankind would have been spared the horrors of this world-enveloping war, thrust upon us by the criminal ambitions of the leaders of Japan, Germany, and Italy, who, intent upon conquest, rejected all principles of law, justice, fair dealing, and peaceful negotiation and resorted to the sword.

In making this information more fully available to the people of the United States, we earnestly hope that a study of it will help our citizens to a clearer understanding of the problems and tasks which have confronted us, of those which confront us now, and of those which will confront us in the crucial days ahead.

There will be confident hope for the future provided our people and other peoples hold fast to the eternal principles of law, justice, fair dealing, and morality which we have constantly proclaimed and sought to apply, and which must underlie any practicable program of peaceful international collaboration for the good of all.

Our people and the peoples of the United Nations will need to have in the future, as they have today, a unity of purpose and a willingness to make appropriate and indispensable contributions toward the achievement of military victory and toward the establishment and maintenance of a peace that will endure. With unity of purpose and common effort, there can be achieved a peace that will open to all mankind greater opportunity than has ever before existed for welfare and progress in every avenue of human endeavor.

Permit Suicide Squad of Jewish Army To Bomb Nazis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on December 16 I delivered an address in New York, under the auspices of the Committee on a Jewish Army, in which I advocated the organization and training of suicide squads of stateless and Palestinian Jews to bomb the Nazis in retaliation for their persecution of helpless Jews in Europe. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Unfortunately, close association with misery often breeds callousness. One may anticipate, therefore, in a world at war a dulling of sensibility toward blood and carnage. Sordid report follows sordid report, and we proceed with our knitting as each soggy blood-soaked head falls with a dull thud into the basket. Mass murder in another continent seems far removed. But even so, America views with far too much unconcern for her own good the current cold-blooded deliberate premeditated extermination of 5,000,000 Jews.

A few weeks ago, I noticed a front page story in one of America's leading newspapers whose glaring headlines announced "Lovesick Woman Kills Self." It seems a poor demented soul desperately in love with a man she could not have took the easy way out by destroying her own life and thereby made the big type and front page.

I glanced through other pages. On page 17 of that particularly well known, widely read metropolitan newspaper, I noted a short story, this time in small headlines; in fact, it was inserted in the bottom left hand corner of page 17. Substantiated by our own State Department it reported therein very casually that since 1939 in central Europe 2,000,000 human beings have already been mowed down by machine-gun fire, choked to death in poison gas chambers, and buried alive.

Think of it! Two million human beings created in the image of the Father deliberately destroyed by beasts in men's clothing, and it barely made page 17.

Is it because these 2,000,000 human beings happen to be Jews that the story is so well hidden? I challenge the American press for a reply—and the radio news commentators—and the leaders of democracy and of the United Nations. Why should we not hear at least the same strong words of condemnation heaped upon the perpetrators of these indescribable horrors as was heard immediately after the Lidice tragedy, when an entire Czech village was wiped out by the Nazi barbarians? The Jews have suffered a thousand Lidices.

Men speak of international cooperation after the war, 'tis well they do; but before there can be international cooperation there must be universal sympathy and understanding. Hearts must grasp and hold fast to the knowledge that Israel cannot bleed alone but that her wounds are the wounds of all mankind.

Jews in Europe are being slaughtered on the average of 7,000 per day or 5 per minute. In the 10 minutes allotted to me on this program, 50 Jews have been ignominiously put to death. And yet no outraged demand that such mass tragedies shall end. Why this silence? Why the closed lips of democracies' spokesmen? Why the paralyzed hands of democracies' penmen? Enough of silence. We must speak out—we must do something—ignoring these tragedies is second only to their commitment.

What can be done immediately? Today—not tomorrow. I recommend at least three steps: First, notify the Nazis in no uncertain terms that for every 10,000 Jews slaughtered a suicide squadron composed of Palestinian and stateless Jewish youths well trained by the United Nations will bomb the residence section of some Nazi city in reprisal and continue the bombing until 10,000 Nazis shall have paid with their lives. That is one form of protest they will respect.

Second, a call to arms by the United States of all Jews of military age living in North Africa. There are thousands of such Jews there. These young Jews should be organized into a separate unit within the ranks of the American Expeditionary Forces and given an opportunity to face the Nazis in Tunisia on equal terms.

Lastly, England and the United States must get together and squarely face this problem of mass murder of Jews and stop "passing the buck" and stop "dilly-dallying" and stop "playing hide and seek" and immediately permit the formation of an all-Jewish army, composed of Palestinian and stateless Jews, to fight as Jews against those who are exterminating them because they are Jews. Think well—if a Jewish army had participated in the routing of the Rommel Afrika Korps, and if the thousands of Nazis taken prisoners in that campaign had fallen into the hands of these young avenging Jews, that fortunate circumstance could have been used to stop, or at least slow up the swift and terrible massacre of their helpless brethren caught in Europe's hell hole.

Jews are murdered with impunity only because Jews are helpless to enforce reprisals. How different it would be if Jews enjoyed the dignity of other nationals and held membership in the family of nations as equal partners in this great cause.

These unfortunates whom Hitler has vowed to exterminate and whom Hitler is methodically exterminating have been denied not only the right to fight in the common cause of the free people of the earth but they have been denied the God-given right to defend themselves and their ancient home, the Holy Land, against the threat of barbarian hordes.

The battle for the Mediterranean is entering its fateful phase. Hitler and his gang of arch murderers are working frantically day and night to muster every available ounce of fighting strength in both men and munitions because he realizes that this is the crucial battle of the Mediterranean.

At this hour the situation not only appears hopeful—it appears downright encouraging—and yet we must not let our optimism for a quick victory run away with our better judgment. Hitler will not give up the vital Mediterranean without playing every trick in his bag. That old desert fox, Rommel, may be drawing General Montgomery as far away as possible from the Middle East to make it feasible to launch a new campaign into that area from Greece. The immediate result from such a countermove would be to trap the British Eighth Army and turn to ashes our hopes of quick success.

Once that is done, the Axis will not stop in Syria, Palestine, and the Suez. They will march on against little or no resistance into oil-rich Iran and Iraq and farther until they clasp bloody hands with the sneaking Mikado in Burma and Indochina. That is why the immediate recruitment of all the available and loyal manpower in the Middle East is of immediate necessity. As far as I know, the only completely loyal potential soldier in that threatened area is the Jew who has been pleading for the opportunity to fight and die like a man. He asks to give—not to receive. In this desperate situation, and it is a desperate situation, why do we not mobilize him? Why is this potential human resource not being permitted to join the ranks of those other oppressed peoples who are fighting with us for a better world for all humanity and among other things for a national future for the Jewish people?

In the circumstances, it is foolhardy—yea, it is wicked—to deny ourselves the military services of these Jews of the Middle East. How can we in decency and in justice to ourselves deny them the opportunity to show the world in general and the common enemy in particular that they, too, do not accept slavery.

Interview Between Earl Godwin and Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Stephen Fuller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on the evening of January 12, during the broadcast over the Blue Network, by Mr. Earl Godwin, there appeared an interview between him and Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Stephen Fuller, a resident of Chevy Chase, Md., with regard to his experiences recently in the war. It was a very interesting and impressive dialogue, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends, you and I are honored tonight to have with us a survivor of the aircraft carrier *Hornet*, which the Navy announced last night had been sunk after a violent battle in the South Pacific. That was in October. Our guest is Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Stephen Fuller, of Chevy Chase, Md. He was graduated from Chevy Chase High School and Duke University, where he was a member of the splendid fraternity, Kappa Sigma. Steve is just a regular American—an insurance man who a few years ago was swatting baseballs for the Duke team. Now he has given up all that to swat the Japs. Instead of a baseball bat, his sharp eyes direct the fire of an antiaircraft gun. Steve, suppose you tell the folks about your experiences.

Lieutenant FULLER. All right, Mr. Godwin. After a destroyer trip to Iceland I was transferred to the carrier *Hornet*. Our first real action was in the Battle of Midway. We carried the famous Torpedo Squadron Eight. That's the Navy squadron of torpedo planes—about 15—that went out, and none came back. The only survivor was Ensign Gay.

Mr. GODWIN. How did that affect morale on the *Hornet?*

Lieutenant FULLER. Naturally, everybody was mighty blue and moody for days. But the boys were also mighty mad, and they made up their minds to really crack those Japs.

Mr. GODWIN. Did they get a chance later?

Lieutenant FULLER. Yes, sir; after a rest at Pearl Harbor we sailed for the South Pacific. And it wasn't long before our planes were soaring off the deck for heavy raids on the Japs at Rabaul, Guadalcanal, and Jap bases in the Shortland Islands.

Mr. GODWIN. Did you get to see that action?

Lieutenant FULLER. Not those of us left on ship, Mr. Godwin. Things were pretty quiet for the gun crews, though lots of Jap submarines sniped at us. One of the ship's officers told me the *Hornet's* log recorded 32 Jap torpedoes that had been fired at us. But all missed. One of them was headed right for us when a Navy patrol plane spotted it and dropped a depth charge right in its path. The torpedo was blown out of the water, and when it crashed back into the sea it had exploded about 2,000 yards from us.

Mr. GODWIN. Then what?

Lieutenant FULLER. Well, that was about all, Mr. Godwin, until the battle of Santa Cruz on October 26. We knew a Japanese task force was in the area, but planes from another carrier had failed to locate it the night before. The moon made it almost as bright as day. It was beautiful. Then the next morning about 9:30 our planes took off. Just a short time later we got word 2 groups of enemy planes were headed our way. There were 70 or 80 altogether—torpedo planes and dive bombers. After that we were pretty busy. We were hit by several torpedoes and several bombs before being disabled. They hit the engineroom, knocking out our power and lights. That left us just drifting helplessly. Of course, we were blasting them with everything we had. I never saw so many things drop into the water in my life as the Jap planes that fell. Our ship must have knocked down about 20. Other ships in the area shot down another 40. Then, too, 3 Jap planes crashed right into the ship—1 on the flight deck, another into the stack, and 1 torpedo plane that had already dropped its torpedo crashed into the side of the *Hornet* just below our guns. It went through 3 staterooms and into the hangar room. Its gasoline exploded and started quite a fire, singeing the hair and eyebrows of our gun crew. Fighting the fire was almost impossible because our power was out and the water hoses were useless. We started a bucket brigade. Finally we got it out, but the blaze had warped my guns and they were useless. We'd thrown the ammunition overboard to prevent it exploding from the heat.

Mr. GODWIN. That must have been a regular bedlam.

Lieutenant FULLER. Everybody was orderly, Mr. Godwin. But the day was one wild scene after another until the order came to abandon ship. The salt water stopped my wrist watch at 5:05 that afternoon. I started swimming and for some reason started picturing the sailors searching all about the Jap planes that crashed into the ship for souvenirs of pistols, knives, and belts.

Mr. GODWIN. I can see you're hale and hearty. Did we lose many of our boys?

Lieutenant FULLER. Actually, we lost very few, Mr. Godwin. Some, of course, but few in comparison to the total men aboard. The destroyers moved right in to pick us up. And you could see the men on their decks firing submachine guns at the sharks. I didn't actually see any sharks myself and as far as I could learn only one man might have been lost that way. The destroyer which picked me up later transferred us to a cruiser. It was the *Northampton*, which was sunk later in another battle. I was returned to one of our bases and then here to Washington.

Mr. GODWIN. What are your plans now, Steve?

Lieutenant FULLER. The same as all the boys who've been up against the Japs, I guess. I'm in school right now but expect to be shipped out soon to a new carrier. And then, back at them till they're licked. And we will beat them—you can count on it.

Mr. GODWIN. I'm sure we will. Thank you, Lieutenant Fuller. This is the first radio broadcast from anyone who was on the *Hornet* during its heroic death struggle, and, I believe, the first time in history that anyone has reported the destruction of a torpedo in the water by an aerial torpedo from one of our war planes.

Delay in Allotment Payments

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members have received letters from mothers, in particular, and relatives of men in the service who live in their districts, complaining about the delay in the payment of allotments, with particular reference to the Army and the fact that letters of inquiry have not been answered. Several weeks ago I was very much concerned about this situation, and I took it up with the War Department. I have received a very interesting letter from Col. H. N. Gilbert, Director of the Office of Dependency Benefits, and also a letter and enclosure from Brig. Gen. A. H. Carter, which I am going to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD.

The import of the letter is that the hump that they experienced, due to the tremendous number of applications and the lack of help, as well as in moving from Washington to Newark, has now been gone over. The consideration of applications for allotment and the making of allotments will be accomplished more speedily. I am sure this is of interest to every Member. I know it is of great interest to me and particularly to the relatives to whom allotments have been made.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Does this also cover the bonds that have been purchased by the boys in the service?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot answer that question. I have not had it called to my attention. If the gentleman will give me some information in relation to it, I will take it up with the department that handles that matter.

Mr. RABAUT. There is a delay in the delivery of the bonds that the boys buy.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will take that matter up if my friend will give me information. These letters from Colonel Gilbert and General Carter, with the accompanying memorandum, will be interesting reading, because it shows that the hump has been gotten over and the situation is much improved and will be better in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include these letters as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

The letters and memorandum referred to are as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF DEPENDENCY BENEFITS,
Newark, N. J., January 6, 1943.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. McCORMACK: Undoubtedly many inquiries have reached you concerning class E allotments and family allowances to dependents of Army personnel. I am writing this letter with the thought that it might be helpful for you to have at hand a few facts about the operations of this office, the common misunderstandings or errors made by soldiers and their dependents which delay payment of these benefits, and the accomplishments of the Office of Dependency Benefits to date.

The principal payments to dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Army admin-

istered by the Office of Dependency Benefits at this time are the family allowances under Public Law 625, Seventy-seventh Congress, the emergency class E allotment under Public Law 490, Seventy-seventh Congress, and the voluntary class E allotments. The family allowance consists of a soldier's contribution from his pay supplemented by one from the Government; the emergency class E allotment, under Public Law 490 is an allotment which may be made by the Secretary of War (so far as Army personnel is concerned) for the benefit of dependents of Army personnel who are missing in action, interned, beleaguered, besieged, in the hands of the enemy, and under several other conditions; the ordinary class E allotment is a voluntary allotment which any officer or soldier may authorize from his own pay and which he may terminate or change at his option.

Army personnel should submit authorizations for class E allotments or applications for family allowance to the Office of Dependency Benefits, 213 Washington Street, Newark, N. J. Applications or inquiries concerning benefits to dependents of sailors, Marines, or members of the United States Coast Guard are not handled by this office. Many people are confused as to the difference between a family allowance, under Public Law 625, Seventy-seventh Congress, and a class E voluntary allotment, and who is eligible for each. A family allowance is applied for on WD, AGO Form 625, and the class E allotment authorization is filed on WD, AGO Form 29. WD, AGO Forms No. 625 are available at Army posts or camps, at Army recruiting stations, or at any of the nine service commands, at local chapters of the American Red Cross, and this office. WD, AGO Forms 29 are used only by the soldier or officer and are available at all Army posts or camps.

In a large portion of the inquiries being received by the Office of Dependency Benefits there is no record of either an authorization for a class E allotment or an application for the family allowance having been received. We have received applications from overseas as much as 151 days after the date on the document and many from domestic sources 35 days after the date on the application. Such delays are beyond our control. The probability of properly addressed mail being lost is rather remote except by losses at sea. Many cases of alleged family allowance applications show that upon approval of the act some soldiers filed informal applications with their organizations in the field in order to establish a filing date for their formal applications to be filed later and those subsequent applications have not been executed and submitted to the Office of Dependency Benefits.

Authorization of payments under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 is subject to requirements of law which must be met as to relationship and/or dependency. Obviously, all applications for the family allowance cannot be approved for payment. Thousands of them do not meet the requirements of the law. In spite of the wide publicity that has been given the matter, many persons seem to think that the payments are due them simply because they are the father or mother of a soldier. In one instance, the widow of a Spanish-American War veteran applied for her family allowance based on her deceased husband's service.

There seems to be a widespread misunderstanding among dependents regarding the effective date of allotments and family allowances. Neither is paid in advance. A class E allotment is payable after the end of the month in which it begins, since it comes out of the pay which accrues during that month. A family allowance begins to accrue the first day of the month following that in which it is applied for, and is actually payable after the end of that month. Thus an application for family allowance made in January becomes effective February 1, and the first check is payable on March 1.

In the great avalanche of business developed in a mass task such as this and the pressure under which the job must be done, a certain percentage of errors and some delays are inevitable. However, we are doing everything we can to keep them to a minimum. The law is relatively new. The Office of Dependency Benefits is new, and the procedure of getting a dependent paid must minimize the possibility of improper payment and fraud. A frequent error on the part of dependents or soldiers applying for the family allowance or Class E allotment is the omission of essential information such as the soldier's Army serial number, to properly identify him, the correct address of the dependent to whom the payments are to be made, or, in family allowance cases, the omission of required documentary evidence to establish the relationship of the individual to the soldier.

In addition to building a completely new organization, training and equipping it, being thrown into operation 2 months' ahead of the originally scheduled time, making the largest and fastest decentralization move from Washington to date, getting reestablished in a new location, and again having to procure and train over 4,000 new employees with limited or no previous experience, the War Department, Office of Dependency Benefits and its component parts have accomplished the following within less than 6 months.

Of the 1,519,055 family allowance applications received through December 31, 1942, already 1,294,852 have been approved and 133,750 have been temporarily disallowed pending the submission of additional necessary information or evidence, and 10,607 have been disapproved.

Class E allotment accounts in effect as of December 31, 1942, total 779,544, of which 183,617 are new accounts received since November 2, 1942.

In addition, we have received and handled over 3,500,000 pieces of incoming mail, and have prepared and dispatched over 5,000,000 pieces exclusive of the millions of checks mailed. At this time our incoming mail averages over 62,449 pieces per day and our outgoing mail 63,422 pieces per day.

There is nothing of record in the Army or civilian life comparable to the work that has been done under similar conditions in such a brief time. Despite the handicaps and the magnitude of the task, the main job to "Get 'Em Paid!" is being accomplished. We are working day and night. The skies look clear ahead.

Might I take this opportunity to invite you to stop over in Newark at any time convenient to you and see our plant in operation.

With regards and best wishes for the new year, I am,

Sincerely yours,

H. N. GILBERT,
Colonel, A. G. D., Director.

JANUARY, 13, 1943.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: In view of your helpful interest in the operations of the Office of Dependency Benefits, I am taking the liberty of enclosing herewith a statement of the status of business in that office as of January 6, 1943. I think you will agree that the statement discloses that the business of the office is as nearly up-to-date as could be expected, considering the volume of applications received. I believe it will justify your continued support of our efforts.

Sincerely yours,

A. H. CARTER,
Brigadier General, G. S. C.,
Budget Officer for the War Department.

Over a million and a half checks were mailed to the wives and parents of soldiers, January 6, 1943, by the Office of Dependency Benefits, War Department. These checks are for the support of the dependents of soldiers. A total of 1,693,319 checks covering December payments were mailed. This was reported by the Office of Dependency Benefits, Newark, N. J., which is charged with the administration of the Servicemen's Dependency Allowance Act of 1942 and the voluntary allotment activities of the War Department.

The principal payments to the dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Army administered by the Office of Dependency Benefits are the family allowances under the Servicemen's Dependency Allowance Act, the emergency class E allotments under Public Law 490, and the voluntary class E allotments. The family allowance consists of a soldier's contributions from his pay, supplemented by one from the Government; the emergency class E allotment, under Public Law 490, is an allotment which may be made by the Secretary of War (so far as Army personnel is concerned) for the benefit of dependents of Army personnel who are missing in action, interned, beleaguered, besieged, in the hands of the enemy, and under several other conditions; the ordinary class E allotment is a voluntary allotment which any soldier or officer may authorize from his own pay, and which he may terminate or change at his option.

The family allowance work constitutes an activity of the War Department which was created last June on the basis of issuing the first checks on November 1. This date was subsequently advanced to October 1. The Office of Dependency Benefits which administers these activities reports that, through December 31, 1942, 1,519,055 family allowance applications were received, of which 1,294,852 have been approved with over 100,000 in process and over 150,000 cases which have been temporarily disallowed pending the submission of additional evidence.

Class E allotments are voluntary allotments made by officers and men to dependents and for payments to commercial insurance companies. As of December 31, 1942, 779,544 class E allotments were in effect. New applications, changes in amount of allotment and changes in address on hand total 126,796.

While there have been some delays caused by the large influx of applications over a short period of time and by moving the office from Washington to Newark, the figures given above indicate that considerable headway has been made in getting checks out to the families of men in the service.

The Pay-As-You-Go Income-Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER G. GERRY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, on January 7 last the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a very able address on the subject of the pay-as-you-go income-tax plan, delivered on January 6, 1943, before the Advertising Club of New York, by Mr. Beardsley Ruml, chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. The manuscript was returned because it would take up three and one-third pages of the RECORD, and

two pages is the limit for matters which may be inserted in the RECORD without stating the cost and again obtaining the consent of the Senate. I am informed that the cost of printing the address will be $150. On behalf of the Senator from Missouri, I renew the request that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A new legislative year has just been begun, a new Congress takes up new and unfinished legislative business, and a new opportunity is presented to correct an old defect in our income-tax procedure, a defect which has now had the result of putting 27,000,000 income-tax payers in debt for the tax on their last year's income.

When the Federal income tax bill was passed in this country in 1913, it had a defect which at the time seemed of no practical consequence but which has since come to have the greatest importance. This defect was that a citizen was required to pay in the year 1914 a tax on his 1913 income. In this way, we got started on a vicious practice of paying out of 1 year's income a tax on the year that had already gone.

I have said that at the time this defect seemed of no practical consequence. The reason is that income-tax rates were low and affected comparatively few people. In 1913 the rates began at 1 percent and the top (normal plus surtax) was 7 percent. Exemption for a single person was $3,000. Contrast this situation with that which confronts us in the Revenue Act of 1942.

The consequence of these increasing rates is that the debt which people owe to the Federal Government for tax on their last year's income has become a national danger. Nothing is to be gained by arguing that people ought to have saved the tax on last year's income out of last year's income. The fact is that they did not do it and now they cannot do it.

Statistics showing large increases in aggregate net savings during the past year give cold statistical comfort to the majority of income-tax payers. These savings have gone to liquidate old debts, to provide circulating medium needed by a vastly expanded and a more mobile working population, to cushion the shock of sudden economic reverses, to buy War bonds as a foundation for a normal peacetime life. Only a small portion indeed has been earmarked for taxes on the income of 1942, earmarked so tightly that it will be at hand to permit 2 years' taxes to be paid in the one year of 1943, or even to permit one year's payment if 1943 income should for some reason stop. Evidence on this point is everywhere at hand and each can judge by his own experience and by questioning others. The Gallup poll of November 16, 1942, showed 75 percent are not saving for income tax and 71 percent underestimated the tax they would have to pay. No substantial portion of the tax on 1942 incomes has been accrued by individual taxpayers in a form either intended or available today to meet the tax debt on 1942, and it would come as a shock to the public if Congress should require that the 1942 tax be paid concurrently with the income tax on the income of 1943.

The fact is that few people seem to realize how much money they owe the Government for income tax. They seem to feel that since they have paid an installment on December 15, and since the next payment isn't due until next March, for the time being at least, they are not in debt for income tax. They are wrong. They are in debt now for income tax on what they earned last year. Under our present system this debt will have to be paid whether this year they then have any income or not.

If they die, this amount will be taken from whatever estate they leave. If they lose their jobs, there will be a charge against what they have saved. If their earnings are less, the full tax must be met out of the lower earnings. Nothing can stop the march of the days, and when the due date comes they must pay the tax they owe on the income they have already had. It is a real debt, and practically all income-tax payers are actually in debt continuously for about 1 year's full income tax.

There are two broad purposes for reforming our historic income-tax practice in order to place our income taxes on a current basis and to eliminate the accumulated income-tax debt. The first purpose relates to the financing of the war, to the reduction of potentially inflationary purchasing power, and to the preservation of the integrity of our income-tax system through obtaining the highest possible level of collections and the lowest possible level of defaults. The second purpose springs from the personal and humane desirability of removing from millions of citizens the constant threat of unpaid tax debt, a debt imposed under a faulty tax system, unwittingly unprovided for by our citizens, a debt now grown so large under present tax rates that loss of current income for any reason by the individual taxpayer brings acute financial and personal distress.

The first purpose, that of financing the war and maintaining the integrity of the income-tax system, appeals powerfully to all students of taxation, in and out of the Government. They are well aware that the economic well-being of the country will be safeguarded by collecting the taxes on our rising 1943 income in 1943 and not a year later in 1944. They are also aware of the probability that it will be necessary to supplement the present tax program with a program of compulsory savings, and that this program too must be related to the current income of the citizen.

These authorities are also apprehensive about income-tax collections and default. Can we expect 10,000,000 new taxpayers to make declarations and begin to pay income tax under the old scheme on what they earned last year? Can we expect these new taxpayers, or even the old ones, to keep up their payments for tax on their last year's income at present rates if their current income should slacken or abruptly cease? How would the defaults be handled? Would the Federal Government seize their savings, their War bonds, and their homes?

All these considerations force the placing of income taxes on a current basis and at once, even if there were no personal or humane reasons for doing so. But it is impossible to get on a current basis without eliminating the tax debt on 1942 incomes. No current program, whether it be withholding, compulsory savings, or spending tax, can be applied at the rates necessary as long as the 1942 tax debt is also simultaneously payable. There is no escaping the conclusion that the income tax on 1942 incomes must be either dropped or deferred.

The second broad purpose for this income-tax reform rests on personal and humane grounds. On the 1st of January under our present system some 27,000,000 citizens will be in debt to the Federal Government for income tax. If we estimate two persons back of each taxpayer, we have 80,000,000 people involved in the hazard of income-tax debt. It is inevitable that every year, even in 1943, some small percentage of our taxpayers will suffer loss of income from one or another cause. Even if as few as 4 percent were so affected, this would mean more than a million taxpayers in trouble because of income-tax debt. What are the reasons that might make for lower current income for the individual income taxpayer? Men are called into the armed services, others go into Government work at lower pay, men and women are displaced from peacetime industry by wartime dislocation, some suffer sickness and accident, others must retire because of advancing years. All of these find that now with the new high tax rates their income-tax debt becomes an intolerable hardship, wiping out savings that have been accumulated over the years. And for the hundreds of thousands that have already been injured, millions of us are in danger, because we are each subject to the same hazards and the same inevitable loss of income.

The present system is a bad system for all of us, and it should and can be corrected. It is clear that the Government cannot continue for long to be the creditor of some 27,000,000 taxpayers and their families in debt for income tax, particularly when there is no substantial question of revenue involved in skipping a year and getting the whole country on a current pay-as-you-go basis.

In order to accomplish this desirable objective of getting our income taxes on a current basis, I suggested to the Treasury in March of last year and to the Senate Finance Committee in July a plan which I called the pay-as-you-go income-tax plan. This plan is to be applied to individuals, not to corporations. Since then there has been a great deal of discussion, many suggestions and a little criticism.

I welcome this opportunity to make a statement about the plan which will bring it up to date, adding to and modifying the original plan in the light of the suggestions and criticisms which I have received.

The first problem is how to get our personal income taxes on a current basis without paying 2 years' taxes in 1 year. The answer is as simple as daylight saving. Let us turn our tax clocks ahead 1 year. The taxes we have paid last year out of our 1942 incomes are taxes on our incomes received in 1941. We can best solve the problem now by recognizing these 1942 payments to be taxes on 1941 as they really are; and by beginning 1943 by paying on 1943, thereby dropping out the year 1942 from the tax calendar forever.

In my original testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, I suggested dropping out 1941, but the Treasury preferred that if any year was to be dropped, it should be 1942. Now that 1943 has already begun it is clear that the Treasury is right, and that 1942 would be a better year to skip. It is unfortunate that action could not have been taken in time to make practical the skipping of 1941. The year 1941 would have been a much better year to be skipped for many income taxpayers who are serving the people of the United States in the armed forces or in the Federal civil service. Perhaps some method can be worked out to give them the choice of 1941 or 1942. I hope that this can be done.

The question arises at once in everyone's mind, How can we drop an income-tax year out of the calendar in this way without having the Treasury lose a lot of money that is badly needed for the war effort? The answer is that we shall all go along paying our income taxes as we have before, only they will will be on a current basis. The Treasury will also go along getting its revenues. The only difference is that when a taxpayer dies or ceases to receive income he will not owe income tax as he does under the present system. Reduction of tax payment by the taxpayer as a result of setting the tax clock ahead occurs only at some future date, when and as the taxpayer's income ceases or declines. The reduction is therefore spread over the whole lifetime of the present income-tax-paying generation, and occurs beneficially for each taxpayer at the time when his income fails. As for the Treasury, the Treasury has never considered taxes receivable as an asset, and accordingly they can be written off the balance sheet of the Government without the change of a single penny.

If we study the consequences of the plan over the generation, we find that, since the loss would be spread over a period of some 35 to 50 years, the gross amount of $8,000,000,000 estimated as the tax liabilities on 1942 income would amount to an average of only $160,000,000 to $220,000,000 a year over this period. This gross loss of revenue in any case would be partially offset by better tax collections and collection methods and also by recoveries through the estate tax of part of what would otherwise have been payable as income tax. The loss in revenue is relatively not substantial in comparison with the gross tax revenues to be received in these years. Another way of looking at it is that the net loss over a generation would be about the same as 1 month's current expenditures. The first big loss would come, if at all, in the first year of a post-war depression, and it would occur as a timely adjustment both for the economic welfare of the Nation and for the help of each individual taxpayer whose income had suffered reduction. It is a small cost to achieve a basic income-tax reform, preserving the integrity of the system and affecting beneficially 27,000,000 citizens.

The question is sometimes raised as to the effect of the plan on inflation. The only persons who would have more cash on hand under the plan are the few who have accrued their income taxes and who hold them in liquid form. These are few indeed, and they are not spendthrifts. On the contrary, it is a matter of common observation that the American people will not spend their savings, or their War bond purchases when they have once been acquired, except under conditions of real economic pressure. Striking evidence of this is found in the familiar Christmas savings clubs, where money is purposefully saved to buy Christmas presents; and yet when the time for expenditure comes, under all the pressure of the holiday season and in spite of the identification of the savings with the season, only 30 percent of the Christmas club resources are actually spent for consumer purchases. As a matter of fact, since the pay-as-you-go plan will make withholding taxes possible at a high level, and since we will be collecting for 1943 in 1943, the total effect will be anti-inflationary rather than otherwise.

The Tax Research Department of the Treasury feels that a withholding tax at a high rate is important in keeping taxpayers current. I too favor a withholding tax, because it makes it easier for people to keep on a pay-as-you-go basis. And if we want a withholding tax at a high rate, the pay-as-you-go plan does solve the problem of having a withholding tax without having some amount of double taxation; that is, of paying 2 years' taxes in 1. However, if a withholding tax provision at a high rate turns out to be either undesirable or impractical, the pay-as-you-go plan stands on its own feet as a sound method of getting the country free of income-tax debt.

The second point in the pay-as-you-go income-tax plan is designed to solve the problem of how we can pay our income taxes on a current basis, when we do not know at the beginning of a year what our income is going to be in that year. The way of solving this problem is not too difficult. We will go ahead as we do today, filing an income-tax schedule about the 15th of March declaring our previous year's income. But this will be a tentative return for the year then beginning and we will pay our current taxes on the basis of this tentative return. After the year had ended there would have to be an adjustment up or down depending on whether our actual income for the year was greater or less than that on our tentative return. But this adjustment would be made on the same blank and at the same time as our return for the following year. This return would be at one time the final return for the old year and the tentative return for the new. There would be no doubling of returns involved and only a few extra lines for the adjustment computations.

The third feature of the plan is the provision for relief in case a taxpayer knows his income in the current year is going to be less or greater than that of the year of his tentative declaration. The plan provides that he may declare his true knowledge of lower or higher income, as a result of salary changes, and so forth, which have actually occurred, and make his current payments accordingly.

This provision eliminates the awkwardness of avoidable year-end adjustments and keeps the plan closer to a true pay-as-you-go basis than it would otherwise be.

The fourth point about the plan covers the special provisions for minimizing objectionable windfall cases. These provisions were not included in the original plan and have been added to meet a widespread feeling that, even though the number of cases be few, it is desirable to guard against them.

To meet this feeling, I have made the following three suggestions for handling these windfall cases:

1. Do not cancel the income tax on capital gains. Capital gains are not like ordinary recurring income, and can properly be separated out in the plan.

2. Provide a special death tax to recover what may be considered windfall arising because of death in 1942, or during some appropriate transition period.

3. In all cases where claim for credit exceeds $10,000, or some other suitable amount, take an average of 1941, 1942, and 1943. The average of the 3 years will be a practical way of determining a fair normal income instead of windfall income.

These three provisions will catch all of the most objectionable windfall cases. But even so, there may still be a few remaining. What then?

Much as I dislike windfalls, even if they cannot be entirely eliminated, I am still for the plan. In all fairness, we should not refuse to do good for millions simply because we will be doing too much good for a few that don't deserve it.

The fifth point about the pay-as-you-go income-tax plan is that it proposes to give equal treatment to all taxpayers under the plan. This means to skip a tax year for all alike in every bracket and start the whole country income-tax debt free.

These are my reasons: For those in the lower brackets, the plan will obviously have far-reaching beneficial results since unfortunate circumstances of loss of income will not be doubly unfortunate because of last year's debt.

For those in the middle brackets, the plan will eliminate countless personal and family tragedies, free many able citizens for public service, and step up the efficiency of American industry by making possible the retirement and pensioning of executives who are holding on, largely to pay their income tax and never catching up.

For those in the upper brackets, it will make much less practical difference than might appear. First, because, like anybody else, as long as they have their income they continue to pay their taxes; and, when they die, what otherwise would have been payable as income tax on the taxpayer's previous year's income is subject to estate taxes in his highest brackets.

But apart from the practical considerations, the reason I favor over-all application of the principle is because it gives equal treatment to all taxpayers under the plan. In adopting pay-as-you-go by skipping a year, I believe we should treat all citizens alike. As we turn the tax clock ahead for some, we should turn it ahead for all, and get the whole Nation out of income-tax debt as of the beginning of 1943.

Insofar as we want more equality of income and of wealth we can have these through the progressive income tax and the progressive estate tax, but we should not use this general income-tax reform, pay-as-you-go, unequally to accelerate indirectly the impact of progressive taxation. Let us achieve such levelling, or lack of it, as we desire, directly through legislative action on measures explicity drawn to serve that purpose.

There is a deeper and perhaps a truer way of looking at this problem of correcting our income tax practice equitably. Most agree, I suppose, on a policy of taxation based on ability to pay, with graduated rates as steep or as mild as Congress from time to time determines proper. We are not unmindful of other social criteria for the imposition of taxes, but presumably these would all be consistent with ability to pay.

If we now look at our traditional income-tax practice fundamentally, we see what we have really been doing is to estimate ability to pay in terms of last year's income. Now as a matter of observable fact, last year's income is over and gone as income; it is a criterion of ability to pay only in so far as last year's income remains as a residue in current wealth, or as it portends income presently to be received.

The true significance of the pay-as-you-go plan is that it denies the applicability of last year's income as a criterion either of current wealth or of income presently to be received; and therefore rejects for all alike the use of last year's income as a basis of taxation according to ability to pay. The plan involves not only the elimination of income-tax debt; basically it involves a change in the criterion of ability to pay. By starting the new year with a new criterion of ability to pay, we simultaneously start it with all citizens income-tax-debt free.

The Treasury has devised a modified plan which would apply to the full tax debt of some taxpayers and to only a part of the tax debt of the rest. Concretely, the Treasury proposed that the tax year be skipped for only the normal tax and the lowest bracket rate of surtax (that is, a total of 10 percent and that the balance of the tax debt remaining should be paid over the next 2 years), this in addition to current income taxes that will be payable in those years. The Treasury conceded that this would leave between 10 and 20 percent of our taxpayers still owing the Government for taxes on their last year's income. This group of 10 to 20 percent includes practically all of the country's technical, administrative, and professional workers, men and women vital to the creative and dynamic evolution of our country who need freedom from income-tax debt danger as much as anyone else.

I am invariably asked what the Treasury's objections are to the plan. In order to answer this question, I have analyzed the sources known to me of official Treasury pronouncement on the plan. These consist of the following:

1. Statement to the press by Randolph Paul, August 19, 1942, as reported in the New York Times.

2. Press release of August 24, 1942, from the Treasury.

3. Radio speech by Randolph Paul on August 31, 1942, over the Mutual network.

4. Speech by Randolph Paul to the National Lawyers' Guild, September 26, 1942.

5. Letter by Randolph Paul in reply to Louis Bromfield in the Washington Post of December 17, 1942.

On analyzing these several statements, there appear to be four principal points of difference.

1. The Treasury raises the point of administrative difficulties. Here the objection is so weak that the following statement is used: "In effect, the Ruml plan requires two returns and two sets of computations to determine 1 year's tax." Yes, in effect, that is true, but in fact it is all done at the same time and on the same return.

2. The Treasury suggests the possible danger of inflation. This objection falls into two parts: First, people who have saved for taxes may spend their savings; and second, people would not have the repressive influence on their spending of a large impending tax liability. This argument has been presented strongly only in the December letter to Mr. Bromfield. As I have said earlier, the few who have accrued their taxes are not spendthrifts; and second, the burden of current tax payments under the pay-as-you-go plan will be as great or greater than payments against the debt on last year's income under our present practice. In a later sentence Mr. Paul states: "As desirable as collection at the source is, it is unnecessary to adopt it at the cost of forgiving a year's tax liability." This sentence seems to imply that there is thought of collecting 2 years' taxes in 1 year, in whole or in part, for some or all income taxpayers. This is exactly what we want to avoid. Congress fixes the income-tax rates according to its judgment as to what is proper at the time. These rates are fixed openly and no carry-over of debt liability should be permitted to carry us beyond the decision of Congress as to the assessment to be imposed currently on the income taxpayers. If, in the opinion of some, the burden should be greater, the evidence can be presented to Congress and it will make an explicit determination of its own for the country.

3. The Division of Tax Research of the Treasury has persistently insisted that the pay-as-you-go plan be linked with collection at the source. I have from the beginning favored collection at the source and have said so. I think collection at the source improves the pay-as-you-go plan. But collection at the source is not indispensable for pay as you go. Accordingly, if collection at the source proves impractical or inacceptable, there is no reason for not having the benefits of the pay-as-you-go plan anyway. I became particularly apprehensive about linking pay as you go too closely with a withholding tax after an incident before Senator CLARK'S subcommittee on the withholding tax which Senator CLARK described in the New York Times of August 20, 1942. On the same day that the Division of Tax Research was advocating collection at the source, the Collector of Internal Revenue, another department of the Treasury, "raised a number of objections" to it. Under the circumstances, it seemed to me that I had gone far enough in expressing favor for the withholding tax without tying up the pay-as-you-go plan in a controversy that was in no way crucial as far as the pay-as-you-go plan was concerned. I gladly support the recommendation for collection at the source, but not at the risk of the pay-as-you-go plan itself. As a matter of fact, I doubt whether we can have a withholding tax at the needed high rates without first adopting the pay-as-you-go plan.

4. The last objection of the Treasury centers around the question of giving equal treatment to all taxpayers. I have made the suggestions which you have heard for eliminating windfall cases, but these seem not to satisfy the Treasury since they do not and are not intended to affect the higher brackets that are not windfall cases. It has been my feeling that, except for windfalls, all citizens should be treated alike and the tax year should be skipped for all.

I feel that the Treasury misjudges the political tides because it is too close to the waves. I believe that the country is tired of indirection in the attempt to achieve a leveling beyond the explicit acts of Congress. Equal treatment for all by turning the tax clock ahead for all alike has been a point of principle that I have felt worth while defending.

But this point of principle is one that Congress properly will decide. If the principle is not so important, or if I have wrongly construed it, then I must point out frankly that it is entirely practical to draw up a pay-as-you-go plan that would leave a residue of debt remaining to be paid by taxpayers in the higher brackets. Several proposals of this sort have been suggested, but none of them, as they stand, is satisfactory because the residue of debt remaining is not sufficiently closely related to ability to pay. But a plan could be drawn up that would leave a residue of debt payable and at the same time relate this debt sharply to the taxpayer's ability to pay.

One criticism of the plan that has been made by some, but not to my knowledge by the Treasury, stems from a feeling that somehow it is wrong to cancel a debt. These critics would like to get on a pay-as-you-go basis in 1943, but retain the tax liability for 1942 as well, although they recognize that it must be deferred or spread over many years. The effect of all such proposals is to complicate the problem, to leave a disagreeable debt overhanging millions of taxpayers—a debt that would be a perpetual football of politics—and to increase beyond the will of Congress, as expressed in legislated income-tax rates, the burden of payments to the Federal Government assessed on the individual taxpayer.

The feeling that it is somehow wrong to cancel a debt runs very deep and it is respected in quarters where the feeling itself is not shared. It is not easy to find the reason. Certainly it is a common practice, as evidenced by the experience of banks and other commercial institutions, to reorganize debtor-creditor relations without prejudice, upon the initiative of either party, whenever it becomes necessary in furthering the best continuing interests of both. Removal of debt liabilities in this way is considered a means of preserving the integrity of the relationship and a recognition of joint interest in a future welfare. It avoids the deceit and bitterness characteristic of evasion and default.

Certainly the canceling of debt in order to further the welfare of all concerned has had the high approval of age-old moral authorities. An interesting contemporary comment has been made on the plan itself. A writer in the Information Service of the Federal Council of Churches, after describing the pay-as-you-go plan, goes on to say, "At the meetings of various interdenominational organizations held at Cleveland in December, a member of this Department's staff informally interviewed a number of church officials and found those consulted uniformly in favor of the plan."

There is also a special reason why the liabilities which have arisen under our income-tax procedure may properly be set aside as I have suggested. These liabilities are not debts such as those which arise in the exchange of money, property, or services between private individuals. They cannot be removed by bankruptcy proceedings. On the contrary, they are the result of a unilaterally imposed levy by a legislative body under a traditional practice of assessment recognized by all to be defective. This practice was, in fact, so defective that in 1942 not only was the income-tax debt itself so imposed, but the amount of the debt was not established until October 21, 1942, nearly ten months after the taxable year began.

There would therefore appear to be neither practical nor ethical grounds of a general character for not canceling the old income-tax liability if that seems the best way of solving our problem. Moreover, in view of the defect and delay in our income-tax law there is sound and just reason why the correction should now be made. At this time when citizens will bear more tax burdens than ever before, and when the expectation of additional burdens is in the minds of all, Congress may well extend a friendly and a helping hand to the Nation's taxpayers. Congress may well remove the distress of income-tax debt from the unfortunate whose incomes fail, and the fear of income-tax debt from the rest of us.

Broadly speaking, what will the plan accomplish?

The pay-as-you-go income tax plan is a three-way plan.

First of all, it is a plan that will relieve thousands of citizens from hardship and distress arising from income-tax debt, and that will bring peace of mind to millions more who are in income-tax-debt danger.

Second, it is a method for clearing the decks for an all-out war financing program. If we can all be free of income-tax debt on the first of next year, we can start on a pay-as-you-go basis and stay there. If we need high withholding taxes we can have them; if we need to supplement voluntary savings with compulsory savings, we can do that too. But whatever is called for, it would be paid out of the current year's income as an assessment on the same year's income. We would not be paying for dead horses while we are fighting a war.

In the third place, the pay-as-you-go income-tax plan is the best kind of financial planning for the post-war period. Our policies can then be forward looking, not backward looking. We will not be trying to collect income taxes from people who are unemployed; we will not be debating whether we should collect taxes on 1941 incomes from men demobilized from the armed forces. We will not have a spending spree in the first little boomlet, financed on unpaid taxes, and then a tax-debt headache if incomes should drop off for a year or so.

The chances of getting the new year 1943 on a pay-as-you-go basis seem to me to be distinctly good. I feel that a pay-as-you-go plan in a form acceptable to Congress will certainly be adopted, because income-tax payers want to pay their taxes on a current basis, they want to be free of income-tax debt and they know it can be done without hurting the Treasury and without paying 2 years' taxes in one. The taxpayers know that pay-as-you-go solves the problem simply and fairly by skipping an income-tax year. They know the whole trouble was caused by a basic defect in our income-tax law which has existed from the beginning, that of paying a tax on last year's income out of this year's receipts. This defect was not their fault and they know it. They want it corrected and they want to be on a pay-as-you-go basis in 1943.

Enough time has elapsed since the plan went to the Treasury and since it was made public before the Senate Finance Committee to permit the development of criticism, suggestions, and modifications of the plan. The critics have not been negligent and I feel sure that the objections which have been raised are the result of painstaking examination. At the same time, the lack of force in the objections which have been made to the plan has been apparent to press and public alike and has been the subject of nation-wide comment.

It seems to me that we are rapidly approaching the time when the pay-as-you-go plan will be in the realm of legislative action. The needed decisions and compromises are the appropriate responsibility of Congress. The evidence is in. Let us have earnest consideration and early action.

As a nation of individuals we will be better able to meet the present and to attack whatever the future has in store for us if we are paid up in our income tax and, being out of income-tax debt, we can pay as we go out of what we earn.

Interim Report of New England Members of the Congress of the United States To Investigate Fuel-Oil Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an interim report of the investigation of the fuel-oil situation made by the New England Members of the Congress of the United States.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this interim report is to present the facts, findings, conclusions, and recommendations to date of the New England delegation in the Congress on the fuel-oil situation as it concerns the six New England States.

The New England Members of the Congress, having further reviewed and investigated the fuel situation, find the following facts:

1. Prior to the outbreak of the war more than 95 percent of all petroleum products were transported to New England by ocean tankers. Submarine warfare and the needs of our armed forces have reduced this method of transportation to a minimum. Practically all transportation of fuel oil into New England today is by rail or local barge.

2. The amount of petroleum required in the 6 New England States has been variously estimated by experts, but it is approximately 320,000 barrels per day.

3. The amount of petroleum now being transported into New England is about 220,000 barrels per day.

4. The difference in the amount required and the amount now being transported is 100,000 barrels per day—one-third short of requirements.

5. The supply on hand, or the inventory, has also been variously estimated by experts and is between nine and one-half and eleven million barrels.

6. The danger point on inventories has been estimated at 5,000,000 barrels. This means that whenever the New England inventory becomes less than 5,000,000 barrels many consumers in New England will find it difficult or impossible to secure any supplies.

7. At the present time the reserve supply of No. 2 fuel oil in New England is relatively good, but the supply of bunker oil and range oil is much below normal.

8. The conclusion reached by the experts is that unless there is a considerable increase of shipments into the area within 60 days, we will have used all available inventories on hand and be down to an unsafe level. The Office of Petroleum Coordinator assures us that early in February there will be an increased movement into the East of 120,000 barrels a day as a result of the completion of the pipe line to Illinois. Whether more than 20,000 barrels of this will go into New England is uncertain.

9. New England can no longer depend upon any ocean tanker movement—at least for the first 6 months of the year 1943.

10. Pipe lines now under belated construction will be of little benefit to the New England area during the present winter.

11. Prior to December 2, 1942, there were amazing conflicts in the views, opinions, and delegated authority—if any—to the various governmental agencies charged with the expeditious solution of this problem. The evidence shows that until December 2, 1942, the policies controlling the entire petroleum set-up were under several and various agencies, such as rationing, price control, Office of Defense Transportation, Office of Petroleum Coordinator, and War Production Board, and that frequently these agencies were working at cross purposes.

The Office of Petroleum Coordinator has dealt more than any other agency with the supply of petroleum products. The Office of Defense Transportation had no authority to designate the shipment of petroleum products or other freight to the east coast or elsewhere. It dealt merely with the general transportation problem from the standpoint of facilitating the transportation, by rail, of all freight and passengers.

The rationing of petroleum and other products is under the direction of Mr. Henderson, and the allotment and distribution of the prescribed amount is entirely in the hands of the local rationing boards appointed by Mr. Henderson and is not under the jurisdiction of the Petroleum Coordinator.

It will surprise the people of New England, who have not been in close touch with the situation, to learn that the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator has had no authority hitherto to order or direct any producers of oil to direct rail shipments to New England. Its efforts have been confined to using its good offices to make recommendations. It had no authority to compel or enforce the diversion of petroleum products from one area to another. This lack of authority has been apparent to all interested for many months. For more than 9 months, continuously and repeatedly, efforts have been made to induce the Chief Executive to establish a Nation-wide authority to control the distribution of petroleum products. Nearly every Member of the New England delegation has requested this power and has been promised that it would be done. It is remarkable that conditions are not worse than they are, in view of the absence of any real official power to act. The naming, on December 2, of a so-called oil czar with greater authority should tend to improve the situation, for it at least fixes definite responsibility and grants the necessary power to act.

12. The Government policy through voluntary instruction and solicitation to convert oil burners to coal burners wherever possible has met with very little degree of success among home owners, apartments, public buildings, and institutions. It has met with some degree of success among the industries and it is estimated that about 50 percent of the potential conversions have been accomplished by industry. The savings by conversion of approximately 32,000,000 barrels per year have been absorbed and offset, however, by the expanded requirements of war industries and war uses.

13. The tank cars now in service were never intended to be used at the terrific speed and turn-about that is now necessary. Great delay has been brought about because of ever-required repairs, and the repairs have been made only at the repair shops of the car-owning companies. The speed of the movement is hampered by the less serviceable cars.

14. Various Government agencies have from time to time in the past stated in the public press and otherwise that their best estimate is that the people of New England would have 75 percent of their oil requirements subject to various qualifications which include military requirements. Such statements have been unfortunate in their effect upon our present problem, since too few people have understood the significance of the qualifications and have not converted to coal because of the assumption held out that they would be supplied with 75 percent of their normal requirements.

15. The evidence shows that the chief bottleneck at the present time is the lack of sufficient tank cars. The delegation is assured that the movement in barge transportation has been greatly increased and with the addition of the Great Lakes barges to the New York and Philadelphia areas, additional supplies of fuel oil will come into New England.

16. The delays in transportation and unloading are due in many instances to the inevitable results of changing over from water transportation to rail transportation.

17. It is possible that the amount of fuel oil for heating purposes may be as low as 50 percent of normal requirements—some evidence other than that from Washington officials indicate from 40 to 60 percent. In view of this, the people of New England should and must do a great deal more in the way of conversion to coal than they are doing at the present time

18. The directive of the President of December 2, 1942, placing greater power and authority in the hands of Mr. Ickes, subject only to minor limitations, is in line with the recommendations repeatedly made by the New England delegation.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the opinion of this committee there are four major causes, all contributing to the present fuel shortage situation in New England:

1. The war—the transferring of tankers that have carried oil to New England, to the Allies before and since we entered the war, and the loss of tankers by submarine warfare.

2. The lack, until December 2, 1942, of an Oil Coordinator with power and authority to compel the delivery of fuel oil and other needed petroleum products to areas like New England where it was apparent a famine in these necessities was developing.

3. The failure to build the oil pipe lines that were authorized by Congress in July 1941 which, if immediately constructed, would now have been in full operation and would have made available more tank cars for transportation of oil to New England.

4. The slowness and unjustifiable delays in making decisions and in carrying out directives by the Office of Petroleum Coordinator, Office of Defense Transportation, Office of Price Administration, and the War Production Board.

It is obvious, from the facts as outlined above, and from the evidence presented to the committee, that New England will have a dire and dangerous shortage of residual or bunker oi and domestic heating oil during the coming winter unless steps are taken immediately to increase the supply.

The committee considers that the rationing plan at long last in effect all over the United States since Decemoer 1, 1942, should help New England but it is extremely unfortunate that its inauguration was so long delayed. In no other way that this committee can ascertain can more fuel oil be had in New England except by the use of more tank cars and barge transportation on the New England run.

The Office of Defense Transportation gives little encouragement that there can be any substantial increase in petroleum shipments by rail to New England because of the general transportation situation throughout the country and the possible increased military needs.

The authorities agree that the difficulty in New England is greater than anywhere else in the country because the storage is less, the climate colder, the distance greater, and the means of reaching the area are more limited. The authorities also assure the committee that the fuel-oil rationing program has been applied throughout the 17 Atlantic Coast States and 13 Midwestern States.

The authorities testify that domestic conversion has not been accomplished to any

appreciable extent and that compulsory conversion is going to be necessary. The New England delegation earnestly recommends conversion whenever practicable.

It is hoped that placing the principal control of petroleum products under one head and granting the authority necessary will remove the confusion formerly caused by conflicting statements and directives issued by the heads of various bureaus and their subordinates.

The New England delegation as an organized group will continue its year-old struggle for adequate fuel supplies for New England. The present crisis has been long anticipated and called repeatedly to the attention of the authorities in Washington by the delegation and by public officials of the various States and by various civic organizations. Failure of those in authority to act has brought us to the present perilous situation.

The committee believes that the public should be informed that even under the most favorable circumstances there will be a drastic shortage of petroleum products in New England this winter. Even with greatly accelerated conversions and increased tank-car transportation, one factor which no one can determine is the type of winter New England will experience.

Addresses by Rev. Dr. John P. Boland and Paul M. Herzog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Rev. Dr. John P. Boland, chairman of the New York State Labor Relations Board, who was formerly associated with the National Labor Relations Board, and also an address by Paul M. Herzog, chairman of the New York State Labor Relations Board, at a testimonial dinner in honor of Father John P. Boland.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAID IN PARTING

(By Rev. Dr. John P. Boland, chairman, New York State Labor Relations Board)

Years ago I paid a visit to the little House of Divine Providence, in Turin, an institution of many-sided mercy which reached out, with motherly interest, and embosomed the unwanted of all the ages of man. Inside the walls of this city of refuge its busy builders had fashioned a foundling asylum, an orphanage, vocational schools, a home for the blind, and one for the aged. In its 800-bed infirmary the patients, when expressing their gratitude for gifts of dolci or fruit, did not use the common phrase thank you. I heard them say, instead, "Thanks be to God, Deo gratias," as if they meant, they and the nuns who had taught them, we are grateful for the things you bring us, to Him from whom they originally come.

I can think of no better way of saying thank you to this vast gathering of my friends than by imitating those beneficiaries of Old World acts of kindness. I am grateful to God for inspiring you to be generous in your thoughts about me. Your speakers, your committee, you yourselves, individually and collectively, have done me the honor of breaking bread with me, the bread of warm, tingling friendship. The effect has been, as you may have noted during the program of speaking, akin to that wrought by the white magic of a man's love for his fellows. We have discovered that our various philosophies, when fused, melt into that of the Sermon on the Mount. We love God best when we serve one another and thrice blessed are they who clasp tight the hands of men afflicted by poverty or oppressed by despots or persecuted for justice's sake.

We stand as one in our deep conviction that the earth is the Lord's and by His wish, every man's. We believe unitedly that man's innate dignity is his most precious possession and that it must be acknowledged, respected, and, when attacked, defended with all our substance and with our lives. We hold, together, that opportunities for employment should exist for all, always, whatever the color of our skin, whatever our racial or national origin, whatever our creed. No man can enjoy the blessings of a satisfying standard of living, if one man suffers from their lack or loss. We must agree, too, that whatever we do, by organization or legislation, to pull our depressed fellowmen to higher places alongside us, must be guided by the moral law. Its supremacy and finality must be recognized by state and by private citizen. It must be accepted as the instrument by which each day's conduct is measured.

Within the limits of this moral code must all good labor relations be planned and practiced, including the right of employees as well as of employers to organize, the right of both freely to choose agents as their spokesmen in collective bargaining, the right to negotiate contracts covering all terms of employment, contracts that will be binding for a mutually satisfactory period of time and the right to invoke local conciliation and, if it fails, voluntary mediation and, as a final step, if the dispute continues, voluntary arbitration, thus pushing strikes into the distant atmosphere of things that are rare. Workingmen and their employers, farmers and professional men, too, make their vocational contribution to the sum total of free and abundant industry and service, more adequately, when they make it through organized groups. Woe unto that state where there are no free associations of individuals, where the state deals only with masses of individual men. There you will find totalitarianism. Finally, normal labor relations cannot subsist long on a rich diet of rights and claims and privileges. A just regard for our duties and responsibilities and the other man's viewpoint keeps the body economic healthy.

Today we are engaged in a task that may occupy us for a generation. We are getting the feel of its opening phases. Slowly and onerously we are readying ourselves for the shock of a full head-on collision with the mightiest forces in all history, forces that are bent on warping our theories of government and industry to suit their own narrow racial and corporatistic formula. Labor and management in the free countries are forging the weapons that are needed to defeat them. Our servicemen are fighting them on every continent, must fight them on every island that the world knows, in jungles and on mountain tops, on all seas and under them, and in the heavens above them.

I see in this conflict two separate wars, one military and the other philosophical, a war of ideas. Physically the enemy is but one, though across the Atlantic his language is German or Italian, while to our west it is Japanese. They have said that they are one. He is ideologically one, also, for the Axis countries give complete allegiance to one political theory, that all men, individuals, and families and professions and business and craftsmen are the servants of the state. Men's bodies and minds and souls, their birth and death and all the sacred happenings between these outposts of life, their employment and recreation, their sickness and recovery are to be stooped and bent over the state's work benches. Against such evils we are battling. God giving us unity and seriousness of purpose and the spirit of sacrifice and the gift of prayer, we will win. We will win both wars. We will keep our souls as well as our bodies free.

I, too, want to take part in that struggle, as busy a part as I may, in the field of wartime mediation and arbitration, hitherto closed to me by statute, as well as in the task of keeping America America after the war. This and my parish with its added war duties made my resignation imperative.

The fact that my colleagues on the Board and my associates, members of the Board's staff, are thoroughly steeped in the traditions of good employer-employee relationships and fully awake to their responsibilities under the act, and wonderful men and women, besides, made the chairman's seat a firm and fixed one. They were my family, bright, willing, loyal, oh, so loyal. I am proud of them. I cannot properly thank them. Whatever of good has been accomplished by the Board must be attributed to them, wholly, in toto, and without any reservation. This dinner is given to honor them, and in particular John D. Moore, whose beautiful soul is with God, and my dear younger brothers, Paul Herzog and George Cassidy. I am but an ancient ship's figurehead sticking out over the sea, yards beyond the prow, a symbol. You will never know how comforting it is to feel that you have a friend when a fellow needs one, a source of unfailing patience and of solid counsel, until you have someone to back you like the indefatigable Governor who has just finished an epochal social program for his native State and is now beginning one for the world—Governor Lehman whom it will be impossible for me to forget. I am grateful to you, Governor Poletti. Father Gannon, Mr. Blaine, Mr. Green Mr. Carey, Mr. Herzog, I am your debtor.

Friends, all, quiet, quarrelsome, shy, impetuous, generous, thoughtful, helpful, employers, employees, members of the American Federation of Labor, of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, of independent unions, legal counsel, State and city officials whose advice I needed so often, members of societies, members of the reporting staffs of the daily newspapers who have been so sympathetic and honorable and helpful, folks without any such affiliations, if I have offended, forgive, please; if I have been wanting, forget. I hold you close to my heart with hoops of steel. You have made me love New York, in December as well as in June. To me New York is more than a city; it is an institution, America's greatest, the world's most magnificent, history's chief institution, dedicated by human daring to human needs, spiritual as well as bodily, cheerful, valiant, beloved. I am happy because you adopted me. Let the adoption papers stand. When you meet the members of the committee which worked out this testimonial, tell them for me that I am simply overwhelmed. Charles Tuttle and Jim Farley, Judge Collins and Jim Mead will know. I will always remember to ask God to bless you, all of you, forever and a day.

ADDRESS OF PAUL M. HERZOG, CHAIRMAN OF THE NEW YORK STATE LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Poletti, Your Excellency Bishop Donahue, Father Boland, and admirers of Father Boland who comprise this audience, I rise tonight to voice a formal tribute of farewell to Father Boland from Commissioner Cassidy and the members of the board's staff who love him so well. More than any other speaker, per-

haps, I am aware of the solemn character of this occasion. To all of us at the New York State Labor Relations Board it symbolizes the sad day 3 weeks from now, when Father Boland will cease to be our colleague and our daily associate. We have been preparing for that day for 6 months, always hoping against hope that some change might occur which would allow us to keep him a little longer. But now he has resigned the chairmanship. Tonight merely confirms that melancholy fact to his friends on Fifty-seventh Street.

Most of you must long have envied the board and its staff, knowing that we had the great privilege of being with Father Boland every day for 5 years. Remember, please, that his colleagues are paying the price for that privilege tonight, paying it in our deeper pain at present parting. But we are proud, too, of Father Boland and proud to participate in tonight's splendid tribute to him.

Knowing him, I suspect that he may try to thank you for that tribute in the name of the board. This will be because he is too modest to admit to himself that it is directed to Father Boland, the man. I shall force him to recognize the true fact by robbing him of the opportunity to thank all of you in the board's behalf. For that reason, and that reason alone, I do so now myself.

I address my closing remarks, which are personal, directly to the guest of honor:

Father Boland, your two colleagues and the board's entire staff will miss you more than you can ever know. We shall miss your unending patience with the individual peculiarities of some of us, which must have tried that patience more than many of the labor disputes that you have settled. We shall miss your humor, your calm, your sure capacity to penetrate legalism wherever found and to discover the simple, the moral truth which lies beneath. We shall miss your priestly guidance wherever a deep understanding of human nature offers the only solution to a difficult problem. Most of all, we shall miss the wisdom and idealism which pervaded your every thought and action whenever we embarked together to discover the true meaning of the State Labor Relations Act.

We hail you, Father, for the lessons you have taught us in the 5 years that you have been our guide. Rest assured that for your friends at the board your teachings will not have been in vain. They will point us the way in the years to come. As your successor, I will strive to keep the chairmanship the post of honor which you have made it George Cassidy and I pledge ourselves to do everything in our power to continue your policies and methods, knowing that any other course would bring destruction to the thing which you have built with such loving care.

Father, you have done God's work here. You return to Buffalo to do God's work in your parish. The men and women at the board send you on your way, repeating the words which you once taught me: "Go away slowly; come back quickly."

Bernard Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Spartanburg, S. C., Herald, of December 25, 1942, in reference to Mr. Bernard Baruch. This distinguished American, a native of South Carolina, has on various occasions been of great service to his Government, and from time to time has made noteworthy contributions to various worthy causes, in his native State, South Carolina, and the United States of America.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERNARD BARUCH

When a man gives away a million dollars it makes a news story worthy of publication and comment. That was the story contained in a New York dispatch of Friday. The giver was Bernard Baruch, a son of South Carolina who left his native State when a boy to find opportunity in America's largest city. He was successful. He worked his way uphill from an obscure position in Wall Street and became one of the leading financiers of his country.

But Bernard Baruch was more than a successful financier. He was counselor and adviser of men in high political positions—of governors, treasurers, members of the State Department, and of Presidents. During the World War he was intimately associated with President Wilson. He has been of service to other Presidents since the war and in the present conflict Franklin D. Roosevelt often has called upon him for guiding counsel.

Friday Mr. Baruch gave away $1,000,000, as follows:

Army Relief, $200,000; Navy Relief, $200,000; Merchant Seamen's Relief, Red Cross, Russian Relief Society, United China Relief Society, each $100,000; American Friends Service Committee (Philadelphia-Quaker), $20,000; Joint Distribution Committee (Jewish), $20,000; Greek War Relief, $10,000; Norwegian Relief, Inc. (Chicago), $10,000; American Friends of Czechoslovakia, $10,000; American Committee for Christian Refugees, $10,000; Catholic Committee for Refugees from Germany, $5,000; Unitarian Service Committee (Boston), $5,000. A balance of $10,000 was earmarked for later.

Read the list of gifts carefully. Note that, though Mr. Baruch was born of Jewish parents, only one gift, $20,000, went to a Jewish organization. The donation was one to mankind, regardless of nationality or creed.

In this great charity Bernard Baruch adds to his rich life as a philanthropist—as one who loves his fellow man. He takes his place in the company of that galaxy of American Jews, from those who helped to finance the American Revolution to those of the present day, who have built hospitals, established schools, supported welfare movements, sponsored libraries, and encouraged study of the arts and sciences.

Mr. Baruch once said, "It has always been easy for me to make money, why shouldn't I give it away?" May there he many more men like him in the America of the future.

Pay-As-You-Go Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Ernest K. Lindley, referring to the so-called Ruml plan.

I have not as yet found a reason why I should not support the Ruml plan, and I am among those anxious that the Congress prepare legislation providing for tax payments on a pay-as-you-go basis. I am very confident that the Finance Committee of the Senate looks with favor on such a proposal, and I should like to be recorded as among those anxious and hopeful that such a proposal will be adopted before the date when income-tax payments are next due.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAXES

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

NO LOSS TO THE TREASURY

The President favors pay-as-you-go taxes, but thinks, or thought, that the Ruml plan would mean a loss of revenue to the Treasury. It does seem incredible, at first glance, that a year's taxes can be "skipped" without loss of revenue to the Treasury.

Under the Ruml plan there is no interruption in the flow of money into the Treasury. The personal income tax clock simply is moved ahead one year. You pay the tax due on your income for last year, but it counts as payment against your tax on 1943 income. At the end of the year, or next March, the adjustment will be made for over or under-payment. In 1944 you will pay the tax calculated on your 1943 income, but it will count as payment on your 1944 income, and at the end of 1944 or in March 1945, the adjustment will be made for under or over-payment.

As long as tax collections are kept on a current basis, there is no loss, or none that is substantial, to the Treasury. There would be substantial loss if, at some future date, we went back to the present system of paying our income taxes a year late. But there would be no point in going back to the present system. Paying as you go is preferable at all times.

There are ways in which the Treasury might lose some money under the Ruml plan. It would get less from persons whose income in 1943 is smaller than in 1942. They would be chiefly men going into the armed services; and some tax relief for them is only fair. It might lose some revenue from taxes on capital gains; but this loss can be avoided by separating capital gains from income from other sources. Mr. Ruml has proposed that that be done. Taxes on capital gains would continue to be paid a year late, just as the taxes on corporation profits would continue to be paid a year late.

The Treasury might lose a little when a man dies, since he would have paid 1 year's less taxes. But this loss would be recovered in large part from estate and inheritance taxes.

The Treasury might lose some money when, or if, income taxes are reduced after the war. But it need lose none. For Congress will determine when and by how much income taxes shall be reduced. In the same way, all the small losses which the Treasury might suffer in the long run from adoption of the Ruml plan can be offset easily by slight adjustments of the tax rates. And most taxpayers, certainly, would be willing to pay a little more, if necessary, if taxes were put on a pay-as-you-go basis.

The Ruml plan is the way of putting personal income taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis without double taxation. Some persons whose incomes have increased substantially but on whom the income tax still falls lightly can pay the tax for 2 years in 1 year without hardship. Persons with accumulated capital can pay the tax for 2 years in 1 by drawing

on their capital. But for many persons in the middle brackets, who have not accumulated substantial savings, paying 2 years' tax in one is impossible at present rates of taxation. They would have little, or nothing, left for living expenses.

Various proposals have been made for spreading or postponing the second year's tax, incident to switching to pay-as-you-go. The tax on 1942 incomes might be spread over 5 years or postponed until after the war, as Senator GEORGE has suggested. These alternatives are feasible, but you would get the same result by increasing the tax rates somewhat or by maintaining the high war rates a year or two longer after the war.

The Treasury's opposition to the Ruml plan is hard to fathom, since no Treasury spokesman has made a convincing factual rebuttal to the claims made for it. It is impossible to believe that the Treasury's opposition reflects the best tax thought in the Treasury, or that the statement of Chairman DOUGHTON of the House Ways and Means Committee that the Ruml plan would impair the credit of the Government, came from careful study.

The Treasury's attitude probably is influenced by its difficulty in obtaining adequate taxation from Congress. It is against anything that even looks like tax relief. The Ruml plan would give actual relief to persons who suffer a sudden decline in income. The relief to other taxpayers would be chiefly psychological—altogether so if capital gains were separated and other tax rates adjusted slightly to cover the small longer-range losses. And this is without assuming any tax defaults under the present system of paying a year late. The Treasury does not expect much trouble on that score, but it may be overly optimistic: The Ruml plan might actually increase tax revenues by eliminating defaults.

The advantages of getting the income tax on a pay-as-you-go basis, both psychologically and for purposes of better fiscal management, are so great that they would be worth probably some slight loss in revenue. But the Ruml plan can be put into effect without the loss of a dollar to the Treasury, now or in the long run.

Review of the Prosecution of the War in 1942

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech by Raymond Gram Swing broadcast on December 31 over the Blue Network from Radio Station WMAL. The speech impressed me very much, and in my opinion it is worthy of inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a natural evening to look back at the past year and to peer ahead into the year to come. Nineteen forty-two has been a more gratifyfing year than we had a right to expect on last New Year's Eve. It was clear that it was going to be a year of catching up. We had only just become a belligerent and we had a stupendous task of converting our life to a war basis. The Allies were behind in production, they still had to bring the offensives of the Axis to a halt, and to produce force of their own which could start the long and grueling campaigns that should push the enemy back. The year in the Pacific started with a sequence of defeats. In Europe one awaited the new German advance into Russia, and it took more faith than calculation to believe that by tonight the Germans would not be in Moscow, Stalingrad, and Leningrad, and have completed their occupation of European Russia. No one could guarantee that Rommel would not drive through to Cairo and Suez, and that the Fascists of Europe would not join hands with the Japanese, and so have thrown their encirclement over two continents, with Africa, too, in their domain. Nineteen forty-two was the year in which the Axis had to win the war if it was going to win it. It was the last year in which the Allies would be inferior in men, weapons, and war materials. By tonight we have cruised past the shoals and reefs of these menaces. We end the year in a spirit of confidence, perhaps a shade too easygoing in our acceptance of our improved position. We are better off than we knew we were going to be, because of great achievements. Some of these are unsung and unrecognized, such as the achievements of the individual men on ships and in battles, and some of them are not adequately acknowledged, as the work of the Navy in the Midway and Solomons battles, and the success of the British Eighth Army in standing off Rommel, and then driving him back in the war's most spectacular retreat. Above all, stands the feat of the Russians. They not only bore the shock of the German offensives, but they actually added to their strength and vitality so as to bring this year's offensives to a stop inside Stalingrad and then launch their counteroffensives. This has been the outstanding contribution to the United Nations' war in this year.

For many months, the Allies gave ground. It could not have been otherwise, and the question was not whether to retreat but where the retreat could be stopped. But the Japanese came to the limit of their reach, and so did the armies of Hitler. And by the end of the year the Axis was on the defensive.

The most spectacular event of the year was the landing in Africa. That act brought many men and much material to Morocco and Algiers, but it brought more; it brought dark foreboding to the Axis and high hope to the oppressed peoples of occupied Europe. It may not have been the turning point of the war, speaking in military terms. Probably it was less so than the defense of Stalingrad. But the landing in Africa was the swinging of a sword in the light, where no sword or light had been before. It was a promise and a materialization. It was America, the name of a far-away country, transformed into men and tanks and planes; it was this America collaborating with Great Britain in an intricate operation of most amazing difficulties. Between them, they were annihilating space, and the Axis would be beaten if space could be so effectively destroyed.

So in this year of 1942 we have lost less than had been reasonably expected and grew strong more quickly than reasonably could have been hoped. And the Axis showed signs, not of exhaustion, but of inability to maintain the rate of expanding power which the global war called for. They have disappointed themselves. We have surprised ourselves. And it is in this spirit that we go into 1943. Last year was our year of catching up; next year will be our year of forging ahead. We shall begin to have the superiority, first in the air, then as the months advance, on the ground, if not in numbers, then in weapons. And behind our flyers and sailors and soldiers will be an industrial plant the like of which the Axis cannot duplicate, and which had not even been dreamed of in the past.

It would be interesting to speculate about the course of this coming year, to predict a campaign in this or that country, to foresee the likely counter moves, and try to fill in the box score in advance. My own sense of the future, if I may speak subjectively, is somewhat fatalistic. We are now caught up in the stream of doing, and the stream is stronger than any individual of today. For what is in this stream is our past—all of it, both strong and weak—and, coming now to the test, we ourselves cannot be sure how we as a nation shall perform. For better or for worse, we are committed. An individual cannot foresee before his hour comes how he will act. A general, in the heat of a campaign, is submitted to the acid of the unknowable, and it eats away what is weak in his judgment and his character. And in the same way a nation goes to war with the stamina bred through generations, with the inventiveness of courageous spirits, with the capacity for work, with the ability to sacrifice, not any of them developed on the spur of the moment, but filling the reservoir of its accumulated character as a nation. No doubt sometimes you have wondered whether the strong in us was going to be enough, and the weak in us was going to be too much, for us to triumph in this war and in the peace to come. Well, we can't be sure. We are what we are, and we aren't going to be better now. And it is what we already have become that will carry us to the point we are destined to reach.

But if we can't be sure, we can have deep satisfaction in appraising what has been done in this past year of our testing time. Living as I do in Washington, and seeing government at close hand, I hear a great deal about the inefficiency, the conflicts, the bottlenecks, the this and that of the experiences of one person or another. And these all make a lot of news, which I also have to read. It happens that I have spent a large part of my life as a foreign correspondent, which means that I have watched several governments at close hand. Perhaps I have become immune to a certain kind of tale about how badly a government is doing things.

When I was in London last year I found myself several times with persons who were moaning and groaning about the dreadful way things were being done by the British Government. And I said, "Wait a minute; let me tell you about things in Washington"; whereupon the Englishmen looked startled, and said, "For goodness' sake, don't. Let us at least have the comfort that government somewhere else is better." Wherever there is government you can be sure there is friction, ferment, fever, frustration, and a high heat of personal fury. It is so in Berlin and in Moscow, not only in London and Washington. I am not saying that things couldn't be better in Washington, or that efforts should not be insistent on making them better. But I do say that the measure of progress is not the temper of critical observers who watch Washington. Washington and the Nation are like a ship, and one could go from one part to another and find everywhere that the work isn't all going smoothly; that relations are not as they should be; that this corner is in need of overhaul; that morale of some individuals is low, and so on. And after such a round trip an observer might be tempted to say, "This ship is doomed." But the answer is not how the ship seems on the inside but what the day's run has been and what is the progress on the voyage. The ship of America has moved remarkably this past year, and

the prospect for a triumphant voyage is bright. That may not be the daily story in your newspapers or the topic of your Congressman's last speech. Well, judge for yourselves; take a look at the chart. See where you were a year ago tonight, what you were thinking and fearing about the voyage. Then look at the chart and see where you are tonight. And carry the lines of progress forward and see where they point for the year to come. Most of the news in your papers about Washington has been true enough. Washington is full of friction and conflict. But I don't think it would matter much who was running the Government, or with what personnel, Washington would still be full of friction and conflict, for that is the nature of any government I have been close to. The friction and conflict and criticism are all part of the process. They are not what matters most. What matters most is the voyage.

The truth is that beside friction and conflict there is something in great volume and high quality in Washington which doesn't make news, and so it isn't recognized enough. It is the loyalty and hard work of the persons who are here. If there is a harder-working city in the world than Washington, I never heard of it. That is a generalization, but I think it holds despite the exceptions. Men and women of ability toil long hours. They have to work harder, I grant you, because Government work always is frustrating. Nor is it well compensated, and certainly it does not bring much reward in praise and personal honor. The same hard work has been done not only in Washington, but wherever war work has been in hand. The fervor and public spirit of industrial management in this war has been, as a whole, a flowering of citizenship and ability of the highest order. The devotion of American workers in industry and on the farms has been steady and deep, and not enough gratitude has been expressed for that. I have said before that two most remarkable achievements this year have been the building of the American Army and the expansion of American war production. Any year that records them both is a great year in American history. Neither has been done without mistakes and delays, but they are there to see. And the Army is in Africa today, the Marines are on Guadalcanal, the Navy is active in all corners of the world, our planes are ranging over the Pacific, over Burma, China, and the homelands of the European axis. This is the fruit of tireless effort and of a leadership that has been both sound and imaginative. A year ago we had little inkling of it. And tonight, before we go into another year which is bound to bristle with incessant criticism like the old one, we can quite truthfully and gratefully think back over 1942 and take heart from it. It looks very much as though, being what we are, we are going to fulfill our destiny and not fall short of it.

Agricultural Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. O. B. H. Miller, of Winchester, Ind., a representative farmer of one of the most substantial agricultural communities in my State. I believe it reflects the calm judgment of a large proportion of the farmers of my State, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD for the benefit of all the Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator RAYMOND E. WILLIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIS: With the tremendous responsibility you are facing in this present session of Congress and after noting the contents of one of the circular letters sent out seeking views as to agricultural conditions, I thought it my personal duty to write this letter. I realize if the demand and need for food continues very long there will be a shortage which will be a very serious handicap in winning the war. I am a farmer and I have been observing the farmers and their activities in my own community for the past few years, especially since the soil-conservation program has been in operation. I believe what is true in my own community would be the experience, from a basic standpoint, of agriculture in general. Without Government planning and aid, farmers would have been producing foodstuffs of which perhaps the major part might have been in the hands of the speculator, but it would be available now in this emergency. Instead, they have been flirting with the farm program to the effect that by the time they received their benefit payments the money was spent and nothing to show for it. It was a live issue and was used more or less as a political football by some politicians. Now, this is water over the dam and by mistakes we benefit and should proceed more carefully.

Referring to your committee inquiry and question:

No. 1. If the selective-service boards continue to draft experienced farm labor as they have been doing, the result will be very disastrous. It is high time for the Manpower Commission to exercise their authority to retain experienced farm hands for the production of food, also the Commission should establish and control equitable wage scales to lessen the pressure on agriculture labor to go into industry. The boys in the armed forces have no choice as to wages.

No. 2. Let supply and demand with market guaranties insure necessary production and eliminate Government doles and subsidies from tax collected funds.

No. 3. If provisions are made to keep the present farm machinery in proper repair and it is efficiently operated, there is enough in use at the present time to keep up production.

No. 4. Industry figures labor costs in their finished products. In computing parity prices or production costs for farm products, why should they not be permitted the same privilege?

No. 5. Restrictions on farm transportation in present form promise to get top-heavy and may prove to be a hindrance on production.

No. 6. If the city press and some of the radio commentators would voice an honest and intelligent view of this price and labor situation one great cause for discouragement on the part of farmers would be removed. Farmers are working long, honest hours which have always been necessary to conduct successful agriculture, and under present conditions industrial labor should be appreciative enough of the present wage scale, to call a halt to some of their radical labor leaders and their ideas.

Farmers are becoming discouraged with the enormous agency that is being set up and employed to administer the program pertaining to agriculture, which has developed too much red tape and unnecessary requests and demands. Famers will give to the future as they have in the past, the best they have, if reasonably dealt with.

If this will be of any help to you in making future decisions you are welcome to it.

Yours for fair dealing for agriculture.

High Time To Shackle America's Greatest Saboteur, Our National Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I present for the attention of the House the following editorial, High Time To Shackle America's Greatest Saboteur, Our National Waste, appearing in the January 13 issue of the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call. Time is of the essence. The campaign against waste must be all-out and effective to win the war and keep faith with our fighting forces and allies.

The editorial follows:

During the 10-year boom of inflated prosperity that followed the First World War this land of plenty gained the none too laudable reputation of being the wealthiest nation in the world, and on its heels came the all too shameful reputation of being also the most wasteful. Even during the staggering depression that was the natural sequence of our wasteful and ridiculous excesses, waste still unbridled continued with wanton abandon, flagrantly exhibiting itself not only in the so-called upper crust of society but in our less materially fortunate strata of humankind as well, until it had even infected and dulled the minds of many of our elected representatives at Washington, with its false bootstrap doctrine of prosperity through scarcity. To such an unbelievable extent did it spread that even our trusted officials, blind to the God-given blessings of bumper crops to feed our hungry thousands, ordered those precious crops plowed under and thousands of pigs and other livestock slaughtered because they could see no immediate need, and were too blind to foresee the famine and pestilence to follow, too negligent to recall the eternal lesson which Joseph, Viceroy of Egypt, gave to the world in the days of Pharaoh, when with divine guidance he stored the surplus crops of Egypt's bounteous 7-year harvest to tide his people over the 7-year drought that was soon to plague a sorry world.

But now that the rationing of all foodstuffs is in sight on the home front in the hope of amply providing as we must for our own soldiers, sailors, and marines, and our long-suffering allies, who with the opening of spring will be with us on the march in the mightiest military struggle of all history, ready to sacrifice their lives, as many thousands surely will, to rid the world of Hitler and keep the Nazi menace from our shores, we will as a nation learn to our sorrow the bitter lesson that the wages of waste, like the wages of sin, is death.

Only a year ago, just prior to Pearl Harbor, it was estimated that there was enough food waste in this country annually to feed all the starving peoples of Europe whom Hitler has enslaved and methodically starved into submission. While this food waste has been

lessened since we entered the war, it is still said on good authority to be enormous, and must be checked.

But not only does this sin of waste apply to our foods, as we enter the second crucial year of the war, but also to every vital product needed for ammunition and implements of war, of which we are bound to face a shortage unless the leaks of waste are effectively stopped up; and in time of war, with the life of our Nation at stake as well as of our boys at the front, they must be stopped up forcefully lest we find no force left us in the final hour that spells victory or defeat. We, therefore, respectfully but emphatically urge our Government to take the bull by the horns and set the pace for the Nation in stopping the turbulent stream of Nation-wide waste that has its source in Washington.

For example, we are told a serious shortage of paper threatens on account of the war, but they should have added on account of waste, for hundreds of tons of paper could be saved daily by the simple innovation of using, instead of wasting, the reverse side of the millions of sheets of Government forms, reports, and letter which daily congest the mails throughout the Nation. Here is a proposal that would offend and hurt no one, and if the Government decreed it the people of America would willingly follow suit by also using both sides of their paper for every phase of our business and social correspondence. Any businessman of today who has been deluged from Washington with a constant flow of forms and reports and instructions during the year just past can realize the tremendous paper savings that would result from this one simple expedient.

When a business letter is only long enough to fill one page, as are the great majority, the reply to the sender could be usually just as effective written on the reverse side of same, instead of continuing the present peacetime practice of making every reply, no matter how brief, on a separate sheet. Here also would be an immediate paper saving of hundreds of daily tons.

We are told that already there is an acute shortage of oil on account of the war, and here in the East we need no further proof, but they should have added, on account of waste, for in one vital branch of the Government service here at home there appears to be a standing order to change the oil in every motor vehicle every 500 miles, whereas, with a simple oil-cleansing attachment, the oil in the thousands of vehicles affected could be used without any loss of efficiency twice and three times as long.

Months ago the American people were told of the shortage of iron and metals so essential to our war industries, but little was done to tap the vast stores of scrap metal lying in the dumps and vacant lots, in the attics and cellars, throughout every square mile of our vast domain, until the school children, with a patriotic enthusiasm that electrified their elders, organized the great youth army of Junior Commandos to do this vital job of collecting the millions of tons of wasted scrap for their country, and we can be proud here of the fact that our Paterson and north Jersey boys and girls were among the first of the Nation to blaze the way.

But there are still millions of tons of unused and rotting metals waiting to be collected and one large yet untapped source that everyone could spare in these days of scarce and slow driving are the front bumpers of the millions of pleasure cars that will do mighty little driving from now on until this war is won. Ninety-nine percent of the people of America would immediately donate this rich source of metals, now merely wasted deadweight, to turn into the munitions that will help save our Nation, for the mere asking of our Commander in Chief.

These and many other untouched sources of the precious metals and materials that will be needed by us this year in ever-increasing volume to speed the day of victory are at our Government's immediate disposal.

To fail to make use of them in this crucial year of the struggle for our survival may prove nothing less than criminal and disastrous waste, for which our boys at the front, like their predecessors at Wake Island, must tragically suffer.

We must stop the waste in every town, in every home and on every front, or the waste will stop us in our tracks, on our last mile to victory.

The Morning Call, therefore, urges upon our authorities in Washington the immediate launching of a national antiwaste campaign that will give to our fighting forces this year, in the shortest possible time, the tools that are going to be so desperately needed by our boys at the front to save themselves, their Nation, and their world.

Congress Can Save Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, in his article in this week's Collier's Magazine, entitled "Congress Can Save Itself," Representative ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, has had the courage to scotch a snake, to strip an idol of its glittering tinfoil, and to tell the truth.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE—AN ANCHOR

A long-time clerk and later speaker of the finest parliamentary body in the world—if you do not know, it is the House of Representatives of the State of Vermont, which follows rules and sustains its speaker who abides thereby—jealous of everything and anything which interferes with, abrogates, or minimizes pure parliamentary procedure, I am not going to talk at any length about parliamentary law and procedure, the necessity for rules and their strict enforcement, the prestige and power and protection of the minority afforded by the rules themselves, but I am going to say that one of the most devastating things ever done to this country and the prestige and power of Congress, as represented by the House of Representatives, was accomplished exactly as Congressman GORE sets forth in his article.

THE POWER OF THE SPEAKER

It was a sad, sad day for representative government, and it has been ever since, when the champion of parliamentary law, its exponent in personam, was laid in the dust by those horsemen insurgents who did the country irreparable damage by riding rough-shod over the body of America as they did.

I was present in the gallery of the House as a spectator when Representative Norris, of Nebraska, and his crackpot insurgent followers stripped the then Speaker of the House of Representatives of that power and prestige which had always theretofore been enjoyed by that presiding officer of the coordinate branch of this Government, third only in rank to the President; destroyed and never since that day enjoyed by reason of the action then taken.

I do not agree with all that my distinguished colleague from Tennessee suggests as to procedure, but his idea is all right and much of what he says is in line with what the minority has been trying to do and to accomplish for several years as evidenced by speeches made and by bills introduced by Representatives DIRKSEN and TABER, and others on our side of the aisle.

DESTRUCTIVE DEVASTATION OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

I am sure that cooperative and concerted action on the part of those who are jealous of the rights and power and reputation of the House, and particularly of the power which should belong in the Speaker as the representative of this coordinate branch of the Government, will accomplish much to retrieve that which was lost on that sad day to which Representative GORE has referred.

So I am including, under permission to extend my remarks, a copy of the article by Representative GORE, which appeared in Collier's for January 16, and which everybody who believes in the system of checks and balances in our Government may well take time to read and profit by the reading.

What Congress needs is to have its valves ground and the carbon cleaned out. The old motor has lost its zing. Congress, in other words, should reorganize itself. Its fundamental design is good but it should step up its efficiency. It must reach a swift, sure pace to keep up with current events and to keep its place in our three-cornered system of government.

I hope I'm not being presumptuous in making such a dogmatic statement. I'm not precisely a congressional veteran, but that may only give me greater objectivity in approaching the problem of what's wrong with our legislative branch. I am, after all, in my fifth year of service and I have studied the situation as extensively as I could because I've been disturbed by Congress' loss of prestige. Our democracy would be a farce without a strong, dignified, and lively Congress.

Congress has reorganized, or allowed to be reorganized, both other branches of the Government. In the fury of fighting over the so-called Supreme Court packing bill, many of us overlooked the fact that court procedures actually were revised rather extensively by the legislation, although the proposal to increase the number of Justices was defeated. And twice the President has been given considerable authority to remold the executive end of our Government. Only Congress has been untouched and is still plodding along with the methods and ceremonies of 50 years ago.

Asking Congress to modernize itself is like expecting a dentist to pull his own tooth, but I believe it could be done with little pain, compared to the advantages to be gained from it.

Congress should, it seems to me, take three definite steps: First, it should hire itself a staff of specialists in each of the major areas of public welfare. These experts would not represent the biased view of bureaus or private groups, but just what Congress represents—the public. Second, it should reorganize its committees to end the confusion and complexities which now tie us down. Third, it should give more power and responsibility to its leaders, the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the

Senate, bestowing upon them authority to speak for Congress in formation of national policy and to preserve the integrity of Congress.

In behalf of Congress, it should be said that much of the criticism and contempt has not been leveled at Congress alone, but vaguely at something called Washington, of which Congress is only a part. The institution is blamed in the abstract for the confusion and contradiction emanating from the Capital. In short, Congress takes the rap for many things of which it is innocent.

For instance, a person who had become confused by conflicting statements on the draft asked me, "Why doesn't Congress clear up this confusion?" Another person wrote me ridiculing Congress for being so slow in passing a pending bill, but later, when he became dissatisfied with the administration of the law, he cussed Congress for ever passing such an infernal law.

Nevertheless, there are basic reasons why Congress has steadily declined in public popularity and power, and the need for an overhaul job is clear. The fact is that Congress has failed to keep step with national development. Appropriations for the Federal Government leaped from a little more than $1,000,000,000 in 1916 to over $13,000,000,000 in 1940. Yet Congress has remained the simple, parliamentary body that was conceived by the founding fathers. So Congress has become wholly unable to function on an equal footing with the ever-swollen executive branch of the Government. Circumstances have been too much for Congress.

Even the initiation of legislation—certainly a basic function of any legislature—is now mostly in the hands of executive bureaus and agencies. Rarely does Congress pass an important law that does not originate in some executive agency. Today, executive officials not only draft legislative proposals and submit them to Congress, but they use the facilities and overwhelming strength of the executive branch to push and persuade the people and Congress to their points of view.

According to Dr. Floyd M. Riddick, in the first session of the Seventy-fifth Congress—a typical session—no less than 271 drafts of proposed bills were fed into the congressional hopper, after having been sent to the hill by the heads of departments, bureaus, and commissions. Many of them became law as they came to us.

This is a far cry from the attitude of the Senate in 1908, when a terrible row was created because a Cabinet officer had sent to the Senate the draft of a proposed bill. The Senate indignantly ordered the bill sent back and adopted a rule ordering all gratuitous executive communications returned unless transmitted through the President.

Perhaps the most ironical reflection to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was uttered by Representative MONRONEY last year while speaking in support of a bill I had offered as a substitute for the administration-sponsored price control bill. He said, "There is criticism attached to this substitute bill, a blight that I am afraid may kill it, according to the popular conception on Capitol Hill, and that is that the bill originated in Congress."

Then, in the field of public relations, vital in a democracy, the legislative branch is at a distinct disadvantage. The Executive, fully realizing the power of public opinion, has become extremely skillful in shaping and controlling it. The Presidential press conference, invented by President Wilson and adopted and improved by President Roosevelt, has become a terrific propaganda weapon. When our President speaks, whoever he may be, the world listens and absorbs. He can bring public opinion to bear upon a Congress in a most potent manner.

A WEAKNESS IN PUBLICITY

Even with the heads of executive departments and agencies, Congress is painfully handicapped in public relations. The heads of these agencies speak with authority, and their names and words make news. If, for instance, the Secretary of the Treasury makes a statement on the tax bill, it is carried to the whole country. A score of Congressmen may make statements of equal profundity and even more sense, but nobody pays much attention.

The proceedings of Congress are open to the public, press, and radio. The routine sessions seldom make headlines; a crackpot idea or an intemperate speech usually does, and Congress takes a blast of ridicule, for all such utterances are for some reason considered typical of the whole body. But the deliberations and discussions of an executive agency are closed to the public eye and ear. If some participant in the discussion has a wildly ludicrous quirk of mind, it is not broadcast to the country to make the whole conference look foolish. Only the result of the conference, a carefully worked-out program, dripping with dignity, is released.

On the other hand, Congress is frequently used as a whipping boy. For instance, Secretary Morgenthau now criticizes Congress for not having enacted a compulsory-savings program. Though the public has forgotten it, Members of Congress know that this is the same Mr. Morgenthau who for months resisted every effort to pass such legislation.

On last May 11, I introduced a carefully drawn compulsory-savings bill and it received a very favorable public response. Three days later Speaker RAYBURN told me that Secretary Morgenthau had called, expressing concern lest such a move hinder the bond sale program, and he wondered if I would not "lay low" on the subject as a matter of cooperation. I did.

On Labor Day, for another notable instance, the President gave Congress perhaps the most severe castigation of any President in American history. He undertook to blame Congress for its failure to enact a proper bill to combat inflation, without mentioning the fact that Congress passed the bill he then wanted and which he signed into law, and without mentioning that several months ago, the Administration itself brought about the defeat of the very kind of over-all price-control bill we are now accused of having stalled.

The President not only blamed the Congress for both its action and inaction but said he would impose an over-all control, similar to that previously opposed, unless Congress acted by October 1. So Congress was scolded by the press and the public as well as by the President for doing almost precisely what the President wanted done. A few Members publicly pointed out that Congress, though mistaken, had acted upon what it supposed was excellent advice, but this did not even dent public opinion.

So in an age marked by rapid changes and quick decisions, Congress is finding itself at an increasing disadvantage, as traditional legislative procedure clashes with a well-oiled, well-staffed, and organized executive branch with its myriad bureaus, commissions, and boards.

Now, how can Congress regain its rightful place as an independent branch of the Government and recapture public esteem? Obviously, such a significant political metamorphosis cannot be wrought quickly or without conflict. The more one studies the problem, the more difficult the task appears, and yet the deeper becomes one's conviction that unless it is to become even more impotent, Congress must open its eyes and face the problem with courage and intelligence.

In wartime, Congress has an egg-walking job. If Congress fails to perform the legislative functions necessary for victory, the President, though against his will, would be driven to an assumption of such powers. On the other hand, Congress cannot abdicate its constitutional responsibilities. What it can—and must—do is make itself more efficient, so that it can handle the responsibilities it will have if it is in fact independent and undominated.

SPECIALISTS COME IN HANDY

Executive agencies, whatever their shortcomings, are fully staffed with specialists in all fields. Congress has not thus modernized itself, and the bureaus consequently speak with more assurance and respectability. At committee hearings on a proposal from some bureau, the bureau presents exhaustive statistics and smooth arguments to establish its viewpoint. Then the skilled advocates of special interests and groups particularly affected by the bill present their side of the question.

It is a rare sight indeed when someone appears before a congressional committee with a disinterested viewpoint. This is not to say that the bureau misrepresents the facts. It presents its point of view, and bureaus have a habit of becoming overenthusiastic about their particular field of endeavor. At any rate, everybody gets ardent and skillful representation except the general public, the one group that should get a special break.

Of course, Members of Congress are supposed to be guardians of the general welfare. Many are, but heavy duties and many problems make it impossible for individual Members to study every proposal in detail. They need help—help of their own. This help could be provided by an efficient, strictly nonpartisan staff of trained specialists and analysts, assuring the presentation of at least one factual, unprejudiced viewpoint, and supplying the necessary information for policy and program planning—the first step in making Congress efficient.

I would go further and give to the principal minority party (whichever it might be) a staff of its own to assist it in developing a political program. A stronger minority opposition would make for a stronger and better majority performance. But, of course, this may as well be forgotten, because no party in power would want to strengthen the opposition party. It would be helpful, though.

In overhauling the congressional committee system, the committees should be set up along the broad lines of policy, program planning, and functional need. As an example of the duplication and frustration in the present committee system, let us take fiscal affairs: Any one of several committees in both the House and the Senate can consider and report bills authorizing appropriations. Any one of several different subcommittees can consider and report appropriation bills, and yet, in both the Senate and the House, entirely different committees must consider and report tax bills.

This confusion is still further confounded by the Bureau of the Budget being a purely executive agency. In this situation, how could Congress have a fiscal policy or follow it, if it had one? Impossible.

But what is even more essential is for the legislative branch to become more coherent in its relationships with the executive branch, and this is where its leaders must be made stronger. Unless Congress can unify in support of its basic rights and in giving authority and responsibility to its agents to defend them effectively, domination will continue to be its lot.

Before the revolt which overthrew "Speaker Czarism," led by the then young Representative George W. Norris against the legislative reign of former Speaker Joe Cannon, the Speaker of the House of Representatives actually was second only to the President in power and prestige, and he frequently

exercised even more influence over legislation. Overthrow of the system undoubtedly resulted in more democracy within the House, but it just as surely denuded the leadership of Congress of sufficient authority to maintain its position as a coequal branch in the American political system.

True, there are majority leaders in both the House and the Senate, but they have no authority other than that arising out of party organization. Too, the party having a majority in Congress has usually held the Presidency also, so the majority leaders have been, for the most part, men satisfactory to the President. Under such circumstances, the majority leaders, quite understandably, are more truly spokesmen for the White House than for the Congress.

A NEW POLICY NEEDED

These leaders—the Speaker and the President pro tempore—should represent all Congress in defending it against encroachments, preserving its power in the general governmental situation and making it a leader rather than a docile follower in national policy and planning. To mitigate this concentration of authority in leadership, strong joint House and Senate committees on policy and program should be created to work constantly with these leaders empowered to aid as well as check use of power.

In this way, Congress could exercise some initiative in solving the Nation's problems, thereby adopting the surest way to get public confidence and avoid domination by the executive branch of the Government.

This suggested plan of action need not result in a battle between the executive and legislative branches for prestige and power. It would not strip down the executive branch; it would only build up the Congress, which I consider absolutely necessary to democracy.

Aberdeen's Scientific Contribution to the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, sometime in December, as a member of the Truman committee, in company with several of my colleagues, I made a visit to the Aberdeen Proving Ground, at Aberdeen, Md. The visit on that occasion was not only interesting and educational in character but was amazing. I recommend that every Member of the Senate make a like journey to Aberdeen to see the great contribution that the men of the Army, of the Ordnance Department, and of science are making to our war effort.

In this connection, Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Aberdeen's Scientific Contribution to the War Effort."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The importance of science in the present war is a matter of common knowledge. The very existence of England as a free country has been authoritatively attributed to the development by British physicists of new apparatus for airplane detection. This enabled the powerful English Spitfires to fly aloft in time to shoot down the attacking German bombers.

While many scientific agencies and laboratories are devoting all their efforts to the war, the scientific work carried on at the Aberdeen Proving Ground is of especial interest because it pertains to phenomena and uses techniques which are not encountered in the civilian scientific laboratories.

In the field of electricity, the speed of a bullet traveling at nearly a mile a second is measured by the small transient currents produced by the bullet and timed with astonishing precision. In the field of aerodynamics the complicated force system of the swiftly moving projectile or bomb has to be measured by special techniques. The pressure in a gun as it goes off and the pressures near an exploding bomb have to be recorded accurately even though they last only a thousandth of a second.

Even if suitable civilian scientific laboratories were prepared to carry on the type of work needed in the design and development of the weapons of war, the time factor alone renders it imperative that the Military Establishment have under its direct control a competent scientific organization to deal with these matters. New offensive weapons to surprise the enemy must be continually developed and weapons or armaments to neutralize the new enemy weapons also. The more rapidly these developments are brought about the more effective they will be on the field of battle. To obtain the utmost rapidity, an organization under the direct control of the Army is essential. Such an organization is to be found at the Army's Aberdeen Proving Ground, which has been visited and inspected frequently by Members of the Congress.

The Army Ordnance Department's Aberdeen Proving Ground is under the command of Maj. Gen. C. T. Harris, Jr. Its training center, which was brought to a high state of efficiency under the direction of Brig. Gen. J. S. Hatcher, provides skilled men for the supply and maintenance of arms; its proving center, under the command of Col. W. B. Hardigg, looks to the quality of the weapons. The proving center has two distinct divisions to look after two logically different phases of quality: The proof division, under the command of Col. G. G. Eddy, which tests currently produced ammunition, guns, and tanks and carries on the engineering and development work of new models; and the ballistic research laboratory under the directorship of Lt. Col. Leslie E. Simon, which furnishes fundamental design data for new weapons, firing and bombing tables, and carries on the more highly scientific phases of research and development.

The data furnished enable the designer to calculate how long and how strong a gun must be to give the projectile the required velocity, what velocity the projectile must have to attain the desired range, and what striking velocity it must have to penetrate the steel armor or concrete at the target. The firing tables tell the artilleryman how to point his gun to hit the distant target, making allowance for wind and the varying air density. The bombing tables tell the bombardier in the flying fortress how to set his bomb sight that the released bomb may hit the enemy battleship.

The design data and the firing and bombing tables depend upon the science of ballistics. This is the science of the motion of the projectile and powder in the gun (interior ballistics), of the motion of the projectile in the air (exterior ballistics), and of the motion of the projectile and its fragments at the target (terminal ballistics). The quality of our weapons and the accuracy of the firing and bombing tables depend to a large extent upon the state of ballistic science as developed at the ballistic research laboratory.

The laboratory has a staff of competent scientists many of whom have devoted many years to special phases of ballistics. Those who have joined the staff more recently are well qualified for work in this field because of their outstanding achievements in the sciences upon which ballistics depends: Mathematics, physics, astrophysics, aerodynamics, and physical chemistry. The staff members have adequate facilities: Office laboratories supplied with gas, water, compressed air, scientific apparatus, and special instruments for experimental work, and a panel board which supplies alternating current of any desired frequency as well as direct current, connections to experimental ranges, and connections to special measurement services which measure time in millionths of a second and distance in microns.

For the computation of firing, bombing, and other ballistic tables the laboratory has the most modern labor- and time-saving equipment: the Bush differential analyzer and the automatic Hollerith card-punching machines.

When Lt. Col. Leslie E. Simon, the director of the laboratory, was asked how the Ordnance Department succeeded in assembling such a modern plant and such specialized equipment so early in the war, he promptly replied that it had not been done during the war. This valuable asset to the Nation in a time of peril is due to American support of science and especially to the vision and foresight of his predecessor, Col. H. H. Zornig. In the years of peace Ordnance officers spent nights and Sundays drawing up detailed plans for the laboratory, its staff, and its relations with peacetime civilian science.

In peacetime the Government could not afford the expense of maintaining a large staff of competent scientists in the field of ballistics. The small staff, including such men as Kent and Dederick, had done a great deal of important work and had accumulated a considerable store of ballistic knowledge which had borne fruit in sound ordnance design and satisfactory firing and bombing tables. To supplement the slender staff and to advise the director and staff in scientific matters a scientific advisory committee was appointed. The following eminent scientists have now been serving on this committee for several years:

H. L. Dryden, Bureau of Standards, president, Institute of Aeronautical Sciences.

A. W. Hull, research laboratory, General Electric Co., president-elect of the American Physical Society.

Bernard Lewis, physical chemist, United States Bureau of Mines.

I. I. Rabi, physicist, Columbia University.

H. C. Urey, chemist, Columbia University, Nobel prize winner in chemistry.

H. N. Russell, astrophysicist, Princeton University.

J. von Neumann, mathematician, the Institute for Advanced Study.

Theodore von Karman, director, Guggenheim School of Aeronautics, California Institute of Technology.

These scientists have made many important contributions, in the form of suggestions and criticisms and in advice regarding personnel.

The outbreak of the war required the swiftest enlargement of the laboratory's staff consistent with efficient absorption of new personnel, in order to bring its vital services to maximum efficiency. At an early stage the services of Prof. Oswald Veblen of the Institute for Advanced Study were secured. Through his long leadership in the scientific world he knows not only a great proportion of the best scientists but also their work and its relation to other war-essential activities. He was of great service in selecting and recruiting competent personnel and in explaining to them the importance of their playing a vital role in the obscurity of the laboratory, rather than accepting some more obvious and prominent war work. In this way the laboratory's staff

has been greatly strengthened by the addition of such men as Hubble of the Mount Wilson Observatory, Johnson of the Bartol Foundation, Lemon of the University of Chicago, Mayer of Columbia, McShane of the University of Virginia, and Webster of Leland Stanford.

Under war conditions it was important not only to swiftly augment the laboratory's staff but to alter the nature of its work. In all-out war effort the abilities and capacities of all civilian agencies should be used to the greatest extent practicable. The National Defense Research Committee (N. D. R. C.) and later the Office of Scientific Research and Development (O. S. R. D.) were formed by the President to facilitate this work on a huge scale. These agencies turned to the Ballistic Research Laboratory first as a repository of ballistic information and as a source of practical advice; and later began to look to it for assistance in defining problems and in swiftly getting the products of their scientific research into practical form for useful fighting tools. Here they found men who spoke their language, in whom they had confidence, and an institution close to the firing line whose practicality was proved. On its part the Ballistic Research Laboratory welcomes the cooperation of the National Defense Research Committee and has recommended the initiation of various National Defense Research Committee projects. It has found the scientific data obtained from the National Defense Research Committee of the utmost importance in its work.

The proof division has two main functions; first, the development and research on new weapons, automotive vehicles, and ammunition, and, second, the testing of guns, automotive vehicles, and ammunition. It is the engineering proving ground of the Ordnance Department where the "bugs" are taken out of new designs and where the quality level of production is established for new manufacturers of ordnance matériel.

To provide direct liaison with the combat arms and to obtain at the earliest possible moment the opinions of these arms on the military features of the new weapons, representatives of these arms are stationed at the proving ground and witness the development tests.

The instruments of the proof division have to be highly specialized and as modern as the new designs on which measurements are taken. Their concept can arise only with men who have devoted a major portion of their lives to the development and testing of munitions. Many of them have been developed jointly by the proving ground and leading industrial laboratories and have led to precision developments which will later pay dividends in peacetime industry. As a large part of the instruments is associated with violent phenomena which exist for very short times, it is quite natural that modern electronics should be important in their construction. The time of travel of a projectile between two points (from which velocity is inferred) can be measured to a hundred thousandth of a second and automatically recorded in a distant building. The burning time of an antiaircraft fuze can be measured with like accuracy and absence of effort or human fallibility. The drawbar pull of tanks, rate of fire of guns, and other operating characteristics are taken with utmost precision, not just because such methods promote good engineering discipline but because precision of measurement reduces the number of measurements which must be made, thereby reducing the time and cost, and because proving-ground test measurements must be correct to inches, in order to assure field performance correct to yards.

As its name implies, one of the jobs of the proof division is the test of ammunition, tanks, and guns. To conserve material and to obtain the maximum of information from a minimum of tests, scientific statistical methods have been introduced by Colonel Eddy into the formulation of specification requirements and the analysis of the results of tests. These methods have been conspicuously successful in the test of armor plate and of powder. In the very nature of the case, however, many preliminary tests of a nondestructive nature are made to satisfy the exacting military requirements, the final test has to be made under conditions simulating service conditions on the field of battle as closely as possible. The armor of the tank must be shot at and the powder must be fired in the gun. If all the pieces of armor were fired at, there wouldn't be any left for the tanks. If no armor is shot at, there would be no degree of assurance that any of it would stand up under the enemy fire. To strike the just balance between firing at everything and firing at nothing, calls for the assistance that statistical science can give. This assistance has been most effectively utilized in the proof division. As a consequence of the application of these statistical techniques, the Army is now receiving better armor plate with approximately one-half of the testing previously employed. The savings in material should result in considerable increase in tank production.

The major function of the proof division is research and development in the weapons of war. Pilot models of new weapons are brought to the proving ground for test. As a rule, defects and weaknesses are discovered. The proof division analyzes the results, suggests modifications, which are quickly made in the shops of the proving ground, and the modified weapon is tested again. In this way rapid progress is made in perfecting the weapon to the point that it is ready for the field of battle. The development of armor plate and its fabrication is an outstanding illustration of this procedure. At the beginning of the war all tanks were of riveted construction. Tests made at Aberdeen and elsewhere indicated the undesirable features of this type of construction and work was started by the Ordnance Department, in collaboration with industry, on the welding of armor plate. That this development has succeeded is shown by the fact that all tanks now manufactured by the Ordnance Department are of welded construction.

Many of Aberdeen's scientific contributions to the war cannot be told until after the victory, because they are a part of the present "secret weapons." However, some of these weapons have wrought so much destruction upon the enemy that they are already well known, at least to him. Statistical methods for the analysis of acceptance tests which the proving ground has brought into actual use during this war have saved millions of dollars, thousands of precious man-days, and have improved ammunition quality. The success of the Flying Fortresses in shooting the enemy pursuit out of the sky is due in no small part to exacting experiments conducted at Aberdeen employing precision techniques and involving long hours of painstaking labor over the waters of the Chesapeake Bay. In this precision work cognizance was taken even of the bending of the machine-gun barrel in the slipstream of the airplane. The results speak for themselves. Pursuit craft have been forced to flee from our bombers. Urgent jobs have been swiftly done on tanks and combat cars to adapt them to beachhead landing in time for immediate use by our combat forces. The antiaircraft fire controlled by directors using the cam data provided by the Ballistic Research Laboratory has been found effective against the Japanese bombers to a most gratifying degree. Aside from human life, almost any one of these accomplishments would pay for the entire cost of the organization many times over. Firing tables, bombing tables, or cam data for every type of gun, ammunition, bomb, or fire-control device have been supplied on time (firing by the Proof Division, computation by the Ballistic Research Laboratory). These are some of Aberdeen's scientific contributions to the war effort.

Air Power Continues To Prove Its Worth in Winning the War for the United States and the Allied Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in all sectors of this global war the strength of air power is proving its value for victory. In this connection I herewith include a statement issued by William H. Byington, Jr., chairman of the Aviation League of the United States, Inc.:

In order to confirm these statements of the two pioneer advocates of air power "to make America supreme in the air," the late Rear Admiral Bradley A. Fiske and the late Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell, we are giving some incidents and disasters of the present world war.

When Poland, a nation of over 30,000,000 people, was conquered and destroyed by Hitler in 1939, there were nearly 2,000,000 well-trained and well-armed Poles ready to protect their country. They tried to stop this Nazi invasion backed up by a small air force. They were unsuccessful as Hitler first attacked with planes, bombing cities, airports, and landing fields and at the same time strafing troops with machine gun fire from these same planes. The airports and landing fields were destroyed and the few planes that the Poles had available were unable to take off, which made the conquest of Poland only a matter of days. The Poles didn't need soldiers or battleships to stop the Nazis and could not use them but begged both France and England for planes. Unfortunately, neither of these countries could send planes as they did not have them, although both countries had known for years that war with Nazi Germany was inevitable, but made no effort to build up an air force in the face of repeated warnings as to what was taking place inside Germany. After inspecting the air forces of the different European powers, Lindbergh told both countries that the Nazis were building plane after plane and had the strongest air force in the world at that time. He was discredited and called a Nazi sympathizer, among other things. France depended on her supposedly mighty manpower army and England depended on her supposedly invincible navy.

When Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and northern France were overrun by the Nazis it looked bad for the French and English. What happened? France kept calling for planes from America. The commanding general begged for planes, and the last despairing cry of officers and men before France went down to an inglorious defeat was: "Planes! Give us planes!" France did not beg for soldiers. They did not need manpower. They had millions of well-trained and well-armed men in the field backing up the supposedly impregnable Maginot Line. France didn't ask for battleships and cruisers. They had one of the strongest navies in the world—which couldn't help them. What they did not have were planes and horsepower when they needed them most. France could have been saved with planes but was helpless without horsepower.

The English were forced to retreat to Britain and were able to continue the fight with the few planes that the Royal Air Force could muster. However, the bombing of London and other cities forced the English into a night and day production on horsepower and all types of military planes. This

all takes time and the Royal Air Force was handicapped by the small output of planes, but was able to save the British Isles with this horsepower while the production was increased and more pilots were being trained.

A hectic program was started here to build all types of military planes well over a year after France and England entered the war. This was done in order to make up for the time that we had lost when we should have been building up our air forces. In the meantime, the fate of Britain was in the balance but we were able to send over more planes that had been ordered for our Army and Navy, and others that had been bought from air lines and individuals. By that time we had increased our production of planes to such an extent that we were able, during the following year, to send aerial horsepower throughout the world.

And now to our own country, where the damage and destruction wrought by the Japs at Pearl Harbor a year ago, the details of which have just been made known to the public by the Navy Department.

This damage and destruction was accomplished in 90 minutes by the Japs using the horsepower in 21 torpedo planes, 48 dive bombers, and 36 horizontal bombers with a few hundred men. A total of 2,343 of our Army and Navy officers and enlisted men were killed, 1,272 were wounded, and 960 sailors and marines are still reported as missing. Ten warships, including 5 battleships, were sunk or seriously crippled; 3 other battleships and 5 other warcraft were damaged so severely that they could serve no military purpose for a considerable time. Everyone of the battleships in Pearl Harbor was a victim of Jap bombs from Jap planes from Jap aircraft carriers, not shells from Jap battleships or cruisers.

The loss of the warships was not all. Installations and a large floating drydock were blasted into wreckage; 177 Army and Navy planes were lost and 70 more were disabled. A Navy spokesman said, "Sixty or seventy fighter planes able to get into the sky would have saved the day; they could have shot the Japs out of the sky. But there was no adequate air support for the fleet." Why? Who should have supplied this air support? The Army or the Navy? The answer is an independent and separate United States Air Force. England, Canada, and Germany all have independent and effective air forces, organized as a separate military unit.

Now to the South Pacific, where the Dutch and their allies were fighting desperately to hold Java in the last days of February 1942. Daily came such pleas as the following trans-Pacific telephone request from Ensign Edgar F. Hazelton, Jr., in Batavia to his father: "I'm sure that we can hold Java if you can only send us some planes—fighting planes, dive bombers, bombers, planes of every sort." Once more, while it is a far cry from France, Poland, and England, horsepower could also have saved Java.

We have shown what has been done with aerial horsepower to date in this war; in spite of these facts most of the leaders of our armed forces want this war won with manpower—with soldiers in hand-to-hand fighting in ground attacks. They still figure that wars are won at the point of the bayonet with manpower. French and British generals also felt this way at the start of this war.

Our naval leaders feel certain that this war will be won on the seas, forgetting that battleships, armored cruisers, and other war craft have proven obsolete in the face of an aerial attack without the protection of a strong air force. The sinking of the British battleship *Prince of Wales* and the armored cruiser *Repulse* proves this, not mentioning the losses of other ships in both the British and our own Navy through aerial attack. The whole British Navy could not keep the Nazis out of England, but the Royal Air Force—small as it was at that time—did this with aerial horsepower.

We can and will win this war with horsepower, as we are the greatest creators and builders of horsepower in the world and can produce thousands of horsepower overnight. It takes just so long to produce manpower and you cannot cut this time very much. Allowing so many years for babyhood, childhood, and boyhood, then after a total of 18 years you have a man. With from 6 to 12 months more of military training you have a soldier—1 manpower. While we can create and build thousands of horsepower overnight, we are not able to make future soldiers or manpower in any less time.

"Only God can make a man" and "Only God can make a tree."

A Nazi or a Jap coolie hasn't much to live for, as they are born to become cannon fodder or manpower in a dictator's army. Our Army, on the other hand, is composed of educated, liberty-loving, and patriotic Americans from all walks of life, who have become soldiers in this fight for freedom. Let's not draft a larger army than we can possibly find use for at this time. This is causing an unnecessary shortage of manpower in many essential and other important industries. This manpower is more effective and is worth much more on the industrial line building horsepower or planes to fight the Nazis and the Japs than it is on a battle line being shot at by these same Nazis and Japs. We have the manpower to build this horsepower which will enable the Allied Nations to win this war quickly, but we haven't any manpower to needlessly waste or sacrifice on any battle line.

We need a strong Navy and a strongly mechanized Army and the strongest and greatest air force in the world. This air force, which should be a separate branch of our armed forces, would make it easier for our Army and Navy to do their part in winning this war with fewer men and ships and, in the end, smaller losses in both men and ships.

We must and will win this war quickly with a minimum loss of American lives provided we keep ample manpower at home building horsepower. Horsepower will win this war! Horsepower for a speedy victory!

AVIATION LEAGUE OF
THE UNITED STATES,
By WILLIAM H. BYINGTON, Jr., *Chairman.*
DECEMBER 15, 1942.

World Trade—Final Declaration of the Twenty-ninth National Foreign Trade Convention

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the final declaration of the Twenty-ninth National Foreign Trade Convention, held at Boston, Mass., October 7, 8, and 9, 1942. As a reflection of the views, by and large, of American industrialists and businessmen generally, the final declaration of the 1942 convention is a valuable guide to public opinion on questions which ultimately must engage the serious consideration of Members of Congress. We cannot too early decide the broad lines of our post-war foreign commercial policy. The part that private enterprise must continue to take in the development and expansion of its external commerce must be adapted to a reconstruction of world trade relations. It is my belief that domestic economic security is attainable only through international cooperation and the defeat of all isolationist tendencies. I am advised that the manuscript will make approximately three pages of the RECORD, and will cost $135.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINAL DECLARATION OF THE TWENTY-NINTH NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE CONVENTION

Now that we are at war, we face the necessity of defending the Nation against the ruthless aggressiveness of the Axis Powers. The defeat of these enemies is the supreme pu pose of all our people. Th convention pledges its support to the Government in its task of utilizing most effectively the entire resources of the Nation behind the fighting forces. Superior economic power will play a decisive part in the attainment of victory, in a war of production for backing up the armed services.

Our foreign trade is an integral part of the national war economy. Imports of strategic materials, and the supply to our Allies of war and other necessities, are of vital importance. Our external trade also is indispensable as a means of bringing relief to friendly nations to whom we are so closely bound by a common interest in the future destiny of the world. Shut off from their normal sources, our exports supply their pressing needs, and the loss of a part of their former markets is largely compensated by our increased imports from them.

During a war which presages great economic changes, the convention reaffirms its adherence to the following program which embodies the fundamental principles of international trade and commerce:

1. RECONSTRUCTION OF WORLD TRADE RELATIONS

Reconstruction policies should have as a primary purpose the rehabilitation of the world economy, by which the individual nations may in turn share in the fruits of increased world prosperity. Opportunity for private enterprise is indispensable to any lasting peace. This opportunity can exist only if our national policy avoids both isolationism and regimentation.

As stated in the final declaration of last year, the emergency measures so widely adopted in the last post-war period were nationalistic and discriminatory. Trade bilateralization, barter, exchange manipulation, quotas and licenses, export subsidies, excessive and preferential tariffs, and other devices, were the practices generally adopted. These prevented the normal flow of international commerce and the expansion of production and its wider distribution, causing a definite setback in the improvement of the standards of living throughout the world. We are fighting for a peace which will bring freedom from these trade restrictions, and for the open door to the rehabilitating processes of sound reconstruction measures.

The convention reaffirms its adherence to the principle of nondiscriminatory, multilateral trade, and expresses agreement with the declaration contained in the Anglo-American agreement of February 23, 1942. This agreement provides for early conversation between the parties, including subsequent signatories of similar agreements, and other like-minded governments, with a view to determining the best means of attaining the stated objectives.

Steps should be initiated now to establish the proper basis on which these multilateral adjustments can be made.

A formula should be agreed upon for the abandonment of discriminatory bilateral trading and the adjustment of uneconomic tariffs, having proper regard for the maintenance of the standards of living in the participating countries. The convention believes the reciprocal trade-agreements program should be continued in force.

2. PLANNING POST-WAR POLICIES

The convention requests the National Foreign Trade Council to confer with local export bodies, national associations, and trade organizations, and to form a council committee on foreign trade reconstruction.

This committee should seek to coordinate the recommendations and planning of all foreign trade interests concerned with policies for the post-war protection and expansion of our foreign trade.

The services of this committee should be offered to the Government agencies and committees that are engaged in devising post-war economic measures, so as to utilize, in cooperation with the Government, the advice and experience of private enterprise in world markets.

3. MONETARY POLICY AND EXCHANGE STABILIZATION

At the present time, the monetary policy of this country and of the other United Nations, must of necessity, be concerned primarily with the financing of the war. In accomplishing this objective, every effort should be made to minimize and control inflation, for otherwise war production will be impaired and the difficulties of post-war economic reconstruction will be intensified.

What stabilization of price levels is to war finance, stabilization of the exchanges is to post-war reconstruction. World trade cannot be fully revived or prosper in the face of abnormal fluctuation of exchange rates.

Post-war currency stabilization is not to be achieved by itself alone. It is dependent upon sound domestic budget, monetary and price policies, liberal trade policies, and procedures designed to avoid violent business disturbances. It depends also upon the firm resolution and commitment of a people to maintain the stability of its currency. This commitment was a major virtue of the gold standard. It resisted the whims and prejudices of political pressures better than any other mechanism so far devised.

For these reasons, we reaffirm our confidence in the international gold standard and our belief that, in order to reestablish post-war trade, the stabilization of world currencies should continue to receive the careful consideration of responsible Government officials.

4. GOVERNMENT CONTROLS AFFECTING EXPORT TRADE

United war effort requires close cooperation between Government and business in the regulation of our foreign trade, and the utilization of established American commercial shipping and financial services throughout the world. The existing structure of private enterprise must be utilized, in the joint effort of government and business, to maintain our war efforts and our commercial relations with friendly nations.

The convention, accordingly, requests the National Foreign Trade Council to continue to advocate to the Government the necessity for such cooperative effort. Those experienced in industry, commerce, finance, and transportation, can be of great assistance in establishing simplified, practical controls, with the opportunities now given to express their views prior to the imposition of new regulations.

While agreeing that certain controls are necessary, these should be such as to assure the shipping, in the most expedient manner possible, of the maximum volume of essential supplies available to friendly nations. Exporters must not be burdened with unnecessary requirements and technical regulations. Goods which are in plentiful supply or of a noncritical nature, and which can be readily manufactured and processed, or which already have been specially produced for foreign consumption, should be shipped to acceptable consignees under general license wherever possible. Changes in procedure and policy recommended by exporters, are now being considered jointly by government and by committees of exporters in order to minimize delays in license procedure, and to reduce the amount of detailed paper work and information required. Some of these changes have been announced at this convention.

Revisions in the shipping allocation system, now also under consideration, should be made effective at once so that delays in the movement of goods can be avoided. Regulations must provide for close, effective, cooperative action by Government agencies, directly or indirectly involved in the movement of export commodities, in order to assure adequate, prompt clearance of such export shipments within the full loading capacity of available ships.

The maximum export price regulation should be constantly reviewed so that the price allowed for exports shall include the customary additional expenses of conducting export business, the increase in overhead expenses, and costs arising from established recognized contractual obligations both here and abroad. Sales to export merchants in the United States should come under the export price regulations.

The present regulation specifying control of resale prices or end use of goods, beyond the jurisdiction of the United States, should be discontinued as conflicting with the rights and laws of foreign countries, and as unenforceable.

Retroactive governmental regulations, affecting contracts in foreign trade, should not be permitted to prejudice the exporter or importer when it can be proved that the contract, when made, complied with the regulation then existent.

New interpretations of existing laws that are made retroactive have resulted in the prosecution of American firms. This convention regards such action as prejudicial to the war effort and to production for export.

5. GOVERNMENT CONTROLS AFFECTING IMPORT TRADE

The convention recognizes the necessity of wartime control of imports to assure that foreign materials urgently needed by war industries are imported in the priority order and in the volume required.

The convention approves the practice of relaxing such restrictions as soon as these objectives have been achieved. A flexible policy should be consistently followed, designed to permit of a maximum flow of imports essential to civilian requirements after war needs have been supplied.

The convention recommends that maximum price regulations affecting imports continue to be based upon the present policy of maintaining desirable imports insofar as consistent with domestic production under wartime conditions.

The convention commends the policy of the Government in pursuing economic warfare in full cooperation with importers of strategic materials, and with the least possible disruption of established channels of supply and distribution.

While recognizing the necessity of Government control of foreign trade during the war, the convention recommends that such controls should be removed after the war to the greatest possible extent in order to provide for the development and maintenance of private enterprise.

6. CENSORSHIP AND MAIL REGULATIONS

The prompt dispatch of legitimate communications by air mail or cable, transmitted to promote the foreign trade of the United States, is an essential part of the war effort and should be so considered by those making regulations to govern transmittal of such documents and communications.

Inasmuch as the current limitation of weights and measurements of the Foreign Parcel Post Service imposes serious hardships on our customers, especially those in Latin America who, prior to the war, always depended upon this practical and economic service, this convention urges that the proper Government departments establish a system of issuing exception permits, preferably blanket permits, under which the pre-war users of the Foreign Parcel Service may resume their normal export shipments under the limitations previously in effect.

7. SHIPPING

The American Merchant Marine is effectively serving the fighting fronts and lines of supply. Men and officers are making a brilliant record of valor, endurance, and sacrifice, commanding the Nation's pride and gratitude.

The regular and frequent American-flag steamship services developed by private enterprise pursuant to the national shipping policy, have been disrupted. In response to war needs, American ships have been withdrawn from nonwar trades with friendly countries to an extent which impairs their economic welfare. Insofar as this is inescapable, no criticism is justified, but the strength and stability of the friendly countries adhering or favorable to our cause have such a definite relation to the total war effort, that nothing should be left undone to give them American steamship service for the trade which is their economic lifeline.

Thanks to the foresight of the United States Maritime Commission, and the skill of American industry, new ships are being built with unprecedented speed. In excess of 700 new ships this year, and probably 1,500 next year, will be added to the merchant marine. We urge that, while making this vast addition to war transport and supply, the War Shipping Administration and Maritime Commission endeavor to restore such frequency and regularity of American steamship service as essential military objectives permit. The dependence of both defense and commerce upon American flag shipping has been so thoroughly demonstrated that privately owned and operated American shipping organizations at home and abroad should be maintained and not permitted to disintegrate.

A problem of surplus tonnage may follow this war as it did the last. While lending every energy to the war, it is not too early to plan for the future, as suggested by the Maritime Commission's encouragement of the American Maritime Council, with which the National Foreign Trade Council is cooperating. Now, as always, since the latter council was formed on the eve of World War I, the objective is continuance, under private ownership and operation, of adequate freight and passenger service under the American flag, to all markets on a scale commensurate with the national interest.

While war conditions necessarily tend to slow up the movement and handling of ships, there are certain avoidable delays the elimination of which would add to the total of shipping space available. The convention urges the interested Government departments and agencies to redouble their efforts to reduce such delays to the absolute minimum.

8. INSURANCE

Both marine and war-risk insurance on cargo shipments are of the utmost importance

during these days of increased hazard for all types of voyages.

The council is commended for its action in requesting the Government to take a part in the insuring of war risks and the convention also commends the War Shipping Administration for the efforts that have been made, and the arrangements that have been put into effect, to provide such insurance in a practical form.

The convention also expresses its appreciation for the cooperation evidenced between commercial insurance underwriters and the War Shipping Administration in dealing with the difficult question of vessels missing for unknown causes. The action of the War Shipping Administration in providing open-policy coverage on imports is especially commended, as it indicates an endeavor on their part to furnish insurance in a form which will meet the requirements of commerce. The convention recommends that consideration be given to the extension of the same coverage to exports.

The convention further recommends that the Government facilitate the adjustment of all insured losses through experienced commercial underwriters and that the Government retire from the direct underwriting field and, instead, provide adequate reinsurance facilities for the commercial underwriters at reasonable rates.

9. INTEGRATION OF PROTECTION, PROMOTION, AND CONTROL AGENCIES

The protection of the Nation's foreign commerce during and after the war requires close integration of those governmental departments and agencies in Washington concerned with the protection and promotion of our foreign trade. Any lack of essential coordination of autonomous departments through a central authority results in confusion, is prejudicial to the war effort, and detrimental to the present and permanent interests of our foreign trade and shipping. The additional expense, delay, and complexity involved is an added burden on our commerce and irritates and alienates customers and suppliers in friendly nations.

10. FEDERAL FINANCIAL AGENCIES

Financing of foreign trade will be a major post-war problem.

Under world conditions of great risk and uncertainty, governments of all countries must assist and cooperate with private enterprise in industry, trade, and finance. Such financial assistance as has developed through the Export-Import Bank, Lend-Lease, the Rubber Reserve Company, the Metals Reserve Company, etc., which may be necessary during war, should not, however, prevent the post-war encouragement and return to private enterprise and financing of sound undertakings abroad, in association with available foreign capital, and with adequate protection of American investments, equities, rights, etc. All governmental trade arrangements with, and loans extended to, foreign governments should permit of the encouragement and support of subsequent private financing in those fields. Provision should be made for the prompt transfer of funds arising from imports, earnings, dividends, interest, royalties, services, and the repatriation of capital.

United States Government loans extended to foreign governments for development of resources and facilities tributary to our war requirements, or to assist in maintaining the economies of friendly nations, should provide for American participation in capitalization, construction, and management of new or expanded enterprises.

The convention urges the further study of the possibility of providing foreign credit insurance facilities, preferably through private banking channels, such as are available to the exporters of other nations. American exporters should enjoy facilities in the post-war period equal to those available to the exporter of other countries.

11. LEND-LEASE AID

The convention approves the war policy of reciprocal aid and services amongst the Allies, in supplying munitions and such other necessities as cannot be secured through private business channels. Congress now has authorized lend-lease aid to the extent of over $62,000,000,000.

The convention recommends to the National Foreign Trade Council continuous collaboration with the Government in the solution of the problems arising from the extension of lend-lease aid; utilizing for this purpose the experience of the foreign traders of the United States whose operations will be intimately affected.

The continued operation of American export industry and representation, both at home and abroad, is of vital importance to our post-war economy. Likewise, the preservation of American trade-marks, names, brands, etc., is essential and will be of great value to American industry when peace is established. The convention urgently recommends that lend-lease and other governmental purchasing agencies recognize the value to our post-war economy of trade-marks, names and brands, and that they cooperate with their owners in supplying goods by trade-marks, brands, or names, whenever they are specified by the foreign purchaser. Such specifications should not be ignored or changed. The maintenance of the normal agencies of sales and distribution, and their competitive and goodwill relations, is important during the war in order to insure their preservation in post-war years.

Sales to Government procurement agencies, operating under lend-lease authorization, should be considered as "sales for export," and should come under export price regulations. Proper allowance should be made for legitimate and customary expenses involved in the handling of such business.

12. INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS

The interdependence of the nations in the Western Hemisphere in peace and war has been demonstrated. Our economy and the arming of our forces require materials from the other American nations; their economies need from us the sustained supply of their essential requirements.

The ultimate objective being the establishment of a sustained and mutully beneficial post-war economic relationship, the convention urges continuance of the utmost inter-American collaboration, economically and politically, and the continued allocation, supply, and transport of essential requirements as a vital part of our war effort.

13. ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES AFFECTING AGREEMENTS

The convention calls attention to the fact that agreements made between nations are too often voided, in whole or in part, by unilateral administrative measures. The convention recommends that corrective measures should be taken to prevent such practices.

14. AMERICAN ASSOCIATIONS OF COMMERCE AND PRODUCTION

The convention regards with satisfaction the completion of the organization of the Permanent Council of American Associations of Commerce and Production which, with headquarters at Montevideo, now provides needed opportunities for the interchange of views and formulation of policies for the economic development of all the countries of the Western Hemisphere, and the promotion of inter-American exchange of commodities. Congratulations from the business interests of the United States are extended to the Permanent Council upon the successful results of its first plenary session held at Santiago and Valparaiso, Chile, in July 1942.

15. STANDARDIZATION

The convention approves the endeavor to establish throughout the Americas a comprehensive acceptance of agreed standard specifications as a necessary step forward in facilitating orderly commercial procedure, and closer inter-American commercial cooperation.

16. COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION

A national, inter-American, and Canadian system of commercial arbitration constitutes a complete hemispheric plan for the settlement of business disputes, and provides an important element of economic peace in post-war reconstruction. The convention recommends that the National Foreign Trade Council collaborate with the American Arbitration Association, the Inter-American and Canadian-American Commercial Arbitration Commissions, the International Chamber of Commerce, and such other international organizations as those named may invite, for study of the plans and facilities in effect at the beginning of World War No. 2 and, as projected, with a view to making recommendations for a complete world-wide system of commercial arbitration, to be instituted as part of the post-war reconstruction.

17. PROTECTION OF DIRECT FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

The convention believes that legal security against confiscation is an indispensable basis of international trade and investment. International law and municipal law, during the past century and a half, have established such legal security, under the rule that private property may not be expropriated without adequate and concurrent compensation. This principle, adopted in the constitutions of most states, should be reemphasized by the United States as a condition of all international cooperation and should be included, as an encouragement to foreign investment and trade, in treaties with foreign nations.

In thus reaffirming its belief in the value of law, justly administered, within and between nations, the convention at the same time invites attention to the practical necessity for the restoration of, and compensation for, property of American concerns and individuals which has been taken over or destroyed during the war. The Axis Powers have systematically practiced spoliation under the pretense of legality. They are deliberately planning for economic domination in the post-war world through the control of property and through other means.

Before the American Government commits itself reciprocally to abstract principles—admittedly essential in a secure, stabilized world—it should see that injustices done American owners are redressed by restoration, by substitution, by full compensation, from the enemy. It should weigh the equities in each case and insist upon a reality of solution which will frustrate unfair Axis interference in foreign trade and investment, and which will enforce the spirit of law, condemning confiscation and the misuse of power; then, in the more deliberate processes of seeking a durable peace, the United States can be more effective, as in earlier days, as the champion of those legal and moral principles which make possible the sound movement of capital and goods across frontiers.

18. FOREIGN PROPERTY LOSSES FROM WARFARE

It is recommended that consideration be given by the Congress to compensation for damage suffered by Americans to their property situated in enemy occupied or controlled territory.

The operations of the War Damage Corporation should cover the Philippines, so that American owners of real and personal property in those islands may secure coverage for losses suffered since the outbreak of the war, but without the requirement of premium payments until the islands no longer are under enemy control.

19. TAXATION

The burden of war taxes in the United States, as well as the sharp increase in rates in Allied and friendly countries, makes relief all the more imperative from the cumulation of such tax burdens on American companies operating in those countries. The maintenance of the credit for foreign taxes, and the exemption of earned income of American citizens who are bona fide residents of foreign countries, as well as special relief for war losses abroad, are among the matters of particular concern to American foreign trade. The convention is gratified over the coming into force of the treaty between the United States and Canada, to prevent double taxation, and will welcome favorable departmental and congressional and State consideration of any measures to extend the relief provided in existing Federal and State legislation. It commends the tax committee of the council for the excellent work it has done, and requests it to give continued consideration to tax measures which will tend to maintain our foreign trade and stimulate the resumption of commerce in the period of reconstruction.

20. GLOBAL AIR TRANSPORT

World-wide scheduled air transport of passengers, mail, and cargo was attained long before the war by American carriers, albeit with fairly low frequencies and capacities. Technological developments, stimulated by the war, and the transport demands of the reconstruction period to follow, will afford opportunity for tremendous expansion of our global air service and the extension of its benefits to the people of every land.

Consonant with the objectives of winning both the war and the peace, the Convention recommends to the Government the following program:

(a) That it make available for air-line purchase, at the earliest date consistent with urgent military needs, a sufficient number of passenger and cargo planes to enable a resumption or expansion of existing services to levels essential to pressing industrial, commercial, humanitarian, and good-neighbor needs.

(b) That it simultaneously make available for air-line training sufficient flight and ground personnel to man the above-mentioned equipment.

(c) That it seek stabilization of safety control, franchise authorization, mail payment, and other basic policies, and intensification of long-range planning, with particular regard to cargo-transport developments and to every essential of the minimum sixfold expansion of passenger services, within 5 years after the war's termination, as predicted by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

21 PAN-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

The Convention notes with satisfaction the efforts of the participating American governments to expedite the completion of the Pan-American Highway, by which hemispheric defense and the strengthening of close commercial and cultural ties between the United States and the other Americas may be advanced.

The completion of the Alaskan Highway, and projects for additional highways in that area, will link North America more closely to its southern neighbors, in addition to serving military needs in the present emergency.

22. FOREIGN TRADE ZONES

The Convention notes with satisfaction the adaption of the New York Foreign Trade Zone to emergency wartime operations and supports the further establishment of foreign-trade zones in Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coast ports.

23. FOOD-DISTRIBUTION PLAN FOR HAWAII, PUERTO RICO, AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The present food procurement and distribution plan followed by our Government for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, to meet the situation caused by the shipping shortage, is of grave concern to shippers in this country who have been obliged to cancel bookings and take losses, and also to merchants here who no longer are able to keep up their connections in these outlying areas.

The Convention again recommends that the procurement and distribution of food and other merchandise, wherever possible, be made through the usual commercial channels and that every possible facility be provided for private business to keep open its trade channels.

24. EDUCATION

The constantly changing economic scene, due to the global war, makes active work in the field of foreign trade education of increasing importance. The program of the Foreign Trade Education Committee, operating under the auspices of the National Foreign Trade Council, has been shaped to meet this responsibility. The experience of the last 3 years has clearly demonstrated that the procedure of working through regional committees, in order to convince adults and undergraduate student bodies throughout the United States of the vital reality of world economic interdependence, is the most practical and effective method. It is recommended that the number of these committees be enlarged, as circumstances warrant, beyond the 12 now existing, and that educational effort in the foreign trade field be amplified through forum meetings for adult groups, radio broadcasts, motion pictures, foreign language classes, and closer cooperation with commercial groups and with Federal, State, and local educational authorities.

Inter-American education has made gratifying progress. The convention endorses the efforts of the Department of State, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, private business, and philanthropies, which have brought a large number of Latin-American students to the United States for education in the arts, sciences, and professions, and enlarged the program of exchange scholarships and professorships.

The Prepayment Plan for Post-War Purchases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, numerous schemes are being advanced at the present time to provide a means whereby any excess funds remaining in the hands of individuals, after payment of taxes, insurance, and bonds of all sorts, may be drained off in an effort to avoid possible inflation. The most widely publicized of these schemes is the one which proposes to reverse the usual installment purchase plan, whereby the purchaser takes delivery after a down payment and then proceeds to pay the balance due in regular installments. Under the proposed scheme the purchaser would proceed in the same manner to make his down payment and continue to pay the various installments of the purchase price, but would not take delivery until after the war has been terminated.

The scheme sounds quite plausible at first glance, but there are many difficulties to be encountered. The foremost consideration is that the articles to be sold have not been manufactured and no model or type of the article to be bought is available. The buyer therefore must purchase blindly some article for future use, which may or may not be desired when the unknown delivery day shall arrive. He must purchase some article which today appears useful, but which he might not need or which he might not be able to afford when the unknown delivery day shall arrive.

Under this scheme the buyer must purchase from some dealer, who may or may not be in business at the future date, some article, which may or may not be manufactured at the future date, to serve some need, which may or may not exist at the future date, at some price, which may or may not be what you expect at the future date, to be delivered somewhere—and it may or may not be delivered—at the future date. Yet we tried to stop speculating on the stock market to prevent the loss of huge sums through such gambling, and now we propose to legitimize the blindest kind of blind buying which may lead us, we know not where.

Then as to the money to be paid in on the proposed or anticipated purchase price, what is to become of that? It will be turned in to the Treasury to be spent by the Government, not invested, and ultimately paid over to the proposed dealer when the future delivery date may have arrived. The Government, having spent the money for war purposes, will have to raise the needed funds through additional borrowing at that future date, regardless of the condition of the national debt and regardless of the amount of interest which may ultimately have to be paid out on this new borrowing. The only benefit from such a program will be to the Government, which will use the money between now and the future date without having to borrow it and pay interest on it. The Government will merely act as custodian or trustee of the dealer's funds until the dealer shall deliver the goods. But it will be the first time that a trustee of funds will be permitted to use trust funds for his own benefit without having to render an accounting thereof.

To add further to my comment on this scheme, I desire to call your attention to the following editorial from Southern California Business, published by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce:

THE PAY TWICE PLAN [1]

If, in the name of post-war prosperity, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce were to send up the following trial balloon, how would the citizens of this community react?

After the payment of the new income taxes, property taxes, the 5-percent Victory tax, retail sales, and other taxes, and after spending 10 percent of income for War bonds, and after paying the new high costs of living, all citizens in this area should buy bonds or purchase certificates from the county of

[1] The people will pay for merchandise-purchase certificates and they will have to be taxed later for the Government to redeem them. The reason for this is that the Government will not save or invest the money received from these certificates. The Government will spend the money for expendable war items.

Los Angeles which, after the war, will be exchangeable only at John Doe's for any merchandise that store holds for sale. It is to be understood that the county government will not save or invest the money received for these bonds but will spend it, for some worthy cause, of course.

No doubt such an idea would be labeled preposterous. Few people would see any prosperity angles to the notion and nearly everyone would consider it unfair to Jones', Smith's, Brown's, and the thousands of other stores selling at retail. Obviously, John Doe's, its employees and the firms from whom it buys, would have an advantage over their competitors. No other benefit can be perceived.

Yet this silly fabrication is fairly similar to a proposal under consideration in Washington, so seriously considered that it has been released to the press to determine the country's reaction.

NO CRYSTAL GAZERS

As nearly as it can be understood from press releases and from supporting utterances by some business leaders, the proposal calls for the buying of bonds or purchase certificates now, from the Government, these certificates to be exchangeable after the war for automobiles, automatic furnaces, pianos, radios, and refrigerators. These purchase certificates are to be distinguished from war bonds and political support is to be won for the scheme.

1. By giving the certificates priority and discount features.

2. By assuring their handling through local finance companies, and

3. By applying their purchase value to certain specified durable consumer's goods of the installment variety—goods which provide not only mass employment but high-wage employment.

As Angelenos, we inquire, why should not airplanes be added? It may be argued that our Government planners don't know the shape of planes to come. But do they know the shape of post-war automobiles and radios?

Perhaps it will be argued that, as yet, we do not know what aircraft companies will be making planes for civilian use. Do we know who are to be the future manufacturers of autos and refrigerators and furnaces? If they are known now, why should you or I, in considering our part in private post-war reconstruction give any thought to starting new businesses in these lines? The future is already being cut and dried?

WHAT CHANCE FOR OTHERS?

What chance has the aircraft industry or any other maker of consumer durable goods if a substantial part of our savings is to be earmarked for a few or even two dozen items? With what will we purchase the other things we may want after the war?

What incentive will be left the designer of new things? New products will have a tough time competing in a market already committed to the purchase of pianos and other items favored by this plan. Or, have we invented everything?

With what will be buy new homes? New furniture? New vacuum cleaners? New lawn mowers? New sausage grinders? The tax burdens to pay for this war will be heavy for years to come, leaving skimpy margins at best for new goods and services. Yet we are to be encouraged to tie up what margin we will have, or a goodly part thereof, by pledging ourselves now to buy certain specified articles. The resulting curtailment of our post-war freedom of choice will not make post-war prospects interesting for consumers. For those manufacturers not numbered among the favored few, it will assure an uphill fight, a very unfair fight, for their share of the consumer's dollar.

And where did we pick up the amazing notion that government should help determine what we shall buy or not buy after the war?

HIJACKING BY "PATRIOTS"

Perhaps you are a person who wants no automobile or any of these other things usually bought on the installment plan. However, if this proposal is put into effect the purchase of these bonds will be "talked up" as a patriotic duty just as War bonds are presented today. Campaigners will be at you—over the telephone, at your door, by mail, in the cinema, on the radio, at public meetings, everywhere. Thousands of them selling automobiles, radios, pianos, automatic furnaces, and refrigerators! Doing it as a patriotic duty! What a manufacturer's dream come true!

The makers af airplanes, of homes, of furniture, of lawn mowers, and of sausage grinders will still have to hire their salesmen when the war is over, salesmen who will have to plod in a market with all the gravy gone. But there will be a superabundance of salesmen to compete for these lean pickings, for the selling of autos, pianos, refrigerators, radios, and furnaces will already have been done.

One thoughtful businessman sums up the idea as follows: "The purchaser of one of these certificates or bonds can get no definite promise; no one can promise to deliver to her or to him a specific item of merchandise at a specific date. All that can be promised is that if the item of merchandise you want is being manufactured at the time you want it, and if the style of merchandise available is what you want, and if the price is what you expect it to be, and if you are still alive and have not in the meantime changed your mind, there will be delivered to you the merchandise which you now think you want."

WHY NOT WAR BONDS?

The proposal finds support in some quarters on the ground that it will "sop up" purchasing power and thus lessen inflation. True, it would partially postpone one of the symptoms of inflation, rising prices—no more, however, than would any form of savings on a comparable scale. The same anti-inflationary objective would be accomplished with a comparable increase in the sale of war bonds, which will put no producer under an unfair handicap in competing for post-war markets. This already has been pointed out by the Secretary of the Treasury who also observes quite properly that the plan would give an unfair advantage to the stay-at-homes at the expense of our fellow citizens who have gone overseas. The latter would return to find many of the things they want to buy already reserved for those who had used war savings to gratify personal desires.

But apart from the above, the scheme has one grave hidden danger. It rests upon the fallacy that all financial sacrifice caused by the war will end with the cessation of hostilities. It assumes that a large part of the public can convert War bonds into cash immediately after the war to gratify every postponed whim. It relies upon the mistaken notion that Government and the banks can supply cash in exchange for billions of dollars of bonds represented by exploded shells, useless cannon, warships tied in docks, empty cantonments, and other items of no economic value. Such an idea could bring about the most stupendous inflation ever witnessed by man.

POST-WAR PERIL GREATEST

The real danger of runaway price inflation will not occur during the war. It will come later when the people, tired of the deprivations of war, try to embark on a spree of spending and consuming as soon as the fighting stops. It has been thus after past wars, and human nature is little changed. If the owners of war bonds are going to throw them on the market in a wild scramble for cash for spending, we will have billions of dollars with which to buy limited supplies of goods and services. Price controls will be disregarded, if they should still be attempted, and all prices will skyrocket. The bonds themselves will depreciate in value. America will resemble a small town in the midst of a gold-mining boom. This will be the price of attempts to "monetize debt" that should be kept in our safety deposit boxes long after the war.

Some will say that this proposal—estimated at $6,000,000,000 per year—involves only a fraction of the war debt and that it could not alone cause all the evils mentioned above. True, but it is one more powerful force pulling us in a direction we ought not to go.

Lest this be misconstrued as a criticism of the War-bond program, it should be pointed out that the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce was solidly back of high taxes, cutting of nonwar expenditures, and sales of bonds to investors long before Pearl Harbor.

The same enlightened patriotism that impels us to buy bonds now should tell us that they cannot be used as cash immediately after the war, and that attempts to do so then will be as unpatriotic as failure to buy them now.

QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

Several questions suggest themselves for consideration on the part of our thinkers in Washington and by some of our businessmen:

What will be the value of the dollar when this war is over?

Can this be determined now? Will $1,000 buy the automobile it will today? If so, what measures have been undertaken to insure labor and other costs remaining the same? If the dollar value is severely changed is not this plan likely to cause public disfavor and distrust of government?

Is money and willingness to spend it all that is needed for post-war recovery?

This proposal seems to imply just that. Were these the only two conditions for full employment and prosperity, we would have enjoyed them long ago. We would not have had to wait 100,000 years for Mr. Keynes to come over here from England or for the Washington spenders.

To what extent would this plan promote the cartellization of industry?

Obviously, the Government would not parcel out this business to individual firms. Government would give the radio orders to the radio industry as a whole. Pools would be formed to distribute the business. To assure equitable factory distribution prices and models might have to be on some "victory" standardization basis. Competition would cease to exist. Government would supervise the details of manufacture. This would be fascism in an extreme form.

Perhaps this proposal should not be taken so seriously. But we have had such thoughts before. Most people, last summer, did not take the $25,000 salary limitation idea seriously when it was tossed out as a trial balloon. Most people thought it was too far-fetched to bother about. Wasn't Congress opposed? But we got it.

Congress and public opinion have a hand-in-hand job to do in batting down harmful schemes while they are still trial balloons.

We'll Have To Feed the World Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD an address by the Honorable Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, entitled, "We'll Have To Feed the World Again."

I am advised by the Public Printer that the cost of printing the address will be $202.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'LL HAVE TO FEED THE WORLD AGAIN

(By Herbert Hoover)

A starving world must be fed after this war ends. That has been promised to the victims of the war again and again by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill. Even if it had not been promised, we would have to do it if we want to make a lasting peace instead of lasting anarchy. And we will need to do it unless we are willing to stand by and watch millions of human beings die after we have made gigantic sacrifices to give them a chance to live.

If this war stopped tomorrow there would be millions of permanently debilitated adults and millions of stunted children. But there will always be millions who can be saved. If European civilization is to live, they must be fed. And especially must this be done for the children, or we shall be faced with a generation of physical degenerates and potential gangsters.

But if these promises are to be kept we shall need to begin preparedness long before the war ends. That preparedness means some new direction and new strategy for American agriculture. It means preparation of supplies from South America. It means advance agreements with our Allies as to control of world supplies, finance, shipping, and administration. It means creation of organization in advance, with an understanding of the huge volumes needed, the kind of food needed, the source of these supplies, their transportation, distribution, and the economic, social, and political problems which must be met.

There are more horsemen that follow modern war than at the time the Apocalypse was written. In modern total war famine and pestilence are accompanied by four new recruits whose names are revolution, unemployment, suspicion, and hate. These additional destroyers make the job harder to manage.

That there is and will be famine needs little demonstration. Already 148,000,000 people in the occupied democracies in Europe and Asia are short of food; millions of them are actually starving and our allies are obviously running on very short rations.

The Nazi's food supply is sufficient for their evils of today. They are working hordes of prisoners on the farms and robbing some of the occupied territories. But their internal production will get worse as the war goes on and there is less to steal from the subjected peoples.

In fact the whole of Europe will continue to degenerate in domestic food supply. The reasons for that are simple enough. Europe in peacetime—and by "Europe" I here mean Britain and all of Europe excluding Russia—has to import large amounts of food for human beings. That is now cut off by the blockade except to Britain and some small amounts to the neutrals.

On top of this, under the pressure of total war field crops decline year by year. Manpower and horsepower are increasingly drained to the war; farm implements cannot be replaced; fertilizers are diverted to explosives; planting is less effective and harvesting less perfect. Also the animals in Europe are in considerable degree dependent upon imported feed. In consequence of the blockade some part of the dairy and breeding herds must be slaughtered early in total war. And domestic feed for the remaining animals decreases because more fields must be turned to direct food for humans—and thus still more of the flocks and herds must be slaughtered.

In the last war the principal food animals of Europe—cattle, hogs, and sheep—decreased by over 70,000,000 head and that is again going on. The invaluable chicken vanishes, and fishing is greatly diminished. Thus the stream of animal products steadily decreases. To all this must be added the ravages of armies and schorched-earth policies.

Nor will famine this time be limited to Europe for these causes are also working in Asia and Russia.

THE MEANING OF HUNGER, STARVATION, AND FAMINE

It is difficult for Americans to picture widespread hunger or starvation. We have not had such a thing in America.

Nation-wide hunger and starvation mean grim suffering, incalculable grief over wilting children, physical degeneration, stunted growth, distorted, embittered minds, and death. Its lasting effect is one of degree and time. Adults can recuperate from months of undernourishment. Children can stand less. In fact, the undersized, rickets, and the death rate among children are the sensitive barometers of starvation. Not even during our Civil War was there a town or city where these effects reached one-tenth of what they are in certain cities of the occupied democracies at this moment.

THE THREAT OF DISEASE

From all food shortages comes the danger of pestilence. People do not often die directly from starvation. Their resistance is weakened and they fall easy prey to contagions. Moreover, people consume their available fat supplies and have little, or none, left for soap. Uncleanliness invites such scourges as typhus, which is transmitted by lice.

There is another vital peril in this question. Unless these masses of people in scores of nations can have food and be protected from pestilence there can be no social or political stability upon which peace can be built.

THE SIZE OF THE PROBLEM

We had a parallel experience with this problem after the First World War. In that famine America bore the major load of supplies, finance, and administration. Except for American food preparedness, food strategy, and American intervention there would then have been the greatest sacrifice of human life in all history—even more devastating than that which followed the Thirty Years War, when one-third of the population of Europe is said to have died. That America succeeded in its task is evidenced not alone by grateful statement of every government in Europe but by the statistical fact that their populations did not decrease during the period.

No nation had ever undertaken such a mission before. We had to pioneer through the thickets and swamps of governmental, social, financial, and economic problems, including human nature in the raw. From that experience we can make some estimates as to the need next time, the source of supplies, and the strategy and tactics necessary to defeat both famine and pestilence and to set millions upon the road back to strength and health.

The nations in Europe, outside Russia, short of food after World War No. 1 varied in degree of need and again after World War No. 2 will vary in need, as all nations in any circumstance have some domestic supplies. After the last war we grouped them as to degree of hunger and, for administrative purposes, into four categories.

There was the "neutral group" of 6 nations of 43,000,000 people, the "Allied group" of 5 nations embracing 132,000,000 people, the "enemy group" comprising the 4 shrunken old empires with 102,000,000 people, and the "liberated group" of 13 states freed from domination having 98,000,000 people. That was a total of 28 nations embracing about 375,000,000 human beings.

Although the positions of nations in the groups will be shifted after World War No. 2 yet there will be about 390,000,000 people short of food. And this time Russia and China will need to be added.

In the last war defeated Russia, with roughly 140,000,000 people, was famine stricken in certain areas. We made an effort to furnish food, but Russia refused relief because the Allies stipulated that she must stop fighting her neighbors. It was not until the renewed famine in 1922 that we were able to assist her on a large scale.

Russia will need food help during this war and afterward, with lands despoiled and scorched by the Germans, there will be tens of millions to add to the prospective totals.

China's normal food supply is a bare subsistence level and therefore shortage spreads disaster even faster than in countries of higher standards. Despoiled and ravaged by Japan, she will have scores of millions to add to these totals.

Therefore it is possible to estimate over 500,000,000 people will be suffering from some degree of food shortage after this war and that some European countries—Norway, Holland, Belgium, France, Greece, Poland, Yugoslavia, and the Baltic States—will be much worse off than last time.

HOW MUCH FOOD WILL BE NEEDED?

Certainly the amount of food required to meet the emergency cannot be less than after World War No. 1, even if the war should end tomorrow. The ultimate need will depend on the length of the war, as that controls the degree of the demoralization in domestic supplies.

The total amount of food for human beings imported from overseas into the European area during the acute period of 12 months following the armistice in November 1918 was about 27,000,000 tons (54,000,000,000 pounds). Of this, between 4,500,000 and 5,000,000 tons (9,000,000,000 to 10,000,000,000 pounds) were animal and vegetable oil products, the balance mostly grains, rice, peas, beans, and sugar. There was insufficient shipping to transport much feed for animals. The total value of this food at the prices of that time was roughly $6,000,000,000.

Something over 16,000,000 out of the 27,000,000 tons of food came from the United States, including about 2,400,000 tons of animal and vegetable oil products.

Of the American food which had a value of about $3,300,000,000, we furnished about $2,400,000,000 on credit, about $325,000,000 in charity (mostly for children), and about $575,000,000 was paid for in goods, gold, and services. As the credits (our war "loans") were only about 6 percent repaid, the balance of that item can be written off as a gift also.

Of the 11,000,000 tons from other quarters, most of it went to the neutrals and our allies and was paid for in gold and foreign trade. The Allies and neutrals also furnished $200,000,000 of food on credits to the more desperate countries. Of this, the British furnished about $100,000,000, the French $30,000,000, the Italians $30,000,000, and the balance came from the neutral nations.

PREPAREDNESS OF ORGANIZATION

To be prepared to fight these famines and their inevitable companion of pestilence, we shall need to have great preparedness in supplies, but to lay some foundations of organization in advance.

After the present war the organization, the tactics, the strategy will not differ much from the last one. There are no new inventions in food except synthetic vitamins, and these do not reduce the need for food. The methods of determining the supplies needed, their sources, the methods of finance, of transportation and distribution will be the same. The area of famine will be greater and the need more intense.

Advance preparedness in 1918 was placed by the President in the hands of the United States Food Administration. We not only had great reserves prepared but we had accurate knowledge of all the other possible supplies in the world. In October 1918, with the armistice in prospect, I was able to lay before the President an estimate of world supplies. It showed a total of about 30,000,000 tons of essential food available for overseas shipment, and as 27,000,000 tons of it was delivered the estimate was reasonably accurate. Ten days after the armistice we had cargoes headed for the famine areas and we had arranged to turn over several hundred thousand tons accumulated in France as a reserve for our armies as insurance against submarines.

FOUR FUNDAMENTALS

During the last war we demonstrated certain fundamentals in organization to fight wide-scale famine that will repeat themselves again.

The first of these was that fighting famine is a gigantic economic and governmental operation handled by experts and not welfare work of benevolent handing out food hit or miss to bread lines. There must be no waste, no inefficiency.

The second was that when this mass of hungry people add their demands upon world food supplies there will not be enough fats to go around on a normal basis of consumption for everybody. There will again likely be a shortage in shipping. Therefore, the division of food among nations must be controlled during the emergency period. To do this a large part of the purchase, the overseas transportation, and the distribution must be in the hands of governments. And with the economic prostration of the famine area, the food must be largely financed by the Allied Governments. Restoration of commerce will be too slow to meet such emergencies.

The third fundamental which developed was that the problem divided itself into two periods—the acute period and the reconstruction period. The acute period lasted about 12 months, from the armistice in November 1918 until after the harvest of 1919. This is a period demanding fast work and complete controls. The second, or reconstruction period, last time extended from the autumn of 1919 until the harvest of 1921. Peace having been made, the harvest of 1919 being in hand, the situation relaxed. Industry, exports, and private credits revived somewhat, and we abandoned control of shipping and control of distribution. The European shortage of food during this second period was of large dimensions but was largely overcome by the initiative of European governments themselves. We were able to confine our activities in this period to the aid of those governments still economically destitute or to groups of destitute children and others which weak governments were unable to protect.

The fourth fundamental was that the problem of undernourished and diseased children had to be separated from all other questions and handled directly and independently of local governments.

The fifth fundamental was that some individual with great powers must direct and coordinate all this. Such an operation would be hopeless in the hands of international commissions or committees. In the last war, by the appointment of the Allied Governments and with the willing cooperation of all the countries short of food, I occupied that position—which is my justification for speaking on the subject.

Having been appointed by the Allied Governments to direct and coordinate these matters, I set up headquarters in Paris within 2 weeks after the armistice.

For the American staff, I brought to Europe some keymen from the United States Food Administration and in time added to them, through the cooperation of General Pershing and Admiral Benson, a magnificent staff of some 1,500 American officers. They were worthy pre-war civilians who had special skills, courage, and singlemindedness. Aside from clerks, no civilian received a salary, some received expenses. The Army and Navy men received pay and allowances from those services.

To save time, avoid duplication and red tape we made as much use as possible of our existing American organizations, that is, the United States Food Administration, its subsidiary, the Grain Corporation and the Belgian Relief which had functioned during the war feeding the 10,000,000 people in Belgium and France.

SIMPLIFYING COMPLEX PROBLEMS

We created only one new organization—the American Relief Administration—which dealt largely with the charitable problems, chiefly children. We used the European branches of the United States Shipping Board, the Treasury, and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. We set up branches of combined organizations in each of the 28 countries short of food and in 8 countries which were major sources of food supplies.

Coordination with the other Allied Governments was worked through the Allied Food Council, of which I had been a part during the war. This council comprised the food ministers of the Allied countries. We cleared many joint problems through the Allied Blockade Council, the Allied Shipping Council, and the Supreme Economic Council.

In order to coordinate the diversion of world supplies and to simplify the whole administrative problem, we divided countries short of food into four groups—that is, the Allies, the neutral, the enemy, and the liberated nations. We further separated out the special problem to undernourished children.

The Allied countries—Britain, France, Italy, Greece, and Portugal—comprising about 132,000,000 people, drew part of their supplies from the Far East, the Southern Hemisphere, and Canada, and part from the United States. They did their own purchasing, shipping, and finance for the supplies from outside the United States. We furnished their American supplies through the United States Food Administration as we had done before the armistice.

Our European allies provided the shipping for their American food and we financed their supplies through loans from the United States Treasury. The Allies restored their consumption to not far below normal. Their total overseas supplies during the acute period amounted to about 17,000,000 tons of which some secondary part was feed for animals.

The "neutral" group—Denmark, Holland, Norway, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland—comprising about 43,000,000 people, were assigned their supplies partly from the United States, but mainly from other parts of the world. They furnished their own shipping and finance. They cooperated splendidly with us in coordination of sources of supply, and in chartering their surplus shipping to us. On many occasions they diverted cargoes and their own stocks to us with which to meet emergencies. We replaced these supplies to them later on. This group restored the consumption of their people to near normal by importing, during the acute period, about 4,300,000 ton of food.

In the "liberated" and "enemy" groups our administrative problems were enormously greater than the other groups. This was the area not only of acute famine but of economic prostration and our organization had not only to procure the food, finance, ships and organize the distribution, but we had to do it amid the chaos of revolution, suspicion, hate, and conflicting allied purposes.

The "liberated" group of 13 nations with 98,000,000 people embraced Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Georgia, Poland, Rumania, and Jugoslavia.

The enemy group comprised Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Germany, and Turkey. The total population was about 102,000,000.

During the acute period our organization brought from one quarter or another about 4,000,000 tons of food into the liberated countries and about 3,000,000 tons into the enemy countries which, added to domestic supplies, lifted the ration for adults to an endurable level.

FOOD AND REVOLUTION

Prior to the armistice all the peoples under enemy domination, liberated as well as enemy, were being rigidly rationed. At the armistice the people in the 13 liberated countries at once set up their own independent governments in democratic form. Most of their ministries were formed of revolutionaries who had been active against the old empires. In the shrunken enemy areas of Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Turkey the old governments collapsed in revolutions and also emerged in democratic forms. They likewise were controlled by men of revolutionary type. Hungary in fact went through 4 revolutions while we were trying to feed her. Most of the former officials of all these nations were driven from office.

In these transformations and revolutions the disciplines, such as rationing food, either collapsed or near-collapsed. Control of distribution was weakened or nonexistent. Everybody who could, grabbed food from the farmers, bootlegged it, and hoarded it. There was at the start some rioting and pillaging of the countryside. The poorer people of the towns and cities were for a time much worse off than they were before the armistice when there were rigid food controls.

Thus a considerable part of the 200,000,000 hungry people in the liberated and enemy groups were suddenly governed by men with little or no experience in administration and whose minds were more fixed upon political and ideological ideas than the hard toil of government housekeeping. Added to all the other growing pains of these new democracies was the fact that the Communists were stirring up more revolutions. And they found so receptive an audience in hungry people, that Communist revolutions one time or another seized a dozen large cities and one whole country—Hungary.

SUSTAINING DEMOCRACY

Our major purpose was to save hundreds of millions of lives. But food and restored employment were the foundations upon which order could be preserved and the completion of the peace made possible. Moreover, we sought to sustain the feeble plants of democracy which had sprung up in all of these countries. We had hope that they would bring not only freedom to men but that they would make the firm foundations of lasting peace.

A weak government possessed of the weapon of food for starving people can preserve and strengthen itself more effectively than by arms. Therefore, in our major operations we sought to work through these governments, even at the price of some lost efficiency.

In consequence, one of our first necessities was to stiffen or set up a food administration in each of these new governments. To secure the proper working of distribution we had to furnish to many of them experienced Americans as advisors. These new

food administrations took control of agriculture, all domestic food stocks, and plus the imports which we furnished, and to ration their populations anew. We set up machinery to check them constantly, to see that food reached the people equitably and sufficiently.

UNDERNOURISHED CHILDREN

I believe that the problem of restoring the acutely undernourished children was of such importance from a humane point of view and so vital to the future that we organized it as the "American Relief Administration," independently of all local governments, but in cooperation with them.

The love of children is universal in mankind. It seemed to me that this was a point where these peoples, torn with internal dissension, conflict, and discouragement could find a common cause and a common hope. We set up in each country a national committee, principally of women, who, with the assistance of our staff, extended their organization into every ward and village. We selected the initial staff from Americans who had already had experience in Belgium.

The plan was to give, under medical supervision, one meal a day to undernourished and undeveloped infants and children in addition to the national ration. This food and clothing for the children was a gift, partly American private charity and partly from our Government. We delivered the supplies to seaboard and these devoted women raised the money locally to transport it, to equip and conduct the canteens. Schoolhouses, public buildings, anything available were turned into kitchens and eating places.

Some 12 or 15 million of these children, enemy and friend alike, were thus fed until they were restored to normal.

We handled some 175,000 tons of second-hand gift clothing which was made over by workshops which we organized among the women in the different countries. Mostly for the waif and undernourished children we furnished millions of yards of new materials and new shoes to the value of several millions of dollars.

The total of our American charitable outlays amounted to about $325,000,000. The expenditure of the local committees for transportation and equipment amounted to at least this much again. We continued this work for over 2 years. The local organizations were strong enough to carry on thereafter.

PESTILENCE

Originally it had been intended that problems of pestilence should be met by the Red Cross organizations of the different countries, assisted by the American and Allied Red Cross organizations. But typhus developed on a fearful scale along the line of the old Russian front and began a march westward over Europe. The health authorities of the countries infected reported to the Supreme Council in Paris that there were 1,000,000 cases and a mortality of 125,000 every week. It was not the province of my organization, but the Red Cross societies, finding themselves unable to cope with it, the job was assigned to us by the President and the Prime Ministers. As typhus is a louse disease, our job was to quarantine a huge area and then delouse the population in those areas. We secured a staff from the Army Medical Corps, some 8,000 carloads of delousing equipment of the British, American, French, and German Armies. The job required many months of steadily pushing back the invasion, but we completely succeeded.

POST-WAR ORGANIZATION TO FEED THE WORLD

In my previous article I discussed the inevitability of widespread food shortage and famine after this war and some of the experience developed after the First World War.

There are a multitude of problems to be met. Many of these will be different from our experience in 1918–21. But there is no more effective way to indicate what may be anticipated than by some account of what happened and what we did last time.

In some form most of the old questions will rise again. Preparedness includes an understanding of these questions and the measures to meet them.

FINANCE

All imported food to meet any famine must be financed from somewhere. The farmers, the processors, the transporters of the world must be paid. After the First World War, American Government "loans" were made to the Allied and liberated countries covering the food furnished from America. Some comparatively minor loans were made by the Allied and neutral Governments to the amount of food furnished by them. That also included one enemy country—Austria.

We had no loan funds for Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, or Turkey. One result of the war blockade was that the enemy countries had not been able to spend their gold abroad to buy things during the war, and they still had it. We supplied food against gold payments, against the service of their ships, and against some goods which they exported.

Both the delays in removing the blockade and the delays in peacemaking after the First World War contributed to increase the financial burden upon the United States.

THE EFFECT OF BLOCKADE AND DELAYS IN PEACEMAKING

During the war, the Allies had maintained a food (and other) blockade against the whole of Europe, including neutrals as well as enemy-occupied countries. After the armistice, the military authorities were fearful that they would not be able to enforce the armistice terms on the enemy or to impose the peace terms if the blockade were relaxed before peace was signed. The neutrals and Belgium had been allowed a meager ration through the blockade during the war, but they were suffering a great deal of hardships. And the military authorities feared that if the blockade were taken off even for the neutrals or liberated countries there would be leaks into enemy areas.

After 2 months we finally got the blockade removed from the neutral and liberated countries, except as to some special articles. But as to enemy countries, despite our strong urging, we were not able to secure even a partial relaxation of the blockade until four and a half months after the armistice.

It was not until those countries were on the verge of collapse into communism that relief from the blockade was given. Thereafter, a limited amount of food imports and the export of a few industrial articles were allowed until the peace was signed in July. Then all restrictions came down. That chapter is not an agreeable one upon which to expand.

Nine months were consumed in making the peace. This delay, together with the blockade, increased suffering, and stifled economic recuperation greatly in both the liberated and enemy areas. The unemployment was huge and dangerous. Had the blockade been promptly removed and peace quickly made, all Europe could have made more rapid recovery. We could have greatly lessened the social disturbances and the burden upon us to finance relief, if exports could have been carried freely in our returning empty vessels.

The first lesson from this is that, in our own interest, the blockade should be taken down instantly when the enemy hands over his weapons.

The second lesson is the need for a quick—an immediate—provisional peace. We cannot afford to delay the revival of industry, exports and the reestablishment of private credit during the long months necessary to elaborate a final treaty of peace. The intelligent course would be for the United Nations to reach agreement in advance as to the terms of a provisional peace—recognizing de facto governments, drawing provisional frontiers, and taking other steps to allow people to get to work. Such a peace could perfectly well be imposed by the military authorities simultaneously with the terms of surrender—and thus do away entirely with the armistice period. Then the process of reconstruction can begin at once. Arrangement of the final terms of peace can be completed later on.

The amount of loans or gifts by the victorious governments that will be required to fight the next famine, of course, cannot be estimated, but it is not likely to be less than after the first World War, save by the one possibility of the immediate removal of the blockade and a provisional peace.

COMMUNICATIONS AND PASSPORTS

For some time after the armistice the passage of mail, telegrams, or persons over the frontiers of enemy and liberated countries was slow and uncertain. Fear, tension, and hate were universal. The first need of our organization was communications and passport recognition. In order to secure communications, I requested each of the governments to lend us two telegraph circuits between principal centers.

All 23 governments involved willingly did so except the French. General Pershing solved this by giving me two wires from Cologne to Paris from the American military service lines. Within 2 weeks we had a complete telegraph system connecting every capital from Helsingfors to Constantinople with American Army and Navy operators at the clearing points.

Passage over the frontiers of the liberated and enemy nations was a great trial and filled with delays. I finally appealed to all the governments in the acute area to honor an informal passport signed by myself personally. They did so. Such arrangements as these should be agreed upon and established at once when firing ceases next time.

SHIPPING PROBLEMS

Shipping was scarce from war destruction and made more so by the frenzy of all the Allies, including our Americans, to get back to foreign trade.

The Germans and Austrians had some 3,000,000 tons of cargo and passenger ships held in their ports during the war. At once after the armistice we requested the Allied military authorities to secure these cargo ships for use of our organization in carrying food. Furthermore, with the assurance of food, they could secure the passenger ships to repatriate the armies.

The ships were ultimately obtained, but some of our allies kept part of the cargo ships—aside from the enemy and neutral ships we still required Allied ships. During the whole acute period we had daily to haggle, beseech, and swear at our allies and the American Shipping Board to get the millions of tons we needed to save the lives of this mass of humanity.

Our shipping division had not only the duty of directing a giant fleet but also of maintaining large warehouse facilities in some 20 ports. Obviously, one of the problems was to determine a program to meet the need of each of the countries.

Inexperienced, panicky officials, faced with heart-breaking situations and fearful that our organization might fail in deliveries, always wanted their food all at once. We were fortunate in having able and patient men in our organization to determine these programs. They successfully guided the flow of cargoes to meet the need.

Shipping problems will be with us again, but should be settled in advance by a fleet

of approximately four or five million tons, definitely assigned to the relief organization.

CHAOS IN INTERNAL TRANSPORTATION

Another of the problems which will arise again will be to secure some unity of action among the liberated and enemy countries. These countries were dependent upon one another for inland transportation, coal, communications, and many other things. Underlying and spread over them all were the violent hates resulting from centuries of oppression and outrage, conflict, jealousy, and other mental disturbances that made it difficult to secure joint action.

There were just two points of unity—a realization that somehow there must be unified action if millions were not to die of starvation and disease; and a willingness of all (enemies and friends) to trust the Americans completely.

In the liberated and enemy areas the ports, railways, and canals were demoralized by the war and more demoralized by the revolutions. Ten new states had been separated from the five old empires, and the boundaries in four other liberated states had been rearranged. Each government seized all the railway rolling stock and canal boats that it could lay hands upon, and, out of greed or fear, refused to allow them to cross the twenty-odd frontiers.

The railways of Central Europe had been government-built and operated upon empire systems. When the empires cracked the railways were disjoined so that to move between places within a new country by rail it was necessary to pass over the frontiers of neighboring countries.

On top of all this, some of the new government railway officials had never seen a railway before except to ride on one occasionally. The railway systems in several countries almost ceased to function. Therefore, part of our problem was to get the ports open and to arrange, where necessary, for shipment of food by rail or canal across one country to another. In order to persuade the different governments concerned to allow rolling stock to pass over frontiers, we undertook to check the locomotives and cars at frontier points and guarantee their return, and we did the same with canal boats. In some areas we had practically to take over operation of the railways under American and Allied railway executives. We further furnished experienced American railway advisers to several of the governments and aided those who had secured little railway stock in the grab to obtain it from other countries. We required that each government pay all costs of internal European transportation and distribution.

COAL FAMINE

Beyond these troubles, the coal districts in the old empires came under new governments, some of which did not need all the coal but did not want to sell the surplus to hated neighbors. In any event, most of their neighbors did not have money or exchange to pay for it. Certain important coal districts were in the grip of bloody struggles by rival countries for their possession. In others, violent strikes were in progress. As a result, we had a famine in coal. In the grip of winter, the supplies were insufficient in certain countries to keep the people warm or to operate their railways and utilities.

We therefore placed American coal engineers in charge of certain coal districts; we established American coal advisers in the governments of others, and we had to negotiate the financial arrangements for coal purchases by those countries which were short. We had the same problems in moving oil from Rumania to the other countries. The abilities and tact of our Americans brought back the coal production in an astonishingly short time.

One day I received a telegram from the American colonel of engineers in charge of a certain coal district: "Sending $25,000. Send me that much tobacco." This was new in our experience in two directions, both the paying of cash and the use of tobacco for relief. I inquired for more details. It appeared that the colonel had found $25,000 in American gold certificates in the banks of the region which they had held since before the war.

"These poor devils of coal miners haven't had a smoke in 3 years," he explained. "You know a miner must have a smoke. We could lift the production of this district by 20 percent if we could give a tobacco premium."

We bought him the tobacco from the American Army.

BARTER SYSTEM FOR FOOD

Some limited districts had a surplus of food, and those which needed it had no acceptable money with which to pay for it. Currencies were breaking down and, during the stagnation of the armistice, there was little movement of trade even inside Europe. To aid generally, our organization furnished American financial and economic advisers to several governments. The handling of food and coal exchanges with neighbors mostly came down to barter under direction of these Americans as neutrals in the performance.

One day I had an appeal from one of our representatives to decide how many eggs from Galicia should be paid per locomotive from Austria. Being stumped, I could only tell the man to decide it himself and to be guided by the age of each. We moved by this barter system some 600,000 tons of food internally in Europe, and millions of tons of coal.

PRICE AND ACCOUNTING PROBLEMS

In order to secure the great surpluses with which to carry the Allies in war over 1919 or to meet famine if peace came, we had guaranteed our American farmers $2.20 per bushel for wheat and $15.50 to $17 per 100 pounds for hogs. There were some other minor guaranties. The armistice brought a temporary choke in the flow of our gigantic American supplies. It came perilously near breaking down our guaranties and bankrupting the American farmer and everybody who had loaned him money with which to produce. The situation came about because food prices for the dammed-back supplies from the Southern Hemisphere were much lower.

Some of the Allies naturally went at once to these quarters for this cheaper food. This, together with delays in removing the blockade, created a perilous situation for the American farmer, as we did not have storage capacity in the United States to hold such enormous quantities as he was marketing while we were settling these problems. We only solved it by transporting huge quantities of food to European ports and storing it there.

Ultimately the Allies had to come back to us for supplies. I have no doubt the farmers' prices would have crashed had it not been for the guarantees and the measures taken. We may experience this situation again.

All the huge sums of money, quantities of commodities, services of ships and men had to be accounted for. We worked out some simplifications in our accounting. We made the same prices for the various articles of food to every nation and made them at a level that would cover all our guaranties and outlays plus a margin. We contracted that the receiving governments in the liberated and enemy areas would accept the final statements of a well-known firm of accountants without question. In turn we agreed that if we made any profits from our margins we would turn it over to child feeding. We were able to turn over some $40,000,000 and lived a peaceful accounting life as well.

FOOD THROUGH MONEY EXCHANGE

As I said, the currencies of most of these countries had broken down or at least commanded little respect in the exchanges of the world. To accomplish a multiple job of relieving our Government from making loans to pay for food and at the same time get the food into the hands of the needy, we set up some mechanism of exchange. We accepted remittances through banks in the Western Hemisphere to friends and relatives in the demoralized currency areas. We paid for food in the United States with these sums, and turned the food over to the governments concerned for local currency, which we then turned into their domestic banks for payment to the individual designated.

A little later we improved this greatly by selling through the banks in North and South America what we named a food draft. This draft called for a specific number of pounds of flour, lard, sugar, milk or bacon, and upon its presentation to any of our many warehouses, we delivered the goods. These transactions ran into many millions, saved that much in "loans" from the American Government. We made a modest profit on the "drafts" and turned it over to the Child Feeding Division for charitable work—some $2,000,000.

The urgent question today is to lay some foundations in preparedness of supplies, especially in fats, to meet the inevitable need.

To understand the practical problem of food supplies requires a short digression to nutritional questions. Human beings cannot be kept alive or rebuilt in health by just any kind of food.

In nutrition terms, food should be a balanced ration of, first, carbohydrates (principally bread, potatoes, sugar, rice, etc.); second, proteins (principally meats, fish, cheese, eggs, etc.); and, third, fats (principally butter, lard, bacon, vegetable oil). There is some protein in the first and last two groups.

The high-protein foods are hard to come by under famine conditions. Any large supply of meats requires refrigerator ships, and there are not many to be had after a war. But we found, out of vast experience in the last war, that adults can be carried over emergencies on a bread and fat diet, supplementing their domestic supplies. The development of synthetic vitamins makes this easier to do, but a positive supply of fats is just as urgent as bread. Given time enough, people will die on bread alone.

Children must have a supplement of meat, dairy products, and some other protective foods to a bread and other fat diet, if they are to recover strength from their privations.

For reasons given later on we will most likely again go through the experience of a shortage of shipping which will require the utmost condensation and the exclusion of feed for animals at least in the initial stages.

In addition to our experience with the quantities required last time, we can get some idea of the forthcoming European need—supposing the war stopped tomorrow—by inspecting the rations now current in the different countries as indicating their domestic supplies. On this basis, to bring the supply not to normal but to an endurable level for adults would now require more than the last time. At this moment a rough estimate for the war would be, for the first year, a minimum of 24,000,000 tons of bread grains, rice, peas, beans, and at least 7,000,000 tons mostly of animal and vegetable oil fats. This 7,000,000 tons would include a supplemental program for children. And Russia and China will also require help which is not included in this estimate.

A rough exploration of the food resources that will be available in the world discloses two pertinent facts—one good and the other terribly bad.

We have in the Western Hemisphere a surplus of wheat and other breadstuffs sufficient to meet any probable requirement. But at this moment, there is not in sight 20 percent of the meat and especially fat supplies necessary.

SOURCES OF SUPPLIES

This volume of meats, fats, and supplementary food for children cannot be mobilized unless there is definite advance food strategy. The situation at the armistice in 1918 was much better than if we had to meet this problem tomorrow.

The shortage of shipping in the last war ultimately forced Britain, France, Italy, and Belgium, and neutrals to depend mostly upon the short route to North America. To help the then 180,000,000 people of our European Allies and their armies, together with neutrals whose ships we were pressing into use, the United States Food Administration undertook to produce for them for the harvest year of 1918–19 a surplus from the United States of about 17,500,000 tons, of which 2,600,000 tons were to be largely animal and vegetable oil fats. The balance was mostly bread grains, beans, rice, and sugar. This huge program was far in excess of our normal pre-World War I annual export surplus of about 5,300,000 tons of breadstuffs and 650,000 tons of animal and vegetable oil products.

Besides this Allied program, we had to supply our own armies. Men in armies use up about twice as much food as when at home. We met all these requirements. We did it by elimination of waste and unnecessary consumption and by appealing to our farmers for their maximum effort.

I may emphasize again that the most difficult part of the future problem, just as it was last time is the fat supplies. In the last war we decided that the shortest route to fats was the American hog. To insure the farmer against loss if the war suddenly ended, we, as I have said, guaranteed him from $15.50 to $17 per hundred for hogs. Under patriotic urge and our guaranties, the farmer certainly delivered the hogs. In the years 1918 and 1919 he sent an average of 66,000,000 of them to slaughter, compared with 57,000,000 in 1917. He increased the surplus of other animal products also. The Canadians had likewise built up their surpluses.

Altogether we had North America geared up in preparation to carry the brunt of the Allied situation until the summer of 1919 had war continued, or alternately we were prepared to aid in the inevitable famine if the war came to an end. With the armistice in November we had a large part of these supplies in hand.

At the present moment the United States is geared up to supply less than one-half the meat and fat surplus of the last war, and the next famine will demand more. We are already feeling the pinch of shortages of this kind at home as the result of even these demands.

Moreover, after the last war we had large quantities of animal and vegetable oil reserves in South America, South Africa, Australasia, the Indies, and Manchuria dammed back by the shortage of shipping. Japan will have exhausted these supplies from the East Indies and Asia. In fact, after the present war the only consequential sources of supply will be the Western Hemisphere and Africa with some supplement from Australasia.

The reason for our diminished American supplies of meats and fats is that during the 24 years since the last European famine, the population of human beings in the United States has increased about 30 percent while the animal population has not increased proportionally.

Animal statistics are difficult to compare because of several variants, but taking the Food Administration statistics as of January 1, 1918, and those of the Department of Agriculture for January 1, 1942, the figures are:

Jan. 1, 1918:	
Cattle	73,040,000
Hogs	70,880,000
Sheep	48,900,000
Jan. 1, 1942:	
Cattle	74,600,000
Hogs	60,530,000
Sheep	55,930,000

There is some compensation by increased productivity from improved breeding. No doubt, under the present admirable stimulation of production and reduced civilian consumption, our production will increase. But even these increases, after satisfying our domestic needs and those of our allies and our armies, have no present margin for the volume of fat that will be required for the next famine, without further preparedness.

If we look over the rest of the Western Hemisphere for after-war supplies, and even if we include Australia and Africa, we will find that their pre-World War No. 2 exports of animal and vegetable oil products amount to less than 200,000 tons a month. Of this, however, the largest part is fresh meat, which not only in in minor part fat, but requires refrigerator ships of which there will be but few.

The fat part of the problem will be unsolvable unless the strategy is determined now and unless Western Hemisphere agriculture is oriented to carry it out.

The only immediate source would seem to be to stimulate our hog production still further. And to do this the farmer may possibly need to be assured that his prices will not suddenly collapse when the war ends. Such assurances must be given to him a year before the hogs are ready for market. The product cannot be carried in storage for more than 6 or 8 months. If the war did not end at that time there would be another loss to chalk up against the cost of the war. Dairy products will be no less needed but they increase more slowly.

However, a stimulated American program would require much more agricultural labor than is now in prospect. With the heavy drafts upon farm labor and scarcer equipment our production is more likely to decrease than to increase in a long war. If we are to solve our food problems, agriculture must be envisioned as a munitions industry and treated as such. If it is not done we may be faced with gigantic failure after the war.

Certainly the whole question of fats needs urgent consideration. It would seem, outside our own possibilities, that stimulation of production could be undertaken in South America. They have the feed and labor. With Allied financial guaranties, they could do a great deal in preparedness.

IN CONCLUSION

All these are but a few of the possible problems that will arise again. In the last famine, the day-to-day purchase of food in eight countries from over seven seas, the fight for ships, their assignment to sources of supplies, their programing to keep the flow constant to a score of countries, the unloading, warehousing, distributing, accounting, disputing with dumbbells, listening to hourly advice from the well-intentioned but ill-informed and to the prayers of heads of needy governments, conciliating hurt feelings of our allies, coordinating supplies with them and the neutrals, and tempering the ideas of military authorities made a 112-hour workweek for a magnificent staff of Americans.

All this account may seem dry and statistical. But the high purpose was to meet the prayer of nations for a chance to live and the cry of mothers for their children. Beyond that, it was the hope that we were giving strength to the frail democracies which had been brought into being, that through them the world might find peace. We had won victory by arms, and we dreamed that this unparalleled generosity and service by a great nation would set new standards of human relationships in the world. And it expressed the Christianity that was within us. We will need to do it all over again as part of our effort to bring peace to a weary world.

Pay-As-You-Go Income-Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the growing demand for pay-as-you-go income-tax legislation is emphasized in the following letter just received from Mr. Walter T. Margetts, Jr., president of the New Jersey Taxpayers Association, Inc., which recently surveyed its membership on the subject:

NEW JERSEY TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Trenton, N. J., January 13, 1943.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman CANFIELD: The New Jersey Taxpayers Association has asked its large membership for expressions of individual opinion on the proposal that 1943 income taxes be collected from 1943 receipts. A copy of an authoritative booklet describing the Ruml pay-as-you-go income tax plan has been furnished each member.

This is probably the most complete canvass of rank and file taxpayer opinion made anywhere on the proposal which is attracting widespread attention everywhere.

Testifying to deep public interest in pay-as-you-go taxation is the continuing flood of hundreds of individually written letters pouring into this office in response to the request for personal opinions. The consensus of opinion expressed in this thorough-going taxpayer poll, is one of hearty endorsement of pay-as-you-go taxation. Without exception every reply approves the proposal and most writers favor adoption of the Ruml plan to carry it into effect.

The poll cuts across all classes of taxpaying citizens. Included are home owners, leaders of local taxpayer organizations, realtors, businessmen, professional men, finance authorities, tax experts, industrialists, civic leaders, and virtually every other major class of taxpaying citizens. Despite their diverse interests, these citizens express a unanimity of opinion that is probably unprecedented in New Jersey where citizens are among the most alert of the Nation on tax matters. The results of the poll are indicative of a powerful demand for a sensible plan of financing the huge burden of war costs.

Typical of sentiment widely expressed in the response to the poll was one letter which stated, "Taxes must be paid and the closer you can get to pay-as-you-go the better."

Many considered the plan essential to the war effort, one letter declaring, "I think this is one of the most important things in the financing of the war that can possibly be done." Another said, "I heartily approve

of the plan and feel that if it is not put into full force and effect literally millions of taxpayers in this country will 'go busted' and the loss of income to the Federal Government will be so tremendous that the war effort will be seriously impeded."

Said a tax specialist of 20 years' experience: "In my opinion the Ruml plan is the best scheme yet proposed for making the income tax a workable law."

The present system of finding money in 1943 to pay 1942 taxes reminded one writer of "searching down the river for a purse * * * that flowed over the dam a year ago." A similar idea was expressed by another citizen as follows: "The present retroactive system of rapidly increasing income taxation presents a situation similar to that of a person running downhill with cumulative equalibrial instability. The steeper the grade, the greater increase in speed required and the faster one goes, the surer and greater is the catastrophic collapse."

Businessmen declared: "Pay-as-you-go is the only safe way and also is a businesslike procedure," and "It seems to me like a sound business proposition."

Fear of widespread tax defaults under the present system was many times expressed. Said one writer: "Human nature being what it is, any effort by the Government to collect taxes from millions of new income-tax payers on the present methods can only result in disappointment and failure * * * I wish to register my approval of immediate congressional action on the adoption of a pay-as-we-earn basis of tax collection."

A local taxpayer organization leader declared: "Our Association is of the unbiased opinion that the Ruml tax plan is the one best suited for ourselves at this time." Another said: "It is my firm belief that the taxpayers of this community will be unanimously in favor of paying income tax as we go along."

Many individuals expressed surprise at any reluctance on the part of national leaders to go forward with pay-as-you-go taxation. "Not one person with whom I have talked has raised any question except to wonder what sound reason the Treasury Department can have for hesitating to adopt the plan," observed one writer.

"The sooner it is put into effect the better it will be for individuals and for the government," was a viewpoint common to many citizens.

Since the pay-as-you-go plan is meeting such widespread public acclaim among the taxpayers of New Jersey, we sincerely hope it will receive the full support of the New Jersey Congressional delegation. Failure by Congress to adopt such a program may lead to a national financial fiasco.

Very truly yours,

WALTER T. MARGETTS, Jr. *President.*

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, CLASON, of Massachusetts; HALE, of Maine; and FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, are Cecil Rhodes scholars.

A one-hundred-billion budget for 1 year is two-thirds of the assessed valuation of all the property in the United States of America.

Hoover promised a car in every garage and a chicken in every pot, but it took the Roosevelt gas-meat rationing program to do it.

The White Book does not disclose a word on a half dozen positive acts of war—it is not a complete history of the pre-Pearl Harbor events.

While 45 of the minority party went down in the congressional election, LOUIS LUDLOW, famous for his resolution, still survives.

The best evidence of the restoration of Constitutional procedure in the House, is the Speaker's positive announcement that he was going to see to it.

Josh Lee's going to the Aeronautics Board after his defeat for reelection to the Senate suggests the lame duck or the bird with the broken pinion.

Repudiating congressional action by Executive order on the $25,000 income had precedent in the lend-lease bill; convoying was expressly prohibited, and yet in 2 weeks we were convoying.

CLARE BOOTH LUCE is capable and is liked by the House. She can charge her failure to make the Foreign Affairs Committee partly to the announcement by Walter Winchell in early December that she was "slated" for it.

A Suggestion for the New Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from one of the folks back home—just one of the plain, ordinary, common people—come a few suggestions which every Member of Congress might stop and consider and then act upon. That part of the letter to which reference is made is as follows:

Here are a few things I would like much to see the Seventy-eighth Congress enact:

Open the way for a court review of all Executive orders and also all doings of bureaus—yes—everything.

Word all appropriations so that funds cannot be switched here and there, even in same department, and cut most appropriations by 50 percent, except on definite war phases.

Kick England's domination of our war effort overboard.

Kill all the craziness in rationing; leave it in large measure to our honesty.

Put a midwesterner—a real man—as censor.

Choke off WALLACE'S mouthings — even though he is stooge for his boss.

Quit talking about four freedoms until they are established here at home.

Kill off the War Labor Board and put in real red, white, and blue men, and so curb the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Give an incentive for food production by removing restrictions and red tape, and cut Agricultural Adjustment Administration and Agricultural Department appropriations at least half.

Best wishes for good health to stand up under what's coming.

Cordially,

HENRY C. ANGELL.

Speaker Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert Humphreys, from the New York Journal-American of January 6, 1943:

(By Robert Humphreys)

WASHINGTON, January 6.—The House today reelects SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, to what traditionally has been called the second most powerful office in the land—the Speakership.

The action comes, by coincidence, on his sixty-first birthday

With many Members already inclined to rate him with the great Speakers of all time—the Thomas B. Reeds, the Champ Clarks, and the Nick Longworths—this quiet-mannered but tenacious Texan resumes his post under circumstances almost certain to make or break his rank in history:

1. He heads a war Congress.

2. On his left is a liberal President whose nominal legislative agent he is. On his right is a highly conservative House whose leader he is in both name and fact, but whose Members have already made it clear that a substantial majority of them are against the New Deal.

NO WORKING MAJORITY

3. He is without what Congressmen call a working majority, there being only 14 more Democrats in the House than Republicans. With the count now 222 Democrats to 208 Republicans, only a half-dozen or so Democrats need join with the Republicans to upset any New Deal legislative program.

4. Congress itself has been under severe fire during the past year, with RAYBURN its leading and staunchest defender. An almost fanatical believer in the democratic role of Congress, he has already gone on record that he will sink or swim with the legislative branch of this Government, come what may.

In short, RAYBURN is in the well-known "middle."

On the question of vigorous prosecution of the war, there is an unanimity in Congress, but on the domestic front and on post-war policies the differences are sharp and bitter.

Crux of the picture is the part some 50 to 75 conservative Democrats, mostly Southerners, are going to play. Their leader, Representative GENE COX, of Georgia, has already made a speech in the House proposing "coalescence" with Republicans.

RAYBURN'S FOLLOWING BIG

House Members rate RAYBURN'S personal popularity with his southern colleagues as the one thing that may save much of any domestic program the President may advance. COX, although he differs with the Speaker on much, is one of RAYBURN'S closest friends and has repeatedly pledged his "devotion" to the man occupying the chair.

Although it is not likely to result in many votes for New Deal legislation, RAYBURN also has a considerable following on the Republican side of the aisle. Twice during the past year, House Republican Leader JOSEPH MARTIN took the floor to laud the Speaker, terming him "one of the great Americans of the era."

As with Members of Congress, RAYBURN'S relations with President Roosevelt have always been on a steadfast basis. Having an abhorrence of effusiveness, and being a dev-

otee of the unadorned truth the Speaker has never been less than plaintalking in his frequent conferences at the White House. There are numerous incidents, notes, and public statements that attest to Mr. Roosevelt's regard for his principal legislative lieutenant.

"I LOVE THE HOUSE"

Of his 61 years, RAYBURN has devoted 37 of them to a legislative career. Born of humble parents, reared on a meager, little Texas cotton farm, and educated on a "two-teacher" country-school basis, he was elected to the Texas House of Representatives at 24, was speaker at 29, and a Member of Congress at 31. He has been in Congress ever since.

Making one of his rare speeches on the last day of the Seventy-seventh Congress, the bachelor RAYBURN stated his creed in the following measured words:

"I love the House of Representatives.

"I am proud of its accomplishments.

"I am proud of its membership.

"To those of you who will be with me in the next session, I say that it will be my unwavering ambition to protect the honor, the prerogatives, and the powers of the House of Representatives."

And with characteristic abruptness, he sat down.

The Destruction of the Dairymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, what the dairy farmers in my State think about the way the milk situation is being handled is summed up in the following letter of Gerald C. Fullam, which I have received, and which I insert herein under my leave to extend my remarks:

WEST VIEW FARMS,
Randolph Center, Vt., January 9, 1943.

Hon. CHAS. A. PLUMLEY,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: On April 1st, unless someone does something to prevent, 48 creameries in New England are to be closed by orders from Washington. The power, so we are told, is given by F. D. to Wickard and he in turn to Samuel Tator, milk administrator of Boston. These creameries are all doing business and have built, and some of them Government financed, to take care of the milk business of New England. No man or company wants their plant closed so the dictator decides which to close.

Is this giving us protection, under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, to free business and free enterprise?

They claim this is a measure to save tires and manpower but it looks as though it was just a blind to control. Everything that has happened in Washington since 1932 has been under stress of an emergency but he was not smart enough to see we needed rubber and pipe lines to the east coast and strong protection in our Pacific possessions.

We farmers save manpower by working 12 to 14 hours a day 7 days a week and yet he tries to tell us what we are to raise, where we shall sell, and what we shall get for it. The future will tell if he wins. We remember his program to curtail production; taxing hogs, killing little pigs, destroying cotton; in fact, destroying everything truly American. If they can tell us who shall stay in business and who must get out they will soon tell us where to go to church and when.

If Congress has delegated any such power to Roosevelt and his gang it is up to Congress to take that power away and at once.

It has been publicly stated within a few days that this administration is intending to establish a dictatorship here and if they can do this to the milk industry of New England they have it established now. The next thing in line will be to send you men home or to the firing squad as in Germany.

Please get at the bottom of this at once and let me know what we must expect.

Very truly yours,

GERALD C. FULLAM.

Mr. Speaker, this very morning I have received a letter from A. Leroy Smith, secretary of the Vermont Dairymen, enclosing copy of a letter they sent to the Regional Office, Office of Price Administration, Boston, Mass., which I here insert:

JANUARY 7, 1943.

REGIONAL OFFICE,
OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Boston, Mass.

GENTLEMEN: A committee representing a majority of the milk markets of Vermont have today considered the serious conditions which milk distributors in the State are now facing, and have furnished your representative, Mr. C. P. Smith, Jr., with figures for your consideration.

It has been clearly brought out that it is imperative that ceiling prices be raised in order to prevent further serious diversion of milk from Vermont markets.

Recognizing that the relief recently given is not sufficient, we request that the Regional Office of Price Administration send a representative, with power to act, to meet with this committee within 1 week, to establish ceiling prices which will enable Vermont distributors to meet Boston and New York producer prices and thus insure an adequate volume of milk for Vermont towns and cities.

Respectfully submitted.

Signed: Ernest H. Bancroft, Barre, Vt.; Richard H. Hall, Bennington, Vt.; Howard E. Wilcox, Manchester, Vt.; Fred C. Fiske, Burlington, Vt.; The Hill Farm, G. S. Rand, manager, St. Albans, Vt.; Kemper F. Peabody, St. Albans, Vt.; A. R. White, Burlington, Vt.; William J. Burke, R. D. 1, Rutland, Vt.; Fred W. Knowlton, St. Johnsbury, Vt.; N. T. Scott, Newport, Vt.; I. H. Buck, White River Junction, Vt.; Willard C. Arms, Burlington, Vt.; A. Leroy Smith, Barre, Vt.; G. E. Fleming, St. Johnsbury, Vt.; O. A. Thomas, Rutland, Vt.; A. B. Edwards, Burlington, Vt.

Mr. SPEAKER. In this connection I cannot resist the temptation to say that, while the President appeals to the farmers to produce more food, his bureaucrats make it impossible. The farmer is forbidden to plant or sow or reap, except under certain prohibitive regulations. They make a rule one day and send out a regulation the next day canceling the rule, they practically prohibit the use of gas and trucks by the farmers; they close creameries, while the supply of milk dwindles, the price of butter soars, and it becomes a scarcity; they force the sale of dairy herds for beef; the price of beef reaches such figures that nobody can buy it; they wake up when too late, to find that they have taken the essential men from the farms, men absolutely necessary to the production of food, a primary weapon of war.

This administration has done about everything that could be done to destroy little business and the individual farmer, and behind that program stands the sinister program of the socialization and centralization these bureaucrats have hoped to accomplish.

All the bureaucrats' talk amounts to nothing, for what they have done speaks louder than any honeyed words of theirs. Thanks to this mismanagement we are in an awful mess economically and internally. The responsibility for it all rests squarely on the shoulders of the administration, its bureaucrats and those misguided, coat-tail hanging rubber-stamp Members of Congress, most of whom today are convinced of the error of their way. This will be evidenced later in this Seventy-eighth Congress, we hope.

To Make the O. P. A. Effective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Reno Evening Gazette of January 8, 1943, which, in my opinion, is very pertinent to the situation as it exists in the State of Nevada at the present time:

Greater authority must be vested in the State directors of the Office of Price Administration if the price-control structure which has spread out from Washington is to work with any degree of success.

Reno and Nevada are entirely conscious of this need. The milk situation, which has been a problem for weeks, could have been solved quickly and with a minimum of trouble if the Nevada Office of Price Administration office had been granted the authority to make a proper settlement. Instead, the problem must be referred to a regional office in San Francisco, and then, more than likely, sent on to Washington for a final study.

This gives rise to the question: What does a regional Office of Price Administration executive in San Francisco, or a general Office of Price Administration executive in Washington, know about economic conditions in Nevada?

Competent men were selected to serve the Office of Price Administration in Nevada, and it is safe to assume that in a majority of cases the State directors and their top assistants are men who have the welfare of their communities and State at heart. But they are handicapped and smothered under a maze of regulations from which there has been no escape so far.

If the Office of Price Administration is to become an effective force, State directors must be given power to settle problems within their own State, and the scope of control over products must be limited to the basic items affecting increased cost of living. It is folly to believe that any effective control can be exercised over the thousands of items which the ambitious program stemming from Washington now seeks to include. A simplified program can be made to work if authority is given the State directors.

Problems of American Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the House Select Committee on Small Business under chairmanship of Representative WRIGHT PATMAN is doing a splendid job. The Patman committee, in connection with a similar Senate committee under chairmanship of Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, sponsored legislation out of which has come the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Next week, on January 19, 20, and 21, 1943, pursuant to a call from Chairman JAMES E. MURRAY, the Senate Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business will hold a conference in the Senate Office Building. This conference is for retailers and wholesalers. The California Retail Grocers and Merchants Association, Ltd., with head office in my district in San Francisco, addressed a letter, under date of January 4, 1943, to Senator MURRAY outlining the association's ideas. The letter clearly sets forth several problems affecting the Pacific Coast and I submit it herewith:

CALIFORNIA RETAIL GROCERS
AND MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION, LTD.,
San Francisco, January 4, 1943.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is our understanding that the Special Senate Committee on Small Business is calling a conference for retailers and wholesalers interested, on January 19, 20, 21, 1943, to consider certain questions of primary importance to our people here on the Pacific coast. Inasmuch as it will not be possible to have a representative at this meeting, I am submitting some of the facts relating to the questions which we trust will be helpful in aiding small business in meeting the present situation under war conditions.

Question 1: Government policy relative to meeting essential civilian requirements for goods and manpower:

The Pacific coast area offers many different situations that do not exist anywhere else in the United States, especially when we take into consideration climatic conditions, production, and increased population. At the present time California has an increase in population of approximately 2,000,000, when we include the armed forces moving in and out and around this State This naturally has caused an added drain on the food industry, seriously affecting the stocks of both wholesalers and retailers to such an extent that in many of the communities where defense industries have caused an abnormal increase in population, we are now confronted with a tremendous increase in volume of business but a material reduction based on normal purchases.

In order to make our position clear, we cite several specific instances:

We have a case of a retail grocer in the city of Richmond, located close to large Kaiser shipbuilding plants. This retailer formerly did a business of some $6,000 per month, and is now doing a business of $7,000 per week, struggling each day to secure enough merchandise to try and serve these defense workers housed near the base of operation. This retailer definitely informs us that he cannot hold out much longer unless he is given an increase in quota allocated to him as his present quota is based on his purchases during normal times.

We then cite a second case of a retail grocer located in Mill Valley, a community close to the Marin shipbuilding plants recently constructed and employing 22,000 defense workers which have been added to the community. Quoting from this grocer's letter, he writes:

"I spoke to your secretary regarding allotments from our wholesalers. We are in a difficult position here due to increased population from Marin shipyards that has more than doubled our volume, yet our source of supply has been cut in half. In other words, we are receiving approximately a quarter of our necessary staples required to serve the demands of the community. We have far less than our normal supply of stock on hand at present, and are advised that we are unable to replenish them because of the 10 percent quota set on many of these canned items."

This same problem has been repeatedly submitted to us from many other retailers and wholesalers throughout the State where a similar condition exists. We feel that recognition of such increased population must be given consideration by the War Production Board in allocating its quota to those respective States or sections of States where these conditions exist. Under the same question we submit another problem which has caused a great deal of grief to the consumers as well as to the industry, and that is the failure on the part of the Office of Price Administration to take into consideration all branches of the food industry in making price adjustments. We have numerous instances of this, but cite two specific instances in order to bring out our problem.

All prices on fresh citrus fruits were frozen under a temporary 60-day freezing order of Office of Price Administration. However this was shortly revised by removing the freezing order from the producer and the wholesaler but allowing the frozen price to stand for retailers. The result was that the cost of these citrus fruits jumped from $1 to $2.50 per case—even in such a citrus fruit State as California. Retailers whose prices were frozen were confronted with a demand from the consumer for these products but because of the tremendous increase in price at wholesale were unable to supply this demand without destruction to their business, or violation of Office of Price Administration regulations.

It is our opinion that many changes in such price structure should be carried on through to the consumer, otherwise it should not have been granted at all.

A similar situation existed on an increase in price granted to manufacturers and condensers of evaporated milk (granting an increase of 45 cents per case), while the price to the wholesaler and retailer was frozen as of September 28 to October 2. The result was that wholesalers and retailers were unable to purchase this evaporated milk from the manufacturer without sustaining a heavy loss, because the price advance allowed by Office of Price Administration did not make any adjustment in the price to the wholesaler and retailer. There is no sound reason why such changes should be made without giving due consideration to all branches of distribution.

At the time the increased allowance on evaporated milk was made to the manufacturers, there was a very definite shortage of this product on the markets of the Pacific coast which presented a serious problem to the feeding of babies in hospitals and private homes. It was expected that the increase in price would release a large amount of evaporated milk which was being held by the processors because of the price situation but this did not take place as the price of wholesalers and retailers were frozen on the old basis. This presented a very serious situation and urgent appeals were made to manufacturers to relieve the situation even at a loss to them which was apparently done.

Still a third instance existed on dry, edible beans, where farmers had raised their price far above the frozen price of the brokers. In this instance wholesalers and retailers could have adjusted their price according to a percentage allowance under GMPR 237 and 238 as amended, but here we have a case where the broker's price was frozen. He therefore refused to purchase because of the severe loss that he would have to sustain in operating under the higher price from the farmer.

Still another problem presents itself under essential civilian requirements for merchandise, and that is the seasonable conditions that exist along the Pacific coast. As a large farm and dairy producing State, California has a very heavy buying period of canned fruits and vegetables during the months of November, December, January, and February, which drops off materially when new items of fresh vegetables and fruits appear on the market beginning with the month of March. Under the quota set by the War Production Board the distribution is equalized throughout the 12-month period of the year, but no special recognition is given to the increased demand due to seasonable conditions on canned goods during the heavy buying period.

Unless this situation is relieved consumers will have to go without canned fruits and vegetables before the end of January, February, and March. We believe that greater percentage allowances should be granted to wholesalers and retailers of these canned items during the peak period of sales and the percentage reduced when fresh products enter our markets.

Question 2: Voice of small retailers and wholesalers in Government policy making:

Under this all-important question we wish to present certain conditions and recommendations which we trust will be helpful in a more practical application of the necessary requirements under the powers granted to the various governmental agencies under laws recently passed by Congress.

While we recognize the shortage of manpower and the inability to secure the varied types of full-time employees in connection with the administration of these laws and the difficulty to secure types of men necessary to promulgate regulations applying to the various types of industries, yet we believe this could be greatly solved by using two additional methods, that is, first to grant authority to regional offices of these various governmental agencies, and second to incorporate official recognition of boards or committees from these industries to cooperate with governmental agencies in the preparation of rules and regulations necessary to comply with provisions of the law. In this manner, men who are qualified to advise and serve could be secured and a great deal of the difficulties of small business could be presented before official orders are issued. They might even be drafted into service from trade groups.

We are satisfied that these two provisions would be extremely helpful and that the selection of such boards or committees of industry should be made in a manner that would give equal recognition to both small and large businesses.

We do not believe that committees should merely be called in for advice and then before the meeting is over that they should be given

the instructions and the regulations without any due consideration having been given to the advice and counsel of these committees. After all, men in industry today are fair minded and desire to serve their country to the best of their ability with all honesty and sincerity and render that service in whatever manner the country needs, whether it be on the battlefields or in giving sound counsel for the proper allocation and regulation of the food industry of our Nation.

We believe that if sufficient authority is granted to regional offices that many local problems can be adjusted speedily without all the necessary Washington red tape which sometimes takes months to correct.

Another problem of serious concern to both retailers and wholesalers in the food industry is the increased requirements for voluminous records and the filling out of numerous forms required by governmental agencies. With a shortage of manpower operators, instead of devoting most of their time to the operation of their business of buying and selling of food commodities, are being required to devote a large portion of their time to the filling out of forms and complying with other demands of Government. This has reached such serious proportions that they find it physically impossible to comply 100 percent with regulations—and run their business.

If the various governmental agencies could simplify the forms, and eliminate many that are not absolutely neecssary, it would be extremely helpful to the industry. There are many of these required forms, such as the monthly changes in cost-of-living commodities, several hundred items to be filed with the rationing boards under Form 338.1, regular interval filing under the Victory tax, filing of income tax returns, social security, State old-age and unemployment, filing of State sales tax, reports of sales of alcoholic beverages, returns on special Federal taxes on alcoholic beverages, cigarettes and cigars, registering of tires and trucks, proper control of sugar and coffee stamps under the rationing plan, numerous local, State, and Federal licenses, and others of a like nature.

We appreciate that some of these are applicable to State regulations, but nevertheless they still are problems of the industry for compliance under the laws. We urgently appeal for a simplification and elimination of some of these forms and regulations as the food industry with its limited manpower has a tremendous problem in endeavoring to purchase and sell foods for civilian use.

Question 3: Steps necessary today for securing a competitive distribution system after the war:

This question is all important for the future welfare of small business in our country. Unless we plan for such post-war conditions, we may find business confronted with a destructive element which would be difficult to guard against. One of the worst items of destruction would be below-cost selling. Many people would be driven out of business because of their inability to stand the strain of such price slashing. This must definitely be guarded against, and it is possible that the same machinery which is now functioning to prevent inflation could continue to function to prevent deflation, establishing a minimum below which merchandise could not be sold until such time as proper reductions could be made without total destruction to small business. It is reasonable to assume that a tremendous exchange of business operation and manufacturing will take place immediately after the war is over to replace many of the items which have been on the priority list and which undoubtedly will need replacing. This expansion for the time being should bring great prosperity to the Nation but after we have reached this peak and returned to normal conditions it is then that we can look for the big problems. We believe that some system of credit to small business could be adopted whereby reasonable loans could be made by Government to permit this business to expand on a sound basis and to make the necessary changes which always follow any war, as wars introduce new methods of merchandising, many new items, and many economic changes in business operations. Therefore Government aid is most necessary to help small business and plan now for post-war conditions.

In submitting this brief we have not included many other items of equally serious importance to the food industry but trust that these suggestions will be helpful. Our association compliments the Special Committee on American Small Business for the excellent work that they have been and are doing and wants to encourage them to continue this excellent work on behalf of small business.

Sincerely yours,

CALIFORNIA RETAIL GROCERS AND MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION,
W. D. HADELET, *Secretary.*

The Aladdin Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of Tuesday, January 12, for the benefit of my colleagues:

THE ALADDIN CLUB

Mrs. Roosevelt, who makes more Republicans every time she opens her mouth, assured an audience in New York State the other day that "after the war there will be a complete state of chaos throughout the world." The prospect did not appear uninviting to her. She continued that the British people are soon going to have to decide whether they will continue rationing for 3 years after the end of the war in order to feed other nations. The implication was obvious that the United States, which is doing a major part of the job of feeding Britain, might be expected to follow this example.

It does not seem to occur that the American people will take a different view of their responsibilities after the fighting stops, the view that Europe brought the war on itself by its failure over the decades to adjust its political and economic problems more wisely and that the primary responsibility for bringing order in the chaos which Mrs. Roosevelt anticipates rests on the same people whose mistakes brought it about. Our people have never been wanting in a spirit of charity in the past, nor will they lack any generosity to genuine calls for charity after the war, but a nation which had already sickened of the Work Projects Administration on domestic scale is not going to exhibit much enthusiasm for it on an international scale.

Mr. and Mrs. Roosevelt, their star boarder in the White House, "Hardship" Harry Hopkins, the New York investment bankers who have managed to get themselves such a big slice of the war controls, and the social climbers who glow in the patronage of the exiled princelings all see themselves collectively as Aladdin and Uncle Sam as the slave of the lamp. They deny that Americans have any interests to be respected or protected. Americans have only the duty to sacrifice themselves for foreign rulers and for the rectification of blunders in statesmanship for which our people bear no responsibility.

The lamp which these fake Aladdins are rubbing is that of patriotism. The sacrifices are represented as being for the good of the country, whereas in many instances the country itself is being sacrificed. Nor is the charmed circle of mutual admirers sharing them. Eight hours after the Office of Price Administration prohibition of all so-called pleasure driving in the East became effective, Mrs. Roosevelt and Mrs. Hopkins rode to a concert in one of the White House automobiles.

We Ask Representation for the West on Policy-Forming Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California.—Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Mr. Manchester Boddy in the Los Angeles Daily News states forcefully, and, I believe, unanswerably, the case for the appointment to positions of real influence in policy-making governmental agencies of western men who know the problems and conditions of our agriculture, our business, and our people generally.

TWO VIEWS OF THE NEWS

(By Manchester Boddy)

Food trouble was inevitable in any event. Our war position made that certain.

However, much of the trouble could have been mitigated at least by intelligent action in Washington. Throughout the Nation the public was literally driven into food markets—hoarding bent—by constant warnings about drastic shortages to come.

Rationing should have been invoked first, then explained. As matters stand, hoarding was precipitated and followed with threats of rationing which have not yet been carried out.

As always, the blow has fallen hardest on citizens least able to take care of themselves. Small home owners without warehouse or freezing facilities have been forced to buy from day to day. Still worse, they are forced to buy from little businessmen who in turn are on the tail end of the line of dealers in a position to take care of themselves.

All of this is old stuff; merely an elaboration of the obvious. There is no use talking about it unless we accompany the recitation of abuses with a suggestion as to how they can be eliminated and the damage repaired.

Our first specific criticism is that official Washington continues to ignore a shameful situation that we have pointed out on innumerable occasions.

The West simply does not have representation at the top in the bureaus that make decisions affecting us.

Consider the case of agriculture.

As the editor of the Pacific Rural Press points out, Pacific coast States depend to a large extent on an irrigated agriculture. Our year round production of crops under irrigation and the development of specialized equipment and skills gives us a production per acre many times greater than in other sections of the country. The Southwest is

of vast importance to the war effort—citrus fruits, deciduous fruits, vegetables, dairy and poultry products, meats—all dependent upon irrigation directly or indirectly.

Our problems of processing and distribution are different.

Yet—and notwithstanding the unique nature of our problems—Washington gives full powers over our food production, our processing, our distribution, and our rationing to strangers from a distant section of the United States who have demonstrated by their actions time and again that they are handicapped with a fatal lack of knowledge with respect to local conditions.

These strangers to our agriculture and its problems write the law and then get local men to act as enforcement agents. Chaos always results. The local men finally penetrate the outer defenses of Washington bureaucracy and plead for recognition of local conditions. This is granted, if at all, only after weeks and often months of disastrous experience.

We in the West recognize the need for bureaus, for rationing, for cooperation, and for united action.

But we ask that Washington recognize the vital necessity of putting western men who know local conditions at the right elbow of the men who dictate the law.

This section must have representation in policy making. That is a constructive suggestion.

Official Washington will either act upon it or they will shoulder the responsibility for continued chaos in the food situation, which can only result in a critical let-down in the whole war production effort.

Labor and Economic Reconstruction After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Rt. Rev. John A. Ryan, D. D., at the American Catholic Sociological Society Convention at Cleveland, Ohio, on December 29, 1942.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our main concern here, I assume, is not labor all over the world; it is labor in the United States. In this respect and for present purposes we are all isolationists. And I take the liberty of restricting the subject still further. I shall deal mainly with organized labor. All intelligent and realistic observers are aware that the condition of the wage-earning classes in a reconstructed capitalist order will be determined, as in the past, mainly by their ability to organize. In this connection I desire to quote the eloquent historical summary put down more than 40 years ago by Adams and Sumner:

"In the last six centuries the laboring population has risen from a condition of serfdom to a state of political freedom. In this struggle for economic equality the victories have been won by the wage earners themselves. When they did not pursue their interest they lost their interest. When they forgot to demand their full reward they failed to receive their full reward. They had occasional encouragement, and even an occasional leader, from the employing class, but in the main they fought their way against the opposition, and not with the assistance of their employers. Their weapons were the strike and the trade union. When the pondercus machinery of supply and demand was ready to give them a lift its inertia and initial friction had to be overcome with a strike. When it had begun to thrust wages down it was prevented from entirely degrading the wage earner by the trade union. Always and everywhere the salvation of the working class has been collective action; and while the wage system remains their progress will continue to depend upon collective action." (Labor Problems, p. 205.)

Either of two diametrically opposite situations may confront American labor after the war. It may lose all the advantages that it has obtained since June 1933, in particular the National Labor Relations Act and the Minimum Wage and Maximum Hours Act.

This will undoubtedly happen if it can be brought about by the dominant economic groups and their associates and satellites. That such is their deliberate desire and design is clearly indicated by certain significant events: The declarations of the National Association of Manufacturers, the attitudes and utterances of the majority of the metropolitan newspapers, the pronouncements and performances of the most powerful of the farm organizations, and the reactionary attitude of the majority of the recently elected Congress. These persons and institutions are the authentic Bourbons of our time. They have learned nothing and forgotten nothing.

In an address delivered December 7 in New York City, Mr. Wayne L. Morse, one of the ablest members of the War Labor Board, denounced those industrialists who are so "doped by the philosophy of economic feudalism" that they misinterpret the trend of events and jump to the conclusion that the time is ripe to "carry on a fight against unionism." He went on to say, however, that "the number of these would-be feudal barons among American employers is small * * *." I wish I could agree with him in this encouraging estimate. Even if the group of "feudal barons" among employers be small numerically it will, I am afraid, exercise a dominant influence upon the thinking and plans of business as a whole with reference to post-war industrial relations.

If the Republicans elect their candidate for the Presidency in 1944 and if they are able, with the assistance of Democratic reactionaries, to control both Houses of Congress, the status and influence of organized labor, and therefore of the whole body of wage earners, will undergo a disastrous decline. As a matter of fact, this combination of Republicans and reactionary Democrats already dominates the House of Representatives, that is, the body that was elected the 3d of last month. Except for two obstacles the most important recent gains of labor would all be swept away within the next 6 months. These obstacles are the Senate and the President, and we cannot be too confident about the Senate. So long, however, as the present occupant of the White House remains there, no fears need be entertained for the cause of labor or the cause of social justice.

After the beginning of the year 1945 the situation may be disastrously different, and labor may face the imminent peril of losing all that it has gained through legislation since 1933.

Assume that this possibility is realized. In order to simplify the problem let us assume, too, that by 1945 the war will have ceased and the period of post-war reconstruction will have commenced.

What political and economic policies will the masters of industry adopt in order to guide and determine the processes of economic reconstruction? According to their most vocal representatives they will restore what with wearisome reiteration they have been calling the "system of free enterprise." The phrase itself is not very precise. Probably it was not intended to be too definite. Probably it is more effective as a magic formula, a slogan, a shibboleth. At any rate many of those who are fondest of it seem to give it about the same meaning that is conveyed by the phrase, laissez faire. "Free enterprise" implies freedom of business from the restraints imposed by either labor unions or political governments. Give business a free hand and it will automatically produce universal prosperity.

To be sure, the champions of "free enterprise" would admit that for a few months after the boys come marching home from the war, many of them will be unable to find jobs. But the "free enterprisers" wishfully think that this temporary difficulty can be adequately met by Government relief. Vast public works will be as unnecessary as they are undesirable. When the brief emergency is over "free enterprise" will automatically insure full employment.

I have called these men Bourbons. They have learned nothing from the false prosperity of the 1920's, nor from the real depression of the 1930's. They have forgotten nothing of their antiquated and discredited economic heresies. They look back longingly to the 1920's, as the golden age of "free enterprise," when Government never interfered with the performances of business and when labor unions were almost equally impotent. They shut their eyes to the well-known facts that in that decade of pseudo prosperity "free enterprise" was unable to keep the industrial plant operating at more than 80 percent of capacity, even though sufficient idle and willing workers were available to maintain operations at full capacity. Why did not "free enterprise" bring the idle men and idle machines together? Because the "free enterprisers" knew that they could not sell the additional product. Why could they not have sold those additional goods? Because they had not put sufficient purchasing power into the hands of those who would like to buy, that is, the wage earners and the farmers.

This unpleasant bit of industrial history our champions of "free enterprise" have conveniently forgotten. They still believe—not explicitly, only implicitly—that goods can be sold without buyers. Hence they are longing for the time after the war when they can "put the labor unions in their place," even if that means greatly reduced wages and greatly reduced purchasing power.

A few weeks ago I heard over the radio a university professor extravagantly eulogize "free enterprise" because of its achievements in the last 150 years, and particularly in the years 1921-29. I listened in vain for the effective retort that his opponent should have made. It could have taken this form: "Yes, free enterprise had full scope in the 1920's and it did produce a kind of meretricious prosperity. But why did it not use its magic powers and formulas to prevent the crash of 1929? Why did it not bring about industrial recovery during the 4 long years that elapsed between 1929 and 1933? Why were the last months of this 4-year period worse than the first? Free enterprise was as free and unhampered under Herbert Hoover as under Warren Gamaliel Harding and Calvin Coolidge." Sometimes I think that the exponents of "free enterprise" are without a saving sense of humor.

A few weeks ago, Walter Lippmann cited Alexis de Tocqueville's L'Ancien Régime et de la Révolution on the different reactions of the aristocracy of France and of England to the doctrines and the threat of the French Revolution. The privileged classes in England took account of these events, gave up some of their privileges and saved themselves from destruction. Les classes dirigeantes.

that is, the aristocracy in France, refused to yield up anything and lost everything. According to Mr. Lippmann the business classes of the United States have long occupied and still occupy the position of power which was held more than a century and a half ago by the nobility in England and France. He raises the question, whether our aristocracy of business will imitate their social forbears in England, or those in France. They will soon be compelled to make a decision. Here are the words in which he describes the situation:

"I think that the American businessmen today face essentially the same choice as did the British and French nobles in the eighteenth century. Will the American businessmen assume very heavy burdens in order to continue to lead our industrial society, or will they become so absorbed in complaining about their burdens that they will not be able to lead? This is a very real question. It is the answer to this question which will determine the future of American businessmen and, I believe, the very future of American industrial society under private management."

It is somewhat more than a hundred years since De Tocqueville wrote the following sentences in another great work:

"I am of opinion, upon the whole, that the manufacturing aristocracy which is growing up under our eyes is one of the harshest which ever existed in the world; but, at the same time, it is one of the most confined and least dangerous. Nevertheless, the friends of democracy should keep their eyes anxiously fixed in this direction; for if ever a permanent inequality of conditions and aristocracy again penetrate into the world, it may be predicted that this is the gate by which they will enter." (De Tocqueville, Democracy in America, II, 197.)

Of course, the business element in our present society includes other groups in addition to the manufacturers, who were the dominant social class 110 years ago. The great financial, commercial, railroad, petroleum, and mining interests have to be added to the manufacturing interest. Taken together these great economic groups wield far greater social power in our time than did the manufacturing aristocracy in the days of De Tocqueville. The question of what they will do with their great influence after the war, is one of the most crucial that has ever confronted the American people.

So much for the unpleasant situation that labor may have to face in the post-war period. Let us turn now to the contrary possibility. It is possible that the economic theories of the "free enterprisers" and their spiritual associates will not determine the policies of post-war reconstruction. Accordingly, the Congress and the national administration will recognize the immediate necessity of very large expenditures for public works to take care of the millions whom private industry will be unable to employ. The tragic mistake made in the years 1933 to 1937 of spending only a fraction of the amount necessary to reemploy all who were unemployed in that period must not be repeated. After the war appropriations for public works must not be limited by the discredited theory of priming the industrial pump. Public works can "prime the pump" in the sense that so long as they are continued they cause an increase in private business and private employment. The ratio, I believe, is two and one-half men employed in subsidiary private industries for every one engaged upon the public project. After the stimulus of public works is withdrawn, however, private industry cannot continue at the pace that it has artificially acquired. Even if the Government were to put into operation a program of public works so large that all the unemployed found either public or private jobs, private industry alone would not be able to continue this happy condition. Private industry would be unable to continue with full operation and full employment. The reason is to be found in the bad distribution, in the fact that the owners of capital still would receive more than they could spend and that labor would obtain less than it would like to spend. In other words, the industrial pump would not stay primed, unless capital received less and labor more than under the present distribution. (Can Unemployment Be Ended, p. 12.)

To be sure, when and if private industry brings about a better distribution of purchasing power than any that we have known under the free enterprise system, when and if the masters of our industrial system come to realize that full employment cannot be maintained unless more of the national income is spent for consumption goods and less of it saved for unprofitable or impossible investment, when and if they reach the conclusion that capital must be content with less, while labor and the farmers receive more, of the national product than has been the case in the past, then public spending to employ the unemployed can safely be brought to an end. Until this remote and improbable contingency arrives, government will have to maintain a public-works program of sufficient magnitude to provide a job for every person who cannot find a remunerative place in private industry.

If the foregoing policy should be put into operation in the period of post-war economic reconstruction, obviously it would be of great benefit to labor. Full employment would mean good wages and, therefore, adequate opportunity for labor organization. The possibility that Congress might wipe out labor's recent legislative gains, or in any other way unduly restrict the activities of the unions, would be negligible. Such an attitude toward labor could not exist side by side with the economic and political philosophy implied in a program of Federal spending to provide full employment, any more than a generous attitude toward labor and labor unions is compatible with the economic and political theories cherished by the champions of free enterprise. The two attitudes and the two philosophies are mutually exclusive.

My own opinion of the merits, feasibility, and necessity of large public spending in the period of post-war economic reconstruction is in line with that of Prof. Alvin E. Hansen and his colleagues on the National Resources Planning Board. Here are three pertinent paragraphs from their pamphlet entitled "After the War—Full Employment," issued in January 1942:

"We have to make up our minds as a nation that we will not permit a post-war depression to overwhelm us. We do not have to take economic defeat after the military victory is won. We can, if we will, maintain business prosperity. We can sustain a continuing demand for goods. We can keep industry going at high levels. We can maintain substantially full employment. We can achieve a society in which everyone capable of and willing to work can find an opportunity to earn a living, to make his contribution, to play his part as a citizen of a progressive, democratic country.

"If purchasing power is maintained at a high level, we need have no fears that private manufacturers, retailers, wholesalers, and farmers will not come forward and supply the market with the goods demanded by the public—a rich variety of goods at reasonable prices. Private business can and will do the job of production. It is the responsibility of government to do its part to insure a sustained demand. We know from past experience that private enterprise has done this for limited periods only. It has not been able to insure a continuous and sustained demand.

"When the war is over the Government cannot just disband the Army, close down munition factories, stop building ships, and remove all economic controls. We want an orderly program of demobilization and reconstruction. The Government cannot escape responsibility. To fulfill its responsibility it needs the hearty cooperation of business, labor, farmers, and the professions in the great task of developing a vigorous, expanding, and prosperous society."

Which of the two possibilities that I have tried to describe is the more likely to be realized? I have no confident answer. If I were required to lay a bet on the question I should offer even money on either side, but I should determine my choice by the toss of a coin. When I reflect upon the insidious and enormous power of American plutocracy and its retainers and satellites in politics, in journalism, and in the professions, I am inclined to be pessimistic. On the other, when I recall the education which the people have received from economic events and political personages during the last decade and a half, I have some hope that by 1944 the majority will be able to see through the fog of shams and shows which now surrounds them, and that they will choose for their rulers men who believe in labor organization and social justice.

About two future contingencies I can speak confidently. First, the millions of returning soldiers and sailors will not be satisfied or fooled by the old claptrap concerning "rugged individualism," "American opportunity," or "American equality." With their knowledge of the almost unlimited productive capacity of our industries, as shown during the war, they will demand the opportunity to earn by honest labor a decent amount of that enormous potential product. And they will demand that their share of the potential product be made actual. They will not be lulled to sleep by commonplaces about the limitations and difficulties of distribution, nor by promises of "prosperity just around the corner." They will demand jobs here and now. I do not believe that an economy dominated by the philosophy of "free enterprise" will be able to meet that demand.

The second positive statement that I can make with some confidence is this: Unless the middle classes—that is, the comfortable farmers, the members of the professions, the small businessmen, the holders of executive and directive positions in the great corporations, and, indeed, the majority of the white-collar classes—cease to get their opinions, directly or indirectly, from the daily papers and strive to acquire a greater amount of realistic economic intelligence than they now possess, they may exercise sufficient voting power to place the champions of "free enterprise" in control of economic reconstruction after the war. From such a calamity may the good Lord deliver us.

United Nations Can Win Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Morgan, from the Boston Sunday Globe of January 10, 1943:

UNITED NATIONS CAN WIN PEACE—IT CAN BE LOST BY TALL TALKING AND THEORIZING, BUT IT CAN BE WON BY ACTING NOW

(By James Morgan)

"The way to resume is to resume," blurted Horace Greeley in his impatience with too

much talk and too little action on the subject of the resumption of specie payments after their suspension in the Civil War. While we today are standing around talking about how to organize the world after this war, we need to be similarly reminded that the way to organize it is to organize it, and organize it now. We have the organization already at hand, the most widespread and imposing one in history, but we are giving the United Nations nothing to do.

Whatever befalls, let us in this country try not to be caught in another crossfire between the so-called idealists and the so-called realists, between the starry-eyed and the fishy-eyed. Their furious quarrel left the dead of the other war without an epitaph and left the living a disillusioned and bitterly cynical generation. At Versailles the idealists got a League of Nations that wouldn't work and the realists got a treaty of peace that gave them control of the world. And look at that world now!

WALLACE'S HYBRID CORN

It takes no prophet to prophesy that there will be precious little idealism—or good will—left in a world wearied, hungered, exhausted by this most savage war. The peacemaking, if we leave it all to be done then, will be another open season for reactionary marplots, with their demagogic appeals to the primitive passions of mankind.

It may be that we can avoid another head-on collision between so-called idealists and so-called realists by not sentimentalizing the hard, practical job ahead of us. President Wilson's rhetoric permitted his policy and purpose to be mistaken for an altruistic internationalism. His opponents took advantage of his fine words to misrepresent him as a dreamer with his head in the clouds, who wanted us to save Europe instead of staying home and looking out for the United States.

Now, Vice President Wallace is an executive character, with both feet on the ground, a practical thinker who thought out a thing as practical as the successful food stamp plan. Nevertheless he is not, in his campaigning for an organized peace, sufficiently guarding himself against the attack that defeated Wilson.

In his youth, Mr. Wallace saw the folly of awarding prizes at county fairs to the most beautiful ears of corn, when he reflected that they were grown mainly to be fed to swine with no sense of beauty. He went to work on the development of a hybrid corn, which is not so pretty to look at but is a more profitable hog-fattener, and he started a revolution in the growing of that greatest of all American crops.

Hybridization—or compromise—often is best in the field of ideals also, lest these be too bright or good for human nature's daily food. That is what politics and statesmanship are for—to fit institutions to the people and not attempt the impossible of making the people over to fit even a perfectly logical theory.

WORK WITH THE WORLD WE HAVE

By all means, let us go on debating what kind of world we want, but meanwhile let us go to work right now with the kind of world we have. Let us take the United Nations as they are, and do our best to make them function. "What we need," Mr. Willkie said recently, "is not the hope of a grand council after the war. What we need is a council today of the United Nations, not a paper council but an actual working council."

But when Mr. Willkie proposed "a council of grand military strategy," that most publicly useful of our private citizens went beyond the bounds of what we have a right to demand of the United Nations. That organization is not competent to cover the military field because, among its four principal members, only America and Britain are involved in the global war. China is at peace with the Axis Powers in Europe and fighting only the Asiatic partner. Russia is at peace with Japan and is at war with only the European partners in the gang.

In these circumstances, justifiable in each instance, there can be no unified command or grand council of military strategy. Nor could we improve at present on what Stalin and Chiang Kai-shek are doing on their respective fighting fronts. Nor could they be of help to us on our fronts in the South Pacific and in North Africa. The British and Americans are operating under a unified command in both those areas, with two of the commanders Americans—MacArthur and Eisenhower.

LEARNING FROM OUR NORTH AFRICAN MESS

There is quite enough work waiting to be done by the United Nations outside the combat zones. In the apportioning of supplies, we have organized a close lease-lend cooperation with Britain. But we hear of no common council where Russia and China, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa sit in on a round-table discussion of their needs and of what resources they have to contribute to the common pool. They should all be made to feel that they are on an even footing.

There is too much of an Anglo-American alliance, which Stalin, in his talks, expands into an Anglo-American-Soviet alliance. That is chiseling on the grand alliance

The United Nations can be highly useful immediately in studying and agreeing upon political policies for the territories that will come under our power Axis propagandists have made hay out of Anglo-American bickering over the recognition of Darlan. We were lucky in having North Africa for an experiment station, where we are learning by experience what a mess we can get into when we occupy a country. That is but a tempest in a teapot. It could easily become a hurricane in the occupation of France herself or of Italy or the Balkans

WHAT THE UNITED NATIONS COULD BE DOING NOW

Why should there not be a standing committee of the United Nations on occupied countries? And a committee on relief for the 300,000,000 hungry people of Europe, whom we cannot abandon to starvation after we shall have liberated them from the Axis?

A committee on economic rehabilitation could be planning how to take those people off relief, with loans of credit and materials for the restoration of their devastated farms, without livestock, seed, fertilizers, or implements, and for the reequipment of their looted mines and factories A committee should be readying plans for the repatriation of the wretched millions who have been uprooted and driven from their homelands. A committee on nationalistic, racial, and religious minorities should be studying how certain of the reestablished nations can be persuaded or, if need be, compelled to abandon their former misrule of those minorities. A committee on the occupation of enemy countries would have a most perplexing question to examine and decide.

Once the United Nations got the habit of working together they might even be permitted to explore the future of the overseas empires. American forces will have a large part in clearing the Japanese out of Dutch and British possessions in the east. Surely we should not be left in the embarrassing plight of freeing those people from their new master only to deliver them over to their old master.

Here is an opportunity for an epoch-making achievement in statesmanship—to devise and proclaim a charter for the gradual, scheduled advancement toward freedom of the peoples of the east, a majority of the human family, accompanied by their training for self-government.

HOW TO WIN A WORLD-WIDE PEACE

In his greatest message to Congress, President Roosevelt said last Thursday that "the United Nations can and must remain united for the maintenance of peace." The way to unite is to unite, and unite now

The United Nations should be slowly, gently, but persistently pushed just as fast and as far as they can go without disruption. To do more would be suicidal. To do less would be suicidal on a vaster scale. If humanity should be left in despair of saving itself by means of existing political and economic and social institutions, those institutions would be doomed.

The United Nations have not the military training and the war spirit of the Axis. But they have a more decisive advantage. Germany and Japan are losing the war because their peace aim provides no partnership for any other people but only a mailed-fist domination by an assumed master race. All the once free peoples now in subjugation are drawn to our side because our success would not mean our rule over them

We are going to win this World War. We should not miss the opportunity to win also a world peace. To draw to our side all peoples everywhere we have only to give them the pledge of the United Nations that everyone shall have a stake in the victory.

Address of Hon. William G. Stratton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to insert the address given by our colleague of the Seventy-seventh Congress, William G. Stratton, Congressman at Large from Illinois, to a joint session of the Sixty-third General Assembly of Illinois on his inauguration as State treasurer of Illinois:

Mr. Speaker, I am highly conscious of the great honor and responsibility which has just been conferred upon me with the taking of the oath of office from the distinguished chief justice of the supreme court, Mr. Justice June Smith.

In a State the size of Illinois, the treasurer is the custodian of hundreds of millions of dollars. This year we have an added responsibility for the investment of a large surplus fund totaling over $60,000,000. In view of the treasurer's small bond, we can realize the personal obligation borne by the individual holding this post.

Although the number of employees in the office is not large when compared with some of the other State departments, the nature of the work is such that they play a very important part in the functioning of the State's business.

With this thought in mind I have taken great care to obtain able and well qualified persons to serve in supervisory and expert positions. And I am insisting that all employees give full attention to the duties assigned them. Furthermore, inefficiency or discourtesy to the public will not be tolerated.

It is my firm belief that efficiency and proper administration of the office can only be maintained through close personal supervision. With this in mind, I shall devote my full time and efforts to the conduct of the office.

It will be the policy of the office at all times to cooperate with the legislature and the other government bodies.

Operating under these policies I am hopeful that the treasurer's office will be a credit to the State and that anyone having business with the treasurer will feel that he has received courteous and friendly service.

Investigation of Office of Price Administration Enforcement Procedures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today filed a resolution for an investigation by the Committee on Banking and Currency of certain enforcement procedures which are or have been practiced by the Office of Price Administration. My reasons for filing this resolution are briefly as follows:

Violators of price-control regulations are subject to criminal prosecution, with heavy fine or imprisonment if found guilty, and are subject also to civil suits for triple damages. These penalties are provided for in the Price Control Act. They are the teeth in the statutory enforcement provisions. No one proposes their repeal. No one seeks to dull their edge.

Businessmen, big and little, harassed by an avalanche of rapidly changing price orders, report forms and complicated regulations, and when honestly doing their best to comply are deserving of sympathy, and if guilty of involuntary violation are deserving of mercy. But deliberate price chiselers and black marketeers are a menace and ought to be prosecuted and severely punished. However, this punishment should be meted out by the courts through regular legal procedures and as provided by law.

The fact is, however, that O. P. A. enforcement agents have used a technique of their own for dealing with alleged infractions of price and ration regulations. It is an arrangement whereby the accused culprit is called upon to make a voluntary contribution to the United States Treasury in an amount specified by the O. P. A. and receives in return an inconclusive and unenforceable promise that the charges will not be pressed.

This sort of thing has no sanction either in law or in conscience. Its vice is self-evident. It affords unlimited opportunity for abuse and tyranny. It is the extortion of hush money perilously close to blackmail. O. P. A. agents are powerless to give the violator of price or ration regulations a legal immunity bath. They cannot secure the violator against a civil suit by the overcharged customer, and if there is a basis for criminal prosecution, any hush-up in consideration of a money payment is in itself a criminal act. It is compounding a felony. The fact that the money reaches the Federal Treasury makes no difference.

These so-called voluntary contributions are carried on the Treasury books under "Miscellaneous receipts, donations to the United States—Office of Price Administration." The names of the contributors are not published, and I am reliably informed that they are not subject to public inspection but that each contributor receives a letter from the Division of Bookkeeping and Warrants, acknowledging that his money has been turned in to the Treasury by the O. P. A.

This shocking and utterly indefensible practice ought to be exposed; the extent to which it has been resorted to should be ascertained and the persons responsible for it identified. There should be an end to it not simply by a promise of O. P. A. officials to cease and desist but by such explicit legislative action as will prohibit the O. P. A. or any agency of the Government and any bureaucrat at any time hereafter from pursuing such a policy.

If the civil and criminal penalty sections of the Price Control Act are too unwieldy for effective use in enforcement, then Congress by an amendment of the act should legalize some simpler procedures, but not the tactics of the gestapo.

The resolution which I have filed seeks to shed light on the whole question of the enforcement policies of the Office of Price Administration, and in particular to sift out the facts with respect to the matters I have enumerated above. I realize that there are many matters of the greatest importance before the Congress. However, as the enforcement of price and rationing regulations will soon be affecting every citizen in the United States, and is most important in maintaining the necessary anti-inflation efforts of the Government, the sooner it is investigated and placed on a proper statutory footing, the better. Nothing could add more to the morale of our people than the feeling that the restrictions which are daily being put on them are being equitably enforced under statutes specifically approved by the Congress, rather than by arbitrary dicta.

Child of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this occasion of paying tribute to the late Dr. George Washington Carver for the fine accomplishments that he made during his lifetime under the most extraordinary handicaps. His career typifies the fact, emphasized by Emerson many years ago, that America is another word for opportunity. His life should be an inspiration to the youth of the land, particularly of his race, in illustrating what one can do if he has undying energy, indomitable will power, and a desire to learn.

I am particularly interested in education because my own State of Michigan is known as one of the pioneer States in education. Therefore, I am vitally interested in schools such as the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute for Negroes and Howard University of Washington, D. C. These two institutions have played an important factor in the upbuilding of the colored race.

Howard University was organized during the school year of 1866–67, with very meager equipment, with a handful of students surrounded by an atmosphere of unfaith in the ability of the colored man to advance. It was organized for the purpose of developing teachers to help that race. During the 75 years of its history, it has attained a distinction as a great institution of learning, whose students now number in excess of 2,200. These students are in the undergraduate, graduate, and professional schools of that university. They come from more than 42 States and 16 foreign countries. The university has an investment in excess of $9,000,000. It has more than 10,000 graduates who are now working in 43 States of the Union and in more than 24 foreign countries. Howard University has been an inspiration to the youth of the colored race.

The Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute for Negroes, in which Dr. George Washington Carver was a teacher, has attained also an enviable reputation for progress and for efficiency. The Tuskegee Institute was founded in 1880 by Booker T. Washington, who was its principal until his death in 1915, and was endowed by Congress in 1889 with 25,000 acres of land. The institute provides practical training for many trades and agricultural occupations and for nursing, teaching, and homemaking and commercial positions. In the year 1940–41 the enrollment was 1,280 full-time students. Its endowment exceeds $7,000,000.

Dr. Carver accomplished much for the Tuskegee Institute and for the colored students. These two institutions, Howard University and Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, are pioneering in education for the colored race. These two institutions have demonstrated to the youth of that race that here in America much can be accomplished by proper work and proper study.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include certain extracts from the Flint Journal of January 7, 1942, pertaining to Dr. George Washington Carver and the great work that he has accomplished in education, in science, and in the upbuilding of his race:

CHILD OF DEMOCRACY

Story of Dr. George Washington Carver outranks that of many of America's self-made men. Dr. Carver was the son of slave parents; he had extraordinary handicaps to overcome that were peculiar to his time and environment.

This noted Negro scientist, teacher at Tuskegee Institute for more than 40 years,

gained world-wide fame in some of the most useful arts known to man. Dealing with such lowly products as cornstalks, peanuts, sweetpotatoes, trees, even clay, he found that chemical and physical transformations could change these into highly useful materials. He produced paper, plywood, inks, pigments, food products from sources hitherto unnoticed. Science will benefit from his work for generations to come.

But if George Washington Carver had done none of these things, his life presented a shining example of service in behalf of mankind. He wore threadbare clothes while much of his salary went toward helping deserving students through school. Many of his formulas were given to the public without a cent in return. In his spare time he developed his talents as an artist; one of his paintings hangs in the Luxemburg Gallery.

Dr. Carver's greatest regret was that he had left so many things undone—the mark of a truly educated man who realizes how pitifully small is his knowledge compared with what there is to learn and do. America honors the memory of a man whose life work was one of the most eloquent testimonials to the soundness and worth of its democratic system.

Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment for Service-Connected Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill introduced by me:

A bill to authorize and to direct the Veterans' Administration to provide vocational rehabilitation and assistance in securing suitable employment for service-connected disabled veterans in need thereof, and feasible therefor, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1, title I, Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 20, 1933, be amended by adding at the end thereof a new section known as subsection (f) and to read as follows:

"(f) Any person who served in the active military or naval forces shall be entitled to vocational rehabilitation, subject to the provisions and limitations of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, part VII."

SEC. 2. Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new part to be known as part VII and to provide as follows:

"PART VII

"1. Any person who has served in the active military or naval service at any time and who was or is honorably discharged therefrom and who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension or compensation is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, or would be but for receipt of retirement pay, and is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for, and place him in suitable employment consistent with, the degree of his disablement: *Provided*, That no course of training under this act in excess of a period of 4 years shall be approved.

"2. The Administrator shall have the power and duty to prescribe and provide suitable training and other services to persons included in paragraph I, and for such purposes may employ such additional personnel and experts as are deemed necessary, and may utilize and extend existing Veterans' Administration facilities and utilize those of any other governmental agency as well as those maintained by joint Federal and State contribution; and, in addition, he may, by agreement or contract with public or private institutions or establishments, provide for such additional training facilities as may be suitable and necessary to accomplish the purposes of this part.

"3. While pursuing training prescribed herein, and for 2 months after his employability is determined, each veteran will be rated as totally disabled by reason of service-connected disability, and pension and compensation shall be payable to him accordingly: *Provided*, That when the course of vocational rehabilitation furnished to any person as herein provided consists of training on the job by an employer, such employer shall be required to submit monthly to the Administrator a statement under oath showing any wage, compensation, or other income paid by him to such person during the month, directly or indirectly, and based upon such sworn statements, the Administrator is authorized to reduce the pension of such person to an amount considered equitable and just, but not below the amount of pension, compensation, or retirement pay to which he would be entitled for service-connected disability if not following a course of vocational rehabilitation.

"4. Where any person while following a course of vocational rehabilitation as provided for in this part suffers an injury or an aggravation of any injury, as a result of the pursuit of such course of vocational rehabilitation, and not the result of his own willful misconduct, and such injury or aggravation results in additional disability to or death of such person, the benefits under laws applicable to such veterans shall be awarded in the same manner and extent as if such disability, aggravation, or death were service connected within the meaning of such laws; except that no benefits under this paragraph shall be awarded unless application be made therefor within 2 years after such injury or aggravation was suffered, or such death occurred.

"5. (a) The purpose of rehabilitation is to restore employability lost by virtue of a material and permanent handicap due to service incurred disability. The Administrator shall have the power and duty to cooperate with and employ the facilities of other governmental and State employment agencies for the purpose of placing service connected disabled veterans in suitable gainful employment.

"(b) To remove the prejudice against employment of honorably discharged veterans having 10 percent or more service-connected disability, and to aid in securing employment of such veterans, where an injury or death of such veteran is incurred under such circumstances as to result in payment of benefits under State employees' compensation laws or by recovery from or settlement with or on behalf of the employer, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall reimburse the insurer or the fund from which such payment is made to the extent of the net loss suffered by such insurer or fund: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as authorizing payment of benefits under an Employees' Compensation Act for such injury or death, and under paragraph 4 hereof for the same period of time to a veteran or his dependents, by such veteran or his dependents may elect which benefit to receive: *And provided further*, That the appropriations of the Veterans' Administration shall be available for any expenses incurred under this section.

"6. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary in order to promote good conduct and cooperation on the part of persons who are following courses of vocational rehabilitation provided by this part. Penalties for the breach of such rules and regulations may, with the approval of the Administrator, extend to a forfeiture by the offender for a period of 3 months of such portion of the pension herein provided as will leave him not less than the amount of the monthly pension, compensation, or retirement pay to which such person is entitled for service-connected disability, and such penalties may also extend to permanent discontinuances of all further benefits of this part.

"7. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary for the granting of leave of absence to those following courses of vocational rehabilitation provided by this part where in his opinion such leaves do not materially interfere with the pursuit of such courses. Such leaves of absence shall not in the case of any person be granted in excess of 30 days in any consecutive 12 months except in exceptional circumstances as determined by the Administrator: *Provided*, That during leave of absence under this paragraph such person shall be considered to be pursuing his course of vocational rehabilitation under this part.

"8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, available immediately and until expended, the sum of $500,000 to be utilized by the Veterans' Administration under such rules and regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, as a revolving fund for the purpose of making advancements not exceeding $100 in any case, to persons commencing or undertaking courses of vocational rehabilitation under this part, such advancement to bear no interest and to be reimbursed in such installments as may be determined by the Administrator by proper deductions from any future payments of pension or retirement pay.

"9. The Administrator shall have the power to provide courses of instruction for personnel and may detail employees to attend the same any may detail any such personnel to attend courses conducted by other than Veterans' Administration agencies, including private organizations and such employees, in addition to their salaries, shall be entitled to the payment of expenses incident to such detail, including transportation and tuition, as the Administrator by rules and regulations shall provide; and also in his discretion, to make, or, as by agreement with other agency or institution, cause to be made, studies, investigations, and reports inquiring into the rehabilitation of disabled persons and the relative abilities, aptitudes, and capacities of the several groups of the variously handicapped and as to how their potentialities can best be developed and their services best utilized in gainful and suitable employment, including the rehabilitation programs of foreign nations. For this purpose he shall have the power to cooperate with such public and private agencies as he may deem advisable and to call in consultants who shall receive as compensation for their services a reasonable per diem, which the Administrator shall by rules and regulations provide, for each day actually spent in the work provided for herein and shall in addition be reimbursed for their necessary traveling and other expenses. For the purpose of this part, the Administrator may

accept uncompensated services upon such agreement as he may deem feasible.

SEC. 3. The appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, "Salaries and expenses, medical and hospital, and compensation and pensions," shall be available for necessary expenses, including but not confined to necessary medical care, and pension payment, payment or reimbursement of expenses in connection with supplying suitable training under this act; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amount or amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purpose of this act.

Veteran Organizations Endorse Vocational Rehabilitation Training by Veterans' Administration for Disabled Members of Armed Forces of World War No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 6 I introduced H. R. 739, a bill designed to provide vocational rehabilitation training by the Veterans' Administration for those members of the armed forces who become disabled by reason of their service in line of duty in the present war.

The several veteran organizations of the country support H. R. 739 and militantly oppose the idea that vocational rehabilitation training shall be administered by any other agency of the Government other than the Veterans' Administration.

The veteran organizations of America are not opposed to the consideration of the needs of all disabled persons in this country, but they believe that disabled war veterans should be treated as a separate class and their problems handled specifically by the Veterans' Administration which was created for that specific purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point a self-explanatory communication received from Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, National Legislative Representative, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., December 30, 1942.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VAN ZANDT: Enclosed is draft of a bill which would provide vocational rehabilitation training for those members of the armed forces who become disabled by reason of their service in line of duty during the present war.

As legislative representative for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States I would like to have you introduce this bill at your earliest convenience when the new or Seventy-eighth Congress convenes. This bill has the unanimous support and approval of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and is covered by a resolution adopted by the delegates to the forty-third national encampment which was held in Cincinnati, Ohio, August 30 to September 4, 1942.

For your further information, this bill was drafted in collaboration with the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans' Administration of the Federal Government, and I understand has the complete endorsement and approval of the two mentioned veteran organizations, as well as tentative approval by the Veterans' Administration.

An effort was made in the Seventy-seventh Congress to obtain approval of this bill, but due to the desire of the administration, along with certain other groups to incorporate the needs of disabled veterans for vocational rehabilitation in a broad program to cover all disabled persons in the Nation, no final decision was reached before the adjournment of the Seventy-seventh Congress. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States are not opposed to consideration of the needs of all disabled persons in this country, but we do believe that disabled war veterans should be treated as a separate class and their problems handled specifically by the Veterans' Administration which was created for that specific purpose.

No doubt you are aware there are already thousands of disabled veterans of the present war who are in need of vocational rehabilitation training, and the Congress should give early and favorable consideration to their needs and not continue to jeopardize these needs by waiting to work out a program which would tie all disabled persons in with disabled veterans.

Trusting we may have your wholehearted cooperation, as well as that of your colleagues, in pushing this meritorious legislation to a successful conclusion, I remain

Respectfully yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
National Legislative Representative.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that every Member of Congress will realize the importance of having disabled veterans of the present war given the benefit of having the Veterans' Administration administer to their needs and not subject them to an independent agency whose prime interest is rehabilitation of civilians.

Farewell to a Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial published in the Helena Independent, of Helena, Mont., of January 7, 1943, eulogizing the late Lt. R. E. (Red) Morrison. "Red" Morrison's death is felt keenly not only by his multitude of friends in Lewis and Clark County but by all the people of the State of Montana as well. He was a fine citizen, an outstanding soldier in the defense of our country, and a real American.

The editorial follows:

FAREWELL TO A FRIEND

Helena has the sad duty of saying its final farewell to First Lt. R. E. Morrison, who gave his life for his country in an airplane crash a few days ago.

Because "Red" Morrison was good and genial, because he was a community leader and never-tiring worker, and because he was a wholesome example for many a boy here, news of his death in the line of duty was particularly shocking.

Lieutenant Morrison was State senator from Lewis and Clark County at the time of his passing. Before he had served in the house of representatives. He was every busy in public affairs, but this popular citizen leaves his greatest mark as an aviation expert, one who prepared many Montana youths for aerial careers that today find them serving their Nation, just as did their skillful mentor.

A veteran of the last war, Lieutenant Morrison, in the intervening years, kept up his qualifications as a flying officer. When the call came again he was ready.

Now he comes home from his second war. His legion of friends will miss his affable greetings. These friends will miss his happy way. It is difficult to say goodbye to "Red" Morrison.

Tennessee Cooperates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I desire to include the text of House Joint Resolution No. 1, passed by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee.

The resolution, which expresses appreciation for the work of the President, his Cabinet, military and naval leaders, and the Congress of the United States, also pledges every possible cooperation of the State of Tennessee in hastening the day of victory.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the President of the United States, his Cabinet, military aides, and the Congress have worked untiringly and unselfishly in giving their leadership for the prosecution of the war; and

Whereas, considering the magnanimity of their task, we feel that they have led us in making most excellent progress toward saving our Nation and the world from tyranny and slavery: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee (the senate concurring), That we hereby express our sincere appreciation and gratitude to the President, his Cabinet, and other aides, and the Congress for their invaluable and sacrificial services which they have rendered to the Nation since our country has been at war; and be it further

Resolved, That this body most heartily endorses the general idea of a world congress to keep the peace, when, through God's help, we shall have attained it, so that our posterity may be saved from the constant recurrence of war, and the dire threat of the annihilation of our civilization; and be it further

Resolved, That this general assembly assure said leaders of the Nation that it is most anxious to cooperate in any way possible toward hastening the day of victory; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Roosevelt, Secretary of State Hull, and to each Member of Congress from Tennessee, and that it be spread upon the Journal of the House and Senate.

A Message to the Italian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, citizens of Italy, I am an American of Italian origin, and I have the honor of being a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States. As such, I represent a district which is populated by thousands of Americans also of Italian origin.

I know the activities of these particular Americans. I also know their sentiments and their prayers. All of us are convinced that an Allied victory is inevitable. No effort has been spared by the Americans of Italian descent to bring about an Allied victory. They have been at the front lines of Bataan, Corregidor, Midway Island, North Africa—yes, wherever the toil, sweat, and blood of Americans were needed there did you find them striving hard for an Allied victory. In addition, they are found on the home front, amongst the purchasers of War bonds, amongst all the voluntary civilian war workers, and in every activity to further the war effort.

Throughout the history of our two countries, the Italian people and the Americans have been at peace. They have always had a mutual regard and respect for each other. You know, and I know, that there were never any designs on the part of the Americans against the safety and well-being of the Italian people, and vice versa. In fact, our two peoples have been comrades in arms, facing death together, in an effort to insure the safety of our two countries. America has stood out as a haven and land of opportunity to those millions of Italians who left the Italian shores and have taken their places in all walks of American life. All this has been changed. Why? Simply because of the unwarranted interference in your affairs by Hitler, who directed Mussolini to declare war against the United States. We in America are convinced that you people of Italy have no rancor nor hatred against us. Certainly we Americans have no hatred for you. We appreciate the fact that this is a war forced upon you by the Italian politicians, acting under orders from Hitler, and against your wishes.

You, as the descendants of Christopher Columbus, must share the same pride which we Americans of Italian descent experience, in the knowledge that it was the courage and foresight of an Italian which gave to the world a land dedicated to the grand ideals of human freedom, tolerance, and charity. You are being forced against your will to contribute to an effort to destroy those ideals. It is in accordance with those ideals that America has assured the world that it is feeding, and shall continue to feed, the people of all lands which are now, and will in the future be, occupied by the Allies. Contrast this attitude with that of Hitler, who, through his German officials, has publicly assured the Germans that if anyone will starve in Europe this winter, it will not be the Germans.

The exigencies of war have made necessary the bombardment of Italy itself. Genoa, Milano, Torino, and many other places in Italy have already experienced the ravages of aerial bombardment. You must understand that, of necessity, this will be nothing compared to what will follow if the Germans are still permitted to overrun and control your country. Do you not realize that Mussolini, because of his cooperation with Hitler, has brought chaos and ruin to your empire? Can you not see that the only hope for the future of Italy lies in Allied victory?

We are your friends. We do not wish you harm. All the sufferings of your people, all the agony which we know is yours, will come to an end the moment you put your faith and trust in the United States. Only through an Allied victory will the Italy of the arts, music, and peace exist once more.

The Allies seek no territorial aggrandizement. America is in this war against your government because 1 year ago Mussolini declared war against us. We know that the hearts of your civilian population and of your soldiers are not in this war which was forced upon you by the Nazi-Fascists. We have only one objective and that is to rid the earth of Hitlerism and of fascism and all the evil they have brought in their wake. There can be no peace until this objective is attained.

Five Sons of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas F. Sullivan, of Waterloo, Iowa, Missing in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the people of Iowa learned with pride that from one family five brothers were in the United States Navy. They were Francis Henry, Joseph Eugene, George Thomas, Madison Abel, and Albert Leo Sullivan, sons of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas F. Sullivan, 98 Adams Street, Waterloo, Iowa. They enlisted January 3, 1942, with the understanding that they would be allowed to serve together.

All of these young men were on the cruiser *Juneau*, sunk in enemy action on November 13, 1942, and the Navy Department reports them all missing in action. I am sure we all join in the prayer that a report of their safety may yet be received.

No poor words of mine could lessen the grief that must be felt by these parents. I can only say that the sympathy of our community of this House, and of the Nation goes out to them. In the face of this dreadful tragedy how small the troubles of the rest of us seem.

Let us resolve that the sacrifices of this family shall spur us on to greater efforts until the great day dawns when the war will be brought to a victorious close.

The Alternative to a Post-War W. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVAN HOWELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Fred I. Kent, which appeared in the Seventh Annual Voice of Business Edition of the New York Sun:

THE ALTERNATIVE TO A POST-WAR W. P. A.—IF THERE SHOULD BE NO BOOM TO ABSORB QUICKLY OUR WORKERS IN PEACETIME INDUSTRIES, IT IS PROPOSED THAT THE GOVERNMENT UNDERWRITE EMPLOYMENT IN PRIVATE JOBS

(By Fred I. Kent)

The world has been flooded with propaganda which has tended to steal the sense of individual responsibility from all mankind. People have been taught to think that the world owes them a living, that they have the right to demand security from outside of themselves, that society is obligated to provide them with work or with buying power.

Of what does this world and this society consist? Nothing more nor less than the people who are upon our earth, and each individual bears the same responsibility to every other individual that each and all bear to him. Therefore, what the world and society owe to every man every man owes to the world and to society. In the last analysis, this means that every individual, to the extent of his capacity, owes it to society and to himself to provide himself with a living, and to strive for the security of himself and of those for whom he is responsible.

The complexities in living, engendered by vast populations and racial and climatic variables, have resulted in the formation of nations and of group forces within these nations, of different forms of labor both mental and physical, and of many kinds of government. However, the highest standard of living always prevails where individual initiative and individual incentive exist, and in the proportion that they are controlled by fair laws for the protection of all the people.

The chaotic world of today is in large part the result of the growing curtailment, through government usurpation, of the dynamic values which lie within the power of individual initiative and incentive.

SO-CALLED SECURITY

Now, with the turmoil of war brought upon us through the widespread unrest created by false promises, the accent upon post-war planning is being directed in high places toward social security built upon a foundation of quicksand rather than upon one of constructive recovery through private enterprise.

Government will have a great work to do in the post-war period and it will take all of

the ability and all of the energy of men in government to successfully carry out its legitimate functions without intruding upon those which should be borne by its citizens.

There will be many problems to solve when the war ends but the most critical of all will be that of how to put back men and women into peacetime pursuits without a long period of great unemployment.

This problem must be solved first of all. Others will depend upon its proper solution. Paying men and women by government, with no constructive work being demanded in return, is no answer. If undertaken it will certainly lay the foundation for another war which will begin to brew at the inception of the peace. Nor can government take the place of private enterprise in the employment of its citizens and provide a standard of living that the people can have and should have.

UNDERWRITING JOBS

What, then, can Government do that will be effective? Create public works? Yes; in a limited way, but if carried too far it can be most harmful. The acts of Government to be effective must serve to restore confidence because business revival builds upon confidence and lags or disintegrates upon uncertainty. To treat this subject fully would require volumes, but it is possible to take up one phase in this article.

If upon the close of the war every industry had confidence that the people would have consumer's power and could buy their requirements and fulfill their desires, men would be employed to peacetime capacity.

Let us suppose, then, that Government should guarantee the consumer-goods industries against loss if they would reemploy men in pre-war numbers. If this were done, men would be employed in constructive jobs by private enterprise. But to meet the conditions of private enterprise industry should pay Government if it made a profit. If industry had to pay Government, say, half the profit it might make, it would naturally wish to get out from under the guaranties as quickly as possible. Also, if the industries realized that men were being employed generally, because Government guaranties were available, many would prefer to undertake employment at their own risk. They would know that the consumer power created through work would build demand and they woul have confidence that there would be markets for their goods.

The carrying out of such Government guaranties could be accomplished on a decentralized basis without the development of bureaucracies. The Treasury Department, through the Federal Reserve System, could authorize member banks to arrange the guaranties with their own customers under proper regulations. The banks would then be justified in making advances to their clients for raw materials and the cost of processing goods. The whole banking system would be reestablished on a sound basis. The demand for raw materials would restore the producing industries and their shipment to factories would add to transportation requirements. The movement of finished goods to markets, made possible by renewed consumer buying power, would further accelerate transportation

A STIMULANT

The reestablishment of industry would therefore spread out through normal channels and restore the demand for services of all kinds. Giving the guaranties only to the consumer-goods industries would make work for men without guaranties on the farms and in the mines and for purposes of transportation. Durable goods would be required, making for employment in those industries. Increased consumer buying power would result in growing consumption of food. But the farmers would gain most from the normal employment of men, taken from the farms and made both consumers of farm products and producers of industrial goods required by the farmers, instead of growers of additional unneeded food units.

Such a system should only be established for a short period, possibly for a year or at most, a year and a half. It is of course entirely possible that its necessity would disappear before that time in which case it would automatically run out.

This method of procedure would be a true pump primer whereas Government expenditures lead into a continuation of depressions which are apt to become progressively worse.

Government spending such as we have witnessed during the last decade has not been a pump primer at all, but has proved to be a very bad system harmful to all concerned and one almost impossible to stop.

THE PRICE OF "RELIEF"

If some other method is devised that may be better than a Government guaranty of consumer's industries against loss if they reemploy men it should be adopted. Otherwise we may have only two alternatives in the post-war period provided a quick boom does not develop, the one Government relief, the second the guaranty we have outlined.

Government relief, the giving of buying power without receipt by Government of its equivalent in work or production, would mean growing Government expenditures, the building up of bureaucracies and the dissipation of the wealth of the country that might remain following the war.

From the standpoint of the public, it would mean increasing taxation and the development of many unemployables as has been the case in the United States and in European countries during the past 10 years. When men and women begin to lean upon Government they lose their sense of independence and rapidly deteriorate into public burdens. Unemployment is not necessary. There is work for everyone under a system which does not restrict business and industry but only aims to control wrongdoing. There has been propaganda claiming this is not true, but production and work statistics prove the contrary.

Labor-saving devices and inventions always result in creating new conveniences for the people which require more labor than that which inventions may save. To be sure, they often occasion a transfer of work from one plant to another, from an old one to a new one, or from one department to another in the same plant. But again statistics show that even in individual plants where labor-saving devices have reduced the requirement for the employment of men there has been a lag of only about 2 years under normal conditions before the same plants have required greater numbers of employees than before, due to the increase in markets which inventions have provided by lowering of prices and by the production of new, useful articles.

The alternative to relief would be that Government guarantee the consumer's industries against loss if they employed prewar quotas. Under such conditions, with the certainty that buying power would be created, confidence would be restored. Then Government, instead of paying out money that could never be recovered, could be expected to make a profit as losses would undoubtedly be more than offset by the income received from the extension of guaranties to industries which make a profit. Men would be working in normal ways and the buying power which they received would come from the production of goods that would go into the markets and directly or indirectly replace those things which they had taken through their purchases.

Taxes, other things being equal, would be greatly reduced and could be obtained on a fair basis from all citizens and not have to be a burden upon a few.

WAR MEASURES

As between the two methods of procedure, if either one proved to be necessary, there would seem to be no doubt as to which would be in the interest of the people. The expenditure of funds by governments in some form of dole has throughout history proved to be harmful to all the people and particularly to those who received the payments, whereas government guaranties to the consumer's industries against loss would result in the natural normal upbuilding of all the forces which, working together, go to build a sound national economy.

While the war continues it is our duty to increase the effectiveness of the war effort while at the same time laying a safe foundation for procedure during the post-war period. To accomplish this, Congress must reduce wasteful expenditures, amend the Wagner Labor Relations Act in such manner as to make it fair for labor, fair for industry, and fair for the public, clean out our bureaucracies while the manpower is needed in industry and by the military services, and rebuild our systems of rationing in such manner that they can be dropped promptly when they are no longer needed. Effort should also be made to see that such regulation of the people as the war makes necessary shall be set up so as to enable prompt withdrawal when the need is over.

The immense sums that are going to be needed to win the war call for the conservation of the financial power of the country in every legitimate way.

The country is going to require the individual and composite intelligence of our people to the utmost if we are to keep the loss of life necessary to win our battles to the minimum. We cannot afford to have bureaucracies play fast and loose with the forces that lie within the individual initiative of our people any more than we can afford to have them waste our economic power and needed raw materials.

We must be an alert people during this war and make certain that the peace is not delayed one single month or one single day with the unnecessary loss of life that would be entailed.

The people of America must be ever wide awake.

They Shall Not Die in Vain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in calling the attention of the Congress and the people of the United States to the splendid editorial on realistic post-war aims which was written by Editor Elmer W. Olson, of the Red Wing, Minn., Republican Eagle, in the issue of his paper on January 11, 1943:

FOR MANY THERE CAN BE NO VICTORY

Amid all this talk about what the peace shall be when this horrible war is at last ended—ended, perhaps, not because the aggressors have been made to acknowledge that their ideas were wrong, but simply because

they have been overwhelmed by those who think otherwise—it should be taken into consideration that there is one great mass of humanity which will have no voice in the world's future, but who should be considered first. This is the voice of the great host silenced forever in the struggle.

After every war the peacemakers solemnly resolve that "these who died here shall not have died in vain," and then the world proceeds about the business of getting itself involved into another conflict, and the sordid business has to be repeated all over again.

There is always talk about brave young men of all nations giving up their lives willingly, and gallantly, for the cause they believe just and right. But deep in our hearts we know that a majority of those who fight do so because it is a duty; most of them are not at all sure of the right or the wrong of the main issues; there is confusion in their minds whether they have been led aright and whether there isn't a chance they are fighting merely because someone has maneuvered them into a position where there isn't any other way out, through blundering or the evil machinations of the enemy.

One thing is certain—those who die in war do so for a cause, or for a purpose—right or wrong. Seems as if it is up to the peacemakers to make sure they didn't die in vain by aiming, first of all, to remove any and all causes which resulted in their being offered up as human sacrifices. Too often, after victory perches on the banners of those who are still living, those who made such victory possible through their sacrifices are forgotten in the human bickerings that follow. For those who have died there can be no victory; neither for them nor for those whose entire lives were wrapped up in them. The signing of an armistice, the drawing up of treaties, the fixing of boundaries, brings no thought of joy to those who have lost dear ones in the fight. To them there is scant comfort in the oft-repeated phrase: "They did not die in vain."

So it would seem it is up to those fortunate enough to survive because others have died, to bend every effort toward creating a world in which other young men won't have to go out and give up their lives in like manner; to see that there is no need in the future to repeat "they shall not die in vain," but rather to make sure they don't have to die at all except in the orderly pursuit of their own lives and ambitions.

In the writing of the peace the debts between the living should be forgotten; the debt owed those who, through force of circumstances in which they had no choice, gave up all, should be settled in full. Those who survive have no right to make selfish peace terms. Those who survive didn't win any wars; it is those who perished and in doing so made victory possible. And unless in dying they have made future wars impossible, then they, too, have lost. They have, without a doubt, died in vain.

One Basic Defect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mark Sullivan so clearly sets forth the reasons why the present administration has not been as successful as it might well have been, that it properly has a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I commend it to the Members of the House and Senate:

ONE BASIC DEFECT

(By Mark Sullivan)

CONSEQUENCE OF CENTRALIZED AUTHORITY

The discontent about rationing, climaxing in the resignation of Chief Rationer Leon Henderson, is occasion for considering the whole matter of Government controls and limitations.

The first thing to say is that the controls, and the sacrifices by citizens, are necessary—they are an inevitable accompaniment of war. The greater the sacrifice by the citizen, the greater the help toward winning the war (assuming, of course, that the system of control is wisely devised and well-administered). Right now, the gas we did not get on our Pennsylvania farm last Saturday is the identical gas which, a few weeks from now, will turn up in the engine of one of our tanks in North Africa. The direct reason for the extremely drastic limitation on gas in Atlantic seaboard States, over Saturday and Sunday, was a hurry call from North Africa for more gas. The citizen who did without gas was helping, directly and concretely, to win our battle in North Africa.

But the need for sacrifice, and the willingness of the citizen to make the sacrifice, does not relieve us from considering whether the system is sound and well administered. To that question the answer is, in many respects no. The system has fundamental mistakes of planning and carrying out.

The most conspicuous single mistake was about rubber. Of rubber we ought to have no shortage at all as yet, and perhaps never. That we are short of it is the result of a most serious defect of foresight and judgment. The Administration ought to have foreseen that war with Japan, and possible early successes by Japan, might cut off our supply of rubber from Malaya and the East Indies. In forehandedness against that possibility, we should have built up in advance an immense stock pile of rubber or have set up synthetic rubber manufacture.

Yet even the avoidance of that mistake might not have helped us as respects automobile driving. Even if we did not lack rubber, we would still lack gas. Our need for maintaining two large fighting forces in two oceans, at distances some 7,000 and 5,000 miles away, creates a need for gas and oil that is unlimited. The need is unlimited in the sense that the more our fighting forces have, the better they can fight. If we could, without detriment to our manufacture of military supplies, do without any gas at all for civilian use, we would help our war effort. And what is true of gas is true of food, clothing—everything. There is literally no degree of sacrifice that is too much—again, provided the system is well devised and administered.

The system so far has had, among others, one basic and glaring defect—it was recognized and admitted, belatedly, in Mr. Henderson's radio swan song last week. This defect is, too much authority held tightly in Washington, over minute details—unwillingness to give discretion or authority to local communities.

This mistake is inherent in the broad pattern of the present administration's policies and practices. During the years before war came, the effort was to centralize authority at Washington, an effort going so far as to deprive States and other local units of government of functions they have always had. The administration was erecting a changed structure of American society in which centralization at Washington was a cornerstone. This broad purpose, and the details of it, when war approached, were guarded jealously. Not only did the administration hold fast to changes already made, it insisted on more. Mr. Roosevelt said that preparedness for war would not be allowed to interrupt the program of what he called social reforms.

In this spirit, when wartime controls were set up, care was taken to man them with administration men. Mr. Henderson is a conspicuous example; he is a veteran of the New Deal's old guard; his service goes back as far as the National Recovery Act and the blue eagle in 1934, and has been practically continuous since. In practically all the war and defense organizations, veteran New Dealers, such as Vice President WALLACE and Mr. Harry Hopkins, were placed in positions where they, with fellow New Dealers, could have control or check.

When outsiders were brought in, they were surrounded with boards on which New Dealers had a majority. When outsider Mr. William Knudsen was put in a high post, his power was limited to exactly 50 percent; along with him, and having equal authority, was New Dealer and labor leader Mr. Sidney Hillman.

This determination to keep the personnel of the New Deal in authority, and to preserve the purpose and pattern of social reform, the reluctance to concentrate solely upon fighting the war and organizing the country for that purpose only—this accounts for much of what the country must endure.

Military Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present to the membership of the House an outstanding address delivered by Brig. Gen. Cornelius W. Wickersham, United States Army, commandant of the School of Military Government at Charlottesville, Va., on "Military Government." This address was given last night at the Mayflower Hotel before a joint meeting of the Federal Bar Association, the American Bar Association, the Military and Naval Law Committee in the presence of the outstanding members of the law profession, Members of the legislative branch, and the leading military officials.

The military occupation of enemy territory suspends the operation of the enemy's civil government in the occupied area. It is then necessary for the occupying power to exercise the functions of government and to maintain public order. The responsibility for restoring law, order, and public safety falls on the military forces of the occupant under the command of the commanding general of a theater of operations, who is the military governor. The organs through which the military forces carry out this mission are known collectively as military government. The exercise of the function is a command responsibility and the assistants to the military governor are known as civil affairs officers. They are the administrators.

Military government must be distinguished from martial law. The former is the form of government established and maintained by a belligerent by force of arms over occupied territory of the enemy, and its inhabitants. Martial law, on the other hand, is the control and government of the civil population through the military forces in domestic territory as distinguished from oc-

cupied territory of an enemy recognized as a belligerent.

To give an idea of the necessity for wide knowledge and experience of those who administer military government, I invite your attention to the functions of civil affairs sections on the staff of the military governor. They must deal with public works and utilities, the financial affairs of the occupied territory, public health and sanitation, education, public safety, legal matters, communications, public welfare, economics, and public relations.

Too often in loose discussion and thought as expressed in the newspapers and elsewhere, reference is made only to those one or two individuals who appear as military governors. One thinks of General Wood in Cuba; of Clive in India; of Lord Kitchener in Egypt; and of Lyautey in Morocco. We are apt to forget that one man cannot do it all; that he must be supported by a large and highly trained staff; and that unless he is so supported, and unless the staff is so organized that all of the necessary functions of government will be given adequate attention, it will be impossible for him to accomplish a worth-while result.

These principles are even more necessary to be borne in mind when we consider occupation under the complexities of modern governmental organization in an industrial country with a large population. This fact has been recognized by our enemies who have trained not dozens, but thousands of civil affairs officers. All our own studies lead to the same conclusion.

At the end of the last war we were, as in the past, wholly unprepared for the task of military government. In the occupation of the Coblenz bridgehead in Germany we employed over 200 officers in the work. Hastily organized, wholly unprepared, with no definite plan, they succeeded better than we had any reason to expect.

Owing to economic and other conditions, the Germans were willing to accept our government and, with few exceptions, to obey its decrees. When the occupation was over, the officer in charge of civil affairs under General Dickman and General Allen made a report which in many ways is one of the most thorough and interesting ever made by an American officer. In making this report, Col. I. L. Hunt, of the United States Army, expressed the hope that never again would the United States Army be found unprepared for the important duties of military government. This report slumbered in the archives of the War Department for many years. It was resurrected shortly before the present emergency and, owing to the foresight of Col. Archibald King, of the Judge Advocate General's Department, and other officers, it was used as the basis for our manual on military government, which was issued in 1940.

The manual led to the establishment by the War Department of the School of Military Government at Charlottesville under the supervision of Maj. Gen. Allen W. Gullion, United States Army, the Provost Marshal General. This, in turn, led to the adoption by the War Department of a wide military government program. We are determined that in the great tasks that lie before us, the Army shall not be unprepared.

Let us visualize the organization and requirements as they actually exist in a theater of operations. When our front-line troops invade enemy territory the powers of the hostile government cease to exist. The advancing armies will find chaos, physical, mental, and moral. Authority will have been removed, cities will have been destroyed, channels of communications disrupted, food, money, clothing, medical supplies swept away, and the civil population will be disorganized and without order. It is obvious that only the commander of our troops can give orders, for the prime necessity is the successful conduct of military operations without interference from the local population, and the protection, feeding, and housing of our own troops. The armed forces of the enemy may be only over the next hill. Military necessity requires that our tactical operations shall be conducted with the least possible interference from the hostile population. Subject only thereto, humanity requires, and the best interests of our own country demand, that they shall not be allowed to starve or to suffer unduly from our occupation. The best results will be obtained by a policy of justice, honor, and humanity.

Civil affairs officers must be ready with plans for the prompt restoring of public order and public safety, and for the necessary supply of food, medical supplies, and other relief to the local population. The sooner that normal life can be restored the better.

As the fighting troops advance, a more stabilized form of military government can be established, where officers in charge of civil affairs can be appointed for each large city, country, or province, and for larger areas. Each of these officers must have an adequate staff of trained assistants to administer the matters of public health and sanitation, public safety, economics, fiscal, legal, and the other functions of military government. At the headquarters of the commanding general of the theater of operations there must be an adequate planning staff under an officer in charge of civil affairs who will advise the commanding general on matters relating to civil affairs and see that his decisions are carried out within the theater.

The broad policies under which the functions of government will be conducted will be laid down by the President or the State Department or other agencies of the Government. It will be the duty of the theater commander and his staff, and of subordinate commanders and their staffs, to carry out and administer the policies so laid down. In this way it is hoped that the policies of our Government can be carried out in the field by trained administrators. Many operatives will also be needed, and the military government program contemplates, besides the training of the staff, the selection of an adequate number of engineers, public-health experts, fiscal, legal, and other specialists who, when the time comes, will be called upon to assist in the operation of the various activities that will be required in enemy territory. Junior assistants to the Army administrators will be obtained from the Military Police Corps and other sources.

The use of tactical officers without particular training for this work must be kept to a minimum. The better the work is done, the less will it be necessary to call for the assistance of tactical officers and troops, who must be kept at all times ready to continue or resume tactical operations in the field.

At the School of Military Government, courses are given in Army organization and staff functioning, public administration, the principles of military government, and those of international law liaison functions and duties, the history of and experiences in military government, including our own past experiences and those of other countries, and courses in the intensive study of the principal enemy countries and special areas, including their system of government and political economy, their recent history and geography, their national psychology, and their legal system. Lectures are given by the members of the faculty and by visiting lecturers. We have called upon the universities, various branches of the Government, and others to assist us by sending their experts on various topics of interest to lecture at the school. They have included some of the best-known experts in the country. In addition to lectures and individual study and research, and in order to obtain the advantage of the applicatory method through the problem work, which is similar in procedure to that of the War College, the class is divided into committees, each with a section chief, and problems are issued periodically. These committee reports have a double value. They are useful as an applied method of instruction, and also as a basis for plans which may be put into effect when called for.

The work requires a large amount of research. Among other documents examined, our school library has secured over 1,000 documents of relevant materials of recent information; 50 periodical publications are received; over 6,000 selected books have been obtained from 30 libraries in the country on loan during each 4-month course; and approximately 1,000 volumes have been purchased for our use. Our own catalog now numbers in excess of 5,000 items, and the bibliographies prepared from institutions, regional experts, and elsewhere, together with our catalog, now contain over 10,000 selected items. The map collection consists of 2,600 maps of varying scales. This illustrates the broad field of research and study which form the basis of the committee reports.

From these facts, and in view of the mission of training for subsequent detail to military government and liaison the principal administrators of the work, it will be seen that only those of the highest qualifications can be considered as students. We have an allotment of officers of the Army from the grade of captain to colonel and an allotment of civilians who may be commissioned in the Specialist Reserve for the course. They must be those who have had experience in a former military government or in Federal, State, county, or city government, or in public utilities, or as lawyers, sanitary engineers or civil engineers, or have real acquaintance with certain foreign countries by former residence or travel. Their experience must have been far beyond that of the ordinary, or they must have exceptional distinction and have exhibited particular success in their field. In addition, they should possess administrative or executive ability of a superior type. The language qualification is also of high importance. All recommendations and all applications are thoroughly examined by a board of officers and only a small percentage are finally recommended. There were over 2,000 applications for the course beginning this month, from whom only 150 were selected.

The organization of the civil-affairs section on the staff of commanders of high units does not appear to be thoroughly understood. It is a separate section of the staff, wholly distinct from all other sections. The officer in charge of civil affairs will be the head of the civil affairs section of the staff of the unit concerned. He will supervise civil affairs in the subordinate territorial commands; he will advise the commanding general on civil-affairs matters in the hostile territory, and he will handle for the commanding general, in accordance with approved policies, matters in connection therewith.

It will be interesting to you as lawyers to know that the legal department of the civil affairs section is charged with the duty of supervision of provost courts; the supervision of the civil courts, of public prosecutors, and the practice of law; the consideration of claims of inhabitants of the occupied territory against the United States, and of claims by the United States against the enemy countries. This department is also charged with the duty of giving legal advice to the commanding general, the officer in charge of civil affairs, and other personnel engaged in military government in respect to the operation of such government and matters connected with it.

The procedure for military commissions and provost courts is very similar to that of

general, special, and summary courts martial, respectively. While the general courts martial have concurrent jurisdiction with military commissions and provost courts to try any offender who, by the law of war, is subject to trial by military tribunals, it is the general practice that military commissions do not deal ordinarily with such purely military offenses specified in the articles of war, and governing our own forces, as those articles expressly make punishable by sentence of court martial, except where the military commission is also given express statutory jurisdiction over the offense. In practice, offenders who are not subject to the Articles of War, but who by the law of war are subject to trial by military tribunals, are tried by military commissions or provost courts.

Members of our armed forces who commit offenses are usually tried by our own courts martial. Members of the civil population who violate the proclamations and ordinances of the military governor are ordinarily tried by military commissions or provost courts, depending on the character and seriousness of the offense.

While the other functions of military government call for administrators of high ability and real experience in the fields of finance, engineering, economics, sanitation, communication, and public relations, there is also an important place for trained lawyers of wide experience who will be prepared to advise many complicated questions of law and the administration of justice in hostile territories. I feel sure that our bar can produce men of sufficient experience and ability for this most important work.

The policies which govern the conduct of military government by American forces emphasize military necessity, the welfare of the Government, flexibility, economy of effort, and permanence of personnel during the period of occupation. Our manual contains a striking statement of policy with which I may well close tonight, "As military government is executed by force, it is incumbent upon those who administer it to be strictly guided by the principles of justice, honor, and humanity—virtues adorning a soldier even more than other men for the very reason that he possesses the power of his arms against the unarmed."

Government Should Utilize Facilities of Private Business Schools in War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, this Congress should take immediate steps to see that the facilities of the now-existing 1,700 private business schools of the Nation are utilized for training typists, stenographers, and clerical help so greatly needed in today's war effort.

The present system of hiring incompetent stenographers, bookkeepers, clerks, and typists and then training them while on the job in Government offices through improvised departmental schools while there are ample facilities throughout the United States to train efficiently, economically, and in the shortest possible time all such employees needed, just does not make sense.

Private business schools pioneered business training in America and are rightfully entitled to consideration by the Government in this much-needed program. These schools already have their organizations, experienced instructors, and the equipment necessary to do an efficient job at a great saving of money. Their facilities were utilized in the last World War, and in the rehabilitation program that followed—and with marked success. I can see no reason why they should not be considered now.

Certainly the Government should not maintain "departmental schools" in competition with the private business schools. That is what is actually happening today, and at a needless waste of the taxpayers' money. To add insult to injury the private business schools were recently called upon to surrender to the Government 10 percent of their typewriters—many of which are now being used in competition against them.

It is the policy of this administration to utilize already existing facilities wherever possible for the production of necessary war materials. It utilized the engineering schools for technical training along mechanical lines. I think all Members of this House will agree that some common-sense program to utilize the facilities of private business schools to overcome the existing shortage in efficient office help should be followed.

Unless some action is taken by the proper committee, I am serving notice now that when the various appropriation bills are considered I shall ask that no part of the moneys appropriated shall be used to defray the costs of maintaining the so-called departmental schools that have recently come into being in government.

Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on the calendar of Calvary Baptist Church, of Washington, D. C., for Sunday, January 10, 1943, was printed a very beautiful and expressive poem, which, under leave to extend my remarks, I now print in the Appendix of the RECORD as an extension of my remarks:

TOMORROW

Tomorrow when this night is passed
  As even long nights do,
And peace and brotherhood return
  To weary hearts, yet true.
When nations all at least are free,
  And our great world at rest;
When children sing, and mothers smile,
  And no land is oppressed.
When liberty, and peace and hope
  Have come with new day's dawn—
Tomorrow, magic word, rose-hued,
  With sunrise, night is gone.
Tomorrow, when the night is passed,
  We'll build our world anew;
Restore our broken dreams, and find
  Lost joys and treasures too.
With faith and love and truth we'll build
  Our house of life once more,
With justice as the cornerstone
  And hearts forever pure.
With courage for these darkest days,
  Calm and unshaken, we
Await tomorrow unafraid
  Though black the night may be.
Tomorrow's morning sun will fade
  Dark clouds to azure sky.
Tomorrow, blessed, magic world—
  God grant that morn is nigh.

—*Rena Mary Taylor.*

Transportation of Oil and Gasoline by Intracoastal Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to Mr. Roy Miller, vice president of the Intracoastal Canal Association, Corpus Christi, Tex., by the gentleman from Texas, Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD:

COLUMBUS, TEX., *December 27, 1942.*

Hon. ROY MILLER,
Vice President, Intracoastal Canal Association, Corpus Christi, Tex.

DEAR ROY: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 19th in which you call attention to a Washington Associated Press dispatch stating that Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, had authorized the construction of more than 1,000 barges, towboats, and tugs to convey oil to the eastern seaboard, and of new terminal facilities at Cairo, Ill., and Jacksonville and Panama City, Fla.

I am also advised that the Washington Evening Star of December 16 published an article entitled "Federal Officials O. K. Inland Fleet To Bring Fuel Oil to East." This article goes on to say that the inland waterways are expected to increase by 100,000 barrels per day the movement of fuel oil to the eastern seaboard, 50,000 barrels to go up the Mississippi River, and 50,000 barrels by the Gulf Coast Canal from Texas to Panama City, thence by tank cars to the Atlantic seaboard. The article states that the program had been under discussion for more than a year.

In your letter you call attention to the fact that more than a year ago I had urged that the Intracoastal waterways be made use of to relieve the then threatened oil and gasoline shortage in the East. My letters to Admiral Land, of the Maritime Commission; Mr. Ickes, Oil Coordinator; and Mr. J. J. Pelly, president of the Association of American Railways, were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in September and October 1941.

My proposal, as you will recall, was to build a large number of wooden barges and a few additional steel barges for the shipment of oil and gasoline from Texas to St. Joe, then by rail or pipe line across Florida to Jacksonville, then by barge up the Atlantic coastal canal. Failing to get full cooperation along these lines, I then introduced a bill to enlarge the inland channel along the Gulf coast and to extend it across Florida to connect with the Atlantic inland channel. For immediate use, the bill provided for one or more pipe lines across Florida.

This bill passed the House and Senate and was approved by the President. An appropriation was made for building barges to be operated on this waterway, but up to this time no barges have been built. The bill contemplated pipe lines sufficient to move 250,000 barrels of oil per day across Florida, but one 8-inch pipe line only has been laid, having capacity for only 25,000 barrels daily.

Instead of connecting the Gulf and Atlantic coastal channels with an adequate pipe line, a 24-inch line has been laid from Texas to Illinois. It is two and one-half times longer than the distance across Florida, requiring two and one-half times as much steel. Its terminus is approximately 1,000 miles by rail from the center of need on the Atlantic seaboard. Its extension to the East has now been authorized, as I am informed, requiring another year and enormous expenditures for its completion.

There are two or three administrators or coordinators involved in the problem, the most powerful of which are the Administrator of Defense Transportation and the Administrator of Oil. The transportation czar has spent his life on the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is only natural that he should not be able to imagine any course of action but one which will help the railroads get priorities and which will increase railroad revenues. Moreover, if the organization principles of the Interstate Commerce Commission are followed there would be thousands of clerks, great volumes of paper work, and years of delay instead of prompt and virile action.

The oil and gasoline shortage is on and near the eastern seaboard, the region formerly supplied by the ocean tankers. The intracoastal waterways extend through the same region and can supply it at less cost than would be possible by any interior pipe line. With the exception of the steel pipe for the comparatively short distance across Florida, the equipment will consist largely of wooden barges and towboats. The huge continental pipe line is all steel—steel, so necessary at this time to build tankers to supply the Armies and Navy overseas.

Certain major oil interests are promoting the transcontinental pipe line. If extended to the eastern seaboard, its estimated cost exceeds $100,000,000. The pipe is 24 inches in diameter, requiring enormous pumping installations perhaps every 40 miles. This size of pipe has never heretofore been used for oil or gasoline, but only for natural gas. Insofar as oil and gasoline are concerned, the line will become obsolete when the coastwise tanker service is restored. Its principal promoter stated to a congressional committee that the line would then be used for natural gas. Private interests might profit enormously in the post-war period by having a great transcontinental pipe line erected for them at Government expense.

Months ago when the transportation of oil products by barge was before a committee of Congress, a major oil company official from the Office of the Oil Administrator, submitted evidence designed to prove that transportation by pipe line was more efficient than by barge. He did this by giving figures on the number of barrels per day per ton of steel. But when the pipe line across Florida to connect the Gulf coast waterways to the Atlantic Coast waterway was brought up he gave evidence to the effect that this pipe line could carry only gasoline because the viscosity of other products precluded the pumping of them with efficiency. In neither case did he give the number of barrels per day per ton of steel for viscous products.

The arguments presented at first appeared to indicate that pipe lines were best for oil products, but later a pipe line across Florida could not transport anything but gasoline. Now, the newspapers say that fuel oil (which according to the oil man's testimony could not be piped across Florida) is to be piped by the transcontinental line to the East.

Barges can carry all oil products with just about the same efficiency, that pipe lines can carry gasoline, and barges will carry fuel oil and crude oil with more efficiency in barrels per day per ton of steel. Moreover, barge transportation is flexible and can carry whichever product is desired when and where it is desired. Pipe lines pumping gasoline could not very well change to other oil products within a reasonable time.

If the Gulf and Atlantic coast waterways had been promptly utilized in accordance with my urgent recommendations in September 1941, with the comparatively short pipe line or rail haul across Florida, the oil shortage of the East would now have been infinitesimal, if at all.

After all the delay the most practical and efficient way to transport all oil products from Texas to the Atlantic seaboard, in the absence of the ocean tankers, was, and still is, in barges by way of the canals already in existence along the Gulf and Atlantic coasts, and across Florida in pipe lines.

Of course, it would not have done to put into operation the coastal route before the transcontinental pipe line had been authorized, because in that event there would never have been any need for the transcontinental pipe line.

I want to commend the good judgment of Donald Nelson for providing this additional waterway equipment. If the transportation czars will now help us to get across the Florida isthmus by pipe line or short rail haul, the Intracoastal Waterway will give at least partial relief to the eastern oil situation in less time and at less cost than can be afforded by any other proposed method of transportation.

I am,

Yours sincerely,

J. J. MANSFIELD.

Payment of Income Taxes by Minors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to furnish information to several minors who are earning more than $624 a year. Some of them are still attending school. I am sure that both the minors and their parents will be interested in the information furnished to me by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Guy T. Helvering, concerning the liabilities and responsibilities of both minors and parents with reference to the Victory and income taxes. As this problem confronts the entire country, I am pleased to bring it to the attention of other members of Congress.

The letter which I have received is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 12, 1943.

Hon. CHARLES R. CLASON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CLASON: Reference is made to your letter dated December 29, 1942, relative to inquiries received by you from school children under 16 years of age who wish to know whether or not they are subject to the Victory and income taxes. You request information as to the responsibility for the payment of these taxes on the income of minors under present laws.

An individual, although a minor, having gross income from a source other than earnings for personal services, equal to or in excess of the credit allowed by section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by section 131 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1942 ($500 if single or $1,200 if married and living with husband or wife), for the taxable year 1942, must file a return or a return must be filed for him by his guardian or other person charged with the care of his person or property. Amounts received from any property which he possesses or from any funds held in trust for him by trustee or guardian must be reported on the minor's individual return and are never included in the parent's return.

In the absence of proof to the contrary, the regulations assume that all earnings of a minor for his personal services belong to the parent and should be included in the parent's own return. If, however, under the laws of a State, the earnings of a minor belong to the minor, or if he has been emancipated by his parents, or if the minor marries with the parent's consent or enters the armed forces, such earnings are not required to be included in the return of the parent.

In most jurisdictions emancipation need not be evidenced by formal act but may be expressed, either orally or in writing, or it may be implied from action of the parent. For instance, if a minor son is permitted to keep his wages for his own use and is not dependent for support on the parent or the parent permits the child to leave home and work for his own benefit, there is implied emancipation and the minor would be responsible for filing his return and paying the taxes on his income.

The provisions of the Internal Revenue Code as added by section 172 of the Revenue Act of 1942 imposing the Victory tax make no distinction between minors and other individuals. Every individual, other than a nonresident alien subject to the tax imposed by section 211 (a) of the code, having gross income in excess of the specific exemption of $624 for the taxable year ending December 31, 1943, is subject to this tax. A minor who files his own return or whose return is filed for him for the year 1943 would be responsible for the payment of the tax computed on his Victory tax net income. A parent who includes a minor child's earnings with his taxable income for 1943 must also include such income for Victory tax purposes.

In the case of an employed minor receiving wages or salaries for services rendered, there will be withheld from such salaries or wages paid a tax equal to 5 percent of the excess of such payment of wages or salaries over the withholding deduction allowable. The act provides that the total deduction allowed any individual with respect to wages received from any one employer during a calendar year shall not exceed the amount which would have been allowable if such individual had an annual pay-roll period. The maximum amount of the deduction allowable with respect to wages paid to an employee by any one employer during the year is $624.

Very truly yours,

GUY T. HELVERING,
Commissioner.

Edward J. Lynett, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from

the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune of January 2, 1943, and also an editorial from the Scranton Times:

[From the Scranton Tribune of January 2, 1943]

EDWARD J. LYNETT, SR.

In the death of Edward J. Lynett, Sr., editor and publisher of the Scranton Times, northeastern Pennsylvania has lost one of its foremost citizens and public benefactors, and American journalism has lost one of its most vigorous and positive figures.

Although he had achieved an advanced age which would have found many another publisher retired from the field, Mr. Lynett was daily at the office of the Times, until just recently, as had been his custom for many years. While he had divested himself of many duties, Mr. Lynett interested himself in the conduct of the publication that he had guided from a circulation of 3,000 to one of the most successful and enterprising newspapers of the East. His death comes as a shock to his wide circle of friends who had been unaware of his brief illness.

Mr. Lynett's career was a saga of American journalism. Like so many other leaders of this area, he began work as a slate picker. When he was 16, however, he was employed as deputy clerk to the mayor's court. Later he turned to the study of law but found this was not his calling. It was a happy circumstance for the community and region that he embraced journalism, for his years of service in the newspaper field were productive of countless public improvements.

First obtaining a job as a reporter on the Sunday Free Press, Mr. Lynett in a short time became managing editor and editor of the publication and remained with it until 1895 when he bought the then struggling Scranton Times. Mr. Lynett's fearless editorial policies, his championship of the common man, his leadership in community affairs soon won the paper a following, and year by year the Times grew in circulation and influence until it achieved a secure place among the journals of the United States.

A charitable man by nature, Mr. Lynett generously supported every worthwhile cause. Apart from his prominent association with organized charities, Mr. Lynett, through his generosity, aided countless numbers of people, and helped establish others in independent careers. Before the organization of the Scranton Community Chest, of which he was an organizer and an ardent supporter since its inception, Mr. Lynett was secretary of the Associated Charities.

A Democrat in politics, Mr. Lynett loyally supported his party year in and year out, the Times rallying to the Democratic banner through many lean years for the party in Pennsylvania and the Nation. Although Mr. Lynett never aspired for a city or a county elective office, he was honored by his fellow Democrats on many occasions by being national delegate to Democratic national conventions. The State Democratic organization time and again paid tribute to his loyalty and notable services to the party by bestowing honors on him. When President Roosevelt visited Scranton during the second term Presidential election the Chief Executive made it a point to meet Mr. Lynett and renew his friendly relations of former years. Democratic notables across the years, as well as distinguished visitors to Scranton, paid Mr. Lynett the respect of a call to his offices or to his home.

The city and region and State have lost a valued public figure at a time when America can ill afford such a loss, but the Times has lost a beloved leader, and the management and staff of the Tribune extend heartfelt fraternal condolences to the official Times family. To Mr. Lynett's immedi e survivors, this paper expresses its deepest sympathies on the loss of a loving and devoted father.

[From the Scranton Times]

EDWARD J. LYNETT

Over a long lifetime Edward J. Lynett—he was 86 past—had deeply impressed himself on the community and won an abiding place in the hearts and minds of the people. Mr. Lynett, who died today, was editor and publisher of the Times. His newspaper career extended over a period of more than 65 years, a longer time than any other man in Scranton journalistic history. He had not only developed the Times from a paper with little prestige into a great journal but had seen and helped Scranton and the county grow with it. In building the Times he built for the community.

The Times under his direction strove for the best interests of the people of the community. Strong convictions were a part of his nature. He believed that when a task was undertaken it should be completed. His judgment was certain. He was prompt to make a decision. In his newspaper career he had seen many changes in the community and had battled in many causes. The going was not always smooth. There were blows to be taken as well as to be given. His courage was on a par with his convictions; he never flinched. He yielded to no man or group where public interest was concerned.

It was not easy away back when beloved John Mitchell came into the region to stand out almost alone in the newspaper field in support of the cause of the mine workers. The power and influence of the coal companies was great. Mr. Lynett wrote and argued that the miners' cause was just. This same courage he displayed in numerous other battles. Through the Times he fought for lower water, gas, electric, and street-car rates. He urged better treatment for workers in many fields of endeavor. He was a leader in granting better wages and working conditions in the printing industry and rightfully proud that in all of his half century or so of management of Scranton newspapers there was never an industrial disturbance on or within his publication.

Mr. Lynett felt that he had a duty toward the community. For 60 years he worked for practically every movement for Scranton's benefit and contributed of his means, as well as the influence of his newspaper. In World War I he was energetic in gathering funds for the prosecution of the war and for organization purposes. He was an organizer of the community chest, a board member and campaign worker. Munipical reform found in him an advocate. He was crusader but not reformer. There was no influence strong enough to prevent him from exposing misrule or grafting of public funds. He believed in an uncontrolled press and kept his newspaper free of outside domination. Newspaper making was his life work. He controlled the Times for 47 years.

Politically, Mr. Lynett was a Democrat of the old school, stanch and loyal to his party but reserving for himself and his newspaper the right of criticism and of dissent. There were periods when the party's outlook was dark, yet Mr. Lynett was sanguine that a new dawn would come again. He had no personal political ambitions. He could have had any office within the gift of the party in city, county, or State. Mr. Lynett was last of the original county officeholders, having been named, when but twenty-two, a county auditor when Lackawanna was created in 1878.

Mr. Lynett, without display, was openhearted and charitable. He gave to people of all races, creeds, and color. Naturally friendly, Mr. Lynett enjoyed companionship. He was close to his workers, advised and helped and was free in saying that much of the success which came to him as the editor and publisher of the Times was due to the loyalty and the capacity of the men and women who helped him, day by day, in making the newspaper. He was loved by his employees for his often-displayed kindnesses and consideration for them.

By his achievements in his profession, by his participation in community effort, by his deep understanding of people and their needs, acquired by close association, and by his devotion to whatever task was assigned him Mr. Lynett had gained for himself an enduring place. He leaves a record that has few parallels in the life of Scranton. He will be missed by his children, by the people of the community, humble and great, and by those of us who labored with him in making the Times a newspaper which reflected his honest, unafraid, progressive public viewpoint.

Official Statement by Farm Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, those who oppose adequate farm legislation often excuse their opposition by asserting, with tongue in cheek, that they would be glad to cooperate in behalf of the farmer, if they knew what he really wanted, but the failure of the farm organizations to agree on a program makes it impossible to reach common ground on which friends of agriculture can unite.

Such alibis are conclusively disposed of by the collaboration of the national farm organizations in the last Congress, and by their unity of program in this Congress as expressed in the statement just issued by the four great farm organizations, the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives and the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. The statement is also concurred in by unaffiliated state organizations throughout the Union, including the Missouri Farmers Association of my own State.

The statement is admirably set forth in an address by Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, over the Blue Network on January 9, 1943, which I include in full:

Farm organization leaders from all over the United States have been here in Washington this week to formulate programs to meet the agricultural problems created by the war, and to work with Congress and the administration in carrying out those programs through legislative measures.

The war has changed everything, including the procedure of the farm organizations in seeking farm legislation. Realizing the value of unity, the leaders of the four major farm organizations are meeting in joint sessions to come to agreement on as many issues as possible, so that all may join in the requests that are made to Congress. The organizations cooperating in this way are: The National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Milk Producers Federation. It will be recalled that these four organizations worked together very effectively last fall in the price-control fight.

Starting in where we left off last fall, we have already reached agreement on some

major issues, and we will continue our conferences throughout the year in an effort to attain still greater unity. It is too much to hope that all the organizations can agree on all issues, since in our ranks are representatives of all types of farming and all commodities produced in this country. It is our hope to reach agreement on major issues which affect the welfare of agriculture as a whole. If we can do this, it will be an achievement of tremendous significance to agriculture.

In a statement adopted yesterday, these four organizations announced agreement on the price control and manpower issues. These issue are so important that I am going to read the statement, which is as follows:

"STATEMENT BY FARM ORGANIZATIONS, JANUARY 8, 1943

"We reaffirm the position of our respective organizations in offering our fullest cooperation to the Government in carrying out sound means to prevent inflation.

"We again affirm our conviction that price ceilings on some war-essential agricultural commodities as presently applied, under the condition of agriculture's continued disparity with war industry and labor, discourages their production. This promotion of scarcity, in addition to threatening the Nation's food supply, releases inflationary forces of the most vicious character.

"We demand that whenever Government imposes agricultural price ceilings, its officers and agencies exercise their responsibility and authority to approve only such price ceilings as will neither discourage nor prevent increased production.

"Furthermore, we insist that the use of subsidies in place of fair prices in the market place be discarded.

"II

"Early victory in the war requires the maximum effort of every individual. Therefore, for the duration, while American boys are giving their lives and fighting without regard to hours, and American farm families are working to meet the Nation's food and fiber requirements without any limit as to hours, we insist:

"1. That increased volume of labor be provided by adopting legislation extending the work week to at least 54 hours and eliminating any requirements for overtime payments. Any increased profits accruing to employers as a result of this action should be recovered by Government through adequate taxation;

"2. That all tributes now being exacted as a requisite for employment be immediately and definitely terminated.

"We believe that these actions, if immediately taken, will aid materially in solving the manpower problem in both industry and agriculture.

"III

"We reiterate our former position that all farm labor shall be included in any computation of parity for price-ceiling purposes and condemn vigorously the contrary interpretation by some administrative agencies of the present law which interpretation excludes the consideration of the labor of the farmer and his family. Furthermore, we may seek additional legislation calling for more fundamental changes in the method of computing parity prices when studies which are now being made have proceeded to satisfactory conclusion.

"Other conditions necessary for essential production are—

"1. Elimination of slow-downs and racketeering practices being imposed by organized labor.

"2. Adequate machinery and equipment.

"3. Importation of Mexican and West Indian labor under practical procurement and distribution conditions.

"4. Elimination of all impractical restrictions on the placement of domestic farm labor.

"5. Full utilization and organization of voluntary and school labor.

"6. Adoption of practical, workable regulations and standards under the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act so as to assure the deferment of all essential persons engaged in agricultural production (including seasonal labor) as intended by Congress.

"7. Elimination of any attempted regulations or activities in the operations of the United States Employment Service, Farm Security Administration, or any other agency of Government, which seeks to impose union conditions in the employment of farm labor.

"ALBERT S. GOSS,
"Master, the National Grange.
"EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
"President, American Farm Bureau Federation.
"CHARLES C. TEAGUE,
"President, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.
"JOHN BRANDT,
"President, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation."

So much for the joint action of the farm organizations. Now I will report on the other Washington activities this week of my own organization, the American Farm Bureau Federation. Our executive committee has been here, as well as a number of State Farm Bureau leaders, to map out a legislative program based on the resolutions adopted at the last convention of the organization in Chicago in December.

We prepared a series of recommendations based on the resolutions, and presented them to Secretary of Agriculture Claude Wickard last Tuesday afternoon. These recommendations do not represent our complete legislative program but on the issues covered they do represent the ideas of our convention delegates, which we as leaders are laboring to carry out.

The complete text of our recommendations is as follows:

1. American farmers pledge all-out effort to produce the food and fiber necessary to the successful prosecution of the war, but farmers will not be able to meet their responsibility unless the Government cooperates by assuring certain minimum essentials.

2. Experienced and skilled workers must be kept on farms. Impractical restrictions on the importation of Mexican and other labor should be liberalized. Because of the impracticability of regulating wages and hours of farm labor, we urge that all attempts to do this be abandoned.

3. Additional supplies of farm machinery and equipment must be made available as soon as possible. We further insist that plans now be put into effect to greatly step up production for 1944. Extremely urgent is the immediate need for additional repair parts.

4. Transportation facilities essential to farm production and marketing must be provided and maintained.

5. Farm-price provisions of price-control legislation and of the Steagall Act, literally interpreted, must be observed. Farm-price ceilings must be immediately adjusted to permit establishing prices which will assure adequate farm production. Subsidies used in lieu of fair market prices should be eliminated immediately. Prices at which the market will be supported and the time limits of such support should be announced at the time the production goal is announced.

6. In order to permit farmers more nearly to meet competitive wages for labor we insist that all increased farm labor costs be taken into account in determining parity prices for farm commodities at least for the duration of the emergency.

7. To win the war requires the maximum effort of every individual. This cannot be given with the restricted hours of employment now in effect. We therefore insist on the elimination of these restrictions, at least for the duration of the emergency.

8. Nonessential Government agencies and services should be immediately eliminated, and other Government agencies and services should simplify and decentralize administrative procedures so that personnel may be reduced, costs lowered, and citizens relieved of the present intolerable burden of red tape and confusion imposed on them by administrators of national programs and regulations.

9. A larger portion of war costs must be paid currently through tax and savings programs designed to siphon off that part of every individual's income which is in excess of fair normal income.

10. All necessary services of the Farm Security Administration should be transferred to other existing State and Federal agencies, with the administration of such services decentralized as far as possible.

11. Congress should immediately enact legislation to eliminate racketeering and other abuses in the labor-union movement, including violence, coercion, hot cargoes, secondary boycotts, enforced membership, etc.

12. All efforts to destroy the cooperative features and to centralize control of the farm credit system in Washington should be vigorously resisted.

13. The Commodity Credit Corporation should take immediate steps to make available to livestock, dairy, and poultry producers the protein ingredients so badly needed in feeding operations.

14. The services of the grand-land colleges, experiment stations, and extension services should be utilized to a greater extent in carrying out the various farm programs. These agencies should be charged with the full responsibility of disseminating the essential facts and information pertaining to these programs. I wish I had time to discuss each of these recommendations, but time remains only to present the formal action taken by our executive committee on the question of revamping the parity formula. In the resolution on this issue we said:

"Consistent with our resolutions of 2 years ago, and last year, the leaders of the federation (1) do not consent to any change in the parity formula as directed to the basic crops enumerated in the Agricultural Adjustment Act as originally enacted; (2) but that for the term of the emergency they join with others in seeking authority and direction of the Congress that there be added to parity as computed under the present law an amount to compensate for the increased cost of farm wages; and (3) that the leaders of the federation be authorized and directed to clearly and forcefully inform the leaders of any commodity group not considered as a basic crop of the willingness and desire of the federation to aggressively pursue study and determine and seek a law that will formulate a parity for the particular commodities that will give them a comparable position in the markets of this county with the producers of basic crops."

Freedom of the Press Threatened in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, because of the high respect in which I hold the courts of this land, nothing less than an

imminent danger to one of our national fundamentals could impel me to discuss upon the floor of this House a case pending in the courts.

One of our national fundamentals is in danger—that fundamental established and proclaimed by the Constitution, the freedom of the press. The danger to the freedom of the press does not arise from the courts—I am confident that they will maintain that freedom—but the danger does arise from the maneuverings and the snide and cynical acts upon the part of governmental leaders and politicians which preceded the filing in the Federal court in New York the action seeking to enjoin the Associated Press on the ground that it is a monopoly within the meaning of the antitrust laws.

As I say, my confidence in our system of justice is such that I would not make any remarks that might be interpreted as seeking improperly to sway the judge or judges who might hear this case. They will, I know, judge it wisely and in accord with American tradition, not blindly and in accord with certain practices and so-called principles which have sprung up in our national comity within recent years.

However, the vital importance of the issue of a free press and the equal importance of a government which governs all with even-handed justice prompt me to raise before the House and before the country a warning. That warning should be heard with particular clarity in certain Government offices here in the National Capital. For it is in these offices that what seems to be a morbid conspiracy to destroy that bulwark of all freedoms—an untrammeled and uncontrolled press—seems to have been hatched.

Mr. Speaker, that the personnel of our Government in recent years has become irritated and irked by the operation of a press free to print the news and comment upon it has been most evident.

Petty bureaucrats have only been following the expressions of more highly placed officials when they have snivelled and smirked their plaints against the exercise of our newspapers' precious heritage. Unable to answer factually the legitimate objections which some of our papers have raised against the fads and fancies of those who would make America over, Government officials at first threw mud at the press and then deliberately and maliciously set out to destroy the confidence of a free people in their free press.

And unfortunately they almost succeeded. Sycophancy from the press was what these Government officials sought. They wanted adulation. They demanded that the press conform in every way and in every detail with everyone of the schemes they advanced, the degree of the idiocy of the scheme being no criterion.

Why we have even been treated to the ludicrous spectacle of those sitting in Government offices in just so many words telling the editors of the country not only the manner in which a specific story should be treated, but actually dictating the headlines which they wanted on that story.

Ask any country editor—and all of the Members of this House know many of them—just how asinine such a procedure is. And then ask them just how dangerous to every man, woman, and child in the country such a procedure is.

Mr. Speaker, we have the spectacle in many countries in Europe where the Government tells the editors just how each story is to be played in their papers. We have country after country in which the headlines over each story are dictated by Government officials. And those spectacles, Mr. Speaker, are among the reasons why we find in the so-called Atlantic Charter, listed as one of the aspirations for which our great country is fighting a bloody war, the freedom of the press.

It might be well if those who prate about the four freedoms we are going to impose on the world would restore to American editors the freedom which has been guaranteed to them from the establishment of our Republic. It might be well if they, in the exercise of the authority which they have been briefly clothed, would relieve the pressure and the mud-slinging by which they have sought to coerce American editors to surrender their freedom, which in essence is the guaranty of the other freedoms we hold so dear.

The attempt to ridicule and debase the American press to political servitude by means of jibes and sneers fortunately failed. Confronted by that failure our bureaucrats decided that more forceful even if more obvious tactics must be followed to bring the free press to heel.

A person of tremendous wealth—one of those who fits the well remembered phrase "those who sit in well-stocked clubs"—was induced to take some of his millions and start a so-called newspaper. It has been said that he was the more willing to do this because he knew, or was told, that if the paper did not prosper—certainly a remote possibility because our bureaucrats must know what the people want to read—he could deduct his losses from his income taxes. As to the truth of that I do not know.

But I do know that he started a newspaper dedicated to the theory that the bureaucrats could do no wrong. For whatever, reason, that man sold the birthright of American editors to free expression and apishly followed those with whom he curried favor.

Now it happened that this man, made wealthy by inheritance, as so many of our poseur "champions of the peepul" are, found that his newspaper did not prosper. Not only did not prosper from the standpoint of revenue, but did not prosper from the standpoint of circulation. For, although that newspaper could tell all that the bureaucrats wanted told, the free Americans expressed their opinion of it by staying away from it in droves.

Then was born the most brilliant brain-child of an epoch in which many a scintillating offspring has been born. The bureaucrats would obtain for this publisher, by force of government, that which the publisher could not, with his record, obtain for himself, something which would dress up and disguise and thus perfume the bureaucracy-dictated stories and headlines. They would obtain for this publisher membership in the Associated Press.

As a result of that bureaucratic cogitation, agents of the Government, accredited agents of Government offices in which the freedom of the press might be thought to be most secure, went among the members of the Associated Press. Directly and by indirection they told these editors that unless the new-fledged publishers were voted into membership in the highly respected and tremendously efficient and clean Associated Press the most dire things would befall. Civil court action would be brought, maybe the members of the Associated Press would even be sent to jail through criminal proceedings.

Well, the members of the Associated Press did just exactly what the American people could depend upon them to do. They voted, with marvelous accord, that the sycophant publisher could play in his own back yard with his customary playmates, but that the Associated Press wanted none of him.

So the bureaucrats took what was to them the logical step. They moved to break up the free association of free editors of a free press. They took the attitude of many a doting parent and went to the neighboring children's parents and told them that they had to "let our boy play with them or else."

Mr. Speaker, that brings the matter into court. The issues set forth in the Government's suit on behalf of a blindly following publisher will be tried there. I do not seek to try them on this floor.

But the great misdeed of attacking our free press not only this once and not only with this weapon, but many times and with a whole arsenal, cries aloud to this Congress and to our people for investigation and punishment.

This attempt to torpedo an institution essential to our national livelihood, an institution recognized by Government officials, at least in words, as being so beneficent that it must be given—by force—to the whole world, is an attempt against the life of our entire body politic. Whether the court action succeeds or fails it is by its very filing a gun held against the ribs of every editor and every writer in America, whether he operates in a vast city or a humble township.

This House, representing those editors and representing the people for whom they hold in trusteeship the right of a free press, cannot longer ignore the insidious as well as the overt attempts to destroy the strongest thread in the fabric of our democracy.

General Justo Passes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, January 13, 1943, entitled "General Justo Passes." General Justo, who had served as President of Argentina, was a great statesman as well as a great warrior. He was a leader of foresight and vision who had registered consistent dissent against the isolationist foreign policy of the present Argentine administration. Especially since the entry of the United States into the war, General Justo had been an ardent supporter of pan-American solidarity and the cause of the United Nations. His passing, particularly at this time, is a great loss to the cause of hemisphere solidarity and it is to be hoped that his farsighted and patriotic aims will be carried on to the successful conclusion for which he had labored so long.

GENERAL JUSTO PASSES

For the second time within the war period, sudden illness and death have intervened in Argentina's political scene. The unexpected death of Gen. Agustin P. Justo after a brief illness removes one of the most colorful and influential factors in Argentina's political life. Unfortunately, both those bereavements have been detrimental to that country's attitude toward the United States and Pan-American cooperation.

General Justo, who died at the age of 66, had behind him a long career as both soldier and statesman. After able service as Minister of War during the troubled years which fell upon Argentina during the world-wide economic depression, he was elected President for the 6-year term from 1932 to 1938. Ineligible immediately to succeed himself under the Argentine Constitution, General Justo did much to insure the election of a coalition ticket by which Roberto M. Ortiz became President and Ramon S. Castillo Vice President. The new chief executive was pledged to a program of liberalism and reform. When the European War broke out in the autumn of 1939, President Ortiz at once showed his solidarity with the Pan-American policy of the United States and his moral sympathy with Britain and France as against Axis aggression. Had he remained at the political helm, the isolationist and indirectly pro-Axis policy of Argentina would never have evolved.

Unfortunately, the President was stricken by an illness which soon incapacitated him for his office. As provided by the Argentine Constitution, the Executive functions were taken over by the Vice President, who exercised them, first in a temporary capacity and then as President when Ortiz' sickness was diagnosed as incurable.

Ramon S. Castillo represents the most conservative, not to say reactionary, elements in Argentine politics, centering in the big landowners and commercial interests, which play a political role disproportionate to their voting strength. Partly for domestic reasons and partly because of economic considerations, those elements favored a policy of aloofness toward the war and toward Washington's mobilization of the New World against aggressive Axis aims. Both as acting President and as Chief Executive, Castillo has hewed consistently to this line, despite growing opposition at home and increasing diplomatic pressure from abroad.

Against this isolationist foreign policy, General Justo has registered consistent dissent. Especially since the entry of the United States into the war, he came out as a stanch supporter of pan-American solidarity and the cause of the United Nations. When Brazil declared war against the Axis, General Justo offered his services to that country, thereby arousing such anger in conservative circles that he was pelted with a barrage of eggs and tomatoes when he left a meeting in which he had made a strongly pro-Ally address.

Argentina's political pot is already beginning to boil in anticipation of the next presidential campaign, and General Justo's name was prominent on the list of prospective candidates. That he had presidential ambitions is more than probable, and his political shrewdness combined with his excellent connections rendered him a likely rallying point for a coalition of several powerful elements which could unite on his candidacy more easily than on any one else. His sudden removal from the political arena probably will have a disturbing effect on the formulation of campaign plans. As a power behind the scenes and as a potential candidate, General Justo will not be easily replaced.

The Rationing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement sent to me by the director of the O. P. A. in Santa Barbara, Calif.:

SOME CONSTRUCTIVE SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN THE RATIONING PROGRAM BASED ON THE EXPERIENCE OF A LOCAL RATIONING BOARD CHAIRMAN SERVING A CITY OF 35,000 SINCE RATIONING BEGAN

Under war-inspired patriotism the public has accepted the discipline of rationing like good soldiers. But they have been subjected to much unnecessary confusion, delay, and irritation, the cumulative effect of which can ultimately undermine the success of the program. Many of these factors which handicap the movement may be eliminated through relatively small increases in expenditures, in decentralization, and in planning. An outline of the needed improvement follows.

I. EFFICIENT FUNCTIONING OF LOCAL RATIONING BOARDS IS A PRIME REQUIREMENT

A. Adequate staffing

1. More paid clerical help is a first essential: The boards have been overloaded and understaffed from the very inception. Month by month the work load doubles and trebles without a corresponding increase in staff. Much of the delay and irritation of the public is due to this situation.

2. Revised salary schedules are necessary: Clerical salaries of from $100 to $120 per month fail to attract or to retain competent employees in face of competition from other Federal agencies, not to mention war industries. Even the made-work programs of Work Projects Administration offer higher pay for some classes of clerks than Office of Price Administration pays. The $2,300 compensation to chief clerks generally fails to produce men capable of coping with the rising volume of work. Changing the title of this office from "executive secretary" to "chief clerk" produces a wholly unnecessary psychological barrier.

3. Volunteer help fails to fill the requirements: While voluntary help does respond to meet peak loads, a larger skeleton of trained staff would eliminate much of the confusion which prevails at such times. For the steady grind of daily work and the turning out of ever-increasing reports, the 3 or 4 hours per week work of the volunteer is totally inadequate. The increasing complexity of each new rationing program can only be met by a permanent staff far larger than is now provided local boards.

B. Adequate office space and supplies

1. Ample working area must be provided: Lack of rental funds forces many boards to operate under overcrowded conditions which add to the dissatisfaction of the public and handicap efficiency.

2. Local acquisition of supplies would relieve a serious bottleneck: National, regional, and State offices are months behind in furnishing such ordinary office supplies as pencils, pens, and paper. No funds are available to provide for such simple time-saving steps as printing stationery with local board addresses and acquiring much-needed rubber stamps.

C. The work load of local boards and their chairmen should be reduced

1. Persons actively engaged in the business life of the community make the most desirable board members: Such men and women are best equipped to exercise a sound judgment in applying rationing regulations to local conditions with which they are thoroughly conversant. Carrying on their own business affairs limits their time available to rationing problems to an hour or two per day.

2. Competent staffs should process applications for board consideration: Each application requires preliminary scrutiny and investigation before submission for board action. The work of board members is far more valuable in considering all available facts pertaining to applications than in spending their time developing needed information which properly staffed offices could secure.

3. Boards should be relieved of extraneous burdens: Local boards and their chairmen should not be required to devote so much time to recruiting volunteers to offset undermanned permanent staffs and to overcome the tremendous turn-over of this type of assistance. They should not be called upon to spend hours begging for free office space and seeking aims with which to buy otherwise unprovided office supplies.

II. INCREASED DECENTRALIZATION

A. More authority to local boards

1. Rationing regulations should provide means of meeting local problems: The most serious injustices created by rationing are often minor cases not covered by the general rules. Every regulation should contain a general relief clause authorizing local board action on such problems. This would enable conscientious boards to make within the law the small modifications needed to soften the impact of regimentation, adjustments which many boards now approve regardless of any real authority to do so.

2. Requests for rulings from district offices on minor matters should be eliminated: The present requirement of referring many almost insignificant matters to district and State offices could be avoided by vesting only slightly increased authority at the local-board level.

B. More authority to district and State officers

The process of decentralization includes enlarging the authority of these intermediary bodies to handle problems of larger scope.

C. Uniformity through wider dissemination of departmental rulings

Digests of rulings made by national, regional, State, and district offices should reach all local boards promptly by indexed weekly bulletins. Pressure from applicants for more liberal interpretation of regulations because other boards have taken conflicting positions would be greatly reduced by this procedure.

III. BETTER PLANNING AT THE TOP

A. The rubber-boot program, a model of how rationing should be done

A thoroughly thought out system placed in the hands of local boards in completed form before being announced to the public. Result: No confusion, immediate answers to all questions, full acceptance of a firmly and quickly enforced ration.

B. The gasoline program. How not to ration

Lack of conception of the time elements involved. Results: Delays, confusion, and incipient revolt. Boards forced to operate gasoline rationing for weeks without having available for study the final regulations. Forms prepared with little conception of their inadaptability for public use and inadequacy of space for required entries.

C. Split authority fatal

Truck rationing partially by Office of Defense Transportation, with its highly centralized organization, and partially by the local agencies of the Office of Price Administration, has already been proven unsuccessful. The division of authority over trucks could well be resolved in either of two ways:

1. Complete operation of truck rationing through present local rationing boards. The Office of Defense Transportation might retain authority to set standards, but all directives would be given to the national office of the Office of Price Administration, with dissemination from that source to existing boards throughout the Nation. Processing of farm truck applications by local United States Department of Agriculture war boards, functioning in a capacity similar to existing Defense Plant transportation committees, would insure sound consideration.

2. Complete divorcement of Office of Defense Transportation activities from any connection with local Office of Price Administration rationing boards. Office of Defense Transportation under such circumstances would be impelled to establish its own local agencies to ration gasoline and tires to trucks.

The public could understand the first solution, could eventually be educated to accept the second, but is completely befogged by the present dual control.

Considering the issues at stake, is it too much to ask that the money, the thought, and the faith in local authority called for by the above suggestions be forthcoming?

Respectfully submitted.

DONALD MYRICK,
Chairman, Local War Price and Rationing Board, No. 82.11.2, Santa Barbara, Calif.

DECEMBER 8, 1942.

Poll-Tax Bill's True Nature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINDER R. HARRIS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I herewith submit a recent editorial from the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, which was captioned "Poll-Tax Bill's True Nature." This editorial was reprinted in The Christian Science Monitor and other nonsouthern newspapers, and commented on widely. I trust it shall be read carefully by the Members of the House, especially the new Members, when the next announced effort is made to stampede them in support of this unconstitutional and highly dangerous legislative proposal.

The editorial from the Indianapolis News is as follows:

POLL-TAX BILL'S TRUE NATURE

Now that the poll-tax bill has been laid aside for the session, and will die with this Congress, its true nature is being examined. While it was under consideration, both in the House, which passed it, and in the Senate, it was grossly misrepresented. The public pressure exerted for its adoption aroused more than a suspicion that the deception was deliberate, and that the true purpose of the bill was to establish the right of the Federal Government to define all the qualifications of voters, which is one of the aspirations of the totalitarians who would destroy the States.

The poll-tax requirement for voters in eight Southern States does not discriminate against Negroes. All qualified electors who choose to cast a ballot are required to pay.

It is true, of course, that most States have repealed the poll-tax requirements for voting, and that the eight hold-out States would do well to repeal it. But to force repeal from Washington would necessitate a validation of the right by the Supreme Court.

As time affords the advantage of a fair judgment of the filibuster, the general conclusion may be that the southern Senators made two good contributions to a settlement of the issue—they drew attention to the infringement of Negro rights in the South, and they helped to preserve the sovereignty of the States.

The Way We Have Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently there was published a book by Samuel Crowther entitled "Time To Inquire." This book must be read to really appreciate what a magnificent contribution it is to the understanding of The Way We Have Come Further, it sets forth clearly what we must do if we are to preserve this as the land of opportunity for coming generations.

I was much pleased to read a review of this book by Mary Carter Roberts in the Washington Post of December 20. Because of the splendid way in which this writer has briefed the things incorporated in "Time To Inquire," I am offering it for the RECORD. I commend it to everyone who finds himself concerned over the present and future welfare of his country.

THE WAY WE HAVE COME—WRITER SEES IT AS INDICATION OF THE WAY WE ARE GOING

(By Mary Carter Roberts)

TIME TO INQUIRE

(By Samuel Crowther (John Day))

Some time ago, apropos of the times and customs, the reviewer commented, purely in passing, on the prevalence of what she called socio books. There were, she felt obliged to remark at that moment, a great many works being written which publishers hastily described as covering the broad socio-politico-economic field. Examined somewhat more closely, such books generally revealed themselves to be the emotional opinions of earnest but unprofessional thinkers on the state of the world in general.

John Jones, for instance, a good fellow who did not pass his exams in engineering or law school, but, nevertheless, sold an article to a big magazine when he was only 23 and so became a writer—John Jones looks about the world and sees a lot of things which do not strike him as perfect. John has several books behind him by the time he does this prospecting; he is by then not only a writer, but a middling prominent writer. So he takes 6 weeks off and turns out a hot number on how to fix it all up. He dips about quite freely in this writing. He is not a sociologist, so he cannot write a book on sociology. He is not an economist, so he cannot write a book on economics. He is not a political economist, either, so he cannot write on political economy. But he is an ingenious fellow, so he covers the broad socio-politico-economic field. Result: John becomes an authority, is widely quoted, is petitioned for his opinion on astronomy, egyptology and chiropractics, and quite probably before long is respectfully asked to come to Washington and take a job telling the taxpayers what they cannot do. Such works, the reviewer decided, might well be called socio books. After all, it saved approximately 6 picas of type.

A book reviewer, naturally, looks only on the field of books. The prevalence of socio-literature is her concern, but not the prevalence of socio-men in office. There are qualified writers, however, who have turned their eyes on the latter phenomenon. Samuel Crowther is one, and his present book combs the hair on the socio-heads very finely.

Mr. Crowther calls this book an inquiry, and its subject is, How Can We Restore the Freedom, Opportunity and Dignity of the Average Man? "Restore"—observe please—not "secure." For Mr. Crowther's thesis is that, under the guise of securing the good things of life to the citizens, those socio-office-holders already have taken most of the good things away and are in process of taking the rest as rapidly as is feasible. He enters a slashing protest. He differs from the John Jones school of writing in that he does not apply emotional thinking to fields of exact subject matter He does not close his eyes and leap enthusiastically into the future, but plants his feet on the factual earth and points sternly to the recent past. Look at the way we have come, he says. Figure out for yourself the way we are going.

Sees currency being made valueless by rationing coupons

It is an appalling picture. Our chosen public servants, says Mr. Crowther, have served us by removing our liberties and our prosperity. They seem to have as their objective, he declares, to substitute a universal and compulsory poverty for a poverty which, heretofore, has been partial and escapable. Their economic policy, as he describes it, is much like the reasoning of the man who says to his neighbor: "We are all down with smallpox at my house. Why don't you infect your family, too, so that I can be sure you are really sympathetic?" Looking on the ills of the world and perceiving that America has, to some extent, fared better than other countries, our servants in office seemingly have decided to plunge us into the worst of the misery in the interest of making the situation better everywhere. Presumably, they believe that smallpox should not be allowed to spread, and conclude that it cannot possibly spread once everybody has it. So they hasten to make the infection universal.

That is a condensation of an elaborate, coldly reasoned case which Mr. Crowther presents in Time to Inquire. We are on our

way, he says, to acquiring dictatorship and all its horrors, not excluding the concentration camp. Our currency is being made valueless; you have a dollar but no ration ticket, and you cannot get the $1 rationed article which you need. In other words, the ration tickets become our American money, and you have not as many as you have earned, but as many as you are permitted to have. They bear, moreover, no relation to your service to your country, to your energy, brains, or good citizenship. We have not come to full rationing as yet, but it is being foretold and our minds are being prepared for the advent by admonitions that rationing is necessary if we are to win the war.

Rationing, says Mr. Crowther, would have been necessary, given our recent course, whether we went to war or not. As he sees it, war has merely hastened the process. It was the war itself, in his view, which was the necessity. It was necessary because it is always necessary to a country which is substituting dictatorship for free economy.

It should be said here that he makes no charge of a malignant plot on the part of our public servants. He does not claim that they have undertaken, deliberately, to destroy our constitutional government. They are in the midst of such destruction, he says, because they have not realized that wealth is goods and services, and that trade is an exchange of goods and services for other goods and services. In place of that fundamental truth they have put the "money illusion," which is a belief that money itself is wealth, and that by creating great sums of money and great resources of credit they have made the Nation rich. According to that notion, says Mr. Crowther, Germany, in the midst of its inflation period, was the richest nation in the world, for it had the most cash. He traces our own course, from the setting up of the Federal Reserve System to the 1929 crash, and finds that through those 13 years we were steadily losing sight of economic realities.

Says income taxes transfer spending rights to politicians

"The Federal Reserve System," he says, "has been the instrument by which most of the virtues of private banking have been lost in the course of stamping out the vices of private banking. In consequence, we are already in a situation where the normal function of money has ceased, and credit has become a political force gradually jamming the people into the narrow confines of a rationed economy."

The present administration, in his view, inherited confusion. But it made the confusion worse. Mixing up social theorizing, economic singing by ear and political skulduggery, it has arrived at a point where only the politicians are safe. The social thinkers and the economists, once so fine and free, now rapidly conform to the political pattern, and the common man's freedom to disagree with that pattern is being removed as fast as possible. Economic enslavement is already close at hand, says Mr. Crowther, with intellectual bondage imminent. An American dictatorship is on the way.

Here are some of the book's hard comments:

"The income taxes merely take away from the individual the right to spend money and thereby to employ someone, and they transfer that right to the politicians."

"A corporation tax is a concealed tax, which gives the politician the chance to talk unctuously while he is picking pockets."

"A planned and regimented economic (international) union is being actively planned * * * by a use or misuse of the Lease-Lend Act and the war powers. * * * The scheme, as its outlines begin to appear, is strikingly like the world which Hitler has promised under Nazi domination, except that in the Hitler plan the economies of all nations will fit into the German economy and Germany will be the sovereign state, while in the American plan, the member states, including the United States, will merge their economic nationalities and therefore their standards of living."

"We are in the grip of welfare workerism conceived on noble principles and implemented by vast delusions of grandeur."

In other words, Mr. Crowther covers that "broad socio-politico-economic field," but without strewing any roses. His book closes with a project for recovering our freedom and prosperity, based on the suggestion that we limit Congress' taxing powers. It is a most eloquent plea for our traditional American way of life.

Maryland's Contribution to the War Effort—Address by Maj. Gen. Milton A. Reckord

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD of a very illuminating speech made in Baltimore on January 11 by Maj. Gen. Milton A. Reckord on the subject of Maryland's contribution to the war effort. General Reckord is the head of the Third Service Command, which includes in its area Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. General Reckord was born in Maryland, and has spent most of his life as a civilian. However, he had an excellent record in the First World War, and he is now doing highly efficient work in the Army.

This address was made by General Reckord before the century-old Maryland Historical Society, of which society I have been an officer for 30 years, and of which I am now president. The Maryland Historical Society has an exceedingly large and valuable collection of records and other historical materials and the society is playing a useful role in connection with war activities.

The address by General Reckord illustrates clearly what our State of Maryland is doing in furtherance of our war program.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was an agreeable surprise to be asked to address the members of the Maryland Historical Society this evening. I think some who delight in studying the recurrences of the past are prone to forget the importance of our daily activities, and I feel this occasion affords me an excellent opportunity for stressing Maryland's contribution to the war effort of today.

I believe that reverence for past events should never be permitted to blind one to the significance of current happenings.

You will agree, I think, that the real historian is the man who strives to develop from amidst the welter of past occurrences certain universal truths which serve as guideposts in the interpretation of contemporary trends. The purpose in delving into the past is to shed light on the present.

In this connection permit me to quote Lt. Gen. James G. Harbord: "The roads you travel so briskly lead out of dim antiquity, and you study the past chiefly because of its bearing on the living present and its promise for the future."

I do not need to point out to the group before me that Maryland is today writing the pages of history of tomorrow—and glorious pages they are. She is already operating on the basis of a full wartime economy. All her resources of manpower, machinery, and materials have been mobilized to the end of getting men to the fighting fronts and of keeping them properly equipped with vital weapons, foods, and supplies.

More than any war in history, this war has demonstrated the interdependence of the military, the agricultural, and the industrial fronts. Our theater of operations must be regarded as extending from the combat zone to our factories and shipyards, and even beyond, to the mines, farms, and forests, from which we get the raw materials for our instruments of war. Having a full crew of steel workers at Sparrows Point is as important to the Army as having a full complement of soldiers in an Aleutian islands base. We cannot attack the Nazis with planes that never come out of the factory. We must be sure that we have more and better planes, more and better arms of every sort before we can be certain that we will win this war in the shortest possible time and with the least sacrifice of American blood.

Since Pearl Harbor our national progress has been remarkable. No longer are we merely on the defensive. We are aggressively taking the offensive on the far-flung battle fronts of the world.

Victory in total war depends on overwhelming economic as well as military prowess—on production and on manpower. In these important spheres Maryland is making history today. In the short time allotted me I cannot hope to cover the whole panorama of Maryland's contributions to the war effort—but let me touch briefly on the highlights.

Naturally, I am most conversant with her contributions to the armed forces. When war clouds first began to threaten, the President called the National Guard into active Federal service, and on February 3, 1941, as commanding general of the Twenty-ninth Division, I was proud to take over 4,000 fellow Marylanders into the service with me. Many of those officers and men have left the old division to form the cadres for new organizations and are now bravely fighting in the four corners of the earth.

The Reserve Officers' Training Corps units of the colleges of this State have been and are continuing to produce highly trained and skilled officers. At the State's capital, the Naval Academy, by shortening its courses, is turning out the largest annual number of midshipmen ever to be graduated and commissioned.

Selective service in Maryland has been functioning efficiently and smoothly. Of incalculable value in the operation of the system has been the capable work of the hundreds of volunteer members of the local draft boards. Already many more men from this State have entered the armed forces than in World War No. 1 In the last war Maryland furnished 9,413 men to the Navy, 1,241 to the marines, and 51,914 to the Army. Today all of these figures have been eclipsed.

The doctors, too, have responded to the call. More than one-third of Maryland's medical men are now in the service. The famed medical units from Johns Hopkins and the University of Maryland are today carrying on the rich traditions of their predecessors. Maryland men are strengthening the ranks of that brave body of sailors in the

merchant marine who are responsible for maintaining the steady flow of shipping. In addition, many patriotic young Maryland women have entered the Army and Navy Nurse Corps or have become WAACS or WAVES.

True, the emphasis of our military leaders today is placed on carrying the war into enemy territory, but the security of our home shores has not been overlooked. In this respect you will be interested to know what Maryland is actually doing in the way of organization for the protection of its citizens if the emergency comes. At all defense plants the personnel is carefully checked to guard against the danger from saboteurs. Prohibited and restricted zones have been established in vital areas as a precaution against the influx of enemy agents. Lights from the shore, which otherwise would silhouette our friendly shipping and disclose it to preying enemy submarines, have been dimmed. Undesirable enemy aliens are under constant surveillance. Through the wholehearted cooperation of Governor O'Conor, missions have been assigned and a plan has been formulated for the employment of the Maryland State Guard and the Maryland Minutemen as an indispensable adjunct to the Army in the event of an attack by the enemy.

Over 3,000 public-spirited men have joined the State guard. They diligently attend weekly drills and summer training at Camp Ritchie without pay. The Maryland Minute Men now number over 11,000 members and are capably organized throughout the communities of the State. Further protection is provided by the Aircraft Warning Service. It was organized by the Maryland Council of Defense in cooperation with the American Legion in the summer of 1941, and at present there are 15,000 men and women volunteers manning 212 spotter posts throughout the State at all hours of the day and night. The posts were equipped by the volunteers at their own expense. In addition, volunteers in the protective services—the air-raid wardens, auxiliary firemen, auxiliary policemen, emergency medical crews, fire watchers, nurses' aides, messengers, drivers, road-repair crews, and others who have qualified for civilian defense jobs total over 165,000 enrollees. The State police has established a communications center for coordinating the activities of the Army, the police, State guard, air-raid warning centers, and other civilian defense agencies which is the first and best of its kind in my command.

Numerous black-out tests have been held in preparation for the eventuality of an air raid. I can assure you that owing to the enthusiastic response of its citizens, Maryland is well prepared and will not be caught napping.

Now let us glance at the steps taken by Maryland to gear its economy to a full wartime pitch.

Maryland was the first to organize a State defense council. Sensing the emergency which then was developing, Governor O'Conor on August 1, 1940—16 months before Pearl Harbor—established the Maryland Council of Defense and Resources for the mobilization of the State's facilties and manpower should the need arise. Mr. W. Frank Roberts was named chairman of the council.

One of the first assignments was from the Federal Government—a request for a survey of Maryland's industrial and labor resources. The report submitted as a result of this survey was a major factor in Maryland being recognized as a key industrial center in war production.

It might be well to list a few figures of the War Production Board in this connection. Three hundred and eighty-one manufacturers in Maryland have received prime or subcontracts, and virtually every usable facility is being utilized, particularly in the metal-working trades.

The dollar value of prime contracts awarded to Maryland plants exceeds $2,500,000,000. This represents 2.2 percent of the national total, whereas Maryland's proportion of the population is but 1.4 percent. The State ranks twelfth in the Nation in the dollar value of prime war contracts. It has been given 17½ percent of the dollar value of all the prime contract awards to the 17 Southern States.

The E award for excellence in production has been presented to 35 plants in Maryland—an indication that the armed services are keenly aware of the quality and quantity of war materials produced in Maryland plants.

Here in Maryland we are producing steel, ships, and planes in large quantities—all vital in our drive toward victory.

The first Liberty ship—the *Patrick Henry*—was launched at Fairfield on December 30, 1941. Since that date this yard alone has launched and delivered 77 of these ships. Many other Liberty ships have been completed at Sparrows Point, and scores of smaller vessels have been constructed at other yards along the Chesapeake and its tributaries. In addition, the various ship repair yards have been overhauling and reconverting hundreds of vessels. In every war in our history the shipyards of the Chesapeake have constructed and outfitted vessels which brought fame to their home port, and Maryland is continuing this splendid tradition today. Ships are launched, completed, and put in service at an almost unbelievable speed. Maryland-built vessels are carrying supplies to our armed forces throughout the world.

Maryland is achieving an enviable record in the production of bombers. More than 50,000 workers are engaged in turning out this type of plane which has proved so effective in the aerial warfare of today.

It is hardly necessary to mention the importance of the steel produced in Maryland. Our mills are busily engaged in the manufacture of huge quantities destined for protective armament and combat weapons.

The Baltimore Association of Commerce, along with the 20 other chambers of commerce throughout the State, has transformed its operations to fit into the war effort, and is assisting in handling the administrative and detail work of war housing, war transportation, and commercial and industrial civilian defense. It has assumed many tasks incident to emergency port operation, and has cooperated in matters involving war manpower, priorities, contract distribution, salvage, civilian mobilization, conservation, and rationing.

Approximately 300,000 persons are now actively working in Maryland's war industries. Of this number more than 65,000 are women. The need for manpower in these plants has become largely a womanpower problem. Women are needed as replacements for the men taken by selective service. Reports from approximately 200 essential establishments, employing 303,000 workers, indicate that while their combined total employment advanced 25.5 percent from May to November, the number of women employees increased by 85.1 percent over the same period. It is noteworthy that the employment of women in certain selected plants in the Baltimore area alone jumped from 22,000 to 44,000 in the past 6 months. This is most gratifying, but the area war manpower office says 35,000 more women must be added to war industries within the next 12 months ending December 1943. The figure is not worrisome, however, because the recruiting job has been turned over to a womanpower committee, and I am sure the ladies will succeed in reaching their quota.

Of course, the problem of transporting the thousands of workers to war-production plants has been enormous. The Maryland Wartime Transportation Committee has been working feverishly and has succeeded in eliminating most of the difficulties. Access roads to the large industrial centers have been completed. A cross-harbor ferry service has been effectively put into operation, and additional bus facilities have been secured. Workers have been eager to cooperate in the share-your-car plan. In order to lessen the load at peak periods, work hours at plants have been staggered, and school hours have been changed.

Nor has the importance of feeding our Maryland soldiers and war workers been neglected. City dwellers have even turned their minds to the problem. In June of last year it is estimated that nearly 4,000 acres of Victory gardens were in cultivation. Maryland farmers have shouldered their overwhelming responsibility magnificently. In their work they have been assisted by the Department of Agriculture and by the State and county war boards, with the extension service of the University of Maryland conducting the educational phases of the various activities.

In the early fall of 1941 goals for increased production of vitally needed farm products were established on a State, county, and individual farm basis, in line with the goals set up in the national-defense program. Maryland farmers met these goals last year, and they are confident of repeating in 1943, despite the problem of soil conservation and a critical shortage of labor and farm material. Limitation of travel resulted in curtailment of the farmers' ability to keep abreast of new measures. This has been overcome to a great extent by organizing neighborhood leaders who are charged with passing on important information to 10 or 12 of their neighbors. Some 7,500 of these leaders have been appointed, with the result that the rural population has been able to keep up to date with the news.

The State Farm Labor Committee and the various county committees were successful in providing approximately 5,000 farm laborers in 1941. By agreement with the selective-service officials, some 2,000 boys were deferred for farm work. The University of Maryland instituted a course to train women for farm work, and boys are being educated for this essential activity at the McDonogh School. Tomorrow—January 12—has been proclaimed Farm Mobilization Day by President Roosevelt, and Maryland farmers are recognizing the occasion by assembling at a conference in the Lord Baltimore Hotel to discuss the 1943 farm program.

Other cogs in Maryland's war machine are operating smoothly and efficiently. The tremendous job of bearing its share in financing the war has been undertaken with enthusiasm. During the era of the last war Marylanders subscribed a total of over $290,000,000 to Liberty Loan and Victory Loan issues. It is amazing to learn that this figure has already been far exceeded. In the short time elapsing since Pearl Harbor, Marylanders have bought over $530,000,000 worth of all series of War bonds.

Under the capable guidance of the Maryland State Salvage Committee of the Maryland Council of Defense, the citizens of Maryland have given tangible evidence that they are solidly behind the Victory program. The first effort was centered upon waste paper. At the end of a month dealers reported that paper collection had increased approximately 100 percent, and that the conversion mills were receiving more paper than they could use. By March 1942 the paper program was called off because of the glut. The people of Maryland had responded too well.

The collection of scrap metals is best indicated by the Bureau of Mines reports of scrap iron shipped to consuming mills. In October 1941, the total shipments to steel mills amounted to 12,043 gross tons. By March this had increased to 21,904 gross tons, and by September had reached 28,468 gross

tons. Shipments are being maintained at this level. The scrap iron from Maryland will make steel enough for 2,280 27-ton tanks, or 127,800 2,000-pound aerial bombs.

During the 15-day scrap rubber drive Maryland contributed 10,000,000 pounds to the scrap-rubber stock pile. This State has already collected 500 tons of tin cans prepared for detinning.

During the first month of the fat-salvage program, Maryland housewives turned in 34,659 pounds, and by the third month this had increased to 64,943 pounds and is increasing every month. Preliminary reports indicate that at least one pair of silk or nylon hose has been turned in by every woman in the State.

Maryland has proven a strong bulwark in furthering the efforts of the Office of Price Administration to curb inflation and control the cost of living. Many roll-backs in prices involving hundreds of thousands of dollars on commodities ranging from frankfurters to bobby pins have occurred. People are now accustomed to having automobiles, bicycles, typewriters, rubber, sugar, gas, oil, and coffee in rationed quantities. Three hundred and seven thousand applications for fuel oil have been processed in this State. The Maryland State office of the Office of Price Administration reports that in all these activities the public has been very understanding and, in general, they have taken their "cut" in a patriotic manner. Of course, the administration of this vast program would have been impossible without the help of volunteer workers. Local war and price rationing boards are comprised of over 700 citizens who work entirely without compensation. Eight thousand five hundred school teachers have devoted their time to assist in registering applicants for sugar, gasoline, and fuel oil. Nine hundred thousand sugar ration books were issued in this manner. The volunteer service of 2,500 ladies made possible the delivery of copies of the general maximum price regulation to every retailer in the State on July 8, 1942. Approximately 3,500 volunteer clerical workers assist regularly at the boards, in addition to hundreds brought in for the peak load as each program reaches its climax.

A brief comparison of the prices existing in 1918 with the present-day levels demonstrates the effectiveness of the combined efforts in this field. In 1918 butter sold at $1 a pound and eggs at $1.40 a dozen; whereas today the same may be obtained at 65 cents and 63 cents, respectively.

Unlike the conditions existing in Nazi-dominated totalitarian countries, the humanities have not been neglected in the creation of the Maryland war machine. The American Red Cross, the United Service Organizations, the Army Emergency Relief, the Navy Relief Society, and the churches are all continuing to minister to the wants of the needy. Hundreds of volunteer workers have been attracted to assist these worthy causes. The blood-donor project of the Red Cross, which was awarded the Army-Navy "E" a few months ago, can proudly boast that 65,000 Marylanders have donated 60,000 pints of blood during the past year. Ninety thousand men and women have been graduated from the course in first aid. Hundreds more have devoted their time and energies in assisting the canteen service and the Motor Corps. The churches and United Service Organizatior have established recreational centers for the enlisted men who seek relaxation in the larger cities and towns wher off duty. The Army Emergency Relief and the Navy Relief Society has been efficiently organized in this State, and are relieving the financial worries of many of the families of soldiers and sailors in the service. In Maryland the race tracks during the last year contributed over $130,000 to Army Emergency Relief alone.

The adjustments made in the educational program of this State to conform to wartime conditions are manifold. Briefly they involve accelerating and adjusting the school program to prepare youths more quickly for professional training and service in the armed forces. Courses in pre-flight aeronautics and pre-induction training to prepare high school seniors for entry into the Army and Navy have been instituted. Vocational schools are giving full credit for time spent by high school seniors actually working part-time in defense plants. The problems resulting from a shortage of teaching personnel and inadequate heating and transportation facilities have been squarely faced, and practical solutions are being reached.

Nor have the arts in Maryland suffered as a result of the war. The Baltimore Symphony, under the direction of Mr. Reginald Stewart, has attracted some of the finest artists in the country, and has enjoyed an unprecedented attendance. A recent exhibit of the art of the armed forces at the Baltimore Museum featured the paintings of 10 Maryland artists. The works revealed appealing qualities of boldness, humor, and persistence, coupled with the true American passion for freedom of spirit.

From the foregoing synopsis it can readily be seen that Maryland is a cardinal link in the accomplishment of the one goal we have as a Nation: To destroy the military strength of the Axis Powers so completely that they will never rise again to disturb the peace of the world. Yes—100 and 200 years hence your successors in this organization will experience a justifiable sense of pride as they leaf through the pages recounting the history which is being forged in Maryland today. The years to come will never tarnish the brilliance of this record.

Acting Governor Goodland's First Message to the 1943 Wisconsin Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the message which the Acting Governor of the State of Wisconsin delivered to the legislature, and I ask unanimous consent that I be given 1 minute to make a prefatory remark.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, perhaps every Member of this body has read of the tragic death of the Governor-elect of the State of Wisconsin, Orland S. Loomis, on December 7, 1942.

The supreme court of our State has since decided that Lt. Gov. Walter S. Goodland will serve in the capacity of Acting Governor for the term for which Mr. Loomis was elected. Because of this unusual circumstance, there has been a great deal of interest in the situation and a number of Senators have questioned me concerning the new State administration.

In view of this interest, it seems fitting that the first message of the Acting Governor to the 1943 Wisconsin Legislature, delivered on January 14, 1943, be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent for its insertion. I feel that this message is of distinct value to every Member of Congress because it so well expresses the nonpartisan approach which I am certain is characteristic of every State in this great crisis in the Nation's history.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow citizens of Wisconsin's Legislature, it is a great privilege to stand here today and greet you members of the Wisconsin Legislature at the beginning of its sixty-sixth session. I am sure you have come here to give the best that is in you in service to the splendid citizenry of this great productive and prosperous State of ours, and I wish to assure you that that is my own single and sincere desire.

Paramount to duty to our State is duty to our country. In every act we perform we should ask ourselves, "Will this fit in with and not detract from the national struggle for self-preservation?" Wisconsin has never failed in the past in its full duty to our common country.

It will not fail now.

We are fighting not only for self-preservation but also to preserve to future generations the rights and privileges our people have enjoyed for over 150 years. Every ounce of effort—all we possess—will be freely given, if necessary, in defense of our country and to win victory for our cause.

We meet also with a feeling of sadness because of the untimely death of one of Wisconsin's splendid young leaders. I address you as Acting Governor of the State of Wisconsin because the inexorable working of fate decreed the tragic death of Governor-elect Orland S. Loomis after his election and before he could take office. The provisions of our constitution, as interpreted by the mandate of our supreme court, have imposed upon me the duties of Acting Governor for the residue of the term for which Mr. Loomis was elected.

I know that the duties of the office of Governor would have been ably administered by Mr. Loomis had not fate decreed otherwise.

He had the confidence of the people of this State regardless of creed or party.

I served with him in the State senate. I know something of his ideals and so far as lies in my power I will endeavor to carry on for him.

He was one of the finest examples of clean, wholesome, upstanding citizenship.

Wisconsin's head is bowed in sorrow for his untimely death and the deepest and sincerest sympathy goes out to his stricken wife and family.

For the first time since the Civil War, a new incumbent is called upon to become chief executive of Wisconsin during wartime. I am fully cognizant of the grave duties and responsibilities which war brings to you and to the executive department. Those duties and responsibilities are now more grave and frightening than have been those facing any of my predecessors.

War conditions call for sacrifices unknown to all of us in the past; they call for vastly increased Federal taxes; they demand that we eliminate from the class of necessity much that we thought that we could not live without, and certainly they call for a changing, if not a lowering, in our standards of living.

The cost of this war is enormous.

We should not deceive ourselves in believing that our tax burden will end with the ending of hostilities. The post-war economy will necessitate taxing the resources of this

Nation as never before in its history. This is apparent to all and does not need elaborating.

Our State will follow the course of wisdom if it prepares adequately for the strain that is sure to follow the closing of the war.

We hear some people say that it is folly to talk about post-war plans before we have won the war, but those who follow this line of thinking forget that the transition from a war economy to a peace economy does not take place over night.

We have learned from bitter experience that the time to plan for peace is while we are at war.

The readjustment of our life from a war economy to a peace economy will give rise to many complicated and serious problems. Some of these problems we encountered after the close of World War No. 1, but many of them will be new and we will have to solve them without the benefit of precedent or experience.

It is estimated that there will be a minimum of 30,000,000 men now serving in the armed forces and in war industries who will have to be absorbed in peacetime employments. It seems evident that our unemployment problems will be intensified to a degree never before experienced unless adequate plans are made to meet the problem.

About 200 agencies throughout the country, both governmental and private, have been created and are now at work studying post-war problems and preparing peacetime planning. Some of the States, including New York, have created a State agency to study post-war problems, particularly as affecting employment.

It is my judgment that Wisconsin should provide for an agency to study post-war conditions as affecting the livelihoods, occupations, and businesses of the people of this State, to cooperate with similar agencies throughout the country and in other States, and to make plans and recommendations for meeting various problems which will arise following the termination of hostilities.

These duties could well be imposed on a State council of defense, which I will discuss later, or they might be assigned to some existing State agency, whichever, in the judgment of the legislature, would be the most effective.

Along with this idea of future planning, we must not overlook the necessity for making financial provision ahead of time so that the burden will not be so great in the future. One way to insure this financial provision is to practice economy at every turn.

This should be done not only in our private lives but in government itself.

The cost of government, not only the State government, but government at every level, should and must be reduced to a minimum so that reserves may be built up to meet, as adequately as we can, our post-war problems. I am confident that the members of this legislature will fully cooperate to that end.

All these responsibilities, sacrifices, and duties can be met if we work together as one people, and not as parties or groups. We face a common enemy and unity alone can defeat a common enemy.

I pledge to you my complete and wholehearted cooperation with the legislative branches of our Government, to the end that partisanship as such, be completely eliminated for the greater cause—the welfare of State and Nation.

I will expect, and am sure I will receive from you, that same kind of statesmanlike cooperation. I am confident that, as matters of vital importance come before you, they will be considered strictly upon their merits and upon the basis of the effect of such measures upon the people of Wisconsin and the people of the United States, rather than upon the basis of how they may affect you individually, or your district.

It seems not to be out of order now to state that I am here for the sole purpose of serving my State and country, to the limit of my capacities; I have no future political ambitions; I have not political debts to pay nor future political rewards to seek.

It has been my past privilege to serve in several public capacities—long years as an editor of a Wisconsin daily newspaper, several terms as Mayor of the second city in the State, 12 years as a member of the State senate, and 4 years as Lieutenant Governor and presiding officer of the senate, have given me an insight into public life which comes to few men. During all these years, I have never been a hide-bound partisan, but have always sought to learn the needs and wishes of our people as a whole, rather than the needs and wishes of any group or party. My experiences have confirmed in me a strong conviction that the welfare of this State calls for that kind of an approach now, and it will be my pledge to you to carry on for such period in the future, as it is my privilege to serve, with the same principles and philosophy which have motivated me in the past.

We are all united on one fundamental proposition—that we must all do everything we can to aid in winning the war. Our first and primary consideration, not only in our private homes and businesses but in our State and local governments, should be to do those things which are urgently necessary in this emergency. I submit that this should be your guiding thought in this session of the legislature.

In past wars Wisconsin and her citizens have played their full part. The record of Wisconsin fighting men at the battle fronts and of the people in the fields and factories at home is one of which we are all very proud.

The record is one of achievement and of duty well done.

The present war has been no exception. Our citizens have responded nobly to the many demands and sacrifices that have been imposed. They will continue to respond and will never falter in doing their full duty.

The citizens on the home front are anxious to do their full share. At times there has been some confusion and lack of understanding as to what citizens could do. This was perhaps due in large measure to the lack of an effective organization for the civilian defense activities throughout the State.

In World War No. 1 Wisconsin was the first State to enact a law creating a State council of defense and was the first State to perfect the organization of civilian defense on a State-wide basis.

The Wisconsin plan was copied promptly by many States.

The Wisconsin plan was exceedingly effective and was so thoroughly organized that citizens in every section of the State participated.

It is my thought that we should have a similar plan in the present emergency, organized on a democratic basis, and with broad powers to enlist the services of all the citizens. I am informed that the late Governor-elect Loomis had the same view. I do not wish to suggest any details for a State plan of civilian defense. I have confidence that this legislature will provide a plan that will be effective and beneficial to the State and Nation.

Much has been said of late about Wisconsin finances, including suggestions for drastic reduction in taxes.

We are faced with a war, and with war economy and with vast post-war problems. These cannot now be decided in detail, because we know not when hostilities will cease, and we have less knowledge of what economic conditions will be when that happy moment arrives. Would it not be folly now to determine problems of which we have no definite knowledge? Would it not be the safer and more conservative course to build for the future, so that when the day comes these problems may be solved as to detail, with a financial backlog to make their solution possible?

I shall not attempt to present to you at this juncture any study of State finances or suggestions for a tax program. This is a subject for future study and conference, and I will submit to you, in a future message, a detailed study of these matters, and limit comment on the subject at this time to the statement that, in the light of conditions facing us, I do not deem it necessary or desirable to make substantial tax reductions.

I favor a short and businesslike session of the legislature.

This must not be construed to justify the sacrifice of good judgment and sound deliberation for speed. In this State it has been a tradition that all legislation proposed is well and seriously considered before it is disposed of. That tradition must ever be carried on, but speed and efficiency can be attained by eliminating much unnecessary legislation.

I do not believe it to be amiss to request of you that you refrain from the introduction of anything but essential measures, devoting all your energies and thought to victory in the war and to perpetuating the institutions of democracy which have made our progress possible.

During the course of the legislative session I shall communicate with your honorable body whenever any problems or questions arise which may warrant your special consideration.

I recognize the well-defined functions of the three branches of our Government, and take this opportunity to assure you that neither the legislative nor the judicial branches will be imposed upon by the executive department during my period in office.

I shall scrupulously endeavor not to interfere beyond what I deem to be necessary, with the administrative agencies of the State so long as their functions are carried out efficiently and in conformity with law.

Nor do I believe that the executive office should usurp the functions of the legislature by unwise use of the emergency board or by failing to call you into special session whenever the needs of the State may require it.

I shall invite you to confer with me for counsel and advice on matters of importance to the State service. It will also be my purpose to comply literally with the statutory provisions for appointment of men to State service, where the law provides that such appointments be made "upon the advice and consent of the senate."

Such provisions have, in the past, been construed to mean merely the "consent," but I prefer to counsel with the senate on such matters before asking their consent.

As was the case 25 years ago, many matters may be presented to you as the result of war hysteria. Pressure groups may try to stampede you on matters having no real connection with war or victory, but using those terms as justification. I am sure that you will be capable of sifting the wheat from the chaff and not be misled by groups and causes of this kind.

Plans will be presented to you for post-war needs, possibly not in minute detail, but in form to permit the building of a solid foundation for that period. Those plans will be in recognition of the fact that men will want work—not doles; wages, not charity. We should so build and prepare that industry may not be hampered and hamstrung, but that it be given opportunity to furnish to

labor its God-given right to work and receive fair pay for its efforts. We should so plan that government may not need to subsidize and artificially create work of questionable value. Now is the time to build such a foundation when all who are able to work are employed, and earnings are at an all-time high.

Our soldiers, sailors, and marines who return from foreign battlefields and foreign seas, are entitled not only to the best that we can give them, but to our constant and persistent efforts now in preparing for their future social and economic welfare.

The denials and sacrifices we at home are called upon to make are trivial indeed when compared to what the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and other members of the armed forces in the Nation's service are cheerfully and faithfully giving. The very least we can do is to try and equalize, as best we can, their sacrifices as compared to ours when peace comes and they return home. The ill, wounded, and disabled should be given every possible care. It is our duty to see that the State is prepared to do this in full measure.

My long and varied experience in public affairs, has demonstrated to me that government can be run efficiently and on a business-like basis, although government is not a business. Government is a service—demanded and created by the people it serves, and government must be subservient to the wishes of the people. As a service, government is as different from our concept of a private business as day is from night, but that difference should never be the excuse for inefficiency and dishonesty.

CONCLUSION

I have tried in this message to keep before you the paramount duty of the State in dealing with the present war emergency. If we will give our most constructive thought and our whole energy to its primary problems, we will have met our duty and rendered a great public service.

I rely with complete faith on your cooperation. I am confident that in times like these you will not permit selfish party loyalty or partisanship to control your deliberations. You and I have been called to render a public service in a time of great public emergency. Let us rise to the high opportunity which is before us, forgetful of self, and conscious only of our duty to the State and Nation.

WALTER S. GOODLAND,
Acting Governor.

JANUARY 14, 1943.

Tennessee Senators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by William P. Kennedy and published in the Washington Star of January 10, 1943, with reference to a book entitled "Tennessee Senators," written by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. Among other things, the book sets forth the long fight of the Senator from Tennessee to do justice to an early predecessor, Senator William Blount, the first Senator ever expelled.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star of January 10, 1943]

MCKELLAR CALLS BLOUNT OUSTER UNFAIR BLOT ON TENNESSEAN—SENATOR, IN BOOK, SAYS PREDECESSOR OF 150 YEARS AGO SHOULD HAVE GOT MEDAL

(By Will P. Kennedy)

Senator MCKELLAR, Democrat, of Tennessee, serving his thirty-fourth consecutive year in Congress, has just published his first book, a volume of 625 pages which sets forth his long fight to do justice to an earlier predecessor, Senator William Blount, the first Senator ever expelled. The book was the result of Senator MCKELLAR'S determination to study the original records whereby Senator Blount in 1797 was expelled by a vote of 25 to 1.

In his book Senator MCKELLAR takes to task Labor Secretary Perkins and Dr. A. E. Morgan, former Tennessee Valley Authority chairman, for their aspersions on the eastern Tennessee mountaineers, especially those residents of counties in the lost State of Franklin.

This book, a "labor of love," is "affectionately inscribed to the memory of my beloved mother, Caroline Howard McKellar, whose tender and ever present devotion, whose careful training, and whose teaching from a vast storehouse of learning and knowledge, have ever been an inspiration to me."

It is entitled "Tennessee Senators," as seen by one of their successors, and contains biographies of the 39 Senators from Tennessee who have died. Regarding them as a group Senator MCKELLAR writes: "I do not believe any other State has had more gifted or more unusual representatives in the Senate. The lives of many of them read like romance. Nearly all of them have attained most enviable places in the country's history."

This list includes two, Jackson and Johnson, afterward Presidents of the United States; three were presidents pro tempore of the Senate,—Anderson, White, and Harris; five were later Cabinet members—Campbell, Eaton, Cave Johnson, Grundy, and Key; one, Howell E. Jackson, was subsequently a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

HAS HISTORIC VALUE

Senator MCKELLAR has made a valuable contribution to history in his summary and conclusions regarding the Blount incident. Mr. Blount had been a paymaster of the Continental troops, a Member of the Continental Congress (1782–87), member of the convention that framed the Constitution, was appointed by Washington Governor of the territory south of the Ohio River and served as chairman of the convention that framed the Constitution of Tennessee.

He was found guilty "of a high misdemeanor entirely inconsistent with his public trust and duty as a Senator." He was charged with conspiring and intending to set on foot a military expedition against the territories and dominion of Spain while a treaty of friendship existed between Spain and the United States.

It all happened years before Congress had passed its first Neutrality Act, and many Americans were heeding Washington's warning to avoid entangling alliances.

Florida, southern Alabama, and southern Mississippi were owned by Spain. Louisiana, which comprised Arkansas, the Indian Territory, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, North and South Dakota and parts of Wyoming and Montana, was claimed by the French, and also by Spain. America did not own any of it. The only way Tennessee had of getting its products and merchandise to world markets was down the Tennessee or Cumberland Rivers to the Ohio and on down the Mississippi to the port of New Orleans. France had closed this port to the great injury of all the western country, as it was then called.

Governor Blount was interested in having New Orleans, in the hands of the French, made a free port and Mobile and Pensacola, in the hands of the Spanish, made free cities.

Through his influence while Governor and chairman of the Constitutional Convention, it was written into the Constitution of Tennessee as the twenty-ninth section of its bill of rights: "That an equal participation in the free navigation of the Mississippi River is one of the inherent rights of the citizens of this State; it cannot, therefore, be ceded to any prince, potentate, power, person or persons, whatsoever."

ENGLISH DESIGNS

The English had long had designs on both Louisiana and Florida. Governor Blount was approached to cooperate with an expedition of Canadians—was considering it—and had written on the subject to James Carey, an Indian interpreter, who was in the pay of the United States at $25 a month and his board.

After searching through more than 1,000 pages in the annals of Congress and examining every book and magazine article he could find on the subject, Senator MCKELLAR writes: "I am convinced that William Blount violated the terms of no treaty; that he committed no actual overt act against his country is just as certain. I do not believe that there were any real grounds for expelling him. I do not believe that the Senate ever would have found him guilty on the impeachment charges if all the proof—and it is published in the annals of Congress—had been brought before the Senate; and I believe that had he lived he would have been restored to his place in the Senate."

Senator MCKELLAR points out that just a few years later Spain yielded to France her claim to Louisiana but retained Florida, southern Alabama, and southern Mississippi. In 1803 President Jefferson bought the Louisiana Territory from France, and in 1818 Andrew Jackson, figuratively following in Mr. Blount's footsteps, conquered Florida, threw out the English there, and our Government afterward paid Spain for Florida.

"The only crime of which Mr. Blount seems to have been guilty was that of conceiving, before Jefferson did and before Jackson did, the great benefits which would come to the United States from opening up the ports of New Orleans, Mobile, and Pensacola. For this, in my judgment, he should have received a Congressional Medal of Honor instead of having been expelled from the Senate. Undoubtedly, if Mr. Blount had lived a year or two longer, the Senate would have repealed the order of expulsion. The men who were really guilty of favoring Britain were Robert Liston, the British Minister, and Timothy Pickering, President Adams' Secretary of State, but the weak administration of Mr. Adams would not even have Liston recalled."

Senator MCKELLAR calls attention that Mr. Blount was of distinguished lineage—"one of his forebears being a favorite official in the reign of Queen Elizabeth and a personal friend of that great queen."

STATEMENT BRINGS RIDICULE

In reply to aspersions cast upon the mountaineers of east Tennessee, Mr. MCKELLAR pays his respects to Secretary Perkins as follows: "I recall that so distinguished and highly educated and personally agreeable a person as Madam Perkins, Secretary of Labor, once spoke of the people of east Tennessee as being so far down in the scale of

civilization that they did not even wear shoes. She knew nothing about the people of the South and her unfortunate statement brought upon her head much ridicule in the entire country. She was perhaps never in the State of Tennessee and the truth is there are perhaps more ignorant and unkempt people, many of them not Americans at all, living within a few thousand yards of where Madam Perkins lives."

Answering criticism of his people made by "a very wealthy and lovely lady who owns a newspaper in Washington," Senator MCKELLAR said Washington has its counterpart of persons in his east Tennessee.

Senator MCKELLAR makes reply also to Dr. A. E. Morgan, one-time chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, who told him that "the real purpose of the Tennessee Valley Authority was to lift up the 'poor, benighted, ignorant people of east Tennessee' to a higher plane of civilization and enlightenment equal to that of other communities of the country." The Senator says that Dr. Morgan "had no capacity for meeting people or knowing them. He kept himself aloof from them and did not know how to talk to them."

He challenges in his book Dr. Morgan, Madam Perkins, or anyone, to show as many nationally known persons from their home States such as he names from east Tennessee, which is one-third of the entire State. He lists 2 Presidents, 13 Cabinet members, 5 Justices of the Supreme Court, 39 Senators, 25 Governors of States and a very long list of noted persons in many callings.

To give particular point to his defense of east Tennessee mountaineers, he cites the records of nine famous men, including Gen. John J. Pershing, who was in supreme command of the American Expeditionary Forces in the First World War, whose mother was born in East Tennessee, and Sgt. Alvin C. York, the most celebrated enlisted soldier in the First World War. The others are Cordell Hull, Secretary of State; Speaker Sam Rayburn; John Q. Tilson, former House leader; Frank Houston, president of the Chemical Bank & Trust Co., New York, one of the eight largest banks in the world; Sam Houston, who grew up in east Tennessee, was Governor of the State, President of Texas, who served long in the United States Senate, and was a noted warrior; Martin W. Littleton, one of the all-time great lawyers of the Nation; and Samuel L. Clemens, known best as Mark Twain, whose father was postmaster at Pall Mall, where Alvin York now lives.

DEBUNKS SCANDAL

As a result of his research for the biography of Senator Eaton, Senator MCKELLAR endeavors to debunk much of the scandal about Peggy O'Neill, whom Senator Eaton married. He points out that her mother was a sister of Gov. Richard Howell, of New Jersey, and her father, who operated the "best hotel in Washington," as a Mason, was one of those selected to officiate at George Washington's funeral. She herself, instead of being a "tavernkeeper's daughter or bar maid," was well educated and popular in Washington society until gossips, less well bred, gave her a bad name.

The first chapter in Senator MCKELLAR'S book concerns the United States Senate, and he writes that "perhaps in the history of mankind no other legislative body was ever equal to it in importance," or has "so impressed itself upon the people of the world; no senate has been freer from scandals or has better maintained its constitutional rights." He challenges that "no legislative body on earth has set for itself and uniformly maintained a higher order of ethics, legislative morality, and honorable dealings."

Small Business Helped Very Little by Murray-Patman Act Creating Smaller War Plants Corporation but Intent of Congress as Expressed in Act Has Caused War Department To Make Special Effort To Assist Small Business and Has Succeeded in Doing so to a Very Substantial Extent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Public Law No. 603, the Murray-Patman Act, creating the Smaller War Plants Corporation, has not been satisfactorily administered, since the act was signed by President Roosevelt, June 11, 1942. I have reasons to believe that a reorganization of the Smaller War Plants Corporation Board and its activities is now under way by Mr. Donald Nelson, War Production Board chief, and I am very hopeful that this organization will yet get a satisfactory start and help small business even at this late day in accordance with the expressed will of Congress.

WHAT CONGRESS INTENDED

In the passage of the act, it was contemplated that there would be a Smaller War Plants Corporation representative at each War Production Board office in the Nation; that this representative would be in a position to inform any small business man what the needs of the Government procurement agencies would be in the near future, or in 1 year or 2 years; that this representative would be in a position to make a contract with a small business man and, if needed, furnish capital for additional machinery or for operating expenses, and, in addition, if needed, his plant could be rehabilitated or extra facilities or equipment furnished by the Smaller War Plants Corporation; and that a special effort would be made by these representatives to aid small business during the war in producing or manufacturing the following:

First. Essential war supplies.

Second. Essential civilian supplies.

By December 31, 1942, these offices had not been set up, nor these representatives provided. Neither has there been, up to this date, a satisfactory inventory or census taken of the available capacity of small businesses in the country, as provided in the first part of the act expressing the will of Congress. The Smaller War Plants Corporation can take prime contracts and subcontract them out to small concerns. This has not been done in a single case. There have been other failures. The fact is, the will of Congress has not been carried out and the Committee on Small Business of the House reported this fact to the Speaker of the House the 17th day of December 1942. I have confidence in the ability of Mr. Donald Nelson to yet make this corporation function. Having that confidence in his ability and sincerity of purpose I am waiting patiently for a new start to be made.

BILLIONS FOR SMALL BUSINESS IN 1943

The War Department aided during the month of December 1942 a substantial number of smaller plants over the number aided in November, the preceding month. In November 14.7 percent of the total contracts let were given to small concerns. In December the percentage was 24.1 percent. This gain was made notwithstanding the fact that there was a great reduction in procurement activities during the month of December. If this percentage is projected into 1943 the small concerns should receive contracts aggregating from ten to twenty billion dollars from the War Department alone in 1943.

I am inserting herewith a letter from Maj. Alvin Hewitt, acting chief of the Small War Plants Branch, Purchases Division, under Services of Supply, War Department, Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell in charge, dated January 15, 1943, together with a chart showing the distribution of business to small concerns:

JANUARY 15, 1943.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Small Business Committee,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, during the month of December the trend toward a greater proportion of purchasing being done in small plants by the War Department continued.

December contracts placed with all contractors by the Services of Supply totaled 25,089 and represented an outlay of Government funds of $1,226,051,000. In November 36,418 contracts were placed for a total outlay of $2,317,324,000. While the December volume was lower the proportion of contracts and dollar volume directed to smaller war plants employing 500 persons or less showed a continued gain.

In plants with less than 100 employees 11,183 contracts were placed in December totaling $98,133,000, or 8 percent of the overall total as compared with 9 percent during November.

In plants from 100 to 500 employees, 5,681 contracts were placed during the month of December for a total dollar value of $197,744,000. This represented 16.1 percent of the total dollar volume for the 7 supply services. In November this classification of smaller concerns obtained 14.7 percent of the total.

The added gain in December over November for smaller war plants employing less than 500 persons was four-tenths of 1 percent, bringing the total percentage to small plants up to 24.1. This gain was made despite the reduction in procurement activities.

The accompanying charts show the distribution by supply services. It should be noted that the Ordnance Department increased its percentage of dollar volume placed with plants employing less than 100 persons by approximately 60 percent.

The Signal Corps more than doubled the percentage of dollar volume placed with plants employing 100 persons or less and nearly doubled the percent of dollar volume acquired by plants employing from 100 to 500 persons.

A reduction of approximately 65 percent in the dollar volume of the Corps of Engineers' contracts is shown for plants employing less than 100 persons. This was principally due to the fact that the December figures include a large procurement of tractors, contracts for which could only be placed with a few large manufacturers of this item.

Normally, the Transportation Corps places the bulk of its contracts with plants employing less than 100 persons. In November, when the Transportation Corps was placing contracts for small boat construction, nearly all went to smaller contractors. In December, however, the ratio was temporarily reversed with the inauguration of the Transportation Corps' locomotive procurement program, the contracts for which could be awarded only to comparatively large locomotive builders.

While the percentage of prime contracts placed to date by the Army Air Forces with smaller plants has been relatively low, you will note that it is increasing. Preliminary investigation indicates that the greatest use of small plants by this service lies in the field of subcontracting.

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN S. HEWITT,
Major, Acting Chief.
FRED C. FOY,
Colonel, A. U. S.,
Chief, Small War Plants Branch,
Purchases Division.

Number and dollar value of prime contracts awarded in December 1942, 7 supply services of the War Department

[Values expressed in thousands of dollars]

Service	Break-down of contracts by size of plants (number of wage earners)					
	Under 100		100-500		Over 500	
	Number of contracts	Dollar value	Number of contracts	Dollar value	Number of contracts	Dollar value
Chemical Warfare Service	121	2,311	184	10,461	200	12,321
Corps of Engineers	1,563	4,194	713	17,021	1,338	47,025
Medical Corps	131	8,002	129	13,834	142	17,530
Ordnance Department	1,728	37,820	460	42,033	1,033	501,981
Quartermaster Corps	5,782	40,263	2,708	90,114	2,586	207,305
Signal Corps	1,848	4,688	1,467	19,942	2,891	122,185
Transportation Corps	10	855	20	4,339	35	21,386
Total	11,183	98,133	5,681	197,744	8,225	930,174

NOTE.—Above figures represent supply contracts only.

WAR DEPARTMENT DEMONSTRATES SYMPATHETIC FEELING FOR SMALL BUSINESS

In addition, I am inserting herewith a letter of January 16, 1943, from Major Hewitt, stating what has been done by the War Department to carry out the intent of Congress, as expressed in Public Law No. 603 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. This letter discloses a sympathetic feeling on the part of the officials of the War Department toward the act and a sincere effort to carry out fully the intent of Congress, as expressed in the act:

JANUARY 16, 1943.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, House Small Business Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: In response to your request for a review of the activities undertaken by the Services of Supply in order to comply with the intent of Congress as expressed in Public Law 603, Seventy-seventh Congress, the following facts are submitted:

You will recall that beginning in July, ranking officials of the War Department in addition to those who were to be charged with the functioning of the small war plants program within the Services of Supply met at frequent intervals with Mr. Holland and others interested. In these meetings careful consideration was given to every possible factor that might affect the functioning of this program and, after study, including a report from Mr. Hedley Williams on the British experience with small plants, a workable policy and procedure was agreed upon which we believed would have the proper effect in spreading War Department purchasing further to small plants.

A preliminary policy directive was issued from the headquarters, Services of Supply, on September 15, very clearly pointing out the desire of the War Department to spread procurement as widely as possible to small plants.

On October 14, Brig. Gen. W. H. Harrison, Director of Procurement, issued instructions to the Supply Services that the earmarking of procurement directives from the headquarters of the Supply Services for placement with particular contractors by the field contracting officers was to be discontinued regarding both new and continuation orders, except where it was necessary due to particular circumstances. The basic reason for this was to insure that the local contracting officer would have as much authority as possible to spread the work to those local factories which he knew from personal experience were suitable. This procedure also made it more possible for the small plant manager to secure his business from the local contracting officer without the necessity of further contact with Washington headquarters.

On October 30 General Somervell issued a personal memorandum throughout the Supply Services and the Army Air Forces Matériel Command together with a policy and procedure directive which set up the basis of the small war-plants program operation between the War Department services and the Smaller War Plants Division, War Production Board, as it was finally agreed upon between these two organizations.

This policy and procedure directive assured to the Smaller War Plants Division, War Production Board, the opportunity of reviewing the related parts of the Army supply program, selecting from it items suitable for manufacture by small plants and developing through agreement the proportion of the procurement on suitable items which would be held aside for placement in plants recommended by the Smaller War Plants Division, War Production Board. Such procedure has been adopted by each service and is beginning to be effective.

Also, it continues to be the policy of the War Department not to limit its placing of business with small plants to the proportions allocated to the Smaller War Plants Division, War Production Board, for facilities recommended by them, in cases where additional suitable small-plant facilities are known to our contracting officers.

In order to coordinate the small war plants program and our work with the Smaller War Plants Division, War Production Board, a small war plants branch was established within the Purchases Division, Headquarters, Services of Supply, in September and staffed with competent personnel. In addition, at the headquarters of each service, personnel was designated whose function it is to assist representatives of the Smaller War Plants Division, War Production Board, assigned to that service in working out the maximum degree of cooperation with the Smaller War Plants Division, War Production Board, in keeping with the intent and specific directions of Public Law 603, Seventy-seventh Congress. Furthermore, in December personnel was designated at each district procurement office or depot of the Supply Services and the Army Air Forces Matériel Command whose function it is to coordinate the local procurement activities with the local Smaller War Plants Division, War Production Board, representatives and to assist those representatives in their relations with the local contracting officers.

In December, in order to assure that our field offices as well as the Smaller War Plants Division, War Production Board, field representatives had a full understanding of the intent of Public Law 603, Seventy-seventh Congress, and the procedures established to carry out that intent, we jointly organized with the Smaller War Plants Division, War Production Board, five regional meetings, to be attended by both the local representatives of the Smaller War Plants Division, War Production Board, and representatives of the district procurement offices. All reports indicate that these regional meetings had a most beneficial effect.

In addition, representatives of both the Small War Plants Branch, headquarters, Services of Supply, and the Supply Services have held many meetings and conferences with procurement officers both at headquarters and in the field in order to further the placing of contracts with small plants and to work out details of procedure in coordination with the Smaller War Plants Division, War Production Board. These meetings and conferences have related both to the placing of prime contracts as well as subcontracts.

The above is a review of major actions taken in organizing the Small War Plants effort within the War Department in keeping with the intent of Public Law 603, Seventy-seventh Congress. It is to the results that we must look for an indication of the merits behind this planning and initial operation. Reports have been submitted to your committee and to the Senate Committee on Small Business showing the increasing proportion of the volume of business placed by the Services of Supply with small plants since the law was passed. For reference, as of September 1, 1942, the 7 supply services had 53,072 contracts in affect with small plants employing under 500, amounting to 20.8 percent of the dollar volume of outstanding War Department contracts. In November, contracts awarded by the 7 supply services to small plants with under 500 employees totaled 26,201, for 23.7 percent of the dollar volume awarded during that month. The December figures, just available, show a continuation of this trend with 16,864 contracts placed with small plants employing under 500 for a slight percentage gain of the dollar volume to 24.1

percent of the total for the 7 supply services.

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN S. HEWITT,
Major, Acting Chief.
FRED C. FOY,
Colonel, A. U. S., Chief, Small War Plants Branch, Purchases Division.

CONGRESS HAS DONE ITS PART

It should not be overlooked that Congress stated in this Murray-Patman Act that small concerns should be helped and, if necessary, procurement agencies should pay even more to small concerns for the same items purchased. However, I think experience has demonstrated that small concerns can usually meet the price of the larger concerns and sometimes produce for a lower price than the larger concerns. Congress placed in that act everything necessary to help the producing and manufacturing concerns in this country and provided the Corporation with $150,000,000 in capital.

I am also inserting a letter from Major Hewitt, dated January 15, 1943, relative to the information that was disclosed by our Committee on Small Business of the House when public hearings were conducted recently in a number of the principal cities in the country. Col. Fred Foy and Major Hewitt attended most of these hearings. This letter is self-explanatory and is further evidence of the close cooperation of the War Department in endeavoring to carry out the will of Congress, as expressed in the Murray-Patman Act of June 11, 1942:

JANUARY 15, 1943.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: During the recent hearings conducted by your committee in the Southwest, some of the testimony brought forth certain problems with respect to Army purchasing procedure. These fell into two general classes: Those applicable to all or a considerable part of Army purchasing, and specific cases which seemed in need of some attention.

Specific cases called to the attention of our representative present were checked into and in some cases already have been adjusted. In other cases where no immediate adjustment was possible, steps have been taken to insure adequate consideration for the parties concerned in future Army purchases.

In the broader field of general procedure there were four general practices which seemed in need of attention:

1. Many prospective contractors felt that they did not have sufficient time in which to prepare bids.

2. Many smaller plants felt that it was difficult for them to learn in advance what the Army planned to buy.

3. Some difficulty was had in obtaining necessary specifications or in some cases it was felt specifications tend to place a penalty on small business.

4. The committee's attention was called to the waste of raw material on construction projects because no apparent provision had been made for the sale of lumber and other scrap material.

For your information the following steps have been taken with respect to each of these four broad problems:

1. ALLOWING SUFFICIENT TIME TO BID

The chiefs of the supply services have been directed that "the normal time to be allowed for the return of bids to contracting officers should be extended to 3 weeks wherever it is possible to adjust the planning accordingly. On difficult or conflicting items more time should be allowed if available."

2. ADVANCE NOTICE ON WHAT THE ARMY PLANS TO BUY

We have already, as you know, established a procedure whereby liaison representatives of the Smaller War Plants Division of the War Production Board are in residence at the headquarters of each of the supply services and the Army Air Forces, Matériel Command, where, with the active assistance of the liaison officer designated for this purpose by the Chief of the Supply Service, this War Production Board representative will review with the proper personnel of the Supply Service the related parts of the Army supply program and select from it products suitable for manufacture by plants recommended by the War Production Board. In addition, this War Production Board representative will daily review all procurement directives issued at headquarters to the district office or depots so that the Smaller War Plants Division, War Production Board, may recommend suitable facilities.

Steps are now being taken with the Smaller War Plants Division of the War Production Board which will result in these recommendations with respect to suitable facilities being made by the local Smaller War Plants representative of the War Production Board working in cooperation with our own local contracting officers located throughout the country in areas where the purchases will be made. In this way knowledge with respect to War Department purchasing plans will be made available to the small businessman whether he contacts the local Smaller War Plants Division of the War Production Board in his area or our own contracting officer.

3. ISSUANCE OF SPECIFICATIONS

We are now making a careful study of our practices with respect to issuing specifications to prospective bidders with a view to seeing what further steps may be taken to make specifications as readily available as possible to small business concerns.

In addition one section of the Production Division is concerned at all times with a study of specifications with a view to simplifying them as well as to conserving critical materials.

4. RESALE OF SALVAGED WAR DEPARTMENT MATERIALS

At one point in the testimony presented before your committe, the complaint was made that waste lumber from War Department construction projects was being burned rather than offered for resale. The witness was reported to have said that War Department regulations made it impossible for him to purchase this material.

In order that your committee will be fully informed as to War Department regulations with respect to this subject, there is attached a marked copy of our procurement regulations showing the procedure established for the disposal of salvaged materials.

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN S. HEWITT,
Major, Acting Chief.
FRED C. FOY,
Colonel, A. U. S.,
Chief, Small War Plants Branch,
Purchases Division.

OTHER AGENCIES REQUESTED TO MAKE REPORTS

I am requesting the Navy Department, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Procurement Division of the Treasury, and other procurement agencies of the Government to give our Committee on Small Business of the House a statement, which will disclose the progress they have made in assisting small business after the passage of the Murray-Patman Act. Their statements will be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when received.

Appointments to West Point

REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe this announcement will be of special interest to Congressmen from at least 16 States, that is, the States of Arizona, Florida, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, and Tennessee, each of which gained 1 congressional district, and California, which gained 3, also the States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania, each of which lost 1 district.

On the 5th of January the West Point section of the War Department informed me very emphatically that we who represent States which have lost districts would not be entitled to our appointments to West Point. Later some of the officials decided it would be best to charge these against the States which had gained districts. I pleaded and argued with them for 8 days in behalf of these 16 States, urging that a district at large be created by the Secretary of War in order that neither the States losing nor those gaining districts would lose appointments.

Yesterday, through the efforts of Col. C. J. Hauck, Col. E. J. Walsh, and Adjt. Gen. J. A. Ulio, it was decided that the Secretary of War would carry an "account at large," as suggested by me in order that neither the States which lost nor those which have gained districts would be deprived of West Point appointments.

This will mean that you Congressmen from these 16 States will not be adversely affected either this year or 1944 or 1945.

The Navy Department is inclined to agree accordingly, therefore we will have approximately 75 more West Point and 75 more Annapolis graduates within the next 3 years than we would otherwise have had.

The Florida Barge Canal—Letter of General Summerall

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if Congress had passed the rivers and harbors bill a

year ago, or if the bill that we did pass to build a barge canal across the peninsula of Florida had been put into operation, the eastern seaboard would soon be supplied with ample oil. We have all the oil in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Mississippi needed to supply the entire world, but our boats are being sunk in the Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean Sea, the Florida Straits, the Windward Passage, and the Dragons Mouth to such an extent that the people of the East are freezing for want of fuel.

General Summerall, former Chief of Staff and one of the ablest men in America, says that if this barge canal were started now, it would take only about 10 months to finish it. Then, before another winter rolls around the eastern seaboard would have all the oil it needs from American oil fields; besides that, we would have eliminated one of the chief preying grounds of the German submarine. I am inserting at this point a letter from General Summerall which I hope every Member will read:

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., *January 16, 1943.*

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Governor, Boston, Mass.

DEAR GOVERNOR SALTONSTALL: The present gasoline and fuel-oil famine in the East could have been avoided.

Even now, the recurrence of these conditions next winter can be prevented.

Within 10 months the petroleum shortage in the Eastern States can be fully and permanently relieved by connecting the Gulf and Atlantic intracoastal waterways and resorting to large-scale inland barge transport direct from the oil fields.

This inland water route is now open to traffic from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Trenton, N. J., except for a short connecting section across northern Florida comprising about 3½ percent of the total length of the waterway. This connecting channel was authorized by Congress in an act passed last July, "in order to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment."

But in the 6 months which has elapsed neither Congress nor the Government has moved in the matter. In fact it has been definitely opposed and retarded by those executive agencies whose duty it is to provide fuel and transport for the Nation.

The inevitable results have overtaken our people in the East, and bid fair to remain with us with increasing acuteness for the rest of the war period, unless we demand action.

Any statements to the contrary notwithstanding, it is possible to construct this connecting channel and to initiate barge traffic on a scale adequate to supply the entire petroleum needs for the Eastern States (without rationing) within 10 months after the work is begun. This Authority is prepared to undertake this construction and to complete it in time to entirely relieve the situation next winter, if Congress and the Government will act now.

I have before me proposals from a number of the largest and most responsible construction firms in the country comprising offers to complete the work within 10 months, using their own existing and available equipment, and without consequential amounts of so-called critical materials or manpower. Barges and tugs also will have to be built in large numbers, and built in time to move with the opening of the waterway. Facilities for this exist in abundance.

The responsibility for the delay and the resulting situation rests squarely in the lap of government. There has never been any excuse for the failure to provide adequate inland transport between Gulf and Mississippi Valley areas and the Atlantic seaboard. The strategic necessity for connecting and completing these waterways has been continuously urged over a long period of years.

It is admitted by all that if this completed waterway were now in existence, there would be no petroleum shortage in the East; no looming shadow of food and other vital supply shortages beginning to materialize; and no breaking down of our rail transport.

The situation for the present winter is past mending, and is only a foretaste of the next. But it is possible, by immediate, energetic action, to fully solve the problem of next winter. We shall have only ourselves to blame if we do not now demand action. Congress should forthwith make the necessary appropriation and the work should be begun at once.

Our transport must be maintained, regardless of priorities, materials, or manpower. It is time for Congress and the Government to take a realistic view of the position; to cease considering the Nation's arterial water transport in political and sectional terms; to look upon this work as the stark military necessity it is, and to think of construction in months instead of in years.

It can be done, and it must be done, if we are to avoid a situation which none of us cares to contemplate.

Sincerely yours,

C. P. SUMMERALL,
Chairman, Ship Canal Authority,
State of Florida.

National Youth Administration

REMARKS

OF

HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, the Administrator of the National Youth Administration testified before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures regarding the work of the National Youth Administration. Before a great while the Congress will have to pass upon the question of the continuance or not of the National Youth Administration and its functions either under its present setup or in combination with the activities of some other organization of the Government. The House, therefore, I am sure, will be interested in a summary of Mr. Williams' evidence, whether they agree with it or not, for I know that all of us want to secure as much information as possible on this subject. I have prepared such a summary, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, for the information of the Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, four reasons were mentioned which critics of the National Youth Administration have given as to why this organization should be abolished. These are as follows:

First, that the agency was established to provide employment for young people who were unable to secure work in private industry, and now that these conditions no longer exist, it should be discontinued.

Second, that the N. Y. A. War Production Training Program does not provide genuine training, that it serves no useful function in the war effort, and that the time of young people spent in N. Y. A. training is being wasted.

Third, that the N. Y. A. training program is too costly, and,

Fourth, that whatever there is of worth in the N. Y. A. should be turned over to the vocational schools.

These four points were answered one by one.

It is true—

The Administrator stated—

that the National Youth Administration was established to give employment to unemployed youth. During the 7½ years of its existence, it has given work and training to 4,600,000 youth, 2,100,000 of whom were in school at the time of their employment. * * *

Therefore, there is not too much historical validity in the position taken by the critics of the National Youth Administration that, because it was depression born, it should for that reason be abolished. Even admitting—which I do not—that the National Youth Administration is not rendering timely and valuable service to the war, this would not, even if it were true—mean that this agency is not needed in our national economy and should be done away with.

Everyone who is familiar with what is happening to young people in the cities and on the farms realizes what has become a familiar fact that during recent years persons under 20 years of age have found it increasingly difficult in normal times to secure employment and the percentages of young people employed have steadily declined. It is also well-known that in periods of unemployment young people along with old people, are the first to be let out and the last to be rehired. It is also common knowledge that young people are more easily influenced and more readily take up this or that "ism" and become the ready prey of false leaders.

It is apparent to all who inquire into the matter that we have a very serious task ahead of us if we are to succeed in including all of our young people in industry, agriculture and business and that we will need every bit of knowledge and every possible aid, both public and private, in accomplishing this goal.

I hold that the National Youth Administration, which has operated work programs for young people in every part of the Nation and which has developed a seasoned technique of training and employment is a very valuable resource and a very necessary activity and that if we dismantle it now that such will mean a great loss, for it is inevitable that we shall have to have something similar to this and the Civilian Conservation Corps before we are through with the total war and the reestablishment of peace.

However, regardless of the merits of the case, the matter will be settled, for the present, not upon the long-time issues involved, but upon the basis of whether the agency is capable of making a contribution to the winning of the war. * * *

Again, it was stated—

No one should quarrel with this requirement. It is right that it should be so, and I welcome this test being applied to the National Youth Administration. In what terms may one measure whether an agency is contributing to the war? That, I suppose, goes back to the simple elements of making war. Reduced to its elemental parts, you

make war with soldiers and their equipment, and anything which contributes to either of these is helping to win the war. It is with regard to the latter, equipment, that the National Youth Administration has to do. Briefly, the facts are these: we have, in round numbers, 700 work locations in all parts of the country. In these 700 locations there are 39,000 work stations. There are 16,800 lathes, drill presses, and other heavy-duty types of equipment. There are 2,200 heavy-duty arc welders.

We have a turn-over of 30,000 young people a month, of which approximately 17,000 go into war-production industries. The great bulk of these are machine operators, welders, sheet metal and radio workers. That is, they go into the skilled parts of production, and not into the automotive part.

Teaching these people we have, put together, a staff of less than 5,000 seasoned craftsmen—not 12,000. This is about 1 craftsman to 12 persons. In industry, it is 1 to 1, or, at best 1 to 3. Usually, they assign a beginner to one craftsman and his machine.

Further, it was testified that—

If you are a critic and a doubter, you say, "But how can you feel so sure that what you are doing is of real service? You say it is so, what do those who run the production plants say?"

In the extensive file of letters sent to me by officials of war firms in virtually every State of the Union and representing virtually every type of war industry, there is more solid praise of the National Youth Administration war contribution than I could read to you in 1 day or even 1 week. War firms all over the country are benefiting from the pre-employment training which many of their present employees received in National Youth Administration workshops, and these war plants have not hesitated to express their appreciation, and to request that more National Youth Administration trainees be referred to their plants for employment.

The attention of the Members of Congress is called to the attached letter that this agency received from the Kaiser Shipbuilding Corporation:

RICHMOND SHIPYARD NO. 1 OF THE
PERMANENT METALS CORPORATION,
Richmond, Calif., January 9, 1943.

Mr. LEONARD SEIDENMAN,
National Youth Administration,
Richmond, Calif.

DEAR MR. SEIDENMAN: This is to advise you that the Richmond shipyards will employ all the sheet metal, coppersmith, machinist, and welder trainees you can train.

We have found a definite shortage in skilled men within these crafts and, with the anticipation that we will hire approximately 20,000 additional employees within the next 3 to 4 months, we believe the shortage will become still more acute. This figure might also be enlarged by the inroads made on our personnel because of Selective Service, enlistments in the armed forces, etc.

These shipyards appreciate the work your organization has been doing in the past and thank you for your continued cooperation.

Very truly yours,

JAMES C. EGAN,
Director of Labor Relations.

Mr. Williams states:

It should be noted from the above that this agency is placing 700 persons a day in war production industries. I am listing below some figures with respect to the types of war industries in which these people are entering (these figures cover the period from July 1942 through November 1942):

Aircraft frames and engines	11,580
Smelting and refining, steel works and rolling mills	1,466
Brass, bronze, copper, aluminum, and other nonferrous products	735
Electrical machinery, apparatus and supplies	2,095
Foundry, machine shop, and other iron and steel products	5,568
Other machinery and equipment (excluding metalworking machinery)	1,658
Machine tools and accessories	2,143
Ordnance and accessories (including small arms, explosives, and ammunition)	2,536
Ship, boat building, and Navy yards	13,008
Transport and combat vehicles	651
Instruments, optical goods and abrasives	298
Direct war industries, total	41,740
Textile, rayon, leather and allied products	4,702
Petroleum, chemical, rubber and coal products (excluding explosives)	779
Food and kindred products	1,617
Other manufacturing industries	3,048
Indirect war industries, total	10,146
Manufacturing industries, total	51,886

With regard to cost—

At the present time it costs $65.86 per month per trainee, of which $52.63 is for trainee wages, subsistence, and cost of direct training and $13.23 is for supervision and administrative overhead. These costs could be pared downward if National Youth Administration facilities were utilized to utmost capacity; but under the present statutory limitations, the trainee costs are as low as they can be made, consistent with effective training.

The allegations in regard to possible economies at the expense of the National Youth Administration are out of all proportion to the amount of money expended by this agency. The expenditures of the National Youth Administration for war training during the first 11 months of 1942 account for only about 10 cents out of every $100 of total Government war expenditures during this period.

In actual facts, on a dollars-and-cents basis, National Youth Administration training is now one of the least expensive forms of preemployment training. Take as one item of comparison the cost of trainee wages. The average wage to National Youth Administration trainees is 15 cents an hour. In comparison with this rate, the average wage paid to industrial in-plant trainees is about 60 cents an hour; the average wage paid to trainees employed by industry and assigned to training courses under the sponsorship of the United States Office of Education is 55 cents an hour, and ranges from 28 cents an hour to $1 an hour. On an average, that is to say, National Youth Administration trainees are paid at least 72 percent an hour less than persons employed by industry and assigned to United States Office of Education training programs. Many of the trainees who are close to the completion of their National Youth Administration training period have acquired a large measure of skill, but even so, their National Youth Administration wage averages 74 percent less per hour than unskilled workers are paid in the war industries and 69 percent less than unskilled workers are paid on an average in nonwar industries. These are the going rates, and despite the fact that we pay substantially less than the going rates, there are those who claim that our costs are excessive. Quite the contrary is true. If anything, our present costs are too low and it may prove necessary for us to increase them in order to preseve the quality of training and to continue to attract a high type of trainee.

This is not a question of being unemployed any longer, and we are not operating a work-relief program. It is a question of the Government—that is, war production—being in need of the services and having to pay the market price for labor. * * * It is, therefore, necessary, and, under present circumstances, proper, to pay these workers whether they are in the National Youth Administration or in industry.

Between July 1943 and July 1944 an additional 4,600,000 persons must be employed in war production industries. Practically all of these will have to receive some form of definite training in unit skills before they can be producers. The urgency and size, therefore, of the immediate training problem imposes a difficult task on the agencies responsible for the mobilization and supplying of trained and qualified manpower.

Now, with regard to the fourth and final point that the training functions and facilities of the National Youth Administration should be transferred to public vocational schools, it should be remembered that we do not have a Federal school system but 48 school systems representing as many States and that within each State there is also almost complete autonomy in the conduct of the schools. The power and responsibility for their direction is reposed in districts and local school boards. Even if local school boards or State legislatures were willing to assume financial burden and direction for the plants which have been established by National Youth Administration, which is very doubtful in many, many instances, the loss in time and the confusion which would result at this time would be very costly to the war effort.

The Sanctity of the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and timely sermon by the Reverend Ignatius Smith, O. P., dean, school of philosophy, Catholic University of America, at the Red Mass, at the Immaculate Conception Shrine, on Sunday, January 17, 1943. The subject of the sermon was The Sanctity of the Law. I commend to my colleagues of the Congress the reading of this splendid effort. They will find it both enlightening and refreshing.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Catholic University of America, and its School of Law, welcome you to the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. You are lawmakers, judges, advocates, and others interested in the law by which this great Republic has become a genuine and a successful democracy. You gather with us at the solemnization of the sacrifice of the Mass, the highest act of our religion.

For centuries, it has been the custom in France for judges and legislators to participate in the Red Mass. The tradition was initiated by the judges who, conscious of their human limitations, met at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass to invoke the aid of the divine source of wisdom and justice in their deliberations. The unique term "the Red

Mass" was adopted because the particular petition of the mass sought the aid of the Holy Spirit, symbolized by the flaming fire of divine love and wisdom. The vestments of the priests were red, and the robes of the justices who attended were scarlet. The deep appreciation by the court of the solemn significance of this votive mass was evidenced by the fact that a special chapel was erected in Paris during the reign of Louis IX, St. Louis of France (1226–1270), as a proper setting for this beautiful ceremony. La Sainte Chappelle, an architectural gem, was used but once during the year, and then for this impressive ceremony.

You assemble at a time when this Nation with its sister nations of Central and South America is at war, fighting against might and totalitarian power, for right and liberty which real law is obligated to protect. You meet with hemispheric solidarity in a spirit and in an atmosphere of prayer, in a genuinely American plea to God for His blessing on your important work and on our nations. All this would indicate that the law, in which you are so interested and which we honor today, is something holy. It should be holy and it will continue to be sacrosanct in this Nation when it preserves its relation to reason, when it has regard for human dignity, when it respects the importance of the commonweal, and when it retains its affiliation with religion. This statement I would like to elaborate.

I say that the sanctity of law is conditioned by its relation to sound intelligence. In this connection one must keep in mind three facts. The first fact is that law must be reasonable in the sense that it must emerge from intelligence and not from sentiment, whether this sentiment be good or bad. Sound reason is a stable foundation for law and for the government of which it is the voice. Even noble sentiment is too instable and untrustworthy an anchor for law and government. Base passions as a foundation for legislation profane the law with official expressions of class hatred, race prejudice, religious bigotry, and party intolerance and they jeopardize the stability of any political society, particularly that of a democracy.

The second fact essential in the relation of law to intelligence and reason is that any law must be reasonably possible of observance. Civil society and earthly authorities legislate for men and not for angels; they legislate for men with human limitations that seem to be ineradicable. One need not abandon the hope of individual and national betterment in accepting the conviction that Utopias are impossible of realization and the conviction that unreasonable and unintelligent laws, impossible of enforcement, are subversive of all law and social order.

The third fact essential in the relation of law to intelligence and reason is that reason itself is most likely to be sound when it is reenforced by the light of sound religious faith and by the strength of religious devotion. There is sound Americanism, sound political philosophy, and sound jurisprudence behind the frequently repeated call of our President for a revival of religious faith and worship. History reveals that sound reason is never so completely abdicated as when the Almighty is repudiated. The sovereignty of reason in law is erased when the sovereignty of God in life is effaced. Fantastic philosophies always multiply with the widening of godlessness. Laws that mock reason increase with the development of irreligion. Menacing and irrational governmental forms always attempt first to blockade the boulevards of communication between men and their Maker. These facts indicate that the sanctity of law postulates its intimacy with sound reason that has not divorced itself from eternal values.

I say that the sanctity of law depends on preserving the relation between law, in all its phases, and the holy value of individual human nature in all its aspects. Law, national or international, which ignores distinctively human dignity and destiny, individual and social, disgraces itself and frustrates its purpose. In this Nation there is legal separation of church and state, but only the law of death can separate the soul from the body of man. Law is concerned with individuals, composed of body and soul. The soul is created by God personally, for every person, individually; it is of divine origin, made to the image and likeness of God; it has an immortal destiny in another world. This life leads to another future life. The laws for this life must reverence the divine origin and endless existence of man. They must be evaluated by their recognition of real human dignity and by their power to advance humanity to its really human destiny. Law is a fiasco when it is based on a merely materialistic or positivistic concept of the value and destiny of the individual man. Governments which articulate such laws have gone far on their way to either totalitarianism or anarchy.

For the law to know the inestimable worth and eternal destiny of each individual citizen, regardless of sex, religion, or race, friend or foe, resources of human thinking may be sufficient, but the incontrovertible principles of divine revelation are challenging and assuring It is well to know that God has revealed Himself as the Creator of the human soul; that on this soul, which makes man human, is impressed the image of the Creator; that this divine touch gives to every individual sublime dignity, and rights which are inalienable and beyond the power of human government and law; that God is the sovereign Lord and judge of all men, both subjects and rulers. From the viewpoint of the dignity and destiny of individual persons the law is helped to retain its sanctity by maintaining its contact with the Almighty.

I say that the sanctity of the law can be preserved only by a sacred regard for the commonweal. Let me explain what I mean. Law merely for the sake of law is a nuisance. Law is disastrous and hateful when enacted for the benefit of strongly intrenched minorities, for the accumulation and perpetration of party power, for the security of a dictator. By such laws, ignoring the commonweal, the sanctity of law is profaned. By such laws, the security of democracy is threatened. Law may be profaned even by a wrong concept of the common good. Law, like that of the absolutistic state, which aims to promote national power and a commonweal in which all citizens do not share is a profanation of the sanctity of law. The commonweal, which all law must advance, is a common good to which all will contribute according to their means, from which all will receive according to their needs, and which the government will achieve and distribute with justice. Law deserving of a respect as holy must be enacted and enforced on such principles.

It is not difficult for law to become isolated from the commonweal when lawmakers have broken faith with God. It is not difficult for law to lose sight of its obligations to some or many people when the justice, the equity, and charity which spring from religion are blurred by godlessness. Law has a better chance to remain holy when legislators and the legal profession accept and are guided by principles from which godly men cannot escape. They are safest when they acknowledge that the brotherhood of man is more than a phrase, that it means more than a natural affinity of like-natured human individuals, that it means more than sonship under a common divine Father but that it means also high-level kinship of human nature with humanity everywhere because this humanity met with divinity in the person of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. All men are His brothers and brothers of one another. Law and lawmakers are safest and sanest when they know and live the basic principle of Christian discipline, that the love and service of God is nullified by failure to love and serve neighbor, by failure to advance the commonweal.

I say that the sanctity of law is preserved when it maintains its relation with religion and consecrated conscience. Human law may not obstruct the sound religious life of a people any more than it can erase the laws of nature or the laws of God. Law should make opportunities for worship easy for all people if it hopes to obtain the human cooperation and the divine assistance which law needs. And law needs religious support. It needs principles and sanctions which only religion can give. It needs the moral conscience which religion promotes. It needs the spiritual organization of interior life, where crime begins, which human law cannot touch and which religion promotes. It needs that interior sense of moral responsibility, of hatred of perjury and injustice, of love of truth and justice, of detestation of sin, of hope of eternal reward, of fear of eternal punishment which genuine religion creates and preserves. The collapse of religious life in so many millions of our American citizens has wiped out so many internal and conscientious motives for correct deportment and has thrown such a burden of responsibility on civil law that despite our avalanche of legislation it is confronted by a task well nigh impossible of fulfillment. You do well in gathering here today to try to bring to law, to your profession and to your work, the God to whom this Nation is dedicated and without whose providence the Nation cannot endure.

The law, in all its phases will remain holy if it retains its essential relations with intelligence, with sacrosanct human personality, with the genuine commonweal and with God. For the preservation of these relations, and for all of you, so help us God.

Pay-As-You-Go Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, suggestions for the adoption of the pay-as-you-go method of Federal income-tax collection have been made to the Congress, and I wish to say that I heartily favor the plan. This morning I read a very interesting and enlightening editorial entitled "Anybody Lose by Ruml Plan?" published in the Washington Times-Herald. I ask that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANYBODY LOSE BY RUML PLAN?

The Ruml plan for a complete one-jump shift to a pay-as-you-go method of Federal income-tax collection is so simple that some people fear it would mean a large loss of revenue to the Government.

That is not so, and here is why:

Under the present system we do not pay as we go.

TWENTY-SEVEN MILLION TAXPAYERS

Federal income taxpayers are always a year behind in their payments. This is because,

ever since the adoption in 1913 of the income-tax amendment to the Constitution (amendment 16), the Treasury Department's Internal Revenue Bureau has been billing taxpayers this year for income brought in last year.

It's an old story to long-time income taxpayers. As long as there were only a few of them, with tax rates low and exemptions high, it made little difference. Now, however, tax rates are high and probably going higher, exemptions are low and probably going lower and an estimated 27,000,000 persons are going to be stuck for income taxes this year.

Many of these persons will not have saved the money to pay taxes this year on income earned last year. Many others will be hard put to it to scrape up the money. All of them—those who do pay and those who can't—will go on performing the squirrel-in-a-revolving-cage act, never getting out of debt to the Government, as long as the present system is kept.

SKIPPING A YEAR

The Ruml plan would change all this, and in one simple operation. It would put all Federal income-tax payers on a pay-as-you-go basis as soon as it went into effect.

Here is how it would work: We would all pay income taxes as usual this year; but we would redefine the taxable year by calling them taxes on 1943 income, instead of taxes on 1942 income. The taxes would be taken out at the source of income, meaning deducted from pay checks, dividend checks, etc., periodically. As fast as one made the money one's income tax on it would be paid up.

In the case of a businessman who didn't know how much he was going to make this year, he would file a tentative return on March 15, on the basis of what he might reasonably expect, from experience and business prospects, to make this year. He would pay as he went along. If he found at the end of the year that he had overguessed or underguessed, adjustments with the Internal Revenue Bureau would be made.

The scheme is similar to daylight saving. We would turn the income-tax clock ahead 1 year and go on paying our regular taxes, just as we've turned the time-telling clock ahead 1 hour for the duration and gone on working our regular days' schedules.

HOW ABOUT THE SLUMP?

The Treasury theoretically would lose 1 year's income taxes per taxpayer by this scheme—when the taxpayer died. Inheritance taxes, however, would make up for much of that loss; and it looks as if death taxes are going to keep mounting apace with other taxes.

Another offset to this theoretical loss would be the fact that the Government would be much surer than it now is of getting its money from many a taxpayer. Employment is at a peak this year, because of the war; will most likely stay so for the duration. All these people can pay their income taxes now, on a pay-as-you-go basis.

But how about after the war? As soon as the war ends, it is a 100-to-1 bet that war orders are going to be canceled, and that there is going to be widespread unemployment, at least for a time. If the war workers are then in debt to the Government for taxes on income earned during the war boom, what chance of collecting will there be in millions of cases?

The most the Government will be able to do will be to grab a lot of personal property, sell it for what it will bring, and hound these millions of people for its balances due for months or years afterward. There will be an incalculable amount of popular resentment, premature cashing of War bonds, and demands for some income-tax revision far more radical than the Ruml plan.

The Ruml plan is not radical at all. It is a plan for shifting us to the prudent, safe, sure-fire pay-as-you-go system of collecting income taxes under which we should have operated from the start. It is, further, mainly a bookkeeping operation, from which all of us will profit and the Treasury at worst will lose only a small fraction of what it will lose if we stay on the pay-next-year-or-when-they-catch-you basis.

Congress should enact the Ruml plan before next March 15, when the first installment under the present system becomes due.

First Things First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of January 12, 1943.

This article is entitled "First Things First," and comments upon one of the very serious war problems with which we are confronted, that of protection against enemy submarines. Mr. Lippmann's article sets forth the suggestion that there be appointed a "commander of the submarine war." I should like to associate myself with that suggestion.

It seems to me that too many persons entertain the thought that we are heading rapidly toward final victory—and without much doubt; but I am fearful, and Mr. Lippmann is also among those who appear to be apprehensive, that the war will be delayed and the losses much heavier unless we find a way to reduce the sinkings by submarines. I have long thought that someone should be charged with the responsibility of directing our antisubmarine operations. Nothing in connection with this war seems more important, at least to me, at the moment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

FIRST THINGS FIRST

The controversy over priorities for the synthetic-rubber plants seems headed for the White House. Unless the answer is more self-evident than it now seems likely to be, would it not be desirable to reconvene the Baruch committee and ask it for an advisory opinion?

There are, it seems to me, good reasons for doing this. The controversy has arisen because much the same kind of mechanical equipment, of which there is a short supply, is needed for the rubber plants, for the high-octane gas plants needed for combat aviation, and for the escort vessels which the Navy uses to fight submarines.

No one will deny that the Navy escort program is of absolutely first importance in the year 1943. No one who knows a little of the history of that program will have any doubt that come what may, the construction of these indispensable ships must not be interfered with again as it has been in the past.

Nor will anyone deny that high-octane gas, which is now used solely for aircraft in battle and no longer for training, is of equal importance. Our military prospects for 1943 in all theaters of war are based first of all upon the conquest of the air.

But when we come to rubber, though no one will underestimate its vital importance, the position is not so absolutely clear as it is in regard to the escort vessels and the high octane gas. It is not so clear because it is by no means certain that we have reached the limit of our power to conserve the existing supply of rubber.

It may be that Mr. Jeffers has done all that can safely be done to make the existing supply last a few months longer—the few months of the danger period which would come if he doesn't get the absolutely highest priorities for his whole synthetic program. All that the ordinary lay observer can say is that the appearances are against him and that the civilians do not seem to be conserving rubber as strictly as they could. A matter of this sort should not, however, be judged by mere impressions, and a judgment by the Baruch committee would, therefore, be very useful.

It would be useful to know from them whether existing tires could not be conserved still more if throughout the country pleasure driving were prohibited for a few months—say all Sunday driving and all driving after 8 o'clock in the evening except, of course, for war workers, doctors, and those specially designated as doing indispensable services. It would be useful to know whether further savings could not be had by strict rationing of tires for commercial vehicles, and by expedients which compelled them to get along with poorer quality tires. Certainly it is not on its face convincing for Mr. Jeffers to assume that escort vessels and combat aviation must be cut down because no further measures are possible to conserve rubber. If that contention is correct, it should be supported by the Baruch committee. And if it is not supported by the Baruch committee, then the contention should not be advanced.

This controversy gives added point to the argument that the Navy would gain much by carrying on its war against the submarine through a more distinctive organization—through some kind of division or corps within the Navy which had its own known leader and responsible advocates. There is no more critical phase of the war than the fight against the German submarines. In the coming months it is the general expectation that the submarine will make a fierce effort to break down our supply lines to Africa, and it is no secret that the Navy's escort vessels, on which it relies principally, have been delayed because other things have been pushed ahead of them.

If things go poorly in the next months, as they may, and the highest hopes of our offensive are disappointed because the shipping is not sufficient, the Navy will suffer for it. And one of the reasons it will suffer will be that it has waged the war against the submarine silently and anonymously, and in consequence has not had the kind of support it needed when its program came into conflict with other programs. The time has come when the Navy ought to become as aggressive publicly for its rights and its needs in fighting the submarine as the Air Corps is in fighting for its planes and its high octane gas. This is not likely to happen until somebody, as clearly identified in the public mind as any of our other commanders—as Eisenhower, MacArthur, Halsey, Nimitz, Arnold, Spaatz—is made the commander of the submarine war.

How many people in the United States today know anything about Vice Admiral Edwards, or have any notion of his tremendous burdens?

Successful Small Plant Pooling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems confronting the country and the Congress is the situation that presents itself to our small businessmen. Its solution, in whole or in part, offers many difficulties. Inaction will not solve, but only increase, the situation that exists. One of the ways to lessen the effects of the war upon this group of businessmen is to place as many of them as is possible in a position where they can compete with large corporations in obtaining war contracts. I think most persons would support our Government if a reasonable higher price was paid to them for the production of weapons or materials of war—if it is not too high—than is paid to larger corporations, recognizing the fact that the production or operating costs of smaller units is and must be higher than larger units. Too high a cost of production, so I am informed, in individual units of smaller companies or firms is the difficulty.

To help meet this problem and difficulty, the small businessman and local government and organizations of businessmen, as well as the Federal Government, should cooperate.

Recently I read an interesting article appearing in a magazine, and written by Frank J. Taylor, Bringing Small Shops Into War Production, showing what has been accomplished to date in California through a production pool to handle war contracts, and the prominent part played by the son of our distinguished colleague and friend from California [Mr. TOLAN] in the success in California of small concerns in the forming of pools, resulting in the reduction of high operating costs, so that as a pool they were able to compete and obtain war contracts. The importance of this is apparent.

I am extending my remarks on this important subject in the RECORD and including therein the articles mentioned, as well as that pertinent portion of the letter received from the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN], because they might present a thought or an idea to some of the small businessmen of other sections of the country that they can develop and utilize to their advantage.

If the small businessmen of California and of Iowa, which State is also mentioned in one of the articles included in my remarks, can pool their activities and interests and successfully compete for war contracts, it seems to me that small concerns or firms of other sections of the country can do the same thing.

While this might not constitute a complete solution of the problem of what is termed "small businesses," nevertheless, if developed as extensively as it is possible to do so throughout the country, to the extent that pools are formed and succeed in securing contracts, the present plight of the small business group will be improved upon.

As a result of reading that article, I wrote a letter to the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN], seeking further information as to the means employed by his son in forming of pools in California.

I include in my remarks an interesting article written by his son, John H. Tolan, Jr.:

[From California of September 1942]

SUCCESSFUL SMALL PLANT POOLING

(By John H. Tolan, Jr., War Production Board Pooling Specialist)

Through small plant consolidation, some 16 manufacturing groups in California have discovered that they are wanted in Uncle Sam's war production program. They have acquired most of the earmarks of large corporations. They are able to stand side by side with California's largest production plants. They offer to procurement officers of the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission short delivery dates, precision performance, and quick-acting, responsible management.

Today small west coast plants no longer bid against national competition. It is futile for war agencies to place orders with the larger corporations when short deliveries are required. War Production Board Chairman Nelson has a new stop order on plant construction. Now it is plainly up to the small manufacturer in California to sell the Government on the basis of his readily available production.

"Pooling," "mother hen," and "facilities groups" were suggested to the little businessmen over a year ago as a tailor-made cure for their troubles. There were real reasons, it was urged, why 30 large corporations had been awarded 67 percent of all the Army and Navy orders. Following the good old American slogan, "E pluribus unum," many unsuccessful war production associations were formed throughout the Nation. They usually gave the armed services a new reason for dealing with the big fellow.

Obtaining legal clearance for collusive bidding under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, and haphazardly associating a number of small plants met with failure, in most cases, because the member plants forgot that ultimately they would have to sell under terms imposed by the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission. They would have to sell their ability to perform satisfactory manufacturing operations on specific jobs. Too great an emphasis was placed on what the plants wanted to do, and too little emphasis on what the armed services needed to get done.

In California our pools had anticipated that procurement officers were going to meet them only about halfway, and that if any one of a number of objections to dealing with consolidated plants could be maintained, their efforts to get an order would be fruitless. In anticipating these objections, they closely studied Government procurement requirements in negotiating contracts. They knew in advance where the buyer could yield and where he was bound not to act by inflexible military directives.

Associations were formed with particular military needs in mind. Programs were confined to the production of items necessary for the outfitting of troops, the construction of ships, the manufacture of gun and airplane parts. Landing such a contract would insure high priority assistance and repeat orders. The heaviest congressional appropriations were earmarked for the supply of these items on the Pacific coast. Metal and woodworking tool lists were assembled to show clearly the balanced manufacturing facilities and idle capacity.

By August 1, 1942, pooling operations in northern California had resulted in almost complete acceptance. We found a new appreciation by certain procurement officers that in order to get some jobs done expeditiously, organized groups of small shops had become the only answer.

"If you are a small plant with only limited capacity we will try to help you along," they said. "But we will never have available salaried inspectors who can afford to stand by in a plant filling a $5,000 order. In spreading work we prefer to deal with pools."

Pooling in northern California would never have been successful if it had not been for the helpfulness and encouragement given these small plants by the procurement staffs of the United States Army, particularly the Army Engineers, the Chemical Warfare Service, and the Quartermaster Corps at Oakland and at Philadelphia. On July 1, 1942, the Mare Island Navy Yard introduced its newly perfected type C contract, and this contract already has been signed with five approved pools.

When the pool engineer-manager found himself before the right procurement officer, at the right time, and inquiring about the right item, almost invariably the conversation followed the hypothetical pattern shown below. Many hungry California shops today remain in business because they joined with others to work out these answers.

PROCUREMENT OFFICER. My experience is that when you little fellows get together no one is responsible. You can't make up your mind who is going to act and when. If I give you this contract, who's going to be the boss, and to whom can I look for performance?

POOL MANAGER. Before I came here we had already decided which plants were going to do this job. As many of our members as possible submitted figures on each operation. Those with the lowest bids submitted to our board of directors will do this job. Participating shops have named a production committee. They will in turn select a production chief. You will deal with the production chief, and the shops have agreed to accept his decisions, and can appeal only to the production committee if they don't like his orders. In other words, you are only going to deal with the actual shops that are participating on this job—not the entire pool membership.

PROCUREMENT OFFICER. Well, if it is as simple as that, why do you have the reputation of fighting among yourselves?

POOL MANAGER. Reputation, or no reputation, pools are working. Potential internal bickering is always cited as the chief stumbling block for successful consolidation of small business. In actual practice our board of directors can make a quicker decision than a large company can give you a decision out of New York or Chicago, because we know local conditions. We are normally competitors, but the war effort is bigger than our past business history. Majority rules. We'll give you action.

PROCUREMENT OFFICER. I don't see how your members will be able to finance this job. Most of them are doing business in their own name or as partnerships. Reconstruction Finance Corporation regulations for defense loans require that the borrower be a corporation.

POOL MANAGER. We have formed a nonprofit corporation under the State law. We have the power to borrow in the pool name and will arrange with the bank to finance the individual firms.

PROCUREMENT OFFICER. But your corporation has no assets, and it says in the articles that the members are not liable in any way for the debts or liabilities of the corporation. How can you borrow without assets?

POOL MANAGER. We have arranged with our local bank to accept from the plants participating on this job a ratable guaranty for their share of the contract. On the basis of that guaranty the bank will participate with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or obtain an insured loan through the Federal Reserve to purchase materials and provide working capital.

PROCUREMENT OFFICER. Suppose the tool and die shop owner dies insolvent, before he tools you up for this job. We are not requiring a performance bond, but who is going to make good to the pool?

POOL MANAGER. The tool and die shop will hold a subcontract from the pool for his share. We will obtain a performance bond or other surety that he will perform. If he dies, or is unable to meet schedule, we will take the job elsewhere and go against him for the difference in price on his bond.

PROCUREMENT OFFICER. This is a cost-plus job. We require rather rigid accounting procedures, and if the pool can't get reliable costs from the members, you may lose all your profits.

POOL MANAGER. For cost-plus jobs we have figured in our price the cost of employing a local qualified accountant to acquaint all the participating members with the requirements. Our systems will be uniform.

PROCUREMENT OFFICER. Suppose my commanding officer demands a performance bond. There isn't a firm in this list of shops with a bonding capacity to handle the entire bond. Can you supply a performance bond?

POOL MANAGER. While there has been only one instance where such a bond was issued to date, we have discussed performance bonds in the name of the pool with several local companies. A bond has been issued to a pool under the following conditions: If the bond required is $100,000 and five plants are equally involved in the job, each plant executes an indemnity agreement with the bonding company for $20,000. He will be liable for default up to $20,000 whether the default is due to his failure or that of any other member. But, by this arrangement, he does not get involved in the job for any more than his share.

PROCUREMENT OFFICER. This all seems terribly complicated. One of the firms you suggest will take about 40 percent of this job. Why can't we award the contract to him and deal with him instead of the pool?

POOL MANAGER. We worked up the contract as a joint effort. No one can perform without the help of the other shops. However, we are not frozen to any procedure; and if your branch of the service wants to deal with one of the plants, we are ready to cooperate with you and give you the kind of program that is satisfactory to you. We are saving you time and the Government money. You only have to deal with one person to reach 15 to 25 shops. A lead firm will take a profit above the subcontractors. Our nonprofit set-up cuts this added cost of subcontracting and our member plants are not squeezed on the profit they earn by doing the job.

PROCUREMENT OFFICER. I would rather deal with a large corporation because some of our specifications and plans are not definite. Some jobs need engineering and development work.

POOL MANAGER. We are all paying initiation fees and monthly dues to bear the cost of selling our facilities to the Government. If part of that cost is engineering and development work, we can hire it done out of the pool treasury. In several cases we have called upon the chamber of commerce and the city and county to help us get Government contracts into our city. That help has already sent engineers and technical men twice to arsenals in the East.

PROCUREMENT OFFICER. All your members will attempt to go on the market for the scarce materials involved in this job. There aren't going to be carload shipments, and they'll never get delivery in less than carload lots.

POOL MANAGER. We can and do pool our purchases. We have other contracts in our group, and if the priority is the same, we may buy at the same time for both jobs.

PROCUREMENT OFFICER. What about labor supply? I hear that you have lost most of your men to the shipyards.

POOL MANAGER. We are training our shop people for this job and they are donating their time. We are converting their skills to wartime manufacturing. Some of our members not involved on this job are loaning men to their neighbors to get this work out, with the assurance that they will be returned to their home plants when the job is finished.

Those who are closest to the picture would certainly disapprove any unrestrained statement that pooling is a cure-all for idle plant capacity in California. It is a sound and proven method to do a better selling job with the Government, and it provides a new auxiliary technique in bidding for a negotiated contract. Individual small plants have let thousands of jobs go by because they have had trouble in the past showing adequate manpower and available facilities to undertake a heavy production schedule.

Chairman Donald Nelson, of the War Production Board, in August appointed Lou Holland, of Kansas City, as his deputy in charge of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Mr. Holland was the first successful pool operator in the country.

The Pacific coast is an area short of production tools. Remaining idle capacity is scattered in railroad shops, oil fields, mines, and small towns. Administratively the Government can never lead these plants individually by the hand and into war work. Some way must be found to handle their capacity cooperatively and collectively.

An approved war-production association, or pool, can be had by any group of plants that can show production capacity.

Contract status of approved facilities groups in northern California, Aug. 7, 1942—Contracts held in pool name

No.	Name of association	Date War Production Board approval	Prime contracts	Subcontracts
1	San Jose Manufacturers, Inc	Dec. 20, 1941	1	4
2	San Francisco Defense Works, Inc	Jan. 15, 1942	5	----
3	Defense Manufacturing Pool, Inc	Jan. 30, 1942	1	----
4	Kern County War Industries, Inc	Mar. 26, 1942	1	1
5	Yuba-Sutter Defense Works, Inc	Feb. 27, 1942	(1)	----
6	Stockton Coordinated Manufacturers, Inc	Mar. 11, 1942	1	1
7	San Francisco Garment Manufacturers, Inc	Mar. 28, 1942	3	----
8	Monterey Bay Industries, Inc	May 10, 1942	2	1
9	Yolo-Solano Industries, Inc	Apr. 2, 1942	(1)	----
10	Central California War Industries, Inc	May 11, 1942	1	3
11	Oakland War Industries, Inc	May 12, 1942	1	----
12	San Francisco Wood and Metal Workers	May 11, 1942	3	1
13	Associated War Contractors, Inc	June 25, 1942	(1)	----
14	Peninsula War Products, Inc	July 7, 1942	1	----
15	Sacramento War Industries, Inc	July 6, 1942	3	2
16	Lodi United Manufacturers Corporation	Pending	1	----
	Total		24	13

Total pool contracts	37
Total pools with contracts	13
Estimated value of contracts	$22,000,000

[1] No present distress in group, sufficient subcontracts held by individual members.

The total number of plants involved is 254. Total number of employees, 7,331.
All contracts listed in the above table are pool operations and do not include contracts held by individual plants secured on their own initiative, approximating 200.
Individual items manufactured run the range of Army and Navy requirements, from blankets and uniforms to ship and barge sections.

PRODUCTION DIVISION, WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
1355 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, I also include the article hereinbefore mentioned, and written by Frank J. Taylor:

[From the Reader's Digest of January 1943]

BRINGING SMALL SHOPS INTO WAR PRODUCTION

(Condensed from Forbes)

(By Frank J. Taylor)

When the war began to pinch the California town of Lodi (population 11,079) early last spring, Henry Lombardi took stock of his business. His auto truck agency had no trucks to sell. His repair-shop mechanics had been lured away by higher wages in the shipyards. Other shops in town were in the same plight. Almost a thousand good craftsmen had been drained out of Lodi, leaving the community anemic and depressed. Scores of homes were empty, families gone.

The town's best machine shop, with as fine an assortment of machine tools as any small manufacturer could ask, was idle because its workers, and finally its owner, had gone to war plants in the big cities. Without much effort Lombardi persuaded the owner to sign an option to sell the shop.

"Lodi can do something to help win the war," he told his neighbors. "I'm going to San Francisco and get a war contract."

In the small-contracts branch of the War Production Board, fast-talking Lombardi tackled Army, Navy, and civilian procurement officers. All had the same answer, "Your plants are too little." But one War Production Board engineer said, "You'd better see Tolan."

"Who's Tolan?"

"He's a young fellow who was sent to California from Washington to help the little fellows out."

Lombardi repeated Lodi's story to Jack Tolan.

"You ought to have a production pool to handle war contracts," advised Tolan.

"What's a pool?" asked Lombardi.

"A number of plants that consolidate their facilities under Government sponsorship. Such a pool is able to meet the heavy production schedules demanded by even the smallest Government contracts today."

"How about your coming over to help us?" Lombardi asked.

Tolan agreed. Lombardi called a meeting. Every employee in Lodi attended. Tolan explained why the Army and Navy, and large buyers like shipyards and aircraft factories, insist that their contracts be fulfilled by mass production. They lack inspectors to check production on smaller orders, and the goods

must be on time or the war machine will be thrown out of gear. A $10,000 minimum for war contracts is required by the Walsh-Healey Act.

That evening 16 businessmen, including the owners of the town's garages, planing mill, awning store, and machine shops, formed Lodi United Manufacturers, Inc., a pool. Into its treasury each member put $300, and the local manager of the Bank of America promised them $10,000 credit for wages and materials. Now when Lombardi rushed back to San Francisco the Army and Navy buyers, instead of saying, "You're too small," handed him specifications upon which to bid. The pool's first order was for 25,000 carpenters', draftsmen's, and machinists' tool chests for Army engineers.

The work was divided among the cooperative's members best qualified to handle it, and 70 Lodi men and women went into war production. While they worked, Lombardi, the bird dog of the pool, went once more to San Francisco and talked up Lodi's facilities. This time he landed a contract for canvas water bags for Army trucks. Mary Putnam's little awning store had eight idle sewing machines. The staves for the bags were a job for the Enterprise Planing Mill. Hooks and fasteners were right up the alley of the Lodi Precision Manufacturing Co. With Henry Lombardi selling the town, it seemed there was much that Lodi could do to help win the war.

Affable young Jack Tolan, who solved Lodi's war problem, has done the same for 16 other communities in central California. He is the son of Congressman JOHN TOLAN, chairman of the House committee which is studying wartime labor migration. Young Tolan, while secretary of the investigating committee, discovered that workers in town after town in the rural Middle West had abandoned their homes to crowd into defense plant centers. Back in Washington early this year, Jack Tolan learned that the War Production Board had successfully organized pools in medium-sized cities but had not yet scratched the small towns.

"If you'd organize the little towns, you wouldn't have to build so many defense plants and small-town workers could get into the war effort without leaving their homes," insisted Tolan.

"If you know so much about it, why don't you go out and do it?" barked a War Production Board official.

"I will, if you'll let me go to California where I know the towns," replied Tolan.

Arriving in the San Francisco War Production Board offices on January 7, Tolan was told to go ahead. War Production Board engineers were instructed to divert to Tolan "any plant too little to handle a contract alone."

The Lodi production pool is the smallest Tolan has organized. He calls it his "puddle." His first pool was in Stockton, a manufacturing city with 54,000 population. Several plants there were already doing war work. Others, with excellent equipment, were unable to get contracts and faced complete shut-down as priorities shut off supplies for civilian manufacture. Their skilled craftsmen looked toward the shipyards.

Toland had the answer. It was Stockton Coordinated Manufacturers, Inc., a pool authorized to make bids, purchase materials, and divide work among its members, who get the profits. The pool has 20 members, employing 580 craftsmen. Its shops, some of them working three shifts, now turn out incendiary bomb components, wooden truck bodies, sections of tank and landing ships, winches.

In 4 towns on Monterey Bay 2,000 homes were empty and hundreds of valuable machines in shops were idle. Toland met 65 small employers with shops in Santa Cruz, Monterey, Salinas, and Watsonville, and organized the Monterey Bay Industries, Inc. Before long the 32 partners who joined the pool had 550 men working on sections of landing barges and invasion boats, on watertight submarine doors, and pontoons for the Army.

Nearly every shop brought into war production by a pool otherwise faced shut-down for lack of materials. In Fresno—hard hit as San Francisco and Los Angeles drained their skilled workmen from foundries and machine shops—Central California War Industries, Inc., soon had 338 men back at their machines in 25 small plants. In Bakersfield a pool of shops that once serviced the machinery of the oil fields is tooled up to make gun barrels and barge sections. The San Jose pool landed two Army contracts for gun carriages.

Tolan's 17 pools have landed contracts aggregating $24,000,000. This figure represents less than half the total work handled by pool members because many of them, proving what their little shops can do, have now been given primary contracts and are even subcontracting work to other small firms. All jobs are taken on a partnership basis. A pool bids for the job, buys the material, guarantees on-time delivery. Each employer undertakes as much of the contract as he can handle and shares proportionately in the earnings.

Now, because of his outstanding work, Tolan is War Production Board contract specialist for six Western States. Enthusiastic over the possibilities of mobilizing small-town production, the Small Plants Division of the War Production Board is organizing "the sticks" all over the country. Already there are 99 pools in operation, with more than 2,100 members, producing materials to win the war.

"We're getting deliveries from these pools in months' less time than it would take to turn out small orders in overloaded large plants," declared Tolan. "For instance, one of our garment makers' pools just delivered mattress covers 4 months ahead of schedule, and is now starting on nurses' uniforms. There are 700,000 machine tools scattered over the country in small shops, and skilled men who know what each tool will do. In putting a few thousand of them back to work we've just scratched the surface."

Mr. Speaker, in his letter to me, dated January 7, 1943, the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN] said, in part:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. January 7, 1943.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: * * * The idea of pooling was first developed at one of our committee hearings about 2 years ago in St. Louis, Mo. Mr. Holland, presently head of the Small Plants Corporation in Washington, testified at that time before our committee concerning a pooling of 17 small plants in Iowa, by which they were able to get Government contracts. Singly and alone, they were not able to do so. Jack was my secretary at that time and became intrigued with the idea, got himself a position with the War Production Board and is presently in that office in San Francisco and has accomplished 25 pools of small industries on the Pacific coast, under which the pools have obtained about $24,000,000 in war contracts.

I am enclosing herewith an article written by Jack, which explains the pooling idea in detail. He visits different regions on the Pacific coast and helps the small industries to get together and incorporate. I spoke to Donald Nelson about the matter and he is of the opinion that it is one of the finest things in the country to save the small industries. I do not think the idea has caught on as yet on the Atlantic coast, but my personal opinion is that it should be developed at once, for you know as well as I do that small businesses and industries are going down by the thousands. We certainly cannot and must not neglect our home front.

Financing Post-War Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great interest shown by our people in the post-war economy of this country; and in the question of social-security-law revision which has been added to by the President's message to the Congress and the announcement of the Beveridge plan for England, I wish to submit for the RECORD a letter which I have received from Ralph W. Manuel, of Minneapolis. For years Mr. Manuel has been giving a great deal of his time and energy to a study of this important question, and I consider his views worthy of serious thought and study by other students of the questions involved:

THE MARQUETTE NATIONAL
BANK OF MINNEAPOLIS,
Minneapolis, Minn., December 2, 1942.

The Honorable FRED L. CRAWFORD,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CRAWFORD: Your comments suggested by Dr. Alvin Hansen's lecture are very welcome. I, too, am keenly interested in the problem created by our recurring periods of mass unemployment and deep depression. It is a problem which we must face again after the war and, this time, with greater intelligence and more realism.

There is no physical reason why substantially all men and women capable of performing useful service may not have opportunity to participate in the economic process by which we make our living in the world, and thereby to earn the right to their respective shares of the useful goods and services created by that process. Only a dictator can make jobs for everybody, to be sure, but even a democracy can and must provide an economic pattern within which pretty much everybody may find or make a job for himself. Probably no nation without such a pattern can long survive.

As I understand Dr. Hansen's plan for maintaining full employment, it proposes that whenever, for any reason, the participants in the economic process of creating useful goods and services withhold or divert from the current markets a substantial amount of their current money income, and markets begin to shrink and employment to slacken, the Federal Government shall directly or indirectly take into the markets enough money purchasing power to replace the money income which is being withheld or diverted and thus sustain the markets for currently created goods and services, and maintain full employment.

There appear to be numerous rather fundamental objections to the adoption of this plan but, in this letter, I shall discuss only one of them. Where is the money purchasing power which it is proposed that the Government shall take into the markets to come from? Honest money purchasing power is not created by government fiat. In the days of our simple barter economy, goods

and services exchanged for goods and services and everybody knew it. Indeed, goods and services were the only purchasing power for goods and services and everybody understood that, too. What we now call a money economy is only a barter economy implemented by the useful device of money income. Goods and services still exchange for goods and services, though indirectly, but we behave as though we did not know it. Goods and services are still the only primary purchasing power for goods and services but we seem not to understand it.

Money income simply reflects this primary purchasing power. It is generated by the economic process of creating useful goods and services, and is distributed among the participants in that process as wages, salaries, fees, commissions, royalties, rents, interest, dividends, and profits. Money income is the only wholly honest money purchasing power there is, and it is always roughly just enough to buy the whole for-sale product of the economic process at the existing price level. Money income in our private industrial capitalism is primarily a device for implementing the distribution of the common product of our largely collective economic process amongst those who, by their own efforts or by the use of their possessions, called capital, contribute to the creation of that product.

The Government may possess itself of honest money purchasing power with which to carry out Dr. Hansen's plan only by taking it from those who have it. It must take current money income from the participants in the economic process because there is no other source of honest purchasing power. The Government may take this money income either by taxation or by borrowing, but most of the money income so taken would otherwise have been spent or invested by its owners and would thus have been just as effective in sustaining the markets and employment as when channeled through the Treasury. Taking money income from you and me in order that the Government may spend it or invest it to sustain the markets could be effective only to the very slight extent that the money income so taken might happen to be money income which would not otherwise have been spent or invested. Almost all the burden imposed upon current and future taxpayers by this procedure would make no contribution toward the maintenance of full employment, and all of the money income still withheld or diverted from the current markets would remain a dead weight upon the markets and employment. The net extent of market support which such a procedure would provide would be negligible. The main effect of this course of action would be a long step (perhaps one should say another step) toward an arbitrary distribution of the benefits created by the participants in our economic process amongst the whole population, participants and nonparticipants alike.

The Government, instead of taking honest money purchasing power from its owners by the honest process of taxation or borrowing, might create new money either by way of the printing press or by monetizing its own credit through the sale of its bonds to the commercial banking system, and take this rather spurious money into the markets to replace current money income which is being withheld or diverted. This would be money which would not come into the markets otherwise and, therefore, would be temporarily effective in replacing money income which failed to come into the markets in due course. This would not be a sound procedure, however, because this fiat money reflects no primary purchasing power in currently created goods and services, and is not honest money purchasing power. It is only counterfeit purchasing power. This is the sort of thing we do temporarily in a great war emergency, just as we give powerful stimulants temporarily in the crisis of illness, but few will be heard to argue that it would be sound continuing practice.

It would appear that of the two methods of financing Dr. Hansen's program, one is honest and sound but burdensome and ineffective, while the other is temporarily effective but dishonest and unsound, and probably disastrous. If Dr. Hansen's plan contemplated the Government financing its support of the markets by means of a confiscatory tax on hoarded current money income only, I think we would have little reason to quarrel with it. Such a levy, if accompanied by sound reform of our banking process, would be both effective and sound. Automatically, it would provide the Government with roughly just the right amount of money purchasing power.

Perhaps it is hardly fair to propose such a procedure as a means of implementing Dr. Hansen's compensatory device, however, because it seems quite certain that instead of producing revenue to finance the Government's support of the markets, it would do what is vastly more desirable—namely, cause the would-be hoarders to invest their own savings in due course, and thus would largely remove the need for any plan of Government support of the economy. If we knew that we must currently invest that portion of our current money income which we do not choose to spend, or permit the Government to take it—if we knew that we must use it or lose it—we would choose to use it, of course, and the diversion of current money income from the markets into hoarding would cease.

The levy of a confiscatory tax upon that part of each person's current money income which he does not take into the markets currently, or give or lend or trade to others who will take it into the markets in his stead, when accompanied by sound bank reform, becomes, in itself, an effective and wholly honest plan for maintaining full employment.

Since sound banking reform must accompany a confiscatory tax upon current hoarding of money income in order to make it completely effective in maintaining full employment, perhaps I should pause here to make that fact plain.

While diversion of current money income away from the current markets is the principal immediate cause of mass unemployment and deep depression, such diversion is not always diversion into hoarding. It may be diversion into the payment of captal or consumer loans at commercial banks, which act extinguishes the money income without taking any goods or services from the markets. The unsound practice of monetizing capital and consumer credit, like the practice of monetizing Government debt, creates a sort of counterfeit money purchasing power having no honest foundation in primary purchasing power (currently created goods and services), and comes into the markets in addition to current money income (itself sufficient to buy the whole for sale product at the existing price level), creating inflationary distortion of the economy. The subsequent extinguishment of a corresponding amount of money by the diversion of current money income into the payment of these capital and consumer loans creates corresponding deflationary distortion.

Many smart men appear to believe that the continuance of this manifestly unsound practice is justified by the need of such a compensatory device to offset the economic distortions created by hoarding and "dishoarding" money income. This may be true, though little success has thus far been attained in so using it. Thus far this misuse of the banking process has operated rather to magnify the evil effects of hoarding and dishoarding than to minimize them. In fact, this counterfeit purchasing power does not come to the support of the markets in the downswing of the business cycle when it might offset the hoarding of money income, which always takes place at that time, but does come into the markets in the upswing of the cycle, and augments the evil influence of disgorging previously hoarded money income into the current markets. Likewise, the diversion of current money income away from the markets into extinguishment by the payment of capital and consumer loans in commercial banks does not occur in the boom phase when it might offset the inflationary influence of disgorging previously hoarded money income, but does occur in time of depression when it serves only to augment the deflationary influence of hoarding current money income.

There is plenty of room for doubt that this perverse influence exerted by the monetizing and demonetizing of capital and consumer credit can, by any sort of credit control short of dictatorship, be converted into a beneficent influence. At any rate when we have, by the threat of escheat to the Government, prevented the hoarding of current money income, there will be no need to set up artificial, arbitrary, and unsound devices to offset hoarding and dishoarding. All that will be necessary then, and probably all that could be accomplished anyhow, is to prevent market distortions due to the banking process itself—to render the banking process neutral with respect to inflation and deflation. This can be quite readily accomplished by permitting commercial banks to make capital and consumer loans only with the separate saved money income of their depositors. When the even flow of the money income generated by the economic process back through the markets can no longer be interrupted or distorted, either by the disuse of current money income or by misuse of the banking process, we shall have an honest and sound economy in which every man capable of performing useful service can find an opportunity to participate, and can thereby acquire as much of the good things of life as he is willing and able to earn.

This, by the way, would appear to be the very essence of social justice. Attempts of society to provide individuals or groups of individuals with more of the common product of our economic process than corresponds to their contribution to the creation of that product would appear to be social injustice instead of social justice. It is compulsory beneficence on the part of the other participants in the economic process.

This proposal to remove the immediate cause of mass unemployment by the threat of escheat of currently hoarded money income to the Government, accompanied by sound banking reform, is an untried plan, to be sure, and it probably involves many administrative difficulties, but there is much to be said for it, particularly that it definitely would accomplish our purpose, prevent mass unemployment and deep depression, and that it would not be another step in the direction of state socialism. Unlike the many other plans now so eloquently advocated, it would not tend to destroy our free institutions but to preserve them.

It should be noted that the plan involves no political planning, bureaucratic bossing, money manipulation, or economic magic. No policy decisions by Government bureaus, agencies, or officers are required. No discretion must be exercised by those in authority, no unsound money would be brought into being, no public debt would be created, no inescapable tax burden, present or future, would be imposed upon anybody. It is a reversal of trend; a realistic proposal to remove the economic distortion which creates mass unemployment instead of the artificial and dubious procedure of creating new distortions to offset the one from which we suffer.

This is a radical remedy comparable to a major operation, to be sure, but the disease is a malignant one which threatens the very existence of our free economy and, perhaps,

even the survival of our democracy. Time was when we simply endured these periodic debacles with patience and fortitude as though they were God's discipline. More recently we have tried all sorts of appeasement, amelioration, alleviation, pump priming, boot-strap lifting, confidence games, and faith cures. All have proved useless or inadequate. Now the situation becomes desperate. Before the next downswing begins (the time may be shorter than we think) something adequate must be done. Shall we remove the root of this cancer by surgery or shall we put our faith in magic?

Yours very truly,

RALPH W. MANUEL.

The Training of American Youth for Ground Aviation by the National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I hold no brief for the National Youth Administration, nor for the apparent waste, extravagance, and all-out-of-proportion number of employees that have been carried on its pay rolls as compared with the number of trainees. In fact, I have repeatedly expressed my opposition to certain phases of the National Youth Administration program.

However, I know of my own knowledge that the ground aviation center of the National Youth Administration, located opposite Stewart Airfield, near Newburgh, N. Y., is doing a fine job training young men from 17 upward as airplane mechanics, and some of them, according to reports, as qualified flying cadets.

Both our Army and Navy are in need of skilled mechanics, as are our war industries, and I am in favor of this phase of training American youth, under the National Youth Administration program, as aviation mechanics either for our armed forces or for employment in our war factories.

In accordance with permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newburgh News, Newburgh, N. Y., of December 23, 1942, which endorses the record made in the ground aviation center of the National Youth Administration near Newburgh in turning out trainees who are badly needed by the aviation branch of our armed forces and also in our war factories:

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION CENTER TURNING 'EM OUT

Ground aviation center of National Youth Administration, Richard S. Wallach, director, located on Cochecton Turnpike, at Stewart Field, is making a proud record in training boys for ground and sky duty in the flying forces of Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. So exceptional is the training that nine trainees in a class being graduated tonight have been accepted outright as flying cadets.

Six others have been taken by the Navy as ground mechanics, and nine are going to the Rome supply depot because they are under age and will receive additional experience before entering the armed forces.

All the rest of the 63 graduating trainees will seek induction into the armed forces and will be readily accepted, because they have had the preliminary training which makes them valuable in maintaining and flying warships of the air.

It is a far cry back to the early days of the National Youth Administration when youths were received on basis of family needs and were put to work at various projects, with their training for jobs the main objective.

National Youth Administration is now geared 100 percent to the war effort. The training it gives relieves Army and Navy of much preliminary work. Both these forces keep an eye on the Stewart Field center and vie with each other in getting the more promising lads.

Federal officials who have visited the center are warm in their praise of the instruction being given. Shop work is practical and calculated to afford trainees a certain future in the aviation branches of the services.

Nomination of Edward J. Flynn To Be Minister to Australia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the remarks made by Earl Godwin, radio commentator, on January 15, 1943, over the Blue Network, dealing with the nomination of Mr. Flynn to be Minister to Australia.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Next week there will be a thumping big open hearing on the charges that Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, brings against Eddie Flynn, nominated Minister to Australia.

And now that the Bridges charges against Flynn have been aired, printed, and headlined, let me take the other side and relate to you some of the reasons why the President chose Mr. Flynn to be minister to a country with whom we Americans are growing into closer and friendlier relations.

Mr. Flynn is an educated gentleman with a charming personality. He is diplomatic. He can be as close-mouthed as any man and rarely says the wrong thing. He is a natural-born politician, which is a natural development under a democracy and in this Republic. To those who can't abide politics let me remind you that in this country at this moment one must first be a politician before one can stick it out long enough to be a statesman.

In the Bronx, Flynn was closer to the Tammany organization than the Brooklyn boys. Flynn became a Roosevelt man early in the game. In all the years leading up to the Mayor Walker debacle Flynn is said by Democrats here to have kept his bailiwick pretty clean. Goodness knows big-city politics has dirt around the edges at its best, and there are a lot of folks who will tell you with considerable authority that New York politics have not been as corrupt and dirty as the politics of many another city.

I just recall now that Flynn made a speech on politics at the University of North Carolina. The American political system was his general topic. He frankly stated, in effect, that loyal party workers should be rewarded. As long as we have the two-party system, Flynn believes the party workers should be rewarded. That, of course, is nothing new. Andrew Jackson is commonly believe to have made the statement, "To the victors belong the spoils," but I think it is more nearly correct to say that Senator Marcy, of New York, dropped that statement into the mill of history.

The thing which will live long after Flynn's constructive deeds have been forgotten is the so-called scandal of the paving blocks. Someone found out or charged that the courtyard to the rich Flynn estate had been paved with blocks that belonged to New York City, and that New York labor laid the blocks. Flynn is a well-to-do gentleman who didn't need to steal paving blocks and his friends say someone put something over on him as a misdirected favor. As to the other charge by Senator BRIDGES that Flynn had a noted criminal on his staff as deputy sheriff, I have not found anyone in Washington so far who can explain or answer that statement. And so I let that ride. Next week there will probably be a perfect hailstorm of charges and criticism against this well-mannered and well-educated gentleman. Tonight, in the interest of fairness, I present an independent side to the case.

Contribution of the Average Citizen to Winning the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. James W. Shoemaker, secretary of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, of Charleston, Ill.

I ask that this letter be printed because it represents a cross-section of country which is representative of our people. The Eastern Illinois Normal School, which is charged with the education of the teachers of that section of the State, is located in Charleston. It is one of the charming cities of Illinois in which retired farmers, active business and professional men, artisans, and the ordinary citizen live. The letter is temperate in tone, and presents a sentiment which might well be taken to heart by the organizations which are drafting the complex regulations under which our people must live. I hope that it will receive the attention which I believe it merits.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLESTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Charleston, Ill., December 31, 1942.
The Honorable C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BROOKS: You have visited our community. You know us and our neighbors—small business and professional men—the self-respecting little people—the ones so often accused of complacency, of indifference, of failure to understand the problems which war has brought to us.

We are weary of these accusations. On our public square is a board bearing the names of our men in military service. The vast majority went as volunteers. Everyone in our community has some direct or collateral interest in one or more names on that board. The board is lightly dotted with gold stars now; we expect that sprinkling will grow, but we have no interest in seeing it expand.

As a community, we've hit no jackpot in this war; we have neither great nor small war industries. Because of that many of our people have gone elsewhere. We certainly make no complaint about lack of material gain from this conflict. Our community has exceeded its quota in War bond purchases and willingly assumed its share of taxation.

We believe many of the accusations leveled at us rise from the fact that we are still people of independent thought. We may be little people but not necessarily people of little intelligence. We have not blindly followed every Washington proposal made in the name of war winning. To follow blindly implies an absolute faith in and respect for the opinion of those who propose. If we lack that complete and unquestioning confidence, we are not to blame.

Some proposals recently made would accelerate the much advertised destruction of Main Street business. We believe it is important to the war effort that Main Street business survive; we believe it is both reasonable and possible for our little economy to live in a war economy. Apparently, all Washington officialdom does not agree with us.

Not long ago we saw the text of an address which Mr. Randolph Paul, general counsel of the Treasury, made before the American Academy of Political and Social Science on November 30. We assume that Mr. Paul's speech reflects the thinking of the Treasury and is not merely an expression of personal views. Doubtless you are familiar with this speech or with the trend of thought it represents.

In his address, Mr. Paul states that the Nation will have an income of $110,000,000,000 in 1943—that in 1943, goods and services available to civilians, will be so restricted that an inflationary gap of some $40,000,000,000 will be generated.

On the basis of these estimates, Mr. Paul proposes to close the gap by the restriction of spending. He would prevent spending, beyond a bare minimum for the necessities of life, by penalizing the spender through a medium of progressive taxation. Apparently this is not a case of the Treasury seeking a new source of revenue, but a resort to punitive taxation to achieve a predetermined end—regulation for regulation's sake.

We are alive to the dangers of inflation. We believe the curbs so far imposed are vital and we submit to them gladly. If we have complained, it is because the inflation curbs failed to apply, or were gingerly applied, to all elements of production alike, and because the complexity of the regulations appear to defeat their purpose. Imagine the difficulties the 1-man proprietor of a country store faces in understanding and complying with 11,000,000 words of Office of Price Administration regulations. Much of those 11,000,000 words apply to him, and the Office of Price Administration is only one regulatory body with which he must deal. Incidentally, he must try to run a business whose problems are increasingly difficult.

As we said, we are aware of the dangers of inflation to us individually and collectively. We are equally aware of the implications in Mr. Paul's proposal, and we believe these proposals threaten Main Street business as grimly as inflation.

We believe controls exist for curbing inflation—if such controls are properly exercised. We believe existing controls can keep the inflationary gap within bounds—a gap whose size must necessarily be a matter of pure conjecture.

We are anxious—and abundantly willing—to make any needed sacrifice or contribution to the task of winning this war but we suspect that at times the war effort is used to cloak objectives which are not at all concerned with the war and its winning. We believe regulation for regulation's sake in wartime is a brake on and not a help to the war effort.

We have every legitimate right, we think, to protest those proposals which threaten the destruction of us little people and handicap the war effort.

Individually, or in tiny groups such as this chamber of commerce, we are inconsequential, but in the aggregate we represent a formidable force in the war effort. We believe our liquidation would materially weaken that effort.

We believe you are sympathetic with the viewpoint which we respectfully submit to you in this letter.

Very truly yours,
JAMES W. SHOEMAKER,
Secretary, Charleston
Chamber of Commerce.

Expansion of Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a number of editorials in support of an expanded program for social security.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of January 4, 1943]

POST-WAR SECURITY

Immediate expansion of the social security program is being urged by Arthur J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board, on the ground that a well-rounded system would cushion the shock of post-war readjustment. Of course, Mr. Altmeyer's suggestions for rounding out and extending the existing system are not war-inspired. When compulsory Federal old-age insurance and Federal-State compulsory unemployment insurance systems were introduced some years ago, it was generally understood that certain wide gaps in the protective system would eventually be filled in and other changes made in the light of experience.

Enough time has now elapsed to enable the authorities to take on new administrative tasks, such as extending old-age insurance coverage to farm labor and domestic service and providing new types of insurance to cover sickness and disability. There is no doubt, furthermore, that many of the State systems of unemployment insurance are inadequate and that there is need for greater uniformity of unemployment benefits. The immediate question at issue, therefore, does not concern the patent merits of Mr. Altmeyer's recommendations but rather their timeliness.

Unfortunately, proposals for extending social insurance have been linked by President Roosevelt and Secretary Morgenthau with recommendations for increasing pay-roll levies as a means of combating wartime inflation. The Post has consistently taken the position that pay-roll levies should not be deliberately increased for such ulterior purposes. However, if increases in such payments bear a rational relationship to increased benefits, there is much to be said for expanding the social-insurance program at a time when employment is supernormal and pay rolls tremendously inflated.

Contributions made under such conditions will, from the viewpoint of wage earners, provide a reserve against the rainy days that will inevitably be the lot of thousands of displaced war workers in the years ahead. The people rightly expect systematic provision to be made for dealing with such cases. And they are opposed to having that provision take the form of charity or spasmodic handouts. Insurance benefits financed by contributions of wage earners and roughly adjusted to meet varying needs best satisfy the unpredictable requirements of the future and provide the kind of aid that does not impair self-respect. For these reasons Mr. Altmeyer's appeal should be given sympathetic consideration by Congress.

[From the Washington Post of January 8, 1943]

SOCIAL INSURANCE SHOULD BE EXPANDED AND IMPROVED

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

For several weeks we have been hearing about an "American Beveridge plan." There is no need to borrow a British tagline for the studies of social security which have been under way in the American Government for some time.

The Beveridge report goes back to June 1941. Then Sir William Beveridge accepted the chairmanship of an interdepartmental committee of the British Government to survey existing schemes of social insurance and allied services. His report, submitted in November 1942, is not a plan for postwar reconstruction. It is not an over-all economic, social, and fiscal program. There is nothing revolutionary or even startling about it. It makes recommendations for expanding, consolidating, and otherwise improving the British social insurance and public assistance system. This system is already more comprehensive than ours, but it is in some respects a patchwork. It has some holes and many of the benefits are too low to provide the essential minimum of security against the principal hazards of life. The Beveridge plan would consolidate the various British insurance systems into a single system providing insurance for a worker and his family against interruption and destruction of earning power, for old age, and for special expenditures arising at birth, marriage, or death. The plan is admirable in its comprehensiveness, but the benefits proposed, although as a rule higher than the present benefits now paid in Great Britain, are not large enough to thrill an American. With our productivity we can afford a more liberal system of social insurance and allied services than Beveridge has proposed for Great Britain.

There are two sets of studies or proposals issuing from the American Government which have been referred to loosely and rather misleadingly as an American Bever-

idge Plan. First are the long-standing proposals of the Social Security Board for rounding out our own system of social insurance and public assistance. These are not new. In part they are the missing pieces of the original social insurance program of 1935. In part they are improvements and extensions in the existing system.

Then there is a second study completed a few months ago by the National Resources Planning Board, a planning agency responsible to the President. This study was begun in 1939, 2 years before Beveridge went to work. It is a review and analysis of our experience during the last 10 years with social insurance, relief, public works and related subjects, with proposals concerning future policy. It is, therefore, more comprehensive than the Beveridge report.

Social insurance is not a substitute for full employment. It depends upon at least a fairly high level of employment and productivity over the long run. Only one phase of social insurance, as we now have it or as anyone now proposes to have it, is an insurance against unemployment for an able-bodied worker. That is unemployment compensation. This provides limited benefits for a limited period. It is a cushion for a period of temporary unemployment. All the other divisions of social insurance are insurance against hazards to which all workers are subject, even in periods of full employment—against the death or disablement of a wage earner before his family has been reared, against temporary loss of earning power due to illness, against hospital and doctors' bills, and against old age.

Social insurance is not a barrier to an economic depression or to a general inflation. But it can be managed so as to even off somewhat the economic peaks and valleys. When employment is high and at good wages, social-security taxes can be increased and reserves piled up. When depressions set in, the taxes can be lowered and the reserves drawn upon. Right now, when there is an immense excess of purchasing power over the total of goods and services available, is the proper time to increase social-security taxes and pile up reserves. These can be piled up not only for the general social-insurance program but for special unemployment compensation payments to cover the post-war reconversion to civilian production.

Thus, from the viewpoint of sound finance and economics now, and looking ahead to the next several years, this is a most appropriate time for Congress to expand and improve the social-insurance program. There are other good reasons for acting now. It probably would make a lot of prudent people feel better, without in any way interfering with the prosecution of the war. It might reassure many citizens at home who cling tenaciously to social gains, such as the 40-hour week, which should be suspended for the duration of the war, and would be a demonstration of confidence in our own future which would have propaganda value abroad.

[From the Chicago Sun of December 28, 1942]

SECURITY IS NONPARTISAN

The new Congress will face a challenge of the first order when it considers a proposal for liberalization and extension of the social-security program. President Roosevelt announced in his Budget message of last January that such a proposal would be offered in 1943. Congress turned down his request for immediate increase of pay-roll deductions then for a variety of reasons. But there will be no excuse for rejecting the liberalization program itself, except hostility to the fundamental idea of social security.

We know of no better way for the new Congress to show that it comprehends the needs of today's world—and tomorrow's—than to declare itself in favor of social security. That would lift the program above party politics and make it a part of established national policy.

There was a time when society considered as none of its concern what happened to individuals who lost their jobs, grew too old to work, suffered injury or illness, or became dependent on others for support.

Those were the individual's problems, we said; let each look out for himself. It is still true that the primary obligation rests on the individual. Yet we have learned that under the conditions of modern life the multiplication of individual distress produces social crises so acute that they cannot be ignored. It is elemental prudence to prevent the occurrence of those crises so far as we can. Society, as well as the individual, has a stake in providing against the loss of income caused by unemployment, illness, accident, or old age. For the preservation of democracy and of an economic system based on private initiative, we would be blind not to insure ourselves against the social injustice and social upheavals which might sweep both away.

Whatever party or coalition is in power, these principles cannot be gainsaid. Let the new Congress recognize them and it will extend old-age insurance to farm and domestic workers and otherwise liberalize and strengthen the security program.

The Victory Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Alabama Baptist of January 7, 1943, dealing with the Victory tax.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCERNING THE VICTORY TAX

A provision of the act entitled "The Victory Tax" is that every American who gets a wage or salary above $12 a week or $624 annually shall be taxed a flat 5 percent for all salaries or wages above that amount. There are certain exceptions as in the case of domestic servants or farm laborers, but the exceptions do not come within the purview of what is now to be said. This 5-percent tax upon all citizens who have an income above $624 a year is in addition to the surtaxes which will be levied on those who have larger incomes. The levy has been extended to reach about 23,000,000 citizens who hitherto have paid no income tax at all and the levy is supposed to yield about $2,000,000,000. All the people who pay this tax will thereby be made better citizens, for they will feel that they have some part in the victory which must be won and the tax each one pays will help bring about that victory.

It should be remembered that this is an "over-all tax" levied upon all people alike, but it was enacted by the Congress primarily for business and commercial agencies, for corporations, and the great munition plants which employ millions of men. A provision of the levy is that the tax be taken out at its source. That is to say that all who are paid more than $12 a week, or $624 a year, will have the tax deducted by the agency which employs them weekly or monthly, as the case may be.

Doubtless the churches and religious institutions never once entered into the minds of those who enacted the levy, but whether this is true or not there was certainly no intention on the part of the Government to encroach upon the matter of religious freedom or the separation of church and state, and if there was no such intent, this should go far to relieve what some consider an embarrassing situation.

In some quarters the Baptists are objecting not to this tax, but to the method of collecting it. They object to making the churches and religious institutions agencies for the Government in collecting the tax with severe penalties attached in case they do not do it. This seems notably to be true in Texas, Kentucky, and Maryland. The Texas State Baptist Convention adopted strong resolutions against the tax on the ground that the collection of the tax at its source, in the case of the churches and religious institutions, contravenes the Bill of Rights. As we understand, representatives from Maryland and Kentucky brought a memorial to the executive committee of the Southern Baptist Convention at its recent meeting in Nashville. The matter was discussed by the committee but was finally referred to the committee on public relations. This latter committee, it will be understood, exists under the aegis of the northern and southern conventions and the national (Negro) convention, but, of course, neither the executive committee nor the committee on public relations have any authority in the premise and neither could do other than act in an advisory capacity.

In our judgment this matter in no wise contravenes the Bill of Rights. That Bill grew out of the conviction on the part of the founders of this Republic that the Government should not foster or support one church in preference to another as had been done in colonial America until the Established Church (Church of England set up in Virginia) was overthrown. Prior to that time the Government fostered that church in preference to others. But the provisions of the Victory tax in no way favors one church in preference to another. Instead of that, it is a tax alike upon the people of every faith and of no faith and, as we see it, in no wise comes within the purview of the Bill of Rights.

The penalties attached to the bill, in case the tax is not collected at its source, in the thinking of some, smacks of coercion of the churches and religious institutions on the part of the Government. But in a time of dire national peril why shouldn't the churches and religious institutions assist the Government in collecting a tax which is imposed upon all the people without regard to church affiliation. Hundreds of churches throughout the Southern Baptist Convention and many of them in Alabama are assisting the Government in buying War bonds and in turn the bonds which bear interest are of financial assistance to the churches.

We think with reference to this matter, as with many others which come up in the course of human events, that purpose and intent should be taken into consideration and if this is done it helps to clarify many things. And we do not believe that in the case of this Victory tax there was any intent on the part of the Congress to encroach either upon the matter of religious freedom or the separation of church and state. For how could either the Congress or Government do that when the present war is actually being fought to preserve the freedom of religion along with our other freedoms and rights? Therefore, we, for one, hope that the Baptists shall get by this difficulty in this time of national peril without embarrassment either to the Government or to the churches.

Forward America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I send to the desk excerpts from an address delivered by me, and ask that they be included in the Appendix of the RECORD. This address was to the Traffic Club of Chicago at their Forward America dinner, in the grand ballroom of the Palmer House, Chicago, Thursday evening, January 14.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The sharp outlines of the story of the famous ride of Paul Revere from Lexington to Concord have dimmed under the erosion of time. His was a mission of transporting the news to the forces of the New World of the approaching army of the Old World, sent here with equipment and gold, to beat or buy up the forces of rebellion out of which a new civilization was to be formed.

The story of the heroic trek of the covered wagons across the mountains, through the streams, to push and build westward this new civilization has become less distinct through the passing years, giving way to the appearance of the freight train and then the truck.

The danger and romance of the pony express passed into distance with the appearance of more modern facilities.

The building of the transcontinental railroad was the marvel of another day. The slow-moving tug and barge of lake and canal and the side-wheeler steamboat that carried life, entertainment, and freight up and down the Mississippi, seem far off in the present day, filled with stories of the dash and daring of the modern PT boat.

The modern motorcar running 60 miles an hour over wide ribbons of cement across an entire continent was a new experience of only yesterday. The fast, comfortable, streamlined trains, speeding by night and by day, are slow compared with the speed of the modern transcontinental airplane. They, too, lose their glamour in the presence of the globe-girdling clippers, and even they move back in the presence of the stratoliner. Each one has played, however, a brilliant and significant part in the building of a civilization and a transportation industry of which you are a proud and important part.

If you want to see a monument to the American transportation system, look around. Every factory, every mile of steel track or cement through or over the mountains, every bridge across the streams, every airport, every thriving city, every prosperous community, every happy countryside are the product of our American transportation system, and they constitute living monuments to American transportation as developed by the ingenious mind and the restless, heaving energy of free Americans. They are the product of free private enterprise, envisioned and created by free men, operating under a system of government with written guaranties of individual human rights.

Yesterday we led the world in peacetime transportation. We were a nation rolling on or propelled by wheels. We produced and used more wheels than any nation on earth. We had the finest railroads, the finest highways, more trains, trucks, and automobiles than any other country. We had developed the finest civilian aviation system in the universe.

Today we transform this transportation system into the action of war. Our trains, our planes, our automobiles and trucks, our barges and boats move American resources and our gallant armed forces by sea, by land and air to make the world unsafe for tyranny.

The great transportation system and industry of America is now devoted and dedicated to war and to victory, so that we may have a better and a happier world in which to live and move forward, where responsible men of integrity may work out an enduring peace, a peace in which our ships, trains, planes, and trucks may be transformed from temporary instruments of destruction to permanent instruments of common good and help weave a finer pattern of man's humanity to man.

Our American transportation system and industry that has been the bloodstream of the finest peacetime civilization known to man must now be the pipe line of terror in war and then reach out in peace again to continue our American progress, to develop our American civilization and American security, plus aid in the building of a greater fellowship among the men of the earth.

You, gentlemen, and your transportation industry, like all Americans, must now stand the crucial test of trial by battle. You, the men, the means, and the method of modern American transportation must push, pull, and propel hundreds of millions of tons of food, material, and military supplies, by night and day, across the continent, across the sea to the desert, to the swamp, to and over the mountains, to supply the battle front and the home front as well.

The rails and the trains, the cement and the trucks, the hulls and the propellers, the wings and the motors, the men and their nervous systems, must measure up now as never before and carry burdens never contemplated, but caused by the grim strain and cruel realities and necessities of war. You have been the longest and most regulated industry in America. You will, no doubt, submit to additional pressure, burden, and restriction of war necessity to serve your country. You must do it so well that you will continue, as you have in the past, to be a leading part and standard bearer of private enterprise in America.

The gallantry of our soldiers at the front, the miraculous endeavor of our production lines at home, the morale and stamina of our whole people, will write new pages of glory and accomplishment of freemen. But the raw material must be transported from the mine, from the field, the forest, and the factory to the production line and then to the fighting line.

Your achievement, past and present, in peace and war, has earned for you the gratitude and admiration of all America. Upon your achievement now and in the future rests the success of our armed forces, the health and safety of our civilian population, and in a large measure the hope of the entire civilized world.

Good luck, gentlemen.

Great Grandmother Third Generation of War Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Greenfield (Mass.) Recorder-Gazette of Saturday, January 9, 1943:

GREAT-GRANDMOTHER THIRD GENERATION OF WAR WORKERS

The entrance of Mrs. Flora Kalldian, 58, of 146 Davis Street, into defense work completes what is believed to be the first trio of county women representing three generations of one family engaged in war work.

Mother of 5 children, grandmother of 25, and great-grandmother of 6, this intrepid matriarch began work this week as caretaker in plant 1 of the G. T. D.

She is a former chef and was in charge of kitchens in hotels and many other organizations. She has three grandsons in service and feels it is only her part to work along with them.

Her daughter, Mrs. Bertram Blinn, 41, of Davis Street, is employed at the same plant as an inspector, while her granddaughter, Mrs. Adelard LaPointe, 22, of 62 Lincoln Street, is employed as a gage lapper at plant 2.

Nobody's Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Nobody's Business," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

NOBODY'S BUSINESS

While the Axis is exaggerating our losses in the submarine war, our own reports are concealing the seriousness of our losses. If the whole picture, stripped of statistical finagling, were disclosed, we should wake up with a start to a realization that the German submarine is now our most deadly opponent.

The facts cannot be printed. But it may be said that we have lost and are continuing to lose so many cargo ships, tankers, and transports that everywhere—in North Africa, in New Guinea, and the Solomons, on the vitally important Burmese front—we are like a man fighting with one hand tied behind his back. Eventually we shall win the war anyway. But eventually is not soon enough. It is quite possible that the German submarines can soften our blows enough to prolong the war in Europe for an extra year. If they do, it may well mean that the Japanese will gain the time to exploit their conquests while our indispensable Chinese, Russian, and British allies will be suffering from the cumulative strain of an additional year of war.

It may be said that in 1942 the submarines sank more ships than our shipyards, with all their miraculous achievement, were able to launch. Moreover, the German submarine navy is today larger than it has ever been. New submarines are being built very much faster than we are destroying them. The newer submarines are increasingly formidable. Strategically and tactically the Germans are always several jumps ahead of us.

There is no prospect now of our having enough escorts to deal with them until the end of this year. Even this prospect is at present dubious.

If these general statements could be supported with the actual figures and with maps showing where the sinkings occur, everyone would appreciate the extreme gravity of the situation.

Yet the problem is soluble. We know it is soluble because whenever we decide that a convoy must go through we can organize its protection and push it through. The solution depends upon two things: one, upon enough escorts, planes, and other material equipment, manned by trained personnel; and, two, upon setting up the command and an adequate general staff to wage a sustained, coordinated campaign from North and South America, from the British Isles and from Africa.

Our shortage of equipment was due initially to lack of foresight in the Navy Department. After that had been remedied, as it was about a year ago, and after the Navy had adopted a good program, the production of the necessary ships and equipment has been set back at least twice and perhaps oftener because other things got a higher priority. We have lost perhaps as much as 9 months time. On the basis of recent sinkings of inadequately escorted convoys, this means something near the destruction of the equivalent of our current output of cargo ships, and yet the Navy is still not assured of the backing of the rest of the Government. In the present controversy over synthetic rubber, there is grave danger that the escort ships will once again be set back. If they are set back, it will be because Mr. Nelson and Mr. Jeffers are more impressed with the civilian demand for rubber tires than with the paramount importance of fighting the submarine.

The Navy is set back in this controversy because the Navy has yet to make the administration and the country aware of the seriousness of this business. That is at bottom the Navy's own fault; if the Navy would organize an adequate command and staff to conduct this complicated war of all arms as a combined operation with our allies, it would at the same time possess the organization capable of making its case effectively with Mr. Nelson, Mr. Jeffers, the Congress, and the country.

Although the Atlantic is one ocean, and the German submarines are under one strategical command, there is nothing on our side which corresponds to the situation. Theoretically, of course, the American effort is all headed up in Admiral King. In fact, the antisubmarine war is carried on by a loose conglomeration of several naval services and of the Army Air Force, partially but not firmly coordinated with several Canadian and British services. But as the Atlantic is one ocean, as ships have to cross it, the case for unity of command and a combined operating staff would seem to be compelling.

It is most probable that no radical improvement can be expected if we rely upon negotiations between our admirals and our generals and upon their negotiations with the admirals and air marshals of our allies. In this respect, the situation today has many resemblances to 1917 when the war might have been lost if Mr. Lloyd George and the war cabinet had not intervened at the Admiralty.

It would be well if the President would reread today Lloyd George's War Memoirs, volume III, beginning page 1129, and also Victory at Sea by Admiral Sims. These will remind him, for he himself played a distinguished part in the matter, that without any reflection upon the admirals, a situation of this kind needs the strong hand of a powerful civilian to set it in order. There is no civilian today who has the authority to make it his one and only business to get the campaign organized and commanded. A civilian is needed because the hierarchy of rank, the jealousy of the services, and the stand-offishness of the professionals on both sides of the Atlantic have to be tactfully but firmly mastered.

Mr. Lloyd George tells us in his Memoirs how it became necessary for him to transfer Sir Edward Carson from the post of First Lord of the Admiralty in order to put through the necessary reform. "Someone was needed at the head of the Admiralty," he says, "with a greater reserve of vitality, more resource, and greater mastery of detail." Carson, he tells us, never got the views of the younger naval officers because he felt that this would "imply distrust of his colleagues and therefore a professional disloyalty. He therefore availed himself of the advice of the acknowledged Admiralty chiefs." The Prime Minister, on the other hand, felt the need of a man who felt that no "rule of honor or etiquette" prevented him "from sending for any person either inside or outside his office, whatever his rank, to seek enlightenment on any subject affecting his administration."

There is now needed in the administration a strong civilian with vitality, resource, and mastery of detail to see that this campaign is pulled together and stepped up. Secretary Knox cannot do it, and has plenty of other useful things to do. But until there is somebody who makes this campaign his business, it will falter because what is everybody's business is nobody's business.

Employment of War Production Board Dollar-a-Year Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum issued by the Food Distribution Administration of the Department of Agriculture entitled "Director's Memorandum No. 39. Policy on the Employment of W. P. B. Dollar-a-Year Personnel Transferred to the Food Distribution Administration."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In connection with the transfer of the War Production Board personnel under the Executive Order 9280, questions have arisen concerning the assignment of transferees, who include some 43 persons who have been employed in the War Production Board on a dollar-a-year basis. Accordingly, the following policies are outlined:

1. No one shall be employed in the Food Distribution Administration on a dollar-a-year basis of compensation.

2. All deputy directors and chiefs of branches of the Food Distribution Administration shall be full-time, paid employees of the Government.

3. All persons having procurement functions in the Food Distribution Administration shall be full-time, paid employees of the Government.

4. All persons administering any orders in the Food Distribution Administration series shall be full-time, paid employees of the Government.

5. Those persons employed on a dollar-a-year basis as they are transferred into the Food Distribution Administration, shall be invited to accept positions as full-time, paid employees of the Government, ceasing entirely to receive compensation from a private corporation or similar enterprise.

6. If they feel that this involves a sacrifice which they are unwilling to make financially or otherwise but wish to contribute their time and broad experience to their Government in wartime, they shall be assigned to a consultants panel without compensation. The consultants panel as such shall have no administrative responsibility or authority.

7. Personnel from such consultants panel shall be available as consultants to any deputy director or branch chief to perform duties as a consultant under their personal direction.

8. In order that their status as consultants without administrative responsibility or authority shall be entirely clear and to protect them as well as those executives utilizing their services from any misinterpretation of their status and function, it shall be clear in all instances that:

(a) No person who is serving without compensation as a consultant shall participate in making any determination directly affecting the affairs of the firm or company in which he is employed.

(b) The services of such persons shall be utilized as a consultant in connection with problems which require special business or technical knowledge and experience; for other work, we will employ paid personnel.

(c) Any person whose services are utilized as a consultant without compensation shall be subject to the same supervision and direction as regular, salaried employees and are expected to observe established policies and regulations.

The Place of Farmer-Owned and Farmer-Controlled Cooperatives in the National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a declaration made by the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, adopted by the executive committee of the National Council on January 6, 1943, entitled "The Place of Farmer-Owned and Farmer-Controlled Cooperatives in the National Economy." This is very timely and should be read with a great deal of interest by the Members of Congress. It follows:

The national interest demands that farmer-owned and farmer-controlled nonprofit cooperatives be accorded effective consideration because they have gained experience in accomplishing for years the very objectives now required of Government war agencies. Being agencies regarded by the Congress as highly important to farmers for the best development of their contribution to the national economy, farmer cooperative marketing and purchasing associations must more than ever be preserved and strengthened. The maximum effectiveness of our farmers is recognized as indispensable to the war and post-war effort—both because the United Nations' program rests on the production of these farms and because the industry, initiative and devotion to responsibilities of

American farmers dramatizes as nothing else can the cause which Americans defend.

Such cooperatives are skilled in getting farm products from farm production into consumption expeditiously and at low cost in terms of precious manpower and materials. They enable farmers to secure supplies of the most effective sort in the same manner. They are organized to contact scattered producers quickly and intimately for prompt and needed action.

In time of peace such facilities are highly desirable. In the successful prosecution of an all-out war, they are absolutely essential. Being a part of the farm enterprise they occupy a different place as links between the farm and market than distribution agencies established to serve for profit in the chain of distribution.

It is appropriate to emphasize that on June 15, 1929, the Congress enacted that:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote the effective merchandising of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, so that the industry of agriculture will be placed on a basis of economic equality with other industries, and to that end to protect, control, and stabilize the currents of interstate and foreign commerce in the marketing of agricultural commodities and their food products * * * by encouraging the organization of producers into effective associations or corporations under their own control for greater unity of effort in maketing and by promoting the establishment and financing of a farm-marketing system of producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations and other agencies."

Subsequently, on June 3, 1935 (Farm Credit Act of 1935), the Congress included farmer-owned and farmer-controlled nonprofit cooperative purchasing associations with such marketing associations.

Recognizing this national policy and the opportunities it affords toward the successful prosecution of the war, those responsible for the administration of this Nation's war effort must see to it that all programs dealing with farmers and farm products specifically take these facts into account and specifically direct their agents throughout the country to do likewise.

Your committee recommends that these facts be promptly brought and kept before the attention of the keymen our executive secretary shall select, preferably with, but if necessary without, the support of the other national farm organizations.

How We Can Meet War Debts—And Live Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the Vice President entitled "How We Can Meet War Debts—And Live Better," which appeared in PM's daily picture magazine of January 18, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW WE CAN MEET WAR DEBTS—AND LIVE BETTER

(By HENRY A. WALLACE)

I am happy to answer this question which has been put to me by PM, "Must we all go hungry to pay for the war?"

If we make the wrong decisions and try to pay for the war the wrong way, millions may go hungry, just as they did in 1932 but there is no need for that. When the war comes to an end there will be the farms, the farm help, the soil, and the technical skill to produce more than has even been produced in the world before. Our own farms are now producing 25 to 30 percent more food than the average of the decade before the war. Most of that increase now goes to our armed forces abroad and to our allies. But, after the war, as devastated countries quickly restore their crop production, all of the increase in our own capacity to produce will be available to make us a better-fed nation than we have ever been.

There is no more reason why people should go hungry to pay for the war than that they should go without jobs to pay for the war. As a matter of fact, the only way we can really pay for the war is to see that people have jobs and full stomachs. Technologically this is possible. Psychologically, it may be difficult because not enough people have looked at the simple arithmetic of the problem.

A nation that maintains full employment at useful production in peacetime has no problem of people going hungry. People then have income not only for food but also for the rest of their budget, and the Nation as a whole has income to pay debt charges that are not burdensome.

At present costs of borrowing our primary fear should not be of the size of our national debt, even with the steep increase in that debt which the war inevitably brings. We need rather to make sure that jobs and adequate incomes are maintained.

It is conceivable that, as we push on to victory, the cost of the war will double the Federal debt over what it is now, raising the total to around $200,000,000,000. It is also conceivable that private long-term investment after the war, will increase the private debt to $100,000,000,000. The burden of the annual interest charges on these debts at present interest rates would be about as light in proportion to income as in 1923 or 1929, provided we have full employment and a continued total national income of about $130,000,000,000.

These simple figures will show what I mean: In 1929 we had private long-term debts amounting to $87,000,000,000 and an annual interest charge of five billion. We had a net Federal debt of nearly sixteen billion and State and local government debts of nearly fourteen billion, with interest charges amounting to one and one-fourth billion. These interest charges, totaling six and one-fourth billion, were the equivalent of 7½ percent of a national income of $83,000,000,000.

At present interest rates the annual carrying charge on a $200,000,000,000 Federal debt would be $5,000,000,000, the carrying charge on a $100,000,000,000 long-term private debt would be $4,000,000,000, and the carrying charge on a $20,000,000,000 State and local debt would be $600,000,000, making a total interest charge of $9,600,000,000. This would be equivalent to a little over 7 percent of a $130,000,000,000 national income (our prospective income for 1943) and would be approximately the same percentage of our national income as we devoted to paying interest on debt in 1929.

The real problem is to maintain full employment in peacetime production as we are now doing in war production.

As peacetime production expands and war production is contracted, the annual deficit will go down, and we can then begin to have substantial relief from the wartime burdens of taxation. But if 10,000,000 people should be thrown out of work, the result would be a reduction of national income by perhaps 30 billion dollars, and a proportionate reduction in both private and corporation income tax payments. The one criterion by which we should judge all fiscal, monetary, and taxation policies is whether they bring about an increased balanced production of useful goods.

Two simple facts for all of us to bear in mind are these: First, that the more successfully private enterprise maintains full employment, the less Government spending is required; and, second, that certain types of Government economy, if they bring on widespread unemployment, can actually drive us deeper into debt instead of pulling us out.

We need not go hungry or unemployed if we follow sound policies, if experts in money and taxation match the technical competence of those who work on the farms and in the factories. As a matter of fact, the way to pay for the war is to utilize fully our greatly expanded farm and factory facilities, and to continue to expand the productivity of our agriculture and industry to the limit. If we do this, it is quite possible, within a few years after the war ends, in spite of the war-created debts, for the people both in the United States and in most other parts of the world to have a higher standard of living than they have ever had before.

Address on One Hundred and Thirty-sixth Birthday Anniversary of Gen. Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me in Statuary Hall on Saturday January 16, 1943, on the commemoration of the one hundred and thirty-sixth birthday anniversary of Gen. Robert E. Lee, the same actually being January 19, under auspices of the District of Columbia division, United Daughters of the Confederacy:

It is indeed a distinction of the highest degree to appear before you in these circumstances and surroundings.

The hallowed Chamber in which we have thus assembled, at our Nation's Capitol, known as the Statuary Hall, is an appropriate place for the statue of the immortal Lee. In all the world no better selection, either of location or company, could possibly be made than this sacred shrine to our honored dead.

As we stand in the presence of these towering statues, bronze or marble, portraying features of our founding fathers, we readily recognize why they are represented here. On this side a President, on that side a Senator, there a Member of the House of Representatives, a Cabinet officer, an Ambassador, a scientist, a physician, an educator, a soldier. By what right comes the inquiry, Does the statue of Lee repose here?

It is indeed gratifying that under our democratic form of government even while we are fighting the most destructive war of all history, the descendants of those brave and gallant soldiers who followed Lee and Jackson are permitted to unfurl the Confederate flag in our Nation's Capitol and to observe the annual birthday of the commanding general in the lost cause. We inquire, What makes the life of Lee appear so immeasurably grand? It must be the fact that he went beyond the heights of greatness and on to peaks of nobility.

"His life was gentle, and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world: This was a man."

We have only to witness the degree of fortitude and courage with which Lee accepted adversity as well as the gracious manner in which he bore pain, suffering, and even defeat to appreciate the true stature of his greatness. Everything about Lee, the loftiness of his ideals, manliness of his actions, and the unselfishness of his deeds, seemed firmly anchored in the bedrock of Christian faith, hope, and charity.

Both by nature and necessity General Lee was a lover of hard work. He cared little for the social or lighter pursuits of life. He liked the soldier's hardships, the soldier's toil, even the soldier's fare, as well as the soldier's glory.

General Lee was born in Virginia January 19, 1807. The youngest son of Maj. Gen. Henry Lee ("Light Horse Harry") and Ann Carter Lee. Due to financial reverses the rearing and training of the Lee children was left largely to Mrs. Lee. In 1825 through the generosity of that noble South Carolinian then Secretary of War, John C. Calhoun, young Lee was admitted to West Point, graduating therefrom 4 years later without a demerit, second in his class.

In 1831 our hero was married to the daughter of the adopted son of George Washington, the grandson of Mrs. Washington. He was commissioned first lieutenant in 1836 and captain in 1838. During the Mexican War Lee was advanced to the rank of colonel and was appointed superintendent of West Point Military Academy in 1852.

Probably the most unusual experience ever coming to an individual came to Lee in March 1861, when at the Blair House in Washington, he was confronted with the decision as to whether he should command the Federal forces or the poorly organized, scantily clad troops of Virginia. He assumed command of the Confederate forces in 1861, with the rank of general, which he held until his surrender at Appomattox on April 9, 1865.

After the war General Lee was chosen to be head of what is now Washington and Lee University, which post he held until the date of his death on October 12, 1870.

Someone has said that the presence of Napoleon in battle line was equal to the presence of 100,000 troops. If that be true, how could we estimate the value of the presence of the matchless Lee as he recklessly rode among his troops in his modest uniform of gray bearing only the stars to indicate his rank?

We have always been fortunate and with hardly an exception our military leaders have been men of high character and great ability. It is gratifying and comforting to know that those in command of our troops in this global war are of unquestioned character, broad experience, and unexcelled leadership.

The late Benjamin H. Hill, of Georgia, has described the character of Lee in these beautiful and striking words: "He was a foe without hate; a friend without treachery; a soldier without cruelty; a victor without oppression and a victim without murmuring. He was a public officer without vice; a private citizen without wrong; a neighbor without reproach; a Christian without hypocrisy; and a man without guile. He was Caesar without his ambition; Frederick without his tyranny; Napoleon without his selfishness; and Washington without his reward. He was as obedient to authority as a servant, and royal in authority as a true king. He was gentle as a woman in life, and modest and pure as a virgin in thought; watchful as a Roman vestal in duty; submissive to law as Socrates; and grand in battle as Achilles." So, like the varicolored threads of a rich tapestry which combine to produce one perfect, balanced design of beauty, the attributes of Lee's greatness—that is, his outstanding ability and talent, his sterling character, his high moral caliber, his Christian faith and devotion, together with the nameless other qualitative attainments and representations of his life—were joined, it seemed, to create the world's grandest and most enduring design for noble living.

I quote the following unbiased opinions of General Lee: Said the late President Theodore Roosevelt: "The world has never seen better soldiers than those who followed Lee; and their leader will undoubtedly rank, without any exception, as the very greatest of all the great captains that the English-speaking people have brought forth."

Sir Frederick Maurice said: "I place Lee as a general above Wellington. 'Read and reread,' said Napoleon, 'the eighty-five campaigns of Alexander, Hannibal, Caesar, Gustavus, Turonne, Eugene, and Frederick. Take them as your models, for it is the only means of becoming a great leader, and of mastering the secrets of the art of war.' To that select band of great commanders the name of Robert E. Lee must be added."

British Field Marshal Garnet J. W. Wolseley once said: "He was the ablest general, and to me seemed the greatest man I had ever conversed with * * * General Lee was one of the few men who ever seriously impressed and awed me with their natural and inherent greatness."

To be sure there is no longer any feeling of sectionalism, no South, no North, no East, no West; all of us are now sons and brothers of our great common country. It is with a feeling of pride, however, that those of us from the South extol the virtues of our heroes and count their contributions to history. Patrick Henry provoked the Revolution; Thomas Jefferson wrote its Declaration of Independence; George Washington led the Continental armies; James Madison drafted the Constitution; John Marshall interpreted the organic law; James Monroe promulgated the great doctrine bearing his name; Andrew Jackson routed the British at New Orleans; General Scott scaled the walls of Mexico; and Woodrow Wilson steered our Ship of State safely through the turbulent waters of World War No. 1.

The South has unequestionably contributed her share of leaders and has and does give unstintingly of her brave sons in the present world conflict.

If called upon to designate one individual from all the pages of history for my own sons to follow, I would unhesitatingly name the matchless, courageous, Christian soldier and leader, Robert Edward Lee.

Renewal of Pre-War Controversial Issues by International Newspapers Disrupts National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune, dated January 12, 1943, and published in its edition of Sunday, January 17, 1943. The letter is in answer to a front-page article in the Herald Tribune stating that I had been rebuffed because of my pre-war noninterventionist views by the Republican Members of Congress from New York State, when the facts were that I was not a candidate for any office and the question of intervention or nonintervention was not raised by anyone on the delegation.

This statement that I had been rebuffed is utterly unwarranted and is part of the scheme of the internationalist press to attack former noninterventionists, regardless of the truth. This policy is further demonstrated by the failure of the eastern internationalist press even to mention last week the election, in Missouri, of MARION BENNETT, a Republican noninterventionist, by 14,000 votes in the same congressional district which his father—now deceased—carried by 7,000 votes only last November. The election of Mr. BENNETT to replace his father, by double the majority, is an indication of the temper of the American people and that they are not being deceived by New Deal and foreign propaganda of any kind.

The letter referred to above follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1943.

THE EDITOR,
The New York Herald Tribune,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I dislike replying to false inferences and statements emanating from the New York Herald Tribune, as it interferes with far more important work in the Congress. The New York Herald Tribune, like the Harriman Times Herald of Middletown in my district, apparently continues to see everything through a discolored and distorted interventionist vision, as if there had been no Pearl Harbor and as if 100,000,000 Americans who favored keeping out of foreign wars unless attacked were not making equal sacrifices with interventionists to win the war.

Every word or action in Congress, according to these two rabid interventionist and internationalist newspapers, seems to revolve around pre-war controversial issues, sunk at Pearl Harbor, but which are revived by them on every possible occasion, tending to disrupt national unity and impede our war effort and march to victory.

If such a policy was inspired by Hitler or the Japs, it would be readily recognized as enemy propaganda. However, coming from American newspapers, it serves the same purpose and, in the interest of national unity and winning the war, should cease immediately.

The latest insinuation of the Herald Tribune and quoted in other newspapers, was that because I was a noninterventionist prior to Pearl Harbor I had been rebuffed by the New York State Republican Members of Congress expressing a desire "to get rid of any isolationist tinge." I was not a candidate for any office but did place the name of Representative DANIEL A. REED, of Dunkirk, N. Y., one of the ablest Members of the House, where he has served with distinction for 24 years, in nomination for election to the committee on committees, to which he was entitled as the senior member of our delegation. He refused to solicit any support and also requested his friends not to. There was no mention of intervention or nonintervention. Mr. WADSWORTH'S name was presented without debate by Representative JOSEPH O'BRIEN, of Rochester, who often differed with him on foreign policies. I merely cite these facts to show how the internationalist press tries to make mountains out of molehills and revive dead issues, which can only be a disservice to the Nation at this time.

The committee on committees recommended me for election as ranking Republican member of the Committee on Rules, which was approved by the House today, and which carries with it membership on the Republican steering committee of the House.

The Republicans in Congress are united in their determination to do everything to expedite victory and an overwhelming majority resent the continued attempts to resurrect pre-war issues and thus create disunity when all our efforts should be devoted to winning the war at the earliest possible moment.

HAMILTON FISH.

Resolution of Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Cooperative Milk Producers' Bargaining Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this Nation have never failed to make their full patriotic contribution in manpower, food supply, bond purchase, and taxes in every war in which this country has been engaged. This World War No. 2 finds the farmers willing and anxious to make their maximum contribution to the cause to which their country is committed.

Notwithstanding that an administration spokesman has charged the farmers with lack of patriotism, I assert that no group in the Nation has responded to the country's wartime call with greater alacrity than has the farm group. This has been true even in the face of a shortage of farm labor, resulting from failure of the administration to recognize the farms as essential war-production plants. This shortage of farm labor is admitted by the administration in its Information Digest, dated January 16, 1943, where it is stated that—

> the number of farm workers on January 1 was estimated at 8,171,000, the smallest for any month since records were started in 1925.

In the face of the foregoing statement of fact from official records that the number of farm workers on January 1, 1943, was the smallest for any month since 1925, what could be more disturbing and inconsistent than the statement of Mr. Paul V. McNutt that "farm production has not been curtailed by shortage of manpower"?

I represent one of the most important segments of the dairy industry in the United States, and one that has been carefully and skillfully built up over many decades. The war policies of the administration have deprived the dairy farmers of labor. It has sought to step up production of oleomargarine. It has attempted to raise farm wages to $2,500 a year, a rate of wages for farm labor at the present price of farm products that would bankrupt the farmers generally and the small dairy farmer in particular.

The case of the dairy farmer is presented in a recent resolution adopted unanimously by the board of directors of the Metropolitan Cooperative Milk Producers' Bargaining Agency on January 12, 1943, which I insert as a part of my remarks under leave to extend:

In response to the President's call for an expression of farm opinion on this Agricultural Mobilization Day, the board of directors of the Metropolitan Cooperative Milk Producers Bargaining Agency, Inc., desire to express their appreciation of the opportunity afforded to present to the country a description of some of the obstacles which must be cleared away before farmers will be able to accomplish their part of the war task.

We regret that the total necessary farm production will not be achieved this year; instead, there will be important shortages and increased rationing for consumers. All true farmers believe in ample production and are opposed in their hearts to arbitrary crop curtailments because, knowing the uncertainties of Nature, it seems to a farmer a sacrilege for the land and the animals on it, not to produce to the utmost. For about 2 years the leaders of dairy cooperatives have been urging Government officials to make possible ample production and have warned them that shortages, both relative and actual, were in the offing. Our leaders have pointed out particularly that when farmers are forced to slaughter good dairy animals for lack of adequate price returns, it requires from 3 to 4 years to make replacement and in times of war those will be long years.

Most people attribute this condition to farm labor scarcity. While farm labor scarcity is generally recognized as being the major handicap, those segments of the Nation aside from agriculture do not realize the real causes of the labor shortage. Only one man in four leaving the farms, goes into the Military Establishment. The other three are drawn into civilian employment and no inconsiderable part of this employment is in nondefense industries. Not only are hired hands leaving the farm but many farmers everywhere are selling livestock and farm equipment because they cannot afford to carry on under present relatively small compensation for their effort.

The reason for all of this is the price repression policy of the Federal Government and the wage increase policy of the same Government. Wages continue to skyrocket. Almost every strike is settled by a wage increase. Any industrial disturbance is referred to the War Labor Board, which has a standard policy of settling every wage dispute by giving labor a 15 percent increase in wages. The administration and the Congress have worsened the situation by increasing the wages of 3,000,000 white-collar workers by amounts estimated to be sufficient to pay the income taxes of these workers on their 1942 income. This wage advance for Government workers has disturbed the entire inside office-work situation throughout the United States and has opened the door to the loss of womanpower on the farms.

If agriculture is to carry on, there must be immediately inaugurated a wartime policy of guaranteed minimum prices for those agricultural commodities now known to be essential to the prosecution of the war and the sustenance of the civilian populations who are behind the firing line. Such a policy was adopted and enforced in the last World War and it worked satisfactorily for all. Minimum prices of these essential agricultural commodities should be at least the cost of production, which shall include all farm labor costs.

The authorities in Washington should immediately announce the abandonment for all time to come, of the payment of subsidies in lieu of price increases. It matters not whether such payments are called farmer subsidies or consumer subsidies. The facts are that they are Government subsidies intended to help people pay their kitchen bills and they are being paid at a time when the buying power of the American people is at its all time high. These subsidies are being paid at a time when the greatest problem before the Treasury is how to absorb an excess purchasing power of about $15,000,000,000. We can see no justification for a policy which keeps industrial profits, rates of wages, and farm prices in a state of unbalance, even though such a disastrous policy is called a move against inflation. We point out that subsidies in lieu of price are funds taken from the tax moneys and must be paid for probably in the days of economic depression or else the break-down of Government credit will result in real inflation.

We remind those in power that farmers must have enough farm machinery to produce their products even if there were adequate prices and sufficient labor to man the machinery. At the present time the production of farm machinery has been reduced to 20 percent of the normal output.

Inasmuch as a high percentage of the milk produced on eastern farms is priced under the Federal order system, based upon a maximum of parity purchasing power, we insist that Congress direct the Secretary of Agriculture to include all the elements of farm labor in building the national price index. Failure to do so aggrevates the situation of inequality produced by a 40-hour week based upon enormous wage rates and overtime, and the cost-plus system of producing war materials. If industry is entitled to recognition of its costs why should not farmers be entitled to at least recognition of farm-labor costs in the pricing of farm commodities.

We particularly urge upon our national officials a kindly attitude in their putting into effect restrictive regulations covering the transportation and country processing of farm commodities. We doubt whether the tragic effects of Washington blueprints with this respect is realized by those responsible for them. The certificate of necessity cannot aid but it may destroy hundreds and even thousands of farmer cooperatives. There is a fundamental difference in the effect upon commercial handlers and cooperative handlers of concentrations of routes and closing down of plants. In case of the one, it merely transfers the volume and in the case of the other it may destroy the membership relations.

Finally we protest against the unsympathetic attitude of many city publications, radio commentators, and spokesmen of the Federal Government. The farmers and their leaders have been maligned, abused, and their own attitudes distorted. This long-sustained propaganda against agriculture greatly weakens the morale of our producers. It has discouraged them and made them feel that everyone's hand is against them. We, therefore, appeal to those in Washington to change this unfair attitude.

What Dauphin County, Pa., Has Accomplished by Voluntary Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable achievements in the sale of Government securities has been made in Dauphin County, Pa., during the

last 6 months of the year 1942. In addition to the successful raising of the money, Dauphin County has shown what can be done with a true spirit of cooperation and individual effort. I am including in my remarks the report of the victory fund committee and also the names of the directors of it and the banks that participated:

A PURE CASE OF VOLUNTARY COOPERATION—REPORT OF THE VICTORY FUND IN DAUPHIN COUNTY, JULY–DECEMBER 1942

Subscribed $88,422,314 in 6 months to 14 United States Government issues at a cost of $834.25, or less than one one-thousandth of 1 percent, through the voluntary effort of 15 members of the victory fund committee and the cooperation of the 28 banks in Dauphin County, supported by patriotic investors of all kinds and fine assistance from State officers and other public officials.

Perhaps another unusual feature of this intensive and, we believe, record low-cost campaign was that the victory fund committee, at its members' own request, never had a meeting, but conserved the time and energies of its members—all of whom had other essential war activities—for the job at hand.

This result, which was encouraged by the press and accomplished by patriotic subscriptions on the part of many firms, corporations, associations, societies, and individuals, was featured by especially large purchases by funds of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, whose officials, particularly Mr. John Byerly, head of the bureau of securities, gave the utmost cooperation. In addition to Mr. Byerly, Mr. George W. Reily, director of the Federal Reserve bank, and Mr. M. S. Hershey, Hershey, Pa., have served from the inception of the victory fund in an advisory but unofficial capacity, and their guidance and assistance have been of the greatest value.

An all-out effort of this nature, including many nonrecurring subscriptions, naturally exhausts the capital accumulations of years and cannot be sustained or maintained over any protracted period, or to any comparable degree. Dauphin County's financial cupboard has been searched and scoured clean and its investors have bought again and again up to the limit, so that if future results are not comparable in even a small degree, it will only prove the job has been well done in the past.

List of issues and amounts of reported subscriptions, July-December 1942

July 15, 2-percent Treasury bonds, 1949–51	$17,647,600
Aug. 3, 2½-percent Victory bonds, 1962–67	13,552,218
Aug. 15, ⅞-percent certificates, due Aug. 1, 1943	9,552,000
Sept. 21, 0.65-percent certificates, due May 1, 1943	581,000
Sept. 25, 1¼-percent Treasury notes, March 1945	10,137,000
Oct. 15, 1½-percent Treasury notes, December 1946	2,352,000
Oct. 19, 2-percent Treasury bonds, 1950–52	1,043,500
Nov. 2, ⅞-percent certificates, due Nov. 1, 1943	1,654,000
Nov. 30, 2½-percent Victory bonds, 1963–68	5,163,000
Nov. 30, 1¾-percent Treasury bonds, 1948	2,403,500
Nov. 30, ⅞-percent certificates, series E, 1943	9,510,000
91-day Treasury bills	6,044,000
Series F and G Savings bonds	3,783,471
Tax Anticipation notes, A and C	4,999,025
Total	88,422,314

Dr. Alfred H. Williams, president, Federal Reserve Bank, at Philadelphia; chairman, Third Federal Reserve Area.

Hon. William C. Freeman, Cornwall, Pa., regional chairman, Group Five.

Edward C. Bendere, executive manager, United States Treasury Victory Fund Committee.

DAUPHIN COUNTY COMMITTEE

George R. Bailey, chairman, vice president, Harrisburg National Bank-Harrisburg Trust Co.

William W. Dodson, president, Merchants' and Business Men's Mutual Fire Insurance Co.

E. R. Eckenrode, Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Robert A. Enders, president, Camp Curtin Trust Co.

Benjamin Gainsburg, president, Vision Co.

A. F. Gilbert, president, Millersburg Trust Co.

Henry M. Gross, vice president, State Capital Savings & Loan Association.

William N. Hardy, manager, Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers Association.

Ezra F. Hershey, treasurer, Hershey Chocolate Corporation.

Arthur H. Hull, Snyder, Hull, Leiby & Metzger.

Donald McCormick, president, Dauphin Deposit Trust Co.

H. A. Rutherford, vice president, Harrisburg National Bank.

Robert M. Rutherford, president, Steelton Bank & Trust Co.

Wilbert Wear, president, Harrisburg Steel Corporation.

W. D. Lewis, secretary, assistant secretary, Dauphin Deposit Trust Co.

DAUPHIN COUNTY BANKS

Dauphin National Bank, Dauphin; First National Bank, Lykens Valley Bank, Elizabethville; Halifax National Bank, Halifax; Allison-East End Trust Co., Camp Curtin Trust Co., Capital Bank & Trust Co., Central Trust Co., Citizens Trust Co., Dauphin Deposit Trust Co., Harrisburg National Bank, Harrisburg Trust Co., Keystone Trust Co., Market Street Trust Co., Harrisburg; Hershey National Bank, Hershey; Highspire State Bank, Highspire; Farmers Bank, Hummelstown National Bank, Hummelstown; Miners Bank & Trust Co., Lykens; Citizens Bank & Trust Co., Farmers Trust Co., Middletown; First National Bank, Millersburg Trust Co., Millersburg; National Bank of Penbrook, Penbrook Trust Co., Penbrook; Peoples Bank, Steelton Bank & Trust Co., Steelton; Williamstown Bank, Williamstown.

Shortages of Farm Labor and Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of the House to a summary of conclusions reached at a conference on the subjects of farm labor and machinery, held in Columbia, Mo., on December 30, with representatives of the implement industry in Missouri and the University of Missouri College of Agriculture participating, which is an authoritative statement showing the situation as regards shortages of farm labor and machinery in Missouri at the present time, as follows:

First. There is a serious shortage of farm labor in Missouri, practically one-third of the hired and family labor having gone into the armed services and into better paying jobs in industry, in spite of an increase of 30 percent in farm wages and a 25 percent increase in "furnish" in 1942.

Second. Normally, the labor shortage would have been offset to a large degree by increased use of farm machinery. But, by Government order, manufacture of machinery has been restricted to about 23 percent of normal, and prospects are that only little if any of this will be available to farmers for the planting season of 1943. Releases of steel and other materials should be made to manufacturers at once.

Third. From the standpoint of food production it would seem to have been wiser not to have restricted new machines so much, particularly in view of the fact that only about 2 percent of the country's normal steel production is required for making farm machinery.

Fourth. In order to meet the situation in the best possible way, it was agreed that the county extension agents, representing the college of agriculture, and the implement dealers of the State, would do everything within their power to keep all present farm machinery in repair and in running order.

Statement on 1943 Burley Tobacco Acreage Allotment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a statement prepared by me in opposition to the proposed plan of increasing burley tobacco acreage allotments for 1943 eight-tenths of an acre, or 20 percent, whichever shall be the greater. Such a plan, if adopted, would, in my opinion, wreck the burley tobacco growers. I hope the burley growers will read the statement carefully and, having done this, that they will then let me know their wishes in respect to the matter.

I have read with a great deal of interest the articles on increasing burley tobacco allotments that have been appearing in the Bristol Herald-Courier. I understand similar statements have been appearing in other papers over the burley tobacco area.

That I am in favor of increasing the burley tobacco allotments to the highest figure consistent with safety to the growers, and in seeing the smaller growers given preferential treatment, goes without saying. I have, since being in Congress, along with others, devoted a great deal of time looking after the interests of the tobacco growers—especially the smaller growers—and I do not think that our efforts have been entirely in vain, because during this time I have witnessed a marked improvement in the condition of the tobacco growers generally.

While thoroughly in accord with the stated general objects of the articles referred to, namely, the improvement of the condition of the tobacco growers, I am a little disturbed as to the influences

behind these articles, especially so since the increases asked for would, in my opinion, absolutely destroy the burley growers and at the same time enrich the large tobacco companies and probably the warehousemen. I hope that this is not the motive that prompted the articles. However, if the allotment plan advocated is adopted, I think I have correctly stated the results.

In the beginning let me say this to the tobacco growers in general: While I am one of the Members of Congress to whom the tobacco growers look for representation, I have not received a single communication from a single tobacco grower advocating the adoption of the proposed plan, nor has any other tobacco Representative, as far as I am able to find out, received such a communication. It is therefore apparent that the proposed plan is inspired by others than the tobacco growers. Who is furnishing the inspiration is a pertinent question.

With reference to tobacco, my one object since being in Congress has been to improve the condition of the growers, especially the condition of the small growers. For taking my stand with the tobacco growers, and standing up and fighting when the fighting at times got hot, I know I have received a lot of underground kicks from those whose interests are inimical to the interests of the growers. Well, I can still stand the underground kicking, and will gladly stand it before I will sit idly by and see the growers duped. Now, I simply want to present the true facts to the tobacco growers, and offer a suggestion based upon my long study of the tobacco problem. After I have done this, I want the tobacco growers to write me frankly what they think should be done. It will be my pleasure to respect their judgment, arrived at after a careful consideration of the true facts, and I hope they will, as in the past, feel free to write me.

I said that the program advocated in the articles, that is an increase in allotments of "eight-tenths of an acre or 20 percent, whichever shall be the greater," would destroy the burley growers and enrich the large tobacco companies and probably the warehousemen. Now, let me tell you why I think this is true.

First as to the tobacco companies:

Overproduction of burley tobacco, like overproduction of any other crop, brings about a surplus. The surplus of any crop fixes the value of the crop at surplus or ruinous prices. We all know what happened when we had an overproduction of burley tobacco. The buyers bought the tobacco crop for a song and dance and the growers, due to the surplus, were helpless. For instance, when I came to Congress in 1931 there were 503,000 acres planted in burley. This acreage produced 425,000,000 pounds, when the disappearance was only 252,000,000 pounds, and the farmers received 8.7 cents per pound, or $36,900,000 for the entire crop. And at that time we did not hear any of the buyers telling the farmers, as I understand they are today, that "we are sorry we cannot pay you 70 or 75 cents per pound, but, you know, the Government has placed a ceiling upon us." Why, they took the entire 1931 crop at 8.7 cents without compunction of conscience or offering a single apology; and if we bring about overproduction again the same thing, in my opinion, will happen.

Now, Mr. Grower, compare the surplus year 1931 with the deficiency year 1942 and decide for yourself if the grower is not running a greater risk producing a surplus than he is a deficiency. In 1942 the Government allotted 382,800 acres, expecting a crop of three hundred and forty to three hundred and fifty million pounds. Due chiefly to late planting and climatic conditions, the production is now estimated at 330,000,000 pounds, ten to twenty million pounds short. What does this mean to the growers? It means this: The growers, due to the supply being less than the disappearance, are placed in a strong market position, and for their 330,000,000 pounds will receive at least 40 cents per pound or, in dollars and cents, $132,000,000, which is the largest price per pound, as well as the largest amount in dollars and cents, the burley growers ever received for a crop of tobacco. While I am not advocating production of deficiency crops—I would like to see supply and demand kept in line, so we would have stable and dependable markets—I do say that a reasonable deficiency is far better than a surplus. Let me recapitulate, so the growers can get a bird's-eye picture of these 2 years, because it tells graphically the story of controlled and uncontrolled burley allotments:

Year	Acreage	Poundage	Price	Value of crop
			Cents	
1931	502,700	424,800,000	8.7	$36,900,000
1942	382,800	330,000,000	[1] 40	132,000,000

[1] At least.

Now, Mr. Grower, do not let anyone fool you into believing that the allotment plan now being advocated will not bring about overproduction. Let me tell you what an increase of "eight-tenths of an acre, or 20 percent, whichever will be the greater," means. In 1942 there were 245,600 burley growers in the United States, divided into groups according to acreage, as follows:

Size of allotment	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
0.1 to 0.5 acre	84,500	29,700
0.6 to 1.0 acre	58,250	46,700
1.1 to 1.5 acres	28,875	38,100
1.6 to 2.0 acres	24,550	43,750
2.1 to 3.0 acres	21,525	54,650
3.1 to 4.0 acres	10,950	38,200
4.1 to 4.2 acres	1,450	6,000
4.3 acres and over	15,500	125,700
Total	245,600	382,800

A similar break-down covering Virginia is as follows:

Size of allotment	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
0.1 to 0.5 acre	7,338	2,573
0.6 to 1 acre	3,647	2,828
1.1 to 1.5 acres	1,321	1,666
1.6 to 2 acres	800	1,421
2.1 to 3 acres	462	1,120
3.1 to 4 acres	114	398
4.1 acres and over	88	524
Total	13,770	10,530

It will be observed from these figures that the breaking point, that is, the point up to which the eight-tenths of an acre increase would apply and the point from which a 20-percent increase would apply is 4.2 acres. Of the 245,600 growers, there are 230,100 at and below the breaking point and 15,500 above the breaking point.

Now, an increase of "eight-tenths of an acre, or 20 percent, whichever is greater" would mean that every burley grower under 4.2 acres would be increased eight-tenths of an acre. What would this mean? Why it would mean that 230,100 of the 245,600 burley growers would be increased eight-tenths of an acre, which, in turn, means an increase in the burley acreage of 184,080 acres. This additional acreage would produce around 950 pounds per acre, or a total poundage of 174,876,000 pounds. The remaining growers, that is, the growers from 4.3 acres and up, amounting in numbers to 15,500 growers, would be increased 20 percent under the proposal. This would mean an additional acreage of 25,140 acres, and an additional poundage of 23,883,000 pounds. This would simply mean increasing the burley tobacco acreage from 382,800 to 592,020 acres and the burley poundage from the estimated 330,000,000 for 1942 to 528,759,000 in 1943. Hence, if the allotment proposal suggested is adopted, the 1943 acreage and poundage compared with the 1942 acreage and poundage would be as follows:

Year	Acreage	Pounds produced
1942	382,800	[1] 330,000,000
1943	592,020	528,759,000

[1] Estimated.

In pounds this would be an increase of 198,759,000, or in percentage an increase of 60 percent. The 1943 burley market simply cannot stand such an increase. It would simply mean a glutted market and ruinous prices. And, Mr. Grower, a glutted market and ruinous prices translated into plain English means impoverished farmers and increased earnings for the tobacco companies.

Now, as to how the warehousemen would probably profit by this tremendous increase. The warehousemen have a minimum charge or a fixed charge of so much per basket plus a commission on sales. Of course, if you increase the volume of tobacco handled, that is, if you increase the poundage the growers produce, the fixed and minimum charges of the warehousemen increase proportionately. I doubt seriously, however, if the increase in the fixed and minimum charges would be sufficient to take care of the loss in commission the warehousemen would suffer by reason of the reduction in the value of the crop a surplus would bring about.

I am not charging that the tobacco companies and warehousemen are behind the agitation for an increase of "eight-tenths of an acre or 20 percent, whichever is the greater." I do not know. But I think I have correctly detailed what will happen if such a plan is put into effect. The plan will help every

one except the grower, and the grower is the man I am interested in and trying to look out for.

Really and truly I hope the tobacco companies and warehousemen are not behind the movement, because here of late the tobacco manufacturers have shown a disposition to go along with the tobacco program and pay a reasonable price. Many of the warehousemen have for years cooperated with every effort to improve the condition of the growers. Why, as recently as Christmas, Warehouseman Bernard came to see me with reference to improving the condition of the tobacco growers, and expressed deep concern over the plight of the smaller growers, and I told him I would cooperate to the fullest. I am sure if warehousemen like Bernard have anything to do with the proposal, that they have been incorrectly informed as to just what the proposal would do.

Before going home for the holidays, realizing that the 1943 market would stand an increase, I commenced to work on a plan that I thought would not only be fair but workable. And in working out the plan, I am frank to say, I ever kept in mind the smaller grower. The plan, simply stated, is this: Increase all growers now having allotments under one-half of an acre by enough to bring them up to one-half acre. Increase all growers having one-half acre and over by 10 percent. And this proposal, of course, is predicated upon the grower having enough labor and barn space to take care of the increase. As above shown, there are 84,500 growers with allotments of one-half an acre or less. These growers would all be increased to one-half an acre. This would amount in acreage to 12,550 acres and in poundage to 11,922,000 pounds. Increasing the 161,100 growers over one-half of an acre 10 percent would amount to 35,310 acres and in poundage to 33,544,000 pounds. This would amount to a total increase in acreage of 47,860 acres and in poundage of 45,466,000 pounds. If this plan is adopted, the 1943 picture, compared with the 1942 picture, would be as follows:

Year	Acreage	Poundage
1942	382,800	330,000,000
1943	430,660	375,466,000

The 1943 market could stand such an increase.

While the plan I have worked out will—I am afraid it will be charged—favor Virginia, the truth is it will favor the smaller grower wherever he may live. Many of these smaller growers live in Tennessee, North Carolina, West Virginia, and parts of Kentucky.

And I want the growers to know that whichever proposal is adopted it will be necessary to amend the Tobacco Act. This being true, I hope I may hear from the growers immediately, because if an amendment is to be gotten through it should be put through before the 1st of March, 1943.

The suggestion of increasing the smaller growers 20 percent and the larger growers 10 percent has also been made. This suggestion is worthy of careful consideration.

My thought in suggesting the raising of all of the smaller growers up to one-half of an acre is in keeping with my efforts of the past to assist, as far as possible, these struggling tobacco growers who are in the lower brackets. The tobacco money is the only cash many of these growers have with which to buy shoes and clothing and schoolbooks for the children, pay taxes, and so forth.

Then, too, many of these small growers can produce one-half of an acre with the family help about as well as they can produce two-tenths of an acre.

Before closing, in order to set the record straight, let me correct two or three incorrect statements appearing in the Bristol Herald-Courier articles.

In the issue of the 6th the statement is made "the Government did not find it necessary to place a ceiling on flue cured." Now, the Government did, during the marketing season of flue-cured, place a ceiling of 34.86 cents per pound on flue cured, which applied to all purchases except those made by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the lend-lease program. Since the ceiling price was based on average prices paid by individual companies during the part of the season before the ceiling was established, certain exceptions were made to permit companies having price averages lower than 34.86 cents to buy up to this figure. The resulting market average for the entire flue-cured crop was 38 cents, which is 3 or 4 cents under the burley average to date.

Prior to the war between 50 and 60 percent of the flue-cured tobacco was exported. Since the war most of the export tobacco has moved under lend-lease and the percentage of flue-cured exported has been reduced to about 30 percent. Very little burley tobacco is exported, 2 to 3 percent, hence the Commodity Credit Corporation has not purchased any burley tobacco for lend-lease shipments.

In the issue of the fourth the statement is made that the 1942 burley crop is sixty to seventy million pounds short. Now the Government was figuring on a poundage of from three hundred and forty to three hundred and fifty million pounds. The latest estimate places the crop at 330,000,000 pounds, a shortage of from ten to twenty million pounds. While I did think the burley poundage could have been increased in 1942, and, along with others, tried to secure an increase, the Department of Agriculture thought otherwise, and we submitted to their judgment. Had it not been for late planting and climatic conditions, in all probability the 1942 poundage would have been up to expectations.

Let me call attention to the fact that on October 1, 1942, the stocks of burley tobacco on hand amounted to 755,000,000 pounds, which, plus the 1942 crop estimated at that time to be 338,000,000 pounds, made the October 1942 supply 1,093,000,000 pounds. Against this supply the disappearance for the year was placed at 380,000,000 pounds. The estimated supply of burley as of October 1943 is 1,060,000,000 pounds. So there is nothing to be alarmed over.

In only 5 years during the last 25 years have we had such a large supply. It is well for us to play conservative, so the growers will come out of the war period in as strong a position as possible.

In the issue of the 10th it is stated that "to the ceiling the farmers made no objection." Well, the farmers did object to the ceiling, and numerous hearings were held with the Office of Price Administration. It looked like we were going to be held down to the 34-cent flue-cured ceiling. We finally succeeded in securing a 38-cent ceiling based on grades, which I hope, due to the good smoking quality of the crop, will bring the average up to around 42 cents.

Ever keeping in mind that food for victory must come first, let us keep our feet on the ground and work the 1943 burley allotments out in a sane, safe, and sensible way.

Majority Leader Writes on Necessity of Working Out Program To Meet Problems of the Peace Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, herewith I include with my remarks a most forceful and timely article by the distinguished majority leader of the House, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, appearing in the Washington Post for Sunday, January 17.

This article is especially heartening to me because the type of committee for which Mr. MCCORMACK pleads is precisely the kind provided for in House Joint Resolution 36, introduced by myself on the first day of this session:

PEACE PLAN TERMED NECESSARY

(By Representative J. W. MCCORMACK)

The task of working out a post-war program is one that will challenge the best minds of the country. It is something that we should devote our attention to now, in order that we may have something ready when the war ends.

In my opinion, a special committee, representing the Congress and the public, should be created to draft a post-war plan.

Legislation would be required to set up such a committee. It should be a group of outstanding men and women in whom the public would have confidence—a group representative of the various economic and social elements of the country, prominent among which would be those capable of guiding and considering the spiritual life of our Nation.

If we do not work out a post-war program while the war is on, we shall face the necessity, after the war ends, of trying to devise hasty plans to meet emergencies that will descend suddenly upon us.

Shall we be content with unpreparedness for the social and economic conditions that we know are bound to exist when the war is over?

One thing is certain, and that is that we must keep our eyes forward. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that the war will end some time.

It is absolutely in the interest of the public that this whole post-war situation should be given consideration now.

Of course, winning the war is our first objective. It will continue to be our first objective until the Axis Powers are thoroughly crushed. But that does not mean we should not work on post-war problems at the same time.

It will be a severe shock to the country if, at the end of the war, nothing has been done to meet the post-war emergency.

With regard to another matter—the suggestion that a permanent peace may be made—it is interesting to note the fatalistic reaction of some people that the human race must always endure war, and that nothing can be done about it.

Naturally, we shall always have wars if we continue to be dominated by fear, and if we lack the courage to stop them. This may be an idle dream on my part, but I would rather be an idle dreamer on this question than a calloused opponent of any constructive effort in this direction—a believer in the kind of defeatism that says the human race cannot achieve what the animals in the woods are able to do.

In the period since the last war, we failed the youth of today who were infants then, or were born since the last war. Unless we establish international machinery with the necessary implements to assure permanent peace when this war is over, the young men who will come along 25 years from now, in the event of another world maelstrom, can justifiably say that we betrayed them.

The Agricultural Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech delivered by me over station WNBF, Saturday, January 16, 1943:

Men and women and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, before I begin my discussion this evening, I want to take a moment to express my thanks to the management of WNBF for making this time available to me. Because of my continued absence from home due to the pressure of business in Washington, I have little chance to talk personally with you folks about problems and matters of importance to you. Letter writing is never as satisfactory as conversation face to face. Although these programs are transcribed, they are almost direct contact with you because the spoken word means more than the written one.

Nevertheless, I want you people at home, you parents of the boys at the front, you wives and dependents to keep in touch with me by letter since I cannot return as often as I would like to talk with you. Please do not hesitate to let me know about your problems. If I can help you with them, I will be glad to do it.

Remember this; all people on the Government pay roll, including myself, are your servants. They are supposed to serve you, the American people. They are not your masters. They derive whatever authority they have from you because you the people are hiring them to work for you. Therefore, you have the right to expect fair, just, and honorable treatment from all those in authority during these dark days. You have the right as free Americans to anticipate the use of the Golden Rule from your public servants. As long as the people are masters of the state, this will be America. Remember the office of your Congressman is dedicated to your service, no matter how humble your request may be or how trivial your interest may seem to others.

As I have many times stated, the most important task any of us has is to the war. To that end we as patriotic Americans must strive. We must back up our sons and husbands and brothers now struggling for our safety throughout the world. But you and I owe it to those stalwart men to make their lot better. We are producing the weapons of war in great quantities; we will see to it that the families of the boys in service are cared for and that their dependents are given every consideration.

Every day there comes to my Washington office a whole sack of mail from wives and mothers and fathers back home asking me to straighten out their allotment problems, asking for information as to the whereabouts of their husbands and sons or a hundred and one other questions. I am only too happy to supply this data for you all and I assure you that it gives me no end of satisfaction when I go to bed each night to recall that on that day, God has enabled me to help some mother with her allotment so she can provide food and shelter for herself and the children of her soldier or sailor husband. So I say to you people on the home front; please let me know if I can help you.

A few days ago, I made public my feeling about the income-tax situation with which we will all soon be faced. My statement appeared in the Binghamton Press last Saturday evening and I quote: "The people of my district may count on my vote for a reasonable pay-as-you-go income tax plan. A year of worry and confusion on the part of everybody earning a living over how he will pay last year's tax with this year's money has shown me the necessity for immediate action.

Many people making good wages in 1942 were forced to use what they would ordinarily save for their income taxes to clean up bills they had incurred in previous years of unemployment. Even people who have lived frugally find that the cost of living has risen so drastically they have been unable to take enough money out of their budgets to meet the taxes required in the revenue bill passed in the latter part of 1942. The majority of those in the middle and lower income brackets are at a loss to meet their heavy tax bills for 1942, because no way has been shown for them to catch up and start out on a current payment basis. Therefore, I expect to give careful consideration to the pay-as-you-go plan of meeting income tax obligations. This will bring about cooperation and cheerfulness on the public's part and less trouble and grief for the people and Government in collecting these taxes.

It is my purpose today to discuss in the time allotted me the agricultural situation and the serious dislocation which the farmers of my district and the farmers throughout the country are facing. A little while ago we heard a Budget message from the President of the United States. Among other things, I think you will find if you peruse its pages carefully, a statement that food is a primary weapon of war. I do not think there is very much disagreement with that statement, but there is considerable disagreement as to how the best methods of obtaining as much of that food as is possible may be brought about. Today I want to express my dissatisfaction with the way the food situation is being handled by the Government of the United States and by the agencies which are authorized to carry out such a program. I think the only fair way to describe one's reaction to the way things are going, so far as agriculture is concerned, is to go back to the actual experience which he runs across in his own locality. It is my privilege to represent a dairy district, which is one of the most productive in the country. It is also my privilege to represent as patriotic and interested a group of American farmers as there is in America.

When I make observations on the floor of the House, I am sure that I do so only as a result of conferences, suggestions, advice, and instructions from those same farmers I represent, and for whom I want to do everything within my power in the Congress of the United States. As a result of those observations I am introducing a bill today, the title of which is the return to the law of supply and demand in production, and to suspend laws, regulations, and orders which restrict the production of agricultural commodities.

I shall read from the resolution so you may know what it contains: "*Be it enacted, etc.*, That until the day following the date on which the President proclaims that hostilities of the present war have ceased, all provisions of law and all regulations and orders which restrict, authorize the restriction of, or the payments of, benefits having the effect of restricting, the production of any agricultural commodity are hereby suspended."

Throughout the entire Nation, Mr. Speaker, for the past few years there has been a tendency to restrict the American farmer in his production until he has reached the point where he is just about dependent upon the Government for orders and regulations and subsidies of all kinds to run his business. I think, more than any other occupation, the American farmer has been singled out to be made a guinea pig, so to speak, for all the socialistic and bureaucratic experiments that can possibly be imagined. Under ordinary peacetime conditions these experiments are odious enough to those from farm sections. But when the farmer is restricted in production in wartime, when it is absolutely necessary to do everything within his power to produce an essential primary weapon of war which the President calls food, I think it is high time that the Congress of the United States took some action for his benefit.

The dairy farmers in my section are sick and tired of regulations imposed on them which are definitely working against their doing their best in producing food for freedom.

The farmers throughout America are becoming irked and resentful over increasing regulations being placed upon them in many cases by men who never had any kind of experience in working one. I submit to you, therefore, that it is high time, as we are embarking upon a period of food production on the farm, to put an end to the regulations which are hampering the farmer and which make him unable to do his part in the production of food for freedom.

Dear friends, I also beg leave to read to you this evening a letter I wrote to Leon Henderson, Office of Price Administration chief, appealing to him on behalf of those in

my district who are dependent upon their automobiles for transportation to and from church. I read as follows:

JANUARY 11, 1943.

Mr. LEON HENDERSON,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: I have had several complaints from patriotic clergymen of my district about church people being deprived of gasoline to the extent of their having to forego church attendance in the case of rural residents. I take this occasion to appeal to you.

In order to illustrate my point, I quote from a typical letter I have received on this subject:

"I have folks in my church that have had to drop a little in their attendance because of their lack of gasoline. I know that the A book is for that purpose, but it is also for the purpose of going to work, and so forth. Can they receive gas to go to church or must they stay at home?

"The keeping up of the spiritual end of this war is more important than the munition end. We don't want to joy ride all over the country, but we just want enough gas to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience.

"The ration boards don't seem to pay any attention to a request for gas to go to church, and you know we can't neglect this part; if we do, look out, America.

"Can my people get gasoline to go to church?"

I present this matter to you because I feel that it is important. Personally, I will greatly appreciate any solution you might have to suggest regarding this problem. If you can work out a policy with local draft boards to allow churchgoers enough gas to attend their place of worship, I am sure the entire country will benefit therefrom.

Any suggestion or aid you may have in this matter will be most gratifying.

Thanking you, I remain,

Very truly yours,

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Standing Congressional Committees on Aviation Should Be Established; Select Committee on Air Accidents Commended for Its Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JANUARY 15, 1943.

Hon. JACK NICHOLS,
Chairman of the Select Committee
to Investigate Air Accidents,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JACK: Referring to my letter to you of yesterday I am pleased to follow it with further observations today. I do this after having received a copy of your final report. The findings, suggestions, and recommendations which you set forth are most interesting and informative and will certainly challenge the Members of Congress to action. I am especially interested in the proposal which you have made for the creation of a standing committee on aviation. You will perhaps recall that I have long favored such a proposal.

During my campaign in 1940 I advocated a four-point program for the development of civil aviation and national defense, which I made at that time in the following language:

"1. We must immediately begin a Federal airport program which will bring about the establishment of thousands of landing fields in this country. Already Congress is going forward with plans for constructing needed airports. We have delayed too long this important phase of our air activity. West Virginia should share fully in such developments due to the rugged terrain over which our planes navigate.

"2. It is absolutely necessary that we decentralize our defense factories. Aircraft and allied industries are now located so as to be vulnerable to possible aerial attack. It is vital to our well-being that we have inland aircraft facilities established, not 10 years from now, but at once.

"3. Standing committees on aviation should be established in both House and Senate. We have a special committee devoted to maritime affairs of this country, and a special committee for land transportation. Building roads on the ground receives attention of a special group. It is necessary that transportation by air and the matter of building roads in the air should receive exclusive attention of a committee charged with the duty of fostering healthy and needed aviation growth. Aviation, more than any other force in the world, is changing the very map of the globe. We must further strengthen America's proud position in the skies.

"4. In the Cabinet of the President of the United States, instead of having a separate Department of War and a separate Department of Navy, with military aviation scattered between them, there should be a single department of defense, with the three great arms of our Nation's power coordinated on an equal basis. Our fighting forces by air, by land, and by water should, on an equal footing, find a place in a single great department with one head."

At that time I also said:

"Our people bend every energy, both in government and private industry, to the task of making the United States supreme against the jealousy of unprincipled aggressors. Especially during the past year have we recognized what the power of aviation means in the hands of a ruthless invader. While God gives us time, let us nourish our aviation that the Stars and Stripes will continue to fly triumphantly over land and sea, over mountain and wave—bulwark of strength in our continued efforts to keep America safe for the perpetuation of republican and democratic institutions."

Your committee is to be congratulated on its work. You have made a constructive contribution to the cause of aviation.

Assuring you again of my sincere cooperation, I am

Cordially yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

G. O. P. Turmoil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of January 15, 1943:

GRAND OLD PARTY TURMOIL

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The evidences of the inner turmoil through which the Republican Party is going are coming more clearly into the open.

This turmoil is not a personal affair. It is a public affair. It concerns what the Republican Party is going to do with the United States if and when it accedes to control of the Government, which at least in Congress can be any time because of the ever-present prospect of coalition with disaffected Democrats.

The conflict is over where the Grand Old Party is going to stand in foreign policy and whether it can be relied on to enable America to play its full part in building and securing the future peace. The issue is not complicated; it is simple, as all honest and fundamental issues are.

The issue is: Shall the United States seek through national isolation and no commitments to avoid war, or shall the United States seek through international cooperation and positive commitments to prevent war?

RIDING IN ALL DIRECTIONS

At the present time the Republican Party has taken no responsible position on this most vital of all questions, is without any coherent viewpoint and as yet shows no signs of reaching one. It may be a stage of confusion which precedes clarity but at the moment its Members in Congress are perpetually riding off in all directions.

All in recent days:

The Republicans removed HAMILTON FISH from the House Foreign Affairs Committee because it wanted to avoid identifying itself with such extreme isolationism. * * *

The Republicans took note of the fact that Harold E. Stassen, thrice G. O. P. Governor of Minnesota and keynoter at the 1940 Philadelphia convention, had recently advocated a world parliament and from the floor of the House of Representatives branded him "a stalking horse for the Democratic Party."

Not a single Republican Member of the House rose to utter a syllable in behalf of his party's Minnesota Governor. It remained for Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts ironically to come to Mr. Stassen's support and remark: "It seems rather strange that a Democrat should rise to the defense of a Republican, but I am doing this for the man, whom I have had the pleasure of meeting, the man himself, whom I respect. Does the gentleman from Michigan (Republican Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD) who has the floor entertain the opinion that Governor Stassen would be a stalking horse for anybody?"

They didn't say "no" and they didn't say "yes."

The Republicans witnessed one of their number, Representative KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, introduce a resolution to appoint a post-war planning commission to prepare the way for helping America play a strong role in maintaining the future peace. "It is just as important," he said, "in time of war to prepare for peace as it is in peace to prepare for war. No wise and lasting peace can be developed on narrow partisan lines."

MUST MAKE DECISIONS

The Republicans witnessed another of their number, Representative JESSIE SUMNER of Illinois, introduce a resolution to appoint a post-war antiplanning commission to prepare the way for keeping America from playing a strong role in maintaining the future peace. "Our traditional American foreign policy," she said "consisted of letting European nations find out that when they went to war America stayed out and developed, while they lost their resources and the flower of their manhood. That traditional American

foreign policy brought more peace, freedom, prosperity, and civilization to the world than it had ever known before."

Like now, maybe.

In any event this is the kind of thing which the Republican Party will have to resolve and how it resolves it will be the most important political development of the coming months. It is a difficult and unpleasant and embarrassing turmoil for any party to have to go through, but it is a worth-while turmoil because it involves a real issue, not a phony issue—an issue of perhaps life-and-death consequences for the party as well as the Nation.

It is evident that the Republican ranks in Congress are deeply divided on isolationism, but it is by no means evident that numerically the isolationists are in a majority.

On this point Robert E. Kennedy, the painstaking Washington correspondent of the Chicago Times, has just completed a poll of the new Grand Old Party membership on the Hill and, although repulsed by some determined and skillful fence sitters, merges with this significant finding: "The old-time, die-hard isolationist, who still shudders at the word internationalism, and who wouldn't accept aid to the Allies as a national policy as late as 2 months before Pearl Harbor, may be just as vocal and just as acrobatic in the Seventy-eighth Congress, but he can expect few votes and little sympathy from the new Republican Members who filled 64 out of the 208 Grand Old Party seats. The majority of the freshmen do not consider themselves pre-Pearl Harbor isolationists of the Stephen A. Day-Clare Hoffman type." Mr. Kennedy wrote that on the basis of his personal inquiries a box score of the 64 new Grand Old Party Members would read—definitely isolationist, 14; definitely not isolationist, 34; no definite position or position unknown, 16.

The Grand Old Party isolationists still have the words and are still controlling a lot of appointments; it remains to see whether they really have the votes.

If the American people don't want isolationism, the Republican Party won't want it.

Problems of the Dairymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about milk. The problems of the dairymen are close to every Congressman whether from urban or rural districts. I present resolution and statement issued jointly by the Dairy Department of the California Farm Bureau Federation; the California State Grange, Dairy Department, and the Statewide Milk Producers' Committee. Resolutions were adopted at Fresno, Calif., December 2, 1942:

Whereas both fluid and manufacturing milk producers of California are in full accord with and desire to assist and cooperate with the national policy of preventing inflation; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of California, in enacting the State Milk Control Act, has recognized that the production of an adequate supply of fluid milk is vital to the public health and welfare and has authorized the establishment of minimum prices to producers reflecting the proper economic relationship between fluid and manufacturing milk prices, taking into consideration feed and labor costs incurred in producing both fluid and manufacturing milk. Unless this relationship is maintained, supplies of fluid and manufacturing milk will tend to become unbalanced; and

Whereas milk producers, especially fluid milk producers, in California, because of the highly commercialized methods of production which involve the employment of skilled labor and the purchase of much of their hay and grain concentrates and herd replacements, are unable to long withstand maladjustments of milk prices with production costs; and

Whereas some of the principal production cost items, such as the prices of hay, certain grain concentrates, and the wages of milkers and other dairy labor have not yet been stabilized while the wholesale and retail prices of fluid milk have been placed under a ceiling by the Office of Price Administration; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration has recently granted some relief to California fluid-milk distributors by increasing consumer prices to the extent necessary to offset increases in producer prices necessitated by increases in production costs which have occurred since the effective date of the general maximum price regulation issued in May 1942; and

Whereas there is grave danger that such relief may be only temporary because of increases in the prices of the uncontrolled factors entering into production costs; and

Whereas it is our earnest desire that these uncontrolled cost factors should be stabilized so that fluid-milk prices in California will not be forced to higher levels as a result of such increasing production costs;

Now, therefore, we, the members of the dairy department of the California Farm Bureau Federation, representing both fluid milk and manufacturing milk producers; and we the members of the State-wide milk producers' committee and dairy representatives of the California State Grange, representing a majority of California fluid-milk producers, meeting in a joint session in the city of Fresno on the 2d day of December 1942, do unanimously recommend that the following steps be taken immediately to stabilize our milk production costs in order to prevent the necessity of further increases in milk prices in this State:

1. It is requested that all agencies of our State and Federal Governments give immediate consideration to the necessity of maintaining a milk supply in California which will be adequate to cover at least the requirements of both the personnel of the armed forces and civilians residing within the State of California. While our milk production has been maintained close to the same level attained in 1941, demands for fluid milk and milk products have increased greatly because of the increase in the number of persons in military service quartered within the State and also because of the greatly increased civilian population in connection with the war industries operating in California. Eminent physicians, dentists, and nutritionists agree that milk and dairy products have a high protective value in helping to maintain a proper health standard. This is of particular importance today, since so many doctors have been drafted or have enlisted in the armed forces that we are informed that there is left in civilian life only 1 doctor for every 2,000 persons. It would, therefore, appear all the more necessary that the milk supply in California should be increased to a level which would provide an adequate supply for the military forces and at the same time maintain for the civilian population at least the minimum required for the maintenance of proper health.

2. The Office of Price Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture should take steps immediately to stabilize the prices of dairy feeds and particularly the price of alfalfa hay. By reason of hay shortages which now exist in some of the principal California consuming areas, including San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Oakland, and Sacramento, and other important milk-production areas, rapid increases in alfalfa-hay prices are taking place and it now appears that the situation will probably become much worse before new supplies can be produced or before supplies can be obtained from sources outside of the State because of the present difficulties and costs of transportation. Steps should be taken immediately to control the prices of alfalfa hay, which at present prices (approximately $30 per ton) is now the largest single item in the cost of producing milk. If it is allowed to increase further over the November basis upon which our present fluid-milk prices are established, it will then necessitate a further raise in the price of fluid milk in order to maintain our present production. Present increases in alfalfa-hay prices are largely resulting in speculative gains to dealers rather than increases in prices to alfalfa-hay growers, since most of the hay has left the growers' possession. One method of correcting this situation would be to advance crop loans to alfalfa growers who at present are forced to sell as soon as the crop is produced. This would reduce speculation which has not worked out to the benefit of either the hay growers or the dairy farmers.

3. The War Manpower Commission should take steps immediately to make sure that sufficient manpower will be made available to hay growers to enable them to properly care for the 1943 crop.

4. The Secretary of Agriculture and the War Production Board should take steps at once to provide sufficient equipment and supplies such as hay-baling equipment, irrigation pumps and repair parts, bale ties, canvas, seed, and fertilizer to enable hay growers to produce necessary supplies of hay required in California. Hay growers in California are at this time deciding which crops to grow in 1943 and present indications are that much alfalfa acreage will be used for other crops unless growers are assured of adequate help and supplies. Also, the Secretary of Agriculture should take steps to provide essential equipment such as milking machines, cooling equipment, lumber, and other items to milk producers in sufficient quantities to enable them to maintain production of fluid and manufacturing milk to required levels. It should be pointed out that War Production Board Order No. L-170 (corrected copy) will cut dairy-farm machines and equipment to such a low point that California dairymen will not be able to maintain present production. These quotas must be raised substantially if serious decreases in production are to be avoided.

5. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration should stabilize farm prices at levels which will enable agriculture to pay wages reasonably comparable to those paid by competing war industries, in order to enable farmers in California to retain sufficient help to maintain production at desired levels.

6. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration are requested to take steps to make soybean meal available to California dairymen. Due to the fact that California is unable to import copra meal, which was one of the most commonly used and satisfactory high-protein feeds, it is now necessary to replace it by using soybean meal as a high-protein source. We are advised that it is not profitable for California mills to receive and crush middle western soybeans and to sell them at present price ceilings imposed by the Office of Price Administration. This disadvantage should be removed immediately so that existing crushing equipment in California may be utilized and so that soybean meal may be made available to California milk producers at prices com-

parable with those of other high-protein feed concentrates.

7. It is requested that the War Manpower Commission arrange to make available to California milk producers and hay and feed growers a sufficient number of competent farm workers. All unnecessary restrictions should be removed which make it impossible for milk producers and hay growers to obtain such persons without long delays and inconvenience.

8. The United States Department of Agriculture should take appropriate steps to make sure that the proposed subsidy plan recently announced for manufacturing milk products is not operated in California in a manner which jeopardizes fluid milk supplies. It must be kept in mind that, in order to maintain stability of supply, fluid milk prices must be kept in proper relationship with manufacturing milk prices. Thus a subsidy paid to manufacturing milk producers without a corresponding adjustment in prices to fluid milk producers would cause a shift in supply away from fluid milk channels, a trend which should not be brought about at this time because of present shortages of fluid milk.

9. The Office of Price Administration and the War Production Board should remove existing quotas regulating the slaughter of dairy-type cows by packers operating within the State of California. The present regulations have reduced the prices of cull dairy cows in the stockyards from $10 to $15 per head, thus causing loss to dairymen; have slowed up the sale of cull cows which are no longer profitable for dairymen to keep in their herds; and have created a serious conflict with State and Federal laws which require that tuberculous reacting cows must be slaughtered within 30 days if an indemnity for the owner is to be obtained. It is our opinion that these regulations should be removed entirely so as to permit the normal flow of such cull-type cows for slaughter. We believe that the present methods of buyers in the various stockyards of the State will remove to a large extent the possible slaughter of good dairy cows since any such cows, for the most part, are now reclaimed and returned to dairy herds so that their production is not lost.

10. The Office of Defense Transportation and the Office of Price Administration should make sure that adequate gasoline, trucks, repair parts, and other transportation facilities are available to milk producers, hay producers, and others engaged in performing essential services for the dairy industry of the State, to enable them to carry on their work without interruption and delay.

DAIRY DEPARTMENT, CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
By DWIGHT STEPHENSON, *Chairman.*
CALIFORNIA STATE GRANGE, DAIRY DEPARTMENT,
By MATHEUS OLIVERIA.
STATEWIDE MILK PRODUCERS' COMMITTEE,
By FRANK L. PELLISSIER, *Chairman.*

The Governor of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks, I am including a press statement released by me today, in relation with my bill to provide a greater degree of self-government for the Territory of Puerto Rico; to provide for the election of the Governor by the people of Puerto Rico and, to that effect, to amend the organic act of Puerto Rico; and for other purposes:

Today I introduced in the House a bill to provide a greater degree of self-government for the Territory of Puerto Rico; to provide for the election of the Governor by the people of Puerto Rico, and, to that effect, to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; and for other purposes.

This bill provides for the election of the Governor by the people of Puerto Rico, at the general elections to be held in 1944, amending thereto the present Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

In 1898, when the Americans took over Puerto Rico, the island was enjoying a charter of autonomy or home rule granted by the Spanish monarchy. By such charter a parliamentary form of government was established, with an insular parliament elected by the Puerto Rican people, and a premier and executive cabinet responsible to, and removable by, the Puerto Rican Parliament. The insular government was authorized to pass tariff laws and to enter on trade agreements with foreign countries, to protect and foster the Puerto Rican economy and welfare. Said charter further provided that no law of the Spanish Congress could be enforced in Puerto Rico without the consent of the Puerto Rican Parliament. In synthesis, under the Spanish monarchy, at the time when the American military government ousted the island's civil government, Puerto Ricans had home rule. The home-rule charter also made Puerto Rico a province or state within the Spanish Nation, and Puerto Rico had the right to elect 3 senators and 16 representatives, with full rights and prerogatives, to the Spanish National Congress.

After 44 long years of American administration, Puerto Rico is today a mere possession, under an out-of-date colonial system of government established by the present Organic Act. The people of Puerto Rico have no voice in choosing its Governor who wields tremendous powers over the Puerto Rican people. The Governor is appointed and removed at the pleasure of the President. The heads of the executive departments of the Puerto Rican government are appointed, some by the President and others by the Governor. The judges of the insular supreme court, which may overrule all decisions of the other insular courts, are appointed by the President. All other insular-court judges are appointed by the Governor. Our insular legislature passes its bills, but subject to the veto of the Governor, which veto is practically absolute. The President decrees if a bill passed over the Governor's veto becomes a law or not. And the Congress of the United States reserves the right to annul all our insular legislation.

Such colonial shape of government is out of date for the Puerto Rican people, which is a civilized people, orderly and loyal to the United States, and educated and trained for self-government.

Puerto Rico deserves and is requesting the right to choose its own Governor, one that may be removed by the Puerto Rican people.

Under the present organic act it has been possible during over 1 long year that one Rexford G. Tugwell has been Governor of Puerto Rico, against the will and against the consent of the Puerto Rican people. Tugwell has been facing a bitter opposition from the Puerto Rican people and from its bona fide organizations representing industry, agriculture, commerce, and labor. Governor Tugwell is taking Puerto Rico as a guinea pig for crazy experiments. He is enforcing measures which were rejected by the Puerto Rican people at the polls in last general election. While Tugwell is wasting millions of the Government money in his experiments and unconstitutional new set-ups, today the Puerto Rican people, more than ever, are suffering unemployment, want, and misery. Industry, agriculture, and business are practically wrecked, free enterprise is threatened to disappear, and the island is at the verge of ruin and chaos.

As a matter of justice, and to prevent other Tugwells in the future, the Puerto Ricans are requesting the right to choose and remove their Governor.

The champions of the Atlantic Charter, of the "four freedoms," and all that for foreign lands should see that Puerto Rico, an American Territory, inhabited by 2,000,000 American citizens, under the American flag, should have a fair and just treatment and should be under a truly democratic government, supported by the will and consent of the Puerto Rican people.

Maj. Gen. Patch's Address to His Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, at Camp Forrest, Tenn., on November 23, 1942, Maj. Gen. J. D. Patch, division commander, addressed the soldiers of the Eightieth Division.

The originality, sincerity, earnestness, and high moral tone of his remarks were calculated to inspire the highest patriotism in his soldiers, and I think the American people would like to hear his words, and under leave granted, I submit herewith the address so delivered by him. His appeal to the spiritual side of his soldiers is highly commendable.

General Patch entered the Army many years ago as a private, and came up the hard way. He went to France with the first contingent of American soldiers in the last World War, and remained there until the summer of 1919. He was badly wounded in action during that war.

Since the close of the first World War he has had many important assignments. He is quiet, unassuming, and above and beyond all that, he is at all times a soldier.

His wife was the former Minerva King, and is related to Congressman RICHARD KLEBERG, Mr. and Mrs. Roy Miller, and other prominent Texans.

The address follows:

Soldiers of the Eightieth Division, as your division commander, I want to offer you one word of advice relative to preparing yourselves for the trying days to come. I may say that I speak with some personal experience.

My one piece of advice is to be yourself, be an American. In preparing ourselves for battle—haranguing, nagging, bullying, cursing, or any other driving methods—are entirely out of order. We can produce a sort of surface discipline by such methods—but it will break in battle. Battles are won and

lost long before the battlefield is reached. It is the kind of leader who says "come on," not "go on" that American men will follow.

The foundation of the strength of our great Nation is the sacredness of the home. Our spiritual strength comes from our mothers, our fathers, our wives, our sweethearts, our sisters, and our brothers back home. Harden yourselves physically—yes—but always look back home for your spiritual guidance, and attend religious services when you are away from home. He isn't a sissy who goes to church—he is a man, because he there derives the full knowledge of the righteousness of his cause—and once in that state of mind he is the most dangerous of all fighters.

Again, let me repeat—you are an American—you are Bill Smith from Little Rock, Ark.—you are Tom Jenkins from Newark, N. J.—you are Jim Moran from Pittsburgh, Pa.—and no slave-driven Jap or German can ever molest or destroy our people back home. You will fight for your country, and you will fight for her as you would fight for your own mother if a criminal were to assault her, because you will know that you are fighting for the best people and the best country on the face of this earth.

Books and Reading for Service Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity of congratulating the American Library Association, the Red Cross, and the United Service Organizations for sponsoring the 1943 victory-book campaign, which opened officially January 5. This movement was laudable and thoroughly patriotic and should meet with the heartiest response from all those who have books and reading material available for our men in camps, naval bases, ports of embarkation, on ships, and behind the battle line.

Our Army and naval officers have repeatedly asserted that our boys in service are lovers of books and of reading. This movement is a Nation-wide project because the supplying of books and of reading material engenders the readers thereof with more hope, more courage, more enthusiasm, and more devotion to duty. I know of nothing more important to the welfare of the boys and girls and the men and women of America than the love of reading, and this statement holds particularly true with the millions of boys now in our armed forces.

I have long been interested in books and reading, and I feel I know the influence good books have had upon the youth of our land.

Palmer, in his great book on self-cultivation in English, aptly says:

He is unwise, however busy, who does not have his loved authors, veritable friends, in whom he may seek refuge in the intervals of work, and by whose influence he enlivens, refines, enriches, and emboldens his own limited existence.

Milton, in his splendid essay, Liberty of Printing, in comparing men and books, said:

Many a man lives a burden to the earth, but a good book is the precious lifeblood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life.

Those of us on the home front have repeatedly stated that we would make every sacrifice on behalf of our boys in service. If our books home bring a joy and solace to us after the turmoil of a busy day, how much more joy and solace and comfort and inspiration they will bring to our boys scattered everywhere in their fight for liberty. This movement should be endorsed by every liberty-loving man and woman.

Uncle Sam as Santa Claus Forgot the Postal Employees at Pay Boost Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the following short editorial taken from the De Kalb (Ill.) Chronicle of January 12, 1943, expresses my feelings and sentiments so well concerning the forgotten postal employees of the Nation that I wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues in the House. I therefore include it in my extension of remarks:

UNCLE SAM AS SANTA CLAUS FORGOT THE POSTAL EMPLOYEES AT PAY BOOST TIME

Just now while the memory of the great job they did with the Christmas rush is fresh with the De Kalb public is a good time to remind the citizens that the action taken a few days ago by the retiring Congress in voting for a so-called salary increase for Federal employees does not meet the just demand of post office employees for a basic increase in pay.

We hope that the public does not get the idea that the faithful and hard-working postal employees had been taken care of under this action because that is not the truth.

The actual facts are that the postal employees have received no basic pay increase since 1925, but they did receive a direct cut in their basic pay back in 1932 and 1933 and a further indirect cut through the rising prices.

The new measure passed by the Congress applies only to overtime worked by postal employees. During the holiday season and in areas crowded by new war industry populations, postal employees stand to benefit very slightly by the increase in overtime allowance because the vast majority of postal employees do not work overtime.

The work of the post office forces is about the most important part of our communications system. Their demands for a better basic wage rate have been given the run-around time after time by the Government. While thousands and thousands of unnecessary clerical help have been hired at good wages to hamper the work of the bureaus at the capital, most every post office is understaffed and the pay is not commensurate with the grand job that has been done.

While Uncle Sam was doing the Santa Claus stunt for the horde of workers who decorate the Federal scene at the National Capital he might well have reached in his sack and pulled out something for the post office workers. They deserve it.

Fuel Shortage in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, because of the critical fuel shortage in New England and the East at the present time, the members of the State legislatures are deeply concerned in the handling of the problem.

I submit for the consideration of the Members of the House resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in support of any necessary legislation which will provide relief for the many sufferers in Massachusetts at this time. I hope that the Members of Congress will take such steps as are necessary on their part to relieve this critical situation.

The resolutions are as follows:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO TAKE IMMEDIATE STEPS TO RELIEVE DISTRESS AND SUFFERING CAUSED BY THE SHORTAGE OF FUEL OIL IN MASSACHUSETTS

Whereas the prosecution of the existing war has limited the facilities for the transportation of fuel oil into the New England States, thereby drastically reducing the supply thereof; and

Whereas the people of this Commonwealth are undergoing great suffering by reason of their inability to properly heat their homes due to said reduced supply of fuel oil, thereby creating a deplorable condition and a serious menace to the lives and health of the people of this Commonwealth; and

Whereas the people of this Commonwealth look to Congress for the providing of immediate relief from this dangerous situation; and

Whereas tragedy has already occurred in this Commonwealth in the death of residents thereof due to exposure to cold in their homes; and

Whereas many stricken families without heat in their homes will soon be forced to seek shelter elsewhere unless immediate relief is provided: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts respectfully urges upon the Congress of the United States the dire necessity of immediate action by it, through legislation or otherwise, so that relief may be provided without delay for the people of this Commonwealth who are so vitally affected by this extraordinary emergency which deprives many of them of the only means of heating their homes and who are threatened with increased suffering if such action is not taken forthwith; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth forthwith forward copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress and to the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth.

Farm Production Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, on January 12 the United States Department of Agriculture War Boards will hold county conferences throughout the State of Iowa to explain and discuss 1943 production quotas for the farms of the various counties. Farmers will be asked to produce more food.

They will do so in spite of the shortage of manpower and other difficulties. The demand for food for ourselves and our allies will be met.

It is slightly discouraging, however, that at the same time announcement is made of further cuts in the supply of new farm machinery. For example, for the whole State of Iowa there will be allowed the following quotas of certain essential machinery:

Horse-drawn row-crop planters, more than 1 row	400
Tractor-drawn row-crop planters	207
Tractor-drawn cultivators	2,992
Tractors	2,051
Farm wagons	1,050
Cream separators	1,162
Horse-drawn mowers	404

This will mean, for example, an average of six new corn planters for each county. On certain equipment no quotas at all were established.

We also have constant appeals from small companies making farm equipment in regard to their inability to get small quantities of material necessary for the making of farm machinery.

The situation is complicated further by the fact that many men skilled in the repair of farm machinery are now in the Army.

It is not the purpose here to make any complaint. We in the agricultural communities recognize fully the necessity for getting the maximum production of planes, tanks, and guns. It seems entirely proper, however, at this time to call attention to the fact that the United States production of steel in 1943 will approach twice the combined output of the Axis Nations. Current United States steel capacity of 89,000,000 tons will be increased to approximately 97,000,000 tons by mid-1943. All we wish to urge is that food also is necessary to win the war. We trust that those in authority who fix the quotas for machinery will take a broad and realistic view of the situation and allot for making and repairing of farm machinery the maximum tonnage of materials consistent with the military program.

As part of these remarks I include a letter from E. R. Aschenbrenner, of Traer, Iowa, which sets out very clearly the practical effect of the limitation of machinery on the production of food. It should be noted that since the letter was written further limitations have been made than those referred to in the letter:

TRAER, IOWA, *November 29, 1942.*
Hon. JOHN W. GWYNNE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GWYNNE: As I am a pioneer farm-tractor owner and operator (I purchased my first farm tractor in 1916), I am qualified by experience to state the needs and requirements of agriculture so far as tractor machinery is concerned.

Regardless of how good your land is, no matter how thoroughly the seed bed is prepared, unless the crop is properly planted the harvest will not meet the requirements of present war-production needs. For the last few years I have needed a new corn planter but have put off purchasing one because there was no company manufacturing one that could be operated successfully when drawn by a tractor.

To the best of my knowledge no manufacturer built a planter especially designed for tractor operation. They did attempt to adapt their horse-drawn planters to a tractor but these make-shifts are not reliable. Some manufacturers have developed mounted planters which can only be used on tractors manufactured by them.

Last year the John Deere Plow Co. placed a two-row tractor-drawn planter on the market. My investigation has proven them very satisfactory and last spring I placed an order with V. D. Webrandt, of Reinbeck, for delivery in 1943. Last week Mr. Webrandt informed me that he could not deliver me a corn planter next spring because some efficiency expert in Washington has denied the John Deere Co. the right to produce a single one of these planters. He supported his statement by showing me a copy of the quota allowed different manufacturers of farm implements. The manufacturers are grouped according to their volume of sales. Large manufacturers are given small percentages of production while the smaller companies are given about 75 percent of the production. The Deere Co. falls in the larger class. Following are quotas allowed on corn planters:

	Percent production
Tractor-drawn corn planters, 2-row:	
Large companies	None
Smaller companies	100
Tractor-mounted corn planters:	
Large companies	15
Smaller companies	85

Now Mr. GWYNNE, here is the situation as I see it in regard to the thousands of corn producers that find themselves in the same situation facing me. My crop is reduced in 1942 by at least 15 percent because of worn-out planting equipment. The 1943 crop will be reduced more unless this equipment is replaced. I cannot replace it with mounted or horse-drawn equipment. Because the order issued forbidding the John Deere Co. to build any planters that have been designed and have proven successful for tractor operation prevents me from purchasing one of these machines, I must do one of the following, and I know that neither plan will result in 100-percent production.

I must either use my old planter which already has shown 15 percent inefficiency, or else purchase a machine primarily designed for horses and therefore not adapted to tractor speed, inequality of seedbed and many other problems that confront the man in the field and are unknown to the efficiency expert who farms from a desk in a heated room and imagines himself a dirt farmer.

This may seem a small matter to you but in the face of all-out war production it is a very big item to me and thousands of other farmers in the Corn Belt. It certainly demands the investigation and action of Congress while there is yet time to get these planters in the hands of the farmer before corn planting starts which will be about the middle of April.

Yours truly,

E. R. ASCHENBRENNER.

Tool Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MAYHEW STEEL PRODUCTS, INC.,
Shelburne Falls, Mass., January 4, 1943.
WAR DEPARTMENT,
Army Air Forces, Western Procurement District, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Your Public Relations Bulletin No. 1 has been received and carefully studied.

All that you say is important and should be of material aid in the tasks which confront all of us.

You have our assurance that in our plants a minimum of waste or loss of time is experienced.

It is a safe statement that had we been able to obtain steel and other materials on time and without the delays and "red tape" of the system used by War Production Board our organization readily could have produced from 50 to 60 percent more in 1942 than we did accomplish.

Furthermore, we have just examined some of the recent invitations to bid from the Air Corps, Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio. For the tools we are prepared to supply we object to the plant protection clauses, we object to the requirement about copies of our balance sheets every 90 days and if we are bidding competitively we object to the annoyance and in most cases impossible calculations as to a break-down of manufacturing costs. So far as we have seen no other branch of the services goes to such lengths in setting up what we regard as unnecessary detailed reports and expense.

Our experience for nearly 100 years is the manufacture of tools—not the making of reports or the preparation of all kinds of data, most of which will never be used and which accomplishes little toward the supreme war effort.

This past week we have had the worst sleet and ice storm in a generation. With no fuel, with power lines down, with no lighting and with no transportation in our plant in Conway for days, we nevertheless continued with our work in zero temperatures and on December 31, in accordance with our promises, we made the largest shipment of thread-cutting tools for war production use ever made from our plant in its entire history.

Men with the fortitude, the backbone, and the fiber which this represents can carry out the ideals of accomplishment which your excellent Bulletin No. 1 requests. But by the same token men of this character and unbreakable determination can be mentally and spiritually worn down when they see the unnecessary wasted manpower hours of an increasing percentage of workers who are bequested, besieged, and required to make reports, reports, reports for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the Army, for the Navy, for the War Production Board,

for the Bureau of the Census, and now for the War Department, Army Air Corps.

My boys, your boys, our boys from the neighborhood are getting into fighting. More of them than I want to think of will die. That Government in its multitude of departments can ask for the nonsensical wasting of hundreds of millions of manpower hours, materials, and energy for the sake of forms, questionnaires, reports, etc., is one of the most pathetic mistakes of this war and one for which there would seem to be a very simple answer, which I earnestly pray our new Congress will quickly find.

Faithfully yours,

J. B. PARSONS, *President.*

Bill To Provide National Commission on Post-War Reconstruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of Congress and of the very large number of organizations and individuals throughout the Nation who have communicated with me about the matter I ask to include herewith the text of House Joint Resolution 36. This measure was introduced by me on the first day of this session and is successor to a measure—House Joint Resolution 291—which was continuously before the House during the Seventy-seventh Congress, and which was unanimously reported to the House by the Labor Committee, to which it was referred after careful consideration by a subcommittee of which Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK was chairman:

House Joint Resolution 36

Joint resolution to establish the National Commission for Post-War Reconstruction

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a National Commission for Post-War Reconstruction (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), to be composed of 10 congressional members and 29 associate members. The congressional members shall consist of 5 Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 5 Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The associate members shall consist of 29 members to be appointed by the President, as follows: Three from the executive branch of the Government; 3 from organizations of farmers; 3 from organizations of labor; 3 from organizations of business and industry (at least 1 of whom shall be from an organization of small business); 1 from organizations of banks and financial institutions; 3 from church organizations; 3 from organizations of American war veterans (at least 1 of whom shall be a combat veteran of the Second World War); 2 from educational associations; 2 from organizations of consumers; 3 from cooperatives, 1 of whom shall be from consumer cooperatives, 1 from producer cooperatives, and 1 from credit unions; 1 from public health and welfare associations; 1 outstanding economist; and 1 outstanding industrial engineer. In the case of appointments to be made by the President any bona fide nationally recognized organization of any group from which appointment is to be made may submit to the President for his consideration a list of not less than 3 persons as nominees for appointment, and the President shall be guided by such nominations in making appointments to the Commission. A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Commission and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

SEC. 2. The Commission shall recognize the fact that the first task of America is the winning of the war, and shall conduct its work with this primary objective of the Nation constantly in mind.

SEC. 3. The Commission may carry forward its work in whatever manner will in the opinion of its members achieve the best results. It may conduct hearings, public or executive, assemble and publish data, analyses, and opinion regarding the meeting of the problems of the post-war period. The aim and objective of the Commission's work shall be the democratic development of a practical program for the continuous full employment of all Americans able and willing to work, the achievement and maintenance of a condition of economic health and welfare, for all groups in the population, and the preservation of opportunity for free enterprise. Such a program shall not be limited to legislative proposals but may also include plans for action by business, finance, labor, agriculture, consumers, or any other groups, organizations, or citizens which would, in the opinion of the Commission, contribute to the objectives set forth in this section. The Commission shall give special attention to measures to be taken at the time of the return of the Nation to a peacetime economy in order that the reduction of war expenditures will not result in unemployment and distress.

SEC. 4. It shall be the duty of members of the Commission to secure the greatest possible degree of participation and interest in the work of the Commission on the part of the groups from which such members shall have been chosen. Members shall constantly bring before such groups problems, findings, and proposals of the Commission and shall encourage discussion, analysis, recommendations, and criticism from such groups.

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission shall elect from its congressional members a chairman and a vice chairman. Members of the Commission shall serve without additional compensation, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the exercise of the functions of the Commission.

(b) The Commission shall select, on the basis of qualifications for the work, an executive director. Such executive director need not be a member of the Commission. The Commission may fix the compensation of the executive director at not to exceed $10,000 per year.

(c) The Commission may, if it deems it in the interest of effective prosecution of its work, select an executive committee from its membership and delegate to such committee such special duties and responsibilities as it sees fit. The Commission may also divide itself into subcommittees for the consideration of particular phases of its work or for dealing with particular problems.

(d) Each member of the Commission may designate some one person to act as his alternate upon the Commission at times of his enforced absence.

SEC. 6. For the purpose of this joint resolution, the Commission, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth and succeeding Congresses, and to use such voluntary and uncompensated services as it may deem necessary.

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress may be used by the Commission to assist it, and the Commission is authorized to transfer such sums as may be necessary for this purpose. The Commission may also utilize the services, information facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government, and it may employ and fix the compensation of such other experts and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties.

SEC. 7. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to continue the Commission until such time as its work is completed. The Commission shall report to Congress and the President from time to time upon the progress of its work. Within 1 year from the date of its creation the Commission shall make a preliminary report. The congressional members of the Commission may recommend legislation to the Congress.

(b) A majority of the congressional members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, and such a quorum being present, the powers conferred upon the Commission by this joint resolution may be exercised by a majority vote of all members present.

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Marion T. Bennett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station KWTO, Springfield, Mo., January 11, 1943:

Voters of the Sixth Congressional District in Missouri, on last Monday I addressed you over this same station, and on that same evening over KGBX in behalf of MARION T. BENNETT, the Republican nominee for Congress to succeed his illustrious father, Phil A. Bennett, in the special election to be held tomorrow. Little did I think a week ago that I would be back here addressing you today. I returned hurriedly to Washington for the opening of the Seventy-eighth Congress last Wednesday, to be sworn in with other Members, and remained to hear the President's annual message delivered the following day.

I wish that every one listening to me could have been present at the opening of this new Congress. My, what a different scene from the ones we have had during the last 10 years. No longer do we have a lop-sided Congress, with a top-heavy New Deal majority, but a membership more evenly divided between the 2 major political parties, which should, and in my opinion will, give better, more efficient and more economical government to the American people. Realizing that the vote last November was a protest against bureaucratic bungling and New Deal waste and incompetence, and faced with the most powerful minority he has had since his first inauguration, the President made a moderate, temperate and conciliatory address. It was the least objectionable of any of his annual messages and, on the whole, was a comprehensive and careful review of

our progress and aims in this war. Smooth politician that he is, he was cautious to avoid controversial subjects and on the whole his address was well received by most Members regardless of party ties.

It would seem that the American people spoke loud enough in November that the President at least heard them, and we should now have more unity and cooperation because of a virile and strengthened minority party. Just as competition is necessary in order to have good business, so, in order to have good, efficient, honest, and economical government, we should always have in this Republic a highly organized, intelligent, and fearless minority party which has not only the sacred right, but also the solemn duty, to criticize and hold in check the party that happens to be in power. This is why I returned to Missouri during the holidays to campaign for MARION BENNETT, and it is the reason I returned to Missouri over the past week end to speak in his behalf. We want to hold our increased minority strength, not merely because we are Republicans but because we believe this increased opposition already has had a tendency to put the brakes on the bureaucrats and has caused the President to pause and more carefully weigh the desperate situation in which the country finds itself. This wholesome opposition will materially aid in quickly winning the war.

All good Americans, wherever they live and whoever they are, regardless of race, party, or creed, want to win this war, and we are willing to sacrifice and deny ourselves not only the conveniences and comforts of life but even give up some of the necessities until it hurts in order to win. At the same time, however, we want to make sure that our sacrifices are not in vain; that the dimes collected from school children to buy stamps and the Victory tax taken out of the pay rolls of the men and women who toil are not wasted in futile fashion and on useless projects. An American always wants to get his money's worth. Certainly we do not want blind obstructionism, but we do want intelligent criticism and effective cooperation.

MARION BENNETT'S opponent in the special election tomorrow is the same man who ran against his father and was defeated last November by almost 8,000 votes. At that time Mr. BENNETT'S opponent boldly and publicly declared that he was 1,000 percent for anything the President wanted and was even for him for a fourth term. The American people do not ask for such blind, slavish, and servile obedience from any Member of Congress, and if the vote last November proved one thing it was that the American people do not want one-man rule in this country. Nor do they want any more rubber stamps in Congress. Their verdict was to restore a proper balance between the three coordinate and coequal branches of our Government. The desire of all true lovers of liberty is to see the new Congress, which has just convened, take back unto itself many of the excessive and extraordinary powers which it has voted the Executive under the pressure of war and the cry of emergency. The people want the men whom they choose and elect to office to write the laws under which they are to live instead of being compelled to carry out the arbitrary orders of the bureaucrats who are never elected by anyone. There is no way for the people to resist the autocratic decrees issued by Executive appointees. The people can hire and fire Members of Congress, but they cannot fire or vote against any bureaucrats in Washington. These appointees are responsible only to the Chief Executive, and in this Republic no one wants government by Presidential fiat.

Since I spoke to you last Monday some of my friends in Springfield have told you over the radio that MARION BENNETT'S opponent is an independent man who will do his own thinking and not be controlled by anyone. Indeed, it is being said over the Sixth District that this same man who 2 months ago was willing to be a rubber stamp for all New Deal legislation, who was for a fourth term, and for the President 1,000 percent, is now really opposed to some of the administration's domestic policies. What a metamorphosis. It makes one smile, if it does not make him laugh, to witness such an about face, or radical change, in a candidate within 2 months' time. Has MARION BENNETT'S opponent really been converted? Has he personally and publicly confessed his error? Has he sincerely undergone a change? Or, is he traveling the way the wind is blowing? I am not questioning his integrity. Toward him I have only the kindliest feelings. He is a most personable and likable man. I have not mentioned his name because I want everyone to forget it. Nor have I said a word against him in this campaign. All I have done is to accurately review the good works and the valuable services rendered by Phil Bennett as your Congressman. All that I have done is to tell you the fine type of man his son is, and how well qualified from the standpoint of character, education, and experience he is to faithfully carry out his father's program which you good people in the Sixth District, Republicans and Democrats alike, approved by such a substantial majority only 2 months ago. MARION BENNETT stands today where he and his father stood during the last campaign. He has not turned an intellectual somersault, nor has he made a political flip-flop because of any election returns. The people of the Sixth District know that Phil Bennett was a friend of the farmer, the old people, the veteran, the small businessman, and the honest union laborer, and those who know MARION BENNETT can rest assured that he will be the same stanch friend to all these groups as was his father, serving them all faithfully and equally well.

On my return to Springfield last Friday night, just as the large BENNETT meeting, addressed by Governor Stassen, was closing, I was chided by two or three of my good Democratic friends. They asked me, "Dewey, why aren't you in Washington?" I quickly replied, "For the same reason my friend HARRY TRUMAN isn't in Washington." Senator TRUMAN and I spoke in the same courthouse at Sedalia Saturday night. He addressed the Democrats on the first floor and I spoke to the Republicans on the third floor, and I believe MARION BENNETT will be at least two floors above his opponent when the votes are counted tomorrow night If a vote had been taken at the two meetings in Sedalia Saturday night, I believe Marion would have won by two to one.

I was greatly amused when I was told in Sedalia that they were spreading the ugly rumor in Pettis County that MARION BENNETT is a cripple, terribly deformed, and unable to perform the duties of a Congressman. I suppose that is because I said in a speech at Sedalia on New Year's Eve, just 12 nights ago, that MARION BENNETT had volunteered his services to the Navy but failed to pass the physical examination. Of course MARION BENNETT is not crippled but was rejected because he was underweight. He is not the only Republican who has been almost starved under this New Deal. The poisonous rumor that he is deformed is nothing but a malicious falsehood. Suppose he were crippled? Would that necessarily bar him from holding office? Are there not many intelligent and efficient crippled officeholders?

My good friend JACK COCHRAN, a stanch Democrat, who has represented the Thirteenth Missouri District in St. Louis for many years in Congress, had one of his legs amputated above the knee the other day. Do these poison peddlers believe that this disqualifies JACK COCHRAN from being a Congressman? Last Thursday I saw the President of the United States, a pitiful cripple whose affliction would elicit the deepest sympathy from the stoniest heart, lean heavily on the arm of General Watson, his aide, and walk with difficulty up the ramp to the Speaker's rostrum in our Capitol. Would these New Deal dabblers in dirt, who are telling the people MARION BENNETT is so crippled that he is physically unfit to be Congressman, criticize their own idol, the Chief Magistrate of this great Nation, because of his affliction? My friends, these tactics merely go to show how desperate the opposition is in this campaign. They know that MARION BENNETT is going to be elected tomorrow, and, like drowning men, they grab at any straw. MARION BENNETT is no physical cripple, and certainly he is not crippled in the head half as much as most of the cockeyed New Dealers in Washington.

Many funny things happen in a political campaign, if one just keeps his sense of humor. I was told on my return to Springfield that several of the Democratic legal lights of this fair city have told you people over the radio since I was here last Monday that the only reason that DEWEY SHORT was back here speaking for MARION BENNETT is because he wants to get all his kinfolk to Washington. Well, it is really too bad I don't have more of my kinfolk in Washington because we certainly would change a lot of things.

But in order to keep the record straight, I want to say that not a drop of MARION BENNETT'S blood is in my body. I am rather sorry that there is not, because I believe MARION BENNETT has good blood in him. He is built on race-horse lines—and you watch him come down the home stretch tomorrow night. MARION BENNETT did marry a cousin of mine, and that is proof positive that he is a smart young man. Marion's wife's grandmother and my father are brother and sister, and I am very proud of the fact. Mrs. Bennett was June Young before she married. I gave her commencement address when she graduated at the head of her class down at the little high school at Hurley, in Stone county. She graduated from Southwest Missouri State Teachers College at Springfield, just as her husband did, and for 3 years she taught English in the Galena high school and lived in my home. She and Marion were married in my home, and why should I not be interested in these two fine young people? I have said many nice things about MARION BENNETT, both in public and private, but the best part of him is his dear, sweet wife, who is one of the finest girls I have ever known in spite of the fact that her mother is my cousin. But again, for the sake of argument, suppose MARION BENNETT himself were kin to me, would that bar him from Congress? Have people forgotten that William B. Bankhead, while Speaker of the House, had a brother, JOHN BANKHEAD, in the United States Senate, who is still there, and whose father served in the Senate before these two boys came to Congress? These critics seem to forget fathers and sons have served in Congress and that their present idol, Franklin D. Roosevelt, is a cousin of Teddy Roosevelt, and his wife, Eleanor, is a niece of the former President.

If MARION BENNETT were my brother, that would not render him ineligible for office, and anyone with a thimbleful of brains knows it. Yet, your great legal luminaries in this Ozark metropolis, who have and now occupy official positions which only lawyers can fill, would have you believe that MARION BENNETT should not go to Congress because he married a distant cousin of a Member of that body. This is not silly argument, it is asinine. It is logic reductio ad absurdum—reduced to absurdity. It has no bearing whatever upon this election and is an issue totally foreign to this campaign. It is an ignoble appeal to blind prejudice. Again it shows how desperate the opposition is, and what tactics they will resort to in order to win. I am surprised that the

Democratic committee would have their campaign orators waste their funds in such an idiotic manner.

Voters of the sixth district, you have not only the privilege but also the duty of choosing your own Government officials. Your sons, brothers, husbands, and sweethearts are fighting and dying on foreign fields and in distant waters to maintain this sovereign power for the individual citizen. America is the last citadel of freedom. This is the only great country left where free elections are held. There are no elections in Japan, in Russia, in Germany, in Italy, or even in the so-called Republics of Finland and Great Britain. Even in these two latter countries elections have been called off for the duration. Unless the right to vote is exercised, that right will die, as one's arm would wither were it never raised. I urge you in the name of patriotism and liberty to be true to the thing for which our men are fighting and dying. Regardless of weather conditions tomorrow and the difficulties of travel, go to the polls and vote for MARION T. BENNETT, who will prove a worthy successor to his good father.

Tonight I will see you good people of Barton County at Lamar.

Happy New Year to everyone. God bless you all and protect our boys wherever they may be.

These Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication by Mr. George E. Sokolsky, from the New York Sun:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

A LETTER TO CONGRESS

Gentlemen and Ladies of the Congress of the United States:

In spite of every pressure from powerful propagandist groups, the majority of the people of the United States spoke their decision in unmistakable language in the last election. If you deduct the votes in the solid South, where the choice is not made on current issues but in adherence to a tradition which is no longer tenable, the protest vote was overwhelming. The American people expect you to respond to their will. They will be a very angry people if you fail them.

You possess specific constitutional powers and obligations. You have the power to legislate. You have the power to appropriate funds for the Government. You have the power to control expenditures. You have the power to tax the people. You have the power to investigate all official conduct. You are required to guard our structure of Government so that it remains a representative Republic and does not become a centralized bureaucracy after the German or Russian fashion. It is up to you to see to it that our relations with all foreign countries, friend and foe, ally and enemy, are such that our future is not imperiled. The Constitution requires that treaties have the consent of one of your Houses—it is your business to see to it that no subterfuge interferes with your duty.

TOO MUCH "MUST"

Your reputation has not been what it should have been in recent years. That definitely was so because you permitted yourselves the luxury of allowing others to think for you and to write bills for you. You passed legislation that others called "must," that unresponsible and perhaps even irresponsible persons passed on to you. The people dislike that. They elected you to legislate, not the others. You cannot pass the buck for your failure to scrutinize bills and to understand their purport by saying that the President wanted something. He has his business to do and you have yours, and it is plain where his functions end and yours begin. When you permitted the wealth of this Nation to be dissipated in futilities, that was your fault and you are to blame. It is your fault because it is up to you to make sure that these things do not happen.

I, a simple citizen, write to you sternly because I have a vote and there are millions like me who vote and who are definitely displeased. We are not disloyal, but displeased. We do not want Hitler or the Japanese to win the war, but we also do not want the war used as an excuse and an alibi for every cockeyed scheme that every crazy galoot wants to put over. We are not exactly dumb. We have a pretty good idea of what is going on and we don't like it.

EVERY DOLLAR SHOULD BE WELL SPENT

For instance, I am quite willing not to use my car beyond absolute necessity, and I am quite ready to admit that a member of the Cabinet ought to have adequate gas to transport him to his work. But I will never agree that his wife is any better than my wife and that she is entitled to more gas. And millions feel the same way about it. And it is bad taste for any official or his wife to accept gifts from any foreign official for any reason whatsoever. It is your duty to discover whether there has been any such practice, and if there has been any such carelessness, it should be stopped.

I select these incidents only because they have already been noted, but there are other matters that are more important and more serious that you ought to deal with and consider. For instance, you ought to know that there is justification for every dollar of the people's money that is being spent. I am told that some of the trips to South America by film stars and other actors have been jamborees at terrific expense with nothing to show. We ought to have the facts about that—the facts, not excuses and whitewashing. It is your business to get the facts and to understand them.

Well, here's good luck to you, and may you justify the confidence of your constituents.

Faithfully yours,

GEORGE E. SOKOLSKY.

Future Roll of Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of an address given by Croil Hunter, president and general manager of Northwest Airlines, Inc., at a luncheon meeting held Monday, January 11, 1943, at the Pennsylvania Hotel, New York City, in connection with the annual convention of the National Association of Retail Secretaries:

Any discussion on the future of air transportation must of necessity cover only the highlights and be a summary of salient facts that have been forcibly brought out recently.

You gentlemen are primarily concerned with distribution of goods of all kinds to the public and in transportation since it plays an important part in that distribution, not only because the cost of the transportation is reflected in the cost of the articles, but because new markets for certain types of merchandise are made possible by the kinds of transportation serving them. In other words, items such as dungeoness crabs from Puget Sound, orchids, gardenias, and other flowers, as well as tree-ripened fruits from the west coast, find new markets in the Midwest and the East only because they can reach those markets in good condition within a few hours after leaving their source. Northwest Airlines has conducted experiments on special rates for those commodities that have proven that a profitable volume can be obtained on rates that approach a competitive basis with other transportation. It is obvious that retail distributors will benefit from high-speed air transport as they will be able to quickly replenish their stocks and change their inventories rapidly as is sometimes necessary due to public demand.

To date we have had only a slight indication of the effect this may have on the manufacturers, the jobbers, and the retailers as the cost of air express has been relatively high and the effect of large-scale air transport has not been felt.

It certainly is conceivable that present passenger fares will be reduced from the current rate of around 5 cents per mile to 3 cents per mile, or even less, and that air cargo rates may be reduced from the present 80 cents to 90 cents a ton-mile to 15 cents or even 10 cents a ton-mile. With the vastly accelerated war development of larger, more efficient aircraft, the utilization of the very greatly expanded production facilities, and the enormous number of personnel trained during this war period, direct flying costs will be substantially lower. It is certain that as costs are reduced, traffic volume will be increased and thus make such changes possible.

When we consider that present rail express rates average from 11 cents to 18 cents per ton-mile, first-class less-than-carload lot freight shipments from 7 cents to 8 cents per ton-mile, and motortruck rates 3 cents to 4 cents per ton-mile, it is certainly clear that air cargo rates will be competitive and that a substantial amount of tonnage now moved by rail express and less-than-carload lot freight will be diverted to air, as well as some which is now carried by motortruck. A diversion of even half of such high-grade cargo, now carried by surface transportation, will require a fleet of some 25 to 30 thousand airplanes, as compared to a maximum of 350 planes used in commercial service before about one half were requisitioned by the Government. This does not include the additional number that will be required for carrying all first-class mail and for carrying Pullman and other first-class railroad passengers by air. Probably even such tremendous expansion will not absorb the present productive capacity but, together with private flying, will serve as a potential cushion against violent readjustments during the period of transition to follow the war. Furthermore, it will provide a powerful bulwark for our national defense by constantly maintaining a reservoir of aircraft and trained personnel for any future emergency.

Diversion of cargo from other forms of transportation should not be a matter of great

concern to surface carriers because it will be a gradual process. In fact, the expansion of air transport alone creates a great deal of business for the railroads. During the past year Northwest Airlines paid the railroads over $275,000. In the meantime, air transportation will develop much new business and open up new areas now inaccessible for trade, which will create a great deal more business for the other forms of transportation. Just consider how areas in Central America and in Alaska have been made accessible by the mobility of the airplane and its capacity to disregard terrain difficulties that made pioneering by construction of highways or railroads too slow and expensive. Air transportation will bring into the channels of trade many of the products and resources of hitherto undeveloped regions as well as make new markets and communities to be later served by railroad and highways.

While we are all interested in how the momentous developments and changes now going on will affect us individually, and they are proper subjects for discussion and post-war planning, there are several problems of even more immediate interest which I should like to touch on. First, air transportation in the war effort; second, aviation as an influence for lasting peace; third, how aviation can aid in averting a post-war economic collapse.

The Air Transport Command of the Army Air Forces and the Naval Air Transport service are utilizing airplanes to transport supplies and munitions to all our allies and battlefields in this global war and to bring back casualties and strategic materials. The air lines are currently operating many Army and Navy transport planes from this country to far-flung theaters, conducting operations that a year ago would have been considered impossible. In addition to this they are performing other services for the armed forces, as well as operating domestic commercial air lines taxed to capacity with priority passengers, cargo, and mail, all vital in the war effort. It is hoped that with the steadily increased production of transport aircraft and with the more urgent needs for them in the combat zones relieved, there may be some available for augmenting the air lines' present inadequate air-line fleets.

It is our conviction that, just as the airplane has been a terrifically destructive force in this war, it can be an equally powerful constructive force in bringing about a new world civilization. With the kind of thinking and planning now being done by some of our foremost statesmen, we can hasten the end of the conflict and immediately progress toward new business horizons.

Vice President WALLACE recently said, I quote: "The situation in the world today is parallel in some ways to that in the United States just before the adoption of the Constitution when it was realized that the Articles of Confederation had failed and that some stronger union was needed. Today, measured by travel time, the whole world is actually smaller than was our little country then.

"Item 7 of the Atlantic Charter proclaimed the freedom of the seas. In the century ahead of us, however, airports throughout the world will be even more essential to the maintenance of a stable peace than Suez, Gibraltar, and the Panama Canal were in the past. The use of these far-flung air bases by the United Nations can do more than prevent war, however. It can tie the peoples of the earth together. It can assure increasing economic opportunity for humble citizens throughout this modern world where science is bringing us ever closer to each other."

A world federation, such as he envisions, knows no artificial boundaries nor barriers except for purposes of local policing and administration. Likewise, in the ocean of air, there are no boundaries or barriers over either land or sea. To permit unnecessary and artificial restrictions to interfere with freedom of travel, the exchange of goods, services, and courtesies between the countries of the world, would be like taking away from our Congress the exclusive power, granted by the Constitution, over interstate commerce, and would seriously retard progress toward the goal we all seek.

To Mr. Pogue, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which governs all foreign and domestic air transportation in this country, we must credit equally advanced thinking when he stated, I quote: "Our future plans must call for a large measure of freedom of the air internationally as we have had freedom of the seas. Aviation has shrunk the world to manageable proportions. No longer will there be continents or parts of continents isolated or unreachable. Our own United States, which many of us in the Middle West were taught to think of as being isolated from the rest of the world, protected by the two greatest oceans in the world, must face the fact that our isolation is ended forever."

"Aviation will broaden our understanding of all the world's people. We will have the means of rubbing shoulders with everyone from everywhere. This is new. This is important. The 'air age' will make possible the extension of the good-neighbor policy to all people. It will change civilization and, I firmly declare, it will contribute mightily toward the cause of an enduring peace."

The adoption of a policy of freedom of the air and its addition to those freedoms guaranteed by the Atlantic Charter would, in my opinion, be a boon to the war effort and to the peace to follow.

It was gratifying to see a press release from Washington recently that stated that the United States is going to seek an understanding on commercial world air-line rights in the post-war world before the end of the war and that no treaty is necessary to establish sound principles and that, therefore, there is no point in waiting until after the war to reach understandings. The policies the United States will advance involve three fundamentals:

"1. Establishment of the 'right of innocent passage' through the air over any foreign country. The principle means that nonmilitary aircraft could fly over any country, so long as they abide by the regulations made by that country for its own commercial aircraft.

"2. Establishment of the 'right to free landing' on the airports of any foreign country to refuel or for technical reasons. This principle means that nonmilitary aircraft could use foreign airports so long as they did not pick up passengers or discharge them, and so long as they complied with regulations.

"3. Establishment of the principle of 'freedom of the air.' This principle means, any country could license commercial aircraft to engage in commerce between its own country and others, or between two or more foreign countries.

"A parallel, negative principle is that commercial aircraft would not be permitted to engage in 'intranational' commerce except in their own country. In other words, foreign planes could not pick up passengers or freight in New York and land them in Chicago, and our planes could not pick up passengers or freight in London and land them at Liverpool."

Minnesota's Gov. Harold E. Stassen's proposal for the organization of the United Nations of the world contemplates the administration and regulation by the United Nations Council of international airports and air routes under which the right of flight, airways traffic, radio beams, coordination, and dissemination of weather data would be governed. Such airports would be policed by the United Nations Legion to be established by the Stassen proposal.

Governor Stassen said also that our country has renounced post-war rights in airports we are now building all over the world with lend-lease funds but that rights should be reserved now for the benefit of the United Nations to provide the basis for such international control.

This would be a logical extension of the principle of "freedom of the air" and provide a method of insuring its continued effectiveness.

There has been some concern among our allies and neutrals over the advantage that our country will have in international air routes by reason of our present military operation. Undoubtedly, the adoption of the principle of freedom of the air would reassure them that we seek no advantage, and that as soon as hostilities have ceased they will be enabled to develop their own transportation systems. As a matter of fact, such an understanding now would, in many ways, clear the atmosphere, as there is great immediate need for additional international commercial air transportation. Mail, medical supplies, blood plasma, mica, and other vital and precious metals and materials need to be exchanged, and the time element is of greatest importance. Civilian as well as military personnel on vital missions could utilize such service and the morale and confidence of our allies would be constantly strengthened thereby.

The problem of averting a world-wide post-war depression and the predicted great challenge to our economic system after the war can and will be met by the planning that our military as well as civilian leaders are now doing. Certainly, with ample manpower and facilities of production released for constructive effort and with the prompt and full utilization of technological advances, there will be plenty of everything for everybody. It then becomes only a matter of securing an equitable distribution. If we can solve the seemingly insoluble problems of conducting a world-wide global war at a tremendous cost in money, property, and lives, we should be able to solve a relatively simpler problem of finding the means of distributing throughout the world food and goods to save lives, and to provide a new basis on which to rebuild. We have the unity for conducting the war and we will have the unity for preserving the peace. Truly a smaller, more understanding, and better world will be brought about by the benefits of the air age.

Haym Salomon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, we have in this country many professional writers and publicists who, for a few paltry dollars, are directly and indirectly used by Nazi propagandists to create discord and dissension in our country, who have wilfully and deliberately sought to create resentment against the Jewish people in charging that they are disloyal and with many other false charges. Therefore, it gives me pleasure to insert in the RECORD today a news article bearing on the unanimous adoption by the City Council of Chicago and a proclamation by Mayor

Edward J. Kelly last Wednesday, January 13, of Haym Salomon Day in honor of the great American patriot of the Revolutionary War, Haym Salomon, who not only gave all of his services but all of his possessions to aid George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and others in our struggle for independence. And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that there are thousands of others who have at all times demonstrated their patriotism, loyalty, and devotion to our country.

HAYM SALOMON DAY

The city of Chicago is to be congratulated upon its splendid observance Wednesday of Haym Salomon Day in honor of the great Jewish patriot of the American Revolution who died in Philadelphia 157 years ago.

The day upon proclamation of Chicago's Mayor Edward J. Kelly and unanimous adoption of the city council, was devoted to retelling in schools and before public assemblies, the story of the contribution of our founding fathers to the building of America, to an intensified campaign for the sale of Victory bonds and to "rededicating our lives to the cause of liberty for which Haym Salomon sacrificed all he had." A resolution introduced by Alderman Frances E. Callahan explained that "Haym Salomon risked his life and sacrificed his fortune in behalf of the American cause and, together with George Washington and Robert Morris, conducted this Nation's first victory-bond drive."

Salomon left his native Poland to find liberty and freedom in the New World. He early identified himself with the American Revolution. In Philadelphia he served as fiscal agent to the office of the Superintendent of the Revolutionary Government, following his escape from enemy internment in New York. He placed his entire fortune and services at the disposal of his country, and in addition advanced large sums to Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, John Paul Jones, Baron Steuben, Thaddeus Kosciusko, General St. Clair, and other heroes of the Revolution, thus enabling them to carry on the struggle for independence.

In 1941, Corporation Counsel Barnet Hodes and Col. A. A. Sprague, who were cochairmen of the Patriotic Foundation of Chicago, successfully initiated plans to erect a monument in Chicago memorializing the services to America by Robert Morris and Salomon. The monument, by the late sculptor, Lorado Taft, was unveiled on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Bill of Rights, December 15, 1941, and has since become a shrine symbolizing the unity of all peoples and all creeds.

This need for unity in the struggle against tyranny was reemphasized on Wednesday throughout the city, and this gesture represents Americanism at its finest. Furthermore, it also serves to bring home to many the fact that there were Jews in America from this country's earliest days and that their patriotic record has been outstanding.

Beginning with Asser Levy, who, in 1654, won his right to stand guard in New Amsterdam, the military record of Jews has kept pace with the growth of the United States. Many of them achieved high rank and many distinguished themselves for bravery under fire. There were Jews, for example, on General Washington's staff, and it was a Jew, Benjamin Nones, who carried General Lafayette from the battlefield after he was wounded. There were Jews on the front lines in every war in America's history. More than 250,000 served in World War No. 1, and this number will be greatly increased in the present conflict.

One of the greatest dangers this country faces is the effort of the Nazi propaganda machine, which has been attempting to spread the seeds of disunity by an attack on the loyalty and courage of Jews, and then sowing dissension by continuing to attack other segments of America's diversified population. This evil design of the enemy can be counteracted and defeated by presenting the truth, and publicizing that truth as much as possible.

It is for this reason that Chicago's observance takes on much more than local color and is deserving of national interest. We would like to see cities throughout the country mark such a day in like spirit, and then go on to setting aside periods to publicize the patriotic records of American heroes of other descents.

General Welfare Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion lately regarding social security. Although our primary purpose is, of course, to win the war first and talk the peace afterward, there still exists a duty, as pointed out by the President in his annual message, to the legislative bodies of this Nation to lay the foundations for a better social plan, not only for the returning men of the armed services but as a stabilizer in the challenge to come of the post-war world.

I have reintroduced again the so-called general welfare bill. The predominating features of this bill, of course, deal with the particular problem of old-age assistance. A smaller bill introduced by myself in 1936 received some 213 signatures from this body, and again the bill introduced last year fell short of only 1 Member on the petition which would allow its immediate hearing on the floor. As a matter of fact, the last week of Congress found 217 Members of the House of Representatives urging the body to discuss and pass the General Welfare Act.

The salient features of the new bill are as follows:

BILL ANALYZED

The new General Welfare Act, which will be presented to the Seventy-eighth Congress when it opens on Wednesday, January 6 (just as this issue of the News-Advocate comes off the presses and goes into the mails) and which will be published in full beginning with out next issue, contains the following salient features:

1. All who pay the Victory tax of 5 percent for 2 years to be guaranteed a minimum or basic "matured annuity" of $30 per month at 65 at the end of the war as a refund of one-fifth of this Victory tax in addition to the cash refund already provided for in the Revenue Act of 1942.

2. The matured annuity is to be increased to not exceeding $85 per month, at the rate of $1 per month for every full $2 above $5 per calendar quarter that is paid under the Victory tax (which is to be reduced to 2 percent after the war and called a Matured Annuity Tax) for at least one-half of the quarters the individual in question is subject to this tax.

3. This matured annuity is to be in addition to "any other benefit or benefits of any nature that such individual may be receiving from any source whatsoever."

4. It is to be considered as akin to life insurance, only in reverse—those who live to be 65 get it and those who die before reaching that age contribute all that they have paid toward the fund with which to pay annuities to those who live to be 65, just as a person who pays life insurance premiums for 50 years contributes toward the fund to pay the beneficiaries of a person who dies the day after taking out his policy.

5. Funeral benefits of 4 months' annuities are provided for those covered by this system of Government annuities, which means most of the people of the Nation.

6. Those not covered by either this matured annuity system or the present Social Security retirement benefits would be benefited by the measure in the following particulars:

(a) The Federal Government under it would double, instead of merely matching, the contributions of the States to those receiving old-age assistance.

(b) The maximum old-age assistance figure would be raised from $40 to $45 per month.

(c) Recipients would be allowed to earn not more than $30 per month.

(d) They would not have to surrender their homes or their life insurance policies.

(e) They would be allowed funeral benefits by the Federal Government of not to exceed $120.

7. Those drawing retirement benefits under title II of the Social Security Act, under which the minimum benefit is still $10 per month, will be allowed to earn not more than $30 per month in covered employment as well as any amount they can get in uncovered employment. (Their funeral benefits are also taken care of as they would get them by virtue of their paying the Victory tax, they being eligible under both systems.)

8. This will leave the taxing facilities of the Government under title II of the Social Security Act and Federal Insurance Contributions Act open for expansion of the Social Security Act along the lines recommended for England by the Beveridge report. The expansion in America, according to recommendations submitted to the President by the Social Security Board and the National Resources Planning Board long before the Beveridge report was made public, would give those covered by the present pay-roll tax system (industrial and office workers) additional benefits in the form of compensation in the case of disability or sickness and free medical treatment. We have no objection to these benefits being extended to those two groups. In fact, we recommend that the Social Security Act be so extended. However, since these two favored groups which already have quadruple benefits under the Social Security Act (a temporary pension at any age in case of loss of position, a permanent pension at 65, pensions for their wives at 65, and pensions for surviving widows and minor children) and have the free services of two Government agencies and two great labor organizations to fight for their further protection, we feel that we should continue our services exclusively on behalf of the totally unprotected and forgotten citizens of America—the have-nots under the present Social Security Act, approximately 20,000,000 of whom would be brought under coverage by the new General Welfare Act for two benefits (a matured annuity for life and funeral benefits). At present they get no benefits whatever under the Social Security Act, except by poverty registration of themselves and their entire families under title I of the Social Security Act, although they help to subsidize the quadruple benefits to the two favored groups by helping to pay in passed on pay-roll taxes

the employer's four-fifths share of the present pay-roll taxes under the Social Security Act, which all economists and tax experts will admit. Other organizations and individuals, including the Ponzi of the pension field, who stated at the Chicago Democratic National Convention that he "would not be interested in the old people as a class" may espouse further benefits to the haves or favored groups, but as for the G. W. F. A., supported mainly by the contributions of the "have nots," it will continue to lead the battle for them at the Nation's Capital until such time as they receive at least their fair share of the benefits and at least the modicum of compensation a country prosperous even in wartime can afford to allow them for their services in helping to build our Nation and make it what it is today—the greatest nation on the face of the earth.

AS BROAD AS WAR WILL PERMIT

This is as broad an extension of social security in America as the war will permit at the present time. Actual contact with practically all the Members of the last three Congresses convinces us that nothing more stringent than this along pension or social security lines has a ghost of a chance of getting through the Seventy-eighth Congress so long as we are at war. All realize that if the war isn't won all social progress whatever will be gone, so everyone must place the war effort first.

NEW BILL HAS SPLENDID CHANCE

However, a bill containing the features outlined above have a good chance of early enactment, as it would help rather than hinder the war situation. No new tax would be necessary. In fact, there would be a modification of a tax already levied. The Nation would welcome this modification, and Congress should hail it, as it would clear the atmosphere and make the task of Congress easier, for Congress will be forced to find new sources of taxation as our war demands grow. The result, however, would be the inauguration of a general system of annuities to all groups in America that would end once and for all the inequitable and un-American system of social security for just certain groups and certain classes.

PRACTICALLY ALL OBJECTIVES ATTAINED

Were this bill adopted, practically all of the objectives for which we have been fighting for 5½ years would be attained. We could then fight for the balance, just as we are now fighting for a universal social security system after having suggested and worked for the tax which was ultimately adopted and which is ideally suited to sustaining such an all-inclusive social security system in America. In other words, right before our very noses the whole pattern is being worked out just as we had planned it and we are getting, by easy stages, everything for which we have fought so hard in the last three Congresses. We are sorry it couldn't come sooner, but better late than never.

SITUATION VERY HOPEFUL

The situation is hopeful indeed and all general welfare advocates have cause to rejoice that they stuck with the ship and are now helping to bring it safely into port.

Mr. Speaker, in the broader field of social security, paramount in the people's minds today for discussion, is the so-called Beveridge plan. This plan originated in Great Britain to coordinate its social security with its war effort. Any discussion of old-age assistance and social security must of necessity lead into an over-all plan, which the so-called Beveridge idea contemplates. It may be well, therefore, in this discussion to look further into the British proposal. One of the brilliant editorial writers on the Pacific coast, Mr. E. B. Fussell, of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, in an article last week gave a very able history and analysis of the Beveridge plan. I think it well that Members of Congress, who will have this problem before them, look carefully into the Fussell analysis. He said in part:

In a world as closely knit as ours has become, no sweeping internal change can be made in one country without affecting others.

The Beveridge report, proposing a striking extension of social security in Great Britain, is a case in point.

President Roosevelt is reported to have on his desk a report of the National Resources Planning Board, which in many ways parallels the Beveridge report. And with a session of the legislature looming some features of the Beveridge plan may command early attention in this State.

Great Britain started social-security plans much earlier than the United States, and already has carried them much further though rates do not compare with those in this country.

The first British workmen's compensation legislation, for instance, dates from 1895. The State of Washington, in 1911, was the first in this country to put a workmen's compensation law into effect. Besides old-age pensions and unemployment insurance, which Britain adopted long in advance of the United States, the British system now includes medical care.

The Beveridge report proposes to add such features as hospitalization, marriage, maternity, and funeral grants.

What is even more striking, however, is the integration of the entire British social-security system which the Beveridge report proposes. The present British system started, much like our own, in a series of separate laws. The Beveridge plan calls for a unified system to which the individual, his employer (if he has one), and the Government will all contribute under a simplified system of distributing costs and with a schedule of equalized benefits.

Under the present British laws, it is pointed out in the report, a British workman, out of a job, may find his compensation increased if he becomes ill. Another workman, also jobless, may lose money if he becomes sick while out of employment.

Similar contradictory situations may be found under the laws of this State.

Up to the last election, for instance, $40 a month was the standard for an old-age pensioner, $35 for a worker totally incapacitated by an industrial injury. Under referendum 22 the rate for the injured workman was raised to $50. But if the injured worker is married he and his wife receive considerably less than the married old-age pensioner whose wife is also of pension age. Rates of unemployment insurance payments are something else again.

Under the Beveridge plan the base rate proposed for payments to an unmarried man is 24 shillings ($5) a week, for a married man with a wife not gainfully employed, 40 shillings ($8), whether unemployed or incapacitated by age or otherwise.

Rates reflect a British scale below that of the United States, but under various contingencies the basic rates proposed may be increased.

As to old-age pensions, the Beveridge report takes into account the same difference between old-age assistance (requiring means test) and old-age insurance (in which the pensioner contributes to the cost by taxes paid through pay-roll deductions) which now prevails in this country.

The plan calls, however, for the gradual elimination of the means test over a period of 20 years.

Another feature of the plan relating to old-age pensions is to encourage the man or woman able to continue work after reaching minimum retirement age (65 for men, 60 for women) to do so. The pension rate would be increased for each year that was worked after reaching the retirement minimum.

In Time of War Prepare for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the initial responses to House Joint Resolution 28, which I introduced on the opening day of Congress for the purpose of creating a 32-member bipartisan post-war planning commission have been very gratifying, and lead me to believe that there is a substantial segment of American public opinion that agrees with the premise that it is just as important in time of war to prepare for peace as it is in time of peace to prepare for war. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Americans generally will applaud any action this House will take to set up the machinery now for bringing representatives of the executive and legislative departments of Government, together with able representatives of the general public, to consider realistically and dispassionately without political bias or partisan plumping, the optimum outlines for post-war policies which will best serve both our domestic economy and our foreign responsibilities while making the maximum contribution to the peace and prosperity of all mankind. I sincerely believe that the early adoption of House Joint Resolution 28 will create such machinery.

Mr. Speaker, what I have in mind in sponsoring my resolution is the creation of a somewhat analogous agency in the field of intangible planning as that which the Government has set up in the field of tangible inventions. The National Inventors' Council provides a board of hard-headed experts and technicians who examine all inventions submitted to it which offer any possibility of advancing our war program. These inventions are considered on their merit. They are analyzed by craftsmen in the field of machinery and science on the basis of the results they will produce. Not the authorship of the invention but the ability of that invention to serve the common cause is the criterion by which proposals are accepted or rejected. As a result, many helpful inventions are being made available to our armed forces and our drive toward victory is accelerated. It is both unfortunate and unwise that no similar testing laboratory has been established for an equally impersonal and nonpartisan examination and analysis of

the various plans and proposals for post-war policies.

Here again, not the authorship of the proposal but its ability to serve the common cause of world peace and human advancement must be the criterion for its acceptance or rejection. What is of importance is not, "Who said it?" or "Who proposed it?" but "Will it work?" and "Will it deal justly and effectively both with our American destiny and the better world which we all hope will follow this war?" As of today, the man with an invention in the field of explosives or armaments has a source to which he can submit his proposal but the author of a proposal in the field of human relations after this war or in the sphere of post-war economics or politics has no court before which to try his case. We must take action to correct this deficiency or the victory which mechanical inventions are helping to make possible may again prove to be only a successful culmination of a military contest with no lasting advancement being made in the long trail toward a better and more orderly civilization.

Idealists alone can neither win a war nor write a lasting peace. The highly desirable plans of the idealists must be measured always in terms of the practical and the possible. The realists who manage the world's affairs must be consulted in the necessary business of translating valuable ideals into workable plans and programs of action. Such a task is not an easy job. It cannot be done upon the impulse of the moment. It cannot result from consultations around a peace table following a long and bloody war unless careful and conscientious planning and preparation have preceded the peace conference.

It takes longer and it is far more difficult to plan a program of peaceful international existence based upon premises which are sound and principles which are just than it does to plan the most difficult of military campaigns. The elements of strength and power in a military campaign can overcome and conquer even highly important errors in advance planning, but in the field of peaceful human behavior even the strongest and most powerful cannot perpetuate a system which is based on inequities or which ignores fundamental lessons of experience in its make-up.

Post-war policies for America must be workable; they must be based upon the lessons of experience, they must recognize the interplay between foreign policy and domestic economy, they must fall within the realms of plausibility and possibility, they must offer real hope for permanent peace and for general economic stability and prosperity here in the United States with opportunity as well for other nations to develop, if they will practice prudent policies, an economy which will provide stable government and individual prosperity. Simply to discuss world affairs and post-war foreign policies without evaluating their impact upon our domestic economy is no more wise or statesmanlike than to attempt to plan domestic economic programs for recovery and prosperity without studying their workability in the world in which we shall live following the war.

The important link in the chain of events to follow this war is the relationship between sound domestic economy and wise foreign policy. Neither must wreck the other. Neither must weaken the other. Neither must ignore the other. From this it should follow that both should be considered together and that plans for both should without further delay be provided with some testing laboratory, uncolored by political bias, where experts and realists could explore their workable features, discard their unsuitable provisions and begin the development of an area of agreement upon which all good Americans could start uniting for the benefit of all. Mr. Speaker, I expect to ask the House Foreign Affairs Committee of which I am a member to give its consideration to my resolution at an early date and I sincerely hope that those in this Congress and the country who feel that the time has come to begin planning for what is to follow our victory will join in urging the creation of some such post-war planning commission as I have proposed.

Among the favorable reactions to House Joint Resolution 28, I have observed comments coming from every section of the country and from almost every conceivable segment of political thought. Frank R. Kent, noted columnist, said:

> It basically has the right view. This planning business should not be left exclusively to the executive branch. If an official commission of this sort could be created by Congress and started to work now, there is no reason the answer could not be found and the goal which all desire at least measurably approached. At any rate, whatever the progress made, such a commission would achieve at once two eminently desirable things: First, it would end the confusion engendered by some 20-odd uncoordinated and unrelated governmental agencies which are mulling around on this "better world" proposition; second, it would keep whatever plan eventually is evolved free of the New Deal brand.

The Christian Science Monitor said:

> Mr. MUNDT's peace-planning resolution which emerged from the week's grist of the new legislative mill, takes on special significance. * * * Those who are familiar with the South Dakotan's peace views know that his objective is to stimulate the most representative and responsible discussion of post-war plans among all groups in the country, to offer an authoritative and responsive forum and to provide the means for bringing the Congress in behind the Executive on the broadest possible agreement.

Many similar statements could be cited from important editors and commentators. However, Mr. Speaker, I shall conclude these remarks by adding hereto an editorial from the Daily Argus Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. This is the largest and most influential newspaper published in five Midwestern States and reflects a typical viewpoint on the part of a paper which opposed pre-Pearl Harbor steps which it felt brought us closer and closer to war but which today is in the vanguard urging an all-out effort for early and conclusive victory and for the development of post-war policies which will be both wise and workable.

A POST-WAR STUDY

Many persons these days are discussing the international policies that should prevail following the war.

The ideas are almost as numerous as the speakers. One school of thought advocates a glorified league of nations. Another sees merit in a plan for a federation of democracies. A third believes in a rule by might on the part of the stronger nations.

Apart from these broad suggestions, there are some specific utterances—a bit of preliminary discussion about how Germany and Japan, for example, should be controlled, territorial divisions, future empires, etc.

The entire subject is a complicated one, and there are few persons so bold as to suggest that they have what they consider a complete and a perfect answer. Even Vice President WALLACE admits some uncertainties.

It is plain, nevertheless, that the post-war world program is one that will be crying for attention as soon as the war is over. It will be necessary to do something. Obviously we will be better prepared to present constructive suggestions if we have engaged in advance study of the subject.

So far, however, the discussions have been quite informal and personal. Governments themselves have refrained carefully from committing themselves to a course of action. This, it seems to us, is judicious prudence under the circumstances. No nation will be able to have a program exactly to its liking. When the post-war deliberations begin, compromises will be required.

Because the problem is so immense and so vital, it is unwise, though, to assume that it should be officially ignored. The first job, of course, is to win the war. But that Victory will be in itself of little satisfaction if it is not followed by the best action possible to insure an orderly world in the future.

Thus, it seems to us, there is much merit in the proposal presented to Congress last week by Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota. He suggests the formation of a commission to study the problem. According to his plan, this commission would consist of 32 members—eight to be appointed by Secretary Hull, eight by former President Herbert Hoover, and the remaining 16 to be named by the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and the Speaker and the minority leader of the House. These latter 16 would be equally divided between Republicans and Democrats.

Explaining his proposal, MUNDT said:

"It is just as important in time of war to prepare for peace as it is in time of peace to prepare for war. No one can predict just when this war will be won nor which political party will be charged with writing the peace and directing the period of reconstruction. It is also true that neither a wise and lasting peace nor a safe and sound reconstruction policy will eventuate if either is to be developed and determined upon narrow partisan lines. Thus I hope Congress will adopt my proposal to make realistic, bipartisan, nonpolitical study of post-war foreign and domestic proposals to the end that America and all the world can benefit from recommendations worked out in such an atmosphere of serious-minded, nonsensational, deliberation on the most significant problems ever facing this Republic. The peace of the world and the preservation of our way of life here at home may well depend upon the results obtained by the type of careful, impersonal, fact-facing planning which a commission of this type can accomplish. The time to start planning without partisanship for a victory which will be secure and significant is now."

A commission such as MUNDT contemplates would serve a definite purpose. It could serve as a fact-finding board as well as a policy-recommending one. The information

it would assemble and the suggestions it would provide should be invaluable in the deliberations following the war.

The basis on which the personnel of the commission is to be selected offers an opportunity for a broad cross section of American opinion. This is an important consideration in view of the fact that national endorsement will be necessary to place our participation in the program in operation.

Food Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOLYOKE, MASS., *January 10, 1943.*

Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALLEN: With the thermometer at 65° in my library I presume your problems in Washington keep your blood in circulation. The Republican Party has a good chance this year to turn the spotlight on the mismanagement of the bureaucrats in Washington, and I hope the New England Members of Congress can get some constructive action in this great country which boasted that it was self-sufficient. The motto in Washington seems to be "Let New England freeze and starve and walk and like it." The silver bloc can hold up legislation. The labor bloc can hold up production. The farm bloc can raise prices but "to h——— with New England." We can take it when necessary for this neck of the woods always has, but there is a limit when bad management shows up so grossly. They knew last August we were to take North Africa. Why did they not plan their logistics to get the gasoline where it would be available? The opinion is that they are using this excuse as an alibi. With plenty of gasoline in the country why can't they send one or two convoys of tankers up this way? The pipe line of Ickes proposed a year ago would have helped but that is over the dam. Why not let the Army engineers who built the impossible highway to Alaska in record time tackle this pipe line job? No beef, no bacon, no butter for New England. With millions of pounds of butter in the storehouses of New York growing rancid waiting for shipment to Russia according to the radio where they may use it to grease their machinery—and probably don't know butter. It is pathetic to see the crowd of women storming Kennedy's butter store on High Street kept in order by a policeman and the weather zero. All the stores here have the sign "No butter, don't ask for it" and there is no butter in Springfield. An Army man from Westover Field told my grocer, "I don't know where all the butter goes, we have not had any in Westover for 3 weeks." We don't expect to get beef any more and there is no bacon here or in Springfield. The less said about the gasoline situation the better and the rubber situation, too. Fulton Lewis Jr. is focusing on that. I think the crowning racket is the invasion of the home by spotters for copper, brass, and bronze, when a woman accompanied by a high-school boy, with scales, goes into the home of a widow on Lincoln Street, as was done since Christmas, and weighs her brass candlesticks and andirons and other household articles it goes back to the times when people openly resented the "search and seizure" edicts of the King. I don't think Hitler has gone as far as that in Germany. How can we be free from fear if our homes are to be searched in New England? Free from want if we can't get food. Free to worship if the churches are closed because of no oil. What good is a free press if you freeze? We need less red tape and more red blood. I hope you can lead the New England Congressmen to action not words. No alibis allowed.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR B. CHAPIN.

Address of Hon. Wright Patman, of Texas, Before the Texas State Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1943

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, permission having been obtained for that purpose, I am inserting herewith an address delivered by our colleague the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, before the Texas State Society in the District of Columbia, at the Mayflower Hotel, Saturday evening, January 16, 1943. Texas people in Washington have one of the largest societies in the Capital City. More than 4,200 temporary residents of Washington, who are permanent residents of Texas, are members of this organization.

The officers and directors of the Texas State Society are as follows:

Hon. Wright Patman, president; Hon. Ed Gossett, Hon. Lindley Beckworth, Mrs. Theo L. Edmiston, vice presidents; Dale Miller, secretary-treasurer; Ira Lee Law, sergeant at arms; Miss Alla Clary, official hostess; Miss Margaret Black, assistant hostess; Mrs. Tom Connally, Mrs. Luther Johnson, Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, Mrs. Roy Miller, Mrs. Bob Poage, Clifford Beckham, Hon. Paul Kilday, Robert Nesbitt, Arthur Perry, Ralph Pittman, Hon. Eugene Worley, George Wythe, executive committee.

The address is as follows:

The people of Texas are willingly doing everything within their power to help our Commander in Chief smash the Axis at the earliest possible time. Texas has contributed generously in men, materials, and money, and will continue to do so as long as the need exists. Texans have gone over the top in every war quota and will continue to do so.

TEXANS IN MILITARY SERVICE

Texas has a higher proportion of her population in the combat services of our country than any other State—50,000 in the Navy, almost a quarter of a million in the Army, and the major part of an entire division of the Marine Corps. The largest naval air station in the United States is at Corpus Christi; and throughout Texas, the Army and Navy have more than 100 camps and stations.

The largest group of aviation cadets ever seen in this country recently gathered at San Antonio, Tex., to hear an address by Lt. Gen. Henry H. Arnold, of the Army Air Forces. The group covered 10 acres and numbered tens of thousands.

UNDER SIX FLAGS

Texans have lived under six national flags, representing France, Spain, Mexico, the Republic of Texas, the Confederacy, and the United States.

ENTERED UNION BY TREATY

Texas is the only State, which entered the Union by treaty made as an independent republic.

The treaty by which Texas entered the Union contains provisions for creating out of its territory four other States "in addition to said State of Texas," if the Texans so desire. It will probably never happen. Texans are too proud of their State as it is.

LAND OF PLENTY, PROMISE, ADVENTURE, AND ROMANCE

Texas is recognized as the land of plenty and promise, where the people combine the culture of the East, with the vision of the West, and the energy of the North, with the hospitality of the South.

Texas has been transformed from a land of adventure and romance to a rich and productive area, where progressive and cultured citizens challenge the world in civic, agricultural, and industrial activities.

INDUSTRIES AND RESOURCES

Texas' industries contribute hugely to the "arsenal of democracy."

Texas oil fuels fighting machines all over the world and working machines at home. Texas has one-half of the oil reserves in our country, and has one-fourth of all the oil in the entire world. Our great chemical industry in Texas is a giant in war production and our State alone could clothe and feed a whole army.

SIZE OF TEXAS

The size of Texas compares favorably with its greatness in many other ways. Her people are equal in spirit to the size of their State. My home in Texarkana is nearer the capitals of 18 other States than it is to another point in our State—El Paso.

Texas has sufficient land to supply every man, woman, and child in the United States with 1 acre each.

Texas produces about three-fourths of the Nation's total supply of sulfur.

"DEEP IN THE HEART OF TEXAS"

Not long ago, I visited a large bombing factory, employing 57,000 people, which was several hundred miles from Texas, but 25 percent of the working personnel was from our State. Every day at noon, there was a silent period of 15 minutes to enable the workers to listen to the news of the world. Usually there were 1 or 2 minutes remaining, and popular selections of music were carried over the public address system during this time. It was necessary to refrain from playing "Deep in the Heart of Texas," as it caused so many of their best employees to resign and go back home in Texas.

DEMONSTRATED PATRIOTISM OF TEXAS

In view of the fact that this is a meeting of Texans here in Washington, I presume it will be in order to point with pride to the demonstrated patriotism of the young men of the Lone Star State without being subject to the criticism of boasting. We are proud of our servicemen in Texas and we are also proud of the civilian population that is so patriotically supporting them and assisting in the prosecution of this war. I have obtained from the War Department the number of enlistments in the Army of the United States from December 8, 1941 (the day after Pearl Harbor), to November 1, 1942, by States of residence. After obtaining this information, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress assisted me in arriving at the percentage of enlistments to population in each State. This includes voluntary enlistments—does not include inductees—and only includes the Army and not

the other branches of military service. I have secured the permission of the War Department to release this information. It is is as follows:

State	Population, 1940 census	Number of enlistments by State of residence	Percentage of enlistments to population
Alabama	2,832,961	8,735	0.308
Arizona	499,261	2,807	.562
Arkansas	1,949,387	6,106	.313
California	6,907,387	37,603	.544
Colorado	1,123,296	6,644	.591
Connecticut	1,709,242	9,025	.529
Delaware	266,505	932	.349
District of Columbia	663,091	2,422	.365
Florida	1,897,414	7,681	.404
Georgia	3,123,723	11,837	.378
Idaho	524,873	2,153	.410
Illinois	7,897,241	31,198	.395
Indiana	3,427,796	12,742	.372
Iowa	2,538,268	8,791	.346
Kansas	1,801,068	6,932	.385
Kentucky	2,845,627	7,580	.266
Louisiana	2,363,880	8,145	.345
Maine	847,226	3,670	.433
Maryland	1,821,244	8,584	.471
Massachusetts	4,316,721	26,093	.604
Michigan	5,256,106	20,708	.394
Minnesota	2,792,300	10,983	.393
Mississippi	2,183,796	4,771	.218
Missouri	3,784,664	12,447	.329
Montana	559,456	3,381	.604
Nebraska	1,315,834	5,762	.438
Nevada	110,247	430	.390
New Hampshire	491,524	3,116	.634
New Jersey	4,160,165	19,309	.464
New Mexico	531,818	3,278	.628
New York	13,479,142	67,050	.497
North Carolina	3,571,623	9,355	.262
North Dakota	641,935	1,610	.251
Ohio	6,907,612	27,712	.401
Oklahoma	2,336,434	14,287	.611
Oregon	1,089,684	4,736	.435
Pennsylvania	9,900,180	52,480	.530
Rhode Island	713,346	4,501	.631
South Carolina	1,899,804	5,040	.265
South Dakota	642,961	1,898	.295
Tennessee	2,915,841	9,501	.326
Texas	6,414,824	53,015	.826
Utah	550,310	1,756	.319
Vermont	359,231	2,336	.650
Virginia	2,677,773	8,630	.322
Washington	1,736,191	9,407	.542
West Virginia	1,901,974	8,671	.456
Wisconsin	3,137,587	14,367	.458
Wyoming	250,742	1,507	.601

TEXANS MAINTAIN THEIR REPUTATION

It is recorded that Jefferson Davis, reviewing the Texas Brigade at Richmond, Va., in 1861, expressed it this way

"The soldiers of other States have a reputation to establish. The sons of Texas have a reputation to maintain."

So in this global war, as in all other wars, the servicemen of the great Lone Star State of Texas will maintain that reputation, and the civilian citizenship of Texas will continue to support them 100 percent.

Farm Financing Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter I received from a friend of mine, Don Holloway, of Pompeys Pillar, Mont. It contains some factual information I think the Congress should have, and I believe it is worthy of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

POMPEYS PILLAR, MONT., *January 6, 1943.*

Congressman JAMES F O'CONNOR,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Immediately after Pearl Harbor our Government, finding the pressing need of planes, guns, tanks, and munitions, reached down in its pocket and financed such industries as General Motors, Chrysler Corporation, and others to expand in an "all out" effort of production, the sky the limit.

Popular weekly magazines carried photos of plants costing millions of dollars, built with Federal money. This was a good investment in our freedom and no kick coming.

However, agriculture—one of the largest industries in our country—was told to get out of debt. Farmers were warned of borrowing money in uncertain times like these. But, in the next breath, they were told to step up their production.

The farmers in the large-producer class are already at top production and have been for several years. They had to be to make ends meet.

Why, then, is there a shortage of food? Why does meat have to be rationed? Why is there a scarcity of butter and eggs?

Here are some of the reasons: Many farmers have increased their production by a small percentage, while, on the other hand, many others have cut down because of labor shortage, machinery shortage, and other obvious reasons There are any number of low-income farmers who have left the farms and taken up jobs elsewhere, and there will be more as time goes on. In my own community I know of three families leaving within the week.

I have attended several auction sales in the past 3 or 4 months. Herds of fine, high-producing dairy cattle were sold at market price. These animals were purchased by packers and local feeders, to be slaughtered later.

Let us look at the farmers in another bracket, the low-income or small producer, and there are about 80 of these to 20 of the large producers. These farmers could increase their production at least 100 percent and in many cases 200 to 300 percent. Many of these farmers are milking two or three cows (with equipment for three times that number). They keep 25 to 30 laying hens, and could, just as easily, take care of 200 to 300. This could be done without additional labor.

There is no manpower shortage on the average farm. Each farmer could easily produce three times the amount he is producing at present. Why don't he do it, you ask.

Finance is the answer. Why not take Farm Security Administration's experience. The percentage of bad loans issued by this program was remarkably small, when we stop to consider the borrowers were bad risks in the eyes of the bankers and other loan agencies. The average farmer is not a bad risk.

Take the case of the aforementioned dairy cattle. Each of these cows could have been placed within a radius of 2 miles, where they could have been kept in production if the farmers were financially able to buy them.

No doubt you feel that we do have just such a program now in the Price Control Administration and Farm Security Administration, but they are inadequate. Here is an example: A farmer with 16 head of good cattle owned his own place, plenty of feed (in fact, enough feed and pasture for 5 times the number he had) went to the Price Control Administration to borrow money. They gave him $400 and even wanted a mortgage on his late-model pick-up besides a mortgage on all his livestock, including 5 head of horses—a $2,500 security and a $400 loan.

If a farmer has 10 good cows, it is equivalent to $1,000, and in a year's time it will increase to $1,500. Surely livestock is just as good, from an investment's standpoint, as factories, which could be obsolete in a few years. It has happened.

We farmers want freedom and security as bad as anyone, and we will do all we can to bring this about. We have one of the finest countries in the world and the best government in the world. If we didn't, I wouldn't feel free to write to you as I'm doing.

I have supported you in the past and will support you in the future. This letter is only my opinion. But I've felt all along that our Government and the men, like yourself, who represent us haven't forgotten the "folks at home."

In order to do any good, this financing should be forthcoming immediately, before another crop year is started.

"Food will win the war and write the peace." So give the small farmer a chance. He wants in this scrap, too.

Give the small farmer some support financially, and see your production of food go up.

Yours for victory,

DON HOLLOWAY,
Pompeys Pillar, Mont.

War Industries in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1943

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to say that I am very much concerned about the war industries in New York City and vicinity.

We are now engaged in a total war. A war that requires the complete mobilization of all of our resources. A war that demands the cooperation of industry and labor. A war that is so total in scope that every hamlet, town, and village, as well as our large cities, must unqualifiedly support the war effort.

Industries and plants which in peacetime manufactured nonessentials, now create the sinews of war. Manufacturing and industrial centers have now become defense areas. Communities formerly nonproductive are now teeming with war enterprises.

In projecting these war aims, New York, with its tremendous facilities, has sought to do its share. Approximately $12,000,000,000 of new Victory loan bonds were sold, which amount exceeds by $3,000,000 the original contemplated subscription. Approximately 50 percent of the entire subscription was sold in New York. In a small theater in Forest Hills, at one attendance on Friday, December 11, 1942, $7,000 worth of bonds were purchased in cash, despite the fact that no one in the audience anticipated a sale.

The New York area, which sent 790,500 tons of iron and steel scrap to mills, during last July, August, and September, led the rest of the country in percentage of quota shipments for the third quarter of the year. New York's men and women have enthusiastically joined every volunteer organization. It has more than met its quota in the armed forces.

Nevertheless, New York has been treated like an unwanted child. It has been discriminated against in the placing of war orders and in the transfer and distribution of Government bureaus.

New York has a surplus of manpower, more than sufficient industrial, plant, and office space, adequate housing, and cheap and excellent transportation, while other sections of the country engaged in war work are experiencing serious shortages of these categories.

In Washington, D. C., the serious lack of housing and insufficient transportation are bottlenecks that impair the war activity. It has been estimated that the housing is far short of the needs for the capital's new 360,000 population and the 30,000 or more expected to come in the next 6 or 8 months. The transportation problem is just as serious. The buses and trolleys are insufficient for the needs of so many governmental employees who are concentrated in less than 2 miles square, abutting Constitution Avenue, from Capitol Hill to the War Department.

These inadequacies exist and are becoming progressively serious and menacing in many of the war areas, such as Washington, Baltimore, Detroit, Norfolk, and so forth.

The Young Women's Christian Association, in a survey of the problems resulting from these shortages, revealed that housing congestion in war centers has created grave issues which cannot be overlooked. Thousands of men and women flocking to war plants have taxed housing, sanitary, and supply facilities.

On the fringe of these war areas, many trailer camps have sprung up housing thousands of workers. Conditions have become so bad as to force the authorities to appeal to families whose sons have gone to war to turn over the vacated rooms to women seeking employment, or employed, in these areas.

It is paradoxical that New York, which has none of these problems, must in the midst of this gigantic war effort, become a dying city. Today New York has the greatest supply of unemployed labor in the country. Only about 10 percent, or 370,000, of the city's workers have been engaged in war work. Between June 1940 and July 1942, the city has received only 2 percent of the Army and Navy contracts, although its peacetime production amounted to 8 percent of the Nation's manufactured goods.

The Office of War Information, about 2 weeks ago, stated that of about 15,000,000 women gainfully employed in this country, 4,000,000 were in war jobs, and predicted by December 1943 there would be 18,000,000 women, about 29 percent of the population, in paid employment, and 6,000,000 of them, or 30 percent of the expected total war labor force of 20,000,000, in war industries. This increased employment has not benefited New York, because the war contracts in this area are practically nonexistent, or inconsequential, in comparison with total contracts let and New York's capacity.

New York has been known as the largest manufacturing center in the country with more than 25,000 factories employing approximately 500,000 people. In peacetime, it manufactured about 45 percent of all of the clothing manufactured in the country. With the large number of men constantly entering the armed forces, the demand for civilian apparel has fallen off, with resultant unemployment in the industry. These men are skilled workers. They could readily adapt themselves to any war work related to their industry. There is ample need for their skill in the war effort.

As a result of war restrictions, private work in construction has practically ceased. Today, there are more than 40,000 registered unemployed construction workers in the city of New York, who have little hope of finding employment in the building trades for the duration of the war. These workers, migrating to other cities, where there is war construction, add to the confusion already existing. On the other hand, they could make a real contribution to the war effort if they were able to obtain employment in their industry or enter a related industry in New York.

New York is also known for its small plants. Ninety-nine percent of our factories employ 250 people or less, and 92 percent employ 50 people or less. These plants are rapidly being eliminated because of their inability to obtain war contracts. As a result, many thousands are facing unemployment daily.

In most instances, these plants could be converted to war use. Mr. George H. Sloan, Commissioner of Commerce for the City of New York, and chairman of the mayor's business advisory committee, in an address before the New York Building Congress on November 25, 1942, stated that had there been planned distribution of war orders with small plants receiving contracts, to manufacture the simpler products, and being provided with the proper financial and technical assistance, small business would not have been in its present plight. The Smaller War Plants Corporation has been in existence for about 6 months, but as yet no New York office has been set in operation, despite the fact that the modus operandi has been prepared and is available for use.

New York, as a wholesale and retail center, faces a gloomy prospect. Many small stores have already been closed. Even chain organizations have been forced to eliminate some units because of lack of goods. The real shortage of consumers' goods will appear next year, and even the so-called soft lines, such as clothing and textiles will be difficult to procure.

For many years, New York has produced 70 to 80 percent of the country's women's apparel, 40 percent of the men's clothing, and 85 percent of the boys' wear. Curbs on production of these consumers' goods and shortages of merchandise will inevitably result in reduced sales and increased unemployment. New York City could easily produce a large proportion of the country's essential civilian goods for the duration of the war without impairing the war production, and at the same time permitting war areas to concentrate upon war goods.

New York today is well equipped to become the center or hub of civilian production without the impairment of the war effort.

There is at present available for war utilization in the city of New York, more than 9,000,000 square feet of industrial space. Many buildings house 100 or more firms per structure. There are about 50 industrial buildings with a floor area in each of more than 400,000 square feet; about 30 buildings with a floor area of more than 300,000 square feet; about 75 buildings with a floor area of more than 200,000 square feet, and more than 250 buildings with a floor area of more than 100,000 square feet. The 1,000 and more industrial buildings of steel construction vary in height from 5 to 45 stories. Much of this area is available for war plants, or is occupied by firms which would like to convert to war industry.

Less than 20 percent of the total area of loft, factory, and warehouse space is now being utilized for war work. A great deal of the remaining area is now vacant because of the scarcity of war contracts.

In a report submitted to the mayor of the city of New York by the regional director of the War Manpower Commission on December 10, 1942, it was disclosed that several Army and Navy contracts had been allocated to the city of New York, in accordance with the new policy of allocating a greater measure of war-production orders to communities with a surplus of available labor.

But more must be done. More Federal agencies could be advantageously moved to the city of New York, must be moved to the city of New York, to provide space for increasing war activities.

More war contracts should be allocated to the city for employment of surplus labor. New York has shown itself capable of meeting great consumer goods requirements, and should be permitted and encouraged to do so, in order that other areas could concentrate on war contracts within their housing and industrial capacities, eliminating unnecessary new construction and the depletion of our vital material stocks. The city could readily absorb these requirements without dislocation of supply, transportation, housing, or other attendant categories.

These problems that have been raised can and should be met. For only by united and by intelligent planning and distribution can we win this war.

New York wants to help, New York can help—it must, and will help win this war. Give it the chance to prove it.

All Should Save

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the people throughout the country are urged

to save, and to conserve, and to do everything humanly possible to aid in winning the war. They hear these demands ringing in their ears. They hear it in the morning; they hear it in the nighttime. The people out in the wide open spaces are saving, and they are conserving. They want to win this war quickly and decisively. The farmers, the laborers, the merchants, the manufacturers, and the downtrodden small businessmen are all saving—they are doing their best to aid in our all-out victory.

There is very little encouragement to those who are saving and struggling to continue when the news is flashed over the country of the White House boarder, Harry Hopkins, giving the pretentious dinner, at which wine and caviar were served to his guests. The people are disgusted over this continuous planning on the part of those in control of our Government. The boys in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Corps, who are fighting for the preservation of this Republic, are disgusted to learn of these uncalled-for festivities in the White House.

This is an all-out war. This is the war in which all the people must participate. This is a war in which all the people, in high places and in low places, must participate; all must save, and all must conserve. The fact that one Harry Hopkins lives in the White House does not give him any special privileges as an American citizen. He should be the very first to save and conserve—he should be the one to set the pattern for every American to follow, not to give rich banquets, but to conserve every resource of our Nation and our people for victory in this war.

One of our very estimable Hoosiers has written a poem on this rich dinner, given by Mr. Hopkins, of White House fame, which is interesting and illuminating, which I extend in the RECORD so that all may read it.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an article and poem from the Indianapolis Star written by F. E. Heiland, of La Fayette, Ind., which I hope all may read:

ALL SHOULD SAVE

To the EDITOR OF THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR:

Every day for a full 24 hours we hear it on the radio and read it in our papers—save, save, save, to help win this war.

None of us objects to the saving of everything we can and doing everything possible in order to bring an end to this war as quickly as it can be done. But when you read in the papers of the elaborate affairs put on by the higher-ups in our National Capital, it seems that those in Washington who are urging this save, save, save campaign are proceeding along the lines of "let's you and him save."

We like to do our little bit to help in this big fight,
We put our shoulder to the wheel and push with all our might.
We've cut down on our sugar, our coffee, and our flour,
While Hopkins is partaking of his wine and caviar.

Each week we pay our taxes, invest in bonds and stamps,
We're daily doing all we can to rout the yellow scamps.
We've cut down on our gasoline—hardly use our car,
While Hopkins keeps a'feasting on wine and caviar.

The man who lives by labor is glad for beans and bacon,
He crawls into his bed at night with all his joints a'achin'.
He is the one who'll carry on—the one to win the war,
And not the Hopkinses who feast on wine and caviar.

We hope the time is near at hand when we have licked the Axis,
We hope it won't be long until there's rationing of taxes.
We hope the day is not far off when there shall be no war,
We hope that then we, too, can have some wine and caviar.

F. E. HEILAND.

LA FAYETTE, IND.

Tax Clinic at National University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the program of the National University School of Law taxation clinic, dealing as it does with one of the most vital matters now before the Congress:

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF LAW,
Washington, D. C.

TAXATION CLINIC

(Dr. Milton I. Baldinger, Director)

SCHEDULE

January 6: The high lights of the Revenue Act of 1942—Mr. Stanley S. Surrey, Treasury Department.

January 13: Spending tax—Hon. Randolph Paul, Treasury Department. The role of fiscal policy in the stabilization program—Dr. Gerhard Colm, Budget Bureau.

January 20: Taxation according to ability to pay and the financing of war—Hon. JERRY VOORHIS. Sales tax or spending tax?—Senator ROBERT TAFT.

January 27: Deductions for income-tax purposes—Dr. Baldinger.

Februar; 3: Some recent important tax cases—Prof. Gerald L. Wallace, Department of Justice.

February 10: Processing tax—Mr. William V. Crosswhite, Internal Revenue. Bankruptcy, receivership, and reorganization—Mr. A. W. Carnduff, Internal Revenue. Jurisdiction of compromise section—Mr. Clifford G. Beckham, Internal Revenue.

February 17: Work of Civil Division—Mr. S. S. Faulkner, Internal Revenue. Work of Appeals Division—Miss Marguerite Rawalt, Internal Revenue.

February 24: District of Columbia taxation—Hon. Jo Morgan.

March 3: The Tax Court of the United States—Judge John W. Kern, the Tax Court of the United States. Practical aspects of tax accounting—Mr. Jack L. Friedlander.

March 10: British taxation—Mr. Redvers Opie, British Embassy. Canadian taxation—Mr. A. F. W. Plumptre, Canadian Legation.

Office of Price Administration Meat Restriction Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1943

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the Kamm Sausage Co., Inc., is located at Oshkosh, Wis., in the district I have the honor to represent. This company has been in business for many years, and their experience under the meat-restriction order of O. P. A. is typical of the small meat processors and nonslaughterers throughout the Nation. The president of this company, Mr. Edward Meyer, is a splendid American citizen who, under the competitive spirit of free American enterprise, has developed a splendid business. Unless relief is afforded the small meat processors and nonslaughterers from the effects of O. P. A. regulations affecting that industry they are all threatened with extinction through the monopolistic influences of the big packing interests.

On January 9 Mr. Meyer wrote me as follows:

I respectfully direct your attention to the unnecessary action taken by the Office of Price Administration in the regulations referred to in the telegram, and urge you to exert every effort to correct the inequities arising from the monopolistic channels through which meat is now being forced to flow to the public.

I fully realize the necessity for meat restriction order No. 1, which limits the slaughter of meats for civilian use to a percentage of the corresponding period of last year. Our armed forces must be fed, no matter whom it may affect.

However, the language of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (title 1, sec. 2 (h)) provides:

"The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices, or methods or means or aids to distribution established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act."

I feel that the order as it has worked in practice, definitely is contrary to the intent of Congress in that no allocation of meats to the wholesalers and processors has been made. The restriction applies only to slaughterers and enables them to direct the flow of the meats which they have killed through any channels they see fit within the permitted percentage.

The slaughterer is thereby allowed, and he is taking advantage of the loophole, to direct the distribution of meats through channels which he controls and the nonslaughtering processor and wholesaler is left without any merchandise to distribute.

If the regulation is to conform to the Emergency Price Control Act, under which

it was promulgated, and if the free trade spirit of American democracy is to prevail, the order must be amended so as to equitably allocate the available supply and the slaughterer must be directed to sell his civilian supply to the wholesalers and processors with whom he did business in the corresponding base period in the same amounts sold in the base period, less the required deduction for the armed forces.

In the event the slaughterer is killing for the exclusive use of the armed forces, or if for any other reason he cannot supply the wholesaler or processor, then he must be forced by regulation to return to the wholesaler and processor the quota to which they are justly entitled in order that they may present it to another slaughterer to the end that meat may once again be allowed to be distributed through its normal outlets, as it has for the past 50 years.

I solicit your immediate assistance in stopping the un-American monopolistic practices now being engaged in due to the meat-restriction order.

Respectfully yours,

EDWARD H. MEYER,
President.

Mr. Speaker, in this letter Mr. Meyer clearly points out the difficulty confronting the small meat processor. There can be little doubt but that the regulations of O. P A. operate to compel changes in business practices and means or aids to the distribution of meats established and existent in the industry for over 50 years. There can be little doubt also that the O. P. A. through the issuance of meat restriction order No. 1 has created a monopolistic control of the meat supplies available for civilian consumption. The big packers have denied the processors and wholesalers of their just percentage of meat supplies that they are entitled to receive.

Mr. Speaker, unless immediate relief is granted by the O. P. A., thousands of nonslaughtering processors, wholesalers, and retailers throughout the country will be forced out of business and Nation-wide distribution to the civilian population will be seriously impaired. I conceive that the morale of the people of America is being seriously undermined by such regulations and orders.

Nothing But Highway Robbery

REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, just how any Congressman or anyone else can stand up and state that farmers are getting a square deal out of the joint price-fixing program under the Department of Agriculture and the O. P. A. is beyond me.

Let me give you a case of definite highway robbery in connection with price fixing of cottonseed and the products thereof—oil, hulls, meal, and linters: Cottonseed produced in the year 1941 sold during that fall and the spring of 1942 as high as $65 per ton. In the early part of the cotton season, September 1942, the Commodity Credit Corporation fixed the price of cottonseed at $49 per ton, f. o. b. the farmer's market, based on the following cost prices of the products produced out of a ton of cottonseed by the cotton-seed oil crushing mills:

Products manufactured from a ton of cottonseed

310 pounds oil, at 12.625 cents per pound	$39.14
850 pounds cake at $32 per ton	13.60
550 pounds hulls at $6 per ton	1.65
180 pounds linters at 4.35 cents per pound	7.83
Value of products	62.22

From the above value of products may be deducted the following approximate costs:

	Per ton
Cost of crushing	$10.00
Ginners' commissions, buying seed	2.25
In-bound freight or cartage	1.00
Total approximate costs	13.25

It should be noted that if approximate costs are deducted from the value of products, a break-even buying price of about $49 per ton for cottonseed is the result.

Farmers, as you know, are unorganized and have to operate as individuals in selling their products and naturally have to accept whatever is offered them or whatever is left after the other fellow does the grading and the pricing. This is not true with others who are operating between the farmer and the ultimate consumer. They, as a rule, are well-organized and usually well financed, and therefore are able to fix their prices. However, in this instance, to show you how completely these groups are in control in connection with the various departments and agencies connected with our war efforts, especially the O. P. A., the price-fixing outfit, let us see how they have taken care of everybody in the handling of products produced out of cottonseed—meal, for instance:

POSITION OF MIDDLEMEN

The following are the fixed prices to the cottonseed crushing mills and others operating between the mills and the farmer on the products obtained from the farmer's cottonseed:

	Carload lots	Less-than-carload lots
Oil mill's maximum price under Commodity Credit Corporation contract of not more than	$35.50	$38.50
And, if bagged, not to exceed, additional	3.50	3.50
To which the wholesaler can add his maximum margin of	2.50	2.50
And the jobber could add his maximum margin of	.50	.50
And the retailer add his maximum charge of	5.50	5.50
Totaling	[1] 47.50	[1] 50.50

[1] Plus freight.

Or, if the retailer buys direct from the processor, under the present language of Office of Price Administration's amendment 81 conceivably he might add his own margin, $5.50, as well as that of the wholesaler, $2.50, and the jobber's 50 cents, totaling $8.50, plus freight, and not to exceed $3.50 for bags.

In a release issued by O. P. A. on December 1, 1942, there was contained the following:

Effective November 30, 1942, less-than-carload-lot sales by a processor to a jobber, wholesaler, or retailer now will command not more than a $1 per ton premium over full carload dealings; small-lot transactions by a processor with a consumer or feeder will be allowed not more than a $3 per ton premium over full lots.

Cottonseed buyers—those who buy from farmers—are just about as helpless as farmers in selling their seed purchased from farmers to cottonseed-oil crushing mills, in that either the mills do the grading or they are graded at some distant point and the buyer does not know just what he is going to receive for his carload lots of seed until they have been shipped in and graded. Therefore, naturally, they have to buy, in a great many instances, from the farmers below the price that farmers should actually receive, with the hope of protecting themselves from any loss that may be brought about by the grading of the seed at the other end of the line.

Let me give you a concrete example about which I am talking. During the week of October 19–24, inclusive, a cotton-gin operator in South Carolina bought cottonseed from farmers as they came in to his gin, at $47 per ton. You will note that this is $2 per ton below the price fixed by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This cottonseed buyer shipped to a cotton-crushing mill in South Carolina. On November 2 the shipper of the cottonseed received a statement from the cottonseed-crushing mill stating that the cottonseed graded only 89 percent, and the price received by the shipper, based on this grade, was $45 per ton, or a $2-per-ton loss to the cottonseed buyer.

I do not know whether or not Congress will be able, during this great emergency, to remedy the serious situation confronting the farmers of this country concerning what I am talking to you about. However, it is my firm belief that unless something is done along constructive lines to put an end to the monopolistic grazing on the part of many useless middlemen, as well as the monopolistic activities on the part of the well-organized groups, who are not only able to control their production and their distribution but who are able to actually fix prices—you can take it or leave it—that we are going to see in this country that which none of us would like to witness.

I have been engaged in farming all of my life. Prior to coming to Congress I was engaged in a large general mercantile business, as well as operating a national bank. I was located in a small village, doing business altogether with farmers, buying and selling their products, as well as having to market my own products, which I am doing today from a good-sized farm, and I can state to you that under the present marketing and distributing system farmers and consumers are just as hopeless and as helpless as a man on the chain gang.

I have introduced House Resolution 38, for the purpose of making a thorough investigation from the rural areas on through to the actual consumers in the large cities of this country, so as to be able to get the real facts, which I am sure will indicate to you that not only are farmers absolutely helpless in securing a fair price but that millions of consumers are called upon to pay unreasonably high fixed prices for farm products. You should read some of the many letters that I am receiving from every section of this country concerning the problem of marketing farm products and the requests that the investigation be made.

May I state to other Members residing in other sections of the country the same thing applies to the soybean and to the cheap corn and wheat that was sold in the name of the farmer, which has gone into the hands of the processors, to whom so far as price is concerned on mixed feed the sky is the limit.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. To ask the gentleman this question. Certain cattle feeders in the Southwest tell me that they are unable to buy any cottonseed cakes or cottonseed meal, and they go ahead and give some details, which support what the gentleman has just said. Does the gentleman know any reason at all why that situation should obtain; that is, why there are no meal or cottonseed cakes at the present time?

Mr. FULMER. When they first fixed the price of cottonseed they assured the cottonseed mills that if they were stuck with this meal they would make them loans or pay a subsidy, believing that the meal might be a drag on the market. However, because of these price-fixing arrangements, with all of these brokers and commission fellows and wholesalers and jobbers, they bought up these products, and now they are being rationed to the real consumer who actually needs them. The fertilizer manufacturers had considerable of this meal to use in their mixing plants for mixed fertilizer, with the understanding that the price of fertilizer to farmers would be one or two dollars higher at the expense of the farmer, this spring, at a time when farmers are called upon to increase their production.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And it goes on to show also, where there are no proteins even to feed baby chicks.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman from Michigan is correct. And in my own country, where we ought to have millions of tons of cottonseed our farmers cannot buy any except on a ration basis and at a very high fixed price.

Benedict Arnold Broadcasters—Resolution To Amend Articles of War To Permit Military Trial of Six Traitorous American Broadcasters Now in Germany and Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there emanates nightly from Germany and Italy short-wave broadcasts by Nazi and Fascist radio broadcasters who unfortunately are Americans. These traitors are Constance Drexel, Fred Kaltenbach, Douglas Chandler, Jane Anderson, Ezra Pound, and Robert H. Best. Douglas Chandler broadcasts under the pseudonym of "Paul Revere." Fred Kaltenbach broadcasts under the salutation of "Dear Harry." Constance Drexel entitles her traitorous utterances as "News from Germany." Robert H. Best uses the alias "Guess Who." He also urges Americans to write to their Congressmen to impeach Roosevelt. Jane Anderson apparently broadcasts from Italy and is introduced uusally as a famous orator. Ezra Pound opens his damnable talk with a sort of verbal Fascist salute.

The Constitution, by article 3, section 3, says that treason, among other things, consists in adhering to our enemies and giving them aid and comfort. Beyond doubt, these modern radio Benedict Arnolds are daily giving aid and comfort to our enemies by attempting to lessen our confidence in our Government and in the cause for which we fight. They bolster our enemies and try to convert their listeners to revere Hitler and his Gestapo, Il Duce and his Black Shirts.

It may be that they can not be brought to book, especially in absentia, by jury trial, because the sixth amendment to the Constitution provides that in all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy trial by an impartial jury and shall be confronted with witnesses. Such confrontation includes the right to cross-examine. Thus, trial by jury may be impossible and, therefore, civil prosecution may be barred.

Shall we stand idly by and do nothing? Assuredly these people must be punished summarily. Their trial now, even in their absence, might have the effect of deterring them or moderating their treasonable utterances.

I, therefore, have this day offered a resolution to provide for amending article 38 of the Articles of War, whereby the President will be empowered to set up military tribunals, or commissions, to try these culprits, even in absentia. The Bill of Rights, which requires trial by jury, is not applicable to the Articles of War. If Congress so provides, persons tried before a military tribunal cannot demand trial by jury nor confrontation of witnesses. The Articles of War, by article 38, may even now give the right to the President to set up these military commissions, but I believe it is proper for Congress to give them the specific power so as to remove any doubt.

Thus far in this war, these six knaves are the only known cases of American traitors on foreign soil. While trials in absentia are a bit strange to us, they are of everyday occurrence in continental Europe. I am bold enough to suggest such a procedure only because without it, we would be helpless. It would be ridiculous to let these curs go unwhipped of justice now.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That article 38 of the Articles of War (sec. 1509, U. S. Code, title 10—Army) be hereby amended to read as follows:

"The President may, by regulations, which he may modify from time to time, prescribe the procedure, including modes of proof, in cases before courts-martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, and other military tribunals, which regulations shall, insofar as he shall deem practicable, apply the rules of evidence generally recognized in the trial of criminal cases in the district courts of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing contrary to or inconsistent with these articles shall be so prescribed: *Provided further*, That all rules made in pursuance to this article shall be laid before the Congress annually (June 4, 1920, ch. 227, subchap. II, sec. 1, 41 Stat. 794).

"SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized to create military commissions for the trial and punishment of citizens of the United States, who on foreign soil are serving our enemies, Germany, Italy, and Japan, or other enemie of the United States, as radio propagandists. The President may by regulations prescribe the procedure for the conduct of such trials before such military commissions. Such trial before such military commissions need not require the actual presence of the accused."

Leon Henderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, entitled "He Didn't Learn," from the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph:

HE DIDN'T LEARN

If we were disposed to give more than lip service to the old quotation of letting the dead past bury its dead, we should refrain from saying any more about Leon Henderson, late Price Administrator and champion tough guy in presiding over the people's comforts.

But Leon breaks into public print again by saying that if he had his job to do over again, he would be tough, tougher than he was.

That kind of policy and the end to which it brought Henderson would make the ordinary man proud to say that if he had his job to do over again he would be more con-

ciliatory and explanatory in what he had to do, and less tough.

Everybody in this country, practically speaking, was and is in thorough sympathy with what Henderson had to do. There are few natural-born bootleggers, who would stew the fat out of dead men for profit if they could, but those people are so few and far between that the right-minded citizen would bring the profiteers and evildoers to book if it were left to public sentiment. But when everyone is threatened with jail and reminded at every turn of the road that the devil is just ahead and is sure to get you if you don't watch out, the threat becomes a game, and one is driven to try out things to see what will happen.

In this case the devil-threatener had the happening to himself, instead of those over whom he wielded the threat and lash.

Newspapers and magazines were responsible for Henderson's downfall. They played him up as a superguy who got to his place by being tough, who succeeded in spite of hell and high water. The superpublicity went to the poor devil's head. And instead of his failure teaching him something, causing him to turn the spotlight on his innards and making him try to eliminate his weakness and all things wrong, he comes back shouting that he would accentuate his wrong policy if he had it to do over again.

Henderson says, "My only regret is that I was not tough enough, and if I had it to do over again, I'd be harder and tougher until they cut me down." The result of that kind of policy would be that the "cutting down" would have come a little sooner than it did.

On the other hand, Jeffers, the rubber man, says Henderson was all wrong in his psychology, if any. Jeffers says: "If we rely on the honesty and integrity of the individual, we will get better results than through a punitive process."

Henderson, in rebuttal, says, "It just ain't so"—that people would cooperate in reducing gasoline consumption if told that it was necessary.

We believe the people will do anything they are asked to do, if they are treated with candor and fairness in the application of regulations.

But when Henderson says to conserve rubber it is necessary to cut down on gasoline and auto mileage, and then applies regulations to 17 States and leaves 31 unregulated, the people just don't "get it" and they refuse to swallow such bunk. Why can't 48 States save more rubber than 17 States? Henderson said because submarines had sunk so many oil tankers on the Atlantic coast the seaboard States had to be reduced in gasoline.

Very good, if true. But why couldn't some freight tank cars hauling oil into Chicago and other midwestern cities be continued on to the seaboard States, and all States and people be treated alike? No answer has ever been made to this.

At the very time Henderson was making his many cross-fire statements and contradictions. Mr. Roosevelt stepped in with the statement that there was no rubber shortage or problem. So what?

We hope instead of Mr. Henderson becoming tougher in whatever else he may undertake to bungle in the war effort, the people will be taken into administration confidence and everybody be treated alike. That is what is the matter with the war effort—to whatever extent there is anything the matter with it.

Officials should find out the truth and tell it to the public, treat the public fairly and alike, regardless of politics and their being Seaboard or Midwestern or Western or Pacific States, and the public will cooperate. The public showed where it stood in this war business in its November election show-down.

A New Approach to Peace—News as a World Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House today, I desire to place in the RECORD a very thoughtful address on the relation of news to global peace, given by Dean Carl W. Ackerman, of the Graduate School of Journalism of Columbia University, at Haverford College, Tuesday, January 12, 1943.

The address follows:

I accepted President Morley's invitation to visit Haverford College today in order to discuss the relation of news to global peace. There were friendly and sentimental reasons, also. As a graduate of Earlham College, I respect and admire the Society of Friends. For more than 30 years Haverford men have been personal friends. Nevertheless, it was not these ties which brought me here. I came because I have a concern. I want to speak about a new approach to peace to you as college students and, on your platform, to other college students, the majority of whom will soon be in the war.

By necessity this must be a personal experience, citizen to citizen, rather than a dean speaking to students. Throughout the last World War, as a young man just out of college, I was a correspondent in Europe and Asia. I traveled and lived with the troops of many nations and with refugees, the suppressed and persecuted peoples of that era. If it were possible for me, as a graduate of a Quaker college, to hate anything, I would hate war. But when war becomes an instrument of international necessity and my own country is involved, I wish I were young enough to line up with you. Inasmuch as that is a physical impossibility, I am striving to keep alive, as an obligation of citizenship, the hope I had as a young man that universal peace is an attainable objective.

More people, including soldiers and sailors, survive wars than perish or are incapacitated thereby. The great majority of college men will return to the United States at the end of this war. You and they will have something to say about global peace and what you say and do, personally and collectively, will have a profound influence on public opinion and the peace conferences.

Therefore, as citizens we have a mutual interest in peace. Because of my personal experience and knowledge of war and many years of travel and study in Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America, I have come here to discuss the relationship between freedom of international news and global peace.

UNIVERSAL INTEREST IN NEWS

Wherever you may go around and about the globe, wherever there is an inhabited locality, town, city, or metropolis, you will find a universal interest in news. News is as essential in the life association of men and women as light, air, food, and water are in the life of an individual. Where there are newspapers or radios this fact is so obvious as to be accepted as a routine factor of living. But even in the remote areas of India, China, Africa, and the South Sea Islands where there are graduates of the Graduate School of Journalism with our armed forces, people seek news as avidly as their daily sustenance because they crave the true facts about daily events.

Ira Wolfert, one of our graduates who has returned from the Solomon Islands, describes how our soldiers make friends with the natives by telling them news about the war. Hollington Kong Tong, another graduate, is in charge of the dissemination of news throughout occupied and free China. Marshall Comerer writes from India, as Grant Parr broadcasts from Egypt, as Everett Bauman reveals in his letters from Argentina and as Ahmed Emin Yalman, from Turkey, told us recently on his visit to New York, news is the universal bond between people around the globe.

These and many other graduates of our school know, as every citizen should know, that this universal bond of news is essential to community life wherever human beings are associated with each other. People everywhere share a mutual interest in news which is readily translatable into every language and dialect. News dispels rumors which lead to suspicion, confusion, and strife. News provides a basis for understanding and peaceful intercourse. News is a universal form of communication.

This global perspective of news is more evident in wartime because when the free flow of news is interrupted by propaganda people instinctively seek and search for information with the hope that they may learn the truth.

Today all belligerent governments are using propaganda to fight their enemies in so-called psychological warfare. Wherever public information is used for that or for any other selfish or tendentious purpose, whenever it is written, timed, and distributed to influence rather than to inform public opinion, it becomes propaganda. In time, peoples generally recognize it as such, as if they knew that information is like water—it may be either pure or contaminated.

My concern is to know whether global peace is to be based upon propaganda or news. As a citizen, I want to know whether our Government, first, and the United Nations, as our allies, plan to participate in the peace negotiations on a propaganda or on a news basis.

If the present censorships, controls, restrictions, and propaganda, as wartime measures, continue throughout the next peace conferences, the treaties will be made by propaganda.

If that happens, global peace will have to be maintained by propaganda. In that case, there will be no national or international freedom of news, psychological warfare will continue and lead inevitably to another war.

ONE OF THE "FOUR FREEDOMS"

The question before us is whether the pledge of freedom of speech in the Atlantic Charter is to be enforced at the peace conference and whether it is to become one of the terms of the peace treaties. If it is to be enforced at the conferences there must be freedom of inquiry and reporting by journalists of all nations. If freedom of speech is to be a practical factor in international affairs, freedom of international communications must be provided for and pledged in the peace treaties.

Freedom of speech is of use to mankind only if the facilities and instrumentalities of communication may be used by all those who participate in debates on public questions. Because of the instantaneous nature of international communications by telegraph, wireless, and radio, news is not only the conveyor of information; it is also the chief medium of global education in daily events, ideologies and policies which determine international relationships.

Therefore freedom of speech as provided in the Atlantic Charter must be expressed in the peace treaties as freedom of international communications, otherwise freedom of speech will be national not universal. Freedom of speech without freedom of the press and freedom of the radio would make the people of one nation as inarticulate in their intercourse with neighboring peoples as the deaf, dumb, and blind.

In his book, Barriers Down, Mr. Kent Cooper, general manager of the Associated Press and a member of the advisory board of the Graduate School of Journalism, reveals for the first time the history of his efforts at Versailles in 1919 and since then to bring about freedom of international news exchange.

ASSOCIATED PRESS AND UNITED PRESS FIGHT FOR FREE PRESS

Mr. Cooper discloses in factual detail how the chief foreign news agencies, Reuters, Havas, and Wolff divided the news areas of the globe into spheres of service and influence before the last war. Then, he describes how the British and French news agencies, subsidized by their governments, prevented the establishment of freedom of international communications after the Versailles conferences.

Over a period of years the Associated Press carried on a continuous battle with these foreign subsidized agencies, chiefly in Latin America. Although business competitors, the Associated Press and the United Press associations, loyal alike to the ideals and high standards of American journalism, finally succeeded in establishing freedom of international news exchange among the newspapers and radio stations of the American republics.

This contribution by North American press associations, in cooperation with the newspapers of Latin America, preceded the good-neighbor policy and prepared the way for it.

The free flow of news in the Western Hemisphere has been a powerful factor in the development of public confidence in the good-neighbor relationships. Freedom of international news communication is the foundation upon which the basic institutions of society, the State, the church, the school, and the family have built inter-American peace.

For two decades Mr. Cooper and the Associated Press carried on one of the most useful peace crusades in modern times. Knowing that world affairs are realistic and recognizing that global peace will be realistic, Mr. Cooper has presented in Barriers Down a constructive and practical plan for the basis of global peace after this war.

"Any country that comes out of this war with power to impose the terms of peace," Mr. Cooper declares, "should insist upon not only a free press but freedom of international news exchange. I come to this conclusion," he added, "because having had no freedom of the press on the European Continent and no means of international exchange of unbiased news, this war that now is had to be."

Mr. Cooper also presents a five-point constructive plan for international intercourse under global peace:

"1. Guarantee freedom of the press throughout the world as we know it.

"2. Guarantee that at least one news agency in each country be owned and controlled mutually by the newspapers it serves.

"3. Guarantee that each agency may make such international news exchange arrangements as it chooses.

"4. Guarantee equality to all in the matter of availability of all official news and transmission facilities, and

"5. Prohibit the intentional covert inclusion in any news service of biased international propaganda.

"If these constituted the basis of international news exchange and if they were implemented by the conviction of all free men that they shall always endure, a happier day for the world would endure. International intercourse would rise to heights of perfection with the barriers down as to news exchange."

In 1933, without knowing the facts as related in Mr. Cooper's recent book, I urged the newspapers of the United States to advocate and support a plan for the establishment of freedom of international news as a new approach to peace.

ALSO PROPOSED PLAN IN 1934

At the twelfth annual convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, held in Washington in April 1934, the committee on press and public relations included an address I delivered in Columbus, Ohio, in its report with a favorable recommendation, which was followed by the endorsement of the editors.

The arguments advanced 6 years before Germany invaded Poland and precipitated this global war may be applied today with greater urgency.

"The map of the world today is black with prohibitions upon freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, of petitions, or of religion," this report said.

"Liberty in Latin or Anglo-Saxon form is limited everywhere excepting the United States, England, Australia, Canada, South Africa, Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and New Zealand. In these countries the press is either 'the voice of the people' or, as in England, it is open to the opinion of the people."

Continuing, this pre-war statement reads: "This perspective of world journalism is presented because there is a direct relationship between the freedom of the press and peace between nations. The time has come for the American press to recommend and support a new American policy in foreign affairs.

"That there is a relationship between freedom and peace is obvious. The chief nations threatening world peace today are Germany, Japan, France, Italy, and Russia. In each of these countries the press is controlled by government officials or militarists who have the power to declare war or force a declaration of war.

"The chief nations which want peace today," the report added, "are the British Commonwealth, the five small but free nations of Europe and the United States. In these countries the press is free from governmental control or censorship. These are facts.

"War follows controlled news

"The most important force in international affairs today is the foreign service of the American press associations and newspapers under the leadership and direction of men who are interested in and concerned with the free flow of information rather than with any form of propaganda by, for, and of governments, or political systems or peace societies."

Concluding, the report said:

"American newspaper correspondents abroad know from experience and as a result of daily contact with realities in every world capital that war follows the control of news as inevitably as darkness follows light."

That proposition was first expounded 10 years ago, but it had not the slightest effect upon international affairs. Neither will Mr. Cooper's book influence the course of global peace after this war unless the people of the Unit d States are aroused to the realization that propaganda in wartime can lead to the freezing of international communications at the peace conference and in the peace treaties. A repetition of the old order of European peace conferences will not give you or your children global peace but another global war.

The concern of American editors in 1934, Mr. Cooper's concern which prompted his book, and the concern which caused me to speak on this subject today is the desire and hope that the people of our country, especially the men who must do the fighting in this war, will support this new approach to global peace.

Throughout the life span of the Graduate School of Journalism, the globe we now seek to make peaceful has suffered successive wars and revolutions since 1912.

Throughout that 30-year period the globe has experienced the creeping paralysis of a black plague of governmental propaganda, censorship and control of news until today the plague has spread to and infects the people of every nation on earth. The only difference between the people in one area and another is the degree of their fever. Under these conditions we must wage a global war but this is not a healthy condition for the establishment of global peace.

Therefore, after the armistice, newspapers and radio broadcasting companies must be immediately freed from censorship and controls in order that public opinion may be based upon freedom of news.

My concern about global peace is that peace terms will be propaganda terms, created by fear, pressed for acceptance in haste, and drafted in the language of emergency rather than the truth.

A French essayist of the 16th Century coined that phrase: "choosing the language of emergency rather than the truth." The "Discours Sur La Servitude Volontaire" by Etionne de la Boetie was published recently by the Columbia University Press. The author describes how custom becomes the first reason for voluntary servitude which leads to autocratic control.

"Men are like handsome race horses who first bite the bit and later like it, and rearing under the saddle a while soon learn to enjoy displaying their harness and prance proudly beneath their trappings. Similarly men will grow accustomed to the idea that they have always been in subjection, that their fathers lived in the same way; they will think they are obliged to suffer this evil, and will persuade themselves by example and imitation of others, finally investing those who order them around with proprietary rights, based on the idea that it has always been that way."

For this reason there are journalists who are vigilant today because voluntary censorships and the voluntary acceptance of propaganda as war measures may become the custom and lead to voluntary international news servitude at the end of this war. For this reason they advocate freedom of international news communication at the armistice so that news may be substituted for the language of emergency.

PUBLIC OPINION BASIC FORCE

Public opinion is the greatest force in every individual nation and in all nations collectively. When the people in all countries are free to be informed and free to act, public opinion, for the first time since the inventions of printing and radio, telegraph, and airplane, will have a real chance to be practiced in international relationships. Human beings respond to honor, justice, honesty, and integrity in their relationships only when they are public, not when they are secret. Until the millennium we cannot expect men in authority in any country to live up to the high standards of international idealism behind the locked doors of diplomatic chancelleries.

If, as a result of this global war, public opinion is free to be informed and free to act; if, by the international force of the free exchange of news, people discover a new approach to understanding each other, global peace might endure more than a single generation. By freeing international news from governmental controls at the

peace conferences, public opinion will immediately become the most powerful international force on the globe.

The only effective means as yet designed by the ingenuity of man to control the congenital weaknesses of human beings, including military men and statesmen in their exercise of authority, is public opinion. Men in industry, in business, in finance, in labor organizations, in colleges and universities, but, above all, in government, fear public opinion even if they do not respect the instrumentalities and agencies of communication. Exposé by the printed word or by radio, or the fear of exposé is a disciplinary force certainly equal to the law.

In the formative years of big business in the United States, it was the public exposé of their ruthless and unsocial policies and practices which destroyed the era of autocratic control of State and Federal governments by the men whose philosophy was symbolized by the famous expression, "the public be damned."

At times in recent years when there have been grave national crises, due to strikes or the era of terror during prohibition, the autocratic authority of strike leaders and of gangsters was broken only by an enlightened and militant public opinion.

Freedom of international news at the next peace conference and as an article in the peace treaties will fortify public opinion in every participating country and thereby enable peoples nationally and internationally to protect themselves from those who will seek to make war in the future. It will hold in check the propaganda pressure groups, which again, as in the past, will sow suspicion and utilize hate motifs to gain selfish, economic, or political objectives which cause international rivalries and conflicts.

Freedom of international news has never existed in the whole history of the world. Surely it merits recognition at the conclusion of this war, for it may be the first real beginning of global peace.

Dr. George Washington Carver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a short article written by Mr. Everett Palmer, of the Jewell County (Kans.) Republican, regarding Dr. George Washington Carver. Some of Dr. Carver's early boyhood days were spent in Kansas and it is interesting to note that he finished his high-school education there. His life was typical of the sentiment expressed in the motto of the State of Kansas, ad astra per aspera, which means, "to the stars through difficulty." Dr. Carver's life was full of difficulties but he overcame them all and achieved great distinction and honor for his race and our Nation. Truly it can be said that he was one of God's noblemen.

The article follows:

DR. GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER

Dr. George Washington Carver, noted Negro scientist and artist, who died last week, was born in slavery. When quite young he and his mother were stolen from their master and taken to Arkansas. The master gave a fine blooded horse as a ransom for them, but before the deal could be completed, mother and child had disappeared. The boy next appeared in Minneapolis, Kans., where he graduated from high school. He earned his way through college and then graduated from Iowa State College and became a member of the faculty of that fine institution. Booker Washington induced him to join the Tuskegee Institute. He became consulting chemist and director of a United States agricultural experiment station. His service to southern agriculture has been unprecedented. He disclaimed credit for his valuable discoveries. He said, "The things already are there. God through my hands brought them to light." Last year he was chosen as "Man of the Hour" by Progressive Southern Farmers for his service to agriculture. As an artist, his pictures hang in numerous noted galleries, and he has been elected Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts in London. Many colleges and institutes have paid him homage, but through it all he walked humbly, seeking no money gains, desiring only to be of service. A great American! A grand life!

Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1943

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, some months ago I directed a letter to Hon. Paul V. McNutt, calling his attention to the necessity for according proper recognition of the magnificent efforts that have been made in the matter of food production in this country.

I had in mind at the time that the Army and Navy, in cooperation with the War Production Board, were awarding official E flags in recognition of outstanding performance by labor and management in the production of war materials. I called his attention to the fact that the production of foodstuffs was as vital to the war effort as the production of munitions. The suggestion was made that the morale in the agricultural field could be stimulated by official recognition of outstanding productive efforts. Some publicity was accorded this thought in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. The idea was immediately accepted as sound by many citizens. Up to date no provision that I am aware of has been made for official recognition of outstanding agricultural effort.

I desire to direct the attention of the Congress and the people of America to what I conceive to be an outstanding contribution to the food-production program of the Nation, and I sincerely hope that the Department of Agriculture and the War Manpower Commission will immediately work out a program that will give official recognition to this effort.

In a letter addressed to me under date of January 3, 1943, Mr. R. W. Havemann, president of the South Side Businessmen's Club, of Oshkosh, Wis., outlined the work of his splendid organization in connection with volunteer aid given to agriculture in the harvesting of crops last fall. This effort was so outstanding that the local press called attention to it on November 6, 1942.

I am including Mr. Havemann's letter, together with the news item from the Oshkosh Northwestern of November 6, 1942, which together describe this outstanding accomplishment. Nearly 500 acres of sugar beets, for example, were harvested as a result of volunteer efforts, which otherwise might have been wasted. Over 10,000 man-hours of volunteer service were performed by students of high schools in my district in assisting farmers in the harvesting of their crops. This number should grow throughout the country, and under proper stimulus from the Department of Agriculture and the War Manpower Commission it will go a long way toward solving the critical manpower problem that faces the farmers of America.

Mr. Havemann's letter and the news item referred to follow:

SOUTH SIDE BUSINESSMEN'S CLUB,
Oshkosh, Wis., January 3, 1943.

The Honorable FRANK B. KEEFE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KEEFE: It is with much interest that I have followed your items in the local news columns of the Oshkosh (Wis.) Northwestern.

The item in particular that I have reference to is the proposed awarding of an official E to agriculture for outstanding performance. You are familiar with the shortage of farm labor this past fall and likewise with the extremely rainy weather we had in harvesting our sweetcorn crop for the canning factories, to be followed up with similar unfavorable weather in harvesting our sugar-beet crop.

Mr. Robert C. Heffernan, Winnebago County agricultural agent, and Mr. Murt Malone, manager of the Oshkosh office of the United States Employment Service, exhausted every effort at their command to try and relieve the labor situation, with the final result that in desperation they asked to appear before the South Side Businessmen's Club of Oshkosh, Wis., to tell of the plight the farmers in this area were in, and to enlist the aid of the businessmen. Facts and figures were presented to reveal the grave conditions existing as to farm and agricultural labor in our district.

The South Side Businessmen's Club, of which I am president, has 150 active members. As a result of the pleas of Mr. Heffernan and Mr. Malone, a committee of this club called on the school boards of Oshkosh, Omro, Winneconne, and Ripon, requesting permission to have youths volunteer for this harvest work, and to excuse from regular classes students with a C or better average, so that these patriotic young men who were willing to step into the breach and assist in harvesting these crops would not be penalized.

This permission was granted, through the efforts of the farm placement section of the United States Employment Service, and experienced supervisors were furnished with each group of boys, in some cases Smith-Hughes agricultural instructors accompanied the crews of boys to the fields. Members of this club, with their personal cars and business trucks, furnished transportation each morning and evening to the farmers' fields. They called at the schools each morning at 8:30 a. m. to take the student workers to

the fields, and picked them up at 5 p. m. to return them to the schools where the students entered their classrooms to report after their day's work was completed.

I, R. W. Havemann, president of the South Side Businessmen's Club, of Oshkosh, Wis., sincerely believe that this was an outstanding accomplishment on the part of the several school boards, the students who volunteered, and all who aided this work.

Even with our exceptionally early freeze-up this fall not a single salable sugar beet was frozen in the ground or failed to reach its destination at the sugar refinery.

Perhaps it will be of interest to you to have some of the figures that were presented to me by the authorities of the schools and the agricultural teachers:

Number of man-hours on harvesting crops

Crop	Hours	School
Harvesting apples	125	Oshkosh High School.
Sweet corn	1,468	Do.
Sugar beets	3,166	Do.
Corn beets	1,275	Omro High School.
Do	1,590	Winneconne High School.
Sweet corn	2,450	Ripon High School.
Total	10,074	

Mr. KEEFE, this country is at war, and we on the home front have a duty to perform which must be performed to the best of our ability regardless of where that duty calls us.

Next spring, when the new crop goes into the ground and throughout the growing and harvesting season, farm labor will again be the Nation's agricultural problem.

We, as businessmen, will have to lock our doors and assist and aid our country cousins in producing foodstuffs whenever we are called upon. We, as a businessmen's club, will again have to appear before these respective school boards and request their assistance and aid from their student body the same as we did this last year.

To pave the way for a duplication of this noble and patriotic cooperation which we received, I am asking you, Mr. KEEFE, to consider the fine work these respective schools and their student bodies have accomplished, singly and separately and to use your efforts to secure an E award for agriculture for the services rendered.

This request has the endorsement of Jerry Shea, Winnebago County chairman, county board; George F. Oaks, mayor, city of Oshkosh, Wis.; C. C. Bishop, superintendent of schools, Oshkosh, Wis; S. D. Fell, principal, Oshkosh High School; J. F. Wilkinson, agriculture instructor, Oshkosh High School; H. B. Patch, principal, Omro High School; R. B. Locke, agriculture instructor, Omro High School; G. R. Leistikow, principal, Winneconne High School; Willis DiVall, agriculture instructor, Winneconne High School.

One could go on and on obtaining more endorsements, but the facts and figures herewith presented are sufficient to give you a picture of the accomplishments of these respective schools and their student bodies:

Oshkosh High School, Winnebago County.

Omro High School, Winnebago County.

Winneconne High School, Winnebago County.

Ripon High School, Fond du Lac County.

These schools, to our way of thinking, are entitled to an official "E" award. We request that you give this matter your attention and use your utmost efforts to secure these awards. If more information on this subject is needed, may we, as a club, be of service to you.

Yours for a healthy, prosperous New Year.

I remain,

R. W. HAVEMANN,
President, South Side Businessmen's Club, Oshkosh, Wis.

[From the Oshkosh Northwestern of November 6, 1942]

BOYS OF HIGH SCHOOLS "SAVE" SUGAR BEET CROP—VOLUNTEERS SECURED AT OSHKOSH, OMRO, AND WINNECONNE HELP HARVEST 500 ACRES IN COUNTY

Wisconsin's sugar bowl may scrape on bottom in 1943, but it won't be empty and credit for this feat must be given 150 high-school boys from Oshkosh, Omro, and Winneconne.

Tons of sugar beets from nearly 500 acres are being topped and harvested and sent on their way to sugar refineries from Winnebago County farms, thank to the patriotic spirit of these youthful volunteers, and the cooperation of school authorities in Oshkosh, Omro, and Winneconne.

On October 1 sugar-refinery men and Winnebago County farmers faced the possibility that nearly 500 acres of sugar beets might go to waste with heavy loss, in spite of the sugar shortage, due to acute labor shortage.

These farmers and sugar company representatives brought their problem to the Winnebago County farm labor committee, headed by R. C. Heffernan, county agent, and Otto Miller, Agricultural Adjustment Administration chairman, who conferred with Murt Malone, manager of the Oshkosh office of the United States Employment Service.

Reason for the shortage of labor in the beet fields, they explained, was the departure of many Mexican beet workers, brought to Wisconsin from Texas last spring. When the heavy frost hit this district these experienced workers had made a beeline for "deep in the heart of Texas."

SCHOOLS AID SITUATION

The Oshkosh employment office files of available men and women for farm work were practically empty. But through the farm placement section of the employment service, contact was made with the Oshkosh, Omro, and Winneconne school officials. The plight of the local farmers had previously been brought to the attention of C. C. Bishop, superintendent of Oshkosh schools, and several school board members by the South Side Business Men's Association, headed by R. W. Havemann.

Principals of the three schools, S. D. Fell, Oshkosh; H. B. Patch, Omro, and G. R. Leistikow, Winneconne; and the Smith-Hughes agricultural instructors, J. F. Wilkinson, Oshkosh; R. B. Locke, Omro, and Willis DiVall, Winneconne, asked for volunteers to meet this situation from their respective student bodies. As a result in the past few weeks all sugar-beet fields in Winnebago County have been harvested.

Oshkosh high-school students who volunteered for this work are: Robert Farrow, Earl Lanning, Walter Dugolenski, Robert Perkins, Edward Hoeft, Arthur Hazen, James Rhyner, Richard Hetzel, Leonard Lange, John Kimball, Thomas Kasten, Leland Bradley, Charles Hamilton, George Jury, Ralph Doemel, Harold Stevenson, Richard Stang, Jack Hanson, Jack Williams, Henry Winkler, Robert Grose, Roger Stromberg, John Schneider, Don Schneider, Ralph Meltz, Robert Crofoot, Earl MacDonald, Phillip Grundy, George Dobberke, Clayton Kuehn, James Marheine, Peter Zimmer, George Reynolds, Albert Frederick, Ray Simons, Melvin Poeschl, Robert Kossel, George Loewen, John Zwickey, Byron Wees, William Jones, Robert Bahr, Carl Pfeiffer, Vernon Simons, Ray Luther, David Fraker, William Koepke, Carroll Kramer, Kenneth Braeger, James Overton, and Edward Rasmussen.

MORE FROM OSHKOSH

Others from Oshkosh are: Norbert Rich, Eugene Bloechl, Herbert Berger, Bruce Siewert, Lawrence Felker, Donald Seiberlich, Alvin Schwanke, Edwin Rolph, Robert Tomlitz, Russell Niermeyer, Arthur Baier, John B. King, Edwin Daubert, Elmer Frank, Walter Doemel, Robert Ciscel, Ray Kliss, Russell Birkholz, Norman Kerrie, Bruce McCray, Robert Ledvina, Robert Koepke, Vernon Gehrke, Vernon Morasch, Franklin Ruelke, Charles Hopper, and Ralph Gerth.

Omro High School students who volunteered for this work are: Orville Carpenter, Charles Retzlaff, Lowell Lee, Gordon Bradley, Nathan Gorr, Gordon Whitemarsh, Lyle Lee, Lester Kallas, Paul Costello, John Costello, Gordon Spiegelberg, Gene Giddings, Robert Challoner, Phillip Monahan, Arthur Behm, Mervin Dehn, Joseph Sainsbury, Robert Fisher, and Harland Tritt.

Students from Winneconne High School are: Myrle Zimmerman, John Bersch, Arthur Nickel, George Benedict, Merwood Amundson, Howard Henschel, Robert Carow, Thomas Hren, Donald Johnson, Arden Luedtke, Donald Duesterbeck, Gordon Fahley, Lyle Berndt, Robert Kittleson, Earl Nelson, Clifford Much, William Utke, Nathan Straunsee, Bruce Amundson, Ted Allen, Robert Neumann, Edward Quigley, Lester Rasmussen, Donald Remmel, Raymond Posselt, Warren Romberg, Norman Flanigan, Henry Clasen, Robert Schueler, and Verne Christianson.

Winnebago County farmers who had sugar-beet fields harvested by the high-school boys, claim the youths did as well or better than the expert and experienced crews used in past years.

It Is Food Storage and Not Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today, by unanimous consent, an editorial from the Big Timber Pioneer, a newspaper published at Big Timber, Mont. The editor of this paper is an old friend of mine and perhaps one of the ablest newspapermen in the West. The editorial is entitled "It Is Food Storage and Not Food Shortage." I believe this newspaperman has something in this editorial worthy of study by not only the Congress but by radio announcers. I ask my colleagues to read the editorial:

IT IS FOOD STORAGE AND NOT FOOD SHORTAGE

According to retail merchants not only in Big Timber but elsewhere, shortage of food, empty shelves or parts of shelves in their stores, is not due wholly to shortage of food but in many cases to storage of food.

They claim, and their claim is just, that food scares put out by radio announcers, not by the Government, result in many cases in a rush to stores by the uneasy to buy and store various foods they may not need for months, if then.

A report comes from the outside that a country merchant had a $400 buying run on his stock after closing time; a run resulting from an exaggerated food shortage announcement in an evening radio program.

Additional reports are that in many cases gas tanks are filled to capacity by car owners; that gas fills demijohns, 5-gallon cans, even quart and pint bottles.

If Government authorities would place a black-out on these radio scares, notify the public to accept only as true Government statements regarding present or future food shortage, published by the Associated or United Press, by Government consent, much of the food-shortage bugaboo would be eliminated.

Representative Clare Hoffman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

REPRESENTATIVE CLARE HOFFMAN

For a number of years Representative HOFFMAN, of Michigan, was, to all appearances, a lonely figure in Congress. He was outspoken in his opposition to the dictatorial trend of the administration, to its friendship for Communists and communism, to its waste and extravagance, to its bias against business, and to its recklessness in domestic and foreign policy. Others in both parties may have shared his convictions, but few of his colleagues had the hardihood to speak out and no man in either House or either party was as uncompromising in his opposition as was Mr. HOFFMAN. It followed as a matter of course that no Member of Congress was more thoroughly vilified by the bleeding hearts and the fellow travelers.

Since the defeat of the New Deal on November 3, Mr. HOFFMAN has been saying the same things he said before, but now his words carry a new authority. More and more Congressmen are coming out of the cyclone cellar to join him and the little band of outspoken men of which he was a leading spirit.

Mr. HOFFMAN'S reputation in the House has been greatly enhanced and no doubt will continue to grow. He has consistently spoken for the people of this country and, as his record of reelections shows, the people of his district have consistently supported him. He has kept faith with them and they with him. He and the growing band of Congressmen who share his opinions may feel confident that their doctrine is that of the majority of the people of this country.

Tolan Plan Hailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago I introduced in the House the first civilian manpower bill. Since that time this problem has grown in complexity and importance, even as the various suggestions for solving it have multiplied.

The current report of the Tolan committee, in my opinion, is the most serious, comprehensive, and practical study yet made of the whole question of manpower mobilization with particular reference to production.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following article, written by Felix Morley, of the Wall Street Journal, in analyzing some of the pertinent recommendations and findings of the Tolan committee:

TOLAN PLAN HAILED AS CLEAN VIEW OF NEEDS IN WARTIME ORGANIZATION

(By Felix Morley)

In the current report of the Tolan committee, which may well come to stand out in retrospect as a document of historical importance, occurs the following tart phrase:

"War production is treated as a salesman's proposition, rather than as a mobilization of our entire national plant for total war."

Many Americans have for months been uneasily aware of the cogency of this criticism. It is brought home by radio broadcasts in which war news is made a setting for dulcet elaboration on the virtues of rival brands of cigars, ice cream, and chewing gum. It is emphasized by newspapers in which advertisements for liquor, furs, and cosmetics sardonically compete with editorials urging Pentecostal sacrifice. The procedures of salesmanship are tacitly endorsed by the armed services in recruiting drives which compete for a dwindling manpower much as the popular brands of cigarettes vie for the consumer's dollar.

Coupled with the confusion and wastage caused by these competitive procedures is a consistent minimization of the strength of our enemies which could scarcely be more helpful to them if it had been planned by Mr. Goebbels himself. The belief seems to be that exaggeration will somehow increase the difficulties of the Axis while understatement will simultaneously solve those of the United Nations. The net result is a general Pollyanna attitude which contributes in no small degree to the as yet indecisive character of the American war effort.

Through this dangerous optimism the report of the Tolan committee cuts with the cold precision of a surgeon's knife. It is not the first time that this able group of Congressmen, first organized to investigate national defense migration, has produced a thoroughly dispassionate and therefore constructive piece of criticism. And the present incisive comments give further illustration of the great value of congressional committees as independent governmental agencies, competent to fulfill that vital function of strictly factual analysis which the newspapers have now to a large extent abandoned.

II

The report of the Tolan committee assails "the absence of a program of production and an organization to coordinate it." It asserts that the war effort in its present form is only "a series of individual, competing production projects." Unfortunately, the official statistics of national production serve to add substance and meaning to these charges.

The Federal Reserve index of industrial production has risen steadily from 161 in September 1941 to an estimated 185 last month, on a scale where the average physical volume of output from 1935 to 1939, inclusive, is called 100. A sharper increase than this could scarcely be expected, though it should be noted that the rate of gain during the past 12 months is only about two-thirds that of the pre-war year preceding.

This climb in industrial production, however, must be balanced against the sharp declines in other fields, such as residential building, which emphasize statistically the grim fact that war production can only continue to expand as normal operations are curtailed.

The indication is that the United States, as the first year of war draws on to its close, is already at or near its maximum total productive effort. Increase of war production can henceforth be made certain only by parallel curtailment in other lines. Or, as the current issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin puts it:

"With a large and increasing proportion of economic activity being devoted to war purposes, it is evident that sooner or later the supply of goods in many civilian markets will decline."

III

This picture explains why the Tolan committee, at the opening of its report, states flatly that: "This war can be lost in Washington."

"If national production, taken as a whole, is already not far from its maximum, there is unquestionably urgent need for a cold appraisal of the whole hastily built war organization, as well as of the character of its direction. That organization and direction alike need overhauling is the contention of this nonpartisan committee of the House of Representatives. And all who have continuous contact with the confusion in our congested National Capital will find it difficult to dispute the charge.

The committee recommends the establishment of a single authoritarian "Office of War Mobilization," to which all of the present independent and often bitterly competing emergency agencies should be subordinated. The task of this suggested supreme agency would be to establish "a comprehensive national program of war production, manpower mobilization and economic stabilization, based on maximum use of resources for meeting military and essential civilian needs."

Until this step is taken, in the opinion of the Tolan committee, the creation of new offices and the proposed conscription of labor can only lead to further confusion and misdirection of effort. The movement to draft and forcibly allocate manpower, says the report, "is a symptom of prevailing administrative shortcomings. If these shortcomings are not quickly faced and corrected, our war effort is in jeopardy."

IV

It is quite possible that certain Fascist implications will be hastily read into the Tolan committee report, from the mere fact that it proposes a well-organized and completely nonpolitical control of the war effort, directed for that end alone by practical administrators. Policy decisions, moreover, would under the suggested plan be largely removed from political hands and entrusted to centralized functional committees, composed not merely of representatives of the armed services, but also of industry, agriculture, labor, and other specialized national interests.

From any long-range viewpoint, however, there seems far less risk of dictatorship in the program of the House committee than in the present rapid drift toward universal conscription without any evidence of clearly focused or carefully safeguarded executive direction. A real danger of nazification may lie behind the confusion which has "brought us to the verge of a manpower crisis" before the Nation has been a year at war.

Furthermore, in pleasant conformity with American tradition, the Tolan committee advocates drastic decentralization of the top-heavy Washington bureaucracy. "Authority for making decisions should so far as possible be conferred upon the regional and area or district offices. Broad policies, however, should be established at the top to a far greater extent than hitherto."

What this committee asks, fundamentally, is alterations which would promise less salesmanship, less ballyhoo, less personal ambition, and less frenzied pulling at cross-purposes in the wartime organization. Here is a clear visualization of the national emergency as one which must be met by eliminating the tinsel and concentrating on the essence of the American way of life. At present, an opposite tendency is apparent.

Already farms are going fallow; institutions of learning are threatened with extinction; many a small business is facing

ruin. Yet in other fields self-indulgence flourishes as never before.

Let us decide, says the Tolan committee, what really is the American way of life, in behalf of which we have gone to war. Having decided what we wish to preserve let us act calmly, without confusion and panic, to eliminate all factors now tending to make the war effort "a salesman's proposition."

There Is No Substitute for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, the homespun philosophy and timely advice of the country editor always contains food for thought.

The Boise City News, in my congressional district, recently carried an article written by its associate editor, Fred Kreiger, styled, There Is No Substitute for Freedom. To my way of thinking, this article presents a fine commonsense philosophy and intelligent understanding of good, sound Americanism. I recommend its reading. It follows:

THERE'S NO SUBSTITUTE FOR FREEDOM

(By Fred Kreiger)

The further we go into the war, the more the various regulations and restrictions have a sobering effect upon our Nation, which seemed to be "hell bent for pleasure and frivolity" before the cowardly attack on Pearl Harbor.

We are now giving more attention to the stern realities of life, and less to appearances and make-believe—realizing that our ultimate victory will depend upon farmers stumbling up and down ploughed furrows, grimy-faced workers producing in factories; sincere clerks working long hours in stores; patriotic wives and mothers giving much time to the welfare of workers in the home, and little attention to their facial make-up.

Russia has given a great lesson to the world of what a nation can do where it is compulsory for everyone to work; where they do not tolerate the blabberings of idiotic radio programs for pleasure, and where there are no top-notch motion-picture stars to pull down ridiculously high salaries; where little attention is given baseball, football, tennis, and golf celebrities, and where night roadhouses consist principally of patriotic sentries on the lookout for German planes.

As free American citizens we must meet the test of war. We have the ability and resources to get things done. Our men have shown in stark heroism that our Nation is not soft on the military front. We can still fight with the tricks of our forefathers learned from the Indians, as we can fight with machines. Guadalcanal and North Africa have proven that. In brief, we can win the war.

But there is more than the military front. There is the home front. And here, except for the production miracle of industry, there is evidence of softness, of confusion of ideals. Group bickering has put the attainment of personal comfort and security ahead of the national welfare. In many quarters the desire to eliminate human want at one swoop has become an obsession. A Government agency has even prepared a new Bill of Rights, the basic tenets of which is economic security. The new bill is proposed as a supplement to the old bill defining our liberties at the time the United States Constitution was adopted. It puts security on a par with freedom, on the theory that the American people will abandon freedom if they are not guaranteed three square meals a day. It implies that the American people, bitter from the great depression of the 30's and fearful of post-war uncertainty, do not propose to go hungry; that if they cannot have their freedom with full stomachs, they will go without freedom.

If such is really true, we have drifted from the ideal the Pilgrims carried ashore at Plymouth Rock. Even as our men on the battlefields are now dying, the Pilgrims died and suffered hardship for just one reason—to preserve a spot on the globe where the individual could be free. And they got that freedom. They got it because they were tough. Their ideals came first, their stomachs second. Our men are winning battles now because they are tough. They are thinking of freedom.

A year ago there was a grave question in the minds of millions whether we could arm fast enough to stem the tide of aggression. There was an equally grave question of whether we could do so without destroying free enterprise and representative government. There were those who believed it would take total dictatorship to beat the dictators. The challenge fell on industry. Our national resources and factories had to be mobilized for war on a scale that wrought shattering changes in technique and precedent. Industry knew that the cracker-box agitators were waiting to pounce upon the country with revolutionary changes at the slightest sign of failure.

It is to the credit of thinking Government officials that revolutionary changes in government and industry were not forced before free enterprise had a chance to show what it could do to prove that our democracy was not a failure. Our factories did a magnificent job. In a matter of months they underwent retooling and conversion. Today tanks, planes, guns, ships, are rolling off the assembly lines by the thousands. Our war production has caught and passed the dictator enemies who spent years producing for war under an elaborate economic security program which by its very completeness had destroyed individual freedom—the same years that our industries continued to produce for America's unregimented, peaceful millions. Back of the manufacturers stand American farm producers and distributors, together with the metal and coal mines, the oil, the power, and transportation industries. They feed our workers and keep materials moving into the assembly lines.

The end of the war may be distant, yet I believe it is in sight. And again free enterprise faces a challenge; again it faces a background of threats. Those threats are again cloaked with the idea that a full stomach is an inalienable right. Far-sighted leaders know that the challenge of the post-war world will be the toughest of all. It will be far tougher than the facts justify because of demagogic attempts to soften our people with illusory social dreams of total economic security.

But industry is making its plans. And these plans will have to be daring. Industry must go on the offensive. It must show that unprecedented production under a system of free enterprise is the only sure way to build a lasting peace under the banner of individual freedom. It must lay the groundwork for this production now. And it must have the wholehearted cooperation of all Americans on the home front. There is no room for the labor racketeer any more than there is room for exploiting capitalists or the faithless politician.

We on the home front must do a lot of clear thinking. We must be hardened by a determination that, above all else, we must save the right of the individual to be free. We must realize now that in the peace to come that individual freedom is more important than individual comfort. Bitter experience has demonstrated that without freedom there can be neither comfort nor security. We must reaffirm our belief in constitutional government.

To Make Right the Master of Might

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, for the seventh consecutive year Legion memorial services were conducted at All Saints Episcopal Church, San Francisco, on Sunday, November 8.

The Army, Navy, and the Marine Corps; the State guard; the city, county, and State officials; the diplomatic representatives, and Legionnaires from various posts attended the divine services.

The Reverend Dr. Paul Little, rector of the parish, preached the sermon. Just a month ago Dr. Little received a citation from the State Legion department for 25 consecutive years of active Legion service as chaplain and is known and loved throughout the State.

Dr. Little's sermon follows:

TO MAKE RIGHT THE MASTER OF MIGHT

Text: II Peter 3:13, "We * * * look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

RELIGIOUS FOUNDATIONS

It has been quite well said that outside of the Biblical messages, there are no greater ethical documents than the American Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Even the compact signed in the cabin of the Mayflower on November 11, 1620, began with an ascription to God: "In the name of God, Amen." Verily, we believe that this Republic was conceived in and born of religion. There were 56 signers to the Declaration of Independence and every one of them was a churchman; two-thirds of whom belonged to our own communion. In a real sense we cannot separate religion and government. In the year 1215 the sturdy ancestors of the Pilgrim Fathers wrested from an unjust king the Magna Carta. In 1620 their descendants signed a compact in the Mayflower which established a free state. In 1776 the "embattled farmers * * * fired the shot heard round the world." On January 1, 1863, Abraham Lincoln with one stroke of the pen gave emancipation to the slaves. On April 6, 1917, Woodrow Wilson in the line of noble succession issued the call to "Make the world safe for democracy." And now in the year 1941 two of the really great leaders of the world, Prime Minister Winston Churchill and President Roosevelt issued the Atlantic Charter.

It was but yesterday that our President thrilled the Nation by broadcasting that our armed forces were landing on the western and northern shores of Africa. In the solemnity of this very hour our soldiers, sailors, and marines, ably supported by our British allies, are storming the ramparts of our enemies.

RIGHTEOUSNESS ABOVE MIGHT

In the early days of the railway industry many were dubious regarding its success. The story is told of an aged couple in the South who had never seen a railway train. The husband and wife decided to make a special trip to the little station miles from their humble farm. When they reached the station the train had already arrived. With wonderment they looked at the iron monster. The husband said to his wife, "Sally, this is a real wonder." Like a pleasant echo, the wife replied, "Yes, Sam, this is really a wonder." After having walked around the locomotive, Sam remarked, "Sally, this thing will never go," and Sally said, "Sam, this thing will never go." Suddenly the whistle blew, the bell rang, and the train moved faster and faster until it was out of sight. Then with great emotion Sally remarked, "Sam, nobody will ever be able to stop that train."

For over 3 years upon this good earth have been hanging dark clouds of death and destruction. But at long last, thank God, the American train (American way of life) has begun to move and move ever faster, and may it never stop until it reaches the terminus and that station bears the motto: "Final victory over Hitlerism and his vulture partners."

"Then conquer we must when our cause it is just,
And this be our motto: In God we trust!"

Today millions of our men and also women have been called into the service. We who still enjoy the blessings of home and hearth also have sacred duties to perform. To be loyal to those undying principles of righteousness, truth, justice, and liberty, and thus cooperate with our Government to the fullest extent of our ability, knowing that:

"Truth crushed to earth shall rise again;
The eternal years of God are hers."

It is told of a typical sturdy young Norseman who presented himself to the draft board for induction into the Army, that the chairman of the board inquired: "What nationality?" The brawny blond immediately replied: "Meester, I am an American but of a Norwegian design." "Well," said our young American, "it matters not what design or from what clime or country our ancestors may have come from so long as we become and remain true Americans. If our flag is worth living under, it is worth fighting for."

This is the essence of good citizenship.

FABLE OF THE OX AND THE DONKEY

All those who think they have grievances against our country, spreading disunity, and imagine that they can overthrow our form of government might well be reminded of the fable of the ox and the donkey. One day the ox balked and refused to work. That night the ox asked the donkey how things were getting along without him. The donkey replied: "I had to do double duty but somehow I staggered through." The second day the ox still refused to work. That night when the donkey returned from its work the ox said: "Well, did the boss say anything today?" The donkey replied: "Not a word, but on his way home, the boss stopped and talked a while with the butcher."

Be it far from us even to imply that we should butcher all those who may disapprove our form of government. In a democracy like this constructive criticism is welcome from any and all sources. The powers of aggression and of tyranny say, "Come, let us murder together." A democracy like this says, "Come, let us ballot together." Just a little over a year ago there were some would-be prophets who predicted that in 1942 we would have a dictatorship in this country and that there would be no election held. Strange as it may seem many were their misguided followers. Last week we had our general elections and there was no blood shed anywhere, and why not? For the simple reason that we in America believe in human rights. The fact of the matter is that this country more than any other, yea, here more than otherwheres, a man may be a man in spite of his ancestry or poverty. By all means let us Americanize the aliens in our midst, but above all, let us first Americanize the un-American Americans.

GOD NOT GOLD

Oliver Goldsmith, the discerning British author of the eighteenth century, well said:

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

Let us not be deceived that in this country corn, coal, copper, cotton, wheat, silver, or gold is king. The Almighty meant that man alone should be king, and the nation that will grow godly men and women will abide while others will perish just as the ancient civilization have become extinct. True manhood is the needed thing today.

In his book, Fundamentals of Prosperity, Roger Babson speaks of a conversation he had with the President of Argentine Republic at a banquet given in his honor. The President said: "Mr. Babson, I have been wondering why it is that South America is so far behind North America, notwithstanding the fact that South America was settled first." Diplomatically, Mr. Babson replied, "Mr. President, what do you think?" To which the President gave the following remarkable answer: "South America was settled by people who came in search of gold, but North America was settled by people who went there in search of God." Well said, Mr. President, but let us not now kick down the ladder by which we climbed and at the same time let us not forget the true foundations upon which all permanent prosperity is built, namely, God.

"What builds a nation's pillars high
And makes it great and strong?
What makes it mighty to defy
The foes that 'round it throng?

Not gold but only men can make
A nation great and strong;
Men who for truth and honor's sake
Hold still and suffer long.

Brave men who work while others sleep,
Who dare when others sigh;
They build a nation's pillars deep
And lift it to the sky."

HIGHER PATRIOTISM

A nation, like an individual, has soul. No nation can survive which not only neglects but actually defies God's divine laws—righteousness, truth, justice, freedom, and mercy. Peace, prosperity, and the pursuit of happiness will be our heritage in the same proportion as our Nation rededicates itself to these high principles of life.

For these higher principles our forebears gave themselves. Freedom was worth more than life itself, or else they would not have died at Valley Forge or Chateau Thierry, and now Pearl Harbor, Bataan, Solomon Islands, and now in North Africa. Truth was worth more than life itself or else Socrates would not have drunk the cup of poison, nor St. Paul gone to his martyrdom. Righteousness and justice for the poor and the weak was worth more than life, else the lowly Nazarene would not have died upon the cross.

Today, as never before, we need good citizenship and godly leadership with unquestioned character. In these days of commercialism we are apt to confuse character with that of mere reputation. Indeed, there is a wide chasm between the two.

Reputation is seeming. Character is being.

Reputation is one's photograph. Character is one's face.

Reputation is manufactured. Character is grown.

Reputation is what men say we are. Character is what God knows we are.

Reputation is what we need to get a job. Character is what we need to keep our job.

Reputation makes one rich or poor. Character makes one happy or miserable.

Reputation is what is chiseled on one's tombstone. Character is what the angels say about us before the throne of God.

Nation with character and a soul will not perish from the earth.

"In the beauty of the lilies, Christ was born across the sea,
With a glory in His bosom that transfigures you and me;
As He died to make men holy, let us fight to make men free,
While God is marching on."

Resolutions Adopted at the Seventy-second Annual Meeting of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a copy of the resolutions adopted on January 15, 1943, at the seventy-second annual meeting of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture.

This board is composed of actual working farmers who are leaders in their own communities and throughout the State. The resolutions adopted represent the considered judgment of this splendid group of farm leaders and I am sure they are representative of the views of Kansas farmers generally. I submit them as being worthy of the most careful consideration by all Members of Congress.

The resolutions follow:

THE FARMER AND THE WAR

The Kansas farmer will strive to produce the food and fiber that the continued war effort will require. He will give his labor and his sons to the cause. He asks only an equitable sharing of the burdens of war; the efficient use of our resources, human and national; the forsaking of special privileges and selfish advantage; and the elimination of all nonessential activities. The Kansas farmer stands ready and will fight and toil with all loyal Americans for the achievement of an early peace and a lasting security.

ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY

In the interest of economy, we earnestly recommend that all Federal and State agencies, boards, and bureaus not essential to the war effort and necessary functions of State and National Government be abolished; that all necessary agencies be examined critically as to duplicating service; and that a program of consolidation be carried out. We recommend further that an honest effort be made to eliminate unnecessary forms and questionnaires, and to simplify as much as possible those that are found to be essential.

Farmers are anxious to do their part in carrying out all necessary regulations, but strenuously object to unnecessary red tape and inefficiency. We insist on improvement in administration of plans and programs to eliminate waste, delay, and confusion. We are convinced that the situation could be

substantially improved by decentralizing the administrative process and by broadening the discretionary power of local boards or State authorities who invariably have a better understanding of local conditions than Washington administrators can possibly have.

We favor the assistance of the Government in providing needed credit to worthy farmers on a basis that will contribute to their economic independence or supplement available credit to allow them to take full advantage of their production unit when such credit is not available elsewhere, provided that such credit is not used as a means of regimenting farmers or for the purpose of building duplicating Government agencies or bureaus.

We urge the enactment of legislation which will retain all needed functions of the Farm Security Administration, including the tenant purchase programs under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, to be administered under standards and policies to be determined by the Congress, by consolidating such functions with appropriate existing State and Federal agencies, and that the administration of such functions be decentralized as far as possible. Such action is essential, in the interest of economy, the greater utilization of manpower, the elimination of duplicating effort, and as a safeguard against further development of socialistic land policies in agriculture.

WAR PRODUCTION

Farmers are being asked to produce in 1943 a substantially greater volume than the record production of 1942. Farmers are making every effort to discharge this responsibility, but it cannot be accomplished unless immediate and definite steps are taken to make available to farmers the absolute essentials for this large production. Such increased production, even with nature cooperating, requires that all recognize that while many untrained people can be very helpful in supplying the labor on farms to meet seasonal demands, maximum production requires men of experience and skill in the arts of producing and feeding livestock, poultry, dairy production, crop production, and the handling of modern machinery and equipment. Farmers are alarmed over the drastic curtailment of machinery, equipment, and supplies available for 1943.

All should recognize the necessity for maintaining transportation facilities essential to production and marketing operations. Transportation equipment and ability to use it both on and off the farm are vital to continued efficient operation.

The necessity for protecting and maintaining farm prices in the markets at levels that will stimulate the increased production desired, through policies that are certain, clear, and practical, should be recognized.

The value of the farm program has proven itself in times of peace and in war. Its provisions are adequate to secure immediate adjustment in production upward as well as downward. Higher prices resulting from intelligent farm production adjustments and increasing demands for farm products have greatly reduced the need for parity adjustment payments and have, to some extent, reduced the need for agricultural conservation payments. We urge the immediate discontinuance of all policies and practices that have for their purpose the holding of market prices below parity and that require continued appropriations if farmers are to secure parity returns. We insist that the specific intent of Congress when enacting this law was that all programs administered under the law should be directed toward encouraging and maintaining the price levels of farm commodities at parity in the market and that commodities coming into the hands of the Government as a result of commodity loans and other practices should never be used to deliberately hold prices in the market below such a level.

Efficient farm operation requires experienced, able-bodied men, as certainly do our fighting forces and industry. The farm manpower problem has been intensified by the current shortage of labor-saving farm machinery. In this critical war period when daylight-to-dark measures the working hours of farm families, retention of the 40-hour week in industry is not understandable. The 40-hour week was adopted as a device to spread the work. Today's war necessity requires that we spread the workers. We advocate abolition of the 40-hour week in industry for the war emergency, and we challenge all workers to subscribe to lengthened hours that will best contribute to maximum production. We strongly urge that overtime pay be eliminated as a patriotic contribution to our common war effort.

We commend Congress for creating the Selective Service System and for prescribing democratic processes for its operation. We commend Congress for enacting legislation which provides for deferment of necessary men in agriculture, and we commend the Selective Service System for immediately putting into effect regulations to carry out the intent and purposes of this act.

THE FARMER AND GAS RATIONING

We commend the War Production Board in its efforts made to adequately meet the requirements of farm people in the rationing of gas and rubber. We especially endorse the additional authority delegated to local boards and efforts being made to simplify reports in connection with same.

SUBSIDIES

Retail prices of some food products are being maintained below ceiling price levels through the payment of subsidies. We believe this subterfuge is wrong in principle. If the farmer is receiving no more than a fair price for his products, the ceiling retail price should be set at a level which will reflect this fair price to the farmer. The use of payments to bring farm returns up to parity at a time when huge surpluses are depressing the markets is entirely justified, but the entire farm program was based on the assumption that parity prices are fair to consumers as well as to farmers, and that as economic conditions improve, market prices would rise to parity, thus eliminating the need for parity payments. Now, with wages higher in relation to food costs than ever before, there is no sound reason why retail prices should not be permitted to rise to such levels as to assure farmers parity for their products in the market place.

The practice of paying subsidies to avoid raising the price to the consumer cannot be fairly considered as preventing inflation, because the same total amount is paid whether the consumer pays at all, or whether he pays part of it and the taxpayer the balance. We are unalterably opposed to the use of subsidies in lieu of fair prices in the market place at times when consumers are fully able to pay fair prices.

FARM REPRESENTATION ON FEDERAL AGENCIES

We wish to restate our request of last year for adequate farm representation on war agency boards.

MACHINERY

Secretary Wickard is to be commended on his stand for making material available for the manufacture of new machinery to the extent of 50 percent of that available in 1941, and adequate supply of material for the manufacture of repair parts in 1943.

COMMODITY PRICES

All factors contributing to costs must be included in establishing ceiling prices on farm products. With the farmer forced to compete with wage scales current in other industries, his production costs have advanced proportionally and these increases must be added to what is otherwise considered parity.

VIGILANCE ON IMPORTS

Our Nation is free of all major animal plagues; we fear foot-and-mouth disease, especially; and we urge continued vigilance against possible introduction of some foreign scourge through the importation of livestock or livestock products.

PROTEIN SUPPLEMENTS

Since protein supplements are essential for economical and speedy production of livestock, poultry, and dairy products, and as it has become impossible for many feeders to secure their requirements, we urge Food Administrator Claude R. Wickard to immediately take such steps as may be necessary to fairly apportion available supplies.

VEHICLE SCALES

Since at present there is no State supervision, we recommend the enactment of a law requiring inspection of all scales used in commerce within the State.

MARKETING

A State agency authorized to supervise the grading and shipment of agricultural commodities, and with current special reference to fruits, vegetables, dairy and poultry products, is badly needed, more so now than ever because lend-lease and military needs can be supplied only under established grades, while products with ceiling prices are, without exception, subject to classification by grades. Hence, we favor legislation that will enable Kansas to best serve the State's interests in the marketing and distribution of its products, with authorization for cooperation with Federal agencies having to do with the grading, classification, purchase, and movement of food supplies.

ASSESSMENT AND TAXATION

We recommend that the State board of agriculture make a study of our tax problems.

PREDATORY ANIMAL AND RODENT CONTROL

Because of the heavy losses to agriculture from predatory animals and rodents, we urge that our present laws be strengthened for their eradication and control or legislation supplementary to existing bounty laws be enacted.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

We oppose any change in our dairy or food laws which would permit the sale of any substitute for pure dairy products.

SORGHUMS

Whereas low temperatures occurred at an unusually early date in 1942, resulting in injuring the germination of sorghum seed; it is recommended that farmers send samples of seed to the State Seed Laboratory of all seed intended for planting. It is further recommended that certified seed be used where specific varieties are desired.

BANG'S DISEASE COMMITTEE

We recommend that the Bang's Disease Committee, authorized by the State Board of Agriculture during the 1941 session, be continued.

BANG'S DISEASE

Bang's disease in cattle results in an economic loss to the Nation by greatly reducing the supply of milk and beef products greatly needed today as a war necessity. Therefore, we recommend that the Live Stock Sanitary Commissioner immediately promulgate a plan which will stop the spread of the disease by prohibiting the movement of Bang infected animals within the State except for slaughter, and that owners be encouraged to develop immunity to infection of the disease by the calfhood vaccination method.

FAIRS

We believe that encouragement should be given to the holding of county, district, and State fairs during this war period so long as they do not interfere with needed war projects or activities. The educational features

that contribute to economic and efficient production should be stressed.

RUBBER

The shortage of rubber within the United States plays a very important part in the production and transportation of agricultural products. Therefore, we urge that all possible speed be used in developing plans for the production of synthetic rubber from any product that proves most economical and available. We especially recommend that special study and consideration be given to the production of synthetic rubber from agricultural products.

APPRECIATION

We express our appreciation for the services of all who have contributed to the success of this meeting and thank the speakers and others who participated, the press for its generous cooperation, the city of Topeka and State officials for the courtesy and hospitality, and particularly to Secretary Mohler and assistants for arranging an excellent program and looking after our care and comfort.

Aimed at John L. Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of January 19, 1943:

AIMED AT JOHN L. LEWIS

That many of the miners in the anthracite belt have decided to remain on strike and ignore the back-to-work order of the War Labor Board leaves the problem in President Roosevelt's lap. Doubtless he will himself send an appeal to the striking workers. And if, as a result of such a request, the miners do return to work, the problem underlying the strike may again be relegated to the background. In other words, we shall be enabled to get on with the war against dictatorship abroad and leave the war against dictatorship at home till a more convenient season. But this problem won't wait. It will continue like a running sore to poison our labor relations till Congress takes surgical action to uproot it. This is what the miners themselves seem to be asking. "I'd rather work under the soldiers," said Louis Novitsky, president of a local United Mine Workers chapter at Tamaqua, Pa., "than under John L. Lewis.

Mr. Lewis, of course, is the dictator of the United Mine Workers of America. And the United Mine Workers has a stranglehold on all coal labor, bituminous as well as anthracite. The Lewis dictatorship was rounded out by the successful effort a year ago to extend the union shop to the captive mines owned by the steel industry. The case came before the National Defense Mediation Board. Mr. Lewis lost by nine votes to the two cast by his friends on the board. Refusing to accept the award, Mr. Lewis called out the miners, and the President set up an ad hoc panel to adjudicate an issue that had already been settled. This agreed with Mr. Lewis, and Mr. Lewis then became dictator of coal labor throughout this country.

At that time the chief argument in favor of the Lewis contention was that the closed shop or any of its derivatives would insure union responsibility. It sounded plausible.

A union shop frees the union officials from worrying about the retention of members and from proselytizing for members among nonunion labor. There is no further trouble about dues, either. Just as no man can be hired who is not a unionist, so the dues are deducted from the pay envelope, and remitted to union headquarters. Freed from these anxieties as to both membership and dues, ran the pro-Lewis argument, the union could give its full time to insuring 100-percent cooperation of labor in the war effort.

Now we see how specious and how disingenuous is this argument. All that the captive mine decision did by buttressing the Lewis dictatorship was to make that dictatorship irresponsible. That is, of course, the way that all tyrannies degenerate. Among slave people they get away with it, but Mr. Lewis forgot that the American workers find Hitlerism just as obnoxious at home as abroad. That is why they have rebelled. The wildcat strike in the anthracite belt is a protest against the extra 50 cents a month in dues which John L. Lewis' union ordered last October and which the operators were contracted to collect. The demand for higher pay was an afterthought.

It is a tragedy that there should have been such a walk-out in wartime. The glee at enemy propaganda headquarters in Berlin and Tokyo, which have lately been hard put to it for material, will be unrestrained. The walk-out will be hailed as a sign of American distintegration. To be sure, the strike is a blow at our American unity and a set-back to our war effort, but the cause is easily eradicable. Let Congress take action to break up these petty dictatorships in our midst by making the unions strictly responsible for their funds and actions. The people have long demanded such a housecleaning. The last Congress was willing to undertake it, but both people and legislature were prevented from insuring it by the pusillanimity of the administration. Now the workers themselves are appealing for help. If the call is ignored, and the sore is patched over, the trouble is bound to break out again in even more virulent form.

Plight of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. TOLAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the December 19, 1942, issue of America, regarding the plight of Puerto Rico:

ANTI-TUGWELL CAMPAIGN

One of the most ruthless campaigns ever conducted against an American public official reached a climax last week when a House committee began hearings on demands for the removal of Rexford G. Tugwell, Governor of Puerto Rico, and a Senate committee started an investigation of social and economic conditions in the island. Whether or not the final outcome of this activity will be Mr. Tugwell's scalp depends on how thoroughly and objectively the committees do their work. If they plumb the bottom of the turgid currents of Puerto Rican life they may be astonished to find that the prime trouble makers are not the Governor and his supporters, but the vested political and economic interests which have reputedly long dominated this dependency.

Puerto Rico is a lovely example of the Creator's beneficence toward man. Its 2,000,000 acres are extremely fertile, and the mild climate, cool in summer and warm in winter, makes it possible to plant three, and even four, vegetable crops a year. Its 1,869,255 inhabitants, of whom somewhat less than one-fourth are Negroes, ought to be among the happiest and most prosperous peoples on earth. Instead, they are indescribably poor and wretchedly unhappy.

For almost 50 years the American Government has been struggling with the problem of Puerto Rican poverty. Although millions of dollars have been spent trying to improve social and economic conditions, Senator BREWSTER, of Maine, could say recently that on a visit to Puerto Rico last fall he found "the poverty, the suffering * * * incredible." Now, after 1 year of war, conditions are much worse, and one of the most fertile spots in the world has become so materially distressed that its inhabitants are actually crying to us for food.

What is the explanation of this cruel paradox?

It is not simple, but if two facts are kept in mind, the situation begins to make some sense. The first is that sugar is king in Puerto Rico, as cotton was formerly king in the South, and 200,000 men and women, engaged in planting, harvesting, and processing it, are its slaves. Technically citizens of the United States, they are in reality peons, completely dependent for their shoddy livelihood on the large sugar corporations which are said to dominate Puerto Rican life.

The second fact is that large estates characterized landholding on the island. So far has the concentration of land ownership gone that in 1935 the 2 percent of the farms which aggregated 260 acres or more, owned or controlled 43 percent of the total acreage. Worse still, more than one-third of the land was operated by managers. Twenty-one of every 26 persons in agriculture were farm laborers, and "merely casual laborers at that," working a few months of the year at meager wages, and living the rest of the time from hand to mouth.

From the concentration on sugar and the concentration of land ownership flow many of the island's ills. The concentration on sugar means that Puerto Rican economic life is at the mercy of the export market. As long as the sugar and a few other cash crops can be sold abroad, the people can use the proceeds to import essential foodstuffs at high prices from the United States. But if the market fails, Puerto Rico faces disaster, since very little food is grown at home. This in turn is the result of the concentration of land ownership.

Students of Puerto Rican affairs have pointed out this danger, and recommended that the unused and underused land be distributed in small plots and devoted to diversified agriculture. Congress actually passed a law years ago which, by limiting corporative holdings on the island to 500 acres, was designed to bring this about; but the sugar corporations easily found ways of nullifying the legislation. Last year, however, the insular legislature renewed the 500-acre law and set about making it a reality. And that brings us back to Mr. Tugwell.

When he took office, in 1941, he announced his belief in a policy of plowing up the land instead of plowing under the babies. This sentiment caused consternation in certain quarters, although the better elements in the island applauded it. Holding power at the time in the legislature was a new party—the Popular Democrats—which had succeeded in ousting the long-dominant Coalition Party, composed of Republicans and Socialists. And the Popular Democrats were

willing—an unusual situation in Puerto Rican politics—to implement their election promises with action. The struggle with the vested interests was on.

Opposed to the social reforms initiated by the Popular Democrats, not by Mr. Tugwell, are the sugar interests, certain leaders of the Free Federation of Workingmen, and the dominant personalities in the Republican and Socialist Parties. El Mundo, which represents the Associated Press and is the island's most influential newspaper, is their mouthpiece. This is the group responsible for the anti-Tugwell campaign.

They have done a very efficient job. Filipo L. deHostos, for instance, president of the Puerto Rican Chamber of Commerce, has managed to secure valuable publicity in the American press. Prudencio Rivera Martinez, head of the Free Federation and up to his neck in island politics, persuaded the American Federation of Labor convention at Toronto to pass a resolution condemning the man who "is creating a reign of terror in Puerto Rico." And the whole movement has been shrewdly advanced by the island's Resident Commissioner in Washington, BOLÍVAR PAGÁN, head of the Socialist Party.

Tugwell is supposed to be a "visionary." He has also been accused of Marxism. But in his determination to cooperate with the insular legislature in the work of social reform, provided the pace of the reforms be gradual enough to be practical, there is nothing visionary, and certainly nothing Marxist. If this is his only crime, Mr. Tugwell deserves the support of every social-minded American. He deserves his day in court.

Operation of School Busses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution concerning the rules and regulations of the Office of Defense Transportation relative to the operation of school busses, adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Indiana, with the Senate concurring.

General Order ODT No. 21 is working a great hardship on the operators of school busses and upon many school children of tender age, and should be modified so as to relieve these harships.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Office of Defense Transportation has ordered, among other provisions, that school busses should be stationed overnight near the point where the first pupil boards the bus in the morning and should be parked close to the school during school hours; that transportation be provided only for those pupils who have to walk more than 2 miles; that existing boundary lines of school administrative units shall not be considered in planning transportation for pupils; that pupils should attend the nearest school having space and facilities in order to be provided with transportation service; and

Whereas most of the school-bus operators keep their busses on their farms and usually live considerably distant from the residence of the first pupil boarding the bus, and such operators do not have facilities for keeping such busses at other places than their farms; and

Whereas the enforcement of such order would result in great hardship to bus drivers and pupils: Therefore

SECTION 1. *Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the senators and representatives from Indiana earnestly urge a modification of the rules and regulations of the Office of Defense Transportation issued under date of November 16, 1942, to all authorities having regulatory powers over school transportation and to all school-bus operators so that such school busses can be operated without such inconvenience to the bus drivers and pupils, and that in formulating any such modified regulations that the Office of Defense Transportation survey the conditions existing in the State of Indiana as to the manner of operation of the rural-school system and school transportation.

SEC. 2. That the principal clerk of the house is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Indiana.

Why Italy Should Withdraw From Axis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting contest has been conducted recently in the city of New York by an Italian-language newspaper, Il Progresso Italo-Americano, published by one of our fellow citizens, who has been commended many times by high officials of our Government for his activities in our war effort, Mr. Gene Pope.

The contest was open to all persons in the United States. The contestants were asked to submit letters setting forth the reasons as to why Italy should withdraw from the Axis alliance and cast her lot with the United Nations.

Five prizes were listed, amounting in all to $2,000, to be paid in War bonds, for the five best letters selected by a committee of judges. The judges were Dr. George S. Counts, professor of education at Columbia University; Col. Henry Breckenridge, former Assistant Secretary of War; and Hon. Ferdinand Pecora, well known to us here in Washington and now serving as a justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

I am advised that hundreds of letters were received from all parts of the United States. The committee labored assiduously to select the first five letters. These letters were printed in full in the aforementioned publication under date of January 18, 1943.

Of course, there should be little trouble in setting forth the many reasons why Italy should join the United Nations. However, when you realize that this contest attracted persons from all over the country, many of them Americans not of Italian descent, then it becomes especially interesting to know what this cross section of the American public thinks of the subject. For this reason I have asked leave to extend my remarks and to include these five letters, as I sincerely believe they are all exceedingly interesting, logical, and forceful in the discussion of the subject.

I wish it were possible to put these letters in the hands of the people of Italy. I am sure that these convincing arguments would strike a responsive chord in their hearts.

I should like to point out that the winner of the first prize is an American soldier of foreign birth, whose last name has not been published because his mother now resides in an Axis-controlled country.

The letters follow:

FIRST PRIZE

Italians, this is the voice of freedom calling. The voice of the same freedom, for the love of which millions of Italians gloriously fought and perished down through the ages of history.

You are told every day that victory is certain. Whose victory? Germany's victory means the utter humiliation of Italy; the victory of fascism is the utter defeat of Italianism. You know it, and we need not repeat it. You know also that only the victory of the United Nations will be your victory, the victory of your freedom. We have the unshakable determination to win, and we have the means to do it. You, too, know that. You can see, week by week, how the mighty air arm of the United Nations reaches out over a continent of powerless enemies and smashes down wherever we choose. Where is the protection promised you by Hitler and the Duce? Where is the power which can halt our armies in Tripoli and Tunisia?

Victory for us is near. Our armies are preparing the decisive blow. Liberty will be won with you or without you, people of Italy. Do you want it won against you?

Now is the time for Italy's people to join hands with the fighters for freedom. We know that means sacrifice. We know that means revolution and bitter struggle against the armed forces of oppression. But this is just what we ask from you.

Will you wait until the German invader accomplishes the work he has begun and makes you suffer the fate he prepared for so many unfortunate nations? Will you wait until he builds up and reinforces the ramparts upon which these countless other heroes of liberty will die? Will you, the people, become thus sullied by your silent complicity in the murder of your own freedom, as your Fascist rulers become accomplices of your German arch enemies? And will you wait in torpid inactivity until we come, and have no part in our triumph? Revolution has its ethical value only in sacrifice. To share in our inevitable triumph over a beaten enemy is no sacrifice.

Freedom is at the threshold of Italy. Freedom from fear, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, and freedom from want. Italy, historic nursery of liberty, home of the holy Catholic Church, whose sons died by the thousands in the concentration camps throughout the invaded countries, Italy must stand up now to fight with her friends, with the sons of the men who fought and perished together with your fathers on the Piave, on the Isonzo, and on the Tagliamento, so that Italy might live. You must stand up now as one man against this same common enemy, the only true one you ever had in history since the memory of men.

Come to us. We shall give you back what was taken from you. We will bring back your sons and fathers driven into cruel im-

prisonment by the mad clique that has oppressed you for two decades. We bring you food and clothing, seeds and cattle, health for you and your children, security in your homes, and our friendship. On our side are triumph, honor, victory, peace, and freedom.

Arise, Italy.

KURT E.

SECOND PRIZE

Listen, Italy! You the farmer, the shopkeeper, the laborer, and you women of Italy. It is all of you together who are the backbone of the Italian Nation. Your sons, fathers, brothers, and husbands have been sent to foreign soil to fight. Many have returned hopeless wrecks of humanity. Some more fortunate ones were left by the roadside to be captured, but great numbers of your men have died horrible deaths. Are these men permitted to fight for the safety of you—their people? No! Are they fighting to protect their land? No! Their sacred honor? No! They are forced to fight for fascism.

While your men ar far away from home, the Nazis, whom your disloyal politicians told you were your friends, are overtaking your country—lock, stock, and barrel—your Italy! They have stripped Italy bare of its young men and have left only old weak, helpless women and little children, so that they could have easy access into Italy, to pillage it, steal your food and crush your spirit. Your soldiers have been absorbed into the Nazi war machine and are forced to shed blood, sweat, and tears for their oppressors, for the oppressors of free people—for the arch criminals of all time.

Have you benefited individually or collectively from this Axis association? And to this question all Italy is united in one thunderous "no." Awaken Italy, free yourself from the shackles of slavery. Upon you at home now rests the burden of freeing yourselves and the future of Italy and its people from subjugation and slavery.

Your men at the battle front are war-weary and disillusioned. You know the heartbreak and terror that Nazi domination means. You have suffered much already. Why then keep up your end of a bad bargain? As you well know, food for Italians grows scarcer and scarcer every day. The Nazis do not starve in Italy—Italians do!

The United Nations want to help Italy rid herself of the tyrannical mass murdering, slave-labor-recruiting race of demagogues led by the diabolically twisted and cruelly fanatic mind of Hitler. Many countries of the United Nations entered this world conflict only after small and pitifully defenseless peoples were viciously attacked and overrun by the Fascist invaders. We feel it our sacred duty to give aid and comfort to those geographically smaller freedom-loving nations, so that by fighting, working, and praying in unison, we will ultimately crush the Fascist parasite. Then, and only then, will all nations again be free from tyranny from within as well as from without.

People of Italy, we, the United Nations want to help you to freedom. Our soldiers will fight side by side again with your soldiers against the common foe. We will share food, clothing, ships, planes, guns, and ammunition with Italy. Yes, we welcome you with open arms and hearts. Our struggle is your struggle. Our goal is one. Help us, Italian people, to help you. We shall be—we must be victorious because we fight for freedom and righteousness. It is the inalienable right of every living man, woman, and child. Freedom must never die!

With Italy arisen from her shame and again asserting her pride we can again be united in the common cause for freedom and lasting peace. Raise again your once mighty voice, Italy; shake off the chains of fascism. Come, join the fold again; because you, too, know in your heart of hearts that regardless of the cost, tyranny must be wiped from the face of the earth.

FLORENCE R. MEYER.

THIRD PRIZE

Before the Italian people can make a wise decision for or against the Axis or the Allied Nations, they must remember those early inspired days before the purge of blood began, and the political and spiritual freedom which they were truly seeking. They must remember that many once hailed fascism as the Italian people's revolution, that they saw in it a return to the sturdy democracy of the early Roman farmers whose bundles of bound faggots they adopted as their symbol; that scholars prophesied from it a reinspiration of the cultural greatness of the Renaissance; and that the hearts of Italy's youth were fired with a new Marseillaise, La Giovinezza, as the stirring anthem of a better day.

The Italian people must face the fact that their very hopes and idealism were deliberately exploited and debased for the personal aggrandizement of one man—oppression for all others. Their government became, not the early Roman democracy, but the very prototype of the oriental tyranny of the debauched emperors of Rome's decay. This, then, is what Italy's partnership with the pagan Axis has profited her.

Let us suppose the Axis had a fighting chance provided only that Italy remained blindly on its side—would Italy gain the destiny she has sacrificed so painfully to achieve? Suppose by placing her bleeding body before the crushing United Nations' war machine, she could temporarily halt the forces of freedom and democracy, what would be her reward? The reestablishment of Italy's cultural and spiritual greatness? Hardly that! To the Nazi mind there is but one culture, the mythological volk Kultur of the legendary Aryan. Would it be the colonial greatness of the early Roman Empire? Hardly, again.

Italy might be suffered, perhaps, to sit as a vassal state at the Barmecide board, while Hitler served up his usual starvation feast with frenzied oratory. In an Axis victory the people of Italy must inevitably lose the very ends for which they have fought.

It is with the United Nations that Italy's true destiny lies, though her false Messiahs led her elsewhere. Her culture is our culture, her inherent political and religious ideals are our ideals, her only hope for political, economic, and spiritual freedom lies in the victory of the democracies. That this victory will be a hundredfold more valuable to Italy if she does not assist Hitler to prolong the European holocaust to her complete national exhaustion, must be even now a burning conviction in all patriotic Italian minds.

And what guaranties have the Italian people that the "four freedoms" that men have been promised again and again shall finally be achieved? No matter what bitter experiences Italy may feel she has suffered in the past, she must believe that the United Nations' Atlantic Charter is as revolutionary a document in the history of world politics as was our own Declaration of Independence in America's philosophy; that it guarantees her the very economic, political, and national security she has tried by such paradoxical means to achieve. It is not just another scrap of paper to be destroyed (as Germany destroys her promises when they fetter her ambitions), but America's sacred pledge, written and signed in our blood, that the selfishness and indifference of World War No. 1 shall never be repeated. This Italy must believe: That she can renew her faith in us, since at such a great price we have renewed it in ourselves.

MRS. AMY CAPPELLI.

FOURTH PRIZE

The Italian people do not need to be assured of the deep and abiding regard which the people of the United States have felt, and still feel toward them. They know that in each country one of the saddest features of the war is felt to be the enforced presence of the other as an armed opponent.

But people must live their lives and make their choices in recognition of all the forces and factors, physical as well as spiritual, which affect them. And Italian people do need to be assured that the advantages to them of joining the United Nations now are so great as to outweigh the difficulties of doing so. In the simplest words, the self-interest of the Italian people, even if there were no other considerations, requires that they force that change of alliance.

If the Axis, as now composed, should finally defeat the United Nations, what will Italy have gained by the victory? Is there anything in the history of the present regime in Germany to inspire confidence in its generosity or fairness toward even an ally? Is there anything in the ruthless voraciousness of the German leaders (as attested by their own declarations) to justify even a faint shadow of hope that they would grant to Italy anything more than the crumbs at the victory table, or anything more than would suit their own purpose? Is there any ground for expecting them to appreciate and give scope to the expression of the culture which has been Italy's glory and her contribution to the better life of man? Japan? Surely no Italian deludes himself with the thought of cooperation in any sense, with a nation of atavistic megalomaniacs.

For Italy to remain a part of the Axis and either win with it or lose with it is for Italy to share in receiving the hatred and horror of people, in Europe and everywhere, who have seen the patient gains of mankind crushed beneath the trampling feet of those who have turned their backs away from human betterment. Such a role is not in the Italian spirit, nor consonant with the Italian heritage.

For Italy to join the United Nations now, and either win with them or lose with them (though loss appears less and less possible) is for Italy to aline itself before the world with those people who, whatever their past faults, now, surely, embody the hopes of mankind for permanent peace, and can be accused of no aspirations at the expense of others.

But one does not slip out of such an association as that of Italy with Germany, as easily as one slips out of an old coat. There will, no doubt, be violence. True, but is it not a reasonable estimate that with the war shortened through the added weight of Italy's power on the side of the United Nations, the net cost to the Italian people, and their loss, will be less than they would bear whatever the outcome of the struggle under the present alinement?

To fight for the salvation of mankind is glorious. To fight for one's self is natural. To fight without hope of either of these rewards, and with only the prospect of defeat or of vassalage in victory, is madness. May the Italian people say to themselves in the words attributed to Spartacus, the gladiator of ancient Rome, "If we must fight, let us fight for ourselves! If we must slaughter, let us slaughter our oppressors!"

MANUEL PRENNER.

FIFTH PRIZE

Because I have known and loved Italy for nearly 40 years I speak to you as an understanding friend.

Disappointed and embittered by the Treaty of Versailles, you turned to Mussolini, a dramatic, blustering fellow who made you grandiose promises—stirred your imagination. Instead of recognizing him for what he is—a braggart, a swashbuckler, a sawdust Caesar, you saw him as a savior. You might overlook his broken pledges, the miseries he has brought upon your unhappy land, but if you are a patriot you can never forgive his betrayal of Italy, which he and his gangsters terrorized, ruined, and finally turned over to the Germans.

Don't you realize, O Italy, that your soldiers are fighting not for Italy but for Germany? Hitler is using them for cannon fodder. He has sent tens of thousands of them to death in Russia; he has heartlessly abandoned whole divisions to be captured, to be slaughtered or to die of thirst in Africa. To him the Italians are not partners but pawns.

Look at Italy after 3 years of war. Almost every strategic point is held by the Germans. Your government is controlled, your mails censored, by Germans. The dread shadow of the Gestapo darkens the land. And the bulk of the food grown in Italy is being shipped to Germany, though Italy itself is on the brink of starvation, though thousands of Italian children are dying from malnutrition.

Surely you must realize by this time that you are fighting for those who have deprived you of your freedom. Not only that, but you have been inveigled into fighting the Americans, who have always been your friends.

Though your present government has declared itself our enemy, we hold no enmity for the Italian people. Rid yourselves of the ruffians who are ruining you, and you will find that we are your friends, eager to heal your wounds, to supply you with food and clothing, to restore your lost freedom. Surely you do not believe that Italy would ever again be free should Hitler win.

You say that you are helpless to rid yourselves of your Nazi and Fascist masters. Nonsense! When Italy was far weaker than she is today she drove out the Austrians, who were the Germans of that time. Are 40,000,000 Italians too weak, too timid, too lacking in love of freedom to do today what a handful of Piedmontese did then? Can't you see the ghosts of Garibaldi, Mazzini, and Cavour beckoning to you? Can't you hear the ragged Redshirts cheering? Fight again, Italians, for freedom. Down with the tyrants and up with the tricolor! Avanti Italia!

E. ALEXANDER POWELL.

The Work of the Tolan Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in order that I might acquaint the Congress with a part of the reaction to the work of the Tolan committee, I would like, under leave to extend my remarks, to include therein a copy of an editorial published in the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune on January 11, 1943:

THE TOLAN COMMITTEE REPORT

With the country in the first flush of a self-congratulatory glow, following the President's "state of the Nation" address, wherein he cited production progress of the past year, the report of the Tolan committee serves as a strong reminder that while headway has been made, there are still many kinks in war production which need to be unraveled. In a discussion of what's wrong with war production, we are cognizant of the tremendous strides America has made since Pearl Harbor.

One of the developments which the Tolan committee finds objectionable, after its 2-year investigation of defense migration, is that too much war work has been concentrated in too few centers. The committee, on its findings, concludes that a small number of communities threaten to gather up the great majority of all the workers in the country. This situation, the committee finds, endangers not only war production, but the welfare of millions when the peace comes. It makes the further important point that our allies have "suffered severely" for nondelivery of lend-lease supplies while "the equipment of our own forces is very uneven." It took occasion to warn in its report: "This is not a war we can win with our surplus energies. We cannot afford the luxury of self-congratulation on the production record of 1942. We do not yet have a strong manpower agency."

As to the delivery of lend-lease equipment to our allies it can be said in all frankness that the Chinese have fared poorly in this respect. Of course, the delivery route was made much more difficult through the Japanese conquest of Burma, but the fact remains nevertheless that China, which has fought the Japanese military machine for 5 years with great heart and unswerving courage, has received only driblets of equipment. In China it is a case of where so little could do so much; in other words, whatever lend-lease equipment was delivered to China would pay off handsomely in war dividends.

As to the concentration of war production in certain areas, this paper has repeatedly warned against the dangers of what it termed the bottleneck of congestion, pointing out the attendant social and economic problems arising from such a policy. It is plain to be seen, too, how this will work against orderly economic readjustment when the war is over and the country must get back to a volume of civilian production sufficient to prevent a collapse. In the post-war era the small-business concern, now so largely ignored in war production, will prove invaluable. The Nation cannot afford to have small industry forced to the wall. It is the best kind of planning and good business to give small plants their rightful place in the war production program, strengthening for the day when they will play so vital a role in post-war industrial readjustment.

The committee while favoring an office of war mobilization to coordinate the demands and means of production, opposes any form of compulsion in dealing with the manpower problem. It is generally apparent that many things can be done on a voluntary basis with manpower to step up production before anything savoring of compulsion was attempted. In fact, the whole issue of manpower is a fertile field for the exercise of American ingenuity and industrial statesmanship. In hitting "laziness and bureaucracy" as two official evils of the war program, the Tolan committee has pointed to two sore spots.

The committee's findings will give Congress something to think about as the legislative branch embarks upon a program of taking a more direct interest in the war production program. The report can be a valuable guide to constructive action. It is the basis for a corrective program which would advance the war effort and help materially in preventing leaden economic frustration after the peace.

The American Federation of the Physically Handicapped Does Not Speak for the National Association of the Deaf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, I wish to insert into the RECORD a letter that I have received from Dr. Tom L. Anderson, national president of the Association for the Deaf. I have known Dr. Anderson for many years. I have the utmost confidence in him. His letter is as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX., *January 14, 1943.*

Representative CARL T. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CARL: Much publicity has been given by the promoter of the so-called American Federation of the Physically Handicapped to alleged endorsements of his legislative program in behalf of a section of our population who can always be exploited by persons with an ax to grind. This promoter is flooding the country with promotional literature. This literature is such a distortion of the facts that I am amazed.

Please be informed that this American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, presuming to speak for the deaf people of America, has never been endorsed by the deaf of this country, and never will be, while the National Association of the Deaf, organized in 1880, incorporated in 1900, which has fought the economic and social battles of the deaf down through several generations, can and does presume to speak in the interests of the deaf of America as an organization solely of the deaf which has minded its own business and refrained from exerting pressure upon Congress for favors, and for this reason alone is unknown to Members of the Congress. Members of the National Association of the Deaf have no desire to aline ourselves with any hastily thrown together conglomeration of orthopedics, cardiacs, tubercular, blind, disabled veterans nor any other physically disabled group, however sterling its individual virtue, whose problems and interests are not those of the deaf and cannot be handled as those of the deaf.

We can assure you that the leadership in this hastily formed organization calling itself the American Federation has been formally rejected by the duly constituted officials of the National Association of the Deaf, they being the ablest authorized judges of the national interests of the deaf in the absence of a national convention. Further, we can assure you that members of the national association want no part in the program of the American Federation nor do we in any sense endorse any program which would include the deaf of America in the organization of a pressure group of 23,000,000 physically handicapped persons for whom this federation seeks a special rehabilitation service bureau, ignoring the fact, as you may have overlooked it, that all physically handicapped persons who are amenable to restoration are now being served by existing Federal and State rehabilitation divisions, subject to no dues.

Finally, I submit that in any matter of legislation affecting the interests of several hundred thousand deaf people of America, the National Association of the Deaf, as their

oldest, ablest, and most understanding champion, should be consulted and should have a voice. In the matter of the legislative program of this American federation as it presumes to include the deaf, we may well ask, Who speaks?

Very respectfully yours,

TOM L. ANDERSON,
President, National Association of the Deaf, Inc.

Pay-As-You-Go Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement written by David Lawrence, entitled "As-You-Go Tax Appeals Hit Congress," which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., Tuesday, January 19, 1943:

AS-YOU-GO TAX APPEALS HIT CONGRESS—PUBLIC UNRESPONSIVE TO MARCH 15 DEADLINE WARNING

(By David Lawrence)

Congress is beginning to hear from home about the delay in enacting a pay-as-you-go plan of taxation.

The recent joint declaration by Chairman GEORGE, of the Senate Finance Committee, and by Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Ways and Means Committee, warning taxpayers that they must pay on March 15 as usual, has been received with little enthusiasm judging by the letters arriving at the Capitol. The people want to know why Congress can't do something about it between now and March 15.

Congress has been here about 2 weeks, and the country thinks the two Houses can act promptly if they wish to do so. The citizens have observed that Congress, when it really wants to pass legislation quickly, can do it overnight sometimes. But Congress has to be convinced that the matter is urgent and that the people want such action.

The pay-as-you-go idea has been presented in various forms, notably by the proposal of Beardsley Ruml, brilliant economist, whose work for the New Deal agencies has been consistently helpful. The Ruml plan, in its essence, proposes that taxes for the year 1942 be skipped and that 1943 taxes be paid currently instead of a year late.

The Treasury Department for reasons of its own, some expressed and some unexpressed, has been opposed to the Ruml plan but has hinted that if some modifications were offered, it might prove acceptable. But the Treasury isn't in any hurry about it. If the Ruml plan got lost in the shuffle of other matters between now and March 15, the Treasury experts wouldn't be at all disappointed.

CHIEF OBJECTION

The chief objection to the Ruml plan from the Treasury viewpoint—and reflected recently by the President at a press conference—is that the Treasury would be minus a year's revenues. The answer to this is that such subtraction would occur over a long period of years and wouldn't be felt by the Treasury.

Perhaps the most interesting suggestion yet made is that which the New York Times recommended editorially this week and which Godfrey Nelson, its tax expert, previously has recommended, namely, that individual incomes of 1942 and 1943 be averaged and that tax payments be made currently on the resultant amount. Thus, 1943 income would be estimated by each taxpayer now and 1942 income is known, and the 2 years would be averaged and taxes would be based on that average. If at the end of 1943 the estimate proved high or low, the citizen could amend his return to adjust it to meet the actual figures.

The Godfrey Nelson plan meets the objection of those who think the skip-a-year proposal gives too much of a break to the citizens. Actually neither plan gives anybody a break, because the citizen will not feel it while he is alive and when he dies, his estate will be tax free, but that merely means that the inheritance tax percentages—usually higher than tax rates—will take approximately the same or a higher amount from the estate.

The pay-as-you-go principle is worth so much to the more efficient handling of the tax problems of the citizen that it would be worth while for the Government to adopt it, even if the windfall did benefit a small percentage of the citizens. It is fundamentally unsound for the citizen to pay this year's taxes out of next year's gross receipts, especially in times of uncertainty when the Government is liable to be left holding the bag.

ADMINISTRATION COSTLY

The Treasury spends a considerable amount of money to administer the whole tax system and if the facts could be gathered on the cost of administration of taxes, it would be found that a lot of official time and energy, plus that of the citizens, is spent trying to take care of the four installment payments on an income that is already a year old when the fourth payment is made.

The dangers to the Treasury in time of sudden panic and depression are greater when taxes are paid a year late. Likewise financial problems of the individual are complicated when he has to give the Government first cut out of a dwindling wage or salary in a year that sees a severe decline in his income. The time when the pay-as-you-go plan will be appreciated most by the Treasury and by the people is when the next cycle of depression begins.

The New Deal, which spends billions in Work Projects Administration projects in time of unemployment, might find that bankruptcies and insolvencies that bring on unemployment when individual finances go to pieces would be fewer if the pay-as-you-go plan is in effect during the boom years. Then, as incomes shrink, tax payments shrink coincidentally and nobody will owe the Government taxes on more than he has earned in a current quarter—a psychological benefit far greater to the Nation of tax-burdened individuals than some of the features of so-called social security so often extolled as the true index of liberalism.

Editorials by William J. McHale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, upon several occasions it has been my privilege to receive unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD oustanding editorials written by Mr. William J. McHale, the editor of the Chilton (Wis.) Times-Journal.

The editorial page of this weekly paper exercises a tremendous influence upon its many readers—it is unfortunate that the inspired word of the editor does not reach all of the people of America. Because the entire editorial page of the issue of January 14, 1943, is of consuming interest at this time, I am inserting it as part of these remarks in order that his thoughts may be carried to the people of the country:

THE FEDERAL BUDGET

President Roosevelt laid before the Congress Monday a Federal Budget calling for the appropriation of $109,000,000,000 for the fiscal year which will begin next July 1. Of this amount $100,000,000,000 is to be spent for war. In the current fiscal year it is estimated that $77,000,000,000 will be spent for this purpose.

The sums are so vast as to be beyond human comprehension. The new Budget will mean expenditures by the Treasury at the rate of $3,515 every second of every passing day. It is a rate of spending which, in effect, demands a contribution of more than $800 by each man, woman, and child in the country during the next fiscal year. This is a spending rate, that defies the imagination, but it is, as the President said, the price of victory. It is notice to our enemies that we shall stop short of no sacrifice to preserve our freedom.

Although the Budget is the largest ever submitted to any government in the history of the world, it was not unexpected by the Congress or the country. We are committed to the cause of victory at any cost, however staggering, and the only reason why the Budget was not larger is because the industrial facilities of this Nation are not large enough to translate more money into war weapons. The limit of the Budget was gaged by the capacity of the country to produce.

The country may be thankful that there is no disunity on the matter of spending without limit to preserve our way of life. We want to win the war and we want to win it quickly and decisively. Even the fact that we are spending far out of proportion to the contributions of our allies will not arouse serious dissension. It is our war now and we must win it even if the entire burden should fall on us.

The job of the Congress must be to see that the Government receives value for the dollars it lays on the line. In so vast a program there will be temptations, and opportunities, for great waste and crooked dealing. The people's representatives must be alert and on guard to keep scandalous waste, extravagance, and shady dealing at a minimum. That should be the principal business of Congress from now until the war is won. It will be a big job, worthy of the talents of our ablest leaders.

SALARY LIMITATION

The ideologies of fanatics, such as communism, facism, and nazi-ism, are probably inspired more by envy and jealousy than any other cause. People who have little beget a dislike for people who have much. When poverty is due to lack of opportunity, or to unfair treatment, such dislike may have justification. But often it happens that the worst grumblers are those who are poor on account of their own intemperance, shiftlessness and lack of frugality. They comfort themselves with self-sympathy and blame their plight on the state or the social order.

All of the modern isms play on this spirit of discontent among the poor. They play on it by promising relief by doing away with the

wealthy class, by confiscation of all property, as in Russia, by regimenting all activities, as in Italy and Germany. The net result of the schemes of the demagogues as tried out to date has not been to elevate the standard of the poor, but to reduce the standard of all.

A step in the direction of eliminating the wealthy class in this country was recently initiated by a Presidential decree fixing $25,000 as the maximum salary anyone may receive after deduction of Federal taxes. The Presidential decree, strange as it may seem, came after Congress had refused to fix such limitation by statute. The $25,000 limit applied to salaries only. In his Budget message Monday, the President recommended the $25,000 limitations on incomes of everyone after payment of taxes, regardless of the source of the income. Since this is a radical departure from the standard that has prevailed in this country, it is certain to cause much debate.

The $25,000 maximum is an arbitrary figure. No argument has been advanced to show why it should not be higher or lower. It was originally decreed as part of an inflation measure, though no one appears to claim that it will have any material effect in preventing inflation. As a political measure it may be more useful. Class consciousness—the distinction between worker and employer—has been strongly emphasized in recent years, and the gesture of fixing a top salary for industrialists may be counted on to curry favor with the millions who envy the rich.

Under our present Federal tax laws, only those whose salaries are above $67,200 are affected by the $25,000 limit on income after Federal taxes are paid, as the taxes on a $67,200 salary will reduce it to $25,000. The limitation will affect less than 3,500 people in the entire country, according to the Government tax experts. Confiscation of all of the salaries of the 3,500 by the Government would reduce the taxes of the rest of us so little as scarcely to be noticeable. Certainly, distributed among the millions of envious poor, that money would alleviate their condition but little.

There is no gainsaying the fact that there are many cases in industry where salaries have been set ridiculously high. The movie industry has been a conspicuous offender. Life insurance companies, railroads, steel firms and others have paid salaries to executives that have run into hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. These huge salaries look especially bad when compared with the salaries of ordinary workmen. That is why workmen hail the President's decree limiting such salaries. That is why a labor government, interested in future votes, may be more concerned about doing what is popular than what will prove sound and right in the long run.

While none of us believe in excessive salaries—for the other fellow—it is obvious that if all of these large salaries were confiscated by the Public Treasury, the benefit, scattered among 130,000,000 people, would be very trifling to each individual. On the other hand much of these salaries are reinvested in business and the increased pay rolls resulting may easily be more beneficial to the country than confiscation of the salaries would be.

At any rate, this country attained the highest standard of living ever reached anywhere without benefit of a salary limitation. The fact that men could reap the benefits of inventive and organizing and directing ability certainly had some part in that record. Before casting aside this long-accepted principle of our way of life, we ought to give serious thought to the consequences rather than take the step in the arbitrary fashion of the dictators.

The public will not be greatly concerned by the $25,000 limitation because the great majority of us get along very well on much less. However, should the principle of fixing an arbitrary limit on income be established, how long will it be before it is found desirable to reduce the figure to $10,000 or $5,000, or $1,000? Before, maybe, we will all be offered a dole from Washington—conditioned on how subservient we are to the administration in power.

"ONLY ONE BOMBER FAILED TO RETURN"

How often we read in a report given out by the War Department these words: "Only one of our bombers failed to return."

The presence of the word "only" implies that the loss was light in view of the number of planes engaged in the attack and the amount of destruction that was done to enemy planes and industrial plants, ships, or harbors.

To millions of Americans, then, the presence of that word "only" is cause for rejoicing. It signifies that our airmen harmed the enemy more than he harmed them, and that is the way to victory.

But in that 1 bomber that failed to return there were 8 or 10 brave and highly trained men. Except for a bare chance that some of them may have parachuted to safety, all were lost. When they set forth on that mission they knew there was a strong probability that some of the ships going forth would not come back. British losses average 5 percent. When 100 planes sail out over German targets, 5 of them do not return. That is the average experience. American losses so far have been lower in the European fighting.

While we rejoice to know that "only one of our planes failed to return," we should not be unmindful that in 8 or 10 homes of America that news was bad news. It meant, most probably, that a son or brother or husband crashed to death in a flaming plane. Only a few months ago those men followed peaceful civilian duties. They had no desire for war. They were content to work at their chosen civilian tasks. But when the call came, they went forth to do their part to turn back the threat of savage tyranny from our shores.

They sought a branch of the service where they would see action. They went through the tough course of training to fit themselves for it. They may have completed many successful flight missions. They may have inflicted more than their share of damage on the foe. But in this engagement the foe proved too tricky or too numerous, or they may have taken an extra hazardous risk to plant a bomb where it would do most good. At any rate a blast of ground fire or a shell from an attacking plane struck their ship in a vital part, and it plunged to earth with its human burden. A few horrifying moments, and the eternal black-out. They died that others—you and I—might live as freemen. Their obituary is an impersonal statement in a formal communique:

"Only one of our bombers failed to return."

AS WE SEE IT

The price of pigs is reaching such a high level that they have a pretty good claim to displace the lion as the king of beasts. If the war lasts long enough, we will probably start making recordings of their grunts and broadcasting them over the radio as music. Then it would be in order for the ration board to have us turn 'em on at mealtime as a substitute for the little ham that isn't there.

Well, somehow we're getting along on the four gallons a week, plus, of course, the vocal exhaust which keeps us from boiling over.

"If the small businessman goes," says Secretary Ickes, "we all will go." Shucks! And all this time we small businessmen have been consoling ourselves with the thought that, if we must go, we'll at least get away from the bureaucrats. And now Ickes steps up to plug that little rift in the clouds.

Reichsmarshal Hermann Goering celebrated his fiftieth birthday Tuesday, and Hungary, an Axis puppet state, awarded him a medal—the grand cross of the order of something or other. As Hermann's broad breast is already plastered with complimentary hardware, he'll probably have to wear the newest piece on his back. Reichsminister Alfred Rosenberg, also marked his fiftieth birthday, but there is no report that he got any decoration. The Nazi press described Goering as Germany's sword and Rosenberg as Germany's thinker. Looks as if both boys are going to have full-time jobs for a while anyway.

That expression, "pay-as-you-go tax," sounds a bit tricky. If the idea were presented in full it probably would read "pay-as-you-go-bankrupt tax."

Although this war has been notable for its rapid pace, the shift in offensive strength from the aggressors to the side of the aroused freemen of the world has come slowly and almost imperceptibly. But the change has occurred and the momentum of it is likely to increase with the passing weeks. If the people of the Axis nations could know what is going on outside their confines, and they probably do sense it quite clearly in spite of all the censorship, they must know that the darkness is closing in. The alarmed urgings of their own leaders must tell them that the jig is up and they cannot win. When that stage is reached men cannot work and armies cannot fight with the resolution of those who are beckoned on by an alluring promise of success at the end of the struggle.

Hitler's armies in Russia are bogged down, and weariness and vanishing hope are probably accountable for their plight as much as Russian guns. The Japs have lost their energy and initiative and are not doing a brilliant job of hanging on to the ground they lately stole.

It is possible that things are shaping up for a catastrophe that will be the prelude to the end of the European war. Hitler has chosen to make a desperate stand in Africa. When he is driven out, as he will be before many weeks pass, the shock to his prestige will produce reverberations that he cannot live down. When that comes, his country will know that his cause is lost, and the only question will be how much punishment to take before bowing to the inevitable. This, too, will pass.

The new Budget calls for $109,000,000,000. We've got the zeros. Now for the hour.—W. J. M.

Small Liberal Arts Colleges Must Have Consideration During Wartime

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, small liberal arts colleges must be treated with sympathetic consideration during war period; correspondence with War Manpower Chairman McNutt and others sets forth view on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, the following correspondence is fully explanatory:

JANUARY 18, 1943.

Hon. PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Chairman, War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MCNUTT: The small liberal-arts colleges in the country are threatened with their very existence. Only speedy, in-

telligent, and sympathetic action can save them.

The local situation in my congressional district was brought to my attention several months ago. Since that time I have made careful inquiry into the affairs of similar institutions in the State of West Virginia and those of other States. I find the conditions almost universal.

At this time I am serving on the boards of directors of two small colleges: Salem, from which I was graduated, and Davis and Elkins, where I formerly was a teacher. In this capacity I have occasion to be accurately informed concerning the drastic reduction in the student bodies and the resulting income. As you know, many of these institutions are not endowed; they receive no Government aid and are dependent on the fees from their students and donations from alumni and friends for their existence. Early in December 1942 letters were sent by one of these colleges to its graduates and friends outlining the plight of the school, and I am quoting from a letter which came in response. This was from a man who normally would have contributed $10,000. The quoted portion speaks for itself:

"You are aware, of course, that the same difficulties which beset educational institutions of the country are also faced by private enterprise and individuals whose incomes are derived from such enterprise. The shocks and dislocations resulting from the war have been severe. Taxes have mounted to the point where they are almost confiscatory, with the result that incomes have virtually reached the vanishing point. At the same time we are called upon to finance great activities which contribute to the war effort, in addition to an ever-increasing number of appeals from worthy institutions like yours which deserve and need support.

"Because of the difficulties with which you are familiar, it is not possible for me to make the contribution to ———, which it deserves and which I would like to make. However, I feel that your work has been so splendid that I must contribute some small token of my appreciation. Consequently, I enclose herewith my check for $1,000. I sincerely hope and believe that you will be able to keep the institution going until the time comes when peace is returned to our world and our economic condition will be such that friends of the school will be in position to give it the support it ought to have."

This, I believe, is a graphic picture of what is happening throughout the Nation. The Federal Government must, therefore, in the immediate future take action to forestall the failure of these schools.

In the world today, when strife and contention, war and bloodshed, tyranny and oppression rise up on every hand, I believe it is well to ask ourselves where we are going, how long it will take us, and what we are going to do after we get there. Particularly is it important to know what we will do when we arrive. Our behavior, we know, will be conditioned by the education of our people. Our tolerance, tolerance of each other's political views, tolerance for each other's religious beliefs, even tolerance for each other's property rights and possessions will be governed by the direction taken by our educational institutions.

As the pioneers from the Atlantic coast filtered through the Allegheny Mountains, crossed the Great Plains, and finally ended their triumphant march on the shores of the Pacific Ocean, they built a new country. As they established new communities in the wilderness with homes, farms, churches, and town halls, they built schools and colleges. The wisdom which led our forefathers to include education as a part of the structural plan of the young American States has contributed largely toward making us a great Nation of tolerant people. These colleges today are the basis for our hope of future achievement and future progress. Not a single person living in a locality where they are situated has failed to profit in some way from the cultural benefits flowing constantly from them.

It is true hundreds of colleges in this country have been graduating many thousands of students every year and that many of the graduates have not been proficient in liberal arts, but it is equally true that each and every graduate is better prepared and equipped to be a better citizen and to accept his responsibilities of citizenship more intelligently.

Mr. Wendell Willkie made a statement in his address at Duke University on January 14, which I believe to be most pertinent and am including in this letter, since it expresses a proposition which I subscribe to most vigorously.

"In fact, so important are the liberal arts for our future civilization that I feel that education in them should be as much a part of our war planning as the more obviously needed technical training. There will be a certain number of young men in every college who, for one reason or another, are not available for military service. They should be given the facilities whereby they may go on with their education.

"There will be a certain number who will be returned disabled for active service, but of sound and eager mind. Ways should be provided by which they may continue their education.

"In addition, there should be some provision in the manpower program for leaving a nucleus in the colleges of men whose aptitudes qualify them as definitely for our long-range needs as, let us say, other men are obviously qualified for medicine. So, the structure of the liberal-arts colleges will be preserved during the war and so, minds will be trained and enriched for the humanizing and civilizing of the world to come after.

"Furthermore, the men and women who are devoting their lives to such studies should not be made to feel inferior or apologetic in the face of a PT boat commander or the driver of a tank. They and all their fellow citizens should know that the preservation of our cultural heritage is not superfluous in a modern civilization and is not a luxury. That it is in fact what gives meaning to that civilization. It is what we are fighting for. And they are serving their country just as surely in fitting themselves to preserve it as are the men who fly the planes or man the ships or fire the guns.

"For we cannot win a true victory unless there exists in this country a large body of liberally educated citizens. This is a war for freedom—freedom here and freedom elsewhere. But if we are going to risk our lives for freedom, we must at the same time do all we can to preserve the deep springs from which it flows."

My plea, like Mr. Willkie's, is not being made for the sake of preserving the colleges' physical assets, but is entirely for the sake of the ability to think under a free system, plus the broad knowledge and sympathetic understanding which our peacetime training provides. It is that for which we are fighting.

The smaller liberal-arts colleges have faculties of trained personnel; they have housing and classroom facilities, both of which are urgently required and difficult to replace. Sufficient funds and a reasonable amount of assistance expended to show these smaller institutions how to serve the war effort, which of course they are anxious to do, will result in immediately implementing it. Equally important, it will preserve for the future the source of that vital understanding, both moral and political, which is fostered by the social sciences.

You are assured of my active cooperation and those of my colleagues in any effort you may make. You, as Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, have an opportunity not only to mobilize the brainpower and manpower of the Nation but by providing for the continuation of those liberal-arts colleges can assure for posterity an unlimited supply of free brainpower and manpower. This will be most effective in winning the war and establishing the peace and the readjustment which must follow.

I strongly urge that an immediate survey be made to determine the amount needed for such a program, that an appropriation be requested, and the work be started forthwith. Whatever the cost, it will be minute in comparison with the tremendous objectives. I have discussed this proposal with Members of Congress and have found them ready and willing to cooperate. I pledge you my most active efforts in support of such a program.

Very sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

JANUARY 19, 1943.

Mr. WHEELER SAMMONS,
Publisher, Who's Who in America,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. SAMMONS: Your letter of January 8 impressed me deeply with the national crisis facing the smaller liberal arts colleges. For some time I had been diligently gathering data in my congressional district in an effort to assist in developing some means of maintaining a sufficient enrollment which would assure their continued operation. I heartily concur with you that the problem is a present one, not local in character but national in scope, and one of vital importance to our future welfare. I have so written Mr. Paul V. McNutt and Mr. Wendell Willkie and am enclosing copies of these letters for your information.

Your kind comments concerning my reelection are appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

WHO'S WHO IN AMERICA,
Chicago, January 8, 1943.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You may be interested in the attached memorandum which we are mailing to colleges in connection with recent brainpower and manpower mobilization changes.

Because over the decades Who's Who has, in the course of its task of recording American leadership, become impressed with the contribution our smaller privately controlled liberal arts colleges make to training this leadership—for example, 8 of the last 13 Presidents were educated in small institutions—we have urged that their facilities and faculties be utilized in connection with the war effort, instead of garroting them because it is somewhat easier to use the similar assets of the large universities and State-supported institutions.

We urge this, not for the sake of preserving these colleges' physical assets, but entirely for the sake of the ability to think under a free system, plus the broad knowledge and the sympathetic understanding, which their peacetime training provides. The armed forces, industry, and agriculture alike need young men trained to think as well as to act, and if the staffs and the facilities for that sort of training are blacked out now, and only the great universities' vocational or

professional facilities preserved and strengthened, the price that must be paid—unnecessarily—after the war will be high and hard, indeed.

Fortunately, now Mr. McNutt and his associates have the opportunity to mobilize brainpower and manpower in the balanced manner most effective for winning the war—most effective because it provides a balance between the manpower and the brainpower needs of the armed forces and the civilian, industrial and agricultural requirements needed for adequate support of the fighting forces. We are hoping the smaller privately controlled liberal arts colleges' facilities and faculties will be used by Mr. McNutt in connection with such a problem, particularly in the cases of institutions without large endowments.

Suitable funds to accomplish this will pay immediate dividends in speeding the war effort and avoiding needless expenditure for expensive housing requiring critical materials, and in addition a return of tremendous national import in terms of the preservation of the type of training which produces ability to think and to lead in a free country's way.

These small colleges are not organized to speak for themselves; they are not by nature adept at pressure-group political canvassing. Those who know from first-hand experience what they mean to America must call attention to the price their extermination will levy on us all for, not being attuned to self interest, they will not speak in time for themselves.

So, believing we are among those who know their worth—and that every member of the Congress is also and will be glad to have their peril called to attention—we have felt an obligation to attempt to speak for them.

Yours very truly,

WHEELER SAMMONS, *Publisher.*

JANUARY 19, 1943.

Hon. WENDELL L. WILLKIE,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. WILLKIE: I offer you my congratulations on the timely talk you made at Duke University on January 14. Once before, in 1940, I wrote you. At that time it was to express my agreement with your views on a unified air force. I was then working for this program and have since consistently directed my efforts to develop it. I am enclosing H. R. 708, which I reintroduced in the 78th Congress. It will, if enacted, bring about the desired reorganization of our armed forces.

Again, in 1943, I concur with you. I am working for and shall continue to devote my efforts toward the preservation of the small liberal arts colleges throughout the Nation.

By way of clarification of my use of the term "liberal arts colleges," I mean those which offer to the student body, not training in a specific subject or skill to the exclusion of others, but rather gives a broad general education. This serves to develop the power to think and gives the individual a working knowledge of the experience and resultant growth of civilization. It presents to each recipient understanding which serves as a strong foundation for later specialization. My early interest in them is evidenced by the following quotation taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 17, 1942:

"As a former teacher in a college myself, I am deeply conscious of the imperative need to keep alive in America our educational institutions."

On the day you made your address I had been drafting a communication on this subject. You so impressed me with the points presented that I have revised my letter to include a portion of your material. The strength of your statement will, I am sure, add persuasive power to our plea for the continuation of the small universities and colleges which are so vital to America's way of life.

I am enclosing a copy of the letter I have written on this subject to the Honorable Paul V. McNutt. You are assured of my active participation in obtaining immediate enactment of legislation to insure the continuation of these seats of learning.

Very sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

JANUARY 19, 1943.

Dr. JOHN W. STUDEBAKER,
Commissioner, United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have written to the Honorable Paul V. McNutt relative to the need for immediate action to preserve the small liberal arts colleges throughout the Nation. I should like very much to have your opinion concerning the steps to be taken to accomplish this end. It is a problem which will of necessity require prompt and effective coordinated action. You, as Commissioner of the United States Office of Education, are undoubtedly in a position to aid materially in its solution. Your counsel and cooperation will be appreciated.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

Townsend National Recovery Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a concurrent resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, the Senate concurring, memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing for the general welfare of the Nation as set out in the Townsend national recovery bill:

Whereas in view of the present war economy and post-war planning to relieve the State of Indiana of the financial burden of old-age assistance and to assist in carrying out the wishes of the President of the United States relative to permanent relief: Therefore

SECTION 1. *Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the senate concurring)*, That the General Assembly of the State of Indiana hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact suitable legislation providing for the general welfare of the Nation as set out in the Townsend national recovery bill now in the act of being introduced.

SEC. 2. That the clerk of the house of representatives is hereby instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Indiana.

M. L. Benedum, Native West Virginian, Writes With Sound Judgment on Proposed Income Limitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, there is increasingly a study of the proposed income limitation of $25,000. Doubt is beginning to arise as to the logic of such a plan. More citizens are beginning to realize the implications which flow from this idea.

Willford I. King, professor of economics at New York University, expresses the above thought in the following observation:

When the usual reader learns from his paper that one of the leading questions facing the next Congress is limitation of incomes to $25,000 net, he is likely to shrug his shoulders and conclude that here is one thing he doesn't need to worry about. He never expects to receive $25,000 a year. He knows few, if any, people having such incomes.

This question of limitation of private incomes is a matter of consequence to the average citizen. Perhaps he prefers an economy in which the boy with brains and perseverance has a chance to make a million and keep it. Perhaps he has doubts concerning a system in which private endowment of colleges, research institutions, and the like will be impossible because no private fortunes will exist. Perhaps he is suspicious that this is merely a roundabout way of destroying free enterprise and perpetuating regimentation after the war. Perhaps he still prefers a square game in which the victors are not robbed of their winnings. At any rate, it is worth his time to think the matter through.

Mr. Speaker, it is correct procedure for all of us to do as Professor King suggests—we must give searching attention to the limitation idea. In this connection I can speak as a member of a small college board of directors, referred to in the following letter by M. L. Benedum, a native West Virginian, who holds the affection of a large circle of business associates and friends who admire his industry and courage, recognize his genuine Americanism, and appreciate his valuable assistance to worthy institutions of religion and education:

JANUARY 19, 1943.

Dr. ROBERT CLARKE,
Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa.

DEAR DR. CLARKE: The delay in acknowledging your fine and much appreciated letter of January 8 has not been due either to neglect or lack of interest. The truth is that I have been debating for several days as to whether it would be appropriate for me to write you in some detail about a situation which confronts our country and which I feel is filled with grave peril to the continued free existence of our educational, religious, and charitable institutions.

My hesitancy has been caused by fear that such a frank letter might possibly be subject to a misunderstanding as to my motives. After mature thought I have concluded that

even at the risk of being misunderstood it is my duty to write you fully and frankly about this threatened condition. Indeed, I am convinced that I would render a disservice to the character of institution which you represent if I failed to do so.

Under ordinary conditions I would have responded immediately to your letter by sending my check for the amount which you requested as a contribution to Geneva College. There is no doubt about the worthiness of your appeal and of the fact that your institution is entitled as a matter of right to the consideration and help of people like myself who are in position to be of assistance. Likewise, we have a duty and responsibility to respond to such appeals in order that there may be no lowering of standards in our educational and religious institutions.

The disturbing factor which prompts this letter is the strong possibility that Congress may adopt the recommendation that the total of any individual income in America may be limited by law to $25,000 a year. It is obvious that if such a limitation is written into our statute books it will no longer be possible for me or any other persons to make contributions of a substantial nature to institutions such as yours, and we will necessarily be compelled to make other severe adjustments in our affairs. Indeed, the very possibility that such a limitation may be placed upon incomes is sufficient to compel me to withhold any contributions until the uncertainty is dispelled.

Frankly, this does not mean a great deal to me personally. I am 73 years old and have no children to benefit from any material resources that may be left in my estate. So far as Mrs. Benedum and I are concerned we could manage to get along comfortably for the remainder of our lives if we were deprived of all income. However, we had hoped that such resources as we have accumulated would be wisely used for the benefit of our churches, schools, hospitals, and other similar institutions. We had keenly felt the responsibility of conserving those resources for that purpose.

Perhaps I am old-fashioned but I cannot get away from the teachings of my beloved father and mother. Neither can I be convinced that everything we have done in this country in the last 150 years has been all wrong. Of course, some mistakes have been made, but on the whole we have built here the most prosperous, the most cultured, the most happy, and the most religious Nation on earth. I for one am not willing to surrender all of these things, including the precepts and examples of my parents, in exchange for a nebulous promise of Utopia.

If the source of the support that for years has been given to institutions such as yours and to the church is cut off by an act of the Government, it is inescapable that our schools, churches, and hospitals will be compelled to turn to the Government for their support. This means that those institutions will become creatures of partisan politics and their very existence subject to the whim and caprice of the leaders of whatever political party may be in power at the moment. When we reach that situation it will indeed be an unhappy day for our great country.

Only the other day I had a letter from the president of a small denominational college in my native State of West Virginia—a college to which I have given assistance on several occasions in the last few years. He wrote me that 50 small colleges in this country had already been compelled to close their doors and that many others were threatened with extinction. This would indicate that the people who have been supporting those institutions feel as I do about the absolute necessity of carefully conserving their resources so long as there is a possibility that their incomes may be subject to arbitrary limitation.

Since I have written you at such considerable length on this general proposition, I feel that I can go a step further and say without being misunderstood that in 1942 I gave many thousands of dollars to institutions that I felt were worthy. This was in addition to a very considerable sum which went into gifts and rehabilitation loans to hundreds of individuals who were in distress. I have worked hard for almost 60 years, having begun when I was 16 years old. In that period of time I have given all of my efforts in building up several dozen corporations with which I was identified, which gave gainful employment to thousands of persons, and which have contributed substantially to elevating the living standards in some backward nations as well as in many localities in our own country. In all that period I have never drawn one penny of salary from any company with which I was connected. Whatever income I have derived from any of these companies has come in the form of dividends out of their earnings. The point I am trying to make is that for more than half a century I have been trying in my humble way to build and it is a source of keen distress to see a movement launched in this country the results of which I can view only as destructive.

It has given me a great pleasure and satisfaction to be in a position to give help to worthy institutions and individuals. I am deeply pained over the possibility, indeed, I may say probability, that I will no longer be permitted to do this—pained not at the consequences to myself, because as I have said it does not mean a great deal to my own personal comfort and welfare, but pained at the consequences to those like yourself who have given their lives to building up worthwhile institutions that serve God and country.

With kindest personal regards and all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

M. L. BENEDUM.

Evils of Cost-Plus Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis News entitled "War Contracts," as follows:

WAR CONTRACTS

When the Federal Government began its war industry expansion following passage of the Lend-Lease Act, it adopted a policy of paying contractors on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. This decision was made to avoid the possibility of such profiteering as was encouraged during the First World War by letting contracts on the cost-plus-10-percent plan. This plan encouraged contractors to increase costs so that the 10 percent would yield them a higher profit.

It appears now that the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee plan is not without its risks of abuse. In a speech to the House of Representatives, Representative LUDLOW, veteran member of the Appropriations Committee and its third in rank, charged that in many instances contractors increased wages and salaries inordinately as soon as they got a Government war contract. He produced hundreds of such instances drawn from the files of the General Accounting Office. Most of the increases ranged from 200 percent to 300 percent, but the greatest was 700 percent. "It is difficult to understand why the services of an official or employee suddenly and in the twinkling of an eye increase in value three or four times the instant he switches from private to Government employment," said Representative LUDLOW.

Hundreds of these contracts have been renegotiated. If they were, in fact, renegotiated with a view to reducing unfairly high profits, and not merely to annoy and badger the contractors, these hundreds of cases of exorbitant salary and wage increases should have been taken into consideration. There is no valid reason whatever for paying higher salaries and wages in war industries than are necessary to obtain competent employees. This provision might call for slightly more than prevailing pay rates in the community, but certainly it would not justify the excessive increases cited in the Ludlow report.

Report of Tolan Committee on National Defense Migration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials with regard to the work of the Tolan committee:

[From the Chicago Sun of January 12, 1943]

CRITICISM BASED ON TRUTH

The House Committee on National Defense Migration (Tolan committee) has made a constructive report on the whole subject of war mobilization which the officials in charge would do well to heed.

There may be legitimate question whether now is the time for a wholesale reorganization of war agencies such as the Tolan committee proposes. Such drastic action in the crucial 6 months of war production would be called for only by a break-down of the present system. Although the present system is imperfect, its results in terms of the 1942 production do not signify a break-down.

Many of the Tolan recommendations, however, could be usefully adopted as guides to administrative practice. If divided counsels and authority have created confusion in the past, the remedy lies in better administration in the future, which requires neither legislation nor a reorganization. If we still lack a strong manpower agency, the administration can make it strong.

The Tolan committee has shown us the better side of congressional investigations. Its findings should be put to work.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of January 12, 1943]

BLUNT WARNING FROM HIGH AUTHORITY

There is no group in this country today more qualified to speak with authority on the long-range problems of manpower distribution than the five-man Tolan congressional committee which concluded its labors of 2½ years last week. The 40 or so volumes of the committee's report represent one of this country's outstanding social studies and although most of its work has been carried on well out of range of the headlines, it represents a monumental tribute to the value of the congressional committee at its best.

It is for these reasons that the blunt warnings of the committee on the Nation's present manpower situation deserve more than ordinary consideration. It finds that we are still the victims of muddle and inadequate planning; that the tendency to centralize production and employment in a few large centers of population is both inefficient at the present and dangerous for the future, and it is a Republican committee member who warns that:

"If the war continues to be the war of the 100 major corporations of this country, we can expect that the peace will be determined in large measure by their viewpoint. The war and the peace are the same piece of cloth."

Those, and the Courier-Journal is among them, who have advocated compulsory mobilization as the only solution of the drifting and maladjustment so evident in manpower distribution will find themselves not far removed in thinking from the Tolan committee, in spite of its forthright denouncement of compulsion at the present time. The committee warns against any attempt to add compulsory mobilization to the present confusion of authority and method, adding that compulsion "would permit the use of a big stick by those incompetent to gain voluntary support for a program which commands respect and confidence."

But in advocating its single, central controlling committee, invested with the responsibility for "careful planning, preservation to the utmost of flexibility, enlistment of all of our men, materials, and machines," the group hopes to achieve the same objectives which advocates of compulsion have seen to be necessary. It is not easy on this point to controvert the vast experience of the Tolan committee, and if it feels that, with reorganization and central control there would be no need of compulsory measures, then its viewpoint is one deserving careful consideration.

The one fact which does emerge is that the Tolan committee is second to no amateur calamity crier in its doubt and distrust of the present set-up. It is dissatisfied not only with the waste and inefficiency of our present manpower allocations, but with the possibilities for the future. Having charted one movement of around 3,000,000 citizens from coast to coast in vain pursuit of employment, it is well qualified to warn us against the possibility of a still larger migratory movement in the future if we continue with our present policies. It is obvious that the Tolan committee feels that present measures aimed at stabilizing workers and restricting piracy are wholly inadequate to solve the larger problems of worker migration. The fact is, of course, that most of them were instituted long after the damage was done, and the mass movement of workers inaugurated by no more reliable guide than grapevine rumors of work and high wages, was well under way long before we began thinking of the need for controlling manpower distribution.

The committee's report is a challenging document for the new Congress. Out of it should grow at last some reorganization of a system which represents our outstanding failure in conversion to war standards. But the time is now desperately short. The endless and futile debates upon manpower already buried in the archives of the Seventy-seventh Congress would fill far more volumes than the Tolan committee has filled. And, if the report can do no more than stir up further verbal avalanches, then its completion and the work of its compilers will have been as tragic a failure as our manpower program may yet be.

[From the Detroit Free Press of January 12, 1943]

THE TOLAN REPORT

The Tolan committee has labored long and intelligently, and the forward looking report which it has evolved should win it the gratitude of the Nation. Under the leadership of JOHN H. TOLAN, California Democrat, the House group bearing his name has charted certain present shortcomings that are critical, and a number of future perils that are grave. If we accept the guidance offered there is hope that we may facilitate both the winning of the war and the transition back to a peacetime economy.

Having had its origins in a study of the migrant problem, the committee's researches lean heavily toward matters concerned with concentrations of labor and if it goes seriously astray on any point it is in its criticism of practices in the placing of war materials contracts. The report finds it bad that these orders should have gone so exclusively to the great industries, such as those that typify Detroit.

And in theory that is bad. However, the practicalities are that the big plants were the only possessors of the engineering staffs necessary for quick conversions and a vast amount of technical planning. And since the first consideration was to arm swiftly, economic desirability had to give way to expediency.

Actually, this undesirable condition has been rectified to a considerable extent through the processes of subcontracting. Nor is there any need to fear that the injustice of such a situation to the small manufacturer and the virtue of dispersing production facilities have escaped the national leadership.

Only Monday, President Roosevelt said in his Budget message, "Some progress, but not enough, has been made in spreading war contracts more widely among the medium-sized and smaller plants. Further efforts are necessary. In certain cases, of course, saving of manpower and materials requires concentration in those plants best equipped to produce a given commodity."

Where the Tolan report struck fire most notably was on the score of manpower. It stated the whole case in one terse sentence.

"We do not yet have a strong manpower agency."

Nowhere in the report are personalities subjected to direct opprobrium, but in the case of Paul V. McNutt there is at least an oblique indication that the committee considers his administration of manpower a failure. The "elation" felt at his appointment has "ebbed," the report states. Mobilization of manpower, despite the existence of the War Manpower Commission, is described as haphazard. It is a definition the accuracy of which most Americans will grant. The only possible objection is to the term's mildness.

Agricultural Production and Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by C. A. Garnier, president of the Los Angeles County Farm Bureau, of December 3, 1942, to the Special Committee to Investigate Agricultural Labor Shortages in the West.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The problem of adequate agricultural production revolves principally around labor.

We shall first consider the farmer himself. It is necessary for maximum production that he be given some reasonable assurance that after surviving risks of climate and disease that the price for his commodity will return him his costs and a livelihood.

The present policy of Government food purchases and the Office of Price Administration price ceilings make it impossible for farmers to continue to produce many essential foodstuffs.

The farmer is in a very different position than industry. Industry buys its raw materials, fabricates its product, and fulfills its sale contracts in a matter of days or a few weeks, production not being started until satisfactory price arrangements are entered into; then delivery is made before any general change in production costs come into being. Not so the farmer. His only guarantee of even costs of production is his faith in the weather, God, and the future, which in too many instances does not satisfy his banker.

During normal times future turns in the labor and commodity markets can be fairly well anticipated; not so today. We have an Office of Price Administration and a Government that has shown no willingness to evolve a stable labor policy. It all lends to a lack of confidence.

We are planting tomato seed now in December. These same tomatoes will not find their way into a can until next fall.

The tomato grower has no control over 70 percent of his production costs, yet he is expected by Government to risk all his life's earnings to produce this vital war crop while common sense dictates the opposite.

With the labor problem being thrown from pillar to post, the tomato grower is expected by Government to enter into fixed price contracts.

You cannot blame the farmer if the Nation does not get the necessary wartime production.

Last year the Department of Agriculture set a minimum canning tomato price to the grower which became the State contract price generally. This minimum price of $18.50 per ton was less than farmers requested, the result being that a majority of California tomato growers were money out of pocket for the tomatoes they produced for their Government in 1942. This will not increase 1943 production. A large percentage of the pack went into lend-lease and Army orders. Certainly this inflationary cost of living nonsense cannot be applied here. Why isn't the farmer treated like the rest of the manufacturers of war supplies? Unless he is very quickly, we will have dire food shortages.

The ill-considered Office of Price Administration price ceilings, I think, are excellently illustrated in the dry-bean-price ceilings. Last year we sold kidney beans for $9 a bag. This year ceilings were set at $6 on the wholesaler. After the wholesaler takes the cost of freight, handling, and commission, there is only $5.70 left for the grower.

In 1941 we paid 40 cents an hour to bean pullers and weeders. This year at harvest time I paid a little fellow whose pitch fork was twice as tall as himself 40 cents an hour, the rest of the men getting 60 cents.

We had to use youngsters to get the crops in. The labor was inexperienced though willing; the result was, in comparison to trained labor, a cost of 70 to 75 cents an hour, on the basis of the work accomplished. Burlap bean sacks increased from 1¼ to 24½ cents apiece; threshing from 30 cents per hundredweight to 50 cents. How then can the farmer sell these beans for 60 percent of last year's easily paid by consumers prices? The result, farmers will not plant in 1943. We must have immediate adjustment of ceiling prices on a regional basis with farmer advisory committees participating.

There is 800 acres of grain land within a half mile of my ranch which is this year idle.

The farmer's equipment stands in his sheds while he produces steel tanks for submarine nets and his wife works in an aluminum foundry, both located in small towns nearby. They are earning twice the money, while working short hours, and have no capital risks as they had in farming.

Another 40 acres adjacent to my ranch, which has been in vegetable production for the last 20 years, has been idle since March of 1942.

When the owner had to disk under 10 acres of onions and 15 acres of cabbage on which he had employed high-cost labor, he said he was through. I could continue to recite instance after instance of this same trend. It is dangerous to the future of America.

A Department of Agriculture survey, in October, in Riverside County revealed market tomatoes which the farmer sold for 2.3 cents per pound being resold in four retail groceries at from 20 to 23 cents per pound.

My Mexican walnut picker labor foreman this year, for the first time in 20 years, was not able to help me at harvest time. He was an apprentice carpenter at an Air Corps training replacement center, earning $62 per week. You can imagine how that labor cost would fit in with Mr. Henderson's price ceilings.

How does Government, entering into contracts with builders so that they may pay such wages, expect its food supply to be plentiful? Food being purchased as cheaply as possible on a bid basis with no regard of the effects of its purchase price or the ability of the farmer to continue to produce.

It is, of course, possible to have cheap food. It is also possible to have abundant food. But it is axiomatic that over long periods it is impossible to have food both abundant and cheap. We can have either abundance or cheapness, but we cannot have both. Government has decided on cheap food. Consequently, it will not be abundant as long as this policy is continued.

Agriculture must have its share of the skilled labor supply. How can a farmer keep tractor drivers at $7 a day when close by Army and Navy contractors are paying $12 to $14, with overtime and short hours? Volunteer city harvest labor saved much of last year's farm production at harvest time in California. Farmers appreciated this most needed assistance, but certainly this condition does not lend to cheap production or very bountiful production over any period of time, especially with gas rationing and restrictions of travel.

In the year ahead permit the farmer to operate on the following premises and all possible production will be achieved:

First, let there be price ceilings established only on those commodities of which an increased production is not needed, it being impossible to have enough flexibility in price regulation so as to not curtail production. Also, the marginal producer who is eliminated under price regulation, must be induced to aid the production of his more fortunate neighbor who may have better land or facilities. We must have all available land and equipment producing war crops, if we are to feed the world our armies are invading as well as ourselves.

Secondly, let us have an end to "crack pot" regulations. Consider the effect on production before issuing regulations that have not been well considered by representatives of farmers. Then give the farmer some assurance that he will at least get his cost of production for the sale of his commodities. Give him confidence, let government take a real position on the big war problems of manpower, selective service, machinery rationing, and economic planning. The farmer must plan his production for a new year and he must have some stability in order to plan soundly. But with government evading and delaying decisions on vital questions, agriculture cannot be expected to produce what is required of it. We must have food, for without an abundance of food for victory, can come only degradation and defeat.

Some Interesting Facts—Do We Have 3,000,000 Workers on the Army Pay Roll?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Budget message of January 11, 1943, shall be read and reread by every Member of Congress. It is the most comprehensive report, I believe, any President has ever made to the Congress, and in view of our total war effort it is of greater importance and more significant than any message that has ever been delivered to Congress.

In speaking of food and shortages, the President stated:

> There will be sufficient volume in our bill of fare but less variety. That may hurt our taste but not our health.

With reference to small farms, he made a very striking illustration that should receive the attention of the Congress. In this message on this subject, he stated:

> Small farms, like other small war plants, must be encouraged to make a maximum contribution to the war. I hope the Congress will give as much sympathetic consideration to these smaller and poorer farmers as it has given to the smaller and poorer industrial concerns.

With reference to the expenditure by the Federal Government for the war and for other costs, his statement in the message is:

> My recommendations contemplate that in the fiscal year 1944, 96 cents of every dollar expended by the Federal Government will be used to pay war costs and interest on the public debt, and only 4 cents for all the so-called nonwar purposes.

DO WE HAVE 3,000,000 WORKERS ON FEDERAL PAY ROLL?

It is my opinion, assertions on the floor of this House, on the floor of the other body, and in public addresses made by one or more Members of the other body especially, that we have a tremendous horde of Federal workers, aggregating approximately 3,000,000, and inferring that many of them are absolutely useless and unnecessary, should be clarified. The statement is often made that we have 3,000,000 workers on the Federal pay roll or in the Federal service. If we have one Federal worker that is not needed, he should be discharged. I am not endeavoring to justify the employment of any unnecessary personnel. On the other hand, I think every effort should be made to obtain the maximum efficiency by the Federal Government from the smallest number of workers in this wartime period when there is such a scarcity of manpower. In time of peace, as well as in time of war, we should economize as much as possible in order to protect the taxpayers.

In President Roosevelt's Budget message on this subject he stated:

> More than 1,600,000—or approximately three-fifths—of all Federal civilian employees are engaged directly in war production. They build and load ships, make guns and shells, repair machines and equipment, build arsenals and camps, sew uniforms, operate airports and signal systems. These are the workers in navy yards, arsenals, storage depots, military airfields, and other operating centers. It is scarcely ethical to try to make people believe that these workers are holding down armchair or unnecessary Government jobs.

I have looked into this matter more fully by securing the aid of Mr. Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information. From the Office of War Information I have the information that there are a total of 2,687,093 Federal employees on the Federal pay roll, but only 1,074,836 persons are employed in the regular civilian operation of the Government. The other 1,612,257 are employed in operations in war plants, navy yards, and so forth, as disclosed by the President.

It occurs to me that it would be just as fair to say that there are 10,000,000 people on the Federal pay roll—3,000,000 carrying on the civilian operations of the Government, working in war plants, shipyards, and so forth, and 7,000,000 in the armed forces, including the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. Obviously, it would be unfair to indicate that the 7,000,000 in the armed services, who are also on the Federal pay roll, should be used to leave the impression that our Government is so top-heavy with employees. For the same reason, it is unfair to say that there are 3,000,000 on the Federal pay roll when 2,000,000 of them are engaged in war work in navy yards, shipyards, war plants, and elsewhere and are no more connected with the civilian operations of the Government than the 7,000,000 in the armed forces.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, while the cannons boom, the dive bombers shriek, and the gallant fighters of the United States and our heroic allies are administering upon the would-be world enslavers one defeat after another, the democracies are giving serious attention to the advent of a better future which must be ushered in when victory has been won. In England a Beveridge plan is announced. In the United States the Government and statesmen and free institutions are laboring over plans for

the day when economic security in America will be the heritage of all, irrespective of origin or station in life.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, has for many years been an active participant in the movement for human betterment. As Governor of the State of Rhode Island, he has worked assiduously in this field of endeavor, and we are all familiar with the valuable contributions he has made to the efforts of the Senate special committee of the Seventy-seventh Congress investigating the old-age pension system.

On January 20, 1943, Senator GREEN addressed himself to the citizens of our land via the radio, and spoke on the vital subject of how we could best provide greater security in this complex civilization of ours against the consequences and hazards of old age, disability, death, and the other casualties due to the frailties of human life. His progressive views and the eloquence and simplicity with which Senator GREEN has tried to focus our attention upon this important subject are worthy of general notice. With that in view, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the illuminating remarks of Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow citizens, the subject on which I am given the opportunity to speak to the people of the Nation this evening is one of vital interest to us all. It is the proposal for improving our present social-security program so that it will reach all of the people and provide greater security against the consequences of old age, disability, death, and other casualties inherent in human life or in our civilization, and over which the individual has no control.

This question is one to which I have given much attention for many years, especially while I was Governor of the State of Rhode Island and since I have been a Member of the United States Senate. During the last session of the Congress, I served on a Senate special committee appointed to investigate the old-age pension system and became very much interested in the information developed at the hearings, and in the committee debates which followed. The views expressed in a minority report and then filed, have now been incorporated in the bill which I introduced in the United States Senate on last January 11. I hope that both Houses of Congress will find time in the near future to give attention to the matters dealt with in that bill.

We sometimes hear it said that we should not bother with such things as social security now. We have a war to win and must attend to that. I agree fully that our first job is to win the war. But surely it will not hamper our war effort if we take steps now to assure both the men in the armed forces, and the men and women working on our farms, and in our factories and mines, that they and their families will have some income to fall back upon in case the wage earner dies, or is disabled, or unemployed. Far from hindering the war effort, I am firmly convinced that such a step will lift morale by relieving the husbands and fathers and sons at the front, and millions of working people at home, of some of their greatest worries about the days ahead.

Of course, we all recognize that a system of social insurance or social security, however comprehensive, is no substitute for employment and production. In the last analysis the security of all of us depends upon our ability to keep our farms and factories and productive facilities generally at work, so that we may have plenty of the food and clothing and housing and other goods and services which make up a good standard of living.

We also sometimes hear it said that when the war ends demobilization of the armed forces should be regulated so that men will not be returned from the service until they are assured of jobs. Of course, it is important—indeed, it is essential—that we have work for these men to do when they come back, but surely when the war ends it should not be necessary to keep them in the armed service just because we have failed to provide work for them here at home. That would be saying that we must continue to wage war, or at least to support a large army and navy, to avoid unemployment. Germany solved her unemployment problems that way, and I am sure we will not follow that same path.

I am not under any illusion on this point. I know it will be a difficult task to get back to the way of peace. It will take time, much more time probably than it took to change from peace to war. And that is one reason why a broad and effective system of social insurance will be particularly important when the war ends. It will help to meet some of the problems which will inevitably arise as soon as the pressure of war demand ceases. But even if there were no war and no problem of post-war readjustment, it would still be essential, if we are to relieve some of the want and destitution which exists even in this wealthy country of ours, that we make some systematic provision for those who lack income through no fault of their own—primarily the aged, the disabled, and the unemployed. It happens that because of the full employment and high wages and ready markets brought on by the war this is a particularly opportune time to expand such a system of social insurance. The contributions will be easier to pay than they would be later in a time of poor business and unemployment.

The bill which I have introduced is intended only to meet some of the present most urgent needs. It does not cover all of the fields that need attention. Some of these matters need much more study than others. One in particular, the system of unemployment insurance, has become so confused with political, if not partisan, issues of States' rights versus Federal administration that it may be difficult to consider unemployment insurance on its merits. This is unfortunate. However, the payment of cash benefits for the unemployed worker presents a different kind of problem than is faced in paying benefits to the aged and the disabled worker or his dependents. The children and the aged and the disabled are not like the unemployed in this respect. They cannot or should not be expected to work and earn an income. They need a different source of income. The unemployed are able and willing to work, and the ultimate solution is to find work for them. This leads directly to a consideration of plans for employment—public employment if necessary. Our thinking is as yet by no means clear on how these matters are to be handled. For these reasons I have omitted entirely the matter of unemployment insurance from my bill.

Of course, this does not mean that there would be no unemployment insurance. My bill would leave unemployment insurance just as it is now. And this does not imply that I am opposed to modification and improvement of the existing program. But I have not been able to give sufficient attention to this phase of social security to be ready now to present any specific proposals.

Without dealing with unemployment insurance there is much that can be done to improve the present social-security program. It is good so far as it goes, but experience proves that it has many gaps to be filled. In the first place it must be made to cover all our people, agricultural workers and domestic workers, and employees of nonprofit institutions, and Government employees, and also self-employed persons. At present some 15,000,000 of these wage earners are not covered at all, or are covered only part of the time. Many pay contributions but are not in covered employment long enough to get any benefits. But if all work is covered, everyone will have the same degree of protection. Incidentally a large portion of the destitute people of our country come from the fields of agriculture and domestic employment and occasional work. If the social-security program is to achieve its purpose it must reach these people who need it most.

There are no special problems in connection with agricultural and domestic workers which cannot readily be solved. We will need to change the method of record keeping and reporting a little, but this might be a good thing to do anyway for other small employers as well as for farmers and housewives. The Social Security Board has reported that a stamp-book system can be developed which will tie in with the present system of record keeping and will be very simple for both the employer and the worker. Under the bill which I have introduced this stamp-book plan could be used for all employers for whom it seems more convenient than the present system of reporting.

Government employees, too, should be covered just as private employees are. Hundreds of thousands of workers have recently come to work for the Federal Government. Most of these have been in private employment covered by the Social Security Act. When they come to work for the Government their benefits decrease, and as time goes on they will lose whatever protection they may have had and they do not acquire any similar protection in Government employment. Most of those in the regular departments do come under the civil-service retirement system, but this provides little protection for dependents or survivors, and nothing even for the workers themselves until they have been employed at least 5 years. And those in the war agencies and in the arsenals and munitions plants and the like which are being operated by the Government have no protection at all. I hope that most of these workers will before very long go back to private employment, and it is important for them that all of their work, including this Government employment, should be counted together in determining the benefits to which they may be entitled.

The problem here is complicated by the fact that there are a number of special retirement systems for various Government groups, unrelated to one another, although a given worker may be affected by several of these systems during his working lifetime. In my bill I outlined a plan which will provide coverage under the Social Security Act for all Federal employees, except those who are certified by the Civil Service Commission to be covered under some other satisfactory program. This seems to be the simplest way to get at this matter for the present. Some day it may be possible to merge all of these separate systems; but that can wait if in the meantime we protect those who at present are left out in the cold.

State and municipal and other local government employees at present have even less protection than employees of the Federal Government. These also can be covered in the same way. If the policemen or firemen or teachers or other groups now have sufficient protection in any community, they could be made exempt, and the remainder of the employees could be brought under the Social Security Act. This would give the latter very substantial protection at relatively little cost. Incidentally, it would relieve a

good many States and municipalities of some very difficult problems.

Then there are a large number of persons who work for nonprofit organizations of some kind, such as schools and churches and hospitals and similar organizations. These institutions have in the past preferred to be exempt, primarily because they feared that, since the social security contribution is called a tax, if they were subjected to this tax for the benefit of their employees, it might constitute a precedent for abolishing their exemption from general taxation. It seems to me we should recognize that this is not properly a tax but, rather, an insurance premium paid for the specific purpose of providing certain benefits for workers. In order to emphasize this special character of the contribution, my bill provides for calling it a premium as in any other system of insurance, rather than a contribution or a tax.

There has also been some objection to treating ministers and members of religious orders as employees for this purpose. My bill specifically exempts such persons from coverage. With these safeguards, I believe the large majority of both the workers and the employing institutions in this field would welcome the protection of the Social Security Act.

If these extensions are adopted, practically all employed persons would have the same protection which industrial workers have now. This still leaves the employer helping to pay the cost, but not sharing in the benefits. Many small employers have complained that this is unfair and ask why they should not have the same protection which is provided for employees. I think they are entitled to it. Then, too, there are several million self-employed persons, owners of small business establishments, stores, garages, filling stations, and farms who are likewise entitled to some protection. The bill I have introduced provides the same coverage for employers and for self-employed persons as for workers.

Those who have not benefited by the social security program may not realize what such protection can mean. The small sums paid will mean the difference between destitution and reasonable comfort for hundreds of thousands of our workers. That is why I say it should be extended to all employed persons and to the self-employed at the earliest opportunity.

But while the present act provides substantial benefits in case of old age or death, it provides nothing for the worker who is totally disabled. The loss of income through disability is one of the worst dangers that the worker has to face. It has been estimated that on any day in the year something like 800,000 people who would otherwise be working are suffering from disability which has lasted for a year or more. But our present social-security program provides no protection in such cases. The bill I have introduced would provide the same benefits to the worker and to his dependents in case of permanent total disability, as in the case of retirement.

Another heavy burden on many workers is the cost of hospitalization in cases of serious illness. Nearly one-fourth of the total amount spent in connection with sickness is paid for hospital costs. While the total amount in any year is not large in relation to the whole population, the burden on the family which needs such care is enormous. If through a system of insurance the total cost of hospital care is spread over all, then the cost to any individual will be very small. The bill which I have introduced provides cash payments for a maximum of 30 days of hospitalization in any year for an insured worker and for any member of his family.

Even if the social security program is expanded to include benefits for total disability and hospital costs and is extended to cover all employed persons, we shall still have for many years the problem of caring for those who are now old or disabled or for some other reason unable to work in covered employment and will therefore never get the benefits provided. These persons if they are in need get some help now from the State or the local community. In the case of the aged over 65 and the blind and some of the dependent children the Federal Government helps meet the cost through what is known as "public assistance." But under the public-assistance program the Federal Government undertakes to pay in any State only as much as a State will spend from its own funds. At first glance that seems perfectly reasonable, but it produces very bad results. It results in most of the Federal money being spent to help the wealthiest States and relatively little being used to help the poorest States. One report which came to my attention showed that one wealthy State regularly uses as much Federal money for old-age assistance as more than 20 poorer States which have several times as much population—and the population on the whole is much poorer. The Federal Government helps those States most which need it least.

The bill I have introduced seeks to correct this. It provides for giving the wealthy States the same proportion as now, but giving an additional amount to all States whose income is below the average for the Nation. The same principle is applied in connection with the grants for the care of needy children.

But even with this provision there is still one large area of need which has in the past been pretty largely neglected. The Federal Government helps the States care for some of the children under 18 and some of the old people over 65 but gives no help at all in caring for those who are between 18 and 65 and may be just as much in need. Since $1 spent by the State for persons over 65 brings an additional dollar from the Federal Government, but if it is spent for persons under 65 brings nothing additional, many States have thought it best to spend what money they have where it will bring Federal matching and have used very little of their resources for the rest of the population. In fairness to destitute persons, whatever their age may be, it seems to me the Federal Government should help the States care for the needy of all ages alike. Under the bill which I have introduced the Federal Government would match State payments for all these groups in the same way it now does for the aged. This change would be desirable at any time but is of particular importance now because of the shifting of population resulting from our war program.

All that I have proposed helps our war effort indirectly. What I now propose helps it directly.

There are a few special provisions which should be made, and made now, in connection with the men in the Army and Navy. These men, so long as they are actually in the service, are covered by the veterans' program, but when they are discharged and go back to their peacetime activities they should not be penalized by reason of the fact that they have been away during the war. Under the present Social Security Act a man's protection depends upon how long he was in covered employment and on how much his average earnings were. Every month he is away from his job, even if in the armed service, decreases his average earnings and therefore his benefit, and pretty soon he may not be protected at all. When he comes back he will have to begin all over again. Under my bill the period of service would be considered as covered employment and earnings would be credited at $100 a month or the average earnings during the year before the man entered service, whichever is higher. This would not only maintain the protection which workers formerly had but would build up further protection which they could take with them when they return to private employment.

While I have not included any provision for changing the system of unemployment insurance, there is one problem in this field which needs special attention. Many of the men returning from service will not have any protection under the State unemployment compensation laws, and the protection of others will be limited and very unequal. We all hope that these men will find work as soon as the war is over and will not be interested in unemployment benefits, but we cannot be sure of that. So it seems wise to make some special provision for dealing with this problem in the immediate post-war period. It is obviously related to the war and should be handled by the Federal Government. My bill provides that if within a year after a man returns from the service, he is involuntarily unemployed but able to work, he shall be entitled to benefits for not more than 26 weeks. The cost of these benefits would be paid by the Federal Government. If a man is still unemployed when the benefits end he may be entitled to benefits under the State law. This provision does not interfere with the State law in any way.

In this short summary, I have tried to make clear the principal provisions of the rather complicated 72-page bill which I have submitted for the consideration of Congress. The bill does not offer a complete plan covering all emergencies like the Beveridge plan in England, or some plans proposed by certain groups in this country. It is intended only to remedy some of the most important defects in our present system and to extend the benefits of that system to all of our working population. It leaves untouched certain other problems such as unemployment insurance and health insurances, which I admit are of equal importance but on which there is wide difference of opinion. I am inclined to think that the program I have outlined is one on which all interested groups may readily agree. If such a program is promptly adopted attention can then be directed to those remaining problems which need more extended consideration and which are more controversial.

As I said earlier, the chief objection I have heard to such action is that we should put it off until after the war. It seems to me this suggestion overlooks a most important point. The present time is opportune to initiate a broad contributory social insurance plan. One of the difficulties in starting the original old-age insurance program was that it had to start in a period of depression, when on the whole it seemed to some undesirable to collect contributions in excess of the benefits paid. It had a deflationary effect when the opposite influence was needed. But now the collection of contributions would have a beneficial effect on the whole economy, even if benefit payments were postponed for a year or more.

We should bear in mind, too, that when we find it necessary to impose higher and higher taxes on medium and lower incomes it is going to leave large numbers of people without any reserves and in desperate straits if adverse circumstances arise. This can be taken care of to a considerable extent if we adopt the program I have suggested, because in these cases a person will be assured a minimum basic protection against entire loss of income.

A natural question for you to ask is: How much would such a program cost? That is a difficult question to answer because, while the cost of retirement benefits and disability benefits, too, is low at the beginning, it continues to increase over a long period of time. Nevertheless, some reasonably satisfactory estimates of cost can be made. Apparently

the contributions being collected now for old-age and survivors insurance are more than enough to pay the benefits for some time to come. The last Congress voted to suspend the increase from 1 percent to 2 percent each on workers and employers which was to go into effect this month, because the present rate seemed to some to be high enough. I am informed that if the rates are increased as formerly planned and another 1 percent is added to the total for hospitalization benefits the contributions would be sufficient to meet the cost of the program I have discussed, for some years to come. This would be a total of 8 percent of pay rolls as compared with the present 5 percent, or the 7 percent already scheduled for January 1944, a total percentage less than that now in effect in our friendly ally England, or in our deadly enemy, Germany.

How this contribution should be shared depends upon one's point of view. Many feel that employers and workers should share equally in the cost of all social insurance programs. If the additional cost is shared in this way it will result in contributions of 2½ percent each for workers and employers for the benefits I have discussed. This is, of course, in addition to the present charge of 3 percent on employers for unemployment compensation. These additional charges are surprisingly low in relation to the social benefits accruing.

If my proposals seem to you reasonable and meet with your approval, you should let that fact be known as widely and emphatically as possible. There is always an ultraconservative group in the country opposed to any change no matter how worth-while, and especially if it entails any expense no matter how reasonable.

The other day in talking with an intelligent man about my bill, I tried to explain how inadequate the present Social Security Act is. The one and only question he asked was, "How much will these changes cost the employer?" So let your views be known and take your part in this reform to bring freedom from want to our countrymen here at home.

In spite of such opposition, social legislation has made great advances under the superb leadership of President Roosevelt. Referring to this, our distinguished majority leader, Senator Barkley, in a recent speech said, "He did more than simply restart the wheels of industry; he brought about the enactment of a series of social reforms which did more than anything else to revive the faith of the American people in the validity and worth of democratic government." Let us keep that faith alive.

The world and the peoples of the world seem to me like a great company of voyagers all sailing on one ship. You cannot damage the efficiency of that ship without in some way affecting us all—everyone of us. You cannot improve the efficiency of the ship without affecting us all, nor can you sink only a part of the ship, for as a unit it will float or as a unit it will sink. We realize this now, in time of this global war, more than ever before. When peace comes at last, we will have discovered that a wealth of material things, such as America has boasted of in the past, is not enough. We must consider the needs of all classes and kinds of people and we must serve them. There will not be enough wealth in the world to save us if it is indiscriminately packed as so much cargo on one side of the ship, unbalanced. We shall pitch over, and the gorged and the hungry will go down together. But balanced and rationally distributed for the rightful sharing of all, our cargo will keep and nourish and prosper all of us, the lesser as well as the greater, the last as well as the first. This means social security.

Election of Hon. Frank C. Walker as Chairman of Democratic National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, many enthusiastic statements have been made endorsing the election of the Honorable Frank C. Walker as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. I offer for the RECORD a telegram from the President, together with two statements, one issued by our distinguished leader the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the other by the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

I feel that the Democratic Party and the country are very fortunate in having so capable a man as Frank Walker selected at this time. By entrusting the management of the Democratic Party to a man of his caliber, we are sure of splendid judgment being shown at all times, and have the definite assurance of party success at the polls.

There being no objection, the telegram and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEGRAM FROM THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1943.

EDWIN W. PAULEY,
Secretary, Democratic National Committee,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR ED: I wish very much that you, in your capacity as secretary of the Democratic National Committee, will extend to all members of the committee attending the meeting my cordial regards and personal good wishes.

The committee is meeting to receive the resignation of its chairman and to elect his successor. I am sure that all the members join me in expression of gratitude to the retiring chairman, my old friend, Ed Flynn, for all the services he has rendered, not only in recent years as chairman, but for many years before.

I see by the papers that his successor will probably be another very old friend of mine—one who has worked long and intimately with me in the cause of sound liberal government. Please extend to the new chairman my best wishes for his usual success in whatever he undertakes.

I am sorry that I cannot at this time greet you in a more personal way and thank you for your work in the past and your efforts for the future.

Americans of all parties, are of course, subordinating all considerations of partisan politics to the single task of these days—defeating the enemy and establishing a better future for ourselves and later generations. Where the safety and welfare of our country are concerned there will be no division on political lines. But even in times of war, democracy, as we know it, continues to rely upon sound, honest, strong political parties—all bound together in a unified purpose to achieve overwhelming victory.

With warm greetings to all my friends in the committee, very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES E. MURRAY, OF MONTANA

The election of Frank C. Walker as chairman of the Democratic National Committee is most gratifying to me. Frank Walker is a real son of Montana. Born in Pennsylvania, reared in the heart of the West where he won success and distinction in his profession, he spent his maturity in the great industrial and financial East. His is a background from the standpoint of geography, education, and diversity of activities and experience in life possessed by few men.

After a distinguished career in Montana, Frank Walker came to the center of this Nation's business and political affairs. In New York he continued to climb the ladder of success reaching his present high position without faltering. His high personal integrity and genial sincerity have won him hosts of friends in all walks of life and in all parts of the Nation. His leadership is of the personal type that inspires men to work for him and with him. The Democratic Party faces important tasks. The pathway ahead requires vision and strength in meeting the complex problems that will come to us as the result of this great world upheaval. By the elevation of Frank Walker to the chairmanship of the party, the confidence of rank and file of party workers and its members generally will be strengthened and unified.

We are divided into three great areas in this country—the East, the West, and the South. We need men in the leadership of our party who can bring a spirit of cooperation and unity among these sections of our country which have grown up with diverse interests. The East, the West, and the South must find a common level upon which they can work for the continued growth and prosperity of the Nation. The agricultural and mining interests of the West and South can only prosper on the basis of genuine cooperation with the industrial East.

Montana has produced men of prominence and ability in the past. The late Senator Thomas J. Walsh left his influence upon the train of events after his death. The Republican party in 1892 called upon Senator Thomas Carter for leadership and made him its national chairman. Hon. Joseph Dixon was chairman of the Progressive party in 1912. In going West of the Mississippi River for its leader, the Democratic Party again places itself in the forefront of those progressive forces of America.

Walker will bring to his work on the national committee a broad western spirit of liberalism. If our party is to be successful, it must find a common ground for the cooperation of the three great regions, the industrial East, the agricultural and mining West, and the South with its growing industrial and agricultural activities.

In my judgment, Walker is the man who can help bring into play that unity of effort so essential to the progress of our country and the success of our party.

STATEMENT OF HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, OF KENTUCKY

The election of Frank Walker as chairman of the Democratic National Committee is a very happy choice. Mr. Walker is not only a loyal Democrat and an outstanding member of the President's Cabinet but he is a man of broad views with reference to policies which our Government should pursue and his whole record in public and private life is one which will inspire the confidence of the American people.

Very naturally the question of purely partisan politics must be submerged to the one great objective of winning the war. I would regard it as a very unfortunate situation if the members of all political parties

were not wholeheartedly consecrated to the winning of the war as the first great job of the American people. Inasmuch as political parties naturally play a vital part in the government of our country, the people are concerned about the character, the ability as well as the outlook of any man who heads any political organization.

The change in the chairmanships of both the Democratic and Republican parties is a normal procedure and the people have the right to expect both parties to present outstanding and qualified men to head their organizations. Chairman Walker is an outstanding American. He has never indulged in small, petty political methods or objectives. He is a credit to our country and we are fortunate in having such a man take over the management of the Democratic Party in this great crisis of our country's history.

As Postmaster General and a trusted adviser of the President, he has made a substantial contribution to the welfare of our country. He is a businessman who is highly respected by his associates in business for his integrity, courage, ability and foresight and as a political leader he has shown like qualities of statesmanship which will, no doubt, be appreciated by men and women of all parties of this country.

Acceptance Address by Hon. Frank C. Walker on Election to Chairmanship of Democratic National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an important address by Hon. Frank C. Walker, newly elected chairman of the Democratic National Committee, delivered in Chicago January 18, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I deeply esteem the honor conferred upon me. To be called upon to preside at the councils of the Democratic Party is a mark of confidence which no man can fail to appreciate as an honor.

I am grateful to you ladies and gentlemen. I am conscious also of the tremendous responsibility thrust upon me—indeed upon all of us charged with the direction of the party to which the people have entrusted the affairs of the Nation for three consecutive administrations.

I realize that I have had distinguished predecessors, men who have carried our party to success gallantly and brilliantly. I pay tribute to the skill and devotion of James A. Farley and Edward J. Flynn in the office to which I succeed.

In accepting the chairmanship of the national committee, I feel it my duty to say something about my own philosophy of government, my personal opinions and convictions in matters dealing with the welfare of the country and with the serious task imposed upon all of us at this time.

First, however, let me state frankly that I do not like to make a speech. I have long felt an impatience with words, a distaste for oratory as a substitute for action.

Particularly is this true at a time when our sons and brothers are fighting for our lives. I want to aid them. I want to struggle with them. I want to share with them the spirit and the determination they are now displaying on many battle fronts and in successive victories, bringing cheer and confidence to afflicted peoples all over the world.

I know that in this feeling I reflect the sentiment of my countrymen, who cherish the deep conviction that we are steadily and surely going on to victory.

It is not, then, in the role of the public speaker that I address you, but rather as one chosen to assume new responsibilities, who feels it his duty to make known his own ideas and ideals for the exercise of free government and the ultimate peace and security of mankind.

I am a firm advocate of the two-party system which has grown to be more than a tradition in the United States. It is the essence of the democratic processes for a full and free expression of popular aims and popular desires.

The very foundation of a democracy is the opportunity afforded its people to determine the will of the majority by open debate, by conflict of opinion, by criticism. The debate should be conducted on a high plane and governed by fair rules and a proper sense of ethics. The conflict of opinion should be without animus, the criticism designed to be constructive in character.

This is democracy at work. It is the antithesis of what Hitler calls his new order. It is my code, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to announce it and repeat it. I believe in the two-party system.

In the exercise of these rights and privileges of free men in a free country, American custom for generations has brought about the division of our vast electorate of men and women into two main groups.

Functioning under the laws and the Constitution, these groups choose their respective national councils. As one of these two councils we are here assembled.

In each party the functions of the national committee are mainly to present for the information and understanding of the public the plans, the policies, and the principles determined by all the members of that party as represented in their national conventions.

The party in control of the Government presents its record of accomplishment and its plans for the future. The other party offers the program it proposes to substitute.

Although mainly, by instinct, a student rather than a participant in affairs of government, I have been from early manhood an ardent advocate of the humanitarian ideals of the Democratic Party. It was under the guidance and example of that great pioneer of progressive thought and action—the late Senator Walsh—that I took my early training in the field of social welfare and economic advancement. One of the proudest moments of my life was when he sat in my seat in the Montana legislative assembly and heard the call of the roll which for the first time sent him to the United States Senate, and to his illustrious career in the national arena.

My more intimate interest and participation was stimulated by the inspiration of a man whose life has been devoted to the welfare of mankind, a man who rose, by successive stages, to a position in which he is now the center of the hopes and ideals, not only of the plain people of his own country but of disciples of freedom in every country the world around.

Liberty found a grand and gallant champion in the person of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

His arrival in the national theater was nothing short of providential. I shall not recount the perils that threatened our country in the late twenties and following years. With that situation you are all familiar. It is enough to say that the United States stood on the brink of economic, if not political, chaos in November 1932. Then the people spoke. They called for a new regime under the leadership of a far-seeing Democratic President.

There followed a period of rehabilitation that forms a bright chapter in the history of the Nation. No man can challenge this simple statement.

No comparable period in history can match the achievements in the fields of social progress, secured under the wisdom, the foresight, the courage of our President, during the past 10 years.

Write it down as the glorious decade in which the friendly hand of the Government in Washington reached into every humble American home to bring security and confidence to families stricken with adversity and dismayed by the fears of fresh disaster.

I am told that it would be a serious error of judgment on my part to discuss our party's record of social achievement in the last decade. It is not my intention nor is it my desire to initiate political bickering—to raise new and unimportant controversial issues. But I am not going to permit the opposition, designedly furthering their own political progress, to select issues most agreeable to their own purposes. I do not propose to permit them to justify their continued campaign of destructive criticism on the basis that it is essential to the prosecution of the war. No doubt they would gladly forget our record of the past decade. The American people will never forget it.

In the years before 1933, our country was powerful and proud; but in our pride we had forgotten the homely things that make and keep a nation strong. We had forgotten that if a nation itself is to endure, the common man must be kept strong and proud of himself, his home, his family.

From behind the clouds of uncertainty and defeat arose the spreading rays of a new dawn unveiling the promise of a brighter, a happier day.

Then and there opened a new horizon—then and there began a program for the solution of the vast and fundamental problem of social security. Other nations had advanced beyond us in that field. Then came action.

Forty-one million wage earners and their families are now assured protection against destitution in the late years of their lives. Forty million workers now enjoy unemployment insurance. The blind, the dependent children, the physically handicapped are sheltered under the protecting wing of Government. Means have been established to improve public health. The working conditions and standard of living of the working man have been improved. Crop planning and other agricultural developments have been instituted. Huge power projects have been developed. Over 600,000 miles of roads have been constructed and improved; thousands of bridges, schools, libraries, air fields, and parks have been built. Farm and home owners have been relieved of the onerous burden of mortgages long past due; electricity has been brought to rural areas; slums cleared; a Federal housing program instituted; bank deposits guaranteed; the security and investment markets safeguarded.

These advances were secured under the direction of our President, by Democratic majorities in Congress, and by capable administrative officers in every State in the Union.

The party which has stoutly defended the political rights of State communities proved

that it could also become the greatest champion in American political history for the human rights of the whole community. This party led our Nation from economic confusion and social division to a unity of national sentiment and ideas unparalleled in the annals of our country. True we made mistakes in procedure; under pressure of critical human needs we sometimes improvised and we had to change certain methods and alter our emphasis to sail on a balanced keel.

The Democratic Party believes that human welfare is the true goal of decent government. The Democratic Party has emphasized the responsibility of government for human security—it will continue to emphasize it. The Democratic Party has adapted its methods to the changing needs of our individual citizens and of our Nation—it will continue to do so. The Democratic Party believes that for the protection of our international freedom it is necessary to proclaim the God-given freedoms of humanity—it will continue to believe so.

We have taken this stand and performed this service for our people under a Democratic administration. Now it is our job to see to it that there is no interruption, no stepping back from the progress we have furthered. That work, and the added responsibilities that the end of the war will bring, make it obligatory on you and me to do our utmost to have Democrats on guard against the forces that hold contrary views. We dare not risk having the wise and humane measures that have been achieved nullified by enemies of those measures.

I would not say that the leaders of the Republican Party joined in unanimous opposition to the social and human policies of our administration; and it would be unjust to imply that they have permitted party differences to prevent their wholehearted cooperation in the prosecution of the war—but, in the policy of preparedness and of that national social security which is the groundwork of national preparedness, it is a fact of record—and of regret—that the Republican Party displayed something less than foresight.

Yet, I prefer to believe that the Democratic Party, under the leadership of a truly great man, overcame the social disorders of our time, and also a deep-seated error for which no party had been responsible; I refer to the error of seeing in humanity a machine rather than a man.

We see now that much of the blame which we had placed on the instruments of industrial organization rests really on ourselves—all of us. There is no mechanical road to progress; there is no economic liberty without political liberty; there is no escape through science from responsibility. We see now that the trouble was not with the world's resources but with our distribution of them. We see now that we had not produced too much but too little. Nature was not ungenerous; we were inordinate. Men starved in the midst of plenty; they were idle while a whole world waited to be built—not because we lacked a technique to control prosperity but because we lacked the understanding that the problem could be solved only by justice and never by science.

The philosophy that science without justice can solve our problems—that economic liberty may be won without political liberty—the philosophy that denies the responsibility of the individual and the dignity of man is the philosophy of the Nazi. It is not defeatism to say that we cannot change the facts of life. We cannot stop the earthquake, the cyclone, nor yet the ravages of disease. But we can in keeping with the dignity of man, with a sense of the responsibility that is ours, stop the evils over which we are masters and of which we are the cause. We can stop unemployment without making our citizens inmates of a totalitarian state. It is in our power to give adequate family security. We can give economic protection and sufficiency.

That idea and that way of life are not imperiled today within the United States by either of the great political parties; they are, however, imperiled by foul forces from across the seas of the world.

These forces stand in direct opposition to everything we hold near and dear in life.

Against these forces we all, all Americans, stand united.

With such forces there can be no compromise but only the conquest of destruction. With such forces we must not only win battles but we must win wars. Too often the warfares of the world have been distinguished by frustration of the high purposes that beckoned men to death. Too often nations have lacked the strength to make that last advance for which all battles have been fought. When their enemies have been defeated, they laid their weapons in weariness away and almost forgot why they had fought. They were exhausted by the triumph of arms; too weak to march on to the triumph of ideas.

That is the tragic folly of past failures. Will it be repeated?

I would be lacking a spirit of proper confidence if I were even to insinuate that the United States will lose its great battles. I scorn the pretentiously wise who caution against overconfidence. We will look carefully to our weapons, then go to battle without the slightest doubt of the outcome. We will count the gain and not the cost. Let the Nazis now measure the blood, sweat, and tears; we have had enough self-consciousness. We are soldiers on a world battleground who have picked the place of our triumph. We will conquer without ferocity. We will conquer with a calm, calculating thoroughness that will call forth the awe and admiration of future generations.

Yet, we fight battles to win wars, not merely to silence guns. When the last barricade of the enemy is breached, when the drums of victory have reverberated over valleys of the dead, a wide prospect will open before us. It is here that the war itself, the essential war, will be lost or won. It is here we must summon all the resources of our soul and mind, our wealth and power, and, this time, our armed forces for the last piercing fight to place the laws of human decency, unshakably and forever, as the pillars of the social order of the new world that will have to come out of the war.

Now, it is an alarming evidence of a dangerous misconception of realities that some of us are dividing the peace and the war. Some seem to believe that war is to be forgotten the memory of it dimmed by diplomatic discussions, before peace can be diagrammed by geopoliticians and technocrats. If we are fighting to put the architecture of the world's future in the hands of diplomatic actuaries, whose only stock in trade is statistical charts, then, though we win the battles, we will certainly lose the war.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that the war and the peace are not divisible. I cannot emphasize too strongly that our war aims are identical with our peace terms. We will continue the war—not until we have reached an armistice, not by any means—we will continue the war until we have established peace. If necessary we will compel the peace of the freedoms by armed force; and we will maintain it by armed force, because that peace, and that alone, is what we are fighting for. Legal devices and political devices, international in character, may serve to maintain the peace after it is won, but a constitution must first be established as the framework.

Shall we have, as some prominent persons propose, a breathing spell when the last shot has sounded round the hills of the world? Voicing my individual opinion, I am not in accord with this view. I ask: A breathing spell for what? For every political rivalry to renew itself? For every national and international faction to make itself intractable in the hope of being bought off at a profit? For various racial groups to set themselves apart again and invoke the very principle that has brought about their ruin? For our enemies to negotiate against us? A breathing spell for what? For more assassinations? To foster civil wars? No, no—the peace is not one thing and the war another; not this time, if we can prevent it.

We are fighting evil forces, not merely military forces; we are struggling against a dark fanaticism of human destruction with which we cannot become reconciled. We are at war because we could not make peace. Shall we fight now only to sit down later for another Munich conference? Another meeting at Berchtesgaden? Another political court of claims at Versailles? Our soldiers are not fighting and dying in order that the politicians of the world may have another conference. We do not intend to negotiate peace with the Nazis or the Japanese militarists. We will state our conditions before we will accept their sword of surrender.

Our war is to compel peace, a peace founded, as President Roosevelt has said, on the laws of God. We do not expect the Nazis to like that peace. The war will not be won until we give our enemies a bill of rights, national and international, and tell them they have no choice but to accept it.

Our enemies have sought to impose upon humanity a slavery of body and soul. We will bring to them a freedom of body and soul in the observance of the laws of justice and of human rights.

The people of this Nation are Americans before they are Democrats or Republicans; and their patriotism is not to be questioned when they become either one or the other. We are brothers in the battlefields of war.

The forces of evil in the world have compelled us to fight, to struggle for the realization of true peace. This time we shall attain it; we shall not, must not, fail. Suffering shall not deter us nor shall the agony of pain distract us. We know that our wisdom is often learned through sorrow. We promise to win the war as well as the peace. With God's help, we shall go on to that victory.

Inauguration of Hon. Edward Martin as Governor of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DAVIS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, in view of the inherent constitutional arrangement of this great Republic, whereby each of the several States is endowed with certain rights and powers, and in view of the further fact that a number of our individual States have only recently elected and inaugurated new executive and legislative officials, I believe that it behooves us all to become familiar with the dominant policy and philosophy of the leaders of the respective States which go to make up this great American Nation. We are all aware that the very sustenance of this Federal Union depends in large part upon unity, cooperation, and understanding

among the several States and their peoples. Therefore, I deem it not only timely, but necessary, to inquire into the policies and programs of State leaders to determine to what extent they are united on the vital issues now confronting the country.

Last Tuesday, January 19, I attended the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of Gen. Edward Martin as the new Governor of the State of Pennsylvania. The oath of office was administered in a most impressive manner by Hon. George W. Maxey, the able and distinguished jurist who is now the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. The occasion was a serious and solemn one, but it was marked by a number of encouraging signs, not the least encouraging of which was the spirit of firm and high resolve with which these State officials entered upon public service. The leaders of Pennsylvania are resolutely committed to a full, relentless, and successful prosecution of the war. They are equally committed to the creation of a firm and enduring peace and they are no less resolved to combat poverty and maintain equality of opportunity for all, not only within the borders of their own State but throughout the length and breadth of this Nation as well.

I can devise no better way of portraying the spirit of determined and cooperative unity which flourishes among our people today than to quote briefly from the inaugural address by Hon. Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania, in which he said:

> With a united people working tirelessly, with strong hands and unflinching courage, God willing, we will achieve victory. Our fighting men deserve every consideration. In all matters pertaining to the prosecution of the war, we Pennsylvanians pledge our united and unreserved support to the President, the Commander in Chief of our armed forces.

Mr. President, because I believe that this memorable address of Governor Martin carries with it an inspiring message of the hopes, purposes, and objectives of the American people, not only those of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania but of our entire Republic, and because I believe that it might well be read by every American in these perilous times, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the commendable address delivered by Hon. Edward Martin on the occasion of his inauguration as Governor of Pennsylvania at Harrisburg on January 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow citizens, it is with deep humility that I accept the office of Governor of Pennsylvania today. These are trying and difficult times. The normal and peaceful pursuits of our daily lives are shaken and perturbed, leaving us puzzled and bewildered, and the problems of administering our Government have multiplied and become correspondingly complex. In one respect, however, we who are about to take office are fortunate. The administration of Governor James has been outstanding. It has turned a deficit into a surplus by the American principles of economy and common sense. On behalf of the people of this great Commonwealth I extend thanks and appreciation, and hope that he and the members of his cabinet may enjoy health, peace, and prosperity in the years to come.

The ceremonies today are a magnificent tribute to the American way of living. In the midst of a total war, with our boys daily marching off to training camps and fighting on every continent of the globe, we took time out for a "battle of ballots"—to permit a free people to elect their representatives, who are their public servants and not their masters. During these critical times it is particularly urgent that those of us who remain on the home front should uphold the banner of democracy and exercise their right to vote. In this way alone can we keep alive for those on the battle front the most sacred right that a free citizenry possesses—the right to choose our public servants. The smoke of battle of the last election has cleared. Today, as the Governor of all the people of Pennsylvania, I ask for united support in order that during our term of office we may accomplish the maximum good for the greatest number of people.

America is in the second year of the greatest crisis in its history, and Pennsylvania is carrying her share of the war burden, just as she has in all past wars fought for the establishment and preservation of our country. Her soldier sons have died everywhere Americans have fought. Her sailor sons are buried under all the seven seas. And now, in our present conflict, one man in every ten wearing the American uniform is a Pennsylvanian. Our mines are producing coal to keep the steel furnaces ablaze and to keep our trains rolling war materials for shipment to the war fronts. Our shipyards are turning out ships with a speed that is startling our enemies. And Pennsylvania, with her billion dollar investment in 175,000 farms is one of the most important food producers in the world. Our farmers are cooperating magnificently to help feed our allies and to make our Army the best fed Army in the world.

This war effort must go on, move forward and its tempo must be increased. To this, we today pledge ourselves and dedicate all our energies. Our land, sea, and air forces must be greater in numbers and superior in training to those of our enemies. Right now, nothing matters but winning the war, because if we do not win it, nothing else will matter. We are fighting a ruthless enemy—an enemy who aims to destroy everything that we hold sacred. Yes, he aims to destroy civilization itself and engulf the world in slavery and darkness and to drive from the face of the earth freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom to worship God. This monster must be destroyed and with him we must root out the poison of hatred, arrogance, and godlessness, which he has instilled into the hearts and minds of millions of men. With a united people working tirelessly, with strong hands and unflinching courage, God willing, we will achieve victory, and our sons will not have died in vain.

While our greatest job is winning the war, there are State problems that must have immediate attention. Our men carrying the bayonets on the front line, guiding and fighting airplanes and battle tanks, manning our ships and supply lines, deserve every consideration. The democracy they are fighting to preserve must be kept clean and strong. The door of opportunity must be kept open for them, so that when they return, they are not deprived of the American prerogative to compete fairly and strive honestly to succeed, each according to his merits. It seems manifestly unfair to fill Government positions by civil service now. We should wait until these men come home and have an opportunity to take their rightful places again in society. In the meantime, those in the service must know that the State is not unmindful of the loved ones they left behind and will look out for and guard them with tender and diligent care.

The war will put unusually heavy burdens on some of the departments of our State government, and in the foreground of these is the department of education. Our schools are suffering from the terrific impact of the war. With the drafting of boys in the teen ages, our high schools will be seriously affected. Boys are restless, and eager for the adventure of serving their country. Many teachers, both men and women, are leaving the profession. Curricula must be changed to meet war requirements. Our department of education must act with fearless strength to see that our educational institutions are preserved intact. Education is the bulwark of our Republic, and next to the church, it fashions our lives and strengthens our beliefs in democracy and its ideals. Let us, above all, teach in the one-room schoolhouse, as well as in our greatest university, what America means; let us teach the homely philosophy of work that made America great. Let us search the records of our pioneers and apply their ideals of thrift, sacrifice, and the love of God to our present-day living, and through our schools, instill in the youth of Pennsylvania the real principles of Americanism. I propose this to be the guiding thought of every man and woman having control of the molding of the minds of our children.

We must have a strong and efficient Department of Public Health. The commanding officer of an army watches, with scrupulous care, over the health of his soldiers, because he knows that disease can bring disasters greater than the ones suffered on the battlefield. It is equally as important to look out for the health of those on the home front. Due to the war, we have suffered many dislocations in our lives. Thousands of men and women, formerly employed in lighter work, are now employed in mines, mills, and factories, producing war materials. In the shifting of populations to accelerate war work, we are faced with inadequate living conditions. With the restricted use of gasoline and automobiles, our means of transportation, busses, streetcars, and trains are overcrowded. Add to this the rationing of food and other essential commodities, the anxiety about those in the service, as well as eventual casualty lists—all these are factors affecting the health of the community. The various departments of our State, therefore, must attain the highest efficiency in the strict inspection of food and sanitary conditions, and increase its activities in all the many branches of its service, in order to guard the health of our people and the safety of men and women in our mines, mills, and factories. A casualty on the home front may be as costly as one on the battlefield.

It will be the constant effort of this administration, through the Department of Labor and industry, to foster and encourage better relations between management and labor. In this country we recognize that the interests of the worker and the employer are basically the same. Both, working together, have helped to mold and create this mighty Republic, a land of equal opportunity for all with the highest standards of living anywhere on this earth. American labor knows how cruelly workers have suffered at the hands of the tyrant abroad. Millions of workers the world over are today enslaved, driven like herds of cattle, toiling ceaselessly in dark despair and without any immediate hope for the future. The employer, too, cannot call anything his own—all he worked for, accumulated, and saved is ruthlessly confiscated by the greedy and

unprincipled oppressors. That such things may never come to pass in our beloved land, labor and capital are working together to forge the weapons for the destruction of our enemies. Let there be no slackening of their joint efforts. We stand ready, in conjunction with Federal agencies, to adjust any grievances that may arise. But it is our profound conviction that no grievance of any kind must impede or delay the making or delivering of war materials to our armed forces and deprive the American soldier of the weapons with which to defend himself from attack by the enemy.

We must help the Pennsylvania farmer to overcome his lack of manpower and his shortage of materials and equipment. It may be necessary for the Pennsylvania school boys and girls to sacrifice some of their time in the school room and help in the fields. Young men have always fought our wars. In the War between the States, 1,151,000, or 41 percent, of the men in the Union Army were under 18 years of age. If they could fight, certainly the boys under that age in this generation can help to produce food. Production and distribution are the basic problems of agriculture. Both of them are vitally related to the public interest and to the war effort. Farmers are willing to work and produce and we must give all the help we can to furnish the necessary manpower.

In all matters pertaining to the prosecution of the war, we Pennsylvanians pledge our United and unreserved support to the President, the Commander in Chief of our armed forces. We pledge the fullest cooperation of every department and agency of this Commonwealth to bring about an early, victorious, and lasting peace. We will, however, jealously guard those functions and prerogatives which, under our Constitution, belong exclusively to the State. The American Government was never intended to direct the lives and control the efforts and desires of the individual. While some form of regimentation to help win the war may be necessary, regimentation under the pretext of war, is dangerous to our freedom and should not be permitted. Bureaucracy is running rampant and must be curbed. Government is now in fields of service never contemplated by the founders. The great tax burden created by the essential war effort and by nonessential Government work is sapping the resources of our people. It is destroying capital which represents the savings of the thrifty. When the war ends, we must have capital for private enterprise. If our people do not have capital, the Government must step in and provide it, and that, when carried too far, is state socialism, which is death to the American way of free enterprise. More than 5,000,000 men and women are now employed by Federal, State, and local governments, and these swollen pay rolls add dangerous burdens to an already over-taxed people. Let us end unnecessary Government boondoggling, snooping, overlapping, and duplication. We must never forget that free enterprise with its free men and women gave us the American farmer, the American industrialist, the American worker and the mighty American industries that are now arming and feeding the United Nations. This Government was created to serve a free people; to establish common defense; promote education; uphold tolerance; stamp out abuses of power; combat poverty; and to maintain equality of opportunity for all. The greatness of the United States always has been and should remain in the strength of its citizenship.

While we are now thinking and acting in terms of war, we cannot help but indulge in a prayerful hope that during our stewardship in office a happy peace will crown our efforts. And peace will bring a multitude of problems in its wake, equally as important as those confronting us today.

First to receive our attention and consideration will be the soldier returning to his home. Under no circumstances must we permit the millions of soldiers to become another lost generation, perplexed and unable to find themselves. Wherever possible, a soldier must be returned to the job that he left, if he desires to have it. New and greater opportunities for employment will have to be provided. We must now lay down a long-range program that will include highway planning, flood control, reforestation, purification of streams, and other needed public works for the reemployment of men and women, and private industry. In addition, many thousands of young men who had left the schoolroom will want to take up their education where they left off, and the Government should do all in its power to make this possible. We propose that a grateful Government shall dedicate itself to the task of rebuilding the lives of our soldiers and give them help and encouragement. We shall also have the problem of the maimed and the wounded, and those who have been widowed and orphaned by the war. While the primary responsibility for these rests upon the Federal Government, Pennsylvania will do its share to heal their wounds and bring cheer and comfort into the bereaved homes. We must, in our own hearts, destroy intolerance. Protestants and Catholics, Jews and gentiles, colored and white, first-generation American and Mayflower descendants—we are all Americans. There can be no divided allegiance. He who is not with us is against us. There is no middle way. There is no place for the merchant of hate in America. "Fox holes" in desert and jungle and rafts adrift in open seas make for deep religious convictions. Sacrifice and sweat on the home front should soften men's hearts. Peace and religion are essential to American life. They are our assurances for the future.

Peace with liberty was the hope, the ambition, and the prayer of those who founded this Republic. Its achievement is still the great issue and the object for which the present conflict is being waged. The conditions under which it can be achieved are no different today than they were in the bitter winter of Valley Forge. These conditions were set forth simply and truthfully by the Apostle Paul when he said, "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

With the help of almighty God, we pledge our resources, our hearts, our minds, the work of our hands, to achieve a quick and victorious end to this life-and-death struggle to maintain our freedom. Humbly asking divine guidance, I assume the responsibilities of this high office.

Mountain Air for the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. WORTH CLARK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Richard L. Neuberger, which appeared in Collier's Magazine for December 19, 1942, under the title "Mountain Air for the Navy."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOUNTAIN AIR FOR THE NAVY

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

(That old joke about the Swiss navy may not be so funny after all. Uncle Sam has a naval training station far from seashore or sea level, in the mountain fastnesses of Idaho. The water they use is as fresh as the whole idea.)

When the news first came through from the far-off National Capital folks in Idaho's mountain fastnesses refused to believe it. The Associated Press and United Press received queries from Idaho newspapers asking if a teletype operator had mistakenly tapped out the word "Navy" instead of "Army" in the dispatch. Don Moore, editor of Sandpoint's Northern Idaho News, scratched his head perplexedly. The State had been attempting for a long time to get an Army cantonment, but what was this about a naval base? Jim Ryan, tall supervisor of the Kaniksu National Forest, rushed a call to regional headquarters to find out who had confused Sandpoint, Idaho, with Sandpoint, Wash., a Seattle suburb 485 miles westward over on the seacoast.

D. WORTH CLARK and JOHN THOMAS, the Senators from Idaho, had just exultantly announced that the United States Navy was going to build a $31,000,000 training station on Lake Pend Oreille (pronounced Ponderay), where the Cabinet and Selkirk and Bitterroot ranges converge in a sprawling jumble of granite peaks and pine forests. People in Kootenai and Bonner counties were a little breath-taken. Not only did the cost of the station exceed the combined assessed valuation of both counties, but in their wildest fantasies they had not dreamed of a great naval undertaking in these outlying ramparts of the Rocky Mountains.

Yet there it stands today—Farragut Naval Training Station, Farragut, Idaho, on the wilderness shores of the largest lake in the Pacific Northwest. Before Christmas 30,000 apprentice seamen will be quartered at Farragut at one time. And in a single year, despite the alpine setting, which makes it unique among the naval training stations of the world, it will turn out nearly 150,000 sailors ready to man America's ships of war.

Because they never visioned their lofty lake, 37 miles long and from 6 to 15 miles wide, as the site of a vast school for gobs, the men and women of northern Idaho may have lacked imagination, but the President and someone in the Navy Department certainly did not. Few maritime projects ever have been constructed so far from either sea level or seashore. Indeed, the location of Farragut demonstrates that there could be such an institution as the Swiss Navy, after all.

SAILORS IN THE HILLS

At either end of the lake, which is shaped like a big, shimmering question mark, dark-green forests slope gently down to the blue water. Along the east shore the cliffs of the Cabinet Range stand up from Pend Oreille as stiff as fortress walls. Off in the distance, wherever crags do not intervene, the Selkirks and Bitterroots are faint, challenging battlements on the horizon. A boat can hug the bank for miles and see no sign of habitation except Forest Service look-out towers on Pack Saddle, North Snow, Bernard, and other peaks high above. It is a wilderness scene, the sort of place where one would expect to meet mountaineers and ski troops rather than the apprentice crews of destroyers, aircraft carriers, and submarines.

After he had glimpsed his first Navy officers, natty in their khaki summer uniforms with blue epaulets, grizzled Gene Best from nearby Coeur d'Alene shifted his weight on his pinto pony and observed, "Well, maybe a real battleship'll come steaming up the Clark Fork through Z Canyon. Wouldn't that be a sight to jar your eyeteeth?"

As a matter of fact, Lake Pend Oreille is both deep enough and large enough to float any dreadnaught ever commissioned. Soundings have plumbed to 2,800 feet, and its 180 square miles of surface make it one of the biggest bodies of fresh water entirely within the boundaries of the United States. The "boots," which is Navy parlance for appren-

tice seamen, who learn seamanship on its glacier-fed bays and inlets, swing their oars in whaleboats that hold 50 sailors each. These are the main craft of Uncle Sam's alpine flotilla. There also are launches and patrol boats and tugs, all brought into the mountains on railroad flatcars, for the streams that drain Lake Pend Oreille into the Columbia River 105 miles away drop over lava ledges and surge through rocky chasms and thus are unnavigable. So the only battleships are the detailed small-scale models used by Navy instructors in the classrooms.

Thirty thousand men are too many to train efficiently in 1 group. Farragut is divided into 6 separate units or camps. Each camp can accommodate 5,000 boots and is practically a separate unit. It has at least 20 barracks and its own mess hall, administration building, parade grounds, recreation building and, believe it or not, swimming pool. The pool is necessary because America's seamen must learn their crawl and backstroke before they brave the chilly depths of Lake Pend Oreille. In addition, there is a general administrative area where headquarters, service buildings, and warehouses are located.

Like the amoeba, the divisions of the Navy's alpine training station are subdivided, too. Men in each unit will be at 3 stages of their apprentice careers. Approximately 1,250 will be in the preliminary 3-week detention period when they are inoculated, acclimated, and generally introduced to naval routine and custom; another 2,500 will be undergoing the basic course of 6 weeks which prepares men to go to sea; and the remaining 1,250 will be trying for higher ratings as electricians, radio operators, machinists, and yeomen.

CAMPS IN THE WILDERNESS

The Navy is using the Idaho wilderness to keep apart the station's six units. Each unit occupies a separate clearing in the thick pine and hemlock forests. From the lookout towers on the summits half a mile above, the clearings look like huge brown football stadiums scooped out of the green mantle that covers the Northwest. This is a pioneering frontier task, the only one of its sort ever undertaken in the American wilderness by our Navy, which usually hugs the seacoasts or the Great Lakes with its bases and shore establishments.

Telephone lines have been strung through the upland fastnesses. With orders to work in rain, snow, or shine, Idaho road crews constructed a four-lane highway along the roadbed of an abandoned logging railway, and a spur is being built from the main line of the Northern Pacific at Athol. Fast freights which never slowed down at Athol now stop to sidetrack scores of cars.

Farragut is being constructed principally from lumber hauled out of the surrounding solitudes. This calls for carpenters, and in Idaho's tall timber where men build their own ranches, churches, and stores, virtually everyone knows how to handle studs and joists. Foresters, loggers, trappers, Indians, and hunters joined the crews. This backwoods assortment worked so fast that a ponderosa pine one day was a roof or rafters by the following sunset.

The foundation for a mess hall was dug on a Thursday morning. On the next Tuesday the smell of the construction workers' beef stew mingled with the pungent odor of pitch and new boards. There will be more than 100 separate barracks at Farragut. Flat-roofed with broad porches, even in their frame forms they look like hunting lodges or national park inns. The Navy is maintaining this esthetic touch by leaving a few evergreens standing in each clearing. These shade the barracks. When they are completely finished the barracks, which will house 150,000 future American seamen annually, will be, in both architecture and setting, genuine wilderness hotels. "I can tell you," said Gene Best proudly, "they're the slickest buildings ever put up hereabouts."

Exactly why the Navy selected this forest and mountain frontier for its big training station is military information. Of course, it is far from the potential bombing raids that Secretary of War Stimson forecast for the Pacific coast and which already have rocked Alaska's Aleutian Islands. But other reasons are equally obvious. Boys from anywhere in the land will find Farragut a recreational paradise. Lake Pend Oreille is chock-full of Kootenai rainbows, cutthroats, steelheads, and landlocked blueback salmon. Some of the steelheads, migrating from the Columbia River, weigh 30 pounds.

The woods and uplands are full of elk, deer, and all kinds of game birds. Sharpshooters can test their marksmanship on pheasants, mallards, and blue grouse. Winter's snows turn the slopes into ski runs. In the summer the lake is dotted with boats, although civilian craft have to stay away from the Navy's end of the lake, which is at the base of the big question mark.

Kootenai and Bonner Counties will never be the same again. Their combined population is 37,950, their combined valuation $22,344,465. The population of Farragut's ample acres, which sprawl almost on the line between the counties, will be 30,000 apprentice seamen and another 10,000 people in instructors, doctors, nurses, cooks, stenographers, warehousemen, and extra Navy personnel. The $46,000,000 cost of the project is resulting in the region's biggest boom, and soon the robust appetites of thousands of young Americans will tax the capacity of the dairies, cattle ranches, vegetable gardens, and orchards in the adjacent Idaho-Montana-Washington area. Nearby farmers are turning to growing corn, potatoes, and peas. The rivers are being gaged for additional irrigation possibilities.

"This is the biggest thing that ever happened in this part of the United States of America," said Jim Rayan, the forest supervisor, "but I've still got to pinch myself to make sure I'm not seeing things when I run into Navy uniforms way up in these mountains." After recovering from the first surprise of having an immense naval station thrust into their peak-barricaded solitudes, the people of Kootenai and Bonner Counties are agreed that the changes being wrought are unanimously for the better. They are particularly certain of this when they contemplate the job that Farragut's stalwart inhabitants will shortly be learning to do.

Nature of the Post-War World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by a very able and well-informed citizen, Frank Altschul, of New York, to the New York Times.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is a healthy sign that Mr. Willkie and so many others are beginning to speculate about the nature of the post-war world. No one would question the wisdom of continuing to act on the assumption that we still face a long, hard struggle. Yet we are aware that when the Germans realize the certainty of defeat, strange and unpredictable consequences may ensue, and we feel we must be prepared to act intelligently and at once in the face of even the most unforeseen development.

It is clear that military victory will not, in and of itself, guarantee the survival of those liberating forces for which we fight. We are coming to realize that our institutions are only likely to survive if in an integrated international order our economic system is able to provide steady employment and a progressively rising standard of living. Twenty years of blundering down the road of economic nationalism has taught us that in this direction we find no answer. We are now exploring the possibilities of a great adventure in cooperation with other nations of similar purpose. We seem for the moment willing to assume new responsibilities.

MOOD MAY NOT LAST

Yet, few familiar with the ebb and flow of American public opinion would be prepared to predict how long this prevailing mood is likely to endure. For once the pressure of armed conflict is removed the forces of domestic reaction will be unleashed; and the wisest statesmanship will be required if we are not to follow the isolationists toward some native brand of thinly disguised fascism.

It is the tragedy of liberal leadership that it so often furnishes reaction with its most effective weapons. Losing touch with reality, it becomes the victim of its own utopian dreams, and makes promises which the hard facts of life will never permit it to keep. Yet, because these promises respond to a universal longing, they gain wide currency and command general confidence. Thus the way is prepared for profound disillusionment, and when masses of men and women are deeply disillusioned reaction is waiting to take over the direction of affairs.

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

This was our experience after the last war. The hopes and aspirations formulated by an inspired President were doomed to the most limited realization long before the delegates to the peace conference met at Versailles. And out of the disappointment of liberal thought the forces of reaction made immediate political capital. As a dream in which so many had believed gradually disintegrated, the mood of America changed, and we withdrew in confusion from commitments we had been almost ready to make. The comradeship forged under the impact of war gave way, with the return of peace, to recrimination, misunderstanding, bitterness. And in an atmosphere of broken promises we set our course for that new disaster which was to overtake us little more than two decades after we had won a war to end all wars.

It is time to invoke the deadly parallel. Once again we are embarked upon a life and death struggle under determined leadership sure to conduct us to military success. Once again we are engaged in formulating an expression of national purpose so unrealistic, so unattainable that it threatens to deprive us of the fruits of victory. And once again we are exposing ourselves to the disastrous consequences of a new disillusionment. Conceived in high idealism, the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms are today the two most striking formulations of national purpose. If one suggests that both require early clarification, it is because in this manner much may still be saved that might else be lost. It is time to build a bridge between the desirable and the possible. Otherwise the possible itself may elude us.

CHARTER HELD AMBIGUOUS

The Atlantic Charter remains ambiguous. It has recently become evident that it means one thing to Mr. Churchill and something

very different to Mr. Willkie. It is unlikely to mean to the German people what it means to us. It has been adhered to by the United Nations. Does Russia on this account consider herself committed to a restoration of the independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania? Does Poland feel it has abandoned all right to raise the question of East Prussia? Does Czechoslovakia agree that the strategic barrier of the Sudetenland is permanently lost? To these and countless other questions the charter itself provides no clear-cut answer.

Yet it is even more urgent that we consider realistically the "four freedoms." There is something so appealing, so captivating, so grandiose about this concept that it has spread like wildfire even to regions where no one of the "four freedoms" had ever been heard of before. Hopes are being kindled which in many quarters are sure to prove vain. The basis is being laid for an appalling disillusionment world-wide in scope. This we shall avoid only if we reexamine our messianic dreams in the light of the humanly possible.

For as we look out upon a war-scarred world it hardly appears realistic to say that the "four freedoms" "represent a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our time and generation." This would seem an optimistic appraisal, even if we faced a task no more difficult than that of solving at last within the framework of our free institutions in a world at peace the unsolved economic problems which have plagued us during the last quarter century. But it is visionary in the extreme in the midst of the devastation and impoverishment of total war. Under such circumstances the very most we can reasonably hope to accomplish is to establish a world climate in which the "four freedoms" may have the opportunity gradually to take root and flourish.

TRANQUIL PERIOD NEEDED

This in itself would be a very considerable accomplishment. After victory it demands, above all, a prolonged period of world tranquillity. Our first task will be to lay the foundations of a durable peace. We attempted this once before—and we failed. We were defeated, in some measure, by a general and irresistible tendency to take an intensely national view of the world we live in. Global war is awakening us to the need of taking a broad cultural view.

We have learned that an attack on the west is only incidentally directed against individual nations. It is, in essence, an attack upon that liberal western European culture of which we form an integral part. We see more clearly now than we did before that we are inevitably threatened whenever western Europe is attacked. Twice in a generation we have reluctantly gone to its defense. On both occasions we moved slowly to the brink of a war which no one wanted because we knew instinctively that the security of our institutions, even of our frontiers, demanded armed intervention.

Within this western European culture there are many nations, many languages, many diverse and conflicting interests. But characteristic of it has been a constant striving for human liberty and a profound belief in the dignity of man. We are the joint heirs of that greatest of human traditions—the Greco-Roman civilization, long since revitalized by the life-giving touch of Christianity.

No preoccupation with the recent progress of alien cultures should be permitted to obscure this fact. We dare not again jeopardize our proud heritage. We can no longer afford the luxury of acute division within one great cultural family during intermittent periods of relative tranquillity. Whenever we lose sight of those imperious forces which unite us we inevitably invite attack. Unless we now stop this fratricidal folly, after some new onrush of the Caesars our western culture may well lie in ruins.

ANOTHER CHANCE

It seems we are to be afforded one more chance to put our house in order. We owe this good fortune in no small measure to the valiant efforts of our Russian and Chinese allies. We hope in time to pay this debt by fostering in every way their rapid development. To be able to do this effectively it is essential that we make our own culture secure. For all prospects of a better world anywhere depend on the survival of those liberating forces which have been cradled in the west. To this end it is imperative that the rift in the western world be healed.

The only therapy lies in the closest, the most sympathetic understanding between Great Britain and ourselves. Events have placed upon our shoulders a grave joint responsibility. With most of the continent of Europe under the Nazi yoke, Great Britain and America have become for the moment co-trustees for the forces of western civilization. The British Commonwealth and friends in Latin America have accepted a share in this responsibility. We assume our allotted role in no spirit of pretentious Anglo-American superiority, but rather in the thought that insofar as we keep the torch of western culture alight we serve the interest of all mankind.

TRUSTEESHIP SEEN

Conducting ourselves in the manner of trustees, we must think in terms calculated to safeguard the western world, whose destiny we hold in trust. If this high purpose guides us, we shall lay firm foundations for a new unity in the west, and we may then expect to be joined in a common enterprise by Scandinavia, the Low Countries, and France, and later by other nations of like intent.

We shall save the hard core of our western culture only on the basis of Anglo-American understanding and leadership. It is just on this account that 24 hours a day the Axis, over the shortwave and otherwise, sows seeds of distrust between the British and ourselves. At the moment the old bugaboo of British imperialism is being used to fan the flames of suspicion. In our own interest, we must resist the impact of this attack. On this account it is important that we consider calmly certain aspects of the Empire.

India is a problem sui generis. In the House of Commons on October 8, Mr. Amery, Secretary of State for India, said: "Indian nationalism, the desire to see India's destiny directed by Indian hands, free from all external control, is not confined to any one party. It is shared by all. To that aim, we in this country have solemnly pledged ourselves before India and before the world. In the name of His Majesty's Government, I repeat this pledge today."

CHURCHILL MISCONSTRUED

This pledge is in no way superseded by a recent speech of the Prime Minister, misconstrued in some quarters as throwing doubt on the integrity of British intentions. The question of India, of infinite complexity, can hardly be answered today in the midst of a war-torn world. However, as loyal Allies, we must rely on the assurance given in all good faith that it will be answered tomorrow. And thereafter this ancient culture should become a welcome partner in the great cooperative enterprise of building a new world.

And what of the rest of the Empire? According to Lord Hailey, it consists of approximately 50 units ranging in size from Nigeria, with a population of over 20,000,000, to small islands with fewer than 3,000 inhabitants. Scattered all over the globe, these dependencies present an infinite variety of problems in colonial administration.

From the time of the explorers Great Britain has made its fair contribution to the long history of colonial exploitation. But there is abundant evidence that their administration today is in the main enlightened and benevolent. From our point of view, however, the essential consideration is not that Great Britain dominates an empire of 60,000,000 souls at varying levels of culture or whether it administers this trust entirely in accordance with our own conceptions.

The important fact is that, through its imperial outposts, it has control of far-flung strategic points looking out upon the communications of the civilized world. Even if we never knew it before, we should know now that it is a matter of life and death for us that these outposts be held in friendly hands.

The reason for this lies grounded in the geography of western civilization. Its component parts are washed by the waters of the seven seas. No one of them can stand alone. They must have a strategy suited to their geographical distribution. This strategy rests upon the freedom of ocean-borne communications.

WESTERN UNITY SOUGHT

And so, when Mr. Churchill says, "I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire," he makes a categorical statement of policy which we should applaud as affirming an interest as much American as it is British.

For it must be abundantly clear that the disintegration of the Empire would shake the foundations of the western world. In the process all hope for the extension of human liberties would for generations be lost.

And so it is for no selfish interest that, in time of war, under Anglo-American leadership we seek so earnestly for unity in the west. We can see nothing but chaos following a victory achieved under other circumstances. We recognize that the awakening of China is preparing that old country for an important role in the new world. We have no doubt that Russia, with its dynamic population of 185,000,000 people, is destined to exert an ever-increasing influence on the course of history. And we have equal confidence that our western civilization has still to make its greatest contribution to the welfare of mankind. To do this we must resolve those inner conflicts which have so long troubled us, seeking, in a faith recaptured, to preserve but not to impose our many-sided culture.

The United Nations are at present joined in the immediate task of attaining total victory. Thereafter, they will be similarly joined in the search for the conditions of a just and durable peace.

To succeed in this, communist Russia, republican China, and the democratic west must have the courage to face their inherent differences in a spirit of sympathetic understanding. They must have the willingness in a great common purpose to reconcile their conflicting aims. Only thus can they hope to establish a world climate in which the Four Freedoms may have the opportunity to take root and flourish.

Should they fail in this, the last vestige of freedom may yet perish from the earth.

FRANK ALTSCHUL.

NEW YORK, *December 15, 1942.*

America at War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2d

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address

delivered by my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] to the Legislature of Alabama on Tuesday, January 19, 1943.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed, following the address, a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Alabama, inviting Senator HILL to address it.

There being no objection, the address and the joint resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. LISTER HILL

AMERICA AT WAR

It is a rare privilege and a great honor for one not a member to address the Legislature of the State of Alabama. I thank you for this opportunity to speak to the chosen leaders of Alabama.

Our country is fighting for its existence. We are fighting upon all the battle fronts of the world, and all the world is our battle front. The loss of this war would mean the end of the United States.

If Hitler and his gangsters, Tojo and his Japanese, civilized in training and technique but savages still, could vanquish us they would destroy us completely. There would be no more assemblies of freemen, meeting to make the laws of a free people. The chosen leaders would die before firing squads and on the scaffold. The free people we love would become slaves, crushed by despotism so terrible that only the anguished people of suffering Europe can fully grasp its horrors. We would have no schools, no colleges and universities, no businesses to occupy our thoughts, and no homes in which to find comfort and happiness. Our sons would be torn from us, our wives and daughters would live miserably and suffer unspeakable degradation, and in the end our vanishing descendants would lead an existence of stark horror in the wreck of a civilization which our forefathers had built through long centuries of toil and tribulation.

We owe to Almighty God our heartfelt thanks that the fate I describe has not already come upon us. We owe to a little handful of English aviators, to the vast multitudes of patriotic Russians, and to the unconquerable Chinese our gratitude for the time they have given us in which to gird ourselves for war.

Last summer I traveled over a large part of Alabama. Everywhere I went I urged the people to have faith, to be of good courage, not to be dismayed. I urged them to have faith in themselves, in our armed forces, in our Government and its leaders, and faith in our everlasting and omnipotent God.

I saw then the mighty forces of the American people gathering themselves together for a victorious war. As a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, I knew then something of the vast plans and mighty preparations being made to save our country. I knew that Congress had passed every single measure necessary for the winning of the war in the shortest possible time, with the least possible cost in human life. I knew then that our President planned to keep the battle lines far from our shores. I believed then that it was possible for the women and little children of America to live and escape the thunder of bombs and the shriek of shells, to escape the death and the mutilation which have rained from the skies upon women and children in so many cities and so many lands.

That belief is stronger today than ever before. The faith which I cherished and urged upon our people has been more than justified. We have finished with the beginning and have begun upon the end of this dreadful conflict. I do not mean to say that our troubles are over and that we shall ride smoothly through the days to come. I tell you that the way will be hard and costly. But I do say that the things we have done constitute strong guaranties of the greater things we shall do.

Those who were impatient with the leaders of our people, who did not know, and could not be told what we in America were doing, criticized us for what appeared to be the feebleness of our efforts. They complained about production, that we had not opened a second front, that we were not giving sufficient aid to our allies. Not knowing the situation and the plans, they complained that our State Department recognized Vichy. Today you and I know that, thanks to that State Department and Cordell Hull, we got to deal with Darlan instead of death for our doughboys.

Do you not remember how they complained because our Navy Department did not give all the facts about Pearl Harbor? Today you and I know that our losses at Pearl Harbor were so staggering the Japanese themselves did not grasp the full extent of the damage they had done to our naval forces. If they had known the full effect of their treachery, is it not probable that battles would now be ravaging the Hawaiian Islands and that the Japs might even have landed in force on our Pacific coast? Today the losses at Pearl Harbor have been overcome. We know all the facts now and the danger in would have been to our country to have released them earlier. Can any reasonable person ask, "Which is more important, a topic of conversation or a plan of salvation?"

Those who complained about production have received their answer. Management and labor, working hand in hand together, have wrought miracles in our staggering lines of production as planes, tanks, and guns wait at the seaboard for the ships to carry them to the battle fronts.

We were proud of our achievements in World War No. 1. We had one front then. That front was in friendly territory. Then our allies supplied us with planes—somehow we never got into production of battle planes in time for them to be of much help to us. Then our allies supplied us with artillery and guns and ammunition. In this war not one of our allies is able to supply us. We are helping to supply every one of them, as well as supplying ourselves.

Today our battle lines touch every continent—they encompass the world. Today American planes are rushing down the assembly lines in numbers that exceed the total production of Germany, Italy, and Japan. The roar of our engines sounds over every land and our planes flash across every sky. There is no hostile city that can escape them. Our Flying Fortresses—forbidding dreadnaughts of the air—deliver their cargoes of destruction, destroy the finest fighting planes of the enemy, and return to their own airdromes. They are changing the course of the war. The score to date stands 4 to 1 in our favor in planes shot down. We alone built our planes and we alone welded the crews that man them into the finest fighting teams ever to course the skies. In the first months of this war our efforts have been five times as great as our efforts of the last war.

Last October alone we delivered to the British armies in East Africa supplies and equipment to the value of $915,000,000, and this at the very time when our own African expedition was imminent and we were engaged in speedily and adequately equipping it.

These American supplies, as Mr. Churchill so gratefully acknowledged, made possible the smashing defeat of Rommel and his army at the hands of Alexander and Montgomery—and we did not forget Russia. One convoy through the icy waters to Murmansk, running the gantlet of Nazi submarines and land-based bombers, was so vast that it required 77 warships to guard it against German attack, and today the Russians have turned the once desperate and seemingly hopeless defense of Stalingrad into a mighty offensive.

The club-room Caesars and the curbstone Napoleons who complained about the second front have also received their answer. The Canadians made a Commando raid on Dieppe in northern France and lost 3,500 men out of 5,000.

We struck in Africa. We landed an army so large that 850 ships were required to transport our men and their equipment and to provide the necessary protection for them. It was one of the most brilliant and daring expeditions, and incomparably the largest and greatest of its kind in all the history of warfare. We lost out of the tens of thousands in the entire operation, 1,910 men.

After the event, Hitler and his jackal were able to learn of it. Before the event, representatives of our State Department had prepared the way. A vast area came into our hands. Great bodies of soldiers, who might so easily have become our enemies, became our allies. Dakar, fortified against our invasion, is now fortified in our cause—and no American soldier lost his life in this transformation. Our planning and our leadership saved thousands of American lives in the African campaign, and at least 6 months of precious time. Yet gallons of ink had been used to say that we lacked unity of command and a global plan.

There were those who complained that our Navy had lost the war in the Pacific, and they have also received their answer. Our Navy received a blow at Pearl Harbor, planned in such long-nurtured treachery and executed with such deadly precision that it might have spelled a long eclipse of our sea power, but for the fighting heart of the American Navy.

With the heart of a champion, our Navy protected itself until its strength returned. Then the fight was carried to the enemy. Under Rear Admiral Halsey, we stung the enemy a little in the Gilbert and Marshall Islands. At the Coral Sea we punished and stopped the enemy. At Midway we dazed them and turned them back with our sea battle from the air. And in the battle of the Solomons we had the Japanese ships shooting one another, sent 28 of their ships to the bottom of the sea and the rest reeling to their hidden bases, while 40,000 Japanese soldiers went to their death beneath the dark waters.

In that battle, Halsey and his gallant officers and men of the American Navy drove their ships at point-blank range between the lines of enemy ships with a skill and a daring not equaled since the incomparable Nelson saved the British Isles at Trafalgar. In that battle, Halsey did not follow the book. He wrote new pages in the book of naval warfare. We shall not follow the book. We shall make plans and work deeds that will make books.

From North Africa we shall cross the blue waters of the Mediterranean and drive the enemy back until we meet and destroy Nazi tyranny on its own soil. We shall then, with our allies, retake Burma, rescue China, and march on to Japan, teaching the Japanese a lesson that a thousand years will not erase from their memory.

NEW DEAL AND LOCAL PROBLEMS

We must put first things first, and now the foremost thing in our lives is the winning of the war. Nothing that interferes with our waging of the war has any place in our lives. All else becomes secondary. This is no time to assume needless burdens. We must give all our strength and all that we possess in carrying on the war. This is no time for any individuals or groups to advance their selfish aims. It is no time to engage in controversies that distract our attention from the great task that confronts us.

I do not mean that we should turn our backs on the New Deal. We could not if we would. We could not close the schoolhouses

built by the New Deal, or discard the great public works established by it, or vacate and abandon the homes saved or built by it for our people, or tear up its roads and highways, or pull down its rural electric lines, or deny the benefits of its social security. We fight today to preserve the freedom to possess and enjoy these very things.

Who would blast the mighty dams on the Tennessee River which provide the power for the operation of the plants from which come most of the aluminum for the building of our airplanes? Who would deny that the development of the Tennessee Valley by the New Deal has made of it a veritable arsenal of democracy?

Who would dare touch the guaranty of bank deposits, or destroy the banks and the insurance companies which the New Deal saved during the dark days of the depression? Who would tamper with the structure of the New Deal which not only saved the Nation from economic chaos and financial ruin but which gives us the strength and the power today with which to wage victorious warfare?

Surely we do not fight the war to return to the bread lines and soup kitchens, to the chaos and the despair of the dark Hoover era.

The present Democratic administration is the only administration in our history that has energetically and effectively aided the American farmer and sought to give him equal treatment in the Nation's economy. It built for him the foundations of a temple of equality and of justice, the cornerstone of which is the Agricultural Adjustment Act, while the Soil Conservation Act, the Farm Security Administration Act, and the Farm Credit Administration Act constitute the other three corners.

In the differences that have arisen among friends of the farmer as to the final shaping and completion of the temple, Alabama and her leaders have stood steadfastly in the position which found wholehearted support from the recognized leaders of the farmer. But not all the storms of controversy, not all the dark waters of petty, selfish interest can wash away one stone from the foundations of the splendid edifice—the new home of equality and of justice for the American farmer.

Let me remind those here in Alabama, small in number but loud of voice and powerful in propaganda, that not even the Republicans, the ancient foe, have advocated the repeal of a single one of the major New Deal measures. Their claim is simply this: "Let us manage all these children of the New Deal. We realize they are your children. You brought them into the world, but we should raise them. We can rear your children better than you can." In support of this claim these would-be stepfathers offer no evidence of previous successes with beneficent measures.

For 75 years powerful and selfish interests in the East, through the machinery of the Republican Party and its control of the Government, forged upon the South the shackles of economic exploitation, deprived us of the advantages of our great natural resources, and time and again robbed us of our inheritance. The New Deal proclaimed the injustice of these shackles and proceeded to break many of them.

Last year, with the removal of the shackles and with war plants and Army camps and fields located within Alabama's borders, from the Tennessee line to the Gulf, Alabama's people enjoyed the largest increase in income of the people of any of the other 47 States.

The South has its own peculiar, local problems. These problems lie in the very depths of the social structure of our civilization. Outside of the South, these problems are dragged into politics, as candidates and factions and parties struggle for votes. We of the South do not need outsiders to tell us what our problems are or how to solve them. We know these problems because we have lived with them. We propose to solve these problems ourselves, without outside interference.

You gentlemen of the legislature will meet the responsibilities of these problems and their solutions with fairness and justice, mindful always of the need for the due respect of the opinions of mankind and of our sister States of the Nation.

In our determination to solve our own problems, let us not permit those who would again forge the shackles of economic exploitation upon us to use this determination, and its white heat, to lead our footsteps away from the paths of wisdom, or to enrage or confuse us to our own undoing. Those who have grown rich and powerful through exploiting us are tireless in their selfish ends, and their proconsuls and agents never cease to bore from within our borders.

As we give of our all to the winning of the war, we may look back with pride upon the New Deal and its mighty achievements. Its reforms are now anchored in the very bedrock of our institutions. The New Deal not only saved the Nation in the beginning and made it possible for the Nation to save itself today, but it opened the doors that common men throughout the land might enter into their inheritance.

TOTAL MOBILIZATION AND UNIVERSAL SERVICE

To win this total war in the shortest possible time, there must be total mobilization of all the resources of the Nation, human and material. I have introduced legislation to this purpose, with universal service for all the people, with each person serving in that place, be it on the farm, in industry or in the armed forces, where that particular person can make the greatest contribution to the winning of the war.

As Alabamians, living in a State that is still predominantly agricultural, we can take pride in the magnificent contribution made by the farmers of Alabama to the production last year of the largest crop in the history of our country, while thousands of their sons were fighting heroically on the battle lines.

Under the legislation which I have introduced, the farmers could secure the labor for their farms now so needed and so necessary if they are to produce the required food and fiber for the winning of the war.

Under this legislation there would be equal burdens and equal sacrifices for all, and war profits and war benefits for none.

We must now make the plans and take the steps necessary to insure that when our boys return home from service in the armed forces they will have jobs and the opportunity of earning a decent living for themselves and their loved ones, and that those who labor in the workshops of war, producing munitions and supplies, shall have work and a fair standard of living for themselves and their families. A way must be found to admit the farmer to the benefits of social security, and the democracy for which we fight must be made effective throughout the land by providing, through Federal aid, equality of educational opportunity for all the children of all the people

PEACE

During the last war we had a slogan, "Peace without victory." I give you for this war the slogan, "Peace with victory," for there must be no end to the conflict until the Prussian spirit of conquest, with its arrogance and its unspeakable brutality, has been crushed to earth, never to rise again, and no cessation until the war dreams of Tojo and his savages have been utterly destroyed and turned to bitter ashes.

And when we have won the war we must win the peace. We cannot step away from the conference table and leave to others the formulation of a peace that will hatch another war for our children. We must play our part in the formulation and maintenance of a world organization built upon the "four freedoms" for all people, an organization that will be strong enough to enforce order, and righteous enough to administer justice among the nations.

If we do not look out for ourselves in battle we shall perish. If we do not look out for our interests and for our personal welfare as a people at the peace table we shall also perish, albeit a bit more slowly.

Other nations will send to the peace conference men of great strength and vast skill, veritable masters of statecraft and diplomacy. I can see them now as they sit around the table.

Stalin, the man of steel, ruler over millions, who saved his country because he was strong and ruthless. And I do not see his strength falling from him. He worked for Russia, fought for Russia, and sent millions to their death for Russia. His own heart will be for Russia until it is stilled in death, or I do not understand the meaning of patriotism.

I see Churchill, brilliant and seasoned leader of the nation which has ruled the world for hundreds of years. And I do not see him consigning his people to any inferior station in the world after the war.

I see Chiang Kai-shek, that great leader of a great nation of 400,000,000 people, a worker of miracles for China in her hour of agony. And I do not see him looking away from China and forgetting the heart of China, as he pulls his chair closer to the table.

I see men, practical men, men toughened by years of suffering and conflict, men who dreamed dreams and made those dreams come true, men who will not through misbegotten frenzy throw away the victory they have helped to win.

The man we send to that table of giants must equal them in stature. No puny figure in a high chair can make his treble voice heard when those powerful voices are speaking.

Once more, our Nation will disclaim any desire for territory or for indemnity. But we shall want something for ourselves at the conference table. We want a peace. We must have a peace. We shall have a peace, so ordered and established that never again can a maniac plunge the whole world into a war; that never again can any group or race of men, driven by hate and lust for power, execute their tortures and treacheries upon those they hate.

We must have a peace that will assure our mothers, and those of all the world, that their sons shall not again struggle and perish in the welter and blood of far-away battlefields.

We must have a peace so maintained in order that our children and generations to come be not compelled to cower in darkness but may walk upright in a world of freedom and of light.

SACRIFICE AND VICTORY

We have reached that stage in our economy where we have used up our fat. From now on we must more and more husband our supplies and tighten our economy. This means that as the war goes on there must be more and more rationing, and more and more control.

In times such as we face, when there must be more and more denial and more and more sacrifice on the part of the individual citizen, when businesses suffer as casualties of the war, when the hearts of more and more parents beat the count of anxious moments as their sons serve in battle in far-away places, there will be more and more unhappiness in the homes of the people, and the faith of the people will be sorely tried.

This is the supreme hour for leadership, when you, gentlemen, as the chosen leaders, must set the example and make clear the way—the way of patience, of understanding, of sacrifice, and of unfaltering faith.

Everywhere people ask, "When will the war end?" The answer to this question, and to the question as to how many of our boys will

have to give their lives, lies more in the hands of the people here at home than most of us realize.

Our boys have shown their fighting qualities, their courage, their valor. They have shown that they can take it. They have shown that they can outfight the enemy. Their need is more planes, more guns, more supplies of all kinds. And the answer to their need, the answer to how long they will have to fight and how many of them will have to die will be found in how much we are willing to work and work, and how much each of us is willing to sacrifice and sacrifice to send them the planes and the guns and the supplies.

Is there an American who has not wept within the quiet chamber of his heart, who has not choked in pride at the heroism of that little band who fought to the last on the peninsula of Bataan?

They were American boys, some not long from the schoolyards, some with sweethearts back home, some with young brides they left behind, and each and every one of them followed by a mother's prayer.

They had all to live for, those boys who died as men on Bataan. But they stood and fought and fell on the little peninsula in that far-away sea, a few at a time, then two by two, and one by one, until they could no longer hold back the flood of fire that rained from the skies and shot from the ships on the seas.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, when the tragic news came that Bataan was at last fallen, penned 12 lines on a single sheet of wrapping paper. Here is what he wrote:

"The Bataan force went out as it would have wished, fighting to the end with its flickering, forlorn hope. No army has ever done so much with so little, and nothing became it more than its last hour of trial and agony. To the weeping mothers of its dead I can only say that the sacrifice and halo of Jesus of Nazareth has descended upon their sons and that God has taken them unto Himself."

Just 12 lines on a single sheet of inexpensive wrapping paper.

But a glorious epitaph from a warrior chief for one of the most heroic bands of soldiers ever to lay down their lives for the country and the people they loved.

Shall we allow another band of American boys to fight to the end with hope forlorn? Is there a man among us in this Chamber who would let Bataan be repeated, so long as there is any sacrifice he can make to prevent it? Is there a heart that beats in all Alabama, in all of our United States, that would not gladly make any material sacrifice to save any band of American boys such a last hour of trial and agony?

Sacrifice?

If need be, we will shiver through the cold of winter, trudge barefoot and blistering up the rugged way, swelter in the midday sun and toil day into night and night into day. We may not sleep, we may not eat, but we will never stop, not until we triumph in victory and victory brings us the peace for which we fight, a just and enduring peace, which even now lies beyond the horizon.

JOINT RESOLUTION INVITING HON. LISTER HILL, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM ALABAMA, TO ADDRESS THE LEGISLATURE OF ALABAMA

Whereas the winning of the war is uppermost in the minds of our people; and

Whereas we are all intensely interested in its progress; and

Whereas the State of Alabama has the honor to have one of her distinguished sons, the Honorable LISTER HILL, on the Senate Military Affairs Committee; and

Whereas he has served his native State long and well and has achieved during the course of such service the signal honor of being named the Democratic whip in the Senate; and

Whereas the Legislature of Alabama desires to give expression to its appreciation of the labors which he has performed in behalf of his State; and

Whereas Mr. HILL is held in high esteem and regard among the citizens of this State as a thinker and an orator; and

Whereas it is the sense of this body that the Legislature of Alabama should seize this opportunity to hear a great Democrat who occupies a position of such high trust in Washington: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), as follows:

First. That an invitation be extended to Hon. LISTER HILL, United States Senator, to address on Tuesday, January 19, 1943, if convenient to him, a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Alabama.

Second. That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of the house to Mr. HILL.

Hitler and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech recently made before the Kiwanis Club in Bristol, Tenn., by former Gov. John I. Cox. Governor Cox served as thirty-second Governor of the State of Tennessee, filling the unexpired term of Gov. James B. Frazier, who was elected United States Senator in 1905. There is no finer patriot and citizen than Governor Cox. He has passed the age for military service, but is putting his income into War bonds.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have asked me to speak to you on World War No. 2, and I have subdivided the question into Hitler, hell, and hate. When Hitler, with the greatest, best-organized, mechanized army of all times, overran the Low Countries, military strategists appraised him the war genius of all times. But from the beginning I have said he was an intuitive fool. The next day after he invaded Russia I said it was the prelude to his Waterloo. Last night the radio announced that the Arctic Circle has moved down to join the Russian winter, to hasten Hitler on to his Waterloo. And with the Arctic Circle came the polar bear, and now intuitive Hitler has two bears by the tail, neither of which he can let go. To further complicate conditions, the intuitive Hitler got to Moscow and to Stalingrad too soon, to Toulon too late. Divided Hitler is freezing on one side and burning on the other, though the latitude of Bristol passes through Toulon. Bristol's elevation is 2,000 feet; Toulon, sea level. The bitterest enemies of Darlan must admit he was a better prophet than Laval. Cordell Hull, when asked about Darlan, said yesterday: "Political questions must be settled after the war."

General Eisenhower has often said that Darlan has greatly helped the Allied cause, and I say today that more fight and less talk will save the lives of many American boys.

AXIS DUMFOUNDED BY INVASION OF AFRICA

To Hitler's everlasting undoing, President Roosevelt, the greatest apostle of peace in nearly 2,000 years, and Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, the greatest diplomat in the world for peace and plenty, have put on a coup de main, the most brilliant and successful in the history of military strategy, that dumfounded the Axis hordes. It inspired a brilliant cartoonist to sketch old Hitler as a turkey gobbler, running like Rommel, losing his tail feathers, gobbling all the while and garbling gobble into glorious Goebbels—German propaganda. Yet the doomed Germans already madly rushed to Toulon to seize the great French fleet. Methinks the spirit of the immortal Lafayette hovered over that fleet while the brave officers and seamen scuttled their ships and went to the bottom of the sea that their beloved France might be free again and restored to its proud place in the galaxy of nations.

I said in the beginning that revolution, famine, and disease would follow in the wake of Hitler to his destruction. Free France has revolted and is fighting side by side with the Allies. The Finns are proposing to make peace with Russia. The Mussolini kids running with Rommel are flagging their few remaining unstained white shirttails as a token of peace to Montgomery. The desert fox, Rommel, is running to Alamein to change from a desert fox to a swamp rat. When the Russians, the best fighters in the world except our American boys, get through with chasing the Germans into traps and exterminating them there will not be left enough German soldiers to shoot innocent people and keep down revolution in the conquered countries.

Kaltenborn said last night: "Italy is tottering"; Earl Godwin characterized Mussolini's attempt to answer Churchill: "It was the boastful performance of a fan-tailed pigeon."

Mussolini, the vulture, never got a chance to swoop down from the crags of the Alps into the laps of the lowland to feast upon the dead bodies of brave soldiers.

HITLER NEAR SUICIDE OR ASSASSINATION

Hitler is nearing suicide or assassination and when he is gone and our boys put cold steel to his deluded followers they will squeal like stuck pigs and stop like steers in the middle of the road.

If the Allies knew how much fight there is left in me I would be a welcome recruit on any front. But perhaps I am fighting where I can do the most good—fighting in the field to produce food for our boys on the battle line who cannot fight on empty stomachs.

Above all it is essential to buy bonds and furnish money to sustain the soldiers at the front. Six months since I wired the Secretary of the Treasury: "Sell offense bonds and I will sacrifice to buy more bonds." He wrote and thanked me for the suggestion and assured me that a new name was being considered. It came as Victory bonds, now War bonds, and I am putting every dollar I get out of tobacco, cattle, and corn, sacrificing real estate, selling it at half its value to buy more Victory Offense bonds to put nails into Hitler's coffin. No, it is not sacrifice—for if we do not buy bonds and more bonds until it hurts, Hitler will win, confiscate our wealth, and make us galley slaves.

HOMES PLANNED FOR HOMELESS SOLDIERS

Hitler scoffs at our plutocracy while at the end of his rainbow is American gold at Fort Knox, Ky. If Hitler wins, our lands and homes would go to German bastards. I said in the beginning if 95 percent of our boys owned homes we would have no saboteur, no fifth column, no Pearl Harbor.

Judge Caldwell and I are planning for homes after the war for the homeless who at the front are fighting for our homes and especially for the widows and orphans of the homeless who bore the battle and returned not but sleep in foreign fields. Our means are limited, and we must ask help from patriotic friends. We may not be able to make it more than homes for the widows and the orphans of those who return not. On this we will be heard from again. It is close to our hearts. Don't consider me a plagiarist, for Solomon said 1,500 years before Shakespeare, "There is nothing new under the sun."

When I cry out, "Fight the devil with fire—hit while the iron is hot—hit Hitler as he runs"—don't tell me Hitler has pledged the beer garden to not flee Germany like the Kaiser, for I tell you he is stark naked with no place to go. Don't tell me Rommel can outrun Montgomery. For answer I say, Montgomery will chase Rommel into the swamps and change his name from desert fox to wharf rat. Insult me not with the boasting of Hitler's twin buddy, old Mussolini, sick abed with heart failure, while his kids are running and doing their damnedest to keep up with the Germans.

Don't tell me of the fatalist Japs, for my grandson, John I., who from the South Pacific has predicted the war will end next summer, has just written me to tell all the mothers and sisters of his comrades from Virginia and Tennessee that they are now at Guadalcanal, well and happy, with Pearl Harbor green in their memories, and raring to go and get the treacherous Japs while getting is good, destroy them on land and on sea, that they may disturb a Christian world no more forever.

Post-War Planning for the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the January issue of the Western Construction News contains a thought-provoking article on post-war planning for the West. It was written by Rex Nicholson, regional director of the Federal Works Agency for 11 Western States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. Service in this capacity and in other important Government posts has given Mr. Nicholson a keen insight into the future needs of the West.

I concur in his thought that the foundation of sound planning for the western region should be built around conservation and development of our natural resources. I ask that the article be included in the Appendix of the RECORD in order that my colleagues from the Western States and others may have the benefit of the views expressed by this able administrator.

I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate of the cost of printing this article. The estimated cost is $120.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After the war, which is it to be—a good job at good wages on important work or relief? Our men in the fighting forces are asking that question. It is up to us to find the answer.

Much has been said recently about post-war planning. There are many different opinions as to what should be done. There are those who believe the post-war problem should be forgotten until the war has been won. They feel that every ounce of energy available will be needed for the job at hand and that when the war is over the demand for consumer goods and materials for the rehabilitation of the war-devastated regions will tax our productive power to the limit and utilize our surplus manpower for several years to come. Another school of thought recommends the immediate initiation of a large-scale program of Nation-wide planning, not only as a solution for the post-war problem but also as the only way of obtaining a stabilized economy in a changing world. James J. Hill, the great railroad builder, once said the only way to succeed in the field of construction and development is to first plan the work and then work the plan. Anyone who has ever been responsible for large scale operations on any front knows how absolutely right he was. The past several years have taught us many lessons that will not soon be forgotten. One of the most important of these is that a stable economy does not just happen any more. I believe the second school of thought is the right one.

Other nations of the world which have been torn to pieces by the war will have to be rebuilt and a large portion of the raw materials for their rehabilitation will have to come from the Americas.

There will also be a considerable upturn in production for consumer markets here at home because of the inability to buy in wartime those goods and services which have come to be regarded as essential to normal, everyday life. Our automobile will either be worn out or will have become obsolete; we will need a new radio, a new range, and a new refrigerator. Furniture will need to be replaced, and the rugs will be badly frayed. A thousand other replacements will be made by those who have the purchasing power.

But let us take a look at the picture from an over-all standpoint. The adjustment to be made this time in changing from a wartime to a peacetime economy will transcend anything we have ever experienced in the past. It is estimated that our armed forces will require from seven to nine million men, and at least 25,000,000 workers will be exclusively engaged in actual war production at the height of the war effort. Six months after the actual fighting ceases 75 to 80 percent of the war plants will close. Some of them will immediately start to retool for peacetime production. But this will require from 6 to 12 months during which time they will be entirely inactive from a production standpoint. It is hoped that at least 50 percent of the armed forces can return home during the first year after the war has ended. It is this period of transition about which we need to be vitally concerned. There will be definite need for a large cushion of public works to provide jobs and sustain the purchasing power of the people until the peacetime industrial upswing can get under way, for it has been estimated that the jobs of from twelve to twenty million workers will vanish at the end of the war.

The great depression of the 1930's caught us wholly unprepared to efficiently utilize the millions of workers thrown out of jobs during that period. It was too late then to sit down and properly plan a program of public work. Time was the vital factor. The workers had to be employed immediately so they could eat; consequently, projects had to be initiated for operation at once without proper preparation and without being tied in with any over-all plan.

It was impossible to furnish employment quickly on the type of project that would be self-liquidating or provide a permanent return on the investment. The preparation of this type of project requires a tremendous amount of time for the development of plans and specifications and we did not have the time.

The question we need to ask ourselves now is, Can we afford to have a repetition of that experience? The answer is very clear. We simply cannot. What we need in the West are more and better opportunities to earn a living. If it becomes necessary to spend money to alleviate unemployment, why not make it a sound investment that will create additional opportunities for men to earn a livelihood in their own communities and accrue a return on the investment at the same time? If we plan now for the efficient utilization of these potentially tremendous surpluses of labor when the time comes a large majority of them can be employed on sound, well-planned projects at prevailing wages that will increase the income of this Nation by creating from $1 to $2 worth of profit-earning assets for each dollar expended.

Let us examine the requirements of a well-balanced plan for this western region of the United States. What are the essentials of any program that would tend to stabilize our community life and make it possible for the average citizen to enjoy a reasonable amount of prosperity, in either the rural or urban community, after the war? First, no urban community in the West can be prosperous without a prosperous rural community to support it; nor can there be any rural prosperity without those essentials that go to make up the source from which the rural livelihood is derived. In general, our rural population in the West derives its income in peacetime from three broad fields of activity. They are:

1. Agriculture and stock raising.
2. Coal mining and the mining and smelting of our vast ore bodies.
3. The lumber industry throughout our Rocky Mountain and west coast regions; the aircraft and shipbuilding industries on the west coast, fishing and other allied activities, and those industries that have been attracted to the West by the availability of raw materials and cheap power.

In an area as large as the 11 Western States the scope of activity in each of these fields takes on great variation and provides wide opportunity for diversification.

Those crops which are grown successfully in various parts of the Western States include citrus fruits, berries, soft fruits, and nuts in the Pacific Coast States, together with all varieties of vegetables and some small grains and cotton; in the Rocky Mountain States large quantities of sugar beets, vegetables, hay, grain, and fruit are grown wherever there is water for irrigation, while in the Pacific Northwest States there is one of the greatest apple- and wheat-producing belts in the United States. Stock raising, dairy farming, and poultry products provide large sources of income throughout the agricultural and farming areas of all of these States. The mining industry in this region produces gold, silver, copper, lead, manganese, magnesium, tungsten, molybdenum, cobalt, antimony, tin, chrome, arsenic, mercury, zinc, uranium, vanadium, zirconium, aluminum, titanium, beryllium, and tantalum. Some of the largest coal fields in the United States are found in the West, plus large deposits of potash and asbestos. There are large national forests in each of the 11 Western States, which contribute more than two-thirds of all the lumber produced in the United States each year. During the past 10 years some of the largest hydroelectric power projects in the world have been constructed in these States, providing an abundance of cheap power within their transmission radii.

Yet with all these developments we have only just begun to open up the potential possibilities of the West. The great rehabili-

tation program made necessary by the war will utilize all of the raw materials which can be produced. In order to insure continuous sources of supply we must develop more mines, timber, water for irrigation, soil protection, and hydroelectric power. These are the basic requirements for sustained production.

Through surveys that have been made by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation it has been determined that there are many more practical sites on our rivers and streams where hydroelectric power can be developed at reasonable costs. Almost without exception, the same water that produces power can be used for irrigation. Cheap power and increased agricultural activity will attract more industries to the West and more industries mean more jobs and more income and more opportunities for small business. Instead of producing raw materials and shipping them East for processing and fabrication as has been done in the past, manufacturers can be interested in establishing large plants near these raw materials and cheap power so that our communities will have the advantage of the resultant pay rolls. The final cost of the finished products can be reduced materially and still allow the manufacturer to earn a reasonable profit through the elimination of the transcontinental transportation costs we have experienced in the past.

The very foundation of sound post-war planning for this western region should be built around the conservation, development, and preservation of all of our natural resources. Every effort should be made to stabilize income and to preserve and perpetuate the sources from which it is derived.

Generally speaking, responsibility for the financing of a program of conservation and development of natural resources will have to be assumed by the Federal Government. A comprehensive plan for this purpose should be laid out for each of our main rivers and their watersheds. In most cases, these rivers cross several State lines, making their development a joint responsibility of groups of States and the Federal Government.

Almost without exception, conservation projects can be set up on a sound, self-liquidating basis, so that the expenditure will become a good investment instead of a capital outlay without hope of return.

It is an accepted fact that the foundation of all wealth is the soil, directly or indirectly. It has been demonstrated that the productivity of the soil can be increased immensely and prolonged almost indefinitely through carefully planned programs of soil treatment. The best authorities on soil conservation state that in order to properly conserve and protect the soil in this western region a balanced plan must include land terracing, noxious-weed eradication, water conservation, and flood control. Millions and millions of tons of the most fertile soil in our States are washed down our rivers and streams to the sea each year because of our failure to provide adequate control of the rainfall and melting snows.

By controlling the quick run-off of surplus water during wet seasons three essential objectives can be accomplished.

First, the conservation of every drop of available water possible for the irrigation of arid lands. Water is the pearl of great price in the West; our land will grow almost anything if we put sufficient water on it. Every effort should be made to develop more water for this purpose; few of our present irrigation districts have a sufficient supply to insure good crops during dry years. There are many ways in which the supply can be increased, and immediate attention should be given this problem.

Second, one of the most destructive forces of nature, namely, floods, can be prevented. It is conservatively estimated that many lives, as well as some $700,000,000 in property, are lost each year in the United States because of the absence of flood-control protection for our rivers and streams.

Third, our timber resources can be conserved. The supervisors of our great forests tell us that one of the first essentials to a sound program of reforestation and preservation of our forests is to prevent the quick run-off of the rainfall and snow water. If proper safeguards are provided and surface water run-offs are slowed down, the entire program of water conservation, soil conservation, reforestation, and flood control can be assisted materially. This can be accomplished by broad programs of land terracing and the construction of literally thousands of small check dams and reservoirs in the mountains, forests, and in the lowlands. This will provide a means of slowing up and impounding the excess water and releasing it slowly, so the capacities of the rivers and streams in the lowlands will not be overtaxed; then the water can be used to the maximum for power development, irrigation, and stock water.

Another very definite advantage of proper water conservation is that it can be made to provide small tracts of irrigated lands for thousands of farmers who are trying to make a living on dry lands. When there is abundant rainfall, these dry-land farmers raise good crops, because the soil is very fertile. But generally the rainfall is light, resulting in poor crops or in no crops at all. How much better it would be if this dry land that has been plowed up could be seeded to grass and again used for grazing livestock. These dry-land farmers could then be transferred to small tracts of irrigated land where they would be sure of regular crops and a fair chance at a livelihood. It is still profitable to raise cattle and sheep on this dry land and will be for a long time to come if proper provision is made.

In the beginning this Nation had 900,000,000 acres of excellent forests. These have been depleted until there are only about 200,000,000 acres left. Even large portions of the forests which remain have been logged off or burned over and more extensive plans should be made for their reforestation. Millions of young trees should be set out each year. The forest rangers are badly in need of additional fire trails and roads to facilitate fire fighting. Comprehensive programs of pest eradication and blister rust control also are essential to protect the growing timber.

There are large areas where snags should be felled and debris cleared away to make way for the growth of new timber. The records indicate that we are consuming two and one-half billion board feet of lumber each year in excess of the new growth. It does not take an economist to tell you what will happen to that source of raw materials in a few years if we do not begin now to do something about it.

In providing this type of treatment for our forest lands a speedy reforestation of those areas would be brought about. This must be accomplished in order to protect our future timber supply.

At the same time, and with the same effort, a great contribution will be made to ward the control of floodwaters. Splendid programs of bank revetment and channel stabilization have been carried on by the Corps of Engineers on some of America's larger rivers. Projects of this kind should be planned for every stream of any size in the entire country. It is conservatively estimated that 3,000,000,000 tons of fertile topsoil are lost every year through erosion caused by wind and surface water. The actual figures on property damage caused by floods in the United States during the past 10 years are simply staggering. If a like amount of money could be spent on well-planned flood-control projects during the next 10 years the Nation would be comparatively free of similar losses for the next 50 years.

There is tremendous need for the extension of rural electrification. Comparatively few country homes are now supplied with electric power and yet it is one of the most valuable assets a farmer can have. Modern improvements in the generation of hydroelectric power have made small plants both practical and economically sound. There are hundreds of sites all over the country where both large and small amounts of hydroelectric power, considered to be unsound for development in the past, are now feasible for exploitation. Each such project can be made to serve the multiple programs of soil and water conservation, reforestation, and flood control.

The potential resources in mines and the metals industry are unknown, simply because to determine where available low-grade ore bodies really are, and their extent, adequate and thorough mineral surveys should be made of each State in the West. It is generally believed these low-grade ore bodies are tremendous, but in order to make proper plans for their development we need definite knowledge of where they are and how much there is in each place. With this information, proper determination can be made as to the practicability of development and whether or not they can be mined and marketed on a profitable basis. We already have knowledge of some large low-grade ore bodies that have not been developed because of the lack of low-cost transportation. These resources should be examined and plans made for the construction of mine-to-market roads wherever feasible; also some shallow water transportation from potential ore bodies to markets should be expanded.

Natural gas and petroleum production are distinctly localized, at present confined to the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, with the exception of a small area in southern California. This leaves a vast area on the western slope which contains potential possibilities of these natural resources which should be thoroughly surveyed for future developments. The present localized production presents a definite distribution problem; long water or rail hauls are necessary to provide these vital products to the rapidly growing northwestern empire, including western Canada and Alaska.

Recent experiences show that, during times of emergency, rail and water facilities are overtaxed in the transportation of materials which can be moved in no other manner. A comprehensive plan of oil and gas pipe lines should be developed at this time in preparation for future emergency needs.

All of this type of work is not only economically sound but it is absolutely essential if we expect to hold what we now have in rural income; it is doubly essential if we expect to increase it.

Employment can be provided on projects of the kinds I have suggested for every surplus worker residing in the 11 Western States after the war is over. Money spent for such projects will be a sound investment in permanent income that will double and triple as the years go on.

The entire transportation system will undergo a radical change during and after the war. Both automotive and rail transportation will be much faster than it is now. It will be necessary to redesign the major portion of our present highway system. A complete grid system, tied in to two or more transcontinental highways of from four to eight lanes each from the West to the East and four or more similar lines from the North to the South should be developed. This North-South system should connect with Canada and Alaska on the north and Old Mexico and Central America on the south. Our State highways and county roads should be tied in to these main arterials in a net of sufficient scope to meet the entire motor transportation needs of the country for the

next 30 years. The development of additional irrigated lands and new ore bodies will require many more farm-to-market and mine-to-market roads. Those of our present highways which are not redesigned will have to be resurfaced because of lack of attention during the war. The Public Roads Administration has developed some excellent plans along this line that should be blueprinted and made ready.

Next I invite attention to the housing problem. By the end of the war, at least 25 percent of the present housing in the United States will be 50 years of age or older. It is estimated there will be a definite need for 9,000,000 new rural and urban homes in addition to the apartment houses necessary to replace slums that must be removed from the larger urban centers. Slum clearance and its replacement with suitable apartment houses and the construction of individual homes offer an excellent opportunity for private investment on a long-time basis.

Along with the need for additional housing will come an equal need for more utilities and community facilities. Very few western cities and towns have ample sewage-disposal facilities. Lakes and streams are still being polluted by raw sewage. Modern sewage-disposal plants and sewer systems of sufficient capacity to meet the need for the next 20 to 30 years should be designed for each urban center. Municipal water systems should be redesigned and expanded. This, of course, will require additional water supplies and must be developed. Sidewalks, curbs, gutters, and street-paving programs should be planned. There will be need for additional schools, hospitals, health centers, clinics, playgrounds, parks, and recreation areas to meet the requirements of an expanding population. Present airport facilities will be found entirely inadequate after the war. Larger and better airports, hangars, and shops will be needed on our national and international airways to accommodate the mammoth air transports that are being developed for long-haul passenger and air-freight transportation. Improvements in light aircraft will make it desirable for each community to have its own airport. A network of small airports should be connected with modern flyways properly laid out and marked so that the average flier can find his way around.

Planning for all of these community facilities should be based on projected population expansion that will come as a direct result of the development of our natural resources and the increase of community income. Three vital factors are to be considered in the development of a plan of this scope. They are:

(1) The acquisition of land for sites and rights-of-way and the financing of the planning.

(2) Population trends.

(3) Coordination and direction of the planning.

Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, in an address before the American Municipal Association in Chicago on October 21, 1942, suggested that in his personal opinion immediate preparation for large scale post-war planning should be initiated by the enactment of legislation that would authorize the Federal Government to make loans or grants or both to States or their public bodies in aid of the preparation of their programs of public works. He suggested that this legislation should also authorize the Government to acquire by purchase or the exercise of the power of eminent domain any lands necessary for the accomplishment of the purposes of any project included in the comprehensive program of public works. It should also authorize the acquirement of additional property when it is found that its control by the United States or by a local public body will promote the purposes of the program, and to sell or lease any property acquired or project constructed to the appropriate local public body. The General's suggestion offers the best solution for this problem that has been brought forth to date.

Comprehensive studies of population trends should be made in each county based on (a) the county's population before the war effort began, (b) what it is now, (c) what it would be likely to be if the county's natural resources were developed to the maximum, (d) how many of those who have gone elsewhere to work in war plants could be expected to return to their own communities when the war is over if they knew there would be jobs at prevailing wages on some important public-work project waiting for them if they need them to help reestablish themselves.

The development of a truly national plan will require the active participation of all States and their political subdivisions; practically all branches of the Federal Government operating in the field, consulting engineers, architects, contractors, organized labor, private enterprisers, civic and trade organizations, and all public-spirited citizens who are interested in the progress and development of their own communities.

No program of the magnitude I have outlined can succeed without thoroughly experienced and competent leadership. The agency to act as the coordinating head should be selected and its responsibilities and authority established.

Each participating body should appoint one or more persons to represent it on a board which would undertake the development of the general plan. This board should have at its disposal the best technical advisers available in the various fields of operation. Second, the general plan should be laid out carefully and checked from every angle to make sure it is all-inclusive. Third, complete and thorough surveys should be made wherever it is found sufficient information and data are not available to assist each local planning body to determine the desirability and location of individual projects. Fourth, as soon as this information is available, the individual project should be decided upon, the actual location to be determined only after it had been thoroughly investigated from an engineering standpoint. Tests for footings and foundations and any and all other tests necessary should be made and raw materials, such as sand, gravel, stone, and timber, should be found as near the construction site as possible and tested for quantity and quality.

When this preliminary work has been completed, the design of the project should proceed. Designing should be done by the most experienced and best trained experts available, after which complete plans and specifications should be prepared and supported with detailed estimates of the man-hours of work required, by occupational classification, and the materials and equipment necessary to complete the job. These blueprints, with all supporting data and appurtenant information, should be approved and catalogued in their proper sequence of priority to the over-all plan. When the time comes to initiate construction, all that will be necessary will be to call in the contractor, price the job, and put him to work.

A considerable amount of planning is being done now by various agencies and groups, but much of it is the same kind of planning that has been done for the past 50 years. It has no particular relation to any comprehensive regional or Nation-wide program and yet most of these bodies have agreed for some time past that if the challenge of the future is to be met we must have a Nation-wide plan developed by regions and completely tied into the over-all for the Nation. The 11 Western States have many and varied problems that are peculiar to themselves, as do the other regions of the United States. But if the outline which has been suggested here is carried to its logical conclusion, it can be tied into the national plan and will help to solve a major portion of our own peculiar problems in the West.

America is a comparatively new country and very rich. She has tremendous natural resources, but we have made the same mistake that humanity has made from the beginning. We have taken the way of least resistance. Raw materials, power, and transportation that could be obtained and utilized with the least effort are being depleted. We have in sight no well-developed, clearly defined over-all plan for the protection, preservation, and perpetuation of the supply. Likewise, we have made no such plan for the development of those latent resources that we have every reason to believe are tremendous.

When the war is over, our war industries will have to close down and retool for peacetime production; during this readjustment period there will be millions of American workers who will need jobs until the Nation gets going on the mammoth job of rebuilding and rehabilitation that lies ahead.

When our boys come home from the fighting fronts they will need and want good jobs at good pay on important work—and God knows they are entitled to them.

If we make proper preparations now to utilize these potential surpluses of labor represented in war workers and men of the armed forces, to develop more wealth and insure a continuous supply of raw materials, we can take our proper place in the rehabilitation of the world and face the future with confidence. More important, we can prove to the whole world that a free people, working through channels of a free democracy, can meet the challenge of any forces that dare to oppose them.

There are those who believe it will be impossible for a free people, operating through the channels of free enterprise, to meet the challenge of post-war rehabilitation. But America has been built into the most powerful Nation on earth through the accomplishments of free enterprises. America does not need and America does not want any other system.

The enterpriser, the worker, and the Government have joined hands with an unbreakable grip in their determination to win this war. It will require the joint effort of this same trinity after the war is over to readjust and restabilize our own country and the other countries of the world. To postpone proper preparation for this task will be courting disaster; to start now will insure success.

The challenge is ours. We must meet it.

Nomination of Edward J. Flynn To Be Minister to Australia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address by Robert St. John, broadcast from Station WRC in Washington on January 14, 1943.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Monday of this week was just plain January 11 on the calendar, but politically—here

in Washington—it was like the Fourth of July, with plenty of fireworks. On Monday President Roosevelt nominated Edward Joseph Flynn, Democratic national chairman, to serve as Minister to Australia and roving envoy for the White House. The effect was like setting a match to a warehouse full of cannon crackers, pinwheels, and skyrockets. Tempers on Capitol Hill sizzled to the boiling point. Words flew in pyrotechnical displays of feeling. Wendell Willkie said the appointment would be revolting to all decent citizens. Senator TOM CONNALLY said he would summon Flynn before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee if such a hearing were requested. Senator STYLES BRIDGES branded the nomination "an insult to the people of Australia." The Melbourne Herald said Australia is prepared to accept, without question, the Roosevelt nomination, knowing that the President's judgment is of the highest worth and that he could not make an appointment from any but the best and most carefully considered motives. The paper said Australia will not be swayed by American political clamor. Before the sun went down on Capitol Hill, Flynn himself was on record as requesting a full and complete hearing of any objections to his appointment.

In a letter to Senator CONNALLY he wrote: "I have nothing to fear in my past life (either political or personal) and I am willing to open it to the closest scrutiny, if such a course should appear to be in the public interest." That was Monday, January 11, in Washington. The only day which could match it for political pinwheels was the day Roosevelt announced that nine men were not enough for the Supreme Court. Well, who is this fellow Flynn, who stands in the middle of the arena, surrounded by angry lancers? Why did he rate this boxing of the ears, this hot denunciation? Edward Joseph Flynn is the political ringmaster of the Bronx. And the Bronx is a borough of New York City which nearly a million and a half people call home. The population of the Bronx is greater than that of the three largest cities in the South put together—Houston, New Orleans, and Louisville. And that makes the Bronx the greatest Democratic stronghold on either side of the Mason-Dixon line. The Bronx, acres and acres of apartment buildings, in solid rows as far as the eye can see. The Bronx, home of the New York Yankees; home of the zoo; birthplace of a certain cheer which is anything but a cheer. This is "Flynn-land." And Ed Flynn is solid with its citizens. He has a reputation for delivering on his promises. The Bronx likes Eddie and Eddie adores the Bronx.

This 50-year-old Irishman with freckles as big as corn flakes, and thinning silver hair, was born, raised, and educated in the Bronx. He went to Fordham University, right there in the Bronx, and graduated from its law school. He is the youngest of five children born to a practical, bread-winning mother and a dignified, cultured father who once studied at Trinity College in Dublin. Eddie had a slew of friends when he opened his law offices and he drifted to politics like iron filings to a magnet. His baptism in the ballot industry is now one of the funniest legends of the Bronx. He ran against another Irishman, Eugene McGuire, for assemblyman. The whole assembly district boiled to a fever over the contest. Even families divided up, over the choice between Flynn and McGuire. Everyone was fanatic on the matter except Messrs. Flynn and McGuire. They used to meet every single evening for a little "nightcap" and a friendly discussion on how things were going for each other. Out in Long Island, Eddie's brother, John, was writing checks to put Eddie over, and Eddie was spending this campaign money on high jinks that had nothing to do with politics. One day brother John announced he was coming to the Bronx to look over the situation. Ed was panic-stricken. He rushed around to all the neighbors and explained the crisis. They agreed to help. When brother John arrived at the Democratic clubhouse, he was greeted by a cheering mob of ardent Flynn supporters. From then on the checks came more often, and Eddie was elected over McGuire.

That was 1918. Three years later Flynn was elected sheriff. One of his deputies was a man named Dutch Schultz. Then a respectable citizen, but later to become Crown Prince of the Beer Racket. Flynn learned the elementary rules of politics from Tammany Chief Murphy, and he practiced them with refinements as he forged his career in the scrawling Bronx. New York State, you know, delivers the largest batch of electoral votes in the country. The Bronx delivers the biggest Democratic vote in the State. And Eddie Flynn always delivered those Bronx votes on a beautiful silver platter. He was a man to conjure with in Presidential years. Flynn and Roosevelt first met in 1923. Roosevelt had returned to work in New York City, after his long illness. Flynn thought it "political etiquette" to call on this man who had run for Vice President—even though he had been defeated. When Roosevelt went to Albany as Governor he named Flynn as his Secretary of State. The Bronx chief then had an opportunity to apply the old Jeffersonian theory of government—the theory that that government is best which governs least. Flynn was reported to have spent an average of 1 day a week in Albany, and when he put in an appearance at his department's New York office, the staff didn't know him. He had to identify himself. When Roosevelt went to the White House, Flynn became regional director of Public Works Administration and he directed the spending of nearly $200,000,000. Then, as United States Commissioner to the world's fair, Flynn was official host to the King and Queen of England on their lightning visit to the big show and the big city.

Life has held few dull moments for Edward J. Flynn. In 1940 he really stepped into a hornet's nest. After that year's Democratic National Convention the party was shy a national chairman. Roosevelt offered the job to Flynn several times. Each time Flynn shook his head. Then one Sunday afternoon in August, the President telephoned from Hyde Park * * * asked Flynn to come up and talk it over. As Eddie went out the door, his wife said: "Remember, you are not going to take that job." "Right!" said Flynn. And he swore that not even Franklin Delano Roosevelt could make him change his mind. When he got back home, his wife opened the door. She took one look at him and said: "You don't have to tell me what happened. I know by that silly grin on your face." The charm of the master had worked its inevitable way. Eddie Flynn was the new national chairman. Apart from his political activities, Edward Joseph Flynn is a man of wealth. His law firm of Goldwater and Flynn (which accepts no government business) has prospered for years—and is in no danger of contracting malnutrition now. Flynn has made money in real estate, and there have been good salaries connected with some of his official jobs. Eddie is in love with clothes. He wears neckties which shout, but his exhibitionist tendencies end with his raiment. He does not resemble the cartoonist's picture of a political boss. He rarely goes to night clubs, voters' picnics, or Labor Day boat rides. As a matter of fact, it's difficult to get into his office. In the midst of a gay scene he is likely to be the pessimist. As a result of his years of horse-trading, he's a skeptic. Often he begins a compliment about somebody with saying: "If Joe Doe told me the truth—which I doubt, * * *."

Then he'll laugh and finish the compliment. Flynn makes it a rule not to let political differences of opinion stand between him and his friends. He prefers men with convictions, no matter what the convictions are. He is well educated and widely read, and therefore decidedly not the Hollywood type of political boss. His New York home is a terrace apartment on the ninth floor of a building in the Bronx, overlooking the Hudson River. Eddie keeps his home life entirely separate from his job. He likes nothing better than to play gin rummy and Russian bank with his attractive wife, who has borne him three children. At his farm in Carmel, N. Y., Eddie plays gentleman farmer and loves it. He relaxes from care at a ranch in Nevada. In all these meetings Eddie chews gum with vigor and smokes a chain of cigarettes. There is no tangible evidence that Flynn ever took money for political favors. His viewpoint on politics is quite realistic. He sees it as a game of uncompleted contracts—or in other words, the power of the boss is measured by the number of favors he has done for which he has not collected in kind—so me for meenie; minie for moe. Flynn weathered both the Seabury and the Dewey investigations in New York, and they didn't cast a shadow on him. He was roughed up a bit but not scarred. Today, Flynn is doing his own talking about the famous paving-block episode. I am not going to sit in judgment on the case. But here are the facts, in brief: A New York City employee, since dismissed by the mayor, accused Flynn of using city-owned Belgian paving blocks to cover the driveway of his summer home. A Bronx grand jury conducted an investigation. That jury cleared Flynn of the charge. Flynn himself says two grand juries and a supreme court judge have vindicated him of any misuse of city property. But the Republican opposition to Flynn as prospective Minister to Australia is going to make stumbling blocks out of those paving blocks, if it can be done. The Democratic Senate leader, BARKLEY, of Kentucky, said this week that he is confident that Flynn's nomination will be confirmed after a lot of what he called political noise. But there are those who don't agree. As for Flynn himself, he may be chewing his gum a little faster and smoking a few more cigarettes than usual, but he's talking without stammering. Meanwhile, the world (and especially the people of Australia) are watching the show on Capitol Hill with considerable interest—watching to see if his opponents will be able to shake the "King of the Bronx" off his throne.

Civil Service Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made over the radio on the program Your Government and Mine, in celebration of the anniversary of the establishment of the Civil Service in the Federal service:

Mr. BERGER. The sixtieth anniversary of the National Civil Service Act, which brought the merit system into the Government service, finds the United States at war, and the number of Government employees greater than at any time previously in the entire history of our country.

The Government employee is doing the work behind the lines that made possible the great achievements described by President Roosevelt in his message on the state of the Union a little more than a week ago. There are, as he had pointed out earlier, about two and a half million of them.

Altogether too many people in this country seem to have the quite erroneous idea that these two and a half million Government workers are clustered in offices in Washington, most of them in soft jobs. The President tried to make it clear that a million and a half of them are working at riveting in Government navy yards, at gun making in Government arsenals, and in the many thousands of other jobs that are being done in Government factories to equip our fighting men. He tried to make it clear that your mail man and mine, your post office clerk, your rural free delivery carrier, are not sitting at desks in Washington—and that there are 300,000 Government employees engaged in handling the mails.

There are, to be sure, a good many clerical jobs in the Government service. No one could seriously contend that it is possible to run as vast a business as that of the United States without clerical employees. There are plenty of other jobs that have to be done. For example, there are thousands of nurses and attendants in Government hospitals; thousands of guards, maintenance men, and watchmen in public buildings; there are employees whose job it is to collect the internal revenues, to inspect meat, to operate the Alaska Railroad and the Panama Canal, and to enforce the laws made by Congress for the protection of the people of the United States.

It isn't necessary to go further. The facts are that the employees of the United States Government are doing jobs the Congress or the President have decided to be necessary. It isn't the province of the employees to say what should be done, they do the jobs to which they have been assigned.

We have in the studio today a group of experts on the civil service—President Harry B. Mitchell and Mrs. Lucille Foster McMillin, of the Civil Service Commission; Representative Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, ranking member of the House Civil Service Committee; and James B. Burns, national president of the American Federation of Government Employees—so that we may obtain a pretty fair cross section of opinion representing the Government service itself, the public, and the employees.

First, let's get a picture as it is seen from Capitol Hill by a Member who has given long and efficient service to the cause of better government as an influential and public-spirited friend of civil-service reform and of Government employees on the House Civil Service Committee. Representative Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, is well qualified to speak on Government employment as it looks to Congress. I take pleasure in presenting Mr. Randolph.

Mr. Randolph. Mr. Berger made the point that Government employees are all doing work that has been assigned to them, either by act of Congress or by Executive order of the President. They are doing work that the Executive or the National Legislature thought essential to the welfare of the people.

Now, it is true, of course, that an agency may be set up to do a certain job that seems highly important at the time; but the need for the functions it exercises may diminish for one reason or another. There is, then, always the possibility of vestigial survivals in the governmental establishment—the continuance of some function that was necessary when Congress or the President decided upon it, but which is essential no longer.

Chairman Ramspeck of the House Civil Service Committee intends to make a thorough investigation of the Government service this year to determine whether or not we have too many Government employees. Anyone who knows Chairman Ramspeck's sincere devotion to the cause of good government and to the merit system has advance assurance that this inquiry will be conducted capably and fairly and that the interests of the American people and of Federal workers will be protected in the fullest possible degree.

It is quite possible that in the rush of creating a civilian establishment to carry on the manifold activities essential to the prosecution of a global war, some mistakes may have been made. It is quite possible that some agencies may be overstaffed. But we know, too, that others are understaffed. We know that employees in some Government offices right here in Washington have been working a great amount of overtime without compensation until the recent adoption of Senate Joint Resolution No. 170, which permits payment of overtime compensation under certain conditions.

It is reasonable to expect that enactment of this resolution will have the effect of keeping overtime within the bounds of the official hours set for Government agencies, and thereby it will serve to eliminate inequities and discriminations.

I think we can agree that in this time of national crisis every Government employee should do the best work of which he or she is capable. I think they are eager and willing to work hard and to do their best. If some agencies have more employees than they need, on the basis of a 48-hour week, which has now been extended throughout the service, they can shift the surplus to other agencies that need more people.

Whether or not there are too many Government employees we shall not know definitely until the forthcoming investigation has had the opportunity to bring out the facts. But the mere presence of this inquiry will have the effect of getting administrative officers at work tightening, making sure that the employees under their supervision are utilized to the best advantage.

There has been extraordinarily high turnover in the Government service in the last year or so, and that has meant inefficiency in the agencies—because they have constantly had to train new people for jobs—and a great burden on the Civil Service Commission, which has had to recruit the replacements for those who have quit. Recently the Commission has arranged for interviewing some of those who have left the service, and the results show that poor health and low pay have been the principal factors in turn-over, apart from the factors that cannot be prevented, such as death and retirement of employees and induction of a great many men into the military service.

The pay situation will be substantially corrected by the recently enacted legislation, and a great deal will have been accomplished if we can reduce the high turn-over rate and eliminate the need for hiring large numbers of new employees to replace those we have not been able to retain.

In any event, as Mr. Berger has pointed out, if there are too many employees, it is not the employees' fault. Congress or the President have, no doubt, set up some agencies not urgently needed now. Supervisors may have employed too much help. Or again, it may be that in some offices too many employees are occupied with internal administration instead of with the job the agency was set up to perform.

All Americans, Government employees included, are cooperating in winning this war at the earliest possible date. We are all interested in efficiency in the Government service, and in economy too; but I think we all agree that winning the war comes first, doing the job as efficiently as possible comes second, and that we want to do the job economically.

Thank you very much, Mr. Randolph, for an instructive presentation.

Mr. Berger. I think Mr. Mitchell can tell us some of the more important facts about the part Government employees play in the war. Mr. Mitchell, just what problems has the war placed before the civil service and how are these problems being met?

Mr. Mitchell. There is rather surprising lack of understanding on the part of the public, and even on the part of people who should know better, about what Federal civil employees do. On October 31 last, there were 2,687,000 persons in that branch of the Government. Of that number 1,826,000 were working directly in connection with the war. These were in the War and Navy Departments, and in other agencies that exist only because of the war, such as the Office of Emergency Management, War Production Board, Selective Service, and others

Mr. Berger. Have other Government agencies had to increase their personnel because of the war?

Mr. Mitchell. Yes, Mr. Berger; some of them have. The Veterans' Administration, for instance. To care for additional war activities, it has been found necessary to add about 4,000 more employees, and probably there will be further increase as the war goes on. There are more men at work at the Panama Canal, and 23,000 in the Tennessee Valley. The Treasury Department has 10,000 more employees to collect additional taxes and pay the money out and the Post Office Department has had to add 13,000 more people. It is quite a job to care for the greater volume of mail, and get it distributed to the four corners of the earth, where the men in the Army and Navy are.

Mr. Berger. What do all these men in the War and Navy Departments do?

Mr. Mitchell. It would take some time to answer that in detail. Briefly, however, of the 1,178,000 civilians employed by the War Department on October 31, only about 5 percent were employed on desk jobs in Washington. The others are located throughout the country wherever war construction work is going on. Of the 531,000 employed by the Navy Department, 483,000 were employed outside of Washington. The people in these two departments who were working in the field, as we class it, were employed in turning out implements of war, just as other workers who are employed in privately owned factories who have a war contract are doing.

Mr. Berger. These are not white collar jobs?

Mr. Mitchell. No, Mr. Berger. Of course, these are engineers and other experts and supervisors in these plants, but the vast majority of the field civil-service employees in the War and Navy Departments are laborers and skilled workers who are in the navy yards, arsenals, ordnance plants, proving grounds, air bases, and other necessary war establishments.

Mr. Berger. Has the Civil Service Commission increased its staff?

Mr. Mitchell. Yes. It is just about double what it was 2 years ago. However, the work the Commission has been doing has increased much more than that. For instance, during the 6 months ending January 1941 the Commission found about 200,000 persons for the War and Navy Departments; and during the last 6 months of 1942 we made slightly over a million placements in these Departments. That does not mean a million new jobs, as the turn-over in these days is very large.

Mr. Berger. That's quite an increase. How have you done it?

Mr. Mitchell. Well, we reorganized for the job and we have cut a good many corners. We feel that some of the short-cuts we have adopted in order to get men on the jobs as soon as possible may be continued in peacetime with good results.

Mr. Berger. Thank you, Mr. Mitchell, for a very informative statement.

Mr. BERGER. And now it is indeed a pleasure to introduce our friend and a friend of all Government employees, and a most gracious lady, Commissioner Lucille Foster McMillin. Commissioner McMillin, I know you could discuss many phases of the civil service in the war, but this afternoon I would particularly like to have you say something about the importance of women in war work.

Mrs. MCMILLIN. I am always glad, Mr. Berger, to bring to WWDC listeners a civil-service message. It is particularly a pleasure, this Civil Service Week, as we look back over a year in which thousands upon thousands of capable women of all ages have responded to the demands of their Government and given so willingly and eagerly of their time and effort and skill to meet the war emergency. From the Canadian border to the Gulf; in large cities and in tiny villages; in small industries and in gigantic war plants, American women have laid aside their dainty aprons, taken off their party frocks, and, in greasy overalls, or natty slacks, or leather jackets have stepped into the places left vacant by the men who are now fighting in the far corners of the earth. Women, young and old, throughout the length and breadth of our land, have gone to war.

Mr. BERGER. Won't you tell us more about them, Commissioner McMillin?

Mrs. MCMILLIN. Gladly, Mr. Berger; I cannot tell about all civil-service positions, but I especially want to mention the hundreds of women draftsmen who are fashioning the blueprints from which come bombers, tanks, destroyers, and the thousand-and-one implements of an all-out war. At many strategic points, women engineers help to plot the charts and graphs of production that will eventually bring freedom to enslaved peoples in many lands. And, too, I should mention the dim reaches of the laboratory where lights burn far into the night as women scientists fathom the intricacies of formulas that are to bring hope to a world that is now darkened.

Thousands of white-robed nurses, medical technicians, and laboratory aides soothe pain-racked bodies and bring comfort and health. Denim-clad young women cut long bolts of cloth and their skilled fingers fashion parachutes that bring safety to flyers over Guadalcanal and the African Desert.

Many a white-hot rivet goes into place in the fabrication of an airplane or tank guided by the same hands that once made a fourth at afternoon bridge. The fingers that used to fashion tempting titbits for tea parties now fashion the materials that will make possible parties for our boys in Berlin, Tokyo, and Rome.

There are few places, Mr. Berger, in all the great Government structure where the sure touch of a woman's hand and the keen insight of her patriotic mind have not reached.

Mr. BERGER. And now before you close, Commissioner McMillin, have you one word for the women of America who are working in these war positions?

Mrs. MCMILLIN. Of course you know, Mr. Berger, that a woman should never be restricted to just one word. Shall we make it a sentence? Wherever you are working, in the home, in a parachute plant, in a Government office, or on the farm, your Government is very proud of you, it will always be grateful to you for the invaluable help you are giving, and above all, your Government is depending on you to help win this war.

Mr. BERGER. Thank you, Commissioner McMillin. That was indeed an inspiring picture you have given us of the contribution women are making to the war through their work for Uncle Sam.

Now we have a spokesman for the Government employees themselves, the president of a great employee organization, who will tell us how the Government service looks to those on the inside who, as the cogs in the great war machine, make it tick. I take great pleasure in presenting President James B. Burns, of the American Federation of Government Employees.

Mr. BURNS. Government employees occupy a unique position among the working men and women of America. They are employed by the public; they are themselves a part of the public. They pay taxes. Thus to a certain extent they are their own employers and pay their own salaries. They have therefore an attitude toward their employment that is somewhat different from that of the average employee. They want fair wages and working conditions, to be sure, but that is only sound Americanism. We believe that American standards should be the highest in the world.

Perhaps the difference between the attitude of the typical Government employee and that of the employee in private industry is that he takes a more personal interest in his job. He is an American citizen as well as an employee of the Government. Perhaps this will illustrate what I have in mind.

A recently published book, "Public Plunder," by David Loth, tells a rather extraordinary story of those opportunists who have, since colonial days, used public office or public trust to enhance their personal fortunes. The author begins with 1617 and continues practically to the present day. He excoriates the activities of certain profiteers in the First World War, but draws a sharp contrast in his reference to the record of classified civil service employees of the Government. I quote:

"In the exultation of victory and disappointment over the peace, the most valuable administrative lesson of the war was largely missed. This was the plain fact that security of tenure under civil service, combined with responsibility exercised in the revealing glare of the national spotlight, worked powerfully for honesty. Eighteen thousand new millionaires were produced by the war, the income-tax figures showed, but none of them was among the permanent Federal servants.

"The contrast between the permanent jobholders and their temporary colleagues was plain and understandable. Civil service had developed a standard that was noticeably lacking in private business."

I think anyone familiar with the civil service will bear out that judgment. It has its deficiencies, but civil service personnel in general is noteworthy for the pride it takes in its work and for its integrity.

Mr. BERGER. Do you think, Mr. Burns, that the record you cite as made by Government employees in the First World War will be equaled in this one?

Mr. BURNS. I think it will be surpassed. I think the tremendous implications of this war are much more apparent to our people than was the case 25 years ago. The war then seemed remote; a wall of fire in France and the Low Countries held the enemy back, and, though submarines prowled about our coasts, planes in those days could not cross the Atlantic and the Pacific was quiet. Now we have powerful enemies facing us on the shore of Europe and in the mid-Pacific islands. Our people know that; they know that their energies will be taxed to the full. They are ready to meet the test and confident that our cause will win. Government employees are making a splendid contribution to victory.

Mr. BERGER. Do you want to give us a little more detail on that point, Mr. Burns?

Mr. BURNS. I think the eagerness of Government employees to serve their country was shown conclusively by the attitude they showed when they were called upon to work many hours of overtime without any added pay. Government officials have testified that not one complaint was made on the score of overtime work. It is true that Government workers have asked and obtained more pay within the last few weeks, but it was generally agreed that they needed it. They had for the most part had no pay adjustments in many years. Another proof of their interest in the national cause is shown by the fact that so many of them have asked to be assigned to jobs where they feel they are making a direct contribution to winning the war. Many have taken work at lower pay because they had skills which, while they may not have used them for many years, are needed by Uncle Sam today. Some have made real sacrifices of this nature. And of course thousands upon thousands of them have gone into the armed services.

Mr. BERGER. Thank you, Mr. Burns. Mr. RANDOLPH opened our discussion panel and I shall ask him to close it.

Representative RANDOLPH. As we prosecute this war to victory let us pay tribute to the bravery of our fighting men on all battle fronts and let us commend our workers on the home front, including our Government employees. They are loyal and efficient. Let us not forget that every extravagance in the operation of government here lessens by that degree the equipment and manpower with which we wage war against our resourceful and ruthless enemies.

Mr. BERGER. This completes a roundtable discussion, in connection with the observance of National Civil Service Week, of the help Government employees are giving to bring victory. We have had with us this afternoon Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, ranking member of the House Civil Service Committee, and President Harry B. Mitchell, and Mrs. Lucille F. McMillin, of the Civil Service Commission, and President James B. Burns, of the American Federation of Government Employees. This is Carl Berger speaking and reminding you to buy War bonds and stamps.

Campaign for the Sale of Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several articles from the Delaware Coast News and the Sussex News relative to the campaign for the sale of bonds in that section.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Delaware Coast News of October 23, 1942]

CITIZENS OF LEWES-REHOBOTH HUNDRED PROCLAIM MONDAY AS "BUY WAR BOND" DAY—COMMUNITY WANTS BOYS TO KNOW THEY WILL BACK THEM UP—PUBLIC URGED TO PURCHASE BONDS ON MONDAY

Citizens of Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred I want you to read the following and think well and think fast because there is going to be action in this small community on Monday, and I mean action.

You realize that we have boys and girls from this section of Sussex County that are in the United States military forces and are being sent to all parts of the world. You have heard that one of the two sons, in service, of Mr. and Mrs. John P. Graham has been shot and is recuperating, or, ladies and gentlemen, if you want to know the facts, he is hovering between life and death; you know that Frank Harold Stevens, Jr., is catching

hell on Guadalcanal in the Solomon Islands, and you know that Capt. Roy Simpler is in charge of a flying squadron on a battleship shooting down Japs in the Solomons. There are others and many others away from good old America fighting for their country and, ladies and gentlemen, for you and yours.

Yes; we are going to have a Buy a Bond Day in Lewes and Rehoboth on Monday, October 26, 1942, and you and I are going to buy a bond on that day. Why are we going to dedicate Monday for our bond drive? Is it a special date or a special day? No. Friends, we are going to show the rest of the United States of America that a small community, numbering not over 4,000 citizens, can give our moral support to our boys and girls in the service of our Government.

Does politics enter into this buy a bond drive to give moral support to our service personnel? Not by a damn shot.

The President of the United States is our man because we, the American people, respect the office irrespective of whether we regard the man as a great man, an average man, or an ordinary man. He is our President and as long as he is in office the people of Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred will stand back of him in all his efforts to end this war and give to our people a free and everlasting peace.

This little community is very well prepared to buy bonds on this date to show the rest of the people in other little communities and hundreds that it isn't necessary to have a good-looking girl, a brass band, and a big parade to instill the spirit of Americanhood into our souls. In this bond drive if there is going to be any kissing done, then this 48-year-old editor with false teeth locked up in a closet is going to do the kissing, and if the drive doesn't go across right, then the other will kiss XXXXXXX in John Wanamaker's window on the Tuesday following Monday, October 26.

You will find in this article a list of our Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred boys in the service. This list was given to us through the hard work of Mrs. Myrtle Wingate and Daniel G. Anderson. Because of the fact that this drive started on Tuesday morning, October 20, and will end on Monday, there has been much work to do and we have been helped by the banks, the post office personnel, the various organizations of Lewes and Rehoboth but we have been unable to get every boy's or girl's name in this list. The names will be held over until our next issue and if you know anyone in the military forces not listed call the Delaware Coast News and the names will be added the following week and that week we will also list the names of the buyers of bonds and they will be placed on the desk of our President, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Citizens of this hundred, I know you have bonds, bonds, and bonds and I have been smacked in the face with that fact, but the people who read this paper are not quitters and they can make a special effort to buy a bond on Monday.

If you can't get into the spirit of this drive to show our service men and girls that they have the support of us back in the sticks then you are in a rut and absolutely out of gear.

Bonds can be purchased on Monday at the Rehoboth Trust Co., the Rehoboth Post Office, the Lewes Trust Co., the Sussex Trust Co., or the Lewes Post Office, but remember that they are to be purchased on Monday, October 26, 1942.

Over 75 boys in the service get our paper each week. No, I can't afford to send them myself, but they are being paid for by various organizations in Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred, and if you don't think that they appreciate a home-town paper then you ought to read some of the letters we receive from them.

O. K. ladies, gentlemen, girls and boys—get on the band wagon—buy a bond on Monday.

Show our military personnel that old Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred can dig down and buy bonds when it is necessary. And folks, it is necessary.

On Monday stick out your chests and go to the banks or post offices and smack down that $18.75, that $37.50, that $75, or that $3,750, and say: "Give me that bond."

[From the Delaware Coast News of October 30, 1942]

FIFTY-THREE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED DOLLARS—DID LEWES-REHOBOTH DO THEIR PART? YES—COMMUNITIES SHOW GREAT ENTHUSIASM IN "BUY WAR BOND" DRIVE—NUMBER OF BONDS PURCHASED GREATLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATION

It is better to give than it is to receive. You can sleep sound when you have in your heart a feeling that you have done a job to your complete satisfaction.

Citizens of Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred you have done a job and done it well. Satisfied, certainly you are, for you did your part in backing up our boys and girls who are now in the service of our country.

Four hundred and ten people purchased bonds in our "Buy a War Bond on Monday" drive and they purchased $53,700 in bonds. The bonds were purchased through the Rehoboth Trust Co., the Rehoboth post office, the Lewes Trust Co., the Sussex Trust Co., and the Lewes post office. Splendid cooperation on the part of the above, the cooperation of the Kiwanis Club, the cooperation of the Rotary Club, and other civic organizations in both Rehoboth and Lewes made this drive the success it turned out to be.

The editor of a small-town newspaper conceived the idea and started the movement but it was finished by practically everyone who told his neighbors to buy that bond. The editor hoped that $20,000 could be raised but look at that amount of bonds sold—$53,700—and you will know that it wasn't a one-man drive but a community drive that enthused people to such a height that it became contagious.

Now you citizens of Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred have started something that might become a Nation-wide movement. If we can purchase that amount of bonds to back our boys and girls in the service, why can't the powers that be in Washington, D. C., get in touch with other little weekly newspaper editors and tell them to start a drive. Yes, to the American people our little contribution doesn't amount to a drop in the bucket but it will if they give the many, many editors a chance to put on a drive to give moral support to the boys and girls in their own particular towns, communities, and cities.

The list of names will go direct to President Franklin D. Roosevelt because Mr. Daniel G. Conant, secretary to the Honorable JAMES M. TUNNELL, our Senator from Delaware, is going to see that he receives them. Yes, ladies and gentlemen, there has been cooperation from the start to the finish.

If necessary for another "Buy That Bond" drive we, the citizens of Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred, can do it again.

The $53,700 was raised in exactly I week and without any "hullabaloo" and without any premature notice to our people.

[From the Delaware Coast News of January 1, 1943]

UNITED STATES SENATE,
December 23, 1942.

Mr. ROWLAND B. INGRAM,
Editor, the Delaware Coast News,
Rehoboth Beach, Del.

DEAR MR. INGRAM: You deserve the congratulations of the Nation in the remarkable success you achieved through your newspaper, the Delaware Coast News, in sponsoring "Buy War Bond" Day. The fact that the citizens of Lewes and Rehoboth purchased more than $50,000 of War bonds during the short campaign indicates that the appeal made in the Delaware Coast News on October 23 was genuine and sound. The people of Lewes and Rehoboth responded in the images of our honored patriots in their determination that America will not fail. Through you, I extend to them my sincere congratulation for their spirit, faith, and the support of our boys at the front who are making every sacrifice in order that our freedom, liberties, and the American way of life may be continued.

The record made by the Delaware Coast News should be an inspiration to every newspaper in the country. Such a patriotic program, which you were first to initiate, should be followed in every community. I am informed other newspapers have followed your example with much success.

The program inaugurated by the Delaware Coast News and the response of its subscribers has been called to the attention of the Members of the Senate and other public officials, all of whom join in their praise of such an effort.

The copy of the Delaware Coast News of October 30 announcing the success of your "Buy War Bond" Day drive and list of the names of those who so cheerfully subscribed was transmitted to our Commander in Chief, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who I am sure deeply appreciates your patriotic achievement. I am informed, were it physically possible, he would acknowledge the American spirit of the Delaware Coast News, and compliment you for a most successful endeavor to help our Government win an early and decisive victory.

Wishing you and your staff a most pleasant holiday season, I remain

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES M. TUNNELL.

[From the Sussex (Del.) News of November 5, 1942]

MILTON "BUY-A-BOND" DRIVE SATURDAY-MONDAY—GOAL SET AT $10,000

From an idea suggested by the editor of the Delaware Coast News 2 weeks ago, The Sussex News will make a similar drive in Broadkiln Hundred for the purchase of War bonds. The Lewes-Rehoboth drive resulted in the sale of over $50,000 worth of the bonds. Let's make the boys from Milton in the armed forces of our country proud of their home town by making as good a showing as did the people of that vicinity. Of course, we cannot expect to do as good as they for their territory was much larger, but we believe a $10,000 goal is fair enough to set. The dates of the "Buy-a-Bond" Drive in Milton will be Saturday, November 7, and Monday, November 9. Bonds may be purchased at the Milton post office or the Sussex Trust Co. Let's show our Milton boys in the service that we are doing something to help them win this war!

We urge everyone in this community to purchase at least one bond on either of the two above dates. We know that you will not let our boys down!

Every man in the service receives this paper, at home or overseas. Next week's issue will bear the names of every person who buys a bond on Saturday or Monday! See to it that those boys see your name in that list!

[From the Sussex (Del.) News of November 12, 1942]

MILTON GOES OVER TOP!—BOND GOAL IS EXCEEDED BY $3,300—$13,300 WORTH SOLD DURING 2-DAY DRIVE IN MILTON

The citizens of Milton really came through! Sixty-three persons purchased a total of $13,300 worth of United States War

Savings bonds during our 2-day "Buy-a-Bond" drive, on Saturday and Monday. That's a mighty good showing for our little town, folks! And we don't mind telling the world that we are proud to send this news to our boys in the service. These boys, are really the ones that are sacrificing, and the news that this paper is carrying them will certainly make things a lot more comforting for them.

We want our boys to know that the people back home are also willing to do a little sacrificing in order to make things a little easier for them! The fact that the people of Milton made it possible for our drive to reach and even exceed its goal of $10,000 is proof to these boys that they are being backed up on the home front! We can well realize just how much this news will help our fighting men from Milton.

The Sussex News' drive held on Saturday and Monday, without any advance notice to the people of Milton, was taken from an idea suggested by the editor of the Delaware Coast News, of Rehoboth Beach, our neighboring community. Mr. Roland B. Ingram, the editor of that paper, held a similar drive 3 weeks ago and set a goal at $20,000. Mr. Ingram's drive succeeded in the sale of $53,700 worth of bonds in one day! Your editor thought that this was a great idea and followed it up, as suggested by Mr. Ingram for all small newspapers all over the country. Rehoboth and Lewes Hundred is our neighboring district. It came through—so did we! Mr. Ingram visited Milton on Monday and assisted us in the drive.

The business firm of Clyde Betts went "all out" in a 100 percent bond-buying spree when the 11 employees of the firm each purchased at least 1 bond during the drive.

An Enduring System of Justice, Progress, and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent editorial, written by Mr. McClellan Van Der Veer, and published in the Birmingham Age-Herald of Tuesday, January 12, 1943, under the caption "The only basis."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ONLY BASIS

There is only one dependable basis for an enduring system of justice, progress, and peace. It is a general spirit and understanding which freely and consistently strives for those objectives.

Of course, a measure of justice can be enforced; there can be certain kinds of progress, under compulsion—even in the absolutist countries there have been certain kinds of advances in social and economic fields; there is the sort of peace that can prevail by force in a prison. Often, it is necessary temporarily to limit objectives to such mere mitigations. Enforced order, for example, must be a primary objective in a prison. But even in a prison, if it is intelligently operated, further goals are established. Some limited liberties are permitted. Under all circumstances, men must seek some form of progress if they are to avoid deterioration.

Certainly there could be no security or satisfaction in a civilization which was content to rely basically on compulsion, coercion, and regimentation. It is to prevent such an order that the United Nations are fighting the Axis, of course. Whatever may be the limitations that must be placed on objectives and hopes in this world, it is apparent that if men do not at least keep on trying to press forward in pursuit of high aims, they will rapidly slip backward.

The Nazis afford a graphic illustration of this truth. The more they have resorted to compulsions, the deeper they have sunk in retrogression and barbarism.

If the great purposes of the United Nations in this war are to be actually advanced, our aims and efforts must continue to be centered on that fundamental progress which is possible only through the expansion of understanding and good will among men.

It is such progress which the Peoples Mandate Committee for Inter-American Peace and Cooperation is working to advance.

This committee, of which Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt is honorary chairman, Miss Mary E. Woolley, chairman, and Miss Mabel Vernon, director, and which includes among its vice chairmen Miss Katherine Devereux Blake, Mrs. Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Mrs. Burton W. Musser, and Mrs. Gerard Swope, has recently issued a pamphlet outlining various proposals for post-war world reconstruction now being discussed in this country.

The committee wisely realizes that the widest possible discussion of such plans and problems will advance that understanding which must afford the foundation for sound and enduring progress. It also stresses that more than mere plans and systems is essential to a lasting advance for humanity.

"Every plan for a post-war future," the pamphlet declares, "implies that if we are indeed to creat a new order we shall have to do more than draw up outlines of new institutions. To succeed in creating the kind of world we want we shall have to prepare our minds to accept new standards of value and to enliven greatly our faith in the spiritual truths that underlie the material world. Humanity must change spiritually if the world is to change politically or economically.

"Spiritual change can arise only in individual men and women and needs to be accompanied by full intellectual understanding of the issues at stake. The peoples of the Americas have now the opportunity and responsibility to develop by constant exchange of views an educated, democratic opinion which will create and maintain the conditions necessary for a world at peace."

Often cynical or merely dispirited persons despair of any real change in the spiritual standards of the peoples of the world. They have little or no faith in the regeneration, or even the spiritual growth, of their fellows.

Now it is no doubt sensible not to count too heavily—or even at all, for that matter—on the sudden conversion of men from one way of life to another. It is possibly true that fidelity to conscience may have been as great many generations ago as it is now. But there is such a reality as growth in understanding. That growth makes for the elevation of standards to which conscience is faithful.

To what extent understanding dictates action—to what extent the human will is free irrespective of its understanding—these are difficult questions to which thoughtful minds will not undertake to give precise answers. But there can be broad and ready agreement that the growth of true understanding does make for the advancement of human standards. In striving to increase such understanding, groups like the Peoples Mandate Committee are working at the foundations that must underlie any durable peace and progress. These and other educational efforts are imperative to the success of statesmen striving to fashion a new and better world.

A Positive, Constructive Liberalism for Teachers in the Labor Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address on "A Positive, Constructive Liberalism for Teachers in the Labor Movement," delivered by the distinguished Rt. Rev. Monsignor John A. Ryan, D. D., Director, Department of Social Action, National Catholic Welfare Conference, at a luncheon of the New York Teachers Guild, Local No. 2, American Federation of Teachers and Teachers Guild Associates.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Madam Chairman and members of the Teachers Guild and associates, it is a great pleasure and privilege indeed for me to address today this very large and representative and intelligent audience.

The topic that I am to present to you has been given you already by Mrs. Simonson—A Positive, Constructive Liberalism, for Teachers in the Labor Movement. The adjectives in the title of this address imply that liberalism is not a simple, rigid concept. The Teachers Guild is aware of other kinds of liberalism than that which is positive and constructive. As a matter of fact, very few words that have done duty as shibboleths embrace so great a variety of meanings or have been used with greater lack of precision. Therefore, I shall begin with a few preliminary definitions.

Liberalism may denote a disposition of will, an attitude of mind or adherence to a set of opinions. Accordingly, the liberal is a person who is generous, tolerant, and inclined to credit with sincerity those who differ from him. He is unprejudiced, open-minded, and friendly to new ideas. His opinions tend to magnify freedom and to diminish restraint and authority. Liberalism may exist in many fields of thought and discussion: Economics, politics, governmental policy, religion, education, science, philosophy, ethical theory and practice, social conventions, etc. A person can logically and consistently be a liberal in some of these departments and a conservative or an authoritarian in others. He can look upon complete and centralized authority as reasonable in some and as unreasonable in others of these spheres of thought and action. For example, he can be a liberal in politics and economics and at the same time an authoritarian in religion. Many men find no difficulty in taking a diametrically opposite position under both these heads.

I should like to mention a good illustration of that. In 1923 a meeting was called here in New York to see what we were going to do about minimum-wage legislation since the Supreme Court had a few days previously declared the District of Columbia's law unconstitutional. I remember Mrs. Florence Kelley was there—the most active person in the group—and Felix Frankfurter and a great many other prominent persons who took part in the discussion. Before the meeting opened, a man happened to be sitting beside me who was from my own State of Minnesota, in fact, a member of the State senate, and also a member of the industrial commission of that State. His name was

Putnam. He said, "Father Ryan, it is a curious thing that you are interested in these liberal movements and radical movements, but your church is very conservative and authoritarian." I said, "Yes, what about it?" He said, "Well, perhaps it is not so surprising. Now, I am a conservative in economics." I knew he was. His position in the State senate of Minnesota and also on the industrial commission showed that. "But," he said, "I am what would be called a liberal in religion as far as religious government is concerned. I am a Congregationalist." And, of course, the Congregationalists are the most liberal of the protestant denominations as regards church authority. I understand each parish or congregation is its own boss.

Well, there is a good example, I think, of the fact that one can be a liberal in one field of thought and an authoritarian or a conservative in another.

One of the best-known uses of the term "liberalism" is that which has for many years prevailed on the continent of Europe and in some Latin-American countries. Those who profess this variety will almost invariably be anticlerical, which is frequently a euphemism for anti-Catholic. On its theoretical side, this continental liberalism denies or minimizes the authority of God and of the church over the human intellect. On its practical side it denies or minimizes the authority of God and of the church over human conduct. Both the theoretical and practical forms of continental liberalism exhibit several degrees, from the complete denial of divine authority—doctrinal and legislative—to the rejection of church authority outside those principles of faith and morals which enjoy the prerogative of infallibility.

In passing, I will say that it is the attitude of the Catholic Church toward this kind of liberalism that has led many persons to say that the church is opposed to all liberalism. As a matter of fact, it is not opposed to economic liberalism, or political liberalism, or some other kinds, but it is definitely against this philosophical liberalism, this liberalism which denies divine authority—that is the extreme form of it—or which denies the authority of the church.

If I were required to describe in a single sentence a man who deserves to be called a liberal, I should write it thus: A liberal is a tolerant person who is a democrat (with a small "d") in politics, who believes in ample economic opportunity for the masses, and who lays strong emphasis upon freedom in speech, in writing, in theological opinion, in education, and in civil activities of all sorts.

I mentioned in theological opinion. I did not say in religion, because we have differences of opinion in theology in the Catholic Church and plenty of freedom in that matter.

To be sure, many liberals demand an excessive amount of freedom for themselves in one or more of these relations, while others are intolerant and illiberal liberals. But this short description does indicate roughly the limits and the content of adequate liberalism.

Probably the kind of liberalism that interests us most is that which has to do with economic theories, practices and institutions. In this sphere the meaning of liberalism has undergone not only profound modifications but a complete revolution. From the time of Adam Smith down to the middle of the nineteenth century and for some decades longer in France and the United States, economic liberalism advocated the freedom of industrial activity from restraints imposed upon it by civil law. It held that the best government is that which governs the least, that freedom of contract should hold sway almost without exception, that civil and political equality by themselves provide all the economic freedom and opportunity that any citizen could reasonably demand. In a word, that liberalism in the economic sphere was identical with the policy of laissez faire.

In this connection I turn aside for a moment to note that Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical Quadragesimo Anno, denounced liberalism, but he was very specific in that he denounced the liberalism which would not permit the government to intercede on behalf of those who needed special legislation—the weaker economic classes. But that was the old economic liberalism. The traditional, the classical economic liberalism is identical with laissez faire.

That position is flatly, sometimes contemptuously, rejected by the man who today calls himself an economic liberal. In our time economic liberalism advocates all those measures of government, and those activities of private organizations which promote opportunity for the masses and protect them against economic oppression under the guise of free contract.

The old economic liberalism demanded freedom from public restraint. The new demands freedom from the restraints imposed by private powerful persons and corporations. The concept of freedom held by the old economic liberalism was almost entirely negative—absence of governmental restraint and compulsion. The concept of freedom held by the new economic liberalism likewise includes freedom from restraint, but it conceives undesirable restraint as not merely governmental but private as imposed by individuals, associations, and institutions.

A more significant difference between the old and the new economic liberalism is that the latter adds to the negative concept of absence of restraint, the positive idea of opportunity. After all, opportunity—the effective power to do, to earn, and to possess—describes the real end of all liberty and all rights.

The new economic liberalism was very well described by Justice Robert H. Jackson in an address on the meaning of liberalism almost 5 years ago when he occupied the position of Attorney General of the United States. From this address I quote two sentences:

"The liberalism of our day is concerned with the right of men in industry to be free from unfair labor practices, to enjoy the privacy of their individual lives without the invasion of labor spies, the right collectively to bargain, the right to have some security in tenure in their jobs as against arbitrary dismissal and the right to a place in our economy where they can apply their labor in return for the commodities which labor produces. And we are also concerned with the right to see that the surplus of production above what labor consumes while producing is in a proper proportion applied to protection against unemployment and against dependent old age, against industrial accidents, and against illness."

This is the kind of liberalism that the teachers should strive to promote in the organized labor movement. This is progressive and contsructive liberalism. Its most important specific elements and aims are: The right of labor to organize and bargain collectively through its chosen representatives, at least a decent minimum of compensation for every worker and for labor as a whole, a progressively larger portion of the national income, labor sharing in industrial management—as illustrated in the industrial committees established by the War Production Board—the union shop wherever it is necessary to prevent destruction of the union by insidious managerial methods and wherever the union shop promotes harmonious relations between labor and management; finally, extension of the Social Security Act and expansion of its provisions.

All these reforms concern specifically the welfare of wage earners. Some of them have been already realized. To maintain them undiminished should be the object of continuous vigilance on the part of organized labor, including the Teachers Guild. Those reforms in the preceding list which have not yet been achieved or fully achieved should be fought for by all legitimate efforts and methods.

Economic liberalism champions reforms which would be beneficent to other groups as well as to employees. These, too, should command the interest and support of the Teachers Guild.

Here is a summary of the principal economic and social reforms achieved since 1933, within and without the field of labor relations: guaranty of bank deposits, reform of the Federal Reserve System, the Holding Company Act, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Social Security Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the Wages and Hours Act, the law which enables farm tenants to become farm owners, and the change in the attitude of the Supreme Court toward economic and social legislation.

While the legislation which established the Works Progress Administration and the Public Works Administration has declined in present importance, it deserves brief mention as indicating a revolution in the attitude of the Federal Government toward the needs of the people. The first of these measures implies that our National Government has the obligation of providing something like a tolerable living for persons who would otherwse become paupers. The second commits the Federal Government to acceptance of the economic theory that depressions must be met by public spending.

The National Labor Relations Act is by far the most beneficent labor law ever enacted in the United States [applause], notwithstanding the agony occasionally manifested over this by Westbrook Pegler and Mark Sullivan and others. The wages and hours law is equally helpful and even more revolutionary.

I give you a very brief review of the change indicated by the Minimum Wage and Fair Labor Standards Act.

In the year 1920, five members were expelled from the New York Legislature, ostensibly because they belonged to a disloyal political organization, namely, the Socialist Party, but more probably because of their radical economic views. The most powerful factor in their expulsion was Mr. Sweet, at that time the speaker of the assembly. One year previously he had successfully opposed the enactment of a minimum wage and an 8-hour law for women and minors. These proposals he characterized as "bolshevistic."

In 1923 the United States Supreme Court declared minimum wage laws for women and children unconstitutional. However, in 1937 the same tribunal upheld the minimum wage law of Washington State and explicitly reversed the unfavorable decision which it had handed down 14 years earlier in the District of Columbia case. And in reversing that decision the Court used language that it has very seldom employed. As a rule when the Court wants to reverse its position or change it very much it distinguishes between the former case and the instant case and it looks as though they are not reversing themselves, but in the Washington State case Chief Justice Hughes, speaking for the Court, said, "We think that the Adkins case," that is the District of Columba one, "should be and it is hereby overruled." No pussyfooting about distinguishing. They just overruled.

In 1941 the Supreme Court upheld the Federal Wages and Hours Act in these terms. The decision was written by Chief Justice Stone.

"Since our decision in West Coast Hotel against Parrish"—that is the Washington State case—"it is no longer open to question that the fixing of a minimum wage is within the legislative power and that the bare fact of its exercise is not a denial of due process of law under the fifth more than under the fourteenth amendment."

How will the foregoing liberal measures fare in the immediate future? Will they

continue in operation after the war or after Franklin D. Roosevelt leaves the White House? If the history of World War No. 1 repeats itself at the end of the present conflict, a systematic and powerful attempt will be made to take away from organized labor not only the gains made during the present war, but some of those which antedated that event. These questions cannot now be answered with any degree of confidence. The mild set-back sustained by economic liberalism at the recent congressional elections is undoubtedly disturbing enough to put all its friends on their guard.

The most immediate task of the Teachers Guild and all other friends of humane liberalism is to oppose to the best of their ability any attempt to destroy or substantially to weaken the National Labor Relations Act. [Applause.] They should recall that the Smith bill, which would have done this very thing, passed the House of Representatives by a large majority a few months ago. In all probability, it or something very like it will be offered again in the Congress which assembles at the beginning of the year 1943.

Teachers in the labor movement can serve progressive and constructive liberalism by endeavoring to correct certain abuses of power in the unions. These improper practices not only injure individual workers but bring discredit upon the general cause of organized labor. They lower the standing of the labor movement in the eyes of outside persons who would otherwise be friendly.

Racketeering in the unions, I pass over, because it is an obvious evil and because I do not see just what the teachers can do to correct it. A more important and more difficult abuse is found in various restrictive union practices; for example, the insistence upon hand brushes instead of spraying machines in the painting industry, the recent banning of canned music by the Musician's Union, the jurisdictional disputes between different crafts in the building trades and elsewhere.

All these evils, these three classes of evils, spring from one general source; namely, scarcity of jobs. The painters fear that the use of spraying machines will throw many of them out of work. The musicians know that many of them cannot find employment in their trade because of transcribed musical records. The plumbers feel that if some of their tasks are taken over by the steamfitters, or vice versa, some of their number will be compelled to seek other employment.

I don't know how many of you have reflected on the fact that this is the root to the evil of these three situations, particularly jurisdictional disputes—scarcity of jobs.

For these conditions the only fundamental remedies are adequate unemployment compensation and adequate dismissal wage and a program of retraining for those displaced by technological changes. The cost of progress in industry should be borne by industry itself instead of shifted as a burden upon the displaced workers. [Applause.] Teachers in the labor unions could make a considerable contribution to progressive and constructive liberalism by working for this humane solution of a very difficult problem.

It is not necessary to remind the Teachers Guild that they should continue their active and vigilant opposition to communism. To organized labor, as well as to all other groups of Americans, communism has nothing to offer except strife, false promises, and futility. Nor should teachers promote any other form of collectivism. Collective ownership and operation of the means of production or even of the greater part of the means of production is not liberalism under either the new or the old conception. True economic liberalism demands, indeed, a fundamentally reformed capitalism. The system of private ownership and management of the instruments of production must be modified by collective ownership of certain public utilities and national monopolies, by wide extension of cooperative enterprise, by associations of workers and management in what Philip Murray calls industrial councils and Pope Pius XI called vocational or occupational groups.

The latter system, or anything like it, would be neither historical capitalism nor a dictatorial collectivism. Subject to the encouragement and supervision of the state, it would be a practical scheme of industrial self-government and social justice. It would exemplify sane and progressive liberalism. I suggest the realization of it as a lofty and long-time objective for teachers in the labor movement.

Among the characteristics of a liberal which I mentioned at the beginning of this address was tolerance. This attitude will always remain a pervasive element of constructive and progressive liberalism. Those who adopt it will not hesitate to cooperate for common purposes with other groups whose liberalism in some fields will differ from theirs. Many persons whose ideas and ideals of economic liberalism are the same as yours have other conceptions than yours concerning liberalism in philosophy, religion, and education. Your assertion and defense of your own brand of liberalism in these domains should be carried on in such a way as not to antagonize those persons whose economic objectives are the same as yours. Honest convictions need not be given up or disguised. Neither should they become an obstacle to common effort on behalf of liberal economic programs. This attitude and this policy are not the least important and beneficent elements in a progressive and constructive liberalism.

Unfulfilled Predictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the State Magazine of January 16, 1943, by Carl Goerch, editor, entitled "Unfulfilled Predictions."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNFULFILLED PREDICTIONS

At the beginning of 1942, Look Magazine asked some of the most famous commentators in the country for their predictions on what would happen in the theater of war last year.

Harry Flannery, former Columbia Broadcasting System commenator in Berlin said: "Next fall (1942, that is) the Nazis will be forced to consider once more the chances of a successful invasion of England. They may turn instead toward Spain, Portugal, the Azores, and Canary Islands."

Raymond Gram Swing, radio commentator, said: "Germany will offer peace, decked with terms appealing to British pride, American idealism, and Europe's pitiful need for recovery. Either the person of Hitler will be removed by his own promise to retire, or the Army will oust him."

Raymond Clapper, columnist and commentator, came forth with this prediction: "The east coast will see a token bombing. England will get a spring blitz, with gas. Japan will be checked by military and economic pressure. Most isolationist Representatives and Senators up for reelection will be defeated."

And Maj. George Fielding Eliot, war analyst, stated: "Unless Japan backs down, it is war. If it's war, Japan will be swiftly and decisively beaten."

John T. Whitaker, war correspondent of the Chicago Daily News: "Within a month of mid-March Hitler will invade Spain, Portugal, and North Africa—which are vital to his war against America."

According to our way of thinking, we are two lessons to be learned from these comments. The first is, never to put down one's predictions in black and white, because—like chickens come home to roost—they're liable to cause you considerable worry. The second is: your opinion about the war, after having listened to the news over the radio or after having read it in the newspapers, is just as good as that of any of the commentators who write or talk daily about the developments on the home and foreign front.

Similar predictions were made in Look Magazine a couple of weeks ago. We are saving the issue and will let you know a year from now how these predictions have worked out.

Treasury Tax Policy—A Reply to Mr. Bromfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under permit to extend my remarks and include a statement by Randolph Paul, General Counsel, Treasury Department, I now submit same for the RECORD.

With the enormous deficit-financing the Treasury is now forced to participate in to obtain the dollars with which to meet war orders and expenses, it appears to me that our people cannot very well afford to ignore our responsibility in paying taxes. I have never agreed with the philosophy often expressed to the effect that a Member of Congress should always vote for every appropriation bill and against every tax proposal. That has never been my policy. If we believe in a program of Government expenditures then let us proceed to put the necessary dollars on the barrel head with which to finance that program to the very limit of our endurance. I have not yet been convinced that it is necessary for us to remit or cancel out the tax liability against the more than $115,000,000,000 of national income which our people received in the calendar year 1942. If we, the American people, cannot meet the taxes now imposed against us and which relate to necessary expenditures then pray tell me how we can move into the position of world leader and retain that position. A lot of the people who are now so brazenly advocating world union might well consider

where the tax dollars are coming from and to the extent they may be involved, discontinue their advocacy of canceling 1942 income-tax liabilities or obligations.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post of December 17, 1942]

TREASURY TAX POLICY—A REPLY TO MR. BROMFIELD

Mr. Louis Bromfield in a letter published in the Washington Post on November 20, headed "Federal Taxation Up to Date," eloquently voices a growing concern about the ability of taxpayers to meet increased taxes next March 15. He foresees difficulties for many taxpayers and charges that the Treasury has not taken adequate steps to help them.

I think the record will show that the Treasury has been in the forefront in its efforts to bring about a more realistic attitude toward meeting our increasing need for war revenue. We have urged that the income tax be placed on a current basis in order to accomplish two primary objectives (1) to adapt the income tax to the weekly and monthly budgets of the millions of wage earners and other income recipients who are not accustomed to yearly budgeting and (2) to convert the income tax into an effective and flexible instrument for the control of inflation.

The enormous and ever-growing war program during 1941 resulted in an increasingly inflationary threat of price rises. In response to this threat the Treasury Department, in the fall of 1941, developed a program designed for immediate adoption. This program contemplated the imposition of a 15 percent withholding tax on individual incomes above exemptions to be collected at the source on wages, salaries, interest, and dividends. The need for this step was not generally understood at that time and action on the proposal had to be deferred until Congress took up the revenue bill of 1942.

In his statement to the House Ways and Means Committee on March 3, 1942, the Secretary strongly urged the adoption of collection at source of a part of the regular income tax. At that time he said: "Because of the threat of inflation and because of large increases suggested throughout the existing rate scale it becomes essential to afford a more convenient method for the payment of income taxes. The best available expedient for this purpose is a provision for collecting at the source for those incomes that are paid periodically, including wages, salaries, bond interest, and dividends."

Throughout the consideration of the revenue bill of 1942 the Treasury consistently urged the importance of introducing collection at source for the net income tax. The bill as passed by the House of Representatives contained provision for collection of part of the income tax at source on wages, salaries, bond interest, and dividends. The Senate Finance Committee, however, after initially approving this provision, substituted for it collection at source under the new victory tax on wages and salaries only. Despite repeated emphasis by the Treasury on the importance of current collection of the regular income tax, the bill as enacted did not include such a provision.

There now appears to be rather widespread support for the adoption of collection of the regular individual income tax at the source. Through some very successful publicity, "pay as you go" has become associated in the public mind with the plan proposed by Mr. Beardsley Ruml, which Mr. Bromfield mentions—apparently with approval.

The Treasury agrees with the professed objective of the Ruml plan, that of putting taxpayers on a current or pay-as-you-go basis. The sound and equitable method of paying as you go, however, is not the Ruml plan, but collection of the individual income tax at the source. The Treasury has opposed the original Ruml plan for several reasons. This plan does not, in fact, put the taxpayer on a current basis; it merely changes labels on the income-tax payments he is now making. By canceling a year's tax liability it gives a windfall to persons whose incomes were abnormally high in that year. There are also numerous administrative difficulties.

Moreover, both the psychology and the fact of cancelation of tax liabilities would be inflationary. Reserves that had been set up in advance for payment of taxes would be freed for expenditure, and people would not have the repressive influence on their spending of a large impending tax liability. In the midst of total war it is economic suicide to encourage rather than to discourage spending

Mr. Ruml's recent modifications have not eliminated effectively the serious shortcomings of his proposal. As desirable as collection at source is, it is unnecessary to adopt it at the cost of forgiving a year's tax liability.

Contrary to Mr. Bromfield's assertion that we have suggested paying 2 years' income tax out of 1 year's income, the Treasury has been fully aware of the problem of doubling up involved in the introduction of collection at source and has suggested several solutions. In its recommendations to the Committee on Ways and Means, the Treasury proposed a gradual transition to current collection. The committee adopted a plan providing for withholding at a 5-percent rate in 1943, and 10 percent thereafter. When the urgency of current collection became even more apparent during the summer of 1942 and when the Victory tax was under consideration, the Treasury recommended inauguration of collection-at-source on January 1, 1943, at a rate of 15 percent of net taxable income; doubling up was to be avoided by scaling down the rates on 1942 income by 10 percentage points and raising the rates on 1943 incomes by 5 percentage points.

The Treasury plan would have led to the collection of a large part of individual income taxes at the source for most taxpayers. About three-fourths of all income-tax payers would have been shifted to a substantially current basis, with about two-thirds of their 1943 tax liability collected at source. The taxpayers who would have the largest proportion of their tax liability placed on a current basis are those in the lower-income brackets. In other words, the Treasury plan would meet most fully the needs of precisely those taxpayers whose budgeting habits and unfamiliarity with income taxes make a pay-as-you-go system most useful.

The Treasury's proposal for securing collection at the source lacks the allure of the Ruml plan. However, it recognizes the demands of equity and the urgency of curbing inflation. These are important guideposts in developing adequate measures for financing the war, and the Treasury will continue to be guided by them in its effort to protect the interests of the masses of taxpayers.

Besides repeatedly urging the introduction of collection at source, the Treasury has sought to facilitate the current payment of income taxes in other ways. Since August 1941 it has offered the public tax-anticipation notes to encourage the prepayment of taxes by providing an interest return. In addition, the Treasury conducted an extensive publicity campaign to encourage individuals to accumulate reserves in advance for payment of income taxes.

Exception must be taken to Mr. Bromfield's statements relating to the fairness of the sales tax and to the absence of complaints against the State sales taxes. The statement that the sales tax is the "fairest tax" is insupportable. Treasury opposition to the sales tax has been based on several inescapable facts. The sales tax rests most heavily upon the very low-income groups, since, on the average, persons with small incomes spend larger percentages of their incomes for taxable articles than do those with larger incomes, which normally are in considerable part saved. The sales tax tends to reduce the plane of living of those whose incomes are so low as to prevent the maintenance of an absolute minimum standard of living necessary to maintain health and working efficiency. The sales tax discriminates against those with large families and those who for other reasons must spend on taxable goods an unusually large proportion of their incomes.

The State sales taxes, against which relatively little complaint has been raised once they have been in operation for several years, are levied at rates of from 1 to 3 percent. If a Federal retail sales tax of perhaps 10 percent were added to the existing State and local sales taxes, levied now in 23 States and 2 large cities, it is certainly not unlikely that very serious objection would be heard. Yet even a 10-percent sales tax levied on all retail sales except those to governments and war contractors would yield only some $4,000,000,000 of additional revenue, an amount far short of fiscal requirements. If additional exemptions commonly suggested, including food, medicines, clothing, and articles subject to excise taxes, were provided, the yield would be reduced to about $800,000,000. Exemption of food alone would reduce the yield by $1,500,000,000.

The difficulty of paying increased taxes which concerns Mr. Bromfield is only the symptom of a more basic problem. This problem, which we all face, is that we must adjust our standard of living to the reduced supply of goods remaining for civilian consumption after war needs are met. When we devote substantially half of our manpower and natural resources to war, we cannot expect civilian goods to grow where war goods are planted. The economic burden which we are going to bear in the next few years should not be blamed on taxes. Taxation is the method by which much of the cost will be distributed, but the burden would be there and would have to be borne regardless of taxes.

Mr. Bromfield speaks of "the present alarming rate" at which War bonds are being cashed. The rate of redemptions today is not only not alarming but shows conclusively that all but a minute fraction of the 50,000,000 bondholders are holding their bonds and buying more of them month after month, for the most part out of their current earnings.

RANDOLPH E. PAUL,
General Counsel, Treasury Department.
WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 8.*

Expansion of Post-War Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with aviation playing a conspicuous role in the present war, the attention of the American people is centered on the future development of aircraft and its effect in the field of commercial transportation.

A most interesting analysis of post-war air transportation is contained in the following address by Mr. Harry R.

Stringer, vice president of All American Aviation, Inc., before the Junior Traffic Club, of Chicago, January 14, 1943. Mr. Stringer's address is as follows:

It is no prophecy that there will be a great expansion in commercial air transportation beginning immediately after the return of peace. It is a certainty. The expansion was impending when the war intervened. Ultimately, it will be accelerated by the recoil of war which has made the world conscious of the tremendous utility of the airplane as well as its fighting power.

Within the past few months, military air routes have been established throughout this country, and from this country to all parts of the world. Over these routes transport aircraft, many of them converted airliners which were designed primarily to carry passengers and not cargo, are moving troops, supplies, and strategic materials which cannot wait on trains, or trucks, or ships. The tonnage they are moving is enormous. They are doing an incredible job and their performance has demonstrated the proficiency and versatility of the airplane. There now can be little doubt that much of the international commerce of peacetime will be airborne. It is entirely possible that the military routes of today will be the nucleus of a vast system of world airways in the future. In fact, it is this field that appears to offer the most immediate opportunities for the postwar expansion of civil air transportation.

When the war ends there obviously will be a surplus of aircraft-production facilities, a surplus of pilots, technicians, and mechanics, and a surplus of airplanes. These facilities or airplanes cannot be junked, nor can these men, most of whom will want to keep on in aviation, simply be sent back to their homes, because, if for no other reason, public opinion in which this legion of airmen will then have an organized and articulate voice will not permit it. These conditions will give additional impetus to the expansion of air transportation although admittedly no peacetime system immediately conceivable will be able to absorb aircraft at the present rate of production, nor all the airmen either.

This is a provocative point because it is in the effort to make a dimensional forecast of the post-war expansion, especially in reference to air cargo, where opinions diverge and the future is not quite so clear. Our air lines, independently and jointly, are trying to get the answer. So are the railroads, the Railway Express Agency, and the trucking industry which have a big stake in the freight business. So are the aircraft manufacturers who want to know what kind and how many planes to build for the job. Some universities have turned their research staffs loose on it. Independent aeronautical analysts are deep in it. The Civil Aeronautics Board and other branches of the Government are studying it.

Judging by what has appeared in print, the net result thus far, is confusion.

The great difficulty is the dearth of experience or factual data on air cargo. Unlike the railroads which freight supports, the only cargo the air lines have been handling is mail and express, and it represents only a fractional part of their traffic. Air freight operations have been notably successful in Central and South America and other foreign countries, but they have not had to compete with the best rail and highway system in the world which is our own. Statistical data on military transport operations is not available because of war secrecy. Figures on railroad and truck traffic are obtainable and costs are comparable and they seem to afford the best index of the future potential of air freight except that they have been cited by both the extremists and the realists to prove their points and predictions.

Under these circumstances, it is no surprise that the public lately has been treated in word and print to futuramas of air commerce showing winged leviathans, flying boxcars, trains of mammoth gliders, and immense helicopters filling the heavens. Extremists among the visionaries, their imaginations soaring higher and farther than any airplane has ever flown, predict the day when aircraft will supplant railroads, and trucks and ships and all commerce will move by air. To them, the modus operandi is a mere detail. In 1942, the railroads carried 600,000,000,000 ton-miles of freight, trucks about 40,000,000,000 ton-miles more. Depending on their size, aeronautical and transportation authorities have estimated that it would require 40,000 to 60,000 airplanes to handle the rail traffic alone. Granting that enough airplanes can do the physical job and selecting either figure, the problem of traffic control itself would utterly preclude such an operation. Before the war domestic air lines were operating 364 ships, a fleet of infinitesimal size compared with the dream fleets of the future, but already traffic control was becoming a serious headache at some of our air terminals.

While the investors in railroads and trucking companies and shipping securities need have no nightmares over the possibility of the airplane putting them out of business, there is the stern stuff of reality in all these visions of our future air system, fantastic as some may seem. Transport aircraft which dwarf our present air liners in size and capacity are now flying. Glenn Martin has produced the Mars, a flying boat weighing 70 tons, and Henry Kaiser and Howard Hughes are preparing to build bigger ones. Military prototypes of future transport planes which will be able to carry between 15 and 30 tons of cargo are now unloading their lethal cargo on the enemy. The Curtiss Commando, designed strictly for cargo purposes, is operating on military routes. The Curtiss Caravan and the Lockheed Constellation which are said to be even larger cargo carriers have had successful flight tests. Possibilities of gliders in commercial air transportation have been demonstrated by the Germans who used them in Norway and Crete, and are now using them in North Africa in transporting troops and supplies in large numbers and quantities. The air pick-up system by which cargo is collected and discharged by airplane in flight is constantly developing greater proficiency. And anyone who has followed the progress of the helicopter realizes that it is certain to have a tremendous effect on future air transportation and may even completely revolutionize present thinking and planning.

Thus, aviation potentially possesses the physical facilities for doing the job ahead, but in the final analysis the extent to which these facilities will be employed in the future will depend essentially on the economics of the undertaking. In war, cost is of no importance, but in peacetime it is the fundamental consideration and commerce normally moves by the medium offering the cheapest rate. To successfully compete with surface transportation for freight as distinguished from express, the cost of air transportation must be drastically reduced. Technological progress, and new operating efficiencies are gradually bringing this cost down but the day when it will be within the range of ground transportation is still remote.

In estimating the effect air cargo may have on post-war growth of air transportation the figures on rail freight are often cited as an index of potential traffic. In 1941 the railroads moved, to use round figures, about 475,000,000,000 ton miles of freight. Of this tonnage 62 percent was coal, ore, lumber, and other heavy commodities. This traffic moved at an average ton-mile cost of less than 1 cent making it quite obvious that air transportation cannot compete in this bracket. The remaining 32 percent, which consisted of manufactured goods, less-than-carload freight, and farm products probably offers some possibilities for shipment by air, although this traffic moved at an average ton-mile rate of around 5 cents, much lower than any prospective air freight rate that has been quoted so far. While the ton-mile rate of air express to the shipper is between 80 and 90 cents, actual carrier cost cannot be estimated because air express always has been handled by the airlines as incidental traffic. The over-all operating cost of air transportation is about 33 cents a ton mile. It has been estimated that the cost of operating the cargo ships that will be available after the war will range from 10 to 20 cents a ton mile, but even this reduction will still leave a substantial margin to overcome to enable air transportation to successfully compete for this class of freight. Proceeding from freight to express the potential for air traffic becomes more attractive. In 1940 less-than-carload express totaled 1,600,000,000 ton miles. Half of this traffic moved at first-class mail rates and the other half at deferred or commodity rates. The average rate was about 11 cents per ton-mile for all classes. The first-class ton-mile rate was about 18 cents. When costs are reduced air transportation will undoubtedly make sharp inroads in this field where speed and service are also important factors.

The slogan "All first-class mail by air" which has become a national advertising theme of aviation suggests another potential source of air cargo. However, a more practical plan and one that would be immediately productive would be to establish an air parcel post. Air mail now constitutes about 5 percent of first-class mail. Parcel post poundage in 1941 amounted to 3,530,011,091 pounds. Assuming that air parcel post developed in the same ratio as air mail to first-class mail, 176,500,554 pounds would have moved by air in this period, which is eight times the volume of air express carried in 1942.

A discouraging and short-sighted feature of the post-war planning is that most of it is predicated on bigger and faster aircraft which is the policy that has been pursued in building of the domestic air-line system. In the light of the lessons and developments of the past few years, it appears that this policy needs revision if the peacetime expansion in air transportation is going to mean much in terms of additional equipment and new routes.

The trend in air-line development toward bigger and faster airplanes has been dictated by sound economy. This is not disputed. By reason of their increased capacity these aircraft can render more efficient service and they cost relatively less to operate. At the same time this course has restricted rather than promoted the growth of the air-line system because the modern airliner as it has developed in size and speed has steadily lost its flexibility. It cannot be operated efficiently on routes requiring frequent stops because landings neutralize its speed. A recent study has disclosed that on a transcontinental flight making four intermediate stops 525 miles apart an air liner maintained a scheduled speed of 157 miles an hour, or nearly 88 percent of its cruising speed. On a flight of 570 miles making four intermediate stops 114 miles apart, the scheduled speed of the same air liner dropped to 108 miles an hour.

Normal growth of the air-line system also has been adversely affected in another way by faster and bigger aircraft. Many cities have not had airports large enough to accommodate them. The expense of providing adequate field facilities discouraged many other communities that were seeking air service. The result is that the growth in the air-line system has been mostly vertical. In other words, growth has been attained through flying additional schedules over the same routes

rather than through expanding route mileage. For example, the air-line system in 1936 measured 30,399 route-miles. In 1941, it measured 40,910 route-miles, an increase of 35 percent. By contrast, the revenue miles flown by the air lines in the same period increased from 58,528,101 miles to 121,824,854 miles or 108 percent. To do this flying the air lines operated 272 aircraft in 1936; in 1941 they operated 364, an increase of only 92. From the standpoint of aircraft employed, figures on air-line operations last year when they are made public will present a more striking contrast. This is quite generally known. It is no military secret, for instance, that early in 1942 a large percentage of the industry's aircraft was mobilized for war purposes, commercial service was curtailed and the air-line system skeletonized, possibly for the duration. Meanwhile, air-express traffic has increased from 11,165,812 pounds to approximately 22,000,000 pounds; air-mail volume has jumped nearly 50 percent and per mile passenger traffic has increased, all of which the air lines have handled efficiently with less than half the number of planes they operated in 1941. The record is a splendid tribute to air-line manangement, but when it is analyzed in reference to post-war plans, it is a further indication that even though air traffic multiplies manyfold the air-line system will not require any tremendous number of additional planes to handle domestic expansion if it is confined, as it has largely been in the past, to its own ambit, especially since even bigger and faster equipment will be available at that time.

A more graphic illustration of how conditions and influences produced by bigger and faster flying equipment have stunted the growth of domestic air transportation is reflected by the map of the present trunk-line system. It covers only 250 cities and at a liberal estimate serves only about one-third of the population. In 1941, service to 40 or more of these cities had been suspended, mainly because their airports were inadequate. In 1934, the air-line system covered 178 cities. Certainly, the expansion that occurred in this direction in 7 years' time cannot be called impressive. The bigger and faster transport ships now on the way will obviously aggravate rather than relieve this situation. Strictly cargo operations will impose still another restraint. The vitiating effect of stops on scheduled speed in present air-line operations already has been described. It will be felt more seriously in air-freight operations because cargo cannot be handled with the same celerity as passengers. This will make fewer stops necessary on comparable air cargo routes if the service is to preserve its advantage, speed, over ground transportation, and that, of course, is imperative.

These circumstances make it plain that in order to make the benefits of air transportation available to all of the country instead of just to a handful of cities and a third of the population, post-war plans for the expansion of the air-line system must make definite provision for the establishment of short haul or feeder lines. Before the advent of the air pick-up system little or nothing in a constructive way had been done either by the Government or the air transport industry on a feeder problem. Such was the prevailing attitude at that time that it literally took not one but 2 acts of Congress to get recognition of the air pick-up idea. It was called impractical. Many said air pick-up lines would never haul enough mail to justify their expense to the Government. The service has now been in operation nearly 4 years. It provides direct air-mail and air-express service to 115 cities and towns in 6 States. These communities get the same air-mail service as the trunk-line cities. Their mail is not delayed a day by a rail haul from an air terminal which largely nullifies the value of the service.

The population of the communities on the air pick-up routes, outside of the terminal cities ranges from 500 to 120,000. They are an average distance of 17 miles apart. Some are only 5 miles apart. Most of them have no airports and of those that have only a few could accommodate a modern air liner. Since the service was started the air-mail pick-up planes have flown 2,344,485 miles and have made 215,000 pick-ups and deliveries without serious damage to either cargo or equipment. The area served by the air pick-up routes lies chiefly in the Appalachian region, where some of the worst and most variable flying weather in the country is encountered. Schedules are maintained at an average speed of 110 miles an hour. Although a pick-up plane on a regular run must always fly contact or within sight of the ground and it can never fly high because of the proximity of the ground stations, the system has consistently completed from 90 to 95 percent of the schedules in the years it has operated, a performance record that compares favorably with that of the regular transport liners which can go "over the top" when the weather gets bad. Government officials have described this record as unprecedented for a new operation. It has even surprised the birds. Out in the Appalachians it is said they don't come out in the morning until they see the pick-up plane go by. From a trickle, air-mail volume on the lines has increased to a point where the postal revenues are more than paying for the cost of the service. It took the trunk lines nearly 20 years to reach this point.

The success of the air pick-up system has demonstrated that short-haul air routes are practical and can pay their own way even though they can at this time carry only mail and cargo. At present, there are pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board applications for new pick-up routes which would add 25,000 miles to the air-line system and extend direct air service to 1,500 additional communities. These prospective routes have only scratched the surface of the opportunity in this country for the establishment of air pick-up operations. There undoubtedly will be considerable post-war expansion in this direction.

As to the feeder problem, however, air pick-up lines are not the complete answer. There are several communities on the present pick-up lines and many throughout the country which could support passenger service. These communities have small but first-class airports on which feeder planes could easily operate if the planes are tailored to fit the facilities of the community rather than making the community build airports to fit the planes. As feeder routes naturally will be short and it will be necessary for them to serve more points to properly render service they are going to experience more trouble with the problem of stops than the trunk lines. A combination pick-up and passenger plane which would make landings unnecessary except to handle passengers may solve this problem. The idea is entirely feasible. Helicopters also give great promise of providing the answer. Gliders, too, are a big possibility.

The spectacular achievements of gliders in warfare has started the air-transportation industry thinking about their commercial adaptation and value. Air-cargo men particularly have been interested because the glider appears to offer a practical and economical means of augmenting the pay load of the transport plant, which would be one approach to the problem of reducing ton-mile costs. The study of their utility has provoked controversy as to whether better results could be obtained by building the extra capacity afforded by the glider directly into the tug. That question has yet to be satisfactorily answered. A very thorough analysis of this subject has been made by Richard C. du Pont, president of All-American Aviation, Inc., who was among the first to introduce gliding in this country. All-American pioneered the development and now operates the air pick-up system which is being rapidly adapted for military use in launching gliders, a program that is being carried on by All-American under contracts with the Army Air Forces. Mr. du Pont has expressed the conclusion that the best prospect for the use of gliders in commercial operations is on short-haul or feeder routes. Over long routes, he has said, the airplane would be more efficient. However, Mr. du Pont has qualified his opinions to some extent by saying that the success of gliders in short-haul operations will depend on the use of the air pick-up whereby they can be picked up as well as delivered at intermediate points nonstop. He has emphasized that if landings are necessary at these points, the size of the airports required for launching the gliders, the time lost on the ground in loading and discharging cargo would make their value in air transportation dubious. On the other hand, he said, flexibility and speed, factors indispensable to the success of short-haul lines, would be afforded glider operations by the pick-up method of operation.

In forecasting the future of air transportation in a post-war period, it appears that there will be—

1. A tremendous expansion, both in service and equipment, in international operations where surface transportation is slow, the routes long, and the stops few, which will permit the maximum utilization of the higher speed transport aircraft of tomorrow.

2. An intensive rather than extensive expansion of the domestic trunk-line system because of the inflexible pattern which large and fast aircraft have automatically imposed on its growth. For the same reason, expansion in terms of equipment will be moderate because the air transport of the future will be able to carry the same volume of traffic that several now handle.

3. A moderate expansion of air cargo through the development of a heavier volume of air mail, air express, and perhaps an air parcel post rather than through heavy freight.

4. A widespread expansion of feeder lines, including air pick-up routes, passenger feeder routes, glider routes, and helicopter routes. If nothing else, one thing that will bring about this expansion is, should an air parcel post system be established, Congress will not be willing to restrict the service to a few cities and a fraction of the population.

This picture will undoubtedly disappoint the visionaries. Yet their more extravagant predictions may eventually become realities. In view of the progress made by aviation, which all began as a fool idea anyway, their opinions cannot be entirely discounted by those who in trying to fly forward are constantly looking back at the past. Unquestionably, the world has entered the air age, and this age may produce a new economy and a new social and cultural structure in which all of the old concepts will have no importance.

The Telegraph Trail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, during the closing days of the Civil War a project was initiated to extend a telegraph

line from San Francisco overland to Siberia, Russia, and the Orient. It was a stupendous undertaking and was a project of vision and foresight on the part of our pioneer ancestors to bring into closer relationship the North American continent and the Old World. While the project was never completed due to the successful laying of the Atlantic cable, a considerable portion of it was successfully completed and is of great interest now in view of the successful completion of the Alcan Highway connecting continental United States and our Alaskan possessions.

An original journal and letters of Col. C. S. Bulkley, of the United States Army, of this Telegraph Trail Expedition, 1865 to 1867, is now in the possession of the Portland Public Library and is a most treasured and valuable historic document.

Richard L. Neuberger, special writer for the Oregonian, living in Portland, has written an illuminating and intriguing article describing this noteworthy expedition. I include as a part of my remarks the article, which is as follows:

THE TELEGRAPH TRAIL—WIRE-STRINGERS OF 1865 BLAZED A ROUTE NOW USED IN PART BY THE PLANNERS OF ALASKAN RAILROAD

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

The opening of the 1,630-mile Alcan International Highway has fired men's imaginations. Gov. Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, calls it "the new Northwest Passage," the start of the legendary route to Asia and the Orient.

On the day that the road was dedicated Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE wrote to Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, of the Northwest Service Command: "The Alaskan Highway is part of an eventual highway serving the New World from South America to Siberia. In the not too distant future I believe it will be possible to drive from Buenos Aires to Moscow."

Three-quarters of a century before the first trucks rolled on the Alcan Highway, adventurous men dreamed, too, of a land route northwestward across the North American Continent and then over the narrow gap of the Bering Strait to the vast continental domain of Asia. This route was the Telegraph Trail. It was the first of all efforts to make British Columbia and Alaska an immense land bridge between the United States and the vital centers of Siberia, Russia, and the Orient, an effort now under way with the construction of the Alcan military highway.

In March of 1864, as the Civil War was drawing to a bloody climax, the Western Union Telegraph Co. completed a line northward from San Francisco to Portland, Oreg. This was the beginning of an ambitious and historic project, a telegraph system penetrating 5,000 miles of measureless solitudes. Hiram Sibley, second president of Western Union, visioned it as a system which would link in communication the great cities of both hemispheres.

LINE WOULD REACH EUROPE VIA BERING STRAITS

The line was to stretch through British Columbia for approximately 850 miles starting at the international boundary. Then it was to thread across 1,800 miles of Russian-America, as the then almost unknown land of Alaska was called. After a 40-mile thrust by cable over the Bering Strait, the line would span Siberia for 2,450 miles to the mouth of the Amur River, on the Sea of Okhotsk north of Vladivostok.

Attempts to lay a cable across the Atlantic Ocean were meeting with scant success. Perhaps this line through the fastnesses of North America and Siberia was the only way to join the New World and the Old by telegraph. The line would enter Europe at the back door via Moscow, rather than at the front portals via London. Russia agreed to do its part by constructing 7,000 miles of line across the Siberian tundra to Nikolayevsk, near the mouth of the Amur.

In 1864 Queen Victoria's government granted Western Union a right-of-way through British Columbia. Preparations were thus completed. The line would go northward from Portland, along the shores of Puget Sound to the United States-Canadian border. It would span British Columbia via New Westminster and Quesnel, and it would cross the wide neck of Russian-America. Much of the territory to be traversed was blank space on the maps. The expedition was to explore as well as build.

To lead this venturesome undertaking, the Western Union Co. selected a colonel in the United States Army engineers, Charles S. Bulkley. He knew telegraphy and telegraphic construction. During the critical days of the Civil War he had been in charge of the military telegraph in the Southwest. He had constructed the line down the Atlantic seaboard to New Orleans and he was the inventor of important electrical instruments. He had strung wires through the Indian domain of the American Southwest. He was aware of what perils and hardships meant.

In an old ledger Colonel Bulkley kept the account of this first trek into Alaska's far-flung hinterland. In it, too, he kept the letters and reports which came to him from his subordinates—from Serge Abasa, a Russian nobleman, chief of the Siberian undertaking; from Edmund Conway, another American Army officer, who explored the Skeena River watershed in British Columbia; from Frank L. Pope, who also probed British Columbia's timbered fastnesses.

Nearly a year ago, while engaged in research for an article on the Alcan Highway for the Reader's Digest, the present writer was shown a valued document from the vaults of the Portland Public Library. It was a frayed ledger, of the kind that apothecaries and general-store proprietors once used for all their bookkeeping. At the front was written in faded but neat handwriting: "U. S.-Russian Telegraph Expedition, Charles S. Bulkley, engineer in chief."

This was it; this was the story of the Telegraph Trail, the most fabulous attempt in American history to open the mythical Northwest Passage.

Here was Colonel Bulkley himself, in the bitter winter of 1865 and 1866, reporting to his superiors on places which now have a niche in world strategy: "We arrived at Petropavlovski and found the steamship *Golden Gate* lying in harbor. Mr. Abasa (chief of the Russian engineers) and one of his party started from this place moving northward through the Peninsula of Kamchatka, intending to arrive at the head of Thyinsk Bay in time for snow, traveling westward. The Russians, sensible of the importance of the enterprise, have neglected no opportunity to express the most kindly and highest interest in our success, receiving us with unbounded hospitality."

Today, Petropavlovski and the dagger-like Kamchatka Peninsula figure in all speculation over Russia's ultimate role in the war against Japan. So, too, does the Soviet naval base at Nikolayevsk, where long ago Abasa conducted his telegraph surveys. In one of the ledger's faded letters the Russian nobleman, Abasa, wrote Colonel Bulkley, "No mail has been received at Port Petropavlovski since nearly 3 years ago. This seacoast province is so thinly populated that travel is extremely difficult."

Abasa was also concerned about day-to-day operating handicaps. "Colonel," he asked, "don't you feel alarmed about the glass insulator? Will not the severe cold affect it? I am also told that the wind blows fearfully during storms. I will use strong poles and put up stations at shorter distances. In winter, if the cold is not too severe, we can easily put up a reel on a sleigh and string the wire nicely. But in summer, as no wheel vehicles are to be had here, could we not fit a reel on a special saddle and uncoil the wire from horseback?"

Northward from Portland, in the United States, the line was strung. Under R. R. Haines and James Gamble, the telegraph trail was hewed 300 miles to New Westminster, British Columbia. When the line reached the Fraser River, British Columbia's Governor, Frederick Seymour, was on hand himself to aid in spanning the surging stream. He piloted the launch with his own hands.

POLES CUT ON PUGET SOUND AND RUSHED NORTH

In the primeval forest along Puget Sound men cut and trimmed countless poles. These were rushed to the workers setting up the line. And always ahead of this operation, trailblazers were exploring and reconnoitering. Conway chartered the little steamer *Union* and investigated the basin of the Skeena River. To Colonel Bulkley he sent this bill, which was duly entered in the thick ledger:

Wages	$930
Charter for steamer	1,325
Sundries	605
	2,860

And from Quesnel, Conway sent this report on the region: "The country is extremely favorable. In general it is open. Beautiful prairies are scattered along the route, which, in every direction seems to be covered with lakes. Occasionally we pass over a swamp, but most of the swampy country can be avoided by following the high knolls. Hay and pasturage can be had in abundance, and, by preparing for it in time, sufficient hay can be secured to winter any number of stock. This section of the country will also be found well adapted for raising stock and growing vegetables for the subsistence of employees."

Here, again, history has a contemporary application. In this area which Conway described, United States Army engineers have recently surveyed a route for a proposed railroad to Alaska. And by "following the high knolls," General O'Connor succeeded in building the Alcan Highway around the muskeg swamps in the vicinity of Fort Nelson and Fort St. John, British Columbia settlements across the Rocky Mountains.

While his subordinates toiled over the ranges, Colonel Bulkley sailed into the fiords and coves of the Inside Passage looking for places to land supplies. President Lincoln had instructed the American Navy to lend sloops and cutters for this purpose. From Fort George one of Bulkley's assistants, Frank L. Pope, wrote to him:

"I have preferred to use the original Indian names of rivers, lakes, and mountains in most cases, not only as they are more appropriate, but also from the fact that they are distinguished by the Indian appellations in those portions of the country in which they are located."

Reporting on possible sources of food in the area, Pope continued, "Whitefish are taken in the lakes from November 1 until the ice covers the water. They are excellent fish and are quite numerous. Trout may be taken in the lakes and large rivers in the spring. The scarcity of birds is partially compensated by the superabundance of insects such as mosquitoes, black flies, gnats, and ants, with which the whole country literally swarms during the summertime."

In this instance, too, modern developments highlight the Telegraph Trail report. Fort George, from where Pope wrote to Colonel Bulkley, is now Prince George, the southern terminus of the proposed rail route to Alaska. And, as for the gnats and flies which mantle the uplands in the summer, the men who built the Alcan Highway have an appropriate story. They claim that one of them came down on an airport and the attendants

thought it was a Flying Fortress and filled it with 180 gallons of high octane.

North of Quesnel in the British Columbia solitudes the Western Union party hewed a 50-foot right-of-way out of the forests. For nearly 8 decades this swath has been known throughout British Columbia and Alaska as the Telegraph Trail. Aviators have used it as a route to guide them to Alaska. Near the British Columbia-Yukon line the Telegraph Trail becomes part of the Alcan highway.

COLONEL RECEIVED REPORTS FROM WILDERNESS

As the work progressed, Colonel Bulkley received his reports from the wilderness. Pope wrote back that the Hudson's Bay Co. "has charged us most exorbitant prices for all that we have received, as you will perceive by the vouchers." The vouchers listed $3 for a blue serge shirt, 50 cents each for combs, $5 for beaver traps, $9 a pair for blankets, 50 cents each for calico handkerchiefs, and $3 for scarlet-hued belts. Pope also boasted that he and his men were learning more about the country than the Hudson's Bay factors ever had known.

As some of the parties entered Russian-America and others roamed across Siberia, hardships multiplied. The temperature crowded 70 degrees below. Men's eyelids froze shut. Beards became as hard as the telegraph wire. Colonel Bulkley complained to Secretary of State Seward that the Navy was failing to deliver the promised supplies. Capt. R. J. Bush, in a masterpiece of understatement, wrote from Bush's station in Siberia.

"I regret very much that the crowded state in which our house has been during the past winter prevented me from taking any observations of the effect on the line by the Aurora Borealis. A house 25 feet square occupied by from 30 to 60 men to eat and sleep in leaves but little room for experiments."

Slowly but steadily the adventure went forward. Poles were erected, lines strung, and routes surveyed. Negotiations even were started to extend the line to China. Then in the summer of 1866 the steamship *Great Eastern* miraculously laid the Atlantic cable. Europe and America were thus united across the ocean. The long, tortuous route via North America and Siberia seemed unnecessary. The Western Union Co. issued orders to stop work.

These orders did not reach the parties in Alaska and Siberia for nearly a full year. Glass insulators were sold to Indians and natives for drinking cups. Ponderous spools of telegraph wire were bartered for furs, the wire became suspension bridges and fishnets. To this day Indians in British Columbia still ride on packhorses along the trails blazed by Bulkley, Conway, and Pope. On the map appear Telegraph Creek and the Bulkley River, and in Alaska a lake, a glacier, and a mountain are named for another member of the expedition, Robert Kennicott.

When at last all the adventurers had returned to San Francisco, the main outfitting point, Colonel Bulkley told them: "Over nearly one-quarter of the circumference of the globe in frozen wilds, among savage tribes, and in unknown regions, you have steadily pursued your way, and, although the telegraph is unfinished, the world will recognize and applaud the knowledge you have added to its stores, and the daring spirits who have accomplished so much."

Part of Bulkley's ledger is the map he used. It is listed in the ledger as "Map of Russian America, or Alaska Territory, compiled for charts and surveys of Western Union Telegraph Expedition, Charles S. Bulkley, engineer-in-chief." On the map appear many places easily recognizable in Alaska today, even though the spelling has slightly changed: Fort Kadiak, Fort Sitka, Fort Wrangell, Fort Youkon, Behring Strait, Kodiak Island, Bristol Bay, Mount Fairweather.

The Lewes River, along which is located Whitehorse, main base on the Alcan Highway, appears as the Lewis River on Bulkley's map. The Andreanof Islands appear as the Andreanoffski Islands, and Unalaska Island is Ounalaska Island. But most points are instantly familiar to Alaskans—for example, the St. Elias Mountains. Oumnak Island, Norton Sound, Cook's Inlet and the Taku River. In fact, the reports which Colonel Bulkley forwarded to Secretary of State William H. Seward may have been the determining factor in the latter's decision to purchase Alaska from the Czar's Government in 1867 for the pittance of $7,200,000.

The Telegraph Trail did not accomplish its mission, because an easier route for wires to Europe had been found. Yet it played a vital role in America's acquisition of Alaska, a step of immeasurable historic significance, particularly in the light of present-day events. It also pointed the way overland across America to Asia. The Alcan International Military Highway is one of the first efforts to follow that trail.

"Whenever I think we have difficulties," said General O'Connor, the commander of the Alcan Highway, "I can thumb through the journal kept by Colonel Bulkley and see the practically insurmountable obstacles which he and his men subdued." Although the Bulkley journal is still in the Portland library, copies have been photostated at the order of Lt. Col. Paul W. Thompson, a noted author in his own right and head of intelligence for the Army engineers.

A copy is now in General O'Connor's office and another in the office of Brig. Gen. Clarence L. Sturdevant, assistant chief of Army Engineers, who outlined the basic plan for constructing the Alcan Highway. General O'Connor has said he hopes to be able to present additional photostatic copies to libraries in such cities as Seattle, Vancouver, Victoria, Prince George, Juneau, Whitehorse, Fairbanks, Ketchikan, Edmonton, and other places directly or indirectly associated with the Alcan Highway and the Telegraph Trail.

The G. O. P. Spangler Manner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sprague Holden, from the Detroit Free Press of January 16, 1943:

THE G. O. P. SPANGLER MANNER
(By Sprague Holden)

Tender plants who wish to preserve their illusions about the G. O. P.'s status as one of the two principal bastions of our democratic system are urged to stay away from the current American Magazine. Therein is dynamite to their dreams. The piece is The G. O. P.'s New Stand; the author, Harrison E. Spangler. In the space of one short article the new Republican national chairman manages to give more aid and comfort to the New Deal than any one since Alf Landon came out of Kansas. True and earnest friends of the two-party system will read it and weep.

If what Chairman Spangler has outlined is new then time flows backward and old men grow into diapered babies. The G. O. P. has beaten to the bursting point, to little avail, any number of empty drums in the last decade. Spangler misses the remains of not one, patching them up with threadbare catchwords and tattered swatches—then pounds their heads off once more.

The piece has more clichés and tired phrases than can be found outside of Bartlett's Quotations. It has the fresh, electric quality of the air in a sarcophagus. If this is a sample of the G. O. P. credo from now on, then a fourth term or a hand-picked White House heir apparent are a lead-pipe cinch 21½ months hence.

The appaling part of it is not in what Spangler says he is for and what against. The fault is that he offers standard fare—too blamed standard. There is not an original idea or thought in the whole piece. His vision is limited to the point of blindness. The America of tomorrow, and the role we must play in the world, draw from him only timorous conjectures and a timid endorsement of United Nations cooperation. His closest approach to a positive stand on postwar matters is an approving word about jobs for returning soldiers. But even with that there are only vague generalities about how these are to be provided.

Perhaps the most damning fact of all is that most Democrats could freely endorse everything Spangler sets down, except items that are clearly partisan. Lists, of course, don't make for strong political leadership and the old saw about it being unfair to rip things from their context applies here. But it is unfair to the reader, not Spangler.

You have to read the text to get the whole dead flavor. "What can humanly be done the Republican Party will do to see to it that this thing is done," is a sample of his pedestrian and negative exegesis.

Either as a whole, or by items, the piece is unbelievably bad. Spangler's summons has less lift than a wingless bomber. It is constructive with appalling infrequency and when it does veer slightly from the stale old pattern the affirmation is half-hearted. Caspar Milquetoast is a brash daredevil in comparison.

One screed doesn't make a party program, of course, but when a new national party chairman seeks to survey the Nation's future one expects something besides puerilities. Parties—and governments—perform their principal function, which is popular leadership, only when their aims are challenging, their principles inspiring, and their programs create enthusiasm. Spangler's prospectus is a negation of these basic elements.

Oswald Spengler wrote apperceptively of The Decline of the West, Harrison E. Spangler unwittingly writes of the decline and bankruptcy of the Republican Party. Consider The G. O. P.'s New Stand as a criterion and the Republican Party may have got itself an undertaker instead of a national chairman.

The Congress and 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include a featured editorial which appeared in the Indiana Farmers Guide, issue of January 1, 1943.

This editorial is so pertinent and timely that it needs no comment. In calling it to the attention of the House, however, I do want to emphasize the fact that no statement I have seen more accurately reflects the hopes and desires of the American people for this Seventy-eighth Congress. If there is any doubt in your minds as to the thoughts of the voters as they went to the polls last November 3, I want particularly to commend this short editorial as well worth your careful thought and study:

THE CONGRESS AND 1943

When the new Congress convenes in Washington in January it will carry into its session the one remaining hope of the people of the United States for a continuation of the constitutional government under which they have lived since the birth of the Nation.

If the Members of this Congress, more evenly divided in political party allegiance than its immediate predecessors, can unite to recover the legislative authority which the body has heretofore been cajoled into surrendering to the executive branch, there will be an immediate surcease of the reckless impositions that have wrecked transportation, business and individual effort in the United States.

If the Members of the Congress aline themselves as Democrat and Republicans, abdicate to the lame duck administrators nominated by the New Deal and supinely allow the personal appointees of Franklin D. Roosevelt to exercise authority vested only in Members of the Congress the socialization of the Government will be complete.

There exists no doubt in the minds of anyone as to which course the people of the United States desire the Congress to follow. The Nation is more than weary with the effort to keep up with the thousands of rules, proclaimations, and regulations imposed, without rhyme or reason, in the effort to destroy the social economy of our forefathers. It is looking to this Congress to call a halt to the encroachments on the liberties of the people, the regimentation of their lives, and the senseless spending which is undermining the ability of the people to fight a total war.

It has been suggested that there is no better way to curb the rioting of the bureaucrats than to cut off at the source the money from the Public Treasury that is necessary to the continuation of the visionaries' pet schemes. Congress may do this.

It has also been suggested that a renewal of the bill which sought to confer on the Federal district courts the authority to review each mandate of the multitude of New Deal bureaucrats would serve to curb the mad usurpations of authority under which the Nation is writhing. Always it has been the case that when dictators must justify their dictation they are more restrained and wiser in their action than when, as at present, there is no way to put their decrees to the test of reasonableness and sense.

Either, or both of these methods of preserving the Government under which the United States grew into the strongest nation of the world is recommended to the Members of the new Congress.

The people of the United States care not how the task is accomplished but they are praying, as fervently as they can pray, that this Congress will not let them down—that it will function as our forefathers who created it expected it to function.

On the answer to the prayer depends much. With the first indication that Congress is responsive to the will of the people as expressed at the last election there will spring up a confidence in the future that will put more effort and vigor into the prosecution of this unwanted war than our enemies ever believed was possible.—THE PUBLISHER.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the agents of Russia refuse to accept any oleomargarine on lease-lend. They demand butter. Allies are choosers.

The political complications on the North African battle front are only a hint of the difficulties toward a permanent peace.

The jockeying now going on between nations for future control of commercial airways is the second war now in progress.

The main difference between the indictments of Ed and Errol Flynn is that the former deals with the taxpayers and is not statutory.

The guaranteeing at home of the first of the four freedoms we intend to extend to the world is the safest way to prevent dictatorship here.

Two store burglars, being apprehended at night, told policemen they were janitors. "O. K.," say the officers, "we'll give you time and a half for this overtime."

Representative O'BRIEN, of Chicago, left the House 4 years ago to be the Cook County sheriff. Having served his 4 years there, he now returns to Congress.

The victorious sweeps in recent months of the Russian Army had no effect whatsoever on the House Democrat caucus toward putting MARCANTONIO on the Judiciary Committee.

Defeated "lame ducks,"
The voters turn down,
Are put in bureaus,
To push folks around.
—Contributed.

The recent death of the soldier, Rowan, who "carried the Message to Garcia" reminds one of the often forgotten lesson it taught. His type in the work-a-day world today is so refreshing yet so rare.

A paid half-page ad in a Washington paper calls Congress' attention to the wicked waste of three men doing only the work of one in defense industries and suggests where our lost manpower might be found.

Chairman CLARENCE CANNON of the Appropriations Committee throws a luncheon for his 43 members, the largest standing committee of the House in all the country's years. The table was decorated with 20 pots of flowers and there was not a woman in the room.

Farm Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the attached communications to call attention to one of the many serious problems that confront our country's farmers, who have been asked to produce more food than ever before in the Nation's history. In the name of common sense and fair play, why cannot some of these burdensome and unnecessary restrictions be lifted so that farm producers can produce to the limit?

The communications follow:

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
LAW AND UTILITIES DEPARTMENT,
Berkeley, Calif., January 15, 1943.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are sending you a copy of a resolution passed at a regular meeting of the board of directors of California Farm Bureau Federation held on January 7, together with a copy of a letter to Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES, from Mr. Ray B. Wiser. A similar letter was sent to Messrs. Jeffers, Eastman, Henderson, and Wickard. The statement of facts referred to in Mr. Wiser's letter was completed by the writer and copies sent by air mail to each of the persons named above on Monday, January 11.

We are also sending you a copy of the statement prepared as directed by the resolution. A careful inspection of this statement will show you that a desperate situation prevails here in California as a result of the handling of applications for certificates of war necessity by the Office of Defense Transportation, and the administration of gasoline rationing for farm transportation equipment and the regulation of its use for all other farm purposes by the Office of Price Administration.

A careful analysis of over 600 cases shows that farmers who filed their applications direct with Office of Defense Transportation received only 50 percent of the mileage requested and only 52 percent of the mileage actually operated in the conduct of their business last year, while those farmers who made their applications through county farm transportation committees, and the mileage requested had the committee's approval, only received 46.5 percent of the amount requested and less than 41 percent of the miles used in their farm operations last year.

While Office of Defense Transportation employees now are inclined to make corrections and in some cases local rationing boards are doing a good job, more often the local Office of Price Administration boards are arbitrary and unreasonable, and in many cases even refuse to grant the amount of gasoline provided for on the farmers' Office of Defense Transportation certificates.

All of these points are set forth time after time in our statement of facts, and we assure you that the program as now being operated does just the opposite from what was intended, and should be discontinued immediately. If that is not done it will result in a serious situation in the production of food. We urge you to have the proper parties give this matter personal attention. If any additional

information is desired, we will be glad to furnish it.

Yours very truly,

J. J. DEUEL,
Director.

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Berkeley, Calif., January 8, 1943.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Director, Office of Economic Stabilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The handling of Office of Defense Transportation Order No. 21 in connection with farm transportation equipment has been such that it has materially reduced plantings and interfered with the maximum production of food. A thorough discussion of the factors involved was had at the meeting of the board of directors of California Farm Bureau Federation yesterday. Following the discussion the attached resolution was passed.

California Farm Bureau Federation is a general farm organization having more than 25,000 farm families in California as members. Its primary activities are now being carried on to increase the production of necessary food and fiber needed in the war effort.

There will be filed with you in the next few days a statement as to the facts which caused the attached resolution to be passed by J. J. Deuel, manager of our law and utilities department. Your prompt cooperation in carrying out the request of the resolution will be sincerely appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

RAY B. WISER,
President.

Whereas the present maladministration of the enforcement of Office of Defense Transportation Order No. 21 as it is applied to farm transportation equipment, and the regulation of the use of gasoline for all farm uses in connection therewith is seriously interfering with the production of food so necessary to the war effort; and

Whereas due to the use of application forms by Office of Defense Transportation containing many questions impossible to answer, requesting information that does not exist, and not applicable to California agricultural conditions, the use of poorly worded form letters which are not suitable for the cases in which they are used, and the lack of necessary forms or blanks for appeal, much confusion exists resulting in many thousands of miles of useless driving and waste of manpower at this time of great shortage of labor; and

Whereas here where no shortage exists, the rationing of gasoline for farm transportation and regulation of its use for other farm equipment by Office of Price Administration offices, which in many cases are not properly equipped and have insufficient help to handle the work, causes much unnecessary driving and loss of valuable time by both farm owners and farm employees: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor discontinuance of gasoline rationing for farm transportation and regulation of its use for other farm purposes, and instruct our law and utilities department to make prompt application to the proper authorities for immediate discontinuance of this useless and wasteful practice.

Food Production Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MORRIS, N. Y., *January 15, 1943.*

Representative EDWIN A. HALL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HALL: The recent Associated Press release in which you were quoted as telling the House that efforts had been made to make a "guinea pig" out of the American farmer, is very timely, and perhaps you would be glad to receive a small portion of my slant, and observations along that same subject.

First of all, I wish to state that I am producing about 500 pounds of milk per day, and could produce 800 pounds or more per day. I have the necessary hay, and silage to increase production that much. However, the trouble lies in the fact that I do not know from one day to the next, what new bureaucratic, flim-flam plan will be released out of Washington, which will always be designed to slap the farmer in the face, and win votes for this socialistic New Deal.

If this was all for the war effort, farmers would not mind. They are willing to work even longer hours to bring about a quick victory. However, when they note the attitude of labor, and that of the present administration toward the 8-hour day, with time and a half, and double time for Sundays, their morale, and that of their hired help is becoming weaker and weaker. Hired help is actually "gold-bricking," and quoting wages paid to war workers. They say, "Why should I kill myself on the job? You do not pay me overtime." What can the owner of a farm say?

The fact of the matter is, as badly as this country needs milk, and its products, I predict that there will be much less next year, unless steps are taken at once to forestall the reasons.

What are some of these reasons? Let me give you my own experience in respect to feed and I might add, that I am in a position to know what constitutes my difficulty, also constitutes the difficulty of all milk producers. Some months ago, I bought on contract, 20 tons of 24 percent dairy ration, which cost me $2.47 per hundred. After taking out 1 ton, I was told that the balance could not be mixed, and no more would be available, because the Government had clamped down on necessary ingredients of high protein. That in the future, only an 18- or 20-percent protein feed would be available. The price of the same would be $2.77, or 30 cents higher, to produce, if my judgment is correct, from 10 to 20 percent less milk. This would, of course, vary on the individual farms, due to quality of hay, etc.

There are conflicting stories, as to just who is responsible for a condition which can only spell less production of milk, at a time when every pound and even more is needed to feed a hungry world.

It is up to Congress to investigate and correct the same, or this Nation may awaken with too little and too late.

It is not just my loss in this feed company not being able to live up to their contract. It might mean that the soldiers and rifle makers will have to go without, or eat the steel for the guns.

May I offer a few suggestions to you and to Congress?

Get tough, and see that justice and equality are shown to all in this country. See that the legislative and judicial branches retain the same power and dignity as was given them in the Constitution, and that the executive branch goes not further than its proper place. Leave the farmer free to produce and expand his production of all foods. It is wistful thinking to ask farmers to produce more and to establish goals of production by one bureau and then have them roped and hog-tied by another bureau. You cannot place an electrical engineer in a position of authority to tell me how to milk cows nor to tell another man how to feed hogs.

Find out who some of these socialist-minded reformers are. Look into the background of those who hold responsible jobs in these various departments in Washington. It might be found that all of their flag waving for our way of living is a blind alley for other activities.

Farmers want to win this war, and they know that it means hard work, not just hot air, and overtime pay. They are not asking for an E on their barn doors, nor a banquet thrown in their favor, if they refuse to work after 8 hours. They expect Congress to be just, and fair, and to make laws with that in mind. They want no special handouts, and then have the Government rub those same handouts into their faces, to build up parity prices, based on prices of 1909 to 1914, the time when Columbus discovered America, or any other period except the present period.

In my constant contact with farmers, I find that they are ready to back you nearly 100 percent in your efforts to preserve democracy, under the system which has made this Nation the greatest country on earth.

The subject is long, and I must close.

Respectfully yours,

HOWARD H. HALBERT.

McMasters Advocates World Federal Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chelsea (Mass.) Record of January 13, 1943:

M'MASTERS ADVOCATES WORLD FEDERAL UNION—CHAIRMAN OF NATIONAL PENSION COMMITTEE, SPEAKING AT ROTARY, URGES ELECTION OF ROOSEVELT AS PRESIDENT OF NEW ORDER

William H. McMasters, chairman of National Pension Committee, speaking before the Rotary Club at its regular weekly meeting yesterday, outlined a plan for the "United States of the World" that he insists must follow the present war or else our entire war effort will prove just as ineffectual as the last war.

"I feel that the Federal Union that has been so successful in the United States of America can be spread out until it takes in the entire world," said Mr. McMasters. "I heartily disagree with most of the plans for world peace that are being suggested by those who feel that only a part of the world should become associated for the purpose of preserving peace. Such a peace of compulsion would be only temporary. Just as we have finally entered into a total war, so we must eventually enter into a total peace.

"I would set up the same sort of union and the same general legislative machinery and executive power as is now in force in America—a house and senate, a president of the world, a cabinet of advisers, and a supreme court. To give the idea tangible substance, I offer as the candidate of the United States for president of the supergovernment our own President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is my opinion that in the present state of world thought, if the plan were set up right now, that President Roosevelt would be the unanimous choice of the whole world for the post of president of the new and peaceful world government.

"I advocate direct election by the votes of the people of their senators and representatives in the world congress—every nation to have at least one i each branch. In nations that have large populations I would limit the representatives to 1 for each 5,000,000 of population. On that basis the lower branch of the world government would have only about the same number as our own Congress. Those who think the plan fantastic might visualize President Roosevelt as the new head of this voluntary world democracy and it will then become practical and intriguing. The only time when wars will cease to scourge the earth will be when every nation has its free voice in the world management. This plan covers that point fully."

Mr. McMasters, introduced by Rotarian William E. Dailey, gave the club one of its most interesting sessions of the season.

The New Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include comment from Iowa on The New Congress, an editorial written by a distinguished citizen, A. L. Frisbie, for the Grinnell (Iowa) Herald-Register:

THE NEW CONGRESS

We cannot help wondering about the new Congress which came into being last Monday.

One thing seems evident and that is that it will not be a "rubber stamp" Congress. We believe that is as it should be. A Congress which insists on passing its own legislation instead of passing legislation which has been written for it is a Congress which is performing its function. It is a healthy sign when we find a Congress which gives every evidence of doing this.

There seems to be no question that in past years there has been an increasing tendency on the part of the executive department of the Government to take unto itself the powers of the legislative branch. There has been too much of the "pass this or else" attitude. We have always felt and believe that we have mentioned the fact occasionally, that a government that operates on this basis is a lopsided government. Congress was created to make the laws and Congress should be allowed to make the laws.

Indeed, judging from the past, we believe that laws passed by Congress would have been better than some of the half-baked and poorly written measures which have been passed under Executive compulsion.

We believe that there is no question but that the present Congress, no longer overwhelmingly pro-administration, will "feel its oats" to some extent and will insist on standing on its own feet. This, we believe, is the way it should be.

We hope, however, that Congress will remember that the great business before the country today is winning the war and that no partisan considerations should be allowed to interfere with that great objective. Congress, we feel, can cooperate to that end without in the least interfering with its functions as a law-making body. We hope that it will, and in the meantime we await with considerable expectancy whatever it may be that will happen during the next few months.

Questions and Answers Concerning the Income-Tax Liability of Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable confusion regarding the filing of income-tax returns and payment of the tax on the part of members of the armed forces. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue has prepared a series of questions and answers on the subject which I believe would be helpful to Members in answering inquiries on the subject, and I therefore have asked unanimous consent to have the brief statement inserted in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

Commissioner of Internal Revenue Guy T. Helvering said today that certain questions have arisen with regard to the Federal income-tax liability for the year 1942 of the personnel of the armed forces of the United States. The questions and answers thereto are as follows:

POSTPONEMENT OF PAYMENT

Question. When may the payment of income tax be postponed by reason of a person being in the armed forces of the United States?

Answer. If such a person is serving in the United States, the collection of the tax (whether the tax falls due prior to or during his period of military service) is deferred without interest for a period up to 6 months after the termination of his military service if he establishes by a statement of his financial condition filed with the collector of internal revenue that his ability to pay is materially impaired on account of such service. The form of statement may be obtained from the collector.

In the case of a person in the military forces of the United States, who at the time the tax would otherwise be due, is serving on sea duty or outside the United States, the collection of the tax is postponed until the 15th day of the third month (approximately 75 days) following the end of the month in which the individual ceases to be in such service outside the United States or ceases to be on sea duty. In such cases it will be unnecessary to establish inability to pay the tax.

RETURNS OF THOSE SERVING OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Question. Are members of the armed forces serving outside the United States required to file their income-tax returns on March 15, 1943?

Answer. The due date for the filing of income-tax returns is postponed in the case of any person in the military or naval forces of the United States, who at the time the return would otherwise be due, is serving on sea duty or outside the United States. The term "United States" means the States and the District of Columbia. The time within which a return may be filed in such cases is the fifteenth day of the third month (approximately 75 days) following the end of the month in which the individual ceases to be in such service outside the United States or ceases to be on sea duty.

TREATMENT OF FAMILY ALLOWANCE

Question. Is the family allowance made to the dependents of the members of the armed forces of the United States exempt from Federal income tax?

Answer. The entire amount of the family allowance is exempt from tax on the part of the beneficiary. A portion is contributed by the Government and part is withheld from the pay of the enlisted man. The portion contributed by the Government is considered to be a gift and the amount withheld from the pay of the enlisted man is part of his taxable income.

TREATMENT OF PAY ALLOTMENT

Question. Is the pay allotted by the personnel of the armed forces to designated beneficiaries taxable to the beneficiaries?

Answer. No. The amount allotted is taxable income to the person making the allotment.

INCREASED EXEMPTION

Question. Is any part of the pay received in the year 1942 by the personnel of the armed forces for active service during the present war exempt from Federal income tax?

Answer. Yes. If the person is not a commissioned officer and then only to the following extent—the person must be a member of the military or naval forces of the United States below the grade of commissioned officer on December 31, 1942, in which event he should not include in gross income the first $250 if he were single on such date or the first $300 if married or the head of a family on such date. These exclusions from gross income are in addition to the personal exemption of $500 allowed single persons and $1,200 allowed married persons.

TREATMENT OF GRATUITY PAY

Question. Is the amount paid to the beneficiary of a deceased officer or enlisted man representing 6 months' pay, known as "gratuity pay," taxable income to the beneficiary?

Answer. No. This amount represents a gift by the United States and need not be included in income.

Give Recognition Where Recognition Is Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable W. G. Skelly, president of the Skelly Oil Co., outstanding business executive, philanthropist, and community builder of my State, recognizing the outstanding part the American farmer has, and is, contributing toward winning the war, has initiated his own individual plan of recognition to the farmers for their outstanding achievements. I insert the same as part of my remarks:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE FARMERS OF AMERICA

MY DEAR FRIENDS: Well-deserved praise has been given the members and branches of our fighting forces for distinguished service on the far-flung battle fronts of this global war.

Defense plant workers in all parts of the United States have been cited for outstanding contributions in the battle of production.

Business, too, has received honorable mention for putting national welfare ahead of private gain.

All of this is entirely fitting and proper.

But what about the American farmer?

It is my feeling that no group of citizens has responded more generously or more magnificently to this Nation's call for increased production than American farmers. You have done what was asked of you, quietly, without fanfare—and in spite of increasing shortages of labor and equipment.

I feel that due recognition of your achievements should be made. Because of my many years of close association with farmers in the Midwest I would like the privilege of sponsoring recognition of superior achievement in agriculture.

Starting as soon as possible, therefore, we will honor, each week, a Midwest farmer, farm wife, farm family, 4-H Club member, Future Farmer of America, or member of some other farm organization for notable contribution to the war effort in the production of food. A committee of recognized authorities on agriculture will select one outstanding person or family for each week's award on a basis of accomplishment, such as record crops, record production of poultry, livestock, etc.

The name of the person or family selected for citation each week will be announced on Skelly Oil Co.'s radio program over the National Broadcasting Co. network, and the accomplishment will be told in detail, so that other farmers may profit thereby.

To each person or family thus cited for superior achievement in agriculture, we will award a $100 United States war bond, and the Skelly "S" pennant for superior achievement in agriculture, along with other distinguishing and identifying insignia.

Presentation of these awards for superior achievement in agriculture will be made at appropriate ceremonies in the city or town nearest the recipient's residence.

I hope and trust that this step will encourage you to hasten victory with ever-increasing production of food.

Sincerely yours,

W. G. SKELLY.

Address of Speaker Sam Rayburn at Houston, Tex., December 21, 1942

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having heretofore been granted to me for that purpose, I am inserting herewith an address delivered by the Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, on December 21, 1942, on the occasion of the launching at Houston of the U. S. S. *Moore* by the Brown Shipbuilding Co. of Houston, Tex. It is as follows:

We watch today while a ship goes down to the sea in freedom's cause. Meeting fire with fire, blast with blast, she is dedicated to the protection of men who go to face a like ordeal on foreign soil. For such purpose the name she bears—U. S. S. *Moore*—is well chosen; it is the name of a young American, scarcely out of boyhood, who stood up most bravely to that ordeal, and most bravely is fallen in that cause. No higher adventure can our life hold than that which is here symbolized.

We bid this ship, the destroyer escort vessel U. S. S. *Moore*, Godspeed. But also, for the people of America, let us address ourselves to one who has gone through worse than fire, worse than the terror of bullets or the deadliness of bombs. To the mother of Fred Kenneth Moore, seaman, first class, who fought gallantly for man's freedom and gallantly died, and whose name this ship takes back into the same fight—to this mother who now stands here at my side let us speak for America.

It is not easy to tell you, courageous American mother, what is in our hearts. It will not be easy to tell the other American mothers whose losses match your own. The price your son has paid is reckoned in a brighter currency than words. So, too, the silent agony that tears do not wash away. That is why we are trying to speak to you in action rather than in words—to you, Mrs. Fred Moore, and to those other American mothers who go hand in hand with you through the days ahead. We are trying to say it in the launching of warships, rather than in speech. We are trying to give you our answer in victories, rather than in ceremony. That is the answer your sacrifice deserves. And answer it we shall, at home in working and giving, and on battlefields abroad in fighting, until the blows that have felled your loved ones are given back, until we shall know that they are not fallen in vain.

Your son, Mrs. Moore, left the home you made for him in the little town of Greenville, Tex., as countless other American boys have left their homes to joint this fight, confident of his strength, sure of his purpose, a smile for you on his face, and an ache for you in his heart. When he walked into the Naval Recruiting Station in Dallas on July 31, 1940, he was not yet 19 years old. Old enough to join the Navy, yet not so old that you yourself could watch him go without something of the heartache you once felt on seeing him off to his first day at school; not quite old enough to have lost the boyish grin you loved so dearly, not so old that you could see him off now without wondering whether he still might need the care that you and the Baptist minister who is your husband had given him through the years.

But your son, despite his years, Mrs. Moore, was very much a man. So much a man, so sure that what he was fighting for was also worth dying for, that when the hour of test came, he met it as only a man could. Fred Kenneth Moore was killed in action at Pearl Harbor. There is no need to repeat to you the story which your mother's heart has gone over—too many times since then—of the way he met death, but for those gathered here I shoud like to read the brief citation that went with the award to your son of the Navy Cross, presented March 18, 1942. From this citation I quote:

"For distinguished service, extraordinary courage, and devotion to duty and disregard for his own safety during the attack on the fleet in Pearl Harbor, T. H., by Japanese forces on December 7, 1941. In spite of orders from his gun captain to take cover when the enemy strafing became severe, Seaman Moore remained at his station on antiaircraft gun No. 1 of the U. S. S. *Arizona* with two other members of the gun crew and assisted in keeping it in operation against the enemy until he was killed by an explosion."

Your son fought, Mrs. Moore, as only a man can fight who has within him the love of freedom in which our Nation was founded. Your son knew, Mrs. Moore, as only a man can know from a conviction deep within his soul, the menace to that freedom which suddenly filled the skies over Pearl Harbor. We can forget his tender years. In the memory of what he did, we can seek to imbue ourselves with his spirit, to fortify ourselves with the understanding that was his. We can work and fight and give and, if need be, die that this boy who was so very much a man and his comrades shall not have died in vain.

This, then, is our answer, Mrs. Moore, to you and to the mothers of America who, in spirit, stand with you today as another ship of war goes down to the sea. We shall launch yet more ships, we shall train yet more men to fight the enemy your sons have fought, we shall send yet more planes and guns against that enemy. And of ourselves, whatever we are called upon to give, we shall give, whether it be work or sacrifice or life itself. The Nation for which Fred Kenneth Moore died, the Nation for which the U. S. S. *Moore* carries on in 1942, finds her immortality in the spirit of free men. That spirit is undying.

Message of Governor Snell, of Oregon, to the Oregon Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the following message was delivered by Earl E. Snell, Governor of Oregon, at the opening session of the Oregon State Legislature, at the time he was inducted into office. The Governor discusses many of the problems confronting our State in this critical period, many of which are of national importance:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the forty-second legislative assembly of the great State of Oregon, in assuming the high office of Governor of my native State I feel impelled by a sense of gratitude to express my profound appreciation for the honor conferred. However, I recognize full well that my appreciation may best be expressed by a dedication to the fullest extent of my energy and capacity to faithful performance and acceptance of many duties and responsibilities incumbent upon the Governor of this great commonwealth.

As members of this forty-second legislative assembly, you are meeting during one of the most critical periods in the history of our Nation. You are meeting at a time when our country is engaged in a great global war—the extent and scope and likeness of which the world has never known. Upon victory depends the continuation of all that we cherish and hold dear—our liberties, our homes, our sacred institutions—the American way of life. Representatives of Nazi tyranny and Japanese despotism—cruel, greedy, and ruthless—have as their goal world power and conquest and complete subjugation of all peoples of all the earth. Their designs are so all-inclusive and so fraught with danger and potentialities that they stagger the intellectual powers of human comprehension. The over-all progress and advancement of the Allied forces during recent months have given us cause for increased hope and encouragement. Yet it is only the beginning of a determined march—a march that is difficult but certain—that leads down that long road to victory.

OREGON'S WAR RECORD CITED

In keeping with her duty and glorious traditions of the historic past Oregon once more has demonstrated her unswerving loyalty and patriotism by establishing records which are the envy of the entire Union.

We are reminded that in the Spanish-American War an Oregon regiment, composed entirely of volunteers, was the first to land in the Philippines, and the first to enter the walled city of Manila.

In the First World War Oregon in proportion to population led all States of the Union in furnishing volunteers; was first in the Nation to recruit all National Guard quotas to

full war strength—mobilization overnight of the first National Guard regiment in the country to be ready for service; first to complete machinery for the operation of the Selective Service Act, and in addition Oregon established the enviable record of oversubscription of each and every one of the four Liberty Loan drives held during that period.

Oregon's record during this present emergency is equally significant. Oregon has been at the top in several phases of civil defense activities, and for a period ranked first in the Nation in purchase of individual Defense bonds. Oregon has consistently exceeded its quota. In the fall of 1940, when the President ordered expansion of the National Guard our quota was filled in 1 week, to lead the entire Union. Most significant, however, is the fact that once again Oregon led the Nation in volunteers for both the Army and Navy.

Many of our Oregon boys have already made the supreme sacrifice in this great cause of liberty, truth, and justice. Our sympathetic hearts are filled with grief as we share the emotions of the mothers and fathers, the sisters and brothers, the wives, sons, and daughters of those brave men who gave the full measure of devotion. Yet no greater honor, no greater glory hath any man.

I wish to suggest that here we pause during the deliberations of this assembly to rise and bow our heads in a moment of silent tribute.

May it please God that the day of victory—final and complete—be hastened and made secure.

SHORT SESSION URGED

Many of you members of this legislative assembly are occupying places of responsibility in your various communities in connection with America's all-out war effort. I know that you are anxious to return to those important posts at the very earliest opportunity.

This is no ordinary session. These are no ordinary times. During normal times the legislative mill ofttimes has become clogged with unimportant and unnecessary legislation, resulting in delay, confusion, added expense, and a lengthened session. Such incidents should not occur in ordinary times and certainly not now when every available ounce of energy and effort should be directed toward hastening the day of victory. Time truly is of the essence. With essential industries and business generally pleading for help; with various war activities and defense programs in dire need of additional assistance, the men and women of this legislative assembly together with those whose presence is required, should not be detained here a moment longer than is absolutely necessary.

Therefore, I suggest for your earnest consideration that legislation at this session be confined to measures having to do with the winning of this war; post-war planning or legislation essential to that period; taxation, particularly property tax relief; consolidations and economy programs; necessary appropriation measures and only such other legislation as determined to be necessary and essential to the welfare and well-being of the people of our State and deemed to be of such urgency as necessary of enactment now.

Your responsibilities as members of this forty-second legislative assembly are greater than those heretofore attendant upon legislators any time in the history of our State. When the resolution of adjournment sine die is adopted may it be said that the Forty-second Assembly of the Oregon Legislature, meeting at a time when our country was involved in a great World War, was one of the most forthright, consistent, and businesslike sessions in Oregon's history. To that end is pledged the fullest cooperation of the executive department.

The founders of the government of the State of Oregon, under the provisions of section I of article III of the constitution, wisely ordained that the powers should be divided into three separate and distinct departments of government—the legislative, the executive including the administrative, and the judicial. The constitution further provides, however, that the chief executive shall, from time to time, make certain recommendations to the legislative assembly.

In keeping with the suggestions for a short session and under the provisions of the Oregon constitution I welcome the opportunity to suggest certain specific recommendations for your earnest consideration.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE BILL PLANNED

The present Oregon State defense council was organized June 1, 1941, by executive order of the Governor. It was formed promptly following a request from the President of the United States. By virtue of the method of its creation it has lacked statutory authority as a legal entity or State agency and as such could not receive nor disburse State funds. With approval of the State emergency board, and supplemented by the assistance of personnel from several State departments, its activities have been financed from appropriations made at the 1941 legislative session for expansion of activities of the State police and organization of a State guard.

Thousands of loyal and patriotic Oregonians are contributing freely of their time and effort in carrying out the responsibilities assigned to them under this program which is designed for the protection of home and fireside and for the general welfare of our citizens.

There have been mistakes and misunderstanding to be sure but when we consider that the civilian defense program was, and is, a voluntary emergency organization virtually set up overnight our appreciation for the splendid service it has rendered to our State is increased.

A civilian defense bill taken from the uniform act as adopted by many States of the Union will be submitted for your consideration and approval. The proposed measure carries an appropriation, as funds sufficient from other departments are no longer available. It is hoped that no emergency will arise which will make necessary an appeal to the emergency board. However, it will be necessary to rely to considerable degree upon supplemental aid and assistance from departmental personnel and in the use of equipment. The full success of the program depends upon the continued help and assistance of individuals, groups, organizations, and private and public agencies.

The Oregon National Guard was mobilized and called into Federal service by Executive order on September 16, 1940. As a result of this action the 1941 legislature passed an act authorizing the creation of a State guard and outlining certain of its responsibilities. Under the provisions of that act a State guard was organized December 10, 1941, and has functioned as such since that date. By the terms and provisions of that act the organization will cease to function as of January 21, 1943, the date of its termination as set forth in the law.

The need and importance of a continuation of the activities of a State guard during this emergency are well recognized, I am sure. In recommending its continuation and keeping in mind that the present act expires January 21—10 days hence—I suggest that the emergency clause be employed and that attention be given to early enactment.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION PROPOSED

It is my recommendation that this legislature enact legislation extending the benefits to Oregon members of our armed forces serving in World War No. 2. Among other things those benefits should include real-estate-loan privileges, veterans' preference, educational opportunities, and vocational training.

The recommendation contains no thought or suggestion of financial award because the extent of their patriotism and unreserved devotion cannot be measured in terms of money. From the cities and farms they came—thousands of the finest of Oregon's young manhood—relinquishing gainful employment, yielding educational pursuits, sacrificing aims and ambitions of the morrow, to engage in one of the greatest battles for freedom the world has ever known. The pages of history will never reveal greater courage, bravery, patriotism, and sacrifice than demonstrated by American boys at Bataan and the Philippines, at Wake, Guam, the Solomons; in fact, on land and sea and in the air on far-flung battlefields of the world.

We here at home, in addition to the responsibility of making every possible contribution to our all-out war effort, have a very distinct and definite obligation—an obligation to preserve and maintain constitutional representative government and the unrestricted sovereignty of the political subdivisions of these United States of America.

Thus will we keep faith with those who are contributing most toward the preservation and perpetuation of our free institutions.

We are fighting a war which among other things is designed to preserve democracy. What a sad commentary twould be if in preserving democracy abroad we lost it here at home.

TAX REDUCTION RECOMMENDED

Taxation has always been one of the most complex problems of government. To meet the demands of the citizenry for orderly government, for schools, for police and fire protection, sanitation and modern facilities; city, county, and State institutions, streets, bridges, and modern highways—all of these and more—necessitate the raising of revenue. Civil government cannot exist without revenue. Yet, there are definite limitations as to taxes and beyond which are placed in jeopardy the immediate social and economic stability and security of such government. Full consideration should be given to the question of finding ways and means of reducing property taxes—eliminations, reductions, nonessentials, and consolidations—both State and local. Every consideration must be given to the relief and encouragement of home ownership. It is obvious, of course, that State and local governments cannot be adjourned, but with Federal taxes the highest in our history and with further increases scheduled, this question takes on added significance and importance.

In many localities of this State the Federal Government has acquired large real estate holdings which thereby have become tax exempt.

I suggest that this legislature memorialize the Congress to enact legislation at an early date which will reimburse adequately those taxing districts which through such Federal ownership are being deprived of a considerable portion of their tax revenues.

Considerable relief will be forthcoming in the distribution to the school districts of surplus income-tax revenues for property tax offset. In conversation with leaders of the proponents of this recent initiative having to do with this question and as quite generally known, I learned that bills will be presented to clarify any possible ambiguity in the intent or wording of the act to the end that the moneys in question shall be used definitely for property tax relief, but that there shall be established the polity of equalized State support of public schools, I concur in these objectives. The effective date of the transfer to these funds should likewise be clarified by legislative action. If this honorable body decides affirmatively upon such action may I suggest that consideration be given to the advisability of an earmarked reserve fund.

CAUTIONS ON INCOME TAX

From time to time there have been advanced proposals calling for a reduction in the rates on the State income tax. That these proposals have merit I concur and agree, and, particularly so in view of the tremendous burden of Federal income taxes. Yet paradoxically, recently increased Federal income taxes mean lower State income taxes; and, here then according to recent figures and estimates, gives cause for considerable concern.

According to conservative estimates from reliable and informative sources state income-tax payments, because of increased Federal payments, will be reduced automatically by 15 percent this year and next year by as much as 30 percent—nearly one third. While in normal years reductions of state income tax might well be in order, in view of an automatic reduction of 30 percent next year, I caution that full, long-range, and careful consideration should be given to any suggestion for reduction at this time.

I wish to acknowledge with appreciation the splendid services of Mr. Guy Cordon in connection with matters of taxation. His valuable assistance was made available without salary through the courtesy of the Interstate Association of Public Land Counties. It is recognized full well that in the space of a few weeks only cursory examination and consideration can be given to a question so important and complex as that of taxation. An effective committee might well be organized to study this problem thoroughly. We want the lowest taxes possible. We want the fairest and most equitable distribution possible to obtain. We want to attract and retain industries. We want to develop our State and its resources. Much depends upon this important problem of taxation—a question which reaches out into the homes and daily lives of each and all of our citizens.

CONSOLIDATIONS RECOMMENDED

I recommend that the administrative duties and functions of the World War veterans' State-aid commission and the State land board be consolidated.

Such consolidation affords an opportunity to coordinate the renting, sale, and disposal of State-owned real properties and permit uniformity in the valuation thereof; to permit standardization in the handling of loans, collections, foreclosures, and contracts; to consolidate the activities of field personnel permitting a maximum of flexibility, uniformity, and economy in administration, which, together with a reduction of administrative personnel, should reflect substantial savings and at the same time provide a more efficient service for all those utilizing the facilities of these departments now and in the future.

"I recommend that the milk control board be abolished and the administration of the act be lodged with the Department of Agriculture under the supervision of the director of that division. This would further consolidate the administration of State laws relating to agricultural pursuits; would centralize control over office and field personnel, inspection services, and general rules and regulations as provided by law, which should effect savings in salaries and eliminate duplication of travel and general expenses of investigators, auditors, and inspectors.

With the same general view in mind of economy and efficiency in administration, I recommend the consolidation of the duties and functions of the State banking board and the corporation department under a division to be known as the department of banking and corporations.

At present the State tax commission is composed of three members appointed by three members of the State board of control. However, the appointive power lodged with the board of control marks the limit and extent of that board's jurisdiction and supervision over the policies, responsibilities, and administrative duties and functions of the tax commission.

I recognize that there is considerable opposition to any change in the laws affecting the administrative set-up of the tax commission, and which opposition, among others, includes groups and organizations of State-wide significance. That there is basis for their contention, there can be no doubt. I recognize, too, that there is a wide difference of opinion among legislators themselves. Were it not that I am convinced of the merit of the following proposal and confident that it would reflect economy and efficiency in administration, I would hesitate to suggest consideration at this particular session.

I recommend that a single tax commissioner appointed by and directly responsible to the Governor be substituted for the present three-man commission now appointed by, but not responsible to the State board of control.

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT APPOINTMENTS

Oregon now has four congressional districts. In connection with the appointment of the membership of several boards and commissions, the law provides for three members and yet calls for representation from each congressional district. In the laws creating the many State boards and commissions the following general language appears in at least six of those acts: "Board to consist of three members appointed by the Governor, one from each congressional district." Those six boards and commissions are:

State highway commission.
State board of barber examiners.
Liquor control commission.
State milk control board.
Oregon real estate board.
State sanitary authority.

It is recommended that appropriate amendments be made which will reconcile the provisions of these measures and remove by clarification any confliction brought about by the recent creation of Oregon's Fourth Congressional District.

Much has been said and written about the problems and difficulties which we shall face during the post-war period. Many of these problems are recognized to be national in scope and application—some of them international—yet right here in our own State and in our own communities we have certain definite responsibilities and obligations. We must lend every effort to the all-out prosecution of this war, yet it is timely, indeed, that thought and study be directed toward developing plans for the transition period that lies ahead. The uncertainty as to the date hostilities shall cease is not justification for delay in shaping future plans for action.

I do not share the view that a post-war depression is inevitable. There will be great demand for change-over equipment and materials; transportation facilities, now strained to the utmost, must be replaced and repaired; projects and improvements have been deferred; there will be shortages to fill in equipment, materials, and supplies; new buildings required, public and private; highways, roads, and bridges to be constructed and repaired; housing programs, prefabrication, new products, and developments.

Yet we must look forward to potential problems of unemployment immediately following the war. We must look forward to the rehabilitation and reemployment of the boys in our armed forces when they return home. We must prepare now for emergencies that might develop during that period of transition.

I therefore recommend the creation of a substantial reserve from surplus revenues and other sources which seem to be practical and sound. It should also be made possible to invest such funds in United States War bonds, which would serve the two fold purpose of providing sound interim investment and of promoting our all-out war effort. Like authorization should also extend to counties, cities, and other political subdivisions.

I recommend further that appropriations be made at this session of the legislature for much needed new buildings and improvements at our State institutions and agencies, and for such additional services necessary to raise within proper limitations institutional standards. Construction of new buildings must necessarily be delayed until the close of hostilities because of shortages and priorities but such delay will coincide with a post-war program.

I recommend, also, that $150,000 of the surplus revenues in the hospital accident fund collected from motor vehicle operators be transferred to the State highway fund, there to be earmarked with other reserve funds for use following this war emergency. Further, that permission be granted for creating reserves from racing funds which have been distributed to the counties, the Pacific International Livestock Exposition, Oregon State Fair, Pendleton Round-up, Eastern Oregon Livestock Show, and Northwestern Turkey Show, such reserve funds to be used following the war for plant expansion, repairs or improvement.

COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR READJUSTMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

I recommend further that there be created a committee known as the Committee on Post-War Readjustment and Development, such committee to include a membership of 15 and composed as follows:

The chairman of the ways and means committee of the senate, the chairman of the ways and means committee of the house, the State budget director, director of department of agriculture, State forester, director of geology and mineral industries, State highway engineer, representative of the school of economics or business administration at the University of Oregon, representative of the school of engineering at Oregon State College, six members to be appointed by the Governor.

This committee should be charged with the responsibility of devising programs and methods, and coordinating plans of action for the post-war demobilization and transition periods; of promoting actively the industrial, mineral, and agricultural resources of our State; cooperating with other agencies and groups, individuals, and organizations, both public and private, all to the end that the committee's work may contribute materially to sound, practical, orderly, and satisfactory solutions to the important problems that lie ahead.

This must not be just another committee. There is important and necessary work to be done. Questions of unemployment, the development of our State and its resources, the rehabilitation and reemployment of our boys now in the armed forces of this country are questions not to be taken lightly. The appointment to this committee of State officials, well informed and advised on Oregon's resources and problems to be considered should expedite the work to be undertaken. Others added should be equally qualified in their particular fields. A full-time capable and able executive-director should be selected by the committee.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

We could write pages of tribute to our senior citizens for the valuable contributions they have made toward the growth and development of this great State and Nation. Pages could be utilized—and properly so—in reciting their many sacrifices—in recounting our obligations to those loyal citizens of another generation for their vision and foresight and resolute determination, all of which contributed much toward the freedom, happiness, and prosperity which we of this generation have enjoyed. Would that we might

pass on to the younger generation a similar heritage.

However, to every thoughtful American, a program which provides sufficient financial assistance for our senior citizens is sound—is timely and practical. And, such assistance should not be on the basis of charity but rather on the basis of earned security—of right and decency.

During the current biennium the over-all assistance budget which includes old-age assistance, relief, aid to the blind, dependent children, crippled children and child welfare services, totaled in round numbers $21,700,000. The estimated revenues contained in that budget were to be derived as follows:

Revenues under the Knox act	$6,800,000
State general fund appropriation	2,450,000
Counties appropriation	4,700,000
Federal match funds	7,750,000

The average old-age assistance payment over the biennium was approximately $24.

KNOX CONTROL ACT

May it be said here that so far as the Knox control act and liquor revenues enter into this question, promotion of sales and the desire for profits are in direct opposition to the underlying principles of temperance and control which are fundamental to the spirit and intent of the Knox control law.

FORTY DOLLAR PAYMENTS PROVIDED

The budget for the coming biennium, on the basis of the present schedule and taking into consideration the amount of cash on hand, together with anticipated revenues, provides for an average payment estimated to reach approximately $34 for old-age assistance. Furthermore, that schedule has been projected with the complete elimination of the general fund appropriation raised from State general taxes, which were levied for this purpose during the current biennium and which totaled $2,450,000.

Both the Federal and State laws provide for a maximum payment of $40 per month. We must bear in mind that the basis of need is also included in the Federal law. However, I am confident that we are all agreed that in view of increased prices and present-day costs, $40 per month is little enough to provide sustenance and reasonable comfort for these elderly citizens. Therefore, I recommend that we provide an additional amount of approximately $3 per month per capita which when matched by the Federal Government will provide the approximate $40, designated as the maximum in both State and Federal law. In any event, it seems highly advisable in view of contingencies to supplement these funds from other sources. Several suggestions have been presented: To reenact the 1941 general fund appropriation; use moneys from surplus funds, or enact measures providing for special revenues from so-called indirect sources. Another suggestion is amendments which would grant permission to earn, or receive as gifts, an amount on the basis of the proposed schedule of not to exceed $10 per month.

In my opinion these additional revenues should not come from property taxes nor should the counties be asked to assume any of this portion. Counties should be provided with every possible assistance. Therefore, I recommend the enactment of the following proposal:

That public utilities be brought under the provisions of the Oregon excise-tax law and an equivalent amount of revenue be used for old-age assistance. At the present time utilities are expressly exempted from the Oregon excise-tax law. If additional funds are deemed necessary, consideration should be given to a tax on certain nonalcoholic beverages or to an amusement tax. There will, of course, be opposition to, and arguments against, any method proposed. Yet this matter is before us for solution and I submit that we should not look to property taxes, but on the contrary every possible consideration should be given to property-tax relief.

There is much that can be said in favor of a national pension act, but this problem from a State point of view is imminent and immediate. According to my understanding of the present act, it is not the purpose or intent at any time to prescribe definite rules of living for these senior citizens, yet the maximum payments when qualified should require less detail and thereby reflect savings in costs of administration.

MESSAGE LIMITED

In this inaugural address and for reasons previously mentioned I purposely have refrained from discussing problems of agriculture, forestry, dairying, education, highways and transportation, labor, mining, power, fish and game, and other important phases of social and economic activities over which State government exercises certain controls and jurisdiction. In many instances State departments having jurisdiction can proceed satisfactorily for the duration without the necessity of new laws or amendments. Others can make certain necessary adjustments within the scope and authority of laws and regulations now effective. In some cases amendments may be in order.

However, these are days of rapid changes and constant adjustments. I know personally that members of this assembly have given much thought and study to vital and important questions of the day and current problems of the State and its political subdivisions. And, undoubtedly remedial legislation already has been prepared.

However, if in the next few weeks additional items develop which are determined by the executive department to be urgent and of sufficient import they, together with recommendations, will be submitted forthwith for the consideration of this honorable body as prescribed by the Oregon constitution.

We must keep in mind, however, that many of our problems cannot be solved by legislation.

OLD OREGON TRAIL CENTENNIAL

This year, 1943, marks the one hundredth anniversary of the blazing of the Old Oregon Trail on into the Willamette Valley and of an historic meeting at Champoeg which centennial anniversaries should be observed with fitting ceremonies appropriate to times and conditions.

EXPRESSES APPRECIATION

During the years that I have been a member of the State board of control I have been privileged to serve with Governors Meier, Martin, and Sprague—with Treasurers Holman, Pearson, and Scott. I feel that Oregon has been extremely fortunate in the type and character of the men who have occupied these important and responsible positions. Gov. Charles A. Sprague, my predecessor, has served this State ably, efficiently, and well.

I desire to express here my appreciation for the courtesies and consideration extended.

As elected and appointed representatives of the people in this forty-second legislative assembly, you are meeting at a time when the over-all problems of government are more momentous than at any in our 84 years of statehood. The people of Oregon have confidence in your ability and capacity and your determination to perform notable public service. Their appraisal of the results of our work here will be determined not by the number of bills introduced nor the volume of legislation considered but rather on the basis of a minimum number of important and timely measures considered and a minimum number enacted into law.

In all our deliberations let us, one and all, keep foremost in mind our country's cause; the welfare of our boys in the armed forces; the value and importance of unity and undivided effort.

The processes of democracy and free institutions must survive—and with the aid of a Divine Providence—survive they will.

"In every turn of fortune God has stood by the republics. * * * Philosophers may argue as they will, and rationalism may draw its conclusions; but the mysterious power unexplained by either has, from the beginning of time, ruled the destinies of men."

EARL SNELL.

"Paving Block" Diplomat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, unfortunate as it is, disappointing as it is, damaging to the morale of the country as it is, it nevertheless is apparent that the administration is still determined to play partisan politics with the war. The nomination of Edward J. Flynn, ex-chairman of the Democratic National Committee, in the face of unsavory episodes which made it politically unwise for him to remain at the helm of the Democratic Party, fully demonstrates that the administration is still continuing to think in terms of politics first and the war secondly. No other explanation can be found for the appointment to a most important diplomatic post of a man as completely unfitted by temperament, reputation, habits, and lack of experience as is Mr. Flynn. His appointment is peculiarly offensive to the American people, because he is to go not only as a Minister Plenipotentiary to Australia, one of our allies, but also is really to be an Envoy Extraordinary representing the President in that part of the world.

It has been hinted by the eastern press that perhaps another explanation is to be found in the fact that Governor Dewey, of New York, is noted for his ability to look beneath coats of whitewash and find the guilty whose misdeeds have been carefully covered up for political purposes. Not only is Mr. Flynn under the shadow of the paving-block scandal, involving the alleged private use of public property on his estate, but he is the man who, when sheriff of his county, appointed a notorious gangster and gunman as one of his deputies.

There can be no doubt that if the Senate concurs in his appointment that his presence in Australia, although it may put him far beyond Governor Dewey's grasp for the time being, will be offensive to the Australian people, as it properly should be.

Mr. Speaker, our allies are entitled to the best diplomatic representatives we can send to them. With able, proved, diplomats such as Joseph C. Grew, whose long years of excellent service have

demonstrated his capacity and ability, standing idly by, it is impossible to find any excuse or any extenuating circumstance for the President's action in naming this arch politician of questionable reputation to a diplomatic post for which he is fitted neither by temperament, ability, nor experience.

This is simply a continuation of the New Deal practice of taking care of party henchmen when they have become so notorious in their political manipulations as to constitute themselves liabilities instead of assets to their party. The Flynn appointment recalls the manipulations in the case of Harry Hopkins after his stenchful handling of the W. P. A. for political purposes in Kentucky and other States, and his still more stenchful handling of the Chicago Democratic National Convention to achieve the third-term nomination for Mr. Roosevelt. He had to be withdrawn from his post so he was made the paid confidant, friend, admirer, and adviser of the Chief Executive, and there he is today. His career of notoriety has not ended, however, as witness the now notorious Baruch dinner for him and his wife at $50 per plate and the allegations, denied by Mrs. Hopkins, of course, that Lord Beaverbrook had presented her with a fortune in emeralds. Some people regard it as significant that Mrs. Hopkins specifically stipulated that Lord Beaverbrook had given her no emeralds, instead of making her denial cover diamonds, gems, or other gifts of great value.

It is a singular commentary upon our times, Mr. Speaker, that in the very hour in which the Congress is trying to reestablish the people's confidence in their Government, the President should resort to this ill-advised and highly unpopular measure in order to get one of his henchmen out of the way of the implacable Governor Dewey.

A recent cartoon in a newspaper, both conservative and friendly to the administration, very accurately described the situation when it pictured the President with his hand on Mr. Flynn's shoulder, saying, "Ed, there isn't any place farther away than Australia, is there?"

Flynn's nomination is more to be regretted, because of its reaction on the American people at a time like this than because it may put an arch politician beyond the necessity for answering in the courts for some of his alleged acts.

Extensions of Electric Service to Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Supplementary Preference Rating Order P-46-c, issued by the War Production Board on January 14, 1943. I also include the press release which was issued on that date by the Office of War Information.

This order permits utilities to construct limited types of rural electric extensions on certification by the local county war boards of the Department of Agriculture. Utilities are permitted to proceed with construction, in cases meeting the requirements of the order, without securing permission from Washington or any regional office of the War Production Board.

Mr. Speaker, the order and press release follow:

PART 978—UTILITIES: MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, AND SUPPLIES

(Supplementary Preference Rating Order P-46-c)

In accordance with the provisions of section 978.1 Preference Rating Order P-46, as amended, which the following order supplements:

Section 978.4 Supplementary Preference Rating Order P-46-c: (Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (f) (3) (ii) of Preference Rating Order P-46, as amended, electric service connections may be made by producers to permit the operation of farm production equipment: *Provided*, That all of the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) The prospective consumer possesses one of the following types of electric farm equipment of sufficient capacity for the use contemplated or can obtain such equipment without priorities assistance, or a preference rating of AA-5 or better has been assigned to deliveries of such equipment to him:

(1) Water pump for livestock; (2) milking machine; (3) milk cooler; (4) incubator; (5) brooder; (6) feed grinder.

(b) There is no other means of operating such equipment on the premises.

(c) The length of such connection will not exceed 100 feet per animal unit, determined in accordance with Schedule I annexed hereto, and will not exceed 5,000 feet total length, except upon specific authorization from the Director General for Operations.

(d) The prospective consumer will use electric service to operate equipment for farm production derived from animals aggregating not less than 10 animal units, determined in accordance with Schedule I annexed hereto.

(e) Primary lines are single phase and are constructed of No. 6 galvanized steel wire (except that copper-covered steel wire or No. 4 or No. 6 A. C. S. R. conductor may be used to the extent that it is available in the excess inventory of any producer).

(f) Secondary lines and services require not more than 30 pounds of copper for any prospective consumer.

(g) The prospective consumer's application for service is accompanied by a certification from his United States Department of Agriculture county war board in substantially the following form:

(To the Utility Addressed):

Mr. _____ is eligible for an electric connection of _____ feet under the terms of preference rating order P-46-c. In the opinion of this United States Department of Agriculture county war board this connection will result in a substantial increase in farm production, or a substantial saving of farm labor, and is in accord with the spirit, as well as the letter, of preference rating order P-46-c.

_____

(For U. S. Department of Agriculture County War Board.)

(P. D. Reg. 1, as amended, 6 F. R. 6680; W. P. B. Reg. 1, 7 F. R. 561; E. O. 9024, 7 F. R. 329; E O 9040, 7 F. R. 527; E. O. 9125, 7 F. R. 2719; sec. 2 (a), Pub. Law 671, 76th Cong. as amended by Public Laws 89 and 507, 77th Cong.)

Issued this 14th day of January 1943.

ERNEST KANZLER,
Director General for Operations.

Schedule I

EQUIVALENT ANIMAL UNITS

	Unit
A. Livestock on hand:	
1 milk cow	1
10 beef cattle (all cattle, including calves, other than milk cows and cattle in feed lot)	1
30 breeding ewes	1
3 brood sows	1
75 laying hens	1
40 turkeys or geese	1
B. Estimated production of livestock for market:	
20 cattle (in feed lot) per year	1
160 lambs (in feed lot) per year	1
30 feeder pigs per year	1
250 chickens (not broilers) per year	1
600 chickens (broilers) per year	1

In line with the Government's program to increase food production this year, the War Production Board today partially lifted its ban on new electrical connections to permit short extensions of existing rural distribution lines to operate specified farm production equipment.

It is expected that such extensions will, among other things, assist in increasing the country's supply of meats, poultry, and dairy products, and relieve the farm-labor shortage.

Before qualifying for an extension, a farmer must receive certification from the local county war board that the requested electrical connection will result in a substantial increase in farm production or a substantial saving of farm labor.

The War Production Board action was taken in Supplementary Preference Rating Order P-46-c. Previously under P-46 no new electrical connection has been permitted, urban or rural, except for war plants or war housing.

The length of an extension allowed under the order is based on a formula worked jointly by War Production Board and the Department of Agriculture and made a part of the order.

To be eligible for an extension, a farmer must meet the following qualifications:

1. He must own or be able to obtain one of the following kinds of farm equipment: Water pump for livestock, milking machine, milk cooler, incubator, brooder, or feed grinder.

2. He must have no other means of operating such equipment on the premises.

3. He must receive certification from his county war board that the electrical service will result in a substantial increase in farm production or a substantial saving of farm labor.

4. He must have a minimum of 10 animal units.

An extension of up to 100 feet is permitted for each animal unit, except that a minimum of 10 animal units is required for an extension of any length. An extension of up to 5,000 feet may be made upon certification by the county war board to the local utility or electric cooperative. Extensions longer than 5,000 feet must receive specific War Production Board approval.

The supplementary order applies equally to private utilities and publicly owned cooperatives.

Animal units on which extension lengths are based are of two kinds: Livestock on hand and estimated production for market. In the category of livestock on hand, 1 unit

consists of any of the following: 1 milk cow, 10 beef cattle, 30 breeding ewes, 3 brood sows, 75 laying hens, or 40 turkeys or geese. In the category of estimated production of livestock for market, 1 unit consists of any of the following: 20 cattle (in feed lot) per year, 160 lambs (in feed lot) per year, 30 feeder pigs per year, 250 chickens (not broilers) per year, or 600 chickens (broilers) per year.

Most of the materials required for the connection will come out of existing inventory in the hands of utility companies or electric cooperatives. Necessary appliances will be supplied out of existing stocks now in the hands of manufacturers, dealers, and farmers. In order to conserve copper, primary lines—the lines running from transmission lines to transformers—must be single phase and must be constructed of No. 6 galvanized steel, except that copper-covered steel wire or No. 4 or No. 6 A. C. S. R. conductor may be used if it is available in the excess inventory of the utility or cooperative. Secondary lines—the lines running from transformers to the farmer's equipment which for technical reasons require copper—may not contain more than 30 pounds of metal for any prospective customer.

Herbert S. Marks, Acting Director of War Production Board's Power Division, said simultaneously with the issuance of P-46-c today that War Production Board will consider appeals from farmers who require electricity for the operation of irrigation pumps, which are not covered by the new order. Standards similar to those stated in the order will be employed in reviewing such appeals.

Continuance of W. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to call the attention of the Congress to the following letter from the Anaconda Mill and Smeltermen's Union of Anaconda, Mont. This organization is composed of sound, solid, and substantial American citizens who have always taken a keen interest in the affairs of their community, State, and Nation. The letter is self-explanatory and I agree with its contents completely. The individuals referred to—I know them personally—are the finest type of people and they, and others like them, should be given the opportunity to make a decent livelihood. The assistance which my State can render with the closing down of W. P. A. is negligible. The only agency capable of giving them the necessary help is the United States Government. With the ending of W. P. A. it is necessary that some other functioning Federal organization step in, relieve the slack, and give these people an opportunity to live. It is little that they ask; it is something they must have. I urge the Congress to note particularly one statement:

This country is the richest in the world but what faith can the oppressed of Europe and the seething masses of Asia have in our "four freedoms" if we fail to provide freedom from want to our own people?

The letter and material referred to follow:

ANACONDA MILL AND
SMELTERMEN'S UNION,
Anaconda, Mont., January 18, 1943.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, *Member of Congress,*
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: We are writing you in behalf of all the over-age and handicapped Work Projects Administration workers in the United States, though we are going to name specific cases which are close at home. We know that there is a small number of young and able-bodied persons on this set-up, but if our State is a criterion for the country at large, this number is mostly administrative or supervisory personnel. We are quite agreeable to forcing able-bodied people, acceptable to industry, into defense work, with few exceptions, even if they have to leave home, but those who cannot be absorbed into industry should be kept where they can support themselves, instead of being forced into idleness on the dole.

The Work Projects Administration sewing rooms here and in Butte employ women with an average age of about 55. You people know quite as well as we that industry will give them no consideration whatever. We in the Smeltermen's Union wish that there was some way in which every Member of both Houses of Congress could be compelled to witness the misery and stark terror in the faces of these women as they receive their discharge slips—we wonder if this was happening to the mothers of you Congressmen if it would bring home to you a realization of what closing Work Projects Administration, without providing an alternate set-up, means to so many of our aged and handicapped people.

This country is the richest in the world, but what faith can the oppressed of Europe and the seething masses of Asia have in our four freedoms if we fail to provide freedom from want to our own people. These people were earning their own way, despite their handicaps, for they were doing work useful to society. Now it seems that society—our society—would rather keep them in a state of semistarvation on the dole than let them earn their own way and live.

In our Anaconda union hall, workers' service used two persons, one a woman past 60, a widow and grandmother, raising two of her grandchildren. She has six first cousins and one nephew in the armed forces of our country. She is an intelligent woman and is doing a grand job of manning a consumers' information desk. Here people learn about price and rent ceilings, about salvage and reclaiming of material. She conducts a large number of demonstrations in home dressmaking, making over garments, home canning, and low-cost nutrition cookery. She has distributed many hundreds of pamphlets on consumer problems, chiefly from Government sources, and has made a great contribution to the home front. Now she is to be cast aside like an old shoe. Society has no more use for her, but we wonder how it is going to affect the morale of her nephew and first cousins in the service when they learn that she has been forced on the tender mercies of direct relief in Montana. Don't you suppose that they will wonder how democratic this democracy that they are fighting for really is? Have you Congressmen the courage to give these men in the service the right to express themselves on this matter and to ask how they feel about it?

The other worker in our hall is a man past 50, with a paralyzed left hand and arm. He is doing an equally good job of manning a workers' information desk. Without giving legal advice, he is setting people straight about their rights on the compensation act of Montana, on the wage-hour law, the draft law, social security, the State welfare act, and other legislation important to working people. He is pulling his own weight and doing useful work, a work greatly appreciated by members of our union and the general public, but how he must go to the poor farm or on direct relief. He has never been married, but he has a number of nephews in the service, and we wonder how they will feel about Uncle Jim going to the poor farm.

We are not going to name any more individual cases, though we could document hundreds of them. However, we wish to point out that this callous disregard of these people's welfare is not conducive to national unity in this time of crisis.

We have long prided ourselves on being an example of everything that is clean, decent, humanitarian, and democratic to the rest of the world. Do you think this neglect of a considerable portion of our population exemplifies this spirit?

Throwing so many hundred of thousands of these people out of employment into the poorhouse or on direct relief is going to seriously damage the morale of hundreds of thousands of their friends and relatives in our armed forces. Men fight well only when the know or have good reasons to believe that their loved ones are being well taken care of. German morale cracked in World War No. 1 largely because the German soldiers learned their families were starving, and if this situation is not relieved it might well have a serious effect on our own war effort. We know that our 500 members in the service do not approve of this situation.

It certainly seems far fetched that a country which is setting itself up as (1) having the capital of the world, (2) the brains and inventive genius of the world, (3) the greatest natural resources—both developed and undeveloped—in the world, and (4) a determination to make world democracy work, should take advantage of the present situation to revoke practical application of these principles to these aged and handicapped people. The tax cost of giving these people self-respect and independence is infinitesimal compared to the war costs.

In the name of common decency, of humanity, of national unity, and of democracy we demand that Congress do something constructive about the matter—that some way be provided whereby these aged and physically handicapped people can earn their own way and contribute useful work to society.

We demand that this letter be read before the House of Representatives and the Senate and that you, as our representative, make an honest effort to correct this situation.

With best wishes to you in your efforts to serve the people of Montana, we are

Sincerely yours,

WALTER DOOLEY,
Recording Secretary.

Unsung Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an interesting comment by Robert L. Norton, special writer of the Boston Post, appearing in the issue of this paper

of January 15, 1943. It presents valuable information which should receive as wide publicity as possible:

COMMENTS

(By Robert L. Norton)

As the story of the North African expedition is unfolded, Americans are entitled to a justified feeling of pride in the accomplishment of our military leadership. To our mind, the movement of supplies was altogether the most extraordinary feat of the largest operation of its kind in world's history.

UNSUNG HEROES

The unsung heroes of the war are the men who supply armies, since it is they who make victory possible. There are few persons who have not heard of Napoleon but scarcely anyone recalls the name of his quartermaster. So that the tremendous task of furnishing our troops with food and the accouterments of war has been dimmed by the glamour and dramatics of action on the battlefield.

The magnitude of the job in supplying this Army has escaped general notice, thus some facts related by Under Secretary of War Patterson are well worth reciting.

For instance, we are told that 700,000 different items of equipment and supplies were required for the North African operation. There are more than 390 different items of clothing and individual equipment; more than 10,000 different Signal Corps items; 68,000 items of medical supplies and drugs; 100,000 Engineer Corps articles, including such things as bridges, bulldozers, well-digging equipment, storage tanks, railroad locomotives. There are 250,000 different ordnance items alone, including tanks, guns, ammunition, and spare parts.

These are highly arresting statistics. And in addition it is to be noted that the ammunition requirements are tremendous. We are handing the enemy plenty, when you consider that in a normal day of combat an infantry division expends 300 tons of ammunition. One hundred thirty-seven mm. antiaircraft guns in a normal day require 128 tons of ammunition.

For those of us who are kicking about the shortage of gasoline it is well to know that on the basis of planned requirement 10 gallons a day is necessary for each vehicle. This is a matter of utmost concern and importance to our fighting forces, since there are no filling stations in North Africa.

Not only must the initial supplies be shipped but the maintenance of troops in any field in combat must be assured. Take shoes, for instance. Each soldier on the North African expedition carried with him in his barracks bag 3 pairs of shoes. To maintain these troops in the field, for every 100 men in the force, 17 pairs of shoes must be shipped each month.

SEVEN TONS PER MAN

Then there is the shipping, the escorting war craft, and the loading of ships, so the troops can come off the ships fighting. In the North African expedition 7 tons of shipping per man were required for the initial equipment.

In organizing this great expedition it was necessary, first, to decide upon the force itself—its numbers, the proportion of air troops and ground troops, and the number of armored units. Port units were required to unload vessels, railways units to operate railroads, engineer units to build roads, bakery units to provide bread, medical units to care for the wounded and the sick, and many other units of specialists to see to it that the men at the fighting front were supplied with their needs.

No army is better than its supply system—on that its whole operations depend.

Those armchair strategists who are constantly yapping about second fronts can well give thought to the fact that these great offensives are not established overnight. It doesn't take a great stretch of the imagination to appreciate the extent of the necessary preparations and the huge task in front of our military leaders before the invasion of Germany and the march to Berlin, with an army of millions, becomes a reality.

Reciprocal-Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Clapper printed in the Boston Traveler of January 5, 1943:

WASHINGTON

(By Raymond Clapper)

WASHINGTON, January 5.—Republicans are under strong temptation to make a party football out of the reciprocal-trade program which has been fathered by Secretary Hull.

They have the power to bring about a repudiation of the program and force a return to the old method of tariff making that was followed in the Hawley-Smoot High Tariff Act. They have almost a majority in Congress and can pick up the necessary handful of Democratic votes through the pressure of cattle interests or other local groups that have always wanted prohibitive tariffs.

Thus the Republicans could, at the outset of the new Congress, hand the administration a decisive and spectacular defeat that would humiliate it and frustrate it and make completely clear both at home and abroad that the policies of the Roosevelt administration could be overthrown. It would make plain to other countries, especially to the United Nations, that a drastic reversal of American policies back toward isolation was under way.

The Trade Agreements Act expires in June, and the issue of renewing it therefore is an immediate one for the new Congress. President Roosevelt is ready to make a fight for another extension. The act was first passed in 1934 and twice extended. The Republicans can consistently block its renewal this time because they have opposed it almost solidly heretofore. Only two House Republicans voted for the act on its original passage and only five Republican Senators. On renewals, Republicans have once cast unanimous votes in opposition in the House and again in the Senate.

Now, for the first time, the Republicans are near enough to a majority to make their position controlling. The Republicans in Congress will determine whether the reciprocal-trade program is to continue.

The temptation is strong to make a political issue and to show by a clear-cut and dramatic action that the Republicans are in the saddle in fundamental policy making. Repeal of the Reciprocal Trade Act would please a number of special high-tariff groups. If the Republicans want to follow the isolationist trend—and there are undoubtedly a considerable number of silent isolationist votes left in the country—this is the chance to raise the issue and take charge.

Most Republicans once would have leaped at the chance. The only question is whether a good many Republicans will feel that circumstances have changed and that now the national interest would be better served by continuing the program, especially in view of the conservative course followed under it by Secretary Hull.

Considerations higher than politics may deter more thoughtful Republicans from junking the trade program. For several years before the war it was the one sane effort to break through the economic barriers that were constricting the world and driving nations into desperation. The trade program still stands as the symbol of America's desire to trade with other nations, to make friendly adjustments for mutual benefit so that trade may be a profitable two-way venture and so that we may have customers. Because we cannot hope to sell if we do not buy. More than that, repudiation of the program now in the midst of the war would be taken abroad as notice that the United States was going back into isolation. It would mean that the United States could not be counted on to play any part in helping to prevent a third world war.

Republicans may not wish to move openly to kill the Hull program and may try to do it by indirection, by requiring all trade agreements to be approved by both Houses of Congress or by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. Those are only hypocritical methods of getting rid of the Trade Agreements Act without doing it openly, as of course everyone around Congress knows.

This is the first real test of how the Republicans intend to use their new political strength. It will show whether they are ready to work constructively with other nations to reduce the chances of another war, or whether they are looking for party advantage regardless of any other consideration.

Our Duty Now—Tomorrow's Responsibilities and Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am extending my remarks by including an address which, at the invitation of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, I delivered to the General Assembly of the State of Vermont on Wednesday forenoon last:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here to accept the invitation of the House of Representatives of Vermont to speak from this rostrum today.

You well know that for me to stand here once more revives old memories, makes me humble, forces a realization by me of the responsibility I have assumed when I undertake to represent all of you in Congress at your sufferance.

One would be absolutely devoid of all sense of appreciation if he were not affected by the warmth, genuineness, and unanimity of your welcome and by the reception accorded me.

Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness I do not feel that I merit the complimentary comparison you make, or the fine things you say about me. I do hope I have some of that old spirit of Ethan Allen in my make-up. Really, I know I have and do not regret it. I do try my best to represent all the people of Vermont. That is a big job.

My "ruggedness," to which you allude, is something I cannot help; nor do I try to. It is in my blood; for the last four generations of rugged, fearless Green Mountain boys, Plumleys and Smiths and Fletchers, are to be held responsible for me and for my being where I am. Blood certainly is thicker than water.

Believe me, I do not intend to offend anyone—not even those who criticize me for the ruggedness which you commend. I do intend, however, that so long as I am representing the State of Vermont in the Congress of the United States, everybody shall know where the State of Vermont stands insofar as I see it, and insofar as I am competent to represent it and to make its position known.

THE INEVITABLE

Mr. Speaker, since last it was my pleasure to address the members of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont, the inevitable, unavoidable, but anticipated has happened. We are now involved in a life and death struggle in a war between two worlds as far apart as the poles in ideologies which have nothing in common. Vermont was the first State to realize that we were at war with Hitler.

Never before has the future of the East and West, of the old and new worlds been in balance at the same time. Democracy and freedom face today their crucial test, not only of armies and battles, but to determine for all time whether liberty and freedom are worth the price, worth fighting for, and worthy to survive. This is a war of survival. The sooner we realize it the better.

LIBERTY AND SECURITY

Never have American liberty and security been so seriously threatened from without as they are at this hour. This is no time for partisan politics, no time for personal ambition. This is a dangerous and a tragic moment in the history of this Republic. The liberties and the freedom which are the right and tradition of its people stand in jeopardy. Today we fight and sacrifice to save our freedom and to conserve our liberties from a foreign foe. Tomorrow we shall make the peace, reassert our liberties, reestablish our freedom, for, like charity, freedom and unity and liberty begin at home.

If Nazism and Fascism be permitted to spread their tentacles in the wake of their victorious armies all over and around us, then our basic human rights will have been choked to death, demolished, destroyed, and will disappear from the face of the earth at least for generations, if not forever.

We of this day and generation have put our hands and our seals to the solemn compact and the declaration that such a thing as is contemplated by our enemies shall not be permitted nor allowed. We are determined that human progress shall not long be clogged, stopped, or delayed, but shall go on to greater achievement for humanity and for the common good of the individual. We may well be satisfied, relying on our strength which is the might of right, that ours is bound to be the eventual victory. Nevertheless, we should face facts frankly. We cannot afford to be too optimistic. It is a long, hard road we have undertaken to travel. We are on our way.

THE PRICE WE PAY

In order to accomplish what we have undertaken to do, hundreds of thousands of American lives must be offered on the altar of freedom; hundreds of thousands of American men will be wounded; our wealth and our natural resources will be well-nigh exhausted, at least taxed and spent to a degree which must eventually lower the standard of living of which we rightfully boast. Moreover, unless we are ready to fight to the death, it is not impossible that, sooner or later, not only will our coasts be subjected to attack, our shipping totally destroyed, but our land may be invaded and possibly dominated by the hostile hordes and the military minds of our enemies. Even today our western coast is vulnerable as is almost any area which the enemy may see fit to attack in a suicidal attempt to get revenge.

We must weigh all these grim facts in the light of what we know. We must bear bravely our part of the heavy burden of death and sorrow, privation and effort, which all of us will be called upon to carry in the tragic days which are at hand and in those which are bound to increase in number, in sorrow, and in travail in the future. This will be a long war, despite the optimists.

From the practical and material standpoint, we shall have to appropriate more and to spend unlimited billions of our wealth. We shall have to impose upon ourselves and shall have to pay taxes which will be heavier and heavier and more burdensome. We shall have to submit to regulations, limitations, and regimentations to which we are not accustomed and which normally we would resist. They will have to be enforced against our normal lives and our activities in order that we may live, as thousands die to make it possible.

All these things are imperative. We are at war, not of our choosing or because we wish it. We must submit to regulation in order the sooner and the more effectively to defeat the savage onrush of the merciless, treacherous, mad millions who have made themselves the mechanical tools of the gangster thugs of Rome and Tokio and of that evil genius of Berlin.

Whether we like it or not, we are compelled to face these facts. The problem of saving ourselves, if we are to preserve our national existence and save civilization, reduces itself to the ultimate that in order to live we must die, to fight against and completely defeat and destroy the most powerful and ruthless combination of dictators and conscienceless aggressors the world has ever known.

FREEDOM

It is not enough and it is never sufficient to want freedom.

"Oh, Freedom, thou art not, as poets dream,
A fair young girl, with light and delicate limbs,
And wavy tresses gushing from the cap
With which the Roman master crowned his slave
When he took off the gyves. A bearded man,
Armed to the teeth, art thou; one mailed hand
Grasps the broad shield, and one the sword; thy brow,
Glorious in beauty though it be, is scarred
With tokens of old wars."

Those only are entitled to enjoy freedom who are willing to fight for it.

NOT A NEW DEAL WAR

We might as well understand that we will not win this war until it ceases to be regarded by some as a struggle for the realization of personal aims, the enjoyment of material things, and an attempt to maintain a political or social ideology, until it becomes a unified, nonpartisan, nonpolitical, national crusade for America and for the realization of the American dream. This is not a New Deal war, as some seem to think.

It is not enough for us to do to convert our factories to their maximum of production. We must convert our minds. We must know that the past, dedicated to so-called social gains, is buried in the rubbish of the mistakes that have been made; that we cannot go back to normality as we have known it and enjoyed it, because we have destroyed it in our effort to save our lives.

CHANGE IS THE LAW

There is bound to be a change. Change is one of the fast, inevitable laws of nature. Justice is the first prerequisite of a lasting peace, as has been truly said.

POST-WAR CRISES

The post-war crises we will have to meet, present not only great dangers but wonderful opportunities for America. The military victory we shall eventually have accomplished spells only the beginning of the trials and tribulations which are to be ours to overcome. Our military victory will be only the prelude of our victory to be won. Our problems multiply rabbitlike.

After this war the responsibility of the Nation will not be circumscribed within the territorial limits of the United States. We should recognize this fact. Our Nation has an obligation to assist in bringing about understanding, comity, cooperation among the nations of the world in order that our own liberty may be preserved and that the blighting and destructive processes of war may not again be forced upon us and upon the free and peace-loving peoples of the earth. That may be, and is, a declaration of the principles of the Republican Party, but it is the truth. It is not to be ignored.

ISOLATIONISM IS A DEAD DUCK

The day of our isolation as a Nation has sunk out of sight with yesterday's sun, with old Atlantis, under the water of experience which covers the globe of theory with the irrepressible, irresistible flood of reality. The sooner those who are still hiding, lurking under the cloak of isolationism, shake off the musty cobwebs which choke them in order to have a comprehensive vision of what is and is to be, come out and into the bright sunlight of the new day that is about to dawn, the better it will be for all concerned.

THE GYROSCOPE AND ANCHOR

After this war the United States of America will be the source, the supply, the storehouse, for all the world's new needs, the gyroscope and also the anchor for the safety of civilization. We cannot dodge the issue or our responsibility. As against the progress made in the last 100 years that which is to come will be so immeasurably greater that it is beyond the comprehension of man's mind even to contemplate or to anticipate it.

I know whereof I speak when I say that as against the wonderful opportunities so also will be magnified the burden of our responsibility. It will be for us to see and to ensure that every child shall find itself a member of a family housed with decency and dignity, unspoiled by underfeeding or overcrowding or by dirty and drab surroundings or mechanical monotony of environment; to supply the children of tomorrow with a full, free, and adequate opportunity for an education along such lines as we shall have to prescribe within due bounds; to assume the responsibility of undertaking to provide that every citizen of every country shall be assured an income sufficient to enable him to maintain a home which shall be his, in which he shall be secure, assured of liberty and of freedom of worship, of speech, of assembly, with all the rights equal under and to those we guarantee our citizens under our Bill of Rights.

THE BLUEPRINT

The blueprint for the freedom of the world, for the new world order, in the peace which shall follow this war, shall be the Constitution of the United States of America, a government of, for, and by the people, a government of laws and not a government of men. There can be no other.

And this new and better order again—what of it and what shall it be? It is outlined briefly in the eight points of the Atlantic Charter wherein the United Nations

not only pledge all the Allies to the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny and to complete victory over our enemies, but make present and future collective cooperation on the basis of equality between men and nations the fundamental concepts for the establishment and maintenance of the peace that is to be.

We are all fighting for the right to live—industriously, independently, and peacefully.

(1) The charter provides that the signatories will seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.

(2) Territorial changes must accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

(3) Sovereign rights and self-government must be restored to all peoples.

(4) All states will enjoy access on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

(5) Improved labor standards for all with concomitant economic advancement and social security shall be brought about.

(6) An established peace shall afford all nations safety within their own boundaries and freedom from fear and want.

(7) All men must be assured safety at sea and the right to cross and to recross it without hindrance.

(8) Pending the establishment of a wider and more permanent system of general security, land, sea, or air armaments must not continue to be employed by nations which threaten or may threaten aggression outside their own frontiers.

That is what we are fighting for. There shall be no armistice with tyranny ever again. That is our burden to assume, forever.

It is for us to remember also, as former President Hoover suggested, that any declaration of peace should embrace—

(1) Total disarmament of the enemy.

(2) The designation of provisional boundaries of nations.

(3) Machinery for repatriation of prisoners and civilians driven from their homes.

(4) The removal of the economic blockade the instant the enemy has handed over his arms.

(5) The immediate organization to relieve famine, combat pestilence, and aid in reconstruction. Otherwise there would be anarchy and no peace.

(6) The provisional restoration of all commercial treaties.

UNNECESSARY ITEMIZATION

I am very much in sympathy with those who believe that until the complete and perfect destruction of the Axis anti-Christian effort is accomplished there is no occasion for us to take too much time to conjecture as to what we will do. That we should generally prepare for that day is our clear duty and a foregone conclusion. That we should attempt to itemize our program is as unwise as it is unnecessary.

The principles under which we shall establish the peace we hope and pray shall be lasting we may very well discuss. I admire and respect the courage of those who have had the vision to realize that we must prepare for what is to happen after the war. I agree with some of the tentative suggestions made for our consideration. I know that the day of our ostrich nationalism has gone.

WHO WILL ANSWER

The recurring question for us to try to answer again is this: Is it humanly possible to avoid the arbitrament of war for the settlement of such questions as involve humanity? Must we kill off, periodically, so many millions of human beings in order to permit the habitation of the globe by those who survive? Is war a scourge or a benefit to civilization? Must civilization as such periodically be subjected to "trial by the sword"? And so all the old questions which are found from Genesis to Revelations and from the day of the first Caesar to the last peace conference are again raised to be answered by the enlightened conscience of more intelligent humanity. What is the answer? Quo vadis? Nobody knows.

These days are dark and dreary and in thousands of homes the light of life has gone out to keep burning and to furnish the fuel for the torch of liberty held high over the head of every American.

Let there be no diminution of our patriotic support of every measure intended to conserve and to preserve all those things for which our founding fathers fought. Let there be no petty partisan politics which shall diminish the force or impede the effect of our unity.

THE MAGNITUDE OF OUR BURDEN

I am staggered by my own concept of the greatness of the undertaking we have assumed. We of the United States shall have to play a large part in enforcing the edicts which issue out of the conference which the United Nations shall hold to guarantee for generations yet unborn the beliefs for which we fight. We cannot be lulled to sleep by any siren's song to the effect that this war will soon be over or that it will end when the last shot has been fired. That is but the call to battle.

"The high crusade whereon we have embarked
calls forth the free
In hosts, with spears and flaunting flags
arrayed;
Not for one dragon's end, one victory,
One last great war, but to unending war
Without, within, till God's white torch
supreme
Melts the last chain; and the last dungeon
door
Swings slowly wide to the triumphant
dream."

OUR RESPONSIBILITY

Our first responsibility today, then, is of course to win a military victory. To do this we must all be prepared to make and are making real sacrifices. The production of food and essential farm products becomes the primary duty of the farmer. The turning of industrial plants into full-time production of war materials is the responsibility of our businessmen and industrial leaders. The highest speed production of every possible tool and weapon of war is the job of every worker. Our women, as always, will prove their devotion not only by doing more than their share of man's work but even better by keeping alive the home, the church, and the finer ideals of our lives. Not for one moment may we comment upon what the men in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps must do. Upon land, sea, and in the air they have already set the highest standards of loyalty, fidelity, and patriotism. From the icy seas of the North Atlantic to the fever-infested swamps of Luzon, they are daily giving their very lives that we may live.

Our boys are dying on battlefields on every continent. Theirs is no light and casual gift to the cause of the better world for which they fight. They are giving their all. Their sacrifice is supreme, and falling and dying they challenge us to carry on, to make any and all and every necessary sacrifice to speed the better day for which they so gallantly die. We shall not build a new world order at any lesser cost or on any other foundation. We shall build a better world as a monument to those who have given their lives to make it possible and as a tribute to our own self-respect. We can do no less.

DEMOLISHED GOVERNMENT

More than 100 years ago, Daniel Webster, in his justly famed eulogy of George Washington, speaking in sight of the very seat of the Federal Government, addressed these words as if to the actual ears of our people in this war afflicted time: "If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it should exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolates and lays waste our fields, still, under a new civilization, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvest.

"It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be covered by the dusts of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

"But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government?

"Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberties?

"Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites a national sovereignty with States' rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

"No, if these columns fall, they will not be raised again.

"Like the Colosseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and melancholy immortality.

"Bitterer tears, however, will fall over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw—the edifice of constitutional American liberty."

THERE WAS A DREAM

There was a dream—that men could one day speak the thoughts of their own choosing. There was a hope—that men could one day stroll through streets at evening unafraid. There was a prayer—that each could speak to his own God, in his own church. That dream, that hope, that prayer became America. Great strength, youthful heart, vast enterprise, hard work made it so. Now that same America is the dream, the hope, the prayer of the world—our freedom its dream; our strength its hope; our swift race against time its prayer. We must not fail the world now. We must not fail to share our freedom with it afterward.

General Public and Small Telephone Companies Benefit From Action by Federal Communications Commission

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the recently announced settlement of the rate proceedings brought by the Federal Communications Commission against the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. illustrates what can be done, even in time of war, by conscientious and reasonable effort by a Government agency toward the protection of the public interest. When the proceedings were started, many sources raised objection that the war effort would suffer if A. T. & T. were not left alone and permitted to keep intact its very substantial profits. It was said that the hearing would tie up greatly needed manpower for a long period. And fear was expressed that wartime telephone service would badly deteriorate as a result.

These things have not happened, but, on the other hand, as a result of the action by F. C. C. a settlement was reached in a very short time with the company.

There was no tie-up of manpower and no deterioration in service as prophesied. Telephone service has not and will not suffer, but the rate payers and taxpayers of this country will be saved a minimum of $34,000,000 per annum and probably more than $50,000,000 per annum, depending upon the action taken by the State regulatory authorities with reference to additional payments which will be made by A. T. & T. to independent and associated companies to reimburse them properly for their part of the cost of rendering long-distance services. The saving effected is, of course, many times the annual appropriation to the F. C. C. for all of its activities.

It is to be hoped that the investigation of the Federal Communications Commission recently authorized by the House will not only go into charges that have been made against the Commission but will also consider the broader problems connected with the proper and effective carrying on of its work.

I include herewith an article from the Baltimore Sun of January 21, 1943:

AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CUTS COST OF LENGTHY CALLS—FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION ANNOUNCES $50,700,000-A-YEAR SAVING TO USERS—PROBE CALLED OFF

WASHINGTON, January 20.—The Federal Communications Commission announced tonight that American Telephone & Telegraph Co. would reduce its long-lines revenues by an estimated $50,700,000 per year, of which $34,700,000 would be an immediate saving to the public.

No reduction will be made in the charge for the initial 3 minutes of long-distance telephones calls, but the overtime charge will be cut.

PRESENT CHARGE

At present the charge for each additional minute is one-third of the charge for the first 3 minutes, but under the new rates the charge will be one-fourth. For example, it was stated that at present a station-to-station call from Washington to Denver costs $3 for 3 minutes, $5 for 5 minutes, whereas under the new schedule the 5-minute call will cost $4.50, a saving of 50 cents.

The Federal Communications Commission said the reductions are being made under an agreement it reached with the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

The agreement calls for cancelation of an investigation ordered last November into all charges of American Telephone & Telegraph's long-lines department, which includes the leasing of telephone and telegraph wires, as well as the leasing of long-distance telephone service.

HEARING SOON RECESSED

A public hearing in the investigation proceeded only 2 days before it was recessed and followed by private conferences.

The Commission said that the agreement would cut $11,900,000 off the Government's bill for private telephone and telegraph lines leased from American Telephone & Telegraph Co. The Government leases 43 percent of all such lines rented by the company.

The Government will share very largely in the savings on the overtime charges for toll calls, the Federal Communications Commission said, since it is the largest single user of long-distance telephone service.

INDIRECT SAVING

The $16,000,000 not listed as a direct immediate saving to the public presumably will be the larger share of revenue of the long-lines department which will be turned over to companies in the Bell System.

"All persons or organizations using leased private lines, including newspapers and broadcasting stations," the Federal Communications Commission said, "benefit substantially from the reductions, which are equivalent to approximately 25 percent in private telephone lines and 35 percent in private telegraph lines.

"The small broadcasting stations, as the casual users of telephone lines, will benefit from a lowering of the initial rate per hour for line costs by approximately 50 percent. Larger broadcast users will benefit by a reduction from $8 to $6 per air-line mile."

NO INCREASE

The Commission said it was expected that there would be no increase in the number of ordinary long-distance calls since no reduction in the initial charge had been made.

American Telephone & Telegraph, in opposing the investigation, had contended that a reduction in telephone rates would tend to accelerate business at a time when the company's facilities already were overtaxed to the point where the Board of War Communications had found it necessary to establish a system of priorities on long-distance calls.

DETAILS SAVINGS

In detailing the savings, the Commission said there would be a "$22,800,000 reduction in the overtime rate per minute from approximately one-third the initial period rate (initial period rates of over 30 cents) to one-fourth on long lines and associated companies' interstate business, to become effective February 15 for the long lines and March 1 for the associated companies."

The reduction in private-line telephone and telegraph and program rates will become effective February 1 on the long lines and March 1 for the associated companies' interstate service.

BASIC RATES STAY

In New York, American Telephone & Telegraph President Walter S. Gifford said "It will be noted that no reductions in basic message rates are to be made and that the reductions agreed to were those least apt through stimulation of business to add a further burden to the already overloaded long-distance lines."

He said extraordinary long-distance business had resulted—probably only temporarily—in an earnings rate for the company's long-lines department which was "in excess of the average for the Bell Telephone System as a whole."

Explaining the Federal Communications Commission had exclusive jurisdiction over long-lines rates, Gifford said the Commission had insisted that earnings from such rates should be considered by themselves and had insisted that when so considered, they produced a return greater than could be justified.

One Thing That Is Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Times-Star of January 10, 1943:

ONE THING THAT'S UNNECESSARY

Typical of the irritating and useless regulations of Government bureaucracy is the Office of Price Administration's order requiring tire inspections. Any motorist who has already paid out his 25 cents for this procedure knows just how farcical it is. A brief check of serial numbers, a cursory glance at the condition of the tires, and the job is done. And the automobile owner is minus a quarter.

When this regulation was outlined, its purpose was supposed to be that of keeping tires in good shape. Periodic examinations were expected to reveal tire damage in time to have it repaired. That was the official explanation.

Actually, the tire inspection is a Government device to check up on the honesty of the citizens by keeping them from using more than five tires. It is a petty little scheme based on the premise that the majority of our civilians are doing their best to sabotage the war effort and will gyp and chisel whenever they get the opportunity. It is an insult to the American people.

There are many other ways to conserve the Nation's tires without threatening the public, or building up a huge staff of inspectors and forcing the owners of automobiles to waste time and gasoline on periodic junkets that prove little or nothing. One of the most important would be the realization by Washington that all but a handful of Americans are patriotic.

Representative J. HARRY MCGREGOR, of Ohio, has introduced a resolution in Congress to rescind the tire-inspection order. He is on the right track.

Byelection in Missouri Cheers G. O. P.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gerald Griffin, from the Baltimore Sun of January 22, 1943:

BYELECTION IN MISSOURI CHEERS GRAND OLD PARTY—REPUBLICAN MAJORITY OF 7,700 IN NOVEMBER IS 14,000 IN JANUARY—REPRESENTATIVE BENNETT, VICTOR LAST FALL, DIED; HIS 28-YEAR-OLD SON REPLACES HIM

(By Gerald Griffin)

WASHINGTON, January 21.—Strong evidence that public sentiment against the Roosevelt administration has increased since last November is offered by a special congressional election in a typical cross section of Missouri.

Although the significance of the vote has largely been overlooked thus far in the East, an analysis today showed that it apparently was an important straw in the wind.

It involved 28-year-old MARION T. BENNETT, a Republican, who was sworn in today as the Representative of the Sixth Missouri District.

FACTS OF THE ELECTION

The facts of his election, which Republicans are finding distinctly encouraging, are these:

In the November election, Philip A. Bennett (MARION'S father) was reelected to Congress from the Sixth District over Sam Wear, a veteran Democrat, by a majority of approximately 7,700 in a total vote of 85,000.

Early in December Mr. Bennett died. A special election was set for January 12.

In the special election the younger BENNETT, running as the Republican candidate against the same Mr. Wear, was elected by a majority of approximately 14,000 in a total vote of nearly 55,000.

Thus, although the total vote was reduced by 30,000, the Republican's majority was almost doubled.

RATIO GAIN OF 9,000

If the ratio between Republican and Democratic votes in the November election had been maintained in the special ballot last week, it was pointed out, the young BENNETT would have received a majority of only 5,000. The fact that his margin actually was nearly 14,000 indicated the extent of the Grand Old Party gain.

Expressing it another way, the younger BENNETT received 62 percent of the votes cast on January 12, whereas his father had received 55 percent of the ballots on November 3.

The Sixth District lies in the west-central part of the State, and includes farming areas as well as the cities of Springfield, Sedalia, and Warrensburg. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch calls it a representative slice of the United States, noting that it has railroad shops, mills, small factories, agricultural markets, farm land, and fruit orchards.

This district was established in 1933, under a reapportionment, and in 1934, 1936, and 1938 it chose a Democrat, Reuben T. Wood, president of the State Federation of Labor, as its Congressman.

TURNED TO GRAND OLD PARTY IN 1940

In 1938 Mr. Wood was elected by only 615 votes over Philip A. Bennett, and 1940 Mr. Bennett won the congressional seat by a majority of 10,894.

President Roosevelt carried the same district by 11,898 votes in 1936, but in 1940 Wendell L. Willkie carried it by 5,914 votes.

The location and population of the district together with its voting record since the 1934 congressional election, were cited as evidence that the manner in which it casts its votes reflects, to a considerable extent, national sentiment.

RURAL VOTE SHIFT SEEN

The special election last week provided at least one answer to the question that was raised shortly after the November elections; that is, whether the North African invasion, if it had been begun before the elections, would have been a factor in increasing the Democratic vote and cutting down the Republican gains.

It strengthened the impression, moreover, that much of the farm and small-town vote has turned against the Democrats. Experienced observers said, too, that it further emphasized the point that labor, which stayed away from the polls in large numbers in November, still was not interested in turning out for a Democratic candidate.

BENNETT'S CAMPAIGN TOPICS

The younger BENNETT, in his brief campaign before the special election, had assailed the "inefficiency" in the conduct of the war on the home front, giving special attention to the rubber situation, gasoline and fuel-oil rationing, the effect of rationing and regulations on small storekeepers, the drafting of farm labor for military service and the Administration's opposition to the farm organization's demands for higher prices.

Observers expressed the belief, further, that the President's appointment of Edward J. Flynn as minister to Australia, and the $10,000,000,000 Federal budget promising new and heavier taxes, were additional factors in Mr. BENNETT'S success. Both of these developments occurred shortly before the election.

In the elections last November 209 Republicans were elected to the House as against 222 Democrats. Two years ago, the Republicans elected 162 and the Democrats 268.

COMPARED WITH 1918

The net gain of 47 House seats was greater, numerically, than the Grand Old Party gain in 1918, when Woodrow Wilson was President and when the Republicans took control of the House. In that year the Republicans acquired only 21 new House seats, but the previous Democratic margin had been so small that this was sufficient to bring about a Republican majority.

OBSERVERS SPECULATING

Noting the similarity between the 1918 and 1942 elections—and recalling further that the Republican trend of 1918 grew stronger in 1920—students of politics have been speculating as to whether the 1942 trend will continue into 1944.

The Missouri election afforded the first check-up.

Farm Manpower Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, ex-President Herbert Hoover, whose record as a successful food administrator during and following the World War has never even remotely been approximated before or since, proposed in a radio broadcast last night, and reported in this morning's newspapers, that immediate additional steps be taken to provide the necessary manpower on American farms to meet the Nation's food program. Mr. Hoover proposed that as many able, experienced men with actual farming background be furloughed from the Army as necessary to assure the fact that the world's biggest bread basket—America's—be enabled to produce its maximum foodstuffs in this all-important crop year. Mr. Hoover also urged that drafting of farm labor be entirely stopped until adequate provisions have been made to remedy existing shortages of farm labor, which are acute in certain sections of rural America.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in position to know whether or not Mr. Hoover's proposal is essential to avert serious food shortages. If it is, it should most certainly be adopted. He is at least emphatically correct in stating that agriculture must be envisioned as a munitions industry. It is also obvious to those of us who have repeatedly been presenting the manpower and machinery problems of the farmers to Washington authorities that no such "envisioning" has governed directives and decisions concerning the American farmer up to at least the past few weeks.

Progress is being made, today, in the matter of providing manpower and machinery for American farmers. It is slow progress and it comes late in the season, Mr. Speaker, but it is movement in the right direction. We still have too many metropolitan lawyers issuing curbstone decisions and directives regulating the activities of American farmers, but headway toward developing a clear-cut recognition of the farmers' problems and the selection of men in administrative positions who have a background of rural experience is being made. This progress should be accelerated. Even omnipotent bureaucrats cannot delay the resistless march of the seasons and there is little time to lose in correcting the remaining injustices which prevent the American farmers from producing the largest possible crops of the most essential products in this critical year.

OPEN LETTER FROM SOUTH DAKOTA VICTORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker, the following open letter is one of the regular weekly news releases from the South Dakota Chapter of the Citizens for Victory Committee, with headquarters in Mitchell, S. Dak. It reached my office this morning. Its author is the secretary of that committee, Loyson G. Troth, who is also a former State secretary of agriculture in South Dakota.

The publicity and speakers bureau of this committee for which Secretary Troth speaks is comprised of a group of distinguished newspaper editors and publishers of South Dakota of divergent political affiliations. The fact that the committee's regular news letter to the papers of the State and elsewhere places such direct emphasis on the farm-labor situation is indeed significant. Included among the directors of the committee's publicity bureau are the following well-known South Dakota newspaper people: W. R. Ronald, editor and publisher of the Mitchell Republic, Mitchell, S. Dak.; J. A. Bailey, editor of Aberdeen News-American; Robert D. Lusk, editor and publisher of the Huronite, of Huron, S. Dak.; Fred C. Christopherson, editor of the Daily Argus Leader, of Sioux Falls, and Ed Lighter, business manager of the Rapid City Daily Journal.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that an official news letter emanating from the secretary of a committee whose publicity bureau is comprised of the leading newspapermen of a great farm State like South Dakota deserves the serious consideration of those charged with manpower management in America. This is especially true when considered in conjunction with Mr. Hoover's recent statement and when it is realized that these newspapermen live in widely scattered localities of one of the Nation's most important farm States, that they are members of differing political parties, and that through their network of rural reporters and observers they are in position to have personal information concerning the problems confronting American farmers:

FARM MANPOWER

(By Loyson G. Troth, secretary, South Dakota Chapter, Citizens for Victory Committee)

A quarter million farmers moved from farm to camp, or war industry, in 1942. Now, Washington says that from a million to a million and a half will be taken in 1943. We lost tens of thousands of bushels of food grains last year due to labor shortage. If more than a million of our farmers are taken from the farm this year, we will be headed for the brink of world-wide disaster.

Washington offers three solutions: First, move Okies from the Ozarks; second, import foreign labor from Mexico, Puerto Rico, the Bahama Islands; third, send an army of women and girls from city to farm. None, or all of these makeshifts will avert, national, or world calamity. Washington forgets that

agriculture is a science, a profession, requiring as many years of basic training as law, medicine, business.

American women are the equals of their brothers in war plants, where they work 8 hours a day, 5 days a week, protected from sun and weather, doing precision work, for which they are well adapted. Farming is vastly different. Farmers work 16 hours a day, 6 and 7 days a week, exposed to the burning sun and the elements, at work requiring greater physical strength than the average city woman has. There is but one solution. Defer the men that are still on the farms, return many of those now in the camps to the farms, and do it now, or we face the most tragic situation in our history.

An Open Letter to Raymond Clapper and All Newspaper Reporters and Columnists and Radio Commentators Who Will Cover the New Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in the January issue of the Cosmopolitan magazine there appeared an article by Mr. Raymond Clapper, well known newspaper columnist and radio commentator, which was entitled "An Open Letter to the New Congress." This article was so erroneous and misleading that I addressed an open letter to Mr. Clapper and all other newspaper reporters and radio commentators in the hope that the Cosmopolitan would see fit to give both sides of the question and to present to the public an opportunity of knowing the truth about the Congress.

I sent a copy of this open letter to the editor of Cosmopolitan and after waiting for several weeks for a reply, which was not received, I directed a second communication to the editor, who informed me that my original communication had not been received. I thereupon sent a copy of my original communication, but this time sent it by registered mail to prevent a second mysterious disappearance. After another week's delay I received a reply from the editor stating that my original communication had suddenly turned up but he deeply regretted the fact that the schedule of the magazine prohibited its publication.

This is a typical example of how some magazines smear the Congress and refuse to open their columns to a true presentation of the facts where Members of Congress are concerned. To say that I was surprised at the refusal of the magazine to publish the answer to Mr. Clapper would not be the truth. As a matter of fact, I would have been surprised had the answer been published.

Anticipating the refusal of the magazine to publish the answer I planned to place the letter before the House myself and for that reason I ask permission today to so extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I now submit to you this open letter which speaks for itself, I believe. Although we cannot change the spots of the leopard nor the stripes of the zebra, at least we can keep the records straight:

There are two reasons why I am writing this letter:

The first is that I was a Member of the Seventy-seventh Congress—the Congress which Mr. Clapper and many of his contemporaries have so viciously and unjustly attacked. It was my first term. I was reelected and will be a Member of the Seventy-eighth Congress—the Congress which Mr. Clapper addressed in an open letter through the columns of the January issue of the Cosmopolitan.

The second is that my profession is the newspaper business. Newspaper reporting is the only business I know. I came to Congress from the city desk of the New Orleans States. I gained the position of city editor only after I had been in the game for more than 20 years, starting as a sports writer and running the entire gamut of general reporting, feature writing, columnist, political writing, and, finally, as executive.

It was because of my newspaper work that I was literally catapulted into the Congress of the United States. Six months before I was elected I never had ambitions for public office. My only hope and ambition in life was to rise to the top of my lifelong profession—the newspaper game. I never intended my newspaper work to be a stepping stone to political office—elective or otherwise.

I make this statement because by it I believe I demonstrate that I not only see the issue from the critics' viewpoint of Congress but also from the viewpoint of a Member of the Congress itself. I make this statement also because while a Member of Congress I have never forgotten that I really am a newspaperman and most jealous of the heritage and traditions of newspapers and their reporters.

While this open letter is addressed to Mr. Clapper, it is done so only because it was Mr. Clapper who addressed an open letter to the new Congress. In reality, this letter is addressed to every newspaper reporter and columnist and radio commentator whose task it is to report the happenings of the Congress in Washington to the American public.

Members of Congress are at a distinct disadvantage in presenting their views and opinions to their constituency and to the American public. They are literally in the hands of the newspaper reporter and the radio commentator. The newspaper reporter, through the newspapers of the country, has a potential field of millions of readers. The radio commentator, in my opinion, has an even greater field, because, since the advent of the radio, millions of men and women depend on the radio newscast and the expressions of individual commentators for their main source of news and information.

Members of Congress, on the contrary, have a limited audience which, in comparison to the field covered by the newspapers and the radio, is most insignificant. A Member of Congress, for the better part, addresses sparsely filled galleries and has only the limited circulation of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for complete quotes.

A newspaper reporter or radio news commentator holds the life-and-death decision over what he will report to the Nation concerning Congress. His judgment is final. His interpretation of what is news is what reaches the general public. His opinion of the value of what a Member of Congress says on the floor is what the American public receives and not, in all too many cases, of what a Member of Congress actually says or does, or what, in the final analysis, is really the important thing. The reporter is constantly on the alert for the punch lines which will make the headlines.

It is easy to understand, therefore, the great responsibility which is charged the press and radio of America.

America has a free press. Its only restraint, and that only during war times, is a voluntary censorship. Pray God that the free press in America will continue, because when a free press dies, democracy dies. I am naturally a champion of a free press, being what I am, and I believe it to be not only the right but the duty of a free press to criticize.

If the new Congress has an opportunity, an opportunity expressed by Mr. Clapper as "second only to that which was given to the forefathers," then I submit that the press and radio of America have an equal opportunity of demonstrating to the men and women of America their right to continue as a free and unbridled press and radio.

If honesty, sincerity of purpose, and devotion to country is asked of every citizen, certainly it is not asking too much of the press and radio of America in these trying times to exhibit the same honesty, the same sincerity of purpose, and the same devotion to country as demanded and expected of every other individual.

There has been much said and written concerning the activities of the present Congress, the Seventy-seventh Congress. Some has perhaps been justified. Too much has definitely not been justified on the facts, but has been the result of misstatements, propaganda intended to reflect on the Congress, and outright biased opinions.

The future of America lies not only in what the Congress individually will do, or what the press and radio individually will do, but in what Congress, press, and radio will do together. Never in our national history has there been a greater demand for cooperation, understanding, and unity than at the present time. It is not going far afield to say that democracy, the American way as we know it, stands at the crossroads of future civilization.

To the new Congress, Mr. Clapper says: "You have an opportunity to make Congress a living force in our democracy again."

To Mr. Clapper, well can the new Congress say: "You, Mr. Clapper, and your contemporaries have an opportunity to prove that a free press has the right to continue to exist and to exert its influence in the continuation of a democracy which cannot exist without a free press. The press and radio of tomorrow are your responsibility of today."

You, Mr. Clapper, and your contemporaries, are men of great talent. You have risen to the height of your profession because you possess extraordinary ability. That unusual ability has given you the power to formulate public opinion, to sway men and women, to influence the manner in which your Government shall function. It is a great power enjoyed by a select few.

Because of the position of power which you occupy, you should be most cognizant of the effect which such a position has on your country and for that reason present the facts, and only the facts, with a religious zeal. Well could the press and radio alike raise their hands and take the oath of the courtroom witness to give the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help them God.

If the Congress during the past 2 years has fallen in public opinion and esteem, it has been because of the activities of yourself and many of your contemporaries and not because of the action, or lack of action, of the Congress. The responsibility of the past has been just as much yours as it has been theirs, and the responsibility of the future is equally as great. The Congress cannot shirk its duty or responsibility, and neither can the press and

radio of America shirk their duty, or their responsibility.

I make these statements on the basis of fact and not presumption and respectfully direct some examples and incidents to your attention as to what I mean.

Let's take your open letter as an exhibit in point.

You say: "Sacrifices are being asked of everyone. Why not also of Senators and Representatives?"

Here is an exhibition of superb adroitness and cleverness on the part of a writer. The inference in those lines is that Senators and Representatives have up to this time been a select group apart. The impression has been left that Senators and Representatives do not submit to the same regulations as all other citizens. As a matter of fact, Senators and Representatives are no better or no less than the people they represent. They are rationed and subjected to war regimentation equally with every other citizen. They are called upon to make the same sacrifices. The sons of Senators and Representatives are in the armed forces of our country the same as their constituents. Many of them, themselves, were in the armed forces until ordered on inactive duty by the Commander in Chief. Many of them have been under fire in actual combat. Many of them have suffered the loss of those dear to them.

However, by sly innuendoes you leave the impression that Senators and Representatives are without conscience in their appreciation of sacrifice and duty to their Nation.

As a matter of fact, Senators and Representatives have the same mental anguish and suffer the same sacrifices and tortures as you or any other loyal American suffers.

You, as a newspaperman, have experienced the sensation of seeing men die and you know how horrible it is. You, as a human being, would not want to send your fellow man to his death unnecessarily.

I, as a newspaperman, too, have seen men die. I have seen murders, suicides, and fatal accidents. I have lost count of the number of men I have seen die on the gallows. I can't fix a figure of the number of men I have heard condemned to their death in a courtroom.

The sensation which I felt on those occasions cannot compare to the specter of being compelled to declare war with the knowledge that your vote would contribute to the death of thousands of men, and yes, even women.

Don't you think that those of us who voted for war thought about all these things prior to the actual declaration of war? Of course, Pearl Harbor made it much easier to vote for war, but it didn't remove the prior realization that a declaration of war was inevitable, even before Pearl Harbor. It is a heavy responsibility which only those of us who have been through can fully appreciate.

But, to continue, from your open letter to the new Congress you further state:

"You can rescue Congress from fear-ridden submission to pressure groups—labor groups, farm groups, and all of those special self-seeking lobbying groups that are trying to use the war for their own special advantage."

Why didn't you continue and include those groups, within the Government, who are attempting to turn this democracy into a permanent bureaucracy? Why not go all the way?

Why didn't you mention the most vicious pressure group in the whole set-up—the group which seeks to make this a country not of law but of men?

How cleverly that paragraph is worded and what an impression it leaves in the mind of the reader.

Now to two of the most misleading paragraphs in your entire letter.

The first:

"Congress has in the last 2 years sunk to a new low. Only by one vote did the House authorize an extension of the draft in the summer of 1941. Congress slyly voted itself a retirement benefit plan and then had to repeal it under public pressure. When gasoline rationing was first applied in the Eastern States, the number of Senators and Representatives who obtained unlimited X cards shocked a good many people."

Superlatives are very dangerous, Mr. Clapper, unless you qualify them.

You state dogmatically and unequivocally that "Congress has in the last 2 years sunk to a new low."

Surely you must have authority for such a statement, but where is the authority except your statement?

Wouldn't it have been more factual for you to say, "In my opinion, Congress has in the last 2 years sunk to a new low?" Then the reader could place his own limitations and appreciations of what your opinion was worth.

But you don't say that. You make what is supposed to be a statement of fact, which would mean that never before in the history of the Nation has Congress fallen to such depths. Having the reputation of a good reporter, your reader accepts such a statement as a fact per se, which analysis proves it is not.

Not in my opinion, anyway, and my opinion is substantiated by a few facts which might be of interest to you and to those who read what you have to say.

Away back, on March 25, 1837, the Baltimore Republican had this to say about Congress:

"A more weak, bigoted, persecuting, and intolerant set of instruments of malice and every hateful passion were never assembled in a legislative capacity in any age or any land."

Rather harsh words. Even such things haven't been said about the present Congress; certainly not to my knowledge. It would seem that the Congress of 1837, from such a description, was at a much lower ebb than the Congress of 1942, but you fail to make mention of this fact.

On September 15, 1857, the North American and the United States Gazette said:

"How can we expect integrity or uprightness in our legislatures or in Congress when the barrooms and bullies furnish the candidates?"

Seems like the Congress of 1857, in the opinion of some, was even lower than the Congress of 1942.

Surprising to find that a Congress which had sunk so low carried on its roster the names of Jefferson Davis, Andrew Johnson, Stephen A. Douglas, Sam Houston, Charles Sumner, and Alexander Stephens.

In 1873 when such men as Leland Stanford, Henry Cabot Lodge, Charles Curtis, and Nelson Aldridge, the great tariff expert from Rhode Island, were Members of the Congress, the Indianapolis News of December said:

"Does the Senate understand that at the present writing it is the most thoroughly despised body of public men in the world."

I haven't heard anybody, not even you Mr. Clapper, write or say, that you "despise" the Seventy-seventh Congress, but you say this Congress has sunk to "a new low."

The tirade continues through the years.

In the New York Times of January 20, 1894, there appeared the following:

"The long list of interviews with Congressmen reveals in an appalling manner the dense stupidity and arrogant cowardice of many of them."

Seems like that was also a rather low ebb to reach, and definitely somewhat lower than the present ebb in which you say Congress has fallen in 2 years.

Again, Mr. Clapper, you say that the Congress in the last 2 years has reached a "new low" but I haven't heard anybody say of the Congress in the last 2 years what the Albuquerque Morning Journal of January 28, 1908, said of the then-existing Congress:

"If God had made Congress, He would not boast of it."

But to get along with your open letter and more misstatements of fact contained therein, which contributes to the estimation in which the Seventy-seventh Congress is held by the public. You say:

"Congress slyly voted itself a 'retirement benefit' plan and then had to repeal it under public pressure."

The single quotes on the words are mine, of course.

This is the first time I have known you to refer to the retirement-benefit plan as such. If you have done so before, I have not seen it. I did see many times, however, and up until the time I read your open letter, that Congress had voted itself liberal pensions. There's a lot of difference in telling the public that Congressmen voted themselves handsome pensions and telling them that they voted to participate in a similar retirement benefit plan participated in by all Government employees and then allowed to participate only after qualifying under certain conditions of service and payment of premiums commensurate with the relief to be obtained.

You were one of the most vigorous Congress-baiters on this so-called pension issue, but not once did you tell the whole truth of the proposition which, if explained, would not have met with the disfavor which it did from the uninformed and misled public. You and your contemporaries contributed your share to fan a flame of hate and distrust in the minds of the American public for their elected representatives.

I still quote you:

"When gasoline rationing was first applied in the Eastern States, the number of Senators and Representatives who obtained unlimited X cards shocked a good many people."

Why did it shock them?

Because you and many of your contemporaries again didn't tell the whole truth about the issuance of the X cards. You didn't tell the people that Senators and Representatives did not get X cards just because they were Senators and Representatives, but they received them under a ruling of the bureau in charge and only after they had qualified like any other citizen.

Let me quote here a letter from a prominent Washington newspaperman who did try to tell the truth about the X cards. I prefer not to use his name because it was in a personal letter to me, but it explains the point which I made most graphically:

"Many thanks for your very kind letter regarding what I wrote about Congress and the X cards for gasoline. I was in Philadelphia, writing about the primary campaign up there last week, and read what the newspapers were saying about Members of Congress and the gas situation, and it seemed to me that they were both ignorant and unfair."

That, Mr. Clapper, from one of your colleagues, who to his everlasting credit believes in the presentation of facts and not fancies.

Only recently the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee of the House approved a bill which would authorize the removal of the air-conditioning systems in the office buildings and Capitol in the interest of the war effort. I haven't read a line by you or anybody else concerning this piece of legislation, but I can well imagine what would have been written had the committee rejected such a bill.

Let me get along, however, with observations in your open letter to the new Congress. You have this to say:

"True, Congress has voted money to carry on the war promptly and in the amounts asked. In almost every other respect Congress has followed, reluctantly and only under the most severe prodding from the White House and the public, in taking the actions

necessary to prepare for the war. It has followed and never led. Had the initiative been left to Congress, we would have met the present crisis in a state of almost complete unpreparedness. As it was, Congress was months in giving the administration price-control authority, months in passing the latest inadequate tax bill."

I never thought even you would go as far in making such a statement which is so contrary to the facts.

What do you mean Congress only acted after "the most severe prodding from the White House"?

As a matter of fact, much of the laxity attributed to Congress has been because of the reluctance of the administration to allow the Congress to act. And much of the criticism directed against Congress for relinquishing so many of its powers, has come about because of administration pressure.

With a too-heavy administration majority in the House it has been impossible, with one or two exceptions, to get any legislation through unless given the green light from the White House. Not once was a caucus of the Democratic side held to discuss proposed legislation. The rank and file were never taken into consideration. Much, I am confident, could have been learned from them. They were in touch with the folks back home. They didn't need the recent elections to inform them of how the people felt. They knew it all the time, but neither their opinion nor advice was sought. The pressure was put on them under the pretext of party loyalty.

Every effort to effectively settle the labor or price-control situation was blocked by the administration.

All moves to settle the labor controversy were successfully blocked in administration-controlled committees. When a vote finally reached the floor, it was on an amendment, a rather roundabout manner in which to act on so important a piece of legislation.

The one price-control bill which would have been truly effective, the Gore bill, was not passed because administration pressure against it was too strong. Yet, in effect, the same bill was passed months later after the President made his now famous statement, "You do it or else," to which you refer.

That rather gratuitous threat would not have been necessary had the administration allowed the bill on price control to pass the House, which would really have controlled prices, and would not have caused the confusion which resulted from the bill passed.

Your statement—

"Had the initiative been left to Congress we would have met the present crisis in a state of almost complete unpreparedness."

Gods of truth and fact.

Don't you know, Mr. Clapper, that it was the Congress which initiated the selective service and started our Army training a year before we were actually in a war?

Don't you know, Mr. Clapper, that in 1937 in the House, and in 1938 in the Senate, the accumulation of stockpiles of critical materials was being advocated by the Military Affairs Committee in each legislative body? Who was to blame for not carrying through the recommendations of the Congress in this instance?

Don't you know, Mr. Clapper, that Congress authorized the construction of pipe lines on July 30, 1941, long before the fuel shortage in the East, but it was only in June 1942 that a pipe line was actually started from Texas to Illinois?

Don't you know, Mr. Clapper, that Congress gave the authority for the construction of the Alaskan Highway 4 years before it was actually built?

Don't you know, Mr. Clapper, that the Congress authorized the construction of six Army air bases under the Thomas-Wilcox bill 7 years before two of them were actually built?

Don't you know, Mr. Clapper, that it has been the Congress and its committees which have attempted to curb nonessential expenditures and have taken the initiative in recapturing huge profits from would-be war profiteers, who have operated under various agencies of the Government?

Yet, Mr. Clapper, you make the statement that Congress has not taken the initiative.

But to hurry to a conclusion. You further state:

"There is no guaranteeing that if you do what you think is best for the Nation as a whole, some political racketeer, some political boss, some lobby pressure group, or some loud-mouthed fellow on a soapbox, won't distort your position, misrepresent your unselfish purpose, paint you as an enemy of local interests, an ingrate who thinks himself too big for his people."

Isn't that a most accurate description of what you and some of your contemporaries have been guilty of?

Haven't you, as I have pointed out in what has gone before, distorted the position of Members of Congress, misrepresented their unselfish purposes, painted Members of Congress not only as enemies of local interests but inimical to the best interests of the Government itself? Isn't that what you and some of your contemporaries have been doing? And your medium has been far more powerful than a soapbox; it has been the columns of the newspapers of America and the microphones of the Nation.

My appreciation of the American form of representative government is that if it were possible to gather 133,000,000 people under 1 roof to decide on how the government of the people should be conducted, it would be done. Since this is obviously impossible, a certain number of Representatives of the 133,000,000 are elected by the people themselves and sent to Washington to represent them and express the opinions and desires which they would express if they themselves would be able to be present.

The reason the Constitution provides for the election every 2 years of Representatives is that the people themselves will have an opportunity of expressing themselves on the current topics of the day and will not have to wait for 4 years for the election of the President or 6 years for the election of a Senator.

The Representatives, and the Representatives alone, have been the direct Representatives of the people since the Constitution was adopted. The method of electing the President and the Members of the Senate has been changed since the adoption of the Constitution, but the Representatives have always been directly elected by the people for the purpose of expressing the views, thoughts, and ideas of the people they represent.

Each Representative is elected upon certain presentations of policy and action to the people of his district. He is elected on the basis of keeping those promises. If he doesn't keep those promises and if he doesn't express the wishes and desires of the people who elected him to represent them, he is not returned. Yet when the Representative attempts to express what a majority of his people want him to express, he is charged with playing politics or engaging in some other diabolical form of governmental activity by certain newspaper columnists and radio commentators.

Members of the House of Representatives are intended by the Constitution and by those who wrote the Constitution to be sounding boards of the views of those they represent, yet you write thus:

"Furthermore, you of the new Congress will need to be more than sounding boards. You and I engage our doctors and lawyers to work with us, and to work for us. We defer to their judgment on complex technical matters. Why should not you have similar latitude in exercising your judgment? That latitude is something that you of the new Congress are entitled to have from the public."

And who would be the doctors and the lawyers to so advise the Congress?

Would they be the bureaus and those bureaucrats who have no sympathy with the American way of living and the democracy we live under, and who would destroy the kind of government which gives the people the right to send their Representatives to a Congress of the people?

Would they be the forces which you so vehemently condemn as pressure groups who are really most expert in their particular field?

Would they be interests which would have Members of Congress break faith with the people who elected them and compel Congressmen to recede from the promises made before their election? Would you suggest such procedure as being honest and sincere?

I again quote you:

"In this dangerous period when representative government has collapsed almost everywhere else, isn't it worth risking your reelection chances to do your part in bringing health and vigor, intelligence and informed free judgment to the legislative arm of the Government?

"That is the question, it seems to me, that everyone must answer for himself, in his own conscience, and in his own sense of responsibility to the people who elected him."

Permit me to paraphrase your own closing paragraphs in this open letter to you and those contemporaries of press and radio who keep step with you.

I say in the spirit, and almost the letter, of the two paragraphs quoted above:

"In this dangerous period when representative government has collapsed almost everywhere else, when only in a democracy is a free press allowed, isn't it worth risking the loss of a few plaudits from revolutionaries and enemies of a real people's government, to do your part in bringing health and vigor, intelligence, unprejudiced, unbiased, and factual information to the public of the Nation?

"That is the question, it seems to me, that every newspaper reporter, every newspaper columnist, every radio commentator, must answer for himself, in his own conscience and in his own sense of responsibility to the people of the Nation who depend on him for information and news of the new Congress."

Farm Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the great speech of former President Herbert Hoover, calling for increased farm production. He is the only living ex-President and knows more about feeding people than any other living man. His words will carry conviction to all who read them. The bureaucrat must be restrained, if not abolished, for the duration, and the farmer must be liberated and encouraged if we are to win the war.

Mr. Hoover's speech follows:

I have been requested by your board to say something on our war food problem. I believe I can speak not alone from some experience but in entire detachment from any group interest. It is not a problem to be dealt with in emotional terms. Nevertheless its ultimates are safety or suffering, the loss of human life or the saving of it. And this is not a subject for criticism, nor do I believe in the doctrine of—I told you so. We need to face the hard facts and secure a remedy. And at once.

Food supply has now become secondary only to military operations in determining the outcome of the war. And it will take first place in saving the world from anarchy after the war.

When firing ceases we will be faced with three or four hundred million starving people. That such things should be is but part of the crimes of Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini and unparalleled in all history. To save these millions of people is not alone a transcendent act of compassion. It is the only road to peace. But we must be prepared. In the meantime, we need more food to carry on the war.

The burden of furnishing food supplies to the United Nations now and to a starving world after the war rests largely upon American and Canadian farmers.

And at once let me say I have no sympathy with attacks being made by armchair consumers upon the American farmer. He is working a 70-hour week to win the war. My purpose is to say a word in his behalf to you who represent the industrial world.

That there is today an acute shortage in meats and fats in all the United Nations, including ourselves, needs no demonstration. And fats include the whole gamut of lard, milk, butter, cheese, and edible oil products.

CITES FARM LABOR SHORTAGE

The shortage of labor, of machinery, and methods of price control are limiting the vitally essential expansion of this production and the flocks and herds upon which production depends. And unless we can quickly realize and quickly reverse these limiting factors there are dangers to the conduct of the war. It may definitely increase the suffering after the war, for the greatest need of these millions of starving people will be meats and fats.

We have present ample stores of breadstuffs on the North American Continent to supply our allies and to contribute to the inevitable world post-war famine. The Biblical injunction was, however, that man cannot live by bread alone. The scientists have long since proved that the deficiency in that Biblical diet is meats and fats. And to maintain a cheerful and fighting spirit in the human animal he needs frills and flavors like coffee and jam. He feels still better if he can have eggs and fruit.

While we have Germany blockaded from overseas food, her submarines have done a fairly effective job of cutting off much of both British and our own meats and fats from the Southern Hemisphere. And the Japanese conquests have stopped much of our own and British vegetable oils from Asia and the Indies. Russia has lost a considerable part of her food areas and must have some support from us. China is at present cut off in every direction.

We in the United States are short of meats and fats not only because we must supply the deficiencies on our allies, and because our possible imports of meats and fats are curtailed but because our armed forces eat more of them than they do in civil life.

DECREASE IN UNITED STATES LIVESTOCK

But there is an even deeper cause of these shortages. We had all these burdens and difficulties in the last war. We are today exporting less than half the meats and fats to our allies than we did in the last war, for we then had to support France, Belgium, and Italy also. Yet with this lesser burden of exports we are threatened with greater shortages of meats and fats on our own home front than in World War No. 1.

The larger problem which confronts us is that since the last war American livestock has decreased in proportion to the growth of human population.

At the end of that war we had 26 percent more beef cattle for each 1,000,000 of human population than we had 23 years later on January 1, 1942.

We had 26 percent more hogs in proportion to the population. We had proportionately 5 percent more milk cows than now. But the modern cow gives more milk. We have in 1943 about the same sheep proportionately as in the last war. We have less chickens in proportion to our population, but the chickens work harder and produce more eggs.

The demands upon us today call imperatively to build up our flocks and herds and our production of vegetable oils. I may repeat that we urgently need more meats and fats and edible oils to reduce the hardships at home and to meet the crisis of world famine after the war. We can, of course, slaughter our breeding herds for immediate war purposes. But that would starve ourselves and the world afterward.

We can build up our flocks and herds and consequently their production. During the period of the last World War our hog population increased by 22 percent, our beef cattle by 27 percent, our milk cows 10 percent. It was this increase in production that was the salvation of Europe last time.

We can produce the feed resources to again greatly increase our food animals. For one thing, the gas engine has retired 20,000,000 horses and mules from the national pastures and city feed bags.

PROGRESS NOT SATISFACTORY

That the progress we are making today is not satisfactory can be demonstrated. In January, a year ago, the Secretary of Agriculture gave to the country an admirable victory program of increased herds and increased production. The climatic conditions during the year were most favorable. Detailed statistics of actual farm results during the year are not yet available. But it is already obvious that this program was not fully met. This was due to various causes out of control of the Secretary. And now the Secretary warns us that production for 1943 may be less than that in 1942 in several directions.

The causes of this blockade on possible production are obvious:

First, some 2,000,000 men have been drained from the farm labor supply into arms and munitions.

Second, the methods of food price control.

Third, the manufacture of farm machinery has been reduced by 75 percent.

There is, indeed, every evidence that without prompt remedy we shall not secure the increases that are vitally necessary.

A congressional committee reports that millions of dollars worth of crops in the Southwest were lost last year because they could not be harvested.

Word from farmers in many parts of the country indicate that unless their difficulties be remedied they will be compelled to reduce planting this spring.

And they are compelled to limit their herds below what they could otherwise do. The news comes daily from all parts of the country that the farmer is sending his dairy cows to slaughter for lack of labor. And this is amply verified by the arrivals at the slaughter houses. For the 4 months ended November 1, 1942, the inspected slaughter of female cattle increased 30 percent over the same period in 1941, while the increase in the slaughter of steers was only 5 percent. The increased slaughter of female cattle in this 4-month period was nearly 40 percent greater than the same period in the average of the 3 previous years. This does not increase our supply of dairy products. Also the cattle coming into the market during this 4 months ended November 1, 1942, were an average on different calculations from 30 to 40 pounds an animal lighter than for the same period the year before. This beef loss would have supplied several million people during the period.

SHEEP SLAUGHTER UP 300 PERCENT

During this 4 months the number of sheep slaughtered has increased nearly 300 percent over the year before. Our national flock is less today than a year ago and will apparently be still less a year hence. There also seems to be some disturbance in the hog world, for sows have been coming to slaughter during the last 4 months faster than would seem desirable if we are to increase the herd with the rapidity needed.

This undue slaughter of cows, ewes, and sows gives a temporary increase in meats, but it is an illusion. The numbers slaughtered so far are not disastrous. We will not starve. Our allies will not starve.

But these demoralizing forces are continuing. And if we keep traveling in this direction we will see more hardships at home if we supply the Allies and armies. And with such a situation it is nonsense to talk about furnishing meat and fat supplies to 300,000,000 additional famine-stricken people after this war is won.

Agriculture simply must be envisaged as a munitions industry. The farmer must be given men and tools if he is to perform his part.

It is useless to talk about making up the farm labor shortage wholly from women or children. Much of farming is hard physical labor. Modern farming requires great skills in nursing the crops and livestock. Moreover farming has been mechanized. Now he is a mechanic. These skills cannot be learned quickly. But with organized preparatory training, women can be of great service for lighter, simpler tasks.

There are other major remedies. The first is to cease the draft of labor from the farms into arms and munitions. The second is for industry to rigidly economize on labor and release the economies to the farmer. The third is large and temporary import of Mexican farm labor. The fourth is to give consideration to the method of European armies. That is to furlough farm boys from the Army for the few months of peak planting and harvest, they remaining under military direction, and in our case to draw both the Army and farmers' pay.

Obviously price control of short commodities is necessary. Food cannot be allowed to go to the highest bidder. And prices and wages must be controlled to check inflation. But prices also dominate production. They can be the most powerful stimulant to production. They can stifle production.

Prices can be made to produce the commodities we need and to minimize those which are the less necessary. We give enormous wages and prices to stimulate planes and ships. Increased production of meats and fats are today just as important to win the war as planes and ships. And some bacon to the consumer at a few cents more is better than too little bacon.

At best, price controls of food can be only a brake upon the pressures of shortage and inflation. We considered the method of retail-price ceilings on food were a failure in the last war. And prices on food have risen about 16 percent since they were partially applied a year ago and about 9 percent since they were fully applied. This in fact comprises a slightly larger rise than took place during the first year of food control in the last war under other methods.

Systems of frozen retail-price ceilings on food or even farm parities are not adapted to the problems of war production. They cannot single out and give premiums on production of the things we most need in parallel with the shifting demands of war.

The first reform needed is to abandon retail-price ceilings on food and to substitute the alternative methods developed in the last war. That method is to fix prices as near the farm as possible. And they can then be fixed to stimulate production of the things we need. The consumer can be more effectively and more simply protected by regulating the turn-over and profits of the food processor and the mark-ups of the wholesaler and retailer.

ASKS SINGLE PRICE DIRECTOR

The second reform is that all the functions of price control should be vested in the Secretary of Agriculture instead of several other places as at present. He alone can direct price so as to secure production and protect the consumer.

After all, the best remedy to price is increased production.

Whatever we are able to do in increasing production of meats and fats, we will still need to reduce our domestic consumption if we are to feed the Allies and our armies. We have margins of consumption which can and must be reduced—and it means rationing. But with maximum production the hardships on the home front would be less.

I could talk at length on methods of rationing, having participated in that surgical operation one time or another on some 500,000,000 people. It is no use to criticize the mistakes that have been made during the last year or the hardships imposed. They are a part of war. We should give Senator Brown, the new Administrator, a chance and our support in the revisions he will no doubt make. I will make only one observation. In rationing the American people with their widely different habits, products, and problems, the system should be decentralized into the States and under State administrators.

But the first and imperative necessity is to get more production. The American farmer will do it if he is given a chance. And the fate of the world may depend upon it.

Yesterday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Pvt. (1st cl.) Vincent H. Cassidy, Jr., United States Marine Corps, First United States Marine Raiders Battalion, Guadalcanal:

YESTERDAY

Yesterday? Ah, yes; I remember yesterday.
I was young then, light of heart and gay,
A stranger still to fear and sleepless nights,
But that was yesterday.
The clang of steel, the pang of pain,
The bitter twang of twice-born hate,
I had not known, nor yet had been at war.
I had not noticed day by day
Dear ones' faces fade away
And home become a dream, a thing remembered—
Hoped for—all but lost in memory;
But now I've seen more than I'll say.
How old I've grown since yesterday!

— Pvt. (1st cl.) Vincent H. Cassidy, Jr., U. S. Marine Corps, First United States Marine Raiders Battalion, Guadalcanal.

First Things First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of January 6, 1943:

FIRST THINGS FIRST

Some well-meaning Americans, including Wendell Willkie, Vice President Wallace, Secretary of State Hull and a number of others are discussing the part the United States is to play in world affairs when the war is won. Let us have first things first. Let us win the war, and after that we can consider the job of world reconstruction. But do not let these questions, with the bitter controversies they create, distract us from the immediate task which is going to take all the men, all the money and all the effort we can devote to it.

In his Toronto speech last month, Mr. Willkie expressed the fear that the war might end before the people of the world have come to a common understanding. We hope Mr. Willkie does not mean that the war should be prolonged until this understanding is reached, because no such understanding is possible. Here we have militaristic Germany and Japan, communistic Russia and explosive France and Italy. How can a common understanding be reached in a world containing these nations?

We even have dissidence on this hemisphere. Argentina, most progressive of the Latin-American nations, refuses to go along with the other American commonwealths in their war against the Axis. And we have a lurking suspicion that Mexico and some of the other countries south of us are going along not for any love of us, but because they are afraid of the Axis and Japan.

It is possible to bring about some understanding among the English-speaking and the Scandinavian countries because they are intelligent enough to grasp the fundamentals of democratic government, but let it not be forgotten that in time of peace the British are not particularly careful of the rights of other nations unless that policy is to Britain's particular advantage.

We are dealing with a world made up of diverse races, languages, religions, customs, and viewpoints. Free trade is a beautiful theory, if we want to see our shelves and counters loaded down with the products of Japan and other countries where pauper wages are paid and which, as soon as this war is over, will turn their industries into competition with the United States. The principal aftermath of the war will be overproduction, just as it was the principal aftermath of the last one. This brought on the greatest depression in our history, with a volume of unemployment greater than that of all the rest of the world combined.

Whether or not this means isolation in peace it is time we reached an understanding in the United States that this is going to be our last world war. We were left holding the bag in the first one and will be left holding the bag in this one.

There is no use making peace agreements if they are to be broken by greedy belligerents. We must keep the predatory nations disarmed. If we do not do so then it is our duty to constantly maintain the most powerful army, navy, and air force in the world for our own protection and the protection of this hemisphere.

Men like Willkie and WALLACE are talking about the kind of a world that can come only through evolution, requiring decades if not centuries. The task is too great for any man or group of men or any nation or group of nations. When Germany and Japan are soundly defeated in this war they will immediately proceed to lay the ground work of another. That ground work must be smashed.

The essence of this war is the total defeat of the nations which started it, and until they see the light they must be overpowered before they again destroy the peace of the world. After the war the United States will be so busy with her own problems of reconstruction that she will have little time to devote to the job of keeping the world straight.

This is no time to scatter our shot. It is a time for intense concentration on the immense task of winning the war—and after that our duty will be to look out for the United States, first, last, and all the time.

Issue of Fiat Money by a New Deal Illegal Subterfuge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Journal of Commerce of Friday, January 22, 1943, which I am inserting under leave to extend, is a disclosure of a glaring resort by the New Deal administration to inflate the currency by means of subterfuge instead of utilizing lawful means to meet wartime currency exigencies:

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK NOTES

The Federal Reserve banks are in the process of issuing $660,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank notes, to help satisfy the huge wartime demand for currency which has been met to date with Federal Reserve notes. The reason given for resort to this type of currency is that these notes, which had been printed for possible use in 1933, were lying unused in the vaults of the Federal Reserve banks, while the Bureau of Printing and Engraving has been hard put to it to fill War Savings bond certificate and ration book requirements.

Had the Reserve banks issued these Federal Reserve bank notes as in 1933, listing them as a liability, no question could have arisen about this episode, which is trivial in itself when compared with the expansion of $4,250,000,000 of currency circulation during 1942 alone. But the Federal Reserve banks are crediting the deposit account of the Treasury immediately in an amount equal to the Federal Reserve bank notes issued, and the Treasury thereupon assumes the liability for their redemption.

Whatever the intent of the Reserve banks and the Treasury, this procedure does have two specific consequences. These are:

1. The Treasury raises money through the assumption of a non-interest-bearing liability, instead of through the sale of obligations on which interest is paid. When the Reserve banks credit the account of the Treasury for the amount of Federal Reserve bank notes issued, the Treasury obtains a non-interest-bearing advance so long as these notes remain outstanding.

2. Currency circulation is expanded without reducing member bank reserves. When

the Federal Reserve bank notes are issued in response to demands from member banks, the reserve account of the latter is debited. But immediately thereafter the Treasury's own deposit account is credited by the Reserve banks, and when the Treasury spends this money the member banks' reserve account is restored to its original level. When Federal Reserve notes are issued to satisfy a demand for currency, on the other hand, the member banks' reserve account is reduced correspondingly.

It is thus clear that the issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes, in the manner in which this is now being done, has exactly the same effect as the issuance of additional greenbacks by the Treasury, except that the currency bears another name. Any decision to finance the war in part through this device, therefore, should be made by Congress, for in the issuance of money there should be a scrupulous regard for the letter, as well as the spirit, of the law.

Just because the new procedure is being questioned, it would be the part of wisdom for the Reserve banks to remain liable on any further Federal Reserve bank notes that will be issued, as was done in 1933 and 1934. On the other hand, if the Treasury wants to finance some part of the cost of the war through issuing currency of its own to satisfy the enormous wartime demand for additional cash, so that no interest would be paid on such funds and member bank reserves would not be reduced, the proper way to do this would be to ask Congress to authorize issuance of additional greenbacks, up to a stated amount, for the period of the war.

Synthetic Rubber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by Drew Pearson printed in the Washington Post of January 20. This particular Merry-Go-Round column dealt with the new storm brewing over synthetic rubber.

I have today introduced another bill attempting to deal with this problem by giving the Rubber Administrator of the War Production Board full authority to proceed with the construction of plants for the development of rubber from agricultural and forest resources. Mr. Jeffers has admitted publicly his inability to get the necessary priorities to implement the recommendations of the Baruch Report insofar as they relate to the production of synthetic rubber.

Apparently the only part of the Baruch report that can be carried out is that part which takes away from the American public the use of its automobiles. Those parts of the Baruch report which would give to the public a new supply of rubber and thereby relieve the gasoline-rationing situation in those areas where gasoline is plentiful seems constantly surrounded by difficulties and discouragements.

Mr. Jeffers has been trying to get 100 percent of the necessary materials to complete the program as outlined by the Baruch committee. Now he seems willing to take 50 percent because that is the best deal that he seems able to make. The bill I have presented would give him authority to proceed immediately with the construction of plants in the areas and along the lines which the Baruch committee recommended and which the Congress of the United States by a huge vote declared to be a proper governmental policy.

The article by Drew Pearson is as follows:

NEW STORM BREWING OVER SYNTHETIC RUBBER

Rubber Czar Jeffers, who moans that everything always goes wrong in Washington and wishes he were back in Omaha, is in for more trouble.

Up in Philadelphia, Polish inventor Szukiewicz has been twiddling his thumbs waiting for a chance to tell the Senate how only 2 short years ago he built an alcohol rubber plant in Italy, now producing more than 10,000 tons a year, and how he can get no steel or anything else to build a similar plant in Philadelphia—even with private funds.

Down in Louisville, Fred Willkie, of Seagrams, brother of Wendell, is chafing at the bit because he is given the run-around in getting materials to build a rubber plant, again with private money and again using a quick alcohol process.

Finally, right in Washington, a group of Senators are seeing red and saying "I told you so" over rubber delays.

All of which illustrates the fact that sometimes Congress has done a better job than the Executive in prosecuting the war. If the President had not vetoed the Gillette bill providing for synthetic rubber from grain alcohol, we might be better off today.

Last summer Senator GILLETTE and his Agriculture Committee pointed out that rubber from alcohol was quicker, cheaper; that it would not use up as much steel as building big new petroleum rubber plants, and that it would benefit the farmer.

BILL VETOED

Franklin Delano Roosevelt vetoed the Gillette bill, simultaneously asking Bernie Baruch to study the entire rubber program and make recommendations.

In the end Baruch froze the rubber program already started because, he said, it was too late to change, though most of the big new rubber plants to be built under the petroleum process, requiring about $10,000,000 worth of steel and copper, still were in a blueprint stage. Baruch also recommended modified manufacture of rubber and alcohol.

So the Gillette committee held everything, decided to play ball. Instead of trying to pass its bill over the President's veto it waited to give Jeffers a chance.

But now that Jeffers has come out publicly, warning that the rubber program is seriously delayed, and repeating some of the Senate's identical warnings, GILLETTE et al. are up in arms again.

SENATORS SEE RED

Furthermore, when GILLETTE summoned Rubber Czar Jeffers to a hearing, the committee discovered that not until then had he moved to carry out Bernie Baruch's minimum recommendations for alcohol-rubber plants. Three alcohol plants were to be built at Omaha, Kansas City, and Muscatine, Iowa. But arrangements for these plants were made only after Jeffers got the official summons to appear before the Gillette committee.

Naturally, the Senators are seeing red.

They see even redder when Jeffers points out that there just isn't enough steel to build rubber plants, plus high-octane gasoline plants, plus airplanes, plus escort vessels so badly needed to combat submarines.

This is absolutely true. But it was also true last summer, and the Gillette committee pointed it out last summer.

They maintained that making rubber from petroleum required the same type of equipment as for aviation gasoline. The two conflict.

They also argued that the petroleum process is a high-pressure process, requiring great quantities of plate steel, and thus competing with escort vessels and other shipping.

Finally, they contended that, being high pressure, the petroleum process needs compression equipment—also required in escort vessels, landing barges, etc. The rubber-from-alcohol process, on the other hand, does not.

So you may find Congress stepping into the rubber situation again—and this time they won't be stopped by any Presidential veto.

First Things First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, 4 months ago today, under the caption "First things first," I called attention to the fallacy of the administration formula for the food problem, with the deduction that it would only result in food scarcity and possible famine. It was like a voice crying in the wilderness.

However, sometime afterward the Secretary of Agriculture confirmed the danger and this menace to our war effort has now become a matter of grave and general concern. One month ago the administration appointed a single food administrator, as suggested in my remarks of 4 months ago. However, there is little evidence that the food administrator functions as an integrated unit to secure an over-all administration for coordination of our war and civil needs and efforts. Such correlated coordinated administration is the crying need of our whole war economy. The administration should immediately get down to organizing to win the war and solving the vital domestic problems connected with the war effort.

The following letter, typical of others showing conditions in my district as well as districts all over the country, confirms the emphatic need of doing first things first:

JENISON, MICH., *January 19, 1943.*

DEAR MR. JONKMAN: I am a farmer in Ottawa County, Mich. Yesterday I filled out a form sent by the Government, what and how much we intend to raise in 1943. We are discouraged; hardly know what to do. Many farmers in the vicinity of G. R. have had sales and work in factories. Their farms are idle. They got good prices for their stock and tools. Cattle are high, and you get more for old tools than what you could buy them for new in 1940. Why do they quit? Let me give you some of the many reasons: They can get no hired men. If they are lucky enough to get one, the wages they have to pay are impossible. Still the hired man feels he is underpaid, look at the hours he puts in and no pay and a half for overtime. He don't

earn 30 cents an hour. Women in the Grandville factory get 60 cents an hour. So they up and leave. The farmer faces all the hard work alone again. He could not pay more, in fact he is working for less himself, and worries his head off. Why not sell, too? But if we all sell, then what? What is going to become of our land, our people, our armies? But we are not to blame. We are a class that have been, and are without rights. Ceilings on our goods—not allowed to figure labor cost. Who ever heard of such a ruling? Everything went up. But did goods we produce? I make my living (if you can call it that) as a dairy farmer. I got 5 cents a quart or 20 cents a gallon average for milk in 1942. We had no corn in 1941. Little oats and hay so the feed I had to buy was about $35 to $40 per week. I had 2 hired men, 1 for $15 a week, 1 for $20 a week, married men, so I paid out right there $70 a week. Then taxes, insurance, tool and building repair, interest on mortgage, veterinary, cows dying, etc. Do you know how much I got for myself and wife to live on in 1942 from earnings? Less than $400 and I have a $20,000 investment, 30 cows worth $125 each. We raised 57 tons of sugar beets, but sugar at less than $5 per hundred now (worse than depression price). What do we get after the Mexicans get paid for labor, the seed bill, fertilizer, trucking to factory, etc.? Precious little. Potatoes are a good price, but who had any? Blight struck them, and 9 out of 10 bushels were rotten. Wheat I sold at $1.09. Farmers got a dollar when wages in factories were 12½ cents to 20 cents an hour, so there you are. We can't get decent help because we can't pay them; we can't keep on because prices are far too low comparatively. We bought sugar at $30 a hundred in 1918. Wheat sold for $2.50 and $3.00. Talk about inflation. We have not enough to live on, and work all the time. We can't get barbwire to fix our ancient fences. Nor a farm tool when we need it. So there are the reasons farmers are quitting by the thousands. They are not crazy. Next fall will tell the story. If the good Lord of whom we hear so little in Washington, and in whom we live and move and have our being, gives us rain and sunshine and health, and all, we will still have a limited crop in 1943 unless changes are made in our earnings and priorities, and the farm help situation. Please pass this letter on to where it will do the most good and oblige.

Yours truly,

JOHN P. GLASHOWER,
Grandville, Mich.

The First Double Check

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Wednesday, January 13, 1943:

THE FIRST DOUBLE CHECK

Let anyone in Washington or anywhere else who thinks that the November 3 congressional election was an accident read the returns from the special election in the Sixth Missouri District. Last fall the late Republican Congressman Philip A. Bennett defeated Democrat Sam Wear by a majority of 7,789 in a total vote of 85,681. Yesterday his 28-year-old son, MARION F. BENNETT, swamped Mr. Wear by a majority of approximately 14,000 in a total of nearly 55,000. Thus, the Republicans almost doubled their majority, whereas had they been no stronger than on November 3, young Mr. BENNETT, in the somewhat smaller vote, would have seen the Republican advantage whittled down to something like 5,000.

The voters of the 11 counties which comprise this Missouri congressional district have given their answer to those who said that earlier commencement of the African offensive and earlier appointment of manpower and food administrators would have prevented the sweeping Republican gains of last November. To wave this retest of sentiment away as the opinion in only one isolated congressional district is to be politically blind. This district contains typically American cities—Springfield, Sedalia, Warrensburg. It has railroad shops, mills, small factories, agricultural markets, farm land, and Ozark fruit country. It is a representative slice of the United States.

If the Roosevelt administration has any regard for its political future, it will read the returns of this double check in the Middle West, study them, and act accordingly. One of the things it will quit doing is playing politics as usual. It will make no more Boss Flynn appointments.

Bureaucratic Penalties Questioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert the very excellent article of Mr. David Lawrence, entitled "Bureaucratic Penalties Questioned," from the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, January 20, 1943.

The article follows:

BUREAUCRATIC PENALTIES QUESTIONED—ENCROACHMENTS ON RIGHTS MAY PROMPT CONGRESS TO ACT

(By David Lawrence)

The average citizen, in his desire to cooperate with the war effort, is taking a good deal on the chin. He is obeying Government edicts on the theory that they are lawful or that someone in Washington has looked up the law and found authority for administering punishments if "regulations" are violated.

As a matter of fact, there exists scant authority for some of the high-handed punishments now being meted out to the citizen. Thus the Office of Price Administration thinks it can issue overnight a ban on so-called pleasure driving and arrest a citizen and take away his ration book.

This is equivalent to denying transportation facilities to a citizen on the ground that he has violated the law. To mete out such a severe punishment is to introduce a penalty which Congress—supposedly the lawmaking body—never prescribed.

LEGALIZES NO CAPRICE

There is plenty of law permitting the Office of Price Administration to issue or withhold ration books, but this does not mean it can act capriciously or that it can suddenly decide that it will forbid pleasure driving and that it can make its own definition of what the term means.

The principle that no executive agency can impose a penalty unless it is specified in the law itself is well grooved. In fact, the Attorney General, on June 21, 1934—under the present administration—ruled that no Executive order could of itself prescribe penalties. And the Attorney General stated that the broad general provision usually contained in all statutes—vesting authority "to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title and by virtue of other authority conferred by the act"—does not cover the imposition of new penalties.

"The general power," wrote the Attorney General, "to make regulations to carry into effect any particular statute does not carry with it the power to create offenses or to assess penalties for violations of the statute (*United States* v. *Eaton*). An executive officer cannot, by his regulations, alter or amend a law. All he can do is to regulate the mode of proceeding to carry into effect what Congress has enacted (*Morrill* v. *Jones*).

LAW IMPOSES PENALTIES

"Penalties are purely the creatures of the legislature. They cannot be created by judicial implication, but must be expressly imposed by statute (*The Board of Health* v. *The Pacific Mail Steamship Co.*, California; *the Western Union* v. *Jones*, Indiana; *Health Department* v. *Knoll*, New York)."

It is obvious that the above reasoning applies also to the recently announced decree by the Executive whereby net incomes were limited and the surplus was ordered retained by the Treasury, even though Congress had passed no revenue law stipulating such a rate of taxation.

The whole theory of government in America has been that Congress made the laws and that the executive agencies merely executed these statutes. It has always been assumed that Congress would not write into the statutes all the details, but would leave these to the enforcement body. But until recently it never was assumed that the executive agencies would undertake to impose new penalties or to derive meanings from the statute virtually amounting to the same thing as passing new legislation.

In countries where parliamentary governments exist, as in Canada and Great Britain, the executive agencies are held strictly accountable for what they do, because if they err in the interpretation of an act of Parliament, the party in power can be turned out of office because of the acts of the administrative officials. The executive and legislative departments are one and the same thing.

MAY PROD CONGRESS

In America, however, there is no way to hold executive agencies responsible for violating the spirit or the letter of the laws of Congress. Once in a while, as a result of public furore, a top official resigns, but the damage he does cannot be undone, and the violations of law cannot thus be prevented.

If the abuse of power grows, it may be necessary for Congress to do a little bit of penalty imposing so that administrative officers who are found guilty of straying beyond the letter of statutes will be subject to fines and imposing of penalties through Executive disregard acts of Congress or seek to deprive the citizen of his rights or property without proceeding through a lawful process.

Congress, of course, has all the power to stop the abuse of the citizen's rights, and the imposing of penalties through executive order or regulation might well become a subject of further inquiry if the representative system of government is to be maintained.

The "Spirit of Boyle Heights" Demonstrates Faith in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to the remarkable response which the people of Boyle Heights, a portion of my district, have made to the appeal of the Treasury Department.

During the month of December, 21 communities in the county of Los Angeles entered a contest to purchase $300,000 in War bonds. The Army Air Forces promised that as each community reached its goal of $300,000 it would be given the privilege of having the name of its community inscribed on a bomber plane.

It is a great pleasure on my part to announce that the people of Boyle Heights were the first to reach their goal, and the first bombing plane has been christened the *Spirit of Boyle Heights*. This bomber will take off for first-line duty immediately, with the hopes of the good people of my district that it will prove its metal in the fight to eliminate the scourge of totalitarianism from the face of the earth. The purchasers of these bonds live in a metropolitan area and are comprised of many races and religious beliefs. This remarkable demonstration of the unifying force of democracy is a proof of their patriotism. Not content to rest on their laurels, they will finish this week the purchase of a second quota of bonds entitling them to name a second bomber; and I wish to include the following article from Mr. Al Waxman's community paper, the East Side Journal, under date of January 13:

Purchase of War Savings bonds by the people of the East Side has exceeded all expectations. To date over $750,000 worth have been sold through the Boyle Heights Citizens' Committee. This means that the second bomber, to be known as the *Spirit of Hollenbeck Heights*, will be a reality by the week's end. The first bomber, *Spirit of Boyle Heights*, will be officially launched next week, according to Treasury Department officials.

Myer Pransky, chairman of the Boyle Heights war savings committee, announced yesterday that, "We shall continue selling bonds on the home front as long as our boys are fighting on the battle front."

Special events continue every evening at the Boyle Heights Victory House on the corner of Soto and Brooklyn. Various organizations sponsor these nights and get credit for the sale of bonds on the occasion.

Following is the schedule for the coming week: Wednesday, January 13, East Los Angeles Property Owners; Thursday, January 14, Odessa Ferein; Friday, January 15, Enchandia Street School, program from 1 to 3 p. m.; Saturday, January 16, Independent Order of Foresters; Sunday, January 17, country store; Monday, January 18, community talent night; Tuesday, January 19, Twentieth Century Searchers; Wednesday, January 20, Warsaw Young Men's Society.

The Boyle Heights district has won the distinction of being the first community or city in the Nation to begin and complete the sale of War Savings bonds toward the purchase of a heavy-duty bomber.

As the Congressman of the new Nineteenth District, I wish to pay tribute at this time to the members of the Boyle Heights committees, and to all persons who contributed to the success of this bond drive, which has made the *Spirit of Boyle Heights* a real factor in our war effort.

Tolan Committee Should Be Continued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial from the Star-Times of St. Louis, Mo., under date of November 30, 1942, and an editorial from the Miami Herald under date of January 6, 1943. These two editorials comment very favorably upon the splendid work of the Tolan committee. I feel that this committee has done an exceptionally fine job, that there is much for it to do in the future, and that it should be continued during this session of Congress. The editorials are as follows. The Star-Times:

THE TOLAN PLAN IS NEEDED

Behind the scenes in Washington, the most bitter domestic struggle of the war is being waged between the military forces, reputedly led by Gen. Brehon H. Somervell, of the Services of Supply, and Donald M. Nelson and other civilian leaders of the War Production Board. The issue is whether civilian control of war production shall be completely displaced by military control.

Senator TRUMAN analyzed the issue accurately the other night when he said that "the function of generals and admirals is to fight battles, and to tell us what they need to fight battles with. They have no experience in business or industry, and the job of producing what they ask for should be left to businessmen under the direction of experienced civilians."

That is in accordance with the fundamental American tradition that the civilian administration is supreme over the military. It is in harmony with the democratic doctrine which makes its soldiers the servants of the state—never its top commanders.

Yet the issue is not settled by enunciating principles. Many in the armed forces, who bear the burden of fighting a difficult war and are naturally impatient with the slowness and frequent errors of our production program, may understandably feel that they need real authority as well as responsibility. It is openly speculated in the War Production Board, according to some columnists, that it is only a question of time until the military seeks to assume control of our war economy.

Here is an added reason, if more should be needed, for the swift reorganization of our war administration along the sound, simple lines proposed by the Tolan committee, with the backing of Mr. TRUMAN and the chairmen of three other important congressional committees and subcommittees. To maintain the sound principle of civilian control, the war administration should be reformed, rescued from confusion, and made to work at the highest pitch of efficiency.

The Miami Herald:

THE TWO GREAT PROBLEMS

Two of the great problems confronting the Congress as it convenes today are manpower mobilization and finances.

Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt says that 65,000,000 Americans will be needed in the armed services and employment by the end of the year for full implementation of the national war effort.

McNutt has yet to declare a freezing of manpower necessary. It remains in the air. The American Federation of Labor through President William Green says labor is not yet convinced of the need for such a program, but pledges its support when it becomes apparent that it is necessary to win the war.

The Gallup poll shows that the majority of the American people are willing to see such drastic steps taken as may be required. Nevertheless, the survey points out that one of the chief fears expressed is that compulsory manpower mobilization "might not be fairly or equitably administered and would result in arbitrary rulings from Washington that might not fit personal or local circumstances."

A coalition of House and Senate Members investigating the war program has advised McNutt it will cooperate with him provided the United States Employment Service removes "incompetent personnel." The findings of the Tolan defense migration committee is the basis for the coalition's proviso. The very fears expressed in the Gallup poll are specifically singled out as the underlying cause for manpower criticism by the Tolan committee's ad interim report to the last Congress. It said:

"The nationalization of the Employment Service was prompted by a recognition that the narrow spirit of localism permeating its field offices was detrimental to mobilizing the Nation's whole manpower.

"Today, the Employment Service is still composed of separate operating units which respond to State and local pressures before taking action in accord with national manpower policies."

Green recommends an immediate survey to determine the manpower facts. A contributing factor to the confusion over labor resources is that very lack of detailed data. The Tolan committee comes nearest to having accurate information. Its report to the last Congress with legislative recommendations died in the House Military Affairs Committee. It will present its final report shortly to the Seventy-eighth Congress. The report should show how existing manpower shapes up in face of insistent and increasing wartime demands for labor in all productive fields, agricultural as well as industrial.

The problem is as complex as any ever faced by Congress. Its solution may well mean the margin between an early and successful conclusion of the war or an indefinite prolongation of hostilities.

Against this confused background of allocating human resources is the complementary task of raising the gigantic treasure chest for financing the war program.

The United States ended the calendar year with a Federal debt of $112,470,920,266. That is $48,108,785,114 deeper in the red than a year ago. During the first half of the fiscal year, which ended January 1, the Government spent $35,109,773,285, of which $32,113,914,445 went for war activities.

By the time the fiscal year ends next July, war will have consumed at least $100,000,000,000 out of a total national income of

approximately $135,000,000,000. The immensity of what this war is costing and the burdens that must be borne are crystal clear when compared with the entire cost of World War No. 1, which ran up a total of $26,000,000,000. The costs of the first 13 months of World War No. 2 amount to about $200,000,000,000. And we have only begun to fight.

Where is the money coming from? Taxes on income already carry a full load. Income is a source that can be tapped further only at danger of drying it up. Oklahoma's Senator THOMAS would draw out "idle millions" and help prevent inflation in financing the war effort by compulsory purchase of war bonds. He cites as an argument that voluntary bond buying and collection of taxes are not enough to finance the war. That is self-evident, but the financial feasibility of his plan is highly debatable.

Adoption of the Ruml pay-as-you-go plan would assure a continued flow of income-tax collections. Immediate adoption of a sales tax would open up a new source of revenue that would not jeopardize the national economy, would increase war funds, and would be practical and easy in collection and fair in application.

The new Congress could find no better method of asserting its independence and contributing to safe war financing than by legislating this tax.

Congress cannot escape the fact that converting $100,000,000,000 a year into war, unless skillfully and carefully handled, can upset the lives of civilians to such an extent as to endanger the whole national fiscal policy.

Rationing, food, and fuel shortages are headaches. They are small in comparison with the manpower- and finance-mobilization programs with which Congress must deal.

The people are ready and willing for any sacrifice. Their temper in being regimented into the modes and molds of total war will be largely governed by the degree of honest fearlessness with which Congress shapes them.

The Wartime Agricultural Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, before the National Industrial Conference Board, at New York City, on January 21, 1943. I have attached to the address a statement by the Public Printer that the printing of the address in the RECORD is estimated to cost $135.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before this group of businessmen to discuss the wartime agricultural situation. I have been actively associated with farmers' organizations on the national level for over 20 years and I have never seen such a campaign of misinformation and abuse as has been carried on during the past 4 or 5 months. The authoritative voice of Donald Nelson when he said that the farmers had done the best job of any industry in meeting the war demands was completely drowned out in the cries of profiteers, selfish pressure groups, and pocketbook patriots which have been hurled at us from the press, over the radio, and by news commentators. I am, therefore, glad of the chance to speak to you directly upon this whole subject.

The truth is that when farmers were asked to produce to the utmost they did not stop to ask for any 40-hour week, any time-and-a-half for overtime, any cost guarantees, or any guarantees of any kind. They knew that the expansion of production during the last war had produced post-war surpluses which ruined them. In spite of this they took off their coats and their shirts and went to work. They met and exceeded every goal set for them and have produced the two biggest crops in all history. Nothing was heard from them until they were confronted with Washington orders which made it impossible to carry on a number of lines of production. Since then they have been fighting for the right to produce at a fair figure without calling on the Government for subsidy.

I want to review the facts briefly, for without this background I would find it difficult to discuss the wartime agricultural situation. First, however, let me say that the whole blame should not be placed upon the press generally or all of the columnists and radio commentators. Although they have lambasted us around the clock from Maine to California, they themselves have been the victims of false information coming from sources which ought to be dependable but which are organized to give out propaganda, and unfortunately are not to be relied on. As an example of what I mean, some of you may recall an article which appeared in the pages of one of America's leading weekly magazines not long ago telling of a battle royal staged in the President's office between President O'Neal, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and President Patton, of the Farmers' Union. The controversy was described in detail with the President acting as an amused referee. Pictures of the contestants were published and the story told how the young liberal Patton, representing a virile organization of progressive farmers, had worsted the old war horse O'Neal, who represented the reactionary capitalistic farmers. It left the impression that the Patton group was running the O'Neal group out of the national scene. It was a well-written article and created widespread comment. The worst feature of it was that there was not a word of truth in it. I attended the conference which was so entertainingly described, and O'Neal and Patton did not say a single word to each other from the time we entered the President's office until the time we left. The article which was fed to the public as news was the product of somebody's imagination and was completely false. The article had no background of news whatever. It was a build-up, pure and simple.

I don't know who furnished the false statements upon which the article was based. Probably the same source is still furnishing the same quality of propaganda, for the same magazine continues to attack the farmers in the same way. The incident is unimportant and is only cited as an example of how propaganda is used. The point I make is that the people are not being told the truth. Much of the press and many of the columnists and radio commentators are themselves victims of propaganda arising from sources which ought to be reliable, but are not.

FARMERS NOT PROFITEERS

As for the farmers being profiteers, I wish these few simple facts would sink home:

From 1920 to 1930, when industry and labor enjoyed the greatest prosperity in peacetime history, the farmers' wealth shrank from eighty billions to approximately fifty billions. During those years we almost destroyed the spending power of 30 percent of our population and those who were directly dependent upon their trade, or full half of our people, and thereby brought down on ourselves the worst depression of our lifetime. For 30 years the farmers' per capita net income has averaged only $179 a year, as compared with $668 for nonfarmers, or a ratio of less than 2 to 7—and what the farmer eats from his farm and an allowance for rent have been added in to build up this farm income. In 1942, the most prosperous year in a generation, the farm income averaged $340, as compared with nonfarm income of $980, improving the ratio to a little more than 2½ to 7. Do you realize that over half the farm homes in America do not have running water in them? This is not because farmers don't want running water but because they have not had enough income to install it. To hold this group up as profiteers is ridiculous; it is cruelly false. However, go into a store today where meat is rationed or unobtainable, largely because of short-sighted Washington controls which have strangled production, and two times out of three the housewife is told it is because of the profiteering farmers. The American farmer receives the lowest percent of the consumer's dollar of any nation on earth, yet everybody is placing the whole blame for rising costs on him.

But let us trace what has happened.

PRICE CONTROL IN OPERATION

It is nearly 2 years since price control was first proposed as a means of curbing inflation. The organization which I represent—the National Grange—pointed out that price ceilings had been tried many times but had always resulted in curtailed production, black markets, and, finally, in chaos, in which the poor suffered the most. We pointed out that abundant production must be maintained and rationing, rather than price ceilings, would protect the poor. (And, by the way, when the administration proposed its 110 percent of parity, our organization and Mr. Teague's were the only two who would not support it. Our annual convention went on record opposing it 3 weeks before Pearl Harbor, but the blame was shifted to our shoulders by the propaganda machine.)

While the price-control bill was still in committee, Mr. Henderson placed a ceiling on lard at less than cost. We were hard at work on a pork expansion program, and his order sent thousands of breeding sows to slaughter. It became apparent that Congress would have to write safeguards into the law to prevent well-meaning but inexperienced officials from destroying a food-production program. The fight which followed resulted in the Price Control Act of last February, which was satisfactory to no one, but which clearly indicated the intention of Congress to maintain production. Everyone knew it was hopeless craziness to put a ceiling on everything else and let labor prices run wild. It could not be done, but, for political reasons, that is what we have been trying to do.

Then came the Office of Price Administration slapping a ceiling on everything at the March level. This immediately reduced the prices to farmers on many products to less than cost. For example, take the first crop to be harvested, berries. The berries sold in March were picked the previous June, and the March price was made up of the price paid the farmers plus the processing, transportation, and marketing costs. Every one of these items had gone up materially since June; and if the distributors and processors were to stay in business, they had to roll their increased costs back on the farmers, for they could not pass them on to the consumers because of the ceiling. The result was that farmers, whose costs had also gone up, could not get enough to pay for the picking, and approximately one-half the berry crop fell on the ground. In the name of price control and in the interests of the consumers, we produced and packed a 50-percent

berry crop. What happened to berries was happening in other lines of production. The situation was becoming so serious that the four farm organizations called on Mr. Henderson and demanded that the law be obeyed and that ceilings be adjusted to permit production. He finally made this proposition: "If you can prove to me," he said, "that all the margins between producer and consumer have been squeezed out, and still the price to the farmer is below cost, I'll puncture the ceilings."

The farm organizations split on this point. The Farmers Union declared it satisfactory. Our organization said, "No." If profiteering existed it was the job of the Office of Price Administration to curb it. We had neither the power nor the facilities to control processors' or distributors' margins. In the meantime, beef production and dairy production were being rapidly curtailed by unsound price rulings, and the situation was becoming desperate. The Grange and the Farm Bureau laid the facts before Congress. It passed a simple amendment requiring the Office of Price Administration to obey the Price Control Act of February 2 or get its appropriations cut off. It was given 60 days to adjust the ceilings which were in violation of law. It had to act by October 6 or get no more money. Then came the Presidential attack in which he said that a great emergency existed; that prices could not be held beyond October 1; and that if Congress did not act, he would act himself.

Again we laid before Congress the facts about the forces which were strangling production, but the story never got through to the public because of the barrage of propaganda and condemnation turned loose on the farmers and the Congressmen who tried to protect production. After the law was finally passed, and rationing was started in earnest in an effort to protect our dwindling supplies, people began to wake up and find that we had a food problem, but very few of them realize today the cause of the problem and what is necessary to correct it.

LAW AGAIN IGNORED

You may be interested to know that the new law was promptly ignored by the Office of Price Administration. We had pointed out to Congress that if prices were held below cost, one of two things would happen. Either production would be strangled or it would be necessary to resort to subsidies to keep farmers going. Farmers don't want subsidies. We merely want a reasonable price. I'll tell why later. We asked an amendment requiring the adjustment of ceiling prices if necessary to maintain adequate production goals, and such an amendment was written into the law in these very clear and understandable words, "Modification shall be made in maximum prices * * * in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes or where by reason of increased labor or other costs * * * the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs." That provision was included for the express purpose of preventing the use of subsidies instead of compensatory prices, but the ink was hardly dry before subsidies were put into effect on dairy products in this very city. However, they have recently been withdrawn and we hope that this holds promise for a better day.

But there is one violation still going on which is not so promising. The law prevents setting ceilings below parity. A regulation has been promulgated setting ceilings on corn at parity less benefit of other payments. The effects of such a regulation is that a farmer who has complied with the regulations of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for acreage control suffiget the ceiling price plus benefits sufficient to equal parity, but the noncomplier gets no benefits, so his ceilings are set below the limits provided by law. There is nothing in the law requiring a farmer to meet Agricultural Adjustment Administration regulations to protect his price, and we now have this sort of a cockeyed situation. Although we are trying to maintain maximum production, the man who cuts his acreage gets a subsidy, while the man who raises more than the amount allotted to him is penalized by having a price slapped on his product at less than the price protected by law. It does not make sense.

The law passed on October 2 was little better than the law which it superseded, but I will not detain you longer with a discussion of its details. What we are interested in is where do we stand now and where do we go from here?

PRESENT PRODUCTION OUTLOOK

In 1941 and 1942 we have harvested the two greatest crops in history and Secretary Wickard has just set up goals for the 1943 production substantially above 1942. The biggest increases in total volume are requested in livestock, dairy, and poultry products ranging as high as 36 percent increase in lard. The question is, "What are our chances of meeting the goals?" I believe the farmers are going to give all they have in them to try to meet them. They are going to do a good job, but let us be realistic about it. Our chances of meeting the goals are rather poor. Unless most unusual conditions prevail, or unless there is a change in price control policies in Washington, our chances of doing even as well as last year are pretty slim. Let us take stock of the situation.

1. We had the best growing season on record in 1942. Under the law of averages, we cannot expect its equal in 1943.

2. We have lost over 2,000,000 men from our farms and while the drain has been slackened, it is still going on.

3. We have not been able to maintain our equipment, and replacements are cut to 23 percent of our 1940 level, which was in itself below the maintenance level. Power machinery is badly needed. Our horse population is decreasing about 300,000 per year, and it will be at least 4 years before this decline is even halted. An increase would require many years more. Last year we were allotted 197,000 tractors, almost but not quite enough to cover replacements. This year we are cut to 37,000.

4. We are somewhat short on fertilizer.

5. We are short on transportation to and from market.

6. We are 1 year older. It is estimated that the decreased efficiency of the men above 60 now working on farms equals the loss of more than a half million men, and this is going on at an enhanced rate, because most of the young replacements have been leaving the farm.

7. Price-control policies have been forcing many farmers out of production. They have forced unfattened beef cattle and producing dairy cows to the slaughter block at an unprecedented rate. I've left price control to the last, not because it is least important, but because I want to discuss it last.

REMEDIES SUGGESTED

Now, what can be done about it?

1. We can't do anything about the weather. Even the Office of Price Administration can't regulate that. We can only hope and pray for the best, but we will have to take it as it comes.

2. There are several approaches to the manpower problem, but the one most favorably considered in some quarters is the least workable in our judgment. I refer to the proposal to freeze the men on the farm. Not only is it un-American but an unwilling worker is not worth his hire. He can and likely will do more damage than his services are worth. We want none of it.

The two great drains on farm labor have been military service and war industry, the latter taking twice as many men as the former.

The Tydings amendment, which provides for deferring essential, nonreplaceable farm labor, will relieve the pressure of the military service if administered according to its intent. For months, however, those farm organizations which are not controlled by labor have been fighting attempts to regulate farm labor much as industrial labor is regulated under the Wagner Labor Relations Act. For example, the Manpower Commission proposed to regulate the operations of the Tydings amendment by requiring the standardization of wages, hours of labor, and working conditions on farms after Congress time and again had expressly exempted farm labor from such regulation. This danger still exists and justifies an explanation as to why Congress has so acted.

Most farm labor can't be standardized. On the farm there is no set task to perform. If the operator is young and vigorous, he probably does many of the chores, and the hired hand does mostly field work. If the operator is older, the hired man must help with the chores. The work depends on the weather and a hundred other uncertainties. It must be performed at all kinds of hours and under all kinds of conditions. The old sow has never read the Wagner Act, and if she gets ready to farrow at 2 o'clock in the morning, she's going to have pigs. Nobody can stop her, and if somebody isn't there, pigs will be lost. If the cows break into the alfalfa at bed time, they have got to be driven out and the fence fixed or there will be dead cows in the morning. If it looks like rain at quitting time, the down hay has got to be put up, or the hired man may have to go to town to do the shopping or the banking, or tend the kids when the folks go to grange.

It is a very personal relationship which cannot be standardized or regulated by any law other than the law of competition for help. As I have said, the regulators are doing their best to regulate farm labor in the name of social reform. If they succeed, look out for the cost of food. Standardizing and regulating farm labor will not aid in our war effort and certainly has no place in the present picture.

DRAIN TO INDUSTRY

As to the drain to industry, we believe that the greatest source of relief in the farm labor problem would be to find means for everyone everywhere to do a full day's work during the war emergency. With the average workweek in industry at less than 43 hours, farmers who work from 60 to 100 hours, and sometimes even more, can see little hope of keeping farm labor from seeking war industry jobs. They believe that if everyone worked 54 to 60 hours, there would be manpower enough for all. Then with farm prices on an equitable level, farmers could get their share of the labor supply. They don't believe we can win the war on a 40-hour week, when our enemies are working from 60 to 75 hours.

Some relief can be expected from mobilizing and training school labor, but this would not be great at best.

Some contend that our greatest source of farm labor lies in financing and training the million and a half farmers who are not now producing much more than a poor subsistence, and setting them up in business for themselves on new farms. Some relief may be expected from this source, but this too, would not be great. Such a movement is a worthy educational movement, and should be encouraged within reasonable limits, but it is very costly and requires an enormous amount of supervision not now available. Mass migrations and mass resettlements have been very difficult to carry out even on a very small scale in peacetimes when land, machinery, and transportation facilities were available, with ample trained supervision. Even so, most of them have failed. To expect any such movement cov-

ering a quarter of our farms is an impractical dream, no matter how well meaning the purpose or how desirable the end. There is not time to resettle and rebuild rural America. Our energies should be devoted to making the most of the production facilities at hand. Some substantial help can be expected from moving farm hands with more or less experience from places where production is low to work where production possibilities are high, but such labor placement must not be surrounded with unworkable conditions.

3. As to equipment, we are in no position to say where the critical materials are most vitally needed in the form of equipment. It may be best to let food production go down in order to build escort vessels or airplanes. All we can do is to urge that in building an armed force, we keep our economy in balance, so that we develop no weak sources of supply because of having overbuilt some segment of our total war machine. We should recognize that without essential equipment, food production will decline, and measure carefully the effect on our war economy.

4. As to fertilizers, the same general principle prevails. We believe we are doing a fairly good job of distributing the available supplies where they will do the most good.

5. The same principles also apply to transportation. We hope that the recent disastrous attempt to control farm-truck use has taught us the value of local control instead of having all decisions made in Washington or Detroit.

6. Advancing age is another problem beyond control. We would be shocked if we could see the record of the elderly men and women who have either gone to their graves or to permanent invalidism during the past year in trying to carry on the work after the boys have left the farm. This problem will get worse rather than better.

Last is a fair price. Only with such a price can farmers continue to produce. The hidden question in our price-control fight of the past year has beeen, "Shall agriculture be maintained as a self-supporting industry, or shall it enter a period resembling peasantry, when farmers will have to go, hat in hand, to the Treasury to stay in business." Do not misunderstand me. Most lines of farm production are on a profitable basis today, but we have had to fight to keep them there. However, some prices are not compensatory and the problem is shall noncompensatory ceilings be maintained to hold the price down to the consumer and subsidize the farmer to keep him in production.

We believe the laborer is worthy of his hire. Farmers are not naturally beggars. They don't like subsidies. We believe it is an unsound economy which cannot pay the cost of feeding and clothing itself. As a matter of fact, the American public can pay it. They are probably better able to do so than ever before in history. To say that consumers must not pay the increased cost of conducting a war, is placing on future generations a burden of debt greater than they should and probably will carry. It is heading directly into inflation. The natural increased cost of producing some items of food would have an infinitesimal effect toward promoting uncontrolled spiraling inflation as compared to the effect of the enormous increase in public debt. That is a far greater cause for concern than any possible increase in food to meet production costs.

Do you realize that while wages and income are about double what they were in the last war, farm prices are still under 60 percent as high as they were then? Think that one over. Wages and income double, farm prices a little over half as high—yet the farmer is being blamed for the whole price rise, and being asked to accept a subsidy instead of being allowed prices to meet his increased costs.

SUBSIDIES OPPOSED

No, the farmers are unalterably opposed to subsidies in lieu of honest prices.

1. As proposed, they would be subsidizing the consumers and the farmers would get the blame.

2. Subsidies are inflationary.

3. Subsidies conceal costs and defeat efforts to correct leaks.

4. Subsidies promote inefficiency.

5. Subsidies make everyone pay for benefits enjoyed by a few.

6. Once used, subsidies are hard to get rid of. If we employ them now during a period of maximum income, how on earth could they be abandoned when the war is over and income falls? An empty treasury would mean they had to be dropped; and food prices would have to go up or farmers go bankrupt. Rising food costs with declining purchasing power! Isn't this a mighty dangerous trap to stick our heads into?

7. Subsidies destroy initiative and undermine character. They are not the means of building an independent, self-reliant people.

8. Subsidies are an expedient way of dodging a hard, disagreeable issue. They are the means of evading a fundamental correction to an unbalanced economy.

9. Subsidies open the way to political abuse.

10. Subsidies are the means of building a strong centralized government and lead to dictatorship.

How better could it be expressed than in a decision of the Supreme Court in the wheat case. An Ohio farmer refused to pay his overproduction fine, arguing that the law had been passed after his crop was planted and he was denied the protection of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, which prohibits taking property without due process of law. Pointing out that wheat prices were being maintained by subsidies, the Court said: "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

What could be plainer? "For the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." Of course, it is true. We want none of it, but I'm telling you right now that it will take the combined effort of agriculture, industry, and all sound-thinking people to prevent it. The plans are made, and they will be hard to change.

My friends, we seek a simple end—a free and self-supporting agriculture. Oh, if the people could only realize what it would mean to America, in these days of centralized controls and regimentation of all kinds, to be able to maintain this great industry on a free, self-supporting basis. The greatest single group in America, comprising one-quarter of our people, is struggling to maintain its independence and to maintain the principle of free enterprise. I'm serious about it. The American farmer, with half a chance, will hold the line for the principle of self-supporting independence in a world gone power crazy. This is our aim and our determination.

Can the United States Win the Peace While Fighting the War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered over the radio at America's Town Meeting of the Air, at New York City, on January 21, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United Nations must both win the war and establish a lasting peace. We must let nothing in our conduct of the war block the road to a lasting peace. We must let nothing in any plan for peace block the road to our complete victory in the war. There can be no lasting peace without complete victory first, and victory without a lasting peace is empty. There are some things we should do and there are others we should not do.

We should keep our principles clear. We should so conduct ourselves, at all times, as to earn the complete faith and respect of our allies. We should study the needs of the post-war world and our place in it. We should outline our internal, and I might add regional, post-war policies. We should agree with our allies on immediate post-war steps in liberated and occupied territory and toward world-wide military stability. We even should agree with our allies on plans of procedure for considering solutions to the problems of lasting peace, but should not attempt to reach the solutions now.

We should not, during the fighting, try to define and much less dictate concrete terms of economic, social, and governmental relations for the post-war world. We must not make any occasion for unnecessary dissension among the United Nations. However good our intentions, if our conduct weakens our united military action we become our own worst enemy. Our cause is too sacred, the tide of battle is too uncertain, and the lives of our men are too precious to permit any possibility of this. We owe it to our cause and to our fighting men to maintain absolute unity of support for their supreme effort at the front. They need all the help there is.

To be more specific, we should begin now to outline our internal, and I may add, our regional, post-war program. We should develop that outline now through quiet conferences of officially recognized representative leaders. It should include a plan for termination of war powers and expenditures. It should provide a program for a return, with governmental guidance and help, to an economy of private enterprise capable of making large use of scientific advances of all kinds. It must be based upon deep faith in our constitution and our people. We must set a good example of how to meet intelligently and progressively, in the interest of the common man, the problems of peace as well as of war.

We should seek agreement with our allies upon a program if postwar demobilization; feeding of hungry people whether allied or conquered; establishing temporary boundaries; establishing temporary governments to maintain law and order; rebuilding homes, farms, and factories and starting production in liberated and conquered areas.

We should seek agreement with our allies upon a program of world-wide military stability. It should be based upon domination of the air and should provide for appropriate use of planes, aviators, supplies, and landing fields.

We should agree upon plans of procedure for considering solutions to the countless international problems of lasting peace without prescribing those solutions now.

On the other hand the countless questions of international economics, social and governmental relations present a different type of issue. These are neither internal nor military problems. Many of the facts upon which their solution will depend cannot yet be known. The degree of post-war mutual faith and respect among the many nations cannot

yet be known. It will be greatly influenced by the war. Opportunity does not now exist for hearing directly from people in areas held by the enemy. Concrete applications of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Declaration of the United Nations, questions of trade, finance, labor, health, culture, permanent boundaries, regional grouping of nations, tribunals for disposition of disagreements, and all questions as to forms of administrative or policy-forming bodies for world affairs are capable of countless solutions and naturally lead to countless differences of opinion.

Upon the solution of these questions depends much of the stability of a lasting peace. Each of them will benefit from a thorough understanding of naturally conflicting views, from the greatest possible faith in, and respect for, each nation by every other nation and from circumstances that will allow ample time and opportunity for reaching agreements in an orderly manner and for modifying those agreements to meet changing conditions.

Accordingly, while we should study these questions now we cannot know enough of the important elements involved in each to be sure of the final answers. We should neither take the time, nor risk the controversies, that would be involved in their full discussion now even with our principal allies. Some of these questions will take much longer than others to solve. All of them will benefit by careful consideration in the calm light of peace. To divert to them the attention of the leadership in all the United Nations at this critical time of battle inevitably would distract needed attention away from winning the war. For these problems we need that undivided and dispassionate undertanding of facts and feelings that can come only with the presence of peace.

Let us, therefore, do now those things, and only those things, that will help us both to win the war and to establish a lasting peace.

The Truth About Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Walter Lippmann published in the Washington Post on January 23, 1943, and reprinted this morning in the Post by order of the International Latex Corporation, of Playtex Park, Dover, Del. The title of the editorial is "The Truth About Lend-Lease."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT LEND-LEASE

(Editorial by Walter Lippmann)

The Associated Press reports that the Republican leaders in Congress have decided not to support an attack on lend-lease. No other decision was possible. To oppose lend-lease today, to suggest that the United States should not do all in its power to help our Allies fight our enemies, would be just about as sensible as to suggest that we economize by closing down the Panama Canal and dismantling Hawaii. The British Isles, Russia, and China are so obviously vital to us that Senator WHEELER, for example, who was no enthusiast for lend-lease 2 years ago, is now proposing to defeat the Germans by relying almost entirely upon lend-lease shipments to our Allies.

That is going further than a prudent estimate of the facts can justify. But it shows a political howler the Republicans would have made if they had taken the position that only Americans must use American weapons, and that Mr. and Mrs. Harry Hopkins must not be allowed to deprive Americans of the privilege of fighting a good big bloody single-handed war against the Germans and the Japanese.

Lend-lease will be continued for the same reason that it was adopted 2 years ago, once the compelling logic of supporting our allies had been laid before the people. What is more, the underlying principle of lend-lease will for the same compelling reasons be extended into the period which follows immediately upon the armistice and lasts until order has been restored.

This will be done, not because we are Lady Bountiful or Santa Claus to the human race, but because at bottom our vital interests demand it. Once the realities are examined, the case will be so obviously compelling that public men who are now committing themselves to oppose it will wish they had not been in such a hurry.

The testimony which was brought forward 2 years ago against the adoption of lend-lease will show, if we read it now, that the opposition thought we had a free choice between intervention against Hitler and staying out of the war. They would not and could not believe, though the matter was explained to them, that Japan and Germany were allies in aggression, and that if Britain fell, Germany would attack us in South America while Japan ran wild in the Pacific. A month before the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor, a majority of the Republicans in Congress during the debate on repealing the Neutrality Act had not yet grasped the idea that the war for us would start in the Pacific, and that we had to support the British and the Russians if we did not wish to fight a two-ocean war with a one-ocean Navy.

Some of the same gentlemen are now thinking that once we have defeated our enemies, the problem of American security will have been solved. They are just as much mistaken now as they were 2 years ago.

If they prevail, it is not necessary to be a prophet to see what will happen. Let us see where they would lead us. They are anti-British and do not wish us to form a working partnership with Britain to keep the peace and promote the reconstruction of the economic life of the world. They are anti-Russian and are spoiling for a quarrel with the Soviets. They are unfriendly to the Fighting French and look with a jaundiced eye upon the strong, proud spirit which General de Gaulle is bent on infusing into the broken and demoralized body of the French Nation. They do not like the governments in exile, and think they may deprive us of some of our butter and eggs to feed their starving compatriots when the war is over.

Moreover, some of the former isolationists are getting ready to think that once the fighting stops we can find civilian jobs for some 30,000,000 American soldiers and war-workers by closing our frontiers—shutting down exports and imports to the barest minimum which can be paid for in gold cash—and doing nothing to assist Europe and Asia to return to normal.

Let us suppose that we followed this philosophy, imagining that we were hard-headed realists who were not going to be hornswoggled by a lot of damned foreigners. What would the damned foreigners do? They would look at our wealth and our power and then they would look at the unfriendly spirit in which we used our wealth and our power. They would look at their poverty and their ruins, their dead and their maimed, and they would say: Well, that is not what we hoped for. But the Americans have decided that it is now a matter of each for himself and the devil take the hindmost. And, so, as the answer, as the defense, as the insurance against that kind of America we must go in for a Europe for the Europeans and an Asia for the Asiatics?

The result, in other words, of our rejecting the partnership of the United Nations will inexorably be an ever-closer alliance of those nations—with us on the outside looking in. The currents are already beginning to run in that direction, and every time a public man makes a destructive speech, every time an American admiral or general, or diplomat, or Washington official uses brass knuckles in his negotiations with the United Nations, there is a push in that fatal direction.

Thus we shall have to cure ourselves of the illusion that the issue is whether we shall return to isolationism, whether we shall help ourselves or help others. We could return to isolation. We could become quite isolated; that is always possible. Japan has managed to become isolated in Asia. Germany has twice managed to become isolated in Europe. We could become isolated, too, and indeed we shall if we listen to those who do not know better.

We could leave ourselves without a friend in the world. We could deprive ourselves of all our allies. We could turn our backs upon the British, the Russians, the French, the Dutch, the Scandinavians, the Poles, the Serbs, and the Greeks. But if we do, let us at least not be surprised if, after we have refused to work with them, they then unite and work against us, and that having chosen isolation we find ourselves isolated in a world where we are universally disliked and suspected.

That is why, when the true case for a constructive foreign policy has been presented to the people, they will support it, as they did lend-lease, as an American interest of such compelling importance to the welfare of the Nation that no demagogy can blind them to it.

Utilization of Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "First Things First," published in the Washington Evening Star of January 23, 1943. I invite the attention of Senators to the editorial. I think it is a very timely and appropriate one on the subject of manpower throughout the country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST THINGS FIRST

Senator BANKHEAD, Senator WHEELER, and some others are contending that China, Russia, and the British Empire should furnish most of the fighting men while we concentrate here at home on producing the supplies they need. The weakness of this theory is that it is not being advanced primarily as a military solution of the problem of winning the war, but as an expedient to relieve the manpower shortage on the farms. Until the military men advocate it as the best and

quickest way to win the war, the plan cannot command serious consideration.

There is danger now in the tendency to look on the military requirements as the chief cause of all our troubles, instead of regarding the military machine as our chief hope of salvation. Cutting down the size of the Military Establishment should be regarded as the final, not the first, resort in averting the danger of production break-downs. And the question now, for which the Senate Military Affairs Committee should seek a definite answer in its forthcoming investigation of manpower needs, is whether everything has been done that could be done to utilize the Nation's civilian manpower.

It should be remembered that the military men have a pretty definite idea of the task that lies ahead of them and a very definite plan of performing it. Can the same thing be said for the civilian authorities dealing with manpower problems? General Hershey has said that more men have been lost to the farms by the attractions of higher pay and shorter working hours in war industries than have been lost through the draft. Some of the same people who are worrying now over the size of the Army and the inroads of the draft were advocating not long ago the location of war industries in their home districts. If the War Manpower Commission has any definite, over-all plan for meeting the requirements of war and farm production, it has not succeeded in making it known.

How can we even seriously discuss the proposition of cutting down our military requirements below what the military authorities consider necessary, while we still cling to impediments on industrial production originally introduced as methods of "spreading the work"? How can we talk about cutting down the size of the Army to relieve manpower shortages in industry as long as absenteeism continues to be a major problem in many types of war work? And how can anyone advocate reduction in the size of the Army when there does not exist any definite plan for utilizing to the best advantage all the existing manpower outside the Army?

These are some of the questions with which the Senate Military Affairs Committee undoubtedly will concern itself in its investigation of the manpower problem in relation to the Army's needs.

Rural Electrification and the W. P. B.

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, for one time, I am glad to say, the American farmers are waking up, organizing, and demanding justice. The greatest thing Congress has ever done for the farmers of this Nation was to electrify their homes through our rural electrification program. That program has been slowed down as a result of the war, and it is now being further handicapped we are told by certain bureaucrats in the War Production Board.

If that is true, we are going after them, and will do our best to drive the last one of them from power. If we fail, the farmers of this Nation are going to know why.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I wonder if Mr. Krug, who has just been appointed to take charge of all power activities, is the man to whom the gentleman from Mississippi refers.

Mr. RANKIN. No; I am in hopes that Mr. Krug will bring about the desired changes. But if he does not, then Congress will have to act.

I am inserting a resolution that was adopted by the National Rural Cooperative Association in its recent convention in St. Louis, Mo., representing more than 1,000,000 farmers from practically every State in the Union.

The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association representing 1,000,000 farmers in convention assembled in St. Louis, Mo., on the 20th day of January 1943, That action be taken immediately to clean up the Power Branch of the War Production Board.

In July 1942 the War Production Board, after due consideration, limited the extension of construction of new projects by rural cooperatives. The Power Branch of the War Production Board misinterpreted this order to prohibit extensions to serve farm families from existing distribution lines. Rural electric cooperatives during the past 6 months have attempted to show the Power Branch that this order had no bearing whatsoever on extensions from existing lines. The Power Branch consistently pursued a policy of, in effect, prohibiting any connections of additional farmers engaged in the production of food for war.

In the early part of this month, January 1943, representatives of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association discussed with Chairman Donald Nelson this misinterpretation by the Power Branch of the War Production Board order. Chairman Nelson agreed that the Power Branch had misinterpreted the order and that the materials designed for rural extensions, and immediately available should be put to productive use. In the conference with Chairman Nelson it was again urgently insisted that these materials now frozen in the hands of the cooperatives should be put to use for increased food production or should be used for the making of ammunition and other implements of war. Chairman Nelson emphatically stated that increasing food production was imperative for the conduct of the war and these materials, without limitation, should be used for this purpose.

A new directive was issued to use these materials for the production of food for war. The Power Branch again distorted the clear intent of this program. They have again misinterpreted the order, without even attempting to confer with the rural electric cooperatives engaged in the production of food. Their interpretation benefits the Power Trust.

We are today confronted, through the press, with the astounding announcement that Curtis Ernest Calder, of Bronxville, N. Y., who lists his office address as No. 2 Rector Street, which is the office of the Electric Bond & Share Co., as Director General of Operations in the War Production Board is now to determine the destiny of our country in the application of power to the production of food and to the relief of the shortage of manpower. Mr. Calder is a former secretary, vice president, and president of the Texas Power & Light Co., a subsidiary of Electric Bond & Share. He is now president of the American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., and the Southwestern Sewer Co., and he is a director in one of Mussolini's power companies—the Italian Super Power, Inc.

We respectfully urge, in the interest of the war program, that intelligent, patriotic use be made of the materials now available and the country place its destiny in the hands and hearts and minds of individuals who have only one allegiance—the United States of America.

"Henry McLemore Says——"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including, by request, an article by Henry McLemore, columnist, relative to postwar problems and the attitude of Vice President WALLACE in respect thereto, with which attitude Mr. McLemore and many others, it appears, are not in accord.

The article follows:

We formed the "Halo for Henry Club" today.

A group of us got together after reading the latest speech of HENRY WALLACE and decided to raise enough money to buy the Vice President of the United States a fitting halo.

We will need at least $1 from every citizen in the country to get the right kind of halo, because you can't have the man who has set his heart on leading the world out of the wilderness going around in ordinary headgear. He must have a halo at least four sizes larger than the one that hung on Woodrow Wilson's hatrack.

The one the founders of the "Halo for Henry Club" have in mind must be as large as the large thoughts swimming around in his head.

Mr. WALLACE can't see the war for looking at the peace. While our enemies are shooting American boys in the belly, the throat, the eyes, and the mouth; bombing them, bayoneting them, sniping them, and subjecting them to every known human agony, he sits in a big office and tells a harmless dictaphone how his Iowa heart beats for the world, all men included.

One of Mr. WALLACE'S suggestions for retaliation against our enemies is that we supervise their schools after the war is won and see to it that the little Germans, Japs, and Italians do not have their little minds poisoned in the future by the naughty leaders. I suppose that Mr. WALLACE'S supervision of the little Axis kiddies would not only include better erasers, stronger lighting, more milk at recess, but constant repeating of pledges such as this:

"I promise never to bomb Pearl Harbor on a Sunday, and under a flag of truce.

"I promise never to slaughter innocent thousands of Poles, Belgians, and Dutch.

"I swear that I will never stab a helpless country in the back."

Mr. WALLACE speaks of punishing the guilty leaders. He intimates that by swinging a dozen or two high-ranking officials from the gallows, World War No. 2 will be avenged.

That doesn't go in my book, and I don't think it goes in the books of most of the people of the United Nations.

Is Hitler any worse than the pilot of the pursuit ship which strafed helpless civilian stragglers on the roads of France? Is Goebbels any worse than the bombardier who opened his bomb bays at roof-top height over a cowering Rotterdam? Are any of the leaders any worse than their followers who openly and gladly committed every horror known to man, and for the greater part on helpless people?

Mr. WALLACE is a part and parcel of the New Deal, and the New Deal is supposed to be chiefly interested in the little man, the little people, the common folk. I would suggest to him that before he gets another national hook-up and sounds off for all the world to hear that he poll the little people of the world. He is speaking for them, you know. They make up most of the world.

Let him get the opinion of the enslaved Poles, the crushed Czechs, the starving Greeks, the battered, humiliated, and heart-broken Jews of Europe. Let him sound out the little people of all the other countries who have felt the merciless fire and flame of the Axis hordes.

After he had taken this poll, then let him speak for them. If they dream of a Utopia from their concentration camps; if they pray and hope for sweetness and light for their barbarian masters, then let Mr. WALLACE say so; but if they tell him that those who brought all this misery to the world should get their come-uppance, then let the little people be heard, and let the Axis get its come-uppance.

Wonder how the boys in Guadalcanal feel about Mr. WALLACE'S speech? Wonder if they wouldn't rather hear the Vice President of the United States say, as they battle in the hell of the jungles, that some day the Japs who seek to kill them will be paid in full. The same is true of the boys who are carrying the battle to the enemy in Africa. Dirty, burned, thirsty, hungry, how do you think they feel about establishing a peace that will feed, fatten, and generally delight the enemy that is working 24 hours a day to kill or cripple them?

Get your mind on the war, Mr. WALLACE. Think more about our boys who are dying in it than of the people who are killing them.

Congressmen Rallied To End Dies Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the following article written by Adam Lapin taken from the Daily Worker of Saturday, January 23, 1943, is a notice to the Congress that "the battle is on once more" to discontinue the Dies committee. According to this article the battle forces are to be led by Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., with so-called liberal Members of the House providing the over-all strategy and behind-the-scenes manipulation for the campaign. I am including this article in my remarks so that the House membership may know what to expect in the way of a barrage of letters, telegrams, and delegations from the C. I. O. groups in their respective districts, on the theory that "forewarned is forearmed":

CONGRESSMEN RALLIED TO END DIES GROUP

(By Adam Lapin)

WASHINGTON, January 22.—The fight is on to end the Dies committee's systematic disruption of national morale and of the war effort.

Within the next few days Representative E. E. Cox's resolution to extend the life of the Dies committee for another year will reach the House floor, and liberal Congressmen are getting ready to make their opposition as effective as possible.

They will have to work quickly and get immediate backing from organized labor, because the strategy of Dies committee supporters is to sneak the Cox resolution before anybody gets wise to what is happening.

An important development which will aid the fight against the Dies committee was the action of the Congress of Industrial Organizations' president, Philip Murray, in sending a letter to all members of affiliated unions urging immediate action against continuation of the committee.

Murray is also expected to indicate his opposition to the Dies committee directly to Members of the House.

COFFEE BLASTS DIES

Representative JOHN COFFEE, leader of the liberal bloc in the House, said that Dies committee blasts against the Office of Price Administration, the Board of Economic Welfare, and other agencies had given "aid and comfort to the Axis enemy."

"The main thing is to subordinate everything to strengthening national unity and winning the war," COFFEE said. "And this will not be done by continuing the Dies committee."

Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, American Laborite, of New York, said that House foes of the Dies committee "will need all the support we can get."

MARCANTONIO urged that all labor and progressive organizations ask Representative ADOLPH SABATH, Rules Committee chairman, for permission to appear before the committee.

It is expected that the Rules Committee will meet early next week on Representative Cox's resolution. Cox is the ranking member of the Rules Committee, and his resolution will get strong support from the coalition of reactionary southern Democrats and defeatist Republicans on the committee.

A similar coalition will give the Cox resolution powerful support in the House and will make beating the Dies committee a tough but by no means impossible job.

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS KEY FIGHT

One important factor in determining the fate of the Cox resolution will be the speed with which the Congress of Industrial Organizations opposition to the Dies committee can be rallied.

Opposition to the Dies committee is an important phase of the Congress of Industrial Organization's legislative program, and President Philip Murray emphasized this point in a radio address earlier this week.

It will now be a question of translating the Congress of Industrial Organizations official position into letters, telegrams, and delegations to Congress at very short notice.

Another important factor will be the attitude of the administration.

So far the indications are that administration leaders in the House will not oppose the Dies committee, and may even give it verbal support.

A word from the President, however, would undoubtedly change the attitude of administration leaders and might have a decisive effect on the temper of the House.

Mr. Speaker, as an antidote for the communistic virus contained in the article, I want to offer the following "fruits of the committee" that I discussed on the floor the other day. Judged on the basis of the Biblical injunction, "By their fruits shall we know them," the Dies committee is worthy of the continued confidence and support of the House because:

(a) The Dies committee has compiled and tabulated an invaluable stock pile or reservoir of facts and information concerning the subversive agents and organizations at work in America today.

(b) The files of the Dies committee are being consulted daily by representatives of the F. B. I., Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, Secret Service, and other Government agencies, and the information secured from those files used as a basis for action against these subversive agents and organizations.

(c) The activities of the Committee for Democratic Action, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, and other organizations that had for their chief purpose the undermining of the Congress and the smearing of many of its most outstanding Members of both parties, were so thoroughly exposed by the Dies committee and their communistic tie-ups so clearly pointed out that these organizations were discredited and their activities nullified. As a result, not one Member of Congress listed by these organizations for defeat was defeated.

Therefore, on the basis of the fruits that the Dies committee has produced during the past year, and also judged by the list of friends of the committee and the list of foes of the committee created over the 4-year period the committee has existed, I feel quite sure that at least 95 percent of the membership of this House will give the committee a vote of confidence and a new lease on life.

Service Men and Women Should Be Exempt From Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 14 I introduced H. R. 1210, a bill to exempt enlisted and commissioned personnel of the armed services from payment of Federal income taxes.

Under present laws a service man or woman is taxable with certain exceptions on his civilian income plus his service compensation. The exceptions include allowances for transportation charges which are not considered as income, but allowance for the transportation of his dependents is deemed to be income within the purview of the present

law. The value of subsistence and quarters or cash received in commutation of these items is not considered as income. Allowances toward the cost of uniforms and equipment are not taxable.

Servicemen below the rank of commissioned officer are given an additional exemption of $250 if single and $300 if married. This is in addition to the exemption granted civilians of $500 for single persons and $1,200 for married persons.

Under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 many members of the armed forces have made application for allotments. These allotments are paid under a plan which allows a deduction from the serviceman's pay which is matched by a contribution of a certain sum by the Government. The amount of money received by the dependent is not taxable but the serviceman must account for his deduction as income. He is not required to charge himself with the amount contributed by the Government because that sum is considered as a gift.

Under H. R. 1210 which is now before the Ways and Means Committee of the House all men and women in the armed service are exempted from payment of all taxes imposed by the United States upon income.

The legislation is designed to give recognition to the sacrifices made by those who have had their civilian life interrupted as a result of the war and who, under the present law, are being called upon to pay income taxes on the compensation received as a member of the armed forces as well as any income earned before their enlistment or induction.

The approval of H. R. 1210 should strengthen the morale of the servicemen and women because under the present scale of exemptions many of them are greatly concerned over the fact that they are expected to meet the income-tax payments due in March from their greatly reduced income as members of our fighting forces.

This legislation should receive the immediate attention of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Congress as a whole to relieve the present situation confronting the members of the armed forces.

Farm Machinery Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

Senate Memorial 1

Whereas there is a genuine need for more farm machinery than has been allotted the State of Montana if the farmers are to produce the foodstuffs desired; and

Whereas a diminishing supply of available labor makes farm machinery even more necessary than in normal times; and

Whereas lack of both materials and labor is making it increasingly difficult to make repairs to machinery: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana, That we petition the War Production Board and the Secretary of Agriculture to reconsider both the national quotas of new farm machinery for 1943 and the present Montana State quotas, to the end that quotas may be increased and more equitably allocated and that farmers may be equipped to handle the huge task of farm production which it is well known is so vital to the successful prosecution of the war and the feeding of our armed forces, our Allied soldiers, and our civilian workers; and be it further

Resolved, That copies properly attested by the president and secretary of the senate be transmitted by the secretary of state to the War Production Board, Donald M. Nelson, Chairman, and to Claude E. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Montana.

House Memorial 1

Whereas the War Production Board has seen fit to severely curtail the 1943 production of farm machinery, despite representations of need by county and State war boards and the Secretary of Agriculture, and despite the fact that the steel needed for producing farm machinery is a very small percentage of total annual steel production and further despite the fact that more farm machinery is needed in order to meet 1943 war production goals of food and fiber crops and to replace lost farm labor; and

Whereas the quotas of both 1943 farm machinery production and other new machinery which it has been necessary to set up to allocate available supplies entails unfortunate discriminations among States, counties, and individual farmers needing machinery and replacements; and

Whereas as an example of the foregoing, Montana now needing hammer mills and feed grinders for grinding winter feed for livestock and having requests for approximately 500, has been allotted only 49 in comparison with 379 allotted North Dakota whose total livestock units are practically the same as the State of Montana; and

Whereas a survey conducted among the many members of the house of representatives who are engaged in agricultural pursuits, revealed that inability to buy sufficient badly needed farm machinery is one of the major factors which threaten to seriously handicap food production: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives in session assembled, That we petition the War Production Board and the Secretary of Agriculture to reconsider both the national quotas of new farm machinery for 1943 and the present State quotas to the end that quotas may be increased and more equitably allocated and that farmers may be equipped to handle the huge task of farm production which it is well known is so vital to the successful prosecution of the war and the feeding of our armed forces, our allied soldiers, and our civilian workers; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the journal of the house, and that a copy thereof properly attested by the speaker and the clerk of the house, be transmitted by the secretary of state to the War Production Board, Donald M. Nelson, Chairman, and to Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Montana.

A Committee We Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK NICHOLS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Clarksburg (W. Va.) Exponent of January 22, 1943:

A COMMITTEE WE NEED

Congressman JENNINGS RANDOLPH'S proposal for the creation of a standing congressional committee on aviation should receive immediate support from the Members of the West Virginia congressional delegation.

Such a committee as Representative RANDOLPH suggests, one that can consider all phases of aviation, "including civil and commercial aviation and including their relationship with or between Army and Navy air services, and any other correlated services," can play a leading part in the building of the peacetime world.

The last war made the automobile. This one will make the airplane.

We need an alert and air-minded group of men in Congress to lead and direct the giant activity of America that will be released after the victory of the United Nations. If this committee had been functioning in Congress prior to the present war, it is possible the plane would have had a larger place in our national defense.

We must not fall into the rut again. This committee ought to be created, and we can think of no better qualified aviation enthusiast and worker than Congressman RANDOLPH for its chairmanship.

Dedication of Marble Bust of Thomas Brackett Reed, Former Speaker of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with House Resolution 315, adopted October 1939, a marble bust of Thomas Brackett Reed, former Speaker of this House of Representatives, was authorized.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by my colleague,

Hon. ROBERT HALE, of Maine, Saturday, when this bust was placed in the gallery of this Chamber:

Mrs. SMITH. Distinguished Senators, colleagues, and guests, we recall with admiration that when Mr. Reed, a Representative from the First Congressional District of Maine, was Speaker of this House of Representatives, the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court were also men from the Pine Tree State.

Maine traditions and names continue, and this year we have representing the First Congressional District, ROBERT HALE, of Portland, who will speak on the life of Hon. Thomas Brackett Reed, of Maine.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, "we all know too sadly well that oblivion begins to devour the mightiest when dead, and has in all ages been so greedy as to overtake some men yet living. Human fame, even of those who are at pains to preserve their memories, is as evanescent as the cloud of a summer sky."

The words which I have just spoken were first uttered by Thomas Brackett Reed, of Maine, when 65 years ago almost to the day he presented to the Nation the statue of William King which stands in Statuary Hall.

It would be most unfitting if oblivion were ever permitted to devour the memory of Tom Reed, the Speaker of this House in the Fifty-first, Fifty-fourth, and Fifty-fifth Congresses. He would also have been its Speaker in the Fifty-sixth Congress, but he disbelieved in the Spanish War and in the policy of annexation and imperialism which succeeded it. So he announced his intention to retire. "I have tried," he said to his secretary, Asher Hinds, "perhaps not always successfully, to make the acts of my public life accord with my conscience, and I cannot now do this thing." To his constituency he said with perfect justice, "No sail has been trimmed for any breeze nor any doubtful flag ever flown."

The record of the public life which was the public manifestation of his conscience is a remarkable one, for Tom Reed served in this House from 1876 until 1898 and almost from the beginning of his service was one of its leaders. Standing 6 feet 2 inches, weighing 300 pounds, with a bald head, beardless face, brilliant hazel eyes under great arches of brow, and a gentle drawling voice, he was physically an unforgettable man. His intellectual attainments were as remarkable as his physique.

Indeed a critic no less experienced than Henry Cabot Lodge, who was certainly not blind to the defects of his contemporaries, said of Reed, "There never has been a greater or more perfectly equipped leader in any parliamentary body at any period." And John Sharp Williams, who had been the Democratic leader of this House in Reed's day, described Reed as "that ever-memorable genius, the ablest running debater the American people ever saw."

Even today we can feel the sting of Reed's retort to the pompous Springer, who, quoting Henry Clay, had declaimed that he had "rather be right than President." "The gentleman," drawled Reed, "will never be either."

Yet brilliant as was Reed's record as a debater and as a party and parliamentary leader, he is best and most justly recalled as the Speaker who by giving a bold and courageous interpretation to the rules of this House rescued its procedure from discredit and enabled it to transact the Nation's business.

Prior to his time a minority of the House could frustrate its activities by refusing to attend an answer to a roll call, thus preventing the presence of a quorum. In his day 166 Members made a quorum. This was Reed's precise vote on his first election to the speakership. If his party had the responsibility of maintaining a quorum, every one of its members had to be on the floor all the time—a practical impossibility. The Democrats, when they wished to prevent action by the House of which they disapproved, adopted the simple expedient of attending and sitting silent when their names were called.

Previous Speakers had uniformly ruled that the presence of a quorum was to be determined solely by the calling of the roll. To depart from this precedent was a bold course. But Reed determined to depart from it and, if not sustained, to resign from the speakership and retire from the House.

On January 29, 1890, Dalzell reported from the Committee on Elections, giving a disputed seat in West Virginia to the Republicans. The Democrats raised the question of a quorum, only 163 Members having responded to the roll call. Instead of ordering the roll to be called again, Reed looked down from the Speaker's chair and, in what must have been one of the most dramatic moments in the history of this body, said: "The Chair directs the Clerk to record the following names of Members present and refusing to vote." The House was instantly in uproar. Reed alone remained calm, and when the House for a moment subsided he persisted in his count of Democrats present and not answering to the roll call.

McCreary, of Kentucky, rose with a book in his hand and said: "I deny your right, Mr. Speaker, to count me as present, and I desire to read from the parliamentary law on the subject."

"The Chair," Reed replied, "is making a statement of the fact that the gentleman from Kentucky is present. Does he deny it?"

Reed then stated at length the legal and constitutional reasons for his ruling with the precedents from other bodies in its support. For 3 days the House was a bedlam. Reed's decision was denounced as corrupt. Men spoke all manner of evil against him. Reed admitted that he had broken all the precedents of the House, including those of Speaker Blaine, described by the opposition as "the most eminent of living Republicans." But Reed boldly said that the precedents were wrong, pointing out that the word quorum, as used in the Constitution, meant a quorum of Members present and not merely a quorum of Members answering to the roll call. After prolonged debate, his ruling was sustained on appeal.

Thus was established the most important landmark in the whole parliamentary practice of the House. The Supreme Court subsequently sustained the constitutionality of the ruling. (U. S. v. Ballin, 144 U. S. 1.) Though in the two succeeding Congresses the Democrats reverted to the old rule, they later found themselves helpless and were forced by Reed to ratify Reed's precedent.

Since that time, Reed's precedent has become section 3, rule XV, of the House. The good name of the House has been saved. The transaction of its business has been facilitated. Party responsibility has been strengthened.

Reed's achievement stands as an enduring triumph for his vision, his courage, and his self-control.

More than half a century has passed and we have come to a day when millions of armed men are challenging not only the methods of democrary, but its capacity as an institution to survive under the laws of political biology. It is, therefore, peculiarly appropriate to commemorate today the man whose interpretation of a great democratic process preserved this House from paralysis and frustration. Unless the legislative branch of the Government can and will function efficiently, it is hardly in a position to exact efficiency from the administrative branch. On the other hand, an efficient legislature can exercise a powerful influence in the direction of orderly and competent administration which is superlatively necessary in time of war. When the machinery of military destruction is so mercilessly efficient, the people expect an analogous efficiency from the machinery of government. And there is some evidence of their doubt as to whether such efficiency exists.

The House has accordingly done well to commission Mr. Gutzon Borglum to do honor at this time to Reed's memory by the bust.

"Whatever may happen," Reed wrote in his farewell message to his constituents, "I am sure the first Maine district will always be true to the principles of liberty, self-government, and the rights of man." It is because the district has been true to these principles, that I take delight in acclaiming the example left us by this great man.

Real Spirit of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, while some of our citizenry squawk about tire and gasoline rationing, grumble about sugar rationing, and whine about food shortages, the majority of the American people accept the rationing orders with a smile, for it is part of our traditional proud heritage to accept sacrifice in an hour of peril, and, further, because the majority fully realizes the tremendous sacrifices being made by our fighting forces on the battle fronts of the world.

To typify this real spirit of America, I am happy to include in my remarks a letter which a soldier boy in Guadalcanal wrote to his father, and which letter was read by Al Jolson, great American comedian, during his Colgate broadcast to the world on the night of November 24, 1942:

DEAR DAD: I know that a foxhole isn't exactly the most comfortable place in which to write a letter, but I wanted to get it to you in time for Thanksgiving. I thought that as long as I won't be there with you this letter might take my place.

A year ago today I had never heard of Guadalcanal. At that time my only battlefield was our college football stadium and my immediate enemy was the opposing tackle. My only thoughts then were my tuition, my studies, and my date for the junior prom. They all seem so unimportant today. What really matters is that our alma mater is now our country and we've got 130,000,000 rooters yelling for a touchdown.

Dad, we've got a tough line to buck before we reach our goal, but with veterans like MacArthur and Admiral Halsey calling signals, we can't miss. One of the corporals I bunk with—a kid named Pinky Schwartz—said something cute the other day. He said he doesn't mind us sharing the Pacific with the Japs. We'll take the top and they can have the bottom. Kinda good, huh, Pop? And don't think we're not celebrating over here, too. We cleaned out a nest of snipers yesterday and all I've got to say is that a machine gun may not have the Thanksgiving spirit, but it certainly can talk turkey to those Japs.

It seems awfully strange, Dad, when I realize that this will be the first Thanksgiving dinner I haven't shared with you,

Mom, and the kids. But we here feel that all this is worth while if we can fix it for once and for all so that in years to come there won't be any more empty chairs around the Thanksgiving table—ever.

Well, Dad, I guess I'll have to close now, as it gets dark mighty fast here and naturally we can't have any lights. You see, even the flicker of a match would give our position away to the enemy. It's kinda tough trying to do things in the dark, but our hope is that someday things are going to be different.

With all my love,

JIMMY.

Problems Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker and Members of Congress, the problems that confront us and will be presented to the present Congress are so important and so many that it is particularly pleasing to receive from a constituent a comprehensive and progressive statement of the same that I believe it merits the attention of the Members of this body.

We may not agree with the ideas expressed in all of these 20 suggestions but with many of them there appears to be at least favorable comment from both sides of the aisle. It is with the thought of presenting to this body a brief résumé of what we have before us that I give you herewith a letter received by me from Mr. C. H. Cuno, of the Cuno Engineering Corporation, Meriden, Conn.:

JANUARY 13, 1943.

Hon. RANULF COMPTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MAJOR COMPTON: May I take this opportunity to welcome you as a Representative of the people of Connecticut to the Seventy-eighth Congress just convened.

Your problems will be many and difficult, but on the wise decisions of this Congress will depend not only the winning of the war and the future history of mankind, but particularly the determination whether we in the United States are to continue in our historical and constitutional way of life with free enterprise and equal opportunity without too much bureaucratic interference or to remain fettered to the chains of an administration ever grasping for more power over the people whose servant it is.

Without taking too much of your time with explanations and reasons, may I list a few of the many matters to which Congress might give its attention, as follows:

1. A law governing the matter of justly settling all war contracts which may be canceled through no fault of prime or subcontractors, such as proposed by the National Association of Manufacturers.

2. Legislation to abolish the limitation of incomes. Such limitation is un-American, vicious discrimination, and can lead only to a dulling of initiative and enterprise.

3. A pay-as-you-go plan of tax collection with either entire elimination of 1942 personal income taxes or, say, the payment of only 20 or 25 percent of 1942 taxes, payable in installments during 1943 and 1944. We don't want 20,000 delinquent taxpayers after the war is over.

4. A stabilization of tax rates for the duration of the war.

5. Stabilization of the capital-gains tax at its present rate of 25 percent to encourage investment.

6. Don't under any circumstances, make it possible to suspend immigration laws or open the doors to a flood of unwanted undesirables for whom jobs must be found.

7. Change the laws governing the renegotiation of war contracts so that all funds so secured revert to the funds of the General Treasury to be reappropriated by the Congress and not remain at the disposal of the various departments to spend at will.

8. Repeal all silver purchase and holding acts.

9. Appoint a joint congressional committee on civil aviation.

10. Make it impossible to redeem War Savings bonds until some time after the war is over, except under regulations formulated by the Congress, not the Treasury.

11. Beware of a national service act. What the country needs is a 54-hour week; at present it averages only a little over 43 hours. There isn't a shortage of manpower, just a shortage of plain willingness to work to win the war.

12. Look diligently for hidden and unlimited powers in all bills.

13. A thoroughgoing, long overdue overhauling of the one-sided so-called Wagner Labor Relations Act. Federal incorporation of labor unions, limitation of dues and assessments, annual filing of financial reports with the Secretary of Labor and open to public inspection, payment of taxes like every other corporation, eliminate compulsory membership in a union, outlaw the compulsory closed shop, stop the pressure and threats against employees who don't want to be members of a union, make it possible for a person to withdraw from membership at will, free the millions of patriotic Americans now suffering under the yoke of unscrupulous self-styled labor leaders, and make it unlawful for a labor union to contribute to political campaigns.

14. Don't permit suspension of tariffs if you expect and want American workmen to have jobs after the war is over.

15. A clear-cut definition should be established for the end of the war or ending of hostilities, etc.

16. The Ed. Flynn proposal is a disgrace to the honor of the country and slap in the face to its citizens. It represents the worst kind of dirty politics and the nomination should not be confirmed.

17. Don't federalize unemployment compensation—this is one of the worst things that could happen to the state as well as its citizens.

18. Outlaw, for the duration, in war industries all strikes and lockouts and make the penalties stiff.

19. Eliminate all so-called social and other emergency (and now useless) agencies such as National Youth Administration, R. E. C., etc.

20. Scrutinize and cut all requests for huge blanket appropriations for war purposes which are so huge that they cannot be spent within the allotted time without throwing billions down a rat hole.

Here is a ready reference table which will tax the fortitude of any legislator. May you serve your State and your country with distinction and honor.

With best wishes, believe me,

Sincerely,

C. H. CUNO.

Automobile Tires Turned In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following report in compliance with my request, relative to the campaign for idle tires.

It is as follows:

Tires received through Jan. 2, 1943, from the idle-tire-return program by Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan agencies

Atlanta	107,740
Birmingham	104,000
Boston	508,113
Charlotte	320,920
Chicago	1,430,000
Cleveland	1,021,935
Dallas	294,000
Denver	199,741
Detroit	362,342
Helena	97,874
Houston	101,133
Jacksonville	129,272
Kansas City	350,900
Little Rock	61,954
Los Angeles	642,600
Louisville	69,948
Minneapolis	620,364
Nashville	287,375
New Orleans	125,618
New York	780,600
Oklahoma City	156,000
Omaha	408,156
Philadelphia	293,245
Portland	175,000
Richmond	418,568
St. Louis	299,000
Salt Lake City	95,000
San Antonio	99,814
San Francisco	450,900
Seattle	136,000
Spokane	94,500
Total tires received	10,242,612

Based on reports made to the Defense Supplies Corporation.

OFFICE OF THE RUBBER DIRECTOR,
Statistical Department.

Mr. Speaker, it is my information that the inspection of these tires, which is still under way, indicates to date that approximately 50 percent are suitable only for scrap. A small percentage are usable as is and a few more are subject to repair. The balance are in a condition requiring recapping.

Food Supplies for the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of food

supplies for the war, delivered by Hon. Herbert Hoover before the National Industrial Conference Board, New York City, on January 21, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have been requested by your board to say something on our war food problem. I believe I can speak not alone from some experience but in entire detachment from any group interest. It is not a problem to be dealt with in emotional terms. Nevertheless its ultimates are victory and peace, the loss of millions of human lives or the saving of them. And this is not a subject for criticism, nor do I believe in the doctrine of "I told you so." We need to face the hard facts and secure a remedy—and at once.

Food supply has now become secondary only to military operations in determining the outcome of the war. And it will take first place in saving the world from anarchy after the war.

When firing ceases we will be faced with three or four hundred million starving people. That such monstrous things should be is but part of the crimes of Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini.

To save these millions of people after the war is not alone a transcendant act of compassion. It is the only road to peace. But we must be prepared.

In the meantime we need more food for our own people and to carry our allies. The burden of furnishing food supplies to the United Nations now and to a starving world after the war rests largely upon the American and Canadian farmer.

And at once let me say I have no sympathy with attacks being made by armchair consumers upon the American farmer. He is working a 70-hour week. He is working for a far less average income than any group in industry. No one is working harder to win the war.

We have at present ample stores of breadstuffs on the North American Continent to supply our Allies and to contribute to the relief of the inevitable world post-war famine. The Biblical injunction was, however, that "man cannot live by bread alone." The scientists have long since proved that the deficiency in that Biblical diet is meats and fats. And to maintain a cheerful and fighting spirit in the human animal, he needs frills and flavors, like sugar, coffee, and jam. He feels still better if he can have eggs and fruit.

There is today an acute shortage, especially in meats and fats, in the world. And fats include the whole gamut of lard, milk, butter, cheese and edible oil products.

All over Europe the flocks and herds are being consumed. There is already desperate shortage of meats and fats in every country ravaged by the Germans. And that shortage will grow steadily worse right up to the end of the war.

Britain and Russia are short of animal products and must be supplied by us if they are to carry on the war.

And every householder knows there is a shortage already in the United States. And we are confronted with the fact that our shortage of labor, of machinery, and methods of price control are limiting the vitally essential expansion of this production and the flocks and herds upon which production depends. And unless we can quickly realize and quickly reverse these limiting forces, there are dangers to the conduct of the war and winning the peace.

OUR PRESENT SITUATION

While we have Germany blockaded from overseas food, her submarines have done a fairly effective job of cutting off much of both British and our own meats and fats from the Southern Hemisphere. And the Japanese conquests have stopped much of our own and British vegetable oils from Asia and the Indies. Russia has lost a considerable part of her food areas and must have some support from us. China is at present cut off in every direction.

We in the United States are short of meats and fats because we must supply the deficiences in our allies, because our possible imports of meats and fats are curtailed, because our armed forces eat more of them than they do in civil life, and because we are not increasing our production fast enough.

We had all these burdens and difficulties in the last war. Yet today we are exporting less than half the meats and fats to our allies that we did in the last war, for we then had to support France, Belgium, and Italy also, and with this lesser burden of exports we are threatened with greater shortages of meats and fats on our own home front than in World War No. 1.

Our difficulties are increased because American livestock has decreased in proportion to the growth of human population since the last war.

At the end of that war we had 26 percent more beef cattle for each 1,000,000 of human population than we had 23 years later on January 1, 1942. We had 26 percent more hogs in proportion to the population. We had proportionately 5 percent more milk cows than now. But the improved cow gives more milk. We have in 1943 about the same sheep proportionately as in the last war. We have less chickens in proportion to our population but the chickens work harder and produce more eggs.

IMPERATIVE TO BUILD UP OUR HERDS

The demands upon us today call imperatively and without delay to build up our flocks and herds and thus increase their production. And further we must increase our production of vegetable oils. We can of course, like the Germans slaughter our breeding herds for immediate war purposes. But that would starve ourselves and the world afterwards.

Alternatively we can build up our flocks and herds and consequently their production. We did it during the last war. Once during the whole period of that world war our hog population increased by 22 percent, our beef cattle by 27 percent, our milk cows 10 percent. It was this increase in production that enabled us to supply our Allies and prevented hardships on our own home front. And it was the salvation of Europe last time.

We can produce the feed with which to again greatly increase our food animals. For one thing the gas engine has retired 20,000,000 horses and mules from the national pastures and city feed bags.

WE ARE NOT MAKING THE PROGRESS WE SHOULD

That the progress we are making today is not satisfactory can be demonstrated. In January a year ago the Secretary of Agriculture gave to the country an admirable victory program of increased herds and increased production. The climatic conditions during the year were most favorable. Detailed statistics of actual farm results during the year are not yet available. But it is already obvious that this program was not fully met. This was due to various causes out of control of the Secretary. And now the Secretary warns us that production for 1943 may be less than that in 1942 in several directions.

THE CAUSES

The causes of this blockade on possible production are obvious:

First. Some 2,000,000 men have been drained from the farm labor supply into arms and munitions.

Second. The methods of food price control by which prices to the farmer in many instances are lower than costs of production.

Third. The manufacture of farm machinery has been reduced by 75 percent.

Fourth. We still go on subsidizing the farmer to restrict production in some commodities.

THE EFFECT

There is indeed ample evidence that without prompt remedy we shall not secure the increases that are vitally necessary.

A Congressional committee reports that millions of dollars' worth of crops in the Southwest were lost last year because they could not be harvested.

Word from farmers in many parts of the country indicate that unless their difficulties be remedied they will be compelled to reduce planting this spring.

And they are compelled to limit their herds below what they could otherwise do. The news comes daily from all parts of the country that the farmer is sending his dairy cows to slaughter for lack of labor. And this is amply verified by the arrivals at the slaughterhouses. For the 4 months ending November 1, 1942, the inspected slaughter of female cattle increased 30 percent over the same period in 1941. In the same period the increase in the slaughter of steers was only 5 percent. The increased slaughter of female cattle in this 4-month period was nearly 40 percent greater than the same period in the average of the 3 previous years. And there was still a further increase in the month of November. This does not increase our supply of dairy products. Also the cattle coming into the market during this 4 months ending November 1, 1942, were an average on different calculations from 30 to 40 pounds per animal lighter than for the same period the year before. This beef loss would have supplied several million people during the period.

During this 4 months the number of sheep slaughtered has increased nearly 200 percent over the year before. Our national flock is less today than a year ago and will apparently be still less a year hence. There also seems to be some disturbance in the hog world, for sows have been coming to slaughter during the last 4 months faster than would seem desirable if we are to increase the herd with the rapidity needed.

This undue slaughter of cows, ewes, and sows gives a temporary increase in meats but it is an illusion as to supplies for the future. That is "eating the seed corn." The numbers slaughtered so far are not disastrous. We will not starve. Our allies will not starve. But we can have far shorter supplies.

The evil is that these demoralizing forces are continuing. And if we keep traveling in this direction we will see more hardships in our households unless we reduce our supplies to the Allies and armies. And with such a situation, it is nonsense to talk about furnishing meat and fat supplies to 300,000,000 additional famine-stricken people after this war is won.

Agriculture simply must be envisaged as a munitions industry. The farmer must be given men and tools if he is to perform his part.

REMEDIES FOR LABOR SHORTAGE

It is useless to talk about making up the farm labor shortage wholly from women or children. Much of farming is hard physical labor. Modern farming requires great skills in nursing the crops and livestock. Moreover farming has been mechanized. Now he is a mechanic. These skills cannot be learned quickly. But with organized preparatory training women can be of great service for lighter, simpler tasks.

There are other major remedies. The first is to cease the draft of labor from the farms into arms and munitions. The second is for

industry to economize rigidly on labor and release the economies to the farmer. The third is for our munitions workers to contribute by removing all possible restrictions on effort and thereby increasing their production, and freeing men to the farmers. The fourth is large and temporary import of Mexican farm labor. The fifth is to give consideration to the method of European armies. That is to furlough farm boys from the Army for the few months of peak planting and harvest, they remaining under military direction, and in our case to draw both the Army and farmers' pay.

THE RELATION OF PRICE CONTROLS TO PRODUCTION

Obviously price control of short commodities is necessary. Food cannot be allowed to go to the highest bidder. And prices and wages must be controlled to check inflation. But prices also dominate production. They can be the most powerful stimulant to production. They can stifle production. Prices can be made to produce the commodities we need and to minimize those which are the less necessary.

We give enormous wages and prices to stimulate planes and ships. Increased production of meats and fats are today just as important to win the war as planes and ships. And some bacon to the consumer at a few cents more is better than too little bacon.

At best price controls of food can be only a brake upon the pressures of shortage and inflation. We considered the method of retail price ceilings on food were a failure in the last war. And they have failed to keep the promises made for them in this war. Already prices on food have risen about 16 percent since they were partially applied a year ago and about 9 percent since they were fully applied. And that does not average in prices of the black market. There has been in fact a slightly larger rise in the past year than took place during the first year of food control in the last war under other and much simpler methods.

Systems of frozen retail price ceilings on food are not adapted to the problems of war production. They cannot single out and give premiums on production of the things we most need in parallel with the shifting demands of war.

The first reform needed is to abandon retail price ceilings on food and to substitute the alternative methods developed in the last war. That method is to fix prices as near the farm as possible. And they can then be fixed to stimulate production of the things we need. The consumer can be more effectively and more simply protected by regulating the turn-over and profits of the food processor and the mark-ups of the wholesaler and retailer.

The second reform is that all the functions of price control should be vested in the Secretary of Agriculture instead of several other places as at present. He alone can direct price so as to secure production and protect the consumer.

Above all, the best remedy for run-away prices is increased production.

REDUCTION IN CONSUMPTION

Whatever we are able to do in increasing production of meats and fats, we will still need to reduce our domestic consumption; that is, if we are to feed the Allies and our armies. We have margins of consumption which can and must be reduced—and it means rationing. But with maximum production the hardships on the home front would be less.

I could talk at length on methods of rationing, having participated in that surgical operation one time or another on some five hundred million people, I do not on this occasion propose to discuss the alternative methods of reducing consumption. There are methods more simple and of less hardship on the housewife than those in use. But it is no use to criticize the mistakes that have been made during the last year or the hardships imposed. We should give Senator Brown, the new Administrator, a chance and our support in the revisions he will no doubt make. I will make only one observation. In rationing the American people with their widely different habits, products, and problems the system should be decentralized into the States and under State Administrators. We should also recognize the value of local government as opposed to centralized government. And we should rely to the maximum possible extent upon voluntary and cooperative measures rather than force. The American people are the most cooperative people in the world, and the hardest to drive.

Above all the greatest remedy to rationing is production and more production.

THE JOB BEFORE US

I realize that the calls for manpower and supplies pile in upon the Government from every direction. I realize that the generals and admirals, intent on their responsibilities, tend to accept the popular phrase that America has unlimited power and resources, and that we can do anything. But there is a limit even to the resources of America. We have undertaken a job far greater than any other nation in history.

We can appreciate how great this job is if we look at Germany for a moment. It is true we have over a third more population than Germany, but we have undertaken a far larger task. The Germans have called about 9 percent of their people into their armed forces. We are calling about 8 percent or a little less. But the Germans are using 6,000,000 prisoners and imported labor, a large part working on her farms. Germany is impressing the mechanics, the machine shops, and the food of 180,000,000 conquered people to her support. She does not have to build merchant ships to transport much of her armies overseas. She is not building much of a navy except submarines. She is not supplying her allies with food or munitions—she is taking from them. She is not financing her allies. She has much less mileage of railways to operate, for her whole population is in an area less than that of Texas. Yet Germany with all these differences in her favor is badly strained.

We, on the other hand, have undertaken to place almost as many men in arms. We must fight a war at 3,000 to 8,000 miles from our shores. We must build a host of merchant ships and a larger navy. We must furnish vast quantities of munitions and food to our allies. We get little food from the outside. We must finance our allies. We do not have 8,000,000 imported laborers or prisoners, as would be proportionate to those in Germany. We exact no contributions of food or munitions from occupied countries.

But Germany is in the fourth year of total war. We are in the first year. She has passed the zenith of her strength. We are on the ascendant. Time runs in our favor. But we may run so fast that we get out of breath. Trying to do too much too fast may delay the inevitable Axis defeat.

CONCLUSION

We urgently need to determine what we can do within our strength of manpower, materials, shops, and agriculture, and the bottlenecks with which we must contend. We need to determine which of our tasks comes first.

And if we determine rightly we will place agriculture in the first rank of the war effort alongside of planes and ships.

Our imperative necessity is the maximum food production. The American farmer will do it if he is given a chance. And the fate of the world may depend upon it.

Statement by Chairman H. A. Millis on the Seventh Annual Report of the National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an important statement made by Dr. Harry Millis, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, in connection with the seventh annual report of the Board. I call special attention to the fact that among cases under consideration election cases are now in the majority, so that the bulk of the Board's work is in the adjustment of disputes through the democratic process of free ballot by the workers themselves.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The activities of the National Labor Relations Board during the past fiscal year, as submitted in the Board's annual report to Congress, marked several significant developments, all pointing to the increasing acceptance and use of the procedures of collective bargaining. The most outstanding development was the sharp rise and preponderance in the number of representation cases as contrasted with the much slower rise in charges of unfair labor practices. The past year also brought the largest number of cases yet received by the Board in a comparable period. With an eye to speed in the consideration and handling of these cases in a war economy, the Board streamlined its procedures, set up a system of priorities for the handling of war-production cases, and perfected a system of liaison with other Federal agencies.

The increased membership of organized labor, division and competition within the labor movement, and the giving up of the right to strike combined to increase the work of the Board. During the year ended June 30, 1942, a total of 10,977 new cases were filed with the Board. Election cases for the first time were in the majority, 6,010 as against 4,967 unfair labor practice cases. Representation cases had increased 39 percent, while unfair labor practice cases had increased only 8 percent over the previous fiscal year. The Board in a majority of representation cases, 3,420, settled the controversy over recognition through agreement on informal methods, such as checking union cards against company pay rolls. In 1,157 instances, formal hearings were held in disputes over representation. The Board issued 951 decisions in representation cases, an increase of 28 percent over the preceding year. The number of decisions based on elections fully agreed to by all parties or pay-roll checks alone increased 150 percent.

These figures show that the Board is more frequently occupied with orderly determination of representatives for collective bargaining rather than with prevention of unfair labor practices—and this is heartening. The emphasis on representation cases indicates increasing acceptance of the act by employers. It shows that the election machinery made available by the Board, rather than direct action, is becoming the accepted means of settling and determining representation

disputes. Over a million workers during the past fiscal year utilized this machinery to choose collective bargaining representatives in 4,212 such elections.

It is significant that in approximately 75 percent of these elections there was no contest between unions. Instead, a single union was attempting to establish its right to recognition by the employer. In newly organized fields, the election machinery of the Board was thus used as a substitute for the old method of the strike to demonstrate the union's strength.

We are holding more than 10 elections a day—in munitions plants, shipbuilding yards, mining communities, logging camps, and on ships ready to sail. In the absence of this machinery for the orderly determination of representatives in cases of uncertainty or controversy, there would have been no way to resolve these questions but through the same old method, industrial strife. Especially under the conditions of 1941–42, with a divided and subdividing, competitive labor movement, the resultant conflicts would have meant serious interruptions to war production. However, unions adopted the machinery made available under the Labor Relations Act, and further pledged itself to a no-strike policy, secure in the belief that controversies over recognition would be resolved through resort to a poll supervised and protected by the Federal Government.

In carrying out its task of proscribing unfair labor practices the Board was able to settle 92 percent of the cases without the necessity of formal proceedings, by obtaining agreements, dismissing cases of no merit, and requesting withdrawals of unfounded charges. The remedies in these unfair labor practice cases were varied: A total of 8,251 workers were reinstated to remedy discriminatory discharges, while 32,137 in addition were reinstated after strikes caused by unfair labor practices; 5,925 workers received $1,266,408 in back pay; company-dominated unions were disestablished in 283 cases; and orders to bargain collectively were part of the remedy in 1,032 cases.

By its efforts to prevent and remedy unfair labor practices and by determining representatives for collective bargaining the Board has been able to remove causes of dissatisfaction which might otherwise have seriously hampered war production. Through each of these two types of activity the Board, in effect, encouraged establishment in industry of sound collective-bargaining procedures whereby grievances can be handled. Thus, while upholding the right of workers to self-organization and collective bargaining at a time when organized labor in the national interest voluntarily gave up the right to strike, the Board contributed to good morale among workers and the sound labor relations so essential for full production, whether in war or in peace.

With the declaration of war, the Board took immediate steps to perfect its liaison with other Federal agencies. War production brought to the Board from other agencies not only request for expeditious handling of cases but also for information concerning labor relations at hundreds of war plants. Among the agencies with which the Board has had most frequent occasion to consult are the War and Navy Departments, the War Production Board, the War Shipping Administration, the National War Labor Board, and the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor.

Essentially the Board's function in relation to war plants in which other agencies were interested, has been to act with speed—to resolve a question concerning representation or to act on a charge of unfair labor practice as promptly as possible. The Board has made every effort to give priority to cases which might interfere with or impede war production. The Board has welcomed the cooperation of the other agencies in adjusting cases by informal methods, wherever this was possible, consonant with the rights of employees under the act.

An important function has been to supply information and to expedite action on cases affecting Government-owned, privately operated enterprises. To this end the War Production Board, Army, Navy, and War Shipping Administration supply the Board with current lists of such enterprises. These lists are checked when new cases are filed, and everything possible is done to bring about an early and appropriate disposition of the case.

The Board cooperates fully with the National War Labor Board, exchanging information and integrating closely their efforts for the maintenance of industrial peace. Determinations by the National Labor Relations Board of bargaining representatives has been a prerequisite in many cases to the settlement through the War Labor Board of disputes over wages and other conditions.

It has sometimes been suggested that the normal procedures of the Board should be relaxed in the emergency. It has been argued, for example, that the holding of a representation hearing and an election for choice of bargaining representatives would be prejudicial to war production. The Board has, however, followed the reasoning of the Congress stated in the act, believing that strikes obstructing the free flow of commerce result from disputes over representation and the right to collective bargaining. In the interest of the sound labor relationships which are conducive to industrial peace and maximum war production, the Board therefore proceeds with its hearing of the case, making all necessary and appropriate arrangements for the convenience of the parties, such as conducting hearings after working hours. On the other hand, every effort is made to handle these cases informally, when this is possible by agreement of the parties, in order to settle the question as quickly as possible and permit the parties to proceed with collective bargaining.

In unfair labor practice cases, also, the Board makes every effort to secure compliance through informal administrative procedures. In the less than 10 percent of these cases which require formal action, however, in the interest of the protection of the rights of all concerned it is essential that the regular procedure be carefully followed. In wartime as in peace, it is the duty of the Board to prevent unfair labor practices. The Board considers that to do so will continue to effectuate the policies of the act by removing obstructions to commerce. The Board in upholding the basic right of workers to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, therefore, acts in the interest of the sound labor relationships necessary for maximum production.

In general, the courts have accepted the Board's view that full enforcement of the act is necessary in wartime, particularly when labor organizations have relinquished the right to strike, as a measure to insure harmonious labor relations through collective bargaining. As the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit pointed out in a recent case:

"Neither we nor counsel may assume that the Board is not conscious of all the factors to be taken into consideration in the present emergency nor have we any reason to assume lack of competence on their part to arrange such adjustment as is necessary to preserve the public interest. The problem is peculiarly one for expert administration and that the statute had lodged in the Board."

As in the past few years, the court litigation involving enforcement or review of Board orders was relatively stable with a progressive decline in the number of such orders set aside. During the past fiscal year, the various circuit courts of appeals decided 87 cases involving Board orders, setting aside 5, or only 6 percent. Of the 7 cases that reached the Supreme Court, 5 were enforced in full, 1 was modified, and 1 was remanded to the Board for further proceedings.

For the same reasons which make an informal settlement of a Board case preferable to one which must go through protracted legal procedure, the Board is gratified that in its litigation work the number of decrees entered by consent of all parties in the Circuit Courts of Appeals was 69 percent greater than the number which were contested to final court decision. There were 159 consent decrees so entered during the year. A measure of progress in this respect lies in the fact that 4 years ago only 11 such decrees of compliance were entered during the year.

Reduction in Long Distance Telephone Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the New York Times containing an announcement by the Federal Communications Commission of a reduction by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. of long-line revenues by an estimated $50,700,000 a year, of which $34,000,000 will represent a saving to the public. I think the announcement is important, and I should like to have it inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONG LINES MAKE $50,700,000 CUT—AGREEMENT OF AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH WITH THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION MEANS $34,000,000 REDUCTION TO PUBLIC—WILL END THE INQUIRY—CHIEF SAVING IS ON OVERTIME—CHARGE AFTER 3 MINUTES TO BE ONE-QUARTER

WASHINGTON, January 20.—The Federal Communications Commission announced tonight that the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. would reduce its long-lines revenues by an estimated $50,700,000 per year, of which $34,700,000 would be an immediate saving to the public.

No reduction will be made in the charge for the initial 3 minutes of long-distance telephone calls, but the overtime charge will be cut. At present the charge for each additional minute is one-third of the charge for the first 3 minutes, but under the new rates, it will be one-fourth. For example, a station-to-station call from Washington to Denver costs $3 for 3 minutes, $5 for 5 minutes, whereas under the new schedule the 5-minute call will cost $4.50, a saving of 50 cents.

The reductions are being made under an agreement the Federal Communications Commission reached with the American Telephone & Telegraph. The agreement calls for cancelation of an investigation ordered last November into all charges of American

Telephone & Telegraph's long-lines department, which includes the leasing of telephone and telegraph wires, as well as the leasing of long-distance telephone service. A public hearing in the investigation proceeded only 2 days before it was recessed and followed by private conferences.

GOVERNMENT TO SAVE $11,900,000

The Commission said that the agreement would cut $11,900,000 off the Government's bill for private telephone and telegraph lines leased from the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. The Government leases 43 percent of all such lines rented by the company.

The Government also will share largely in the savings on the overtime charges for toll calls, the Federal Communications Commission said, since it is the heaviest single user of long-distance telephone service.

The $16,000,000 not listed as a direct immediate saving to the public presumably will be the larger share of revenue of the long-lines department which will be turned over to companies in the Bell System.

"All persons or organizations using leased private lines, including newspapers and broadcasting stations," the Federal Communications Commission said, "benefit substantially from the reductions, which are equivalent to approximately 25 percent in private telephone lines and 35 percent in private telegraph lines. The small broadcasting stations, as the casual users of telephone lines, will benefit from a lowering of the initial rate per hour for line costs by approximately 50 percent. Larger broadcast users will benefit by a reduction from $8 to $6 per air-line mile."

The Commission said it was expected that there would be no increase in the number of ordinary long-distance calls, since no reduction in the initial charge had been made.

American Telephone & Telegraph, in opposing the investigation, had contended that a reduction in telephone rates would tend to accelerate business at a time when the company's facilities already were overtaxed to the point where the Board of War Communications had found it necessary to establish a system of priorities on long-distance calls.

GIFFORD EXPLAINS THE DEDUCTION

In commenting on the agreement between American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and the Federal Communications Commission which ends the rate case, Walter S. Gifford, president of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., issued this statement last night:

"It will be noted that no reductions in basic message rates are to be made and that the reductions agreed to were those least apt, through stimulation of business, to add a further burden to the already overloaded long-distance lines.

"The extraordinary volume of long-distance business and the overloaded condition of the long-lines plant have resulted, in all probability only temporarily, in a rate of earnings for the long-lines department of the company which is in excess of the average for the Bell Telephone System as a whole.

"The long-lines department rates are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission, which has jurisdiction over interstate rates only. The Commission insisted that the earnings from such rates should be considered by themselves regardless of over-all system earnings and insisted that, when so considered, they produced a return greater than could be justified.

"The reductions in rates were agreed to by the company because of this position of the Commission, which the company believes is unsound under present conditions, but which the Commission considered is within its discretion; and because the company felt it important to have the rate proceedings discontinued so that it could get on with the business of helping win the war."

Internationalist-Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the News-Sentinel of Fort Wayne, Ind., January 20, 1943, entitled "We Must Be on Guard."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST BE ON GUARD

From time to time, advocates of internationalist-imperialism and of submerging American sovereignty in a world state speak of "isolationist organizations which openly flourished before Pearl Harbor" as though they were speaking of bands of counterfeiters, white slavers, or other criminals.

Of course, "isolationist" (or nationalist) organizations flourished openly in this country before Pearl Harbor.

And why not? It was not against the law to oppose American involvement in war prior to December 7, 1941. It is not now against the law to oppose permanent American entanglement in foreign power politics.

Moreover, nationalist sentiment is the traditional American sentiment of sovereign independence and aloofness from alien intrigue. It continues to be the sentiment of about four-fifths of the American people.

"Isolationist sentiment," thus defined, did not die on the day that Pearl Harbor was bombed; and nobody has ever claimed that it did.

Indeed—why should it?

This country is not, by any declaration of the people or their Congress, at war for any purpose other than the defense of this country's rights and its security and general welfare. It is not at war for the furthering of any minority schemes to bury American sovereignty in a power-politics grave. Americans fight for just one thing—America.

After Pearl Harbor, those who had been noninterventionists (at least equally with those who had been interventionists) addressed themselves instantly to the primary consideration of winning the war.

Only a handful of internationalist-imperialists refused to put "first things first."

Only this bitter, vindictive minority, distilling from its members' bigoted hearts a more virulent hatred for their fellow Americans than they could brew against the foreign foe, persisted in a unity imperiling agitation of wanton, vicious and gratuitous insult and abuse against neighbors who had happened in good conscience to disagree with their not-yet-substantiated notion of things.

In this, as in various other respects, the zealots of anti-American imperialism reveal that, like the Bourbons of old, they have neither forgotten anything nor learned anything.

Those who want to win the war, to write a decent peace, and to preserve the independence and security of the United States had better be forewarned. They are deceiving themselves if they think the internationalist-imperalist smear brigade has any intention of relaxing its unholy effort to hamstring the common war effort by stirring up a species of virtual civil strife among our own people.

So far as the future is concerned, the internationalist-imperialists have scarcely begun to fight. Note this well: They will employ every weapon of division, disunity, obstruction, prejudice, and intolerance that can be forged.

Forewarned is forearmed.

Nomination of W. B. Rutledge, Jr., To Be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the January 13 issue of the Free Press, of Chattanooga, Tenn., which gives a brief story of the life history of Rev. W. B. Rutledge, Sr., father of W. B. Rutledge, Jr., whose name has recently been sent to the Senate by the President as a nominee for Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRING OF EVENTS IN WEEK BRIGHTENS RUTLEDGES' HOME

CLEVELAND, TENN., January 13.—W. B. Rutledge, Jr.'s nomination to the Supreme Court has brought forth a twinkle in the eyes of his 81-year-old father, who lives on Maple Street in this city.

A visit to the Rutledge home here brought out how fast and exciting things can happen in a short time. With the announcement of the President of the planned elevation to the Supreme Court from the United States Court of Appeals several other events have taken place in the Rutledge household. Ivan Rutledge, who is a younger half-brother of Judge Rutledge, has recently received promotion in his work in the Bureau of the Budget in Washington, and Dwight Rutledge, youngest half-brother, who is now in the Army, is expected home this week end from Fort Sill, Okla., upon graduation from officers' training school.

W. B. Rutledge, Sr., was born 6 miles from Pikeville, October 21, 1861, and attended schools in that section. After becoming a Baptist preacher he returned to Pikeville as pastor of the Baptist Church there where young Wiley attended the Pikeville schools. From Pikeville the family moved to Maryville, where the Reverend Rutledge was pastor of the Baptist Church and young Rutledge attended and graduated from Maryville College. The Reverend Rutledge was pastor of the North Chattanooga Baptist Church for several years.

Judge Rutledge's last visit here was after his appointment to the court of appeals on the occasion of his father's eightieth birthday, which was October 21, 1941. Judge Rutledge planned to come last year for a visit, but work of the court caused him to put it off.

The Reverend and Mrs. Rutledge are now looking forward to the time when it will be possible for another visit from their now famous son.

The World Waits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able editorial by Mr. McClellan Van der Veer, appearing in the Birmingham Age-Herald for December 16, 1942, under the title "The World Waits."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD WAITS

House and Senate Democratic leaders met with the President Monday to plan for the convening of the new Congress. The date is set by the outgoing Congress. January 6 was chosen for the first meeting. During the day the House passed an authorizing resolution. The Senate was expected soon to follow suit. The President will address Congress the next day.

One of the leaders who attended the conference said the President probably would discuss problems of peace as well as the course of the war. This indication may presage a pronouncement of tremendous importance both in the prosecution of the war and in the struggle for a better world after the war.

Further elaboration by the President of his ideas for the application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the extension of the "four freedoms" conceivably could have a great effect on the course of the war and the hastening of victory.

Hitler has built up his support in Germany in large part through his insistence that his country has been, and if the Allies win, will continue to be, denied a fair opportunity in the world and through his allegations that the great democracies are unable to make their systems work for the welfare and progress of the people.

It is evident that the Beveridge plan advanced in Great Britain for the broadening of social security is being regarded with great concern by Nazi leaders because of its effect in countering their propaganda as to the internal working of the democratic systems. Of course, if the German people became deeply impressed with indications of prospective social progress in the free countries, their repudiation of absolutism, with all its tyrannies and repressions, might be speeded.

But stronger even than the Nazi talk against the democratic system in its influence on the German people has been the Hitler charge that the Allied peoples are resolved on subjugation of the Germans. In the face of these allegations, the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" probably have not been very effective in Germany, because they have been too general in nature, too lacking in specific commitments as to their application. The Nazis have doubtless striven ceaselessly to make these general principles seem only hypocritical declarations, offering no hope for the German people.

In order for more specific and convincing meaning to be given to these declarations, some further agreements between the United Nations as to the future are necessary.

Such agreements are, of course, very difficult of achievement. The temptation to put aside such problems for the present, on the ground that we already have our hands fully occupied, is very great. But these problems are a part of the struggle that now is going on. The struggle cannot be successfully concluded without dealing successfully with these problems. The time and cost military victory will require may be considerably affected by the way we deal with these problems.

Of course, there is not only the formidable matter of achieving further agreements between the United Nations. There is also the question of how to advance agreement within the United States on such issues. The tragic aftermath of President Wilson's efforts in behalf of peace still is well remembered.

We are not of one mind in this country. Nor will the new Congress be of one mind. Intimation of the problem faced by the President in this respect is apparently made in the Washington dispatch, quoting the unnamed leader as saying that the President's address to the new Congress probably will emphasize "that its actions very well might determine to an important degree the course of world history for many years to come."

We have never been of one mind on all questions in this country. We never shall be. But that has not meant that we have been made helpless and futile by these differences. Instead, the stimulation and enlightenment of discussion and debate of opposing points of view have furnished the atmosphere and method by which we have gone forwerd to many of our most important advances as a nation.

It is our belief that the President well realizes the fundamental necessities of progress toward world peace. Surely he understands that true peace can only come through progress in cooperation among the nations, rather than through armed domination by one group over another. We believe that the great majority of the people of the United States well realize this basic truth, whatever the cynicism, the isolationism, the nationalism, of some of our leaders and some of our citizens.

We believe the President can obtain overwhelming support from the country for further efforts in the direction of international cooperation after the war. If the President speaks clearly and forcefully along these lines and the country responds strongly to his words, we believe that there will be an immediate and strong response from the rest of the world also.

Not only will the effect be marked in Britain and other Allied nations, it will be deeply influential, in all probability, also among the peoples of enemy countries.

If the President can proclaim forcefully and effectively what we hope to help achieve for all the world after this conflict, the result might be to develop a renewed and creative human unity not only broadening the cooperation of the Allied peoples, but extending to win more and more of the disillusioned victims of the dictators to our side.

Indeed, this forthcoming speech by the President of the United States may be of profound consequence. It is time now for a new declaration of the hopes of man, which will enlist the overwhelming allegiance of the common peoples of the earth. The President has the vision for such a declaration. He is marvelously equipped to voice that hope. The world waits on it.

Radio Address of Hon. Edwin Arthur Hall, of New York, to His Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station WNBF Saturday, January 23, 1943:

Men and women of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, Norwich, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, tonight I want to urge upon you the necessity of your keeping in touch with me and letting me know how you feel about the great questions which must be decided by your Congress. As I have urged you before, please do not hesitate to write me if you desire to exercise your American privilege of expressing your opinions. I am always glad to receive your suggestions and advice, so feel free to send them to me. Only by getting the reaction from those I represent can I better my work as your Congressman. As it is a natural desire to improve my capacity and office, I must, therefore, depend upon you folks at home, my boss.

When I am not on the floor of the House of Representatives, much of my time is taken up in welcome service to mothers, wives, and children of the men in our armed forces. I take special pride in being able to obtain an allotment for some dependent, particularly when he or she is not aware of the correct procedure in applying for this money or when some other difficulty arises. Personally, I feel that nothing is too good for our soldiers, sailors, and marines, and they have a right to expect their servants in Washington to look after their loved ones. This, I am pledged to do. A day never passes during which I fail to receive at least a half dozen requests from folks in my district to help them with allotment matters. Your sons and husbands are giving everything for victory; you people at home must be financially provided for.

Among the fifty-odd letters from my district which I receive each day, lately I have noticed a large proportion from people who are finding the petty tactics of certain bureaucrats more and more obnoxious and difficult to bear.

I refer particularly to the recent high-handed and definitely illegal action taken by an agency of our Government in connection with pleasure driving. I am prepared to discuss this issue tonight because it is foremost in the minds of folks back home. I can frankly say that I have never seen American citizens in the triple cities so aroused by these same tactics which I shall describe.

Ever since rationing became the common custom of the land I have believed in its necessity. I have felt rationing was necessary if the American people were to be fed after all of the great obligations were met as a result of lease-lend agreements which bind America to feed all the world not under domination of Hitler and his friends. I have felt the necessity of rationing because I did not see how we could possibly feed the men in our armed services unless it was brought about.

I also believed that rationing was necessary because I can see nothing ahead but food shortages if the present abandonment of our best farms and the loss of our most experienced farm managers are not stopped immediately by revising draft procedure and finding means to prevent migration of farmers into defense plants.

Yes; I have advocated the rationing of food and civilian goods because I realized only too well that unless some foresight were used and equitable distribution of these vital necessities were brought about, our population would suffer in no small degree. I fear that even now we might be feeling the pinch of hunger if rationing had not been instituted. I am positive that if rubber and gasoline had not been conserved, our armed forces would lack equipment and weapons which are even now carrying them to victory in the Pacific and in North Africa.

So I am not ashamed to state that in the last Congress I voted to create the necessary agency in our Government to control for the duration our consumption of food, our purchases of gasoline and tires, and our national economic structure of price ceilings and fluctuations. I did this to assure the American people the fairest possible treatment in an economy bound to be seriously dislocated by the most furious turmoil in history. Like every other American, I looked for results in the expenditure of millions which such an administration would require. Like every other American, I counted on patriotism to motivate cooperation on the part of our people to this whole rationing program.

I observe that the patriotism of the folks I represent has resulted in hundreds of my constituents volunteering without pay to help in the rationing program. I find that same patriotism to be the only guaranty of proper functioning of the ration system.

Unfortunately, during the past few days, something has happened which may undo everything which patriotism has built up since this great war effort began. I refer to the sudden grab for power made by certain bureaucrats in Washington by superseding the functions of all three branches of our Government. I refer to the deliberate action of these bureaucrats to make their own laws regarding pleasure driving and the like, to try to be their own policemen by enforcing these laws, and to set themselves up as judges to try the victims of the rules they have established. As your representative, I denounce such action on the part of the bureaucrats not only as out of order and in violation of their authority but also as downright illegal and in opposition to your rights as citizens.

When the Constitution was written, three agencies of government were created—namely, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. Each branch represented a check on the powers of the other two branches. Congress was to make laws, the executive branch was to enforce them, and the judicial branch or the courts was to interpret them.

But here we find a distinct violation of the powers of both Congress and the courts by administrative branches of our Government. Congress has authorized the Office of Price Administration to ration food, gasoline, tires, and other vital goods, in such a way as to aid in winning the war. Congress has not, however, authorized any agency to set up penalties for and deal out punishment to offenders of the rules and regulations that agency sets up. Congress has provided simply that this agency shall determine the amounts to be rationed and issue coupon books and permits for gasoline, tires, food, and commodities. Congress has never given its sanction to any agency tracking down violators of petty rules of conduct and attempting to mete out punishment to those offenders.

The Office of Price Administration is authorized by Congress to set the amount of gasoline or the extent of food which you folks shall buy. This agency or any other agency has never been authorized to tell people how they shall use those 3 gallons of gasoline or how and when they shall drink their pound of coffee or in what manner they shall drive their cars, be it for pleasure or otherwise.

I want it distinctly understood that I am not finding fault with the rationing program of limiting the amount of gasoline or coffee or distance which you or I are to drive our cars. I am, however, taking issue with anybody who says it is legal for a Government agent who is supposed to be your servant to come to you and tell you how you are to use the 3 gallons of gas or the pound of coffee or in what manner you are to drive your car. I contend that no power has been given any agency of Government to do these high-handed things. In order to make such action legal, the agency would first have to get these steps authorized by the Congress.

At this time, I want to pay my respects to those hundreds of patriotic men and women of my district who have given and are giving so much of their time to the work of rationing and draft problems. They have sacrificed much of their time they would ordinarily be giving their families and they are doing a splendid job. I feel proud to represent such a splendid group of citizens whose very patriotism has made this whole war program effective and efficient.

I am sure they will agree with me that power and authority are derived from the people of the United States. I am sure they recognize that to maintain a proper balance of power in America, laws should be carefully interpreted and that citizens' rights must be protected individually and collectively if we are to preserve the America for which our sons are fighting.

I submit to the people of my district a bill which I recently introduced in Congress. This prevents agents or administrators of our Government from superseding their functions and imposing upon the free will of American citizens. The bill prohibits the use of sanctions not provided by law for violations or alleged violations of regulations and orders issued by the Price Administration.

The bill is as follows:

"Bill to prohibit the use of sanctions not provided by law for violations or alleged violations of regulations and orders issued by the Price Administrator

"Be it enacted, etc., That no person who violates or who is alleged to have violated, any provision of a regulation or order issued by the Price Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, shall be subject to any penalty or sanction or the withdrawal or denial of such benefits, rights, or privileges, or such discrimination, as the case may be, is specifically provided by law as a sanction for such violation or alleged violation."

As I have said, this bill was introduced for the purpose of following the wishes and desires of many people back home who feel that the Government has gone far enough in encroaching upon the personal rights of free Americans. If I had not felt that my fellow Americans had gone all out in their patriotic efforts to win this war by their blood, sweat, and tears, I would not have introduced it. If I had not felt they were being snooped upon, threatened, browbeaten, or intimidated while they are trying with might and main to serve their country, I would not have proposed this measure. But I feel that these Americans have an enthusiasm for sacrifice which needs no impetus of fear or coercion. I am sure that taking away their ration coupons for gasoline or their drivers' licenses as penalty for alleged violations will not be fair pay for my friends, neighbors, and countrymen who are giving their all to win the war. I feel equally certain that they are not criminals if they have driven their car to visit a sick friend or if they have stopped at a barber shop to get a haircut without first driving their car straight home and taking a bus back to the shop, or if they have violated unintentionally a dozen other rules they never knew existed. No, those people are free Americans, they are sacrificing their families, their homes, their all for victory and I submit it is poor policy to bear down on them at a time when national success depends upon cooperation, not upon pushing people around.

Forest Products Service Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent on the subject of the so-called forest products service plan:

WILMINGTON, DEL., *January 13, 1943.*

Hon. EARLE D. WILLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILLEY: Please refer to the forest products service plan which we understand is now on the President's desk for his approval.

We sincerely trust you will use your influence to keep this plan from becoming effective. We are in the lumber business and our men are experienced in lumber manufacturing as well as wholesaling and retailing; the writer also studied forestry back in 1908 and 1909. We feel that lumber manufacturers and loggers do not need Government subsidy in any shape or form.

While in normal times our production comes largely from the large band mills throughout the South, the Appalachian hardwood section, and the far West, yet during the last 5 years we have been developing the production of the small so-called peckerwood mills. In other words, we have found that before we entered the war, these small mills needed sales help and instruction as to the proper sizes they should manufacture to meet the requirements of the trade.

Much to our surprise, we found these small mills did not need any financial aid. What they do need is a change in the 40-hour law, deferment of their help by the selective service boards, and proper recognition of their necessity to have tires, trucks, etc. To make a long story short, we in the industry are helping each other wherever possible, and we do not believe that Washington can increase the production of lumber through the approval of this plan. The approval by the President, as we see it, will result in more Government in business, more "red tape," and less production.

Thanking you to give the above your careful consideration, we remain,

Yours truly,

BUTE LUMBER CO.

The Campaign in North Africa and Conditions in Chile and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD extracts from a radio address delivered by Hon.

James W. Gerard in New York yesterday. Mr. Gerard was formerly Ambassador to Germany. The address deals with the political and military situation in North Africa and the military situation in Chile and Russia.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is much sniping at our conduct of affairs in North Africa.

The one thing to be made clear in our relations with the French of north Africa, and indeed with the French everywhere, is that we are in Africa in order to win the war and in order, therefore, to restore France and that every yard of territory which we occupy we hold as trustee for the great French nation, and any authority which we exercise is exercised for the protection of French interests as well as for ultimate victory.

On the other hand, we must make clear that we will not permit the clash of the rival ambitions of little men to interfere with our efforts to defeat the Germans and that those political intrigues, the like of which ruined France, must wait until the end of the war.

We can point to our excellent record of self-denial because after the Spanish War we occupied Cuba, appointed General Wood Governor General and, after cleaning up the island and eliminating yellow fever, returned it to the Cuban people. We did this a second time in Cuba after political disturbance made our intervention necessary.

In Africa I am afraid that we shall find the intrigues and rivalries of French politicians more difficult to eliminate than the yellow fever of Cuba.

After all the proof of the pudding is getting it and, to my mind, the State Department, General Eisenhower, General Clark, and Robert Murphy are deserving of great credit because with very little bloodshed we hold almost all of north Africa as trustee for France and the great and important port of Dakar as well. Generals Eisenhower and Clark, the State Department and its representative, Robert Murphy, were faced by a great problem which I believe they have successfully solved.

Do not forget that there was not much democracy left in France and its possessions after Petain assumed power. On the 12th of August 1941, in a radio broadcast from Vichy, he announced the appointment of Vice Premier Darlan as minister of national defense in direct control of all land, sea, and air defenses, and the marshal went on to say that "authority no longer emanates from below. The only authority is that which I entrust and delegate." Not much democracy in that statement

Payrouton has been made governor general. We do not know much about the workings of his mind, but we do know that he was an able administrator and at one time ordered the arrest of Laval after the collapse of France.

Let us leave this question of north Africa and Dakar in the able hands of our representatives who have hung in the sky the star of the resurgence of France.

General Wavell leads a great force down the west coast of Burma toward the port of Akyab, perhaps a dangerous move, as the Japanese from that part of Burma which they control may attack his flank or cut his line of communications I wish that this force could have gone to the aid of the Chinese.

We have heard much lately about the four freedoms, of which freedom of speech is one.

Freedom of speech includes, of course, freedom of the press and must comprise freedom for the radio as well—the latter something, as I showed you in a previous broadcast, more powerful than the press, and which has restored the power of individual oratory.

But when Winston Churchill, after helping to create the Atlantic Charter, returned to England, did he land in a country where there is freedom of speech? Oh, no.

In Great Britain the radio is in the hands of the government and nothing goes on the air which does not have governmental approval. There is no advertising but the owners of radio receiving sets pay an annual license tax.

Tonight, for example, I do not pay this radio station for the privilege of addressing you, nor does the station pay me. They let me say anything I like which is not libelous and if I become too controversial on the questions of the day, one of the announcers says that my views are not necessarily the views of the station.

Freedom of the radio is a small price to pay for being compelled to listen to the virtues of a toothpaste or a hair dressing.

There would be little use of my talking on the radio unless I could get the news of the day.

It was heartening to learn that the great Republic of Chile had joined the United Nations.

The Chileans cannot be blamed for delaying. With their long, undefended coast, they are peculiarly open to Japanese attack. This leaves the powerful Argentine Republic at odds with the other nations of the hemisphere—the only one maintaining diplomatic relations with the Axis Powers.

Day after day comes splendid news from Russia. How those Russians can fight, and those who believed that Russia in this war would parallel its disorganization and confusion of the last war are astounded not only at the wonderful organization of supply but at the skillful leadership which brings such resounding victories on the frozen steppes.

Red Tape Slows Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, we from the farm districts apprcciated the eulogies that were delivered recently on Farmers' Mobilization Day. I know that the farmers in the Third District of Nebraska appreciated the fine words of praise. They have stayed with their farms through years of drought. They stayed on their farms in spite of the fact that their young men have gone to war and farm hands have been lured to defense plants by higher wages. Our farmers, their wives, and children have kept faith with their Government and have answered the call for more food and more food. They have worked day and night to plant the fields, to care for the livestock and poultry and they have worked unlimited hours to gather the harvest. So they are proud that their work has been praised and they will carry on to provide the essential food for our armed forces, for our civilian population at home, and for the civilian populations and combat forces of the United Nations.

But all of these words of praise are hollow so long as the farmer's desperate efforts to remain on the farm are dogged by handicaps. The handicaps that I refer to are: First, lack of experienced and reliable help—for that matter, lack of adequate help of any kind; second, insufficient new machinery and inadequate repairs to keep old machinery in working order, third, apparently unnecessary complications in the procurement of tractor fuel; fourth, confusing, bewildering procedures, vexing regulations, and puzzling questionnaires; fifth, finally, the not infrequent slowness of Federal agents in servicing the papers that have given the farmer so much trouble in the first place.

I incorporate in my remarks an editorial from the Norfolk Daily News, Norfolk, Nebr., as an illustration of tragic delay directly the result of unreasonable red tape and bureaucratic slowness of foot:

AS BUREAUCRACY DOES IT

The story of Amos Grant, who operates a ranch in Loup and Rock Counties, and his cattle shows up two faults inherent in rule by Government bureaus, as we have it now.

Those who read Wednesday's dispatches will recall that 11 of Mr. Grant's herd of 600 head became infected with scabies last November. He obtained a tank and prepared to dip his cattle and those of his neighbors. He needed 3 small valves, weighing less than 2 pounds. His dealer had the valves but couldn't sell them without an order from War Production Board.

So Mr. Grant obtained a blank and sent it to Washington. The blank came back with instructions he must file a blank for each valve wanted. He fired back his three blanks. They came back because he had said he wanted the valves as soon as possible instead of putting in a definite date. He put in the date and returned the blanks.

This time he seems to have dotted all his i's and crossed all his t's, but the blanks, as the War Production Board's office stamps showed, lay in the Washington office for 14 days before they were sent back with permission to buy the valves.

In the meantime the scabies had spread to 410 head of cattle, some, weakened by disease, had died of exposure, and others had lost weight, some of the heavier ones as much as 250 pounds. Tons of beef were lost.

The first typical fault of bureaucracy shown by this transaction is that the big thing in the mind of the bureaucrat in Washington was not to check the ravages of scabies in this herd, but to see that the forms were filled out with exactness to every detail.

This is being changed now, we are told, to give lower offices greater authority, which is good. But it shows a second fault of bureaucracy. It has taken more than 2 years since the priorities set-up was formed to bring the system into workable shape, and this is being done only under great pressure.

Letter to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Letter to Congress," published in the New Republic for Monday, Jan-

uary 18, 1943. The article is by Prof. Max Lerner, of Williams College.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER TO CONGRESS

Dear Congressmen and Congresswomen, no deliberate body has ever faced a task more highly charged with consequences for the future than the one you face. You will be a crucial sector in the campaign of history; on what you do; on what you allow the President and his administrative assistants to do, may depend the future of our world for a century to come.

Except for a few outstanding leaders, the country knows very little about you. It is not that you are new, though some of you are. It is rather that the conditions of your task make you nameless and faceless, except perhaps in your own district and State. Your work is a crushing burden; you can easily sink into becoming errand boys of your constituents; you are left without effective aid in fact-gathering, and the irresponsible outpourings of some of you have undermined the confidence of Americans in most congressional utterances. You are, on the whole, ordinary Americans. In that lies your great strength, if you can use it. In that also lies your great vulnerability, if you allow yourselves to be swayed by the easy slogans of those who are governed by their hate rather than by their sense of life's possibilities.

In his message to you last week the President set you an example of largeness of spirit. Despite provocations that would have made a lesser man irritable and pugnacious, he spoke to you with simplicity, buoyancy, serenity, and with an underlying note of affirmation. It was a great speech, for a great occasion, delivered by the leader of a great nation. Will you rise to the challenge of its greatness?

The military situation has been going well, in view of the Russian offensives, the warfare in the Pacific, the north African campaigns: Should you any longer withhold the homage due, from liberals and tories alike, to a great commander in chief? Our allies have fought with skill and heroism: Should you not put an end immediately to the talk about diminishing or terminating lease-lend? Our war weapons, with only minor bottlenecks, are being turned out of our factories on a scale hitherto thought impossible: Should you not abate the labor-hatred which could spread among you like a virus and destroy you, as it once destroyed French parliamentary institutions? Our administrative effort is by and large, an achievement to be proud of. To mobilize a nation like America in a brief year, despite its fierce individualism and its localisms, and to do it without the loss of liberty, is exactly the test of a living democracy: Should you not be wary of those who would push administrative irritations into the foreground—those who would have you forget that they are but a small price to pay for victory?

Your leaders want the Seventy-eighth Congress to be known as the victory Congress. It will merit that name only if it understands that victory will not be enough if it is gained only over the enemies in the field. It must also be a victory over poverty and inadequate jobs, over insecurity, over world chaos—and in that war there is no armistice. Do you understand that? Numerous thoughtful people regard the approach of many of you to these problems with misgivings.

This is partly because, on the bare facts of the record, many of you who were most obstructive in the old Congress have been reelected, while some of the best of the old Congress are no longer with you, and some of the new voices sound as if they will be raised for the wrong causes. Nor is this only a matter of party.

There are those who are elated because the party lines are more closely matched in the present Congress than in the last. Theoretically this might be cause for elation, but actually there are nominal Democrats among you who hate the President as heartily as if they were the most primitive Republicans. In terms of actual social beliefs, instead of party labels, the scales were balanced more evenly in the old Congress. They are now heavily weighted against the President, against the administration, against labor, against a militant effort to establish the conditions of a lasting social peace. Only a tremendous effort of imagination and restraint on your part will save the Congress and the country.

Of course you are smart. All of you have survived the great test: you were smart enough to get yourselves elected, often in the face of past legislative records that needed a lot of explaining or ignoring. But does that necessarily mean that you are smart enough to understand the massive issues of our time? In France, where politics were developed to a greater pitch of refinement than anywhere else in the world, some of the governing group were so smart that they maneuvered their country into slavery. In America after World War No. 1 the group of Congressmen that followed the lead of Senator Lodge outsmarted President Wilson, and lost the peace for us and for the world. Political smartness is a cheap commodity, to be bought and sold in any party back room in the country. If you make up your mind to it, there will be nothing to prevent your outsmarting the New Deal forces, and wrecking labor, liberalism, the war effort. The farm-organization lobbyists now in Washington will encourage you and show you ingenious methods. You can break the price ceilings, destroy the rationing system, pass a tax bill which does nothing about the inflationary gap and which bears most heavily on the low-income groups. You can by restrictive legislation goad the trade unions to the point of sullenness and strikes, and then rouse the country to a fever pitch against them. You can extend the reign of terror against liberals in the administrative agencies.

There will be those among your leaders and spokesmen, among newspaper publishers and National Association of Manufacturers careerists, who will encourage these impulses in you. They are your enemies, as they are the enemies of what is best in American life. They will raise the old bloody shirt of bureaucracy again, they will shout about congressional independence. They are not your friends. There are many areas in which you must demand greater publicity for what the administrative agencies do, and recognition by them of the need for consulting Congress and keeping it informed. But congressional independence can become an empty catchword if it leads to government by deadlock of government by pressure whirlpools.

The President's message pointed the way to the greatness of the Seventy-eighth Congress. You may be the Congress to terminate hostilities. You may have the duty of providing the returning soldiers with an America and a world in which they can have jobs and peace. On the first of these two issues, the President said some wise—if self-evident—things about social security. An American counterpart to the Beveridge report will soon be issued by the National Resources Planning Board. Will you have the greatness not to mutilate it? But social security is not adequate to provide jobs; there must also be an economic program for peacetime America, involving the Government in spending and in investment controls which many of you will not like. And above all, both jobs and peace will depend on the enlargement of the United Nations into a long-range world federation, with power not only to disarm the enemy countries, but also to use international force against future aggression, and take economic action for the interdependent welfare of all nations.

If you keep your eyes and your minds open, these things will be plain. If you think with your hates and your prejudices, we shall be lost. We shall, no doubt, find ways of punishing individual members among you, in later elections. We may have the strength to apply pressures to you. But a government of pressures and of belated punishments is scarcely a satisfactory one. If you do not rise to a sense of the greatness of the time, there is little we can do. It will be left to a future generation to pursue you with their contempt, and to call you the Congress of little men in a great time.

Small Business Continues To Get Runaround and Brush-off by Smaller War Plants Corporation—Will of Congress Not Being Carried Out—Example Given Which Represents Thousands of Similar Cases

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Congress has passed the law and provided the money to make it possible for at least 99½ percent of all manufacturing and producing companies in the United States to stay in business during this war and be ready to continue in business after the war is over.

Congress made this possible through the passage of what is called the Murray-Patman Act, which also created the Smaller War Plants Corporation. The act has caused the procurement agencies of the Government to be more liberal and generous in their treatment of small businesses and, therefore, has been very helpful to small business generally. But the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which has $150,000,000 of money provided by Congress and plenty of power to really do a job, has not functioned in accordance with the will of Congress.

This act was signed by the President June 11, 1942. It was contemplated that an office of the Smaller War Plants Corporation would be immediately established in all the War Production Board offices of the country. They are in all of the principal cities of the Nation. This would enable the small businessman to go to his nearest district office and be able to secure a contract and other aid and assistance needed in exactly the same way and manner that the big businessmen have been getting the same services through their personal representatives here in Washington, D. C. These offices have not been established although they could have been established within 24 hours without trouble.

The small man, when he comes to Washington, is almost compelled to go to

some broker or lawyer and pay a fee for the purpose of getting entree to the various procurement agencies. This has cost the small businessmen a lot of money, and, in most cases, the services they have received from these lawyers and brokers have not been effective, and where it was effective the prices paid were outrageously high for the services received.

Congress wanted to make it possible for this small man to get service near home. Obviously the big concerns, who have their personal representatives here year in and year out, and who know by first name practically every procurement officer in the Federal Government here in Washington, have a great advantage over any small man who comes here uninformed, unacquainted, and does not know where to start.

EITHER WAR SUPPLIES OR ESSENTIAL CIVILIAN GOODS INCLUDED

When the Smaller War Plants Corporation is set up as Congress intended, it will not be necessary for the small man to hire a lawyer or broker. Under this act, every producing and manufacturing concern that is making or can make either war supplies or essential civilian goods can obtain from the Smaller War Plants Corporation a contract and not only obtain the contract but may also receive engineering skill and advice, additional capital, rehabilitation of his plant, or additional facilities. In other words, Congress has made it possible for him to receive the same treatment with the same ease that the big businessman now receives. The intent of Congress has not been carried out.

I am perscnally, and so is the Committee on Small Business of the House, very much disappointed because the clear intent and expressed will of Congress has not been carried out in this act.

I am inserting herewith a letter from a businesswoman at St. Petersburg, Fla. Any Member of Congress reading this letter will be impressed that the small businessman continues to get the run-around and brush-off by the Corporation.

Mr. Tyre Taylor to whom the letter is addressed is the attorney for our committee.

It is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 21, 1943.*

Mr. TYRE TAYLOR,
Attorney, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TAYLOR: The following statement covers my experience, endeavoring to secure work for the small, distressed manufacturing plants in St. Petersburg, Fla., from the Smaller War Plants Corporation of this city for which definite purpose I came here in my capacity of business manager of the St. Petersburg War Production Manufacturing Association.

I arrived here the morning of January 8, and called at the offices of the Smaller War Plants Corporation in the Raleigh Hotel, where I was most courteously received and competently interviewed by Mr. Earl C. Noyes. Mr. Noyes turned me over to Mr. F. Laurence Post, who again reviewed my case for a period of about an hour and a half; after which he presented an organization chart which showed the particular functions of the various branches of the Smaller War Plants Corporation service, calling attention to his own department which accepts requests for war work and immediately dispatches lieutenants to the various procurement departments to obtain it.

Mr. Post explained it would take a few days to make these contacts and requested that I return to his office on Tuesday, January 12, at 2 p. m., which I did. On my arrival, Mr. Lacke called Mr. Post out of his office. I was not invited in, nor did Mr. Post tell me the result of the visits of those whom he had presumably sent out to the various procurement agencies in search of work.

Mr. Post most cordially stated he was going to have me presented to Mr. Karyl Meek. Mr. Lacke so presented me. Mr. Meek was also most courteous and expressed an earnest desire to be helpful. Incidentally, no one seemed concerned about the fact I had returned after 4 days' hopeful and anxious waiting while many of the plants I represent, including mine, were facing a shutdown, and found no work awaiting me.

Mr. Meek reviewed a number of cards on his desk and finally inquired whether the plants I represented could manufacture the following items:

Seventy-five house trailers, 500 blacksmith's chests, 25,000 bomb boxes, 600 artillery packs, designating the two latter items as Nos. 688 and 801, respectively.

Mr. Meek also told me to keep in contact with our local War Production Board at Tampa, Fla., which branch he would immediately notify to secure the blueprints and specifications on all three items from the Regional Office at Atlanta, and forward same to me. Mr. Meek explained that small plants in distressed areas such as ours would be given a certain consideration on the subject of price. I left Mr. Meek's office rejoicing and even went so far as to notify the folks back home of my success.

I notified my office at St. Petersburg to keep in daily close touch with the Tampa War Production Board, secure the blueprints and specifications and wire me as soon as they reached my office, when I would leave here for St. Petersburg immediately. I waited until the 19th inst.—7 days during which time neither specifications nor blueprints ever arrived at St. Petersburg. I then called Mr. Meek who informed me he had phoned the Atlanta Regional Office to forward them and was unable to account for the delay. He advised me to have my St. Petersburg office keep on calling Mr. Entz at Tampa and have him follow through. All of this phoning was losing time and money.

Today, January 21, my St. Petersburg office called and informed me of the receipt of a page and a half telegram from Washington signed by a Mr. Murrin, stating an opportunity was being offered us to bid on 75 house trailers—that specifications could be seen at 1109 Longfellow Building, Washington, D. C., and bids must be in Washington at noon January 25. To even attempt to file such a bid without the necessary time to secure prices on materials, etc., in 3 days, would be commercially insane. I informed Mr. Meek of the telegram to St. Petersburg, asked what it was all about and was told to see Mr. McKee at the Longfellow Building immediately as Mr. McKee was leaving Mr. Meek's office in 5 minutes to meet me there. I rushed to Mr. McKee's office. After waiting 35 minutes, he called his secretary, spoke to me and suggested I see Mr. John J. Hartke on another floor of the same building. I went to see Mr. Hartke, in charge of the trailer division. Mr. Hartke explained to me three telegrams had been sent out because the Small War Plants Corporation wanted to give three plants (among them mine) other than those who had been regularly engaged in making these trailers, a chance to bid. After all my effort—just another chance to bid. What possible help can the Small War Plants Corporation afford when all it does is to steer people into more incessant and interminable bidding. We have been bidding for 15 months and our plants closing down one by one.

Thirteen days have elapsed since my first call January 8 on the Small War Plants Corporation in Washington, where I was led to believe I could negotiate a contract, with no hope of securing a contract or an order of any kind—just a chance to bid, and the attendant loss of time and money just to be informed I could keep on bidding.

The items of 25,000 bomb boxes and 600 artillery packs will probably go the way of the house trailers—no specifications nor blueprints yet. Mr. Meek informed me someone had decided to withdraw the 600 artillery packs and make them themselves.

I am willing to lose the time, the money, and perhaps our business if perchance other manufacturers in the same condition as ours in St. Petersburg may benefit by my experience.

Mr. Taylor, is there any redress? Can you refer me to someone with the knowledge and authority required to cause the Small War Plants Corporation to function in accordance with the intent of the law which created it? Namely, to help small business throughout this country survive.

I shall deeply appreciate whatever assistance or advice you may be able to give me.

Respectfully yours,

ST. PETERSBURG WAR PRODUCTION MANUFACTURING ASSOCIATION,
C. E. QUINN, *Business Manager.*

P. S.—I regarded the items Mr. Meek listed as a virtual assignment.

C. E. Q.

ASTOUNDING TESTIMONY ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker, when our Committee on Small Business was at Jacksonville, Fla., December 1 and 2, 1942, Mrs. C. E. Quinn appeared and testified. No witness made a better impression before our committee than Mrs. Quinn. She has done an outstanding work in organizing the producing concerns in her area, in the hope that Government contracts would come their way. In order that Members of Congress may know how these people have been given the run-around by the Smaller War Plants Corporation and procurement agencies in the past, I am inserting herewith a copy of Mrs. Quinn's testimony at the Jacksonville hearing.

It is as follows:

STATEMENT OF MRS. C. E. QUINN, BUSINESS MANAGER, ST. PETERSBURG WAR PRODUCTION MANUFACTURING ASSOCIATION OF FLORIDA, ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

Mrs. QUINN. Mrs. C. E. Quinn, business manager of the St. Petersburg War Production Manufacturing Association, and general manager of Broquinda, Inc., of Florida, at St. Petersburg, Fla.

I do not believe I can add very much to the splendid presentation made here by Governor Holland. I listened to him with great interest, and he certainly presented the case exactly covering the situation in the State of Florida. I come from St. Petersburg, which is apparently the forgotten area so far as the various War Production Boards are concerned. You asked us some distinct questions, Nos. 3 and 4, in the questionnaire, that the manufacturers were expected to answer. The first one was: Have you obtained any war work, and did the War Production Board or other agencies assist you materially or did you obtain that work principally through your own efforts?

The CHAIRMAN. I presume the chamber of commerce sent those out. We didn't send those out. They were assisting us and they have helped us a great deal. That is one of the things they did.

Mrs. QUINN. I thought I should answer those questions here.

The CHAIRMAN. We would be very glad to have you answer them.

Mrs. QUINN. The little war work obtained by the small plants in St. Petersburg and immediate vicinity, has been entirely the result of their own individual efforts. In the districts where the War Production Boards are established, namely in Jacksonville, in Tampa, in Miami, and in other localities, such as Atlanta, where the manufacturers have machine shops, our plants have been well taken care of. When it comes to distributing work outside of those immediate regions, we don't seem to be considered, at least to the extent that we should be. In the interests of our organization I have sat up all night, Sundays, and every other day in order to conform with the Board's requirements, the difficulty being that when you undertake to make a bid you must first line up your materials. If you don't do that, and when you are not able to state on the form specifically that you have the materials either on hand, which you are not supposed to do now, or in sight, you are not—well, you don't stand a very good opportunity of securing the award of the contract, and so you hustle around all over the country, spending money for telegrams and telephone calls to find the material, and if you do secure a small contract, you are liable to have lost the material in the interim, because it has been sold. I have gone through that repeatedly, not only in the interest of our own corporation, but in my capacity as business manager of the St. Petersburg War Production Manufacturing Association, which I organized back in January.

I am the inventor and patentee of a system of controlling temperatures of dry-ice refrigeration for the transportation of perishables in railroad cars and trucks. I have manufactured for a period of years a lot of refrigerating equipment, ice-cream cabinets, ornamental ironwork, sheet-metal work, some machine-shop work, and cabinet work. We have a very well equipped shop. We have a shop covering about 45,000 square feet of floor space, comparatively small, but the largest one in our area. It was my intention in organizing this association to take on prime contracts, which we are competent and financially able to handle—we were then financially able to do, and then distribute to the rest of our people in our locality so as to keep us all alive. Our repeated and continued efforts have not met with any success. Our finances have dwindled, but we have all determined to keep our shops open and carry on as best we could.

If I may, I would like to read a paper, this report, if you don't mind my taking the time [reading]:

"The second question asks: Why have you failed to obtain work?

"We attribute this condition to the following:

"The industrial plants in this locality are relatively small compared with those in the greater industrial centers. Evidently when war was declared, contracts for war requirements were promptly placed with the large, nationally advertised and known manufacturers with whom the procurement agencies had become accustomed to place their orders in peacetime. In the hurried preparation for war, the smaller plants and businesses were overlooked to a large extent, especially in this part of the country.

"The large manufacturers are financially able to maintain their own representatives in Washington and other procurement centers.

"EFFORTS TO OBTAIN WAR WORK

"The writer could submit volumes on the subject of the almost superhuman effort involved.

"In the early part of January 1942 our various manufacturers in the metal, woodworking, textile, machine shop, boatbuilding, etc., industries began to feel the pinch of business curtailment in this locality. This condition became so increasingly acute I organized the St. Petersburg War Production Manufacturing Association, consisting of 21 member companies. Later the St. Petersburg Industries Corporation, with 30 member companies, was organized and merged with the previous association—making a total of 51 member companies. Both of these pools had been certified by the Attorney General's office. We expected this pooling or combination of all our manufacturing facilities, skilled labor, and experienced management to place us in a better position to obtain war work.

"Our continued failure to obtain work proved we were mistaken in our expectations.

"While the result was discouraging, still St. Petersburg industries were no longer competitors as in the past. We had become a group with a united purpose, which, at least, gave us the strength, moral courage, and sportsmanship to 'carry on.' All of the 51 members of the pool pledged themselves to the utmost to keep their plants open and their organizations ready to serve in the war effort. Knowing their useful qualifications, they anticipated at least the overflow from the work of the prime contractors in the form of subcontracts to come in their direction. Their plants have been kept open and their organizations maintained at a serious monetary loss.

"In our effort to secure war work in the early part of this year we considered employing a very active and able man in our community to call on the various procurement officers to secure business. The Tampa branch of the War Production Board frowned on this effort, their objection being it was wrong to pay a man to handle an activity for which purpose the War Production Board itself was established.

"Our plan was therefore abandoned. We have never received a single contract through the War Production Board, although we sincerely believe it has put forth every effort to help us.

"We extended our efforts further as follows:

"1. We classified and compiled approximately 350 pages, itemizing the manufacturing facilities of the 51 member companies of our pool and filed over a hundred bound copies with the various procurement offices and headquarters in Washington and elsewhere throughout the country.

"2. We mailed hundreds of letters outlining the kind and class of work we are qualified to produce. These were mailed to shipbuilders and other prospective sources of work in the South and Southeastern States. Still, no work, except a few small orders for bunks.

"3. The Director of the Industrial Department of the St. Petersburg Chamber of Commerce went to Washington many times and solicited war work for us. He never secured a single order. Other representatives, among them the writer, went to Washington several times and interviewed the various procurement officers there, without avail.

"4. Last December 15, the writer who was in New York at the time—and I think this is pitiful—hurried to Tampa to meet one of the trains traveling around the country submitting samples of products required in the war production effort. I spent a whole day on that occasion with the attendants—commandants, lieutenants, captains, and other officials. I selected a large number of items we could make, and registered for blueprints, plans, and specifications to be sent to us, which the various attendants promised to forward immediately upon their return to headquarters. This train was packed with manufacturers endeavoring to secure war work. Not one single plan, specification, or blueprint, or invitation to bid form, was ever received by any of us as the result of this contact.

"Our continued, persistent application for work brought notice from the War Production Board that its Contract Distribution Division was sending Major Schuman to St. Petersburg. We understood Major Schuman's appearance would solve our problem. We hopefully and anxiously waited 3 months for his advent—not listlessly nor aimlessly—but still carrying on our own individual efforts. Major Schuman never arrived here.

"After Major Schuman failed to appear, and upon the insistence of the writer that we receive some attention from the Contract Distribution Division, a Mr. Salsbury was sent here from that office. A general meeting of our hopeful membership, well attended, received Mr. Salsbury, who launched into a long description of the tremendous number of miles he had been traveling over a long period of time—his efforts in the field and the trouble he had encountered. When his narrative had consumed about 20 minutes and the writer saw to her absolute dismay, there was nothing ahead for the anxious people present, I suggested to Mr. Salsbury: 'Your troubles, plus our troubles, only equal more troubles,' and pointedly requested him to clearly state whether or not he was in a position to secure war work for us. He very kindly gave the direct answer, 'No,' and left.

"Refusing to abandon hope, the writer went to Washington again, and called upon Mr. Dicus, head of the Contract Distribution Division. I had the pleasure of meeting Major Schuman and again seeing Mr. Salsbury in Mr. Dicus' office. Mr. Salsbury told me he was leaving that day for Philadelphia, from whence he would return to St. Petersburg with some real business. Mr. Salsbury did return to St. Petersburg subsequently, but had no business for us. He merely stated he was going to have charge of the southeastern section of the country, and solicited my full cooperation in the efforts he expected to put forth. I extended my hearty offer to do anything in the world I could to assist him, or even serve him in his effort. I never saw Mr. Salsbury again, although over 3 months elapsed since that visit.

"I asked Mr. Dicus on this occasion whether or not he was in a position to distribute war work to the manufacturing plants and machine shops in St. Petersburg. After an exchange of polite expressions of his pleasure in meeting me, and so forth, Mr. Dicus suddenly discovered he had an appointment and left, without giving me any encouragement whatever.

"After the lend-lease went into effect last year, I employed a lieutenant colonel in Washington who was recommended to procure war work for us—I would rather not give the names—and paid this gentleman $100 to procure war work for us, and paid this gentleman $100 a month for 3 months. During this period he introduced me to several people in the Office of Supplies and Accounts at Washington. They subsequently forwarded a number of the old bid invitation forms on various items. These old contract forms required bid and performance bonds. We set about filling out these various forms as they arrived and filed our bids. We found the bid and performance bonds a considerable handicap. They cost us money in the form of a fee for an investigation of our companies by the surety companies to determine our eligibility for the bonds. Although we did secure bonds and filed a number of bids, we never received a particle of work as the result of our time, effort, and expenditure of money. Fortunately, the bid-bond program was ultimately superseded by negotiated contracts."

Mr. HALL. Will you state who mentioned that you employ him?

Mrs. QUINN. Just an old friend of mine, entirely outside of war activities. Would it get this man in any difficulty? I don't want to give that information.

The CHAIRMAN. It is up to you. If there was any effort made to get people to employ brokers to help them get contracts, I would like to know it, and I think that situation

would be very bad and that we should be advised of the information.

Mrs. QUINN. Not now.

Mr. PLOESER. The remedy is continually obstructed by just such things in trying to keep a few abusers out of trouble, and which is keeping our Nation in trouble.

Mrs. QUINN. He is not doing that any more. He is an old man, and clear out of that activity.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't think he was engaged in that business?

Mrs. QUINN. Not now.

Mr. HALL. Was it his activity at that time?

Mrs. QUINN. I don't think so. Here is what he did——

The CHAIRMAN. All right; go ahead.

Mr. HALL. Was this lieutenant colonel a retired individual?

The CHAIRMAN. You just paid him to introduce you, didn't you?

Mrs. QUINN. I thought I was going to get the work.

Mr. HALL. He promoted pretty well about getting contracts for other people?

Mrs. QUINN. No; I didn't say that. Since you ask the direct question, he didn't promote himself. It was rather on the recommendation from an old friend of mine.

Mr. HALL. Did he have an office in Washington?

Mrs. QUINN. No.

Mr. HALL. Did he live in some hotel there?

Mrs. QUINN. No; he has a home there.

Mr. HALL. Do you know whether he represented any other small business people?

Mrs. QUINN. I do not know. I wish he had been able to do something. I would have been very glad after the battle I put up, if he had assisted in any way.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Mrs. Quinn, go ahead.

Mrs. QUINN (reading):

"Numerous invitations to bid have frequently been received after the close of the bid date, or so close thereto it has been impossible to mail bids in time to be received at the hour and on the day required.

"Individual members of our association have traveled from place to place soliciting war work. They have filed numberless bids without result. The outstanding bid experience—and I think this ought to be investigated—was that of an invitation to bid on several hundred thousands of mosquito bars for export."

Our process in St. Petersburg is to take these bids and then hand them out and get individual prices from each one who could make them, and we then compiled the figures in my office, and submitted the actual, or an average bid, not the highest or the lowest, but the average reasonable price based on my figures of labor and material.

"We quoted $1.07 each, barely material and labor. The contract was awarded by the Chicago Quartermaster Corps to a manufacturer in another locality at 19½ cents each. The material alone for these mosquito bars could not possibly have cost less than 76 cents each. We inquired particularly how this could possibly be accomplished, and were told that the Quartermaster Corps could not disclose such information. Subsequently, however, and from a different source, we learned the award at this ridiculously low price was made, first, because the bidder had the material on hand, wanted to use it up, and therefore was willing to take a loss. Secondly, the bidder would get more work of this kind for which he could charge a sufficiently high price to cover his previous loss in the bid of 19½ cents."

Many such instances with which I was not directly contacted came to my attention in this regard, and one of those was in Houston, Tex.

Mr. PLOESER. Have you ever checked back to see whether the bidder delivered on the contract?

Mrs. QUINN. I do not know. They didn't tell me.

Mr. PLOESER. They have to tell you. If you protest, they have to tell you, and you can find out. Mosquito bars do not happen to be one of the war secrets. They make a lot of those.

The CHAIRMAN. Either a Member of Congress or one of your Senators can get you the information.

Mr. PLOESER. I would get it, because it would be interesting to know whether that contract was later renegotiated.

The CHAIRMAN. It doesn't make sense that way at all.

Mrs. QUINN. I know. [Reading:]

"This would have been a contract on which we could all have worked. There are numerous other instances of this description—too many to detail.

"Contracts for boat construction which could have been made and floated here by our competent local boatbuilders were awarded in the North and the boats shipped here by rail."

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us some cases on that Mrs. Quinn?

Mrs. QUINN. I can mention them.

The CHAIRMAN. I heard of one like that.

Mrs. QUINN. That is the Bayboro Marine case. They had that experience. Mr. Orville Ray, of the Bayboro Marine Works, and I will get the specific case for you.

The CHAIRMAN. And you will write the case to me?

Mrs. QUINN. Yes, sir; I will do that.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; fine.

Mrs. QUINN [reading]:

"The Florida Defense Council located at Jacksonville, did its utmost to assist us. The few blueprints and specifications which were submitted to us as the result of their effort represented very small items, and apparently, only such items in the machine shop line, as others did not want to make—perhaps could not make—because of their close tolerances. Some of this work was accepted, but there was not enough of it to do any good. The Florida Defense Council after several months of intensive work, abandoned its activity on the 1st day of September 1942.

"It is not surprising that we have been unable to secure war work when the Florida Defense Council, organized for that specific purpose, was not able to accomplish very much along that line.

"Our individual plant, designated by the pool members to receive prime contracts and subcontracts for the other members of the pool, has spent considerable money making and shipping samples of products covered by bids, and traveling from place to place. The writer made the rounds in Miami, Palm Beach, Fort Lauderdale, and other places in Florida. The Demountable House Corporation at Fort Lauderdale agreed when I called upon its manager, Mr. Hedrick, last August, to distribute work in sufficient quantities in St. Petersburg, to keep us busy for many months. We corresponded with Mr. Hedrick from time to time, urging him to follow through with his agreement. He has never appeared, nor have we heard from him since last August.

"The writer feels this recounting of our efforts has now taken sufficient of your time, and shall close by saying the statements made herein can be substantiated.

"I would like to say in that connection that these repeated and continuous promises caused us to keep our plants open and battle along because I thought I was in position to serve these anxious people, if we waited a little longer, and Mr. So-and-So says he is coming and nobody ever came.

"I might say that we have skilled machinists, engineers, mechanics—engineers with all the grease required on their hands to handle the war work.

"Members of our association have addressed letters to me, in my capacity as its business manager, describing their efforts and expenditure of money, which they could ill afford from their fast dwindling finances, traveling to various places throughout the country in pursuit of war work, which are almost pitiful.

"Some of our plants have, by direct solicitation, managed to secure a few small contracts which have kept them as many have said, 'eating' from day to day. These comparatively small jobs which consist principally of bunks for the Navy, boxes, machine work, repair work, etc., would not have been available had some of these plants not had the material on hand. Many shops here are in a position to work three shifts per day, if they had the work, but nothing in the form of a contract sufficiently large to enable them to establish an economical line production, or anything approaching it. In figuring costs on these small jobs, there has been no possibility of attempting to include a profit—they would get a job here and a job there, and you just lose money on it. Sometimes, only a very small percentage to assist with overhead costs, but more frequently, none at all. We merely ask to serve in the war effort, subsist for the duration, and be able to maintain our plants for production after the war is won.

"Three plants have already closed down. Many more are on the ragged edge and will be obliged to follow suit unless early relief is afforded. One plant was obliged to move away. This was fortunate for it, but not for the community.

"The State of Florida has been generally regarded as a winter playground for tourists. While this is true to some extent, nevertheless, the many advantages attributable to its climate have been attractive to industries. For instance, plant heating is unnecessary. Those of the older generation skilled in engineering and mechanical pursuits, come to Florida to escape the rigors of the northern winters. They find employment here. This fact should be particularly advantageous during the period of the war because employment of those of the older generation, releases the younger people for the war effort. In one plant alone, the average age of those employed, including officers, management, and factory help, is 60 years, and all are producing efficiently, and most satisfactorily.

"Many of the industrial plants in St. Petersburg have been in operation here for 5 to 20 years.

"The only value of this report outlining over a year's intensive effort by the manufacturers of St. Petersburg to exist, is to prove the stalwart, determined effort made by patriotic industrialists to hold their plants and their skilled organizations together, to be ready for the time when their services will be employed in the immediate war effort. They should be put to work now, and enabled to continue after the war is over.

"Whether it is generally realized or not, the failure of small plants, machine shops, distributors, and industrial activities would, to say it mildly, result in a very bad situation for this country after the war is won, because the question of distribution is involved. One of the outstanding distributors of electrical appliances in this country once said to the writer: 'If you can show me how to save 1 percent of my distribution costs, I will hand you a check for $1,000,000.' This man meant exactly what he said, and has proven he knew what he was talking about by his subsequent success. Distribution is one of the great problems having to do with the economic life of this country. If manufacturing plants, machine and repair shops, stores, and distributing activities of all kinds were not generally established in widespread areas throughout this country, the problem of distribution from any centrally located plant would not only be a burden on transportation, an inconvenient and costly problem to

the consumers, but a decided national curtailment.

"Let us, therefore, not overlook the advantages of the smaller plants.

"Let us not assassinate them, either by intent or oversight. Remember, the second fiddle always carries the tune. And that was what we were, a little second fiddle.

"In conclusion, it would seem there is a lack of proper coordination between the procurement agencies and the branches of the war production boards throughout the country. If there had been closer contact, undoubtedly branches of the war production boards would have been in a better position to obtain and distribute war work. Apparently, the regional and the district war production boards have either not been properly authorized, or have not been sufficiently well informed to enable them to function in this regard.

"Some time ago the writer addressed a letter to Mr. Donald M. Nelson, suggesting that several intelligent, well-qualified engineers be sent from his headquarters to investigate the activities of the large plants holding many millions of dollars worth of contracts. These engineers to be vested with authority to determine whether a bottleneck existed in the production in such plants, and if so, to select items that could be more economically manufactured elsewhere, and allocate them to the smaller plants throughout the country.

"We further recommend that when a manufacturer, for instance, of ships, becomes a prime contractor, he devote his time, engineering ability, and labor to the direct manufacture of those ships; not waste his time manufacturing office furniture, ship's lockers, mess tables, and other items which could be easily subcontracted to qualified manufacturers in his immediate vicinity. This is a case in point.

"I visited a boatmaker here and solicited work and got a job for him that nobody else in the world could do, which was painting 2-inch heavy steel, which we did for him, and he pointed with great pride to the fact he had made all these desks and files, and it was a lovely job. I said, 'I thought you were in the boat-building business.' 'Why, Mrs. Quinn, we have even established a very efficient machine shop. We have sheet-metal work.' I said, 'You are making concrete boats. How about pouring your concrete, and so forth?' but no answer."

SMALLER WAR PLANTS HER "WHITE HOPE"

I have a little thought, and I hope you gentlemen realize that you are going to be our "white hope," after what I would call a real battle.

The CHAIRMAN. The courage you have demonstrated is very inspiring to anyone. I will say that—your patience and your patriotism.

Mrs. QUINN. I think you are our "white hope," and ever since I heard of the Smaller War Plants Corporation activities, I have felt this way. True, it has been slow, but let us pass over that and look forward to the future. I, too, have suffered as these other gentlemen here have testified about losing money, and turning in aluminum which I used on my railroad car equipment. When Pearl Harbor came about I bundled it all up. Copper tubing by the ton, carload after carload. They set their price; they determined the price, and at a good big loss to us. I sold the aluminum and took a loss. The copper tubing is still in the offing. Somebody suggested to me if I didn't, I would find myself in jail. I said, that is all right, too, if it is in the interest of those whose rights are to be established.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions of Mrs. Quinn, gentlemen? Thank you very much, Mrs. Quinn.

Mr. Speaker, I am insisting every day that the executive officers put the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act into effect at once by making available to every small manufacturer in this country the services contemplated by Congress when it passed the act.

COL. ROBERT WOOD JOHNSON

Col. Robert Wood Johnson, of the well-known firm of Johnson & Johnson, surgical dressing manufacturers, of New Jersey, has been placed in charge of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. It is my belief that Colonel Johnson will make every effort to do a good job in enforcing this act and in carrying out the will of Congress. It has been almost 8 months since this act became a law and it is bound to be sorely disappointing to all the Members of Congress, who supported it, that nothing so far has been done that is of substantial aid and assistance to small business generally under this act through the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

American Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the text of the People's Platform radio program of January 9, in which I participated as the guest of Mr. Lyman Bryson and the Columbia Broadcasting System:

ANNOUNCER. The People's Platform—Columbia's weekly discussion of vital national issues—comes to you tonight from the Nation's Capital. JERRY VOORHIS, Democratic Member of Congress and Representative of a Los Angeles County district in California, is the guest tonight of The People's Platform, chairman, Lyman Bryson, as the two men discuss the post-war problem of American leadership. In considering the subject of leadership, Mr. Bryson seeks answers to many questions now puzzling far-sighted citizens. Are the leaders of today capable of curing the peacetime ailments of the world and the United States? What are those ailments? Are the leaders of tomorrow trained for world-wide responsibilities going to be available? What are the necessary conditions of American world leadership?

Mr. VOORHIS has served continuously in Congress since 1937 and, as an outstanding liberal, has long played a prominent role in this country's affairs. Before entering Congress he was a factory worker, a freight handler, a ranch hand, and a schoolmaster. And now, here is Lyman Bryson.

Mr. BRYSON. Congressman, we talk a good deal these days about American leadership, something we can't avoid because world conditions will in some degree force it upon us. A good many people are wondering if we are facing squarely the kinds of problems which such leadership would involve. For instance, on the international stage, how many Americans do you think are willing to face the fact that if we have a peaceful world after the war, in the opinion of some very well-informed people, we've got to have a system that will enforce peace against aggressors?

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, I think an increasing number of people are beginning to realize that.

Mr. BRYSON. You would be of that group yourself?

Mr. VOORHIS. Yes, sir, I would. I feel that two mistakes were made after the last war that we can see now, that one of those mistakes was that America didn't take the full measure of responsibility that she should have taken, and that, in consequence thereof, the victorious nations failed consistently and over a period of time to enforce the disarmament of the nations that had caused that war. This time I hope we'll not make that same mistake, and I hope we won't make the companion mistake either.

Mr. BRYSON. Which was——

Mr. VOORHIS. Which was an attempt at, or at least a neglect, which resulted in such severe economic conditions in Germany as to put it in a condition which made for the possibility of the rise of Hitler, and then we let the rearmament take place.

Mr. BRYSON. Of course, that question, you know, Congressman, has two sides. One is the big and dangerous nation, and the other is the little nation, the little nation that feels very strongly its nationality. What are you going to do with those little nations?

Mr. VOORHIS. One of the first jobs after the war has been won will be the reconstituting of those nations which Hitler and Japan have destroyed.

Mr. BRYSON. Are you going to set them all up again?

Mr. VOORHIS. I think that you've got to have at least a restoration of those people's right to self-government, and I think that then in the course of the development of the peace, I would hope that we wouldn't have too many tiny nations. But in future certainly this is true: that we've got not only to remember Pearl Harbor as a war slogan, but we must remember Manchuria, for example, and we must remember the Rhineland, and we must attempt to pursue a course whereby the strong nations like the United States will not permit aggression to get started again, because, after all, that's the place where you can stop a war from beginning.

Mr. BRYSON. Doesn't that bring you right to the question of some kind of international organization?

Mr. VOORHIS. I think it does.

Mr. BRYSON. You can't very well enforce peace unless you've got machinery to do it.

Mr. VOORHIS. That's right; I agree. The only thing I would say about that is that I would hope that in the interim we would concentrate primarily on two points: the necessity of taking responsibility and the elimination so far as possible of the causes of war. Because I think one difficulty that the League of Nations had a lot of trouble getting over was that it was given a virtually impossible assignment, because many of the basic troubles and sources of friction hadn't been removed beforehand.

Mr. BRYSON. That's true, of course, Congressman. I think everybody would agree to that. There's a prior point, however. Suppose you could remove all the reasonable causes of war; you might still have ambitious and aggressive nations.

Mr. VOORHIS. I think so——

Mr. BRYSON. Should we contemplate ceding some of our own sovereignty to an international organization that would have the right to enforce peace?

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, I think——

Mr. BRYSON. Or don't you want to take that up?

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, I—it's of course the crux of the problem. I'd put it this way: That I felt that America, in conjunction with other nations, had to take a responsibility for the enforcement of peace and the prevention of aggression. Now, I'm inclined to believe that it may be that this means more of an extension of sovereignty—than it does a ceding of sovereignty, but it——

Mr. BRYSON. But it does mean if you do it, doesn't it, Congressman, that the larger nations, the more powerful ones, will have to restrain themselves?

Mr. VOORHIS. It does indeed.

Mr. BRYSON. Have we got the kind of world-consciousness and world-conscience that would make it safe for us to set up that kind of an organization?

Mr. VOORHIS. I don't know, but I believe with all my heart and soul that the men who are fighting this second World War are going to expect us to have when we get through with it and when they've finished doing the job.

Mr. BRYSON. Have we got the people or any system of training that will produce the people who could administer that sort of thing?

Mr. VOORHIS. Could administer the international organization? Well, I believe that out of this war experience is inevitably going to come that kind of training.

Mr. BRYSON. It will just have to.

Mr. VOORHIS. I think so.

Mr. BRYSON. In the meantime, what are we going to do with these nations that are torn to pieces by war, these peoples that are driven out of their homes—no systems, no schools, no utilities, no way of living, no farms——

Mr. VOORHIS. I believe that we must face the fact that with the war ended and with victory, that we're going necessarily to have a job, in conjunction with other nations that are still whole, of bringing relief to a stricken world. Now I believe there are some entities in some of those nations that haven't been destroyed. For example, I am told—and this may be a point that may come up later—but I'm of the opinion that there are certain cooperative groups in some of those countries—in Central Europe, for example, and we know there are in China—which might well be the means of helping to make a start in the administration of this relief.

Mr. BRYSON. Kind of a nucleus.

Mr. VOORHIS. Yes; perhaps.

Mr. BRYSON. And is this to be done out of our pockets, Congressman?

Mr. VOORHIS. I don't think that will be necessary altogether.

Mr. BRYSON. Where do we get the food and the supplies and the nurses and the doctors, the material, the capital?

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, you said food first, and, of course, that's a tremendous problem at the moment, and I'd like to put in here that, in my judgment, no policy can be justified in our own country at the present time that would tend to reduce our food production. I think that that ought to be remembered by everybody.

Mr. BRYSON. Produce for the world——

Mr. VOORHIS. I could go on speaking about that * * * for our own people and the world. You say: "Where are we going to get the doctors and the nurses, and so on and so forth——"

Mr. BRYSON. And pay them——

Mr. VOORHIS. We are, of course, training a good many of those people. The Army has a program now of using some of our educational institutions in connection with the draft for the training of men in that field among others.

Mr. BRYSON. Some people are worried, Mr. VOORHIS, because they think that what's going to happen is that Americans are going to pay for the rehabilitation of the rest of the world and get nothing out of it except a little moral satisfaction. Perhaps that would be enough.

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, but, after all, we're going to live in the world of tomorrow ourselves, aren't we? And I think sometimes that we forget that a healthy situation in other parts of the world is a necessary condition of real health at home. We probably can, to some degree, live unto ourselves, but not permanently at peace, I think. Eh——

Mr. BRYSON. Permanently prosperous?

Mr. VOORHIS. Probably not, although I'm of the opinion that in many cases the No. 1 economic necessity is neglected in favor of emphasis on international trade. I mean I believe that the basis of a normal and healthy international trade is the ability of the people within each nation to consume in proportion to their power to produce. And I'm quite certain that the hope that our own Nation and people will take a far-sighted attitude about this international problem is directly dependent upon whether or not we have the wisdom and the foresight to see to it that we have not only full employment but a continuous balance between the power of our people to buy and consume after peace comes and their power to produce, and having that balance at home, so that you've removed the fear on the one hand of unemployment and on the other hand of unsalable farm surpluses in a land of people that need the food, and so on, having removed that fear by securing such an economic balance, then you're in a position to establish a mutually advantageous international trade with other people. Whereas, if you try to solve your domestic problems simply by promoting international trade, I don't think you can do it, frankly.

Mr. BRYSON. When you talk about a balance, Congressman, you're talking about some kind of credit machinery?

Mr. VOORHIS. Yes, I am.

Mr. BRYSON. But what is it? What's your—machine?

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Bryson, I have here a fundamental economic philosophy. I believe that, for democracy and free government to live, two things are necessary. The first and most obvious one is constitutional liberty, and at the moment, I think, very much in the public mind, the vigor of the legislative arm of government. I belong to that arm of government, and I believe very strongly in the maintenance of its proper position. But the other thing that's equally necessary is to have an economic situation in which there is hope for people.

Mr. BRYSON. You can't do that in the old-fashioned way, you think?

Mr. VOORHIS. I don't think you can go back to normalcy, so-called; I don't believe you could just turn things loose and let the powerful organizations push other people out of the business picture, nor do I believe you can permit a depression to take place such as came in 1929, and have either economic or political health. I'm convinced that there are ways to achieve economic balance and to overcome unemployment which do not mean an extension of governmental regimentation or the setting up of new bureaus or agencies, or any of those things.

Mr. BRYSON. You mean entirely by credit control?

Mr. VOORHIS. No, not entirely, but by——

Mr. BRYSON. Partly?

Mr. VOORHIS. By this program, based upon this principle—the principle I would say is that whenever the supply of needed goods exceeds the demand, always increase the demand and never reduce the supply. And don't be afraid to increase the demand, for obviously if you have a situation like that, there is room for increased demand from an economic standpoint, and to keep your people continuously employed, your industries working, you need an additional buying power.

Mr. BRYSON. And you get that—how?

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, you get it in two or three different ways. One is that, to the extent that your economy is expanding, so that you have more goods coming on the market—to that same extent, your Nation as a Nation should have the right, and it should be accorded by law, to use its own credit to the extent of bringing about a like expansion——

Mr. BRYSON. And not by borrowing money?

Mr. VOORHIS. Not by borrowing and not by interest payments.

Mr. BRYSON. Not by selling bonds?

Mr. VOORHIS. No; not by selling bonds, but by the creation of that much new national credit to match the expansion of the Nation's economy and production.

Mr. BRYSON. What do you say to the people who just call that inflation, Mr. VOORHIS?

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, it isn't inflation, because inflation, Mr. Bryson, takes place where the supply of money or buying power gets ahead of the supply of goods. The reason we're worried about it now is because the supply of consumer goods is necessarily being artificially reduced because of the war, and, of course, the monetary policies we should pursue during the war are quite the opposite from what they should be in peacetime to assure full employment and prosperity.

Mr. BRYSON. What you're talking about is the sort of control over credit that the Government ought to have when peace comes again?

Mr. VOORHIS. That's right—that's what I was talking about.

Mr. BRYSON. What about a social-security plan? Is there one to go along with that?

Mr. VOORHIS. I think it's the next step. Because I believe that, if we are to have a balance between consumer buying power on the one hand and power to produce on the other, it's obviously necessary not only to maintain a sufficient total over-all volume of buying power but to have it reasonably well distributed. Now there are two or three ways of achieving that. There is a way to achieve it which does not set up a means of having the Government decide who shall work or who shall not and doesn't set up any new agencies, but which simply, by a law of Congress which can be written in detail, says, in effect, that by means of the payment of just and fair contributions on the part of workers, employers, and other people—by contributions perhaps from general tax funds—we will have a general over-all national insurance or social security program. I think it's got to include, for one thing, a general provision for old-age pensions. And you would say that those people who cannot or should not be employed normally would still be able to consume a reasonable share of the national production, and then you would have a fundamental basis for the maintenance of a steady demand for your goods. It wouldn't be all the answer, but it would be an approach to it.

Mr. BRYSON. What does that do to our tax program? Does it mean we'd carry extremely heavy taxes for an indefinite period?

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, of course the tax burden is onerous and difficult to bear to the extent that people are in economic distress, isn't it? And the greater your production——

Mr. BRYSON. I'm not so sure about that, Congressman; some people hate to pay taxes even when they've got plenty of money.

Mr. VOORHIS. I'm not talking about people wanting to pay them, and I don't want to get mixed up now with war taxes. Perhaps I might just say, so I'll not be misunderstood that, in my judgment, we should come much nearer to paying the war bill than we are now by means——

Mr. BRYSON. Heavier taxes?

Mr. VOORHIS. By means, on the one hand, of taxes, and on the other hand of forced savings, which I've believed for a long time

are a necessity, and I believe that the use of those two devices should be used instead of letting a lot of new money be created by the private banks and then used to buy Government bonds so that the people are obligated to pay that interest on what is really their own credit in the future. But with regard to the support of a social-security program by means of taxation, I do not believe that it would entail a tax burden which would be, by any means, impossible to bear. And if we could have an assurance of full employment, we would have gained far more than we could lose by the payment of those taxes. and may I add that we just simply are going to have jobs for these fellows when they come back from winning this war—that's all there is to it.

Mr. BRYSON. We're going to have to——

Mr. VOORHIS. We're going to have to, and everybody had better put that down as No. 1.

Mr. BRYSON. Does that mean that if there isn't a quick pick-up in normal production, Congressman, that we'll have to have large programs of public works?

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, we might. Now, of course, I don't believe that we're—I think that probably immediately after the war that there will be something in the nature of a boom. I think 6 months, maybe 8 months, maybe a year after the end of hostilities, that we need to look for trouble. I think we've got to be determined that we're not going to go in for a deflation then. I think we should attempt to stabilize the buying power and the debt-paying power of our dollar as of the level at which we come out of the war and try to keep it close to that.

Mr. BRYSON. And enough public works to carry that?

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, now, I want to say this: There are certain public works that we'll have to have after the war, because there'll be things that have been neglected. For instance, we're not keeping up our roads——

Mr. BRYSON. Oh, you mean for their own sake——

Mr. VOORHIS. That's right——

Mr. BRYSON. Not to make employment.

Mr. VOORHIS. You bet. Now, then, the primary public works consideration should be to consider those things which are going to have to be done for their own sake, and, indeed, I would say that ought to be the main thing with regard to public works, and I would rather see the Government as a means of combating unemployment use a broad social security program, use a means of passing consuming buying power down to the people, in order that it can transfer economic power to the people of this Nation, instead of exercising it directly itself. I'm not excluding necessary public construction projects, like dams, the development of electric power in certain instances, roads, flood control—soil conservation and things like that. They are a necessary——

Mr. BRYSON. Is there anything else we need to do? What about price controls? Do we need to maintain price controls? Some people think we do.

Mr. VOORHIS. I would certainly hope that we wouldn't have to maintain price controls in the sense that we have them now. I do believe that we should have had long since, and ought certainly to have in the future, the kind of a balanced monetary system that I've been speaking about, where we don't permit inflation and deflation to follow one another at periodic intervals. But that's a matter of monetary controls and not a matter of the intimate regulation of prices, such as we have today because of the disparity between purchasing power on the one hand and the reduced supply of consumer goods on the other, which is the real reason we have price control now.

Mr. BRYSON. Would that also take care of differences—serious differences between the normal earnings of farmers and wage earners, industrial workers?

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, that's another great big question. I mean I think it would help——

Mr. BRYSON. It's a question that worries people.

Mr. VOORHIS. That's right.

Mr. BRYSON. You've got both kinds in your district?

Mr. VOORHIS. Indeed I do! I think that America's got to raise her sights on the matter of agricultural income. We've gotten used to the idea that farm folk are supposed to be at a level about half as high as city folk are with regard to income. I think we've got to get over that. I think the quicker we do it the better. And I feel very profoundly that the type of monetary system that I've spoken about already some tonight will be of tremendous benefit to agriculture, because, after all, one of the things that's hurt agriculture the most has been periods of deflation and inflation. Agriculture, you see, is still a competitive industry, and it was farm prices in 1920, when we returned to so-called normalcy, that were reduced to half their former level in about 8 months. With industrial prices that didn't happen, but in farm prices it did. Now we've got to be determined that it won't happen again, and we've also got to maintain farm prices, I think, at a reasonably decent level.

Mr. BRYSON. But industrial workers, Congressman, organize; they come together, they exert a common strength.

Mr. VOORHIS. That's right.

Mr. BRYSON. Is there any way for farmers to do that?

Mr. VOORHIS. Oh, yes—through farm cooperatives. And two kinds, I'd say. One, the cooperative for farm producers, whereby they market together their commodities so that they are not at the mercy of the middleman, and the other farm consumers' cooperatives, if you want to call them that, whereby they purchase together the things they need and sometimes even produce some, like they've done in Ohio with fertilizer, for example, and like they're doing in some—in Minnesota and other parts with gas and oil and things of that sort. Cooperatives are means whereby our people can do a great deal for themselves in solving economic problems without depending on government at all, and, for my part, I want to see those means taken just as much as we can take them.

Mr. BRYSON. You don't believe in government intervention for its own sake?

Mr. VOORHIS. No, sir, I don't.

Mr. BRYSON. You think it's bad on its own account, unless it's absolutely necessary?

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, that's a big question—

Mr. BRYSON. That is, you'd reduce it to the minimum?

Mr. VOORHIS. Yes, I would. I mean to say that I believe that there is a real danger from people becoming too dependent on the Government and there's a real danger from an increase of governmental power. I really believe that. Now, then, in saying that, I don't mean to say that I think the Government is wrong in setting up an electric power yardstick, because electric power is a natural monopoly and that monopoly if turned loose and let alone will take more of the consumer buying power in that area than it's entitled to, and therefore hurt other businesses. But I do mean to say that I'm not for the increase of governmental agencies. I'm not for trying to solve our problems by having Congress just pass a bill and say that we hereby create a new agency and give that agency broad and generalized powers to solve a problem; I think we've got to do much better than that. I think we've got to be ready to do better than that when the war has been won.

Mr. BRYSON. When you say we've got to be ready, Congressman, it reminds me of the fact that the only piece of legislation that's come to my attention, the only piece of legislation that's really been talked about that would prepare the legislative arm of the Government, is your own House joint resolution—what's it now? No. 36.

Mr. VOORHIS. That's right. I appreciate your mentioning that, Mr. Bryson.

Mr. BRYSON. Well, are you going to get it through? Are you going to get a commission set up on post-war problems?

Mr. VOORHIS. I earnestly hope so. You can be sure I'm going to do my best. I reintroduced my bill on the first day of the session, and I'm going to press for it, and I know that there's tremendous public support for it.

Mr. BRYSON. What do you want? Is it to keep Congress better informed of what outside experts think ought to be done, or is it to organize the powers of Congress for more efficient application to this kind of problem—or both, perhaps?

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, both, and more yet. No. 1 is that all sorts of people are now doing post-war planning, and so on. I believe that all those different and separate efforts of governmental agencies and private groups are worth while and to the good, as far as they can go, but I think you've got to have one central over-all group, and I think the initiative on this matter ought obviously to come from the Congress of the United States. I want the Congress to be prepared, not just to combat Executive power, not just to take back the powers and prerogatives that properly belong to it—although I want it to do that—but I want it to have a constructive program of its own, which, after all, is the only way that it can really go before the people and say that it's occupying its proper place. That's the first thing.

The second thing is that I have believed for a long time that the important economic groups of the Nation have got to recognize the fact that the problem America faces in the future is so fundamental to the preservation of liberty and freedom and constitutional democracy that it won't do for them to just come before Congress and make demands; but that industry and labor and agriculture and all the rest of us have got to recognize that we have a responsibility for working out this problem and that maybe we've got to do a little bit better than just present our demands. And so I'd like to see the people from those different groups meeting together on a commission, which would be primarily congressional, to sit down now to begin to develop democratically four or five basic principles of policy which we could follow and which we know would reasonably assure us of economic health after the war is won.

Mr. BRYSON. Well, before you get to that assignment, how are you going to get the major groups of America into such a commission? The power has got to remain with the congressional members, hasn't it?

Mr. VOORHIS. Yes; I think it does, and the resolution in its present form provides that the chairman and vice chairman shall always be from the congressional group, and it divides the membership between the 10 congressional members who are really the full members and the other members who are associate members but who would participate fully in all the work of the commission, except reporting legislation to Congress, and that would, of course, have to be done by the congressional members alone.

Mr. BRYSON. As I understand it, these associate members represent large groups of American interests and American thought.

Mr. VOORHIS. That's right. I can tell you what they are briefly. There would be three from industry, three from labor, three from agriculture, two from consumers' organizations, three from cooperatives, producer cooperatives, credit unions and consumer cooperatives, three from the churches, two from educational associations, three from

veteran organizations, at least one of whom has to be a combat veteran of the Second World War, and one economist and one engineer. Now, and three from the executive department of Government.

Mr. BRYSON. I hope some of these other people are economists as well as the one who has that ticket on him. It's going to be a little tough on him.

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, they would be. I imagine it would be tough on him, but perhaps he could hold up his end.

Mr. BRYSON. And you think Congressmen who belong to that and are real members, where these people are associate members, are going to listen to the associate members?

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, the job of Congressmen is to listen to the people, you know.

Mr. BRYSON. And try to figure out what they want him to do?

Mr. VOORHIS. That's right. I think that Congress would be very much impressed by anything that that group of people had to say.

Mr. BRYSON. We've got a new Congress on our hands, or perhaps it would be better to say we are in the hands of a new Congress, Mr. VOORHIS. A lot of people say that this Congress has a mandate. I think some of the Congressmen think it has a mandate to just stop everything that's going on now and start over again, perhaps not in winning the war, but in every other present tendency. Is that the mandate that this commission would be putting into effect for the post-war?

Mr. VOORHIS. No; I certainly don't think so.

Mr. BRYSON. Does that mandate exist?

Mr. VOORHIS. I wouldn't interpret the mandate that way at all. I think there undoubtedly was a mandate from the people that confusion be ended, that they be given a much clearer and simpler idea of what the Government intended to do about some of these programs. I think the mandate meant that the people desire to see a streamlining of the war effort. I've spoken about that other places, but there isn't time now. I think the mandate also meant that in future the people did want to see their problems solved with less reliance upon special governmental agencies. But I don't think the mandate meant that Congress should turn around and go backward. Certainly it didn't mean that Congress should destroy the necessary powers of government to prosecute this war effectively, and I think it will be misinterpreted if it's regarded as a mandate to destroy the hope of people in a better tomorrow.

Mr. BRYSON. I'm glad you're hopeful and I'm glad you've got a solid and substantial idea for putting that hope into effect.

Ruml Plan Will Not Lose Treasury Revenue, Say Accountants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks there has been some criticism of the proposed Ruml pay-as-you-go tax plan on the theory that the Federal Treasury would lose substantial revenue if our Nation's tax clock were moved ahead 1 year. I am today placing in the RECORD a letter written by Mr. Beardsley Ruml, of New York, which goes into this matter thoroughly. He makes the direct statement that "the gross loss will be more than offset by better tax collections and collection methods without increased burden on this account to any taxpayer." In other words, the Federal Treasury would lose no revenue and the taxpayers of our Nation would be on a current basis, which would eliminate income-tax debt and do it without loss of revenue and with no additional burden on any taxpayer.

Mr. Ruml presented this letter and statement to a group of members of the American Institute of Accountants for their opinion as to whether or not his statement was correct. A large number of accountants have analyzed and studied the proposal and submitted letters stating his analysis is correct. The signatures of these accountants and the firms they represent are made a part of the letter I have submitted for the RECORD. I want to urge the membership of this House to study the letter closely. It follows:

JANUARY 22, 1943.

Representative FRANK CARLSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CARLSON: With respect to the so-called "loss" which some contend that the Treasury would suffer as a result of the pay-as-you-go plan, many people believe that not only would there be no loss, but that the gain might be substantial. I share this opinion, and I wanted you and others to know it and to know the reasons why.

I must explain why I have so far never made this claim in any public address. First, it is my conviction that any gross loss, less offsets estimated at any figure one chooses, is so small as compared with the present and long-enduring benefits of reforming our income-tax practice that it seems to me irrelevant whether the net position is a little or a lot more favorable than the worst that can possibly be claimed. Second, the demonstration of the absence of any net loss is sufficiently technical and the result so paradoxical that I feared that debate on this point might becloud more important issues.

However, for the record let me state my views.

The proposition that the Treasury would have no net loss by setting the tax clock 1 year ahead, thereby eliminating personal income-tax debt, depends on two major assumptions which seem reasonably probable.

1. That over a long period of years national production will increase, with variations from year to year to be sure, thereby increasing the taxable real income on the average from year to year over a long period; and

2. That we adopt a withholding tax that will obtain collection at the source at least on the bulk of salaries, wages, and dividends.

Let us take 1943 as compared with 1942. It is clear that the aggregate taxable national income in 1943 may be expected to produce more revenue at the same rates than the income of 1942. Some taxpayers will pay less because their income in 1943 was less than in 1942, but this will be more than offset by those who pay more. Now it is important to notice that those who pay more do not pay more than they would otherwise pay on their 1943 income, they only pay it sooner, in 1943 instead of 1944. If we project the situation over a long period, this taxpayer living whatever number of years he does, pays no more tax but pays what he pays 1 year sooner. In return, he is on a current basis and out of income-tax debt.

Let us consider what the status of the Treasury would be for the period January 1, 1943, to December 31, 1962.

Under the present system of collecting taxes, the Treasury would have collected taxes for the 20 years, 1942 to 1961, both inclusive.

Under the pay-as-you-go system the Treasury would have collected taxes for the 20 years, 1943 to 1962, both inclusive.

The change is that by skipping 1942 the Treasury gains 1962, or any other year that one wishes to take at the end of any stated period.

If one accepts as axiomatic that national income over a period will rise it is evident either

(a) That the Treasury will have collected more dollars under the pay-as-you-go system than it would under the present system, both at exactly the same rates, or

(b) That the Treasury to collect the same number of dollars under the period under the two systems would be able to collect them under pay-as-you-go at lower rates than under the present system.

It is further true that people who either stop paying taxes or have their income reduced during such a period would have paid less taxes for the period, and that taxpayers who became new taxpayers during such a period would have paid their taxes 1 year sooner but for their lifetime will have paid no more tax. It is therefore true that since the Treasury is on a cash-receipts basis and not on an accrual basis, the Treasury not only does not lose anything by adopting a pay-as-you-go basis in lieu of the present system, but it actually gains as the country continues to grow.

So much for the demonstration, and now to reconcile the paradox: How can the present taxpayers over the generation gain 1 year's income taxes and at the same time the Treasury gain revenue and no taxpayer pays more than he would otherwise be called on to pay?

The answer is to be found by examining the position of the Treasury on Judgment Day when the books are finally closed. Under our present system the Treasury would have billions owing from the taxpayers. These would be bad debts in any case. Since the Government is not concerned about any final loss on Judgment Day, the Government is able to turn the tax clock ahead, make all taxpayers current, eliminate income-tax debt, and do it without loss of revenue and with no additional burden on any taxpayer.

I am indebted to Mr. James W. Gerard for his vivid allusion to Judgment Day in his letter to the New York Times which prompted me to put down my thoughts on this question. You will recall that in earlier statements I have said that the "gross loss would be partially offset by better tax collections and collection methods." If we assume that we shall have a long-time trend toward rising national production, and rising taxable real income, and if we have an efficient withholding tax, I believe we can truthfully say, "The gross loss will be more than offset by better tax collections and collection methods without increased burden on this account to any taxpayer."

I submitted the foregoing to a group of members of the American Institute of Accountants for their opinion as to whether my statement as to the fiscal status of the Treasury is correct, and I have letters from them in which they all state. "Since the United States Treasury operates on a cash receipts basis there is, in my opinion, no reason to suppose that the receipts from taxation of individuals in 1934–44 would be any less if the pay-as-you-go system were adopted than on the present basis. Furthermore, over a long period of years it is likely that the income of this country will increase and the receipts under the pay-

as-you-go system would be greater with the same tax rates than under the present system."

Attached is a list of names of the persons who have signed the letters.

Very sincerely yours,

BEARDSLEY RUML.

William L. Ashbaugh, Price Waterhouse & Co., New York City; F. Merrill Beatty, Arthur Andersen & Co., New York City; Samuel J. Broad, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co., New York City; Percival F. Brundage, Price Waterhouse & Co., New York City; George Cochrane, Deloitte, Plender, Griffiths & Co., New York City; H. Hilton Dumbrille, Lybrand, Ross Bros. & Montgomery, New York City; J. P. Friedman, Touche, Niven & Co., New York City; P. W. R. Glover, Barrow, Wade, Guthrie & Co., New York City; Thomas B. G. Henderson, Lybrand, Ross Bros. & Montgomery, New York City; John B. Inglis, Price Waterhouse & Co., New York City; Paul K. Knight, Arthur Andersen & Co., New York City; Norman J. Lenhart, Lybrand, Ross Bros. & Montgomery, New York City; Earnest O. Lothrop, Price Waterhouse & Co., New York City; Prior Sinclair, Lybrand, Ross Bros. & Montgomery, New York City; Victor H. Stempf, Touche, Niven & Co., New York City; C. Oliver Wellington, Scovell, Wellington & Co., New York City.

Demands for United States Cotton During the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Dr. A. B. Cox, director, bureau of business research, University of Texas:

Cotton is grown to sell. The demand for United States grown cotton, and especially Texas cotton, has been altered substantially since 1940 due to the fact that the market has been changed from a world market to a domestic market, and the domestic market has been changed from a market for civilian goods to one predominantly for war goods.

The great majority of cotton mills in the United States were built to consume medium staples and grades of United States grown cotton, and foreign markets took the larger portion of our short-staple, low-grade cotton, as well as our highest grades. A large part of the market we formerly had for low-grade, short-staple cotton is thus cut off for the duration of the war.

The war itself has shifted the demand of United States cotton mills from the shorter side of medium staples toward the longer staples and better grades.

Reports of United States cotton mills to the United States Department of Agriculture on qualities of cotton consumed supplemented by data on qualities sold by cotton merchants indicate that only about 1 percent of the demand for cotton is now for staples shorter than seven-eighths of an inch, or about 120,000 bales, whereas production of these staples in the United States amounts to from about 2 to 6 percent, or from 250,000 to 700,000 bales.

The demand for seven-eighths- and twenty-nine thirty-seconds-inch staples amounts to about 10 to 13 percent of total consumption, whereas production ranges from 11.3 to as high as 21.3 percent, and during the 5 years ending August 1942, average of 15.3 percent of the crop. There is apparently some overproduction of these staples in relation to current demand.

The second largest demand for cotton by American mills is for the staple length of fifteen-sixteenths and thirty-one thirty-seconds, which account for 25 percent of the Nation's consumption for the years 1939–40 and 1940–41 according to the United States Department of Agriculture. That was not only true prior to 1941 but percentages of sales indicate that that is still the case even this year. It is important to note that these two staple lengths alone constitute from 20.9 to 27.6 percent of the Nation's crop. The December estimate indicates that only 20.9 percent of this year's crop is of these staples. The production of these staples during the 5 years ending 1943 has averaged 24.8 percent of the crop. Sales indicate this year's production of these staples will be less than the demand at the present high rate of consumption.

The largest amounts of cotton consumed in the United States are of the staple lengths of inch and $1\frac{1}{32}$ inches. These two staples constituted 36 percent of total consumption during the years 1930–40 and 1940–41, according to the United States Department of Agriculture. Sales to date this year indicate very little change to slight decrease in the demand for these staples. Production of these two staples over the last 5 years has ranged from 25.4 to 38 percent of the crop and has averaged 32.3 percent. This year they constitute 35.4 percent of it.

Demands for cotton measuring $1\frac{1}{16}$ and $1\frac{3}{32}$ inches show a substantial increase from 1939 to the present in the United States. During 1939–40 17 percent of the cotton consumed was of these lengths; in the season 1940–41 it remained at 17 percent. Percentage of sales indicate an increase during the year 1941–42 for these staples and more especially for the year 1942–43. According to grade and staple estimates reports of the United States Department of Agriculture, there is a wide variation in the percentage of these staples produced, the range during the last five seasons being from a low of 13.1 percent this year to as high as 20.3 percent in 1940–41, and a 5-year average of 17.2 percent of the crop.

Demands for cotton $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches and longer normally constitute about 10 to 11 percent of the Nation's total cotton consumption. Sales during the season 1941–42 indicate an increase in the demand for these qualities. According to reports of the United States Department of Agriculture, there has been a substantial increase in the production of these staples this year from around 8 percent of the crop to 13.9 percent. Consumption of these qualities in the United States has normally exceeded production, and the difference was made up by imports especially from Egypt. Cutting off of imports and increased demands for war uses have created real shortages of these staples, and where feasible, farmers should increase production of these staples as a part of the war program. This effort to increase production of long-staple cotton should not blind us to the important fact that they are specialities and that the great bulk of the cotton consumed in the United States is fifteen-sixteenths to $1\frac{1}{32}$ inches.

Facts just cited should be extremely helpful in clarifying the objectives of the cotton production program of Texas this year to make the industry more profitable and more serviceable in winning the war. The loss of the export market and the demand for longer staples in the United States resulting from the war indicate very positively that Texas farmers growing the short staples should shift to varieties producing staples at least fifteen-sixteenths to $1\frac{1}{16}$ inches for which sales and consumption figures show to be relatively scarce.

Quality differences being paid in the market emphasize the correctness of the above figures and observations. The average discount for thirteen-sixteenth in the 10 designated spot markets in the South is 155 points off fifteen-sixteenths inch and the local or farm market difference is about 200 off. Even seven-eighths inch is worth about $5 per bale or 100 points off fifteen-sixteenths inch.

Premiums for staples longer than fifteen-sixteenths inch do not reach significant proportions below $1\frac{1}{16}$ inch. Inch cotton is worth about 25 to 30 points, or $1.25 per bale more than fifteen-sixteenths inch. The premium for $1\frac{1}{16}$-inch staple on the other hand, jumps up to 130 points, or $6.50 per bale more than fifteen-sixteenths inch.

Consumption figures, market demand, and premiums in the market indicate there is still room for increases in the production of the longer staples. The fact is that while commercial premiums for these longer staples have declined substantially in recent weeks, they are still wide, especially for the very long staples such as is produced by Sea Island, Pima, and the Pima-Sakel cross being grown especially in the El Paso irrigated area.

The strong preference of the market for the medium grades of cotton (grades measure the amount of trash, dirt, etc., in the cotton and its preparation) is due to the fact that most United States mills were built to consume these grade qualities. This is significant because the amount of opening and cleaning machinery installed was just sufficient to clean a supply of cotton of these grades to meet the capacity requirements of the mill's drawing and spinning equipment. The result is that if such a mill tries to consume lower grades it finds it cannot clean as much cotton as it is set up to draw and spin and the result is a reduction in output.

In view of the facts just cited relative to the demand and the further fact that our mills do not have the capacity to manufacture all of the cotton goods in demand, it is highly important that farmers furnish the mills a sufficient supply of the medium to better grades and medium to longer staples to guarantee maximum production for the war program.

After the war demands for cotton will be discussed later.

A. B. Cox,
Director, Bureau of Business Research, The University of Texas, Austin, Tex.

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from our former colleague, Hon. Ross A. Collins, together with the enclosure referred to therein:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 16, 1943.*

Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: I am frankly at a loss to understand why certain Members have suggested

that the National Youth Administration be abolished. At this critical time, when every one of us is committed to the single-minded purpose of winning the war, can it be that some of us are so misinformed or so uninformed that we are in grave danger of cutting down a vital flow of labor in the war effort?

The National Youth Administration is turning over to industry 700 trained persons a day, or close to 20,000 a month. These are not merely figures; they are facts. Attached for your information is a list of the number of National Youth Administration youth who have accepted employment in private industries and public agencies by States for the 5-month period July through November 1942.

A few days ago—as recently as January 11, 1943—the Kaiser Shipbuilding Corporation wrote to the National Youth Administration. Because this letter is representative of letters from hundreds of other firms which are employing National Youth Administration trained workers with good results, I quote it:

"This is to advise you that the Richmond shipyards will employ all the sheet metal, coppersmith, machinist, and welder trainees you can train.

"We have found a definite shortage in skilled men within these crafts and, with the anticipation that we will hire approximately 20,000 additional employees within the next 3 to 4 months, we believe the shortage will become still more acute. This figure might also be enlarged by the inroads made on our personnel because of selective-service, enlistments in the armed forces, etc.

"These shipyards appreciate the work your organization has been doing in the past, and thank you for your continued cooperation."

I have asked National Youth Administration for letters from producers that employ large numbers of workers, and find that these letters are similar and come from all sections of the country and from nearly every large war-production plant in the Nation. The Aluminum Co. of America says that "your organization has done a wonderful job * * * in securing qualified workers to meet our needs." The Alabama Drydock & Shipbuilding Co. writes, "We trust that you will continue to give us the service that you have in the past." From Fort Worth, Consolidated Aircraft writes, "We have hired and are continuing to hire a large number of young women trained by the National Youth Administration, and feel that this is one of our best sources of supply." From San Diego the same company writes, "The students sent us by your school, about 100 in all, have been regarded as superior in attitude and very competent in performance of their duties." International Harvester Co. states that "We are forced to lose valuable machine hours to train these people within our plant. If they could come to us from training centers such as National Youth Administration has available, our program would be materially benefited." The Bridgeport Brass Co. is planning to requisition a number of National Youth Administration trainees periodically "in order that we may keep our plants supplied with the proper men." The David Bell Co., of Buffalo, thanks the National Youth Administration for its assistance, adding, "We find that it has helped speed production by being able to have our girls trained before they are employed by us." From New Orleans the big Higgins plants write, "We hope that you will be able to house and train at least 2,000 youth for us by March, which is the time they will be needed."

I have quoted briefly from a few letters and will be glad to submit others at greater length. I feel that you should be fully informed as to the importance of the job National Youth Administration is doing, and has the capacity for doing, and the importance of the National Youth Administration to such firms as the Kaiser Shipbuilding Corporation and others who are so magnificently expediting the war effort.

I hope that the service of this organization will be recognized and continued. It seems to me only fair that those who would abolish it must prove that they can provide the additional 700 workers trained in the unit skills needed for war production who are now being furnished daily by the National Youth Administration, and at less cost to the Government. There is no evidence that they can do it. Until they offer proof, I urge that we keep the National Youth Administration, which has proved it can do the training job. Increased production is imperative; otherwise, our fighting forces will not have the implements and facilities necessary to carry on the war.

Attached is a statement showing the number of youth who left the National Youth Administration to accept jobs in private industries and public agencies, July through November 1942.

With warmest regards, I am,

Very sincerely,

ROSS A. COLLINS.

Number of youth who left the National Youth Administration to accept jobs in private industries and public agencies—regional and State summary—July 1942 through November 1942 [1]

Region I:	
Connecticut	2,566
Maine	777
Massachusetts	2,559
New Hampshire	170
Rhode Island	367
Vermont	251
New York	5,867
Total	12,557
Region III:	
Delaware	30
New Jersey	1,730
Pennsylvania	9,300
Total	11,060
Region IV:	
District of Columbia	598
Maryland	2,801
North Carolina	3,343
Virginia	2,485
West Virginia	1,873
Total	11,100
Region V:	
Kentucky	3,283
Michigan	3,429
Ohio	5,441
Total	12,153
Region VI:	
Illinois	5,757
Indiana	3,152
Wisconsin	3,890
Total	12,799
Region VII:	
Alabama	1,825
Florida	954
Georgia	2,783
Mississippi	1,654
South Carolina	829
Tennessee	1,273
Total	9,318
Region VIII:	
Iowa	1,650
Minnesota	2,636
Nebraska	586
North Dakota	187
South Dakota	311
Total	5,370
Region IX:	
Arkansas	2,368
Kansas	1,618
Missouri	2,185
Oklahoma	2,921
Total	9,092
Region X:	
Louisiana	1,510
New Mexico	171
Texas	5,237
Total	6,918
Region XI:	
Colorado	337
Idaho	440
Montana	132
Utah	339
Wyoming	176
Total	1,424
Region XII:	
Arizona	209
California	2,284
Nevada	1
Oregon	428
Washington	3,390
Total	6,312
Grand total	98,103

[1] Includes an estimated number of youth who left to seek employment and for unknown reasons.

War Production Problems

REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Congress is confronted with the most momentous problems of any in our history. Winning this war is the first consideration for action.

More escort vessels are needed if we are to cut down the loss of our ships, foods, and supplies. More aviation gas is needed if we are to hold up our African campaign. More rubber is needed if this country wants to keep pace in war-goods production.

Does this Congress or the President know for certainty which of these rank first in order of necessity? I am offering a resolution that will direct or request the President to employ a committee, such as the Baruch committee, to study and give us the information we need to deal with this problem intelligently. The Army, Navy, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Jeffers are divided in their opinion. The Baruch committee could answer this question, and they should be brought back and given the assignment.

BARUCH COULD TELL US

The Baruch rubber committee is needed again.

Its authoritative, unbiased opinion on a major question of war production policy can be extremely valuable.

The issue is simply this: For which do we have the most pressing need—naval escort

vessels, greater capacity for making aviation gasoline, or synthetic rubber plants?

Or, if one doesn't definitely stand out above the others, what division shall be made of critical materials needed for all three?

The Army and Navy, on the one hand, and Donald Nelson, War Production Chief, and William M. Jeffers, Rubber Director, on the other, have been unable to agree on this issue. The public, vitally concerned by the outcome, has its opinions, but they aren't based on adequate knowledge of the facts.

Perhaps even the participants in the controversy don't have enough information on the other side.

The President has delegated to James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, the duty of ironing out the dispute. But Byrnes is not a technical expert. He is primarily a politician, or, if you prefer, a statesman. Those qualifications aren't good enough in this case.

Byrnes needs advice. The President needs advice. To what better source could they turn than Bernard Baruch and his associates, Dr. James A. Conant and Dr. Karl T. Compton? These three men are already fully familiar with the rubber situation, including present supplies and the job which lies ahead in creating a whole new industry to make artificial rubber.

They have intimate knowledge of production problems. They are capable of understanding both the military and the civilian point of view. They are so highly respected that there would be faith in their recommendations and a willingness to accept them.

Estimates as to the needs for aviation gasoline ought not be much different now than they were last September, when the Baruch committee recommended that nothing be allowed to stand in the way of the synthetic rubber program as then outlined.

But the submarine menace, which was thought a few months ago to be lessening, is now realized to be worse. The Navy says it needs more escort vessels if it is to keep much of our production and manpower from being wasted in ship sinkings. Unfortunately, these escort vessels take some of the same materials that are needed for the synthetic rubber plants.

The armed forces not only think their needs are more important but they believe, according to Arthur Krock in the New York Times, that the synthetic plants, once in production, will bring in more than their rated capacity. The Army and Navy would cut civilian use of rubber considerably more, in order that synthetic requirements might be reduced.

Neither Joe Doakes nor President Roosevelt knows the answers. The Baruch committee could find them. The committee should be called back and given the assignment.

Ship Construction for 1942 by the United States Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the United States Maritime Commission and every other agency of government will receive criticism so long as the war continues. That is natural. Democracies cannot be satisfied. They should not be. The same is true of republics, and that is the form of government we have in the United States. The urge should always be to do better. The Maritime Commission established in 1942 a world record for the construction of ships, and it proposes to surpass that record in 1943. When the goal was set for 1942, I doubted seriously that it could be met. The answer is that the goal has been surpassed.

This Republic and all its allies are indebted to the United States Maritime Commission for the answer it has made to the Nation's call. How well that call has been answered, the letter of Admiral Vickery to me dated January 19, will disclose. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include therein the letter to which I have referred.

I extend my heartiest congratulations to Admiral Land, Admiral Vickery, and all of the other members of the Commission, to all of the employees of the Commission who have brought this result, to the shipbuilding companies and all of their workers who have made these magnificent contributions to victory possible, with the earnest prayer that each of us may realize that victory is in sight if we will only redouble our efforts, cease our bickerings, and each give to our respective tasks all that is in us and more. Generations of the future will then rise up and call us blessed.

The letter of Admiral Vickery follows:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, January 19, 1943.

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: Now that the successful accomplishment of the 8,000,000-ton deadweight merchant shipbuilding objective for 1942 is a matter of history, in view of the part which you and your committee played in its achievement, and in order that you may have a better picture of the progress which has been made, there are enclosed tabulations of the year's deliveries by merchant shipyards, grouped according to regions, yards, and types of vessels. A trip to the Gulf coast, made on rather short notice, prevented my furnishing you with this data earlier, as I had intended.

You will observe that the 8,000,000-ton goal was exceeded by some 90,800 tons. In addition to this, during 1942 the Commission transferred to the Navy Department the facilities of the Seattle-Tacoma Shipbuilding Corporation, together with a number of vessels under construction at that yard. These hulls, based upon the percentage of their completion at the time of transfer, were the equivalent of 68,644 tons of shipping. As you undoubtedly are aware, there were also numerous time-consuming conversions to naval auxiliaries of merchant vessels under construction. Moreover, during the last 4 months of the year, 24 highly productive ways were diverted to the construction of LST vessels for the Navy. Considering these factors, it is my opinion that, had materials been available as required, building capacity existed during 1942 for not less than 10,000,000 tons deadweight of standard merchant ships.

As one member of the Commission, I am well aware that the present success in merchant shipbuilding would not have been possible without the foresight and unstinted endeavor of your committee. The wisdom of the legislation which has resulted from the committee's efforts is borne out by the sound progress of American shipbuilding, upon which so much depends. It has been enjoyable to work with you, and I am confident that our continuing mutual cooperation will lead to even greater achievements in 1943.

Sincerely yours,

H. L. VICKERY,
Commissioner.

VESSELS AND DEADWEIGHT TONNAGE DELIVERED IN 1942

(Grouped geographically and by types)

West coast: 322 EC2 cargo, 15 C-type cargo, 25 British cargo, 1 M. C. tanker, 1 coastal cargo, 4 special type, total 368; 3,888,400 deadweight tons, estimated; 48.06 percent of total.

East coast: 142 EC2 cargo, 28 C-type cargo, 30 British cargo, 32 M. C. tankers, 29 private tankers, 11 special type, total 272; 3,089,500 deadweight tons, estimated; 38.18 percent of total.

Gulf coast: 78 EC2 cargo, 19 C-type cargo, total 97; 1,010,400 deadweight tons, estimated; 12.49 percent of total.

Great Lakes: 5 private ore carriers, 4 coastal cargo, total 9; 102,500 deadweight tons, estimated; 1.27 percent of total.

Grand total: 542 EC2 cargo, 62 C-type cargo, 55 British cargo, 33 M. C. tankers, 29 private tankers, 5 private ore carriers, 5 coastal cargo, 15 special type, totaling 746; 8,090,800 deadweight tons, estimated.

Vessels and deadweight tonnage delivered in 1942 by shipyards

Shipyard	Number of vessels	Type of vessel	Deadweight tonnage
Alabama	18	EC2 cargo	194,200
American	2	Ore carrier	36,800
Bath Iron Works	2	C2 cargo	15,100
Bethlehem, Fairfield	77	EC2 cargo	830,400
	11	Special type	25,300
Bethlehem, Quincy	3	Tankers	45,400
	1	C3 cargo	9,900
Bethlehem, Sparrows Point	13	Tankers	197,400
	3	P&C	27,100
California	109	EC2 cargo	1,176,000
Consolidated	5	C1 cargo	46,300
Delta	28	EC2 cargo	302,200
Federal	2	Tankers	33,800
	11	C2 cargo	102,000
Great Lakes Engineering Works	3	Ore carrier	54,500
Gulf	4	C2 cargo	41,400
Houston	32	EC2 cargo	345,300
Ingalls	5	C3 cargo and P&C.	53,200
Kaiser, Swan Island	1	Tanker	16,600
Kaiser, Vancouver	2	EC2 cargo	21,600
	4	Special type	9,200
Leathem Smith	3	Coastal cargo	8,400
Marinship	5	EC2 cargo	54,000
Moore	3	C2 cargo	20,100
North Carolina	51	EC2 cargo	549,600
Oregon	113	do	1,219,400
Pacific Bridge	1	Coastal cargo	2,800
Pennsylvania	10	C1 cargo	74,100
Pusey & Jones	5	do	37,500
Richmond No. 1 (formerly Todd-California).	25	British	252,500
	30	EC2 cargo	323,800
Richmond No. 2	63	EC2 cargo	679,400
Seattle-Tacoma	3	C3 cargo	27,000
South Portland	12	EC2 cargo	129,500
Sun	41	Tankers	673,400
	6	C2 cargo	57,200
Todd-Bath	30	British	303,000
	2	EC2 cargo	21,600
Walter Butler	1	Coastal cargo	2,800
Welding Shipyards	2	Tankers	31,300
Western Pipe & Steel	4	C3 cargo	39,700
Total	746		8,090,800

Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Loren Pope:

WISCONSIN IN THE CAPITAL

(By Loren Pope)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Although it was sidestepped in accounts of his resignations, Herbert W. "Parse" Parisius, who resigned last

week as Director of the Federal Food Production Administration, says that the issue was the fight for the little people in getting all-out food production. Parisius, a native of Wisconsin who lived in Madison when he was head of the Farm Security Administration, wants the world to know that there is much more to the fight which brought about his resignation than has been printed so far. When he quit last week, his action was attributed to a victory of the triple-A theory of crop-production control over the farm security theory of credit to small farmers to put them on their feet and make it possible for them to increase their production of food. "This is not a bureaucratic battle," said Parisius. "The issues go far deeper than any bureaucratic concepts. This is a fight for the little people, and after all, that's what we're fighting this war for, isn't it—the little people."

Parisius was named Director of the Food Administration on December 10 by Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture. Prior to that he had been Associate Director of the Office of Agricultural War Relations. He has a long-time Wisconsin record. Born in Elroy, Wis., Parisius attended Northwestern College, Watertown, and received degrees from there and served as an instructor and coach. In 1922 he was granted a master's degree at the University of Wisconsin. He served as director of the Barron County Public Welfare Department before joining the staff of the Farm Security Administration.

In contrast to Mr. Parisius' ideas is a policy which has been followed to a considerable extent—as in arms production—of helping the big producers on the theory that less machinery and less material will be needed to increase their production than to raise the output of the little fellow. And aid for the little fellow is what some Members of Congress from Wisconsin and similar States have been fighting for—days and weeks of pleading and threatening to get barbed wire, a truck, or a cream separator for some small farmer. These are the producers who should be getting aid to meet our war-production needs, says Parisius. And all necessary credit must be extended to them to buy a cow, a piece of machinery, or whatever it is he may need to get on his feet and start producing. But credit for these family-size farms has been slow in coming in the war program. Parisius advocates all-out use of credit to increase production. As he says, "The use of credit must not stand in the way of increasing production. If a farmer needs it to buy a cow or machinery, he should have the credit. A year from now the question won't be 'What did you do about credit?' but 'What did you do about food?' "

Not only must the family-size farms not pass out of the picture, says Parisius, but we cannot have the co-ops pass out, since they, too, are a part of the little fellow and of private enterprise. And they, he believes, are vital to obtaining all-out production. He cited some convincing figures to back up his stand. Last year, he said, 500,000 farmers aided by the Farm Security Administration increased milk production 29 percent. And this increase represented 48 percent of the country's total increase in milk production. In eggs, these same 500,000 farmers jumped output 38 percent or 12 percent of the national total. In dry beans, these farmers boosted production 41 percent, or 33 percent of the total increase for the Nation. Displaying such figures as these, Parisius can say with conviction that we are not using our resources to the full to get maximum production.

"Much can be done right now about increasing food production this year," Parisius asserts. "Farmers can and must be given assurance of a sufficient labor supply to meet their needs. They must be assured of sufficient immediate credit. They must be assured against financial losses. An economy based on restriction must at once give way to an economy of all-out production. We have stored up fat so that we might have it to live on when the emergency arises. That emergency is here. When credit stood between industry and all-out production, no questions were asked—credit was given. That same principle must be followed in agriculture."

And the funds are available, Parisius points out, if they will only be put to work. The Farm Security Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Commodity Credit Corporation all have authority and resources sufficient to meet production needs. "But," he says, "these resources must be mustered and administered so that no farmer in America fails to meet his maximum production goals because of lack of credit. That can be done, if there's the will to do it. It cannot be done by banker-minded people. These people have already let one precious year go by without making their full contribution to this battle for freedom." Just where Mr. Parisius thinks this banker-mindedness occurs in the Federal agricultural set-up is apparent from this statement in his letter of resignation: "It is my firm conviction and I understand it to be yours that the typical banker philosophy of credit which prevails in the Farm Credit Administration is incompatible with wartime demands that credit and other facilities be utilized to the fullest extent in increasing the production of food. It is notable that the very large credit resources of the Farm Credit Administration and particularly the funds of the regional agricultural credit corporations have not been made available in any sustained attempt to aid the department's food production program."

In resigning, Mr. Parisius made no secret of his opposition to the naming of Albert G. Black, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, as head of the financing unit for agricultural production for war. "This action," he said, "would seriously disrupt the morale of the 15,000 field employees of the Farm Security Administration with whose work and objectives the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration has demonstrated little sympathy or understanding. I am sure he has no appreciation of the value of supervised credit as a means for increasing food production or for holding down inflation." Named in Parisius' place as Food Production Administrator last week was M. Clifford Townsend, former Governor of Indiana. Parisius has no plans for his own future as yet, but several Wisconsin Members of Congress believe he has brought to a head a fight that will have repercussions for some time to come. And if they are able to marshal sufficient forces, they intend to change the Agriculture Department's policies to conform to Parisius' way of thinking.

A Judge To Draft Objectors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, a session of United States district court in Deadwood, S. Dak., was made memorable recently by the remarks of the Honorable A. Lee Wyman, Federal judge, addressed to five men convicted of violating the Selective Service Act.

The men had refused to register for the draft. They also refused to go to a conscientious objector's camp, although their objections to military service were based on their membership in a religious society opposed to war. Judge Wyman's remarks were delivered extemporaneously, but they so impressed other hearers in the courtroom that the reporter's notes were transcribed and sent to me, with the suggestion that they deserved a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an outstanding commentary on the meaning of an act of Congress and its place in the history of our times.

Under permission given by the House, I place it in the RECORD at this time:

It is to be regretted, gentlemen, at a time like this, when the country is in dire need of all of its available manpower in carrying on its commendable effort to save civilization for the benefit of those who are left and the generations to come; it is to be regretted that at such a time, men of your age and your physical ability should seek to shirk that patriotic duty and responsibility which devolves upon every able-bodied American citizen at this time to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States, and all of the institutions which it stands for. The regret is not only a regret that you will not be serving your country as you should be, alone, there is another regret and that is as to each one of you personally. This is a serious matter viewed from your own individual personal standpoint.

While it is true that in maintaining the position which you have assumed, you will not be subject to the hardships of military service, you will be placed for the duration of the war in a place where you will be protected from the hardships of serving in the Army or Navy of this country; you will be protected from death at the hands of a foreign foe; you will be placed where you will have plenty to eat and a good warm place to sleep; where you have proper medical attention; where you will be protected from the bullets of the Japanese and the Germans. That is true. And viewed from your own selfish standpoint, that may be the wise thing for you to do if you don't take into consideration the value of the esteem and the respect of the people of this country, because, while the right-thinking people of this country are usually willing to overlook and forgive a mistake made by a young man, even if it results in his serving a term in a penitentiary for some violation of criminal law, if by his conduct and behavior he conducts himself in such a way as to merit their esteem and respect. But that doesn't apply to the offense such as the one which you have been convicted of.

You may think that when the war is over that your punishment will be ended, but you are mistaken in that. The one thing that the right thinking people of America can never forgive is disloyalty, is evidence of moral cowardice. Society has little use and no respect for a man who is unwilling to fight to preserve those blessings and privileges which have always been vouchsafed to each one of you as citizens of this republic. While I have no right to say, and I don't say, that you are cowards—you may sincerely and honestly believe that you are justified in the attitude you take because of a strained, irrational conception of your religious duty—the public will never accept that. You will be branded as moral cowards from this day forward and you and your children will feel the effect of your conduct at this time from now on. It is something that the public don't forget.

As I indicated awhile ago, if you are willing to sacrifice the respect and esteem to which you would be entitled as loyal American citizens, and which would be gladly accorded you if you had done your duty in this instance, if you are willing to sacrifice that for your own personal safety, you will be

protected, there is no question about that. Men like you, men of your age, men who have the moral courage to go out and fight and die for everything which you and the rest of we Americans hold dear, will see to it that no harm comes to you while you are in charge of this country, because the American flag protects the man that stands under it whether he be a prisoner in a penitentiary or a man wallowing in the swamps of New Guinea or Guadalcanal. You may rest assured as far as your personal safety and comfort is concerned, it will be taken care of, but to the day of your death you will have cause to remember the cowardly attitude which each one of you has assumed at this time of stress.

I don't think anything I have said or might say would have any effect upon any one of you. However, I think it was proper for me to say what I have said to you, and having said that I will say to you that if I knew exactly how long this war was going to last and had the legal authority to do so, I would commit each one of you to confinement in a Federal prison for the duration and for 6 months thereafter. I don't know that, so all I can do is to put you where you will be protected for just as long a period as the law permits me to do. You may think that the sentence which I am about to pronounce is severe punishment. You may think it is unwarranted. But when you think it over you have got way the best of it then. As I have indicated to you before, you will know, you will have the absolute assurance, that the Government which you refuse to aid in the time of its need will see to it that you are comfortably quartered, that you are well fed, that you are protected from the ravages of war.

The boys over in the south Pacific from the standpoint of personal comfort and safety would gladly trade places with you, but they have the good red blood of American manhood flowing through their veins and not one of them would shirk the duty which citizenship in this country imposes upon them at this time. You have passed up a wonderful privilege, young men. You have had an opportunity to go out and have part in the saving of civilization, to have part in the building of a safer and better world, so that you could tell your children with pride that you had helped make the world better for humanity.

What will you tell your children and your grandchildren in years to come when they speak of the heroic efforts being made in the salvation of humanity and civilization? What will you say when your little daughter or son comes home from school and tells how one of their playmates' father fought in such a place and asks you where you were during the World War? I imagine your heart will swell with pride when you say you were doing your religious duty in a penitentiary.

It is the judgment of the court that you and each of you be committed to the custody of the Attorney General of the United States for imprisonment for and during the full term of 5 years.

Letter From an Air Pilot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

GLASGOW, MONT., *January 13, 1943.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DICKSTEIN: When I graduated from West Point in June of 1941, I promised myself to make an annual report to you of my doings. I felt that this would be the least I could do to show my never ending gratitude to you for the grand opportunity you gave me in the form of a West Point appointment. I felt that to write you oftener would be bothering you and wasting your valuable time.

After graduation, I spent my 2 months of leave with my family in Long Beach during the months of June and July. I am very fond of sports, particularly outdoor ones. Among them swimming is one of my favorites. There is no fun grander than splashing wildly about in the breakers along a sunlit sandy shore. So I got myself a job as a lifeguard, in East Atlantic Beach. While the life was somewhat of a lazy one, it kept me in the sunshine 10 hours a day and included enough beachcombing to keep me from getting soft. Naturally, when I reported for my first duty as a student officer in Tulsa, Okla., I was in top shape.

As you may know, upon graduation, I was assigned to the infantry but because I had no limiting physical defects I was able to get a detail to the Air Corps for pilot training. Since two of my brothers, Bill and George, had washed out of flying school due to "lack of inherent flying ability," some years previous to my attempt at flying, I was particularly anxious to take a crack at it and succeed. I guess it was more to show them that I wasn't as dumb as my academy record showed me to be, than it was to be an airplane chauffeur. After my first week of flying everything in my past and present life slid into the background. I wanted nothing more than that first solo ride. I wasn't just going to write my family and my Congressman, I was going to send them a picture of myself with my goggles pushed up on my forehead, the prerogative only of pilots who have soloed. But soon I learned that there was so much more to being a pilot than just soloing that once against everything else slid into the background, and I wanted only to win my wings.

I'll never forget the day I learned that. It was a beautiful, brilliant August afternoon. The cloudless sky seemed to invite me to soar into it, just the way the eagles could. And I was no longer a "dodo." I, too, could fly, because yesterday I had soloed. As confidently as Corrigan, I climbed into my primary trainer with instructions to practice spins. As quickly as the ground sped away from me, my confidence waned and, instead of the soaring eaglet, I became the fledgling dodo. I missed the familiar figure in the front cockpit who always knew when I wasn't doing a good job of flying, and I missed the certain terms in which he informed me of it. Well, I climbed up to 6,000 feet, nursing my confidence all the way. I knew I could do spins, but I also knew I wasn't very good at them. Then began a monolog: "O. K., here I am at 6,000; bank it up sharply to the right, then to the left, to see there is no one underneath me. O. K., that's enough, Rod; you know there's no one down there; quit procrastinating. O. K., here we go; ease the throttle back as soon as she stalls; stick back into your stomach—hard rudder on the low wing—there goes the nose; she's stalling. O. K., kick rudder. Whoa, baby! What's going on here? The airspeed is past the red line. Altimeter reads 2,000. And I'm not spinning. What is this?" Well, I got it out all right with not too much to spare, and when I did I wished I was back in the infantry with both of my two feet on the ground. "Oh, you want to be a pilot, eh? Wel', you're a fine one. Scared of a stall. I am not. O. K., I guess I am. Anyway, the man that doesn't scare hasn't any sense, but I'm going up and try it again. Yeah, you're scared. I am not. O. K., I am scared, but I'm going to try it."

All the way back up to 6,000 feet I argued and prayed. I called on all the saints in the book I could remember. I prayed to every one of the ones to whom I owed any allegiance or who owed me any. I called on St. Roderic, if there was one; St. Patrick, because the church named me after him; St. Francis Xavier, because that was the middle name I took at confirmation; all the O'Connors; and I even prayed to the unknown saint who might be named Dhu.

Again came the business of looking to see if anyone was underneath me, and this time I was most cautious—and scared—and again came the arguing monolog—only longer this time. Evidently my prayers were heard, because the spin was O. K., but it took at least three or four more for me to regain enough of my confidence to feel that I was a pilot—or at least a would-be one. It showed me I had a long road to travel before becoming a pilot.

That's why you never got a picture of me with my goggles on my forehead. From Tulsa I was sent to Randolph Field, Tex., to get my basic training. I learned much there, and the more I learned the more I could see I had to learn, so that I never reached the point where I felt I could write you and proudly show you my accomplishments. It was there I learned to fly heavier ships and it was there I had my first forced landing.

As my classmates continued to wash out, my zeal to earn my wings continued. I went on to advanced school at Ellington Field, in Houston, Tex. There I learned to fly twin-engine trainers and there I finally got my wings. At last I could say I was a pilot. Now, in a few weeks, I would go to a tactical (combat) unit, learn to fly fighting ships, and be happy ever after. I had asked for pursuit because pursuit had the fastest planes and had always been acclaimed as the "hottest" pilots. Therefore, when I was assigned to a heavy bombardment unit in Boise, Idaho, I was spiritually crushed. What had I done to deserve such a fate? To add further to my disgust was the fact that I was not allowed to get any pilot training in the "flying boxcars" (B–17's), because I would soon be transferred again. I was transferred. In fact, I was transferred twice in 2 weeks and wound up as an instructor in a school for "30-day wonders." I have since learned to marvel at the "flying fortress," and would not trade one of them for all the pursuit ships in the world.

This was the first time I was actually to see service as an officer. I had been an officer for 9 months, but only as a student officer. Until then I had only the responsibility of my own training. Now, with the aid of a brother officer, a classmate, I was responsible for the training of 60 civilians who were to be trained officers in 30 days.

This was my first real job and under the inspiring leadership of Colonel Scherer, my immediate superior, I sunk my teeth into it with satisfaction. It was like eating steak after having been on a diet of breakfast food. To me this was one of my most interesting experiences. I learned much. All of my students were older than I, and many of them senior to me in rank. Most of them had been commissioned directly from civilian life; a few had seen service in the last war, and a few were formerly enlisted men. I was tremendously impressed with the worth of all of them. Whether it was because they were an especially intelligent group or whether they were imbued with a very high sense of duty to our country in its hour of need, it was hard for me to determine, but it taught me to look with great respect upon the average American citizen. They did, and are still doing, a marvelous job with only one reputed failure. One man, a former enlisted man, did not measure up to the others' high standards, but I heard that later he was doing a better job of being an officer.

It was there that I received my first promotion—from second to first lieutenant. It

was there that I had the pleasure of serving under an excellent officer and a fine gentleman, Colonel Scherer. I do not wish to seem to be a member of a mutual admiration society because I have enclosed a commendation he gave me upon the closing of the school; but he is a keen man and a superior officer. I was delighted to receive his commendation because at last I had something which I could bring to you and say, "See, I am deserving of your faith in me. Remember all those times you appointed me? I haven't forgotten. I was always grateful. Gratitude isn't one of the attributes of an officer, but I have delivered the goods." How you were so patient with me I'll never understand, but I'll never forget you for your kindness.

I offer this commendation as proof to you that your faith in me was justified. I cannot ask you to have it put in my 201 file in The Adjutant General's office where it would do me the most good in the years to come, because that 201 file is supposed to be for the reference to The Adjutant General only, and I have no access to it.

From the officers' school I went to a unit in Tucson, Ariz.; since then I have gone through various stages of training at different stations; first as a copilot, then as a pilot, then a flight commander, and then to my present position as an operations officer. I have moved from station to station and have attended two schools, one for blind landings and one to qualify me as an oxygen officer.

A month ago I received my captaincy. I am quite proud to be a captain and fully realize my responsibilities. As operations officer I am second in command of the squadron. My sole function is the training of the combat crews. Each unit of 10 men who fly in one of our fortresses is called a combat crew. There are 9 crews in my squadron and I must see to it that they are ready to go to combat. There are always interesting problems which keep me busy, so I am very happy in my job. But in just the same way I wanted to solo and then to get my wings, so I look forward to the next job ahead. I am always learning and always feel I know so little that I seem to be always at the double time.

As I am now in the final phase of training with this squadron, I expect to leave for the combat zone shortly. I do not know for a certainly, but I think that it is now only a matter of days before I will go to the port of embarkation. As a human being I deplore the fact that we have a war but as a professional soldier I feel that only in the fire-fight will I gain the knowledge and experience that is necessary for the future protection of our country. As a citizen of these United States I am ready to pay the obligations I owe. I have been trained to a military life but I am thoroughly sold on a democratic form of government and I am ready to pay any price to fight for it.

I know that Congress must be on a large scale, like what my operations office is when things start happening. There must be times when you ask, "Is it all worth it?" And then you go on trying. I am going out to fight with perfect confidence in you and your colleagues that you are fighting with me. The pressure and strain has long been on you and you have come up fighting like true Americans. I am proud of you.

I have gone on at great length and not said very much, but isn't that typical of annual reports—voluminous and verbose? However, if you do not object, I shall report again next year.

I send you my best wishes for a happy and victorious year. If I can be of any service to you in this country or out, I would be delighted to comply with any of your wishes.

Respectfully yours,

RODERIC D. O'CONNOR,
Captain, Air Corps.

SECOND AIR FORCE,
OFFICERS' TRAINING CAMP,
Fort George Wright, Wash., May 25, 1942.

Subject: Commendation.
To: First Lt. Roderic D. O'Connor, A. C.

1. As officer in charge of the Officers' Training Camp at Fort George Wright which concluded its first course on May 23, 1942, I wish to express to you my appreciation for your services as instructor in this course. You came to Fort Wright shortly before the beginning of the 4-week course, helped to organize it, and served as an instructor for the full period. Whatever success the course obtained in preparing newly commissioned officers for their duties was due in large measure to your efforts. Your initiative, ingenuity, and attention to duty have been outstanding. You have shown that you possess all the qualifications required of an officer in the Army. Through your tact and spirit of cooperation many difficulties in this pioneer effort were surmounted and the instruction offered was made more interesting.

2. I am sure that all the students in the course feel as I do that your example has given them a more complete understanding of the high standards that will be expected of them in their future careers as officers.

HARRIS F. SCHERER,
Colonel, A. G. D., Officer in Charge.

Ceiling Price on Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters and newspaper articles:

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
Oberlin, La., January 23, 1943.

Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LARCADE: Enclosed you will find a copy of a resolution passed by the dairymen of Allen Parish, protesting to the ceiling price of 12 cents per quart on milk in Allen Parish, placed by the Office of Price Administration.

I have been requested to provide you with this resolution and ask that you render whatever assistance possible in getting same adjusted.

Yours very truly,

G. C. MEAUX,
County Agent, Allen Parish.

Whereas for the past 12 to 24 months the prevailing retail price for milk has been 15 cents per quart, 7½ cents per pint, and the prevailing wholesale price has been 12½ cents per quart and 7½ cents per pint; and

Whereas since 1935 the prevailing retail price in Allen Parish was 12½ cents per quart, which was greater than the present ceiling; and

Whereas since 1940 the cost of labor has practically doubled, and the cost of feed has increased about one third, which has made it necessary to increase the price of milk to the present price; and

Whereas the cost of producing feed and pasture, due to low fertility of the soil of the parish as a whole is greater than sections where the soil is more fertile, the dairymen of this parish are therefore handicapped; and

Whereas Allen Parish is further handicapped in the fact that it is located away from any cottonseed and feed mills, which makes the cost of feed higher due to transportation, and so forth, than localities where these mills are located; and

Whereas the cost of producing milk during the winter months is equal to or larger than the returns, which is shown by the attached statements of cost of production, which is a true picture of the average cost of production for the dairymen of Allen Parish, and which shows that dairymen realize a profit only during spring and summer months: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the undersigned dairymen of Allen Parish, petition the Office of Price Administration to reconsider the price ceilings established, and request that the ceiling be placed at not less than the present prevailing prices which are as follows: For retail—quarts, 15 cents; pints, 7½ cents; for wholesale—quarts, 12½ cents; pints, 7 cents.

G. G. WISENBAKER,
W. A. DYER,
R. B. PARRISH,
O. W. HUDSON,
J. T. CHRISTIAN, JR.,
SAM S. HUDSON.

ELIZABETH, LA., *January 20, 1943.*
ALLEN PARISH WAR PRICE AND
RATIONING BOARD NO. 61,
Oberlin, La.

GENTLEMEN: In protest against your order, I want to submit my cost of production which is as follows:

	Per quart
Concentrate feed	$0.06
Hired labor	.03
Hay	.02
Operating truck	.01
Miscellaneous	.01

This includes nothing for the services of myself and my family. My price has not changed from 15 cents per quart in 2 years. It is still the same now, 15 cents per quart.

Yours truly,

O. W. HUDSON.

[From the Opelousas (La.) Clarion-News of January 21, 1943]

CITY DAIRIES SUBMIT COSTS OF OPERATION—OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION DIRECTOR GOODMAN TO PRESENT FIGURES TO DALLAS OFFICE—PRESENT PRICES STAND IN MEANTIME

Opelousas dairymen, who Monday advised the Office of Price Administration they would discontinue operations February 1 unless allowed a ceiling price of 15 cents per quart for retail sale of milk, were asked Tuesday to submit their figures for cost of operating their dairies now and in March of 1941. These figures will be presented to the district Office of Price Administration office in Dallas, Tex.

The request for operating cost of the dairies was made by U. S. Goodman, State Office of Price Administration director, who came here Tuesday afternoon to confer with Mayor Martin Roy on the present serious milk situation. Mr. Goodman said such figures would give the district Office of Price Administration office something concrete on which to base the plea from dairymen for 15 cents ceiling. He expressed the hope that he would have some solution to offer Opelousas dairymen shortly, and asked that in the meantime they continue to sell their product at prevailing prices.

The Office of Price Administration has fixed a ceiling of 13 cents per quart and 6½ cents per pint in Opelousas and Eunice and 12 cents per quart and 6 cents per pint in the remainder of this parish.

Mr. Goodman said he would be in Dallas Wednesday night and would present the local dairies' figures to the Office of Price Administration office there.

Following the conference with Mayor Roy, Mr. Goodman and the other two Office of Price Administration officials met with the St. Landry tire board to discuss routine matters.

[From the DeRidder (La.) Enterprise of January 22, 1943]

PARISH DAIRYMEN PROTEST OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION CEILING PRICE

DeRidder this week has faced a milk famine when, protesting against the new price regulations on milk, which went into effect Sunday at Ridder and a few other towns at 12 cents a quart retail and 10½ cents a quart wholesale, the DeRidder Cooperative Dairies, Inc., ceased pasteurizing milk for local civilian consumption and most dairymen, refusing to sell in DeRidder, shipped their milk to Lake Charles or other points, where a higher price a quart retail and 12½ cents a ceiling was set.

The Beauregard Cooperative Dairies and other independent dairymen started selling milk again on Thursday morning at the prevailing Office of Price Administration price of 10½ cents wholesale and 12 cents retail, but will do so only until the Office of Price Administration sets a higher price ceiling. If the Office of Price Administration does not adjust the ceiling price by February 1 the dairymen will not sell any more milk in DeRidder.

The Beauregard police jury, the DeRidder Chamber of Commerce, various civic organizations, the cooperative dairies, independent dairymen and others rushed telegrams of protest to the Office of Price Administration, and to Congressmen, asking that an Office of Price Administration representative be sent to DeRidder to study the situation and determine why so low a ceiling should be set in this parish. With the State divided into several areas, with a different ceiling price for each area, DeRidder was placed in that class having the lowest ceiling.

The prevailing price for milk here has been 15 cents a quart retail and 13 cents wholesale. The ceiling price set in Lake Charles, effective Monday, was 15 cents retail and 13½ cents wholesale, which local dairymen receive by shipping there.

The dairymen state in their protests that they cannot continue to operate at the ceiling price set by the Office of Price Administration with the production costs having so greatly increased. The price that must be paid for a good cow has doubled what it was before the United States entered the war; the price of labor has, in some cases, trebled. No ceiling has been placed on most types of feed. Producers say they paid $1.75 a sack for some dairy feed, a year ago, for which they must now pay $2.75. Most dairymen, to meet the rapidly expanding needs for milk, have increased their facilities by purchasing new equipment, at a high price. They cannot, they declare, meet these increased expenses and continue in operation with milk back at a price which existed several years ago, before the cost of production soared.

OPELOUSAS, LA., *January 8, 1943.*

Hon. HENRY D. LACARDE, Jr.,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR HENRY: Your card received and in due course I will write you fully about the "flooring" for farm crops, but you can understand what I mean when I tell you that what I believe should be done for the Louisiana farmers is what is being done for some of the others.

For instance, you will see in the Times-Picayune of today, that is to say, January 8, 1943, an article quoting the Agricultural Department of the United States of America as giving to the farmers of California and Arizona planting long-staple cotton a guaranteed price of 48 cents. The other day it leaked out and was commented upon by all papers that the Government had been giving a bonus to the farmers producing milk and selling on the markets of Detroit, Chicago, and other war-favored, war-industry cities; yet, strange as it may seem, no milkman in our section received any bonus. It seems that the view is that the babies in Detroit and Chicago had to be protected. No sane person would deny the right of the babies to their milk even if it had to be paid for in full by the Government, but on the other hand, the babies who live in the country districts are as important to the Nation as those in the Detroit-Chicago area. What the Government officials overlook is that there is in proportion to their number more abject poverty and slums in the country than there is in the larger cities. The majority of cities have institutions supported by the taxpayers who look after the old, the sick, and the infirm in their way; while not entirely satisfactory yet there is no actual impossibility of getting assistance; while in the country, as you doubtless know, whole families are huddled together in two-room cabins, and at this time of the year no doctor will go to see them unless somebody the doctor knows guarantees the account.

I know personally that there are white people, let alone Negroes, living close enough to Opelousas who haven't even drinking water at their homes, and that they have to go a great distance to get the water, either from neighbors or ditches and gutters. Of course, up at Washington they have the idea that people who make our crops have hot and running water and bath tubs in their homes.

I do not believe, Henry, that even one-half of the country people even have bathtubs in their homes. The country people are the ones on whom the future of the country really depends. When you go to the Union Station at Washington you will see an inscription on the top of the building which shows what the founders of the Government really thought of the farmers. You will see carved in rock the words: "The Farm. Best Home of the Family. Main Source of National Wealth. Foundation of Civilized Society."

Of course I realize that the majority of the boys working for the Government have never seen that inscription although most of them either personally or by ancestry come from the farm. It is a poor parody on American civilization when we see ourselves face the fact that the millions of men, women, and children who live on the farm and who produce all the food that the balance of the Nation consumes, and who raise all the cotton and all the wool that clothes the rest of the people, are themselves, the worse fed, the most badly clothed and shamefully housed of all the different groups that make up the citizenship of this so-called greatest Nation on the face of the earth. The truth is that the farmer is being sent into the serfdom of abject poverty, and the sons and daughters of those who fought at Bunker Hill and Valley Forge have been, and are being, shunted aside in modern America, and the wealth of the Nation while still great and abundant is going into the hands of corporations and institutions who cannot trace their ancestry to those who fought to make this Government possible.

I mention these matters so as to try to give you the spark that might bring forth the light which will enable you as a new Member of Congress to grasp the real problem now confronting America.

My past 2 years have led me to believe that the South lacks leadership and that too many of our leaders neither have the ability nor the patriotism of men like Clay, Calhoun, and Jackson, three Civil War southerners, or Grady, Tillman, and Huey Long, after Civil War southern statesmen.

O. P. A. Price Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by Mr. Edward C. Welsh, regional price executive of the O. P. A.:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION PRICE POLICY

The Office of Price Administration has one major object from which there is no intention of swerving for a moment—the cost of living must be kept down.

No static approach to price control in an economy changing as ours is would be practical. Consequently, the Price Division of the Office of Price Administration is continually engaged in attempting to make its regulations fit the problem more closely.

During the earlier period of price control, the Office of Price Administration's chief activity was one of keeping down the cost of the war to the taxpayer by controlling prices which our Army and Navy had to pay for war materials. More recently, although still striving to maintain the existing success of that accomplishment, the Office of Price Administration has a bigger job and that is keeping down the cost of living to consumers.

The situation is, in brief, that the consumers are getting an increasing amount of money and are finding a decreasing amount of goods on which to spend this money. The Office of Price Administration is not concerned with whether individual businesses flourish or fail, just so long as necessities are produced in as large a volume as war conditions will permit and that these necessities are available at controlled prices to all persons essential to our war effort.

To accomplish these wartime objectives, the Office of Price Administration is making the following changes:

1. Simplifying the existing price regulation.

2. Developing new improved price regulations wherever the situation demands such changes.

3. Setting dollar and cents ceilings wherever this is practical.

4. Making price adjustments only in cases which involve war materials or commodities and services absolutely necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. All other things must be considered of secondary importance during an all-out war, and, hence, the manpower of Office of Price Administration cannot be dissipated in considering price adjustments for nonessentials.

The policy of considering price adjustments for individual concerns or for cream puffs and hairnets is a thing of the past. The Office of Price Administration recognizes that the impact of general regulations will not necessarily be the same in all localities. Local shortages of essential materials do occur because of the fact that general regulations do not always fit specific situations. The present adjustment policy is predicated on the necessity of prompt price adjustments to prevent local shortages of necessities. Local shortage adjustment provisions contain a number of requirements that must be satisfied before action can be taken. In brief, these requirements are as follows: (1) the commodity or service involved must aid directly in the war program or be essential to a standard of living consistent with the

prosecution of the war; (2) there must be an existing or threatened shortage in the supply of such a commodity or service; (3) the shortage in supply must be a local one in which a local price adjustment could be instrumental in substantially reducing or eliminating that shortage; (4) action by price adjustment rather than by the use of other measures must be consistent with Office of Price Administration's general price policy.

It is not the intention of the Office of Price Administration to set up a list of commodities and services which are essential. The reason for not setting such a fixed list is based on the fact that some items are essential in some areas and not essential in others. Likewise, some supply of some items is essential, although a portion of a larger supply might not be necessary. For instance, it might be considered essential that there be some laundry service in an urban area, but it is possible that all of the available laundry service in that area may not be necessary for a successful prosecution of the war effort. Local shortages caused by failure or refusal of a manufacturer to produce a particular commodity or of a processor to render a particular service, although resulting in a local shortage, will not necessarily qualify as a local shortage within the meaning of the adjustment provisions. Likewise, a local shortage must not be merely incidental to a general shortage throughout all or most of the country. A local shortage exists only if an adequate supply of a commodity or service is available in other areas but not in a particular locality. Frequently this type of shortage will occur when there is sufficient price differential between two areas to cause a diversion of the supply from the low price area to the higher price area.

These local shortage adjustments will customarily be made by the regional Office of Price Administration office. There is no required form for application, for such adjustments and an adjustment might be made without application if the regional office considered it necessary to prevent a local shortage of an essential commodity.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of William McKinley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. H. CARSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proclamation of the Governor of Ohio:

Whereas on January 29, 1943, this Nation will observe the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of William McKinley, the twenty-fifth President of the United States of America; and

Whereas William McKinley was born at Niles, in Trumbull County, Ohio, and after serving with distinction in the Congress of the United States became the fortieth Governor of the State of Ohio; and

Whereas William McKinley, as Governor of Ohio, represented all that is best and noblest in the citizenship and leadership of this State; and, as President of the United States, guided this Nation to a new position of honor and eminence among the nations of the world; and

Whereas the memory of his splendid character, his lofty ideals, his exemplary life, both public and private, and his unselfish service to his fellow men have endeared William McKinley to the hearts of all Ohioans and indeed of all citizens of this Nation in whose service he gave his life; and

Whereas at the base of his monument at the State Capital in Columbus are inscribed these words of William McKinley, a message to all peoples thoughout the ages, but a message of special significance to men and women of this age who must shape the destiny of the post-war world:

"Let us ever remember that our interest is in concord, not conflict; and that our real eminence rests in the victories of peace, not those of war. Our earnest prayer is that God will graciously vouchsafe prosperity, happiness, and peace to all our neighbors; and like blessings to all the peoples and powers of earth."

Now, therefore, I, John W. Bricker, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby designate the week beginning Sunday, January 24, 1943, as an appropriate time for a State-wide observance of the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of William McKinley; and I do hereby call upon all churches, schools, civic, patriotic, and fraternal organizations and all citizens to pay tribute to the memory of this great American and of his steadfast devotion to all that this Nation holds dear and sacred.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Ohio to be affixed at Columbus this 12th day of December in the year of our Lord 1942.

JOHN BRICKER.

Where Uncle Pays the Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, while Congress is attempting to hold to a minimum expenditures not directly tied to the war, while Congress is confronted with the task of raising $16,000,000,000 in additional taxes to meet the war cost, while our Nation is struggling with the manpower problem it is most disconcerting and disturbing to come upon the activities of certain Government agencies and bureaus which are flagrantly wasting money and manpower. I am incorporating herewith an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of January 19, 1943, which elaborates upon one of the many instances of waste carried on by some Government agencies. We are at war, but even in peacetime such waste should not be tolerated.

The article follows:

WHEN UNCLE PAYS THE BILL

Down in Paducah, Ky., we read, a Federal nursery school has been established to take care of the children of mothers working in the city's war plants. It is a fine school with two specially trained teachers, two maids, a janitor, and a cook. The operating cost will, it is said, run to about $900 a month—and it now has 4 children in care. The number may, of course, grow, but right now it is costing the Federal Government $225 a month to care for each child.

It would be interesting, it seems to us, to find out just how much the mothers of these 4 children are earning at their war work. It seems likely that it will be less than the $225 which is being lavished on their offspring.

It would also be interesting to get an explanation of how the manpower situation is improving by putting six persons to work taking care of the children of three or four women employed in factories.

Finally it would be interesting to discover why a Federal agency should have established this school when there was already a community fund school languishing for lack of patronage.

The people who foot the bills for this sort of thing would like these questions answered. Now that an additional $16,000,000,000 is being sought from them "for war purposes," they would like even more to hear the answers.

No Substitute for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARVE TIBBOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Punxsutawney Spirit, Punxsutawney, Pa., entitled "No Substitute for Freedom":

NO SUBSTITUTE FOR FREEDOM

As free American citizens we have found we can meet the test of war. We have the ability to get things done. We have courage and daring. Our men have shown in stark heroism that on the military front we are not soft. We can fight with the tricks our forefathers learned from the Indians, and we can fight with machines. Guadalcanal and North Africa have proven that. In brief, we can win the war.

But there is more than the military front. There is the home front. And here, except for the production miracle of industry, there is evidence of softness, of confusion of ideals. Group bickering has put the attainment of personal comfort and security ahead of the national welfare. In many quarters a desire to eliminate human want at one fell swoop has become an obsession. An agency of government has even prepared a new bill of rights, the basic tenet of which is economic security. This new bill is proposed as a supplement to the old bill defining our liberties at the time the United States Constitution was adopted. It puts security on a par with freedom, on the theory that the American people will abandon freedom if they are not guaranteed three square meals a day. It implies that the American people, bitter from the "great depression" and fearful of postwar uncertainty, do not propose to go hungry, that if they cannot have their freedom with full stomachs, they will do without freedom.

If such is true, we have drifted far from the ideals the Pilgrims carried ashore at Plymouth Rock. Even as our men on the battlefields are now dying, the Pilgrims died and suffered hardship for just one reason: to preserve a spot on this globe where the individual could be free. And they got that freedom. They got it because they were tough. Their ideals came first, their stomachs second. Our men are winning battles now because they are tough. They are thinking of freedom.

A year ago there was a grave question in the minds of millions as to whether we could arm fast enough to stem the tide of aggression. There was an equally grave question

of whether we could do it without destroying free enterprise and representative government. There were those who believed it would take total dictatorship to beat the dictators. The challenge fell on industry. The machines had to be built by industry. Our natural resources and our factories had to be mobilized for war on a scale that wrought shattering changes in technique and precedent. Industry knew that the cracker-box agitators were waiting to pounce upon the country with revolutionary schemes at the slightest sign of failure.

It is to the credit of thinking government officials that revolutionary changes in government and industry were not forced before free enterprise had a chance to show what it could do to prove that our democracy was not a failure. Our factories did a magnificent job. In a matter of months, they underwent retooling and conversion. Today tanks, airplanes, guns, ships, are rolling off the assembly lines by the scores of thousands. Our war production has caught and passed the dictator enemy who spent years producing for war under an elaborate "economic security" program which by its very completeness had destroyed individual freedom—the same years that our industries continued to produce for America's unregimented, peaceful millions. Back of the manufacturers stand American farm producers and distributors, together with the metal and coal mines, the oil, the power and transportation industries. They feed our war workers and keep the materials moving into the assembly lines.

The end of the war may be distant still, yet it is in sight. Again free enterprise faces a challenge. And again it faces it against a backdrop of threats. Those threats are cloaked in the prevalent idea that a full stomach is an inalienable right. Far-sighted leaders know that the challenge of the post-war world will be the toughest of all. It will be far tougher than the facts justify because of demagogic attempts to soften our people with illusory social dreams of total economic security.

But industry is making its plans. These plans will have to be daring Industry must go on the offensive. It must show that unprecedented production under a system of free enterprise is the only sure way to build a lasting peace under the banner of individual freedom. It must lay the groundwork for this production now. And it must have the wholehearted cooperation of all Americans on the home front. There is no room for the labor racketeer any more than for the exploiting capitalist or the faithless politician.

We on the home front must do a lot of clear thinking. We must now be hardened by a determination that above all else we must save the right of the individual to be free. We must realize now and in the peace to come, that individual freedom is more important than individual comfort. Bitter experience has demonstrated that without freedom there can be neither comfort nor security. We must reaffirm our belief in our constitutional government.

The Patient Postman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the January 25 issue of the Boston Daily Record, of Boston, Mass., entitled "The Patient Postman."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PATIENT POSTMAN

Any general impression that the long-sought wage increase for post-office workers was accomplished by passage of the Mead-Ramspeck bill will be promptly dispelled when the public examines the terms of that feeble stopgap.

The Seventy-seventh Congress, in effect, evaded the issue with a meaningless gesture. The Mead-Ramspeck bill merely provides extra pay for overtime work.

This will help a few clerks who put in long hours during the holiday rushes, but the majority of postal employees do not work overtime.

Fortunately, the makeshift bill expires on April 30.

There is opportunity for the new Congress to reopen the matter with honesty and sincerity and justice.

The postal personnel has not had a wage increase since 1925.

Instead they have had pay cuts, in 1932 and 1933.

Add to this direct cut the factor of rising prices during the 17 intervening years, and we have not only a financial crisis for the loyal, experienced, and patient postmen, but a gross injustice against them.

It is an obvious fact that in wartime the services of communication are vital to the Nation and that the post office is the core and soul of communications.

To ignore the needs and deserts of postal workers, to force them into other kinds of war work where they receive decent wages and fair treatment, is deliberately to injure this vitally essential service.

The last Congress, and several Congresses before, have hemmed and hawed, procrastinated, quibbled, and finally awarded a stone where bread was wanted.

Timid and time-serving legislators found it convenient and safe to ignore a body of invaluable public servants who could not strike, nor lobby, nor exert pressure in other ways.

But the same legislators found it necessary at the same time to give preferential treatment to other labor groups who could, and did, strike, lobby, and turn other necessary screws.

The Mead-Ramspeck bill should be allowed to expire without regret or help.

It should be replaced by a practical, generous, and equitable measure, giving the postal people what they deserve and what they need in order to live.

This is not only just, but sensible.

It is the only way the Seventy-eighth Congress can correct the economic and social myopia that notably, in this instance, marred the action of its predecessor.

Explanation of Ruml Income-Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1943, the opening day of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I introduced House Joint Resolution 30, a pay-as-you-go income-tax plan. I extended my remarks in the January 12 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in which I urged this Congress to supplant our present antiquated income-tax system with a modern streamlined pay-as-you-go plan. The sentiment of the Nation seems to be overwhelmingly in favor of a pay-as-you-go plan, according to the Gallup poll of January 23, which states that 90 percent of the American taxpayers favor such a plan. I feel certain this Congress will meet the challenge and enact such a plan into law. Few people fully understand the Ruml plan, and I am therefore including in my remarks an article by Lewis Haney, professor of economics, New York University, which appeared in one of the New York newspapers, as said article clearly explains the Ruml plan. It is one of the best explanations I have ever read, and his statement imparts with simplicity the pay-as-you-go income-tax plan:

HANEY EXPLAINS RUML INCOME-TAX PLAN

A Brooklyn reader asks: "Will you please explain the Ruml tax plan before we come to blows and our family is broken up. Some claim, as Mr. Roosevelt does, that the Government would lose a year's tax. But since I must pay my income tax year after year in consecutive payments, what can the Government lose? I will bet that my checkbook will show no tax payment missed."

It is amazing that there is such a persistent misunderstanding concerning this matter. But people who can believe that internal public debt makes no difference, because we "owe it to ourselves," can believe most anything, I suppose.

The plain fact is that the Government could not and would not lose a dollar of taxes as a result of adopting the pay-as-you-go plan. The Government has to collect a large amount of taxes every year. If the pay-as-you-go plan were adopted now, the Government would collect about the same amount of taxes this year as it would get under the old scheme. Probably it would collect more. The same would be true next year, and the year after that, and so on to the end of time.

The so-called Ruml plan does not propose that anyone's taxes be eliminated, or that the Government lose a nickel of revenue. In no year would anyone get out of paying an income tax.

What it does propose is merely that the base for figuring the tax be shifted. The taxes we pay in 1943 would be figured on the income earned in 1943, instead of on the income earned in 1942. And hereafter we would always pay our income taxes each year as usual, and would pay according to our current earnings instead of the past.

It is something like taking water out of a stream. The stream flows by eternally. For pumping the water, you may put the pipe in the stream at one point or another. The water is much the same, and the effect on the stream is much the same, even if you take water out farther down the stream.

Just so, the stream of national income flows on from year to year. The Government has to pump or siphon out from this stream a certain amount each year. What difference does it make whether it collects on the basis of volume at one point or another?

I know of no other way to pass to a pay-as-you-go basis than to begin to figure our taxes on the basis of our current incomes.

Such a shift is important now. It is estimated that 27,000,000 people now are liable to pay income taxes—over 20,000,000 of them paying for the first time. What do you think will happen if those taxes are not withheld by employers at the source?

I am inclined to think that millions of persons would (1) misunderstand, (2) forget, (3) neglect, (4) be unable, or (5) willfully refuse to pay their income taxes. If the

Government were to try to collect direct from each individual, and to rely on savings out of past income, its collection forces would break down. Then the system of income taxes would become a joke—like prohibition was.

After all, we can't put millions of ourselves in jail.

"There are none so blind as those who won't see." I suppose that a war worker who expects to get bigger pay this year than last thinks he will be hit harder if his tax is figured on his 1943 income. But he is going to have to pay on it someday. And I ask you: How much of his 1942 income does he have left now?

Social Security and the Beveridge Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I wish to include an address on Social Security and the Beveridge Plan delivered by the Honorable W. Arthur Simpson, old-age assistance commission chairman, of Vermont, at a meeting of the Rotary Club of Montpelier on January 18.

It is with some pride that I say there is no man in the country who speaks more authoritatively on the subject of social security than does Arthur Simpson. To a long and careful study of all matters included, from both a State and National standpoint, with respect to the theory involved, he has added a practical experience as an administrator which justifies him to speak with genuine authority.

The address follows:

It is an encouraging sign that people are talking about the sort of world we are to live in after the war. It is well to have Utopian ideals even if they must be eventually formulated along more practical lines. The overwhelming majority of the American people realize that the United States must assume some definite leadership in world affairs when this terrible conflict is terminated but the idea of "living unto ourselves" will be vigorously promulgated by isolationists notwithstanding our great expenditure of lives and treasure. We have in this country two prominent groups, some in the administration steadily going to the left and some in the opposition firmly resolved to restore the old order. We desperately need a practical common ground for those realistic enough to see that sacrifice, hard living, and sound thinking are what is needed in a post war world. What we need to know is that Uncle Sam can be neither a Shylock nor a Santa Claus and that the most expensive war in history will prevent us from assuming the latter role even if we desired.

An attempt is about to be made to vastly expand social reforms through further liberalization and extension of the social-security programs and much has been said about the Beveridge plan which has recently been advanced as a post war program in Great Britain. The Beveridge plan proposes a system of old-age pensions for those above working age, a system of children allowances to those below working age and benefits to those of working age not gainfully employed. Benefits would include children allowances adequate for subsistence without other means, unemployment benefits for an unlimited period, old-age pensions as a matter of right, widowhood benefits, industrial disability benefit payment for other disability and rehabilitation, medical treatment including hospital, dental, ophthalmic and convalescent homes for the whole family and burial benefits at death.

These cradle-to-the-grave programs would be financed by security contributions from all employees under contract services, all others gainfully occupied including employers, traders, independent workers of all kinds, and housewives. Employers of persons under contract service would also contribute and an additional amount would be contributed from the National Treasury. The cost of this stupendous program, although providing payments which would be deemed inadequate by our own social reformers, is, of course, an item of concern to the British people and it is uncertain whether it could be financed except in periods of great prosperity and vast employment. This, of course, is the question which has not yet been determined for our social-security programs in the United States.

The theory that contributions should be increased during periods of prosperity in order to establish a large reserve for periods of adversity seems sound in theory but if a government is spending more than its income, as all nations are doing today, and the reserve is spent for armies, navies, armament and other expenses as it is in this country, there will actually be no reserve when depression comes except as contributions may be made by those employed or by new taxation for an already heavily taxed people. Any system of this nature is dependent on continued contributions to the fund to meet the Government I O U's.

Already some of our less ambitious but very liberal State programs of public assistance are running into financial difficulties incidental to the war where gasoline rationing is causing curtailment of horse racing, dog racing pari-mutuel betting, and other activities from which revenue has been secured. It is fortunate that we have been less ambitious but more practical in Vermont.

The United States faces many financial problems with heavy taxation, tremendous debts, and the expense and difficulty of feeding our allies and the peoples of the countries we occupy. Both the Social Security Board and the National Resources Planning Board have prepared suggestions for the President and Congress and they are known to be somewhat similar and the cost of either plan would be 10 percent of the Nation's pay roll. This on top of a Victory tax of 5 percent with a prospect of being increased to 10 percent, a pay-as-you-go income tax of possibly 20 to 30 percent for the lower brackets, local and State taxes, together with the probability of a sales tax would virtually place all Americans on a low-subsistence level We need to make our present programs sound before embarking on new ones which may wreck the entire system.

This is the year when war will really begin to hurt us, when casualty lists will be greater, when taxes will be higher, when rationing will be tougher, and our whole life must be one of sacrifice and toil. We all want to gain a greater future for America but we cannot destroy a great proportion of the material wealth of the world or expend it in powder, shot, and shell without severe economic aftermaths and a long period of rebuilding and reconstruction.

This has been the experience of all the ages.

A person does his fellow citizens no service if he paints the future in terms of a life of milk and honey. Life magazine for January 18 contains the following significant statement:

"A democratic statesman is, of course, tied to his people. And yet, because the ties are never absolutely rigid, he always has a fundamental choice. He can choose (1) to express the will of the people, right or wrong; or (2) knowing that he is better informed, to press his convictions, not alone with fine words, but with tough argument, deeds, and the acceptance of political risks. It is arguable that either of these courses is admissible. But the tragedy of the last decade lies in the fact that our leaders sought to straddle both of them. Like the President when he signed the fatal Neutrality Act, they have acted one way and talked another. The White Book itself is a gigantic straddle. It justifies itself for doing what the people wanted by proving that the Department knew all along that what the people wanted was wrong."

We are destined for bitter disappointment if we think that freedom from want will rise full-fledged from the ashes of this great war.

It will require many years and many generations to turn the entire world into the single, large, and prosperous workshop, regardless of language, race, or previous condition of ancestral glory, which it is ultimately destined to be.

Life means change and this is not the first time that the human race has been faced by emergency. Instead of being more prodigal, we need to become more industrious, more practical, more prudent, and to build our cooperative endeavor to higher and higher levels.

If free enterprise and the democratic way of life are to survive, it must be through the elimination of prejudices, hatred, and class advantage and through cooperative communities and states, established on Christian principles.

Freedom from want cannot be forced on a democracy or given a democracy. It must be won by them. Winning it needs courage, faith, sense, national unity—courage to face facts and difficulties and overcome them, faith in our future and ideals, freedom, the fair play for which century after century of our forefathers were prepared to die.

This is the social security which the world of today and the world of tomorrow so urgently needs.

Is Americe Passing the Lord and Praising the Ammunition?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following address by Paul E. Martin, minister of the Methodist Church, Cambridge, which comes to me from my good friend Mr. G. E. Simon, lawyer and patriot, of Cambridge, Nebr.:

I. INTRODUCTION

With phrasing adapted from a reputed actual happening at the Pearl Harbor attack, Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition, current hit song, has brought the Lord's name to the lips of millions.

But how strange it is that many of those who take this sacred name on their lips know nothing of His wonderous person and works. Here is what they are actually doing: They are passing the Lord and praising the am-

munition. For, does not America boast of its productive capacity and that our planes, tanks, and ammunition will eventually blow the enemy right out of the war?

Time magazine for January 11, 1943, states: "The total production is to be up 100 percent. For a hint of what this means, citizens could remember the Government's recent announcement that 49,000 planes were produced last year. Left for the man in the street will be what officials term 'a lean but healthy civilian economy.' To many who have not yet felt the full pinch of war, the degree of leanness will be surprising before year's end."

But how often do we actually seek the Lord and look to Him for help? The mistake, in my own personal opinion, and it amounts to a great sin, is that we are simply passing the Lord and praising the ammunition.

The main thesis of this sermon is not to be limited to the statement alone, namely, "Passing the Lord and praising the ammunition," but we are speaking more specifically of putting God in a secondary place and letting other worldly things take precedence over spiritual values of life. Therefore, when the statement is used, "Passing the Lord and praising the ammunition," we shall not confine our interests to that alone, but also to other worldly things. Eddie Rickenbacker has called them the mere things of life in times of great crisis.

Before we begin the statements concerning who God is and the person of God, it is my purpose to state my own position about the war. If it is being fought for our freedom of democracy, our religious liberty, and all that for which our forefathers have fought and given their lives, and for all that which is right and holy, and for making this a better world in which to live, then it has my wholehearted cooperation and sympathies. I shall be very patriotic if this war is being fought in the interest of the above mentioned facts and I shall continue to believe this until I have been made to believe to the contrary. However, if it is being fought for the sake of power and greed, then I shall say that this war is wrong, like all wars which have been fought for that purpose only.

II. WHO IS GOD?—THE PERSON OF GOD

First of all, let us understand what the Scripture has to say about the Lord. Hebrews I: 1–3: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past * * * hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds; who being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power, when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."

In this remarkable declaration we see that the Lord is the eternal Son of God. He is the Creator of the universe. He is the one who purges sin. He is living now in Heaven.

Is there any reason why we should take the name of Deity lightly on our lips? Especially when it is to be used in a current hit song Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition.

To know this One is the grandest experience in life. He alone has the key to the past, present, and future and a life entrusted to the Son of God is a life of fruitfulness and victory, a victory that may be individual or national. But why is it that so many folk are passing by our God and praising all things save our Lord and Savior? The answer, when it comes to my personal conviction, and it is a conviction rather than an opinion, is sin. Oh, if only men could see the exceeding sinfulness of sin and God's awful punishment for it, they would hasten to bow at the Savior's feet and never again use that sacred name in such a flippant manner. Unless America repents and turns to God, she will eternally perish.

It is this God of whom we speak who shall save America from her sins. He is the one who purges sin.

III. WHAT CAN GOD DO FOR THE WORLD?—GOD'S WORKS

The news which God has for a sinful world is all good news. The word "gospel" itself, when translated, means "good news." Romans 5: 6–8 states what God can do for a world that needs His guiding hand: "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. * * * God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."

Now, as to our answer to the above question, namely, What can God do for the world? here it is very briefly: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus Christ, * * * thou shalt be saved." This is what God is able to do for the world if it will only begin praising Him and putting in the background other worldly things. Let us cease forever passing the Lord and praising the ammunition. When there has been repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, then, and only then, may we as a nation truly have the right to praise the Lord.

Why are we as a nation praising the ammunition and passing our God? It is simply because we do not know God and are not acquainted with the business of God and the Kingdom of God.

Something happened this past week, as may be found recorded in Time magazine, January 11, 1943, which in a measure convinces me that America is in grave danger of passing the Lord and praising other worldly things, and also praising man. The following is quoted from Time magazine:

"In Washington the United Nations lost a campaign. It was not military. News from the battle fronts was still excellent. It had nothing to do with production. That war was being won over and over again. The misfortune was the failure of the United States to practice the United Nations principle that it had preached—with the result that a great and good ally was slowly losing faith.

"From Chungking, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek sent orders that the Chinese military mission which came to the United States last April to plan a united strategy against the Jap in the Far East should return home. No explanation was given. None was needed.

"Everyone who had followed the mission's progress knew that it had been ignored and rebuffed. Its leader, brilliant General Hsiung Shih-fei, had been assured a place at the tables where United Nations high strategy is made. Nothing happened. No invitation to sit in on the councils ever arrived. Probably most of the trouble was a vast and inexcusable neglect.

"One noted Chinese who did not have to conceal his bitterness was Philosopher-Author Lin Yutang. Said he: 'Let me ask the American people a question: Why should not General Hsiung leave? Of what use can his presence in Washington be to the Allied cause—since the leaders of the United Nations appear to be far from ready to share with China a unified strategy against Japan? The enormous reservoir of goodwill between China and America is being severely drawn upon. * * *'"

When one considers that China is under the leadership of a Christian man, and when it looks as if here was a grand opportunity for America to link up herself with a Christian nation, one cannot help but think "Is America Passing the Lord and Praising the Ammunition?" Unless America repents and turns to God, she shall eternally perish.

Inaugural Address of Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, Governor of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, in his third inaugural address at Boston, January 7, 1943, Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, said:

While our country is at war, there is only one question to consider: How can our Commonwealth best contribute to the winning of the war as quickly as possible?

He urged the Legislature of Massachusetts to adopt, in its deliberations, the watchwords:

Maintain, improve, curtail, postpone, and prepare.

Because I believe that the philosophy of government in a time of national peril as set forth by Governor Saltonstall is so admirably expressive of the hopes and purposes of the American people with reference to cooperation of the States in the prosecution of the war, and is so clear a call to a unified spirit of service and sacrifice in the national emergency, I deem it appropirate that this hopeful and inspiring message be printed in the RECORD.

The address follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives, the people of Massachusetts have chosen us to serve them in one of the most critical times in the history of our country. Our decisions on their problems must be made in a world filled with violence, haste, anxiety, and sorrow. We must not fail.

While our country is at war, there is only one question to consider: How can our Commonwealth best contribute to the winning of the war as quickly as possible? This has been the only policy that has guided my action since the legislature last met. It was made possible by the legislature's unanimously giving me very full and complete powers to take those steps needed to back up the war policies of our country. Now it becomes the only policy which must govern our joint actions.

By means of executive war orders I was able to handle each situation as it arose. Hence my recommendations are necessarily few. When the war is won—and if our prayers are answered that victory will come soon—we can readily meet together at short notice to deal with the problems that may then arise.

The time is not for words, but action. Your session will be short and businesslike. Of that I am sure. As guides to bending all our thought and energy to the war effort, I urge you to—

Maintain those services which are essential to health and strength on the home front.

Improve the management of public business. In the face of growing Federal taxes and the drain on manpower, be more efficient than ever in order to get the best out of the manpower and dollars available.

Curtail, reduce, or eliminate all services not materially contributing to the prosecution of the war, and utilize the services of every

employee for the most vital duties without impairing any civil-service rights.

Postpone any construction of roads and buildings not directly vital to the war. Because of priorities and greater war needs, no nonwar construction now.

Prepare for the days of peace, when employment and other post-war problems will be enormous. Reduce or eliminate debts. Build up savings by curtailing nonessentials.

Therefore, in our deliberations, let maintain, improve, curtail, postpone, and prepare be our watchwords.

We must harden ourselves to doing without. We must endure hardship. But, above all, we must keep our war program rolling at top speed over every obstacle.

At the moment the fuel shortage is critical and other shortages will arise. These place a great responsibility on Massachusetts citizens. As a State, we have no control over rationing, but we must be treated fairly and not suffer uselessly. To this end I have appointed Col. Thomas F. Sullivan as State emergency conservator. In the past year I have constantly attempted to see that Massachusetts gets its full share of fuel. The picture changes rapidly, but I am confident that our people, once they understand the need for any new action, and realize what is expected of them, will outdo themselves to carry on. Patriotism is stronger than policing.

More than 225,000 men and women from Massachusetts are serving in the armed forces of the United States. With this enrollment, we are high among the first ten States in proportion to population. Of this record we are proud. Our minds and hearts are with those boys and girls. We want them back home. As they return, we must be prepared to assist them. Planning for post-war employment of our returning veterans is an essential part of our present job. I recommend that the measures assisting veterans of other wars be studied and those helpful to and needed by the present veterans be extended to them as liberally as possible.

Our Committee on Public Safety has done an outstanding job in organizing civilian defense. Its work must go on.

Our State guard has done a pioneer job in training for modern defense in any emergency. Its service must go forward.

The splendid work of our teachers in registrations and our citizens on rationing and selective service boards has made possible our fuller participation in the war effort. This activity must continue until the war is won.

The team play of our workers and management has won for Massachusetts thus far 70 Army and Navy E awards for production—the second highest total of any State. Any action you can take to make possible still greater use of manpower, or womanpower, and more speedy production, I will gladly endorse.

In plants and industries not directly engaged in war production there is a shortage of manpower due to the war. To meet vital civilian needs, these plants must be kept efficient. I, therefore, recommend that you grant to the commissioner of labor and industries the same powers in all plants and industries that he now has in war production. I also recommend increasing the maximum benefit rates for unemployment compensation along the lines which will be suggested to you by the advisory council of the employment security division.

The entire State is still shaken by the most tragic disaster in Boston's history—the Cocoanut Grove fire. This must never happen again in Massachusetts. I recommend the immediate study, review, and revision, where necessary, of our laws pertaining to safety at all places where the public gather. Divided authority must be eliminated. Responsibility must be definite and fixed. Enforcement must have no loopholes.

So far as Boston is concerned, the licensing board is a logical body to assume this responsibility. Sufficient authority, funds, and qualified personnel must be assigned to this board to perform its duty.

Farmers are face to face with serious war problems and have suffered a severe loss of manpower. Any help you can give our dairy and other farmers, I will gladly endorse. Remember, they are providing our necessities of life in greater quantities than ever before.

The care of our people in institutions, when facilities cannot be expanded to meet crying needs, becomes in reality a war problem. A year ago I initiated a survey of the available accommodations for patients and inmates in State, county, and municipal institutions. This revealed that if all facilities were cooperatively used, overcrowding could be greatly relieved. Some transfers between State agencies have been accomplished with beneficial results. More can be done if certain legal and physical restrictions are corrected. I recommend your careful consideration of the suggestions in the special survey on this subject, dated June 1, 1942.

In the light of rapidly changing conditions I also recommend that you carefully consider the suggestions made to you by the commissioner of public welfare on the administration of old age assistance.

Our judicial system must function efficiently under war conditions. I recommend that during wartimes you consider the revision of jury service.

Action of State and local governments in fiscal affairs must help maintain national economic stability and build a cushion against post-war shocks. Federal taxes are rising enormously. Our people expect us to help them by keeping State and local taxes as low as possible. For that reason, I shall recommend no new taxes. At the same time, I feel that present revenues must be maintained, in order to continue to keep the State tax burden on local communities as low as possible. We must pay our bills; we must continue to retire debt; and we must accumulate reserves. It is better to prepare now for the future than to borrow heavily later. General or special reserves may be set up and duly protected against premature or uneconomical expenditure. A fund for use in case of disaster must continue to be immediately available. I recommend that you pass the necessary legislation to permit municipalities to set up such reserves and the State again to build up its war emergency fund. I shall report in my budget message on the use made of that fund. What is left of it, if any, can be used for post-war purposes when peace comes.

I have already discussed the war problems as they apply to our State and local governments, but there are post-war difficulties which government alone cannot solve. That must be done by all of us as individuals—upon our own initiative, imagination, courage, assumption of risk, and all those qualities which have made America great.

For a year now, a committee appointed by me has made preliminary studies to determine: (1) Those skills for which our workers are best fitted; (2) the possibilities of getting war industries quickly converted to peace production; (3) the possibilities of encouraging all industry to meet unemployment conditions sure to follow the ending of war.

I recommend that the creation of this committee and its work receive your support. The all-important objective will be to create positions in private industry.

During the early readjustment from war to peace, employment will be supplemented by carefully thought-out public works. Our Commonwealth and many of its communities are already making specific plans for this purpose. A special committee under the leadership of the Commissioner of Administration and finance has been preparing a State program, which for reasons of organization I recommend be carried further by a group consisting of the State Emergency Public Works Commission and the chairman of the State Planning Board.

One such project which demands our immediate attention is the enlargement of the East Boston Airport. This can be commenced now without interfering with the war effort by the purchase of additional land and by using fill, from time to time available and otherwise wasted. The future of Massachusetts and New England will depend greatly on air transport. Our present airport is inadequate, even now, and entirely inadequate for the tremendous expansion of air transport sure to come at the close of the war. I strongly recommend a bond issue of $3,000,000 for enlarging this airport in addition to funds already appropriated and still available.

In considering all the subjects which will come before you, the constant question which you must ask yourself is, "Will the action we take help win the war?" In the critical bygone days of American history Massachusetts has gloriously played her part. To that illustrious role will be added the year 1943, if we here assembled do our full share. That is the tremendous task for all of us. You and I today face a great challenge and a greater opportunity.

Initiative, courage, tolerance, patience, vigilance, and faith bring order, justice, and personal freedom. There is no sacrifice too great for us to make that we may keep these blessings for ourselves; and that others may enjoy them in the future.

Not since the grim years of the Civil War has our country faced a graver crisis. The fierce trial through which we now pass, as Abraham Lincoln so nobly said, "Will light us down to honor or dishonor, to the latest generation." We are ready to meet our challenge as he met his. With God's help, together we will go forward to victory and lasting peace.

Meet an Economic Royalist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including, by request, the following editorial by Thomas O'B. Flynn, editor of the Wheeling Intelligencer, of Wheeling, W. Va., entitled "Meet an Economic Royalist":

MEET AN ECONOMIC ROYALIST

Elsewhere in this issue the Intelligencer prints a letter written to the president of Geneva College by Mr. M. L. Benedum, the oil man.

The people of West Virginia know Mike Benedum. He began his career here and never has lost touch with the people of this State. We hope every reader of the Intelligencer will take the time to read Mr. Benedum's letter, and can only regret that every citizen of the United States cannot read it, and with the same understanding of the background and record of the man who wrote it.

We think the letter is important because it deals so simply, so convincingly and sincerely with one phase of a governmental concept which, if it prevails, is as certain to

make this country over into something alien to what we have cherished for a century and a half as the night is certain to follow the day.

Mr. Benedum shows with crystal clarity what it will mean, not to the rich man, but to the country, its culture, and its institutions, if the pending proposal to limit all individual income to $25,000 a year goes through.

But that's only one, and the less important effect, of a governmental policy of which this salary-limitation proposal is but a manifestation.

The theory seems to be that no man can amass wealth save at the expense of others; that there is just so much to go 'round, and that when one man has more than his share others must do without. It holds that the concentration of great wealth, even substantial wealth, in the hands of relatively few individuals makes for the oppression and economic slavery of the masses. Therefore, a benevolent government must not only break up large fortunes but prevent their accumulation in the future.

You see where it leads. Its logical end must be collectivism—common ownership of wealth, which is the means of production; the national economy managed by a central government for the benefit of all of the people. That has been the unswerving path of the New Deal from the very beginning, manifested in the phase we are here considering by the smear campaign against individual bigness in the business world, from the "economic royalist" sneer down to the salary-limitation proposal.

The practical question, therefore, arises: Is the sort of existence envisioned by these prophets of a new order superior or inferior, viewed from the standpoint of all of the people, to what we have had heretofore in this country?

We do not propose going here into a comprehensive discussion of socialism versus the private enterprise system. But there are several obvious flaws in the particular phase of the New Deal doctrine we now are considering which should appeal immediately, it would seem to us, to all normal Americans.

In the first place it isn't true that men of wealth can get it only by taking it from others. The truth is that most of them create it, at least in the sense of making it available. In the second place, it isn't true that the possession or control of great wealth means that the possessor consumes all or even a substantial part of it himself, or has the exclusive enjoyment of all that it means in the way of human welfare.

We don't mean by this that there are no crooks or greedy, selfish individuals among men of wealth. We don't mean that nobody has gotten rich by taking advantage of others, by robbing others, by outsmarting those with whom they deal. We don't mean that men have not abused the power given them by possession of wealth. By no means. There are villains in every walk of life. And we must have laws and a vigilant government to protect the weak from the strong. Certainly. But we do mean that by and large men of wealth have largely created what they possess and that they have managed it in the public interest to vastly greater advantage than any government could. And the important thing is not the wealthy class, but the system which made it possible for these men to amass wealth.

Take the case of Mike Benedum. We simply deny, flatly and without qualification, that Mike Benedum climbed to a place of economic eminence on the backs of other men. And we believe Mr. Benedum to be typical of his class.

What is his record? He started with nothing but his brain and his body. Intelligence, courage, vision, character, stamina, a boundless capacity for hard work—these were his tools. With them he pioneered in oil development in many parts of this and other countries, building, building throughout the years. How much Mike Benedum has contributed to human progress through the discovery and production of oil; how many communities his enterprises have brought economic improvement to; how many individuals he has provided gainful employment for, directly and indirectly, all aside from the human happiness he has spread through the direct contribution of his own money, nobody ever will know. But it is obvious that the beneficial influence of his activities has been very wide and very great. On the other hand, if any human has suffered because of Mr. Benedum's wealth or his accumulation of wealth, that fact is not apparent.

What happens to M. L. Benedum and his property is of relatively little importance, as he himself would be the first to admit. But what happens to the system of government, the way of life that made his career possible is important.

Does any intelligent man or woman actually believe that this country would have been better off today had we adopted 75 years or so ago a system of government under which this man could not have done the things he did do?

Attention of O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK FELLOWS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of January 20, 1943:

ATTENTION OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Young Representative EDWIN ARTHUR HALL—Cornell man to Congressman, Binghamton, N. Y., to Washington, D. C.—speaks his mind courageously and blasts the newest Office of Price Administration motor-car exactions:

"There is no law on the books which forbids an automobile owner to use his gas ration as he pleases."

No, Mr. HALL; there is no such law.

No, Office of Price Administration; there is only your fiat.

And that's what's the matter with this whole automobile show.

The recent prohibitions are sectional.

They are in ludicrous and irrational contradiction to the spirit of other of Office of Price Administration's self-set standards.

They are essentially wanton and morally indefensible.

SECTIONAL

They apply to only 17 States of the Union.

They say that sauce for the goose is no longer sauce for the gander.

They say that what may be innocent in Bangor, Mich., is treason in Bangor, Maine.

CONTRADICTORY

Drink rationing decrees that a citizen may have only 1 pound of coffee in 5 weeks—but it doesn't decree that a citizen mustn't drink all his coffee at one breakfast.

Food rationing permits you only 1 cup of sugar per week—but it doesn't forbid you to put all that cupful into a single sponge cake—if you suffer from a super-sweet sponge-cake complex.

Clothes rationing orders a man to curtail the amount of cloth in his trousers—but it doesn't compel him to leave his trousers at home when he goes to a dance.

Leather as well as gas is a wartime critical material. If it is a misdemeanor to drive to the movies on gas legally obtained, why isn't it a misdemeanor to walk to the movies on leather legally obtained?

MORALLY INDEFENSIBLE

These Office of Price Administration prohibitions are an authoritarian interference with the natural prerogative of free will.

Man-made law may interfere with free will insofar as man-made law says, "If you do wrong, I shall punish you." Man-made law may even define what "wrong" is—for the individual and so long as the wrongs defined are acts by which their doer hurts some other individual. But man-made law may not forbid any individual to do any wrong that harms nobody except himself.

From Maine's Madawaska to the Florida Keys, the people against whom the Office of Price Administration discriminates—American citizens of 17 States—are remembering Macaulay's sadistic censors who "hated bear baiting, not because it gave pain to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the spectators." Every one of these unjustly inhibited Americans is, in effect, saying this to the Office of Price Administration:

"If the fighting forces of our country need more gas, then let the Government of our country issue us civilians less gas.

"But let it be less for all—not for some.

"And don't try to dictate to us how, when, and where we shall burn the allowance.

"If the Government's war effort needs all that we have, we shall give it gladly.

"But, if the Government's war effort doesn't need all of it, then what is left is ours.

"And, so long as it remains ours, and so long as what we do with it hurts nobody, then we have the right to use or abuse this remnant—each man and woman among us, as his or her own desire directs."

The Office of Price Administration has done many wise things. It will do a wise thing now if, in this matter of the individual's disposition of his gas ration, it takes to heart the words of Ecclesiastes:

"Dead flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savor, so doth a little folly him that is in reputation for wisdom and honor."

This Mule Is 48 Years Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a very interesting story, concerning an old mule, written by my good friend, E. B. Friday, North, S. C., which I am sure will be of interest not only to the Members of Congress, especially those from the rural areas of the country, but the many readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NORTH, S. C., *January 23, 1943.*

On December 21, 1942, the writer was at the home of Ed Davis, Negro farmer near

here, and made a photograph of Davis and his mule. The mule was 48 years old on November 15, 1942, and still going. The age of this mule can be substantiated by competent proof. Davis, in his younger days, drove this mule while courting the girl he married. After he married he reared a family of six children, plowing the same mule and other livestock acquired by him. He now has several other mules and other livestock, all of which are well fed and kept.

When Davis was married he had no property but now he owns a nice farm of 150 acres and a comfortable home; he also has purchased a modern tractor, cultivators, and an up-to-date grain harvester, all of which is paid for with the exception of a small amount owed on a small tract of land.

How much this old mule has contributed in labor to the purchase of the farm and the support of the family would be difficult to estimate. We think that the mule and his master deserve some attention, so long have they lived on the farm together and so many thousands of miles of furrows they have plowed.

Ed Davis is a native of Orangeburg County, and we commend him as a worthy citizen who has, along with his aged mule, contributed to agricultural interests in this section.

I do not know how long a mule will live, but am informed by veterinarians that the life of a mule is approximately 33 years.

Davis stated to me today, January 23, 1943, that he had been offered a fancy price for his mule but would not sell it, and that it would remain on his farm as long as it lives.

E. B. FRIDAY.

Life of Gen. Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include herein a very excellent radio address delivered by Miss Sarah Ruth Frazier, of Chattanooga, Tenn., poet laureate of the United Confederate Veterans, on January 19, the birthday of Gen. Robert E. Lee. The address was part of a memorial service sponsored by the General A. P. Stewart Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

The address is as follows:

General Lee was one of the finest generals the world has ever known. He was one of the greatest southerners, greatest Americans, and greatest Anglo-Saxons the world has ever produced. He was born at Stratford, Westmoreland County, Va., on January 19, 1807. He was quite young when he passed away, being only 63 when he died on October 12, 1870. Of course, we realize that Lee is a world hero. He belongs to all ages and all climes. Lee went through West Point without a single demerit. He neither smoked nor drank. He might have been chosen the "Young Bayard of the Army," "a knight without fear and without reproach." He left West Point in 1829, a second lieutenant. In 1831 he married Mary Custis, a granddaughter of Martha Washington and her first husband. Lee won distinction in the Mexican War where he was twice honored for bravery on the field of battle, especially courageous was he at Chapultepec. He was wounded and came out of the Mexican War a colonel.

Gen. Winfield Scott, his commander, said that Robert E. Lee was the world's foremost military genius. General Scott said that if he, the general, were on his death bed, and a fierce world war raging, and he was asked to select a commander, he would unhesitatingly select General Lee to lead the world out of chaos.

He was made Superintendent of West Point in 1852, where he inaugurated several needed reforms. He was on the western border, when he was called to Washington, and offered the command of the United States Army at the time of the War between the States, but Lee said he could not forsake his native State—Virginia. Just as his father, "Light Horse Harry Lee," helped to throw off the yoke of British oppression, so was Lee prepared to help Virginia resist invasion.

He resigned his commission in the United States Army and returned to Virginia. "Save in defense of my native State, I never desire to draw my sword again," said Lee.

He offered his services to Virginia and was made commander of the Virginia forces. He was eventually made commander in chief of the Confederate forces. Outnumbered three times to one he won one brilliant victory after another and outgeneraled the enemy at every turn, until he came to Appomattox, where pure force of numbers overpowered him. It was on the morning of the fatal 9th of April about 3 o'clock that General Lee said to General Gordon, "Reconnoiter and see if Sheridan's cavalry is all that stands in the way of our escape. If that is all, we will cut our way out." Gordon routed Sheridan's splendid cavalry, but returned with the news that the army of the James 80,000 strong, and more pouring in, were drawn up in serried columns, so there was nothing for Lee to do but meet Grant between the lines and arrange the terms of surrender.

The surrender of Lee at Appomattox—what a picture it brings to my mind, of gray clad battle-scarred veterans at the close of 4 years of desperate fighting, 4 years of privation, of hunger, of daring escapades, hairbreadth adventures and thrilling escapes—overpowered, but not conquered—outnumbered, but not out generaled. Only 7,892 men with arms of that magnificent army of northern Virginia, only that small number left to surrender at Appomattox, but some way in my mind's eye, I can see these same veterans when they marched forth to battle—most of them mere youths—straight and strong, ready to do battle for a great cause, a noble principle, a lofty ideal. And how they did fight. Never in the history of the world have men endured such privations. Without money, without food, without clothing, without ammunition, they fought on and on, and when the end came, broken in health but not in spirit, they returned to homes laid waste by war's desolation, where hunger flaunted its grim visage, and poverty stalked at will, did they repine?—they did not. Without money and without credit they built anew on the ashes of the past. How well they have built you can see for yourself in this beautiful southland of ours.

But that day at Appomattox General Lee's expression was calm, dignified, but very sad. He said to his men as they crowded around him, "Men, we have fought through the war together, I have done my best for you. My heart is too full to say more." Lee's men were devoted to him. The scene was an affecting one, the sad farewells of men who were bound so closely together by common hardships, common dangers, and victories shared, and now this crushing blow, the death of all their hopes. Noble Gordon in a simple but eloquent speech bade the soldiers a long farewell.

As Lee thought of the forced marches—the hard-fought battles, and the death of the hope he held most dear, the thousands of unmarked graves between the Rappahannock and the James, the agony of his spirit was so great that even his iron control could not prevent the exclamation, "I would rather die a thousand deaths," and it was then that the temptation assailed him to ride along lines and meet a soldier's death, but instantly duty, the great motivating force of his life, asserted its sway, and he said, "But what of the women and children of the South, it is our duty to live and protect them." Yes; by a sacrifice nobler than death he lived to care for and protect not only the women and children, but his entire beloved Southland. It was in the parlor of the McLean home, where the terms of the surrender were drawn up, where General Lee said to General Grant, "I am determined to maintain the honor of my army to the end and will not submit to a dishonorable surrender." General Grant said, "I have no intention of offering a dishonorable surrender. What would you consider an honorable surrender?" General Lee outlined the peace terms which he would consider honorable, and General Grant said they suited him all right. Then General Lee asked that they be reduced to writing, which they were. Here you see the remarkable spectacle of General Lee dictating the terms of his own surrender. The South will always be grateful to General Grant for his courtesy and consideration of General Lee and the Confederate veterans at this, the most crucial hour of their existence. These were the terms of the surrender:

"The officers to give their individual parole not to take arms against the Government of the United States, until properly exchanged and each company or regimental commander to sign a like parole for the men of their commands. The arms, artillery, and public property to be parked and stacked and turned over to the officers appointed by General Grant to receive them. This will not embrace the side arms of the officers, nor their private horses or baggage. This done each officer and man will be allowed to return to their homes, not to be disturbed by United States authority, so long as they observe their parole, and the laws in force where they may reside."

Be it said to the credit of General Grant, when Lee had returned home, and there were charges against Lee of treason preparatory to issuing an indictment, Grant came to Washington and told the authorities if the charges were not withdrawn, he would resign his commission in the United States Army; that he had given his word of honor, and it must be respected. It is needless to say the charges were withdrawn.

Lee at first thought he would spend his last days on a farm, but the South called him to be president of Washington College, afterward called Washington and Lee College at Lexington, Va. For a mere pittance, he taught the sons of the men who had worn the gray obedience to order and allegiance to law. Many stories have been told of the fabulous sums of money offered General Lee after the war for the use of his name, especially one large insurance company offered a colossal sum for the use of his name, but he always replied that neither "his name nor his honor were for sale." Senator Butler of Georgia said that "Lee was Caesar without his ambition, Napoleon without his selfishness, Frederick the Great without his tyranny, and Washington without his reward."

I quote from the London Standard: "Lee was always outnumbered, always opposed to a foe abundantly supplied with food, transports, ammunition, clothing, all that was wanting to his own men; he was always able to make courage and skill supply the deficiency of strength and supplies. Never perhaps was so much achieved against odds so terrible. But from the day Lee assumed

command after the Battle of Seven Pines, when Gen. Joseph E. Johnston was disabled, to the morning of the surrender at Appomattox Courthouse, he was almost invariably victorious in the field—the one exception was Gettysburg, which was a pitched battle."

Col. Charles Cornwallis Chesney, a noted English military critic, said of Lee: "In strategy mighty, in battle terrible, in adversity as in prosperity a hero indeed, with the simple devotion to duty, and the rare purity of the ideal Christian knight, he joined all the kingly qualities of a leader of men. In the annals of years to come, there will be found few names that can rival in unsullied luster that of the heroic defender of his native Virginia—Robert Edward Lee. He has made his own name and that of the Confederacy he served immortal."

The surrender took place on April 9, 1865, on April 10, Lee issued the following order to his men, the last that was ever to be issued by that immortal leader: "After 4 years of arduous service marked by unsurpassed courage and fortitude, the Army of Northern Virginia has been compelled to yield to overwhelming numbers and resources. I need not tell the survivors of so many hard-fought battles who have remained steadfast to the last, that I have consented to this result from no distrust of them, but feeling that valor and devotion could accomplish nothing that could compensate for the loss that would have attended the continuation of the contest. I have determined to avoid the useless sacrifice of those whose past services have endeared them to their countrymen. You will take with you the satisfaction that proceeds from the consciousness of duty faithfully performed, and I earnestly pray that a merciful God will extend to you his blessing and protection. With an increasing admiration of your constancy and devotion to your country, and a grateful remembrance of your kind and generous consideration of myself, I bid you an affectionate farewell."

Bureaucrats Fiddle While People Freeze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the distribution of coal in my home city of Battle Creek, Mich., is threatened with complete cessation because of a tangle which has arisen under the Office of Price Administration regulations. The drivers of coal trucks and the handlers of coal employed by retail coal dealers are about to go out on strike in an effort to obtain an increase in wages to meet the increased cost of living. The coal dealers are powerless to meet the demand for a wage increase because their profit has become nonexistent in recent months under the ceiling price regulations. Further than that the retailers of coal could not grant the increase under the regulations freezing wages.

The strike of coal employees was originally scheduled for January 16. At that time I and others interested took the matter up with the O. P. A. here in Washington in an effort to obtain relief under the ceiling-price regulations, so that the wage increase could be granted. We were told that the authority for granting such an increase did not rest in Washington but with the Cleveland office of the O. P. A. We appealed to Cleveland. In the meantime the threatened strike, which would bring unendurable hardships to our community, was postponed because the labor element involved realized what would happen. The Cleveland office told us that it would grant no relief. It insisted that a profit-and-loss statement be submitted by every coal dealer involved. It would require 3 months to obtain the information which O. P. A. insists, through its Cleveland office, it must have. It would cost each dealer between $150 and $300, and many of these are small dealers, indeed. It is obvious they could not meet the cost.

I submit this simple statement of the facts for the consideration of Members of this House, and I ask them to bear in mind while they are thinking about it, that it is cold in Michigan these days. Last Friday the temperature was down to 16° below zero.

I might add that bureaucratic technicalities do not keep people warm.

Ruml Tax Plan Gains Paying Public's Favor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the Gallup poll of January 23, 1943, in regard to the Ruml pay-as-you-go income-tax plan. It is interesting to note that only 2 months ago a survey conducted by the institute throughout the country found that 22 percent of those who said they expected to pay an income tax in March had heard about the Ruml plan. One month later the proportion had risen to 44 percent. At the present time you will note 81 percent of the taxpayers have heard of the Ruml proposal, and the proportion of those who favor the plan has risen to the overwhelming total of 9 out of 10 among those with opinions on the subject.

The poll follows:

RUML TAX PLAN GAINS PAYING PUBLIC'S FAVOR

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., January 23.—The Ruml pay-as-you-go income-tax plan has been gaining increased support from the public as more and more taxpayers have learned about it in recent weeks.

The spread of the plan has been truly phenomenal, particularly in view of its somewhat complex nature. Only 2 months ago a survey conducted by the institute throughout the country found that 22 percent of those who said they expect to pay an income tax in March had heard about the Ruml plan. One month later the proportion had risen to 44 percent.

Today a new survey indicates that 81 percent of taxpayers have heard of the Ruml proposal. Moreover, among that group, the proportion who favor the plan has risen to the overwhelming total of 9 out of every 10 among those with opinions on the subject.

The plan, devised by Beardsley Ruml, treasurer of Macy's department store in New York, and chairman of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, is a bookkeeping device which would, in effect, write off the income taxes on 1942 earnings and would start collecting taxes on 1943 incomes immediately by pay-roll deductions, etc. In this way the Treasury would avoid the problem of trying to collect 2 years' taxes—1942 and 1943—in the same year.

The institute took the Ruml plan issue to the taxpayers of the country in a survey which asked a number of questions. The first was: "Have you heard of the Ruml pay-as-you-go income-tax plan?"

A similar question has been asked in two previous surveys. The trend follows:

Have heard of it

	Percent
November	22
December	44
Today	81

Have not

November	78
December	56
Today	19

Taxpayers who have heard of the plan were next asked:

"Do you favor or oppose the Ruml plan?"

The vote of those with opinions today, as compared to December follows:

December

	Percent
Taxpayers favoring Ruml plan	76
Taxpayers opposed	24

Today

Taxpayers favoring Ruml plan	90
Taxpayers opposed	10

Seventeen percent of those questioned in the latest survey who had heard of the plan did not express an opinion about it. Although the Treasury is cool toward the plan, few proposals in modern times have ever taken such rapid hold on the imagination of the public as the survey indicates the Ruml plan has.

TREASURY'S PROBLEM

One explanation is undoubtedly the enormous increase this year in the number of persons who will have to pay taxes and are therefore directly interested in pay-as-you-go schemes.

The Treasury estimates that 7,500,000 persons in 1941 paid a net income tax on 1940 earnings, that almost 18,000,000 in 1942 paid a net income tax on 1941 earnings. This year, the Treasury estimates, about 27,000,000 persons will pay individual net income taxes on 1942 income. The latter figure does not include Victory-tax payers, who are now paying on their 1943 earnings.

A number of tax experts have expressed concern over whether all of those people will have enough cash on hand to meet their payments, particularly if they have not been accustomed to paying such taxes in the past.

The seriousness of this year's problem can be seen from the fact that in November an institute survey found that only about one-fourth of those who expect to have to pay a tax had begun saving to meet it.

The same survey found that a substantial group of people had not yet taken the trouble to find out whether they will have to pay a tax, and that many have underestimated the extent of the new levies.

WHAT TAXPAYERS THINK ABOUT THE RUML PLAN

Poll among income-tax payers

Have you heard of the Ruml-pay-as-you-go income-tax plan?

	Percent
Yes	81
No	19

Of those who have heard. Do you favor or oppose the Ruml plan?

	Percent
Favor	90
Oppose	10

Trade Zones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, men and ships are today's unbeatable team, according to Admiral E. S. Land, the hard-hitting Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission. Both are doing a grand job operating through torpedo-torn waters to deliver vital war materials to the fighting fronts. But what about tomorrow when these ships and men sail into their home ports to resume normal peacetime pursuits? Will we be able to keep this unbeatable team together when peace is restored? Can we find gainful employment for both men and ships in the gigantic task of world reconstruction or will we permit this combination of brains and brawn, of steam and steel to disintegrate, the men to seek employment ashore and the ships relegated to the limbo of the laid-up fleets?

Some may ask why raise these questions now? Why not win the war before worrying about post-war problems? To these questions there is only one reply. We can win the war and still lose the peace. Identical problems confronted the Nation after the First World War and records show that we had developed no plans to solve them. Let us not get caught napping a second time. Our entry into the last World War following an all-out submarine attack launched by the German Admiral Von Tirpitz almost brought Britain to her knees. Merchant shipping losses reached an all-time peak early in 1917. The cry of our allies was as today—ships and more ships. The United States responded, and in the language of Chairman Hurley, of the United States Shipping Board, we built a bridge of ships to France.

In 1914, at the outbreak of the European war, only 10 percent of our international commerce was carried in American flag ships. The withdrawal of belligerent shipping from our trade routes creates a serious problem for our foreign traders. Our seagoing merchant fleet had shrunk to a scant 800,000 gross tons as compared to 2,500,000 gross tons a half a century before. Congress was aroused and after extensive investigation enacted the Shipping Act of 1916. This legislation created the United States Shipping Board and its operating subsidiary, the Merchant Fleet Corporation. The extension of the European war to other world areas made it necessary to recreate our merchant fleet under the pressure of the emergency. By 1920 the gross tons of shipping under American registry jumped to 16,193,903, 28 percent of the world's total, of which 56 percent was engaged in foreign trade. Personnel totaling 53,200 were required each month in 1920 to man this fleet, receiving monthly wages in excess of $6,100,000.

While the Armistice put an end to further expansion of our merchant fleet, when the construction program ended in 1922 we had built or otherwise acquired 2,546 vessels at a cost of more than $3,000,000,000. Lack of competition from foreign vessels due to war losses resulted in our carrying 51 percent of the volume of our foreign trade in 1921. From this period on our merchant marine declined in every particular. Progressively smaller percentages of our foreign trade were carried each year until 1936, when it reached 29.02 percent of the volume. Between 1921 and 1928 the Government sold to American citizens 1,164 ships, representing 5,360,000 tons, for $90,620,000. During this period few new vessels were added except for particular trades. The average wages for vessel personnel dropped from $115 per month in 1920 to $85 per month and remained at this figure until 1937.

Several factors contributed to this retrogression. Efforts were made in 1928 to correct some of these by the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928, wherein essential trade routes were established and construction and operating subsidies authorized. It was not, however, until 8 years later that a substantial effort was made through the passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to get at the cause of these failures. Surveys were made to determine our position in world economics with particular emphasis on the part our merchant marine should assume. In 1937 our seagoing merchant fleet consisted of 1,517 vessels aggregating 8,500,000 gross tons, of which only 426 vessels totaling 2,500,000 gross tons or 30 percent were engaged in overseas foreign trade. This latter figure included 52 tankers of 383,000 gross tons.

The 1937 plans for rehabilitating our merchant marine called for the construction of 500 ships on a replacement basis over a 10-year period. The outbreak of the war in Europe prompted the Maritime Commission to augment and accelerate this program. On October 1, 1941, we had spent a billion and a half dollars on merchant ship construction. Thus we entered the war with a building program costing more than one-half the amount expended for the cargo fleet during the last war.

Following Pearl Harbor, the program was further expanded and on September 30, 1942, the Maritime Commission had built or had contracts to build more than 2,800 seagoing vessels of approximately 28,000,000 deadweight tons. The cost of building the giant fleet will be in excess of $6,000,000,000—twice the amount expended for ship construction during the First World War.

Our total merchant fleet including the pre-war American merchant marine, vessels requisitioned and built or in process of construction, but not allowing for war casualties, consists of nearly 4,500 vessels of more than 40,000,000 deadweight tons. True, we may expect to lose more of these in the battle of the Atlantic and the other theaters of this globular war. These, however, will be replaced by additional construction.

What disposition will be made of this tremendous cargo fleet when peace is restored? Will we employ these ships in the giant task of reconstruction and in developing permanent channels of foreign trade or follow in the footsteps of the last post-war period and permit these ships to be laid up in our rivers and harbors to rot to their bones and ashes? Plans must be developed now if we are to avoid this latter course.

It is safe to assume that when the war is terminated we will control nearly all the merchant shipping in the world and should be in a position to secure a just share of the world trade. Naturally, a merchant marine is essential for the development of any maritime nation, but international trade requires more than ships.

Nations must be willing to freely exchange their products for the goods of other countries. Traders must arrange these transactions to the advantage of each country and banking facilities must be provided to finance such trade. Plans for the exchange of commodities will be worked out around international conference tables in accordance with the terms of the Atlantic Charter, which provides in article 4 for access by all states, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

While the matter of international shipping policy will be determined by the Federal Government, there are steps which can be taken by our steamship operators and port authorities to improve the efficiency of our merchant marine for peacetime operations. Facilities must be provided in our ports to handle ships and cargo in the most efficient manner. Obsolete terminals, congestion, delays in unloading and loading ships, customs bonds and red tape, all add to the total landed cost which foreign merchandise must pay.

In 1934, to overcome these handicaps, I sponsored a bill in Congress which would permit the establishment of foreign trade zones in our ports of entry. These foreign trade zones or free ports, which are designed to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, have operated successfully in Europe for many years.

Their purpose is to provide enclosed and policed areas, under Federal supervision, in or adjacent to ports of entry where foreign and domestic merchandise may be landed without application of the customs laws. In a zone goods may be stored, processed, or otherwise manipulated, but not manufactured or exhibited, and may be exported or brought into customs territory subject to the laws

and regulations of the United States affecting imported merchandise.

Since the enactment of my bill in 1934 only one zone actually has been established. This foreign-trade zone was opened in Stapleton, Staten Island, in February 1937, and has handled more than $200,000,000 worth of merchandise since it was opened to world trade.

During the year 1940, of the 140,000 tons of foreign merchandise valued at $30,000,000 which was brought into the New York Foreign Trade Zone, 70,000 tons, or 50 percent, valued at $13,000,000, were reexported to foreign countries.

Before introducing the bill in Congress I undertook a thorough study of the advantages of the foreign-trade zone in developing international trade and shipping, and was fully convinced of the value of this facility. An analysis of the actual operations of the New York Zone has convinced me that my previous conclusions as to the benefits to both foreign commerce and shipping have been accomplished.

The achievements of the New York Foreign Trade Zone under war conditions are only partial evidence of what may be accomplished when peace is restored. The acclaimed success of the trade zone definitely dictates that other ports should proceed immediately to establish similar facilities so that they may be made available to meet the requirements of post-war international trade.

Officials of several other of our ports are now considering the establishment of foreign trade zones, but are inclined to contemplate minimum makeshift facilities. This is short-sighted policy and one which will never permit full advantage of my bill. Our major ports should set aside and construct if necessary, when materials are available, complete terminal facilities for the economical handling of both import and export trade. Provision should also be made for air transport which is sure to develop. Shipside warehousing should also be provided so as to reduce costs on goods for transshipment and reexport. These terminals, whether in or out of a foreign-trade zone, should engage competent staffs to develop the interchange of foreign commerce.

Every shipping man knows that his vessel makes money only when it is actually steaming at sea and delays in port are extremely costly. Foreign-trade zones offer the following savings of time and expense to vessels which should be of interest to steamship operators:

First. Delays due to customs boarding officers would be obviated.

Second. Prompt docking and uninterrupted discharge of cargo.

Third. Omitting necessity of giving heavy bonds to customs, obligating steamship agents to pay any loss of duty by fire, theft, casualty, etc., and the consequent delay while these matters are adjusted with the customs.

Fourth. Not being required to make applications to customs, obtain permit, and pay for inspectors' services when it was desirable or necessary to work early or late hours, or on Sundays and holidays.

Fifth. Bonded and/or foreign cargo laden or unladen at will.

Sixth. Vessel's discharge not stopped because of some error or delay in customs papers, which, at times, besides the cost by reason of delay, has entailed fines to vessels ranging from $100 to $5,000.

Seventh. Not being required to keep draw-back goods separate from other cargo and give to the customs officials 6 hours' notice before lading same.

Eighth. No further holding of trucks on the dock until customs inspector is able to check all bonded goods trucks may have, before loading on vessels, or unladen bonded goods trucks may have, for export vessel, bonded warehouse, or appraiser's store; this checking would be done outside of free port. Once goods were placed on the dock, either from or for the vessel, no customs delay could occur, thus securing more prompt clearing of docks.

In planning our war economy this country has encouraged increased production and the development of manufactures in the Latin-American republics. Most of our Latin-American neighbors have adjusted their output to meet our war demands. As an evidence of "good neighbor" cooperation, a number of our neighboring republics have established industrial plants to provide for local needs and for the requirements of neighboring countries. A recent press dispatch from Caracas, Venezuela, sets out the effort of the Republic of Colombia to expand its markets for manufactures as follows:

> The Ambassador of Colombia to Venezuela recently opened a showroom in Caracas in which were displayed samples of the various products manufactured in Colombia and now available for export. The exhibit serves as a measure of considerable industrial progress that has been made by our sister Republic. The exhibit included toys, articles made of leather, pharmaceutical products, silks, hats, moldings and woodwork, chinaware, objects of hammered silver, rayon stockings, and a great variety of fabrics, including cashmeres, cotton bed sheets, cotton cloth of various types, as well as silk and wool. The textile industry of Colombia is now said to be able to fill all the requirements of that nation and to produce a surplus for export. Colombia reportedly has 65 mills producing silk.

Colombia's industrial revolution is indicative of what is taking place in other of our sister republics. Surely we must assist them in disposing of both manufactures and raw materials when the major effort of winning the war has been achieved. It is a foregone conclusion that we will have the ships but will we have other facilities necessary to efficiently carry on foreign trade? Terminal storage, and banking facilities must be provided at fixed and reasonable costs for the stock-piling of products of Latin America until markets can be found either in our country or abroad. If we fail to make provision for handling this trade now, we must not be disappointed if our Latin American neighbors resume business as usual with the European successors of the Nazis and Fascist leaders on the terms which they propose.

The value of foreign-trade zones for the promotion of Latin-American commerce was recognized at the recent meeting of the National Foreign Trade Convention which included in its final declaration a resolution urging the establishment of additional foreign-trade zones.

Amply equipped foreign-trade zones in major ports on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts will provide reservoirs for the economic handling and storage of the products of Latin America and other friendly countries without expensive customs supervision. Steamship executives whose companies have substantial investments in the American merchant marine should join with foreign traders and port authorities in planning now for the establishment of foreign-trade zones.

President Roosevelt Utilizes Aviation To Hold Conference Vital To Planning for Victory

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt, using commercial and military aircraft, has flown to north Africa for conferences with Prime Minister Churchill—who also used plane transportation from England—for a precedent-shattering journey. He was the first Chief Executive of our Republic to make an air journey, and practically every believer in air power congratulates him on this method of travel.

Gradually there is dawning upon the entire country and the world the realization of the importance of aviation and absolute supremacy in the air. There are still those among our countrymen who question our efforts to push aviation ahead. They still question the importance of this activity, and think of it as a luxury or merely a thrilling sport.

Mr. Speaker, the prophecies of a few years ago that aviation is changing the very face of the globe have already come true. The strangling tentacles of war now reach from the skies and snatch away the security which those who have failed to understand the place of aviation had foolishly thought they had achieved.

Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, a visitor on Capitol Hill today, declared in a statement here yesterday that he fully agreed with General MacArthur that knockout blows from the air will defeat Japan. He advised against the slow method of taking island by island. Germany and Italy today fear the power of the air supremacy we are forging between the United Nations. I herewith include an interesting and informative article from today's Washington Post:

PRESIDENT'S FLIGHT SHATTERS PRECEDENT—TRIP COVERED 10,000 MILES IN 2 WEEKS—10 DAYS AT MEETING

(By Marshall Andrews)

For the first time in history a President of the United States has made a trip by airplane.

President Roosevelt's flight to north Africa and back not only shattered precedent, it was

an act simple enough in itself but pregnant with momentous implications.

The busiest man in the world has been scarcely more than 2 weeks away from his desk and in that time has traveled some 10,000 miles with time enough left over to spend 10 days at the task for which he left.

Now that the ice is broken, it is probable President Roosevelt and other Presidents to follow will make full use of this modern means of transport.

IMPETUS TO FLYING

The safe transportation of the President, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and their staffs and retinues by air will give an incalculable impetus to flying as a mode of travel.

As much as anything else, this journey underscores the great changes which have been brought about by man's conquest of the air.

In 1492 Christopher Columbus brought the New World into history in the first place by a voyage from Spain to the Caribbean Sea which required 70 days of sailing. That was one way only and consumed fivefold the time needed by President Roosevelt for round trip, conference, and all.

President Wilson after the last war crossed the Atlantic to Europe twice by fast steamer. The first trip required 30 days of travel, over and back, more than President Roosevelt's entire trip. Wilson's second round trip took 22 days.

WASHINGTON HAD TIME

The first President of the United States, George Washington, traveled from Mount Vernon to New York for his first inauguration in April 1789 by coach. It was the most up-to-date method of travel in those days and his journey was expedited as much as possible. Yet it required 15 days on the road, at least as long as President Roosevelt consumed going to Africa, conferring there for 10 days and coming back.

In 1800 it was fast going to make a trip from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh in 20 days.

By 1861 the railroad had become the established mode of travel in the United States, yet President Lincoln used 23 days traveling from Springfield, Ill., to Washington by rail, almost twice as long as President Roosevelt's entire trip. It is true that Lincoln consumed considerable time making speeches along the way, but Mr. Roosevelt spent 10 full days in conference near Casablanca.

FIRST IN 10 YEARS

By breaking the precedent against a President traveling by air, Mr. Roosevelt made his first airplane trip in 10 years. He last used this mode of travel when he flew from New York to Chicago in 1932 to accept the Democratic nomination for his first term in the office he now holds.

Until now, it was his last journey by air. The Secret Service, charged with the President's safety, has consistently frowned upon any President trusting himself to an airplane since President Harding was prevented in 1921 from making a flight.

How remarkable this trip was can be understood only by taking into account the multiplied safeguards thrown about the President whenever he travels anywhere. If he moves by rail a pilot train goes ahead of the Presidential train to guard against mishap and a third train follows behind. If he travels by road, the highway ahead is cleared well in advance of his coming and kept closed long after he has passed.

Should the President stop overnight at a hotel, all guests are carefully checked by the Secret Service before his arrival and the lobbies are cleared when he is to pass through them.

PRECAUTIONS TAKEN

Precautions taken to safeguard the President on this trip have been definitely detailed, far-reaching, and begun long before he left Washington. Weeks before the first inkling of his departure reached newspapermen, Secret Service men were known to have been disappearing quietly from the city.

How much the trip was by air and how much was by rail is not now known. It is known, however, that a trans-Atlantic clipper, a great seaplane capable of enduring for days if forced down on the sea, made the overwater leg of the trip. In Africa a four-motored military airplane carried the President from the point where the clipper landed to the scene of his conferences with Mr. Churchill.

Now that a President of the United States has entrusted himself to an airplane, not for a local hop but for a trip of thousands of miles over water and unfriendly land, few citizens will look askance at this modern vehicle. Presidents and aviation both have gained by Mr. Roosevelt's disposition to shatter precedents.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that the President of the United States made use of the airplane at a time when far-visioned people are thinking of the world of tomorrow. In the words of an editorial writer in the Washington Star today, the President—

Made a journey that symbolizes the new part we have come to play as a nation in the new and smaller world that is being forged by the war; a world where distances and modes of travel no longer mean what they once meant, and where territorial boundaries no longer stand as rigid walls.

My colleagues of the House, we must not fail our responsibility in making certain America's leadership.

What's Wrong With Rationing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Clifford A. Prevost from the Detroit Free Press of January 10, 1943:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH RATIONING

(By Clifford A. Prevost)

WASHINGTON, January 9—Here it is. Take it or leave it.

A lot of this rationing is just plain nonsense and directed by men who have no other desire than to make you feel it. This knowledge came to us on Wednesday night, shortly after Leon Henderson, head of the Office of Price Administration, and singing a prolonged swan song, threatened 8,400,000 motorists of the Eastern States with cancelation of all of their rights to gasoline.

Of all the stupid things which can properly be charged to Henderson this was the worst.

It threw James F. Byrnes, the Economic Director, and, theoretically, at least, the overall authority in the war effort, into a dither. "Jim" doesn't like the idea of forcing people to do the unnecessary.

In all candor, let us say that Henderson was doing what he has always wanted to do—just laying down the law to all who disagreed with him. He forced sugar rationing upon the American public when all of the sugar warehouses were bulging—just to regiment us. He was then planning to "make it easy" when he would impose the boot.

But "the boot" isn't coming to this country, and, we believe, the new Congress will see that it doesn't.

Henderson has resigned. But Mr. Roosevelt hesitates to name his successor until such time as Leon has had his final fling. There is something in this picture which approaches the sadistic. When, in Detroit, butter went to $1 a pound there was nothing in the Henderson formula to meet that situation. There is nothing in his formula today to meet the black market which is embracing America.

We know that Prentiss M. Brown, retired Senator from Michigan, has been drafted as Henderson's successor. Brown has reluctantly accepted the job. But the President of the United States still wants to play with the new Congress, wants to find out just how strong is the opposition to him. He knows that while he put the pressure upon Brown to agree to accept the job that he hesitates to name him until he can feel the pulse of the new Congress—probably better stated, the guts of that legislative body.

One new Senator walked right into this building to express his disgust at the rationing situation. We accept him as a sincere man. To our knowledge he has never taken a drink, doesn't even smoke, or drink coffee.

Yet, when a reporter accompanied him to a restaurant and asked for a pound of coffee he was tipped off by the waitress to see the proprietor. The proprietor slipped a pound of coffee to the reporter, charging outrageous prices.

This provoked in the Senator's mind the question as to whether Henderson is not directing the Nation into another bootlegging era. We had that when the Volstead Act was imposed. But, and we propound this question in all sincerity, must we resort to bootlegging to obtain food—milk, bread, and butter? Under the existing system, that's just what the country will face—unless Americans and the new Congress have guts.

There was no reason for Henderson's latest edict and, let's ask again, who ever elected him to anything. But he doesn't choose to give reasons. He assumes that he is answerable to no one. As a matter of fact he isn't. No one elected him, no one can fire him. He has put over on a Nation an entirely unnecessary rationing system not, as we see it, because it was necessary but just to show us that we had to be regimented.

This is the same Henderson who, under the National Recovery Administration, wanted to eliminate the small independent dealers. He knew, from the books he had studied, that the chain stores, whether they dealt with drugs, or meats, or bread and butter, could best serve the country.

But the National Recovery Administration died with a Supreme Court decision in 1935. Henderson's philosophy, however, didn't die with that decision. The Court has changed. Roosevelt has appointed the majority of its members. Without offense to that Court, this reporter frankly states his belief that there could not be another decision similar to that which outlawed the National Recovery Administration, if the rationing issue should be raised.

This country has never been noted for class distinction. But under Office of Price Administration that is just what is happening. It's pretty difficult for the free American housewife to walk into a grocery store and be denied her butter. But, it's even more difficult when she knows that the grocery clerk has been instructed to call up favored customers and tell them that the

shipment will be in at a certain hour. We've seen this happen in the last week.

There was no shortage of butter when Bernard M. Baruch threw his $3,000 party for Henderson, Harry L. Hopkins and his bride, and for the chosen few of this Capital. No one thought about where the butter came from. A lot of it came from the stores which otherwise would have been providing supplies for children, and just ordinary workers. That same week hundreds of stores were short of butter and couldn't supply their customers.

Is there discrimination? Most certainly.

As a matter of fact, in bureaucratic Washington, there is no such thing as an appeal. The boards are, for the most part, organized by Federal tax eaters, or their relatives. Otherwise, by volunteer workers whom most people choose to regard as thwarted women. You file an appeal. You get back a card which says "rejected"; that is, unless you have influence or unless you bow to the will of everything this administration chooses to impose. That won't last long. You can only kick people around so long.

To accuse Henderson and his machine of dishonesty would be inaccurate. It is stupidity, coming from men who know nothing beyond the textbooks.

A Charles E. Sorenson, a Charles F. Kettering, or a K. T. Keller could have worked it out. Because they've gone beyond the textbooks to give a practical application to what some college professor taught them to think about. Thinking about something and then applying it to the needs of the day represents something a lot of New Dealers haven't thought about.

Let's illustrate: Nine lawyers were called in to draw up a 23-page instruction for farmers butchering their own cattle. At the last minute it was considered advisable to call in a practical butcher. We get this straight from the packing houses at Chicago—the butcher threw up his hands, remarked that he didn't know "what in hell you guys are talking about," and walked out. He couldn't fill out the questionnaire.

Another illustration: A friend of ours representing the top news service of the Nation came back from the battle fronts the other day and faced the home front to get coffee and sugar rationing.

He explained to a tired Office of Price Administration employee in the local office that he had been away some time in places like Guadalcanal where the troops are very active, and that he and his wife were taking an apartment until he had to go back. They needed a simple rationing card.

He waited for more than an hour. He saw some clerks fumble over some records. He departed when the hour was up. He said, "I wish these people had seen what I saw on the real front. They would probably quit playing checkers."

In all truth it must be stated that a Frankenstein monster has been created. The bureaucracy is so great that no one understands it.

The Daylight Saving Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1943

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that the real American citizen is patriotic by birthright and heritage. Either he has that spark of loyalty imbedded in his heart, which is automatically kindled into the white flame of patriotism wherein the interests of his country are at stake, or he does not have it. This type of patriotism particularly peculiar to the American people can never be instilled in their hearts by any edict. The American people are intelligent and are not, as one individual expressed it, "Too damn dumb to govern themselves." If they were dumb, they would not question regulations and regimentations. They would accept them as dumb, driven cattle and not stop to ask or reason why.

There seems to have arisen a tendency in recent years on the part of certain bureaucrats to advance legislation, ascribing its "must enactment" as essential to an all-out war effort, when in reality it appears to me as simply another effort on their part to take away further rights of the individual States.

I am in no manner attempting to belittle or smear Congress for their part in passing some of this "must" legislation. It has been impossible for them to actually obtain the facts, as they were told and given only such information as those in authority desired that they be given. The Congress, in the main, were all desirous of lending their unlimited support to any and all war measures which would actually hasten the successful conclusion of the war, and not being able to obtain all the facts, and being told only those stories which tinted with rosy hue some of this "must" legislation, they—as they hoped and thought—patriotically went along with some of this crackpot legislation.

One example of this is Public Law 403, passed during the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and entitled "To promote the national security and defense by establishing daylight saving time," approved January 20, 1942.

The enactment of this law has very definitely worked an utter hardship upon the vast majority of the citizens of my State, Ohio, and I agree with them in saying that it has inhibited rather than promoted the successful prosecution of the war in Ohio. I have not yet seen any argument advanced in support of this law as contributing to the war effort in my State; while on the other hand, I have seen many glowing examples to prove that it has very definitely impeded the war effort by lowering the morale of the people, just to note one example.

The power utilities have never produced any figures in Ohio purporting to show any saving in kilowatt hours, which as I understand it, was the chief argument in favor of the passage of the bill.

If I read the times aright, and if, as we are told, food will win the war, then it seems to me that increased production is many times more essential to the war effort than the saving of a few kilowatt hours of electricity, though you will first have to prove that it actually does save power before I will concede that point.

The farmers of Ohio have never worked by a time clock, and yet you must agree that they have successfully operated their farms, and, operating on the law of supply and demand, have done a good job. They operated long before any such fool ideas as the triple A or the regulating of their hours of labor were ever conceived in some ideologist's sterile brain. I am, indeed, surprised that some of our would-be planners have not advocated a change in our solar system and ordered the Supreme Architect of the Universe to remake the entire structure.

Therefore, knowing and realizing that Public Law 403 has and is definitely working a hardship upon the vast majority of the citizens of Ohio and hindering rather than contributing to the war effort, I sincerely trust that you will go along in helping me to repeal this obnoxious piece of legislation and return the power of governing and regulating the business of the individual States to their respective legislatures, where it rightfully belongs.

The Making of a Representative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1916, the Honorable Champ Clark, then a Representative from Missouri and later one of the most distinguished Speakers who have presided over this House of Representatives, delivered an address at the Washington Press Club reception for newly elected Congressmen.

The speech he made on that occasion has been characterized as abundant in logic, sound reasoning, and might well serve as a guiding star to new Members.

In spite of the passing of the years, the address carries its full force and is as apropos of today as of 27 years ago, and I am including it in this extension of my remarks under leave heretofore granted:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 17, 1916]

THE MAKING OF A REPRESENTATIVE

It is a high honor to be a Representative in Congress, if for only one term, and with the number of terms the honor increases in geometrical rather than in arithmetical proportion. A Member's usefulness to his country should increase in the same proportion. A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

"Poeta nascitur non fit"—a poet is born, not made—says Horace; but Congressmen—that is, useful and influential Congressmen—are made largely by experience and practice.

The old Charlotte district in Virginia knew this and kept John Randolph, of Roanoke, in the House till he became a great national figure. Then the Old Dominion sent him to the Senate and General Jackson sent him

to St. Petersburg. There are sporadic cases of similar action in other districts.

It is an unwise performance for any district to change Representatives at short intervals. A new Congressman must begin at the foot of the class and spell up. Of course, the more brains, tact, energy, courage, and industry he has, the quicker he will get up. If he possesses these qualities, and if his constituents will keep him in the House, he is as certain to rise as the sparks are to fly upward. No human power can keep him down. It is only fair and rational to assume that every Representative's constituents desire to see him among the top-notchers.

Let us take the present House and see how long the men who hold the high places have served. I cannot name all, but will cite a few as samples.

Mr. Speaker Cannon is serving his fortieth year. He holds the record, or, in pugilistic parlance, "he holds the belt," for the length of service in the House in our entire history. In several Congresses he was chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations and then was Speaker 8 years, only one man, Henry Clay, having been Speaker longer.

I am serving my twenty-second year; Minority Leader Mann is serving his twentieth year; Mr. Kitchin, chairman of Ways and Means, his sixteenth; Mr. Fitzgerald, chairman of Appropriations, his eighteenth; Mr. Moon, chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads, his twentieth; Mr. Jones, chairman of Insular Affairs and "father of the House," his twenty-sixth; Mr. Flood, chairman of Foreign Affairs, his sixteenth; Mr. Hay, chairman of Military Affairs, his twentieth; Mr. Glass, chairman of Banking and Currency, his sixteenth; Mr. Adamson, chairman of Interstate and Foreign Commerce, his twentieth; Mr. Stephens, chairman of Indian Affairs, his twentieth; Mr. Slayden, chairman of the Library, his twentieth; Mr. Henry, chairman of Rules, his twentieth; Mr. Lever, chairman of Agriculture, his sixteenth; Mr. Padgett, chairman of the Navy, his sixteenth; Mr. Lloyd, chairman of Accounts, his twentieth; and Mr. Sparkman, chairman of Rivers and Harbors, his twenty-second. There are other big chairmanships, but these will suffice to show that as a rule the big places go to old and experienced Members, for most of the men who rank close to the chairmen are old-timers. The same think holds good with reference to members of the minority. As an illustration, Messrs. Gillett and Cooper, who are serving their twenty-fourth years, are the ranking Republicans on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs, almost certain to be chairmen thereof should the Republicans ever again have a majority in the House, as in that event, in all probality, Mr. Mann will be Speaker, unless he is nominated for President next June.

Go through the whole list and you will find, with few exceptions, that the men of long service have the high places.

New England and the cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh have understood the value of long service all along, and, having elected a fairly good man to Congress, they keep him in the harness.

The Member of longest consecutive service is called the father of the House. Five Philadelphians in immediate succession bore that honorable title—Randall, Kelley, O'Neill, Harmer, and Bingham. Then it went to Mr. Dalzell, of Pittsburgh. When General Bingham announced the death of General Harmer, his immediate predecessor as father of the House, he stated that the five Philadelphia fathers of the House had served a total of 147 years, and he served 8 or 10 years after making that interesting statement.

In the second and third Congresses in which I served, Maine, with only four Members, had the speakership and the chairmanship of the great Committees on Ways and Means, Navy, and Public Buildings and Grounds—a most remarkable circumstance, giving the Pine Tree State an influence in the House and the country out of all proportion to her population and wealth. These four men—Reed, Dingley, Boutelle, and Millikin—each served in the House 20 years or more. Other States might profit by her example.

No man should be elected to the House simply to gratify his ambition. All Members should be elected for the good of the country.

The best rule, it seems to me, is for a district to select a man with at least fair capacity, industrious, honest, energetic, sober, and courageous, and keep him here so long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. Such a man will gradually rise to high position and influence in the House. His wide acquaintance with Members helps him amazingly in doing things.

I can speak freely on this subject without violating the proprieties, for my constituents have kept me here 22 years, and for 20 years have given me nominations without opposition, for all of which favors I thank them from the bottom of my heart. Their generous action and unwavering friendship have enabled me to devote all my time to the public service. I have not been compelled to spend any portion of my time in "mending my fences." My constituents have attended to that. God bless them.

One other thing. I do not know what committee assignments you new Members secured. If they are good, you are to be congratulated. If bad, do not be cast down. No congressional tenderfoot ever had poorer assignments than I had—Claims and Old Pensions—but I never complained or kicked. I went to work as though those committees suited me exactly. Here is an illustration of what may happen and how luck plays an important part. I was next to top Democrat on both Foreign Affairs and Patents for 8 years—never advanced a peg so far as committees went. Just when, at the beginning of the ninth year on those two committees, I was about to become top Democrat on Foreign Affairs, Hon. John Sharp Williams, then minority leader, assigned me to the foot of Ways and Means, and at the end of 4 years through the happenings of politics in five different States I jumped from the foot to the head of the Democratic minority on Ways and Means. So it may be with you. Events over which you have no control may advance you more rapidly than you dream of or hope for. My advice is this: "Whatever your hand finds to do, do it with your might."

Commending Policy and Administration of Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, this Congress will shortly be called upon to consider the extension of the Lend-Lease Act.

On January 26, 1943, there appeared an editorial in the Washington Post entitled "Lend-Lease," which is a thoughtful, well considered, and accurate statement of the benefits accruing under the lend-lease policy, and should be of interest to the American people, and especially to Members of Congress, and under leave granted I submit same herewith:

LEND-LEASE

It will be up to the Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress, as well as the newspapers, to spread the full story of lend-lease which Administrator Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., has just presented. About few other matters of war policy has there been such misconception. Yet about few others has there been such a wealth of information. Far from being secretive, the Lend-Lease Administration has been frank and detailed. Indeed, it is compelled to be open about lend-lease operations by the act of Congress authorizing lend-lease. The present is the fifth report which the Lend-Lease Administration has submitted. In addition, every time a fresh appropriation has been requested, the officials responsible for the program have been questioned exhaustively. Consequently, there is no justification at all for the statement so frequently made that operations have been conducted in the dark. Nor will there be any further excuse that the American public do not know the facts. If the ordinary agencies of publicity do not make these matters understood, then patriotism alone should persuade every Member of Congress to acquaint his district with the facts appearing in the Stettinius report.

In point of fact, the criticism in Congress on lend-lease does not represent the sentiments of the American people. In reply to a question whether lend-lease should continue, the latest Gallup poll shows that only 9 percent dissent. It would have been surprising if there had been a larger percentage of dissenters. Theodore Roosevelt said that in the final analysis the great rock of reliance in the conduct of Government affairs was the common sense of the American people. The common sense of lend-lease springs to the eyes. Americans know that the lend-lease program of providing goods and services to nations resisting the Axis aggressors was undertaken for the defense of this country and has been carried out in the interests of the people of the United States.

Any qualms about lend-lease must have disappeared at Pearl Harbor. Then the great statesmanship underlying lend-lease became apparent even to the meanest, if not the distorted, intelligence. We had not only strengthened the nations who were destined to be our allies; we had helped to put our own inner defenses in some condition for our day of reckoning with an enemy bent upon our extinction. New plants and new shipyards had been built in order to supply our allies with war goods. They could now turn out material for our own mobilization. But for Allied takings, our aircraft factories would have been puny, and years would have had to be wasted in giving them the machine capacity for turning out bombers and fighters. And let us not forget, either, that our capacity for manufacturing munitions had likewise been brought into being by the cash orders of our present allies. "As a result of the lend-lease and cash orders," comments the Stettinius report, "this country's capacity to produce arms on December 7 was far greater than it would otherwise have been."

Thus lend-lease was of mutual advantage even when the goods and services were all going one way. Now lend-lease is a two-way trade. Not enough has been said about the reciprocal side of lend-lease, and for this reticence a charge might well be preferred against the service departments for the ban on publicity. Perhaps the reason was that the American people might not have taken kindly to the evidence of our own unpreparedness contained in such items as British barrage balloons for the protection of our Pacific coast. They might have been

troubled if at the time the report had appeared in the press that the British hurried antiaircraft guns to our cities and even to the Panama Canal.

At any rate, since Congress never asked such an accounting, none was made. Thus lend-lease was made to look like a one-sided picture. Yet the amount of reciprocal lend-lease is sizable. Britain has lend-leased to the United States as well as the Soviet Union. Our allies on the battle fronts have saved us millions of dollars in maintaining and servicing our million and a half troops abroad. They have contributed their combat experience. Machine tools have been among the precious items coming from our allies. We have depended upon them for help and apparatus in aircraft detection; corvettes and smaller craft for fighting the U-boats off our coast line; all kinds of munitions for our fighting forces. If the amount could be computed, we should find that the total went far to offset the amount of aid we have ourselves rendered.

Yet there is no standard of values for statistical computation. In very truth the dollar sign has been obliterated by the very nature of the services we are exchanging. As Mr. Stettinius says, "There is no standard of values by which the loss of a thousand Russian lives can be compared with a thousand fighter planes." The one inescapable fact emerging from this latest report is that all that we have and are as allies is being thrown into the common struggle for survival. We are "mixed up," in Mr. Churchill's phrase, in a pooling of men and resources which is the prime insurance of victory and the best hope for a peace when we shall have to live together again.

One Solution of the Rubber Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, while Jeffers is insisting that he get materials for the construction of the plants to produce the necessary rubber to keep our factories in production, here at home there still appears to be no indication on the part of the administration to adopt or put into operation the Chicago Tribune's plan for rubber production.

Is it possible that because the plan originated with the Chicago Tribune—a pro-American publication—that even though it would solve our difficulty, it is to be ignored? An editorial from the Tribune reads as follows:

NINE HUNDRED THOUSAND TONS OF RUBBER

The paper on which these words appear is made of wood fibers. Two kinds of fibers are used. One is obtained by holding a log against a grindstone. In this ground-wood pulp the fibers are short. They need longer fibers to hold them together and give the paper strength. The longer fibers are obtained by the sulfite process, in which the lignin that cements the wood fibers together is dissolved chemically. Newsprint is a cheap paper. Stronger and more expensive papers are made wholly of sulfite pulp.

Lignin is a carbohydrate, a not too distant cousin of starch. The sulfite liquor in which it is dissolved in the papermaking process used to be thrown away as worthless. Recently chemists discovered that this liquor could be fermented and run through a still which distills ethyl (grain) alcohol from it.

As everyone in the country knows by now, ethyl alcohol can be made into butadiene, and butadiene can be made into synthetic rubber. Alcohol is the source of Russia's synthetic rubber and the Baruch committee's report to the President called the failure of American officialdom to investigate this Soviet process inexplicable. The error is being remedied now, and at the insistence of agricultural interests, the grain-alcohol-butadiene-rubber conversion has been undertaken on a large scale.

The tremendous possibilities of the sulfite liquor process as a source of alcohol have barely been touched however. Engineers have estimated that the sulfite liquor now going to waste at American and Canadian paper mills will furnish alcohol sufficient to make 900,000 tons annually of synthetic rubber. This is virtually double the present objective of the rubber program.

The raw material is free. The manufacturing process will require far less facilities, and thus less use of critical materials, than the manufacture of alcohol from grain. Not only are the paper mills already going concerns with power and steam supplies and shipping and maintenance facilities already provided, but the actual conversion of the sulfite liquor into alcohol is much simpler than alcohol distillation from grain.

The American people have had confidence, based on their history, that somehow American ingenuity is going to solve the rubber problem before the shortage has too serious an effect on our national economy. That confidence is probably justified, providing the ingenuity and initiative on which hopes are based are given a chance to function.

The sulfite-liquor alcohol process offers such an opportunity. Every paper mill in the United States and Canada should be encouraged to put it in operation and given the materials necessary to construct the distilling plants. There is no excuse for a rubber shortage if industry is allowed to attack the problem unhampered.

Mr. Speaker, may I most humbly, most respectfully, suggest to the administration that an organization which, like the Tribune, has preached Americanism consistently and vociferously and which has been able to continue to exist, in spite of all efforts of the administration to destroy it, through the use of the F. B. I., the Department of Justice, the Secretary of the Navy, and multimillionaire friends like Marshall Field 3d, now offers a solution of the rubber problem, is entitled to have its plans given consideration.

This administration should not let its intolerance, its hatred of the Tribune, its determination to destroy that publication, prevent it from adopting processes or methods which will aid in defeating our enemies.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1943

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the importance of preventing the spread of the foot-and-mouth disease in the United States of America is so evident that I am taking this occasion to insert herewith a letter from Mr. H. C. H. Kernkamp, secretary of the Minnesota State Veterinary Medical Society at its regular annual meeting of January 11–12 of this year.

I hope the Members of the House will study carefully Mr. Kernkamp's letter and also the resolution adopted by the Minnesota Veterinary Medical Society at its regular annual meeting of January 11–12 of this year.

The letter and resolution follow:

MINNESOTA STATE VETERINARY MEDICAL SOCIETY,
St. Paul, Minn., January 22, 1943.

The Honorable H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Congressman, Seventh District of Minnesota, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSEN: Enclosed herewith please find a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Minnesota State Veterinary Medical Society at its annual meeting held in St. Paul on January 11 and 12 of this year.

Permit me to call your special attention to the second paragraph of the resolution.

Since the control of importations of meat and other food products for the period of the war has been taken away from Congress and placed in the hands of the President, the members of this society are strongly of the opinion that the situation should be placed before Congress and also should be explained to the President personally and that the persons who are in control of the lease-lend program should be aware of the necessity and importance of keeping foot-and-mouth disease and all other foreign livestock diseases out of this country. If it is the necessary national policy to purchase meats and meat products from other countries to be used for lease-lend purposes, this can be accomplished, as suggested in the resolution, without endangering the livestock of this country.

Foot-and-mouth disease exists in England and in the foreign low countries who are our allies and such meats could be shipped directly to them, as well as to our own forces now on foreign shores without endangering our livestock.

We depend on the farmer and livestock producer to produce food products as well as poultry, and we are constantly being informed of the present situation of shortage of farm labor and of farm machinery necessary to increase the output. It seems that they are overlooking this serious situation and they should be informed that if any of these foreign diseases are introduced into this country under present conditions they will deplete and demoralize our livestock and the source of this important food supply.

Following the resolution you will find a statement relative to the present situation of foot-and-mouth disease in Argentina as taken from a bulletin of the Ministry of Agriculture of that country. It shows that the disease at the present time is worse than it has been in 40 years and involves the central as well as the extreme southern part of Argentina.

Respectfully submitted.

H. C. H. KERNKAMP,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The United States is now serving as the food arsenal for democracy. If we are to be successful in providing meat, milk, cheese, eggs, and other animal food products for our armed forces, for the civilian army, and our allies, we must exert greater vigilance than ever before in guarding the health of the Nation's livestock. The control of disease will enable the livestock producers to attain

the goals set for them in 1943. In support of this effort, the Minnesota State Veterinary Medical Society at its regular annual meeting of January 11–12 unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas, as a result of repeated outbreaks of 'foot-and-mouth' in these United States prior to 1927, there was enacted in that year a congressional embargo against the importation into this country of dressed meats and meat products from any country where foot-and-mouth disease exists; and

"Whereas prior to the imposition of this embargo the spread of that disease in this country seriously demoralized the domestic livestock industry, jeopardized public health, and resulted in the expenditure of millions of dollars by Federal and State Governments and by the owners of livestock for eradication of that evil; and

"Whereas the wisdom of that congressional embargo, embodied in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, has been indubitably justified as attested by the fact that since January 1, 1927, there has been only one minor recurrence of foot-and-mouth disease—in the State of California in 1929—which outbreak has since been found to have resulted from a violation of Federal regulations relating to the unloading of certain materials; and

"Whereas there is at present increasing evidence from authoritative sources that a serious attempt is now being made to permit the importation of dressed meats and meat products from countries in which foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent; and

"Whereas, if permitted, it would be inimical to the best interests of this Nation and would result in a recurrence of the evils existing prior to 1927 as enumerated above; and

"Whereas the agricultural and livestock industry of this Nation is playing and must continue to play, a vital and indispensable part in the support of the war effort, nothing would more seriously affect that burden and the program of national war support than a relaxation of the existing barriers to the importation of diseased meat and meat products: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we hereby respectfully and earnestly importune the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States for reasons herein stated, to resist all attempts and to refrain from any actions that would permit the importation of dressed meats and meat products of all kinds from foreign lands in which there exists foot-and-mouth disease, the most dreaded disease known to attack cloven-hoof animals (cattle, sheep, swine, and goats); and be it further

"*Resolved*, That if, for the period of the war emergency only, it appears to be a necessary national policy to obtain dressed meats and meat products for lend-lease purposes from countries in which foot-and-mouth and other highly infectious diseases exist, which diseases are now foreign to this country, then that such dressed meats and meat products be purchased and transported in ships directly, and without touching at any part of the continental United States, to those countries wherein the above mentioned infectious diseases are already present; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Congressmen of the State of Minnesota."

FOOT-AND-MOUTH SITUATION IN ARGENTINA

Worst in 40 years and involves central part of country in addition to southern tip and Terra del Fuego.

Three hundred and thirty-two new outbreaks (premises) in 11 Provinces in March.

Three hundred and forty-two new outbreaks in 12 Provinces in April.

Two hundred and sixty-four new outbreaks in 14 Provinces in May.

Four hundred and forty-five new outbreaks in 13 Provinces in June.

Total premises under quarantine increased from 852 in March to 1,463 in June.

(Data taken from "Politia Sanitaria de los Animales"—a bulletin from the Ministry of Agriculture.)

Alexander Woollcott—Democratic American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, Thursday afternoon next, at the McMillin Theater, Columbia University, New York City, will be held the funeral of Alexander Woollcott, who died Saturday night. His home was at Bomoseen, Vt.

In his passing the common people of this country have lost one of their idols, and all of us have lost a friend. Mr. Woollcott was one of my constituents, and my friend. He interested himself in State and local matters and was a member of the board of trustees of the library in Castleton, Vt. He gave of his great storehouse of knowledge advice and counsel to those who were undertaking to father and to further such projects as those in which he had a particular interest.

The Brattleboro Reformer of January 25 carried the following Associated Press dispatch from Castleton:

MOURNED IN CASTLETON

This little town mourned its first citizen, Alexander Woollcott, the "bard of Neshobe Island," who had entertained famed folk and his fellow townsmen at his secluded home in the center of Lake Bomoseen.

A man of books, he had served Castleton for the past 4 years as a trustee of the public library and was credited with helping to stock it with books and periodicals that a town of 1,800 population could not have provided.

On hearing of Woollcott's death, a group of townspeople issued a public tribute signed "The citizens of Castleton," saying of the sharp-tongued former newspaper drama critic:

"He came among us quite unostentatiously and took up his citizenship, extending the hand which made him one with everyday folks of the town. Expecting neither more nor less than the humblest among us, he assumed at once the responsibilities of the individual citizen and identified himself with the activities of the community."

Mrs. Huldah Cole, librarian, said:

"I received a check, issued on Christmas Eve, by Mr. Woollcott, to renew magazine subscriptions with which he first presented us 3 years ago."

Remarked veteran fisherman and boatkeeper Bill Bull, one of the writer-actor's closest friends for 30 years:

"He loved it here, but all his near friends are doing something for the war effort and he wasn't satisfied until he was giving of his best. He always said he wanted to die in the saddle."

Mr. Speaker, the Lake Bomoseen colony will miss his genial presence. The people of Castleton will mourn his loss. The country generally is the loser by reason of his passing.

With Senator SCRUGHAM, of Nevada, and Admiral Allen, of the Navy, I was present in the theater at San Francisco the night he made his last appearance in The Man Who Came to Dinner, a never-to-be-forgotten occasion—by reason of its significance—for he never recovered from the effects of the serious illness which made itself manifest so menacingly that night. He was a man of great courage and not disposed to advertise it. He lived it.

I have in my files a couple of letters from him, which I shall always treasure, for they were and are indicative of his genuine interest in the State he had made his home, and in his friends.

So many people who are better qualified than I will write and speak concerning his contribution to his day and generation that I shall not undertake to do more than to include an editorial from the Washington Post, and an article by Walter Lippmann, both of which are deserved tributes to his memory:

[From the Washington Post]

TOWN CRIER

Alexander Woollcott was a "character" who will be missed in the Bohemian world which centered on the green room and who, like Wilson Mizner, seems destined to be an American legend. Except for Percy Hammond, he was unexcelled as a dramatic critic. He had a profound knowledge of the theater, a charming, if rotund, style in writing about it, though his pen dripped with acid when an offering displeased him. Managers and actors who are wont to berate unkind critics with the question, "Could you have done better?" were disarmed by Woollcott. For he himself went on the stage, and proved adept on the other side of the footlights.

Woollcott appeared in several shows, and actually played himself in a play that George Kaufmann wrote about him called The Man Who Came to Dinner. Woollcott at first had declined the role, and Monty Woolley took his place, playing the part with considerable distinction. Then Woollcott changed his mind. The palm for histrionic ability would certainly be given to Mr. Woolley, who is a veteran and accomplished actor, but Woollcott acquitted himself well. His habit of changing the lines and relating them to the audience in front added to the gayety of the Woollcott performances. The versatile Woollcott had many other interests besides the theater. He wrote literary criticism, and earned a fat living in later years as The Town Crier on the radio. Here he displayed the great gift of story telling which hitherto had been known only in literary and theatrical circles. His success showed that Woollcott was by no means caviar to the general, as had been assumed. With his prodigious memory, his careful choice of words, and his precise attention to detail, he did a superb job of entertainment.

This was the way that Alexander Woollcott climbed to contemporary fame. But it is not in this role that his quality is celebrated. Even in his mountainous bulk, Woollcott was a modern Dr. Johnson, renowned as host, wit, and raconteur. It has been said that his best art form lay in conversation. But conversation implies good listening as well as good talking, and Woollcott, like Dr. Johnson, was intolerant of interruption. He would hold forth on a variety of subjects, and when thoroughly wound up, was good for a whole evening. Those who knew him slightly regarded him as the man Kaufmann impaled in The Man Who Came to Din-

ner; that is to say, as an egocentric monologist, a show-off. But his friends, who were legion, remember, along with his intellectual attributes, his loyalties to his friends and to the causes he espoused, and think of his many kindnesses. Whatever else may be said of Woollcott, he stood out as a rare and provocative personality, and a writer who did a great deal to stimulate the public into an appreciation of the best literature, past and present.

A WREATH FOR WOOLLCOTT

(By Walter Lippmann)

Alexander Woollcott, who was stricken during a radio broadcast on Saturday evening and died a few hours later, was quite well-prepared for death. The last time I saw him, which was a few weeks ago, he talked about the correspondence which he carried on with his great friend, Alice Duer Miller, during her long illness, and of how much it had meant to her that with him, at least, she did not have to pretend that she was going to recover. It was evident that he wanted me to know that he would prefer to be treated that way himself, with no moaning of the bar when he put out to sea.

Some months ago when he was discharged from the hospital after a critical illness, he wrote me that "My recent operation has already been voted a spectacular success. It is predicted that by fall at the latest I shall be entirely well, a somewhat disconcerting outcome, as all my planning had envisaged a different contingency."

Yet I know that he would like his friends to say what they felt about him. That will be easy. For Woollcott's talent, and his pleasure, and his ambition, and indeed his vanity, was in his friendships which were exceptional and varied, among the great and the simple, the eminent and the humble

He spent more time and certainly more of his best energy on conversation and on letter writing than he did on his published works. And thus his fame will grow and his legend flourish, as in the course of time his letters are published and his table talk finds its way into the memoirs of our age. He liked applause and he liked being a public character and he liked a good audience. Yet, among men of letters, he was singularly without the careerist's vices, the proof being his pleasure in the successes of others and his indefatigable passion for making his friends admire his friends.

This private virtue was also, I think, the source of his distinction as a critic. In the writing of criticism it is much harder to express appreciation than it is to find fault; it is much easier to be interesting and witty in the assault than it is in putting into words why the author's work is good, enjoyable, and worthy of praise. Only the best critics are able to write convincingly and persuasively when they praise. Woollcott had a sharp taste. He had a piercing eye for sham. He had an acid tongue. But he had gusto, he really liked what he praised, and he cared much more for the men and women he liked than he worried about those he did not like. Thus in his private friendship and his public work he encouraged, inspired, approved, and consoled an extraordinarily large number of men and women.

And in them his genial influence will persist.

Mr. Speaker, as I knew him, he was a great American. He was an exponent and an exemplar of that democracy in which he believed so sincerely. In the words of Mrs. Florence Alvord Dieterich, of Chevy Chase, a Vermonter by descent and devotion, written upon the occasion of the anniversary of the Lincoln Address at Gettysburg, I know I speak the thoughts that were uppermost in the mind of Alexander Woollcott:

IT SHALL NOT BE IN VAIN

What is democracy for which we fight? • • •
It is that state wherein are manifest
Results of upward strivings. There, possessed
Of equal chance to live and grow—in spite
Of many ills, man has a pilot light
That kindles hope and pride within his breast
And opportunity to do his best—
With brotherhood and freedom as his right.

This basic principle has made our land
The torch for all the world that men may rise
Beyond the state of pawns. It shall not be
In vain our fathers took heroic stand
If we do not surrender such a prize,
But give our all for our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, he gave his all.

Hon. Lister Hill, of Alabama, Addresses Alabama Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1943, the able junior Senator from Alabama, LISTER HILL, formerly a Member of this body and now majority whip of the Senate, addressed a joint session of the two houses of the Alabama Legislature. A few days ago that speech was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator BANKHEAD. I commend its reading to everyone. It was a great address and received wide acclaim among the people and in the press of Alabama.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include some of the editorials dealing with this speech:

[From the Birmingham News of January 20, 1943]

SENATOR HILL'S SPEECH

LISTER HILL came back home from Washington, at the invitation of the Alabama Legislature, to address a joint meeting of that body yesterday. Before the chosen leaders of Alabama, Senator HILL delivered a speech that was one of the most realistic, one of the most encouraging, one of the all around best public utterances to be heard in this State lately.

And it was, particularly, a timely speech, in more respects than one. It was timely not only in that it dealt with immediate aspects of the war effort; it was timely also in the very special sense that it was high time some public leader in Alabama, some man who had a right to speak for the people of the State as a whole, got on his feet and spoke his mind in behalf of our national leadership in war and in peace—in behalf, if you please, of that great leader and great Democrat, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Where the people of Alabama stand in this regard everybody knows. The vast majority of them are behind our President in wartime and are convinced that he is doing a magnificent job. The vast majority of Alabamians are equally convinced that President Roosevelt did a superb job in leading this country out of the worst depression in history and onto a more stable and more sensible economic footing than it had ever had before—the New Deal, if you please. It is well known how the masses of Alabamians feel about these matters, because they have repeatedly shown their sentiments at the ballot box in unmistakable terms.

But there is a minority in Alabama, as in the country as a whole, which is far more vocal than numerous—a minority which in season and out keeps hammering away and sniping away at Roosevelt. They did it year in and year out before the war; and neither the fact that the country is at war under his leadership, nor the fact that he has done, on the whole, an admirable, an almost superhuman, job of leading a nation at war, has served to stop the anti-Roosevelt snipers.

To be sure, they do not always mention him by name nowadays, because, after all, the United States is at war, and he is the Nation's President, and it just does not sound right to be talking about the President in such a way at a time like this. That is, they seldom mention his name when talking publicly; but in private conversation with some of these persons it is often a different matter. They do not leave you then in any possible doubt concerning whom they mean.

They used to talk about that man in the White House before the war—even though they never got to first base with the American people with all their running down of Roosevelt. Lately they have been reciting the same speeches with slight changes in personal references. Now they say that the New Deal is through, instead of saying, as before, that Roosevelt has ruined us. Now they talk about crackpot reforms—but usually vaguely, seldom specifying the ones they mean. They talk about bureaucracy, which is a very handy word that can be applied to practically anything in the Government you do not happen to like.

What are the facts? The facts are what they have been all along. Senator HILL listed some of them yesterday in his speech to the legislature. So far as they are concerned with domestic affairs, the facts cited by Senator HILL were substantially the same as those listed by another speaker the last time the Alabama Legislature gathered on a similar occasion. That was in 1939, when the legislature invited the beloved Will Bankhead, late Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to address a joint session.

Speaker Bankhead told the legislature then what President Roosevelt and the Democratic Party had done to make life better in this country. A few months later Will Bankhead, as keynote speaker at the Democratic National Convention of 1940, recited the same record and reminded the Nation that the Republican Party had not advocated repeal of a single major act of the administration.

Said Senator HILL yesterday: "Let me remind those here in Alabama, small in number but loud of voice and powerful in propaganda, that not even the Republicans, the ancient foe, have advocated the repeal of a single one of the major New Deal measures."

"Now we must put the war effort first," said the Senator, "and nothing that interferes with our waging of the war has any place in our lives." Not that we should turn our backs on the New Deal—for, as he said, we could not if we would. "As we give of our all to the winning of the war, we may look back with pride upon the New Deal and its mighty achievements. Its reforms are now anchored in the very bedrock of our institutions. The New Deal not only saved the Nation in the beginning, and made it possible for the Nation to save itself today, but it opened the doors that common men throughout the land might enter into their inheritance." That is justly said of the New Deal.

Impressive and encouraging were Senator HILL'S remarks about the war. As majority whip and a leading member of the Senate

Committee on Military Affairs, he is in position to know more than most others about the progress of the war. And in Montgomery, yesterday, he gave a heartening account of that progress. He gave this striking comparison:

"We were proud of our achievements in World War No. 1. We had one front then. That front was in friendly territory. Then our allies supplied us with planes—somehow, we never got into production of battle planes in time for them to be of much help to us. Then our allies supplied us with artillery and guns and ammunition. In this war not one of our allies is able to supply us. We are helping to supply every one of them, as well as supplying ourselves.

"Today, our battle lines touch every continent. They encompass the world. Today, American planes are rushing down the assembly lines in numbers that exceed the total production of Germany, Italy, and Japan. The roar of our engines sounds over every land, and our planes flash across every sky. * * * In the first months of this war our efforts have been five times as great as our efforts of the last war."

There have been criticisms and complaints about our war production, aid to our Allies, opening of a second front, and so on; and in each instance events have answered the critics. Our troubles are far from over, as Senator HILL made clear; the way will be hard and costly, and we must make sacrifices. But we are on the way to victory, and to the just and lasting peace for which we fight.

[From the Montgomery Advertiser of January 20, 1943]

BEYOND THE HORIZON—PEACE

Senator HILL's address delivered before the Legislature of Alabama yesterday was a great speech, a speech full of wise understanding of present urgencies and one calmly confident of the future. Always eloquent, Mr. HILL was especially convincing in his informed defense of New Deal leadership and accomplishments. Standing high in administration councils himself, the facts he marshals in support of his anticritical thesis ring out clearly with the undeniable sincerity that true belief inspires. Like Tennyson's Ulysses, the Senator has indeed become a part of all that he has met in these tremendous times.

Referring satirically to the "clubroom Caesars and the curbstone Napoleons" who have ceaselessly criticized our Government in its conduct of everything from invasion of Europe to official release of war news, Mr. HILL reminded his listeners that in every case where these critics have flayed the administration events have later proved the wisdom of the official stand and the sureness of official methods, as was shown by the bloodless winning of Dakar and by the resuscitation of our half-drowned Navy—the latter made possible by suppression of the real facts of Pearl Harbor, facts which Japan would surely have acted upon had she but known the full results of her treacherous attack.

The Senator was eloquent in his praise for the valor of our soldier heroes and equally appreciative for the labors of the men behind the men behind the guns. Reiterating his firm belief that ultimate victory can only be won by complete national unity and all-out national effort, the speaker warned snipers at the New Deal—malcontent Democrats as well as Republicans—that the present Democratic Administration has so far accomplished more for American safety and security than has any other administration in our history.

Pointing with pride to the progress of Alabama under the New Deal, Mr. HILL stated that the people of Alabama last year enjoyed a larger increase in income than the people of any of the other 47 States. He repeatedly stressed the help the New Deal has given the southern farmer through the Farm Credit and Farm Security Agencies. Referring to legislation he has recently introduced, Mr. HILL promised that Alabama farmers may soon be able to obtain the labor so sorely needed on their farms.

Affirming his faith in the willingness and ability of the South to handle its own peculiar problems in its own way—the way experience has shown to be wisest and best—Senator HILL did not mince his words in reference to the termites in the house of democracy nor to the borers from without whose common effort appears to be liquidation of the solid South. Now as never before we of the South should cherish our tradition within the great fabric of American Democracy, praise God for our honest leader, and pass the ammunition against our foreign foes and against those who would rob us of our gains under the most fruitful administration in our history.

Passing from a survey of America at war to a consideration of the peace that is to come, LISTER HILL paid deserved tribute to the leaders of the United Nations—Stalin, Churchill, Chiang of China—giants who have emerged from the crucible of war to lead their countries. With men like these seated at the peace table, it will behoove America to choose wisely her representative. It will be only by men of vision—far-seeing, wise, and benevolent—that lasting peace may be won for ourselves and for the world.

Coming at this time, with its plea for unity and with its reaffirmation of faith in the democracy we are fighting to save from the tyranny of barbarism, LISTER HILL's speech should do much toward lining up Alabama's citizens along with Alabama's lawmakers in our national drive for victory and for peace.

[From the Birmingham Age-Herald of January 20, 1943]

LISTER HILL REPORTS

LISTER HILL, who retains his warm, neighborly Alabama ways and remains one of us for all his years in high place at Washington, brought back home yesterday a report on how the war is going and on the outlook for the further future beyond victory. It was the ardent, eloquent talk characteristic of the junior Alabama Senator, the kind of talk we can understand. Coming from the majority whip of the United States Senate, a member of the key Committee on Military Affairs, it was nevertheless the deliverance of the Alabamian we know as one of ourselves. Consequently, the whole tragic and dramatic world situation, as viewed in the highest Government quarters, by this authoritative review was brought closer to us, made more vivid and understandable, translated into our own language.

It was not to be expected that there would be any revelations in such a report. This address was, fundamentally, close in spirit and content to President Roosevelt's message to Congress earlier this month. It must have reinforced hereabouts the deep confidence that was drawn from the President's words.

It added to the emphasis that constantly must be placed on unremitting effort and ready sacrifice, that our victory may come as quickly as possible and with its cost held down as much as feasible.

It stressed, too, the importance of safeguarding the progress that has been made in this country in the last decade.

Its vision penetrated to the climactic urgency of winning the peace to come, through the establishment of a just, wise, and strong world order, to which the United States will give its active allegiance.

Senator HILL's survey of the battle fronts ably managed to convey the confidence which the situation warrants, the stimulus that disciplined reassurance brings, without in any degree minimizing the pressing necessity to maintain all our efforts at the maximum.

Indeed, this kind of talk, we thought, far from inducing any tendency to relaxation and overconfidence, inspired to greater endeavor.

It was so stirring in its presentation of the stupendous meaning of what we are doing that it intensified the will to achieve the utmost, whatever our respective duties and obligations.

This is the kind of strong, yet tempered spirit that will make for the greatest national strength in the swiftest possible time.

The simple, powerful thesis underlying the Senator's address was that the speed and cost of victory will largely depend on the fidelity and devotion of all our people in meeting the demands that are confronted by every single citizen. How relatively trivial, he suggested, are inconveniences, denials, hardships, and even sacrifices when considered in the light of their contribution to the future destiny of all mankind.

"If need be," Senator HILL said, "we will shiver through the cold of winter, trudge barefoot and blistering up the rugged way, swelter in the midday sun, and toil day into night and night into day. We may not sleep, we may not eat, but we will never stop, not until we triumph in victory and victory brings us the peace for which we fight, a just and enduring peace, which even now lies beyond the horizon."

Here, in one brief, burning paragraph, is caught up much that is now deepest and dearest in the purpose and hope of many millions of Americans.

There are selfish, small Americans, whose concentration upon themselves largely blinds them to the immense issues of destiny now being wrought out. But they are, we are convinced, relatively few. The great majority are ready, like the men and women in the battle zones, ready for any sacrifice that will serve the common cause. They merely ask to understand—or be responsibly told—what is required of them. If it be small denials, if it be great sacrifices, if it be treasure, if it be death itself, they are ready.

Though the instinct of self-preservation, the natural love of one's own land, enters strongly into this spirit, still there is much more there—something going beyond the self, beyond even our own country, something taking in all mankind, something exceptionally fine and noble. For it is, in truth, in simple, unquestionable truth, a better world for all men for which our people are striving.

They are not concerned to save their lives merely that a petty existence may be prolonged.

They are not dominated by a desire to be strong at the expense of the other peoples of the world.

They are aware, in a sense often too deep for words, that all mankind must be one in spirit, however various otherwise, if real peace is to be achieved, if men anywhere are now to get on with the achievement of their true destiny.

Victory is the first step in that direction now. But Senator HILL does well to keep before us that the peace must be just and enduring. Else our victory soon will be getting away from us and we will be moving toward another war.

Mere military victory, of course, will not be a complete victory. Victory at arms in itself will not bring a just and enduring peace. Such a peace, the only final victory, can come only out of the spirit of self-sacrifice, of absolute devotion, of common purpose, that makes now for the military triumph. After that certain triumph we shall move on toward a just and enduring peace to the degree that we maintain the spirit of justice for all men.

Indeed, what we are doing these very days, the spirit we are maintaining, the thoughts we are thinking, as we battle for the over-

throw of violence, will have much to do with what is to come when the fighting is done.

War compels many terrible acts of destruction and produces much evil. We cannot escape those costs. Such heavy levies inevitably will handicap our future. But through it all, we can maintain a just and humble and aspiring spirit, a clear vision, an inexorable purpose that embraces all men. Otherwise we shall be lost, our sacrifices in vain.

[From the Alabama Journal, Montgomery, Ala., of January 20, 1943]

SENATOR HILL'S CHALLENGE

Senator LISTER HILL's address to the Alabama Legislature yesterday, delivered in response to a legislative invitation extended last week, shows how Alabama's junior Senator has grown with his job and grown in the public service. The Senator has convictions and he stands by them. Of course, it takes no courage to say the fine things about our fighting boys that Mr. HILL said, nor does it take political courage to give praise to the industrial workers at home who have done such a fine job of providing for the men at the front. But with all the sniping, the criticism, the jealousy, the attacks upon the Democratic administration both from within and from without, it takes real courage to stand up and tell the world that this is the greatest and most constructive administration in the Nation's history; that it has done more for the South than any other; that its policies have resulted in phenomenal economic prosperity in Alabama. Not only that, but Mr. HILL defies the critics and challenges them to say what part of the New Deal they would abolish, what part they would put on the scrap heap. Not even the Republican critics, let alone so-called Democratic critics, have advocated the repeal of a single one of the major New Deal measures.

"As we give our all to the winning of the war," declared Senator HILL, "we may look back with pride upon the New Deal and its mighty achievements. Its reforms are now anchored in the very bedrock of our institutions. The New Deal not only saved the Nation in the beginning, and made it possible for the Nation to save itself today, but it opened the doors that common men throughout the land might enter into their inheritance."

[From the Anniston Star of January 20, 1943]

HILL RINGS THE BELL

It was a decided compliment to Alabama's junior United States Senator to be invited to address the joint session of the Alabama Legislature this week, and it may be said without exaggeration that LISTER HILL, always eloquent and entertaining as a speaker, was never in finer fettle.

Senator HILL came to Montgomery with a timely message. He walked into an atmosphere that had been charged with disaffection as regards the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and in his defense of that administration, both in peace and in war, he was at once forceful and convincing.

Nor was that all; the Senator also was encouraging and inspiring. Undoubtedly, he had heard complaints against the wartime censorship, criticism of the Army and the Navy, and griping about the manifold restrictions that the war has made necessary. From his positions as Senate whip and a member of the Military Affairs Committee, he was able to impart authentic information and a record of achievement on the part of our armed forces that should put the critics to shame.

The Senator is right in his affirmation that the first job all Americans have to do now is to win the war; and if all of us will put forth a mere fraction of the labor and self-forgetfulness that characterize the fighting forces, victory soon will be in sight.

The Voice of the Lawyer Is Heard in the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on December 29 and 30, 1942, the Nebraska State Bar Association held its annual convention at Omaha, Nebr. The convention was presided over by the association's president, Mr. Paul E. Boslaugh, one of the outstanding trial lawyers of the Middle West. It was the good fortune of that convention to have on its program a Member of this House, the Honorable JOHN JENNINGS, Jr., of Tennessee. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a copy of his address made at that convention. The address is as follows:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, fellow Americans, it is a privilege and a pleasure to come to Nebraska and learn of the constructive work the integrated bar of this State has accomplished for the members of the profession, the courts, and the public. And I shall carry back to Tennessee a lesson that we may well learn of how you have speeded the trial of cases, maintained the high standards of your profession, and in the unpartisan selection of your judges set an example the whole country might well emulate.

To my mind the best definition of a nation is Abraham Lincoln's "a nation may be said to consist of its people, its territory, and its laws." To know the United States of America, therefore, one must know its people, its territory, and its laws.

One of the great privileges and pleasures of membership in the House of Representatives at Washington is that it has afforded the only opportunity that I possibly could have had to know intimately and to learn to respect and enjoy the friendship of men of character and ability from every section of this great country. The House of Representatives is a cross section of America. Its members are from every walk of life. They are farmers, bankers, industrialists, teachers, newspapermen, doctors, dentists, veterinarians, civil engineers, ministers of the gospel, and last, but not least, lawyers. And I deeply appreciate coming to the home city of Congressman Charles F. McLaughlin, your Representative in Congress and one time president of your association.

As a Member of the House, his industry, ability, and fidelity to duty "bought golden opinions from all men"; and among the Members of the House I have no closer, dearer friend than Representative CARL T. CURTIS. He is a splendid lawyer and a tireless and effective Member of the Congress. KARL STEFAN and Harry Coffee have always been on the firing line, on the floor of the House when the welfare of Nebraska was in any manner involved. In fact, your entire delegation in the House is a credit to this great State. There is a fiction of the law that when the representative of a sovereign state enters upon his ministerial or representative duties in the country to which he is accredited he carries with him the sovereignty and majesty of the State he represents, and hence wherever he may be in the country to which he has been sent he is deemed to stand upon the soil of his native country. In meeting your Representatives in Congress, through them their colleagues have met the people of Nebraska and have seen through their eyes and their devotion to their people the fertile plains, the great agricultural and livestock resources of this State, your people and your institutions. In fact, your Representatives in the House brought with them to Washington the great State of Nebraska.

You have heard Congress derided and assailed. Let it be remembered that its Members are of your choosing. They are no better nor worse than the people who elect them. Abuse if you will the individual Members, but cling fast to Congress as an institution. It is the only body through which you can have a voice in the making of the laws that safeguard your property, your liberties, and your lives. So long as Congress functions there can be no dictatorship in America. Dictatorships have always been erected upon the ruins of representative government. The wreckage of legislative bodies has always been used as stepping stones to arbitrary power. And Congress will continue to function as long as its membership is composed of men of the intellectual capacity, honesty, and moral courage of those who have represented your State.

The first thing a lawyer must learn on entering our profession is that "the law is a jealous mistress." A beginner, as a rule, is not overwhelmed with eager clients.

You have heard of the young fellow who hung out his shingle and after 3 weeks of waiting for clients, who did not come, closed up shop and said in disgust, "The law is not what it is cracked up to be, and I wish I had not learned it."

In talking, a lawyer must have terminal facilities. He must know when to quit. A young lawyer went with his friend Henry out in the country to make a speech. He related his experience as follows: He said, "Henry was introduced, and he had not spoken 5 minutes until the crowd hissed him off the platform; then I was introduced, and I had not spoken 3 minutes until the crowd got to hissing Henry again and I had to quit."

And there are times when a lawyer may with profit forego the privilege of talking to a court or to a jury.

When I was a young lawyer, a carload of dynamite exploded in the railroad yards of the town where I lived. It was allowed to stand in the yard overnight and at 8 o'clock the next morning exploded, wrecking the town and killing 15 people. Many suits against the railroad company were brought. The plaintiffs claimed the railroad company caused the explosion by kicking a carload of pig iron against the dynamite car. The railroad claimed it was caused by a young man shooting into it with a rifle, thereby exploding its contents.

A number of mistrials were had, the juries being unable to agree. The railroad company was ultimately held liable on the theory that by leaving the car of explosives for an unreasonable length of time, unguarded and unplacarded in a thickly populated community, it created and maintained a dangerous nuisance, and must respond in damages regardless of whether the explosion was caused by a switching operation or by a shot.

The first case, in which a verdict was obtained for a plaintiff, was tried by Gen. George W. Pickle, former attorney general of Tennessee, and myself for the plaintiff. The railroad company was represented by its division counsel, L. D. Smith, afterward attorney general of the State, and Col. W. A. Henderson, a noted trial lawyer, who had been a colonel in the Confederate Army and who was the idol of southern sympathizers in that section.

The introduction of testimony occupied 2 weeks. On the jury was an old gentleman known to his friends as Uncle Jimmy Ingram. He had been a member of the Legislature of Kentucky and was also a Baptist

preacher. He was plenty smart and a good talker. I made up my mind from his demeanor in the jury box that he was favorable to the plaintiff. When the time came for argument, I suggested to General Pickle that we propose to the other side the submission of the case to the jury without argument. In surprise, he asked my reasons, saying to me, "We make the opening and closing arguments." I replied, "Uncle Jimmy Ingram, if he is for us, and I believe he is, can make a better argument for our side in the jury room unanswered by Colonel Henderson than you and I can in the courtroom and have it answered by Colonel Henderson." General Pickle then said, "I believe you are right." We made the proposition and the other side agreed.

The case was submitted to the jury under the charge of the court without argument of counsel. The jury was out for 3 hours and it looked as if we were to have a hung jury. Finally they came in with a verdict for the plaintiff, awarding him the value of his house that had been destroyed.

Desiring to know what was the cause of the delay, after the jury was discharged, I went to an old friend of mine, a mountain man, known as "Miller John" York, who operated a grist mill in his neighborhood, and said to him: "Uncle John, what was the reason for the delay in reaching a verdict?" He replied: "Uncle Billy Chadwell was on the jury. He is my neighbor and a good citizen. But he is a Democrat and a rebel, and hasn't got much sense. And he 'lowed as how Col. Bill Henderson was here defending the Southern Railroad Co.; and as how Colonel Bill was in the Rebel Army, the Southern Railroad Co. must be a part of the Southern Confederacy, and that he'd be damned if he'd bring in a verdict agin his politics." I asked him: "How did you get Uncle Billy to agree to the verdict?" He replied: "Uncle Jimmy Ingram threatened to tell the judge on him and scared him." If Colonel Henderson had argued the case Billy Chadwell never would have agreed to a verdict for the plaintiff. He would have had something besides his politics to hang his verdict on.

A good place to quit talking in a lawsuit is the point where the judge begins to talk in favor of your client, and your adversary gets into an argument with the court.

Some years ago, while attending court in a mountain county of Tennessee, I fell in company with the late Frank Bond of the Nashville (Tenn.) Bar. He was advanced in years, troubled with asthma, and could not sleep. I found him a most interesting talker and sat up with him far into the night. At that time Tennessee had an official poet, John Trotwood Moore. Bond told me that in the spring of that year the Nashville Bar decided to give a banquet in honor of the supreme court, who had just finished their labors at the State capitol. He was commissioned to induce Moore, if possible, to write a poem, laudatory and commemorative of the labors of the court and of the members of the bar. Seeking John Trotwood Moore, he found him on a street corner of Nashville and, as usual, doing nothing and with no particular destination in mind. Bond said to him, "John, I have got to have a poem in honor of the lawyers and our supreme court, to be read at our banquet which we are giving in honor of the court tomorrow night, and I want you to write it for me." Moore replied, "Frank, I have not been on speaking terms with the muses for 6 months, and I cannot write a poem on such short notice." Bond replied, "Come with me, John, I will put you in touch with the muses." It was a June day, shot to the core with sunshine. Bond drove Moore out into the country and led him out beside a brook which wended its way under giant trees to where cattle grazed knee deep in clover, orchard grass, and blue grass. From the trees there came the song of birds, the bees were busy with the blooms of flowers, and all nature seemed to smile. Then said Bond, "After I had saturated him with the loveliness of this rural scene, I drove him back to town, gave him a quart of red liquor, and said to him, 'John, damn you, take this and go commune with the muses and have me a poem by this time tomorrow.'" Someone who is not a Tennessean has said that in Tennessee John Barleycorn has more public enemies and private friends than anywhere else in the world.

The late Will Rogers said of us that as long as the people of Tennessee were sober enough to stagger to the polls they would vote "dry." There are a lot of people, including some lawyers, who are firmly of the opinion that for purposes of rain, boat navigation, and culinary uses around the kitchen, water is unexecelled, but for drinking purposes there is something better. At the appointed hour on the following day, John Trotwood Moore handed to Frank Bond the poem on the lawyer, which I now give you:

"We wrote the Magna Carta, we wrote the
Bill of Rights,
The path of human progress is lit with legal
lights;
We wrote the Declaration with an eagle
pinion quill—
It globed the world where force and hate
fell powerless and still;
We wrote the Constitution, we codified the
page
That made the great Republic the wonder
of the age.

"Our shrine is loyal service and our reward
the flame
That lights the path of knowledge in the
temple of our fame;
Say not our fame is nameless, say not our
race is won,
Say not our Declaration pales in a setting
sun;
Forever and forever, in God's great code of
men
The lawyers' blood has been the ink that
flowed from freedom's pen,
And when time's day has ended, and midnight hath no star,
We will plead for truth and justice before
the judgment bar."

I do not know how this poem would be rated by the literary critics. To my mind, however, it comprehends and expresses in its two stanzas a deserved tribute to the contribution of the lawyers to civilization, to the liberation of the race, to the conception and the founding of this Republic. No nation has ever become strong, or free, or prosperous without the work and guidance of lawyers. "The glory that was Greece" and "the grandeur that was Rome" were made possible by their lawgivers. The Greeks were primarily a race of thinkers. The laws of thought evolved by them are as full of vitality as when they were first laid down by Socrates and Plato. The arts, civilization, and law and order followed where Rome's eagle flew. The law of every State in this Union is full of maxims and fundamentals which survive in the language of the Romans. The great liberator and lawgiver of the Jews, Moses, who brought from Sinai and the presence of the living God the Ten Commandments and who, in the 40 years of his leadership and transformation of a race of slaves into a pioneering, conquering, dominant race, gave to the world and gave to his people the magnificent system of laws that have been reenacted both in letter and in spirit in the statutory law of every State of this Union.

The greatest concern of man on this earth is justice. The men and the women who first sought sanctuary in this country came here in search of the justice and liberty which the Old World denied them. Our forebears brought with them to this country the priceless heritage of the common law, the innate love of the Anglo-Saxon for liberty, and his inherited capacity for self-government. When the time came the Thirteen Original Colonies were forced by pig-headed George III to fight for their rights, the lawyers of the Thirteen Colonies took the lead in defending the rights of the people to liberty under law. The words of the Virginia lawyer, Patrick Henry, electrified the colonists when he said, "I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

Alexander Hamilton, a boy in his teens, braved the Tory sentiment of New York when he became fired with the patriotism of New England, Virginia, and the other Colonies. Jefferson, a lawyer, with an "eagle-pinion quill" wrote the Declaration of Independence. Its language and its thoughts were not original with him; he put in classic, deathless form what had been said by the people's representatives in Virginia, in Connecticut, and in Massachusetts. But "force and hate" did not "fall powerless and still" until the patriot fathers under the leadership of George Washington and his generals rewrote in sacrificial blood the Declaration of Independence on the unrolled scroll of the battlefield. With Washington, Alexander Hamilton served as a member of his staff and his secretary for 4 years. Both he and John Marshall were with Washington through the dreadful winter at Valley Forge. During this awful period Washington's troops, ragged, hungry, sick, neglected, and abandoned by the Continental Congress, starved, froze, and died like flies.

In Holy Writ is this injunction: "Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set." And we can remember with profit the admonition of the great Isaiah: "Look unto the rock whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged." It was Macaulay who said, "A people who do not remember the great deeds of great ancestors will never do anything worthy of celebration by posterity."

Two of the greatest documents ever penned are the farewell address of Moses to the Children of Israel and the Farewell Address of George Washington at the end of his second term as President. These great men knew human nature. They knew how prone are people to forget. After Moses, in panoramic splendor, had detailed to the people of Israel the benefactions of their Heavenly Father, he closed with these words:

"And these words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart:

"And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up.

"And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes.

"And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates."

And the words of Washington's Farewell Address should be in our hearts, and should be taught diligently to our children, lest we forget the "rock whence" we "are hewn" and the "hole of the pit whence" we "are digged."

Let us set the timeless truths of the Declaration of Independence in the "amber of memory." "We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," and then follows a Bill of Particulars, and indictment against George IV. He had denied to the people of the Colonies the sacred right of representative government. The taxes which he laid upon them without representation were the essence of tyranny, he had transported the victims of his wrath beyond the seas for trial. He had polluted the very springs of justice itself because "He made judges dependent on his will alone for the

tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries."

And how like present-day abuses is this charge: "He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of new officers to harass our people and eat out our substance."

This Declaration would have been but a scrap of paper, had it not been underwritten in the blood of patriots. The fruits of victory would have turned to ashes upon the lips of the American people had not the principles of the Declaration of Independence found permanent and workable expression in the Constitution of the United States. The adoption of this document would have been impossible but for the wisdom, the foresight, the devotion, the determination, the character, the patience, the courage, and the overweening influence of George Washington. He presided over the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, and when it looked as if its labors would come to naught, he frankly admitted the difficulties of the situation, in the lofty words: "It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God." Of the work of this Convention, William E. Gladstone said, "The Constitution of the United States is the greatest instrument of free government ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man in the history of the world."

It is the work of lawyers. It provides a dual form of government—national and state; it is a government of enumerated, delegated, and limited powers.

Ours is a government of checks and balances—of three branches—legislative, executive, and judicial.

Naturally, under such a system there must be a tribunal to determine just what power the Federal Government has and just how far any one of these three separate, independent, and yet coordinate branches of the Government may go in the exercise of the power delegated to them respectively. Our form of government, or any similar form of government, cannot function without an independent, honest, and able judiciary. It is unthinkable that in the administration of justice and in the determination of controversies between individuals or between citizens and the Government one of the litigants should bring with him his judge to decide the controversy.

Virtually every suit between individuals is to protect or assert a right or to redress an injury.

Again and again in the history of this country it has been necessary for the individual to fight for his life, his liberty, and his property against usurpation of power on the part of the Government, both State and National.

The Constitution of this country has been defined by Elihu Root as "a solemn contract between all the people on the one hand and each individual on the other, that if necessary the combined power of all the people will come to the protection of the life, the liberty, or the property of that one individual." It is the "ark of the covenant"; its interpretation and enforcement are committed to the courts.

In most instances, however, the Constitution and the laws made pursuant to it are not self-executing. We, therefore, have courts to which men may repair when they seek the protection of the law. In ancient Israel they fled to cities of refuge. In medieval times they sought sanctuary under the altar of the church and again in trial by combat, but the fleeing wretch was overtaken and slain in his tracks by the avenger of blood; the hapless victim was dragged from the shadow of the altar and his blood spilled at its very base and trial by combat was but a mockery where the issue was determined by the skill of him who wielded the weapon and not by the justice of the cause. Hence as men became more enlightened, courts were established and presided over by judges.

The men who drafted the Constitution of this Nation were governmental experts. They thought in terms of government; they were familiar with every governmental experiment from the dawn of history to their day. They worked in the light of the world's experience. They knew that the pathway of man from savagery to civilization is strewn with the wreckage of empires and the ruins of kingdoms. The past is the nursery and the cemetery of nations. They have risen, flourished, decayed, and died. Our civilization is but the sum of man's experience preserved and woven into our present-day fabric of society.

An independent judiciary in all ages has been the only and last refuge of the citizen when threatened by private wrong or governmental tyranny. The American people have been so long free and protected in their liberty under the law and by the courts that they take their liberty for granted. They forget that the Constitution and the courts exist primarily for the protection of human rights.

The right to property is a human right, recognized by divine law and by the law of the land. There are those who now say that our system of government has failed—that the liberty of the individual should be surrendered to an all-powerful, benevolent, and paternalistic government. We are asked to exchange a government which heretofore has existed for the protection of human rights for one in which the individual is subordinate to the government.

John Trotwood Moore was wiser than he knew when he penned the words:

"Forever and forever in God's great code of men
The lawyers' blood has been the ink that flowed from freedom's pen."

Andrew Jackson was the first commoner to be elected President of the United States. His victory over the British at New Orleans on January 8, 1815, after the treaty of peace had been signed between this country and England, terminating the War of 1812, made him President. Our experience in that conflict was a series of humiliating and disastrous defeats. Jackson's victory at New Orleans, therefore, captured the imagination of the American people and galvanized into life the national spirit and restored the self-confidence of the people. With a handful of regular soldiers, with the aid of French pirates whose peculations were largely responsible for the prosperity of the city of New Orleans, and who were among the finest artillerymen in the world, and with an army of Indian fighters from Tennessee, Jackson defeated the flower of the British Army under Packenham—veterans who, under Wellington, had captured walled city after walled city in Spain. In this battle more than 1,200 British soldiers were killed. Jackson's losses were 7 killed and 6 wounded. Andrew Jackson was a lawyer. Prior to his selection as major general of the Tennessee Militia he was a judge and held court in my home city of Knoxville. He was not what we would call a learned lawyer, but he had an intuitive sense of justice. Charging a jury about all he would say was this, "Now, gentlemen of the jury, you have heard the testimony in this case; go out and do what is right about it and bring us in a verdict."

As is the case with every great man this world has ever known, there was back of Jackson the inspiration and the influence of a great mother. His Irish mother gave her life nursing stricken Revolutionary soldiers, and Jackson carried to his grave a scar from a wound inflicted upon him by a British officer who struck him in his face with his saber when as a boy Jackson refused to black the Britisher's boots.

Jackson never forgot and he never forgave. At New Orleans he was notified the British had landed. He sprang to his feet, brought his clenched fist down upon the table, and said, "By the Eternal they shall never rest upon our shores." By day and by night he harried them with the tactics of his trained Indian fighters and when the battle was won, in an address which he delivered to the people of New Orleans, he quoted his mother's words of advice when she talked to him for the last time on the eve of his departure from South Carolina to Tennessee. She said, "Andy, be honest; never take anything that don't belong to you. Be sincere; always tell the truth. Never tell a lie. Make friends by being honest and keep them by being steadfast. Never sue anybody for assault and battery or for slander. Attend to them things yourself"—and he did.

Prior to the battle of New Orleans, it became necessary for Jackson to imprison an editor on account of publications which he made in violation of Jackson's orders. Federal Judge Hall, of New Orleans, issued a writ of habeas corpus for the release of the imprisoned editor. Jackson ignored it and held his prisoner. After the battle, Judge Hall issued a citation for contempt against the victorious General Jackson. Feeling was so high that the judge would have been mobbed, but for the protection of Jackson. On the day of the trial, Jackson took off his uniform, laid aside his sword, went into the court in civilian garb and submitted to and paid a fine of $1,000. It was years before the Congress made restitution to him.

Texas is an empire in itself. New Mexico, Utah, Arizona, Nevada, and California came to us through the valor and statesmanship of Sam Houston, a Tennessee lawyer. He served as a Member of the House of Representatives from the Hermitage District. He was elected Governor of the State. He served but a few weeks when due to a separation from his newly-wed wife, he resigned, moved to Arkansas where he lived with the Cherokee Indians on the Red River. Then at the suggestion of Andrew Jackson he went to Texas and took that State and the Southwest Territory from Mexico at the Battle of San Jacinto.

Carlisle said that the reason for the failure of the Constitution of the Constituent Assembly of France was that, "It did not have the power to march." John Marshall, a great lawyer without whose influence it is doubtful if Virginia would have ratified the Constitution, was induced by Washington to leave the practice of law and enter public life. He rendered distinguished service as the representative of this Government in France during the reign of Napoleon, where he measured arms with the unscrupulous and brilliant Talleyrand. He served as Secretary of State in the Cabinet of John Adams, and in the closing days of that administration was appointed by Adams as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

John Marshall as presiding officer of that tribunal rescued it from oblivion, breathed into its nostrils the breath of life, established it in the confidence and respect of the American people, and gave it a preeminent place as the head of the judiciary. He gave the Constitution the power to march. He was not only a great judge, he was a great statesman. His opinions are milestones on the highway of our national development.

There have been those who from the beginning have assailed with pick and ax and crowbar the foundation and the superstructure of this Government. They early questioned the authority of the Supreme Court to preserve inviolate the Constitution as the supreme law of the land. Despite the character, extraordinary ability, uprightness, charm of personality, commanding will, unyielding purpose, and masterful mind with

which John Marshall sustained the Constitution, it was assailed by its enemies. A weakling as Chief Justice of this great Court during the 35 years that Marshall served would have seen our form of government wrecked. Although the power of the courts to set aside an act of Congress which was violative of the Constitution was announced by Hamilton in the Federalist No. 78, and although the courts of the colonies had repeatedly set aside acts of their respective legislatures as violative of their organic laws, Jefferson declared:

"To consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy."

On the other hand Marshall wrote: "The Constitution is either a supreme, paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on the level with ordinary legislative acts, alterable when the legislature shall please to alter it. It is emphatically the province and duty of the judiciary department to say what the law is. This is the very essence of judicial duty."

Of this great pronouncement by Marshall, Rufus Choate said, "To have inscribed this vast truth of conservatism upon the public mind, so that no demagogue, not in the last stages of intoxication denies it—this is an achievement of statesmanship which a thousand years may not exhaust or reveal all that is good." Those who made Marshall's life miserable, advocated the power of the State to nullify an act of Congress and to defy the decisions of the Supreme Court. They sowed the seeds of the Civil War.

He defied the political power of Jefferson's administration in the trial of Aaron Burr, who, but for the intellectual honesty and dauntless courage of Marshall, would have been railroaded to his death. In his conduct of that trial, Marshall refused to follow in the footsteps of those English courts whose decisions dotted the soil of England with the graves of countless Englishmen, illegally sent to their death on charges of treason.

He preserved the independence of our legislative bodies by establishing the principle that courts cannot overthrow a law on any ground other than its unconstitutionality.

In the Dartmouth College case, he established the sanctity of contract.

In *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, he again upheld the supremacy of the Federal Government within its proper sphere and proclaimed the truth, "The power to tax is the power to destroy."

Now is a good time to resurrect this truth.

In the celebrated controversy between the States of New York and New Jersey, with respect to the free navigation of the waters of the Hudson he made commerce between the States forever free.

Abraham Lincoln was a disciple of Marshall.

"Nursed in the frontiersman's lowly shed,
To hardy independence bravely bred,
By early poverty to hardship steeled,
And trained to Arms in stern misfortune's field."

Abraham Lincoln is the most magnificent tribute the common people of this country ever paid to our free institutions.

His was a heart tender as a woman's, warm as a summer sea.

During President William Howard Taft's administration, eminent members of the bench and bar attended a banquet in honor of a distinguished jurist.

The toastmaster was Judge Alton B. Parker, erstwhile Democratic candidate for President, who related the following story:

"On a cold, miserable day in 1864, a lady in widow's weeds was seen slowly coming down the steps of the War Department Building in Washington, and with faltering tread wandered across the avenue into the White House grounds. An old darky, a factotum about the Executive mansion, came up.

"'Missus, is you in misery or is you in trouble?'

"The distressed little lady, looking into the kind face of the old Negro answered: 'The Secretary of War, Mr. Stanton, won't let me help my sick son.'

"'Missus, yer gone to the wrong gem'en. Come with me.'

"The old servant led the way through a side door of the White House and cautiously entered the President's study, where sat President Lincoln, with a shawl drawn about his shoulders, poring over documents.

"'Master President, here's one of my white lady folks. She's introuble en' I brung her to you.'

"Mr. Lincoln," began the little lady, "my Confederate soldier son has been captured * * * is in a northern prison, sick—very sick, and unless I can get him home, where I can nurse him, he will certainly die. I——"

"Have you seen the Secretary of War?" asked the President.

"I've just come from there. Mr. Stanton said, 'All rebels should die!'"

"Did he say that?"

"Yes, sir; he did."

Lincoln rose, strolled to his south window, looked far out over the Potomac in the direction of the battlefield of Bull Run. Then, slowly turning, faced the trembling little Confederate mother. "If I release your sick son into your custody, will you give me your word of honor that he will never again bear arms against the Union?"

"I swear it, Mr. Lincoln."

Here Judge Parker paused in his story, putting his arm upon the shoulder of the honored guest, continued: "Gentlemen, this devoted little mother nursed her paroled Confederate son back to health. He became a brilliant lawyer, an eminent judge of the Federal Court of Appeals, and now President Taft, a Northern Republican, has appointed this ex-Confederate soldier to the Supreme Court of these United States.

"Gentlemen, we gather here tonight to honor Mr. Justice Horace H. Lurton."

Little wonder it is that at the height of his fame he said, "All that I am or that I ever expect to be I owe to my angel mother." He knew the people; he understood them; he loved them. They understood him; they loved him. It was natural for him to say, "God must have loved the common people, or else he would have not made so many of them." He was a great lawyer. The thing that characterized him most was his eagerness to learn and his ability to grow. He advanced with steady stride from the log cabin to the Capitol. His was—

"A prophet eye that turned across the night
Of bondage and disunion, woe and tears,
And saw afar the coming of the light
That marked the dawn of gladder, juster years,
A heart that dwelt among the shadows much,
Yet covered all its dismal brooding o'er
With laughter and preserved the human touch
Despite the heavy burdens that it bore;
A hand assigned to labor by the fates
And by labor rendered great and strong
To lay its hold upon the iron gates
And rend the walls of deep intrenched wrong."

His practice of law gave him the prominence, the growth, the loyalty, and support of devoted friends who, at the supreme hour of our country's history made him the savior of the Nation. From his cradle, he was dedicated to the cause of human liberty. He was brought into the world to save this Union. A union saved was the goal toward which his eye was single and the martyrdom, though infamously aimed, which took him from this earth gave him to the ages and enshrined him forever in the hearts of his countrymen.

Thus in every crisis of the Union's history, "the voice of the lawyer has been heard in the land." They have been the builders of this Union. Should the day come when there are no longer lawyers, there will no longer be liberty in America. Our Constitution was built by them. It has been interpreted by them. It has been enforced by them. The laws of this Union and of our several States have been written by them. I know of no other profession where the opportunities for intellectual growth are equal to those offered by a study and practice of the law.

Reading makes of a lawyer a full man; writing makes of him an exact man; and conference makes of him a ready man. He must know something about everything. He also must know people because the determinative factor in every human equation, and in every lawsuit is the human factor. Col. W. A. Henderson, a great trial lawyer of my city, was accustomed to say, "There is a heap of human nature is a man." Carlisle said, "The proper study of mankind is man." A lawyer to succeed must know and have the confidence of the people.

He must have the power of simplicity of statement. In talking to courts and juries he should put the "fodder down on the ground where they can all get it." In talking to courts and juries he should talk about the things they will talk about when they make up their minds on what their decision and verdict shall be. He should be able to go to the heart of a question and not, to use a mountain man's expression, "stick in the bark."

I shall never forget a land title suit, known to our lawyers as an ejectment suit, which a great mountain lawyer, Lute Smith, tried before me when I held court. It was his insistence that the tract of land his client claimed was granted by the State of Kentucky in the year 1835, that the beginning corner of this tract of land was a white oak tree on the bank of the South Fork River, and that this tree had been marked by the surveyor in 1835 by 3 hacks made with an ax, each of which went through the bark of the tree. Although it was against the law for him to do so, Smith had this oak tree cut and sawed out a segment of it containing the hacks made by the surveyor. He then did what he called annulating—he counted the rings of wood beneath the bark toward the center of the tree to where evidence of the surveyor's marks no longer appeared. The number of rings of wood thus counted were 80, which demonstrated that the hacks, and consequently the survey, had been made in 1835. On this testimony, I decided the case in his favor and was affirmed by the Supreme Court.

A lawyer should know right from wrong. I have seen a few whose vision with respect to this line of demarkation was slightly blurred, but be it said to the eternal credit of the great majority of lawyers they are true to every trust confided to them. They are the unbonded trustees of society. Men freely trust them with their reputations, their property, and their lives, and it is a rare thing that any lawyer betrays his trust, or is recreant to the cause committed to his care. I once heard a young man ask a great and good lawyer what the law was with respect to a certain state of facts. The lawyer replied to him, "When you are in doubt about what the law is, ask yourself what is right; that is the law."

Lawyers are officers of the court. They should be and are a great aid to the Court. Sometimes, however, they becloud rather than clarify the issues.

A certain lawyer in addressing the Supreme Court of the United States when William Howard Taft was the Chief Justice talked for about 10 minutes without disclosing to the Court what his lawsuit was about.

Taft then said to him, "Won't you please tell us what your lawsuit is about, where it originated, what was done by the lower court, what you are complaining about, and what it is that you desire this Court to do for you and your client." The lawyer replied, "I am coming to that, Your Honor." He then proceeded without coming to anything for another 10 minutes. Taft, with a twinkle in his eye, then said to him, "Mr. Jones, why don't you tell us what your lawsuit is about? Why do you want to keep it a secret from us? Some of these days we will find out."

The first thing a lawyer should do when employed in a case is to get the facts, ascertain the truth of the whole matter. The law is but a shadow cast by the facts.

When Benjamin Franklin walked out of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, at the end of its labors, a lady asked him, "What kind of government have we, Mr. Franklin?" He replied, "A republic, if we can keep it." In a war torn world, the minds and hearts of our people are bewildered and troubled and they are asking of those who keep watch and ward over their homes and loved ones, "Watchman, what of the night? Can we keep our republic? Do we still believe in ourselves, in our traditions, in our institutions, in our future?"

May we not say to Americans everywhere: "You are America to the extent of your ability to influence the destiny of your country for weal or for woe. You are the vital, the determinative factor in the fight to preserve our country, the American way of life, our system of free enterprise—the profit system, if you please."

The right of the citizen to support his family, to accumulate something for a rainy day, to be free, unregimented, to live outside of the suffocating walls of a strait jacket, must not be surrendered.

America stands at the crossroads. We must and will win the war. And we are determined to win the peace. It must be just and we hope permanent.

Of necessity, vast powers have been lodged in the hands of the executive branch of the Government. This does not mean that we have abandoned a government of laws for one of men.

But we have traveled far down the road that leads to absolute power. Under war emergency legislation, the two mightiest governmental powers, the sword and the purse of this Nation have been placed in the hands of one man—our President. Under the Constitution, he is the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. His vast powers as such have been tremendously extended under lend-lease, the Selective Service Act, and other legislation with respect to the seizure of property and control of the daily lives of our citizens.

These vast powers can only be exercised through their delegation by the President to others, who in turn make rules and regulations having the force and effect of laws.

From time immemorial the greatest threat and menace to the life, property, and the liberty of the citizen has been in the hands of his own government. And hence, the framers of our Constitution undertook to safeguard the rights of the individual against the encroachment and abuse of governmental power. They did this in the limitations set on the power of Congress, on the power of the Executive, and by setting up the judicial branch of the Government. Not content with this, they wrote into the supreme law of the land, the Bill of Rights.

The Constitution was made for ruler and subject alike. Its framers had just fought a war to free themselves from the arbitrary abuse of power by the English monarch.

The people are alarmed at many things that are going on in Washington.

They have seen what looks like an effort to suppress and stifle the freedom of the press and to muzzle and silence free speech. This can be accomplished through priorities on paper, through the suit now being prosecuted against the Associated Press. It can be brought about through the administration of the Federal Communications Act.

They have seen the encroachment by Federal power upon the rights of free men to engage in free enterprise. The creeping paralysis of bureaucratic control has laid its crippling and retarding hand on the laborer and businessman alike.

The farmer has been made the whipping boy of the bureaucrats in Washington. He has never struck; he has been guilty of no slow-down in production.

Every farm is a battlefield. Every farmer, his wife and children are soldiers in the fight for victory.

Food will win the war. It will dictate the peace.

Under the guise of waging war, socialism and communism must not be forced on the people. The Federal Government has acquired since Pearl Harbor more than 12,000,000 acres of land at a cost of $284,000,000. This area is equal to that of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, District of Columbia and four-fifths of New Jersey. The Department of Agriculture is seeking title to 30,000,000 acres in all—the extent of this acquisition will equal the area of New England. Mr. Littell, of the Department of Justice, says this land is to be used after the war to re-establish farm families in agriculture and for a social experiment "to make democracy work."

The bureaucrat does not love a lawyer. The lawyer "delights to walk with measured tread, the beaten path of precedent."

The bureaucrat is a law unto himself. And his normal activities afford a fine example of "confusion worse confounded." He delights to sail uncharted seas; he exults and is exceeding glad when he is "on the dubious wave of error tost; his ship half foundered and his compass lost."

Congress must issue no more blank checks for money and for power.

The treaty-making power must remain where the Constitution puts it—in the hands of the President; any treaty negotiated by him to be approved "by and with the advice and consent" of two-thirds of the Senate.

All roads lead to Washington. It is the only capital in the world where things are given away. We are spending billions we do not have for things we do not need and can do without.

Those who are getting this money receive it with almost as much joy as those experience who are giving it away.

And it is a dull day when someone does not appear with a plan to give every person in the world a "bottle of milk a day" and to remake this wicked old world.

Can you blame those of us who pause to examine the credentials of these architects of a new world, these prophets of a new day?

Not for 1 minute would we play the ostrich. We live in a world in which distance has been telescoped. We will play our part. We can best do this as in independent, sovereign state in cooperation with the great peoples whose governments are allied with us in this struggle for national existence and for freedom and for civilization.

I have no doubt about the ultimate outcome. No man has ever been able to turn back the hands of the clock of progress or to permanently enslave the spirit of man. The human personality is inviolable. It cannot be shackled.

America is God's last hope for the world.

Under our form of government, under our system of free enterprise, the American people have enjoyed a larger measure of liberty, a more marvelous industrial growth and development, a deeper intellectual, moral, and spiritual life than have been accomplished and enjoyed by any other people in all the 5,000 years of recorded history that precede the adoption of our form of government. And yet today there are those who are proclaiming by an executive edict, without the sanction of law, that no man in this country, regardless of his ability and genius, shall be permitted to earn more than $25,000 per year. There are less than 3,000 men in this Nation who have such earning power. This nostrum, therefore, affords a rich dish for a demagogue. Let it be remembered, however, that they would make of this Nation the China of the Western Hemisphere. They would shackle the human intellect. They would hamstring those who would pioneer in thought, invention and industrial enterprise. Great men are fountains of light. Let's not put these luminaries under a bushel. It has long been the boast of the American people that on the broad highway of this country's splendid progress the barefoot boy may outstrip the golden chariot of inherited wealth, and that the humblest mother in this broad land, as she hushes her infant's sobs upon her holy breast knows that her child may hold a position of honor and trust in the land that gave him birth. Do we not want any more Henry Fords, Henry Kaisers, Thomas A. Edisons, William Knudsens, and other giants and pioneers of American industry? They don't stop at this, there are others saying that we must have Union Now.

I listened to its author not long ago in Washington. He had the effrontery to say there should be at this time, in the midst of this war, a world state set up, with a world parliament; that the membership and voting strength in this world legislative body should be based upon population. In this world parliament, the United States would have a minority voice. Aside from the insuperable barriers of differences in speech, race, religion, culture, tradition and ideals that lie in the pathway of such a crackpot scheme, this proposal is treason to the United States of America.

The people of this country in this crisis must look more and more to the members of our profession, and I feel safe in asserting that the lawyers of Nebraska, and the lawyers of this Nation, will not let the people down.

In this battle for the preservation of America, they who are for us are more than those who are against us. Ranged on our side in this struggle is the inspiring example of the founding fathers.

"We are the heirs of the ages, foremost in the files of time."

We know full well—"1,000 years scarce serve to found a state, an hour may lay it in the dust."

On this day we have raised a curtain on the stage where has been enacted the thrilling drama of America in the making of which the lawyers of this country have played a major role. We take up the torch. We set our hands to its defense and its preservation, lest "The work of centuries is undone, and freedom shorn of her victorious garments."

The Federal Register and Code of Federal Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1943

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article and

editorial which appeared in the American Bar Association Journal of January 1943, containing a lucid description of the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations.

These two publications are of increasing importance to the public generally and to lawyers in particular. The Federal Register is published under the direction of Maj. B. R. Kennedy, who is to be commended for the efficient and excellent job he is doing.

The article and editorial follows:

THE FEDERAL REGISTER AND CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS—HOW TO USE THEM IF YOU HAVE THEM

(By John H. Wigmore, lecturer on law, Northwestern University)

Today, 90 percent, say, of United States industry and commerce is living under Federal regulations, in some degree. And the managers of industry and commerce realize this. Now the sole authentic source for the validity of those regulations is the Federal Register, and its companion, the Code of Federal Regulations. But do the legal advisers of the men of industry and commerce know this? And are they adequately familiar with the scheme of the Register and the Code, on which their legal advice must be based?

It may well be doubted. The doubt arose in the writer's mind upon hearing from a lawyer friend in a far western city of 300,000 population. A casual reference, in correspondence, to the Federal Register elicited the response that the Register was not to be found in any law library of that city or county, and could be found only in the city public library. If this instance were typical, then apparently the legal profession not only there, but in scores of other large cities, were making no demand on the bar law libraries and the county law libraries to carry these sources, and were thus apparently unaware of the existence of these authentic sources for their legal advice.

1. To learn whether this disquieting inference was well-founded, correspondence was had with the Division of the Federal Register, the National Archives in Washington, in whose agency the Register and the code are prepared and edited. The official figures are as follows:

Number of subscriptions to the Federal Register: By public and university libraries, 115; by bar or other law libraries, 48, going to only twenty States; by individuals, 10,000 (about); to Government offices (free), 8,500. Evidently, then the legal profession has not yet awakened to the utility of these sources. And evidently, also, it is unaware of their extraordinary merit as legal-literary documents; for they are indeed virtually perfect of their kind.

As their system of construction, though perfect of their kind, calls for some preliminary study, the purpose of this article is to explain the system and thus to save waste motion for those lawyers who may for the first time start to make acquaintance with them.

2. The story goes back to 1935. In 1934 the Congress was alarmed by an incident in a Federal trial (*Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan*, 293 U. S. 388) when the Attorney General, arguing in the Supreme Court, admitted that the trial had proceeded below in ignorance of a technical though inadvertent revocation of the regulation upon which the prosecution had rested. The Congress then passed the act of July 26, 1935 (now U. S. Code, title 44, ch. 8–A, sec. 301). It created the office of Director, authorized the publication of the Federal Register and required that all executive and administrative regulations "of general applicability and legal effect" be printed therein; and that they should have no effect until so published. The statute's words are (Code, sec. 307): "No document required * * * to be published in the Federal Register shall be valid as against any person who has not had actual knowledge thereof," until it is filed with the division and a copy, "made available for public inspection in the Office of the Director of the Division of the Federal Register"; and the printing follows promptly. Thus, thenceforward the attorney watching over this client's affairs, controlled or affected by regulations of any of a hundred Federal agencies, now has but one central place in which he needs to look regularly—the Federal Register. This amounted to a reformative revolution in Federal administrative law.

The act also directed that by a certain later date each department or bureau or agency should codify all prior regulations still in force and publish them in the Register. This latter provision created at first much consternation among the hundred or more bureaus. There was great hustling and searching among the records, to eliminate the obsolete and to codify the still effective ones. But the task has been long ago completed by most of them. So that this act of 1935 prepared the way for presenting the legal world with something unique in our legal history—a single current periodical in which every valid Federal regulation could be found at the time of issue, and a single book in which all of them would ultimately land in classified places.

3. This giant problem of classification was successfully solved by an able editorial committee. The materials are classified under 50 titles. Within the titles are parts, numbered serially. Within the parts are sections numbered decimally and serially. So a complete citation can be made thus: Title 8, section 22.127; here 22 is the part and .127 is the section. This numbering is applied to each new regulation when it first appears in the Register; so that its number there shows where it will later be found in the Code volume. For example, in the Register for Saturday, October 3, 1942, the documents contained are thus listed: Title 6, Agricultural Credit, section 3.70, functions of officers; title 30, Mineral Resources, section 333, coal-price schedule; title 32, National Defense, section 944.30, priorities system; etc.; all arranged in the chronological order of filing dates.

The Register is published daily, except Sundays, Mondays, and days following a legal holiday. Each year forms a volume, beginning with 1936; so that volume VII represents the regulations issued in 1942. It can best be cited by volume and page, and not by date of publication. (Annual subscription, $12.50.)

4. The Code serves to replace the Register conveniently; for the Register nowadays has become bulky (some 10,000 pages in a year), and the Code assemblies all germane regulations on one subject together.

The Code now consists of the Code proper and annual supplements. The main Code makes 15 volumes (one for the index) and includes all regulations dating (as issued) up to June 1, 1938 (if still in force on that date). The 1938 supplement contains everything dated June 1–December 31, 1938. The 1939 supplement (2 volumes) and the 1940 supplement (4 volumes) contain everything dated in those years respectively. No 1941 supplement has yet appeared. In the supplements, the same classified order of the Code is used. (Cost of Code and supplements, $60.)

5. How to pass from Register to Code. As the Code is much more convenient than the bulky Register to handle, the Code and its supplements will naturally be used for all regulations still in force and dating prior to June 2, 1938. But the problem of finding one's way into the Code from the Register is not as simple as might be supposed.

(a) For regulations, strictly so-called, the problem is simple enough. The text of a regulation, when it appears originally in the Register, is indexed with title, part, and section, and so will be later found in the Code, or a supplement, under the same serial index numbering.

For example, under the Neutrality Acts of 1937 and 1939, United States citizens were forbidden to travel abroad on a belligerent vessel, except under regulations. The Secretary of State promulgated revised regulations on September 5, 1939, and on November 6 and 17, and later. These regulations were printed in the Register, volume IV, pages 3838, 3882, and later as amended, where they were given the code places of title 22 (Foreign Relations), part 55C (Travel). On turning to the code, 1939 supplement, at title 22, part 55C, page 1265, the notice appears, "This part has been redesignated as 'Part 156'." Then, proceeding to part 156, in the 1939 supplement, at page 1308, we find part 156, "Travel," and under it sections 156.1 and 156.2 containing the above regulations of 1939.

But for Executive orders and proclamations, the problem is not so simple. These documents have the force of law, and must appear in the Register. But as they emanate directly from the Executive, they are not usually given an index number when originally published in the Register; and the indexing for the code has to be taken care of later. Moreover, they often cover several subjects in one document; so that the code must show them both in their complete original text and also as distributed into the appropriate title, etc. Hence they form a special problem. And the status of neutrality for 1941 and of belligerency since that date has vastly increased the number of orders and proclamations. The Executive orders between 1933 and 1942 have gone up from No. 6000 into the 9000's; the proclamations from No. 2025 into the 2500's. Yet their details, like the regulations, reach into all corners of daily life.

So, if you have a citation to an Executive order or proclamation dated prior to 1941, here is how to go about locating it in the code or a supplement:

(b) Executive orders and proclamations in the main code (prior to June 2, 1938).

In the code, title 3, "The President," all the orders and proclamations are first listed by catchword only, with right-hand column figures showing where the text of the document appears under the proper title subject. So,

(1) For orders, look in the code, title 3, part 3, at page 216, where the orders are listed in order of their serial numbers and dates. Follow along till you reach the order that you seek, and in the right-hand column you will find the citation of the later place in the code where the text provisions of that order are codified.

For example, suppose that your client is interested in the export of tin-plate scrap, and you have found that the act of February 15, 1936, authorizes the President to regulate such export under license, and that by Executive Order No. 7297, of February 15, 1936, he has authorized the Secretary of State to make regulations licensing such export. You now desire to locate the order and the regulations in the code. Take down the code, volume 1, turn to part 3 of title 3, beginning at page 216. Follow down the serial number or the chronological date (whichever you have), and at page 312 you come to order No. 7297, the one you are concerned with. Then in the right-hand column you find a reference to 32 C. F. R. 3.1, which means that this order is found in title 32 of the code at section 3.1. Title 32 is "National Defense," and is contained in volume 8 of the main code. Under title 32 you will come, at page 16, to part 3, "Domestic Sources of Tin." At section 3.1 you will find the text of the order; and at sections 3.2 to 3.19 you will find the Secretary of State's regulations.

(2) For proclamations, suppose you are interested in proclamation No. 2236, of May 1, 1937, published in the Federal Register, II, 776, dealing with the export of munitions to Spain, then in the midst of civil war. Take

again the code, volume 1, turn this time to part 2 of title 3, beginning at page 193, and follow along as before.

(c) Executive orders and proclamations in the annual supplements: Here another stage in your search must be reckoned with; for in the supplements the full text of the document is first given, and then at a later place the several portions are distributed among the titles where they belong (if more than one subject is covered, as sometimes occurs).

So, proceed as follows:

(1) For orders, take down the supplement for the year concerned, turn to title 3, "The President," and there you will find (ch. 2) the Executive orders listed in sequence of date and serial number, in full text. Then turn back to the listed titles of orders and proclamations at the beginning of title 3 (arranged in like order as above), and in the right-hand column you will find the citation to the later part of the supplement, where the text of the order is distributed under the appropriate titles and sections.

For example, if you are concerned with the order of September 5, 1939, No. 8233, defining the departments that are to enforce the neutrality laws, you will come by turning to title 3, at page 86, to the full texts of the 1939 orders, and (following them chronologically) you will find the full text of Order 8233 at pages 211, 212. Then, turning back again to the list at the beginning of title 3, and running it down in serial order, you will find, opposite Order 8233 in the right-hand column, the index citation "22 C. F. R. 143.11." So turning to that title in the same volume, you will find the order set forth in its appropriate code location under part 43, Enforcement of Neutrality.

(2) For proclamations, take down the supplement for the year concerned, and proceed as above for orders; the proclamations being here grouped as chapter I (instead of ch. II) under title 3.

For example, if you are concerned with the lengthy proclamation of September 5, 1939, No. 2348, defining the various duties of citizens in maintaining strictly the status of the United States as a neutral in the war between Great Britain-France and Germany, turn to title 3, the President, of the 1939 supplement, and at page 17 you will come to chapter I, Proclamations. Follow this along chronologically, and at page 49 you will come to the full text of No. 2348. It is more than four pages long. Now turn back to the beginning of title 3, and at page 1 you come to the list of proclamations arranged chronologically, and at page 2, where No. 2348 is listed, you find in the right-hand column the citations "22 C. F. R. 143.21-24, 146.1, 164.11-19," which means that this proclamation covered three distinct separable topics. So, turning ahead to the body of the volume, you find that the text of the proclamation has been distributed as follows, under title 22, Foreign Relations: "Sections 143.21-24, Enforcement (of the neutrality restrictions); section 146.1, Forbidden Acts (a long list); and sections 164.11-19, Ships (various rules).

Does the foregoing arrangement seem complex? Perhaps so, at first. But, after one experience with it, all goes smoothly; for it is both logical and practical. It would be hard to conceive of any arrangement which could as well have taken care of all the documentary needs and conveniences of those who must resort to these laws, both in current and in permanent form.

So, let us congratulate ourselves that the system came into effect in good season to enable us to cope conveniently with the ever-mounting mass of Federal administrative law.

But—what shall be said of the extraordinary blindness of our legal profession to this reformative revolutioni n the organization of one of our principal law sources?

Just turn back to the figures supplied by the division, and reflect on their significance.

THE FEDERAL REGISTER

Dean Wigmore is still a teacher of the law. Although he has reached and passed the age which the members of our institutions of learning by common consent have fixed for the retirement of their teaching staff, and has become dean emeritus of Northwestern University School of Law, the urge to impart useful knowledge to the men of our profession proves at times to be irresistible.

Fortunate for us it is, that this generous urge still persists. Doubly fortunate it is that having given to so many the theoretical side of the science of law, and guided so many to the solution of its most intricate problems, he demonstrates in the article which we print in this number, practical advice for our guidance in a new field, which is rapidly becoming of dominant importance, so new in fact that only the specialists understand its vocabulary, and know how to find what we must know if we are to keep pace with the needs of our clients for guidance in a changing world.

The Federal Register is an invention of which the mother was the necessity of forcing administrative orders from the obscurity of filing cases and pigeonholes in governmental offices and of compelling them, as a condition for continued existence, to be made matters of record where they could be easily accessible to all. The ultimate value of that invention will depend in large measure upon the extent to which the general practitioner understands what it is and how to use it.

For the origin of this useful device it may be permissible to call attention to the fact that in 1934 our Special Committee on Administrative Law, of which Louis G. Caldwell was chairman, recommended just such a solution of the problem. Our instrumentality in that enterprise was recognized by the director of the Division of the Federal Register in the National Archives, Washington, D. C.

It is there said that the Special Committee on Administrative Law of the American Bar Association for 1934 recommended Federal legislation requiring the central filing and publication of every rule, regulation, or order of general applicability and legal effect issued or prescribed by any executive officer or administrative board of the United States. The substance of the bar association recommendation formed the basis of the Federal Register Act.

The Casablanca Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an interesting commentary on the Casablanca meeting by the outstanding military writer, Capt. Lowell Limpus, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on January 27, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUROPEAN INVASION PLANS SCHEDULED, LIMPUS REVEALS

(By Capt. Lowell Limpus)

The north African conference presents a peculiar significance to military men here. It means that the combined high command has taken the one final step which was a necessary preliminary to the actual invasion of Europe.

It indicates that the supreme military authority has laid down what soldiers call the schedule of operations for each theater commander.

SCHEDULES WORKED OUT

It seems a virtual certainty that these schedules were worked out by the generals and admirals at endless series of staff conferences, while the civilian heads of the two great governments concerned were busy with the problems of statecraft.

That's why so many key fighting men went along. They had to work out the schedules called for by the current development of the project of operations, which they outlined a year ago.

These are routine steps in modern warcraft—routine to soldiers but steps with which the public generally is unfamiliar. And the schedules laid down at Casablanca had to come between the project of operations and the various plans of campaign for each theater.

ALL RELATED

One leads directly into the other, and they all involve monumental staff work.

The original project of operations was prepared by the combined United Nations staffs in Washington as soon as we entered the war. It laid down the broad general strategy of the global conflict, and it is now evident that this project called for us to assume the defensive in the Far East, while building up a striking force across the Atlantic Ocean.

A resultant schedule of operations presumably was handed at that time to General MacArthur and the Army and Navy chiefs in Washington.

CHANGES NEEDED

The beginning of this year saw the striking force reach such strength that a new schedule, outlining its use, was in order. Such a schedule could only be prepared by a great conference of all the Army, Navy, air, and supply chiefs concerned. And it evidently was staged at Casablanca as an accompaniment of the Roosevelt-Churchill meeting.

They were all there, too: Marshall, King, Arnold, Somervell, and Eisenhower for the United States; Pound, Brooke, Portal, Dill, Mountbatten, and Ismay for the British Empire; Giraud and De Gaulle for France. And around that table was worked out the detailed strategy for the invasion of Europe.

TACTICS NOT WEIGHED

They didn't deal with tactics at those meetings—these first fighting men of the democracies—for tactics concern the actual fighting and that's up to each theater commander to go about in his own way. They simply decided where to strike, how many troops and ships to move into each key position, and how many supplies should be delivered where and when.

And the German intelligence service would give its collective eye-teeth for a hint concerning those decisions.

Each decision was incorporated into a proper schedule of operations and handed over to the commander of the various theaters that they agreed to establish.

ON OWN INITIATIVE

They may have decided to open up one theater—or two—or a dozen. But a commander in chief was selected for each theater, given the mission covered by the schedule handed him—and left to rely on his own judgment in drawing up his own plan of campaign for that theater.

For these high commanders only told their subordinates what to do. They didn't tell them how to do it. Because that isn't the military way.

Every subcommander, all the way down the line, is left free to solve his problem in his own way.

TIME WILL TELL

It would be useless to guess what plans were evolved at the military conference, while the statesmen parleyed. Only time will show. But it seems probable that arrangements were made for numerous feint attacks at the European continent—and it will be up to the Germans to guess which blows are genuine and which are fake.

The genuine blows will lead to the establishment of the beachheads that will broaden into the selected theaters of operations, in which whole armies and groups of armies will maneuver.

Gradually the schedule outlined last week will become clear, as the theaters develop and the commanders emerge. Some may be British, some French, some American. And the first to take shape will probably be the North African one, which already is being organized. Then we will see what kind of assignment Marshall, Arnold, Brooke, and Portal gave to Gen. John Doe (whose real name may turn out to be Eisenhower or Alexander) in that particular theater.

PROBLEM SHAPING UP

The problem there was taking shape rapidly this week, as Rommel scurried up the dry road to Tunisia and the Allies came plunging out of the mud up there in a race to seize the one remaining corridor that offers him an avenue of escape. The Desert Fox is running for his life now, and American troops are closing in on the safety lane rapidly. Along it he is fleeing to join the garrison of a besieged position. And it must be wiped out to give us one springboard for the invasion.

Meanwhile the Reds continue to roll forward all along the line as the Germans fall back, fighting desperately in Russia. This week sees that conflict still continuing—but the Nazis' line is still unbroken, too. The big break in that campaign is yet to come. But the German Government is preparing the people for more bad news.

Action in the Pacific was marked by indications of a new American offensive, as we struck by sea and air at the New Georgia Island group, 200 miles beyond Guadalcanal, and continued mopping up the latter. The pressure on both the great Axis defensive circles—European and Asiatic—was unyielding this week.

FRICTION IN CAPITAL

Only here in Washington were there signs of friction, as Rubber Czar Jeffers lashed at service "expediters" and another Senate committee discussed tying up the purse strings to reduce the size of the Army, which the general staff says it needs to do the job outlined by the President as leading to "unconditional surrender."

The Commander in Chief, incidentally, made a real hit with soldiers here by his trip abroad. They freely express admiration for his "guts" in visiting a combat theater at this time.

Human Nature and the Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Times-Herald, and also in the New York Daily News, on Human Nature and the Ruml Plan.

While I have the floor, Mr. President, I desire to state that the Ruml plan is the basis of measures introduced by Representative FRANK CARLSON in the House, and by myself in the Senate, which would place the payment of individual income taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis. I consider this highly desirable, in fact, as necessary, if the Treasury is to collect income taxes from our millions of income-tax payers with a minimum of delinquencies and defaults.

I send to the desk the editorial which I desire to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMAN NATURE AND THE RUML PLAN

The Ruml "daylight saving" plan for income-tax reform is meeting with the expected opposition from the Treasury Department.

Henry Morgenthau's tax experts and alleged experts every other day or so put forward some suggestion which they claim is an improvement on the Ruml plan, and which is not. These tactics have been called a rear-guard action by the Treasury against the Ruml plan backers' effort to put income tax collections on a businesslike, pay-as-you-go basis.

We think that description is accurate. We also think the Treasury's behavior is an interesting illustration of one quirk of human nature. It hurts when somebody else has a good idea that never occurred to you. You're something of a superman if you can swallow your chagrin, admit cheerfully that it is a good idea, and cooperate in bringing it to fulfillment.

Whatever else he may be, Mr. Morgenthau is no superman. At the bottom of this Treasury resistance to the Ruml plan is the Treasury's chagrin over not having thought of it first. That seems obvious to us, and quite understandable.

The fight high lights another familiar fact of life, too: The fact that desirable reforms always have hard going.

DIE-HARDS ETERNAL

As the New Dealers found out when they began to remold the Nation in 1933, there is always somebody who will set up a howl whenever it is proposed to take a step forward in any line, no matter how short or desirable the step.

Now that the New Dealers are 10 years older, some of them are lining up with the die-hards in the argument over the Ruml plan, which is a simple and desirable plan for shifting us all to pay-as-you-go income taxation. Some of the die-hards of 1933 must be snickering in their beards at the spectacle.

The Ruml proposal was thought up by Beardsley Ruml, chairman of the New York Federal Reserve Bank and treasurer of the R. H. Macy store. Its essence is that we all go on paying income taxes this year, but call them taxes on 1943 income instead of on 1942 income. Details of the operation can be worked out without difficulty. The effect of it would be to jerk all us income-tax payers (meaning 27,000,000 of us) out of our present condition of everlasting indebtedness to the Government, and put us on a cash basis.

Nobody would really lose by the change. The Treasury would be far surer than it now is of getting its tax money from every taxpayer. There would not be the blizzard of tax defaults and bankruptcies which there surely will be if the war ends before we move to a pay-as-you-go system.

We'll interject here a paragraph or so on one of our favorite topics—the metric system.

SIMPLE AND EFFECTIVE

The metric system, a decimal system of weights and measures, is completely scientific, absolutely accurate, and easily learned. It is far superior to the hodgepodge of pounds, feet, quarts, acres, miles, gallons, etc. Yet die-hard opposition for 153 years has prevented adoption of the metric system in the United States and Great Britain.

The Ruml plan is equally simple and scientific. Among its other benefits, it would cut out a great deal of waste motion.

Under the present pay-next-year-or-when-they-catch-you system they spend a great deal of time catching you. You think you paid in full in 1939, for example, on your 1938 income. But there is no guaranty of that. Any time the Internal Revenue Bureau may be coming around to nail you for a few more dollars, or a lot more, on that 1938 return.

These things happen frequently; and each time such a thing does happen it means that at least one revenue agent has spent a great deal of time and effort combing through your returns, analyzing your answers and explanations, and mayhap burrowing into your supposedly personal and private business. What the net profit to the Treasury is, we don't know; but we would expect it to be a net loss instead. Certainly there is a net loss when the Treasury finds that you have overpaid and blows back a few dollars—which sometimes happens.

This waste motion and expense should be largely eliminated by the Ruml reform. Doing business on a cash basis always means less bookkeeping than doing it on a credit basis.

We think Congress would be wise to override the phony objections to the Ruml plan, and adopt it before March 15, when the first income-tax installment becomes due.

The First Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on January 14, 1943, Sterling F. Mutz, eminent Nebraska lawyer, and president-general of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, delivered an address in New York City titled "The First Freedom." In view of the present public interest in post-war planning, I feel that the address of Mr. Mutz might well be printed in the RECORD, and that it will be of considerable interest to the Members of this body.

I therefore request unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America will have to take world leadership after the war. No other nation is equipped mentally or physically for that task. As the most powerful Nation, and the least selfish, we have no other alternative. If peace is to be assured we must act in a positive way and with a firm hand.

History tells us that treaties have failed; they have long been mere scraps of paper,

to be thrown aside at the will of irresponsible leaders. Shall we proceed once more to hold a peace conference; to form a treaty which shall again be useless and breed more war? Shall we again leave the terms of peace to world diplomats, trained in the school of selfishness, charged by their countries to seek advantage and wield power? God forbid that in the year 1943 we follow such known paths of failure.

What, then, shall we do with the broad principles of the Atlantic Charter? Shall we file them away as beautiful expressions of world philosophy, or shall we implement them with some practical machinery to end war and to compel peace?

We cannot embark upon the plan of the League of Nations. No one wants a world organization whose foundations are so weak and unstable.

Shall we turn to a board of arbitration to again quibble over the enforcibility of its findings? Or to such a world court as we know it now? A court of law as we understand it is one designed to interpret and administer existing law. But there is no existing international law worthy of its name for such a court to interpret or enforce.

A man of national prominence recently announced his plan of establishing a world parliament. This experiment would require a delicate and complicated legislative machinery to begin the slow and arduous process of establishing an international law. When we consider the difficulties involved in making laws to fit divergent conditions in widely separated countries we may well doubt that this would be practical, especially so without some means of enforcement.

What, then, is the answer? In my judgment it is found in the establishment of an international tribunal, judicial in character, without legislative authority, independent in thought, fearless in action, bound by no traditions of world diplomacy, with jurisdiction solely over the problems of peace and equipped with a police force strong enough to carry out its decrees. For the want of a better name it might be called the International Court of Equity. Not a court of law circumscribed with its customary limitations, but a court composed of men and women empowered to supply the remedy where the law is weak or helpless. A court whose sole responsibility should be to administer justice and equity between nations, purely upon a humanitarian basis. The Allied Nations must establish and be responsible for this tribunal if it succeeds. Its authority must be imposed upon the conquered countries by force. Its work should be circumscribed with two broad limitations:

1. That no nation shall resort to war to settle international disputes, and

2. That each nation shall be required to do unto others as it would be done by.

True, this would would be a government of men and not of laws. But who will gainsay that in our so-called government of laws, interpretations of our own Constitution have not been colored by human prejudices and the political thought and idealism of the individual judges of our own Supreme Court.

Such a court should be an instrument of sovereignty—rather an extension of the sovereign power of our country. Each country must retain its legislative power, its right to determine what character of government it desires within its borders and not be subject to any authority beyond its boundaries except for the purpose of maintaining peace.

You may ask "Will not judges of this court be expected to protect the interests of the Nation from which they are selected?" One chosen to sit upon such a court, charged with the duty of administering justice and equity, conscious of the high responsibility which rests upon his shoulders, could not practice cunning, or indulge in selfishness, or misuse power. Men of intelligence will not so stultify themselves. For example, would you fear that judges such as Elihu Root, John Bassett Moore, Charles Evans Hughes, or Cordell Hull would debase themselves by rendering judgments unduly favorable to the country from which they came? Of course not.

Such a plan will not succeed if it is not implemented with the positive hand of force. With this, an imperfect plan will succeed. Without force it is doomed to oblivion. It might be set up at once to provide the agency to deal with the peace when that time comes, to take cognizance of the problems arising from this war. The long and arduous task of framing a peace treaty would be wholly unnecessary, if the court is ready to assume its proper jurisdiction.

The first case presented might be entitled "The Allied Nations vs. the Axis Powers." The complaint directed against those responsible for the war with a prayer for appropriate punishment for the high crimes they have committed. Speedy justice should be dealt out here. The next complaint might be for the civil damages that have accrued to the Allied Nations. The prayer for relief, that the Axis Powers be required to make proper reparations, within the ability of the defendants to pay, and also for an order distributing the recovery among the Allied Nations in proportion as they have been damaged. This cause of action could be leisurely determined in accordance with equitable principles.

The court's decrees will be meaningless unless an instrument for their enforcement be included in the plan. They will become mere scraps of paper unless the iron hand of an international police be set up to carry out the penalty and to enforce the decrees. It may offend the sensibilities of those who firmly believe in the separation of powers to charge the International Court with the authority to arrange for an international police but what better agency could determine the need and the men, materials, and money, and how much each nation should contribute to pay the cost? Not the court, but the international police, as arms of the executive department of each Allied Government, must be charged with the responsibility of enforcing the court's decrees.

Having carried out its duties respecting the present war, the court might be the instrument to entertain other complaints between nations in peacetime. Assuming that a particular country has a complaint against its neighbor, the Allied Nations must require those involved to submit that complaint to the court. Upon receipt of the complaint a summary order may issue that until the matter is determined neither shall resort to war. Issues can then be joined, evidence submitted, arguments made, and the decree entered and spread upon the minutes of the court. All proceedings must be open to the public and submitted to the test of a sound public opinion.

What better tribunal could be set up to enforce freedom of the seas and freedom of the air, or, to adjust rights of ingress and egress by ships and planes or to equitable principles to traffic between nations? Or to provide reparation for damages accruing as a result thereof.

What better tribunal could be found to deal with territorial encroachments or aid in the establishment of natural or political boundaries or enforce the right of self-determination.

What better agency could be found to prevent insidious propaganda by radio or the nefarious work of fifth columnists?

The vital questions business and capital are asking are: "How can we be assured that the money we invest in some foreign country can retain its value? If we aid backward countries to develop their natural resources, are we not entitled to some protection in the integrity of our contracts? Is not capital entitled to demand that every country be bound by the principle that no nation shall pass a law impairing the obligation of contracts, not alone business contracts, but contracts between nations as well?" If fear can be removed may we not expect capital to be invested to process raw materials so that all the peoples of the world can be well fed, well clothed, and well housed.

But what of the starving people of the world? This proposed court could not, without assuming governmental powers, implement the Atlantic Charter to distribute the raw materials among the nations. A world court should never assume such administrative or executive functions lest it be charged with setting up a supergovernment. The advisability of any government agency undertaking the task of distributing the raw materials of the world may well be doubted. The first objection is that it must be administered by boards and bureaus, and fact-finding agencies and would require formulas for distribution. Rationing at best is a doubtful experiment in peacetime within the confines of one country. To extend this principle internationally would be to embark upon uncharted seas with the chance of success small indeed.

But you say, America has an obligation to prevent starvation and anarchy among the helpless peoples of the world. While this is true, need we do so upon the plan of a supergovernment?

It is my judgment that surpluses can better be distributed upon a voluntary basis than through some governmental agency. Perhaps we might set up an international community chest administered by the Red Cross, to which all countries would be invited to contribute food, clothing, and money for the alleviation of human suffering. What better investment in good will could we make than to have the Red Cross distribute food to the starving millions in China? Or Britain, or Russia, or France, or Belgium? How much cheaper it will be to feed and clothe the helpless people of the world than to suffer the cost in men and money which arises from war. And by this voluntary plan we need not yield our sovereignty to a supergovernment.

These are thought-provoking considerations. Someone must evolve a plan to implement the Atlantic Charter. In the final analysis, justice and equity must be administered by men. They should not be required to wait for a restatement of international law, or wait for experimentation in the doubtful field of world legislation. We must preserve our national integrity and use its power to establish that one additional attribute of sovereignty—the enforcement of world peace.

The first freedom then, must be freedom from war. This cannot be realized without the positive hand of force. That force must come from the Allied Nations and be retained by them, if the peace of the world is to be assured.

The Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically

Handicapped, and my own address delivered at a meeting of that organization held January 12, 1943:

ADDRESS BY MR. PAUL A. STRACHAN

Mr. President, distinguished guests, and fellow members, this is the first meeting we have held since the beginning of the Seventy-eighth Congress. We have already begun our legislative campaign. The national employ the physically handicapped week resolution has been reintroduced in the House by the Honorable JERRY VOORHIS, our very good friend, upon the opening day, and it will be reintroduced by the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Jr., in the Senate within the next few days. Following that, piecemeal, as the opportunity presents, other legislation will be introduced to cover other phases of the national program for the physically handicapped.

One thing that all of us have ascertained in the past has been the necessity for the establishment of a bureau of welfare for the physically handicapped. There is, to my mind, every reason why that should be done. If, for no other reason, because it would ultimately bring together many of the various units now handling some phase of the welfare activities—rehabilitation, training, etc.—for the physically handicapped. I want to say, however, that we must not expect too quick action upon such matters. Bills have been introduced and others will be introduced by other organizations who believe in the expansion of the present set-up, which, frankly, means that those interested in such a program for themselves today, if they visited all agencies each having a part of the program, would have to go to 17 different agencies.

Nevertheless, I have talked with a great many Members of Congress and I find that they are interested in our program. I am frank to say that, whether they are interested to the extent of voting for a bill, I do not know, but I do believe that, on both sides of the aisle, there is an awakening of interest as to what to do, as to the 23,000,000 physically handicapped people in this country. And, I believe that we are in excellent position to push forward—a piece at a time—building against the future, a program that will cover this group adequately. I also know that one of the cardinal principles of successful legislative work is, never to overlook the temper of the Congress with which we have to deal. We must first build a program that will stand up under punishment—one that is so right that it can stand criticism and keep coming. We believe we have that kind of a program.

We believe that there is not a single item on our program today that is not needed, or, if enacted, would in any way conflict with any pending legislation. That is important. Because powerful groups which have initiated their ideas of legislation—rehabilitation experts and educational groups—must not run counter to ours, nor our program to theirs, at least not to the extent that we must lose sight of what we are trying to get specifically for our own special group.

I feel that the program we have designed is sound, in the sense of being practical. I know that we have not asked Congress for anything unreasonable, and that, too, is important. We have asked that Congress itself determine the scope that such a program should take, by the setting up of a special investigating committee to go into the whole field as to the physically handicapped.

I know that there is plenty of precedent for that, because nearly every piece of important legislation which has been put upon the statutes in the past 25 years has originated as a result of congressional study and action, itself. I have no compunctions about asking Congress for money, but I would much rather know exactly what is needed, so that we might apply the rule of reason. If it is 5 million, or 25 million, or even 100 million—if the job justifies it—I believe it should be done, and I believe that Congress is fair-minded enough to do it, and I am hopeful that some activity will be started soon looking to a congressional committee to investigate and determine a national program for the physically handicapped being set in motion.

We have already called upon the various agencies of the Government to lay down a definite program for the handicapped. We are calling upon the Civil Service Commission to establish a division to be charged with the handling of the handicapped, as to employment within the civil service. The reason for this is that there is no question but that there will always be handicapped persons, and in the system of economics now facing the Nation and which will intensify as this war goes on, one thing we are going to need is the skill of every person—men and women—as well as their aptitudes and abilities, who can do any kind of work to speed our final victory.

That, I believe, is self-evident, and I feel that all agencies of the Government must prepare now—not only for what is needed today—but, tomorrow, and the next day, as well. And, if they do that, they cannot escape the conclusion that the handicapped must be dealt with in a specialized way. We are calling upon the United States Employment Service, in the light of the approximate million and a quarter handicapped citizens who have registered already, since the war began, to set up qualified divisions to handle them, and those who will, inevitably, follow them.

It is an undeniable fact that a very large percentage of our handicapped people are not possessed of the experience, the wisdom—the education, if you please—as to what has been done for them by the Government, or what is being done now, or may be done in the future. I am sure that is true, because I have hundreds of letters from handicapped all over this country, and, notwithstanding that Governmental agencies have used every medium of publicity to tell the people what is being done, nevertheless these letters indicate that many people have never heard of any of the things that have been, or are being done in their interest. It must be a part of the job of this federation to apprise the handicapped of what benefits they may avail themselves in order to be rehabilitated, and to take part in the production of war matériel which will speed the day of victory. We must do that. I venture to say that 50 percent of the efforts of our office here, now, is devoted to telling people who are in absolute ignorance of what they may get now, or what is in store for them, as well as how to get it, and who to see, to get it.

As you know, we very early called upon private industry—through the National Association of Manufacturers, United States Chamber of Commerce, and leading industrialists of this country—to make use of handicapped individuals, pointing out that they must make use of them for the Nation's sake as well as for that of the individually handicapped. I am very glad to advise that, through various manufacturers, I have been informed that more than 200,000 of the handicapped have been put to work in the past 7 months. But there is still much need for the handicapped themselves going forward on their own steam instead of depending upon outside agencies and individuals. Still there are very definite signs of continuing improvement, and I am certain that if we keep pounding away, and if we do not expect to win all we ask for in a day or a week, we shall continue to push forward with our program and thus lift the horizons of the handicapped higher and higher all the time.

There are three steps in the development of any organization's program. The first step is to overcome public indifference and inertia to the program. The second, to meet the antagonism which that program will engender from those who do not wish to see the status quo disturbed, and the third step is to bring about a general understanding on the part of the public as to just what the program means, for from that point on, I am confident of our success.

That is all I have to say tonight on the subject of our general activities as to legislation.

Ladies and gentlemen, I think one of the gravest moments that can come to anyone is, to introduce his own Congressman. You can't strike a happy medium, because if you say too much, you get in dutch, and, if you don't say enough, you get in dutch, so, I shall throw myself on the mercy of the court, and I enter a plea that you, and he, shall both forgive me any commissions or omissions.

I can start back, about 16 years ago, when I first became aware of the fact that in the grand old State of Georgia, there existed a citizen by the name of ROBERT RAMSPECK. Just by accident, about 2½ years later—mostly because I have a yen for attending political rallies—I visited a meeting at which the gentleman in question was a speaker. There was an opposition speaker, too, who sounded off in full strength, vocally, for his side, but, when BOB RAMSPECK said his piece, well, the other feller just faded away.

When I returned to Washington, I was very proud to find that he had, already, begun to climb upward. Sitting on four important committees, he has gradually built for himself a reputation for fairness, considerateness, and honorable dealing, as to which he has no superior in the House of Representatives.

Now, I want to say that he has proven to me to be a pretty tough customer, and I am often reminded that he was born in Decatur, Ga., in the shadow of the largest block of granite on earth—Stone Mountain. There are times within my knowledge that I have felt that he has a great deal of that familiar granite in his make-up. Nevertheless, he has had a profoundly beneficial influence upon Government employees' affairs; upon Labor, in fact, upon all working people. One reason why I am particularly proud of him is because—and I am almost ashamed to admit it, although it is perhaps undeserved in many ways—and that is, the South is ultra-conservative, but, despite that, his whole career in Congress has been that of a liberal who chose the middle of the road and yet, held fast to the ideal of continual progress. For that, I honor him.

Now, I want to bring this down to short focus. Early last year, I presented to Mr. RAMSPECK a program on behalf of the physically handicapped. He took it first to the Civil Service Commission, and later to the head of the War Manpower Commission, Paul McNutt, then and now the head of the Federal Security Agency. So far as I have been able to determine, that was the first effort to launch an over-all program for the handicapped, and I think we should accord Mr. RAMSPECK full credit for his efforts in that direction.

In September 1941, after considerable research, I ascertained that since 1919, there has been a grand total of 171 laws put upon the statute books on Civil Service matters, and of that number, 155 had been enacted while our friend had been chairman of the House Civil Service Committee. That record speaks for itself. It means that during his jurisdiction, more laws have been placed on the books, bearing on benefits to Government employees, than all the time previously in our history .

This, my friends, has been a rather rambling dissertation, but I can sincerely say that in ROBERT RAMSPECK we have no better friend in Congress, and I am proud to present him to you. Congressman RAMSPECK. [Appleuse.]

ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, of course. I am grateful to my friend, Paul Strachan, for the kind remarks he made in presenting me to you. I think, perhaps, he is a little partial, because I let him come to my office and pound on my desk, and I do not try to argue with him, because he could not hear me anyway, and, besides, I am too lazy to try to write him notes all the time; so I would not be surprised if I have not listened to more speeches by Paul Strachan than anyone else.

He has made two speeches here tonight, and, I submit, in all fairness, what has he left for me to say? He has told you about his experience with me in regard to the programs for the physically handicapped. Therefore, he has used up a good part of my speech, which I had hoped to make to you. It is true that, at his request, I have tried to persuade the Civil Service Commission to establish a division for the physically handicapped. Then when that was unsuccessful, I went to Paul McNutt, after considerable urging by Paul Strachan, and tried to sell him the idea that the War Manpower Commission should have a division especially to look after the physically handicapped, in order to fit them into the war program.

We were not successful, specifically, but I think we can claim credit to this extent the Civil Service Commission did have a study made of positions that could be filled by persons having some physical handicap, and they have published a report—which I hope to make available to some of you—listing a large number of positions which will be open to persons suffering from some handicap. Therefore, we have made some progress on your behalf, and, so far as my activities on your behalf are concerned, they have been due to the fact that your friend, Paul Strachan, sold me the idea.

Now, with regard to the resolution asking that the President set aside a week, designated as "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week," I am heartily in favor of such a resolution, because I think it is true that a vast majority of the people in this country are not familiar with the problems which you face. Such a proclamation, issued by the President, would focus attention upon this important problem, and would help to bring understanding to many people who have no conception of what it means.

I am also heartily in favor of having Congress investigate, as proposed by Paul Strachan, although, in that respect, I guess that some of that Stone Mountain granite is cropping out, for I do not agree with his idea as to a special committee. My own opinion is that one of the regular standing committees of the House should do the job, and should make a full and complete study of all the facts relating to this problem, in which you are so much concerned. However, I do not think that it is so important what procedure is followed as it is to get the investigation, and, therefore, have Congress and the public get all the facts.

I do feel, as Paul does, that somewhere in this great Government of ours we should have a bureau devoted to safeguarding the interests of the 23,000,000 citizens of America who suffer some handicap—major or minor—and I also feel that that bureau should be, so far as is possible, staffed by handicapped persons, because they, above all others, will undertand and appreciate the problems facing those other citizens who come within this classification.

Now, I do not know that there is anything further that I can add to what has been said here tonight, except this: This country—our United States—is a big country; the people are hard to impress, and to bring home to the average citizen the problem of selling a program to the Congress and to the American people takes a lot of hard work; it takes organization; it takes constant and persistent effort; it means many disappointments and delays, and you can hope to succeed only if you are willing to form a strong organization and do a lot of work in order that the people may be made to understand and appreciate what your problem is.

If you are willing to do that, and you have a sound program to offer, it is my judgment that you can win the fight, and get the legislation necessary from the United States Congress. I shall esteem it a privilege to do anything that I can, to assist you, but no idea was ever sold to Congress unless the people back home—those people who sent us to Washington—were first interested in the idea. So may I leave this suggestion with you, that the important thing for you to do is to focus attention of the people in the 48 States, through local organizations, on your problem, giving them the information, and asking them to support your program. When you get the support of the public throughout this country you won't have any difficulty in the Congress.

I am very happy to have the privilege of coming here and attending your meeting. I have a real affection for my friend Paul Strachan, and I think he is devoting his heart and soul to this movement. I sometimes get a little peeved at him because he takes up so much of my time, but since it is in the interest of such a good purpose I forgive him and I want to tell you how happy I am to have the opporunity to work with him and with you in any way that I can.

I thank you very much.

Pay-As-You-Go Tax Plan Endorsed by Workingmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the steady increase in Federal taxes has made it imperative that serious consideration be given to the launching of a method of collection of taxes that will act as insurance against wholesale defaults by millions of honest American citizens.

There is widespread discussion of adopting the Ruml pay-as-you-go plan or its principles in some modified form. So urgent is the matter that any further delay is certain to have a bad effect on the whole economic structure of the Government.

Millions of American citizens in the smaller salary brackets are faced with a gigantic problem in meeting the Federal income taxes levied on their 1942 income. It is plainly evident that some program must be adopted to arrange for the payment of income taxes from the salaries as earned in order to avert chaos in providing the funds necessary to finance the cost of government.

Whether the Ruml plan or other similar proposals are the answer to the pressing problem is a question that must have the immediate attention of Congress not alone from the standpoint of guaranteeing the credit of the Nation but also from the fact that it will contribute greatly to civilian morale to remove the harrowing specter that confronts the average American citizen as he contemplates means of paying his 1942 income tax.

It is of no aid to the average citizen to be forced to borrow money at high rates of interest to maintain his standing as a good American because the test of citizenship involves, among other requisites, a man's ability to meet his obligations as a taxpayer.

At this point I wish to call attention to the following resolution received from the Brotherhood of Railroad Shop Crafts of America through their local affiliate, Altoona Works Local No. 42, located at Altoona, Pa., in my congressional district.

Altoona is a city of over 80,000 inhabitants, the chief industry being the giant shops of the Pennsylvania Railroad, which are regarded as the largest railroad shops in the world. Over 12,000 citizens of Altoona are employed at the Pennsylvania Railroad shops in that city. These employees are substantial citizens and home owners who are anxious that the virtue of thrift be given every possible assistance in becoming a reality in everyday life.

The resolution points out the difficulty that will be experienced by loyal American citizens in meeting the increased 1942 income taxes if the pay-as-you-go plan is inaugurated without deferment of the taxes for that particular year. In other words to expect payment of 1942 income taxes and at the same time commence to deduct the 1943 income taxes at the source will impose an intolerable burden upon those employed in industry where the high wages received in war industry are not experienced.

Therefore the deferment of the 1942 income taxes until after the present war is a desirable and necessary expedient in the event that favorable consideration is not accorded to the suggestion embraced in the Ruml plan that the taxes for the year 1942 be forgotten entirely.

The resolution adopted by Altoona Works Local No. 42 of the Brotherhood of Railroad Shops Crafts of America is as follows:

Whereas War bonds totaling nearly one-third of a million dollars were purchased by means of the pay-roll deduction plan in 1942 by the Altoona Works employees; and

Whereas in addition, approximately $60,000 has been contributed recently to the War Fund, Community Chest, Red Cross, etc,. by the same group; and

Whereas living and food costs have risen approximately 31 percent over 1941; and

Whereas the Altoona Works employees will have deductions from wages for pensions, relief, and Victory tax; and

Whereas no extremely high wage scales such as are in effect in defense plants exist in the Altoona Works; and

Whereas the new income-tax rates greatly exceed last year's tax; and

Whereas it is now proposed to introduce a so-called pay-as-you-go anticipated tax deduction from income; and

Whereas such additional burden, coupled to the new increased income tax, would make it absolutely impossible for the average

worker to continue bond purchases and make it necessary to cash in bonds already bought: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we respectfully urge you to advance and support legislation commonly called modified Ruml plan deferring 1942 income tax to a period following the war.

The Truth Which Will Prevail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article of Walter Lippmann from the Washington Post:

THE TRUTH WHICH WILL PREVAIL

(By Walter Lippmann)

The Associated Press reports that the Republican leaders in Congress have decided not to support an attack on lend-lease. No other decision was possible. To oppose lend-lease today, to suggest that the United States should not do all in its power to help our allies fight our enemies, would be just about as sensible as to suggest that we economize by closing down the Panama Canal and dismantling Hawaii. The British Isles, Russia, and China are so obviously vital to us that Senator WHEELER, for example, who was no enthusiast for lend-lease 2 years ago, is now proposing to defeat the Germans by relying almost entirely upon lend-lease shipments to our allies.

That is going further than a prudent estimate of the facts can justify. But it shows what a political holler the Republicans would have made if they had taken the position that only Americans must use American weapons, and that Mr. and Mrs. Harry Hopkins must not be allowed to deprive Americans of the privilege of fighting a good big bloody single-handed war against the Germans and the Japanese.

Lend-lease will be continued for the same reason that it was adopted 2 years ago, once the compelling logic of supporting our allies had been laid before the people. What is more, the underlying principle of lend-lease will for the same compelling reasons be extended into the period which follows immediately upon the armistice and lasts until order has been restored.

This will be done, not because we are Lady Bountiful or Santa Claus to the human race, but because at bottom our vital interests demand it. Once the realities are examined, the case will be so obviously compelling, that public men who are now committing themselves to oppose it will wish they had not been in such a hurry.

The testimony which was brought forward 2 years ago against the adoption of lend-lease will show, if we read it now, that the opposition thought we had a free choice between "intervention" against Hitler and "staying out of the war." They would not and could not believe, though the matter was explained to them, that Japan and Germany were allies in aggression, and that if Britain fell, Germany would attack us in South America while Japan ran wild in the Pacific. A month before the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor, a majority of the Republicans in Congress during the debate on repealing the Neutrality Act, had not yet grasped the idea that the war for us would start in the Pacific, and that we had to support the British and the Russians if we did not wish to fight a two-ocean war with a one-ocean navy.

Some of these same gentlemen are now thinking that once we have defeated our enemies, the problem of American security will have been solved. They are just as much mistaken now as they were 2 years ago.

If they prevail, it is not necessary to be a prophet to see what will happen. Let us see where they would lead us. They are anti-British and do not wish us to form a working partnership with Britain to keep the peace and promote the reconstruction of the economic life of the world. They are anti-Russian and are spoiling for a quarrel with the Soviets. They are unfriendly to the Fighting French and look with a jaundiced eye upon the strong, proud spirit which General de Gaulle is bent on impressing into the broken and demoralized body of the French Nation. They do not like the government-in-exile, and think they may deprive us of some of our butter and eggs to feed their starving compatriots when the war is over.

Moreover, some of the former isolationists are getting ready to think that once the fighting stops, we can find civilian jobs for some 30,000,000 American soldiers and war workers by closing our frontiers—shutting down exports and imports to the barest minimum which can be paid for in cold cash—and doing nothing to assist Europe and Asia to return to normal.

Let us suppose that we followed this philosophy, imagining that we were hard-headed realists who were not going to be hornswoggled by a lot of damned foreigners. What would the damned foreigners do? They would look at our wealth and our power and then they would look at the unfriendly spirit in which we used our wealth and our power. They would look at their poverty and their ruins, their dead, and their maimed, and they would say: "Well, that is not what we hoped for. But the Americans have decided that it is now a matter of each for himself and the devil take the hindmost. And so, as the answer, as the defense, as the insurance against that kind of America we must go in for a Europe for the Europeans and an Asia for the Asiatics."

The result, in other words, of our rejecting the partnership of the United Nations will inexorably be an ever closer alliance of those nations, with us on the outside looking in. The current's already beginning to run in that direction, and every time, a public man makes a destructive speech, every time an American admiral or general, or diplomat, or Washington official uses brass knuckles in his negotiations with the United Nations, there is a push in that fatal direction.

Thus we shall have to cure ourselves of the illusion that the issue is whether we shall return to isolationism, whether we shall help ourselves or help others. We could return to isolation. We could become quite isolated—that is always possible. Japan has managed to become isolated in Asia. Germany has twice managed to become isolated in Europe. We could become isolated too, and indeed we shall if we listen to those who do not know better.

We could leave ourselves without a friend in the world. We could deprive ourselves of all our allies. We could turn our backs upon the British, the Russians, the French, the Dutch, the Scandinavians, the Poles, the Serbs, and the Greeks. But if we do, let us at least not be surprised if, after we have refused to work with them, they then unite and work against us, and that having chosen isolation we find ourselves isolated in a world where we are universally disliked and suspected.

That is why, when the true case for a constructive foreign policy has been presented to the people, they will support it, as they did lend-lease, as an American interest of such compelling importance to the welfare of the Nation that no demagogy can blind them to it.

Utilization of Small Colleges in the Educational Program of the Army and Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a statement made to the Committee on Military Affairs by Mr. Wheeler Sammons, publisher of Who's Who in America. This statement has to do with the utilization of small independent colleges in connection with the educational program of the Army and Navy:

I am not an educator and I am certainly not an expert on educational problems. I am in the publishing business, and one of the properties I publish—Who's Who in America—was founded many years ago to record worth-while accomplishment for reference use.

From decade to decade analyses of this record have been made by interested investigators and research experts. Some of these studies are comprehensive and have been published as books. We early became interested in this type of research ourselves, and have continued it ever since.

Both our analyses and those made by professional research authorities invariably agree on one conclusion. This conclusion is that the smaller privately-controlled liberal arts colleges are vital to our way of life.

Naturally we as a result became interested in doing what we could to preserve these colleges, which have been hard pressed by declines in gifts, the dwindling return obtainable on these gifts, and the growing competition of publicly supported educational institutions.

When the Selective Service Act was last amended these colleges appeared to us to be in extreme danger. They are not separately organized to press their case. Moreover, their faculties are not by nature attuned to that sort of task.

So we have attempted, totally without authority from them, to act in various ways that we felt might possibly help them. We did so entirely because we are convinced their preservation is of vital importance to the Nation.

As a step in endeavoring to present their case, we decided to write directly to you, the Members of Congress. Sophisticated advice warned us to expect little from this particular effort, and we knew of course of the flood of mail flowing in on every Member of the Congress every day.

But a surprising thing happened. Members of the Congress took an immediate interest. Expert advice was given. Promises of cooperation were prompt, unqualified, and earnest.

It was one of the most heartening and stimulating experiences I have ever had. It was democracy actually at work. Not one of these Members of the Congress who responded with sincere efforts to assist had any possible motivation than that of aiding a cause important to our way of life. Whatever may be the final result in this particular case, this response stands as a positive refutation of everything Hitler has said derisive of representative congresses.

So gradually this cause of the small liberal arts college attracted attention. You hear of it now rather frequently, and as a result of the interest taken in it by Members of the

Congress to whom we wrote it was suggested that I come to this hearing. That is why I am here—because a citizen can write, here in this country of ours, to the Congress about a problem he feels to be of national importance—as a matter of fact, of military importance—and receive intelligent and unselfish consideration, even to the extent of being asked to come before the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives in time of war.

While I realize I cannot contribute anything of importance by coming, I wanted to come, nevertheless, so as to complete the record, for I imagine that in no other country in the world could the way of my coming be duplicated today, and that way exists because our way of life has so far preserved liberal education.

So I feel that the way in which I happen to have come before you is in itself an exceedingly telling argument for the cause of liberal education. What, if anything, I can contribute in addition must necessarily be drawn from my practical experience and what investigation I have been able to make of certain educational problems because of my interest in the smaller colleges.

Common sense alone convinces me that in the emergency brainpower should be rationed and allocated against not only the requirements of the services, but of the industry and the civilian necessities essential to effective support of the services. That is surely also true of manpower.

At this late date we are finding that scarce materials must be rigidly allocated—the controlled materials plan now prescribed by War Production Board. In my opinion brainpower and manpower should be similarly controlled. In other words, we need a controlled manpower plan as well as a controlled materials plan.

If that is common sense, it is also common sense that a capable authority, over and above any of the interested groupings, must be responsible for the rationing and the allocation. If the War Manpower Committee does not discharge this responsibility, the Congress should provide for its assumption and discharge.

Perhaps indeed a set-up along controlled materials plan lines might be found desirable. But it is certainly obvious a business could not be successfully operated if one of the subsidiaries or branches could take brainpower and manpower, let alone scarce materials, from the others almost at will, or set up its requirements practically independently of the others. And that sort of set-up won't work in a government at war, either. As I say, we have at long last found it won't work in respect to materials, and it certainly won't work in respect to brainpower and manpower, either.

Not only does common sense so dictate, but wartime experience in both England and Germany does also. It is all very well to brush off tested experience by shouting we are going to do it bigger and better, but tested experience always seems to come into its own sooner or later.

It is also all very well to take the stand that German experience is beyond the pale simply because it is German. But nevertheless it seems sensible that if we can lick Germany quicker by turning some of her experience against her, it might not be a bad idea to do just that.

If you will ask the Library of Congress or the Office of War Information to supply you with a digest of the summary of German economic control methods which has been published for over 2 years now in the Economic Journal, an English quarterly, I am confident you will be surprised how long ago German experience demonstrated that priorities would prove ineffective as controls and a CMP be required; and that price ceilings under our procedure would fall short of their objective—just to select two examples as illustrations. And, of course, it would be obvious that experience indicated many months ago that our manpower procedures could hardly prove satisfactory.

It is true our allies and our enemies can prescribe effective patterns of control more expeditiously than we can. We have what we believe to be worthwhile compensations for this handicap, but we must reduce the handicap as much as possible in time of war—and that can be done by the Congress—in fact, will apparently probably only be done by the Congress.

Now what about the smaller privately controlled liberal arts colleges in relation to this picture? I imagine first we want to know exactly what we are talking about when we consider them.

I also imagine you will be surprised, just as I have been, at the wealth of usable facilities and trained brainpower these institutions represent. And I think you will be just as surprised at the relative unimportance in poin of numbers of their students—students, however, so very important because they are among those we depend on to acquire that all-important "something more" than professional or semi-professional or technical skill.

There are about 400 so-called liberal arts colleges privately controlled. That is, of course, aside from technical institutions, universities, teachers' colleges, and junior colleges. Call half of them small, and you have around 200. Call one-half of the 200 smaller liberal art colleges, and you have about 100.

I took exactly 100 of the smaller ones and had some of the pertinent facts about them put through an adding machine. These 100 have buildings, equipment and improvements listed at $65,649,002. They can house under roofs they own or directly supervise, 9,533 men, and in addition 9,948 women. They maintain 3,196 trained faculty members, each with the education know-how. They own 11,986 acres of land, valued at $20,628,642. They are certainly capable of handling over 40,000 students annually, as they did so year before last—41,415 to be exact.

That is, as I say, but 100 out of the 400 odd. There you have an indication of what these colleges have to offer the war effort. Can you imagine anything as valuable in the present emergency not being utilized by an enemy possessing it?

Now to the other side of the picture—their students. I for one had accumulated an idea that hundreds of thousands of young men were involved. Of course I knew that the students in these small schools were not an irresponsible group getting as little useless education about impracticalities as possible and as much partying and jitterbugging as their parents' cash would permit, although that is the picture some paint of them.

And I did not worry a great deal about their getting educational advantages others could not get, for I knew how many of them were working their ways through college. And I hoped for a world after the war with sufficient production to make it possible for the parents to pay for their children's higher educations, if their children proved they justified such educations.

And I knew no one but a member of a class of '88 would make the mistake of holding that liberal education should be garrotted on the false assumption that these students were playing with Latin and Greek and courses far removed from daily life simply because they are classified under "liberal arts" in the recorders' records. There have, I at least knew, been some changes since I was born.

As a matter of fact, the liberal arts colleges, as we all know, today teach (in addition of course to their other subjects, some of which, it is true, were taught in '88): business administration, chemistry, French, German, Spanish, Dutch, mathematics, journalism, government, public speaking, English, political science, economics, physical training, physics, biology, psychology, dietetics, geology, history, engineering drawing, astronomy, secretarial, mechanical drawing, education, library science, and home economics.

I did, however, have the impression that there were hundreds of thousands of these male liberal arts students. But when I had the figures shaken down I was convinced the actual figure is around 110,000, and that 45 percent of these are preparing for their chosen profession, that is, to be educators. So that leaves about 74,000 young men as the so-called liberal arts students in the privately controlled liberal arts colleges and not definitely preparing for education as a life-time profession. And that is the figure I offer in respect to this group, with the exceptions I have already mentioned, and not merely in respect to the typical 100 smaller institutions and statistics regarding which I have summarized.

Obviously, I have, in other words, narrowed the facts down to the specific institutions I am considering—the so-called independent liberal arts colleges, privately controlled, and their male, full-time students.

Naturally, no one suggests special treatment for these particular students. I merely want to point out that liberal arts students, even when those so classified by universities are included in the total, do not constitute an immense group wasting their time and somebody's money.

As obviously, what is suggested in respect to these students, or others becoming of college age, must be measured by war-effort usefulness, and by that alone. A practical suggestion of that type would be, I think, that a brain-power control establish courses of study it feels to be necessary in wartime, and to be followed to an extent it fixes, and to then direct that its local selective boards, either made up of, or advised by, experienced educators, pick those to be directed, if approved by the local board for selection of manpower, to take them and to continue taking them so long as their marks are satisfactory.

For example, the many thousands now in the science clubs at preparatory-school levels represent material justifying such inspection, not at all for the students' good primarily, but for the Nation's good. Certainly if all boys reaching 18 and all students now in colleges with distinct possibilities along definite skills or professions, plus 4 years or less preliminary study to that end, excepting only those in certain engineering, medical, or semi-medical courses, are disposed of entirely according to their physical conditons, heights, and weights in respect to armed combat, the country, and the services eventually, will pay an appalling price for a relatively small number of additional combatants. And it will be a price no other fighting nation has shouldered upon itself.

Naturally, steps should be taken to sort out in the secondary schools those obviously physically unfit for combat service. Those who maintain satisfactory grades in the war-useful courses, and the specified associated courses, should be directed to such preparation for greater service, and only those who cannot maintain satisfactory school records inducted for limited service.

I am not referring to the military's plan to make soldiers of present students first—with limited exceptions—and then add junior skills to the training of some of them by sending them back to certain short courses, for this procedure, while admittedly unique, certainly is far removed from anything but junior-skill education of a type being very extensively encouraged by another branch of the Government already. Indoctrination courses have perhaps a purpose in connection with such a problem, but a basic course in military combat training I take it is something else again. However, those to be treated in this novel manner were already on the Army's rolls, albeit with at last the moral understanding they could complete certain

studies before being called into active service, as I understand it.

Therefore this question was already the Army's, and not the War Manpower Commission's, and is hardly directly connected with the over-all issue.

The designated courses of study can be financed by the Government—and even the upkeep of the students directed to take them—without running into any inordinate sum. As a matter of fact, any imaginable cost on this score would be but a drop in the bucket compared with the amounts spent, being spent, and to be spent, on technical or vocational education. Along with the designated purely wartime courses, there should be prescribed courses in the social sciences and the humanities to an extent directed by the controlling governmental authority.

It is true this is somewhat like the English plan but that fact should not damn it. The British paid a terrific price for unplanned brainpower mobilization during the last war, and are attempting to avoid making the same mistake twice.

Just as the allocation of brainpower and manpower must be made solely with the objective of increasing war-effort effectiveness, so must also the utilization of the smaller liberal arts colleges. If their trained faculties and their important physical assets cannot be used, then we do not need housing, laboratories, instruction rooms, or training grounds, and these colleges must be blacked out—blacked out because we do not need more chemists, more physicists, more nurses, more doctors, more weather observers, more linguists, more navigators, more physical instructors, more calculators, more map readers, more supply experts—or more of any of the long list of skills we are given to understand are short-handed.

But if we do need in the emergency more young people trained in any of these skills, and can profitably use these institutions ready-made to train them in, what do we gain by going out of our way to put these colleges to work helping win the war?

We gain perhaps more than we know how to evaluate today, something the value of which we shall only be able to measure adequately in the perilous days of the peace to come. For we shall have preserved the home of liberal education, education for broader and better social undertsanding; education for developing social competence; education for emphasis of breadth, unity, understanding; for education that stimulates a grasp of developing civilization and of our place in it. And above even all these, education that trains for character, and for leadership under our way of life.

What explains the domination of the German people by the Nazis and their tenants? Most certainly the blacking out of liberal education in Germany, following a tremendous concentration on pure intellectual training, or technical, education. We too are concentrating on "use" education—if we also weaken liberal education at the same time, what may be our own future?

A friend of mine, now the president of a leading college but with outstanding business experience, has wisely observed: "It would be a tragic paradox if as a result of the war we were to allow our system of higher education to be transformed into the type of education which has made it so easy for a crowd of governmental gangsters like Hitler's outfit to commandeer a whole population."

You may say the 100 or so universities can supply all the liberal education we need. They could; but they, with certain exceptions that prove the rule, are dedicated, first, to research, and, secondarily, to mass production for professions, and only finally to their undergraduate liberal colleges. The small, independent liberal arts college is peculiarly adapted to training for more than skills, to training that makes men as well as minds, and its record so proves.

For example, of our Presidents all but four of those who went to college are alumni of small institutions, for several of the large universities of today were, of course, small in the past. Most of these colleges are privately owned institutions, exactly of the type endangered now as never before, and certainly far more so than under the policies established during the last war. Twenty-one of our past Vice Presidents were similarly educated.

I notice a 1930 analysis of Who's Who reports that of 333 members of the then sitting Congress, 198 were alumni of small privately controlled liberal arts colleges. At the same date, 16 of 32 of the governors in office were similarly educated, and 5 among 8 of the 9 judges of the Supreme Court.

Finally, let a great American statesman speak for these small liberal arts colleges—he was also a member of a graduating class of the last century, incidentally, but one educated in a small college:

"From such sources as these come the influence and the characters that are to make our Government still more useful and prosperous, and glorious, in the forefront of civilization—the preserver of liberty, and justice, and peace."

But today, another observer, recording the pressure for youth "with manual and technical skills necessary for the manufacture of guns, tanks, and aircraft" concludes: "It seems that this is exactly the challenge that might be expected by a group of educators in a totalitarian state."

Trade-Union Organization and the National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by John P. Frey, president, metal trades department, American Federation of Labor, before the Town Hall, Los Angeles, Calif., January 20, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I can recall when the labor injunction threatened the continued existence of our trade-union movement, when our right even to attempt to organize was restricted by State and by Federal injunctions, when we were denied the right to say that a labor dispute existed. I attacked that infamous situation. I attacked the labor injunction feature of our equity courts with what vigor and understanding I possessed. As I began to see the end of the labor injunction a new problem arose and that was the so-called yellow dog contract. We were haled into court if we endeavored to organize men who had signed one of those infamous papers on the ground that we were prevailing upon them to breach their contract with the employer. I had the privilege along with other trade-unionists to put up a fight against this vicious system, and eventually it was outlawed.

Then in 1933 we were given what we hailed, or the majority hailed, as labor's Magna Carta. The Wagner Act was passed. We thought we had passed through our trials and tribulations and that we were going to enter into the green fields of trade-union opportunity. I was one of those who had doubts about the Wagner Act. Immediately I had no friends. Now, the truth is coming out. On this occasion I want to reveal much of the truth. There is not time to tell the whole story in any one meeting, two meetings, or even in three meetings. I had doubts about the Wagner Act because of the way it was drafted. Previously when we found ourselves interested in securing legislation to protect our interest, we had an active hand in the drafting of the legislation. We sat in with the other trade-unionists. We called in attorneys to be certain that it was legally correct and sufficient. We went to members of the legislative committees and consulted with them and finally when the legislation had been drafted, we would go before the committees of the legislative body and present our reasons why it should be enacted as labor's measure.

Now, Congress did not draft the Wagner Act. No member of the American Federation of Labor had any hand in the drafting of the Wagner Act. The Wagner Act was drafted by a group of men who were referred to at the time as the starry-eyed dreamers of Washington. The American Federation of Labor was not given an opportunity to read the act until the day before it was introduced in Congress by Senator WAGNER. That in itself was enough to make some of us old-timers have doubts and when, as one of those, I rose to ask some questions pertaining to the act, I was told I was not a lawyer, I didn't understand the legal meaning of words, and for that reason the lawyer proponent of the bill would not discuss with me the questions I had raised. Notwithstanding my experience, I had high hopes for the Wagner Act. It seemed to be a splendid effort and still seems that way to me, but unfortunately it has been perverted by the National Labor Relations Board from the beginning.

The Wagner Act was intended to guarantee to wage earners the right to trade-union organization and it was intended to foster collective bargaining and that was all it was intended to do.

We didn't understand the act to give to anybody in the United States, regardless of the position he held in the Government, the right to determine a form of labor organization which would take the place of our American Federation of Labor which we organized ourselves. There were some things which developed not long after the Wagner Act was enacted, which have had a bearing ever since. No sooner had the Congress of Industrial Organizations been organized than the Communist Party officially endorsed the Congress of Industrial Organizations. They completely endorsed its president, John L. Lewis. So the Congress of Industrial Organizations began its activities with the full endorsement of the Communist Party in this country.

The next thing that attracted our notice was the fact that the majority of the legal staff of the National Labor Relations Board in Washington, and many of its original representatives and many of the attorneys who were attached to the several regions of the Board, were either active members of the Communist Party or were fellow travelers and were to be found continuously in the company of those who were known to be members of the Communist Party or Communist sympathizers. Now, the result of that was a series of decisions by the Board deliberately intended to cut the ground from underneath the feet of the American Federation of Labor trade-union movement and to build up another organization in its place—the Congress

of Industrial Organizations. Not one decision but a multitude of decisions were handed down to cut the ground from underneath our feet where the same decisions were applied in building up the Congress of Industrial Organizations. That led to protests on our part. That led to a statement by the president of the American Federation of Labor at the Denver convention in 1937 pointing out that what the National Labor Relations Board was doing was very prejudicial to the American Federation of Labor and that we could no longer remain silent. As a result of the action taken by the convention, Congress investigated the National Labor Relations Board.

You all recall the investigation which uncovered one of the foulest pages in the history of bureaucracy in the United States. As a result of what was uncovered by that investigation, it was made impossible for any member of the Board, including Chairman Madden, to have his renomination confirmed by the United States Senate. We know that it was the intent to renominate them and we know that the Senate was opposed to them. We know that in the case of these men when they came up for reappointment that the majority of the Senate was so strenuously opposed to confirming them if they were renominated that they failed to get that renomination.

But in spite of all that was brought out by the Congress of the United States, powerful interests in Washington have continued to cause the Wagner Act to be perverted. We saw what was in the minds of some men in administrative circles there because we refused to abandon one of the basic policies of our federation, which was our nonpartisan political policy. We had long determined that we would never permit our American trade-union movement to become a tail for any individual in politics or of any political party. It was our movement. We were determined to run it according to our will and not subservient to the will of some people in high places. These people wanted a trade-union movement or a labor movement built up in this country which would be partisan politically. I told the international officers then what the facts were and now the time has come to take the entire trade-union movement into our confidence. I have not liked this situation.

When we got in the war, President Roosevelt called President Murray and President Green to the White House and a so-called unity committee was created. President William Green and President Philip Murray gave the President their pledge that during the war there should be an armistice between the two organizations until the war came to an end. Well, so far as Mr. Green is concerned, he made that statement from the bottom of his heart and he carried it into effect.

When the meaning of the Labor Board's present attitude began to come to the surface in Washington, the administration took an interest in the matter. The Navy Department, the War Department, the Maritime Commission, the War Production Board, and the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee were aghast, as we were, as to the effect of the fight between ourselves and the Congress of Industrial Organizations in the shipbuilding industry at this time. The National Labor Relations Board was urged, because of the war, to take no action which would increase the enmity between the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor which might possibly set industrial disputes afire from one end of the country to the other. These war-production agencies wished labor to put its effort into contributing its best to the war effort. Justice Byrnes called upon Phil Murray and William Green to appoint a joint committee to meet and discuss what could be done to prevent warfare. He told the conferees that there could be no unity program between the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor, unless both declared an armistice and unless both declared there would be an end to raiding. Our position was settled right there at the time for we had previously requested an armistice for the period of the war, but the Congress of Industrial Organizations didn't consent, they had to consult and a few days later when the two committees again met with Mr. Justice Byrnes, the Congress of Industrial Organizations said they couldn't agree to an armistice and couldn't agree to end raiding.

We are being attacked. Our group—the metal-trades department—was the first one attacked by the Congress of Industrial Organizations when they began organizing in January 1936. While it is true they didn't organize many organizations, it is equally true that they did what they could to raid our union shops. I look upon this trade-union movement as ours. Nobody gave it to us; we established it through sacrifice and painful effort and brought it to where it is today. Now a Federal agency is endeavoring to attack it through the use of most improper means, and I will resist that even though we are at war.

This administration owes an obligation to us which they have not yet fully discharged. The President of the United States was Assistant Secretary of the Navy during the first World War and was familiar with the trouble we had in the shipbuilding industry. During that period we experienced blunder after blunder until a few months before the Armistice was signed. In this war he wanted to stabilize not only in the shipbuilding industry but in the war production industries, and so the shipbuilding stabilization committee was brought into existence. To give a better application to the President's desire we negotiated the first general zone stabilization agreement which was made. This is what we call the master shipbuilding agreement of the Pacific coast. Had we failed to negotiate that agreement, there would have been no joint agreement in the other three zones, which are the Great Lakes, the Atlantic seaboard, and the Gulf of Mexico. Immediately after Pearl Harbor the President called upon industry to make use of every tool, every equipment, every manufacturing building 24 hours a day every day in the year.

There was no one to give proper application to this until the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor said, we will do it for you, Mr. President. We came to the Pacific coast in January of 1942 and in San Francisco, with all of the shipbuilders on the coast, with the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission present, with the delegates of our Metal Trades Councils, we negotiated the first continuous production agreement that had to do with the war effort. So in this most important matter, it was the metal workers of the Pacific coast, assisted by their associates in the shipyards, teamsters, painters, and carpenters, which gave validity and practical application to an honest method of continuous production.

Now, after all we have done we are being attacked by an agency of the Government, the National Labor Relations Board, and the administration so far has taken no steps to save us from this unfair and outrageous attack.

I think I know our trade-union movement. I think I know it well enough to know our members will go so far and they will not go any further. So far as it lies within my power, I am going to stand upon that. We are not going to surrender our union movement which we have organized ourselves and which is ours.

I know somewhat of the history of our trade-union movement. It didn't begin in the United States, it is much older than that. It goes back 700 years to the time when Edward the Second of England handed down his statute of laborers which held that it was an act of conspiracy for two or more workmen to discuss together over either wages or terms of employment. That was the beginning.

It is difficult to understand how a Federal agency would do what the National Labor Relations Board is trying to do at the present time, laying down a dictum that no union-shop agreement is valid unless the Board has previously given their approval to it. Ninety-five percent of our union agreements are entered into today as they have always been in the past and I doubt whether more than a small fraction of 1 percent of them have been entered into because the Board has given their approval. Now, the Board lays down the dictum that every union contract is not valid unless the Board has certified or approved it in advance. When we think of my statement of the people who built up the Congress of Industrial Organizations, when we recall what I said about the Communist Party having an official interest in the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and when you remember what I said about the large number of Communists who went into the National Labor Relations Board as employees in the beginning of that organization, you can understand a little better what I meant when I said there is now being an effort made to officially change the character and structure of our trade-union movement.

One important thing that should be brought out so that you can better understand what is involved, is that the United States Supreme Court in their decisions has held that the Board has an indeterminate authority. Now, of course, we don't have any such thing in our State courts. These courts are governed by the law, and if they hand down a decision contrary to the law, their decision is reversed by the higher court, but the Supreme Court is giving the Board this indeterminate power. I say to you that this is a complete disregard of self-government, that it is a complete destruction of the representative form of government, it is a setting aside of judicial, executive, and the legislative branch of our Government. It is an effort to destroy every trade-union agreement that we have entered into and consequently it defies all precedent, everything that has kept us going in the past.

Now what is involved here is of importance to all employers; indeed, it is of importance to every element of our life.

Not since the beginning of the American Federation of Labor—more than 60 years ago—has the right of an employer and a bona fide labor organization to get together and work out their problems been seriously challenged. There were employers who bitterly resisted labor organization, who bitterly resisted the union shop. But there were other employers who preferred the latter arrangement. Certainly no Government agency challenged their right to reach an agreement if they could.

The National Labor Relations Board now denies this right. It is saying, in effect, that agreements must be reached under its auspices. It is saying, in effect, that the so-called Magna Carta of labor, the Wagner Act, is not what it was supposed to be. It is saying that this act did not strengthen labor's hands in pursuing collective-bargaining agreements; that, instead, it weakened this hand. It is saying, in effect, that employers are to be damned if they do negotiate with labor organizations, and they are to be damned if they don't. The Board is saying that an employer such as Mr. Kaiser is not to be permitted to stabilize his labor relations at the outset in order that he can determine his labor costs. He must negotiate with labor only at the Board's will and in such a way as the Board says.

In view of the extraordinary contribution which we have made to the war effort, we

are entitled to the support and the protection of every Federal agency; but now the continued existence of our trade-union organization and our agreements is being threatened by the National Labor Relations Board. We have made sacrifices in our wage rates to conform with the President's request. We have abolished all calendar days so that continuous production can be carried on. We have maintained most cordial and cooperative relations with our employers; but, even though the Nation is at war, we cannot, and will not, sit idly by and witness the tearing apart of the organizations we have built up. Labor also has boys at the front—and they do not want the structure of livelihood which their fathers built torn down while they are away.

Proxy Rules of Securities and Exchange Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and accompanying report of the Board of Directors of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York:

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK, INC.,
New York, January 25, 1943.

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: Now that the Securities and Exchange Commission has adopted many of the burdensome proxy rules it formulated last summer in spite of the opposition of responsible organizations and businessmen throughout the country, and the full implications of this needless additional assumption of power to control business is being felt by organizations attempting to comply therewith, you may like to read the enclosed report dated September 14, 1942, which clearly states our reasons for opposing the adoption of these proxy rules.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS JEFFERSON MILEY,
Secretary.

The staff of the Securities and Exchange Commission has presented to the Commission a proposed revision of its proxy rules. Copies of these changes have been circulated among corporations having securities listed on national securities exchanges and other interested parties, with the request that comments thereon be sent to the Commission on or before September 15, 1942.

Inasmuch as so much more is involved in these proposed changes than the mere regulation of proxies and as these proposed new rules are affected with so much public interest, your Association believes the Securities and Exchange Commission should hold a public hearing, at which all sides could be publicly presented before these proposed new rules are adopted.

The Commission has officially taken no position on these proposed changes. However, in a recent address before the National Association of Securities Commissioners, the Chairman of the Commission vigorously attacked corporate management in announcing that the Commission had undertaken a sweeping revision of its proxy rules and deplored the fact that so limited a move was available for effectively exerting control over corporate management. It seems likely, therefore, that the Commission will adopt the proposals unless deterred from so doing by public criticism of the move.

The Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., is not opposed to rules and regulations which will actually operate so as to carry out the sound objectives of protecting investors from fraud, for which the Securities and Exchange Commission was created. In an effort to prevent isolated abuses, however, all corporate activity should not be unduly hampered, especially by arbitrary requirements that exceed the authority granted the Commission by Congress. The practical effect of these proposed amendments would be to give the personnel of the Securities and Exchange Commission power to influence many of the policies and operations of the managements of listed companies. This power would definitely obstruct the application of sound management ability to American business and to that degree would injure rather than aid investors.

PROPOSED CHANGES

The principal changes which have been proposed are that every proxy statement shall include—

(a) The equivalent of a lengthy annual report to shareholders.

(b) A statement of the salaries of all officers and directors receiving over $25,000 per annum and detailed information as to the prior occupations, business experience, and transactions with the company of officers, directors, and nominees.

(c) Any statement submitted by any stockholder of any proposal advanced for any purpose.

Other changes are also proposed which will add to the difficulty of complying with these already complicated rules, the most important of which would require that stockholders specify the action they desire to be taken on their proxies.

BASIC ASSUMPTION INCORRECT

The basic assumption of the proponents of these changes appears to be that corporation executives act only in their own interests and without regard for their stockholders. "Management feathering its nest at the expense of its stockholders, as well as that of the Government," Securities and Exchange Commission Chairman Purcell stated, "we see more and more today."

It is generally recognized that most stockholders do not bother to read through the lengthy material which the Securities and Exchange Commission even now requires a company to send to them and often cannot and do not understand it. Consequently, the net result of the increased burden which the amendments would place on proxy solicitations is a greater diversion of executives' time away from vital war efforts and a greater waste of corporate funds with little practical benefit to anyone. What is really needed, as a practical matter, is simplification of proxy statements so that stockholders will read and can understand them.

The Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., therefore, opposes these proposed amendments as not in the public interest, for the following principal reasons:

1. Under the guise of regulating proxies, the proposed amendments would indirectly give the Securities and Exchange Commission the power, not conferred upon it by Congress, to regulate annual reports to stockholders.

Congress did not confer upon the Securities and Exchange Commission authority to regulate annual reports to shareholders of ordinary business corporations. The Commission has asked Congress for an amendment to the law which would confer such authority upon it and which is now under consideration by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The prospect of congressional action on this subject may be remote. Consequently, that power is now being sought indirectly through the Securities and Exchange Commission's power to regulate proxy solicitations.

This cannot be emphasized too strongly. This is an attempt to usurp a power not conferred by law, a specious device to short-circuit Congress so as to enable the Securities and Exchange Commission to regulate annual reports to shareholders under the pretense of regulating proxies.

2. Under the guise of regulating proxies, the amendments would give the Securities and Exchange Commission power to interfere with the internal management of corporations and constitute an attempt to regulate, through the device of publicity, executives' salaries and their transactions with their corporations. This is a subtle device to usurp a power of control over business practices beyond the proper scope of the Commission authority.

It is significant that the information which would be required concerning officers and directors exceeds that required by the Commission in applications for registration under the Exchange Act, and even that required in an offering prospectus under the Securities Act for the sale of securities.

The proposed requirement that all salaries over $25,000 be set forth is probably an effort to discourage the payment of salaries in excess of that amount. Ganson Purcell, Securities and Exchange Commission Chairman, practically said as much in his speech on September 3, 1942, before the National Association of Securities Commissioners in which he attacked corporate officials generally for voting themselves excessive compensation.

Whatever the merits of this social theory may be, there is nothing in the law which authorizes the Securities and Exchange Commission to use its authority to promote such a theory or to attempt to regulate and control corporate salaries.

There appears to be no rational basis for requiring disclosure only of salaries of over $25,000. Salaries over that amount may not be excessive for one company or one executive, while salaries well under that amount may be excessive for another company or another executive. It may be far better for a company to pay a few top-notch men high salaries than to pay a large number of mediocre men low salaries, aggregating far more, to do the same work. The proposal would thus expose high-grade executives to unfavorable publicity while sheltering mediocre and less able executives from publicity.

3. The amendments would serve to promote the harassment of corporate managements by professional troublemakers and blackmailers without affording any substantial protection or rights to minority stockholders which they do not now have.

The requirement that any proposal of any stockholder be set out in the proxy material would be a boon to the professional heckler. Many an unscrupulous shareholder might attempt to exact substantial sums from his corporation for withdrawing statements of proposals intended for no other purpose than to embarrass the management and to extort such a payment.

The change would be of little benefit in most cases because stockholders usually have confidence in the management of corporations in which they own stock and hence would not vote for proposals opposed by the management. When stockholders lose confidence in the management they usually sell their stock. The pretense that these changes would "enable stockholders themselves to

control the actions of management" is without foundation in fact or in law and is typical of the disingenuous and misleading arguments advanced in support of the proposals.

The requirement that stockholders' proposals be set out in the proxy material should, if adopted, specifically exonerate the company and its management from liability under rule X–14A–5 for false and misleading statements made by the stockholders. At present the proposals contain no such exemption from liability therefor.

4. The amendments would accelerate the trend toward not soliciting proxies, thus serving to disfranchise stockholders and to perpetuate existing managements.

As the proxy regulations apply only to the solicitation of proxies, the nuisance of complying with them may be avoided by the simple expedient of refraining from any solicitation of proxies. So many companies have done this even under the less onerous rules now in force that the Commission has asked Congress to amend the law so as to compel companies to solicit proxies.

5. The amendments would increase the already excessive burdens on listed companies, while unlisted companies bear no such burdens, and are, therefore, grossly discriminatory.

One of the reasons so few companies are listing stocks today is that they do not wish to subject themselves to this type of Securities and Exchange Commission regulation. For the same reason, a substantial number of companies have delisted their stocks. This, of course, has seriously weakened the exchange markets. The adoption of the proposed amendments, which would aggravate the discrimination between listed and unlisted companies, will accelerate this trend which is destructive of the organized markets of the country, the safest and soundest markets for the ordinary investor.

6. The amendments are ill-conceived in that they further complicate regulations which should be materially simplified.

7. The requirement that the shareholders must specify in their proxies the action they desire to have taken is impractical and will probably lead to there being insufficient valid proxies at many meetings.

8. The proposals, if adopted, would distract corporate officials from giving their full time and attention to the production of war materials by requiring them to consume time and energy in fruitless efforts to comply with intricate bureaucratic regulations and administrative red tape.

Pay as We Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to insert a letter which I have just received from Mr. Leo Keller, general manager of the Howard Manufacturing Co., of Council Bluffs, Iowa, in the Seventh Iowa District which I have the honor to represent.

In a few words Mr. Keller sets out in plain understandable language the problem his and many like concerns in America will face unless our present method of collecting income taxes is changed to meet the changing times.

I am especially anxious that every member of the House Ways and Means Committee read Mr. Keller's letter as well as all my colleagues in the Congress:

HOWARD MANUFACTURING CO.,
Council Bluffs, Iowa, January 26, 1943.
Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are deeply concerned about the tax situation and desire to urge that if the Ruml plan is adopted in its proposed form or some modified form that it be made to apply to the employer as well as to the salaried employee. The employer should be permitted to pay monthly or quarterly out of his earnings on a pay-as-you-go basis.

The case of the Howard Manufacturing Co. illustrates the need for some such program of taxation, and we believe it is typical of many such concerns.

The Howard Manufacturing Co. is a partnership and is engaged wholly in war production. We manufacture and assemble radio crystal holders for use in tanks, airplanes, and other mechanized equipment of the armed forces. We are producing approximately 25,000 finished crystal holders per day under subcontracts. We cannot begin to meet the demand of the armed forces and are constantly urged to increase our production. The increasing of our production entails large expenditures for expensive machinery and expansion of our plant. We now have invested in the plant and equipment approximately $75,000.

If the war should end suddenly and we should be required to pay our income taxes on the preceding year, it will take all of our profits to pay the income taxes and we will have nothing left except our plant and equipment set-up for war production. It will be practically valueless for any other purpose, and our original capital, together with our earnings, will be tied up in a worthless plant. Under the present set-up, we see nothing but bankruptcy ahead when the war ends.

We are personally devoting 16 hours a day to the business, under a terrific strain, in an endeavor to increase the production to comply with the demands of the armed forces.

If a program can be worked out along the lines of the Ruml plan, it would permit us to pay income taxes out of our current earnings. The Government will be the gainer in the long run. We would like to enlarge our plant with the addition of much required equipment so as to meet the demands of the armed forces but it is simply impossible to expand our production and invest additional capital when we know that the plant and its equipment will be of practically no value when the war ends. If the Government has to levy upon and take over the plant for income taxes due when the final settlement is made, there will be a loss to the Government as well as a loss of our entire capital investment.

This is such a serious matter to this concern and to similar establishments throughout the country that we urge upon the Ways and Means Committee the adoption of the Ruml plan in such form that it will apply to the employer and the manufacturer of war products and we feel that it should be enacted speedily so that we can properly determine our future course.

Very respectfully yours,
T. W. KELLER,
General Manager.

Navy Yard in Narragansett Bay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article written by Mr. S. G. Webb, of Newport, R. I., and published in the Newport County Sentinel.

This article explains in detail a matter which is most important to the States which comprise the northeastern section of the United States.

A complete navy yard in Narragansett Bay will protect about 70 percent of the total population of the United States and approximately 30 percent of the Nation's industry.

I invite the attention of the Members of the House to this clear statement by Mr. Webb, and I ask them to give to it their careful consideration:

A NAVY YARD IN NARRAGANSETT BAY AREA IS A NATIONAL NECESSITY

(By S. George Webb)

Recognition of the outstanding strategic importance of the Narragansett Bay region to Rhode Island, to New England, to the Northeast, and to the United States as a whole, is slowly gaining widespread acceptance.

In each recurring war this immense strategic value is at once recognized by our Government and expensive facilities are hurriedly installed to enable our Army and Navy—particularly the latter—to function most efficiently in carrying out their increased war duties.

In the peaceful periods between wars many of the wartime facilities, so hurriedly and expensively created, have been dismantled.

Thus an enormous waste of money and resources has taken place after each previous war. This waste should and could be prevented.

The prevention is simple and obvious: It is to create a permanent modern navy yard within Narragansett Bay, equipped with drydocks and all facilities, so that it will be capable of servicing, repairing, and building naval ships of all categories.

When this modern navy yard has been created all the hurriedly constructed wartime establishments and facilities will become of adjunctive, permanent value. The whole region then will become a permanent naval operating base of the highest usefulness to the Nation in both war and peace times, instead of being a vicarious, temporary base for wartime use only.

NATIONAL ASSET

In this way all the expenditures made and being made in and near the Narragansett Bay region could be transplanted into permanent assets of great and increasing value to our country.

In this statement a distinction is drawn, for full understanding, between the Narragansett Bay area and the Narragansett Bay region.

The area includes all Narragansett Bay from its entrance to Providence, Mount Hope Bay, and Sakonnet River with the islands therein, the shores thereof and the cities and towns located thereon.

The region goes farther afield. It includes all of the Narragansett Bay area and in addition thereto Cape Cod Canal, Cape Cod, Cape Cod Bay, Buzzards Bay, Vineyard Sound, Nantucket Sound, Marthas Vineyard and Nantucket Islands, Block Island Sound and Block Island. On the land it includes New London with the submarine base and the United States Coast Guard Academy and Providence, Newport, Pawtucket, Woonsocket, Fall River, New Bedford, Taunton, and Plymouth.

The inner line of defense of Narragansett Bay area already exists in the line between Point Judith and Sakonnet Point.

The outer line of defense would comprise a fortified Gay Head, a fortified Block Island, and a fortified Montauk Point. This line would be the southern boundary of the region. It should be heavily fortified at the three-named points so as to protect the ship lane to and from New York which lies just to its south, and to protect Block Island Sound, Buzzards Bay and the southern approach to the Cape Cod Canal and to protect Long Island Sound.

Thus are included in the region water areas of highly strategic importance and a heavily industrialized area in Connecticut, Rhode Island and Massachusetts as well as the Narranganset Bay Area itself.

Within the Narragansett Bay Area have been created from time to time a naval torpedo station, a naval war college, a naval training station, a naval hospital, two naval ammunition storage depots, a naval supply depot, a naval fuel station, a PT boat basin, and other facilities which can be permanently useful.

Within the region many recently created facilities, including the North Eastern Naval Air Base at Quonset Point, the fortifications at Point Judith and Sakonnet Point, and numerous interior and surrounding harbor forts and antiaircraft gun installations are products of anticipated defense and offense needs of the region in the global war which we actively entered immediately after December 7, 1941.

NAVY YARD LACKING

All of these facilities, in the aggregate, make an important nucleus of a permanent naval operating base. A navy yard within Narragansett Bay, necessary to make this base complete and permanent, is lacking.

When such a navy yard is located within Narragansett Bay, all of the present facilities would be of permanent value and usefulness. Without such a navy yard, many of these facilities will probably be abandoned when the war ends, with the attendant huge financial loss to Rhode Island and to the country. This happened after the First World War.

From the highest interest of the United States a modern, fully equipped navy yard should be created within Narragansett Bay without further delay.

The United States is now building a two-ocean navy, and, on top of this, additional war vessels totaling 1,900,000 tons have been authorized. This huge building program, now well advanced, will give this country the greatest Navy of all time. But this is not all, for on top of this program literally thousands of small craft, including PT boats, are being built at inland as well as at coastal yards for various uses, including the fighting of submarines.

Assuming that only one-quarter of all these ships—large and small—are employed in the Atlantic; the Narragansett Bay area will undoubtedly be called upon to serve the manifold needs of many of them, and thus, if fully equipped to perform these services will be a busy place for years to come. But the area cannot be fully effective in such service without a navy yard.

But apart from this crying need the region occupies the premier strategic position of the north Atlantic coast line. It is in geographical position to protect New York, the principal shipping point and financial center for all that part of our country lying east of the Mississippi River, north of Mason-Dixon Line and south of Canada. This is the principal industrial, commercial, financial, and population center of our whole country. The full efficiency of the Narragansett Bay region thereby becomes of vast importance to the United States as a whole for if New York was injured these 19 States would also be seriously injured, if not actually crippled, and a national disaster would result.

The Narragansett Bay region must therefore be made outstanding in strength and efficiency as the protector of the largest part of this country's population, industry, and wealth.

The outer line of defense from Gay Head on Marthas Vineyard Island, westward to Montauk Point passing through Block Island when fortified as it should be, would become an important part of this strength. Block Island should be made into an American counterpart of Heligoland without any further delay.

The region has long been recognized by United States naval boards and eminent naval strategists as one of the two necessary naval operating bases on the North Atlantic; the other being Norfolk. But, unlike Norfolk, Narragansett Bay lacks an essentially necessary navy yard.

This brings up the question "Where in Narragansett Bay should the navy yard be located?"

IDEAL NAVY YARD LOCATION

Fortunately we have a made-to-order ideal location ready for such use.

In the approximate center of Narragansett Bay area lies Prudence Island with its two satelites, Patience and Dyer Islands. It is here at the southern end of Prudence Island where the proposed navy yard could and should be placed. This navy yard should be complete with two or more dry docks, shipbuilding ways, foundry, machine shops, cranes, warehouses, railroad tracks, and all the appurtenances of a modern navy yard.

It would be close to the naval fuel depot at Melville, R. I., and close to the protection of the Northeastern Naval Air Base at Quonset Point, R. I. As Prudence Island is 6½ miles long from south to north by one-half to 2 miles in width and is almost uninhabited there would be ample room remaining for other naval and military establishments, for housing, and for a shipbuilding plant for building commercial cargo carriers—so badly needed—and smaller crafts, in addition to the shipbuilding facilities of the proposed navy yard itself. The United States Government, which already owns a part of Prudence Island, should own all of Prudence, Patience, and Dyer Islands.

It is herein proposed that Prudence and Patience Islands be connected by a causeway across the intervening narrow and shallow cove and that a railroad vehicular bridge be built to connect the northwest point of Patience Island with Warwick Neck. At a point near the southern end of Prudence Island, near to the contemplated navy yard, it is proposed that a railroad vehicular bridge be built to connect Prudence Island with Dyer Island and that another such bridge be built to connect Dyer Island to the land of the United States naval fuel depot at Melville, R. I.

When the causeway and bridge connections have been made a vehicular road should be built over the entire length of this route from Warwick Neck to the proposed navy yard and to Melville and be connected at Warwick Neck and Melville with the highway systems of Rhode Island and thence with the highway systems of Connecticut and Massachusetts and territory beyond.

When the causeway and bridge connections have been made railroad tracks should be laid over the entire route from an existing New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad connection on Warwick Neck, over the north bridge and causeway, over the entire length of Prudence Island with tracks therefrom into the proposed navy yard, and over the Dyer Island bridges to the United States Government land at Melville. At this point these tracks could be joined to the Old Colony Railroad now operated by the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.

But these traffic facilities would not be all. In addition it is proposed that floating bridges which are large ferry boats capable of taking 80 or more loaded railroad cars, such as are used for naval and civilian purposes in Puget Sound, could connect from ferry slips on Prudence Island to similar ferry slips which could be built at Providence, Fall River, Quonset Point, the torpedo station, the training station, naval hospital, Fort Adams, and any other suitable point to be reached to and from the proposed navy yard.

Thus by a combination of railroad, vehicular road, and floating bridges traffic connections could be established between the proposed navy yard on Prudence Island and all naval, military, and civilian establishments within Narragansett Bay and with all cities and towns surrounding the bay. Trucks to and from the proposed navy yard could reach near and distant parts.

Having floating bridges as well as railroad-vehicular bridges no conceivable bombing could put all these means of communication out of business at one time.

Thus Prudence Island, with the navy yard and other possible naval, military, and shipbuilding establishments thereon would be tied in by rail, water, and highways, not only with all naval and military establishments in the Narragansett Bay area, but would tap the population and industrial resources of the entire region.

A great navy yard situated on Prudence Island would be at the very heart of the Narragansett Bay area.

Every naval, military, and industrial establishment within the region would then be coordinated into a highly efficient driving unit, effectively ready to help win the war and after the war to continue full operation and thus insure the permanent prosperity of industry and labor in Rhode Island and contiguous territory.

This permanent prosperity can and will be ours and our country will benefit if the region possesses, as the hub of a wheel in its center, a fully equipped navy yard, whose traffic and communication spokes would radiate out and reach into every naval, military, and industrial establishment in the region and whose combined activities will then be continued into all the peacetimes to follow.

On the other hand, we will be permanently deprived of this continuing prosperity and our country will suffer during and after the war if the region possesses no navy yard in its center. Then there will be nothing to tie together into a coherent and permanently busy whole the naval, military, and industrial establishments scattered throughout the region. Then will certainly be repeated the wasteful work of dismantling, abandoning, or reducing the activities of many of these establishments throughout the region as happened after World War No. 1.

In the best—indeed, vital—interests of our country, of Rhode Island, and of all concerned, let us have the vitally necessary navy yard—now.

Gallant Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of January 27, 1943:

GALLANT LEADER

America stands today mute in awed admiration of bravery no less than any, and valor equal to all, of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Commander in Chief in name and deed.

New England, in particular, where courage in the crisis was born and leaders of men risked their lives that this land be free, salutes the spirit which inspired our President to make his hazardous journey.

The other journeys of the war, the frequent trips of Churchill, the trek of Kai-shek to India, the Hopkins flight to winter-bound Russia and the Knox visit to smouldering Pearl Harbor—daring as they were—pale in comparison to the chosen leader of a nation, on the continuance of whose living so much of the future of the world depends, risking 5,000 miles of ocean to speed the way to victory.

Without pomp or circumstance—in a small, white villa—hard by the bright target of Casablanca, he lived and conferred through 10 gruelling days, so that he might make the thrilling announcement that the Allies had come to complete agreement on war plans for 1943 to bring about the unconditional surrender of the Germans, Italians, and Japanese.

And the conference table alone would not do him. He went to the front, to the fighting front, where begrimed tanksters, nerve-keyed bombardiers, sound-deafened artillerists and mud-coated raiders of our Nation, stared in joyous amazement, stirred to the depths, as their general of generals rolled down the battleline, sharing their dangers.

The history of the United States is a history highlighted with surpassing deeds, that leaders who had accomplished at great peril. But few equal this.

Something was needed to bring the French together. No emissary would do. And De Gaulle and Giraud now know why he is the light that shines in a world of darkness, why he is the spirit that unites free men and why he is the force that outdares the Hitlers and Hirohitos.

There was need of agreement on the best strategy. In his presence the leaders learned how vital was the solitary objective, victory, and how unimportant were any picayune points which might delay us from that goal.

Stalin and Kai-shek could not attend? He let them know, as the conferences progressed, what was going on, demonstrating to them and to all thereby, that to him the phrase, "United Nations," means just what it reads, all nations that defy, marching shoulder to shoulder to freedom over the enslavers of men.

A perilous trip? Of course. A dangerous journey? Beyond any question. Hitler would have sacrificed a hundred divisions. And Goering would have given a thousand ships of his Luftwaffe to have ended that journey to North Africa. But the President of the United States, undertaking it, knew that and did not flinch.

In his example, how infinitesimal becomes the yearning for a second cup of coffee, a second lump of sugar, or a second pat of butter. And how proud Americans are today, to pin upon the coat of the gallant leader, who rendered service beyond the call of duty, that superlative decoration—the red badge of courage.

The Home Front and the Post-War Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. DANAHER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] recently delivered an interesting and timely address in Boston before the New England Iron and Hardware Association. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I deeply appreciate the honor of addressing the members of this organization, especially so at a time when they are striving to overcome so many new difficulties in performing their great services to the community. I am also personally touched by the fact that I come to you exactly 25 years after my beloved grandfather addressed you. In an organization of this kind I see an example of the genius of New England, of its enterprise and mechanical skill, which have made it famous throughout the world.

It is especially appropriate to take a look into the future at this time and in this place at the start of a new year and at the start of a very new Congress. We but voice the sentiments of every American when we say that it is the duty of Congress, just as it is the duty of every citizen, to put the winning of the war at the head of every other consideration. This must come first and no other plans, no matter how attractive they may be, should divert us from the grim business at hand.

When I say this, I have in mind some of the public discussions about the peace. By all means, let the proper agencies of government be thinking about the peace, but let no discussion of the peace lull us into thinking that the war will soon be over and that we can relax our effort. Let no dispute about the peace divide the American people at a time when they must, above all, be united to save their own beloved country. It is enough for us to know that we can have no choice whatever about the peace if our enemies are not utterly destroyed. It should suffice us to believe in a peace which will be lasting—which will prevent our children and our children's children from going to war again.

It should be enough for us to believe in a peace which is not only lasting—but a peace which is also just, a peace resting on the spirit of the Atlantic Charter which stated that the United States and the United Kingdom respected "the right of all people to form the government under which they will live."

This statement is in the American tradition, set forth by Abraham Lincoln in the deathless words of the second inaugural, when he asked for a just and a lasting peace. It is in the spirit of the common people of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, whose forebears 80 years ago espoused the cause of American Union and demanded the abolition of American slavery even though their own economic interests suffered thereby. The question of a just peace is a very simple one. If a people is in possession of the right to choose those by whom it wishes to be governed, or even if it is ruled arbitrarily by one of its own, it is a free people. If it is not in possession of that right, if government is imposed upon it, by any outside agency, it is not a free people.

These general principles, however, suffice us for the present. No man can give detailed discussion of a peace settlement which has not yet been made. We can moreover recognize that when victory is ours, those who have seen the great power of American industry to make new things and create new wealth, as they are doing in this war, will not willingly go back to a system of doles and bread lines. This fact, I believe, is recognized by the leaders of industry who are prepared to take the lead in preventing the economic chaos of unemployment which so often follows war.

Let me point out, however, that the same people who have witnessed the accomplishments of American industry in time of war have also witnessed the failures of bureaucracy. The same people who expect of our system of free enterprise that it will provide jobs in plenty are more determined than ever that our country will not become socialistic. The filling out of countless incomprehensible forms and questionnaires has, I believe, destroyed any lurking love of socialism which may have existed.

These are the broad generalities which we can have in mind about the post-war period. We must, I repeat, first of all win the war. We must win it on the home front and on the military front. Let me talk of the home front first.

History shows conclusively that no nation has ever been successful in battle if the home front was not secure. In fact there are many cases in history when troops which were well supplied, well trained, and ably led, laid down their arms when they became convinced that all was not well on the home front. The will to win of the civilian population has been and always must be the mainspring of victory. The maintenance of high morale on the home front is a matter of prime concern.

I say to you very frankly that I do not think that conditions on the home front are as good as they could be and as they ought to be. Nor do I think that the people are to be in any way blamed or criticized for this condition. The American people are ready to submit to any order and to undergo any sacrifice provided they are asked to do something definite, something which they can understand, something which makes sense, and something for which some one person can be held responsible.

We have not got that kind of a system in effect as yet in the United States and I conceive it to be one of the prime functions of Congress to make such a reform. Today there is too much fumbling, there is too much divided responsibility, there are too many overlapping agencies, and there is a tendency to use un-American methods. I am one of those who believe that those who violate the law should be prosecuted, but that no one should be persecuted.

How can Congress make itself felt in the remedying of such a condition? Congress can make the laws, but it cannot enforce them. It has no power of appointment. Congress can authorize the construction of unlimited pipe lines, or of large numbers of barges, but Congress cannot be blamed if those in control did not lay the pipe lines or build

the barges soon enough to bring oil into New England. I do not mean to say that Congress has not made mistakes or left undone things which it should have done. I know the mistakes of Congress probably as well as anyone. But Congress, like every private citizen in this country, had a perfect right to expect that an administration which for so many years warned of the danger of war should have taken the steps to prepare us for this war, in particular, insofar as submarine attacks on our coastwise shipping were concerned.

The most effective route for Congress to follow is the money route. We have been presented with an enormous Budget, $109,000,000,000. It is the duty of Congress to scrutinize every single appropriation, to demand a complete justification of it, find out where the unallocated balances are, to compare this year's items with similar items last year—and finally to follow through and see to it that these moneys are used in the way which has been represented. This is a colossal job. It is a job which has not been made easier by the past 10 years during which Congress abdicated its authority and its responsibility and gave the executive branch virtually a free hand. I believe the era of blank checks is definitely over, but it is going to be a big job to run down all the blank checks which are still outstanding.

It is for this reason that I, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, have been actively proposing the setting up of a trained staff which would work 12 months a year in following these expenditures of the Government. The members of this staff would be paid by Congress and be responsible only to Congress. They would be present in the committee rooms when the committee receives its demands from the executive branch. They would justify and give their opinions as soon as the representatives of the executive branch had given theirs. They would ferret out waste. They would ascertain the numbers of Federal employees who are not now given enough to do and who could be more profitably used in some other branch of the war effort. A group of us on the House and Senate Appropriations Committees have been working on this thing since Congress began. Frankly, I can imagine nothing more constructive or more likely to yield beneficial results.

It will be a broadened continuation of the splendid work of Senator BYRD, whose efforts last year resulted in a reduction of over a billion dollars. I was happy to join my vote to his in an effort to reduce expenditure. It will always be a pleasure to support his crusade for clean and economical government.

Let no one think this Congress will not as loyally support the winning of the war as any previous Congress has done. I am sure that any specific grant of power which is needed to win the war will be given. But it will be a definite and a specific grant and not a blank check.

And this Congress, I hope and believe, will insist that no action is taken which is not authorized by law. No arbitrary limitation on salaries, for example, shall be imposed by the administrative branch, when such a limitation has never been approved—and in all probability never would be approved—by Congress. I object to such a limitation, not only because it would produce very little revenue, not only because it would discourage incentive and thereby discourage the production of new wealth; I object to it above all, because it is an act of usurpation, and unsound in principle.

Real power has gone to the executive departments, while public responsibility still rests with Congress. Between January 7, 1941, and April 12, 1942, the President issued 500 Executive orders—laws which were never written in the halls of Congress on the responsibility of men chosen by the public and known to the public. This is an intolerable situation.

Congress should not only exercise more care in the delegation of powers; the Executive should stop expanding its policies by interpretation. Moreover, Congress should enact legislation for a judicial review of administrative decisions.

One of the great dangers facing this Nation is uncontrolled inflation. In its simplest form inflation means that the dollar buys less goods, or, stated in another way, when demand for goods exceeds the supply, prices, unless rigidly controlled, skyrocket under the impetus of competitive buying. In spite of the steps which have been taken, we are experiencing quite a degree of inflation. A step which would tend to prevent inflation is to exempt small life-insurance policies from taxation.

This exemption should apply only to an individual limitation of premiums on a policy value not in excess of $5,000, in order not to permit an avenue of escape by taxpayers of wealth or corporations.

This principle is already embodied in the present tax law by which medical and certain other expenses in a limited amount can be taken as a tax credit.

Every additional dollar that the wage earners pay into life, endowment, health, and accident insurance not only restricts inflation, benefits the individual as to protection and assets, curtails spending power to some degree, but it contributes to the financial fabric of our Nation by creating the reservoirs of ready cash whereby natural channels will further increase their assets in liquid form by the purchase for investment of large amounts of United States bonds and securities and for other sustaining business purposes.

One thing more. To maintain the home front, the energies of the American people must be concentrated on winning the real war which we are fighting against our foreign enemies. Our energies must not be wasted and dissipated in fighting the battle of Washington. In this war we have seen splendid cooperation between the leaders of the Army and Navy on many foreign battlefields. Why can we not have the same cooperation among the agencies in Washington? Let us get together to fire more bullets at the enemy and fewer questionnaires at American citizens.

I close with a subject which is of the utmost importance to us all and one regarding which, you, as leaders in your respective fields will soon have to pass judgment. You have heard it said in the past that the Army which is contemplated for the United States is too big, that it is a mass army, that it is beyond the productive capacities of our Nation, that it is beyond our ability to ship it overseas, and that we should arm other nations to do the fighting instead of training troops for ourselves.

I would like to analyze these statements for a moment and lay the facts before you so that you can draw your own conclusion. I first ask you to consider the fact that the figure of 7,500,000 was arrived at after exhaustive studies and surveys by well-qualified experts—experts who have access to more information than can possibly be true of any private citizen. Any man, no matter how brilliant he may be, would be rash to dispute the judgment of men who, unlike him, could see the entire picture.

The Army which we are building—and I speak from experience—is a mechanized army throughout. It is not a mass army or a "cannon-fodder army." It is an army which is very high in the number of its specialists.

The question of bigness in an army can only be measured in comparison with the size of the enemy's forces. We believe the Axis can muster approximately 585 divisions. That is a good figure to think over when people say that our Army is too big.

Let me break down this figure of 7,500,000. First come 2,200,000 for the Army air forces. These have the first priority on men, on supplies, and on shipping, which is as it should be. The next subdivision is 3,300,000 for the ground troops, that is, infantry, artillery, and tanks. This is about the same figure as was projected for our ground army in the World War. Another million goes to the service of supply, which is a problem which did not exist in the World War as it does today. The final million is for the defense commands to guard our own shores, which were not threatened in the World War, and also include trainees and replacements. I do not think it should be called an extravagant figure.

In an emergency like this one, we have to trust someone. We must have qualified men who will make decisions. I believe we have such men and that we should accept their judgment until they show themselves to be incompetent. We cannot run the war in a civilian debating society.

The waging of modern war against able and well-prepared adversaries is a hard job which requires enormous contributions of money, of inconvenience—if not of actual hardship—by the civilian population. The support of an Army and Navy which will enable us to defeat these powerful enemies across vast oceans is a tremendous undertaking. Unfortunately, we have no choice as to whether or not we shall conduct such a struggle. We are in it and our very survival is at stake.

The greater our effort is, the sooner the war will be over. To restrict our effort is merely to prolong the war. The trial is severe, but the survival of our beloved country is a treasure beyond price.

As Abraham Lincoln said on another occasion when our Nation was in great and pressing danger: "We shall either nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope on earth." Confronted with this choice, we know what our answer will be.

The Railroads' Place in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD the text of an able address delivered before the Kansas Press Association at its annual meeting, in Wichita, Kans., January 15, 1943, by Mr. F. G. Gurley, vice president of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., on the subject The Railroads' Place in War.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Railroads' Place in War is my subject tonight. The protection of our country has first call upon the services of the railroad industry, as it has upon the fine young men who so bravely go forth to meet the enemy. The railroads' place in war, therefore, is in support of the fighting forces, yet in many respects their place in war is similar to their place during peace. Their job at any time is to move people and commodities from one

community to another. That calls for the creation and use of power; that means locomotives pulling vehicles over a roadway, and, last, but by no means least, it means the employment of thousands of men and women each hour of the day, working at their jobs, doing many important yet humble tasks, none of which perhaps are spectacular but all are essential to the war effort, and the ultimate result is a splendid achievement. All who participate should, and do, take pride in that.

Some railroad men, and some railroad women, get even closer to the fighting front. An Army Engineering Corps composed of many Santa Fe officers and employees has been in training near Clovis, N. Mex., under the command of Colonel Notgrass, one of our superintendents. He is assisted by Major Foulks, another Santa Fe superintendent. Today some 5,000 Santa Fe men are in the armed forces. John Gillies, our friend and capable general manager from Amarillo, lost his life early in 1942 while acting as a colonel doing special work for our Army in Iran.

When we consider the place of the railroads in today's war and their contribution to the war effort, it is helpful to recall World War No. 1 and the intervening years whether those years represented peace or merely a hiatus in hostilities.

In World War No. 1 the railroads under private management did not function to the satisfaction of the Government, and because of that the railroads were taken over by the Government which operated the roads for a period of 26 months. Time does not permit a complete discussion why that was thought to be necessary, but there are a few outstanding reasons which exerted a great influence. There was not sufficient cooperation between the shippers and receivers of freight, and there was inadequate coordination between railroad shipments and shipments on the high seas. Thousands of cars were loaded before the consignee was prepared to unload the cars, and thousands of others were loaded with overseas shipments without knowledge concerning the availability of vessels for off-shore movement.

World War No. 1 occurred not long after the era of railroad construction. The two decades immediately preceding that war witnessed a large amount of new railroad mileage. The time and energy of railroad management had been engaged more in building a railroad plant than in developing the technique of completely integrated operation. Neither the fixed property nor the rolling stock was thought to be capable of rendering sustained service under the pressure inevitably produced by war, which demands the near impossible. There were too many engine failures and too many bad order cars.

And so the Government embarked upon a great experiment in transportation which no one claims was successful. When the railroads were returned to their private managers those managers in reflecting upon the causes which led to Government control and upon the many disadvantages of that method of operation decided upon a courageous program of rehabilitation and increased efficiency. Millions and billions of dollars were spent in the physical rehabilitation, in more and better cars and locomotives, in improved roadway and stronger bridges.

In collaboration with shipper organizations there was established something which I think did more than any other one thing to improve mutual understanding and secure greater cooperation. I refer now to the shippers regional advisory boards. These provided a forum where shippers, who after all are the principal users of the railroads, and the railroad managers got together. The prospective car requirements of the shipper for the ensuing 90 days were forecasted regularly, there was a consistent contact between the railroads and their customers. It is impossible to measure the good which came from this but it was tremendous.

Since World War No. 1 the railroads organized along better lines for centralized action. The Transportation Act of 1920 and subsequent laws extended the powers and jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission and they are in position to take more constructive action than was true during World War No. 1. By virtue of his constitutional and statutory authority the President established the Office of Defense Transportation on December 18, 1941. The Office of Defense Transportation was charged with definite obligations, including the direction to coordinate the transportation policies and activities of the several Federal agencies and private transportation groups in effecting such adjustments in the domestic transportation systems of the Nation as the successful prosecution of the war may require. All of these things made it possible for the various Government agencies and the railroad industry to work closer together.

The 2 decades between World War No. 1 and this war, the nature of which justifies the designation "global war," were two vastly different decades. The first was one of substantial and sustained business prosperity during which occurred most of the physical rehabilitation I have mentioned and the other was one of a business depression, during which it has been said the railroads lived off their fat. Because that statement was made frequently some people thought the railroads were neither financially able nor physically strong enough to function adequately in the war effort. They failed to evaluate correctly two vital facts. The first is that during the first decade the railroads builded better than they knew, and during the second economic pressure brought forth more efficient managerial techniques, and furthermore during that time new materials, such as improved metals, made possible better cars and other modern instrumentalities of transportation, such as Diesel engines and better designed steam engines. Despite certain financial perplexities all of these were utilized more generally than was commonly known.

During both of thse decades other forms of transportation were greatly expanded. These include the Panama Canal coastwise shipping, pipe lines, and a perfectly amazing highway system. The airways too got a start, and we are grateful that our air forces have that much of a background. All of this increase in competitive transportation, however, made railroad managers ask whither they were going but I am thankful that despite those uncertainties they embraced the new methods and new facilities when they were available.

Between the days of the Chamberlain-Hitler meetings and the invasion of Poland, thoughtful men, including the President of the United States, turned their minds to the problem of railroad transportation in the United States. Intelligent questions were asked. Not long after the fateful day in September 1939, when Hitler marched into Poland, railroad executives meeting first in Washington and later in New York, studied the implications of European war and solemnly pledged that they would do their part to insure transportation essential to the national defense.

During 1940 and 1941 the potential transportation capacity of the American railroads was increased by the installation of locomotives, cars, and other facilities. The railroads believed then that in the event our Nation was drawn into the war it would be realized that the sinews of war included men, equipment, and facilities necessary to fulfill rail transportation requirements within the continental limits of the United States. That would seem to be the policy of those in Washington charged with the serious obligation of allocating materials and supplies and the wise utilization of manpower. These men have a hard job and a tremendous responsibility. There have been differences of opinion as to what is essential, both with reference to transportation itself, and that which is essential in providing essential transportation.

I said earlier that the place of the railroads in time of war was similar in many respects to their place during peace. In order to meet war demands some industries faced a tremendous conversion problem. In connection with that I commend to all of you the three fine articles by Boyden Sparks in the Saturday Evening Post of December 26 to January 9, inclusive, entitled: "Shoot the Works." These are thrilling stories of the manner in which the American free enterprise system responded when the war emergency came. Huge plants were changed over very quickly from making peacetime products for sale in a competitive market, to the production of instrumentalities of war. We should be thankful for those men who were willing and had the "know how" to respond to the new demands. I hope, too, that as a people, we remember what they did. When danger no longer threatens it's so easy to forget.

Instead of the conversion task which confronted some industries, the railroad obligation was to take on more and more of a transportation burden. This is indeed a global war, and our armed forces, which are composed of your friends, your relatives, and my friends and my relatives, are fighting on many fronts. They must fight the enemy wherever he is found. They need fighting tools. It is the job of our manufacturing industry to provide the equipment these men need, and it is the obligation of the transportation agencies to take the equipment to them. The job of the American railroads is to transport all of it to tidewater. But there is a lot of other transportation the railroads must perform. People, foodstuffs, raw materials, fabricated materials, all must be moved. I spoke earlier of the developments in other forms of transportation between World War No. 1 and this one. The submarine menace stopped coastwise shipping almost entirely. The intercoastal shipping through the Panama Canal has been discontinued except perhaps in rare instances. Tonnage which formerly moved that way now moves in freight cars across your State of Kansas and neighboring States to the north and south. The shortage of rubber caused a decline in highway traffic.

The railroads of the United States successfully handled during 1942 the greatest volume of freight traffic any form of transportation in the world has ever been called upon to move in any corresponding period. The volume handled by the railroads amounted to 630,000,000,000 ton-miles. This was 155,000,000,000 ton-miles, or nearly 33 percent greater than that handled in 1941, the previous record year. It was more than one and one-half times the volume moved in the first World War year 1918.

At the same time railroads established a new high record in volume of passenger traffic in 1942. Passenger-miles (the number of passengers multiplied by the distance carried) totaled 53,000,000,000. This exceeded by more than 6,000,000,000 passenger-miles, or 13 percent, the previous record established in 1920. It also exceeded 1941 by more than 23,000,000,000 passenger-miles, or 80 percent. Part of this heavy passenger traffic in 1942

can be attributed to troop movement, approximately 2,000,000 members of our armed forces now being transported monthly in organized movements. Railroads now are moving twice as great a volume of passenger traffic as they did at this time last year but with the same amount of equipment, as they have been unable to acquire more. Months ago decisions were made by the War Production Board that no more new passenger cars would be built.

The statistics I have just quoted relate to all of the American railroads. The increases in Santa Fe volume have been in excess of the national figures. Our tons carried 1 mile in 1942 totaled 28,000,000, which was an all-time high record and was two and four-tenths times the ton-miles of 1939, and two and two-tenths times the ton-miles handled in either of the years of 1917 and 1918 during World War No. 1.

Santa Fe passengers carried 1 mile in 1942 totaled 3,000,000, which was an all-time high record, and was three times the passenger-miles of 1939; one and four-tenths times the previous high record year of 1920, and one and eight-tenths times the heaviest year during World War No. 1, which was in the year 1918.

Because of war activities in the Pacific, the volume of export freight moving to Pacific ports now approximates 30 percent of the total handled through all ports compared with 7 percent in 1941. This has increased considerably the average length of haul. The indications are that the Santa Fe has busy months ahead.

Ability of the railroads to handle the record traffic this year has been made possible by the wholehearted cooperation of our patrons, the sympathetic and harmonious attitude of the Army and Navy, and the wise advice and directions of the Office of Defense Transportation, and help from the Interstate Commerce Commission's Bureau of Service. Through various organizations shippers have concentrated on the prompt loading and unloading of freight cars and other means of improving the efficiency with which freight cars are being utilized by shippers and receivers of freight. The railroads appreciate the cooperation which they have received from private and public sources. We are very thankful for your sympathetic cooperation in meeting the tremendous passenger-traffic problem. We know that passengers are unable to find seats on our trains passing through Wichita, and that they are forced to stand up for undesirably long periods of time. We know that due to overloading of our dining cars you do not always get the high-class type of service in our dining cars that Fred Harvey and the Santa Fe like to give. We think it is fair to say that while there have been inconveniences, we have moved everything and everybody that wanted to be moved. No factory has closed or had its output reduced for want of rail transportation. No soldier has failed to get his equipment because we did not haul it to tidewater.

I have mentioned the cooperative attitude of shippers and Government agencies without which the burdens of the railroads during this war period would have been greatly increased or perhaps rendered impossible. Now a word about the newspapers. I see the clippings from all the newspapers in our territory each week and I study them carefully. I do that because I believe the newspapers are pretty good mirrors of public opinion. While there have been certain criticisms, much of the criticism has been constructive, and by and large these newspaper clippings which I read have reflected an understanding of the difficulties under which we are laboring and a recognition of the effort we are making not only to serve the war effort but to keep up and preserve the service to the civilian population as far as possible. This has strengthened us in our determination to continue to do everything humanly possible.

But what about the future? Can the good record be continued? It can be if there is recognition of the basic requirements of manpower, supplies, and materials, and arrangements are made to meet those requirements. The first question is: What is there for the railroads to do? How many military personnel are to be moved, how many other passengers, and how many tons of freight?" We seek advice on those important questions, and then we suggest what we think might be helpful in answering the questions.

From the trend of recent developments in Washington it is becoming increasingly obvious that production and services for civilian consumption in 1943 will be drastically cut. It does not follow, though, that there will be a corresponding reduction in the demand for transportation services, and more particularly in railroad transport services. To the contrary, every indication points to an increase in the over-all demand for railroad services in 1943. It is true, of course, that there will be a considerable reduction in some commodities, such as lumber and other building materials, but that reduction will be more than offset by increases in other commodities, such as ores, coal, iron and steel, agricultural products, and the implements of war. These items, basic to the war effort, must be moved principally by rail or they will not move at all.

From a transportation standpoint the outlook for 1943 may be summed up as follows:

1. A greater physical volume of production than in 1942.

2. The nature of production, predominantly for war and lend-lease, will require more transportation per unit, in terms of distance, than in 1942.

3. Rubber shortage, gasoline rationing, and depletion of stocks of motor vehicles and parts will result in less service to be rendered by motor vehicles.

With the possible exception of passenger service, which may retain an element of nonessential civilian travel in 1943, railroad services this year will be almost wholly in furtherance of the war effort, lend-lease, and essential civilian needs. As such, it must be considered as an integral part of the war effort.

There is a school of thought which believes that substantial economies in transportation can be effected by radical changes in the distribution of commodities. The advocates of this school believe that the economies in transportation are of sufficient importance to outweigh the disadvantages in the distribution of commodities. I have seen no estimates which attempt to state the economies in transportation produced by such new methods of distribution. The idea may be explained by using flour as an example. The sale of flour manufactured in Wichita would be restricted to a zone within some specified distance of Wichita. It would not be permissible under this zoning system for flour manufactured in Wichita to be sold outside of the Wichita flour zone and, on the other hand, the plan would contemplate that flour manufactured, say at Minneapolis, would not be sold in the Wichita area. It is claimed that such plans have been adopted both in England and Germany. It is not being advocated by the railroads but it may receive strong support from the emergency war agencies. To the extent that any industry might be able to so revise its method of distribution without doing injury to itself it might make a worth-while contribution to the war effort.

Evaluating as best we can all of the known factors our advisers, who are experts in their line, say that a reasonable expectation is that there may be an increase of about 10 percent in ton-miles in 1943 as compared with 1942. No one in the railroad industry can forecast the strategy of this war, but railroads serving the Pacific Ocean may be called upon to render a greater service than that represented by the national average. On the railroads, which are in the main channel of movement, the adequacy of the locomotive supply is of greater importance than the supply of cars for loading on that railroad. This is so because in the large movements actuated by military programs the cars may be loaded in many sections of the country and consequently the transportation burden would not be pronounced until they reach the main channel. We are a part of the main Pacific channel and have been and are actively engaged in securing a substantial number of new locomotives.

The Association of American Railroads estimated that for the year 1943 the railroads ought to have approximately 80,000 new freight cars, and approximately 900 new locomotives.

During the first 11 months of 1942 the railroads installed in service 60,769 new freight cars, and 668 new locomotives.

The War Production Board has announced a program for the first part of this year which will enable the railroads to purchase 20,000 new freight cars, and 386 new locomotives.

They are deferring their decision with reference to the construction of additional equipment, their idea, as I understand it, being that they desire to determine by a little experience just how much more equipment the railroads actually have to have over and above this allotment.

Any service institution requires large numbers of employees and the problem of an adequate supply of manpower is becoming more and more important and has become acute in some localities. Generally speaking the local draft boards have recognized that rail transportation is essential to the war effort and that men employed on the railroads are doing their part. Women have been used generously to release men who may enter the military service or a branch of railroad service where women cannot be used safely or advantageously. I think, however, we must find ways and means of using women more and more.

We serve a hot, arid section of the Southwest where experience has shown many Americans do not like to work, particularly in our track department. For some several weeks we have been engaged in conversations with the War Manpower Commission and other agencies at Washington concerning a plan whereby we would be permitted to import Mexicans to work on the track in the Southwest for a specified period of time and with proper safeguards surrounding their entry into the United States and subsequent return to Mexico. There is no other way in which we have been able to solve this particular demand for manpower.

It may be that as the war effort is intensified there will have to be further relaxations from peacetime regulations which restrict the servicee of employees.

There always has been a railroad problem or there have always been many problems about the railroads. We are confronted with two problems at this time, both of which would have a detrimental effect upon revenues. One is the effort on the part of the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Economic Stabilization to withdraw the increases in rates granted the railroads in the spring of 1942 and which increases were granted subsequent to the increases in railroad wages in December 1941. It its estimated that the 1941 increases in wages amounted to approximately $397,000,000 per annum, and it is estimated that the increased revenues by reason of the freight and passenger rates authorized in the spring of 1942 were about $357,000,000 on an annual basis. Recently the employees of the railroads have sought still further wage increases. Their request was for an amount approximating $780,000,000 per annum. Both the request of the governmental agencies for a reduction in rates and the request of the employees for an increase in their wages are now being actively handled through the ap-

propriate channels. While it is admitted that the average revenue per ton-mile is not an exact measure of freight-rate levels it does give an indication of what the people of the country pay for a unit of railroad service. The revenue received by the railroads for hauling a ton of freight 1 mile during the first 6 months when the increases have been in effect, that is, April to September 1942, was 9.27 mills as compared with 9.42 mills for the corresponding period of 1941.

It is fair to say that all responsible business leaders and Government officials, including the President himself, have been favorably impressed with the manner in which the railroads have responded to this war emergency. So far as I know the railroads have financed through private channels all of the new equipment and new facilities needed by reason of the suddenly increased transportation burden. It has not been necessary for the Government to advance money for these railroad facilities as it has found it desirable to do in connection with many of the new war plants and industrial conversions.

It is fair to say also that the performance of the railroads to date has been a fitting answer to the fears of those who held the opinion that the railroads were neither financially able nor physically strong enough to function in the war emergency. We find, however, in a recent report of the National Resources Planning Board on transportation that the authors feel that following the war the Government in order to provide adequate employment should make large expenditures for waterways, highways, and airways. These people who obviously are advccates of the concentration of economic power in centralized Government express the opinion that the tremendous task of planning adequate public works in the period of transition from war to peace cannot be successful in the field of transportation unless it comprehends all transport media. They advocate, therefore, that the Government should acquire railroad rights-of-way, tracks, and terminals in order that the Government itself can make large post-war expenditures on the railroads which these people believe will be required to help provide employment. I hold that the history of railroad development and services does not support such reasoning. If, on the other hand, that viewpoint is the proper one for our country to adopt as regards the railroads it is not difficult to conceive how the extension of the idea could soon embrace other, if not all, business enterprises. A greater threat to the whole doctrine of private enterprise could hardly be conceived.

It seems to me that the railroads have but one plea for the post-war period and that is that they be given a fair and free opportunity to compete with other forms of transportation on an equal basis. They do not advocate a guaranty or any subsidy to survive. As private enterprises they must be permitted over a period of time to earn their expenses and a fair return on capital. That is true of all business. If we may compete in a fair field we cannot complain. We earnestly hope that we may have the opportunity to compete on a fair and equal basis.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me to the convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association in St. Louis, Mo., Tuesday, January 19, 1943:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it affords me more pleasure than I can express to address you at this time on the greatest economic issue with which this country will be confronted for a generation to come—that of providing electricity to every home in America, and especially every farm home, at rates the people can afford to pay.

Electricity is the lifeblood of an advancing civilization. The cheaper the rates, the more freely it flows; and the more freely it flows, the greater are its benefits to mankind.

Throughout uncounted centuries Almighty God has written his name in fire across the face of the storm cloud, while his thunders have echoed a challenge to humanity to come and investigate. Man in his ignorance and in his stupidity has fled in terror or stood with fear and trembling before that terrible, awe-inspiring, scintillating, fascinating, and sometimes death-dealing apparition.

About 200 years ago, Benjamin Franklin, experimenting with his key and kite, brought down from the lightning's flash an electric spark, and revealed to the world a new energy that was destined to change the civilization of mankind.

A little more than 60 years ago, Thomas Alva Edison, the greatest inventive genius of our race, inserted a filament into a vacuum tube and generated into it an electric spark, thereby creating the first electric light, the first incandescent lamp.

With that one act he did more to change the course of civilization than has any other man who has ever lived in all the tide of times.

He not only lighted our homes, our halls, our streets, and our highways, but he gave us the spark that fires the gas that makes the motor machine possible.

He ushered in the electric age and the motor age as well. He made possible the automobile, the airplane, the submarine, the radio, the refrigerator, the electric range, the X-ray, as well as that great multiplicity of electrical appliances that go to make our homes and our business establishments more pleasant and more attractive, and lift from the shoulders of humanity the great burden of drudgery under which we have struggled since the beginning of time.

Through the motor machine he gave us a new system of overland transportation. Through the radio he eliminated time and space, and with the X-ray enabled us to see through objects that formerly were supposed to exclude all light. He made it possible for us to navigate the air, and enabled us to roam with safety on the bottom of the seas.

In other words, he ushered in the electric age—a new civilization, the like of which mankind had scarcely dreamed.

He revealed to us a wealth of energy more valuable than all the oil fields, gold, and diamond mines of the modern or ancient world.

There is enough water power now going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries to electrify every home in America, including every farm home, and supply them with ample current for heating, cooking, and refrigeration.

The object of our power program is to get that power developed and then, through the Rural Electrification Administration, get it distributed to every farm home in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay. We were well on our way toward that goal when the war came on and compelled us to cut down on the use of strategic materials; and as soon as the war is over we are going to redouble our efforts to place cheap electricity in reach of every single farm home under the American flag.

Don't let anybody tell you that this program is communism, or socialism, or that through it the Government is interfering in private business. The power business is a public business. Electricity has now become a necessity of our modern life. It must be handled by a monopoly, since it would be too expensive for three or four or a half dozen different concerns to attempt to supply electricity to the same community. The overhead expenses would simply be too heavy for the consumers to bear.

Besides the water power in our navigable streams and their tributaries really belongs to the Federal Government, as the Supreme Court has held time and again. It is public property to begin with; and being a necessity of our modern life that is necessarily handled by a monopoly, it is primarily a public and not a private business.

Our public power program is one of the soundest and most progressive movements of modern times. It has already resulted in the development of a wealth of hydroelectric power, the value of which cannot be estimated in dollars and cents.

We hear a great deal about manpower. Let me remind you that the power generated at Muscle Shoals alone exceeds the combined physical strength of all the slaves freed by the Civil War. There are considerably more than 200,000 horsepower of electricity generated at the Muscle Shoals Dam. A horsepower represents the strength of 10 men. Therefore, the power generated at Muscle Shoals represents the physical strength of considerably more than 2,000,000 men. There were only about 4,000,000 slaves freed by the Civil War; that included women, men, children, the crippled, the sick, the crazy, and the superannuated. They could not have exerted the strength of more than 2,000,000 men. But even if they had all been men, and each one of average normal strength, they could not have exerted the energy generated at Muscle Shoals, for the reason that they worked only about 8 hours a day, and the power at Muscle Shoals works 24 hours a day, and would be equal to the strength of more than 6,000,000 men working on an 8-hour shift.

The power generated at Boulder Dam, working 24 hours a day, exceeds the combined physical strength of all the men living west of the Mississippi River working 8 hours a day.

The power generated at Grand Coulee and Bonneville on the Columbia River, working 24 hours a day, exceeds the combined physical strength of every man living in the United States, working 8 hours a day.

The power proposed to be generated on the St. Lawrence River, working 24 hours a day, would exceed the combined physical strength of every man living east of the Mississippi River, and north of the Potomac, working 8 hours a day.

The undeveloped water power of this Nation, working 24 hours a day, would exceed the combined physical strength of every man of every country in the world, working 8 hours a day.

That great wealth of undeveloped water power amounting to 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of annual production, is now running waste and wanton to the sea, while the people in the East are begging for heat, and the farmers of the Nation are praying for power.

We expect to carry on this fight until we develop the water power of the entire Nation, supply it to the people of this country at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution, and electrify every farm home in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

We are already on our way. Through the Rural Electrification Administration we have already electrified more than 1,500,000 homes, the average occupant of which, 10 years ago, did not dream that he would see an electric light in his home during your day and mine.

This program has done more for the farmers of the Nation in the last 7 years, or I might say in the last 5 years—since I forced through the first amendment for $100,000,000 for rural electrification in 1938—this program has brought more lasting benefits to the farmers of this Nation in the last 5 years than every other similar activity combined has done for them from the beginning of the Government to the present time.

While we are still lagging far behind the other civilized nations of the earth in rural electrification, we are on our way; and when this war is over and strategic materials are made available, we are going to move forward with a sustained pace that no force can successfully resist, until we take the blessings of cheap electricity to every farm home in America.

Electricity is the greatest helper a farmer ever had, and the greatest servant the housewife has ever known, and the only one that the average farmer or the average housewife in America can afford. And they can afford it only when it is provided to them at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution, with a reasonable return on legitimate investment.

The time has come for the farmers of this Nation, who fight its battles in times of war and sustain its institutions in times of peace, to organize and demand electricity for every community and for every home, and then make those demands felt. No man should be elected to Congress, either the House or the Senate, to the State legislature, or to the governorship in an agricultural State, who is not willing to put his shoulder to the wheel and help the farmers get the benefits of this great God-given resource.

It is true that we are losing our great friend and exponent of public power, my personal friend and coworker in this cause, Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska. But we are not losing his influence, and we are not going to give an inch of the ground that he has helped us to gain. As he retires to the shades of private life, as Shakespeare says, "an old man, broken with the storms of state," he will carry with him the love and affection of every man and every women who now enjoys the benefits of his great services in the cause of public power, as well as the ones who have not been served but are stretching out their hands to us now and pleading for this service.

And here let me pay my tribute to my distinguished friend and former colleague, Clyde Ellis, who has always been one of the most valiant soldiers in this great cause of humanity. As you know, I have been chairman of the public power bloc in the House for many years, and I can say without hesitancy that we never had a more ardent, a more enthusiastic, or a more trustworthy associate in this cause than my distinguished friend from Arkansas, Clyde Ellis.

While we are giving him up as a Member of the House, he is still a soldier in this crusade and is rendering a service the value of which cannot be estimated by helping to unite the power consumers of this Nation, and especially the farmers in every State, in this fight to give them the benefits of our greatest natural resource outside of the soil from which we live.

I promise you now that those of us who remain in public positions, who are conscientiously committed to this cause, will carry on the fight until victory is won, not only on the battlefield, not only on the seas and in the air, but victory at home that will be seen and heard and felt in every farm home in America. This is the cause nearest my heart. I have often said that if I should pass away before this battle is completely won, that I should like to have a light placed above my last resting place and kept burning until every farm home in America is supplied with electricity at the rates the people could afford to pay.

So let's renew our faith in the cause for which we fight; let us support our war efforts with all our hearts and souls and strength, until victory is won and peace restored to the nations of the earth; but let us also keep the home fires burning, keep our people organized, keep our program alive, so that when this war is over and strategic materials made available, we can make this the outstanding, the paramount program for the betterment of our own people and for the future of our own country, so that in the years to come we can make it possible for every human being to live comfortably in his own home, whether in the city, in the town, or on the farm; make our Nation the most prosperous, the most enlightened, and the most progressive in all the world, that she may go down to the future, as Henry Grady once said:

"Holding high the torch and making light the way up which all other nations of the earth must come in God's appointed time."

The Problems of Small Newspapers and Wartime Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, there are two problems which I wish to call to the attention of the House on this occasion.

The first is the problem of the small newspapers of this country, particularly the weeklies published in smaller towns and cities. These papers have had a great deal of their revenue cut off as a result of the war. Local small business people simply cannot afford to do the advertising they formerly did. Whereas considerable institutional advertising is being done in the magazines and larger newspapers and some advertising is being carried even by public agencies with regard to the war, nevertheless the small papers have not shared in this to any great extent. It seems to me fundamental to democracy to keep these small papers in operation, and I would most earnestly suggest some program whereby they might share in advertising campaigns for War bond sales and similar purposes.

On the other side of the question is the undoubted fact that a very large amount of institutional advertising is being done by the large businesses, which in most cases are being benefited by the war and its economic effect.

I personally believe that many of the advertisements carried by American corporations in some of our magazines and newspapers have been very excellent in their content and emphasis and have carried worthwhile messages to the people. In the second place, however, I wish we could have more and not less advertising in the ordinary small newspapers of the country in order to assist them in weathering this difficult period. However, there is likely to be a very great advantage gained by the larger corporations of the country out of the present situation relative to their smaller competitors who cannot, of course, afford to carry on an institutional advertising campaign.

TEXT OF OPEN LETTER URGING LIMITATION OF WARTIME ADVERTISING

DECEMBER 18, 1942.

To HENRY MORGENTHAU, Jr., *Secretary of the Treasury,*

JAMES M. BYRNES, *Director of Economic Stabilization;*

DONALD NELSON, *Chairman of War Production Board;*

LEON HENDERSON, *Head of the Office of Price Administration:*

GENTLEMEN: The undersigned economists, political scientists, psychologists, and other educators wish to direct your attention to the overwhelming waste involved in the continuation of the full peacetime volume of advertising when the scarcity of raw materials, power, transportation, and skilled labor should dictate drastic curtailment in this field. We are not here disputing the peacetime services of advertising. We are nevertheless aware that there is now little present need to stimulate current consumption. To the extent to which advertising accelerates present buying, it is running in direct opposition to the effort of the Treasury and the war agencies to check inflation.

According to a reliable advertising index (Tide magazine [1]) the total volume of ads is now some 21 percent above the level during the years 1935–39. Newspapers and magazines are filled not only with ads designed to stimulate immediate purchasing but with patriotic affirmations indicating the successes of particular companies in fulfilling their war quotas or otherwise associating the company's name with the war effort. Much other advertising stresses the post-war potentialities of industries now working on war orders. Other appeals are for the conservation of materials and the purchase of war bonds.

We fully appreciate that among these are advertising messages that the Government needs to carry to the public. Where these exist, let them be paid for directly by the Government rather than associated with the private trade names of commercial companies. We urge, therefore, that, through administrative order, commercial companies be permitted to include as a deductible cost (for tax purposes) only that minimum of advertising absolutely essential to secure the sale of actual current output.

Such a ruling would make it unnecessary for the Federal Government, as at present, to be paying the bulk of the advertising cost of those companies now subject to high excess-profits taxes. If in highly competitive fields all concerns which advertise are, for the duration, silent with respect to their trade names, their relative competitive position will be maintained fully as well as if they were all to be reminding customers of their existence.

Undoubtedly such a restrictive program would bring sacrifices in particular cases and would lower the income of advertising media. We would urge that in an all-out war essentional sacrifices must be made; furthermore, that the freedom of the press may well be enhanced if newspapers are less dependent upon advertising and more dependent upon collecting the true cost of publication directly from the readers.

Sincerely,

Prof. Z. C. Dickinson, department of economics, University of Michigan; Prof. John Ise, department of economics, University of Kansas; Prof. Elizabeth Hoyt, department of economics, Iowa State College;

[1] Tide magazine, November 1, 1942, p. 71.

Prof. J. Russell Smith, Columbia University, New York City; Prof. Leland J. Gordon, department of economics, Dennison University, Ohio; Prof. Mabel Newcomer, department of economics, Vassar College; Prof. Frank T. Carlton, department of economics, Case School of Applied Science; Prof. Henrietta C. Jennings, department of economics, Wheaton College, Mass.; Prof. Paul F. Brissenden, department of economics, Columbia University; Prof. Lawrence Smith, department of economics, Wellesley College; Prof. Max Lerner, department of political science, Williams College; Prof. George P. Adams, Jr., department of economics, Cornell University; Prof. C. E. Dankert, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N H.; Prof. J. J. O'Leary, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.; Dr. Warren S. Thompson, Scripps Foundation, Miami, Ohio; Dr. P. K. Whelpton, Scripps Foundation, Miami, Ohio; Prof. J. H. Ennis, department of sociology, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa; Prof. Hartley W. Cross, department of economics, Springfield College, Mass.; Prof. Ralph Gundlach, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Prof. Elizabeth K. Nottingham, department of sociology, Wheaton College, Mass.; Prof. Ada Kennedy, Pasadena Junior College, Pasadena, Calif.; Prof. E. Kingman Eberhart, department of economics, Wooster College, Ohio; Prof. John Hope II, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga.; Dr. Robert E. Parkinson, Battelle Institute, Columbus, Ohio; Prof. William A. Carter, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.; Prof. William E. Taylor, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Prof. Elizabeth Donnan, department of economics, Wellesley College; Dr. Lincoln H. Clark, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.; Prof. Marion Hathway, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Prof. Paul A. Reynolds, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.; Prof. Hannah Roach, Connecticut College, New London, Conn.; Dr. John B. Thomas, Jr., Louisville, Ky.; Prof. Ralph B. Tower, department of economics, West Virginia University; Prof. Florence Warner, department of economics, Connecticut College; Prof. Charles W. Hauck, department of rural economics, Ohio State University; E. A. Daniels, Hinsdale, Ill.; Prof. Richard Murphy, University of Colorado; Prof. Colston E. Warne, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.; Prof. E. J. Knapton, department of history, Wheaton College, Mass.; Prof. F. M. McGaw, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa; Prof. Philip Gamble, department of economics, Massachusetts State College, Amherst; Prof. Margaret Dilley, department of political science, Connecticut College; Adelaide H. Brown, Classical High School, Springfield, Mass.; Prof. Jean M. Orsenian, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Prof. Bertha K. Stavrianos, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Prof. Olive J. Reddick, Hood College; Prof. Iva G. Hood, Scripps Foundation, Miami, Ohio; Prof. H. G. Lull, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kans.; Prof. C. F. Littell, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa; Prof. Louise R. Heath, Hood College; Prof. C. M. M. Morton, Hood College; Mary Sidney Branch, school of social service administration, University of Chicago; Dr. Otto E. M. Ruhmer, Brooklyn College of Pharmacy; Prof. Dorothy W. Douglas, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Prof. A. P. Lerner, department of economics, Amherst College; Prof. Morris E. Garnsey, department of economics, University of Colorado; Prof. Walter Rautenstrauch, Columbia University, New York City; Prof. David Rozman, Massachusetts State College, Amherst, Mass.; Prof. Paul F. Cressey, department of sociology, Wheaton College, Mass.; Prof. Paul Kirkpatrick, Leland Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif.; Prof. Margaret B. Crook, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Prof. E. Dorothy Littlefield, Wheaton College, Mass.; Prof. Katherine R. Baker, Scripps Foundation, Miami, Ohio; Prof. J. H. Wheeler, Hood College; Prof. J. B. Culbertson, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa; Prof. L. S. Stavrianos, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Prof. E. W. Goodhue, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.; Prof. L. V. Chandler, department of economics, Amherst College; Prof. J. S. Prentice, Middlebury College; Prof. Elsie E. Gulley, department of history, Wheaton College, Mass.; Prof. Louise Heathers, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Prof. Sally Matthias, Scripps Foundation, Miami, Ohio; Prof. M. L. Lindahl, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.; Prof. M. C. Ott, Hood College; Josephine A. White, Springfield, Mass.; Dr. C. C. McBride, agricultural marketing, Ohio State University; Prof. A. E. Cance, Massachusetts State College, Amherst, Mass.; Prof. G. B. Greig, department of economics, Wellesley College; Prof. Elisabeth Armour Curtiss, Wellesley College; Prof. Frith Heider, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Prof. James Cusick, department of economics, Dartmouth College; Prof. Clyde R. Miller, Teachers College, Columbia University; Prof. Katharine B. Neilson, Wheaton College; Prof. Maud A. Marshall, Wheaton College; Gertrude Luehning, department of home economics, Palo Alto, Calif.; Dr. Alfred Kirshner, William Howard Taft High School, New York City; Dwight C. Francis, Springfield, Mass.; Prof. Wayne C. Neely, Hood College; Prof. William Orton, Northampton, Mass.; Taulman A. Miller, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.; Prof. Ann M. Aikin, New York State College of Home Economics, Cornell University; Prof. Francis W. Hopkins, department of economics, New Jersey College for Women; Prof. Philip L. Howell, Hendrix College, Conway, Ark.; Dr. George F. Henning, agricultural marketing, Ohio State University; R. W. Sherman, agricultural marketing, Ohio State University; Prof. Gertrude Wilson, University of Pittsburgh; Prof. J. C. Hubbard, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.; Prof. Dorothy N. McMillin, Scripps Foundation, Miami, Ohio; Prof. Charles Keyer, Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa; Charles H. Oswald, Springfield, Mass.; Prof. S. Ralph Harlow, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Prof. Robert J. Harris, department of government, Louisiana State University; Prof. S. J. Brandenburg, department of economics, Clark University; George E. Hargest, department of economics, Clark University; F. Eugene Melder, department of economics, Clark University; Arthur F. Lucus, department of economics, Clark University; Kurt Ehlers, department of economics, Clark University; S. V. Gustafson, Springfield, Mass.; Clara B. Hawks, Springfield, Mass.; Harriet W. Marr, Springfield, Mass.; Sarah C. Porter, Springfield, Mass.; H. M. Bosshard, Clark University, Worcester, Mass.; Haven D. Brackett, Clark University, Worcester, Mass.; D. M. Dougherty, Clark University, Worcester, Mass.; Paul F. Marble, Clark University, Worcester, Mass.; Edwin C. Rozwenc, Clark University, Worcester, Mass.; H. D. Jordan, Clark University, Worcester, Mass.; Prof. A. F. Saunders, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.; Prof. Paul F. Gemmill, department of economics, University of Pennsylvania; Dean Edwin C. Voorhies, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Dean Helen R. Wright, University of Chicago, social service administration; Prof. John F. Dashiell, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.; Dr. James W. Martin, director, business research, University of Kentucky; Prof. G. R. Schmeidler, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Prof. J. M. Tinley, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Dr. J. M. Kuznets, University of California; Dr. S. W. Shear, University of California; Dr. John B. Schneider, University of California; B. P. Burlingame, University of California; Geo. B. Alcorn, University of California; Arthur Shultis, University of California; Prof. R. L. Adams, University of California; Prof. H. R. Wellman, University of California; Prof. David Weeks, University of California; Prof. Ronald L. Olson, University of California; Prof. Florian Heiser, University of Connecticut, Storrs Court; Edwin L. Clarke, sociology, Rollins College; William Melcher, economics, Rollins College; Alex Waite, psychology, Rollins College; Andrew L. Parkham, psychology, Rollins College; Chas. T. Knipp, physics, Rollins College; Chas. S. Mendell, Jr., English, Rollins College; Guy Waddington, chemister, Rollins College; A. H. Marvill, business administration, Rollins College; Richard Fuerone, modern languages, Rollins College; Georgiana R. Sheldon, history, Rollins College; Dr. Royal W. France, economics, Rollins College; John H. Buckwalter III, drama, Rollins College; Wendell C. Stone, philosophy, Rollins College; Asst. Dean James Brown, social service administration, University of Chicago; Grace Browning, University of Chicago; Prof. R. Clyde White, University of Chicago; Prof. Ross Stagner, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.; Prof. Irving E. Bender, Dartmouth College; F. Lerche Karwoski, Dartmouth College; Clark W. Horton, Dartmouth College; Prof. Charles L. Stone, Dartmouth College; Prof. O. L. Nordstrom, Augustana College, Rock

Island, Ill.; Professor Schersten, Augustana College; G. K. Yacorzynski, Northwestern University; Prof. Jean W. Macfarlane, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Prof. Harold E. Jones, University of California; Prof. Herbert S. Conrad, University of California; Prof. R. Newitt Sanford, University of California; Prof. Catherine Landreth, University of California; Prof. Edward C. Tolman, University of California; Jane Loevinger, University of California; Nancy Bayley, University of California; Prof. Hazel Kyrk, department of economics, University of Chicago; Prof. Henry C. Simons, department of economics, University of Chicago; Prof. Elizabeth F. Baker, department of economics and sociology, Columbia University; Prof. Sylvanus M. Duvall, George Williams College; Prof. Hedley S. Dimock, George Williams College; Prof. Harvie J. Boorman, George Williams College; Prof. Guy L. Schreytener, George Williams College; Prof. K. P. Zerfass, George Williams College; Prof. Harold Haydon, George Williams College; Prof. John W. Fuhrer, George Williams College; Prof. W. Hamson Carter, Jr., University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.; Prof. A. P. Becker, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.; Prof. Paul N. Taylor, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.; Prof. Harry W. Casidy, department of social welfare, University of California; Prof. Jane Shaw Ward, department of social welfare, University of California.

Japanese Boys Go to College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the War Relocation Authority has decided to permit Japanese boys to resume their studies in our colleges and universities while our own American boys are fighting the war. I am told that two Japanese students will enter Olivet College, in my congressional district, this fall.

In connection with the War Relocation Board's decision, the National Legionnaire has published an editorial that should be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Because I am in substantial agreement with the writer of this editorial, I am having it printed in the Appendix:

THE JAPANESE GO TO COLLEGE

American boys, physically fit, of the late teen ages and verging on into the twenties, are faced with the almost certain prospect of immediate service in the American armed forces. These are the lads upon whom we rely and who will stand with bared breasts on the battle lines, fighting—dying—for the preservation of our American civilization. These lads are our hope and our pride. They also form our bulwark of defense.

Higher education and professional training for them will be halted until the war is over. Not until peace comes again—whether it be soon or late—will these boys be permitted to resume their class work and fit themselves, educationally and professionally, for their normal places in our American scheme of life and government. We honor our young lads and our young men for their patriotic devotion to our flag and country, and deplore the necessity that has thrown them in this unnatural environment.

But Japanese boys—young men of Japanese parentage, though born in this country—are being permitted to leave the Japanese relocation centers and resume their studies in schools and colleges. These young men, it is true, even though of American birth are not charged with the obligation and responsibility of defending the country of their birth. Legionnaires—American citizens—find it hard to understand why, at this time, men whom the Government does not see fit to trust with rifles are permitted to pursue uninterruptedly their college and professional courses. Isn't that a discrimination against American boys of undoubted loyalty? Isn't it putting a high premium on doubtful allegiance?

There was no division of opinion on the subject when representatives of the more than a million Legionnaires met at Kansas City last September. With one voice the delegates protested any favoritism being shown these first-generation Japanese in the matter of higher education. Protests continue to come in to national headquarters from posts, departments, and from individual Legionnaires—to all of whom the situation is summed up as a shocking injustice and breach of faith with our own American sons.

To the internationalist, that thought will be waved aside as a narrow, nationalistic point of view. But it is more than that. There is a rankling hurt in the bosom of good, honest, patriotic, loyal, and devoted Americans when they see their sons come to the crossroads—their sons take the road that leads to war and the battlefields. The Japanese boy takes the road that leads to college and, to use a trite phrase worn rather thin and threadbare, the more abundant life.

It would seem more of right and justice that these young Japanese, if they are recognized as American citizens, should be required to take their full burden of national defense. If the authorities of Government do not believe them fitted or loyal enough to be given a rifle and a place on the firing lines, then there is the alternative of a hoe and a place on the food production line.

We must all serve; we must all sacrifice; we must all pay. The war must be won. But color, race, or national origins should not be made an excuse for any form of favoritism.

According to figures gathered by the Legion's National Americanism Commission approximately 113,000 Japanese have been moved from the west-coast war zone to 10 relocation centers: 2 each in California, Arizona, and Arkansas, and 1 each in Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, and Colorado. It is estimated that of this total number about 2,500 Japanese-American students are eligible to leave the concentration centers and, under authority of the War Relocation Authority through a group known as the National Japanese-American Student Relocation Council, attend any one of 259 colleges and universities approved by the War and Navy Departments. True, these students, so far as known, will not go out at public expense.

"They pay their own expenses of all types," writes an official of the War Relocation Authority. "I believe a few of them have earned scholarships offered by churches and other organizations, just as other college students are helped. We do not have precise information on this particular matter, and we are not directly concerned with it since no Federal funds are involved."

There is also the fact that all Japanese born in the United States are considered by Japan to be citizens of that country, even though our laws grant them full citizenship by virtue of birth here. Dual citizenship is a principle long opposed by the American Legion.

Certainly the Legion and Legionnaires offer no objection to the plan of extending the benefits of higher education to these Japanese-Americans on the same basis granted our own boys. But it does seem highly improper to grant exemptions and special privileges to a certain class because of birth and race. That discrimination the Legion will continue to protest.

Present War Responsible for Nationwide Discriminations Against Italian-Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by G. N. Longarini, which appeared in the daily newspaper La Notizia, published in Boston, Mass., under date of January 22, 1943:

DISCRIMINATIONS PREVALENT IN INDUSTRIES—LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BUREAUS GUILTY OF SIMILAR PRACTICES—PRESS, PUBLIC OFFICIALS, AND SUBVERSIVE GROUPS FANNING FLAMES OF PREJUDICE—UNFAIR TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS LIKELY TO BE RESENTED BY OUR MEN IN THE SERVICE

(By G. N. Longarini)

A few years ago the propaganda chief of Hitler made the following statement: "Nothing would be easier than to produce a bloody revolution in the United States. No other country has so many social and racial tensions. We shall be able to play on many strings there."

Now our country faces the most crucial situation in its history. Never in the annals of time has any nation been faced with so gigantic a task. In addition to sending our men a steady stream of guns, tanks, planes, and munitions, we must preserve the moral and spiritual values of the democratic ideals and freedoms for which they fight.

DANGER AHEAD AS HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF

This is the right time to chasten ourselves with the recollection of that incalculable tragedy which was wrought upon innocent persons during the spy-phobias of 1917–18. If ever we reach the point where anyone of German or Italian blood becomes ipso facto a suspect, we shall have adopted the racial superstition that we have so roundly and justly condemned in the Nazi. Moreover, we shall have created a confusion and disunity which the real fifth column will assuredly turn to its own advantage. Unity cannot be promoted by fears, passions, hatred, and by the spread of suspicions against loyal groups of our population.

Twenty-eight years ago the outbreak of the First World War initiated for men and women of German origin in the United States a period of emotional strain, misunderstandings, persecutions, and tragedy which few of their fellow Americans ever completely understood or appreciated. Everything of German origin or connection in the United States was suddenly denounced as part of the "virus of the new Prussianism," with which the imperial government of Kaiser Wilhelm II ex-

pected to inoculate and conquer the world. Hitherto innocent activities in German immigrant clubs, churches, schools, and newspaper offices now appeared in a new light—as part of the organized German propaganda calculated to win the United States for the pan-Germans.

PUBLIC ATTITUDE TOWARD ITALO-AMERICANS

This Second World War has created an extremely serious situation for all Americans of Italian origin, almost identical to that of the German-Americans during the First World War.

The general American reaction to the present world conflict has raised a new and critical issue in the relations between Italian-Americans with fellow Americans of other racial origins. A wave of discrimination against Italo-Americans first began to manifest itself in 1935 with Italy's invasion of Ethiopia. It increased in intensity as the European war clouds grew darker, reaching its climax with the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

GENERAL EXAMPLES OF DISCRIMINATION

As the national sentiment became increasingly charged with determination to defeat the Axis Powers, we began to witness on the part of many well-meaning but misguided citizens a mischievous transfer of bitterness against Italian Government leaders to people of Italian background in these United States. During the past year thousands of evidences of this kind of embittered feeling and activities have come to public attention.

Discriminations on a Nation-wide scale and under various forms have played havoc with millions of innocent men and women of Italian descent whose integrity, loyalty, and fundamental decency had never before been questioned. They have been subjected to mass discharges from employment, harsh treatments, removals from responsible positions, general boycott of business and professional men, wholesale discharge of longshoremen and stewards working in steamhip lines.

Many firms will not employ naturalized citizens, but will take only native-born Americans. Others will accept no naturalized or first-generation Americans of Italian extraction. From New England to the Pacific coast, aliens and citizens of even remote Italian background are denied employment in factories turning out such nondefense items as clothing, kitchen utensils, toothpaste, and chewing gum.

DISCRIMINATION BY THE GOVERNMENT

The United States Government itself discriminates. Naval Intelligence excludes all who are not at least fourth-generation Americans. Many other departments have ignored the principle expressed in the Constitution that only the privilege of holding the office of President shall be withheld from foreign-born citizens.

Aliens, of course, are taboo in Government posts and long have been denied Work Projects Administration work. Last spring, President Roosevelt suggested in vain that Congress eliminate this restriction.

State and local governments are guilty of similar forms of discrimination. The battle of Office of Production Management against discrimination is at once simplified and confounded by the fact that the Government propagates discrimination, in addition to practicing it. Congress outlawed employment of aliens in work on secret and confidential defense contracts. Many aliens have lost or have been denied jobs simply because there is no authoritative interpretation of the laws respecting employment of aliens on subcontracts, and little consistency between various Army and Navy bureaus in applying the restrictions even where the law is clear. Often inadvertently, Federal Bureau of Investigation agents and Army and Navy inspectors have left many employers with the impression that the Government wants all the foreign-born ousted from defense industries. Alien baiting in the halls of Congress is quite obvious. Several antialien bills now awaiting action in the House of Representatives and the Senate are indicative of an unhealthy state of mind in America. Those who have introduced these bills profess to have as their object the elimination of aliens who believe in the ideology of totalitarianism or who wish to make any change in the American form of government.

It is plain that some of these laws have simply been designed to impose unjust restrictions upon noncitizens and to make the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness an unhappy and unnecessary drudgery.

PRESS FANNING THE FLAMES OF HATRED AND PREJUDICE

After a year of war, American emotions appear to be following the old World War pattern, which is the standard pattern of mass psychology in time of war or in great emergencies of national character. The weight of this growing mass hysteria is a force that is hopeless to cope with. This explains the reason why newspapers, correspondents, writers, lecturers, artists, cartoonists, have all given way gradually and have gone along with the tide of emotionalism of the people, resulting in vicious attacks against the Italian people in hundreds of newspapers and magazines either by direct and derogatory statements or by malicious innuendos. In many cases, newspapers have allowed their sense of melodrama to overcome their sense of proportion. Thus we have witnessed sensational headlines giving overdramatic interpretations of routine activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

INDISCREET STATEMENTS OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Thousands of public officials, whose primary duty should be that of cautioning the people to remain calm and collected during this period when passion is inclined to overcome reason, have instead indulged in an orgy of sensational and fantastic statements about imaginary fifth-column threats, false and malicious intimations about sabotage plots; of alien foes waiting to strike; of Axis spy rings operating in the United States.

For instance, a few days after Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor, J. Wells Farley, executive director of the Massachusetts Committee on Public Safety, speaking before the assembled police chiefs of Massachusetts, said, "German and Italian nationals already planted in our local communities are prepared to engage in sabotage undertakings of the most shocking nature. Scores of our enemy aliens have organized for the destruction of defense production and public-utilities plants. They are well financed to pursue their terroristic measures."

On March 20, 1941, in an Associated Press dispatch carried by most of the newspapers of the country, Congressman MARTIN DIES, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, charged that his committee had information indicating that Italy was attempting to draw its nationals in the United States together into a superstate. He said that Italy, working through its consulates, Italian-language newspapers, fraternal organizations, and insurance societies, was asking its citizens to join a Nation-wide organization to which they would make contributions and for which they would work.

"They want to form one big organization of loyal Italians in the United States," DIES said, and that details would be presented to a Federal grand jury soon.

Recently, in one of his speeches, United States Attorney Edmund J. Brandon, referring to the threat of enemy agents in our midst, stated: "Right here in Massachusetts, right here in Boston, we have been and undoubtedly are now walking on the streets, meeting them while shopping in stores, sitting beside them at church, riding with them in street cars, meeting them in our everyday life—these men who have devoted their lives to bringing into the United States the ideals of the Nazi Party, and they are still here, only awaiting the instructions from ther masters on what to do and when to strike."

Similar statements and declarations were prominently displayed all over the country in screeching newspaper headlines, with the result that they added plenty of fuel to the already fast spreading flames of hatred and resentment against all nationals and citizens alike whose country of origin happened to be at war with us.

Nothing could be more dangerous to the Nation than fear-inspired fantasies whereby an element of the population, numbering many millions and much admired for industry, sobriety, and good nature, becomes today a gigantic Trojan horse. This applies also, of course, to that other large body of citizens who are of German antecedents.

ANTI-FASCIST ORGANIZATION MOST VICIOUSLY MILITANT OF ALL WITCH-HUNTING GROUPS

To complicate matters and render the situation still more difficult for the five or six million Italian-Americans in the United States, a handful of so-called anti-Fascists, composed mostly of Communists, anarchists, and political refugees have been conducting a systematic campaign of vilification against the great mass of decent and respectable Americans of Italian origin who are not avowed anti-Fascists, but who have in the past considered fascism as something good for Italy. Since they organized in what is known as the Mazzini Society, this group has been actively engaged in spreading poison throughout the Nation by defaming the character and the loyalty of the great bulk of Americans of Italian origin, denouncing all the Italian organizations, societies, clubs, newspapers, radio commentators and the clergy as Fascist agents under the direct orders of the Italian Government, and all paid fat salaries by Mussolini. Part of their campaign consisted in holding conferences in the various large cities of the United States where they labeled all the Italian-American communities as hotbeds of fascism.

With the political and financial backing of Communist groups of other racial origins, they have been able to carry on a Nation-wide campaign of defamation over the radio, in the press (through the cooperation of the Newspaper Guild), through thousands of circulars and press releases, through weekly and monthly periodicals which have been established by them for that specific purpose. Their whole campaign has been dedicated exclusively in accusing, in the most lurid and unprintable language, thousands of respectable citizens of Italian origin, placing them under suspicion of disloyalty.

According to certain Government officials, some of these anti-Fascists have not only denounced loyal Americans of Italian origin of long residence in our communities, but have caused the Government to investigate all these people only to find there was no basis at all for the charges. The campaign conducted by these political refugees has caused great expenses to the Government, considerable inconveniences, moral and material losses to thousands of innocent people, and has greatly retarded our national unity by causing discriminations, resentment, and antagonism among the various groups in our communities.

Evidently these self-styled champions of democracy forget that democracy is totally alien in deed and thought to their ruthless tactics, and that real patriotism can best be judged by our diligence in protecting American ideals from the rapists of justice and common decency.

On June 28, 1941, in one of the articles against discrimination, the writer warned Government officials to be on guard against this group which had already embarked in its

nefarious campaign against the decency, patriotism, and loyalty of men and women with clean and reputable records.

Through the aid of their Communist friends, who manage to keep pretty well behind the scenes, some of these Italian refugees have been placed in several Government bureaus and have become the soothsayers for certain Washington officials who have been the most powerful supporters of their sinister maneuvers.

Lacking the proper understanding of the psychology and attitude of the Italians of America, and also of the Italians of Italy, Washington officials have believed that they could change local conditions and the general state of mind by favoring the most confusing medley of anti-Fascists, Democrats, and Communists, without any other thought than that of achieving some sort of unity at whatever cost. The results have been most disastrous.

ALARMISTS GIVEN THE LIE

Much to the chagrin of all these false prophets, informers, and gentlemen of the yellow press who have been poisoning the public mind against people of Italian origin, the Federal Bureau of Investigation announced some time ago that after several years of painstaking investigations only 228 Italian enemy aliens out of 600,000 in the United States had to be apprehended, and those for more or less technical violations.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a persistent question here which is better, truth or propaganda. The O. W. I. is not so high as it was. Americans generally want the facts.

Our loss of men and planes in training in America is challenging the attention of the Nation. Possibly this war effort was too hurried after all.

The purchase of the Loose mansion in Kansas City for a labor center smacks of the prosperity which has come to that group by high initiation fees and the closed shop.

The recent visit to the Hill of Mr. and Mrs. William Allen White reminded me of the vivid story we heard them tell once on their first trip here, their honeymoon, at McKinley's inaugural.

Two English boys from a man-of-war at Norfolk headquartered at my office last week. Coming to the Capital, they were farmed out to private homes, and from there went in pairs to see and hear.

If I had been running the Navy, Mrs. Sullivan, of Iowa, the mother of five sons lost in the Southwest Pacific, would have christened the great carrier *Yorktown* and not the "tug" she has been asked to serve.

How are we going to compete successfully in the world market after peace for the sale of our goods with the maintenance of the Roosevelt-Perkins wage scale set up during this war? Wish some "brain truster" would answer that.

The Appropriations Committees of both Houses want more expert help to hold down spending. My experience with experts has been that they advocate more spending in the name of efficiency. The only way to save on a budget is just to cut.

There is more hope for flying over the North Pole for safety and the saving of mileage than at first one supposes. There is no freezing moisture to weigh down the wings of a plane. It falls, but it is already frozen and falls off.

Bureaucratic Usurpation of Congressional Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Congress intends to look into a technique which has been developed by the bureaucrats for evading the authority and the expressed will of the legislative branch of the Government. Several instances are already causing widespread discussion in the Congress, because they indicate the method by which these bureaucrats appear to be proceeding almost as though by agreement to evade congressional mandates. One glaring instance which has received widespread attention throughout the Nation was the imposition by the President of a limitation of $25,000 a year on salaries. Certain labor leaders, and some of the bureaucrats, and particularly the Communist leaders, have been pushing ever since for a limitation of $25,000 a year on all incomes as well as salaries. This sudden move on the part of the President to thus limit salaries was made immediately after both Houses of Congress had been repeatedly assured by the Democratic leadership that nothing in the tax bill then before us could be construed as either authorizing or favoring such limitation. Section 8 of article I of the United States Constitution provides that—

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises * * *.

This means that no other agency of government has such power. The Presidential action was a usurpation of congressional authority.

Another glaring instance which has not received so much publicity is a ruling by the Securities and Exchange Commission that all corporations must accept and publish in their reports to stockholders asking for proxies any proposal made by any qualified stockholder regardless of its nature. This ruling was promulgated after the Congress, through its standing committees, had been assured by the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission that there was no intention on the part of the Commission to try to expand its authority.

Within 2 days after the last Congress adjourned, the S. E. C. turned squarely about and issued its new proxy regulations. Under those regulations, any individual irresponsible or otherwise, who purchases a share of stock, can submit in a hundred words the most scurrilous, libelous, or scandalous material, and can accompany it by a resolution in which he airs his views at unlimited length. A corporation must publish all of these proposals and resolutions, no matter how many of them there may be, and no matter what their nature, or else find itself in violation of the new regulations issued by the S. E. C. Although the officers of the corporation can be held responsible under the law for any libel or any damage done by these statements, the shareholder making such statements apparently is not amenable to any law or to any action for redress by those he may slander, in these hundred-word statements and supporting resolutions.

The secret of this technique is to be found in an opinion rendered by the Chief Counsel of the O. P. A., one Ginsburg, in which he held that under the President's war powers, the President—or, by implication, any of his subordinates—could, with his authority, issue any regulations or directives whatsoever and they would have the full force and effect of law unless the Congress took affirmative action to prevent them and to rescind the Presidential order or directive. This, of course, is a wholly new doctrine in that it would set up a government by default. It would leave the Congress in the position of having to take affirmative action to stop unwarranted and illegal directives or regulations issued by the President or the bureaucrats. This would mean that Congress would be unable to keep up with the flood of regulations, orders, and directives which could be issued by the President and his army of subordinates upon his authority, and would, of course, leave in the hands of the President his veto powers, which require a two-thirds vote of each branch of the Congress to overcome.

Little attention was paid to the Ginsburg opinion at the time it was submitted in evidence before the Banking and Currency Committee in 1941, but now that the pattern of bureaucratic evasion of congressional authority has assumed such clear outline, this opinion gives the key to the method by which the bureaucrats apparently intend to take over the Government and operate it by decree instead of the constitutional method of congressional legislation.

Many Members of the Congress believe it is imperative and of the most pressing importance that the Congress move immediately to put a stop to this trend toward a bureaucratic government by decree.

It is not yet too late to save the situation, but if the bureaus and departments are permitted to get away with their attempt thus to evade congressional authority, the damage to free government may go beyond any point which could be foreseen now.

Action by the Congress can be looked for in the near future on this highly vital question of maintaining free government at home while the fighting men on the battle lines are struggling to protect it from foreign enemies.

The Puerto Rican Storm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday January 28, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Carlos J. Benitez which appeared in the Puerto Rican World Journal of January 21, 1943:

CRAWFORD BILL STARTS POLITICOS TO TALKING

(By Carlos J. Benitez)

Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD'S resolution to annul certain laws passed by the Insular Legislature, including the Land Law and Water Resources Act, has created furore among local political party leaders.

CRAWFORD'S action was taken pursuant to a section of Puerto Rico's Organic Act by which the United States Congress reserved the right to annul insular legislation when and as it deemed convenient.

Radio waves have been burning lately with the opinions of politicians of all parties, some flaying CRAWFORD himself for his action, and others blaming the organic act though applauding the Michigan Representative for his quick and necessary action to put a stop to the undemocratic measures adopted by the island legislature which are endangering the economic and social conditions of the Puerto Ricans.

The first to attack Representative CRAWFORD for his resolution was Luis Muñoz Marín, president of the Popular Party and of the Puerto Rican Senate, who called it, in a radio speech delivered last Monday, "CRAWFORD'S hold-up on democracy."

CLAIMS MANDATE OF PEOPLE

The Popular Party leader based his attack on the alleged fact that his party has the mandate of the Puerto Rican people, who, as he said, "approved before the 1940 election the legislation which was later passed by the legislature," and which are slated for annulment in Representative CRAWFORD'S resolution.

"Such action would be like spitting on the people's vote," Muñoz Marín added, "and we are not going to permit it." When he pronounced these last words—"we are not going to permit it"—Muñoz Marín repeated them with a strong enunciation which made all listeners wonder if they did not imply that if Congress approved the Crawford Resolution the Popular Party would put the independence plan in its program.

Still wondering what Muñoz Marín meant with his words, politically-minded radio listeners went back to their sets the succeeding night to listen to Senator Celestino Iriarte's speech, which, coming from the president of the Union Republican Party, who has opposed Muñoz Marín's and Gov. Rexford G. Tugwell's so-called experiments in social justice, was awaited with considerable interest.

BACK CRAWFORD'S RIGHT

Though making it clear that his party has always been asking for a favorable modification of the Organic Act and for the improvement of Puerto Rico's political status, Senator Iriarte supported Crawford's right to ask the annulment of legislation which he asserted "is aimed at the establishment of a supergovernment of a totalitarian brand in Puerto Rico."

Iriarte asked how could a man "hold up democracy, if democracy itself—through a vested right in an act—gave him grounds on which to base his resolution?" The Union Republican leader went further and charged that Muñoz Marín, not very long ago, had gone to Washington to use his influence with the Federal administration to overrule acts of the insular legislature. "Muñoz Marín then did not believe in the kind of democracy he pretends to preach these days," Iriarte said. "And in contrast with CRAWFORD—who now is trying to save Puerto Rico from disaster—Muñoz Marín tried to infringe upon the rights of a true majority by asking the approval by Congress of legislation which the local legislature did not want."

A CHALLENGE

The Union Republican senator then challenged Muñoz Marín to join him in a petition to ask Congress to grant the island the right to define its political status in a general election to be held immediately, including the election of a Governor and the right to recall.

In the fight for and against the Crawford resolution and for and against the Michigan Representatives for his action several prominent Puerto Ricans have so far joined and more are expected to take a part.

Last night it was Senator José A. Balseiro, another prominent Union Republican leader who has earnestly fought the Tugwell regime, who was scheduled to speak over the radio, and more top-ranking members of the Popular as well as of the Union Republican and Socialist Parties are awaiting their turn to tell the people, over the radio and in newspapers, their opinions on the issue.

ABUSE OF MAJORITY

Meanwhile, Cayetano Coll Cuchí, president of the San Juan Board of Commissioners, and a well-known corporation lawyer, well versed in constitutional matters, published a statement in El Mundo yesterday saying that "democracy, to Muñoz Marín, is the absolute guaranty of the abuse of a majority."

"The hollow, sob-sister-like paragraph on democracy, the people's mandate, and the 'jibaros' coming to vote even without drinking a cup of coffee, etc., to which the Popular leader has accustomed us," Coll Cuchí said.

"Mr. Muñoz has a joking concept of democracy which he exploits his way in his political propaganda, without stopping to think on the lack of exactness of his affirmations, the awkwardness of his exaggerations, and his total ignorance of the concept of public rights."

LIKE ST. FRANCIS

Then Coll Cuchí said that Muñoz Marín talks about democracy like St. Francis of Assisi used to talk about fraternity. "Sister stone, brother bird, and brother wolf, without the good saint realizing in his pilgrimage across this world of God that then, like today, brother wolf killed and ate sister sheep, brother man hunted brother bird, and all brothers and sisters stepped on and worked over sister stone."

To Muñoz Marín, he added, democracy consists in that men, elected by the people by universal vote as mere servants of sovereignty, may, "at their pleasure and whim," legislate in the form they like best "without due account" for the interests and ideals of those who do not agree with their opinion. That democracy to Muñoz Marín means the absolute guarantee of the abuses of a majority, and that to Muñoz Marín there are no constitutional limitations, "nor rules for judicious conduct which in a democracy prevent the abuse of majority power." That under the spell of a "true drunkenness of demagogic dreams," Muñoz Marín had questioned the right of Representative CRAWFORD to offer his concurrent resolution to annul certain laws of the insular legislature.

NO DEMOCRACY HERE

"Muñoz Marín's first conscious and malicious falsehood in his Monday speech," Coll Cuchí continued, "made for personal conveniences, was to affirm that there is a democracy in Puerto Rico, and that, there being a democracy here, its principles had been violated by the Crawford resolution.

"The Organic Act which serves as a constitution for Puerto Rico, from its first line to last, is a constant violation of democracy. Mr. Muñoz knows it, but pretends not to. When it is convenient to him, it is not a violation of democr..cy, but, on the contrary, a democratic act for Governor Tugwell to be holding the governorship, as the first magistrate of our country, after an appointment made by a power not responsible to us. Legally, as well as morally, it is a greater violation of democracy to support the acts of a governor not responsible to the people than to permit or accept the nullification of a law of a legislative assembly by a body beforehand stipulated on a constitutional limitation to exercise that right."

LIMITATIONS

Coll y Cuchí then explained that a constitution is not Muñoz Marín thinks it is, judging from his speech, and that constitutions do not grant rights, but rather limit them. "Rights emanating from sovereignty, to wit, personal liberty, property right, free speech, and liberty of conscience, and the right to attain happiness," he said, "constitute the essential basis of sovereignty. The people, who need to insure the exercise of those rights and prerogatives, constitute a government which is carried out through officials whom, clearly and emphatically, are limited in their actions by the people so that they do not overpass the reasonable margin of the mandate. That limitation is made through constitutions. That is why a democratic government is a government of constitutional limitations.

Then Coll y Cuchí explained that our organic act is not democratic because it was not born out of our people, although it is a constitution that insures a republican form of government for our island, which is not in itself a democracy, because the three classic powers of the republican state are vested (1) in an executive; (2) in the legislative assembly, which is a delegate of the national Congress; and (3) in the judiciary, which is also a delegate of the national and insular executives.

Creation of War Labor Board Office at Detroit, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent

resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan:

Whereas Michigan industry, home labor and the problems arising out of production and employment up to this time when they develop must be referred to the War Labor Board or any of its allied groups at Washington, D. C., or the District office at Cleveland, Ohio; and

Whereas both such groups, labor and industry, would be saved vital transportation and time and money if such problems could be settled right here at home, a step to which Gov. Harry F. Kelly referred and recommended in his biennial message of Wednesday, January 6, to the Michigan Legislature, also a step which the Detroit Board of Commerce, in fact all concerned, would appreciate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the War Labor Board or any of its groups having to do with this problem be respectfully urged to create a Michigan office for our State problems in the city of Detroit, Mich.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Michigan Members of Congress, to the head of the National Labor Relations Board, to the War Production Board, and to all agencies concerned.

War Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, American families who have soldiers serving in the war are very much interested in the delivery of mail to their sons, brothers, and fathers. An interesting story of the efforts which the War Department is making to deliver mail to our forces abroad appears in the January 29 issue of the United States News. I think it is sufficiently important that it should be put in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIE-UP IN WAR MAIL—WHY LETTERS FROM HOME ARE SLOW IN REACHING THE BOYS OVERSEAS—GREATER USE OF V-MAIL EXPECTED TO SAVE SPACE IN SHIPS, SPEED DELIVERY

Soldiers and sailors overseas are grumbling about their mail service. They complain that letters from home sometimes take weeks to arrive, that often they show up in batches of 20 or 30. Relatives and friends at home can't understand why it takes longer for mail from this country to reach the boys overseas than it does for mail from overseas to reach the United States.

Back of these complaints is a lack of understanding of the enormous job of mail handling that goes with operating an army and navy of several million men. The Army alone is handling about 20,000,000 pieces of overseas mail every week; mail must compete for cargo space with food and munitions; most mail ships sail only in convoys, and convoys sometimes take weeks to assemble; only a comparatively few persons are using the speedier V-mail service; more than 10 percent of all overseas mail is incorrectly addressed; and it often takes weeks to catch up with men who are moved to new locations before their mail arrives.

Herewith is presented a first-hand story of what happens to the mail you write to the soldier and sailor abroad and to the mail he writes to you.

Size of the job: For months the Army has been handling three times the volume of overseas mail that it handled at the close of the last war, when there were twice as many soldiers abroad as there are now. Secretary of War Stimson has estimated that, if the volume continued to increase at the present rate as more troops move out, the full time of twenty-five 11,000-ton Liberty ships would be required to carry overseas mail by the end of this year.

With this prospect in mind, restrictions recently were placed on the sending of packages and publications abroad.

Reasons for delay: When a boy receives a whole batch of letters at once, the reason is this:

The letters that his family has been writing him every day or so have piled up at an embarkation port waiting for a convoy to be assembled, which may take 6 to 9 weeks or longer.

Or the boy may have been transferred to a new post. If he is able to leave a forwarding address, his mail will reach him sooner than if he has to rely on the Army post office to locate him. More often than not, a soldier assumes that mail will follow wherever he goes and fails to leave a forwarding address even when possible.

Or, again, the letter may have gone down in a ship sunk by a submarine. Or it may have been incorrectly addressed. Several ships carrying more than 100,000 parcels of mail have been sunk. To be sure of delivery, a letter should carry a man's full name and rank, serial number if known, unit to which he is assigned, and his Army post-office number. Most important is the Army post-office number.

Every letter leaving this country must be read by a censor. That takes some time. Often, as in the North African occupation, mail is held up purposely to conceal from the enemy the whereabouts of certain units. Mail from soldiers abroad to their families at home sometimes moves more quickly because more cargo space is available on returning ships.

Translated to individuals, 20,000,000 letters a week means almost 20 letters a week for each of the million or so soldiers in the various American expeditionary forces. And, unlike the last war, when all American Expeditionary Forces' mail went to Europe or the British Isles, mail now goes to troops in all parts of the world, in some of which mail never has been delivered before.

The V-mail system was devised to speed up delivery and save cargo space. Until recently, only 5 percent of the letters going to and from troops abroad was sent by V-mail. As this percentage grows there will be much less delay.

A V-mail letter is photographed on a roll of film that is developed and printed when it arrives overseas. V-mail is fast because it gets priority over all other mail and goes by air wherever plane service is operating. It is never lost, because the original letters are not destroyed until the films arrive. It permits a great saving of cargo space. One thousand ordinary letters weigh 22 pounds, while 1,000 V-mail letters weigh 4 ounces.

Delays are inevitable in wartime when there can be no such thing as a definite mail schedule. But most of the delays are for reasons set forth above. The Army and Navy are striving to see that the mail goes through, ever mindful that high morale without mail is impossible, that almost any soldier or sailor would give up a square meal for a letter from home.

Building for a Better Rural Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Building for a Better Rural Life," delivered by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at St. Louis, Mo., on January 20, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With the focusing of our thoughts on the war today, it may seem inappropriate that I should choose for my subject Building for a Better Rural Life. Some may ask, "What right have we to think and plan for comforts and happiness when sacrifice is the watchword of the day? Why should we be visualizing rural homes replete with the modern advantages of life while those whom we hold dear die in the jungle or go down to their graves beneath the sea?"

To those who question the propriety of this, I can only say that while our hearts are with the boys out there, their hearts are here at home. They look forward to the time when they can return to their own land—their own homes. Their letters ask us to look after the home front while they are away.

They are giving the best years of their lives to ridding the world of fear—to filling the world with hope. They fight to free the people of oppressed and exploited lands from slavery. We must fight at home to maintain the freedom which we have gained by centuries of sacrifice. Freedom is not a static thing, which, once gained can be laid away secure or handed down from generation to generation.

More people today are slaves to circumstances and conditions than are slaves to men. Conditions constantly change, and as they change freedom and security may give way to slavery and want unless we, as trustees of a dearly earned heritage, recognize and adapt ourselves to these changes. Failure to do so results in having to repurchase freedom over again at a heartbreaking price.

So our job is no less important than theirs. They expect us to keep the faith, to hold the home front and to so conduct affairs here that they will not return from a victorious war abroad to find defeat stalking their own countryside.

We live in a world of incomprehensible wealth and resources, which paradoxically is also a world of want. Reviewing the history of this world, we cannot help but realize that most of its evils, most of its poverty, most of its bloodshed has been due to the failure of mankind to distribute our resources in an equitable manner.

Concentration of political power, concentration of natural resources and concentration of commerce in the hands of a few has paved the way for disaster and downfall in many a nation. Concentration of population is probably the most fatal concentration of all. When the history of this tragic era in which we live is written, these facts will be found to be doubly true. The overpopulated and underfed nations under dictatorial control lend themselves to the starting of conflagrations, which in this day soon become world-wide.

With the example of other countries before us, we Americans are challenged with the task of beating back the same evil-fraught conditions which have brought disaster and misery to people of all races and colors since the world began. Decade after decade has seen the population of America concentrating in great cities. The percentage of our rural population has declined until today it comprises only about 22 percent of the whole. We have seen industries expand until their employees in a single locality are numbered by the hundred thousand. We have seen titles to the great natural resources of our Nation so manipulated by corporate organizations and cartels that today the transportation, the power, the products of our mines, the commerce of our seas and the financial policies of our Nation are ultimately controlled by less than 1 percent of the people.

We see this right before us. Even those who are themselves in control see it. Many of them recognize such a condition as leading only to ultimate disaster and would themselves correct it if they could. We are challenged with the problem of working out a better system and putting it into operation. To meet this challenge will require all of our resourcefulness and courage.

While millions of our young men in the armed services are bringing the war to a successful conclusion, we who are left at home must wage equally important battles lest they return to find they have gained but a hollow victory.

We have no doubts but what the final military victory will be ours, but if we achieve victory by force of arms alone, we will not have won the war.

Unless we can bring a greater measure of freedom and security and happiness to the 2,000,000,000 people comprising the earth's population; unless we can make a repetition of world conflict less likely in the future; unless we conclude the conflict of arms with a peace that is just and which will promote a better working harmony among nations, and unless we preserve here at home the ideals for which our boys are fighting, we will not only have lost the war, but have contributed American lives, American resources, and American ingenuity in vain.

That we shall emerge from this conflict the most powerful military nation in the world will not be disputed. The manner in which we exercise that power will mean the difference between freedom and slavery for all people. The hope of the world is America. The hope of America lies largely in a better rural future.

In speaking to the members of the Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives, I feel that I am addressing representatives of groups who have laid the foundation for a transformed rural life.

People who live on the land learn to love it intensely. They love freedom equally well and resent any attempt to wrest it from them. Even though they lack conveniences which the urban dweller may possess, there is something about contact with the soil which gives them a sense of security which their city cousins, no matter how well endowed with worldly goods, cannot possess.

Because too many rural people do not have what we call the conveniences of life, it does not follow that they do not deserve them. Indeed, they do, and it is our job to see that the people on the land, upon whom the Nation relies in times of dire distress, are recognized according to their merits.

I am speaking not only of the man who follows the plow or wields the ax, but also for that great part of our population who would live out where God intended folks should live if circumstances would permit them to. When I am perforce required to spend time in one of our great cities, I wonder what wrong all those millions have committed that they are sentenced to spend their days under such circumstances, constantly haunted by the fear of insecurity.

We must restore a safer balance between our rural and urban population, even if the process of so doing may bring financial distress to some of our great cities. Better to do this than to bankrupt America of things that count for more than gold.

The Rural Electrification Administration has laid the foundation for a better rural life. Light and power has become a necessity for the farmer and the rural dweller, as well as for the city businessman. The work which has been done during the last few years has given little short of marvelous results. It has made it possible for tens of thousands of farmers to contribute to our food supply during this time of greatest need. It has enabled thousands of farmers to remain on the land when they would otherwise have had to give up. It has lifted the morale of millions of rural people when higher morale was badly needed.

The work has just begun. We must keep on with it in spite of obstacles until every farm and country home in America enjoys advantages which only electricity can provide. I say we must continue this work in spite of obstacles. You know what those obstacles are. You know that they are mostly in the form of human weaknesses.

There is no longer any question of the economic feasibility of rural electric lines. When the Rural Electrification Administration law was enacted and Government loans authorized, critics of rural electrification freely predicted financial disaster for our cooperatives. I heard it predicted more than once that private utility companies or the Federal Government would own the lines long before the 25-year period was up. In less than 5 years' time our critics have been confounded. Most of our cooperatives have already demonstrated their ability to meet their loan payments on or ahead of time and to retire their indebtedness within the 25-year limit.

We will still meet the opposition of selfish and short-sighted groups of men. I am not speaking from hearsay. In my capacity as an official of the State of Vermont, I saw their work first hand. I saw them try to prevent the extension of electric lines to farms and homes which they would not or could not serve themselves. Today in Washington I see them working to prevent any further extension of rural advantages, except those which they control.

I have seen them so far successful in their efforts to prevent the public development of electric power and navigation on the St. Lawrence River—precious power that would mean more and cheaper airplanes, more desperately needed food, more and cheaper ammunition, a waterway that would unlock an inland sea greater than the Mediterranean so that the goods of our Midwest empire could have easy access direct to the ports of the world.

What a pity that these great advantages, this precious power, this navigation route is not available to us now in time of war. What a pity that this same development cannot be used to promote the comforts and efficiency of mankind in times of peace.

And I have seen them successful in preventing the construction of safe inland waterways that could even now be adequately supplying oil to the Northeast, and relieving the strain on our tremendously overburdened railroads.

Yes, as we go ahead in our program for a better rural life, we must deeply consider that there will be determined opposition. We must be equally determined that we will overcome it.

Mind you I have no quarrel with private industry. I believe in it. The strength of our Nation was founded upon it. It performs necessary services. It produces necessary goods. But when the time comes that a comparatively small group of men virtually obtain a monopoly over a necessity of life, then it is high time that action be taken to effectively regulate or eradicate such monopoly and eliminate unearned profits based on a tribute.

As individuals we would be helpless in a struggle for our rights against highly organized, well-financed groups. They have been called special-privilege groups, but if they enjoy special privileges it is because the people, through their representative bodies, have granted those privileges, and through the same representative processes such special privileges can be withdrawn. However, such processes are slow and often costly.

There is another way through which the public can successfully regulate over-zealous private enterprise. By this way our people can secure to themselves a greater share of that which they earn. The way I speak of is the cooperative way.

Through our cooperatives we have not only extended the blessing of light and power to rural communities, but we have regulated quality of goods sold and purchased. We have standardized grades. We have regulated prices for sales and services. We have found it possible to do many things which we as individuals could never hope to do.

As I look down the long road to the future I see a considerable expansion of rural—yes, even city—cooperatives, too, which will take a leading part in building a better rural life, in making a better America; even wielding a mighty influence for a better world.

I have never advocated the organizing of cooperatives where they are not needed. Where the field is already adequately and economically serviced, we only spread confusion and weaken our cause by attempting to duplicate such service. But when there is a need the co-op methods will regulate private industry far more effectively than laws enacted in legislative halls or regulations promulgated by boards and commissions.

In a world of resources so great that no one should want for things that make a better living, we see a comparatively few people living in affluence and a great majority wanting for food or clothing or health or opportunity.

This is not always because the few people wish the rest to go without, but because we have not yet been able to devise adequate and equitable systems of distribution. Over 75 percent of our population live in towns and cities. They live there primarily because the things they desire for their families are more easily accessible. They have better shops. They have more schools. They have more varied forms of entertainment—beside concentration of business opportunity.

It is very difficult to argue for a decentralization of population in the face of this and it will be very difficult to make much headway along this road until a complete and coordinated system of transportation is devised.

We have a really magnificent system of railroads. We have air lines which in peacetime have connected our larger cities. We have an elaborate highway system over which fleets of trucks and millions of automobiles normally perform a tremendous service. To a lesser extent we have waterways and pipe lines. But at the same time we have operators of these various methods of transportation working not only independently of other methods but actually against them and in a hostile manner. The ultimate consumer, whether on farm or in the city, pays for the cost of much uneconomic competition.

America must get away from the old narrow and selfish viewpoint on transportation and put into effect a fully coordinated system utilizing to proper advantage airways, railways, highways, waterways, and pipe lines, each occupying its proper place and all fairly and impartially regulated.

Since I have had any connection with Government, different transportation systems have constantly striven for unfair advantages over others, hiring the ablest and most expensive lawyers, infesting legislative halls with their lobbies, maintaining uneconomic services in many cases and charging the cost of all to the public.

Aviation has now entered the picture and will soon be in the field of transportation to an extent which the wildest imagination has not dreamed of. Even in the midst of war transportation agencies engage in a terrific struggle for post-war advantages. The allocation of trade routes and the regulation of transportation is bound to be one of our most vital post-war problems. If handled fairly and soundly, the result will be more business for railroads, more business for air lines, and more business for trucking companies. If handled on a special privilege basis, it will mean special advantages for certain groups, which will result in less business for all and more costly services for the people.

As rural electric lines wind their way into communities previously unserved, bringing better living and more efficient production to these localities, they will pave the way for the relocation of much of our population and many industries.

Cities that at first thought themselves blessed by the allocation of immense wartime industries are now frankly worried. While the people pray for the ending of this war, yet in another sense they dread it. Wholesale bankruptcy of large communities and wholesale Federal relief is bound to come unless we look and plan ahead.

I have faith to believe that we are capable of planning in such a way that economic disaster need not follow the most costly war in the world's history. I foresee the time when our rural communities, such as are represented here today, will be easily accessible for millions of our citizens who do not necessarily depend directly upon the land for their income.

The development of aviation, traveling with unprecedented speed as a war necessity, will make this possible. Distances will be annihilated. Our splendid system of large airports now being built will be necessary only for large-scale commercial transportation of passengers and freight. I expect to see the time in the not far distant future when one can travel at an average of 250 miles an hour at a rate of 1 cent a mile. This is entirely possible and practicable.

It will not be necessary to have expensive landing fields for personal and local travel, for we shall have airplanes that will land in our front yards safely. Rural dwellers are the greatest consumers of goods. If people locate their homes all over our green countryside, it will necessitate the transportation of merchandise amounting to many times the present need.

Railroads need not fear the competition of the airplane except in occasional instances. In making decentralization possible, air transportation will give a longer and more profitable lease on life to the rails.

To build a better rural life, electricity will be used in ever-increasing amounts. Electric power today is too costly over most of our Nation. It is costly because the consumers are required to pay for overcapitalization, legislative lobbies, dummy officials, excessive holding-company charges, and other unwarranted costs brought on by the shortsightedness and avidity of the promoters of 20 years ago.

The excuse generally given for the high rates today is that widows and orphans own a large percentage of the stock in these corporations, and, anyway, the present management is not to blame for what their predecessors did. In building for our better rural life, we must make available to all people greater quantities of electric power at very much cheaper rates.

It is little less than criminal to permit mighty sources of power such as the St. Lawrence River to lie idle and undeveloped in this day and age. Twenty years ago the private utilities thought the power rights on the St. Lawrence were worth more than a billion dollars to them. Failing to secure such rights, they have successfully blocked its development to this time.

Our foreign enemies make the fullest use of electric power. Their farms and their industries are almost fully electrified. It is largely because of this that they have been able to carry on the war. Yet we have let a little group of self-centered men jeopardize our national defense by preventing the development of this power for the public good.

It is almost incomprehensible that, while we are maintaining armed forces which will soon approach 10,000,000 men, there should be anyone who still opposes the public development of the great sources of electric power which we so badly need. This same power would go far in peacetime toward building better rural communities.

I do not advocate retail distribution of power by the Federal Government. That should be done through cooperative, municipal, or private systems where such systems will perform the service at a price which will return a reasonable profit only on a legitimate and actual investment.

Great progress has been made during the last few years in the processing of foods. The war has given a boom to the dehydration process, so that fruits, vegetables, milk, and eggs are reduced to a fraction of their natural weight for overseas transportation.

Another method of processing food has rapidly come to the front. It is especially adapted to communities served by the Rural Electrification Administration. That is the quick freezing process. There are now in the United States some 4,600 quick freezing locker plants—largely cooperative—which last year preserved three-quarters of a billion pounds of food.

The field for these quick freezing plants is very large. The need is very urgent. Every community should have its processing plant for the curing, packing, and freezing of meat, fruit, and vegetables. After processing, these foods should be stored either in the community locker storage or in the home storage plant.

Especially during wartime can quick freezing plants be of vital service. They make it possible to save all surplus food from the farm during these times. They would make it possible during times of reduced income for farm people to literally live off the land as well as on it.

There has been difficulty in persuading Washington officials to grant priorities for these community plants. The fact is that it only requires half as much strategic material to build a quick-freezing plant of a given capacity, which can be used over and over and over, as it does to put the same amount of food in tin cans which can be used only once. Commercial packers appear to be far more successful in getting priority allocation of materials than do the rural communities. I think we can well spend some of our time in seeking out the reason for this and pointing out to these public officials the error of their ways.

I have attempted to point out to you only a few of the things which we should do in building for a better rural life. The rural power line is a necessity. Over those wires we must send power at a price which will permit it to be used to the fullest advantage.

Coordinated transportation systems will distribute the necessities and luxuries of life to all parts of rural America as well as deliver the production of the farms to the city consumers swiftly and economically.

Food-processing plants will improve the quality of our food and cut the cost of living.

Aviation will annihilate distances, making it possible to decentralize industry, or, if industry remains centralized, to decentralize those that are employed in it.

So I conclude by reminding you again of the duty which we have of holding the home front. Let us all work together against the day when our boys return from the battlefields and take up once more the pursuits of peace. Let us, while they are away from home, carry on in building for a better rural life.

A Wartime Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made at the Y. M. C. A. Forum, Portsmouth, Ohio, January 18, 1943, on the subject A Wartime Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fighting a war is primarily an executive job. Military operations must be decisive. There must be centralized command. Our Constitution prescribes that there shall be one Commander in Chief, the President. It does not, however, suspend the duties of Congress. It expects that Congress shall cooperate with the President and that he shall cooperate with Congress in winning the war. This means that while the 531 Members of Congress must not interfere with the command of the Army and Navy, they do have many important functions in the war. Among these are the following:

1. To the public: Congress is the natural agency for developing and preserving popular unity. Its Members constantly speak to, with, and for the people for whom and by whom the war is fought and financed. It is the natural guardian of the constitutional rights of each individual citizen. It is itself the constitutional agent through which the people as a whole may express their views and determine many national policies. Upon it rests the responsibility for the declaration of war by act of Congress. Upon the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, rests the responsibility for the treaty of peace.

2. To the purse: Congress has the powers of appropriation and taxation in war as well as in peace.

3. To the President: Congress can help in the conduct of the war by stating clearly in the acts of Congress the extent to which it finds it wise to delegate discretion to the Executive. Unless so defined there may be a conflict of opinion between the Executive and Congress as to where the limits of his discretion end in view of his primary constitutional obligation to preserve, protect, and defend the life of the Nation. When so defined by act of

Congress signed by the President, it provides a clarifying working agreement. The need for this is increasingly great as total war brings into the military field, not only armed forces on the firing line, but producers of equipment, food, and clothing. Total war also involves economic warfare touching upon both international and local problems of supply and demand. It calls for economic stability at home as the foundation for military operations at the front.

4. Investigations: Congress has the power and duty to supervise closely, through constant investigations, the use made by the Executive and his agents, of the discretion vested in him.

5. Appointments: The Senate has the duty to pass upon the appointment of all major officers of the United States. It may vest, however, the appointment of such inferior officers as it thinks proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

6. Post-war obligations: After the war Congress has a special duty to—

(a) Recapture discretion that was delegated for war purposes.

(b) Reestablish private enterprise as the foundation of our economy.

(c) Determine many questions of international policy.

The Job of the Seventy-eighth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Akron Junior Chamber of Commerce on January 28, 1943, on the subject The Job of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Seventy-eighth Congress meets in a great national crisis. It meets in the midst of confusion, confusion in government, and confusion in the minds of the people. It meets with the confidence of the people, who look to it to cure every ill, to straighten out all the tangles, and to make itself the victory Congress. The hopes for it are so high that they may well concern any sincere Member. No legislative body can do what is apparently expected of it by many, for in the long run no group of 531 legislators can run a war or win a war. The actual operations of the Army must be under the direction and responsibility of the Commander in Chief. Even the administration of detailed controls over the civilian population must be primarily the responsibility of the executive departments.

And yet the functions of Congress are vital to the effective conduct of the war. It represents the people of the United States, their views, their hopes, their rights and freedoms, their aspirations, as no one else in Washington does or probably can do. It has very distinct fields in which it can forward or hinder the progress of the war. It alone has any power or interest to defend and perpetuate the essentials of the American way of life. Only Congress can assure the people that that way of life will be utterly restored at the end of the war.

We are in the midst of a war with the greatest military nations of the world, perhaps the greatest military nations of all time. We have fought for a year and fought successfully, but essentially the work that we have done is only preparatory to the main battle. We have seen the Nation reorganized from a peaceful nation to a nation whose whole available strength is directed toward the winning of the war. We have been willing to submit to temporary Fascist controls in order that we may assure the end of fascism.

Whatever our differences may have been before the war as to the wisdom of entering that war before we were attacked, there is no one today who doubts the justice of our cause, no one who is not thrilled by the exhibition of the tremendous strength of America in the support of that cause. We are at war to bring an end to the theory that might makes right; to bring an end to the theory that any nation has the right to attack its neighbors; to bring an end to the philosophy that any nation has a right to persecute and starve and slaughter any of its people. Hitler, Mussolini, the Japanese Army have sought to glorify force, and we intend once and for all to prove that justice and freedom in this world shall forever prevail over brute force.

I have said that we must be thrilled by the exhibition of the tremendous strength of the United States, certainly the greatest productive nation in the world. I have criticized the manner in which the war has been conducted and I intend to criticize again, but I want to pay tribute to the heads of the executive departments who have built from almost nothing a tremendous army, have improved our Navy, have initiated the greatest building effort of all time, and transformed the industrial system of the United States. Because I see the faults that have developed and the manner in which our effort can be improved, I don't want to be thought to lack appreciation for the accomplishment which has resulted from the sincerity, honesty, and ability of so many thousand leaders in our war effort.

1. IT IS THE DUTY OF CONGRESS TO GIVE WHOLEHEARTED SUPPORT TO THE WAR EFFORT

What are the functions of Congress today? Of course, first of all, it can give wholehearted support to the war effort. That is a simple task, and there isn't any difference of opinion that exists anywhere about it. It is easy to pass appropriations and give authority to the executive departments to act, almost too easy. There is no doubt that Congress will take any action which is necessary to success in the war, but Congress cannot actually conduct the war.

2. IT IS THE DUTY OF CONGRESS TO OBSERVE, INVESTIGATE, CRITICIZE, AND CORRECT BY LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Congress is and must be largely in the position of an observer, a jury determining the correctness of the acts of others. Particularly in time of war its job is to investigate the conduct of the war and of the various departments, and to criticize that conduct. If the criticism is justified, it must correct by legislative action. Sometimes I get letters accusing me of too much criticism, but remember that one of the legitimate functions of Congress is criticism. It is peculiarly our duty to arouse the public interest necessary to secure corrective legislation by pointing out the defects which have already developed. Nothing so distinguishes a democratic form of government as the freedom of criticism which exists in England, for instance, today, and does not exist in Germany or Japan. Too many officials desire to suppress criticism simply because they think that it will give some comfort to the enemy to know that there is such criticism, or because they don't want their own mistakes to be dragged into the light of day. Even if the enemy does get some comfort for a few moments, he is welcome to it so far as I am concerned, because the maintenance of the right of criticism will do the country maintaining it much more good than it will ever do the enemy. It is the only way in which bureaucrats can be shaken from the ruts into which they too frequently fall. President Wilson once said that criticism in time of war was even more necessary than in time of peace. Attorney General Biddle said recently: "Government can live only on criticism."

3. CRITICISM OF CURRENT MILITARY AND NAVAL POLICIES MUST BE RESTRAINED

Criticism should be both temperate and constructive, and in the field of current military and naval operations it can hardly rise to a higher level than that of a suggestion to the Commander in Chief. It is impossible for civilians and for Members of Congress to have the information which is necessary to form a military or naval judgment in advance.

It is an expert question on which we must follow the advice of experts. If their policies fail, we must seek for other generals or other admirals. Who except the General Staff can really tell where and when we can successfully open a second front? Who knows one-tenth of the problems faced by General Eisenhower when he landed in North Africa? How silly for our know-it-all Communists and others who pretend to a knowledge of international problems, but who really have no more information than you or I, to set themselves up against the military judgment of a man in command of the American Army 4,000 miles away. So also, if a question arises in Congress between the construction of battleships or carriers or airplanes, or regarding the equipment needed by our Army, I intend to follow the advice of the men who alone know the real story of this war.

But there are certain circumstances under which even military and naval policies must be criticized and controlled by Congress. First, when the actual result shows the failure of existing policy. Second, when the services themselves cannot settle their differences of opinion. Third, and most important, when military policy conflicts with other essential war interests.

I see no reason why we should not expose and point out those failures in military policy which require an immediate change to prevent further disaster. We can see now the lack of coordination between the Army and Navy and the careless practices within both forces, which led to the disaster of Pearl Harbor. We can see now that if we had acted promptly in building up our air force, even from the time when the Germans showed the power of the air, we might have provided enough planes to defend the Philippines and hamstring the Japanese advance to the south. The English had shown that a land-based air force could defend an island against invasion, and yet a year later we had only a handful of planes, many of them obsolete, to defend the Philippines. Congress authorized 6,000 Army planes in May 1939. If there had been 1,000 modern planes in the Philippines 2½ years later we could probably have prevented the landing of Japanese troops on Luzon and the tragedy of Bataan.

Secondly, a difference of opinion sometimes develops between the armed services themselves with regard to questions of organization. This is true, for instance, with regard to the question of an independent Air Force, for as a general thing neither Army nor Navy is willing to agree to such independence. It happens that this has been the subject of serious consideration by the Secretary of War, and he seems to have solved it for the present by making the Air Force practically an independent unit. In fact, to read Ernie Pyle's column from Africa one would conclude that the American ground

forces were there only for the protection of the Air Force. There is still serious question, however, whether the organization of our armed forces is correct, whether the conflict of authority is not a serious handicap. While Congress should move with the greatest care in overruling the administrative recommendations, still it must ultimately be Congress that decides whether a better form of military and naval organization should be prescribed. Should the War and Navy Departments be consolidated in one department? Should the War Council consist of more than the three men who are now directing military and naval policy? Should there be even more consolidation of command than there is today, particularly in the Pacific?

4. CONGRESS MUST DETERMINE SIZE OF ARMY WHEN IT CONFLICTS WITH OTHER ESSENTIAL WAR INTERESTS

But the most important function of Congress relating to the Army arises when the interests of the Army conflict with those of other essential war purposes. For instance, Congress is beginning to concern itself with the question of the size of the Army. As long as it is only a question of the number of men necessary to do a specific job, I feel that we must accept the judgment of the War Department. I have never had much doubt that we could support 10,000,000 men in the armed forces and still do all the other work which must be done; and that is the limit of present plans as far as they have been officially announced. But there is, of course, a point at which the size of the Army may conflict with the work which must necessarily be done at home and which may well be as important as the military operations.

The War Department is inclined to dispose of every objection to the size of its Army by the claim that the opponents are really concerned with preserving civilian comforts which many of the soldiers have long had to forego. But the question is much deeper than that. We cannot starve our people at home. If we don't ship food to England, the whole backbone of England's war effort may be broken. The shipment of food to Puerto Rico takes a few ships from the Army in Africa, and yet we cannot starve the people of Puerto Rico in order to maintain a larger army abroad. Some shipping must be allotted. We must produce some food for the populations of countries which we occupy, like Algeria, or they tell us that our armies there will have a much more difficult task.

Then there is the production of munitions and supplies for our own Army and Navy, for the English, the Russians, and the Chinese, and we can't permit interference with the building of ships to carry them, or with their transportation by rail or truck. We cannot allot rubber to the Army to an extent which will prevent many workmen from reaching the place where they make munitions. We cannot take steel from the railroads to an extent which will break down the transportation of products needed for war purposes or essential civilian purposes. We cannot take so many men for the Army that there are not enough men to raise the necessary foodstuffs and munitions for ourselves and our allies. Some claim that the application of 10,000,000 men to the armed forces is dangerous, and point to the shortage of manpower which has developed on the farms. That shortage is serious, and farm production next year will be reduced from this year. But I believe that an intelligent over-all manpower plan can solve the problem, and without a system of forced labor. In some locations many men are available and the employment of women workers in large numbers has only begun. In any event, there is a point beyond which we cannot go, and it seems that Congress must determine where that point is.

Many of the problems which we face involve the same general question, How far can we change civilian practices and living standards and demands without hurting the war effort as a whole more than we help it? Congress must decide the principle and some of the problems. For instance, it is proposed to shut down many plants, like sugar refineries, making essential civilian goods, and concentrate all manufacture in the remaining sugar refineries in order to save manpower. Is it necessary or wise?

It is proposed to stop the construction of essential flood walls at Portsmouth and Cincinnati, the completion of which would protect war industries at those points. Will the number of men required by that work really interfere in any way with the progress of the war, considering that they may avert a serious stoppage later of war production? Is it necessary to order many small businesses to quit operations because they use small amounts of materials also used by the Army, as has been done in the case of some stationery manufacturers? Is it necessary to close all the barber shops and hairdressers because several hundred tons of steel a year are necessary for razors and repairs? Some of these questions are purely administrative, but underlying them all is the great basic problem of the necessary limit of our war effort. We begin to see that there is such a limit, and that the United States, with 5 percent of the world's population, even with its tremendous industrial power, cannot conquer the entire world by itself. Up to this time there has been no comprehensive planning for the civilian population, no over-all study to determine what activities are really essential or desirable, or even though they are not essential because they interfere so slightly with the war plans. It seems to me that many departments have been guided rather by the purpose of making everything as inconvenient as possible for the people in order to teach them that they are at war than by any real necessity. My own view is that most of the theorists have been much too anxious to upset every established custom, every established business, long before any real necessity has arisen for such action and when that necessity may never arise. Now, we need some department of Government concerned with protecting essential war effort at home against the war effort abroad. That is one reason I believe that over-all manpower control and over-all control of production should be under civilian directors.

There was no constructive thought on the subject of selective service. The Seventy-seventh Congress was largely to blame because it accepted without real study the usual proposal of the administration that it be given the power to do anything it chose to do. Careful planning should have determined the ages and family status of the men who should be taken into the Army, and the men who should go into the war industry, and the men who should remain in civilian industry. Priorities should have been established by age groups, physical qualifications, and family status. I introduced two bills to carry out such a system, but it has remained hit-or-miss from the beginning.

For months no one did anything about the question of family allowances for the dependents of draftees. It was only because I introduced a bill, and some few of us maintained a constant criticism of the conditions, that finally a democratic bill was introduced and passed. There isn't any doubt that criticism can accomplish results, and that there are fundamental questions which Congress should assume to decide by definite legislation.

5. CONGRESS SHOULD DEAL WITH GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION, PARTICULARLY IN THE MANY CONFLICTS BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS

Another failure in which Congress must investigate and legislate is that of Government organization. It is true that we passed an act, known as the Overman Act, giving the President full power to reorganize the Government and transfer bureaus as he sees fit. In a few instances that power has been well exercised, as in the consolidation of the housing agencies, but in general it has left the Government in as great confusion today as it has ever been. Departments overlap and fight each other regarding jurisdiction. Five agencies operate in South America: The State Department, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Rockefeller Bureau of Inter-American Relations, and the Department of Agriculture. They compete between themselves not only for power, but in dishing out the largest sums to South American governments and suppliers. In spite of the Jeffers consolidation in rubber, rubber is still the concern of three or four bureaus. Agencies like the Price Administration and the Board of Economic Warfare cut across the commodity controls of rubber, food, and steel. There is no doubt in my mind that Congress should adopt, and adopt promptly, an organization similar to that of the World War, in which one man has everything to say about food, another man everything to say about rubber, another man everything about munitions, the heads of each section to sit with the President in a war council to coordinate all policies.

Congress can accomplish something in consolidating and organizing departments even over administrative opposition, though it is slow work. Senator AUSTIN, of Vermont, and I both introduced bills long before the war started to set up a war resources administration with a single head to control the production of war material. This was in accord with the plan of the World War, long approved by the Army and Navy. The President was so unwilling to delegate authority that he set up instead a seven-man board without even a chairman, the old Council on National Defense. Later, public opinion forced him into the inefficient Knudsen-Hillman Office of Production Management, with a board of four. Action in Congress on our bills was blocked, but, finally, 2 years after the bills were first introduced, the organization recommended was adopted in the War Production Board, headed by Donald Nelson. No one questions the wisdom of that form of organization today, no matter how many the mistakes which have been made in some of its bureaus.

6. CONGRESS SHOULD INVESTIGATE AND CRITICIZE EVEN METHODS OF ADMINISTRATION

Congress cannot administer, but it does have the duty to investigate the various methods of administration pursued by the different departments and even by the Army and Navy. There is not so much to be done on these matters by way of legislation, but the operations of the Truman committee show how effective investigation and criticism can be in securing an improvement. A large part of public dissatisfaction relates rather to these methods of administration than to the controls themselves. There is vast public dissatisfaction with the uselessly complicated questionnaires and red tape of the Office of Defense Transportation, though no one questions the necessity of controlling truck transportation today. The inequalities and the stupidities and complications of the rationing system have created public resentment against the Office of Price Administration, although some rationing is undoubtedly necessary. Businessmen are willing to have prices controlled, but they object to the arbitrary procedure of the Price Administration.

The truth is that these bureaus are full of theorists who have no administrative experience and have never had the slightest contact with, or knowledge of, the businesses they are trying to regulate. In the World War the Food Administration informed each

trade of the purpose sought by control, and asked the trade to recommend its own regulations. The Administrator made any necessary changes and asked the trade to enforce them. The regulations were fitted to the infinite variations of each situation, and the members of the trade were on their honor to obey. Last war we wrote into the price-control law elaborate provisions for trade committees and agreements upon which control could be based. They have been practically ignored. The Government bureaus have inherited from the New Deal a complete distrust of business and an attitude which treats every businessman as a crook until he proves otherwise. New controls are announced without consultation with those concerned, and acceptances demanded by threats of crackdowns. These methods are not the methods which secure cooperation and obedience from the American people. My impression is now that the November election itself has already effected some improvement. Constant investigation and criticism by Congress, such as that being done by the Truman committee and our Small Business Committees in the House and Senate, should definitely reform the conditions which have existed.

7. CONGRESS HAS THE DUTY OF DISTRIBUTING EQUALLY THE BURDEN OF THE WAR

Congress has the control over appropriations and Congress imposes the taxes. It is almost impossible to refuse appropriations claimed to be necessary for the conduct of the war, but the Members of the present Congress are determined that there shall be as little waste as possible. The Republicans have proposed a joint staff for the two Committees on Appropriations to investigate thoroughly every request of the executive departments. They are determined to eliminate everything that is not essential for the conduct of the war. The war expenditures themselves should be carefully scrutinized.

But at best war is a wasteful adventure. The public debt will be $200,000,000,000 by a year from July, and the very size of that debt threatens the value of all the savings which any American has made. In fact, apart from war casualties, the burden of the war is likely to fall more heavily on the owners of the property than on anyone else. The distribution of the burden between our citizens is determined primarily by the tax laws and the regulation of wages and prices. It is not an easy task. Everyone can see his own burdens, and the burdens of others appear to him to be light. We have gone into this war with the theory that no one shall profit from the war if we can prevent it. Excess profits of corporations are taxed at 80 percent and normal profits at 40 percent, so that more than half of all profits go to the Government, and the money left to corporations this year is considerably less than in 1940 and 1941. Wages have increased, but not much more than prices. Farm prices have increased, but not much more than farm costs. There are inequalities, and in order to prevent a still more dangerous increase of debt, Congress must increase taxes further.

It is the function of Congress to see that no group enjoys special privileges. In most fields it has succeeded, but it has probably been too easy in the case of labor. No regulation of labor unions has been imposed. The closed shop and the check-off have been extended far beyond their status at the beginning of the war. Congress certainly has the job of seeing that the growing strength of labor unions is accompanied by an equal responsibility, such as has long been imposed on corporations. It has the job of seeing that no man shall inspire a strike which interferes with essential production. The Government can force any employer to do anything which it demands, but it has no such power over the employee.

8. CONGRESS MUST BLOCK EXCESSIVE POWER AND OTHERWISE PRESERVE OUR DEMOCRATIC SYSTEM

There is no doubt in my mind that many members of the administration have deliberately sought power much greater than required for the war, for the purpose of extending the regulation of business and individuals with a view to the continuation of such regulation after the war. Every law that has been written has requested wide-open power. The President sought power to set aside all tariff and immigration laws because of a few minor provisions which interfered with the simplicity of war control. Because the Secretary of War desired to appropriate a few machine tools, a law was introduced giving him power to seize any kind of property, real or personal, in the United States. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation sought the right to form corporations to engage in any business whatever. The first draft of the inflation-control law proposed to give the President arbitrary power to fix wages and prices by any system which he saw fit to adopt.

Even before the last election, we were able to cut down very often the powers that were requested, but in most cases they were still wider than justified by war necessity. We have been able to attach a limitation in nearly every case to terminate the emergency grants of power when the war ends. But the end of the war is an indefinite time, and Congress must have the independence when the end of the war has in fact occurred to declare the termination of these powers.

For there is real danger after the war that an attempt will be made to extend these powers indefinitely. Under the guise of war, various New Deal projects are pursued forward. There is a proposal on the President's desk to put the Government into the business of lumbering and spend $100,000,000 in financing sawmills and so-called independent operators. It is claimed that the effort is only to produce more lumber for the war, but the people who are urging it believe in the socialization of our forests. The war was seized upon at once as an excuse to nationalize the employment services of the Union and to forward the nationalization of unemployment compensation, which has long been sought by the Federal bureaucrats.

After the adjournment of Congress and with public opinion concentrated on the war, the Securities Exchange Commission has issued new proxy rules, imposing a tremendous burden on corporations whose every effort is bent toward the prosecution of the war. At the last session an effort was made to push through a bill appropriating $300,000,000 for Federal aid to common school education on the ground that education was essential to the war. The people of the United States have indicated very clearly their doubt and distrust regarding the further progress of the New Deal, of a tremendous increase in Federal power, of an infringement on individual freedom and freedom of enterprise. Certainly it is the duty of Congress to hold open the entire question of social reform and Government regulation until we have finished the all-important task of winning the war.

Furthermore, there have been very obvious cases of usurpation of power, like the order limiting salaries to $25,000 after taxes, the Manpower Commissioner's orders freezing labor in industrial plants, and Office of Price Administration orders like that which prohibits pleasure driving. The tendency of Government departments today is to make laws as they please, with little regard to their statutory authority, and rely on the patriotism of the people to secure 50-percent compliance. Certainly it is the function of Congress to prevent the use of the war to extend and usurp Executive power. Undoubtedly many liberties must be suspended during the war, but Congress should be alert to see that no liberty is suspended unless it is absolutely necessary for success in the war. There is no use in fighting for freedom throughout the world if we wake up at the end of the war to find that we have lost that freedom at home. We must live under a rule of law or we will be no different from the Germans and the Japanese, whose lawlessness we condemn. Where more power is really needed, Congress can give that power by legislation. Undoubtedly it is more work to draft the right kind of legislation, but it can be done, and it can give the necessary power within the framework of our Constitution, and preserve those rights which American citizens must enjoy in wartime as in time of peace. Let me quote from the resolution adopted last month by the Corporation of Yale University the need of maintaining the fundamental features of American life even in time of war:

"The corporation wishes to impress upon Yale graduates and upon the general public the danger of the impoverishment of the Nation's mind and soul, should the less tangible values of our culture be allowed to shrivel while our energies are devoted to the task of winning a war to maintain them. Of what worth is freedom from want, if our minds be on a lower intellectual level; or freedom from fear if we have a less cultured life to defend; or freedom of speech if we have poorer thoughts to express; or freedom of religion if we bring a less enlightened faith to the worship of God?"

9. CONCLUSION

In short, the job of Congress is to take every act which will contribute in any way to the winning of the war, and at the same time keep open for decision after the war, or at least until the end is in sight, final decision on great controversial questions of policy. It must insure the ability of the people to return to a system of free enterprise and local self-government, a system in which only those laws can be enforced which have been adopted by Congress. It must leave the people free to choose between a nationalist policy or an internationalist policy, or any combination of the two.

The Spirit of Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at Chicago, Ill., on December 16, 1942.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, fellow Americans, America has ever been the land where the spirit of liberation has found a home.

This spirit of liberation—that which will free us from intolerance, bigotry, class and race hatred—we must feed into our very souls. Washington did it. Lincoln did it. Him whom the Christian world calls the Wayshower, a Jew who walked through Palestine 1,900 years ago, He did it. And George Washington Carver, a great Negro American, does it today. Many other living Americans are doing it. If we as a people want to make America a true master race—a race which will build a better world—we must all do it—

feed our souls with the spirit of the "larger freedom" in which there is no guile.

We must cast out the miasma of intolerance and hate and thus expand our freedoms. If we do this, surely His presence will go with this people as His presence went with Moses, with Washington, and with the great spirits of all time.

All the prophets, sages, and saviours of the race have emphasized the need of breaking through the veil of human limitation to an inheritance as children of one father—as freedom's children. This is an individual job, no one else can do it for another. It presents to each of us an opportunity for a glorious adventure.

The trouble with most of us individuals is that we have become groove-minded. We are deep down in the rut of our business or vocation so that when an opportunity for high adventure comes we are not ready for it.

You remember the story of Moses. He was told by the God of Israel to go down into Egypt to save his people, and Moses answered, even as you and I, "Who am I, Lord?"

In other words, "Who am I to do this job?—I cannot do it. I have no background, no experience."

But something happened to Moses which made him the great leader. He was told that "My presence shall go with thee," and he sensed the power that was in that message, and that made him the great leader.

Today we Americans are told "My presence shall go with thee." It is for us then to go forward with the might of the Almighty back of us, gloriously adventuring for God and country.

America in her beginnings saw the way and wrote the concept of equality into her basic law. Shall we present-day Americans observe our own law or become lawbreakers? We hear much said about the good-neighbor policy in connection with our relationship with foreign nations. It would be well for us to remember that this policy has special application within our borders and between ourselves.

America must never permit persecution of an individual, a group, or a race. We must take special care to see to it that there is no entering wedge of this kind now and in the post-war period. We know the technique of men like Hitler—blind men, hate-filled men. They have applied the rule "Divide and conquer" on every front. No one must ever attempt to apply that technique on the home front in America. This Nation has always been the haven for the persecuted. God made America great because of that fact—great that we might in the critical days up ahead prove equal to aid in the solution of the critical problems of a tired and war-torn world.

On the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor there are carved these words:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest tossed, to me!
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

And America said to every one of our fathers as they came to these shores:

"As you breathe the free air of our shores,
Homeless wanderer, reaching home,
Become one with us in freedom's cause,
Take the riches of our liberties,
And repay the gift by becoming one of us,
An American."

The world leadership America is called to now has not one iota in it of race or class hatred. As a free people, we are called upon to demonstrate to all peoples of the earth that we are free from Europe's outmoded concepts, especially such as pogroms, class persecution, race persecution, anti-Semitism, tautening of class tensions.

We must be on guard against the action of the demagogue. We must see to it that no one shall create cleavages among us Americans. We must get rid of the enemy within—not only within the Nation but within each one of us. Our fathers left Europe to get away from political oppression and terrorism and from political, economic, and social frustration, and here they found what they sought. Why did they find it here? Because that is what we, as a nation, meant when we wrote into the Declaration of Independence, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

We followed that basic statement by embodying in our Constitution and the Bill of Rights that on this continent the purpose of government was to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to all our people, and we said that government itself was prohibited from abridging the freedom of speech and press and from making any law in respect to the establishment of religion or interfering with the right of the people to be secure in their persons, and that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude except as a punishment for crime shall exist within the borders of this land.

In this hour of the world's travail it is up to each one of us, as pillars of the state, to appreciate what a great country this is. When we do that we will start cleaning our own mental temples. The human mind must be made clean. It must get rid of hate, greed, bigotry, intolerance, all uncleanliness. This can be accomplished by our churches, by right education, by each of us dealing fairly in business and elsewhere with our brother—applying the Golden Rule in our daily lives. There is a Chinese proverb which states the same truth in these words: "If everyone would sweep in front of his own doorstep, the world would soon be clean."

The challenge that comes to each one of us is this, How can I be more fit to aid my country in this crisis?

Lincoln answered that. In the critical war days he spent in Washington he recognized the need of having safety valves. That is why he was constantly telling funny stories. He knew that a sense of humor was imperatively necessary—a good story released the taut muscles, the shattered nerves, and made the closed minds of his advisers workable again. He found in prayer—simple communion with his Maker—another safety valve. He found in good reading, high thinking, and altruistic aid of his fellowmen another safety valve. No bigotry, no intolerance was his. He walked like the Master with his big hand clapsed to the hands of the lowly of earth. If we would be fit, we can imitate Lincoln.

These remarks express a deep-rooted conviction which I have. I am just one generation off from the sod of Europe. My mother and father were immigrants. My mother came to this country with her parents when she was 3 years old, and my father came immediately after the Civil War when he was about 19 years old. America to them was home—a glorious home of opportunity with friends and neighbors who stemmed from different racial roots, but who, like my parents, dug their roots deep into this soil of America and became a new breed—called the American.

My friends, until the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor most Americans were hoping and praying that we would not get involved in this war. We as a people were divided on the issue of intervention or nonintervention. But on December 7, 1941, when the dastardly Jap like a thief in the night struck at our outpost in Hawaii, snuffing out over 3,000 lives—from that date on, there was no question of what had to be done. Why? Because the Axis Powers had intervened in our peace and threatened our liberty. From that time on we—131 million Americans—became as one man, dedicated to the job of cleaning up the Axis and perpetuating the American way of life, on our continent, and everywhere else on the globe where people desire to accept the American way. And what a job we have done in 12 months! History has never seen the like—but that is another story we cannot tell tonight.

In the American way, as I have indicated, there is no place for any of the Hitler concepts.

Tonight our boys are in Africa under an American command. Up to date, for reasons satisfactory to the British Commonwealth of Nations, the Jewish people of Palestine have not been given an opportunity to fight, neither have the stateless Jews of Europe. We cannot take the time to discuss why this is so. I agree with the proclamation, signed by hundreds of the best citizens of this country, that those whom Hitler has persecuted—and he has killed their kindred by the millions—those who have survived certainly have a right to fight. I believe, further, that America should take an active hand in making possible the assembly of a Jewish contingent made up of the stateless Jews and the Palestine Jews. Let it be a sort of foreign legion in the American Army. These fathers and these sons would make one of the greatest fighting forces in the world. They are the direct descendants of the Maccabees, who knew why they fought and knew how to fight. If we brought about the creation of a Jewish contingent, we would not only be aiding the Jews but we would be aiding America. Manpower in this land is a problem. We read about it in every paper. It is a subject of continuous discussion in the Congress, and we have gone so far as to appoint a manpower czar.

We who are here tonight feel it is not adequate to simply feel compassion for the Jews of Europe for what Hitler has done to them. We proclaim it is the right of the Jews of the Old World to live in freedom and equality, enjoying the rights and privileges of all other human beings, and we proclaim it is their right to fight for their homes and their loved ones and join the ranks of the liberators.

It has been stated that probably a quarter of a million fighting men—the remnants of the tribes of Israel—could be raised to fight with the allies in Africa. They would make great fighters—fighting under the ancient banner of David. If this were done we would not have to transport as many troops to Africa. This would save our ships for transportation of foodstuffs and munitions and make sure that our 18- and 19-year-old lads would get adequate training. It would save some of our manpower which is so badly needed for production of munitions and foodstuffs in America. It would also make more men available for the Pacific front.

So, from every viewpoint it would be a practical, feasible thing to do—to arm and permit the Palestinian and stateless Jews to fight.

But over and above this question of practicality, America must take this step in order to save her own soul. We have always stood for the downtrodden of earth. We have always been the moral arsenal of the world. We know now compassion is not enough. Tolerance and good will will not do the job. We are dealing with Hitler and Hirohito—forces of darkness. So we have indeed a duty to perform. All of the oppressed of earth are looking to America. Why? Because here is the home of the "spirit of liberation." Here liberty obtains, and it is a flame which all the world may behold.

Therefore, we agree with the conclusion stated in the proclamation on the moral rights of the stateless and Palestine Jew. "We the people of America recognize the solution of the age-old Jewish problem in Europe as one of the objectives of democracy

and as a preliminary condition to permanent peace in the world. We recognize the right of these Jews to return to their place among the free peoples of earth, and we recognize their right to fight as fellow partners in this war against our common foe."

As free men in a free land tonight, we exercise the right of petition to our Commander in Chief, presenting to him our sincere convictions on this subject of the arming and utilization of the Palestinian and stateless Jews.

Let us Americans ever bear in mind what David said: "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble"—"He restoreth my soul."

William McKinley the Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a statement I made on January 29, 1943, at Niles, Ohio, at the McKinley Centennial Celebration, on the subject William McKinley the Man.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The brief statement cut into the stone on the McKinley Monument at Canton after paying tribute to President McKinley's career as a soldier and statesman concludes with the following description of him:

"Helper and leader of men—exemplar to his people of the virtues that build and conserve the state society and home."

Especially in Ohio it is these personal characteristics of William McKinley, the man, that continue to hold the personal affection of those who knew him personally or have known of his career. It is these characteristics, which on the one-hundredth anniversary of his birth, bring out a gathering of loyal friends at the beautiful McKinley memorial which has been erected at Niles, the place of his birth, in addition to that in which his body and that of his wife rest in Canton.

In addition to his distinguished career as a soldier, Member of Congress, Governor, and war-time President, we pay tribute to him as a man and we may well emphasize his personality, his family life, and his religion.

While he is a man whose courage responded to every demand of battle and of political or governmental contest, this courage was after all the natural product of a depth of conviction as to what his conduct should be which made all other conduct impossible for him, no matter what its hazard. He demonstrated this when, as a mess sergeant, he drove a mule team through heavy fire to deliver warm food to his men on the firing line. He demonstrated it again when he galloped through heavy shell fire to carry a message to a unit which had been separated from the rest of the troops and was in danger of destruction if his message did not reach it. He demonstrated this when he rose to the crises of the legislative debates in the House of Representatives and when, as President, he faced the issues of the Spanish War. The characteristic, however, for which he is more particularly and deeply remembered, is his understanding kindliness. He is one of the few Presidents who is said never to have lost his patience.

The faith of officials in him was so great and their recognition of his purity of motive so clear, that it brought forth such remarks as that of Senator Cullom, of Illinois, after McKinley had overruled the Senator's recommendation for an appointment in his State. He said: "Now, Mr. President, I could not get mad at you if I tried." This same sentiment was expressed by President McKinley himself when he remarked to Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, after they had disagreed on Philippine policy, that "I shall always love you whatever you do." McKinley loved his fellow man and thoroughly believed in the brotherhood of man.

Of all McKinley's characteristics, however, the one which has most deeply impressed itself upon the hearts of people of Ohio was his affection for and devotion to his invalid wife, Ida Saxton. McKinley also was deeply devoted to his mother. He was the seventh of her nine children. He was devoted to her throughout her long life. His wife was Ida Saxton, for whom he had the deepest affection, and for whom he cared so well that although she was an invalid she herself survived him. Their only two children died within 5 years after their marriage, and Mrs. McKinley was never strongh enough to be able thereafter to live a vigorous life, although her spirit and his care for her were such that she accompanied him throughout his career and on many of his trips. One of the best established of all personal incidents of his thoughtfulness of her is the habit which he formed while Governor of Ohio of always turning to wave to her in their room at the Neil House, as he crossed the street each morning to the State capitol. It is at this crossing that the McKinley monument now stands.

Even more characteristic of his continuing thoughtfulness is the tradition that every afternoon at 3 o'clock he would again wave to his wife from the window of the Governor's office, which likewise faces the Neil House. Her condition was constantly a matter of concern to him and it occurred on many occasions that he would leave a Cabinet meeting in the White House to respond to some need of hers. When he had been fatally wounded while attending the Pan-American Exposition at Buffalo, one of his primary concerns was again the effect which this might have upon his wife. It was, of course, necessary that she be told promptly of the incident but he turned to his secretary, Mr. Cortelyou, and said: "My wife—be careful, Cortelyou, how you tell her—oh, be careful."

Many incidents of his thoughtfulness, companionableness, firmness, tact, honesty, simplicity, altruism, and generosity can be told. The most important influence in his life, however, and that which is the best guide to his character as a whole, was the depth of his religious feeling. He joined the Methodist church at the age of 10. He was always devoted to religion and had the deepest faith in its importance, both to the individual and to the Nation. He responded to the inspiration of church music and among the hymns which were his favorites was Nearer My God to Thee. He wrote in May of 1899: "My belief embraces the divinity of Christ and a recognition of Christianity as the mightest factor in the world's civilization." He maintained that: "We need God as individuals and we need Him as a people." He was a regular attendant at public worship and he was deeply interested in the development of young people's organizations connected with religious work. At the dedication of the Young Men's Christian Association building in Youngstown on September 6, 1892, he said:

"The men who established this Government had faith in God and sublimely trusted in Him. They besought His counsel and advice in every step of their progress. And so it has been ever since; American history abounds in instances of this trait of piety, this sincere reliance on a higher power in all great trials in our national affairs. Our rulers may not always be observers of the outward forms of religion, but we have never had a President, from Washington to Harrison, who publicly avowed infidelity, or scoffed at the faith of the masses of our people."

He was fond of poetry which conveyed the message of religious inspiration and one of the poems from which he frequently quoted was the Song of the Mystic by Father Abram Joseph Ryan, which included the following favorite stanzas:

"I walk down the Valley of Silence—
Down the dim, voiceless valley—alone;
And I hear not the fall of a footstep
Around me, save God's and my own;
And the hush of my heart is as holy
As hovers where angels have flown!

* * * * *

"But far on the deep there are billows
That never shall break on the beach;
And I have heard songs in the Silence
That never shall float into speech;
And I have had dreams in the Valley
Too lofty for language to reach.

* * * * *

"Do you ask the place of the Valley,
Ye hearts that are harrowed by care?
It lieth afar between mountains,
And God and His angels are there;
And one is the dark mount of sorrow,
And one the bright mountain of prayer."

The war we are fighting today is due to the attack by ruthless enemies upon the very foundations of the Christian religion and the belief in the Golden Rule, the brotherhood of man, and the fatherhood of God, all of which lay at the heart of McKinley's personal and public thought. Hitler believes in only the power of force. McKinley believed in, and practiced, the power of love as taught in the Bible. The war of today is as deep as the soul of man. We need today that full depth of conviction that was the strength of McKinley's character and we fight to preserve the principles for which he lived and died.

The courage, firmness, and depth of conviction of McKinley would today find its counterpart in the response of Gen. Douglas MacArthur to his welcome in Australia, when he said:

"I have come as a soldier in a great crusade of personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery. * * * There can be no compromise. We shall win or we shall die, and to this end I pledge you the full resources of all the mighty power of my country and all the blood of my countrymen."

Training of Soldier Mechanics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by

Walter McCallum, dealing with the training of soldier mechanics at Aberdeen, Md., published in the Washington Star of December 26, 1942.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABERDEEN OFFICERS ARE PROUD OF SCHOOL TURNING OUT SOLDIER MECHANICS

(By Walter McCallum)

Blatantly the Nazis have admitted their best scientific brains have been given over to production of the implements of war. And blatantly they have proclaimed that their brains toward that end are the best in the world. Dr. Joseph Goebbels has admitted as much.

But the Nazi brain trusters have overlooked the fact that American science, once turned to war and production of the tools of war, does a better than fair job of outmasterminding the Axis. Some of the lethal tools for killing now being developed and tested at Aberdeen, Md., on the vast proving ground there, will shock Axis troops in the coming American offensives.

"If we find a scientist with something new in war-weapon design or development we want him," said affable Col. George W. Outland, commanding officer of the Replacement Training Center at Aberdeen. "This man's Army is open-minded on all phases of ordnance production. We don't say we have the best, but if anyone has anything better we want to know about it."

BARRACKS SPROUT OVERNIGHT

Colonel Outland happens to be a veteran ordnance man, one of the few officers who made up the numerically weak officer staff of Army ordnance a few years ago. Just 2½ years back Aberdeen was a sleepy Army post, its slumber punctuated at intervals by the "wham" of big guns under test. Then it turned out from its ordnance school, the only one in the country, by the way, about 15 ordnance officers and 150 enlisted men a year.

Proudly, Colonel Outland pointed to the expansion apparent in all directions at Aberdeen, where substantial barracks sprout overnight, where thousands of ordnance experts are being trained, and where the men to handle the machines of war and keep them running under all climatic conditions are learning their multifarious jobs.

"Our yearly output now exceeds 10,000 second lieutenants of ordnance," said Colonel Outland, "when even more specialists—enlisted men—and about 5,000 officer-students in specialized courses." That means in the handling of special types of ordnance and motorized equipment. But the apple of Colonel Outland's eye, and of Maj. Gen. C. T. Harris, Jr., post commandant, is the school which turns out soldier mechanics, the specialists who keep the wheels of war greased and turning smoothly.

SHOW SPECIAL APTITUDE

These men, having indicated special aptitude for such work, are taken from regular Army reception centers and sent to Aberdeen for highly specialized training. The scope of the job at Aberdeen is huge. Men are being trained as firearms mechanics, armorers, automobile mechanics, tank specialists, aviation ordnance specialists, munition handlers, bomb specialists, including bomb disposal experts, welders, electricians, carpenters, painters, and even cooks. I had lunch in a mess hall capable of seating a thousand men at one time.

Here Joe Doakes from Keokuk Center, who may have thought a few months back that he was an accomplished automobile mechanic, really learns how to keep the engines of war in operation.

"We make expert mechanics of men who never before handled a tool," said Lt. Col. Paul Kelly, director of technical training. "A lot of men come here with some mechanical training, and we really teach them the right track, really teach them to handle tools. Our work here is opposed to the alley mechanic training ground. The men are not trying to sell a gallon of oil or a spare part. They're here to keep the machines running. Our expertly trained men are trouble shooters who can sense trouble before it starts, and do something about it."

By early 1943 Aberdeen will have a capacity of 60,000 of these mechanics annually, turning them out to send them all over the world, wherever the machines of war move and fire, to keep them running.

LEARN POST-WAR TRADE

"In peacetime we could go along slowly," said Colonel Outland. "But now we must move fast and save time. We can turn out an accomplished automotive mechanic in 6 months. He may never have handled a tool before, but he will be able to do any job on a tank or automobile when he leaves this school. We have no morale problem here at the training school. The men realize they are learning something that will be invaluable to them after the war. They have the motive of personal gain. Many of them work long overtime hours teaching themselves how to handle tools."

In big, well-lighted laboratories labor the keen men of science, at drafting boards and with test tubes, turning out new things to confound our enemies. "These men are the unsung heroes of this war," said Colonel Outland. "They may never shoot a gun or see an enemy, but they turn out the ideas that make our arms the most effective in the world."

In a special section of the proving grounds, open only to visitors who come with proper credentials, is the tank laboratory. Here are all types of the lumbering machines of war, getting the grooming they need before moving into battle. Strangely enough, these elephants of steel are marshaled by dungaree-clad women. More than 500 trained women work in the shops at Aberdeen, actually testing weapons, tuning up tank engines, and keeping the guns in shape.

INTRICATE TESTS MADE

When a second lieutenant of artillery on some battle front cuts a shell fuse, he knows that shell will explode at the right time, because an ordnance expert at Aberdeen proved it. That mystical science of ballistics holds no secrets at Aberdeen. Ballistics in case you don't know, is the science of knowing what a projectile will do under any set of conditions, how it will act, the speed of its travel, its piercing capabilities—in short, how lethal it is.

Far out in the Maryland fields stand frameworks from which drop a network of wires, one network behind the other. Against these wires shells scream, breaking wire after wire, to set off automatic clocks which record the speed of the shell. Frameworks of armor plate stand against heavy buttresses, testing platforms for armor-piercing shells. Cameras, clicking with split-second precision, "stop" the shells part way through the steel plates.

Nothing about the way a projectile acts is secret from the scientists of ballistics at Aberdeen. "We recover much of the metal," said Maj. Harvey Rivkins.

Elaborate firing data by which for example, a gun crew may send a shell screaming against enemy positions behind a ridge miles away is figured out at Aberdeen. The place is a highly specialized scientific workshop for the weapons of war.

Characteristics of the guns used by American soldiers are worked out here. Shell and bullet ballistics are open secrets to the men of mathematics. Anywhere an American gun goes, whatever the caliber, along with it goes the firing data, figured at Aberdeen.

Pay-As-You-Go Plans for Payment of Federal Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received by me today from Mr. H. Grady Gore, a very prominent businessman of Washington, who was originally a Tennessean. In the letter Mr. Gore discusses the Ruml plan and other pay-as-you-go tax plans. The question is discussed from the viewpoint of a businessman and, I think, will have quite an appeal, and will prove to be very interesting to read.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 1, 1943.

Hon. TOM STEWART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR STEWART: You will recall that many months before the suggestion of the Ruml plan we discussed at length the necessity of Congress taking steps to bring the taxpayers of the United States into a current status concerning their income-tax obligations to their Government. This action was seen as necessary primarily for the reason that practically all taxpayers of the country had established the custom of paying their income taxes for each respective year out of income received in the following year; and that since that proportion of each taxpayer's income that is to go to the Government had reached such staggering heights it has thus turned the former custom into the citizen's greatest worry and fear. That while unintentionally upon the part of the originator of the income-tax idea, and those who have from time to time changed its basis of operation, it has actually turned into a trap, in that it will create debts against the people at a time when under sudden changed conditions we will be unable to meet such income-tax debts, and then your capitalistic system will be brought into disrepute.

To see the urgency of putting the country on a pay-as-you-go income-tax plan, with tax-collection-at-source feature, you only have to take into consideration one simple fact, that a very large percentage of our citizens are wholly engaged in war production and that by the end of the war the greater part of the citizens' income, throughout the country, will be directly or indirectly derived from the war effort. That upon the end of the war our country will go into a transition period, with industrial income very low, and millions of our people thrown out of employment or

their incomes greatly reduced, and, therefore, be unable to meet their large income-tax obligations for the preceding year. Thus you have your people caught in the income-tax trap. The pay-as-you-go income-tax plan, with its collection-at-source feature, will prevent such a situation from arising, because under such a plan the people will find themselves in a paid-up status concerning their income-tax obligations at all times.

The most practicable method in transferring from the old system of income-tax payments to the pay-as-you-go basis is simply to make a bookkeeping change, moving the income-tax calendar up 1 year, from 1942 to 1943, and let the payment that would otherwise be made upon the 1942 return be made, but let them apply to the payment of the 1943 obligation, thus canceling the 1942 liability. This procedure is now commonly referred to as the Ruml plan. I presume that the details of working out such a plan would be something along this order. That the new law would provide for monthly payments, instead of quarterly payments as heretofore; that taxpayers would file their returns for the year 1942 on or before March 15, 1943, just as they have heretofore; that payments made by taxpayers during the year 1943 would be made upon an estimated basis, using their 1942 return as a guide; the law might provide that upon the filing of this return on or before March 15 that 2 months' estimated taxes be paid at that time, and that on or before the fifteenth of each following month that an additional one-twelfth of the estimated tax be paid. And that upon the filing of the return for the year 1943 that the account be balanced.

Another important reason why it is imperative to adopt the pay-as-you-go plan, with its collection-at-source feature, is that the income-tax law now includes millions of citizens of the lower income groups who have never been able to accumulate and hold money reserves for any purpose, regardless of their greatly increased earning capacity during boom times, and unless these taxes are collected as the money is earned it would undoubtedly never be collected to any appreciable extent, thus resulting on the whole in a loss to the war effort, rather than an assistance, as the inclusion of the lower income groups was intended.

Another great advantage to be gained from the pay-as-you-go plan is that millions of citizens will be earning incomes during 1943 who were not earning incomes during 1942; especially the millions of women who are rushing into industry and other war activities, and under this plan the Treasury will immediately begin to receive taxes on these millions of dollars of new earnings. Under the present plan the taxes on these new earnings would be from 12 to 24 months away. The Government needs these taxes now!

There are slight objections, of course, to this bookkeeping change of the income-tax calendar. One is that heirs of parents who died during 1942 would not have to pay income taxes on the income earned by their parents during that year, but the high estate or inheritance tax takes care of this. Also a loss will be sustained because many people had incomes during 1942 who have since lost their businesses and for various reasons will not have such an income during 1943; for instance, the people engaged in the automobile business, and other lines of endeavor, which have been sacrificed in the interest of the war effort; also the millions of soldiers who gave up good positions with good incomes during 1942, will be giving their services during 1943 to their Government, but, when considering the realities of this situation, I would be willing for this loss to be sustained. However, should it be the judgment of Congress that these taxes be paid and in order that there be no windfall cases, such could be embodied into the Ruml plan by providing in the law that the taxpayer will pay taxes for the year 1942 or 1943, in whichever they had the greater income.

The adoption of the pay-as-you-go plan for income-tax payments by the bookkeeping entry of moving up a year the income-tax calendar, which has the effect of canceling the 1942 liability, would perhaps at first thought, appear to be a windfall to the taxpayers of the United States; that it would afford them great savings, or that there would be no taxes to be paid this year, but that is not the case. You will go right on paying your taxes, as heretofore, except that the pace will be accelerated from a quarterly to a monthly basis. All people who paid taxes last year, would pay taxes this year, and also, the millions of new income earners would pay taxes this year. The difference would be, that Congress would put the citizens on a pay-as-you-go basis, and when the war ends, we would be paid right up to date with our income-tax obligations to the Government, and could give all of our thought, time, and efforts, to the task of reconverting our institutions to the peacetime basis. So you see, what the Ruml plan really means, is that Congress is looking ahead, and working out a plan now, that will keep its people from becoming overburdened, at any future time, regardless of what conditions may arise, that they will always be on a paid up-to-date basis, which will place the people in the best possible condition to tackle any task.

We do not want this income-tax trap to continue to exist, because it will create millions of defaulters, out of people who do not possess the faculty of saving, thus bringing about among the common people, a disrespect for the whole income-tax system, after they have been harrassed by agents, seeking to collect tax money, that they have long ago spent. That is why we need action from Congress, putting the people on the pay-as-you-go plan, with collection at source, thus removing these hazardous positions, into which our people will find themselves.

Keep in mind that under the pay-as-you-go plan, there will be no let-up in making income-tax payments to the Treasury. The only change is the period of time for which the money will pay, and the benefit derived by the change will inure to the heirs of each taxpayer, at the taxpayer's death, and that only to the extent that the taxpayer will have his debts to the Government paid up to date. Therefore, there is no living taxpayer who will benefit in dollars and cents from this change of moving the income tax calendar up 1 year, except through inheritance, and again, as heretofore pointed out, that has been amply cared for by high estate or inheritance taxes. Under what is known as the Ruml plan every living taxpayer will continue to pay taxes as they have heretofore done, and will continue to do so as long as they live, and at their deaths they will be paid up to date to the Government on their income-tax obligations, instead of being 1 year behind as heretofore.

The real beneficiary of the change is the American way of life, in that it makes it possible for the citizens of the United States to be relieved of their greatest worries and fears, and prevents them from becoming overburdened and confused. In short, it removes the trap, that would after the war require greater performances of the American system, than it could possibly render; thus creating in the minds of many people, who would not understand that the impossible had been asked, that the American financial system had failed to function. Under the pay-as-you-go plan it will be hard indeed for the American way of life to break down, even though it becomes necessary for the citizens to pay into the Government every penny of their net incomes. We would still have intact our homes, our farms, our businesses, the American system and our courage, and we would be paid up to date, and with these assets we will rebuild America. Congress, I am sure, will see to it that we hold on to these necessary tools, because the sacrifice of any of them would not aid in winning the war, but would greatly handicap our future efforts. We would be placing all of these in jeopardy should Congress permit the people to remain in the income tax trap, with their large income-tax debts to the Government at the close of the war.

To make a strong citizenship with strong public morale, the best thing that can be done is to keep the people current in their financial obligations. The Government has wisely advocated such a policy to the people in their business dealings, and it is equally as important that we stay free of debt to our Government. When the citizens can look the whole world in the face, and feel that they can meet all of their just obligations, that citizenship is in position to face any possible task. The pay-as-you-go plan, will give us just that.

In addition to the plan suggested by Mr. Ruml, of moving up the income-tax calendar 1 year, thus letting the taxes that the people pay during the year 1943 pay for the year 1943, there are several other plans that have been suggested. First is the suggestion of paying 2 years' income taxes in 1 year, that is, paying both the 1942 and the 1943 taxes during the present year, thus putting the people on a pay-as-you-go basis, at the beginning of the year 1944. This, of course, was the original idea and the original plan that we discussed, and would be the best plan today, if Congress felt that the people could stand the burden. Personally, I feel that the time has passed, or in other words, that the schedule of rates has now been placed so high that such an effort at this time would not be wise.

Take for granted that the income-tax rates for the year 1943 would not be raised over that enacted for 1942, you can determine from a glance at the schedule of rates that a person would only have to earn as much as $50,000 net income a year to be required under this plan to pay into the Government more than his entire net income; for net earnings of $100,000, they would be required to pay $130,280 or $30,000 more than their total net income; for net earnings of $200,000 they would have to pay $302,280, or $102,000 more than they made; for net earnings of $5,000,000 they would have to pay $8,749,232, or three and three-quarters millions of dollars more than they made. I believe that to require the payment of 2 years' taxes this year would throw a great number of our industries into bankruptcy, and at a time when every ounce of their energy is sorely needed in the production effort. As serious a situation as this method would create, it is still much preferable to any plan that would pass this debt over to be paid after the close of the war.

Also it has been suggested that the taxes for the year 1942 may be passed over until 3 years after the close of the war, and then amortized over a 5- or 10-year period. This, in my opinion, would be worse than not doing anything about the income-tax matter at all, and when you consider that Congress has the right to regulate the rates from year to year for income-tax payments, this suggestion becomes valueless. The people know now that if they cannot pay this debt now, when their income is the highest in history, that it would be worse than folly for them to believe that they could pay it after the close of the war, at a time when they will have less income and be engaged in trying to rebuild their country. Congress should know that when this debt is passed over, that the

people will not expect to have to pay it, and the courts will become clogged with estates, etc., that cannot be finally liquidated on account of this contingent liability for this 1942 income tax, which they will not want or expect ever to have to pay. Just imagine the burdens that would be placed on all the citizens, when they have to place this debt on all of their financial statements, which will in millions of cases prevent them from being able to obtain necessary credit. As difficult as our present predicament is, it can be made worse.

Why would Congress want to pass this debt over to some future date, when they have the right to add any amount that they see fit to the citizens' income-tax liability, at any time they see fit to do so? For example, instead of passing the debt over until 3 years after the war, or passing it over for any period, why not cancel it and let your citizens be in the clear until that date arrives, and then, if you see that the people can stand to pay a greater amount of income taxes, and you feel that it is for the best interest to have them do so, then all Congress has to do is to add the amount that it would like to have paid at that time.

Still another suggestion is that it be passed over and held as a financial obligation of each citizen as long as they live, and that it be taken out of their estates after their death. Could it be the judgment of Congress that any good could come from making the financial affairs of its citizens more complicated for all of their natural lives? They would be required, of course, in every application for credit from their banks and elsewhere to set up the amount of this debt, etc., and that in as much as taxes are prior liens on estates, millions would be refused credit just for this reason. I do not believe that such a plan would get far with Congress, when all that Congress would have to do, should it want more money at the death of its citizens, would be to raise the estate or inheritance tax. All pass-over suggestions are just simply confusing to the people and would have utterly no value, especially when you can plainly see that the objective can be so easily achieved by Congress through instrumentalities of its own. The people are not complaining of any obligations that Congress may see fit to place upon them, and they are willing to pay taxes to their full ability, but they do not want to see this debt passed over under any plan.

The prize suggestion, or the one that has no democracy embodied in its make-up, is the one that suggest the cancellation of the 1942 income taxes on all citizens whose income is in the lower brackets. The mention of such a plan is not helpful. All the people must have confidence in their Government and this cannot be achieved through favoritism, or class legislation. Even the low-income group, favored under such a plan, would not appreciate it and would become fearful of their Government. Nothing breeds respect like the same treatment for all; no discrimination.

If Congress saw fit, it could cancel the liability for the year 1942, and add any part or all of the sum so waived to the 1943 tax bill. Therefore, what is gained by passing over and holding such tremendous burdens over the people, which will create endless difficulties for them, when Congress could so easily arrange the matters involved by adding whatever amount it desired be paid to the current tax bills, and thus we would be paying currently at all times.

Under the pass-over plans how could any Congressman know what the total tax requirements of citizens would be, and soon under such a procedure, you will find many people called upon to pay into the Government in taxes each year, more than their total net incomes. If the matter is kept in its simplified form, which the Ruml plan provides, every Congressman would know the total requirements of each group of citizens, because it would all have to be set forth in one place—the 1943 schedule of rates.

To sum up briefly what the Ruml plan is, or should be when adopted, you have the three following items: (1) Pay as you go, which gives the Treasury immediate collection of taxes for 1943, especially important in the collection of taxes on all new earnings of millions of women who have gone and are going into industry; (2) collection at the source of income of wages, salaries, dividends, etc., which will save millions annually; (3) let the taxpayers pay for the year 1942 or 1943, the year in which they received the greater income. This will add millions and prevent windfall cases.

What we want is for the year 1943 to break all records for income-tax collections, and if the above three provisions will not give that, then raise the rates for 1943. The people are willing to pay when they have the money with which to pay. We ask for the enactment of the Ruml plan because that will prevent us from being called upon to pay when we do not have the money. We have in mind the year following the war.

Sincerely yours,

H. GRADY GORE.

The Farmer and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting editorial entitled "The Farmer and the War," which was published in the January 28 issue of the Farmington (Conn.) Valley Herald.

This editorial points to the seriousness of the agricultural situation in Connecticut and offers suggestions as to how conditions might be improved in Connecticut. The suggestions made insofar as Connecticut is concerned would likewise apply to agriculture in all of the other States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER AND THE WAR

The way to correct the food shortage is to do something about it. The way to make the shortage worse is to do nothing more than is now being done by the bureaucratic experts in whose intentions we are asked to have implicit faith.

Today, in addition to the job of keeping our civilian population and the troops in training here in fighting trim, we must also cope with the tidy problem of supplying adequate quantities of food to our own and allied troops abroad and must plan to feed a goodly portion of the globe, once the war is won.

Yet the trend of farm production today is less and less, instead of more and more. The cart is hitched before the horse, and we are traveling backward fast.

A few livestock figures from the single Farmington Valley Township of Canton are typical, and mirror the general downward trend:

	1942	1941	Decrease
			Percent
Horses owned	72	80	10.0
Cattle owned	800	846	5.4
Poultry owned	5,326	6,180	13.9

Cutting farm production is not the way to get more produce from the farms, and the farmer, who has never lost his ability to add up two and two to get the answer four, knows this apparently better than the white-collar agrarians in Washington who have supervised our farm production along this backward course.

Milking cows three times a day instead of two, or building fishponds on every farm—both of which suggestions came from the Department of Agriculture—or any dozen of countless other visionary plans now germinating in the minds of the swivel-chair farmers, cannot offset the cold facts of decreased production from the grass roots up, nor camouflage the obvious truth that the farmer needs practical, common sense cooperation which thus far he has not had.

Locally, the farmer cannot sell milk at 7 cents a quart and pay wages to compete with munitions industries. Nor can he work his farm properly without adequate tools.

To farm harder, he must have more farm help, as well as good, workable machinery for them to use.

No matter who it hurts, if three basic policies were adopted and enforced, it should go a long way toward assuring more produce from our farms:

1. Essential farm labor should be deferred from military service, in recognition of farming as a most essential war industry.

2. Farm machinery, now frozen, should be thawed out, and more new farm equipment manufactured as vitally important weapons of war.

3. Provision should be made for the farmer to pay his help more in keeping with earnings in other essential industries, by increasing the prices on certain items of produce which he cannot raise and sell today at a profit.

With these policies in force, the farmer will stop slaughtering his cows and letting rich, tillable soil go to waste, because it will no longer be necessary for him to do so.

The farmer himself will get busy at the job of increasing farm production from his land. This is his war, too, and he knows it, and it will have been made possible and practical for him to go to work in deadly earnest, with adequate help and efficient tools, at his vitally important job of producing food for a nation at war.

Time for the Bureaucrats to Take Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal bureaucrats and their communistic friends over long have been sowing the wind; and if they do not watch their step, they are going to reap the whirlwind. The summer-heat lightning showed up in the sky November 3 when the people indicated that they had had enough from those who would destroy this Government by subterfuge.

The real thunder and the real lightning and the cyclone's blast will come if official Washington does not mend its ways.

Let me quote from a letter just received:

I enclose two communications from companies in which I am a stockholder, among the number that have come to my personal attention.

There has been a steady stream of this dirty politics, and the end, I suppose, is not yet. The great urge is to get votes and give hell to any decent business and fair play.

The two enclosures read as follows:

ST. JOSEPH ACQUITTAL

To the Shareholders of Swift & Co.:

Perhaps you have read in your newspaper or elsewhere in recent months that Swift & Co. and others in the livestock and meatpacking industry have been indicted in several cities on charges that we have violated Federal antitrust laws. The charges have been denied in every instance because we know they are not true.

The first case to come to trial was at St. Joseph, Mo., where Swift & Co. and two of its employees, also others not associated with Swift & Co. were charged with having conspired to control the price of hogs on the St. Joseph market.

The case went to trial June 1, and on June 8 the jury brought in a verdict of not guilty thereby exonerating Swift & Co., its employees, and all others in the case.

It is most unfortunate that the time and energy of so many of our important people must be devoted to the necessary defense of these cases when our efforts are so urgently needed in our business.

JANUARY 22, 1943.

To the Stockholders of the Timken Roller Bearing Co.:

Your company has just received a directive from the National War Labor Board which, because of its importance, we feel should be made the subject of a report to you.

On August 3, 1942, your company received a request from United Steelworkers of America (Congress of Industrial Organizations), the union with which your company has had a contract since 1937, to commence negotiations for a new contract. These negotiations were promptly begun and were terminated on August 14 by the union. During the course of the negotiations various things were discussed and changes in the contract agreed upon. The negotiations were ended with the refusal of your company to accede to the union's demands for a 5½-cent-per-hour wage increase retroactive to February 15, 1942, a union maintenance-of-membership clause, a check-off of union dues, and the refusal of the union to have inserted in the contract a no-strike clause with teeth in it, as proposed by your company.

Subsequently, upon application by the union, the case was referred to the National War Labor Board and was submitted to a panel appointed by that Board. The panel was composed of three men, none of whom has ever had any connection with or knowledge of the roller-bearing industry. We were not allowed to appear before the Board.

The directive issued by the Board, which is based upon the recommendations of the panel, grants to the union the union maintenance-of-membership clause, the check-off of union dues and the 5½-cent-per-hour wage increase, retroactive to February 15, 1942. The Board has also directed your company to insert, in the contract what the management of your company feels is a valueless no-strike clause.

On the matter of wages, when the case was presented to the panel we pointed out that your company had been, from its foundation, primarily engaged in the manufacture of tapered roller bearings; that 75 percent of its employees are now engaged in the manufacture of tapered roller bearings; that such steel operations as it has conducted and is conducting were incidental to the manufacture of bearings; that in August 1942 the average hourly wage paid in your company's plants was 10.78 percent higher than paid on January 1, 1941. In addition the Board was apprised of the fact that the 1941 contract between your company and the union established wage rates during the life of the agreement. This agreement did not terminate until August 23, 1942 (20 days after receipt of the notice requesting the commencement of negotiations for a new contract). Notwithstanding the undisputed character of the data on the subject of wages, the Board has undertaken to find that this company is a basic steel company and has used this pretense as the basis for ordering the payment of the 5½-cent-per-hour wage increase retroactive to February 15, 1942.

The much publicized Little Steel formula adopted by the Board provides that the average hourly wage should be increased 15 percent from January 1, 1941, to May 1942 to compensate for increase in cost of living. Application of the formula in your company's case would call for an increase of 3.44 cents per hour. The increase ordered by the Board results in an increase in wages of 59 percent over the "Little Steel" formula and is in plain violation of the terms of the 1941 agreement.

On the matter of the union maintenance-of-membership clause, the check-off and the no-strike clause, we supplied the Board with extensive information concerning the union's record as to labor stoppages and strikes in our plants since 1937, totaling 12 in number. In addition, it was shown to the Board that union representatives who had participated in the strikes, all of which were in violation of the terms of the contract then in existence between the company and the union, were promoted to higher and better jobs in the union. Your company maintained that no union with such a record of irresponsibility was entitled to perpetuation through the medium of a union maintenance-of-membership clause with check-off of union dues.

This record is entirely disregarded by the Board with the observations, first, that the Board has accepted the union's statements that the strikes were unauthorized by the union, and, second, that the union's representatives have sincerely pledged themselves not to cause any further stoppages during the war.

In the no-strike clause proposed by your company, the following provisions appeared:

"Refusal to work with anyone because of race, color, creed, national origin, or religious, fraternal, political, or other affiliations or refusal to use materials from other union or nonunion plants or any plants on strike, shall be construed as a strike within the meaning of this contract."

Without explanation or comment, the panel, supported by the Board, has seen fit to remove this paragraph from the no-strike clause.

The management of your company strongly feels that the directive of the National War Labor Board is not founded upon fact and is in plain disregard of the terms of the 1941 contract between the company and the union. As a matter of fact, it appears to the management that the effect of it is to destroy the principles of collective bargaining between your company and the union.

You, of course, keenly realize that our country is engaged in the prosecution of a war, the extent of which almost defies imagination, and that the aim of every citizen should be the successful prosecution of that war. Accordingly, the management of your company is constrained to accept the directive of the National War Labor Board and to recognize the order as a condition under which we must operate for the duration of the war.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing from a constituent in the Fourth Congressional District is typical of the feeling throughout the Nation—at least, in that part which lies west of the Alleghenies and east of the Rockies. Our people have had enough. While they are patient and long-suffering, there is a limit to their endurance.

Affairs in Our Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station WNBF Saturday, January 30, 1943:

Men and women and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth District, once more it is my privilege to bring to you through the courtesy of station WNBF my weekly observations of affairs in our Nation's Capital. Once more it is my privilege to talk directly to you folks back home whom I am proud to represent in Congress. This is better than letter writing, it is almost as good as speaking to you all face to face. As your Congressman, I am grateful for the marvelous advantages of our present day of scientific progress. How else but through the medium of radio could I bring a weekly message to you in form of the spoken word while it is necessary to remain close to my official duties in Washington. I fear that Members of Congress of a half century ago must have been way out of touch with their people when we consider lack of communication for which the radio now makes up.

Of course in those days, I am told, Congress only stayed in session about 3 months of each year. This is in sharp contrast to the last 4 years when both House and Senate have remained on Capitol Hill practically all the time. In former times, Members of Congress, I understand, did not enjoy as close contact with the folks at home. Nowadays, however, the people have realized the necessity of their keeping in touch with their only direct voice in the Government. The people have learned that in order to have the Congress pass legislation in their interests rather than for the advantage of selfish groups and individuals, they must let their Congressmen know how they feel about important issues of the day. I say to you folks tonight that the closer attention you focus upon Congress, the better laws you will get. The more you insist upon being heard in Washington, the less you will be in danger of losing your rights, your personal liberties and your priceless heritage of America.

Therefore I urge you all in the Thirty-fourth District for the sake of preserving everything at home for which our boys are fighting so bravely and so hard, to keep in touch with me by writing as often as you can. I am always glad to hear from you. I welcome your thoughts, complaints, advice, and suggestions. By writing me these, you not only give me information about what people

in my district want and how they feel but you also make me a better representative because you give me better understanding of your problems. Remember, I am your servant, desiring only to reflect your wishes and desires to the best of my ability. This is the very cornerstone of our American form of government. Take the direct voice of you folks away from your Government and you have left only a dictatorship. I am pledged to the preservation of our American system as long as I am in Congress.

While I am on the subject of letter writing, I will tell you about a rather interesting fact of which I am very proud. According to a newspaper article I read a short time ago, my colleague, Mrs. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, whose national reputation as a brilliant writer is glamorous indeed, stated that she is receiving 150 letters a day from all parts of the country. This is surely an amazing number. Be that as it may, however, and Mrs. LUCE'S national prominence notwithstanding, your own Congressman receives 50 letters a day from his own 4 up-State New York counties of Broome, Chenango, Delaware, and Otsego.

These letters I receive are not fan mail; most of them are written by people who need assistance with their many problems. These letters I receive come from people who are in need of allotments from their soldier sons and husbands. They are without funds in many cases and must have money from Uncle Sam to feed and shelter their children. These letters I receive are written by friends back home who have wondered and waited long months for some word of their boys in service. They have asked me to supply them with information about their boys. In many cases I have been able to do this. It is a great satisfaction, I assure you.

Many other letters I receive come from small businessmen who are just about frantic with all the confusion developed by various bureaucrats trying to concentrate power and authority in their own hands. These small businessmen are the backbone of private enterprise. Unless the Government changes its arbitrary attitude toward these private entrepreneurs, there will be little revenue from what is left of private business in 1943. Frankly, I am alarmed and disturbed about the fate of small business. I assure the gentlemen who write me on this subject that I will be very glad to go to bat with the War Production Board or with the Office of Price Administration here in Washington if they have any complaints which they feel I can help them with.

Among the current subjects you folks are writing me about these days is the all-important matter of our income taxes. Practically everyone who has expressed any opinion at all is in favor of a pay-as-you-go system to meet this necessary obligation.

In just 49 days the heaviest tax bill in human history will sock the American people. Are you ready with your cash in hand? Well, who is? Obviously, the Nation is not prepared to carry the burden being thrust upon it.

All but a very, very few of us are already in debt to the Government on taxes, and in the era of heavier and heavier taxes to come, have no chance to escape.

Except one.

Last fall a New York City businessman and financier, Beardsley Ruml, offered to the Government a plan to turn the tax clock ahead one year and pull the country out of debt.

It is a plan of sound common sense, not of magic. It has been acclaimed and approved in principle by the President of the United States. Only the details need to be juggled around to meet particular arguments.

Nearly everybody knows the Ruml plan by now, but just in case you feel need of a refresher, here it is:

Under the present system of taxation, the citizen earns his income one year and the next year he pays taxes on those earnings. The practical result is that most people would in 1943 be paying taxes on their 1942 income out of 1943 earnings. Meanwhile, tax debt against the 1943 earnings would be piling up without the citizen having enough reserve on hand to meet that.

And so, in 1944, he would enter a new tax period still in debt. If he should die in 1943, he would put upon his estate the burden of paying the full taxes on 1942 income, the taxes on whatever 1943 income he had received, and the usual estate taxes.

Ruml's plan would forgive the taxes on 1942 income and start us all on a fresh footing as of March 15, 1943, on which date we would pay the first quarter's taxes for this year. Then we could keep current from here on out. At death the citizen would owe only estate taxes, plus whatever part of one quarter's income taxes remained unpaid.

There is no problem of revenue loss to the Treasury of any significance, for the Treasury's financing is based on tax income it receives, not on the basis of what it is due.

And so, in order to receive whatever it needs, the Treasury, under the Ruml plan, needs only changes in tax rate to make up its losses caused by dropping out of past debts.

The Ruml plan is sound; it has national approval. We are all waiting for it to become law.

I believe the minority in the House of Representatives has shown smart judgment in calling on the leadership of the Ways and Means Committee to get on with this monumental job now, regardless of whether the Treasury Department is ready to participate.

Last year, when it was as obvious that we would get a heavy tax bill as it is obvious this year the tax system must be revised, the Treasury stalled and stalled at giving its expert opinion on the size and shape of the bill.

Not until March 3, 1942, did Secretary Morgenthau and his brain-trusters get up to Capitol Hill with their formula.

That put the Congress in the position of having to pass the world's most gigantic tax schedule in just 12 days to make it effective by March 15, 1942, when taxpayers paid their first installments on 1941 income.

But the 1942 tax bill did not actually become law until October 21, 1942, so that the Nation was in the dark for more than three-fourths of the year as to what it would have to start paying this March 15.

Stalling on the pay-as-you-go tax principle is even worse than stalling on the size of the bill.

For if the pay-as-you-go plan is to work for 1943 it has to be finished law by March 15, 1943; which again, is just 49 days away.

Chairman ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of the House Ways and Means Committee, which will have charge of drafting the new law, says he is in favor of going ahead with hearings early this week, whether the Treasury is ready or not.

Putting Men Where They Will Do the Most Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sheldon Sun, Sheldon, Iowa, of January 20, 1943:

PUTTING MEN WHERE THEY WILL DO THE MOST GOOD

What is more important toward winning the war and preventing world-wide anarchy after the armistice than to provide a bounteous food supply?

While there is now some evidence that the big-shots in Washington are beginning to realize the importance of maximum farm production, there are still too many essential farm workers being taken into defense plants and into the Army.

Many farmers of advanced years and physical infirmities are obliged to sell out and move to town, not being able to get suitable farm help. You can't turn a complex farm over to a couple of greenhorns and expect it to produce, any more than you can turn a business in town over to some inexperienced transient and expect it to operate. A farmer's son, reared on the land, and knowing every little detail of the farm's operation, is worth two or three itinerant farm workers who might be hired for help even if such workers were available. One mistake on the part of a grist-mill farm worker can soon cause a whole herd of swine to become ill and die, or break up a valuable tractor or other piece of machinery.

Finding a good man for the farm is quite different than hiring one to carry a hod of bricks or work on a railroad section. Unless action is taken at once to keep good men on the farms (and we don't ask for more than are absolutely necessary for any one farm) the day is very close when there will not be farmers available to farm the land being vacated March 1 by those who are now closing out.

When this time comes we will face a critical situation. It is rumored, and these rumors are not verified, that farms in the Spirit Lake area and in some parts of Minnesota are already destined to be reclaimed by Nature this spring because no farmers are available for them.

If we were representing this State in the United States Congress, or were Governor of Iowa, we would make sure that the proper keymen in Washington were appraised of these facts and that disaster-preventing action be taken before it is too late.

In our opinion if a young man of military age is well trained to work on his father's farm or any other farm, he can do more toward winning the war there than he can in a military uniform. The national interest is best served by putting young men in positions where they will do the most good toward throttling Hitler and his heinous henchmen.

Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the national headquarters of the Military Order of the Liberty Bell:

THE MILITARY ORDER
OF THE LIBERTY BELL,
COWART, VA., *January 27, 1943.*

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress, House
Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: As commander in chief of this order it is my pleasant duty to

advise that our national executive committee has, after careful consideration of all pending measures looking toward vocational training, given unqualified endorsement and support to your bill (H. R. 1189). Not only do we endorse and support your bill, but we also desire to express to you our sincere appreciation of and gratitude for your work.

Our rapidly growing order, formed last year, has as its slogan "Equality always." Our membership is comprised of men with pride in rendering or having rendered honorable and faithful service in our armed forces. Among the objectives of our order, as stated in our constitution, is fair and reasonable economic status for members of our fighting forces and reasonable as well as equal protection against the hazards of service.

The basis of our endorsement of your bill (H. R. 1189) is that it provides for equality. It is devoid of discrimination. Another bill also given careful consideration by our committee was H. R. 739 and which was rejected as discriminatory in that it would provide vocational training only for those disabled in line of duty after the start of this war and prior to its ending. That bill is unjust. It is unjust in that it discriminates against the men disabled the day before or the day after the war period. It is unjust in that it is bad for the morale of the man behind the gun and against the best interests of our country which requires and must have the very highest order of defense.

History of the immediate past and on back as far as history is recorded fairly screams a warning to Congress; a warning that the best interests of our country are not served by legislation which separates our line of duty disabled into classes according to dates disability was incurred.

Rome, in its greatness, cared for the service disabled. It provided cash pensions for men disabled in service by disease, injury or years of service. Roman soldiers, who garrisoned the Holy City at the time of Our Saviour, were so protected. True, this protection was a burden upon the people and was eventually curtailed. But this saving proved expensive economy; Rome crumbled and fell. It fell because it lacked protection and lacked the inspiration to the people that comes through adequate national defense.

Our ancestor England first protected its servicemen by providing them with licenses to beg upon the highways. History doesn't show when that started, but it does show that it was stopped in 1592 when provision was made for cash pensions for line-of-duty disabled. Regardless of what we may think of the world politics of England during the last 350 years, we must admit that the feats of its fighters have been magnificent. Those feats, and the high morale that made them possible of accomplishment, all stemmed out of the proposition that government was assuming the hazards of service.

In this land the Colonies, to some extent, provided pensions for those disabled in public service against the Indians. Congress, during the Revolutionary War and upon the insistance of General Washington, enacted laws under which government assumed the hazards of service. The very act creating our Regular Army carried with it protection for the soldier against disability.

Thus, down through the ages, civilized nations have always assumed the hazards of service as an obligation. That obligation comes out of the proposition that pay of the services has never, in any nation, been high enough so that the individual could personally assume the hazards. Decent governments have never taken young men into the service at the peak of health and vigor, consumed their usefulness, and then dropped them without earning power to suffer hunger and cold. A government which would do that could not long exist because of the very order of things.

In 1862 that statute called the general law was enacted. It provided in original form and as amended down through the years for pensions for line of duty, death, or disability. Under that statute there was equality. Pensions were equal for equal disability. There was no discrimination of any kind due to date disability was incurred. That statute provided equality down to the First World War.

It was with that First World War that Congress embarked upon a mistaken policy of group legislation in pension matters. Persons entitled to line of duty death or disability pensions were grouped according to dates death or disability was incurred. The career enlisted man disabled in a nonwar period was sorely discriminated against; his lot upon disability, regardless of length of service or number of wars participated in, was a miserable one carrying with it misery, hunger, and cold.

Among all those groups into which Congress, by legislation, divided the disabled, the career man was given the extremes in care. The career officer was given retirement at three-fourths pay and which I believe averaged about $187.50 per month. That was the highest order of care given any group of disabled. At the other extreme was the career enlisted man from whom Congress had withheld disability retirement (except as to the Coast Guard) and whose average pension was but a very small fraction of that of the retired pay of the officer.

The record of the career man down through the years is wholly devoid of the least particle of indication that he is an inferior citizen rendering inferior service and properly entitled to inferior care when disabled. We are all agreed that in this war we have shown superiority in weapons, in aircraft, in surface craft, in subsurface craft, in ordnance, and in methods. That superiority comes only because of the superior service rendered through the years by the career man; by the man who at meager pay and often without flight pay carried on year after year in development of aircraft and other weapons. Certainly the records of the career men at and since Pearl Harbor are of the very finest. No man can say those records have the slightest tinge of inferiority.

There are those who argue that service in a war period is of more value than service in a nonwar period and therefore worth more to the country. On that proposition we have taken no position. But certain it is that if war service entitles to greater reward then that reward ought to go to all who render that service and not be confined to those disabled while rendering that service.

We may ascribe many reasons for this war but the real reason is that the Axis dared to attack us. As war threatened we sought to increase our Army. Volunteers in sufficient number did not appear. For the first time in our history we drafted men in a nonwar period. We had to take the unwilling as well as the willing; those suited as well as those unsuited for service. There was substantial reason for dearth of volunteers. Many youths declined to accept the economic status of a soldier which was far below that of the Civilian Conservation Corps boy in terms of pay and protection. Scattered over the country were 33,000 disabled career men seeking to exist on pensions far below the standards found necessary as a minimum for other citizens temporarily unemployed. While we were trying to expand our defenses under those conditions the grinning Jap observed and struck. It may well be that had Congress given greater attention to the career men; to their pay and disability protection and general economic status, the Jap may not have dared attack us.

In this lengthy letter I have endeavored to set out the principal reasons why your bill, H. R. 1189 is splendid in principle and ought to be enacted in preference to any measure which would discriminate against the career man. I hope that Congress will awaken to the realization legislation-making groups and classes of disabled is unfair to individuals rendering honorable service. Of even more importance is the fact such legislation does not serve the best interests of our country.

Assuring you of the gratefulness of this order for H. R. 1189 and the fairness therein involved, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER JOHNSON,
Commander in Chief.

Poems From Zion's Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me, I insert in the RECORD two poems which appeared in Zion's Herald of November 11, 1942.

The first poem is a Prayer Hymn, by Frank D. Howard of Chicopee Falls, Mass. Mr. Howard is one of the most prominent Methodist laymen in New England and is widely known as the donor of the Frank D. Howard Fellowship Fund of Boston University School of Theology. While a student at this institution it was my good fortune to win this fellowship which enabled me to study abroad and naturally I shall always feel deeply grateful to Mr. Howard, whose generosity has made it possible for many young men to further their education. The poem he has written at the age of 85 reveals the true spirit of his great soul. "The Christian aspiration that has motivated his life finds fitting expression in it."

A PRAYER HYMN

(By Frank D. Howard)
(Tune, Abends)

O Lord our God, to Thee we pray
For light and guidance on our way.
As we press forward through the years,
Grant us release from doubts and fears.

We would be kind in thought and deed,
To all Thy precepts giving heed.
When we incline to go astray,
Reveal to us Thy better way.

Faith, hope, and courage, Lord, we need
And for these virtues now we plead.
Cleanse Thou our hearts from every wrong
For all our toilings make us strong.

O Master, for our souls' great race
Endue us with abundant grace;
And while we onward, upward go,
Increase our zeal Thy love to show.

Create in us Thy kingdom, Lord.
May all our wills with Thine accord.
Be Thou our Guide; from sin set free,
Help us keep faith, O Lord, with Thee.

Mr. Speaker, the second poem, Lest We Forget, by Earl Marlatt, was written for last Armistice Day. Dr. Marlatt was a lieutenant in World War No. 1 and is now dean of Boston University School of Theology. He and I were classmates at this institution and he was elected Jacob Sleeper Fellow at the same time I was elected Frank D. Howard Fellow. I consider it one of the greatest privileges of my life to have studied with Dean Marlatt, not only at Boston University

but also at universities in Europe. He has won wide acclaim as a versatile poet, and possesses one of the most brilliant and creative minds I have ever known. He is truly a modern prophet of good will and a great lover of beauty.

LEST WE FORGET

(By Earl Marlatt)

Down the ages, riding, riding,
Moves a restless cavalcade:
Wraiths of unremembered soldiers
Who were young and unafraid;
Ethiop, Mede, Athenian, Roman,
Teuton, Kelt, Crusader, Jew,
Loyal to a land or vision
Of a world they never knew.

Comrades roused from poppied dreaming
In a field where vultures fly
Follow on but question mutely
Where they lost their way and why.
Phantoms hovering over crosses
Whisper, "Have we died in vain?"
Ghosts from mountainside and ocean
Chant, "It must not be again."

We who live, because they suffered,
In a world they died to free
Must not desecrate their valor
Or delay their jubilee:
Only when the peace they dreamed of,
And the comradeship they found,
Have outwitted greed and malice
Will they rest in hallowed ground.

NOVEMBER 11, 1942.

Office of Price Administration "Bright Boys" Lashed for Chaos in Ration Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely and pertinent article by one of America's foremost authors. I firmly believe that Mr. White's observations are an accurate commentary on the general public attitude toward the mismanagement and confusion in our national rationing program:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION "BRIGHT BOYS" LASHED FOR CHAOS IN RATION RULES

(By Stewart Edward White)

It occurs to me that it would be an excellent idea if Washington would select from its staff a sample of the eager young law school graduates who write its various documents, directives, amendments, forms, and instructions, and send him out on a visit to all the ration boards in the country. He should be picked by lot, in order to avoid any suspicion that he has been especially chosen for propaganda purposes. His only function should be to exhibit himself. Five minutes would be to prove that he has no cloven hoofs, no pointed barbed tail, and no horns.

Right now each and every board member and assistant is firmly convinced of his ingenious diabolism. No ordinary human being, without Satanic assistance, could think them all up. Right at this moment we are on the verge of the issuance of Ration Book No. 2. Even the young lawyers at Washington admit this is going to be quite a task. It will repeat, with frills, all the mechanism of No. 1, and coffee, and rubber, and gasoline. Even the Washington bunch admits that, and urges that the public be educated "to condition them for full understanding of the scope of the job."

ONE WOULD THINK

One would think, indeed, that it would be sensible to leave the decks clear for handling of it. You don't know the boys. They have decided now that they want reports, and in order to fill in the leisure moments they are getting out a whole new series of what they call reporting instructions with numbers on them such as OPA R-562, OPA R-563, OPA R-551, with supplementary revisions, also numbered, with rationing letters thrown in for good measure.

They are admirably specific. They want to know a whole lot of things—how many cars; what kind of cars; what cars are excluded from listing here, and why; what is to be entered on "line 4" and why, and so on. There are, up to this day, 3 of these instructions, containing in the aggregate 9 sections, under which are just 42 explanatory subsections. I shall not try to list them or tell about them. I do not like to feel my head spin. But here's a sample, just shows you how the juvenile legal mind works.

"F. Part II. Lines 2, 3, and 4. Data for these lines shall be tabulated from the Document Register OPA Form No. R-181. In the following paragraphs, references are made to symbols entered in column 7 of the register. Instructions for entering these symbols on the register are provided by 'Accountability: Gasoline: Operating Instructions Number 1.'"

ENDLESS JOB NOW

What these birds seem to want—and once a month, mind you—is simply a report of how many books have been issued; for how much gasoline; and for how long. To get that simple information, in the exact manner specified, means digging into files, cross-referring to a mass of long-past documents of instruction, and intensive study of this present spate of legalisms.

Furthermore—and here is an important point—those files could have been arranged with all this in view, if the bright boys had only let it be known before instead of after all the filing had been done. But not they. That would have spoiled their record.

And just to top it off, this morning comes Reporting Instruction No. 4 that says, "In the process of reproducing OPA Forms R-562 and R-563 the continuation sheet which should have been printed on the reverse side of Form OPA R-562 was inadvertently printed on the reverse side of Form OPA R-563 and incorrectly numbered." So straighten that out, doggone you!

BEYOND PATIENCE

Really, this sort of thing is getting beyond all patience. Incompetence is all very well in moderation. We expect trial and error in a big job in war time. But when it becomes an insult to common sense, and when it penalizes the wrong people who are doing their best at a thankless task, it is time somebody did some firing.

I saw a picture the other day of the "staff of young lawyers who place in proper form the regulations under which the Office of Price Administration mechanism operates." They are just off the legal nursing bottle, r'aring and eager to use all the complications they used in law school. We do not need young lawyers. We do not need exact legalisms. Our local boards need plain statements of the desired results, and the authority to get them in their own way. Maybe they would not always get them 100 percent. But they would get a workable majority of them done, and that is what we want in wartime, not airtight court law for young lawyers to squabble about.

On second thought it might be just as well not to send that sample young lawyer around to prove they are not devils. He would be lynched before he got this far west. And I would not blame them. It has about reached the point of break-down in this sort of thing, and it would be an excellent idea to write your Congressman to tell him so. I am going to send mine a copy of this. If something is not done to send the young lawyers back to their nursing bottles, we either shall not have any rationing boards at all, or else more members of these boards than there are motorists.

Sponge Iron

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, sponge iron, found in abundance in North Carolina and a number of other States, has made a substantial contribution to the ordnance in every war in which our Nation has been engaged. Because of technical developments in the processing of other types of iron ore and because the deposits of these other types of ores furnished a sufficiency for our peacetime needs, sponge iron has become a neglected resource.

Recently, two important events have changed this picture entirely. First, our country is facing a serious shortage of steel. The iron deposits which are being worked are not proving adequate to our enormous wartime demands. Second, the discovery of the Brassert process for the treatment of sponge iron has made certain an economical and feasible development of our enormous deposits of this valuable ore.

North Carolina has tremendous deposits of sponge iron. She also has the labor, the electric power, and the coal necessary for processing this ore. Our distinguished Governor, the Honorable J. Melville Broughton, has brought these facts forcefully to the attention of our Government and our people. Governor Broughton's statement is as follows:

PROGRESSIVE AMERICANS

The Nation faces a serious shortage in steel. North Carolina offers to help relieve this war-effort-hampering shortage through her tremendous resources of iron ore.

Manufacturers coming to North Carolina are assured ideally located factory sites and an adequate supply of raw material.

A steel shortage "can't happen here" if North Carolina is given an opportunity to help pour into the furnaces of America's gigantic steel industry the production of modern sponge iron plants.

We have in North Carolina the iron ores.

We have in North Carolina untapped coal deposits from which can be taken coal of chemical composition and physical properties that is ideally suited for the processing of sponge iron.

We have in North Carolina native-born labor, and electric power which can be diverted for use in sponge iron plants.

Tens of thousands of North Carolina boys are in the armed forces, and North Carolina wants those boys and their comrades-in-arms from other States to have the tanks, the

planes, the guns, and the bullets that will assure them victory, a victory that is possible only if the steel shortage is ended.

Cordially,

J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON,
Governor of North Carolina.

I should also like to draw attention to a report of the able and diligent subcommittee of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which, under the chairmanship of my distinguished friend the gentleman from Alabama, the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN, emphasizes the necessity of fully developing our lower-grade ores throughout the Nation if the steel shortage is to be overcome. The following brief excerpts from this interim report—Report No. 2743, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session—are extremely important:

The ceaseless bickering and the intolerable attitude shown all proposals which would demonstrate the merit of the sponge-iron processes and the delay in getting the benefits of this process under way is largely attributed to the state of mind prevalent in War Production Board Iron and Steel Branch. At the present rate of mining of high-grade iron ores at the vast Mesabi Range open pits, exhaustion is expected at about 1945. The extent to which this significant threat to the whole war economy is understood, and has been provided for by action of the agencies responsible, calls for further inquiry and examination.

The committee, however, is already fully satisfied that there is in the United States iron ores in amounts which are adequate. If small business is permitted to participate in the efficient well-distributed manner known to the Axis and to this country in previous wars, there will be iron and steel produced in an abundance that is capable of supplying the full war requirements of both the Allies and this Nation and with plenty more for the thousands of items now denied civilians.

Such production management calls for broader perspective and a genuine urge for victory. Progressive ore mining and beneficiating have yet to make their maximum contribution, and there is room for practical iron and steel producers who dare to pioneer.

Were the hundreds of small local enterprises—the mining and little blast furnaces that were put out of business in recent decades—permitted to stage a come-back with Federal relief favors of new equipment, the basic economy of almost every State in the Union would be materially improved, the total contribution to the war effort would be enhanced, for it would tap sources of manpower of a quality that cannot be shifted economically to the already congested steel centers.

In our judgment this procedure is necessary and should be adopted as a measure essential to win the war and to assure our own and the Allies an adequate supply of steel. The present situation is a continuing menace to our success in the war and to the maintenance of rational economy.

I should like to draw the particular attention of my colleagues to the following article on sponge iron, written by Waldemar Kaempffert and carried in the New York Times of December 20, 1942:

SCIENCE NEWS IN REVIEW

(By Waldemar Kaempffert)

SPONGE IRON—BRASSERT PROCESS SOLVES STEEL MAKERS' PROBLEM

A hullabaloo has been raised about sponge iron, as if it were something new and as if we had done nothing about it to aid the production of steel. Sponge iron is as old as iron itself. It has always been a problem in the foundry, a problem, moreover, which has engaged the attention of metallurgists for generations and which at last has been solved by Herman A. Brassert, an expert metallurgist who has designed and managed blast furnaces all over the world. The War Production Board thinks so well of his process that it has appropriated $450,000 which the Republic Steel Co. is to spend in building at Youngstown, Ohio, a 100-ton-a-day plant designed by him.

Iron as a metal is rare in nature. It occurs chiefly in meteorites. The ore that we call iron is really a combination of iron and oxygen—rust to most of us. The oxygen must be burned out to obtain metallic iron.

At first charcoal was used as a fuel. The iron thus produced was always spongy because it was mixed with slag. This spongy iron was covered with a gangue (something like ash in coal and therefore an impurity). It did not run freely out of the furnace because the temperatures were too low. In Queen Elizabeth's time foundrymen worked the spongy iron in various ways to force out the slag but, since much still remained, the metal was not pure enough for many technical purposes.

Use of coke as fuel

By the early seventeenth century wood was so scarce in England that the charcoal-fired furnace was no longer able to meet the demand for iron, especially iron for cannon. The blast furnace was therefore introduced, with coke as the fuel. At once it became possible to erect furnaces near coal mines, with the result that England was able to meet the continental demand for cannon. But the coal contained such impurities as carbon, sulfur, and phosphorus, and these had to be removed in supplementary processes.

To burn out the impurities iron is nowadays passed into a second furnace. Steel makers have always wanted a process which would make steel directly from the ore. Scores of patents have been issued for solutions of the problem. Until Brassert came along there was no economical way of making good steel in a single stage from the ore. Directly produced sponge iron, the product of the first furnace, never could compete with indirectly produced iron and steel either quantitatively or qualitatively.

Like all extraordinary innovations, the Brassert process could not be developed until a technical heritage had accumulated. One new fact had to be dovetailed with another. Relationships had to be perceived to which most engineers were blind. We find, then, that Brassert has combined the most modern developments in ore dressing and in powder metallurgy to obtain a pure, dense melting stock, out of which steel can be made.

Ore first crushed

First of all Brassert crushes the ore to a powder. Next he separates the metal-bearing component from its impurities by gravity, flotation, magnetic, or other approved and inexpensive means. This powdered ore is fed not to the usual blast furnace but to a Herreshoff furnace—a huge vertical cylinder with about 11 floors or hearths. In the furnace are rotating rakes, called rabbles. These slowly push the ore over the hearth to the discharge opening on each floor. On the upper hearth the ore particles are merely dried. As they slowly journey downward from floor to floor they are preheated, roasted, calcined, partly smelted. Finally they drop on the hottest and lowest floor—the reducing hearth. Here they are converted into approximately pure iron.

On the reducing hearth the mineral is blown to the discharge opening by the hot reducing gas, which consists mainly of hydrogen. The ore becomes almost liquid, so that it flows in a stream 6 to 10 inches deep. Heavy particles advance slowly, light ones rapidly, so that the rate of travel more nearly coincides with the rate of reduction than was possible before. The rotating rakes or rabbles constantly stir the hot reducing gases, keep the stream of ore particles fluid and break up pockets of gas. As a result the ore particles are not only retarded as they move but are turned over and over. When they are thus converted into new-born iron they drop down a chute to a briquetting machine. Here they are compressed into briquettes in a reducing atmosphere of 500 pounds pressure and more.

For the moment the object of the Brassert process is to enable foundrymen to produce a metal of constant quality and to do away with the high-grade scrap so essential when electric furnaces are used. The superintendent of an open-hearth or an electric furnace can mix his Brassert melting stock with other metals and minerals in any way that he pleases to obtain high-quality steel. He can specify the character of the melting stock to be produced and rely on a steady supply of constant composition. Foreign substances are no longer his bane when he must make high-quality steel from scrap of unknown origin.

Not all ores yield pure briquettes. When the ores are impure the briquettes are fed into a cupola where the molten slag is separated in the usual way from the metal.

Length of process

The temperature of the hot reducing gases in the Brassert process is about 1,100° F. when the ore is eastern magnetite. In a blast furnace the temperature of operation may reach 3,200° F. Lower temperature clearly means less fuel.

Ore becomes iron when its oxygen is removed. The Brassert process accomplishes this removal in 3.5 hours with eastern magnetite, and the ore obtained is 90 percent pure. A higher degree of purity can be achieved if the process is prolonged, but this is unnecessary when only melting stock for electric or open-hearth furnaces is wanted.

A 1,000-ton-a-day Brassert plant could be built in less than 6 months at a cost of about $2,500,000. It would take a year and more to build a blast furnace of equal capacity, and the cost would be about $10,000,000. Only about 1,250 tons of structural steel (including gas-treating and reduction equipment) is needed, compared with 6,500 tons for a blast furnace of equal capacity. Supervision is largely a matter of watching the indicators of instruments. Repairs are infrequent because the operating temperatures are so low.

More than the sponge-iron problem is solved. A Brassert plant is so light that it can be transported easily, and the fuel requirements are so low that they are easily met almost anywhere. It follows that it is now possible to develop small high-grade ore deposits all over the world in accessible regions.

Requisitioning of Metal Materials for War Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, with a desire to cooperate to the fullest extent possible with the war effort the Cleveland City Council, on January 18 last, passed the following resolution which I hereby make known to the Congress:

An emergency resolution declaring that it is the sense of this council that if and when the Government of the United States of America determines that any metal materials

or metal structures are needed for war purposes, that the same shall be made available to the Government for war purposes through the process of requisition.

Whereas requisitioning of metal materials and metal structures for war purposes is necessarily in the interest of a speedy and successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas it has come to the attention of this council that metal materials and metal structures are scattered over the entire city which could and should be made available to the Government by requisition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the council of the city of Cleveland:

SECTION 1. That it is the sense of this council that if and when the Government of the United States of America determines that any metal materials or metal structures, whether individually or municipally owned, are needed for war purposes, that the same be made available to said Government for war purposes through the process of requisitioning.

SEC. 2. That the clerk of council be and he hereby is directed to transmit forthwith a copy of this resolution to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt; Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board; Congressmen Bender, Crosser, and Congresswoman Bolton, and Congressman-elect Feighan.

SEC. 3. That this resolution is hereby declared to be an emergency measure and, provided it receives the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members elected to council, it shall take effect and be in force immediately upon its adoption and approval by the mayor; otherwise it shall take effect and be in force from and after the earlier period allowed by law.

Adopted January 18, 1943.
Effective January 20, 1943.

Food for America and Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as spokesmen for "the great bulk of family farm production in the Nation," Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange; Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and Ezra T. Benson, executive secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, have issued a statement asserting that only the American farm family stands between the United States and hunger.

They are unanimous in the opinion that immediate steps in the formulation of adequate agricultural policies and programs are imperative if we are to avert grave food shortages.

The statement follows:

Today the American farm family stands between a large part of the world and hunger.

Only through the initiative, the ingenuity and the hard work of our farm families can our people, our armed forces, and our allies possibly be fed.

American farmers are handicapped and the food supply for the United Nations jeopardized by:

1. The Government's manpower and labor policies.

2. The confusion and loss of confidence created by an impractical and wasteful bureaucracy more concerned with social experimentation than the production of food.

3. The policy of using subsidies in lieu of a fair return to the farmer in the market place.

As spokesmen for the national farm organizations, which represent the great bulk of family farm production in the Nation, it is our unanimous opinion that an immediate right-about-face by Government on these policies is imperative.

We emphasize the vital necessity on the part of Government to take such steps promptly as will restore the confidence of farmers and end confusion.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of subsidies in lieu of a fair return in the market place. The Department of Agriculture has announced a program of so-called incentive payments for the production of certain crops. We insist that these payments as now projected are nothing but subsidies disguised. Despite repeated protests, it continues to be the policy of the administration to restrict returns to farmers by ceilings and to attempt to compensate them by subsidies with their attendant uncertainties. For the first time in 20 years, normal adjustments in the national economy, if permitted to function, would put the farmer on an equal basis with American labor and industry.

We warn that any economy which does not pay the cost of its food bill will inevitably collapse. If this situation persists, we consider it a grave danger to the Nation.

We insist on price control policies which will assure maximum production as the best protection against both inflation and hunger.

We urge an immediate reduction in nondefense expenditures and in the volume of directives sent out from Washington. We also urge a decentralization and restriction of the enormously expensive bureaucracy which polices these orders.

Finally, we recommend that immediate assurance be given American farmers by the Congress and the administration of their intention to preserve agriculture as an independent and self-supporting industry.

ALBERT S. GOSS,
Master, The National Grange.
EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.
EZRA T. BENSON,
Executive Secretary, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

Vital Stepping Stone to United States World-Trade Advance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Foreign Commerce Weekly of January 23, 1943:

VITAL STEPPING STONE TO UNITED STATES WORLD-TRADE ADVANCE

(By Thomas E. Lyons, Department of Commerce)

The success of Yankee merchants of the clipper-ship era is periodically recalled as indicative that we are a nation of natural-born foreign traders, and that this heritage has been passed down through succeeding generations. Some of us still cherish the idea that since we have been inherently a nation of foreign traders, it may be taken for granted that this lucrative international traffic will continue uninterrupted. We often overlook the fact that the whole fabric of conducting foreign trade has been rewoven since the golden days of the *Donald McKays* and the *Flying Clouds*.

CLIPPER-DAYS TRADING

In accepting an outmoded theory, we complacently pass over the reality that during clipper-ship days the trader accompanied his merchandise abroad and all transactions were closed before the goods were removed from the vessel. The ship itself was the warehouse, and, if profitable transactions could not be negotiated in one foreign port, the ship's master gave the "up anchor" order, and the floating warehouse was shifted to another harbor where trading was resumed. Except in infrequent cases of disaster or damage to ship or cargo, the merchandise usually reposed safely on board until ownership and title had passed to the foreign buyer.

In exchange for his goods, the American merchant purchased foreign commodities which were stored aboard ship for the homeward voyage. In these early days many foreign products were much in demand to meet our domestic requirements. Merchandise of foreign origin, when entered through customs and sold by the importer, moved immediately into domestic distribution channels. In event a part of the merchandise was intended for resale in some third country, it was stored in the warehouse of the owner until ready for reexport.

The tempo of business of the clipper-ship days was geared to a "place economy," and when imported goods were available there were buyers ready and willing to purchase them. Otherwise, if foreign merchandise was not at hand, buyers complacently awaited the unpredictable arrival of another argosy to supply their immediate needs. The problem of meeting future requirements, if it existed, was left to solve itself.

PROCEDURE REVOLUTIONIZED

The advent of the steamship accomplished something more than the ultimate demise of the sailing vessel—it revolutionized foreign-trade procedure. Ocean shipping rapidly developed into a separate and distinct business and, for all practical purposes, passed from direct control of the merchants themselves. The practice of the trader or his representative accompanying shipments to foreign markets was discontinued, and instead, agencies or branch offices were established in import foreign-trade centers to represent merchants. Manufacturers with exportable surpluses and those requiring imported materials entered directly into the field of foreign trade.

The advantage of speed and reliability of steam-propelled vessels, along with the development of transoceanic cable communications, and more recently the radio and telephone, enabled merchants to schedule arrival of their shipments to take favorable advantage of market conditions.

INJURIOUS NEGLECT

The transition from sail to steam caused another wholly unanticipated result—in effect, it drove the American flag off the high seas. Although the American ship *Savannah* was the first to employ steam propulsion in her historic 1819 trans-Atlantic crossing, the commercial development of the steamship and the application of iron and later steel for hull construction were left to European nations. The results of this neglect were disastrous.

In 1860 the United States merchant marine engaged in foreign trade consisted of approximately two and one-half million gross tons of sailing ships and less than 100,000 gross

tons of steam vessels. During the same year 67 percent of our foreign trade was carried in American bottoms. By 1914 our merchant fleet engaged in foreign trade had shrunk to less than three-quarters of a million tons of steam-propelled vessels, and the picturesque sailing ship had all but disappeared. Less than 10 percent of our foreign trade was carried in American-flag vessels at the outbreak of World War No. 1 in 1914. In contrast, the leading European maritime nations had substantially increased their commercial fleets, and during the years following the War between the States, foreign-flag vessels were carrying the bulk of our international waterborne commerce, as well as their own foreign trade.

FOREIGNERS WON ADVANTAGES

The ultimate effect of our withdrawal from the field of international shipping was more far reaching than the loss of direct benefits derived from the industry itself. It gave foreign maritime nations an opportunity to divert trade channels to their own ports and to develop exclusive primary markets for exotic commodities which our Yankee traders had formerly obtained directly from the producing areas.

Foreign governments, alert to the commercial advantages which their fast-developing merchant marines offered, sponsored laws and decrees designed to extend their facilities for handling this indirect trade. Continental countries having high protective tariff schedules extended or enacted bonded-warehouse laws and authorized the setting apart of harbor areas as free ports or foreign-trade zones to encourage this lucrative trade.

EARLY FREE PORTS

Genoa and Leghorn, established in 1876 and 1883, respectively, were the first free ports as these are known today. For several years prior to 1888, Hamburg's Senate defiantly ignored Bismarck's edict to enter the German customs union, until provision had been made to perpetuate her great free port. Similar facilities also were established in Trieste, Bremen, Copenhagen, and other European ports. Altogether, about 30 free ports or foreign-trade zones were established in European harbors extending from the Baltic to the Aegean Seas.

About the middle of the last century, Great Britain, consistently a free-trade or low-tariff country, repealed its unpopular corn laws and navigation acts—the latter which restricted to British ships importations into Britain from Asia, Africa, and America. As a result, the entire country in effect became a great foreign-trade zone, and many British seaports developed important transshipment and consignment traffic in specialized commodities of commerce—traffic that has been retained up to the present day.

WHY HAVE WE BEEN SLACK?

Although entrepôt trade is the inalienable handmaid of a successful merchant marine, until recently the United States has made little effort to develop either. The vicissitudes of our merchant marine are well known, and no purpose would be served by repeating them here. The reasons for our failure to develop our portion of international consignment trade—estimated by the Tariff Commisison in 1922 at more than $4,000,000,000 annually—have not been so well understood.

BONDED-WAREHOUSE SYSTEM

About the time that Great Britain was repealing its navigation acts and corn laws (1849), our Congress enacted legislation providing for the customs bonded-warehouse system as it is known today. The functions of these early public bonded warehouses were limited and merely permitted the storage of dutiable merchandise for a period of 1 year provided a bond for double the amount of the duty was given. Later, the time which bonded goods could remain in warehouses was extended to 3 years. No provision was made for examination or withdrawal of a part of the consignment. These rigid restrictions presented little or no opportunity for the development of transshipment and reexport trade.

DRAW-BACK PRIVILEGES

Supplementing bonded-warehouse statutes, Congress in 1861 extended the so-called draw-back privileges. Under this procedure an importer, instead of bonding his goods, may pay duty on the entry and then, if goods remain in continuous customs control, draw back from the Treasury, on their exportation within 3 years, 99 percent of the amount of the duty paid. Studies by the Tariff Commission indicate that the relief offered by the draw-back law, except in the sugar and tin-plate industries, has been relatively small, and that scores of industries in this country that use foreign materials to produce goods for export do not exercise the privilege because it is so hedged about with exacting and intricate regulations. This is evidenced by the fact that the draw-back refunds paid by the Treasury Department during the past 10 years averaged only slightly more than $10,000,000 annually.

ALLEVIATION ENVISAGED

Far-seeing legislators and commercial interests early recognized the difficulties besetting the development of our foreign trade and shipping and, before the close of the last century, proposed measures to alleviate the situation. In 1894 a bill was introduced in Congress to permit foreign-trade zones in this country. Similar bills were introduced in subsequent Congresses during the 25 years that followed. Although the Sixty-seventh Congress failed to take action on the foreign-trade zone measure, it added a new section to the 1922 Tariff Act, providing that with the permission of the Secretary of the Treasury, and under customs supervision, and at the expense of the proprietor, merchandise may be cleaned, sorted, and repacked in bonded warehouses and withdrawn therefrom for exportation without the payment of duty.

This provision, section 562, was added after a representative of the Tariff Commission testified that, if our importers were permitted to repack goods of foreign origin in the United States, so that they could include in their shipments some American-made and some foreign-made goods, it would greatly increase our position as a producer for Mexico, Central and South America, and Canada.

PURPOSES NOT ACCOMPLISHED

Experience of the past 20 years conclusively demonstrates that the manipulation privilege extended by the 1922 act has not accomplished the purposes which its sponsors had expected. This is no summary conclusion of the present writer. The statement is based on observations of an individual in an eminent position to know, a former head of the Warehouse Division of the United States Customs Service at New York. Late in 1940 this former official, who spent nearly half a century handling bonded-warehouse matters for the Customs Service, made the following comment regarding manipulating privileges extended by section 562 of the Tariff Act of 1922: "The customs records at New York will bear testimony to the fact that, during all these years, manipulations as provided for have been few and of a trivial character."

As more than 50 percent of our imports are entered and one-half of all customs revenues are collected at the port of New York during normal times, this former customs official's statement regarding manipulations may be safely taken as representative of manipulations in bond in other customs districts. However, if further proof is required, the experience of the port of Mobile may be cited. In 1939 a bonded manipulating warehouse was opened on the State-owned docks, intended to replace the short-lived foreign-trade zone which had just been closed. A recent examination of customhouse records at Mobile reveals the enlightening information that not one occasion has been offered to use the manipulating privilege since the warehouse facility was started 4 years ago.

DISADVANTAGEOUS POSITION

Although section 562 of the 1922 Tariff Act was designed to relieve that part of our foreign commerce which was not intended nor ready to enter our domestic trade, many importers and foreign-trade interests felt that the restrictions and formalities involved were not calculated to encourage trade and commerce. Opportunities for freedom in the manipulation and transshipment of cargoes which were available in at least 43 strategically located foreign fields placed the United States in a clearly disadvantageous position for competing with European trade centers.

FOREIGN TRADE ZONE LAW

To overcome these disadvantages in 1934 Congress enacted the Foreign Trade Zone Law. The legislation, sponsored by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, had the unanimous support of all foreign traders, port interests, and Government agencies. The purpose of the statute is to provide enclosed and policed areas, under Federal supervision, in or adjacent to our ports of entry, where foreign and domestic merchandise of every description, unless prohibited by law, may be landed without application of customs laws. In a zone goods may be stored (without restriction as to time), processed, refined, or otherwise manipulated. Manufacturing as such is prohibited. If reshipped to foreign countries goods may leave the zone without intervention of customs officials. Such products cannot leave the trade zone for domestic use or consumption without full compliance with existing customs requirements.

Although this law was enacted more than 8 years ago, only one locality, New York, has taken advantage of its provisions. During the year just closed, harbor officials at Houston, Tex., and New Orleans, La., filed applications for the establishment of foreign-trade zones in their respective ports.

THE STATEN ISLAND ZONE

Early in 1937 a foreign-trade zone was established on the municipally owned piers and adjacent upland on Staten Island. Built shortly after the First World War, these facilities had seldom been used during the intervening years. That this zone has successfully performed its function of fostering and promoting our foreign commerce is clearly reflected in the cumulative summary of activities for the 5 years that it has been in operation. During this period 11,790 lots of merchandise, weighing 451,000 tons and valued at $205,000,000, have passed through the zone. Duties collected on that part which entered the United States amounted to $6,688,745. The gross operating income for the 5-year period totaled more than $1,500,000.

During 1 year (1940), 70,000 tons of foreign merchandise, valued at $13,000,000, or 50 percent of all the foreign tonnage handled, were transshipped or reexported to 60 foreign countries. For emphasis, let us restate in slightly different language: During 1940, 1 out of every 2 tons of foreign merchandise brought to the zone for manipulation or storage was reshipped to a foreign destination.

FACTS SPEAK CONVINCINGLY

Since the opening of the New York foreign-trade zone, hundreds of thousands of cases of South American canned meats, $50,000,000 worth of Sumatra tobacco, thousands of tons of Brazil nuts, entire shiploads of tungsten ore, Brazilian cotton, Mexican garbanzos, and many other commodities have been manipulated there. On many occasions, upward of

500 people have been engaged in the various zone manipulations at the same time. Some operations have been conducted on a 24-hour basis.

Substantially all these activities were performed on piers which had long been known as Hylan's Folly. One can only speculate as to the results if modern warehouse facilities with low insurance rates had been provided.

SHIPPING LINES' POSITION

Scant praise for the success of the foreign-trade zone can be given to the American shipping lines serving the port of New York. Up to January 1, 1942, out of 180 vessels in foreign trade which docked at the zone to discharge cargo, only 32 were of American registry. In other words, 5 out of 6 vessels entering the zone were foreign-flag ships. When the facility was opened in 1937, foreign shipping lines readily agreed to accept cargo destined for the zone and to so stipulate on their bills of lading, but some of the American lines required prodding by the Department of Commerce before finally agreeing to make similar arrangements. These observations are not offered in a spirit of criticism, but rather with the hope that American shipping executives may be disposed to reappraise the potentialities of the foreign-trade zone—this vital stepping stone to a successful merchant marine—in the light of present and post-war conditions.

NEW ORLEANS TAKES ACTION

The late Norman Owens Pedrick, of New Orleans, an outstanding figure in the shipping world, whose death occurred in December, did not favor the enactment of the foreign-trade zones bill in 1934. Early last year Mr. Pedrick, who was president of the Mississippi Shipping Co., as well as of the Louisiana Shipyards, took time out from his important duties to serve as a chairman of the special committee of the New Orleans Association of Commerce to reexamine the matter of establishing a foreign-trade zone at that great port. After a thorough study and a detailed analysis of the operations of the New York zone, Mr. Pedrick personally prepared the committee's report favoring the immediate establishment of a zone at New Orleans. His report was unanimously accepted by the directors of the Association of Commerce, and the State Docks Board has already initiated plans to put these recommendations into effect.

PRIMARY INTEREST

American-flag lines, whether they realize it or not, have a primary interest in port-terminal and storage costs on commodities which they transport. An arbitrary increase of 10 cents a square foot or 5 cents a bale in storage rates may create more resistance for a traffic solicitor than a $2-per-ton advance in his ocean tariff.

By conference agreement ocean freight rates are generally uniform, and shippers can anticipate increases by adjusting delivery prices accordingly. On the other hand, a shipper confronted with an increase of storage or handling charges on which he has made no calculations, after shipment arrives in port, may be placed at a serious disadvantage, especially if his merchandise is not ready or permitted to enter through customs. Such situations—and they do occur—may divert traffic away from an American-flag line or a port or even from this Nation itself.

WISE ADVOCACY NEEDED

Although private corporations, including commercial warehouse interests, may operate foreign-trade zones, some warehousemen have consistently opposed the program, apparently because the establishment of such a zone in any port would tend to stabilize storage rates. Foreign-trade zones must be operated as public utilities; rates and charges must be just and reasonable, and tariff schedules must be published—a shipper knows exactly what his costs will be before the goods are loaded on vessels abroad. Generally speaking, privately owned commercial warehouses are under no such obligation to the shipping public.

The Propeller Club of the United States, the American Merchant Marine Conference, and the American Merchant Marine Institute, each would render a useful service in the upbuilding of the Nation's merchant marine by urging that steps be taken to establish properly equipped and operated foreign-trade zones in our major ports of entry.

What's Wrong With the Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent, published in the Washington Evening Star on Wednesday, January 27, 1943, in which he states that a "fearless and searching inquiry by Congress, with the view of weeding out the incompetents and decreasing waste, is exactly what is needed in Washington":

FEDERAL AGENCIES UNDER NEW CONGRESS ORDER FACE FIRST REAL INVESTIGATION IN DECADE

(By Frank R. Kent)

The enthusiastic unanimity with which the House has recently approved resolutions to investigate various governmental agencies is indicative of the difference between this Congress and those we have had for the past 10 years. For that length of time the executive branch of the Government so dominated the legislative branch that the latter sank to probably the lowest level in our history.

Its independence and its initiative practically vanished. Save in the case of the attempted packing of the Supreme Court it appeared powerless to resist the White House will. With a few exceptions hardly a bill or resolution which the administration opposed was passed.

Congress practically gave up. The President absorbed its powers and to an unprecedented degree operated as though he owned it, as, indeed, he did. House and Senate ratified, when required, the Executive acts and almost invariably obeyed the Presidential orders. Under these conditions any such thing as a genuine investigation of a governmental agency was impossible and those now ordered are the first real ones in a decade.

BASIC FUNCTION

Yet, the investigation of governmental departments is one of the basic functions of Congress, the exercise of which is of great value to the Nation and without which there is no check upon waste, incompetence, or dishonesty. In his able book, A New Constitution Now, Henry Hazlitt of the New York Times points this out and emphasizes it by quoting from John Stuart Mill's Representative Government, as follows:

"The proper office of a representative assembly is to watch and control the Government; to throw the light of publicity on its acts, to compel a full exposition and justification of all of them which anyone considers questionable; to censure them if found condemnable, and if the men who compose the Government abuse their trust, or fulfill it in a manner which conflicts with the deliberate sense of the Nation, to expel them from office and either expressly or virtually appoint their successors."

And Mr. Mill added that in a legislative body competent and alert to perform these functions "would repose at all times sufficient security for the liberty of the Nation." After 10 years in which the multitudinous Government agencies and commissions of the New Deal have been wholly free from congressional scrutiny, the timeliness of reiterating the great truth in this Mill paragraph is clear.

Certainly, the overwhelming vote by which the investigations were ordered is strong evidence that this new Congress, over which the administration has lost control, intends to make up for lost time.

Other investigations are sure to come. Before this session ends, the belief is that every major agency will be subjected to congressional overhauling. There is not one that will not be improved by having the light turned on it. They have been operating much too long behind their own publicity departments without anyone being able to get a clear idea of what they are doing or how.

Efforts of individual Senators, like Mr. BYRD, of Virginia, to dig out the facts have been hampered and frustrated by delays and evasions. Newspaper efforts are easily blocked. The only way by which the full truth can be obtained is through congressional investigation, and it is a good thing they are beginning.

These investigations do not mean any weakening of the war effort. They will not, if properly conducted, divert men from the important jobs of war production. They will not waste the time nor energy of the responsible officials. On the contrary, they ought to result in the correction of abuses, the coordination of effort, and the simplification of the machinery.

Fearless and searching inquiry by Congress, with the view of weeding out the incompetents and decreasing waste, is exactly what is needed in Washington. The mere threat of that kind of investigation—the knowledge that such investigations can no longer be blocked by administration leaders—is certain to have a beneficial effect upon the executive branch from top to bottom.

Mr. Speaker, I am also including a statement made on January 29, 1943, by George Galloway of the Twentieth Century Fund, as part of his answer to the recurring question "What's Wrong With the Congress?":

Effective action in putting through the reforms, he said "must ultimately rest on an aroused and sustained public opinion." He saw hope that the results of last fall's elections might make the Seventy-eighth Congress "more inquiring, more critical, and more assertive of its prerogatives.

"Perhaps, at long last," he declared, "Congress will now undertake, by modernizing its internal machinery, to equip itself to play a truly great part at this crucial stage in the history of the Republic."

The Negative Side of the Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, because of the confusion created in the minds of the people by the great amount of pub-

licity given the Ruml plan, in the press and over the radio, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "The Negative Side of the Ruml Plan," which was delivered on October 22, 1942, before the Stationers Club of New York, by Nicholas Picchione of the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. Picchione is a certified public accountant and a tax specialist. He is also a member of the American Institute of Accountants, the National Association of Cost Accountants, and the American Accounting Association. He is a member of the Governor's special tax commission, and of the Federal taxation committee of the Chamber of Commerce in Rhode Island. He has for some time been conducting extension courses in income taxes, and is the author of the Dome Simplified Weekly Income Tax Record. I commend the reading of his analysis of the Ruml plan to all the Members of this House. His address follows:

For the first time in its history our Federal Government is seriously worried about the collectibility of individual income taxes. Ever since the opening of hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee, which began on March 3, 1942, all sorts of suggestions to collect a mass tax at high rates from 33,000,000 persons filing returns in 1943 have been presented.

The American people are demanding a tax program adapted to their needs and ability to pay. As wage earners and recipients of low incomes, they are accustomed to budgeting on a weekly or monthly basis, rather than on a yearly basis.

Confronted with this new and difficult situation, congressional tax committees have considered numerous plans as a substitute for the present outmoded system of trying to collect taxes on previous year's earnings already spent. One by one, each plan was presented, considered, and rejected.

In desperation, Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, suggested the 5 percent Victory tax which was approved by the committee by the slim margin of one vote and over the opposition of the Treasury.

Of all the plans submitted, however, one plan has met with widespread public approval, namely, the Ruml pay-as-you-go plan. I agree that the general objective of the Ruml plan is sound, but the method of arriving at the objective is defective and the practical results inequitable. A careful study of the mechanics reveal that the plan, as a whole, not only fails to accomplish its avowed objectives but is in reality unfair, undesirable, and unacceptable.

What is the Ruml plan? The Ruml plan is known as a pay-as-you-go plan which was submitted to the Finance Committee of the United States Senate on July 27, 1942, by Mr. Beardsley Ruml, treasurer of R. H. Macy & Co. and chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. The plan proposes to do three things:

1. It cancels all 1941 taxes on individual incomes, including partnership income and income from trusts taxable to the beneficiary or grantor.

2. New rates and exemptions for individual taxpayers would not become operative until the year following enactment, and

3. Taxpayers would pay a "tentative" tax during the current year at current-year rates but based on prior-year income, such tentative tax to be subject to adjustment to actual tax.

Mr. Ruml admits that the plan has imperfections, but that they are of a minor order. At one point he said: "Insofar as there is inequity in the plan on this account, it resides in being too beneficial to some few taxpayers; but since the plan is beneficial to all and harmful to none, inequity of this kind, though regrettable, is an imperfection of a minor order as compared with the great good that will be achieved." At another point he said: "This loss of revenue, spread perhaps over a period of 50 years, would be partially offset by certain increases in tax collections under the plan; and in any case could be made up by slightly higher rates over this long period of time." What in Mr. Ruml's opinion are minor imperfections, in my judgment, are such major defects that I am convinced that the Ruml plan is unfair, undesirable, and unacceptable.

After a careful study, I find that the plan contains five major defects:

1. It is unfair because it confers the greatest benefit on the rich and little or none on the poor.

2. Cancelation of tax liabilities for 1941 is unjust because it results in a loss in revenue to the United States Government.

3. Novelty of measuring "tentative" tax against actual tax requires two returns and two sets of computations involving 3 years in order to determine 1 year's tax.

4. Morale of war worker and fighting men will be adversely affected.

5. Fails to accomplish its avowed objectives.

RUML PLAN UNFAIR

To permit wealthy men who received abnormal high incomes during 1941, probably as a direct result of the war effort, whose incomes in 1942 were normal or very low, to receive a nontaxable gift from the United States Government in the form of a refund is unfair and intolerable.

For example, Mr. Smith, who received $500,000 in 1941, directly traceable to the war program, and whose income in 1942 was very low, would have his tax liability of more than one-third of a million dollars for 1941 canceled and having already paid his tax in 1942 is entitled to a refund of the more than one-third of a million dollars in 1943.

Now let's see what the benefit is to the small taxpayers. Here are the latest available official Treasury statistics:

For the calendar year 1940

	Individual returns filed	Percent	Tax paid	Percent
Under $5,000	[1] 13,662,785	95	$208,192,000	14
$5,000 and over	749,466	5	1,234,647,000	86
Total	14,412,251	100	1,442,839,000	100

[1] Included in this figure are 7,086,423 nontaxable returns.

From the above figures it is evident that out of 13,662,785 small-income earners 7,086,423 persons or 52 percent will receive no benefit and 6,576,362 or 48 percent will receive little benefit.

Allowing substantial refunds to wealthy taxpayers during these critical times will further increase the amount needed by the Treasury to meet the severe cost of the war and the probable result will be to again call upon low-wage earners for more contributions by further lowering of exemptions.

CANCELING 1941 TAX DEBT UNJUST

Why should the United States Government suffer a loss during the coming years of huge war expenditures and gigantic deficits? I wish to quote from a letter I received two weeks ago bearing the signature of Randolph E. Paul, General Counsel, Treasury Department: "I have consulted the Division of Tax Research on the cost of the plan to the United States Government. While there is no way of estimating accurately the loss, the amount of taxes that would be forgiven (the tax liability for 1941) would exceed $4,000,000,000."

Mr. Ruml would minimize the loss by saying that "this loss would be partially offset by certain increases in tax collections under the plan and in any case could be made up by slightly higher rates over this long period of time." Continuing, he says: "Balancing any possible net loss in revenue to the Government are certain important advantages." It is my belief that the disadvantages of the plan far outweigh the advantages.

TENTATIVE TAX SCHEME COMPLEX

In attempting to put taxpayers on a current or pay-as-you-go basis, the Ruml plan creates a novel formula so technical and complex that I believe the average taxpayer will be utterly lost in the maze of figures. Stating it as simply as I possibly can, the Ruml plan calls for a tentative tax collectible during the current year, based upon income of preceding year, which tentative tax is to be applied against the actual tax and any difference to be adjusted in the following year. This really is too much not only for the taxpayers but also for the Government because it involves two tax returns and two sets of computations affecting 3 years, in order to determine 1 year's tax. For example, to compute the tax of an individual for the year 1942 requires:

1. Income for 1941.
2. Payment in 1942.
3. Adjustment in 1943 (means either refund or assessment).

To further complicate matters there will be millions and millions of adjustments in the form of tax refunds or assessments. In all cases of assessments the Ruml plan's objective of keeping taxpayers out of debt to the Government fails.

I understand that recently the Treasury Department made a study of incomes of selected taxpayers over a 10-year period and the study showed that in every case taxes would have fluctuated more, would have been further out of step with income, under the Ruml plan than under the present method of collection. If this is true, then the Treasury Department would be faced with the insurmountable task of computing refunds and assessments for a big army of income taxpayers.

MORALE ADVERSELY AFFECTED

What would be the effect on the morale of marines down on Solomon Islands, sailors at sea, and soldiers in and out of America when they learn that while they are on the receiving end of bullets and bayonets the wealthy are on the receiving end of a bounty? Will war workers feel like producing and buying War bonds when they hear that $4,000,000,000 of taxes legitimately owed to the United States Government has been scratched off the books in the midst of this cruel and costly war? I think the morale of these people right now is so necessary and important to win this war that we should carefully examine all plans to make certain that none tamper with it.

AVOWED OBJECTIVE UNACCOMPLISHED

The Ruml plan has been widely publicized as a pay-as-you-go plan. Its chief objectives are to wipe off all tax debts and to put taxpayers on a current basis. I have already shown that the cancelation of 1941 tax debts is undesirable and that millions of taxpayers will still be in debt in later years under the Ruml plan.

I now want to show that the plan is not an honest-to-goodness pay-as-you-go plan. A true pay-as-you-go plan would have tax payments for the current year deducted from current earnings. The Ruml plan does this in fiction but not in fact.

By basing tax payments for the current year on prior year's income the Ruml plan is

not using the true current income out of which current payments should be made. Further, severe hardships result in many cases on this account. Let me illustrate: Mr. Green, married with no dependents, earned $2,000 in 1941 and 1942, $10,000 in 1943 and $2,000 in 1944. In 1943 Mr. Green pays $140 (1943 tentative tax based on 1942 income) out of a $10,000 income, which is the same amount payable under present system. In 1944 he must pay $2,152 (1944 tentative tax based on 1943 income) but out of a $2,000 income. His tentative tax is high because his income for the preceding year was high. Also payable by Mr. Green in 1944 is the big adjustment because in 1943 his tentative tax was less than the actual tax. To soften the impact of these injustices the Ruml plan makes a provision for relief.

All this not only sounds complicated, it actually is.

PROPOSED PAY-AS-YOU-GO PLAN

The ideal plan is one that collects the tax at the source, in short, one that collects the tax during the current year out of current earnings. To accomplish this will of course necessitate the cancelation of tax debts at a given point. It can be done in the manner now proposed which I will call the pay-as-you-earn plan. Before stating the new plan, let me say that it successfully overcomes every single objection leveled against the Ruml plan. Further, it is simple, clear, effective, and actually puts taxpayers on a current basis. Briefly, the plan is as follows:

Every taxpayer, effective on tax returns due March 15, 1943, will receive credit for the amount of tax not exceeding the tax on the first $5,000 of surtax net income, plus the tax on the first $5,000 of normal tax net income. Commencing April 1, 1943, all persons filing returns and paying no tax as of March 15, 1943, are to be subject to current tax deduction, based on current income. All other taxpayers are to be subject to current tax deductions based on prior year income as under the present system. The new 5 percent victory tax is to be canceled and current tax deductions made from January 1 to March 31 be applied against current year's tax. New rates, if passed prior to June 30, would be made retroactive to January 1 and if passed subsequent to June 30 the new rates would become effective January 1 of the following year.

The effect of this plan is to automatically wipe out the tax debt for the year 1942 for approximately 95 percent of persons filing tax returns, or 31,350,000 persons. This means that these persons would start the year 1943 with a clear bill of health, and that from now on, they will pay their just share of the war cost on a weekly basis out of their weekly income.

As for the other 5 percent of the taxpayers, approximately 1,650,000 persons, they will receive the same basic credit which in their case will result in a greater benefit in actual dollars and cents. For these few, comparatively speaking, the tax debt is reduced but not canceled.

To demonstrate the simplicity and workability of the proposed pay-as-you-earn plan, I present the following examples:

Basic computations

[Married persons—No dependents]

	Small wage earner	High-salaried person
Net income for 1942 per Mar. 15, 1943, return	$4,000.00	$100,000
Tax due	532.00	64,060
Credit per plan	532.00	1,080
Net tax due	0	62,980

OPERATION OF PLAN FOR 1943

	Small wage earner	High salaried person
Net income for 1943	$4,000.00	$100,000
Tax debt for 1942 payable in 1943	0	62,980
Tax debt in 1943 on 1943 income	532.00	0
Less:		
(a) 5% Victory tax deducted from Jan. 1 to Mar 31, 1943	42.00	1,234
(b) First quarterly installment paid Mar. 15, 1943	0	15,745
Net tax due from Apr. 1 to Dec. 31, 1943 (39 weeks)	490.00	46,001
Weekly deductions from Apr. 1 to Dec. 31, 1943 (39 weeks)	12.55	1,179

OPERATION OF PLAN OF 1944, ETC.

Net income for 1944	$4,000.00	$100,000
Tax debt for 1943 payable in 1944	0	64,060
Tax payable in 1944 on 1944 income	532.00	0
Weekly deductions	10.23	1,232

ADVANTAGE OF PAY-AS-YOU-EARN PLAN

As previously stated the pay-as-you-earn plan I propose carries none of the stigma of the Ruml plan. It relieves the mental anguish of 31,000,000 persons suffering from "taxitis" and gives them a new lease of life by the mere knowledge that they owe no back taxes, and that from now on when the close of the year comes around they need not worry about raising money to meet taxes. As for the comparatively few other taxpayers, no complaints are anticipated as no harm has been done.

Briefly summarized the advantages of this pay-as-you-earn plan are as follows:

1. Overcomes all five objections to Ruml plan.
2. Not one single red penny is paid out to anyone by the United States Government now or ever.
3. Operation is simple and workable.
4. Can be conveniently put into operation at an early date.
5. It is equitable to high- or low-income groups.
6. It is a true pay-as-you-earn plan because it taps income as it flows into hands of taxpayers.
7. Loss to United States Treasury negligible.
8. Provides for one tax, one deduction, one form all for 1 year.
9. Admits no imperfections and requires no relief provision.
10. Is fair, desirable, and acceptable.

CONCLUSION

For Congress to write a new tax bill during wartime is not an easy assignment. I believe it has done a good job under extremely difficult circumstances. Congressional tax committees have had to sit and listen for hours on end, week after week, to tax experts, corporation executives, economists, professors, and plain citizens describing in great detail complaints, suggestions, and tax plans and all this not without patience and understanding.

The most conspicuous mistake of the new 1942 tax law is the omission of a genuine pay-as-you-earn plan. We all fervently hope that in the next tax bill, soon to be presented, Congress will give more thought to the collectibility of taxes, rather than to search for new sources of revenue.

To this end I offer the pay-as-you-earn plan as my best suggestion, because it does, in fact, accomplish its objectives.

The American people and Government should be grateful to Mr. Ruml for having brought to light the theory of a pay-as-you-go plan. But I would be remiss in my duty as a loyal citizen if I did not raise my voice to the disastrous results of his plan.

Mr. Ruml is asking for support of his plan because he believes in it. I am asking for support of my pay-as-you-earn plan because I believe in it and because I believe it is a better plan for the American people and for the United States Government.

Idle Tires Should Be Recapped and Retreaded by Smaller War Plants Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the extensive hearings in the past 12 months by our Committee on Small Business of the House, both in Washington and other cities throughout the Nation, it was the universal complaint from various industries of the lack of functioning by the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

ALSO CONTRACT WITH PROCUREMENT AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT

It would appear to me that the facilities of the Smaller War Plants Corporation could be put to immediate productive use in securing the necessary contracts to keep small industry within the tire industry functioning during this war. It is a known fact that for many years independent tire rebuilders pioneered in the tire-rebuilding field, and, because of the extensive experience in pioneering, have been able to develop a serviceable retread, or recapped tire. It also appears that during this pioneering by these independent small businesses within the tire industry, they did run into opposition and conflict from dominating influences within the rubber industry, which in some instances attempted to discourage the promotion of the use of either retreaded or recapped tires. With this thought in mind, it appears to me at this moment, that the Smaller War Plants Corporation should enter into contract immediately with the Army, Navy, and the Maritime Commission, in fact any Government agency that has anything to do with automobile tires and tubes, and affect an over-all contract with these war agencies; the Smaller War Plants Corporation, in turn, subletting these contracts to the independent tire dealers and tire rebuilders throughout this Nation.

MR. JEFFERS' TESTIMONY TODAY, FEBRUARY 1

We all know that severe gasoline rationing is in effect along the Atlantic seaboard which has reduced and almost eliminated the use of automobile passenger cars. Indications show that this curtailment of passenger-car use may spread throughout the Nation. If this takes place, small independent business within the automobile industry will suffer a terrible blow. Mr. William Jeffers' testimony before a subcommittee on Military Affairs today made provision for

the use of rubber in truck and bus tires, for the farmer, and for some types of salesmen. You will note that no mention is made of the use of rubber for passenger cars, either for new tires or rebuilt tires. Reports are also reaching me that in some sections of the country, due to the lack of business in the rebuilding field, independent tire rebuilders are closing their places of business. I also have had reports reach me from the Middle West, where tires have been returned under the idle-tire-return plan. Those who returned these tires were receiving approximately 20 cents a tire from the Government agencies. In my opinion, this may be a tremendous waste and good used tires are probably being wasted. Furthermore, it takes out of use those tires which might have been retreaded or recapped.

UTILIZE SMALL CONCERNS IN RECAPPING

In the House Small Business Committee resolution of February 5, 1942, the committee recommended unanimously that these war agencies utilize the small businesses in the recapping of tires and also the channeling of recapping machinery to these small businesses. These recommendations were in order then, and they are in order now to save small business.

BIG ONES HELPED UNDER PRESENT PLAN

It is our understanding that the Army and Navy retreading contracts will expire very shortly. The way these contracts were originally made, they were placed in the hands of about 8 or 10 people throughout the Nation. This arrangement denied the right to thousands of small, independent businesses to secure this business and it is my recommendation that the Smaller War Plants Corporation enter into negotiations immediately for the repair, retreading, and recapping of tires and that these contracts be sublet to independent tire rebuilders and retreaders throughout the Nation. These independent businesses must be kept going to serve war purposes and also to preserve the necessary transportation system of the country. If they were to fail, to close, or be liquidated this country's war efforts and our transportation system would be severely injured. No time should be lost on this by the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

I respectfully invite these suggestions to the agencies involved for their consideration, and, I hope, early consideration.

A Protein Shortage in 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. R. W. Howard should assist in furnishing the information as to the protein situation at the present time. This article is from the February issue of the Farm Journal and Farmer's Wife, published at Philadelphia. This is a reliable publication, and this article should be of interest to Members that are receiving so many requests in regard to the protein shortage.

The article follows:

A PROTEIN SHORTAGE IN 1943

(By R. W. Howard)

"Nobody's holding back the protein feed supply. There just isn't enough in sight to go around."

So, in two sentences, college livestock nutritionists from Ohio, New York, and Michigan summarized a potent threat to 1943's production of dairy products, eggs, poultry, and pork during secret hearings held in Washington January 7 to 9 before officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Basing their conclusions on a month-long investigation, conducted for the Feed Industry Planning Committee of the American Feed Manufacturers Association, the three concluded that:

1. Farmers have stepped up protein, vitamin, and mineral feeding to such an extent that they are forcing feed manufacturers to reduce mixes to a formula not much richer than that of straight grain feeds.

2. Government has failed to release steel and machinery to construct plants where the riboflavin and phosphorus needed to replace meat scraps, bone meal, and fish meal could be manufactured.

3. Price ceilings and the ship shortage have created a demand for soybean meal so abnormal that available processing facilities cannot meet it.

4. Dairy herds and hogs should have a 16-percent balanced protein feed to achieve the 1943 goals. Poultry should have 18 to 20 percent. Without it, milk, egg, and fat production will slow down; marketing seasons will shift; home supplies, in view of Government commitments on lend-lease, will be smaller in 1944.

"Human foods in the form of animal products cannot be made available unless the animals are provided adequate feeds to produce meat, milk, and eggs," Dr. R. M. Bethke, of the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station, told John Hutson, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation. "In that sense, feed precedes food."

"The United States faces liquidation of some of its livestock unless quick action is taken," J. A. McConnell, general manager of the Grange League Federation Exchange and chairman of the Feed Industry Planning Committee, told Farm Journal in an exclusive interview. "As a matter of fact, it's already taking place. Some northeast poultrymen are drowning baby chicks because they cannot obtain feed for them—shocking but a fact.

"Farmers need 23 percent more protein, mineral, and vitamin feeds for the rest of 1943. A rationing system won't solve the problem because there is no way to ration the shortage and make it go around so that production goals can be reached.

"In round figures, we're going to have about 30 percent of the fish meal we should have, 75 percent of the meat scraps and tankage, 80 percent of the soybean oil meal, 95 percent of the cottonseed meal, 75 percent of the linseed meal, 40 percent of the bone meal, 85 percent of the alfalfa meal, 40 percent of the skim milk. We need a supply of 11,700,000 tons of 12 essential feed ingredients. There are only 9,516,000 tons in sight."

The whole situation, the millers found, goes back to the failure of national planners to coordinate their schemes. The boatloads of menhaden and other oil-bearing fish that used to come into Charleston, Seattle, and San Pedro eventually went down chicken gullets in Maryland and Iowa as Vitamin G and phosphorus. Bone meal, imported from Argentina, filled out dairy rations in Wisconsin. Meat scraps and tankage from Australia gave Corn Belt hogs a bigger frame to lay ham and bacon on. War put the fishing fleets into coast patrol service, cut off the imports. Soybeans, while the best of the vegetable protein substitutes, don't have the riboflavin, phosphorus, and other "boosters" that animal and fish proteins contain.

Yet, when a large chemical company made application for materials to build a plant that could manufacture 15,000 pounds of clear riboflavin a year (the vitamin equivalent of 800,000,000 pounds of skim milk), Washington officials turned them down. Companies who produce phosphorus for stock feeding through a process of defluorinating phosphate had similar experiences.

Office of Price Administration juggled matters a bit more by putting a ceiling on soybean meal. Consequently, soybean meal was being quoted at $39.35 a ton wholesale in Buffalo on January 9 while ground corn sold at $39.20. (The meal is 35 percent protein; the corn about 10 percent.)

Commodity Credit Corporation officers made no promises after the hearing. But on January 13 Washington raised a price ceiling on corn, and stated that crop quotas might be up this year.

Mr. McConnell's committee will carry out an effort to obtain priorities for the production of critical feed materials.

"The farmer's been told that food will win the war," he concluded. "He can't produce the food without proper feed quotas. And that can't be obtained without additional mill capacity, vitamin factory, fishing fleets, and a heck of a lot of red tape scissoring."

HOW TO MAKE THE FEED LAST

From college campuses, feed manufacturers, Government officials, and its own experts, Farm Journal presents a hurried round-up of some "tips" to keep your livestock from eating the bottom out of the feed box this year and next.

1. Don't feed dairy or hog rations above 16 percent protein, or poultry rations above 20 percent protein. Protein is short—make it last.

2. Put in stocks of available grains right now, such as crushed or ground wheat, corn, hominy, and the like. Feed it liberally. Grains for dairy feeding should be ground as coarsely as possible.

3. Hold up delivery on that early order of baby chicks if you don't have balanced protein rations on hand to see them through. Feed problems may be simpler in March and April.

4. Talk up the idea for a national house-to-house bone collection. Millers feel that there must be thousands of tons of meat scraps and bone going into garbage pails which, turned back to processors, would make fine bone meal.

5. If you have grass silage, feed some of it to hogs. If not, plan to put some up this summer.

6. If hens drop production now because you can't give them feed, don't sell them off. Cornell professors claim that good breeding strains will make up production lost on slim feed when they get out on grass in the summer.

7. Make plans right now to push next year's haying forward a week, no matter what the weather is then. Younger hays will provide more protein for 1944 feeding.

8. Plan to raise all the grains and roughage crops you can for 1944.

The New Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 28, 1943, on the new farm program.

The editorial follows:

THE NEW FARM PROGRAM

The administration has announced a plan for increasing food production in 1943. The plan has two parts: (1) Subsidies amounting to $100,000,000 to be paid to those who increase their production of sweetpotatoes, soybeans, grain sorghums, peanuts, flax, and dried peas; and (2) the recruiting of an army of farm hands principally from women, store clerks, and students.

The need for action to increase the supply of food in the United States has long been evident, with many stores unable to get enough goods to stay in business and more and more things which were always abundant disappearing from the market. It can be assumed that the food administrator's list of commodities was well selected.

But to recognize the need for more food is not to give approval to the plan as announced. A subsidy, the Government finds, is needed because the farmers cannot afford to produce more at present prices. If the price were allowed to go up, more production would result, but the Government insists upon pretending that prices are not going up.

The subsidy is a mere mask for a higher price. The farmer gets more but the consumer is excused from paying the advance. The rest of the price is to be borne by the taxpayer. A price advance would meet the problem frankly and more effectively. It would stimulate production and discourage consumption. By having the consumer pay only a part of the cost of obtaining the supply the consumer is not encouraged to be economical in using what is available. Rationing therefore becomes necessary. Thus the Government creates a new problem in the process of solving an existing one.

It may be that all that can be done now about the farm-labor crisis is to recruit women, store clerks, and pencil pushers to work in the fields next summer and harvest the crops next fall. What a little gray matter in important places could have accomplished a year ago in making secure the food supply for the duration of the war! Plenty of professionals were then available; now we must depend upon amateurs.

Washington apparently couldn't understand that an adequate food supply was as essential in wartime as an adequate munitions supply. Skilled workmen in essential manufacturing industries from the beginning have been given deferment from the draft on the ground that they were doing as much for the war effort where they were as they would in the Army, and because other persons of equal skill could not be had to take their places. Agriculture was not similarly treated, although experienced hands are required to do the work effectively and substitutes of equal skill are unobtainable. After 3,000,000 workers out of a total of 12,000,000 had left the farms, Manpower Administrator McNutt froze farm hands on their jobs and they were given deferment status. That was locking the farm gate after a large part of the farm hands had gone to town or into the Army. It may be that the milliners and stenographers will be able to husk corn and pitch hay, but we doubt that it will be possible for farmers to raise bigger crops with such assistance.

Ruml Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the calamities which other countries have suffered by the collapse of public credit should warn us to adopt a sound fiscal policy of revenue collection to avert the danger of national insolvency following the war boom.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following timely article from the Washington Post of February 1, 1943, by Mark Sullivan on the Ruml plan:

RUML TAX PLAN
(By Mark Sullivan)
PAY AS YOU GO

When this pay-as-you-go tax plan, or Ruml plan, was first put forward it seemed just another idea. Many persons regarded it skeptically, being dubious about any plan that proposes to make taxpaying easier. But it has stirred so much discussion that the House Ways and Means Committee will hold hearings on it this week.

To understand the plan, begin with what many persons know—and some 10,000,000 more new taxpayers will learn this year; that is, under the existing system the income taxes we pay in any year are on the income of the year before. The taxes we pay this year—1943—will be on the income we earned last year—1942. Everybody is always a year behind.

Now, what the pay-as-you-go plan proposes is that taxes we pay this year shall be on the income we earn this year. This implies something that seems startling. It implies that nobody will pay any taxes on last year's income—the income for 1942 would just be skipped—and that is what the pay-as-you-go plan means.

As a way of making the proposed change clear, imagine a dialogue between the Government and a taxpayer. While this dialogue states the basic idea, the method of carrying it out here outlined is only one of several suggested ways:

GOVERNMENT. You don't need to pay any tax on your last year's income—that's wiped out. You must go on paying income tax as usual, on March 15, and quarterly thereafter—but is to be tax on this year's income.

TAXPAYER. Okay by me. But how come? I don't know what my income this year will be.

GOVERNMENT. On that, we'll just make a guess—though a guess in exact figures. We will assume that your income for 1943 will be the same as in 1942.

TAXPAYER. But I know my income this year is not going to be the same as last year.

GOVERNMENT. All right. At the end of this year you will make out a return showing just what your income this year was. Then we'll make an adjustment between us. If your income turns out to be more than in 1942, you'll pay additional tax to us. If less, the Treasury will make a refund to you.

TAXPAYER. One thing about that I don't like—it means making out two returns in one year.

GOVERNMENT. Not at all. The return you make at the end of this year will be the return you would make anyhow, under the existing system. You will go ahead making one return a year as now.

TAXPAYER. Well, it's all right with me—but how about you? Won't you lose a whole year's tax money?

GOVERNMENT. Not at all. We'll take 1 year's taxes, as usual. The only change is, it will be on this year's income, instead of last year's.

This fact, that the Government would not lose, is difficult for many to grasp. But it's like turning the clock forward—or in this case the whole calendar forward. Consider periods of years. In any 3-year period, or 5, or 100, the Government will collect taxes for that number of years. It does not matter how the years are labeled on the calendar. In the coming 3 years, it doesn't matter whether the Government collects on incomes of 1942–43–44, as under the present system—or on incomes of 1943–44–45, as under the proposed system. The Government is interested in totals; total national income. And the average total over a series of years would yield about the same taxes under the proposed system as under the existing one.

Would the taxpayer benefit? Yes; in a fundamental way. All would be free from having taxes for a past year hanging over them. All would be brought up to date; that is what pay-as-you-go means, and it is an immense advantage. For example, under the existing system, on February 3 everybody owes the Government all the taxes on last year's income. Call that, as an easily understood figure, $1,200. And he owes also 1 month's taxes on this year's income. Call this $100. That is $1,300 in all. But under the proposed plan, this taxpayer would owe $100. And every quarterly tax day—March 15 and so on—everybody would be square with the Government.

The basic virtue of pay-as-you-go is that the taxes any person pays in any 1 year are in proportion to the income he receives the same year. This would be a relief to many persons who this year receive small incomes because they are in the Army, or for other reasons, but are expected to pay taxes on larger incomes received last year.

John O'Donnell Wins $50,000 Verdict Against Philadelphia Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of Saturday, January 30, 1943, entitled "John O'Donnell Wins $50,000 Verdict Against Philadelphia Record."

I believe the American public will be very much interested in reading these facts and in drawing their own conclusions. The constant attacks of the Philadelphia Record and such newspapers as

the Washington Post, PM, The Daily Worker, and the New York Evening Post on former noninterventionist Members of Congress and those who disagreed with Roosevelt's foreign policies prior to Pearl Harbor are well known. Mr. O'Donnell has rendered a real public service by instituting legal action as a result of the smear attacks made against him by the Philadelphia Record, and has set a good example for others who may be likewise libeled.

The article follows:

JOHN O'DONNELL WINS $50,000 VERDICT AGAINST PHILADELPHIA RECORD

PHILADELPHIA PA., January 30.—Damages totaling $50,000 he asked were awarded yesterday to John O'Donnell, chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Daily News, in his suit for libel against the Philadelphia Record, because of an editorial it published April 18, 1941, attacking O'Donnell, whose "Capitol Stuff" column is also published in the Washington Times-Herald.

The issue in the case, as defined by Common Pleas Judge Joseph Sloan in a 40-minute charge to the jury, was the "good faith" of J. David Stern, publisher of the Record.

CALLED HIM BIASED

The Record did not attempt to plead or prove the truth of its editorial attack upon O'Donnell. The editorial called him a "Naziphile" and said he "broadcast to his friends and barflies his sympathies with Hitler's aims, such as destruction of the British Empire, suppression of labor unions, and liquidation of the Jews." O'Donnell is "not an unbiased reporter," the attack continued.

Stern testified that he wrote the editorial in the Washington bureau of the Record—the office of Robert S. Allen, who was then his correspondent there.

Stern also testified he obtained information adverse to O'Donnell from George Backer, former co-owner of the New York Evening Post, in which Stern is a stockholder and director; from Drew Pearson, with whom Robert Allen was formerly associated in writing the column "Washington Merry-Go-Round," and from Charles Michelson, former publicity director for the Democratic National Committee.

O'Donnell's counsel later pointed out in argument that all of the defendant's witnesses were either associated with the defendant in business or were members of the Fight For Freedom organization, who were later employed by the Government.

NEW TRIAL SOUGHT

The jury of eight women and four men reached its verdict against the Record Thursday night and handed it to the court in a sealed envelope to be opened at 10 o'clock yesterday morning.

The trial took a sensational turn when, after the verdict was announced, Defense Counsel Scofield charged the jury had deliberated only a few minutes and hadn't given the evidence "sufficient consideration." He said he made these allegations "in the light of information given by court attachés who overheard the deliberations."

The jurors, upon being questioned this morning, all stated they devoted 25 to 45 minutes to deliberations before taking their first vote, which admittedly was unanimous in favor of O'Donnell. Further deliveration was held on the amount of damages.

IMMEDIATE ARGUMENT REFUSED

The court refused Scofield's motion for immediate argument and ruling on his new trial petition.

This motion will be argued next Thursday before a panel of three judges, including a trial judge in the case.

This just-closed trial, which lasted 9 days, was O'Donnell's second attempt to get the evidence of libel before a jury. His first, in November 1941 in another branch of the Philadelphia Common Pleas Court, ended in a mistrial of a sort that has since attracted widest attention among lawyers all over the United States.

It developed as follows:

On the first day of the proceeding, O'Donnell's counsel entered most of their evidence in chief of libel by the Record and put on several of their principal witnesses.

The Philadelphia Record for the next day published a news story with an 8-column banner line disclosing the fact that O'Donnell had asked damages for $50,000. Under Pennsylvania law, the amount of damages claimed in any lawsuit is supposed to be kept secret from the jury, and to publish such information is contrary to the law of court procedure.

O'Donnell, therefore, was entitled to ask a mistrial, but his counsel informed the court they felt it more important to go on with the trial than to claim their rights under law.

FIRST TRIAL ENDED

Thereupon, Lemuel B. Scofield, counsel for the Record, went into the corridor of the courtroom building for consultation with Stern and, on his return, announced that the Record itself would ask for a mistrial on the basis of the story it had published.

To everyone's amazement, the judge promptly granted the motion, and the trial was ended with O'Donnell's principal evidence disclosed and the defense's still unrevealed, thus allowing the Record to profit from its own misconduct.

O'Donnell's counsel asked for the earliest possible resumption of the case, and this just concluded trial was set for January 18. Among the witnesses for the Record, in its attempt to prove its good faith in writing the libelous editorial, was Stephen Early, secretary to President Roosevelt.

Other witnesses for Stern included Kenneth Crawford, of PM, one-time correspondent for Stern's New York Evening Post, and Gardiner Jackson, whose $5,600-a-year Agriculture Department job has just been abolished.

Ulric Bell, now with the Office of War Information, former executive secretary of Fight For Freedom, came from Los Angeles to testify for Stern.

Jackson has been cited several times by the Dies committee. Before going to the Department of Agriculture as special assistant to Under Secretary Paul Appleby, he was for several years an official of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union.

Testimony favorable to Stern was read into the court record in the form of a deposition by Robert S. Allen.

Among the witnesses for O'Donnell was Sir Willmott Lewis, Washington correspondent of the London Times. Others who testified for O'Donnell were: Morris Ervin (Cincinnati Times); Warren Francis (Los Angeles Times); Theodore Goldsmith, financial writer; Charles Gridley (Chicago Sun); Lt. James Preston O'Donnell, United States Army. Also testifying by deposition was Arthur Hachten, International News Service.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY (Republican) of New Hampshire, confirmed O'Donnell's statement that before writing the story that brought the record editorial, he (TOBEY) had conferred with O'Donnell and that he was one of the Senators who gave O'Donnell the information on which the story was based.

DEPOSITIONS GIVEN

Depositions favorable to O'Donnell were given by Washington correspondents Edwin W. Gableman (Cincinnati Enquirer), Richard L. Harkness (formerly of the Philadelphia Inquirer, now National Broadcasting Co. newscaster), Paul Ward (Baltimore Sun), and Clifford A. Prevost (Detroit Free Press and other Knight papers), but these were not allowed by the court.

Counsel who obtained the $50,000 judgment in O'Donnell's favor, included John D. M. Hamilton, of the Philadelphia firm of Pepper, Bodine, Stokes, and Schock, and Louis G. Caldwell, Washington partner of the Chicago firm of Kirkland, Fleming, Green, Martin, and Ellis. Thomas E. Comber, Jr., assisted Mr. Hamilton.

Born and educated in Masachusetts, John O'Donnell began his newspaper career as a police reporter for the Boston Record in 1913, at the age of 17.

His first job in New York was writing descriptions for McCall's Fashion Plates, after which he got a job picking serials for a syndicate, and joined the staff of the New York Daily News in the middle 1920's.

He came to Washington to cover President Roosevelt's first inauguration in 1932 and has remained here since.

Nazi Jewish Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me over station WHN, Friday, January 29, 1943:

The guilt of the Nazis with respect to the murder of innocent men, women, and children in all the conquered countries, including 2,000,000 Jews, is beyond anything recorded in history.

Since the last war, we in this country have become so skeptical of atrocity stories, generally, that we have hesitated to believe the reports coming out of Europe. The Nazis have banked on this skepticism, knowing in advance that their butchery would be unbelievable. They have continued fairly unmolested their reign of terror. It is now about time that the American people were really and thoroughly aroused to what is happening.

They must correlate the slaying of innocents in countless thousands with the type of peace to come and with the machinery that must be set up to enforce that peace and to prevent recurrence of any massenmord (massacres). It is essential to impress upon America the present peril of the Jews. The 5,000,000 remaining in the Nazi-controlled countries await annihilation. Hitler-inspired pogroms abound everywhere.

Frankly, it is also essential to impress upon the conscience of freemen everywhere that what is happening to the Jews foreshadows the fate of all peoples under the Nazi heel.

Hitler faces certain defeat. The day he realizes that, his ruthlessness will know no bounds. He will unleash such unbridled terror, particularly against the Jews, as the world has never before witnessed.

"If the day should ever come," Goebbels wrote recently in his weekly Das Reich, "when we must go, if some day we are compelled to leave the scene of history, we will slam the door so hard that the universe will shake and mankind will stand back in stupefaction."

Goebbels, Horthy, Antonescu, Quisling, Mussert, Himmler, Goering, and other stooges

of Hitler will make it their business to destroy every Jewish life and rip out of the universe, as far as they may, all traces of Jewish existence.

Americans must be made to realize that Hitler's destruction of the Jews simply reveals a pattern of what he intends to do in his treachery and vindictiveness against all the peoples of the western world.

There is to be the Herrenvolk. Lower in scale would be the Sklavenvolk—those who are slaves to the master Herrenvolk. All others are unworthy and must, therefore, be destroyed in this wholesale purge. There is no place for the Jews. They must be destroyed and Europe must be made Judenrein. They cannot be made Sklavenvolk for they are even beneath the unworthy. The role of Sklavenvolk is reserved for non-Aryans like the Poles, the Czechs, the Serbs, the Croats.

In the beginning, Hitler confined his raids to the Jews in Germany. The foreign officials both here and abroad said it was a matter of no concern of theirs. We adopted the usual "hands off" policy. Hitler knew there was anti-Semitism in every country, including our own. He took advantage of it. The people of the United States, Great Britain, France, and Scandinavia were indifferent. They tossed it aside as a mere Jewish problem. They said "it could not happen here." It did happen there.

At first the Jews were the victims, then the Czechs, then the Poles, the French, the Serbs, the Albanians, the Greeks, and, lastly, the so-called Aryans, the Danes and Norwegians. Through failure to heed and take proper precaution, the Jewish problem had become a world problem. But even at this late hour, we in America are not sufficiently apprehensive of the killings, mass migrations, the shooting of hostages, the slaughter of the innocent by the Nazis.

Repetition has dulled our senses. There are many who still feel we are beyond Hitler's reach and have nothing to fear. This is a senseless attitude. We have loads to fear.

No country has suffered more than Poland. No race has suffered more than the Jews. Each day brings the word of more startling cruelty, more ingenious methods of torture. The Nazis show keen delight in killing people, but keenest frenzy in destroying the Jews.

During a recent transfer of Jews from villages near Warsaw to the Warsaw ghetto, all who were unable to keep pace with Nazi guards, particularly old people and children, were indiscriminately shot.

In Lublin, the patients in a Jewish hospital and a goodly portion of the general population of the ghetto were machine-gunned as they were driven along the streets and shot down in cold blood. Jews, regardless of sex and age, are taken in groups from the ghetto and shot. Their bodies are used to supply fat, and their bones are used for fertilizer. Even buried corpses have been disinterred for this commercial purpose. Each Jewish body has a utility value of 50 reichsmarks.

Veritable slaughterhouses for the destruction of Jews have been set up in Kowno, capital of Lithuania. At Bilzec the poor unfortunates were massed together in a large building. The victims were ordered to strip naked, as though they were to have a bath. They were then led to a sort of barracks with a metal floor. The door was locked. An electric current was turned on. The victims died in utmost agony. It was indeed a bath—a Blutbad (blood bath). There have been numerous reports of Jews being packed into freight cars in lots of 50 and 60 and then destroyed by lethal gases.

A new horror devised by Nazi doctors consists of injecting air into the veins of the human body. This leads to general poisoning and death ensues after a few hours. One physician can make 100 injections in 1 hour.

We can hardly believe the dreadful fate that awaits Polish and other European Jews, Catholics, and minority groups. The mass murders and indescribable torture will cause men for generations to shudder. In comparison the horrors of Roman persecution of the early Christians, the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Night, or the terrors of the Jacobin's guillotine pale into insignificance.

We face the soul-retching spectacle of a "führer" boasting that the Jews had once laughed at his threat of extermination, but now "countless numbers of those who laughed," he said, "are no longer laughing." The demoniacal shrieking of Hitler reaches its highest point of violence in proclaiming that the world must be made Judenrein (free of Jews).

There were 500,000 Jews in Germany when Hitler came to power. By 1939 oppression and forced migration had reduced the number to 200,000. Today there are only 40,000 elderly, weakened Jews in Germany who cannot long survive. Since the beginning of the war more than 100,000 Jews have perished in Germany through pogroms, suicides, exposure, and expulsion.

The picture revealed by a few bald figures of "man's inhumanity to man" should need no elaboration. In Yugoslavia, 99 percent of the country's Jews and those who had taken refuge there from other countries are now dead. In Slovakia, 65,000 Jewish men, women, and children were deported to Jewish ghettos and the deportation of the remaining 20,000 is imminent. It is reported authentically that not more than 270,000 Jews are left of the 900,000 who lived in Rumania proper in 1939. Of the 185,000 deported to the prison camp at Transistria some 75,000 have perished. Fewer than 10,000 Jews remain in Belgium of the 85,000 who lived there in 1940. In the Netherlands, all Jews between the ages of 16 and 42 were deported. No Jews could use the telephones, trolley cars, or trains. All wear the yellow star as the insignia of degradation.

Puppet Quisling neatly solved the Jewish problem in Norway. In the early hours of the dawn when faked air-raid alarms had cleared the streets of the populace of Oslo, an army of state policemen, Gestapo agents, and "hirdmenn" (storm troopers) burst through the town and rounded up the Jewish residents. Throughout the night they were herded aboard a northern ship on its way across the Baltic, eastern Europe for their destination, their fate unknown. Of Norway's 1,300 Jews, 1 for every 2,250 of the population, 532 were aboard the ship, some 300 had escaped to Sweden, the rest were either in hiding, dead, or in concentration camps.

Beginning with November 15, 1942, the planned liquidation of the Jews in France proceeded steadily with increasing pitch. The report has reached us that Germany has placed February 15 as the day for the total bermichtung of the Jews in "new France." The program of denaturalization, internments, and wholesale deportations of an estimated 30,000 to 35,000 Jews will be handed over to German authorities. The imagination is overstrained in the realizations of the horror to follow.

Where is the conscience of humanity?

Every ravaged woman, every slaughtered innocent, every child torn from its mother, every slave, every victim of oppression and outrage says, "I accuse." Let us not forget them.

The world hails the joint declaration by all the Allied Nations, including our own, condemning Nazi slaughter of Jews and pledging retribution. Churches everywhere have re-echoed the protests against the carnage of the race of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

But Hitler knows only the law of the sword. Only force will deter him. He and his hordes must be strafed and strafed mercilessly. It shall be for him "unconditional surrender."

Up to January 27, not a single bomb was dropped by American pilots on Germany. Such retribution has been left to the Royal Air Force. Our air armada must soon let loose over Germany tons of bombs and explosives.

It is said that the bombing of Germany by the Royal Air Force has intensified Nazi anti-Semitism. Goebbels has warned that the Jews would atone for the bombings of Cologne—atone with the extermination of the race in Europe and, perhaps, even beyond Europe. Assuredly, the Jews are always the scapegoat for the Nazis. Jews will pay with their blood for all the reverses and frustrations of Hitler. He visits reprisals upon the Jews for the failure of the Wehrmacht in Russia. He already blames them for the speech of President Roosevelt wherein he said that the Nazis have asked for it and they shall have it.

The Jews cannot be any worse off than they are—American bombing of the Reich or no American bombing. The time has now arrived when we shall make "thunderbolt" raids by our Flying Fortresses, Liberators, and Avengers a tri-weekly occurrence. They shall hurl death and destruction up and down the land of the so-called herrenvolk. We shall not cease our air blitz until panic reigns all over Germany and the Nazis shall beg for mercy while Hitler takes his plunge of death from the top of his castle at Berchtesgaden.

In our thirst for retribution, well might we quote St. Paul from Romans, chapter 13: "For he (the ruler or magistrate) is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

The destruction of Jews is really a Christian problem for it is only in the lands of Europe that are called Christian that the anti-Semitism comes to such full flood. The Archbishop of York recently characterized the bestial cruelty practiced on the Jews as "the greatest crime in history * * *." "These people," he said, "have committed no crime. Their only offense is that they belong to the race of which our Lord and his apostles were members."

Dr. Atkinson, general secretary of the Church Peace Union, states: "It is imperative that the Christian churches, Protestant and Catholic alike, help to make the winning of this battle against Jewish persecution and the other manifestations of anti-Semitism the spearhead of a new effort to rehabilitate the world and guarantee liberty for all people everywhere."

It is well that we are not silent. It is well that the clamor of protest be heard above the cries of the victim. What further steps, however, can we take to save the innocent? Some answer, perhaps, lies in the statement issued from London by the three leading spokesmen of the Anglican Church—the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Wales—who appealed to the British Government to take immediate action to find sanctuary for all Jewish refugees fleeing Hitler, either in "the British Empire or elsewhere." There is a practical wisdom in the manifesto of these three archbishops which contained the following: "The bishops of England and Wales declare that the sufferings of these millions of Jews and their condemnation, failing immediate rescue, to cruel and certain death constitute an appeal to humanity which it is impossible to resist. They believe it is the duty of civilized nations, whether neutral or allied, to exert them-

selves to the utmost possible extent to provide sanctuary for these victims * * *." They advocated therein the finding of "immediate refuge territories."

Sanctuary, refuge, and asylum. These are the words that are inextricably woven into the fabric of our great country. Out of these concepts grew a Nation, rich and powerful. The oppressed throughout the world dreamed of these United States as the land "dedicated to the principle that all men are created free and equal." Does not the thought strike you that we, too, can be enmeshed in an ideology of cruelty and callousness (and perhaps complicity in murder) if we do not open the door together with other Allied Nations to take care of the otherwise trapped victims of Nazi brutality?

Rigid immigration regulations now tie our hands as they do Great Britain's. It is most pertinent to note that in Great Britain nearly 40,000 Palestine immigration certificates remain unused of the 75,000 assigned to Jews under the provisions of the White Paper of 1939. In the United States, it may be of value to observe, that if all the applications for entrance visas to the United States which are now being considered by the Federal authorities were granted, the total number of immigrants would still be only 10 percent of the pre-war immigration quota.

I want to leave you with the thought of the driving necessity for concerted action on the part of the Allied Nations to save a helpless people from the extremities of torture to be followed by total annihilation. Our humanity is there. Do not let it sink beneath the weight of inertia.

Faults of American Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for fear some Members of the House and Senate will fail to read the article by Westbrook Pegler in the Washington Daily News of Monday, February 1, 1943, I am offering the same for printing in the Appendix

In my opinion there has never been a time in the history of this country when its future was so uncertain or when the economic welfare of its citizens was so seriously jeopardized. I realize fully that there is a great difference of opinion as to what this Nation should do in order to help bring peace to this troubled world, after the war, and I believe the situation would be greatly clarified if those who would shoulder upon this and coming generations the responsibility for feeding, clothing, and policing the peoples of other countries would cease indulging in wishful thinking and begin to take stock of the price America must pay if we attempt to bring the four freedoms to all the people of the world.

After all, Mr. Speaker, this is a thoroughly practical world we live in. There are many things that we individually and collectively would like to do; there are many things we would like to have, but a wise and practical person, regardless of how deeply, how seriously he wishes to have certain things or to do certain things, counts well the cost before embarking upon something which may bring economic ruination upon himself.

Mr. Pegler deals with this question in a way that will appeal to every thoughtful person. The article follows:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, February 1.—The deadly fault of the American propaganda by which the political leaders of our Government try to win the confidence of the world, including the Axis, is that it is only a lure which is certain to be repudiated by Americans because it commits them to idealistic sacrifices which they never authorized. If it succeeds in helping to conquer the enemy, it will have been useful to us.

But when the time comes to make good Americans will refuse because, as the first operation in the establishment of the four freedoms movement everywhere in the world, we would have to depose our gallant ally, Joseph Stalin, and liberate the Russians and all the other continental European peoples who, in the fulfillment of victory by the Allies over the Germans, would fall under his rule or the rule of his successor.

The Americans will refuse to assume that task not only because of the probability of military defeat abroad and consequent dissolution at home but because we have no mission to impose our form of government on the rest of the world. That would be the rule of a small minority over a great majority, even if it could be accomplished, as, of course, it can't. As a military enterprise it would be insane. As a political project, hopeless.

It is useless to try to refute the fact that Russian communism is no less oppressive, dictatorial, brutal, and treacherous than Hitlerism. Some publicists, who a few years ago were describing Hitlerism as brown bolshevism, have more recently had less to say about the practical identity of the two brutalitarian systems. This is polite and expedient with Russia fighting savagely on our side, but the Russian form of government has not changed and it must be noticed that Stalin has neither expressed any intention to adopt the four freedoms in his own country nor to institute free government in any lands which he would occupy, seize, or police, as his victorious soldiers moved onward behind the crumbling legions of the Fuehrer.

If it is to be argued that the four freedoms can exist under some other system than ours, then nobody has yet named that system. For that matter, all four of them cannot exist at all, and they are, in plain truth, just skywriting thought up for propaganda purposes by two strong, determined political leaders with a gift for phrase making and an alert sense of expediency. Freedom from want and fear everywhere in the world is an order which cannot be fulfilled in the time of any person now living, and probably never can be in the world, and when the present military enemies are beaten the surviving fighters abroad will want to come home and resume life, and their families will demand that they be brought home. Any program of deliberate permanent impoverishment here for the benefit of the rest of the world will be beaten at the polls.

The United States did not enter this war to raise the living standards of the rest of the world but to protect this country and those living standards which Americans alone enjoyed. And the American contribution so far has been colossal and in the end will be just as important in the victory as the contributions of Britain, which stood alone while Stalin cooperated with Hitler, and of the Russians, who fought only when invaded and for honest reasons which they have had the decency not to misrepresent with sanctimonious slogans. They are fighting for the same reason that aroused the United States, namely love of homeland, and Stalin has been honest enough, confident enough in his strength, not to go in for hypocritical preaching.

If our propagandists could kid the rest of the world and deal us out at home, our people might be practical and cynical enough to understand and let the four freedoms pass without challenge. But when it all seems to commit us in dead earnest to a national career of pestiferous do-gooding all over the world, and to sharing forever our butter and beef, our clothing, automobiles, and all else that constitutes the material standard of American life, it suggests that the country which the fighters will come back to would be just another land of want.

And whoever gave anyone permission to promise all this in the name of the people of the United States?

Tribute to Small Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 1943, the Deport Times, which is published at Deport, Tex., by Mr. Sam Holloway, carried an article entitled "Tribute to Small Newspapers." It is such a fine tribute that I would like to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time. It is as follows:

TRIBUTE TO SMALL NEWSPAPERS

The Clarksville Times recently celebrated its seventieth birthday. In honor of the event R. M. White, superintendent of Clarksville schools, tendered his congratulations and paid the following tribute to country newspapers:

"I note with interest that this week marks the seventieth anniversary of the founding of the Clarksville Times. Three score and ten years is a long time in the life of men and institutions. The launching of any business is an interesting event, but to my mind the birth of a newspaper holds the deepest significance of them all.

"Some organizations become cold mechanical units which move with unvarying routine—highly efficient but inanimate. Not so with newspapers. They have personality. Like human beings, they live. They visit in the homes of their communities without distinction or discrimination as to race, color, or creed. The small-town newspaper used to refer to its subscribers as its 'family of readers,' and the phrase was aptly used.

"The newspaper does indeed become a member of the family. It may sit around an open fire in a country home and furnish entertainment on winter evenings. It visits homesick boys on battlefields and ships, and revives happy memories of home and friends. When some member of the family marries, the newspaper is there to offer congratulations.

"When a child is born the newspaper welcomes the arrival and stays nearby to record faithfully all the events of its life. When death comes to a member of a family, the

newspaper stands with uncovered head among the mourners. It is rich in memories—sweet and tender—but it draws the mantle of charity over the weaknesses and sins of those who have gone.

"From its pages may be gleaned an epic story filled with joy and sorry, failure, and success, comedy and tragedy—the story of a plain, rural people not all good and not all bad, but a story which portrays vividly a cross-section of life in a typical American small town and county—a story which runs the whole gamut of human emotions."

While the Valiant Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., of Sunday last:

WHILE THE VALIANT DIE

The Firestone Rubber Co.'s plant at Memphis was shut down yesterday.

It was shut down by the willful selfishness of its workers.

Every machine was idle. The great shops were quiet.

No collapsible rubber boats were made for fighting airmen who have to bail out over vast expanses of lonely, friendless seas.

No tires were made on which guns, ammunition carts, supply trucks, or any sort of military equipment could move in this most mobile of all wars.

Recording the strike the newspapers said: "Few workers remained at the plant. There was no trouble."

No—there was no trouble. There was nothing but quiet where normally is such heavy clamor of machines making equipment for fighting men.

The violence and trouble, the clamor and sounds heard only in combat—they were far away.

On Guadalcanal.

In New Guinea.

In north Africa.

In the air over Europe.

On the seven seas where lurk the enemy's terrible underwater wolf packs.

There was no quiet there—nor peace.

Americans died yesterday—far away. More will die today. Many more will die on the tomorrows.

They are men who have soldiered 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, on a rough pay basis of 7 cents an hour with a fox hole thrown in for a home, and concentrated field rations to boot. Only they don't die on that basis.

They die for country—and for the security of us at home—even those who strike.

The Firestone workers who quit work on war contracts repudiated their obligation to country and to their country's fighting forces because they wanted a guaranty that they would continue to get 70 cents an hour.

Nobody had told them they wouldn't get it. The company had merely announced that it could not continue to guarantee it for tire-room workers. Even at the hour they struck all of the machinery for an amicable settlement was in motion. The case was before the labor-favorable War Labor Relations Board.

But no—that and the needs of the armed services was not enough—the workers had to arbitrarily and summarily shut down the plant.

We wonder what the Memphis men now serving on the far-flung fronts will think of their fellow citizens when they hear about that. We wonder what all men of the armed services think of this sort of obstruction at home while they fight, thirst, starve, and die that the American way of life can be preserved.

But this ugly closure of a war plant through economic selfishness is not, and never will be, the true American way of life.

It is something alien, repugnant, and unforgivable in wartime.

We advise the striking Firestone workers to reflect on what they are doing—doing chiefly to their own cause of unionism—and go back to work.

A whirlwind of public reaction to all this sort of thing is in the making. They will not escape it.

Smaller Manufacturers and Producers Can Now Get Consideration for Contracts Near Home Without Coming to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress ask me every day how a manufacturing or producing concern can get consideration for a war contract. Now the opportunity is afforded to get consideration near their homes. For the first time since June 11, 1942, when the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act was signed by the President, the will of Congress is at least partly being carried out.

Before the passage of the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act, known as the Murray-Patman law, Public, No. 603, anyone who wanted a contract to do war work had to come to Washington in order to get consideration. The big concerns already had their representatives in Washington and, naturally, had a great advantage over the inexperienced representatives of small business, who came to Washington wholly unacquainted and without knowing how to proceed.

It was the purpose of Congress, in enacting Public Law No. 603, to give the small manufacturer and plant operator an opportunity to go to a nearby city and contact a representative of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and receive the same consideration and the same benefits in proportion as the big concern's representative would receive here in Washington. Before the passage of this act, the small men were given the brush-off and the run-around by the different agencies of our Government, and received no contracts. In some cases, a plant owner was offered a contract if he could get the money, then he went to the lending agency and found out that he could get the money if he got the contract first. Then in some cases, the plant owner was persistent enough to finally get the contract and the money and still could not get materials. The object of the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act was to place in Mr. Donald Nelson, Chief of the War Production Board, sufficient power to not only give the small man a contract, but also furnish him the money and, if necessary, rehabilitate his plant or even furnish him additional facilities or machine tools. The law makes it possible for Mr. Nelson's representative under the Smaller War Plants Corporation to make it possible for all of these things to be made available to the small businessman in a nearby office in the same way and manner that the big man had received such privileges in Washington.

Up until now there was no organization in the field to give the small man these benefits and privileges through the Smaller War Plants Corporation as contemplated by Congress when it passed the act and gave Mr. Nelson $150,000,000 for its administration. But now there is an office in each city where there is a War Production Board office. The production service branch in each W. P. B. office has been transferred to the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

ADVICE TO CONSTITUENTS

Any constituent of a Member of Congress who desires consideration for a war contract to make war goods or to make essential civilian goods should be directed to go to his nearest War Production Board office and inquire for the manager of the Smaller War Plants Corporation in that Division.

It should be remembered that Public Law No. 603 not only includes the making of war supplies but it also includes the making of essential civilian goods.

Mr. Donald Nelson's order setting up and revitalizing the Smaller War Plants Corporation is as follows:

FIELD FUNCTIONS AND ORGANIZATION OF THE SMALLER WAR PLANTS DIVISION

SECTION 1. PURPOSE

.01 The purpose of this order is to define the functions of the Smaller War Plants Division which are to be performed as part of the field operations of the War Production Board and to establish the responsibilities and working relationships necessary for the performance of such functions.

SECTION 2. FIELD FUNCTIONS OF THE SMALLER WAR PLANTS DIVISION

.01 The field functions of the Smaller War Plants Division are to:

1. Develop and maintain in district and regional offices records of all production facilities available in the districts;

2. Maintain current records of the production facilities of distressed plants separately from other facilities records, such records to be verified and copies filed with the Washington office of the Division;

3. Develop and maintain in district and regional offices a critical tool service and current records in order to make available for war production all usable critical tools, copies of such critical tools records to be filed with the Washington office of the Division;

4. Investigate plants under consideration for recommendation to procurement agencies to determine the degree of distress, the amount of business on hand and scheduled,

and competency to produce prescribed items, including adequacy of facilities and engineering ability and previous experience in the manufacture of similar products;

5. Work with field offices of the several procurement agencies to assist in the placement of prime contracts with plants recommended by the Smaller War Plants Division, such assistance to include the placing of orders for work to be performed on available working tools;

6. Work with procurement officers and contractors in breaking down prime contracts into subcontracts and assisting in the placement of the work to be subcontracted;

7. Provide technical services to small plants to assist them in bidding on and delivering under contracts;

8. Provide adequate follow-up services on orders placed through the Smaller War Plants Division to assure maximum performance on the part of contractors;

9. Provide such services as may be necessary to acquaint manufacturers, who request information, with the services available to them through the Smaller War Plants Division and the Smaller War Plants Corporation;

10. Provide such financial and related service to manufacturers as may be necessary for them to carry out the programs of producing material essential to the war effort or maintenance of civilian economy;

11. Obtain, process, and transmit to the Smaller War Plants Corporation such information as may be required by the Corporation in the performance of its functions;

12. Prepare and transmit to the Washington office of the Division such reports as are required covering program operations of the Smaller War Plants Division; and

13. Carry out such other specific assignments as may from time to time be made by the Deputy Chairman of the War Production Board on Smaller War Plants.

SECTION 3. RESPONSIBILITIES AND WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

.01 It shall be the responsibility of the regional director to carry out the policies, programs, and procedures of the Smaller War Plants Division as established by the Deputy Chairman of the War Production Board on Smaller War Plants.

.02 There shall be established in each region the position of deputy regional director for smaller war plants, who shall devote his full time to the smaller war-plants program. He shall appoint such regional and district staffs or representatives as may be necessary to effectively carry out the program of the Smaller War Plants Division.

.03 Pursuant to section 6.02 of General Administrative Order No. 2-51, the Deputy Regional Director for Smaller War Plants for each regional office shall be selected by the Deputy Chairman of the War Production Board on Smaller War Plants and the regional director concerned. The deputy regional director for smaller war plants will be governed in the performance of his duties by the policies, programs, and procedures of the Smaller War Plants Division.

.04 The regional director shall furnish the deputy regional director for smaller war plants with the personal services and administrative services and facilities necessary to the effective performance of his duties.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE

.01 This order is effective January 7, 1943.

DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a list of the field personnel of the Smaller War Plants Division of the War Production Board. It is self-explanatory:

War Production Board regional offices

Region	State War Production Board deputy director	Address	Phone
1. Boston	Richard Cooke	17 Court St	Laf. 7500.
2. New York	H. P. Ingels	122 East 42d St	Murray Hill 3-6805.
3. Philadelphia	A. Whittemore	1617 Pennsylvania Blvd	Locust 340.
4. Atlanta	T. E. Falvy	116 Candler Bldg	Walnut 4121.
5. Cleveland	D. P. Ford	1300 Union Commerce Bldg	Cherry 7900.
6. Chicago	L. A. Miller	226 West Jackson Blvd	Andover 3600.
7. Kansas City	R. W. Webb	Mutual Interstate Bldg., 13th and Locust Sts.	Victor 7780.
8. Dallas	J. B. Joyce	910 Fidelity Bldg	Riverside 5711.
9. Denver	R. W. Gordon	Kittredge Bldg	Tabor 3173.
10. San Francisco	O. L. Starr	1355 Market St	Klondike 2-2300.
11. Detroit	H. A. Weissbrodt	7310 Woodward Ave	Trinity 2-4900.
12. Minneapolis	R. C. Duncan	344 Midland Bank Bldg	Main 3244.

War Production Board district officers

Location	District manager	Address	Phone
1. Bridgeport, Conn	R. L. French	144 Golden Hill St	4-9441.
2. Hartford, Conn	E. L. Milliken	119 Ann St	7-2641.
3. New Haven, Conn	C. A. Newton	152 Temple St	7-5891.
4. Portland, Maine	C. E. Hyde	142 High St	4-1431.
5. Lowell, Mass	W. E. Stanwood	8 Merrimac St	6388.
6. Springfield, Mass	H. G. Philbrook	1500 Main St	2-7493.
7. Worcester, Mass	D. C. Daniels	340 Main St	6-4671.
9. Manchester, N. H	T. H. Hagan	Amoskeag Industries Bldg	2031.
10. Providence, R. I	J. C. Nash	530 Industrial Tr. Bldg	Dexter 4684.
11. Montpelier, Vt	L. E. Richwagen	84 State St	1700.
13. Newark, N. J	L. C. Ward	Globe Indemnity Bldg	Market 2-0700.
14. Albany, N. Y	F. J. Holman	112 State St	5-6251.
15. Buffalo, N. Y	P. R. Smith	1138 Rand Bldg	Madison 3-160.
17. New York, N. Y	R. F. Morse	122 East 42d St	Murray Hill 3-6803.
18. Rochester, N. Y	M. H. Gregg	707 Commerce Bldg	Stone 3-607.
19. Syracuse, N. Y	T. D. Harter	224 Harrison St	3-7101.
20. Utica, N. Y	E. R. Mason	First National Bank Bldg	2-9268.
21. Wilmington, Del	T. E. Doramus	314 Pennsylvania Bldg	4-8879.
22. Baltimore, Md	G. W. Creighton	Baltimore Trust Bldg	Plaza 8170.
23. Camden, N. J	F. H. Cohen	300 Broadway	9075.
24. Trenton, N. J	C. B. Gilbert	City Center Bldg	3-7151.
25. Allentown, Pa	J. R. Sanborn	506 Hamilton St	3-740.
26. Chester, Pa	Abbott Smith	12-14 East 5th St	6207.
27. Harrisburg, Pa	Ritchie Lawrie, Jr	112 Market St	4-1157.
29. Lancaster, Pa	do	Woolworth Bldg	3-3941.
30. Norristown, Pa	F. P. Gross	Norristown-Pennsylvania Trust Bldg.	6700.
31. Reading, Pa	J. A. Archer	615 Penn St	4-4901.
32. Scranton, Pa	J. P. Eyre Price	First National Bank Bldg	4-6158.
33. Williamsport, Pa	J. H. McCormick	120 West 4th St	9142-3.
35. York, Pa	R. S. Cole	25 North Duke St	7881.
36. Norfolk, Va	C. F. Rhodes	528 Dickson Bldg	5-1654.
37. Richmond, Va	O. D. Dennis	10 South 5th St	7-2331.
38. Roanoke, Va	A. D. Miller	118 Kirk Ave	3-4421.
41. Birmingham, Ala	J. P. Barnes	322 Phoenix Bldg	4-6711.
42. Mobile, Ala	J. A. Miller	First National Bank Bldg	
43. Jacksonville, Fla	T. L. Staton	George Washington Hotel Annex	5-0693.
44. Miami, Fla	F. D. Banning	701 Congress Bldg	3-0756.
45. Tampa, Fla	H. A. Brannan	901 Wallace S. Bldg	M-8461.
46. Jackson, Miss	A. C. McIntosh	605 Tower Bldg	3-4062.
47. Charlotte, N. C	J. E. MacDougall	Charlotte Law Bldg	3-6194.
48. Raleigh, N. C	T. J. Love	Capital Club Bldg	3-1091.
49. Columbia, S. C	D. E. McDuffie	204 Manson Bldg	2-8546.
50. Greenville, S. C	Fred Pattersall	Palmetto Bldg	
53. Chattanooga, Tenn	P. E. Shacklett	911 James Bldg	7-4412.
54. Knoxville, Tenn	W. W. Mynatt	203 Goode Bldg	3-0791.
56. Memphis, Tenn	J. K. Lester	1821 Sterick Bldg	5-7421.
57. Nashville, Tenn	Stuart Fonde	1013 Stahlman Bldg	5-8525.
58. Louisville, Ky	H. Dale Rue	Todd Bldg., 4th and Market Sts	Wabash 6553.
59. Akron, Ohio	H. B. Harpham	618-19 Central Tower	Jefferson 2141.
60. Canton, Ohio	E. O. Kuendig	601 Commercial Bldg	3-9104.
62. Cincinnati, Ohio	E. C. Henlein	34 East Fourth St	Cherry 3740.
63. Cleveland, Ohio	F. L. Williams	Union Commerce Bldg	Cherry 7900.
64. Columbus, Ohio	B. C. Kuhars	513 East Town St	Main 6573.
65. Dayton, Ohio	H. B. Doty	129 S. Ludlow St	Hemlock 5321.
66. Lima, Ohio	Harry Wright, Jr	Colonial Finance Bldg	
67. Youngstown, Ohio	Leif Oyen	Union National Bank Bldg	3-0415.
68. Erie, Pa	H. B. Joyce	Erie Trust Co. Bldg	26-901.
69. Johnstown, Pa	I. W. Sell	U. S. National Bank Bldg	6-1351.
70. Pittsburgh, Pa	A. H. Burchfield, Jr	800 First National Bank Bldg	Grant 296.
71. Charleston, W. Va	E. J. McClees	34 Capitol City Bldg	3-9511.
72. Clarksburg, W. Va	A. H. Cooper	Empire National Bank Bldg	1460-1.
73. Huntington, W. Va	F. B. Enslow	309-11 West Virginia Bldg	29316-7.
74. Wheeling, W. Va	E. C. Drake	Fidelity Building	4750.
75. Decatur, Ill	Paul Fields	308 Standard Office Bldg	2-7612.
76. Peoria, Ill	R. W. Prichard	1107 Alliance Life Bldg	3-4433.
77. Rockford, Ill	James Marks	621 Gas and Electric Bldg	Main 654
78. Springfield, Ill	W. L. Eckhardt	407 Leland Office Bldg	2-8889.
79. Evansville, Ind	R. C. Hubert	8 Koenig Building	3-5406.
80. Fort Wayne, Ind	G. A. Dinnen	410 Utility Bldg	Anthony 8415.
81. Gary, Ind	W. J. Barndollar	926 Gary State Bank Bldg	6213.
82. Indianapolis, Ind	Jack Frohlich	Circle Tower Bldg	Market 8311.
83. South Bend, Ind	Howard Richardson	206 City National Bank Bldg	
84. Davenport, Iowa	William Ogden	404 Kahl Bldg	2-5326.
85. Des Moines, Iowa	Walter Muir	600 Liberty Bldg	3-8681.
89. Appleton, Wis	P. W. Romig	341 College Ave	7603.
90. Eau Claire, Wis	D. W. Walters	128 Graham Ave	2-1637.
91. Madison, Wis	J. D. Howard	405 Washington Bldg	8234-5.
92. Milwaukee, Wis	F. W. Greusel	7048 Plankington Bldg	Broadway 4440.
93. Wausau, Wis	Herbert Crane	408 3d St	4665.
94. Fort Smith, Ark	F. P. DeLarzelere	Kelly Bldg	8911.
95. Little Rock, Ark	C. S. Christian	Pyramid Bldg	4-7401.

War Production Board district officers—Continued

Location	District manager	Address	Phone
96. Wichita, Kans	H. G. Hartzell	Union National Bank Bldg	5-9815.
97. St. Louis, Mo	L. E. Crandall	Paul Brown Bldg	Central 320.
98. Kansas City, Mo	W. B. Satterlee	Mutual Interstate Bldg	Victor 7780.
99. Joplin, Mo	L. R. Reynolds	701 Joplin National Bank Bldg	
100. Omaha, Nebr	L. B. Holland	City National Bank Bldg	Jackson 6466.
101. New Orleans, La	A. T. Dusenburg	Canal Bldg	Canal 3481.
103. Shreveport, La	G. F. Cunningham	Ardis Bldg	2-9303-5.
104. Oklahoma City, Okla	C. F. Aurand	Key Bldg	7-1151.
105. Tulsa, Okla	A. E. Ballin	Petroleum Bldg	2-6221.
106. El Paso, Tex	R. C. Stryker	410 Caples Bldg	M-11080.
107. Houston, Tex	G. L. Nobles, Jr	Electric Bldg	C-7201.
109. San Antonio, Tex	Carl L. Pool	Majestic Bldg	F-5321.
110. Pueblo, Colo	Louis M. Mathis	Post Office Bldg	7860.
111. Helena, Mont	Oscar A. Baarson	Power Block Annex	570.
112. Albuquerque, N. Mex	John J. Ginner	103½ West Central Ave	6741.
113. Salt Lake City, Utah	Ralph E. Bristol	Atlas Bldg	57531.
114. Casper, Wyo	W. F. Wilkerson	P. & R. Bldg	Casper 319.
115. Phoenix, Ariz	H. S. Wright	Security Bldg	47101.
117. Tucson, Ariz	William I. Walsh	68 East Congress St	5526.
118. Fresno, Calif	John S. Moffatt	Mattei Bldg	4-5929.
119. Los Angeles, Calif	Alexander Macdonald	1031 South Broadway	Ri-0311.
120. Oakland, Calif	W. P. Collins	1924 Broadway	Templebar 6830.
121. Sacramento, Calif	Orlando McCrane	Farmers' & Mechanics Bldg	2-5808.
122. San Diego, Calif	Ralph Proctor	1126 San Diego Trust & Savings Bldg.	Franklin 8907.
123. Boise, Idaho	Raymond J. Briggs	Capitol Securities Bldg	6720.
124. Reno, Nev	Edwin S. Bender	Saviers Bldg	2-4833.
125. Portland, Oreg	J. Fred Bergesch	Bedell Bldg	Atwater 7241.
126. Seattle, Wash	Milton H. Luce	White-Henry-Stuart Bldg	Elliott 0200.
128. Spokane, Wash	Dewitt E. Wallace	Sun Life Assurance Bldg	Riverside 6135.
130. Grand Rapids, Mich	Ray M. Olds	1004 Michigan National Bank Bldg	6-5373.
131. Iron Mountain, Mich	George Wallner	400 Commercial National Bank Bldg	1400.
132. Saginaw, Mich	Raymond G. Donahue	614 People's Building & Loan Association.	3-6444.
133. Toledo, Ohio	A. E. Buchenberg	833 Security Bank Bldg	Garfield 1941.
135. Duluth, Minn	A. J. Newman	307 Christie Bldg	Melrose 7735.
136. Bismarck, N. Dak	Robert Schwitzenberg	First National Bank Bldg	174.
137. Fargo, N. Dak	Paul W. Fawcett	Universal Bldg	
138. Sioux Falls, S. Dak	James G. Scott	4th floor, Western Security Bldg	6340.
141. San Juan, P. R	Gordon W. Foote	Bldg. B, stop 8	San Juan 46.
139. Ottawa, Canada	Joseph Tucker	Temporary "3" Bldg	2-2811.

Mr. Speaker, this is the finest progress that has been made in the carrying out of the intent of Congress in the passage of Public Law No. 603.

If the Smaller War Plants Division will now carry out the purposes of the act, the small manufacturing and producing concerns in this country will not have to go out of business. They can all stay in business and be properly taken care of by producing for a fair profit either war supplies or essential civilian goods.

Completion of Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the Senate of the State of California:

Senate Joint Resolution 10

Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore appropriated an aggregate of $149,969,000 for the construction of the Central Valley Project, California, and it is estimated that the further sum of $114,031,000 will be necessary to complete said project; and

Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior has for the past 7 years been engaged in constructing said project; and

Whereas some units of the project are only partially completed, including Shasta Dam, Keswick Dam, the Contra Costa Canal, Madera Canal and Friant Dam, while work has not even commenced on vital units such as the Delta Cross Channel, the Delta-Mendota pumping system, and the Friant-Kern Canal; and

Whereas construction of said Friant Dam on the San Joaquin River has been virtually completed by the United States Bureau of Reclamation except for installation of control gates; and said Friant Dam and Madera and Friant-Kern Canals can be completed enabling beneficial use to be made of waters now going to waste, by the use of a comparatively insignificant amount of strategic materials and expenditure of a relatively small additional appropriation by the Congress, and the necessary machinery and equipment for such construction is now idle and therefore available, the necessary labor, skilled and unskilled, can be obtained without material conflict with the manpower demands of the war program, and, with irrigation water available from said Friant Dam through said canals, said San Joaquin Valley lands will be capable of affording an enormous increase of production of foods, fibers, and raw rubber vital to the progress of the war; and

Whereas the War Production Board has recently ordered cessation of construction of all units of said project except Shasta Dam; and

Whereas the Great Central Valley of California is now making a contribution to the current war program by the production of essential foods and fibers; and

Whereas the completion of the Central Valley project by providing sorely needed supplementary water supplies will enable an enormous increase in the production of foods and fibers of which there are now serious shortages throughout the Nation; and

Whereas completion of the project will make available many thousands of acres peculiarly suited to the growing of guayule, the most feasible source of natural rubber; and

Whereas on completion the project will afford a source of electric energy which will enable a vast expansion of ship building yards, factories, and other strategic war production plants in California; and

Whereas all features of the Central Valley project are designed as mutually interrelated, and to fulfill the objectives of the project and to make a material contribution to the war program, it is imperative that the project, including all features thereof, be completed in its entirety: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes and urges the President and the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the War Production Board that all units of the Central Valley project and all features thereof and particularly those portions thereof positively necessary to aid the war effort be promptly completed, and to that end that the necessary funds, priorities, and materials, be made immediately available; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the War Production Board.

Tall and Straight and Proud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I desire to place in the RECORD an editorial written by William M. Tugman of the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard concerning Maj. Tom Taylor, United States Army Air Corps, who died in action and whose service is symbolic of the price of freedom paid by those who gave all for this Nation in times of peril in the past and those who are giving all in the present crisis:

TALL AND STRAIGHT AND PROUD

As most of us are learning, the war becomes very real when it takes someone we have known. Maj. Tom Taylor is the latest, killed in action, leading his army bombers "somewhere over Western Europe."

Tom was one of the boys we have watched growing up—grade school, junior high, Boy Scouts, University high, the University, and then the Army Air Corps, which was as it should be because he was one of those young fellows who love flying and look beyond war to the great new era of aviation.

One fine day in the summer before Pearl Harbor, Lieutenant Taylor came home to be married to Alice Giustina. Then he went away again and there were only the reports that he was leading patrols over the Pacific and had been promoted to captain and that he had been given command of a squadron evidently headed for the European front. Just a few weeks ago came the news from "somewhere in the A. E. F." that he had been given the gold leaves of a major.

There was a boy, and then there was a very tall young man, very straight, merry with youth, but gravely proud to wear the uniform and the wings. He was the sort to make you feel more secure about America, whatever the future might bring, a young man, competent and completely unafraid, fit to lead. His parents, Howard and Hazel Tay-

lor, and his bride, and all who knew him had reason to share his pride.

There is nothing to be said now to make up for such loss, except to recall the stout conviction that this soil breeds such men. In the last war the young Englishman, Rupert Brooke, who died in Gallipoli, wrote:

"If I should die, think only this of me:
That there's some corner of a foreign land
That is forever England."

Tom Taylor and his kind do not write poetry but they live it—on land and sea and air. This home-town boy whose earliest dreams were air-borne may have thought of liberty as freedom of the skies. There are no words adequate to tell what brave men feel. Their deeds have surpassing dignity.

The skies will be free, and men will be free. This will come to pass and the brief life of Tom Taylor may be read as prophesy. He did not fear to die, nor did he fear to live. He led his squadron into the daylight hell over Lille, not merely under orders but because such men as he believe devoutly that what they do is for the future.

There are millions more, on land and sea and air, proud of their service, confident of worthy destiny. When war comes so close to us there is sorrow—and there is anger—at a blundering civilization which has coddled tyrannies. But there must be pride in undaunted youth which meets the challenge. They shame petty, selfish fears. Their lives say the future begins now, and they are unafraid.

Outline of Details of 1943 Objectives of Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

UNITED WE WIN

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an outline of the 1943 objectives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, which was compiled by Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative representative of that organization. Some of the objectives will require legislation by the Congress, while others may be handled by regulations or changes in administrative policies. Where legislation is required and a bill has been introduced to accomplish an objective, the number and author of the bill is shown after the item.

This statement is formulated on the basis of resolutions adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars at their forty-third national encampment, and reads as follows:

UNITED WE WIN—AN OUTLINE OF THE 1943 OBJECTIVES OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

The following four-point program is formulated on the basis of resolutions adopted by the Forty-third National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and utilizes the current theme of the organization, United We Win:

Point 1. For the war effort.
Point 2. For Americanism.
Point 3. For veteran welfare.
Point 4. For the post-war program.

POINT 1. UNITED WE WIN—FOR THE WAR EFFORT

A. Armed forces

1. Continuation of pay for the armed forces after termination of the present war. H. R. 923 (by Mr. VAN ZANDT).

2. Cost of uniforms to be tax exempt. S. 228 (by Mr. CLARK of Missouri).

3. To insure appropriate noncommissioned rank and retirement privileges to enlisted persons of the Regular Establishment who serve during the present war in a temporary commissioned status and who return to enlisted status. H. R. 1008 (by Mr. KEARNEY).

4. To grant pensions at wartime rates for disabilities received on or after October 8, 1940. S. 229 (by Mr. CLARK of Missouri).

5. To grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits to certain World War No. 2 cases. S. 230 (by Mr. CLARK of Missouri).

6. Vocational rehabilitation for disabled veterans of the present war. H. R. 739 (by Mr. VAN ZANDT). H. R. 801 (by Mr. RANKIN).

7. Conferring citizenship upon alien veterans of World War No. 2. H. R. 921 (by Mr. VAN ZANDT).

8. First-class traveling accommodations for the armed forces.

9. Opposition to age restrictions in the armed forces.

B. Resources and production

1. Availability and offer of the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for individual or group service in the public interest.

2. Infiltration of veterans in ranks of younger service men.

3. Condemnation of those refusing to accept military service.

4. Use of men not of military age in defense industries so as to release younger men for military service.

5. Use of intemperates, rejected by the armed forces, on construction of military highways and similar projects.

C. General

1. Universal service principle. S. 41 (by Mr. HILL).

2. Opposition to unauthorized strikes in war industries.

3. Recommendation that the President of the United States arrange for an inventory of all employable persons.

4. National Employment Week. Calls upon all officers and departments to make National Employment Week a major activity in our employment program.

5. All facilities of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to be placed at the disposal of the Navy Department in recruiting drive.

6. Expeditious exchange of enemy aliens in the United States for American prisoners of war held by enemy nations.

7. Continued cooperation with the Veterans of Foreign Wars "Speak-up-for-democracy program."

8. Veterans of Foreign Wars supports the National Government in the war effort.

POINT 2. UNITED WE WIN—AMERICANISM

A. Development of Americanism

1. Urge the Federal Government to promote and encourage organization of senior and junior rifle clubs and to supply them with ammunition to make them an effective reserve to the armed forces of our country.

2. Organization and development of home-guard units for internal security.

3. Continue to advocate the adoption of the military salute as the standard salute to the flag by all American citizens.

4. Urge the continuance of the Veterans of Foreign Wars motion-picture committee.

B. Protection of Americanism

1. Compulsory military training in high schools and colleges.

2. To support the United States Office of Education in program to provide basic knowledge to illiterates in furtherance of the war effort.

3. To seek and support legislation for compulsory fingerprinting of all persons in the United States.

4. To commend Federal military and naval authorities on their action against fifth-column activities in the United States.

5. To commend the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its work in the preservation of our country.

6. To commend the Dies committee and urge its continuance indefinitely.

7. To oppose the liberation of Grover C. Bergdoll from prison until he has served his full term.

8. To urge political candidates to avoid statements that would undermine the faith of our people in the war program and its leaders.

9. To urge the exercising of franchise of voting.

POINT 3. UNITED WE WIN—VETERAN WELFARE

A. Provisions for service-disabled veterans

1. To define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes. S. 227 (by Mr. CLARK of Missouri).

2. To provide that World War veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof. H. R. 1010 (by Mr. KEARNEY).

3. To provide that the compensation or pension of service-connected disabled veterans shall be increased by 10 percent of the basic amounts, payable for each 5 years of age beginning with the fortieth birthday. H. R. 740 (by Mr. LESINSKI).

4. To provide for a statutory award of $10 per month to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities. H. R. 738 (by Mr. VOORHIS of California).

B. Provisions for non-service-disabled veterans

1. To define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes. S. 227 (by Mr. CLARK of Missouri).

2. To provide the same privileges for hospitalization and domiciliary care for campaign and expeditionary veterans as are now applicable to World War veterans. H. R. 887 (by Mr. VAN ZANDT).

3. To provide pensions for disabled veterans of the World War under similar conditions, and in the same amounts, as now provided for disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War. H. R. 1250 (by Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana).

4. To provide pensions for disabled unemployable veterans who served in a war, campaign, expedition, or insurrection beyond the continental limits of the United States. H. R. 1009 (by Mr. KEARNEY).

C. Provisions for dependents of veterans

1. To increase pensions payable to widows and orphans of deceased World War veterans who had service-connected disabilities; and to establish pensions for widows and orphans of deceased World War veterans, regardless of whether said veterans had service-connected disabilities. H. R. 1180 (by Mr. PETERSON of Florida).

2. To increase the monthly rates of World War death compensation payable to widows and children of deceased veterans. H. R. 859 (by Mr. BURDICK).

3. To extend eligibility for compensation to the widows and children of World War veterans who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment. H. R. 791 (by Mr. RANKIN).

4. To include persons who stood in loco parentis within the definition of a parent. H. R. 792 (by Mr. RANKIN).

5. To provide for adjudication of any claim for compensation, pension, or retirement pay upon evidence in file at time of death of the veteran. H. R. 793 (by Mr. RANKIN).

6. To eliminate the income limitation as to eligibility for pensions to the widows of certain World War veterans. H. R. 1505 (by Mr. MCMILLAN).

7. To provide that the widows and orphans and dependent parents of deceased World War veterans who were suffering with permanent total combat-incurred disabilities shall, regardless of the cause of death, be entitled to the rates of pension which would be payable to them if the veteran had been killed in action in such service. H. R. 888 (by Mr. VAN ZANDT).

8. Opposition to reduction of exemptions.

D. Hospitalization and medical treatment for veterans

1. To provide a scale for payments of compensation, pension, or retirement pay to veterans during hospitalization or domiciliary care. H. R. 920 (by Mr. LESINSKI).

2. To provide that a veteran's compensation or retirement pay shall not be reduced during first 90 days of his hospitalization or domiciliary care. H. R. 1035 (by Mr. KEARNEY).

3. To provide the same privileges for hospitalization and domiciliary care for campaign and expeditionary veterans as are now applicable to World War veterans. H. R. 887 (by Mr. VAN ZANDT).

4. Opposition to transfer of Veterans' Administration facilities.

5. Opposition to merger of Veterans' Administration with any other Government agency.

E. Insurance

1. To provide insurance benefits for total disability under contracts of National Service Life Insurance. S. 231 (by Mr. CLARK of Missouri).

2. To provide that Government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after 2 years. H. R. 795 (by Mr. RANKIN).

3. To amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits (under certain conditions) to persons permanently and totally disabled. H. R. 794 (by Mr. RANKIN).

F. Administration of veteran benefits

1. To provide liberalized definitions of permanent total disability. H. R. 780 (by Mr. VOORHIS).

2. Veterans' Administration, to correct erroneous adjudications. H. R. 796 (by Mr. RANKIN).

3. To define "unemployability." H. R. 781 (by Mr. VOORHIS).

4. To establish more equitable procedure governing the determination of service connection of diseases or injuries alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service in a war, campaign, or expedition. H. R. 782 (by Mr. VOORHIS).

5. 1933 schedule to include rating for gastritis, chronic.

6. Establishment of an appeal board.

7. Opposition to reduction in veterans' benefits.

G. Employment for veterans and their dependents

1. More effective preference for war veterans and their wives and widows as to Government jobs. H. R. 882 (by Mr. STARNES).

2. Granting a preference to war veterans, their wives, and widows in defense industries working on war contracts. H. R. 886 (by Mr. VAN ZANDT).

3. To authorize the acceptance by Federal agencies of a certification from the records of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard as to place and date of birth of a veteran. H. R. 1007 (by Mr. KEARNEY).

4. To permit reopening of civil-service examinations upon request of any war veteran. H. R. 922 (by Mr. VAN ZANDT).

5. To correct procedure of civil service rules relating to prosthetic appliances. H. R. 911 (by Mr. REES).

6. To grant civil-service preference of 15 points to wives and widows of certain veterans. H. R. 1620 (by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts).

7. Urge the President of the United States to appoint a committee to explore the field of employment by the Federal Government and private industry of handicapped persons, including disabled veterans.

8. Creation of Bureau for Handicapped Persons, other than veterans.

9. Prohibit the employment of enemy aliens by any Federal, State, county, or municipal government.

10. Employment in defense plants of men not of military age.

H. Miscellaneous provisions

1. Vocational rehabilitation of older persons and handicapped persons, other than veterans. S. 180 (by Mr. LA FOLLETTE).

2. To extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act may be filed. H. R. 707 (by Mr. CARLSON of Kansas).

3. To provide increased pensions for disabled members of the Regular Establishment. H. R. 919 (by Mr. LESINSKI).

4. To grant burial allowances in cases of certain deceased veterans of the Regular Establishment. H. R. 885 (by Mr. VAN ZANDT).

5. Government grave stones for veterans. H. R. 906 (by Mr. REES of Kansas).

6. To provide that the rates of compensation or pension to veterans and dependents of deceased veterans shall be increased by 15 percent. H. R. 1121 (by Mr. RANKIN).

7. To provide for presumption of soundness at enlistment after 6 months' service in the active military or naval service. H. R. 884 (by Mr. VAN ZANDT).

8. Tax free cigarettes and tobacco for hospitalized veterans.

9. Civilian Conservation Corps assets for Veterans' Administration facilities.

10. Favor increased wages for Veterans' Administration facilities employees.

11. Approve and support legislation to increase salary of postal employees.

12. Opposition to enactment of a Federal prohibition law.

POINT 4. UNITED WE WIN—FOR THE POST-WAR PROGRAM

1. Appointment of a national committee to study post-war plans and problems.

2. Support the stand of the President of the United States in bringing to justice, at the close of the war, those responsible for the atrocities against Americans and others interned by the Axis Powers.

3. Unconditional surrender of Axis Powers.

4. Adoption of program of adequate national defense in times of peace.

5. Abandonment of the traditional isolationist policy, and urge that the leaders of our Nation pursue a policy which will preserve the freedom and independence of all nations.

Address of Hon. Wendell L. Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to offer a few possible pertinent observations on what I believe is today's vital issue and to include therein a speech by Mr. Wendell Willkie.

It cannot be doubted that great changes in our distribution of and unregulated control over property will come out of this war. The oft-forgotten danger lies in the present and growing materialism, with its utter disregard for and disrespect of moral values or obligations in government. These threaten to give us a more equal distribution of material things, but at the terrible price of lost political morality and freedom.

This was the underlying issue of 1940, which reasserted itself more successfully in 1942. It should be the fundamental issue in 1944. The ends must no longer be considered debatable, but the means have become all important.

Mr. Henry Bamford Parkes has well stated it in the preface to his recent book, The Pragmatic Test:

> Only by the development of reason and will can we discover what we really want, establish order and harmony among our desires, and learn how best to express them in activity. In proportion as we approach this condition of maturity we achieve moral freedom. This kind of freedom is connected with political and economic coercion, since it is only in a free society that men can most nearly achieve moral freedom, while only men who value freedom can be trusted to defend free institutions. Any philosophy which denies the possibility of moral freedom undermines the foundation of political freedom.

It is also true that an educational system which ignores the liberal arts and stresses so-called "worth while" or purely scientific or material subjects will raise up in this country after the war a generation whose education will be so unbalanced on the material side that they are apt to be swept away by either of the prevalent totalitarian, materialistic systems of government and economics, with the resultant destruction of the moral and political freedoms inherent in our constitutional concept of government.

For this reason the recent address of Mr. Wendell Willkie at Duke University on January 14, 1943, is so timely and well considered that I feel justified in requesting its inclusion in the RECORD:

> I think it can be stated as almost an historical truism that the greatest civilizations of history have been the best educated civilizations. And when I speak of education in this sense I do not have in mind what so many today claim as education, namely, special training to do particular jobs. Clearly, in a technological age like ours, a great deal of training is necessary. Some of us must learn how to be mechanics, some how to be architects, or chemists. Some will have a special aptitude for medicine. And a great many will have—or think they have—a mysterious talent which induces them to undertake the practice of law.
>
> But none of these specialists constitutes true education. They are training for skills by which men live. I am thinking, rather, of what we call the liberal arts. I am speaking of education for its own sake; to know for the sheer joy of understanding, to speculate, to analyze, to compare, and to imagine.
>
> Look back across the panorama of history. Is it not true that the pinnacles of civilization have been achieved by the cities and states most proficient in the liberal arts and occupations? In their contributions to the en-

richment of human life, the Greeks, I believe, tower above us all. Yet this is not because the Greeks were good navigators, which they were; nor because they were great architects, which indeed they were. It was rather because almost all their leaders—and many of their citizens whose names we do not know—enjoyed knowledge and reverenced the arts. The Greek cities conquered the eastern Mediterranean with the sword. But they conquered posterity with their minds.

The onrush of what we call modern civilization has obscured this essential truth of history. People—some of them in very high places—have openly disparaged the liberal arts. You are told that they are of little help to a man in earning his living or in making a contribution to his fellow men. The thing to do, you are told, is to get trained; learn an occupation; make yourself proficient in some trade or profession. Of course this advice is sound, so far as it goes. But the inference, and sometimes the outright declaration that frequently follows it, strikes at the very roots of our society. The liberal arts, we are told, are luxuries. At best you should fit them into your leisure time. They are mere decorations upon the sterner pattern of life which must be lived in action and by the application of skills. When such arguments gain acceptance that is the end of us as a civilized nation.

Today we are engaged in a desperate war, and we need for the fighting forces almost all the young men who would, normally, have had an opportunity to acquire a liberal education. It is right and proper that these young men should abandon their education temporarily and go forth to fight. It is right and proper that the universities of this country should turn over to the armed forces whatever facilities can be made useful. The Government is moving very vigorously in this direction and no patriotic citizen will fail to cooperate.

But I must confess that the attitude in which the conversion of the colleges has been undertaken, together with certain public declarations, fill me with alarm. A few weeks ago, for instance, an administration spokesman advised all young girls to devote their time to technical training courses in college or to leave college and go to work. Now it is clear that we cannot solve our manpower problem without putting women to work. Yet the fact is that there are millions of women above college age, not needed in their homes or for the care of their children, who are still available. Until these older women are all employed there is no need whatever to drag young women out of the colleges and to deprive them of their one great opportunity for a liberal education. On the contrary, it is a very harmful thing to do. For just now millions of our young men are being deprived of this opportunity, and the per capita percentage of college attendance in the United States is going to fall to a record low for our time. At least, therefore, let us preserve, through the women of America, the continuity of the liberal arts.

In fact, so important are the liberal arts for our future civilization that I feel that education in them should be as much a part of our war planning as the more obviously needed technical training. There will be a certain number of young men in every college who, for one reason or another, are not available for military service. They should be given the facilities whereby they may go on with their education. There will be a certain number who will be returned disabled for active service, but of sound and eager mind. Ways should be provided by which they may continue their education. In addition, there should be some provision in the manpower program for leaving a nucleus in the colleges of men whose aptitudes qualify them as definitely for our long-range needs as, let us say, other men are obviously qualified for medicine. So, the structure of the liberal-arts colleges will be preserved during the war and so, minds will be trained and enriched for the humanizing and civilizing of the world to come after.

Furthermore, the men and women who are devoting their lives to such studies should not be made to feel inferior or apologetic in the face of a PT boat commander or the driver of a tank. They and all their fellow citizens should know that the preservation of our cultural heritage is not superfluous in a modern civilization; is not a luxury. That it is in fact what gives meaning to that civilization. It is what we are fighting for. And they are serving their country just as surely in fitting themselves to preserve it as are the men who fly the planes or man the ships or fire the guns.

For we cannot win a true victory unless there exists in this country a large body of liberally educated citizens. This is a war for freedom—freedom here and freedom elsewhere. But if we are going to risk our lives for freedom, we must at the same time do all we can to preserve the deep springs from which it flows. Recently we have been prone to think of freedom in purely economic terms. It is true that a man cannot be free unless he has a job and a decent income. But this job and this income are not the sources of his freedom. They only implement it. Freedom is of the mind. Freedom is in that library of yours, around which this campus is built. When you range back and forth through the centuries, when you weigh the utterance of some great thinker or absorb the meaning of some great composition, in painting or music or poetry; when you live these things within yourself and measure yourself against them—only then do you become an initiate in the world of the free. It is in the liberal arts that you acquire the ability to make a truly free and individual choice.

Our American higher education for many years has felt the influence of the German university. And it has been a harmful influence. It has encouraged the sacrifice of methods that make for wide intelligence to those who are concerned only with highly specialized knowledge; it has held that the subject is more important than the student; that knowledge is more important than understanding; that science, in itself, can satisfy the soul of man; and that intelligent men should not be allowed to concern themselves with politics and the administration of state. Such matters should be left to trained politicians. President Hopkins, of Dartmouth, has stated these trends more clearly than anyone I know and has pointed out that "it would be a tragic paradox if, as a result of the war, we were to allow our system of higher education to be transformed into the type of education which has made it so easy for a crowd of governmental gangsters like Hitler's outfit to commandeer a whole population."

The destruction of the tradition of the liberal arts at this crisis in our history, when freedom is more than ever at stake, would mean just that. It would be a crime, comparable, in my opinion, with the burning of the books by the Nazis. And it would have approximately the same results. Burn your books—or, what amounts to the same thing, neglect your books—and you will lose freedom, as surely as if you were to invite Hitler and his henchmen to rule over you.

The preservation of our system of liberal education during the war will make an enormous difference in the moral and human tone of our society in the future, of the very atmosphere in which the peace is made, and, since we are not an isolated society, of all civilization after the war. Let me remind you of Irwin Edman's recent fine statement of the significance of the very word "humanities." "It is not trivial art or playful thought. It is the name for the whole of the tradition of civilized life which from the Greeks down has accented freedom in political life and individuality and creativeness in personal relations, creativeness in art, and originality in the experiment of living which is each individual's opportunity. If the humanities, or the humanistic temper which they promote, are permitted to lapse now, we shall have lost the peace before we have gained it, and the real victory after the war will be to the way of life, inhuman, tyrannical, mechanical, of those whom we shall outwardly have conquered."

In pleading for the humanities, I am not preaching any gospel of high-browism. The relationship between a liberal education and freedom is good sound American doctrine. There are hundreds of colleges in this land of more or less advanced education, and in recent years they have been graduating thousands of students every year. Naturally, all of these graduates are not proficient in the liberal arts. And yet no matter how they may have neglected their college courses, or how over-zealously they may have specialized, they have won some measure of equality with all the great minds and all the challenging personalities of all time. That fact has been immeasurably important in making our American doctrine of equality a real and living doctrine.

I regret that during the last several decades we have had a tendency to overlook this important American fact. And I think we are paying the penalty for our shortsightedness in unexpected ways.

For instance, there has been a trend recently toward what is called leadership, but what is really nothing more than the idolization of individual men. In Italy, Mussolini took the title of Il Duce—the leader—on the grounds that he was the one man who could fulfill the destiny of the Italian people. Not long after, in Germany, Hitler began calling himself Der Fuehrer. The politics advocated by these men were totalitarian, and therefore, antipathetic to our way of life. Yet the overemphasis on single individuals has gone on, even in countries which are fighting totalitarianism now. Everywhere you turn today you find people clinging to certain men who have been exalted in the public mind out of all proportion to their talents, however great. In Russia there is Josef Stalin; in China, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek; in Britain, Winston Churchill; in the United States, Franklin Roosevelt. The stature of these men is in every case out of the ordinary and they deserve the high positions they have won. And yet, dare we say that any one of them is indispensable? The moment we say that, our world must change.

I do not know all the reasons for this emphasis on single individuals. But I do perceive a connection, here in America at any rate, between that emphasis and the neglect of the liberal arts. Had we more faith in liberal education, we would have, I believe, more faith in ourselves—more faith in the great leavening process of democracy, which forever pushes new men to the top.

I have had the privilege of meeting most of the great men of our time and of conversing with them intimately. I have talked with and know all the Allied leaders I have just mentioned, and many more besides. Yet I can say truthfully that, however impressive their abilities—and I have found them impressive—I saw nothing in them that could not conceivably be duplicated in Akron, Ohio, where I practiced law for many years, or here at Duke University. I think it was William Howard Taft who said that you could find a man fit to sit on the Supreme Court Bench of the United States, in any town in America of more than 5,000 population. Possibly Mr. Taft exaggerated. Yet surely the principle has been proved time after time in American history. The vast American educational system has set men free—free not alone to serve, but free also to lead. Education is the mother of leadership.

Now I think there is another phenomenon of our time which is linked with our failure to grasp the real significance of liberal education. This is an excessive indulgence in the practice of what is known as censorship and propaganda. Of course, censorship of military matters is necessary in order to conduct a war. But this principle is being daily, if not hourly, abused and extended to many other matters that have no military significance whatsoever. More and more the doctrine of telling us what we should know is being adopted.

It is, of course, natural for men who attain high office to seek to preserve themselves from the ordeal of public criticism and to attempt to stimulate approval of their policies and so to perpetuate themselves in power.

And those who are suppressing free discussion among us and our allies have of course a rationalization for their policy. They say that they must conduct political warfare. In the conduct of political warfare, they claim, it is damaging to say certain things. The enemy, they tell us, picks them up, distorts them, uses them against us. All this, of course, is true enough. But what of it? The time has never been when men did not seek to distort the utterances of their enemies for their own advantage. And what has won out in the long battle? Always the truth. Spread the facts, analyze them, debate them, make them available to all the world. There is no other form of political warfare that can possibly win the great political struggle in which we are engaged. Truth alone can win it.

Is not this worship of leaders, this willingness to be told what to think, this unquestioning acceptance of unnecessary restrictions on our freedom of speech, is not all this part of the same trend—the trend away from self-reliant judgment, the trend away from the little towns, the trend away from the dignity of the common man, the trend away from liberal education, by which men achieve equality in fact as well as in law? We have seen these impulses take root in other countries, which are now our enemies. We have seen them carried to their dreadful conclusions. We have seen the exaltation of government, the abasement of culture, and the resulting violation of all that civilization cherishes. We have seen the devolution of human aspiration. It is a tragedy as great as men have ever witnessed. And it is our task, a task in which we shall be engaged for the rest of our lives, first to stop it, and then to repair it.

There is much discussion now—and quite properly—of the matter of war aims. Yet I have listened to some of these speeches with misgiving. I have shuddered to hear a member of our Government planning, when the war is over, to police the education of our late enemies, after the traditional manner of conquerors. To disarm those enemies, yes. To take whatever measures are necessary to prevent rearming, yes. To remove from the necks of the people an enslaving totalitarian rule, certainly But having done that, education is another matter. It must grow out of and carry on a native culture. To determine the nature and manner of their own education is the right of men everywhere. And alien ideals superimposed by force will only produce resentment and hatred.

Too many of the planners I feel, are trying to look ahead by looking backward. Too many are seeking the future in the past. I find in many of their speeches an attempt to solve everything by their pet economic theories—the same attempt that has nearly ruined us during the last 10 or 15 years. The study and practice of sound economics is indispensable to a successful solution of the peace. And yet even sound economics cannot define the aim of the peace, nor the aim of the war. To discover that aim we must go deeper. We must establish beyond any doubt the equality of men. And we shall find this equality, not in the different talents which we severally possess, nor in the different incomes which we severally earn, but in the great franchise of the mind, the universal franchise, which is bounded neither by color, nor by creed, nor by social status. Open the books, if you wish to be free.

Now, in the midst of war, I give you as war aims the perpetuation of this university, your right to attend it, and the certainty that your children, if they so wish it, can follow in your steps.

An Open Letter to Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter to the Members of Congress from the Farm Journal and Farmer's Wife of January 1943:

Gentlemen: You are heartily welcomed to your duties by the farmers and by the whole people of the United States.

We rejoice that two-party government is restored to the extent that a numerous minority can again be heard in our National Legislature. We expect that Congress shall again debate and write our laws, and the bureaucrats shall no longer have their wishes rubber-stamped. You are our nearest part of the Government. You are the equal of the Executive and of the judiciary.

Our whole interest now is in two things. The first is victory over our foreign enemies. The second is that the powers of us, the people, shall not be destroyed, either directly or by indirection.

In total war we expect to lend to our Government a good many of our normal prerogatives; we must center all necessary power where it can be exerted in the common cause.

But for every power we lend, we want a demand note providing for its prompt return at the earliest proper time. See to that for us.

Events of the past year prove that censorship has been used to cover up blunders that you and we should be told the truth about, as soon as the enemy knows. Will you have that stopped? Tell us the bad news so we can then believe the good news.

Washington and the whole country are overrun with paper patriots and plain pay rollers. Can't you cut out and off enough appropriations to get rid of several billion dollars' worth of these? War is our only job, probably for years. After we figure up our new taxes we are going to be pretty mad whenever we see or hear of a single paper-pusher or pay roller who isn't absolutely needed. How about contributing a few hundred whole boards, bureaus, and all the other dead timber to the scrap pile?

We can't always tell, from out here, which bills are intended to help win the war and which are calculated to slip over, under the cover of war, schemes that have no good intentions. We're depending on you to use a fine-tooth comb on anything suspicious.

We want to do everything to win the war. But we don't want to waste any time on wild-goose chases, and we resent any needless pushing around.

Further, we want to be trusted and we want our home people to be trusted. Tell the bureaucrats that if they'll let us know what is to be done, we can often figure out the details here lots better than their city boys can do it for us.

Tell them they can count on us. Our initiative will get more done, quicker and better, than their regimentation.

Free people can do anything, even fight a total war, better than regimented people.

We have hired you to do some work that has been rather neglected at times lately. That is to represent us.

Hope you do all right.

Sincerely,

THE HOME FOLKS.

Will Security for All Americans Tomorrow Come From the Blood, Sweat, and Tears We Are Shedding Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT CANNON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have heard it said that this Congress is rapidly swinging to conservatism, and that we are forgetting we are actually engaged in a war against arch conservatives who would destroy the freedom and security of the entire world.

I, for one, cannot believe that this is true. I do not believe that any of my colleagues here today wish to see this Nation go back to the conservatism of yesteryears; nor can I believe that anyone of us have forgotten that we fight not only to preserve the liberty which we Americans all have, but that we fight to give each man, regardless of his station in life, greater freedom and greater security.

I for one, could not agree that the vast majority of our people wish to go back to those old days when a 10- or 12-hour day was the rule, rather than the exception, when there was no such thing as social security of any sort, when we had no protection against unemployment, and when men were forced to stand on street corners selling apples to earn a meager livelihood for themselves and their families.

Of course, during this war, when we are out to defeat the monkeymen of Tojo, and the fanatical minions of the madman of Berchtesgaden, we expect to work long hours, we expect to give up our comforts and we expect to tighten our belts. These things we must do for the sons we have sent out there to do the job.

But, Mr. Speaker, this war will end one day—may that day be soon—and when it ends will we be in position to welcome our sons home with jobs for them and security for all Americans?

Mr. Speaker, while we are struggling with the problems of providing rubber for military and civilian life, while we struggle to provide the financial sinews to carry on this war, while we labor to build up the food supply for our Army and our civilian fighters at home, we

must struggle with the problems of the future as well.

Most of us now seated in this Congress voted for selective service to take our young sons out of their jobs and out of their schools; we voted reluctantly and with heavy hearts, for we knew that many of these happy lads would never come back to us, that many more would come back maimed and sightless, and that for many it would mean the end to education and careers. Yet we voted, for, if we had not, the hordes of bygone barbarism would have swarmed across the free lands of Europe and Britain and across the seas into our own freedom-loving Nation.

But, Mr. Speaker, by so voting we took upon ourselves the greatest obligation any representative government ever accepted. We took upon ourselves the task of providing a better America to which these sons of ours could return. That task, gentlemen, is not a job for tomorrow—it is a job to which you and I must set ourselves today. Tomorrow will be too late.

If you and I do not accomplish this job—this sacred obligation—then we can predict chaos for our families in the future. I do not need to paint the picture of boys coming home—as some of my colleagues right here came home after the last war—to a U. S. A. without jobs, to industries which do not need men, to stores which cannot hire more help. Many of you know what I mean, and I believe I speak only the truth when I say that thus far, we have done little or nothing to plan for the day when this war will end.

I am sure that the mothers and fathers of these boys who are fighting for us are wondering if we here will wholeheartedly accept the task, however arduous, to provide security in the peace of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, we have all heard that cry, "We're fighting a war—let's leave social planning until the war is won!" That cry is frightening, for it implies that if we do any social planning—if we pass any security legislation now we will be derelict in our duty to help by all legislative means to win the war.

But I cannot believe that the common man of this country wants us to close our eyes to the future. He has asked what we are fighting this war for. He has asked what our objectives are. And we must answer that we are fighting to free the world of the tyrants who do not want man to worship as he pleases, who do not want man to speak as he pleases, who do not want man to be free from misery and poverty. Let us speak out—we are fighting against the tyrants behind the puppets Hitler and Mussolini—those tyrants who do not want the common man to control his own destiny.

We fight for the four golden freedoms so simply and plainly outlined by our President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. And when we hear that cry, that we cannot take time to plan for the future because there is a war on, let us remember that the President has taken time to outline for us the task before us. Let us remember that he devoted a major part of his message to this Congress to the plans for future domestic security, and that the battle for the "four freedoms" can only be won if this freedom-loving people see that we are progressing toward them.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will go a long way toward the solution to our post-war problems. It is a bill supported by hundreds of thousands of our citizens, yes, millions. It is a bill which many of my colleagues in this Chamber have studied and worked over.

This bill, when enacted, will provide us with a security insurance system within the means of every citizen. It provides for the voluntary retirement of all citizens when they reach the age of 60 on a decent American annuity or pension. It provides as well for decent and reasonable annuities for those under 60 who become physically incapacitated so that they no longer can carry their share of the Nation's work, and it provides decent incomes for widowed mothers with children.

We do not need to give Americans dole; we do not need to give anyone something for nothing. We do need to provide reasonable incomes for those who, through no fault of their own, are cast aside unable to earn their own living.

Such a system is security that America will continue to be a free America, neither turning to dictators nor to radical communistic doctrines, but progressing as it was hoped that we would progress—a free, untrammeled democracy.

As we live in a machine age, when less and less men will be needed to turn the wheels of industry, we must legislate to protect those whom industry will not need in the peace to follow this war; for, by protecting them, we also protect those who will do the work; and we safeguard our liberty against external and internal strife.

How better can we provide for those not needed than by a pension system which will permit men to retire from gainful employment at 60 years of age so that younger men may take their jobs?

We have this problem to face the moment the war is ended. The boys will be coming back, wanting jobs. Men now employed will do all they can to hold the jobs they are now doing. Some must be unemployed. What will we do? Fire the older men now working and put them on a dole or will we graciously give the younger men, our returning heroes, the dole?

We cannot do either.

We can pass a law during this session of Congress which will permit older men—those past the age of 60—to retire on decent pensions and make room in industry and in commerce for the men now in uniform.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, make this final observation: We have been wont to look upon a pension as a charity, and our miserable social-security payments under old-age assistance have been charity in its lowest form. We have been paying honest, foursquare Americans from $6 to to $30 a month and expecting them to live on those amounts.

That day is over, for to whip this post-war unemployment problem we will be forced to retire men and women decently. That is what we are fighting for, and these young men coming home are not going to let us make paupers out of their fathers and mothers.

Decent living in normal times does not begin much short of $100 a month. America is ready for and demanding pensions of from $60 to $80 a month, and we had better start right now figuring how we are to provide the machinery in government to pay these pensions. Let us not think we cannot pay for such a pension program in America, for the money that is paid out in pensions or annuities goes right back to business and industry and is never lost.

The bill I have introduced today is known as the Townsend plan. It calls for the imposition of a 3-percent gross income tax on salaries, wages, business and corporate incomes. It would pay pensions only equal to the pro rata share of the revenue collected, less administrative expenses. It would do away with the vast, cumbersome machinery of the social-security system as we know it today. It will do away with the pauperizing public and private charities we now know. It would make far less drain on business and industry than the social-security law now envisions for the future.

It would provide us with a sure, unfailing system of security insurance that will do away with dole and public works projects, which we want to forget, but which some of our planners for tomorrow still try to bring up as a solution to unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, by this system we can provide jobs for youth and security for the elderly, and each man and woman in America will buy and pay for his own retirement annuity.

May I earnestly plead with my colleagues to get a copy of this bill, to study it, and then help us pass it for the future of America. Let me say in closing, that this bill does not provide pensions of $200 a month as some of you have been led to believe—but it does provide a reasonable and decent annuity on which our older citizens can retire to provide the jobs for younger men.

Resumption of Construction on Friant-Kern and Madera Canals of Central Valley Water Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the people of San Francisco have always shown great interest in the problems of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. Actually, the Central Valley Project of California was passed by the majority it received in San Francisco. Our city gave the measure an almost 2-to-1 vote.

The Friant-Kern and Madera Canals should be completed without delay. The

water tables in the lower San Joaquin Valley are dropping at an alarming rate.

I submit herewith Resolution No. 3134 of the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco, asking that the canals be completed. It will require very little in the way of materials and the water received will increase food production as well as guayule rubber, so vitally needed in the war effort. These canals can be finished in 2 years.

The resolution follows:

Whereas hundreds of thousands of acres of fertile land in the San Joaquin Valley could produce food, fiber, and guayule rubber for the Nation's war effort if water were available on the land; and

Whereas water impounded behind Friant Dam, now virtually completed, could be placed on such land and the water table of the entire southern San Joaquin Valley could be raised if the Friant-Kern and Madera Canals of the Central Valley water project were completed; and

Whereas Congress has appropriated funds to start construction of these canals and has urged the use of these funds at the earliest possible date; and

Whereas construction of these canals is prevented by a War Production Board order denying priorities for the steel needed for the construction of these canals; and

Whereas engineers estimate that only 330 tons of steel are necessary to place these canals in operation for the duration of the war, compared to 5,000 tons of steel which are now being used annually in the southern San Joaquin Valley for the deepening and repair of water wells to keep pace with the dropping water table; and

Whereas it would appear that completion of the canals not only would save steel but also would contribute substantially to the production of vitally needed food, fiber, and rubber, and to the permanent development of a large portion of San Francisco's trade area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors hereby declares itself in favor of completion of Friant Dam and resumption of construction of the Friant-Kern and Madera Canals of the Central Valley project to the extent compatible with the total war effort, and that the board strongly urges the War Production Board to issue priorities necessary for completion of these canals; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the War Production Board, the War Department, the Navy Department, and California Members of Congress.

Address of Hon. Harrison Spangler, Chairman of the Republican National Committee

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Harrison Spangler, chairman of the Republican National Committee, delivered the principal address at the annual meeting of the Kansas Day Club, in Topeka, Kans., last Friday evening, January 29. I had the privilege of being present on that occasion. I believe Members of Congress will be interested in reading Mr. Spangler's speech. It is included herewith:

As we meet tonight the freedom of our country is in peril. We are attacked from without by ruthless and savage foes. We are also threatened from within by the forces of collectivism and regimentation which lead inevitably to tyranny and dictatorship. Under these tragic conditions it is wholly appropriate that we meet to discuss our problems in the great State of Kansas, the soil of which was, by its fighting pioneers, dedicated and pledged to be forever free.

Here in this great western Commonwealth, one of the last American frontiers in which courageous Americans settled to carve out a livelihood and to create a great State of our Union, it is only a short time, as history measures it, since the covered wagons were moving slowly across these plains. Many of the people living today in this prairie State have parents, or grandparents, who faced the dangers, the privations, and the sacrifices of the long trek across the continent, behind the plodding horses in the canvas-covered wagons, under the burning sun, the blasting gales, defying the blizzards—and why? Because they loved liberty more than they loved ease or security. They were in search of new, raw, free land on which they could settle and by their own efforts conquer the prairie and make it fruitful. Here these rugged pioneers implanted that something we call the American spirit and the American way.

WE MUST WIN

We meet in the midst of the greatest war in all history. How or why we got into the war no longer matters. We are in, and we must win. That is our first duty.

Without counting the cost, we are pouring the savings of a hundred and fifty years into the struggle. Our matchless industrial system has been geared to the machinery of war. Our living standards have been stepped down, our people have submitted cheerfully to the reduction and the rationing of the means of living. Our boys are fighting upon every continent, on, under, and over every sea, on every battle front in the world. The news wires and the radio bring back inspiring tales of the gallantry of those boys; they bring also sobering stories of our losses. There are vacant chairs in millions of homes—on the walls of some of those homes hang pictures of their boys, draped now in the colors of mourning.

NEED UNITY

To win this war is both our duty and our opportunity. There must be no let down in that effort. To win, we must have national unity. Republicans will tolerate no side show, no political ambition, no internal differences to destroy or decrease that unity. This is not a Democratic war, it is not a Republican war, it is not a New Deal war. It is an all-American war. This war is not merely total war, from which no one is exempt; it is a war of survival. It will determine whether mankind's noblest dream shall survive, or human liberty shall be snuffed out into the blackness of medieval night. And we will win it; we will win it because we dare not lose it.

It is in the midst of such stresses as these that our discussions must be held. The task of the constructive critic is hard. The temper of political discussion must be restrained. But that does not mean that Americans must abandon their principles. We have not arrived at the time when Americans must submit their thoughts, their lives, or their liberties to the dictation of others.

If we survey the events and the measures of the last 10 years, there is abundant reason for caution in accepting the fiat of this New Deal administration as to its proposals and purposes.

WASHINGTON CONFUSION

Our people are on the alert to do their full duty; their burdens are becoming heavy, yet the New Deal administration refuses to lighten these burdens by economies which have long been demanded. The homes and the farms of America are being drained of their boys, but the administration proposes to fight the war without the loss of a single bureaucrat. If there is confusion in Washington, the answer does not lie in erecting new boards and bureaus on the ruins of those which have already failed—new bureaus built out of the same personnel which has already been discredited; they are the same old wooden tenpins no matter what alley they are set up in. The cure for this confusion lies in calling up the best brains of the Nation, regardless of political differences.

Let the administration call to its aid in managing this war those who have the ability and capacity to do the job; who have not only the experience but the desire to serve the cause of free America. Let it throw out political henchmen whose first concern is their own profit and power; keep the "lame ducks" out where they were relegated by the people; weed out of Government those who would change our free system into some form of national socialism. If these things are done, we can save precious lives and treasure, and we will hasten the day when we, with our allies, can, in a spirit of cooperation and good will, chart a lasting peace.

NEW DEALERS SNEER

During the last 10 years we have witnessed a steady, cumulative, ominous attack upon the American philosophy and upon American institutions. We have been told that our democracy has failed; that liberty was selfish and greedy. The New Deal has looked upon the unparalleled achievement of America, and found it wrong. For the American faith in the character, initiative, and self-reliance of the people it has substituted the economic fiction that government owes everybody a living rather than an opportunity to make a living.

For these 10 years, we have heard from these men little except sneers at American institutions. According to New Dealers, everything which was done prior to their appearance was archaic and wrong. The Constitution has been the particular object of New Deal sneers. The men who wrote it, New Dealers say, were befogged in antiquity, encrusted by legal precedents, ignorantly bound by these lessons of history. The philosophy of liberty and individualism which guided the framers of the Constitution is held to be outmoded. The multiplication table is merely something to be managed around. The civilization which our people have built, although unequaled anywhere, any time on earth, is now held by the New Dealers to be a monument merely to ruthlessness and greed.

BILLIONS SPENT

Following this philosophy, the ramparts of American liberty have been under continuous assault. Sometimes by direct aggression, sometimes by furtiveness and stealth, American landmarks have been attacked. Until the last election, Congress has been reduced to complete subserviency; laws written by the executive branch were passed by Executive order; appropriations were made in bulk without regard to those who had to bear the heavy tax burden; blank checks for billions of dollars were voted with no limitations except Executive discretion; the power of the purse has been supinely surrendered. The Supreme Court was first attacked, then filled by men who were more conspicuous for their faith in their economic

theories than for their knowledge of or experience in the law. The rights of the States have been violated and sabotaged. The President has demanded, and received, immense grants of discretionary powers which heretofore had been reserved by the Constitution to the Congress, the States, or the people. Boards and bureaus have been multiplied and invested with broad powers under which thousands of laws were written, not by legislative assemblies in the full light of public debate, but behind closed doors written and promulgated by Executive order or bureaucratic edict.

AWAKE TO DEBT

The paralyzing hand of Government has been laid upon every form of human activity, replacing initiative with shackles and burdens. No man dares make the simplest business venture without trying to find what the Government will do—and when he finds, he dares not venture.

At long last the people, once allured by the promise of Utopian security, have awakened to find themselves bound around with restrictions and limitations, burdened with a debt so monumental as to be incomprehensible, smothered by such executive and bureaucratic edicts as to be intolerable. The last election means that the people have sampled the New Deal philosophy, tested New Deal measures, tasted New Deal planning—and found them bitter.

ALL LIES IN IDEALS

Of course, there must be unity in war, unity of purpose, unity of command in Army and Navy. But if, behind the lines, all human action must be bent to the dictates of one will, what becomes of the inventiveness, the enterprise, and the creativeness of liberty? Our hopes and our faith in final victory are based solidly upon the unparalleled American industrial system which free men, under liberty, created. Is it possible that liberty cannot operate the industrial system which liberty created? Without that system, we would not have the slightest chance of winning the war. Can repressive Government operate it more efficiently than the freemen who built it? Is Government any wiser, any less selfish, or any more patriotic than they?

MIGHTY PRODUCTION

When the ominous clouds of war were approaching we heard much to the effect that our industrial plant, built as it is on the principle of free enterprise, could not hope to compete with the controlled industrial system of dictator nations. Such assertions were made by mistaken men who do not understand the industrial system of America created by freemen.

In 2 years our industrial system has surpassed the concentrated efforts of the dictator nations in the production of ships, guns, planes, and other implements of warfare. This unparalleled achievement of our free American industry has been achieved in spite of abuse, confusion, bureaucratic interference, labor difficulties, and political snipers. This mighty production record has been accomplished in spite of the fact that American industries, from the smallest to the largest, have been accused, abused, and reviled by professional demogogues, who have sought to gain personal political power and profit by arousing class hatreds in this free country of ours.

In the face of these mighty achievements of the American people the only note of discord is found in the agencies of the New Deal administration. The confusion, contradictions, incompetency, and unwarranted delays caused by appointed officials are of great concern to our people. While there are many fine and competent men in Washington who are rendering effective service, we would be derelict in our duty if we refrained from calling attention to the many unfit and incompetent men who have become a part of the vast bureaucracy which the New Deal philosophy has imposed upon our country. This vast bureaucracy is falling apart with sheer weight of numbers. It is top-heavy with many men and women who have no recommendation except that they have faithfully performed as party henchmen. Bureaucratic scandals have become commonplace.

TOO MANY UNFIT

The people know that there are too many men in responsible governmental positions who are there as appointees of sordid New Deal political machines; there are too many men who have trod the dark alleys with the Hague group in New Jersey; too many who are the denizens of the Kelly-Nash haunts in Chicago; and too many who have walked the paths of political corruption with that matchless New Dealer, Mr. Pendergast, of Missouri.

There are too many in New Deal Washington who simply are unfit and incapable of doing the job. Too many, if you please, who are members of cults which would destroy America. Too many termites who seek to destroy the very foundations of our free American society under our Constitution. In voicing these views I am not merely expressing my own opinion but the thoughts of the many millions of men and women who expressed themselves at the polls on the 3d of November, last. The voters sought to purge these men into oblivion. They will finish the job in November 1944. When some of these incompetents have been driven from public life, through the weight of public opinion, we find them going out the front door only to be cordially admitted a little later through the back door. We further find that when the people have determined, as they did in the recent elections, that certain men are unfit to represent them, their will is thwarted when these men are appointed to positions of power. As a matter of fact, Washington in all its history has never been such a haven for lame ducks as it is today.

LIBERTY IS PRIZE

We have a terrible, a devastating war to win. We cannot successfully carry on a foreign war with disunity at home. Those who advocate revolutionary changes in our form of government and in our economic system are under heavy moral obligations to state them so clearly that the people may know what they propose. More than this, any man, or any set of men, who use this war emergency as a smoke screen to effectuate revolutionary changes in our economic, social, or political system does so at the risk of being repudiated by the American people.

It would be tragedy indeed if we fight a war to preserve liberty, only to find that, in winning, we had destroyed liberty in her own house. The only valid objective of this war, the ideal for which we fight, the prize without which any victory would be hollow, is liberty—the kind of liberty which is defined in the Declaration of Independence, fortified by the Constitution of the United States.

GUARD THE RAMPARTS

The ramparts of that fortification are three: The Bill of Rights, economic freedom, constitutional government. These are the ramparts which we as Americans, and as Republicans, must watch, guard, and defend.

1. The Bill of Rights—in which is contained the guaranty of respect of man's character and his human dignity before the law, endowed by his Creator with the inalienable right to think his own thoughts, to speak his own mind, to worship in his own way, to plan his own life, to dare in his own adventure, to win, and to possess the fruits of his winning, or to lose, and losing, to accept the consequences of his own failure, but still to be a peer in a society of equals.

2. Economic freedom, which we must defend and preserve that not only the "four freedoms" but all liberty may not perish.

3. Constitutional government: I shall not now attempt to defend the Constitution. I shall only hope the American people will continue to permit the Constitution to defend them. The Constitution is not a law which the people must obey; it is a charter which the Government must obey.

This, then, is my hope merely as one Republican, an American, for my party, that it protect and defend the ramparts of liberty. If these stand, this Nation can meet all emergencies, surmount all obstacles, and rise again to new and greater heights of achievement. If these fail, all is lost.

This message I give you. The Republicans are in the thick of the fight to win the war. They are planning for a just and lasting peace. They are carefully scanning and examining proposals now being brought forth, both for the conduct of the war and the conduct of America after the war. This assurance I give you: They are irrevocably determined and intent upon preserving the free America of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

National Youth Administration—Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pledged to vote to do away with unessential nondefense bureaucratic governmental agencies, and it is my purpose, in connection therewith, to take occasion from time to time to bring to light the reactions of responsible constituents in my district.

I have received a letter from a highly responsible citizen of my home city of Grand Rapids, Mich., relative to the National Youth Administration.

Her letter is, in part, as follows:

We have two children in our family, a girl of 23 and a boy of 21. Neither of them need any help from State or National funds. They have had 2 years of college training and have been on their own ever since war was declared. We were surprised to receive this letter from the National Youth Administration urging them to join up for training of some kind—

The husband of this lady owns and operates an important war production manufacturing plant, and, continuing the quotations—

has tried people supposedly trained in one of these schools and all of them were worth nothing and were definitely "dawdlers." Several of them admitted that there was not enough work in their school and nobody urged them to work steadily, so they just fooled around. These schools are beautifully equipped with the best type of machines for which there is crying need in the honest-to-goodness war plants of the country. We and many of our citizens feel that this type of thing is being kept alive by people in administrative positions who do not want to give up these jobs and get down to the serious business of working. Because it is becoming increasingly hard to get students, since they are going into jobs for direct and better training, this type of promotion is carried on. How long are we going to continue such nonsense?

The following is the form of solicitation received by the children of my constituent:

YOUR PART IN TODAY'S WAR EFFORT

This is a war of production. As the armed forces of the Nation increase and war-production increases, more and more young men and women are needed each day in industry to take the place of men who are called to the armed services. Your help is needed on the production front.

If you are capable of doing war-production work, the patriotic thing to do is to prepare yourself for a job in industry so you may do your part. If you are a young man or woman, 16 years of age and under 25 (married or single), the National Youth Administration has been designated as one of the agencies for production. Thousands of American youth have been trained for war-production work by the National Youth Administration and more and more will need to be trained if we are to wage a total war. Those young men and women who are now receiving unemployment compensation are also eligible and will not forfeit their benefits while training.

The National Youth Administration maintains in Grand Rapids two large training centers.

For industrial sewing for young women, woodworking, and training for clerical skills, report to the National Youth Administration office at 11 Commerce Avenue SW.

For training in machine-shop practice, acetylene and arc welding, and sheet metal, report to the National Youth Administration war-production training center at 1433 Monroe Avenue NW. (opposite the city filtration plant). The machine shop and arc welding is open for young women as well as young men.

The equipment of these training courses is most complete. Supervision is given by competent foremen and instructors who have had years of experience in industry.

How long does this training take? That depends on the young person taking the instruction. Some young people can complete the training in 1 month, and for others a longer time is necessary. The length of time depends on the aptitude of the person for acquiring the necessary skills.

How much does this training cost? There is no tuition—on the contrary, a small wage is paid which will cover carfare, etc.

If you are now unemployed and out of school, it is your duty to prepare yourself so you may help Uncle Sam win this war.

Mr. Speaker, the President has just returned from a momentous visit to foreign lands with promise of an all-out Allied victory drive which will be universally supported, and yet the administration forgets the home front and apparently seeks to perpetuate such bureaucratic nonessential and wasteful organizations, both from the standpoint of great expense as well as dawdling output, as the National Youth Administration, so aptly and timely called attention to by my constitutent.

Pay-As-You-Go Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, failure to act upon some sort of a pay-as-you-go tax plan in this Congress might eventually lead to a break-down of our entire income-tax structure. The pay-as-you-go philosophy in taxation is one of the most constructive ideas in tax legislation since the enactment of the first income-tax law. There is nothing new or untried to this principle. Individuals have managed their own personal lives on a pay-as-you-go basis since time immemorial. I believe that the Government can also operate on the same theory.

The passage of legislation of this nature would enable the taxpayer to meet the tax on the income in the year it is earned, instead of building up a tax debt which he must pay at some future date. I do not question the willingness of the American people to pay taxes, but with the present set-up for the collection of income taxes, a situation could arise in the future when millions of our citizens, despite their willingness, would find it impossible to pay a tax debt which had been built up in a previous year. When these millions should default, not because of any lack of ability to pay or patriotism, but only because they didn't have the dollars to pay, there wouldn't be a jury in the United States that would think of condemning them. For example, take the case of a married man with his wife and two small children. For 11 months he earned an average of $85 a week, or a salary of approximately $4,000, and then suddenly, through no fault of his own, but because of a business collapse, or any other reason, lost his income. Assuming he was out of work from December 1 to March 15, a period of 3½ months, can you see the plight of this family to suddenly realize they owed the Government approximately $300 and that he must pay or be prosecuted. It is estimated that there will be about 27,000,000 people in this country who will be liable for an income tax March 15, 1943, on their 1942 income. If as few as 10 percent, or about 2,700,000, couldn't pay it and didn't pay, and went unpunished, it would soon mean that the people of this country would have no regard for the law. When the people themselves begin to have no respect for a law, the logical conclusion is the break-down of that system.

The pay-as-you-go proposal does not mean people are going to be tax-free this year. The citizens in 1943 are going to pay their taxes on 1943 income; in 1944, on 1944 income, and so ad finitum. When a man's income stops, his taxes stop; when his income increases, his taxes are higher.

The people are ready and willing to pay taxes, and the Government should find a solution which accepts their offer without putting these individuals in debt, and which does not threaten the future security of themselves and their families. Give the people a fair, simple method of paying their taxes out of the current income. While differences of opinion and questions concerning the method of collection may arise, it is up to our Congress to speedily formulate a plan embodying these principles and not try to make it so complicated that our people cannot understand it. Former revenue bills have taken too long a time to discuss. In 1942 we did not know what our taxes would be for 1942 until October, nor could we calculate or budget the future until the passage of the bill.

I have received numerous letters from people in all walks of life and have, as yet, to find any person opposed to this policy. The President stated that he is in favor of some such plan. The legislators that I have conversed with appear to be in accord. The people I contact are asking for it. Polls show an overwhelming preponderance for the principle. Recently the New Jersey Legislature went on record for the pay-as-you-go principle.

It has always been the duty of Congress to enact tax legislation. The raising of revenue has been a cold-blooded financial task with not too much consideration of easing the taxpayers' burden. With the need of larger revenues and the greatly increased number of taxpayers, this is the day to recognize the human side of the governmental ledger. I feel that passage of pay-as-you-earn legislation will again demonstrate that Members of Congress are alive to their constituents' problems and welfare.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is starting hearings today. I feel reasonably certain that the distinguished and able Members of our Congress will give earnest consideration to the people's requests. They must formulate a workable bill, devoid of complexities, enabling the American public to meet its current obligations on time, protecting it from uncertainties, and insuring the country's stability.

The "Four Freedoms"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous-consent request to extend my own remarks and include an editorial, I am inserting the very comprehensive statement of Westbrook Pegler, printed in the afternoon papers of February 1, regarding the "four freedoms" after the war. I think every American should have an opportunity to read this:

REPUDIATION OF FOUR FREEDOMS BY UNITED STATES AFTER WAR CALLED CERTAIN

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, February 1.—The deadly fault of the American propaganda by which the political leaders of our Government try to win the confidence and cooperation of the people of the world, including the Axis people, is that it is only a lure which is certain to be repudiated by the people of the United States because it commits them to idealistic sacrifices which they never authorized. If it succeeds in its purpose of helping to conquer the enemy, it will have been useful to us.

But when the time comes to make good, the American people will refuse, because, as the first operation in the establishment of the "four freedoms" everywhere in the world, we would have to depose our gallant ally, Joseph Stalin, and liberate the Russians and all the other continental European peoples

who, in the fulfillment of victory by the Allies over the Germans, would fall under his rule or the rule of his successor.

The Americans will refuse to assume that task, not only because of the probability of military defeat abroad and consequent dissolution at home, but because we have no mission to impose our form of government on the rest of the world. That would be the rule of a small minority over a great majority, even if it could be accomplished, as, of course, it can't. As a military enterprise it would be insane. As a political project, hopeless.

STALIN STILL A DICTATOR

It is useless to try to refute the fact that Russian communism is no less oppressive, dictatorial, brutal, and treacherous than Hitlerism. Some publicists, who a few years ago were describing Hitlerism as "brown bolshevism," have more recently had less to say about the practical identity of the two brutalitarian systems. This is polite and expedient, with Russia fighting savagely on our side; but the Russian form of government has not changed, and it must be noticed that Stalin has neither expressed any intention to adopt the four freedoms in his own country nor to institute free government in any lands which he would occupy, seize, or police as his victorious soldiers moved onward behind the crumbling legions of the Fuehrer.

If it is to be argued that the four freedoms can exist under some other system than ours, then nobody has yet named that system. For that matter, all four of them cannot exist at all, and they are, in plain truth, just sky writing thought up for propaganda purposes by two strong, determined political leaders with a gift for phrase making and an alert sense of expediency. Freedom from want and fear everywhere in the world is an order which cannot be fulfilled in the time of any person now living and probably never can be in the world, and when the present military enemies are beaten the surviving fighters abroad will want to come back home and resume life, and their families will demand that they be brought home.

SURE OF DEFEAT AT POLLS

Any program of deliberate permanent impoverishment here for the benefit of the rest of the world will be beaten at the polls.

The United States did not enter this war to raise the living standards of the rest of the world but to protect this country and those living standards which Americans alone enjoyed. And the American contribution so far has been colossal and in the end will be just as important in the victory as the contributions of Britain, which stood alone while Stalin cooperated with Hitler, and of the Russians who fought only when invaded and for honest reasons which they have had the decency not to misrepresent with sanctimonious slogans. They are fighting for the same reason that aroused the United States, namely love of homeland, and Stalin has been honest enough, confident enough in his strength, not to go in for hypocritical preaching.

SUGGESTS A LAND OF WANT

If our propagandists could kid the rest of the world and deal us out at home, our people might be practical and cynical enough to understand and let the four freedoms pass without challenge. But when it all seems to commit us in dead earnest to a national career of pestiferous do-gooding all over the world, and to sharing forever our butter and beef, our clothing, automobiles, and all else that constitutes the material standard of American life it suggests that the country which the fighters will come back to would be just another land of want.

And whoever gave anyone permission to promise all this in the name of the people of the United States?

When were the American people ever consulted on all that?

They never were consulted. It just happened one morning in the news and ever since then a campaign has been running to make them believe it was their idea and therefore legal and binding on them and their heirs forever.

Inaugural Address of Hon. Dwight Griswold, Governor of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Nebraska delegation in this House are proud of the record which has been made by our State government during the past and during the present. The people of our State are united in the Nation's determination to win a quick victory, and to that end our present legislature is dedicating much of its work. I have the honor to include in my remarks on behalf of the members of our delegation the very able inaugural address delivered to the members of the fifty-sixth session of the Nebraska Legislature by the Honorable Dwight Griswold, the Governor of Nebraska:

Mr. President, members of the senate, you gentlemen have been chosen by the people of Nebraska to assemble here and work in their behalf. I am here as Governor, chosen by the same people, elected for a second term.

Our task is different from that usually confronting a legislature and a Governor because our Nation is now engaged in a horrible war which, in one way or another, is thrusting its way into the life of every man, woman, and child. It completely dominates our thoughts.

These are days of danger—danger not only from the vicious struggle for survival but from the inevitable post-war period when proper readjustment will be threatened by swarms of crackpot schemes.

What can we—the governing authorities of this State—what can we do during a brief legislative session to repel these dangers?

There are signs to guide us.

Two years ago at my inauguration I stated that very few new laws were needed for Nebraska and that my duty was rather to furnish a better administration of the laws we already had. Since then we in the executive departments have worked on that premise. If there were doubts as to its soundness, I think those doubts were washed away by the voters on November 3.

Now again I say, but even more emphatically, we can do the people of Nebraska a real service by just leaving them alone. Our people are busy with crops and livestock, they are busy in factory and business, they are busy with thoughts of fighting sons, husbands, and fathers. In the name of common sense, let us rise above this fad of regulation and leave our people free to work and fight for the victory which must be won.

That is my paramount recommendation.

Two years ago we could not know, of course, that within 11 months war would come to us. Our planning necessarily was based upon what we thought might happen. It as your foresight in creating the defense organization and in establishing an emergency appropriation, which permitted the State to properly function without a special legislative session. I trust the same foresight will continue with the enactment of war emergency measures, effective only for the duration.

So that you would not be delayed in your consideration of this emergency program or in your consideration of such other routine and corrective legislation as I have to offer, these bills have been printed. They are now ready for introduction. My budget recommendations are also ready. This is in keeping with plans of your own legislative council which, I believe, has its own legislative program ready for submission. Consequently, you can begin work at once. The avenue is open for a short, businesslike session, free from petty squabbles—a session worthy of Nebraska and one of which you as senators may well be proud.

As the session progresses, many other bills will be placed before you from other sources. In considering them I suggest you bear in mind that our State agencies must contemplate assisting in the war effort by the orderly release of all possible manpower. State and municipal construction work should stop. Travel must be held to a minimum. Like other Americans, we in the State's service, must be willing to work longer hours. We ask such performance and more of our fighting men; we cannot shirk it ourselves.

We will also aid in the war effort by keeping taxes at a minimum. People must have opportunity to pay the tremendously increased Federal taxes, meet higher living costs, and invest in War bonds. In my judgment, there are better ways of avoiding inflation than by levying taxes merely to reduce consumer purchasing power.

As you work, remember Nebraska is a great State. We have no State debt of any kind, we impose neither a sales nor income tax, and we are the only State in the Union with such a record. In addition, we have about $2,000,000 in our general fund, $9,000,000 in other funds, and about $14,000,000 invested in bonds. As a State, we own 1,700,000 acres of land. We have the most beautiful capitol in the Nation—all these paid for in full.

You, as senators, and I, as Governor, have a heritage to uphold; the reputation of a State to keep. But we have even more. I say to you that Nebraska is in a position to become a governmental model for the other States and for the Nation itself. To people beset with doubts and uncertainties, we can give sorely needed reassurance by proving that in Nebraska are legislators and executives who are statesmen, voting for what is right even though it be temporarily unpopular; statesmen who trust the people and who can be trusted by the people. In this we must not fail.

When this war is won—and won it shall be—our Nation will have a national debt of more than $200,000,000,000, perhaps $300,000,000,000, blooming in the shadows of an overstuffed bureaucracy. We will have with us tens of thousands of governmental problem children, the offspring of this bureaucracy, all suckled on red tape and accustomed to giving orders to the people. We will all be tempted by recent habit to look to the Government for help with every difficulty that confronts us.

This is not a partisan problem; it is an American problem and it bids fair to become the great American tragedy. We of Nebraska, as Americans, must assist in solving it. The solution will not come easily, and it will require foresight and faith, courage and conviction. And the task will be complex because as we cut away the tangled growth of demagoguery, we must be vigilant to preserve the good roots.

We recognize, certainly, that there is important governmental work to be done; that

there can be proper planning by public agencies representing the whole people; that society has a responsibility to care for those in real need; that labor is entitled to fair treatment; that capital has a right to prosper; that work and industry deserve rewards, but, above all, that in times of peace the individual citizen shall be master of his own destiny.

Under a system of free enterprise we built here an industrial order which trained the workmen and built the factories which are today saving us and saving the world. In this land of free decision, we have raised the young men who have gone out with courage and faith in their hearts and with a smile on their lips to fight the enemy on land and sea and in the air.

The American way of life is more than a name, and it must be retained.

So again I ask, what can we—here, this winter—do to make sure Nebraska shoulders her proper share of the current and coming problems?

We must prove that our State, a large unit of government, can be operated in a businesslike, efficient manner; that useless positions need not be created; that appropriations can be wisely made; that Nebraska is fully capable of making progress without making debts. As we keep our standard of government high, we will be living up to our responsibility by setting an example others may wish to follow.

Our people have already shown they know how to do much, with little. Our farms, with scars of drought fresh upon them, have in 1 year, through hard work and sacrifice, made an amazing production record. Volunteers have risen by the thousands to aid in necessary civilian defense work and scrap drives. Our industries, battling shortages, have plunged into 24-hour operations without a serious misstep. Surely, we need have no fear that our people lack spirit, intelligent enterprise, or competent self-control.

We can best recognize their accomplishments by leaving them unbothered and unhampered by trivial legislation and new schemes. We can take care of present-day emergencies, make necessary corrections, pass an appropriations bill, and permit people to go ahead with their work.

That is our immediate duty. Our swift and efficient execution of it can well serve as a bright beacon in a dark sky.

Joe Sinnott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of the 27th of January 1943 a very distinguished citizen, employee of the House of Representatives, my friend, Joe Sinnott, passed over the river from whence no man has ever been known to return.

During my long service in Congress I have been privileged to know and admire Joe Sinnott. He was a man of character, deeply interested in properly performing his duties, always having in mind the rendering of every possible service to the Members of Congress.

He lived to the ripe age of 82 years, but stuck to his post of duty up to the last minute.

Those of us who knew him best and who loved him will miss him after all of these years of faithful service.

I am sure during his last moments and in his passing he could well utilize the words contained in that beautiful song entitled "Rise, My Soul, and Stretch Thy Wings":

RISE, MY SOUL, AND STRETCH THY WINGS

Rise, my soul, and stretch thy wings,
Thy better portion trace,
Rise from transitory things
Toward heaven, thy native place;
Sun and moon and stars decay;
Time shall soon the earth remove,
Rise, my soul, and haste away
To seats prepared above.

Rivers to the ocean run,
Nor stay in all their course;
Fire ascending seeks the sun;
Both speed them to their source:
So a soul that's born of God
Pants to view His glorious face;
Upward tends to His abode,
To rest in His embrace.

Cease, ye pilgrims, cease to mourn;
Press upward to the prize;
Soon our Saviour will return
Triumphant in the skies;
Yet a season—and you know
Happy entrance will be given,
All our sorrows left below
And earth exchanged for heaven.

Lease-Lend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Francisco Chronicle of January 18, 1943:

LEASE-LEND

An Associated Press poll of the House Foreign Affairs Committee indicates that renewal of the Administration's lease-lend authority when that expires June 30 will have the backing of the committee, Democrats and Republicans alike.

This is not a partisan question. It is the practical issue of continuing to give to our allies the aid without which they might not be able to continue the war. Nor is it possible to see how Lease-Lend can be handled in any other way than through authority to the President. His judgment on the use of that authority cannot prudently be circumscribed by restrictions laid down by Congress.

Surely it is unthinkable that Congress should try to tell the President in advance to whom and what and when and how much should be leased-lent. Congress has not the military information; the President has all there is to be had. Congress cannot foresee future contingencies, perhaps almost instantaneous needs. The President is up with the military information day by day.

There has been talk of a fight on lease-lend. There was a fight on it the first time, but that was between interventionists and noninterventionists, a division that ceased to exist on December 7, 1941. There is no division now on the necessity of winning the war. Under the circumstances of our situation in this war there is no more important thing we can do than keep our allies supplied with the articles they need to carry on the fight.

We may doubt if those who have threatened to fight renewal of lease-lend had any intention to hamstring the program. It is more likely that their purpose is to force an investigation of the management of lease-lend. That could be useful, provided it were carried out for the right purpose. If the purpose is merely to get somebody, Harry Hopkins or anyone else, we do not want it. If the aim is to bring about a better administration of lease-lend, an improvement in combined economy and efficiency, and to make sure that lease-lend all goes to its original object of winning the war, then it can be constructive. In this Congress we want nothing but constructive action.

Time Works for Japs Feverishly Consolidating Conquests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Butte Daily Post, Butte, Mont., of January 23, 1943, which I think is pertinent at the present time.

I feel quite strongly that we are too prone to underestimate the difficulty in overcoming the Japanese enemy in the Pacific theater of operations and I wish to commend this editorial to the Members of Congress and to specifically commend Mr. Joseph Grew, the late Ambassador to Japan, for the one-man campaign which he is conducting throughout the country in an effort to educate the American people to the real dangers of the Japanese designs. We have been too complacent for too long. We cannot afford to ignore the Japanese nor to treat them cheaply. It will take all our attention, all our ability, to defeat this enemy and to that end we must begin working on a large scale now. There must be no compromise with Japan and our motto should be, in the words of Admiral Bill Halsey, "Attack, attack, attack."

The editorial follows:

TIME WORKS FOR JAPS FEVERISHLY CONSOLIDATING CONQUESTS

Ambassador Joseph Grew, who spent 10 years at Tokyo and should know the Japanese well, is putting on a one-man campaign to arouse the American people to the seriousness of the situation in the Pacific. In every public statement about the war he emphasizes the toughness of the Japs, their preparedness, and their skill as fighting men. He warns against the belief held by a good many Americans that it will be an easy matter to defeat Japan "when we get around to it."

"The Japanese is a thorough and ruthless foe, and nothing less than all our effort, all our determination, will bring peace and security in our time," he declared in a recent address to civilian defense workers in Omaha. "At this very moment thousands—yes; millions—of Japanese soldiers, administrators, and merchants are swarming over the con-

quered lands, entrenching themselves against the struggle with us which they know will come. * * * The future is theirs or ours. There is no other choice."

Mr. Grew's words are not voiced to spread purposeless alarm. They are designed to awaken the American people to the gravity of the Pacific war and to impress the need of decisive action there before the Japs can exploit the conquered territory and make themselves impregnable. His warning should be heeded.

Our prewar estimates of Japan were of a nation with a strong army and navy, but lacking in the raw materials which are essential to continued military strength. We realized that its armed forces would put up a fierce battle for a short period, but felt sure that lack of supporting resources would ultimately insure their defeat. After their initial rush, time would work steadily on our side.

But the phenomenal Jap victories in the first year of war changed all that. The Japanese conquests of the Philippines, Malaya, Burma, Borneo, Sumatra, Java, Hong Kong, and Singapore gave them control over huge and vital supplies of rubber, tin, oil, and rice which they are feverishly developing. Every day they are permitted to hold these lands gives them additional opportunity to exploit their resources and consolidate their gains. Time is working for them instead of for us.

Giraud on the Fall of France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gen. Henri Honore Giraud, which was published in Life magazine:

GIRAUD ON THE FALL OF FRANCE

(By Gen. Henri Honore Giraud)

What are the causes of this unforeseeable crash, unheard of in the history of France?

First, the primordial question, that of birth rate. France, even without the war, was on the slope of suicide. The family was disappearing to give place to couples without children. In the world's richest country, where the soil gives to anybody who wants to work it, the countryside was depopulating itself.

There was a great deal of talk in France, beautiful programs were made, many blue ribbons were distributed. The matches of football and rugby, the boxing, the horse races, the bicycle and automobile races had more and more success. * * * The result was fatal. In a race formerly solid, rustic, tough against fatigue, but where alcohol and syphilis had opened suppurating wounds, the skeleton shrank, the tissues became lax, the resistance disappeared. Neither from the point of view of endurance, nor of training was the soldier of 1940 equal to that of 1914. Very limited ability in marching, even less capacity for work, insurmountable need of sleep—these were the characteristics of the soldier of 1940.

Between 1914 and 1918 we made a superhuman effort. We emerged from the test physically and morally exhausted. Our ideal wasn't to profit by the victory to make a better world; it was to enjoy ourselves. From the first to the last rank of society, people wanted to amuse themselves, or rather to daze themselves.

What did the school teach these youngsters and these men? First, egoism, personal interest, and the cult of envy. After that, negation of everything spiritual, of everything divine, of everything ideal. Atheism, if not proclaimed, was at least encouraged.

Could the military service improve or correct this education? Certainly not at a time when the service of 1 year was practically reduced to 4 months, and when, as I ascertained, certain men had not even learned the appellations of their officers.

To sum up—youth insufficient in quantity, insufficient in quality. That's what the 20 years following the victory gave us.

If from youth, which formed only a small part of the Army, we pass to the entire Nation, what were its characteristics? At the base, lack of authority. One doesn't delegate authority; one asserts it. In France between 1919 and 1939 it merely exhausted itself. In the Government, under whatever label, we never saw anything but parties; we never saw France. The composition of every ministry—and they were many—was a scandal.

Our officers and noncommissioned officers of the Reserve who made up the enormous majority of our staff, did not dare to command, whether the simplest piece of work or the gravest mission was in question.

It was the same from the top to the bottom of the industrial ladder. The result was a weakening of output, a lack of method, an increase in overhead, incompatible with any well-conducted business. Whether it was a typist arriving a quarter hour late or putting on her lipstick a quarter hour early, a truck driver wasting 5 minutes or a fitter chatting with his neighbor instead of polishing off his piece, the result always came back in costs.

But the damage was even more moral than material. Getting used to disobeying his chiefs, getting used to no commanding, the Frenchman from his earliest youth became used to doing as he pleased.

And the reservist returning to his regiment no longer knew how to obey or how to make his squadron or section obey him. When colonels and generals must do the work of corporals it is obvious the house is upside down.

The war of 4 years taught us how to die and to suffer. It did not teach us how to work. Until 1914 the French laborer and peasant were hard workers. Our country was a country of petite bourgeoisie, citizen and peasant, where the woolen stocking was a fact, where economy—by certain people called miserliness—guided the French citizen.

The war of 1914–18 did not help to sustain this petit bourgeois spirit. * * * The arrival of the Americans—their methods, their supplies—helped considerably to upset their ideas. They got into the habit of counting in billions or not at all.

Spurious luxury increased. Perfumers made fortunes. The proprietor, the worker, the foreman, the subordinate—each one of them came to think of pleasure first and of reducing work to a minimum. * * * At the same time it was forgotten that throughout the centuries the church had ordered Sunday as a day of rest, and that the strict observance of this was the surest method of giving to each the necessary weekly relaxation.

First of all, it was the short English working week which crept in on the Continent, and so the number of hours became the contract basis between employers and wage earners. From 48 hours it went to 45, and then to 40.

The employer had a hundred pretexts, a thousand occasions. In summer it was the seaside, in autumn, hunting, then winter sports. The employee looked on and drew his own conclusions.

Not only the working hours but the working conscience diminished. The job was no longer the thing that mattered. All that had gone to build up the excellence of French production—its elegance, its finish, its attention to detail—diminished or disappeared, altogether. American methods were adopted, forgetting that France had neither the spirit nor the potential of America.

It was easier to succeed by intrigue than work. Politics became a career of compromise, arrangement, betrayal. Many lawyers, professors, and journalists suddenly believed themselves statesmen, as soon as they had taken their first degree—but above all, as soon as they had managed to get into the office of some undersecretary of state, or into the reception room of some woman of importance. Ministries, commissions, prefectures, colonial administration, etc., were in this way filled with young men who, instead of using their brains for examinations, used their shoe leather or their fathers' gasoline to make useful and profitable contacts.

Shortage of equipment, unfilled orders, airplanes that never materialized, obsolete tanks, munitions that never arrived—all this was the result of work inadequate in quantity and quality.

From 1918 to 1940 France luxuriated in every kind of regime that might be called republican—from horizon blue to the red Popular Front. Ministries fell like houses of cards, scandals accumulated, riots caused the spilling of French blood, even on the paving stones of the capital; but always the same men trod the boards. The ruin which the Popular Front caused France is immeasurable, but its greatest responsibility was to teach the people of France laziness under the grandiose name of "leisure."

The king of all was the corner cafe. The 40-hour week did not bring in anything more to the mother of the family because the breadwinner spent in 2 days twice as much as in 1. The only result was that alcohol merchants did well.

Let us hope that those who were crushed on the northern battlefields by the Luftwaffe, that those who had neither antitank guns nor antiaircraft guns nor munitions will cry vengeance against the idlers who neglected to make these things, and above all against those whose criminal ideology and lack of responsibility have created this disorder and anarchy.

To preach under-production at a time when Germany shouted that it was better to have cannons than butter was not only treason against the nation, but a crime against honesty. They gave the greatest success to the totalitarian regimes and the greatest assistance that those regimes could have desired, for sincere Frenchmen who have been in Germany as prisoners of war can bear witness to its prosperity and to its physical and moral health. Admittedly the Germans do not perhaps have liberty, but there is certainly neither disorder nor anarchy. Everywhere it is work, the only fortune for a people which wishes to live and live happily. May France remember it and profit by it.

Economic and Technical Problems for Post-War Recovery of Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, one of the nations alined with us as a member of

the United Nations is Norway. She was one of the democracies that loved peace, worked for peace, was utterly unprepared for war. Norway's standard of living was high. Her social standards were as advanced as any in the world. But the Norwegians, like us Americans, neglected too long the Al Capones, the Hitlers, the Lavals in the world.

So the Norwegians, like ourselves, are now fighting our common enemy with all their might. But the Norwegians are planning now for the years ahead when the war is over. These plans were recently discussed in an address given at the Brookings Institution by Dr. Hans Bull, who for several years was the commercial counselor for the Norwegian Embassy in Washington.

The suggestions he outlined seem so sound and constructive that I think they should be given careful study by everybody who is seriously interested in seeing the close cooperation between the United Nations in war develop into peaceful and mutually beneficial relations between them after the war.

The address follows:

Norway was one of the democracies that was caught unprepared for war. If at all possible, we should not be caught unprepared for peace.

I shall not here touch on the military and political problems connected with peace, but concentrate on an outline of some of the economic, commercial, and technical problems involved.

If not satisfactorily solved, these will again, as after World War No. 1, unavoidably lead to starvation, unrest, revolt, and to World War No. 3. The prelude to World War No. 2 included trade restrictions, exchange restrictions, duty barriers, clearing agreements, imperial preference, national sufficiency, etc.

While we must not interfere with or hinder the war effort, it is imperative that confusion, unrest, internal disturbances, and political or military revolts be avoided when the enemy surrenders, and nothing can better pacify the nations that have been subjected to the heel of Mars than work, food, and healthy living conditions.

It has been seen in the press lately that the Norwegian Government in London has created a new department for supply and reconstruction, which was started on October 1, 1942.

Our Norwegian problems this time, compared with the last war, are very different and much greater, because during World War No. 1 we were not directly involved. Also, last time our Government and our business and trade organizations could cooperate even during the war, while this time most of our people are without connection with our Government in exile, which is a labor party government.

Many changes may yet take place before the war is over, and many of the problems at home are not well enough known abroad, so whatever plans are made while the war goes on must be supplemented when the war is over.

Our aim should be to have ready plans which are as clear as possible, so that the great danger—internal disturbances—will not follow the armistice.

It goes without saying that efforts should and will be made to have ready and send as soon as the war is over food, clothing, medicines, and fuel, to relieve the most urgent supply shortages, starvation, sickness, and other suffering. When the enemy surrenders there will surely be large Allied supplies of food, clothing, medicines, fuel, and other supplies intended for military stock piles or reserve supplies abroad. Many of these supplies may be afloat and could very quickly be diverted as first aid to our starving peoples, the cargoes be discharged into empty warehouses, silos, and tanks, and the ships freed for other purposes. The cargoes could be consigned to the Norwegian Government or to the different commercial or industrial organizations, depending upon how it will be handled. This plan should be worthy of careful study and planning now between the United States authorities and our Ministry of Supply and Reconstruction.

How can we avoid a terrible unemployment when armistice comes? What can we do in order to recover the best possible standard of living within our own country, and what can we do to help other countries recover their standard of living?

By friendly cooperation with our allies while the war lasts and afterward, we should be able to further mutual aims.

Having during the last 8 years had a very great respect for Secretary Hull's trade policy, I believe that this policy after the war, more than ever, will be the most constructive policy for protection of the highest possible standard of living, not only in the United States of America, but in all countries. It will help to avoid new wars or internal disturbances.

Each country's greatest strength in the peaceful economic relations will be its sound buying power, but payment for purchases over a period of time must be made in the form of goods, services, or money.

There will necessarily be a period of adjustment right after the war, but the better the post-war recovery is planned during the war the quicker the recovery will be when the surrender comes—perhaps suddenly as after the last war.

In the free countries practically the entire economic life is now geared to the war effort as decreed by each country's own government. After the war all this has to be readjusted and there must necessarily be some lost time on account of the momentum from the gigantic war effort. Also, there will be time and money needed to bring the peacetime effort over into the new direction, which will be a streamlining of the pre-war economic life.

During the war the sciences have marched forward as never before and many discoveries or new methods and uses will be available for a better peacetime existence. Some of these improvements have been used for the war effort and can without delay be converted to peacetime use, others only after adoption to the changed demands. In many cases the progress made during the war will be equal to 20 years of normal progress. This will seriously affect the world's supplies and demands and will force many readjustments.

But in the occupied countries the problems will be very much more difficult. The money, effort, and time needed for rebuilding of property damaged or completely destroyed may for some time hinder other problems. Also, supplies of food, clothing, raw materials, machinery, farm equipment, ships, automobiles, and so forth, have been used up, confiscated, or destroyed. Production has been ordered by the enemy to suit his needs and to fit into his picture of how he hopes the world will look after the war, and I presume these plans will often not suit our ideas about work and life after the war. Our railroads will need equipment and repairs, our coastwise ships serving our very long coast line have disappeared, our fishing fleet and equipment will be badly reduced, and our ocean-going fleet has suffered tremendous losses in the service of the United Nations.

Without doubt we will need financial and material help to get started as soon as possible, but if this is planned right, so that we can get our production and services started, we should be able to pay for everything reasonably soon.

To what extent is the United States economically interested in seeing a small country like Norway reconstructed as well and as early as possible? Our mutual trade has always been very satisfactory and correct payment has been made both ways.

Our purchases here were heavy and consisted of grain, flour, tobacco, fruit, automobiles, office machinery, oils and fats, textiles, cotton, and numerous other items.

We sold fish products, paper and wood pulp, whale oil, metals, and other products from our electrochemical factories, as well as service in the form of cheap and good ocean transportation, which is such an all-important service for your industries and for your agriculture.

Only if Norway can be restored so that we can produce and deliver our products and services will our buying and paying power come back so that we again become a valuable customer.

Many of the scars caused by the war will never heal, but by intelligently planned reconstruction much can be done soon, including recovery of our buying and paying power.

The different problems should be classified into: (1) Urgently needed solutions, (2) problems that can wait.

Financial demands can be classified as: (1) Investments that will soon produce profits and thereby pay interest and capital. These may be both governmental and private business investments. (2) Long-term investments that are expected to produce profits. (3) Non-profit-giving investments.

Altogether the needs for repairs, substitutions, new equipment, and material will be enormous.

But how can we provide money, material, and labor for all of this, without greater hardships than our future life can stand? The great immediate problem will be the question of how to get started in order to avoid a terrible unemployment, famine, and general weakening of the Nation's resistance against contagion of all kinds.

The first step should be to provide work for productive employment, which will produce material needed or which will provide funds with which to pay for needed imports.

I should like to mention a fire that happened in a chemical factory in Philadelphia during the last war.

Suddenly one night the factory fire whistle started to blow. Soon the fire engines came in a very large number. The factory's own fire brigade, supplemented by the city fire department, fought the fire for many hours. But as soon as the fire was under control and the fire fighting was definitely in the hands of the experienced fire fighters, other men gathered during the same night to consider what to do in order to get the production started again. It was clear that much new machinery and equipment, as well as raw materials, had to be provided. The debris had to be cleared out, what could be had to be repaired, and new equipment had to be ordered or designed. The next morning at 8 contractors, builders, manufacturers, etc., gathered and quick progress was made.

The opportunity was utilized to make desired improvements, but only the essential problems were handled at once. Other problems including painting, etc., were left until later.

The factory had been making war materials for England, France, and Russia, and it had paid all bills, had paid salaries, wages, raw materials, as well as interest and amortization. There was just no question about the factory as a business, and the men at the head of it wanted to produce, wanted to deliver according to the company's obligations, and they did—with improved quality and quantity.

Similarly, our country was a good business before our fire. The foundations are still good, and after the essential parts have been repaired we also want to produce and deliver the goods and pay our bills—after the

management and the employees together have repaired the damages.

But what will the international supplies and demands be after the war? Which old markets have disappeared and which new ones have come in? What new demands have come in place of the old ones and who will be able to pay for their imports, and with what? And how will the new, war-time production fit into the picture? Each one of these problems will take time to solve and without doubt many of them will cause great upheavals. And after the war there will be headaches caused by the war debts. There will also be serious problems caused by nationalism originating behind many gateposts.

Mr. Sumner Welles in a recent speech urged post-war building and stated in part as follows:

"We all envisage the tragic chaos and anarchy which will have engulfed Europe and a great part of the rest of the world by the time Hitler's brief day is done, and when he and his accomplices confront their judges. The United Nations' machinery for relief and rehabilitation must be prepared to operate without a moment's delay.

"People who want to work must be able to find useful jobs, not sometimes, not in good years only, but continuously. These jobs must be at things which they do well, and which can be done well in the places where they work. They must be able to exchange the things which they produce, on fair terms for other things which other people, often in other places, can make better than they.

"Efficient and continuous production and fair exchange are both necessary to the abundance which we seek, and they depend upon each other. In the past we have succeeded better with production than exchange. Production is called into existence by the prospects for exchange, prospects which have constantly been thwarted by all kinds of inequalities, imperfections, and restrictions."

In the occupied countries one of the very big problems will be each country's exchange, to avoid inflation of a run-away kind as after the last war.

As my own personal opinion, I believe that it will be useless to try to solve all these problems at once. All the effect of this, the most far-reaching war in history, cannot be eliminated during the lifetime of our generation.

The problems must be sifted and the constructive or "bread and butter" problems solved first. Otherwise we shall starve, half starve, or at least march backward for many years.

It will not hurt us at all to live a simpler life, spiritually as well as materially, but we must try very hard to avoid the common danger of far-reaching unemployment of mind and body, which may even threaten the peace itself.

The Norwegian economic life that should be placed on a sound economic basis first of all is:

Agriculture, which employs the largest number and which at best can only supply part of our country's own needs.

About 30 percent of our population live on the farms. About 70 percent of farm income is from livestock.

Our biggest item of importation of agricultural products before the war was about 600,000 tons of cereals annually, but we were about self-sufficient in other agricultural products except those that could be grown only in the warmer climates.

That was the picture before the war, but there will certainly be big changes after the occupation.

Our cattle have already been reduced to about half, and there may be an even more rapid decrease from now on, because the people must live. Recently the Germans requisitioned 300,000 head of cattle.

Our livestock before the war was about 2,000,000 cattle and horses; about 2,000,000 sheep; almost 1,000,000 goats and pigs; about three and one-half million poultry.

The demand for restocking our farms will therefore be imperative, and we have no other way of utilizing our hay, grass, and pastures in the woods and on our mountainsides.

Besides, agriculture will need seed, fertilizer, and farm implements.

It seems as if the farmers in unoccupied countries could do well in increasing sharply the number of calves and young cattle that are suitable for our climatic conditions. And for some time to come the new trans-Atlantic air lines may consider incubator chicken shipments as fill-in cargoes.

While our normal consumption of meat was low—about 1½ pounds per person per week—we will not be self-supporting in meat until our livestock supply has been built up, and we will be short of dairy products.

Incidentally, shipping will face a new demand in connection with transfer of so large numbers of cattle, which must not only be transported across the ocean but must also be distributed within the country.

There are hundreds of thousands of Norwegian-American farmers in this country who know so well the local conditions in their own old-home farms in Norway and they would know exactly what kinds of cattle would be suitable for their old homes.

Nothing could be more suitable or welcome than an attempt by these farmers to help to restock the farms of their fathers, brothers, or cousins from their own new farms. It would give these farmers another interest to look forward to, when, some day after the present ordeal is over, they can visit their own old homes and see their own cattle or offspring of these graze along our green mountainsides.

This problem is of great dimensions. It involves numberless details and collaboration between agricultural experts, shipping experts, and others, and it takes time. Therefore, it should be explored soon.

Industry will need raw materials, machinery, technical help, and refinancing.

Shipping will need much new tonnage as substitution for our very heavy war losses and extraordinarily heavy depreciation while our fleet has been almost exclusively engaged in war work. One of the leading British generals said recently that the service which the Norwegian merchant marine had given to our mutual war effort was equal to an army of 1,000,000 men.

All of this merchant marine has been created entirely by private initiative and without any kind of Government subsidy.

Based on ship construction up to the invasion, April 9, 1940, it was estimated that the Norwegian Fleet possessed the third largest merchant fleet in the world, having passed Japan by a small margin.

Our shipping losses during this war are already enormous. Not only have we lost our coastwise and our fishing fleet but also a large number of ships, that used to connect us with the outer world—passenger ships that represented the last word in a long line of evolution—also a very large percentage of our cargo fleet.

After the last war, the United States had a considerable fleet of war-built cargo ships, the so-called shipping board fleet. They became superfluous when the war was over but many of them, although idle, were maintained at great cost. It may be very likely that history will repeat itself in this case. If so, the surplus tonnage could be turned over to Norwegian experienced shipowners on long-time charter basis.

Banking: Our banking's first problems will be stabilization of the currency. Before the war the Norwegian krone was stabilized as a member of the "sterling bloc." The war losses, occupation costs, wartime printed money, etc., will lead to a severe strain on our currency when the war is over. This will have to be faced and solved without too much interruption of the daily life. Provisions have to be made so that now, badly needed capital can be safeguarded.

Our national bank—Bank of Norway—will need a substantial exchange stabilization fund or guaranty of at least $50,000,000 to protect the confidence in our monetary system, internally and abroad.

Financial help needed by agriculture, industry, shipping, fisheries, commerce, etc., should preferably be distributed and guarded by our existing banking institutions after these have been satisfactorily backed by our Government.

With the Bank of Norway as the central bank, the experience and knowledge of all the local private and savings banks should be utilized to the fullest extent in order to utilize to the best advantage possible available funds. And if ample funds are available at a very low net rate of interest to the user, this would encourag him to use the money and to give all the security he can muster even if he obligates himself to repay the capital in a reasonably short time. This worked well after the last war and after the great depression following 1929 and it should work again.

General trade will require supplies of all kinds.

Fisheries will require new ships and equipment as well as service.

Trade will need international good will and cooperation to encourage exchange of goods and services on an equitable basis.

Communications are but a service for all economic life, but inferior traffic facilities hinder or stop trade and good communications make the economic life flow easier. It is of the greatest importance that all sorts of communications, inland, coastwise, and foreign are tried and put on the cheapest but most efficient basis as soon as possible. This would include railroad equipment, automobiles, planes for mail, passenger and freight service, passenger and freight ships for local and other coastwise service, as well as suitable ships for service between Norway and the European countries as well as for overseas service. The same applies to mail, telephone, and telegraph services, which were excellent before, but which after the war will face a severe set-back.

We must build in the foundation of existing transportation facilities, replace losses, and anticipate the new conditions caused by the war and by post-war developments. The financing of all of this reconstruction will demand very heavy capital outlay after our country's resources have been heavily taxed by the war.

If the first attempt is confined, as mentioned before, to the most urgent demands and preferably to purposes that will pay their own way, that is, to pay interest on loans as well as repay the capital invested in relatively short time, it ought to be possible to obtain loans or credits on reasonable terms.

The amount needed would be large, but the purposes for which it is intended could be more or less earmarked. Most of the financial aid would be needed in the form of credits to be used for purchases and very serious attempts should be made soon through trade negotiations to find a mutually advantageous formula for equitable trading supported by large cheap credits.

Creation of sound peacetime conditions after the armistice will call for even greater statesmanship than our present time does. Statesmanship which is not sufficiently farseeing will lead to starvation, revolt, civil war, or even to a World War No. 3, whereas real creative statesmanship can recover lost happiness and, at least theoretically, lead to centuries of peace among the nations. But it must all be planned carefully, faced courageously, and handled as quickly as possible.

Our ship of state is going through a terrific storm and it has already suffered great

damage to hull, rigging, and tackle. And while we firmly believe the ship will weather the storm, there may yet be very much damage coming.

In order to save the ship from complete destruction the crew must hope for a great wave of balanced optimism which will carry it safely over the reef and into the quiet lagoon behind, where the ship can be anchored safely for repair to hull and rigging.

But the ship of state flies our own red, white, and blue flag and on the pennant on the foremast is the name, Democracy. It has been built after 1,000 years of experience. It should be worth repairing, and it will be repaired.

While the ship is being repaired a new cargo will be collected and the good ship will again sail out through a well-marked channel into a world that is free.

APPENDIX

Having been asked to provide a brief outline of the specific steps to be taken in order to get the Norwegian reconstruction economy actually started, I shall do so, but with considerable hesitancy. Hesitancy, because there are so many ways to tackle these involved problems; and the results aimed at will depend upon policies accepted by the Norwegian and the United States Governments and economic institutions, and the results possible will depend upon reactions from policies adopted by other countries.

Because Norway has established a new and separate department of supply and reconstruction, this department should logically be the clearing agency for the Norwegian reconstruction program, but it must naturally avail itself of all available experience and assistance from interested Norwegian and United States organizations and individuals.

A similar United States department or organization should handle the American part of the program.

The most practical solution may be to try to work out the Norwegian-American desiderata in the form of a trade treaty or as mutual trade and reconstruction agreement in treaty form, which should include the mutual aims over a fixed period of time, for instance, 10 or 20 years.

The agreement should be in two steps, a preliminary plan to go into effect the day the enemy surrenders and a final plan which should be worked out and agreed upon within another 12 months. Meanwhile, the first plan must be mutually binding until a permanent one has been approved.

The most important part of the first agreement would be the basis on which payment for purchases and loans will be made, including the rate of interest to be paid, as upon this will depend to which extent and how quickly purchases and other commitments will be made.

Capitalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, at a time when those who hold key positions in the executive department of the Government are gradually preparing the ground work by which to have the Government acquire control of the major instruments of production, the views of Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, set forth in the February issue of the Reader's Digest in Your Stake in Capitalism are worthy of careful consideration by those who believe in the American way of life:

YOUR STAKE IN CAPITALISM

(By Eric Johnston, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States)

I am for capitalism; and almost all labor leaders I know are really just as much for it as I am. They do not go along with the idea that capitalism is dead. They know that either private business or Government bureaucracy must save this country when the war is over; and they prefer private business.

They have a sound reason. You cannot strike against a government. You cannot even truly bargain with a government. Wages and hours in Government employment are fixed by public law. No group of Government employees can overturn public law enacted by the Congress and backed by the Army and Navy. In any knock-down contest between a government and a union, the union is beaten from the start.

A Congress of Industrial Organizations leader in Washington had good sense when he remarked the other day: "I would rather bargain with any private employer than with any bureaucrat. The bureaucrat has jails."

Labor and business therefore can be firm allies in preventing the governmentalization of this country. I fear no direct effort by labor to destroy business in favor of Government. What I fear is that people in general, including millions who are wage workers and millions who are not—may forget just what it is that makes business go.

For this I very considerably blame us businessmen. We are too mealy-mouthed about the basic principle of our economic system. We have been intimidated by all the tirades against bloated capitalists and swollen profits. We fear that the word "capitalism" is unpopular. So we take refuge in a nebulous phrase and talk about the free enterprise system. And we even run to cover in the folds of the flag and talk about the American way of life.

Such language disastrously obscures the main issue. You cannot take a whiff of free enterprise or a stretch of a way of life and start a factory with it. To start a factory, and to start the jobs inside that factory, you have to have savings. You have to have money. You have to have capital.

It takes thousands of dollars of capital to equip a really modern factory with the machinery for one job for one wage worker. Freedom and Americanism are the atmosphere. But capital is the seed in the soil. Unless we produce that seed, and unless we plant it, there will be no new crops of private jobs for the American people when this war is over.

Right there is the basic point, I think, in all planning for American postwar prosperity. And right there is the reason why I do not hestitate to say that the word upon which to fix the national mind at this time is simply, outrightly and frankly, capitalism.

Do I sound old-fashioned? In this age, which is prone to think about welfare without thinking about the wealth which is necessary to welfare, do I sound reactionary? I summon to my aid one of the wisest friends of labor and of business that this country has ever had, the late Mr. Justice Brandeis. Addressing a trades-union audience in Boston, Justice Brandeis once said:

"It is absolutely essential that a business be profitable. I do not mean merely that the business should not be run at a loss. I mean that the business should be run under such conditions that the owner is willing to risk his capital in the business."

Note: "Risk his capital." Mr. Brandeis, the sociological and judicial innovator and pioneer, was for capitalism; and, under his great shadow, I am, too, without apology.

Experienced labor leaders generally quite agree with Mr. Brandeis. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, recently said:

"If this country ever gets a system of governmental regimentation, labor will suffer most. Labor, therefore, is deeply interested in the preservation of private business; and labor should everlastingly maintain that the owners and managers of business are entitled to a fair and just return upon their investments."

Mr. Green, I hope, will everlastingly try to teach that truth to all his followers. Business can get nowhere by starving labor. When it starves labor it is starving the purchasers of its own products. But labor, similarly, cannot get anywhere by starving capital. When it makes demands which starve capital of all profits and savings it is preventing the creation of new capital and thus preventing the creation of new and better jobs. It is starving its own future.

People will never understand this point unless we say "capitalism."

The same remark can be made on the point of taxes.

Just because we have not said capitalism a great many people—in polling booths and in legislative bodies—have thought that you can tax business just as much as you like and still have free enterprise and the American way of life. You cannot. Because, just suppose that you taxed all new savings and all new profits and all new capital out of private hands into the Public Treasury. What would you have left to be the creator of new jobs? Only the government—only the totalitarian state.

Hardly anybody in America deliberately wants totalitarianism. What threatens us is unintentional totalitarianism. Unless we use our heads, we can slip into it absent-mindedly.

On the subject of taxes, some meetings have been started in Washington between economic experts representing the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Labor today has its thinkers, just as management has its thinkers. I am hoping that these thinkers may arrive at many points of agreement as to future taxes.

Everybody now is willing to be taxed right down to his last crust of bread rather than let the Axis win. But what about the day after victory? How do we resume and continue and expand and improve our economic freedom as we have known it?

Business leaders are putting much thought upon this problem. They sometimes do not realize that labor leaders are, too. I think it extremely significant and hopeful that the American Federation of Labor has made recommendations to the Congress as follows:

"Provision should be made for the return, in cash, after the war, of a part of the present high taxes. We can well be guided by the English policy which proposes to return a high percentage of the taxes now assessed against low-income workers. Corporations also need a post-war reserve in order to convert their facilities from war use to peace use and in order to maintain employment. We think that any corporation called on to pay more than 75 percent of its total net income under the war taxation laws should be eligible to receive a refund of such excess when the war is over."

Here is a frank recognition of the proposition that for post-war prosperity we need not

only freedom but freedom plus capital. Our taxes after the war must permit both employers and employees to stand on their own feet and not become wards of the Government. This objective was admirably stated the other day by Robert Watt, a labor leader of great prominence in Government wartime agencies. He said:

"After this war I want no gigantic governmental Reconstruction Finance Corporation to finance business and dominate it; and I want no gigantic governmental Works Progress Administration to employ labor and dominate it."

Business and labor should be able to unite toward that end with good will. We should have a closer cooperation between business and labor in the future than we have ever had in the past. By cooperation I do not mean surrender, either by business to labor or by labor to business. By cooperation I mean that both sides should jointly bring forth better fruits of efficiency and productivity.

Labor should drop all "make-work" devices. It should drop all devices for getting paid for work not necessary or for work not done. It should drop all merely negative resistance to improvements of machines and of methods. It should universally adopt the positive policy which some outstanding unions have already adopted. That is, it should help management to improve processes and to reduce costs. More than 1,500 labor management committees are doing this now in the course of the war-production drive to win the war. They should keep on doing it after the war to make the peace also a victory. They should master and memorize one other remark once made by Justice Brandeis. He said: "The one final way in which we can improve the condition of the worker is to produce more, in order that there may be more to divide."

Capitalism has been the greatest force the world has ever known for increased production. Labor in the future could greatly help to make that force even more successful.

But business also must open its eyes to newer and better performance.

The President recently abolished the Work Projects Administration. Why did he ever establish it? Because business was not giving full employment. If business again fails to give full employment, there will be another Work Projects Administration. This will be so under any President. The first President ever to do anything of any importance for the relief of the unemployed during a depression was a Republican, Herbert Hoover. He set the precedent. The precedent has grown. Public indignation against unemployment, against its misery of body, against its misery of mind, has grown. No American President will ever again permit American citizens to be unemployed. They will be employed by business or they will be employed by the Government.

I say that business can employ all American citizens except those needed for absolutely necessary governmental functions. It can do it if it plans for it.

There are two unpopular words. One is capitalism which is hated in certain quarters. I am nevertheless for it. The other is planning, which is hated in certain other quarters. I am nevertheless for it. I say that business, if it wants to escape from being taxed for another and larger Work Projects Administration, must plan; and it must plan on a scale of which it has never before even dreamed.

It has always planned for its own individual enterprises. It must now plan for Nation-wide projects by whole industries.

It must look, for instance, at the horrible houses and at the vast wretched, unwholesome, substandard residential areas in which millions of American citizens still live; and it must say:

"To change all this squalor and ugliness into decency and sightliness is a job meaning billions of dollars of business. It cannot be done small. It has to be done big. It has to be done through cooperation among a lot of different elements. There are the manufacturers of standard building materials. There are the laboratory designers of new and more economical building materials. There are the wholesale and retail dealers in building materials. There are the architects. There are the engineers, contractors, building-trade unions, financing agencies, savings banks, building and loan associations. We have been puttering at this job, everybody by himself, and not getting it done. Now we will make organizations which will include representatives of all elements of housing production and we will produce housing at a private cooperative consolidated cost that will baffle all the public planners in the whole of Washington. Some of them would like to do all this building. We will do it first—and better. We will stop railing at the Government. We will start outthinking it and outdoing it and outstripping it."

And there are quite a few other big national-scale jobs for business to plan. Consider our railroads. To give this country a really modern railroad system, a system as good in all its parts as it now is in its best parts, would mean at least $10,000,000,000 of business contracts.

To modernize everything in this country would mean so many billions of dollars that business could not get through earning them and spending them in 20 years.

We need again the spirit of the pioneers. Only this time it must be a planned and organized spirit. I say to businessmen, Do the planning and the organizing that is worthy of your freedom or there will be no more freedom and no more businessmen.

But I also say on behalf of businessmen, They cannot plan, they cannot organize, they cannot maintain a free system unless they get one definite concession from labor and from Government. It is this:

"Business must be allowed to keep enough savings, enough profits, enough new capital to be able to go ahead into new investments, new adventures, new services.

"Free private business is like a motorcycle. It must move. If it stops for lack of gasoline, it topples." And then, I repeat, there is only totalitarian governmentalism.

We stand at a solemn parting of the ways. Our business leaders and our labor leaders want freedom. No American wants slavery. But what is the price of freedom? I say it is the capital with which to operate capitalism. The word is "capitalism."

The Future of the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1943

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gov. J. Melville Broughton, of North Carolina, at council of State governments, Baltimore, Md., January 26, 1943:

The American state existed in its geographical and governmental concept long before there was any Federal Government. For more than a century and a half it has endured under our federated system. It has weathered wars, external and internal, depressions, panics, square deals, no deals, and new deals. It is more potent if not more powerful today than ever before.

It should be remembered that the creation of the Federal Government was not the result of coup or edict, nor even by action of the several States; it was the creation of the people. They retained for themselves all powers not expressly delegated to the Federal Government or committed to the States. That which the people retained to themselves was and remains, inherently at least, the greater part.

The people delegated to the Federal Government those powers which they did not feel capable of exercising for themselves, such as national defense, interstate and international trade, treaties and the regulation of money. But they were careful to state those grants of power in definite terms. At least they thought they were. Subsequent Supreme Court decisions revealed that they had been a little loose in their phraseology.

For their respective States they retained those powers which would give sovereignty without a sovereign and convenience without confusion. They wanted in the State a medium for self-expression, and wanted the State government to be simple, direct, and subject to rebuke. They have at least preserved the latter prerogative.

For themselves the people sought to reserve those rights and privileges which they held most dear: Individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, sanctity of the home, and the right to live their own lives without too much interference on the part of the government, State or national. The Bill of Rights is the formal expression of these purposes and aspirations; but they were written into the hearts of the people long before the Bill of Rights was declared. This instinct for democracy, this intuitive love of freedom and of the simple, unrestricted life were the motivating purposes which brought our ancestors to this continent. It is for these things that we have fought in the past and fight now. They are of the essence of our American way of life. They constitute the fabric of our national character.

It was in this fashion that the people of the United States in the days of beginning fixed the pattern for our State and National Government. The Federal Government, within carefully stipulated limits, was deemed a necessity and such plan was accepted, though with no marked enthusiasm. The State was designed to operate in a very simple and limited governmental sphere, maintaining courts for the punishment of crime and settling of disputes, and legislative bodies for the passage of such few laws as the people were willing to accept. Neither the State nor the Federal Government under the original conception was designed or expected to give any consideration to such matters as public health, public welfare, public highways, agriculture, or education. These were matters which the people would look after for themselves and in their own way. This was a simple plan, almost primitive; but it worked with reasonable success for nearly three-quarters of a century.

Under these conditions personal liberty and rugged individualism had full sway. We were largely an agricultural people, with virtually no mass social problems or industrial complications. Such was "the land of the free and the home of the brave" in the so-called good old days.

But even rugged individuals had to eat; and with the growing population, increase of industrial activity and concentration of larger groups in municipal sections the people began to experience other needs. Public health became a matter of concern. Education could no longer be limited to a favored

few. Public roads became a necessity, and farmers began to learn that agriculture could be vitally affected by national and international circumstances. Such matters as tariff regulations, immigration laws, and slave labor became subjects of heated debate and violent expression. The straitjacket of State rights began to crack under the expanding social consciousness. Issues were drawn, sectional flames were fanned, and the tragic era of the War between the States was the almost inevitable culmination of this effort to change the pattern of our life and government.

In the intervening years there has been an ever-increasing demand on the part of the people for a wider range of Government service, both State and National. On the part of the Federal Government the response began to take shape in various grants in aid. Land-grant colleges, Federal appropriations for road construction, and health programs to match State funds for similar purposes became the order of the day.

Decisions of the United States Supreme Court were influenced by the changing social order, and the rigid concepts of local self-government and State's rights have inevitably experienced the relaxing influence of these new interpretations. The great body of the common people of this Nation have not been content with more theories of government. Poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, inadequate educational facilities, starvation wages and pitifully small returns for the labor and sweat of the man of the soil are factors which have brought about the almost revolutionary change in the nature and scope of Federal activities. Whether we like it or not, this tide, welling up from the homes and hearts of the American people, demanding better living conditions, has swept forever away many of the narrow limitations of government conceived by the founding fathers. There are those who are still sitting by the abandoned camp fires of the past, who yet believe that we can and should return to the ancient landmarks. Their hope is in vain.

The true function of government is to promote the welfare and the happiness of all the people. The people of this country will never again submit to those conditions which too long existed in this country. Child labor, unconscionably long working hours, inadequate and unjust wages, poor housing and unwholesome living conditions, low sta dards of public health, unequal educational opportunities and pitiful farm prices, in contrast with the vast enrichment, frequently through artificial and unrighteous circumstances, of a relatively small percentage of the people, are conditions which will not be tolerated.

Fundamentally, the people may prefer less government, and certainly less bureaucratic Federal Government. They believe inherently in the old principles of local self-government and State's rights; but they also believe in having for themselves a reasonable share of the Nation's prosperity and a fair chance for themselves and their children to live under decent conditions. The vast majority of the people are willing to give up many things of sentimental or traditional value provided they are able to eat, wear better clothes and enjoy the comforts and conveniences of life. If they could get these and still maintain the old principles of government, well and good; but if they cannot, they will not hesitate to look to the Federal Government for relief, and no amount of harking back to ancient creeds will deter them.

Those of us who believe in the fundamental principles of State's rights and local self-government may as well concede frankly that much of the almost terrifying expansion of Federal encroachment upon the original domain of the States has come about because State governments failed to meet the challenge of the new day. Inadequate educational opportunities, archaic labor laws and regulations, unrelieved hardships and inequities suffered by the working people, low-pitched politics and unjust class and race discriminations have all too frequently caused the people to lift their eyes beyond the horizon of State lines and call for relief from the Federal Government. Fortunately, there has been an awakening social consciousness in most of the States with a resulting quickening interest in State government. The best answer, indeed the only one, to the alarming and rapid spread of Federal encroachment is to give to the people a better government through State agencies. Conditions like these cannot be met either by harking back or moaning low.

It is, of course, unfortunately true that there is a large and growing group of theorists who believe that our National Government should take over all control and authority, leaving only to the sovereign State the police power and such other local regulation and control as relate to the intimate needs of the people. They think—some of them honestly think—that we should have one central powerhouse in Washington and that the 48 States should bear the same relation to the National Government as the counties of the separate States now bear to the State government. Undoubtedly there are many of these theorists connected with the Federal Government, and some of them in positions of large influence. They have been quick to capitalize upon national distress or need. This group has sought and still seeks to use even the war emergency as a pretext for expanding their sociological experiments. Unsound measures which were repudiated in normal times have been trotted out under new regalia, accompanied by a waving of the flag. Recent attempts to federalize unemployment compensation and State forestry prerogatives are but glaring illustrations of the purposes of this group. These and similar attempts of an unsound nature should be and must be rebuffed by the militant spirit and resistance of those who believe in the right relationship of Federal and State governments. Furthermore, we must rid these unsound and frequently un-American theorists of their opportunity by showing that the States themselves can do the job better.

It is, of course, inevitable that Federal activities and powers should increase in time of war. No nation can fight a modern war without exercising some dictatorial powers. We cannot defeat our enemies with the deliberative methods of the town meeting. We cannot master the inflation evil by leaving the law of supply and demand free play. There must be extradordinary restraints on the liberties of the individual citizen. There must be unusual, even harsh, limitations on business.

During the War between the States President Lincoln exercised such arbitrary powers that his enemies—notably the Copperheads—charged him with permanent designs on the liberties of the people. During the First World War President Wilson was granted unprecedented authority which he did not flinch from wielding.

The American people have always regained with the return of peace the liberties which they surrendered in time of war. History will, I am sure, repeat itself.

But what about the future of the American State? Will it recover the authority which it has waived? What will be its rule in the post-war years?

Too often, I think, we discuss the American State in terms of its rights and as we watch these rights steadily narrowed and even despoiled by congressional act and court construction, we are disposed to take a despairing view of the State's future.

The most doleful of our prophets foresee the early coming of the time when the individual State will be—to borrow Metternich's classic definition of Italy—"only a geographical expression."

It is true that throughout our history as an independent Nation the almost unvarying trend has been toward a greater centralization of power in the Federal Government. The South undertook to interrupt that trend but its efforts, however heroic, were unavailing.

It is only as it is viewed vis-à-vis the National Government that the American State has lost power. Set against its own past, the State is today an infinitely more powerful governmental unit that it has been at any time in the Nation's history. What the States have been forced to surrender to the Federal Government, they have more than made good with extensions of their own authority over the lives and fortunes of their citizens.

For instance, the average American governor today wields considerably more power than President George Washington could have pretended to in his proudest moments. The State of North Carolina will spend during the next fiscal year as much as the Federal Government expended in 1860. The police force of New York City is much larger today than the standing Army of the United States on the eve of the War between the States. I am far from certain that the size of a government's debt is a yardstick of its power, but it is interesting to note that the municipal debt of New York City—a subdivision of one State—is appreciably larger than the entire debt of the Federal Government in 1916.

If Thomas Jefferson were alive today and were influenced in his present-day judgment by the anxieties that weighed with him in his own distant day, he would doubtless be greatly disturbed by the vast powers which the Federal Government has appropriated from the States. He would probably invoke the tenth amendment which he hoped would be the shield and the buckler of the rights of the States. The tenth amendment is, of course, the most meaningless section of our Constitution.

But Mr. Jefferson's alarms would not be restricted entirely to the National Government. I think that he would be just as deeply concerned over the large authority which the States have acquired over their citizens. He once confessed: "I own I am not a friend of very energetic government. It is always oppressive."

The American State of today is not an anaemic government that lives precariously on the crumbs of authority that may be dropped from the overflowing table of Federal power. It is a vital, indispensable political unit that has broadened its authority to cope with the changing circumstances of a changing civilization.

Powerful as the American State is today, it has not attained the summit of its authority. As our national life becomes more complex, there will be more, not less, government. Society will exercise increasing controls over the lives of the people and will accept new responsibilities for their social well-being. The States will share, perhaps disproportionately, in this expansion of governmental authority and opportunity.

Because our country will play a larger role in the life of the world in the future, our national government will have less interest to devote to strictly internal problems. There will be less disposition to appropriate for the Federal government functions which are now being discharged by the States or which can be acceptably discharged by the States.

The preoccupation of our National Government with international problems will be especially exacting in the months that will follow the conclusion of the active fighting.

Famine already scourges all of the conquered peoples. Their tragic miseries must be relieved when we can deliver food to them. This will be perhaps the most colossal relief undertaking in all human history and we must provide much of the leadership and most of the food.

Millions of refugees who have been driven from their homes by prescriptive laws or by advancing armies must be resettled. This will be one of the largest mass migrations of all times and we must assist with statesmanship and money.

Our Government will not be able to retreat before any of these problems. While they appear on the surface to affect only Europe, they actually come home to the businesses and bosoms of the American people. There will be no durable prosperity in this country until a gravely stricken world has been rehabilitated. Reconstruction will be a long and difficult process.

Even if our Federal Government should be inclined during the next few years to embark upon new and costly experiments in governmental service, there will be one formidable deterrent—our national debt. We have already been told that our national indebtedness will pass, on June 30, 1944, the $200,000,000,000 mark. It is difficult to grasp the dimensions of such astronomical figures. Roughly speaking, that means $1,500 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It would build a $6,000 home for every family in the land.

The national debt will lay a restraining hand, I think, on the ambitions of our Federal Government. This is particularly true because now, for the first time, the average citizen is paying direct taxes to the Federal Government. It is easy to clamor for expenditures when their costs will be borne by others. Citizens scrutinize budgets with a skeptical eye when the money must come from their purses.

There will be problems—old problems in aggravated form and new problems—demanding statesmanlike action by our Government. There will be many and proper demands for new governmental services which must be met.

Many of these problems will be laid on the doorsteps of our State capitols where they properly belong and there will, I suspect, be scant inclination on the part of the National Government to grab them. In fact, we may discover in the years immediately ahead that Washington is more disposed to pass the buck to the States than to raid their jurisdictions.

Furthermore, the States are better equipped than ever before to carry their full share of burdens arising from changed conditions. My own State of North Carolina has a surplus of over $30,000,000. I am sure that most of the States would be able to report a substantially similar improvement in their financial position. Accordingly, while the States will not be ready or willing to take over any nonessential or useless activity or service, they will be equipped to do the essential things.

One further observation: Centralization has about reached the saturation point in this country. Public opinion which has previously supported the Federal Government in its encroachments on the prerogatives of the States is now beginning to question the wisdom of a large and highly centralized government.

It is a noteworthy fact that most of the worst labor disputes in this country develop in the large industries. Big business as such is perhaps no more insensible to the interests and feelings of its employees than is little business. But it is necessarily impersonal in its relations with those who work for it. It is this dreary impersonality which so often arrays the employee against the employing corporation.

Governments are not exempt from the defects of size. No government can become large without becoming impersonal and without losing that human touch which in government no less than in business conduces to understanding. The average citizen is apt to become somewhat suspicious of his government when it speaks to him only through questionnaires, taxes, and petty officials who come from other sections and who, naturally enough, have no lively interest in him. A bureaucracy is usually incorruptible, but it is rarely human, and citizens demand something more than integrity and capacity from the officials. They want that plus a quality of humanness. The British civil service alienated the people of Burma, not because it was dishonest or incapable but solely because it neglected in its austerity to show the common touch in its relations with the natives.

Public opinion in this Nation is swinging back to the view that more should be expected of the States and less of the National Government. This is a comforting trend, for public sentiment can do more to preserve the rights of the States than all of the constitutions and supreme courts.

The future of the American State? It was never so bright. Those of us who administer the affairs of our Nation's commonwealths need not worry that we will lack either work to do or the power with which to do it. The legal doctrine of States' rights may be as dead as the gallant boys from North Carolina who fell on the battlefields of this State fourscore years ago. But while we may have lost in technical rights, we have gained in large opportunities. The American State is still one of the irreplaceable pillars on which this federated Republic rests.

Labor and Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, because there are a few strikes—and there always will be—those who have been opposed to organized labor come forward now—as they did last year—to blast all organized labor. The people generally hear of these strikes, but they do not hear all of the story. As a result public opinion at present, during the war, is so strongly set against labor that legislation is apt to be passed that will not make the situation better, but infinitely worse.

Let us review the facts. In 1941, those engaged in labor were distributed, roughly, as follows:

In manufacturing	12,816,000
In nonagriculture employment	34,409,000
In agriculture	9,416,666

The total employment was 56,641,666.

For this same year, 1941, I give you the following significant statistics:

Disabling injuries on the job	2,180,200
Man-days lost from such injuries	42,083,000
Deaths from such injuries	19,200
Total number of strikes	4,288
Number of workers involved	2,362,000
Man-days lost because of strikes	23,047,556

You will note that the man-days lost because of occupational injuries were nearly twice the number lost because of strikes.

For 1942, our first year in the war, only figures on strikes are as yet available. They are as follows:

Total number of strikes	3,000
Number of workers involved	825,000
Man-days lost because of strikes	4,225,000

A definite trend is immediately apparent. The number of strikes as compared with those of the previous year was greatly reduced, the number of workers involved were about one-third, the strikes were evidently of shorter duration, and the man-days lost because of them were cut down to little more than one-sixth of what they were. In 1941, 4 percent of the workers in America were involved in strikes, and in 1942, fewer than 1½ percent.

Regarding occupational injuries in 1942, all we know is that they exceeded those in 1941 both in number and seriousness because of the increase in quantity and intensity of employment. This means that more than 42,083,000 man-days were lost because of injuries as compared with 4,225,000 lost because of strikes, or 10 times as many.

In view of this record, do the people of the United States want to withdraw all protection from organized labor when over 98 percent of labor has stuck to the job? Shall we punish 98 percent of labor because of the action of 2 percent—even granting that the 2 percent was wrong?

We need no further legislation on this matter because the President already has full power and authority to deal with strikes, and he has used that authority when the occasion required. He has used his power wisely and through his action the rank and file of organized labor has conformed to the request of the President and the needs of the public more speedily and willingly than has been the case in any other country on the face of the globe.

If the people know the facts, their actions will be fair and just. We cannot afford to wipe off all labor legislation any more than we can afford to wipe off all sections of the Bill of Rights. During this war the rights of labor will be curtailed in the interests of the public good, but in the same degree the rights of an individual under the Bill of Rights will also be curtailed for the same reason. When this conflict is over all our machinery of government must be intact and all wartime restrictions lifted. No one but an unthinking alarmist believes that we are losing our liberties. On the contrary, we are making those liberties secure.

Where would our rights be if we lost this war? Any citizen who is not willing to live under restrictions during this great war effort doesn't deserve to have liberty when the war is over.

Do we want to repeat in this country what France did to organized labor? Do we think we can win this war more easily by throwing a bombshell into the midst of one-third of our population—that third that build, transport, and condition our machines of war?

The men and women who work in our factories, mines, transportation and

construction businesses are giving their lives as freely as our boys at the front. The injured coming back from production are in long lines of suffering humanity—over two million in 1 year. Does not this demonstrate that they need protection—much more than they have? Does not this mean that labor is as loyal as any other portion of our millions?

Because a few manufacturers see an opportunity to make huge profits during our extremity, shall we condemn all these loyal manufacturers who are willing to give their time and their plants for the defense of their country?

This is the time to be careful about our actions; this is the time to be just to the whole population. And since the record of labor, through the leadership of the President, is making good with a vengeance, we ought not to embroil the country in a great debate concerning proposals to destroy all protecting labor laws.

Quit Coddling the Japs

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as one Member of Congress, I want to raise my voice in protest against coddling the Japs.

As I have said before, Japan is our permanent, and probably our most dangerous, enemy in this war. There can be no compromise with them. America must be humiliated or Japan must be destroyed.

I was shocked beyond expression to learn a few days ago that the Secretary of War was organizing a Jap unit in the American Army. Such a unit would not only be dangerous but it would do much to injure the morale of the men in our fighting forces and to shake the confidence of their people at home.

Instead of organizing these Japs into a so-called American unit, they should be separated and put into labor battalions where each and every one of them could be watched at all times. Not only that, but the American people are sick and tired of this policy of pampering the Japs in these concentration camps. Those camps should be turned over to the Army, and every one of them should be put under strict military control.

While our boys are being butchered by these brutal apes in the Pacific and while these savages are now on our soil in the Aleutian Islands, I submit it is no time to continue that maudlin policy toward them that resulted in, if it did not invite, the Pearl Harbor disaster.

Our most insidious and treacherous enemy in this conflict, I repeat, is Japan. We are either going to have to destroy the Japanese Empire or suffer defeat, humiliation, and probably invasion of our Pacific Coast States by her forces.

Patriotic Americans are demanding, and they will continue to demand, that we not only quit coddling the Japs but that we redouble our efforts in the Pacific until we forever wipe the Japanese influence from the face of the earth.

The Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal and Mr. Flynn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the Nation, the press, and a multitude of the President's loyal friends and supporters were greatly shocked and deeply grieved when he announced the appointment of Mr. Edward J. Flynn, of the paving-block scandal and Democratic boss of the Bronx, in New York City, to be our Minister to Australia and the roving Ambassador of our country in the great south Pacific.

This appointment was denounced by friend and foe of the President, in the press, and on the radio. In fact, it was almost universally condemned as a bad appointment.

Among the many able editorials expressing opposition, one of the best written was by the editor of the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, under the caption "Flynn should withdraw, or be rejected." This forthright announcement of the Courier-Journal stated the case against Mr. Flynn ably. By permission of the House, I am including in my remarks excerpts from this editorial. The editorial carries great weight because no great newspaper has been more consistent in its support and in the defense of the President and his administration since he assumed office March 4, 1933, than the Courier-Journal. I do not often find myself in agreement with the Courier-Journal on matters political. I wish to commend the editor's independence and courage in this instance. The editor has rendered a real service to the cause of good government and to our country.

I agree with the editor that the paving-block incident is not the important factor in opposing Mr. Flynn. There is evidence both ways on this subject. The editor points out the important factor is, Mr. Flynn has no qualifications whatsoever except a record of fidelity as a Democratic boss and organizer, and that is no qualification at all. In fact, it is, in the end, the opposite of a qualification.

This appointment could not be justified in peacetime, and it is unthinkable to send Mr. Flynn as Minister to Australia and as roving Ambassador to the south Pacific at this time. Within the next year or two literally millions of American boys will be fighting, and many of them dying in the south Pacific. Important issues will arise daily with the British Empire, the Chinese Republic, Holland with her Dutch East Indies, and other countries. To occupy such an important post at this time requires a man long trained in international law and of wide experience in the diplomatic field, and the many international problems arising in that part of the world. Mr. Flynn's training as the boss of the Bronx and his lack of success as chairman of the Democratic National Committee in nowise fits him for this important post.

It is true, as stated in this editorial, the President recently delivered an able address to the Congress when reporting on the state of the Union and did it in a very eloquent way. He made a strong appeal for unity, and within a few days following this splendid address and this appeal, he appointed Mr. Flynn. He must have known this appointment would provoke acrimonious debate and would weaken his position as the leader of this country engaged in a great war. It was purely a political appointment. He was paying a political debt. It had no redeeming feature. Not one good reason for the President's action can be found. We had a trained man in that position, Mr. Johnson. He was a career diplomat. He knew the people and the problems of the south Pacific. To make a place for Mr. Flynn it was necessary to force out Mr. Johnson, a faithful, honorable, and able public servant.

None of Mr. Roosevelt's friends can point their finger to any other man in public life and condemn him for partisan political action. Mr. Roosevelt has not only in this case but throughout his entire service in the White House played politics with the taxpayers' money and with the interests of the American people.

The protest against Mr. Flynn was so strong that 12 or more outstanding Democrats of the Senate made it plain they would not vote to confirm Mr. Flynn. This courageous attitude on the part of these Democrats, with the increase of Republican strength in the Senate as a result of last November's election, made the confirmation of Mr. Flynn impossible.

It was a great relief to the country, the President, and his friends when Mr. Flynn followed the suggestion of the editor of the Courier-Journal and asked the President to withdraw his name from consideration, and we are advised his name has been withdrawn. This will be welcome news to the people of this Nation, to Australia, and to the countries and peoples of the southwest Pacific.

The action of the Senate in the Flynn case and the action of the House and Senate in other matters since the November election prove that the "yes men" Congresses are at an end and that the Seventy-eighth Congress will function as one of the three great coordinate branches of our Government. This will

expedite the winning of the war and prove to be of incalculable benefit to the American people.

We have many men trained in international law and diplomacy and of wide training and experience to fill this important post. There is perhaps no diplomatic post of more importance at this time than the one to which Mr. Flynn was appointed. We need one of our very best men there. Let us indulge the hope the President will keep Mr. Johnson or make a better selection next time.

FLYNN SHOULD WITHDRAW OR BE REJECTED

Naturally, paving blocks began flying in the Senate—and in the headlines—even before Edward J. Flynn's announcement that he was going to be appointed Minister to Australia and roving Ambassador in the south Pacific was verified by the White House sending his nomination to Capitol Hill. But we think the paving blocks are rather incidental. They make the whole thing worse, but they are not the worst of it.

They were second-hand granite blocks, worth about $11 a thousand and there were 8,000 of them. They were laid in a courtyard at the Flynn country estate by a few New York municipal employees working 4 days in November 1941. The workers were transported to and from the estate in city vehicles. A Bronx County grand jury last May asserted Mr. Flynn had no knowledge that any of this was done. The jury reported that when the matter was brought to his attention, or more exactly when the fact that an investigation was under way was brought to his attention, Mr. Flynn sent the blocks back, paid the city workers himself and also paid for the gasoline used transporting them.

Mr. Flynn is Democratic boss of Bronx County. The New York Citizens' Union, a civic organization whose judgments deserve respect, denounced the grand jury report as a whitewash. * * *

However, even if the Senate committee, like the grand jury, should find Mr. Flynn as innocent as a lamb in this episode, we don't think his qualifications for the diplomatic service would be appreciably better. The fact is he has no qualification whatever except a record of fidelity as a Democratic boss and organizer, and that is no qualification at all—in truth, it is in the circumstances the opposite of a qualification. His appointment follows a pattern which would be dubious in peacetime and is utterly anachronistic in wartime. A job, which is wholly a war job, is made political patronage. It is given not to as competent a student of Pacific problems as could be found but to a deserving Democrat currently under fire on his home grounds.

The saddest part of all, of course, is that President Roosevelt did this immediately after he had appeared, in his message to Congress, at his superb best as a national leader as distinguished from a political leader. The message was genuinely great. It had not only inspired the confidence of the country, it had also vastly promoted the unity of the country. And then, to the delight of the enemies of the President and the enemies of unity under the President—Eddie Flynn!

There is a precedent in the paving-blocks incident which we wish Mr. Flynn would employ now. He sent the granite back and made restitution for the workers' pay and transportation. We wish he would send the Australian appointment back—that is, ask Mr. Roosevelt to withdraw the nomination. * * *

But if he cannot see the wisdom of withdrawing, as a real service to the President and the country, then the Senate certainly ought to reject his nomination.

Coal for Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1943

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of January 29, 1943:

COAL FOR OIL

When the war crisis and the collateral emergencies are merely a memory, and the demon statisticians review the fuel problems, long rows of digits will tell of the large part which conversion from oil to coal has played. The gallonage saved will be in the billions. Some of the salvage will be due, of course, to change-overs in houses, but the industrial plants have done most of all.

The case of the Revere Sugar Refinery indicates what has been accomplished. Normally it burns about 10,000,000 gallons a year, or about 27,000 a day. Early last summer, when the storm signals were first hoisted, the management began to substitute coal. Now the economy in oil amounts to 22,000 gallons daily, which is another way of saying that enough has been saved to heat more than 2,000 homes. When operations are completed the 10,000,000 gallons once used annually will dwindle to 500,000 gallons. Moreover, as the Office of Price Administration says, the cars which carried the oil "now haul light oil and kerosene for the homes in the community."

Millions of Americans have participated quietly, forehandedly, and patriotically in this oil-salvage campaign. Some of them have grumbled at the contradictory directives, but their opinion that the administration has been botchy has not made them hold back. In their modest way they are supporting the men at the battle front and can properly feel at the end of the war that they have helped to turn the heat on the Axis.

The Problems of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which was given by me before the banquet of the National Home Builders' Association at their national convention, Hotel Jefferson, in St. Louis, on January 27, 1943:

Ladies and gentlemen, I have a twofold obligation this evening: One, to make a partial report on the accomplishments of the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives, of which I am a member, and in which you have all displayed such keen and constant interest; and, two, to give some idea on my own thinking about the future of small business in the post-war period.

The new resolution passed by the House of Representatives last Friday, re-creating the Small Business Committee for the next 2 years, goes beyond the original resolution of 1941. The new resolution as adopted not only authorizes the committee to study the impact of the war on small business, but also authorizes our committee to study plans for and needs of the post-war economy. This additional authority, in the opinion of the committee, and obviously in the opinion of the House, is most needed.

MISMANAGED WAR PRODUCTION

On the firing front, the war effort appears to be highly efficient. On the production front at home, however, governmental inefficiency is rampant. Unless this incompetency is quickly eliminated, some serious situations are likely to result.

Recently I made a tour of nine important cities in the southern and southwestern parts of the United States, as a member of the House Committee on Small Business. Hundreds of businessmen appeared before the committee to testify about numerous situations which were frustrating the war effort on the production front. From the testimony of those businessmen, it became clear to me that a lot of bureaucratic bungling and lost motion is overdue for a thorough cleaning.

WASTE OF MAN AND MACHINE POWER

I was shocked to find so much valuable man and machine power still idle in the making of war supplies. In every city visited, the committee listened to small manufacturers repeat an almost monotonous tale of their diligent but vain efforts to get contracts to produce war equipment. Witnesses estimated that only 50 percent of the manufacturing capacity of the Nation that could be put to work to turn out war supplies has been utilized to date. Yet for nearly 3 years American industry has been mobilizing for war. There is little question that there has been a criminal waste of machine power by those directing war production.

This large waste of our own productive powers was the more amazing to me because some 7 months ago Congress established an agency called the Smaller War Plants Corporation to see to it that smaller manufacturers should be taken into partnership in the crucial effort to turn out such a flood of war equipment that the Axis Powers would be hopelessly out-classed. In spite of the fact that this Corporation has been in existence for more than 6 months, the committee was astounded to find that in none of the cities visited had there been established a local office of the Corporation, or a representative whom small manufacturers could contact for war business. Instead, many thousands of such manufacturers, fighting off bankruptcy by drastic methods of spending their reserves or reducing their plants to skeleton forces, are still waiting for a chance to turn their machine power loose on Hitler.

RETAILERS' PLIGHT

The plight of many thousands of retailers is serious. The administration of the Office of Price Administration under the recently removed Mr. Leon Henderson has been particularly inept. Indeed, if Henderson had continued in office, it is my opinion that our whole system of distribution faced destruction. Henderson's great boast was that he was keeping prices down. What he didn't tell the public was how he kept them down. He kept them down by forcing retailers to pay out of their own pockets the bills for increased prices on farm products, increased wages, and increased transportation costs. By keeping price ceilings inflexible as the costs of distributors increased, he kept prices down by forcing many distributors out of business and

bringing many more to the verge of closing their doors.

Finally, production for civilian needs—a very important problem—is facing disaster. Many shortages in products extremely essential to the maintenance of civilian morale are developing and will continue to develop because of mismanagement on the part of war agencies. I found many farmers slaughtering their milk cows because Government regulations had made the sale of milk unprofitable. It will take years to replace these lost herds, and yet even in good times there are millions of undernourished children in the United States. I found acute meat shortages developing in cities because slaughtering quotas prescribed by bureaucrats in Washington had made no allowance for the growth of population in such cities, due to the expansion of war industries or the activities of the Army and Navy.

I do not wish you to think I am trying to unnecessarily alarm you. I am telling you what reputable businessmen themselves told the House Committee on Small Business. They ought to know. But now that Congress knows look for a swift and effective attack on the kind of bureaucratic management which has been responsible for such blunders and remedial action to prevent their continuance.

Our committee found alarming evidence as follows:

Complaint that the present war effort relies too largely on compulsion and not enough on voluntary patriotism, which proved so successful in the last war.

Complaint that only 50 percent of the available productive facilities of the Nation are being utilized in the war effort—this estimate was made to the committee by Mr. Olin Linn, president of the American Association of Small Business.

Many small plants are being liquidated and their machinery and tools being sold to South American businessmen. Witnesses pointed out to the committee that under this policy we are giving away productive power that could be used here, both now and after the war, and that we will particularly need this productive power when the war is over.

Government housing authorities have reduced the income of landlords and yet the rents of landlords are frozen by law.

While most of us believe that something must be done to keep rents from inflationary heights and, therefore, approve the sensible application of rent ceilings based upon like and comparable values, I am sure that it never was the intention of either the Congress or the people that an Executive order should usurp all property rights and render the property owner impotent. Even decency cannot be maintained under present regulation of the Office of Price Administration in regard to the so-called attempt to freeze rents. They have gone much further than just freezing rents—instead, they have actually usurped the free American right to own and maintain income property. This is not helpful to the war effort. It is helpful to the effort on the part of New Deal regimenters to bring about an abrogation of time-honored real-estate law and even the Bill of Rights. In this particular regard, the new Price Administrator has an immediate opportunity to demonstrate his belief in the American way. The situation is one that demands action now.

Complaint of home-building finance agencies that inroads made by credit unions and customer cooperative societies supported by various Government agencies and paying no taxes are endangering the private financing of homes.

Complaint that the private home-building industry is being threatened by the public home-building industry, not only for the duration but for years to come. Witnesses contended before the committee that public housing cannot be done "for any cost comparable to that of private industry."

Complaint that public-housing industry can obtain materials to build while private home-building industry cannot, although there is a serious shortage of housing facilities for workers in many industrial States.

Complaint that the Government is trying to force the construction of homes next door to the factories, though workers will not live in them, and is preventing private home-building companies from constructing low-cost housing.

Millions of soldiers must be fed, clothed, and sheltered before combat equipment can be even used. Many millions more of civilian workers must also be sustained by a standard of living which will not fall so low as to impair their efficiency and spirit. There must, in short, be the fullest possible production, not only in industries turning out combat equipment, but in many other industries as well. In order for American industry as a whole in the war effort to meet this challenge, it is necessary that there be a high degree of efficient coordination between the various war agencies which are determining the allocation of materials, the distribution of the labor supply, the use of the transportation system and the prices at which goods manufactured shall be sold. In the war effort thus far, there seems to have been an overemphasis on production for military use and an underemphasis of production for civilian use. The predominant concern of war agencies regulating business has been to secure the proper equipment of our armed forces, with too little consideration being given to the maintenance of an adequate volume of essential civilian production. To date, civilian production has simply meant what is left for the civilian population after the needs of the armed forces have been met. Nowhere in the war effort so far is there to be found an individual or an agency vested with the power to protect the war effort from a decline in essential civilian production to dangerously low levels.

The Military Establishment must not be overexpanded beyond the capacity of civilian workers to sustain it and themselves as well. During the past year the Congress has heard testimony to the effect that one of the factors causing the swift collapse of France was the failure of those directing war mobilization in France to properly balance production, so as to prevent an overexpansion of the military establishment from cutting too deeply into essential civilian production to meet in time even its requirements. The result was economic chaos, ill-equipped soldiers on the front, undernourished civilians in the rear, and a thorough demoralization of the French war effort.

Finally, the war effort on the production front must be geared to prevent the needless failure of business units in our economic system. It has been often said that we cannot win the war unless we win the peace. In order to win the peace, we must preserve as much as possible of our free-enterprise economic system, so that, when the war is over there may be a recovery of business in such a system. If small business is needlessly and largely destroyed as a consequence of the war effort, it will be a serious question whether business can recover in a free-enterprise system so shattered. A free-enterprise business system too much shattered by war is certain to culminate in economic chaos with the end of the war; and out of such economic chaos, the proponents of communism or fascism, and such un-American ways of business life may indeed hope to find their opportunity. If that happened, we will have fought the war in vain.

The testimony which the committee heard is convincing that there is much left to be desired in the coordination of production in the war effort. Selective Service appears to be uncoordinated with industrial and agricultural production. The indiscriminate drafting of agricultural workers, skilled mechanics, and keymen in industries is having an adverse effect upon the capacity of important industries to keep production at levels necessary to furnish an adequate supply of both critical materials and goods and services essential to the maintenance of the morale of civilian workers. Though the Manpower Commission has been in operation for several months, it does not appear to have afforded business in the areas visited by the committee any substantial relief from a critical condition caused by the indiscriminate drafting of men for the armed services.

The Smaller War Plants Corporation, created by law last June, as a result of the activities of the Small Business Committees of the Congress—House and Senate—has been virtually ineffective to date. This has been directly due to inept management. Nevertheless, the very existence of the law has been of such weight that the Army and Navy Offices of Supply have set up special Smaller War Plants Divisions which have been quite effective in the distribution of supply orders to smaller plants. In this respect progress has been made and the immediate future promises much greater fulfillment of the needs of smaller plants for a greater proportion of participation in the war effort.

In the price-control field some very definite changes in vicious practices have been brought about through the dogged persistence and startling revelations made by the House committee.

The report which will be issued within the next few days will reveal facts so startling as to tempt us to believe that the destruction of the American system in the distribution of consumers' goods was a goal to be achieved rather than a danger to be avoided.

We have hope that with the change in the management of the Office of Price Administration all such destructive practices will be avoided. The Small Business Committee of the House is determined to stand as a sentinel in this regard, both to the benefit of the war effort and the national economy.

When this war is over, American business wants to go back to work in an economic system which is free. American business wants to build a new and greater prosperity than has ever before been known. Such a prosperity is well within our grasp, as we complete the period of reconversion to peacetime pursuits.

When hostilities cease, Americans will want to be assured that we have given our enemies total defeat. In addition, Americans will want to know that we have a 100-percent pro-American delegation at the peace table. We cannot expect to depend upon any other nation to protect our interest. To anticipate a final pattern for that world peace at this time, when the war is not yet won, is the dream of only the most naive. To make flexible plans which may include the selfish aims of other powers, as well as our own, is the work of practical statesmen. America stands ready to take her rightful place as the greatest world power in the domination of any feasible arrangement which will definitely contribute to world peace.

Above all, American public opinion is particularly realistic at this time. The people do not intend to be led by a group of visionaries who have already demonstrated their inability to manage the national affairs of the United States in the peacetime of the past decade.

Propagandists may write to their hearts' content in their effort to smooth the way for a world works progress administration, supported by the United States taxpayer, but they will never blind the American public to their one and foremost interest—American post-war security. It is my belief that Americans intend to stay American with the guarantee of continued political independence. Supergovernments and world citizenship, which in the end mean to us foreign control over our own Government and free American citizenship to the world, will not be acceptable to the American people as our spoils of victory.

If we are to again enjoy free prosperity, it becomes our duty to maintain just as many units of business as possible during the prosecution of the war. These units must have a fighting chance to rehabilitate themselves after the war. They must have the opportunity to a full participation in the post-war reconstruction period. Their right to live and prosper must be guarded zealously. The existence of private monopolistic control or the imposition of regimentation of business can destroy post-war prosperity in America.

We are not living in a free economy now, during the war. Furthermore, we expect a forced economy during the war period of forced production. But this is not prosperity, and none should be so deluded. The continuance of present-day war controls would mean eventual economic disaster.

We are concerned about the return of our fighting men. Are they to come home to a place on the dole, handed out by paternalistic Government, or to a job? One is the shackle and chain of economic slavery, with eventual security for none; the other is the free way of life, with opportunity for all.

In my opinion these men must be gradually reinfiltrated into our economy. That should be done in a way which gives back their civil liberty immediately, with assurance of limited military sustenance until they individually have the opportunity to reestablish themselves. Industry must be given its freedom to reconvert and reemploy these millions of heroic and deserving American men. I do not favor the destruction of worth-while gains or the return to old abuses, but I shall always oppose the imposition of governmental abuses which pretend to be for the common welfare.

Your particular industry may be threatened with plans of widespread Government activity which would replace you. I believe that you can well supply the materials, the credit, the manpower, and the competent management for the proper and adequate housing of the Nation. The post-war reconstruction period will demand of you just such performance. I believe that in a free economy, you can do a better and more economical job than Government has done or will be able to do.

Freedom for your industry, as well as all industry, means our chance to develop American post-war prosperity, worthy of our tradition—a challenge to the future.

Communists in Governmental Key Positions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Chairman MARTIN DIES, of the House Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, called upon the Congress on Monday, February 1, to drive from the Government pay rolls "irresponsible, unrepresentative, crackpot, and radical bureaucrats." Congressman DIES listed 38 important executives in different departments of the Government and proved their connection with communistic organizations which have advocated the overthrow of our free constitutional representative system of government and the substitution of communism.

The chairman of the committee revealed that David J. Saposs, who was ousted from the National Labor Relations Board as the result of exposures as to his communistic affiliations, is now snugly ensconced in the War Production Board, Labor Division, at a salary of $8,000 per year. He also revealed that David Lasser, the ex-head of the Workers' Alliance, and ex-president of Interplanetary Travel Association, is now a senior economist for the War Production Board at $4,600 per year.

Other officials high up in the scale who are out and out Communists as revealed by Congressman DIES are Frederick L. Schuman, chief political analyst of the Federal Communications Commission at $5,700 per year; G. B. Watson, chief broadcast analyst for Federal Communications Commission at $6,500 per year; William E. Dodd, Jr., employed by F. C. C. at $3,200 per year; Paul R. Porter, chief of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Branch of W. P. B. at $8,000 per year; John Herling, principal business consultant in the Inter-American Affairs Office at $5,600 per year, and numbers of others of similar position and influence in governmental affairs.

It is individuals of this character and connections and philosophy stuck around everywhere in the governmental departments who have caused the American people to be suspicious of the aims of a good many of the bureaucrats. We might just as well recognize the fact that officials like these high in governmental service and influence injure the war effort by damaging the morale of the people and the confidence of the citizens in the aims and purposes of the war administrators.

It has been frequently asserted by some of the New Dealers that the American people have been slow to become enthused with a war spirit which would make for total victory. These men revealed by Chairman DIES of the House Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities are the answer to that condition if it exists.

The people sent the new Congress to Washington for the very purpose of rooting out of government those who do not believe in our American constitutional representative forms and processes and of replacing them with officials whose supreme motive would be to help win this war as quickly as possible and to help put back on an effective peace basis of operation our free American governmental economic and social system.

It is men like these who make the people fearful that our Nation may be heading toward bankruptcy, inflation, and repudiation after this war, because many of these individuals have expressed sentiments, according to the Dies committee, which indicate that they have little or no sense of loyalty to our form of government or its obligations. Most of these individuals are of foreign birth or extraction. Chairman DIES also revealed the fact that the magazine, the New Republic, which has been assailing Congress as an institution as well as individual Congressmen for a long time, is entirely foreign-owned.

It is this sort of influence in the Government which must be rooted out. It is people like these who must be relegated to the side lines. It is an unconscionably wicked thing that we should send our boys into the battle lines to fight and die to protect our American governmental, economic, and social system and our Bill of Rights and our American standards of living and liberty while we have high up in the administration of the war efforts men like these who avowedly do not believe in our form of government. This constitutes a betrayal of our American armed forces behind the lines. Every earnest, patriotic American will agree with Representative DIES' demand that these people be ousted from the Government pay roll.

It is not safe in a struggle as bitter as this one to take any chances at all on having the wrong kind of people directing the war effort. Only men and women of the most impeccable reputation, the most unimpeachable character, the most unquestionable integrity, the most profound patriotism, and the most undivided loyalty to our American system of government and society should be permitted to have any power or influence in the administration of the war program.

The Dies committee has again rendered a signal service to the Nation.

Pay-As-You-Go Tax Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WIRT COURTNEY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1943

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call to the attention of the Members of the House a letter written by Hon. H. Grady Gore, of Washington, to Senator TOM STEWART, of Tennessee, and by him inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A370.

Colonel Gore was formerly an outstanding lawyer in Tennessee, but for many years past has been in business here in Washington and has been eminently successful.

In his letter he discusses the Ruml plan and other pay-as-you-go plans in an exhaustive, enlightening, and convincing manner, which will be interesting to all Members confronted, as they soon will be, by the new tax bill.

Merchant Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1943

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial taken

from the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin. This editorial refers to a recent item of alleged news which cast aspersions on the characters of men in our merchant marine, men who are giving everything they have got for the preservation and success of the American way of life. I am proud—just as I know every real American is proud—to know that these brave men have been vindicated and this foul story proven to be absolutely false.

The editorial follows:

MERCHANT SEAMEN

The Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal in a copyrighted story of January 21 quoted six returned Guadalcanal veterans as saying that the civilian crew of a cargo ship lying off the island had refused to unload needed supplies on a Sunday because it was against union rules. The crew, the story said, worked a few hours on Saturday and then laid off until Monday morning while tired servicemen carried on.

This story, officially cleared through the Office of Censorship and printed by the Akron paper in good faith, was put on the wire and published in this newspaper and other newspapers in good faith as being reliable.

An investigation by Admiral William F. Halsey, Jr., in charge of naval operations in the South Pacific, has, however, cleared the merchant marine crew of the serious charge. Admiral Halsey, reporting to the Navy that more than a dozen cargo ships with civilian crews had reached Guadalcanal since the Marines landed, said in his report: "Under the supervision of naval officers, the crews participated in unloading all of them."

The Navy said that the report "stated that none of the crews has ever refused to discharge its ship's cargo, and the merchant seamen's cooperation, efficiency, and courage on some occasions in the face of enemy attack have won high praise."

We are happy to pay our own tribute to the gallant and heroic performance of the members of the American merchant marine in the fighting of this war. Since Pearl Harbor more than 3,200 have lost their lives. In the face of the threat of enemy attack they have carried on with their jobs with a spirit that has won them the admiration of the Nation. In spite of having ships shot from underneath them, survivors have signed up on other ships. They have gone through hardships in the open sea in open boats or on rafts that make epics of man's bravery. The stories of merchant marine members, of which this newspaper has printed a great number, are second to none in the annals of the war. These merchant seamen deserve to be formally recognized for the work they are doing by the right to wear a distinctive uniform and in other ways. They are writing a fine page in the history of the American war effort.

Distribution of Victory Garden Seeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1943

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a communication I have received from the chief of police of the Bethlehem Steel Co., of Lackawanna, N. Y.:

Both the agricultural department of the State of New York and Federal Department of Agriculture are advocating a garden program for the season of 1943 to help relieve the food-shortage situation.

You know in the past the Bethlehem Steel Co., of Lackawanna, N. Y., have maintained a community garden program for its employees on their property in Woodlawn. What I would like to know is, If the Federal Department of Agriculture is going to furnish free seeds.

I think if there was a distribution of free seeds on Government-issued garden books it may be an inducement to carry out a very extensive program throughout this district.

Yours very truly,

WM. F. ERTELL,
Chief of Police, Bethlehem Steel Co., Lackawanna, N. Y.

I agree with Mr. Ertell that if the Department of Agriculture or some civilian defense agency could arrange to furnish the right victory-garden seeds to responsible organizations for distribution, it would be an inducement for greater effort on the part of gardeners.

The chairman of the Agriculture Department's committee on victory gardens has said:

Home food production will contribute to the war effort, both on the fighting front and the home front.

Any inducements or assistance that can be given these prospective victory gardeners will be well worth while.

The Anti-Pleasure-Driving Edict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I think it well that we all have an opportunity to read a recent editorial by Russell Kay, secretary of the Florida Press Association, on the anti-pleasure-driving edict. While my friend Mr. Kay pokes considerable fun at the program, he also hits at some basic weaknesses. The Government's rationing agencies appear to be in danger of losing sight in this country of the important fact that Americans cherish the rights and privileges of freedom. Americans can be led. Sacrifices hold no terror for them. But Americans cannot be driven. O. P. A., prior to Prentiss Brown, did not seem to know that.

Mr. Kay's editorial follows:

This anti-pleasure-driving edict of the "national gastapo" has a lot of folks in a sweat, for the innocent word "pleasure" covers a multitude of sins, and ideas as to what constitutes it are as varied as the winds that blow.

Driving to the train to meet your mother-in-law is termed a "pleasure" by the "lawyercrats" who juggle the alphabetical definitions, and I know one guy who is ready to dispute that ruling all the way to the Supreme Court.

An ice-cream cone, if you deliberately go after it with malice aforethought, is "pleasure," but if you sneak up on it, in the course of what is officially termed "legitimate" driving and can manage to snag it without traveling one additional foot out of your way, then it's okay.

While it is all right to use your car to drive to the doctor's office, it is all wrong to drive to a theater. Tampans are in a first class helluva fix in view of the fact that a flock of our best doctors have their offices in the Tampa Theater Building.

While visitors at the local hospital have not increased during the past week, the number of cars parked in front of the establishment has. Smart guys keep a bouquet of flowers and a bedpan in the car, just in case a snooper turns up they'll have a reasonable alibi. It's not far from the hospital to either a picture show or the bowling alley.

A lot of timid souls went hungry for 3 days fearing to drive to a restaurant. They were told to catch a streetcar or a bus, but it gets monotonous standing on a corner and watching those sardine cans go by without stopping. Now, the order has been modified and you can park at a restaurant provided you go there to "eat" and not for "pleasure." If a guy gets any pleasure out of eating he'd better keep it to himself. Personally, I play safe and order a double helping of sand-blown spinach, feeling confident that no court would convict me on that kind of evidence.

Attending church, not being a pleasure, is permissible. But on the way there Sunday morning I stopped to "share-the-ride" with a gorgeous blond, and if you don't think that was a pleasure, you're a lot older than I hope to get and I'm no adolescent.

I could go on and on and give you countless other examples, but you probably have more and better ones of your own. While I may have been unduly flippant in drawing this verbal picture, don't get me wrong, I'm not trying to be funny. It is downright pathetic and becoming increasingly dangerous.

From its inception, the Office of Price Administration has approached this rationing problem the wrong way. Instead of creating public confidence and generating a spirit of cooperation it has worked on the assumption that every man, woman, and child is a crook, a cheat, and a chiseler. Its edicts have been heralded with warnings, threats, and penalties.

It has maligned the honest citizen and placed him on par with the gangster and racketeer. It has encouraged the hoarder and proved the way for petty crooks and chiselers. Honest, patriotic men and women have been abused, embarrassed, and annoyed.

A government that distrusts, suspects, and bullies its people only generates distrust, suspicion, and faithlessness. Courageous leadership that reveals faith and confidence, coupled with a little run-of-the-mill common sense, will receive full and complete cooperation.

No one questions the need of rationing. Americans realize full well how critical is the situation. They expect, and will accept, all intelligent, necessary sacrifices if properly approached. But they are not criminals or children or imbeciles. Arrogance, stupidity, and nonsense in administrative effort only serve to retard the victory that in the end is the aim of all.

Post-War Trade Pacts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the most acute post-war problems

will be the restoration of our industries to peacetime production to insure employment to our soldiers. This cannot be accomplished by the surrender of our home market to the products of foreign countries.

The lower tariff rates resulting from the trade agreements now in operation will invite foreign competition with our farms and factories, which will long delay recovery following the war.

I insert a timely editorial from the New York Sun of January 29, 1943:

POST-WAR TRADE PACTS?

Among the favored cure-alls proposed by those who plan to reshape the world as democracies would like it to be after the war is a much freer exchange of goods than existed before the war. It has been a constant theory in some schools of political economy that militarism must melt when international trade attains its maximum. When, 9 years ago, Secretary Hull set out to make reciprocal trade pacts, his hope was that as the United States reduced tariff rates others would do likewise. Every 3 years since 1934 Congress has renewed the authority of the President to raise or cut duties as much as 50 percent. It has permitted him to make treaties for that purpose—treaties never ratified by the Senate, yet binding this Nation to hundreds of concessions on imports in return for similar treatment by partners to the pacts.

Between now and June Congress must again make up its mind whether to continue delegating such power to the President, or to permit the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to expire, and thus bar further making of trade treaties without specific congressional approval. Only last month Congress opposed granting to the President the right to suspend our tariff laws.

War has virtually nullified our trade pacts; nearly all imports and exports are now subject to wartime license control. Technically, post-war revision of the trade pacts might not be constitutional unless Presidential power over the tariff is retained this year. The old argument will again be heard—that American duties are much too high to encourage foreign trade.

In his book, The New Deal and Foreign Trade, Alonzo E. Taylor observes that "Most treaties are fair-weather treaties; when storms arise they are wrecked." If it becomes necessary to build a new set of reciprocal trade pacts, must they rest upon the fallacy that American tariff duties are excessive? The American Tariff League has examined that charge in objective fashion in a report entitled "How High Are United States Tariffs?" Though its figures are based on 1937 rates, it must be remembered that even as late as 1940, in hearings on the trade agreements program, Secretary Hull referred to "terrific restraints" then existing on foreign commerce.

The league's new report shows that United States duties relatively are among the lowest in the world. This conclusion is reached by the device of supposing a hypothetical $100,000,000 cargo of goods to be entered at ports of 19 different countries. Commodities in the cargo were chosen from those listed in the Department of Labor's publication, Wholesale Prices; they represent more than 70 percent of that list. The proportion of each commodity was based on trade between United States and the United Kingdom. The duties collected in New York were taken to represent 100. On that scale it was found that 12 of the 19 countries had considerably higher tariff rates than we had in 1937. Foreign government monopolies and prohibitions were not included, hence the real height of many tariff barriers abroad are not indicated. It should be a useful study of foreign tariffs for Members of Congress likely to become involved soon in controversy over the post-war reciprocal trade program.

H. C. Ogden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial appearing in the Wheeling Intelligencer on February 1, 1943, with reference to the Honorable H. C. Ogden.

I have personally known Mr. Ogden for many years. He was one of the Nation's great men. His contribution to every constructive effort in the State of West Virginia and in the Nation at large is a monument that mere words cannot sufficiently describe. Mr. Ogden was a newspaper publisher, directing the policies of many newspapers in the State of West Virginia and elsewhere. His contribution to the industrial welfare, as well as to the civic and political betterment, will be difficult to emulate. I include the editorial which speaks for itself:

H. C. OGDEN

To every writing man there comes a time when words fail; when those at command are frail things with which to frame the thought that clamors for expression.

Such a time has come for the present writer, as he faces the sad task of conveying to Intelligencer readers something of the sense of immense loss that we of the newspaper family feel in the death of H. C. Ogden.

To those of us who worked with and for him for years, Mr. Ogden was more than the boss. He was more than a great editor and publisher. He was more than a man of large affairs. He was more than the first citizen of West Virginia. He was our friend. And more than that, he was the friend of man.

That's the H. C. Ogden we of the newspapers will remember. It's the H. C. Ogden we knew best. It's the H. C. Ogden the public knew least. It's the H. C. Ogden we wish we had the ability to tell you about.

Elsewhere in this issue appears a brief biographical sketch of Mr. Ogden's career. It followed the traditional pattern of American achievement; the pattern into which are woven the strength and the greatness of this Nation. It is not necessary to dwell here on the course or the material accomplishments of that career. These are an open book for all to read. What we'd like to do is to afford a glimpse behind the material to the spiritual qualities we knew so well and which, we suspect, the public knew so little.

While Mr. Ogden's amazing energy carried him into many fields of enterprise, he was, first of all, a newspaperman. His life was centered in his papers. The printed word was the lifestream of his existence. And he used the power of this force unswervingly in the public interest, public welfare. That was the hallmark of H. C. Ogden's newspaper policy. He was essentially a crusading editor. He sought eternally for public wrongs to be righted. He was tireless in the pursuit of any governmental reform he believed in; relentless in the exposure of public corruption, yet tolerant to a fault of human frailty.

He was a man of strong and positive convictions, yet big enough to waive them in the face of evidence that public welfare lay in another direction. The material success of any enterprise was important to his keen business sense, yet he never permitted personal gain to stand in the way of his two cardinal newspaper principles—to keep the people informed and to promote public welfare. How well he built in this direction will not be realized until viewed in the calm retrospect of time. West Virginians of today have been too close to him and his time to realize the tremendous contribution he has made to the upbuilding of this State and the welfare of its people.

The same warmth of feeling that controlled his newspaper policy dominated Mr. Ogden's personal relations. He had relatively few intimates—because he devoted so much time to work and to his family that he had little left for social contacts; and because, despite his personal fearlessness and dominant character, he was essentially a shy man. But he had a boundless affection for people in general, a deeply religious character, and only those privileged to know him intimately knew the full measure of his innate tenderness.

How many people he went to the rescue of financially and otherwise; how many he helped over rocky places on the path of life; how much he distributed in the way of direct charity; how lightly he dismissed the ingratitude of countless beneficiaries of his aid or intercession, nobody ever will know, and only those very close to him can guess.

It is the history of life that no man is indispensable. One man takes up the torch of progress where another falls with it. Somewhere, perhaps, there is a man to fill H. C. Ogden's shoes. But he will have to be of greater stature than any we see about us. We only know that the city of Wheeling and the State of West Virginia have lost a great citizen; that the newspaper profession has lost a towering figure; that we who are left behind to carry on as best we may the great work he did here have lost, with the members of his own family, a father and a friend.

Bureaucrats Aim To Destroy Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since the close of the First World War the Veterans' Administration on the whole has done a splendid job in administering laws providing benefits for the war veterans of the Nation and their dependents.

The present conflict is expected to produce twice the number of casualties experienced in World War No. 1, and a corresponding increase in the number of cases requiring rehabilitation.

As the American people pay homage and tribute to the Nation's gallant sons

and daughters engaged in deadly combat on every continent and sea in the world, there is a well-organized lobby of bureaucrats whose chief mission is to see the Veterans' Administration abolished and its functions absorbed by the Federal Security Administration.

The idea of these bureaucrats is to put the war veteran and his dependents on the same plane as a civilian employed by private industry who received wartime wages and enjoyed the luxuries of life denied to the citizen serving in the armed forces.

No veteran of any war desires that a civilian should be denied any benefits conferred upon him by his Government through the Federal Security Agency. But veterans of the Nation sincerely believe that the will of the American people is to care for the Nation's fighting men in accordance with the policy established by Gen. George Washington in caring for his Continental troops, and which is now being done by the Veterans' Administration, an independent agency of the Government devoted entirely to veteran affairs.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial taken from the January 28 issue of the National Tribune. This editorial will convince any right-thinking American citizen that the problem of administering to the needs of the veterans of the Nation can best be solved by the experienced and independent agency of our Government—the Veterans' Administration.

The editorial is as follows:

TUG OF WAR IS STILL ON

During closing weeks of the last Congress, providing vocational training for World War No. 2 veterans was a hotly debated question. There was no disagreement whatever on whether or not new veterans disabled in service should have aid in rehabilitating themselves. Nobody was at odds over the need for such training. Everybody was of a mind that what Uncle Samuel gave to World War No. 1 veterans should be granted to men who are discharged incapacitated from service in this war. But there was a wide divergence of opinion as to who should do the job and who should control it.

The result was that no legislation was enacted. The Federal Security Agency was adamant in its demand to administer the law. Organized veterans were equally insistent that the Veterans' Administration should be the governing agency. There was a tug of war between those who favored the Barden-La Follette, or Federal Security Agency, bill and the veterans' groups, who sponsored the Rankin-Walsh-Clark measure. Eventually the Rankin bill was favorably reported, passed unanimously by the House on October 19, and went forthwith to the Senate. No other legislation came out of committee.

Over in the Senate the Subcommittee on Finance that handles veterans' affairs called a meeting. No witnesses were heard except the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who asked that the legislation be set aside pending further study, and who said he thought a compromise satisfactory to everybody could be reached. The representatives of major veterans' organizations had met with General Hines only the day before and had forcibly disagreed to that so-called compromise, prepared by the Bureau of Budget, but the general's statement stood and his wishful thinking, if such it was, successfully blocked the bill for the remainder of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

The National Tribune chose to believe then that the delay requested merely meant that there was need for more jockeying for position, and we said so. We thought that after a bit of oriental face saving, the Security Agency would bow to the inevitable and accept the Rankin bill. This, too, was wishful thinking, somewhat excusable because of public and private protestations by spokesmen for both the Federal Security Agency and the Veterans' Administration that their real purpose was a genuine relief measure and that both administrators had the interests of veterans at heart. The fact is that the tug of war is still on, with no quarter being asked, and the disabled veterans who have no part in it are the losers.

There have been further conferences between representatives of the veterans, the Budget Bureau, and the Security Agency. New bills have been introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress—several of them. Hearings are again being conducted, but the veterans and the Federal Security boys are still as far apart as the poles. There is no longer any question as to who will supervise the training of veterans; all have agreed that shall go to the Veterans' Administrator and his agency. The Rankin bill is now a separate title in the so-called compromise measure. But, says the Federal Security Agency, there must be but one bill, which must include other social-security features. The President, they say, has demanded that, and it is said that he will veto any separate bill for veterans alone.

It is a correct statement that the President asked for one bill. He messaged the Congress to that effect, at the request of Federal Security Agency. But he has not threatened to veto vocational training if it is passed separately for veterans. The whole truth is that Federal Security Agency wishes to put through a full program of utopian measures. Some have merit; others do not and cannot stand on their own two legs. So they must be incorporated in a popular veterans' bill in order to get by. Goofy ideas must be ridden on the backs of disabled warriors who will need immediate assistance to earn an honest livelihood.

As a result of his conferences with legislative representatives of veterans' organizations, General Hines knows full well that they are not in accord with any program which ties in war veterans with civilians for rehabilitation purposes. He said so frankly and publicly on January 10 when the question came up at a meeting of representatives of Spanish-American War veterans. Not only did he assert that veterans unanimously oppose such a program but he also related that there was a vast difference of opinion in the Congress on bills relating to the subject, and he expressed the hope and expectation that when a bill is passed, administration of it will be with his office.

On several occasions we have commented editorially on the arguments involved in this issue. There is no need to repeat those views now, but there is need for those interested to take off their pink glasses and look at this thing for what it is worth.

Whatever there is of merit in the Federal security program—and the veterans do not disagree with much of it—should have the attention of the Congress, but there is no justice in any squeeze play. Those proposals that cannot pass without being tacked on a bill to rehabilitate wounded soldiers and sailors should be discarded. There is much more involved in this issue than appears on the surface. There is a matter of high principle far more important than what shall be done for these veterans and who shall do it. The question is, How is this country going to treat the men who give life and limb on the battlefield to save the Nation's honor and preserve its institutions?

Are the fighting men to continue in a class by themselves, honored above all others for the sacrifice they make, or are they to be treated as ordinary citizens, some of whom may have contributed to their country in its hour of need and others of whom were slackers who would permit its downfall? We choose to continue down the trail broken by the founding fathers. This is no time to change over to some other fly-by-night socialistic scheme. If the vocational training measure is gotten through the way the Federal Security boys will it, and that principle is made to stick, it is only a question of time before veterans will be classed with citizens for all other purposes. Their distinction as the country's saviors will be wiped out, and they will be listed with other derelicts of society.

This legislation for World War No. 2 disabled is needed at the earliest possible moment. Men are now being invalided out of the services. They need the chance the country owes them to secure their futures and it is the responsibility of organized veterans to get it for them. The veterans' groups can no more carry water on both shoulders than others who profess to be the veterans' friends.

Let us stop temporizing with those who speak of vetoes of sound beneficial legislation. Since 1933, neither the President nor the Congress have failed servicemen. We have no thought that they will start now. If a veto of a separate measure to effect this purpose comes, we are confident that the Congress will attend to that matter as it should. Let us put an end to this tug of war and get on with the veterans' program.

The American Plan for a Reorganized World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kingsbury Smith, former manager of the London International News Service Bureau, has for the past 3 years specialized in State Department news. Last year he won the George R. Holmes Memorial Award for the best reportorial work of 1941, and the National Headliners Club Award for outstanding Washington correspondence. In the American Mercury of November 1942, Mr. Smith presented what I believe to be the first detailed report to the American people of how the present administration plans to guarantee freedom from want, freedom from fear, and freedom of speech and religion to all other nations.

In the December issue of Reader's Digest, under the heading, "The American plan for a reorganized world," there appeared this article in condensed form. I believe everyone in this country can thank Mr. Smith for having at last given our people a better understanding of what is involved in the administration's attempt to transform this very practical and sordid world into Utopia.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert this article from the Reader's Digest in the RECORD with my remarks:

THE AMERICAN PLAN FOR A REORGANIZED WORLD

(By Kingsbury Smith)

(Condensed from the American Mercury)

Behind the scenes in Washington, a new world is being planned for you. If the plans materialize, you are to be given a try at running the world. You are to try to make it a better world and keep it so.

If you think that defeating the Axis is the chief aim of the United States Government's foreign policy, you are in for a surprise. Smashing the Axis is only the beginning. Establishment of a better economic and social, as well as political, world order is the main objective.

Uncle Sam is going to help police the world as well as feed, house, and clothe great areas of it. He hopes the British, Russians, and Chinese will act as fellow cops, but if they fall asleep on the beat Uncle Sam will swing the night stick alone. The administration's post-war planners are convinced that the only way to maintain peace permanently is to be prepared to enforce it, and their bold intention is to prevent any future Hitler-led nations from becoming strong enough to start another such war.

You will pay a high price in taxation, and in your standard of living for the experiment of attempting to make this a better world in which to live, but the planners believe that you will find it worth while; that you will certainly find it less costly than the disturbance of a world war every 20 years. They also believe that eventually it will bring you lasting prosperity.

The plans rest on this basic idea: That the countries now bound together under the name of United Nations shall form the organization of a better world order, which will have two main objectives:

To maintain world peace through the compulsory disarmament of the Axis Powers and the policing of the world.

To make membership in the association so beneficial that no nation can afford to remain outside.

The economic benefits to be offered the other nations will include:

1. A system of open trade among the member nations, guaranteeing nondiscrmination in commercial relations.

2. A fair distribution to all member nations of sufficient raw materials to meet their reasonable peacetime needs.

3. American financial assistance for essential enterprises such as public works programs, in those countries which do not possess the capital for such development.

4. Strict regulation of the supply of commodities among member nations so as to protect the interests of consumer countries.

5. A cooperative movement for the rapid expansion of trade among the member nations to produce materials for markets created by human needs, as in China and India.

In the sphere of political security, the United States will agree to assist those member states which are engaged in forcible resistance to unprovoked aggression. All other member states will be pledged to do likewise.

In return for these benefits, members must fulfill the following conditions:

1. Guarantee to their citizens certain fundamental human rights such as freedom of speech and religion, freedom from terror, and freedom from want.

2. Solemnly promise to settle all international disputes by peaceful methods of arbitration, submitting such disputes to an international court of justice when direct negotiation fails.

3. Agree to drastic limitation of armaments under strict international control.

Any nation which refuses to fulfill these conditions and which threatens a member state with aggression will immediately be subjected to trade discrimination within the association. Behind the economic boycott will stand the power of Anglo-American naval and aerial might, and, it is hoped, the Russian army and air force.

The planners realize that if this better-world-order idea is to be successful it must include the vanquished as well as the victor nations of this war. They believe that, to obtain the cooperation and eventually the support of the defeated Axis countries, there must be a long armistice period—three to five years—during which armies of occupation will maintain law and order in the vanquished nations. This prolonged transition from war to peace is to be a cooling-off period for the passions and hatreds on both sides.

The post-war planners hold that one of the great mistakes made by the victors in the First World War was to permit statesmen and military leaders to write the peace while they were still literally in the heat of battle. Those whose minds have been concentrated on the destruction of the enemy can hardly be expected to propose a sane peace at the moment of their triumph. The danger of revolutionary or revenge movements in the beaten nations must also pass, and their peoples must be convinced of the good intentions of the United Nations before the armies of occupation can be withdrawn.

The immediate objectives during the armistice period are:

1. To disarm Germany, Italy, Japan, and their satellites completely.

2. To prevent revolutions in the defeated countries.

3. To arrange swift relief measures, including food and clothing, for the people of all the devastated war areas.

4. To avoid the demobilization of the armies of defeated nations until provisions have been made for their return to peaceful employment.

5. To make sure that the cessation of hostilities will not be followed by a continuation of economic warfare.

6. To assist in the establishment of trustworthy governments in the defeated countries, which will maintain law and order and agree to cooperate with the United Nations in the establishment of the better world order.

The Axis Powers will be deprived of weapons of offensive warfare and of means of producing or obtaining them. No promises will be given them that they shall ever again be permitted to have equality of armaments with the United States, Great Britain, or any of the other United Nations. In starting two world wars Germany has forfeited the right to equality of armaments. Japan is a half-savage urchin in the family of nations—too immature in the ways of civilization to be trusted with the dangerous weapons of modern warfare for many years to come.

During the armistice period the defeated nations will be permitted to retain only police forces, whose weapons will be limited to small arms. Two of the principal functions of the armies of occupation will be to see that these police forces are not converted into shock troops by ex-generals or political racketeers of the vanquished countries, and that military or political cliques are prevented from organizing underground revenge movements.

It is hoped that the liberal distribution of food and clothing in the Axis countries and the rapid rehabilitation of the war-wrecked areas will eliminate the possibility of chaos and win over the common people of Germany, Japan, and Italy. Relief will be offered them in return for cooperation in the better world order. Persons who receive American food and clothing will, after the initial stages of relief, be obliged to work for it if physically able to do so. Since the United States will carry the greatest share of this burden, the planners feel that this country shall play a leading role in determining the methods and terms of relief.

Because a defeated nation's discharged soldiers on the loose are ripe for trouble the armies of the vanquished are to be put to work on rehabilitation projects in their own countries until their gradual return to normal, productive employment can be arranged. The victor nations likewise will gradually demobilize their own armies.

In order to prevent the continuation of economic warfare after the cessation of hostilities, an understanding will be sought among the United Nations concerning the joint line of policy to be followed by them in their trade relations with the defeated nations. We don't want the United Nations to start underselling in an effort to grab markets in the vanquished countries.

In assisting the establishment of trustworthy governments in the defeated countries, American planners will not insist upon their adopting our form of democracy. The State Department is more realistic than that. In the first place, there is too much difference of opinion in the world as to what constitutes democracy. Soviet Russia considers herself a democracy. She is not, as we understand that doctrine. Nevertheless, Russia's cooperation in the post-war world is essential to the success of the better-world-order plan.

Many peoples are not yet sufficiently advanced in popular government to carry out the responsibilities of successful democracy. This applies not only to Japan and to India, with its extreme religious and caste differences, but even to Germany, where a great educational campaign will be necessary to erase the stamp of Hitlerism from the minds of the German people before they are prepared for as much political freedom as true democracy implies.

The cooperation of governments of nondemocratic countries will therefore be accepted, provided they prove themselves capable of maintaining a decent and orderly way of life and are sincerely willing to cooperate in the better world order. As Secretary of State Cordell Hull said, the United Nations must "exercise surveillance over aggressor nations until such time as the latter demonstrate their willingness and ability to live at peace with other nations." Some officials in Washington think that this period of probation can be terminated in 5 or perhaps 10 years.

The President issued a special Executive order making it unmistakably clear that the Department of State is the chief agency of the United States Government to study and draft peace plans, although the Treasury and the Department of Commerce are also engaged in various aspects of the peace planning. The leading State Department planners are Hull; Welles; Assistant Secretary of State Adolf Berle, Jr.; Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson; Dr. Herbert Feis, Economic Adviser; and Leo Pasvolsky, Special Assistant to the Secretary.

The work is proving no easy task for Secretary Hull and his associates because of the "let's win the war first" attitude that exists here and among our allies. In the case of the American people there is almost complete indifference toward post-war plans. In the case of some of our leading allies, especially Great Britain, it seems deliberate policy to avoid definite post-war commitments. The reluctance of some of our allies to discuss in specific terms the solution of post-war problems does not auger well for the spirit of cooperation that should prevail.

The indifference of the American people is causing graver concern than is the reluctance of our allies to discuss peace plans. Assistant Secretary of State Sumner Welles and other high officials have warned that, unless public opinion stands overwhelmingly behind the Government in its international post-war

plans, we shall lose the peace this time as we lost it the last time. Winning the peace is going to be almost as difficult as winning the war.

If we are to win the peace, Hull and his associates believe, the plans must be made now. The better order they envisage will involve both economic and political sacrifices by some of our allies, particularly Great Britain and the Netherlands. Economically, for instance, it will mean the end of the pre-war British and Dutch monopoly over raw materials such as rubber and tin, and the abandonment of empire preferential tariffs. Politically, it will mean independence for India, the return of Hong Kong to China, a greater measure of home rule for the Netherlands East Indies. It will mean, too, international—United Nations—control of such vital points as Singapore, the Suez Canal, and Gibraltar.

The planners in Washington maintain that it will be easier to persuade our allies to agree to sacrifices of this kind now than it will be after victory over the Axis has removed the threat to their survival. The State Department planners believe, also, that if the better world order is to have a chance of success it must start functioning the moment hostilities cease, so that there will be no let-up in collaboration. This can be insured only by agreeing on peacetime procedures well in advance and actually putting them into effect as far as possible while the war is still going on.

The entire program rests on the assumption that a better world order of this sort can be established only if the United States assumes leadership; it alone will possess the strength, resources, and influence necessary for such leadership.

The most important step so far achieved by the American Government is the conclusion of the so-called Master Lend-Lease Agreements with our allies. They go far beyond the extension of lend-lease aid. They are, in reality, mutual aid and economic pacts—not merely for the duration of the war, but for all time.

In the political sphere, they pledge mutual aid against aggression. Under the terms of the agreements, the American Government has declared that the defense against aggression of Great Britain, Soviet Russia, China, and the other allies is vital to the defense of this country. In return, Britain, Russia, and the others promise to continue to "contribute to the defense of the United States of America" and to provide such aid as they are "in a position to supply." The agreements remain in force "until a date to be agreed upon" by the contracting parties. Thus is established the basis for permanent cooperation among the United Nations to suppress war in the future through joint action.

The pledge of economic cooperation embodied in the agreements is of equally momentous importance. In return for American aid in this war, the other United Nations agree to accept Cordell Hull's liberal trade principles as the basis for a postwar international economic system. They promise that the final terms of settlement for the aid they have received from this country shall include provision for agreed action between them and the United States for:

1. The expansion, by appropriate measures, of production, employment and the exchange and consumption of goods.

2. The elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce.

3. The reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers.

4. The attainment of the economic objectives set forth in the Atlantic Charter, including equal access by all States, "great or small, victor or vanquished," to all raw materials needed for their economic prosperity.

Our allies further agree that they will discuss with us, "at an early convenient date," the "best means" of attaining these economic objectives. The vague promises made by the Allies on Hull's economic policies are not as definite as he would like to see them. They still leave much to be accomplished. There is no unconditional pledge to put the policies into effect as soon as the war ends. The Allies merely promise that the "final terms" of settlement with this country shall include "provision for agreed action" to make the policies effective.

Although the promises obtained from the Allies in these agreements do not go beyond the acceptance of principles, they nevertheless represent a genuine accomplishment. Under the terms of the pact signed with us on February 23, 1942, the British Government agrees, in effect, to abandon after the war the Ottawa trade agreements which guarantee preferential trade treatment to members of the British Commonwealth of Nations. It took months of negotiation and the submission of five different drafts before we persuaded the British to make these concessions.

One of the strongest arguments our officials have in seeking acceptance of such American peace plans is that they not only are intended to benefit the world generally, but that by accepting them the Allies will cancel indebtedness to us for the aid we have rendered them during this war. That is the only price we are asking for our aid—aid which, in terms of lend-lease, already has reached the rate of $8,000,000,000 a year. Our allies, especially Great Britain, China, and Russia, feel that we owe them a great deal for having held the front lines while we prepared for war. We have agreed to take these "intangible" benefits into consideration in the "final settlement."

We are keeping record of all the aid we send—the value of every plane we give to China, every shipload of materials dispatched to Britain, every tank we send to Russia. But we do not expect full repayment in dollars or in goods. We know that the attempt to enforce payment of huge debts and reparations the last time led to dislocation of the entire world monetary system and to the repudiation of solemn obligations by debtor governments.

We have said in the Atlantic Charter that we want no territorial aggrandizement out of this war, therefore we cannot take the land of our allies or our enemies in payment. What, then, do we want?

Those who are planning the peace believe that what the American people want is a world in which they can live fully and enjoy lasting peace. Cooperation that will make this possible is the price that we are asking from our allies in return for canceling the material obligations that will be due us when victory has been won.

To those nations that are willing to cooperate with us, we are prepared to continue lend-lease aid after the war. Yes; when you have bought enough War bonds to win the war, you will be asked to buy peace bonds to win the peace. You will be told that the needs of peace should be no less compelling than those of war. You will have rationed goods and price ceilings for a long time to come. You will be asked to help police the world indefinitely and to rehabilitate great areas of the world.

The reward held out to you will be a promise of lasting peace; a pledge that the youth of the Nation will not be called upon to shed its blood every other decade; that your children and your children's children will have a finer world in which to live. The promise will be in the nature of an experiment—the American experiment in establishing a sane society of mankind.

These are the plans your Government has in mind.

Statement of Metal Trades Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL,
San Francisco, Calif., January 28, 1943.

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Attached hereto is copy of a statement issued by the metal trades unions which is self-explanatory.

The San Francisco Labor Council has officially gone on record as fully approving the content of this statement and respectfully requests your cooperation in estopping the National Labor Relations Board from interfering with contracts now in existence.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN F. SHELLEY,
President.

JOHN A. O'CONNELL,
Secretary.

We, the undersigned, authorized to speak for the shipyard workers, members of our local unions and local metal trades councils, American Federation of Labor, present this statement to all Federal departments charged with procurement for the prosecution of the war and all civilian and Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of furthering the war effort, and to the Members of the Congress of the United States.

We are American Federation of Labor trade unions who have fully won the right to be heard because of the major contributions we have made to the war effort.

It is the undersigned who, acting individually and federated in the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, were the first to respond to President Roosevelt's call for stabilization in the shipbuilding industry. It was our active assistance and final approval which made possible the master shipbuilding agreement covering the shipbuilding industry on the Pacific coast, the first agreement of its kind ever entered into in the history of American shipbuilding. With this cooperative and practical action on our part there would not have followed the zone standards shipbuilding agreements later on entered into on the Atlantic seaboard, the Gulf coast, and the Great Lakes.

When, immediately after the treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt called upon the country for the use of all machinery, equipment, and industrial buildings 24 hours per day, every day in the year, it was the undersigned acting in cooperation with their trade-union associates on the Pacific coast, who with the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and the shipbuilders, negotiated an agreement in January 1942 placing continuous operation into effect in the shipyards of the Pacific coast.

Since then, with the exception of our fellow trade unionists on the Gulf of Mexico, we are the only ones in any industry to establish continuous production in the war industries.

In shipbuilding, our contribution to production has been far ahead of all other sections of our Nation. We have built the so-much-needed ships faster and faster to such an extent that our record of production has become an inspiration to the Nation and to our fellow Americans in the armed forces.

Our record of active and intelligent cooperation with our employers has won the hearty and the public commendation of every governmental agency charged with procurement for war purposes.

It is true that we must receive wages but we have been working for something far more important than wages. We are working so that free American institutions can be maintained. We are working so that our fellow Americans in uniform on all the continents of the world and the seven seas shall not want for food or munitions for a single day because a ship was not launched on time.

We had an agreement with our Government signed by its representatives that on April 1, 1942, if the cost-of-living index showed an increase of 5 percent or more, this amount would be added to the wage rates provided in the master shipbuilding agreement of the Pacific coast, which was ratified in April 1941 and to which the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and the Office of Production Management were signators, as well as the shipbuilders of this coast and ourselves, an agreement which when signed was declared by our Federal authorities to be the most constructive action that had been taken by labor and by management since the war began.

The cost of living had increased 13.1 percent on April 1942 We were entitled to the increase in wages which had been pledged by our Government, but during the year a serious condition of spiraling prices had developed. The President of the United States informed us that it would materially assist him in his effort to prevent inflation if we would agree to accept less than the Government had pledged itself to give us. By the vote of our membership they agreed to a much smaller increase in wages than our agreement with the Government provided.

We have been able to accomplish these objectives in connection with the war effort because for many years the shipyard workers of the Pacific coast have been members of our American Federation of Labor trade-unions, federated in each shipbuilding center into local metal-trades councils, who, in turn, are federated into the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, and for the further reason that our international officers have cooperated with us and cooperated together in helping to work out an industrial policy which would be of greatest service to our country.

Our shipyards, with one or two exceptions, on the Pacific coast have been 100 percent trade-union even before the beginning of the First World War. This coastwide integration and unity of organization has now been attacked and our continuous existence threatened by an action taken by the National Labor Relations Board against the Kaiser Co. shipyards, of Portland, Oreg., and against several other shipyards 100 percent American Federation of Labor If the policy which the National Labor Relations Board evidently intends to put into effect is established, then every trade-union agreement which we have negotiated with our employers through the years is subject to cancelation unless the National Labor Relations Board has previously authorized it. Collective bargaining as our trade-unions have carried it on with employers will come to an end for all practical purposes.

The National Labor Relations Board is pressing a charge that the Kaiser Co. has violated the Wagner Act, at the request of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipyard Workers, a Congress of Industrial Organizations organization. Should the unconscionable policy of the National Labor Relations Board be carried into effect, our agreements declared null and void, and the yards turned over to the turmoil and dissention and bitterness which a National Labor Relations Board election would bring and the National Labor Relations Board stimulate, and should the Congress of Industrial Organizations be successful in part in any shipyard, it would be impossible for them to increase the wages, change the hours of labor, or in any other way alter the terms of employment and labor relations with the management, for these are not only covered and fixed by the Government's participation in the negotiating and signing of the master agreement, but were definitely determined at a national conference held in Chicago, Ill., in May 1942, which established all of these terms of employment for the shipyards of the Nation as a whole.

If the National Labor Relations Board is to continue its present policy which has already alarmed every Federal agency in Washington having to do with the wartime conditions, there will be let loose upon the Pacific coast a struggle between the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor which will reach into every industrial establishment. To precipitate such a conflict is to render the greatest disservice to the Nation in wartime which can be conceived. Where management and labor enjoy free and cooperative relations and where production is greater than that in any other portion of the United States, to now inject the question pressed forward by the National Labor Relations Board is to strike at the very vitals of the war effort. No saboteur of the Axis Powers could begin to do as much injury to the production effort as is involved in the position now being taken by the National Labor Relations Board.

In view of the extraordinary contribution which we have made to the war effort we are entitled to the support and the protection of every Federal agency and the national administration, but at the moment existence of our trade-union organization and our agreements is being threatened by the National Labor Relations Board. It is only through these organizations of ours we have built up, that we can secure the necessary protection. We have made sacrifices in our wage rates to conform with the President's request. We have abolished all calendar days so that continuous production can be carried on. We have maintained most cordial and cooperative relations with our employers, but even though the Nation is at war we cannot, and will not, sit idly by and witness the tearing apart of the organizations we have built up. We will protect the organizations we have formed for our self-protection. Unless the Federal Government can immediately relieve us from the threat presented by the position assumed by the National Labor Relations Board, we are convinced that if forced to stand alone, we must withdraw the pledge we have made that there will be no stoppage of work on our part.

(Signatures omitted.)

Is It Another Monkey Wrench?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the press of Tuesday, February 2, carried the announcement that War Manpower Commission Chief McNutt had notified all married registrants that by May 1 they must either be working in an essential job or in uniform.

That order was aimed specifically at married men with children, and, if my understanding of the law is correct, Congress has never given McNutt or anyone else authority to tell men where they shall work or to order them into the Army if they failed to follow the directions of some administrative executive.

McNutt may have in mind the President's order to Montgomery Ward & Co. or the President's decree that salaries should be limited to $25,000. It is quite evident from the acts of some in the administration that they assume that, inasmuch as the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, his authority is unlimited. That assumption is erroneous.

While the Constitution provides that the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, it also provides that Congress shall have the power to—

> Raise and support armies * * *, to provide and maintain a Navy; * * * to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

Neither Mr. McNutt nor the President himself has any authority whatever to determine the number of men who shall be sent into the armed forces, nor when they shall be sent, nor from what classes they shall be drawn, and it is about time that this administration began to confine itself to the exercise of the powers granted it. This administration, with the war on, will find that it has plenty to do in its own sphere of action without attempting to usurp the powers of Congress or to unlawfully regulate the lives of the citizens.

Already this administration has brought about a condition where every well-informed, thinking, intelligent citizen knows that there will be a drastic shortage of food unless the foolish policy of stripping the farms of those who must produce food is ended without further delay.

It is quite true that civilians should listen to the advice of military experts as to the number of men needed in the armed forces. It is equally true that military experts should listen to civilians charged with the production of food and munitions and who know something about how many men can be fed, armed, and maintained on a battle front.

The havoc wrought by McNutt's order is strikingly illustrated by a telegram received the morning after McNutt issued his order. This wire comes from the Sturgis Posture Chair Co., which has been manufacturing equipment which goes almost exclusively to the armed forces of the United States. The wire reads as follows:

> Please wire us today stating manufacture of wood chairs for Army and Navy and steel chairs for shipboard use is considered essential production. Such a message from you is imperative to keep our organization intact after yesterday's Manpower Commission announcement. Many employees threatening to leave our employ although practically every chair we make is for Army, Navy, Coast Guard, Air Corps, Maritime Commission, and other important agencies. Thanks for your cooperation.

A reading of the telegram to the Manpower Commission and an inquiry as to what might be expected resulted in the advice that manufacture of furniture of any sort or description was not included in the list of essential production, notwithstanding the fact that the entire output was to be used in the war effort, and that there was little likelihood of furniture being placed on the essential list at any time in the near future.

The result, insofar as the operations of the Sturgis Posture Chair Co. and of thousands of other industrial plants are concerned, is that thousands of employees of those industries are in effect notified that they must seek other jobs or get into the Army.

Apparently, what McNutt and this administration propose to do is to knock the underpinning right out from under the foundation of our civilian structure. Just where, if the administration destroys all business which pays taxes, it expects to get the billions necessary to carry on the war has never yet been answered. Just how the administration expects to carry on the war by destroying civilian industry, which supplies the armed forces, is another puzzle to many of our citizens, who already have been brought face to face by rationing with the realization that the administration has destroyed the foundation upon which food production rests by stripping the farms of our manpower and of their machinery.

Lines of supply are vital to every armed force, as everyone with any sense well knows. Yet this administration continues to issue order after order, compliance with all of which would make it impossible to even maintain an army or a navy.

The administration seems to feel that, even though the submarines are destroying our shipping by the thousands of tons; even though the enemy submarines destroyed by our armed forces are being replaced almost as fast as they are destroyed, it can still shackle civilian operations, build and equip a navy, furnish transportation, raise and maintain an army from three to twelve thousand miles away from its base.

Nor is the foregoing the whole of the picture. Men in industries which heretofore have been considered essential—and do not forget that in this particular instance this company is manufacturing equipment for the armed forces—are ordered into other jobs. There are few other jobs available in Sturgis, Mich. Employees out of jobs there will be forced to go to other towns, and when they go they may be confronted by the fact that those essential war industries have all the employees they need.

If not confronted by that fact, they will beyond question be met by the demand that, if they want a job in a war industry, they first cross the palm of a union agent with an initiation fee before they can go to work.

This administration, not satisfied with compelling the men who are in essential war industries to join union organizations and pay tribute to those political allies of the administration, now follows that up by depriving employees of jobs and telling them that they must transfer to a job where they will be required to pay the union politician or racketeer, who is almost invariably an administration political supporter.

I would like to ask just what is the purpose of this war. Is it to carry the "four freedoms" to all the corners of the earth? Is it to destroy Hitler and Hirohito? Or is it to make supreme here in America this administration and its political allies, the union politicians and the union racketeers?

I wonder if we realize that today the administration proposes that the man who wants to work in his own town to aid the brother or the son who is fighting in the Solomons or in Africa must give up his job, go to another where he cannot work until he makes what amounts to a political contribution.

I wonder, too, what the people are thinking about this order of McNutt's when they remember that when the demand was made to draft the 18- and the 19-year-old boys they were told that that would save the fathers with dependent children from being forced into the Army.

We get right back to the question of whether we are trying to win a war or to maintain the so-called social gains.

That brings me to the point where attention is called to a situation which exists right here in Washington. We have an agency or division of the Government whose sole function is to place and keep in repair airplanes for our armed forces.

This agency has 427 employees, all of whom are under civil service. In January 1943, the month just past, 871 man days were lost because of absenteeism.

Last week we had a snowstorm and on January 30, a Saturday, 70 of the 427 employees laid off, giving all sorts of excuses. The day before, Friday the 29th, 18 percent of the total force was off. Now, we all know we had a snowstorm, but we have had snowstorms before and snowstorms are a common thing in Alaska and the Aleutians, where our men do not lay off.

To show that the snowstorm was an excuse and not a reason for the absenteeism, attention is called to the fact that, in an adjoining Government agency, employing 165 persons who were not under civil service, but one of those individuals was off—and that because of sickness—on Friday, and none was absent on Saturday.

What is the cause of this deplorable condition? It is due to the fact that here in Washington the people do not yet realize the meaning of war. To all too many war means higher salaries, higher wages, more money to spend.

Under the law, these Federal employees who are under civil service, have 30 days vacation and 15 days sick leave each year; and, if they lay off they still draw their pay for those 45 days. Each employee can lay off 3½ days each month and still be paid in full and still, under the new ruling, be paid overtime, even though not on the job.

At the agency to which I referred and where 427 employees are engaged in work vital to the war, work on all kinds of aircraft, during January in that one department 190 man-days were lost because the employees were taking part of their annual leave, and for every one of the 190 days the employees received full pay.

Four hundred and fifty-eight man-days were lost because of alleged sickness, and for that lost time the employees received full pay.

Two hundred and fifty-four days were lost because of so-called emergencies. Under the law, for time lost because of these so-called emergencies, which may include anything from a flat tire to an automobile stuck in the snow, the employees were paid in full.

In this one department, in the month of January, where 427 employees were supposed to be at work, 902 man-days were lost and for every one of the man-days lost, the Government paid full time and, for a portion of the time, pay and a half.

With a war on, is it not long past time that this Congress gets its mind off of social reforms, pressure groups, and insist upon the passage and the sensible administration of a few acts which will increase our war efforts?

Protein Feeds for Livestock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include Concurrent Resolution No. 10, adopted by the Fiftieth General Assembly of Iowa, now in session at Des Moines, Iowa, on January 28 and 29, relating to the subject of protein feeds in connection with the increased production of pork, beef, poultry, and other livestock in the war effort:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

Whereas Claude R. Wickard is Secretary of Agriculture, and there has been a demand by the United States Government for increased production of food in the war effort; and

Whereas the progress of increased production is retarded by lack of protein feeds necessary to provide balanced rations for livestock; and

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation has protein feeds available in this territory, which should be immediately released to aid in meeting the demand for increased production; and

Whereas the 1938 Yearbook of Agriculture emphasizes the fact that protein feeds to supplement the feed of home-grown grains

are necessary in the economical production of pork, beef, and poultry: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House concurring), That Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, be requested to immediately release and make available to the farmers of Iowa, protein feeds, especially soybean meal, to supplement the home-grown grains in connection with the increased production and feeding of pork, beef, poultry, and other livestock necessary in the war effort, and that the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to mail a copy of this resolution to Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Commodity Credit Corporation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, to Senator GEORGE A. WILSON, and each Member from Iowa in the National House of Representatives.

Power Development in Quebec

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday's issue of the New York Times carries a report of an unprecedented power development in northern Quebec that should attract the attention of the people of the entire Nation. I am inserting that article as a part of these remarks.

While I am highly in favor of Quebec developing her own water power just as I am in favor of our developing the water power of this Nation, yet I am somewhat disappointed that this great project is not to belong to the people of Quebec instead of to the aluminum monopoly.

While we have been quibbling over the question of developing the water power on the St. Lawrence, the Connecticut, Coosa, the Savannah, the White, the Cumberland, and other streams throughout this country, it seems that this development has gone so far as to be nearing completion, under the most adverse circumstances.

You will note that it will produce firm power to the amount of 970,000 horsepower which would be more than 8,400,000,000 kilowatt hours a year—to say nothing of the secondary power, or flood water power, amounting to 230,000 horsepower.

One of the most astonishing statements in this whole article is the paragraph which reads:

> Not the least amazing thing about it is that it is already paid for. The $65,900,000 cost of the new plant was financed by the Aluminum Co. of Canada out of contracts for sales of aluminum to Britain and the United States, which were in some measure paid for in advance so as to encourage this enormous new power development so essential to war.

It seems to me that if the United States can afford to help finance a project of this kind under these circumstances, it can afford to assist our own people in developing the water power of this Nation for the benefit of our own people now, and for centuries to come.

The article referred to reads as follows:

NEW POWER PLANT GIVES QUEBEC LEAD—SHIPSHAW RIVALS BOULDER DAM WITH 1,200,000 HORSEPOWER—ALLIED UNITS TOP WORLD OUTPUT—SECRECY MARKS BUILDING—ALUMINUM CO. FLIES IN MEN AND MACHINERY—JOB BEGUN IN OCTOBER 1941, NEARS FINISH

ALBANY, January 30.—Up in the back regions of Quebec Province a power development is nearing completion that rivals Boulder Dam both in guaranteed power and speed of construction. For many months it has been a "hush-hush" war mystery not to be written about. But strange tales circulated in Quebec Province about how the work was being carried on in temperatures 30 degrees below zero, of the blasting of 18,000 cubic yards of solid rock, of the big dam at Lake Manouan, 170 air-line miles up in the wilderness, where there is no railroad and no road, so that everything, men, horses, and thousands of tons of equipment, including bulldozers, trucks, and steam shovels had to be flown in.

Now the mystery has been disclosed and the Shipshaw power development on the upper waters of the Saguenay River has been presented as another of the world's wonders.

Not the least amazing thing about it is that it is already paid for. The $65,900,000 cost of the new plant was financed by the Aluminum Co. of Canada out of contracts for sales of aluminum to Britain and the United States, which were in some measure paid for in advance so as to encourage this enormous new power development so essential to war.

Already it is in partial operation and by November it will have a capacity of 1,200,000 horsepower, which is only a little less than that of Boulder Dam. But to that figure should be added the present production of Chute a Caron with 300,000 horsepower built in 1931 and the Isle Maligne plant with 540,000 horsepower, so that this district can claim to be by far the largest electric-power-production area in the world, with a total of 2,040,000 horsepower.

BEGUN IN OCTOBER 1941

The building of the new plant was begun on October 1, 1941 It has been rushed along through two intensely cold winters, employing at the peak 10,595 men with a maximum pay roll of $1,771,000 per month. Now the number has been reduced to some 3,000, with some being released every day. Some of the construction figures are:

Total excavation necessary, 5,731,000 cubic yards.

Concrete used, 1,024,000 cubic yards.

Reinforcing steel, 14,109,120 pounds.

Dynamite used, 3,240,000 pounds.

(Of the dynamite, 83,000 pounds were used in one shot to clear the rock plug between the canal and the Saguenay River.)

Concrete mixing capacity, 7,800 cubic yards a day.

These figures will tell experts something of the work that has been done in this remarkably short period of time. Another fact about this new plant is that it willfurnish approximately one-fifth of all the electrical energy generated in Canada, sufficient to light every home on the North American Continent. It will give far more power than Canada would have obtained from the St. Lawrence waterways scheme and approximately as much as that obtained from Niagara by both the Canadian and United States plans.

One feature that is regarded as clinching the superiority of Shipshaw over Boulder Dam is that it will have an exceptionally high rate of firm power as compared to its total installed capacity. Even under most unfavorable conditions it will guarantee a firm of 970,000 horsepower. This is due to flows from the 400-square-mile Lake St. John, a few miles higher up, and drains a watershed of 28,000 square miles, while the anciliary dams being built away up in the wilderness conserve the waters entering the lake.

One of these huge storage basins at the conjunction of Lake Menouan and River Manouan is now a lake of 100 square miles, about one-fourth of the size of Lake St. John. At Passe Dangereuse (so-called because the rapids are so fast that neither Indian nor white man has ever run them and lived) a lake 75 miles long has been formed.

FIVE DAMS IN HUGE GORGE

At Shipshaw itself the rushing waters of the Saguenay River were almost literally picked up, transported over a huge rock barrier separating the river from the canal and laid neatly down to run through a gorge a mile and a half long. Cut mainly through rock, this gorge has five big dams with two side wings, the equivalent of dams. It is 300 feet wide at its narrowest point and at least 35 feet deep, big enough to take an oceangoing liner.

Some of the dams are 130 feet high. The head block at the main powerhouse is 208 feet high, with a drop greater than that at Niagara Falls. It has 12 steel headgates for controlling the flow of water which is carried into the turbines through 6 tunnels, each 30 feet in diameter. These were excavated through solid rock and lined with concrete.

The big powerhouse, 800 feet long, will consist of 12 generating units, 2 of which have been operating for some weeks. The rated capacity of each of these units was originally about 85,000 horsepower, but with improvements to water-wheel runners now under way, each will actually generate 100,000 horsepower.

The vast project is, of course, that of the Aluminum Co. of Canada and its associates. The Aluminum Laboratories were the consulting engineers for Shipshaw, with H. G. Acres & Co., of Niagara Falls, doing the plan work. The Aluminum Co. of Canada supervised the construction, with the Foundation Co. of Canada as the general contractors.

At Passe Dangereuse, the Aluminum Co. of Canada did the planning, with the Dufresne Construction Co. doing the work, and the Shawinigan Construction Co. as consultants.

SOUTHERNER DIRECTS WORK

McNeely DuBose, manager of the power branch of the Aluminum Co. of Canada, was the directing genius of the development. A big southerner, still retaining his drawl, comparatively young and forceful, he is given much credit for the achievement.

A. O. (Paddy) Hawes was the resident engineer for the company on the spot, with R. F. Oglivy the resident engineer at Passe Dangereuse. They were the men who kept the pace of construction up, who ironed out difficulties and overcame others.

What about this power after the war? Developed for war purposes, can it be used in peacetime? Frankly, authorities here are doubtful if it can all be used immediately after the war on peacetime work. But, on the long-term basis, they are optimistic.

They believe the war has opened up the field for light metals and that they will be utilized more and more in automobiles and other machines, as well as in civilian aircraft. If this development takes place to a sufficient extent, the problem of disposing of the electrical energy will be solved, it is contended.

Further, the power lines in Quebec are now integrated. Shawinigan power can be sent

down to Montreal, and Saguenay power into Shawinigan. Thus, if there is a big industrial development in lower Quebec, much of the Saguenay power could be used by this interrelated transmission system, with it replacing other energy used comparatively nearby and the other power transmitted somewhere else. But, in the meantime, all the Saguenay power is vital, and is playing no small part in winning the war.

In fact, there are enthusiasts who go so far as to assert the war will be won on the Saguenay.

Labor Disturbance in the San Francisco Bay Area

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on the 21st of January I addressed the House in connection with a serious labor dispute that has existed in the San Francisco Bay area shipyards. During the course of my remarks I took occasion to criticize the Secretary of Labor for her lack of action in dealing with that problem. She apparently is not used to being criticized, because she has addressed a three-and-a-half page letter to me and requests that I have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent to place Madam Perkins' letter in the RECORD, together with my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 28, 1943.

The Honorable JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: I have read your speech concerning the labor situation in the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry in the San Francisco Bay area and the comments of your colleagues which are contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated January 21, 1943, on page 298. There are certain comments which I should like to make with the request that you make these comments a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

You refer to an article which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner, which is as follows:

"From an indisputably reliable source, it was learned that a union spokesman had dismissed the matter by explaining offhandedly that 'Secretary Perkins told us, in a phone call from Washington, not to do anything until her representatives got here, so we just didn't go to the conference with the admiral and the general.'"

In my telephone conversation on Friday, January 1, with Messrs. Hook, Dillon, and Smith, who are the union leaders in question, I requested that the members of local union 1034, of which Mr. Smith is a representative, work in the shipyards on the following Saturday and Sunday and to do nothing with regard to demanding double time or suspending or fining members who had worked on Sundays without continued overtime until our representatives got there and could help clear up the situation. I stated I was dispatching a representative from my office for the purpose of clearing up the dispute which then existed and explained to them the provisions of zone standards under the shipbuilding stabilization agreement and its relation to Executive Order 9240.

You quote a Navy spokesman as follows:

"At twelfth district naval headquarters, spokesmen for the Navy, most vitally interested in the effects of the machinists' work stoppage, had no official word of the Labor Department's agents' arrival, said 'they apparently did not see fit to take us into their confidence.'"

As a matter of fact, my representatives were accompanied by a representative of the commandant of the twelfth naval district, from Washington, D. C., to San Francisco, Calif. They traveled by plane and were forced down at Pittsburgh where they spent the week end. During these several days together the Navy representative acquainted them with the situation and showed them certain reports which he had in his possession. After arriving in San Francisco, my representatives were in daily contact with Admiral Greenslade and members of his staff. During a conference with the 28 machinists who had stopped work a telephonic communication was made by my representatives and the leaders of these 28 men to a representative of the Navy, who was instrumental in causing them to return to work.

The news item to which you refer was brought to the attention of Admiral Greenslade, who promptly issued a release to the press, the pertinent part of which is as follows:

"GREENSLADE DENIAL

"Meanwhile, Vice Admiral John W. Greenslade, commandant of the twelfth naval district, said reports that labor officials 'apparently did not see fit' to take the Navy into their confidence were erroneous.

"'A representative of the commandant who was returning from Washington flew to San Francisco on the same plane with Robert T. Amis and C. R. Reynolds, Jr., of the Department of Labor,' the admiral's announcement said, adding that 'the agents arrived here prior to any official word concerning them.'

"IN COOPERATION

"Admiral Greenslade said the Navy and the Labor Department men 'are at present working in full cooperation.'"

This item is quoted from the San Francisco Call Bulletin, dated January 6, 1943.

In your speech you stated:

"I have just this criticism to make of the Secretary of Labor: This situation has been fomenting out there for something like a year and a half. I cannot understand why Madam Perkins had to wait until this good moment before sending her representatives out to attempt to settle it. She should have had her representatives there long ago trying to prevent these disturbances and not wait until they have actually occurred before taking action."

As you know, there are many jurisdictional disputes among the unions in the shipbuilding field on the Pacific coast, which disputes are followed closely by this Department, largely through the conciliation service, with a view to preventing stoppages. As you undoubtedly know, the shipbuilding stabilization agreement was effected in the summer of 1941, and under this agreement the shipbuilding stabilization committee has had major responsibility for the settlement of disputes in that field. I do not mean to imply that the Department of Labor has no responsibility in that field, but to indicate to you that we welcome supervision of that committee and try to assist them and to adjust such disputes or problems as seem to exist outside their opportunities for prompt settlement. In this instance our San Francisco representative of the conciliation service was in close touch with the situation and did all possible to prevent stoppage of work. When this did occur, I took immediate steps which were successful in causing those machinists who had not worked on the previous Sunday to return to their jobs on the following Sunday. The 28 machinists who had been suspended from the union because they worked on one Sunday contrary to orders of the union were also returned to working status following intervention of our special agents. The problems of legal rights and obligations of these unions not parties to the shipbuilding stabilization agreement and their duties under this agreement and under Executive Order No. 9240 were cleared up and regular work resumed. My representatives arrived in San Francisco around midnight Monday, and on the following Thursday 24 of the men were back to work, and on the following Saturday the remaining 4 returned.

So much has been said about this dispute by the local California press and other sources that I think it would be well for you to have the facts. Briefly, they are as follows:

(a) Under date of September 9, 1942, the President issued Executive Order No. 9240, which reads, in part, as follows:

"V. All Federal departments and agencies affected by this order shall refer to the Secretary of Labor for determination questions of interpretation and application arising hereunder. In any industry or occupation in which the Secretary finds that a wage stabilization agreement approved by a Government department or agency is operating satisfactorily, or in any industry or occupation in which the Secretary finds that the nature and exigencies of operations make such action necessary or advisable for the successful prosecution of the war, the Secretary may determine that any or all of the provisions of this order shall not apply to such industry or occupation or to any classes of employees therein."

(b) Under date of September 28, 1942, the Chairman of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee requested that the application of Executive Order No. 9240, as it affects the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry, be temporarily stayed for a period of 60 days from October 1, 1942, to permit the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee to satisfactorily adapt, amend, and conform existing zone standards agreements affecting ship construction and repair, and their amendments, and the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council master agreement relating to the provisions of Executive Order No. 9240.

(c) Under date of September 30, 1942, I granted the stay requested by the Chairman of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee.

(d) On November 28, 1942, the Chairman of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee requested a further temporary stay until January 31, 1943.

(e) On November 29, 1942, I granted a further temporary stay to expire on January 31, 1943.

Copies of these are attached.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES PERKINS.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1943.

Hon. FRANCES PERKINS,
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MADAME SECRETARY: I have for acknowledgment your letter of January 28 with reference to my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 21 on the shipyard labor situation in the San Francisco Bay area.

You request that I make your comments a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This I shall gladly do. However, I shall also ask to have my reply to your communication printed in the RECORD at the same time. In my reply I intend to comment on each of the

points raised by you so that there will be no misunderstanding of the facts involved.

Your first reference is to an article which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner concerning the failure of Messrs. Hook, Dillon, and Smith to meet with Vice Admiral Greenslade and General DeWitt at the latter's request. Your paragraph on this subject fails to explain why the three union agents in question refused to attend a conference that was arranged by the ranking Army and Navy officers on the Pacific coast to discuss the very pertinent question of permitting the members of two local machinist's unions to return to work on critical and essential war-production jobs.

A letter on this phase of the situation which I have received from the Navy Department reads, in part, as follows:

"The Navy Department was informed on January 2, 1943, that arrangements for a meeting on January 1, in the commandant's office was communicated to Messrs. Harry Hook and E. F. Dillon, business agents of Local 68, and Mr. James P. Smith, business agent of Local 1304, but that these union representatives did not appear as requested."

Furthermore, I should like to know just why it was necessary for you to call Messrs. Hook, Dillon, and Smith by long distance after the President of the United States had directed them by wire to have their respective unions return to work. For further clarification I should like to quote the President's wire at this point:

"I am informed by Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission that actions of your union are seriously interfering with vital war production and have delayed shipments of men and supplies to fighting fronts because, contrary to the action of practically all other labor, you have refused to abide by agreements for work on Saturdays and Sundays and to comply with measures established to prevent unnecessary migration of labor.

"You are directed to conform with the amended Pacific coast shipbuilding and ship-repair stabilization agreements and to anti-migration measures adopted and generally operating in San Francisco Bay area."

I think you will have to agree with me, Madame Secretary, that there is nothing ambiguous about President Roosevelt's message. It is a direct order to the two union organizations involved to return to work and to conform to the Pacific coast shipbuilding and ship-repair stabilization agreements. Why, then, did you contact these union representatives by phone, prior to the arrival of the President's wire? To whom are they primarily responsible—the Commander in Chief, or the Secretary of Labor?

In your second reference you state: "You quote a 'Navy spokesman' as follows:". That is incorrect. I was again quoting from a newspaper article—page 300 of the RECORD. However, that is inconsequential. The main point is that I was attempting to establish the fact that your representatives were not working in close cooperation with Admiral Greenslade and his staff while they were in San Francisco. You say otherwise.

The fact of the matter is, that during the 6 days your representatives spent in San Francisco they had one personal conference with Admiral Greenslade, one personal conference and not over four telephone conversations with his labor-regulations officer. Apparently we just don't agree on what constitutes close cooperation.

Your third reference is to my statement that:

"I have just this criticism to make of the Secretary of Labor: This situation has been fomenting out there for something like a year and a half. I cannot understand why Madame Perkins had to wait until this good moment before sending her representatives out to attempt to settle it. She should have had her representatives there long ago trying to prevent these disturbances and not wait until they have actually occurred before taking action."

In spite of your argument I can see no good reason for withdrawing my criticism. It is my personal opinion that you, as Secretary of Labor, have been extremely remiss in your duties as far as the two machinists' locals under discussion are concerned. For over a year and a half they have refused to conform to agreements that are considered binding by all other labor in the San Francisco Bay area. The "problems of legal rights and obligations of these unions" should have been cleared up long ago, not after their failure to work on certain days had resulted in actually delaying the sailing of convoys with essential supplies for our fighting men.

Finally, I must say that it was kind of you to furnish me with the facts in connection with the dispute under consideration. However, they are superfluous. I had the facts when I made my remarks to the House of Representatives on January 21. In addition to the information which I have obtained from the various Government departments involved, I spent a week in San Francisco last December personally inquiring into the entire situation.

It was not good then. It is not good now. The question is, what are you going to do about it?

Sincerely yours,

JOHN Z. ANDERSON.

House Concurrent Resolution, House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am printing House Concurrent Resolution F, introduced by the Committee on Agriculture, Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of North Dakota, memoralizing the United States House of Representatives to adopt and pass House Resolution 38, introduced by me on January 8, 1943, which has for its purpose directing the Committee on Agriculture to make a study and investigation of the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products from rural areas through the various marketing agencies to the ultimate consumer:

Whereas the economic security of this Nation depends primarily upon the economic security of those engaged in agriculture; and

Whereas the welfare and rehabilitation of the entire world is going to be dependent to a large extent upon American agriculture; and

Whereas the recent rise in food costs has been due almost entirely to increases accruing after the products have left the farmer or producer, and before reaching the ultimate consumer, and have not been reflected in the income of the farmer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring), That this legislative assembly of North Dakota respectfully memorialize the United States House of Representatives to adopt and pass House Resolution 38, directing the Committee on Agriculture to make a study and investigation of the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products from rural areas through the various marketing agencies to the ultimate consumer; be it further

Resolved, That attested copies of this resolution be sent to the United States House of Representatives, and to Hon. H. P. FULMER, chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Representative C. T. Olson, chairman of the agriculture committee, North Dakota House of Representatives, in submitting a copy of the resolution above referred to, states:

I want to congratulate you on your effort to improve on our obsolete marketing and distributing system. A continually widening spread between producer and consumer will eventually wreck the whole system. I wish you luck in your efforts.

It may be of interest to you and the Members of Congress that I am receiving letters from every section of the country, endorsing my proposal, and that many of the legislatures of the country are passing resolutions in line with that passed by the North Dakota House of Representatives.

The major problem confronting farmers, as well as consumers, today is the manner in which farm products are marketed and distributed. Under the present system, farmers, operating as individuals, are in a hopeless and helpless position in demanding fair prices for their products. On the other hand, in that, under the present system, farm products are marketed and distributed through various middlemen, all of whom are interested in profits, the consumers at the other end of the line who are called upon to pay high fixed prices for farm products, are just about in the same position that the farmers of this country are in, under the present wasteful and disgraceful marketing and distributing system.

Resolution of Lions' Club of Riverton, Wyo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution, which was adopted by the Lions' Club, of Riverton, Wyo., which resolution deals with the waste of taxpayers' money, manpower, and materials in relation to the handling of information from, and operations of, the Office of Price Administration.

I firmly believe that the matters and opinions set forth in this resolution correctly reflect the sentiments of most of the people of the State I have the honor to represent. In fact, I have correspondence almost daily, calling my attention to the fact that certain departments of government seem to be obsessed with the idea

that the more money they spend and the more men they employ to spend it, the more important they become.

Frankly, the people do not like it, and are demanding the elimination of unnecessary agencies and the discontinuance of unnecessary peacetime expenditures. They are looking to this Congress for relief. Our people are intensely patriotic, and are 100 percent behind the war effort, and will not object to wartime or necessary expenses. They have the privilege and right to complain about expenditures that are wholly unnecessary or serve no useful purpose.

The matters set forth in the following resolution clearly and concisely express the thoughts and minds of our people:

Whereas the shortage of manpower and waste of taxpayers' money has become a serious matter to our whole Nation, we desire to call to the attention of our congressional delegation in Washington the waste of such manpower and money as is shown by a meeting recently held in Riverton.

This meeting was held for the purpose of informing businessmen in regard to the rules and regulations of the Office of Price Administration. Both Lander and Riverton businessmen were asked to attend, making necessary a 50-mile trip for those attending from Lander.

Not one but three Office of Price Administration representatives were present, and when the meeting was over only such information was had as was presented in a pamphlet distributed at the meeting. This could as well have been mailed.

We deplore such waste of needed manpower, which should be devoted to better advantage in other more vital war effort.

We further protest against the waste of taxpayers' money in sending three representatives when one would have been more than sufficient. No doubt they are well paid and travel on mileage and expenses. We also protest on the waste of vital rubber and gasoline caused by the apparently unnecessary trip of the Lander businessmen: Be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senators O'MAHONEY and ROBERTSON and to Representative BARRETT at Washington, D. C., and to T. C. Tonkin, Office of Price Administration director at Cheyenne, Wyo.

Resolution of Citizens of Kimball County, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from Kimball County presented to me to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

We, the undersigned citizens of Nebraska residing in the Kimball territory, do hereby pledge our wholehearted support to the war effort and especially in the production of foodstuffs so vital to the feeding of the armed forces of the United States. To this end we respectively petition our Members in Congress to support the following program:

1. That the present administration, insofar as it can be done, guarantee adequate labor for the harvesting of crops especially potatoes.
2. That the rationing of new farm machinery now in the hands of retail dealers be handled exclusively by local rationing boards.
3. That necessary fuel, including gasoline, be assured the producer.
4. That the present deferment of necessary farm workers subject to selective service be continued in accordance with the latest regulations.
5. That farm prices either be raised in order to enable the farmer to pay wages competitive with defense industries or the scale of wages in defense industries be lowered in order that the farms be not robbed of vital manpower.
6. That necessary parts for machinery be allocated sufficient to accomplish increased production.
7. Elimination of excess profits between food producer and consumer.
8. Elimination of trade barriers between States for the duration of the war.
9. Elimination of all nonessential Government spending.

(Signatures omitted.)

Increased Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I wrote to Secretary of Agriculture Wickard:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1943.

Hon. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your recent announcement of the new farm acreage goals that it will be necessary for this Nation to achieve in the near future if essential supplies of food and fiber are to be made available to our people and to our allies, brings out very forcefully the importance of the irrigated lands in the Western States to any proposal for increase of food and fiber crops.

It is my belief that the irrigated lands of the Western States offer the greatest opportunity for meeting the increased demands for food and fiber, not only because of the diversity of crops made possible by irrigation, but on account of the high crop production per acre that comes from the rich soils of the irrigated valleys.

I believe it is timely to again call your attention to the possibilities that exist for increased production of food and fiber that would be made possible by the early completion of the Central Valley water project of California. Some 20,000,000 acres of extremely fertile land would benefit from the completion of this great reclamation project. Ten of the first seventy agricultural counties in the United States are situated in this area and the other ten counties located in California's Central Valley rank high in their productive capacity per acre.

The irrigation dam at Friant, which is designed to serve the five southern counties, namely, Kern, Tulare, Kings, Fresno, and Madera, with a supplemental water supply, is virtually completed, lacking only the control gates. The irrigation canals, the Friant-Kern and the Madera, can be built with a very minimum of critical material so that they will be adequate to convey available water to the fertile lands for the duration.

The Shasta Dam, second largest concrete dam ever to be built, will be completed early in 1944. The water it is designed to conserve for irrigation needs, like those from the Friant Dam, will continue to waste to the sea unless the Delta Cross Channel and the Mendota Canal are built to convey it to the hundreds of thousands of acres of highly productive land that but waits for this water to produce in very substantial quantity the products now so desperately required.

You realize, of course, that besides the soil, climate, etc., required for producing a crop, that the lands in the western half of the United States must have one other thing, without which all the others are useless; that essential thing is a supplemental water supply that must be provided by means of irrigation.

I am convinced that the records of your Department will bear out the fact that these irrigated lands will provide in increased production such vast quantities of essential food, fiber, and rubber that those reclamation projects now partly constructed should be completed as rapidly as possible with the minimum use of essential materials. The demand for foods will exist long after the war is over and every month of delay in again getting construction under way on those projects now curtailed will mean untold suffering and loss of human life that otherwise could have been prevented.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. ELLIOTT.

Move the Capital West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, my remarks recalling when the White House was in the Black Hills of South Dakota in the summer of 1927 were prompted by the following editorial in the Washington Times-Herald of January 30, 1943, which I place in the RECORD under permission given:

MOVE THE CAPITAL

Maj. Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift, who commanded the Marines on Guadalcanal from August 7 till the Army took over recently, is back in this country. In Washington day before yesterday, General Vandegrift told reporters part of what he thinks about the Guadalcanal fight and the troops engaged.

VANDEGRIFT ON THE JAPS

No soldiers in the world are braver than ours. Our boys are more inventive and resourceful than the Japs. But, says Vandegrift, the Japs are excellent fighters. In addition, they are so fanatical that "the Jap soldier won't surrender until he is practically unconscious from wounds. Most of those we captured were so badly wounded they were unable to kill themselves."

All of which moves us to suggest that the Capital of the United States be transferred

from Washington to some point in the Middle West—maybe on one of the many beautiful Minnesota or Wisconsin lakes.

OUTWORN CAPITAL

When Washington was built on a swamp site to be our Capital City, it was logically located in about the middle of the Thirteen Original States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia.

The Nation's geographical center now, however, is Centropolis, Kans., and its population center is just outside Carlisle, Ind.

Washington has one of the country's worst climates in the summer; and in winter, too. It is one of the country's worst laid-out cities for modern automobile traffic, with its east-west and north-south streets hashed up by avenues radiating like spokes from the Capitol and the White House.

The city's original planners doted on Greek architecture. Result: Large numbers of low, sprawling buildings, in which you have to walk miles to get where you want to go, instead of letting elevators do that work for you in high, compact, efficient buildings.

We think we ought to start all over again and build us a modern American capital city somewhere in the Middle West. The Washington buildings, including the new and monstrous Pentagon, could be used for storing records—businessmen's answers to ceaseless questionnaires, motorists' lists of how many tires they had last year and what serial numbers those tires bore, etc.

But the fact that Washington is outmoded as a Capital City and geographically left behind is not the main reason why we should have a new Capital much nearer to the middle of the United States.

LOOK WEST, AMERICANS

The main reason is that as long as we keep the Capital on the Atlantic seaboard the Capital will keep worrying mainly about Europe's problems and underrating the Japanese threat to the United States from the Pacific.

For two foolish but powerful reasons, the Japs are our logical enemies: (1) Their skins are brownish yellow, and (2) their eyes are squinchy. We are not built that way; hence, we feel that they are all wrong, and they feel that we are all wrong, and each group feels a manifest duty to destroy the other.

Worse, the Japs as fighters are comparable to the Iroquois Indians of Colonial times. Our forefathers licked the Iroquois; but they could not have done so if the Iroquois had had as good weapons as our forefathers had.

The Japs' weapons are almost as good as ours. We can lick them only with superior weapons and superior forces. They are hungry for more power and more territory; they hate us, but they love the lush looks of California, Oregon, and Washington, and are determined to take at least that much out of us sooner or later.

Washington, being 3,000 miles from the west coast, cannot grasp this ominous fact. It is fascinated by Europe; and so it sends a badly planned, undermanned expedition of dauntless marines to push the Japs out of the Solomons, and our boys are stopped on Guadalcanal and all but get their faces shot off.

After this war, Washington will again be meat for pacifists with disarmament goods to sell. If the country falls for that, the Japs will wait until we disarm sufficient to suit them, and then they will descend on Hawaii again. If they can take Hawaii in a second try, as they well may, they will swarm onto our Pacific coast, while Washington wonders what has hit us.

What we need is a genuinely American capital of the United States, in place of the present semi-European capital at Washington. If all the Congressmen and Senators from west of the Appalachians would band together to put over a constitutional amendment to that end, we don't see how they could lose.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent, from the Washington Star of February 3, 1943:

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS MAY TRAP REPUBLICANS INTO ISOLATION STAND

(By Frank R. Kent)

The administration politicians are proceeding on the assumption that, politically, the Republican leadership in Congress is foolish and, itself, can be depended on to nullify the advantage which the November elections have given its party. Perhaps they are right about that and within a short while the Republican attack will be of such character as to rob their 1944 prospects of their present charm.

Certainly, it requires no particular discernment to see one of the pitfalls into which the rejuvenated and strengthened Republicans may easily fall. It is easy, too, to grasp the fact that the clever administration politicians are silently praying that they will do exactly that. They hardly can wait for the thing to happen.

What the coldly practical fellows among the New Deal strategists hope is that the Republicans as a party, or, anyhow, the bulk of them, will become responsible for the repudiation of the reciprocal trade agreements which come up for congressional approval within a short time.

STEADFASTLY EXPOSED

These are the pacts with which for 10 years Secretary of State Cordell Hull steadfastly has tried to break down the tariff barriers that blocked the international channels, and open up a clear and unrestricted flow of trade between nations. Against opposition (or, anyhow, lukewarmness) inside the administration as well as outside, with undeviating persistence, he achieved a remarkable degree of success.

The strength of his ideas and his quiet courage in fighting for them have made him the outstanding member of the Roosevelt Cabinet and rendered him immune to the sniping from the inside as well as the outside, to which he is constantly subjected.

Recent bitter criticism of his north African policies, which were fully approved by the President, has been singularly ineffective in shaking confidence in either his integrity or his wisdom.

FAR-REACHING ACHIEVEMENT

Though the New Dealers do not list them as such, these reciprocal trade agreements rank as the most wholesome and far-reaching achievement of the Roosevelt regime. They constitute the one expression of international cooperation during the years when the administration was as isolationist in its color as any we have had.

If, now, these agreements should be repudiated, it would be a disastrous backward step toward the old high-tariff protection system for which there would be neither defense nor excuse.

This can happen only if the Republicans cast the bulk of their votes against them. It is true they are not in a majority, but there is enough inertia among administration Democrats to permit the Republicans to create a majority on this issue.

If that happens, the Republicans will be branded again as the isolation party. All their committee resolutions and public proclamations favoring international cooperation will be nullified, and as a party they will be put on the defensive—and deserve to be.

It is not too much to say that administration politicians, who, themselves, have cared little about the Hull pacts, are eager to see this happen. It is not too much to say that various administration journalists are already laying the foundation for the attack.

It is almost incredible that the Republicans should fall into this trap. Their leaders must know that any form of isolationism is now abhorrent to the majority of the American people.

Smart Republican politics would be to seize the lead in urging indorsement and extension of these agreements. That would accomplish three things—first, it would frustrate and disappoint the New Deal politicians; second, it would stamp the recent Republican Party professions with sincerity and, measurably at least, free it from the taint of reactionism; third, it would contribute to the health of our own country and of the world. The last ought to be enough—but, in politics, there are always other considerations.

Legislative Program of the National Grange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the legislative program of the National Grange for 1943. This program was adopted at the seventy-sixth annual convention of the National Grange, held at Wenatchee, Wash., November 11–19, 1942. I regard this as a constructive program well worth the serious consideration of the Congress.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. GENERAL POLICY

The supreme task confronting the American people and those who fight with us in defense of civilization in this crucial hour is to conquer, subdue, and disarm the aggressor nations. With that accomplished, the next step will be to establish a just and enduring peace. To the accomplishment of this high purpose, the Grange pledges its undivided loyalty and devotion and the best efforts of all its members.

Besides furnishing its proportionate share of the fighting men, the responsibility resting upon agriculture in this crisis is to furnish the food and fiber needed to feed and clothe our armed forces and the civilian population, besides making up the deficiencies of our allies. Confronted with many handicaps, the best the farmer can do will fall short of meeting existing needs, and anything short of our best efforts would jeopardize the safety of our cause.

To insure maximum production, farmers must have labor, equipment, and a price for their products which will meet production costs. To temporize on questions involving these major essentials is to invite disaster. The conditions which the Grange deems necessary to success are briefly outlined below and are then discussed in greater detail in the paragraphs which follow:

(a) Adequate manpower, supplies, equipment, repair parts, transportation, and credit facilities must be made available to enable farmers to achieve the production goals which have been established.

(b) Farmers must receive compensatory prices for their products to insure adequate supplies of food and fiber, and to protect us against shortages which are already developing.

(c) Food production must be recognized as a defense industry and treated as such.

(d) The national interest demands that a sane and sound manpower policy be developed without further delay, and that agriculture shall not be further stripped of essential workers.

(e) Give agriculture its fair share of the national income. The present parity formula should be modernized and should include all farm labor costs.

(f) Curb inflation by (1) promoting abundant production, (2) rationing where shortages are inevitable, (3) the use of ceilings only to prevent profiteering, and (4) capturing excess profits by taxation for war support.

(g) Adopt the pay-as-you-go principle in the collection of Federal income taxes.

(h) Unnecessary nondefense spending must be eliminated and the wasteful use of public funds under any circumstances must be discountenanced.

(i) Maintain an adequate system of transportation, and give free play to the forces of legitimate competition.

(j) It is imperative to place floors under farm prices to prevent another post-war collapse in agriculture. These floors should be at levels equitable to industry, labor, and agriculture.

(k) Maintain the family-sized farm as the standard of American agriculture and discourage large-scale or corporation farming, thus upholding America's greatest bulwark of democracy.

(l) Encourage the further development of farmer-owned and controlled cooperative associations in the interest of both the producer and the consumer.

(m) There must be an end to strikes, with their crippling effect on the war effort, and boycotts, embargoes, "hot cargoes," and similar devices interfering with the normal production and marketing of food cannot be tolerated.

(n) Encourage cooperation, good will, and mutual understanding between agriculture, industry, and labor to promote the common welfare.

2. MANPOWER

The acute shortage of farm labor which exists today constitutes one of the most serious threats to the security and well-being of the Nation. The need for the development of a more rational and workable manpower policy is imperative.

Adopted at a time when there were millions of idle men in the country, the 40-hour week was designed to spread employment opportunities, while the provision for time and a half for overtime was intended to make overtime so expensive that it would be employed only as a measure of last resort.

A full day's work for everyone is demanded by existing conditions. Men should be furloughed from the armed forces when necessary to plant and harvest crops. We oppose any attempts to freeze labor on farms. Prices that will enable farmers to compete for desirable labor are an essential requisite.

3. REVISED PARITY FORMULA

Based on conditions which existed 30 years ago, the present formula for determining price parity in agricultural products is largely obsolete. It is grossly unfair to agriculture.

A comprehensive survey should be made to determine the proportion of the national income which would be equitable for each of our major economic groups, and a new parity formula developed which will assure farmers an equitable share of that income. Pending the completion of such a survey, upon which a new formula may be based, it is essential that we establish a temporary method of determining parity based on a sound economic foundation. Methods should be adopted for keeping the formula up to date, and all items entering into production costs should be included in the index of things which farmers buy.

4. CONTROL OF INFLATION

One of the most important battles we have to fight on the home front is the battle against inflation. A plentiful supply of goods is one of the surest safeguards against inflated prices. Any policy which denies farmers compensatory prices, so that they may produce freely, will inevitably cause shortages and advancing prices.

It has been demonstrated that any sound plan for the control of inflation must include wages as well as commodity prices and every other factor entering into the situation. The 40-hour week, with time and one-half for overtime, coupled with the high wages paid in our war industries, is the underlying cause for our drift toward inflation.

Increased purchasing power should be used largely to meet production costs and to pay the increased costs of Government. Price ceilings may be necessary to prevent profiteering.

The Grange is opposed to subsidies on farm products to keep price ceilings intact. Such subsidies would in reality be for the benefit of the consumer, but the stigma of drawing money out of the Treasury instead of paying it in would attach to the farmer. Besides, subsidies operate to increase the national debt, which is in itself inflationary. With billions of dollars of excess purchasing power in the hands of the people, caused by the huge war expenditures of the Government, we have no moral right to pass on to future generations any part of the cost for the food consumed today.

5. POST-WAR PLANNING

While present conditions call for the greatest possible production of farm products, agriculture will again be face to face with a surplus problem when we pass from a wartime economy to one of peace. To prevent the recurrence of the disastrous conditions from which agriculture suffered after World War No. 1, a floor must be placed under farm prices. This floor must be established at a level fair to agriculture, industry, and labor. This will call for reasonably balanced production and machinery for the removal of surpluses from the market, so that prices may not fall below equitable levels.

The United States should assume its responsibility in planning and enforcing a just and lasting peace. Agriculture should be represented at the peace table to assure proper protection of the farming industry.

6. STABILIZING PRICES

Prices of nonsurplus crops can be stabilized at equitable levels by sound practices, employing cooperative marketing, marketing agreements, and commodity loans.

A two-price system should be utilized in dealing with surplus crops. Means should be provided to expedite the flow of such crops to foreign markets, or for conversion to special uses domestically. A sliding scale of domestic prices based on volume can be employed as a self-enforcing means of production control, as has long been done by the dairy industry.

7. SOIL CONSERVATION

Soil conservation practices should be continued, but should not be used as a means of enforcing acreage control under any farm program. In no case should surpluses held by the Government be disposed of with deliberate intent to depress farm prices below parity levels, determined on a sound basis.

8. FARM CREDITS

The Grange favors a cooperative credit system based on sound business principles under the ownership and control of farmer borrowers. Proper Federal supervision is necessary to assure that the provisions of the law and the purposes of the Congress are complied with. The activities of the Federal agency should be strictly limited to supervision, and all responsibility for operation should be placed in the boards of directors of the cooperative institutions in the field. The principle of individual and joint responsibility of borrowers should be retained as one of the strongest bulwarks for the safety of the system.

More responsibility should be placed on the national farm loan associations in the making and collecting of loans, and a sufficient portion of income should go directly to the associations to enable them to meet their legitimate costs of operation.

For several years efforts have been made to supplant farmer-owned and controlled cooperative credit with Government-financed credit, which would involve increased centralized control, to which we object. Some of the money advanced by the Government to refinance the farm-mortgage debt during the depression has since been refunded. Our purpose should be to continue this process as rapidly as it can be done without sacrificing the efficiency of the system.

9. SYNTHETIC RUBBER

With our supply of natural rubber cut off by the war for an indefinite period, the delay and bungling that have characterized our efforts to launch a program for the manufacture of synthetic rubber can no longer be safely tolerated. The maintenance of essential motor transportation is vital to our national economy, as well as the war effort.

The need for speeding up the construction of plants for the manufacture of synthetic rubber is so pressing that ways and means must be found to allow the work to proceed. Other essential industries must yield sufficient priorities in critical materials to make this possible. Transportation is just as vital as production. Wherever practicable surplus farm products should be utilized in the manufacture of rubber.

10. FARM CHEMURGY

The dislocations occasioned by the war render it necessary that we should produce domestically many commodities which we formerly imported, such as rubber. We favor specific appropriations to the Department of Agriculture and the State experiment stations to develop new crops to fill existing needs. We also favor continued research to find new industrial uses for surplus farm crops.

11. FARM MACHINERY

In view of the shortage of farm labor, if production goals are to be met, it will be necessary to enable farmers to secure more adequate supplies of farm equipment, machinery, and repairs. We believe that the allocations made by the War Production Board in this connection will fall far short of filling minimum needs.

12. TRANSPORTATION

We are convinced that each type of transportation should be allowed to develop and operate without any undue restrictions or handicaps imposed by the Government. Car-

riers should not be allowed to charge higher rates than are necessary to produce compensatory returns.

We favor continued private ownership and operation of the railroads and permitting the consolidation of competing lines in the interest of economy, where such consolidations do not adversely affect the public interest.

We favor the retention of the long-and-short-haul section of the Transportation Act.

We favor the speedy elimination of all arbitrary and unnecessary transportation barriers as between States.

We also favor uniformity as between the States in codes regulating traffic, as well as the size, weight, and speed of motor vehicles using the public highways.

The Grange is opposed to placing any arbitrary restrictions on the distance that a motortruck may be driven under prevailing conditions on any particular trip.

Every special tax collected for highway improvement should be conserved for that purpose alone. No diversion of such funds should be allowed and no taxation or regulation of motor vehicles should be permitted which has for its purpose any increase in cost or restriction of use in order to equalize competitive conditions as between different types of carriers.

The tremendous volume of wartime traffic now being carried on our inland waterways, supplementing other forms of transportation and relieving congestion on the railroads, more than justifies the money expended in their development. Our waterborne commerce should not be hindered or restricted by unnecessary regulation or interference from any source.

13. TAXATION

We recognize the fact that the national emergency with which we are confronted calls for the highest taxes in our history. Any new taxes that may be imposed in this connection should be levied as fairly and equitably as possible, always keeping in mind the principle of ability to pay.

These levies should be of such a character as not to destroy our system of private enterprise. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that without a system of free enterprise there can be no such thing as democracy. On the other hand, no one should be allowed to make any undue profits in connection with Government contracts or otherwise.

No unduly burdensome or discriminatory tax should be placed on any commodity solely because the tax is easy to collect.

We favor the pay-as-you-go plan in collecting Federal income taxes, believing that whatever shortcomings such a plan may have will be more than counterbalanced by its advantages.

We favor the principle of allowing limited deductions from income tax for funds invested in war bonds, the payment of life insurance premiums on policies acquired prior to September 1, 1942, and for the payment of debts contracted before that date.

In the development of our Federal tax programs, due care must be exercised not to dry up the sources of revenue upon which the States and their subdivisions must depend to finance their activities. Tax policies that would pauperize the States and local units, would strike a deadly blow against the very foundations of our system of government.

14. NONESSENTIAL EXPENDITURES

The unprecedented burdens of taxation that the people are compelled to carry call for greater economy in Government than we have heretofore practiced. The expenditure of public funds for nonessential purposes should be stopped without further delay.

While the exigencies of war make it necessary that our national debt should be expanded to unprecedented proportions, recklessness and waste in the use of public funds must not be tolerated.

15. CONSERVATION AND FORESTRY

As an aid in the development of a long-time forestry program for the Nation, we recommend:

(a) Aid to forest land owners in such matters as protection against insect pests, fire, and disease; technical advice in the production and marketing of forest products; suitable credit provisions; equitable taxation; research, and the speedy completion of the forest survey of the United States.

(b) Speeding up acquisition and additions to the national forests of forest and submarginal land unsuitable to private ownership, under conditions that will be fair to the land owners, the States, and to local governmental units.

(c) Adequate Federal reimbursements to counties in lieu of taxes during readjustment of the tax program.

(d) Proper encouragement and assistance to the owners of farm woodlots, comprising one-fourth of all our forest lands.

(e) Needed steps to conserve watersheds, soils, and wildlife.

(f) The Forest Service must remain in the Department of Agriculture, and all Federal forest activities should be consolidated thereunder. The administration of the Taylor Grazing Act should be transferred to this department.

16. AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

We approve of proper appropriations for the land-grant colleges and for the support of extension work in agriculture and home economics, together with adequate funds for State experiment stations. We commend the helpful and practical nature of the vocational-training programs conducted under the direction of the United States Office of Education. This work is hampered under present conditions by reason of the fact that more than one-tenth of the agricultural teachers have entered the armed forces or are engaged in other phases of war work. The courses concerned with the repair and operation of tractors, trucks, automobiles, and general farm machinery have been particularly useful.

17. FARM TENANCY

The Grange favors continued efforts for the development of a sound program for the relief of farm tenancy. In attacking this problem, proper emphasis should be placed on the correction of conditions which annually cause many home owners to slip into the tenant class.

18. FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

To improve the banking system of the Nation, we recommend:

(a) Making the Federal Reserve Board more strictly responsible to Congress, with proper safeguards against temporary interruptions of policy for purposes of political expediency.

(b) Preventing the manipulation of bank credit for private profit.

(c) Making the banking system of the Nation more responsive to the needs of agriculture, industry, and business, with no unnecessary monetary barriers to foreign commerce.

(d) Giving agriculture proper representation on the boards of the 12 Reserve banks.

19. FOREIGN TRADE

We believe that in the past the interests of American agriculture have not been adequately protected under the workings of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. While foreign trade has naturally been greatly disrupted by the war, with the return of peace we shall again come face to face with this issue. The Grange maintains that the American farmer is entitled to the home market to the limit of his capacity to supply it.

All laws and regulations respecting sanitary requirements and to prevent the spread of insect pests and animal diseases must be kept in full force and effect.

20. THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Neither the Department of Agriculture nor any other agency of the Government should engage in promotional work to encourage the use of imitation dairy products. It is of vital interest to the dairy industry as well as to the consuming public that all legislation for the control and regulation of manufacturers or dealers in imitation dairy products should remain in full force and effect.

21. LABOR LEGISLATION

We are in accord with the legitimate aims and objectives of organized labor. However, there is urgent need for revamping Federal legislation with reference to labor and industry and to eliminate all bottlenecks that in any way retard the successful prosecution of the war. Disputes between labor and management should be promptly settled without the stoppage of work.

We condemn strikes, boycotts, "hot cargo" edicts, and general racketeering that interfere with the orderly marketing of farm products and the production of war supplies, or the free flow of commerce. We ask for the enactment and vigorous enforcement of more stringent regulations to prevent abuses in this connection.

22. CURBING BUREAUCRACY

The growth of our Federal bureaucracy constitutes nothing less than a menace to our dual system of government and the liberties of the people. The rights of the States and the freedom of the individual must be preserved and defended. The Constitution must be obeyed and respected, and all attempts at usurpation of power must be sternly resisted. Extraordinary delegations of power by Congress for the prosecution of the war should contain a proviso for their automatic termination at the end of the emergency.

23. RADIO BROADCASTING

Since the major proportion of the farm homes of the Nation depend upon service from "clear channel" radio stations, we oppose any action to reduce the number of these stations in order to give more service to the large centers of population, which are already well supplied.

24. FARM REPRESENTATION

We urge that agriculture be given proper representation on all war agencies, boards, and commissions dealing with farm problems.

The Bar in a World at War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1943

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of an address delivered at the annual meeting of the Nebraska Bar Association by the president of the association, Mr. Paul Boslaugh, on the very appropriate subject The Bar in a World at War.

The Government Printing Office has estimated that it will cost $135 to print the address in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In December, 1 year ago, this Nation was precipitated suddenly into the horror, the perils, and uncertainties of a world war. Gradually, but continually, since that day the grim shadow of this mighty conflict has moved across our land. The assault upon all we count dear has united America, as we have thrown into the contest the material wealth, the creative scientific skills, and the millions of the sons and daughters of America. Fully mindful of the dangers of the road we must travel, of the strength of the foes that would conquer us, we have yet seen the spirit of America—the intangible quality of life that is the bulwark of a free people—rise to meet the challenge, and dedicate itself to the service of mankind upon the altar of victory.

The members of the bar of Nebraska are now convened in this important, peaceful, and metropolitan city in the initial hour of another annual meeting of the association, many thousands of miles removed from any of the actual conflicts now occurring in the widely separated parts of the world. But the bar in a very real sense, like the Nation, is subject to and affected by the whims and actions of one cruel, ambitious, and wicked man and his followers. Wholly opposed to our choice, and without regard to how much we resent it, the manner of our living and our future depends in no small measure upon the uncertain course of the fortunes or misfortunes of Hitler and his evil-intentioned partners in conquest.

It is the pleasure and duty of lawyers to study, consider, and discuss subjects and problems peculiar to the fields of their activities. But the reality that now confronts us is world wide, total, grim war, unrelieved by prospect of immediate victory or early peace—a war, the objective of which is the destruction of our plan of government and philosophy of society. Peace we will not consider except as a sequel of unconditional surrender and our complete victory.

This being our situation and our mood, a pronouncement on an academic or abstract theme would at this time be of doubtful acceptance. Rather, it is more appropriate now to be conscious of the problems and dangers which threaten our Nation and its institutions, and to consider the part that can and should be taken by the bar in a world at war.

It would not be entirely to the credit of the profession if the members of the bar were disposed or able to continue about their usual engagements in the performance of the duties of their professional activities uninterruptedly and unaffected by the many changes and duties caused by and incident to this all-out conflict. When loyal citizens meet together their program and proceedings should reflect and consider something of the dislocations, obligations, and new opportunities for service.

The bar has a large stake in this contest, both in the defeat of the ambitions and plans of the would-be world conquerors, and in the return to the people of our Republic, immediately the emergency is past of the liberties, rights, and privileges which have been and may be surrendered by them.

This is well expressed in a report to the house of delegates of the American Bar Association in 1941:

"One of the phenomena of social violence which inevitably recurs in parallel with the rights of every absolutist regime is the disintegration of the bar and the destruction of its capacity to protect the citizen from aggression. It may be laid down as an axiom that the freedom of the profession of the law is inseparable from the liberties of the people, and they must both decline as autocracy and bureaucracy advance. The extent to which members of the profession are forced downward to be mere technicians is an infallible index of the loss of popular liberty."

The lawyers of Nebraska have unselfishly and unhesitatingly done and are doing their full part in this tremendous undertaking to assure the complete disappointment of the enemy and the continuance of constitutional representative government. They largely make up the local and appeal boards provided by the Selective Service Act. Civilian defense activities have had their full contribution. They predominate as members of the ration boards. They have been participants, and in more than a few instances leaders, in the campaigns for necessary scrap materials, for the sale of bonds, and in providing relief and benefit funds. A wide range of other war work has benefited and been advanced by their sustaining efforts. No instance has been disclosed, either fancied or real, in which any member of the bar has failed to respond to every opportunity or reasonable expectation in these and many other fields without regard to the size of the undertaking, the time required, or the personal sacrifice involved.

It was the objective of the special committee on war work of the Nebraska State Bar Association that every county and community in the State should have a functioning committee of lawyers who would, as their individual, patriotic duty, extend the aid proper to be given to those in, or about to enter, the armed forces, and to their dependents; to be available to advise and cooperate with all auxiliary arms and agencies, and to conserve the practice of those practitioners of the bar who had, for the duration, ceased their professional pursuits. This objective has been all but attained, as is shown by the report of this committee published as a part of the program of this meeting, as a result of the untiring effort and determination of the committee under the able leadership of its chairman, Robert R. Moodie.

The Nebraska State Bar Association has here again demonstrated what an organized, unified bar can do. It early realized that many conditions would have to be confronted which were entirely new, that the natural unit of helpfulness in the State, as applied to local matters, was the State association working through a committee on war work, and that to the extent it was implemented to advise, counsel and execute, it would be helpful and successful, and entitled to credit and the reward of important and indispensable work well done.

It may, and in fairness should be said, in sincerity and truth, that the special committee on war work has obtained remarkable results in organizing the bar of Nebraska on behalf of the people of the State, and that when the full facts and results are known, they will testify to a devotion to the tradition and ideals of the bar in behalf of the people which has seldom been equaled.

This voluntary, important service of the lawyers of Nebraska, without personal advantage, flows from purest patriotism and is a guaranty of their continuing efforts in the national cause.

The opportunities and responsibilities of the bar in a world at war are many and progressive.

This is the fifth year of the existence of the all-inclusive, integrated bar of Nebraska. It has just attained kindergarten age, but its activities and accomplishments have been many. They exhibit evidence of gradual improvement and elevated standards, and have reached a high standard of excellence. The members may with becoming modesty be justly proud of its progress and its accomplishments.

The major objective of this association should and must be the improvement of the administration of justice; anything else is minor. The character of justice, enjoyed or suffered as the case may be, depends in a large degree upon the character, industry, confidence, and conscience of the members of the bar.

The court, the bar, and the judicial council of this State have under consideration the subject of simplification of procedure as a means of improvement of the administration of justice. There are those who have questioned whether now is a proper time to consider or adopt changes in the rules of practice or procedure. All agree that the fundamentals of the system must be preserved. One of the ways to contribute to the preservation of these, it is believed, is by the improvement and simplification of that system, and the elimination of the causes of or opportunity for unnecessary delays and inefficiency. The system should be, it is believed, as a guaranty of its continuance, brought into harmony with the tempo of modern life, and strengthened to withstand the stress and exactions of the forces which will come into operation when the full effect of the dislocations of the present crisis are experienced. Many instances of the past convince that it has not been in times of peace, ease, and plenty, when people are satisfied with things and conditions as they are, but in periods of stress and crisis, when thought of fundamentals are imperative, that forward steps in law and government have been taken.

The immediate task is to win the war. Failure to win means the loss of that most precious thing we call our way of life. This is a task for all, and while it is being done our civilian and military organizations and facilities must be made to function with the utmost efficiency. The ones who remain at home have the important and necessary duty of preserving inviolate the American fundamentals, the liberties, rights, and privileges for which men have fought and died, and for the continuance of which many of our young associates are offering their bodies as bulwarks for our liberties and homes.

When the glorious day of peace comes, as it will, and American institutions are subjected to unprecedented test, as they will be, if our democracy is to survive in the contest with foreign ideologies and systems, it must be able to demonstrate its efficiency. In those days, probably nowhere will efficiency be more important than in the administration of justice.

The bar in a world at war, the courts, and the people as well, are confronted with and affected by the problems resulting from the trend toward and the tremendously increasing number of boards, agencies, and commissions, and the ever-widening of the authority and powers assumed and exercised by them. Governmental agencies, boards, and administrative bodies endowed with, or which have assumed, quasi-judicial powers have come in conflict with judicial processes, and have provoked much opposition, dissatisfaction, and discussion. The support for these has been the belief that the bar has employed dilatory tactics, created, tolerated, and resorted to technicalities, and that the procedure in the courts is slow, too expensive, too cumbersome, and that the results are too uncertain. These charges have been supported by some instances and experiences. The legal profession has lost confidence and has been ousted from some of its former activities. It is claimed that this has been due to procedure which is too much bound to the formalities of the past and has not adjusted itself to the speedier tempo of the present progress. Much of the proper business of the courts has been lost to administrative boards and agencies. It may be conceded that these have on occasion given speedier decisions; but that they have been of a better quality of justice no one can honestly claim. To

suggest that such an organization can be accuser, prosecutor, and judge, and arrive at a just verdict, is contrary to human nature and experience. Many of the decisions verify this conclusion.

The conception that these should be administrative in character, created and limited by definite provisions of duly enacted law, has long since been abandoned; they are now quasi-judicial bodies; the origin of some is not enacted law, but executive order; they sometimes make orders based on the contents of executive order, with small consideration or regard for the Constitution or acts of Congress. Their rulings are frequently free from any real or effective review by the courts.

A recent ruling of the War Labor Board reads:

"After careful consideration of all the matters presented to the National War Labor Board at and in conjunction with the public hearing * * * the Board finds it has no power under executive order * * * to issue any directive order or regulation in these disputes governing the conduct of the State or municipal agency involved."

The subject then for decision was the right of the Board to intervene in disputes between local governments and their employees. In its ruling there is no reference to Constitution or law, but only to the Executive order which was silent on this particular subject. Presumably if the Executive order had said something a little different, the Board could have reached an opposite conclusion and put the affairs of a community, such as Omaha, at the mercy or whims of the War Labor Board. The fact that this ruling was based solely on Executive order is neither novel nor exceptional.

It is important to note that the ordinary procedure was applied in this case, not to the Steel Trust or a large mail order house, but, to the taxpayers and people of the metropolitan city, which, under the Constitution and the law are entitled to the privileges and rights of local self-government. Its rights, however, in this instance, were not resolved by what is written in the laws and constitution—these did not have either notice or mention—but by the terms of an Executive order, as interpreted by the Board, which few, if any, of the people in the municipality affected had seen or even heard about. Such judgments are not subject to any effective review by any court.

Here is occasion for serious thought. This trend fairly presents the issue, whether the American people shall be governed by the laws made by their duly elected representatives, construed and enforced by independent courts, or by appointed bureaucrats who interpret and decide almost as they please.

The American people in normal times want their controversies heard and their rights adjudicated by the courts, and not by boards and commissions. They have confidence in the procedure and ceremonies of the courtroom.

It is a tradition of our people that they have faith and pride in, and respect for the courts. Elevated and in a measure isolated as judges are, the American people nevertheless feel that the courts are their own, and their refuge and their protection.

There are many people not directly connected with any work of the court, who have never seen and may never see an American court in operation. They do not precisely know its jurisdiction or comprehend its procedure. The principles which control its proceedings or determine its deliberations and conclusions are unknown to them, but they continue with a satisfying assurance, under the roof and in the ownership their efforts and labors have raised and accumulated, and they enjoy and have confidence in their freedom and rights, because they know that there is an established area where oppression and lawlessness may not enter and stay, that they cannot be dispossessed, injured, or destroyed except after a fair hearing by their peers, guided by the law, and crystallized into a lawful judgment of a court, proceeding from a just consideration of the facts, and controlled by the principles of law of universal application and not by the caprice of any one man or small group of men. They have faith that if all other redress fails, there is for them, as a last resort, a remedy provided in some manner not clearly understood or discerned by them by the provisions of the constitution. It is not infrequent that the layman who believes that he has been wronged asserts that he will go to the Supreme Court, if necessary, for his final relief. It is imperative for our democracy, freedom, and domestic tranquillity, that this confidence and pride in, and respect for the courts shall not be lessened, much less destroyed. True it is that this devotion is often incorrectly conceived and sometimes childlike in its simplicity, but it is noble in its origin and indispensable in its perpetuity. The faith of the common man that American, even-handed justice under law, is available without discrimination for all, should never be penetrated by even the faintest suggestion that this belief is in any degree unfounded or untrue, either in theory or experience.

A devoted and consecrated people will strive and fight for the institutions of democracy as long and as long only as they are convinced of their efficiency for freedom, justice, and the advancement of the common good. This means that justice must come from the courts; the experience of a litigant in that institution must be fairly satisfactory. The litigant must be heard patiently, openly, intelligently, and without bias or prejudice, and the decision must be fair and prompt. No group or theory or doctrine may inherently have an advantage. These things can only be expected as a result of earnest untiring effort for improvement in the methods of administration of justice in the courts and in whatever administrative agencies are inevitable, but under strict rules for their control and operation, and for full review of their rulings by the courts. This is the special task of lawyers

Another opportunity and responsibility of the bar in a world at war is in the field of proposed legislation, local and Federal. Many such proposals may be expected. The exact purpose and effect, and the manner of accomplishing the objects sought of all such projected legislation should be, by the bar, studied and scrutinized with impartiality, but with great care. One instance will suffice to emphasize the importance of this—the recent proposal described as:

"An executive statutory suspension law, empowering the Governor to suspend or modify the enforcement of any State law that interferes with the war effort."

The authority to the Governor of a State proposed to be bestowed by this would be, as said by the late Judge Cardozo: "Unconfined and vagrant." A grant to the executive of a "roving commission to inquire into evils and then upon discovering them, do anything he pleases," and "this is delegation running riot" (295 U. S. 552). The passage of such a law, either with a good Governor or a bad Governor would be a deplorable, stupid blunder. It would disregard and outrage constitutional requirements and prohibitions. The mere fact that such legislation is proposed indicates how far we have drifted from the traditional course, and is a challenge to the bar to be ever on the alert.

The bar in a world at war must recognize today that there are two schools of thought contesting for support—the one, that the State is the master and the individual has no rights the State must respect; the other, that the individual is the master and may direct the State, and that he has rights the State may not interfere with or deny. There are in this country numerous and powerful sincere, and intelligent supporters of the former. Those who speak of a "new order" are opposed to democracy as we have known it, and believe that life has become so involved and intricate that people can no longer govern themselves as they have heretofore done in this Republic, but must be governed by experts, who not only advise them what they ought to do, but also what they must do. It is from this that bureaucracy in government develops. There have always been some who have believed in a strong executive leadership, a strong central government, and the subjection to it of both the Congress and the States.

If we believe in a system of checks and balances, a separation of the powers of Government as expressed in the Constitution, and if we expect this to prevail after the war, we must be alert to and oppose the recent trends.

The delegation by Congress of some of its powers to be exercised by the executive, or by appointed bureaus in the manner and within the restrictions prescribed by Congress, as expressed in the acts of the legislative branch of government, has been practiced for so long that it has become a tradition. But in the last decade this practice has been indulged so frequently, and the powers exercised under such delegation have been so enormously enlarged, until it is no exaggeration to say that Congress is in danger of largely forfeiting its authority to the bureaucrats. The result of this would be that the laws would be made by appointees, in disregard of constitutional provisions, and there would be a virtual merger of the legislative and executive powers which the Constitution carefully and positively separates.

If any believe this is a groundless fear or an unsupported statement, let them consider the facts.

In the period between January 7, 1941, and April 12, 1942, the President issued 500 Executive orders. Nearly 12 months of that 15-month period was in time of peace. Congress had nothing to do with the contents of these. They were written in private by experts selected by the Executive, without hearings, debate, publicity, or opportunity for amendment. They were not known to the public until they were in force. Some of these were frankly intended and recommended to change the world, and others to alter the industrial and economic institutions.

Because of these orders, thousands of rules, orders, and regulations having the force of law, affecting the lives of millions of people, have been issued and promulgated by the bureaus acting under the Executive orders. The Federal Register of December 5, 1942, contains more than 66 executive "laws" which Congress never saw before they were put into effect, consisting in the aggregate of more than 50,000 words, and issued by only 16 of the more than 110 departments, boards, bureaus, and agencies authorized to issue regulations.

And this, as bad as it is, is not all. There is a more recent manifestation of a dangerous extension of the power of the Executive, and this is the claimed and exercised right by interpretation to expand the powers and authority granted by Congress beyond that intended or reasonably expressed in the act making the delegation. The direct result of this is: The executive branch of the Government has been doing a large part of the lawmaking, and the danger is that the delegation of such power so broadly interpreted and so liberally exercised may easily develop into a permanent bureaucracy.

This also merits the serious thought of the bar.

It is the privilege and duty of the bar in a world at war to be at all times vigilant to the end that fundamental rights are not unnecessarily flaunted or disregarded as the result of war hysteria or at all. There are some who pretend to believe that those, or some of those, who were opposed before the assault on Pearl Harbor to the participation

in the war and those who offer any criticism or disagree in any manner without regard to how impossible or fantastic any proposal or course may be are not patriotic citizens; they are under suspicion of being appeasers, compromisers, and even enemy sympathizers. The advocates of this position are literally trying to ostracize those who, before that terrible event, opposed the entry of the United States into the war. The obvious fact is that millions—more than a majority—of patriotic, sincere Americans held this view, and they are now giving unreserved support to their country's cause—some at the front and some at home. This is to set up an artificial, unrealistic standard and to engender and extend discord.

There is no basis for denial of fair criticism or honest disagreement. It is of the very essence of our civil liberties, and is a vital principle which makes democracy worth preserving. It is the height of arrogance to assume, even in time of war, that everyone can or should be made to think alike, and it is stupid to advance the doctrine that it would be a good thing for national security if they did. Public officials are the servants of the people, and they should be just that. Sometimes they are surprisingly competent, and sometimes they are astonishingly incompetent and cruelly arbitrary. Prohibition of public criticism may protect incompetence at great cost. The administration of the program for victory must be efficient and thorough. This task demands the services of our most able men, without reference to party, race, or creed—men who are experienced, just, and courageous. The administration of laws and regulations in a manner which merits and commands respect will vastly increase and sustain the range of loyal cooperation.

The challenge of the war is to every individual and every organization. Some it inspires and others it depresses. There is no half-way house of refuge. The new responsibilities make opportunities. If the bar acts unitedly with courage, sustained and intelligent effort, it may attain a leadership comparable to any heretofore achieved. If it hesitates or refuses, it may descend to a depth from which it may not easily emerge.

The bar has a grave responsibility and an unusual opportunity to assist in molding and directing a sound public opinion. It has often and recently been demonstrated that in a democracy public opinion is the only absolute power. At last legislatures, executives, and even courts—some freely, others belatedly and most reluctantly—conform to the demands and commands of public opinion. The opportunity for and importance of a sound public opinion has seldom been so great. It will crystallize and assert itself with almost miraculous alacrity if aroused and guided by competent leadership.

A safeguard against undesirable "must" legislation, autocrats, czars, and unfortunate laws induced by minority and pressure groups, and decisions resulting more from expediency than from conviction, is an aroused, properly directed, sound public opinion. Tremendously important decisions must be arrived at during and after this war. A misguided, aroused public feeling could result in acts of disaster. There are, it is true, many desirable voices operating now to prevent this, and to mobilize and properly direct public opinion, such as the great free press, the fearless commentators, and the leading publicists.

The bar is especially well qualified for this leadership. It is a public agency of justice and freedom. Every active lawyer is a student of history, of human nature, and practical affairs. He knows that the American way of life and plan of human action are better than any other in the world; that lawyers have a special capacity and skill to mediate differences, to get things done, and to act in concert for the orderly and timely discharge of their high public duty. The bar is realistic. The meeting and solving of difficult problems is frequent in its experience and work. It has constant practice in the methods of persuasion; its contacts are numerous and personal in every section, and can be made centers from which to radiate information and proper influence through the Nation; it depends not upon suffrage; it need not fear political purges or retaliation; it can speak bluntly, boldly, and courageously.

But the bar with these advantages cannot render maximum service or obtain the best results without special study of and preparation for solution of the problems and issues that are present and will develop. Some appear to have a new aspect, but are really old and only thinly disguised. Others are novel and so intricately involved that they seem hardly capable of solution by much study and the best analysis and sound reasoning. But they must all be solved, and ultimately by the judgment of the people. It is for this task that the public are entitled to and should have the reasoned and informed sustained judgment and leadership of the bar.

The bar, to be effective in leadership of public opinion, must first convince the public of its disinterestedness. What the people generally do not understand is that in a free country the organized bar is the public's lawyer. It is not enough for a lawyer to understand and be able to explain the important problems and questions to the man on the street, and suggest a proper and desirable policy or solution. He must be a disinterested leader and advocate.

An independent, unified bar is a servant of democracy, and in rendering its service it has two functions—one to represent the cause of his client loyally and fearlessly; the other is in public affairs where he speaks for himself only, regardless of class interest and clients past, present, or potential. Many of the bar have been so engrossed in the first that regard for the other has been, to a considerable degree, lost. The bar has permitted the people to almost forget that this second function of the lawyers exists.

It was not always so. The Federal Constitution was largely written and its adoption secured by lawyers. The present confronts the bar with an opportunity and obligation no less than theirs, and calls for a devotion no less complete.

A unified bar may prove to be a greater national asset than is usually thought. Little by little we are surrendering our freedoms and independent rights and privileges in the hope and belief that by so doing a few may be enabled to plan and act the better for all of us. No one should or does object if this is temporary. The bar should be alert, however, to the fact that a short-term grant of power is easily converted into a grant with a much more remote maturity. In the course of human experience those who have parted with power and rights have often been unable to recover them, or have become unfit to resume them. Those to whom the temporary surrender has been made have sometimes easily paralleled public interest with their own desire to retain the power and rights surrendered and to appropriate new and enlarged authority. There is something of a challenge in the thought that a unified, active, devoted bar may help to save America, after the Army and the Navy shall have successfully defended America.

The organized bar has put at the service of the public during the war its whole capacity and facilities for freedom and justice; for the assistance and comfort of the men in the service and their families; in every way possible for the protection and continuance of those institutions which have come from the bravery, devotion, and wisdom of the past into the keeping of the present, and which are now held in sacred trusteeship for posterity.

The challenge of the present conflict is, on the one hand, to the strength of the United States, and on the other hand, to our way of life. We are united upon and pledged to the two objectives: to win the war and to preserve the democratic way of life. If we win the victory and lose our freedom, the fight will have been in vain. Defeatists have asserted that a democracy cannot win a war and still stay free. We must accept that challenge. We must prove that this Nation can pass through the flames of war and emerge therefrom both victorious and free.

One of the most significant and important tests of any form of government is whether it is able to endure as well as adjust itself to some great national crisis. The Government of the United States, founded by the Constitution more than 150 years ago, has stood the strain of several foreign wars, one bitter civil struggle, and numerous severe economic depressions. Democracy never collapses. It disappears because of neglect.

A large number of our associates, fellow members of our association—about 15 percent of our total active membership—have now laid down the duties of the profession and have taken up the obligations and implements of war, and more are being added daily to their number. They are now engaged in a variety of fields, in locations near and far, some domestic and some foreign. They are in Iceland, Ireland, the Aleutians, the Solomons, Australia, China, Russia, Panama, Egypt, Africa, and the South Sea islands. They are in the air, on the water, under the water, in the jungle, and in the desert, and whenever and wherever they are found, they are in the thickest of the battle. Their vocabulary has been contracted for the duration, and in it are no such words as appeasement or negotiated peace. Their idea of a negotiated peace is where they alone would do the negotiating. They have no faith in the word of a gangster or the pledge of a snake, and especially after he has bitten without warning and while pretending friendship. Their demand and objective is unconditional surrender, and they are proving by their bravery and accomplishments that they can win just that.

When the call of war sounded, these lawyers laid aside their lawbooks and left their practice and homes for battle with the enemy. We at home can never know the sacrifice they make. We can never know what it means to wait and fight against uneven forces for the aid and help that never came. We honor them for their courage and devotion that liberty, justice, and civilization may not perish.

In total war all are soldiers. Each has his assignment, and no opportunities to strike the enemy should ever be overlooked. The American people have always arisen to the occasion, and they will now. Let us firmly resolve to do our part so that when victory is won and these men return to Nebraska, they will be as satisfied with our efforts as we will be proud of their successes.

First New Home Paid for From Agricultural Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD 2d

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address

delivered by me on December 18, 1942, at Athens, Ala., on the occasion of the delivery to Curtis C. Haraway of the note and mortgage executed by him to secure the purchase price for a farm under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, this purchaser being the first tenant to pay in full for his new home from agricultural commodities produced on the farm.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This splendid meeting has unusual historic significance. The fact that so many people are here to participate in these proceedings fully demonstrates the importance as well as the value of the splendid accomplishments of Curtis Haraway and his helpful wife. This celebration commemorates the completion of the purchase and payment in full by Mr. Haraway of his farm home, under the auspices of the Farm Security Administration.

It is appropriate at this time to briefly review the record of the passage and the administration of the act under which it was made possible for the Haraways to accomplish their life's ambition.

In 1935 I introduced a bill in the Senate to provide a program for stopping the trend toward farm tenancy and to encourage and aid farm workers to become the owners of farms. That was the first bill that had ever been introduced in the Senate on that subject. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry conducted protracted hearings on my bill and gave it careful and intensive study. The committee made a favorable report on the bill, and a short time thereafter it was made the unfinished business of the Senate. After a long-drawn-out debate, the bill was passed practically as reported by the Senate committee. The bill was handled in the House by Congressman Marvin Jones, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. That committee held hearings on it, but did not agree upon the terms of the bill. It was not reported to the House before the end of that session of Congress.

In 1937 I introduced practically the same bill. It was not reported to the House before fully considered by the committee and by the Senate. On account of President Roosevelt's opposition to the amount of money authorized to be appropriated and to the bond issue authorized, it became necessary to reach an agreement with him on those subjects. He finally agreed to approve a bill which authorized an appropriation of $10,000,000 the first year, $25,000,000 the second year, and $50,000,000 annually thereafter. The Senate passed that bill. The House also passed it, and it became a law. It is the only law that Congress has ever passed which provided in the law that it should be known by the name of its author or authors. It is therefore called the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

This law has not been popular with a majority of the Members of Congress who reside in the large cities of the North and East. Most of them know nothing about farming or the farm-tenant problem. As a result of that situation, friends of this law have had a most difficult job each year to secure an appropriation to continue the work as authorized by the law. After having an appropriation of $50,000,000 for the last fiscal year, it became necessary for this fiscal year, on the insistence of the House, to reduce the appropriation from $50,000,000 to $37,500,000. These facts are stated so that the public may know that it is necessary for the supporters of this program to be constantly on the alert when the time comes each year to make appropriations for the operation of the various agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

The law is being administered by the Farm Security Administration. That agency has two different and distinct farm programs under its jurisdiction. In addition to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, it also administers the rehabilitation program. These two programs are intended for different types of farmers. The rehabilitation group is composed of farmers who cannot secure credit elsewhere for farm operations and for whom farms are not purchased. The rehabilitation farmers operate under leases and when their leases expire or when they fail to meet the requirements of the Government involved in the farm operation they have no further interest in the farm. It is hoped that that type of experience under strict supervision of the Farm Security supervisors and home demonstration agents will prepare that low-income group for a step-up to the group eligible for loans to acquire homesteads under the Bankhead-Jones Act. It is of interest to note that the farm-tenant group who have acquired their own homes have the benefit of supervision and guidance by the Farm Security supervisors and such helpful service as the Extension Service may be able to render them.

About one-half of the farmers in this country are tenants. The evidence before our committee showed that 1 out of 3 tenants changes farms every year. It is difficult to build a community or a country or an area where so large a percentage of its people move out every year and their places are taken by new people who follow the same practice. Of course, all tenants do not move that frequently, but, taking the country as a whole, tenants move entirely too often for their own good, as well as for the good of the community. Whether they move voluntarily or for other reasons, the results are the same.

There are many tenants who have been obliged to farm on submarginal lands. Many of these tenants would become prosperous farm owners with a bright future if they could be relocated on better land and could be given a good start toward home ownership, but, as conditions now stand, as a rule, they can only eke out a living on land that is too poor for profitable cultivation. Some of you know that 60 years ago Denmark had a farm problem similar to the one we are passing through in this country. Denmark solved her problem by doing something similar to the thing that the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act provides for in part. The Denmark system has operated successfully for more than 50 years. Until recently invaded by the Germans, Denmark was one of the finest agricultural countries in the world. Her farmers practically controlled the country on a cooperative basis. We would be fortunate if we could work out a farming system in this country for many landless farmers that would help us as much as the Danish system has helped Denmark.

Some 50 years ago in Ireland nearly all the farms were owned by landlords. Now practically all the farms are operated directly by their own owners. Finland is an outstanding example of a country composed almost entirely of small land-owning farmers. During the late short war between Finland and Russia the people of Finland startled the world and gained the admiration of people everywhere for their courage and patriotism in resisting so brilliantly and effectively the great hordes of Russians who invaded Finland. It is characteristic of landowners that they will fight to the last for the preservation of their country and for the defense of their families and their homes.

A tenant working for an absentee landlord or some mortgage company or some bank which had acquired the property under foreclosure has no incentive to protect the soil to prevent soil erosion or to work in the interest of soil preservation and conservation. Such tenants have no sufficient incentive to keep their buildings in good condition and to erect new ones. A large part of all of the benefits which have come to the prosperous farmers have been through accretions from their building up their farms year by year, thereby giving them more value as a result of soil conservation and the improvements upon them, and building up larger herds of stock and cattle in the natural order of things by accretion. A tenant cannot do that. He does not know this year what farm he will occupy next year. As a result, there is great economic waste.

Then think of the social problems involved in the case of a man with a family who recognizes that in a few years under the average conditions they must go on to some other community. His wife cannot take the same interest in church and social organizations. When the children move, they get out of touch with their schoolmates. It means a general break-up of the social order, with no stability on the part of the tenant and his family.

In the early days of our Government our forefathers recognized the value of farm ownership. With our Government owning all the public land in the country Congress passed the homestead law and other laws making it easy for farmers to establish homes of their own upon the soil. Unfortunately, proper protection was not afforded in the laws for the preservation of such home ownership and as a result of speculation, of fluctuation in prices, and for other reasons many of those homes went into the hands of others and are now worked by sharecroppers and tenants.

We need more individual home ownership. We have 6,500,000 farmers in the United States, with nearly half of them drifting from farm to farm without stability of residence. Wherever suitable land may be properly acquired by the consent of land owners, we need to establish these roving men and women in homes of their own—Mine! Mine!—so they will feel that way about it. That is my philosophy about this program. I have often looked upon it, as I have expressed to friends, as a program in favor of the underdog in agriculture.

Only farm tenants, farm laborers, sharecroppers, and other individuals who recently obtained the major portion of their income from farming operations are eligible to participate under the Farm Tenant Act. It is required that preference be given to persons who are married or have dependent families, or wherever practical, persons who are able to make an initial down payment or who are owners of livestock and farm implements necessary to successfully carry on farming operations. It is provided that no loan shall be made for the acquisition of any farm unless it is of such size as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be sufficient to constitute an efficient farm-management unit and to enable a diligent farm family to carry on successfully farming of a type which the Secretary deems can be successfully carried on in the locality in which the farm is situated.

The Secretary is directed to appoint in every county a county committee composed of three farmers residing in the county. The committeemen are paid at the rate of $3 per day while engaged in the performance of their duties, but such compensation shall not be allowed with respect to more than 5 days in a month. In addition, they are allowed such amounts as the Secretary may prescribe for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses. The committee is required to meet on the call of the county agent.

Applications for the purchase of farms must be filed with the county agent. The county committee is required to examine applications of persons desiring to acquire farms by means of a loan under the act. The committee is also required to examine and appraise farms in the county in respect to which an application for a loan is made. If

the committee finds that an applicant is eligible to receive the benefits of a loan and that by reason of his character, ability, and experience he is likely successfully to carry out undertakings required of him under the loan, and that the farm with respect to which the application is made is of such character that there is reasonable likelihood that the making of a loan with respect thereto will carry out the purposes of the act, the committee shall so certify these findings to the Secretary. The committee shall also certify to the Secretary the amount which the committee finds is the reasonable value of the farm.

It is further provided that no certification shall be made with respect to any farm in which any member of the committee or any person related to such member within the third degree of consanguinity or affinity, has any property interest, direct or indirect, or in which they or either of them have had such interest within 1 year prior to the date of the certification. No loan can be made to any person or with respect to any farm unless the certification required by the act has been made with respect to such person and such farm by the committee.

Loans shall be made in such manner (not in excess of the amount certified by the committee to be the value of the farm) as may be necessary to enable the borrower to acquire the farm and for necessary repairs and improvements thereon, and shall be secured by a first mortgage or deed of trust on the farm. The instruments under which the loan is made and security given therefor shall, among other things, provide:

1. For the repayment of the loan within an agreed period of not more than 40 years from the making of the loan.

2. For the payment of interest on the unpaid balance of the loan at the rate of 3 percent per annum.

3. For the repayment of the unpaid balance of the loan, together with interest thereon, in installments in accordance with amortization schedules prescribed by the Secretary.

4. The borrower shall pay taxes and assessments on the farm to the proper taxing authorities and insure and pay for insurance on farm buildings.

5. Upon the borrower's assigning, selling, or otherwise transferring the farm, or any interest therein, without the consent of the Secretary, or upon default in the performance of or upon any failure to comply with, any covenant of condition contained in such instruments, or upon voluntary transfer or sale, the Secretary may declare the amount unpaid immediately due and payable, and that, without the consent of the Secretary, no final payment shall be accepted or release of the Secretary's interest be made, less than 5 years after the making of the loan.

It is further provided that the Secretary may provide for the payment of the debt under a system of variable payments, under which a surplus above the required payment will be collected in periods of above-normal production or prices, and employed to reduce payments below the required payments in periods of subnormal production or prices. This is the first authorization I know of anywhere in the laws of this country which permits the borrower, without the consent of the payee, to use his surplus in fat years in anticipation of shortage of funds in lean years.

It is well to point out also that this act for the first time in American history fixes a legal rate of interest on improved farm lands at 3 percent per annum. There is no better security than improved farm lands when properly cared for and prudently operated. The rate of interest established by this act resulted in the passage of a bill by Congress reducing the rate of interest on Federal land-bank mortgages from more than 5 percent to 3½ percent and on Land Bank Commissioner mortgages from around 6 percent to 4 percent. Subsequently the Federal Housing Administration was created for the purpose of insuring mortgages given to secure loans for the construction and repair of residences in the towns and cities of the country. The rate of interest was originally 4½ percent but was subsequently reduced to 4 percent. That legislation brought about a reduction in the rate of interest by the big mortgage and loan companies including the building and loan companies throughout the country, to around the same rate of interest. The result is that the rate of interest on both urban and rural homes has now reached a reasonably low rate, following the example and precedent set on the subject of the rate of interest by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

The Secretary of Agriculture is directed by the law to give due consideration to the desirability of avoiding the expansion of production for market of basic commodities and shall assist beneficiaries of the program to become established upon lands now in cultivation. There are millions of acres of farm land which belong to absentee owners and which are cultivated by tenants. The law contemplates enabling farm-tenant purchasers, by having a low rate of interest and a long period within which to pay the principal in small installments, to acquire a home with annual payments equal to the rents heretofore paid on an average for property similar to that acquired for tenant homes.

Under the Farm Tenant Act there are now 28,945 farms secured by mortgages and occupied by farmers and their families. The loans on these farms aggregate $117,041,378 through June 1941. Figures for 1942 are not yet available. It is remarkable that on the first day of January 1942 the purchasers of these farms had paid 99 percent of all installment payments that had fallen due, and in addition had paid $925,311 on installments that are not yet due. In Alabama a better record was made where 1,922 purchasers were due to make payments in 1942. The total amount of money investing in the tenant-purchase loans upon which payments were due in 1942 is $10,141,274.30. The maturities through 1942 amounted to $853,753.02. The amount paid was $933,041.47. The percent paid is 109.2. The number with delinquent accounts is 10. Total amount of delinquent accounts, $1,198.64. Percent of delinquency, one-fifth of 1 percent. No finer testimonial could be presented of the value of the Farm Tenant Act in the matter of enabling worthy farmers to acquire farms of their own, and no finer record could be made of the splendid administration of this law and of the worthiness and dependable character of the purchasers of farm homes under that act.

The total amount appropriated for the purchase of farm-tenant homes, including 1942, is $175,000,000. Under the act establishing the Federal Housing Administration, the Government has insured mortgages given to secure loans for constructing 693,542 new homes in towns and cities amounting to $3,000,000,000. This shows that very little has been done by the Government for the acquisition of farm homes in comparison with what has been done for the acquisition of town and city homes.

At this point permit me to read a statement made by Dr. George Foster Peabody when my bill was pending in the Senate. Dr. Peabody was one of the great educators and philanthropists of the country. He gave 50 years of his life and a large fortune to the promotion of the cause of education. He was old and full of experience and wisdom when he made this statement:

"I have no doubt but what this new tenant bill if passed and properly administered will help to remake many of our agricultural sections. What we need in America is more home owners and fewer tenants. Change a tenant to a home owner and you plant the seed of stability and permanency. You lift the social, economic, and moral standards of the community. You change indifference to interest and shiftlessness to thrift. In short, you remake both the individual and the community. That is undoubtedly the reason the churches are supporting the measure. They see in it a program of more homes instead of merely places to stop awhile. And the home is the backbone of our civilization. It is what the churches and the schools build on, and it is these things that have made America what it is today."

One of the most touching and emotion-stirring incidents that has happened to me is a letter which came to me at Christmas 1938 from the Pike County Tenant Purchase Committee. It is as follows:

"DEAR SENATOR BANKHEAD: At this season when the minds of men turn for a day from the dross and drab to the things that moths and rust cannot corrupt, we of this office think it fit to send you an earnest expression of our appreciation of your worth to your fellows. You hear something of that brain child of yours, the Tenant Purchase Act, but that is colored with pomp and hurrah. These lines come from unheralded coworkers that deal with cases down at the grass roots in the huskings.

"We wish that you could see the enthusiasm, the childish glee of our tenant-purchase clients, after hope has been planted in their breasts by the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Purchase Act. Watching these clients brings up these lines: 'Give a man secure possession of a rock and he will make a garden of it.' The few enemies of the farm program say of the Tenant Purchase Act that 'You have got something there.' This Tenant Purchase Act extends stability and integrity to these 'men with the hoe.'

"We feel that after a while, when you shall look across the years, and when the events of an eventful life shall pass in review, this Tenant Purchase Act of yours will be carrying the banner. Greater service is rarely given to flesh and blood.

"May you have many returns of this day and many years of service to your fellows.

"Sincerely yours,

"PIKE COUNTY TENANT
PURCHASE COMMITTEE."

It gives me genuine delight to have the privilege of delivering to Curtis Haraway the note and mortgage on his farm home which was executed by him at the time he borrowed the money to buy it. I doubt if Mr. Haraway fully realizes how valiantly he has wrought in making possible this occasion. He has led the way of approximately 30,000 farm-tenant purchasers in the matter of completing repayment of their loans from the proceeds of production on the farm. He has demonstrated to his fellow farm-tenant purchasers that the acquisition of a farm home, free of debt and incumbrance, is possible to the family that is willing to work hard enough to that end. He has shown all purchasers of farm homes that the ability to pay for such homes is an actual reality. He has demonstrated to all worthy farmers, including tenants and sharecroppers, that the way lies ahead of them to stop roving over the country and to plant the taproot of family life deeply and firmly into the soil. I sincerely congratulate Mr. and Mrs. Haraway upon the notable success that we are here now to celebrate. I am sure that they are happy today. I can assure them that I participate in their feeling of joy and satisfaction. I believe that the evidence of the success that we are witnessing today will be a beacon light to show countless thousands of home-seeking and home-craving farm workers the way to the accomplishment of their heart's desire.

Mr. Haraway, I take very great pleasure in delivering to you the note and mortgage, paid in full.

Post-War Development of Water Power—Address of Gov. Sidney P. Osborn, of Arizona

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, some Members are contending that the greatest development after this war will be in aviation. But in my opinion, the greatest development will be that of the Nation's water power, and in the use of electric power, and the employment of electrical appliances.

Boulder Dam, one of the greatest projects of our time, is supposed to supply a certain amount of power to the people of Arizona. If the people of Arizona were permitted to use that power as the people of Mississippi and surrounding States are permitted to use the power generated on the Tennessee River, as Governor Osborn, of that State, has pointed out in his recent message, which I am inserting, it would save them about 50 percent on their light and power bills.

If we had developed all the water power of this Nation that is now going to waste, and had made it available to all the American people at reasonable rates, they would today be saving more than a billion dollars a year on their present light and power bills alone, and they would not be suffering from cold as they are in some sections of the country at the present time.

Electric heat is the finest, cleanest, most wholesome heat in the world, next to heat from the summer sun. The time will come when practically every home in America will be heated by electricity.

The dam I referred to earlier in the day, that is being built in Quebec now, to a large extent with American funds, will produce as much power as the St. Lawrence project would produce. It will produce as much power as Boulder Dam, or one-half as much as all the domestic consumers in America used in 1939. If the American people would take the same attitude that the people of Ontario have taken, and develop all the water power of this Nation and supply it to the American people at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution, and to every farm home in America at those rates, as they do in Ontario, it would make America a better, a brighter, and a richer place in which to live.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am inserting the very able address of Gov. Sidney P. Osborn, of Arizona, to the Legislature of that State on January 26, 1943:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and members of the sixteenth legislature, in my convening message to this body I declared my intention to submit within a few days a proposal for the enactment of a State power and water authority act.

Never has any Governor addressed the legislature of this or any other State upon an issue more clearly drawn, more vitally significant, or more pertinent to the interests of every person who now lives or ever will live within our borders. That subsequent events will confirm this judgment there can be no doubt.

Stated bluntly, the issue is this: Shall the rights of Arizona to the Colorado River continue to be denied her by the connivance of out-of-State commercial and financial interests, or will you, individually and as a group, accept the challenge and free the benefits of this, our greatest natural resource, to the people of our State?

I recognize that to many people the Colorado River is synonymous with playing politics, that the mere mention of it suggests only another period in the game of political football. Such an erroneous evaluation is the result of a systematic propaganda campaign carried on relentlessly by a selfish minority who have thus deliberately confused the issue.

For it is an age-old strategy of those with selfish ends to be served, that if they cannot find flaws in an argument or cannot attack a principle, they can always put the issue on personal and political grounds, usually, as in the case of the Colorado River, with telling effect.

When vast concentrated wealth—and I am not reflecting against capital in general or competitive business in general—when vast concentrated wealth sets up an invisible government through pressure groups, then democratic government has been choked out at its roots. But is this "playing politics"? Certainly not. This is merely "good business practice." Yet, when the people, to whom this great resource belongs, attempt to set up an agency which will control, which will not be dictated to, and which will spread the benefits of this natural wealth among themselves, instead of to a handful of eastern stockholders, the cry of "playing politics" is always raised, and tragically for the common good, this oldest of wiles is still effective. Against the legislation proposed to you today, no one can honestly bring such a charge and no one will bring it except for purely selfish purposes.

The historical background of this proposed legislation is better known to some of you than to others. Because Arizona was a pioneer State without local capital to expand even the first small-scale power producing facilities, these, with few exceptions, passed into the hands of out-of-State holding companies. Rates were fixed on the basis of expensive out-of-State fuel shipped at a relatively high freight rate. This original high cost has remained, despite the Arizona Corporation Commission, as the yardstick of rates, while lowered costs through the introduction of natural gas and other cheaper fuels has widened the margin of profit to the point where Arizona today, notwithstanding her hydro-electric potentialities, has the third highest electric rate in the Nation. The reason Arizona does not rank highest is because of the fact that the other two States have no hydro-electric facilities and therefore must manufacture all their power.

Even on the floor of our National Congress has this exploitation of Arizona's citizenry brought us notoriety. Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi, as quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1941, said, in part:

"Of all the States in the Union (the one) in which the people are paying through the nose for their own electricity, (it) is the State of Arizona."

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 30, 1940, appear further information and data showing Arizona's rates about 30 percent in excess of California's, more than 50 percent over TVA's, 60 percent over Tacoma's, and about 70 percent over Ontario's.

Recognizing that some slight rate reductions have since been made, a few comparisons between prices in Arizona and neighboring States taken from the Federal Power Commission Typical Electric Bills, as of January 1, 1941, indicate the excessive prices Arizonans have been forced to pay:

For 25 kilowatt-hours, which he could buy in Glendale, Calif., for $1.13, and in Los Angeles for $1.10, a Phoenix citizen paid $1.54; for 250 kilowatt-hours costing in the same California cities $5.23 and $5.10, respectively, he paid $8.40.

On a bill demand of 12 kilowatts and 1,500 kilowatt-hours' use, costing in St. Louis, Mo., $49.93; in Racine, Wis., $46.38; in Seattle, Wash., $45; in Portland, Oreg., $43.50; and in Salt Lake City, Utah, $40.50, the Phoenix citizen paid $72.97.

It is not surprising that such a lucrative field for profit should have attracted more than a dozen foreign holding companies, whose unjustified debt structures, wasteful duplications, and inefficient and nonintegrated hodgepodge of facilities bleed the people of this State of about three-fourths of a million dollars every year.

Nor is it surprising that to protect this field, the out-of-State power interests should be willing to go to any ends to prevent the people of Arizona from understanding the situation.

Invisible government has ever been the chief foe of democracy. Nowhere are its manifestations more apparent than in the thus far unsuccessful efforts of Arizona to throw off the greedy hands which not only rob her now, but, of far more significance, strangle her future.

For it is a basic and indisputable economic fact, supported by the history of England's American Colonies, our own agricultural South, and all other historical evidence throughout the world, that any area whose wealth is based on the production of raw materials will, as industrialism proceeds elsewhere, find itself inevitably slipping to a relatively lower standard of living.

Such an area is Arizona, whose wealth consists almost exclusively of the products of her mines, forests, ranches, and fields. (Even our important tourist business depends on the sale of natural commodities—atmosphere, climate, and sunshine.) On such a basis, this State will face the prospect of being perpetually in the role of a colony, a colony of the industrialized States.

However, nature has made such a role conditional only on the shortsightedness and lack of courage of Arizona's citizenry.

For nature gave us a possible combination of factors exceeded by no other State, important not only during these critical days of war, but equally so in the crucial period of readjustment to follow. We have an inland location, much less vulnerable than the coast; large and increasing supplies of essential raw materials and produce; unlimited space; a highly desirable climate with equable temperatures; and—if we can but realize it and break the present bottleneck—a tremendous potential supply of cheap firm power in the Colorado River. Already under the pressure of war we are having a sample of what an industrial economy could mean for the entire State, no matter where in the State those industries are located. It would seem that clear thinking, hard-headed, practical citizens from every walk of life and every part of Arizona would long since have sensed this unique fortune that nature has given us and as a most natural move would have taken whatever steps were necessary to capitalize on it. Instead, a selfish minority has succeded in so confusing the issue that today, more than ever, those who would serve the interests of the people must first recognize the necessity of showing the people what their interests are.

In doing this they have been aided by Nature, which, it would almost seem, was shocked by the unresponsiveness of those to whom she was offering such bounteous gifts.

There is probably not a one of you who came through the period of serious drought of 1938, 1939, and 1940 without being affected, directly or indirectly. We have not forgotten the growing apprehension, the enforced liquidations, the increased assessment on irrigated lands, the abandoned citrus groves, the tremendous economic loss to the State which lack of water and power occasioned. In 1939 and 1940 a power shortage almost ruined the agricultural interests of central Arizona. Farmers were obliged to invest hundreds of thousands of dollars in various types of engines to provide irrigation power to save even a portion of their crops.

Do you care to envision what would certainly have overtaken this valley, and indirectly the entire State, had Nature seen fit to continue her warning for another year or two? You men in the highly important livestock business throughout the State: Would you vote to continue a situation wherein the range conditions of 1942, and thus far in 1943, and an agricultural drought like that of 1939 might coincide, leaving your industry with no hay, no pasture, no cottonseed cake, or other forage? That situation must never occur. But the threat may be repeated, may even now be in the making, and Nature, revolted by our continued indolence and indifference, may next time wipe out our entire State-wide economy and return us to the desert.

Remote as you may feel this proposal to be, it nevertheless is a possibility and thus serves as a strong deterrent to industry, which overwise sees in our location, climate, and resources, as promising a spot for both wartime and post-war expansion as is afforded anywhere in the Nation. Add to the drought prospect the fact of our having the third highest power rate in the Nation and it is not surprising that with a few exceptions industry locates elsewhere. While we temporize, other States are going boldly ahead, building dams, developing power, breaking monopolies, lowering rates, increasing their war output and readying themselves for the great technological advances of the post-war era, which, unless we are also aboard the train, will sweep past and leave us, perhaps for decades, a commonwealth of lost hopes and wasted opportunities.

The dream of freeing Arizona from her double handicap of insufficient water and excessive power rates has inspired numerous of her leaders since pioneer days. With the passage by Congress of the Boulder Canyon Project Act in 1928, the era of theorizing about the Colorado's riches ended. Whatever our previous opinions about the best place or the best plan for utilizing its water or the fairest basis for dividing its power, we now can only recognize that the decisions have been made, the dam has been constructed and is producing power, and our share, 17.63 percent of the present firm generating power, has been available for the past 6 years and waiting for us to claim and use. Seven hundred and sixty-three million kilowatt hours of power, at a price of 3½ mills, or less, delivered, of which we are still getting not 1 kilowatt.

To the end that we might have the benefit of this potential wealth, the twelfth regular session of the Arizona Legislature by joint resolution created the Boulder Dam Power Commission, which in January 1937 submitted a report showing the great need for electric power at reasonable prices throughout the State and proposing an Arizona Power and Water Authority for consideration by the legislature. This and other necessary legislation to make cheap power available was defeated by a small but powerful and selfish group, whose spurious arguments may be summarized as follows:

1. "Power could not be practically transmitted such a distance."

2. "Power could not be brought into the market areas as cheaply as power could be produced therein."

3. "Notwithstanding that several destructive shortages had occurred previously, there was and would remain a surplus of electric power in the State's market areas for more than 50 years."

How sincere these arguments were may be judged from the fact that even as they were being most strenuously presented to the legislature in 1937, and again in 1939, the objectors were themselves plotting to obtain a part of the Boulder power, which they would buy from the Government, which is the people, for less than 3 mills per kilowatt hour, and sell back to the people at their established exorbitant rates.

Right here let me emphasize that this exploitation is not the work of local men or organizations, but of eastern interests who dictate the rates and policies of most of Arizona's power-producing companies. For them any regulation is intolerable and they fight against it as a matter of general policy.

Shortly after their victory in defeating the people's legislation in the twelfth and later legislative sessions, there followed the drought referred to, and we bitterly realized that instead of a surplus of power for 50 years, we had a present acute shortage of power for pumping purposes.

Stung into action, the fourteenth State legislature, in 1939, approved Senate Memorial No. 4, summarizing the seriousness of the situation and urging the Federal Power Commission to institute an immediate and extensive investigation of the Arizona power situation.

This highly competent and impartial agency of our democratic government made the requested investigation, and its findings are the basis for the major conclusions of this address. The Commission's complete report, dated March of last year, is available for study and examination in the Governor's office, and copies of the introduction are transmitted herewith. The statements in the introduction will be found amply documented and sustained in the other portions of the survey.

Briefly, the report shows abundant market demand for Colorado River power, which it finds can be distributed at rates comparable to those of the Tennessee Valley Authority—from 3 to 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. It further finds that Arizona in common with other States dependent on an economy based on the production of raw materials has a below average per capita income which might be brought up to or carried above average by providing cheap motive power for the attraction of manufactures and utilization of its abundant supplies of raw materials.

It points out that notwithstanding the vast hydroelectric potentialities within very reasonable distance, Arizona has the third highest electric rate in the Union and states its belief that the population and income can be greatly developed by the taking of such steps as may be necessary to bridge the gap between the cheap power of the Colorado River and the abundant demand in market areas throughout the State. The report is too lengthy to be further touched upon herein, but note what the Federal Power Commission says to the people of Arizona:

"Arizona possesses an abundance of water power in the Colorado River and its tributaries, which can be developed at costs which will make possible low electric rates, with resulting expansion of use. Full utilization of these resources, with the accompanying benefits to the economic, family, and community life of the State, will depend upon recognition by the people of the necessity for that planning which alone can make such results possible, and for that initiative which will translate plans into action."

The inescapable first step which must be taken to translate plans into action is the enactment of the legislation required of us by Congress in the Boulder Canyon Project Act. Hence the first recommendation in the Federal Power Commission report is to that effect.

Obviously, legislation of this character cannot be hurriedly prepared, or prepared at all without extensive knowledge of the problems likely to be encountered in its application and administration. As presented to you, this measure represents the joint efforts of many interested parties and organizations, which have joined their experience and talents, so that it reflects the competent advice of engineers, rate experts, auditors, accountants, bankers, bond buyers, executives, members of previous legislatures, and other persons or groups who might be interested or affected by its provisions. The final draft was submitted to the Federal Power Commission, who, after careful examination and a number of conferences with counsel and engineers, approved it in a letter to me under date of March 20, 1942.

PURPOSE OF ACT

The purpose of the act is to enable citizens of Arizona to obtain power from the Colorado River at the lowest economic price by bridging the gap now existing between the idle power of the Boulder and other dams to be constructed and our market areas where electric power at a fair price is sorely needed. Furthermore, it fulfills the Boulder Dam Project Act as to the legal requirements respecting the establishment of a State agency for purchase and distribution of Boulder Dam power.

The United States Department of the Interior, through the Federal Reclamation Bureau, has been conducting surveys and studies for the purposes of determining the most practical and economical manner in which water may be brought from the Colorado River to our arable lands and the authority will be qualified to serve the water user with respect to irrigation water, in the same helpful manner as it will serve the public generally with respect to power. It will also act as a State contracting agency by which Arizona may participate in any program or advantages accruing from further developments on the Colorado River. With these agencies we must bargain for power and water which we are to obtain from that river. To effectually negotiate and carry out any bargain, the State must have a functional and administrative agency. Such a unit in State government we do not have. By enacting this proposed Power and Water Authority Act, we will create the necessary agency by which we may procure both water and power.

Having collaborated with the Federal Government in the making of surveys as to the most practical method of bringing power and water to our people, and having conferred, investigated and ascertained the wants and needs of the different localities of the State, of the municipalities, water and power agencies, individuals and corporations, the authority formulates its plans and begins negotiations with other interested parties. It will do for Arizona what the Reclamation Bureau is doing for the United States, only on a smaller scale and under a financing system which does not involve public appropriations. While the Federal Government may bargain with separate agencies for individual projects, no State-wide integrated or comprehensive project can be established by such a private transaction. If we are to secure a harmonious, nonpreferential use of the great resources of Arizona, we must provide a State-wide and not a sectional unit as our effective functional and administrative medium; and such a medium, the Arizona Power and Water Authority will be.

Service will be furnished at the lowest practical economical price. Power or water will be picked up from the point of delivery and consumed or distributed by the organization bargaining for same. No public-service company, municipality, or other power distributor will suffer because this wholesale

power is thus made available. In most instances, this power can be distributed for far less than what it is now costing many organizations to produce it. It is quite evident that no firm hydroelectric power is being produced in Arizona at less than about 3½ mills per kilowatt-hour; and it is also evident that the average cost of steam or Diesel power is from 6 to 9 mills per kilowatt-hour. Certainly if firm Colorado power can be distributed wholesale at from 3 to 4 mills per kilowatt-hour as against the present high production price of firm power, no harmful dislocation can occur. All danger of power shortages will be removed and costly drought damage eliminated.

Except as unjustifiable profiteering will be eliminated, public-service corporations, associations, and other distributing or consuming agencies may continue to operate as in the past. If they wish to take advantage of cheap power, they may do so or if they prefer to continue using their own high-priced power, they may still do so—the authority causes no interference whatever. But it does offer the only medium whereby new major industries can locate within our State with the guaranty of cheap electrical energy. Taxable property remains in the hands of private owners, but millions in profits will no longer be diverted to absentee owners outside the State. The need for costly private financing incidental to enlargement and extensions of production units will be obviated. A constant and reliable supply of firm power will be at hand without further capital investments in units that can produce only at a cost of from two to three times that of the Federal impounding dams on the Colorado River. Such firm hydroelectric power, practically as cheap as that to be found anywhere in the United States, will be available for motive power for factories, plants, commerce, and the innumerable uses incidental to a manufacturing State.

With respect both to our contribution for winning the war today and to cushioning the inevitable shock of post-war readjustment tomorrow, a shock which may well prove to be many times greater than that of our last such experience, there is no question of the urgency of passing this legislation and passing it now.

Under other facts and circumstances, I should feel reluctant to tender you a legislative act already prepared, but I believe you realize why on a matter of such specialization, this is the only practical way. Obviously, a proposal of this kind embracing such involved subject matter, must be covered comprehensively and cannot be compressed into a limited number of brief paragraphs as is the ordinary legislative act. The agency is not intended to disturb existing statutes, or established rights. It must have the necessary functional and administrative powers to accomplish the purpose for which it is set up; and furthermore, must have reasonable financial powers, since it is a non-tax levying, self-liquidating and self-sustaining body—particularly as it is dependent to a considerable extent upon financing through the medium of revenue bonds and hence needs powers, rights, and privileges to stabilize such securities which look to income alone for repayment. The very length of the bill and the number of sections, far from being a valid objection thereto, testify to its technicality and the care which has gone into its preparation.

The self-interest of every Arizonian, now and in the future, demands your immediate favorable action. The national interest, likewise, in this crisis, demands that we move forward with a unity of purpose toward the greatest good for the greatest number.

The history of the power corporations since their inception is the written evidence that nowhere in the Nation have they demonstrated that they can be trusted to serve any interests but their own. Our struggle to free Arizona from the grip of those who exploit her is no isolated battle. It is but a contemporary and local phase of a struggle that through the years has been highlighted by the establishment of other nonpolitical regulatory agencies such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, to mention but a few.

Underlying it is an issue far greater than any of us as individuals, but as individuals the responsibility is clearly ours to take this step on which rests the entire future of our State.

Undeterred by the specious arguments that will be raised, or the proposals for changes and amendments which would nullify the entire act, I challenge you to accept the privilege which is given you to live in the grateful memory of future generations as the legislature which had the courage and the vision to unlock for Arizona the door to golden opportunity.

The Pay-As-You-Go Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered on the Washington Evening Star Forum, on February 3, 1943, dealing with the pay-as-you-go taxation and the Ruml plan of tax collection, broadcast from station WMAL.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, it is my belief that next to the actual events as they transpire from day to day on the various fighting fronts in which Americans are participating throughout the world and to the problems of supply and munitions to our forces, the most important problem which confronts the American people is the crisis in Federal taxation which is rapidly developing. It is this subject which I wish to discuss with you tonight.

I speak as a lifelong advocate of the personal income tax as the fairest tax which was ever devised, because it is a tax based upon ability to pay, as opposed to consumption taxes of various kinds, which inevitably fall most heavily upon the poorest and neediest of our citizens. Before I was old enough to vote I was making speeches in Missouri attacking the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Pollock case, which invalidated the income-tax feature of the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill of the early nineties. I was an ardent supporter of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which specifically authorized the levying of the Federal income tax. I have always been proud of the fact that as Parliamentarian of the House back in 1913 I had a small part in the passage of the first income-tax law under the new constitutional amendment—a law which was actually drafted by that great American, Cordell Hull, now our distinguished and beloved Secretary of State.

I still believe that the income tax is the fairest and least burdensome of all taxes, because it is a tax based upon ability to pay, which should be the basis of all taxation. It has been the backbone of our tax structure since the days of the First World War. A famous British Chancelor of the Exchequer once said that there was no such thing as the science of taxation—that the whole secret of successful taxation lay in "getting the greatest amount of feathers with the least amount of squawking."

The graduated income tax is unique among taxes in this that everyone who does not pay an income tax wishes that he did have to pay one, and that everyone who pays in a lower bracket wishes that he had to pay in a higher one.

There was, however, in the original enactment of the income-tax law one vital defect, insignificant at the time, but of a magnitude which has constantly increased until it has become a tragedy to millions of American taxpayers. This defect is the provision that we do not pay taxes upon the income we earn this year currently, as the income is earned, but next year after the income has in the vast majority of cases been spent. Thus is created a vast tax debt that hangs over the United States like a storm cloud and haunts the dreams of millions of Americans.

I have said that the defect of paying taxes on this year's income next year instead of currently as the income was acquired was originally inconsequential. This was true because in the beginning the rates were not burdensome and only a relatively small number of taxpayers were affected, and these in a large part of a class who were in the habit of budgeting their affairs and making some provision for the future.

With the comparatively low rates and comparatively liberal exemptions of those days it did not make a great deal of difference whether we paid this year out of what we earn this year, or paid this year's tax bill next year out of what we earn next year, except for those cases in which a taxpayer's income fell off so much from one year that he died insolvent, or was unable to satisfy his tax liability out of a distraint warrant on his household effects in which case the Government simply lost the revenue it might have had if it had had the foresight to collect the tax currently as the income was acquired. Defaults on income-tax payments when the income had been spent or lost before the due date for the tax payment arrived have cost through the years the United States Government many hundreds of millions of dollars.

But with the tremendous increases in rates and the drastic cuts in exemptions bringing millions of new taxpayers from among the poorest of our citizens into the class of income-tax payers, the present system of paying last year's taxes on income, which has already been spent, out of this year's income spells stark tragedy for a multitude of taxpayers, large and small. Many of these taxpayers have had and will have no increase in income whatever since last year. In millions of cases the net income of the individual will be less this year than last, which is particularly true of the vast salaried class and the small businessmen—who constitute so much of the backbone of America. It is sad to relate but incontestably true that very few of our citizens have had the forethought or the necessary information to set aside out of last year's income as it was acquired sufficient funds to pay the greatly increased taxes on that income.

Many new taxpayers, who never had to pay income taxes before in their lives of course have made no provision for paying taxes on income which was earned last year.

No one, so far as I know, has disputed the desirability or the absolute necessity of getting the Nation on a current basis, that is to say of providing for a change in the system by which taxpayers will be permitted to pay as they earn. Very few will dispute either the

desirability or the necessity of collection at the source. By collection at the source I mean some device such as a withholding tax which will prevent the individual from spending that portion of his income which the Government claims for itself and thus going in debt to the Government, by taking it before it ever gets into the hands of the individual.

But despite this universal recognition of the great necessity for getting the Nation on a current basis with its taxes only two essential plans have been proposed for dealing with the transition period, one known as the Ruml plan for moving the tax clock forward, in much the same way that daylight saving was carried into effect, by a bookkeeping entry crediting the payments on personal income tax made in 1943 on the 1943 taxes instead of the 1942 taxes; and second, a fake pay-as-you-go plan proposed by Mr. Randolph Paul, General Counsel for the Treasury Department, which involves for a multitude of taxpayers an intolerable scheme of double taxation. In brief Mr. Paul's scheme, as I understand it, based on the proposals he made last summer to the Senate Finance Committee, would involve as to taxpayers with incomes in excess of $2,000 a year paying 2 years' taxes in 1 year and in many cases would involve a tax of much above 100 percent of the income actually received in 1943. He proposes to find new sources of revenue by whipping the pulling horse. It apparently has never dawned on Mr. Paul and other so-called experts on taxation who are now operating at large, that you can only confiscate once and that when the time comes that either through maladjustment of rates or unfair differences in the manner of collection, it will be possible for an individual to actually retain more for himself from a smaller income after payment of taxes than he could by increased effort retain from a larger income, incentive will be destroyed, total income will decrease and the total Federal income will be correspondingly diminished. I intend tonight to discuss these plans in some detail.

In that connection I may say that I have been asked many times as to the reason for the bitter opposition of the Treasury Department to the Ruml plan, and I am always reminded of the classic remark of President U. S. Grant about Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts. A bitter feud existed between them for years. On one occasion it is related that someone told Grant that Sumner did not believe in the Bible, whereupon the "Iron Soldier" is reported to have replied, "Yes; damn him; that is because he did not write it." I greatly fear that that is the explanation of the attitude of Mr. Paul and his associates on the Ruml plan. And the statements of some legislators that they favor pay-as-you-go taxation but are opposed to the Ruml plan leads me to the belief that either they have not taken the trouble to find out what the Ruml plan actually provides for or have not confronted the only alternative suggested of an unbearable system of double taxation.

Let me explain the authorship of the Ruml plan. Let me first emphasize that his name is R-u-m-l; Ruml—and he has no connection either by consanguinity or mental affiliation with Marshal Erwin Rommel, with whom some in high places would like to have him confused. Mr. Ruml is an American citizen, born in the great State of Iowa. He has enough college degrees to qualify him in any New Deal school, having graduated from Dartmouth, received his Ph. D. at Chicago, and was dean of the social-science department of that great university. He is a successful businessman and, among other things, is chairman of the board of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, of which Mr. Paul was formerly a member. He is also a public-spirited citizen who, as an economist of acknowledged renown, devoted his talents to working out a solution for an admittedly desperate situation confronting millions of taxpayers in the United States.

The people of the United States are today faced with the most stupendous burden of taxation which has ever confronted any people on this earth. It is true that we are the richest nation in the world but it is also true that our expenditures already made or in contemplation are far greater than any other nation in the world has ever dreamed of being able to make. The American people have looked this situation in the face. They are prepared for the sacrifices which are necessary in submitting to an unprecedented burden of taxation. But they are entitled to demand and do demand that this burden be imposed in as equitable and humane a manner as possible and that neither by inequity of rates nor unfairness of collection shall this burden be increased.

I hold no brief for Mr. Ruml. I had never seen or heard of him until he appeared before the Finance Committee of the Senate last August, some 4 or 5 months after he had presented his plan to the Treasury Department without being able to secure even decent consideration for it. His plan was so simple and so sensible, it accomplished so much of good without any loss to the Government, that I was immediately struck with its great possibilities of benefit to the Nation as a whole without any injury to the revenue or unfairness to anyone.

The Ruml plan is as simple as A B C. I have already said that it is so simple and so sensible that some people seemingly cannot understand it but profess to see complexities in it which do not exist—in other words they are looking for bugs under the chip which are not there.

The Ruml plan briefly stated would simply provide that for bookkeeping purposes—and that is all that it is—tax on 1942 personal incomes be disregarded and that the payments which we will all have to make at the new and higher rates during 1943 be considered as taxes on 1943 income rather than 1942 income. As a practical rule of thumb the returns which under the present law we will have to make on 1942 income before March 15 would be taken as a tentative return on 1943 income, with the provision that if that resulted in underpayment for 1943 at 1943 rates there would be an additional assessment and if there were overpayment there would be a credit or refund. After 1943 the system would, of course, work automatically. During 1943 the transition period, all taxpayers would be treated exactly alike and the change to a current basis would be accomplished without subjecting any taxpayer to the dire outrage of being subjected to double taxation—that is, to being compelled to pay 2 years' taxes in 1, or 3 years' taxes in 2, which are mere variations of the alternative proposal.

Now at first blush it seems to come—unfortunately apparently including Mr. Paul, the current brain of the Treasury Department on tax matters—that this involves the loss of a year's taxes by the Government. Even if this were true, it might not be a bad investment for the United States if it permitted us to escape the old, bad, improvident system by which the taxpayer is always a year behind with his payments and the Government a year behind with its collections.

But, actually, nothing could be further from the truth than that the Government would lose a year's taxes under the Ruml plan. No one would escape the payment of taxes. Each of us would go on in 1943 paying at the 1943 rates of tax on his income in 1943. The only difference would be that we would each be paying in 1943 on 1943 income, instead of paying in 1943 on 1942 income, and waiting for 1944 to pay for the old dead horses of 1943. Theoretically, it is true that the Government would lose a year's taxes scattered over a period of 40 or 50 years as the present generation of taxpayers die or cease to be taxpayers. This would, in the opinion of the most responsible authorities on accountancy, as represented by the leading firms of tax accountants in the Nation, be offset and far more than offset by the greater promptness and certainty of collection, particularly if the Ruml plan is attached to a provision for collection at the source by a substantial withholding tax as is done in my bill, S. 280, which I introduced merely as a basis for discussion. Of course, under the Constitution revenue bills cannot originate in the Senate but we can at least discuss these great problems. It cannot be too strongly emphasized, moreover, that what the Government is gaining by this plan is cash money in the till—while what the Government is giving up is nothing on earth except a tax debt unenforceable until judgment day or the date of the end of the Republic, whichever occurs first, and then uncollectible by reason of insolvency. I believe it cannot seriously be questioned that the actual cash position of the Government will be sensibly improved immediately by the adoption of the Ruml plan, and that this improvement will progress from year to year, as it becomes the foundation for a scientific tax structure—which it has been impossible for us to have heretofore by reason of our philosophy of pay a year later on birds that have flown. I assert without fear of successful contradiction that as a mere matter of dollars and cents the Government, so far from losing a year's revenue, will actually make money immediately and every year thereafter by the adoption of the Ruml plan, if coupled with a substantial withholding tax for collection at the source as is provided in my bill, S. 280.

One feature of the pay-as-you-go plan which cannot be too strongly emphasized is that its adoption would make possible the adoption of a bona fide system for collection at the source by means of a withholding tax. By this combination taxes could be collected with the greatest possible certainty and promptness and with the least amount of pain to the taxpayer—and I have never yet met anyone who really enjoyed paying taxes—because within the limits of possibility of the withholding tax, which necessarily cannot include the deductions and higher surtaxes, the taxpayer would have his taxes paid without handling the money and possibly spending it and then having it or its equivalent taken away from him at a time when it would hurt the most.

The alternative is Mr. Paul's scheme—which he denominated last summer as a "modified Ruml plan"—which is a fake, pure and undefiled. It has nothing whatever to do with the Ruml plan or its objective of getting the Nation free of its tax debt and established on a basis of being able to pay as you earn. It represents the lowest form of class appeal. It simply proposes to forget the taxes for 1942 as to those taxpayers whose income is less than approximately $2,000 but as to all others to undertake to compel them to get current by compelling them to pay all of 1942 taxes and most of 1943 taxes at the same time. In many cases Mr. Paul's proposal would run well above 100 percent of income. Mr. Paul is apparently not familiar with that sage old Dutch proverb which says: "Milk the cow but don't pull off her udder."

I predict without hesitation that unless the Ruml plan is adopted there will be hundreds of thousands of defaults and distraint warrants and that if the Paul plan—which is infinitely worse than no change at all—should be adopted there will be many millions of defaults, distraint warrants, bankruptcy, and suicides.

I urge all Americans who listen to me tonight to consider this problem, make up their minds and make themselves articulate. A recent Gallup poll showed that 90 percent of Americans who had considered the Ruml plan are in favor of it. The Treasury has

obstinately set its head against it because it did not originate it. It is the business of the Congress under our Constitution to write revenue bills. The Treasury is trying to usurp this function. I urge every man and woman who is interested in this vital problem to write his Congressman and Senators expressing his view whatever it may be.

Broadcasts to Japan by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the November and December 1942 and the January 1943 messages broadcast by me to Japan.

There being no objection, the broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPAN AGAINST JAPAN

NOVEMBER 7, 1942

The program, Japan against Japan, today brings you a special message from Washington, D. C., the Capital of the United States of America. The message is addressed to the Japanese people by an American who has been a friend of the Japanese people throughout the greater part of his life. This American is United States Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, who is chairman of the United States Committee on Education and Labor. The great number of years he personally spent in Japan, and his lifelong study of the peoples of Asia, qualify Senator THOMAS as a noted authority on far eastern affairs.

On the seventh day of each month, Senator THOMAS has taken time out from his busy affairs to speak honestly and frankly to the people of Japan. We bring you now the special message prepared especially for this 7th day of November. These are the words of Senator THOMAS:

"Eleven months ago this morning, the Japanese militarists betrayed the Tenno Heika and violated the honor of Japan. Without the knowledge or consent of His Imperial Majesty, and contrary to all provisions of international law—Japanese armed forces struck the most treacherous blow of modern times against a country which had been Japan's best friend for 90 years. Even while the Tenno Heika's personal representative was still talking peace in the chambers of the American State Department, the Japanese militarists acted under Tojo's orders and committed an act of international murder at Pearl Harbor.

"During the 11 intervening months, America has girded itself for an all-out war. A miracle has been achieved in the transformation of American production from peacetime to wartime construction. No better evidence of the firm determination of the American people to utterly crush those responsible for forcing war upon them can be presented than the evidence of the Nation-wide elections which were held in this country just 4 days ago. Election day in the United States came at the same time the Japanese were observing Meiji Setsu. The meaning of that day in America and in Japan is of significance which may well be stressed.

"The people of the United States went to their ballot boxes and voted for the men and women they wished as representatives in government. The people of the United States were absolutely free to choose among the various candidates. There were no police to tell them how to vote—no faked ballots—no threats of reprisal from the majority party. There were no riots and no gangs of hoodlums to intimidate the voters.

"The people of the United States were under only one compulsion—both major parties charged them with the solemn duty of participating in democracy. Both parties urged them to vote.

"The elections were conducted in what the Japanese militarists would call an 'emergency.' The country is at war. But the majority party did not use this 'emergency' as an excuse for curtailing the elections. It did not—as the Japanese militarists did—attempt to maintain itself in power by taking advantage of the 'emergency.' Instead—the majority party made it a point to urge that democratic processes should function now just as they always have.

"Before the election democratic leaders expressed themselves on the need for the maintenance of free elections. It urged people of all political views to take part. In a public statement, President Roosevelt asked the American people to vote. He said: 'We are engaged in an all-out war to keep democracy alive. Democracy survives through the courage and fortitude and wisdom of many generations of fighting Americans. We should fight with ballots as well as with bullets.'

"The election just past provides an illuminating contrast between the workings of a democracy and a dictatorship. In a dictatorship the leaders are afraid to let the people speak. In a democracy, however, even during wartime, the people are expected to think for themselves and to make their own choices. In a dictatorship the people take orders from their leaders, and they have no choice but to obey. Their wishes are not consulted. In a democracy the leaders take orders from the people. The people are eternally free to decide every issue which affects their welfare and the good of their nation.

"No dictator would ever dare give his people such a choice. While the regimented peoples of Europe and Asia were suffering under the regime of dictatorship the people of America went to the polls. They went to tell their leaders what they want done during the coming months.

"The message which the people gave to their Government was simple and direct. They want the most vigorous possible conduct of the war. They want war to unconditional victory. They will be satisfied with nothing less. Statements by various opposition leaders make this fact very clear.

"Former President Herbert Hoover is a recognized leader of the minority Republican Party. President Hoover made the following statement:

" 'Our enemies can get no comfort from this election. The platform of every candidate was vigorous, efficient prosecution of the war. There was a strong element of protest in the vote but it was the protest of insistence upon a more effective organization of the war. Those who believe in freedom everywhere will gain confidence from the demonstration that freedom can hold to its protective institutions even in desperate war.' That is the end of the statement by former President Herbert Hoover, a leader of the Republican Party.

"One of the new Representatives to appear in Congress will be Mrs. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, a friend of China, and an advocate of vigorous war. Mrs. LUCE was an opposition candidate. But when she was elected, she said: 'I have campaigned for fighting a hard war—not a soft war. Therefore this election proves how the American people want to fight this war. I know that the American people want to fight it in honorable all-out plain spoken partnership with our allies. They want to fight the war for America and for peace and good will on earth. And they want to be served by their Congressmen as they themselves would serve to win the war and build a better world.'

"The sentiments of other Republican candidates was well expressed by the great Republican newspaper—the New York Herald Tribune. An editorial in this newspaper said:

" 'If the minority Republican Party gains strength it will only increase the obligation of the party to uphold the hands of President Roosevelt in his war leadership and to criticize or oppose measures and policies only to the end that the prosecution of the war may be made more effective.' That is the end of the statement by the New York Herald Tribune.

"The American wartime election clearly affirms the fact that the American people are fighting with complete confidence and absolute unity. They have the complete confidence that their elected representatives are now doing and will continue to do all that is necessary to insure victory. They have the absolute unity of a people who know why they are fighting and who are determined to win that fight. The singleness of purpose of Americans is in complete contrast with the disorganization which now exists among Italians who are no longer united under Mussolini. The American war spirit is a far different thing from the Nazi war spirit which flames high under the stimulus of victory but ebbs to the point of disorganization when defeats become the order of the day.

"The strong contrast, too, is the spontaneous unity of Americans and the artifically created will for military conquest imposed upon Japan by her militarists. Japanese are inspired by a desire for plunder or increased power for expansion of a militaristic empire. The Japanese militarists desire to take from others that which they wish for themselves. By contrast, the Americans are inspired by a will to preserve decency and freedom—not only for our own Nation, but for all nations. Americans elect their own leaders to carry out the will of the people. The Germans, the Italians, and the Japanese have no voice whatever in their government.

"It is indeed significant that while the American people were conducting their election, Tojo was creating the greater east Asia ministry.

"Thus, in both Japan and the United States, a choice is being made during the first days of November. The American people were making their choice. Tojo was making Tojo's choice."

Those were the words of Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor. His message was presented from Washington, D. C. It commemorated the eleventh month since the treachery of the Japanese militarists at Pearl Harbor on the 7th day of last December.

DECEMBER 8, 1942

To the People of Japan:

Eleven months ago today I first addressed you regarding your raid on Pearl Harbor last December 7, and since that time I have spoken to you by radio each month on the same day. I want to repeat now what I said on that first occasion, for current events in the war are bearing out more strongly each day what I then predicted. I said:

"On December 7, 1941, your war lords committed the most colossal suicidal act in the history of nations. No single step recorded by man has been 'more filled with signs and portents for the soul,' more fraught with tragic consequences. With that act your military masters set forces in motion so mighty that all the strength of your nation, coupled with all the strength of your Axis partners, will seem like broken toys."

During the year that has passed, your military masters have not only imposed the severest strains on you, the people of Japan, in

all your history, including bringing death or permanent injury to more than 250,000 Japanese in the Pacific, but they have brought suffering and misery to millions of peaceful people in your sister nations of the Far East. Like your partner across the world, Germany, your nation has based its program on aggression and aggrandizement—on conquest and booty and slavery and blood. Your war lords have caused you to be opposed by a phalanx of nations pledged to justice and liberty in whom the people now in bondage have confidence.

That is the record of Japan for the past year. You, the people of Japan, have gained nothing except stern promises from your masters that you must face the death and destruction of war for many, many more years.

What is the record of the United States in that period? What is the record of the United Nations during this past year? When the attack came on Pearl Harbor—an attack which was meant to be immediately disastrous for us, but which time is proving to have been eventually disastrous for Japan itself—when that attack came the United States pledged no instantaneous victories; it promised no rapid gains, no quick lightning strokes to disable the enemy. Our job was too big for that. Our job was not to disable but to crush; not to capture and punish a relatively few individuals but to tear out by the roots the militarism which threatened the safety and peace of the whole world.

On January 6, 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt expressed the essence of our job when he said that this war "will end just as soon as we make it end, by our combined efforts, our combined strength, our combined determination to fight through and work through until the end—the end of militarism in Germany and Italy and Japan."

Our job, as pledged by the President of the United States on behalf of the American people, was a promise of action—a promise to repair the damage that had been done by the Pearl Harbor raid, to rebuild and modernize ships which had been injured, and to build new ships in greater volume than the world has ever known—a promise that when the time came to engage the enemy in battle with adequate force on our side, to win major victories—a promise to turn our Nation into a mighty arsenal and to conduct continuous convoys of troops and supplies across both oceans in ever-growing quantities. Those were the promises of the American people's confidence.

And, people of Japan, these are the promises that have been kept and are being kept today. This year, month by month, has been a demonstration of the keeping of those promises.

But what has been done is just a beginning. The President was planning far ahead. Let me quote you his exact words of January 6 to the United States Congress: "It will not be sufficient for us and the other United Nations to produce a slightly superior supply of munitions to that of Germany, Japan, Italy, and the stolen industries in the countries which they have overrun."

No, that is not enough, the President said. He asserted: "The superiority of the United States in munitions and ships must be overwhelming—so overwhelming that the Axis nations can never hope to catch up with it."

People of Japan, always remember these further words of President Roosevelt: "For the first time since the Japanese and the Fascists and the Nazis started along their blood-stained course of conquest they now face the fact that superior forces are assembling against them. Gone forever are the days when the aggressors could attack and destroy their victims one by one without unity of resistance. We of the United Nations will so dispose our forces that we can strike at the common enemy wherever the greatest damage can be done.

"The militarists in Berlin and Tokyo started this war. But the massed, angered forces of common humanity will finish it."

Where do the United Nations stand today as this first year since the Pearl Harbor raid ends? You, the people of Japan, do not know, for your war lords do not permit you to learn the facts. But even with this ban, you have surely noticed the change in the tone of your newspapers and of your radio stations. You have seen the stock markets of Tokyo and Osaka reflecting the increasing lack of confidence of your stockholders in a victory for Japan. You have heard the whispers of your Japanese friends who returned to your country recently from the United States, and who have reported that the earth-shaking war program of the United States is indeed as tremendous as it has been painted, if not more so. In many ways you have felt the rumblings of the changes occurring in the war picture.

On the other side of the world American and British forces are in North Africa in great numbers. Italy is shaking in its boots as bombing raids are destroying its war plants and strategic centers, paving for the way for a possible invasion in the future. Russia is now on the offensive against Germany and the promised triumphs of the Nazis in Russia have not materialized.

And in the Far East, the disasters you have suffered in the Solomons cannot have been entirely hidden from you. The major victories of the United States in the Pacific have surely reached your ears, even though in distorted form. The constantly increasing large-scale convoys are taking more and more men and arms and supplies to your very gates.

But again, at the end of a year, the United States makes only the promises that I have described to you. Day by day they are being made good and they will continue to be made good. People of Japan, remember that you have been betrayed by the doctrine that might makes right. In this case you are facing not only the nations who are in the right, but you are also facing an aggregation of might which will overwhelm your country.

Let me, as a parting word, quote to you once more what President Roosevelt told the United States Congress last January 6. He said:

"Our enemies are guided by brutal cynicism, by unholy contempt for the human race. We are inspired by a faith which goes back through all the years to the first chapter of the Book of Genesis—'God created man in His own image.'

"We on our side are striving to be true to that divine heritage. We are fighting, as our fathers have fought, to uphold the doctrine that all men are equal in the sight of God. Those on the other side are striving to destroy this deep belief and to create a world in their own image, a world of tyranny and cruelty and serfdom.

"That is the conflict that day and night now pervades our lives. No compromise can end that conflict. There never has been and never can be successful compromise between good and evil. Only total victory can reward the champions of tolerance and decency and freedom and faith."

JANUARY 7, 1943

ANNOUNCER. Thirteen months ago today Japanese military forces struck their neighbors and friends without warning. They began a war which was unexpected by the Japanese people, which was contrary to the desires of the Emperor and which the United States had done everything in its power to avoid. Today it is certain that the war thus begun with infamy will reach an end of shame for the Japanese.

On the 8th of each month since that attack the Japanese Empire has celebrated the date as Imperial Rescript Day. The false designation is yet another attempt on the part of the Japanese militarists to convince the Japanese people that the beginning of the war had the sanction of the Emperor. It is a well known fact that war had already begun and was about 2 hours old before the Emperor affixed his imperial seal to a legitimate declaration of war. Thus in Japan the day is observed as an occasion to pay tribute to the valor of Japanese fighting forces.

In America, by contrast, the equivalent day—the 7th of each month—merely recalls memories of a cowardly and unjustified attack by a nation which the United States had long befriended. On this day of each month since the Japanese attack against Hawaii, a well-known authority on far eastern affairs has taken the time to address the Japanese people by radio. This authority is Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor. We take pleasure in presenting the following special message from Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS:

"One year ago today I spoke to the people of Japan for the first time on this day. Fresh in my mind at that time was the horror of the unprovoked Japanese attack against its most powerful neighbor. It was still difficult for me to believe that Japanese leadership could be so foolish as to commit an act which constituted national hara kiri. It was incredible to think that sane men could even dream of literally getting away with murder.

"A year ago I expressed something of those feelings which were then in my heart. I spoke regretfully of the fact that Japan had discarded the ways of national honor and embarked upon a program which made her an international outlaw. I spoke of the grief which was in my heart for the people of Japan who had been compelled by their war-lords to shoulder an impossible task—a task which would bring untold suffering and almost irreparable damage to a land I had once admired and respected. I spoke at that time of the things Japan had once stood for in the minds and the hearts of the American people. I gave the warning that Japan by her own act was inviting one of the greatest national catastrophes ever suffered by any nation. The truth of that prophecy is today being confirmed by the tide of world events which has completely changed during the past 12 months.

"It may be recalled that in my talks from month to month thereafter I warned the Japanese people that they should not be misled by the outward appearances of military success. I spoke of the tremendous changes which had been brought about in the United States as the direct result of the illegal attack against this country. That attack, as I have repeatedly stressed, achieved in 1 hour the complete unification of all elements of American life. It aroused a cold anger in the hearts of the peace-loving American people. It steeled their hearts to carry out a task the very nature of which was repugnant to them—a task of prosecuting a war which would inevitably be very costly and very bloody. Once committed to a course of this kind there was no turning back for Americans.

"During succeeding months I also gave from time to time a picture of the tremendous fighting machine which was being created out of the inexhaustible materials of this country. In 12 short months Americans have created, assembled, and shipped to the fighting fronts of the whole world the most colossal aggregation of fighting equipment ever achieved by any nation. During that same period an Army of a few hundred thousand men has grown into millions. Already 1,000,000 of them are overseas. These men are tough and determined and fearless. They are not fighting because they are ordered to. They are fighting for a principle—the same principle for which their ancestors fought in preceding generations. They are fighting to preserve their own freedom and to restore to less fortunate peoples freedom which has been taken from them. Americans are fighting for ideals.

"One year ago today there was triumph and certainty of victory in the sound of the words uttered by the leaders of Germany, Italy, and Japan. Today the sounds coming from all three of our enemy countries are those of gloom.

"Japanese leaders are no longer assuring their people of easy and early victory, as they were a year ago. The reasons for the new gloom which is the official attitude of the Japanese leadership are in the record of the past 12 months.

"The Japanese drive against Australia was stopped in its tracks by the severe defeat inflicted upon the Japanese Navy in the Coral Sea. In the battle of Midway, the Japanese Navy again suffered shame and humiliation in that one great engagement. Four great Japanese carriers sank forever beneath the waves of the Pacific, and thousands of courageous sailors were drowned. Instead of leading the Japanese Navy to victory after victory, Admiral Yamamoto has been responsible for one great disaster after another. Not since the greatly outnumbered Filipino-American forces in the Philippines were forced by disease and hunger to capitulate, have the Japanese enemy achieved any major military success.

"In the 12 months just ended, United Nations production has strengthened every threatened area on earth. Supply lines have been firmly established to every fighting front. Mountains of shells, uncounted tons of explosives, endless lines of tanks, millions of tons of shipping, and inconceivable numbers of working and fighting men and women have been prepared for the great task which will be executed in the months to come.

"Japan—like Italy and Germany—is no longer in a position to choose the times and places of attack. The situation of these three nations is now entirely defensive. Instead of planning where and how they may strike, there is grave concern now as to where and when they will be struck.

"In the minds of the Japanese leaders—just as in the minds of the German and Italian leaders—are visions of clouds of bombing planes. All too real in their minds are pictures of death and devastation which are as certain to come as the rains. Just over the horizon are gathering great fleets of submarines and fighting ships of every type, on unknown landing fields throughout the world fighting ships of the air are gathered, and no man can guess the hour of their departure. Throughout the world, decent men are waiting and eager to carry out assaults on a global scale which will end forever the menace of oppressor nations.

"All of these things were to be seen in the offing even a year ago. I was but one of many who warned the Japanese of their terrible folly.

"In the months to come, the Japanese are certain to learn the grim meaning of war itself. Until now, the sounds of the guns and the whine of the airplanes, the shrill scream of falling bombs and the ghastly results of terrifying explosives, the sorrows of the homeless and the pitiful sight of devastated areas and of men maimed and mutilated, have been for the most part far away from the shores of Japan. A little more than a year ago they were far away from Germany too. And a year ago Italy had not experienced these things. Today Italy and Germany have learned at last the terrible and shattering and terrifying things about war which they forced upon unwilling peoples.

"That same experience will soon be the lot of the unfortunate Japanese who must suffer for the misdeeds of mad leaders. For the sake of people I once admired and respected, I can only voice the prayer that their sufferings will be brief and that the certain victory of the United Nations may come earlier than we may dare to dream."

You have just heard a message addressed to the Japanese people by Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

This broadcast has come to you from the United States of America.

Economical Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business, on January 11, 1943, in New York, before the National Retail Drygoods Association, on the subject of the economical distribution of all that is being produced and consumed in the United States, a problem which has engaged the minds of businessmen and of economists for many years. This is a very timely address, and I trust it will have the attention of the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A few days ago the Wall Street Journal reported consideration of a new type of rationing—the rationing of speeches made by Government officials and politicians. I cannot help but sympathize with the motives of the gentlemen who thought up this bright idea; not that I think there have been too many speeches by those who speak on behalf of the Government. Perhaps we have come to the point where we need fewer speeches of the ordinary variety and more of a really constructive character.

I wish to assure you at the outset that I did not come here merely to deliver a speech. I have come here mainly to confer with you on the mounting problems of your industry resulting from the various programs of Government control. As a legislator it is not my duty to solve your specific problems. That, manifestly, is your own obligation and you are not asking for any such action. You wish to be left alone to work out your own problems. The Congress can, of course, be of vital aid in seeing to it that no unwise, unnecessary or destructive regulations are established. It can aid also in providing measures which will cushion the impact of the war effort and ease the various Government controls so that the Nation's business concerns may be able to survive the devastating consequences of the war.

I have come here to issue a challenge—not only to you as members of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, but also to some 2,000,000 smaller retailers and wholesalers who constitute the majority of small businessmen in this country. My challenge is this: What do you propose should be done to solve the complex distribution problems resulting from the war?

Before I undertake to enumerate any of these problems I should first like to say a few words about the role of distribution in modern warfare. Have you ever thought what distribution means on the battlefield? The heart of our military strategy lies in having the right equipment available at the right moment, in the right quantity, at the right place.

However courageous an army may be, however excellent its equipment, unless delivery of munitions is made at the proper moment and unless supply lines are effectively maintained, it cannot win a battle, much less a war. The Army has a word for it—"Logistics." Logistics is the science of synchronizing our maximum production capacity with the most efficient methods of distribution.

Today the leaders of our armed forces are applying the science of logistics over a front that ranges from the Atlantic seaboard to the continents of Europe and Africa, and from the Pacific coast to the continent of Asia.

Yet there is another front requiring equal study and the application of sound principles akin to the science of logistics. It is the home front—a front 3,000 miles in length and almost 2,000 miles in depth. It is a front where the greatest productive capacity on earth is concentrated. It is an area where the most efficient distribution system in the world is in operation, to serve not only our own needs, but the needs of many nations scattered throughout the world. It is an area where the greatest mechanical geniuses in the world are performing veritable miracles in forging the weapons and machinery of war for our gallant Army and Navy and those of the United Nations.

Failure on this home front would result in a break-down in our supply lines to Iceland, Europe, Africa, Alaska, China, Russia, and the Pacific.

It may seem a far cry from the copper and chrome mines of Montana to the fighting privates in the jungles of Guadalcanal, but they are both essential parts of our total war effort for the safety and security of our beloved country.

The logistics of the battlefield is an ancient art. Its principles have been studied and debated for centuries in the schools and academies of military science.

The logistics of the home front is in its infancy. Distribution of civilian goods in this country has always been guided—and rightly so—by the rise and fall of prices and profits. Today we are just beginning to learn how vital it is that we plan to get sufficient oil to New England and enough milk and butter and coffee to our cities. The public is beginning to realize that price control, rationing, inventory control, and other regulatory programs, insofar as they apply to civilian commodities, are techniques which are indispensable to prevent inflation and provide a fair distribution of our essential civilian requirements in a total war.

There are many Federal agencies that must participate in these programs of control and regulation. The War Production Board, the Office of Economic Stabilization, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Office of Price Administration, the Food Administrator, the Petroleum Administrator, the Rubber Administrator, and others.

I should like to sound a note of warning to the administrators of these war agencies. I should like to warn them that they can never solve the problems of distribution on the home front until they learn the essential difference between supply on the battle front and supply on the home front. On the war front the key to successful strategy is secrecy and the use of propaganda to deceive the enemy. The enemy must never be allowed to know our plans of war supply and distribution.

On the home front secrecy and failure to trust the public is a mistaken policy. The public must always know what the Government is doing and the basis of the action it takes. On the home front our administrators have to a great extent failed to take the

public into their confidence in formulating their programs of control and regulation. As a result there has been much confusion, unfairness, and injustice resulting. These mistakes and injustices could have been avoided if the administrators had taken the people more fully into their councils in the first instance. Plans for price control and rationing in any industry should be finally formulated only after the fullest consultation with the group engaged in the industry to be affected. Such a course would avoid many prevalent errors.

On a recent trip to Montana I sat at a chamber of commerce meeting with a group of local businessmen—wholesalers and retailers. I learned from them that the Government was working entirely in the dark in its rationing program for the State of Montana, which has many conditions and problems entirely different from other sections of the Nation.

It is utterly impossible for a group of men, who are unfamiliar with the widely varying conditions of American life, to sit behind closed doors in Washington and determine an over-all program to fit the entire country. What is proper rationing in Montana, Texas, or California, may be quite the contrary in New England. To be effective, our Government planning must be so ordered as to fit the varying conditions of the Nation. Moreover, it must be based on the sanction of the people as a whole. The people of this country are united in the will to win the war. They are willing to make any necessary sacrifice to that end. They are an intelligent and patriotic people. They fully recognize the necessity of these Government controls. But they should not be needlessly harassed or have their businesses destroyed by arbitrary or unnecessary regulations. They should not be ignored in the planning of regulations which may have the effect of a death warrant on a business which took a lifetime to develop. In other words, the people should be called into council in planning these civilian war-time programs.

More specifically, the retailers and wholesalers of America, who, after all, man the major supply lines of the home front, must be permitted to contribute their special knowledge and understanding to the solution of these problems.

I should like to enumerate some of the questions with regard to which your contribution can be especially valuable.

1. How can we meet our essential civilian needs?

This question breaks down into a series of minor questions. How can we see that the proper kinds of essential civilian goods and services are produced in the quantities needed? How can we prevent hoarding by large distributors or by consumers? How shall we prevent further inflation and still avoid a huge, complicated, and unmanageable price-control system?

2. How can smaller distributors obtain a larger voice in the consideration of these questions?

To answer this latter question, we must find out how to give small business a larger voice in trade associations and industry advisory committees, and how to give the associations and the committees a larger voice in influencing Government policy-making.

3. What can we do now to see that after the war we have a distribution system in which small business can thrive and expand?

It has often been suggested that one of the best answers to this question is the establishment of an improved credit system now to finance the expansion, rehabilitations or reentry of small distributors after the war is over.

Naturally, I have just skimmed the surface. Many more problems of national policy on the distribution front have been brought before the Senate Special Committee on Small Business. Many more problems of this character will be discussed at our coming retailer and wholesaler hearings to be held by our committee in Washington on January 19, 20, and 21.

For the convenience of the many trade associations who have come to regard our committee as a clearing house for ideas on national policy, I have had a list drawn up of some of the more important problems and have made this list available to all the trade associations in the distribution field, including your own. Discuss these questions at your round-table conferences, debate them with your members and neighbors, and take votes upon the more controversial issues. Then bring your conclusions to our committee, so that we may benefit from your experience and knowledge in shaping our formal recommendations to the administrative agencies and to the Congress.

The Senate and House Committees on Small Business are in full sympathy with the difficulties besetting American retail business resulting from the war effort, and I can assure you that the Congress is willing to consider any reasonable and proper proposals to foster and preserve our American system of free enterprise.

And here, let me say just a word on the new Congress. We have heard much in the press of late about the revulsion of Congress against the executive branch of Government. The hue and cry against the Congress, in my judgment, has been carried to an extreme. The Government and the Congress, to be sure, have both made mistakes.

In a great country like ours mistakes are unavoidable. The people themselves are to a large extent answerable for many of the mistakes in the pre-war period. For example, the isolation policy of the Congress was largely due to the attitude of the people. The people were divided on many of the great issues. The failure of the Government to prepare for war also in a large measure is attributable to the people. They were influenced by the treacherous foreign propaganda which has flooded our country. Those who sought to arouse the Nation to the threatened dangers were charged as warmongers seeking to involve our country in a war in which it had no concern.

The American press too, must take its share of the blame for the plight of our country when we were suddenly catapulted into war through the Pearl Harbor attack. We had been lulled into a sense of security. We had been propagandized into the notion that we were secure in America from any danger of foreign aggression. When war did come we were unprepared and the transition from a peace economy to a war economy produced disastrous dislocations in our American system of small business enterprise. This was due largely to the fact that the Army and the Navy in accordance with their traditional course sought to deal only with the large national plants and concerns which could quickly engage in war work. Small plants soon were deprived of raw materials for civilian production and were unable to convert to war production. Furthermore, it must be remembered that this is the first genuine total war ever waged by the United States.

In a transition from a peace economy to a total war economy, it was impossible to avoid serious dislocations. To show you that Congress was alert, let me tell you, the Senate Small Business Committee was set up long before Pearl Harbor. We saw the trend in this country developing toward collectivism. American business was getting bigger and small business was dwindling. Our committee sought ways and means of preserving our small-business system as essential to our way of life. When the great program of national defense was started it became more evident than ever that some congressional action should be taken to prevent small-business enterprise in this country from being totally swallowed up by the trend toward collectivism.

The Seventy-seventh Congress, which has just passed into history, has uniformly stood with the people on the issue of preserving small-business enterprise.

The Senate Committee on Small Business Problems, of which I am the chairman, has sponsored and has had enacted into law a number of measures for the protection of small-business enterprise. I cannot take the time here to review that record in detail. I might call attention to Senate bill 2250, drawn up by our committee and passed unanimously by both Houses, setting up the Smaller War Plants Corporation with a capital of $150,000,000 designed to aid small concerns in participating in war work. This measure also provided a special division in the War Production Board to aid in securing contracts from the procurement divisions of the Government for the smaller concerns, concerns engaged in civilian production to convert to war work, etc., and to assist small concerns in converting to war production or essential civilian production.

Also, Senate bill 2315 was enacted by the last Congress under sponsorship from our committee. This bill provided relief for all dealers with rationed products in their stocks by making it possible for them to borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on such stocks or to dispose of such stocks without sacrifice to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The Federal Reports Act, also sponsored by our committee, afforded relief to the business concerns of the country from the burden and expense of innumerable requests from Federal agencies for unnecessary Government reports.

Our committee has also published many studies on important phases of the small business problems. It has held many conferences with the executive agencies of the Government for the purpose of protecting small business from arbitrary actions of those agencies, and has brought about many modifications of orders and regulations of such agencies.

Both the Senate and the House are taking the initiative in seeing that the resources and capacity of small business in the war effort shall not be neglected, and that they shall be fully mobilized for the production and distribution of war and essential civilian goods. The Senate and House Committees on Small Business are cracking down on any bureaucrats who neglect to realize that small business is needed to win the war and the peace. We are developing constructive legislation to bring more rhyme and reason into the structure of the wartime Government and to see that small business is given its proper place in the war effort. With the support and counsel of American business this purpose can be achieved.

With this support and with this counsel, moreover, the Congress, the Government, and the American people will marshal the forces of our Nation for the annihilation of our enemies and the reestablishment of a free economy in a free world.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very

timely editorial from today's Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., entitled "Time for Congress to Assert Itself." The editorial deals exclusively with the Ruml tax plan, which I favor very heartily.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO ASSERT ITSELF

The Treasury Department continues to try to sell Congress some sort of fancy, involved, and complex substitute for the simple, effective, and fully thought out Ruml plant to put the Nation's payers of income taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Let's be frank about the reason why the Treasury Department thus strives to muddy the waters and becloud the argument. The reason is that the Treasury Department bureaucrats are humanly and naturally jealous because Ruml had this idea and they didn't and because the general public is cheering more and more loudly for Ruml's idea.

The Treasury's latest wool-pulling stunt as we go to press was the Tuesday appearance of Randolph Paul before the House Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Paul is the Treasury's general counsel. He presented a plan which we defy anybody but a certified public accountant to understand in full—and we think some certified public accountants would be befuddled by parts of it.

From Mr. Paul's omelet of wordage we were able to gather that he thinks the Ruml plan would force the Treasury to "forgive" taxpayers of their 1942 Federal income taxes, and that thereby the Government would lose some $10,000,000,000 in revenues.

Both of these beliefs are mistaken. There is no "forgiveness" of any income taxes involved in the Ruml plan, and no loss of revenues to the Government.

PAY AS YOU GO

The author of this plan is Beardsley Ruml, of New York City. Some of its opponents have begun a smearing campaign based on the sneer that Ruml is a mere amateur in these matters—just an executive of a department store. Mr. Ruml, however, is also chairman of the New York Federal Reserve bank, most important unit of the entire Federal Reserve System, and is therefore anything but an amateur in financial matters.

Under his proposed system, all incomes would be taxed as at present, but we would say that the payments were being made on 1943 incomes instead of on 1942 incomes. There would still be inheritance taxes to take up some of the alleged loss to the Treasury of revenues from 1942 incomes.

The dangerous year in the whole present set-up is the year after the war ends—or the year it ends, if it ends early in a year. Throughout the war boom it will make little difference to taxpayers whether their payments are called taxes on last year's or on this year's incomes. But if they are caught in the expected post-war slump with bills for taxes on the big money they earned, but are no longer earning, the effects on the people will be murderous and the Treasury's losses will be tremendous.

The Federal Constitution says (art. I, sec. 7, subd. 1) that "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

TAXING POWER IS IN CONGRESS

It further says (art. I, sec. 8, subd. 1) that "the Congress shall have power: to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

That means that Congress is the body to which the Constitution gives the taxing power. It does not mean that the Treasury Department has the power to write tax bills and pass them to Congress for a rubber-stamped "ja"; though current Treasury performances lead one to suspect that the Treasury feels that it has such power.

The Nation urgently needs the Ruml plan, to meet the expenses of this war as efficiently as may be. The administration plans to spend $100,000,000,000 for the war in the fiscal year beginning next July 1. Of this astronomical amount, roughly half is planned to be raised by taxation and the other half by borrowing.

Public approval of the Ruml plan is widespread—90 percent, according to one poll. Public disapproval of the Treasury's muddleheaded, jealousy-inspired substitute suggestions is shown unmistakably every time the Treasury hatches a new one.

Here is an ideal occasion for Congress to assert itself against bureaucrats who are trying to reduce it to the condition of Hitler's Reichstag. Congress can thus assert itself and exercise its constitutional powers, not to mention pleasing the great majority of Americans, by adopting the Ruml plan—and adopting it before March 15, when the first income tax installments become due.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Birth of William McKinley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at Niles, Ohio, on the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of William McKinley.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate greatly the honor of being invited to speak at the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of a great Ohio President. It is not a mere chance that Ohio has had more Presidents than any State except Virginia. No State represents so completely the spirit of America and a cross-section of its real interests in its agriculture and its industry and its people. It is an inspiration to come back from the confusion and the artificial voices, often with a foreign accent, which are raised in Washington, to get in touch again with the opinions and the point of view of those who really believe in American democracy. Such a man was William McKinley, a plain representative of the people, thinking their thoughts and favoring their interests. I have a special interest in President McKinley because he persuaded my father to leave the circuit court bench and become head of the Philippine Commission, the first step to his entire political career. My father was only one of many who were started by McKinley, for he was noted for his judgment of men, and for sound common-sense judgment in the decision of every political and personal problem.

The situation today suggests many parallels with the days of McKinley. The predominance of a Democratic administration had been broken in Ohio by the election of a Republican Governor, and that election was the forerunner of a return to Republican control in Washington. We may reasonably hope that the tremendous Republican victory in Ohio in 1942 will lead to the same result, with John Bricker playing the part which McKinley played in 1896.

There is another parallel. McKinley came into office at the end of the greatest depression which this country had ever seen. It was followed by war, and then under McKinley's leadership a return to peace and the beginning of one of the greatest eras of prosperity we have ever seen. What lesson does McKinley's example hold for us today?

The Seventy-eighth Congress has just met in a great crisis in this Nation's history, in the midst of the greatest war in which we have ever engaged. Our first job is to win that war, but it is not too soon to look ahead, as did McKinley, and make plans for the restoration of the American Republic at the end of the war. The Capital is full of planners of all kinds. Every economic panacea any long-haired crank ever thought of is being dusted off and incorporated in a magnificent collection of glittering landscapes supposed to lead to Utopia. Nearly every one of them rests on the huge expenditure of Government money, without telling us where the money is coming from, when we already face a debt of more than $200,000,000,000. If we do not develop a constructive plan of our own the country is likely to drift into policies which can only mean bankruptcy, the destruction of private savings, and I believe the end of our American way of life as we have known it.

The basis of any reasonable plan for prosperity and full employment must be the same as that of McKinley's, however the details and the accompanying policies may differ. Prosperity and full employment must be sought now, as it was sought then, by the encouragement and full development of private enterprise. We are prepared now for a greater participation by Government in the process, but it must still be incidental to the growth of independent business. It is said that times are different today, that unemployment is with us forever, that the frontiers have disappeared, and that we can only recover from depression by Government action. That was the attitude of the New Deal for 10 years, and they failed at any time prior to the war to reduce unemployment below the figure of approximately 10,000,000. From every other depression we came back to a period of full employment and greater prosperity than before the depression, but not after 1933. Why not at least try the old method of restoring prosperity? Undoubtedly the Government should develop an adequate program of public works, but no program of public works of which the wildest dreamers conceive will make any substantial impression on the kind of unemployment we saw before the war and may see again. Undoubtedly Government must assist in the giving of direct relief and work relief to those who are unemployed, but if we learned anything in the thirties it is that the giving of relief does not restore prosperity.

I believe that the restoration and full development of private enterprise to a point at which it provides full employment depends on maintaining the great principle of individual incentive which has created the America of today. From the time our forefathers landed in this country they have sought by hard work to improve constantly the position of themselves and their family. This has been a country in which the man who worked a little harder and worked a little longer, who had ideas and ability and genius greater than that of his neighbors, was able to provide a better living for himself, a better education for his children, and a better provision for his family after his death. No socialist state, no governmental bureau distributing rewards can possibly provide the incentive which the free-enterprise system has provided. It is the absence of that incentive

which makes a turn to socialism so hopeless. People refer with scorn to the profit system, but this system of reward for incentive is the profit system, and for the day-in-and-day-out life of millions of people no one has discovered an effective substitute. The moment a nation reaches a state in which incentive is removed and the man who works hard is no better off than the loafer, where bureaucratic inefficiency and political pull take the place of individual effort, then there will be as little progress as there has been over the years in China and in India.

It may be that we have overdone the degree of reward; that the discrepancy between the financial recognition given men in different positions is too great in the United States; that the rich are too rich and the poor are too poor. That is the criticism of the New Deal, and I have every sympathy with a desire to reduce the degree of the differences to help those at the bottom, to put a floor under wages, to tax those at the top so that they bear a greater proportion of the expense of government. But in trying to obtain these objectives the New Dealers have completely ignored and largely destroyed the whole system of incentive. They are unfriendly to any difference between the economic position of different men, and their philosophy seems to favor the equality of theoretical communism.

I believe that we should provide relief and old-age pensions, but the man who gets a pension of $40 a month without contributing a cent should not be better off than a man who has worked all his life, built his own home, and saved his own money. Many policies of the New Deal, particularly the artificial reduction of the interest rate, have made it very difficult for an average workman to save enough money to provide himself at 65 without an income of $40 a month.

I am intensely interested in public housing, but it made no difference to the New Deal that a man who could only earn $1,000 a year, probably because of his lack of capacity, was given a better house on cheaper terms than an able workman earning twice that sum, who provided his own house and paid taxes to the Government. If we are going to give a noncontributory old-age pension to those who have saved nothing—and I believe that we should—we will also have to give assistance to men in the higher bracket of income, so that they may retain the reward of their superior work. We must give some assistance in the building of individual homes to the group whose income is just above the grade of public housing. We must oppose the steady New Deal effort to destroy the patent system, because we need a liberal incentive for the development of new inventions.

I believe that a complete social welfare program can be worked out, maintaining the system of incentive and the relative position of men according to their deserts, while reducing the too-wide difference now existing, but it can only be done if the tremendous importance of incentive is realized at every step. If we adopt a system in which the bum or the loafer is better off by Government expenditure than the conscientious worker, it will not be many years before we are a Nation of bums and loafers.

Just as the New Deal program has neglected incentive at the bottom, it proposes to neglect incentive at the top. That is the result of the new $25,000 salary limit and proposed ceiling on income. I do not object to the taxation of high incomes and salaries at the high rate of 92 percent which it has now reached, but in my opinion the income which a man is allowed to retain should bear some relation to the income which he is earning or the proceeds of savings which he has made. In my opinion the New Deal has not merely neglected incentive, it has attempted to destroy it. Many of its earnest advocates are working toward complete equality of reward for every character of work or shirk, which is absolutely contrary to every principle of American democracy.

There are many things which the Government can do to encourage free enterprise. Particularly it must encourage the investment of savings in old and new private business. I don't mean loans to such business, for loans are now available to those who can ultimately pay them back, but I mean the provision of equity capital. Men must be encouraged to retain money in the business and build up their businesses as most of the larger industries in this country today were built up. Well-to-do men must be encouraged to put their money into enterprises of this kind, a course almost prevented today by the present system of taxation. There must be opened up a freer capital market. The Securities and Exchange Commission was set up to prevent fraud in the sale of securities, and no one believes in that purpose more than I. But they have surrounded investment of capital in business with so much red tape and so much expense and so much discouragement that today there practically exists no free capital market in the United States for this kind of capital.

The tax system might well be improved to encourage investment in new ventures. There should no longer be a double taxation on stockholders of corporations and no longer any preference to investment in municipal bonds or corporate bonds. I suggest that we might well provide an exemption on capital gains from money invested in corporation capital and used to build up private business. There is no capital-gains tax at all in England. After all, nothing is as risky as business enterprise. If we maintain a system in which those who risk their money in new enterprises lose it all whenever there is a failure, and have to pay the profit to the Government when they occasionally achieve a success, then we can't expect anyone to continue the silly and unprofitable business of taking a chance on free enterprise. He had far better put his money on a roulette wheel, where the take is a relatively small percentage.

In short, you can't expect the free-enterprise system to provide employment for all available workers, if every measure of the Government is aimed at destroying the incentive on which the whole system is based.

The Sherman Antitrust Act was passed in the days of McKinley, because it was recognized then that we could not keep free enterprise in this country if we permitted American business to be consolidated into a few great trusts. Today small business is still alive in America, although subjected to the greatest pressure in this war effort. Thousands of independent plants, scattered all over the United States, millions of independent wholesalers and retailers make the backbone of our free enterprise system. Undoubtedly certain industries must be conducted by large units, but if free enterprise is to have a chance to grow, to develop new projects, and to employ more men, there must be a strict policy of preventing monopoly and protecting small business against unfair competition. Competition must be restrained in order that competition may continue to exist. Furthermore, it is only through competition that we can hope for a steady decrease in the price of manufactured goods, which is by far the best method of improving our standard of living.

Finally, the McKinley policy included the protection of the American wage standard by reasonable tariffs. Without a tariff policy the restoration of prosperity after 1896 would have been impossible. There is a lot of loose talk today about the establishment of complete free trade throughout the world after the war. That seems to be the policy advocated by Mr. WALLACE, by Mr. Wilkie, and by other international planners like Governor Stassen. In my opinion it would be destructive of any hope that free enterprise in this country can put the people of this country back to work after the war.

How can the American workman compete with wage rates running from one-half in England to one-twentieth in some Far Eastern countries when American machinery can be taken to any one of these countries and men taught to do excellent work in a reasonably short time? How can the farmer sell his grain and livestock if they can be produced for less than half the cost in Argentina, and delivered here for much less than his cost? Free trade is a beautiful theory, but talk to any person who is actually producing and manufacturing goods, and ask him whether free trade will increase or decrease the number of persons to whom he is able to give employment.

A free trade policy extending throughout the world might improve the standard of living of the Chinese, but it would certainly drag down the standard of living of the American workman. It would certainly reduce the price of American farm products. I believe that a tariff policy should be reasonable and not prohibitive, but free trade between peoples who have completely different standards of living and different methods of life will not produce the results that it will between peoples of about the same standards, like the people of the Thirteen Colonies in 1789. I do not wish to discuss here the whole principle of protective tariffs, but a reasonable tariff policy is an essential part of prosperity in the post-war world. Without it we will have neither industry nor agriculture nor labor; nor will we have the materials and industries necessary to protect ourselves if war should ever come again.

I have only touched lightly on our post-war domestic problems. In that field, as in the foreign field, we should stimulate discussions and encourage the development of plans to deal with each. The time to adopt precise policies of the serious problems which we face is perhaps not yet here, because our minds must be centered principally on the winning of the war. But every plan should be based on continuing the fundamental principles which preserved freedom and democracy in this country for 150 years and created a Nation able to make the greatest war effort of any nation in all time.

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from May G. Schaefer, chairman, department of public relations of the American Federation of Soroptimist Clubs, endorsing the proposed equal-rights amendment to the Constitution.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
SOROPTIMIST CLUBS,
January 28, 1943.

Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Forgive the delay in writing you to express fully our appre-

ciation as an organization as well as my personal one, for your introduction and sponsorship in the Seventy-eighth Congress of the equal-rights amendment.

It would be our wish to express in the same measure our thanks to each cosponsor of the amendment and to give further voice to the gratification of American women for the goodly number of these; yet it is just because of their number that at least this one business woman finds it physically impossible to write to each of them.

Perhaps you might read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this expression of complete accord and of commendation for the galaxy of our representatives—Senators and Congressmen—who are fully awake to the need for giving the women of our Nation that complete equality under the law, be this law Federal or in the individual States, which will be surety for the future of America and of the world that men and women shall work together in a shared and equal responsibility of action.

It has always seemed to us a most short-sighted view if women were to be the recipients of what has been called special privilege or special legislation to protect them, why objection should be raised to including men also in such humane legislation. There have been times when I have wondered whether men were "half citizens" under our Constitution—for surely if women had been accorded certain rights in which men did not equally share, then some of us were not being included in the inalienable rights of the fourteenth amendment—"nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The fact of the matter, however, has been that such legislation has never been protective but discriminatory against the women. It is only through recognizing that women are persons, that they are responsible human beings, that we can approach the problems of post-war reconstruction, of guarantees of freedom for others, in the only spirit that will truly make our voices ring through the generation of the future.

It is in this spirit that I extend to you and to your cosponsors the since thanks of a united citizenry.

Faithfully and sincerely yours,

MAY G. SCHAEFER,

Chairman, Department of Public Relations.

Scotland Gets Its Own T. V. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER T. BONE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a story appearing in the Washington Daily News of December 18, 1942, entitled "Scotland Gets Its Own TVA."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCOTLAND GETS ITS OWN TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY AND A FIGHT, TOO

LONDON, December 18.—An industrial-power development similar to America's Tennessee Valley Authority will arise among the crags, glistening lochs and erosion-scarred valleys of the Scottish Highlands, a Government announcement indicated.

As in the case of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the project for industrial rehabilitation of the Highlands has its bitter opponents. But the British Cabinet has let it be known that a bill soon will be introduced embodying recommendations of a special Scottish committee headed by Lord Cooper.

The committee urged the Government undertake such hydroelectric development of five northern counties of Scotland as would make possible expansion of industry and arrest the steady decline in population.

The Government's decision ends 20-year effort by private interests to acquire hydroelectric rights in northern Scotland. The last such plan was defeated by Parliament last year.

Opposition has come partly from the masses, but more effectively from Scottish collieries which objected to competition from hydroelectric power, and from ducal and other landed interest who complained the scenic beauties of Scotland would be impaired.

It has been alleged the latter class has determined to resist agricultural and industrial development of the Highlands, including 3,430,000 acres devoted to deer forests which are rented annually to British and American millionaires.

The 5 northern counties of Scotland now have a population of 290,000, compared to 388,000 a century ago.

Political correspondents pointed out the cabinet would not have approved Lord Cooper's report had they not been assured sufficient conservative party support to insure passage.

The committee conceded that it would be impracticable to carry electric light and power to every tiny hamlet in the Highlands owing to cost of transmission. Development would, however, aid industries engaged in production of calcium carbide and calcium cyanamide, and electric-metallurgical industries producing aluminum and magnesium, and refining copper, zinc, vanadium, and cadmium for the production of much needed ferro-alloys.

Congress Shall Have Power To Coin Money and Regulate the Value Thereof

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, during the debate today the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] referred to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] on yesterday pertaining to our use of certain kinds of paper money. Both gentlemen seemed to want to have full faith in the money of our country. I want to join with them in that faith, for we must have faith in our money, which means we must have money which we are justified in having faith in completely.

The gentleman from Massachusetts indicated he could not quote the law, but apparently he was recalling the language of the basic law, the Constitution which we are all sworn to uphold. Let me quote from several parts of that basic law.

The fifth clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution says:

> The Congress shall have power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coins, and fix the standard of weights and measures.

Knowing the gentleman's feeling toward certain kinds of printed money, I want to assure him there is nothing said in this grant of power to Congress about printing money.

Now, paper money is not coined, it is printed. Nothing but metallic money may be said to be coined. I cannot find anything in the Constitution of the United States authorizing anybody to issue printed money, nor has the part of the Constitution above quoted ever been abrogated.

Evidently the fathers of the Constitution authorized as money—legal tender—only metallic money. In section 10 this same basic law forbids the States to "make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debt," while at the same time forbidding the States to "coin money."

How the various kinds of paper money we have today, including the so-called printing-press money, came into being constitutes several long chapters in American monetary history. This history should be critically studied by every Member of Congress.

In advocating any kind of paper money over another kind the burden of proof is on the advocate, and he who would substitute any kind of paper money for metallic money of both precious metals has a double burden of proof upon him. Saying nothing of economic wisdom, he must first show that the portions of the Constitution quoted above have been repealed—and they have not been repealed.

The Farm Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a short but informative editorial on the question of farm labor appearing in a recent issue of the Billings Gazette, a newspaper of wide circulation in my district, published at Billings, Mont. I trust that my colleagues will read the same. It is my belief that all farm help should be deferred and kept on the farms. This has been my contention from the start. The production of food is a vital element in the winning of the war. If more serious and enlightened thought is not given to the question of farm labor and the stimulation of production of farm products, I am fearful that this country will face a period bordering on starvation.

The editorial follows:

THE FARM JOB

Again Uncle Sam has to turn a keen, untroubled face home to the instant need of things. It's the farmers.

As a direct result of their recent roaring, Congress is now facing facts about agricultural relation to the war effort. It seemed lately that farm production was going to be endangered by the drafting of too many farmers for the armed services. Thousands of farms had already been stripped of needed men. This was caused by drastic action of some selective service boards, as well as carelessness at Washington. But now it is announced that the selective service rules will be eased so as not to cripple the farms.

This policy is necessary in order to make sure of adequate production for the American people and their armed forces. And it is especially necessary if the United States Government intends to make good its promise of feeding starving foreign nations.

This latter pledge means more than philanthropy. It is also a practical war measure, which may help to win the war as much as the fighting does.

Renegotiation of Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from James C. Self, president of the Mathews Cotton Mill, of Greenwood, S. C. The letter concerns the renegotiation of contracts. The textile industry is not only one of the principal industries of South Carolina, but pays enormous taxes for the upkeep of the State government. I should like to have this letter from Mr. Self printed in the RECORD, so that when the hearings on the renegotiation of contracts are held the committee may have the advantage of what is stated by Mr. Self.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATHEWS COTTON MILL,
Greenwood, S. C., January 28, 1943.

Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: It is our understanding that the whole question of renegotiation of contracts is going to be considered by the Finance Committee of the Senate, and we feel that in the interest of time and expense in this emergency that the textile industry should be exempt from renegotiation for the following reasons:

First, the procurement branches of the armed forces have been outspoken in their praise of the cooperation which they have received from the textile industry.

Second, the constructions of cloth supplied to the armed services are standardized, therefore eliminating the element of guesswork as to prices which the procurement officers have placed on these fabrics.

Third, the mills in a spirit of cooperation have accepted these prices, which, in many instances, have been lower than prices for which the same or similar goods could have been sold to the domestic trade.

We have before us statements of mills that have continued to sell their product to the civilian trade, and their percentage of earnings equals, and in some instances is higher than, the earnings of our own mills that have gone all-out to help the war effort. If, therefore, the Price Adjustment Board operates on a fair basis, we believe that, based on our own operations, excess profits on textile contracts have already been collected by the Treasury Department through taxation.

For reasons stated above, we have been informed that the committee had decided to eliminate the textile industry from the original bill, but for some reason it was included at the last minute.

In discussing the profit limitations on war contracts before the bill was passed, Senator DAVID I. WALSH, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, said:

"It became apparent to the Senate Appropriations Committee that many negotiated contracts were awarded before either of the contracting parties had any accurate idea as to the actual cost of producing the article on a mass production basis.

"Firms and corporations naturally bid very high or negotiated at a very high price in order to play safe. When the actual cost of manufacturing the article became known it was apparent that some firms were making excessive profit, and both the Government and the manufacturer desired to renegotiate the contract in order to reduce the cost to the Government."

This, as you well know, is not true in the textile industry, where, as previously stated, the constructions of cloth are fairly well standardized, and the Government has not been called upon to finance the production. Furthermore, this eliminates guess work in price fixing on the part of the procurement officers, which avoid indiscriminate and inflationary price increases. Therefore, we feel confident that as far as the textile industry is concerned, profits and the danger of inflation are fully protected by the present income and excess-profits tax law.

We urge you to give this important matter your immediate attention, in order that the textile industry may have an opportunity to substantiate these facts, which will clear up the existing confusion and permit us to give our entire time to our part of the job of helping to win this war.

With kindest regards, believe me,

Yours sincerely,

JAS. C. SELF,
President and Treasurer.

Subsidies for the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, is the farmer to continue to be treated as if he were a ward of the Federal Government? Is a concerted effort being made to have it appear he cannot maintain himself without Government aid and subsidy? The farmer of the country resents such treatment at the hands of his Government. He is well able to take care of himself. It is not necessary to offer him inducements or bribes in order to get him to perform his duty and obligation in this crisis. The farmer is as patriotic and liberty loving as any other group of citizens. The farmer wants no dole, he needs no subsidies. All he asks for is enough manpower and machine power to efficiently perform his work. In the Milwaukee Journal of February 1, 1943, appeared an editorial entitled "Subsidies for the Farmer." Because it is timely I wish to incorporate it with my remarks. The editorial reads as follows:

SUBSIDIES FOR THE FARMER

Farm organizations, which favored farm subsidies in lean times, are against the administration's latest proposals to stimulate maximum production of food through farm subsidy payments. An "economy which does not pay the cost of its food bill will inevitably collapse," say these organizations.

Sound thinkers on the side lines agree with these farm organizations in their present position on subsidies. There is no gain in hiding food costs from the taxpayer as consumer, while charging them up to the consumer as taxpayer. We all have to eat and, in one way or another, we all have to foot the food bill. We may better do so directly than through subterfuge.

Farmers should have an adequate war level price for their crops. That price should be such that farmers will be induced to produce as much as possible. It should, however, be a controlled price, calculated to prevent unnecessary inflation. Consumer food prices should be based on the cost of what the farms produce, plus the cost of preparing and handling. They, too, in these war dislocations, should be controlled. Subsidy should have no place in the picture anywhere. Shortages should be managed through rationing.

A program such as this would, of course, entail some increase in food costs to consumers. Properly handled, the increase would not be large, for neither the farmer nor the processor nor the retailer would be permitted to go as far as he desired in his price demands.

There are only two big difficulties in putting such a plan into complete and immediate operation. The first is that the farmer, having seen the coddling of labor by the administration, now seems obsessed with the idea that he must achieve a "parity" with labor. The second is that labor, having acquired an advantage over the farmer, is determined to maintain it.

The problem now is to face the whole matter realistically, denying to both labor and the farmer the privilege of further jockeying for position. Today we have a war to win. We can win it only by producing every needed supply at a maximum rate.

We need guns and bullets and tanks and airplanes. That is labor's job. We need food for ourselves and our allies. That is the farmer's job. "How much is in it for me if I produce?" should cease to be a prime consideration for either.

The worker already has more buying power than he can profitably use. The farmer is again in a position where he can pay off on his mortgage. The general level of agricultural prices is at the highest point since 1920—15 percent above parity. Minor adjustments will continue to be made to correct "injustices." So why all the fuss?

The farmer is right. We do not need subsidies. We should not have them. But we also do not need a "free" market for food at this time. We should not have it. We need price controls (subject to moderate adjustment) and wage controls (subject to review) and rationing (subject to modification), with everything clearly understood and with everybody getting fair treatment and no more.

We Should Put Our Own House in Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, no matter what we thought about getting into this war—we are in it. Past considerations of the advisability of war are now foreclosed and we have just one thing to do and that is to hit the enemy as hard as we know how.

All of the public debates and discussions as to who was who or who said what before or after Pearl Harbor should now be silenced. A running discussion of this matter now only tends to divide us in our all-out efforts to win this war. Members of Congress who were reelected in spite of a pre-Pearl Harbor noninterventionist attitude ought to be satisfied to go ahead from now on and ignore what is past. Reporters and commentators who keep up a constant barrage against these Members will have little to talk about if we do not talk first. They will still have less to talk about if we tend to our business in winning this war.

No matter what we thought about the ideologies of our allies before the war, they are our partners now in a common effort to defeat our common enemies. It comes with poor grace for us now during this war to stop to take issue with Russia about her form of government. Whatever kind of government Russia has, it obviously is a fighting government supported by the men, women, and children of Russia to the last ounce of their energy. The Russians are putting up a heroic fight and it seems to me that Russia is entitled to the kind of government she wants.

There are a lot of people in this country mortally afraid that because we are allied with Russia we are in danger of becoming a communistic state. Stalin has made it very plain that the ideology of the Russian system may not be the cure for all governments. He recognizes, for example, that if, here in the United States, we desire to rearrange our own affairs it is our problem and not Russia's.

There may be a small number of citizens of the United States who believe in the Russian system as it could be applied here, but the vast majority of the citizens of the United States believe that our form of government, constitutionally improved, is the correct answer to our future well-being and happiness. The people of the United States will determine their own form of government; during this war we should all be tolerant enough to work with any other government that has the same war purpose as our own.

The great majority of the people of the United States would like to see India obtain her independence, but during this war shall we stop and divide ourselves in a contest with England over this question? Evidently we should not. Only when we attempt to force our way of life upon them, or these governments attempt to force theirs upon us, should there be any break in our common effort to win this war.

The United States may demand that India be given her independence. It may well appear that to withhold this independence will threaten the peace of the whole world; if so the United States at the peace table can talk the language that Great Britain will understand. The whole world should be told that now.

The United States cannot uphold any system of colonial control for commercial purposes only, which will inevitably lead to war. The United States cannot afford to permit any nation to strangle others by economic or other means. When the time comes we can speak. But in this actual and continuing battle we cannot right the wrongs of other governments. There is just one thing we can do, outside of fighting side by side with our allies, and that is to right the wrongs of our own Government and let the nations of the earth see and understand what the four freedoms mean.

A lot of people have it already figured out just what kind of a peace we shall have and just what our world status shall be after the war. When the actual time for peace comes, however, there will be so many new elements in the situation that well-calculated plans in being now will have to be revised, so that the original plan will not be recognized by its author. We should not use up too much energy during the war on this matter; we should first win the war, and when the proper time comes keep our heads clear to do our part in establishing a peace which will be as nearly a permanent peace as humans are capable of achieving.

After the last war, we made more mistakes than we did during the war. We had a chance to approach a perpetual peace in adopting a system of control over all belligerents, but we missed the pass entirely. We had it right in our hands but did not hang onto the ball. President Wilson passed the ball right into our hands and we dropped it. The result was this war. Instead of wearing out our brains figuring what kind of a peace we shall have this time, we had better dig in and win the war and keep our heads clear for any eventuality. If it is then possible to write a peace that will prevent future wars, I am sure the American people this time will take that step.

While the war is in progress, the more talk we have about nationalities, religions, and political beliefs, the more divided we shall become. It would be a better policy to assume that all our citizens are loyal to our war effort, and as long as they are, let them have any beliefs they want. As long as those beliefs are not antagonistic to our American way who should complain about them? Only when those beliefs ripen into acts calculated to defeat our war purpose or destroy our Government should we go into action against them.

All of our enemies know we are not fighting for territory, as we do not want land anywhere—we have enough. We have stated our purpose and our aims and any plan of peace which we propose, if not consented to by our allies, can mean nothing and will add nothing to what we have already said. The two allied states which shall have contributed the most in lives in this common effort are Russia and China, hence it is nonsense to talk about the kind of peace we shall have if it does not embrace the wishes of these two great contributors.

My responsibility here in Congress seems clear to me. We should do everything we can to unite all of our people behind our war effort, to keep our fighting front and the production front, especially that of food, going at full strength; to steer clear of all religious and racial indictments; to be tolerant of all shades of belief; and to hit the line hard against our common foe. After the war we must conduct ourselves in the same spirit and take our place at the peace table with our allies clear of mind and conscience and use our best efforts to frame a peace that will last as long as human ingenuity can then contrive. Experience has taught us that we cannot agree to crush any people anywhere. The Germans, the Italians, and the Japanese have a right to live and become members of a peaceful society of nations. The power which their leaders have had to disturb and threaten the peace of the world must be destroyed, and the ambition of no man or set of men should again be permitted to plunge the world into suffering, destruction, and death. Broadly speaking, this should be and I think will be the attitude of the people of the United States at the peace table.

It is obvious that any definite formula of peace proposed by this Government now, without the concurrence of our allies, and without a knowledge of actual conditions following the war, is a waste of time. All we can do to this end is to present the general principles of a just peace. In order to be in a position of leadership at the peace table, we should be able to prove that we are what we say we are. If we say we are committed to the "four freedoms"—freedom of speech and expression, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear of physical aggression of one nation against another—we should be able to prove conclusively that we practice those freedoms here in our Government.

We should right now and before that time comes put our own home in order and by example demonstrate our right to be of influence in shaping the peace of the world.

The one thing, above every other, that foments war is economic forces which drive people to war. If every citizen were given security against the ever-present threat of insecurity, if full social security were given to our aged, our crippled, our unemployed, we will have made the first significant move in the struggle to secure permanent peace for the people of the world. But not having adopted this policy ourselves in our own Government we can hardly expect any other nation to depend upon us for leadership in a world movement to prevent future wars.

We can do that one thing right now while this war is in progress; we can write a thoroughgoing social security

law. That will be the one action we can take toward preventing wars in the future. If the returning soldiers of this country knew they would be welcomed back into our business life with security against lost employment; if the crippled and the sick soldiers knew that they would return to a grateful homeland that had removed the uncertainty of the future; if the aged of this country knew that they would be freed from the constant fear of neglect and starvation; if these things were done now, we could offer at the peace table an example in government which if followed by others would remove the economic distress that foments all wars. Will we do that now before we are called upon to frame a peace?

"Pigs Is Still Pigs"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, in the hope of shedding one more ray of light on a dark picture, food for America and its allies, I want to give this angle on lard, so well set forth by this fine farm magazine, the Farm Journal and Farmer's Wife, of February 1943. Lard is being included in millions of cans of pork for our Red allies. My opinion for what it is worth as to point rationing: I believe it will be the most devastating program of them all in its effect on public morale. Food stores short of help, millions of Americans without transportation to get to super markets, long waits in line, fluctuating value of the little coupons. The outlook for Americans to obtain their daily food is dark indeed.

The article follows:

WHY MORE PORK YIELDS LESS LARD

When the Food Administrator's office warned of a national fat shortage of 7 pounds per capita in 1943, market-wise economists in the Department of Agriculture were quick to point out to him that half of that estimate isn't a shortage at all but merely another unforeseen turn caused by price ceilings. A lot of the pork fat that would normally go into lard production is being sold across meat counters as bacon and pork, and will continue to do so as long as ceiling regulations operate to put penalties on lard production.

This is, in fact, the usual result of interference with production processes by bureaucratic edicts, which seldom take all the factors into consideration.

Statistics show that the hogs marketed in 1942 weighed 14 pounds per head more than hog carcasses did between 1921 and 1930. Yet last year's hogs yielded 4 pounds less lard per head than their ancestors of the predepression. A 1942 lard yield averaging out with those of 1921–30 would have given the United States an additional supply of approximately 420,000,000 pounds for 1943. And that's without considering the 14-pound increase in average weights.

Instead, the economists report, much of 1942's lard went to market as 45-cent pork loin and 50-cent bacon because of the price ceilings slapped on wholesale pork and lard by the Office of Price Administration. The ceiling on wholesale pork loins at Chicago last week was $26.50 per hundredweight. The ceiling on prime steam tierced lard was $14.41 per hundredweight, or 61 cents per hundredweight less than the price of live hogs in the Union yards.

"Look from that to the specifications in Office of Price Administration's pork regulations, which permit bacon cuts to be up to 3 inches in thickness and skinned hams to carry 1.25 inches of solid fat," the economists point out. "Because of the cash loss entailed in lard production and the fat allowed on pork cuts, many packers have sold the fat from this year's hogs as meat. Any businessman with a quarter ounce of brains would do the same."

The packers appear to agree, but do point to lend-lease bids as another reason for the lard shortage. "There has been a very strong demand from the Agricultural Marketing Administration for dry salt meats such as fat backs and jowls for shipment to Russia," one packer representative explained. "The ceiling price on these meats in relation to the ceiling price on lard has distinctly favored the dry salt cuts."

"The Office of Price Administration trimming specifications," explained another packing house official, "restore to hams and loins and shoulders about the amount of fat which was left on them in the old days before keen competition had taken all the fat off. Present ceiling prices on lard are low in comparison to the prices which can be realized on cured fat backs, and the effect of this is to encourage the marketing of fat backs as meat rather than as rendered lard."

Up to the Food Administrator's desk last week came recommendations for taking some of the drippings out of pork and putting it back into the lard box. The first, naturally, is to raise the price of lard to a point where it will pay its way to market.

A second suggestion is that changes be made in Office of Price Administration rulings, with resultant closer trimming of marketed pork. Third and final notion is to establish a higher price ceiling on close-trimmed pork cuts. By using one of these plans, Claude Wickard could get some of the lost fat back into its proper market channel.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Army is now 20 times the size it was 2½ years ago.

The "WAAC's who had no clothes" would have gotten a rise from the strip-tease girl at Des Moines.

The first bill to pass the House this session went through Tuesday. It authorized a $200,000,000 expenditure for the Navy.

The three handicaps our really wonderful arsenal has in connection with foreign wars are: Labor standards here, distances, subs.

The Harrison Spangler banner waved at Topeka, January 29, and it looked good to those who appreciate things fiscal and who are concerned.

The Ides of March will be lend-lease again, as 2 years ago. It will be argued for a wholly different purpose now. In 1941 it was offered as the way to escape war.

The question before the Nation today is, Is there a battle going on in the Solomons again? Secretary Knox says "No." But the genial Secretary said after Pearl Harbor, "Our Navy was chasing them."

The fuel-oil and gasoline supply to the eastern seaboard zone formerly came 95 percent from tankers. This is about as definitely out as rubber from the East Indies. All transportation facilities today are only 60 percent adequate.

From a village of 300 people with a high school of 100, and my home town, came Bernard Rogers, the first captain of the Corps of Cadets at West Point. He led the 500 who go out in June and he did not come from the top of a civil-service list, either.

The Congress could save annually $22,000,000 in one stroke, but they will not do it. If all the postmasters in cities of the first and second classes, 1,444 and 3,849, respectively, should go to hospitals tomorrow morning, the mail service in the United States would not be impaired one iota.

Address of Eugene B. Casey, Before National Rural Electric Cooperative Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Eugene B. Casey, Special Executive Assistant to the President, to the first annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, held at St. Louis, Mo., on January 19 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The fight for freedom is being fought on the farms of America no less than in the air, abroad, and on the seas throughout the world. No class of citizens has shown more patriotism in the face of difficulties than our farmers. The record crop production of 1942 proves their mettle.

American farmers have set a magnificent example of self-sacrifice and devotion to duty in these trying times. Though handicapped by loss of many of their sturdy sons to the fighting forces or to war industries, they have done little complaining. Lack of farm equipment is another serious drawback, though as long as the supply of baling wire lasts many a farm implement will be kept in fair shape to do its part.

That is why I, a Maryland farmer, consider it so great a privilege and a pleasure to appear upon the program of your association with another American farmer who has become the great American statesman, yes, elder states-

man, Senator George W. Norris. It is seldom that history allows any of us to participate much beyond the developmental work of our acts of creation, but for you, Senator Norris and, as I know, for the President, we here tonight are seeing the coming of age of a great movement which you both fathered and developed.

The Rural Electrification Administration, now serving more than a million farm homes, has proved itself a great creative force in peacetime and has established its true worth as a great force of production in the present struggle.

In every trial of strength that this Nation, or any nation undergoes, the final test inevitably resolves itself into a test of the capacity of the farm people to supply the armies with food and other items as farms produce for war. Great military leaders throughout history have paid tribute to the fact that wars are won with the full belly of the soldier. Guns, bullets, tanks, and planes; these are the front-line weapons, but a basic necessity to keep them in action is food and more food.

Farmers today are truly on the war production line as much as are the great airplane factories of the west coast, Kaiser's shipyards, and the vast munitions plants of Michigan. Last year farmers throughout this country earned their E in their battle of food production. This year again the pennant for extraordinary service must symbolically float from the gable end of every barn throughout this land if our sons, and brothers, and wives, and daughters will have the necessary food to persevere and win.

From living with its soil farmers know a love of country perhaps richer and deeper than any other group of men. Never in any time of strife and struggle in this country's history has their patriotism been found wanting, or their answer to the challenge imposed by the struggle proven inadequate. So, once again with less machinery, with less manpower, with less fertilizer, they gear themselves to meet the challenge of more and more production for our war machine. "Food for freedom" was one of the earliest watchwords of the war, and it met with immediate response.

No one could have foreseen the great result to this Nation in its rural electrification program in 1935 when it was established. All thinking men knew that farmers should, in fact must, adopt the principles of production of the twentieth century if they were to be able to take their place in our economic life. And yet, today we still have those who think of the farm and its relation to production in terms of the ox and the cradle. This is doubly unfortunate. Unfortunate for the Nation which is now calling for the greatest all-out production that this country has ever produced. And unfortunate in the days to come in its insistence that the farmer be something different from his neighbors by depriving him of that essential element of production—electric power—that is basic to a high standard of living in this twentieth century. But I do not believe this to be true.

It is fortunate, however, that we had the great progress in rural electrification during the past 7 years—without it the Nation's food problem today would be far more critical.

In 1937 an editorial in a big midwestern newspaper expressed the opinion that in the construction of great dams by the Federal Government we were creating millions of kilowatts of power which would never be used by the people. I wonder what the writer of that editorial thinks today when he realizes—if he does—that without these millions of kilowatts of power the great arsenal of democracy would have produced merely an anemic trickle of arms and food, instead of an American productivity that no one has ever had the boldness to imagine.

I wonder if he knows now that without these millions of kilowatts of power—brought at cheap rates to the American farms through the medium of the Rural Electrification Administration—it would not have been possible for the American farmers to feed our own Army and Navy, to feed our own families, and to help feed the fighting men and some of the war workers of the United Nations.

I wonder if he understood what President Roosevelt meant, when he said, just 1 week ago, that "In spite of the handicaps under which American farmers worked last year, the production victory they won was among the major victories of the United Nations in 1942. Free people everywhere can be grateful to the farm families who made that victory possible."

Truly, when the President, by Executive order established the Rural Electrification Administration in 1935, he had his eyes on the future of the Nation. On a strictly materialistic basis, he knew that its cost would be returned to the people of the United States many times over in the cheapening of electric power and the distribution of this power to hundreds of small farms and communities. But the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration expressed, in a sense, those principles for which the common men all over the world are fighting today.

The Rural Electrification Administration has meant the widespread availability of electricity in its innumerable forms. The Rural Electrification Administration has meant a higher standard of living. In its 7 years of operation the Rural Electrification Administration has encouraged, financed, and provided technical help for the electrification of rural America. It has made possible the cheaper production of many items, including milk, butter, eggs, and pork. It has been responsible for developing a higher quality of many farm products. It has reduced drudgery in farm work and in the farm kitchen. It has made life pleasanter for the farm household. It has engendered a powerful community spirit, which I assure you, in times like these is all-important.

I have been privileged to glance at a summary sheet of the Rural Electrification Administration's purchases of wholesale power for the fiscal years 1939-42. I found them to be most interesting. More than anything else they point, in my opinion, to these facts, first, the very healthy growth and expansion of the program in meeting the needs of the farmers and, second, the fact that the farmers evidently are using the power productively in ever greater quantities. In comparison with other years, not many consumers or miles of line were connected or built within this past year and yet there has been a tremendous gain in the amount of kilowatt-hours purchased.

Again, the publicly owned suppliers are way below the average cost of the privately owned; 2½ mills on this amount of power means a lot of money. A very significant figure is the average cost for 1942 which has now shaded 1 cent. Inasmuch as in 1936 and as late as 1937, private power companies were crying to the public that any wholesale rate below 2 cents was almost confiscatory, to me this seems real accomplishment on the part of farm cooperatives in their wholesale rate bargaining. I need not tell you, of course, that the thing that has really forced down these rates has been the threat by these cooperatives to build their own generating plants and then, of course, the public plants built through agencies of the Government.

But there is so much more to be done. Today 60 percent of our farms are without electric power. It is indeed tragic that these millions of farmers are deprived of the electric service they need for war food production and for meeting labor shortages.

That is why I would like to add another freedom to those that we are fighting for. Freedom from drudgery. The members of this association, through the aid of its Government, have found a new way of living. A way of living that has, as I said before, immeasurable benefits in times of peace and uncalculated help for the Nation in time of war. During the critical days ahead it seems to me that the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association must pledge that every mile of line, every electric appliance, every kilowatt-hour of energy will be dedicated to our fighting men and women on whatever battlefield they may be. The battle of production on the food front must be won in spite of all the handicaps which the nature of our duties presents to us.

The creation of your organization is indeed timely. It comes not only with the normal resurgence of the reactionaries, but coincidentally with a planned and disreputable attack upon you by those interests who voted against your conception, attempted to smother you at birth and aimed to deprive you of every sustenance in the 7 years of your rangy and healthful youth.

There are those who thought that the war would stifle—yes, and destroy—the forward march of rural electrification. They reckoned not on the organized power of the farmers and the rural electrification cooperatives. They underestimated the strength of a good hearty kick from a healthy, sturdy, modern mule.

As you all know, the War Production Board, 5 days ago, eased its rules against new electrical connections, thus making it possible for short extensions of existing rural distribution lines to be made when the extension is needed to operate specified farm production equipment.

This is indeed bad news for those who would strangle you. And on the other hand, it is certainly a tribute to your association and your leaders. It is, of course, one of the first major victories in which your association has taken part.

I can warn you, however, that the forces of darkness are still at your heels and only the complete solidarity of your membership can assist and protect you now and during those years to come when prosperity may blind some of us to the real purposes of the selfish interests.

Today you are on guard. I say to each and every one of you to pledge to yourselves as sentries in the service of public power and to remain on guard.

Then, when this job is done and peace once again comes to this land of ours, this association must be found carrying the banner for those farmers now without electricity so that the day will come when twentieth-century America meets the challenge of peace with twentieth century farms.

The events of the past 2 months must have convinced most of us that the people are on the march. That they are fighting for democracy—its preservation and enrichment.

Make no mistake—this war is bigger than any of us, and what have been our concerns for years are swept away in each sea, air, or land action. In every American city and town, the children of all the races of the earth are bound together as one people, driving ahead on all the lines which make up the war effort of a country like ours. It is our duty to serve that people, not only the segment of one particular group but the whole people. These 13 months of war have told a story of democracy and the unity of the most diverse people on the earth as no

other event in our history. It is the duty of an association such as yours to serve that unity

I realize full well that there are some groups in the Nation who have never paid more than mere lip service to that unity. I can see in some of the current attacks on Rural Electrification, on the President and all that he stands for, symptoms of a resurgent toryism. In the dark days of last spring and last fall when defeat was staring us in the face, the tories slyly stayed in the background and we were promised a brave new world if we did our duty and won the war. But with the first sign of victory all this changed, and toryism blooms again in full flower. As long as the cause of the United States appeared in doubt, the voice of toryism was quiet and apologetic. But now that we have started the uphill grind we see a marked revival of the spirit of tory reaction. And so today, behind the scenes, the powerful interests are staking out their claims and are again putting up their barricades against social progress. These are the interests who did not want anything new in 1933. These are the interests that do not want anything new during the war. These are the interests that do not want anything new after the war. In the shadow and chill of defeat their toryism wilted somewhat, but it will become more and more active and insistent with every victory.

Now, these lip servers of democracy, who are forever looking backward to the time of what was called Coolidge prosperity, would like nothing better than when the war is over to destroy the New Deal and all that it has meant to the common people of America. It is these people who, by resisting all economic and social changes gave us "the locust years of the hungry 1920's and rebuilt the slum world which was fit not for heroes, but for Hitlers."

We cannot feel that it is enough to rid the world of Hitler and Mussolini and Tojo. We must remove the economic causes that give rise to such types.

We must go on to repudiate the uncooperative attitude which has characterized our foreign policy as completely as we have repudiated the uncooperative attitudes which characterized our domestic affairs prior to 1933. The road ahead is grim. It is a long, hard road, stormy and beset with many obstacles. But it leads to final victory.

We have girded ourselves well for the greatest battle the world has ever known. We must gird ourselves equally as well for the greatest peace the world has ever known. We agree that this is indeed a people's war—a war for the preservation of decency and dignity. And you and I are certainly agreed that this is a war for the preservation of decency and dignity here at home—on our farms and in our cities—as well as overseas.

Victory will be ours; let no one doubt it for an instant. Victory will be ours, though it demand more of us than millions of the free and favored peoples of the earth have yet imagined they would ever have to give. But it will not be a victory which will suddenly shower blessings upon us and permit us to go back to whatever ease or luxury we had. Neither will it give us a peace in which we can be lazy and careless, ignorant and self-indulgent.

If our victory is to be a victory worthy of our heroic dead, it will not save the world as it was or as it is. It will set the stage for a new and more inspiring chapter in human history. Our victory must be a victory for a new hope for the common man, the ordinary people, all of us; a victory for the dream of hundreds of thousands of people all over the world.

But the realization of such a victory depends largely upon the courage, zeal, determination, and alertness of the type of ordinary Americans who make up the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Penny Milk Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, so that the membership of the House may know what a constituent of mine thinks of the penny milk program, I am inserting the remarks of James V. Skaates, secretary of the Association of Commerce, Lima, Ohio:

Serious arguments in favor of the penny-milk program (the U. S. Government Manual labels it the so-called penny-milk program) were advanced by some darn fine Lima people whose interest in children's welfare must be admired. In fact, we might agree, in normal times, that a bottle of milk served to school children every day, in their classrooms, would be a good thing. No doubt many of the children need it. But let's not go only half way. They need orange juice, too, so let's serve them a bottle of orange juice in the mornings and milk in the afternoons. Now, vitamins are a fine thing, and until we arrive at the day of outdoor nudist classes maybe the children ought to get their vitamins at school. How about meat? Think of the pounds it would add to their frames to have a nice T-bone steak for lunch every day. Surely they should eat lunch at school, and save that tiring walk home, and be able to play on the school playgrounds where they are properly supervised. Let's build a race of supermen. What do we care if it adds another b-b-b-billion dollars to our public debt? The Government has to pay it, not us.

My own little boy was downcast when I told him he couldn't buy his penny milk at school. Into his mind flashed a picture of the other children drinking their Government-sponsored milk while he had none. He brightened up, however, when I suggested that he tell the others "My daddy buys me all the milk I want at home." We're not on relief yet, and resent anybody's feeling that they have to feed my children.

J. V. SKAATES.

Financial Summary of War Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 5, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave given me to extend my remarks, I include the following letter and statements from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on appropriations and contract authorizations made available during the period from July 1, 1940, to December 31, 1942; appropriations and contract authorizations, expenditures, obligations, commitments, unexpended balances, unobligated balances, and so forth, as of December 31, 1942, and projected to June 30, 1943:

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1943.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: In accordance with your request, I have had a statement prepared and a table developed summarizing the status of appropriations and authorizations which have been made for war purposes. Two copies of each of these are enclosed.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY OF THE WAR PROGRAM COVERING APPROPRIATIONS, CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS, AND COMMITMENTS BY GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS JULY 1, 1940, TO DECEMBER 31, 1942

In the President's Budget message early this month he stated, among other things, that there was about $170,000,000,000 of unspent war appropriations and authorizations and that about two-thirds of this amount was already obligated or committed. It is proposed to discuss here the relationship of these funds as they might affect future appropriations and to explain in detail how the majority of these funds are already committed and will be used for specific war purposes. In the accompanying table a summarization has been made of the situation as of December 31, 1942, for funds and authorizations then available. An estimate has also been included in the table which shows what may be expected to be the status of these funds on June 30, 1943, with reference to unobligated and unexpended balances. This statement is based entirely upon appropriations and authorizations, including commitments of Government corporations, which were approved between July 1, 1940, and December 31, 1942, and it should be noted that for the purpose of estimating the condition on June 30, 1943, as well as throughout this discussion, no consideration is given to any supplemental appropriations or authorizations that may be approved during the last 6 months of this fiscal year.

The total war program provided from July 1, 1940, through December 31, 1942, measured in terms of appropriations, net contract authorizations, and commitments of Government corporations, amounted to $241,000,000,000. This amount includes $24,800,000,000 contract authorizations, mostly to complete naval and merchant vessels, for which funds have not yet been appropriated, and $17,200,000,000 representing commitments by Government corporations. The net cash appropriation of $199,200,000,000 includes small amounts of unexpended balances brought forward in fiscal year 1941, small amounts to liquidate contract authorizations against which obligations were incurred prior to June 30, 1940, and amounts made available to special funds through receipts, payment for services, and the like.

Expenditures through December 31, 1942, against the $199,200,000,000 of appropriations available totaled $67,700,000,000, leaving $131,500,000,000 unexpended appropriations.

This, plus the unfinanced contract authorizations and the unliquidated Government corporation commitments, brings the total of appropriations and authorizations unexpended on December 31, 1942, to $170,000,000,000. It is estimated that this unexpended $170,000,000,000 will be reduced to $101,000,000,000 by the end of this fiscal year. However, as heretofore indicated, these unexpended balances are made up of contract authorizations and corporation commitments as well as appropriations. On an appropriation basis, the unexpendad balance for June 30, 1943, is estimated at $89,500,000,000. Additional amounts must still be appropriated to liquidate obligations chargeable against the $24,800,000,000 contract authorizations for which no appropriations have yet been made.

On December 31, 1942, only $43,400,000,000 of the $241,000,000,000 program remained unobligated or uncommitted. This will be reduced through obligations incurred during the next 6 months to $8,100,000,000 at the end of this fiscal year. This unobligated balance includes $1,500,000,000 in contract authority for the Bureau of Ships in the Navy which the Navy does not propose to obligate until fiscal year 1944.

Certain unpredictable amounts of the $89,500,000,000 of appropriations estimated to be unexpended on June 30, 1943, will eventually flow to Government corporations, thus making additional funds available to the corporations with which to liquidate outstanding obligations. In considering expenditures after June 30, 1943, this flow of funds to the corporations should be borne in mind, as it tends to reduce the total net outlay of Federal funds to be expended.

Before reviewing the major phases of the war program in greater detail, it may be well to discuss at least in a general way some of the things involved in putting money to work, once it has been appropriated. First, however, a brief definition of the term "obligations incurred," as used in relation to Federal funds, may be helpful. "Obligations incurred" consists of orders placed, contracts awarded, services received, and all other transactions during a given period which legally reserve an appropriation for expenditure. Such items include expenditures not preceded by obligations.

Funds used for current day-to-day or month-to-month requirements and operations, such as for pay, subsistence, fuel, transportation, etc., are obligated almost concurrently with the service rendered or with the delivery of the goods. However, the requirements for services and goods falling in this category for a given period are pretty well known once the pattern of operation is fixed. For example, with the strength of the Army for the end of this fiscal year determined and the monthly rates of accession fixed, funds must be automatically committed or earmarked to provide for the pay of the Army for the size determined to the end of the fiscal year even though they will not legally be obligated until the month in which they are spent. However, in all such cases, appropriations and authorizations for purposes in this category, although not expended or legally obligated, must be held intact for use when required and are not generally available for obligation or expenditure for other purposes.

As contrasted to the type of fiscal operation just described, there are those items which require long-time planning and sometimes even extensive production before obligating all funds for the item. Take a hypothetical example in the aircraft industry. It is determined that a certain type of aircraft, heretofore unproduced, is required by the Army air forces for certain types of operations. Before this plane can be put into production, a plant must be constructed to build the airframe, an engine plant is required, arrangements must be made to retool a propeller manufacturer and arrangements made with subcontractors for several hundred parts, such as instruments, accessories, etc. These and many other similar and equally important operations must be handled before production actually starts. And after the work has started in the airframe plant, it may be several months before the first plane is delivered, and probably as much as a year before the maximum rate of production is reached. From the financial point of view, once it has been decided to produce a given quantity of this particular type of plane, available funds must be earmarked or committed for the whole program. To build airframes without engines and propellers would be folly, and so it follows that all parts of the program must be planned and financing must be assured once it is decided to proceed with any major part of the program on the thesis that completed planes are to be the end product.

These facts, in general, explain why a substantial amount of funds were unobligated on December 31 and why a larger amount was unexpended. As heretofore stated, most of the funds will be obligated by the end of this fiscal year and the unexpended balance will be substantially reduced. The normal operation of a well-planned fiscal program of the war magnitude requires the obligating and committing of funds considerably in advance of actual expenditures. Likewise, funds must be appropriated or authorized, for most operations, well in advance of obligation and commitment.

WAR DEPARTMENT

The net appropriations to the War Department for military purposes during the period July 1, 1940, to December 31, 1942, total $127,283,000,000. There is included in this sum an amount of $401,000,000 representing unexpended balances of prior year appropriations available for expenditure subsequent to June 30, 1940, and there has been excluded from this sum the amount of $11,420,000 which has lapsed due to failure of the Department to obligate within the legal life of various appropriations.

During the same period the sum of $85,624,000,000 was obligated and, in addition, commitments, on December 31, 1942, entailing a future obligation, amounted to $13,836,000,000, thus bringing to a total of $99,460,000,000 the cumulative obligations and commitments at the close of the calendar year 1942.

As of December 31, 1942, there was available to the War Department an unobligated balance of $41,649,000,000. Of this sum, however, nearly $14,000,000,000 had been definitely committed for subsequent obligation during the second half of the fiscal year 1943, leaving a completely free balance (neither obligated nor committed) of $27,822,000,000 on December 31, 1942. The War Department estimates that during the period January 1 to June 30, 1943, it will definitely obligate approximately $35,103,000,000, thus leaving an estimated unobligated balance of $6,555,000,000 on July 1, 1943.

Expenditures on account of the military effort by the War Department during the period July 1, 1940, to December 31, 1942, have amounted to $35,481,000,000, leaving an unexpended balance of $91,802,000,000 as of December 31, 1942. Estimates indicate that $24,200,000,000 will be expended in the last half of this fiscal year, which, when added to the aforementioned expenditures between July 1, 1940, and December 31, 1942, give a total estimated expenditure over the entire period from July 1, 1940, to July 1, 1943, of $59,680,600,000. This leaves an estimated unexpended balance of $67,602,300,000 for expenditure subsequent to July 1, 1943, on account of appropriations authorized since July 1, 1940.

The appropriations for the War Department contain large amounts for the payment of personnel and for the furnishing of supplies and services, the nature of which requires relatively uniform rates of obligation and expenditure throughout the year; hence, large sums for these purposes are obligated on a month-to-month or even a day-to-day basis. This results in sizable unobligated amounts being carried in the books of the Department down to the concluding month of a fiscal year.

In projecting the procurement program, every effort has been made to schedule procurement and production to minimize peak loads upon industry and to spread and synchronize production with consumption. Under this procedure, large sums are, from time to time, committed or earmarked for various procurement projects although the legal obligations do not arise until some months later. Until near the close of the fiscal year, therefore, substantial amounts remain in an uncommitted and unobligated status.

In a war program necessitating the accomplishment of huge construction projects and the procurement of large amounts of heavy matériel and equipment, such as aircraft, tanks, and guns, there is always a lengthy lag, in some instances a year or more, between entering into a contract and the delivery of the finished product and final payment. This results in large sums being carried as unexpended balances which are available to pay bills upon the delivery of goods.

Details of the unobligated and unexpended amounts for the military program of the War Department, as of December 31, 1942, are as follows:

Expediting production

Of a total appropriation of $6,297,000,000 for expediting production, there had been expended $3,153,000,000, while obligations had been entered into entailing a subsequent expenditure of $1,792,000,000, making a total obligation against this appropriation of $4,945,000,000.

There remained unobligated the amount of $1,351,000,000. Of this sum, however, commitments had been made covering $528,000,000, thus leaving an uncommitted balance of $823,000,000. The Under Secretary of War advises, however, that approximately $500,000,000 of this latter amount will be obligated by June 30, 1943, thus leaving an estimated unobligated balance at the close of this fiscal year of $323,000,000.

Finance Service, Army

Since July 1, 1940, there has been provided under this appropriation, Finance Service, Army, which is largely for pay and travel, the sum of $9,263,000,000. Expenditures from July 1, 1940, to December 31, 1942, aggregated $4,564,000,000 and there were unliquidated obligations entailing a subsequent expenditure of $1,092,000,000. While there was an unobligated balance on December 31, 1942, of $3,606,000,000, this sum will be obligated on a month-to-month basis during the concluding months of the fiscal year and will be entirely absorbed in the pay and travel of the Army; in fact, additional funds must be transferred from other military appropriations in order that the Army may have sufficient funds to meet the pay-roll requirements for troops. The impending deficit in this appropriation results from an increase in the strength of the Army subsequent to the enactment of the appropriation

act, the expansion of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, etc.

Supplies and transportation

For supplies and transportation there has been provided $16,155,000,000, of which sum $6,650,000,000 had been expended on December 31, 1942. Outstanding obligations amounted $3,034,000,000 making a total of $9,684,000,000 obligated during the period July 1, 1940, to December 31, 1942. There remained unobligated the sum of $6,472,000,000, but of this amount commitments had been set up aggregating $1,688,000,000, leaving an uncommitted and unobligated balance of $4,783,000,000. The Department estimates, however, that this entire amount will be obligated before the close of the fiscal year 1943. The rate of obligations under this appropriation will be accelerated from month to month as our combat effort increases. In addition to providing food, clothing, and all general supplies for the Army, the Army Transportation Corps costs, including the Army Transport Service, are met from this appropriation.

Signal Service of the Army

The total provided under the appropration Signal Service of the Army was $6,525,000,000. Of this amount but $952,000,000 had been expended by December 31, 1942, although there were unliquidated obligations amounting to $1,878,000,000, thus making a total of $2,830,000,000 obligated during the period July 1, 1940, to December 31, 1942.

There was unobligated on December 31, 1942, the amount of $3,695,000,000, although $1,649,000,000 of this amount had been committed and will be obligated prior to June 30. While there was an uncommitted balance of $2,047,000,000, it is estimated that but $544,000,000 will remain unobligated on June 30, 1943, and the balance of $1,502,000,000 will be both committed and obligated during the last half of the fiscal year for equipment, construction for the aircraft warning service, telephone and radio construction, maintenance and operation, and pay.

The slowness with which obligations are entered intc and expenditures made from this appropriation results from the highly technical character of the equipment procured and from the critical materials situation.

Air Corps, Army

The total provided for the Air Corps amounted to $36,661,000,000. Expenditures to December 31, 1942, had amounted to $7,292,000,000 and unliquidated obligations totaled $22,168,000,000, making a total obligation to December 31, 1942, of $29,460,000,000. Commitments had been made aggregating $2,166,000,000, leaving an uncommitted balance of $5,035,000,000. It is contemplated, however, that contractual negotiations now in progress, including purchase actions initiated for the procurement of aircraft, spare parts, and other aeronautical materials and supplies, together with personal services and operation and maintenance, and purchase of certain special equipment by the Corps of Engineers, will result in the complete obligation of all funds available to the Army Air Corps by June 30, 1943.

Engineer Service, Army

The total provided under this appropriation was $13,602,000,000, of which $6,275,000,000 had been expended on December 31, 1942. The outstanding obligations on that date, for which expenditures will subsequently be made, total $2,378,000,000, making a total obligation of $8,653,000,000. In addition, commitments had been made amounting to $1,374,000,000—all of which will be obligated before the close of the fiscal year—leaving an uncommitted balance as of December 31 of $3,576,000,000. Of this latter amount it is estimated that $2,056,000,000 will be obligated by June 30, 1943, resulting in an estimated unobligated balance at the close of the fiscal year of $1,520,000,000.

With reference to the unobligated balance, the requirements for certain construction were such that commitments and obligations of December 31, 1942, were not necessary to meet schedules. Designing and planning for part of the program had not reached the stage where commitments and firm obligations could be made, and the scarcity of materials and equipment made it impracticable to obligate all available funds by December 31, 1942. Most of the construction is of an emergency nature, to be accomplished as the situation requires. Personal and other services, and particularly all repair and utility activities, are obligated on a month-by-month basis.

Ordnance service and supplies, Army

For ordnance service and supplies there has been provided a total of $34,381,000,000. Of this sum there had been expended on December 31, 1942, the amount of $7,174,000,000, and there were unliquidated obligations amounting to $15,692,000,000, making a total obligation between July 1, 1940, and December 31, 1942, of $22,866,000,000. On December 31, 1942, there were commitments aggregating $1,557,000,000, all of which will be definitely obligated before June 30, 1943. There were uncommitted balances of $9,957,000,000, but it is estimated that the requirements for contracts under negotiation and awaiting approval, transportation, machine tools and equipment, spot purchases for international aid, spare parts for ordnance equipment and vehicles, and the operation and maintenance of the Ordnance Department will result in the obligation of only $5,749,000,000 of this sum. It is estimated that there will be an unobligated balance on June 30, 1943, of $4,209,000,000, reflecting savings due to the renegotiation of contracts, probable decreases in international requirements, and reduction in the Army supply program.

Chemical Warfare Service

There has been provided a total of $1,749,000,000, of which $211,000,000 had been expended by December 31, 1942, with unliquidated obligations amounting to $462,000,000, or a total obligation against the appropriation of $673,000,000. In addition, commitments had been made on December 31 entailing obligations in the last half of the fiscal year of $223,000,000. There remained in an uncommitted status the amount of $853,000,000, but of this amount it is estimated that $386,000,000 will be committed and obligated prior to June 30, 1943, thus leaving an estimated unobligated balance of $467,000,000 at the close of the fiscal year 1943. This estimated saving results from reductions in the Army supply program, savings resulting from improved methods of manufacture and changes in specifications, and reductions in requirements for international aid.

Other War Department military appropriations

For 26 miscellaneous appropriations a total of $2,649,000,000 has been provided. Major items were for the Medical Department, construction of seacoast defenses, and for the operation and maintenance of the Army of the Philippines. Of the total appropriated, $995,000,000 had been expended on December 31, 1942, and unliquidated obligations amounted to $576,000,000, thus giving a total obligation of $1,570,000,000. There was an unobligated balance of $1,079,000,000, of which amount $330,000,000 had been committed, leaving an uncommitted balance of $749,000,000. It is estimated that obligations will be incurred between January 1 and June 30, 1943, amounting to $717,000,000, thus leaving an unobligated balance at the close of the fiscal year of $362,000,000. The principal items making up this unobligated balance are $196,000,000 in the appropriation for the Army of the Philippines and $100,000,000 in the Chief of Staff's contingent fund. With respect to the former, this sum is being held in reserve pending new developments in the Far East. The estimate of the unobligated balance in the Chief of Staff's fund is, of course, subject to many contingencies for which this fund might possibly be employed.

It is estimated that there will be a total unobligated balance in military appropriations for the War Department of approximately $6,555,000,000 on June 30, 1943, arising largely from savings resulting in a reduction in requirements under the Army supply program, the renegotiation of contracts, changes in the construction program, and reductions in requirements for international aid items. The availability of this sum will lapse on June 30, 1943, under present appropriation language.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

The Navy program, including the Marine Corps and Coast Guard, reached a total of $64,000,000,000 for the 2½-year period ending December 31, 1942. This is made up of $42,000,000,000 of cash appropriations and $22,000,000,000 of contract authorizations. About $20,000,000,000 of the latter is the estimated cost of authorized ships which have not yet been completed.

Obligations and commitments against the $64,000,000,000 totaled $52,000,000,000 on December 31, 1942, leaving an unobligated or uncommitted balance of $12,000,000,000 on that date. However, the Navy Department expects to have all except $1,550,600,000 of its funds obligated by June 30, 1943.

On the cash side of the picture, nearly $19,000,000,000 of the $42,000,000,000 available had been expended by December 31, 1942, leaving an unexpended balance on that date of $23,600,000,000. It is estimated that this amount will be reduced by $9,300,000,000 by the end of this fiscal year, leaving an unexpended cash balance on June 30, 1943, of $14,300,000,000.

Of the $1,550,600,000 estimated to be unobligated on June 30, 1943, $1,500,000,000 is contract authorization under the appropriation title "Increase and replacement of naval vessels." This amount is being held in reserve for the fiscal year 1944 to obligate in that year for the purchase of armor, armament, and ammunition to be placed on ships which will be completed in that year or later and for which schedules are not yet detailed. It should be noted that this entire $1,500,000,000 is in contract authority.

Under the appropriation title "Increase and replacement of naval vessels," total appropriations and contract authorizations amounted to $31,500,000,000 between July 1, 1940, and December 31, 1942. This amount includes $11,200,000,000 net appropriations and $20,300,000,000 unfinanced contract authorizations. Obligations and commitments against these amounts totaled $24,500,000,000 on December 31, 1942, leaving a free balance at that time of $7,000,000,000. Present plans of the Navy call for the obligation of all but $1,500,000,000 of this amount by the end of the present fiscal year. This $1,500,000,000 represents contract authority which will not be used until 1944 and has already been discussed. Expenditures under this program totaled about $6,900,000,000 through December 31, 1942, and an increased rate of expenditure is expected during the last 6 months of the fiscal year. However, on the basis of present estimates, sufficient cash to finance this program

through the end of this fiscal year has already been appropriated.

Under the Bureau of Ordnance, in the ordnance and ordnance stores appropriation, there will be obligated for the 3 fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943, $6,200,000,000. All of this amount has already been appropriated. During that same time there will be expended $2,600,000,000, which leaves $3,600,000,000 available at the end of the fiscal year 1943 with which to pay off obligations incurred before that time.

There has been provided under the appropriation title, "Aviation, Navy," a total of a little over $12,100,000,000 in appropriations and contract authorizations. However, the present unfinanced contract authorizations amount to only $240,000,000. Obligations and commitments to December 31, 1942, under this program amounted to $9,300,000,000, leaving an uncommitted and unobligated balance of $2,800,000,000. The Navy Department estimates that it will obligate the $2,800,000,000 free balance by July 1, 1943.

Under the appropriation, "Aviation, Navy," it is estimated that the total of $12,140,000,000 which is available, will be obligated during the 3 fiscal years ending June 30, 1943. Expenditures against these obligations will amount to a little over $5,000,000,000, leaving a little less than $7,000,000,000 of unexpended appropriations at the end of fiscal year 1943. In aircraft procurement it has been necessary to make obligations substantially in advance of the delivery of finished planes, and this in general accounts for the large amount of unliquidated obligations to be carried beyond June 30, 1943. Initially, this program was financed through the medium of cash appropriations and substantial contract authorizations. It was subsequently considered desirable to appropriate cash to take up most of the contract authorizations, and this action has also contributed to the large cash carry-over.

The program of the Bureau of Yards and Docks totaled $4,300,000,000 for the 2½-year period ending December 31, 1942. This amount is made up of $2,800,000,000 of cash appropriations and $1,500,000,000 of unfinanced contract authorizations. Obligations and commitments on December 31, 1942, under this program totaled $3,960,000,000, and it is expected that the total amount of $4,277,000,000 will be entirely obligated by July 1, 1943. Total expenditures against this program amounted to $2,294,000,000 on December 31, 1942. The Bureau of Yards and Docks estimates that a $317,000,000 uncommitted balance on December 31, 1942, will be completely obligated on or before March 15, 1943, and that approximately $800,000,000 additional cash will be necessary before the end of fiscal year 1943 to cover obligations made against contract authorizations which will become due between now and the end of the fiscal year.

The Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, under the appropriation title "Pay, subsistence, and transportation," had a total of $2,743,300,000 available through December 31, 1942. This was all either committed or obligated on that date and all but $843,000,000 was expended.

In the combined Coast Guard appropriations, totaling $872,000,000, there will be obligated during the fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943, $834,000,000. There will be expended in cash during that same time $664,000,000 out of total cash made available of $872,000,000. This means that $208,000,000 will be left over at the end of the fiscal year 1943 with which to pay off any and all obligations made prior to that time.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

The Maritime Commission now has as its major responsibility the building of merchant-ship tonnage to the greatest extent possible. Its early program of 50 ships a year was augmented at the beginning of hostilities abroad, and it has now been accelerated because of America's war effort to maximum production. Expenditures for various activities carried on by the Maritime Commission during the period from July 1, 1940, to July 1, 1942, but later assigned to the War Shipping Administration, are included under the Maritime Commission activities which will be discussed here.

Total Maritime Commission appropriations, available balance carried forward, receipts, and allocations from July 1, 1940, to December 31, 1942, were $4,223 000,000. In addition, contract authorizations amounted to $2,388,900,000, making a total program of $6,608,500,000. Cash expenditures for this period by the Maritime Commission total $2,456,000,000, leaving unliquidated obligations on December 31, 1942, of $4,153,000,000.

The construction fund of the Maritime Commission is a revolving fund to which there has been appropriated for the period July 1, 1940, to December 31, 1942, the sum of $3,485,000,000 cash. There was also available a cash balance on July 1, 1940, of $69,900,000. Other receipts to the fund from sales of ships, etc., total for the same period $311,000,000, making available to the construction fund for this period the total sum of $3,866,000,000 cash. As of December 31, 1942, $2,389,000,000 of contract authority previously granted remained unliquidated. All of the $6,255,000,000 available for obligation between July 1, 1940, and December 31, 1942, had been obligated prior to December 31, 1942. Further, a supplemental estimate for ship construction is now pending in the amount of $4,000,000,000 cash and $5,250,000,000 contract authority. Of the $4,000,000,000 cash, the sum of $924,000,000 will be required to meet accrual payments in fiscal 1943 because of the acceleration of the ship construction program, and the remaining cash is to be applied to meet payments for ships in 1943 and 1944 as they become due under the additional contract authorization requested. It is expected that the total amount of the new contract authorization will be obligated before June 30, 1943.

It will be necessary to appropriate $1,277,000,000 for already authorized ship construction in the 1944 Budget; and if the above-mentioned supplement is approved, it will be necessary to appropriate $2,362,000,000 for liquidating ship building contract authority after fiscal year 1944.

Under a separately authorized emergency ship construction program of 200 ships, appropriations of $313,500,000 with an allocation from the President's emergency fund of $36,500,000 (a total of $350,000,000) is being applied to construction of ships all of which will be completed in calendar 1943. Of the total amount of $350,000,000, the sum of $321,000,000 had been expended to December 31,1942, and the entire amount is obligated or committed.

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

Establishment of the War Shipping Administration was authorized by Executive order February 7, 1942. Among its most important activities are the operation, purchase, requisition, and use of all ocean vessels (excepting combatant vessels and transportation vessels owned by the Army and Navy, certain vessels engaged in coastwise and similar transportation, and vessels under the control of the Office of Defense Transportation) and to provide marine insurance against risk of wars. Funds for the operation of the War Shipping Administration from its inception until the enactment of the War Shipping budget on July 25, 1942, were provided by transfer from Maritime Commission. These expenditures are reflected in the statement just made concerning the Maritime Commission.

On July 11, 1942, there was transferred to the War Shipping Administration the merchant marine training function previously carried on by the Coast Guard, and under the War Powers Act and Executive Orders 9083 and 9098 appropriations for State marine schools were likewise transferred.

Total funds made available to the War Shipping Administration up to December 31, 1942, amounted to $1,564,000,000, all of which had been obligated or committed.

Expenditures against this amount to December 31, 1942, aggregated $589,000,000, leaving unliquidated obligations of $245,000,000 on that date.

OFFICE OF LEND-LEASE ADMINISTRATION

Through December 31, 1942, three appropriations totaling $18,410,000,000 had been made by the Congress for the Office of Lend-Lease Administration. These appropriations all stem from the authorizing act of March 11, 1941, which provided for aiding any country whose defense the President deemed vital to the defense of the United States.

Of the total $18,410,000,000 appropriated, $13,000,000 was transferred as a reimbursement to other appropriations, leaving a balance of $18,397,000,000.

In addition to this, but not to be confused with it, authorizations have been granted to the Army and Navy to use limited amounts of their funds for lend-lease purposes.

Obligations and commitments totaling $16,021,200,000 had been made against the $18,397,000,000 up to December 31, 1942, leaving a free balance of $2,388,800,000 for obligation during the remainder of this fiscal year. The Lend-Lease Administration has indicated that the total amount available will be completely obligated by the end of this fiscal period to meet requirements which have already been projected.

Commitments of $3,134,200,000 are included in the $16,021,200,000 which has been obligated or committed. The obligations total $12,887,000,000.

Of the commitments, $1,800,300,000 is set up to cover specific projects and $1,333,900,000 is to cover requisitions processed to departments but which have not been covered by obligations made by the departments.

The $1,800,300,000 set up for specific projects is to cover the costs of specific approved projects, of which the greater portion is already under way.

The $1,333,900,000 for which requisitions have been processed to the departments are for specific approved purposes and should soon be completely obligated.

A detailed statement by major categories of obligations and commitments of lend-lease funds is included in the accompanying table.

Expenditures against the $18,397,000,000 aggregated $7,777,300,000 through December 31, 1942, and it is expected that $4,500,000,000 will be added by June 30, 1943, bringing the total to $12,277,300,000 at the end of the fiscal year. On an accrual basis, expenditures reported amounted to $8,602,500,000 through December 31, 1942.

Summary of appropriations, authorizations, obligations, commitments, and expenditures for war for appropriations and authorizations through Dec. 31, 1942 (July 1, 1940, through Dec. 31, 1942, actual, with certain estimates through June 30, 1943)

[Millions of dollars]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Fiscal program, July 1, 1940, through Dec. 31, 1942			Obligations, commitments, and balances							Expenditures and unexpended cash balances [1]				
	Net appropriations and corporation commitments [1]	Unfinanced contract authorizations	Total	Obligations, July 1, 1940, through Dec. 31, 1942	Commitments on Dec. 31, 1942	Cumulative obligations plus commitments, Dec. 31, 1942	Unobligated balance, Dec. 31, 1942	Uncommitted balance, Dec. 31, 1942	Estimated obligations, July 1, 1940, to July 1, 1943	Estimated unobligated balance, July 1, 1943	Expenditures, July 1, 1940, through Dec. 31, 1942	Unexpended appropriations and corporation commitments, Dec. 31, 1942	Estimated expenditures, Dec. 31, 1942, to July 1, 1943	Estimated expenditures, July 1, 1940, to July 1, 1943	Estimated unexpended balances of appropriations and corporation commitments, July 1, 1943
			(1+2)			(4+5)	(3−4)	(3−6)		(3−9)		(1−11)		(11+13)	(1−14)
FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES															
War Department:															
1. Expediting production	6,296.8	0	6,296.8	4,945.4	528.1	5,473.5	1,351.4	823.3	5,973.5	323.3	3,152.8	3,144.0	.....	.....	.....
2. Finance Service, Army	9,262.6	0	9,262.6	5,656.2	3,606.4	9,262.6	3,606.4	0	10,132.2	−869.6	4,563.7	4,698.9	.....	.....	.....
3. Supplies and transportation	16,155.4	0	16,155.4	9,683.9	1,688.3	11,372.2	6,471.5	4,783.2	16,155.4	0	6,649.9	9,505.5	.....	.....	.....
4. Signal Service of the Army	6,525.4	0	6,525.4	2,829.9	1,648.7	4,478.6	3,695.5	2,046.8	5,980.9	544.5	951.8	5,573.6	.....	.....	.....
5. Air Corps, Army	36,660.6	0	36,660.6	29,459.6	2,166.0	31,625.6	7,201.0	5,035.0	36,660.6	0	7,292.0	29,368.6	.....	.....	.....
6. Engineer Service, Army	13,602.5	0	13,602.5	8,653.3	1,373.6	10,026.9	4,949.2	3,575.6	12,082.5	1,520.0	6,275.3	7,327.2	.....	.....	.....
7. Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army	34,381.4	0	34,381.4	22,866.6	1,557.4	24,424.0	11,514.8	9,957.4	30,172.8	4,208.6	7,174.3	27,207.1	.....	.....	.....
8. Chemical Warfare Service	1,748.8	0	1,748.8	672.7	223.4	896.1	1,076.1	852.7	1,282.1	466.7	211.2	1,537.6	.....	.....	.....
9. Other	2,649.4	0	2,649.4	1,570.3	330.5	1,900.8	1,079.1	748.6	2,287.6	361.8	994.5	1,654.9	.....	.....	.....
10. Adjustment for working funds	.....	.....	.....	−713.6	713.6	0	713.6	0	0	0	−1,784.9	1,784.9	.....	.....	.....
Total, War Department	[2]127,282.9	0	[2]127,282.9	85,624.3	13,836.0	99,460.3	41,658.6	27,822.6	120,727.6	6,555.3	35,480.6	91,802.3	24,200.0	59,680.6	67,602.3
Navy Department:															
1. Increase and replacement, naval vessels	11,182.7	20,308.9	31,491.6	24,428.4	24.7	24,453.1	7,063.2	7,018.5	29,971.6	1,500.0	6,892.4	4,290.3	.....	.....	.....
2. Aviation, Navy	11,899.7	240.0	12,139.7	7,662.8	1,719.7	9,382.5	4,476.9	2,757.2	12,139.7	0	2,249.4	9,650.3	.....	.....	.....
3. Ordnance and ordnance stores	6,211.1	0	6,211.1	4,483.6	181.9	4,665.5	1,727.5	1,545.6	6,211.1	0	1,588.7	4,622.4	.....	.....	.....
4. Maintenance, Bureau of Ships	2,687.9	0	2,687.9	2,334.0	210.0	2,544.0	353.9	144.0	2,688.0	0	1,048.8	1,639.1	.....	.....	.....
5. Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks	2,802.2	1,474.6	4,276.8	3,950.3	9.9	3,960.1	326.6	316.7	4,276.9	0	2,293.6	508.6	.....	.....	.....
6. Pay, subsistence, and transportation	2,743.3	.....	2,743.3	1,942.6	800.7	2,743.3	800.7	0	2,743.3	0	1,900.3	843.0	.....	.....	.....
7. Marine Corps	1,168.8	.....	1,168.8	844.7	201.9	1,046.6	324.1	122.2	1,158.8	10.0	518.4	650.4	.....	.....	.....
8. Coast Guard	872.0	.....	872.0	547.6	197.1	744.7	324.3	127.3	834.6	37.3	288.4	583.5	.....	.....	.....
9. All others	2,632.1	25.0	2,657.1	2,242.6	183.4	2,426.1	414.5	250.9	2,673.7	3.3	1,788.8	843.4	.....	.....	.....
Total Navy Department	42,199.8	22,048.5	64,248.3	48,436.6	3,529.3	51,965.9	15,811.7	12,282.4	62,697.7	1,550.6	18,568.8	23,631.0	9,300.0	27,868.8	14,331.0
U. S. Maritime Commission, total	4,222.6	2,388.9	6,611.5	6,608.5	3.0	6,611.5	3.0	0	6,611.5	0	2,455.5	1,767.1	1,767.1	4,222.6	0
War Shipping Administration, total	1,564.3	0	1,564.3	833.7	730.6	1,564.3	730.6	0	1,564.3	0	588.9	975.4	975.4	1,564.3	0
Office of Lend-Lease Administration:															
1. Ordnance and ordnance stores	1,843.6	0	1,843.6	1,621.9	191.1	1,813.0	221.7	30.6	.....	.....	921.5	922.1	.....	.....	.....
2. Aircraft and aeronautical material	2,708.0	0	2,708.0	2,596.7	103.4	2,700.1	111.3	7.9	.....	.....	1,545.7	1,162.3	.....	.....	.....
3. Tanks and other vehicles	791.0	0	791.0	662.3	93.5	755.8	128.7	35.2	.....	.....	453.9	337.1	.....	.....	.....
4. Vessels and equipment for vessels	2,209.0	0	2,209.0	1,737.3	392.9	2,130.2	471.7	78.8	.....	.....	599.4	1,609.6	.....	.....	.....
5. Miscellaneous military equipment	361.8	0	361.8	328.3	33.2	361.5	33.5	.3	.....	.....	156.8	205.0	.....	.....	.....
6. Facilities and equipment for production	1,147.3	0	1,147.3	1,023.9	78.4	1,102.3	123.4	45.0	.....	.....	739.1	408.2	.....	.....	.....
7. Agricultural, industrial, and other commodities	6,641.2	0	6,641.2	4,355.4	1,736.6	6,092.0	2,285.8	549.2	.....	.....	3,035.6	3,605.6	.....	.....	.....
8. Servicing of defense articles	514.7	0	514.7	331.1	124.6	455.7	183.6	59.0	.....	.....	147.8	366.9	.....	.....	.....
9. Miscellaneous services and expenses	445.1	0	445.1	216.1	229.1	445.2	229.0	−.1	.....	.....	166.0	279.1	.....	.....	.....
10. Administrative expenses	16.4	0	16.4	14.0	1.6	15.6	2.4	.8	.....	.....	11.5	4.9	.....	.....	.....
11. Transfers	13.0	0	13.0	.....	.....	.....	13.0	13.0	.....	.....	.....	13.0	.....	.....	.....
12. Unallocated	1,718.9	0	1,718.9	.....	149.8	149.8	1,718.9	1,569.1	.....	.....	.....	1,718.9	.....	.....	.....
Total, Office of Lend-Lease Administration	18,410.0	0	18,410.0	12,887.0	3,134.2	16,021.2	5,523.0	2,388.8	18,410.0	0	7,777.3	10,632.7	4,500.0	12,277.3	6,132.7
Other Federal agencies, total	5,536.2	335.0	5,871.2	3,934.2	[4]1,000.0	4,934.2	1,937.0	937.0	5,871.2	.....	2,792.7	2,743.5	1,300.0	4,092.7	1,443.5
Total Federal departments and agencies	199,215.8	24,772.4	223,988.2	158,324.3	22,233.1	180,557.4	65,663.9	43,430.8	215,882.3	8,105.9	67,663.8	131,552.0	42,942.5	109,706.3	89,509.5
Unfinanced contract authorizations	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	24,772.4	.....	.....	.....
GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS															
Reconstruction Finance Corporation and subsidiaries, total	17,184.0	.....	17,184.0	17,184.0	.....	17,184.0	.....	.....	17,184.0	.....	3,782.7	13,401.3	1,800.0	5,582.7	11,601.3
Federal departments and agencies and Government corporations, total	216,399.8	24,772.4	241,172.2	175,508.3	22,233.1	197,741.4	65,663.9	43,430.8	233,066.3	8,105.9	71,446.5	169,725.7	43,842.5	115,289.0	101,110.8

[1] Together with unexpended balances made available and appropriations made after June 30, 1940, to liquidate obligations made under prior contract authorizations.
[2] Includes unexpended balances of $400,941,348 from prior year appropriations available for expenditure in fiscal year 1941.
[3] Expenditures are on checks-issued basis except those under "Other Federal agencies" which are on a checks-paid basis.
[4] Estimated.

Historical Records Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 5, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding accomplishments of W. P. A. was the Historical Records Survey, started January 1936, by Dr. Luther H. Evans, now Assistant Librarian of Congress.

A very complete report of the work done by this survey was presented by Sargent B. Child in a paper read at the annual meeting of the American Library Association last June. This report is of such great interest not only to historians but to all who are interested in the country's history that it ought to find its way into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it will be available to millions of our people.

The work has been suspended since W. P. A. came to an end, but the work accomplished by this survey shows us the way, and when times become normal there is no doubt but what the work will be continued. While this survey only scratched the field of historical interest it did demonstrate what can be done, and presents the picture of what further should be done if the people of this country desire to preserve their vital and first-hand history. In reading historical works we are very often left undecided and must take the conclusions of the author. The Historical Records Survey gives you the facts, and we are left to form our own conclusions.

Too much credit cannot be given Luther H. Evans, Mr. Child, and all others connected with the direction, supervision, and work of this survey. Here follows the report:

WHAT IS PAST IS PROLOGUE

It is fitting that those who have assisted in the progress of the historical records survey should learn how much has actually been accomplished and how much remains to be done. It is also important that, after a most careful evaluation has been made of the completed work and of the methods used in reaching the goals already attained, blueprints be drawn for the future day after the war when the survey will again be continued. I say "will" rather than "may" because it is inconceivable that there will be permanently discontinued an undertaking which, beyond question, has been the largest-scale project of its nature ever undertaken by any nation at any time and which has produced, in spite of obvious shortcomings, a remarkable valuable result. Its mode of operation and its structure may be altered and its goals enlarged or modified, but the momentum which it has steadily gained over the period of 6½ years cannot be lost even with the interruption of an earth-shaking war.

Before we discuss plans for future activity, let us glance back over the road we have traveled. A year ago we had overcome a number of difficulties by stabilizing procedures and by introducing new policies which led to various technical improvements in the quality of the publications. At the same time, the rate of their issuance had been accelerated. The support of the sponsors and cooperating sponsors throughout the country had contributed immeasurably to our efforts in Washington and in the State editorial offices. It was reported then that 1,337 publications had been issued up to June 21, 1941—an increase of 481 volumes in 1 year.

There were several factors which, we then felt, would alter the emphasis of the work of the survey. The new appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, would curtail the total number of persons employed by the Work Projects Administration by approximately one-third. This cut was subsequently effected. The personnel, trained in the tasks peculiar to the survey, would find their way to employment in our expanding industries or would be transferred to certified Work Projects Administration defense projects. The events have borne out this prediction. Further reductions followed in rapid succession until on January 1, 1942, we had only four persons—including a secretary—left in Washington. Obviously, administrative, and in some instances technical, authority had to be delegated almost completely to the State supervisors.

The competence and loyalty of the State supervisors and their assistants rose to the occasion as the difficulties increased both in Washington and in the States. Almost heroic efforts were exerted by State editorial offices to meet the situation and to carry the work forward in spite of all odds. This they did in addition to new work directly connected with the war effort. Because of the loyalty, integrity, and persistence of these men and women the results, as measured in terms of new publications, exceed those of last year. This year's total is 609 as measured against 481 for the year 1940–41, bringing the grand total to date to 1,940. There is every reason to believe that when the publications now being printed or mimeographed are issued the number will exceed 2,000. Deterioration in the quality of these publications, which we had every right to expect, has not taken place. This fact has surprised us more than anything else this year.

This year 134 published volumes in the Inventory of Federal Archives series have been issued, bringing the total to 584. This virtually completes this phase of the program initiated in February 1936 as a Nation-wide project sponsored by The National Archives and for which the Historical Records Survey assumed responsibility in July 1937. Only in a few States does there remain a small number of completed inventories which, due to the national crisis, may not be mimeographed. Those which cannot be published will be forwarded to The National Archives, where they may be consulted. The fact that this work has been completed is due in large measure to the efforts of Dr. and Mrs. Philip M. Hamer, of the National Archives staff.

The number of published Inventories of State Archives has advanced from 11 to 28 volumes. This work was initiated quite late in the program's history when the curtailment of personnel caused the State directors to suspend work in rural areas and concentrate many of the remaining workers in cities where the editorial headquarters were located. In a number of instances this meant the State capitol. The States in which the greatest amount of work in this field has been done include Louisiana, North Carolina, Wisconsin, Ohio, Michigan, and California. The number of volumes published represents but a small fraction of the work completed or approaching completion. In a future continuing program a relatively large number of publications could be issued in a short time because of the amount of field and editorial work already completed. There is no way of ascertaining in how many departments of State governments the work has been completed until the inventories of our editorial files in the 48 States have been forwarded to Washington. If the reports from the 12 States already received are indicative of what we may expect from the other States, we can underscore in red this phase of the program for future planning.

In the inventory of county archives series, the number of publications has advanced from 504 to 628, an increase of 124. The best estimates which we can make, based upon incomplete reports, indicate that the field work has been completed in 90 percent of the 3,066 counties in the country. In the tons of material which will be deposited for the duration of the war in State archives, State libraries, and State universities not only will unpublished inventories of county records be included but also tremendous quantities of rechecked transcriptions and abstracts of source material, upon which the State editors have relied in compiling the historical sketches and governmental organization essays contained in these inventories. In quantity this material staggers the imagination. From this material authentic local history—as differentiated from the antiquarian pseudo-genealogical histories of the seventies, eighties, and nineties—can be written. Since this portion of the survey program has been the core or heart of its existence, questions will arise—in fact, they have already arisen—as to why the efforts of the survey were dissipated or siphoned to other activities. There is an answer to these questions which I shall give later in this paper.

The number of published inventories of municipal and town archives has advanced during the year from 131 to 180, a gain of 49. As with the inventory of State archives, the publications in this series only suggest what has actually been completed though not yet made generally available.

The manuscript program has also advanced considerably. To the 64 guides, calendars, and lists which had been issued a year ago we have added 43 new ones, bringing the total to 107. Perhaps the two most significant manuscript publications are the Guide to Manuscript Collections in New York State, which is supplemented by a similar publication for New York City, and the Guide to the Manuscript Collections in the Archives of the North Carolina Historical Commission. The Georgia and the Montana projects are following the example set by the North Dakota project in issuing guides to unpublished graduate theses in their respective States. The Inventory of Manuscript Accessions for 1941 is being published as an appendix to the annual report of the American historical association. In these two activities we have again set a pattern for future work when the war ends. A revised checklist of all of the publications of the survey, which we hope to have issued before October, will contain the titles of the new manuscript publications and those now being mimeographed or printed.

Many new church archives, inventories, and directories have also been published this year. The total has risen from 97 to 164 volumes, a net gain of 67. In spite of the many factors which have tended to hinder the efforts of the State editors, the technical quality and the accuracy shown in the volumes of this series have improved to a greater degree than those in any other phase of our program. The outstanding inventories in this field have been the Inventory of the Church Archives of Massachusetts, Universalists, and the Inventory of Church Archives, Society of Friends in Pennsylvania. An important directory was a Directory of

Churches and Religious Organizations in Greater Detroit. The continued review of this material in Washington prior to publication was made possible by the generous contributions of the American Jewish Committee, the American Catholic Historical Association, the Presbyterian Historical Association, the General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches, and the Church Historical Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church, through the Library of Congress.

Some who have spoken about the survey previously have created quite innocently an erroneous impression regarding the work of the American Imprints Inventory. Reports have stated that from 7,000,000 to 8,000,000 imprint slips taken from catalog cards in thousands of libraries throughout the country have been filed in the central editorial office. How this count was made we do not know. Let us call it an administrative error, for certainly the tireless Historical Records Survey workers in the field were not to blame. The corrected figure is slightly smaller than 15,000,000. This enormous mass of material has been given to the Library of Congress in accordance with the plan originally made when this inventory was undertaken. The physical custody of the files has been given to the Wisconsin Historical Society for the duration. Ten additional volumes for the following States have been published during the past year: California, Louisiana, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, Tennessee, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. Twelve more have been edited and approved for publication. The last numbers assigned were 48 and 49, to two Texas check lists. We hope that most of these will be issued.

While only two new volumes have been added to the American Portraits series, I would like to call your attention to one book in particular now in press. Intrinsically important, it is even of greater importance as an illustration of how the "theory of progressive bibliography," so strongly advocated by Dr. Luther H. Evans, the late Robert C. Binkley, and others, has worked in the past and how it can be successfully employed in a future program. Over a year ago, the New Jersey project issued a book entitled 1,440 American portrait artists, 1663–1860, to be used as a tool by those compiling inventories of American portraits. As the publication date approached, the editor, Dr. George C. Groce, felt certain that quite a number of additional names might be found if the date were postponed. Copies of the published volume were sent to strategic libraries and museums where they were carefully checked by Historical Records Survey workers and interested scholars. By this cooperative method, new names long suspected by the editor were located, and the revised volume will contain 2,900 names. Since the value of this kind of book can be more than doubled in such a short time, I strongly recommend that this method be employed more widely in the other fields of scholarship in the future.

During this year check lists of newspapers have been issued in Texas and Louisiana. Others will be issued this summer in Wisconsin and Mississippi.

In spite of new work introduced to assist the defense program which became the war effort, this year's results, so far as the work common to all of the State projects is concerned, have been better than those of last year. Other very important phases of our program have suffered, however. The Annotated Bibliography of American History, which was announced as having been completed by Dr. George M. McFarland last year, is one casualty. It is true that 3,000 new annotated titles were added to the 29,000 which had been edited a year ago. The District of Columbia project was closed on July 1 of last year, which cut off all clerical and editorial assistance. This exceedingly valuable bibliography, now safely deposited in the Library of Congress, should be given an A–1 priority rating for post-war work. Little more than some reclassification and proper arrangement is necessary before it can go to the printer.

The enormous Atlas of Congressional Votes, which is to indicate by graphs and maps every roll call of the Senate and House of Representatives prior to 1933, which is more than 50 percent complete, has had to be suspended. I have been informed by Mr. Clifford L. Lord, consultant, that it is to be moved from the New Jersey project office to Columbia University for temporary deposit this month.

The Bibliography of American Literature, upon which a very great amount of time and effort has been expended, will remain at the University of Pennsylvania. Large quantities of materials on historic sites in a number of States must go to storage also.

We do not know definitely at the present moment whether the series of Messages and Papers of the President, 1898–1938, and the Executive Order Index will be published or not. It is probable that at least a beginning will be made.

The accumulated files of the survey have proven to be most useful this year for purposes which never had been considered when the project was initiated early in 1936. Many guides to public vital statistics, based largely upon data found in the published and unpublished inventories of State, county, municipal, and town records, have been distributed to all State vital statistics offices so that each State office might have necessary information about the location of birth and supplementary vital records throughout the country. They have also been of great value to large industrial organizations which are holding war contracts and which have had to recruit thousands of workers from other States and other regions. Proof of citizenship has become essential to the war effort, and the survey has made a distinct contribution. Guides to vital statistics found in church records have been compiled and distributed in a similar manner. These have proven to be particularly valuable for States in which the keeping of public vital statistics records was not required by law prior to 1905 or 1910. An official in another Federal agency in Washington which is using these guides estimated that this work could not be duplicated for less than $4,000,000. The Bureau of the Census is assisting in this work at the moment by contributing to the salary of a reviewing editor in the central office. A good start has been made in compiling guides to naturalization records.

Very useful guides to maps are being issued for the State defense councils. Again, these books are based upon information found on countless thousands of field forms which the survey workers have filled during the past 6 years in the normal work of the program.

I hardly need to mention to this audience the assistance given by the Historical Records Survey to the central and State committees on conservation of cultural resources. When the State committees were established they were informed that the survey projects already had the necessary legal authorization in the Presidential letters, which govern all project operations, to render this assistance. The close cooperation between the central committee office and the central Historical Records Survey office was reflected in many States where in some instances the project sponsor became chairman of the committee or one of its active members. In other instances the survey supervisor became secretary of the State committee. As soon as the State committees organized themselves, work began immediately in making inventories of space in areas which were felt to be reasonably safe from possible bombing or other hazards and dangers of war. The information was used by the local committees in making recommendations to institutions within their States which needed such space for the removal of their most valuable holdings. The information was also forwarded to the central committee in Washington so that institutions from other States, particularly those States facing the two oceans, could learn what space was available in the interior of the country.

Under the same program the survey workers have also assisted librarians, curators, and public officials in making lists of the more valuable material in vulnerable institutions which would have priority if and when the evacuation of it should become necessary. I wish it were possible to learn how frequently the survey files were used in this work because in them, of course, were deposited thousands of inventories already made for peacetime pursuits. Some day, when time is less pressing, I hope that the story of this emergency work may be adequately written.

Let us now turn toward the future. Although 30 State projects are still in operation and new publications are being issued at the rate of approximately 40 per month, the work in all States will cease during the summer months. It is quite apparent to those who have examined the final inventories of the files for those projects which have already been suspended that 10 times as much inventory and research material has been collected and placed in orderly arrangement as has been published. What an extraordinary background this is against which new plans can be drawn. What a vast amount of material awaits editing and publishing. Can anything be done about it? For the present, aside from completely edited inventories which will be published by the project or the project sponsors, and aside from certain material which may be used by graduate students as suggested hitherto, the answer is clearly in the negative. We are engaged in a titanic struggle in which our whole philosophy of living is at stake. This total war is requiring our total effort.

It is then to the post-war period that we must direct our thinking. The reconstruction of a shattered world, with cities and towns decimated, with the peoples of many nations numbly facing famine and starvation, and with economic and political systems in chaos, will call upon the energies and resources of America as they have never been called upon before. The costs of reconstruction will greatly surpass the costs of the war. Few, if any, of us actually comprehend the significance and only vaguely realize the implications of these expenditures. Moreover, even the economists are far from being in agreement on matters such as post-war employment or unemployment.

While I dare not predict what the post-war employment or lack of it may be, I would like to point to the fact that much of the very best work which has been done by survey workers has been accomplished by persons who, because of physical handicaps or age (which in our modern world is a very relative term) or sometimes because of the lack of age, have not been considered employable in our business and industrial life. Parenthetically, I should like to ascertain at the present moment in just what activities contributing to the war effort many of these "unemployable" individuals are now engaged. There will be these same groups of people, and there will also be a new group of our fellow countrymen who will have been physically incapacitated in the battles to save the American way of life. There may also be an-

other large group who cannot be fitted into the post-war worlds of education, business, and industry.

If, in time, we approach an economic pattern in the post-war era which resembles that which we have known during the past 10 years, then surely there will be an opportunity for the work of the historical records survey to go forward. The kind of work in which we have been engaged is, in a broad sense, never done. It will engage the attention of some of our grandchildren as it did some of our forefathers. But since it has been proven that so much can be accomplished in such a relatively short space of time when we can employ the energies of so many people, I count myself as one of those impatient individuals who would like to see the survey reopened on a scale comparable with that on which it has functioned in the past.

I say that this is not only good for the future scholarship of America, but exceedingly good for those who will become engaged in it. The enthusiasm for this kind of work, the growing realization of its long-range importance to American living, to say nothing of American history, which has been engendered in the lives of those who have been a part of it, can scarcely be understood by those who have merely used the published results of the survey. I have taken many field trips from Washington to try to interpret the over-all importance of the work in which the survey has been engaged. I must confess that many times I have learned more than I have been able to give. By evening camp fires in Arizona, in the libraries and on the streets of New York and New Orleans, in the rolling bluegrass country of Kentucky, and by the raging wintry sea off Portland, Maine, or the quieter water near Los Angeles, I have listened to the outpouring of local and national history by State directors, by workers and editors. They knew their sources of information and they cited them. They gave me something that is found too infrequently in our colleges and other institutions of higher learning. I think, in discussing the survey, we have never stressed enough its value to the 25,000 or more persons who, at one time or another, have been connected with it. May I intensify a note I sounded 2 years ago? To have the graduate schools of America's universities use increasingly the product of the unemployed is a new if not revolutionary practice in American education.

From the point of view of its cost, I am quite certain that any intelligent taxpayer would feel that the money appropriated had been well spent, once he was shown the direct and the indirect results of our work. The 2,000 widely distributed volumes are but a portion of the result. When we count the material which can be published in 10,000 or more additional volumes, we come nearer a justification of the work. But this is not enough. The thousands of records rooms and vaults in which order has been brought out of chaos—the courthouse attics and basements which have been remade into usable libraries of local records—all must be added to the credit side of the ledger. This work had to be done before accurate and usable inventories could be made. Yet this valuable byproduct of the survey would have been a most worth-while project in itself.

The Survey never became engaged in constructing annexes or wings to courthouses or building fireproof vaults. Yet they were built all over this country as a result of the focus brought upon the housing conditions in our public buildings by the survey workers. It may have been brought to your attention previously that in Tennessee alone 25 percent of the courthouses were enlarged or had ample fireproof vaults installed. The effect of the work upon public officials and other employees of local governments has been tremendous. The initial indifference or even hostility which was frequently reported in the early correspondence and field reports disappeared as time went by. Funds were appropriated by these very officials when needed for publication purposes. When the workers were withdrawn from the public record rooms because of the curtailments in our budgets, angry protests frequently replaced the earlier attitudes of indifference or tolerance. The purposes and usefulness of the survey had become clearer in the public mind.

This brings us to local participation and the part it must play in a future program. The scope of this paper does not permit adequate treatment of this important factor in the survey's success and the brevity of our reference to it is due only to the limitations of time. Let me say at once that in my opinion the events of 1939 which caused the abolition of the five Federal projects, popularly known as the arts projects, greatly strengthened the Historical Records Survey. What appeared then to be a tragedy to some, turned out to be a blessing. When Congress determined that local legal sponsorship was necessary, the supervisors were forced to obtain local financial support, which brought with it an increasing interest and then participation. I desire to add quickly, but with equal emphasis, that had the survey been initiated as 48 autonomous projects, with no strong central administrative and technical controls, the whole program would have collapsed in confusion in less than 2 years' time. Too many divergent and conflicting points of view were present in the early days to have permitted local control with even a faint promise of success. During the past year evidences have continually appeared in some States to prove that we have been compelled to go too far in the direction of decentralization. There is a middle position between the two extremes which has been adequately tested and which, most of those close to our administrative and technical problems agree, is solid ground upon which future plans can be soundly made.

Another very important point to consider in looking forward is made clear if we glance back another moment. Local participation came when it was needed and wanted in many ways. It came to support and sustain a program which had gone beyond an experimental stage—a program that had a variety of interests and maturing policies. It is quite apparent that this assistance by participation never would have come with the strength it did had the project not been partly diverted from one or two of its original goals. The introduction of the State and municipal archives inventory work; the manuscript, church records, and the American imprints and portraits phases; the work on historic sites and markers; the special bibliographies and other miscellaneous work all served to strengthen the program because it brought greater outside participation. I do not defend certain specific if minor decisions which may not have been wise, but I do maintain with all emphasis that the policy of diversification proved to be so sound that the projects in 47 States, where local interests and forces vary widely, were producing accurate and useful guides and inventories as late as March 1942. There was little precedent when Luther H. Evans initiated the survey in January 1936. There will be a great deal of it when the time comes for its continuance. One final and most important factor which contributed immeasurably to the success of this great undertaking has been the strong, friendly though objective counsel and ever-available support to the director by members of the National Advisory Committee.

SARGENT B. CHILD,
Director, Historical Records Survey.

You Cannot Subsidize Vermont Farmers

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 5, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I told Chairman CANNON and JOHN TABER, the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, that Vermont farmers would back them to the limit as against subsidies. I was not in error.

In order to verify my opinion, and substantiate my statement, I asked the Honorable E. H. Jones, commissioner of agriculture of Vermont; the Honorable Henry A. Stoddard, master of the Vermont State Grange; and Arthur Packard, president of the Farm Bureau in Vermont, to advise me as to their attitude and that of the Vermont farmer, in the premises.

I have not heard as yet from Mr. Packard, but the Commissioner of Agriculture wired me:

Most Vermont farmers, including myself, do not believe in subsidies. They want fair prices, recognizing increased labor costs. Incentive to farmers toward reaching production goals, as war emergency, is only defense for standard prices. Mr. TABER'S remarks express my personal views.

The master of the Vermont State Grange spoke eloquently, but briefly, as is his custom, when he wired me:

I am opposed to subsidy under any name or form.

Only the out-and-out New Dealers and their Republican left-winger friends and crystal gazers, of whom there are a few in Vermont—sort of hyphenated Republicans living off the New Deal's gratuity—favor subsidies.

But this gratuity is pretty much discredited and recognized as blood money by those who can recognize—"The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

The rank and file—the great majority of self-supporting, hard-working real dirt and dairy farmers—are opposed to and want no subsidies.

It is difficult for some people to realize or to understand that you have to make and save a dollar in order to have it to spend, especially those who have been living off the Government, or have been drawing a salary for so doing, and that means off the people—and that means you.

It is easy for a lot of these people, so living off the rest of us, to plan how to spend the farmer's money by taking $3 out of his pocket and giving back to him one of his own dollars as a subsidy. It is crazy; it does not make sense; it must stop.

So far as I am concerned, and I am sure I voice the sentiments of a substantial majority of the Appropriations Committee, I propose to follow the leadership

of Mr. CANNON and Mr. TABER, as indicated by the statements which they made to the House.

Mr. CANNON said:

SUBSIDY PAYMENTS

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has announced unexpectedly a new subsidy policy under which a bonus is to be paid to farmers from the United States Treasury in the form of incentive payments. The Department states that the payments would be subsidies to the consumer rather than to the producer. In other words it proposes to pay a part of the grocery bill of certain classes of people and charge it to the taxpayers.

On the testimony submitted by the Department when the subject was before the committee during consideration of the price-control bill in the last session, the committee not only disapproved such a policy but incorporated in the Office of Price Administration bill a provision that no part of the funds therein appropriated should be used for subsidies in any form. That provision was approved by the House and is now a part of the law.

The release by the Department of Agriculture does not say that the plan is under consideration or that Congress will be asked to take action, but is a categorical statement that the policy will be followed and that the money will be forthcoming.

It is not only an encroachment on the constitutional prerogative of the Congress but it is a proposal to take a vast sum from the Treasury to pay a part of the cost of living of certain consumers at a time when the consumer's income is the highest in the history of the Nation and when every available dollar is needed for the prosecution of the war.

Mr. TABER said:

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Wickard has announced a program of payments of subsidies to farmers to plant the things that he tells them to, and conform in every way to his regulations. This is another subsidy designed to create inflation by robbing the public of the normal curb on higher prices resulting from the fact that the people will not buy when the prices are higher.

It means appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars and adding that amount to our national debt, and that increase in debt is highly inflationary.

The farmers do not want this. They want a fair price for their product. They are entitled to it, and the Office of Price Administration should obey the law which Congress has passed so that they can get it.

I know that the Congress does not want to provide this subsidy money.

The Secretary has tried to deceive the farmer into believing that he will get this subsidy. I do not believe that the money will be appropriated. The farmer must have a decent price for his goods, but subsidies must end.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, I subscribe to the foregoing statements.

I have just received an air-mail special delivery from my friend Packard, who is at Columbus, Ohio, from which I quote as follows:

I believe it is better to pay incentive payments for crops absolutely needed than to lose the war. A new farm plan must sometime be conceived; for instance, is the production of more cotton absolutely vital to winning the war? How much subsidy is now paid cotton farmers? Everyone who realizes the poverty of many of the cotton farmers wants to see them helped, but not to grow cotton when it is not needed, but rather to help them to help themselves.

Not Due Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 5, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of February 3, 1943:

NOT DUE PROCESS

The latest report of Representative DIES, made on the floor of Congress, cannot wholly commend itself to those who have an old-fashioned, 100-percent fondness for orderly procedure, the rules of evidence, and the democratic process. Mr. DIES objects vigorously to "a vicious assault upon Members of the House" which was made last May by a magazine with which he is out of sympathy. This "assault" was a political document and was so used in the congressional campaign ending in November. One may stoutly defend its right to appear without endorsing all of it, or even any part of it. We can't have elections without discussing candidates, no matter whether those candidates are brand new or incumbents running for reelection. To some of the candidates and their friends any full and free discussion is bound to appear an "assault." Who is going to draw the line? Who is going to say that it is wrong to call Mr. DIES or someone else an isolationist or a Tory and right for Mr. DIES to call Federal officeholders "irresponsible, unrepresentative crackpots"? One would really like to know.

Mr. DIES also proffers a list of persons holding Federal jobs whom he appears to consider allies of communism. Concerning some of those mentioned, the imputation is sheer nonsense. About others, one simply doesn't know. If Mr. DIES is going to make these charges, he ought just as publicly to produce his evidence. It is not evidence to establish that Mr. X, a self-styled liberal, knows Mr. Y, a Communist sympathizer, who is acquainted with Mr. Z, a Communist Party member. It is not evidence that a name is found on a left-wing or right-wing sucker list. If Mr. DIES believes in the old American principle of fair play and fair trial, he ought to bring forth some real evidence or stop blackening people's names.

War Veterans in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 5, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a poll taken of the 531 Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress reveals that there are 28 Senators and 161 Representatives or a total of 189 war veterans in both branches of Congress.

Twenty-two Senators served their country with the Army, five with the Navy, and one in the United States Marine Corps. Senator TOM CONNALLY and Senator GUY GILLETTE served during the Spanish-American War and during World War No. 1.

During World War No. 2 Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., is the only Member of the Senate to have seen service in the present conflict.

In the House of Representatives 126 Members have served with the Army, 31 with the Navy, and 4 in the United States Marine Corps. During the Spanish-American War, Representatives CULKIN, MICHENER, ROGERS of Pennsylvania, WADSWORTH, WHITE, and WOODRUFF of Michigan served their country, with CULKIN and WOODRUFF of Michigan again serving during the First World War.

During World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, Representatives MAAS, SATTERFIELD, SCOTT, VAN ZANDT, and WALTER saw service in both conflicts; while Representatives LYNDON B. JOHNSON, MAGNUSON, WILL ROGERS, Jr., and WORLEY have served during World War No. 2.

The following list portrays the various wars and the branch of service in which the Member served. It is to be noted that the term W1 denotes World War No. 1; W2, World War No. 2. The letter S denotes the Spanish-American War; the letter O indicates service with the Army; an asterisk (*), Navy service; and the letter M denotes service with the Marine Corps:

VETERANS IN THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

REPRESENTATIVES

Leo E. Allen, Illinois (W1–O).
H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota (W1–*).
Walter G. Andrews, New York (W1–O).
Leslie C. Arends, Illinois (W1–*).
James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey (W1–O).
Joseph Clark Baldwin, New York (W1–*–O).
Graham A. Barden, North Carolina (W1–*).
Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming (W1–O).
J. Glenn Beall, Maryland (W1–O).
Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina (W1–O).
Fred Bradley, Michigan (W1–O).
Michael J. Bradley, Pennsylvania (W1–*).
Overton Brooks, Louisiana (W1–O).
Joseph R. Bryson, South Carolina (W1–O).
Alfred L. Bulwinkle, North Carolina (W1–O).
Fred E. Busbey, Illinois (W1–O).
A. Sidney Camp, Georgia (W1–O).
Gordon Canfield, New Jersey (W–O).
Frank Carlson, Kansas (W1–O).
Henderson H. Carson, Ohio (W1–O).
Francis Case, South Dakota (W1–M).
Robert B. Chiperfield, Illinois (W1–O).
Ralph E. Church, Illinois (W1–O).
Charles R. Clason, Massachusetts (W1–O).
William C. Cole, Missouri (W1–*).
William M. Colmer, Mississippi (W1–O).
Ranulf Compton, Connecticut (W1–O).
Harold D. Cooley, North Carolina (W1–*).
Jere Cooper, Tennessee (W1–O).
Wirt Courtney, Tennessee (W1–O).
Fadjo Cravens, Arkansas (W1–*).
Francis D. Culkin, New York (S–W1–O).
Paul Cunningham, Iowa (W1–O).
William L. Dawson, Illinois (W1–O).
Charles S. Dewey, Illinois (W1–*).
Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois (W1–O).
Carl T. Durham, North Carolina (W1–*).
Henry C. Dworshak, Idaho (W1–O).
Herman P. Eberharter, Pennsylvania (W1–O).
Hubert S. Ellis, West Virginia (W1–O).
Harris Ellsworth, Oregon (W1–O).
Charles H. Elston, Ohio (W1–O).
Albert J. Engel, Michigan (W1–O).
Joseph Rider Farrington, Territory of Hawaii (W1–O).
James H. Fay, New York (W1–O).
Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania (W1–O).

Hamilton Fish, New York (W1–O).
Aime J. Forand, Rhode Island, (W1–O).
Grant Furlong, Pennsylvania (W1–O).
Joseph A. Gavagan, New York (W1–O).
Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania (W1–O).
Bertrand W. Gearhart, California (W1–O).
Walter K. Granger, Utah (WI–M).
George M. Grant, Alabama (W1–O).
P. W. Griffiths, Ohio (W1–*).
John W. Gwynne, Iowa (W1–O).
Robert Hale, Maine (W1–O).
Charles A. Halleck, Indiana (W1–O).
Clarence E. Hancock, New York (W1–O).
Forest A. Harness, Indiana (W1–O).
Brooks Hays, Arkansas (W1–O).
William E. Hess, Ohio (W1–O).
Carl Hinshaw, California (W1–O).
Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa (W1–O).
Clifford R. Hope, Kansas (W1–O).
Walter F. Horan, Washington (W1–*).
Ed. V. Izac, California, (W1–*).
Pete Jarman, Alabama (W1–O).
Ben F. Jensen, Iowa (W1–O).
Jed Johnson, Oklahoma (W1–O).
J. Leroy Johnson, California (W1–O).
Lyndon B. Johnson, Texas (W2–*).
Ward Johnson, California (W1–O).
Walter H. Judd, Minnesota (W1–O).
Robert W. Kean, New Jersey (W1–O).
B. W. (Pat) Kearney, New York (W1–O).
Clarence E. Kilburn, New York (W1–O).
Cecil R. King, California (W1–O).
Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio (W1–O).
John C. Kunkel, Pennsylvania (W1–O).
Charles M. LaFollette, Indiana (W1–O).
William P. Lambertson, Kansas (W1–O).
Gerald W. Landis, Indiana (W1–O).
Thomas J. Lane, Massachusetts (W1–O).
Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana (W1–O).
Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa (W1–O).
Jay LeFevre, New York (W1–O).
Lawrence Lewis, Colorado (W1–O).
John W. McCormack, Massachusetts (W1–O).
James P. McGranery, Pennsylvania (W1–O).
J. Harry McGregor, Ohio (W1–O).
Charles E. McKenzie, Louisiana (W1–O).
John L. McMillan, South Carolina (W1–*).
J. D. McWilliams, Connecticut (W1–O).
Melvin J. Maas, Minnesota (W1–W2–M).
Ray J. Madden, Indiana (W1–*).
Warren G. Magnuson, Washington (W2–*).
Mike Mansfield, Montana (W1–*–O–M).
Thomas E. Martin, Iowa (W1–O).
Matthew J. Merritt, New York (W1–O).
Earl C. Michener, Michigan (S–O).
Louis E. Miller, Missouri (W1–O).
Thomas B. Miller, Pennsylvania (W1–O).
William J. Miller, Connecticut (W1–O).
B. J. Monkiewicz, Connecticut (W1–*).
James W. Mott, Oregon (W1–*).
Tom Murray, Tennessee (W1–O).
John P. Newsome, Alabama (W1–O).
Jack Nichols, Oklahoma (W1–O).
W. F. Norrell, Arkansas (W1–O).
George D. O'Brien, Michigan (W1–O).
Joseph J. O'Brien, New York (W1–*).
Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota (W1–O).
Emmet O'Neal, Kentucky (W1–O).
Wright Patman, Texas (W1–O).
Hugh Peterson, Georgia (W1–O).
J. Hardin Peterson, Florida (W1–*).
Philiip J. Philbin, Massachusetts (W1–*).
John Phillips, California (W1–O).
W. R. Poage, Texas (W1–*).
D. Lane Powers, New Jersey (W1–O).
John E. Rankin, Mississippi (W1–O).
B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee (W1–O).
Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois (W1–O).
Edward H. Rees, Kansas (W1–O).
James P. Richards, South Carolina (W1–O).
A. Willis Robertson, Virginia (W1–O).
Robert L. Rodgers, Pennsylvania (S–O).
Will Rogers, Jr., California (W2–O).
Ed Rowe, Ohio (W1–*).
Sam M. Russell, Texas (W1–O).
Lansdale G. Sasscer, Maryland (W1–O).
Dave E. Satterfield, Jr., Virginia (W1–W2–*).
Thomas E. Scanlon, Pennsylvania (W1–O).
Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Pennsylvania (W1–O–W2–*).
Dewey Short, Missouri (W1–O).
Richard M. Simpson, Pennsylvania (W1–O).
Sid Simpson, Illinois (W1–O).
Lawrence H. Smith, Wisconsin (W1–O).
Andrew L. Somers, New York (W1–*).
John J. Sparkman, Alabama (W1–O).
Raymond S. Springer, Indiana (W1–O).
Joe Starnes, Alabama (W1–O.)
Foster Stearns, New Hampshire (W1–O).
Maurice J. Sullivan, Nevada (W1–O).
Henry O. Talle, Iowa (W1–*).
Albert Thomas, Texas (W1–O).
J. Parnell Thomas, New Jersey (W1–O).
Harry L. Towe, New Jersey (W1–*).
James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania (W1–W2–*).
Beverly M. Vincent, Kentucky (W1–O).
John M. Vorys, Ohio (W1–*).
James W. Wadsworth, New York (S–O).
Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania (W1–*–W2–*).
Compton I. White, Idaho (S–O).
Richard B. Wigglesworth, Massachusetts (W1–O).
Thomas D. Winter, Kansas (W1–O).
Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan (W1–O).
Roy O. Woodruff, Michigan (S–W1–O).
Eugene Worley, Texas (W2–*).
Orville Zimmerman, Missouri (W1–O).

SENATORS

Lister Hill, Alabama (W1–O).
Carl Hayden, Arizona (W1–O).
Ernest W. McFarland, Arizona (W1–*).
J. L. McClellan, Arkansas (W1–O).
Eugene D. Millikin, Colorado (W1–O).
Francis Maloney, Connecticut (W1–*).
John A. Danaher, Connecticut (W1–O).
Claude Pepper, Florida (W1–O).
Richard B. Russell, Georgia (W1–*).
Scott W. Lucas, Illinois (W1–O).
C. Wayland Brooks, Illinois (W1–M).
Guy M. Gillette, Iowa (S–W1–O).
Albert B. Chandler, Kentucky (W1–O).
Allen J. Ellender, Louisiana (W1–O).
Ralph O. Brewster, Maine (W1–O).
Millard E. Tydings, Maryland (W1–O).
Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., Massachusetts (W2–O).
Bennett Champ Clark, Missouri (W1–O).
Harry S. Truman, Missouri (W1–O).
James G. Scrugham, Nevada (W1–O).
Harold H. Burton, Ohio (W1–O).
Burnet R. Maybank, South Carolina (W1–*).
Chan Gurney, South Dakota (W1–O).
Tom Connally, Texas (S–W1–O).
Mon C. Wallgren, Washington (W1–O).
Harley M. Kilgore, West Virginia (W1–O).
Chapman Revercomb, West Virginia (W1–O).
Kenneth S. Wherry, Nebraska (W1–*).

(Key: W1, World War No. 1; W2, World War No. 2; S, Spanish-American War; O, Army; *, Navy; M, Marine Corps.)

1943 Protein Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 5, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the vital problems confronting the American people this year is the protein-food shortage.

The Department of Agriculture is urging the increased production of soybeans and peanuts, but it should not be overlooked that from each bale of cotton there is obtained a byproduct of 400 pounds of protein feed and 240 pounds of cottonseed hulls, both of which are essential animal food. There should be no reduction of cotton acreage.

This subject is well presented in an editorial in the Dallas Morning News, issued February 2, 1943, and under leave granted, same is submitted herewith:

1943 PROTEIN SHORTAGE

In a country as large as our United States there are bound to develop regional conflicts of interest, whether in peace or war. An outstanding example is presented in the News Monday on the agricultural page in connection with the grave threat of a national shortage of perhaps 2,000,000 tons of protein feeds next fall. No one questions the soybean as a source of concentrated protein feed or food, nor would any informed persons doubt cotton's ability to provide protein in substantial quantities from probably a much wider variety of soils. It is a comparatively limited area which now raises the American soybean crop—the Corn Belt, and not all of that. It seems that highly localized varieties had to be developed by our experiment stations which often lose their effectiveness when planted 200 miles away; not so with cotton. It does fairly well even on poor soils.

Are we not overlooking one of the greatest food crops in all the world when we keep on reducing cotton acreage in Texas and our Southwest because that region grows shorter cotton staple than the Government demands? For each bale of cotton, produced often on soil which would show no profit for corn or peanuts, there is obtained a byproduct of 400 pounds of protein feed and 240 pounds of cottonseed hulls—both essential animal food.

If protein feed is becoming scarce, and the North's soybean mills are taxed beyond capacity to handle the supercrop just harvested there, why should an already overburdened group of farmers and mills be asked to increase their crop area by 1,500,000 acres this season? Is it not logical to parcel out some of this needed increase in our Cotton Belt, where 20,000,000 acres have been retired from cotton during the past eight seasons? The two regions—the Cotton Belt and the Corn Belt—certainly could work out this protein shortage together by supplementing each other's efforts.

At this writing soybeans from Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana are being crushed in Texas cottonseed oil mills because our great cotton byproducts industry has been reduced to working half time through systematic cotton acreage reduction. Even the largest peanut crop ever grown in Texas will not keep these mills occupied fully, because peanuts grow in the sandy soil areas and not on the black land where most of our cotton oil mills are located. Texas wants a part in this great protein food program. It has the land, the climate, the trained farmers, the mills, and other needed facilities to get the job done. Even during record cotton-crop years Texas has never had to ship cottonseed to northern oil mills to be crushed.

Pvt. Nicola de Palo, United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 5, 1943

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have received permission to

include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a news article which was printed in the New York Sun January 19, 1943.

Of course, I am proud to know that this young man mentioned in the article is a resident of my congressional district. He has displayed courage, initiative, and patriotism. It is typical of our fellow Americans, who, no matter what their origin, are always alive to their sense of duty and obligation to our country in its hour of need.

I understand that Nicola de Palo was born in Herkimer, N. Y., but was taken back to Italy when he was 6 months old. He was returned to this country in 1934, after 15 years in Italy, and attended school here. I am advised that he enlisted in 1940.

The history and activities of Private de Palo, as reported in the New York Sun, must put to shame those individuals who have been prejudiced against American defense workers because of their Italian descent. This case is typical of the faithful service being rendered by thousands upon thousands of Americans of Italian extraction, serving with distinction in all branches of the armed forces.

The article follows:

LOWER EAST SIDE DOUGHBOY IN TUNISIA FINDS HIMSELF AT END OF FOE'S CHOW LINE—ITALIANS STANDING IN DARK FOR SUPPER ARE UNAWARE OF UNITED STATES SOLDIER—HE PLANTS MINES ALL AROUND—DOESN'T WAIT TO EAT—BIG BANG TELLS HIM ENEMY DIDN'T EAT ANYTHING EITHER

(By Gault MacGowan)

WITH THE AMERICAN FORCES IN NORTH AFRICA, January 17.—Private Nicola de Palo, of 207 Grand Street, on New York's lower East Side, went out on night patrol to lay road mines. He carefully and silently skirted a hilltop in the pitch darkness and suddenly found himself on the end of the chow line of an Italian outpost.

The Italians were hungry after the day's operations and their eyes were straining forward in the pitch darkness to the blackout mountain bivouac, where the cook truck was drawn up just off the road. They did not detect the arrival of a stranger.

"Was I surprised," said Nicola in telling his story to James A. Burchard, correspondent for the soldiers' newspaper, Yank. "I suppose they were so busy trying to eat that they didn't expect guests."

Nicola backed up a few yards, circled around the Italians and planted the mines where they would do the most good. Then he withdrew, but in about 15 minutes he heard a big bang and knew for certain that several of his recent chow-line mates were permanently horizontal. He said: "Sure, I gave them some desert."

Nicola's buddies now call him "The man who came to dinner."

Earlier Nicola made a name for himself when he was chased by four Italian tanks. He had gone out on lone patrol with an automatic rifle and shot up a group of Italians who, using a scout car and seven motorcycles, were establishing machine gun posts. Nicola blasted the scout car and two of the motorcycles. The commander urgently summoned tanks to deal with the big Allied offensive, but Nicola, the one-man army, vanished. The Italians certainly will be glad to see the last of Nicola.

Newspapers and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 5, 1943

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mississippi Sun, of Charleston, Miss.:

"NEWSPAPERS AND WAR

"Newspapers are being called upon to a greater extent than any other line of business for free service, and this is about the only business that is not paid by the Government for merchandise service rendered.

"In fact, reams of copy are sent to the press of the country, written by paid agents, containing information the Government wants put in the hands of the people, from Main Street to the remotest sections of the country, but it is always stated that it must be published free—no funds available for newspaper space.

"Not only are the newspapers expected to furnish newsprint, ink, wrapping paper, services, overhead, etc., free, but they must pay the Government in hard cash postage in getting its own message to its own people.

"These same services are also rendered to community, city, county, and State without limitation.

"This unusually heavy load, plus increase in all expenses, has brought the number of newspaper failures since the war began to 400. This is a heavy mortality—perhaps the heaviest in the history of the country." (Kosciusko Star-Herald.)

All of which is true. But we would not have it otherwise. We know the terrific losses we have sustained in advertising, caused by Government ban on sale of automobiles, tires, batteries, refrigerators, etc. We know the cost of carrying free Government advertising. We know its importance; we know the Government has no other means of getting its message to the people; we know that the strain upon us is terrific and that many more of us will go under.

But this is war. And we stand ready and willing to make any sacrifice to win it.

Another reason:

Start Government pay for advertising and you start another Government bureau, which would cost more than the advertising. Then subsidy would edge in—and your free press would be gone

Concurrent Resolution of Minnesota Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 5, 1943

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to preserve inviolate the State rights as provided in the Constitution:

Whereas we are engaged in a great world war, fighting for the preservation of democratic principles, our form of government, and the American way of life; and

Whereas these issues, now on trial, have caused the American people to reexamine the basic concepts of our form of government to reaffirm their loyalty and devotion to our Federal type as established by our fathers; and

Whereas the Federal form of government was created to insure a positive division of powers, conferring upon the national specified enumerated powers and reserving to the States all others; and

Whereas under this form we have enjoyed unexcelled progress, the full realization of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness and the enviable position of being the peer of all nations; and

Whereas it has ever been our cherished policy to keep government as close to the people as possible in order to effect desired economies, more direct participation, and more rigid control of problems, sectional and local in character; and

Whereas there are apparent dangerous tendencies on the part of the National Government to increase its powers at the expense of the States, reducing State rights and centralizing authority in Washington, definitely reserved to the States and their subdivisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the House of Representatives concurring). That we deplore this tendency and view with alarm any and all encroachment upon our State rights granted under the Constitution, and that we strongly urge the executive and legislative branches of our National Government to be diligent in adhering to the rights and powers as expressed and defined in the supreme law of the land; and be it further

Resolved, That copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each presiding officer of all State legislative bodies now in session and to each Member of the Minnesota delegation in Congress.

Message From the President to the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a message sent by the President of the United States to the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at their session in St. Louis on January 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1943.

Hon. CLYDE T. ELLIS,
Executive Manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, St. Louis, Mo.:

The President has asked me to transmit for him the following message:

"I would like to have you express to the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association my real regret that I cannot accept your invitation to address its first annual meeting at St. Louis on January 19.

"I wish that you would also express my appreciation of the importance of such an association, representing hundreds of thousands of farmers who have joined on a cooperative basis to assure their families the economic and social advantages of plentiful electricity at low rates. I shall always look upon the electrification of the country's farms under the Rural Electrification Administration as one of the lasting achievements of my administration.

"Year by year, through Rural Electrification Administration reports, I have followed the advance of the rural pole lines, like a peaceful army, to the conquest of a better life for those who produce the Nation's basic agricultural products. It has been a victorious march, bringing to over a million farms in 45 States, the means to better farming and the comforts of American civilization.

"Today the scores of electric devices, performing essential farm operations, are also potent implements for winning the war. Production and preservation of food have become of critical importance to the defense of democracy. Thus the extension of electric service to a million farms was an important step in preparedness for ultimate victory. As the strain on manpower grows, the Nation will realize ever more clearly how much the rural electric cooperatives have added to its strength.

"But I think that the forward march of electric cooperatives has an even more profound significance in terms of our fight to preserve democracy. For it represents an extension of what is perhaps the most democratic form of business enterprise, one in which the individual finds his greatest gain through cooperation with his neighbors.

"For this reason I welcome the creation of your national association. It will be a healthy influence in our national life. I shall count upon it to assure a better understanding of our national problems in war and to contribute materially to the solutions which alone can assure victory and lasting peace.

"Sincerely yours,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

The release of this message to the press and radio is being left to your discretion, which I assume you will release simultaneously with its presentation to the convention. In any event, it will not be released in Washington. Please confirm to me receipt of this telegram.

Regards.

STEPHEN EARLY,
Secretary to the President.

World Economic Organization and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "World Economic Organization and Peace," delivered by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], under the auspices of the Citizens Conference on International Economic Union, over the network of the Columbia Broadcasting System from Washington, D. C., Tuesday, February 2, 1943, at 10:30 p. m.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very glad indeed to speak under the auspices of the Citizens Conference on International Economic Union. It is important that the people of the United States concern themselves with the problems of establishing a lasting peace. The well-being of our citizens demands public investigation and discussion of those questions involved in developing and maintaining friendly intercourse among all nations. Concentration on our war effort has a tendency to obscure the need of a national program of peacetime collaboration.

Definition of geographical boundaries will naturally follow after military developments. The stabilization or reorganization of political life in many nations is going to be a complicated and, for the present at least, an unpredictable process. But this is the time for the United States to formulate a national policy of economic collaboration with other nations. Also, it is not only possible but necessary, I believe, for the people of America, Great Britain, Soviet Russia, and China, to consider and come to some agreement on the form, composition, and procedures of the economic organization of all nations which they consider essential to world peace.

World peace must be built upon economic lines. A purely political international organization would be ineffective in its results. The world organization that will ultimately succeed must be based on the fact of world economic, social, and physical unity and the proper place of men, women, and children in that unity.

The shortage of certain essential commodities in the United States today emphasizes the economic interdependency of nations. Americans have come to understand that their country, so fortunate in its vast natural and human resources, can be a land of plenty only if sufficient quantities of certain raw materials, foodstuffs, drugs, manufactured goods, etc., are imported from other countries. Through the operations of lend-lease aid it has been made clear that the people of the other United Nations also require the food and goods and services of our Nation, not only for their war production and armed forces, but for their civilian populations as well.

After the close of the war, the strength of many peoples will be seriously reduced by exhaustion, starvation, and despair. It is imperative that the United States, if only for its own protection, prepare to cooperate with the other nations in providing the assistance which will be so urgently needed. First attention, of course, must be given to the immediate problems of men, women, and children. The starving will have to be fed; ruined homes, villages, and countryside restored. To some extent such assistance will need to be provided in the form of outright gifts. The American people, I believe, desire to grant such aid in reconstructing the lives of families dislocated by the war.

But there will also be a tremendous demand for other forms of assistance—the demand for crude materials and for machinery for production in factories and on the land. This demand will come from potential consumers unable to pay for what they need. Plans for the peace will have to include provision for world-wide economic organization by means of which this need can be transformed into an effective demand. A stable post-war economy will depend on the revival of production. Only thus will the people earn the income with which to pay for the goods they need and desire.

After the war, governments will be the only major source of finance and credit. It will take time for private capital to be reaccumulated. There will have to be established an international public instrumentality through which public credit may be extended for the rebuilding of peacetime industry and agriculture. While the United States very possibly would find it necessary to provide the major portion of credit through such an agency, participation by other nations in proportionate shares would insure the international character of the services rendered.

Another form of economic collaboration which should be accepted as part of our national peace policy is the free exchange of goods. There are indications that the rank and file of Americans wish to remove barriers to the flow of trade. They are coming to realize that excessive tariffs and other unnatural interference with commerce have through the years caused friction which has led finally to armed conflict between nations. Nationalistic trade walls built by competitive imposts have tended to depress the living standards of the people of all nations. Differentials in wages and cultural standards must of course be recognized, but one of the most certain means of raising the level of both would be the joint effort of all nations to promote the more efficient and freer distribution of the products of capital and labor.

If the lanes of commerce are to be kept open, to a degree mutually satisfactory to all nations, an international trade or tariff agency seems essential. The services of such an agency, with the resources available to it, would be directed toward the gradual elimination of high tariffs, quotas, exchange controls, manipulation of monetary unit and currency values, dumping, and other "mine fields of commerce," as the President labels them. The lending and tariff agencies should work hand in hand to achieve more effective production and distribution in all nations, and to aid those parts of the world which possess superior productiveness in developing their resources to the utmost, that the people of all nations may benefit.

The world economic organization should also include provision for international banking and currency stabilization services. A recent report of the British Federation of Master Cotton Spinners' Associations urges, as one principle to be observed in the post-war economy, "the acceptance by all nations of goods for goods as the basis of external trade." There is reason to believe that acceptance of this principle would be world-wide were a stable unit of value internationally established. An international standard of measurement of economic values in production and distribution is essential to a peaceful and orderly world. Were a monetary agency to be set up as an integral part of the economic organization of nations, further bases of conflict would be removed.

Finally, an international bank ought to function in close relation to the lending, trade, and monetary agencies. An international bank would give further guaranty of mutual trust and friendship among the nations of the world if it operated to reduce the need for actual money—enabling goods to command goods in the process of exchange and thus to establish liquidity, nationally and internationally. It would provide the needed international machinery for credit information, credit control, and free communication of the instrumentalities of exchange.

Is such a program as I have outlined possible of organization? Yes; I believe it is. A number of steps in this direction have already been taken. For some years before the present war piecemeal efforts had been

made to break down the resistance to economic curbs on nationalistic tendencies. The reciprocal trade agreements, aside from their economic value, have contributed much to a tendency toward mutual confidence in the collaborating nations. The same can be said of the currency stabilization agreements. By passage of the Lend-Lease Act Congress outlined in national policy, for the war period, a program which in spirit and in fact holds useful suggestions for peacetime joint effort in behalf of common objectives. In addition to the granting of emergency aid, the Office of Relief and Rehabilitation, under the direction of Governor Lehman, will lay a solid foundation for both emergency and long-range cooperation. Its work will cut a pattern for the external exchange of food, goods, and services, which will be rich in suggestions for peacetime economic organization.

And, of course, the economic sections of the Atlantic Charter clarify and make specific reference to the necessity for world economic organization as basic to lasting peace.

The development of these proposals would seem to make inevitable some machinery closely approximating the world economic organization which I have suggested to you this evening.

In 1941, I submitted a resolution to the Senate which proposed the study and investigation by a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the problems that will be involved in establishing a peacetime economy after termination of the present conflict. This resolution further provided that the committee study matters pertaining to the establishment of a permanent and lasting peace throughout the world and the avoidance of future wars.

As yet I have not introduced a similar resolution in the present Congress. However, I believe it is even more important today that all possible information be obtained with respect to efforts being made for a permanent peace, and to the problems that will confront the United States and other nations when hostilities have ceased and peace established.

The Citizens Conference on International Economic Union is to be congratulated on its efforts to stimulate interest in this vitally important problem. Its educational work among the citizens is indispensable to the ultimate definition of a democratic and sound national policy of world economic organization. We cannot build such a policy without popular support. The intelligent understanding by the people of their problems is the only certain method by which these problems can be solved.

Prohibition of Charge Accounts at Filling Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Pocatello Tribune of January 24 entitled "Will This Idiocy Ever Stop?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL THIS IDIOCY EVER STOP?

The latest—and, by far, the most outlandish—edict from bureaucratic Washington prohibits charge accounts at gasoline filling stations after the first of February. No explanation is given as to just how this master stroke will contribute to the war effort. But if there is some magical mental gymnastic behind this move, then most certainly the same "logic" (sic) should dictate that all credit transactions of every nature under any and all circumstances be discontinued. Why pick on one industry alone?

Of course, flag-waving patriot, who is governed by emotions and not mind, will contend that we, as citizens, must do everything to win the war. We agree. Everything necessary to win the war. But that certainly does not mean, to our way of thinking, that we should sit meekly on the sidelines and blindly accept the dictates of a crowd of nit-wit New Dealers who are trying to justify their existence in their bureaus. That's not our idea of patriotism.

We still have a healthy respect for the America in which we grew to manhood. As a matter of actual fact, we liked the America of the early part of the century much better than we do the "re-formed" New Deal America. And we have hopes that the America we reverence will some day be returned to the people who made it what it is.

We regret to see New Deal ideology crammed down our throats under the guise of defense necessity. We believe this war can be won with a minimum of Government regulation. Some, of course, is necessary. We fear—and, we believe, with just cause—that the end of the war will not mean an end of needless regulation. We are disturbed over the probability that regulation and regimentation will be continued—even extended—during what will be called the reconstruction period. And just who will there be to decide when the reconstruction period shall end?

As we stated a few weeks back, we are hoping that the new Congress will not only investigate the limitless power given Harry Hopkins, stop unnecessary nondefense spending, investigate and bring to light the tremendous scandal in connection with Government cost-plus contracts, cut defense spending down to an efficient basis, curb labor racketeering—we are hoping the new Congress will do all these things and, additionally, we look to Congress to eliminate the useless regulation and interference with private enterprise.

If some of these things aren't done—and done quickly—we are going to some day discover that we have waged a war to establish the principles of democracy throughout the world only to have lost at home the very principles for which we have fought.

William Pickens

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, last Friday when bill H. R. 1648 was read under the 5-minute rule, an amendment was adopted prohibiting the use of any of the funds in the bill to pay the salary of one William Pickens. This amendment was offered because the Dies committee had submitted his name to the House as one of those whose views were not healthy to our form of government. I attempted, with the short amount of time that I had, to give the reasons why this should be done. But the time was too short, and for that reason I wish to submit the information that I have to the House.

In October of 1933 the United States Congress Against War held a meeting at which William Pickens spoke. The Daily Worker, which everyone recognizes as a Communist newspaper, carried this bannerline, "Resolve unyielding struggle against war, fascism, and for defense of Soviet Union." Earl Browder, who has many times been a candidate for President on the Communist ticket, spoke first and William Pickens followed him later. The one statement attributed to Pickens in the Daily Worker was as follows, "To take the profit motive out of war we must take the class-profit opportunities out of our economic system." I leave it to you to judge whether this is a statement which would be favorable to the capitalistic system or to the Communistic system of government.

Again, according to the Daily Worker of October 3, 1933, William Pickens was a member of the national committee of the American League Against War and Fascism. The American League Against War and Fascism was branded by Attorney General Biddle as a subversive organization. On page 2 of the Daily Worker of that date William Pickens' name appears as a member of that organization.

Fight is the title of another communistic publication, and in the issue of that publication of November 1933 there appeared on the masthead, "Vice chairmen: William Pickens, Earl Browder." This is the company that William Pickens has been keeping.

On September 29, 1932, William Pickens spoke to the American League Against War and Fascism, later known as the American League for Peace and Democracy. The first plank in the program as outlined by that organization was, "To work toward the stopping of the manufacture and transportation of munitions and all other materials essential to the conduct of war, through mass demonstrations, picketing, and strikes." After the adoption of that plank William Pickens became a member of the organization's national committee and also vice chairman along with Earl Browder. According to an advertisement in the New Masses, William Pickens was one of the featured speakers at a mass meeting held by the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. This was on September 27, 1938.

Report of this is given by the New Masses in its edition of September 27, 1938, page 31. This organization was unanimously found by the Dies committee to be a Communist Party front.

According to a notice appearing in the New Masses, a Communist weekly, of November 14, 1939, William Pickens was scheduled to deliver a lecture at the Workers School at 35 East Twelfth Street, New York. The Workers School was and is the official training school of the Communist Party, a fact so well known that it is not possible that one of

Pickens' political experience could be ignorant of it.

Again, according to the New Masses, Communist weekly of December 2, 1940, page 28, William Pickens is one of a group of prominent individuals who signed a statement on behalf of Luiz Carlos Prestes, Communist leader of Brazil. Nearly all of those who signed their names are easily identifiable as Communists. The statement signed by them was released under the auspices of the Council for Pan American Democracy, which the Dies committee named as a Communist organization.

Luiz Carlos Prestes was convicted for subversive activities in Brazil and was widely known as a Communist leader, and these men at this time were trying to seek his release, even though they knew the charges for which he had been convicted.

According to the Daily Worker, of December 19, 1940, page 5, William Pickens was one of the signers of an appeal issued on behalf of the well-known Communist leader Sam Darcy, whose true name is Sam Dardeck. The appeal was sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, another organization which is known to be communistic.

To give you a brief history of Mr. Darcy, I may say that in 1937 he was a candidate for Governor of California. When he registered to vote he did so under the name of Sam Darcy, although his real name was Sam Dardeck. He was indicted for perjury and for answering incorrectly the place of his birth, which was Russia. Subsequently he went to Pennsylvania, where he was State organizer for the Communist Party. He was subject to extradition proceedings instituted by the State of California. The Communist Party and its auxiliary organization instituted a Nation-wide campaign in his behalf. If I remember correctly, he was convicted. Of course, there is no question about Mr. Darcy's Communist relations, because he spoke at the Sixth Conference of the Communist International in 1928, and also at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, in which he praised the Communist leadership and activities in San Francisco general strike. Mr. Darcy's speech before the Congress of the Communist International in Moscow in 1935 called forth a vigorous protest from Secretary of State Cordell Hull. Yet William Pickens is one of those who signed urging Governor Olson to release Sam Darcy.

It may be argued that this is only circumstantial evidence, and if so, when the House of Representatives comes to the place where they can only take action when a man is actually convicted, then the House of Representatives has sidestepped the issue and its duty. Many a man is convicted on circumstantial evidence, and while there are many things that we cannot prove, we still know that they are true. I doubt seriously that anyone can deny that William Pickens has communistic leanings.

I want to relate just one thing that happened in this case. When it was discovered by the Treasury Department that this amendment would be offered, one Mr. Charles Adams came to see the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], to discuss the case with him. Then he called to see me the following day, after which I had received the file from the Dies committee. Mr. Adams showed me the file of the investigation made by the special investigator of the Treasury Department, in which they gave William Pickens a clean bill of health. I proceeded to go over my file and asked Mr. Adams if he knew of certain things in that file. He admitted that he did not and that he would immediately go back and investigate them. He took notes and returned to the Department, and in all fairness to Mr. Adams I must say that he did not appear to be defending anyone, but simply trying to give facts. He went back to the Department and William Pickens was called in and deposition taken. After the deposition was taken, Mr. Adams called and asked if he could see me. I told him that he could and that I would withhold my amendment just as long as possible. He arrived at the House of Representatives with the deposition while I was on the floor informing the House that I would offer the amendment when we reached the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule. Mr. Adams handed me the deposition and I told him I appreciated it and I would be glad to look it over, whereupon he said that was the original copy and he could not leave it with me. Then I asked him why he did not bring a copy, and he said he just did not think of it. I then read the deposition over rapidly, because it consisted of a number of pages typewritten, Mr. Adams remaining while I was reading. I told him that I would like to have a copy of that for careful study. He said that he would have it for me the next morning before I offered my amendment in the afternoon. I waited on him all the morning for the copy and I instructed my office force that if he attempted to get in touch with me to be sure and communicate with me. I have heard nothing more from Mr. Adams.

Maybe you would like to know why he didn't give me a copy of the deposition. I think I know why, and it was because through the entire deposition William Pickens was evasive as to almost every question, admitting some, but in most instances saying that "I did not know." In other words, he indicated that he was ignorant of the fact that many of these organizations were communistic, and he also said that, while he knew that some of them were radical, he was simply taking the opportunity to express his views.

William Pickens is a man with a splendid educational background, according to the report of the special investigator of the Treasury Department. He is drawing a salary of $5,600 as "Principal Securities Promotion Specialist," with the Treasury Department. If William Pickens has the educational background which is shown by the special investigator, and if he is worth $5,600 a year to the Government, he is intelligent enough to be fully aware of the communistic principles of the various organizations to which he belonged and to which he spoke and of the men with whom he associated.

Every Member of this House has the opportunity to verify the statements that I make by calling on the Dies committee for the information which I have given.

I would not for one moment deny William Pickens the right to believe what he wishes, but I do deny anyone with his views and anyone who has kept the company which he has kept the right to be in a very strategic position within our Government. If this Government is waterlogged with people of these views when this war is over, then the Communist Party will have accomplished exactly what they started out to do, and that is the overthow of the Government.

In conclusion, I simply say that I would not want my people to know that I had voted to keep a man on the pay rolls who has the background that William Pickens has.

No, No, Mr. McNutt, Congress Represents the People

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, "Work or fight" is the proper slogan, and fair enough; but when Manpower Chief McNutt shakes his finger at Congress, has his picture taken in the act, and says "10 out of every 14 able-bodied men between 18 and 38 will be in the armed service by the end of the year" he speaks out of turn and without authority.

It is unpardonable, egotistical, and reprehensible for any bureaucrat to take such an attitude toward the people, without authority. Mr. McNutt has neither the authority nor has he the necessary information as to our possible or probable numerical Army or Navy needs, to justify such disruption of family life as is involved in his uncalled-for prediction and threat to our domestic relations, and to our internal economy. It does not make sense. He does not know how big an Army we will need and shall have. Does anybody?

It is true that the work-or-fight order is raising a furor, but it is because it distorts an act of Congress and makes compulsory service in the armed forces a punishment for failure to obey an unauthorized executive edict. That is un-American. When Congress passed the Selective Service Act, its purpose was only to raise men for the Army and Navy in the fairest possible way consistent with the national interest. We faced no manpower shortage at that time. Congress authorized the President to defer the drafting of men whose continued employment in their usual occupations is

necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. What a trio. It also provided for the deferment of men with dependents. Wisely done. There is, however, no specific grant of authority to force men with families to change their jobs, under penalty of being drafted.

NO MORE GOVERNMENT BY DIRECTIVE

The Government cannot impose such service upon citizens as a punishment, without minimizing, by implication, the patriotic devotion of millions who are risking their lives for the national safety.

A writer in the Washington Post says that Mr. McNutt and the Selective Service System are thus using the great power entrusted to their hands to accomplish a purpose never approved by Congress. Right. In this respect the current instructions to draft boards are of a piece with the executive order creating the W. M. C. That order gave Mr. McNutt indirect control over every man's job. He may direct that all hiring be done through the United States Employment Service and that workers be transferred from plant to plant with or without their consent. To be sure, the W. M. C. has no direct means of enforcing such orders. Congress has not legislated on the subject. But its edicts may be enforced indirectly by threats to take over the plants of employers who refuse to fire workers disobeying W. M. C. orders.

Mr. McNutt need not shake his finger at me, nor Congress. It will be a boomerang. Congress is responsible for the original Selective Service Act and will give the Army and Navy all the men and money they need, and will try, against bureaucratic interference, to save manpower for the farms and other essential industries to win the war.

The truth is also that the work-or-fight order fails terribly and falls short woefully of giving us an adequate system of overtime service. The truth is also the W. M. C. has up to date been a perfect example of a complete failure to accomplish anything to help win the war.

When the shortcomings of the work-or-fight order are summarized, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the W. M. C. is taking this means of covering up its failure—to work out a satisfactory manpower policy. Absenteeism, comparatively short hours of works, overstaffing, and a high turn-over of employees in many plants are creating an artificial manpower shortage. The W. M. C. is trying feebly to stop this inexcusable wastage of human energy, but without much success to date, as its job-freeze order of Friday indicated. Under heavy pressure to do something, it has turned to another expedient that is likely to produce more irritation than war equipment.

BUREAUCRACY DOOMED

From now on no bureaucrat will tell Congress, or the people where they get off, and get away with it, or I miss my guess, and I misunderstand the expressed sentiment of a people wholeheartedly determined to win this war, and to get rid of bureaucratic domination, responsible for 75 percent of the ills and friction from which we suffer today, internally.

As the writer in the Post suggests: The most hopeful aspect of the order is that it will probably spur Congress to action. By this move the administration has admitted the necessity of a National Service Act. As the shortage of civilians to carry on war work becomes more acute, the need for placement of every man where he can serve best can no longer be questioned. No halfway measure indirectly put into effect by Executive decree will serve the purpose.

The responsibility is now upon Congress to adopt a fair and straightforward manpower policy consistent with the demands of total war. The way in which Congress responds to that obligation will be one of the most severe tests of its ability to regain its rightful place as our chief policy-making body. It will respond.

CONGRESS WILL FUNCTION AGAIN

Congress will neither abdicate, to the bureaucrats, nor try to save anybody's face, but it proposes to save the country. You watch, and wait, and see.

The bill recently introduced by our colleague, Representative KILDAY of Texas, and now being considered by the House Military Affairs Committee, of which he is a member, fixes four categories of men subject to the draft. The first category includes all men of draft age without dependents; the second, those men with collateral dependents, mothers, fathers, sisters, or brothers; the third, married men without children, and the fourth, men with children. In this order men would be subject to the draft.

There is strong prospects that it will receive favorable and quick action, both in the committee and in the House itself.

PRESERVATION OF FAMILY LIFE

At the bottom of the demand for deferment of married men, particularly those with children, lies a conviction among many Members of Congress that everything possible should be done to preserve the family in American life as the basis of American society. If the time comes when, for military defense of the Nation and to win the war, it is necessary to take all men fit to bear arms, another situation will be presented. Under the present plan a married man with dependent children might be called into the service, while a single man with no dependents, living across the street, would not be called, if the two men were in different draft board areas. There seems no good reason why the proposed change in the system suggested by the Kilday bill should not be carried into effect. The local draft boards would continue to function as at present, acting on all deferments and hardship cases.

War Manpower Commission Chairman McNutt and other administrative appointees better profit by the experience of Leon Henderson.

They should refrain from threatening, pointing fingers, and shaking fists at the American people. They should stop talking about "treating them rough and tough." The American people will not be bluffed nor bulldozed nor scared.

You can lead the people to make any and all necessary sacrifices and efforts willingly and gladly, but you cannot fool all of them, even some of the time, and you cannot drive any of them any of the time.

You will do well to read the Wadsworth bill, which you will find in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A473.

Slicing of Bread by Bakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to Mr. Roy F. Hendrickson, Director, Food Distribution Administration, Department of Agriculture:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1943.

Mr. ROY F. HENDRICKSON,
Director, Food Distribution Administration, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDRICKSON: A mounting volume of complaints and criticism impels me to protest the provision of Food Distribution Administration Order No. 1, which prohibits the slicing of bread by bakers. As your office is doubtless aware, this provision has led to considerable inconvenience and hardship in private homes, as well as in hotels, restaurants, and institutions ordinarily supplied by bakers.

Burden of the complaints is that the order will prove wasteful of food, time, and manpower without effecting any commensurate saving. It is contended that if each housewife who now must slice bread were equipped with the best type of knife for the purpose, her efforts would be wasteful in comparison with the perfect slicing accomplished as a part of the baker's machine-packaging operation. It is correctly pointed out, too, that thousands of homes are without proper knives for this work and, because of existing restrictions, cannot possibly buy them.

The situation appears to be more serious in hotels, restaurants, and institutions, which will be called upon to slice bread in considerable volume. Simple as the slicing operation may appear to be, this item will impose a real added labor cost upon the average public eating place. It should be borne in mind also that the operators of eating places, like all other types of business, are confronted with serious labor shortages. In all cases, therefore, this order will prove a real hardship; in some cases it may even prove an insurmountable hardship.

Other important factors appear. Using constantly improved machine methods, bakers for years have delivered bread to consumers which is produced under most ideal, sanitary conditions. From the baker's flour bin to the point where the loaf is finally unwrapped in the kitchen, no human hand ever touches it. Now, hand slicing forces unnecessary handling of the bread, which nullifies much of the effort which has been made to guarantee its absolute cleanliness.

Finally, a sharp knife used by hand is a dangerous tool. The predictions that this

order forcing hand slicing of bread will lead to innumerable injuries and consequent loss of time seem entirely reasonable.

In conversations with officials of your office, it has been pointed out to me that restaurants, hotels, and institutions may be served with sliced bread by the supplying bakers under specified conditions until March 18, 1943. I am advised that the exception to the order is granted to give these operators sufficient time to provide for slicing tools or machinery. It may be that the small operators may improvise hand knives for bread slicing within that time, but in view of the existing restrictions it would seem to be wishful thinking to expect the larger operators to secure any kind of machine slicers. The extension of time to these operators, therefore, would seem to be nothing more than a short delay before the hardship overtakes them.

So far as I am able to ascertain from my inquiries to date, the only real savings contemplated under this order will be in waxed paper, it being taken for granted that a sliced loaf must be wrapped more heavily than a whole loaf. Granting that packaging methods practiced when this order was issued were wasteful of wrapping materials, and further, that there may be a real need to prevent this waste, I wonder if the administration has gone exhaustively into the problem of saving these materials with the bakers and manufacturers of packing machinery, and has found that there is no practicable alternative to the present order.

It is naturally my firm belief that the private industries involved can quite quickly effect by more simple methods any savings in materials expected under this particular provision of the order; and that they can effect the savings without the hardship and inconvenience inevitable under the present order.

I insist, therefore, that particular provision of the order prohibiting the slicing of bread at the bakery should be immediately rescinded unless the administration is prepared to refute the contention that the losses involved more than offset any savings; and unless the administration is further prepared to prove that the savings in materials contemplated can be accomplished in no other manner.

May I point out, in supporting the demand for the cancellation, that Congress, in granting extraordinary authority to the Executive, did not contemplate that the authority should be used arbitrarily or short-sightedly, as the complaints indicate that it has been used in the present instance. In fact, it is implicit that the authority will be used with the most meticulous care to avoid any burden or hardship which is not absolutely necessary in the emergency.

I shall greatly appreciate hearing from you in detail in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

FOREST A. HARNESS.

Idaho Farming Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. E. T. Taylor, master of the Idaho State Grange, relative to the difficulties experienced by the Idaho farmers in trying to operate under the regulations imposed upon them.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDAHO STATE GRANGE,
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, December 12, 1942.

Senator JOHN THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Rules and regulations now imposed on Idaho farmers by the Office of Price Administration, Office of Defense Transportation, and War Production Board threaten to stagnate and stop the production of food in our State.

As an example of the asinine nature of these regulations, I am quoting in full herewith a letter received by me from Glen R. Kunkel, a farmer living near Pocatello:

"POCATELLO, IDAHO, *December 2, 1942.*

"Master E. T. TAYLOR,
"Idaho State Grange,
"Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.

"DEAR MASTER TAYLOR: I was up at Blackfoot yesterday with a load of potatoes. While I was there one of the country sorting crews came in. They were unable to secure enough gas to even operate one car to get to and from their country sorting job for the Idaho Potato Growers Association.

"I would call that direct sabotage of war effort.

"There were six boys from 18 to 24—laying around the warehouse, idle, when they could have been out sorting potatoes for our war needs.

"That wasn't the worst of it. They were so thoroughly disgusted with the treatment by the Bingham County Ration Board that they were ready to go to Ogden and take up work on a building contract. They are farm boys that have had enough faith in agriculture to stick with agricultural work, but they won't stand for such treatment and remain in the agricultural industry.

"How are we going to hold them? One of the boys said he would rather be in the Army, at least he would know what he was going to do.

"The ration board refused to take their mileage on the job the past 2 years. They seemed to think that because the "B" form called for a lot of fancy information and then a big cut in mileage, that that was what they were supposed to do. Cut mileage and cut production—because every potato that doesn't get sorted will not go to market. That is, if enough gas is allotted to haul them to points of shipping after they are sorted.

"My personal example is typical. They didn't even allot me enough mileage to move my potatoes to point of shipment for this quarter, let alone this month. I am willing to sacrifice along with everyone else, but I believe that rationing to the point of interfering with or contracting the production or flow of foodstuffs to market is as much sabotage as it would be for me to blow up a bridge between our armed forces and the objective they were trying to reach.

"Fraternally yours,

"GLEN R. KUNKEL."

Mr. Kunkel's predicament is the story of Idaho farmers over and over again.

The time has come when a constructive policy toward the farmer will have to be put into effect if the American public is going to eat.

It doesn't seem possible that the horrible mess placed on the farmers by the Office of Defense Transportation, Office of Price Administration, and War Production Board could have just occurred by accident. It would seem that somewhere along the line one little peep of common sense would have developed.

The whole program has the outstanding appearance of a coordinated effort designed and planned to put the farmer out of business.

The reckless abandon with which the draft took needed farm help off the farm, with no thought of the future, could only have been the result of incompetence to the last degree

The result of that bungling will mean less food and a slowed war effort, and someone high up is to blame for that, and it cannot be pinned on the farmer.

The cost-plus contracts awarded so that it is more profitable for a contractor to pay labor from $11 to $25 a day than it would be to pay the previously going wages of $4 to $6 a day for similar work did its big part in sinking the farmer

The excessive wages offered for 8-hour days, with time and one-half and double time for overtime, plus the help of the United States Employment Service in aiding these campaigns, stripped the farms of the nondraft help.

The farmer is not to blame for this bungling.

Someone higher up rigged up this mess.

Now comes the War Production Board with its wonderful order calling for a reduction in farm machinery for 1943 to 20 percent of the amount manufactured in 1941.

Less help and less machinery and the frantic call for the farmer now to produce more and more than he did in 1942 only spells out the familiar words "too little and too late."

Secretary Wickard's call for the farmer to get up earlier, go to bed later, and work harder falls on ears that have worked from 70 to 100 hours a week to produce the largest crops ever raised in the history of our country.

The farmer did this while labor was working an over-all average of 42.8 hours a week this year.

Permit me to say that the call only produces discouragement to the farmer and his family, who, doing more than their share, find that every effort to get labor to speed up and release help to the farmers by taking on longer days falls on a national leadership that says "no."

The Office of Price Administration ceiling prices on the farmer, while wages are allowed to run hog wild, has driven farmers to sell out and abandon their life's work. The snowstorm of farm sales over this country tells the story of crazy bureaucracy run wild.

Farmers, who must know what they are going to do in 1943, find themselves confounded with rules and regulations, restrictions and stalling at the time when the 1943 plans must be made.

In Idaho there will be less sugar beets, less potatoes, less onions, less poultry, less milk, and less livestock, due to the above causes.

The time has come for Congress to shake up the bureaus and formulate a policy in which the American farmer is going to be permitted to produce, rather than the present organized effort to stall and stop production.

Less help, less machinery, less transportation means less food, and don't let any of the alphabet group tell you otherwise.

The farmer wants to produce to the limit, but he must be given a chance.

If he is going to produce what is required someone is going to have to move fast—right now, and not next spring.

Senator, the whole situation is full of dynamite. The new Congress would do the whole American cause a great good if its first task was to clean up the mess that now engulfs agriculture.

Whether our boys on the far-flung battlefields have food hangs in the balance.

Whether the bare shelves in the grocery and meat market are to become more pronounced hangs in the balance.

And agriculture, that was set up to produce vast amounts of food, has been sabotaged by incompetence, if not criminal stupidity.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. TAYLOR,
Master, Idaho State Grange.

Let's Prevent a "Food Dunkirk"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, if a "food Dunkirk" is to be avoided, due to the failure of bureaucrats in the Department of Agriculture, then it is the duty of Congress to insist that the American farmers are now given the tools and labor to produce the food for our armed forces, civilians, and allies.

Not only are we faced with a food shortage during the war, but a post-war food problem must be met to furnish food to more than 500,000,000 hungry people, if we intend to feed the world and have a lasting peace.

If we are to prevent a food shortage and keep the cost of living down for farm products, some methods must be found to provide the farmer with enough labor and equipment to sow, care for, and reap his crops. The farmer must have the necessary gas, oil, and tires to produce and market his crops. This is just as necessary as seed, fertilizer, and tools to carry on the work. Unless all of these factors receive the consideration they deserve, we can expect a marked reduction in our 1943 food production.

MELONS SHOULD BE ON THE ESSENTIAL FARM LIST

Cantaloups and watermelons should be changed from the less essential list to the essential list. The following reasons are presented by Indiana melon growers and shippers:

First. The more cantaloups and watermelons marketed, the less is required of other foods.

Second. Cantaloups are the breakfast food for thousands of people during the melon season.

Third. Cantaloups—no cream and sugar are required; other breakfast food require both cream and sugar.

Fourth. The cantaloup, according to food experts, contains vitamins A, B_1, C, and G; also minerals, proteins, calcium, phosphorus, iron, and fats. The cantaloup yields an average of 80 calories, with sugar content of 37 percent.

Fifth. Watermelons are used for dessert—no cream and sugar is required.

Sixth. Production of melons requires a minimum of farm equipment, thus relieving the burden of strategic war materials.

Seventh. The cantaloup crop is handled in wooden containers, thus using no strategic war materials.

Eighth. Growing melons require a winter-cover crop on the sandy soil. This cover crop serves as an ideal pasture through the season for beef and dairy cattle, sheep, and hogs, thus aiding in the essential war effort of producing meat and dairy products. Unless the growing of melons is permitted there would be no income to these farmers to buy grain with which to fatten and finish this beef and pork.

Ninth. If these melon farmers are required to grow other products they will be forced to buy new equipment, of which there is a shortage and not available for the 1943 crop.

Tenth. Sand hill land will not produce grains at a profit; these farmers cannot make a living and pay taxes on this high-priced land unless they produce melons, sweetpotatoes, and various other fruits and vegetables, particularly adapted to this high sandy soil.

Eleventh. Cantaloups can be grown year after year indefinitely on this high sandy soil.

According to the food-chart release by the Bureau of Home Economics in January 1943, cantaloups rate among the top fruits in nutritive value. Apricots, strawberries, oranges, and peaches rate higher, but pineapple, grapefruit, lemons, plums, bananas, grapes, cherries, pears, and apples have a lower rating in food value.

Our melon farmers do not ask for any special favors, but wish to do their part in producing the food to win the war.

Investigation of Civilian Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses by myself and Mr. Dillard Lasseter delivered on the Washington Star radio forum upon the subject of the Civil Service Committee investigation of civilian personnel:

ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK, OF GEORGIA

May I first express my appreciation to the Washington Star for this opportunity to speak to the people of the Nation on this important subject.

Not long ago I read a joke in which Washington was referred to as being like a "madhouse operated by the inmates."

I am glad, tonight, to assure my fellow citizens, that such a statement does not present the true situation.

Notwithstanding what you may have heard, on the whole, your Government and the people who work for you here are doing an excellent job. They are doing a much better job than was done in the last war, and the task to be performed is a much greater one.

Since the task confronting our people is vastly larger than that of 1917, it is taking more people to accomplish the desired effort.

The Congress, in the present period, in my opinion, is doing a better job than was done by the Congress of 1917. We are trying to correct the mistakes as we go along—and by doing so, I think, we are saving money for the taxpayers; and we also are expediting the war effort.

On November 11, 1918, your Government had 917,000 civil employees. Today we have approximately 3,000,000. The War Department alone today has more than a million and a quarter civilian employees.

It seems to me that this fact makes it imperative that Congress investigate the civilian personnel. We should not keep a single unnecessary person on the pay roll of the Federal Government.

The pay roll for civil employees today is approximately $6,000,000,000 annually.

For more than a year the monthly increase in the civilian employees has approximated 100,000. If it is possible to do so, this increase should be checked.

It should be checked for the reason of cost, but the question of available manpower is also of greatest importance.

During the past several months many stories have come to me of Federal offices that were overstaffed, of employees not having enough work to keep them busy.

I do not wish to prejudge the matter, but I feel very strongly that these stories should be investigated thoroughly.

Therefore I have proposed, and the House has authorized a sweeping investigation of the whole queston of civilian employment in the Federal Government. Funds have been appropriated for the employment of a staff to carry out the inquiry.

The investigation resolution authorizes the Committee on the Civil Service, of which I am chairman, to (a) conduct thorough studies and investigation of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in the departments and agencies of the Government, including Government-owned corporations; (b) to study and investigate the effect of such policies and practices upon the conduct of the war, with the view of determining whether such policies and practices are efficient and economical; (c) to determine the number of employees in each department or agency, whether such number is necessary, and whether their skills are used to the best advantage; (d) all other matters relating to the recruiting and the efficient and economical use of the civilian employees; and (e) to make such inquiry as said Committee on the Civil Service may consider important or pertinent to any matter coming within the jurisdiction of said committee.

Since this proposal was first suggested late in the last session of the Congress, hundreds of letters have come to me detailing conditions alleged to exist in various agencies and departments.

Many of these letters make serious charges of over-staffing, of lack of work, of the appointment of persons not qualified, and of promotions given to some and withheld from others.

Charges have been made to me of officials giving positions to relatives, to friends, to former business associates, college and schoolmates, without regard to the qualifications of those being appointed.

These are serious charges. They would, if true, be things to be strongly condemned in normal times. But these are not normal times. We are at war. To win this war will require every resource at our command. It is no time for playing favorites—it is no hour for incompetents—it is no time for employing needless manpower on the Government pay roll.

Therefore as your agent, the Civil Service Committee, expects to conduct a most searching inquiry into conditions in the government service. We will ascertain the numbers employed in each agency; how these people were employed; what their qualifications are; whether any unnecessary persons are being employed and we expect to find out whether or not they are keeping busy and doing their best to help win the war.

It will not be our purpose to smear anyone—but we will not "whitewash" the sit-

uation. If we find too many people in an agency, we expect that agency to reduce its force. If we find incompetent people on the pay roll, we shall demand their dismissal.

It will be our purpose to review the methods of procedure in the departments and agencies for the elimination of red tape and to expedite the business of the Government.

In the preliminary stages of the investigation I have conferred with high officials of the War and Navy Departments, the Director of the Budget, officials of the Civil Service Commission and others. I have also talked with a great many employees.

The officials with whom I have talked have assured me of their hearty cooperation. I shall ask and expect to receive the cooperation of all officials of the Government.

Many loyal employees, wanting to see our country go forward in its war effort, have come to me with information. I thank them for this fine evidence of their patriotism. I am sure that others will assist.

Unfortunately I find many employees afraid to come forward with what they know. Such a situation should not exist. I pledge my every effort to protect the employees from any harm because of information given to the committee.

Businessmen, and others, having dealt with Government agencies can render a patriotic service by advising the committee of any facts showing inefficiency or overstaffing. I appeal to all of our citizens to help the committee with any information they may have. The names of persons furnishing information will not be used without their permission.

In order that the committee might do a constructive job, careful consideration has been devoted to the selection of a staff director. The person selected for this important position will be presented to you on this program. He will tell you something of the general plans for the investigation.

This staff director comes to the committee with a background of broad experience in business and Government. He is a native of my own State, and I have known him for many years. I have the utmost confidence in his ability, his integrity, and his capacity.

His business experience consists of sales work, sales promotion, and corporate reorganization in the textile field. He has been admitted to the bar of Georgia but never engaged in the practice of law.

For a while he taught public administration and administrative law at Emory University in Atlanta. He is a graduate of Emory with a bachelor of arts degree and received his master of arts degree from New York University.

His governmental experience covers important administrative positions with the National Recovery Administration, the National Youth Administration, and the War Manpower Commission. He was also in the Foreign Service of the United States Department of State for several years.

This varied and extensive experience fits him, in my opinion, for the great task in which the Civil Service Committee will be engaged.

He is an old-fashioned American, with a progressive point of view.

One of the motives actuating me in proposing this investigation is to preserve the merit system in government.

For many years I have devoted much of my time as a Member of Congress to efforts to improve the service rendered the public by the Government.

I have visualized a personnel in the Federal Government, composed of expert public servants—persons retaining their personal political views but prepared to render nonpartisan service to whatever party might hold power. My objective was a career in public service for those with demonstrated capacity who wished to make a life work of serving the public.

Frankly, I have been disturbed lately by some of the things happening here and elsewhere in reference to the public service. If conditions are not improved, I have fears that the resentment of the people will sweep aside the merit system and the improvements we have made in the government regarding personnel policies.

In March of last year, the President suspended the normal civil-service procedure as to appointments in all branches of the government except the Post Office Department.

Under normal procedure the Civil Service Commission holds competitive examinations, grades the papers, and places the names of those making passing grades upon an eligible list. The person making the highest grade heads the list and the others follow in the order of their grades.

Appointments were made from these eligible lists by choosing one of the first three names. A person so appointed attained a permanent civil-service status if he rendered satisfactory service during a period of probation.

Since last March except in the Postal Service, comparatively few competitive examinations have been held. Most applicants, especially for the administrative and executive positions, have been rated upon education and experience and placed upon an ungraded list of eligibles.

Appointments have been made for the duration of the war and the appointees will not attain civil service status. The Commission does endeavor to have the best qualified applicant selected and has rejected many applicants, but the departments and agencies, during the period of rapid expansion incident to the war, have had very wide latitude in making selections.

The departments and agencies have also been permitted to make grade promotions without the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

This new procedure was adopted to speed the employment of the persons needed in the war effort.

I am afraid that many cases exist where advantage has been taken of this new procedure by officials. It has made easier the employment of relatives, friends, former business associates, and chums of college days—even though those appointed were often not the best qualified persons obtainable.

Many competent men and women, seeking an opportunity to serve their Government in its hour of emergency, have sought positions in vain—while they have seen others, less qualified, get these places at good salaries—because of some connection with an official, not because of ability.

These people, so appointed, in many instances have not had the first essential for public service, which is the ability to get along with the public, nor have they remembered that all Federal employees owe courtesy and consideration to each citizen. We all work for the public and we should never forget that fact.

There has arisen much resentment in the country over many of the appointments made in the manner I have described. Much of this resentment has been directed at the civil-service system—partly, at least, because the changed methods have not been understood.

There can be no place in the ranks of those employed by Uncle Sam for any incompetent employee—there should be no place for anyone proving discourteous to the public he serves. Officials should not be permitted to employ relatives, friends, former business associates, and former college chums—unless such persons are those best qualified for the job to be done.

Our job is to win this war, to win it as quickly as possible. The public service must be selected with that objective in view. It must be competent. It must be courteous. It must consist of as few people as can do the job we have to do.

It will be the purpose of the Civil Service Committee, through the means of this investigation, to do all possible to improve the quality of the public service and to reduce costs and the number employed.

I now take pleasure in presenting the staff director, Mr. Dillard Lasseter, under whose direction our work will be done.

ADDRESS OF DILLARD LASSETER

Thank you, Mr. RAMSPECK. I doubt whether I can at this time add any details to the general plans you have just outlined in regard to the House Civil Service Committee's study of Federal personnel practices. I believe that I am fully conscious of the importance of the study and the complexity of the task confronting me, personally, in endeavoring to secure for the committee data upon which to base recommendations for the improvement of a system which I believe every thoughtful American citizen feels needs immediate attention on the part of the Congress. While, obviously, I will be governed and directed by the House Civil Service Committee with respect to policy, I will say quite emphatically that I am approaching my section of the work with a positive intention of doing a constructive job. I have been, in the past 10 years, responsible for various types of Federal administration on State, regional, and national levels. I think that I know well a good cross-section of the group who administers the activities of our Federal Government. I believe that the great majority of these administrators are anxious to perform their jobs in a manner that best serves the interests of our country. I do feel, however, that a veritable snowball of procedures and specifications has been gaining such size and momentum that it will, if not halted, threaten democratic Government. It is going to be exceedingly difficult to ascertain which procedure is useless, which specification is superfluous or unfair. These practices seem to "just grow up," and their origins are sometimes shrouded in mystery; no one seems to know where they come from or why, but they are here, and their heavy hands are always on us.

I come to this task from the War Manpower Commission, and I am keenly conscious of the necessity for the conservation of manpower. Our conduct of Army and naval operations in the field, our efforts to supply those operations, and a proper balance between those two needs is the toughest nut out leaders have to crack. The greatest employer of civilian labor is, of course, our Federal Government, and any effort to conserve labor should, in my opinion, start with this employer. The War Manpower Commission has organized a Division of Manpower Utilization, whose responsibility it is to work with producers of war matériel in an effort to bring about a maximum utilization of every worker in every plant. It is just this objective the House Civil Service Committee hopes to attain.

It is perfectly obvious that when you withdraw millions of men into the armed services, and when you furnish some millions more to war industry, the supply of labor available from normal civilian sources is going to be greatly diminished. We have, in addition to the needs of the Army and war industries, summoned a great many men and women into the Government service. We know that Government agencies are not created in a uniform manner. The Congress creates some through legislation, and the President establishes others by Executive order. If there are too many agencies, or if they employ too much help, clearly, that is not the fault of the rank and file of the employees; they are there to do a job, and

I think it only fair to say that most of them are doing it to the best of their ability.

But it has reached the point where coordination and clarification of the Government personnel problem is urgently necessary. The House Civil Service Committee can perhaps discover to what extent there may be duplication in the Government service, and to the extent that the committee can perform this function it will, I believe, render a great service to the people of America at this time.

But it is not merely a question of whether there are superfluous agencies and where there may be duplication among them. There is another great potential means of wasting manpower, and that is in internal administrative detail.

It is an easy matter to set up an agency to perform a specific task, to man it with administrators, clerks, stenographers, and keep that staff intensively occupied on administrative details to the extent that the energies of the agency are devoted only in a small degree to the task that it is supposed to perform. The employees of this agency may be excessively busy, they may work a great deal of overtime. They may feel quite justly that they are doing more work than their salaries call for. They probably will not realize that so little of it is of real consequence.

I think that the possibility of eliminating unnecessary administrative detail may open up considerable fields for the study we are about to undertake. I think the potentialities may be vast. This is a Government of laws, and the laws set up certain requirements of agencies which they cannot ignore. They must do what the law requires. This necessitates a certain amount of what is commonly known as red tape. It is necessary, to a certain extent, to safeguard the public interest and the public funds. I know, and I think all other Government administrators who have been very long in the service know, from experience, that businessmen who come into the Government service often find it extremely difficult to adapt themselves to the requirements of these highly necessary safeguards.

But it is also true, I think, that a great deal of administrative detail is not of a nature necessitated by the law, Executive orders, or regulations having the force of law. I think that it is also true that in a time of national stress, like the present, it may be possible, by pointing out some instances where red tape entails an effort and utilization of manpower out of proportion to the beneficial results it attains, to pave the way for relaxation of certain of these onerous requirements.

The job of determination of just where manpower is being wasted, and just what should be done about it, is obviously not a job for the House Civil Service Committee alone. It is a job that in the long run must be taken over by Congress on the basis of what the committee discovers and the recommendations it makes on the basis of its findings.

The columnists in Washington who devote themselves to the affairs of Government employees have received numerous letters from Government workers who complain that they have too little to do. To a certain extent that cannot be helped. An agency entrusted with a vital war task builds a staff to meet what it expects to be the demands that will be made on it. This agency may not be able to time exactly the impact of this demand. It knows that sooner or later its resources will be taxed to the limit and that it must be prepared to meet the problem when it arrives. That is perfectly understandable and it is only a matter of prudence on the part of administrators to be prepared for the peak load when it comes.

But, obviously, there is something wrong when an agency continues to be overstaffed perhaps for months and when in all probability it has already attained its peak load of work.

There have been complaints from employees that certain supervisors have hired recklessly, building up large staffs because they believe that the larger the number of employees they supervise the greater will be the prestige of their positions and the higher the salaries they will be able to command.

The Civil Service Commission has on several occasions asserted that the number of employees supervised does not necessarily bear any relation to the grade or salary of the supervisor, but that lesson is one that may not have sunk in as far as some supervisors are concerned.

Any such unit, built up to gratify the ambitions of supervisors can, I believe, be detected in the course of such a study as we plan.

We hope, and expect, in this study to get the facts about any overstaffing that may exist in the Government service. But I think we would not be doing a full job if we did not also investigate understaffing which may exist in certain agencies. It is unquestionably a fact that the load of Government work is unequally distributed, and that some agencies are swamped with work while others are getting along comfortably without accomplishing too much. Clearly it is unfair to overwork employees beyond their capacity, and the recently enacted overtime-compensation legislation will probably have a very beneficial effect in equalizing the work load throughout the service. As I see the task of the committee, however, it is to get the facts regarding government employment whatever they may be, and to that task we shall sincerely devote our efforts for the duration of the study.

Conducting a war calls for the full utilization of all the energies of the people. This is a war for survival, and no man can afford in his own interest or in the interest of the Nation to be a slacker. But there are tremendous demands for manpower. The Army, Navy, war industry, shipping, agriculture, and the Government service are all competing for labor, and there is obviously a very difficult task in determining priorities for the manpower and womanpower available. Determination of policies is the duty of the highest authorities, and it is the duty, similarly, of every American to cooperate loyally in carrying out those policies once they are formed.

If Uncle Sam can set his house in order, can utilize his employees to the best possible advantage, perhaps releasing some of them for more essential tasks of carrying on the war, he will set a splendid example to industry and the American people everywhere.

We are in this war to win, and we are going to win. To win in the shortest possible time we must exert every ounce of effort where it will count most. To the extent that this study will make that possible, I believe we are undertaking a task of the utmost importance, and I am confident that the House Civil Service Committee will pursue it vigorously and patriotically until it is completed.

A First Test of Labor's Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Louisville Courier-Journal, the Anniston Star, and the Atlanta Constitution:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 30, 1943]

A FIRST TEST OF LABOR'S STATESMANSHIP

The story that some union seamen unloading a ship at Guadalcanal Island laid off for a Sunday so that marines had to do their work that day seemed implausible in the first place. Guadalcanal must offer no inducement whatever to leisure and men usually don't hazard their lives for 1 day off. Refusing to work, the seamen would have risked a longer stay than necessary in what must have been one of the most dangerous spots in the Pacific. Besides that, the evidence is that the average union seaman has quite as much patriotism as other civilians, besides undergoing far greater hardship and peril than other civilians do.

The tale was authoritatively contradicted, moreover, soon after it was first told. That did not prevent its spread, and probably not even the emphatic assurance of its falsity which the Southern Pacific commander himself, Admiral Halsey, has just given will stop it. This is the significant thing for members of labor unions and friends of labor unions—the enormous zest with which the story has been repeated in many quarters; its persistence in the face of its obvious unlikelihood and of official denial; the attempt to keep it alive and string it out by congressional inquiry. All of that is indicative of the kind of public opinion which is confronting organized labor today.

The Courier-Journal has repeatedly argued that this hardening state of opinion needs to be met by union labor statesmanship. It cannot be successfully met by bullheadedness and defiance. As it happens, just at this moment sponsors not generally friendly to unions have reported out of the House Judiciary Committee a trial balloon to test the sentiment of Congress on labor legislation. This is the Hobbs bill to make labor unions subject to the Federal anti-racketeering law. The bill was drawn last year after the Supreme Court, by a six-to-one decision, had held that the anti-racketeering statutes exempted unions from their application.

The case in which the decision was reached concerned a teamsters' union in New York. There was no question that there had been outright racketeering. Union members would lay in wait for trucks going from New Jersey into New York and by beating the drivers or threatening to beat them would extort a sum of money—the union scale for a day's work, $9.42 for a large truck, $8.41 for a small one. Sometimes the union members would give some return in service, such as helping unload the truck at its destination. But usually they simply skedaddled with the money.

All this was outrageous, of course. The Supreme Court majority acknowledged as much but was convinced that Congress had not meant the Federal law to apply to unions. However, Mr. Byrnes, who was then a Justice and wrote the opinion, said significantly: "This does not mean that such activities are beyond the reach of Federal legislative control." And there is no reason why they should be beyond that reach. Federal anti-racketeering legislation was enacted because local laws and their enforcement had been proved inadequate against this kind of hoodlumism in general. There is no reason to believe local laws and enforcement are peculiarly effective against labor union hoodlumism.

Will the labor lobby again, as it did in the last Congress, fight the Hobbs bill and thus again put labor in the position of protecting labor hoodlums? We are sorry to say we are afraid the lobby probably will do just that.

However, we cannot forbear saying that the Hobbs bill presents to labor a magnificient opportunity. The thing to do is to accept the measure with good grace. The thing to do is to make it plain to the people in this way that labor wants no trace of immunity in law for labor's crooks, and, incidentally, labor's crooks are far less numerous than Westbrook Pegler would have people believe.

If the hostility to labor of some of the promoters of the Hobbs bill, if exaggerated, fears about dangers to unions in the enforcement of the law by labor-hating prosecutors, if an enormous solicitude for indefensible stand-by and make-work rules—if these things prevail in the mind of labor's leadership, then that leadership will have failed in what may be the first test of its statesmanship in the Seventy-eighth Congress.

[From the Anniston (Ala.) Star of February 4, 1943]

LABOR STATESMANSHIP TEST

The Louisville Courier-Journal which, like the Anniston Star, has consistently been a strong backer of labor in its legitimate aspirations, sees in the Hobbs measure to make labor unions subject to the Federal antiracketeering law a test of labor's statesmanship, a test that can do untold harm to the organized-labor movement if not met successfully by the union leaders.

The bill, sponsored by this district's Representative, Judge SAM HOBBS, was drawn last year after the Supreme Court, by a 6-to-1 decision, had held that the antiracketeering statutes exempted labor unions from their application.

The case on which the decision was made involved obvious racketeering practices by a teamsters' union in New York, and the court in its decision recognized this fact, but held that the statute, as passed by Congress, did not apply to the unions. The Hobbs bill's passage was not completed at the last session, and hence had to be reintroduced.

Now, there is little question that the Seventy-eighth Congress intends to do something about the labor situation; for the Nation as a whole, growing tired of wildcat strikes, slanderous absenteeism, etc., which slow war production, is demanding that something be done. The extent of the legislation will depend upon labor's reaction to the Hobbs bill, which is little more than a trial balloon to test the sentiment of Congress on labor legislation.

This hardening state of anti-labor opinion must be met by union labor statesmanship if labor is not to suffer extensive damage, and the loss of some of its gains of the past decade. It cannot be met by bullheadedness and defiance on the part of labor's leaders. If it is Congress may step in and bear down on legislation that will destroy many of labor's recent gains.

The antiracketeering legislation is not directed at labor unions but at labor hoodlumism, just as other antiracketeering statutes are directed at hoodlums. If the labor lobby again, as it did in the last Congress, fights the Hobbs bill, it will be putting organized labor in the position of protecting labor racketeers, contrary to the wishes of its own membership.

The rank and file of organized labor has no use for the racketeering type of members and heartily wishes to rid organizations of these parasites who by their actions taint the entire movement. The Hobbs bill presents to labor a great opportunity to rid itself of these racketeers, a clean-up that has been impossible thus far.

What labor leaders should do is accept the Hobbs bill with good grace, and in this way make it plain to the people of the Nation, both its friends and foes, that labor wants no immunity for labor's crooks. Contrary to what many labor haters would have us believe, labor racketeers are in a vast minority; but it must be admitted that the damage they have done to the labor movement has been far in excess of their numbers.

Labor need not fear the effects of the Hobbs bill, for it will not result in any persecution of the movement in general; but it will result in cleaning out those crooks who are bringing down the wrath of many people on labor unjustly.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, February 1, 1943]

NOT A LICENSE FOR CRIME

If a bill reported favorably to the House of Representatives at Washington by its Judiciary Committee becomes the law of the land a card of membership in a labor union will no longer be construed as a license to commit certain crimes with impunity.

The measure, introduced by Representative HOBBS, of Alabama, simply subjects labor unions to the provisions of the Federal antiracketeering law, enacted in 1934. The 1934 law makes robbery or extortion in interstate commerce a Federal offense. It was aimed at gangsters and underworld racketeers. However, by direct inference, that same bill conceded that certain types of labor unions might engage in similar activities when it included a clause specifically exempting "legitimate labor disputes" from its coverage.

Last year a similar bill to the Hobbs measure was approved by the House Judiciary Committee, but was kept off the floor of the House when labor leaders entered protests.

It is difficult to see how any legitimate labor leader can, with straight face, object to a measure which is aimed, specifically, at racketeering and extortion. That very objection is admission that organized labor does indulge in these crimes, for otherwise there would be no ground to protest.

If, on the other hand, it is conceded that labor indulges in these crimes, this Nation has come to pretty pass when its Congress upholds a law giving unscrupulous labor leaders the legal right to practice outrageous crimes and protects them against punishment.

In the words of Representative HOBBS, the bill is "grounded on the bedrock principle that crime is crime no matter who commits it, and that robbery is robbery and extortion is extortion whether the perpetrator has a union card in his pocket or not."

If union labor is not willing to submit to the fundamental law that robbery is a crime, then union labor has not only placed itself above the law of the land but above the law of God also. "Thou shalt not steal" must apply to everyone alike.

Proposal To Sell the American Farmer—Not Down the River—But Involuntarily to Our Big Industrial and Financial Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, a congressional committee inquiring into our lend-lease deals was this week refused details of the negotiations, contracts, and arrangements being made with our allies and "good neighbors" on the grounds that military information would be disclosed.

We hear rumors that we have agricultural missions in many foreign countries to assist in saving agricultural lands from floods and droughts. We had supposed that these things were being done to aid in the war effort until we saw the article in Capital Compass column of Times-Herald of February 3, by George D. Riley, stating that after the war our planners propose that we obtain our food supply from Latin America and force our farmers to move to our cities to become slaves of our industrialists. Mr. Riley in his column states:

> It seems the Bureau of Agricultural Economics wants to make 20 percent of the rural population of the United States move to cities after the war, whether the ruralites like it or not.
>
> F. F. Elliott, chief agricultural economist of the department, says the plan to cut postwar rural population to 80 percent of its present level is in line with the projected revamping of American economy, and possibly that of the entire world.
>
> The outline fits in snugly with recurrent reports that the planners have in mind creation of a hugely industrialized United States with Latin America supplying the food.

We hear that some of our great planners propose that leand-lease money in large amounts be made available now for building railroads and highways in our good-neighbor countries so at the end of the war millions of people may be moved from the destroyed areas of Europe to begin life anew on rich agricultural lands of Central and South America.

This would then require huge quantities of industrial and farm equipment and almost everything imaginable that would be produced in our great factories and huge industrial establishments.

So to complete the circle and give our new customers for manufactured articles something to pay with, we would quit growing our food in the United States and buy from our neighbors, thus leaving our own farmers of the South and West high and dry without a market. Thus we would force them, contrary to American ideals, to give up their lands and homes and move to our cities to become involuntary prisoners and chattels of industry.

And the irony of it all is that all these plans to destroy the American farmer are being made by the one department—the Department of Agriculture—that is supposed to be protecting him and working exclusively in his interest.

Russia, Doing the Fighting, Gets the Arms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the

following editorial from the January 22, 1943, issue of the Waterloo Daily Courier, Waterloo, Iowa:

RUSSIA, DOING THE FIGHTING, GETS THE ARMS

Justifiable pride in the accomplishments of our own armed forces should not blind us to the fact that the principal engagements of the war against Germany are being fought on the Russian front. It is possible that isolated actions on this front will never be decisive; but the slow exhaustion of the Nazi fighting machine effected by the Soviet armies will undoubtedly be the decisive factor in the war as a whole.

Some criticism has been voiced in this country at the sending of lend-lease aid to England, whereas Russia, at the present time, is contributing more to the ultimate defeat of Hitler. It was evidently in answer to this criticism that Lend-Lease Administrator Edward Stettinius, Jr., presented figures recently on aid to Russia.

The United States is sending more planes, tanks, and food to Russia than to Great Britain, or any other battle zone, Stettinius said. We have sent 3,200 tanks and almost 2,600 planes. The British have sent an additional 2,600 tanks and more than 2,000 planes.

While losses in transporting this material to Russia have undoubtedly been heavy, British and American aid has been an important factor in recent Russian winter offensives. The real test, however, will come next spring and summer when the world will find whether Russia, with this and additional Allied aid, can block any attempted German drive toward Stalingrad, Moscow, or Leningrad. If the Russians are to hold, they must hold in the summer what they have recaptured this winter.

In any case, Stettinius' figures will do much to justify continuance of lend-lease aid and remove that policy from the field of controversy. Lend-lease was originally devised to aid England in preparing to withstand a German invasion. Partly because of that policy, England became so strong that Hitler did not dare to attack.

Now the picture has changed and strategy demands the continued existence of a Russian front on a major scale. The public is gratified to know that lend-lease distribution has been amended to meet this changed situation.

Radio Address From the Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address to my constituents, which I delivered over the radio over station WNBF on February 6, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, Norwich, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, I greet you once more from Washington, which has become in 2 short years the military capital of the world. I was thinking just the other day of this bright, gay city before Pearl Harbor. I recall so vividly now walking up Capitol Hill in the warm spring evenings, literally dazzled by the brightness of a thousand street lamps surrounding our magnificent legislative edifice. I recall so vividly gazing in never lessening awe upon the Capitol dome, in itself a symbol of America's greatness, with its brilliant yet soft white splendor, accentuated by powerful rays of giant searchlights. On every side far down to the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers I could see the sparkling wonder of millions of lights, past the lofty Washington Monument, past the noble memorial of Abraham Lincoln, on across the bridge to Arlington.

Yes, I could enjoy all this before Pearl Harbor but I regret to say the evening beauty of Washington has been blacked out; blacked out for the duration. One can only remember the matchless sight of the world's most beautiful capital city by night.

But if Washington looks grim and more somber, she is also better prepared. Throughout the War and Navy and Pentagon Buildings there is a bustle and a tension not known since the days of World War No. 1. The extensive lawns along the Mall and around the Tidal Basin and Reflecting Pool are now covered with cheap looking temporary buildings for thousands of offices comprising tentacles for the greatest Armies and Navy ever known to mankind. Washington has undergone a metamorphosis; her appearance is not as tidy and as neat, but her strength is being gathered. In this, your capital is the personification of the whole country. We are not as tidy as we once were, but we are gathering our strength.

We are all very happy with recent events on the various fighting fronts. The year 1943 has already begun to show the promise of a full victory. Our armed forces have met with a degree of success and are becoming stronger as time goes on. Our production is soaring. We are definitely making strides on the home front. We hope and pray that those in authority will continue to guide our course wisely.

In connection with our leadership—and I want to say that leadership is not only national but also State and local—I would like to read a few able lines by Mrs. Emma Shepherd Griffith, historian of the town of Kirkwood, which appeared in a column of the Binghamton Press recently. I quote:

"COMMUNITY LEADERS

"Some leaders lead too far ahead,
High-visioned, unafraid;
Yet ages after they are dead
We tread the paths they made.

"Some leaders lead too far behind,
Nor seem to keep the track,
Yet they bring on the deaf and blind
Who else would hold us back.

"And some seem not to lead at all,
Slow moving on the way,
Yet help the weary feet and small
Of those who else would stray.

"Lead on, O leaders of the race!
Your work is long and wide;
We need your help in every place—
Before, behind, beside."

Almost all business and labor leaders I know are really just as much for it as I am. They do not go along with the idea that capitalism is dead. They know that either private business or Government bureaucracy must save this country when the war is over, and they prefer private business.

They have a sound reason. You cannot strike against a government. You cannot even truly bargain with a government. Wages and hours in Government employment are fixed by public law. No group of Government employees can overturn public law enacted by the Congress and backed by the Army and Navy. In any knock-down contest between a government and a union, the union is beaten from the start.

A Congress of Industrial Organizations leader in Washington had good sense when he remarked the other day: "I would rather bargain with any private employer than with any bureaucrat. The bureaucrat has jails."

Labor and business, therefore, can be firm allies in preventing the governmentalization of this country. I fear no direct effort by labor to destroy business in favor of government. What I fear is that people in general, including millions who are wage workers and millions who are not, may forget just what it is that makes business go.

For this, I very considerably blame the businessmen. They are too mealymouthed about the basic principle of our economic system. They have been intimidated by all the tirades against bloated capitalists and swollen profits. We fear that the word "capitalism" is unpopular. So we take refuge in a nebulous phrase and talk about the free enterprise system. And we even run to cover in the folds of the flag and talk about the American way of life.

Such language disastrously obscures the main issue. You cannot take a whiff of free enterprise or a stretch of a way of life and start a factory with it. To start a factory, and to start the jobs inside that factory, you have to have savings. You have to have money. You have to have capital.

It takes thousands of dollars of capital to equip a really modern factory with the machinery for one job for one wage worker. Freedom and Americanism are the atmosphere. But capital is the seed in the soil. Unless we produce that seed, and unless we plant it, there will be no new crops of private jobs for the American people when this war is over.

Right there is the basic point, I think, in all planning for American post-war prosperity. And right there is the reason why I do not hesitate to say that the word upon which to fix the national mind at this time is simply, outrightly, and frankly, "capitalism."

Do I sound old-fashioned? In this age, which is prone to think about welfare without thinking about the wealth which is necessary to welfare, do I sound reactionary? I summon to my aid one of the wisest friends of labor and of business that this country has ever had, the late Mr. Justice Brandeis. Addressing a trades-union audience in Boston, Justice Brandeis once said:

"It is absolutely essential that a business be profitable. I do not mean merely that the business should not be run at a loss. I mean that the business should be run under such conditions that the owner is willing to risk his capital in the business."

Note "risk his capital." Mr. Brandeis, the sociological and judicial innovator and pioneer, was for capitalism; and, under his great shadow, I am, too, without apology.

Before long the House of Representatives, in which all tax and revenue bills must originate, will consider some sort of pay-as-you-go income tax legislation. Personally, I can see no alternative but to adopt a method of paying one's income tax currently instead of waiting until next year to pay this year's taxes.

Oh, yes, the people who want to put off until tomorrow what we must get done today will tell you that a pay-as-you-go system will cripple everyone's weekly income. I would be the last one to say that any tax burden in these times is light. I do not relish the idea of never seeing a percentage of the money I earn. But I would rather pay income tax as I go along than to wait until next year when I might not have as much income as I have this year and then be forced to pay a lump sum which I will not be able to raise. It will certainly be easier for everyone on a budget even on a war budget to take his income tax out of monthly or weekly earnings than to be forced to borrow the money at a high rate of interest and thereby increase his already generous indebtedness. I believe everyone agrees this way is less painful.

Let me make this clear, however; the burden must fall lightly upon the low-income

groups. These people are doing everything they can now to buy War bonds, meeting a higher cost of living, patriotically responding to every call their community and country gives. In my opinion, tax experts will make a sad mistake if they advocate placing a heavier responsibility upon the folks with small incomes. The fellow who is earning big money should be willing to assume his commensurate share.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize again, as I have many times before, my desire to be of service to my friends in the Triple Cities and throughout my district. Remember, I enjoy splendid contacts with the War, Navy, Agriculture, and other departments. I will be glad to take up any requests you may have with these sources.

During the next months there will be an increasing number of married men with children called up for service. To these men I strongly urge get your family affairs in order before you go. Check up with the War Department or recruiting authorities what you should do to care for your loved ones in your absence. Don't leave a stone unturned. Your wives and children deserve your first and best consideration. Write to me, and I will supply you with answers to questions you may have about dependency benefits. Bear in mind, your wife is entitled to at least $50 a month, your first child to $12 a month, and each one of the others to $10 a month. Call on me for any further details. In case the departments do not respond immediately to your individual letters, get in touch with me here in Washington. I will help you. Thank you.

Classification of Industries by War Manpower Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the recent edict of the War Manpower Commission ordering a program to classify industries as essential or nonessential to the war effort and national welfare, and thereby to exercise blanket authority over the Nation's manpower, is another flagrant assumption of authority not specifically granted by Congress.

Not only has Congress not granted the Executive such authority to make blanket classifications by industries or groups; legislation on the subject quite specifically provides that—

> No deferment from such training and service (as prescribed in the Selective Service Act) shall be made in the case of any individual, and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution. (Pub. Law 625, 77th Cong., title II, June 23, 1942.)

That passage repeats a clear denial of the Executive right to classify industries, groups, or even individual plants in any blanket manner; and certainly denies to the Executive the very approach which the Manpower Commission is attempting to take in classifying certain types of industry and business as nonessential. In fact, Congress has acted quite explicitly in such grants of power over the individuals as it has given the Executive, and that power is all contained in the Selective Service Act. There, and there only, does the Executive derive such authority as it has over the individual citizen. And nothing, either explicit or implied, can be found in the act as a legal basis for the authority which the Manpower Commission now proposes to exercise over great groups and classes of people.

Hence, completely without authority, the Executive is striking another devastating blow at thousands of American business enterprises which already are being overwhelmed in the unequal struggle to remain alive through the present emergency. In effect, this latest edict amounts to a specific warning to all persons not directly employed in some approved war industry to get out of their present jobs or be drafted into the armed services. The result ought to be obvious to anyone who gives the matter a moment's thought. It will not occur to many of the millions of men threatened that the Executive may be acting without legal authority in driving them out of their present jobs, and there will probably be an early and general exodus from the so-called nonessential fields of enterprise. Thousands of business activities, already suffering extreme labor shortages, will find their difficulties suddenly multiplied.

This latest move by the Manpower Commission is just one more in a long series of arbitrary Executive actions playing havoc in our civilian life without making any real and immediate contribution to our war effort.

Build Ships, Yes—But Also Sink U-Boats—And Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Admiral Sir Percy Noble, which was published in the Washington Post of February 7, 1943.

BUILD SHIPS, YES—BUT ALSO SINK U-BOATS—AND NOW—ESCORT BOATS, AND MORE, AND MORE, HELD SOLUTION

(By Admiral Sir Percy Noble, K. C. B.)

Early in 1917 I was the executive officer—that is, commander—of a very large, very new, very fast, and very powerful ship called the *Courageous*, and one day while lying at anchor in our base in Scotland I received a signal to say that Admiral Sims, of the United States Navy, would like to visit the ship. My captain was ashore, so I had the pleasure of welcoming Admiral Sims on board and showing him round.

Just before he was going I asked him if I might ask one question—and the question was this: "You, sir, having just come over from the United States, probably have a very good, common-sense opinion as to who is winning this war—spectators always see more of the game than the players—therefore, who do you think is winning this war?" Admiral Sims, after a moment's thought, replied very briefly, "If you cannot kill the submarine sinkings in the Atlantic, you will lose it."

SAME SITUATION TODAY

As you know, America came into the war very shortly after that and joined us in fighting until victory came, but it gives me a very good excuse for enlarging upon what Admiral Sims said then in relation to the situation at the present day.

The most important factor governing the conduct of the war today is shipping. Every new move in the war game means more shipping—shipping to Russia, to north Africa, to the United Kingdom, to the South Pacific, to mention some of the more important commitments.

War nowadays is a grim and desperate business, and nowhere is it being waged under more difficult conditions and with more grim determination than in the battle of the sea lanes. No military barriers, such as mountains and rivers, confine it.

Across the oceans sail the ships of the United Nations, carrying men, munitions, food, and supplies. It is of these ships and of the men who man them, and to whom the United Nations owe a debt, the magnitude of which their peoples do not always seem to realize, that I speak of today.

ROUT ENEMY ON SURFACE

In 3½ years of war the German surface ships have seldom dared to show themselves on the oceans. When they have, on rare occasions, they have been brought to battle and sunk, as in the case of the *Bismarck* and of the *Graf Spee*, or have been chased back to their ports. And so the small but powerful navy that Germany possesses has confined its activities of late to operations from the Norwegian coast, under cover of the Luftwaffe, from where it seeks, without success, to stop our convoys to Russia.

The task of these convoys and of those responsible for their safe arrival to deliver aid to Russia is a heavy one. The route lies through 2,000 miles of the most inhospitable seas in the world. In summer the white nights in the Arctic give the convoys no respite from the heavy attacks of German aircraft and submarines. In the winter the nights are long and relieved only by the short gray twilight which passes for daylight in these latitudes.

The ships edge their way along the edge of the ice pack in the teeth of great gales and mountainous seas, when the spray freezes into sheets of ice as it strikes, and life itself is hard to support in the intense cold. It is in these conditions the convoys are fought through to Russia. Ships are inevitably lost, but the great majority get through.

But they got through only because of the gallantry and undaunted determination of the men who man the ships, men who sail in ammunition ships or in tankers full of aviation spirit, knowing full well that one bomb or torpedo may well result in their complete destruction, and men who fight their guns in the snow and the bitter cold on reeling icy decks, so that the enemy turns tail rather than press home his attack.

BOTH SIDES LOSE HEAVILY

And so the Germans have turned their efforts and their production to the war that goes on under the surface, and the battle of the Atlantic, which has been in progress since the first day of the war, goes on day and night without ceasing.

For the past 2 years I have been in command of the western approaches to the British Isles, charged with the conduct of the antisubmarine offensive. We cannot publish the lists of sinkings either of U-boats or of our own merchant ships, for to do so would be to give most valuable information to the enemy. I would like to emphasize that point. This

I can say, though, that the sinkings of each have been heavy.

Have no doubt whatsoever on this point: It will take all our strength, all our resources, all our ingenuity, and all our determination to overcome this great danger.

In peacetime the great bulk of the people of both our countries know little about shipping and the Navy's work generally. The military and air forces are something much more tangible because they work and live amongst the people on land. This is quite natural, but in wartime, knowledge by the people of the great part the sea plays is, in my opinion, most important. Lack of full realization of the fact that winning the war depends on sea power can lead us to disaster. By sea power I mean the safe and timely arrival of our convoys as well as the denial of the use of the sea to the enemy.

THERE'S BUT ONE COURSE

Unless we can beat the U-boats we are in danger of losing our sea power, and there is only one way to shorten this terrible conflict. It is quite simply "beat the U-boat."

Do our people realize that the tanks, the guns, the airplanes which they fashion with their own hands, the products of the fields which they harvest with such care and effort, are daily being sunk on the high seas on their way to their own fighting men at the front? That every ship so lost prolongs the war, and that every one which arrives safely shortens it? That to bring the impact of our tremendous resources to bear on the enemy, every fighting man and every weapon has to be sent overseas? That Hitler's best weapon is just to prevent, by means of his U-boats, those men and those weapons reaching the fighting fronts? Because if they don't all I can say is this: "That the sooner they do realize it the sooner we shall win this war."

There is no royal road to success in this matter. Nothing but blood, and sweat, and tears can achieve it. But there is one outstanding essential in which we all can help to win this war and the peace which will come after. It can be summed up in the one word, "cooperation."

SHIPS ALONE NOT ENOUGH

It is not sufficient by itself to build more ships than the submarines sink. You can't replace crews like you can ships! Not only have we a very great deal of leeway to make up, but valuable cargoes go to the bottom with every ship sunk.

The answer is to sink the submarine by escorts, more escorts, and yet more escorts, working in the closest cooperation with each other and with the air forces which hunt the submarine from the air. And yet again numbers of escorts are not themselves enough. They must be trained to work as a team, anticipating every move of the enemy and countering it with swift offensive action, for it is wrong to think of the battle of the Atlantic as defensive. No football team would take the field without practice and a full knowledge of the tactics of the game, trained to work with each other as a team.

So it is with the war at sea, and as dive bombers are synchronized with infantry attacks, so must the work of the air patrols be synchronized with that of the escorts. Otherwise gaps are left in the line of defenses of which the enemy will take full advantage.

If there is still need of an example to point the moral it is this: The armada which sailed across the seas to the shores of north Africa was the biggest amphibious expedition in the history of war. It consisted of hundreds of ships of all kinds, and was escorted by the warships of the British and American Navies. Yet so good was the planning, so excellent the secrecy, and so close the cooperation, that of those hundreds of ships not one was lost before the Mediterranean was entered, and only one before the ships cast anchor off the beaches. As an example of what can be achieved with adequate escort forces, it is unique. But if we can produce the ships and the aircraft, and train their crews in this deadly game of hunting the submarine, there is no reason why the exception I have given you should not become the rule. In the past years we have met disasters by having too little, too late. This U-boat campaign cannot be beaten by too much, much too late. It has got to be plenty now.

Asylum for Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to exteno my remarks in the RECORD I include the following statement made by me over station WNEW, Sunday, February 7, 1943:

American tradition lists many noble names that sought refuge in our shores and became part of the American legend. George Washington's grandfather was a political refugee. The fight for freedom of conscience led William Penn to the prisons of England from whence he fled to the New World. Tom Paine who dared pen The Rights of Man fled twice to this country, once from England and once from France in the days of the French Revolution and our own fight for independence. Out of Ireland as religious refugees came the forebears of Woodrow Wilson. And among the forty-eighters who fled the Prussian Junkers, then as men do now, were the fathers of Justice Brandeis and Adolph Ochs. My own grandfather came over with Carl Schurz in 1848.

The fight for freedom continues through the ages, the upward struggle of mankind, and now, once again, refugees fleeing death and oppression seek asylum with the right to live, work, and pray.

Under date of January 28, an all-party delegation in both Houses of the British Parliament appealed to the British Government to save the Jews from annihilation at the hands of Hitler and his satellites. It is very encouraging to note that Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden stated that conversations were progressing continually among the United Nations with a view "to expediting the victory and restoring liberty to the enslaved peoples of Europe at the earliest possible moment."

Measures were also formulated in a meeting of peers and members of the House of Commons with the Archbishop of Canterbury for the following purposes:

1. Approach the German Government through the proper channels with the proposal that Jews under German control be allowed to leave.

2. Announce that the British Government, its dominions and colonies and other Allied Nations, including the United States, will offer refuge to Jews.

3. Provide facilities for transporting Jews.

4. Encourage neutrals to help in receiving them.

Deputy Prime Minister Attlee gives the encouraging statement in answer to the questions asked by several members of the House of Commons, "that his Government is now working on certain practical proposals to aid Jewish refugees and that his Government intends to bring about an end to Hitler's mass extermination of Jews."

It is hoped that all these good intentions will result in some international agreement whereby Jewish and other refugees fleeing the Nazi scourge can find asylum. It is hoped also that the United States will not shirk its responsibility in this regard—its responsibility to common humanity.

The world stands aghast at the massacre of a people whose only crime is that they are of the same race in which Christ and His apostles were born.

The voice of America in international affairs is most potent. That voice should not be silent. In an attempt to hold back the flood tide of Nazi cruelties and atrocities against Jews, the matter cannot be tossed aside as is being done by some benighted ones that it is a Jewish question and, therefore, no affair of ours. That attitude was displayed in many countries now suffering under the Nazi heel. The Czech in self-deception said that, then the Poles, then the French, and what was a Jewish problem became a world problem and western civilization now finds itself almost at the brink of destruction.

The question might well be asked, How can we be of concrete help?

Among other things, the administration can broadcast warnings by short wave to the people of Germany and Italy holding them and their leaders responsible for the atrocities visited upon the Jews and others.

Political and financial aid might well be given by the United Nations to Jews and other victims who have succeeded in escaping the Nazis. A temporary "open door" might be attempted by Great Britain and the United States by way of giving temporary shelter as "visitors" at least to those escaping from Nazi-dominated territories. Requests, coupled with financial aid, can be made by the administrations of the neutral countries that they be liberal in granting passports or immigration visas. Such a visa could be made valid for, say, a short period of 2 years. Food, medicine, and clothing to succor the escapees could be given to neutral countries like Turkey, Ireland, Switzerland, Sweden, and pan-American nations on the condition that they grant them asylum.

Vichy-inspired decrees now operative in parts of Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia must be summarily abrogated. There would be no purpose served either in military or political strategy in the maintenance of any of these restrictions.

Both England and the United States must redefine their immigration policies.

It is well in this connection to quote the resolution adopted by the Church Peace Union, comprised of clergymen and laymen, representing various religious denominations:

"We urge further that havens of refuge and asylum be provided in all the free countries of the world, including the United States, for such Jews as can be rescued from the hell of Fascist Europe. We urge that the United Nations give their immediate thought and attention to the possibilities of Palestine as a present place of refuge for some of the Jews now living in deadly peril. We recognize that Palestine as a homeland cannot solve all the problems of the Jews, but we urge that consideration be given to the policy of opening this country to increased immigration at the end of the war; thus permitting the persecuted either to settle in their former homes or to reconstruct their lives in the ancient land of their fathers. We join all civilized mankind in a demand that in the post-war world there be established a political, economic, and social status for Jews and Judaism consistent with the requirement of decency and democracy; that Jews shall be free men; and that the Jewish tradition shall be free to fulfill itself."

Many protests have been made against the Nazis. We can protest to high Heaven. We can express horror at the Nazi cruelties, but such should be a prologue to the acts of real relief to follow. We in this country might set an example. Our immigration is limited to 150,000 a year. That number is divided

into national quotas. The British and German quotas comprise well nigh two-thirds thereof. Of the 65,000 Britons admissible each year, only 962 immigrants came in last year. Two hundred and forty-four came from Scotland and 36 came from Wales. The balance of the quota numbers for Great Britain went to waste. The German quota is 27,370. Less than 20 percent of this was used and more than 80 percent went to waste. Most victims of Nazi oppression hail from those countries that have pitifully small quotas.

Note the annual quotas from the following countries:

Belgium, 1,304; Estonia, 100; France, 3,086; Hungary, 869; Latvia, 236; Lithuania, 386; Poland, 6,524; Rumania, 377; Russia, 2,712. This includes European and Asiatic Russia.

Significantly, if all the visas were granted for which applications had been made and are now pending, the total number of immigrants would still be only 10 percent of our pre-war immigration quota.

I would not increase the total quota for all nations. I would leave it at 150,000. I would simply rearrange the size of the quotas or rooms in the edifice of immigration. I would reduce somewhat the size of the room of Great Britain and the size of the room of Germany proportionately. I would make larger some of the other rooms, like the quotas from Rumania, Belgium, Hungary, Latvia, Poland, etc.

Great Britain is a far greater offender than we are when it comes to the exclusion of immigrants, particularly Jews. Both the homeland and the commonwealths, the Crown colonies, and the mandated territories are hermetically sealed against refugees. Only a mere trickle goes into Palestine.

The Commonwealth of South Africa has a population of 2,000,000 whites and 7,000,000 blacks. It is one-half the size of the United States. Since 1938 practically no Jews have been permitted entrance. Australia, which is larger than the United States, has a population of 7,000,000. Its doors are closed. New Zealand has a population of 1,500,000. No Jew can enter.

Chaim Weizmann in the January 1942 issue of Foreign Affairs states there is room in Palestine for 400,000 more Jewish families, making a total of 2,000,000 souls.

Legal immigration, assured by the MacDonald White Paper of 1939, permits entrance of 75,000 Jews in a 5-year period. It is deplorable that thus far only 45,000 immigration certificates have been granted.

It might be well for the allied and western nations to reach an agreement to accept yearly a reasonable number of refugees of all faiths, let us say, 10,000 for larger countries like Brazil and Canada, 7,500 for Mexico (especially Lower California) and Argentina, 5,000 for Venezuela, Chile, Egypt, Morocco, Algeria, etc. Jews in their asylum will have much to offer. For example, Jewish refugees in this country have added immeasurably to our economic worth. They have not subtracted; they have added to our wealth. It is interesting to note that the figures of the Foreign Property Control show that, exclusive of the capital of a few rich immigrants, a maximum of one and a half billion dollars has been brought in since 1933. In New York City these refugees have created scores of new industries It is reported by the Committee for Selected Studies that 150 immigrants have recently brought 150 new trades to the United States and are now making articles which were formerly imported, such as fine leather goods, gloves, perfumes, Karlsbad wafers, Viennese knitted goods. As a result of the establishment of glove manufacturing, we need no longer look to Europe for our supply of gloves. Diamond cutters have transferred their business, together with their special skills, from Belgium and Holland to the United States. All these businesses have given employment to Americans.

It is interesting also to note that our greatest periods of prosperity have been the periods of greatest immigration. Our periods of depression have been the periods of lowest immigration. Whenever we have had large mass immigration, the number of available jobs has continuously increased and prosperity dawned upon us. With the decline of immigration there has always been the decline in business activity and economic stagnation.

Remember, it was our immigrants who tunneled our mountains, built our subways, highways, and bridges, dug the coal and made our prairies rich farm land. They were the hewers of stone and carriers of water. They made America great.

Then, there is also Alaska. A few years ago a plan was offered providing a refugee settlement there. The climate is not as cold as one would imagine. It has a population of 72,524 as reported in the last census taken in October 1939 in an area of 586,400 square miles. Great opportunities are open for the development of the Territory. At its worst, it would be better than Poland or Rumania. It is worthy of investigation. Certainly, Alaska is rich, with its untold, untapped natural resources. A reasonable number of refugees could easily be assimilated.

It is disheartening and sorrowful to speak of Jews being shunted off in manner indicated, but we must be realistic—any port in the storm.

Assuredly, at the peace conference table duly accredited representatives of the Jews and other refugees must be permitted places. The plea of the Jew in a post-war era must be recognized. His status must be well defined. Righteousness, decency, and democracy should be the guiding posts to the end that Jews may be freemen in the countries in which they live. They too must be accorded the four freedoms without let or hindrance.

Enlightened minds must help alleviate the terrible conditions that may again arise to confront them. It is not only necessary to incorporate in any peace treaty the obligations of nations to give the Jews equal rights with others, but some international police force must be devised to enforce these human rights accorded the Jews. Saving clauses have appeared in covenants heretofore, but they have been mere empty promises. Repudiation and evasion of these rights must be prevented. I repeat this must be so not only for Jews but for all minority peoples.

The Jews returning to their homes in Central Europe (if homes remain unshattered) will find themselves still insecure. Disturbed economy of these countries ravaged by Hitler will indeed not be helpful to the Jews. They again may be the whipping boys and scapegoats. They will again be blamed for all the ills of the land. Must they always remain unwanted? As Dr. Philip S. Bernstein says in a current issue of the Nation. "They are driven about like the last dying leaves before the chill winds of winter."

Donation of Agricultural Scrap by Albert Stoessel of Ottumwa, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, permit me to bring to the attention of Congress and the country the fact that during the drive for agricultural scrap Mr. Albert Stoessel, 401 North Madison Street, Ottumwa, Iowa, has donated to the Government over 86 tons of scrap metal, which has been shipped to the mills for processing. This scrap was worth approximately $1,000. Such generosity on the part of one individual in helping the war effort deserves commendation and the recognition of the country at large.

Following is a copy of my letter to Mr. Stoessel:

In connection with the scrap drive I have noted with considerable pride the generous contributions made throughout the 14 counties of the Fourth Congressional District, but so far as I can learn no other one person was as generous as yourself in this great patriotic effort. I am simply amazed at your ability to gather up 86 tons of scrap metal, which I understand is the amount you donated, and which was worth in the neighborhood of $1,000. My sincere congratulations to you.

The United States Bureau of Animal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Bureau of Animal Industry, which was created more than 50 years ago, has done a good job in the control of livestock diseases as well as the inspection of meats under the Federal meat inspection program.

I am including as a part of my remarks, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 7, adopted by the Kansas State Senate, January 21, 1943, opposing the transfer of the Meat Inspection Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry to the new Food Distribution Division. The resolution is as follows:

By an act of Congress the United States Bureau of Animal Industry was created in 1884, under the direction of Dr. Solomon. The development and guidance of the Bureau has successfully brought about a disease-control program now operating under the direction of Dr. John R. Mohler, whose ability is recognized throughout the world as a genius in the control of livestock diseases and his administration of the present Federal meat-inspection program. Under his direction foot-and-mouth disease has been eliminated from the United States and the occurrence of such diseases as Texas fever, cattle and sheep scab, tuberculosis, anthrax, black leg, hog cholera, malignant edema has either been minimized or practically eliminated in various sections of the United States. Through his endeavors Federal meat inspection in the United States is recognized throughout the world and through his scrutiny and effective quarantine programs we have been able to keep out many of the infectious diseases of foreign countries that are of untold values to the livestock interests of this country as well as public health. Any curtailment of Dr. Mohler's authority could possibly bring about a serious menace to our livestock industry as well as to our meat food supply. The United States, Canada, and Mexico are reported to be the only

three countries in the world today that are free of foot-and-mouth disease, which can be attributed directly to Dr. John R. Mohler's meat-inspection program in cooperation with the governments of Mexico and Canada.

Whereas we are advised that the meat-inspection division of the Bureau of Animal Industry has by Executive order been transferred from that bureau to the new Food Distribution Division; and

Whereas no Government agency has functioned more efficiently in the interest of the livestock industry than the Meat Inspection Division in correlation with field inspection of the Bureau of Animal Industry in the quarantine and control of animal diseases: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Kansas Legislature, That the Bureau of Animal Industry be restored to its full power as has existed since 1884, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Kansas United States Senators and to each of the Kansas Representatives in Congress.

Surplus Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Congress to what I consider to be a gruesome situation. I have been receiving information from a number of my constituents to the effect that the Federal Surplus Commodities Division of the Agriculture Marketing Administration is distributing butter and other food products to schools whether they want or can use them or not.

In the editorial, which is herewith inserted, from the Bucyrus (Ohio) Telegraph-Forum, it states that one of the schools in that section was given 100 pounds of butter, that later that school was required to take another 50 pounds when it was not needed.

I have a letter from one of my constituents in which he tells me of an instance where a rural school had been forced to accept 75 pounds of butter which the school did not want and did not need, and that the butter was finally used in frying hamburgers. The same party also informed me that last summer a local relief distributing office in my district took about 150 hams out to the city dump and burned them because they had them left over, for if they had reported a surplus their allotment would have been reduced the next time and meanwhile the hams had spoiled.

If these things are true, and I have no reason to doubt that they are, a crime of the first sort is being committed against the whole country.

There is little doubt in my mind but that this is going on in all parts of the country. It is just what the people should expect under the terrible bureaucracy that the New Deal has brought forth. Nor should we be at all surprised if the political planners bring this Nation to a state of starvation. There is no question in my mind that they are destroying America.

There is only one way to destroy the cruel bureaucratic tactics that are sapping the life of our Nation. That is to destroy the bureaucracy itself, by which I mean abolish all such agencies as the Federal Surplus Commodities Division of the Agricultural Marketing Administration.

The following editorial certainly goes to the root of the matter and I hope every Congressman can find time to read it:

SURPLUS COMMODITIES

If the distribution of so-called surplus commodities ever had a place in our economy that place ceased to exist the day this country began its arms program long ago. Yet surplus commodities are still being handed out free in these days of the biggest industrial boom in all American history. Of particular disgust is the distribution of butter at a time when thousands of housewives are tramping the streets from one store to another trying to buy a pound or half a pound at a time. And the Government is handing it out "free" to rural schools; handing it out in lots beyond the schools' ability to use it; handing it out where there is the means of securing it by purchase.

The December distribution report for Crawford County shows that dry milk, canned milk (also being rationed to all of us), canned pork and beans, cheese (about to be rationed), apples, and grapefruit juice were handed out during the month. Defending the distribution during December of 231 pounds of butter, Local Distributor R. L. Hertzer said that the butter is butter that has been in cold storage since the 1939 market. The people will hardly accept this as a reason why this cold-storage butter cannot be released to retail stores for their purchase instead of being handed out "free."

If ever there was a time in this country's history that every man can have a job if he wants it, it is today. And if ever in American history there was a time when there should be no need of the Government paying big salaries to maintain surplus commodity distributors and offices, it is now. And, further, if ever there was a time when there is no need to make such distribution on such a wholesale scale, it is now.

An instance is reported at one Crawford County school which was given 100 pounds of butter. Later this school was required to take another 50 pounds when it was not needed, according to most reliable authority. If the New Dealers who haven't yet learned that the country is financially imperilled by the war on top of their 10 years of wastefulness are so hard up to get rid of butter that they have to ask schools to accept it, then they might try putting it on the market and see how long it lasts under the honest-purchase plan of America's housewives.

There are still poor people in this country. No one denies that. There always have been and there always will be, but there are not so many that the Government needs to maintain a surplus commodity division here. As a people we cared for these unfortunates before Franklin Roosevelt and his spenders were known outside of Tammany Hall, and we can do it again at a far less per capita cost to us than we are going to have to pay for the surplus commodity, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Work Projects Administration, and all the rest of the "planned economy" that put us in financial peril long before there was a thought of war. Today we are being told that we must dig and dig for taxes because war costs money. Sure, war costs money, and Mr. and Mrs. America stands ready to pay the bill to hasten the day when their sons will no longer face bullets, but the war is not the sole reason for the taxation which is threatening our individual security today. Surplus commodities is one of these causes. It should be discontinued overnight.

Such a halfbaked program at a time like this is not a reflection upon local agencies. They are hired to do a job. It is another New Deal insult that we lack the intelligence to believe that products rationed to all of us should be handed out "free" to some of us. It is even an insult to the intelligence of those who receive these goods. They are told it is "free," but they, along with the rest of us, are going to pay and the price is likely to be $100 a pound for butter—in taxes.

Through the Wringer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Northern Virginia Daily, of Strasburg, Va.:

THROUGH THE WRINGER

It is difficult to follow the arguments of those Members of Congress, public officials, and Treasury experts who insist that the taxpayers of the Nation must be squeezed through the wringer to the tune of 2 years' income taxes in 1 year in order to place tax payments on a current basis. It is not merely the fact that this heavy drain on the resources of small-income people will work a great hardship on this class of taxpayers. That is bad enough. But such pyramiding of taxes will impress the average citizen as the manifestation of a disposition on the part of his Government to take advantage of him and strip him of every spare dollar he can earn or borrow.

Speaking before the House Ways and Means Committee yesterday, Representative CRAWFORD, of Michigan, condemned the Ruml plan and oracularly exclaimed: "To me it is almost economic blasphemy to advocate that there be no Federal tax assessed and collected against the $115,000,000,000 of net income in 1942, this especially in view of the fact that such a large percentage of it came out of deficit financing." And Chairman DOUGHTON, of the committee, challenged Ruml's assertion that the idea would improve the financial well-being of the Government and told the plan's sponsor to "sell that to all business people and have them cancel debts by their customers."

Exploding this myth that the Government would lose a year's revenue, Mr. Ruml said:

"Notice that we shall go along paying our income taxes as we have done before, only they will be on a current basis. The Treasury will also go along getting its revenue. The only difference is that when a taxpayer dies or ceases to receive income, he will not owe income tax as he does under the present system. Reduction of tax payment by the taxpayer as a result of setting the tax clock ahead occurs only at some future date, when and as the taxpayer's income ceases or declines. For those in the upper brackets, it will make much less practical difference than might appear. * * * As long as they have income they continue to pay their taxes, and when they die the previous year's income is subject to estate taxes in the higher brackets."

Representative ROBERTSON, of this congressional district, proposes to erase the 1942 obligations for about 90 percent of the taxpayers, that is for those in the lower brackets, and to reduce obligations for the other 10 percent by canceling the 6 percent normal and first-bracket surtax of 13 percent, this affecting the first $2,000 of net taxable income. His plan also embodies a "withholding levy" to be deducted from income at its source, the proceeds from which will constitute a sort of sinking fund from which the current taxes will be deducted when the return is filed. Whatever balance remains is rebatable to the taxpayer. Another plan put forward by Chairman DOUGHTON would tax 1942 incomes on the basis of 1941 rates and exemptions.

Major Robertson has taken the basic feature of the Ruml plan—relief of the taxpayer from the burden of having to pay 2 years' income taxes in 1 year—and has put the proposal on a more practical basis than was embodied in the Ruml plan. The proposal of Representative DOUGHTON to revert to 1941 rates and exemptions for 1942 taxes would serve to reduce the amount of 1942 income taxes to be paid, but would still leave the taxpayer saddled with 2 years' taxes in 1. No patriotic citizen wants to escape or evade reasonable taxation, but the average person is apt to regard such double taxation as an unreasonable and unwarranted burden. We believe the Robertson plan offers the fairest and most practical approach to the problem of putting taxes on a current basis.

Appeals for Additional Mileage and Gasoline Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday February 8, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a letter received from John L. Rogers, Director of Division of Motor Transport, Office of Defense Transportation, containing information of interest to many persons throughout the United States:

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
January 26, 1943.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to acknowledge your letter under date of January 14, 1943, addressed to Hon. Joseph B. Eastman, to which was attached a letter from your constituent, Mr. Charles F. Adams, 101 Milk Street, Boston, Mass., together with newspaper clippings and appeal forms.

Mr. Adams makes particular reference to the application form used for the Certificate of War Necessity and appeal forms to be used in making an appeal for additional mileage and gasoline allotment.

I can well appreciate that there were a number of things in connection with the issuance of the certificate which did not meet with the approval of those to whom they were issued; however, let me state that the limited amount of time available to prepare for the Certificate of War Necessity program was a governing factor in the preparation, printing, and distribution of applications to approximately three and one-half million operators of commercial type motor vehicles, including farmers.

Members of my staff here are formulating what might be termed "simplified forms," e. g., forms that are more applicable to specific vehicle operations. In the case of trucks owned and operated by farmers, we requested and are receiving the assistance and cooperation of the United States Department of Agriculture, the national farm organizations, and others who have knowledge of farming operations.

Prior to the foregoing, forms of a "reminder nature" pertaining to farm trucks were formulated by my office and the United States Department of Agriculture which have been, and at this writing, are being used by the county farm transportation committees as a basis for disclosing essential needs of each farm truck operation.

If any farmer feels that the allowances of maximum mileage or motor-fuel allotments are not sufficient to conduct essential operations, he may ask his county farm transportation committee, which is a part of the United States Department of Agriculture county war board, for an adjustment to his certificate of war necessity.

Upon review of the individual case the county farm transportation committee may recommend to the district office of the Office of Defense Transportation that certain adjustments are necessary. All district offices of the Office of Defense Transportation have been instructed to accept such recommendation, unless they contain obvious errors, and if such occurs, the Office of Defense Transportation district manager will contact the county farm transportation committee, which eliminates any bother to the farmer.

If information comes to the attention of the county farm transportation committee disclosing facts that a farmer has been allotted excessive mileage or motor fuel, it is the duty of the committee to recommend adjustments be made to each certificate of war necessity, and the district manager of the Office of Defense Transportation will accept such recommendations in a like manner as outlined above.

If I may be of further service to you, do not hesitate to call on me.

Very truly yours,

JOHN L. ROGERS,
Director, Division of Motor Transport.

Antiracketeering Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, on the bedrock principle that crime is crime, no matter who commits it, and robbery is robbery whether or not the perpetrator has a union card in his pocket, I wrote and introduced H. R. 653.

Extensive hearings were held on the same bill last year. These hearings are printed and are available to all Members of the House.

This bill was reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary both last year and this.

The protection of interstate commerce from obstruction by robbery or extortion is one of the plain duties of Congress.

Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I am including a few of the editorials and an article that appeared recently in the press of the Nation's Capital:

[From the Washington Post of January 29, 1943]

ANTIRACKETEERING BILL

The House Judiciary Committee has acted with commendable dispatch to report out a bill correcting the Supreme Court's blunder in interpreting the Antiracketeering Act. That the committee would urge the adoption of some such bill was taken for granted. Extensive hearings on the proposal were conducted last year, and the bill reported out by the committee would probably have been adopted if it had not been blocked in the House Rules Committee. This time the Judiciary Committee has gotten an earlier start. If the Rules Committee should again interpose objections, the measure could doubtless be carried to the floor, where it appears certain of passage.

Actually the statute enacted in 1934 was intended to punish any sort of racketeer who preys upon interstate commerce. Members of the House Judiciary Committee, which gave the bill its final form, have since indicated their intention to penalize racketeers in industry and labor alike, while safeguarding the legitimate activities of labor unions. But the Supreme Court interpreted the measure as granting immunity to sluggers who collected fees from truck drivers entering New York. It seemed to regard extortion, violence, and the beatings of nonunion drivers as legitimate union activities.

Congress has already waited too long to correct that gross misinterpretation of its will. We hope that correction will be simple and forthright. For that reason it is disappointing to see that the Judiciary Committee has amended its bill so that it would be effective only in wartime. It is important, of course, to eliminate this despicable threat to the free movement of interstate commerce during the war. But it is no less desirable that the enforcement of law against extortion and violence in legitimate commerce between the States be carried over into peacetime. Racketeering is racketeering in either peace or war and Congress should have no hesitation in recognizing it as such.

[From the Washington News of January 30, 1943]

LABOR NEEDS THIS LAW

There is some reason to hope that Congress may soon take the Supreme Court's pointed hint and pass a law to subject racketeering labor unions to the penalties of the Federal antiracketeering statutes.

The Hobbs bill for that purpose has been approved by an overwhelming vote of the House Judiciary Committee. The same bill was reported out last year, but administration opposition sidetracked it. This time it has a better chance.

The necessity for this proposed law grows out of a Supreme Court decision 2 years ago. Union teamsters had been waylaying trucks as they entered New York City, using intimidation and violence to make the truckers pay a day's wages to union drivers whose services were neither wanted nor needed. In some cases the union drivers refused to do any work after receiving their tribute. The facts were proved in lower courts. But the Supreme Court held, in effect, that Congress had not intended Federal laws to stop or punish such conduct by labor organizations and their members. Chief Justice Stone dissented vigorously and spoke of "common-law robbery." Justice Byrnes wrote the majority opinion, but added that such conduct was "not beyond the reach of Federal legislative control."

We have never believed that Mr. Byrnes and his colleagues read the intent of Congress rightly. But many months have passed and Congress has not accepted his plain invitation to write its real intent into unmistakable law. We hope it will do so now.

Passage of this bill would be a service to all honest members of unions. They certainly do not believe that racketeering should be a protected right of labor.

We believe that other union interferences with interstate commerce, designed to extort unearned tribute from the public and not to further the legitimate aims of labor organization, should be punishable under the Federal antitrust laws. The Supreme Court, in other decisions, has held they are not. Representative MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, has a bill to correct those decisions, and the Judiciary Committee should act also on the Monroney bill.

[From the Washington Star of February 1, 1943]

RACKETEERING ISSUE

Nine years after it presumably had disposed of the issue, Congress once again is faced with the question whether racketeering in the guise of labor activity should be given any special exemption under the law. A so-called antiracketeering statute, designed to clean up a variety of rackets disrupting interstate commerce, was passed in 1934. But when this measure at last found its way to the Supreme Court a year ago that tribunal rules that Congress had not intended to include unions within the scope of the statute.

The majority decision, delivered by Justice Byrnes, now Director of Economic Stabilization, provoked a sharp dissent from Chief Justice Stone. It was shown that members of the Teamsters Union had been waylaying trucks coming into New York and extorting sums of money equivalent to union wages from the drivers by beating or threatening to beat them. In some cases the union men offered to drive the trucks within the city; in others they simply took the money and disappeared. For the Court to condone such practices, the Chief Justice said, would be to sanction what was plain robbery at common law. But the Court did sanction it, on the theory that Congress, in passing the law, had intended to exclude unions from its scope.

To overcome the effect of this decision Representative HOBBS of Alabama has introduced an amended antiracketeering bill, and the House Judiciary Committee has reported it favorably. This brings the question squarely before Congress. Most union spokesmen are opposing the measure, but their opposition is based on the untenable contention that it is not possible to wipe out vicious racketeering which masquerades as union activity without also stifling legitimate labor aspirations. Certainly it should be relatively simple to show that a distinction can be drawn between proper labor practices and outright rackets. If this is done labor will benefit no less than the country as a whole.

[From the Washington Post of February 1, 1943]

MURRAY CALLS RACKET BILL STAB AT LABOR—CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS CHIEF DEMANDS CONGRESS LEADERS ORDER HEARINGS

President Philip Murray of the Congress of Industrial Organizations yesterday assailed bitterly the Hobbs labor "antiracketeering" bill reported to the House by the Judiciary Committee Thursday, as a direct attack upon legitimate labor.

In letters to Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN (Democrat) of Texas, Rules Committee Chairman ADOLPH J. SABATH (Democrat), of Illinois, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK (Democrat), of Massachusetts, House majority leader, and Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN (Republican), of Massachusetts, House minority leader, Murray demanded that the bill be referred back to committee for appropriate hearings.

No hearings were held by the committee of the new Congress on the measure, introduced last year by Representative SAM HOBBS (Democrat), of Alabama, though extensive hearings at which both the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor voiced strong opposition, were held last fall. The measure was approved at that time by the Judiciary Committee, but did not reach a vote on the floor.

It proposes to subject labor unions to provisions and penalties of the Antiracketeering Act of 1934. Anyone, including union officials or members, convicted of interference by violation or intimidation with interstate or foreign commerce movements, would be subject to maximum penalties of 20 years' imprisonment, a fine of $10,000, or both.

"The bill poses as a curb on racketeering," Murray wrote. "The simple truth is that there is a Federal antiracketeering law now on the statute books, and there are State laws more than adequate to deal with any form of truly criminal conduct.

"The authors of the Hobbs bill are seeking action merely to eliminate present language protecting legitimate labor activities and to insert language such as has been used by antilabor courts in decades past to outlaw the very existence of organizations of workingmen and women.

"Today over 60,000,000 American workers are being called upon to make, and are making, gigantic contributions to the promotion of our war effort, in the armed forces and on the production front. In the name of the Nation, to whose defense we have all dedicated our lives, I urge that you make this truly a victory Congress by refusing any support to legislation which serves private interest and attacks the structure of our national morale.

"Certainly so dangerous a measure as the Hobbs bill merits better-advised action than a report adopted in haste and secrecy by a committee of which the bill's author is a member. I trust that you will take all necessary action at least to return the bill for appropriate hearing."

[From the Washington Post of February 2, 1943]

AIMED AT ROBBERY

We find it impossible to follow the reasoning of the Congress of Industrial Organizations President Murray's protest against the Hobbs bill which was favorably reported to the House last week by that body's Judiciary Committee. Mr. Murray's most specific request is that the bill be returned to the committee for "appropriate" hearings. But extensive hearings on the measure were held last year at which the Congress of Industrial Organizations was amply represented. Those hearings brought forth abundant racketeering which the Hobbs bill is designed to curb.

Mr. Murray rightly says that there is now a Federal antiracketeering law on the statute books. But he is well aware of the fact that the Supreme Court scuttled that law so far as racketeering by union men is concerned. It is nonsense to pretend that this measure designed to correct the Court's mistake would obstruct any legitimate activities of organized labor. The heart of the bill is this simple sentence: "Whoever in any way or degree obstructs, delays, or affects commerce, or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce, by robbery or extortion, shall be guilty of a felony."

Nothing whatever in the bill discriminates against labor unions. It is aimed solely at robbers and extortioners. Should robbery and extortion be committed under the cloak of unionism, of course, punishment would be meted out no less than if those crimes had been committed by employers, or brokers, or any other groups. For labor leaders to protest against penalties for robbery and extortion that would apply to everyone alike is equivalent to seeking special immunity for sluggers and racketeers who happen to hold union cards. Apparently Mr. Murray has used snap judgment. We cannot believe in any event that he intends to inform Congress that the practice of robbery and extortion are a part of labor's legitimate activities.

When we commented on the Hobbs bill in these columns the other day we erroneously assumed that the bill had been amended to restrict its penalties for racketeering to the duration of the war. The section which would remain in force only for the duration is a safeguard against interference with the movement of troops, munitions, etc. Those provisions were in force during the last war and have been revived at the suggestion of Joseph B. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation. We are pleased to see that the penalties for obstruction of interstate commerce by means of robbery and extortion would be made permanent. In our opinion, organized labor would be wise to support this bill as a means of clearing its skirts of the racketeering fringe which now tends to bring disrepute upon the labor movement.

Marketing, Transportation, and Distribution of Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following House Concurrent Resolution No. 12 memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the Committee on Agriculture to make a study and investigation of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products. This resolution was adopted by the Fiftieth General Assembly of Iowa now in session at Des Moines, Iowa:

Whereas with the increasing demands on the farmers of the United States to meet the food requirements of our fighting men and lend-lease commitments, at the same time assuring the people of the United States of the proper amount of foodstuffs, it is essential for the war effort and the well-being of our people that a study be made of the complicated problems of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products; and

Whereas farm products should be properly graded and distributed when and where needed, and immediate steps should be taken for a coordination of efforts and the adopting of a comprehensive and workable plan in betterment of the interests of the producing farmer and the consumer; and

Whereas House Resolution 38 has been introduced in Congress providing for the Committee on Agriculture to make a study and investigation of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products, which study and investigation are imperative at this time: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring) That the Iowa

Legislature urges Congress of the United States to enact House Resolution 38.

That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Iowa Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

Civilian Selective War Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill, introduced by me today:

Be it enacted, etc.

DECLARATION OF POLICY AND INTENT OF CONGRESS

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress hereby declares that in view of the critical nature of the present war and in justice to those in the armed forces of the United States, it is necessary to provide further for the comprehensive, orderly, and effective mobilization of the manpower and womanpower of the Nation in support of the war effort.

(b) The Congress further declares as the general principle governing such mobilization that an obligation rests upon every person, subject to necessary and appropriate exceptions as herein defined or authorized, to render such personal service in aid of the war effort as he or she may be deemed best fitted to perform.

(c) The Congress further declares that there is no intention by this act to modify, reaffirm, or otherwise affect existing laws relating to maximum hours, minimum wages, overtime pay, or collective bargaining, or relating to mediation, arbitration, or other procedures for the settlement of any labor controversies or questions, the intention being that if and when any such subjects are dealt with by the Congress this shall be done by other legislation; and that nothing in this act shall be otherwise construed.

(d) The Congress further declares that there is no intention by this act to affect the integrity of the Selective Service System created under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; and that nothing in this act shall be otherwise construed.

LIABILITY FOR NATIONAL SERVICE

SEC. 2. (a) In order to provide for an adequate supply of workers in war industries and agriculture, and in other occupations, activities, and employments which the President shall from time to time determine to be essential to the effective prosecution of the war, and in order to maintain a proper balance between such workers and persons in the armed forces of the United States and among such workers themselves, each registrant and each person required to be registered under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and every woman residing in the United States between the ages of 18 and 50 at the time fixed for her registration under the provisions of this act, except as hereinafter provided, shall be liable to contribute by personal service to the war effort in a noncombatant capacity, according to his or her abilities, and as selected in accordance with the terms of this act and regulations prescribed by the President thereunder: *Provided*, That no service under this act shall be required from any of the following: (1) Persons relieved from liability for training and service under section 5 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; (2) commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, and enlisted men of the land and naval forces of the United States (including the Army of the United States); (3) commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, and enlisted personnel of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, the WAVES, the MARINES, and the SPARS; (4) persons serving in the Women's Auxiliary Ferrying Service; (5) persons deferred from training and service under section 5 (c) (1) or exempted from training and service under section 5 (d) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; (6) any woman who has living with her and under her care either a child or children under 18 years of age, or one or more other persons who, on account of illness or advanced age, need her personal care; (7) any woman while she is pregnant, as certified by a duly licensed physician; (8) any person who is an officer or employee of any State or of any political subdivision thereof, or of any corporate instrumentality or agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, unless the Governor of the State in which such person is an officer or employee consents in writing to service under this act on the part of such person; or (9) any officer or employee of a corporate instrumentality or agency of two or more States or political subdivisions thereof, unless the Governors of the States concerned consent in writing to service under this act on the part of such officer or employee.

(b) No exception from registration and no exemption or deferment from service under this act shall continue after the cause therefor ceases to exist.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the term "between the ages of 18 and 50" shall refer to women who have attained the eighteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and who have not attained the fiftieth anniversary of the day of their birth.

METHOD OF SELECTION OF WORKERS; RESPECTIVE FUNCTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SEC. 3. (a) The Selective Service System, created under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, shall be utilized as the agency to register and classify those persons who are liable for service under section 2 of this act and who are not already so registered and classified, and to select as hereinafter provided those to be assigned for such service if and to the extent that it becomes necessary to make such selection: *Provided*, That in order to aid the local boards of the Selective Service System in performing the additional duties required of them under this act, the President may assign to such local boards, in an advisory capacity, representatives of such other agencies of the Government as he may deem advisable.

(b) Whenever the President shall determine that additional workers are needed in any war industry, in agriculture, or in other occupations, activities, or employments essential to the effective prosecution of the war, he shall by proclamation specify the numbers of such workers and the purposes for which they are needed. The President shall thereupon, if he deems it practicable without impairing or delaying the war effort, issue through the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, a call or calls for volunteers, specifying the number of persons required, their qualifications, and, so far as practicable, the places where their work would be performed, and asking that qualified men and women volunteer their services within a specified time or times; and if and to the extent that the President shall deem it practicable, such calls for volunteers shall be issued before action is taken to obtain workers through the selective service process provided for by this act.

(c) If the President shall not deem it practicable to issue such a call or calls for volunteers, or if, after having issued such a call or calls, the required numbers of qualified persons have not volunteered their services within the time or times specified, the President, either directly, or through the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, shall direct the Selective Service System created under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to supply the required numbers of persons from those who are liable for service under section 2 of this act. The President shall also specify the quotas to be supplied, the qualifications desired in the persons to be selected, and, so far as practicable, the places to which the persons selected will be assigned. Thereupon the Selective Service System, through the local boards established under that system, shall proceed to select the required workers in the numbers, and, so far as practicable, with the qualifications, specified by the President. Such selection shall be made in a careful and impartial manner, and the decisions of such local boards shall be subject to appeal as in other cases to the appeal boards and agencies of appeal established under section 10 (a) (2) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

REGULATIONS; AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT; ASSIGNMENT OF WORKERS

SEC. 4. The President is authorized, either directly or through the chairman of the War Manpower Commission—

(a) to prescribe the necessary regulations to carry out in an impartial manner the provisions of this act, such regulations to include appropriate provisions for the registration and adequate occupational classification of all persons who are liable for service under section 2 of this act and who have not been so classified under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or otherwise;

(b) in accordance with such regulations, to assign volunteers who have responded to a call under this act, and persons selected for service under this act by the local boards pursuant to section 3, to such noncombatant service in aid of the war effort as the President deems necessary to the successful prosecution of the war, including the production of war materials of every sort, transportation and agriculture, and training for the performance of all such work, at such times and in such numbers as the President may determine: *Provided*, That in making assignments to work under this act, due regard shall be had to assigning men or women to service in or near their home communities: *Provided further*, That no person shall be assigned to work under the provisions of this act at a location where reasonably suitable housing accommodations for such person and his or her immediate family are not available: *Provided further*, That whenever necessary, and so far as it is practicable to do so, persons assigned to service under this act (including accepted volunteers) shall, prior to such assignment, be given an opportunity of receiving aptitude tests and intensive training for the purpose of efficiency allocating them in places where they may render the most useful service and of redirecting or stepping up their skills in order that they may be competent for the tasks which they are to perform: *Provided further*, That every person assigned to service under this act (including every accepted volunteer) shall receive the compensation and work the hours applicable to the kind of work which he or she is required to perform in the place of employment to which he or she is assigned.

(c) in accordance with such regulations, to provide for the deferment from such service of those men and women whose continued service in any office under the United States or any Territory, or the District of

Columbia, or whose continued employment in any occupation or activity is found by the selective service local boards, subject to appeal to the appeal boards and agencies of appeal established under section 10 (a) (2) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That the President is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from service under this act of (1) persons found by the selective service local boards, subject to appeal as above provided, to be unfit for such service by reason of physical, mental, or moral deficiencies or defects, and (2) persons with respect to whom such local boards find, subject to appeal as above provided, that such service would result in extreme hardship;

(d) in accordance with such regulations, to provide the necessary traveling expenses and subsistence allowances during travel and until commencement of work of persons (including accepted volunteers) assigned under this act to service or to training in a locality other than that of their residence, and, when necessary, during their return therefrom, and, in accordance with such regulations, to provide transportation for the dependents and household effects of such persons: *Provided*, That such traveling expenses and allowances shall be computed in the same manner and on the same basis as those now or hereafter provided by law for members of the armed forces of the United States;

(e) in accordance with such regulations, to provide for the occupational training at Government expense of persons volunteering or selected for service under this act, and to pay reasonable compensation to trainees during the continuance of such training; and

(f) in accordance with such regulations, to provide for the orderly and effective allocation of workers (including those employed or in process of training on the date of enactment of this act) to the particular occupations deemed by the President to be essential to the war effort, and to the particular industries or areas in which the President finds that there is a shortage or a threatened shortage of manpower or womanpower, in order that such workers will be available where they are most needed and also for the purpose of preventing the "pirating" and the "hoarding" of labor by employers.

REEMPLOYMENT; SENIORITY RIGHTS

SEC. 5. Any person assigned to service under this act (including any accepted volunteer) who relinquishes regular employment to undertake such service, shall upon application to his or her employer within 40 days after the termination of such service, if such service terminates while this act is in effect, or within 40 days after the expiration of this act, if such service terminates after the expiration of this act, be entitled to be restored to his former position, or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay, unless the employers circumstances have so changed as to make such restoration impossible or unreasonable: *Provided*, That if such person was in the employ of any State or political subdivision thereof, it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that such person should be restored to such position, or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 6. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall administer this act and shall have general responsibility, subject to the authority of the President and the provisions of this act, for all aspects of the mobilization of manpower and womanpower for service under this act.

PENALTIES

SEC. 7. Any person who refuses or knowingly fails to comply with any lawful order issued under the provisions of this act, or with any lawful regulation promulgated thereunder, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 6 months, or both.

PROTECTION IN EVENT OF INVALIDITY; PARTIAL INVALIDITY

SEC. 8. (a) The modification, withdrawal, or determination of invalidity of any provision of this act, or of any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, shall not result in damages or penalties in any Federal, State, or Territorial court on any grounds for or in respect of anything done or omitted to be done in good faith pursuant to such provision, rule, regulation, or order.

(b) If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EFFECTIVE DATE AND TERMINATION OF ACT

SEC. 10. (a) This act shall take effect immediately.

(b) This act shall cease to be in effect on and after May 1, 1945, or such earlier date as may be specified by the Congress in a concurrent resolution.

POPULAR NAME

SEC. 11. This act may be cited as the "National War Service Act of 1943."

O. P. A. in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the new change in O. P. A. district offices in my State are seriously objected to by many people, including some of those who are giving valuable voluntary service. In my opinion the plan to break down State barriers will cause much hardship for people in my district and will result in the spending of additional unnecessary money. I include in my remarks a letter on this subject by John Forsyth of Niobrara, Nebr.:

NIOBRARA, NEBR., *February 2, 1943.*

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Price Administrator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I realize that you have not been in your present position long enough to know all of the ills that exist; however, there is an organizational change being made that is so outstanding that we had hopes you would stop it immediately upon taking office.

I refer to the orders received from your regional office in Chicago that the State offices be decentralized by the establishment of district offices which would centralize all authority in a little dictator in the regional office. This has been called to the attention of the Nation by Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, and the Governor of Colorado. The Administrator of Office of Price Administration was removed, but apparently an all-powerful group of your employees are still going ahead with their plans.

Senator LUCAS pointed out the tremendous expenditure that would be involved. This expenditure is dollars needed for the war effort. This expenditure is entirely being made for additional rent, office expense, and salaries for supervisory personnel in these offices.

May I cite you what has happened in my home county, which is typical of practically every county in the State. That you may know why I have intimate knowledge of affairs, I am county civilian defense chairman, and a member of the board of county supervisors. As defense chairman I have been asked to recommend members of the war price and rationing board, and as a result, have felt a responsibility for its successful operation.

Knox County has furnished rent-free quarters and a considerable part of the equipment for the board office. A clerical staff large enough to take care of the tremendous duties imposed has never been provided. The Work Projects Administration has provided such clerical help as they had available. This has been withdrawn by the liquidation of the Work Projects Administration. When the clerical help was unable to keep up with their work we employed with county funds an additional clerk. In addition, residents of our county have neglected their own businesses and patriotically volunteered time which they could not afford to give to this work as part of the war effort.

When we have appealed for help to do the work on a local-board level, which is the basis of the entire rationing program, we have been advised that no funds were available and that we should ask school children to leave their classrooms as a patriotic gesture and volunteer their services.

In view of this problem that every local board faces, we are now informed that thousands of dollars are to be expended in establishing more offices with more paid help to regional employees. No request has been made for volunteers to staff these offices. Your full-time paid employees are too busy to recruit volunteers for this work, yet they blithely ask board members, serving without pay, who have their own business to consider, to take still more of their time to recruit volunteers in the local board offices.

This move is so obvious that anyone can see its purpose. Bureaucratic regional offices with high-salaried staffs fear that Congress will discover that they are utterly useless and eliminate them. Such elimination would force the operation of the program into the States, where it properly belongs. In doing this, the expense of maintaining these bureaucrats would be ended with the taking of their names from the Government pay roll. They doubtless insist upon the necessity of regional offices, feeling that no one but themselves are competent to interpret the regulations as promulgated in your office. Nevertheless, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which likewise reaches into every home in our State, has very sucessfully operated without throwing money away on regional offices.

In Nebraska, on the basis that these district offices are to get closer to the people by reason of being located in trade areas, my county and more than a dozen others have been gerrymandered out of the State of Nebraska and into Iowa. We are proud of our State, and do not like to be eliminated from its activity at the will of a group of self-imposed dictators from their offices in Chicago. From that distance it is impossible for them in any way to understand the local problems in Nebraska.

We have been operating with a State office in the city selected by the people of this State as their capital. There we go with our State problems; there we have headquarters of our civilian defense, selective service, and other governmental activities. Under the present plan there we will continue to go for

all these activities, except Office of Price Administration. For Office of Price Administration information it will be necessary to travel to Iowa.

I trust that you will see fit to call a halt to this activity immediately, at least until such time as you can make a personal investigation of these injustices. It is the prayer of every one of the local boards that are volunteering their services at a tremendous sacrifice that you as Administrator will see that adequate office help is provided them rather than being squandered in the manner now being proposed.

Very truly yours,

JOHN D. FORSYTH,
Civilian Defense Chairman, Knox County.

Lend-Lease Aid to Russia Soars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the aid which has been given to Russia under the lend-lease program has done much toward helping Russia in the magnificent victories which she has been achieving over the German forces in recent weeks.

The statement of Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Lend-Lease Administrator, gives these figures in detail, as does also the testimony of Secretary Wickard as to the food supplies furnished Russia, and they are most gratifying.

Those of us who opposed the amendment to lend-lease to prohibit lend-lease aid to Russia, when that bill was considered, now feel that our action is vindicated, and the action of Congress in defeating that amendment was not only justified, but in view of what has happened, it would have been a calamity if such a restriction had been placed upon the Lend-Lease Act.

An editorial appeared in the Houston Chronicle of January 21, 1943, upon this subject, and, under leave granted, I submit same herewith:

LEND-LEASE AID TO RUSSIA SOARS

Announcement that United States lend-lease shipments to Russia include 3,200 tanks, 2,600 planes, and 81,000 military vehicles goes a long way toward answering two questions that many persons have been asking themselves. The first is, how much of our huge and growing arms production is going to Russia; the second is, where are the Russians getting the evidently enormous masses of war matériel they are using in several major offensives at the same time, when much of their own productive area has been occupied by the enemy.

In making his announcement, Edward R. Stettinius, Lend-Lease Administrator, employed an understatement when he said "lend-lease aid to Russia is growing to a sizable proportion." Those figures embrace a lot of offensive power. That many tanks, planes, and military vehicles may well be the factor that has given the Russians the military edge on their adversaries.

November's shipments, Mr. Stettinius said, were 13 times as great as last January's. The percentage of military items by that time had grown to two-thirds, the remainder representing industrial materials and food. Large quantities of the latter are being sent to Russia along with the expanding shipments of arms; in fact, this country now is sending more food to Russia than to the United Kingdom.

Surely our Russian allies will have no reason to complain that they are being slighted in this respect, since ordinarily Russia is more than self-sustaining in food production while Britain is never self-sufficient in that regard.

Still, the shipments are not enough, the Lend-Lease Administrator said, nor are they as heavy as they will be. Some naturally have been lost en route. Shipments "are continuing to increase in spite of the shortage of shipping and enemy attacks along the difficult supply routes to Russia."

Mr. Stettinius added that Britain has sent more than 2,600 tanks and more than 2,000 planes to Russia. In total these figures add up to more than 5,800 tanks and more than 4,600 airplanes sent to aid the Soviet Armies. If no more than two-thirds arrived there the Russians have received a tremendous volume of the most modern weapons of war to hurl at the enemy.

One other fact of interest the Administrator revealed is this: Plane shipments to Russia were larger than to any other theater of war—and that means the United Kingdom, north Africa, the Near East, India, and the Southwest Pacific.

Cowardly Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. MURPHY
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein an editorial appearing January 21, 1943, in the Springfield Union of Springfield, Mass.:

COWARDLY ATTACK

When we do not agree with President Roosevelt and his policies we say so. That is the right of a free press in a free country. We never have indulged in personalities, however, and never shall. We always try to be fair, and to give our reasons for disagreeing with Mr. Roosevelt. An attack has been made on Mr. Roosevelt in Congress, however, that we feel should be protested.

It is the charge, made by Representative LAMBERTSON, of Kansas, that the President has had two of his sons removed from danger spots in war zones, and brought back to this country, so that they might be safe. LAMBERTSON, however, as is usual in cases such as this, refused to name his informant, merely referring to him as "a distinguished American." So far as appears, this is mere gossip, of the sort referred to as "ben told."

At least two of President Roosevelt's sons have been decorated for conspicuous gallantry in action, and no one has questioned that they earned their medals the hard way. They risked their lives, faced enemy fire, and played the part of brave men. Certainly there is no reason why a President's son should be made to suffer ignominy and insult simply because his father is the head of the Nation. And certainly it is a low and mean political trick for any member of Congress to attack the President by attacking his sons, particularly when those sons have proved their heroism in face of the enemy.

"The cheapest, nastiest attack ever made on any President on the floor of this House" is the way one Representative referred to LAMBERTSON'S speech assailing the President.

We have criticized Mr. Roosevelt, and doubtless shall continue to do so when we do not agree with what he does. But we protest this dastardly and cowardly stab in the back delivered by this man on the floor of the House. It is unworthy of an American legislator.

Washington Wakes Up to a New Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include therein two editorials—one from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and one from the Bolivar (Mo.) Free Press:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 26, 1943]

WASHINGTON WAKES UP TO A NEW CONGRESSMAN

Washington regularly takes the arrival of young officeholders in its stride if it pays any attention to them at all. Twenty-eight-year-old MARION BENNETT, new Congressman from the Sixth Missouri District, after an unheralded appearance, is now the subject of more than ordinary notice. But although the politicians and correspondents are finding him personable and alert enough, it is not the newest and youngest member of Congress that they are interested in. It is the Republican majority which swept him to Washington on January 12.

Missourians, of course, were quick to see that young Bennett's majority of 14,952 was double that of his late father, Philip A. Bennett, and that the vote did not fall off nearly as much as forecasters predicted. But Washington somehow missed the significance of this first special election since November 3 until the Baltimore Sun made its results the subject of a page 1 story when the new Representative was sworn in last week. It is putting it mildly to say now that this latest report from what has been called "the most representative district in America" is opening Washington eyes.

No one can know what would happen if there should be a Nation-wide election today. But if such an election were held and the results in the Springfield-Sedalia-Warrensburg district were projected over the country, the narrow edge the Democrats have in the House would be wiped out and a large Republican majority would be installed. The Democratic strength in the Senate would be sharply cut. For its votes the administration would have to depend on the southern Senators, many of whom do not believe in the New Deal and never have, and on hold-over Democrats from other parts of the country.

No wonder a curly-haired young man from Springfield, who tried to get into combat service last summer and was rejected because he was constitutionally underweight, is a person of interest on Capitol Hill. He is Representative of more than a congressional district. He is the agent of a political current and, if Washington often misses trends, it usually wakes up to currents.

[From the Bolivar (Mo.) Free Press of January 14, 1943]

THE PEOPLE HAVE SPOKEN

That MARION T. BENNETT was elected to Congress Tuesday with votes to spare was no surprise to the Free Press, but the tremendous margin by which he rocketed into the halls of Congress was a delightful surprise to even his most enthusiastic supporters.

The voters of this district have chosen wisely. MARION BENNETT appreciates their loyalty and confidence, and as our Congressman he will serve all our citizenry in a worthy manner.

The results of the election lend themselves to analysis which reveals clearly the public sentiment and the causes of that sentiment.

First of all, the heavy vote in the face of tire shortages, gasoline rationing, and the fact that only one office was on the ballot, shows that the people are keenly alive to the importance of the democratic form of government and eager to exercise their right and their duty to choose their public officials.

Also it is obvious that by carrying all 11 of the counties in this district, several of which are traditionally democratic, MARION BENNETT has been appraised by the voters as a young man of ability, personality, and character. Some no doubt voted for MARION because of their deep respect and affection for his father, but in his campaign MARION did not appeal to sympathy. He asked the people to vote for him because, due to his experience at his father's office in Washington, he could best carry out the Phil A. Bennett policies which had been so heartily endorsed by the voters just last November. The response of the voters not only reaffirmed their approval of those policies even more emphatically, but also expressed the confidence of the public in MARION'S ability to carry on.

Especially do we think that the vote was an expression of approval of the policy favored by the Bennetts, both father and son, to advocate a vigorous prosecution of the war but to keep eyes open for waste, bungling, and crookedness in any phase of the war effort or on the home front.

Phil A. Bennett was vigorous in his denunciation of the perpetuation and extension of the New Deal at a time when only the efficient prosecution of the war should be the supreme aim of all officials and of all citizens worthy of the name of Americans. Sixth District voters will approve a like policy as advocated by his son.

The Democrats were counting on popular approval because of the north African campaign. They were so disappointed that the invasion of north Africa came right after the November election instead of just before. But the voters Tuesda, showed that they know that victory in arms, encouraging as it has been for some months now, still must be supported by an all-out effort on the home front with common sense and efficiency instead of senseless regulations and poor administration of such restrictions as are actually necessary.

Many BENNETT votes in the ballot box Tuesday were sharp protests against rationing without reason; Government checks of 10 and 20 cents for tires with many miles of service still left in them; a $100,000,000,000 Budget; heavier taxes to support the New Deal as well as the war effort; maintenance of the 40-hour week for labor while farmers were being urged to work from dawn to dark, expecting greater farm production after taking boys for Army service badly needed on the farms; the elaborate champagne party for Mrs. Harry Hopkins, of the White House, by Barney Baruch, who has been telling his family and all the Nation to economize and live the simple life until the war is won. These and many other irritations, large and small, bubbled over into a scathing refusal by the people in this part of Missouri to send anyone to Congress who would approve the Roosevelt program in toto and urge that Franklin D. Roosevelt be drafted for a fourth term.

It has become quite evident to the American people what a "picklement" our "rubberstamp" Congresses have got this country into. If a choice had been necessary between a candidate who would be for everything that Roosevelt wanted and between one who would oppose everything that Roosevelt favored, we believe the temper of the people has risen to such a pitch that they would have unhesitatingly sent to Congress the man who would fight everything that Roosevelt wanted. But fortunately a choice of that kind was not necessary. In MARION BENNETT the people of this district have a man who respects the viewpoints of all types of folks who make up the citizenry of his district and who sincerely desires to serve conscientiously the people of every party and belief.

He will be on his toes to stop any radical, unreasonable proposal from the White House, but he will be just as eagerly awake to every opportunity to aid in a sensible and vigorous prosecution of the war effort and such adjustments in civilian life as are actually necessary. And such propositions as come from Roosevelt or from any other Democratic source can depend on his support if they are measures which will promote the welfare of these United States. For MARION BENNETT has the same love of country and deep patriotism which his father possessed and which was mentioned so frequently in the memorial services for Congressman BENNETT, part of which were published in last week's Free Press.

Still mourning the sudden death of Phil A. Bennett, the district can yet be comforted with the knowledge that MARION BENNETT will bring to the duties of his office a sense of balance, a keen mind, and a courageous heart which are prime requisites of a true public servant. If only the New Dealers had possessed a sense of balance and proportion, much of the sorrows and privations which America faces now and must face in the future could have been avoided.

What "Pay As You Go" Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of all the efforts of experts to make the so-called Ruml tax plan appear to be a very complicated and even sinful matter, it is refreshing to read the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times for Sunday, February 7, 1943:

WHAT "PAY AS YOU GO" MEANS

The essence of the Ruml plan may be stated quite briefly. It does not mean skipping a year, either in imposing or in paying taxes. It means simply that the measuring rod for a man's income tax in any year would be the income of the same year, instead of the income of the year before. It substitutes for one tax measure another tax measure to produce the same revenue. The substituted measure, in fact, is likely to produce more revenue, because it takes the taxpayer's money when he still has the money and before he has had a chance to spend it.

How Many Years Must the East Coast Wait for Oil Shipped Through the Proposed Florida Barge Canal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last I introduced a bill asking that the authorization for the Florida barge canal be repealed. I stated at that time the reasons on which I based my action. As I said then, it is my hope that in repealing this bill we might save some $44,000,000 for vital war necessities.

Since that time the proponents of the canal measure have had their say. They have told you that there is a drastic need for petroleum on the east coast today—a fact which we all recognize. They have discussed the situation as it relates to tankers and railroad shipments—how, despite the valiant efforts of all concerned the shortage of oil grows hourly. They have discussed the subject of pipe lines across the State of Florida. But these are not the issues. Thus far we are in full accord.

But now they propose once again this Florida barge canal as a panacea—a magic formula by which the momentous problem of the oil shortage will be solved or at least relieved. They state that they believe this miracle can be accomplished in from 8 months to a year. As a result it is likely that some confusion of thought has arisen in the minds of my colleagues.

I shall attempt to clarify this matter of time if I may. When I made my original statement I was naive enough to assume that the proponents of the bill had read and evaluated the studied estimates provided by the United States Corps of Engineers. Some of us evidently are aware of these; others, I fear, are not. Consequently I should like to read to you testimony presented by Major General Reybold, Chief of Engineers, to the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate in hearings from June 29 to July 2, 1942. I personally heard the same testimony given by Major General Reybold before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives, of which I am a member. I now quote from page 55 of the hearings:

Senator VANDENBERG. How long do you think it would take you to build this canal and get it into actual operation?

Major General REYBOLD. Three years.

Senator VANDENBERG. Three years?

Major General REYBOLD. Yes, sir.

Senator VANDENBERG. I am talking about the Florida canal now.

Major General REYBOLD. Yes, sir.

Senator VANDENBERG. Even that would depend upon priorities, would it not?

Major General REYBOLD. Yes, sir.

And further, on page 65:

Senator ANDREWS. I understood you to make the statement that it might take three years

to construct this canal across Florida to the St. Johns River?

Major General REYBOLD. Yes, sir.

Senator ANDREWS. Could it not be constructed in 12 months if it were decided to do it?

Major General REYBOLD. Never, in my judgment, could it be done.

Senator ANDREWS. Part of it is already dug, I believe?

Major General REYBOLD. A very small amount.

On page 66:

Senator ANDREWS. Could not the same machinery that would be used 8 hours a day be used on 3 shifts during the 24 hours, and thus lessen the time for building?

Major General REYBOLD. We considered nothing but three shifts.

Senator ANDREWS. Is that right?

Major General REYBOLD. Yes, sir.

Senator ANDREWS. That is all.

Senator BILBO. I have just one question, General. I was not here when you discussed the question of the time necessary for the completion of this lock canal. Is not that dependent almost wholly upon the number of machines and men you put on the job?

Major General REYBOLD. Yes, sir.

Senator BILBO. All right.

Major General REYBOLD. I might say, considering this time element, that I have taken 6 months off arbitrarily, against the better advice of my engineers.

Senator BAILEY. Nothing they can say to you would induce you to reduce the time below 3 years?

Major General REYBOLD. No; I have gone the limit, Senator.

Now, gentlemen—and I say this with all the fervor at my command—no one wants our tremendous war effort to be pursued with greater vigor than I. No one is more eager than I to alleviate the oil shortage which is now apparent. If I thought building this canal were to alleviate that shortage, if it were to aid in the war effort to an appreciable degree and still not deprive us of other more essential construction, I should be the first to advocate such a measure, whatever the cost. It is a question of evaluating those measures most beneficial to the country's war policy.

But the shortage exists today—not 3 years hence. We are fighting the war this minute, not at some undecided future date. And that canal, according to those authorities who are in the best position to know, will take 3 years to complete. It will require steel, explosives, machinery, time, men.

Some of you gentlemen believe that the estimates of Major General Reybold are too conservative, that the canal can be built with American ingenuity at a fraction of the time in his estimate. Were this true, it would be, I suspect, at a great sacrifice in machinery and men working in the war effort. That is what I fear and that is what I wish to prevent.

I am confident that we can solve this problem as we have solved other equally knotty ones in the past. But I do hope that it will not be at the expense of priorities, manpower, machinery, and money directed from the war effort to a Florida Canal that will take 3 years to build.

A Creative War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I made before the George Washington University School of Law on Monday, February 1, 1943.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and fellow students, I say fellow students advisedly, because I find myself again in Washington studying much harder than I studied when I sat in this room some 10 years ago and listened to Dean Van Vleck or Professor Collier expound the law. As you may have heard, I spent 3 years studying law in this building and later taught here. Those were happy years. It is also comforting to see again those teachers on whose shoulders I can place some of the responsibility for my activities in the Congress. If I am unable to solve the problems now confronting the Congress you should blame this faculty, because the deficiencies in the understanding of the student is, as I know you will agree, due to the shortcomings of the professor. On the other hand, what little confidence I have is largely due to my regard for the excellence of the faculty of this law school. I have over the years known something of several law schools, but I have never found one of better quality than George Washington.

When Mr. Kilgore asked me to speak to you tonight we discussed the question of the subject for my remarks. As a matter of fact, today it seems to me a speaker has little choice. Compared to the war and the peace, all other subjects seem trivial. It is true that we have heard so much about the war that sometimes we would like to talk of other things. Nevertheless, it is our duty to discuss it pro and con until we arrive at some solution to this problem of recurrent wars.

I cannot reconcile myself to the too prevalent idea that nothing can be done about war. On the contrary I feel certain that something will be done about it. It is a question whether we or Hitler or some people of the future do it.

I think that I have heard as many discussions and speeches on the war as any of you, yet I do not think any of them have been very satisfactory. In most cases I am told that we are fighting to defend our country; that we are sacrificing our wealth and our finest young men to defend and preserve our American way of life. That phrase sounds good the first time it is used, but somehow it does not satisfy me. I recall that very similar phrases were used in 1917 and 1918. I have a feeling that these phrases are superficial, that if it is true we are fighting for such a purely defensive goal that the result of our efforts will be no more productive than was the last war. I, for one, am not content with just another armistice.

I believe that we must reexamine our purposes in fighting this war. It is true that we were attacked and that in a sense this is a defensive war. The American people have considered that all of their wars were defensive. We have defense bonds, defense plants, and defense workers. I believe that it is time for this Nation to become aggressive. I think we should make up our minds to fight a positive, creative war and not merely a negative defensive war for the temporary preservation of our way of life. Why after all must we be on the defensive? Should we not promote rather than merely defend our way of life?

I believe that we should help other countries develop their own version of democracy in order to lay the foundations of a warless world. This task cannot be begun until we have rid ourselves of the hang-overs of our appeasement idiocy and our isolationist dream; until we stop regretting that all this happened to us, and realize that we can turn this barren, ghastly tragedy into a tremendous opportunity; a rare opportunity in the history of the world. An opportunity which with imagination, intelligence, and determination will enable us, instead of the evil Nazi, to create the world of the future.

Our choice is between a world founded upon force and slavery, dominated by the foul Nazi, or a world based upon equality and justice for all nations, dominated by no single people. We know that men who believe only in force abuse it when they get it and become slaves when they are weak. Those who believe in justice give it to others when they are strong, and fight stubbornly to get it when they are defeated. We must choose between these two.

We must make this choice now while the minds and hearts of men are concerned with universal and fundamental problems, while danger and sacrifice gives us humility and understanding. With the return of peace and safety our personal problems will supplant our will to sacrifice for the common good. Even now there are many who regard victory merely as a personal favor to them.

I have often been told that we must win the war first before we think of the peace terms. They say let's not put the cart before the horse. But in 1918 we won the war first and at the peace blind and stupid selfishness prevailed. Our own people in a Nation-wide election "returned to normalcy," to a world of periodic wars, each one more destructive than the last. Unless we make our decision to do something positive and creative now before the war is over, futility and sadness will be the only reward for our efforts.

We know from bitter experience that our defensive war in 1918 accomplished little of value to the world. In less than 25 years our own freedom is now threatened as it was never before in our history. In other words we ought to know that our old methods, our old traditions and aims with regard to wars are wrong and should be discarded. Even a dog learns by trial and error.

In 1918 we had a leader in Woodrow Wilson who tried to induce us to make that great decision after the war was won, but the American people would not follow him. In truth, in the last analysis the American people follow no one. They do the leading. Likewise in this war no matter how wise our leaders, unless the American people, unless the citizens make up their minds that this shall be a creative war, again we shall have a dangerous and fruitless armistice leading to another world struggle.

It is exceedingly difficult to put into words the meaning that I have when I say aggressive—creative war. In order to avoid as much as possible the criticism of being visionary, idealistic, and impractical, I think we should try to analyze our purposes from a purely selfish point of view. It is true that it will be satisfying to beat the Japs and the Germans in this war, but obviously merely beating them is not in itself sufficient justification for the enormous sacrifices of lives and wealth. What then can we get out of

this war? We don't want a colony in Africa or Asia. We don't want to recover the machines of destruction sent abroad. The only thing we can get of value is the assurance of a peaceful world, a world in which reason rather than force shall be the rule men live by; a world in which men's energies and intelligence is turned to creative activities instead of to the manufacture of weapons of destruction; a world in which humanity can rise to the limit of its capacity.

I cannot believe that it is necessary to labor the point that war is an unmitigated evil and should be prevented if possible. War is not just a game like football, in which a victory alone is sufficient. As the Marines say, we are playing "for keeps." But what do we expect to keep out of this war?

If we are really after a rational, a peaceful world, how can we get it?

The first step in this process is, of course, the defeat of the Germans and the Japs. I have no doubt that we shall achieve that step. That is largely a military feat. Americans have a way of setting a goal and then proceeding to achieve the goal but no more. But then where do we go after we defeat our present enemies. That is a political question and up to the people to decide.

The second, and no less important, step is that our American people make up their minds to create a world in which war is no longer the accepted method of settling disputes. This means that we set as our goal the active participation with all our strength in a world-wide organization to prevent wars. This organization will require in the beginning a great military police force which we will have to furnish along with our allies. But, as we said before, force alone cannot be relied upon to prevent future wars. Together with force to stabilize the world in the beginning, we will have to create an organization based upon justice and the equality of all men and all nations. The Christian principle that all men are created equal is the first proposition of our own Declaration of Independence and the cornerstone of our own civilization. Once before, 80 years ago, we found that this Nation could not exist half-free and half-slave. Today I believe it is safe to say that the world cannot continue to exist half-free and half-slave. Either the exponents of slavery or of freedom will prevail.

At least I think we can say that civilization as we know it cannot continue to exist in a world in which so large a part is denied even the elementary advantages of civilization. When we consider the condition of the 450,000,000 Chinese, the great masses of India and of South America, we can see that all of them contain the germs of future wars. Oppression and poverty have a way of breeding strong and bold characters who sooner or later seek revenge upon the society that has oppressed them. To save our own civilization, I believe that it is necessary to make it possible for these other peoples to share in the benefits of that civilization. This cannot be accomplished if we have a war every 25 years.

As a purely practical, selfish business proposition, I think we should accept as the goal of this war the bringing to all the peoples of the world the opportunity of political and economic freedom, according to their own national genius. We must accept the responsibility of giving to all the world the minimum freedom to work out their own destinies without interference from other nations.

We surely know now that we can never again remain free from or avoid the disturbances in the world, therefore our only hope of avoiding future wars is to prevent, or at least control, the occurrence of the disturbances in the first place. Never can we prevent a war if our goal is purely defensive. One of the most obvious lessons of the present struggle is that a war can never be won by staying always on the defensive. If we are to win the war against war we must take the offensive. We must attack war itself with all our force and intelligence. Unless we do attack aggressively and without reservations, I believe that eventually we will lose the battle. Even in football we know that a team which is always on the defensive never wins the game.

So I think we can say that purely to prevent our own ultimate destruction it is up to us to wage a creative war. Sooner or later, if wars are continued and we stay on the defensive we will face a foe that will overwhelm us.

In any case I think it is certain that in a world without an organization of authority and power to direct and control its violent elements, there will be no lasting peace. Regardless of what the cost of such an organization is, it will still be less than recurrent wars such as we have today.

I realize that there are many practical difficulties to overcome and that many people will say it is impossible. When our own Constitution was proposed to unite the Thirteen Colonies there were many difficulties to overcome and many people said it was an impractical plan. A terrible civil war had to be fought to finally secure that Union, yet today there are few who are so stupid as to say it was a mistake. In 1789 that Constitution was just as radical as a world organization is now.

When we realize that in time of communication and travel the world today is not as large as was the Original Thirteen Colonies, we should not assume, too readily, that a world-wide organization is impossible or impracticable.

Several plans have been suggested for such an organization, the best known being modeled closely after our own Federal system. But the details of the plan are not as important as is the determination of the people to accept the principle of a world organization, in which part of their sovereignty must be given up for the common good just as our founding fathers in the Thirteen Colonies gave up theirs. In other words, the spirit and motives of the people who create the organization is much more important than the mechanical details of the Constitution.

The first step in the achievement of such an organization is the will to achieve it. We the people of these United States must first make up our minds that that achievement is the goal of this war. When peace is declared we must regard it as merely the first step in the organization for the collective security of the world. We will at that moment have, together with our allies, the power to create such an organization and we must not again neglect the opportunity to save this civilization which has cost us and our forefathers so much blood and treasure to achieve.

I believe that if the American people can ever visualize such an organization and believe that it is possible, that it will have an electrifying effect upon our national spirit. Today we know that there are many among us who have no enthusiasm for this war. Many of our people did not want to enter this fight at all. Their concept of victory is merely all the sugar, coffee, and gasoline that they had before. The reason for their attitude is that we have no creative goal, no definite positive goal which we even hope to accomplish. We merely hope to avoid a defeat.

Our goal is defensive. If we can believe in a real positive creative goal, a goal that challenges our utmost powers, then I am confident our people would rally to the task with zest and enthusiasm such as we have never before experienced in our history. We need such a goal not only to win the war and the peace but we need it for the sake of our own national soul. In recent years much has been said of a spiritual awakening in America, yet it has never come. I think it has not come because we have never had a purpose or goal worth awakening for. There can be no spiritual or moral awakening merely to amass greater wealth, more automobiles, more radios, more bathtubs.

America has been the most fortunate of nations in the history of the world. We as a nation have received the blessings of countless years of struggle by other peoples for freedom. There is, I believe, a law of compensation in these matters. I think the time has now arrived for us to make our contribution to civilization. That contribution can be made by our people setting as our goal the formation of an organization which will prevent war and will give to all the nations of the world the same opportunity for political and economic freedom that we have so long enjoyed. If we deny this obligation I am fearful that we ourselves may lose that freedom which we are now sacrificing our boys to defend and preserve. We are now denying to Hitler the organization of the world according to his ideas. The Nazis are fighting to get the kind of world they want—a slave world over which they shall be masters. They are fighting not just for victory, but because they have a burning hunger for what they believe victory will bring them. Unless our faith burns as fiercely as the Nazis' faith, we not only may lose the war, but we will certainly lose the peace. If we deny the Nazis their kind of world, isn't it our obligation to the world to create a better one?

Isn't it possible for us to want to create our world with the same fanaticism as the Germans want theirs? Certain it is that if we deny Hitler his world and fail to create a better one, it is only a question of a short time until some other power will again attempt the same task. Our choice is clear, either we accept Hitler's new order or create a new one of our own. We will unite with other nations voluntarily or involuntarily. We will either do it now after this war, or it will be done after the next and much more frightful war.

If we miss this opportunity, I think the course of our future can be clearly seen. After the war we will maintain a large Army and Navy for our defense. We will self-righteously proclaim that we desire no profit from the war, we will help feed the starving peoples of the earth. After a few years our good people will protest at the expense and waste of a large Army and Navy and we will seek safety in another disarmament program, and then another greedy power will arise to attack us. After all, is it not childish and stupid to fight, in order to fight again? In the face of our experience is it not foolish not to attempt some positive solution of our problem? Have we no faith in our own ability to solve great problems? While we were a young nation seeking to establish our civilization in this wild and fertile land it was proper that we give our attention primarily to our own internal affairs. But now we have grown up. We have wealth, power, and brains. All we need is the assurance, the confidence, the boldness to apply our talents to problems worthy of a great people. I cannot believe that a nation such as America is destined always to stay on the defensive, to be stabbed in the back more than once.

Today the peoples of the world, of this Nation, of this community, are paying a tremendous price in lives and in treasure; for what? It is up to the people of this country to say for what. The people have the power to demand that they be not again cheated of the fruits of the victory. They can demand and get some compensation for the sacrifices they are making. You and I know that neither an individual nor a nation can continue forever to squander its resources without getting something in return. Unless we do demand and get a creative war and

a creative peace, we will again have spent our youth and our treasure for nothing. Our children and our children's children will inevitably be reduced to the abject economic and political poverty that already exists in more than half of the world.

This positive goal, this battle cry cannot be set by me, or by Congress, or by any national leader. It is too big and too broad for any leadership less than that of the American people. You who have received the benefit of the best education our country offers must take the lead and help our people show the world that Americans have faith in their institutions, that they have confidence in their power and purposes, and that they now are worthy of the freedom which Providence has granted them.

Army-Navy E Production Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF FENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS, United States Senator from Pennsylvania, at the Army-Navy E production award to the Babcock & Wilcox Tube Co., Beaver Falls, Pa., February 4, 1943:

Momentous is the occasion that brings us here today. We are come to dedicate another milestone on the road to victory. This is a proud day for America. This global war is being waged no less upon the production fronts than upon the battle fronts. You soldiers of production, you men and women at Babcock & Wilcox have achieved an inspiring victory.

This banner and these emblems which will be presented here today stand as an enduring tribute to your courage, your labor, and your faith in the great cause. You have every reason to take unbounded pride in your efficient company, in your enlightened management, and in your untiring workmanship. You have written into the records for all time to come that this patriotic company, Babcock & Wilcox, that this sterling community, Beaver Falls, and that these thousands of determined workers, who have more than trebled the production of their company, gave and are giving their utmost to the preservation of rights and justice.

As you labor here, bear always in mind that the materials you produce will speak volumes for you on the fighting fronts of the world. Our soldiers of combat will deliver your materials to the Axis in a series of relentless and destructive blows. And when the smoke of battle has cleared, you will find your equipment on the battlefield of victory—a victory that will end for all time the mad dreams of dictators and preserve forever the right and majesty of a free, enduring world.

Out of this seething world of strife and turmoil will come a work of art—a picture painted by the millions of artists who are the combat and production soldiers of America at war—a picture which will portray for all time the response of America's people in this zero hour of the world's history. For it is written in the Great Book: "By their works ye shall know them." And it shall be with us as it has been with all other generations. Those who come before our creation will either raise their eyes in homage or turn away in shame.

It is our duty as soldiers on the home front to make this the most inspiring masterpiece that the world has ever known. We cannot fail to do less. Working only as free men can work, we shall contribute our full measure to the completion of this ageless painting.

Our labor will not seem long nor our lot grow wearisome if we but keep before us the picture of our fighting men—your sons and mine—who dwell always in the shadow of death. For them there is no stopping, no turning back, no striking at their work. Their hours of toil go on and on—until exhaustion, or wounds, or death overtake them. Their only union is that union of high courage and firm resolve. Their conditions of work are the infested jungles of the Orient, the scorching sands of the tropics, the angry oceans of the world, and the uncharted airways of the blazing skies. Their rates of pay are written in the immortal ink of history. Neither gold, nor wealth, nor value can buy such services as these.

With this stirring picture running through our minds, who are we to complain about sacrifice or hardship? Where is the man who calls himself American who would stop work for one split second in this perilous hour? Where is the man who wants it said that a battle was lost or an American soldier was killed because he shirked at his task?

As the soldier on the battle line moves ever forward at the clarion call of the bugle, so will the soldiers on the home front move resolutely forward in their call to duty. Working and fighting together, we will go onward in the great cause until we have destroyed the last vestige of Axis power, preserved the homeland, and delivered ourselves from the burning bonds of impending slavery. But whatever the end may be, you and all of us will be judged in history. We and the very work we are now doing will be judged by the picture that is painted in this vaunted hour. As future generations file by this painting, will they behold a discordant, disfigured remnant of defeat, or will they behold a superb, symmetrical monument of triumph. The answer rests with us.

As I look out upon you today, as I recount the magnificent progress you have made, I know that I am right in saying that the contribution you are making will go far toward making this picture the greatest masterpiece of all time—an undying tribute to the many millions of Americans who were its creators.

America honors you today. Wear these emblems proudly, and as this banner waves on high, may you resolve never to turn from your task until the hour of victory strikes, and tolls out the liberation of the world.

The House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered over the radio on February 5, 1943:

Ladies and gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure to tell you in as few words as possible the objective of the Congress in creating the standing committee in the House of Representatives known as the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the committee of which I have had the honor to be chairman since 1931.

Our committee is composed of 22 members, one being the Delegate in Congress from Hawaii. It has for many years been the practice of the Congress to have the Delegate from Hawaii sit on our committee. He, being the spokesman of the people from that distant United States possession, has many problems relating to the question of the foreign-born as applied to his own territory.

While it can be said in general terms that the work of our committee relates to the foreign-born, a better description of the work can be made by dividing its functions into two parts. These two divisions of work relate (1) to a study of the laws relating to the admission into the United States of aliens, a certain control of aliens while here, and the deportation of such classes as appear to be unworthy to remain here; and (2) the question of naturalization and citizenship.

Immigration and naturalization problems have been of great importance in the history of the United States, which is quite understandable in the development of a new country settled by immigrants from many parts of the world; a country whose inhabitants are all descendants of men and women who were immigrants at one time or another.

The first Federal immigration law appeared on the statute books in 1875. At that time it provided for the exclusion of but two classes, namely those undergoing a sentence for a felonious crime, other than a political offense, and alien women imported to this country for immoral purposes. Since 1875 Congress, every few years, has enacted new laws providing generally for the exclusion of additional classes and, also, providing new deportation provisions. What is frequently referred to as the basic exclusion act is the law approved on February 5, 1917. This includes dozens of classes of aliens who are denied admission into the United States. One of the revolutionary provisions of that act is a clause calling for the exclusion of persons unable to read. At that time the provision met with such opposition that the bill was vetoed twice, finally being passed over the veto of President Wilson.

In 1921 the first quota act came into the immigration field. It was more or less experimental and provided for the entry of a maximum number of approximately 355,000. Later on, in 1924 that law was amended. Under its terms a maximum of approximately 154,000 alien immigrants may be permitted to enter the United States. However, for various reasons, only a very insignificant percentage of that total have come to the United States. The quota does not apply to the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

There were no statistics kept on immigration prior to 1820 and the Constitution of the United States did not vest powers over immigration in Congress until 1808, leaving it to the various States to legislate on the subject. Of course, the problem of immigration at that period of our history was not the problem of quotas or nationalities but the problem of slavery. The States until 1808 had the right to import as many slaves as they saw fit. Gradually the States began to limit importation of slaves, but it took the Civil War to put an end to slavery. There was no other restriction on immigration at this early period of our history and there was no legislation on immigration problems. The total number of immigrants who entered this country in 1820 was 8,385 and this figure was more or less stationary for many years, the totals until 1826 being about 10,000.

Thereafter the story of our immigration parallels the history of Europe. Whenever a period of persecutions or a period of famines ravaged the European continent, American immigration would naturally rise and fall with each event. The famine in Ireland in the 1840's and the destruction of liberal Germany after the revolution of 1848 are each reflected in the figures of our immigration. The number begins to rise steadily after 1844, the figures of new immigration being between 100,000 and 200,000 each year, some years accounting for even more than this total. Then came the Civil War and the number of immigrants was again below 100,000 although many immigrants, particularly in the northern part of the country, would enter the United States for the sole purpose of fighting in its armed forces.

Public agitation was then directed mainly to the question of proper health control of the new immigration. The nineteenth century was concerned to a large degree with problems of sanitation and public health and it was demanded that no one enter the United States if his coming might result in disease or epidemics. We passed our first immigrant inspection law in 1882. The law provided for a thorough inspection of ships which brought in immigrants, their quarantine upon arrival, and the exclusion of all persons found unfit.

It thus came to pass that the Public Health Service owes its origin to immigrant inspection. In order to carry out the mandate of Congress in the administration of immigration laws we were able to provide a fine medical service for the people of the United States, since we could utilize our medical staffs for the general protection of public health, and many improvements in medical affairs owe their origin to the pioneering work of our Federal Public Health Service which was originally instituted as a service to inspect the immigrants seeking to enter the United States.

The large influx of Chinese coolie labor, particularly on the western coast, was responsible for the Chinese exclusion law passed in the same year.

From that time the Committee on Immigration became one of the key committees of Congress, and its work has been of tremendous importance in the policies laid down by way of legislation. This was also the beginning of the era of restricted immigration, the early policy of free immigration being discarded for all times.

It was in line with this policy that further limitations were placed in our immigration laws from year to year. We established stringent inspections, both at the point of entry as well as at the point of arrival; we redoubled our efforts to keep out of this country all undesirable aliens, whether on physical ground or on the ground of moral unfitness, like persons who have been convicted of crime.

For many years after the passage of the quota law the number of aliens leaving the United States was greater than that of arriving. This was the period of our financial depression and far from being sought after by immigrants, this country offered no inducement to aliens to come and settle with us. On the contrary, many went back to their homes thinking to resume their old lives. In 1933 Hitler came to power and dispossessed from their homes some of the best minds of Germany. Some of these refugees were able to find a haven with us, and I am sure will be of great help to us in fighting and destroying the force of evil which overwhelmed Germany and became a menace to the peace and security of the whole world. I am sorry we could not permit the entrance into this country of many more of this type of people whose help would be so welcome at the present moment.

The war and threat of war placed heavy burdens on the Committee on Immigration. Many problems relating to our national defense necessarily pass through the Committee on Immigration. We had to determine the policy as to whether and to what extent aliens should be permitted to join our armed forces. We have to pass on the question of naturalization of aliens, including those in our armed forces, and we must determine who shall or shall not be naturalized. Particularly in matters affecting conduct of aliens with whose countries we are at war we must be perpetually ready to pass helpful and constructive laws.

The naturalization of aliens is an important part of the work of this committee, and we must be sure that we do not make citizens out of aliens who either don't deserve this great privilege or may abuse it. It is simple enough to prescribe general rules under which an alien may apply for citizenship, but mere lip service to the ideals of American democracy should not be the exclusive basis on which we should establish an alien's right to citizenship. There should be, above all, good character, and I for one would rather grant citizenship to a poor immigrant who cannot speak a word of English but who loves this country and is attached to our institutions than to an educated alien who wants to become a citizen so that he may undermine our institutions with greater ease. Up to the present time Congress succeeded in establishing educational tests for citizenship but did not pay much attention to the plight of the older immigrant who could not comply with the law because of the meager schooling he received on the other side. I expect our committee to make a thorough study of this problem and offer constructive solutions.

We must strengthen our laws which seek to denaturalize traitors, spies, and saboteurs so that no one can claim American citizenship if not thoroughly in sympathy with our form of government and our national ideals. The committee will make a thorough study of this problem to the end that all naturalized citizens whose papers should be revoked may be promptly deported and held in strict confinement for the duration of the war.

Hand in hand with the desire to strengthen our laws to punish the guilty, our committee will always seek to pass legislation to alleviate the lot of the innocent. We passed a law to the effect that aliens illegally in the United States who have families here, dependent upon them economically, may be permitted to stay if they show good character and receive the approval of the Attorney General and Congress. We legalized the stay of all those aliens who came to this country prior to 1924 and will study the question of a further extension of this law. We do not wish to penalize anybody for technical offenses against the law, but will always maintain the great American tradition of fairness and sympathy for those who deserve it and punishment for the guilty without fear or favor.

A Soldier Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a splendid poem written by Maude Harget, and appearing recently in the Washington Times-Herald, entitled "A Soldier Speaks." This poem conveys a powerful appropriate message to many persons at this time:

A SOLDIER SPEAKS

So you're sick of the way the country's run,
And you're sick of the way the rationing's done,
And you're sick of standing around in a line,
You're sick, you say—well, that's just fine.
So am I sick of the sun and the heat,
And I'm sick of the feel of my aching feet,
And I'm sick of the mud and the jungle flies,
And I'm sick of the stench when the night mists rise,
And I'm sick of the siren's wailing shriek,
And I'm sick of the groans of the wounded and weak,
And I'm sick of the sound of the bomber's dive,
And I'm sick of seeing the dead alive.
I'm sick of the roar and the noise and the din,
I'm sick of the taste of food from a tin,
And I'm sick of the slaughter—I'm sick to my soul,
I'm sick of playing a killer's role,
And I'm sick of blood and of death and the smell,
And I'm even sick of myself as well,
But I'm sicker still of a tyrant's rule,
And conquered lands where the wild beasts drool,
And I'm cured damn quick when I think of the day,
When all this hell will be out of the way,
When none of this mess will have been in vain,
And the lights of the world will blaze again,
And things will be as they were before,
And kids will laugh in the streets once more,
And the Axis' flags will be dipped and furled,
And God looks down on a peaceful world.

—*Maude Harget.*

Drafting Farm and Dairy Workers Into Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 5, 1943

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the statement that an army is no stronger than its supply lines is axiomatic, yet the selective-service boards have drained the farms of necessary manpower. This practice is largely due to the fact that selective-service boards have not yet received adequate information and instruction concerning deferment of necessary farm laborers. The fault lies in Washington, and not with the selective-service boards.

Farming, and particularly dairy farming, is highly specialized. The proposed plan for relief of the farmer which embraces the use of school children and inexperienced volunteer help is not feasible.

The only feasible plan is the release of farmers from the Army, and deferment of farm laborers by the selective-service boards. Some immediate action must be taken before the damage already created has passed the remedial stage.

I introduce into the RECORD a letter written me by John P. Weatherwax, counsel to a number of milk producers' cooperatives in New York State, which is very much in point:

TROY, N. Y., *January 28, 1943.*
Congressman DEAN P. TAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As counsel to several milk producers' cooperatives in New York State, and particularly Washington and Rensselaer Counties Milk Producers Association, Inc., located in your congressional district, I am writing to appeal to you for action with respect to the drafting of farm and dairy workers into military service.

The general situation regarding the extreme shortage of farm and dairy workers is well known; likewise the causes of such shortage are well known. However, what I believe is not well known, or, if so, what is not fully appreciated, is the continual drafting of farm and dairy workers in the face of the already desperate farm labor shortage, and in the face of the already and growing food shortage.

Upon information received from hundreds of farmers, from many farm and dairy organizations, and from other reliable sources, including personal observation and experience, farm and dairy workers are being drafted daily for military service through Selective Service boards over the frantic appeals of farmers, dairymen, and farm and dairy organizations for their deferment as necessary agricultural workers. It seems that Selective Service boards are only concerned with the filling of military quotas. They seem to possess no or little concern for the requirements of agriculture or industry.

Some Selective Service boards take the position that their obligation is solely to get men into the armed forces of the country. They feel that if they accomplish this, they have discharged their duty, and it is up to some other organization to take care of the labor requirements of agriculture and industry. Thus you can see how manpower is being and is likely to be distributed among the needs of the Nation, military, agriculture, and industry.

Power in the hands of the Selective Service boards to grant occupational deferments to men is secondary to their power to draft men for military service. It seems that discretionary power is resolved in favor of filling military quotas, and not in favor of filling food quotas. Upon application for occupational deferment, the question is usually asked of the farmer or dairyman seeking to have a farm boy or laborer deferred: Is such person essential? If the answer is "yes," such person is usually asked what would happen in case the person sought to be deferred should die, and in such event, wouldn't the farmer or dairyman have to get along without him anyway. Therefore, under such rule, no man is essential.

There is no use in setting up food quotas for agriculture to meet; there is no use in setting up a program of incentive payments to increase food production, so long as the already desperate farm labor shortage is permitted to grow worse day by day.

In your congressional district, and elsewhere, farmers and dairymen are selling out and abandoning good farms day by day. This is because of the labor shortage and discouragement that anything worth while is being done about it. If this continues, in my opinion, there will be a decrease of upward of 25 percent this year in agricultural production in this area.

The suggestion of recruiting a corps of volunteer laborers to aid with farm work during the planting and harvesting seasons, even if carried out, will be of no substantial aid. Plain common sense will substantiate this conclusion. The taking of farm boys, farm and dairy workers, farm and dairy organization personnel, for military service must be stopped at once, and proper measures must be taken at once to insure such stoppage. The rules of deferment for agricultural work must be explicit and mandatory. The administration thereof must be under the supervision of governmental organizations responsible to the people of the country for food production and not the Selective Service System.

Please do not infer from this letter that farm workers wish to avoid any military responsibility, or that bad faith is charged against the Selective Service System, for such inference is not intended.

Your assistance in solving this great and urgent problem is respectfully requested.

Very truly yours,
JOHN P. WEATHERWAX,
Counsel.

Pay-As-You-Go Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose herewith the following interesting letter submitting some very interesting arguments in behalf of the adoption of the Ruml pay-as-you-go income-tax plan. Personally, I am one of those many Members who have not yet definitely made up their minds just what position they would take were the Ruml plan submitted to us for vote tomorrow. Nevertheless, I do find these arguments in favor of this plan very interesting, looking ahead as they do to the post-war period and the return of our boys from the front which we all hope will be in the near future:

We read and hear a great deal about the necessity of preparing for peace. It is necessary that we prepare now for the many problems that will arise when our military and naval men must necessarily be brought back into civil occupations.

The proposal of Beardsley Ruml is being widely discussed. We hear it praised by citizens in every walk of life. It has a very definite value for the post-war period, in that its adoption will make possible the clearing of the ranks of civil occupations of that great group of men and women who have reached the age where retirement is practical and possible except for the fact that under the present income-tax law they must keep working to pay last year's income tax.

When one reaches the age when chronic or growing physical incapacity sets in, retirement is far more possible and practical if upon retirement no tax responsibility of great proportion is faced.

If this group of our citizens who desire to retire can be encouraged in their desire to vacate the ranks of labor, it will leave just so many more jobs for our boys when they return to civil life.

The Ruml plan to be effective must not be amended so as to eliminate that portion of the plan setting aside the income tax for the year preceding its adoption.

Would it not be a help to the morale of our men in the service to learn our legislators had considered the return to industry of our armed forces when enacting a new income tax law?

Furthermore, the collection of income taxes by a law enacted long after the income upon which these taxes were imposed was earned will continue to create disunity at home. Whereas, the adoption of the Ruml plan as generally admitted will raise the morale not only of our armed forces, but also of our home front.

These considerations, no doubt, will be considered by our honorable Representatives when the new income tax law is formulated.

How can a man retire owing sizable tax obligations when earnings are reduced?

How we can find enough jobs for the discharged men and women if we do not encourage the retirement from active work of that great group of our citizens both male and female, 65 years of age and up, who now hang on in order to pay back tax obligations imposed in many cases long after the earnings taxed were secured.

Any plan requiring eventual payment of income taxes on 1942 income, even though spread over a period of years after the war, would freeze old citizens in jobs which might otherwise be vacated by retirement, thus creating vacancies for our men of the armed forces to civilian life. Cancelation of the excess tax for 1942 is necessary if these results are to be obtained.

JOSEPH B. SEAMAN,
Member of Selective Service Board No. 84, and Chairman of Reemployment Committee of Board No. 84.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

There Was an Election—The Votes Were Counted but the Defeated Candidates Still Hold Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was last November that the people decided that they wanted in their employ others than those who believed in the New Deal. The voters went to the polls; they gave their orders. They discharged some 69 Members of Congress; hired new Representatives.

But apparently the administration does not take seriously orders from the voters for it continues to place in office those the people said they did not want.

Read the following editorial from the Daily Princetonian, Princeton, N. J.:

FARM SYSTEM FOR DEMOCRATS

Prentiss Brown is working in Washington; Charles Poletti is working in Washington. So is Josh Lee and a host of other professional politicians who have only this in common: They are Democrats who at one time or another have been voted out of office by the electorate. Instead of returning to their law practices or grocery stores or factories, they have moved into important posts in the administration of the war. Mr. Brown, ex-Senator from Michigan, is Price Administrator; Mr. Lee, ex-Senator from Oklahoma, is

on the Civil Aeronautics Board; and Mr. Poletti, ex-Governor of New York, is an assistant to Secretary of War Stimson.

It was basic in the opinion of the fathers of the Constitution that a man was to enter public life when his constituents saw fit to put him there, and only so long as he pleased his constituents was he to remain there. That is a good principle and it has served us well. Now, it seems, a new principle has evolved. It is that a term in the legislature is a mere interlude in the life of the professional politician, a warm-up for a job with the administration.

Something of this same spirit was apparent in the affairs of George Norris. The voters of Nebraska decided to dispense with his services last November, and high ranking Government officials had the eternal brass to criticize them for doing so. In such matters the power of censure has always resided with the voters and nowhere else. This is the fundament, the very essence of democracy, and must be kept inviolate.

Messrs. Brown, Poletti, and Lee, to cite three convenient examples, have fallen out of the public favor, yet they are retained in public service, indeed given increased power and immunity from ballot-box criticism. It may be contended that they are capable and industrious. So are any number of men who have not been stigmatized and discredited by defeat in a democratic election. This is not the real issue, however. The real issue is that Mr. Brown is retained because he is popular with the skittish Congressmen, Mr. Poletti because in the past he has proved himself a good vote getter.

Thus it would appear that the administration of the war, like Congress itself, is an elaborate farm system for Democratic political hopefuls.

Horatio Alger Rides Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 6, 1943. The editorial follows:

HORATIO ALGER RIDES AGAIN

Those who have been wondering what plans were embodied for them in that rather depressing phrase, "from the cradle to the grave," as used by Ma Perkins and like-minded New Dealers, may now turn for enlightenment to HENRY WALLACE. That's right, Henry has spoken again.

Until he made his historic declaration there had been only a rough perception of what life would be like between the two terminal points. You would be born a bonus baby. There would be a bounty for tender tots like you, and your fortunate parents would collect. And finally, when you turned your face to the wall, your benevolent Government would again take over. The death benefits would provide as flossy a funeral as any conducted by the Over the River Burying Society.

That takes care of your first breath and your last gasp. Of course, it doesn't come exactly free. You would pay a social-security tax, a la Beveridge, for these boons. Ma thinks a rate of about 10 percent would be about right. The bassinet and the bier having been provided for, the question then arises: What's in between? Take her away, Henry.

Well, says Mr. WALLACE, he envisions "an America where all can become members of the middle class." It may seem like a contradiction in terms that there can be a middle class without an upper class and a lower class, but that's the way Henry sees it. We're all going to be leveled out. There won't be any indigents heading for the mission and a handout of coffee and doughnuts, and there won't be anybody making a million by developing hybrid corn. We'll all be in between.

The process of becoming middle class in a universal way, however, will not be soulless in the least. Private initiative, says Henry, will be permitted to flourish. Ingenuity will be encouraged and we may expect to see many varied forms of adroitness employed as the individual hoists himself into the middle class from below or puts himself into a power dive from above, whichever is warranted by his prior condition. Once in the middle class, of course, he is, in the language of bureaucracy, frozen. He stays there, merely muttering "Move over," for he'll find plenty of company—in fact, all the company there is.

The struggle to attain the middle class should prove exhilarating. The well-heeled banker, obliged to come down a few pegs, will busy himself making unsound investments until he is sufficiently reduced in circumstances. The shiftless parent, accustomed to blowing his Saturday pay check in the pub, will find the bartender paying him for the beers he drinks. The hobo riding the rods will be approached by the directors of the Pullman Co. and invited to put up in a lower berth.

No wonder that Henry, transported by enthusiasm, proclaims, "Horatio Alger is not dead in America and never will be." We do not know what Alger hero we shall be required to emulate, but there is a wide choice of titles: Bound to Rise, Luck and Pluck, A Brave Boy's Fight for Fortune, Slow and Sure, or from Sidewalk to Shop, Sink or Swim, or from Newsboy to the Middle Classes.

We are pretty certain, however, that Government is going to have enough to say about it so that Strong and Steady, or Paddle Your Own Canoe is preempted. And we wouldn't be surprised if Henry had taken his cue from Nothing to Do: A Tilt at Our Best Society. And, of course, we are all to cringe before the British upper class.

Let's Get This Straight About Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 5, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, in the debate today on the Celler-Dirksen-Wolcott amendment many assertions were made which ought to be examined with care. The sponsors of this amendment seem to regard it as a gesture—an opening move for something else, which apparently was the repealing as well as the nullifying of the silver legislation of 1934 and 1939. They shouted loudly demanding the use of this silver in industry—impliedly in war industry. I contend that it is being adequately used in the war industry. They lamented that so much of the taxpayers' money had been paid for this store of white metal which now by law they said was being forced to be a slacker in the war effort. I deny that the purchase of this silver cost the taxpayers anything, and I further deny that the white metal is forced to be a slacker. They suggest that we "get mad about silver." Yea, verily, if their ultimate object is their apparent object, to raid the people's treasure chest by bringing about the sale of this valuable, critical, and precious metal at 50 cents per ounce for the advantage of brokers and silversmiths and nonessential trades, all of us had better get mad—both at the manner and the intent of this move.

I fear the supporters of the Celler amendment have in mind putting silver into nonwar industries more than putting silver into the war. I have it on the most authoritative sources that our war effort has not been hampered from lack of use of silver, and I have it also on good authority that the trades have not been barred from the use of domestic silver so long as they are willing to pay 71 cents an ounce for it and they have been getting some cheap foreign silver. I can readily understand why the manufacturers of silver tableware or jewelry and ornaments should want to get their raw material at 35 or 50 cents an ounce rather than be forced to pay 71 cents an ounce. From my experience in buying silverware I find that an ounce of silver bullion, whether it costs 35, 50, or 71 cents an ounce, is fashioned into something beautiful and sold for $10 or more per ounce. Of course the difference may be justified on the grounds of artistry and the workman's skill.

It is true that there are a good many workmen in Arizona, probably most of them Indians, who make silver articles, chiefly for decoration. Of course, I am anxious that they be kept in business, even in this nonessential business, as long as possible—so long as it does not interfere with essential war work. However, I notice, according to the latest pronouncement, that such workers are not classified as war-workers, and no doubt all of them could and will get into more important and vital war work.

How utterly absurd the foes of silver are when they point out that the stock of silver we have on hand has cost the American taxpayer so many millions of dollars. Why do not they say, as I now say, that the silver purchased since 1934 was paid for in silver dollars or silver certificates—backed by silver dollars—which means that the 110,000 tons of silver, which Uncle Sam held on our entrance into this World War, had been obtained by issuing coins or silver certificates by the Treasury Department at the monetary price of $1.29 an ounce and that the difference between $1.29 and the purchase price represents the Government's profit.

Accordingly, at the outbreak of this World War No. 2 Uncle Sam found himself in possession of about 50,000 tons of silver which was his without cost and represents his profit. This is how Uncle Sam got such a large quantity of silver which has been turned over for war use,

and through more than a year of war we have used less than half of it. I know there were some strings attached to the use of part of this accumulated store of silver, but I also know that there has been enough silver for the war industries in consumptive use so that all requirements have been met.

"Put silver in uniform and make it fight," they shout. "Let's get mad about silver," they say. It is enough to make one mad when one thinks of the deliberate effort being made, or at least the opening move being made, to force Uncle Sam to dispossess himself of this great strategic stock of silver at 50 cents an ounce for the profit of nonessential industries in wartimes. Those same men would also have us wipe out silver from our monetary system, melt our silver coins, call in our silver certificates and substitute other paper therefor. For every silver certificate outstanding we could substitute a Federal Reserve note. Not a few persons want that kind of paper money, but they say nothing about the interest burden in order to have it.

I one time declared, about a year ago, that I would be willing to go to any limit in the absolutely necessary war uses of the precious metals. I would favor filling the teeth of our soldiers with gold or silver or make bullets for their rifles if necessary to win this war. A Confederate woman drew a splendid letter of appreciation from President Jefferson Davis by donating her family plate, which had been in her family for many generations, to the Confederate Treasury. Convince me that the war needs more silver for consumptive use than it is now getting or can get, and I will be willing to destroy every silver certificate, melt every silver dollar, half dollar, quarter, and dime to be found in the country and use the metal only in the building of weapons of war, but in lieu of such money I would substitute greenbacks and shinplasters for the duration. Does such a need exist?

Paul Versus Ruml

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian of February 5, 1943, endorsing the pay-as-you-go plan for collection of personal income taxes. The editorial is as follows:

PAUL VERSUS RUML

Simply stated, the Ruml pay-as-you-go tax plan provides that this year's income, instead of last year's income, shall be the final base for determining how much one owes in Federal income taxes this year. Nobody would pay less than now unless his income declined.

While it lends itself to a monthly deduction-at-the-source system, it is as importantly a plan to get the taxpayer out of constant debt to his Government. At present, if he had a taxable income in 1942 and it unexpectedly fails in 1943, he still must pay out of depleted income or out of savings the taxes levied on what he earned in his immediately prior prosperous year. Under the Ruml plan his tax liability would cease when his income ceased, or be reduced currently with the reduction of his income.

While in instances of falling or disappearing income the Treasury would lose revenues, it would at the same time gain revenues from incomes that currently rose. The gain would substantially wash out the loss and the Treasury revenue would not be greatly impaired if at all.

A great merit of the plan is its psychological, its peace-of-mind effect upon those persons now struggling to pay out of current income the taxes levied on last year's income and knowing at the same time that the income they are now deriving and draining is building up a tax liability to be met next year.

The scheme is so sane, so logical, so simple, that it has gained widespread popularity. Unfortunately it does not have the fatherhood of Treasury experts who glory in assumed right and duty to sponsor anything and everything pertaining to revenue and taxation. Bureaucracy is the same in National and State Government. It is jealous of its assumed prerogatives from Randolph Paul, General Counsel of the Treasury Department, down to Earl Fisher of the Oregon State Tax Commission. Anything not of their own invention is no good, and they are ingenious with undigestible statistics to prove it. Any tax relief devised by someone who sits in the main assembly is an impudence that should be squelched. Be quiet, children—teacher's running the school.

Naturally Randolph Paul is opposed to the Ruml plan. It does not come from the inner sanctum of Treasury bureaucrats. And seemingly, in the eyes of the Treasury experts, the people are financial guinea pigs who must submit to experiments by Treasury scientists. He and his collaborators would try out on them heavy forced savings and extreme withholding taxes. Sure they are for pay-as-you-go, but on a basis that the vast majority of income possessors would pay-as-they-go their taxes on this year's income and at the same time pay taxes on last year's income. By paying 2 years' taxes in 1 year, the vast majority, come March 15, 1944, would be out of debt to the Government and, if still retaining a spark of life, be available for other experiments.

Such is the oppression that the Paul plan for a present withholding tax of 19 percent (24 percent with the victory tax) means to the people. It is a scheme to put in reverse gear the purposes of the Ruml plan to give relief where relief is proper and to ease the mental apprehensions of all, without cost to government. Paul would increase the tax burden and add immediate revenues to the Treasury.

It has come to be recognized and deplored in Congress that the lawmaking body does not have its own experts and investigators, but must rely for guidance upon experts and investigators in the administrative department of government, who have theories of their own on what shall be the character of revenue and other complicated laws, and are in position to befuddle and direct and obstruct. Various schemes are proposed for restoring in this particular the complete function of the lawmaking body. Something of the sort is appropriate, but Congress does not need to wait for it to adopt the Ruml plan. The most confusing phase of it to the bureaucrats is its simplicity. Congress can recognize simplicity without the aid or support of Treasury experts.

This Way Small Business Is Really Helped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the problem of small business is one that has properly concerned the Congress as much as any other in connection with the war. We have tried to find ways to prevent the forcing out of business of small enterprise. We have been none too successful and the effort must be pressed with all vigor.

Here, however, is the story of a company in the district which I have the honor to represent which shows what can be done by businessmen themselves, and which tells a story that should be repeated in just as many cases as possible:

[From Time magazine of November 9, 1942]

LIGHTING THE WAY

A General Electric salesman walked out of the tiny, plain reception room of the unimpressive little plant in Alhambra, Calif., of Lights, Inc., which manufactures lighting equipment for airports and airplanes. He turned to Managing Director Harry Swift Kimball, told him: "If anyone had ever told me that I'd walk out of the front door of that dump of yours with a million-dollar order in my hand I'd have figured he was crazy."

A year or so ago he would have been. But now General Electric with its million-dollar order for cable is only one of about 200 subcontractors working for the amazing firm of Lights, Inc., which has gone and done one of the most vital jobs in the war effort: to make subcontracting really work and really pay.

Four years ago Lights, Inc., was doing an average $150,000 annual business; today it does $1,500,000 in a peak month. If it handled all that business under one roof, Lights would have to hire between 10,000 and 20,000 employees, would require between $5,000,000 and $10,000,000 worth of unobtainable machinery. Instead, it employs only 200 people, owns only about $15,000 worth of machinery. The rest of its work is farmed out—mostly to tiny firms.

Working in a 10- by 12-foot office, Lights' President Thayer Thorndike faces a big Navy E flag which will be formally presented to the company on November 18. One reason for the award: Lights, Inc., delivers on time. Besides lighting equipment (75 percent of its total) the company makes stuffing tubes (which hold cables on ships), bomb release pulleys, etc., and is planning to subcontract the manufacture of butex, a synthetic rubber compound.

Key to Lights' success is that it maintains a small, able engineering staff which plans its own products, breaks them down into efficient subcontracting units, supervises their final assembly.

Related to two old Boston families (Thayer and Thorndike), the young president served a turn with First National Bank of Boston and with Boston Skyways. On a trip to Los Angeles he bought the bankrupt plant of Kay Bee Manufacturing Co., a motorcycle-light manufacturer, began making aviation lighting equipment. Lights, Inc., formed in 1932,

supplied Pan American with field equipment, zoomed in 1940 when the Government ordered $1,400,000 worth of portable lights.

In June 1941, Thorndike brought Kimball into the firm because of his knowledge of manufacturing. A graduate of Annapolis, where he was a classmate of Admiral Leahy, Harry Kimball failed to stay in the Navy because he was one of the seasickest midshipmen ever enrolled. Instead he went to work for Boston Edison, became president of American Zinc, later went to Remington Arms, which he piloted through World War I.

Thorndike and Kimball have now become evangels of subcontracting. They believe, labor shortage or not, that right in the Los Angeles area are 4,000 potential small subcontractors starving for work, including the "cream of the country's mechanics."

Both see subcontracting as something more than a war need—as perhaps the hope of the little businessman in the future. Not long ago the president of a big manufacturing firm, who has sweated blood to get his operation wholly integrated under one roof, took a look at Lights, Inc. Said he: "Mr. Thorndike, you're just 4 years ahead of us."

Our Tomorrow Depends on What We Do Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Lefevre, Jr., of Houston, Tex., which was published in the Texas Press Messenger of December 1942:

[From the Press Messenger of December 1942]

OUR TOMORROW DEPENDS ON WHAT WE DO TODAY

(By Arthur Lefevre, Jr., Houston)

A free press can only exist in a social order founded on the free enterprise system, where the individual citizen is the sovereign. To place sovereignty any place else reduces the citizen to the status of servility. As was so well said by the philosopher Henri Frederic Amiel, "Liberalism is merely feeding upon abstractions, when it persuades itself that liberty is possible without free individuals." This fundamental proposition was clearly understood by the founders of our constitutional Republic, as clearly demonstrated in their wording of the last 2 of the original 10 amendments to the Federal Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights.

All of us have heard the question often asked at recent newspapermen's gatherings, "What happens in the newspaper field when the war is over?" Or similar groping inquiries only slightly different in their verbiage. It is just here that our danger lies for such doubt may indicate a fatal condition if it denotes our loss of faith. Wherever there are men to read, there is need of an intelligent and free press. If in the inviolability of their integrity brave editors courageously meet this want, truly they will have their reward as the laws of nature and nature's God will see to that. "For the fulfillment of duty brings peace * * * if sacrifice has itself become a joy, a lasting, growing, and imperishable joy—the soul is then secure of an all-sufficient and unfailing nourishment."

In recent years there has been created in the public mind erroneous conceptions of the functions of government, producing a flood of special laws and bureaucratic edicts—aside from the exigencies of war. Emotionalism and maudlin sympathy are appealed to in furthering various measures. Every appeal is resorted to to put the regulations over except the proper one of justice. Nothing can be gained and all may be lost by coddling radicals and petting bureaucrats. In listening to the clamor of political demagogues, let us ever be alert for sophistry, or we will be trapped by some catch phrase into foolish action that may even result disastrously to the very genius of our representative institutions.

As an example of present tendencies applicable to the newspaper business, a recent editorial in the Chicago Daily Tribune had this to say:

"A classification of newspaper delivery trucks in the same category with beer trucks, as respects gasoline allowances, has the earmarks of a slur deliberately contrived. * * * Newspapers, which have already restricted their editions and rearranged their deliveries to save 40 percent of their delivery mileage, are required to make additional slashes of as much as 35 percent more.

"The essential contribution of the newspaper to the war effort through the distribution of information was well recognized in the last war, when newsprint was placed high on priorities lists. The story in this war is different. The gas rationing regulations are another addition to the accumulating evidence that * * * bureaucracy, despairing of controlling the press, is using the war as an excuse to destroy it.

"The first of these attacks was the phony paper shortage of last spring. * * * There followed the grand jury fiasco aimed at the Tribune. * * * Next came the antitrust suit against the Associated Press. Here, again, the immediate motive is to misuse the power of government * * * but the fundamental objective is to establish the Associated Press as a public utility so that * * * bureaucratic comrades can get control of the news gathering and disseminating machinery of the country and convert it into a * * * propaganda agency.

"Meanwhile * * * crackpots * * * along with other bureaucrats who have long been on record as asserting that advertising is an economic waste, have been conducting an offensive against the revenue of newspapers * * * have joined in with vague intimations that advertisers may not be allowed to deduct their advertising expenditures as necessary and normal business expense."

As citizens of a free country with a priceless tradition, it is our bounden duty to seriously consider these questions. Freedom of thought and action is of incalculably more value than all the supposed benefits flowing from some temporizing expedient in the way of a strait-jacketing measure. Looking back over the pages of history, replete with the terrible and wicked cruelty of bigoted minds and hearts, and seeing the many blessings and great truths that have been preserved to us because brave and noble spirits refused to bend the knee to tyrannical authority, let us vow anew that those true men shall not have lived in vain and that we shall keep forever burning the torch of freedom. We should never grow weary of studying these truths and they will bear constant repetition, for always a newer generation is rising to learn afresh the wisdom sanctified by the immeasurable suffering and blood of countless heroes. Those who will not learn from the experience of others, will surely suffer anew the terrible scourgings nature metes to all who go that hit-and-miss route. Like spoiled children, we want to keep our cake and eat it at the same time. It cannot be done. If we want freedom consonant with our Declaration of Independence, surely ever increasing the bureaucratic activities of cities, States, and Nation is a drift in the wrong direction. The Federal authority has emasculated the priceless heritage of States' rights through the folly of the States in surrendering their sovereignty for bureaucratic handouts.

Many pose as freemen, yet seek legislative regimentation; many bury individual responsibility in mass action, yet hope to live above servility. Under the complexity of our modern civilization and the tremendous organization of our industrial life, great numbers of men and women are sinking their individuality in groups and blocs. Social decay surely follows the loss of individual responsibility. Editors have it in their power to guide humanity from the morass of class struggles fostered by ignorant prejudices.

What a wilderness of folly soon overtakes the gardens of worthy character and endeavor, if we remove the invigorating element of personal freedom and initiative. Let us ever remember to respect the sacredness of the individual personality and it will protect us from being blinded by insinuating propaganda that works continually our undoing. Stand up in your integrity and resist proposals looking toward uniformity in all things. All cows are not black, although they may appear so if you are in the dark. True progress rests on courage, honor, and faith, which are personal qualities; also remember, guilt is personal.

At this Christmas season, it would be well to think anew, for our very safety and salvation, on the abiding truths in the Master's temptation. In dramatic manner, He teaches us to never surrender our integrity of purpose to any insidious appeal—not even that based on our need for food, nor that which flatters our personal pride or self-glorification, nor, above all, that which tempts us to acquire power by wrong means.

Time and war move apace! Many portentous events, transpiring in almost kaleidoscopic effect, impress upon us the rapid movement of the shuttle in life's loom, weaving the woof in the web of destiny. Dazed neither by the noise nor the speed, as skilled operators we must be quick to catch any discordant note or false thread. If we fail, what ought to be the hoped for and desired result becomes a botched and spoiled affair. Ours is the glorious privilege and opportunity to point the way and sound the alarm:

"Of what avail are plow, or sail,
Or land, or life, if freedom fail?"

With such a challenge ringing in our hearts and realizing also the great utilitarian worth of newspapers through their advertising columns, we should face the future with undaunted courage and high faith, knowing that if we remain true to our duties as editors all will be well.

Address of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker at Annual Banquet of Baseball Writers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, February

7, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, at the annual banquet of the Baseball Writers' Association, delivered a speech which will go down the years as one of the outstanding contributions to the spirit of true Americanism. Captain Rickenbacker's life is an open book. From the time he was 12 years old, he has been contributing to the welfare of this country. He is known throughout the Nation as the outstanding air pilot of our expeditionary forces in the First World War. He established the record of 25 German planes sent crashing to the earth. No other American equaled that record.

Captain Rickenbacker has since his World War experience spent his life in the development of those things the manufacture of which afford comfort for our people and labor for those who work. Few have forgotten his latest exploit in the Pacific when he and his comrades, forced into the sea by a failing airplane, spent several weeks on the bosom of that ocean, enduring the blistering rays of the sun, the winds and the waves with little or nothing to eat, and scarcely enough water to keep alive.

When this accident befell him, he was on an errand for the armed forces of this Nation. He was again offering his life if need be to the service and welfare of his country. If any one man in this land of ours is qualified to discuss the fundamentals of genuine Americanism, it is this man whose record of service both in peace and war is not outshone by any other individual.

Mr. Speaker, Captain Rickenbacker's speech follows:

Naturally, I am very happy to be back again among old friends.

In coming to you today, I am not unmindful of the exceptional honor, and I accept it not as an individual or personal tribute, but as a tribute to a symbol to which I have contributed in my humble way.

The symbol that has made America great—inspired throughout the generations by our forefathers, and which has woven its way through the history of these great United States like a golden thread, comprised of imagination, individuality, self-reliance, initiative, and last, but not least, eternal but simple faith in the Supreme Being.

As all of you have either heard or read of my Pacific mission, there is little need of my dwelling on that subject with the exception of stating that after visiting with General MacArthur's boys in New Guinea—Port Moresby, Buna, and Gona—I returned to Australia and then through the Fijis to Guadalcanal, a veritable hell-hole, as the rainy season was starting.

Henderson Field runway is a metal strip that has been bombed and shelled for months, and is also the airplane graveyard of the Pacific, not only for enemy planes, but our own as well.

Dugouts were filled with mud and water. Men were working in jumpers without shoes or socks. Marines and soldiers were in the fox holes with billions of mosquitoes. Malaria was prevalent, as was diarrhea.

Here you will find a Catholic priest, Protestant preacher, or a Jewish rabbi—all preaching the simple faith to Catholics, Protestants, and Jews alike.

Oh, men and women of America, if you could only understand what our boys—your boys and mine—are doing in these hell-holes throughout the Pacific and the burning sands of Africa, that your way of life may be preserved, and the character that has made this Nation great may be carried on, you would not worry about 8 hours a day overtime, or double time for Saturdays and holidays.

You would not worry about whether you were producing too much per man per day. No, you would be and should be grateful for the privilege of offering everything you know how. For none of us are doing so much that we cannot do more. This is a life and death struggle for the welfare of this Nation.

Without victory, social security, old-age pensions, hours, and wages bills will mean nothing.

France had her slow-down and sit-down strikes—had her social legislation, which I am not against—but they failed in the realization that without work and without producing something of value, they could not last.

Today they are serfs and slaves of Hitler's hordes. Millions of men, women, and children are starving. That goes for Holland, Belgium, the Scandinavian countries, Bataan, Corregidor, Hong Kong, and Singapore.

Accept your responsibilities with the privileges that you are enjoying. Remember, patriotism without service is a hollow word.

Do not let these boys come back from their graves in these hell holes scattered throughout the Pacific and other parts of the world and from the depths of the seven seas—do not let them come back and plague you for having failed in your obligation on the home front to give them more and more of everything that is needed to hasten a final victory.

I know you realize that I have said—and I say again—we have in the past several years spent billions of dollars to destroy self-reliance, initiative, imagination, and individuality trying to plan the lives of 130,000,000 people by a superior few.

Now we are spending billions to recreate self-reliance, initiative, imagination, and individuality.

For once you place our boys in a fox hole in the jungles of the Pacific, or on the desert sands of Africa, they are on their own. Once you have ordered our boys as commando troops to attack the enemy at night, they are on their own. Once you have dropped parachute troops behind enemy lines, day or night, they are on their own. Once you place a man in the cockpit of a plane and send him into the blue above, he is on his own. Once you put our boys into the tanks against the enemy, they are on their own. Once you put an officer into the front line, leading a group of our boys into the face of enemy fire, he is on his own.

And so, I say to you, when the kids on the commons are on third base and steal home for the winning run, they are on their own.

And should the day ever come that there is no more need for imagination, initiative, individuality, and self-reliance in this country—then, and then only, will there be no more reason for baseball and its fundamental advantages in building character into the youth of this Nation.

It is imagination, individuality, self-reliance, and initiative that are going to win this war for America, not only on the field of battle, but on the home front.

For bear in mind, that when this war is over—pray God it will be soon—there will be more rugged individualists come back to America from the four corners of the world than we ever had at any one time in our history, and I thank God for that.

They do not want, and will not accept regimentation of their lives or planned economy. They will want the same opportunities and will demand them, and will get them, that we have had, for they are entitled to them.

As I have said before, if necessary to make us appreciate our duties, bring back the troops from the hellholes of the world, place them in the factories, take the war workers and place them in the fox holes with filth, vermin, diarrhea, malaria, and the Japanese, and I will guarantee you that our production will be increased, and much of it doubled, within 30 days.

We would have no more feather-bedding, no more slow-downs, no more restrictions on effort.

We hear a lot nowadays about the shortage of manpower hours. It is not the shortage of manpower hours that is slowing up the badly needed production of our war weapons.

No, but it is the shortage of productive manpower hours, for again none of us are producing so much that we cannot—all of us—produce a little more.

And while I am on the subject, I noticed a few days ago the announcement of the declaration of the War Manpower Commission to 29 occupational groups that even though they may be fathers of 5 or 6 children, they must find war-important jobs by spring or face induction.

Here again I am shocked to find that our officials in Washington have omitted challenging a group known more commonly as labor racketeers of the "graft" age, and I spell it with a "g" and not a "d."

And I reiterate again that our Congress should see fit to introduce and pass such legislation to first, upon his release or discharge, any member of our armed forces can be employed by any employer without having to join any organized labor unions.

Second, upon his employment he shall have equal voting rights with any other employee in any union, and any employee and management plan of the employer.

Third, his seniority in relation to other employees of draft age should date as of the day he enlisted or was inducted into his country's service.

I definitely feel that our situation here at home is most serious and that by such legislation our Congress could free honest labor from those racketeers and parasites that are right now hindering the effort of our workers to do the best they can to win this war.

Such legislation will insure all the members of our services an equal opportunity right now as well as after this war is over with those who stayed at home in industry.

What better bonus could we give our servicemen than the elimination of their having to buy the right to work in their own country on their release or discharge from the service.

Why should he have to pay exorbitant membership fees demanded by those unions working under a closed-shop agreement—and what better bonus could we give him than to eliminate his having to pay dues for the privilege of keeping that job?

Briefly, why shouldn't a man's honorable discharge or release from the service of his country be all he would henceforth need as a union card when he returns to work for himself and his family after having worked for all of us so willingly and risked his life in our behalf?

Why could we not use the splendid abilities of our local selective service boards to draft those men needed by our war industry or our farmers.

Let these men be sent to Army or Navy schools and there let them be taught an agricultural or industrial skill in the same way that their younger and unmarried contemporaries are being taught a skill of war.

These men could then be released to the farm or to industry and under this legislation they would not have to join any labor union.

They would be men who, I believe, would have a sobering effect on those malcontents

who seem to think it their business to foment strikes and discontent.

These men will have served their country in the Army or the Navy and will be able to tell their children that they did their bit, even though their job was only to make the implements at home that were shipped to those serving at the other end of the supply lines in battle.

These men could replace those single men now in essential industry. It would be better to have a man with a family working at home in industry with his family than to have him drafted for combat service and have our Government liable for the support of his family.

He could earn the wages of industry and in this way make a fairer distribution of the costs of this war.

With the end of the war they could be given honorable discharges the same as those who were in combat and make them feel that they had served their country to the best of their ability.

For there will be millions of young men returning home who have never had a job or have been forced to pay tribute to men who never did an honest day's work in their lives.

We all must realize that this war we are fighting is a total war. It is a war in which all of us can get hurt, for which all of us will have to pay, and in which all of us will have to work and fight in order for all of us to win.

Those of us who are not in uniform must certainly realize that before any food, weapons, munitions, or clothing can move out over the supply routes to the fighting fronts of this global war that they have to be grown or processed.

Unless we do realize that this must be done by us with the same indomitable spirit with which the materials of war are delivered to the fronts and fought with, then we are well on our way not only to a very poor compromise, but possibly a most humbling defeat.

A man is judged here on this earth mainly by the things he achieves in relation to his fellow men and women.

In many ways a man can acquire a record of his service which, although it might not be all in one place and quite informal, is none the less a record.

It is quite different with such records when a man enters the service of his country.

The armed services take no chances in such a haphazard means of recording his deeds or misdeeds. Just as soon as he gets his uniform he acquires what is known as his service record.

In our Army this record of the service that a man performs for his country is inscribed in a little white book that has 24 pages. These pages provide for the detailing of his whole history while in the service of his Nation.

Thus, in these entries in his service record, one finds the story of his transfers, promotions, leaves, illnesses, wounds, his deeds of valor or indiscretion, behavior, and promotion or demotion of rank. They are all duly recorded for his country, himself, and for posterity.

From this service record and by the interpretation of the entries made there, his officers can decide whether or not he has acquitted himself honorably in the service of his Nation.

It is shown just what he did for his country and in the fighting for the safeguarding of those who, he had every reason to expect, were working just as hard for him as he was fighting and risking his life for them.

I feel that the records that those boys are causing to be inscribed in their little white books are of deeds that put to shame some of the selfish and greedy actions that have and are still taking place here behind their backs among many of those who are responsible for the effort and labor to produce what our boys need out there in the hellholes to fight a war with a sneaking and treacherous enemy.

Since this war is a total war in which all of us have a definite responsibility in working side by side with those fighting for us—then I do think we civilians at home should be proud to have records kept of our services for our fighting men in the same manner that records are kept of their service for us.

This can and should be a voluntary effort. Our spirit of competition in doing our best for our country which is the bedrock of the spirit of patriotism should be all that we would need to see that the records of civilian service would compare most favorably with those of our forces fighting for us.

Why shouldn't it be only fair for entries to be made here at home in a formal civilian service record in which we would voluntarily agree to have kept as to our record in the total effort to win this war and insure a decent peace.

All of us would be proud to have such a record—whether a Cub Scout or an invalid in a wheel chair—with which we could prove that we had acquitted ourselves honorably in this fight.

We have many volunteers in civilian service, we have our local draft boards, our Red Cross, our ration boards, our civilian defense groups, our United Service Organizations, our welfare groups, our farm cooperatives, and our air force civilian ground observer corps, and all other coordinating services.

The members of all these civilian organizations are performing unselfish and laborious tasks for the winning of the war in just as serious and earnest a manner as the man out on the battle front. Let their deeds be recorded in their civilian-service records.

The workers in our war factories, shipyards, and munition plants should all be commended when they do their jobs well. But let the foreman also advise as to tardiness, waste of equipment, or absenteeism so that a shirking worker would have such acts recorded in the same way that desertion is entered in the record of a man in uniform.

Our farmers are working harder and with less than they ever did before. Theirs is an uncertain lot as to crops at all times, and with a shortage of experienced help they are grimly going ahead with the stupendous task of raising the food for us and our allies with every bit as much courage and anticipation of a hard fight as is shown by their sons and farmhands now fighting at the fronts. His is in civilian service.

The townspeople of Minnesota, under the able leadership of their Governor, have earned the admiration of the farmers of that State for the wholehearted way they have pitched in to help gather the crops. They are preparing to cooperate even more closely this year, and from their example we can see just how things can be done when there is a will to do them.

Let it be inscribed in the record of these townspeople who go out to help their neighbors—the farmers—just how many hours of service they work—of course, for pay—in helping to grow and harvest the food needed so greatly.

The Office of War Information tells us that the Japanese soldier is paid less in a month than the cost of a meal for one of our soldiers. The Japs are fighting a cheap war. They have stolen far more in booty than it has cost them so far. We have lost greatly both at Pearl Harbor, Manila, and elsewhere. If it is a long war with them and at a far less cost to them, then when we do finally lick them we will be so far in debt that we can never overcome it without chaos.

We cannot waste time or allow any effort here at home to be hindered. This summer the farmer will be working 16 hours a day and 7 days a week in order to feed us.

Wouldn't you be proud to have entries in your record to show how you helped him just as willingly as he is preparing to help you and our boys at the front?

The men on our railroads are accomplishing the impossible; our merchant seamen are risking their lives and going back for vengeance. Our telephone and communications people are doing yeoman service with short help and no fixed hours. The men on our air lines are keeping their schedules and pioneering new routes. They are doing a duty, all of them, and well. Their accomplishments should be entered in their records of civilian service, as well as those of so many other professions.

You housewives who struggle under rationing and shortages of foods, who scheme and plan the meals, take care of the homes, and raise the children, all know what a 16-hour day can be. You can be cited for keeping up the morale of our home front and have entries made for the fats you save, the fuel you save, and the money you save for War bonds.

Let the Red Cross have entered on our service records the times we contributed our blood to help save the lives of the boys at the fronts. Let the paymaster at the plant have entered on our service records the fact that we are members of the 10-percent club.

On the negative side it could be recorded when a person exceeded the speed limit in his car or if he were found to be wasteful of his country's resources. If he went on strike and thus jeopardized the war effort, this also should be recorded.

We want records of praise, and I doubt that anyone who really senses just what kind of a struggle that we are in will ever want anything but this kind of an entry to be made. We should all know just who are doing their bit, as well as those who are in it just for themselves.

We could have our record of civilian service be of the same form as the one of the Army. Registering is no chore these days—why not once more for our own "army"?

When I think of how splendidly and efficiently the civilian-defense units were organized throughout our country, and how their tremendous energy lies latent just waiting for a job such as this, I feel certain that we can prove to our boys over at the other ends of the lines of supply that we are trying to do our share for them as they are doing for us.

Yes, I know I have been accused of being the representative of the National Association of Manufacturers, the automotive industry, the America First Committee, and even accused of being a Fascist. Frankly and sincerely, I represent no person or persons, group or groups, color or creed, nor have I any political ambitions. I speak for myself alone, but echo the sentiments of millions.

And again I frankly state that I much prefer to break bread with Henry Ford, the Fisher brothers, the K. T. Kellars, of Chrysler, and the Charlie Ketterings, of General Motors, for here are men who have come from the soil and given the world one of the greatest gifts humanity has ever received in history—the automobile.

Yes, I would rather sit down with these men than with those who are living in the laps of luxury at the expense of the sweat and toil of millions of honest men and women.

Let us give these millions of young men inducted into the uniform of these great United States an opportunity on their return to again join the union of Americanism.

And to Congress I say again—face the facts and show the traditional American intestinal fortitude by legislating this cancerous element from our midst. Why should these racketeers be immune from reporting their incomes or paying taxes on their tributes from the millions? Let us be honest with ourselves first, in order that we may be honest with the millions of young men who are fighting, bleeding, and dying for us on the far-flung battle fronts.

No; I am not a labor hater. I believe in honest labor unions who are doing their darndest to turn out the weapons we need. I have been laboring for forty-odd years, since I was 12 years of age, in many lines of endeavor. I come from humble parents. I know the value of honest labor. I have served labor as well as employer. And to those millions of honest men and women war workers goes my heartfelt thanks; but to those whom the shoe fits, I say wear it.

For believe me when I say there is nothing under the sun that any of you have on the face of this globe that I want, and yet I pray I may have another 10 years of life with my physical and mental faculties, and only God can give me that.

War Relocation Authority

REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of this House to an activity of the War Relocation Authority which has charge of the relocation centers of all people of Japanese blood who were removed from the critical defense areas of the country, notably on the Pacific coast, to points in the interior of the country. Thousands of these Japanese are distributed in 10 internment camps or relocation centers throughout the West.

In one of these camps, the one located at Hart Mountain, Wyo., the War Relocation Authority is in process of constructing buildings and installing therein modern kiln and shop equipment for the making of pottery ware by the Japanese internees.

In my district there are tens of thousands of people engaged in manufacturing pottery. For thousands of them it is the only occupation and skill that they have ever learned. Vast sums of money are invested in plant equipment. This industry is one that, in the most favorable times, has not been able to compete in the markets of the United States with cheap pottery manufactured by the cheap labor of Japan. Japanese pottery has consistently undersold our cheapest pottery made in the United States here in our own American markets. In my previous term in Congress I introduced a number of bills for the protection of the pottery industry; and I shall, during this present session of Congress, reintroduce those measures and perhaps additional measures for the protection of the American market for pottery against the importation of cheap foreign-made pottery.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I find that our own people in the War Relocation Authority are setting up modern potteries at Hart Mountain, Wyo., and perhaps at other Japanese internment camps, in which it is proposed to teach Japanese to make pottery by American methods and with the most modern American equipment. It requires no imagination to see these Japanese, skilled in the American art of making pottery by American methods and American equipment, returning to Japan and adding their skill and knowledge of American methods to the already existing Japanese pottery industry and further adding to our troubles in the post-war period by the skills and training which they have acquired while prisoners in American internment camps.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this policy of the War Relocation Authority the most stupid and ruinous activity imaginable. When will we ever learn in this country that we should keep American markets for the products of American working people, whether it be pottery or any other product? When will we understand that the training of our foreign competitors in American methods of manufacture and production cannot help but be ruinous to our own people?

Mr. Speaker, in the name of the National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, thousands of whom I have the honor to represent in this Congress, I ask that this Congress give immediate attention and take immediate action to prevent the carrying out of this stupid policy of the War Relocation Authority.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House joint resolution, directing the War Relocation Authority to cease and desist from the establishment and operation at relocation centers where enemy aliens, including persons of Japanese blood, are interned, of plants for the manufacture of pottery, and I ask the Congress to give immediate consideration to the passage of this resolution.

National 4–H Mobilization Week Will Be Observed February 6–14

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, National 4–H Mobilization Week will be observed February 6 to 14. The United States Department of Agriculture, the State agricultural colleges, and virtually every county in the Nation has made plans for its observance. The President addressed a message to all 4–H members to spur them on to greater effort during the week and throughout the year. Many civic, professional, and business groups are assisting. In all these preparations a new note has been sounded. It is yet faint, but it is clear. It is a note of alarm that we may have a critical, if not a dangerous, food shortage during the next 12 or 15 months. Many of our young farmers nave been taken for the armed services and many have been attracted by high wages into industry. Who, then, is left with the tremendous task of growing all the food needed by our armed forces, our civilians, our Allies, and the populations being released from the clutches of the international gangsters? You know the answer—those left are the older men, the women, and the young people mostly under 18 years of age.

Secretary Wickard has asked for sizable increases in the production of most staple farm products, and yet there is less machinery and equipment available to do the job. That means less machine work and more hand work. And it means more hands—young hands, trained to be skillful and useful.

The record of production by 4–H members is impressive. Three million bushels of garden products produced in 1942 is a sizable pile of vegetables. I have not figured it out, but if we had to store those 3,000,000 bushels in the Capitol Building I imagine it would tax its facilities. We might get a million bushels in this Chamber, but I doubt it.

With 3,000,000 bushels of vegetables produced in 1942, by doubling 4–H membership, they should grow 6,000,000 bushels in 1943. The 4–H clubs have set a goal for 1,000,000 gardens this year. To give another example, doubling the 14,000,000 jars of products canned in 1942 will give us 28,000,000 jars this year. That will release 14,000 tons of canned food to those not living on farms. And this is but one of 47 projects in which these young people engage and through which they produce thousands of meat and dairy animals and other products. The total results of these efforts in terms of pounds of food produced is tremendous.

But this is not all they do. They render civic services which contribute mightily to our war effort. By collecting scrap metal, rubber, rags, and burlap; eliminating accident and fire hazards; buying and selling war bonds; increasing farm fuel supplies and giving attention to health conservation, they are rendering notable service to the public and to the cause of free men.

There is no doubt but that every Congressman hopes that the 4–H clubs will achieve their 1943 goals. To do this, once the desired membership is enrolled, there is need for adequate leadership and adult supervision. Assistant extension agents are needed in the counties to see this task through. This is just as important to the 4–H organization as officers are to the Army and Navy. To meet this need I have introduced, and your Committee on Agriculture has approved, House Joint Resolution 75. This will come up for your consideration soon—but not too soon. Our need is pressing and we have cause for grave

concern. As representatives of the people, we cannot afford to overlook any means which can be used to increase food production, least of all, a means so promising and proved as the 4–H clubs. And in this process, we will be building young citizens worthy of inheriting and safeguarding the privileges inherent to this blessed Nation of ours.

Auctioneer Goes To Bat for the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the most substantial men of our Midwest describes the plight of the farmer after 10 years of the New Deal. He tells the story in the following letter written in the inimitable language of an auctioneer:

PLYMOUTH, IND.

Hon. ROBERT GRANT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As Representative from my district I take it for granted that you desire to keep in touch with the sentiment of the farmers whom you represent. I also feel that you desire the facts from the farmers themselves rather than from other sources not so reliable.

In all our previous wars it was understood and proven that there was just as big and as essential an organization as the Army and Navy, and this was the farmer. Seven million five hundred thousand men can be placed on all four corners of the world, be furnished the best in equipment, clothes, and ammunition, but they cannot exist out there on an empty stomach, is very simple arithmetic. In my opinion with first call of draftees in the Army and Navy, preparation should have been made then for the farmer to increase his production and to strengthen his help. But what actually happened?

First maneuvering was made to take the Government out of the hands of Congress and place it in the hands of the President with almost unlimited authority. The people accepted this in the emergency as good government. No sooner was this power vested in him than different offices bloomed forth and individual appointments were made, and the farmers still accepted with the thought in mind that this was still for good government until they found that these appointments were being made from a standpoint of political affiliation and not from a standpoint of efficiency.

Defeated candidates have been placed in office as fast as they have been turned down by the people of their own State, at the expense of the taxpayers when we can ill afford the added burden.

Now what has happened to the farmer?

The wheels of selective service were grinding continually, deferment was given college students to complete their education; a scramble was made by those who thought they had some prestige to get appointed to offices so that they might be eligible for deferment. Others with national reputation were injected into the service as officers, musical directors, or physical educators, etc.

Still there is no deferment for the farmer. Why?

In a war physical fitness predominates and the farm boy being in touch with nature, in a hard physical enterprise almost 365 days in the year, can walk from out between the plow handles and with a few fundamentals be ready for service.

These same farmer boys were born and raised on a farm and had taken 20 to 35 years in their education as to how to farm successfully, yet they are treated as though it takes no education to farm and they were placed in the service at the first opportunity.

Older farmers had investments in farms of from 80 to 320 acres or more and had gotten to an age where the responsibilities of the farm were too great for them, so they had turned their farm equipment and livestock over to their sons who added power machinery and even produced more than the fathers, and did it easier.

Now what happened when the boy went to the Army? The aged father and mother held their little family caucus, after bidding the boy good-bye, and did the only thing that was open for them to do; have a public sale and rent out a few fields to pay the taxes, grass the balance, keep the laying hens, one cow, a few shoats for meat, and wait.

When the scrap drive was inaugurated the farmer was called upon to throw all his junk and worn machinery into the drive. This he did with the thought that he could replace it with new. The Government steps in and first curtailed the new machinery and later froze it to the manufacturer. Now the farmer knew the Government should have first call on all steel, so he more than willingly relinquished his claim for new machinery and went out on the open market at the public sales to replenish his machinery.

Now the Office of Price Administration comes out with the most absurd idea ever placed before the farmer; a law to regulate the price of used farm machinery.

Now your father was raised on a farm, and he had some farm sales, as I cried for him, and he will tell you that the farmers are very shrewd when it comes to judging the value of farm machinery as well as livestock. Now, all used machinery the same age is not worth the same money. A tractor in the hands of a man who neglects its lubrication, overloads it beyond its capacity, or leaves it sit out in the field would be worth a whole lot less in 6 months than the same tractor in the hands of a good farmer even as long as 10 years. The same is true with the man who leaves his machinery out under the apple tree all year round and the man with a good machine shed who appreciates it and cares for it.

What man is there in an Office of Price Administration office in Washington that is good enough judge to tell me what my machinery is worth in Plymouth, Ind., without seeing it; and would his judgment be better than a farmer in a public sale looking at it? If I had a 40-inch combine and went to a sale and bid on a 60-inch on account of its size, it would not be worth as much to me as to the man who had no combine whatsoever, because I could get along with the one I have; so demand would also regulate the value.

Now, the farmers feel that the Office of Price Administration will conduct regulation of used farm machinery as the Government has handled the rationing and other things; they will start with tractors, combines, corn pickers, etc., and if the farmer takes it all right they will later include all used machinery and eventually tell them what their milk cows and brood sows are worth.

Now, even if the Government does think the farmer not overintelligent, he knows that this is not done from a standpoint of patriotism, necessity, or good government; but to him it has gotten down to a plain case of guardianship, and the farmer feels that he does not need a guardian.

Congressman, the following are not commands but they are merely suggestions from a man who is close enough to the farmer in everyday life that he can hear his heartbeat.

First. If it were possible, to introduce a bill to again make Congress the governing body of the United States of America as it was since the days of Washington.

Second. Have the Office of Price Administration get some old-fashioned dirt farmers on their Board, not a politican with his picture taken standing beside a Holstein cow with a pair of Oshkosh-b'-gosh overalls on, but the kind with a little plain horse sense and not so much overeducation.

Third. Get some of these boys deferred from the Army and back on the farms by March 1, and do not even entertain a thought that some of this aged, infirm, or inexperienced help is going to keep production up or on the increase. Remember the surplus is gone, and rationing of the 1942 crop starts February 1. The Army and Navy demands are growing by leaps and bounds, and as territory is accumulated on this road to victory we will have all these added mouths to feed, so pray that you may avoid a crisis by helping and not handicapping our great producer of foods, the farmer.

I am 51 years old, and I have never written or suggested anything to a public official, because I had never thought they got much consideration, but I do feel it my duty as a citizen and taxpayer to inform you of these facts because from what I know of you, you have the interest of the people at heart.

I do not write this from a standpoint of prejudice, because in 1932 I thought that some of the principles advocated by the Government were good; but now I think they have been overdone, and this is the opinion of the farmer.

With this letter go my best wishes for your success in business and in health.

Yours very truly,

HAROLD M. STEINER.

Shortage of Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the attached letter, which was written to me by Mrs. Boyd Reid, Torrington, Wyo.

The matter referred to in the said letter is something of vital importance to not only the farmers and ranchers of Wyoming but to the farmers and stockmen of the entire United States. I insert this letter to call attention to the serious shortage of labor on the farms and ranches of Wyoming.

Some plan must be devised whereby boys in the service who are experienced farm and ranch hands can be furloughed to their home communities to assist in planting and harvesting crops and to assist in caring for livestock, at least during the busy season.

The letter follows:

TORRINGTON, WYO., *February 4, 1943.*

Hon. FRANK BARRETT,
Representative from Wyoming,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am asking you, as a representative of our State, to do all you can to aid in recalling our farm boys to aid us in this deplorable farm situation as to labor, to work these farms.

We have seen both of our boys taken, one in the Army and the other riding the Pacific. Mr. Reid, nearly 60 years of age and unable to go on, and me unable to help him, after rearing 7 children. No labor, they just look at you when you try to hire them. Some don't even attempt a reply—the farmer, indeed, is in a perilous situation!

What's to be the answer? What is the Nation to do without food? What are we facing as a Nation, just ordinary citizens of the U. S. A.?

Sincerely,

MRS. BOYD REID.

Government by Bureaucratic Mandate

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, throughout the length and breadth of America, Lincoln's wise sayings and prophecies are being repeated in school and church and public meeting places as we again observe the date of his birth.

By a curious twist of circumstances, a series of administrative orders have flown out of the great political bureaucracy in Washington which are in absolute contradiction of everything that Abraham Lincoln stood for, and which are directed against the very kind of government in which he believed.

Not long ago, Chief Counselor Ginsburg, of the Office of Price Administration, handed down an opinion in which he asserted that the President, under his war powers, could make any regulation he chose, and that, unless the Congress acted affirmatively to nullify the President's order, it would have the full force and effect of law. That was wiping out the Constitution in one stroke. Some time later, a few days ago, on January 27 to be exact, Assistant Solicitor Milton V. Freeman, of the Securities and Exchange Commission, in defending a certain onerous and unnecessary regulation issued by that Commission, concerning the proxy statements of corporations, said of his Commission:

We do make the law. If this order is valid it supersedes any laws opposed to it.

What Mr. Milton V. Freeman was saying was that he believed an agency of the Congress, the Securities and Exchange Commission, could repeal acts of Congress by bureaucratic decree.

Exactly in line with this sort of doctrine, Federal Communications Commissioner Clifford J. Durr, former Assistant General Counsel to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and former General Counsel to the Defense Plants Corporation, recently outlined what he called a new profit system. In it he described a system of what he called "private enterprise not based on private initiative in which the Government would control the capital and would tell industry what and how much of everything it should produce." Then this public official had the amazing effrontery to say that this is necessary in achieving the general objective of "preserving our democracy." Compare these statements and this attitude with the kind of government Abraham Lincoln stood for when he said:

I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruit of his labor so far as it in nowise interferes with any other man's rights.

He also said:

I like the system which lets a man quit when he wants to and wish it might prevail everywhere. One of the reasons why I am opposed to slavery is just here. What is the true condition of the laborer? I take it that it is best for all to leave each man free to acquire property as far as he can. Some will get wealthy. I don't believe in a law to prevent a man from getting rich. It would do more harm than good. So while we do not propose any war upon capital, we do wish to allow the humblest man an equal chance to get rich with everybody else.

That does not sound very much like $25,000 salary limitations, or the taking over by the Government of all authority over industry and the destruction of private initiative and enterprise.

These tendencies away from Lincoln's government by consent of the governed, and toward a bureaucratic absolutism would be dangerous enough if we were at peace and had nothing to distract our attention from the business of meeting these assaults on our free American Government. They are doubly dangerous now because they are being proposed, promoted, and urged while we are engaged in a deadly world war. These radical and dangerous changes are being promulgated under the secrecy and the guise of war measures and war powers.

No patriotic citizen wants to withhold 1 ounce of energy or $1 of money from the necessary effort to win the earliest possible victory, with a minimum loss of life and the fewest injuries to those who survive the battles of this war. On the other hand, we must be on guard against the machinations of those who apparently are bent on utilizing the war emergency to accomplish the planned economy, the bureaucratic control, and the overthrow of our free system of government, our free enterprise economy, and our free society, which some bureaucrats have been planning for the last 10 years.

If this were merely an assumption, it would lack validity, but from the days of Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell, down through the years with Vice President Henry A. Wallace, Dr. Adolf Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State; the 1936 and 1939 revisions of the industrial mobilization plan; President Franklin D. Roosevelt; several of the T. N. E. C. monographs; Dr. Gerhard Colm, fiscal expert in the Bureau of the Budget; Dr. Alvin Hansen, adviser to the Federal Reserve Board; Richard Gilbert, economist in the Department of Commerce; Leon Henderson, former Price Administrator; Milo Perkins, Director of the Board of Economic Warfare; Charles W. Elliott, Director of the National Resources Planning Board; Francis Biddle, United States Attorney General; Eugene Casey, special executive assistant to President Roosevelt; Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; Milton V. Freeman; Clifford J. Durr; Ganson Purcell, and others; there has been an expressed intent, according to a specific plan, to achieve the kind of government, the kind of economic system, and the kind of social system these people have been seeking for the past 10 years.

Such efforts at a time like this are a positive disservice to this Nation. They endanger our war effort. They damage the morale of the Nation. They make the people fearful for the future welfare of this country.

There have been so many of these bold declarations within the last few months, all according to a pattern, that it behooves the American people to be on guard and to demand that the Seventy-eighth Congress erect proper safeguards around our free Government, our free enterprise economy, and our free social system—in other words, that the Congress make itself the vigilant guardian of the Bill of Rights.

Old-Age Assistance and Assistance to the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following senate Concurrent Resolution 9, adopted by the Fiftieth General Assembly of Iowa, memorializing the Congress of the United States to forthwith take such action as may be appropriate to modify and liberalize the Federal social-security laws to permit recipients of old-age assistance and assistance to the blind to receive from personal earnings a sum not exceeding $240 annually for the period of the duration of this Nation's conflict with the Axis Powers, without having the same charged to them or considered in determining need in all such cases:

Whereas the tragedy of a world conflagration is imposing unprecedented financial demand upon the people of the entire Nation, in the form of greatly increased tax levies; and

Whereas the Nation's all-out effort for an overwhelming victory over the Axis Powers will place upon our people from time to time in the months ahead new and increased financial burdens to meet the demands of the war program and insure adequate defense of our Nation and the American way of life; and

Whereas these tremendous financial demands emphasize the need for holding State and local expenditures to the lowest minimum consistent with the public good; and

Whereas rising living costs have greatly enhanced the problem of needy people receiving old-age assistance and assistance to the blind to subsist on the funds that may be reasonably available at this period; and

Whereas the principle of individual self-help is a traditionally American one; and

Whereas the Federal social-security laws do not permit the matching of funds or grants to States unless the State program consider every source of income of the recipient; and

Whereas the present manpower shortage renders it practically impossible for the people to obtain casual labor or to fill jobs of a temporary nature requiring only light work; and

Whereas many recipients of old-age assistance and assistance to the blind are capable of obtaining and performing casual labor or to fill jobs of a temporary nature, and such recipients should be afforded an opportunity to perform such services for the period of the duration of this Nation's conflict with the Axis Powers; and

Whereas it is deemed reasonable that recipients of old-age assistance or assistance to the blind be allowed to receive from personal earnings a sum not exceeding $240 annually, and this income, when received from any source, be disregarded in determining need in all such cases; and

Whereas modification and liberalization of Federal social-security laws is necessary to permit States to include this provision without loss of Federal grants: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Fiftieth General Assembly of Iowa (the House concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to forthwith take such action as may be appropriate to modify and liberalize the Federal social-security laws to permit recipients of old-age assistance and assistance to the blind to receive from personal earnings a sum not exceeding $240 annually for the period of the duration of this Nation's conflict with the Axis Powers, without having the same charged to them or considered in determining need in all such cases; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to forward a certified copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress (Senate and House of Representatives) of the United States from the State of Iowa.

Manpower Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an attached editorial from the Ohio State Journal of February 4, 1943, and earnestly request that the leaders on both sides of the aisle read it and take the necessary action at once.

The editorial follows:

MANPOWER DICTATORSHIP WITHOUT WARRANT OF LAW

Before we travel any farther along the road to total regimentation, Congress would better take its rightful place in our affairs and do a little exploring and, where necessary, correcting. Specifically, it should at once legalize or withdraw the authority Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt has assumed in issuing his "work or fight" edict. It should straighten out this usurper as to the authority he has.

Furthermore, if McNutt, either by law or by usurped power, is going to compel all males between 18 and 38 years to go into the kind of work he designates, else compel draft boards to call them for military service, Congress should make it plain as to whether those who take war jobs are also going to be compelled against their will, their inclinations, and their beliefs to pay "joining fees" to union organizers in order to perform the tasks the Manpower Commission decrees for them.

While exploring these phases of the McNutt edict, it would be well for Congress to ascertain if this swift follow-up of Harry Hopkins' "you will be mobilized" policy, as boldly outlined in a magazine article after the November elections, is the dictatorship that Hopkins said was coming to the American people.

Without questioning the wisdom of McNutt's decree and without disputing the necessity (those are matters quite aside from the point here), it still remains a fact that the Selective Service Act says specifically that men summoned for military service must be called in the order of their dependents. It does not, either by letter or spirit, give McNutt, President Roosevelt, or anybody else the authority to repeal the express provisions concerning dependency, yet that is exactly what McNutt has undertaken in his decree of "work or fight" regardless of dependents.

The proper, democratic, constitutional approach would have been to ask Congress to change the law so as to permit the things McNutt wants to do.

Congress has given the President wide discretionary powers in enforcing the war emergency laws it has passed. But it carefully and certainly refrained from giving him power to repeal or alter these laws. Congress outlined the ends and left with Mr. Roosevelt considerable latitude as to what means would be used to achieve them. But McNutt not only outlines the means, but changes the ends. He has no authority, expressed or implied, so to do.

It is all a bureaucratic scheme, patterned after the methods learned from Stalin and Hitler, to issue a ukase and enforce it speedily with the machinery of the Government, thus having the system in full operation before the bewildered and suppressed people can resort to the courts or impel the legislative body to assert itself.

If an individual is forced by the Manpower Commission to quit a nonessential job and go to work in a war plant, and then he refuses outright to join whatever union may have control in that plant, what will happen? The union naturally will not permit him to work unless he kicks in with his initiation fee, agrees to the pay-check kickback for dues, etc. If he is adamant about refusing to become a union member, will the Commission then compel him to sign up, just as it plans to compel him to change his job, willy-nilly? Or will the Commission notify the union it cannot prevent a man from working because he won't sign on the dotted line? It is to be doubted that the Roosevelt administration would take the side of the individual in any dispute between him and demands that he join the union.

This is not to quarrel with unions or the labor movement. Nevertheless, it is time to recognize the truth that millions of American workers do not want to join unions and resent being compelled to aline themselves with organized labor. These people have rights that ought to be at least equal to the rights of those who do want to join unions. They must not be compelled by Government to sign with union locals if they do not wish so to do.

This is a situation in which Congress ought to assert itself at once, before it is too late. It should arrest McNutt's usurpation of authority, by resolution or whatever means are available, and then define by law what additional powers, if any, should be given the Manpower Commission.

Congress should examine especially McNutt's suspiciously worded deferable classification, "government services, including services necessary for the maintenance of health, safety and morale, and the prosecution of the war," and make amendments which would transfer a third or half of the Washington bureaucracy into the armed forces.

Unless Congress bestirs itself quickly we all might as well accept the fact that we are headed full speed into the military dictatorship promised by White House Boarder Hopkins, the chief of the bureaucratic family created by the New Deal.

Inaugural Address of Hon. Earl Warren, Governor of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Earl Warren was inaugurated as California's chief executive on January 4, 1943. The program for his administration is set forth in an address delivered to a joint session of the senate and assembly in the State capitol at Sacramento. This message is of interest to the entire Nation, and I submit it herewith:

Members of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, we meet here today under conditions which strip the occasion of all gloss and pompous ceremony.

We meet as men and women assembled to undertake an emergency task—a task which for fulfillment will require that adherence to unity of purpose which we find in our fighting men as they respond to the call to their battle stations.

We meet here as representatives of the people of California in an hour of crisis. Hourly, thousands of those whom we represent will be offering their lives to protect our right to meet.

I feel that you legislators sitting before me will rise to a man in seconding the declaration that we must not leave these halls without a record of accomplishment in keeping with need. I know we are in agreement in the abstract thought that we have a patriotic duty to perform. But, more than that, I believe we are in agreement that we must immediately remove all mental barriers and get to work.

Thus, as we assemble at our battle stations, I appear before you not only in compliance with statute but because of an earnest wish to give you an understanding of my own thoughts in regard to our critical problems. I want to work with you. What we undertake and accomplish here during the next few months will radiate an influence upon the present and future well-being of every Californian and will contribute to the strengthening of the position of our Nation, which is, in its entirety, being harnessed to the requirements of unprecedented mechanized global warfare.

The meaning of war—its compulsions, its disruptions, its distortions, and its cold inclemency already shadows our lives and encompasses our thoughts. This Nation is, I repeat, caught in its entirety in the current of global strife. Where the ship of democracy sails we will sail for we are an integral part of the ship. We in California constitute a vital part of the ship structure—the exposed side of the ship at water's edge.

CLEAR THINKING REQUIRED

As representatives of the people of California, we have been entrusted to find ways of gearing the machinery of State government so as both to absorb the shocks imposed by war and to alleviate the severity of post-war uncertainties.

In rising to the abnormal responsibility imposed, it is obvious that we must cut out all the dry rot of petty politics, partisan jockeying, inaction, dictatorial stubbornness and opportunistic thinking. We must seek with singleness of purpose to make use of every fiber of energy that can be tooled to close the niches of weakness which exist and harden the resistance to impacts to come.

There has never been a period in our history when the need for understanding and appreciation of the true concepts of democracy was so important. Nor has there been a session of the California Legislature at which the full use of democratic processes was more imperative.

We are in the midst of an era in which doubt has been cast upon the efficiency of democratic government. We are at war because in another land a power-mad sign painter capitalized upon the distress of a de pressed and confused people to seize dictatorial powers Once mobilized he raised his challenge to free men the world over in the belief that the Achilles heel of free government would be its indecision and slowness to act.

Our fighting men are disproving his false theory on far-flung battle fronts today, but the theory will not be repudiated with finality until a double victory has been achieved. We glory in the caliber of our fighting men, but let it never be considered that they alone are carrying the responsibility of our day. Confronting us here on the home front is an equally imperative challenge—the challenge for perfection of that for which they fight—the broadening of popular understanding, faith, and reliance in the machinery of democracy and its religious ideals.

We gather here in accordance with the democratic principles for which young men from our home towns are manning guns in Tunisia, over north Africa, over Burma, on Guadalcanal, in Iceland, England, over all continents of the world, and on each of the seven seas. We have seen the signs of confusion arise over the slowness of democracies to function. Ours is an opportunity to restore confidence in those who have become distraught and misguided. Ours is an opportunity to strengthen faith in men's ability to work together for the common good.

I would not be here addressing you today if the people of this great State had not made their own analysis of their common problems and ordered a change in administration. They sent you here as legislators and honored me with the governorship for one reason alone—they expect us to work together and produce results. They rely upon our ability to fix our minds upon common objectives which are in their interests and reach achievement in goals through cooperative action.

I share in this reliance. It is one of the reasons I have said many times that the immediate restoration of good will in California will be one of my primary objectives. I want to see State government achieve a balance obtainable only through warm cooperation and courteous consideration. I recognize you, the legislature, as a coordinate branch of democratic government, possessed of the dignity and the right to meet when you desire, and to plan and initiate legislation which is just as much in keeping with the public wish as that which I may suggest. I want to restore and maintain a balance of understanding and confidence which, through mutuality of effort, facilitates action in behalf of the people as a whole.

CALIFORNIANS ARE NOT TIMID

As we approach our respective tasks let me say: This State has never been afraid to be progressive. It has never been afraid to try new things which it understood. I know that you as legislators are responsive to the ideals, principles, and forward outlook which has so pronouncedly dominated California thought, and that you share in the belief of the voters that no clique, no faction, and no party holds priority on all the rights of helping the common man.

I come before you today with a list of suggestions which I consider in need of immediate legislative attention. In making these suggestions, let me say at the outset that I believe we must, in facilitating the war effort, pursue what might be termed a policy of first things first. That which is involved in the war effort must of necessity be given preference.

There has accumulated in California a wide range of subject matter which, broadly interpreted, comes under the heading of "Wartime legislative needs." Some of it calls for remodeling and streamlining existing social and humanitarian endeavors which show the strain of war conditions. Some of it calls for progressive innovations which correct abuses and advance the considerations given those engaged in war effort. Much of it calls for the introduction of broad protective programs which will blossom forth with their peak benefits after the war has ended. And some of it is strictly martial in character, the direct result of our specific position as a theater of war.

The impelling force of your session will be the need for action in compliance with the needs of war. In part, these wartime needs arise from aggravations of long-existing needs among the people. They loom as emergency in character today, but they do so primarily because they have so far failed to win proper evaluation in our long-range planning. Ours is the challenge of so streamlining government that its efficiency meets the need of the day and at the same time moves forward in the recognition of older problems which we see accentuated by war.

In the latter we will meet the test of our knowledge of needs and also the test of our progressivism.

MUST PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH

There has arisen in California, since the conditions of war became so manifest, a tremendous problem involving public health. Long-established cities have found themselves transformed by population shifts into communities with burdens exceeding all previous conception. Even more startling has been the transformation of mere trailer camps into communities faced with the sanitary responsibilities of large cities.

Behind the outward veneer of these remarkable developments lurks a problem which must be given recognition by government. The strain upon sanitary facilities, the arrival of new peoples, and the extra hours of human effort required by war needs join in creating a health problem of undeniable magnitude. As we approach this problem, we must keep in mind the necessity of long-range planning for the day will come when California becomes the funnel through which men, now fighting in strange lands throughout the world, will be returned to normal contacts. The tests of our ability to control and resist disease are destined to increase.

Nor is the broad consideration of the present and future protection of health the only problem accentuated by the rush of war workers to our State and the return of fighting men from disease-infested lands. Among those workers in production in this State are thousands undertaking tasks with which they are unfamiliar—tasks at which they are at first unskilled and without full appreciation of hazards. We must act to protect them, to protect our war production manpower, and to protect our structures which cushion, at least to some degree, the human suffering which is entailed.

NEW PROBLEMS CONFRONT WOMEN

In our efforts to build protective services to the highest point of efficiency we must direct new thought to those unprecedented considerations forced upon us by the emergency participation of women in war effort. We have seen women by the thousands respond patriotically to the call to relieve men needed elsewhere in war activities and, as they have responded, we have recognized the imposition of new strains upon our social structure. We must recognize that women have assumed their emergency burdens at the sacrifice of normal home life, normal family contacts, and also, at the as yet unmeasured risk of impairment of health.

We must survey this field in its entirety to determine the extent to which human values are involved, for numbered among its deeper aspects is the question of stability of family influence. There must be no weakened generation in California chargeable to failure of the State to recognize the strains of this emergency upon either child welfare or sacrifices called for on the part of our women.

While our schools must, of necessity, perform services in connection with the war effort, we must guard against being sidetracked from appreciation of their fundamental purpose. We must remember that the schools are maintained for the training of our youth. Democracy is not a static form of government. It is maintained by constant struggle. Every generation finds a new assault being made against it by new forces with new devices and the struggle for freedom is always the greatest task of the future as it has been throughout the past. The permanence of a democracy will therefore depend upon the training and inspiration provided for its youth.

Nor should we permit the hysteria of wartimes to cause neglect in our responsibility to such of our youth as loses its way in these times of uncertainty. We want a program for child welfare designed to bring out the best in every child.

In this field there lies a neglected opportunity through which we can make a great additional contribution of future welfare. From out of a long experience in law-enforcement work, I have come to feel with certainty that we have been making a wrong approach to our crime problem. I am convinced we must revise our programs so that the emphasis is placed upon prevention instead of suppression. If we can bring our juvenile courts, our trial courts, our law-enforcement agencies, and our penal institutions into harmony with such an approach, I am confident we will have made a definite contribution to our future welfare.

We have, I feel, already agreed upon the necessity of expanding the influence of the California Youth Correction Authority. I visualize such transfers and consolidations of existing agencies as will streamline, under this authority, all services in the interests of youth in dire need of a helping hand. In broader aspect, I visualize adherence to a policy in all Government activities which reflects a sincere desire to help men, women, and children to develop and unfold the best that is within them—something that can never be done under a policy which places reliance almost entirely upon crime suppression.

PENAL REFORM NECESSARY

In our efforts to rehabilitate those whose missteps in adult life have led to State assumption of responsibility, I want to take every bit of politics out of the parole system and the pardoning power. I shall appoint to

the board of prison terms and paroles only men of character, experience, and a healthy normal approach to our prison problems. We must make certain that those who are paying their debt to society are not ground further into the mire by the pressure of the cruel heel of politics.

People—men, women, and children—cannot develop the best that is within them without doing useful work. Our practice of matter-of-fact confinement of people without affording them, through work, an outlet for body and mental energy is wholly wrong. I want to stimulate the employment of all people in our penal institutions. I want to see them engaged in activities which develop their bodies and spur their desire to be restored to society.

I shall later ask you to consider a new approach to the parole problem. There lies within most men who have been removed from ordinary contact with society a desire to prove their right to the confidence of their fellow man. Procedure could be established under which these men could be restored to community life and permitted, through rightful living, to earn pardon recognition from the courts in the community in which they have demonstrated a right to such consideration.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

As we approach the serious emergency problems which have arisen as a result of the war, I want to express the hope that there can be developed a new correlation between the efforts of cities, counties, and State agencies. I believe that the very essence of democracy is the right of people to govern themselves, and this starts in local communities. Our State administration must be responsive to the needs of the people, and it must counsel with and be ever regardful of the thoughts of smaller units of government. I say this because I believe it to be fundamental. People retain their interest in government only as they are encouraged to participate in it, and it is in local government that we find the greatest opportunity for participation and, therefore, the greatest reflection of public will.

MANPOWER UTILIZATION

We must, in our State government, increase the flexibility of all agencies which are not yet fully participating in the war effort and break down those barriers which retard decision and action. In accomplishing this we will be doing no more than accepting the responsibility of leadership which is expected. We face no greater immediate challenge than to turn loose the full power of State energy in search of solutions for which farm, industrial, and labor groups are now groping as they strive to meet unprecedented production demands.

We have desperate need at the moment of advancing in the solution of our critical farm-labor problem. Our contribution to the better utilization of such manpower as is available will come only after study of the participation that can be expected of our men, women, and children and of possible supplemental labor from sources developed in cooperation with the Federal Government. We must make certain that this study is not prolonged beyond the present brief seasonal respite from peak demand.

Our State has mushroomed in industrial growth and at the same time made heavy contributions to the armed forces. Proper emergency utilization of all labor otherwise available is becoming a matter, not only of State, but of National concern. It rises as a problem which we must recognize as far too serious to be hampered by false conceptions or the delays of red tape.

Supplementing this urgent consideration of manpower utilization there must be launched a companion study of post-war utilization. Patriotic duty is now causing dislocations which will later sorely test our recuperative powers. Yet, I hold that it is possible to plan now in a manner which will add to our strength when these post-war tests occur.

CALIFORNIA OF THE FUTURE

The California I visualize after the war is not one which we have so far known. It is a greater California—a California which has recognized its resources and opportunities and made them ready for peacetime utilization.

There have been introduced into California during recent months vast shipbuilding, aircraft, and war-material industries which came here, not as a result of normal competitive advantages, but as a result of nationally directed war effort. Regardless of how they came, they are shaping the destiny of our State and changing our economy. Whether these sources of manpower utilization and productive energy remain with us after the war will depend, in a large measure, upon our appreciation of opportunity.

If we are to move forward rapidly after the war we must do those things required to attract and hold these and other industries in competition with the rest of the world. To hold them we must make for ourselves every advantage which our geographical position, our climate, the rich deposits in our hills, and our many other resources permit. We must probe beneath the surface and exploit those advantages which have heretofore been but vaguely recognized.

Proper development of these and other resources will inescapably call for new considerations in connection with highway planning. Here again is an activity of State government which I hope can be raised to a scientific level far above the hindrances of petty politics. In substitute for a wholly political highway commission, I believe there should be set up a division of highways which will utilize in the full the research and planning done by our capable State engineers.

Ours is the task of so planning the conservation and development of our resources that industry feeds upon them for its own peacetime recovery and in so doing increases the utilization of our manpower. In pursuance of this task we will be adhering to what I believe to be a fundamental principle of democratic government—the encouragement of free enterprise in a manner which benefits the people as a whole. I hold to the conviction that government and industry share joint obligation in this connection. It is the obligation to so plan and organize that our people have assurance of security and adequate return for services rendered—the opportunity to work.

As safeguards against extremes which may cause a lag in the full realization of our peacetime development, I urge the preparation of a manpower utilization program which can serve to take up the slack. We must avoid a return to the dole. We must set ourselves to the scientific preparation of a backlog of construction projects which coordinate in purpose and service the physical improvement of our State and the bolstering of morale through beneficial utilization of surplus manpower.

PENSION STUDY PLANNED

In supplement to these studies, it is my hope that a way can be found of improving the lot of our elder citizens through the broadening of our approach to the pension problem. They are the first to suffer in periods of labor surplus and the last to receive the benefits of industrial activity. They are therefore entitled to our consideration.

It is my conviction that our pension system should not be based upon the requirement of pauperism. I want it to be based upon social right. I believe, as most of you believe, that the ultimate solution of the pension problem will come through advances made on a national scale. Yet we should not permit this thought to delay our own efforts to build and maintain a pension structure within the limits of our ability to pay.

No sound contribution can be made by us in the advancement of our own and national thinking on the pension problem without removing the issue from the field of politics and propaganda. There must be a correlation of all sincere thinking on the subject in order that we may move in unison toward the most practical goal obtainable. In furtherance of this thought, I am preparing to appoint a representative committee whose duty it shall be to examine the entire problem and prepare a basic report for your immediate consideration.

REORGANIZE CIVILIAN DEFENSE

California is caught not only in the economic grasp of these uncertain times but faces specific uncertainties arising from actual military conflict. We reside in a theater of war. State leadership has no patriotic alternative but to assume responsibility for assisting all agencies in the protection of life, home, and property.

We must guard against the emotional fluctuations produced by daily variances in the news of the war and proceed to place government in a position to perform with promptness and thoroughness all emergency services which may be required. We must offer the people a positive type of leadership—one backed with authority to act and advise—one which invites full public cooperation and confidence.

In making an approach to the reorganization of procedures surrounding our civilian defense efforts, we are all aware that there must, in the interests of speed and complete efficiency, be some further emergency power and authority in the State government. In this connection, however, I would want you, as legislators, to satisfy yourselves in full measure that the innovations adopted will not destroy that fine balance between the executive and legislative processes which our National and State Constitutions contemplate.

There must be a new analysis made of the general scheme of civilian defense and law enforcement and it must be made with new conceptions of the need for closely knit action on the part of all city, county, State, national, and volunteer agencies. We must achieve a new balance of responsibility and cooperation between State and local governments.

It is my intention to treat the entire subject of civilian defense more fully in a special message to the legislature and ask that you give its proposals your earliest consideration. It will be my request that you reexamine the entire civilian defense structure in a cooperative effort to clarify, revitalize, and complete our emergency protections.

It shall be my purpose to afford you the benefit of factual information developed in separate studies encouraged by my office and to urge your consultation with many men and women whom I have found possess broad understanding of specific phases of the problem. I take occasion now to commend to you the efforts of the officers and men of the State guard who have labored under difficulties to build and maintain that important branch of protective service. Nor should words of encouragement be omitted for that body of citizenry which has shown a patriotic willingness to mobilize for auxiliary law enforcement and other war services in home communities.

MUST PROTECT STATE SURPLUS

California is now favored with a sizable surplus. It has come to us very largely from taxes upon war industry. It comes to us in

trust, for it is the money of all the people of California.

This surplus, by its very existence, constitutes a constant temptation to everyone to spend it just because it is there. Everyone sees, according to his own rights, a way, a place and a need for spending it and in some instances even for purposes that have never before been considered State purposes.

I hold to the conviction that this money must be lifted above the dissipating reach of grab-bag tactics. If we yield to such temptations, this surplus will soon be transformed into a deficit by processes which will result in an actual denial of the interests of the people as a whole. I want to see this money either committed for essential State projects or conserved. It is my firm belief that we must use this money for the war effort which produced it and for essential services of government or conserve it faithfully for purposes which will relieve the distress which inevitably follows wars.

BUDGET-MAKING POLICIES

Later this month there will be presented, for your analysis, the administration recommendation in regard to budgetary allotments. I can say to you now that the principle under which this budget is being prepared grants recognition to the times, both in proposed curtailment of expenditures unrelated to war effort and in extra allowance to efforts which can be made the forerunners of better times for our people when the war has ended. We will make provision, not only for war needs but also for the humanitarian services which will keep our structure strong.

We are undertaking moves toward general economy at a time when our tax structure is producing revenue in surplus amounts. It follows, therefore, that we must, in the interests of already burdened taxpayers, proceed immediately to the examination of possibilities for tax reduction.

It is my belief that taxes can be reduced. In evaluating our financial position, however, I see danger signs which we cannot afford to ignore to the point of extreme action. We must bear in mind that the conditions which have created our favorable revenue balance are of a highly transient nature and of a type likely to leave a swell of new problems in their wake. It is not wise, under such circumstances, to blindly trade tax stability for temporary advantage.

It is my intention to render all service and assistance possible to the legislature as it examines the opportunities for altering and reducing our revenue claims upon the people. In an effort to expedite the development of factual information, I am preparing to appoint a committee of representative citizens which will be charged with the responsibility of submitting recommendations for general consideration. I am proceeding in this manner in the belief that there is need for full discussion of all phases of the problem. It is a practice I shall follow whenever possible in dealing with difficult problems, for it is predicated upon my belief that democracy thrives best when it encourages the suggestions of all.

CIVIL SERVICE NEEDS PROTECTION

No State administration can rise above the standards of public service which it maintains. In California we have endeavored to elevate and fix the standards of personnel through a comprehensive system of civil service. The provisions of our Constitution and the statutes on the subject entitle us to a position of leadership throughout the Nation.

There is a general consciousness today that the administration of these laws has, in recent years, been such that the entire structure of civil service is in danger. The situation is not the fault of civil-service employees themselves, for they have been zealous in trying to guard and respect the protections afforded them. It is the direct result of the brazen application of political pressure upon them. Such tactics must cease immediately. Civil service must be restored to its rightful place where the applicant for public service obtains a position through honest competition and merit and retains that position because of merit.

One cannot probe, within the limitations of a single speech, into all the problems which lie before us, and it is not my purpose here to do so. It is my sincere hope that, through warm association and frequent exchanges of ideas, we can advance together in the solution of our common problems.

We meet at a time when the full might of our energy must be loosed to help rid the world of evil aggression which is ravenously feeding upon the rights of freemen. Ours is the responsibility of organizing State efficiency in every direction which will help speed the military conclusion of the conflict.

Paralleling this endeavor must be the assumption of responsibility for preventing the backlash of emergency disruptions from undermining confidence in the structure of democracy itself. Our stake in the struggle is both the prevention of the eclipse of our right to improve our way of life and the prevention of the destruction of the way of life itself.

This is an era of crisis. Christianity itself will wander homeless over the world unless we fight for the right to harbor it in open covenant in our hearts and keep its light reflecting through our social, economic, and political undertakings. These are times when the requisites for courage and cool deliberate action press upon us in inseparable demand. These are times when the formula of government must be derived from the deepest conceptions within men's hearts.

It is with this consciousness and with the determination to make our State administration serve all the people that I assume my duties as Governor of California.

EARL WARREN,
Governor of California.

Washington Foolishness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which was published in the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, under date of February 5, 1943:

WASHINGTON FOOLISHNESS

Robert Patterson, Under Secretary of War, is credited in a Washington dispatch with saying that the Army wants to seize 7,000,000 of the 27,000,000 automobiles now in civilian use in the Nation.

Let us hope Mr. Patterson didn't say it. Or, if he did say it, he has since changed his mind.

What in the hell could the Army possibly do with 7,000,000 second-hand automobiles?

The entire Army now numbers only 7,500,000 men.

It is the idea of some nit-wits among the brass hats of the service that each soldier should have an automobile.

Insofar as equipment is concerned, the Army is getting all the new automobiles it needs, direct from manufacturers. There is no shortage of transportation in our armed forces now in training.

Best way to dismiss such an absurd proposal is that somebody blew off prematurely at the face.

Federal Bureau of Investigation Furnishes Information Showing Winchell To Be a Disseminator of Falsehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert herewith an item from the New York Herald Tribune of February 9, 1943:

WINCHELL'S "TRAP" STORY IS REPUDIATED BY FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION—UNITED STATES GAVE OUT NO FALSE RUMORS ON ROOSEVELT TRIP

WASHINGTON, February 8.—The Federal Bureau of Investigation vehemently denied all knowledge today of a report which originated in London and was revived again last night in a New York radio broadcast to the effect that 22 persons—some of them high in Government circles—had been trapped when they relayed a message to Germany that President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill were meeting in Canada.

According to the stories, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in an effort to stop a "leak" in Washington, put out a purposely misleading story at the time of the Casablanca conferences that the President and Prime Minister were meeting in Canada. The idea apparently was to see whether and how quickly this false story would reach Germany, and to apprehend, if possible, the persons who sent the message. Less than 24 hours later, according to the story, the German shortwave radio announced the false news of the Canadian meeting, and as a result the men involved were trapped.

A spokesman for J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, was ready to answer questions about the story today. He began by saying that he had been answering them all throughout last night since the radio broadcast of Walter Winchell, columnist for the Daily Mirror of New York, had revived the reports.

The spokesman said there was no false rumor circulated, there were no men taken into custody by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And further "the Federal Bureau of Investigation knows nothing about this particular case."

Efforts to check the War Department's G–2 (Army Intelligence) as to the veracity of the report likewise proved unavailing. However, the War Department facetiously suggested that "since Mr. Winchell is a commodore of some sort, you'd better contact the Navy."

Navy Department officials said they knew nothing of the matter, and the next suggestion was that the Federal Bureau of Investigation be contacted "since everyone knows J. Edgar Hoover feeds such stuff to Mr. Winchell." Apprised of this, the Hoover spokesman heatedly denied that Mr. Hoover feeds out anything to anyone.

Spirit of Sacrifice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 5, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, those who complain these days about the small inconveniences and hardships they are asked to bear should read this account of the real American attitude of sacrifice. Dana Milligan lost his son in the service of his country. He wrote a personal note to Alfred D. Mynders, editor of the Chattanooga Times, which Mr. Mynders asked and was given permission to use in his column, Next to the News, on January 26, 1943. The letter, preceded by Mr. Mynders' comment, follows:

Home they brought the warrior dead. And Lt. Jimmie Milligan, 19, from a pioneer Chattanooga family, was buried in the National Cemetery Saturday, while members of his graduating class at City High School acted as pallbearers. The youngest son of Dana Milligan and the late Mrs. Florence Chaplin Milligan was killed in a crash of a Flying Fortress in New Mexico. Next to the News has never printed anything so poignantly combining sorrow and pride, and so truly representative of the old-fashioned Tennessee love of country, as the following comment by Mr. Dana Milligan, father of the Army flier who died for his country while on the threshold of vigorous manhood.

Here is an American father's patriotic tribute to the son he has just given to his country:

"It is difficult to contemplate the future without James. He has been part of life for more than 19 years. It is like an amputation to carve out and set aside his part.

"But there is something fine that keeps crowding through the sorrow and pushing grief aside. Jimmie died with his boots on; happy in the thing he liked best; flying a ship he loved, with the shipmates he admired and respected. He was a good soldier and, although not a victim of enemy action, his death is not without glory. He was a Christian soldier on duty, in the service of his own country, in a righteous, humanitarian cause.

"James realized his danger. Notice of his death found his mother reading the letter in which he set straight his small business affairs 'just in case I get it,' he said. It was a sweet letter expressing his appreciation of and his gratitude for 'all you have done for me' to the mother who has given to James and his two older brothers the best of her youth. 'Mom' is proud of that letter as she is proud of James and Dan and Buddy.

"Looking back over the years we find nothing to regret. There is nothing we would have had otherwise. He was a happy, laughing, intelligent boy, overflowing with life and enjoying every minute of it. But he cheerfully risked losing that life to take his rightful place and do his part. He will have his reward.

"By reason of the crash of his fortress the realities of war came into the homes of 11 families. So they have come into thousands of homes all over America and so they will come into many thousands more. We are only beginning to evaluate life in America; only beginning to realize what price our young men are willing to pay to preserve it for us, and by their sacrifices we will come to find our own parts and places for total war and final victory. As the gift of benevolent providence our way of life has not impressed us as a thing of great value. As we pay a high price for it, it will become very dear to us.

"All of Jimmie's family are grateful to all of our friends who have done so much for our comfort and peace of mind in these last few days. I am especially grateful to all those who, through the year, have contributed to Jimmie's happiness and who have done so much to help him ripen into fine, full manhood before his normal time.

"His mother, first and most of all, has carried the light for a son she did not bear. To 'Mom,' to the teachers in schools and churches, to Major Byington, and his fellows of Reserve Officers' Training Corps, to friends and classmates and to the officers and men of the Army Air Corps, a father who has been much absent from home, says 'Thank you.' I am proud of and pleased with what you have made of my son.

"DANA MILLIGAN."

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include the following from Mr. Mynders' column:

Jimmy Witt, son of Attorney General and Mrs. R. Beecher Witt, of Madisonville, last year went away to the Army. Busy as he is, he takes time out to send a letter to his pal, a dog he left behind. Here is the letter:

"To Spot, my favorite dog:

"Old boy, I guess by now the sharp scent of quail must be drifting in from the frost-covered fields and the naked forest. You must be nearly frantic with eagerness—you have forgotten the bones hidden in the garden and the cats at the barn. You are dreaming of the field, the roar of a flushed covey, the crack of a gun, and the pat on the head.

"I am sorry I can't be with you, I wish I could trade this gun for the shotgun in the corner, but you see this is a different kind of hunt—the biggest ever, I guess.

"I had to go on this hunt without you, Spot, but I promise when it is over we'll hunt from dawn till dark, we'll go often to our special place, that deep wild valley where we found so many birds.

"Spot, this hunt is to make the world a safe place for dogs like you and fellows like me.

"Until it is over you can keep mother and daddy company, cheer them up when they are blue. You can find some birds for Dad and as a secret between me and you, make out like you want to hunt with him, but I will know you are longing for me.

"Your pal,

"JIMMY."

Draft Deferments for Dependency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of last week the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, Mr. Paul V. McNutt, issued an order the effect of which is to completely abolish draft deferments for dependency. Even men with children are not excluded from the order. On the theory that it is necessary to transfer men from nonessential to essential work, workers are to be given until April 1 to find "essential" positions although the time may be extended an additional 30 days if such men have registered with the United States Employment Service for a job transfer. A list which is included in the order embraced 19 manufacturing, 18 wholesale and retail trades, and 9 service activities. Twenty-nine job occupations are listed as "nondeferable regardless of the activity in which they are found," and Mr. McNutt informed the country that the list is "just the beginning."

If this order did nothing more than class certain types of business or occupations as nonessential it would be in keeping with a policy which has been in effect for some time, for ever since draft boards have been in existence they have been required to defer men for occupational reasons. Each case, however, has been considered on its individual merits. Men in essential occupations have been deferred only upon a showing that they are of more value to the country in industry than they would be in the armed services.

While Congress has not specifically provided that dependency shall be a ground for deferment, Congress nevertheless recognized dependency as a particular reason for deferment. In Public Law 625—Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 23, 1942—the President was authorized—

under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes.

With one edict the Manpower Commission undertakes to nullify the expressed intent of Congress. Within 60 days its order will drive from every business and occupation which it designates every man between the ages of 18 and 38, irrespective of the number of persons dependent upon him and regardless of the extent of his financial obligations.

It is not difficult to comprehend some of the possibilities of this sweeping decree. The effect upon the business and economic life of the Nation is incalculable. Some men may not be able to find employment in defense plants. Others may not be suited for the kind of work which is available. There may be no labor problems or no war industries at all in certain areas. Men living there must necessarily move to other localities regardless of the expense involved. Many married men with dependents have fixed financial obligations by way of mortgages or otherwise on their homes or their business which may be impossible to meet if present employment is terminated. No businessman will know when his business may be declared nonessential, nor will his employees know when they may be ordered to seek employment elsewhere. Firms already suffering from labor shortages will be confronted with even greater shortages. The magnitude of the order is apparent from the statement of manpower officials that their purpose is to shift 3,200,000 men from so-

called nonessential to essential work in 1943. The necessity for preserving private industry, even though classed as nonessential, has either been overlooked or ignored, despite the tax burden which all business must assume in order to carry on the war and despite the obligation of private enterprise to provide employment during the post-war period.

An examination of the statutes will clearly disclose that Congress at no time either expressly or by implication conferred upon any person or bureau the power which the War Manpower Commission has assumed to exercise.

The Selective Service Act provided for the selection and training of men for the armed services of the Nation. Neither in the original act nor in any amendment thereto did Congress attempt to authorize the conscription of manpower for industry. The President was authorized to set up a selective-service system and to issue rules and regulations for the selection and training of men for service in the land and naval forces of the United States. He was likewise authorized to defer men from such service for occupational or other reasons, but the law specifically provided—Public Law 625, Seventy-seventh Congress, title II, June 23, 1942—that "no deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual," clearly meaning that draft boards shall be required to pass upon the facts and circumstances in each case. This is made even more clear by the language which follows that just quoted, namely, "and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution."

Mr. McNutt's order, therefore, violates not only the intent but the declared word of Congress. It is a striking illustration of bureaucratic usurpation of legislative authority and Congress should act promptly to correct it. In this instance it cannot be contended that the War Manpower Commission has acted by virtue of authority delegated by Congress under the War Powers Act. The first War Powers Act became effective on December 18, 1941, while the second was approved on March 27, 1942, both before the specific prohibition of Public Law 625 above referred to. If it is necessary that the manpower of the Nation be drafted for industry, the American people will patriotically submit, provided the order is made by Congress, when and if Congress is convinced of its necessity.

Let's Not Bypass the Postal Employee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, every day we read some statement or editorial comment favoring and advocating an increase in pay for the postal employee. At the same time the almost unanimous sentiment of Congress favors such a proposal. But what does the Seventy-eighth Congress expect to do about it? The Seventy-seventh Congress talked for the postal employee and sympathized with him but did nothing for him. He cannot live on sympathy. The postal employee still receives pay based on the 1925 established levels. How can he expect to live decently and maintain his family with rising living costs that have reached staggering proportions in 1943? While we are preaching the four freedoms to the people of the world—let us not bypass the postal employee of the United States. He cannot agitate—he cannot strike for better pay—he must patiently appeal to Congress. This Congress has played fair with our soldiers on the battle front. Let us be just as equitable with the postal employee—the front-line soldier in the campaign of communications. The Pittsburgh Central Labor Union has been constantly advocating better pay for the postal employee and I include in my remarks a letter and resolution adopted by them on January 21, 1943:

PITTSBURGH CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
Pittsburgh, Pa., January 21, 1943.

Hon. SAMUEL A. WEISS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At a meeting of the Pittsburgh Central Labor Union held at Pittsburgh, Pa., on January 21, 1943, the following resolution was adopted by unanimous vote.

Postal workers have not received a salary increase since the passage of the Kelly bill, made effective January 1, 1925. In 1932 each postal employee was furloughed 1 month without pay. In 1933, by the passage of the economy act, their salaries were reduced 15 percent, or $315 per year. In succeeding years this act was repealed; 10 percent retrieved in one session of Congress and 5 percent in a later one; and

Whereas postal salaries stand today exactly where they stood more than 18 years ago. The War Labor Board, after finding that the cost of life had risen 15 percent by January 1, 1941, allowed a 15-percent wage increase in all cases adjudicated by their Board. However, since all decisions rendered were those of strikes, walkouts, or other threatened work stoppages, postal employees were bypassed; and

Whereas we as citizens of this Republic have an abiding interest in postal workers; our own employees. Their loyalty, patriotism, and efficiency are beyond question. They are not permitted to strike nor engage, actively, in politics. The increased and increasing cost of life is ample justification for a wage increase at this time, in common with workers in private industry; and

Whereas Senator JAMES M. MEAD, of New York, has introduced in the Senate S. 360, and Congressman GEORGE D. O'BRIEN of Michigan, an identical bill, H. R. 1366, in the House of Representatives, which provide a bonus of $300 per year to each postal employee for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter. The measure of increase allowed by the Mead-O'Brien bill is less than 15 percent above the salary now in effect fixed more than 18 years ago; and

Whereas we, recognizing the soundness and justice of this modest proposal, realizing that their appeal must be made to Congress through the people as a whole; that in order to meet the mounting living expenses prevalent in wartime, added income is required; that this measure is fair alike to the Government and the worker, and will help to maintain the present high standard of efficiency in the Postal System: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we earnestly request your vote and active support for S. 360 and H. R. 1366, otherwise known as the Mead-O'Brien bill, to the end that justice may be done to this large body of steady, industrious, and capable governmental workers.

Sincerely,

M. J. DORSEY, *President.*
JOHN A. STACKHOUSE,
Secretary.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune of February 6, 1943:

Next to winning the war and making a decent peace there is no problem so close to the lives of Americans as our system of taxation. The present system is an old contraption which has been strung together from time to time in the manner of a rambling house to which one room at a time has been added so that now it stretches all over the landscape with the rooms having little relationship to each other.

The only sensible suggestion about taxation in years has been made by Beardsley Ruml but it seems too sensible for the Treasury Department and some Congressmen. Everyone knows that one of the chief faults with our Federal income tax is that it is levied on the past year's income. In a sense we are paying for a dead horse.

We did not save enough out of last year's income to pay the income-tax payments which will become due in March, June, September, and December so we take those payments out of the money we earn this year. When we die our estate may owe more to the Government for last year's taxes than it can pay or our income this year may be much less than last year's income with the result that we cannot pay last year's tax.

It is not a good arrangement for anyone concerned and Mr. Ruml has suggested a simple way out of the difficulty. He wants to forget and forgive the 1942 taxes and start paying in March the taxes due on 1943 income. As far as possible it would be collected at the source so that when a man drew his pay it would be net pay and not subject to further demands from the Government.

By the use of this method there would be no question about the ability of everyone to pay his taxes and there would be no question about the ability of the Government to collect them. Indeed, one wonders why this plan was not put into effect when the income tax law was passed back in 1913. As far as the total sum levied is concerned it makes little difference whether last year or this year is used as the basis for current payments, but it makes a tremendous lot of difference to the individuals making the payments.

Mr. Ruml and the statisticians who have been working with him on this plan are convinced the Treasury will collect more taxes by this plan than by the one now in effect. Yet Congressman DOUGHTON, chairman of the

committee studying the problem, asks why if this plan would improve the financial well-being of the Government Ruml did not sell the idea to all business people and have them cancel debts of their customers.

If that is the type of mind which determines our tax plan it is no wonder it is such a hodgepodge, for there is no possible connection between the ideas of the Government changing the base year for taxation and businessmen canceling their debts.

It is true some people have saved up money for the purpose of paying their taxes but they are only a fraction of the public. Although the Treasury says it fears they will spend this money and add to inflation it is not likely such foresighted individuals would spend that money for anything they did not need.

As a matter of fact what the Treasury seems to be interested in is using the Ruml idea to force taxpayers to pay double taxes this year. One might expect this of the Treasury which is usually trying to put over some smart tax plan concealing an ulterior motive.

Why not be straightforward about taxation and not transform it from simplicity to complexity? Taxes must be increased and they will be increased. Let it be done in the light so that everyone can understand what is being done and why. Nobody is kicking about high taxes but people do want the problem made as simple as possible and the payments set so that they can be made when the money on which they are levied is available.

Why make tax paying difficult by making payment demands after the money has been spent? This problem affects almost every family, and Congress must not make their problem more difficult than is necessary.

House Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted by the directors of the National Automobile Dealers' Association, at their annual meeting held in Cincinnati, Ohio, January 19, 20, and 21, 1943, as follows:

The House Small Business Committee has been of invaluable assistance during the last year in helping save the local transportation service of the Nation as rendered by passenger automobiles. At a time when it appeared that local service of the retail automobile dealers would be eliminated nationally, members of this great committee moved resolutely to the aid of automobile owners and dealers throughout the United States. With sympathy and understanding, the committee first explored all causes of dealer difficulties. It then launched a public hearing which set a new record for attendance and enthusiasm on Capitol Hill. Once possessed of the facts in the situation, the committee helped draft and vigorously endorsed the Murray-Patman bill and later supported it in the Banking and Currency Committee and on the floor. The act proved the salvation of dealers in every State. The House Small Business Committee also assisted materially in the legislative correction of the purchase price of new automobiles by the Federal Government.

The House soon will be called upon to determine whether the Small Business Committee shall be reappointed. It is the firm conviction of the National Automobile Dealers' Association that this committee is performing an outstanding service not only to motor-car owners and automobile dealers but to the Nation generally: Therefore be it

Resolved by the National Automobile Dealers' Association, That this organization commend the past work of the House Small Business Committee and urges that it be reappointed without delay and granted sufficient funds to continue to carry on its important work.

Lend-Lease Aid to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit an item of information which, while it will bring no aid or comfort to the enemy, should be brought to the fore at this time as a source of inspiration to ourselves.

The key city of Rostov, where the gate to the Caucasus swings two ways, has just fallen. With the loss of that means of egress for her huge southwestern forces, Nazi Germany is brought face to face with the greatest military disaster of the war to date. Not a knock-out blow, but a punch stiff enough to send the paperhangers of Berlin hanging crepe paper.

With our ally, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, we rejoice in this victory, and I think it is time to remind ourselves that we have not been idle spectators. Part of the "superior forces," as the Germans have described the thing they came up against at Stalingrad, and which has been coming up against them ever since at points west—part of that superior force consists of American tanks and American planes.

Under unanimous consent of the House, I insert in the RECORD, as an extension of these remarks, an editorial from the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, issue of January 21, 1943, by George Cottingham, one of Texas' most outstanding and progressive editors:

Announcement that United States lend-lease shipments to Russia include 3,200 tanks, 2,600 planes, and 81,000 military vehicles goes a long way toward answering two questions that many persons have been asking themselves. The first is, How much of our huge and growing arms production is going to Russia; the second is, Where are the Russians getting the evidently enormous masses of war matériel they are using in several major offensives at the same time, when much of their own productive area has been occupied by the enemy?

In making his announcement, Edward R. Stettinius, Lend-Lease Administrator, employed an understatement when he said "lend-lease aid to Russia is growing to a sizable proportion." Those figures embrace a lot of offensive power. That many tanks, planes, and military vehicles may well be the factor that has given the Russians the military edge on their adversaries.

November's shipments, Mr. Stettinius said, were 13 times as great as last January's. The percentage of military items by that time had grown to two-thirds, the remainder representing industrial materials and food. Large quantities of the latter are being sent to Russia, along with the expanding shipments of arms; in fact, this country now is sending more food to Russia than to the United Kingdom. Surely our Russian allies will have no reason to complain that they are being slighted in this respect, since ordinarily Russia is more than self-sustaining in food production while Britain is never self-sufficient in that regard.

Still, the shipments are not enough, the Lend-Lease Administrator said, nor are they as heavy as they will be. Some naturally have been lost en route. Shipments "are continuing to increase in spite of the shortage of shipping and enemy attacks along the difficult supply routes to Russia."

Mr. Stettinius added that Britain has sent more than 2,600 tanks and more than 2,000 planes to Russia. In total these figures add up to more than 5,800 tanks and more than 4,600 airplanes sent to aid the Soviet armies. If no more than two-thirds arrived there the Russians have received a tremendous volume of the most modern weapons of war to hurl at the enemy.

One other fact of interest the Administrator revealed is this: Plane shipments to Russia were larger than to any other theater of war—and that means the United Kingdom, north Africa, the Near East, India, and the southwest Pacific.

Problems Affecting Farm Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CHATHAM, ILL., *January 31, 1943.*

Congressman EVAN HOWELL,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOWELL: We, as farmers of your locality, are appealing to you in the interest of our country to use your influence to help remedy a serious situation.

First of all, we want you to know the machinery proposition is very serious. If we are to produce what we are asked, we must have necessary equipment, especially new tractors and repairs. Sangamon County is allotted approximately 1 new tractor to each township, as you know, 23,000 acres. In normal times there are probably 15 to 20 new tractors each year to each township. In a crisis it is absolutely imperative that there be more new tractors and repairs available.

Second, gasoline rationing. We farm 400 acres, have no truck, and have received a "B" card. We appealed for more gasoline over 6 weeks ago, but to date have heard nothing. Our "B" card barely accommodates us in winter months, and we don't need to tell you how much more important the summer months are for the farmer. May we say we have not seen a movie or play since gas rationing, and have refused party invitations. We don't complain; just to let you know we don't use gasoline unless necessary.

Thirdly, labor. Most farmers are seriously handicapped by lack of experienced help.

Farmers cannot compete with the 40-hour week and high wages offered defense workers. We work full time—and are glad to, if we can only win this war.

The farmers are already getting unjust blame. In order to produce we need—absolutely need—equipment, fuel, and capable help.

Mr. HOWELL, we realize this is an old story to you and you must tire of it all. But, as Congressman of this district, we appreciate sincerely all you have done for us in the past, but will be eternally grateful for any consideration or cooperation you can give us in this crisis. We want to win this war so we can keep fellows like you in Washington.

Very truly yours,

W. G. LUEDKE.

Lend-Lease Is Two-Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of January 30, 1943, dealing with the reciprocal aid feature of the lease-lend program:

LEND-LEASE IS TWO-WAY

The fifth regular report on the progress of lend-lease, submitted to Congress this week by Edward R. Stettinius, its Administrator, reveals that this vehicle for supplying our allies with weapons and food is still gaining momentum. The amount of goods and services supplied in 1942, this report shows, was valued at $7,009,000,000, or more than five times that of the year before.

Total aid under lend-lease from March 1941, through December 1942, Mr. Stettinius' figures disclose, reached $8,253,000,000, while our allies have bought with their own funds here an additional $6,900,000,000.

It is not surprising to find that the lion's share of this aid—$6,353,000,000, in round figures—has gone to the British Commonwealth. The United Kingdom itself has received $3,960,000,000 and the British dominions and territories $2,393,000,000. Soviet Russia's share was $1,532,000,000 but China, because of the physical difficulties of supply involved, received only $157,000,000. Shipments to China by cargo plane, Mr. Stettinius reports, however, are now "increasing considerably," and he adds the promise that "we shall lso find other means to get to China the arms that she needs."

Mr. Stettinius adds his plea to that of others for recognition of the importance of meeting this year's American food-production program. Food shipments to date have accounted for only $1,329,000,000, or 16 percent, of all lend-lease aid, he notes, but are expected to increase materially during the coming months. We have not been able to ship as much food to Soviet Russia as could have been wished, he states, because it has been necessary to use the limited shipping space principally for munitions.

In view of the grumbling that has been heard in some quarters about the one-sided character of lend-lease, some observations offered by Mr. Stettinius the day before publication of his report are perhaps more significant at the moment than even the interesting figures in that document itself. Lend-lease, said Mr. Stettinius, has never been a one-way affair. For example, he observed, supplies other than construction materials received by the United States forces in the United Kingdom alone from May to November would have taken 1,200,000 ship tons if sent from this country. This is more than the tonnage of supplies actually shipped to our men during that period. Again, in the south and southwest Pacific, we have been shipping almost no food to our troops because Australia and New Zealand are meeting that need for us, thus releasing shipping space for guns and tanks. The United States, he pointed out, receives reciprocal aid under the lend-lease agreements concluded with Great Britain, China, the Soviet Union and seven other countries, and receives specific aid for its troops abroad in the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and fighting France.

Lend-lease, as its sponsors had hoped it would, has largely obliterated the dollar sign in evaluating the contributions of individual nations to the joint war effort. Which is, of course, the way it should be. As Mr. Stettinius rightly says, "There is no standard of values by which the loss of a thousand Russian lives can be compared with a thousand fighter planes."

Paul Versus Ruml

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., for February 5, 1943:

PAUL VERSUS RUML

Simply stated, the Ruml pay-as-you-go tax plan provides that this year's income, instead of last year's income, shall be the final base for determining how much one owes in Federal income taxes this year. Nobody would pay less than now unless his income declined.

While it lends itself to a monthly deduction-at-the-source system, it is as importantly a plan to get the taxpayer out of constant debt to his Government. At present, if he had a taxable income in 1942 and it unexpectedly fails in 1943, he still must pay out of depleted income or out of savings the taxes levied on what he earned in his immediately prior prosperous year. Under the Ruml plan his tax liability would cease when his income ceased, or be reduced currently with the reduction of his income.

While in instances of falling or disappearing income the Treasury would lose revenues, it would at the same time gain revenues from incomes that currently rose. The gain would substantially wash out the loss and the Treasury revenue would not be greatly impaired if at all.

A great merit of the plan is its psychological, its peace-of-mind effect upon those persons now struggling to pay out of current income the taxes levied on last year's income and knowing at the same time that the income they are now deriving and draining is building up a tax liability to be met next year.

The scheme is so sane, so logical, so simple, that it has gained widespread popularity. Unfortunately it does not have the fatherhood of Treasury experts, who glory in assumed right and duty to sponsor anything and everything pertaining to revenue and taxation. Bureaucracy is the same in National and State Government. It is jealous of its assumed prerogatives from Randolph Paul, General Counsel of the Treasury Department, down to Earl Fisher, of the Oregon State Tax Commission. Anything not of their own invention is no good, and they are ingenious with undigestible statistics to prove it. Any tax relief devised by someone who sits in the main assembly is an impudence that should be squelched. Be quiet, children. Teacher's running the school.

Naturally Randolph Paul is opposed to the Ruml plan. It does not come from the inner sanctum of Treasury bureaucrats. And seemingly, in the eyes of the Treasury experts, the people are financial guinea pigs, who must submit to experiments by Treasury scientists. He and his collaborators would try out on them heavy forced savings and extreme withholding taxes. Sure they are for pay-as-you-go, but on a basis that the vast majority of income possessors would pay as they go their taxes on this year's income and at the same time pay taxes on last year's income.

By paying 2 years' taxes in 1 year the vast majority, come March 15, 1944, would be out of debt to the Government, and if still retaining a spark of life be available for other experiments.

Such is the oppression that the Paul plan for a present withholding tax of 19 percent (24 percent with the Victory tax) means to the people. It is a scheme to put in reverse gear the purposes of the Ruml plan to give relief where relief is proper and to ease the mental apprehensions of all, without cost to Government. Paul would increase the tax burden and add immediate revenues to the Treasury.

It has come to be recognized and deplored in Congress that the lawmaking body does not have its own experts and investigators but must rely for guidance upon experts and investigators in the administrative department of Government, who have theories of their own on what shall be the character of revenue and other complicated laws, and are in position to befuddle and direct and obstruct. Various schemes are proposed for restoring in this particular the complete function of the lawmaking body. Something of the sort is appropriate, but Congress does not need to wait for it to adopt the Ruml plan. The most confusing phase of it to the bureaucrats is its simplicity. Congress can recognize simplicity without the aid or support of Treasury experts.

Whose Chin's Up?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I consider the following brief inspirational message, written by Mr. Thorwald Siegfried, of Los Angeles, of sufficient value to be included in the RECORD. I hope it will be widely read and will do others as much good as it has done me. It follows:

WHOSE CHIN'S UP?

Your course is clear for the next hour, the next 100 yards; it will always be so. The

sidewalk under your feet was inspected long ago; look at the horizon, and beyond!

A brilliant future will never sprout from the soil of present discouragement and despair. Those who are convinced that men and governments exist only to carry out evil purposes dig pits for themselves to fall into. Better days will come in spite of the obstructions they build. Moved toward selfish work by their own hopelessness, they will see their treasures vanish and their fortresses fall in on themselves, while progress turns back the page on them.

England nearly perished in the depths of cynical financial calculations; she was saved by faith in her present and in her future—by courage, not by fear.

This is a choice which America, too, must make. The end of the war will not lift that necessity, for it is a choice between life and death—life that war cannot kill, or death which neither gilt nor gold can disguise as life.

America has lived by the grace of God acting through a handful of men at various times. Forty of them on the *Mayflower;* Franklin almost alone; 56 on the Declaration of Independence; 40 on the Constitution; Washington; Revere; Paine; Lafayette; Jefferson; Jackson; Houston; Lincoln; and not many with them. Long pauses and blank spaces mark periods of money grubbing. Still, men of insight and courage exist and find their work now more than ever before. They will survive the Dunkerque which America must evacuate at home, bruised but not disheartened. They will praise the Lord and punctuate the record of the days to come. Their confidence, their working prayers, their common sense will be justified by events.

"The steady gain of man" of which Whittier sang is a fact of history and not mere pious poetry. It vanishes only in the gaze of those whose faint and frail hopes evaporate with the sunrise.

The unity which began as individual, then grew to a family, a clan, a nation, now becomes racial as we strive to exclude from the race the ancient and now no longer useful selfishness—ours and our enemies. The pressure for that step is not merely from wisdom but from necessity, and the need for it drives even the unwise and the unwilling into the service of the ideal. Striving to save what is already lost beyond recovery, they will acquire riches and jobs which prophets have always possessed and shared. Our mass kinship obliterates fancied divisions.

There has never been a time when men willing to serve the race as a whole could rely more securely than now on the ancient promise, "nothing shall by any means hurt you."

THORWALD SIEGFRIED,
Los Angeles, Calif.

Civil Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from a debate held in the House of Commons on December 17, 1942, on civil aviation.

I believe that a close study of this debate will greatly reward every Member of Congress. And if read, it should go far to persuade our own people of the importance, even in times of war, of strengthening and planning our civil aviation.

The excerpts follow:

Mr. PERKINS (Stroud). Before the war we had a number of debates on civil aviation. Those debates took place because there was in this House a large body of opinion that all was not well with civil aviation. I can assure the Government that there is still in the House and in the country a body of opinion which is perturbed about the position. The other reason for those debates was the treatment meted out to the pilots. At that time the pilots were treated as untouchables, as men void of intelligence and bereft of reason. The Air Ministry, the Air Council, and the operating company would none of them even negotiate with the pilots' organization. I am thankful to say that the situation has changed. Never have the relations been better between the pilots' organization and the Air Ministry and the operating company. The door is not only ajar but wide open, and every necessary subject is discussed between them. But there is one rather small personal matter which the pilots have asked me to mention. When the Prime Minister went to Russia, when Lord and Lady Halifax flew over to America, and when the Prime Minister of South Africa went back to South Africa, they chose, for some unexplained reason, a comparatively inexperienced pilot, a man who holds no British flying qualification at all, and who, in fact, is not a British subject. These old pilots, who have been carrying the torch of British aviation for 20 years, regard that action of the Air Minister as a personal slight. I ask the Under Secretary to use his influence with the Air Ministry and with the members of the Government generally to do everything in their power to fly British in future.

My quarrel today is not with the operating company, as on previous occasions, but partly with the Secretary of State for Air and partly with the paymaster general. I wish to cross swords with the Secretary of State because he represents the Air Council. The Air Council never has been interested in civil aviation. I do not believe that it ever will be interested in civil aviation. It is commonly reported outside that the only time when members of the Air Council are interested in civil aviation is when they are getting rather elderly and are looking round for directorships in the operating companies. My quarrel with the paymaster general is of a different nature. It has fallen to his lot to initiate a new era of world transport. I know what the paymaster general is thinking. He is thinking of that old Dutch proverb, "Young men think old men are fools; old men know young men to be so."

But, fortunately, I am neither old nor young, but middle-aged. I am sorry for my right honorable and learned friend, being suddenly pitchforked into this civil aviation arena. He has to make decisions—and to make them soon—which will affect the whole future of world transport, which I believe will decide whether we are to remain a first-class power, which will decide whether we are going to have 100 years of peace or ever-recurring wars. He has my sympathy. For some reason my right honorable and learned friend is at this moment finding it difficult to come to certain conclusions.

In August 1941 an interdepartmental committee was set up to explore the position and to advise the Minister. That committee issued an interim report 11 months ago. I understand—I may be wrong—that that report was in the form of a series of policy questions to the Cabinet. Until those questions of policy are settled this committee cannot go on functioning usefully. I do not know what is causing the delay. Eleven months is a long time. Perhaps the report has been mislaid, perhaps it has been pigeonholed, or perhaps it has slipped my right honorable and learned friend's memory. I urge him, with all the power I have, to come to some conclusion now. Until he decides these matters, nothing can be done for the future, no plans can be laid, and no decisions made. Unfortunately, while he is considering this matter—if he is—Pan American Airways are stretching their tenacles all over the world. I am not in any way antagonistic to the great American Nation. I believe that it is vital that in the future we should cooperate with the Americans in air transport. I foresee that unless we do as soon as the armistice comes there will be a race between the Americans and ourselves to control the airlines of the world. We shall have practically no airplanes to compete, except those loaned to us under lease-lend. If we try to run airlines with those loaned to us by the Americans friction is inevitable. I urge the Government now, before we get to that stage, to call a conference with our American allies, to settle once and for all which particular sphere of influence will belong to each country. Otherwise, I am convinced there will be friction, and we might even have another Boston tea party.

In the Pacific the Americans have a complete monopoly. As far as I can see, there is no prospect of a British air line ever operating in the Pacific. In the South Atlantic also the Americans have a complete monopoly. In the North Atlantic—and I include the southern route of the North Atlantic—I believe that for every British-owned air liner crossing it there are at least two American. That is a very conservative figure. Of our machines operating, every one is of American manufacture. We have in this country only two civil aircraft capable of flying the Atlantic—the *Champion* and the *Cathay*. In Africa the Americans were given an entrée. I understand, from an answer I have been given, that that entrée was only for 1 year and that after that year American civil aviation, as far as Africa was concerned, would be militarized. I believe that it has been militarized. But what is the difference? It is the same people; it is the same organization; it is the same airdromes. Everything is exactly the same, except that the men who are running the line, instead of wearing bowler hats and umbrellas, are now wearing tin hats and gas masks. It is merely a change of uniform. I trust that the Under Secretary does not believe that the Americans after the war are going gracefully to retire from Africa. If he believes that, he is the only person in the world connected with British aviation who does. Also, I understand—I hope I am wrong—that we shall shortly see the American air lines operating from Aden and from India. So much for the flying side.

Now the production side. As the House knows, some time ago an agreement was arrived at with America by which we would make the small aircraft—the fighter aircraft and the smaller bombers—whereas they on their side would make the big transport machines which could fly over the Atlantic. As a result of that agreement there are now coming off the stocks in very large numbers in America the most modern transport machines the world has ever seen. These machines are coming in large numbers to all the internal air lines in America and also to the air transport command. Machines such as the new four-engined Douglas, the well-known DC-3, the two-engined Douglas, are now pouring off the production lines and are equipping American lines. In the almost immediate future we shall see coming out from the American factories aircraft at least twice as big as anything even contemplated in this country.

What is our position? British Overseas Airways have a considerable number of aircraft. It is probably not in the public inter-

est that I should divulge the exact number, but at this moment they are using daily 13 different types, and in the near future they will be using 17 different types. As far as engines are concerned, they are now using 14 different types. This mixed assortment of aircraft consists partly of old crocks, 5, 6, 7, years old, many of them ripe for the scrap-heap. It consists partly of Royal Air Force throw-outs, crumbs from the rich man's table, machines which the Royal Air Force do not want, and partly, owing to the generosity of our American friends, modern American machines. Luckily there has been a very substantial sweetening of these American machines, and now well over half of the British Overseas Airways machines are equipped with American engines and nearly a half, but not quite, of the British Overseas Airways machines are entirely American. It must be obvious to anyone how utterly impossible it is to run an air line with this mixed assortment of machines and engines.

What is our future position? And this is where I quarrel with the Minister of Aircraft Production. His parliamentary secretary has admitted in this House that no orders have been placed for genuine civil machines, no plans are in hand and no designs are being considered at present either for a civil engine or for a civil aircraft. I know what the Government will answer. They will say, "Ah, have you not heard of the *York*? I have heard of the *York*. The *York* was not designed as a civil machine; it was designed as a bomber and then was converted to use with the Army. I am fully aware that that machine is an ideal machine for civil airways but—and facts speak for themselves—not a single one has yet been made available for British air transport. My honorable and gallant friend will talk about another machine which I do not think I ought to mention in public, but I can call it the W. The W is a Royal Air Force outcast. It was designed for the Royal Air Force and for some mysterious reason the Royal Air Force did not like it, and so they are generously handing it over to civil aviation—another outcast, another case of crumbs from the rich man's table. I allege that at this moment we have neither in this country nor in the Empire any modern British civil machine and that there are no plans for producing a modern British machine anywhere in existence.

It is always easy to be critical but it is always much harder to put up constructive suggestions. I do not believe that the pass is yet completely sold. I believe that we can retrieve the position partly if we take action now. I want to detain the House another 3 or 4 minutes just to put up one or two suggestions. First of all the short-term program, the immediate program. Surely it is not beyond us to bring British Overseas Airways up to date? I am told that if the Air Ministry or rather if the Air Council, that reactionary Air Council, would release but 30 machines at once—20 Yorks and 10 Sunderlands—we would at any rate be able to look Pan-American in the face. I fully expect that we shall be told that we may be going to get one or two Sunderlands. I hope that that is true. I also hope, if we are going to get these Sunderlands, they will be equipped with what is known as "full feathered airscrews." I am told by my friends that the idea is they will not have this elementary safety device. It seems to me almost criminal that the highly important people who now use our air lines should be asked to fly on machines that have not this elementary safety device. I am told that the Secretary of State will say, "Fancy talking of 10 Sunderlands or 20 Yorks. Why, it is quite impossible. We want every machine we can possibly get in order to bomb Germany." Will it really make any difference to the bombing loads on Germany if 20 of these Yorks are taken and instead of 990 machines going over on one night there are only 970? I cannot believe that the releasing of 20 of these modern machines will really have any effect whatever on our attack upon Germany.

There are four advantages of this scheme. I am told that, if we could only get these 20 Yorks, it would be possible to scrap up to 60 of the old crocks now being used by British Overseas Airways, resulting in a great saving in personnel, expense, time, and spares. The second advantage is that we could look Pan-American Airways in the face now, and if a conference took place we could bargain with them on equal terms. Thirdly, we would have something which would enable us to hold our own for probably 2 years after the armistice, because we have the Yorks for the long-distance lines and the boats for the Empire service, and provided we are allowed to keep them under lend-lease we would have the Lodestars for the European services. The fourth advantage is that two-thirds of the fleet would then be British, and instead of 17 types with 14 engines, we would have 3 types with 3 engines.

Now, the long-term policy. I and many honorable members have advocated this before. Surely the first thing to do is to take civil aviation away from the Air Ministry and hand it over to some other department. Secondly, are we really wise in concentrating after the war on one chosen instrument? Would it not be better, in view of what is going to happen after the war, to have at least two or, if possible, three chosen instruments? Thirdly, would it not be possible to set up a committee now with instructions to publish a report to the Government not less than 3 months hence to consider civil aviation in all its aspects. I do not mean to consider only air liners. I mean gliding, light airplane clubs, private flying, etc. If we had that committee and if we could get a report, something in writing and something on which to work, then I believe we would have done something by initiating this debate. The fourth suggestion is that we should design at once three aircraft and three engines for the future. I know the Under Secretary will say that we have no designers. If he really believes that we are short of designers in this country, I hope he will discuss the matter with the marines. Has he never heard of Sir Roy Fedden? Surely Sir Roy Fedden would have been far better employed designing the civil engine for the future instead of going off on a stamp-licking expedition to America.

But I am not without hope for the future. For the last 3 years I have been flying with the grand young men of the Royal Air Force. I know something of their thoughts, dreams, and ideals, and I am absolutely convinced that when they come out of uniform they will not be satisfied with ships and trains; they will want something different and something faster, and not even the reactionary Air Council will be able to hold them back. They know what they want, and they will get it. There is, however, another reason why I have not given up hope. The public conscience is now beginning to awake on this matter. I have noticed that in the daily press there have been several articles on this subject recently. Even that profound and dogmatic paper The Times is awakening. They published an article a week ago about the need for shipping companies to take up this matter. I hope they will, and I also hope that every director of these companies will sit down and read the report of the American Maritime Commission on this subject. That report was published nearly 5 years ago after the Commission had been set up to advise the American Government as to whether that great country should go in for superships of the *Queen Mary* class or super air liners. After the most exhaustive inquiry they came to the conclusion that these comparatively slow ships cannot compete with fast aircraft. Six large flying boats of the future—and the future is very near—can carry in 1 year over the Atlantic more passengers than the *Queen Mary*. The trip will take 10 hours or less against the 5 days of the superliner. Passengers will travel at great heights in pressure cabins, above all the bad weather, and air and seasickness will become a thing of the past. People will have in those 10 hours approximately the same standard of comfort as have the people who now travel to Scotland at night in an English sleeper.

If we do not start to design these machines now, other people will. Other people will control our trade routes; they will get our trade; the pound sterling will not buy an ounce of confetti; the Beveridge Report will become an interesting relic of the past, and we shall dwindle until we become a second-class power. Never were the stakes so high as they are now, and never was there such a grand opportunity as we have now. Did all those early pioneers in flying who gave their lives to produce modern aircraft and all those grand young boys who gave their lives in the last war and in this, do so in order to produce aeroplanes to perpetuate permanent blitzes every 20 years, or did they do it because people believed, as every pilot believes, that the aeroplane has been given to us to bring about an era of permanent peace and an undreamt-of measure of happiness in this world. As I have said, there is a grand opportunity. I wonder whether the Secretary of State for Air, his air council and the paymaster general will take it. If only they had one tiny particle of the foresight of that old and great poet Thomas Gray, who, 205 years ago, prophesied the future of British civil aviation. He said:

"The time will come when thou shalt lift thine eyes
To watch the long-drawn battle in the skies,
While aged peasants, too amazed for words,
Stare at the flying fleet of wondrous birds.
England, so long mistress of the sea,
Where wind and waves confess her sovereignty,
Her ancient traditions yet on high she bore
And reigned the sovereign of the conquered air."

Group Captain WRIGHT (Birmingham, Erdington). I think the House is grateful to my honorable friend the member for Stroud (Mr. Perkins) for raising this matter today. Certainly I would like to congratulate him on the excellent speech to which we have just listened and which was delivered in his usual breezy and forthright style.

I have spoken on this subject so frequently that I find it difficult to add very much to the case I have put forward on so many occasions in the past. Nor do I feel that we can gain very much by going back and worrying about the mistakes of the past, mistakes which today are so clear and obvious. For instance, I suppose one of the worst mistakes we made in recent years was the sacrificing of the trans-African route. At the time those of us who saw clearly what would happen did not fail to raise our voices, but it was of no avail. The greatest mistake we have made in the past, of course, was the failure on the part of the Air Ministry, in spite of what was said in this House over and over again, to envisage that when the war broke out the right policy was not to shut down civil aviation but to develop and encourage it, because it would be such a very necessary ancillary part of the war machine. As a result of the failure to envisage that, this country is almost entirely lacking in suitable transport machines today.

We have been jockeyed into an exceedingly delicate and difficult political situation, from which it is not so easy now, with our commitments to the war effort, to extricate ourselves. I realize how difficult it is at the present time to develop an air liner for the future. I think there is something to be said for those who argue that we

do not yet know how long the war will last and that development in aircraft and engine production is so rapid and great that even if we were to design today what was thought to be a suitable transport liner for the future, it might well become out of date very soon. That, however, is, I think, a reactionary view, and even at the risk of having to scrap our designs—the worst would be that we should have to keep bringing them up to date—I still think we ought to find time to explore the situation. One of the reasons why my honorable friend and I particularly wanted to raise this matter today is that there is undoubtedly, at long last, a great wakening of interest in civil aviation throughout the country. This interest has been aroused largely because the airplane has proved itself the dominant factor in the successful prosecution of modern war. This was, of course, prophesied by many of us in those happier years when, on the floor of the House, we fought at regular intervals what was known as "the battle of the admirals." In the same way today, we prophesy that the airplane will also prove to be the dominant factor in the successful prosecution of the peace.

My honorable friend has stated that the future of this great commonwealth of nations may well depend on how we handle this matter, and in that I cannot do otherwise than wholeheartedly agree with him. Although we are raising the matter now, we do not expect that the Government will necessarily be able to divulge to us such plans as they may be developing, if indeed they are developing any, at the present time. We appreciate that the future development of civil aviation must very largely depend on the shape of the world when hostilities cease. When I refer to the shape of the world, I do not mean so much its geographical shape, because I think it is agreed that none of the United Nations is seeking to alter very much the geographical formation of the world; I am referring to its shape politically. Obviously, the whole future of civil aviation, as of so many other features of reconstruction, must depend on the degree of cooperation or otherwise which will exist among the nations when hostilities cease. If we are to continue the present unified cooperation which we are using so successfully to prosecute the war, then indeed the future of civil aviation can be dealt with successfully, and I think the future will be bright, but if we are to return to a condition of insane, unrestricted international competition, the future of civil aviation, as of so many other features of reconstruction, will be exceedingly black.

There are, however, things which we can do now, and which we should be doing. If we assume that we are to have this cooperation, then we can envisage certain lines upon which civil aviation will develop. As soon as we can envisage a completely internationalized air-transport service working all over the world, we can envisage a modification of that whereby the great powers would more or less control certain zones of influence, and their individual systems would be interlocked and geared together so as to produce that world system of transport. We can envisage a situation in which there would be free and unrestricted use of both air and airports. I cannot believe that under any system of cooperation we shall return to the dark days of restriction when a country thought it was improper for another country to fly in what it regarded as its air—that is, the air over its own territory—and when there were evil and discriminating influences at work as to who should use a particular airport. I cannot believe we shall return to those days. Therefore, there is a series of obvious lines on which the matter can be considered, and each of these policies, whichever may be adopted, will automatically raise a whole list of difficulties and problems which will have to be solved.

I suggest that if we leave consideration of the whole system until the end of hostilities, these problems will never get the proper consideration which they should have, and we shall return to a state of chaotic confusion in which there can be no properly planned cooperation. The difficulties run on these lines. Let us suppose that we shall have an internationally controlled system of air transport. Shall we have a general pool of designs and improvements? Shall we design machines internationally? How shall we produce them, and will the coutries, all working in cooperation, be given a standard machine to make at regular intervals so that there is a fair sharing out of the great industry which is bound to grow up consequent upon this development of new transport? Will the countries be given those orders under some regular system, or will they compete in the open market under price tenders? All those are points which should be receiving consideration at the present time, so that we may be ready to meet each and any of the situations that will arise.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer before concluding my remarks. It is a subject to which I make no apologies for returning, although it was raised by the honorable lady the member for Frome (Mrs. Tate) most effectively when the House went into committee on the air estimates a few months ago. On that occasion I supported the honorable lady. The question was the condition of the British Overseas Airways Corporation. I do not want again to reiterate the obvious failings which were stated quite clearly at that time, but I want to point out that even as the result of those disclosures nothing whatever has been done in the meantime. If we were in a time of peace, we should have in the British Overseas Airways Corporation all the makings of another Cadman committee and an equally bad report. The corporation is seething with discontent inside. This is well known. I think the fact is actually admitted even by those in control, but it is most regrettable that the directors will not face the situation and will not stand up, if it is necessary, even to my right honorable and gallant friend at the Air Ministry.

When I spoke on the matter on the air estimates, I said I thought the director general was a first-class man who would tackle the job. I regret to say, although I know that the whole situation has been put most clearly to me, although he has been appealed to to take action, he has proved himself in the end, like the others, to be weak and not capable of standing up to the job. So there is something there which should and can be dealt with, and there is no excuse for not dealing with it. It is really not fair to the British Overseas Airways Corporation, which after all is the chosen instrument of this House and was purchased from the shareholders in Imperial Airways and British Airways at very fair prices and a deal made almost when the war was upon us, which has turned out very much to their advantage as things are today. It is not fair to the national interest, to civil aviation in the future, nor to himself that he should postpone dealing with this matter, because he is very busy until he feels that he can make it more or less a whole-time job. The matter should be tackled at once. The Air Ministry has been the grave of a good many political reputations. My right honorable and gallant friend is one of the few who have enhanced their reputations. I beg of him to show once again that keenness which he used to show on the back benches in the old days when he was a director of British Airways and so not take any risk of losing the very great confidence which the House has in him.

Sir LINDSAY EVERARD (Melton). The last war was really the beginning of aviation. Out of the last war civil aviation was born. It is only 18 years ago that Imperial Airways itself was formed out of the amalgamation of the four companies then running between London and Paris. We have during the last few weeks been discussing various plans for the future of the country after the war. It is not generally well understood that although aviation itself means speed, there is probably nothing that takes longer than the preparations for aviation. You can put social reforms into operation and have reports within a few months, but it takes several years before you can get a new design of aircraft into the air, arranging landing grounds properly and all the other things that are necessary. There is no doubt that we have arrived at the moment when something must be done to speed up aviation after the war. We look upon ourselves as a first-class nation. We have never had first-class civil aviation. We have been a long way behind other countries. We could not even compete with the Dutch. Their empire is not comparable with ours, but the K. L. M. Line is not only equal to but better than ours. A great number of officers serving in the east used to come home by that service because it was faster and more up to date. If we are to be a first-class nation, we must have first-class ideas of civil aviation. It is no good trying to run a first-class empire with third-class aviation in the future, otherwise we shall court disaster, and we shall deserve it.

When I have spoken before on these topics I have said that in my opinion in the past civil aviation was best under the air ministry, but I qualified that by saying that there should be three definite ministers, as there are with the army and navy. We have three today, but we only have really a temporary third, Lord Sherwood, I do not suppose we shall have two permanent secretaries after the war.

Until we definitely get a minister for civil aviation we shall never really make headway, because the under secretary—I have the greatest respect for all that he does—has far too much to do with the military side of aviation to be able to undertake this job as well. After all, there are a Minister of Mines and a Minister for Overseas Trade, both under the board of trade, and there should be a minister for civil aviation under the Air Ministry. If the ministry are not able to support that, I am in favor of civil aviation going away from the Air Ministry altogether, because I am convinced that it has had a very poor deal from the Air Ministry in the past and it does not look as if we should have a very good deal in the future. The position is so grave and the issues are so important that we cannot now afford to do anything that we should regret later on.

If we had this minister for civil aviation as a department of the Air Ministry acting on his own, there would seem to me to be two things that we should press for. One is an open-sky policy on the lines of the Atlantic Charter, that is to say, freedom for all aircraft flying over all countries, doing away with prohibited areas which smaller countries delight to put all over their maps—to get a real understanding about the rights and privileges of flying over each other's country. We all remember the trouble the Italians gave us in north Africa, and they would not allow us to fly to Brindisi. Imperial Airways had to go by train from Paris. Now we have practically all the governments of the free nations in this country. We presume that we shall win the war, therefore we should put some restrictions on those which are our enemies today as regards flying rights over their territories. I hope we shall. Now is the moment when we should call together those who are with us now in London and discuss an agreement as to an open-sky policy

for the civil aviation of the world after the war. The second thing that should be done is to have a general more or less detailed arrangement connected with Empire and trans-Atlantic airways, not only on European services but also on engines, instruction, and airdromes and equipment. There are various other items which have to be dealt with under their various heads. The facts of most of them are already known. It is not necessary to waste years on a committee. Perhaps some of those headings would have to be considered by different committees, but there are a great many points of which everyone is fully aware which could quite easily be settled by the minister himself should we have a minister, as I suggest.

The important side of the future of civil aviation is our Empire services and the trans-Atlantic routes. Upon that hinges the whole future prosperity of the country. None of us really realizes what the flow of goods and personnel is going to be after the war, when we get civil aviation into the minds of the people. People have become much more air-minded now. I well remember the time when we had complaints of somebody flying over somebody else's house because of the noise. That was only 3 or 4 years ago. Now we have a continual buzz of machines day and night, and people have got used to it. The more we get used to these things the more we shall use them. Aviation will be the method after the war of bringing the British Empire close to us and bringing our own people together. If we are not able to bring goods from our Empire to our own doorsteps after the war, and if we are not able to live next door to those who are now living in the Empire—literally next door because we shall be able to fly over and see them in a day—the Empire will not be as strong as it could be if we availed ourselves of the facilities available to us.

I cannot speak too strongly of the importance I place on civil aviation as the link between the whole of this country and various parts of the Empire and between the American people and ourselves. There is no doubt that for many years to come the Americans and ourselves will have to rule the world to all intents and purposes so as to see that things are rightly done in the world. We shall have to live almost in each other's countries in order to do that. I was amazed the other day when talking to an American friend in a train in this country. We were speaking about American problems, and he said, "You do not understand the size of the United States." I said that I had not been over there and that I did not. He then said, "Do you know that it is nearer to Washington from this train than some of the constituencies in America are to Washington?" That is to say, it is easier to get from England to Washington than from some parts of the United States to Washington. This is the sort of thing which really shows the vast importance of civil aviation to the Empire.

The training in the past for civil aviation, outside the Royal Air Force training, has to a large extent been done by light airplane clubs. The service these clubs have rendered to the country by making people air-minded has been of greater value than almost anything else from the aviation point of view. The future of the light airplane clubs is with the young men. I am one of those who believe that if we are to be citizens of this country we must make some sacrifice for our citizenship. We cannot just sit at home and expect everything for nothing—improved housing, better education, Beveridge reports, and all sorts of other things—without giving something in return. I hope that we shall never go away from some form of compulsory military training in this country. When a man has the rights of citizenship—employment, decent wages, decent conditions—he should in return serve his country for a definite term. That could be done through the youth services. Those who wished to serve in the Air Force would go through the Air Training Corps.

We should make full use of the light airplane club movement by taking our boys when they become 18 and teaching them to fly under Royal Air Force instructors at the light airplane clubs as centers. In that way we should get a reserve of aviation which would be of enormous value and importance should we ever get involved in such a war as this. I am certain that there must be some give and take with people and that they must make some sacrifice for the country if they wish to be citizens and take all that the country gives them. This training could be done through the light airplane clubs and it would well repay the expenditure of the Government, because the boys would be on the reserve of the Royal Air Force at the age of 20, having had 50 hours' training with the clubs. It would be of enormous advantage to the Government and to the boys themselves. We are grateful to my honorable friend, the Member for Stroud, for initiating this debate and for his excellent speech. I hope that as a result of the debate we shall get a reorganized start of civil aviation after the war on completely new lines—on the lay-out of 1943 and not on the lay-out of before the last war.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Sir Dennis Herbert). Colonel Elliot.

Captain CUNNINGHAM-REID (St. Marylebone). On a point of procedure, may I point out that four Conservatives running have been called? Have not the Independents a right to be called? This is not a meeting of the Carlton Club.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The honorable and gallant member is making an observation which is quite out of order.

Lieutenant Colonel ELLIOT (Glasgow, Kelvingrove). I make no apology for intervening in this debate, and having been called by you, sir, I consider I have a perfect right to address the House. The honorable member who introduced this subject owes no apology to the House for having done so. He has taken a great interest in it and delivered a speech which was of the greatest interest to the House and a worthy introduction to the subject. The Secretary of State for Air will have heard from the observation which his honorable and gallant friend the Under Secretary may have made to him that there is a general demand in the House to be reassured that plans are in existence and are actively being pressed on for the developments which we say are bound to be one of the features of the post-war world. He will know, none better, that the great thing we are deploring in the case of tanks is that while there were in the case of airplanes designs and plans and prototypes of machines which were capable of great and rapid reproduction of a type second to none in the world, there was no such machine in existence in the case of tanks. We are, therefore, still suffering in this case from the enormous time-lag between getting a thing onto the drawing board and getting it from the drawing board into reproduction. I am sure the House is not at all convinced that there is at present on the drawing board a machine fit to take its place in the post-war world with the enormous plans of development which we see under way on the other side of the Atlantic. Many of us who have had our attention forced on this by recent developments realize that it may well be that the industrial set-up of the world will undergo a transformation in the near future in some sense comparable to the transformation which occurred when the internal combustion engine came to supplement and to some extent replace the coal-burning engine. In many parts of the world which did not see developments coming they fell far behind and have not been able to make up the leeway since.

Some honorable Members have concentrated on the fact that after the war it will be necessary for this country to have something in which to fly. I would put forward a plea that it should have something to fly to. The planning of the machines must also cover the planning of the airports, the great air harbors which will be necessary in this country. This is a small island, and it is necessary to make sure of the location of the great central stations which the air lines of the world will use because the geographical position of this country will again be of the greatest importance to its future history. Lying as it does on the rim of the western ocean, it is at the hub of international aviation, and it may well be that it will occupy in aviation a place as important as that which it now occupies in international telephoning—or did before the war. There was a small unobtrusive building in the City of London and anyone who wanted to telephone from any part of the United States to any part of Europe—and to many parts of Asia as well—had to speak through London, being put through by our telephone operators to whatever place he wished to communicate with. Here we have a necessity for planning, and therefore I hope very much that we shall have the views of the Paymaster General. I was glad to see him in his place at the beginning of this debate, although I must say it is a pity that neither the Paymaster General nor the Under Secretary of State for Air was able to watch with us for even 1 hour. The subject goes far beyond the Secretary of State for Air. When we see Uthwatt reports and other reports dealing with very shadowy things, in some respects very far in the future, we could well afford to give some time and some consideration to the lay-out of these practical points which will arise at the armistice immediately, with the movement of the civil tide which will then begin to flow. The speed factor in modern transport may gravely impair the maritime supremacy which this country has previously had by producing a vehicle which, as was said I think by the honorable Member who introduced the subject, will carry throughout the year a number of passengers equal to the number that could be carried by a great liner. It was said that six airplanes might carry throughout the year a number of passengers equal to the whole passenger load of the *Queen Mary* throughout the year.

Those of us who are connected with great engineering centers like the Clyde realize that such a development might make the whole of that area, with its present equipment, obsolete, and it is a matter which demands the most urgent and continuous attention of His Majesty's Government. Many hard things have been said against planners but on this occasion, at any rate, the House is at one. It desires plans and it believes that in this matter planning must be done by and with the aid of the Government and the great machinery of research and statistics which the Government has in its control. The House clearly believes also, I think, that the subject should be looked at not merely as an adjunct to the military side, not merely as a shadowy thing for the future, not even as an opportunity for international cooperation, important as that is, but as an immediate practical problem for British industry, for British design, and British planning the moment the war comes to an end, and on those subjects I am sure the House will desire a very clear statement by the spokesman of the Government when he replies.

Mr. MONTAGUE (Islington, West). As other subjects fall to be discussed today, I will not intervene for more than a few minutes, but I should like to join in complimenting the opener of the debate upon this extremely interesting and well-delivered speech. One thing I should like to say about that speech

is that it disconcerted me and that I felt some regret to find that in opening a debate of this character the honorable member for Stroud [Mr. Perkins] should have spoken in archaic language about civil aviation in respect to the trade of this country and of our relations commercially with other countries. He used phrases such as "The race between us and America," "Looking America in the face," and "Bargaining upon equal terms," and he regretted the possibility of other people getting our trade. I agree with the right honorable and gallant member for Kelvingrove [Lieutenant Colonel Elliott] when he suggested that the development of aviation upon the civil side after the war should be an opportunity for international cooperation. Ten years ago and later, when the formation of British Overseas Airways was discussed here, I and other members of my party put forward the idea of public responsibility for civil aviation in this country and the principle of internationalization in respect of aviation between this country and other countries, upon the ground, apart altogether from our own views as to public ownership and internationalism, that the air is not a personal thing, is not a private commercial thing, is not even a national thing, but is a medium which encompasses the whole world, and that there were many reasons for adopting a policy not merely of give and take but of developing a give and take between countries and, for some measure of international control, or, at least, international agreement in respect of these various air lines.

As the right honorable and gallant member for Kelvingrove or some other honorable member has mentioned, at that time and right up to this war we had the foolish spectacle of corridors in the air along which airplanes could not go because of the desire on the part of nations to keep secret their military plans. Those anomalies were due to the fact that we had considered the question of civil aviation from the point of view if not solely of commercial advantage certainly of national advantage, and I feel that now we have a splendid opportunity to review the whole question of civil aviation from the point of view of the world and the world's necessities after the war. That remark applies to a good many other subjects. We need to make a new start in many directions in view of the necessity for world planning, and I ask that in considering civil aviation after the war, and also what might be done before the end of the war, to get it going upon sound principles, we should look closely to this question of world responsibility for the development of aviation.

I suppose we cannot accept the view that internationalism in a complete sense will be possible immediately after the war, but we have America, we have Russia, we have this country, and we have the other states of the United Nations, and we ought not to look at matters from the point of view of how we are going to race with each other for international trade but link it up with our economic necessities and the economic developments of the world in the future.

There is only one other point which I would like to raise, and it has to do with the subject of transport planes. This question seems to have been left so that we get the crumbs from the rich man's table, the rich man in this case being America. There is a comparison between the policy in respect of transport planes and the policy as regards dive bombers. I cannot, of course, enter into that question, with the many technical matters involved, but it seems that we have missed the bus—to use a phrase that has been used in this House before—in respect of transport planes, and that we are now dependent upon the left-overs of America, a country which, at the very beginning of this war, put its civil aviation, to all intents and purposes, to use. The honorable member for Stroud pointed out that Curtiss and Douglas planes and other big planes had been adapted for transport purposes upon scientific lines, with the direct idea of linking up civil aviation with their national needs now and therefore with the needs of America immediately after the war.

If that can be done by America, we also should have done that kind of thing, but we are not using transport planes as we ought to use them. Even if we get a fair proportion from America, it seems likely that we shall not use them as Russia, for instance, is using them. There are a hundred-and-one ways in which transport planes can be used in the war effort. In the case of the Soviet Union, transport planes are used very much in the war effort. We know that Germany is using transport planes very largely over in Russia. The Russians have the advantage from the military point of view. They have used transport planes all along for military purposes, and not merely for carrying personnel. Soon after the war began, a committee in Washington reported to the effect that 90 percent of military supplies could be carried by airplane and 50 percent of civilian supplies. Russia has also realized that possibility. They not only carry supplies for military purposes between various parts of the front line, but they carry medical supplies, nurses, and other personnel. They also apply transport planes to war production. I can speak of conditions in this country from my own memory of the Ministry of Aircraft Production. When you wanted components taken from one part of this country to another while a blitz was on, as was often the case at that time, you sometimes had to wait for weeks, although the components were vitally needed, because train services were disorganized owing to war conditions. In Russia that does not happen. The Russians use transport planes from factory to factory as well as for military purposes.

I agree with the general trend of the discussion so far. We ought to look to our civil aviation, and view the necessities of this country in relation to the world, in respect to civil aviation. It could well be linked up with a more imaginative outlook on the part of the ministries concerned affecting the development of transport planes now. I am sorry that so much has been left to chance in this matter. Here is a splendid opportunity to have fine planes, with fine designs now on the drawing board, ready to be taken off when the war is over, so that we shall be able to hold our own in the best sense of the word in respect to civil aviation. In talking about holding our own, I hope we shall not confine ourselves to the old idea that when we come to the end of the war we shall be finding spheres of influence and thinking of trade competition. We have to think of something more in the nature of world cooperation, or we shall otherwise want more transport planes and planes for military purposes before long for a war much more devastating than the present war has been, or may be before we finish with it.

Mrs. TATE (Frome). The House and the country owe a very great debt of gratitude to the honorable member who so ably raised this matter in the House today. We know how often he raised it in the past, and we know also that the experience which he has had in this war has made him better qualified to raise it at present. I very much regret, considering the very short time which we have to consider this subject, that the Under Secretary of State for Air did not find himself able to sit with us and to go without his meal until a later hour.

The JOINT UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR AIR (Capt. Harold Balfour). May I interrupt the honorable lady to say that I have not had a meal?

Mrs. TATE. Whatever the right honorable and gallant gentleman was doing, and I am glad that he has not had his meal, it was a very great pity that he did not find himself able to sit here during the whole course of this very short debate. I am glad that those who so often pleaded the cause of civil aviation before the war have, deplorably, been proved right. They have the right to ask that mistakes which have been made heretofore shall not be made again. We owe a very great debt to the men in the air force and to the home population for the part they are playing in the war. Unless this matter is treated with the seriousness which it deserves, we may very well find ourselves winning the war and losing the peace. I hope that due note will be made of the suggestions put forward by the honorable member.

I hope also that we may go further than that. I would ask the under secretary whether any real preparation is being made with regard to the sites of aerodromes on Empire air routes, and, far more important, to the starting of aerodromes on Empire air routes. Before the war, it was estimated in America that for every man in the air you needed 30 men on the ground. Certainly, as civil machines increase in power and complexity, an increasingly large number of ground personnel will be needed. We ought to have plans ready now or being prepared now, in order that, when the war ceases, we should know at once the number and type of ground personnel to draft to each aerodrome throughout the empire routes. I would like to ask whether that is being done.

The honorable member who spoke before me regretted that we had not got civil aviation as far as the drawing board stage, but that is wholly insufficient. All modern transport planes are being manufactured in America, and I believe that is a very great mistake, even in a war period. I know I shall be told that the needs of the war are so great that it is imperative to concentrate on fighting aircraft over here, but I believe that to be false economy and a false idea. I realize that I may be quite wrong and that my suggestion may be impracticable, but I would ask whether it is not possibe to arrange for a larger proportion of fighting craft to be manufactured in America, and that at least some civil craft should be manufactured here. It is a matter of vital importance. Plans for the future are not enough, where this kind of manufacture is concerned. The Minister knows far better than I do that it is very many years before a plane can go from the design stage into the air. I do not think we can afford to leave it until after the war to bridge that gap.

Nor, I believe, have we even considered as we should have done the designs of the aircraft of the future. If the Air Ministry make the mistakes they have made in the past, and continue to make them, and refuse to consider the immediate building of at least some civil machines over here, will they do this; will they arrange the air routes that are to be flown immediately on the cessation of war and bring them to such a stage of perfection that within a few months of the end of the war we shall be flying these prepared air routes at least with mails in converted bomber machines?

I do not advocate the converted bomber machine as a transport plane, but I do say that if we had our Empire air routes so well prepared that we could move adequate personnel there immediately hostilities had ceased, we could at least get our air routes flown with mails in converted bomber machines, and that would be infinitely preferable to not having the routes flown at all, which I greatly fear they will not be unless we show far more foresight in civil aviation than we did before. I would plead, as I have pleaded for so many years, that civil aviation should be taken out of the hands of the Air Ministry.

That is of fundamental and vital importance. We urged the necessity for years before the war. I was the only member of my own party who voted against the continuance of the subsidy to Imperial Airways

until 1953, and every day I live I feel more convinced that that vote was a right vote. I am not happy about the present British Overseas Airways Corporation, but I do believe that a matter as important as civil aviation should either be under a department of its own or under the board of trade. In no case should it be left under the Air Ministry, for indeed civil aviation in this country has perished under the administration of the Air Ministry in the past, and nothing in the past should make us feel it is right to leave it in those hands in the future.

Mr. A. EDWARDS (Middlesbrough, East). One thing is quite certain, and that is that immediately after the war we shall have to use airways long before we have adequate supplies of shipping. It is of vital importance, as has been stressed today, that we must think about this problem now, and as Pan-American Airways have got so far ahead of us, I can see no way out except by a full investigation with a view to getting some international arrangement. We shall never overtake Pan-American Airways the way we are going. It is of vital importance that we should have the fullest investigation into this question of the British Overseas Airways Corporation. As one advocating in this House and in the country Government control and in some cases nationalization, I only do so insofar as it will bring greater efficiency and public good. I have given some pretty horrible examples of inefficiency where Government funds are concerned. This company is one, and I would like to quote one or two others.

I would like particularly to raise a question of British Overseas Airways administration, which I said yesterday I would speak about today. I asked a question yesterday about the dismissal of Squadron Leader Geoffrey Cooper, and I want to tell the House briefly what happened in this case. It was a case of him being much too efficient, much too go ahead.

As a matter of fact he was probably a little self-assertive, but he was a man with some vision of what Overseas Airways should be, and what the organization of our air transport should be in the future. He dared to express himself. It is provided in the act that the managerial staff should have the right to make representations when they think that something is wrong. Speaking for practically the whole of the managerial staff he made representations. As a result he was sent abroad. He went to Asmara, where he was paid £1,000 a year with full keep and nothing whatever to do; he was simply sent out of this country because he was a bit of a nuisance. He dared to protest and wrote to other colleagues, pointing out what was happening out there, that nobody out there had a single thing to do and that people were drawing salaries of which they were thoroughly ashamed. He said he would rather go back into the Royal Air Force and do his bit.

Here a remarkable thing happened. The censor, in contravention of the Official Secrets Act, intercepted the letter and sent a copy of it to the Director-General of the Overseas Airways Corporation, who, after an investigation, sent a signal to say that this man was to be sent home for dismissal—I have seen the original wording—before hearing him, before considering his report. He did return home and was accordingly dismissed. I have reason to suppose that practically the whole of the staff have in recent weeks again met and expressed their views, perhaps not officially yet, on this very serious situation of British Overseas Airways. It will be one of the most colossal fiascos we have had in this country if something is not done. It is thoroughly inefficient. It is a thorough disgrace to this House for not having taken action earlier on the administration of the Air Ministry. Another department should look after commercial aviation. It should be removed from the Air Ministry at once. That is all I have to say about that particular case. The honorable member who opened this debate pointed out that the pilots got satisfaction when they as a body made representations. The only way there will be response will be by the managerial staff, who are practically unanimous, making representations and the department taking the necessary notice.

It has been said that it is no use looking back. It is if we can avoid making blunders in the future The question of Sir Roy Fedden has been raised. About 2 years ago he was being sent abroad to America, entirely against his will. He wanted to do his duty in this country. He realized more than any other man in this country what was needed. I have had the privilege of seeing some reports he submitted to the Government in 1936 and 1937, and he was told that the program he outlined could not be afforded. He is a man of outstanding vision and engineering skill. At a time when he is developing new engines, some still on the secret list, which will be required for the future development of civil aviation, he is again being sent to America. On the former occasion I pointed out that it was some of the back numbers of the back room who wanted to be rid of him. He was a nuisance, but he was a genius, and some geniuses are a bit of a nuisance. He was a man with vision, and he was being sent to America. I said, and members will find this statement practically word for word in the Official Report, that if the Minister had any sense this man, who was being compelled to leave the country, would be kept here. I pay this tribute to Lord Beaverbrook. He got on the Atlantic telephone and brought the man back to this country. The man was back within a fortnight. This man has built up the Bristol Aeroplane Co. He spent 20 years building up that company.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would remind the honorable member of the very recent debate we had on this subject, in which, if my memory is not at fault, the honorable member himself said all these things.

Mr. EDWARDS. But the question of the design of engines is essential to the subject we are discussing. The size of planes depends on types of engine, and that is a matter connected with the man I am discussing. What I want to say—it has never been said in this House—is that this company has had £14,500,000 of the Government's money, yet the Government have not a representative on the board of directors, and the company are in a position to dismiss the man who is essential for bringing out these designs. It is a matter of the control of organizations which have vast sums of public money. Take another company, which has developed what should be the most wonderful engine in the world, the Sabre. It is still unsatisfactory. We have had a director of that company drawing £12,000 a year for the last 12 years. Now they make a deal with another company, because they are inefficient, and they get an immense sum as compensation. It is a disgraceful thing that public funds should be used in this way. From this compensation award their earnings would be between £300,000 and £400,000.

The department is providing £750,000 for a fictitious transaction, to buy some property which is being relet to the company in order that they may finance this deal. There are two cases in which private companies are being allowed to use public money in this way. Every important airplane manufacturing company at this moment is having trouble with or has parted with its principal designers and engineers. It is strange that when we are developing the most important engines these men should be treated in this way.

Mr. SIMMONDS (Birmingham, Duddeston). Is the honorable member criticizing my right honorable friend the Secretary of State for Air? I fail to see where the Secretary of State comes in.

Mr. EDWARDS. Previous speakers in this debate have raised the question of the engines that will be required in future. I am trying to show that, no matter what else you do, if you neglect engine designs you will never get anywhere. It is essential that the men who can design engines should be kept here, and that they should be happy here. I doubt whether Sir Roy Fedden, who has been sent to America, will ever come back. The Americans are ready to buy men of that type. It has been said in the past that ours is an empire on which the sun never sets. People will say in future that it is an empire on which the sun never sets but on whose ministers the light never dawns. Now is the time to take some steps. I have quoted in this House, and I will give the names and details again to any minister who requires them, facts to show that in hardly a case of this kind which I have raised has there not been victimization of individuals as a result. Men with the welfare of this country at heart, who dared to risk everything, have reported the position to somebody who could take action, and they have been victimized. The latest cases are Sir Roy Fedden and Squadron Leader Cooper. The minister directed that Squadron Leader Cooper should be made a director of that company. The company, with £14,500,000 of public money, refused point-blank, and the minister was weak enough to climb down. If we are going to use public money in private enterprises, we must see that we get a fair return, and that they employ people who have vision, who will develop industries that are so important to the future development of the Empire. Let there be no more victimization of the people who have the courage and patriotism to come to this house and expose the position when their immediate superiors have refused to listen to them

The JOINT UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR AIR (Capt. Harold Balfour). By arrangement, I am replying on behalf of the Government, although the debate has ranged——

Mr. GRANVILLE (Eye). Before the right honorable and gallant gentleman replies, might I point out that this debate, which is on a very important subject, has been in progress for only an hour and a half, half an hour having been taken up by a very important statement after questions? Would the Minister consider allowing this debate to go on for another half hour?

Captain BALFOUR. The honorable member knows that it is not in my hands to say how on a motion for the adjournment the time should be allotted to any subject. I was saying that I am replying for the Government, although the debate has ranged over a wide number of subjects, affecting other departments than that which I serve. I hope that honorable and right honorable gentlemen will excuse me if I cannot, in the comparatively limited time at my disposal, answer all the detailed questions which have been put. But there are one or two particular matters to which I would refer. I would like first to deal with the speech of the honorable member for East Middlesbrough (Mr. A. Edwards), and in particular with his reference to the case of Squadron Leader Cooper, about which he questioned me yesterday, and which he said that he was going to raise today. The honorable gentleman put forward, firstly, general strictures on the management of the British Overseas Airways Corporation, and then dealt in particular with the case of Squadron Leader Cooper. On the general issue, Parliament decided to give independence of management, carried through on commercial lines, to this public corporation, as it has done to other public corporations, and such independence of management must include, as I think the House will agree, rights of internal administration and control, including the engagement of staff and dispensation with their services. It would be an impossible position for those to whom the management of public corporations has been delegated if,

on the one hand, we gave them independence and, on the other hand, we tried to exercise, almost the next moment, a restriction on their freedom in operating the functions we have given them. The security of this House and of the Government lies in the powers that my right honorable friend possesses. He can remove the board, he can remove individual members of it, he can add to the board; but unless the secretary of state considers that on grounds of public interest such a drastic step is necessary he will leave the management alone to carry on their own affairs.

As regards the case of Squadron-Leader Cooper, the honorable gentleman asked me yesterday whether the services of this officer were dispensed with because he had voiced the widespread dissatisfaction among the senior staff, and whether I would cause an inquiry to be made into all the circumstances. In a supplementary question he asked me whether this officer was dismissed only after a copy of a private letter criticizing officials had been sent to the Director of Overseas Airways by the censor, which the honorable member alleged was an irregular thing to do. That was the first time I had heard it alleged that a private letter was sent by this employee and was supposed to have been intercepted and reported to the British Overseas Airways Corporation. I had thought that he was dealing with some 40 pages of complaints which this officer had sent forward and which document indeed, the corporation has not hesitated at all to hand to me on my request. I have made inquiries—it might interest honorable members to know that they lasted until about midnight last night—and it is clear as a result of the inquiries I made in the short time at my disposal since answering the question of the honorable member, that his supplementary question made certain new statements purporting to show that the termination of this officer's employment was due in some part to the receipt by the corporation overseas of information derived from censorship sources, and that this might be so. Whether the corporation should have received such information and whether they were correct to base part of its case, if indeed they did, upon it, are matters into which inquiry must be made by the appropriate authorities. I am not responsible for censorship overseas, but as this event took place some months ago and some 5,000 miles away such inquiries must of necessity take time. In order that there shall be no suggestion that this officer is in any way prejudiced because of these events the corporation has informed me that the notice terminating his services has meanwhile been suspended.

Mr. A. EDWARDS. May I have this point made clear? The minister has just made a very fair statement. Do I understand that he is pressing for the inquiry to be made, or is it to be done by another department, and can he confirm whether this particular letter was received by the director general from the censor?

Captain BALFOUR. No, sir; I have not had time to go fully into the details, but I am informed that the corporation did receive some communication from censorship sources. Whether it should or should not have received it is an open question still, and whether it did or did not take that into account at arriving at the grounds of dismissal is also an open question still. These questions must be investigated. The first is a matter for various government departments, and the second is a matter for the corporation, but until these issues have been decided, I repeat, the corporation has informed me that the notice terminating his services have meanwhile been suspended.

I would like to deal with one more particular point, before I come to the main issues, and with which the honorable gentleman who initiated this debate opened this statement, and I am sure that he will accept what I say in the spirit in which I reply to him. I was glad to hear him say that the relationship between the civil pilots and those who are in charge of their activities has never been better or franker, but he said the pilots felt somewhat aggrieved that my right honorable friend the Prime Minister had flown with a United States pilot. I will only say that the pilot in question is a pilot serving with the Royal Air Force Ferry Command, a man of great distinction and experience, and furthermore, the Prime Minister, as records will show, has flown both with British Overseas Airways Corporation captains and with Ferry Command pilots, a fair division of the honor of doing that particular job. There is such an abundance of talent among experienced captains that it is a matter of choice according to operational expediency whether he should go in one particular aircraft flown by one particular pilot or another.

I now want to come to the general debate. I do not disagree at all with what I would term the forward view of the honorable gentleman, the member for Stroud (Mr. Perkins) and others who took part in this debate, nor do I quarrel with his statement when he says that there are disturbed feelings in the House. This is quite understandable, and I hope that what I say today will show that more has gone on than honorable members, of necessity, hitherto have known and also the reasons why some of the questions which have been asked today and others which other honorable members would have liked to ask cannot be answered in full. The theme running through this debate has been, "Do something now." I think I have summarized it fairly well. There is a universal acceptance of the importance of air transport for our national future. There is no question about that, and the government realize that as much as honorable members who initiated this debate, but the background of the whole picture must be that during the war the extent of our support to civil aviation has had to be measured by its contribution to the war effort. We have had to apply our available resources in terms of value rendered to that war effort. Our sole purpose—the sole purpose of every honorable and right honorable member of the House—is to win the war, and where air transport can help, there we can support it, but, on the other hand, where there has had to be given a greater priority for some other requirement, then such priority has had to have preference over our air transport supplies. That is a fact which applies not only to equipment but to the operation of routes.

The honorable and gallant gentleman, the member for Erdington (Group Captain Wright) and one or two other members said that it was a great mistake to "sacrifice the African route." As the honorable lady, the member for Frome (Mrs. Tate) will probably remember, when she tackled me in no uncertain terms, as she always does, in the air debate last year on the Pan-American entry into Africa, I said what I repeat today, that we are glad to see the United States, formerly Pan-American Airways and now militarized as part of the United States Air Corps, in Africa or anywhere else if by so flying these routes they help in our combined war effort to win the war. We have had to concentrate upon first things first, both in routes and equipment, and our first need has been to build up an air force to beat the Luftwaffe wherever it may be met. It is worth remembering that we started this war with a big leaway in first-line strength and the balance has had to be struck as regards the conflicting calls upon our limited resources.

There is no honorable member in this House who would not like to see a bomber force of sufficient strength and reserve to keep up a sustained effort of a thousand-aircraft-a-night raids. That commands universal pproval among all members of the House. There are many honorable gentlemen who are anxious to see that the army has all the air support it will require, a sentiment which commands universal approbation. There is not an honorable gentleman who would not advocate giving the Middle East its full requirements in aircraft, ample supplies of all types. We must have air-borne divisions. There is probably not one honorable gentleman who would object to that statement, but they, of course, need hundreds of aircraft. The Fleet Air Arm must have its share of our capacity. We would all like to see air transport have its requirements met in full. But having said that, we come down to the fundamental fact that we all have to face, that you cannot get more than a pint out of a pint pot. If we had tried to satisfy every demand at any one time, we should have succeeded in satisfying no one and would have achieved nothing positive in any direction. I submit to the House that only those who have the responsibility and knowledge—and, with respect, that is not the critics to whom I have listened today—of what are our demands and what are our available resources to meet those demands who can properly judge where the balance should be as between the conflicting needs, including air transport. I claim that the result of the air warfare up to now justifies those who have had the responsibility for these decisions up to date.

I would like to refer for a moment to the statement made by my honorable friend the member for Stroud when he talked about air transport having just a few crumbs from the rich man's table. Well, the crumbs of equipment provided have been worth £5,000,000 during 1942. They have been not such dusty crumbs; indeed, they have been quite substantial crumbs. My honorable friend asked me about the new equipment coming to the British Overseas Airways Corporation. I am sure the House will appreciate that I cannot give the exact figures, as they would be of value to the enemy, but he is right in saying that a considerable number of Sunderland flying boats are coming to the corporation.

I must, however, correct him on one point, when he said it would be tantamount to a disaster if these aircraft were allowed to fly without fully feathering airscrews, known technically as hydromatic airscrews. We intend to fit these aircraft with these airscrews, but their supply lags behind the supply of aircraft, and we shall at first put these flying boats into operation without these hydromatic airscrews. But a consolation to him and to the pilots who will fly them is that Sunderland aircraft have been flying with the Royal Air Force without this particular fitment for several years, doing gallant service under very arduous conditions and often flying back after an engine has been put out of action.

Hitherto we have had to concentrate our manufacturing resources on combat types of aircraft, and it is only now, for the first time since this huge struggle in the air started, that we can commence to lift our eyes from the immediate requirements of combat aircraft to supplying some part of the needs of our war effort in terms of British transport aircraft. The then minister of aircraft production, on 14th July last, told the House that we had to look to the United States for our transport planes and that while the Government did intend to deal with future construction of cargo carrying aircraft in this country, and while at the present stage of the war effort all our expert engineers had to devote their skill to war work, we had, nevertheless, tried converting one of our bombers into a transport plane. I take issue with my honorable friend when he mentioned that particular type and says that it is only a converted bomber. It is, in fact, a virtual redesign of that aircraft. The minister said

that an order had been given in March and that when he made his speech in July the airplane was actually flying. Since then it has been doing extended trials, it is now in production and deliveries in considerable numbers will take place next year.

I would, however, be misleading my honorable friend and the House if I said that there was any prospect within the next few months early in 1943 of that aircraft coming forward in sufficient numbers for us to be able to think of it in terms of transport for the British Overseas Airways Corporation. I sincerely hope that the time will come—and I shall do my best to press for it—when we shall be able to get some of these aircraft for British Overseas Airways Corporation, but it is no good thinking that it will be next January, February, or March, because the aircraft has yet to be produced in numbers. In spite of this effort on our own part and of now being able to lift our eyes for the first time to the supply of our own transport needs, we must face the fact that with the combined resources of the United States and ourselves in the common pool for the common good of the common cause we shall have to continue to look to the United States for the bulk of our transport demands for the next 2 or 3 years of the war.

Mr. GRANVILLE. Will the right honorable and gallant gentleman deal with the question of the design of civil aircraft? As he knows, almost every large concern in America has a design on the drawing board. One of the great difficulties in this country after the war will be in the change-over of the aircraft industry from a war to a peace footing. Can he say whether his department and the Ministry of Aircraft Production have been through the industry to see whether civil aircraft designers are being employed on war production? If not, could they be put onto civil design now?

Captain BALFOUR. I can assure the honorable gentleman that designers in the aircraft industry are being used to the full at the present time. The particular responsibility, however, of seeing when we can switch over design capacity from combat to civil types is not one for my right honorable friend the Secretary of State for Air or myself. It is one for the Ministry of Aircraft Production, but I can tell the honorable gentleman that at the moment our designing capacity is predominantly occupied with combat types.

Mr. GRANVILLE. May I put this point, because it is very important? To my knowledge there are experienced designers in the aircraft industry of this country working on subcontract engineering. Has the right honorable and gallant gentleman's department, in cooperation with the Ministry of Aircraft Production, been through their names to see whether they can be put on to preliminary plans now for the design of civil aircraft after the war?

Captain BALFOUR. It is essentially the responsibility of the Minister of Aircraft Production, and no doubt he will read the honorable gentleman's remarks. I will deal in a moment with the general picture of design and development of civil aircraft, but I want now if I may refer to the post-war position. The Government wants to go ahead wherever possible. We must look at post-war civil aviation in a big way. It is one of the major tasks of national reconstruction and must be approached in the determination that we must learn lessons from the past—some of which have been quoted today—and not be prejudiced by what has gone before in our willingness to introduce new methods to deal with new problems.

Earl WINTERTON (Horsham and Worthing). I presume that when my right honorable and gallant friend says that he means that in every possible way, through every diplomatic channel open to us, it will be represented to our American Allies and friends that the fact that they are now running particular services through particular parts of the Empire during the war does not mean that they will have any right to do so after the war? That is the crux of the whole matter.

Captain BALFOUR. That is well understood. To use a colloquialism, we have agreed on the highest level with the Americans that as regards routes they are now running for military purposes on lines which may have commercial values "all bets are off" at the end of the war.

Lt. Col. Sir THOMAS MOORE (Ayr Burghs). Can my right honorable and gallant friend give us any information as regards the future of the Atlantic terminal airport in this country? Can he say whether it will be retained in British hands?

Captain BALFOUR. No, sir. I could not possibly, without notice, give information on that comparatively detailed but important point. I repeat, we must be prepared to learn lessons from the past and not be prejudiced by what has gone before; we must be willing to be fresh in our outlook and to introduce new methods. The honorable lady the member for Frome (Mrs. Tate) said that civil aviation should be taken away from the Air Ministry. The honorable member for Melton (Sir Lindsay Everard) said that there should be a secretary for civil aviation. Do not let us turn our minds against any of those things. Though I stand here as the representative of the Air Ministry, but I am not going to say that it is right forever that civil aviation should remain with the Air Ministry or that it should go from it. We have to start with fresh minds and a fresh outlook on all these problems.

I want now to deal with the point that was raised by the honorable member for Eye (Mr. Granville). Although we are limited by the exigencies of war and we cannot divert any large amount of designing staff to the preparation of purely civil types, because the designing staff is fully occupied on war jobs, nevertheless we can now start thinking and planning without detriment to our war effort, and this we are doing. As regards aircraft, the Ministry of Aircraft Production and the Air Ministry are working in close concert on various aspects of post-war civil equipment. We have cooperation—and I think the House will be interested to know this—on the application of war-time radio devices and radio aids to peacetime needs. That is going on now and it has been going on for some time. This work is necessarily secret, but I can assure the House that it is being carried on with the determination that when peace comes our civil transport effort will have the advantage of quick adaptation of wartime practice to peacetime requirements, and I believe the turning of this work into peaceful channels will introduce an unthought-of era of safety in air-line navigation. The Ministry of Aircraft Production and the Air Ministry are working closely on the broad design requirements for types of civil aircraft after the war. In reply to the honorable member for Eye, of course, any civil aircraft after the war must of necessity have de-icing apparatus as part of its equipment. There is, as the honorable member for Frome said, the dual problem of converting existing types of bomber aircraft to civil transport use during the interim period immediately after the war. Then there is the second more long-distance problem which must be tackled now—I mean long distance only in the time that will be taken to solve it—of the design and construction of entirely new types for civil purposes.

As I was saying, even if we cannot actually build civil aircraft at present because of our war needs, we can, at any rate, plan out the broad types likely to be needed.

There are many big issues yet to be decided by the Government, perhaps advised by bodies which may be specially set up for this purpose.

Mr. SIMMONDS. Has the Government considered, instead of setting up an outside body, having a joint standing committee of both Houses to go into this question of civil aviation?

Captain BALFOUR. Obviously, I cannot say anything about that today, except that I am sure those responsible for setting up any bodies that may be decided upon in the future will take due note of my honorable friend's suggestion.

Mr. GRANVILLE. Is the Air Ministry or the Ministry of Aircraft Production responsible for the design of any future civil aircraft?

Captain BALFOUR. We are working in close concert. The Ministry of Aircraft Production is responsible for design of all aircraft.

Mr. GRANVILLE. Then why, in an important debate of this kind, has there been no representative of the Ministry of Aircraft Production present?

Captain BALFOUR. Because the debate has ranged over many subjects, affecting more than one department, and it has been decided that I should do my best to represent the views of those departments. Whatever may be the answer as to these big issues which have yet to be decided, such as the method of operation of civil aircraft after the war, for instance, my honorable and gallant friend the member for Erdington raised the question whether we should have one or more chosen instruments, then the question has been raised whether civil aviation should stay with the Air Ministry, then there is the question whether a special minister should be responsible for civil aviation and whether existing transport interests should participate and, if so, in what form or what international instrument should be set up for insuring maximum safety for travelers or for a common airport policy—whatever may be the answer to these various issues, one thing is sure—we are determined to have our place in the air-transport system of the world for the British Commonwealth of Nations to link up its own interests with those of the other nations of the world.

For this we and the whole world will need aircraft and in large numbers. At the end of the war we may be faced with two alternatives unless we safeguard the position now as far as we are able. Either we shall have to contemplate closing down a large part of the aircraft industry, employing more than 1,000,000 workers, and hope that the industrial labor market will be able to absorb and use the skill of those men elsewhere, or we shall have to continue building bombers and fighters for which there may be little or no use in the numbers that we shall be producing at the end of the war.

It is because the Government is determined that this shall not happen that we are prepared to take bold decisions as to what we are to do in the future. Post-war civil aviation is but one piece in the jigsaw of the building up of the post-war world, the preparation and coordination of which, as far as this country is concerned, is in the hands of the Paymaster General. But I am authorized to say that the Government is now actively considering what these bold measures should be and what form they should take. If decisions can be properly taken now, we shall certainly take them. If further examination is required, this shall be arranged for in the best form to reach a speedy conclusion. In either case the House will be fully informed as soon as we are in a position to do so. I repeat, in conclusion, that only now for the first time are we able to lift our eyes from the immediate, urgent needs of the present to look to the possibilities of the future. Only the Government could decide when this can properly be done, and the Government will inform Parliament as soon as possible of the steps which they recommend should be taken to found a policy for post-war civil aviation which shall be worthy of our people.

John B. Hughes Urges Action Now in Preparation for Post-War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I take sincere pride in including in my remarks the following forceful and in my opinion very timely broadcast by the able commentator, Mr. John B. Hughes:

Again this evening I devote this time to the discussion of post-war planning here and abroad—to planning for our national well-being here in the United States and the planning for a better world.

Again, thank you for your many letters and your flood of contributions of ideas on this subject. Many of you have written specific proposals on certain single problems which you consider of utmost importance, others have sent me broad outlines of complete plans for the organization of peace on a world-wide basis. I repeat my pledge that I will bring these suggestions of yours to the attention of authorities who are directing the planning for the future. This effort is dedicated purely to the purpose of assisting the establishment of a people's peace—which is simply a peace acceptable to the people of this country. No peace program which is contrary to the wish of the people will be effective, for even though it might be put into effect if the people do not like it, it will not last.

Actually, in fundamental, basic beliefs and ideals the people of this country are not so far different from the people of other countries. Our standards of living may be different. Our social and political habits may be different. These are matters of conditioning, but that conditioning has been the result of centuries of education and development. Thus, no leveling off can be immediate. No world-wide plan can be a get-peace-and-happiness-quick sort of solution. World organization has been discussed for many years. Attempts have been made to apply plans. The latest attempt was that of the Hitler hierarchy of Nazi Germany. That has not been acceptable to the people of the world. No more acceptable is the plan of the Japanese men of destiny—the plan of Hakko Ichiu—"eight corners, one roof."

Objections to such planning is not because they are basically centered on world organization but because their method called for brutal, bestial enslavement of peoples. History shows clearly the futility of any such program. People have been enslaved in the past, but they have not submitted to slavery for long. They never will. World organization for economic and political peace must be in accord with the will of the people—the greatest number of the people—if it is to succeed.

No small group of men, however powerful they may become for the moment—for a day, a year, or a century—can retain control. There will be no peace, there will be no satisfactory government, until it is truly a "people's government—a people's peace."

Much concern has been expressed recently about the attitude of the American people's representatives in Government—the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States. There has been a great deal of concern expressed in the letters you have written me on the subject of post-war planning—concern lest the politicians neglect their responsibility in this critical relationship between the present and the future.

There will be more concern unless the Congress does something in line with the people's wish.

Throughout the Seventy-seventh Congress there was a bill, a proposed law proposing the establishment of a national commission to study and to act on the problems of post-war readjustment. The bill was introduced on the first day of the Seventy-seventh Congress in 1941, by Representative JERRY VOORHIS, of California. It died with the end of that Congress at the end of 1942. On January 6, 1943, Mr. VOORHIS put this proposal back into the legislative hopper as House Joint Resolution 36—a resolution to establish the National Commission for Post-War Reconstruction.

Mr. VOORHIS' proposed legislation would be beneficial to the hope for a people's peace, for it calls for 10 congressional members of this commission and 29 associate members to be chosen from representative groups of the Nation, persons designated by the President but to be chosen from government, from labor, from farmer organizations, from business and industry, from finance, from church organizations, from war veterans groups, and from organizations of educators, cooperatives, consumers, health, economics, and engineering.

The appointment of such a commission would be a process in the democratic manner—a process which would indicate a chance of the people's peace. Yet for 2 years the last Congress did nothing to forward this process. I would suggest that you might write a note to your Congressman asking him what he intends to do about House Joint Resolution 36 or, if you would like to study the proposal, write to Congressman JERRY VOORHIS and ask him for a copy of this resolution—House Joint Resolution 36, the resolution to establish a National Commission for Post-War Reconstruction.

The bill does not propose any plan or blueprint of post-war planning; it simply calls for a study of the matter by a representative body of individuals, representatives through election—this is, through Congress—and through the various organized groups of the Nation's economic and social divisions. Nothing could be more democratic in principle.

Those who hold that it is still too early to discuss post-war planning are currently receiving a powerful argument in favor of such discussion from no less a source than the Nazi government of Germany. The practical value of such discussion is best measured in the recent attempts of the Nazis to counteract the favorable reaction in conquered territories to Allied post-war discussion.

The first hint that the Nazis were on the defensive against Allied planning came last December when Hitler's own paper Volkischer Beobachter outlined the Nazi plans for post-war Europe, and especially the place of the small state in the future European order as envisioned by the Nazis. It is evident that the Nazi discussion of a post-war Europe, predicated by a Nazi victory, is defensive—the peoples of the occupied territories have apparently found new hope in Allied discussions of rehabilitation and resettlement. It is also evident that the Nazis have expected the peoples of Europe to accept the cut-and-dried Nazi plan of a new order as something eminently to be desired—a plan for existence in which everyone is supposed to receive the fruits of life as imagined by the Nazis, and everyone is to receive these fruits in return for the complete annihilation of the individual, the submergence of personality in a German-run world. That's all they ask; just sell your birthright for a mess.

In projecting the German idea of a perfect post-war world the Volkischer Beobachter betrays that same peculiar mixture of humorless conceit and short-sightedness that was one of the causes of German collapse in World War No. 1. The Beobachter means to counteract the Allied discussions of post-war planning, but succeeds only in creating new resistance to the new order. The reaction to the Nazis was immediate, and it was especially strong in the few European nations which are considered neutral.

A Turkish newspaper declared that "if there is anyone who does not yet understand German ambition he should read the Beobachter article which clearly states that in the event of an Axis victory there would be only one master in Europe—Germany—and no other course would be open to small states but to obey. The first order to be given by this master would be the abolition of the parliamentarianism of democracy, which would mean that small states would no longer be masters in their own house." Thus Turkish recognition of a Europe under Nazi bondage.

There were also objections voiced in Switzerland to the Nazi post-war plan, and there were disapproving comments in several Swedish newspapers. One Swedish paper, the Sid-Svensak Dag-Bladet, took exception to the Nazi statement that the Germans must make themselves liked by the rest of Europe. On the face of things the statement was somewhat condescending, and the Swedish paper stated that "the Germans have a strong philosophical bent, and are inclined to clothe their political ideas in philosophical raiment, but they are reluctant to confront this philosophy with reality—almost like the philosopher who said that if facts did not correspond with his beliefs, so much the worse for the facts. Now, when the Herrenvolk is discharging its political mission it sometimes stumbles upon unpleasant facts. "One of these is freedom—and consequently freedom is eliminated." Thus the Swedish reaction to the Nazi new order. There was also a reaction from Finland, where the chief newspaper of the labor movement blasted Nazi presumptions, despite the fact that Finland is an active ally of Germany on the Russian front. Finally, there was the Danish reaction to the presumptive Nazi article. The Danish statement was published by a newspaper which no longer appears inside Denmark, except surreptitiously, but the statement contains much in a few brief lines that portrays the general European attitude toward post-war planning, Nazi or Allied.

The statement is this: "Europe is one unit geographically but not nationally and spiritually, for every nation has its own history and traditions. So far this has been repeatedly misunderstood or ignored. Efforts at unity have repeatedly failed because the powers have striven to make the nations uniform politically, as, for instance, France under Napoleon. Therefore, Europe has suffered terribly. One cannot make uniform that which is naturally and inherently different. Scandinavian, German, Italian, Spaniard, and Greek cannot through any dictate of power become uniform so that they think, believe, and love in the same way. Such an attempt will inevitably fail.

"On the day when the various nations and peoples not only possess the will to understand and respect each other, but are also liberated from every suspicion that others will impose upon them something foreign, or torture their souls, then the road will be open toward the great goal which many of Europe's best sons have visualized.

"On the day when a tolerant Europe will secure for Denmark independence, self-determination, and security, Denmark will joyfully and fearlessly tread new roads. A happy world was never built on spiritual or political tyranny."

The little nations of Europe are not looking for security based on the inflexible program of a master race. The Danes are not

looking for a new and perfect era, realizing that perfection still lies far away in the distant future of the human race. But the Danes, as a sensible people, are willing to cooperate in a more ordered world—are willing to support a plan which guarantees national integrity to smaller nations and which recognizes their right to exist.

The German temperament lends itself to regimentation and cannot understand the peculiar love of individual liberty and freedom which come as a fulfillment to other peoples. The German temperament is capable of cooperation only in a planned order, and cannot adjust itself to a flexible order in which each individual or each nation bends a little to the needs and desires of the other fellow. But the rest of the European peoples can and will support an order based on recognition of the individual, whether it be a single person or a nation. The peoples of Europe have been giving considerable attention to the problem of post-war reorganization—and some of the results of that thinking and attention I will bring to you next Sunday night in the next of these broadcasts devoted entirely to the subject of post-war planning.

The Greatest Single Contribution Congress Can Make to Our National Morale Is To Stabilize Income Tax Rates and Place Future Taxpaying on a Sane, Pay-as-You-Go Footing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because of its timely importance, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the very capable pen of Mr. Harlan Logan, editor of Look magazine, an article which first appeared in the issue of Look which reached the newsstands today. Entitled, as it is, "The Truth About Your Income Tax," it is bound to excite widespread interest throughout the country.

The article referred to follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT YOUR INCOME TAX

(By Harlan Logan, editor of Look)

On January 1 more than 27,000,000 Americans were in debt to the Federal Government, many of them for the first time. Their obligation: a heavy tax on income they had received—and largely spent—during 1942.

Most of us, facing this burden willingly, are now preparing to pay the first installment of our 1942 income tax on March 15. Yet, when that has been done, we will still owe a year's tax—for 9 months of 1942, and 3 months of 1943.

In other words, most Americans face perpetual tax bondage. Unless a change is made they will never get out of debt to their own Government.

And what a debt. Right now America's taxes per capita are heavier than either Canada's or Britain's. The demands of war will make them rise still higher. A national sales tax, and perhaps other measures, will be needed to help pay for our world-wide struggle with the Axis.

But income-tax rates must not be increased. Already they are about as high as the traffic will bear. And few people know how to save to meet their quarterly payments. Once the coming March 15 installment is paid, many Americans may be unable to meet the next three payments.

This means that otherwise good citizens may default on an honest obligation—while the Government loses desperately needed revenue.

RELIEF MUST BE FOUND

What is Congress going to do about all this? In the past our lawmakers have not recognized the necessity of income-tax reform. But this year it stares them in the face.

The facts alone are urgent. Widespread public interest has been stirred by the Ruml pay-as-you-go tax plan. This year's Congress is unusually alert to the wishes of the people. It is therefore certain that, spurred on by the people, Congress will take early action.

As Look sees it, two main steps will end the iniquities of the present income-tax system and place the Nation on a sane tax footing.

First: Congress should arrange before March 15 for voluntary pay roll deductions after that date to amortize payments due for the balance of 1943 and in future years. Taxpayers would then be relieved of possible delinquency. A corollary provision would have post offices and banks accepting weekly or monthly tax payments. Quarterly payments would continue, if preferred.

Second: Once this plan is in operation, Congress should concentrate on the regular Revenue Act of 1943. Into this act, before August 1, should be written some form of pay-as-you-go plan. Such a plan, Look feels, must provide that—

1. Income-tax rates will not be increased.
2. Individual income-tax returns will be filed January 15 instead of March 15.
3. Taxes paid in 1943 will apply to 1943 income, not 1942, and will be based on 1942 income, any under- or over-payment to be adjusted next January 15.

Next January 15, income for 1944 will be estimated and taxes paid accordingly. Adjustment will again be made January 15, 1945, and so on, for each succeeding year.

4. Taxes on 1942 income will be deferred without interest and, unless paid during the taxpayer's lifetime, will become a lien on his estate. They will then be payable, along with estate taxes, provided the value of the estate is greater than statutory exemptions.
5. The Victory tax be used for any additional enforced savings which would bear no interest and be nonnegotiable until after the war.

Look believes this plan meets all basic requirements for a real pay-as-you-go-tax system by 1944. It answers one of the main criticisms leveled at the Ruml plan, since it provides no tax windfalls for large taxpayers. Finally, it retains the Victory tax as a combined anti-inflationary and enforced-savings device.

We pay heavier taxes than Britain

ESTIMATED TOTAL TAX RECEIPTS FOR 1942–43

Tax	United States	Canada	United Kingdom
Federal Government	$23,000,000,000	$2,000,000,000	$9,400,000,000
State, provincial, local, etc.	10,000,000,000	500,000,000	900,000,000
Total	33,000,000,000	2,500,000,000	10,300,000,000
Population	131,670,000	11,480,000	47,600,000
Total tax per capita	$251	$218	$216

Post-War Air Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the attached news item from the London Times of December 29, 1942, is submitted to show that there is good reason for the people of the United States to believe that their Government has abandoned, or is seeking to abandon, our historic commercial air policy. The news item below undoubtedly inspired the three articles by William Philip Simms—Air Freedom, February 5; Freedom of Air, February 6; Skyways for All, February 8, syndicated in the Washington Daily News:

POST-WAR AIR LINES.—EARLY AGREEMENT EXPECTED—RIGHT OF INNOCENT PASSAGE

WASHINGTON, December 28.—There is good reason to believe that the United States Government are already seeking an understanding to cover the field of commercial flying after the war on the ground that no treaty may be necessary to establish the sound principles. Briefly the principles or policies upon which this country will seek to establish an agreement with Britain and other nations will be as follows:

First. The right of innocent passage through the air over any foreign country, which is to say that nonmilitary aircraft may fly over any country as long as they abide by the domestic regulations affecting the country's own commercial aircraft.

Second. Right of free landing for nonmilitary aircraft on airports in any foreign country for refueling or other technical reasons; provided again that they obey the regulations, and further that they do not pick up or discharge passengers

Third. The principle of freedom of the air, meaning that any country could license commercial aircraft for commerce between their own country and any other or between two or more foreign countries. It would be understood that aircraft of a foreign country would not be permitted to engage in intranational commerce; for instance, an American airplane would be forbidden to pick up passengers or freight in London for delivery in Liverpool.

NO SUBSIDIES

The general assumption in Washington appears to be that executive agreements, supported perhaps in the United States by a joint resolution of Congress, would be all that is required. It is not believed that the war will be followed by an international

movement to subsidize commercial air lines, since it has already been shown that they can be self-supporting over the main routes, and nearly so over the minor routes.

Obviously the issues involved touch Anglo-American relations with special importance, particularly since Britain is at present placing emphasis on the building of short-range combat types and the United States on larger aircraft whose conversion to commercial activity should be relatively simple. It is reported that negotiations are already under way, based on an American assurance that this country would not at the end of the war attempt to exploit her advantage by "nailing down" concessions over the world air routes.

The War Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following address of Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization, delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System February 9, 1943:

There is considerable, and not wholly unwarranted, optimism about our present military situation, particularly compared with what it was up to a few months ago. There is danger, however, that we may not fully appreciate the terrible stresses and strains upon our accustomed habits of living that we must be prepared to undergo during the coming year.

Our optimism will be justified only by our ability and willingness to accept the burdens and deprivations which will be required of all of us to carry through our war plans for 1943.

Those plans call for a very substantial increase in our war production over last year's record-breaking goals. They require at the same time the enlistment of additional millions into our armed forces. They contemplate, within a measurable period of time, the invasion of Europe, one of the greatest military operations ever planned in history—a military campaign, which no matter how successfully and brilliantly executed, will involve casualties such as this Nation has never before endured. Supplies, in unprecedented volume, must flow constantly, and with consummate timing, over carefully guarded supply lines to the battle fronts. We must also pool our supplies with those of the experienced and well-trained troops of Britain and our other allies who will form a part of the invading armies and gladly share the burden of fighting and dying. We must continue our support of our gallant Russian allies, who having withstood two all-out onslaughts of the Nazi's total might, are now driving the Nazis whimpering back toward a disillusioned Germany. We must send more help to our Chinese allies whose indomitable resistance constantly wears down the fighting strength of the Japanese military machine and holds for us the roads to Tokyo.

It will require the fullest mobilization of our manpower and our resources to carry out these war plans for 1943. It will require the wholehearted cooperation of agriculture, labor, and industry to carry out these plans with the self-restraint and self-discipline necessary to avoid inflation and to preserve our system of free labor and free enterprise.

In the years before the war we were struggling to improve the standard of living of the mass of our people. After the war is over this struggle of man to better himself will continue. But we must face the fact that there is no way that we can hope to improve or even to sustain our customary standards of living during the coming war year. We shall be able to retain for our consumer needs at home only a fraction of our total production. Although we shall not have to endure the shame of poverty amid plenty that we did in 1932, we shall, in fact, have little more goods to use or consume at home than we did at the depth of the depression. We must all prepare to adopt for the duration a Spartan standard of living and to take patriotic pride in it. There is no way of giving any one group of our people a substantial additional part of the Nation's goods or income without hurting all the rest of us.

Despite the rises in wages and prices which have thus far occurred, we have been able to maintain a fair balance between various producers and workers. There are inequities in the wages paid in every industry and in every factory. This has always been true. We cannot hope, while fighting a total war, to eliminate all the real or fancied inequalities of man. Our task is to see that the present balance does not change for the worse and that those on the lower rungs of the economic ladder are not ground down below the margin of subsistence.

In considering the ability of the wage earner to meet the increased cost of living, we cannot look simply at the basic hourly wage rates, even though such rates have risen in excess of the increased cost of living. Today men are working more than 40 hours per week. For the hours over 40, they are paid time and one-half. The average weekly earnings of all factory workers (that is, the amount the worker takes home in his pay envelope) have increased more than 50 percent since January 1941, and more than 60 percent since September 1939.

Millions formerly unemployed, or on relief and W. P. A., now have full-time jobs. Millions more who formerly worked 2 or 3 days per week are now earning overtime pay. Other millions who formerly worked in low-paid occupations have been trained to become skilled mechanics at higher wages. Where a year ago one pay envelope came into the home on pay day, now two and sometimes three come into the same homes. The family requires no more shelter, little more food, and little more clothes, but the income of the family is far in excess of any increase in the cost of living to the family.

Taking into account the rise of living costs—which must and shall be halted—the actual weekly purchasing power of the average industrial worker is still 36 percent more than it was in September 1939.

In other words, the American industrial worker and his family today enjoy the highest purchasing power that has ever existed in this or any other country. If we preserve and protect this purchasing power, it will constitute the basis of an unparalleled prosperity for American workers in the post-war period.

Rising prices will, on the other hand, destroy this purchasing power. A frantic race between rising wages and rising prices, far from helping labor, will only ruin and degrade the worker and his family, depriving them of all the gains they have so painfully built up over the years.

The position of the farmers is equally favorable. The relation of farm costs to farm income is the most favorable ever attained in our history. Between 1939 and 1942 total costs of farm production increased by 38 percent; and farm production increased by 20 percent. During the same period farm prices rose on the average by 71 percent. Since 1939 unit farm prices have increased almost as much as 5 times unit farm costs. As a result of this extremely favorable relationship of costs to prices, the net farm income after all costs, in 1942, stood at the highest level in our history, $1,000,000,000 above the peak earned during the inflationary year 1919.

In a year of total war, we cannot iron out all the inequalities in the wage structure nor can we remove all the imperfections, real or fancied, in the farm parity formula. Certainly it would not be in the real interest of the farmers to introduce any change in the formula which would give the farmer a temporary and illusory advantage during the war and which would, if applied year in and year out, actually reduce parity prices to the farmer.

The Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, contains the most significant and beneficial legislation enacted for the farmer since the Agricultural Adjustment Act. It proceeds on the principle recommended by the President in his message of September 7, 1942, that there should be "a floor under prices of farm products, in order to maintain stability in the farm market for a reasonable future time" after the war. It provides a guaranty to the farmer of 85 to 90 percent of parity prices on basic crops during the war and for at least 2 crop years after the 1st day of January following the formal declaration of the termination of the war. That is a real effort to protect the farmer against post-war deflation. But the effort will fail if we cannot prevent runaway inflation.

Our struggle against rising prices during this war has thus far been successful as compared with World War No. 1. October 1942 was the thirty-eighth month of the present war. In those 38 months wholesale prices have risen 33.3 percent. In the same period during the last war wholesale prices rose 83.5 percent. Between August 1939 and October 1942 the cost of living rose 20.7 percent; in the comparable period of the last war the cost of living went up 32.2 percent.

But we must not refuse to face the very real dangers in the present situation and especially the threat of creeping inflation. Between May 1942, when the general price ceilings were imposed, and December 15, 1942, the cost of food rose 9.1 percent. But food constitutes only one-third of the cost of living and because rents and other items did not increase so much, the actual cost of living rose only 3.8 percent. With certain foods very scarce and the price of others very high, it is natural that the average housewife should feel that the cost of living has risen even higher than these figures would indicate. But it has risen and this creeping inflation must not be allowed to continue and to nullify all the progress we have made.

Higher prices and higher wages will not bring us more food. They will not enable us to buy more canned goods or sugar, because these items are rationed. They will not enable us to buy automobiles or electric refrigerators, because these articles are not for sale. They will simply cause us to outbid each other in grabbing for the food and goods available. They will increase our income, but the Government will be forced to recapture the excess income in higher taxes. It is unwise and useless to increase the size of the pay envelope when the size of the market basket is being cut down. Higher prices will not help the merchant or farmer, but they will bring hardships and suffering to widows and others with fixed income; to old folks with pensions, to the school teachers, and to the unorganized workers in low-paid occupations. They will make unbear-

able the burden of the woman who has been allotted $50 a month upon which to live while her husband or her son has gone to the front to fight and possibly die for you and me.

We must not retreat in our fight to stabilize the cost of living. The act of Congress provided that prices, wages, and salaries affecting the cost of living should be stabilized and except as otherwise provided in the act such stabilization should, so far as practicable, be on the basis of levels existing September 15, 1942. We must hold that line. We must adhere firmly to that program. There must be no further increases in wages beyond the "little steel" formula, except in limited and special cases to correct patently gross inequities, and to rectify plainly substandard wages. Today the National War Labor Board reaffirmed this policy in its decision in the meat packers' case. There must be no further price increases unless and to the limited extent required by law to meet clearly established cost increases which cannot generally be absorbed out of profits.

We must bring under effective control all food prices. We must break up the black markets. Some of the talk about black markets is exaggeration, but by no means all. Price Administrator Brown is making a determined effort to exterminate them. He needs money, but even more he needs your help. The man who helped the bootlegger in prohibition days hurt only himself. The woman who today encourages a merchant to bootleg food is hurting her loved ones, her country, and herself.

To ensure the effective and uniform administration of the policies which I have announced, I have requested the National War Labor Board to make no increase in wage rates which will change existing wage policies or which affects directly or indirectly an entire industry or substantial portion thereof without prior consultation with me. And I have also requested the Price Administrator not to approve any increase in general price ceilings without first consulting me. It is my purpose to exercise all the powers granted by law to prevent any further increase in the basic and essential cost of subsistence living. I am assured by all the agencies of Government concerned that I shall have in this effort their wholehearted cooperation.

This policy of holding basic prices and basic wages firmly at their present levels does not preclude the limited use of price incentives or wage incentives to increase production. But such incentive payments must not be used as an excuse for a general increase in wages or prices. We cannot hand out incentives so freely that they only cancel each other and add to our inflationary gap.

In the labor field it has been customary to pay overtime for work in excess of the normal hours. Overtime payments have been an effective aid to increased production during the war. Paying more for the same work makes for inflation. Paying more for extra work does not.

To make more effective use of our manpower during the war period the President has today signed an Executive order establishing a minimum 48-hour workweek, without affecting the workers' existing right to overtime pay. Many war industries are already working 48 hours or more a week, but the order will induce other industries to go on a minimum 48-hour week wherever feasible. The general adoption of the 48-hour week will enable us to get more work out of our limited labor supply. While overtime payments will add to the wage bill, the addition will be largely made up by the increased production secured. And we shall thereby release manpower for the armed forces, for war industry, and for the farms.

Secretary Wickard has recently introduced incentive payments into our farm program as a means of securing increased farm production. Although the general relation of total farm costs to farm prices is extremely favorable, the farmer must incur unusually high costs in expanding the output of some crops beyond current peak level. To provide this additional output made necessary by the war, the farmer must be compensated for his additional costs. Incentive payments will enable us to increase production without increasing prices.

Some people have dubbed incentive payments subsidies, thinking thereby to condemn them. I disagree. To me they seem essentially sound economically. They will increase the production of basic foodstuffs just as they have been used to increase the production of copper and other critical materials. They cannot be said to be unfair to anyone.

General and indiscriminate wage and price increases will not solve any of our real problems. They will not give us increased manpower. They will not give us increased production. They are advantageous to the groups that get them only so long as other groups can be kept from getting them. The apparent advantages obtained by the groups benefited will prove short-lived and illusory during the war, and will bring retribution even on these groups when the war is over. Those who demand them are only demanding another depression.

No man hates regimentation more than I do. But I would be less than honest if I told you that the stresses and strains on our civilian economy could be met without a high degree of regimentation in our civilian as well as our military life. With the proper spirit and understanding among our people that regimentation may be largely self-regimentation. But whatever you call it, each one of us must take his place and play his part on our team.

When we are drafting men and youths into the armed forces at $600 a year, we cannot let other men and women work where they please, when they please, or allow them or persuade them to jump from one job or business to another just because it pays more. No businessman, no farmer, and no worker has a right to look upon this war as an opportunity for personal profit.

We must all serve, and I am sure that we want to serve where we are best fitted and most needed. Last week Mr. McNutt, the Chairman of the Manpower Commission, took action to control the hiring of workers in critical labor-shortage areas. In the future, workers may be guided to employment where they are most urgently needed. In the future they must not leave essential employment, whether in the factory or on the farm, without good cause.

Last year many workers upon farms and in dairies went to industrial plants to get higher wages. They were splendid farm workers; many are indifferent mechanics. As we have urged men to volunteer for military service, we should urge these men to return to the farms where they are needed, even if the compensation is less. If they refuse to go, their draft deferments should be canceled. If some men can be drafted and sent abroad at $50 per month, every civilian must go where he can render the greatest service, even if it means less money. The Army staff has been considering the practicability of furloughing soldiers to assist farmers during the harvesting season. No plan has been agreed upon. The proposal has difficulties, but I hope they can be solved.

Rationing can equalize some hardships, but it cannot blot out shortages. Nobody likes complicated rationing, but it is important for all of us to remember that the purpose of rationing is not to take goods away from us, but to see that the goods we have are equitably shared. If we evade the rationing rules, we are not playing a trick on some bureaucrat. We are taking something that belongs to our neighbor or something that our boys across the sea should have. Every man who buys on the black market is stealing from his fellow man.

We in the East are forbidden to drive for pleasure not because some bureaucrat at Washington enjoys our discomfort but because the tank cars are needed to carry fuel oil to keep our homes above 60 degrees and to protect our children from pneumonia; and because our tankers are needed to carry high-octane gas to our boys who are bombing Berlin and Bizerte. Who but the slacker could begrudge this sacrifice?

As shortages grow, shopping for the average man and woman becomes more difficult. We do not find the things we customarily buy and we don't always know what else to buy. We are all working now to devise simplified and standardized utility articles so that while we may have less fashion and variety, we shall be able to get more readily the simple things we really need.

But in this field I do not think we should rely exclusively on Government. Within the limits of wartime restrictions there is still room for manufacturers and processors to sense the need of the times and to take an active part in the development of utility articles which give the people what they need at the lowest possible price and in a form which makes the most effective use of critical foods and materials.

We cannot evade the hard and grim realities of the war. We can take pride and even pleasure in simple living, or we can grumble about our deprivations and make ourselves and those about us miserable. As fathers and brothers, wives and sisters of our fighting men, let us show that we, too, have what it takes to win a total war for freedom.

But even if our manpower is used most effectively and our supplies husbanded most prudently, there still is inherent danger in a situation where our national consumer income is so abnormally large in relation to the goods available for consumption. There is a $16,000,000,000 gap. We must tax ourselves to close that gap.

Inasmuch as the great volume of surplus consumer income is in the hands of the lower middle income groups, a part of the additional taxation which must fall heavily on this group should take the form of postwar credits or compulsory savings. Then there will be no feeling that from a long-term standpoint we are departing from the progressive principle of taxing in accordance with ability to pay. We must not shirk from high taxation during wartime. It is one of the most effective and most practical safeguards against inflation. If we can draft a mother's only son, we should not hesitate to draft her neighbor's surplus dollars.

Corporate profits before taxes have risen to unprecedented peaks. Apart from certain loopholes in the tax system, however, the great bulk of the excess profits is turned to the Government through excess profit taxes. But in the struggle to achieve stable prices and stable costs, it would be desirable to keep costs and prices down rather than to let excess profits accumulate, even though most of them are recaptured by the Government. Excess profits provoke inflationary wage demands. An excess-profits tax is no excuse for maintaining exorbitant prices or for saddling excessive costs on the Government or on consumers. Accordingly the Office of Price Administration is reviewing the present structure of prices and will reduce prices wherever exorbitant profits are found to exist.

The casualties of war are many and cruel. The greatest and most irreparable loss is of course on the battlefield. But there are also casualties on the civilian front. Families are broken up, businesses are destroyed.

When many people are bearing great sorrows bravely and silently, there must be no feeling that anybody is trying to profit from the war. When heavy taxes are being imposed on those scarcely above the margin of subsistence, there should not be even the basis for a suspicion that people in the higher income brackets are not bearing their full share of the burden of the war.

We are in total war. We are fighting for a common future. For that future we must all make common sacrifices. We must go through and come out of this war strong and confident. We want, and the world needs, a powerful and prosperous America so that we may achieve an enduring peace. We do not want a return to the deflation that followed the last war, when wheat dropped from $2.16 to $1.03; when corn fell from $1.52 to 52 cents; when cotton declined from 35 cents to 15 cents, and hogs from $16.39 to $7.63; when a large part of our farm lands was foreclosed; when wages fell and returning soldiers tramped the streets hunting for work, when some men went into bankruptcy and some into suicides' graves.

This time we must hold the line against inflation and deflation. This time we must win the peace for the sake of ourselves and all humanity.

Our Armed Forces—Each State Compared With Every Other State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Texas delegation in Congress at a regular meeting has authorized the insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the following statement, which is self-explanatory:

HON. EWING THOMASON,
Chairman, Texas Congressional Delegation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: In compliance with the passage of a motion before our delegation, you selected a committee composed of the Honorable BOB POAGE, and the Honorable ED GOSSETT, and myself to represent the Texas delegation for the purpose of obtaining certain information relative to inductions and enlistments in the armed forces and to make a report on such matters to the delegation.

Your committee has been diligently working on the task assigned, along with yourself and the Honorable PAUL KILDAY, who are members of the Military Affairs Committee of the House from our delegation and who have assisted us greatly in our work, and we desire to make a preliminary report.

Although we have not completed the task assigned, we have received, in compliance with our written request, certain very valuable information that we herewith embody in this, our preliminary, report. This information was given to us by the Office of War Information with the understanding that it would be made a matter of public record, so there is no question of it disclosing military secrets involved.

It is attached hereto, made a part hereof, and is self-explanatory .

Respectfully submitted.

W. R. POAGE,
ED GOSSETT,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Committee.

State	Percent distribution by State					Percent of each State's registrants				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Population	Registration [1]	Enlistments [2]	Inductions	Armed forces, Jan. 1, 1943	Armed forces, Apr. 1, 1943 [3]	Deferred for occupation	Deferred for dependency	Married with children	Deferred for mental, moral, or physical reasons
United States	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	4.12	50.21	41.90	8.38
Alabama	2.15	2.07	1.68	1.91	1.80	1.81	2.20	54.28	46.25	9.74
Arizona	.38	.40	.42	.33	.37	.37	3.23	53.00	44.54	8.81
Arkansas	1.48	1.41	1.22	1.44	1.34	1.29	1.46	47.24	46.08	11.29
California	5.26	5.88	7.63	4.78	6.14	6.24	6.26	45.29	37.72	7.82
Colorado	.85	.81	1.08	.78	.92	.85	4.01	50.03	43.81	8.47
Connecticut	1.30	1.39	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.44	5.67	50.10	37.78	7.34
Delaware	.20	.21	.18	.21	.20	.21	3.89	53.36	38.85	9.30
District of Columbia	.50	.66	.71	.55	.63	.65	3.78	45.12	30.38	12.59
Florida	1.44	1.52	1.82	1.31	1.55	1.51	2.10	46.04	39.38	10.83
Georgia	2.37	2.33	2.16	1.82	1.98	2.01	1.77	50.50	44.29	11.16
Idaho	.40	.40	.44	.34	.39	.37	8.73	50.91	48.36	6.15
Illinois	6.01	6.09	5.54	6.21	5.90	6.16	3.57	54.40	40.47	7.08
Indiana	2.60	2.52	2.31	2.58	2.45	2.47	3.49	56.14	44.21	8.63
Iowa	1.93	1.74	1.96	1.59	1.76	1.72	7.57	51.11	44.06	6.36
Kansas	1.37	1.22	1.41	1.29	1.35	1.26	6.55	48.90	44.17	6.84
Kentucky	2.16	2.02	1.75	2.23	2.00	1.96	1.74	50.79	45.39	10.52
Louisiana	1.80	1.83	1.63	2.07	1.86	1.74	2.76	44.14	43.60	12.49
Maine	.64	.58	.62	.59	.61	.60	3.59	54.87	45.14	6.82
Maryland	1.38	1.52	1.34	1.23	1.28	1.39	5.69	49.62	39.04	7.69
Massachusetts	3.28	3.12	4.45	3.10	3.74	3.57	4.54	50.39	39.51	7.73
Michigan	3.99	4.16	3.31	3.99	3.66	3.98	3.59	52.96	43.61	7.45
Minnesota	2.12	1.97	2.05	2.31	2.19	2.00	9.30	47.17	41.14	7.94
Mississippi	1.66	1.53	1.02	1.78	1.42	1.38	.99	49.80	44.71	8.48
Missouri	2.87	2.73	2.51	2.52	2.51	2.62	3.00	50.76	41.99	8.78
Montana	.42	.42	.52	.44	.48	.44	8.20	44.74	41.46	8.13
Nebraska	1.00	.88	1.01	.89	.95	.89	6.27	45.86	43.56	7.57
Nevada	.08	.10	.11	.10	.10	.11	6.35	43.86	38.16	7.43
New Hampshire	.37	.35	.45	.37	.41	.39	4.08	50.34	40.39	7.29
New Jersey	3.16	3.35	3.34	3.98	3.68	3.61	3.77	49.53	38.80	7.44
New Mexico	.40	.39	.39	.46	.43	.39	3.39	51.91	47.99	9.42
New York	10.25	10.48	9.39	12.34	10.93	11.33	4.15	46.31	39.10	7.69
North Carolina	2.71	2.67	2.00	2.46	2.24	2.28	2.26	51.21	46.18	9.46
North Dakota	.49	.45	.43	.52	.48	.44	11.23	43.45	40.81	7.77
Ohio	5.25	5.18	4.46	5.84	5.18	5.25	3.76	51.76	42.56	7.81
Oklahoma	1.77	1.67	2.18	1.40	1.77	1.69	2.30	52.53	48.05	8.52
Oregon	.83	.84	1.30	.72	.89	.93	5.77	48.40	42.35	7.03
Pennsylvania	7.53	7.52	7.01	7.83	7.44	7.57	4.24	53.04	40.86	8.20
Rhode Island	.54	.53	.68	.60	.64	.60	4.17	47.65	39.62	7.90
South Carolina	1.44	1.41	1.17	1.09	1.13	1.14	1.99	53.79	44.09	10.97
South Dakota	.49	.43	.42	.45	.43	.41	9.16	44.11	42.28	7.54
Tennessee	2.21	2.19	1.78	2.29	2.05	2.07	2.06	53.06	43.78	9.81
Texas	4.87	5.06	6.47	4.61	5.49	5.24	2.60	49.90	44.03	8.71
Utah	.42	.40	.48	.32	.40	.38	3.62	54.47	52.93	5.23
Vermont	.27	.24	.30	.21	.25	.24	6.82	51.57	43.47	9.00
Virginia	2.03	2.11	1.85	1.70	1.77	1.88	3.16	52.40	39.94	10.56
Washington	1.32	1.34	1.85	1.05	1.43	1.37	9.10	47.19	40.73	6.33
West Virginia	1.44	1.43	1.41	1.61	1.52	1.42	3.14	49.23	44.99	9.99
Wisconsin	2.38	2.26	2.10	2.17	2.14	2.13	8.72	51.30	42.98	7.16
Wyoming	.19	.19	.25	.18	.21	.20	5.60	52.69	45.58	5.15

[1] Registrants plus nonregistrant enlistments.
[2] Includes commissioned.
[3] Armed forces Jan. 1, 1943, plus calls already issued to the various States for January, February, and March.

COMMENTARY [1]

In conformance with the request, the chart sets forth the percentages of population and of selective-service registrants by each State. It will be noted that these percentages do not exactly equal the percentage of men furnished to the armed services by each State. The Selective Service Act provides that quotas shall be based on the total number of registrants available for induction—who are not deferred after being classified—after allowing credits for men already in the armed forces by induction, commission, or enlistment, rather than on the percentage of total registrants or of population in each State.

Reasons for this variation are found in the factors which affect the selective-service status of men registered under the various boards. Column 9 in the above table, for example, shows significant differences existing among States as to the percentage of registrants who are married men with children. Other factors influencing the percentages of men available for military service from the States and local boards are the various percentages of men with other dependents; men with mental, moral, and physical disabilities; necessary men in industry or agriculture; men with alien status; and so on. Variations among States and local boards in any of these factors will cause the percentage of men in the armed forces from the various States and local boards to be higher or lower than the percentage of registrants in each State and local board to the total for the Nation.

Selective-service calls for men from each State thus are based not on one fixed percentage of the population or of the registrants in the State but on the total number of registrants available for induction—who are not deferred after

[1] Prepared by Office of War Information.

being classified—after allowing credits for men already in the armed forces by induction, commission, or enlistment.

Column 7 does not include all the men in a given State who are engaged in work vital to the war effort. A great many necessary men in industry and agriculture will be found still classified under class III. As registrants are reclassified from class III, they are included in the percentages under occupational deferment if they are considered necessary men in industry or agriculture.

Percentages in column 6 do not represent a merely hypothetical estimate. The percentages given include the number of men in the armed forces as of December 31, 1942, plus the selective-service calls already outstanding for January, February, and March.

The Magazine Victory

REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there appears in the New York Times this morning a rather unfair statement by Arthur Krock concerning a magazine published by the O. W. I. called Victory. I have a copy of Victory in my hand. This is the magazine that has been devised and published by O. W. I. for distribution abroad, not in this country. It is really for propaganda purposes and to show the aims and aspirations of the United States as a leader of the United Nations, and it, in a sense, indicates the vast preparations of the United States in the war effort. It contains among other things a picture in color and words of fulsome praise of our great President.

Arthur Krock takes exception to the fact that this picture and praise may be propaganda for the purpose of influencing people to revere and honor Roosevelt and also unduly to publicize what the President is doing. It has no such purpose whatsoever. It is an indication to those abroad in foreign lands that we have a man at the helm of this Nation who not only is doing his duty for the United States but for all the United Nations. It is a most appropriate magazine. To have anyone take pot shots at the President or at the O. W. I. for printing this magazine is, to my mind, contemptible; and I say this with the knowledge that O. W. I. has been most sincere in its publishing of this magazine.

People in foreign lands, particularly in those controlled by the Axis, as a result of strict censorship are unable to get a proper pen picture of what the United States and its officials are really doing in the march to victory. They know little of what the 28 United Nations are doing to free the world of the Nazi scourge. This magazine gives the saga of the U. S. S. *Marblehead*, of the intrepidity and heroism of its bold commander, Captain Robinson. It tells of our mighty armada, our aircraft carriers, our "5,000 Planes a Month," our "War Against Disease," our "Women in War Work," our "Flying Tigers," and our "Winged Weapons of America."

Why should not those under the heel of the Axis know how our "Marines Resist"?

The quotations are titles of chapters in this magazine which is beautifully illustrated.

Why should they not know of "New Ships for United Nations," and how our "Women Take on War Jobs," and something of the "Tactics of Air Wizards Blast Japanese Planes"? What wrong is there in having the people of Europe know something of our leaders, President Roosevelt and Vice President WALLACE? It is stated that Roosevelt "epitomizes Free America" and he aided the forgotten man, and that he intends to "bring about a better world after peace." What is wrong with all that? Only carping critics like Arthur Krock and Roosevelt haters can complain.

I advise all Members of Congress to see a copy of Victory, which is not for publication in America. It is sold for approximately 25 cents in countries where it is to be distributed and there is nothing partisan about Victory. Krock says that it will bring about the "wrath of the Members of Congress." Any Member of Congress who would become wrathful about this publication is a biased reviewer.

I find that this magazine which is to be published every 2 months is a splendid answer to the vile lies and deceptions hurled forth by Goebbels' propaganda machine, an adequate answer to the vile fulminations of the radio broadcasts from Berlin, Vichy, Bucharest, and Vienna.

The Farmer's Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress have heard a great deal pro and con about the plight of the American farmer. Although I represent the largest city in the South, New Orleans, and have only a few truck farms in my district, I have always been sympathetic to the problem of the farmer, as the record will show.

It is very significant, I believe, that in at least two instances outstanding metropolitan newspapers have taken up the cudgel in favor of the farmer. Leonard K. Nicholson, president of the Times-Picayune Publishing Co., of New Orleans, publisher of the Times-Picayune and the New Orleans States, has directed my attention to two editorials which recently appeared in his publications. I believe them to be of such value that I have asked for permission to insert them in the RECORD and to direct the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to their contents.

The farmer has been the unjust victim of too many attacks in this fight to hold prices down. It is about time that those of us from the great urban centers of the country come to the rescue of the American farmer in the full realization that the man with the hoe is the lifeblood of America.

Following are the two editorials to which I have referred:

[From the Times-Picayune of February 3, 1943]

THE FARMER'S SIDE

The small farmer's side of the current controversy over his present and future condition was clearly presented in last week's Saturday Evening Post by Ed Will. Writing as "a middle-class farmer whose sole support is the income from his farm," he submitted these averments:

Though his is a skilled occupation, the average farmer of this group has a lower income, including return on investment, than that of unskilled labor in industry. * * * The living standard supported by his farm is far below par for the United States. * * * Many farmers who cannot afford a bathroom still must seek supplemental income to support even their lower standard of living or maintain the condition of even farm buildings and equipment. * * * Their average workweek exceeds 60 hours. Compare this farm family's lot, he challenged, "with that of the skilled industrial worker's family, who, with practically no investment, supports a much higher standard of living working a 44-hour week."

The present farm outlook as he sees it is bleak. Farm labor still is being drawn away by the shorter hours, easier work, and much higher pay offered in the industries. The acute labor shortage thus created is aggravated by scarcity of farm machinery. In consequence, he foresees less ground will be farmed this year and many farmers will put in only such crops as require the least labor.

As one major cause of this situation he cites "the failure to permit farm prices to rise enough to pay wages that would compete with industrial wages." There is, he affirms, "a growing feeling among farmers, amounting in some areas to sincere conviction, that the administration is exploiting farmers for labor's benefit. * * * The administration seems to want low food costs for high-priced labor."

Whatever its past policy, purpose, and theory, the administration must face the stubborn fact of increasingly serious farm-labor scarcity resultant in part from its own conscious or unconscious favoring of organized and aggressive industrial labor at the expense of the farmer and white-collar city dweller. Farm-labor shortage steadily grows more acute. Here in Louisiana agents of industrial concerns even now are touring rural districts and offering farm laborers and tenants shorter hours, easier work, and much higher pay—a combination usually proving irresistible. Not long ago a Carolina farm owner was reported to be offering, for Government use in food production, a 1,000-acre plantation for whose cultivation he could not secure adequate labor.

It won't be long now before great-scale farm preparations must be started. The sooner Washington quits theorizing and playing politics and favoritism, and faces squarely the threatening farm situation which politics, favoritism, and theory can cause but cannot cure, the sooner common-sense remedies may be found to remake or relieve the all-but-prohibitive handicaps

now operating to prevent the great-scale food production the United Nations expect and must have from American farms this year.

[From the New Orleans States of February 3, 1943]

FARM CRISIS

In an article discussing food as a war weapon, a recent issue of Victory, official weekly bulletin of the Office of War Information, said:

"Food is a weapon of war and American food is being used to shorten the war. Hitler uses starvation as a weapon of conquest. American food is being used as a weapon against Hitler."

This makes so much sense that nobody can take issue with it. Food is an American weapon of surer efficacy than bombs and bullets. Our wheat and meat gave the Red Army the power for those knockout wallops landed on the Nazis around Stalingrad. With candy and chocolate the American soldiers won over the populace of Dakar and intrenched themselves there without spilling a drop of blood. Our food has won the friendship of tribes and people in other parts of Africa. It has held Spain's assistance to the Axis down to a minimum. It has kept the people of Britain on their feet and going strong. It has lessened the ravages of famine in France and Greece and Poland—famine caused by Hitler's looting.

We have had, up to recently, an abundance of food in America. The harvests during the 3 consecutive years from 1940 to 1942 were record-breaking. We piled up enormous surpluses of many food items. Yet in spite of successive copious crops all surpluses have vanished except as to corn and wheat and these are going fast. If this year 1943 is not another record-breaker in food crops, the American people will be tightening belts before another midwinter.

Food is not a product of miracle and magic, any more than planes and guns and ships. Food is produced only by arduous labor in the fields, for long hours every day. The farmer's day is from "kin to kaint." No timekeeper lists his extra hours for overtime pay. Neither farm owner, nor tenant, nor hired hand knows the meaning of the 40-hour week or double pay for Sundays and holidays. Nor do they give a minute's thought to "social gains" of this sort.

The farmer is the only producer of the Nation's No. 1 war weapon. And he cannot keep it up less he has labor and tools and gets enough out of the proceeds for his very modest living. This Nation does not expect the captains of industry to manufacture planes or guns without tools, without labor, and at prices that do not leave a profit. Should it expect more than that from the agricultural classes?

We know of only one way the country's urgent demand for more and more food can be met:

1. The labor essential to efficient farming must be kept on the farms. It must not be drawn into the armed services, nor pirated into the war plants with the bait of fancy wages.

2. The farmer must have tools, such as tractors, plows, cultivators, seeders, and harvesters, and if these do not head the priority list, then it is silly to assume that food is the No. 1 weapon.

3. The farmer must receive a little bit more than the cost of his crops; not a big profit, merely enough for a living half as comfortable and luxurious as that of the $1–$2 an hour war plant worker. Either the ceiling price on his grain and livestock must be raised, or an equivalent bonus paid him, to pay higher wages and other increased costs.

If the battle for more food is to be won this year, the farmer must get help quickly. In the lower South the season for planting is at hand, and in the upper South it is approaching. In the North it ain't far behind. It is absurd to set goals for the farmer and then take his labor and his tools from him. Farmers cannot very well share among themselves their meager stocks of tools because all need the same implements at virtually the same time.

Unless the farmers get tools and labor and fertilizers and transportation in ample quantities soon enough, nothing but a miracle will save the people of this country, or our Allies, from acute food shortages. That miracle will be a fourth generous harvest in a row. Four successive years of copious farm production happen very rarely.

Hitler Would Applaud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 10, 1943:

HITLER WOULD APPLAUD

MARTIN DIES is rapidly becoming a nuisance if not a liability to his country. We say this with great reluctance, having vigorously supported the investigations of his committee when it actually was uncovering subversive conspiracies. But even then we deprecated the more extreme of Mr. DIES' own personal pronouncements on the subject and have since come to view his attitude and outgivings as the products of what seems dangerously close to an obsession, and one which in the present circumstances can very easily work serious harm.

As most of us are aware, Hitler's propaganda machine, now that the Wehrmacht is under severe punishment from Russian arms, is seeking again to divide the democracies on the issue of Bolshevism. The devil is sick with defeat, wherefore the devil a monk would be, or, rather, the white knight of a crusade against communism. It seems too obvious for words that we Americans cannot afford to let him make the slightest progress among us with this abysmal deception. Yet equally obvious it is that he has an unwitting tool in a man like DIES, who, on woefully insubstantial evidence, would have us believe that our Government is honeycombed with seditious radicals.

Here is a witch hunt sure to play into Hitler's hands. That this is not too strong a designation of the purge which Mr. DIES has just proposed and to which the House appears committed may be gathered from the report that Representative VOORHIS of California contemplates resigning from the Dies committee and working against the resolution to continue it. Mr. VOORHIS, who in the past has signed more than one of the committee's reports, has always seemed to us a conspicuously level-headed Member, but in his devotion to Congress, he has explained, he is "at all times concerned that its work be dignified and effective, and I do not want anything done by us here to be recorded as narrow minded, bigoted, foolish, or unfair." That statement has eloquence. So, for that matter, has the maiden speech in the House of Representatives of WILL ROGERS, son of the late humorist, who, after listening to Mr. DIES and the applause that greeted him, gained the floor and said: "I should like it to be known that I disagree with the sentiments expressed, the flamboyant manner of expression used, and the use of this great forum as a means of what we in Hollywood would call personal publicity."

No doubt Congress should constantly check on our bureaucrats, on the need for their services and on their loyalty and competency. But such an inquiry should be conducted with an eagle eye for national unity and in a spirit the reverse of that which seems to animate the gentleman from Texas.

Aid to China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, critics of our war strategy sometimes overlook the immensity and proportions of the global war in which we are engaged. Some are thinking of one enemy and some another, but our military strategists have to think of all enemies and all fronts.

Much criticism is heard with reference to the small amount of war materials going to China. Those who criticize this small aid are no more interested in China than the President and his military board of strategy. We all want to send the most that we can to China in the quickest time possible, but there are problems of transportation with which the critics are not familiar.

A lend-lease representative has just returned from China, whose mission was to try to provide ways of expediting and increasing our war materials for that great country, and everything that possibly can be done is being done by all agencies of our Government to help China who is contributing so much in winning this war against the Axis Powers.

An editorial appeared in the Sunday New York Times which deals with this subject in a very comprehensive and intelligent manner, and under leave granted I submit same herewith:

WAR ON ALL FRONTS

The nature of this total and global war brings it about that while the United Nations are able to hail gratifying victories on some fronts, there are stalemates and touch-and-go battles on others, and there are also cries of distress and urgent appeals for help from some of our Allies exposed to an immediate menace.

Such outcries and appeals, combined with foreign and domestic criticism of our conduct of the war, arose during those dark days some months ago when the Russians were apparently holding on to Stalingrad and the passes of the Caucasus with little more than the skin of their teeth and grim determination, and when our marines were fighting for their little beachhead in the Solomons. There were cries for the second front, for more lend-lease aid to Russia, for more troops and supplies for our hard-pressed forces on Guadalcanal. As soon and as adequately as it was humanly possible, supplies were sent to Russia at great risk and cost, a second front was established in Africa, and the German disaster in Russia began to take shape. Likewise our troops in the Solomons received reinforcements and drove back the Japanese.

Now there come similar outcries and appeals from both Australia and China. The first is menaced by a Japanese invasion, the second is pictured as being close to an economic collapse. Nobody will deny the justification of these pleas or minimize the dangers which they picture. If either of these dangers should materialize it would be a catastrophe of great magnitude for all the United Nations.

Yet, in answer to frequent criticism that our aid to China or Australia is still inadequate, it must be pointed out that what we can send is determined in large part by circumstances at present beyond our control, and that the battles fought in Russia, in Africa or in the Solomons are as much battles for China and Australia as for any other country. Unfortunately, despite the American and British production miracles, there is just so much to go around. There are just so many planes, and tanks, and guns, and there are just so many ships to transport them to the front lines.

In the Pacific all our available forces are in there fighting to protect Australia. And in North Africa all available United Nations forces are likewise fighting, not only to drive out the Germans and Italians and thereby blast a way for an invasion of the European continent, but also to open up the Mediterranean as a supply route to India, Burma, and China, without which a major campaign from these regions is impossible.

In this global warfare it is a question of nice military judgment as to just where the available manpower and resources should be utilized to obtain maximum results. Nobody will today challenge the wisdom of the aid to Russia or the African landing which averted a German-Japanese junction in the Middle East. And if there was not enough left to provide more aid to the Far East than was actually sent, that was not a fault of distribution but a result of the original sin of all democracies—the sin of being unprepared for war.

Nor would it do to overestimate the effect of any aid now in sight. If Brigadier General Chennault, head of the American air force in China, is quoted as saying that he could blast the Japanese out of China with 500 more planes, that is a great tribute to the spirit of his splendid fighting flyers, but scarcely a considered military judgment. The Japanese are not that easy. And if Mme. Wellington Koo says that because of the pitifully small American aid China is faced with the danger of inflation, it is necessary to remember that inflation is not only a matter of supplies equaling money circulation but also a matter of monetary and price control. It is encouraging that, as Brooks Atkinson, our Chungking correspondent, reports, the Chinese authorities are taking that problem in hand—as we ourselves must.

For all these reasons, until the United States and Britain are able to concentrate on Japan, the watchword of our Far Eastern allies must be: Hold fast. We are coming to their aid when we fight in the Pacific and attempt to clear the path that leads to Burma through the Mediterranean.

Dollar-a-Year Men in the Saddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, for many months I have been complaining about the manner in which many of the agencies operating in connection with our war efforts have been carried on, under the guidance and control of the operators of big business or their representatives, including the technical advisers, practically all of whom seem to be under the influence of this group.

You can take almost any agency of the committees operating thereunder, dealing with the various problems in connection with our war effort, which has to do with the operation of industry, contracts, distribution, price fixing, and every line of business in this country, and, as stated, you will find in practically every instance those in charge are deeply interested in their own lines of business, regardless of what happens to various other groups.

Now why do we have to have any dollar-a-year men, coming from the largest groups in this country, most of whom are drawing large salaries, to operate in connection with the Food Distribution Administration, under Mr. Wickard, Food Administrator? If we have to have these, why not have the smaller groups and the various sections of the country represented? I am delighted to know that Mr. Wickard refused to accept these dollar-a-year men as dollar-a-year employees.

No wonder the small business group, the small industrial and contractual groups, as well as the farmers, are being paralyzed to a certain extent under the operations of these agencies, which, as stated, are in practically every instance under the control of the monopolistic, selfish groups of the country.

I am going to insert in my remarks the statement issued by Mr. Wickard outlining his policy on the employment of W. P. B. dollar-a-year personnel transferred to the Food Distribution Administration. I am also inserting a list of the dollar-a-year men certified by the W. P. B. to take charge of the food distribution. You will note, out of the 34 listed, 15 are representatives of large concerns located in New York, all of whom are dealing in food products, as well as all the rest of the 34 men coming from the largest cities in the country.

This would clearly indicate to me, and to you, that naturally they would not have the proper training or background to be very helpful in connection with the Food Administration, which is a national as well as an international proposition. If so, it certainly should appear that there should be some others from the various sections of the United States other than the cities of New York, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Eastport, Maine, who would be competent and helpful. But they have not been certified by those who have the authority to certify dollar-a-year men.

It is interesting to me to note that there is not a man on this list from the South, as well as other sections of the country. I am wondering just why they have to all be a part of, or direct representatives of, the largest business concerns in the country. If you do not believe what I am talking about, make a little investigation and see just who compose the various committees and members of the various divisions connected with the W. P. B. and other agencies in connection with our war efforts.

If it is a committee dealing with matters in which the pulp and paper people are interested, take a look at that division. If it is rubber or automobile tires, look who have charge. If it is a committee dealing with fertilizers, secure a list of the members of the fertilizer committee or division and see whom they represent—and I predict this spring when farmers go to buy their mixed fertilizers they are going to have to pay an increased price. But you do not hear anything about an increase in the price of farm products. With this type of operation on the part of those in authority, I am wondering if we will get a production of farm products necessary to win this war.

Mr. Wickard's statement and the W. P. B. list of dollar-a-year men follow:

Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard today made public the policy of his Department with regard to the employment of personnel on a dollar-a-year basis.

In connection with the transfer of War Production Board personnel under the Executive Order 9280, questions have arisen concerning the assignment of transferees, who include some 43 persons who have been employed in the War Production Board on a dollar-a-year basis. Accordingly the following policies are outlined:

1. No one shall be employed in the Department of Agriculture on a dollar-a-year basis of compensation.

2. Those persons employed on a dollar-a-year basis as they are transferred into the Department shall be invited to accept positions as full-time, paid employees of the Government, ceasing entirely to receive compensation from a private corporation or similar enterprise.

3. If they feel that this involves a sacrifice which they are unwilling to make financially or otherwise but wish to contribute their time and broad experience to their Government in wartime, they shall be assigned to a consultants' panel without compensation. The consultants' panel shall have no administrative responsibility or authority.

4. Personnel from such consultants' panel shall be available as consultants to any administrative agency to perform duties as a consultant.

5. In order that their status as consultants without administrative responsibility or authority shall be entirely clear, and to protect them as well as those executives utilizing their services from any misinterpretation of their status and function, it shall be clear in all instances that—

(a) No person who is serving without compensation as a consultant shall participate in making any determination directly affecting the affairs of the firm or company in which he is employed.

(b) The services of such persons shall be utilized as a consultant in connection with problems which require special business or technical knowledge and experience.

(c) Any person whose services are utilized as a consultant without compensation shall be subject to the same supervision and direction as regular salaried employees and are expected to observe established policies and regulations.

THE LIST OF DOLLAR-A-YEAR MEN CERTIFIED BY WAR PRODUCTION BOARD TO FOOD DISTRIBUTION ADMINISTRATION

Nathan L. Allen, vice president and general manager, American National Cooperative Exchange, Inc., New York City.

John S. Barnes, chief engineer, production division, Borden Co., New York City.

John L. Baxter, member of the firm, H. C. Baxter & Bros., Brunswick, Maine.

Clyde E. Beardslee, vice president, Borden Co., manufacture milk products division, New York City.

J. R. T. Bishop, vice president, American Maize Products Co., New York City.

Wilson C. Codling,[1] vice president, general manager, Albany Packing Co., Inc., Albany, N. Y.

Ralph Copp, Pevely Dairy, St. Louis, Mo.

William O. Dillingham, vice president, Best Foods Inc., New York City.

Sterling Donaldson, president, Donaldson Baking Co., Columbus, Ohio.

Frank J. Ellis, vice president, Wm. Wrigley, Jr., Co., Chicago, Ill.

Burt P. Flickinger, president, S. M. Flickinger Co., Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.

George C. Hannon, chief engineer, Frank G. Shattuck Co., New York City.

William W. Harper,[1] salesman and executive work, Lamborn & Co., Inc., New York City.

Everette E. Haskell,[1] creamery operator, Beatrice Creamery Co., Blue Valley division, Louisville, Ky.

Charles F. Hawes, traffic manager, Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, Inc., New York City.

Paul D. Hursh, accountant, Glidden Co. & Durkee Famous Foods, Elmhurst, Long Island, N. Y.

Frank Hutchinson, president, Lawrenceburg Terminal Elevator Corporation, Lawrenceburg, Ind.

Adrian C. Israel,[1] vice president and director, A. C. Israel Commodity Co., New York City.

Ross E. Jones, Jr., traffic manager, H. J. Heinz Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Stroud Jordan,[1] manager, manufacture service division, American Sugar Refining Co., New York City.

Herbert F. Krimendahl, president and general manager, Crampton Canneries, Inc., Celina, Ohio.

John T. McCarthy, president, treasurer, and director, Jersey Bread Co., Toledo, Ohio; owner, Sandusky Baking Co., Sandusky, Ohio.

Wayne C. Meschter, advisory capacity, American Preserve Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Herbert T. Middleton, retired, Corn Products Refining Co., Danbury, Conn.

Jay G. Odell, manager, frozen-egg department, Seymour Packing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

William F. Oliver, assistant vice president, American Sugar Refining Co., New York City.

William L. Petrikin, retired since 1940, former executive, Great Western Sugar Co., Denver, Colo.

A. W. Pike, president and director, Holmes Packing Corporation, Eastport, Maine.

Everton G. Poindexter, director, Techanny Milling Corporation and Commodity Brokers, Inc., New York City.

Eugene K. Quigg, president, Richmond Baking Co., Richmond, Ind.

Arthur C. Schrier, assistant secretary and treasurer, E. J. Brach & Son, Chicago, Ill.

George C. Scott, director of research and engineering, Minnesota Valley Canning Co., Le Sueur, Minn.

R. Barclay Scull,[1] vice president, W. S. Scull Co., Camden, N. J.

George C. Tong, general traffic manager, Minnesota Valley Canning Co., Le Sueur, Minn.

Douglas C. Townson,[2] president and treasurer, Curtice Bros. Co., Rochester, N. Y.

John R. Vander Veer, manager, canned meat sales division, Libby, McNeill & Libby, Chicago, Ill.

A. Rush Watkins, secretary and treasurer, Ready Foods Co., Inc., Chicago, Ill.

J. D. Williamson, head of purchasing division for fish livers, etc., California Packing Corporation, San Francisco, Calif.

Earl B. Wilson, raw sugar buyer and vice president, National Sugar Refining Co., New York City.

[1] Resigned from War Production Board.
[2] Remaining in War Production Board.

House Resolution 10 of the House of Representatives, State of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in my remarks copy of resolution passed by the House of Representatives, Little Rock, Ark., endorsing my House Resolution 38, which has for its purpose authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to make a thorough investigation of the present marketing and distributing system of farm products.

It is generally understood by everyone who knows anything at all about the problems confronting the farmers as well as consumers that the major problem is the manner in which farm products are marketed and distributed.

Farmers operate as individuals, and naturally have to take whatever they are offered for their products. After these products pass through the hands of many middlemen, with many additions between the farmer and the consumer, the consumers of this country are called upon to pay an extremely high, fixed price for farm products.

I am delighted to have this resolution coming from the House of Representatives of Arkansas, in that the members of the State legislature represent the people of Arkansas, all of which would indicate their deep interest in wanting to be helpful in solving this serious problem.

The resolution follows:

Whereas according to report of the Department of Agriculture the farmers, because of an excessively expensive distribution system of farm products, are receiving only 52 percent of the consumer's food dollar; and

Whereas food is one of the necessary materials for the winning of the war, and to secure a greater production during the war and to give the farmers a fair share of the consumer's dollar paid for food and other agricultural products after the war to which the farmers are entitled, Congressman FULMER, chairman of the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, has introduced House Resolution 38, asking the House of Representatives to authorize the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, to make a study and investigation of the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products from rural areas through the various marketing agencies to the ultimate consumer, as it affects farmers, the various types of middlemen, wholesalers, retailers, and consumers, with a view to ascertaining:

(a) The effectiveness of the present system of marketing and the adequacy of present marketing facilities, with particular regard to the protection of farmers and consumers.

(b) The effect of transactions on the futures grain and cotton exchanges upon such system and upon farmers and consumers.

(c) The existence of any practices in connection with the grading, storing, processing, transporting, distributing, or marketing of farm products, which adversely affect farmers and consumers.

(d) The present and prospective development of the types and methods of transportation for farm products, and the existence, if any, of discrimination in railway freight or in motor carrier rates on farm products in the various areas.

(e) The feasibility of establishing an up-to-date marketing and distributing system from the rural areas through local, State, and National marketing agencies under a farm-cooperative program that would provide facilities for proper grading and distribution, necessary storage, and for other essential activities of an orderly marketing program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Arkansas does hereby request the said House of Representatives of the United States Congress to adopt said House Resolution 38 by Mr. FULMER, authorizing said investigation, with all of the authority carried in said resolution, together with necessary funds to conduct the said investigation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house to Congressman FULMER and to the various members of the Arkansas delegation in Congress.

Are We at War With Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, from the speeches that continue to be made it appears that many of the gentlemen do not want to realize or understand that we are at war with the Nazis, the Fascists, and the Japanese, and that Russia, more than any other nation, has been and is aiding our cause in this global war far beyond our fondest hopes.

It is inconceivable that certain gentlemen are continuously trying to bring about an unfriendly relationship with that great country which more than any other is saving the democracies of the world. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who, as well as others, has been attacking and assailing the great leader of the Russian people, Josef Stalin, admitted in his remarks that the Russian people are about to receive their religious and personal freedom, but fails to admit or concede that this is only due to the strong and great leadership of Josef Stalin. He tries to leave the impression that the Russian masses are not in full accord or unified and that they do not have implicit confidence in Stalin's fine leadership. I wish to God that we in the United States appreciated the activities and magnificent leadership

of President Roosevelt and were as completely united as are the Russian people behind their great leader.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] complained that Mrs. Roosevelt, back 3 years ago, coddled some of the Communists. I say to him that we are fortunate that President Roosevelt and Mrs. Roosevelt and all those who possess a knowledge of the conditions have, notwithstanding these incautious attacks, worked toward friendship with Russia. Mr. Speaker, it was not Great Britain, but the United States, that brought about Russia's cooperation, because Russia recognized that the tories of Great Britain were, indeed, endeavoring to have Germany attack Russia. And it is to be regretted that some Members fail to recognize that we are at war with the Nazis, the Fascists, and the Japanese—not with Russia; and that they continue to attack Russia, though not as openly as they had before the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor because there is not the least foundation or basis for the attacks, but they indirectly persist in these rash attacks.

Many of these gentlemen harp upon the idea that Russia entered into a treaty with Germany. That was at the time when they shouted from the housetops, "It can't happen here." And the gentlemen ignore the fact, though it should be known to them, as indeed it is to every intelligent person, that the treaty entered into by Russia with Germany was mainly for the purpose of gaining time to prepare for the eventual attack which Russia knew Hitler was bound ruthlessly to make as soon as he got around to it.

The continuous cry of the danger of communism is without basis and unjustified. Indeed, we have more to fear from our own Nazi and Fascist sympathizers than we have had from the few former active Communists in our midst, who, from the moment we were attacked by Japan, have been and are doing their utmost to aid and bring about total defeat of the Axis.

Though I often disagree with Mr. Kaltenborn, I am pleased to have his view on this important American-Russian situation, and I hope these gentlemen who are promoting this discord and disunion will read Mr. Kaltenborn's article and reread it and will desist from attempting to create artificial and unwarranted fears of Russian communism. That is important, especially at this critical moment in this grave crisis when we are sacrificing thousands of lives of our best American manhood and spending billions of dollars to defeat the Axis. And Russia is amply doing its share to cooperate with us in bringing about the complete elimination of the Nazi-Fascist-Japanese murderous gang.

Mr. Speaker, I take leave to insert Mr. Kaltenborn's article, which deserves thoughtful consideration:

WHERE SHOULD RUSSIA'S WESTERN BOUNDARY BE?

(By H. V. Kaltenborn)

BALTIC STATES WILL REMAIN FREE

We must not blink the fact that we face a difficult problem in reestablishing relations between Russia and her neighbors.

Between Russia and Finland, as well as between Russia and Poland, there are very delicate boundary problems and difficult problems of political and economic relationship. My feeling is that the three small Baltic republics—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia—are entitled to complete political independence. A Baltic federation might be the practical answer, if Soviet Russia were willing to cooperate.

Russia would be more willing to grant political and economic independence to all Baltic countries if she could be assured that the United Nations would create sound peace machinery. On the basis of many visits to the Soviet Union, I am willing to assert that Russia has no imperialist ambitions. She moved into Finland, into Poland, and into the Baltic states because she anticipated Hitler's attack. Russia will always seek the strongest possible frontiers so long as there is danger that German imperialism will again challenge Russian power.

Protection to Russia against attack by Germany or by Japan will secure from Russia cooperation in the restoration of territorial integrity and independence to Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, and Poland.

I would not exclude the possibility of certain frontier rectifications to be agreed upon between the Soviet Union and Finland and between the Soviet Union and Poland.

Salary Limit Is Dangerous Curb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. P. W. GRIFFITHS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Wilbur D. Matson, of McConnelsville, Morgan County, Ohio:

SALARY LIMIT IS DANGEROUS CURB—SELF-MADE MAN PREDICTS DAMAGING EFFECT ON ENTERPRISE

Wilbur D. Matson, editor of the McConnelsville Herald, writing for the New York Herald Tribune, comments as follows on the Government edict limiting salaries to $25,000 a year:

"Culminating 10 years of warfare upon the successful, and brought forth under guise of the national emergency, is the $25,000 maximum salary ukase. In the long series of persecutions of a wealthy minority by radical doctrinaries, who, so often, as Thomas Reed once put it, confuse envy of the rich with political economy, this comes as the cap sheaf. One resents the subterfuge by which this plank, lifted from the Communist platform of 1928, was handed down from above, without public debate on its far-reaching implications and after twice being rejected by the Congress. One doubts the sincerity with which it is defended as a curb on inflation, certainly an act of supererogation in view of the effect which the present income tax will have upon swollen war profits, if any.

"Nor would anyone murmur or complain if this were sincerely a war measure, essential in the conduct of the present struggle and devised to place a curb on inflation. And, even though all the salaries above $25,000 or even $2,500 were expropriated, no one would begrudge the power if it were essential to winning victory in the field. In any event, most of the class affected have ample means of support aside from salaries. Nor shall I discuss the deplorable consequences of this salary limitation upon gifts to colleges, eleemosynary and religious institutions, and private charities. My opposition comes from a fear that, once adopted as a war measure, it will become a permanent portion of our political structure and another milestone in the New Deal revolution. For, if the last 10 years have taught anything, it is that powers, greedily grasped by the New Deal, are rarely voluntarily surrendered.

Again, if the power to fix salaries is maintained as a permanent part of our economic system and salaries may summarily be limited to $25,000 through the taxing power, they may, with equal logic and reason, be limited arbitrarily to any sum at the whim of those in political authority. And if this economic revolution be consummated, what becomes of the Emersonian theory that "America is another word for opportunity"?

But before proceeding further let me qualify as a witness. I am no special pleader for the rich. I was just an ordinary poor boy who has earned what he has the hard way, and at 55 wonders if he has accumulated sufficient to live without a pension. I am no hell hound of Wall Street, that preposterous bug-a-boo which is perennially dragged forth in political campaigns to frighten the credulous into voting the way the demagogues want them to vote. I have never been threatened with a salary anyway near $25,000, which would be a very large sum for anyone in this small community to save in a lifetime. But even in this village of 1,800 inhabitants, we boys dreamed dreams and saw visions. It was our belief that if we possessed courage and initiative and were willing to make the sacrifice and pay the price of success, we might not be condemned to remain for life in the caste into which we were born. And to give substance to our dreams we saw the poor boys go forth from our community and attain great riches in what has been always considered the American way.

I could name several millionaires who tramped out of this small, sparsely inhabited hill country without a nickel in the world. The president of one of our leading local banks is a poor Scotch immigrant boy who landed in New York 30 years ago without a dollar. These typical American success stories can be duplicated in many small towns, hamlets, and rural sections in the land. The boys of my generation were not taught to envy the rich or successful. Rather they were taught to emulate their example and they were told that nothing was impossible in this mighty miracle, America, for the boy who had the tenacity, the courage and energy, and who was willing to sacrifice in order to go places.

Thus, through a process of natural selection, the poor boys of yesterday in America became financial leaders who planned and employed their capital in constructing the mightiest industrial empire of all times. Nor did the material benefits of their vision and courage redound alone to capital and management. As its share labor received the highest reward in real wages which the world has ever known, and in America the age-long dream of the abolition of poverty came nearest to fruition. So much better has been the lot of the average man in America, compared with that of the people of any other nation, and so much higher has been our average standard of living, that restrictive legislation upon immigration became necessary as an answer to the threat of an oversupply of labor.

This mighty industrial machine, the child of private enterprise, is now the arsenal of democracy and, through its adaptation to the military needs of the United Nations, has become the hope of freemen throughout the world.

But, the Jeremiahs wail, the industrial plant is completed—"Master, it is finished." Our job is now that of an administrator, to settle and divide an estate that has been created among the heirs. Instead of our leaders in industry being chosen through a

process of natural selection, let the Nation's business be planned and administered by inexperienced bureaucrats and politicians. Let us divide the wealth. Let us bring all down to the common level of mediocrity.

I do not believe this counsel of despair. I do not believe that the temple is completed and that nothing remains longer for the pioneer spirit of individual enterprise and creative effort. To the contrary, I believe that at the end of the war the human race will stand upon the threshold of the most marvelous period of growth and expansion in all history. Science and invention are in their swaddling clothes, and out of this mighty convulsion through which we are passing will come a tremendous development in the methods of transportation through the air, of medicine and surgery, of the products of the scientist and the chemist. Upon each new discovery of the scientist and inventor will be founded a new industry demanding labor, and new industry plus the rebuilding of a world partly destroyed by the present whirlwind of destruction and supplying the pent-up demand for things which have become household necessities will take up any temporary slack in employment.

The darkest cloud upon the horizon of the world of tomorrow is that of demagogs riding into power through impossible promises and the stirring of class hatred who may father legislation which will kill private enterprise through destroying incentive to create wealth and to pioneer fields of endeavor. Why is it that men vested with a little brief political power believe that overnight, by the mere fact of election to office, they become the font of all wisdom, with a legislative cure-all for every ill suffered by the body politic? I believe, to again quote Thomas B. Reed, that "one of the greatest delusions in the world is the hope that the evils of this world can be cured by legislation."

I want the next generation to be as free as I have been and to have an unlimited field of opportunity for imagination and creative energy. I want the poor boy of tomorrow to dream dreams and see visions and to know that in America these dreams can come true if he is willing to make the sacrifice. When short-sighted restrictions are placed upon earnings, when enterprise and initiative are chilled by the dead hand of government, when incentive is stymied, when the poor boy can no longer rise from the rank into which he was born, when through repressive legislation the career of a Henry Ford or the "Dawes boys" is no longer possible, then we may, indeed, gloomily prophesy that the sun of America is a setting sun.

It is still true that "an institution is the lengthened shadow of a man." Private initiative and free enterprise, working through a process of natural selection, have built an industrial empire which has made us the envied nation of all time and one strong enough to preserve the liberty which we cherish against the mightiest aggressors. Can it be true that, at the close of the war, we shall even consider the folly of abandoning the principles of private enterprise which have brought us to the national pinnacle we have attained, and follow the will-o'-the-wisp of bureaucracy and state socialism?

Future of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me this morning to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of February 10, entitled "Future of Poland."

Any people that can produce the great leaders that Poland has produced during the past several hundred years is not going to be wiped off the face of the earth. This editorial pays deserved tribute to the memory of Nikolaus Kopernicki, the great Polish astronomer.

I doubt if anyone familiar with early European history will contend that "the worst feudalism in Europe" has been found in Poland. Out of this World War, I am certain, will arise a greater and stronger free Poland.

The editorial follows:

FUTURE OF POLAND

This week will bring the four hundred and seventieth anniversary of the birth and this spring the four-hundredth anniversary of the death of the man who probably did more than any other to shape the whole course of what we call modern civilization. We mean Nicholaus Kopernicki, the great Polish astronomer, better known to us as Copernicus. These anniversaries will give rise to much speculation as to what will be the future of this strange nation whose intellectual history has been so brilliant and whose political history so turbulent and tragic.

Will there be another resurrection of Poland from the ashes of this greatest of all the many calamities which have befallen her? How much of the Polish population has survived these 3½ years of wholesale murder, kidnaping, famine, and pestilence? What proportion of the Polish exiles now dispersed throughout the world, and of the Polish soldiers now fighting under their own banners with the Allied armies, will return to the homeland after the war? Will a triumphant Russia permit the creation of another and more powerful Polish state to share with it the domination of eastern Europe?

Although the German attack on Poland was the exciting cause of the present war, there were nevertheless Britons like Lloyd George who could rejoice at the German destruction of "the worst feudalism in Europe." There are many peace planners today who feel that the Polish Nation would be an intolerable anachronism in post-war Europe. The Poles themselves, however, confidently anticipate the resurrection, and many of their leaders are busy with plans of reconstruction. Polish political geographers are arguing the historical and economic right of Poland to Baltic ports and maritime power. Last week in New York, Lt. Col. Antoni Jurasz, dean of the new Polish Medical School at Edinburgh University, appealed for lend-lease medical supplies which could be sent to his stricken people immediately after the victory. Nor must it be forgotten that Poland has friends who, when the time comes, will make themselves articulate in her behalf. The exploits of the Polish squadrons of the Royal Air Force have passed into legend. The Scots, it is said, are already half Polonized, partly through admiration of the Poles, partly through the continuing intermarriage.

Poland is, indeed, a paradox among modern European nations, but it has always been one. Ethnically and linguistically Slavic, geographically eastern, Poland, psychologically, has been in many ways more western than the French, more Latin than the Italians, more Roman than the Pope. The various temperamental and historical analogies of the Poles and the Irish have often been noted. Like the Irish, the Poles are accused of political ineptitude, but, like the Irish, they, in spite of it, have survived the most amazing calamities and oppressions. And like Ireland, Poland appears to be a spiritual even more than a geographical entity, and may therefore be indestructible.

The Late Capt. Richard E. Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette of February 9, 1943, giving an account of the death of Capt. Richard E. Miller in the service of his country:

CAPT. RICHARD E. MILLER, TOKYO RAIDER, KILLED IN NORTH AFRICA—CITY'S NO. 1 AIR HERO SUCCUMBS TO WOUNDS SUFFERED IN ACTION

Capt. Richard E. (Bud) Miller, 26, hero of several major engagements in the Pacific and North African war zones of World War No. 2, died on January 22 of "wounds received in action in the defense of his country."

The military career of one of Fort Wayne's most outstanding heroes of World War No. 2 came to an end with that brief announcement, received yesterday by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edmund H. Miller of 3408 North Washington Road.

The telegram reporting his death came from Adjutant General Ulio of the War Department, and read "Capt. Richard E. Miller died January 22, 1943, in northwest Africa of wounds received in action in defense of his country."

Three times decorated for bravery since the new war started, Captain Miller was a member of the air force who made the daring air raid on Tokyo last April 18, led by Brig. Gen. Jimmy Doolittle. Captain Miller received the Distinguished Flying Cross as well as the Military Order of China for his accuracy in blowing up a Tokyo powder plant and powder warehouse in that raid.

He spent a 2-week leave with his family here last June, and upon return to duty was sent to North Africa, again as a member of General Doolittle's forces.

Early this year he was decorated again, receiving an air medal for having participated in 5 sorties against the enemy in the North African drive. He was 1 of 52 American airmen thus honored.

Born in Fort Wayne, Captain Miller was graduated from Central High School in 1933. He was employed by Bursley & Co., Inc., for 2 years following his graduation, then enrolled at Indiana University. He studied at Indiana University for 2 years and was a member of the Phi Gamma Delta fraternity there.

Leaving school, Captain Miller entered the Army Air Corps as an aviation cadet in 1937, training at Randolph Field, Tex. He failed to complete his training, however, and later went to California, where he was engaged in insurance business for 2 years. In 1941 he again enlisted in the Army Air Corps, and underwent his training as a bombardier at Barksdale Field. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in December 1941, and received his first lieutenancy a few months later. He was promoted to the rank of captain early this month.

Survivors include the parents; a sister, Miss Georgianna Miller, at home; and a brother, Thomas B. Miller, with the A. C. Spark Plug Co., at Flint, Mich.

While visiting his family here last summer Captain Miller was honored at a civic celebration held at Dwenger Park on July 4. City officials and Baer Field officers paid tribute to his daring and heroism during the program.

Amendment of the National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. GIBSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, on the 11th day of March 1942 I introduced a bill designated as H. R. 6777, which constituted an amendment to the National Labor Relations Act, which was in due course referred to the Committee on Labor.

I have no disposition to criticize the Committee on Labor or any of my colleagues who constitute that committee. However, my bill was referred to the National Labor Relations Board for criticism, and in due course the Board offered its criticism to the committee, after which the committee declined to proceed any further on the measure, not having held any hearings on same. Frankly, I am personally opposed to any of the boards or bureaus attempting or being given the right to determine what legislation this House shall pass. However, I have redrafted the measure and have today offered the redraft as an amendment which overcomes all of the criticism offered by the Labor Board.

I now hope that the committee will feel justified in proceeding to consider this measure and that it will further feel justified in reporting same favorably.

I would not personally support any legislation that was vicious in its nature or that would work an injustice on labor, but I have received letters from many individual members of labor organizations strongly favoring the proposed legislation. The purpose of the amendment is clearly to protect the rights of individual workers, and if studied closely and analyzed it will be seen by any unprejudiced mind that it will work many benefits to the great mass of American labor, and in no instance will take any privilege or right from them.

When I introduced H. R. 6777 I discussed briefly on the floor the merits of the amendment in the following language, which I now adopt and reinsert in the RECORD.

I am, of course, more concerned over a diligent and successful prosecution of our war efforts than any other issue currently before the American people. I am concerned, and you are concerned, because our most precious heritage is at stake—that of the right to live in a full democracy of freedom and justice. Much of the wealth of this Nation is going to be dissipated in our efforts to win this war and maintain our rights in democracy. We are going to win this war; we cannot afford to lose it. We cannot forfeit to barbarism that which was bought with the blood of the purest and bravest patriots to ever forfeit their lives on the field of battle for the cause of justice and righteousness. We will not let freedom perish before the fire of hatred blazing from the sword of the aggressors and leave only a despotism to receive our posterity and take from those yet to be born that which they have a right to expect—the privilege of living as free men and women.

I want to remind you and the American people that if victory is worth what it is going to cost us in dollars, in blood, in broken hearts, and homes, it is worth our efforts today, tomorrow, and through the ages to maintain and safeguard the benefits of that victory. Let not our fondest hopes and most optimistic dreams cause us to minimize the sacrifices that must follow our victory. We must face a terrible depression irrespective of what we may be told—it must come, a pay day must come. There is a limit to what any people can pay in taxes. All who profess to be patriots had as well prepare to be guardians of our Nation in its rebuilding. The destruction of war is not blown away by the first soft winds of peace. Years of toil and hardship alone can banish from our people the horrors and poverty left in the path of war. There never comes in the life of any nation so crucial an era as her reconstruction days after a destructive war; her people are demoralized and susceptible to false leadership.

There is not, nor will there ever be, any danger in the true American workingman; there will never be any danger in an American labor organization that is led by true American workmen. We have seen so often, however, where honest labor has been exploited, its money taken and never accounted for by unscrupulous and mercenary labor leaders who have no interest in the cause and who have never done an honest day's work, until we are brought to know that the honest workingman has a right to demand protection. This bill is framed to this prominent end.

There are from day to day efforts exerted looking to the amalgamation of the two great labor organizations—the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Let this occur and the natural era of reconstruction with all its hardships, deprivations, and discontent among our people come, without the protection of the American workmen and the American people the proposed amendment provides, and you will see this democracy fold up and our Government taken over by the leadership of the great labor organization so set in existence. I make this statement with the full conviction that it will be sustained by the verdict of time. It has been said before, and it is true, that it was labor groups that gave bolshevism to Russia. It was violent reactions against violent excesses by labor groups that gave fascism to Italy. It was middle-class groups that helped Hitler to give nazi-ism to Germany. It was a fanatical fight between labor and antilabor extremists that divided and demoralized France, that led directly to its military downfall, and to the antidemocratic government of Marshal Petain. Why should we, the best people in the world, recline in complacency and let these horrors seize us? When this occurs the masses of labor and the American citizen will become serfs and slaves. This is what I see coming and what my voice will always ring out against. Is my prediction sustained by the following facts?—

As matters stand, the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. each boast a membership of 5,000,000 or 10,000,000 members in all.

Just imagine for a moment one labor organization starting off with 10,000,000 members without any competition to interfere. It would not be very long when these 10,000,000 would be turned into 20,000,000, when we consider the millions of workers who do not belong to either organization today simply because they do not know to which organization to belong. With just one there would be no other choice.

Twenty million men enrolled into one organization paying as little as $1 a month dues, to say nothing about assessments, gives the leaders the tidy sum of $240,000,000 a year to be spent as these leaders see fit, and without restraint. This amount is based only on the assumption that the present dues would not be raised. However, this is very unlikely because with just one organization there would be no competitive obstruction and dues would be levied to suit the pleasure of the leaders. This $240,000,000 could very well become $500,000,000 annually. And, as in the past, this money could be used most conveniently for promoting a national political campaign in 1944 with a $1,000,000,000 campaign fund—or for any other purpose to which unscrupulous or unwise labor leaders may appropriate this money.

When labor gains numerical strength it must also gain moral stability. Until we see complete responsibility on the horizon the amalgamation of these organizations does not offer much hope. Every effort should be made to bring peace to organized labor, but this peace must guarantee security to the workers, the employers, and our Nation as a whole. This can best be assured through sensible legislation which will guarantee honest union operation irrespective of numerical strength.

Is it wrong to say that the management and expenditure of such sums of money shall be directed by only citizens of the United States of America or the Dominion of Canada?

Is it wrong to say that such sums of money shall be managed and expended under the direction of persons who have had actual experience in the work and problems of the trades represented by their respective organizations?

Is it wrong to say that those responsible for the care and handling and expenditure of such great sums shall be bonded to insure proper uses of such funds?

Is it wrong to say that those collecting such sums from the masses of the American workingmen shall render to the ones from which the same was collected

an annual statement disclosing fully what such funds have been used for?

Is it wrong to say that the powers invested in a few leaders by such great sums of money shall not be used to influence the American voter in the free use of his franchise in selecting the person or party of his choice to public office in these grand United States of ours?

Is it wrong to say that membership in labor unions shall be voluntary, that the law will not permit one to be forced to pay for the right to work in free America, and that labor unions by their merits should be the strongest invitation for membership?

Is it wrong to say that there shall be no interunion strikes, when it is known that the only resulting benefits is to those in the high command and under no circumstances could benefit accrue to those who actually perform the labor and pay in the dues to the organization?

The bill I have introduced is amply able to stand on its own merits and is not subject to criticism from labor or industry. I have high regard for the American laborer. I worked with the various crafts of a railroad in the United States for a period of 7 years and learned to respect them as a loyal and patriotic body of American citizens. This bill is just as much for the protection of labor as for any other citizen. I say without fear of contradiction that if anyone will be fair and unbiased he will have to admit that the railroad brotherhoods have, through the ages, been reasonable in their demands and just in their means of trying to enforce them. I make this statement, speaking as a whole: We all make mistakes and these brotherhoods possibly have, but they have been minor, and as a whole the railroad brotherhoods are entitled to the respect of the American people. It is true, however, that these brotherhoods as a whole have men skilled in their trade who are American citizens as their leaders. They do not place the responsibility of their leadership in the hands of men like Harry Bridges. Where we see the great abuses of the privileges accorded American labor is in the industrial organizations, where, in many instances, aliens and men with views antagonistic to American ideals, are placed in leadership.

The provisions of the bill that I have introduced in substance codifies, or I may say embraces, the fundamental principles under which the railroad brotherhoods have operated through the years.

I am pleased also to say to you that this legislation is sponsored, approved, and unanimously favored by the leadership and membership of the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc., which is one of the smallest labor organizations in the United States. Mr. Maurice R. Franks, their editor, has been cooperative in drafting this legislation. My motives cannot be assigned to selfish reasons. This organization has only approximately 2,500 members, and, so far as I know, not a one in my Congressional District; certainly if any, they are very few. This organization not only feels that this legislation is necessary for the maintenance of our form of government, but for the protection of American labor. It is a very patriotic service that this organization is rendering our people and to it and its membership should go the highest respects of the American people.

This bill is an amendment to the National Labor Relations Act, and for the benefit of those before me and of the RECORD, I quote in substance the provisions contained in the bill which could consistently be referred to as constituting six points, as follows, to wit:

First. Only citizens of the United States of America or the Dominion of Canada will be eligible to hold office or be a leader.

Second. All labor leaders will be persons with a knowledge of the occupation or trade represented by their organization.

Third. All officers or leaders handling the funds of their organization will be adequately bonded by an independent, reputable company or companies.

Fourth. Each member of a labor organization will receive a financial statement at least once per annum prepared and certified to by an independent certified public accountant.

Fifth. It will be illegal under the terms to promote any political campaigns, or under this act to utilize the funds of a labor organization for political purposes or in the interest of anyone seeking public office before a vote of the membership has given approval.

Sixth. Membership in the unions will be voluntary.

In conclusion, I want to state sincerely to this body and to the American people that I have no disposition to be unfriendly to labor, but say frankly that I have at heart the protection of the laboring man from those who would gulp him up and enjoy a life of ease and comfort from the fruit of the sweat of his brow. I call on every American workman to analyze closely the application of the provisions of this amendment before condemning same. I ask the membership of this House to study the provisions of this amendment and their actual application very closely before you decline to lend your full support thereto. I feel sincerely in my heart that there is no legislation that is more necessary to the continuation of our democracy, with its full benefits, than the amendment I have introduced.

Continuation of the Dies Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. SCANLON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I oppose continuation of the House Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, commonly known as the Dies committee. I have opposed it for 2 years, and this year my opposition is stronger than ever before.

There are two basic reasons for my opposition to this committee. One. I fail to see where the expenditure of any money at this time for this purpose will promote winning the war. In fact, I believe this committee and its activities will, if anything, tend to create disunity, and disunity is definitely a hindrance to the war effort. Two. I oppose the Dies committee, because I believe its actions are in and of themselves un-American.

Mr. Speaker, traditional Americanism calls for fair play, for justice. Our courts operate on the principle that an accused man is innocent until proven guilty. The prosecution must assume the burden of proof and it must prove its case beyond reasonable doubt. Men accused of the most heinous crimes are given the benefit of this doubt. This has been one of the most cherished principles of our great Nation since its founding.

From the record we are forced to the conclusion that such is not the case with the Dies committee. I realize that the Congress and its standing and special committees cannot always operate as a court of law; that it is not practical since the Congress does not try, nor does it convict and sentence in the legalistic sense. But the Congress is a great body and it can convict in the popular sense. The people have a respect for Congress. When a prominent Member of Congress or a creature of the Congress makes an accusation of subversion against a citizen of the United States, whether he be merely a private citizen or an official of the executive branch of the Government, that man stands convicted in the eyes of the public. The words of the Member of Congress carry great weight with the people.

For this reason no Member of Congress or no creature of the Congress should make such accusations without proof beyond reasonable doubt. From the record we cannot say that the Dies committee has always had such proof. The record fails to show that those who have been tarred with the stick of subversion by this committee and its individual members have had the traditional right to appear and defend themselves.

The speech made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] on this floor last week is an example of what I implicate. As a part of that speech many names were read into the RECORD and accused of subversion. Many of those names were names of men I never knew existed. One of the men so accused, Mr. Frederick C. McKee, of Pittsburgh, is a man with whom I am personally acquainted. He and his organization were ably defended on this floor by my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT]. But there are others included in the list who have not been so fortunate in having an able defender. I cannot rise in their defense for I do not know them. I can make no brief either for them or against them for I have no knowledge of them, and,

unfortunately, there was no substantiating evidence presented. One man was tarred because he was scheduled to address the Communist Party workers' school in New York. From the record, this is the only basis for tarring that man with the stick of subversion. For all the Congress knows he may be the most loyal of Americans—or he may be engaged in clearly subversive activities. We do not know the subject of his talk before the school. He may have talked on the habits of the Louisiana muskrat, and discussed its merits or demerits as a food. He may also have talked about a violent revolution which will overturn our Government and install a dictatorship of the proletariat in its place. I believe the subject matter of his talk and not the fact that he talked should be the judge of his subversion. I am speaking this coming Sunday in Pittsburgh to a group of Lithuanian-Americans on the twenty-fifth anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Following the line of reasoning indicated by the chairman of the House Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities that would make me a Lithuanian. But everyone knows that today I am an American of Irish-English extraction and will continue to be that after next Sunday.

Mr. Speaker, I am a Democrat, was elected as such and have been admitted to all the party caucuses since I was sworn in as a Member of the Seventy-seventh Congress. I am also a workingman. All my life I have worked for others. I have never been an employer of labor. I have appeared at meetings of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce composed largely of Republicans and completely of employers. The fact of my appearance before and with these people does not make me either a Republican or an employer. The line of reasoning adopted by the Dies committee would.

Fortunately or unfortunately the charges of the Dies committee are given great publicity in the press of the Nation. The men accused are not given the opportunity to give their rebuttals as much space nor a prominent space. Perhaps most or all of the men so accused by the Dies committee are guilty, but only those so accused should be publicly convicted where complete and substantiating evidence has been gathered which will prove guilt "beyond reasonable doubt," and then only after the victim has had an opportunity to be heard. The record has shown that throughout the life of the Dies committee—from its early days when it investigated Shirley Temple—that innocent men have been tarred with the subversion stick. If the record showed that proof had been secured beyond reasonable doubt, and that everyone accused had been granted the opportunity of full and open defense, I could support the Dies committee without misgivings, but the record shows otherwise and, therefore, I cannot support the committee and I urge that my colleagues view the record in this light and also vote accordingly.

Veterans' Group Endorses Mundt Bill To Provide Copies of Congressional Record to Reading Rooms of Men in Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, since introducing my proposal, H. R. 1176, to make free copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD available to the reading rooms of service people in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Forces, as well as to each public- and high-school library in America, I have received many expressions of support from people throughout the country. I am glad the interest in my suggestion is so widespread, and I think it manifests a gratifying revival of public interest in the activities of the legislative branch of government.

I am attaching hereto a letter recently received from Walter Johnson, national commander of the Military Order of the Liberty Bell, which sets forth some significant reasons why those who are fighting for freedom should have access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which reports the day-to-day activities taking place in the greatest forum for freedom which the world today affords:

THE MILITARY ORDER
OF THE LIBERTY BELL,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1943.

HON. KARL E. MUNDT,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is to advise that our order, through its national executive committee, has endorsed your bill, H. R. 1176. This bill would provide copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for each library, large or small, in every unit of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. That is the basis of our endorsement. If the bill, as now written, could be interpreted any other way we would urge modification along this line.

This order, formed last year, is comprised of men now rendering or who have rendered honorable and faithful service in the armed forces of or country. In terms of monthly percentages it is probably the fastest-growing veterans' organization in the country.

We believe that placing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so as to be available to our fighting men would bring returns many times over. The RECORD has high educational value but of greater importance now it has tremendous inspirational value.

Our men now fight all over the world. They see at first hand the peoples that have given up self-government; peoples ruled by directives through the processes of government-by-decree. Those peoples have been abandoned by their legislative bodies either through piecemeal giving up of power or through outright abandonment.

Here we have self-government. Here we the people make our own laws through our chosen Representatives in Congress assembled. Under the dome of our Capitol courageous men and women, selected to represent the people, function as our lawmaking body. Our way of life, everything we have or can hope to have is dependent upon Congress. Our men are fighting magnificently all over the world. They are fighting for freedom and for self-government. Congress is the very core of freedom and of self-government. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carries the word of Congress. It is inspirational and will encourage men to greater deeds. It should be available to every fighting man.

There are those who would discredit Congress. They use high-sounding words of which "democracy" is used most of all. But democracy as such cannot outlast Congress. There is no democracy in government-by-decree.

This war is serious in the extreme sense of the word. Our continued existence as a nation is dependent upon the courage of our fighting men but to almost equal degree it is dependent upon the courage and ability of Congress. Congress should take courage and inspiration from our fighting men so bravely facing the enemy. In turn Congress should inspire our fighting men by making available to them the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As commander in chief of the Military Order of the Liberty Bell, I extend the thanks of this order to you for introduction of House bill 1176 and our best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER JOHNSON,
Commander in Chief, Military Order of the Liberty Bell.

More About Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in the hurly-burly of debate on the Silver Purchase Acts, two misstatements crept into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I am anxious to correct. In the heat of argument I made the statement that the Federal Reserve System is involved in the silver-purchase program. This is not quite correct, except that the Federal Reserve System may be called upon to act as a Treasury agent. As I understand it, the Federal Reserve System does not directly make any purchases of silver.

Secondly, in the excitement of argument I stated on page 639 of the RECORD that we are not importing any silver. This is not quite accurate. Shipping difficulties have reduced importation from some countries, as have other aspects of the war. But some Mexican and Canadian silver is still coming into this country.

The acquisition of silver under the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 and the act of July 6, 1939, is accomplished without any appropriation of funds to compensate those from whom the Treasury acquires the silver. In effect, compensation of the seller or depositor, as the case may be, is made by the Treasury's coining a part of the silver and returning to the seller or depositor the part so coined.

For example, a producer of domestic, newly mined silver brings it to the mint. Each seventy-seven one-hundredths of an ounce troy of that silver suffices to make a standard silver dollar coin. Nowadays the public generally refuses to use standard silver dollar coins. Since, under the silver laws, the Treasury has the power to issue instead a $1 silver certificate for each seventy-seven one-hundredths of an ounce of silver acquired by it under the silver program, the Treasury has adopted the policy of paying sellers of foreign silver and depositors of domestic newly mined silver in such funds as it happens to have on hand, and replenishing such funds by issuing silver certificates up to the cost value of the silver acquired under the program.

The silver certificates are issued in whatever denominations are needed by the public at the time. There are outstanding silver certificates in denominations as high as $1,000.

Although the Treasury is empowered by law to issue certificates up to the full amount of the silver acquired by it, actually the Treasury has been issuing silver certificates only up to the cost value of the silver acquired, and has kept the rest in its general fund. The latter silver is usually referred to as free silver, that is, silver not held as reserve against outstanding silver certificates.

Up to the cost value of the silver, issuance of silver certificates is not optional with the Treasury, but mandatory, and certificates once so issued must remain in circulation so long as the holders thereof do not turn them in for redemption in standard silver dollars.

The statement was made by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] that:

> Supporters of the Celler amendment have in mind putting silver into nonwar industries more than putting silver into the war. I can readily understand why the manufacturers of silver tableware or jewelry and ornaments should want to get their raw material at 35 or 50 cents an ounce rather than be forced to pay 71 cents an ounce.

As far as I am concerned, I am primarily interested in war industries and not nonwar industries. I want all silver controlled by the War Production Board and the Office of Price Administration. The manufacturers of silver tableware or jewelry should not be permitted to get any silver except as the War Production Board may grudgingly allow them under the priorities. Frankly, if the silver is needed in the manufacture of war implements, I would not want the jewelers or silver tableware manufacturers to get an ounce of it. The war effort comes first.

My esteemed friend, the delightful gentleman from Idaho, COMPTON WHITE, states in a letter to me that "all of this silver has been acquired at no cost to the taxpayers." If the 3,000,000,000 ounces of silver have been acquired at no cost does the splendid gentleman from Idaho claim that it was a gift? If it was a gift, why was the Government required to pay 71 cents per ounce for it? That payment is in the form of silver certificates or silver dollars. They are obligations to the Government to the extent that the certificates are above the actual value of the silver. They increase the national debt. Putting these certificates or silver dollars into circulation tends toward inflation. Not much of a gift in that procedure. When the Treasury Department pays 71 cents per ounce for silver whereas the silver may be worth only 35 cents per ounce, in the last analysis the difference between 35 cents and 71 cents is payment for something the Government has not received. Surely the advocates of silver cannot call that difference a gift to the Government. Contrariwise, it is a gift, or a subsidy, by the Government in favor of the silver miners. Also the occasion arises where the mine owners run upon a solid rich vein of silver—I believe it is called a bridal chamber—where the mining is easy and the cost of mining must be under 10 cents per ounce.

Easy or hard, as the case may be with reference to the mine owner, the Government must still pay 71 cents per ounce. The difference between the payment of 71 cents and the actual cost of the mining and transportation of silver cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called a gift to the Nation. It is just the reverse. If the mine owners intended the silver as a gift, why do they get certificates in exchange? These certificates are money—interchangeable with all sorts of other kinds of money. They thus get money in return.

The issuance of those certificates is a form of hidden and, therefore, most insidious taxation.

Now that my amendment has been adopted by the House it is incumbent upon the Ways and Means Committee to open its doors to consider H. R. 821 and H. R. 822. These are bills that I have offered to give real relief by way of constructive action concerning silver.

Recognition for the American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, a letter has come to me from Mr. W. G. Skelly, president of the Skelly Oil Co., whose offices are in my home city, Kansas City, Mo., which speaks out loudly of the support and recognition by American businessmen of the American farmer.

Farmers throughout our entire Nation are spending longer hours because of the need to produce more food with which to balance out the resources of this arsenal of democracy. They are forced to work from the break of day until long after dark because they cannot get the men they need to help and because they cannot get the machinery they need to use.

While our Government has been slow to plan for tangible rewards for outstanding farm production, although such recognition of labor and industry has been provided, Mr. Skelly has announced through letters and newspaper advertisements throughout the Farm Belt that to each person or family cited each week in its radio programs over the radio as outstanding his company will award a $100 War bond and the Skelly pennant S for superior achievement in agriculture.

Mr. Skelly's letter to me reads as follows:

SKELLY OIL CO.,
Kansas City, Mo., January 18, 1943.

Hon. C. JASPER BELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I have read with much interest an article appearing in the January 6 issue of the Kansas City Times stating that the directors of national farm organizations had gathered in Washington to propose to Congress that E flags be awarded farmers for their efforts in producing foods.

It is my feeling that no group of citizens has responded more generously, or more magnificently, to this Nation's call for increased production than American farmers. They have done what was asked of them quietly—without fanfare or plaudits—and in spite of increased shortage of labor and equipment.

For some time I have felt proper recognition for their splendid achievements should be made. Therefore I have taken the privilege of sponsoring recognition to Middle West farmers for their superior achievement in agriculture. The enclosed open letter to American farmers which appeared in Midwest farm journals explains the plan in detail.

None of us should forget that food is as vital as bullets in winning this war. The program I have initiated is but a small contribution toward the tremendous job ahead. Farmers must be encouraged * * * they must have relief from manpower and machinery shortages * * * they should get the recognition they have so dutifully earned. I shall continue to lend all assistance within my power toward that end.

Sincerely yours,

W. G. SKELLY.

Mr. Speaker, our Government should make some arrangements for public recognition of the soldiers, both men, women, and children, on the farms today. They are a part of our fighting forces. We need them, and I urge the Department of Agriculture, which knows much about the farmers' problems, to submit and inaugurate such a plan.

What the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal Means to Labor at War and in Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the very interesting discussions in the House during the last few days in support of and against the construction of the Florida intercoastal barge canal brings the country and Congress face to face with a very serious break-down in our transportation system and the urgent

national necessity of doing something to eliminate the bottlenecks that are directly responsible for the dire shortage of coal, fuel oil, and other vitally needed materials in New England and other Eastern States.

In July of last year Congress enacted a law authorizing the construction of this intercoastal barge canal but as yet little, if anything, has been done to complete the project although every day's delay costs our Government nearly a million dollars a day in excess freight rates paid to our railroads. For decades our Government has spent hundreds of millions of dollars in the development of our inland waterways and in order that the country might enjoy cheap transportation rates. The one bottleneck that has prevented the full utilization of this far reaching inland water transportation system is the failure to construct the proposed canal from the Ohio River to Lake Erie. The elimination of this bottleneck would make impossible the situation we find ourselves in today, a situation that will be with us next year, and the next, unless something is done, to say nothing about a half billion dollars a year loss we sustain in excess freight rates.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks on this subject I am inserting in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Kenneth M. Lloyd of Youngstown, Ohio, entitled "What the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal Means to Labor at War and in Peace" as follows:

THE PROJECT

The proposal is to build a waterway connecting the Ohio River and Lake Erie, a distance of 105 miles. It is planned to start at the confluence of the Beaver River, 25 miles below Pittsburgh and near Rochester, Pa.; to canalize the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers to near Warren, Ohio; to cut through the northern Ohio ridge to the Grand River which would be dammed to form a huge lake to supply both a channel and a water supply for the waterway. A map of the project prepared by the Mississippi Valley Association is attached.

TIME REQUIRED FOR BUILDING

There would be eight locks and dams between the Ohio River and Warren. Eight locks, under a multiple contract system, can be built as quickly as one. Thus, if the project is started immediately, important transportation benefits can come to the Nation in 1943, and the entire project can be a useful facility in 1944.

THE TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM

Petroleum Coordinator Ickes states that even if every transportation facility (tanker, tank car, pipe line, canal barge, and truck) is used, the New England district, including New York city, will have a fuel shortage this winter of 9,000,000 tons of coal plus a daily shortage of 600,000 barrels of oil. This situation is expected to be aggravated as tires wear out and ships and railroads are used more in moving troops and supplies for our fighting forces to the seaboard. America has been tooling up. The real strain on our transportation system is yet to come. The real need for the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal is not far away.

IMMEDIATE WAR BENEFITS

As the canal nears completion the benefits to the Nation will progressively increase. Within a year six to eight million tons of coal moving to the steel mills of the Mahoning Valley can be shifted from rail to water, and rail equipment thus released can be used to haul coal to New England.

When the Lake Erie-Ohio River canal becomes usable in 1944 a great transportation bottleneck will be broken, permitting the flow of oil and petroleum products, coal, sulfur, etc., up the great Mississippi and Ohio River waterways into Lake Erie, thence into the New York State Barge Canal near Buffalo. The short movement on Lake Erie from Ashtabula, Ohio, to Buffalo can be made by barge, as there are many breakwaters and harbors of refuge. I can state confidently that during the war this waterway will be used to haul iron ore, coal, petroleum, and other products to its maximum capacity and far beyond the 28,000,000 tons estimated by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in 1939 as the tonnage reasonably to be expected in the first year of operation of the Lake Erie-Ohio River canal.

WAR VALUE OF MULTIPLE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

The Lake Erie-Ohio River canal would afford an additional transportation system joining the South with the Northeast, far from submarines, air attacks, or possible landing parties. If the waterway were in operation now, its value would be inestimable. It would allay the fear which New England and New York now hold of living in underheated homes and of flu epidemics this winter. For these areas unlimited automobile travel for every citizen for business and pleasure has passed. This waterway should be built for use in this war, in peace, and in future wars. Its contribution to our national transportation security is tremendous.

PEACE BENEFITS

Because of the present unfavorable transportation situation, it costs from $2 to $2.70 per ton more, depending on the degree of finish, to make steel in Youngstown than in Pittsburgh or Chicago, the principal competing areas. Eight hundred thousand people live in the Youngstown district and depend either directly or indirectly on the steel industry for their livelihood. They make 10 percent of the Nation's steel.

The Federal Government is aiding our South American neighbors to build steel plants. The Defense Plant Corporation is now building 10,000,000 (annual) tons of additional steel capacity in the United States. The Federal Government favors leveling tariff barriers after the war. It has improved the rivers of our competitors. Labor and management in Youngstown feel that these policies are proper but they fear the result may be to dry up the steel industry in Youngstown unless the Lake Erie-Ohio River waterway is built.

Labor and management feel that it is of paramount importance to complete the project now, in order to:

1. Speed up the movement of all raw materials in this time of war and to release rail equipment.

2. To reduce the assembly cost of steel produced in Youngstown to be sold in the domestic market and thus provide employment after the war without wage reductions. The stockholders will not lose out after the war in the same way as labor. The corporations can build their new plants in other districts where water transportation exists. But the employee who has his lifetime savings invested in a home cannot move so easily. Local workers stand to lose their homes and everything worth while if the industries in which they work cannot compete in the domestic markets. Before the war "ghost towns" were common in the Youngstown district.

3. In a post-war world of "free trade," the workers in the Pittsburgh district would benefit if the cost of iron ore can be reduced in their district by using barges to transport it from Lake Erie to Pittsburgh. The Detroit area and the New England and New York areas would get their coal and oil much cheaper by barge. Thus the free counter flow of raw materials and finished products between the Great Lakes district and the Ohio River and Mississippi districts would reduce the costs of our finished products and permit them to compete more effectively in a world market where labor is cheap. If the American standard of living is not to be seriously challenged in the post-war period, public improvements of the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal type must be made now. Every worker from the Mississippi River to the New York State Barge Canal needs the benefits of this cheap waterway transportation system to enable his industry to compete in the world markets of tomorrow.

CRITICAL MATERIAL

Horace Nixon, a registered professional engineer skilled in estimating steel requirements, made a survey of the lower 35-mile section of the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal and found that the bridges, if all were completely improved at this time, would require 14,875 tons of new steel. However, 7,180 tons of scrap steel would be recovered from the old structures to be removed. To those familiar with the steel industry, it is common knowledge that the bottleneck in our production is in the blast furnaces which make pig iron. The second step in making steel is taking the pig iron and mixing it with scrap in the open hearth furnaces. There is an excess of open-hearth capacity due to the scarcity of scrap. Thus, it is apparent that the steel needed to build bridges over the first 35 miles of the waterway is not 14,875 tons, but rather 14,875 tons minus 7,180 tons of steel scrap, or a net demand on the basis steel capacity of 7,695 tons (about 30 minutes production). This study by Mr. Nixon indicates that the amount of critical material needed will be negligible in comparison to the benefits. The United States Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in preparing their specifications by substituting noncritical items can save substantial quantities of critical material.

ENDORSEMENTS

Every legitimate waterway association known to the proponents of the project has endorsed it. Every labor organization, excepting only railroad groups, has endorsed it. The River and Harbor Act of 1935 authorized the project, subject to a finding of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. This finding was made in August 1939, and published as House Document No. 178. In fact, the President of the United States made an allotment of $5,000,000 in 1935 to begin immediate construction of the Beaver-Mahoning Waterway—the first part of the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal—but the allotment was later suspended pending the Board's study of the entire project. The only remaining step necessary is to have the President of the United States ask his Attorney General for an opinion setting forth the legal meaning of the River and Harbor Act of 1935, followed by a request for construction funds.

WOULD THE PROJECT INTERFERE WITH PRESENT TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES DURING CONSTRUCTION?

It is important that our present rail transportation system be maintained at its peak efficiency. Due to provisions against floods the elevation of practically all the railroad bridges and tracks would not have to be changed at the present time. Most of the bridges are designed as "over truss" bridges and they would simply be changed to "through truss" bridges. This procedure, to an engineer, is very simple and would not interfere to any considerable extent with the operation of the railroads.

IS THE LAKE ERIE-OHIO RIVER CANAL ESSENTIAL TO WIN THE WAR?

In a highly mechanized war of uncertain length such as World War No. 2 no one act

can be said definitely beforehand to mean success or failure to our cause in and of itself. Everyone will say that the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, if operating today, would be of inestimable value to the Nation. We know the transportation problem will progressively become more acute until final victory is won over the Axis nations. We know that as a nation we must win the peace in a world economy of cheap labor and boundless natural resources. Thus, I say that a project such as this which will move six to eight million tons of fuel within a year and with increasing benefits as it proceeds toward completion until more than 28,000,000 tons of raw material will move the first year it is in complete operation is essential to winning the war. It is a project that will bring progressive strength to a faltering transportation system by hauling essential raw materials and releasing railroad facilities for use in other sections of the country. A project that has been found by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to be justified in depression years for its beneficial effect on our domestic economy will surely make a major contribution toward winning the peace, also, by reducing assembly costs and protecting our standard of living.

Surely reasonable men would say such a project is essential to winning the war.

Personnel Training in the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter received by me from Mr. Telfair Knight, Director of the Division of Training, War Shipping Administration, outlining the training program under the War Shipping Administration:

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION,
DIVISION OF TRAINING,
Washington, January 14, 1943.

Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND,
Chairman, House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE BLAND: In accordance with your request, I am reporting on the exact present status and scope of the War Shipping Administration's program for training personnel of our merchant marine which is conducted by the Division of Training under the supervision of Capt. Edward Macauley, Deputy Administrator.

A new merchant fleet consisting of approximately 2,300 vessels is now under construction by the United States Maritime Commission. This is in addition to our present merchant fleet. These 2,300 new ships require a complement of about 19,000 licensed deck and engineer officers, about evenly divided, and about 80,000 unlicensed seamen in the deck, engine, stewards, and radio departments. While there are many experienced seamen now ashore in other occupations and while every effort is being made to induce these men to return to sea, the number of them who can be made available involves so many variable factors that provision must be made and has been made to train enough new officers and seamen to supply all that are needed.

The scope of our training program is as follows:

MERCHANT MARINE OFFICER TRAINING

(A) UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE CADET CORPS

There are presently over 4,500 cadets in training to become officers under the Federal system. This number will be increased to 5,200 by January 15, 1943. The course covers a period of 16 months, of which the first 2 months of preliminary training are given at basic schools at Kings Point, N. Y., Pass Christian, Miss., and San Mateo, Calif.; then 6 to 8 months on active merchant vessels, dependent upon voyage time, and finally from 6 to 8 months advanced courses at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, Great Neck, Long Island. Graduates are qualified to sit for licenses as third mates or third assistant engineers. Cadets are also enrolled as midshipmen in the Merchant Marine Naval Reserve for which they must qualify before being appointed as cadets. They receive instruction in naval science as well as in all maritime subjects and are eligible for appointment as ensigns in the Merchant Marine Naval Reserve upon securing their licenses as merchant officers, but they remain in an inactive Navy status so long as they serve on merchant vessels.

Requirements for appointment to the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps are as follows: Unmarried citizens of the United States, native-born or naturalized for at least 10 years; between the ages of 18 and 23 years with overage allowance of 1 year for each year of college; at least 12 units from accredited high schools; good health and good moral character.

The training ships *William Webb*, *Robert Forbes*, *Felix Riesenberg*, and *Emery Rice* are attached to the academy and the *Robert Waterman*, *Alfred Haag*, and *Samuel Samuels* to the basic school at Pass Christian, Miss. A training ship will soon be added to the basic school at San Mateo, Calif.

While in training the cadets are paid $65 per month by the Government ashore and by the ship operators afloat. They are furnished with uniforms, textbooks, quarters, subsistence, and medical, and dental care. While in port on merchant vessels, each cadet is examined by a cadet training instructor and is assigned studies to be carried on at sea under the supervision of the ship's officers. Aboard ship cadets are quartered with the officers.

Approximately 7,000 cadets of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps are expected to qualify as merchant marine officers in the years 1943 and 1944. They will release officers now serving as third mates and third assistant engineers for raise in grade to higher ranks, 6 months' sea service being required for each raise in grade.

(B) STATE MARITIME ACADEMIES

There are five State maritime academies under Federal supervision operated with Federal aid. They are as follows: California Maritime Academy, San Francisco, Calif.; Maine Maritime Academy, Castine, Maine; Massachusetts Maritime Academy, Hyannis, Mass; New York State Maritime Academy, Fort Schuyler, the Bronx, N. Y.; Pennsylvania Maritime Academy, Philadelphia, Pa. The five State maritime academies will graduate approximately 1,500 officers in the years 1943 and 1944.

Requirements for admission to the State maritime academies are the same as for the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps except that they may be admitted at the minimum age of 17 years and 8 months. They receive approximately the same pay and allowances as the Federal cadets and their course of training covers the same period of 16 months, but instead of being trained on active merchant vessels they take an annual training cruise of 3 months on training ships provided by the Government. The ships presently assigned for these cruises are the *American Pilot*, *Golden State*, and *Keystone State*. The State maritime academy cadets are also enrolled as midshipmen in the Merchant Marine Naval Reserve in an inactive status, receive training in naval science and are eligible for appointment as ensigns in the Navy when they secure their licenses as third mates or third assistant engineers.

(C) OFFICER SCHOOLS OF THE UNITED STATES MARITIME SERVICE

The United States Maritime Service trains officers up from the ranks, and new seamen for unlicensed positions in the deck, engine, stewards, and radio departments. The officer schools are located at Fort Trumbull, New London, Conn., and at Alameda, Calif. At these schools, deck and engine men with at least 14 months' sea service are given a 4 months' course to qualify them to sit for licenses as third mates and third assistant engineers. While in training, they are rated as chief petty officers, are paid $126 per month and are furnished with uniforms, textbooks, quarters, subsistence, medical and dental care and the use of recreational facilities. These two schools have a present capacity of 8,250 graduates per annum.

(D) ENGINEER OFFICERS FROM APPROVED TECHNICAL COLLEGES AND WITH MACHINIST EXPERIENCE

Students of approved technical colleges who have completed a 3 years' course and men with 3 years' experience in the machinist trade as apprentices of which 3 months must have been spent in the construction, installation or repair of marine engines, are eligible to sit for licenses as third assistant engineers after completing 3 months' service in the engine room of a merchant vessel as an unlicensed engineer. Such men are eligible for a 1 month's course at the United States Maritime Service training stations at Hoffman Island or Sheepshead Bay, New York. They must be at least 19 years old. They are enrolled in the Maritime Service as chief machinist's mates, and are paid $126 while at the training station. Aboard ship standard wages are paid.

(E) REFRESHER COURSES

Experienced seamen whose licenses have expired and who wish to renew them are eligible to take refresher courses at the officers' schools at Fort Trumbull, New London, Conn., and Alameda, Calif. While at these schools they are rated as chief petty officers and are paid $126 per month.

UNLICENSED SEAMEN TRAINING

(A) DECK, ENGINE, STEWARDS, HOSPITAL CORPSMEN, AND SHIP'S CLERKS

The United States Maritime Service maintains four shore training stations for apprentice seamen at Sheepshead Bay, N. Y.; Hoffman Island, N. Y.; St. Petersburg, Fla.; and Avalon, Calif. The following training ships are attached to these stations: *American Seaman*, *American Sailor*, *Vema*, *Joseph Conrad*, *Tusitala*, *American Seafarer*, *American Engineer*, and the *American Navigator*. The new Liberty ship, *American Mariner*, having a capacity of 500 trainees, is expected to be placed in service on or about February 1. These training units can accommodate 17,000 trainees at one time, so that potentially 68,000 men, less attrition, can be graduated each year. They receive a 3-months' course of training in the deck, engine, and stewards departments. At the training station at Sheepshead Bay there are schools for the training of hospital corpsmen and ship's clerks. While in training apprentice seamen are paid $50 per month and are furnished with clothing, quarters, subsistence, medical and dental care. Engine department graduates are eligible for certificates as oilers, firemen, and water tenders. Deck men are certificated as ordinary seamen and are eligible to be examined for certificates as able

seamen after serving 3 months on a merchant vessel. Stewards department graduates are certificated as cooks, bakers, or messmen. Standard established wages are paid aboard ship.

(1) Ordinary seamen not graduates of the apprentice-seaman training courses, with 3-months' service at sea, are eligible for a 3-months' course of training at apprentice seaman training stations to qualify for examination for an able seaman's certificate. They will receive pay at the rate of $54 per month and will be subject to the same conditions and instruction as apprentices. Upon graduation they will be regularly enrolled in the United States Maritime Service in the grade of seaman, first class.

Ordinary seamen with at least 6 months' actual sea experience are eligible for a course of training of 1 month at Hoffman Island, N. Y., or Avalon, Calif., whichever is nearer to place of enrollment, to qualify them for an able seaman's certificate. Although men with 9-months' sea service are eligible for certification as able seamen without training, many are hesitant to go up for examination without any preliminary preparation. We, therefore, offer these men such course of instruction as will be proved necessary to prepare them for the examination. While in training, these trainees are paid $66 per month and furnished with clothing, quarters, subsistence, medical and dental care. Upon graduation they will be regularly enrolled in the grade of seaman, first class.

(B) RADIO OPERATORS

At Gallups Island, in Boston Harbor, the Maritime Service operates an advanced radio school which accommodates 1,000 trainees at one time. A preliminary radio school is operated at Huntington, Long Island, N. Y., where the first 2 months of the 6 months' course is taken. Successful completion of this course earns entrance to the school at Gallups Island. The course has been reduced from 10 to 6 months and 3,000 radio operators can be turned out each year. While in training enrollees are paid from $54 to $66, depending on previous training, and are furnished with uniforms, quarters, subsistence, medical and dental care, and the use of recreational facilities.

(C) COOKS AND BAKERS

Cooks and bakers are very essential to the welfare of seamen. A specialized school to produce them is established at all apprentice seaman training stations. While in training for 3 months, the enrollees are paid $50 per month and are furnished with uniforms, quarters, subsistence, medical and dental care, and recreational facilities. Aboard ship, standard established wages are paid.

On January 1, 1943, there were in training at each station the following number of trainees:

Prospective licensed officers:	
Fort Trumbull, New London, Conn	1,264
Government Island, Alameda, Calif	360
Total	1,624
U. S. Merchant Marine cadets:	
U. S. Merchant Marine Academy, N. Y	1,006
Awaiting assignments to ships	18
Assigned to ships	1,568
Cadet Basic School, Pass Christian, Miss	242
Awaiting assignment to ships	12
Assigned to ships	350
Cadet Basic School, San Mateo, Calif	339
Awaiting assignment to ships	8
Assigned to ships	941
Total	4,484
State maritime academy cadets:	
California Maritime Academy	75
Maine Maritime Academy	189
Massachusetts Maritime Academy	200
New York State Maritime Academy	309
Pennsylvania Maritime Academy	93
Total	866
Radiomen: Gallups Island, Boston	1,084
Apprentice seamen:	
Hoffman Island	1,204
St. Petersburg	395
American Seaman	221
American Pilot	[1] 1
Santa Catalina	754
American Sailor	251
American Seafarer	[2] 0
American Navigator	383
American Engineer	225
Sheepshead Bay	9,990
Total	13,424
Grand total in training	21,482

[1] 284 State maritime academy cadets are on training cruise on the *American Pilot*.

[2] The *American Seafarer* was beached in a gale in the Cape Cod Canal. She has now been floated and is back in service.

Applications for enrollment can be made at United States Maritime Service Enrolling Offices in principal cities or to the United States Maritime Service, Division of Training, War Shipping Administration, National Theater Building, Washington, D. C. Applications for appointment as cadets should be directed to the Supervisor of Merchant Marine Cadet Training, War Shipping Administration, Division of Training, National Theater Building, Washington, D. C.

While it will be necessary to drive full speed ahead, the War Shipping Administration feels that it has the training problem in hand and that men will be made available to man the new ships.

If this report does not contain all of the information that you wish, I should be glad to supplement it.

Sincerely yours,

TELFAIR KNIGHT,
Director, Division of Training.

The Bureau of Narcotics—The Country Has Reason to Appreciate the Outstanding Work of Hon. H. J. Anslinger and His Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, while the statement I am going to submit has to do with the activities of the Bureau of Narcotics of the Treasury Department, still I feel I am justified in saying a few words relative to Hon. H. J. Anslinger, the head of that Bureau. His accomplishments in enforcing our laws are, in my opinion, secondary to his vision. Realizing several years ago what might happen, Mr. Anslinger brought to this country narcotics for medical purposes that will last over a period of years. The medical profession, more than anyone else, realizes the value of his foresight. Little do you hear of his organization, but, while I commend him for his enforcement activities, I say he deserves a medal of honor for his advanced thought that resulted in the medical profession having a supply of narcotics that are so necessary in treating the sick, not only those in the armed forces but our civilian population.

The statement follows:

Treasury officials revealed today how undercover officers kept a dangerous rendezvous with international opium smugglers deep in the mountains of Mexico, and with the help of Mexican officials, plugged one of the major sources of illicit dope traffic in the United States.

Details of the story-book investigation, which has just culminated in a series of convictions in Federal court, are contained in a report to Secretary Morgenthau by Elmer L. Irey, chief coordinator of the Treasury's enforcement agencies. The review covered 1942 activities of the Bureau of Narcotics and the drug-control work of the Bureau of Customs.

Mrs. Ignacia Jasso Gonzales, widely known on the border as La Nacha, alleged by the officers to have been for years the largest distributor of illicit drugs on the Mexican frontier, and 13 others were indicted at El Paso as a result of the investigation conducted jointly by the two agencies.

Several principals already have been given stiff sentences, but La Nacha has not been brought to trial as she faces charges in Mexico. Treasury officers say this woman was the brains of a gang making deliveries to customers as far removed as New York, San Francisco, and Seattle.

United States officials termed cooperation of Mexican officers in this case particularly significant since gangster elements had attempted to organize traffic from the poppy fields of interior Mexico to replace illegal sources dried up by the war. Customs and Narcotics officers, with the aid of Mexican officials, effected several other major prosecutions in 1942 involving border narcotics smuggling.

One of these cases involved eight New York hoodlums, said by officers to have been recruited from remnants of the old "Dutch" Schultz and "Lucky" Luciano gangs. They were convicted in New York of conspiracy charges and in Arizona on smuggling counts. A similar case developed in California, involving charges against 10 persons.

There was a continued trickle of marihuana into the United States from Mexico, too, but most of these seizures were small. However, several trouble spots of what appeared to be organized addiction to the weed appeared, and resulted in prosecutions on both coasts.

Both H. J. Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, and W. R. Johnson, Commissioner of Customs, reported continued scarcity of illicit narcotic drugs with prices beyond the reach of many addicts.

Breaking of the La Nacha gang was considered a major enforcement accomplishment by the two services. How the Juarez woman acquired her colorful nickname is a matter of dispute. Border agents say La Nacha can be interpreted as Spanish slang for "pug nose," but another school of thought believes the term a corruption of Ignacia, her given name.

The characters in La Nacha's entourage might have been taken from Alice in Wonderland. The case reports of investigating officers list the conspirators by such titles as "The Lawyer," and "The Chemist," and "The Interpreter," and "The Chauffeur," and "The Old Man," and "The Old Woman."

The undercover agents were taken on a trip into the mountains of Guadalajara, where "La Nacha" introduced them to "The Chemist" and "The Lawyer," the processors of the flowers growing in the isolated mountain country.

"The Lawyer," Alberto Torres Ybarra, and "The Chemist," Luis Manuel Vazquez, were arrested subsequently by customs and narcotics agents near San Antonio, Tex. A secret compartment in the gas tank of their automobile yielded 55 ounces of morphine, for which they admitted they had hoped to realize $8,000. They promptly pleaded guilty in Federal court, and were sentenced each to 5 years in prison and fines of $5,000.

More arrests were made in El Paso of alleged runners for La Nacha and total seizures reached 125 ounces of smoking opium and 78 ounces of morphine.

Narcotics Bureau officers carried out another offensive during the year against one of the most persistent centers of internal distribution, a segment of the Kansas City underworld. Successful prosecutions of important members of this gang were effected in 1939 and 1940. The syndicate was revived, however, and 12 additional indictments were obtained in 1942, among those accused being Carl Carramusa, alleged director of the illicit business, Nicolo Impastato, Joseph De Luca, and Charles Benjamin, of Kansas City, and Paul and Joseph Antinori, of Tampa, Fla.

High spot of this investigation was the solving of a secret wall panel in the basement of a Kansas City house, which netted a large quantity of heroin.

Narcotics officers, after a 2-year investigation, found on a cluster of little cabin-studded farms in the green hills of North Carolina the source of much of the demoralizing marihuana peddled in the Harlem district of New York.

The conspiracy involved the most extensive illegal, commercial marihuana enterprise so far discovered in the Eastern United States.

The Bureau of Narcotics won a major court victory in its efforts to prevent dissipation of medicinal narcotic drugs through unscrupulous practitioners. The United States Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the conviction of the Direct Sales Co., Inc., of Buffalo, which sold drugs directly to a physician engaged in illegally dispensing them to addicts.

Phillip Chatard, alias Phillip Chadwick, gunman and desperado, who forfeited bond and disappeared while his conviction on narcotics charges as being appealed, was captured by narcotics officers in Tacoma, Wash., after a series of spectacular drug company robberies, and committed to a Federal penitentiary.

The major seizure by customs officers during the year was a lot of 27 pounds of Mexican smoking opium taken from a bus passenger at Yuma, Ariz. Destination was reported to be a Chinese in San Francisco. The Bureau reports that curtailment of shipping from the Far East has practically dried up traffic in the familiar 5-tael and 1-tael factory-made tins of opium, but that there have been occasional seizures of smoking opium in soft-metal tubes packaged in Singapore and distributed to oriental opium monopolies. However, aside from the Mexican types, most seizures now are of raw opium in the form of small sticks apparently originating in Persia.

Numerous lots have been taken from ships arriving at our ports, the largest shipment being a total of more than 51 pounds taken from an American vessel in extended searches at Hoboken, and 167 ounces taken from Chinese crew members of a Dutch vessel at New York.

An interesting angle in these cases was that the sticks had outer wrappers upon which were imprinted Arabic characters which proved to be Persian versions of certain verses from the Bible book of Luke. Agents have been unable to develop any particular significance to these quotations, which were in addition to the usual labels of the Iranian Government opium monopoly.

Combined seizures by Customs and Narcotics Bureaus during the year were 5,158 ounces of opium, morphine, heroin, and similar narcotics, against 4,962 ounces in 1941. Marihuana seizures fell off sharply to 12,830 ounces, against 22,376 ounces in 1941.

The Bureau of Narcotics reported 2,635 arrests under narcotics laws and the Marihuana Tax Act, against 2,824 in 1941. Narcotics arrests increased slightly and marihuana arrests were somewhat fewer.

Victory Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States, article 1, section 8, provides that:

> The Congress shall have power to raise and support armies. * * * To provide and maintain a Navy. To make rules for the government and regulation for the land and naval forces.

However, the President, under the Constitution is the Commander in Chief of our armed forces and he is in complete charge of all activities of our armed forces.

The Seventy-eighth Congress will guide our Nation in the next 2 years through war, victory, and possibly the peace. It will face the greatest privilege any representative body has ever had in the history of the world. Our big job is to win this war just as soon as possible and bring peace to a weary world. In order to accomplish this task it is the duty of the victory Congress to take immediate action on the vital problems that confront our armed forces and the American people.

The following proposals should be on the "must" list:

First. Military officers who have made a life study in the art of war must be in complete control of the military operations. We must not permit interference from inexperienced bureaucrats or politically appointed military men.

Second. The original concept of the lend-lease proposal was to loan our allies war materials, but this method was later changed to a lend-lease-give-away policy. If the donation concept or policy is to be adopted, our people should be so notified, because they are the ones who must pay the bill. It is our duty to insist on retaining title to planes, ships, and war materials loaned to our allies.

Third. If a "food Dunkerque" is to be avoided, due to the failure of the bureaucrats in the Department of Agriculture, then it is the duty of Congress to see to it that the American farmers are now given the tools and labor to produce the food for our armed forces, civilians, and allies.

Fourth. An unbalanced manpower between our armed forces, industrial workers, and producers of food will prolong the war, greatly increase the loss of men on the battle fronts, and will probably lose the peace.

Fifth. In the post-war period, airports will be as vital as seaports were before the war. Throughout history, seaports have been open primarily because countries desired commerce. These seaports were difficult to control because it took a gigantic fleet to police them. It will be much easier to control airports after this war. We must have title to enough American-built air bases on foreign soil to insure us equal air strength with any other nation. This is the least we can ask of our allies.

Sixth. Today America is engaged in a global war. On this military global basis we must prevent our troops from being caught in pockets without adequate equipment and food. Congress must insist that merchant ships, undersea, surface, and air craft, field equipment, and food be produced and delivered to fighting fronts wherever our men may be engaged.

Seventh. Give the American people the facts. They can take it, regardless of whether it is good or bad. At no time will they seek information that will give aid to the enemy.

Eighth. We must maintain our freedom and reject the doctrine of domestic dictatorship in order to accomplish our task. Dictatorship and regimentation would be our greatest obstacles to victory. With free management and free labor each doing its part and cooperating with the Government, we can outproduce any nation or group of nations in which labor is enslaved and management shackled.

Ninth. We must establish a post-war commission made up of representatives from the Executive, Senate, House, agriculture, labor, business, church, and veterans, in order to maintain or increase production and income, which will insure full employment after the war. When the end of the war comes, it will probably come suddenly. We must be better prepared for peace than we were for war.

In this—the most critical period in our history—there is serious work to do—for all of us. It does seem to me important for this Congress to make a record, so that future generations may know that Congress did its part to save America.

Lest we forget the words of Abraham Lincoln, when he said:

> If we do not make common cause to save the good old ship of the Union on this voyage, nobody will have a chance to pilot her on another voyage.

Tires for Farm Tractors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following letter, suggesting improvements in the rationing of tires for farm tractors, from the Allen County, Ind., rationing board to the Honorable Prentiss Brown, Price Administrator:

FORT WAYNE, IND., *February 4, 1943.*

HON. PRENTISS BROWN,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is from the tire rationing board of Allen County, Ind.

The purpose is to urge a change of the rules in regard to rubber tires for farm tractors.

Two members of the board have served since its inception; a third, since February 1942; and the others have had about 6 months' experience.

During its life the board has had several applications from farmers desiring to change their tractor tires from steel to rubber, which we felt should have been granted in order to increase the production of food. However, under the instructions in force from the start, this has been impossible.

The board members do not see how it would be possible to formulate rules that would cover all parts of the country without leaving a good deal to the discretion of local boards. If this is the case, we realize that we board members should be faced with the problem of granting a very few, out of a considerable number of applications, and consequently being faced with charges of favoritism, but we believe that most boards, if not all, will be willing to undergo that.

There seems to be no question but that this country will need all the food that 1943 can produce. And we imagine you are familiar with the fact that labor available for farms has been terribly reduced by both the draft and the tempting of men away from the farms by the high wages and short hours in industry. The local papers are full of advertisements of farm auctions, and have been for several months. The women of the farms remaining are doing much of the outside work, but there is a limit to that, too. We know of one man owning a large farm just over the line in Ohio who recently sold 36 milk cows to be slaughtered because he simply couldn't keep help enough to look after them.

This part of the country had unusually good weather last year, and extraordinary crops of almost everything, but a distressful proportion of these crops was not gathered owing to labor shortage. It isn't at all likely that we shall have so good a year again, and besides that, many crops that were hopefully planted last year, won't be put in again unless farmers see some chance of harvesting them.

The shortage of rubber you know better than we do, but it seems to be the case that there is a large quantity of tractor tires left on manufacturers' hands when the production of farm implements was curtailed. If this is really true, the question arises whether these tires would be more useful to the country as a whole by being used "as is" on certain selected farm tractors, or, as we suppose would be the alternative, by being reworked into reclaimed rubber and used in some other form.

We cannot give you any statistics for the country as a whole, or even for Indiana, and, anyway, conditions vary so much in different sections that we could not possibly help on that. But we can give you something about Allen County which may be helpful.

As you doubtless know, Allen County, and this part of the State generally, are much like the lower three or four tiers of counties of Michigan—general farming, most farms from 80 to 160 acres, owned and operated by the families living thereon. In the past year or so there has been considerable doubling up, that is, one man operating two or three farms, due to owners or sons or hired hands being drafted or tempted away to work in industry by the high wages.

The area of the county is about 432,000 acres, of which about 388,000 are in farms—about 3,700 farms.

Population of Fort Wayne, which has many busy industries, is about 125,000.

Population on farms and the dozen or so villages is about 35,000. Of these many work in Fort Wayne.

Farm tractors (tax returns March 1942), 1,963.

Of these probably somewhere near 50 percent are now on rubber, and probably most of those on steel would like to change. Not quite all, as many would not want to pay out the about $200, and also there are some soils on which steel wheels are actually better than rubber. Likely, too, many owners of older machines would plan to make the old ones do until such time as they could get a new tractor.

To sum up, our thought is that there are probably from 30 to 50 farm tractors in Allen County that should be changed over.

We should include in this group:

First, a farmer who is working two or more farms, where it would be necessary for him to go over a hard-top road to get from one to another farm.

Second, an operator of a custom rig—thresher, corn picker, or combine.

Third, a farmer whose place is largely muck or sandy soil.

There is a point that will doubtless occur to you, and that is, "why not more extensive use of those tractors now mounted on rubber?" Two things stand in the way: one, that the owner is likely to need the machine at much the same time as the would-be borrower; the other, that he is naturally reluctant to lend or rent a machine that cost him $1,000 or $1,200, that is indispensable in his own work, and that is practically impossible to replace now at any price—unless he is very sure of the skill and carefulness of the man who desires to use it.

If anything is done about this it must be soon to be of use. Spring plowing will be starting in 30 days, and a farmer will not plant without reasonable hope of reaping.

Yours very truly,

F. E. HOFFMAN,
R. J. THIEME,
R. N. SNIDER,
Chairmen, Allen County Rationing Board.

Dies Committee Should Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House of Representatives, today there wi'l be a division in the House of Representatives on the subject of the extension of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, commonly known as the Dies committee.

The reason it is known as the Dies committee is because of the publicity and propaganda which has been spread over our fair land on behalf of the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. MARTIN DIES. The fact that the American people do not know who the members of this committee are is proof in itself that the function of this committee has been diverted chiefly for the advertising of its chairman.

I shall vote against the extension of the Dies committee when the roll is called, for the following reasons:

First, it has prostituted every decent law of evidence and procedure in its investigative actions and has usurped the functions of investigation, trial, condemnation, and punishment, which is contrary to the American principles of civil liberties, toward the accused.

Second, by publishing long lists of suspected individuals and with its unwarranted, unproven attacks on the characters of these individuals, it has caused many law-abiding, patriotic American citizens to suffer the penalty of character assassination.

Third, although we are at war with the Nazi and Fascist governments of the world the Dies committee has utterly failed to warn the American people of this particular danger and it has also failed to investigate Nazi and Fascist individuals and organizations which constitute the prime danger against the democratic peace-loving peoples of the world.

Fourth, the procedure which this committee has followed in a time when national unity of effort is imperative has been an aid and comfort to the domestic Fascists of America even as it has been to the Nazi government abroad, as shown by their constant reiteration of the Dies committee statements on propaganda outlets of the Axis nations.

Fifth, I shall vote against the extension of this committee because I admire and respect the ideals and courage of the one dissenting member of the Dies committee, Congressman JERRY VOORHIS, of California, whose recent minority report is an indictment against the integrity and sincerity of the committee.

At this time I want to pay tribute to the 4 years of sacrifice and hard work which the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has given in his unselfish attempt to secure fair and impartial treatment toward those accused before the Dies committee. To those uninformed individuals who have attacked him because of his membership on the committee, I wish to enter into the RECORD the fact that he would have long ago resigned had it not been for the insistence of many of his friends. We felt that he could render the American people a great service by remaining on the committee in order that the committee should have some restraining influence in its unfair and intimidating tactics, reports, and statements.

In conclusion, may I say that we who love the democratic way of life and would die to preserve the civil liberties of the individual, upon which this Nation is founded, should be more alert now than ever before to guard against those forces within our midst who, under the guise of Americanism, are following the Axis propaganda line of "divide and conquer."

Report of Accomplishments of the Intelligence Division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement from the Treasury Department relative to the activities of the Division of Intelligence of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Here is one Government agency that is not only self-sustaining but brings to the Treasury many, many millions of dollars in excess of its appropriations. It is to organizations of this character we should give additional personnel, because for every dollar we appropriate we will collect hundreds from those who seek to defraud the Government.

The statement follows:

Intelligence agents of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, pressing the fight against evaders of the tax laws in the light of wartime needs for revenue, developed additional assessments and penalties in excess of $61,000,000 during 1942. The promised recovery to the Treasury nearly doubles similar 1941 assessments.

Prominent business and professional men, as well as racketeers, were included in the 116 individuals indicted for income tax evasion in new cases, while 120 persons were convicted during the period.

During the year, agents of the Alcohol Tax Unit, another enforcement division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, smashed several gangs of liquor tax law evaders that had criminal records running back to prohibition days.

Elmer L. Irey, Chief Coordinator of Enforcement, detailed the activities of the two units in one of a series of reports to Secretary Morgenthau covering 1942 calendar year work of the agencies under his direction. Other members of the Treasury investigative family are the Bureau of Customs, the Bureau of Narcotics, the Foreign Funds Control Division, and the United States Secret Service.

Stewart Berkshire, head of the Alcohol Tax Unit, reported an over-all improvement in the bootleg liquor situation parallel with prosecutions involving large groups of conspirators. Continued intense enforcement efforts, wartime sugar, gasoline and tire rationing, and improved employment opportunities were factors making for a falling off of illicit distilling operations. At the same time, extraordinary expansion of industrial alcohol production made it necessary to utilize additional personnel for the supervision of output for war purposes.

The number of illicit stills seized during 1942 dropped nearly 35 percent, and the number of arrests 41 percent. Nevertheless some 14,000 persons were recommended for prosecution.

The volume of mash seized at illicit distilleries, one of the best measures of the production of non-tax-paid liquor, dropped 58 percent. The reduction in illicit distillery operations was achieved in the face of sharply higher taxes on distilled spirits, a factor which under some conditions might be expected to prove an incentive to efforts at evasion.

Instead, bootlegging operations were reported at the lowest level since repeal of national prohibition.

W. H. Woolf, Acting Chief of the Intelligence Unit, reported continued high ratio of convictions from cases prepared for prosecution. Of 125 persons going to trial in income tax cases during 1942, 120 were convicted. Fines totaling $175,000 were assessed by the courts in addition to prison sentences handed out. Evidence gathered by the special agents brought 48 other individuals to trial on miscellaneous charges, and 39 were convicted.

Conviction of Herbert Glassman and Edward C. Ostrow, who controlled corporations operating taxicabs in Washington, D. C., and in Baltimore, culminated one of the important investigations during the year. These defendants also were engaged in selling casualty insurance, dealing in automobiles, and in automobile financing. With the assistance of their accountant, Joseph I. Zucker, the two diverted corporate funds so as to enable them to understate their income over a period of years.

Glassman was sentenced to 5 years in prison and fined $10,000. Ostrow drew 3 years and $10,000; and Zucker 3 years and $5,000.

W. L. Nix, former Texas oil operator, was sentenced to 2 years in prison after having been a fugitive for 5 years. He pleaded guilty in 1937 to charges of gasoline-tax evasion and disappeared after receiving a suspended prison term and a $10,000 fine.

As an aftermath to prosecutions instituted in 1941 against Joseph M. Schenck, motion-picture executive, Schenck pleaded guilty in 1942 to a charge of perjury and was sentenced to imprisonment for a year and a day. His income-tax evasion conviction in 1941 attracted Nation-wide publicity.

Evidence gathered by intelligence agents resulted in proceedings against numerous individuals on such charges as evasion of motor-vehicle use tax, reuse of used or washed documentary stamps, possession of unregistered firearms, and evasion of social security and tobacco taxes.

Agents of the Alcohol Tax Unit ran across the trail of an old customer during the year, Irving Wexler, alias Waxey Gordon. Gordon, notorious prohibition era racketeer, and a confederate were sentenced on charges of conspiracy to violate sugar-rationing regulations on evidence turned over to the Office of Price Administration by the Alcohol Tax Unit agents.

Gordon and his associates were charged with setting up a soft-drink company front for prospective black-market operations in sugar involving 500,000 pounds.

The agents smashed an Alabama hill country moonshine ring that had plagued the Government since national prohibition days. Thirty-six persons were convicted in Federal court at Birmingham, with sentences totaling 42 years of imprisonment to be served, 6 years' imprisonment suspended, and 97 years probation. This group, mostly related by blood or by marriage, resided in a remote section of Shelby County, Ala. After months of intensive undercover work, agents closed in and in 4 days destroyed stills with total cubic capacity of 20,300 gallons a day.

Sentencing of 10 more defendants in a notorious New York conspiracy brought total convictions in the case to 98 persons. The trials involved Marco LiMandri and associates, and was an outgrowth of what is known as the Stahl-Pellegrino conspiracy, in which 74 persons were convicted. The defendants in the two series of cases drew total prison terms of 46 years. Evidence in the LiMandri case disclosed that more than a thousand 100-pound bags of sugar were furnished weekly to illicit distillers in the years 1939-40 when the operations flourished.

George W. Burk, sheriff of Talladega County, Ala., and 8 others were convicted in Federal court at Anniston, Ala., in a case involving interstate moonshine whisky operations. Burk was sentenced to 4 years' imprisonment, 2 of his deputies to 3 years each, and former Sheriff Sam Burns to 2 years. The syndicate operated 16 unregistered distilleries, and produced 20,000 gallons of high-proof whisky. The sheriff was charged with receiving "protection" money from the still operators.

Another interstate illicit alcohol combine operating in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin, was broken with conviction of Emil Ricchio and 16 others. Sentences totaling 23 years were imposed.

Forty-five persons were convicted in the southern district of New York on charges of conspiracy to defraud the United States of liquor taxes. This was known as the Allessio-Livolsi-Pezzulo syndicate, which made arrangements with various still owners to purchase output of finished alcohol.

"Time To Inquire"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, within the last few days every Member of the House of Representatives has been presented with a copy of what I consider one of the most important books which has been given to the public in a long time. I refer to Time To Inquire by Samuel Crowther, the noted economist and writer. I have had in my possession for some time a copy of this book and have read the same with more interest and appreciation than I can express. I think every loyal, thoughtful citizen should read this book. Certainly Members of the House and Senate whose responsibility it is to safely guide the ship of state through the turbulent and dangerous waters ahead should not fail to carefully read this volume.

Mr. Crowther is thoroughly alive to the growing, increasing dangers before us. He deals with causes and effects. In his own inimitable way, he clarifies the problems which now greatly concern all thoughtful citizens interested in the present and future welfare of this country.

The other day a review of this book was published in the Timely War Topics section of the Review of World Affairs—Memorandum of Information, written and published by Genneth DeCourcy with the help of an advisory committee under the chairmanship of Lord Phillimore. The material is cabled in full each month to J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., of Canada, who publish the Review for the United States, the South American republics, Canada, and Newfoundland. Timely War Topics is a special monthly

book service, consisting of a commentary on currently important books dealing with the international scene and with the war. Only books that seem to be authoritative and topical are mentioned. Coming as it does from across the Atlantic, this review of Time to Inquire is of more than ordinary interest. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I offer it for the RECORD at this time and suggest that the Members of the House lose no time in reading this most valuable book. I doubt whether many of us can have a clear picture of our present situation without doing so. It follows:

TIMELY WAR TOPICS

It is refreshing to meet an honest, sturdy thinker, who is not afraid to give his opinions in forthright fashion, without wrapping them up in the amazing verbiage that so often disguises what the writer really wants to say. It is also important, we think, to listen to men who have something practical to propose about post-war reconstruction.

Samuel Crowther is famous for his writings on business subjects. He has nearly two dozen books to his credit, including several written in collaboration with Henry Ford. We do not like to label people, since this is one of the foolish obsessions of our age (and argues that we are suffering from compartmentalizing our knowledge, and not seeing things wholly), but Mr. Crowther could be called a rugged individualist with a great deal of common sense.

In Time to Inquire he has some very pertinent things to say about present trends in relation to what he politicians are pleased to call "the common man and his freedom." Mr. Crowther points out what is, in fact, quite true—that the common man has been steadily stripped of his dignity and of opportunity since the beginning of this century, and that his freedom is more endangered today from 'social reformers seeking full employment" than at any time since the Industrial Age.

It is a controversial book, but one well worth reading, we think. The author disagrees both with President Roosevelt's Looking Forward and with Burnham's The Managerial Revolution. He represents certainly what is, to our way of thinking, a much more typical American point of view than that given in the two books named above. He is an unequivocal advocate of free enterprise, and holds—again rightly, we think—that everyone cannot be wrong at once, and mistakes hold their own cures.

As an economist, he is forthright and courageous. "We have made ourselves think we are rich and, therefore, powerful," he says, "by counting dollars instead of the things which the dollars represent." And more forcibly, "Rationing, with all its consequent regimentation, is a political device for keeping the money ball in the air."

He sees through a great deal of the "planned economy" mania, which threatens, as he points out, to wipe out the few remaining freedoms left to the average man. "We are in the grip of a welfare workerism conceived on noble principles and implemented by vast delusions of grandeur." He cuts through to the root of the old laissez-faire business system of the past, for he is neither a liberal nor a conservative in money matters. "There is no way to explain a modern accounting system in simple language, because it is a mathematical abstraction almost wholly divorced from reality."

We have given sufficient indication to our readers to enable them to form an opinion of what kind of a book Time to Inquire is. We recommend it as a wholesome antidote to a lot of woolly thinking on social and economic reform.

The Secret Service—Chief Frank J. Wilson Has Made a Record Never Before Equaled in the History of This Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, limited in its authority by law, no Government agency can show a record that will exceed that of the United States Secret Service during the last fiscal year. What really appeals to me and should appeal to all is that this was brought about not by a political appointee but by a career man. Hon. Frank J. Wilson, the head of the Secret Service, was selected for this position because of his past achievements. He handled the Capone case in Chicago and later entered the Lindbergh kidnaping case at the request of the President. It was Elmer L. Irey, Chief of the Enforcement Division of the Treasury Department, and Frank J. Wilson who insisted that if they intended to pay ransom the numbers of the bills should be recorded and above all the money should be paid in gold certificates. As a result of their insistence the gold certificates were used and when Hauptmann paid the gold certificate for gasoline he was traced and arrested. Mr. Wilson came to his present position by reason of his ability previously shown by his work with the Treasury Department. As I say, his activities are limited but what he has to do he does well. The following statement I am sure will be interesting. It follows:

The United States Secret Service, riding the crest of the most successful campaign against counterfeiting in its history, has turned its big guns against the forger of Government checks in a drive designed to protect, particularly, men in the armed services and their dependents.

Using the same "crime prevention through education" technique which has cut losses of victims of bogus currency 93 percent in 5 years, the Service now is out to make theft and forgery of Government checks as unhealthy as counterfeiting.

With millions of Army and Navy allotment and allowance checks being mailed to dependents of men in the military forces, Chief Frank Wilson is determined that there shall be scant opportunity for criminals who seek to victimize families receiving allowances and allotments.

Elmer L. Irey, coordinator of Treasury law enforcement activities, summarized the work of the Secret Service in one of a series of reports to Secretary Morgenthau on 1942 activities of his agencies.

He reported that victims of counterfeit bills lost 59 percent less money in 1942 than they did in 1941, and that victims of bogus coins lost 39 percent less. Losses from phony bills dropped to $29,000 and from bogus coins to $23,000. Prior to institution, in 1937, of the know-your-money campaign bogus money losses exceeded $800,000 yearly.

The arrests for making or passing counterfeit bills and coins during 1942 represented a decline of 59 percent from the previous year.

The Treasury campaign to protect recipients and handlers of Government checks takes two lines.

First, those entitled to the checks are urged to take precautions against their mail being pilfered, or their checks otherwise getting into unscrupulous hands.

Second, merchants, bankers, and other handlers are being urged to demand positive identification of every person presenting a check for cashing. The "know your endorsers" theme is being hammered home by widespread publicity, through posters, magazines, newspapers, radio, and motion pictures. Army and Navy publications have cooperated wholeheartedly in carrying the precautionary program to military personnel and their dependents.

One unusual incident in the 1942 war against forgers saw the establishment of a legal precedent for imposing criminal penalties for careless acceptance of a forged check, as well as for actually passing the document.

Judge G. L. Schram of the Juvenile Court of Allegheny County, Pa., placed a Pittsburgh merchant on probation for 6 months for contributing to the delinquency of a minor. A boy had negotiated two forged Government checks in the merchant's establishment because the merchant was careless and did not require proper identification. Judge Schram warned the dealer that loss of American boys through imprisonment was far worse than the loss of a few dollars by the merchants.

Since the Secret Service educational program was inaugurated in 1937, there has been a 60-percent reduction in the number of juveniles arrested for violating the related statutes, although there has been a steady increase during that period in total law violations by juveniles.

One of the most notorious counterfeiters convicted in 1942 now is a fugitive from justice. Nick Medich, sentenced in North Dakota in December to serve 14 years imprisonment, escaped from a deputy United States marshal. Medich was given a long prison term in 1933 for counterfeiting. He was released in 1940, finally returned to counterfeiting, and was captured again shortly after his new product reached circulation.

On the other hand another veteran coin counterfeiter, long a fugitive, is behind bars. Alexander Kerr, alias Edward Wellman, who found relaxation from his counterfeiting labors in fancy skating, wrote his own ticket on the ice he loved. A figure eight on the links at Flushing Meadows, New York, ended figuratively with a glide into the arms of waiting agents, and, it later turned out, was prophetic of the 8-year sentence he received.

Kerr jumped his bond while awaiting trial. Knowing his weakness for gambling on horses, agents watched the tracks, and picked him up again at the mutuel windows at Hialeah, Fla. The coiner promptly worked his way out of Coral Gables jail with a key fashioned from a stolen spoon. The thorough Secret Service agents had learned of Kerr's ice skating accomplishments as well as his love of the horses, and circulated his picture to employees at various rinks. The ice at Flushing Meadows proved exceedingly thin for the fugitive when he at last donned his skates.

The Secret Service, cooperating with Mexican authorities, helped to foil a plot to flood that Republic with counterfeit money with the arrest of Luis Eduardo DeShelley. DeShelley, who has served more than 20 years in United States prisons for counterfeiting, was operating a plant in Mexico City for the manufacture of bogus $50 and $100 American bills and false Mexican currency.

The Service's educational campaign was intensified during 1942. Its 32-page booklet

Know Your Money has been adopted as textbook material by 9,000 high schools, for study by 3,000,000 students. A Know Your Money educational movie was exhibited nearly 10,000 times, to more than 2,000,000 spectators.

To emphasize potential dangers of counterfeit money being used as a weapon of war, the Secret Service, in cooperation with the Chase National Bank and Rockefeller Center, established a huge educational display in New York City, and smaller exhibits were conducted during the year in cities throughout the Nation.

The Dawn of Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address on the subject The Dawn of Aviation, by Hon. Josh Lee, at the aviation forum luncheon of the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce, January 15, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, if Robert E. Lee had had one Flying Fortress he would have won the Civil War. When the Nazi blitzkrieg was rolling toward Paris the French Minister of War said, "Five hundred airplanes would insure that the Germans did not pass." But the 500 airplanes did not arrive.

In a secret meeting of the Military Affairs Committees of both Houses of Congress, Ambassadors Joe Kennedy and William Bullitt told us that if the combined capacity of England and France to produce planes had anything like equaled that of Germany and Italy, there never would have been a Munich. There was France with one of the largest mass armies in the world and England with the largest navy in the world, and yet because these two nations had no air force, they had no bargaining power at the council table.

AIR POWER AMAZED THE WORLD

Churchill thought it would be relatively easy for the British Navy to drive the Nazis out of Norway. But instead Hitler's land-based air force slaughtered the British surface ships and drove them beyond reach of those deadly bombers.

Then, again, the British felt certain that they could hold the island of Crete. It bristled with British guns and it was surrounded by a cordon of British warships. But out of the skies dropped 35,000 Nazi soldiers fully armed with artillery and motorized equipment.

When the Japanese closed the Burma road, 21 medium cargo planes carried the same supplies into China which had required 4,500 trucks to transport over that long, winding road. Let me repeat that. Twenty-one medium cargo planes did the work of 4,500 trucks in transporting supplies into China.

AIR POWER IS DECISIVE

But in spite of the miracles which have happened right before our very eyes since the beginning of this war there are still some who fail to grasp the full portent of air power. They say, "Yes, I'm air-minded. The airplane takes the place of artillery. It raises the artillery up on a platform, so to speak, and increases its range and its accuracy."

That is true as far as it goes. But those who have seen no more than that in air-power "have missed the bus" as poor Mr. Chamberlain would have said. Those who look upon air power as merely the artillery for the Army and Navy are still tied to the surface of the earth by their beliefs. It is true that the short-range dive bomber serves as artillery for the advance of a mechanized army. But the long-range high-altitude bomber is something else. It can strike the enemy at his heart many miles away from the battle front. It can disrupt the nerve centers of a great industrial nation. It can paralyze transportation hundreds of miles back of the battle fronts. It can completely annihilate whole production areas in one day or in one night. Is such a weapon merely auxiliary to the land and sea forces or is it not rather a mighty striking force in its own right?

BOMBERS HAVE GREATLY IMPROVED

Since the Luftwaffe demolished Coventry, the efficiency of the bomber has greatly increased. The bombers of today have a longer reach. They carry heavier bomb loads. Precision bombing has increased their accuracy while the size of the bombs has multiplied their destructiveness. Armor plate and fire power have greatly reduced loss by enemy attack.

Each Flying Fortress has eleven 50-caliber machine guns mounted on it. This 50-caliber gun is a young cannon. It shoots 500 shells a minute. There isn't a blind spot on the Flying Fortress. Every area is covered by one of these deadly weapons. Then when several of these Fortresses are flying in formation, there isn't a single angle from which an enemy plane can approach without receiving a whole broadside from several of the Fortresses at once.

The systematic, methodical bombing of strategic targets is having a telling effect upon the enemy today. These raids will be increased and intensified until the enemy's production, transportation, and communications have been totally paralyzed. Then the land and sea forces will move in for the final drive to victory.

BACKGROUND OF PRESENT PROGRAM

Back in 1937 and 1938 there was a feeling in Congress that the aviation program was not moving forward fast enough. The unfortunate result of the Army's efforts to fly the mail had caused some of us to believe that the War Department should sponsor a preflight program of training in some of our schools throughout the country. The question was timidly raised from time to time but very little was accomplished. The Oklahoma Military Academy authorities at Claremore had been petitioning the War Department to furnish them two instructors and an old airplane in order that they might offer a preliminary course of instruction in aviation. Morton Harrison of Claremore came to Washington. He and I together went to see General Westover, Chief of the Air Corps of the Army. Then later we went to see Mr. Harry Woodring, the Secretary of War. He told us that there were about 500 schools in the United States applying for such a course, but that the War Department had not decided on a policy favorable to such a program.

Later the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate was told by high-ranking officers of the Air Corps that such a program for preliminary training in aviation could not be sponsored by the War Department because there were not enough trained men in the Army to serve as instructors. Then the officers were asked if there was any way in which the War Department would recognize training in such schools if the instructors were civilians. The answer was "No."

In 1938 Congress passed the law setting up the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and today, under that Authority, the Government is sponsoring a great pilot-training program.

When Congress repealed the embargo on arms the United States was turning out only about 50 planes a month. Today we are turning out about 5,000 planes a month. We are producing, on the average, much larger planes than we were then. Furthermore, today we are ferrying across the Atlantic not only the big bombers but even the smaller fighter planes. The result is that the Allies now have superiority in the air on every major war front in the world. When control of the air passed to the Allies the initiative in battle passed with it.

CARGO PLANES

The problem today is one of supply. This demand will be met in part by the ever-increasing production of cargo planes. Last week we saw the first giant C-69 roll off the assembly line. For several months two of the greatest wizards of modern production, Mr. Kaiser and Mr. Higgins, have been tooling up their plants for mass production of cargo planes. Mr. Higgins is preparing his Louisiana shipyards for the production of Navy cargo planes, while Henry Kaiser has a contract for the construction of the Glen Martin Mars and two other of the largest type cargo planes. Just to give you some idea of the size of the Mars, it weighs 70 tons and can carry as much freight as 11 regular Ford trucks.

But it will be a baby compared to the monster 500-ton plane now under consideration. Two well-known aeronautical engineers, Mr. Grover Loening and Dr. Christmas, told my committee that such a plane is even more practical as a cargo plane than the smaller ones now in use.

Furthermore, by the use of gliders, the freight-carrying capacity of cargo planes can be greatly increased. Several gliders can be towed behind a cargo plane. Suppose a cargo plane towing two or three gliders is passing over Oklahoma City on its way to Chicago. One of those gliders is loaded with freight for Oklahoma City. It can cut loose and land safely on one of the air fields here at Oklahoma City without the tow plane stopping at all. Furthermore, the tow plane can pick up other gliders without landing. It doesn't take much imagination to see what a major part aviation is going to play in commerce after the war.

COMMERCE AND TRANSPORTATION

Natural barriers to transportation have determined the trade routes of the world. These trade routes have, in turn, determined the population of the world. Furthermore, oceans, mountains, rivers, and deserts have formed the boundaries of nations because they are barriers to travel. Water transportation has built the great cities of the world. London, New York City, New Orleans, and San Francisco were built by water transportation.

Transportation has rolled back frontiers and built empires. No matter whether it was sailing vessels, canoes, stagecoaches, prairie schooners, or railroads, transportation is the lifeline that holds nations together. Rome held her empire together through a system of highways. England has held the British Empire together by a system of water transportation. The British merchant marine and the British Navy have been the lifeline which has kept the British Empire together.

Our great system of railroads and highways has made the United States one people.

Water and land transportation however, are both limited by natural barriers. When a ship arrives in port, it must stop, it cannot go on inland. When a train arrives in New Orleans, it has to stop. In order to make way for land transportation, rivers must be bridged and mountains tunneled. But these natural barriers mean nothing to air trans-

portation. The luxury liners of the sky and the freight trains of the air fly over land and sea, mountains, and desert alike, shrinking the world and joining the remotest nations in everyday trade and travel.

AFTER-WAR DEVELOPMENTS

After this war, instead of only a handful of people in the whole United States being able to fly airplanes, there will be hundreds of thousands of pilots extraordinary. They will want to fly and my guess is that they will fly. Today thousands of boys and girls are taking preflight courses in our high schools. Will their interest in aviation end with the war? Not likely.

Furthermore there is a new plane called the helicopter which is almost foolproof. It looks something like an Autogiro plane. Any person who can drive a car can learn to operate one of these helicopters in a few hours. It can lift itself into the air from a standing start. It can land in your yard. It can hover, move forward, backward, or to either side. It has a speed of 150 miles an hour.

What does all of this suggest for the future? To me it suggests the greatest age of commerce and travel ever yet dreamed. It means that the inland cities like this one can participate in that commerce to a much greater degree than when we were dependent entirely upon surface transportation. It means that the commerce of the world will be more evenly distributed than ever before. It means that the factories which are today making war planes will be kept busy making commercial planes. It means that we will want to build more airports and better terminal facilities to coordinate travel by train, bus, and plane.

China has one-fourth of the population of the globe. It has been called the "sleeping giant." But that giant is today sitting up and rubbing his eyes. When the war is over the Chinese people will want our manufactured articles. Mother India, with her teeming millions, will likewise furnish an unlimited market for our processed foods and refined wares. The people of China and India will want the products of our mills and factories and will send in the rich treasures of the east in exchange for them. They will want to sell silk and ivory, oriental rugs, spices, jewels, and tin. We will want their commodities and they will want ours. We must take our wares to them in American ships and American planes, and knock on their doors and ask for their trade. This is the answer to our returning heroes, who will want a chance after the war to carry on in the true American way of life.

AIR POWER A POLICE POWER

I believe that air power will not only win the war but that aviation will be the means of preserving peace after the war. If it becomes necessary to police foreign territory, it can be done by the long arm of air power without maintaining troops on foreign soil.

Billy Mitchell pointed out the strategic importance of Alaska as an air base. We shall develop Alaska into one of the greatest air bases in the world and after the war use it for commercial aviation. From it American-controlled commercial air lines will fan out to the different countries in that part of the globe.

NATIONAL POLICY FAVORS EXTENSION OF AIR LINES

Every air line helps to break down differences between countries and brings about a good-neighbor relationship throughout the world. It is the policy of our Government to encourage the extension of American-controlled air lines to other countries. It is particularly desirable that the Western Hemisphere be bound closer together by means of air transportation. More trade with South America means greater continental solidarity.

Commercial aviation is to the air arm of our national defense what the merchant marine is to our Navy. It constitutes a great potential military advantage in case of war.

Today, under the able leadership of General George, the Army Transport Command is utilizing to full capacity the American-controlled air lines. Not only are the planes used to carry capacity loads of military freight and personnel, but the air lines are used for ferrying bombers and fighter planes. The landing fields, the refueling facilities, the radio instructions, and the radio beams all are being utilized today for military purposes. Therefore it is not difficult to visualize the importance of future aviation to the United States, not only from a commercial but from a military standpoint as well.

The Bible says, "The old men shall dream dreams and the young men shall see visions."

Certainly if you have the vision of youth you will see here a great industrial country where our natural resources are developed at the source of supply.

We shall convert these plants and schools and training grounds from the pursuits of war to the pursuits of peace. We shall furnish employment for the soldiers who return from battle. We shall furnish products for a purchase-hungry people; and the aviation industry shall be the spear head of this new age.

Thank you.

Outstanding American Leaders Recognize Importance of Liberal Arts Colleges During War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following correspondence from the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, Wendell Willkie, and John W. Studebaker:

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1943.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RANDOLPH: Your letter of January 18, 1943, in regard to the situation confronting small liberal arts colleges is greatly appreciated.

No one questions the very great importance of liberal education in building and maintaining the democratic way of life. The fact that liberal education seems destined to be sacrificed somewhat in the war emergency is deeply regretted by all the agencies of Government. In prosecuting the all-out war, however, it seems that specific specialized training for members of the armed services must take precedence over continued liberal education in the case of a large proportion of the young men qualified for combat service.

It should be remembered, however, that even in the specialized curricula being established by the Army and the Navy there is some time devoted to courses such as history, English, and other liberal-arts studies. Furthermore, for men in the Army and Navy there is opportunity to study many liberal arts courses under the Army institute.

Many students, both men and women, not qualified for combat duty will wish to continue the study of liberal arts both in order that they may render more effective war service and in order that they may be better prepared for participation in the difficult years following the war.

Finally, the War Manpower Commission hopes to see developed in the colleges many opportunities for civilian training which will emphasize the liberal arts and sciences. Many colleges are adjusting their programs so that they may meet these civilian needs effectively. Such civilian training services rendered by the colleges will be comparable in importance to the services rendered to the Army and Navy.

Sincerely,

PAUL V. MCNUTT, *Chairman.*

NEW YORK, *January 23, 1943.*

The Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RANDOLPH: Many thanks for your letter. I am delighted to know you liked the talk I made at Duke University and appreciate your thoughtfulness in writing.

I feel very deeply about this question of continuing the liberal arts tradition in the colleges and am glad to know I have your support.

I appreciate your sending me a copy of your letter to Mr. McNutt and am encouraged to see you taking offensive action on this question.

I remember our earlier correspondence very well and was interested in seeing a copy of the bill, H. R. 708, which you reintroduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress. Thanks for sending it along.

Good luck to you, and do keep in touch with me.

Cordially yours,

WENDELL L. WILLKIE.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, February 9, 1943.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RANDOLPH: I have before me your letter of January 19, to which was attached a copy of your letter to the Honorable Paul V. McNutt concerning the problem of the small liberal-arts college.

There is no question but that small colleges face a serious financial problem. You have analyzed it well in your letter to Mr. McNutt. The question now is, What ought to be done, and should the Federal Government do it?

You make the statement that you think the program for saving the small college ought not to be proposed for the purpose of saving the college, but, rather, for the purpose of utilizing the facilities of the small college in the war effort. Everyone will agree with that. Yet when one undertakes to suggest a program for utilizing the facilities of the small liberal-arts college, he is confronted with the fact that the purposes served by the liberal-arts college do not loom large in the immediate efforts necessary to win the war. What is the answer?

It has been my belief that certain functions can be performed by liberal-arts colleges where they have a qualified staff, laboratory, and other necessary facilities for the specific function. These include:

A. Extra effort in training teachers for shortage fields.

B. Extra effort for training certain social workers for such jobs as the day care of children of working mothers.

C. The training of women to participate more effectively in programs of nutrition,

home adjustments to war situations, and the like.

D. The offering of special courses and curricula to prepare for jobs such as secretaries, laboratory technicians, accountants, and the like.

E. A widespread program of adult education dealing with the issues of the war and peace, thus assuring a few hundred thousand intelligent men and women ready to assume leadership in the development of public opinion in support of the necessary post-war adjustments.

There are many others besides the above which will occur to you. Some of these cannot be carried on effectively without Federal aid. It is our hope that a program involving such activities as described above may presently be considered by the proper Government officials. I should be interested in your reaction to such a proposal. It is my belief that in some such program as this, liberal-arts colleges will find their legitimate function for which the Government can afford to assist them, thus helping with the financial problem which they face.

Very cordially yours,

J. W. STUDEBAKER,
Commissioner.

Sale of W. P. A. Equipment

REMARKS
OF
HON. C. JASPER BELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, a long suffering public has become so accustomed to bureaucratic incompetence, waste, inefficiency, and wanton destruction that it takes something very unusual to arouse them. An incident happened in my district the other day which has brought to my office a flood of letters and clippings from the Independence (Mo.) Examiner and other papers which evidence a spirit of infuriated public opinion at a bit of unexplainable W. P. A. nonsense which, at a time like this, is little short of sabotage. It is not necessary to tell this body that all kinds of goods for civilian uses and consumption are scarce. That situation arises as a natural result of our all-out war effort. Many a merchant is unable to get things for his customers which are almost necessary to the functioning of his civilian life.

In a Washington paper on the 7th of this month there appeared an article in which it was stated that the equipment used by the W. P. A. has been sent to be used in various war activities. In spite of that statement from the W. P. A. itself to the local press, I must call your attention to the following facts:

At Independence, Mo., a very large stock pile of rubber hose, rubber boots, and hundreds of wheelbarrows were recently found deliberately destroyed. The wheelbarrows were hacked to pieces. The rubber boots were slit so as to make them unusable. The rubber hose was dumped along with the rest of it.

This was called to the attention of the local authorities, and they said that their purpose and reason for making this equipment unusable was that they did not want it on the second-hand market competing with new goods. Of course, everybody knows, and we certainly out in Missouri know, that merchants are seeking to get wheelbarrows. A farmer cannot buy one. If a farmer wants to buy a pair of rubber boots, he has to sign a questionnaire as long as my arm and spend 2 or 3 days trying to get a pair of rubber boots so that he can go out and feed his livestock during rainy weather.

I just want to take this opportunity to protest against that sort of wanton destruction of much-needed material at this time. There were great piles of shovels, hundreds of shovels. The shovels were piled up and the wooden handles were broken or burned. After the handles were burned some of the shovels were then sold to second-hand dealers. One instance is quoted in the public press where dealers then went out and bought new handles and took the time to put them back in the shovels and then resold them at a profit of 500 percent.

It happens that I am acquainted with the State director of the Work Projects Administration in Missouri, Mr. E. M. Basye. I know him to be a gentleman of patriotism, courage, and good common sense, and I am very certain that he is not personally responsible for the things which I have described. The responsibility should be placed right here in Washington where any general orders were issued for such destruction of valuable property.

I have called these matters to the attention of the House because it is my hope that some effort will be made to put a stop to this silly, useless, and almost criminal destruction of much-needed material. I felt that this was the best means of serving notice that the American people are not going to tolerate things of this sort at a time when every man and woman in this country is bending every effort to conserve time and material so that we may win the most critical war our country has ever been engaged in.

I hereby submit, by unanimous consent, the following clipping from the Independence Examiner under date of January 26, 1943:

MUTILATED BOOTS, WHEELBARROWS ON A SCRAP PILE—WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION EQUIPMENT WAS DEFECTIVE, AN OFFICIAL SAYS, AND WAS PUT OUT OF COMMISSION—WASHINGTON ORDER—A. E. WALESBY DECLARES IT WILL NOT GO INTO TRADE CHANNELS NOW—OBSERVERS AMAZED

The appearance of about 300 battered wheelbarrows, many lengths of standard fire hose, many aluminum water carriers, and a great number of mutilated men's rubber boots on the Government-owned scrap pile on the vacant lot just north of the Independence light plant is creating local wonder.

According to Dr. A. G. Campbell, county civilian defense director of war salvage, this is an accumulation of equipment used here by the Work Projects Administration. Dr. Campbell was queried on the matter when this unique collection was observed by a reporter, and said that he was astonished as anyone when he realized that these articles of equipment, mostly believed to be entirely serviceable, had been deliberately battered, cut, crushed, and otherwise ruined for any utilitarian purpose and then thrown on the junk heap.

Dr. Campbell said today that when he recently took up the subject with higher authority in the salvage campaign, he was told that all boots which had been ripped with knives and thrown on the heap were only those which had been previously worn through the soles.

Examination of many of these boots in the scrap pile with Dr. Campbell this morning revealed that none had been worn through the soles. There were knife cuts in the toes or ankles of these boots to render them useless, except as junk. The wheelbarrows were seen to be entirely serviceable except that spokes had been battered from the wheels and the metal bodies in most instances had been slashed or punched. The aluminum water carriers, formerly used by water boys with the various gangs of workmen had been chopped on the outside and tossed on the tops of the heaps. This is expensive equipment. Each is equipped with a hand pressure pump. The standard lengths of fire hose had been coiled and placed on the bottom of one of the heaps of junk. A hurried examination indicated that much of this might be serviceable.

A. E. Walesby, chief engineering inspector for the Work Projects Administration, was assigned by the State director, E. M. Basye, today to make an investigation of this local salvage dump, after the matter was brought to Mr. Basye's attention. Mr. Walesby said that every item on the pile had first been found to be defective before it was demolished in some way and then thrown on the dump. In common work practice, he also pointed out, the common wheelbarrow with a metal rimmed wheel is obsolete and had been superseded with the new models that have rubber-tired wheels.

"All the items on this local junk pile had no possible utilitarian value," Mr. Walesby concluded, "or they would have been kept from the junk pile."

In accordance with a standing order from Washington, Mr. Walesby said, all defective equipment was first demolished before being sent to the dump, in order to keep these articles out of the channels of trade. It was recalled, Mr. Walesby said, that when such items are sold to dealers for junk, that then the articles had been resold as merchandise in many instances by junk men in competition with retail trade. Hence the reason for cutting of wheelbarrows and the slashing of the boots. Concerning the boots on the heap, seen to have no defect except knife slashes, Mr. Walesby pointed out that there was no doubt a leak in the other boot of a pair, which would justify destruction of both boots of a pair.

Mr. Speaker, a story which appeared in the Independence Examiner 4 days later, January 30, revealed the facts regarding the burning of the handles from the shovels and the subsequent sales of the shovels by second-hand dealers after they had placed new handles in them. Yet they had been thrown away by the W. P. A. because some one was apparently tired of having them around and did not know that private parties and even other Government agencies could use them.

Pay-As-You-Go Tax Only a Correction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article which appeared in the New York Times, written by Godfrey N. Nelson, entitled "Pay-As-You-Go Tax Only a Correction."

This article by Mr. Nelson is a very intelligent statement of the facts in regard to pay-as-you-go tax legislation, and I hope it will be studied by Representatives in Congress. There is no doubt in my mind that some such pay-as-you-go legislation must be adopted to secure the greatest amount of money for the Government's needs and at the same time to maintain the solvency of the taxpayers.

The article follows:

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAX ONLY A CORRECTION—PRESENT SYSTEM HELD TO BE A RESULT OF A FAULTY START IN FIRST REVENUE ACT—CLOCK TURNED BACK TWICE—RETROACTIVE CLAUSE ADOPTED IN LAWS OF BOTH 1913 AND 1918—PRESENT TREASURY PLAN

(By Godfrey N. Nelson)

If the Treasury and some of the members of the House Ways and Means Committee could be brought face to face with the absolute necessity for withholding a substantial rate of tax at the source of payment, a way would be found by which the taxpayer could be placed on a current basis.

Although two separate and distinct problems are presented, the more important one, that of placing the taxpayer on a pay-as-you-go basis, must precede the other. Unless such a basis is first adopted, a solution for the second problem, that of a withholding device, is useless. And the reason for this situation is that taxpayers cannot pay both current taxes and back taxes at the same time.

The arguments for the Ruml plan presented at the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee in the past week weigh preponderately in favor of the adoption of the plan. In fact, not a meritorious point has been made against the plan. Certainly the suggestion made by Randolph Paul, Counsel for the Treasury, that a taxpayer's liability is an asset of the Government, and that forgiving a year's liability would be a discarding of assets, comparable to a business canceling its accounts receivable from customers, is not sound.

TAXES, ASSETS, AND LIABILITIES

Taxes are not assets of the Government in the sense that accounts receivable are a business asset, arising from contracts of sales for the delivery of merchandise. While a tax may take preference under the law, the laws governing receivables of government and of business are very different. An income tax, not unlike other taxes, does not become a lien or liability until it has been assessed, and assesments are rarely made until returns have been filed and until the tax list has been forwarded to the collector of internal revenue.

Tax laws may be amended before or after an assessment has been entered, and sometimes tax liabilities are reduced or canceled by legislative act. The Congress in 1924 reduced all income taxes for the year 1923 by 25 percent. In New York State such a general reduction was legislated in 1942 for a period of 2 years, which is now operating as to 1942 income. Such powers of the Government have not been questioned. Nor should objections be deemed proper when it sought to relieve the taxpayer from a method of taxation which could impair the revenues and prove destructive to taxpayers. In the instant case, moreover, the objectors admit that a change to a current basis is in the best interests of the Government itself.

CLOCK MOVED BACK TWICE

Apart from the beneficial effect upon the Government of placing the taxpayer on a pay-as-you-go basis, at least one other plausible and genuine reason can be offered in complete justification. There would be no occasion for moving the tax clock forward if the tax clock had not been moved backward at the start of income taxes. The sixteenth amendment of the Constitution was adopted on February 25, 1913. Instead of making the first revenue act enacted on October 39, 1913, prospective, it was made retrospective to March 1, 1913. Unfortunately, this practice has been followed invariably and sometimes terribly abused.

The belated 1918 Revenue Act was not passed until February 24, 1919, when it was made retroactive to January 1, 1918, nearly 14 months prior to its enactment. This was a war measure which should prove a profitable object lesson. The period was followed by a series of extensions of statutes of limitation and by a mass of litigation lasting for many years. Reported income was offset by interim losses, and taxes thereon in many cases were not collectible.

We are still operating our tax system on a retrospective basis. The 1942 Revenue Act, effective from the beginning of the year, was not passed until October 21, 1942. The highest tax rates ever imposed upon the American people were only made known to them nearly 10 months after the effective date, and many taxpayers, particularly those who never have been required to pay a tax, are not yet aware of their obligations which started to accrue over a year ago.

UNREASONABLE EXPECTATION

It is folly for the taxing authority to say that the taxpayer should have reserved his tax money currently. This would be an unreasonable expectation. Because of retroactive legislation, the taxpayer has not been permitted to place himself on a current basis of making payments, and for the Government to do so now does not amount to a forgiveness or cancelation of a debt; this is merely a necessary stepping-up to the period in which taxes can be collected on a current basis.

The plan proposed by the Treasury last Thursday of requiring payment of tax on both 1942 and 1943 incomes this year would impose an impossible burden upon practically all taxpayers, as shown in the appended table.

It will be noted that on incomes in bracket starting at $22,000 the increases in tax exceed the reported income; the tax would exceed 100 percent of the income, and the net income available to the taxpayer (column 6) would steadily decrease until on incomes of $70,000 and upward the taxes would be greater than the net income.

Any scheme of "catching up" on past taxes necessarily calls for more or less double taxation. Tax rates such as those imposed in the 1942 act allow no overage out of which to pay back taxes. The tax clock should be moved forward for a year without adding to the present tax burden.

Table of taxes under Treasury proposal of Feb. 2, 1943

COMPUTED ON THE FOLLOWING BASIS

(1) Net income same amount both years.
(2) No allowance for difference between normal and surtax net income.
(3) No allowance for post-war refund of Victory tax.

Before tax—Net income in excess of personal exemption and credit for dependents	1943 tax	1942 tax	Total	Effective rate, percent	After tax—Net income in excess of personal exemption and credit for dependents	
					Treasury proposal	1942 act
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
$2,000	$480	----------	$480	24	$1,520	$1,520
$4,000	1,020	$60	1,080	27	2,920	2,980
$6,000	1,640	200	1,840	31	4,160	4,360
$8,000	2,340	420	2,760	35	5,240	5,660
$10,000	3,120	720	3,840	38	6,160	6,880
$12,000	3,980	1,100	5,080	42	6,920	8,020
$14,000	4,920	1,560	6,480	47	7,520	9,080
$16,000	5,940	2,100	8,040	50	7,960	10,060
$18,000	7,020	2,700	9,720	54	8,280	10,980
$20,000	8,160	3,360	11,520	58	8,480	11,840
$22,000	9,360	4,080	13,440	61	8,560	12,640
$26,000	11,880	5,640	17,520	67	8,480	14,120
$32,000	15,840	8,160	24,000	75	8,000	16,160
$38,000	19,980	10,860	30,840	81	7,160	18,020
$44,000	24,300	13,740	38,040	86	5,960	19,700
$50,000	28,740	16,740	45,480	91	4,520	21,260
$60,000	36,440	22,040	58,480	97	1,520	23,560
$70,000	44,440	27,640	72,080	103	[2] 2,080	25,560
$80,000	52,740	33,540	86,280	108	[2] 6,280	27,260
$60,000	61,340	39,740	101,080	112	[2] 11,080	28,660
$100,000	70,140	46,140	116,280	116	[2] 16,280	29,860
$150,000	115,140	79,140	194,280	130	[2] 44,280	34,860
$200,000	161,140	113,140	274,280	137	[2] 74,280	38,860
$250,000	207,640	147,640	355,280	142	[2] 105,280	42,360
$500,000	440,140	320,140	760,280	152	[2] 260,280	59,860
$1,000,000	900,000	665,140	1,565,140	157	[2] 565,140	100,000
					[2] (2)	[3] (3)

[1] Represents tax payments in excess of net income.
[2] Excess of column 1 over column 4 except as to items (3).
[3] Excess of column 1 over column 2.

Column 3 shows tax for 1942, after canceling normal tax and surtax in first bracket on $2,000.

A New Pay-As-You-Go Tax Plan

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, believing that the only sound basis of a Federal tax system is to keep the payment of income taxes current, I have today introduced a bill which I think furnishes a simple, direct, and satisfactory way of placing the American tax system on a pay-as-you-go basis. The text of my bill is as follows:

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A PAY-AS-YOU-GO PLAN OF PAYING INCOME TAXES

Be it enacted, etc., That in order that by 1944 every person subject to the United States income-tax laws may be current in the payment of income taxes and on a pay-as-you-go basis, the following procedure in respect to the payment of income taxes is hereby established:

1. On April 15, 1943, every income taxpayer shall file two reports, to wit: One a complete income tax report with 1942 rates applied to 1942's total income; the other a quarterly report covering January, February, and March 1943, based on income for the first quarter of 1943. With said quarterly report the taxpayer shall deliver a check or money order to pay the tax liability under said quarterly report at 1942 rates for the first 3 months of 1943. A second quarterly report, accompanied by remittance to cover the tax liability for said quarter of 1943, shall be filed on July 15, 1943; a third quarterly report accompanied by remittance to cover the third quarterly period shall be filed on October 15, 1943, and the last quarterly report for 1943, with remittance, shall be filed on January 31, 1944 (allowing full month to enable business firms to close their books, etc.).

2. If a 1943 tax bill is passed meanwhile the new rates provided therein shall be substituted for the 1942 rates in the quarterly settlements, effective at the beginning of the first quarter after the bill is enacted as, for instance, if the bill should be enacted in May the new rates would become effective as of July 1, 1943.

3. At the end of the year 1943, if a person has had a larger income in 1943 than in 1942, resulting in a greater tax liability for 1943 than for 1942, his books are closed as far as the Government is concerned. If he has had less taxable income in 1943 than in 1942, resulting in a less tax liability in 1943 than in 1942, he pays to the Federal Treasury the difference at the 1942 rate between his 1942 and 1943 tax liability with one check, payable on January 31, 1944, when he makes his last return on 1943 income, and his books are then closed. Men and women in the armed forces whose tax liability in 1942 was greater than their tax liability in 1943 shall not be required to pay a tax on the excess of their 1942 tax liability over their 1943 tax liability.

4. All laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

Advantages which I claim for my bill are:

First. The transfer to the pay-as-you-go basis would be made easily, expeditiously, and automatically.

Second. The Government would lose nothing in current revenues and every citizen would have the satisfaction of knowing that he had paid his tax obligation.

Third. Under my plan tax revenues would flow steadily and evenly into the Federal Treasury throughout the year, which would be a great help in Treasury financing. Now there is a hump of revenue in the early part of the year, followed by a dearth of revenue later in the year. In this respect the bill follows the Indiana gross income tax law.

Fourth. Members of Congress are receiving many letters from constituents who state regretfully that it will be necessary to cash their Government bonds to pay their income tax. This, they say, is unavoidable and it constitutes a threat to the Treasury financing. Under the plan of mandatory quarterly payments provided in my bill, income tax will be paid out of current income and bonds bought with last year's income will remain uncashed.

Fifth. This proposal to pay based on ability to pay is offered as a more just plan of taxation than the 24-percent Victory tax for men and women with very low incomes who would find it impossible to adequately feed and clothe their children if such a large deduction as 24 percent were made from their incomes.

I am inserting the text of the bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the public may be informed in regard to its provisions, and I will be especially grateful if officials of the Treasury Department and Members of Congress who are directly concerned with the function of writing tax legislation will give the bill careful study and thoughtful consideration.

A Mother's Plea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written by Mrs. Nettie Conway, of South Whitley, Ind., whose youngest son is serving in the armed forces:

A MOTHER'S PLEA

O, blame me not too much when bitter tears
  Flow, all unbidden, down my furrowed cheek,
Or when in loneliness and anxious fears
  My voice will tremble when I try to speak.
Think not too hardly of me when I weep
  Because the war has taken my dear son;
It is not selfishness that steals my sleep,
  But only love and loneliness begun.
For, though my heart is sad, I still rejoice
  In his clean life, which love of God does prove;
And if he ne'er returns, I'll hear his voice
  And know him when we meet in heaven above.
I still know joy that he was glad to go
  To serve with other lads his country, when
The great need came—and spite of tears that flow
  I bow my head and whisper, "Lord, amen."
I'm glad I cannot pray that God will take
  Some other mother's boy and leave mine here,
For, well I know, that her poor heart would break
  And naught could wipe away the bitter tear.
Today the postman brought a gift of rare,
  Sweet orange perfume in a fancy case,
And also word, "Please, write no longer there,
  For we are moving to another place."
And so, again I anxiously await
  In meekness and humility, the word
Of where he is and what will be his fate
  In days to come—still trusting in the Lord.
I am assured that God is always just;
  That with infinite love His plans will shape,
And with each new temptation I can trust
  That He will find for me a new escape.
War leaves a trail of broken lives and hearts,
  And often, too, the goodly gain is small;
Yet joy and peace will come if hate departs
  And we remember God is over all.

NETTIE CONWAY,
South Whitley, Ind.

Hail the Thirty-second Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I report to this House that the gallant Thirty-second Division of World War No. 1 carries on in this war with still greater distinction. The Evening Star of February 10 carried 2 pictures on the front page of action scenes at Buna in New Guinea. In driving the Japs out of this sector of New Guinea, the threat to the important Allied base at Port Moresby was eliminated. As a result of the heroism and bravery exhibited by men of that division, 55 citations for Distinguished Service Crosses were awarded.

The Thirty-second Division is a National Guard unit, recruited from the States of Michigan and Wisconsin, but at the present time men from 44 States are in its various units.

In World War No. 1 men from Michigan and Wisconsin formed the nucleus of its organization. It rendered gallant service at Chateau-Thierry, Soissons, and in the Argonne where it distinguished itself by smashing the famous Hindenburg line. After the armistice, it was one of the three divisions that held one of the bridgeheads in occupied territory on the Rhine. I am proud to report that it was my privilege to have served in that division. It is with still greater pride to tell you that my only son now serves in that same division in the southwest Pacific.

I am sure my colleagues from Michigan and Wisconsin will join with me in forwarding a message of congratulation to the men and officers who have achieved this great victory in the present war. They are worthy sons of those who served in other wars to make sure that this Republic shall forever live.

Men and officers of the Thirty-second Division, we salute you. Continue the fight until you march triumphantly down the streets of Tokyo.

Food Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, we all agree in the necessity of a unified plan to conserve our energies, materials, and food products, but in doing this, we in Congress should realize that we are the representatives of the people, and those in administrative positions in the different departments of Government should also realize that they are indirectly employees of the people. Neither we, in Congress, nor those in administrative positions, have all the brains of this country, therefore, we should welcome suggestions and advice from those who have been successful in their special fields and take them into our confidence more than we have in the past.

An example of this egotistical and dictatorial attitude is brought out in an editorial by one of the leading editors of the Pacific coast, Mr. Manchester Boddy, of the Los Angeles Daily News of February 6, 1943:

VIEWS OF THE NEWS
(By Manchester Boddy)

Like every other editorial desk in the country, ours is bombarded with inquiries from housewives, businessmen, farmers, and just plain workers-consumers about food and prices.

There seems to be a commendable understanding that meat on the range is plentiful—that grain exists in warehouses in quantities sufficient to feed the world—that there is enough butter, milk, eggs, and vegetables to afford everyone reasonable quantities—If.

That "if" is very important. The general feeling seems to be that food and consumers will get together "if" the Office of Price Administration, functioning through adequate rationing machinery, is able to establish a workable system with justice to all and special advantage to none. Public interest, therefore, is concentrated on what the Office of Price Administration will do; when, where, and how.

Editorial hopes were kindled in Los Angeles newspapers yesterday when the Office of War Information called an official press conference to meet with Office of Price Administration's No. 2 administrator, Mr. John Hamm, straight from his headquarters in Washington.

The press conference was arranged for 11 a. m., but unfortunately Mr. Hamm was tied up in conference, leaving the newsmen to stand in an anteroom and wait—2½ hours.

At 1: 30 p. m. the press was admitted to the conference room. Said Mr. Hamm:

"I don't know what you fellows are doing here. I have nothing to say. I don't intend to be roped into any kind of an interview. Weren't you told I was traveling incognito? I'm going to lunch."

So—he went to lunch.

No doubt Mr. Hamm is grievously burdened with many worries and cares. But perhaps on his way back to Washington to join other indispensable men who rarely leave their 3,000-mile-away offices, it may occur to him that the newsmen also have a job to do.

They were not interested in roping Mr. Hamm into anything. They only wanted to put into the public press some word from a public servant with respect to the progress he is making in solving problems of deep concern to citizens who want to cooperate.

The war effort, the Office of Price Administration, in fact official Washington itself belong to the people. Mr. Hamm's problems are the people's problems. And his parting words to a reporter: "I have nothing to say to you or the public" do not sit well out here.

He may find that the public will have plenty to say to him.

Danger of Executive Lawmaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. SMITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Merlo Pusey from the Washington Post of February 11, 1943:

DANGER OF EXECUTIVE LAWMAKING
(By Merlo Pusey)

Assistant President Byrnes has laid down the sensible rule that we must all serve, in this period of total war, "where we are best fitted and most needed." No patriotic citizen can take exception to this policy. Yet the fact remains that Congress has put no obligation upon the citizen to work wherever he may be assigned by Government officials. The strange thing about Mr. Byrnes' speech is that he did not follow it up with an appeal for a national service act.

In the absence of any request for legislation Mr. Byrnes leaves the impression that he favors Government control of manpower by Executive decree. The administration has already gone too far in regulating our lives by administrative orders unsupported by legislation. The most flagrant of these encroachments upon the legislative power is the order of the War Manpower Commission directing its regional offices to take control of all jobs in 32 areas of labor scarcity. The War Manpower Commission has assumed the right to tell free American citizens where they must work. They cannot leave jobs in industries classified as being essential without War Manpower Commission permission. If they refuse to comply with these edicts, they will be fired through Government pressure on employers.

Until last week it was said that War Manpower Commission orders had no teeth; that they were not undemocratic because no penalties could be inflicted on persons refusing to comply. Now penalties have been added. Men are to be coerced into obeying War Manpower Commission orders by the threat of dismissal from their jobs. If a man is of military age, his penalty for failure to abide by War Manpower Commission orders may be induction into the Army regardless of how many children may be dependent upon him for support. It is also hinted that rations may be withheld to bring recalcitrant workers into line.

These are drastic penalties. They could be used by an unscrupulous administration to enslave the people in time of emergency. I haven't the slightest suspicion that that is the intention of President Roosevelt or the War Manpower Commission. But the fact of vital importance is that they are setting a precedent which any would-be dictator of the future could use to smash our democratic system to smithereens.

The same danger would not arise from a national service law enacted by Congress. Such an act could be surrounded by safeguards and limited in effect to the duration of the war. What is really alarming about the flood of directives going out from Washington is the assumption of executive power over the lives of the people without regard for the will of Congress.

My search for the source of power which the President has thus tapped for the first time in American history has brought two replies from Government attorneys. First, they say that the President is acting under the Second War Powers Act, which granted him broad control over "materials and facilities" for war purposes. But there is nothing in the act giving him power to allocate workers, unless by some stretch of the imagination they might be classified as mere "facilities or materials." When that fact is brought to the attention of Government attorneys attempting to defend this grab of power, the usual reply is: "Of course, the President has enormous powers as Commander in Chief."

Now, if the Commander in Chief is assuming that he has authority, without a stroke of the legislative pen, to tell civilians where they must work, our safeguards to liberty have worn very thin indeed. The Constitution gives him no such power, either by express statement or implication. On the contrary, it gives to Congress in clear and unmistakable language the power to provide for the common defense, "to raise and support Armies * * * to provide and maintain a Navy," and to make all laws that shall be necessary to carry those powers into execution.

In this case executive agencies have taken over a power of Congress closely affecting the lives of the people without even suggesting that appropriate legislation be passed. In some other cases emergency powers granted by Congress have been stretched or distorted by administrative interpretation. The best known examples are the $25,000 limitation on salaries, which was put into effect even after Congress had refused to approve it, and the fixing of farm prices below parity in spite of specific directions to the contrary.

If this executive lawmaking had been the only alternative to disaster in battle or even a domestic catastrophe, it might be defended on the ground that in time of great national peril all laws are silent. Last September Mr. Roosevelt laid claim to extraordinary power "to take measures necessary to avert disaster which would interfere with the winning of the war." But not one of these executive encroachments upon the legislative field has been necessary to the winning of war.

Authority to set up manpower priorities or the enactment of a national service law could have been requested months ago when labor shortages first began to appear. Even now legislation will doubtless have to be enacted to eliminate the inequities of the War Manpower Commission's manpower controls. And as for the $25,000 salary limit, its effect will be to impede the war effort by depriving the Treasury of a considerable sum in taxes.

There is no escape from the ugly fact that the administration is unnecessarily resorting to undemocratic means to put some of its policies into effect. The mere fact that a policy has some connection with the war does not give license for administrators to enforce it without legislative sanction. Edward S. Corwin, noted authority on governmental powers, once asked: "Why on earth should we plan on making a holocaust

of our liberties unless and until we have to?" The least that can be asked by a self-governing people is that their public servants keep within their sphere of authority so long as that course involves no grave national hazards.

It may be a long time before controls now put into effect can be relinquished. In the meantime departure from democratic methods may change national habits and fix precedents that will alter the course of our history. Our forthcoming victory over fascism will be sour indeed if the war leaves us with a legacy of executive lawmaking to threaten our own liberties.

Lease-Lend Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of January 26, 1943:

LEASE-LEND REPORT

The report which Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Lease-Lend Administrator, has submitted to Congress on the progress of his program tells a significant story of the extent to which American power is making itself felt in this world-wide war.

Since March of 1941 we have shipped war supplies valued at $8,250,000,000 to our allies. More than $7,000,000,000 of the total went overseas in 1942 alone, and this flow of military assistance, which began as a mere trickle in 1941, will swell to even greater proportions in 1943.

This is a record in which Americans well may take pride, for it demonstrates that our pledges of assistance have not been empty boasts. Nor, as Mr. Stettinius properly emphasized, has this been a one-way proposition. Undoubtedly, to the extent that such things can be measured in terms of dollars and cents, we have sent and will continue to send more to our allies than we receive in return. With our great productive plant, free from harassment of bombings and other attacks on our home soil, this is as it should be. But the material compensation which has come to us has been of a substantial character. As the Lease-Lend Administrator pointed out, we have saved many hundreds of millions of dollars from the Allied shipping space with which we have been supplied, from food and services furnished our troops on foreign soil, and from actual war equipment turned over to these troops and to this country. Nor is this all. To some extent, at least, American supplies and equipment, or British goods replaced by American products, have enabled the Russians to stop and then hurl back the German armies.

In this process hundreds of thousands of Axis troops have been killed or captured, and it is an undeniable fact that every enemy soldier killed by a Russian reduces by one the strength of the force that our own Army ultimately will have to face. This means a saving in American lives, and, while there is no way to enter that form of compensation on a balance sheet, it is nonetheless tangible and real.

The success of this wartime program of mutual exchange of goods and services also has a certain significance for the post-war period. It would be going too far, probably, to suggest that this loose system of barter, necessary and successful in time of war, could be carried over into the system of international organization which will follow the close of hostilities. But it does tend to demonstrate that a feasible alternative can be found to a system of international trade in which undue emphasis is placed on the role of money and the need for exclusive tariffs.

Food Production in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the New England Council to council directors, council members, and executives of some 1,300 commercial and industrial associations in New England:

NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL,
Boston, Mass., February 3, 1943.

May I address a word to you, as a member of the New England business community, in behalf of our friend, neighbor, and coworker in the war—the New England farmer?

From here out we are dependent, not only for victory but for survival, upon the farmers of New England and the rest of the country. Men can't fight, sail the seas, and make munitions without food and plenty of it. Food is the primary sinew of war and the cornerstone of civilian morale. For the first time since the days of the Pilgrims the American people are confronted with definite and serious food shortages. German submarines prevent us from drawing on other countries; we must grow ourselves all we are to have. Foodstuffs are a product of the soil plus human endeavor. Our soil remains, but our manpower immediately available for food production has shrunk enormously just when we need it most. Selective Service has taken its quota of young farmers and farm workers; many men have left the farm to build ships, make munitions, or engage in other better-paid wartime jobs. There is no line of new men seeking employment at the farm gate.

New England does not feed itself, but that doesn't mean that the food produced on our farms isn't important. On the contrary, it is of tremendous importance—more this year than ever before. We produce most of our fluid milk—that most essential of all foods—more potatoes than we eat, and enormous quantities of poultry, eggs, fruits, and vegetables. Last year, with diminishing labor supply and other difficulties, the New England farmer achieved new high records in food production. Nineteen forty-two was an exceptionally good crop year.

This year, with the demands of Selective Service and our war industries approaching new peaks, he is being asked to produce even more than last year; more milk, more poultry and eggs, more potatoes, more fruits and vegetables.

The result is that today our friend and neighbor is a worried and overworked man. As a loyal citizen, he is eager to do his full part, yet like the businessman, he hesitates to make new commitments until he sees how he is going to fulfill them. No more than you and I does he want to end the year in the position of having failed to keep his promise to his Government—which means to you and me, and to the men of the fighting forces and their allies.

Frankly, I agree with the council's agricultural advisers that the New England farmer can't do all that is asked of him unless he has help—help from governmental agencies, yes, but also help from his friends and neighbors in the New England community. The first thing he needs from the rest of us is a friendly and sympathetic understanding of his problem. The farmer is, relatively speaking, a small businessman; he works alone much. He has no department heads reporting to him every morning; he depends on his radio and daily newspaper to keep in touch with the world beyond his fields. It doesn't encourage him much to find himself accused therein of selfishly trying to take advantage of the war needs through higher prices for his products. He knows that his costs—labor and materials—are up; he knows he cannot produce at wartime costs and sell for peacetime prices any more than can our manufacturers. But, so far as he can see, that's what the rest of us expect him to do, so I say, let's tell him right away that we do agree that he is entitled to the same consideration as to price that is accorded any other producer. But let's go further. Suppose each of us endeavors to become better acquainted with his situation. We can do more reading about his problem, but we shall learn more by talking with our farmer friends and acquaintances. Let us open our business meetings to the farmer by inviting him and his spokesmen to tell us first hand what he is up against and how we can help. I recommend that each one of us who is a member of a service club or a chamber of commerce see to it that the farmer and his problem—which is our food problem—be on their programs within the next few weeks. Let us suggest to our friends, the newspaper editors, that they give more space to news about the situation in the farm areas they serve.

It is time to let the farmer and the farm worker know that we think he is making a real contribution to the war by staying on the farm. Many of those who left for the shipyards and munitions plants did so in a mistaken belief that in that way they were contributing more to the war. It is wrong to believe that higher wages was the only thing that took these men off the farms; many thought they were doing their patriotic duty by leaving the farm. The Government now sees the mistakes that were made and is trying to correct them. I would suggest a badge for every food producer, identifying him (or her) as a war worker. And how about some Army and Navy E awards for excellence in war production?

But much more is needed. The farmer must have more physical help—more men, women, and young people taking their places beside him to help in the job of working the land, planting the crops, gathering the harvest, and caring for the cows, pigs, and chickens. The business community must do its part in making farm work an honored form of war work in New England this year.

The official agencies, State and Federal, must, of course, make the plans and provide much of the organization needed to recruit, train, and place those persons willing and able to work on New England farms this year—whether part time, all summer, or throughout the year. But the rest of us can help, right in our own communities, which is exactly the place the farmer has the right to look for help when he needs it.

It is positively necessary that we bestir ourselves in this matter, just as much as in any other matter related to the war. We must talk about it, and get others to see that if the New England farmer does not get the help he needs his production will fall. If that occurs, some of us will know hunger, for it is certain that our armed forces and those of our allies will get what they require, and the rest of us must get along on what is left.

The national and international food supply situations are serious beyond the realization of the public. Much depends, of course, on Federal policy and action. But before we give too much attention to affairs in Washington, let us determine that so far as New England is concerned our farmers are going to have our understanding, our cooperation, and our help. May I count on you to lend a hand?

Sincerely yours,

_____,

President.

Why We Are Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Clyde T. Ellis, a former Representative in Congress from the State of Arkansas, and now executive manager of the National Rural Electric Association, to the first annual convention of the Association held at St. Louis, Mo., on January 19, 1943. I have ascertained from the Public Printer that the cost of printing the address in the RECORD will be $105.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, members of the board, superintendents, managers, directors, officials of the Rural Electrification Administration, other distinguished guests, and friends: We hesitated about having this convention, fearing that you wouldn't come. [Laughter.]

You are here.

We were awfully sorry to have to move you from that other room. We had thought, surely, a room of 850 capacity would hold you. Some thought it would be too large.

Friends, I am happy indeed to be here with you. I am happy that you have journeyed the long distances that you have come to be here. I hope that before this convention is over I may have the privilege of shaking hands with every one of you, and I want you to make a special effort to shake hands with just as many members of your national board as possible. I doubt if in all America there is any board of directors representing a great mass of the American people that contains a more distinguished list of men, men outstanding in their field, than does your board. Meet them, know them; they want to know you.

We are here this morning, in the midst of a great crisis, to do a great job for the war effort, for our people whom we represent. We are here because a set of circumstances made it absolutely inevitable that this organization come into being, and that this meeting be held if we are to carry on to do the maximum that we are capable of doing for the war effort—if we are to carry on toward the betterment of the great mass of humanity in America who have been relegated to the lower one-third in the income groups because our enemies are at the front door, are at the back door, are striking us from all sides, determined that this effort of ours shall perish from the earth. And we are determined it shall not.

You know the story even better than I. Only 7 years ago, a bare 10 percent of the farm houses of this country were electrified. You set to work and today you have electrified, in 7 years, 29 percent more of the farm homes of this country, and we still have another 60 percent to go.

It has been a long, hard struggle. Even when the first bills were up, the enemy was there, seeing to it that certain restrictions were placed upon you, to cause you to fail in this effort. The Power Trust of this country had not gone into the rural areas, didn't want to; in 30 years it had barely touched you, but that Power Trust was at the doors of the Congress demanding that there be written into your law a restriction that you could serve no town of more than 1,500 people. It was necessary to put it in, in order to get the bill passed, because they said, "We will kill it if you don't; it won't work if you do."

It was put in. Then another restriction was placed in it, that you should amortize your loans in 25 years, and they said, "That isn't possible. It wouldn't even be possible for us."

Certainly not, with all their graft. They did not anticipate we would operate without it, because they thought graft was a part of the utility business. [Applause.]

Then they saw to it there was placed in that bill a set-up that would exact of you an interest rate far beyond reason, if you were going to be financed as it was provided you should be financed. Beginning then, and on down until today, you have had constant difficulty with appropriations. The utility lobby, growing year by year, was always there, fighting. "Cut down those appropriations."

They never permitted you to get into two other phases of the utility industry, from which they have made fabulous sums—transmission of electricity and generation of electricity. They kept you out of those fields and have kept you out almost 100 percent until this day.

When the war came along you were operating in the rural areas, not they. Yet they came in to say that, even though the war plants were going to be located, for the most part, in the rural areas outside the cities, you should not participate in the war program. They placed their men in high places in the Government. They managed to do it in this administration as they have done in practically all the administrations of the past. They tore down your lines in the country, built the war plants, contracted with the utilities to build other lines from the cities out to those plants to supply the power, with the net result that you were serving less and less farms every day.

Then they froze those materials that came out of the areas where the war plants were placed, and you were not permitted to use them to connect other farms.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION CO-OPS DENIED POWER CONTRACTS

Who was doing it? The Power Trust moguls in Government agencies, sent down principally from New York to do a job for their companies. May I give you two or three examples? Some of you here know about these instances:

Camp Gruber was located in the Cookson Hills of eastern Oklahoma. There was no power in that area. It had to come from the Grand River Dam. The Rural Electrification Administration public works set-up down there offered to supply the power at 5.2 mills. The contract was given to the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. for 10.8 mills, more than double what the Rural Electrification Administration Federal works offered to furnish it for. And the taxpayers caught it in the neck, if you will pardon my slang, to the tune of about $124,000 a year.

Here in the State of Missouri, down here at Neosho, Camp Crowder was located out in an area where the Rural Electrification Administration system was operating. They tore down the Rural Electrification Administration lines; tore down the transmission line that went out from the cooperative into Camp Crowder. They denied that cooperative the right to furnish the power, though it offered to, and turned around and gave the contract to Empire District at a far higher price than the cooperative offered it for.

Down in Texas there was a contract let to build several miles of Rural Electrification Administration transmission line—the Brazos project. The contractor went to Chile and got his copper before the war was on. He brought that Chilean copper there and laid it out on the Texas plains, where you could see it, of course, from the highway.

Up in Washington the Electric Bond & Share moguls in the Power Division of Office of Production Management and War Production Board denied Brazos the right to use the copper to build the lines. The Texas Power & Light Co. operates in all that territory and it is a subsidiary of Electric Bond & Share, and while they were being denied the right to string that copper Electric Bond & Share photographers photographed that copper.

A gentleman of the Congress made a speech about it at 5 o'clock one afternoon. Simultaneously, the next morning, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, those pictures, though they had not been syndicated—they had not been sent out by any central news agency so far as we were able to tell—showed up in the papers from coast to coast. The electric utilities systems had been at work, libeling the Rural Electrification Administration. "Rural Electrification Administration Hoarding Copper" was the caption placed on them, though the Rural Electrification Administration could not hoard copper. It belonged to the contractor.

But that is just merely another example of what they have been doing to us. Now, how do they do it?

We went down to see the first head of the power set-up in the old Office of Production Management. Who did he turn out to be? C. W. Kellogg, head of Edison Electric Institute, and Edison Electric Institute is, as you know, the national organization of the eight big holding companies and of many utilities not owned by the holding companies. He brought in these dollar-a-year men, about 20 of them in the beginning, all from Electric Bond & Share and the other big companies. They were the ones who greeted you.

These war contracts were being made by Col. John C. Damon, in charge of power in the War Department, and chairman of the Army-Navy Munition Board. He was the same Col. John C. Damon who was placed partially in charge of power during the other World War, and Col. John C. Damon, it developed, had spent most of his mature lifetime working for Electric Bond & Share, and its subsidiaries, and he even—well, I wish I could tell you this story:

Through a little slip of the tongue on a Christmas night, Colonel Damon let it be known to some of his friends, "They may get me; I own stock in the Utah Power & Light Co.," also a subsidiary of Electric Bond & Share. I dug into the record and found that, sure enough, he did.

That is the kind of situation we have been having to face in Washington.

Colonel Damon has now been relieved of his duties.

THE MATERIALS SITUATION

The War Production Board, on July 21, clamped down upon you that P-46, which stopped you from using any of the materials you had on hand to connect other farms to increase farm production.

You and I know that food, as much as any other one factor, will win this war. We sent out to you, in an effort to determine what materials you had on hand, a questionnaire, and we asked you in that questionnaire—and I want to thank you now for

returning it so well filled out; it helped immensely—"How much could these farms you would electrify increase their production of food?" Your composite answer, "23.7 percent."

Even if it were only 10 percent, surely the use of those materials lying idle, put to work, would have made a great contribution to the war effort, and yet the very agency that was set up for the purpose of increasing war production—the War Production Board—so far as you were concerned and so far as food was concerned, whether intentional or not, had turned itself into a war "reduction" board.

SAFETY PROGRAM

You were having other struggles. You did not have a Nation-wide safety program. You were losing people. From 1939 until 1942, inclusive, you lost 175 people killed on your systems. The rate was entirely too high, and yet you could do nothing about it, for no one system was large enough to inaugurate a vast safety program, and the Rural Electrification Administration did not then, and does not today, have the money to do it.

You were caught again on insurance. Most industrial insurance carries a safety program with it, but because you were purchasing your insurance in small lots from local companies, no one of which has enough of it to justify inaugurating a safety program, you had no insurance safety program. You had high insurance rates, and your rates were going higher.

Furthermore, you were never able to get line insurance.

I have just finished reading an authority on insurance in which this striking example was used:

"If I had one ship at sea, I would have to insure that ship. It might get destroyed, and I would be ruined. If I had eighteen ships at sea, I perhaps would not insure any of them, because, if one should get destroyed, the other 17 could absorb the loss." And so it is with you.

Any one of you cannot carry your own insurance. All of you together could do it, and at a tremendous saving over the years, we think.

It is reported to us that one man in the House and two men in the Senate have stated publicly within the past few months that the Rural Electrification Administration should be virtually liquidated.

The Power Trust campaign is on in Washington now, to liquidate the Rural Electrification Administration and, of course, to liquidate you, if they can.

THEN CAME THE NATIONAL

Now, all of that comprises the reasons for the formation of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Co-op leaders from your ranks who happened to be in Washington at one of these fights decided that if a national association was ever to be organized, as you had talked so long, they had just as well start. There had been much clamor among you fo such an organization; there had been clamor for it from your friends in Congress, and everybody recognized the immediate need for it.

Did not every other class of cooperatives in the land, and every other class of anything else so widespread, have its own national organization?

I will not go into detail telling you how it was set up, why certain things were done. I am convinced that every move that was made was done in the interest of you and the people whom you represent, and I think as good a job was done as could possibly have been done. I think a miraculous job was done in these short months that have gone by since this organization was incorporated in the city of Washington. It has become a major national organization.

Until last night, 429 of the cooperatives of this country had paid their dues since March, and you saw the applications coming in here this morning. They are coming in day by day. This organization, so far as you are concerned, is comparable to the Edison Electric Institute, which represents the big holding companies and other utilities [applause], the difference being that your people back home will fight for you and this organization. Who ever heard of a customer of a private utility fighting for that utility?

We have many things to do. We must work rapidly. There is the Rankin bill, reintroduced the other day, to eliminate that restriction of 1,500, to provide a better interest rate, and for a 50-year amortization period. We must put on a campaign through you, and we must depend upon you. Contact your Congressmen and Senators. Advise them of what it means. Congress is the greatest governing body of free representatives on earth and if we can get them the story I have no fear of the result.

We can do it. We can operate just like the other great farm organizations operate. We can let the Congress know through letters, telegrams, personal contact, what our programs are. If our requests aren't right, we cannot expect to sell them. If they are right, we can expect to sell them, and we must sell them.

Here is a little thing we had something to do with, not long ago, the Norris amendment to the price control bill. Senator Norris arose in the Senate and proposed an amendment providing that before any utility could raise its price of electricity to you or anybody else, it must have the consent of the President of the United States. The amendment came over to the House, went to conference. The House conferees were not favorable. We went to them and gave them the story from your viewpoint. How much we had to do with it I don't know, but they compromised and it was not all lost. It was finally provided that no rate could be raised without the Office of Price Administration being permitted to intervene on any hearing thereon.

The psychological effect that the Norris amendment created was good, because they are not coming in now as they were, asking to raise those rates. Of course, most of the war contracts are gone. There have been a few contracts in recent months that the national association has helped the local cooperatives with, I think. They have gotten a few, and today you are serving war industries, air beacons, and Army camps from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

We are working on an insurance program for you, an insurance program that will enable us to cut down the loss of life, that will enable us to reduce the injuries, that will enable us to give you a great safety program, ultimately, to reduce your rates; an insurance program that will embody, we hope, line insurance.

Companies have already been incorporated. We will hear more about that later on in this program.

There have been and there will be protests against our getting into the insurance business. The protests are being inspired by the Power Trust. I would remind these objectors (1) that you are private and independent corporations; (2) that you are not and never have been subsidized by the Government; and (3) that so long as the Government loan is protected what you do about your own insurance is no concern of anybody, in or out of the Government.

THE REVISED P-46C

We took those questionnaires you sent in. We totaled the figures. We averaged them. Several members of the national board and I took them over to see Donald Nelson. We had been plugging on it a long time with the Power Division.

Officials of the Rural Electrification Association have been helping us on the priorities, particularly Mr. Slattery, Mr. Craig, and Mr. Nicholson. Mr. Nicholson had been working hard on the problem in Washington. We just weren't able to crack the ice until we went to Donald Nelson himself, and said, "Mr. Nelson, do you think these materials should lie idle here when they could be increasing the food production? We want you to hear our story."

He heard our story, and he told us then and there, "I am going to give you the right to use materials that you have in stock to connect those farms." [Applause.]

We know that he had been at work on the problem and that he took it up with the Power Division at once. Then came the Revised P-46. You will receive the new interpretations on that before you leave here.

We were very happy about it. We thought we could connect at least 20,000 members immediately. Maybe we can. I am still hopeful, but the new Power Division interpretations begin to look exceedingly severe.

Now, we have some friends in the Power Division, rather, they are friends of everybody. I think they are sincerely with us at heart, but someway, somehow, we never seem to get what we think the farmers should have. We were talking with Herbert Marks, the head of the Power Division, an hour before we went into this meeting, trying to work out a further interpretation of one of the provisions.

You are making as great a contribution to the war effort as any other group of individuals, either at home or in the factories, or on the battlefield. [Applause.] Last year, in spite of the fact that almost one person from every farm, on an average, had gone either into the armed forces or into the factories, or at least had gone away from the farm; in spite of that fact, though it existed for the 12 months of 1942, your food production in America was the greatest in any year of our history. How could it have been possible? [Applause.]

It could never have happened had those electric motors not been pumping the water; had they not been grinding the feed, sawing the wood, lighting the barns and the chicken houses, heating the brooders, washing the clothes, milking the cows, refrigerating the foods, and doing the many, many other services which this greatest of man's servants performs so magnificently on the farm.

Whether you shall be permitted to continue and to make progress in that vital contribution is partially a decision for you to make. If you continue in the fight, you will get there. The American farmer has won several of our wars. He went into a first-rate war with the old squirrel rifle, fought against the trained and professional Hessians, and won his battles. The American farmer, down through the ages of our history, down through the years of his struggle, has always been the foundation of democracy. He has always been out there and "over there" in the front lines, loyal to the bitter end. He is there today.

You are not asking for something for yourselves in this crisis. You are asking for the right to produce the food to feed your sons at the battle front. [Applause.]

You who are here from the cooperatives and who have not joined this national association can take back to your boards, or your board members can take back to the other members of your boards, what you have seen and heard. I am happy to tell you that I think we have for you one of the most outstanding programs I have ever seen written down on a piece of paper. Perhaps not in all the history of St. Louis has there been assembled here as distinguished a group of individuals as you will hear, except perhaps at political conventions.

I see some of your United States Senators in the audience. You will hear them. You will hear a member of the Cabinet. You will hear the one and only Senator Norris tonight. Every power agency is represented here—Tennessee Valley Authority, Bonneville, Federal Works, and all the others. The

Chairman of the Federal Power Commission is here. Eugene Casey of the White House is here and will bring his own and a message from President Roosevelt. There will be messages from the Vice President and the Secretary of Agriculture. I hope you will attend all the meetings. We need you. We need your help. Let's go on with this convention, and come out of this convention determined that we shall electrify every farm home in America, and give it 1-cent electricity. It can be done!

All of this is why we are here! [Applause.]

Let's determine that we of the electric cooperatives shall set the example for America and for the rural communities everywhere. Indeed you have already lifted one-third of the American farm homes out of the dark ages and set them down into the twentieth century.

United as we are, pioneering a righteous cause, struggling as we are, to do a great work, under God we shall carry on and we shall proceed to transform Edwin Markham's "Man With the Hoe" into proud soldiers of the soil; men who will give us victory in war; people who will give us a greater, a more abundant life in the peace that is to follow; giant citadels of democracy, firm as the rock of ages. [Applause.]

Conditions Affecting the Price of Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana:

Whereas the War Production Board, the War Labor Board, and the Director of Economic Stabilization have found it necessary to take jurisdiction and control over the production and price of all strategic metals during the emergency; and

Whereas practically all of the copper produced in Montana has a fixed price of 12 cents per pound as compared to a price of 17 cents per pound in many other areas, and this price is strongly contended to be not conducive to a fair and equitable profit for labor under war conditions; and

Whereas the bulk of the copper ore in Montana is very high in war material content, but at the same time low in the percent of copper in the ore; and

Furthermore, the copper mines in Montana, particularly in the Butte district, are of great depth, and necessitate very extensive equipment for hoisting of ore, pumping water and ventilation, with a marked increase in labor and power costs of operation; and

Whereas the State of Montana is at the top of the list in furnishing manpower to the armed forces and the citizens of the State in general are in the forerank in the purchase of War bonds and stamps. Management and labor are striving earnestly and hard to produce the strategic metals for our fighting men at the fronts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the Senate and House of Representatives concurring, hereby respectfully petition the President of the United States, the War Production Board, the War Labor Board, and the Director of Economic Stabilization, to review and reconsider the conditions respecting wages, working conditions, and costs of production of copper in Montana, particularly in the Butte district, to the effect that a speedy and just arrangement in the price of copper be made immediately; be it further

Resolved, That this memorial be entered on the journals of both houses, and that a copy be transmitted to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization; the War Production Board; the War Labor Board; the Honorable Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor; the Honorable Burton K. Wheeler, and the Honorable James E. Murray, United States Senators from Montana; and to the Honorable James F. O'Connor and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Congressmen from Montana.

Regulation of Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a talk I delivered on America's Town Meeting of the Air on February 4, 1943, on the question whether there should be legislation for the regulation of labor unions.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The economic and political power of labor organizations has increased phenomenally in the past 10 years. At the beginning of the decade, the bargaining power of unions often was below that of employers. Today that situation is corrected and often reversed.

Three factors, all flowing directly from government, are responsible for this great change. One is the number of statutes protecting and strengthening labor organizations enacted by Congress during the decade. A second is the administration of those statutes by executive agencies friendly to labor organizations and in some instances distinctly unfriendly to employers. A third is the tremendous growth in employment and union membership growing out of the war, with the Government paying the bill and the unions exploiting to the full the opportunity for expansion.

The public is concerned, and rightly so, that this tremendously increased economic and political power of labor organizations shall not be abused. It is demanding regulatory legislation to protect both the public and individual workmen against such abuse.

It is possible that labor leaders, by virtue of their political power, can block sound regulatory legislation written by sincere friends of their movement in the Seventy-eighth Congress. If they do, a succeeding and less friendly Congress is likely to pass drastic restrictive legislation written by foes of the labor movement. American business fought needed regulatory legislation throughout the first two decades of this century, and its reward was restrictive legislation, written and administered by men hostile to business. The same thing can happen to labor organizations.

Eventually, I believe we should have a complete code of labor relations, aimed at substituting the bargaining table for strikes and lockouts in settling labor disputes. But I do not believe that job should be attempted in the midst of war. However, three types of labor legislation should be passed now, both to restore confidence of the people in the impartiality of their Government, and to protect individual workmen.

1. Labor organizations should be made subject to anti-racketeering and anti-trust laws. Recent Supreme Court decisions, in effect, give labor unions the right to violate both of these criminal statutes with impunity. That situation is intolerable and should be corrected at once.

2. Labor organizations, like corporations, should be prohibited from making political campaign contributions. Government dominated by unions through political contributions is just as un-American and undemocratic as government dominated by business corporations.

3. Unions enjoying any form of union-shop contracts, requiring workers to be members in order to hold jobs, should be required to meet certain standards of democratic procedure. These are: One, at least biannual election of officers by secret ballot of the membership; two, annual financial reports to all members and no special assessments or increases in dues without a secret referendum; and three, a secret ballot before any strike.

The determination as to whether a union meets these standards should be made by the Federal district court after full hearing on petition either of a member of the union or of the Department of Labor. Upon a finding that the union did not meet such standards, its union-shop contract should be canceled by the court and the union enjoined from entering ito any other union-shop contract until it had shown to the satisfaction of the court that it was meeting these standards of democratic procedure.

I believe such legislation not only would restore public confidence on this issue but also would assist the labor movement in ridding itself of racketeers and in educating its millions of new members into becoming real trade-unionists instead of mere dues-paying robots.

There is one other problem not connected with this broad issue which demands early action by Congress. That is the effect of the statute requiring payment of time and a half for hours worked over 40 in a week in nonwar industries. Most war industries are working 48 hours or more, and to disturb present pay practices there would slow production. But the nonwar employer must have relief. On one hand he has a shortage of employees, and those he can get are less efficient, and on the other he is up against price ceilings which make it impossible for him to pay overtime at time and a half rates without going broke. There are three possible solutions. One would be to increase price ceilings and a second would be subsidies, paid from borrowed Federal funds. Both are dangerously inflationary. A third would be to permit longer hours in these industries by payment of merely token overtime, say time and one-tenth for hours worked above 40 in a week. That would solve the problem and at the same time preserve the 40-hour-week principle.

Aviation Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK NICHOLS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me last night over station WMAL, Washington, D. C.:

The problems of today and tomorrow confronting aviation involve and are a part of the future of our Nation and the progress of civilization. These problems require specialized and individual attention, in the interest of every American citizen, and the destiny of free people all over the world.

Aviation is suddenly growing up in all of its categories, as a result of the pressure of technical development due to the war.

The airplane, for the next 50 years, will have a greater capacity for good or evil than any other material tool. It is not difficult to imagine, in a very short time after the close of the war, the development of single commercial aircraft, which, when converted to military use, could carry as much destruction as 1,000 of our present bombers.

It is vital and important to our national security and well-being that we develop and maintain a Nation-wide—yes, a world-wide—self-supporting commercial air-transport industry, so that we continue at all times to lead the world in aviation, research, engineering, manufacturing, and operation.

To build such an aircraft industry we cannot be tied to, or integrated with, the railroads, the waterways, or other older and different forms of surface transportation.

The magnitude of our world aviation problem, from the standpoint of our national economy, as well as our national security, is such that immediate attention must be given to it by the people themselves, and certainly by both the legislative and the executive branches of our Government.

In the Seventy-sixth Congress, in 1939, I introduced my first bill providing for the creation of a permanent standing committee on civil and commercial aviation in the House of Representatives. For 2 years after its first introduction, mine was a lone voice, crying out in the wilderness, begging and pleading that Congress give special attention to this aviation child growing up in our midst.

It took the Battle of Crete to prove to our Army Air Corps that the transport plane would play an important part in the winning of a modern war.

Likewise, it took Pearl Harbor, and finally war, itself, to shock the Congress, and the people, into the realization of the important part that commercial aviation would play in the post-war period.

Not all, however, either in Congress, or elsewhere, have yet been convinced; even though today we see our bombers carrying their loads of destruction to far-flung places, where they are disgorged and the aircraft then returned safely to its base—even though only recently the President of the United States flew, in a 4-engine transport airplane, to far-away Casablanca, and return—even though, daily, we are flying shuttle trips across both the Atlantic and the Pacific—and even though we now fly through temperatures 60 below zero, across the top of the world, the North Pole—even as we fly in subtropical temperatures below the equator. Still there are those who, by their outmoded conceptions and their selfish jealousies, would keep the airplane earth-bound and tied to and made a part of surface transportation systems, because of their fear that the airplane may offer to surface transportation a type of competition that would prove unprofitable investments already made in rail and steamship lines.

There are those in the Congress today who say we have nothing to do but win this war—thus we cannot devote the attention of any part of the Congress to any other problem.

Of course, every effort within the power of our people to exert, must be directed to the winning of this war.

But, upon that person who would stop America's planning there, must be laid the charge of short-sightedness, or ignorance, because our only excuse for being in this war is to protect the rights of the free people in the United States and all over the world, to enjoy free enterprise, the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, and the right to freely compete, as private institutions, and as governments, in trade and commerce.

If the above be true, then when this terrible war has ended, people of this Nation must direct their thoughts to economics—and particularly the people of the United States must direct their thoughts to the problem of in some way getting back a portion of the money that our Government has taken from our taxpayers, and spent with lavish extravagance on our allies all over the world.

Thus, we must not only win the war, but we must prepare ourselves to enter into world competition with the other world powers, many of whom are now our allies, and who now, being the beneficiaries of our lend-lease and other programs, will, in the post-war period, be our bitter contenders for the control of the world markets.

And, believe me, that the nation which is first ready with heavy cargo-carrying, fast airplanes, will be the nation that will first recover from the war effort.

In order to be specific, let's see what some of these problems are. To get a proper perspective of the problems we must know that the United States leads all of the nations of the world today in the development of aviation.

I would divide them, basically, into three groups:

First. The question is: How far will the United States press its advantages, and how far will it be willing to share world air trade with other nations?

Second. Government operation against private enterprise.

The questions are: Whether, and how soon, and under what conditions, the Government will turn the nonmilitary air-transportation business back to private air lines.

And third. Freedom of the air.

The problem is whether the air is to be free to the world's air-transport lines, as in peacetime the seas are free to shipping.

Each of these questions bristles with its separate set of problems. And as to all three there are signs of growing division in outlook between an interested group of liberals in the administration on one hand and businessmen and conservative officials on the other hand.

I do not want here to take up the argument as to what should be done in order to answer these three all-important questions. But I do want to see set up, not only in the executive branch of the Government but in the Congress, a body who will devote their entire attention to the study of these questions, with the purpose in mind of arriving ultimately at the proper answer, in light of the best interests of the most of the people of the United States.

With American dollars, modern airports, airways, and air-navigational facilities have been built in Canada, South America, and on the continent of Africa.

What is to become of these air facilities after the war is over?

Are we to follow the pattern of the agreement that our Government has now made with Canada, to wit, that 1 year after the end of the war, all permanent airport facilities built there, with our money, are to be turned over to Canada?

Is this to be the policy of our Government in South America, Africa, and other places throughout the world, where American dollars have been spent?

Are we going to do in the post-war period what we have already done in Africa, where the Pan American Airways System built the modernized airway for the United States Government, from the African West Coast to Cairo, the operation of which has now been taken away from Pan American and turned over to the British Overseas Airways?

Or, are we going to be as zealous in the protection of the rights of our citizens in the post-war period, as Britain and Canada are zealous of the protection of the rights of their citizens?

Now, to return to the domestic, or home field.

Although we in the United States had more commercial airplanes in operation at the outbreak of World War No. 2, than any other nation in the world, at the peak this number of airplanes in commercial operation in the United States was only slightly in excess of 300, although every community in the United States was hungry for air service.

Will this great air industry, in both the field of production, and transportation, grow in the post-war period?

Or, will it be stifled by selfish interests within our own country, who have their money invested in other fields of transportation?

Unless the development of commercial aviation in every aspect is permitted to go forward in this country, hundreds of thousands of people now employed in both the production and operation of airplanes, will find themselves out of employment, and forced to seek other fields of endeavor.

But, if the industry is permitted to go forward, it will do for the United States, at the end of this war, what the automobile did for us at the end of the last war. You might be surprised to know that when we sent our expedition across the Mexican border in 1916, to run down the bandit, Villa, the United States Army owned not a single motor truck. And there were those who argued then that the motor truck would never displace the mule as a means of transportation in warfare.

And, at the time we entered World War No. 1, in 1917, the trucks which were owned by the United States Army numbered less than 5,000.

When the boys returned from the fronts, after that war, they demanded that the automobile be given its place in the economic scheme of things at home.

Likewise, at the end of this war, when the boys return from the fronts, they will demand that the airplane be given its place in the economic scheme of things at home.

And if the development of this great industry is not throttled by selfish, short-sighted people in this country, in the post-war period you will shortly see airplane manufacturers building airplanes adapted to private as well as the commercial use.

This is progress. This is the evolution of intelligent thinking people. Let no man in private or public life stand in the way of this progress, lest he be cast aside and crushed under the wheels of the juggernaut of proficiency.

I can see out yonder a commercial air-line system honeycombing the United States, dealing in the transportation of passengers, cargo, and mail.

I can see great trunk lines of the air, flying transcontinental from coast to coast and border to Gulf.

I can see feeder lines, connecting almost every community with these trunk lines, for the transportation of passengers.

I can see exactly the same system for the transportation of cargo.

I can see a great transport plane leaving the east coast, and, without landing once, pick up, en route, trailer planes without engines laden with cargo, where, when it lands in Chicago, it will be a freight train of 10 to 12 cargo-bearing gliders who could, if necessary, cut off from the train and land at intermediate spots.

I can see mail service by air to every town of any size in the United States, a service where mail will be dropped and picked up by an airplane, without its once touching the ground, feeding once more the great trunk-line air systems, which will traverse the United States, and finally fly around the world.

All of this and many more vexing problems will confront the standing committee on civil and commercial aviation, which I hope soon, within a few weeks, will be set up in the House of Representatives.

Surely our vision in 1943 should be as great as the vision of Tennyson, in 1842, when he wrote the following poem:

"For I dipt into the future,
Far as human eye could see,
Saw the vision of the world,
And all the wonder that would be;
Saw the heavens fill with commerce
Argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight,
Dropping down with costly bales."

Believe me, my friends, the dream of Tennyson of 100 years ago, and the ambitions of many of us who now represent you in Washington, will not be realized without a fight, nor without the cooperation and the support of the people of this country, to stamp out short-sightedness, mercenary, selfish, and greedy interests which are now at work in your Government.

Manufacture and Repair of Farm Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana:

Whereas farmers and ranchers of Montana are most anxious to contribute to the winning of the war by producing a maximum of food for our fighting forces, for our civilian population, and for starving peoples over the earth; and

Whereas Montana farmers and ranchers have the cropland and foundation herds of cattle and sheep to produce large quantities of badly needed food; and

Whereas our Government is urging farmers not only to maintain normal production of grains and feed crops, but to greatly increase the production of livestock, hogs, and poultry, without taking into consideration that much additional help will be needed to carry on such a program; and

Whereas the large-acreage farming practiced in this State requires the best of farm machinery in sufficient quantities, the securing of which has been difficult and of late impossible to obtain; and

Whereas draft, enlistment, and war-production work has drained practically every able-bodied, experienced farm boy for military service or war work, even where the fathers are growing in years and infirmity; and

Whereas experience has proven that floating, unreliable, and inexperienced labor is both inadequate and ruinous to costly and irreplaceable farm machinery; and

Whereas farmers have contributed proportionately more of their older equipment, as scrap iron, to the war effort than any other class of citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the twenty-eighth legislative session of the State of Montana (Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we respectfully urge that a far greater proportion of necessary material be immediately allotted for the manufacture of badly needed farm machinery and repairs, in order that at least normal production of food may be produced for the duration; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge that the War Department be requested to defer experienced farm boys that they may assist in planting and harvesting crops; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be submitted to the officials named in the first paragraph hereof.

South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks on the subject of shipbuilding contracts with the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation, and include therein a recent press release of the Maritime Commission on the same subject.

Subsequent to the filing of the report of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries with respect to the affairs of the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation, and in December 1942 Senators KILGORE and BREWSTER, representing the Truman committee, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Hays, our general counsel, and I, representing the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, held a joint meeting with all the members of the United States Maritime Commission and with various representatives of the different branches of the Commission. At this meeting I made a detailed statement of the reasons which, in our opinion, dictated the termination of the South Portland contract as the best means for obtaining efficient production at the South Portland yard and of saving substantial sums of money in connection with the construction of ships there.

The representatives of the Truman committee were of the opinion that the Commission should give the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation a further opportunity to improve performance and in the meantime should renegotiate the contract in order to reduce the fees payable. From time to time during December and January further conferences were held by me and by Mr. Hayes with various members and officials of the Maritime Commission. In addition, the executives of South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation presented to the Commission various arguments supporting their contention that the performance at South Portland was in fact good and that no changes should be made.

During these discussions, and early in January 1943, substantial changes were made in the management at South Portland. Mr. Newell, president of the corporation, was eliminated from active management. Mr. Pinkham, the general manager, was demoted. Various new men, some of whom had previously been affiliated with Todd Shipyards Corporation, a one-half owner of South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation, and some of whom had not been so affiliated, were brought into the yard and placed in top executive posts.

On the basis of these changes, South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation contended that any faults of management that may have existed had been corrected. Finally, on January 20, 1943, the Commission sent technical notices of default to South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation under both its shipbuilding and facilities contracts. These notices of default, which are required by the contract, enable the Maritime Commission to take over control of the yard provided that the events of default specified therein are not cured within 30 days. At the same time the Maritime Commission addressed a further letter to Todd Shipyards Corporation, stating that on the basis of its own reports as well as the reports of the Truman committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee—

It is apparent to the Commission that the contractor, South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation, has failed to perform the work called for by the aforementioned contracts with due diligence and to fulfill its covenants and undertakings.

The Commission, however, offered to grant the new management a 60-day period from the date of the letter, or a total of approximately 2½ months from the date it was installed, to prove its capacity to perform the contracts efficiently. As a condition, however, to this extension, the Commission required an agreement that on the first 16 ships South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation receive no profit and that on the remaining 68 ships to be built at the yard all fees be reduced 45 percent.

By letter dated January 25, 1943, Todd Shipyards Corporation accepted the Commission's terms, although, of course, it denied that it had been guilty of any fault. The trial period will expire on March 21. Thereupon the Commission issued a press release, copy of which I insert in the RECORD.

We believe it can fairly be stated that the above changes are directly attributable to the investigation conducted by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Speaking as of the present and without regard to what may happen at the expiration of the trial period, a new management has been installed at South Portland which, if it proves efficient, would in and of itself justify the time and labor spent by the Merchant Marine Committee on its investigation. In addition, however, there has already been accomplished a direct saving to the Government of not less than two and one-half million dollars and amounting possibly to over $5,000,000.

The Maritime Commission press release follows:

As a result of investigations by the Maritime Commission and congressional committees, the Commission has determined that the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation, South Portland, Maine, under the management that was in charge up to the end of 1942 failed to exercise due diligence in carrying out its facility and ship-construction contracts, the Commission announced today.

The company, however, installed a new management on January 4, 1943, and the Commission feels that it would be in the interest of the war effort and would avoid any interruption in essential ship production to permit continuance of work by the present company for a reasonable period during which the efficacy of the steps taken by the company might be demonstrated.

Conditions stipulated by the Maritime Commission, under which the shipbuilding contracts awarded to the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation will be continued in force temporarily with the new management of the shipyard, have been accepted by the contractors, the Commission announced. Stipulations by the Commission are as follows:

1. That the new management of the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation will be permitted to continue with work under existing contracts with that corporation for a trial period of 60 days from January 20, 1943;

2. That during that 60-day period the management shall demonstrate satisfactory performance, including fabrication of steel, erection on the ways and ship deliveries;

3. That if the company is permitted to continue after the trial period, the original contract for 16 liberty ships shall be so modified that there will be no profit for the contractor;

4. That the fees stipulated in contracts for 68 liberty ships made subsequent to the first contract for 16 such ships will be cut virtually in half.

Acceptance by the corporation, which now operates the two combined yards at South Portland was made without waiving the corporation's right to "dispute matters of fact involved in the Commission's assertion of evidence of default." The Commission also reserves corresponding rights, it was stated.

The four contracts held by the shipbuilding company called for the production of 84 Liberty ships by the end of 1943. The first for 16 ships was awarded in April 1941, the others at various dates subsequently. On January 4, 1943, when the new management took charge, 14 ships had been delivered and several others launched.

The performance of the South Portland yard was recently the subject of inquiry by the House Merchant Marine Committee and the Senate Truman committee. The House committee recommended that contracts with the South Portland concern be terminated. The Truman committee recommended that the contracts be renegotiated to provide for elimination of what might be considered excess profits and for better shipbuilding performance. In taking the action it has, the Commission believes it has met the primary objectives recommended by both committees, the announcement today stated.

The prime objective of the Commission, it was pointed out, is to safeguard the Government's interest with a minimum of interference to production. In accepting the stipulations by the Commission the shipbuilding corporation stated that "we do so in the light in which it was made because of our conviction, in which we assume the Commission joins, that the construction of facilities and ships is more important to the war effort than the litigation of the respective rights of the Commission and the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation."

Farm Production Problem Needs Attention Immediately—War Effort Is Hindered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I have written to a farm group in the district I represent:

FEBRUARY 8, 1943.

Mr. C. WILSON MOLER,
President, Jefferson County Farm Bureau, Charles Town, W. Va.

DEAR MR. MOLER: I deeply appreciate the letter which your organization has written me under date of February 5. I am pleased to have this expression of your views on pending problems affecting agriculture. I enclose H. R. 1728, introduced on February 5 by Chairman FULMER, of the House Committee on Agriculture. Prior to the introduction of this measure I conferred several times with Mr. FULMER, and expressed to him, and others, my desire to be helpful with a proper solution of the many important subjects related to farming during the war effort.

I call your attention to the following communication which I sen last October 20 to the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission:

"It is my carefully considered opinion, especially after having visited in various agricultural sections recently of the congressional district I represent, that there must be definite deferment from the provisions of our Selective Service System of those men who are essential to the production of foodstuffs.

"The farm workers of West Virginia, and throughout all sections of the United States, are patriotic and ready to serve our country in the all-out effort to win as quickly as possible this terrible war. This feeling amongst our farm population is best indicated by the very large percentage of young men from the farms who have enlisted in our armed forces, as well as those who have been drafted for duty. Illustrative also of their deep understanding of the importance of foodstuffs to feed our soldiers, sailors, and pilots is the exceptionally long workday which they have imposed upon themselves.

"We have had an alarming shortage of farm labor during the present harvest season. Next spring this shortage of farm labor will be acute if we do not now provide methods and procedure for an adequate supply of those persons who have knowledge or experience in farming and livestock activities."

I received an answer from Mr. McNutt on October 20, 1942, in which he stated in part as follows: "The members of the War Manpower Commission have been aware of the serious nature of this situation and have been giving it their careful study." On December 18, 1942, I impressed on Mr. McNutt again the gravity of the farm manpower and equipment problem. Since the convening of the Seventy-eighth Congress I have continued my efforts in this connection.

In a total war of this mechanized type, covering all parts of the globe, it is exceedingly difficult to strike a proper balance between the home front and the actual fighting zones. Sound judgment decrees, however, that we cannot sufficiently supply our armed forces with food if there is inadequate farm labor and machinery to do the job here at home on the agricultural front. It would be like attempting a successful air raid over Germany with no bomb load or too few men to handle the fighting aircraft.

Your members and myself are in agreement about cutting to the bone governmental expenditures not essential to the war effort. For years I have advocated such action. Every unnecessary expense in the operation of Government must be eliminated. This is desirable in peacetime. It is absolutely necessary with our Nation at war. Every dollar spent on nonessential civilian agencies lessens by that degree the equipment and manpower with which we fight our resourceful and ruthless enemies.

Every extravagance which men indulge these days in unnecessary Federal expenditures, every excess in which we indulge ourselves in the operation of Government here at home, decreases by just that amount the money, the equipment, and the manpower which is vitally necessary if we are to carry forward a successful prosecution of this war on the fighting fronts.

Certain agencies have undertaken by regulation to amend statutes adopted by Congress. In this connection I quote in part from my remarks on the House floor, December 10, 1942: "Congress has written certain legislation, which has actually been rewritten by agents of our Government who were not elected as legislators from districts or States." At that time I further stated:

"I, for one, as a Member of this body, believe that the intent of Congress has been misused by some of these individuals who are in leadership in agencies of Government. I think the Congress, if it has the courage, must retake these powers unto itself."

Assuring you of my desire to counsel with your group, I am

Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

Ammunition for Sporting Rifles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana:

Memorial memorializing Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board; Maury Maverick, Director, Governmental Division, War Production Board; Senator B. K. Wheeler; Senator James E. Murray; Representative James F. O'Connor; Representative Mike Mansfield; and Oscar A. Baarson, priorities district manager

Whereas it is essential to the successful prosecution of the war that maximum quantities of food and fiber be produced; and

Whereas losses in sheep, lambs, poultry caused by predatory animals is seriously handicapping Montana's war effort; and

Whereas restrictions on the use of rubber and gasoline have further curtailed the normal activity of sportsmen and hunters; and

Whereas the war production program has limited the manufacture and distribution of ammunition for sporting rifles for other than military purposes; and

Whereas much needed ammunition is totally unavailable to the stockmen of Montana; and

Whereas the predatory animal population of this State is increasing by leaps and

bounds and losses now reported by stockmen are the highest in 20 years and rapidly threatening to assume even larger proportions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we petition Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board; Maury Maverick, Director, Governmental Division, War Production Board; Senator B. K. Wheeler; Senator James E. Murray; Representative James F. O'Connor; Representative Mike Mansfield; and Oscar A. Baarson, priorities district manager, that every effort be made to make immediately available a reasonable quantity of ammunition of the more popular and commonly used calibers; and be it further

Resolved, That the distribution of same be simplified and expedited through the regular channels of trade by allocating reasonable stocks of ammunition to jobbers located in various convenient sections of Montana.

The Treasury Continues Sniping at Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission granted to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the February 3, 1943, issue of the Waterloo Daily Courier, Waterloo, Iowa:

THE TREASURY CONTINUES SNIPING AT RUML PLAN

The Ruml plan, being too daringly simple for Government officials to approve, continues to meet with bitter opposition from the Treasury Department. Randolph E. Paul, Treasury general counsel, Tuesday proposed a complex alternative in the form of a 19-percent withholding tax in the first bracket (under $2,000 in taxable income) only. Payments on 1942 income would be deferred during the transition.

The great fallacy of this proposal is that it would set up two different kinds of taxpayers. It would, to some extent, extend the benefits of pay-as-you-go to the lower 70 percent of taxpayers, while denying those benefits to the upper 30 percent.

What possible justification is there for drawing this arbitrary line? The taxpayers in the upper income bracket are as much entitled to pay-as-you go deductions as are those in the lower. In fact, the higher the individual's tax, the more he needs to pay his tax on a current basis in order to keep his affairs in order. Is there any reason for violating the principle of treating all taxpayers alike under the law?

Speaking of the Ruml plan, Paul said that "forgiving a year's tax would wipe out assets amounting to $10,000,000,000." Yet he admits that this loss would not show up on the Treasury's books and that the loss would be merely a paper transaction. The Government would receive as much (or probably more) per year than it has in the past for each percent of tax levied on each taxable dollar.

Paul said that under the Treasury plan, payments on 1942 income would be deferred, although news stories did not carry the details on how this deferment would work. Once pay-as-you-go is put in effect, however, the taxpayer must inevitably pay on 2 years' taxes in 1 year if the Treasury plan is adopted. This would merely serve to extend the agony over a period of 2 or more years, thus further complicating procedure.

The Treasury's blind refusal to refrain from petty sniping at the Ruml plan has caused the taxpayer to search for motives. He has the distinct impression that the Treasury doesn't like the Ruml plan because it didn't think of it first.

Pay-As-You-Go Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. FREDERICK PRACHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, we read and hear a great deal about the necessity of preparing for peace. It is necessary that we prepare now for the many problems that will arise when our military and naval men must necessarily be brought back into civil occupations.

The proposal of Beardsley Ruml is being widely discussed. We hear it praised by citizens in every walk of life. It has a very definite value for the post-war period, in that its adoption will make possible the clearing of the ranks of civil occupations of that great group of men and women who have reached the age where retirement is practical and possible, except for the fact that under the present income-tax law they must keep working to pay last year's income tax.

When one reaches the age when chronic or growing physical incapacity sets in, retirement is far more possible and practical if upon retirement no tax responsibility of great proportion is faced.

If this group of our citizens who desire to retire can be encouraged in their desire to vacate the ranks of labor, it will leave just so many more jobs for our boys when they return to civil life.

The Ruml plan to be effective must not be amended so as to eliminate that portion of the plan setting aside the income tax for the year preceding its adoption.

Would it not be a help to the morale of our men in the service to learn our legislators had considered the return to industry of our armed forces when enacting a new income-tax law?

Furthermore, the collection of income taxes by a law enacted long after the income upon which these taxes were imposed was earned will continue to create disunity at home. Whereas, the adoption of the Ruml plan as generally admitted will raise the morale not only of our armed forces, but also of our home front.

These considerations no doubt, will be considered by our honorable Representatives when the new income-tax law is formulated.

How can a man retire owing sizable tax obligations when earnings are reduced?

How can we find enough jobs for the discharged men and women if we do not encourage the retirement from active work, after the war, the great groups of our citizens both male and female, 65 years of age and up, who now hang on in order to pay back-tax obligations imposed in many cases long after the earnings taxed were secured?

Any plan requiring eventual payment of income taxes on 1942 income, even though spread over a period of years after the war, would freeze old citizens in jobs which might otherwise be vacated by retirement, thus creating vacanies for our men of the armed forces to civilian life. Cancelation of the excess tax for 1942 is necessary if these results are to be obtained.

Lincoln's Example Shames Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Lincoln Republican Club of Oakland County, Seventeenth Michigan District:

At this period in the Nation's history, when vast sums of money are being expended to carry on the global war in which we are now engaged, it is somewhat revealing and refreshing to know something of what a great American did in another period of the Nation's history when the country was engaged in its great civil strife, the Civil War of 1861 to 1865.

At this time when the people of the Nation are called upon to invest a part of their wages, earnings, and surplus funds in War bonds and other Government issues to carry on the war effort of the country, and in this day when a great deal of discussion and publicity is current for the adoption of some sort of a pay-as-you-go plan, it is of national interest to know and understand the habits, devotion to country, and the frugality of the great Civil War President. It is peculiarly appropriate in this year of 1943 and at this season when we approach his natal day, February 12, that we discuss this subject and meditate upon the records of his estate.

This year, more than any year since the last World War, the people of this country will be interested in answering the question as to what Lincoln would have done, or what he would do if he were President now.

The pages of history will be searched for an answer to such questions. We are all eager to know what he did in time of stress and strain when the Nation was waging war and trying to end the internal strife in which the country was then engaged. What lesson can the American people find in the record of Lincoln's life, his conduct of the war, and the administration of the Nation's affairs when he was at the head of the Government? Would he be in favor of urging the American people to invest their money in Government bonds to carry on the war? Would he be in favor of a pay-as-you-go plan if he were here today or if he were President of the United States? Where can the answers to such questions be found?

One of the least discussed phases of his life is his personal business affairs and his economic or saving traits as a lawyer and as President of the United States. When he

was elected President in 1861 he was asked by a news reporter what he considered himself worth in worldly goods. After some reflection Lincoln answered that he thought he had accumulated in his 25 years as a practicing lawyer and in the 52 years of his life approximately $15,000 in real and personal property. This consisted of a vacant lot in the city of Lincoln, Ill., which was given to him in payment for his services in laying out the plat or subdivision of the town. He also owned a 160-acre tract of land in Iowa, given to him for his services in the Black Hawk War. This tract of land was perhaps worth about $10 per acre, and the value of the vacant lot at Lincoln can be judged by the fact that the taxes on it were less than $1 a year. He also owned the house in which he and his family lived in Springfield, Ill., purchased for $1,500 from the minister who married him, the Reverend Charles W. Dreser, later improved by Lincoln and which he insured for $3,200. This was the only home Lincoln ever owned. In addition he had been able to accumulate, out of a quarter of a century of law and politics, nearly $10,000 in personal property or investments consisting of municipal bonds, railroad stock, and promissory notes, which represented money loaned to friends and prominent citizens in the city of Springfield, Ill. That Lincoln had in his possession and deposited for collection with a friend a few hours before he left Springfield for Washington and his inauguration 11 promissory notes bearing 10 percent interest, the usual rate before the Civil War, varying in amounts from $150 to $3,000; 6 shares of stock in the Alton & Sangamon Railroad Co.; a $1,000 bond of the city of Springfield, and some cash, totaling nearly $10,000, was not known by writers of his day and may be somewhat surprising to many of this generation. The record refutes the statement that Lincoln had to borrow money to attend his own inauguration. These items and a few lawbooks made up the total of Lincoln's worldly goods when he became President in 1861.

Four years later, at the time of his death in 1865, it is interesting to observe that his estate totaled a little more than $83,000. Lincoln's estate had increased nearly $68,000 in 4 years. The bulk of this increase was represented by $57,000 in Government bonds, which Lincoln purchased out of his salary of $25,000 a year as President, and the balance was in cash. He did not invest 5 percent, 10 percent, or 25 percent of his salary in the purchase of Government bonds to assist the Nation in the prosecution of the war then in progress, but it is evident that he invested his entire salary above the necessary expenses of running his household in such securities.

Lincoln set an example and established a precedent for the people of this Nation to follow in the support of their Government in this global war. The frugal habits of Lincoln, his simple wants, his disdain for all show, extravagance, and needless waste underlie this unusual saving of his salary to be invested in Government securities. The dangers of war restricted his movements. The dedication at Gettysburg; one trip to Philadelphia; one visit to Baltimore; two visits to Grant to review the Army at City Point, Va.; one visit to Burnside at Fredericksburg; one journey to Hampton Roads to meet with the Confederate commissioners; and one journey of 75 miles to Antietam to confer with General McClellan after the battle; and short visits to the hospitals and Army camps in and around Washington constituted the extent of his travels in the little more than 4 years of his Presidency.

It is reasonable to conclude that living conditions in Washington, the price of food, clothing, and the necessities of life had greatly increased because of the war in very much the same manner as today. Whatever the expenses of his household might have been, due to the war and such purchases as may have been made by Mrs. Lincoln, the fact remains that he was able to save for investment in Government securities and retain in cash on hand approximately 65 percent of his salary. This record will outstrip many Americans of today. The President's economy and thrift in a little more than 4 years as President enabled him to accumulate and save four and one-half times as much as he had acquired in 52 years of life before he became President.

An examination of the probate records of his estate at Springfield, Ill., presents an example of pay as you go which might well be followed by his fellow countrymen of today. Claims filed against Lincoln's estate totaled only $11. This is unanswerable evidence of his habit and custom of paying cash for the things he required and purchased. He paid as he went.

His estate was not settled until 1868, and by that time it had increased $25,000 from the interest on bonds and other investments he had made. Government bonds bore interest at 6 percent, promissory notes 10 percent. At the time of the distribution of the estate it amounted to $110,974.62. Mrs. Mary Lincoln (widow), Robert Todd Lincoln (son), and Thomas (Tad) Lincoln (son), each received $36,991.54. The real estate was not included in these figures. The three parcels of real estate mentioned which he owned probably totaled $6,000 in value.

The outstanding fact revealed by the probate records, which should encourage not only the Government of the United States but the people of this Nation to pay-as-you-go, is the remarkable fact that only $11 in claims was filed against an estate that totaled over $100,000. Lincoln must have believed, Lincoln did believe and practice, the principle of pay-as-you-go. May we follow his example today.

Farm Labor Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I attach a letter from P. K. Colquitt of Anthony, New Mexico, a farmer, who advises that the guayule project which we are trying to develop, is going to throw agricultural labor prices out of line again. We can't pay on the farm 75 cents an hour for tractor operators. That is the scale fixed by the New Mexico offices of the United States Employment Service.

Our farmers feel that the Employment Service is trying to upset the whole agricultural structure. With his permission, I am inserting Mr. Colquitt's letter on the situation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I think we want to know that every time we try to help to correct one difficulty, as we have in the case of rubber, we destroy something else, this time by an improper application of a wage scale.

No farmer in the Mesilla Valley can pay 75 cents an hour for a tractor operator to produce the type of crops that we have there. Here is the Government tearing down agriculture in the name of the Department of Agriculture, and making our labor problem, which is already acute, impossible to handle. Mr. Colquitt's letter follows:

ANTHONY, N. MEX., *January 28, 1943.*

Mr. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Thank you very much for sending me the speech on the gasoline rationing. It is good for the farmers of New Mexico to know that they have a farmer in Washington looking after their interests. Because of this I feel that you will understand the problem we in this community are faced with at present.

As you doubtless know, the Government is starting a guayule project near here. The men in charge of it are going on the neighboring farms and offering the labor 30 cents an hour for common labor and from 40 cents to 75 cents for tractor drivers. When the farmers have protested, they were told that the United States Employment Office set the price.

In the first place there is not enough farm labor in the valley to supply the guayule project and the cotton growers, especially the farmers raising SXP for the war effort. When the farmers complained last year of lack of cotton pickers they were told that the Employment Service would get help for them. Why then does not the Government use this Service to get its help instead of going at night to hire the labor from our farms?

In the second place, we cannot afford to pay such prices for our labor. True, the price of cotton is up, but the cost of our labor is more than double. This, however, does not concern us so much as the fact that the more we pay the less work we get done. You who know the psychology of the laborers we have to deal with will understand this. The problem of absenteeism isn't peculiar to the factory.

As we understand it, this valley is very necessary to the production of long-staple cotton. We wish to cooperate in every way possible with the Government in its farm-production goals, but unless some change is made in the handling of the labor situation the growing of guayule is going to seriously hamper our long-staple output. If there is anything you can do to help us we will appreciate it very much indeed. We feel that there is no use to complain to the Government agents although many of the farmers have done that. They are men sent out to do a job. And so far we have found the Government Employment Service most unsympathetic to our needs. The only place then that we know to go is to our Congressmen, and we believe we are lucky in having in Washington someone who does understand our problems.

Sincerely yours,

P. K. COLQUITT.

Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it is not often these days that one hears a defense of bureaucracy. I ask, therefore, that a thoughtful, impassioned, and scholarly radio address on this subject, delivered by Prof. Frederick D. Bramhall, of the University of Colorado, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Professor BRAMHALL. The air lanes and the newspapers are full, today, of two of the biggest and most misused terms of abuse the American mind has thought up in a long time—"bureaucrats" and "bureaucracy." They represent, we are told incessantly, an ominous power which threatens to destroy American democracy, the American system of government, American liberties, and the American way of life from top to bottom.

And we're not only told—we're shown in pictures. Some of you may have seen a cartoon recently, a cartoon showing a multitude of desperate men, women, and children in a sea labeled "Sea of Protest," raising their hands in entreaty and calling out for oil and gasoline to keep children warm and business going—while a ship labeled "Bureaucracy," loaded high with cans of oil and gas, shows its stern to the suffering people.

Now, this is important. We are fighting a war for the salvation of all our hopes. And, as we know perfectly well, to save the lives of our boys and bring the war to a quick conclusion, we must have unity at home; and we must also have a readiness to accept without coercion the sacrifices necessary to this end. We also all know perfectly well why oil and gasoline are being rationed. Yet the effect of such appeals as this cartoon, and others like it, and a constant stream of words that go with them—the effect of all these things is to undermine all confidence in leadership and to destroy all willingness to cooperate. What, for example, will be the effect of this sort of propaganda on the success of the forthcoming food-rationing program, a program whose necessity for victory and whose justice on the home front all intelligent people recognize? Is it not, in effect, an invitation to people to welsh on the duty of loyalty? Are we to expect that the American people will respond to every incident of control that war makes inevitable with an indignant cry of "bureaucracy run wild"? Set this alongside of Captain Rickenbacker's moving appeal to us at home to remember the sacrifices of the men in the outposts of the Pacific. I want to talk for a few moments, then, about the true and the false in this bureaucracy and bureaucrat fear, and to see whether we can't guard ourselves against the tyranny of words.

What are bureaucrats? What is bureaucracy? In the first place, if we are not going to let ourselves be fooled by words, bureaucrat is not another name for all public employees, though some people tell us so. A vice chairman of the Republican National Committee, for instance, using figures from the United States Civil Service Commission, said recently that there were now 2,500,000 civil employees of the Government—1 bureaucrat, he said, for every 3 men in the armed forces. Now, this sounds impressive. And yet actually it means nothing. If you call every employee of the Government a bureaucrat, then you find yourself including letter carriers and mail clerks, our forest rangers, employees of the Controller General's office, of the Government Printing Office, of the dockyards and arsenals. President Roosevelt has recently said that some 60 percent of the 2,500,000 are engaged in war production. It is, in short, a trap to catch the unwary to lump them all together as bureaucrats.

Nor must we simply condemn the fact that there are many administrative agencies in Washington and outside with many employees. The careful citizen will try to find out before condemning what useful work any given agency performs, indispensable for carrying on the war and maintaining sound civil life to support the war effort. You can't run the business of the commonwealth any more than of private wealth without the services of management. If it appears shocking to learn that the War Production Board has 20,000 employees, to direct and coordinate the vastest industrial program in all history, ask yourself how that number compares with the managing, directing, and accounting services, say, of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., or the United States Steel Corporation—also vast, but much smaller, businesses. Is 20,000 too many? I don't know. Does anybody? I doubt it; and in any case, you don't solve the problem merely by throwing the word "bureaucrat" loosely around.

Now, the problem of overmanning war agencies, particularly the new ones organized under intense pressure, is a very real one. I have no intention of belittling the confusion and waste that go along with the running of a war. No one who has not seen it can realize how easily they pile up and how difficult, I am inclined to say impossible, it is to prevent much of it. This is somewhat the way it goes: Suppose you are in the Office of Censorship. You know that your task is to prevent damage to the war effort through leakage of information. You are getting daily and hourly reports from postal, telegraphic, cable, and radio censors from thousands of points. You can't let them pile up without prompt analysis and transmission to the authorities concerned. You need not only adequate clerical staffs to avoid costly delay, you also need specialists to sift and weigh a thousand special sorts of data. If you don't have them, the results may be disastrous. Are you going to run the risk of losing men's lives and defeating essential war purposes by failing to have sufficient personnel to do the job? You are not. You will believe that it is better to have a few extra employees ready on call than to fall down on the job and become a bottleneck in the war program. You are out to win the war, and you're not going to lose it for the sake of a salary or two. You know that's the way Henry S. Kaiser turns out his ships, and earns the country's praise for it. What do you suppose an investigation of his plants would show, so far as superfluous employees are concerned? Is he right or wrong?

Or take another case: Suppose you are in charge of a bureau in the Bureau of Economic Warfare, administering, say, the enemy trade list, of persons and firms in neutral countries with whom Americans are forbidden to do business because they are channels through which economic resources may reach the Axis. That's real. That's vital. Can you do it without men who know the conditions of this trade or that country? Can you do it without multitudinous records? You cannot. And every head of an office tends to estimate the vital importance of his own segment of the complex front at the maximum. Much of this is a result of enthusiasm for his work, the pride in the job, which we've got to have. Some of it, on the other hand, is the desire to push oneself ahead and feed one's sense of self-importance. These are, necessarily, in most instances, new jobs, with new men in them. Their superiors are not in a position to deny in every case a doubtful request for additional staff: a blunder now may be irretrievable. And so the job gets the benefit of the doubt. What would you do?

There is, to sum up this part of it, undoubtedly overemployment in many offices. I saw some of it in Washington in 1918. I rather think I could have been dispensed with myself, and I know that the mistake, if it was a mistake, was an honest and patriotic one. It's a matter that needs to be watched, that can never be completely cured, and that is not helped by parrot cries of bureaucrat by ignorant people intoxicated with a big word, for overemployment is not bureaucracy.

What, then, really is a bureaucrat? Well, wouldn't this be a fair description?—a public employee who has forgot that he is the servant of the people, and has come to think of himself as a potentate in his own right. He is insulated against popular criticism, and thinks himself immune from public control, "clothed in a little brief authority." Not only this, however; he is also a worshipper of routine and form. He winds himself up in red tape from pure love of red tape. Immersed in rules and reports, he is afraid of imagination and initiative; rather, he is stiff, rigid, and mechanical, and the established procedure of his office get to be an end in themselves, and become sacred in his eyes. Finally, in his resentment against interference by the public (which does not understand the high mysteries of his business), he tends to unite with his fellow bureaucrats to thwart and defy public control. He wants to become master, not servant, of the commonwealth. That is your bureaucrat. He does exist. His traits are evils; and they challenge the good sense of our democracy to control and eliminate them. Indeed, many serious students of popular government believe that here is its most critical problem: How to reconcile democracy in government with technical expertness—how, that is, to keep government responsive to the discontents and aspirations of all sorts and conditions of men, and yet make use of competent, trained, expert, and permanent officers. In the attempt to solve this great problem, it does no good to try to smear every public servant with the black name of bureaucrat.

Now different countries have tried different ways to work out this problem. In Prussia, in the old days before the First World War, and in most of Germany, the permanent civil service was highly trained and competent; it was respected; it was even feared. But it was not a possession of the people, but something set apart and over them. In France, too, even under the republic, trained bureaucracy threatened to dominate politics; the permanent civil service could usually determine the result of national elections. They had, in France, able, technically proficient, competent public servants; but they had not solved the problem of making that service a responsive instrument for the purposes of the French people. On the other hand, we in the United States have in our past gone far to the other extreme. We have said: "We're going to have a government that is our own, whatever else it is; it is going to be part of us. It's to be common and homely—no experts, no body of permanent officeholders. We're going to elect everybody, from the county surveyor to the President, and we are going to choose them for short terms and change them frequently." And so we did; and we have had a government that was our own, and that we could regard with tolerant affection. But it has generally been loose, sloppy, and incompetent. We have usually assumed that incompetence was the price we had to pay for popularity of government.

But today is different. In our highly industrialized life, our infinitely increased dependence upon one another in countless details of living, our tremendously complicated society, domestically and internationally it does matter whether democracy can be competent, efficient, vigorous, whether it can use effectively the expertness that exists in it. We must have permanent, trained servants in Government. We are not going to repeat the mistakes of Prussia and France, but we must not perpetuate our own blunders of the past either, in a world that will kill a popular government that is sloppy and inefficient. This is still our problem, then: To reconcile democracy with expertness. And nothing can so befog the issue as to go on, as so many are now doing, shouting "Bureaucrat" whenever the head of a public servant shows itself—as if our object were not, as it must be, to make sure that he is our instrument, but to destroy him simply because he is an appointed officer. In all this there is nothing more interesting than the fact that much of this outcry comes from business. Why?

Surely businessmen know that they must have management in their own businesses, for permanence and expertness. Business has, in the past 30 years, frequently shown a concern in improving the efficiency of government, has even supported bureaus and foundations for that purpose. Probably many of the present orators for business are using a temporary, even though very dangerous, technique of discrediting the present administration with a view to the elections of 1944. But we can't allow the management of the war and the peace to be used as an incident in the next political campaign. And this is what the individual citizen must decide for himself—decide cool-headedly not only now, in the heat of war, but in the period of revulsion that will follow when the war is over, and the momentous decision of what we are going to make of this world stands squarely before us.

ANNOUNCER. You have just heard Prof. Frederick D. Bramhall, of the University of Colorado, on the university's regular weekly news-commentator program, History in the Making, produced for you with the cooperation of the Rocky Mountain Radio Council.

What We Will Get Out of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD a very outstanding article by Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, our distinguished and farsighted Vice President appearing in the March issue of the American magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WE WILL GET OUT OF THE WAR

(By HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States)

Ever since the African front was opened and the prospect of peace seemed nearer, thousands of businessmen closely connected with the war effort have begun to worry. They remember how the population of war-boom towns melted away after World War No. 1. They know that in the peak year of this war the United States will spend around $90,000,000,000 on the war effort and that, 2 years after the war ends, this tremendous expenditure for military purposes will be reduced to perhaps $20,000,000,000.

The businessmen know that, within the first year or two after the war ends, at least 15,000,000 workers and returned soldiers will be hunting for new jobs. They ask if all these workers can be employed in making much-needed automobiles, refrigerators, and the thousand and one other types of civilian goods not now produced because of war demands.

Looking back at World War No. 1, the businessmen realize that the shock of this war's end will probably be at least seven times as great as that which was felt beginning in 1920. Those of us who remember 1920 and the years which followed know now that there is just as much need of planning for peace as there was need of planning for war prior to Pearl Harbor. Peace unplanned could be a disaster worse than war, wrecking business, labor, and agriculture throughout the entire world and producing revolution and misery among the millions.

The first step in preventing such a hell on earth is to build, through the United Nations, a mechanism which can disarm and keep disarmed the aggressor nations, and at the same time make sure that never again can a Hitler or a Mussolini rise to lead his nation into war. This will necessitate "mental disarmament" of the people of the aggressor nations, and the creation of world economic conditions which will enable them to lift themselves out of their misery.

No businessman can plan for the future with any certainty so long as there is the fear of war on the horizon. It is vital, therefore, that the United Nations' covenant must provide the machinery to assure "freedom from fear"—an international peace law, an international peace court, and an international peace force. If any aggressor nations take the first step toward rearmament, they must be served at once with a "cease and desist" order and be warned of the consequences. If economic quarantine does not suffice, the United Nations' peace force must at once bomb the aggressor nation mercilessly.

To guarantee the peace, the United Nations will need additional powers. We must prevent international cartels of the German type and perhaps substitute for them a United Nations agency to restore stable conditions in raw material markets, on price terms that assure producers fair incomes and promote expanded consumption.

To prevent world-wide unemployment, there will probably have to be a United Nations investment corporation, under whose direction public and private capital can be put to work for world-wide reconstruction. If unemployment could be prevented without the use of government funds, there would be no need for such a corporation. But the post-war impact resulting from the sudden cessation of tremendous governmental spending everywhere in the world will make it absolutely necessary for governmental investment capital to be used on a very large scale to prevent the sudden and complete destruction of the capitalistic system.

This will not necessarily mean the reduction of private initiative. On the contrary, private initiative probably will be increased.

In launching such an investment program, the establishment of a network of globe-girdling airways ought to be the very first order of business. The airways I visualize would have as their primary justification the safeguarding of world peace. They would be operated by the air arm of the United Nations peace force. To maintain a military air force with nothing to do but wait for some nation's act of aggression would be a big expense and would not give the young men composing such a force enough to do. Instead, after these young men have undergone the necessary military training, they can serve as the air and ground crews of the United Nations air network, which in peacetime would be commercial and would carry passengers and freight.

These airways, because of their vital function in safeguarding the peace, would not be expected to pay their own way on the ordinary commercial basis. In any event, the cost of subsidizing the United Nations airways would be less than the cost of maintaining a military air force in idleness; and the use of the airways to safeguard the peace would largely free them from the handicaps and risks of ordinary commercial development. Either a military air force alone or a commercial air system alone would be more costly and less effective than the combination of the two.

We already have several precedents in the United States for such a subsidy. One is the granting of land to the railroads after the Civil War. Another is the subsidy which was granted to build our merchant marine. Still another is the air-mail subsidy, which brought about our great progress in aviation before this war.

When the war ends, the United Nations will be at the peak of a great airplane construction program. Doubtless some of the fighter and bomber planes will be retained and will become part of the equipment of the United Nations peace force. They will not be suitable for carrying passengers and freight. But under the present airplane program we are also constructing thousands of transport planes. Many of these could be easily adapted to the use of the United Nations airways. Furthermore, our tremendous airplane production capacity will make it possible to turn out any needed numbers and types of planes. The air liners of the future will travel from continent to continent in a few hours.

After the peace of the world has been made secure, it should be possible to internationalize the large airports. The war has already brought the construction of many new airports, most of them for military purposes. With the coming of peace, and the expansion of commercial air service, many more will be needed. Boldness should be the guiding principle in planning a world-wide airport construction program. When this war ends we shall be only at the threshold of the coming air age. Freedom of the air means to the world of the future what freedom of the sea meant to the world of the past.

Anyone can sit down with a globe and trace out what may prove to be significant air routes of the future. Some are likely to follow the continental coastal regions, with their busy seaports and their industrial and commercial centers. For example, one such route which would girdle almost the entire globe in a fairly straight line would extend up the west coast of South America and North America to Bering Strait and then down the east coast of Asia to Singapore.

Another straight-line route of this type would extend from the southern tip of South America to the "bulge" of Brazil, hop over to Dakar in Africa, and then follow the northwest coast of Africa and the north coast of Europe to the Scandinavian countries and northern Russia. Still another route would start in south Africa, follow the east coast of Africa to the Gulf of Aden, hop over to Arabia, and extend to India and China.

A fourth would extend from western Europe to Turkey, India, the Netherlands Indies, and Australia. Other possible routes would cross the Arctic—the Russian fliers followed one of these a few years ago when they flew from Moscow to the west coast of the United States. From Moscow to our east coast, the most direct route is by way of Iceland and eastern Canada. There would, of course, also be many all-land routes, as well as routes crossing the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

With the airways heavily subsidized for reasons of military security, it should be possible to carry passengers and certain types of freight at very attractive rates. Air travel will have an indirect but far-reaching effect on economic development. As people travel from country to country with greater ease, possibilities for utilizing the world's resources will be seen by men of daring and imagination, and they will lead the way in organizing new industrial projects of all kinds.

New airports will inevitably result in the rapid growth of population in many areas where the population is now thin. It is conceivable also that commuting types of planes, combined with rural electrification, will result in much decentralization of population. It is obvious that airplane activity after this war will have a profound influence on housing and on many other vital parts of the national

and the world economy. It is possible that in the Tropics of Latin America, in the highlands of Africa, and in Siberia there will be a population growth similar to that experienced by the United States in the nineteenth century.

Boys and girls of the rising generation are already air-minded to a degree which is not possible for most of their elders who grew up earthbound. Educational courses in the future might well include airplane trips to one or more foreign countries. It is infinitely more important to make the people of the United Nations space-minded for peace than it was for Germany to make its people space-minded for war.

Rivaling aviation in its effect on future business development will be highway transportation. We in the United States can realize from our own experience what highways mean, for highways have been as essential as automobiles and motortrucks in the transportation revolution in this country in the last three decades.

One great road project which has been under way for nearly 20 years, and which is now within sight of completion, is the 9,330-mile Pan American Highway, extending from Laredo, Tex., to Buenos Aires, Argentina. This highway, known as the "lifeline of the Americas," is a monument to the cooperative spirit of the Western Hemisphere republics.

Work on the uncompleted portion of the road between our border and the Panama Canal is being rushed as a wartime measure. The Mexican Government, with no outside financial or technical assistance, has already built 930 miles of paved or other all-weather road. Of the remaining 780 miles in Mexico requiring further work to be usable the year round, 360 miles are dry-weather road, while 420 miles are classed as "trail" or are entirely impassable. These 420 miles consist of two stretches through mountain country in southern Mexico.

In the six countries of Central America there are 990 miles of all-weather road, while further work is required on stretches aggregating 870 miles Of the six countries, Guatemala is the only one to have completed her portion of the road for all-weather use. The 870 miles requiring further work include 225 miles from the Panama Canal to the Panama-Colombia border—a stretch of jungle now impassable.

In South America the route already has the benefit of 4,980 miles of all-weather road, and only 780 miles require further work to be usable the year round. The most difficult portion still to be constructed is the 320-mile link in Ecuador.

While the Pan-American Highway proper has its terminus at Buenos Aires, it connects up with the 1,890-mile road (completed, except that 870 miles can be used only in dry weather) from Buenos Aires to Rio de Janeiro in Brazil.

Northward from the United States the new Alcan Highway extending across Canada to Big Delta Junction, near Fairbanks, Alaska, has been completed and is in use by the Army. From the railhead at Dawson Creek, British Columbia, this new road is 1,530 miles long. With the 100 miles from Big Delta Junction to Fairbanks, the 880 miles from Dawson Creek to the international boundary at Sweetgrass, Mont., and the 2,100 miles across the United States added in, the total distance by road from Rio de Janeiro to Fairbanks will be 15,830 miles.

Eventually we may expect a road to be built from Fairbanks to Bering Strait and to connect up with another road across Siberia to western Europe.

The main purpose to be served by the Pan-American Highway in the future will be and should be economic.

There will doubtless be a close relationship between airways and highways which follow the same intercontinental routes. To some extent airports will be located along the highways, and both the airways and the highways will be fed from the same streams of commerce.

Improved transportation will be the key that will unlock the resources of the vast undeveloped regions of the world. We may expect the history of those regions in the next hundred years to parallel our own history in the last hundred years.

One of the great dramas of American history was the winning of the West. Following the War between the States, the railroads crossed the prairies at the rate of a mile a day. Farmers, ranchers, miners, cities, churches, and schools followed.

A similar drama, unsung as yet, has been taking place in the Old World, as Russia has been winning her East. Most of Siberia, at the time of the fall of the Czars, was little more than waste land occupied by Eskimos, herdsmen, and political exiles. Less than 16,000,000 people occupied a land area twice as great as the United States. Today over 40,000,000 people live in the same area, with its new Siberian Pittsburghs, Bostons, Detroits. Great power dams, great mines, and great factories are operated in a giant new industrial system. On the farms are tractors by the tens of thousands.

What the United States has done and what Russia is doing give a clue to what is possible in such regions as China, Alaska, and Latin America.

China has coal, iron, and other resources essential for industrial progress, but first must come improvement in agricultural production and transportation. More capital is one of China's primary needs, but even more she is in want of technical skill and guidance to utilize her resources effectively. It is in providing such guidance that the United States and the other United Nations can perhaps be of the most help.

Another region rich with new possibilities of industrial and agricultural development is the great Northwest—including Alaska, western Canada, and the northwestern portion of the United States. To such previously existing industries as fishing, lumbering, and mining, the war has added shipbuilding, aluminum production, and airplane manufacture When peace returns, the Alcan Highway and other new transportation routes will lay the basis for further progress, and, with plenty of water power available, there will be the opportunity for great expansion in all the industries utilizing the mineral and forest resources which abound in the region.

Perhaps most challenging to the imagination of the modern businessman is the vast land of Latin America to the south.

Some of the possibilities in the development of Brazil, the largest country in this region, have recently been revealed by Morris Llewellyn Cooke, head of the special economic mission to Brazil. The war is already accelerating industrialization there. A $50,000,000 steel plant, now being built, will utilize some of Brazil's high-grade iron ore, of which she has the greatest reserves in the world.

All through Latin America there are opportunities for profitable and worth-while projects. Reforestation and soil conservation are needed in many countries.

Argentina looks forward to further industrialization as a means of absorbing some of her surplus agricultural workers and consuming more of her surplus farm products at home.

Uruguay hopes for hydroelectric development on the Rio Negro.

Paraguay is trying to modernize her agriculture.

Bolivia, fearing that wartime markets for her tin, tungsten, and antimony will disappear in a few years, would like to diversify her production.

Chile, with similar fears concerning her copper and nitrates, is also striving for more diversification.

Peru has both coal and iron to develop a steel industry, but lacks labor.

Ecuador would like to take advantage of the splendid fishing grounds off the Galápagos Islands, where two ocean currents meet.

Colombia is trying to improve her agriculture, to be less dependent on gold and platinum.

Venezuela likewise is striving for agricultural expansion, to be less dependent on oil.

Mexico is rehabilitating her railroads, building highways, and developing hydroelectric power.

The Central American countries and the island countries in the Caribbean are developing new agricultural products, including rubber, cinchona for quinine, and abacá for Manila hemp.

These are but a few of the possible postwar projects in some of the relatively undeveloped parts of the world. In addition, much will need to be done also to rehabilitate the countries of Europe and to repair the damage done by the war.

An important point is the degree to which the projects can be made completely self-liquidating. Of course, in a broad sense, a loan to a government may be considered to be self-liquidating if it is used to build up the productive power of the country and results in an increased capacity for repayment. But many of the projects I have in mind would be self-liquidating even in the narrower sense.

The experience of our own Tennessee Valley Authority throws some light on what may be achieved through careful planning and skillful engineering. This experiment in regional planning, begun nearly 10 years ago, has been a striking success.

The Tennessee Valley Authority project was based on the idea that some things would be done by public enterprise—such as developing the Tennessee River and bringing to the people its benefits of electric power, flood control, navigation, and public recreation. But it was also based on the idea that such public activity provides impetus for private business enterprise.

The record of Tennessee Valley Authority demonstrates that these ideas were well founded. The widened use of electric power has expanded the electric-appliance business, in the manufacturing and retail fields, far beyond the rate of appliance expansion in parts of the country where Tennessee Valley Authority power rates are not in effect. In a similar way, Tennessee Valley Authority's industrial research resulting in improved farm machinery, new plant foods, and new methods of processing minerals and fibers has led directly to expansion of private business. There are in the area now about 200 new manufacturing plants that would not have been there but for the impetus derived from the Tennessee Valley Authority's program. Furthermore, Tennessee Valley Authority's financial experience has been good and its prospects are equally good. The figures show that Tennessee Valley Authority's total investment in power facilities (about 70 percent of the total investment) can be paid back, with interest, out of power revenues in less than 35 years. Power rate savings to consumers, running into millions of dollars annually, are not included in this computation. Depreciation is included; this means that at the end of less than 35 years the investment in plant will be unimpaired, as well as repaid in dollars.

Thus, the Tennessee Valley Authority project is self-liquidating in the true sense of the word.

From our experience with Tennessee Valley Authority and other regional plans, we know that the per capita income of many low-income communities in the Far East, in South

America, in Europe, and in Africa could be more than doubled in a relatively short time if a better balance between agricultural and industrial activity were provided by the far-sighted use of government and private enterprise.

But the principal value of the experience of the Tennessee Valley Authority is to be found in the light it throws on what our attitude toward other countries ought to be. On the one hand, we do not want to engage in the old type of capitalistic exploitation of the resources of foreign countries. On the other hand, we do not want to spill our own money all over the world without regard to how it is used or whether we ourselves receive any benefits, direct or indirect.

There are practical people in the United States who believe that we have the "know how" to help many of the poverty-stricken peoples to set their feet on the path of education, manual dexterity, and economic literacy. If American missionaries of a new type, equipped with this "know how," can work in cooperation with a United Nations investment corporation to develop flood-control works, irrigation projects, soil reclamation, rural electrification, and the like, it will make possible an expansion in half the area of the world reminiscent of that which was stirring in our own land during its rapid growth from 1870 to 1910

The new missionaries, if they are to make their dreams come true in a really big way, must be able to grasp the enormous possibilities of combining governmental credit and organization with the drive of private initiative. The possibilities are all there—all just as practical and feasible as the growth of the United States.

In our foreign investments and activities, we have an opportunity to avoid the mistakes of the 1920's. At that time the United States loaned billions of dollars abroad, but, through insisting on a high tariff, made it impossible for those dollars to be repaid. In effect, we gave away to foreign countries (perhaps even to Hottentots) billions of dollars of our food and manufactured goods. The kind of investment policy I am suggesting for the future can be more practical and more to our interest than that which prevailed in the decade of the 1920's, provided we manage our tariffs as a powerful creditor nation has to manage them if it is to prevent world-wide misery among the debtor nations, and eventually war.

But I do not mean to imply that the whole answer to our own problem, here in the United States, is to be found in economic development abroad.

To shift successfully from $90,000,000,000-a-year war production to ordinary peacetime activity will require the greatest resourcefulness and determination, the greatest outpouring of industrial energy, and the finest cooperative spirit among businessmen, farmers, workers, professional people, and Government officials that this country has ever seen.

Labor must go beyond hours, rates of pay, and working conditions, and through the appropriate agency of government, cooperate vigorously with business in programs for full employment.

Agriculture must, through the appropriate agency of government, see that the parity principle now written into law operates justly under changing conditions of production and is effectively applied to feed the largest number of consumers at a reasonable price.

Businessmen must, in their governmental relationships, go much deeper than the customary consideration of taxes, economy, and disdain for bureaucrats. They must work activity with appropriate agencies of government in the administration of policies which will best increase productive power, balanced by an ever-increasing consumptive power flowing from a prosperous agriculture and from labor fully and productively employed.

The war, with all its hardship and its pain, has brought one blessing—it is providing a job for everybody who wants a job. We should resolve now that victory will not rob us of this blessing.

Much of the task of shifting to peacetime activity will have to rest upon the shoulders of the businessmen. In their task they will have the inspiration of the great progress of technology, accelerated by the war and the Nation-wide research programs organized by men in the armed services.

If the businessmen are engaged in home construction, they will have many new materials and devices to work with. If they are in automobile manufacturing they will be able, through the use of aluminum and plastics, to produce cars that are lighter, more efficient, more comfortable, and cheaper to operate.

If they are merchants, they will find a host of new products on the market, as the war-time accomplishments in making plastics are translated into peacetime goods. If they are in the food business, they will have the thrill of offering the public many new types of dehydrated and compressed foods, developed by the Army for the convenience of soldiers, but adaptable to peacetime use. If they are in aviation, they can look forward to the introduction of the helicopter and the great changes and opportunities this type of plane will bring.

In nearly every country of the world one of the most feasible projects will be construction of low-cost houses on a scale never before contemplated. Few people realize the multitude of construction devices and gadgets of all kinds which are available to make houses livable at lower cost. Here in the United States the possibilities are enormous. The field for new and better rural housing has scarcely been touched. In cities, the problem goes far beyond the matter of slum clearance and rehabilitation of blighted areas. It involves the construction of houses for individual ownership and of houses for rent by those people whose work forces them to shift their residence frequently.

If each of the United Nations will do its duty for its own people on the housing front, a considerable part of the post-war unemployment problem can be solved. But no matter how far the respective United Nations go with regard to housing projects and the expansion of normal consumption-goods industries, there will be wide-scale unemployment unless some united agency is prepared to plan and finance on a self-liquidating basis international airports and similar projects of the greatest significance to the peace and prosperity of the entire world.

With all the initiative and daring of the businessmen, it is doubtful if, in the short time they will have, they can make the $90,000,000,000 shift by their own efforts alone. They will need the help of government in various ways—the cushioning effect of "dismissal wages" for workers leaving war jobs, of "discharge bonuses" for men leaving the Army and the Navy, of plans for an orderly cancelation of war contracts, of provisions that will encourage the smaller companies to buy the war-production plants from the Government.

They will need the help of financial and tax policies which favor the maximum of individual incentive, but which do not shut out the rapid flow of Government funds when these may be necessary for full employment. They will need the protection of Government insurance of business transactions, as so successfully worked out in the guaranty of of bank deposits and in the insurance of home mortgages under the Federal Housing Administration.

They will need the protection of the social-security system, broadened and strengthened. Social security is a splendid method of easing the individual worker and the business community over the rough spots. But we should recognize that the United States does not yet have a mature economy, and we should not look to a social-security program as a substitute for dynamic, creative business energy and initiative.

In the situation that will face the United States and the world after the war, one might like to follow this course or that, according to his own personal inclinations. But, as is so often the case in the life of the individual, the decision comes down to a choice between very definite alternatives. On the one hand, the people of our country and of the world will have an opportunity to act boldly and imaginatively to organize the greatest utilization of the world's resources that history has ever seen. On the other hand, we confront the alternative prospect of suffering from a disillusionment like that which began in 1930—a disillusionment which will end inevitably in World War No. 3, if not in a collapse sooner in the form of an epidemic of insurrections and revolutions, or the loss of democracy and the sinking into a state infinitely more static and regimented than the life of the Middle Ages.

The American businessman will rise to the challenge of the air age, to the challenge of the new frontier, to the infinite possibilities for development not only in our own country, but in the Tropics and in Asia. Just as he has cooperated with government in time of war to build planes for the saving of civilization, so likewise will he cooperate with government to make air power the preserver of civilization.

More and more everyone will recognize that business, labor, agriculture, and government have just one job in their four-way partnership—to lead the common man to full employment, a higher standard of living, and a peace which will be permeated by the exciting spirit of new frontiers. The creative businessman of the future will recognize that, while government will play a large part in opening up these new frontiers, the Government activity will be such as not to reduce but to increase the field for private initiative. Better Government organization and more individual drive will go hand in hand.

The peace to come will be just as worthy of a supreme effort as the war is now. The men in the armed services are too intelligent to permit a dull, dead, dragging peace which will let the world drift into the maelstrom.

Airplanes and air power have eliminated the old significance of national boundaries. International airports and extensive international air travel will cause the American businessman to think in international terms as never before. The narrow selfishness of the past will more and more seem foolish and harmful. The seas will no longer separate the continents in the way they once did. Information and goods will flow with ever-increasing freedom.

Modern technology, the wings of the air, and the waves of the air mean that the common man will demand and get a better education and a higher standard of living. In serving the common man the business leader will have opportunities for initiative such as he never dreamed of before.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, over 700 cities have 100 or more Government workers now.

The veterans get 96 percent of all the money voted to that bureau.

Some believe the Government itself to be the greatest hoarder of manpower.

The Manpower Commission wants 200 men who will draw $4,500 and over, mostly over.

There are 3,000,000 people on the Federal pay roll now and more coming up if we do not stop it.

The General Accounting Office is asking for $26,000,000 for next year to check up adequately other agencies.

Our efforts are to keep this country what those ahead of us hoped it would be, and what our soldiers want to find it when they return.

General Marshall spoke 2 hours to a joint committee Wednesday without being prompted by an aide or the use of a note. He is a real four-star chief.

Congressman DAWSON, colored, of Chicago, made his maiden speech in defense of his long-time personal friend, William Pickens, the accused. He did a swell job.

General Vandergrift, in discussing the operations of the marines for 6 months in the southwest Pacific, referred several times to the "nonsinkable carrier." We finally discovered he meant a small island.

Everybody beforehand pitied CLARE LUCE for releasing her first speech and then being held till 6:15 p. m. before she got the floor. Over 200 Members stayed to hear her and were well paid. Her "globaloney" is likely to stick to HENRY WALLACE.

Some Plain Facts About the Food Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, on the editorial page of the New York Times of today appears a letter by Louis Bromfield, the well-known novelist, who is also a practical and experienced farmer. I consider this letter an excellent statement of the situation which is confronting our agricultural producers today. I disagree with Mr. Bromfield in only one respect. He places the responsibility for this critical situation upon the Secretary of Agriculture. Perhaps it is there theoretically, but my observation is that the Secretary of Agriculture has had no chance to meet the situation in an adequate way. The responsibility goes higher up than Mr. Wickard.

I am getting tired of hearing speeches by everyone from the President on down extolling the farmer, telling him what an important fellow he is, and how vital farm production is in winning the war. The speeches are all right, but if the President, the Cabinet members, the administrators, the czars, the generals, and the admirals mean what they say, why do they not give the farmer a chance to produce? This year—1943—he is told that he must produce more than last year, when we had phenomenal yields in many cases due to exceptional weather conditions. Yes, he must produce more, but as Mr. Bromfield points out, without adequate supplies of labor, machinery, or fertilizer. If agriculture is a war industry as the speech makers insist, why is it not treated like one? Imagine taking 20 or 25 percent of the skilled labor out of an aircraft factory, telling its management that it could have no additional machinery, and then expecting it to expand its production. When we want to transport more men and more supplies to the battle front, do we cut down the number of ships or the number of men to do the job? We expect Admiral Halsey to eventually drive the Japs out of the South Pacific, but we do not expect him to do it with fewer ships and fewer men. We do not expect him to do it until he has an adequate force to do the job. Yet, we tell the farmer that he must expand and increase his operations and at the same time we make it impossible for him to do so.

The conditions Mr. Bromfield describes exist in every farming area in the country. It is too late now to undo the damage that has been done. It is too late now to secure maximum production from the American farm, our greatest war plant. But by treating agriculture as a war industry in the matter of supplies and manpower, there is still time to save the Nation from actual hunger and to provide something over with which to feed the starving people in the occupied countries. Further temporizing is criminal.

The letter referred to follows:

FOOD SITUATION CALLED GRIM—WRITER-FARMER CHARGES INEPTNESS ON PART OF ADMINISTRATION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It seems to me that the time has come for someone to state a few plain facts about the grimness of the food situation in the United States. The following things are perfectly apparent:

1. That the situation is far more grave than the public has been allowed to know.

2. That the Secretary of Agriculture, who was given charge of the food problem, has proved himself incompetent, that he has taken no effective measures whatever, although the gravity of the situation should have been apparent to one in his position long before Pearl Harbor. He is offering no effective plan even at this late date, but only absurdities such as $100,000,000 subsidies and dream armies of 3,000,000 volunteer ignorant and untrained women and children workers.

3. That nothing whatever has been done to help the farmer in solving the three obstacles which prevent him, despite all the patriotism and good will in the world, from achieving maximum production. These are, in order, skilled labor, machinery, fertilizer, and semi-skilled labor. High wages in industry have drained away the unskilled labor. The Army continues to draft the precious and irreplaceable skilled labor, needed if any food at all is to be produced beyond the farmer's immediate needs. Not only is there nothing done to help the acute labor problem, the inroads of the Army on skilled labor are making conditions worse every day. Machinery, regardless of Department of Agriculture figures, is impossible to obtain. Even to get a spare nut or bolt it is necessary for a farmer to spend long hours of his precious time filling out forms, traveling miles on precious rubber, and then waiting weeks before the nut or bolt is obtainable.

FERTILIZERS HARD TO GET

No nitrogen fertilizer is available, and other fertilizers become more and more difficult to obtain.

No nitrogen fertilizer is available, and other absurd $100,000,000 subsidy. What he wants is the labor, machinery, and fertilizer to get his job done and produce honestly as much as possible. Certainly no taxpayer wants another $100,000,000 item carelessly tossed into the already fantastic expenditures of a hopelessly muddled campaign along the whole of the home front.

As to the dream army of 3,000,000 unskilled workers, they can only be of any practical use in areas where there are flash crops of fruit and vegetables. Even here such an army is not too valuable and is certain to be the cause of 10- to 20-percent loss or damage of crops. To the dairymen, the poultrymen, the livestock raisers, to the farm equipped with expensive machinery, temporary volunteer labor is of no value whatever. What is needed and vitally necessary is skilled, experienced labor 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Without it, hatcheries must curtail production or close, poultrymen and dairymen must cut production or go out of business. Many thousands all over the country have already done so. The talk of increased production is nonsense, and it is criminal to go on deceiving the people of the Nation with the idea that more food will be produced next year.

DETAILED INFORMATION LACKING

The only figures on the situation come from the Secretary of Agricultulre, recently promoted—heaven knows why—to the post of Food Czar, or in hand-outs by press agents from his office, or in interviews to newspapermen who do not and cannot understand the fundamentals of food-production problems. There are, of course, the periodical speeches of the Secretary of Agriculture telling the people of the United States that they must learn to do without, and the farmer—already working 16 hours a day under great handicaps—that he must work harder and put his women and children into the fields. No figures are given out concerning the hundreds of thousands of acres of potatoes, corn, and soybeans that are still unharvested in the field because there is no labor, nor are any figures given concerning the soybeans that cannot be marketed because when the Secretary of Agriculture urged farmers last year to plant more soybeans he overlooked the fact that there is a limit to the capacity of soybean-processing plants.

Farmers must work and plan anywhere from 6 months to a year ahead. One cannot suddenly increase production in the middle of the year On the food-production front we lost the year 1942, and now we have lost the year 1943 because no practical, sensible plan has been offered, but only mountains of questionnaires, the drafting of skilled farm labor, and a shortage of machinery. In making plans ahead a farmer must lay out anywhere from $200 upward into the thousands, according to the size of the food-producing unit he operates. It is insane to expect a farmer with unharvested crops still in the field to lay out large sums of money to begin again in the midst of winter Nobody has given the farmer the least hint of assurance that he will have labor or machinery or fertilizer for next year's crop.

It is no wonder then that one hears, as I have heard, good, honest, patriotic farmers say, "I and my family are all right. We will eat. When the city people haven't enough to eat maybe Washington will do something about the situation." He is at the end of his tether. And, my friends in the city, you are going to go without enough to eat—certainly you are going to go without butter and eggs and cream and meat because your Government in Washington has done nothing

to help solve farm-production problems. At the very moment I am writing, farmers' sons and young farmers, authentic, vital skilled labor, are being drafted into an Army already too big to be fed except at the expense of civilians on the home front.

That is the immediate picture, but its effects are much more far reaching. They touch the future of the Democratic Party, the future liberalism, and the future of the world. At this very moment another big commission is being set up under the able direction of ex-Governor Lehman of New York. Its purpose is to feed the people of the liberated countries. The question is, "With what?" We are not even feeding ourselves and our own armies. "Food will win the war and dictate the peace," Mr. Wickard keeps repeating. Again the question is, "What food?" Without food all the ships and tanks and planes and soldiers are worthless. And what a job there is before us in a starving world.

PEOPLE NOT AMENABLE

Certainly no political party and not even this administration can say to the American people, "You must do without so that we can feed starving Europe." Food, I venture to say, is the most important item in the whole war program today, ahead of arms, or soldiers, or planes, or tanks, or what you will. And still nothing is being done, and still skilled labor is being drafted from the farm.

It is a curious fact, hitherto unremarked so far as I know, that the whole production program is in the hands of a junta of politicians from Indiana—Paul V. McNutt, Claude Wickard, General Hershey, and Clifford Townsend. Together they add up to an Indiana political machine with prodigious ambitions. I think, however, that we need not worry about their ambitions. If things go along the home front as they are going now there will not be a Democratic farm vote north of the Mason and Dixon's line. I doubt if there will be a Democratic Congressman elected from north of that line. The Democratic party will be deader than the Republican party has ever been.

The writer of this letter is the proprietor of a 1,100-acre farm in Ohio, producing eggs, chickens, hogs, beef, wool, lamb, and dairy products in quantity. He knows farm problems intimately and is in contact with farmers all over the country.

From a Democrat who once believed that the New Deal was a program instead of merely a gigantic improvisation carried on from day to day and week to week at the expense of American citizens.

LOUIS BROMFIELD.

LUCAS, OHIO, *February 5, 1943.*

Address by the President at White House Correspondents' Association Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States last Friday evening at the annual dinner of the White House Correspondents' Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is nearly 2 years since I attended the last dinner of the White House Correspondents' Association. A great deal of water has flowed over the dam since then.

And several people have flown over the water.

Two years ago—many months before Pearl Harbor—I spoke to you of the thought that was then uppermost in our minds—of the determination of America to become the arsenal of democracy. Almost all Americans had by that time determined to play their full part in helping to save civilization from the barbarians. Even then, we were in the midst of the historic job of production—a job which the American people have been performing with zest and skill and, above all, success.

Tonight, as I speak to you, another thought is uppermost in our minds: That is our determination to fight this war through to the finish—to the day when United Nations' forces march in triumph through the streets of Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo.

Last September I made a tour of inspection through this country. I saw war plants at work. I saw Army and Navy training camps and flying fields. I saw American men and women—management and labor alike—working to beat production schedules. I saw American soldiers and sailors and fliers doing the job of training for the fighting which lay ahead.

Now I have returned from one of the fronts overseas, where the production from American factories and the training given in American camps are being applied in actual warfare against the enemy. I have seen our troops in the field. I have inspected their superb equipment. I have talked and laughed and eaten with them.

I have seen our men—the Nation's men—in Trinidad, in Belem and Natal in Brazil, in Liberia, in Gambia. In these places there is no actual fighting, but there is hard, dangerous, essential work, and there is a tremendous strain upon the endurance and the spirit of our troops. They are standing up magnificently under that strain.

I have seen our men—and some of our American women—in north Africa. Out there is war. Those men know that, before this war is over, many of them will have given their lives. But they know also that they are fighting to destroy the power of the enemies of their country—that they are fighting for a peace which will be a real and lasting peace and a far better world for the future.

Our men in the field are worthy of the great faith, the high hopes, we have placed in them. That applies as well to the men of our Navy, without whom no American expeditionary force could land safely on foreign shores. And it applies equally to the men of our merchant marine, who carry essential munitions and supplies, without which neither the United States nor our allies could continue the battle.

No American can look at these men, soldiers or sailors, without great emotion and great pride and a very deep sense of responsibility to them.

Because of the necessary secrecy of my trip, the men of our armed forces in every place I visited were completely surprised. The expression on their faces certainly showed it.

I wish that I could pay similar surprise visits to our men in the other fields of operation—the naval bases, the islands of the Pacific, Australia, the mainland and islands of Alaska, the islands of the Atlantic, the two Guianas, the Canal Zone, Iceland, Britain, central Africa, the Middle East, India, Burma, and China. I wish I could tell them, face to face, that their Government and their people are very proud of the great job they are doing in helping to strengthen the vise that is slowly but surely squeezing the breath out of our enemies.

In every battalion and in every ship's crew you will find every kind of American citizen representing every occupation, every section, every origin, every religion, every political viewpoint.

Ask them what they are fighting for, and every one of them will say: "I am fighting for my country." Ask them what they really mean by that and you will get what, on the surface, may seem to be a wide variety of answers.

One will say he is fighting for the right to say what he pleases and to read and listen to what he likes.

Another will say he is fighting because he never wants to see the Nazi swastika flying over the First Baptist Church on Elm Street.

Another soldier will say he is fighting for the right to work and earn three square meals a day for himself and his folks.

A fourth soldier will say he is fighting in this World War so that his children and grandchildren will not have to go back to Europe or Africa or Asia to do this ugly job all over again.

But all these answers really add up to the same thing: every American fights for freedom. And today the personal freedom of every American and his family depends, and in the future will increasingly depend, upon the freedom of his neighbors in other lands.

For today the whole world is one neighborhood. That is why this war, which had its beginnings in seemingly remote areas, has spread to every continent and most of the islands of the sea, involving the lives and the liberties of the entire human race. And unless the peace that follows recognizes that the whole world is one neighborhood and does justice to the whole human race, the germs of another world war will remain as a constant threat to mankind.

I talked with many people in our armed forces—along the coast and through the islands of the Western Hemisphere and up the coast of west Africa. Many of our soldiers and sailors were concerned about the state of the home front. They receive all kinds of exaggerated reports and rumors that there is too much complaining here at home and too little recognition of the realities of war; that selfish labor leaders are threatening to call strikes which would greatly curtail the output of our war industries; that some farm groups are trying to profiteer on prices and are letting us down on food production; that many people are bitter over the hardships of rationing and priorities; and especially that there are serious partisan political quarrels over the petty things of life here in Washington.

I told them that most of these reports are just gross exaggerations, that the people as a whole in the United States are in this war to see it through with heart and body and soul, and that our population is willing and glad to give up some of their shoes and sugar, and coffee and automobile riding—and privileges and profits—for the sake of the common cause.

I could not deny to our troops that a few chiselers, a few politicians, and a few publicists—fortunately a very few—have placed their personal ambition or greed above the Nation's interests.

Our troops know that the Nazis and Fascists and Japanese are trying hard to sell the untruths of propaganda to certain types of Americans. But our troops also know that even if you pile a lot of molehills of deception one on top of the other, you still cannot make a mountain big enough or solid enough to fool many people, or to block the road to victory and to an effective peace.

A fundamental of an effective peace is the assurance to those men who are fighting our battles that when they come home they will find a country with an economy firm enough and fair enough to provide jobs for all those who are willing to work.

I am certain that private enterprise will be able to provide the vast majority of those jobs—and, in those cases where this cannot be accomplished, that the Congress will pass the legislation which will make good the assurance of jobs.

There are still a few who say we cannot achieve this and other honorable, reasonable aims for the post-war world. In speaking of these professional skeptics—these men of little faith—there comes to my mind an old word in our language—the word "pettifoggers."

The formal, dictionary definition and derivation of the word are neither here nor there. To most of us it brings to mind a man who is small and mean and tricky and picayune and—in a word—petty. It is the type of man who is always seeking to create a smoke screen, or fog, for the purpose of obscuring the plain truth.

Today, the pettifoggers are attempting to obscure the essential truths of this war. They are seeking to befog the present and the future and the clear purposes and high principles for which the free world now maintains the promise of undimmed victory.

In north Africa we are now massing armies—British, French, and American—for one of the major battles of this war.

The enemy's purpose in the battle of Tunisia is to hold at all costs their last bridgehead in Africa, to prevent us from gaining access to the straits that lead to Nazi-dominated Europe.

Our prime purpose in this battle of Tunisia is to drive our enemies into the sea.

The British First Army in this battle, commanded by General Anderson, contains many veterans of Flanders and Dunkerque. These men have a score to settle with the Nazis.

The British Eighth Army, commanded by General Montgomery, has to its eternal credit the smashing defeat of Marshal Rommel's army and the now historic 1,500-mile pursuit of those once triumphant Nazi-Fascist forces.

The enemy in Tunisia will be attacked from the south by this great Eighth Army and by the French forces who have made a remarkable march all the way across the Sahara Desert under General Le Clerc, one of General de Gaulle's officers. From the west the enemy will be attacked by the combined forces of British and Americans, together with French troops under the command of General Giraud.

All these forces are commanded by General Eisenhower. I spent many hours in Casablanca with this young general—a descendant of Kansas pioneers. I know what a fine, tough job he has done and how carefully and skillfully he is directing the soldiers under him. I want to say to you tonight—and to him—that we have every confidence in his leadership. High tribute was paid to his qualities as a soldier when the British Government, through Mr. Churchill, took the lead at Casablanca in proposing him for the supreme command of the great Allied operations which are imminent.

The deputy to General Eisenhower is General Alexander, one of Britain's greatest fighting men. General Alexander commanded all British forces in the Middle East, including the Eighth Army which won the decisive battle at El Alamein. He and General Montgomery planned that engagement and the tremendous advance which followed it. At this moment—as I speak to you tonight—General Alexander is standing at the right hand of General Eisenhower planning new military operations.

These important facts reveal not merely cooperation but active collaboration between the United Nations. Let these facts be duly noted by our enemies.

Our soldiers in Tunisia are well trained and equipped, but they are facing for the first time actual combat with formidable opponents. We can be absolutely certain that they will conduct themselves as bravely and as effectively as did those young Americans under General Pershing who drove Germany's best troops through the Argonne Forest and across the River Meuse.

The battle of Tunisia will cost us heavily in casualties. We must face that fact now, with the same calm courage as our men are facing it on the battlefield itself.

The enemy has strong forces in strong positions. His supply lines are maintained at great cost but Hitler has been willing to pay that cost for he knows the consequences of Allied victory in Tunisia.

Those consequences are actual invasions of the continent of Europe. We do not disguise our intention to make these invasions. The pressure on Germany and Italy will be constant and unrelenting. The amazing Russian armies in the east have been delivering overpowering blows; we must do likewise in the west. The enemy must be hit and hit hard from so many directions that he never knows which is his bow and which is his stern.

It was made clear to us at Casablanca that all Frenchmen outside of France are uniting in one great paramount objective—the complete liberation of France and of all the French people who now suffer the torture of the Nazi yoke. As each day passes a spirit of unselfishness is more greatly uniting all Frenchmen who have the opportunity to strike a blow for liberation.

In the years of the American and French revolutions the fundamental principle guiding our democracies was established. The cornerstone of our whole democratic edifice was the principle that from the people and the people alone flows the authority of government.

It is one of our war aims, as expressed in the Atlantic Charter, that the conquered populations of today be again the masters of their destiny. There must be no doubt anywhere that it is the unalterable purpose of the United Nations to restore to conquered peoples their sacred rights.

French sovereignty rests with the people of France. Its expression has been temporarily suspended by German occupation. Once the triumphant armies of the United Nations have expelled the common foe, Frenchmen will be represented by a government of their own popular choice.

It will be a free choice in every sense. No nation in all the world that is free to make a choice is going to set itself up under the Fascist form of government, or the Nazi form of government or the Japanese warlord form of government. Such forms are the offspring of seizure of power followed by the abridgement of freedom. Therefore, the United Nations can properly say of these forms of government two simple words: "Never again."

The right of self-determination included in the Atlantic Charter does not carry with it the right of any government to commit wholesale murder or the right to make slaves of its own people or of any other peoples in the world.

And the world can rest assured that this total war—this sacrifice of lives all over the globe—is not being carried on for the purpose or even with the remotest idea of keeping the Quislings or Lavals in power anywhere on this earth.

The decisions reached and the actual plans made at Casablanca were not confined to any one theater of war or to any one continent or ocean or sea. Before this year is out, it will be made known to the world—in actions rather than in words—that the Casablanca Conference produced plenty of news; and it will be bad news for the Germans and Italians—and the Japanese.

We have lately concluded a long, hard battle in the southwest Pacific and we have made notable gains. That battle started in the Solomons and New Guinea last summer. It has demonstrated our superior power in planes and, most importantly, in the fighting qualities of our individual soldiers and sailors.

American armed forces in the southwest Pacific are receiving powerful aid from Australia and New Zealand and also directly from the British themselves.

We do not expect to spend the time it would take to bring Japan to final defeat merely by inching our way forward from island to island across the vast expanse of the Pacific.

Great and decisive actions against the Japanese will be taken to drive the invader from the soil of China. Important actions will be taken in the skies over China—and over Japan itself.

The discussions at Casablanca have been continued in Chungking with the Generalissimo by General Arnold and have resulted in definite plans for offensive operations.

There are many roads which lead right to Tokyo. We shall neglect none of them.

In an attempt to ward off the inevitable disaster, the Axis propagandists are trying all of their old tricks in order to divide the United Nations. They seek to create the idea that if we win this war, Russia, England, China, and the United States are going to get into a cat-and-dog fight.

This is their final effort to turn one nation against another, in the vain hope that they may settle with one or two at a time—that any of us may be so gullible and so forgetful as to be duped into making "deals" at the expense of our allies.

To these panicky attempts to escape the consequences of their crimes we say—all the United Nations say—that the only terms on which we shall deal with any Axis Government or any Axis factions are the terms proclaimed at Casablanca: "Unconditional surrender." In our uncompromising policy we mean no harm to the common people of the Axis Nations. But we do mean to impose punishment and retribution in full upon their guilty, barbaric leaders.

The Nazis must be frantic indeed if they believe that they can devise any propaganda which would turn the British and American and Chinese Governments and peoples against Russia—or Russia against the rest of us.

The overwhelming courage and endurance of the Russian people in withstanding and hurling back the invaders—and the genius with which their great armies have been directed and led by Mr. Stalin and their military commanders—all speak for themselves.

The tragedy of the war has sharpened the vision of the leadership and peoples of all the United Nations, and I can say to you from my own full knowledge that they see the utter necessity of our standing together after the war to secure a peace based on principles of permanence.

You can be quite sure that if Japan should be the first of the Axis partners to fall, the total efforts and resources of all the United Nations would be concentrated on the job of crushing Germany.

And, on the other hand, lest there be any question in Nazi or Japanese minds that we are wholly one in the prosecution of the war to a complete victory all over the world, the Prime Minister wished to make a formal agreement that if Germany should be conquered before Japan all British Empire resources and manpower would, of course, join with China and us in an out-and-out final

attack on Japan. I told him that no formal statement or agreement along these lines was in the least bit necessary—that the American people accept the word of a great English gentleman—and that it was obvious and clear that all of us are completely in accord in our determination to destroy the forces of barbarism in Asia and in Europe and in Africa. In other words, our policy toward our Japanese enemies is precisely the same as our policy toward our Nazi enemies: it is a policy of fighting hard on all fronts and ending the war as quickly as we can on the uncompromising terms of unconditional surrender.

Today is the anniversary of the birth of a great, plain American. The living memory of Abraham Lincoln is now honored and cherished by all of our people, wherever they may be, and by men and women and children throughout the British Commonwealth, and the Soviet Union, and the Republic of China, and in every land on earth where people love freedom and will give their lives for freedom.

President Lincoln said in 1862, "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us * * * in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation."

Today, 80 years after Lincoln delivered that message, the fires of war are blazing across the whole horizon of mankind—from Kharkov to Kunming—from the Mediterranean to the Coral Sea—from Berlin to Tokyo.

Again—we cannot escape history. We have supreme confidence that with the help of God honor will prevail. We have faith that future generations will know that here, in the middle of the twentieth century, there came the time when men of good will found a way to unite and produce and fight to destroy the forces of ignorance, intolerance, slavery, and war.

Address by Hon. Wallace H. White, Jr., of Maine, on Fiftieth Anniversary of Death of James G. Blaine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief address by my colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], on the life and public services of James G. Blaine, delivered on January 27, before the Pan American Union on the fiftieth anniversary of Mr. Blaine's death.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We commemorate today the death of James G. Blaine of Maine. The half century since the closing of his illustrious career has not dimmed his fame.

Mr. Blaine was an editor, a publicist, and a public man through long years. He edited a small paper in a small community in the State of Maine but his written words against human slavery reached across our country. He served in our National House of Representatives and for 6 years was the Speaker of that great forum of our people. He was a distinguished Member of the United States Senate. He was Secretary of State in the Cabinet of two Presidents. He was the nominee of his party for the Presidency of the United States in 1884. He dominated his party and profoundly affected the thought of his country for many years.

A people without heroes, monuments, shrines, and temples, a people who do not hold in revered memory their patriots and those who have made contribution to thought and achievement in the stirring fields of life and who do not pay respect to them, are a people without traditions, ideals, or lofty aspirations. On this anniversary day and in this place and presence we should recall Mr. Blaine's services to this Union under whose auspices this meeting is held and his interest in its purposes. This occasion does not permit full reference to his public life, his legislative activities and political campaigns, or to his family and personal relationships.

Much of the political life of Mr. Blaine was involved in controversy. The great public of the United States had for him no neutral feelings. He was a storm center. But to millions of his countrymen he was the Plumed Knight to whom they accorded leadership and gave devoted loyalty. They still hold him in respected and affectionate memory.

The views Mr. Blaine entertained marked him as a leader in the political thought of his time. His vision reached beyond the continental limits of this country. He envisaged the reality of this gathering of today. He saw the republics of the Western Hemisphere stirred by common ideals and with common purposes. He persuasively urged the unity of nations through which might be exerted unity of effort in the preservation of peace and in the promotion of the prosperity of all our western peoples. He believed in the arbitration of all questions, disputes, and differences between nations. He believed in the formation of a Pan American Union to aid in this peaceful purpose, to encourage communications between the American States and to promote an enlarged freedom of trade between the countries of this hemisphere.

Mr. Blaine resigned from the Senate of the United States in March 1881, to become the Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Garfield. Early in this latter service he urged upon the President that an invitation be sent to all Latin-American countries to meet in Washington for the purpose of seeking some way of averting strife between nations and of organizing the States of this western world in this behalf. His resignation as Secretary of State following President Garfield's death brought this initial effort on his part to an untimely end. But the ideal of Mr. Blaine persisted. It lived in the hearts and minds of leaders in the States of Central and South America and it lived on in the United States.

I have believed that the life and writings of William Ladd, of Blaine's own State of Maine, president of the American Peace Society, and persistent advocate of an international league for peace and the adjustment of disputes between nations, influenced in Mr. Blaine's early life, his mind and stimulated his activity in the cause of Pan-Americanism and of peace.

Between 1881 and the assembling of the first International Conference of American States in 1889, there were many proposals introduced into the Congress upon this subject. The legislation which authorized the President to call the conference of 1889, from the wise deliberations of which this organization came, was reported to the Senate from the Foreign Relations Committee by Mr. Blaine's immediate successor in the Senate, Mr. Frye, of Maine; it was in his charge while before the Senate; and in its final form it followed closely a bill introduced in the Senate by Mr. Frye in a previous session. But whatever lesser contribution may have been made by others, this Union is an enduring memorial to Mr. Blaine's vision and to his leadership in its organization and in furtherance of the ideals it has served.

A basic purpose of this Union has been the promotion of trade between its members. Mr. Blaine believed in economic understandings between the people of this hemisphere and he regarded reciprocal trade arrangements as the foundation of understanding and of mutual commercial and economic advantage. In his mind pan-Americanism and reciprocity in trade were intimately related. His active and unusual efforts while Secretary of State in behalf of a reciprocity provision in the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890 followed shortly his presence and his speech in the International Conference of 1889. Early in the year 1890, after this tariff bill had passed the House and while it was before the Senate, Mr. Blaine transmitted to Senator Hale, of Maine, an amendment to the measure drafted by him. This amendment authorized the President to declare the ports of the United States free and open to all the products of any nation of the American Hemisphere, upon which no export duties were imposed, whenever and as long as such nations admitted to their ports, free of duties and other taxes, various enumerated articles and commodities, products of the United States. This Blaine amendment verged closely upon free trade between the republics of this Western Hemisphere. It might be asserted with substantial justification that only in our recent reciprocal trade agreements has this country approved such freedom of entry of the products of other countries into our markets, as was proposed in this amendment.

Mr. Blaine believed profoundly in the principle of arbitration of controversies between nations. So always has this Pan American Union believed. So it believes today.

Mr. Blaine accepted as truth that this Nation could not live unto itself alone. If here today, he would recognize that the genius of man has so narrowed our world that an event happening anywhere within it might profoundly affect the interests of the United States and every other nation. Whenever nations might meet for action upon social, industrial, economic, or political problems of common concern, I do not doubt that Mr. Blaine would wish representatives of the United States to be present and to participate in consideration of these problems and in decisions respecting them. I believe he would urge the United States to do its part in making and preserving a more enlightened world; that, if with us in the eventful and trying years in which we now live, he would hope, through international effort, to bring about economic stability, lightening of restrictions upon world trade, disarmament by the nations of the world, international order and justice and the cause of peace and good will among men, and, because he would wish these benefits for the United States, I believe he would insist our country bear in full honor the labors and sacrifices of victory and the burdensome demands upon our strength and steadfastness of purpose which victory and the better days to follow will impose. To make contribution to the realization of these high hopes is the responsibility which we of the United States and other members of this pan-American comradeship in part must assume and serve if we and those who come after us are to enjoy the blessings of freedom, security and peace, through which will come, in ever fuller measure, human betterment and human happiness. The spirit of Mr. Blaine calls us to this task.

Excerpts From Speech of Hon. Rufus C. Holman, of Oregon, at Pontiac, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a speech delivered by me at Pontiac, Mich., on February 10 last.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When we shoot at the target, let us aim at the bull's-eye.

In order to win this war with the least loss of the lives of American boys and that we may recapture the vanishing Government of our country under the Federal Constitution, it is imperative that the Franklin Delano Roosevelt propaganda be debunked.

This can be expedited by letting the light of "truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth" into the dark places of Mr. Roosevelt's pre-war recommendations for congressional appropriations for national preparedness, making known his fraternizing with and support of the racketeers of labor who are demoralizing our industrial productive efforts, the exposure of his strictly political approach to national problems and appointments while prating about "politics is adjourned for the war," and by a union of the Jeffersonian Democrats and the Lincoln Republicans in their efforts to defeat the intrigues of the combined internationalists and New Dealers.

* * * * *

I am convinced that the present administration of the Federal Executive Department is as corrupt as it is incompetent.

* * * * *

Our country needs today some real patriots in high places of this Government—men who are willing to make personal sacrifices or jeopardize their present popularity and public stations, if need be, to save it—men who will emulate the career and example of Nathan Hale and the members of the Boston Tea Party of the American Revolution.

* * * * *

"Every man's house is his castle." The American people must reassert their independence and maintain their freedom which is guaranteed them in the Bill of Rights of the Federal Constitution. I hope the Americans will refuse entry to their homes to any snoopers of the present multitudinous Federal bureaus and prevent them crossing their thresholds for any pretended legitimate purpose whatsoever. The American citizens must not sleep on their rights and thereby forfeit them.

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

* * * * *

I want to win this war; not lose it. Except for those in our combat forces, the Nation has not yet begun to fight.

I want to recapture our constitutional government; not surrender it to a rule by Presidential directives or to a dictatorship.

* * * * *

Extravagance, waste, and misappropriation of funds leads to bankruptcy. No government has ever survived national bankruptcy.

* * * * *

"The power to tax is the power to destroy."

* * * * *

"If we are to be told from Washington when to sow and when to reap we shall soon want bread." (Thomas Jefferson.)

* * * * *

"That country is governed best which is governed least." (Thomas Jefferson.)

* * * * *

"He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance." (One of the justifications for, and causes of, the American Revolutionary War—quoted from the Declaration of Independence.)

It Is Wrong for the Government To Pay Interest for the Use of Its Own Credit—Taxpayers Will Be Compelled To Pay Billions of Dollars in Unearned Interest Unless Congress Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I am extending my remarks on the question of paying unearned interest in connection with the national debt. Hearings were held on this subject by the Committee on Ways and Means, Saturday, February 13, 1943, at which time I submitted testimony substantially as follows:

Mr. Speaker, our public debt by the end of the next fiscal year will be about $210,000,000,000. A large part of this debt, if present plans are not changed, will be owned by the 14,000 commercial banks in the Nation. The interest burden on this debt will be between four and five billion dollars per annum. The interest burden this fiscal year will be $3,000,000,000, which is provided for in the Budget message submitted by the President at the beginning of this session of Congress.

The net increase in the public debt for the year ending June 30, 1944, will be $75,500,000,000.

HOW LARGE PART OF INTEREST CAN BE SAVED

The occasion of my appearance before this committee is to make a suggestion about how billions of dollars a year can be saved by the Government on this huge national debt. Our interest burden after the next fiscal year will be much larger than the entire expenditures of our Government in 1933 and more than four times as large as the total expenditures of our Government in 1914. The question of interest, therefore, becomes one of our major problems. If a substantial part of this interest can be saved it will be of great help to the already overburdened taxpayers. If the plan had been in effect in the past our Government would have been saved at least one-half the interest burden, which would have amounted, over a period of years, to billions of dollars.

It is my considered opinion that not only can a large part—in fact, the greater part—of this interest burden be saved, but the method pursued in saving it will enable our Government to pay the entire national debt in 40 years even if it should reach $300,000,000,000 before this war is over. In addition, the plan proposed will retire a definite amount of the debt each year, thereby reducing annually any inflationary condition that has been brought about because of the war, and more effectively retard inflation than the present system.

Inflation is our greatest danger. Monetary controls cannot stop it; only adequate price control can retard or prevent it. It must be prevented or our country will suffer a shock almost equal to losing the war to the dictators.

My plan is no different from present plans and methods except that no interest will be paid by the Government for a large part of its credit used to finance the war.

I am opposed to the Government owning the commercial banks. Those banks render a good service and are entitled to a fair profit. My advocacy of this proposal is in favor of the private banks and to help them remain private. This is no fight against bankers. They are doing a splendid, patriotic job in the war effort and they are among the finest and best citizens in every community. If it is necessary for the Government to assist the private banks in order to keep them performing efficiently, I am in favor of it.

For the first 125 years of our country's existence the question of interest paid by our Government was of only minor importance. For the past 25 years, however, our Government's interest burden has exceeded on an average more than a billion dollars a year.

Anyone is entitled to pay for hire of his money. When people dug gold and silver out of the earth, it was right, if they loaned it to the Government to get interest on it.

ROAD TO RUIN

We should not permit the war burden to be doubled and trebled through the payment of unnecessary interest. It will be traveling the road to ruin.

The Treasury is spending monthly: [1]

Currently: $6,000,000,000 for war, a half billion for other purposes.

End of 1941: $2,000,000,000 for war, a half billion for other purposes.

End of 1943: $8,000,000,000 for war, a half billion for other purposes.

Fiscal yearly total spending: [1]

Ending June 30, 1943: $74,000,000,000 for war, $6,500,000,000 for other purposes.

Ending June 30, 1944: $97,000,000,000 for war, $7,000,000,000 for other purposes.

Gross public debt [1]

Dec. 31, 1941	$57,900,000,000
Dec. 31, 1942	108,200,000,000
June 30, 1943	134,800,000,000
June 30, 1944	210,500,000,000

Possible banking-system balance—sheet as of June 30, 1944 [1]

Resources:	
Cash and reserves	$20,000,000
Government securities, direct and guaranteed	112,000,000,000
Other investments	8,000,000,000
War loans	8,000,000,000
Other loans	12,000,000,000
Total	160,000,000,000
Liabilities:	
Deposits	152,000,000,000
Capital	8,000,000,000
Total	160,000,000,000

[1] Information from Banking, Journal of the American Bankers Association for February 1943, p. 24.

It will be noticed that the banks are expecting to hold $112,000,000,000 of the Government's securities by the end of 1944, which will be more than one-half of the entire public debt. The annual interest on this amount, which must be paid by the taxpayer, will be approximately $2,500,000,000. The Stevens Hotel in Chicago was purchased by the Government because the annual rent to be paid would soon equal the purchase price.

In connection with the question of how much of the increased debt for this year will have to be purchased by the banks, I desire to quote the chairman of the board of directors of the Chase National Bank of New York, Winthrop W. Aldrich, in a speech he made Thursday, January 21, 1943, in which he stated:

> Through 1943, it is estimated that the commercial banking system, that is, all commercial banks plus the 12 Federal Reserve banks, may have to absorb $40,000,000,000 of Government obligations, an amount equal to about 60 percent of the estimated increase in the total Federal debt.

BANKS IN VULNERABLE ATTITUDE

The Bank of America statement of condition, December 31, 1942, discloses that it owns $1,043,000,000 of the United States Government's securities and has a capital stock of $50,000,000. In other words, this bank will collect as much in interest on these bonds in 2 years as the amount of the entire capital stock of the bank.

The statement of one bank of New York for December 31, 1942, discloses that it had in its portfolio Government obligations amounting to $1,988,096,539.18. The capital stock of this bank is $77,500,000. The interest received on the Government obligations in 2 years would be much more than the capital stock of the bank.

The statement of another New York bank for December 31, 1942, discloses that it had in Government obligations at that time $1,692,372,867.88. The capital stock of the bank is $90,000,000.

ONE-HALF ALL FEDERAL SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

January 9, 1943, it was reported that the 12 largest banks in New York City, as of December 31, 1942, held $11,182,594,000 worth of United States Government interest-bearing securities. These 12 New York banks will therefore collect approximately a quarter of a billion dollars a year interest each year from the Government on these securities. This amount is equal to about half of the Federal Government's total expenditures for social security. Ten times as much as the cost of the legislative Budget of our Government in a year.

It was reported January 20, 1943, that the 20 largest banks in the United States, 12 of them being in New York City, held Government bonds at the end of 1942 amounting to $16,407,197,000. The interest that the Government will pay to these 20 banks will be between three hundred and four hundred million dollars per year.

The total capital stock of all the commercial banks amounts to $3,500,000,000, although their surpluses and undivided profits amount to about $5,000,000,000 more. When these banks own enough Government bonds to entitle them to $3,500,000,000 a year, what do you think will happen?

ALL RIGHT TO PAY INTEREST ON ACTUAL MONEY HIRED

In the beginning, may I make it plain that I am not opposed to interest being paid by individuals or corporations for the use of other people's money that they have hired. Neither am I opposed to the payment of interest by States, counties, and political subdivisions for money that they hire. I am opposed to the United States Government, which possesses the sovereign and exclusive privilege of creating money, paying private bankers for the use of its own money. These private bankers do not hire their own money to the government; they hire only the Government's money to the Government, and collect an interest charge annually.

INTEREST CAN BE SAVED ON PART OF WAR DEBT

Furthermore, in this emergency it is necessary that we sell all the interest-bearing bonds that we can to the public, including corporations who have the money to buy them. This is necessary to retard inflation and it is very helpful to that end. I favor the levying and collection of all the taxes it is possible for the people to pay in order to reduce the national debt as much as possible each year. After the Government has collected all the taxes it can collect and has sold all the bonds to the public that can be sold, there will remain 50 percent or more of the funds to be raised which must be obtained from the Federal Reserve banks or the privately owned 14,000 commercial banks of the country that accept deposits, or from both.

It is this money that must be obtained from the Federal Reserve banks and the commercial banks that I insist can be secured by the Government without an annual interest charge.

H. R. 1 GERMANE TO BILL TO RAISE DEBT LIMIT—WHAT IT PROVIDES

I have before this Congress the bill H. R. 1. It is germane in the consideration of this bill to raise the debt limit to $210,000,000,000. The bill provides for the issuance of non-interest-bearing, non-negotiable bonds by the 12 Federal Reserve banks to finance the part of the war that would otherwise be financed by the commercial banks and the 12 Federal Reserve banks on interest-bearing bonds.

The bill would prohibit the Treasury from issuing any further interest-bearing bonds to the banks receiving deposits, and would restrict the amount of United States bonds held by any bank to the amount held by such bank on December 31, 1941. The date is an arbitrary one. Any other fair date or fair adjustment of the amount of bonds any bank could hold would be satisfactory.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS DISTINGUISHED FROM COMMERCIAL BANKS

First, let us get our definition straight as to the kind of banks that I speak of. The 12 Federal Reserve banks are owned by the private commercial banks of the country. Not one penny of stock in these 12 banks is owned by the United States Government or by the people. The total stock in these 12 banks is about $150,000,000.

The 14,000 commercial banks include not only the national banks and the State banks that belong to the Federal Reserve System, but also the other banks which accept deposits which are State banks and do not belong to the Federal Reserve System, but practically all of them are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

NO INTEREST SHOULD BE PAID ON LARGE PART

The money that must be secured by our Government after all the bonds have been sold to the public that can be sold, and all the taxes have been paid that can be collected without injuring our domestic economy, can be secured without an interest charge through the use of the 12 Federal Reserve banks. It is right that the Government use the banks for this purpose, because these 12 banks, although privately owned, operate exclusively upon Government credit. These 12 banks have the power to create the money that is placed in circulation and used by the people. Congress has farmed out to them this great privilege. It is the most valuable privilege any government on earth ever delegated or conveyed to an individual group or corporation.

POWER NOT DISPUTED

The sovereign power of Congress to authorize the program that is proposed in the bill I am discussing is beyond question. No one questions the power of Congress to do what I propose.

SIMPLICITY AND SOUNDNESS OF PLAN

In order to demonstrate the simplicity, desirability, and soundness of the plan, I desire to first analyze the status of the present national debt. It will not be my purpose to quote exact figures since exactness is not required for the purpose of this illustration. Let us assume that the national debt now is a round number—$100,000,000,000, which is very close to the actual amount. One-half of the amount is held by individuals and corporations, including mutual-savings banks and life-insurance companies which had the money to lend to the Government in exchange for interest-bearing bonds. The other $50,000,000,000 is held as follows:

Forty-four billion by the private commercial banks which created the money by a flick of the pen to purchase interest-bearing bonds from the Government and which they now hold.

Six billion has been purchased by the 12 Federal Reserve banks by creating it by a flick of the pen, and is now held by

these 12 Federal Reserve banks, and the Government will continue to pay interest on it just the same as if the bonds had not been purchased through the use of the Government's credit.

CREATING MONEY IS ACKNOWLEDGED

For fear that someone will think that I am using a very radical and unorthodox word when I say "create" in connection with the banks' creating money with which to buy Government bonds, I want you to know that the highest and best authorities in our Government and in the United States agree that the commercial banks and the Federal Reserve banks actually create money on the Government's credit in order to buy United States Government bonds. There is no dispute about that question. The Honorable Henry Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, admits it. So does the Honorable Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and all other informed people.

Therefore, the main point for consideration by this committee is whether or not the 12 Federal Reserve banks and the private commercial banks that create money on the Government's credit should continue this policy and thereby cause the taxpayers to pay interest on it for generations to come.

HOW GOVERNMENT OBTAINS MONEY NOW

Under the present system if the Government desires more money and it is necessary to borrow the money from the banks, the following procedure is adopted:

First. If it desires, the Treasury can deliver bonds to the 12 Federal Reserve banks directly and receive credit for the amount of the bonds on the books of the 12 Federal Reserve banks. Then as the Treasury pays its debts, checks are given on these 12 Federal Reserve banks and the funds are transferred from the Treasury to the ones receiving the checks. In this way the Government is paying interest to the Federal Reserve banks just the same as it pays interest to the private banks and to individuals, although the Federal Reserve banks operate on the Government's credit. If the receiver of a Treasury check in a case like this desires the money instead of credit in his local bank, he is given Federal Reserve notes. These notes are not obligations of the Federal Reserve banks, they are obligations of the United States Government. Therefore, the Government and Congress, particularly, finds itself in the idiotic position of permitting the Treasury to deliver one form of Government obligation—interest-bearing notes—to the privately owned Federal Reserve banks and receiving credit therefor, and then when the Federal Reserve banks are called upon for the money they issue another form of Government obligation, Federal Reserve notes, to satisfy the demand. In each case Government obligations are used. The net result is that the taxpayers are paying for the use of their own credit.

This power of selling bonds directly to the Federal Reserve banks by the Treasury is authorized by the Second War Powers Act, which became a law March 27, 1942, and can only be used to the extent of $5,000,000,000. The question is, if it is good money up to $5,000,000,000 why is it not good money up to $100,000,000,000? However, this does not stop the Federal Reserve banks from buying $100,000,000,000 or $200,000,000,000 of Government bonds in the open market through the Open Market Committee in New York. The restriction of $5,000,000,000 is only on a direct sale from the Treasury to the Federal Reserve banks.

Second. The other way the Treasury would obtain the money would be to sell interest-bearing bonds of the Government to the 14,000 commercial banks. In a sale of that kind a commercial bank receives the Government bond and gives the Treasury credit upon its books for the amount of the bond. Then when the Government pays its bills it gives checks upon this fund in the local commercial bank. The money has been created by a bookkeeping transaction and it is seldom that the one receiving a check from the Government wants the actual money but desires instead credit at the bank. In that way the money is created on the books of the bank but the actual money is not paid out except to a very limited extent. If the one receiving the check, however, desires the actual money and the local bank does not have the money to pay the check, the local bank can obtain it from the nearest Federal Reserve bank by depositing Government bonds as collateral security. The bank will pay the Federal Reserve bank one-half of 1 percent interest on this money. The Federal Reserve bank will pay the Government 30 cents per $1,000 for the money. The net result is that the Government has not gotten anything for the use of its credit. The cost of printing the money has been paid by the Federal Reserve bank of 30 cents per $1,000; the Federal Reserve bank receives $50 per $1,000 from the local bank; and the local bank receives interest on the bonds deposited by it with the Federal Reserve bank to secure the loan, whatever the rate of interest happens to be.

This way of financing the war debt is frowned upon by the banks because they know it is highly inflationary, but at the same time it is no burden on the banks to buy these bonds. In fact, it is very profitable.

HOW PLAN IN H. R. 1 WOULD WORK

My proposal is that instead of the Government obtaining the money for financing the war that is needed after the sale of bonds to the public and the collection of taxes, that the United States Treasury deliver to the Federal Reserve banks non-interest-bearing, nonnegotiable Government securities or certificates of indebtedness and obtain from the 12 Federal Reserve banks credit for the amount of the bonds or certificates. Then as the Treasury pays its debts checks will be given on these 12 Federal Reserve banks in the same way and manner as if the bonds were interest bearing. The ones receiving the checks will receive their money and the same kind of money and in the same way and manner as if the bonds were interest bearing. The result will be, however, that the Government will be saved interest. In this way the Government can pay each year 2½ percent to the Federal Reserve banks on these bonds or certificates and in 40 years the entire debt will be liquidated, whereas under the present plan our Government can pay 2½ percent each year for 40 years as interest and none of the principal of the debt will be paid but all of the debt will still be due at the end of the 40 years.

OBJECTION WORTHY OF CONSIDERATION

One objection is urged against this plan which I think is worthy of the greatest consideration. It is that if the commercial banks buy the bonds a part of the excess reserves of the bank will be used in the transaction, but if the Federal Reserve banks buy the bonds and the money is paid out into the country, it is deposited in the local banks and the excess reserves of the local banks are increased by that much, which will be more inflationary than the sale of the bonds to the local banks.

This objection can be overcome completely by permitting the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve banks to change the reserve requirements of the local banks. In other words, use the same system to contract the reserves of the local banks that is now being used to expand the reserves of the local banks. Mr. Eccles has testified that the objection can be cured that way.

That is the only real objection that has ever been urged to this plan and upon analysis it becomes an excuse rather than a reason for not approving the plan that will save the taxpayers such enormous sums of money annually.

VIEWPOINT OF PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION ON BANKS HOLDING GOVERNMENT BONDS

W. L. Hemingway, president of the American Bankers Association and of the Mercantile-Commerce Bank & Trust Co., St. Louis, in a speech on our national debt before the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York in New York City, stated:

> The war must and will be financed. It can be done in one of three ways—first by printing paper money, Uncle Sam's demand I O U's. Fortunately this generation has seen the evils of that route and will have none of it. The second is by borrowing from the Federal Reserve banks directly, but that is but little removed from the paper money way because the Reserve banks would issue the money against the Government's notes or give credit on their books to the Government, which would pay it out for war purposes. It would then flow into the commercial banks, increasing their legal reserves, thus inviting further inflation. So we come to the third and least objectionable way, and that is by borrowing from the public and the banks.
>
> Both the Treasury and the banks want to see the banks buy as small a part of the succeeding issues as possible, because both understand that when the banks buy the bonds new bank credit or money is created and remains in circulation until their bonds are paid or taken by the public—an inflationary act to be avoided as much as possible. The banks should be only underwriters and distributors and not permanent investors.

I invite your attention to the following, with reference to Mr. Hemingway's statement:

First. He says that banks should not be permanent investors of United States Government bonds.

Second. That it is highly inflationary for banks to buy United States Government bonds.

Third. In the second way, he says the war can be financed by borrowing from the Federal Reserve banks directly. He also says "that is but little removed from the paper money way because the Reserve banks would issue the money against the Government's notes or give credit on their books to the Government, which would pay it out for war purposes." He could have very well added that the sale of Government bonds to commercial banks is no further removed from paper money than the sale to Federal Reserve banks if the excess reserves of banks are properly handled.

TREASURY'S REASON WHY COMMERCIAL BANKS SHOULD NOT BUY GOVERNMENT BONDS

Reason why commercial banks should not purchase bonds is contained in a statement of the Secretary of the Treasury issued April 25, 1942. It is as follows:

If the Government is compelled to go to the commercial banks for the bulk of these funds, the result will be to increase inflationary tendencies which are already serious. This is true because when commercial banks buy Government bonds they do not pay for them with actual cash taken from their vaults, but by placing on their books newly created deposits to the credit of the Government. When the Government draws upon these deposits to pay for the goods and services it buys, the purchasing power of those to whom these payments are made is increased without any decrease in the purchasing power of those from whom the money is borrowed.

HOW FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS CREATE MONEY

When Mr. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, was before the Banking and Currency Committee September 30, 1941, I interrogated him at length about the banks' creating money on the Government's credit. On page 1342 of the hearings on the price-control bill, volume 2, the following questions were asked by me and the following answers given by Mr. Eccles:

Mr. PATMAN—

The interrogation was with reference to the 12 Federal Reserve banks—

When I consider that the stock only amounts to almost nothing compared to the business of the Federal Reserve banks. The stock is less than $140,000,000, and you do several hundred billion dollars' worth of business a year, sometimes, and furthermore, when you actually hold and claim now over $2,000,000,000 in Government securities which you claim you bought. How did you get the money to buy those $2,000,000,000 of Government securities?

Mr. ECCLES. We created it.

Mr. PATMAN. Out of what?

Mr. ECCLES. Out of the right to issue credit, money.

Mr. PATMAN. And there is nothing behind it, is there, except the Government's credit?

Mr. ECCLES. We have the Government bonds.

Mr. PATMAN. That's right, the Government's credit.

Mr. ECCLES. That is what your money system is.

HOW COMMERCIAL BANKS CREATE MONEY

When Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, and his Under Secretary, Mr. Bell, were before the Banking and Currency Committee on September 24, 1941, testifying on the price-control bill, I interrogated Mr. Morgenthau about banks creating money. He suggested that Mr. Bell, his Under Secretary, answer the questions. Mr. Bell was sitting by Mr. Morgenthau's side and the following questions were asked and the following answers were given, as disclosed on page 1132, volume 2, of the printed hearings on that bill:

Mr. PATMAN. In other words, when you sell a Government bond to a commercial bank, you allow the bank then to create the money?

Under Secretary BELL. That is right. We want to avoid that, as far as we can.

Mr. PATMAN. By a bookkeeping transaction?

Under Secretary BELL. Yes, sir, in the first instance.

Mr. PATMAN. And that increases the supply of money just as much as if the country issued greenbacks directly?

Under Secretary BELL. It increases the supply of money, but I would not say that it has the same effect.

Mr. PATMAN. It increases the supply of money to exactly the same amount as if the Government issued the credit directly?

Under Secretary BELL. That is probably right.

I doubt that anyone should want any higher authority on the question of commercial banks creating money to buy Government bonds than the testimony just quoted.

MORE TESTIMONY ON HOW COMMERCIAL BANKS CREATE MONEY TO BUY BONDS

When Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, testified before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House June 24, 1941, the following questions were asked and the following answers given (page 68 of the printed Hearings on S. 1471, a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act):

Mr. PATMAN. Going back to this issue as to the Government's credit, is it a fact that the $20,000,000,000 that the commercial banks of the country hold today in United States Government bonds were purchased with created money.

Mr. ECCLES. Is it not a fact that what?

Mr. PATMAN. The $20,000,000,000 of Government bonds, approximately; that they purchased these bonds with created money.

Mr. ECCLES. What twenty billion of bonds?

Mr. PATMAN. That the banks hold today; approximately—between nineteen and twenty billion dollars.

Mr. ECCLES. I do not know exactly what the banks hold.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, that is not the main point. In other words, the bonds that the banks hold today—they created the money to buy these bonds, did they not?

Mr. ECCLES. The banking system as a whole creates and extinguishes the deposits as they make loans and investments, whether they buy Government bonds or whether they buy utility bonds, or whether they make farmers' loans.

Mr. PATMAN. I am thoroughly in accord with what you say, Governor, but the fact remains that they created the money; did they not?

Mr. ECCLES. Well, the banks create money when they make loans and investments.

Mr. PATMAN. All right; and these Governments bonds were one of the investments?

Mr. ECCLES. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. Now we are back to where we were. The banks created the money to buy the $20,000,000,000, or whatever it was, in Government bonds. Therefore it increased the available money supply by $20,000,000,000, did it not?

Mr. ECCLES. Yes; that is true, if those are the figures representing the increase in commercial banks. I think those figures are excessive.

Mr. PATMAN. It is over nineteen billion, anyway.

Mr. ECCLES. I think those figures represent a large investment of savings funds.

Mr. PATMAN. I believe they do. Anyway, the commercial banks, when they buy bonds or anything else, create the money, so to speak, to buy them with?

Mr. ECCLES. That is right.

COMMERCIAL BANKS ARE TOLD THAT THEY CAN ALWAYS GET MONEY FROM THE FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Mr. Eccles testified before the Banking and Currency Committee June 17, 1942, on a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act. His testimony, which appears on page 15 of the hearings, discloses that commercial banks can buy all the bonds they desire to buy, and if they are called on for money to pay their depositors the nearest Federal Reserve bank can always furnish them the money they need. The testimony is as follows:

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that you did send out letters to the banks which made the statement that the Federal Open Market Committee was ready to buy all bonds at par?

Mr. ECCLES. No, sir; not buy, we adopted a policy, each bank did, that would loan par on them.

Mr. PATMAN. That would loan par on Government securities?

Mr. ECCLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. Do you charge the interest rate that is effective in that particular Federal Reserve district?

Mr. ECCLES. One percent.

Mr. PATMAN. One percent.

Mr. ECCLES. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Have you ever told all the banks that you stand ready to make loans at par at a 1 percent interest rate?

Mr. ECCLES. Each Federal Reserve bank has done that.

Since Mr. Eccles testified, the interest rate has been reduced to one-half of 1 percent. It is doubtful that the banks will need the money, but if they do the Government, through the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, will furnish it to them. The Federal Reserve banks will pay 30 cents per $1,000, approximately, for the currency, and the commercial banks will pay $50 per $1,000 interest per year but will continue to receive interest on the bonds that they deposit with the Federal Reserve banks to obtain the money at one-half of 1 percent.

HOW EXCESS RESERVES ARE MANIPULATED TO HELP COMMERCIAL BANKS AND FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Mr. Eccles' testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee June 17, 1942, commencing at page 16 of the hearings on the bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act, is as follows:

Mr. PATMAN. What are the excess reserves on the money market at the present time?

Mr. ECCLES. They are running around two billion five hundred million.

Mr. PATMAN. How much could they buy in Government bonds if they were to use the excess reserve to the limit?

Mr. ECCLES. About $12,000,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. $12,000,000,000?

Mr. ECCLES. Yes, sir; that is, assuming that the deposit structure and the present structure does not change.

Mr. PATMAN. It would be about $12,000,000,000?

Mr. ECCLES. Yes; you see, the Federal Reserve requirement is about 20 percent.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ECCLES. For the country it is 14, and for the central Reserve cities it is 20, and for the Reserve cities it is 26, so that we figure on about a 20-percent Reserve requirement, so that on the basis of $2,500,000,000, if that were all fully utilized on the factional Reserve basis, I would estimate that they could buy about $12,000,000,000 worth of governments, that is, if it were utilized fully and completely through the entire Reserve, all the banks.

Mr. PATMAN. Suppose today they bought those $12,000,000,000 of bonds, what would they have back of those bonds to support them in addition to what they have now? In other words, what increased assets would the bank have except Government bonds?

Mr. ECCLES. They would have the Government bonds themselves, which would be an asset, and they would have a liability, however, in the form of a deposit.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

* * * * *

Mr. PATMAN. * * * Let us suppose that the banks are called upon to buy $12,000,000,000 of Government bonds today. That consumes all of their excess reserves. If you wanted to increase their excess reserves in order to buy another $12,000,000,000 of Government bonds, how would you do that, through the Federal Open Market Committee?

Mr. ECCLES. We might decrease the reserve requirements.

Mr. PATMAN. How would you decrease them?

Mr. ECCLES. I think it runs between $5,000,000,000 and $6,000,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. Between $5,000,000,000 and $6,000,000,000?

Mr. ECCLES. Yes; somewhere between five billion and six billion.

Mr. PATMAN. If it were decreased as you suggest, that would enable you to buy how many bonds?

Mr. ECCLES. If we decreased it to the full amount, then the reserve requirements are 10 percent instead of 20 percent, and you can buy about 10 to 1.

Mr. KEAN. What does change it from 5 to 1 or 10 to 1? Would you explain that again?

Mr. ECCLES. As it is the requirements of the Federal Reserve Bank System of the country as a whole are about 20 percent. If we changed the reserve requirements to the full amount we could then say the reserve requirements are only 10 percent instead of 20 percent, and you can get about 10 to 1, and that would be about $50,000,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. After you have already reduced the reserve requirements of the banks and have bought these $50,000,000,000 in bonds, if you need to buy still more, how would you handle the others? Suppose you wanted to call upon them to buy $25,000,000,000 more in bonds?

Mr. ECCLES. We would carry it on then, if it were necessary, by an open-market operation.

Mr. PATMAN. In other words, you buy a billion dollars' worth of bonds, what would be the effect of that billion dollars on the banks?

Mr. ECCLES. If they could get a billion dollars they could buy up about $10,000,000,000 in bonds.

BANKS' POWER TO BUY GOVERNMENT BONDS INCREASED

June 19, 1942, Mr. Eccles testified before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House on the amount of Government bonds that any bank could purchase. His testimony is as follows—page 41, hearings on the bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act:

Mr. PATMAN. In the bill we passed here a few days ago, creating the Smaller War Plants Corporation, there was an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois, which was adopted and it is now a part of the law, providing that there should be no limitation on the amount of a loan to any person or corporation by any bank, providing, of course, that the loan is guaranteed by the Government or some agency of the Government.

Have you given consideration to that amendment, Mr. Eccles?

Mr. ECCLES. Are you referring to the technical aspects of it?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I am talking about—suppose a bank had a capital stock of $250,000, could they, under this amendment, negotiate a loan for say $5,000,000 if it is guaranteed by the Government or some agency of the Government?

Mr. ECCLES. It would take the limit off. There is no limit to the amount of Government bonds, for instance, that a bank can buy. Its only limit is its supply of funds.

Mr. PATMAN. You mean there is no limit now?

Mr. ECCLES. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. This amendment did not cause that—it was already that way?

Mr. ECCLES. No; the difference is—there has been no question about direct obligations of governments. This was simply a case of recognizing the loans which were guaranteed as having the same status as a direct Government obligation.

HOW MONEY IS FURNISHED TO COMMERCIAL BANKS AND FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS TO BUY GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. Eccles testified before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House June 19, 1942, as follows—page 25 of the hearing on the bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act:

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Eccles, the day before yesterday I had gotten down to the point where, if we needed more money, one way to give the banks extra reserves to purchase Government bonds would be for the Open Market Committee to buy Government bonds in the open market, and I suggested if you bought for the Federal Reserve bank $1,000,000,000 worth of bonds, that would automatically create a billion dollars of reserves in the banks and, after the reserves had been reduced 50 percent, the maximum, that would enable the banks to purchase $50,000,000,000 worth of bonds. Now, let us assume that has happened——

Mr. ECCLES. Ten million dollars' worth, by the purchase of a billion dollars' worth of bonds in the market.

Mr. PATMAN. I got the two mixed up. The purchase of a billion dollars' worth of bonds in the market, after the excess reserves had been reduced, will enable the banks to buy ten billion?

Mr. ECCLES. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. Where the fifty billion came in was if you would automatically reduce the reserves now, which you have a right to do, that would give them $5,000,000,000 of excess reserves which they could use to purchase $50,000,000,000 worth of bonds.

Mr. ECCLES. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. Now let us assume that we not increase the reserves in the banks, and you go in the open market and buy a billion dollars' worth of bonds: You buy them with Federal Reserve money, do you not?

Mr. ECCLES. Well, we buy them with Federal Reserve credit.

Mr. PATMAN. I know; but suppose the banks call for the money, you issue Federal Reserve notes, do you not?

Mr. ECCLES. What we do, if we purchase Government securities in the market, is we credit the account of the bank that turns them in. They usually come through the banks.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. ECCLES. Even though they may be individuals who are selling the securities; and we debit the bond purchase account, showing that the Federal Reserve has a liability to the banks to the extent of $1,000,000,000, which represents their reserves on the one hand, and that they own $1,000,000,000 of bonds in what we call the portfolio, on the other hand.

Mr. PATMAN. I know in practice that is exactly the way it is done, Mr. Eccles; but suppose the banks want the billion dollars in currency, you would pay it in the Federal Reserve notes, would you not?

Mr. ECCLES. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. Those Federal Reserve notes, as we have often discussed, are obligations of the United States Government?

Mr. ECCLES. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. Then you use those Government obligations to buy interest-bearing Government obligations and you place them with the Federal Reserve banks, 12 of them?

Mr. ECCLES. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. And they would continue to receive interest on those Government obligations as long as they were outstanding?

Mr. ECCLES. That is right.

HOW FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS THROUGH OPEN MARKETS COMMITTEE INCREASE THE RESERVES OF COMMERCIAL BANKS TO BUY GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. Eccles testified before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House June 17, 1942, as follows—page 21 of the hearings on the bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act:

Mr. ECCLES. No; the Federal Reserve would buy in the open market. If the Federal Reserve then bought a billion dollars of securities in the open market that would be new Treasury issues. The banks would still hold them, and the Federal Reserve would put into the banks another billion of excess reserves. If they used that billion they could buy five billion more of Governments, and you could keep the price up. For every billion of the Federal Reserve banks put in the open-market operations, the private banks could buy five billion.

Mr. DEWEY. That comes pretty close to some other ideas I have heard.

Mr. ECCLES. I mean they could buy ten billion. I mean the Federal Reserve when it carries out an open-market operation, that is, if it purchases Government securities in the open market it puts new money into the banks which creates idle deposits.

Mr. DEWEY. There are no excess reserves to use for this purpose.

Mr. ECCLES. Whenever the Federal Reserve System buys Government securities in the open market or buys them direct from the Treasury, either one, that is what it does——

Mr. DEWEY. What are you going to use to buy them with?

Mr. ECCLES. What is who going to use?

Mr. DEWEY. The Federal Reserve bank to make these purchases.

Mr. ECCLES. What do they always use?

Mr. DEWEY. You are going to create credit?

Mr. ECCLES. That is all we have ever done. That is the way the Federal Reserve System operates. The Federal Reserve System creates money. It is a bank of issue.

OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE FURNISHES UNLIMITED MONEY FOR RESERVES

Mr. Allan Sproul is president of the New York Federal Reserve bank, which

is manager of the open-market system for the Federal Reserve System. January 18, 1943, he addressed the bankers of the State of New York, and stated:

Reserve banks are backing the commercial banks in investing to the limit the war financing.

And further it was said of his speech:

President of New York bank tells bankers of New York State that the Federals are here to save them from embarrassment if withdrawals reduce reserves.

In other words, the Federal Reserve System will continue to furnish all the money that the private banks need to pay their depositors in the event it is needed and they can purchase all the bonds they want to purchase with the assurance that the Government printing presses will protect them.

The Federal Reserve bank of New York is acting as the manager of the Federal Reserve's open-market system. This system is the most powerful factor in the money market in the United States. Washington authorities often do not know of important rules and regulations that the New York bank has put into effect until long afterward.

HOW BANK RESERVES MANIPULATED

In connection with the question of how excess reserves are manipulated in order to permit commercial banks to buy additional bonds, the following is quoted from the bulletin published by the National City Bank of New York, October 1942:

In order to provide the additional funds required, the Federal Reserve banks have bought over $1,000,000,000 of Government securities in the open market since April, and have twice reduced the percentages of required reserve against deposits of member banks in the central reserve cities of New York and Chicago. The latter action followed enactment of legislation in July authorizing the Reserve Board to reduce reserve requirements in these centers independently of reserve requirements for the rest of the country; and the reductions were confined to New York and Chicago by reason of the drain imposed upon those centers by the steady flow of funds to areas where war industries are located.

The first reduction, from 26 to 24 percent, against net demand deposits, came on August 20, and released approximately $345,000,000 of reserves in New York City, and $70,000,000 in Chicago. Within less than a month, on September 14, the second reduction, from 24 to 22 percent, was ordered, adding about the same amounts to excess reserves as in the first case. Despite these two actions to bolster reserves, on September 23 the "excess" totals in the two main financial centers were again approaching their earlier lows, while the total of slightly over $2,000,000,000 reported for all member banks was the lowest since 1938.

BANKS CAN BUY $480,000,000,000 OF GOVERNMENT BONDS

When Dr. E. A. Goldenweiser, Director of Research and Statistics of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, testified before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House on October 1, 1941, on the price-control bill, the following questions were asked and the following answers given—page 1358, volume 2 of the hearings:

Dr. GOLDENWEISER. The total reserves of the Federal Reserve are about twenty and one-half billion, not twenty-three billion.

Mr. PATMAN. I am talking about the total gold supply that is either owned by the United States Government or claimed by the Federal Reserve banks through the——

Dr. GOLDENWEISER. The amount of the stabilization fund is not available to the Federal Reserve.

Mr. PATMAN. No. But I am presuming that it will be available. That will be twenty-three billions?

Dr. GOLDENWEISER. All right.

Mr. PATMAN. That leaves sixteen billions unattached?

Dr. GOLDENWEISER. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. How much bonds could the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee buy in the United States, Government bonds, based upon that?

Dr. GOLDENWEISER. It depends on how much of it will be in deposits and how much in notes. But roughly speaking, about three to three and a half times.

Mr. PATMAN. Three and a half times?

Dr. GOLDENWEISER. No. Not three and a half times. From two and a half to three times.

Mr. PATMAN. That would be about $40,000,000,000?

Dr. GOLDENWEISER. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. When that money is paid out, suppose they pay it to the commercial banks, they could expand about 5 to 7 to 1 on that, couldn't they?

Dr. GOLDENWEISER. If they paid that much assessment.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; they would have the power to under the existing law?

Dr. GOLDENWEISER. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. That means that, say, an average of six times—that is about right now, isn't it—about six?

Dr. GOLDENWEISER. Approximately.

Mr. PATMAN. That means that they could inflate about $240,000,000,000 more?

Dr. GOLDENWEISER. That is right.

It will be noticed that the Federal Reserve banks and the commercial banks could expand their deposits sufficiently to purchase $240,000,000,000 worth of Government bonds at the time Dr. Goldenweiser testified. When the reserves are reduced to the limit that they can be reduced, these banks may purchase as much as $480,000,000,000 of Government bonds without having any more capital stock or assets than they now have, except, of course, as Mr. Eccles always adds, that they will have the Government bonds.

TAXPAYERS PAY FROM $2 TO $4 IN INTEREST ON EVERY DOLLAR BORROWED

The taxpayers have paid at least $4 for every dollar that was borrowed on the $1,000,000 now outstanding on the debt created during the War between the States, the tax-exempt conversion 3's. It is possible that the taxpayers will pay several dollars for each dollar borrowed before the debt is finally liquidated. In the hearings on the price-control bill in 1941, volume 2, commencing on page 1354, the following testimony appears:

Mr. Chairman, I desire to insert in the record two questions that I have submitted to Mr. Morgenthau, under date of February 4, 1941, and his answers under date of February 15, 1941.

The CHAIRMAN. They will be incorporated in the record.

Mr. PATMAN. I asked Secretary Morgenthau the following question:

"Your annual report for the year ending June 30, 1940, on page 730 discloses that there are outstanding now $758,945,800 in Treasury bonds that were issued October 16, 1922, and bearing 4½ percent interest. Please advise how much interest the Government will have paid on these bonds by October 15, 1947, and also by October 15, 1952."

Mr. Morgenthau's answer was as follows:

"The annual interest charge on the 759.9 million dollars of 4½-percent Treasury bonds of 1947–52 outstanding on June 30, 1940, is 32.3 million dollars. For the 25-year period from their date of issue to their first call date, October 15, 1947, the total interest payments with respect to the amount of bonds outstanding on June 30, 1940, would be about 806.4 million dollars; and for the 30-year period from date of issue to final maturity on October 15, 1952, would be about 967.7 million dollars."

Then I asked this question:

"On the same page of the same report it is disclosed that there are $49,800,000 of Panama Canal loan bonds outstanding, which were issued June 1, 1911, and are redeemable or payable June 1, 1961, with a rate of interest of 3 percent. Please advise how much interest has been paid on these bonds to date and how much will have been paid by June 1, 1961."

And his answer was:

"The annual interest charge on these 49.8 million dollars of 3-percent Panama Canal bonds of 1961 outstanding on June 30, 1940, is about 1.5 million dollars. For the 29½-year period from their date of issue to December 1, 1940, the total interest payments with respect to the amount of bonds outstanding on June 30, 1940, would be about $44,000,000; and for the 50-year period from date of issue to maturity on June 1, 1961, would be about $75,000,000."

It will be noticed that in each of the cases inquired about the interest charges will be considerably in excess of the principal amount borrowed. This is typical of long-term bonds. Almost invariably the taxpayers are compelled to pay more in interest than the amount of the principal on all long-term bonds, not only Federal but also States and cities. In the case of the Panama Canal bonds the taxpayers will be required to pay $75,000,000 in interest by the time the bonds are due and will then still owe the $49,800,000 originally borrowed. Other similar instances could be cited.

Address by Prof. Louis J. A. Mercier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a digest of an address delivered by Prof. Louis J. A. Mercier, of Harvard University, before the Hampden County Teachers Association of Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the digest of address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If the world has stumbled into unimaginable catastrophes, then in a broad sense the teachers of the world must have failed.

According to Irving Babbitt, who practically predicted some 30 years ago what is now happening to us, the teachers of the world were failing, because since Rousseau they had come to say that man was naturally good, that he could be encouraged to follow all the urges of his appetites, while, as a matter

of fact, his appetites are selfish and constantly tend to excess.

Nor can you rescue man from his natural selfishness, added Babbitt, by trying to give him the ideal of improving society except through the moral improvement of the individual, for only self-disciplined individuals can improve society.

DIVINE AND NATURAL LAW

In his analysis of the failure of our educators, Irving Babbitt did not mention God, but Walter Lippmann has. He did so in the last chapter of The Good Society, and he called that chapter Upon This Rock. That rock now for Walter Lippmann is faith in the existence of a personal God, of a reality, and a righteousness outside ourselves and antecedent to ourselves.

It implies that our lives and civilization are not to be shaped according to our selfish desires but according to divine law and to natural law, thus respecting the rights of all men that flow from their God-given nature.

As Mr. Lippmann expressed it: "It was in the recognition that there is in each man a final essence, that is to say an immortal soul, which only God can judge, that a limit was set upon the dominion of men over men * * * upon that rock men built the foundation of the good society."

Insofar, then, as we no longer recognize this dual reality; the antecedent abiding reality of God's righteousness, as well as the changing reality of the world, and no longer teach that the changing reality of the world must be made to conform to the abiding reality of the divine law, we have gone wrong on first principles.

The ultimate question, then, is: Have we really rejected widely as a philosophy of education this dualistic philosophy of God's righteousness and of the necessity of teaching our students to discipline themselves to the eternal laws of the moral order as well as to those of the physical world?

In all candor, we must recognize that we have certainly very widely done so. Our foremost philosopher of education has told us that "the faith in the divine author and authority in which western civilization confided * * * and inherited ideas of the soul and its destiny, have been made impossible for the cultivated mind of the western world," and we have very widely believed him, as we have generally believed our materialistic psychologists who also told us that we had no souls.

This new creed has never been better expressed than in a manifesto signed not only by this same foremost philosopher of education, but by others of our prominent educators which reads in part as follows: "The time has passed for deism and theism. The universe is self-existing and not created. Man is but a part of nature and has emerged as the result of a continuous process. The dualism of mind and body must be rejected. The highest ideal of man is the improvement of this life."

The only trouble with that ideal is that without an antecedent God, there can be no humanity. A social group can only be constituted by a common end. There can be an orchestra or a choir only if men and women conceive as their common end the production of more or less harmonious sounds. There can be a nation only if within a certain area people can discover at least one common end. If they don't, they will remain warring minor groups. But where can you find a common end big enough to constitute humanity, as a reality above all times and all places, save in a Being who is above all times and places? That Being can only be an abiding God.

Disown the idea of an abiding God as the Creator and the ultimate end of all men, and you can only have peoples in various times and places, each working for its own ends in terms of their own time and place. Hence, place must forever war against place, and time against time. Progress for the monistic, naturalistic philosophy of total change can only come from repudiations of the past, in the light of new and conflicting exigencies in different places.

What you inevitably must get from the atheistic philosophy of total change is not the improvement of humanity which cannot exist on the premises of that philosophy. What you must inevitably get from that philosophy is perpetual war. And that's precisely what we got.

What we got is Hitlerism, or rather nazi-ism, and nazi-ism is the wonderfully logical product of the philosophy we have been elaborating, and more and more living by, for the last hundred and fifty years. Insofar as we have not defended Christianity, or at least deism, in England, France, and the United States, insofar as we have become atheists, monists, immanentists, humanitarian naturalists, we have all contributed to the production of Hitler. For here we come to a most significant historical fact. The monistic immanentist philosophy from which the philosophy of our still most influential educational leaders sprang is of Germanic origin. It goes back to Hegel. The displacement not only of Christianity but of deism by the pantheistic and hence atheistic philosophy of Hegel was the great intellectual revolution of the early nineteenth century. It reached us through our growing contacts with German thought and universities, it merged with and strengthened the naturalistic conception of evolution after Darwin, it was stripped of some of its elaborations by our American practical sense, it eventuated into our pragmatism and experimentalism, but the upshot of it all was that thus following our most determined educational philosophers, direct or remote disciples of Hegel, we came to believe that constant change was the only reality, that an impersonal absolute was realizing itself in institutions and nations. Abandoning the idea of a God above men, their Creator and end, we came to believe that we are in turn the highest expression of whatever good there is. We made what we considered our social good our only good, created by our own efforts, according to our own desires.

We have remarkable proof of how completely we have become influenced by the philosophy of total change into believing that we are free to devise new moral codes to suit ourselves in the controversy about proposed legislation before this Commonwealth. This is not the place to discuss that issue, but some of the arguments already used in that controversy are to the point.

According to our public press, advocates of that legislation accused its opponents of making their objections "on moral grounds rather than on significant social grounds."

Kindly note the opposition set up in that sentence: Significant social grounds versus moral grounds—a presumed social expediency versus the moral law. That's exactly what Hitler says: "What I consider social expediency requires me to violate what you call moral principles."

The question that obtrudes at this point is: If the atheistic philosophy of total change has brought Europe to its downfall and to unprecedented moral degradation, how can we hope to rescue Europe from that degradation, or even to save ourselves, if we ourselves are permeated by and pay allegiance to the same philosophy?

RIGHT ABOUT FACE

The logical conclusion would seem to be: Insofar as American educators have capitulated to atheistic philosophies, then, unless they want to betray their country and the world, they must right about face.

In other words, we should now be able clearly to understand that there are two and only two ultimate alternatives of thought, the ultimate alternative of the philosophy of total change which denies an antecedent God and the contrary alternative which believes in God as the Creator of the universe.

There is no way of escaping the choice between these two alternatives. Not even agnosticism can do so practically. If we choose the first, we may, it is true, remain free to devise our own morality according to what we shall consider social expediency, but we now see to our dismay what the following of that alternative has led to: The lowest moral or rather immoral standards in the history of the west through the free development of normal appetites and of conflicting selfish wills to power. We deified ourselves and finally one race deified itself against the rest of us.

Why then should we not reexamine the possibilities of the other ultimate alternative of thought: The existence of a personal God, Creator of the universe? It is true that if we believe in God the Creator we are bound to try to discover, and we are bound to obey the laws of His creation. But we might at once recall with Mr. Lippmann that his faith in a personal God reinforced by Christianity was the foundation of western civilization, and that, whatever the failure of men to utilize it fully, it nevertheless raised the west from the uncertain morality of the Roman Empire and from the chaos of the barbarian invasions, and gave us the concepts of the dignity of every man and woman and of inalienable rights—while it took but some one hundred and fifty years for the contrary philosophy to bring us back to barbarism through moral anarchy.

To pronounce those words "inalienable rights" should remind us that faith in God the Creator was the foundation stone of our American democracy. The signers of the Declaration of Independence appealed to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of their intentions, and they inscribed in the same document that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.

INALIENABLE RIGHTS

The speeches of our Presidents, from Washington to Roosevelt, have continued to give us the doctrine that has made our strength as a nation and has safeguarded our liberties, the doctrine that God the Creator endowed man with intelligence and will, that He is our ultimate end, that hence we have duties toward ourselves, toward our neighbor, and toward Him as self-responsible persons, and that, as a consequence of these duties, we have inalienable rights against anyone or even against a majority, that we have inalienable rights against the state, to worship God and to obey the laws of His creation, the natural and the divine law. Therefore all peoples are entitled to a bill of rights, religion must be exempted from civil jurisdiction, we must learn to govern ourselves not according to our own selfish desires but according to the laws of God, and hence we have no right to pass laws against the eternal foundations of righteousness. We may not vote against God. Render unto Caesar what belongeth to Caesar and to God what belongeth to God. This, the makers of our Nation believed, is the only possible foundation of liberty and fraternity, of social progress, and of international peace.

We are thus confronted by the curious situation already alluded to that, insofar as our leading educators are committed to an atheistic philosophy of total change, and keep on telling us, as they must on their premises, that the American people's faith in a personal God, and in abiding righteousness in a fixed natural and divine law, are outmoded ways of thought, they are working directly to undermine the foundations of our American philosophy of life and government.

This I am, as much as you no doubt are, loathe to recognize, but there seems to be no help for it, except to give up logical thinking.

If there is no personal God, there can be no human person. If you merge God in nature, you must also merge man in nature. If a personal God is not the master, then impersonal men will be the slaves of the most ruthless. If there is no God's right, then some men's right will be the law.

As Mr. Lippmann puts it: "In the fury to explain men rationally, there was explained away all their essence which was their manhood. There remained only an organism which was born, was nourished, was stimulated, reproduced itself, was destined to fight, was consumed, and then died; there was only this passive being, determined by inheritance and circumstance, and therefore fit only to be manipulated and used. To the heresiarchs of the nineteenth century, the Hegelians, the Marxians, the pseudo-Darwinians, the destiny of this creature was manifest * * *. Having conceived man as a being without autonomy, they could not believe he had authentic purposes, inalienable rights, or binding obligations: insofar as he seemed to be purposeful, to claim rights, to perform duties, they had to explain his behavior as the rationalization of his appetites and his circumstances * * *. With man [thus] degraded to a bundle of conditioned reflexes, there was left no measure of anything in human affairs: all the landmarks of judgment were gone, and there remained only an aimless and turbulent moral relativity."

Whereupon Mr. Lippmann concludes, "this denial of the human soul was the perfect preparation for the revivals of tyranny."

LOGICAL CONSEQUENCES

In its materialistic form, it forces you to try to explain all psychological processes by brain modifications, all history by physical and economic pressures. It turns you away from even entertaining the possibility of spiritual realities, and it obliges you to dismiss a priori the historical data and the logical reasoning which may support them.

Hegelian pantheism and its offshoots would seem to be less restrictive. But by substituting the notion of becoming to the notion of being, they lead you to look upon all elements of past cultures as obsolete, and to think of studying only the experiences of the present that you may understand the wave of the future.

Hence, from this double aspect of the monistic or naturalistic outlook, the narrowly utilitarian trend in our education of the last 40 years. It disparaged the doctrine of transfer of training or of a general education, for how could there be a general development of intelligence when there was no mind but just a collection of material reflexes, or why should we study principles and standards when the new experience alone was said to count, and even that was changing? Hence, the constant pressure against the studies that had been held to have a disciplinary value and against the humanities, ancient and modern.

And yet it should be obvious that this cutting us off from all the great cultural and religious traditions can only eventuate in a suffocatingly narrow provincialism and a total incapacity for critical thought, since critical thought about our own time and place can only be developed through acquaintance with other times and places and modes of thought.

It should be clear that the slogan that education should be in terms of the pupil's environment is an enslaving doctrine. That's the slogan Hitler uses. On the contrary, education, no matter what else it must do to prepare youth to earn a living or to serve the Nation should free the pupil from his environment, lift him out of it, till he can judge it in the light of the experience of the race presented to him objectively, including the tradition of the natural and the divine law above all times and places which only the study of religion can give. Today we need technicians, but we need, no less, citizens capable of intelligent criticism.

American students have certainly the right to be initiated fully to their own tradition. It is certainly our duty to teach in American schools the American Bill of Rights. If so, it is also our duty to bring out that our Bill of Rights cannot intelligently be defended, and that the founding fathers of our Nation never pretended that it could be defended, without the assertion of the existence of God. That's merely part of the record.

What else can we do? That is evidently the greatest educational problem before us. In the classroom of a public institution, it would seem, no one has a right to take a stand theistic or atheistic, Protestant, Jewish, or Christian. A truly neutral school or college should present all doctrines objectively to its students, but it has no right to tell them to believe any, or even that it believes any.

If then logic and what has happened to the western world point out that the inalienable rights of man and our American ways of life cannot survive except through that faith in God the Creator which was at their source, then evidently the neutral school is practically incapable by itself of safeguarding our American institutions since it cannot teach religion.

NECESSARY PRECAUTIONS

But at least, the school and even more, the college needs to see to it that the dice are not loaded against their students, and to do so they must take the necessary precautions against the subtle atheistic and naturalistic indoctrination of their students by the textbooks used or by the teacher.

At once it may be objected that this would be an interference with the freedom of the teacher. The answer evidently is that in public institutions, the teacher has no right and should have no freedom to indoctrinate in philosophy or religion, and that, on the other hand, the student has rights against such indoctrination and that these rights should be jealously safeguarded.

In other words, the teacher has a right to his ultimate alternative of thought, theism or atheism, but he has no right in a public institution to use a course in science, education, literature, sociology, or history to preach theism or atheism, or any philosophical or religious doctrine.

If a teacher uses a course in science to tell our children that they have uncultivated minds if they believe in God, or a course in education to tell them that all their mental processes are like those of rats because they are wholly material, then, we have as parents the right to protest, and our children have the right to tell the teacher, in their own amiable jargon, that they think that he or she is "all wet" and still get an A for the course.

In any case it should be clear that the rights of the students can be safeguarded only by labeling courses properly. A course in atheism should not be labeled a course in evolution, or a course against Christianity a renaissance course, or a course in communism a course in economics.

Furthermore, the safeguarding of the rights of the students demands that, before the teacher puts a controversial book in their hands, he or she should tell them to what school of thought the author belongs and that books representative of all doctrines should be available. This means also that in the high school and in the introductory courses in college, where the work must be skimpy and rapid, only textbooks should be used which are written in such a way that all schools of thought can be satisfied with their objectivity and that, if this is impossible, textbooks on the survey in question written from the different points of view should be available.

All these precautions, however, can only safeguard our students from being indoctrinated with atheism and naturalism. But if we have the right to ask that in our public institutions our children shall not be indoctrinated in irreligion, the atheist and the naturalist have the right to ask that in the same public institutions their children shall not be indoctrinated in traditional religion or in a theistic philosophy.

FAITH THE FOUNDATION

Well, if faith in God is necessary as the only possible basis for the inalienable rights of man, if that faith is the foundation of our institutions and of our way of life, if the resolutions that you passed last year in your convention that "the development of man can be recognized as the major purpose of civilization" cannot be implemented without the recognition of a personal God, if President Roosevelt was right in saying that the maintenance of our democracy and of religion is all the same fight, and if, on the other hand, the neutral public school and college cannot teach religion, then again evidently American education must be readjusted. Not only must it insist more rigidly that the teachings of irreligion be kept out of the classroom but it must look to the church for help in safeguarding our Nation.

The problem then is that the public-school systems are not set up as opponents of the churches, as they have been in various countries, but that on the contrary, a way be found to make church and school complement each other, which means that, far from weaning our children from religion, the school and the college will encourage them to seek philosophical and religious teaching outside of their own walls.

NEED OF RELIGION

That our citizens have already begun to understand this need is clear from the fact that in New York, in our own State, and, no doubt, in others, provision has already been made not only to encourage but to facilitate such cooperation between the school, the home, and the church in line with our American tradition of the need of religion voiced by our Presidents from Washington, through Lincoln, to Roosevelt.

It may perhaps, therefore, not be too much to ask that we now give more generally our best thought to this needed readjustment of our education.

Anniversary of Sinking of the Battleship "Maine"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] on the anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Habana Harbor.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Forty-five years ago today, the people of the United States were startled by a news report carried under glaring headlines by every morning paper in the United States—a story somewhat comparable in the consternation it occasioned to the news, received on the 7th

of December 1941, of the assault upon our naval base and facilities at Pearl Harbor. The news story of 45 years ago informed the American people that our battleship the *Maine*, which had been riding at anchor in Habana Harbor, had been sunk by an explosion which destroyed the ship and all the officers and men on board to the number of 266. The story of this disaster and of the War with Spain which followed has been told hundreds and hundreds of times, and it would perhaps be pointless again to refer to it on this anniversary occasion were it not for the proofs which we receive through the months and the years that many of our citizens have a misconception of the Spanish-American War and its magnitude and are prone to dwarf the conflict and its results in comparison with other wars in which we have engaged. Because in the last few weeks I have had brought to my personal attention evidences of these misconceptions, even on the part of some of my colleagues in the Senate, I feel that I am justified once more in presenting some of the facts and circumstances surrounding this War with Spain, which may be new information or forgotten facts with some of the people of our Nation.

Immediately after the sinking of the *Maine*, a board of inquiry was instituted by the American Government and one by the Government of Spain for the purpose of determining the cause of the explosion which sank the battleship and the attendant great loss of life. The cause has never definitely been determined, but the weight of conclusion seems to be that the responsibility for the explosion should not be laid to the machinations of the Spanish Government. But whatever the cause and whatever the responsibility for the occurrence, the appalling catastrophe had the effect of definitely breaking the strained relations between the Government of Spain and that of the United States, which over a period of many years had reached the breaking point because of our indignation and consequent protest relative to the treatment and the abuse of the people of Cuba by the Spanish governmental regime.

It brought to naught all of the earnest efforts of our several Presidents to avoid an open break between the two countries, and resulted in a crystallization of determination on the part of the people of the United States that they could not and would not tolerate the tyrannical abuses of the privileges and liberties of an inoffensive people in the Western Hemisphere by the willful acts of a foreign government. Because of this determination a series of events immediately followed which culminated in a declaration of war on the 25th day of April 1898. On the 23d day of April 1898, the President of the United States issued a call for 125,000 volunteers. This call resulted in the most astounding demonstration of patriotic fervor that the world has ever seen. More than a million volunteers offered themselves in answer to the call—more than 8 times those needed to fill the request. The quota could have been filled entirely by former veterans of the Civil War because more than 100,000 of these veterans of the sixties volunteered in answer to the call. Thousands of men and sons of men who had fought under Grant, Sheridan, and Meade, and thousands of men and sons of men who had fought under Lee, Stuart, and Johnston, entered the service. Again in the following May, a second call for 75,000 troops brought out as astonishing a response in the way of volunteers offering freely their services.

It has been well said that this army which fought the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection, which immediately followed, was the only 100 percent volunteer army that the world has ever known. Never before in the world's history, and never since, has an army been created for the conduct of a war composed in its entirety of those who freely volunteered for the service.

It has also been well said that the war which followed was the only war in history that paid dividends and brought a financial return in excess of the moneys expended. Although the war was not fought for the purpose of aggression or acquisition of territory, the fact remains that the monetary returns to the United States far exceeded the expenditures for the conduct of the war.

A few further facts might well be cited which will be of interest in connection with this anniversary occasion and which can be classed as beneficial results from the Spanish War contest. It was responsible for the building of the Panama Canal. To it can be credited the passage of our first National Defense Act. It brought about the researches which abolished yellow fever and similar destructive diseases. It united the North and the South and cemented these sections into one great people, united under one glorious flag. It furnished every commander in the World War from the commander in chief on down. The war was fought with poor equipment, shameful food, antiquated guns, and black powder. It brought about the improvement in maintenance of the Army and the Navy, and the formation of a standing Army through training camps. It marked the industrial reconstruction of the South, and it taught the lesson of the unpreparedness which often claims more lives than the war itself. It resulted in the United States taking its place at the head of the table in the concert of nations. It marked the rebirth of a nation. It taught us lessons in sanitation and disease control which, doubtless saved hundreds of thousands of lives during the World War of 1917, and which are utilized every day in our present war involvement.

Are there those who still say that it was a trivial affair? Allow me to quote some further figures which may be illuminating:

Four hundred and fifty-eight thousand men were engaged in this conflict, including the Philippine Insurrection, and exceeded in number those engaged in the Revolutionary War, the Mexican War, or the War of 1812. The average length of service was 14 months, as compared with 9 months for the World War and 11 months for the Civil War.

Are there those who say that there were no great battles fought? They might be interested in the fact that the loss in death from all causes in the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection was 4.3 percent of those engaged in the service, or six times as large a percentage of death losses as pertained to the World War and seven times the death percentage of loss pertaining to the Civil War.

It might not be amiss to refer to some points of comparison of conditions of service during and after the Spanish-American War and comparable conditions of service during the World War of 1917. As one who served in both conflicts, I had some opportunity to observe the conditions and to make comparisons. The private of the World War drew $30 per month, in the Spanish War he drew $15.60 per month. In the World War the soldier was surrounded and protected by every resource that studies in sanitation and medical protection had developed. Typhoid fever was practically unknown. During the Spanish War in Camp Thomas at Chickamauga Park more than 25 percent of the men in the first and third Army Corps were victims of typhoid fever alone. I vividly recall one occasion at that camp where the company with which I served, composed of 120 men, turned out on one occasion with but 11 men fit for duty as the result of illness. During the service of the World War soldier, he was given the protection for his dependents of a $10,000 policy of insurance. The Spanish War soldier had no such protection or security. When the World War soldier was discharged he received a bonus of $60, the Spanish War soldier received nothing. Most of the States in the years following the World War voted a special bonus for the service men, but none whatever was voted for the Spanish War veterans. The Congress of the United States provided for an adjusted compensation payment at the rate of $1 a day for home service and $1.25 per day for foreign service of the World War veteran, the Spanish War veteran received nothing. For more than 20 years no provision whatever was made for these men who served in the Spanish-American War. No vocational training or no hospitalization was made available for these men until 1922—24 years after the war was over.

Another interesting comparison might be made in the way of benefits provided for the men of these two services, which is afforded by the difficulties of making proof required for participation in pensions and other benefits. After the enactment of the so-called Economy Act of 1933, boards were set up to determine the service-connected cases of applicants for pensions and other benefits who desired to trace their incapacities to their war service. Remember that the Spanish-American War veteran had practically no hospital records available; thousands of his comrades were dead; and 35 years had then elapsed since his service. These service boards examined 51,000 cases of World War veterans at the rate of about 8 per day, and found more than 41 percent of the cases service-connected. Cases of applicants from the Spanish War service were considered at the rate of 1,200 per day, and out of the entire list of applicants only a trifle better than 2 percent were found service-connected. Certainly never in the history of this country of ours has an army of its soldiers been as ruthlessly treated as these Spanish War comrades of mine. I do not make the charge that this was intentionally done. I know that everyone in the United States is ready, willing, and anxious to see that every fair treatment is accorded to every ex-service man that is justified by the service which he rendered. But the fact remains that, because of the failure to compare properly the relative services that have been rendered by these veterans of our various wars, the tendency is to classify them all alike without knowing or understanding the conditions surrounding the sacrifices which they made for our Nation and her interests. These men average today probably better than 67 years of age. They are crippled and infirm in thousands of cases, and unable to make proper proof of service connection for their disabilities through no fault of their own. They have lacked cohesion, as well as desire, to constitute themselves as a potent political force. Survey made by the National Tribune 3 years ago showed that these men were passing at the rate of about 22 each and every day, and, of course, that rate of loss has been and will be accelerated as the years go on.

I did not seek recognition today for the principal purpose of complaining of the treatment of the Spanish War veteran. I wanted to pay something of tribute to these men by recounting a few facts relating to their service and some of the values which resulted from their sacrifices. "Remember the *Maine*" was as potent a slogan then as "Remember Pearl Harbor" is today. The distressed cry and the prayers of the poor, starving Cubans were heard by these men, and the yoke of foreign tyranny was broken forever over the republics of the Western Hemisphere. These men were actuated only by an unselfish desire to aid humanity. Their courageous spirit and sacrifice blessed millions of men, women, and children in Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and throughout the Western Hemisphere. Their joint service wiped out sectionalism and furnished the final healing for the wounds of civil strife in their own land. The unselfish sacrifice made in aid and assistance to the Cubans, together with the

Nation's attitude toward the former Spanish territories of the Atlantic and Pacific areas after the Spanish-American War, furnished the cement for building of the structure of pan-Americanism, which is such a potent factor in our hemispheric solidarity in the war effort of today. The Spanish-American War veteran has not asked and will not ask reward for his service other than equality of treatment with the other fine Americans who have served and are serving their country, and a fair comparison of his service with theirs.

The Survival of Representative Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

February 1, 1943

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address on the subject The Survival of Representative Democracy, delivered by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] at the fifty-seventh annual dinner of the National Republican Club, in New York City, February 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, as Republicans, are here tonight to honor Abraham Lincoln, one of the founders of the Republican Party and the savior of the Union.

The Republican Party, for more than fourscore years, has lived by principle and not by temporary expediency. Lincoln, the first Republican President, set that standard from which our ablest and most respected leadership has never deviated. Lincoln believed that a wise and good Providence gave us the opportunity to be a free and united people—strong in the right as God gives us to see the right. The same God, if we now accept His guidance, will enable us to make safe and continue our heritage of freedom.

That Lincoln would have been in favor of crushing our foreign foes so they never again could challenge and threaten the cause of freemen should be clear to every American. He would know, as we must know, that the great objective abroad cannot be accomplished unless we preserve our fundamental principles of freedom and of a representative republican government at home. The two things are so interwoven they cannot be separated. Without the preservation of these principles, there can be no real victory in this war.

Abraham Lincoln's life gives us evidence of the opportunity for development and accomplishment available to all born in this land of ours. Here was one of the lowliest citizens who, through his own efforts under our republican form of government, reached as high a pinnacle of leadership and fame as has come to the lot of any man. In a land such as ours, where neither aristocracy of birth nor an aristocracy of wealth monopolizes the opportunities for service, such a person as Lincoln comes to us as a gift from God in a crucial hour of the Nation. Lincoln sought and received supreme guidance and exercised it humbly for his fellow men, the little people of his country, from whom he sprang.

Lincoln exemplified the ideal American citizen through his philosophy and doctrine of fair opportunity, hard work, accomplishment, thrift, and belief in the protection of property in the hands of those who legally acquired it.

He never permitted bitterness or hatred to enter his mind. He had no vindictiveness and possessed the quality of self-abnegation—so essential to accomplish any worth-while objective.

He appointed to the Supreme Court those who had criticized him. He selected for his Cabinet able men who had openly ridiculed him. He never showed the slightest signs of permitting politics to affect his judgment, appointments, or actions as Chief Executive and servant of the people. He did not reject masterly talents for partisan reasons.

Lincoln never pitted class against class for political or any other purpose. He tried to build unity and not only preserve the Nation as a group of States, but as a unified people who understood one another and had a common purpose and objective. He said, "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right" and he never deviated from that ideal, no matter what the temptation.

When Lincoln said "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," he meant a representative government in which every element in our population is represented by an elective process. He knew that no single group in our Nation must gain control for its own benefit and at the expense of the rest of the people—whether it be organized labor, organized business, organized farmers, organized bureaucracy, or a monopolistic political party.

Lincoln never lost faith in the ultimate common sense of the common people. His faith in them has been vindicated many times in our history and one of the most heartening indications of the power of public opinion as it is allowed to express itself in a representative democracy has been clearly observed in our Nation on and since November 3, 1942.

In the interest of every man and woman of this country, the Republican Party must dedicate itself to the preservation of free enterprise and free institutions that fit within the bounds of our republican form of government.

We must remember that government is presumed to be permanent, while the administration of government is presumed to be only temporary. Government can be permanent only if the people understand it and are determined to preserve it through courageous action and intelligent choice of their representatives—representatives who believe in the existing form of government and the established way provided for amendments and changes therein—representatives who believe that the safety of the country and the security of the people are more important than the speed of achieving a particular program.

But when we speak of the Republican Party as leading our people on to a restoration of their constitutional rights, we owe a deep obligation to the people of the United States to enlighten them honestly and fairly on the issues before the Nation and the objectives of the party. We are not merely opponents, we are constructive advocates of an American political philosophy.

We should make clear that the Republican Party does not stand for the repeal of constructive legislation which is in the interest of the people.

The Republican Party must reestablish the fact that the Government is the servant of the people and support Lincoln's theory that—

"The legitimate function of government is to do for a community of people whatever ought to be done but which they cannot do for themselves at all or cannot do so well in their separate and individual capacities; but in whatever the individual can do for himself, the Government ought never to interfere."

In our objective for complete victory, the Republican Party must support every measure proper and necessary to win the war. The United States must make its full contribution, but with the idealistic we must couple the practical. As a nation of freemen we must not make promises beyond our powers to fulfill. Greater enemies are made through failure to keep a covenant than failure to make a covenant. While creating friendly relations abroad, let us be certain to preserve them at home.

This war involves 135,000,000 Americans, and we cannot permit it to become the war of any one political party.

The Republican Party must recognize every just and humane obligation to those in the armed forces—both now and after war.

It must recognize the obligation to the aged and incapacitated who are unable to care for themselves.

It must recognize that the American conception is liberty under law. Free enterprise represents liberty at work—not to do as it pleases, but free to exercise its creative energy, subject only to such reasonable restraint as is necessary to secure like liberty and opportunity for all.

All appreciate that restraints and restrictions, of necessity, increase during war, but the people's representatives in Congress should clearly protect the people in the law which creates the restriction by establishing therein a date when the restriction will end or be reconsidered by the representatives of the people then in Congress.

If these principles are supported, they will permit all sound-minded and able-bodied citizens to earn a decent living through the performance of their full part under our American system.

Labor, capital and every citizen of sound body and mind must be prepared, during this time of crisis, to work without complaint on some basis that is fairly relative to what our boys at the front are doing. The work of all must be done without expectation of premium wages or premium profits, so as to support a sound economic structure and keep faith with those who are contributing their lives to the common good.

In this desperate hour, let labor leader, management and capital carefully weigh the consequences of their every act. Let each so conduct himself as to make certain the preservation of individual freedom and opportunity. Each of the 50,000,000 people in this country who work for a living is entitled, under the law, to free choice of union or none at all; and each is presumed to be of equal dignity in the sight of the law and entitled to the same protection under the law.

Let both labor and capital remember that if they destroy our free system there is no place for any of us to work—except for the State.

The Republican Party should help the people to differentiate between false leaders and fair leaders in labor, business, industry, and politics.

I urge the leaders of the Republican Party to remember that with every increased power received from the people as their chosen representatives, we must accept increased responsibility—and accept it as Lincoln did—in humility. Our purpose must be honest; our objective, fair service to the people; and our determination to serve those who opposed us as well as those who supported us, must be as enduring as our tenure of office.

The mandate of November 3 was an order from the sovereign people of our Nation to win the war and a sound, just and enduring peace, preserving at the same time our form

of government and our rights as a free people.

They want an intelligent and efficient conduct of the war and the domestic affairs of the people, having in mind the preservation of the lives of our men, the property of the people, and the civilian business in every way possible under the exigencies of war.

Just as the judicial branch of our Government should keep the legislative branch within the Constitution, so the legislative branch of our Government should prevent the administrative branch from doing, through its multivarious bureaus and agencies, things which break the mainspring of our economic system. Congress must be ever alert that no agency of the Government circumvents the will and desire of the people as expressed by the Congress.

It is not within the realm of probability that a nation the size of ours and possessing knowledge, inventive genius, great resources, and strength, should be destroyed by forces outside our boundaries—unless we, ourselves, through the abandonment of principle and the creation of disunity, lay the groundwork for decadence and destruction.

Lincoln had this in mind when he said, "as a nation of free men we must live through all time or die by suicide."

Liberty remains only with the vigilant—not with the slothful. The marvelous accomplishments of our people can endure only if we immediately do the necessary things to preserve individual freedom. Only vigorous action on our part now will change the course of our ship of state, which I believe is headed straight for state socialism. I, for one, feel that the course we are following is against the interest of every group of the American family and, therefore, against the interest of those throughout the world who would be free and happy.

Our responsibility at home is to prevent any internal condition, either intentionally conceived or carelessly developed through lack of practical wisdom, to grow up amongst us and defeat the objectives of American freedom, to preserve which our armed forces are giving their lives. We must not betray these millions of boys in uniform who are fighting to defend this freedom.

This is our sacred duty in this crucial hour of the Nation and the world. We must not fail.

Power for War, Power for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MON C. WALLGREN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in the Municipal Auditorium at St. Louis, Mo., on January 20 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You and I, as public officials operating power enterprises, are told that public business is inefficient and incompetent. It is charged that public power is "political." We are assured that public power cannot succeed. But none of us is doing badly, as our critics would see if they went to the trouble to examine the record.

I admit that I take a certain satisfaction on such occasions as this in recounting the facts that give the lie to those who attack us. Let us see what the record discloses on the subject of public power. Let us start with what you have done.

The Rural Electrification Administration has loaned to your cooperatives $360,000,000, a good round sum that is soundly invested in electric systems that carry power to more than a million rural homes and farms in all parts of the land. Your cooperatives have been paying the interest and principal on this investment, which represents neither fitful gusts of wind nor murky water, and when your debt to the Government is repaid you, the customers, will own your systems. You have already repaid $24,000,000 in accrued interest and principal and more than $7,000,000 additional on principal in advance of the due date. Your consumers will not be required to pay, over and over again in high monthly power bills, the investment that the Government has helped you to make. You cooperatives follow the sound business principle of paying off your indebtedness and thus bringing down your rates. This proper practice has not generally been followed in the utility business. On the contrary, under the goading of their holding company taskmasters, many of the private electric operating companies have piled debt upon debt, preferred stock upon bonds, prior preference stock upon this or that, like a tower of Babel, vainly reaching for the stars. Nothing could better illustrate the wide difference between an operation for the public good, as compared with one for the maximum private profit.

Your millions of customers own and control your systems. They devote the time and effort necessary to bring the advantages of electric power to their homes and farms. You cooperatives, with your simple and natural relationship to a wise and beneficent Federal program, are not and cannot be deterred by distant money changers erecting a towering mountain of holding companies upon your shoulders. Consumers will never be required to pay power bills that include, over and over again, the cost of the operations of monopolistic corporations that gorge upon each other with never-sated appetite.

The bills that your customer-members pay represent the actual cost of the service provided. You are constantly bringing that cost down because you are not requiring them to pay on inflated capital accounts. Only 6 weeks ago the Federal Power Commission reported that more than $1,000,000,000 in write-ups and other excess charges have been found in the plant accounts of certain electric utility companies. In 64 cases examined by the staff of the Commission there were found alleged costs in excess of 30 percent over original expenses, most of the increase consisting of write-ups—wind from caves where water constantly trickles. This is in striking contrast to the Government's sound investment in you cooperatives.

Your notable accomplishment in the distribution of power to farms is paralleled by that of other public agencies. For example, my Department of the Interior has power plants which are today producing at the rate of 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. These operations brought in to the Government revenues of $21,000,000 last year. From each of these projects the public has received a full measure of value. I am understandably proud of the financial record of the great low-cost power producing plants that we have built.

I am fully aware that, in discussing their monetary value to the Government, I am far from making an appraisal of their real worth. Not only do these power projects return the money that we have invested in them, they make possible the saving of millions of dollars to the consumers. They represent new opportunities for small, decentralized business enterprises based on low-cost electric power. Finally, they have proved to be one of the great buttresses of our war-production program. You and I have made some jealousy-breeding records in the running of public power systems. We have done the job efficiently, competently, and successfully.

Now, how about that charge of politics? We are all able to meet together freely here in St. Louis. None of us is in jail. None of us has been mixed up with anything resembling the odious Union Electric Co. scandal that is of particular interest here in St. Louis. That was a dime-novel thriller that did not happen in the muck-raking days of the turn of the century, nor even in the slap-happy heyday of the late 1920's. This sordid tale of slush funds, prehensile-fingered corporate gangsterism and dirty political legerdemain on the part of a private power company has not even yet drawn to its final conclusion.

Here was a case of the criminal detouring of corporation funds that had been extracted from the users of electricity and shepherded into a political slush fund by way of kickbacks, rebates, padded expense accounts, legal costs, and other improper practices. This slush fund of hundreds of thousands of dollars was used in an effort to influence public opinion and the decisions of public officials. Simply stated, the offense was an "attempt to undermine the foundations of democratic institutions." This is not my charge nor is it my language. It was the considered statement of the judge in closing the case against a pair of the luminous local boys less than a year ago. I hope that the vigorous action taken in this case by a Government devoted to the common good will effectively end such piratical practices on the part of utility companies.

This might be a good time for me to explain my much misunderstood or, it might be better to say, greatly misrepresented, position on the question of power—public and private. I believe, as I always have, in the American system of free enterprise. I want for every man and every corporation a "fair field and no favor." I hate special privilege with a particular hatred. I believe in the equality that was preached by Thomas Jefferson—that is, equality of opportunity under the law. I believe in the square deal of Theodore Roosevelt. I fought for that square deal.

Bigness of itself does not disturb me. I can conceive of particular businesses and of special instances where it is more economical and more efficient, and therefore for the public welfare, to operate in big units. The lowering of costs to the lowest point possible consistent with rendering good service and earning a reasonable profit ought to be the objective of every straight-shooting utility, public or private.

This is where the public comes in. When monopolistic practices are in effect, and when the objective of the corporate managers is to give us an economy of scarcity instead of an economy of plenty so that the fewer goods or services supplied will bring larger prices, which will mean less work and higher profits, then the public not only has the right to step in—it would be derelict in its duty if it failed to do so The Government had to do it when the railroads of the country were riding high, wide, and handsome, bribing legislatures, corrupting public officials, and scattering passes with a benevolence that put Santa Claus to shame. I can also remember the days of telegraph and telephone franks.

We once had a Governor in Illinois who, upon his induction into office, franked, by

express, his cow from his home town to the State capital. None of these corporate practices was willingly surrendered by the offending public utility. It was the long overdue, but much derided, granger movement that brought about a sense of decency and forced a public outlook on the part of various corporate enterprises that they would never themselves have thought of. Ask any railroad man whether he would go back to the riotous and reckless days before we began to exercise interstate railroad regulation and he will honestly and in a voice of relief say "No."

Then came the newly discovered wonder—electricity. If the enterpreneurs of this new source of power and light had read their corporate history and had been willing to profit by it; if they had been satisfied to render good and abundant service at the lowest possible cost, including that reasonable profit to which no one denies that they were entitled, there would not have arisen the conflict that exists today as between public and private power.

I have strong convictions about the misuse of corporate power. The thought of the dirty money of any individual or corporation being used to bribe our city councils and our legislatures, or to deflect an administrative officer from the straight path of his sworn duty to the people has made some of us see red.

And so, as in the granger days, you cooperatives and other groups of public-power-minded people have undertaken to see to it that you are supplied with cheap power—unbribing and unbribable. And if this means Federal hydroelectric projects, as in the Tennessee Valley and as at Boulder and Shasta and Bonneville and Grand Coulee and a dozen other places that I could name, then it means just that.

I have said on occasion, in discussing this subject that, other things being equal, any community is justified in pursuing a program of public ownership of power if only to keep the corrupting hands of the private utilities out of its political affairs. While a low cost is important, especially to people in the lower income brackets, the purity of our politics is of even greater concern.

For the last year or so I have been particularly interested in, and amused by, the effort on the part of some of the private utility companies to pose as pure little independent American businesses. If they could, they would make the public forget all that it knows only too well about the reckless way in which the power game has been played. This noble effort finds expression in a series of advertisements in magazines that are both well manicured and well pedicured—or should I say, "well heeled?" Each is signed with passionate anonymity, by, I quote, "Electric companies all producing power for America under American business management."

The burden of these messages is that the companies footing the bills and their cute little brothers and sisters are paying all of our taxes, doing our household chores, providing the know-how, producing all of our war materials, reducing our living costs, winning the war, and even, if I am not mistaken, generously heaping two scoops of creamy lusciousness into every cone where there was only one before.

It would appear to the casual reader of this series of display advertisements (paid for out of excess rates collected from the customers) that the unsigned—and undoubtedly modest—signatory companies have the situation well in hand so that the President might relax, all other businesses stop worrying, the governmental agencies fold up, Congress go home, and the Army and Navy disband. All is well with the world while the private utilities voluntarily and selflessly stand on guard to protect, at whatever cost to themselves, every conceivable freedom, including the one of charging more for electric current than it is worth.

Neither you nor I will object to a bit of advertising and the more humorous it is the better. None of us will take exception to the flamboyant art of the advertising copywriter. But this series harks back to the palmiest days of the patent-medicine cure-all. One might suppose that these electric companies had provided all of the capacity now being used to care for the Nation's well-being, as well as for its tremendous war needs. At the very least, one might imagine that these utilities had pushed eagerly forward, if indeed they were not solely responsible for, those increases in the Nation's electric-power capacity that are making possible the present war production program. If they did not actually build Tennessee Valley Authority, Bonneville, and Coulee, or any of the many other power plants constructed under the Federal Public Works program, the casual reader of these self-glorifying utterances would be justified in thinking that these modest compositors of advertising copy cannot possibly be the same men who stigmatized these projects as "white elephants," a "scandalous waste of public money," "useless structures."

Not only do these shy and self-effacing advertisers claim to have provided the electric power necessary for the war, they take all of the credit for bringing down the cost of electricity to the consumer. Indeed, they claim to have cut the cost of electricity in half during the last 15 years. You and I know that you cooperatives have reduced by 50 percent the farmers' electric bill since 1935. You also know that these reductions came about in two ways. Under public pressure the companies from time to time grudgingly, and in a niggardly manner, lowered the rates. But the great reductions were made because public power projects proved beyond cavil that electricity could be produced and sold at prices substantially under the gouging rates of the private companies.

As men who believe in public power, we have many things in common. One of them is the problem of determining what a public-power man is. I have often been called a public-power man. Sometimes the appellation has been spat out as an epithet; sometimes it is spoken in praise. If a public-power man is a public official who believes in publicly owned power facilities administered in such a way as to make abundant supplies of power available to the people at the lowest possible cost, then, indeed, I am one, and proud to be, particularly since that label puts me in the company of George W. Norris and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I am proud of the fact that a report of the National Power Policy Committee, made in 1934, under my chairmanship, helped to lay the foundation of this great rural electrification movement, and that it was this same committee which helped to frame the legislation that, at long last, put a checkrein on the holding-company giants. I am happy, too, that your Administrator is my good friend Harry Slattery, who for a long time was a member of my official family.

As I have already indicated, I do not believe in public power as an end in itself. I look upon it as a means to the end of getting power to the ultimate consumer at the least possible cost to him. I insist, too, that public-power agencies particularly need to be administered properly. They must be vigilant in their protection of the public interest. I have no more use for or patience with public-power administrators whose principal interest and concern are to enhance themselves politically than I have for the private-power gentry who, above all other things, seek to pile up fortunes. No one is fit to have place or power in the electric industry—publicly or privately owned—who is not imbued with the idea that his first and constant duty is to the public—a duty the accomplishment of which means good service and low rates.

Just as I deprecate the malign influence of many of our private utilities in local, State, and national politics, I believe also that public power must prove its case and its right to survive. Its sole interest must be the betterment of country, which means the public. It must prove its soundness to the investor, who again is the public. It must prove its case to the consumer, who is the public once more.

In the generation of power, public agencies should have a passion for the conservation and wise utilization of our national resources. The public hydroelectric plants should not be designed, as are the private ones, merely to capture water power; rather they should seek the maximum benefits from all of the multiple purposes which our water resources can be made to serve. In the arid regions, power dams that do not well serve the needs of irrigation when they can be made to do so, are wasteful of our national wealth even though they capture energy. Power dams on dangerous streams that do nothing to reduce the flood losses downstream may actually perpetuate the danger in which people live, since they frequently occupy choice sites for reservoirs. Since the private companies cannot market flood control over their wires, this benefit can only be secured by the public project.

The producers, wholesalers, and distributors of public power have met the challenge of the war. The role of our giant power plants and our transmission networks has been a major one. We have overloaded our generators and strained our systems to meet the tremendous demands of the war programs. The farms that we have electrified are meeting the shock of war and its consequent labor shortages and have continued to increase production for our armies, our Allies, and ourselves. Public power agencies have shouldered their guns as have all of us. And as we march to victory we look forward to the power age that we are molding, when the latent resources of our Nation will be unlocked by low-cost power and the many regions of this country will be developed to their fullest for the benefit of their people.

There are those who would use our present common danger selfishly to turn back from their ultimate goal the programs and the policies that the people have developed. It would be convenient if the people could be made to believe that help to the farmer and to the labor could be forgotten, that social security legislation could be put on the shelf, and our power programs scuttled. I insist that our fight against fascism abroad is a curiously ironic excuse for failing to strive for a better world for our people here at home. We must continue with our public power programs and our other efforts to assure ourselves a post-war world fit for our children.

It is not too early to begin to think of that post-war world. There are those who are suspiciously vociferous in their insistence that we win the war before we begin to prepare for the peace. Well, we refused to think of this war even when we saw it coming and that should have taught us the unforgettable lesson that a lack of preparedness to cope with an impending danger is not only foolish, but costly. I insist that it would be just as foolish and costly not to prepare for the peace as it was to shut our eyes so tightly as we did before Munich. Name me the man who is anxious that we should not prepare for the peace and I will name you one who does not believe in the four freedoms but only in the one freedom—the right of concentrated wealth to get a tighter grab upon the economy of the country and thereby bend to its will your children and mine.

Let no one be so careless as to feel at ease in the belief that such men have only one interest, and that is the winning of the war. They don't want you and me to think of the coming peace or to discuss any of its

possible terms, but they themselves are more concerned about the peace than they are the war. Theirs is a selfish patriotism, the patriotism of money that is without allegiance or loyalty. There lower over the country the threatening shadows of those who would take advantage of your absorption in your loving task of saving for your children the liberties that your fathers handed down to you—sinister shadows of great and powerful interests that will leave nothing undone to return this country to the status quo ante—a status quo ante in which the dictatorship of wealth will rival the dictators whom we are about to crush.

If the ultimate result of our enormous sacrifices in this war shall be to solidify the hold of the monopolists upon this country with their belief in an economy of scarcity; if, flowing from the war, there shall be a renewal of the system of international cartelization—if these are the things that we are sweating for and crying for and shedding our blood for, then my advice to you would be to seek an immediate peace with the enemy. Such a peace as these gentry would impose upon you would be no peace at all. It would be merely an interlude before another war, in which your children would have to stake everything unless, incredibly, they lacked the stamina to fight against a financial and social bondage more cruel than that of Hitler himself. You can take it from me that the irreconcilable private-power interests are no less busy than are other monopolists and cartelists in preparing for their sort of a peace. They are wrapping their transmission lines tightly about our economy, so that when peace comes those who now so eloquently admonish us not to think of peace until the war has been won will have us in their toils and we will never be able to disentangle ourselves, except by a social convulsion that will shake this country as it has never been shaken to this day. There is no difference, ultimately, between an economy dictated by Hitler and one imposed by concentrated wealth.

Those who cry against the efforts of the people to protect their interests through their Government and say, "Leave it all to us," are the same ones who dragged us into the black pit of isolationism after the last war and perpetrated the collapsible prosperity of the twenties. I say to them that the American people will not leave it to them. We are not fighting this war in order to set the stage for another depression here at home or for another inevitable war throughout the world. We must see to it that our great public-power projects that are saving lives now by shortening the war will, when peace comes, play an equally important role in our reconstruction. These enterprises that we have launched belong to the people and they must do the job that the people want done. We are not fighting to spread the "four freedoms" abroad and to preserve want and despair for Americans alone.

Control by the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon before the Republican Lincoln Day banquet at Omaha, Nebr., on the evening of February 12, 1943. The subject of the address is "Control by the People."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to have the pleasure of meeting with the Republicans of Omaha.

We are assembled to pay tribute to those liberal, common-sense traditions of Lincoln—the sad war President—which have been an ever-present influence in our party.

In fact, our liberal traditions have been so much our objective that the party has split wide open on several occasions. But in the end, after testing and working out the bugs, most of the progressive platform of 1912, and back of it, most of the populist platform eventually were written into the Republican platform and Republican legislation.

We are being compelled to fight on two fronts—one a global war, the other a Nazi bureaucratic war. Instead of a leadership uniting us with "an eye single to the task" on the war front, we have a bureaucratic leadership in Washington obviously thirsting for power and just as obviously determined to establish a permanent control of our lives thus creating a second front at home.

It is obvious that we must have a certain amount of rationing and a certain amount of Government control over industry, labor, and agriculture as long as the war lasts.

I do not propose to cast any clods on the essential program of war controls. No real American has any desire to jeopardize the war efforts. Rather we desire to stimulate them. Obviously, criticism has been very helpful and can still be helpful.

But after all we must carry on the democratic processes in war as in peace. We must keep alive in the minds of the American people a respect for and a desire to continue our Republic and our free economic system which is the basis of the Republic.

So what might seem a mere partisan blanket attack is really an effort to spur a win-the-war policy; and, second, to meet the issue that the three great farm organizations described as "under the guise of the war effort a social revolution is being perpetrated on the American people."

The nonpartisan character of that dominating issue is further illustrated by the speeches last week of two great Americans—HATTON SUMNERS, of Texas, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and Senator GILLETTE, the courageous and able Democratic Senator from Iowa—both appealed to the American people to arise to a win-the-war-first program and bring the Government back to the people. SUMNERS referred to the New Deal bureaucrats as "a bunch of crackpots," and GILLETTE described them as "hordes of locusts living off the people through agencies that aren't necessary."

According to both of those able statesmen, the people have had little voice in the administration in Washington in recent years.

Today the Democratic Party is going through the same experience we Republicans did in 1910, 1912, and 1914. Even in 1916 Woodrow Wilson was elected for the second term by reason of the effects of strife that had been raging in the Republican Party.

In 1936 a split started in the Democratic Party. Thousands of real Democrats, in the name of party loyalty, could no longer accept the evident trend toward the state socialism of Hitler's early days. In fact, many of those who supported Mr. Roosevelt did so in the belief that his second term would reverse that trend, but they realize now that only defeat by the people will stop him.

In fact, the Republican Party in the last few years has been more or less a coalition party just as it was in 1896, and even in 1860 with the election of Lincoln. In 1942 a delegate to the 1940 Democratic National Convention was elected on the Republican ticket as United States Senator from Oklahoma.

Nineteen hundred and forty-three finds the Democratic Party split in most of the States of the Union. The New Deal's continued drive toward bureaucratic domination and control of education reveals the ugly form of nazi-ism. Vice President WALLACE and Harry Hopkins have frequently boasted control of education by the Federal Government.

On January 24 WALLACE said, "The spirit of competition will and must continue to be one of our main forces. We can have full employment in this country without destroying private initiative, private capital, or private enterprise.

"Government can and must accept the major responsibilities for filling in whatever gaps business leaves."

This sounds very well, although it does not wholly coincide with the principles of the New Deal so blatantly put forth only a few months ago, as Congressman SUMNERS of Texas describes, "Everything in this Nation is planned for us by a bunch of bureaucrats."

However, on September 14, 1936, another mystic, but one with more "umph," said: "Germany will guard jealously the principle of private enterprise. I will never permit bureaucratization of German industry. I am convinced there must be competition to bring the best to the top."

"Of course," the Nazi dictator continued, "wherever private interests clash with the interests of the nation the good of the community must come before profits to the individual."

As generalities these statements both sound all right. But where is the guaranty that Wallace and his "fellow travelers" will not lead us down the same disastrous primrose path which Hitler has led his people? The only guaranty lies in the people taking charge of this Government through a coalition of real Democrats and the Republican Party.

At last the practical progressives and real liberals of the Democratic Party are awake to the fact that by use of Trojan-horse methods a small but dominant group of Nazi New Dealers, who seek to establish here what Hitler described in his early days as the national socialistic state, have seized control of their party.

The tangle of domestic policies and managing bureaucracy which prevented our return to prosperity under the Roosevelt administration is preventing an efficient prosecution of the war. I hate to think of what life would be under the stupid and petty tyrannical rule we have been enduring if it were not that the committees of Congress are exposing the unsoundness of their orders and correcting some of the abuses.

I dread to think of how much longer this war might last, and of the increased loss in money and blood, if committees of Congress had not disclosed the waste and inefficiency in the administration that threaten even victory itself. Public indignation at the muddling as expressed at the last election has quickened the war effort among the dilettante and dilatory bureaucrats in Washington.

The thinking of such tyrannical bureaucracy, which 10 years of legislative and judicial short cuts have built up is illustrated not only by contempt for the people but by the panic which swept New Deal circles in Washington after the last election. These New Deal bureaucrats actually thought they had accomplished their purpose of rendering Congress impotent, only to have the people restore the National Legislature to its rightful place in a republic.

The last election was not an endorsement so much of the Republican Party as it was an endorsement of a representative form of government as expressed by our original and purely American institution of these branches of government.

The dominant Nazi branch of the New Deal has been boasting—and some are still so ignorant of the meaning of the last election that they continue to chatter along the same line—to the effect that we no longer have our three branches of government.

For a time that seemed all too true for comfort to millions of liberal Democrats and Republicans. Here again the managing New Dealers followed the historical and traditional strategy of the Nazis by first destroying the legislative branch. Concurrently there always is an attempt to undermine the people's confidence in their free press. That the President has repeatedly attempted to do.

No wonder the cult of fascist New Dealers, intent on glorifying the Executive, as in Germany, to the destruction of the two concurrent branches of Government were panic-stricken when the American people turned in such great numbers to elect a free and independent Congress.

Despite the wartime determinations of all to support the Commander in Chief, the Congress has just shown in the rejection of "Dear Ed" Flynn that the Commander in Chief, if he is to instill confidence and respect, must himself live up to the high model of leadership which such a title conveys.

No longer can Mr. Roosevelt play hide-and-seek with the people by disgraceful alliances with odorous political machines in the name of reform. The height of absurdity was reached by the Democratic National Committee's hysterical claim that anyone who opposed "Dear Ed" was guilty of treason. That is on a par with the ridiculous New Deal propaganda that as soon as the Republicans return to power they would exploit labor and allow people to starve to death. The answer to that is easy. America enjoyed a higher standard of living under the last 10 years of Republican Presidents than under these past 10 years of Mr. Roosevelt.

In the 1920's we did have a lot of goofy paper financing that wrecked our prosperity, but also in the 1930's we had a lot of goofy political ideas that prevented recovery and kept thousands of our fellow Americans at a low level of existence—not much above starvation.

Now the last election is having its effect in other ways than restoring Congress to its important functions in our Government.

It is stimulating Republican leaders to arise to the great responsibility which will be theirs, along with real Democrats, in the reconstruction period.

Laying aside the problems involved let us for a minute look at the strange and unprecedented political situation existing today in our Nation.

The New Deal has been in power for 10 years. It has had more Governors and Members of Congress for a longer period of time than any other party in our entire history. Yet in how few States has it developed a leadership of skill, knowledge, and prestige to carry on.

In several States of the Union we see Democratic Senators, Governors, and Congressmen, but few New Dealers.

The real Democrats of the Nation are either cleaning house of the fascist New Dealers in their own party or are joining the Republicans to clean house regardless of party. It would seem that hitherto major issues between us fade into minor issues in face of the new major issues of nazi-ism and Government management of the individual from the cradle to the grave.

Everyone familiar with politics is aware that a party's activity in the State is largely built around the Governor's office. In the congressional districts it is built around the national Representative.

In 1934 we elected only eight Republican Governors. Republican representation in Congress was at the lowest ebb in our history. It was commonly said it might be the passing of a great political party. Contrast that situation with today. We will go into the next national campaign with two-thirds of the Governors north of the Mason and Dixon's line Republicans. And our party elected 106 more Congressmen than we had in 1934.

I hope and pray that the real Democrats will succeed in cleaning the Fascist New Dealers out of their party. But when and where they are not successful I hope that they will continue to place country above party and stay with us at least until we get the job done.

The mere election of Republicans will not "save the country," unless we are equal to the problems of reconstruction not only in the United States, but in the post-war world at large.

The task is enough to stagger any man, but we are not, and the real Democrats are not, dependent entirely on one man.

We must assemble the leaders of the Republican Party and set a pattern, so that our allies, who are somewhat like Washington bureaucrats, just discovering there is a Congress and a Republican Party, may have no doubt that we intend not only to win the war, but also to collaborate with other nations in postwar reconstruction.

It is extremely difficult in this fast-changing world to look across the years with any degree of accuracy. But Mr. Hoover has already outlined in his Problems of Peace a set of principles that gives greater promise of being an accurate blueprint of what must be done to save the world from communism and anarchy than anyone else has yet produced.

To plan forms and institutions now for the fast-moving world is speculative. Besides, the other peoples of the world have their own ideas, which are not our ideas. Nothing is clearer in our foreign policy than the fact that too often we have proceeded on the wrong assumption that the world liked what we liked and wanted what we wanted. That grievous error has been our undoing many times in our international relations. Our paternalistic and patronizing ways do not make us any to popular in the world.

It is plainly evident that the administration which has been indulging in mystical dreams of lifting the standard of living of all heterogeneous races of the world at the expense of the American taxpayer is repeating that mistake.

To all Americans the ideal of a world peace is ever present. We have done a good job on the Western Hemisphere in establishing and maintaining peaceful relations. The underneath people of the world have generally at all times looked to us for leadership. We must not fail them. We must take our privilege and our duty seriously. But not on the hand-out basis proposed by the administration, and which has been unfortunately too characteristic of its thinking and policies over the years. It would not do any good if we did. The only successful policy is to help people help themselves. That goes for any group of any race. All enlightened foreign missions are now conducted on that policy, and certainly government should not pursue a different policy.

Some sort of an international role for this country is inevitable. As I have frequently expressed it, "We cannot live on a high plateau above and beyond the rest of the world." World-wide war makes that more certain than ever heretofore.

Governments will stand or fall after the war era according to the degree they master their economic problems and enable people to make a decent living.

As far as lies within our power, we must seek in the next peace treaty for freedom and justice for all races and all peoples. And I think we should take the lead in encouraging, fostering and developing such movements.

But before we get too liberal with the money of the American taxpayers and too liberal with the blood of the American boys, we should know just what the situations are. That calls for an honest discussion of all the facts and an honest meaning of words.

The cosmic bureaucratic planners are going too far and too fast to give the American people a reasonable chance, predicated on an honest presentation of facts, to agree on a community enterprise toward building and maintaining a peaceful, prosperous, and happy world.

So far we have had a lot of high-sounding palaver calculated to cause the distressed peoples to draw the inference they wish to draw, but comparatively little concrete discussion of principles and blueprints of what we are going to do and how we are going to do it except in Problems of a Lasting Peace and Union Now.

The political situation in North Africa is a concrete illustration of the many contradictions that face us everywhere.

The President compared lease-lend for the entire post-war world to what the North did for the South after the Civil War. But there is no comparison in either the people or principle. The reconstruction of the South was based on private credit and enterprise, whereas lend-lease will be public funds of America managed by a huge bureaucracy and managed in the interest of building and maintaining control by itself forevermore.

I am afraid with that kind of a post-war policy the sovereign squat will become an isolationist and a dadburn hot one at that.

I say we had better think of the taxes we are already committed to, the full force of which has not begun to be felt, before committing the taxpayer to more through the permanent expansion of lend-lease.

I do not think that America can prosper unless other nations of the world prosper any more than America can prosper unless agriculture and labor prosper. Our problems of reconstruction, full production, increased consumption, and effective distribution are interdependent. We must lead the way to return to the system of comparative free commercial and financial regulations that existed prior to the system of special Government agreements. Comparative wide distribution of trade meant comparative freedom and independence both in economic and political affairs for all.

Therefore, we are faced with the real necessity of not only winning the war at the least cost of men and material, but also of realizing that other nations are going to have their ideas of what the political and economic foundations of the post-war era must be.

We must be ready to deal with the economic and political evils of which Nazis and Communists are a manifestation.

But deal with them honestly and forthrightly and justly. We do not need to worry about a world supergovernment if the peace treaty does that.

We must avoid a destructive imperialistic and vindictive peace which will only lay the foundation for another war, and talk of which only prolongs this war.

The Republican Party has a long and consistent record of collaboration with other nations in the interest of world peace. Because of his labors for world peace, Mr. Hoover was denounced as the great internationalist by his opponents in 1932.

The Republican Party must be ready and willing to assume that responsibility of leadership which the people in the next election will confer. We must offer the returning soldiers something more than a starvation existence on the Work Projects Administration. The marvelous expansion of our industries to meet the war demand shows what business will do in peace if freed from the repressive policies of the Nazi New Dealers. We must be willing to cooperate with the world, not on the sacrificial basis that Vice President

WALLACE proposes, but on an intelligent self-interest of a world free from repressive high tariffs, managed currencies, unstaple monetary systems, and monopolies.

I am confident that we will be ready and adequate for the task.

The Unions and the Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES L. McNARY
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a thoughtful editorial published in the Portland Oregonian, of February 4, 1943, entitled "The Unions and the Order."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIONS AND THE ORDER

Up to this time, the civilian population of the United States has retained its essential freedoms, even under war conditions. There has been pressure, of course, to enter the war industries, but in the final analysis, the citizen could "take it or leave it alone."

Now, however, under the latest directive announced by Chairman McNutt of the War Manpower Commission, the draft-age men in a long list of businesses, trades, and occupations must either leave their occupations and take work in the war industries or become liable to military service, regardless of their dependents. These people become a "selected" group from the population as a whole—a group which is, in effect, "ordered" into war production.

That being the case, we face a problem which we did not face during the period when entrance into war industry was voluntary. Most of war industry has been unionized, in large part through the terms written into the contracts by the Government—a Government which has not only accepted but ruthlessly pushed collective bargaining. Thus when Mr. McNutt in effect orders hundreds of thousands of selected citizens into war industry, he also in effect orders them into the unions which operate in these war industries. And in so doing he suddenly becomes the most wholesale recruiter for unionism that history has known.

It boils down to this: The Roosevelt government established unionism in most plants doing Government business. Now it in effect orders selected groups of the general citizenry into these plants. These people must, on the whole, accept work through the United States Employment Service and go where they are sent. They become union members whether or not they like it.

As to the ultimate legality, who knows? It may be a violation of the Bill of Rights. Possibly the courts, sitting in calm times, would so decide, though obviously the answer of the Government would be that the persons designated do not have to enter the war industries—they can enter the armed services. As for ourselves, we believe that it actually is a violation of the Bill of Rights, morally at least, when great numbers of people, with a pistol at their heads, are told that they have to go to work as union members when a large proportion of them are opposed to unionism. But since the legal aspects of the question are not likely to be settled until the war is over, if then, there is little to be done at the moment except to point out to the unions themselves that the process which looks so propitious could easily prove their undoing.

Here on the west coast, for example, where the American Federation of Labor is generally entrenched, the Congress of Industrial Organizations is attempting to change the situation (as witness the National Labor Relations Board hearings in Portland), and has the advantage of offering lower dues and less troublesome rules. The same condition exists in various other parts of the country.

And, on the other hand, there are industries and areas where it is the Congress of Industrial Organizations which is more firmly dug in and where the American Federation of Labor seeks advantages to offer. But whatever the local situation, the unions should realize that people forced into unionism against their will are likely to choose the union which taxes them the least and which they can most easily overthrow when the opportunity presents itself.

In other words, this vast recruiting by Mr. McNutt, which may seem so attractive to the unions at first blush, is fundamentally dangerous to true unionism. The people who have gone into war industry voluntarily have been and are threat enough; the people who are now about to be forced into unionism are calculated to be far less tractable. If they had been tractable, they would have joined sooner.

If a single hour of war work is lost through all this mix-up, we regret it. But we also deeply resent the fact that the Government has so arranged things that, under the crisis of war, millions of our people are driven into organizations, and a system, which they question. What are we fighting for if it is not that our families, our friends, our countrymen, our soil, and our way of life—that of individual free decision—should persevere.

Pettifoggers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of February 15, 1943, entitled "Pettifoggers."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETTIFOGGERS

"In speaking of men of little faith, there comes to my mind an old word in our language, 'pettifoggers.'

"To most of us it brings to mind a man who is small and mean and tricky and picayune and, in a word, petty. It is the type of man who is always seeking to create a smoke screen, a fog, for the purpose of obscuring the plain truth.

"Today the pettifoggers * * * are seeking to befog the present and the future and the clear purpose and high principles for which the free world now maintains the promise of undimmed victory." (From President Roosevelt's Friday night speech.)

At precisely the hour our President was delivering his inspiring radio address to millions of loyal Americans, Congressman HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr., of the Germantown-Chestnut Hill district, was speaking at (believe it or not) a Lincoln Day banquet of the Twenty-second Ward Republican Club.

Congressman SCOTT said:

"It might be just as well if the war doesn't end too soon. For if it does, it will mean that Russia will occupy most of Europe, particularly the capitals of Vienna and Berlin. * * * The American people are sore at New Deal nonsense. They are tired of fools in high places. It is time for the Republicans to take over. We are of the best stock * * * and represent the real grit, brains, and backbone of America."

There was the "smoke screen" the President was talking about; the "tricky" innuendo that it is probably better to let Hitler win than Stalin; the "petty" insolence that Republicans have the only brains in the country. SCOTT was the "picayune" character, who was silent about his country's enemies while he smeared his country's allies.

Thanks, Congressman SCOTT, for so vividly illustrating the President's definitions. Don't you think you ought to accept the citizens' award of a sap bucket as Philadelphia's pettifogger No. 1?

Consider Alf M. Landon, who also spoke (of all places) at a Lincoln Day banquet in Omaha that same night.

Said Alf (Maine and Vermont) Landon:

"A small but dominant group of Nazi New Dealers, who seek to establish here what Hitler described in his early days as national socialism, have seized control of their party."

This Kansas fog is even soupier than the Hugh Scott brand in Germantown. No word of praise for the loyal Republicans who are giving their support to our President; only the statement that we are being nazified by New Dealers while we fight nazi-ism.

Alf Landon is not an intellectual giant, but he knows better than that. In the befogged Republican organization of his home State he could probably win one election—to the title of "Kansas Pettifogger No. 1."

Landon and SCOTT have keen competition as pettifoggers superlative.

Congressman LAMBERTSON, also of Kansas, smeared the four Roosevelt boys who are serving their country, but he had no criticism for Hitler, Hirohito, and company. When called to account for "obscuring the plain truth," LAMBERTSON wrote to his critics over his own signature:

"I have a firm conviction that all you can honestly blast this (Roosevelt) family is never half enough for what they have done to this country."

The President's words, "small," "mean," "picayune," "petty," are a bit too mild for this fellow from Kansas.

He's really not a pettifogger but a majorfogger. Move over, Alf and Hugh; make room for a professional.

We might go on. There is CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, who said our armed forces are "just a suicide squad sent over to be suckers for the British." And HAM FISH * * * GERALD NYE * * * HOWARD SMITH, whose carping in time of war encourages our enemies.

All are men who, if we are to believe their public utterances, hate Roosevelt and progressive government more than they hate Hitler and human slavery.

The country needed a word to cover, with one blanket, all these "men of little faith * * * small and mean and tricky and picayune and, in a word petty."

"Pettifogger" fits like a skin-tight glove. Thank God we don't have many of them. Thank God the overwhelming majority of Americans are immune to pettifog poison.

But though pettifoggers have little influence at home, let us not discount the harm they do abroad.

Axis agents in this country relay every subversive utterance to Goebbel's propaganda bureau in Berlin. Then out on the short wave, to United Nations and to neutrals, goes

word that this country is disunited, wavering in its war effort.

Russians hear that a United States Congressman doesn't want them to win, that another Congressman predicts collapse of the African expedition, that a former candidate for President declares the United States is adopting nazi-ism, etc., etc.

The same broadcast is heard in Turkey, where the scales are delicately balanced between continued neutrality and alinement with the United Nations.

Yes, pettifoggers in high places can be as dangerous as rats gnawing at the foundations of a home.

Lincoln and the Fifth Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address which it has been my privilege to read, delivered by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS]. The address is entitled, "Lincoln and the Fifth Freedom," and was delivered before the Alexander Hamilton Club at Baltimore, Md., on Friday evening, February 12, 1943.

There being no objection the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, members of the Alexander Hamilton Club, the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln is being celebrated with new heights of respect tonight in hundreds of American communities. There is a particular symbolism in your meeting here which makes me doubly proud of the honor of your invitation.

One might conclude—too hastily—that there is something paradoxical about a tribute to Abraham Lincoln, a great commoner, by a group named in memory of Alexander Hamilton, a great aristocrat. Upon reflection, however, the veil of that paradox is lifted; and we behold, in glorious symbolism, the true source of the greatness of a great nation. America's greatness is not equivalent to that of Hamilton alone, any more than it is to the greatness of Lincoln alone. It is the fact that the Nation's greatness stems from the greatness of both Hamilton and Lincoln and of hundreds of others that causes our hearts to beat with pride in the past, and with hope for the future. For it reassures us in a conviction which is the most justifiable and steadfast conviction we can hold: that the temperament of this Nation has never been and must never become confused with the temperament of any one man.

The name of Hamilton has been traditionally contrasted with that of Jefferson (whose 200th anniversary we mark this year), but it is interesting to compare and to contrast Lincoln with both Jefferson and Hamilton.

Hamilton believed in concentrated powers, Jefferson in diffused powers. Lincoln believed both to be necessary and that both must be kept in well-defined relationship. Lincoln's Civil War objective never degenerated into anything beneath the primary objective of preserving a strong Federal Union. In that respect he was comparable to Hamilton. But he insisted that the bricks of strong Federal union could be held firmly together only by the cement of the safeguarded rights of a free people sacredly conserved. In that respect he was comparable to Jefferson.

Hamilton feared anarchy and thought in terms of order. Jefferson feared tyranny and thought in terms of liberty. Certainly Lincoln, here again, reflected the characteristics of both. He wanted the strength of Hamilton's order, but only to safeguard Jefferson's liberty.

Lincoln, from the standpoint of chronology, was closer to Jefferson. He was a young man of 17 when Jefferson died. Hamilton had been dead 5 years when Lincoln was born.

And yet, for all of Lincoln's eternal respect for the Jeffersonian concept of widespread liberty and of the equality of all human souls, he yielded nothing to Hamilton in his insistence that society's wheel required a hub of strong centralization if the spokes of decentralized liberty were to be held together and enable the whole structure to roll irresistibly forward over the ruts and rocks that lay ahead.

The wheel is still holding together. Certainly this is not the time, if it is to stay in one piece, to attack the hub of strong Federal Government. But neither is this the time to halt its necessary progress by tearing out the spokes of our liberties!

Our Nation was forged in the heat of difficult conflict—conflict between the partisans of Hamilton, on the one hand, and the partisans of Jefferson on the other. It was held together by Lincoln because he resolved that conflict in his own mind; he did not choose to dispense with either centralized power or decentralized liberty; he chose to preserve both.

That was the biggest job that faced Lincoln. It is for the masterful way he did that job that we owe him the biggest debt of gratitude.

One other comparison is worthy of note: Hamilton never left the United States, but wanted to transplant to these shores certain aspects of the European culture; Jefferson knew Europe at first hand, but wanted none of it; Lincoln, like Hamilton, never left the United States—and, like Jefferson and Washington, was completely satisfied with America.

Lincoln's greatest problem, however, is still with us. Seeing the present war through to a successful conclusion—and that is America's supreme task today—requires not only that we maintain a strong Federal Government, but also that we safeguard the liberty under which our free people may freely express their own free thought and purpose. Only thus will the strongest Federal Government we have ever set up find it impossible to twist the fruits of the people's victory into something wholly alien to our real purpose in fighting the war.

Lincoln made his people feel that their own personal destinies were interwoven with the outcome of the Civil War. Their destinies remained more important, in his mind, than the numerous pet theories that were urged upon him by some of those who thought those pet ideas more important than getting the war over. In his first message to Congress, Lincoln said: "I have been anxious and careful that the inevitable conflict shall not degenerate into a violent and remorseless revolutionary struggle." We must be just as anxious and just as careful today. We cannot tolerate for an instant the doctrine that we are now engaged in a revolution which must change the whole pattern of America. Neither can we subscribe to that doctrine that to wage this war successfully we must adopt totalitarian processes of government.

Those whom Lincoln rebuked were more interested in emphasizing what is vaguely called in modern language "winning the peace" than they were in prosecuting the war. But, by taking the common people into his confidence, Lincoln gave no indication that he entertained post-war objectives which were any different than those the people understood and desired.

And again today, only the war aims on which the people are united deserve to be reflected in the decisions of their Government. Not only because they have placed their full faith and trust in their chosen officials, but also because from the humblest laborer to the most efficient executive they have contributed their talents and their energy to assembling and equipping a powerful Army and Navy in the incredibly record-breaking time of little more than a single year. In addition to this contribution of talent and energy and time and comfort, the people have made another great contribution; they have contributed irrefutable evidence of the validity of a philosophy. They have contributed indisputable evidence of the speed and efficiency and dependability of the philosophy of freedom of enterprise. How ironically unjust it would be if the fruit of a success won by the genius of free enterprise were to be no more than the stinging death penalty for that very freedom of enterprise!

We have heard of snatching victory from the jaws of defeat. But to lose the very thing which made us successful would be to snatch defeat from the grinning jaws of victory!

Even worse, it would be to repudiate our bond with the millions of brave soldiers and sailors who, whether in the malaria-infested jungles of Guadalcanal, in the dangerous mountain passes of Tunisia, sailing the icy convoy routes of the Arctic, or dodging the hostile submarine packs in the Atlantic or southern Pacific, are bringing immortal tribute to the bravery of a wholly free citizenship. The sons of America of 1943 have set a new all-time high in the annals of courage and patriotism. They are going to win the war for us on the far-flung battle fronts. Their deeds impress our very souls with our obligation to preserve for them the kind of country and the kind of government to which they may return and rediscover the blessings of their tremendous sacrifices.

I presume, then, we are agreed that Americans have no desire for a strong Federal Government, unless it is also a free Federal Government. America's inborn abhorrence of dictatorship knows no preference as between the dictatorship of fascism, of nazi-ism, or of communism. We have learned that American abhorrence of dictatorship also includes resentment of the iron-fist aspects of new dealism, which has come to mean American hatred of dictatorship by bureaucracy. Surely that rebuke was expressed in most emphatic terms on the 3d of last November.

I have no desire, at this time when national unity is so essential, to impute to our President any base motives, but I do believe it is time to raise a warning to the American people that the controls of free citizenship are being needlessly stretched thin, and that precedents are being set up, which in the presence of an acute emergency, real or assumed, or in the hands of an executive of evil designs, could easily be used to supplant our form of free government.

We have learned that when an executive says that Congress must do something "or else," or that he will find ways of acting without congressional sanction, that is the essence of dictatorship.

We have learned that when the Executive limits salaries to $25,000 a year in a manner repudiated by Congress—that is dictatorship.

We have learned that when a bureau places a price ceiling on corn, or sets a price on wheat, in clear violation of a congressional law—that is dictatorship.

We have learned that when the Treasury Department applies a 5-percent pay-roll tax to 1942 income which Congress specifically

ordered applied only to 1943 income—that is dictatorship.

We have learned that when departments of Government spend huge sums of money without appropriation by Congress, sometimes on projects specifically overruled by Congress—that is dictatorship.

We have learned that when the Executive shackles the Nation more and more securely to his socialistic schemes by placing in more and more key positions those "dead ducks" whom the voters repudiated at the polls—that smacks of dictatorship.

We have learned that when executives within an administration take men who have been removed from office by congressional insistence because of their revolutionary philosophies, and then put them right back to work in another department, sometimes with an increase in salary—that is dictatorship.

We have learned that when men who are living off the people's money, sometimes even in the uniform of one of the armed forces, are permitted publicly to ridicule the Congress of the United States, the last bulwark of the people's freedom—then that is dictatorship.

And we have learned that when bureaucrats are confronted with our knowledge of their violations of law, and when they answer, "So what?"—then that certainly is dictatorship.

These are only a slight percent of the evidences of the new dictatorship by bureaucracy. As Senator TAFT said the other day, and as no one can help seeing on every hand: "There is no doubt * * * that the administration has deliberately sought power much greater than required for the war, to extend regulation of business and individuals after the war. * * * But the end of the war is an indefinite time, and Congress must end these powers, not when the administration says the war is over but when the end of the war has, in fact, occurred."

That may remind you of the story, if you have heard it, of the man who was asked how he was getting along under wartime restrictions. He replied, "Well, it ain't the wartime restrictions that bother me—it's this 'duration' stuff. Looks like the duration's gonna last longer than the war."

Meanwhile, we don't want to lose sight of the fact that dictatorship by the Executive, and dictatorship by bureaucracy are not two two separate things. Eighty-one bureaus merely give the President 83 hands. And this vast network of executive bureaus, ruling by decree, are merely a smoke screen behind which the processes of dictatorship can function with less apparent shock to our American system of free government.

During the last 10 years (January 1, 1933, to December 9, 1942) no less than 3,556 Executive orders have been issued, many of which, drafted in the bureaus, have had the effect of law and thus have substituted the will of appointed bureau chiefs for the will of the duly established branch of the Government which was elected to make the laws. I haven't the time to review the scope of these orders, save to say that they range from the killing of little pigs and clipping the cuffs off trousers to the assumption of the right, without an act of Congress, to control the jobs of American citizens in 32 areas. Neither have I the time to discuss this wide range of the political and economic impact of these orders—you'd be surprised. This, however, is most significant, that during the same 10 years, when bureaucrats were passing 3,556 laws of their own, the duly authorized law-passing body of Congress enacted only 4,300 laws. Actually, the people's affairs have been regulated through the past 10 years more by bureaucratic than by legislative procedure. On the basis of the rate of increase of administrative directives in the past 14 months, one is justified in the conclusion that in the proper slogan of our country today is not "make the world safe for democracy," but rather "make America safe from bureaucracy."

I hold no brief for a complacent Congress which permitted such a situation to develop. Rather, I call the attention of the country to the remedy which they have for such an intolerable situation if free government is to continue—the remedy they applied in a liberal dose on the 3d of last November.

On still another front does the maintenance of free government call for increased vigilance on the part of Congress and of the people whom Congress represents. Article II, section II, of the Constitution provides that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

Probably at no time in this Nation's history have so many treaties been concluded in the name of the United States as in recent years, and even in recent months. And certainly there have never been so many treaties bearing so directly upon the welfare of this Nation in the years immediately ahead. Yet, the vast majority of them—and certainly the most important of them—have not been even submitted to the Senate for its consent, as required by the Constitution. Nor has the Senate been requested to give its consent prior to the drawing up of such treaties, as is also required by the Constitution. Nor has the Senate been asked for its advice on such treaties—although that, too, is required by the Constitution. Those Members of Congress who are sometimes called to the White House to discuss a decision of foreign policy do not represent a cross-section of the people's thinking, but are almost always hand-picked to reflect and echo only the President's philosophy.

Thus, also, is the explicit intent and provision of the Constitution regarding the treaty-making power obviously circumvented by the President. The regrettable results which such a practice is certain to yield are obvious. Our unhappy experience with treaties at the conclusion of the previous World War—unhappy because of the failure of President Wilson to take the Senate into his counsel—is so recent that surely a prudent man will take precaution against a like consequence. The people's determination to return to constitutional procedure is abundantly evident. Therefore, sooner or later—and probably sooner—the Congress will insist upon at least the "consent" part of its prerogative where treaties are concerned.

The administration, of course, hopes again to build such a huge superstructure of commitments throughout the world that the Senate will not dare to pull it apart for fear of producing chaos. That is the technique of a little girl whose mother has forbidden her to bring two or three little friends home from school. She thinks if she brings the whole class, her mother will not make a scene by sending all of them home. The little girl has acted too rashly. She has failed to anticipate the increased embarrassment she will experience when her mother makes her warning stick. Nor have the unofficial treaty-makers adequately anticipated the increased embarrassment that would be theirs as a result of having gone on a world-wide spending spree with someone else's promises—which are not theirs to spend without the endorsement of the Senate.

Neither in this case do I have any brief for the Congress which attempts to delegate its constitutional powers to the Executive. Under our form of government power stems only from the people. An unfulfilled power can only be returned to the people. There is no authority by which one branch of our government can delegate its granted powers to another branch of the government—to do so is a perversion of trust; it is a violation of the sacred oath which every official has taken, to uphold the Constitution.

We should also keep in mind that there can be no such thing as a military dictator under our Constitution. The President is the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy in its military fields. The Congress is charged with the responsibility of raising and supplying an army in the civilian fields. There is no legal foundation under the American Constitution by which any one of the three coordinate branches of our government may seize and exercise the functions of another branch. Presumptuous charges dictate military plans.

Today we need a reaffirmation of that faith which Lincoln had in the well-wrought-out judgment of the common people. On that saddest of Easter mornings, with the last feeble heart flutter which released the immortal soul of Abraham Lincoln, Mr. Stanton, his Secretary of War, standing at his bedside, spoke this simple tribute: "Now he belongs to the ages."

Secretary Stanton first knew Lincoln to scoff at him, then to wonder over his patience and wisdom, and now to recognize his genius as immortal. Stanton moved from doubt, through understanding, to praise—because he recognized that Lincoln's power rested upon his steadfast reliance in the wisdom of the great body of people who comprised a free country.

Let us lay hold now upon that lesson, let us rediscover that our Government will never go far astray if it gives heed to the calm judgment of the people. Today, the American people have one supreme purpose in their share in this ghastly World War: They believe they are fighting for freedom and the safety of their homes and their country. They know that America has no right to be called a free country unless its people are willing to fight to the last breath to preserve that freedom. To that high purpose, they are willing to sacrifice ease and opportunity and life itself—as Lincoln gave his life. The millions of boys who march willingly and unflinchingly to every part of the world testify to that love of freedom, and the sacrifices and hardships we accept at home bear testimony to that same noble purpose: That it is better to choose death than to lose freedom.

The great body of American people desire that victory, in the name of freedom, shall be decisive—and they believe it cannot be decisive until our enemies are subdued and disarmed.

If I judge the American people correctly, they intend that this Nation shall continue permanently to maintain an Army, Navy, and air force strong enough to defend our safety and our freedom as long as there is anyone who can challenge those blessings. If there be nations with like purpose, in which we can have confidence, we shall share that responsibility with them in mutual compact.

The great body of the American people, today, as always, believe in the four fundamental freedoms—freedom of speech, of worship, from want and fear, together with a fifth freedom. There is a wide difference of opinion as to our duty and ability to enforce those freedoms everywhere in the world, but not in our desire that every nation may, for itself, enjoy these freedoms, through their voluntary acceptance of them. Nor shall we refuse to do our fair share toward an intelligent adjustment of world political and economic conditions among all nations. I do not believe, however, that the people of America will be willing to pool our God-given resources, our own markets for our own products, our jobs, our superior standard of living, our immigration quotas, nor any of our political or cultural ideals, with all other nations in the vain hope of making everybody happy by sharing each other's misery. I do not believe that the people of America will

ever again permit our supply of rubber to depend upon the peace of remote corners of the world, but will establish our own permanent supply on this continent.

We know that the people of America will never consent to place the hand of the Goddess of Liberty in marriage with the devotees of dictatorship, anywhere in the world.

I spoke a moment ago about the fifth freedom in which the people of America believe and which we have come near to losing in these later days, and that is the freedom from dependency. He only is free who calls no man master nor looks to any sovereign for succor. Because he enjoyed that freedom, the pathway of Abraham Lincoln led from the log cabin to the White House, as it has for many others in America. Because of that freedom Henry Ford, from a little alley machine shop, rose to be a giant in industry. Because of it, Irving Berlin—a poor, half-starved Jewish boy—sang his way into the hearts of millions of Americans. By it George Washington Carver, who knew not the date of his birth nor even his parentage, grew from slavery and ignorance to be one of God's interpreters of his richest remedies for needy and suffering humanity. And because of freedom from dependency, millions of Americans have grown from obscurity to fame and have brought countless blessings to prove that America is the land of whosoever will because they could say, "I was born free."

My fellow citizens, we have a community of interest, a common responsibility, and a common opportunity—not as Republicans or Democrats—but as Americans, to preserve this great system of free government. By the help of God, the boys who survive this great war are going to come back to that kind of a country.

Protection Against Lynching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Helen Fuller, entitled "Section 52 is News," appearing in the current issue of The New Republic.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 52 IS NEWS

It was news, for a moment, when Howard Wash, a Negro, was lynched at Laurel, Miss., last October. It was news important enough for editorial comment in many papers when five of the lynchers, plus the deputy sheriff who had failed to protect Wash, were indicted by a Federal grand jury at Jackson, Miss., several weeks ago. Yet the press had only half the story. When to the fact of this indictment is added the conviction of a deputy sheriff for failure to give police protection against mob violence in West Virginia a few weeks earlier, and it is seen that the story is the calculated result of a historic shift in practice by the Department of Justice, the news becomes the best and perhaps the most important reported on the domestic front during the period.

For years without end liberals, South and North, have tried to get a Federal anti-lynching law on the statutes. The battalions of ignorance have been too strong. But for years there have been on the books sections 51 and 52 of title 18, United States Code. Section 51 makes it a crime to conspire to injure or oppress any citizen in the exercise of federally secured rights. Section 52 makes it a crime for anyone who is clothed with State or Federal powers intentionally to misuse them to deprive any inhabitant of such freedoms as that of speech, of the press, or of the person. The Bill of Rights and the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments are guaranties against oppressive action by State or Federal Governments. Sections 51 and 52 of the code, section 52 in particular, are sharp weapons to enforce those guaranties. When the Federal antilynching bill was once more defeated last year, a group of lawyers in the Civil Rights Section of the Department of Justice, headed by Victor Rotnem, took up the sharp steel of section 52, blew the dust off it and are using it with magnificent results.

Martin Catlette, a deputy sheriff of Nicholas County, W., Va., was the first to feel the blade. Three boys, members of Jehovah's Witnesses, had come to Richwood, W. Va., to distribute their strange literature. They were ordered out of town by members of the American Legion and the local police force. They left, but returned the next day to ask the mayor's protection while they handed out their pamphlets. They were taken to Sheriff Catlette's office. His contribution to law and order was a series of telephone calls to Legionnaires, notifying them that he had "the S. O. B.'s." A mob of about 1,500 people gathered. Sheriff Catlette, evidently a stickler for the proprieties as he chose to intepret them, took off his badge and announced: "What is done from here on will not be done in the name of law." The boys were forced to swallow great doses of castor oil. Then they were roped, led through town to the outskirts, and warned to get out and stay out.

But then, under the direction of Raoul Berger, one of Victor Rotnem's men, Sheriff Catlette found himself indicted and convicted, by the United States Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, under section 52 of the United States Code. Judge Armistead Dobie delivered a momentous opinion. Twenty-five years ago the courts ruled that it is a denial of "equal protection" to refuse a Negro equal Pullman accommodations on the ground that a State law forbids it. Judge Dobie extended this principle, with perfect logic, from lesser matters to great ones, by ruling that it is likewise a denial of "equal protection" to refuse State police protection against mob violence.

Then came the Howard Wash case. Wash had been convicted by the local courts on October 16 of the killing of Clint Wellborn, a white man. Wash claimed self-defense. The jury refused to deliver the death penalty. Wash was temporarily lodged in the Laurel jail waiting sentence to life imprisonment. Around 6 o'clock, Wash's wife and 3-year-old daughter, 1 of 8 children, came to see him. The grapevine had been at work, for when they left, Wash was heard to say, as he kissed them goodbye, "Well, a man can't live forever." At 2 a. m., the mob, which, it is charged, was led by Nathaniel Shotts, Allen Pryor, Barney Jones, and William Oscar Johnson, came looking for him. Luther Holder, deputy sheriff and jailer, had the key to the "mob-proof" steel front door, and he had plenty of time to lock the mob out. But instead he gave them the key—and Howard Wash.

Special Assistant Attorney Frank Coleman of the Department of Justice took direction of the case, in cooperation with the local United States Attorney, Toxey Hall. The highly respected Jackson attorney William H. Watkins presented the evidence to the grand jury. It took the Mississippi grand jury only 5 hours to indict Sheriff Holder and Shotts, Pryor, Jones, and Johnson, under sections 51 and 52, for conspiracy to deprive Wash of his constitutional rights. It charged further that Holder, under the color of law, "did willfully and unlawfully, fail, refuse, and decline to protect the said Howard Wash."

Note that in opening up this road that may lead to protection for Negroes against mob violence without a Federal anti-lynching law, action under these sections of the United States Code has been taken not merely by Washington officials, but by southern jurors, southern judges, southern attorneys. Here is great good news.—Helen Fuller.

Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on Thomas Jefferson appearing in the Daily Advance, of Lynchburg, Va., and also a paragraph from the column of Will P. Kennedy in the Washington Star of February 7, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial and excerpt were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) Daily Advance]

THOMAS JEFFERSON

Thomas Jefferson has been immortalized in the hearts of all Virginians, all Americans and all the peoples of the world for he is our foremost and truest emancipator. The four freedoms for which we fight this global war were given to the world by Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence and, possibly more so than any other man in the world, by his administrations as a public officer. Shall we not on the two hundredth anniversary of his birth, April 13, give to him the homage due his memory?

In 1932, the two hundredth anniversary of Washington's birth was magnificently commemorated. Washington, the Virginian; Jefferson, the Virginian, both gifts to the Nation and the world, should have the due recognition of men whose caliber and character have seldom, if ever, been equalled.

The Thomas Jefferson memorial on the Tidal Basin in Washington is a marble monument to be dedicated to Jefferson's memory on April 13, but the world owes more to Jefferson than just a stone structure, beautiful though it is. Shall we not blazon from the housetops the illustrious name of Thomas Jefferson?

Congress at its earliest opportunity should appropriate funds so that those committees, publicists, and agencies available for such purposes may honor Jefferson the man and the Jeffersonian principles, and give to his memory a full recognition such as few men deserve. With it all we should renew Jefferson's exemplary life so that all the youths of posterity may hope to follow in his footsteps. May we not perpetuate his life so that he will be the benefactor of mankind for all time to come?

Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence; Jefferson, the founder of the University of Virginia; and Jefferson, the author of Virginia's statute for religious freedom—any one of these activities was a gift to mankind for which his memory should be eternally reverenced.

Congress must act quickly on its proposed plan to honor the memory of Thomas Jefferson by making the funds available.

[From the Washington Star of February 7, 1943]

CAPITAL SIDELIGHTS

(By Will P. Kennedy)

Versatility—thy name was Jefferson. This third President who served for 8 years and was mentor to Presidents for 16 years, lived within a day's ride of both Madison and Monroe, whose studies he had shaped and who were to him like younger brothers or adopted sons. Varied and diversified interests crowded his 17 years of retirement from public office. He was surgeon enough to sew up a wound, tie an artery, or set the broken leg of a slave; enough of a mathematician to calculate an eclipse. He invented a letter-copying press, a revolving chair, a folding chair, a hemp machine, a pedometer to measure his walks, a plow that won a gold medal at a French exposition, a light two-wheeled vehicle for heavy Virginia roads. He knew Greek, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, and German. He wrote books and compiled his own edition of the Bible, leaving out of the Scriptures everything except the precepts of divine love, mercy, and goodness. He was a musician, architect, and landscape gardener. In Paris he sprained his wrist so that he could not play his beloved violin, but he sang well and hummed tunes as he rode horseback. He designed his own home and laid out the grounds and was architect of the University of Virginia, rated today as a most beautiful college group.

Absenteeism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a reprint of an editorial from a recent issue of the Oregon Journal, under the title "Absenteeism."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABSENTEEISM

We can still be beaten in the present war.

Not by Germany.

Not by Japan.

Not by Italy.

But by ourselves.

Right here in the shipyards of Portland and Vancouver 7,000 to 20,000 workers a day out of a total of 100,000 are off the job. It is absenteeism. Some of the reasons are flagrant. Talk about the submarine toll. Absenteeism here is costing up to one ship of every five—not built.

The absentee evil on the Pacific coast is costing ships, airplanes, and war facilities essential in winning the war, and doing it as ruthlessly as Hitler and Tojo could dictate.

On the other side of the Nation John L. Lewis makes as desperate a bid for disastrous, defeating inflation as the Axis could wish when he announces—regardless of the War Labor Board's Little Steel formula and contemptuous of the Nation's wage and price stabilization program—he will demand a $2-a-day wage increase for 450,000 bituminous-coal miners. War wages now are dangerously up. Is a coal mine Lewis' country? Does he invert the flag in a shaft? Will he force a crisis either of runaway inflation and ruin or of necessity that the Government take over these basic industries?

Let Lewis—let others who bellow "me first" or who smugly, flatly, let others fight the war—look at the drastic thing Germany just now is doing. This is from John Parris, United Press correspondent:

"German radios broadcast that it would be only a few days before one of the most drastic decrees in German history would close thousands of businesses, including one of Berlin's largest department stores, in order that their workers could be drafted into war industry."

For the record, no one has any right, moral or patriotic—if there is legal right it isn't right, it is specious—to make self profit out of this war. We mean capital, management, labor and any others who should be included to bring the total to an exact 100 percent of American citizens whose survival—yes, we mean survival—depends upon putting themselves and everything they have into beating off the monsters of the Axis. The alternative created by the absenteeists is that they will be absent when the survivors are counted.

In the present war we can be beaten by ourselves, but what a betrayal of ourselves. Let's conclude with the fiery statement by a sailor, survivor of the cruiser *Astoria*, which was sunk in battle near the Solomons. He was wounded, mutilated, shocked, invalided home to Oregon until he can return to active duty:

"I'd like to drop bombs and shoot submarine torpedoes at every war worker who sneaks off the job and adds defeat to the hell in which we fight."

Our President—Newsprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Delaware News entitled "Our President—Newsprint."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PRESIDENT—NEWSPRINT

In my estimation your President and my President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, is a great man, very intelligent, a thinker, very capable, and has the interest of the American people at heart.

His position has been a very trying one due to critics, bias attacks, and even bias attacks against his wife, the First Lady of Our Land. It seems remarkable to me that he has been able to stand the strain, and more remarkable because of war conditions when he must make quick decisions, appoint responsible men to certain duties, and still must be able to feel the pulse of the American people, whom he loves most dearly.

Made mistakes? Why, certainly. What man exists on earth who has not made mistakes? We are all human individuals, and as yet have no actual knowledge of the spiritual life after death.

Our President has more or less stopped free speech. Is he wrong in doing so? No. No. We little fellows in various towns and even large cities are allowed to talk with friends and say: "Roosevelt ought to do this and that." Are we arrested for these sayings? Surely not. We are but mere citizens shooting off our mouths when we know nothing of the situation except in our own little State. But, readers, suppose a radical with a brass band gathers a thousand people on a street corner and talks belittling the American Government, its methods, and tells unthinkable things that he has heard. Should he be locked up immediately and left to exist on bread and water for a couple of years? You are right! He should! We are American people and have been since George Washington instilled in us the spirit of fighting for our rights and liberties. Think well, citizens, and you will surely see why a great President did this for the sake of his people.

Yes, we have many people on the streets, who in their opinion, know how the United States Government should be run but they are generally a retired clerk of a grocery store, a whippersnapper selling widows oil stocks and worthless holdings instead of good investments—War Savings bonds. Yes, we have drug-store clerks, barbers, candy shop workers, and so forth, who can quickly outline, according to their opinion, the mistakes of General Douglas MacArthur in the Pacific. Yes, we have you older men who can navigate a small yacht from the Lewes and Rehoboth Canal to the fishing point offshore to the old Delaware Breakwater. Yes, we have retired sailors, commanders, river pilots, and so forth, who in their estimation, can tell Admiral Nimitz where to place his ships in the South Pacific, and finally we have men who believe that they could take in 24 hours time the position of Lt. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower in north Africa.

We, the little American, all wrought up, and facing the supposing hardships can imagine all sorts of things. But we have not the slightest comprehension of what the true facts are. If we had we would think of our flippant remarks and hide our face and shed tears.

Yes, our men in important positions know the facts and we don't. We, the American people must think, must sacrifice, and must have in our hearts that feeling of confidence and trust in our important men of affairs of the world today, yesterday, and tomorrow.

Our President has also another fine quality—he has good common sense. With the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor (and may I never print that name in my paper in small letters) he was compelled to take quick action, not depending on his personal friends for advice. He was astonished and yet, readers, he responded quickly and efficiently. Later men were fired and new men received positions. This is still going on and will until our President finds qualified men who can do a job and do it right.

Readers, do not fool yourselves and sit back in your easy chairs and say, "There is no hope for us." Forget that attitude. Straighten up and remember that in the White House you have a man fighting for you and yours with the feeling in his heart, "Let there be peace on earth and good will toward men."

Our President has sent men to investigate whether or not small country newspapers are essential and whether or not small presses in thousands of printing plants are essential.

Our President has clamped down on radio commentators and has placed a ban of censorship on all newspapers. Is he right? Absolutely right. No aid or comfort should be given our enemy. Now has the radio commentator and the paper which needs newsprint become disheartened and disorganized by this? No. Then why not? The answer is simply, readers, it is absolutely a necessity to shorten the war and bring back that American boy of yours.

Our great President has ordered that newsprint be reduced 10 percent. Is that right? Yes; by all means, if the Government needs newsprint, we, the small-town editors, will gladly comply and will not be hurt. If the President decided that a 50-percent cut is needed in newsprint, would he be justified in making that reduction? The answer is "Yes," and 75 percent of the real-blooded editors and owners would comply. How could they? The answer: A 60-page paper could be easily cut to a 30-page newspaper. Our little paper could be quickly reduced from an 8-page paper to a 4-page sheet. That would be easy.

But, readers, here is the main point to show you—whether or not upon the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, will he go down in history with our other outstanding Presidents? Will we remember him as a great man capable of standing in bronze along with George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln, or will he later fail and become just an ordinary President No. So-and-So on the list?

The decision is his. He has no one to lean against and cannot put his fingers on another person's shoulder. He stands today firmly on good American soil. If President Roosevelt wishes to be great, he should remain on firm soil. But if he wishes to step from the good old solid ground and with two of his best friends helping him walk around Cape Henlopen where gunners and all kind of sportsmen used to tread, knowing well that there was firm land in the swamps, there was also mucky land, like pulp paper ready to go through a paper mill, and knowing also that there was quicksand.

Yes; knowing our President is great and knowing that the Honorable Senator from Delaware [Mr. JAMES M. TUNNELL] had inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A254, the story of the bond drive in Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred which in 3 days raised for the Treasury $53,700, I feel that Franklin D. Roosevelt would do this: He would walk, without knowing the condition of the land, straightforward as a Christian soldier on the firm soil until he came to the swampy marsh. He would then hesitate and think. Then, showing his greatness, he would stop and say, "Boys, this looks like an unsteady foothold; hold my arms while I jump over this paper-looking pulp, but remember, boys, if I slip over my knees, be ready to pull me back to good old American soil. I cannot take a chance. The American people have placed confidence and hope for the future in me."

Yes; Mr. Roosevelt first pushed a little toe in that newspaper pulp and cut off 10 percent of the newsprint. He later in March, with his friends holding on, jumped into the marshy land and lo and behold he sank to his knees. He then hesitated, talked with, not his earthly comrades but to the Heavenly Father and the Lord Jesus Christ who was born of honest but humble parents in a stable in the little town of Bethlehem, in Jerusalem. He became a great man and called for his two friends to help him back to firm soil.

If he had been a headstrong and demanding President, without any thought of the people he loved, such as an ordinary President, our freedom of the press would have been destroyed. A little man would have held to his two friends, sunk to his knees and then laughed and said: "Boys, I am strong in this country so I am going to see what the next jump will result in." Then he would have jumped into quicksand and then sunk to his knees, to his waist, and then yelled to his two friends to throw him a rope or a plank. But the two friends would be running and he would gradually sink into the mire of quicksand, he would appeal to God and the Lord Jesus Christ but they would not be there and as the sand would quickly suck him down he would scream and shriek and would disappear never to be known again.

The Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of this free-loving and free-abiding world, will not let us down.

I wish to give this illustration and suppose thousands of other country newspapers have had the same experience as I. My paper, The Delaware Coast News, serves both Lewes (7 miles from my plant) and Rehoboth Beach (where my plant is located). When the war started a big construction company came to Lewes to build Fort Miles (this is not a military secret as millions of our people, the Germans, Italians, and those Japs know it); an Air Corps Unit was established in this locality; two canneries and packers are also here. My plant is the only plant available in this section to meet the immediate demands of these military and essential firms. On many occasions my linotype operator, pressman, and I have worked 18 hours a day in order to get a job out when it was needed, and my wife has gotten in contact with a pressman willing to work all night (think of getting one of these birds in a day—you would get a shock of your life). We have often stopped the work we were doing to do these essential jobs. My two men have never failed to complete a Government job on the hour that it was needed.

Mr. President, my little newspaper and my four presses are necessary. My pressman is 68 years of age, and my linotype operator is 33, is married, and has two children, one 8 and the other 4 years of age. If either man is called into service they cannot be replaced. Personally, I enlisted 2 months after the first World War was declared and spent a cold spring and a severe cold winter in a horse stable. They moved the horse in the morning, sprayed, put in new-mown hay and said: "Roll, there's your bunk, go to sleep." Yes, for a year after I was honorably discharged I could smell horses.

Yes, Mr. Roosevelt cut 50 percent of my paper stock but leave me my two men in the plant to continue furnishing these essential groups war supplies. Yes, if the need is strong for the sake of American lives cut my supply 75 percent but do not take my two men as they are undoubtedly essential.

May I live to see the day when I can truly bow my head in prayer, with my heart filled with love and my cup of joy running over and know that you have taken your place in history with Presidents as great as Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

The above sentiments are my own, written freely with a feeling in my heart that Peace on Earth Good Will Toward Men will eventually come true and that the Heavenly Father will again smile and rise from that old oaken chair, join his one and only son, Jesus Christ, and look down upon Christian men and ask at last, his people to read those 10 short commandments which if you will read them over carefully you will find them easy to obey and still enjoy the fruits of life.

Your editor,

ROLAND B. INGRAM.

Home Furnishings for War Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from one of the local furniture dealers in Oregon relating to home furnishings for war workers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 10, 1943.

Hon. RUFUS C. HOLMAN,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have purposely waited until this time to reply to your very kind letter of January 8, wherein you request the observations and recommendations of the businessmen in our field of endeavor.

Your letter was presented by me while in San Francisco last week to a meeting of the Western States merchants of home furnishings with national officers present. They all commented how splendid and cooperative the Senator from Oregon was and that they were going to solicit your support in preventing Government in business, which, under the guise of war emergency has stealthily been creeping into all phases of business and eliminating private industry.

For example, it appears that while manufacturers and dealers of home furnishings could take care of all necessary furnishings for war workers; certain individuals have begun their program within the administration in the following manner. First, they said it was necessary to furnish the dormitories for single men in shipyards. No objections from business. Then they said it would be necessary to furnish the apartments. No unified objection from business. Now, they have forced a local furniture factory to take orders to make furniture to store in big warehouses, for the purpose of furnishing the homes of one-, two-, or three-bedroom individual homes. This, then, removes private business entirely. Yet these war workers are making tremendous salaries or wages and they have large full-enamel refrigerators; beautiful full-enamel electric ranges; full-enamel water heaters (electric), and heaters furnished to them. Nicer ones than you and I possess. Now, they get their furnishings. They have utterly no responsibility of acquiring and furnishing homes. They know none of the requisites or values attached to acquiring things by paying for them. They have lots of money and nothing to buy but liquor and cheap amusement in most cases and relatively few bonds. Result is absenteeism from war work. Their attitude is to hell with working and getting money when there is nothing to buy. A man who assumes responsibility of buying essentials for the home, the bulwark of any nation, becomes a steady working man and a better citizen. As you realize, there is a large percentage of these war workers who have never made such money. They are drunk with it. It would be a grand opportunity for the Administration to teach these people the basic American principles of industry, home ownership, and thriftiness, by forcing them to do like you and I have done all our lives: buy our homes; buy our furnishings; buy our United States bonds; buy our libraries for proper education and environment for our children in our homes, and so forth, and be responsible individuals; but no, they are giving them everything such as described above and letting the taxpayer pay for all of these luxuries which the Administration is giving to these workers. In other words, in a substantial manner, they have taken the two shovels away from Work Projects Administration workers, which they used for leaning purposes, and are now perpetuating the loafing system, either with malice of forethought or unwittingly. You can judge that better than I.

In short, the home-furnishing people can supply all home furnishings for war workers if given the opportunity; but not when the administration buyers go directly to the manufacturer and buy for individual homes as they are now doing and as they are doing in all fields of endeavor, to the end that they eliminate private industry and regiment

capital and the so-called democratic system into something foreign to the American people. More and more, people are talking about dictatorships of foreign countries and wondering whether or not we are actually fighting for true democracy with the present administration in power. No one seems to question the war; they all seem to realize the need of winning and are pledged to do all to win, the same as you and I, but they say it is beginning to appear as though bureaucracy or ism is the ultimate object of communism in this country and the end of democracy as known by the American people.

Thomas Alva Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today is the ninety-fifth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Alva Edison.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address I made in this House concerning him 2 years ago. Everything I said at that time, I repeat today:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my humble tribute to the memory of one of America's most illustrious sons.

Yesterday was the ninety-third anniversary of the birth of Thomas Alva Edison, our country's greatest contribution to the world's list of scientific men.

He was the foremost inventive genius of the age and one of the leading benefactors of mankind. He was the greatest liberator the world has ever known. By the force of his matchless genius, aided by his tireless energy, he struck the shackles of drudgery from untold millions of human beings and lifted the world into the light of a new civilization, the like of which humanity had scarcely dreamed.

He stands in history among the leaders of the men of genius of all time—Homer, Galileo, Michelangelo, Rembrandt, Mozart, Cervantes, Shakespeare, Columbus, Jefferson, Newton, and Marconi. Towering amid that great galaxy rises the immortal figure of Edison, in glorified silhouette against the horizon of the ages, sending a glow of radiance down the centuries to come to stir the hopes and fire the imaginations of toilers of the future who struggle for the betterment of mankind.

It is unnecessary to attempt to magnify his virtues, to minimize his vices, or to clothe him with qualities he did not have. All that is necessary to commend him to the minds and hearts of peoples of all climes is the simple story of this earnest, patient man, toiling through the silent hours of the night to make the world a better place in which to live.

He was the greatest public servant of his day; yet he held no political office, he founded no political party, he advanced no new political creeds. Therefore no array of illustrious speakers volunteer to sing his praise or use his name as a sounding board to further selfish ends.

He was one of the mightiest conquerors this world has ever seen; yet he waged no wars of human destruction, he fought no bloody battles, he stirred no fires of human hate nor pandered to the baser passions of the race. But he conquered the elements, as it were, and gave to humanity the greatest ascendancy over the forces of nature the world has ever known. He brought the dawn of a new civilization—the electric age.

He never intentionally hurt a human being. Therefore no memorial has been erected to him in his country's capital, no monument dedicated to his name, no blazing epitaph upon these historic walls proclaim his services to the world.

I sometimes wonder if we really appreciate the services of men of genius. They scale the heights and blaze the way to those sublime achievements that mark the milestones in the progress of the race, while men of talent dig in, solidify, and hold the gains and enjoy the progress that genius makes.

Have you ever thought what would happen if we should lose all that men and women of genius have accomplished for the world? What this land would be like? It would be a different world—cold, pulseless, monotonous, and silent. Our transportation system would come to a standstill, the telephone and telegraph wires would become useless obstructions, the lights would go out, the radio would be silenced, and all the machinery of industry, as well as that of commerce, would cease to move. As has been well and wisely said, if you take from the world all that genius has given, "all the niches would be empty, all the walls would become naked, meaning and connection would fall from words of poetry and fiction, music would go back to common air, and all the forms of subtle and enchanting art would lose proportion, to become the unmeaning waste and shattered spoil of thoughtless chance."

It would be useless to attempt to enumerate all the things that Edison did for mankind. His greatest contribution was the invention of the electric light—the incandescent lamp. With that one act he did more to change the course of our civilization than has any other man who ever "lived in the tide of time." He not only lighted our halls, our homes, our streets, and our highways, but he gave us the spark that fires the gas that makes the motor machine possible.

He ushered in the electric age, and the motor age as well. He made possible the automobile, the X-ray, the airplane, the submarine, the moving picture, and the radio. He gave us a new system of overland transportation, taught us to navigate the air, and enabled us to roam with safety on the bottom of the seas. He eliminated time and space and aided us to see through objects that were formerly supposed to exclude all light.

He made possible mass production through new industrial machinery, and gave us that great multiplicity of electrical appliances that add to the comforts and conveniences of every home and every business establishment. He made necessities luxuries and luxuries necessities, and enabled us to electrify the farm homes of America and to lift from the shoulders of burdened humanity the great weight of drudgery under which farm men and women have struggled since the beginning of time.

He tapped a source of wealth richer than the diamond mines of Golconda, more valuable than all the oil fields and all the gold and diamond mines of the modern and ancient world—a wealth that is inexhaustible, and one that will last as long as rains fall and rivers flow to the sea.

His monument is in every home that turns an electric switch; his epitaph is written on every heart that beats in gratitude for the services he gave. He needs no pompous memorial to commemorate his life. He needs no monument, save the eternal and indestructible substance of his own greatness to commend him to the consideration of all coming ages. His name will live and his fame will reach to the remotest times in which civilized man shall dwell upon the earth.

Someone has said that—

"They are the truly great who, as the centuries slowly pass, are found by each succeeding race near to the heart of human love."

Centuries may come and go, empires may flourish and pass away, republics may rise and fall, but the work of Edison will endure.

When the monuments to lesser men shall have perished with the lapse of time, when this Republic shall have run its course and taken its place among the dead nations of the past, when in the distant lapse of ages yet to come errant wanderers from different lands shall stand before the crumbling columns of this Capitol and look down across the ruins of the District of Columbia, the name of Thomas A. Edison will remain, unscarred by the wreck of ages and undimmed by the floods of time. [Applause.]

Food Production and Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the comments and suggestions of Robert A. Hudson, president of the Hudson-Duncan Co., the largest operator in food supplies in the Oregon section of the country, regarding food production and distribution.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is gratifying to know that finally Washington is giving food production and distribution attention. Two points arise:

First. Do they realize the amount of food required and what will be necessary to produce same?

Second. Has the program started too late?

Experiences of the last World War seem to be the partial fundamentals of past performance taken into consideration in formulating policies for the prosecution of this war. The food program does not parallel.

In a previous article entitled "Food Will Win the War" it was pointed out that in the last war the entire Mediterranean Sea area was in full food production. The East Indies and all Asia were in production, the Baltic Sea partially, and the North Sea completely, as well as all the producing areas we have today. Food requirements were not as large as today, still food became scarce and prices spiraled to levels way above those of today. History shows that the closing of the avenues to obtain food supplies caused Germany to surrender even though she was in a fairly good position as far as mechanized equipment and munitions were concerned. Therefore, "food should win or lose this war eventually."

It would be ridiculous to intimate that mechanized equipment such as planes, guns, and ships are not the first necessity, but what are they worth without properly trained manpower and munitions and what are they all worth without sufficient food production? All must dovetail on an equally important basis.

Our Government has a perfected plan to produce mechanized equipment, and a positively perfected plan to secure manpower for the Army, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guards. By labeling certain industries, "War Essential," they partially take care of that situation. What about manpower for food cultivating, harvesting, and distribution?

Our major Allies are producing the bulk of the mechanized equipment they require. They must have food; therefore, lend-lease requirements will be larger than last year. Our South American Allies will require a part of our production formerly obtained from food-producing areas of the Mediterranean Sea. As we take over German, Italian, or Japanese occupied territories, we must feed the civilian population; therefore still more food will be required. Right here the old problem arises. History shows that unrest and revolt on the home front is caused by the taking away of food and home supplies made necessary by the requirements of the armed forces and the conquered territory. Victorious armies have often been obliged to retreat and give up conquered terrtitory to reduce requirements for food and supplies in order to pacify the home front and, therefore, have ultimately faced defeat. This all seems unnecessary in a country such as ours, and the order properly handled is not too large.

If a definite plan is necessary to produce mechanized equipment, planes, ships, etc., and if a definite and not a voluntary plan is necessary to secure manpower for the Army, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guards, why isn't it necessary to have a positive plan to take care of the other important partner, manpower for the proper cultivating, harvesting, and distribution of food to insure sufficient supplies?

Newspapers carry articles that 1,000,000 men must be released from the armed forces for food production. This seems unnecessary, and anyhow, to comply with regulations to release these men, would not make them available until harvesting time which would be too late. The cultivating of farms and orchards must be done now. The voluntary system is certainly not satisfactory and not dependable. Last season's operations proved that this system was responsible for shortening our production in the Northwest at least 20 percent, and remember right here that at least 60 percent of regular farm labor was on the farms last season. The bulk of this help will not be there this season. They have been either called in the draft or have taken over more lucrative positions in defense work.

The following plan is suggested to create manpower sufficient to take care of all domestic requirements:

"In this class place all men rejected for any reason for the armed forces, also place in this class all men from 39 to 65 and all boys of the ages, 16 and 17. Separate from these the various farm and orchard operators, business executives, superintendents of various kinds, and department managers. These men should act as instructors not only for the class created, but also to train women for men's positions. Place the operation of this class under the control of the United States Employment Offices subject to the same draft regulations as now are used to secure manpower for the Army, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guards. In other words, if workers are needed for war industries or for producing, cultivating, or harvesting crops, or for work on dairies, farms, or cattle ranches, the same draft regulations used for military purposes should prevail. This would mean that each community in the United States would furnish its quota regardless of where the workers were needed and would eliminate a drain on any one locality and assure sufficient workers for all requirements. With this manpower available to the Committee for Food Production under the able leadership of Secretary Wickard, food supplies would be developed on an equal basis with mechanized equipment."

This production developed would ease considerably the necessity of food rationing and would take proper care of requirements for the armed forces and lend-lease.

Last season we found that boys from 14 to 18 were the most reliable workers for harvesting crops. They might miss some time in school. This can be made up and in later years they will be proud of the fact that they played an important part in winning the war.

Cultivating and harvesting should be under the supervision of the county agents. Our agricultural colleges, with a dependable personnel familiar with all farm and dairy problems in their respective States, should be utilized in aiding cultivation, etc., to assure crops of proper quality.

This plan does not create new agencies, it merely utilizes what we now have and is respectfully submitted on one basis only—that is, trying to be helpful.

P. S.—The manpower situation here is critical. Before the war the Portland immediate trading area served approximately 500,000 people. Our supporting truck farms, retail and wholesale stores, restaurants, and amusement places were in line with the population.

The shipyards alone have approximately 90,000 workers at this time and claim that this figure will ultimately reach 120,000. This does not mention the requirements of the allied war industries, lumber camps, workers in the civilian industries, and last but not least, the requirements to produce our full share of the farm products, remembering that the Northwest produces practically one-third of the food products required by the Government for the Pacific coast.

The present load is too heavy; consequently it is not being taken care of properly. If an additional load is placed in this area, defense and other workers will not stay here long because they will not be able to secure sufficient food, amusements, and home comforts.

Draft boards here, to make quotas, are taking store managers, wholesale executives, and farm operators which is making the situation considerably worse. The Oregonian this morning carries an article that the Kaiser interests are bringing in several thousand men from eastern points, also that the Agricultural Department is sending in some manpower for dairy farms. This shows that manpower must be available in other parts of the United States. Why not, then, to stop this confusion adopt a fixed plan such as suggested in the above article.

ROBERT A. HUDSON,
President, Hudson-Duncan Co.

Woman Suffrage Has Made This Nation a Better Place To Live In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to a woman who has made this a better Nation and a better world to live in, Susan B. Anthony. It was her struggle for equal suffrage that enabled other women to finally bring it about. The women of America have used that right at least as wisely as the men. They have used it more discriminatingly in favor of a higher standard of public morals.

Susan B. Anthony was a crusader. She was ahead of her times. She was criticized and opposed, but in the end her ideals triumphed. We generally oppose that which is new and then later realize that we were wrong. It is to be regretted that those who bring about great reforms seldom live to see the blossoms of their work ripen into fruit, yet, after they depart their work lives on.

No one today would want to deny to women the right to vote. Yet it seems but like yesterday when during the First World War Alice Paul was arrested because she insisted upon woman suffrage. We were then fighting to make the world safe for democracy, and yet I saw women being insulted and beaten in front of the Executive Mansion by civilian employees coming out of the Navy and Treasury Departments. Today no one would understand or tolerate such a performance. We have truly made progress. We know that in the future the suffrage of women will prohibit any such reenactment or such intolerance in the United States of America.

The pioneer women of America are just as responsible for the greatness of this Nation as are the men. They braved the storms and stress of pioneer life. They helped to subdue the wilderness and build the greatest civilization of all times.

The pioneer women of my State, North Dakota, endured the same burdens and hardships as the men. They were as truly pioneers as were the men. They helped to make that State the most progressive and liberal State in the Nation. We are justly proud of their work. In North Dakota, women have equal rights with men.

Yet woman's work is not finished, and, like man's work, never will be finished. In some States women have not yet attained the full rights of men.

Small Vegetable Canning Factories

REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in my district there are probably more small vegetable canning factories than in any other one district in the United States. Up to this time the Office of Price Administration and the Agriculture Department have failed to settle the question of maximum and minimum prices, and put out something about wage freezing, so that these canning industries might contract for acreage to produce peas, tomatoes, and other vegetables. Unless something is done by the Office of Price Administration and the Agriculture Department before March 1, many of these small canning factories will shut down and there will be a tremendous shortage of foodstuffs in the coming year.

MEETING OF INDIANA VEGETABLE CANNERS

On February 3, 1943, the vegetable canners of Indiana were assembled in In-

dianapolis at the request of the Federal Government for the announced purpose of being advised by Government representatives as to the raw products prices, support prices, ceiling prices, and other governmental regulations which were to be imposed upon them in this coming canning year. The result of the meeting was that the canners were given no information except that which they had previously read in the daily papers, and they expressed their reaction to this fact and to other governmental actions in the following resolutions:

Whereas the food processors of the entire country were invited to come to Chicago in December to be advised of the requirements which the Federal Government would impose upon them in 1943; and

Whereas, those who attended said conference were told nothing except that the Office of Price Administration was intending to fix and announce ceilings on canned foods as soon as the Department of Agriculture fixed raw product costs, and that the system of grade labeling which Congress had repeatedly refused to require by statute was to be imposed by administrative edict; and

Whereas, the food canners of Indiana were then asked by the Federal Government to assemble in Indianapolis in January, to be told those things which they had expected to learn at Chicago; and

Whereas, the Government later asked that this meeting be postponed until today so that the Government would be ready to perform its function; and

Whereas, this meeting resulted and was attended by nearly all of the food canners of Indiana and by many from other States; and

Whereas the Government sent to said meeting only persons with no knowledge of either the promised information or of the problems of the industry, and who did nothing but read to the assembled citizens excerpts from press releases which had been published several days before.

Now, therefore, the food canners here assembled hereby express to those responsible, and to the public, their sense of complete disgust with the manner in which they have been treated by the representatives of the Government which they pay taxes to maintain and furnish sons to protect; and further wish it to be known that they have wasted all of the time, money, gasoline, and rubber which they can afford to devote to such useless activities; and want the public to realize that the inevitable diminution in the production of processed foods which will result is in no degree the fault of either the growers, the processors, or the distributors, but solely of those purporting to act in the name and authority of the administrative branch of the Federal Government.

That if the canning industry is to meet the 1943 production goals established for it, the industry must have, in advance of planting season, a greater assurance than has thus far been given that it will have at least some chance of retaining and hiring the labor necessary to harvest and process its 1943 canning crops; that such assurance must include (1) opportunity to increase wage rates to levels comparable to those being offered cannery workers by other industries, and (2) opportunity to obtain indefinite deferment of military service for the most essential supervisory employees in canneries; and that such assurance should properly be given by extending to cannery workers the same treatment as that afforded agricultural workers inasmuch as the canning industry is so closely allied to agriculture and canning plants are generally located in rural or small urban communities, such treatment consisting of exemption from the wage-stabilization order on wages and salaries up to $200 per month and indefinite deferment of the most essential employees in class II-C or class III-C under the Selective Service Act as amended.

That the imposition of compulsory grade labeling of canned foods, as provided for in Maximum Price Regulation No. 306, is a definite deterrent to 1943 production of canned foods in that it is definitely unsound and unworkable as has been heretofore repeatedly shown to the Office of Price Administration; it will submit the industry to criminal proceedings, because of difference in grading by representatives of different governmental agencies; it will operate as a slowdown of production; it will require additional labor and inspection in the face of a manpower shortage; and it will increase costs at a time when all effort should be devoted to minimizing costs.

That the canned food subsidy program announced by the Secretary of Agriculture in his press release dated January 28, 1943, is unsound, unnecessary, and will definitely operate to reduce the production of canned food in the coming year for the following reasons:

1. The canner is being put in the position of taking a subsidy out of the public funds when the subsidy in reality is wholly for the benefit of other groups.

2. It is dishonest to conceal from taxpayer consumers by such a subterfuge the real cost of the food they consume.

3. The canner must commit himself to his operation long before he can have any assurance that Congress will authorize the payment and make available the funds.

4. No canner should obligate himself to pay any grower a firm price for raw products higher than he paid in 1942, plus such subsidy as he may receive, as and when received, unless Congress has previously provided for such subsidy.

The Indiana vegetable canners assembled in meeting at Indianapolis, Ind., on the 3rd day of February 1943, at the request of the Federal Government, hereby express their belief that no price ceiling or Government fixed price on any canned food is just or fair which denies to the canner thereof the opportunity to recover his fair costs and a reasonable profit as provided by the Constitution; and they insist that they are entitled to know just what such ceilings are to be before they decide upon their plans of operation for 1943.

That the first of March is the latest date to which the contracting for raw material can be delayed without serious danger to maximum production; and that, maximum production cannot be expected unless by that time the appropriate agencies of the Federal Government have:

1. Determined and announced the minimum price for each kind, variety, and grade of raw product and all applicable limitations on prices of seed, plants, supplies, and services furnished to growers.

2. Determined and announced fair maximum prices at which the canners are to be permitted to sell each kind, type, grade, and size of each product or have announced a formula by which the same can be definitely computed.

3. Modified the present wage-freezing order so as to give canners the same liberty to make unrestricted wage variations as is given to the growers of his raw products.

4. Ended the activities of the Federal Food and Drug Administration in seizing and destroying tomato products containing high nutritive value and in no sense injurious to the consumer.

5. Definitely abandoned the intent to impose any mandatory system of grade labeling on food packed in 1943.

6. Definitely abandoned any plan to directly or indirectly pay a subsidy to canners.

It is further resolved that it is the opinion of the vegetable canners here assembled that the longer the governmental agencies delay in taking each of the steps above indicated the more serious the results will be.

Why Another Committee?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to request granted by the House, I submit a brief editorial from the Washington News in the issue of February 13. The editorial is as follows:

WHY ANOTHER COMMITTEE?

Where is all the steam coming from in the big drive to create a new committee on aviation in Congress?

One of the great weaknesses of Congress, one of the things that makes its operations so cumbersome, is that it has too many committees.

There is no more reason for a committee on aviation than there is for a committee on radio, or a committee on motor busses, or a committee on motortrucks, or a committee on railroads. Aviation is just one means of transportation. All transportation problems can be better handled through one committee, and such a committee now already exists—the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Crop and Feed Loans

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, much talk and considerable discussion is going on in this Nation of ours today as to whether we have a Republic with its three departments of government—legislative, judicial, and executive—functioning properly, the constitutional way, or whether the legislative department has been completely bypassed and we are now under a government directed by edicts or executive regulations. It is only one step from bypassing the legislative functions of the Congress to the bypassing of all our usual business activities by the Federal Government. I received the following circular letter sent out to the farmers in my district, soliciting loans for the production of farm crops, bypassing the local banking institutions. Under unanimous consent, I include this circular and two letters from bankers protesting the solicitation of loans from our farmers by representatives of the Production Credit Association:

CROP AND FEED LOANS

Loans are now available to farmers for the purchase of machinery repairs, feed for livestock, the production of feed for livestock, seed, fuel and oil, fertilizer, irrigation water, and other expenses incidental to the production of crops.

All loans mature in the fall of 1943 and draw interest at the rate of 4 percent.

All farmers who are in need of funds to enable them to increase their production in the food for freedom program or because of hail or any other reason should contact the county agent's office, field supervisor, emergency crip and feed loan office, and they will be glad to discuss these types of loans with farmers or anyone else interested in agricultural credit.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK,
Julesburg, Colo., January 20, 1943.

Mr. E. H. GOUGH,
Deputy Comptroller, Office of Comptroller of the Currency,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GOUGH: In our locality we are experiencing considerable competition from the Production Credit Associations. They are offering money to our farmers and feeders at rates of interest much lower than we can accept, and still maintain this bank.

Last year on $50,000 capital, our total tax bill was some $9,000. The Production Credit Associations pay no income taxes and they pay no general tax. They do not contribute to the schools, churches, lodges, and other essential organizations for our mode of living.

We understood when the law was enacted for Production Credit Associations that they were to take over whenever private funds were not available. In this district there are ample funds for all responsible borrowers in our banks and we think that a curb must be set upon these Production Credit Associations or our banking system insofar as a country national bank is concerned, is likely to fail.

At the present time we have one-fifth of our deposits invested in Government bonds drawing 2 percent or less and we have one-fifth of our deposits invested in Commodity Credit Corporation loans drawing 1½ percent and we have about one-fifth of our deposits in farmer and businessmen loans. To lose the farmer loans would remove our profit entirely from the bank.

We have been serving on Selective Service boards, victory fund committees, and various other Government organizations and we feel that we are entitled to our Government's protection in our business.

Can you assist us any in our section in curbing the active solicitation by Production Credit Associations among our farmer customers?

Yours very truly,
W. R. MCKINSTRY, *President.*

THE COLORADO SAVINGS & TRUST CO.,
La Junta, Colo., February 10, 1943.

Representative WILLIAM S. HILL,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am advised that the Department of Agriculture has requested the Government to again reinstate the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation (the R. A. C. C.) for the purpose of advancing funds to farmers and ranchmen, under the guise of increasing production in the food for freedom program.

As a banker, I think this is entirely unnecessary, as the bankers themselves are amply able and willing to take care of worthy borrowers and, in addition, the Government has in operation the entire resources of the Production Credit Association and the Farm Security Administration. The banks are heavy taxpayers and contributors to all Government programs and it is decidedly unfair to inject tax-free competition into the picture when the banks themselves are already doing such a good job.

I know that you are interested in this matter and for that reason I am giving you this information.

Very truly yours,
E. G. WOODBRIDGE, *Vice President.*

Civil Aviation and the Post-War World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, increasing public interest in the place of civil aviation under the American flag in the post-war world is an omen of good for America's future.

Congress and the country may well give constructive attention to our civil aviation resources—a national asset which, properly fostered and developed, has already proved its value, and which, in days to come, should be increased manyfold.

Since 1938 the civil aviation of this country has been, and is today, the best in the world. Whatever standard of measurement may be used, America's civil aviation is the strongest, most extensive, safest, and most developed that the world knows. It should be our firm policy to make sure we will always keep the outstanding position we have today.

INTERNATIONAL AVIATION

Recently public interest has been focused on the policies which should be pursued for America's civil aviation in its international aspects after the present war is over. It is hoped this discussion may continue on more constructive lines. In considering our international aviation problems let us not forget that we live in a very practical world with very practical neighbors.

One basic fact to be recognized is that the right of air navigation over the territory of other nations, like that of navigation over our own country is dependent upon the consent of the government of the country affected. This is our rule; it is the rule of our world neighbors. There is no practical prospect of its change.

Such rights of air navigation in other countries must be acquired by negotiation of the carriers or by international agreements between the nations affected.

National negotiations for the acquisition of such rights must be secured through negotiations by the executive department. That is an executive and not a legislative function. The attempt of legislative groups to perform that function would only lead to confusion and disappointment.

Our expansion of aviation for war purposes has necessarily been much in disregard of costs.

The extension of international aviation by other countries prior to the war were accomplished with the aid of governmental ownership or subsidization.

The practical fact is that the advancement of American-flag aviation to friendly nations of the world was accomplished by the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 provided a rule of compensation by our Government to our air carriers in an amount which, with other revenues, was sufficient to maintain the service. That simple rule of compensation made possible the great expansion of the international civil aviation by our craft within the last 5 years.

What I have said does not ignore the fact that legislation alone cannot accomplish the advancement that is required. Better designs, better construction, reduction of manufacturing and operating costs, and the reduction of fuel cost by transmitting to the motor a higher percentage of fuel power than now obtainable.

The finest hope for international aviation will be when we restore to civilization the right to live and let live. A just place for American aviation, a place in air transportation relative to America's importance in the world, is what we should claim for the future of aviation.

The post-war conditions will have many problems of readjustment of which aviation is one.

We should not be confused as to the problems of aviation. The problems of design and construction are those of the mechanic and the manufacturer. The problems of operation and navigation are those of the operator and technicians. The problems of management are those of the businessman. The establishment of legislative policies is the problem of Congress. The execution of those policies are the problems of the administrative and executive departments of the Government. Problems of promotion, of research, of experiment, control of airports and navigation facilities, and like matters, are, too, problems within governmental policies. It is for Congress to define these policies of air navigation and operation and safety, and it is for the experts, mechanics, and technicians under the administrative heads of the Government to carry them into execution.

The direction of our future international course in civil aviation depends almost entirely upon international treaties and agreements which are yet to be negotiated. Those negotiations must be conducted with a cold appreciation of the fact that ever since 1919 every nation has asserted and maintained exclusive sovereignty in its own air space. Our own Nation has done so; England, Russia, and all the others have done so, uniformly.

This fact is of tremendous importance. However glibly we may talk of the Arctic regions as being the center of a great international air traffic in the future, we cannot ignore Russia's ownership of nearly half of those regions and Russia's sovereignty in the air space. Russia's concern to protect that sovereignty is demonstrated by the fact that even today, with her great need for supplies from other countries, she insists upon picking up such supplies in her own airplanes beyond her borders. England, too, owns areas throughout the world which give her a strategic position in the air lanes. We would be foolish to forget the fact that the relationship between England's international commerce and her domestic commerce is almost the reverse of our own. Our international trade is but a relatively small fraction

of our total trade; in the case of England the relationship is almost exactly reversed. We can readily expect England will seek to restore the trade on which her future is so dependent. We likewise must seek the welfare of the Nation.

Therefore, let us not delude ourselves with general formulas or catch-words or fictitious issues; and let us not fall victims to the assumption that we have but to pass a law, express our own will, and thereby accomplish our aims. By all means let us not hamper our international negotiators by boastful declarations which create resentment and distrust and build up against us handicaps to our advancement into the future.

On January 11 of this year, H. R. 1012 was introduced in the House to carry forward the national policy respecting civil aviation which was established in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and to add further important provisions to that act looking to the sound growth and development of civil aeronautics. On February 13 the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce favorably reported this bill.

This bill proposes certain commonsense, practical steps to further advance and continue the tremendous developments in civil aviation which have occurred by virtue of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

H. R. 1012

With appreciation of the common sense of the situation, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported this bill which has two main purposes. In the first place, it provides certain tools to be used, if need be, in effectuating our international policies; in the second place, it adds certain provisions to existing law which will further strengthen our domestic civil aviation.

The bill proposes that we reaffirm and make even more explicit the national policy adopted in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to the effect that we should continue to build up our air transport system as our merchant marine of the air. It provides further for appropriations to be administered directly by the Civil Aeronautics Board, where necessary to accomplish that policy, without relying wholly upon compensation for carrying the mail. It strengthens our existing laws to assure that our own carrier system will at all times be owned and controlled by loyal American citizens. It makes no modification in our power to determine what air transportation will be conducted to or for this country by aircraft of other nations. Thus fortified and fortified further by the existing provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, those who will represent America at the international council tables should be able to represent her well.

Moreover, the bill makes special provision for an extensive study of post-war civil aviation problems by the Civil Aeronautics Board in order that all data on this subject may be gathered by an expert agency and reported to the Congress with plans for the sound and swift development of our air commerce. This important provision of the bill contemplates that Congress will be given a full statement of the facts as early as possible in order that it may have the best possible information upon which to act when the time comes. The bill also provides for extending the regulatory and developmental provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act so that all our air commerce within this Nation may be fostered upon a sound basis, on fair terms, and without destructive interstate barriers.

The bill provides further for regulation of contract carriers by air, which are not today subject to economic regulation, thus rounding out the statutory powers for dealing with economic problems of commercial aviation. Moreover, the bill contains a very important provision for a Nation-wide program looking to the regulation and removal of hazards to air navigation on and in the vicinity of airports, thus assuring for both military and civil aeronautics a necessary protection against unreasonable obstructions.

In addition, and of importance both to our domestic and to our international aviation in the future, the bill grants important powers to the Civil Aeronautics Board looking to continued interest by that Board in the subject of aviation insurance and reinsurance, and calling for a special report on the subject of reinsurance, which is a matter that may vitally affect our national interest in the future.

These and other provisions in the bill are practical steps which have been discussed and carefully considered for years, both by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Civil Aeronautics Board, other agencies of the Government, and the aviation industry. Without being visionary and impractical, but with hard-headed appreciation of realities, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is proposing in this bill definite steps toward further strengthening and developing our civil aviation.

Measured by ability, breadth of vision, practical and long experience in military and civil aviation and business management of air navigation, no man in America is better qualified to speak on aviation problems than Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association of America. Colonel Gorrell appeared before the committee and discussed these problems at length. In referring to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 drafted by this committee, he said that act had "stood the test of experience and has proved its suitability under circumstances which never could have been anticipated when it was drafted." He described the bill now pending before the House by saying "that it is a fit running mate to your Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938."

More About Silver

REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, during the discussion of the Celler-Wolcott amendment to the Treasury-Postoffice appropriation bill on February 5, considerable was said in criticism of the Silver Purchase Acts of June 19, 1934, and July 6, 1939. These acts provide for the purchase of silver, both domestic and foreign, until the ratio of silver to gold shall reach 1 to 3 or until the price reaches $1.29 per ounce, and in the later act for the minting of silver dollars from domestic silver to the extent of 55 percent of the silver received and the retention of 45 percent as for a seigniorage charge, thus fixing the price of domestic silver at 71.11 cents per ounce. While it is true that the Treasury has accumulated about 100,000 tons of silver by the operation of these acts of which 55 percent or 55,000 tons are either in the form of minted dollars or are held as security for a like amount in silver certificates, and 45 percent or 45,000 tons are "free silver," so-called, and await the day when the parity spoken of is attained, I do not concede that either the demands of war industry or nonwar industry or any claim of subsidy to the silver industry warrants the abandonment of this legislation.

My purpose in these remarks is to analyze the functions and the proper utilization of the great store of silver bullion accumulated and held and to be increased and held, under existing law, which it is now proposed to release and dissipate into the channels of trade. I will not speak of the twenty-two and a half billions of gold bullion now underground at Fort Knox, Ky., because, thus far at least, no one has proposed to exhume it and expose it to the processes of undignified decay.

It may be said that the discussion in this House is premature. The amendments referred to do not pretend to repeal the acts of 1934 and 1939. They seem designed merely to place this body in the position of giving a foretaste of a feeling, which is assumed to exist, inimical to those acts. They seem to be merely "gestures," exhibiting, as it were, the whip for the intimidation of those who represent not alone the great industry that takes natural wealth from the earth in the form of gold, silver, copper, lead, and zinc, without robbing any man, but who represent that larger body of citizenry that puts its trust not alone in God but in the constantly precious money metals with which that same God has blessed mankind. Nevertheless, whether gesture or no, there is a challenge in these proceedings, recognized and well repelled by the distinguished and able gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] in the debate of February 5, 1943.

The motto of the State of Nevada is "All for Our Country" and from the day it was adopted to the present day, it has been no idle sentiment. When Nevada was admitted as the thirty-sixth State in the Union, there were but two other States, California and Oregon, in all the great expanse from Kansas to the Pacific. Nevada sent 1,200 soldiers to the Civil War out of 15,000 voters. She sent 6,322 out of a population of 84,000 to World War No. 1 and she is keeping up the good record in the present war, being credited at or near the top in Navy enlistments. In the period 1861–65

Nevada poured more than $100,000,000 in silver into the general wealth of the North to preserve the credit of the Nation and her continued production served largely to hasten the day a decade later for the resumption of specie payments and the reestablishment in the courts of United States currency as legal tender. A few years ago when copper was bringing in the neighborhood of 12 cents a pound, the byproduct silver in that copper was "velvet" to the extent of 1 cent per pound and silver then ranged in the open market between 36 and 42 cents per ounce. At the present time, it is safe to say that were it not for this byproduct silver, found so frequently with the baser metals, as contrasted with its pure form, the production of the commercial, strategic war metals would lag so noticeably as to present a serious impediment to the war effort.

I may say that as between the fullest prosecution of the war and what incidental advantage of a pecuniary sort that might accrue from the hoarding of silver unused in the Treasury, the people of Nevada and of all the silver-producing States of the West would not hesitate one instant. Presented with the proper occasion, they would gladly approve the taking over by the Government for war purposes of the entire stock of silver now at hand or to be produced for redemption or other purpose at any price determined by the Government to be fair and within its ability to afford. And this goes not alone for the so-called free silver but even for the redemption silver that now gives a silver plating to the silver certificates and other currency, taking them out of the category of "fiat money." I say this despite the prospect involved of adding to the stock of currency based on governmental credit alone or backed only by securities of business—commercial paper and the like, coupled or uncoupled with the credit of the Nation. If it is absolutely essential that we have nothing but paper money or rag money in line with most of the rest of the world—depending for our primacy in the markets of the world on a favorable balance of trade, and at the same time incur the horrors of printing-press inflation at home—well, the people of Nevada can stand that too, if it be the well-considered and conscious will of the people.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have yet to find that the emergency I have referred to now exists. All the demands of the war industry can be met from the stock of "free" silver now accumulated in the Treasury. Ever since last May there has been a stock of approximately 45,000 tons of "free" silver available and made available for the uses of the war industry conditioned on a post-war return of a like quantity, and yet, according to the latest reports available, there still remain 23,000 tons unused and uncalled for. Silver has been coming into this country at the rate of 108,000,000 ounces annually. The domestic production is about 60,000,000 ounces annually and it is not rising. There is a law requiring the Treasury to purchase domestically produced silver and pay for it at the rate of 71.11 cents per ounce when and as offered, but there is no law preventing any person or other agency of the Government from buying it, nor is there any law to prevent such persons or agencies from buying imported silver in the open market for outright and absolute ownership and consumption.

But it is claimed that the purchase by the Government of domestic silver constitutes an outrageous expense on the Government and an outrageous subsidy to the silver producers. Every time the Government buys such silver it pays the producer $71.11 per 100 ounces in silver certificates, practically at the cost of running the printing presses, and minting the bullion, if and when called on to redeem the paper. In other words, 55 ounces out of each 100 ounces are coined into silver dollars and the remainder or 45 ounces are held by the Government as a free gift from the miner.

I do not think anyone who will read section 4 of the Domestic Silver Purchase Act will contend that the Government is out 1 penny in buying domestic silver at 71.11 cents per ounce, or will deny that the Government profits by the transaction to the extent of 45 percent of the silver purchased.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a matter of general knowledge that there are pending several bills on the subject now under discussion, and that the offer has been made that ordinarily would have taken care of those jewelers, silversmiths, etc., engaged in the consumptive use of silver by assuring to them the opportunity of purchasing any silver offered for sale not exceeding 30,000,000 ounces per annum. This would, to be sure, involve a market price of 71.11 cents per ounce but there is no reason to suppose that any private individual engaged in accustomed peacetime pursuits would expect, or be entitled to expect, to obtain directly or indirectly from the Government any commodity for less than the Government paid for it. This is all the more true in view of the fact that silver, like gold, possesses many of the attributes of immortality. To be sure it "tarnishes"; but a little elbow grease is good for that. But I conceive that the silversmiths—who are often found to be disguised money-changers in the temple—do protest too much. They remind me of the silversmiths of St. Paul's day who, when they feared that Paul's missionary efforts on behalf of Christianity might interfere with their monopoly as purveyors of silver statues of the goddess Diana, hooted down Paul on the rostrum, crying "Great is Diana of the Ephesians."

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the people of my State and of the mining industry generally are willing to surrender every advantage they may have for the defense of our common country. "Millions for defense; not one cent for tribute." They are willing to be shown the light if there is light, but if there are money changers in the temple, if there are manipulators of the current coin and currency of the land—not to speak of international exchange—then it is high time that the country should know it. For practically all the history of our Government there have been by law 371¼ grains of pure silver in a silver dollar. Nominally, and at least so far as the coinage laws could govern, silver has been worth over that period $1.29 per ounce. The alloy in a silver dollar has been slightly changed at various times, but I am stating history. A half century ago John P. Jones, a Senator from Nevada, stood in the Senate for 4 days without substantial interruption and for a week in all, to discuss the remonetization of silver—opposing the repeal of the purchase clause that was in the act of 1890. At that time it was stated by Senator Cockrell, of Missouri, that Senator John Sherman, of Ohio, was practically the only Member of the Senate who understood the full significance of the pending bill—H. R. 1, Fifty-third Congress, first session: See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 25, part 3, Appendix, page 236; also 606 et seq.

Silver is a money metal, not a mere commodity. She is a full sister, not a stepsister of gold. At a time when we in the United States, in common with all the peoples of the world, were looking about for some refuge from inflation, for some money that is hard and incorruptible, having at least some intrinsic and traditional worth, and having had through the ages the confidence of learned and unlearned alike so that it is accepted as value by weight with or without the stamp, we should view with suspicion any step that may lead to the further chaos of currencies—the further degradation of what we know as the royal metals.

It may be that my conservatism is ill-advised. It may be that my doubts and apprehensions are unwarranted and exaggerated, but let us at least approach this problem directly and not in a collateral way through the embarrassment of an executive agency and arm of government in the administration and enforcement of two well-considered acts of the Congress standing on the books of the written law. If we are to repeal these acts, let us set out to do so rather than beset a rider who is having all he can do to run down the blind horse of war now trampling alike on the graves of the dead and the hearts of the living.

Bureau of Customs' Excellent Contribution in War Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following release from the Treasury Department:

Treasury officers entrusted with keeping out of Axis hands strategic materials, information, and financial and property assets, demonstrated effectiveness of wartime controls with hundreds of investigations, prosecutions, seizures, and arrests during America's first year at war.

Elmer L. Irey, Chief Coordinator of Enforcement, reported to Secretary Morgenthau the conviction of a Japanese national in a $500,000 concealment of assets case, successful prosecution of two Japanese for a plot to deliver huge steel oil-storage tanks to the Nipponese army, and the sentencing of a naturalized American of German origin in a Reich-inspired plot to cash in this country gems looted from the occupied Lowlands.

These were but three of the more important cases investigated during the 1942 calendar year. The Bureau of Customs, carrying out the directives of the Board of Economic Warfare conducted the major part of investigative work at ports and borders. The Foreign Funds Control, newest of the Treasury agencies, was concerned primarily with supervision of funds and other assets of Axis nationals and nationals of occupied or controlled countries that have been frozen by Executive order.

However, under the Treasury's policy of unified direction of its enforcement work, agents of the Secret Service, Intelligence Unit, Bureau of Narcotics, and Alcohol Tax Unit frequently participated in these inquiries.

The funds concealment case brought a 9-year penitentiary sentence to Kenji Iki, a Japanese national, in Federal court at Seattle.

Iki pleaded guilty to an indictment charging him with failure to report to United States Treasury officials $515,000 of Imperial Japanese Government and Japanese utility bonds, and $15,000 in United States currency in his possession. He drew a $5,000 fine in addition to the prison term, and concurrent 5-year and 2-year sentences on related counts.

Customs and foreign-funds control agents developed the case and proved to the satisfaction of the court that Iki's violation was deliberate.

Another investigation of Japanese intrigue by Treasury agencies in cooperation with the Board of Economic Warfare brought conviction of Charles T. Takahaski and Edward Y. Ozuma for a conspiracy to ship the Japanese Army 3 new 80,000-barrel oil storage tanks. They attempted to obtain export licenses by the ruse of setting up a dummy corporation in China, which ostensibly was to receive the tanks. This conspiracy originated before Pearl Harbor, but the investigation, continued into 1942, culminated in convictions in Federal courts at Seattle.

The evidence produced by customs and foreign funds officers pointed to possible income-tax evasion, and the Intelligence Unit was called into the case.

Conviction of Werner von Clemm, naturalized citizen of German origin, a cousin of the wife of Joachim von Ribbentrop, German Foreign Minister, was one of the most sensational cases of the year. The New York gem dealer was sentenced to 2 years in prison and fined $10,000 on charges that he conspired with the German military command to help dispose of gems seized in the invasion of the Low Countries through sale in the New York market.

The case involved concealment of origin of the gems at a time when the United States and Germany were at peace, but during which the occupied countries came under the "freezing" order of the President.

T. H. Ball, chief of the investigative staff, reported that foreign funds made some 2,500 inquiries during the year.

Japanese enterprises on the west coast, most of which were closed at the outbreak of the war, received major attention early in the year. Substantial amounts of concealed assets were discovered and blocked. The agency participated in the wholesale evacuation of the Japanese from strategic areas. Business establishments operating under foreign funds control licenses were closely supervised, and many investigations were made into possible "fronts" for enemy concerns, and into domestic and international transactions coming under the freezing order.

Extension of the import control to American currency opened a new field of activity.

Control of the exportation of all commodities under orders of the Board of Economic Warfare placed upon customs officers under Commissioner W. R. Johnson, the physical control and examination of such shipments out of the country, whether by vessel, aircraft, railroad, truck, automobile, or on the persons of travelers. The Customs Service also had the responsibility for enforcement at the ports and borders of foreign funds control regulation of foreign exchange and currency as applied to persons and things entering or leaving the United States.

Censorship of all forms of international communications except those in the regular course of the mails contained a customs responsibility. Communications control groups, with interpreters, were set up at all principal seaports and border points.

At airports of entry and at seaports, customs officers, acting for the State Department, prevented the departure of American citizens without valid passports. Searches of vessels, vehicles, cargo, baggage, and persons entering or leaving the United States were of necessity far more strict than during the neutrality period.

At seaports, customs men cooperated with and assisted the Navy Department, through the Coast Guard, in protection of water-front facilities against sabotage and fire hazards, working in conjunction with local authorities.

Smuggling of merchandise, including narcotic drugs, decreased to some extent, due to shipping problems incident to the war. Seizures totaled 5,264, a decrease of 3,636 from the preceding year. Liquor smuggling seizures were 2,936, a slight decrease.

But it was in the field of export control and other war measures that the customs agents were busiest.

Platinum apparently continues to be one of the items most sorely needed by the Axis. Numerous attempts to smuggle this vital metal out of the country appeared directly or indirectly linked to enemy agents.

Customs and foreign-funds-control officers, cooperating with United States Secret Service agents and the Canadian Royal Mounted Police continued to plug channels through which gold, high-graded, from Canadian mines has trickled across the border. In one conspiracy case, five persons were convicted in United States court at Buffalo, N. Y., and five others in Dominion courts at Toronto. Three persons were indicted at Buffalo in a second similar case, and a third investigation trapped persons at Detroit, New York City, and Buffalo.

Thomas Alva Edison

REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, today is the birthday of Thomas A. Edison, probably as good an American in his own field as this country has ever produced.

There is one feature of the work of Edison which is not recognized as widely or appreciated as much as his work in the field of science. Edison possessed a clear vision of how absolutely unnecessary it is for the money of the Nation to be tied to public or private debt. On the occasion of an interview which he gave at Muscle Shoals when the great dam at that place was being considered for construction he gave a classic interview on this particular subject, pointing out that the validity of the money of the people depends always on their production of wealth and the taxing power of their Nation rather than on any other thing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a portion of that statement by Mr. Thomas A. Edison on that occasion in the Appendix of the RECORD with my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In the New York Times for December 6, 1921, there was reported an interview with Mr. Edison. The Times article which follows should be carefully read by every thoughtful American, especially those who have so sincerely admired the great work of Thomas A. Edison:

Mr. Edison reiterated his belief, expressed yesterday, that it was a good plan and that if once the currency method is tried in raising money for public improvements, the country will never go back to the bond method.

"Make it perfectly clear that I'm not advocating any changes in banks and banking," said Mr. Edison. "Banks are a mighty good thing. They are essential to the commerce of the country. It is the money broker, the money profiteer, the private banker, that I oppose. They gain their power through a fictitious and false value given to gold."

"Gold is a relic of Julius Ceasar and interest is an invention of Satan," Mr. Edison continued. "Gold is intrinsically of less utility than most metals. The probable reason why it is retained as the basis of money is that it is easy to control. And it is the control of money that constitutes the money question. It is the control of money that is the root of all evil."

"How can this system be improved or changed?" Mr. Edison was asked.

"It can come about in several ways. One way would be to produce so much gold that its psychological hold would be broken. If we all had mines in our back yards or if synthetic gold could be made and sold for 10 cents a pound you would soon see gold disappear as the basis for money. And we are nearing just that; only a few days ago a scientist developed that lead, one of the basic metals, and heretofore an element by itself, is actually a compound. We do not know how near we are from finding that gold, too, is a compound. All the wealth in the world, according to our present standards, may be rendered worthless by the discovery that gold can be made synthetically.

"In that case people could no longer have confidence in it. Money ought to be plentiful and gold is not plentiful. It would be plentiful if it were mined in as large quantities as it could be, but an artificial scarcity is maintained by those who use gold to monopolize money.

"That is one way to do it—make it so plentiful that it drowns its fictitious value and drowns the superstitions of the people along with it."

WOULD FORGET ABOUT GOLD

"Then there is another way—the method my friend Ford proposed the other day. He

proposes just to go along and forget about gold. He says that the Government can finance Muscle Shoals without applying to the money brokers for permission, and I think he is absolutely right about it.

"Of course, as long as the world is on the gold basis, we shall have to recognize it as an element in international trade, but it is not necessary for commerce within our own borders. In internal business we can forget it. And we do forget it. If everybody in the United States suddenly demanded gold for their money, there would not be enough gold.

"Gold and money are separate things, you see. Gold is the trick mechanism by which you can control money.

"Gold is not money until the people of the United States and other nations put their stamp on it. It is not the gold that makes the dollar. It is the dollar that makes the gold. Take the dollar out of the gold, and leave it merely yellow metal, and it sinks in value. Gold is established by law, just as silver was, and gold could be disestablished, demonetized by law, just as silver was. When silver was demonetized the former so-called dollar became worth about 50 cents."

"But would not Mr. Ford's suggestion that Muscle Shoals be financed by a currency issue raise some objection?" Mr. Edison was asked.

"Certainly. There is a complete set of misleading slogans kept on hand for such such outbreaks of common sense among the people. The people are so ignorant of what they think are the intricacies of the money system that they are easily impressed by big words. There would be new shrieks of 'fiat money' and 'paper money' and 'greenbackism' and all the rest of it—the same old cries with which the people have been shouted down from the beginning.

"But maybe we have passed beyond the time when the thoughtful 2 percent—you know, I gather from my questionnaire that only 2 percent of the people think," and Mr. Edison smiled broadly.

"Maybe they can't shout down American thinkers any longer. The only dynamite that works in this country is the dynamite of a sound idea. I think we are getting a sound idea on the money question. The people have an instinct which tells them that something is wrong, and that the wrong somehow centers in money. They have an instinct, also, which tells them when a proposal is made in their interests or against them.

BASED ON SOIL AND ENERGY

"Now, as to paper money, so-called, everyone knows that paper money is the money of civilized people. The higher you go in civilization the less actual money you see. It is all bills and checks. What are bills and checks? Mere promises and orders. What are they based on? Principally on two sources—human energy and the productive earth. Humanity and the soil—they are the only real basis of money.

"Don't allow them to confuse you with the cry of paper money. The danger of paper money is precisely the danger of gold—if you get too much it is no good. They say we have all the gold of the world now. Well, what good does it do us? When America gets all the chips in a game the game stops. We would be better off if we had less gold. Indeed, we are trying to get rid of our gold to start something going. But the trade machine is at present jammed. Too much paper money operates the same way. There is just one rule for money and that is to have enough to carry all the legitimate trade that is waiting to move. Too little or too much are both bad. But enough to move trade, enough to prevent stagnation on the one hand and not enough to permit speculation on the other hand, is the proper ratio."

"Then you see no difference between currency and Government bonds?" Mr. Edison was asked.

"Yes, there is a difference, but it is neither the likeness nor the difference that will determine the matter; the attack will be directed against thinking of bonds and currency together and comparing them. If people ever get to thinking of bonds and bills at the same time, the game is up.

"Now, here is Ford proposing to finance Muscle Shoals by an issue of currency. Very well, let us suppose for a moment that Congress follows his proposal. Personally, I don't think Congress has imagination enough to do it, but let us suppose that it does. The required sum is authorized—say $30,000,000. The bills are issued directly by the Government, as all money ought to be. When the workmen are paid off they receive these United States bills. When the material is bought it is paid in these United States bills. Except that perhaps the bills may have the engraving of a water dam, instead of a railroad train and a ship, as some of the Federal Reserve notes have. They will be the same as any other currency put out by the Government; that is, they will be money. They will be based on the public wealth already in Muscle Shoals, and their circulation will increase that public wealth, not only the public money but the public wealth—real wealth.

"When these bills have answered the purpose of building and completing Muscle Shoals, they will be retired by the earnings of the power dam. That is, the people of the United States will have all that they put into Muscle Shoals and all that they can take out for centuries—the endless wealth-making water power of that great Tennessee River—with no tax and no increase of the national debt."

"But suppose Congress does not see this, what then?" Mr. Edison was asked.

"Well Congress must fall back on the old way of doing business. It must authorize an issue of bonds. That is, it must go out to the money brokers and borrow enough of our own national currency to complete great national resources, and we then must pay interest to the money brokers for the use of our own money."

OLD WAY ADDS TO PUBLIC DEBT

"That is to say, under the old way any time we wish to add to the national wealth we are compelled to add to the national debt.

"Now, that is what Henry Ford wants to prevent. He thinks it is stupid, and so do I, that for the loan of $30,000,000 of their own money the people of the United States should be compelled to pay $66,000,000—that is what it amounts to, with interest. People who will not turn a shovelful of dirt nor contribute a pound of material will collect more money from the United States than will the people who supply the material and do the work. That is the terrible thing about interest. In all our great bond issues the interest is always greater than the principal. All of the great public works cost more than twice the actual cost, on that account. Under the present system of doing business we simply add 120 to 150 percent to the stated cost.

"But here is the point: If our nation can issue a dollar bond, it can issue a dollar bill. The element that makes the bond good makes the bill good, also. The difference between the bond and the bill is that the bond lets the money brokers collect twice the amount of the bond and an additional 20 percent, whereas the currency pays nobody but those who directly contribute to Muscle Shoals in some useful way.

"If the Government issues bonds, it simply induces the money brokers to draw $30,000,000 out of the other channels of trade and turn it into Muscle Shoals; if the Government issues currency, it provides itself with enough money to increase the national wealth at Muscle Shoals without disturbing the business of the rest of the country. And in doing this it increases its income without adding a penny to its debt.

"It is absurd to say that our country can issue $30,000,000 in bonds and not $30,000,000 in currency. Both are promises to pay; but one promise fattens the usurer, and the other helps the people. If the currency issued by the Government were no good, then the bonds issued would be no good either. It is a terrible situation when the Government, to increase the national wealth, must go into debt and submit to ruinous interest charges at the hands of men who control the fictitious values of gold.

"Look at it another way. If the Government issues bonds, the brokers will sell them. The bonds will be negotiable; they will be considered as gilt-edged paper. Why? Because the Government is behind them, but who is behind the Government? The people. Therefore, it is the people who constitute the basis of Government credit. Why then cannot the people have the benefit of their own gilt-edged credit by receiving noninterest-bearing currency on Muscle Shoals, instead of the bankers receiving the benefit of the people's credit in interest-bearing bonds?"

SAYS PEOPLE MUST PAY ANYWAY

"The people must pay anyway; why should they be compelled to pay twice, as the bond system compels them to pay? The people of the United States always accept their Government's currency. If the United States Government will adopt this policy of increasing its national wealth without contributing to the interest collector—for the whole national debt is made up of interest charges—then you will see an era of progress and prosperity in this country such as could never have come otherwise."

"Are you going to have anything to do with outlining this proposed policy?" Mr. Edison was asked.

"I am just expressing my opinion as a citizen," he replied. "Ford's idea is flawless. They won't like it. They will fight it, but the people of this country ought to take it up and think about it. I believe it points the way to many reforms and achievements which cannot come under the old system."

Civil Aviation Speech

REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to appeal to the distinguished members of the Rules Committee for early and favorable action on the proposed new standing committee on civil aviation. This subject has been discussed on the floor on several occasions; but, considering the importance of aviation to the future of our country, it cannot be discussed too often.

During my 6 years' previous service as a Member of this body it was my privilege to be assigned to the Committee on Naval Affairs, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. As the record will show, as a member of that committee I repeatedly emphasized the importance of aircraft as an instrument of national defense. And, as the record will also show, I spoke on this floor on several occasions for the increased development of aircraft as an arm of our defense. It

will be recalled that at that time, before this global war had broken out, there was rather heated debate over the ability of a great battleship to survive an attack from the air. The lessons of this war have vindicated those who argued in favor of air power.

I mention this simply to indicate my personal interest in aviation. I believed then and believe even more so today that aviation is the industry of the future. As it has shown itself to be a military force, capable of great destruction, in the post-war years it will show itself to be an economic-social force, capable of contributing to our national greatness and human progress. If our country is to assume the leadership in commercial aviation following the war, we must begin now to prepare ourselves.

The distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee and the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee have both expressed themselves rather strongly in opposition to establishment of the proposed new committee on aviation. That they take the position they do is quite understandable. But it is not proposed that naval aviation and military aviation be placed under the jurisdiction of a new standing committee on aviation. Whatever fears they may have in this respect are without foundation. It is simply proposed that the new committee devote itself to the regulation and development of commercial or civil aviation.

It has been said in opposition to the proposal that we have too many committees without creating a new one, that Congress should streamline its organization. This argument was used by the chairmen of the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee. I wonder what these distinguished gentlemen would say if it should be suggested that we unite their two committees into a single committee on national defense. If the argument they advanced is valid, such a suggestion for streamlining is valid.

I venture to say, with due respect to the distinguished chairman, that if a committee on national defense should be seriously advocated to take the place of the present Committee on Naval Affairs and that on Military Affairs, it would be immediately contended that no one committee could possibly handle properly the multitude of matters each of these two committees must itself handle. It would be said that Army matters, involving personnel and organization, the Air Corps, the Infantry, the Quartermaster Corps, the Cavalry, and a host of other items, necessarily require a specialized knowledge. And likewise with naval matters.

With such an argument I would be inclined to agree. It requires several years' active and diligent service on either one of these committees for any member to gain such specialized knowledge. It is axiomatic that the longer one serves on a committee the more useful he is to the committee and to this House. The more one knows about a subject the better equipped he is to solve problems that arise in that particular field and to make a constructive contribution to it. That is true in the medical profession; it is true in the legal profession; it is true in the teaching profession; it is true in industry, indeed, it is true in all phases of human endeavor, in private life or public.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the reasons why I believe we should without further delay set up a committee on aviation, the industry of the future. In the course of time members of this committee, assigned solely to aviation questions and problems, will become our group of experts, able to keep abreast with developments, and able to recommend that which will enable this country to be mistress of the air.

If one would take the time to read the various reports submitted to the House by the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS], he will readily see what can be accomplished by having a standing committee on aviation. Permit me to read just a couple paragraphs from the report filed by this committee on January 7 of this year:

> We, therefore, were not satisfied merely to visit the scenes of air crashes and to establish the cause or causes of these accidents, but considered that the prevention of similar accidents required a thorough study of every physical factor and of all the human agencies responsible for the safe and successful operation of civil aircraft.
>
> We studied the adequacy of aircraft now used in air-line operations, aircraft accessories, airports, airport lighting, control towers, Government navigation aids, radio communication systems of the Government, and the air carriers, the organization and operations of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the organization and operations of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the functions of the Weather Bureau, the training and experience of pilots, and of all other personnel engaged in work essential to the safety of commercial flights, and the operations of the air carriers * * *.
>
> Your committee has made recommendations to the air carriers, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Weather Bureau, the War Department, the Navy Department, the State Department and the President on matters of vital importance affecting the safety and development of air operations, and the economic welfare and national security of the United States.

Those three paragraphs in themselves convey, I think, the innumerable ramifications, technical details, with which one must become acquainted in order to legislate wisely in the field of aviation. As stated by this select committee:

> As a result of our study, and contacts, your committee has come into possession of a mass of aviation data, which we deem to be invaluable and upon which we feel there can be built a constructive aviation program.

In recent years the Congress of the United States has placed altogether too much reliance on the executive branch of the Government. It is, to be sure, within the province of the Executive to recommend, but it is also the duty of Congress to reject, adopt, or amend the recommendation in accordance with the dictates of its collective judgment. In order for Congress to pass judgment on the recommendations it must have its experts among its own membership, and in order for Congress to assume again its rightful function it must be able and willing to assume the initiative in developing whatever program it finds to be in the people's best interests.

As stated by our select committee:

> It is highly important that careful preparation be made for the great air commerce of the future.

The first step in making this preparation is the establishment of a standing committee on aviation. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge that this be done at the earliest possible moment. What we do in the present determines the future. Preparation today produces opportunities tomorrow.

Production of Food

REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Nation were appalled as they listened to the broadcast on last Saturday night by Major General Hershey, head of the Selective Service System and Manpower Commissioner McNutt, at which the staggering figures were given as our Army's need for 1943. The figures and the program outlined by those two officials exceed by far any development of our Army which was contemplated by our people. While the people of our country are in full accord with any program which is entirely essential for a speedy and complete victory in this war, yet the people realize that a vast Army, such as is proposed by those two officials, will throw production on the farm and in the factory entirely out of gear and this huge Army, proposed by them, may find itself without the necessary food, equipment, and transportation for its maintenance and for use in reaching the battle lines.

Much confusion has resulted because conflicting statements have been issued. Recently the Manpower Commissioner issued a statement to the effect that "our Army was being overloaded, and that the problem of feeding and transporting our forces was of prime importance." Even at this moment and before the drastic action is taken which is now in contemplation, the farm-labor problem is very serious and acute. Skilled labor in our factories, mills, and defense plants has been subject to tragic inroads. This type of labor in both farming and factory, qualified by experience, will be subject to further depletion by the induction of able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and 38 years. How far will the Selective Service System and the Manpower Commissioner go in this mass-induction of boys and men into our armed forces? We assume the statements made at the recent broadcast will be carried into effect, and they stated—

> Twelve thousand men each day this year will be inducted into the armed forces and

no able-bodied man between the ages of 18 and 38 years can be deferred unless his work is essential and he is irreplaceable.

We are putting into uniform 7 full divisions in a week's time—in a month, 28 divisions.

This year alone the number of men inducted will approach in size the entire American Army in the First World War.

So, Mr. Speaker, we face this ponderous question at a time when our farmers are asked to produce more, yet their sons and their farm help have either been taken into the military or naval service where they are now serving their country, or they will soon be inducted into the armed forces of our Nation, leaving behind them an unfinished job of huge proportions. It is almost impossible for the farmers to obtain farm machinery and parts for replacements and repairs, and he is left with his farm but with no help to farm it—he is left in such a state that increased production is entirely impossible. The result will inevitably be that farm production will be decreased because of the lack of farm help.

Some time ago I spoke on this very problem, at which time there was cited the fact that many farm sales were being held in the farm areas in this country, largely caused by the induction of the farm boys into the armed forces and by the taking of available farm laborers into the military service. These farm sales have continued—and they still continue—without abatement. The newspapers throughout the length and breadth of our land, in farming communities, are carrying many notices of farm sales, and in many of those notices we find the following language:

Because I have been inducted into the armed forces of our country, I am compelled to sell out and quit farming.

And, in many of them, we find the following language:

My son having been inducted into the Army, I am forced to quit farming and am selling out.

Others contain this statement:

Because of my inability to secure farm help on my farm, I am compelled to hold this sale and quit farming.

This is a frightful situation, Mr. Speaker, the farm boys and the farm help already inducted into the armed service of our country has badly crippled our farmers in the production of the necessary and essential food with which to feed our huge Army, our people at home, and the people of hungry nations. If and when further inroads are made upon the farm-labor problem, as was forecast in the recent broadcast, no one can contemplate what the ultimate result will be. However, we do know that there will be a great food shortage. If our farmers are to be left empty handed insofar as farm labor is concerned, we will probably have more hungry people in this country than we have witnessed in the past, and we will be wholly unable to make any contribution of food for the hungry people abroad. Let us remember—and let the Selective Service System and the Manpower Commission remember—that food is essential for victory in this war. Any curtailment in the production of food is a positive obstruction to our all-out war effort. It is my hope that those in charge of inducting our manpower for military service will keep our civilian army of food producers, our civilian army of war equipment producers, and our army in the camps and at the battle front on an even keel—so that no one group will be usually diminished and their production so limited that the result will be the destruction, or partial destruction, of the effectiveness of our Army on the field of battle.

Mr. Speaker, when those in charge of building up our Army induct men into our military forces at the rate of 400,000 per month—that is the staggering figure just given to the people by those in charge—we will face an appalling situation in our factories, mills, and shops. Our workers are producing for war; they are producing war materials and supplies not only for our own army, but for our allies as well. They are making ships, planes, tanks, guns, ammunition, and every kind and character of war supplies. We are trying to supply our own troops with every essential thing—clothing, shoes, blankets, food, and with every implement of war—and we are giving away food, tanks, guns, planes, and every implement and material of war to every country allied with us in this great war for freedom. When the Selective Service System and the Manpower Commissioner reach down into the human pool of men and take 400,000 of them per month who are between the ages of 18 and 38 and who are able-bodied—that pool of men contains only 22,000,000 in all, which includes the sick, the diseased, the disabled, the lame, and the blind—our keymen who are experienced workmen and our reliable and educated productive workers will, in large part, fall victims to this mass seizure of manpower. What will be the net result of such an onslaught upon those who are so splendidly producing our munitions and supplies for war?

Mr. Speaker, according to the information furnished to the people at the recent broadcast, herein referred to, the only ground for deferring any able-bodied man between the ages of 18 and 38 years, in the future, will be "if his work is essential and he is irreplaceable."

Under that ruling by those in charge, we wonder if there is any man who is irreplaceable? The master builder lacks not craftsmen to take our places. Men die—men become disabled—men reach the age at which their productive genius is gone—and there is ever a craftsman standing by to take our places. Therefore, who can say that any man is irreplaceable? Every man is subject to replacement by another. When you replace men in time of war when the all-out effort of all is so essential, when years of experience and great skill are demanded and when speed and accuracy are so essential, much will be lost in our productive efforts if capable and skilled men are replaced with untried workmen with a limited experience. Therefore, if the test is to be based upon the question of the irreplaceability of a man—and that question will be determined by the local draft boards—it is a matter of great concern to the people because the production of war materials and supplies may suffer greatly.

It is chiefly far behind the lines of battle and on the home front that we are given the opportunity to arm and equip our manpower, to build up our air fleets and navies, to produce our food supplies, and to assure the perpetuation of our great manufacturing plants so that a continuous and large-scale flow of munitions may go forward to our fighting men. It is essential that these be maintained in order that we achieve victory in this war.

Mr. Speaker, we will conclude, I am certain, that a huge and over-expanded Army—that the staggering expenditure of money—will not win a war. The army on the battlefront must be supported by a huge army of men and women who produce the necessary food, who produce munitions of war, arms, ammunition, and supplies—who buy bonds and provide the funds for war—and who are not prevented from producing every essential thing for war by having their ranks depleted and their opportunity to produce lessened.

These are serious problems. Many times I have expressed my own thought upon this subject by urging and pleading that equity be observed by those in power and who control the expansion of our Army—leaving an adequate supply of manpower upon the farms and in the factories and mills to produce the necessary food and the essential munitions and supplies for war. Thus, there will be no break-down in any essential group in our country in time of war.

We must win this war. We must win it both quickly and decisively. In order to accomplish that ultimate goal we must not permit any act to be done which will weaken any segment of our people who are producing those things which are so essential for victory. We cannot stand by and witness the induction of our boys into the military service and at the same time know that the production of food, and the production of tanks, guns, planes, ships and ammunition, will be limited. We must never turn our backs upon the boys who are serving in our armed forces. Let us build our military forces for war and victory on the battle front. Let us build our civilian army on the farm and in the factory, so that victory may be assured.

Mr. Dies' Popularity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette:

MR. DIES' POPULARITY

If anyone wonders why Representative DIES retains his popularity in the House of Representatives, the answer is in the new list of

Federal pay rollers which Mr. DIES has just disclosed. On it are the names of at least three individuals for whose salaries the House at various times refused to make an appropriation but who, nevertheless, are still on Federal pay roll—one at an increased salary. On it, also, is that Maurice Parmelee who was fired from the Board of Economic Warfare last spring after the Dies committee had exposed him as a full-fledged nudist and whose book on that subject was declared obscene in a District of Columbia court. He is now employed by the Railroad Retirement Board.

In the vast assemblage of employees in Washington these things would have passed unnoticed but for Mr. DIES. The House—and a very large part of the public—appreciates this information. Mr. DIES is a constant gadfly stinging the Washington bureaucracy—and the instances cited in this last report disclose how cavalierly the bureaucracy ignores the wishes of the House of Representatives. DIES has been smeared, berated, and accused of Fascist leanings by various groups, particularly those of left-wing persuasion such as the National Lawyers' Guild. On the other hand, he has won enormous majorities in the House every time he has asked for funds or authority.

The reply Mr. DIES gives to these accusations is another report, and until the bureau heads at Washington begin to show a little consideration for the desire of the House of Representatives to cut the radical fringe off the Federal pay roll, we predict that Mr. DIES will continue to win both public and House support.

The Farmers' Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] last Saturday on the Farm Hour radio program, N. B. C.:

Ladies and gentlemen, on two of our domestic problems, inflation and farm production, there is a wide and sincere difference of opinion in Washington. Those now charged with the administration of our laws appear to regard cost as of little consequence, and are willing to pay any price to secure the needed production of a gun, a shell, a ship, or a plane. But for food, which some of us believe to be as important in the winning of the war as guns or bullets, they seem to think that the way to control the cost of living is to hold down the price of farm commodities and that the way to prevent inflation is to ration.

I submit that the best way to control the price of food is through abundant production. When there is plenty to eat there will be no bidding up of food prices or black markets.

I submit that the best cure for food rationing is also abundant production. There will be no need to ration when the supply is ample.

Certainly there is no group in the Nation more patriotic or more ready to do their full part than the farmers. In a large degree this Nation was created by farmers. They fought its early battles, just as they are doing today. They have lived a life of independence which has made freedom very dear to them. Those at home are eager and anxious to have a real part in the winning of the war.

While they are intensely patriotic they do not like to see their patriotism taken advantage of. They try to be fair and they want to be treated fairly. If the thing to do in time of war is to work for nothing, they are ready to labor in the fields and deliver their crops without charge. But as long as their Government employs the profit motive and high wages and high prices as a method of securing production, they feel they should at least receive the full cost of production and a fair return for their labor.

While they may be required to accept them as their only choice, they do not seek subsidies from Federal funds but believe they should receive their price in the market place. Neither in time of war nor peace has any consumer the right to ask or expect to buy the farmers' commodities at less than the cost of production. Certainly at this time when the consumers have the greatest purchasing power ever known in the history of the Nation they should be willing to buy their food with their own funds and not look to the Government to pay part of the cost for them.

Mr. Donald Nelson testified that in 1942 the farmers of this Nation did a job not equaled by any other group. The farmers are ready to do an even better job this year if they are given the proper cooperation. Of course, they need a good season, but they ask only four things within the gift of man, namely, an adequate supply of help, equipment, fertilizer, and a fair price to cover all costs of production, including all labor costs.

How can the farmers keep the few workers they have now unless they can pay them a reasonable wage in keeping with the times? How can the farmers secure the 3,500,000 additional workers now needed unless they can offer a wage that will induce them to come back to the farm? And if they are not permitted to include this extra cost in the price of their commodities, how can they be expected to offer or pay such wages?

Inflation will not come from paying farmers a fair price and thereby encouraging abundant production. If inflation does come it will be caused by the present policy which seeks to keep down farm prices without regard to the cost of production, thereby restraining, discouraging, and preventing increased production, and, secondly, by paying people from 5 to 20 times as much as was ever paid before for the same work, and by enormous war profits, thereby educating the people in the policy of easy come, easy go, and giving them a purchasing power several times in excess of supply.

Mr. Justice Byrnes, now Director of Economic Stabilization, in his recent radio address, said, "We must not retreat in our fight to stabilize the cost of living," and then in the next breath he announced the issuance of an order increasing the wage of millions of wage earners 30 percent, thereby adding that much to the present excess purchasing power.

If a person has been working 40 hours a week at $1 per hour, his weekly pay check was $40. He is now ordered to work $48 hours per week, but at 1½ the wage rate for the extra 8 hours. This increases his weekly pay check to $52 per week, or 30 percent. This not only increases the price of everything the farmer must buy, increases the cost of living, aggravates inflationary tendencies, but creates further dissatisfaction among the farmers and the farm workers. They work from 60 to 90 hours each week at from one-half to one-fifth what the industrial worker is receiving, and without any extra pay for over 40 hours. Does anyone wonder that both the farmer and his workers leave the farm for more promising fields? Does anyone wonder why we are now short over 3,000,000 farm workers and how difficult it is going to be to find the necessary farm workers and induce them to return to the farm to work longer hours for less pay?

Mr. Byrnes also said, "The Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, contains the most significant and beneficial legislation enacted for the farmers since the Agricultural Adjustment Act." Of course, Mr. Byrnes overlooked section 3 of the price-control law of January 30, 1942, which the President gave Congress 15 days to repeal, and which Congress did repeal.

But while Mr. Byrnes is praising the Stabilization Act of last October, he should also require its enforcement. If the Office of Price Administration will just carry out that law as it is written the farmers will be very much pleased. In two respects that law is now being knowingly and intentionally disregarded and disobeyed.

First, that law provides that no ceiling price shall be established for any agricultural commodity below the parity price. That language is definite and clear. It does not say parity prices less the conservation and other payments made to some of the farmers. The Congress expressly refused to authorize such deductions. There is not one word in this law permitting such deductions. Yet in every price ceiling fixed by the Office of Price Administration these payments are being deducted. The orders fixing ceiling prices on corn and wheat do not permit parity prices, but establish prices at parity less these payments. If the authorities who administer a law do not themselves respect the law, how can they expect anyone else to do so?

Why should not these payments be deducted? First, because the farmer had to expend time, money, and effort and reduce production in order to earn them, and, second, only a percentage of the farmers received such payments; for instance, in the case of corn, only three-fourths of the producers in the 15 States comprising the commercial corn area, while this deduction in price is being made against every corn producer in every State in the Nation.

These payments have been represented as being of great financial help to farmers. How can it help the farmer to give him a parity payment of 11 cents per bushel on his corn and then reduce the price of his corn 11 cents when he goes to sell it? These payments have been represented as being a benefit or subsidy to the farmers. As now administered they are no such thing, but on the contrary they are a subsidy to the consumer and nobody else.

I am glad to be able to report that this week the Senate Committee on Agriculture reported out a bill to stop and prohibit the deduction of these payments in fixing ceiling prices. I anticipate its early passage by the Congress.

The other respect in which the Stabilization Act is now being disregarded by the Office of Price Administration is in its persistent refusal to carry out the following provision of that law, "Modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes."

In no instance which has come to my knowledge has any farm ceiling price been modified or adjusted to take care of the increased cost of farm labor. In the present calculation of parity prices a farm wage rate of only $1.41 per day is included. Yet the official records of the Department of Agriculture show that the average farm wage rate for the Nation on January 1 was $2.83 per day, and in many sections of the Nation farmers are required to pay $5 and $6 per day to farm workers. Government records also show that labor represents 32 percent of the cost of farm production, which is the biggest single item entering into the cost of

producing a crop. Any fair-minded person must agree that the farmers should not be expected to produce at a loss and that they are not being treated fairly when their prices are held down to parity and those prices do not include the biggest single item entering into the cost of production.

In view of the refusal of the Office of Price Administration to adjust prices to conform to increased labor cost, and realizing that the failure to include all labor costs in parity prices will not only limit the financial ability of the farmers to continue to produce, but will greatly endanger their capacity to produce the crops needed this year, the House Committee on Agriculture has reported out a bill to amend the parity formula to include all labor costs.

At certain seasons last year there was in excess of 12,000,000 people working on the farm, but when reduced to a year-round full-time basis the number of employed on the farms of the Nation last year was as follows: Hired workers, 2,035,000; operators, 5,140,000; family workers, 1,250,000, making a total of 8,425,000.

Is it fully understood what that means? That this handful of people, 8,425,000, must not only produce the food and fiber to sustain themselves and the remaining 20,600,000 members of their own families, but also an Army and Navy totaling over 10,000,000, also the 17,500,000 engaged in war production, also the 21,300,000 who labor in mines and factories of the Nation, and also the remaining 57,200,000 of our civilian population, including several million Government employees, and, then on top of that, also the food for millions and millions and untold millions (estimated by former Governor Lehman at 350,000,000) of those allied with us in the war and those in the conquered countries who must be fed immediately following their liberation.

It may, therefore, be said that this 8,425,000 farmers and farm workers must supply the food and the fiber for around 500,000,000 people. Was ever so much required of so few? Yet there are some who seem to delight in referring to this small group of men and women as a bunch of graspers and greedy hogs.

There are others who saw it published that the national farm income for 1942 was $18,500,000,000 and have the idea that the farmers of the Nation have that amount of money in their pockets. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Last year the farmers sold $15,000,000,000 worth of farm products and they received $525,000,000 in Government payments. As against this they spent $1,435,000,000 for seed, $675,000,000 for livestock, $330,000,000 for fertilizer, $580,000,000 for the operation of vehicles, $1,150,000,000 for miscellaneous operating expenses, $397,000,000 on buildings, $411,000,000 for motor vehicles, $357,000,000 for machinery and equipment, $1,220,000,000 for hired workers, $450,000,000 for taxes, $340,000,000 for farm-mortgage interest, $815,000,000 for land rent. After deducting these expenses and costs there remained $7,165,000,000. After allowing $85 per month to farm operators for their work in planting, cultivating, and harvesting the crops, and allowing $50 per month for 1,250,000 farm family workers, only one-fourth worker per farm, and allowing 3 percent—War Bond rates—on the $39,000,000,000 worth of unencumbered farm property, there remains a net farm income for 1942 of only $4,600,000. With 29,048,000 persons living on the farms of the Nation that means exactly 15 cents for each of them.

In this connection it is interesting to note that of the total national income of $117,000,000,000 last year, the 39,000,000 nonfarm workers received $80,000,000,000 for salaries and wages, or an average of over $2,000 each.

The most critical home problem facing the people of this Nation at this time is an adequate food supply. We are confronted with the possibility of a national disaster. Every person who depends upon the farmers to supply his food should urge that these farmers be furnished with the men and materials necessary for abundant production.

In conclusion I want to urge the farmers to carry on. You have just causes to complain, but I earnestly beg you not to let these things turn you away from or slacken your efforts in the great task now before you. Your representatives in Congress are working to correct these conditions. In the meantime you must remember that our Nation is at war, fighting for its very existence. Our homes, our loved ones, everything we hold dear is at stake.

In this great struggle you have a terrific responsibility. Without adequate food our cause is lost. Our boys are out there giving their lives by the thousands every day in order that you and I might live and be free. We must not fail those boys. If we lose our farms, our mules, our equipment, our all, it will be little compared with what they are giving.

While we are trying to correct these injustices let us show the world that the free men who till the soil are in truth the foundation of Christian civilization, and, regardless of what the sacrifices might be, they intend to remain free and are willing to pay any price necessary to support and sustain their forces out on the far-flung battle lines. It must never be said that the farmers, who brought forth this Nation as the land of the free and the home of the brave, failed in the slightest degree in the most critical hour in our Nation's history.

Russell H. Conwell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, in 1925, when I was a law student at Temple University in Philadelphia, a great and noble American died on December 6. His name was Russell H. Conwell, and he was the founder of the university. He built it to bring higher education to the poor young man and young woman who hungered for a college education or for a professional career but could not hope to secure them anywhere else.

I secured my legal education at night within the walls of Temple University, and I shall forever be indebted to this great humanitarian who gave me the opportunity to realize my fondest hope.

Today, the people of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, indeed the people of the Nation, are celebrating the 100th anniversary of his birth. He was a distinguished educator, clergyman, lecturer, and philanthropist.

As a preacher he was rated with Beecher, Brooks, Talmadge, and Spurgeon. He built and paid for the Baptist Temple, Philadelphia, for many years the largest Protestant church in America. He established three hospitals and by his own initiative and energy he founded Temple University, which began with one student in the preacher's study, and grew into one of the leading educational institutions in the country, with an enrollment of 11,000 men and women. During the years of the expansion and growth of these institutions he carried on his own shoulders the financial burden of all of them.

He was a lecturer of international reputation, and it was said he had addressed more people than any contemporary, at the time of his death. His famous lecture, "Acres of Diamonds," was delivered 6,152 times, and from these lectures he earned many million dollars, all of which he used to give poor boys and girls a college education.

On Thanksgiving Day 1882 he came to Philadelphia and assumed the pastorate of a small and little-known workingmen's church. When he preached his first sermon he had an audience of twenty-seven. At the time of his death, the congregation numbered 3,000 adult members. He carried 28 lectures in his memory, which he gave without a page of notes. He learned five languages during rides on trains and street cars. His writings have been read by scores of thousands and Charles A. Dana once said that Dr. Conwell was the greatest of American biographers.

Dr. Conwell was born on a small Massachusetts farm. He began his schooling at the age of 3, walking two miles to and from the little red school house. At 16 he entered Wilbraham Academy, earning his board and tuition by farm work. In 1860 he entered Yale with his brother, Charles, taking the classical and law courses at one and the same time.

In 1862 he raised a company of mountain boys and became their captain as civil war swept the country. During his college days, Dr. Conwell related to a biographer, he was "hungry and worked to death." It was then that his faith departed temporarily and he vaunted his unbelief. But the war brought his conversion.

Johnny Ring, 16, was my orderly—

He told his biographer.

He read his Bible in my tent morning and evening. I ordered him to stop, as it hurt my conscience and got on my nerves. I went to New Bern, N. C., to see about back pay for my men. The Confederates attacked our camp while I was gone. Johnny Ring was driven away with the rest.

Then he remembered a sword given me by my friends in Massachusetts. He returned and got it. In his second escape he came to a burning bridge. Hanging to the girders, he crossed, hand over hand, but he was so terribly burned he died. But he saved my sword. I was arrested for being absent from my command, although I had a pass in my pocket. After months of delay I was tried and convicted. President Lincoln heard the facts, set aside the verdict, made me a lieutenant colonel, and ordered me west for staff service.

At Kennesaw Mountain, while in command of two batteries, a Confederate shell exploded and I was hit by a fragment. When I regained consciousness at night on the field I found one of my arms broken in two places and there was a bad wound in my shoulder. I was in the hospital a long time. There I had earnest talks with the chaplain, a Baptist minister. Since then I have tried to be a Christian.

Dr. Conwell's call to the ministry was curious. In 1879 a poor congregation in

Lexington, Mass., was compelled to sell its dilapidated church and Dr. Conwell, then a lawyer in Boston, was employed to dispose of the property. The tears of the aged men and women affected the big-hearted lawyer.

"Don't sell, but stick to the work the Lord has given you," he advised. "But we have no money to pay a preacher," was the doleful response. "I'll be your preacher," he offered. He kept his word, and his greater career began.

The fabulous biography of this great American contains much concerning the two instruments which were most influential in gaining him universal respect—namely, Temple University and "Acres of Diamonds."

As an humble Baptist clergyman he answered the call for an education of several poor but worthy and energetic young men by giving them special night classes. His philosophy of "Education for all" was so welcome that within 4 years (1888) he had secured a college charter for a group which then numbered 590 students. During these years (1884–1891) the college operated exclusively as an evening school. In 1891 the college was granted the power to confer degrees. During the same year a day department was opened, and the acquisition of the first of three hospitals announced.

The increasing popularity of Russell H. Conwell and his educational doctrines made insistent demands upon the physical facilities then available. This resulted with acquisition of the Temple College building and adjacent halls and dwellings. The financial advisers and educational assistants with whom he counseled gave added vision and enlightenment to his ideas. New institutions and a wider educational scheme resulted. The citizens and the professional institutions of Philadelphia, in their sympathy for this new educational program, cooperated in making the dreams of the founder come true.

The theological school was opened in 1883. This was followed by an afternoon and evening law school, which was opened in the spring of 1885. In 1901, an evening course in medicine was added. This new venture was such a success that the Samaritan Hospital—now Temple University Hospital—was soon brought within the charter. In this same year another landmark was established by the opening of the school of pharmacy.

In 1907, less than a quarter of a century after its founding, a charter was issued by the courts of Philadelphia changing the name from Temple College to Temple University. During this same year, the Philadelphia Dental College, one of the oldest and best-known dental colleges of the United States, became the Dental School of Temple University. The Garretson Hospital, a hospital of oral surgery, and a part of the Philadelphia Dental College, came into this new university corporation with the dental school. In 1915 the School of Chiropody, the second oldest school of its kind in the eastern part of the United States, opened its doors. A school of music also became part of the university corporation.

Three undergraduate colleges, the college of liberal arts, the teachers college, and the school of commerce, all opened early in the history of the university, and other specialized departments combine to make the institution founded by Dr. Conwell one of America's finest seats of learning.

In 1925, at the death of the Founder, the enrollment of Temple University had grown to 11,000 students. It had expanded to seven professional schools, three undergraduate schools, three hospitals, a high school, and several special departments. These combined institutions had a faculty of more than 600. It had become one of the Nation's finest institutions of learning. Dr. Conwell's dream had come true because he had the energy and the faith and the will to realize the ambition of his dream.

In 1870, when he first delivered his lecture, Acres of Diamonds, he was an almost unheard of New England clergyman. The popularity and personal appeal of this simple gospel soon made him America's foremost platform lecturer. It has been presented in the presence of royalty, as well as to the plain and humble countryfolk. It has been heard from the pulpit of New England to the missions in China. It has reached millions from the platform and over the radio, and millions are still reading this piece of human philosophy as spoken by this great American divine.

Honor and respect were paid him not only by the thousands who crowded the halls to hear him speak. In 1884, when he returned from Europe, the city of Philadelphia tendered him a public reception. The Academy of Music could not hold all who had come to welcome him home. In 1914, he was awarded a golden key symbolic of the devotion of the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This award was made by a committee composed of prominent Pennsylvanians and distinguished Americans. In 1915, he was selected as the person to receive the Pennsylvania award at the Panama-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco.

But his greatest honor came in 1923, when he was presented with the $10,000 Bok Award, which is given annually to Philadelphia's outstanding citizen, while the new administration building of the Philadelphia public school system contains the bust of Russell H. Conwell in a niche which bears the caption "Philadelphia's greatest recent educator."

The biggest and best thing of Russell H. Conwell—

Says one of his biographers—

is not his famous Acres of Diamonds, nor any of his words nor his works. It is Russell H. Conwell, the boy, who took hold of a mighty and discouraging outlook and made it one of the most valuable human estates in the world today.

He himself is more inspiring than anything he has ever said or done, despite all he has said and all he has done. To him life was receptivity to and cooperation with the divine power.

Dr. Conwell died in Philadelphia at the age of 82 on December 6, 1925, and he lies at rest within the shadows of the institution which is an imperishable monument to the genius and life work of a patriot, soldier, preacher, educator, and friend of mankind. Philadelphia has given many great men to the Nation and Russell H. Conwell ranks with the greatest of her distinguished sons.

Emergency Farm Labor Act of 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including copy of a letter which I have today addressed to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House and a copy of the bill H. R. 1728, to increase the supply of farm labor during the calendar year 1943, on which I am requesting an early hearing. It would be perfectly satisfactory to me if the Military Affairs Committee would place the provisions of my bill in the Kilday bill, which I understand will be reported this week. What I want is action and results.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1943.

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Some days ago I wrote Jimmy Byrnes a letter concerning the various problems confronting the farmers of the country, one of them being the serious labor shortage on the farm. I am in receipt of a letter in reply, from which I quote: "I hope that some solution may be found for the very difficult problem to which you refer. I shall be glad to have your helpful suggestions from time to time."

I note, from reports of a recent conference, that those who are interested in our armed forces are endeavoring to build up a force of at least approximately eleven million men. The thing that is worrying those of us who are deeply concerned about what is going to happen in the way of being able to feed these eleven million, as well as the rest of the civilian and war workers of the country—say nothing about the tremendous demand on us for food and clothing for our allies—is just how are we going to produce even a normal crop unless something is done, and done promptly, to remedy the serious situation.

I would like for you or anybody else to explain to me just how putting industrial workers on a 48-hour basis, with time and one-half pay for the 8 extra hours, whereby they will be able to receive from $50 to $60 per week, will induce anyone to give up such work for the purpose of going back to the farm where they will not be able to receive over $50 per month.

Soldiers in service are delighted with my proposal to furlough them, which they claim would not put them in a position of being called slackers, but under such a program would enable them to go back home either for planting or producing, or especially for harvesting, crops this year. Even with all the people we had on the farms in 1942, we had thousands of tons of farm products rot in the fields.

I believe the responsibility of doing this job, which is so necessary not only in winning this war but the peace, rests with your committee and with the Congress, and that immediate action should be taken. Therefore, I am hoping that you will give us a hearing on my bill (H. R. 1728) or permit the bill to come up in a joint hearing with Mr. KILDAY'S bill.

I shall very much appreciate any information as to just when we may be able to come before your committee, which would put me in a position to be fully prepared for coming.

Rest assured I appreciate the fine work which you and your committee have been doing, and I am always glad to be of service.

Yours very sincerely,

H. P. FULMER,
Member of Congress.

[H. R. 1728, 78th Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill to increase the supply of farm labor during the calendar year 1943

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Emergency Farm Labor Act of 1943."

SEC. 2. (a) Every individual who was engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor in any capacity during any part of the calendar year 1942 and who, on the date of enactment of this act, or on the date after the enactment of this act on which such individual receives orders to report for induction into the land or naval forces of the United States, is engaged in any capacity in the production of any agricultural commodity, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until January 1, 1944, or until the date on which such individual ceases to be engaged in any capacity in the production of any such commodity, whichever first occurs.

(b) Every individual who was engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor in any capacity during any part of the calendar year 1942 and who on or after the date of enactment of this act is serving within any of the States of the Union or the District of Columbia in the land or naval forces of the United States shall be placed in a reserve status on inactive duty, for the purpose of permitting such individual to engage in the production of any agricultural commodity, until January 1, 1944, or until the date on which such individual ceases to be engaged in any capacity in the production of any such commodity, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 3. (a) Any individual engaged in producing any agricultural commodity who is unable to plant, cultivate, or harvest all or any part of his crop of any such commodity on account of a shortage of farm labor may apply to the agricultural extension agent of the county in which such individual resides (or, if such county has no such agent, to any such agent) for aid in planting, cultivating, or harvesting such crops. If the agricultural extension agent to whom an application is made under this section determines that insufficient civilian labor is available to plant, cultivate, or harvest such crop without material damage to such crop, he shall notify the commanding officer of the nearest military or naval post, camp, or station of such determination and shall state the number of men needed in addition to the available civilian labor and the approximate time required to plant, cultivate, or harvest such crop. Such commanding officer shall detail immediately the number of men specified under the command of a noncommissioned officer to perform such service as may be necessary to plant, cultivate, or harvest such crop and shall provide for the transportation of the men so detailed to and from the place where such service is to be performed.

(b) Every individual receiving aid under subsection (a) shall pay to the United States an amount equal to the amount he would be required to pay for such service at the prevailing rate of pay for such service in the community in which such service is performed. All sums paid to the United States under this subsection shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of Selective Service each shall promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Radio Address at New Haven, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WELI, New Haven, Conn., on February 13, 1943:

Good evening. It would be unseemly to pass over this occasion without some mention of the man whose birthday this Nation celebrated yesterday. It was fitting that the great majority of American workers remained on the job to produce the tools which are needed to preserve the Union for which Abraham Lincoln gave his life.

Over the graves of the heroic dead at Gettysburg, Abraham Lincoln dedicated the American people to a government "of the people, by the people and for the people."

Today, less than a century later, a new Congress, commanded by the people to protect our way of life is beginning a determined fight to prevent the establishment here of a government "of the bureaucrats, by the bureaucrats, and for the bureaucrats."

The new House of Representatives is only 6 weeks old, but it has found itself a healthy voice and already has established a record of having authorized more investigations by congressional committees than any of its predecessors. I promise you, there is nothing about this new House that even remotely resembles a "rubber stamp."

After a week of activity devoted to testing out its new-found solidarity, the House on Thursday armed itself with two powerful new weapons to enforce congressional mastery over Federal bureaus on questions of money and law. It created a special committee with broad authority to investigate rules, regulations, and directives of Federal agencies and authorized the Appropriations Committee, through its own fiscal experts, to check up on why and how money is spent by Federal departments and corporations.

The special committee was approved by the top-heavy majority of 294 votes to 50, and the authorization to the Appropriations Committee was carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Very definitely, the new Congress is headed in the right direction, and the overwhelming majorities of the votes favoring additional checks on the bureaus indicates that the mandate of the November voters is going to be carried out. This means much to Connecticut business and to the Third District citizens.

Earlier in the week we moved to shut off some of the tons of nonsensical publicity which floods newspaper offices from Federal bureaus by bringing to an end the free mail privileges of the various departments. Last year the Post Office Department handled 1,516,015,444 pieces of free mail for bureaus at a cost of $71,000,000. We cut off the appropriation for bureaucratic free mail this year.

While the Congress is beginning to assert its rightful powers, however, the administration continues to issue Executive orders, such as that calling for a 48-hour week, without even consulting Congress. Because most of us believe the 48-hour week is necessary, particularly in that it does not do away with the time-and-a-half pay for the last 8 hours, there haven't been too many complaints of this Executive order.

Congress is considering the reduction of the size of the Army as now determined without its approval. Congress does dispute the right of the administration, however, to issue such orders without first consulting the lawmaking body of this country.

While a voluntary committee of which I am a member moved this week to prevent the War Production Board from jeopardizing the freedom of the press by invoking any new drastic cut in the amount of newsprint, Congressman TABER brought to our attention that the Office of War Information plans to distribute in foreign countries 8,000,000 copies each week of Victory, the official weekly bulletin of the Office of War Information.

The War Production Board makes a 20-percent cut on newsprint and other paper used to keep our own people informed of the progress of the war and the idiosyncrasies of the administration, but the Office of War Information prints 8,000,000 copies of administration propaganda to send abroad.

We haven't enough shipping space to send our boys cigarettes or a few of the other comforts of home, and we haven't enough shipping to meet the full demands for the weapons of war needed to defeat the Axis, but we can send 8,000,000 copies of Victory abroad. It doesn't make sense.

Who thinks up these bright ideas? Elmer Davis trys to justify it, but I doubt if it was his idea. The latest plan is to change the name to "U. S. A." and make it a second Readers' Digest. Must the Government usurp every field of private endeavor?

Perhaps by reducing the amount of newsprint available to private newspapers the administration hopes to create an apparent need here for a daily Government newspaper? That isn't too far-fetched on the basis of past experience.

Congress may have something to say about this as its unified purpose to check all such bureau activities progresses.

While this new unity among Members of Congress daily becomes more apparent, it is distressing to continue to note too much disunity among the people—and I don't mean wholesome partisan disagreements.

There is still too little thought given to the necessity of putting aside all forms of class distinction, racial distinction, and religious distinction. Too little recognition that we are all brothers-in-arms. And there is too much thought being given to regimentation to force national unity.

All over the world today men and women who hold the same love of freedom that Abraham Lincoln did are giving their lives that you and I at home may enjoy the freedom and the bounties which are ours. All of us—small and great—should keep that thought in our minds.

The labor or other group leader who ignores the importance of voluntary unity to press for selfish and unreasonable gains and power; the capitalist or industrialist who seeks advantage by unfair labor practices and inadequate wages; the bureaucrat who cunningly builds and thrives while his government is immersed in the pursuit of other and nobler aims; the individual chiseler and hoarder who thus deprives his neighbor of an equal share; and all the race-haters; of these there are still too many in America.

Each one, in his selfish disregard for the Nation's welfare is foolishly disregarding his

own welfare and jeopardizing the easy freedom which we all accept and enjoy as a birthright. A little less selfishness and a little more willing cooperation among each and all will achieve the same end that forced regimentation will attempt to produce. Perhaps you see the danger as do I in an article "You Will Be Mobilized," by Harry Hopkins, condensed in this month's issue of the Reader's Digest.

The Government shares in the fault. Officials in high places too must use tolerance and practice unselfishness, or for one example, our home front will collapse we were warned today.

There must be in America a greater recognition of the inherent rights of the individual—the "other fellow"—if there is to be the type of voluntary unity we need for a quick victory in this war. And all the people need is the right attitude—the Government leading by example, and the realization that selfishness today will reap only sorrow tomorrow.

The thoughtless person who acts only in his own interests in days like these fails to realize that instead of breaking through to his personal objective, he is piling new stones on the battlement—erecting an impregnable fortress against himself and his ideas.

Each of us should inspect himself calmly and see if it is our own stubborn selfishness that is fashioning the weapons of defeat or weaving the cords which may bind our own hands.

All too often in life we refuse to accept little personal defeats so that we may pamper our pride, but had we accepted them we might well have staved off a major defeat later. It is the little personal defeats and sacrifices that are necessary today.

We need less selfishness on the part of the individual, the groups, and the factions, official or otherwise, but each of us should remember that it takes only one additional straw to break the camel's back.

Selfishness, disunity, and abuses of power—both by private individuals and leaders, and public servants—are piling up straws on the back of the overburdened camel that represents our American war effort. If, selfishly, one of us add that last straw it will be on his hands and head that the blame must rest.

So many of us ignore the importance of little things—the great over-all importance of the act of the individual for good or bad. The consequences an accumulation of little things can have on the aggregate results.

I'm reminded of an amusing illustration; a week or so ago the announcer on a national radio show casually asked each of his listeners to mail one penny to a worthy Brooklyn woman. The individual response meant nothing, but the accumulated responses of all the listeners brought the Brooklyn woman some 350,000 pennies—$3,500 in cash.

Little things do count you see.

Cooperation on the part of the individual means accepting a few personal defeats and sacrifices, as our soldiers and sailors also accept setbacks and sacrifices. It is all for the common end of victory on the home front and in the combat zone. As the Commander in Chief expressed the hope on the radio last night: "Here in the middle of the twentieth century men of good will found a way to unite and produce and fight to destroy the forces of ignorance, intolerance, slavery, and war."

I had not thought to be so serious tonight, but much of this comment has been occasioned by my recollection of Abraham Lincoln, the great emancipator. He had the courage to make the necessary sacrifices, accept defeats, big and little, to achieve the unity on which the fate of this Union rested 80 years ago. His courage brought him many unhappy days, but the ship of state was saved.

We must not allow the much bigger ship of state of today to flounder in a sea of confusion and uncertainty, selfishness, and disunity.

The milder weather has brought less comment on the fuel situation, but I have not hesitated to give it my attention. Speaking of weather, after 6 weeks' experience with the Washington kind I shall never again find fault with Connecticut weather. Good night.

Deferment of Farm Laborers by Draft Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a letter that I received this morning from the Honorable C. L. Allen, a small farmer of Union Parish, Louisiana:

MARION, LA., *February 10, 1943.*

Hon. CHARLES MCKENZIE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Do you think Congress is likely to change draft regulations in order for boys to be deferred for farming this year, and if so, do you think you can persuade the local board in Union Parish to wait a few days in calling a boy who is scheduled to be called the last of this month?

I have a farm with more than a hundred acres of cultivatable land, have stock, feed, seed, and farm implements, but no labor. I had one hired hand last year and he and my three boys, ages 18, 16, and 12, cultivated 89 acres. We have 19 head of cows and yearlings, 50 to 60 hogs and pigs, including some in the swamp, and a hundred chickens. The boy went to school at Ruston 3 days in each week last spring until the last of May, taking an agricultural course, then went again in the fall, and it seems that the local board thinks he can't farm. He has never done any public work of any kind and has farmed all his life except while in school.

The hired hand which worked for me last year is in Arkansas cutting pulpwood, and I can't get any help. In fact, all my land will lie idle unless my boy can stay out of service long enough to make a crop.

If you believe Congress is going to make any changes in the draft regulations, and you can persuade my local board to wait a few days to call Charles Henry Allen, I shall appreciate it very much.

Thanking you, I am

Respectfully yours,

C. L. ALLEN.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable C. L. Allen is a small hill farmer in Union Parish, La. He comes from old Anglo-American stock that is the very backbone, flesh, and sinew of that section of Louisiana and the Southland. Being a farmer he is and has always been self-sustaining and self-reliant. He is independent in his thought and his action. He is his own boss. Being a farmer and a native-born American, he loves the soil, loves his home and his homeland, the United States of America. He loves and supports American traditions and above all American liberty. He will fight for that liberty. He is intensely patriotic. But, Mr. Speaker, he is confused. He has failed, as have perhaps you and certainly I, to make heads or tails of the confusion of laws, rulings, orders, directives and counter directives that have been so unceasingly thrust upon the American people. He hears that the War Manpower Commission has ruled that farm labor shall be draft exempt. He hears that the Department of Agriculture has set up a system of points to determine whether or not a farmer is producing enough to qualify for exemption. He understands that under this system he does qualify and should have his labor exempt. Yet his hired help has migrated to parts afar to accept much more lucrative employment in industry. In this the Manpower Commission gave him no relief. His only supply of labor is his own family and now the draft board seems constrained to take the only member of that family who is capable of doing a man's work.

Mr. Allen is not asking that his son be exempted from the draft, neither are thousands of other farm fathers who find themselves in similar situations. He is, however, asking that his 18-year-old son be deferred long enough to get this year's crop planted. Long enough to get the seeds in the ground for the food that America will so vitally need this coming winter. Everybody who knows anything at all about the problems of the small farmer knows that because he has very little labor costs he is the best and most dependable and economical source of food supplies. Why then are they being discriminated against when large employers of labor are being exempted because the claim to be in important food producting and processing classifications.

Mr. Speaker, I do not blame the local draft boards. I believe they are doing the best they can under the circumstances. They cannot take what they read in the papers or hear over the radio as the rules and regulations to guide their work, and they can not get clarifying instructions from the State Selective Service or from the Manpower Commission. The fault is no more theirs than it is of the farmer. The fault lies with too much red tape, too many bureaus, too much boon-doggling. Why cannot we get a simple, clarifying statement of who is exempt and who is not exempt? Why does one man lose all of his labor and his family too, while across the road the reverse is true? Why does the Department of Agriculture and the Manpower Commission say that the production of food is as important (and we all know that it is) as the production of munitions and war materials and yet farm labor is either drafted into the Army or permitted to migrate to great industrial centers to undertake work for which they are ill-fitted and inexperienced at rates of pay which, if met by the farmer, would put the cost of food beyond the reach of even the multi-millionaires?

The small farmer, particularly the small farmer of the South, is faced with a momentous problem. His is a critical situation at a crucial time. He needs help. He needs it badly. He needs it now. What is the Government going to do about it?

Farm-Subsidy Payments

REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, Congress will soon be called upon to consider an administration proposal that we appropriate $100,000,000 for incentive payments to farmers, on the New Deal theory that we can buy our way out of the serious difficulties now confronting American agriculture and the food-for-victory program

It should be evident to all of us that the solution to these difficulties is not this simple. No mere appopriation of money will solve the desperate shortages of manpower, equipment, and fertilizer which are plaguing our farmers and threatening the food supplies of the Nation. Direct action—not money—is required to relieve these shortages. And this action must be taken now—before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a splendid editorial analysis of this problem, taken from the Washington Sunday Star of February 14, 1943:

INCENTIVE PAYMENTS

In his address Tuesday night, Economic Stabilizer James F. Byrnes said that the farmer must expand output in the face of inadequate supplies of fertilizer, inadequate replacements of equipment, and inadequate manpower.

How is the farmer going to do this?

Two methods were proposed by Mr. Byrnes. The first consists of incentive payments in the sum of $100,000,000—the plan worked up by Secretary of Agriculture Wickard and which has now been passed on to Congress by the President, with a request that the money be made available.

In theory, up to a point, this is all very well. If the expenditure of $100,000,000 would assure an adequate food supply for the people of this country, for our armed forces, and for the people abroad whom the Government proposes to feed, no one could seriously object to the appropriation because of the expenditure involved. Nor, in those circumstances, would the objection that it is a subsidy—which it is—be a valid one. But how can the distribution of subsidies, of themselves, help the farmer? Money cannot be used as fertilizer, nor to cultivate crops, nor to engage a nonexistent labor force. And, it is these things—fertilizer, farm machinery and manpower—that will be inadequate. What is the purpose, then, in giving the farmer more money?

As a second step, Mr. Byrnes proposed that labor which left the farms to work in war plants would have to be sent back. These men, he said, were splendid farm workers; many are indifferent mechanics. As we have urged men to volunteer for military service, we should urge these men to return to the farms where they are needed, even if the compensation is less. If they refuse to go, their draft deferments should be canceled.

Mr. Byrnes did not say so, but these workers were induced to leave the farms by the attraction of high wages being paid in war factories—wages which were boosted with the encouragement and support of the Government. That was a mistake, and Mr. Byrnes' implicit acknowledgment of the mistake is a first step in the right direction. But it will take something more to get these men, back to the farms. Mr. Byrnes has threatened to cancel their draft deferments unless they go back, and that is not a pleasant thing to contemplate. In effect, it is equivalent to saying that the Government, having made a mistake in the first instance, now proposes to correct that mistake by using the Selective Service Act as an instrument to coerce men into accepting a particular employment. The Selective Service Act was never intended for any such use, and the wisdom of such a threat is questionable. The forthright, efficient and sensible thing would be to seek passage of a compulsory service law, which would obviate any need for these devious and dubious methods.

But perhaps it is too late for that this year. It may be that there is no alternative now except some such course as that proposed by Mr. Byrnes. If so, it should be remembered that the planting season is close at hand. These men, if they are to be of any use to the farmers this year, must be sent back to the farms soon, and it is difficult to see how $100,000,000 for subsidies or incentive payments is going to help accomplish this transfer.

O. P. A. Regulations Affecting Small Business

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to register my disapproval once more against the bureaucratic rules and regulations which make it impossible for small business to operate. Within the past week a store in my home town, doing a business of $50,000 a year, sold out stock and closed up, because of bureaucratic interference, making it impossible to continue.

The York city newspapers have been carrying for the last several days a notice offering for sale a brass foundry operated by a Mr. Cochrane for the past 21 years.

Mr. Cochrane started in business 21 years ago with 6 helpers. Since that time he has never closed down a single day and steadily built up his business until now he employs 85 men doing important war work.

He now finds it impossible to continue due to recent rulings of the O. P. A. He has set forth his reasons for discontinuing business in a letter addressed to Prentiss M. Brown under date of February 3, 1943.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein the letter addressed by Mr. Cochrane to Mr. Brown, the Price Administrator:

FEBRUARY 3, 1943.

Mr. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Price Administrator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We received the new regulation order, Rev. MPR 125, January 27, 1943, to reduce the price of aluminum castings 3 cents per pound and bronze castings 1½ cents per pound from February 1, 1943.

Several months ago when metals were reduced, we voluntarily passed on reductions on castings wherever possible, regardless of the increase in wages from 15 to 20 percent since our price ceiling went into effect in October 1941. The matter of reducing a little more to meet this new regulation does not mean much, because with lower prices there will be less profit, and less income tax to pay, so it will be all the same to me if I am compelled to give it to the customer or to the Government direct.

In going through these pages of instructions in this new order, I am sure we will not be able to comply with all the detailed cost reports specified therein. If we are compelled to meet all these new conditions I would have to enlarge our office and put on extra help which I could not afford and do not intend doing. We already have extra help that do nothing else but fill in volumes of questionnaires and Government reports, a lot of which are absolutely useless, but it costs a lot of extra money to do it, and this added expense must come out of the price of castings. We have a simple practical way of keeping our costs and setting our prices, and have no complaints from our many good customers about our prices being too high, so why should a Government agency interfere in this to save $25,000,000 by penalizing many foundries who are struggling now to keep going, and allowing hundreds of millions to be wasted by inefficiency and extravagance in many other lines and places. I realize if we do not conform to all these new orders we may be penalized by having our metal supply stopped, and if this happens, there will be nothing left for me to do but close the business, which I will surely do.

As a practical molder, I started this business 21 years ago with about six helpers. Through honest dealing and hard work I now have a fine plant and about 85 men employed on important war work for a lot of good customers who depend on this foundry for their castings. We have cooperated to the best of our ability in filling in the numerous reports and questionnaires and have had no complaints from Washington on our work, but the cost of doing a lot of this superfluous stuff I would have considered a good profit under the practical way we operated years ago, when I was considerably smaller. It has been stated in the press many times that Washington was going to cut the red tape and make it easier to do business, but, instead, the questionnaires and Government reports are more numerous than ever and the red tape more complicated. Any foundryman struggling with green help and putting up with all their costly mistakes trying to keep war work customers supplied with good castings, which must be passed on by Government inspectors, should not be harassed by a lot of new impractical ideas from some Government agency every time someone sees fit to impose a new regulation on us; and if I am to be continually up against this thing and not allowed to operate in a sensible, practical way, as I have always done, then I assure you I am ready to go out of the business until such time as common sense in our operation can again be used.

I realize, Mr. Brown, that you have a tough job ahead, so I thought it in order to tell you my story, as it might be of some help to you in seeing things from our standpoint, too.

My greatest regret in closing the business at this time would be the inconvenience it might cause my customers depending on me for castings, as it has been my desire from the start to aid our war effort all possible, and regardless of whether I make any profit, will continue to do my part as long as possible, but if all these new regulations are going to cause me to operate at a loss and soon lose what little I have, then no one can blame me for seeing in time that this does not happen, because if I am forced to go

broke, I can do no more good at my age of 67 to help war production and could even become a public burden myself.

Yours sincerely.

COCHRANE BRASS FOUNDRY,
JOHN H. COCHRANE,
Owner.

Freedom of the Air Becomes an Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RANULF COMPTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend the revise my own remarks, I include an editorial from the New Haven Journal-Courier. In view of the statesmanlike address of my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, Congresswoman LUCE, I find subsequent comment pertinent to the subject she discussed. Therefore, I offer for the consideration of the membership this editorial appearing the morning after the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] spoke in this Chamber:

FREEDOM OF THE AIR BECOMES AN ISSUE

The question of post-war freedom of the air is getting into the headlines more and more frequently, and properly so for it is one of the fundamentals around which international and domestic politics will revolve for a long time to come.

Vice President WALLACE and Mrs. Roosevelt have come out for freedom of the air. Neither has defined precisely what is meant, but it is presumed that the term is used without any hidden tricks of interpretation. Thus freedom of the air would permit the planes of other nations to land on our shores and to fly over our territory without material hindrance.

It is difficult to imagine the United States abandoning this right to regulate the use of our own skies. Further, it is difficult to suppose that the United States will not restrict the use of these skies. Unless we control the air above our land, we cannot insure its defense. Unless we regulate and restrict the use of our air, we cannot protect our commerce.

In supporting her argument, Mrs. Roosevelt said, "We have always had freedom of the seas." That is a complex and highly debatable subject. It is questionable whether there has been freedom of the seas except in a limited sense. Certainly in war there hasn't been freedom. Even in peace freedom of the seas is limited by certain nations' control over the Panama and Suez Canals, by their control over coaling stations and harbors, by the use of tariffs. Anyone is entitled to launch a ship in the ocean, but what he may do with it after that is considerably influenced by other nations.

More realistic than Mr. WALLACE and Mrs. Roosevelt are Congresswoman LUCE and the Marquis of Londonderry. Mrs. LUCE believes that no matter how much we trust our British and Russian allies today, we should not abandon the sovereignty of American air lanes. Of course, this implies control over our airports, beacons and other facilities, imports, exports, and immigration.

The remarks of the Marquis of Londonderry came in a debate in the House of Lords on Britain's post-war commercial air service. Said he, "It is no secret that commercial aviation in the United States is developing with phenomenal rapidity. * * * I am not challenging America and suggesting cutthroat competition all over the world." He went on to favor collaboration between Britain, America, Russia, and the Dutch, and then he advocated that England acquire from the United States under lend-lease the planes needed for post-war commercial use.

In the same debate Lord Derwent spoke of the present appearance of dangerous competition between the United States and other potential rivals. A member of the House of Commons, speaking before that body last December, referred to Pan-American Airways as "spreading its tentacles" all over the world.

Though Josef Stalin has not discussed commercial aviation for publication, it would be strange if the Russians, who for years have been interested in long-distance flying, are not already making plans for their share of the commercial air business.

The question of rights to the world's skyways thus assumes increasing importance as the war mounts to a climax. With peace in sight, all the big nations will step up their preparations to a faster pace, and the first commercial planes will be in the air before the diplomats ever assemble to write a treaty.

Freedom of the air is not likely to be settled so much in debate as in designing rooms and wind tunnels and in the executive offices of companies like Pan American Airways. The United States should remember this and not promise to relinquish any of the rights which later experience may prove vital to our security.

Farm Labor Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following resolution adopted unanimously by the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, urging early passage of H. R. 1408, a bill by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], to include all farm labor costs in the calculation of parity price for farm commodities.

Resolution to memorialize the National Congress urging the passage of the Pace parity bill

Whereas there has come to the attention of the House of Representatives of Georgia that there is now pending in the National Congress certain legislation intended to include the cost of farm labor in figuring parity on agricultural commodities; and

Whereas the certain legislation is known as the Pace parity bill; and

Whereas the cost of farm labor has increased 100 percent within the past 12 months; and

Whereas, with the cost of farm labor increasing as it has, unless adequate legislation is passed immediately, it will be utterly impossible for the farmers of the Nation to compete with industry in the payment of labor, and the food program will thereby be hindered immensely; and

Whereas as a part of the war effort it is necessary that the food program be carried out: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Georgia House of Representatives, That the National Congress be memorialized, and that the Georgia delegation in Congress, and in the Senate in particular, be memorialized that the passage of the Pace parity bill is urgent, is imperative, and is necessary; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted immediately to the Clerk of the National Congress, and the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, there to be read and presented to the Congress in session, and that a copy of this resolution be sent by the clerk of this house to each Member of Congress from Georgia and to the Senators from Georgia, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to His Excellency Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States.

ROY V. HARRIS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
P. T. MCCUTCHEN, Jr.,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Japs Took Airplane Plans Plus $16,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article reprinted from the Log of February 1943:

JAPS TOOK AIRPLANE PLANS PLUS $16,000,000—UNITED STATES MILITARY SECRETS SENT TO JAPAN FROM JAP-OWNED AIRPLANE PLANTS IN NEW JERSEY WORKING ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS. JAPANESE NAVAL OFFICER BRAGGED ABOUT METHODS. HE'S DEAD

(By Miller Freeman, Captain, U. S. Naval Reserve, retired)

This amazing account is published to bring before the public the unbelievable success achieved by Japan through infiltration among United States Government departments in all administrations for many years, and also as a warning to public officials and Congress to prevent a recurrence during the present war. If, as the State Department asserts in its White Paper just issued, that it knew for a long time Japan was preparing to go to war against us, why did it not take appropriate action to prosecute the guilty and expel these corrupt Japanese Government-controlled corporate interests from this country?

SAN FRANCISCO, *December 10, 1942.*
Congressman ROY O. WOODRUFF,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOODRUFF: In the spring of 1922 you introduced a resolution in Congress requesting an investigation of the contracts and expenditures of the United States Government during the last war, and in which you charged that the Standard Aircraft Corporation and the Standard Aero Co. were controlled by Mitsui & Co. In your resolution you maintained that the evidence showed:

"(1) These two firms were overpaid millions of dollars, presumably through misrepresentation and fraud.

"(2) Mitsui & Co. are the fiscal agents for the Japanese Government throughout the world, and were also assisting German secret

service work before the war, acting as paymasters for them.

"(3) These Japanese concerns received orders for almost every kind of airplane work, and some of the motors intended for our forces on the western front were shipped to Japan.

"(4) Among their attorneys handling their negotiations with the Government was George W. Wickersham, former United States Attorney General."

I took your resolution on May 29, 1922, before Rainier Noble Post of the American Legion, which post promptly wired the congressional delegation from this State, urging your request be supported for investigation of Mitsui & Co.'s activities in the United States during World War No. 1.

I propose now to publish a review of this incredible phenomenon whereby Mitsui & Co., a Japanese Government-controlled corporation, was not only allowed to operate plane and chemical plants in the United States during the last war, but to draw millions of dollars from our Government to finance them; also to obtain free access to the latest technical information from the various governmental departments.

I want to put together my part of the picture with yours. During the spring or summer of 1918 there arrived at the port of Seattle from Japan, en route East to the airplane plants of Mitsui & Co., a delegation of 8 or 10 Japanese naval aviation officers. Admiral Coontz, Commandant of the Thirteenth Naval District, Bremerton, instructed me to act as his representative in entertaining this delegation; that he did not want to have them visit the United States Navy Yard at Bremerton, and did not feel that he could personally spare the time. A banquet was held at the Hotel Washington. I found that I had some years before met, in a friendly way, Emo Takaki, in charge of the delegation, when he was a student at Columbia University, and who, in the meantime, had risen to the important post of New York manager of Mitsui & Co. Takaki surprised me by his frankness; in fact, was quite boastful of the achievements of Mitsui & Co., and told me, in some detail, that they were operating two airplane plants in New Jersey, also a chemical plant in the South. He said:

"You hear a great deal about the Japanese snooping around and stealing plans. We don't have to resort to such tactics. We operate these plants in your country and secure all the latest technical information relating to designs, construction, operations, and military tactics. This is all obtained openly, as allies.

"You know, just before I left Washington I said to Thomas Edison, head of the United States War Inventions Board, 'I hear the Navy has just perfected a much-improved torpedo. Won't you give us the plans?' Mr. Edison replied that he didn't think they should do so. I then replied, 'Well, you know, everybody says some day Japan and the United States are going to war. You are a great sporting nation and believe in fair play, and, of course, you would want to have us as well equipped as you are with the most up-to-date weapons.'"

I at once conveyed this information to the commandant of the Thirteenth Naval District. On September 25, 1919, I appeared before the House Immigration Committee in Washington, D. C., requesting a complete congressional investigation of all Japanese activities in the United States, and specifically called the committee's attention to the fact that Mitsui & Co. had been operating these plants during the war.

You can understand I was very much pleased, therefore, when you instigated the investigation of Mitsui's activities in this country during the last war, and presumed that the whole business was thoroughly probed and the findings turned over to the Department of Justice. Although I made some effort to learn what happened, I was never able to find out why Mitsui & Co. were not prosecuted, made to make restitution to the United States Treasury, and, as I believed warranted, have them barred altogether from the United States. What were the underlying facts as to why the affair was dropped? Today we have the tragic sequel in the massacre of thousands of our young men by Japan. How can we safeguard this Nation against a recurrence of this situation? Can we, by revealing the facts, protect against a repetition of penetration by foreign influences? Unless we do, we will see these forces rise again as soon as peace is declared.

Did you ever hear of the strange death, under mysterious circumstances, of Emo Takaki about the time your investigation was coming to a head? The report given out was that he was killed by a streetcar in New York. His death must have been considered a fortuitous happening by both the Japanese Government and Mitsui & Co.

I will appreciate it if you will write me your own recollection of the case, supplemented by such essential information as you are able to supply me from the official records.

Yours truly,

MILLER FREEMAN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1942.

Capt. MILLER FREEMAN,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR CAPTAIN FREEMAN: I have your letter of the 10th and have read the same with more interest than you know. The enclosures you forwarded are very timely.

As you perhaps recall, I put forth every possible effort to secure an investigation of the Attorney General, Harry M. Daugherty, and the Department of Justice, because of the neglect of the Department of Justice to move in the war fraud cases. Being blocked in the House, I called on Senator BURTON K. WHEELER and placed in his hands the information I had. I may say these data were almost exclusively copies of records in the Department of Justice. This accounts for the fact that no one in authority ever denied any charge I made against Mr. Daugherty personally or his official organization.

Senator WHEELER, as chairman of a special Senate committee, made a very thorough investigation of the Department and, as a result, Harry M. Daugherty was tried twice in the Federal courts in New York. The first time the jury stood 10 to 2 for conviction, and the second time 11 to 1 for conviction. Evidently he was able to reach two jurors in the first instance and one in the second.

My opinion of Mr. Daugherty is still what it was 20 years ago. It was known at that time that financially he was behind the lighthouse to the extent of more than $50,000. As Attorney General he could not indulge in private practice, and yet when he was dismissed by President Coolidge he found himself sufficiently well fixed to enable him to live in luxury for the balance of his worthless life.

As you will gather from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD references I am giving you, it was I who "opened the ball" against what was probably the most dishonest, reprehensible administration of the Department of Justice in our history. An inspection of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which will be found in your local library, will bring you up to date on all matters pertaining thereto, with the possible exception of the recoveries made by the Government following my disclosures. Some few years afterward, I learned from the Office of Finance, War Department, that something more than $31,000,000 in cash and $7,000,000 in supplies, which had been turned over to contractors and which had not been accounted for, were recovered. I know a rather large number of Members of Congress had been presented with the information I received before it was brought to me. I was the only one, apparently, who cared to become active in the matter, and it is doubtful whether any part of the above recoveries would have been made had the action not been taken. Thirty-eight millions of dollars in these days seems a trivial sum, but, nevertheless, at the present rate it would pay a congressional salary for 3,800 years.

May I say again that I am greatly interested in your proposal to review the situation so far as it applied to Mitsui & Company. If there is any way in which I can be of further assistance, let me know.

With very kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

ROY O. WOODRUFF.

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Quotation from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5288, second session, Sixty-seventh Congress, April 11, 1922:

"The Standard Aircraft Corporation and the Standard Aero Co. are enterprises of Mitsui & Co., Japanese brokers, and the fiscal agents of the Japanese Government.

"During the first World War, the Standard companies were prominent members of the group of contractors which controlled American aviation.

"Senator FREYLINGHUYSEN. What relation does the Mitsui Company bear to the Japanese Government?

"Senator WORKMAN. They are paymasters for the Japanese Government throughout the world; its fiscal agents, and they were also assisting the German secret service work before the war, acting as paymasters for them. Judge Hughes was correct in his statement to the President that these Japanese concerns received orders for every variety of aircraft work, a proceeding which had no justification from a production standpoint."

"The concerns were operated by Harry B. Mingle and Max J. Frankenstein. While it has been established that these companies were controlled by Mitsui & Co., who owned the majority of the stock, Mingle testified before the Senate committee that Mitsui & Co. loaned him $3,500,000 to carry on the undertakings, 'and that all they have is a memorandum that in case I should die or anything should happen, they could handle it in a way they wished.' It was testified Mingle made a weekly report to the Japanese owners, and we have documentary evidence to show that early in the war the Standard Aircraft Corporation shipped five motors from San Francisco to Japan. The propriety of the situation needs no comment. This investigation has established the fact that agents of the Japanese Government are constantly collecting information of the most intimate character as to the industries, resources, harbors, and other information of a vital character concerning this country, and that these agents work through Mitsui & Co. (Consider this, a statement before Congress in 1922 by Workman.)

"A report by the contract-unit section of the War Department shows the following, as a result of its audits of the contracts of the Standard Aircraft Co. and the Standard Aero Co.:

Total payments by Government (United States)	$16,461,680.15
Amounts unsupported by property, records, or other papers	9,948,028.42
In case supporting papers are produced, there would remain the following amount to be recovered from the contractors for reasons stated in individual audits	6,586,774.61

"The statement showing settlement as of Sept. 30, 1919, and known as exhibit A, shows the following

Amortization and Depreciation

Total amortization on buildings, machinery, and equipment per exhibit F-------- $2,266,479.35

"The comparative balance sheet after Government adjustments as of Sept. 30, 1919, shows the following:

Quick payments to Mitsui & Co---------- $4,470,000.00

Other payments and reserves set up for Mitsui & Co., prepaid expenses, rents, etc--- 370,499.22

"The investigation has developed the fact that the Standard Cos. have never owned these buildings, and as the contractor has collected for both amortization and rent on the buildings, the fraud on the Government is apparent at a glance, and a searching investigation of all of the activities of these companies must be completed.

"Subsequent to these statements, Mingle is alleged to have paid to Mitsui & Co. additional sums in excess of $2,000,000. Although largely indebted to the Government, the Standard Aero Co. (April 1922) is now in the hands of a trustee in bankruptcy and the Standard Aircraft is in the process of liquidation.

"Mitsui & Co. are indirectly exercising powerful influences in this country, which extends to Congress and departments of the Government, and they have on their pay rolls attorneys and politicians who are attempting to run roughshod over the country to whom they owe their allegiance.

"When an investigation of these contracts began, the law firm of Cadwalader, Wickersham and Taft notified the Chief of Finances of the Air Department that they had been retained by Mitsui & Co. (Ltd.) to represent their interests, and requested that certain accountants who had been in the employ of these interests be permitted to work with the Government's representatives during the audit of the books of the Standard Aircraft Corporation.' Their request was refused unless Mitsui & Co. would admit its liability in the premises.

"In a few days after this letter was written, Abraham F. Myers, former office boy at the Department of Justice, who had already received unusual advancement after becoming a law clerk in the department, was given supervision of all the war fraud cases at a salary of $6,000 per year. Shortly after this young man, who it seems was one of those who failed to do military service during the war, notified the air service that no further information was to be given to any person connected with the Department of Justice, except through him. A few days later I established, by conclusive evidence, that the said Myers was placed in this key position through the influence of George W. Wickersham. Since that time the investigation of the air service war contracts has been blocked.

"Aside from the open and aggressive obstruction reported to you in an earlier memo, there enters the name of a high Government official who has been deeply involved and yet powerful enough to seriously impede further investigation. Just at the time when we were closing in on these crooks and were in position to close up the main features of the investigation, my only servant, who was rendering a most valuable service in connection with the various frauds, including the Japanese, was suspended and no reasons have ever been given. In several other cases the same action was taken. One agent who refused a bribe and reported it to the department was fired the next day."

Listen to Lincoln: "It Is for Us the Living—"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a radio address delivered by Representative CHARLES A. PLUMLEY of Vermont over the facilities of the Blue Network on Friday, February 12:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY

These are truly tragic days in the history of this Republic, the maintenance and the continuance of which was the burden of the responsibility borne, but not lightly laid, on the shoulders of the man the anniversary of whose birth we observe.

"It is for us the living," said he, "to see to it that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

This is the burden and the challenge of our undertaking. Shall we meet it? Can we bear it?

In the grandeur of his soul Abraham Lincoln visioned a world unshackled, willed to us the duty and the obligation to carry high the torch of liberty he threw into our hands, to the end that all men everywhere eventually shall be truly free. Do we measure up to our opportunity?

The era in which he lived and moved was but the beginning of things for the United States of America, whose destiny he prophetically saw was foreordained as the savior of the world.

His rugged, honest, steadfast perseverance and stanch Americanism still stand as examples, as objectives which the Nation and all of us as individuals may well try to emulate. Unwavering in his loyalty to the fundamentals of American Government, his genuine respect for the Constitution, and his great concern for the destiny of the Republic ended only with his death.

"So they buried Lincoln? Strange and vain.
Hast any creature thought of Lincoln hid
In any vault 'neath coffin lid?
In all the years since that wild spring of pain?
It is false—he never in grave hath lain.
You could not bury him, although you slid
Upon his clay the Cheops pyramid,
Or heaped it with the Rocky Mountain chain.
If no man's memories not a monument be,
None shalt thou have."

A redeemed and reunited Republic is his monument.

These United States of ours which he saved were welded out of an incongrous mass of indeterminate elements almost as numerous and as diversified as those which the scientists have discovered to be as common as those between us and the planets.

The prism of brains through which the ray of light of the possibilities for man's achievement has registered, and been separated, makes it possible for us to identify our responsibility and to assume our burden. How well this man Lincoln foresaw that which was bound to be. We must meet the test of the prism and emerge "like a light which the fierce winds have no power to extinguish."

So many people have so well said those things which all of us would be proud to put in words that little remains to be said or can be said these days which has not already been spoken. One poet has said:

"Some opulent force of genius, soul, and race,
Some deep life current from far centuries
Flowed to his mind and lighted his sad eyes,
And gave his name, among great names, high place."

No monarch ever had greater power than he; none ever employed it so tenderly, so benevolently, so graciously. No power of pardon, except that of Providence, was ever exercised so mercifully, so benignly. No other human being dried so many tears, stopped so many heartaches, revived so many hopes.

In the words of Edwin Markham:

"Up from log cabin to the Capitol,
One fire was on his spirit, one resolve—
To send the keen ax to the root of wrong,
Clearing a free way for the feet of God,
The eyes of conscience testing every stroke,
To make his deed the measure of a man.
He built the rail pile as he built the State,
Pouring his splendid strength through every blow;
The grip that swung the ax in Illinois
Was on the pen that set a people free."

Today, whether we like it or not, we of these States, once separated and by him welded into one, are as close to all freemen the world over as if, as someone has said, we "rooted for the same ball team or blistered our hands to save somebody from a burning house."

Today on many battlefields, world over, our sons, our husbands, our daughters mingle their blood with the blood of our allies. They are dodging bombs from Murmansk to Moresby. They bleed, sweat, and die side by side on the docks of Basra, in the hangars of China, in the foxholes of Guadalcanal. The word "stranger" has been burned and frozen and laughed and cried, wounded, and nursed out of our language. There is no such word. This era is a cataclysm. We live in it and should thank God we are alive.

All over this portion of the universe which we still call free is found a mixture of men and ideas and ideals, of tools and of skills, of dreams and hope and vision, which has shrunk the world to a single community. If we have our way, it is going to stay so for the common good of all.

No man hereafter should ever ask how small is the world, but how big is it. How boundless and broad is it for us all? Where do we fit?

With the new responsibility which is and shall be ours, there will also come opportunity, which will be our answer. We shall move our goods on highways wider and faster than any of those who came before us ever dared dream of, on new sea lanes never before charted. We shall enjoy the benefits of new materials, new inventions, new comforts, new standards of living beyond the imagination of man to comprehend; we shall wage better and more efficient battles against sickness and death, and against war itself, if we prepare for it now. It is a wonderful future which we shall have a right to contemplate and that shall open up not only for ourselves but for those who shall come after us. Yes, the world has shrunk—but to immensity.

After this war the responsibility of the Nation will not be circumscribed within the territorial limits of the United States. We should recognize this fact. Our Nation has an obligation to assist in bringing about understanding, comity, cooperation among the nations of the world in order that our own liberty may be preserved and that the blighting and destructive processes of war may not

again be forced upon us and upon the free and peace-loving peoples of the earth.

After this war the United States of America will be the source, the supply, the storehouse for all the world's new needs, the gyroscope and also the anchor for the safety of civilization. We cannot dodge the issue or our responsibility.

The day of our isolation as a Nation has sunk out of sight with yesterday's sun, with old Atlantis, under the water of experience which covers the globe of theory with the irrepressible, irresistible flood of reality.

The post-war crises we will have to meet present not only great dangers but wonderful opportunities for America. The military victory we shall eventually have accomplished spells only the beginning of the trials and tribulations which are to be ours to overcome. Our military victory will be only the prelude of our victory to be won.

The blueprint for the freedom of the world, for the new world order, in the peace which shall follow this war, shall be the Constitution of the United States of America, a government of, for, and by the people, a government of laws and not a government of men.

These days are dark and dreary and in thousands of homes the light of life has gone out to keep burning and to furnish the fuel for the torch of liberty held high over the head of every American.

Our boys are dying on battlefields on every continent. Theirs is no light and casual gift to the cause of the better world for which they fight. They are giving their all. Their sacrifice is supreme, and falling and dying they challenge us to carry on, to make any and all and every necessary sacrifice to speed the better day for which they so gallantly die. We shall not build a new world order at any lesser cost or on any other foundation. We shall build a better world as a monument to those who have given their lives to make it possible and as a tribute to our own self-respect. We can do no less.

Let there be no diminution of our patriotic support of every measure intended to conserve and to preserve all those things for which our founding fathers fought. Let there be no petty partisan politics which shall diminish the force or impede the effect of our unity.

The recurring question for us to try to answer again is this: Is it humanly possible to avoid the arbitrament of war for the settlement of such questions as involve humanity? Must we kill off, periodically, so many millions of human beings in order to permit the habitation of the globe by those who survive? Is war a scourge or a benefit to civilization? Must civilization as such periodically be subjected to trial by the sword? And so all the old questions which are found from Genesis to Revelations and from the day of the first Caesar to the last peace conference are again raised to be answered by the enlightened conscience of more intelligent humanity. What is the answer? Quo vadis? Nobody knows.

So we do well to observe the anniversary of the date of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, this child of a Kentucky cabin, this master politician self-developed into a statesman, this backwoodsman who became Commander in Chief extraordinary, this poet, prophet, and philosopher of and for the destiny of a people, a man among men, who, though dead, yet today and for all time and to eternity stands upon the earth "as some tall cliff that lifts its awful form, swells from the vale, and midway leaves the storm," and stands like the Christ of the Andes at the top of man's world.

As we observe this anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, the American people may well be assured that this Congress will undertake in its best judgment to do that and those things which it believes best to be done, and for us to do, in order that we may do all which may eventually achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and all nations.

There was a dream that men could one day speak the thoughts of their own choosing. There was a hope that men could one day stroll through streets at evening, unafraid. There was a prayer that each could speak to his own God, in his own church. That dream, that hope, that prayer became America. Great strength, youthful heart, vast enterprise, hard work made it so. Now, that same America is the dream, the hope, the prayer of the world. Our freedom its dream. Our strength its hope. Our swift race against time its prayer. We must not fail the world now. We must not fail to share our freedom with it afterwards.

Susan B. Anthony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Helena Hill Weed, daughter of the late Congressman Ebenezer J. Hill, of Norwalk, Conn., sent me the following thoughts this morning on Susan B. Anthony. I feel most women in America are in sympathetic accord with them:

Forty-three years ago tonight the eightieth birthday of Susan B. Anthony was celebrated in the Lafayette Theater, now the home of the Stage Door Canteen.

All Washington joined in the ceremonies, and presents for her personally and for use in the movement for the emancipation of women came from all over the country. She wrote a personal reply to every single letter.

In one of these she said:

"If the celebration of my birthday had any significance, it was in the fact that my life had been devoted to the work of gaining the constitutional recognition of equality of rights for the women of the United States." (From The Life and Work of Susan B. Anthony, by Ida Husted Harper, vol. III, p. 1197.)

In 1906 her birthday was again celebrated in Washington, this time in the Church of Our Father. Miss Anthony was a sick woman when she rose, at the end of the congratulatory speeches, to make what proved to be her last public utterance. In touching words she spoke of the 63 years of continuous work she had been able to give to the cause of equal rights for women through the loyal help and devotion of the women about her. Then, as weakness overcame her, she paused for an instant, seeming to be gazing into the future, then, dropping her arms to her side, she spoke her last public words: "Failure is impossible."

That night, as she looked from her window in the old Shoreham Hotel at the Washington Monument gleaming in the moonlight, she said: "Everyone who sees it must feel the love of freedom and justice, and want to be true to the principles it stands for."

The next day she returned to her home in Rochester, never to leave it again. Her life ebbed out slowly and on March 18, 1906, she passed peacefully away.

During her last days she talked often with the friends who came to visit at her bedside.

To Anna Howard Shaw she said on one occasion: "Just think of it! I have been striving for justice for over 60 years without ever obtaining it. Oh, it seems so cruel!"

Reminded by Dr. Shaw that her grand struggle had already changed life for women everywhere, she said: "Young women who are benefited by the changes haven't the least idea how they came about. They do not even realize the change—they do not know what it has cost other women to get it for them."

Speaking once of the future life after death, she said: "If anyone over there can help or influence those who are left behind in this life, I will come to you—if it is possible, I will always come to you when most needed."

Today when we are trying to complete the great work of winning constitutional freedom for women, to which she gave a long life of devoted service, we need the influence of her great spirit and indomitable will as never before.

Strange Panaceas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a most timely editorial, entitled "Strange Panaceas," which appeared in the Clinton Daily Item of Clinton, Mass., Thursday evening, February 11, and which was written by the distinguished and talented editor of that highly esteemed publication, Hon. Orra L. Stone:

STRANGE PANACEAS

The question arises in the minds of many residents of this and other towns, "Must civilian life be entirely sacrificed to the war effort?"

They believe the chaotic situation that exists in the functioning of Federal and State governments constitutes a serious menace not only to the health, well-being, and morale of the American people but that it threatens the dislocation of all social conditions.

The constantly changing and ever-confusing statements emanating from Washington and Boston are partly responsible for the present situation, they believe.

In one release we are told of the enormous and unprecedented quantity of crops raised by the farmers of the United States in 1942, and in the next breath we are drastically restricted on necessary foods of many kinds.

It is a matter of common knowledge that we have limitless oil fields and that the capacity to produce and refine all kinds of petroleum products have never been so great as at present, but, due to insufficient transportation, the arbitrary ban on fuel oil has caused intense suffering, has impaired the vitality of all types of workers, has resulted in serious illness, has increased respiratory diseases beyond all local or national records, and has adversely affected the lives of countless people who, in previous winters, were immune from such attacks.

It would hardly seem that the unanimity which exists among purveyors of petroleum products to the effect that the present unfortunate situation long since developed into a "racket" for the financial benefit of those on the inside can no longer be regarded as a mere idle rumor.

These men who are familiar with the ramifications of the oil industry have access to facts not possessed by the general public.

It is not believed that the heads of oil-purveying establishments are "talking through their hats" or without the facts and the constantly changing picture gives rise to the belief on the part of the public that these men have placed their finger on the sore spot and that everything that could have been done to relieve the England situation has not been tried out lest the "racket" be disrupted.

It is a matter of record that here, in Clinton, as in every other town and city, the small tradesman has been or is being wiped out by a situation that creates a wide and far-reaching disturbance in the economic life of the communities affected.

We are told that we must imitate and follow the restrictions imposed upon the people of Great Britain who have had the enemy at their door for 4 years, whereas we, far from the seat of war and with the certainty of the existence of immense resources in food anl fuel, must be deprived of both.

We witness daily the rows and disagreements of innumerable bureaucratic agencies at odds with each other while in the meantime everybody suffers because of the palsied efforts of those who are popularly supposed to be equipped to solve governmental problems.

Futile attempts to bolster up the crumbling mainstays of our existence are made in the application of totalitarian methods which instead of producing efficiency and tangible results merely end in our being forced to submit to multiple, uncoordinated and ever-changing exactions, all contrary to the American way of life and our commonly accepted standards.

It is difficult when we read that the Ayer rationing board allows recapped tire allotments to soldiers at Fort Devens, for use on their passenger autos to reconcile such a situation with that existing in vicinity towns where boards refuse to approve applications of auto owners for tires on cars used exclusively for essential purposes.

If it is right for soldiers to burn up gasoline in their passenger autos it doesn't seem to some people that it is just the thing to have defense plants shut down, as occurred in Fitchburg, a few days ago, because they lack fuel which might have been delivered to them if gasoline supplies for nonessential purposes had been denied.

And again our sacrifices become irksome when we contrast them with the wild and profligate extravagances of bureaucratic officials in Washington.

The average American strenuously objects to being commandeered by incompetence and many believe it is high time to add a fifth freedom to the other four—the right to belong to a land of the free.

Increasing regimentation; a rising, extravagant, and ineffective bureaucracy and the power assumed by it to establish rules from which an aggrieved citizen has no recourse; the abolition of States' rights which has become a stench in the nostrils for the past 10 years of all who believe in a democracy; the wholesale transfer of extraordinary law-making power in peace and wartimes without suitable riders providing for the withdrawal of such powers at the end of hostilities; and the unbridled expenditures for nonessentials having no connection whatever with the war effort are but a few of the steps that smack of the adoption of a totalitarian form of government entirely at odds with the concepts of a constitutional democracy.

The ease which permits anybody who wants to interrupt the war effort to do so and get away with it provided he is a member or an officer of a labor union; the policy which permits anybody who wants to bring hardship to thousands of families by curtailing coal and oil supplies for their homes, to do so and get away with it provided he is an officer or member of a labor union; the privilege that anybody can absent himself from work whenever he pleases and slow down the production of vitally necessary war machines can avail himself of it provided he is a member or an officer of a labor union; the lack of even the slightest penalty for unauthorized or wildcat strikes, no matter how much damage is occasioned by a worker who thus impairs the war effort—all these and a hundred other lawless acts go unnoticed by Federal officials.

But the average American notices that there is evidently plenty of law to seize a plant if an employer refuses to grant some abstract right such as the maintenance of union membership, or the check-off, or some other advantage to unionism, but union members, when recalcitrant, are apparently not subject to punishment.

These Americans have not forgotten that the people were deprived of hundreds of thousands of tons of hard coal because of a recent strike in Pennsylvania, nor have they overlooked the statement made by the head of a big aircraft plant on the Pacific coast that America was being deprived of the product of at least 300 planes a month due to the absenteeism of individual workers.

They know that the growth of the practice of taking a day off whenever one pleases has been a leading topic of discussion among war plant executives for a year, but no penalty has been developed to end the practice.

Nobody in Washington appears to be interested sufficiently in these interruptions to do anything drastic about them.

Members of the Cabinet and bureau officials do plenty of denouncing but if anybody on Capitol Hill ventured to press for legislation to put into effect these denunciations, they know the administration, if past experience is a criterion, would speedily send one of its lieutenants to Congress to line up its rubber-stamp followers against any such proposal.

Congressional committees investigate and seek by publicity to shame the so-called leaders of the union into ending the interruptions, but knowing that no penalty is involved and that when once the men go back to work after some face-saving gesture makes it easy for them, nothing will be done, the strike weapon is utilized even in the face of formal protests from higher-ups in the union ranks.

It is difficult for the American people to tell whether the top officials really are or are not in sympathy with the so-called unauthorized strikes.

If there is to be no penalty for interrupting work during a war and if the administration is to apply coercion and force against employers who refuse to grant union demands while at the same time using no penalty or threat of penalty to keep workers from calling "wildcat" strikes, then an intensification of this sort of virtual sabotage of the war effort must be expected.

Congress knows full well the abuses, but too many Members are afraid of the labor vote even though they may be at the same time betraying the young men at the front who need the airplanes or the weapons to be produced in the factories that are beset with labor or fuel crises.

The tremendous cost of delay due to labor troubles cannot, unfortunately, be measured either in man-hours or in percentages. In times like these when every ton of material is required, interruption of the war effort without penalty appears inexplicable to the average American and merely adds to the impairment of the morale of the people and intensifies their lack of unity.

As John Griffin says in the Boston Post: "It's about time that some of the Washington officials stopped fighting the American people and got in line with them in their essentially practical viewpoint. These idealists, so-called, have even found fault with the President's handling of the North African situation and have completely ignored the practical considerations that are involved."

The breed of "big wolves" and "little foxes," in Washington, both possess leech-like qualities and it is difficult to liquidate them because, regardless of the desires of Congress, they resort to devious ways to perpetuate themselves.

The "big wolves" are the big bureaucrats who seek to gobble up all American industry and commerce in one governmental gulp by making our present temporary and voluntary relinquishments of American rights and privileges involuntary and permanent.

The "little foxes" are the little bureaucrats who snipe and snap at American rights and privileges, including the privilege to own property by such tactics as overtaxation through overassessment; overregulation by means of zoning rules; artificial limitations on salaries and the like.

We must set our faces resolutely against every bureaucratic encroachment, however innocuous it may appear at first glance, as Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN courageously said in his recent speech, at Fitchburg.

"We must exercise eternal vigilance to assure that Government remains the servant of the people and that the American people do not become the slaves of government."

Rugged individualism and private competitive enterprise are characteristic of America as the land of opportunity.

Among the dangers we face today is that of permanent rent and other controls designed to force the complete socialization of real estate—in other words, national communism.

In all these untoward events the public sees added proof of the fact that the Federal Government has been captured by a minority of European-minded socialists more intent on winning the class war at home than the World War abroad.

Likewise, they see that as the demands for socialism are intensified the isolationists will be given opportunities they hitherto lacked.

If class warfare is what is wanted in Washington, plenty of people are itching to get into the fray.

If what is desired is to win the war, the proponents of all this unfortunate mess in which we find ourselves have chosen a peculiar path toward arriving at such a result.

Resolution of the Utah State Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a concurrent resolution passed by the Utah State Legislature entitled "A concurrent resolution memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to modify certain regulations pursuant to the Marketing Quota Act so as to permit the feeding of excess wheat to poultry and livestock in Millard County, Utah, and so as to adjust wheat quotas for dry farms in Millard County on a basis of normal moisture seasons":

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that H. R. 1605, a bill to amend the Agriculture Adjustment Act, that has now

been reported by the Agriculture Committee and under a rule will be considered by the House sometime this week, is a bill that will partially solve the difficulty that is the subject of this concurrent resolution. If H. R. 1605 is passed, it will permit the feeding of so-called hot wheat owned by a farmer to his own livestock and poultry.

It is my hope that the Agriculture Department will revise its rules and regulations so as to permit the purpose sought in the other portion of this resolution, in that it may be permissible for a county to reallocate its wheat allotments where it is practicable to do so to the best interest of all concerned.

The resolution referred to follows:

Whereas wheat quotas for dry farms in Millard County, Utah, have been and now are based upon a period of extreme drought which requires an adjustment for normal seasons where moisture is average, such as the present season; and

Whereas there is throughout the entire country at the present time an emergency condition which has created an extreme demand for meat and meat products, including poultry; and

Whereas it is advisable to release excess wheat now being held in Millard County, Utah, for the purpose of feeding livestock and poultry in Millard County, Utah; and

Whereas if such wheat were now released for the purposes aforesaid, the transportation facilities which are now used for transporting wheat into the Millard County area for the feeding of livestock and poultry would be relieved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States be respectfully requested to modify regulations now in existence pursuant to the Marketing Quota Act so as to allow the use without penalty of excess or so-called "hot" wheat for feeding poultry and livestock for the duration of the present emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States be further respectfully requested to modify the present wheat quota for dry farms in Millard County, Utah, so as to base future quotas upon seasons of normal moisture rather than upon seasons of extreme drought as the present quotas require; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly certified by the secretary of state, be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to each of the Utah Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

A Tribute to the Flag of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, in these days when war is ravaging the world one consoling thought for every American to entertain is that fundamentally the heart of America is sound. Patriotic men and women, and boys and girls, predominate throughout the land. Our one consuming thought is to win the war in order that the liberty of our own country may be preserved and that freedom may be brought to the liberty-loving nations of the world.

The flag of the United States is the symbol of Americanism, the emblem of the sovereignty of the Nation.

It represents the ideals, aspirations, and history of a people and engenders a feeling of patriotism and respect.

It flies perpetually over the Nation's Capitol as a sign of national perpetuity.

It flies over the schoolhouses of our Nation, signifying the Nation's endorsement of education.

It flies over the capitol of all States and over our courthouses, signifying the administration of justice.

It is the symbol of every right enjoyed by the American people; it reflects the worth and grandeur of this great land of opportunity; it signifies the law of the land; it believes in tolerance; it is the badge of the Nation's greatness and the emblem of its destiny.

The Stars and Stripes symbolize 8 years of struggle and sacrifice to form a union of States. Each star is the star of a sovereign State. Their setting on a blue field signals to mankind that here is a Nation dedicated to personal freedom and religious rights, a sanctuary to oppressed men and women the world over, where they may have life and liberty and where they may pursue happiness.

The red stripes represent human sacrifice and the blood spilled by the Nation's heroes in winning the freedom which is ours; the white ones, the purity of purpose of a great, nobler, and holier America. In the whole is crystallized all the hopes and fears of a Nation, established on the righteous principle of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of worship.

Because of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I am asking unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a tribute to the flag of the United States, prepared by one of my constituents, Zelpha E. McKinnon, of Flint, Mich. This tribute to the flag is one that appeals not only to our minds, but to our hearts, and expresses a lofty and devoted concept of citizenship.

Mrs. McKinnon is an unusually fine and loyal citizen of the United States and the tribute which she has prepared to the flag, represents her own deep devotion and prayer in thus paying tribute to the Nation's emblem:

A TRIBUTE TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Zelpha E. McKinnon)

In the beginning when God created the heaven and the earth, the earth was void and without form and complete darkness lay over all; and God said, "Let there be light," and slowly out of the east came the first red and white ray of the morning sun, growing brighter and brighter until over the universe He had created shone the first day. And then that the world might never be in darkness, He made the stars and set them in the blue of the heavens, where they sparkled softly as the first night fell on the new-born world.

The red, the white and the blue are the symbol of God's first thought when He made for us the world, and lighted it with the red and white ray of the morning sun and the stars set in the heavens' blue at night. These three colors were therefore enshrined in the hearts and the minds of our forefathers, so they blended them together and they have risen to heights of beauty and significance in the Star-Spangled Banner of our fair land.

Into this American flag were woven all the ideals, the hopes, and the aspirations of our people. It throbs and breathes the life for which our ancestors fought. This flag was born in revolution, baptized in hardship, and bathed in the blood of millions of American men. It represents the heartaches and tears of women, the wives, mothers, daughters, and sisters of those who gave their lives that this great democracy should not perish.

All true Americans love every thread of its silken folds, for it represents the Declaration of Independence, it stands for the Constitution of the United States, the law of the land. It controls the strong, protects the weak, and relieves the suffering, it has always stood for peace and good will among nations, but let one hand be raised against it and millions will spring to its defense.

As we pay tribute to this flag today, let us dedicate ourselves to its protection and to the preservation of the principles for which it stands so that this democracy, a government of the people, by the people and for the people, shall not perish and that this glorious flag shall continue to wave unblemished over a free and a happy people.

King College, One of the Reservoirs of Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in my home town of Bristol, on the Tennessee side, is located King College, an old Presbyterian school that, like many of our other small Christian colleges, stands low in endowment but high in character building and the development of youth into pure, unadulterated and undefiled Americans.

Through the years she has had a hard time to keep going. Had it not been for the consecrated men that have directed her destiny, ere this she would have joined the innumerable small Christian colleges that today are but memories of a glorious past and monuments to man's lack of appreciation of true values.

Yes; King College has kept going, and today without even a president is still carrying on; and, knowing the stamina of the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians behind her, somehow I know that she will continue to carry on.

While her history, like the history of most small Christian colleges, is one of struggle and sacrifice, her record justifies every struggle, every sacrifice she has made to develop in the youth of our section the true American concept of Government and the Master's way of life. Why, at the same time two mountain boys, brothers, James and Joseph Vance, attended King College. Later James became the renowned Dr. James Anderson Vance, at one time moderator of the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church, United States of America, commonly known as the Southern Pres-

byterian Church, which is the highest office within the gift of the Southern Church; and Joseph became the renowned Dr. Joseph Isaac Vance, at one time moderator of the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church in United States, commonly known as the Northern Presbyterian Church, which is the highest office within the gift of the Northern Church. I am not saying that this period was not, perhaps, King's high water mark in turning out celebrities, but I am saying that a college that can reach such a high water mark is not apt to turn out many intellectual and spiritual runts and crack-pots.

At King, and the same condition prevails at the other small Christian colleges, and to a large degree at our other small liberal arts colleges, the sons of the well-to-do and the boys who are working their way through college mix and mingle as equals in the good old traditional American way, each contributing something to the other, and thus evening up and leveling off social traits, traits of environment, and other society-made barriers, until after 4 years of American-Christian training they come forth the highest products of Christian-American civilization.

And there is another thing that goes on at our small Christian and nonsectarian colleges that is conducive to character building and the preservation of our American way of life. The members of the faculty know each student and each student knows each faculty member. This intimate, personal contact between student and faculty member means much. Among other things, it means that the student still retains his identity, his personality. He is not just another piece of machinery on the assembly line, stamped with a number, as, I am afraid, too many of our students are in our larger educational institutions where educational mass production seems to be in vogue, but a free-born American who retains his identity while seeking to develop his God-given personality.

Why men of wealth, many of them having earned their wealth in the hard way, will dump their millions into the endowment funds of our large institutions of learning where, as a matter of fact, additional endowment funds are not needed, and forget all about the small struggling Christian colleges, and our other small liberal arts colleges, is nothing short of tragic, and can only be explained on the ground that in the accumulation of their wealth their egoes become so enlarged that they smothered their true sense of values to such an extent that nothing of less dimensions than a Harvard, or a Princeton, or a Yale will satisfy their enlarged and inflated vanities. There is a thought that I want to drop right here. It is this: Those preaching strange un-American doctrines and philosophies in our country today are not the products of King and our small Christian colleges, and our other small liberal arts colleges, but the products--many of them—of the large institutions of learning that have been endowed by our leaders of business and finance. These leaders are now decrying these strange doctrines and philosophies when, as a matter of fact, they are largely the children of their own unbridled egoes. Have they unwittingly created another Frankenstein? And many of these leaders are now coming to me and other Congressmen and complaining about the interminable rules and regulations, red tape, and lengthy and complicated reports, that have been set up in connection with our war effort.

Had these men of wealth spent even a small part of their millions keeping our small Christian and nonsectarian liberal arts colleges open, probably we would not be alarmed today over these strange doctrines and philosophies and plagued with these wonder boys that have weeded their way into our bureaus and departments of government and are bogging down our war effort with interminable rules and regulations, plus miles of red tape and reams of reports, all foreign to every American concept, that make simple problems so complex that the ordinary American had as well try to master Einstein's theory of relativity as to unravel them. Think it over Mr. Businessman, Mr. Financier. Yes. Mr. Businessman, Mr. Financier, the next time you get a little hot under the collar, why, just sit down and think it over.

And in connection with our small Christian colleges and other small liberal arts colleges there is another thought that I want to leave with you. And, while I use King College as an example in expressing the thought, what I say with reference to King applies with equal force to all our small Christian and nonsectarian liberal arts colleges. King College over its glorious history has not averaged, I dare say, over 150 students per year. Its student body has been largely drawn from a small local area. Now the thought I want to leave: King has kept the area from which it draws a real Christian-American area. Yes, my colleagues, King College and the other small Christian and nonsectarian colleges scattered over our fair land have acted as reservoirs of true Americanism and, in my opinion, a greater blow to our Americanism could not be struck than to let these reservoirs dry up from lack of financial support. Think that over Mr. Businessman, Mr. Financier.

When the tocsin of war was sounded at Pearl Harbor let me tell you what happened at King; and the same thing happened at all of our other small Christian and nonsectarian colleges. Why, King College men rushed to the colors to defend the Americanism they had been taught, in which they believed, and which they loved, while, I am afraid, too many men from some of our larger institutions of learning rushed to find shelter in our governmental departments and bureaus. And, when "the lights come on again" these small-college boys will be back home fighting to retain our American way of life. Yes; we need such men now to defend our American way of life and, be not deceived, after the war we are going to need such men to preserve our American way of life. And think that over Mr. Businessman, Mr. Financier.

Let me give you the record of this small Christian college. As of January of this year 194 King college men had entered the service. I am proud of these boys, every one of them, and, under leave to extend, I incorporate in my remarks, at this point, a list of the King College boys in the service:

Paul H. Ashley, Bristol, Tenn.
William S. Aaron, Jr., Christiansburg, Va.
Albert C. Adams, Jr., Bristol, Tenn.
John William Alderson, Lebanon, Va.
Robert H. Alford, Dublin, Va.
Robert H. Alderson, Bristol, Va.
Howard Scott Alderson, Bristol, Va.
Blake Atwood, Mountain City, Tenn.
Mac Alexander, Greeneville, Tenn.
Richard E. Alderson, Lebanon, Va.
John L. Beattie, Jr., Abingdon, Va.
James P. Blackwell, Bristol, Va.
James R. Butler, Mountain City, Tenn.
Reeve C. Boy, Bristol, Tenn.
Harlis C. Breeding, Grundy, Va.
Robert C. Blackburn, Blountville, Tenn.
Theodore Berry, Arno, Va.
Tivis J. Browning, Abingdon, Va.
B. Lowry Bowman, Sarasota, Fla.
Robert P. Bogner, Wooster, Ohio.
Bernard N. Campbell, Bristol, Va.
Alfred P. Crosswhite, Bristol, Va.
John Isaac Cox 3d, Blountville, Tenn.
William C. Craft, Jr., Wise, Va.
Calvin C. Clyde, Effingham, S. C.
James A. Campbell, Saltville, Va.
Henry O. Clabaugh, Galion, Ohio.
Clark B. Cavett, Morristown, Tenn.
S. T. Copenhaver, Jr., Bristol, Va.
Ford Carmack, Bristol, Va.
Francis A. Cash, Bristol, Va.
Wise Canter, Bristol, Va.
Ronald Calcote, Chester, Miss.
Frank Clark, Jr., Abingdon, Va.
Earl Dishner, Bristol, Va.
J. Marvin Dishner, Bristol, Va.
William T. Dix, Bristol, Tenn.
John R. Daly, Jr., Charlotte, N. C.
David D. Duff, Erwin, Tenn.
Fred G. Debusk, Saltville, Va.
Prince A. Eades, Chattanooga, Tenn.
Lewis H. Everard, Ypsilanti, Mich.
Hugh H. Eaton, Bristol, Va.
Edward B. Everett, Bristol, Va.
Frank Moore Fisler, Ivanhoe, N. C.
Francis W. Flannagan, Bristol, Va.
Howard B. Foran, Bristol, Tenn.
Fred S. Frazier, Bristol, Tenn.
Richard W. Fitzgerald, Montgomery, Ala.
Jack C. Fogarty, Bristol, Va.
Benjamin B. Feaganes, Wytheville, Va.
Sam Faust, Bristol, Va.
G. Woodrow Fleenor, Bristol, Va.
James C. Fulwider, Bristol, Tenn.
Robert R. Fowler, Wooster, Ohio.
James B. Fugate, Clinchport, Va.
George A. Fletcher, Bristol, Tenn.
Emil Gavlak, Portage, Pa.
Morgan Goodpasture, Bristol, Va.
John T. Gunn, Cleveland, Ohio.
M. Giffert Groseclose, Bristol, Va.
Charles S. Groseclose, Bristol, Va.
R. Ernest Gibson, Bluefield, W. Va.
William Phillip Greer, Abington, Va.
Cary Gray, Bristol, Tenn.
Fred K. Graham, Indian Springs, Tenn.
John Albert Goodpasture, Bristol, Va.
Hunter Galloway, Bristol, Va.
David E. Hall, Abingdon, Va.
Lloyd C. Hall, Bristol, Va.
Arthur Douglas Hawthorne, Bristol, Va.
James Samuel Hawthorne, Bristol, Va.
Leonard J. Hutton, Bristol, Va.
Beryl J. Hawkins, Appalachia, Va.
George T. Harris, Morristown, Tenn.
Thomas L. Haman, Pittsboro, Miss.
Steve Heinrick, Seanor, Pa.

John Haun, Bristol, Va.
James J. Hamilton, Church Hill, Tenn.
Robert L. Hassinger, Bristol, Va.
R. C. Horner, Jr., Bristol, Va.
Quentin E. Hampton, Bristol, Tenn.
Charles Hall, Bristol, Va.
Lafitte Howard, Bristol, Va.
DeWitt Harrold, Bristol, Va.
Milford C. Johnston, Big Stone Gap, Va.
E. J. Johnson, Jr., Bristol, Va.
James A. Jones, Bristol, Va.
Albert S. Kelly, Jr., Bristol, Va.
Hubert J. Kaylor, Bristol, Va.
Victor E. Kursavage, Century, W. Va.
James L. King, Bristol, Tenn.
Gordon F. Keeler, Bristol, Va.
James Harvey Leonard, Bristol, Va.
Thomas Jackson Leonard, Bristol, Va.
Charles E. Leonard, Bristol, Va.
Jack L. Logan, Bristol, Tenn.
H. T. Lane, Jr., Morristown, Tenn.
Martin Lynch, Jr., Bristol, Tenn.
John N. Lyle, Knoxville, Tenn.
D. Eugene Long, Bristol, Va.
N. Faris Lancaster, Waynesville, N. C.
Landon E. McConnell, Bristol, Tenn.
Herbert C. Marcy, Bristol, Tenn.
David C. Meany, Bristol, Tenn.
Victor Marginian, Campbell, Ohio.
Doniphan McChesney, Abingdon, Va.
Kenneth G. Messerole, Bristol, Tenn.
Charles G. McNew, Jr., Bristol, Tenn.
Leroy McSwain, Hemp, N. C.
William P. Mitchell, Bristol, Tenn.
John O. Marcy, Bristol, Tenn.
Ben R. McEwen, Bristol, Tenn.
Albert E. Metts, Bristol, Va.
Stewart G. Neel, Jr., Alvarado, Va.
Fred W. Nidiffer, Bristol, Tenn.
John W. Olson, Hyde Park, Mass.
Hezekiah Osborne, Norton, Va.
A. B. Oxford, Marion, Ala.
Douglas Owen, Bristol, Tenn.
Ralph Daniel Patton, Bristol, Va.
Carl E. Pettigrew, Bristol, Tenn.
Clyde Price, Saltville, Va.
Hugh Edwin Powers, Bristol, Tenn.
Lucas D. Phillips, Leesburg, Va.
Harry L. Pippin, Bristol, Va.
Olin O. Point, Bristol, Tenn.
Foye L. Prescott, Argyle, Fla.
Albert W. Peoples, Bristol, Tenn.
Theodore D. Perry, Bristol, Tenn.
Douglas Patterson, Abingdon, Va.
Carl R. Pepper, Jr., Bristol, Va.
Charles Phillips, Bristol, Va.
Clennie G. Quillen, Gate City, Va.
H. Eugene Quillen, Gate City, Va.
T. Walter Roane, Fort Knox, Ky.
John I. Rhea, Piney Flats, Tenn.
Eugene E. Rush, Bristol, Va.
Robert G. Rogers, Saltville, Va.
Harry H. Ross, Jr., Bristol, Va.
Milton P. Reid, Micaville, N. C.
Edward M. Rollins, Bristol, Tenn.
S. C. Rutherford, Bristol, Va.
Richard Reser, Bristol, Tenn.
Ola Roberts, Pound, Va.
Walter T. Rotenberry, Roanoke, Va.
Franklin O. Rouse, Bristol, Va.
Mason C. Rowe, Catawba, Va.
Sunshine A. Summers, Bristol, Va.
Morgan Scherer, Bristol, Tenn.
Lewis Preston Summers 3d, Bristol, Va.
William David Snodgrass, Bristol, Va.
Ben P. Scipione, Portage, Pa.
Taylor C. Scott, Sarasota, Fla.
Charles E. Starke, Bristol, Va.
Fred W. Snyder, Asheville, Va.
Norman M. Shelburne, Bristol, Va.
M. Eugene Smith, Bristol, Va.
Thomas L. Singleton, Black Mountain, N. C.
J. C. South, Bristol, Tenn.
David M. Swift, Bristol, Va.
John E. Stauffer, Anniston, Ala.
Maurice A. Stinette, Bristol, Tenn.
George A. Smalling, Bristol, Tenn.
Robert R. Sadler, Wooster, Ohio
Wallace B. Scherer, Clover, S. C.
Everett Trivette, Bristol, Tenn.
Howard H. Thompson, Jr., Bristol, Tenn.
Augustus A. Trulove, Madison, Fla.
William H. Thomas, Bristol, Tenn.
Bryan Stamper, Glade Spring, Va.
Henry Snodgrass, Bristol, Tenn.
Mercer Stevens, Bristol, Tenn.
Frank Shelburne, Harlan, Ky.
William J. Smithson, Bristol, Tenn.
J. E. Shupe, Bristol, Tenn.
Henry Tucker Smith, Bristol, Tenn.
Ival O. Salyer, Kingsport, Tenn.
Lucius Stephenson, Monterey, Va.
Ralph W. Watkins, Grundy, Va.
Donald C. Webb, Front Royal, Va.
William H. Wilkinson, Marion, Va.
William S. Wiley, Jr., Bristol, Va.
Ernest C. Wade, Bristol, Va.
Warren S. Wilkinson, Lincolnton, N. C.
George H. Wyman, Bristol, Tenn.
Edwin L. Wampler, Bristol, Va.
Robert A. Whittaker, Bristol, Tenn.
Frank Willis, Bristol, Va.
James C. Wilson, Bristol, Tenn.
William R. Winders, Bristol, Tenn.
J. Eugene Whitford, Plainfield, N. J.
Frank M. Wells, Bristol, Va.
Fred F. Zehring, Quicksburg, Va.

My colleagues, it is with pride that I state that one of King's boys, Lt. Ernest C. Wade, of Bristol, Va., was one of the first to receive the Distinguished Service Cross. Back in December 1942 he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for "heroism and extraordinary achievement" for successfully completing the flight from Hawaii to the Philippines, described as one of the greatest flights ever made. Capt. Colin P. Kelly, one of the immortals of this war, also participated in the flight.

And, my colleagues, it is with sorrow and profound regret that I state that already five of King's boys have been reported killed or missing in action. May I also be permitted to record the names of these five heroes in the records of the House so that their names and their glorious records will become a part of the permanent records of the Republic for which they sacrificed? Their names are as follows:

Augustus Truelove, Madison, Fla., Air Corps.

John Olson, Hyde Park, Mass., Air Corps.

Ralph Patton, Bristol, Va., Tank Corps.

Alfred Crosswhite, Bristol, Va., Air Corps.

Ed Everett, Bristol, Va., Air Corps.

Truly a great record. Yes, the record of King, one of the great reservoirs of Americanism, is a record that fills the heart of every true American with pride. But listen: The record of King is but the record of every great Christian college in America, because one and all, they are truly reservoirs of Americanism.

Since the creation of the Joint Committee—War Department, Navy Department, and War Manpower Commission—for the selection of non-Federal educational institutions to be used in connection with our manpower war-training program, I have been urging that the joint committee select, as far as possible, our small Christian and nonsectarian liberal arts colleges for such training purposes. If this is not done, many of these small colleges cannot survive the war. We are going to need these small colleges, these reservoirs of Americanism, after the war as never before in order to retain our American way of life.

I am happy in the knowledge that, so far, the joint committee has shown great consideration for our small colleges. Yes; it is heartening to know that the joint committee recognizes the true worth of our small colleges. Only yesterday the joint committee announced that Emory and Henry College, which is located in my district, and which is one of our great Methodist colleges and truly one of our great reservoirs of Americanism, had been selected as one of our training schools. I hope that King will soon be added to the list.

Let me close with this thought: Our small Christian and nonsectarian colleges must be kept open in order to insure the preservation of our Americanism. While fighting to preserve our Americanism, it would be fatal to permit any of our reservoirs of Americanism to dry up. If we keep these reservoirs full to overflowing, we have taken a great step toward the preservation of our American way of life.

The Columbia Basin Project Act (H. R. 839) Should Be Enacted Promptly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein below a short speech recently made by me to the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, in which I discuss the scope and objectives of H. R. 839, a bill now pending in Congress. This measure has tremendous support in the Pacific Northwest, and is urgently needed for the reasons set forth.

The speech is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the privilege of appearing before your committee to express my views concerning the Columbia Basin Project Act, H. R. 839. I am familiar with the background of this bill and of the two bills considered by your committee in the last session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, from which the present bill is derived (H. R. 6522 and H. R. 7722).

All of us in the State of Washington, who are interested in the fullest economic development of the State, are conversant with the Columbia Basin Project—both its power and irrigation aspects. Most of the members of this committee, I am sure, are familiar with the irrigation features of that project and the problems attendant on bringing 1,200,000 acres of arid land into production under irrigation practices. These many problems were rather thoroughly explained and discussed by various representatives from the State of Washington, the local irrigation districts, and several Federal agencies who appeared before you in the hearings held last year during the Seventy-seventh Congress. Therefore, I won't go into detail in discussing the problems to be met nor the provisions of H. R. 839, but I do wish to stress two or three features of the bill. And I wish to point out why it is so important that the bill be acted on promptly.

One of the principal objects of the bill is to provide the mechanics for carrying out the basic reclamation objective of limiting the size of farmsteads on Federal irrigation projects to the amount of land that is required for the support of a family at a reasonable level of living. That objective is certainly sound. It happens, however, that from 85 to 90 percent of the irrigable area in this project is now in private ownership and, because the type of operations now being conducted there requires it, these holdings are large. That situation presents the difficult problem of getting the lands from present large holdings into the ownership of permanent settlers in areas that conform to the limits of the size of holdings that would be established under the provisions of the bill and in accordance with basic reclamation policy. An endeavor to meet some of these problems was made through the provisions of the act of May 27, 1937 (50 Stat. 208), but I know that it is the conclusion of the Department of the Interior and of the local people interested in the project that those provisions are not equal to the problems. H. R. 839 will get at this problem by authorizing the Government to purchase the large holdings at appraised values (excluding purely speculative values based on the prospect of the lands receiving water from Grand Coulee Dam), and reselling these lands to the prospective irrigators in family-sized units. Without going into detail to discuss how this would be accomplished in the bill, I think it sufficient to say that this procedure for meeting the problems seems throughly sound to me (sec. 2 (c) (i) and 4).

Another basic reclamation objective long has been that of getting lands held in private ownership held in excess of the size of holdings permitted under the reclamation law into the hands of permanent settlers at fair prices and stripped of any purely speculative additions to the purchase price. This is essential if the irrigator's debt burden is to be kept within his ability to make a reasonable living and meet debt payments. This problem assumes especial importance where so much of the lands to be irrigated is in private ownership and must be transferred from present holders to prospective settlers. There was an attempt to meet this problem by the provisions of the 1937 act, but, as is reasonably obvious from a study of the provisions of that act, the solution there provided is inadequate. Under that act it is the buyer who ought to be protected, who is pinched by the enforcement of the provisions against speculative sales. The provisions of the new bill put the principal penalties and burdens in such transactions where they belong; that is, on the seller (sec. 3).

Any program of purchase of excess private holdings by the Government there would, of course, be attended by considerable local disruption because of the removal of property from the tax rolls pending the time that it was retransferred to project settlers. The provisions of this bill to authorize payments in lieu of taxes in this interim period strike me as being an equitable solution of this difficulty (sec. 5 (a)).

The bill has a number of other features to it that are improvements on the provisions of the 1937 act. However, I needn't go into these here. These are all fully discussed in the hearings that were held on the preceding bills.

This one thing I stress. It is important to my State that the bill be enacted now. The effectiveness of this bill, and particularly its features concerning the control of land speculation, is dependent on the enactment of companion State legislation. But the State legislature cannot enact the required companion legislation until Congress has acted. The State legislature is now in session but will adjourn about March 5. If it is to have an opportunity carefully to consider the companion State legislation, it should have the Federal legislation by mid-February.

You undoubtedly will ask "What's the rush?" That's a fair question and one that can be fully and satisfactorily answered. The development of this great block of land will prove of tremendous local and almost equally important national significance in our inevitable post-war adjustment program. There remains much construction work to be done. This work is being held in abeyance for the duration of the war. That construction job, however, is one that we will need and want to swing into almost immediately upon the termination of the war, both to provide immediate employment and to provide ultimately for homes and a livelihood for war workers and fighting men. This project has, in its farms and in its towns and cities, the prospect of supporting about 350,000 people.

However, this construction job at the end of the war cannot be undertaken until a number of initial steps are cleared away, such as the making of repayment contracts with the irrigation districts and the taking of initial steps in the prevention of land speculation. These steps cannot be taken until both H. R. 839 and the companion State act are on the books. And these preliminary steps, representatives of the districts have told me, will take 2 years or more. Thus, if we fail to enact both the Federal and State legislation now, at least 2 years that could most profitably be spent in taking care of these preliminaries will be lost, and resumption of construction after the war correspondingly delayed.

House Resolution 65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. GIBSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks with regard to House Resolution 65, I merely want to go on record as enthusiastically endorsing the great work of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, which is commonly known as the Dies committee.

It has been very aptly stated that we are fighting two wars, one against the avowed foreign foe and one who is continually before and during this emergency gnawing at the very sinews of our democracy; that is, foreign influences endeavoring through more or less concealed organized efforts to instill into our people their philosophy of government with the direct purpose of overthrowing this democracy. It is rather singular that the great fight that is being waged on this committee is by those who for one cause or another seek to further the interest of communism in our country. The organizations who so bitterly denounce this committee are generally communistic. It was heartening indeed to see the American Federation of Labor endorse this committee's work, and my strongest congratulations are offered this great organization. On the contrary, it is generally known at least a good portion of the leadership of the C. I. O. are Communist at heart and have opposed this committee.

I am further reminded that among the citizenry of the United States where Anglo-Saxon blood predominates the strongest is where you find no sign of communism, which should within itself be a danger signal to all true lovers of American democracy.

Our people have no desire to dictate to Soviet Russia how to control its internal affairs, and I do not charge Russia with seeking to interfere with ours, but those people only within our borders who are enjoying our freedom and who think more of a communistic government than they do of a democratic government. It is true that Russia is a welcome ally in this great international conflict; but it must be remembered that she is fighting to protect her form of government, which she should do and has a right to do, and we are fighting and sacrificing the flower of our youth to protect our form of government, which we have a right to do. In other words, we are fighting a common fight against a common enemy, but not for a common purpose.

I want to congratulate Chairman DIES and all of his committee members on their great work, for which the overwhelming majority of the American people are deeply thankful. I am happy that the sentiment in favor of this committee is so overwhelmingly strong in this House and assure you that the true fruits of their labor will declare themselves more plainly as the years go by.

Stay South, Young Man!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I call attention to a valuable editorial from the pen of my friend Mr. Marion Gaines, editor of the Pensacola Journal.

STAY SOUTH, YOUNG MAN!

The famous advice of Horace Greeley of "Go West, young man," might well be paraphrased today with "Stay South, young man," by anyone who has read some of figures in the Blue Book of Southern Progress, just issued by the Manufacturers Record.

In fact, that magazine of southern industry itself says:

"The South undoubtedly holds a greater promise for the future of young Americans than any other section of our country. It holds this greater promise because of its natural resources and the potentiality of their development into finished products."

In view of this, it would be well for young southerners to remain in their Southland and to help build it into the great, prosperous area that is its rightful destiny. In doing so, they will be in the nature of pioneers developing new and fertile fields of agriculture and industry, and they will have open to them a prosperous future.

"The South is achieving new records in the part it is taking in national production," says the Blue Book. "It is also making new

friends from all parts of the Nation by thousands who constitute the armed forces stationed at its posts and camps. These are the men who will have the most to do with the country's future progress, and it is well they are able to see at first hand something of this industrial empire which is moving forward with great strides."

Some facts about the South's new production records are especially significant at this time when every effort is being made to increase production for the needs of our fighting men. The Blue Book gives some of these facts, as follows:

MANUFACTURED PRODUCTS VALUE INCREASED

In 1939 the value of manufactured products in the South exceeded $11,000,000,000. Wartime restrictions have prevented the assembling of accurate data for subsequent years, but it is probably safe to say that for the year 1942 the total has gone well beyond $14,000,000,000.

War contracts and allocations to the Southern States up to the end of September amounted to nearly $18,000,000,000. These contracts were for aircraft, ships, and a miscellany of items needed by our fighting men.

COTTON AND TEXTILES PREDOMINANT IN SOUTH

The South's predominance in textile manufacturing is shown by the operating spindle hours in contrast with the rest of the United States. In 1941, the latest year for which figures have been released, the total for the South is 88,120,164,000 compared to 23,655,200,000 for the rest of the United States. The increase in the South of operating spindle hours from 1940 to 1941 was 11,696,985,000.

Cotton consumed in the South in 1941 totaled 8,304,842 bales, contrasted with 1,416,861 bales consumed in the rest of the United States.

The value of crude cottonseed products, which includes cottonseed oil, cake, and meal, cottonseed hulls and cotton linters, totaled $150,655,000. These are almost totally southern products as will be seen by the figures of $15,670,000, the value of production in the rest of the country.

The total board feet of lumber in the South in 1941 was 14,501,667,000. The total for the rest of the United States was 18,974,498,000.

CASH FARM INCOME INCREASES 34 PERCENT

Cash farm income increased approximately 34 percent while the rest of the country increased less than 28 percent. The total for the South was $3,725,704,000. Prosperity for the farmer usually means prosperity for most businesses. Cash income increased for every crop. That derived from lint cotton jumped from $529,000,000 in 1940, to $861,000,000 in 1941.

Income from tobacco increased from $215,000,000 to $297,000,000.

These are only outstanding examples of what went on through the list of agricultural products.

The returns from sugarcane jumped from $10,000,000 to $18,000,000. Along with this larger cash return, the feature of the utmost encouragement was the increased number and higher value of livestock. The number advanced 2,407,000, while values rose $411,476,000.

In comparing the total cash income of the farmers of the South with those of the rest of the United States, it is seen that for this one-third of the country in population and area, the farmer has derived 46 percent of the total received by the farmers of the rest of the United States.

WOOD-PULP PRODUCTION VALUE RISES NEARLY 70 PERCENT

The value of wood pulp produced in the South increased from $62,517,036 in 1939 to $105,934,119, in 1940, the figures for which year are only now available. This is comparable to that produced by the rest of the country, the total for which was $189,589,960.

MINERAL PRODUCTION SHOWS MARKED INCREASE

The South's production of minerals showed a marked increase in 1941, and many of them have been stepped up materially as later figures are certain to show. The list of minerals—metallic and nonmetallic—is a long one and in practically all the increase is encouraging.

It is interesting to note that among some of the country's important products the South produces the following proportions:

	Percent
Bauxite	100
Naval stores	100
Sulfur	99
Carbon black	95
Cotton lint	93
Tobacco	90
Cotton yarn	85
Rice	83
Fertilizers	70
Rayon and allied products	70
Natural gasoline	69
Crude petroleum	59

CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS REACH ALL-TIME HIGH

Construction contracts totaling $2,922,808,000 in 1941 established a new high record and caused the previous record of $1,534,350,000 in 1940 to fade into comparative insignificance. Industrial work far surpassed all other types of construction with a year's total of $1,400,469,000. Making up this sum, which was not far below the aggregate of all construction in 1940, were the large amounts made available by private and Government sources for the building of new plants and expansion of others needed for the production of war materials.

ELECTRIC POWER PRODUCTION INCREASED OVER 20 PERCENT

Largely as a result of stepped-up production in the war program and especially the expansion and construction of huge new plants requiring large quantities of electricity for the production of light metals, the output of electric power in the South in 1941 set an all-time record of 42,208,830,000 kilowatts. This represents an increase of 6,099,706,000 kilowatts, or more than 20 percent above the 1940 total. Making up the 1941 figure was 12,384,488,000 kilowatts produced by water power and 29,824,342,000 kilowatts by fuels.

Resolution To Create a Commission on Tax Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, in a speech made on the floor of the House of Representatives in July of last year, I called attention to the fact that Congress, under the pressure of the war emergency, had neglected one vital phase of the long range planning program we must formulate if we are to emerge from this world-wide conflict with a relatively sound national economy. In that connection I dealt with the confusing, overlapping, pyramided tax structure of the nation, Federal, State and local, and the danger it presents to our national economic well-being, not only in time of war, but in the reconstruction years to follow. I have reintroduced a measure (H. J. Res. 56) to create a commission on tax integration, the purpose of which is to authorize a study of this tax problem and to suggest ways and means of integrating these multifold tax structures to the end that tax burdens be equitably levied and the financial stability of governmental units thus be given immeasurable aid.

Almost a year has elapsed since the legislation in question was first sponsored by me. The problem is more acute today than it was a year ago. The exigencies of our national war effort are bringing new tax complications into existence with the passing of each day. The cities and States, and the Federal Government itself are now finding that previous sources of tax revenue are seriously curtailed and, in many cases, have dwindled almost to nothing. As an example, the governmental units which at one time derived tax revenue from the sale of gasoline must now reconcile themselves to the fact this source of income will be drastically reduced. These governmental units will naturally seek new methods of augmenting their tax receipts. In so doing, they will venture into fields earlier regarded as the exclusive domain of the Federal Government, the States, the cities or the counties, as the case may be. It becomes increasingly obvious that these desperate efforts by various governmental units to find new solutions to their tax and financial problems cannot help but result in more confusion, more over-lapping, and increased pyramiding of the tax structure.

With higher income taxes, Victory taxes, and other tax proposals in the offing, nearly every citizen of the country is today more tax conscious than ever before. The aggregate of taxes of all types, imposed on the average American citizen, undoubtedly makes him one of the most heavily taxed individuals in the world.

Picture if you can the plight of the average owner and holder of real property. Except in those States where maximum tax-millage legislation gives him some basis on which to compute his property taxes a year or two in advance, the average property owner finds himself, metophorically speaking, surrounded by a regiment of tax collectors all "gunning for b'ar," with their victim not knowing what size shooting equipment they are going to bring up if they do not kill him off with the first shot. That poor taxpayer is entitled to be rescued. I propose that this commission on tax integration make a study of the whole tax problem and then recommend the legislative steps which must be taken in order to protect not only real property owners, but others from the uncontrolled tax-collecting forays of a hundred and one different tax-levying agencies. Unless this is done he remains insecure, and will fall easy prey to the unsound, inefficient, disorganized and, I am afraid, fatal tax charges which now make the taxpayer's, and thus the Nation's, economic future fraught with danger and instability.

House Joint Resolution No. 56 is now pending before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives. I have

urged that a hearing be granted on this proposal as soon as possible. I am hopeful that everyone who appreciates the urgent need for a thoroughgoing study of our tax structure will interest themselves in this problem.

Radio Discussion of Proceedings in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, recently I inserted in the RECORD an open letter to all newspaper reporters and radio commentators in reference to the part which they play in getting the news of the Congress to the American public.

The reaction to the letter went far beyond anything I anticipated when I brought it to the attention of the House.

I received letters of commendation from throughout the United States. Not in one instance did I receive a communication from anybody who shared a different viewpoint to the one expressed by me.

My colleagues here in Congress were particularly kind to me in their expressons of approval and I deeply appreciate the kind things which they said.

Among the letters which I received was one from the former Governor of Louisiana, James A. Noe, who not only directed a letter to me but also dispatched letters to the heads of four major networks. Owner of a radio station himself, Governor Noe suggests that Members of Congress themselves carry their own report of their actions in the House of Representatives. Whether his message strikes a responsive chord remains to be seen.

So interesting is Governor Noe's letter that I am directing the attention of the Members of the House to its contents. I am also inserting a copy of the letter which Governor Noe sent to the major radio-broadcasting companies.

Here are the letters:

MONROE, LA., *February 12, 1943.*

Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HÉBERT: I am writing you in reference to your article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, January 22, 1943.

I enjoyed this article very much. I believe that the people of the United States—each one who loves and believes in democracy—would have been interested in your article, if they had had an opportunity to read it.

We, the people, read the columnists and listen to the commentators to learn what is going on in Congress. Of course, I am sure these gentlemen are sincere in what they say, or write, but they give it to us only as they see it. I believe the people of the United States would themselves prefer to have it direct from Congress. That is why I am writing you this letter.

I am the owner of a radio broadcast station in New Orleans. We are affiliated with the Mutual Broadcasting System. At that station, I donate time for any purpose that will be of interest to the people. I believe that the four leading broadcast systems—the National, the Blue Network, Mutual, and Columbia would all be glad to donate an hour each week—or whatever time would be needed—for a discussion by the Congressmen themselves which would tell the people just what is going on or has gone on in Congress for the preceding week, to be carried by all stations in the Nation who wish to afford their listeners this service.

This broadcast time could be equally divided between the two major political parties who, in turn, could select the persons to represent them on the air in discussing what has occurred in Congress. This time could be scheduled at the same hour each week so that everyone in the Nation would know when the discussion was to take place. I believe that it would carry the largest listening audience in the United States because now, of all times, we want the facts from Congress as to what is taking place.

Let the Democrats in the Senate select a Senator from their ranks each week, and the Republicans select a Senator from their side; and let the Democrats in the House select a Representative from their ranks each week, and the Republicans select a Representative from their side. In this manner, each party could make its own selection as to who would carry the broadcast to the people each week. Representatives of the minority parties should be heard at various intervals.

On page A277 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carrying your article, you say:

"Members of Congress are at a distinct disadvantage in presenting their views and opinions to their constituents, and to the American public. They are really in the hands of the newspaper reporters and the radio commentators. * * *"

This should not be the case. We should have this direct from the Senators and Representatives themselves.

In your last paragraph, on page A279, you say:

"That is the question, it seems to me, that every newspaper reporter, every newspaper columnist, every radio commentator, must answer for himself, in his own conscience and in his own sense of responsibility to the people of the Nation who depend on him for information and news of the new Congress."

We, the people of the United States, want to hear direct from the Congress, and not as columnists and commentators see fit to give it to us.

I am sending copies of this letter to the presidents of the National Broadcasting Co., the Blue Network, the Mutual Broadcasting System, and the Columbia Broadcasting System.

I hope that you will be sufficiently interested in this suggestion to take it up with the Congress in order to see if they are interested in letting the people know, direct from Congress, what is happening.

Most sincerely yours,

JAMES A. NOE.

FEBRUARY 12, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM S. PALEY,
Columbia Broadcasting System,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. PALEY: I am sending you a copy of a letter which I have just addressed to Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, regarding an article which appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, beginning on page A277.

I hope that if Congress sees fit to broadcast these reports each week to the people, that it will be possible for you to clear at least 1 hour, so that the people may have this message direct from Congress.

I am writing to Congressman HÉBERT asking him to send you a marked copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carrying his article; and after reading this I know that you will understand why I am writing you this letter.

Most sincerely yours,

JAMES A. NOE.

American Tax Burden Outweighs British—Dispelling the Fog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, for some time it has been the general impression in this country that our taxes were only a fraction of those paid in England. These impressions have been gained largely by citing figures of British taxes and tax rates for the purpose of comparing the tax burden in Great Britain and in the United States. This discussion has frequently been accomplished by much loose talk—in some instances by those who should know better. As pointed out in a recent bulletin of the National City Bank, comparisons of this kind are "likely to influence tax policy, and it is important that the figures be studied closely from the standpoint of their adequacy as measures of the total tax burden and its distribution." My interest is primarily to get the facts straight and dispel the fog.

At the outset it should be pointed out that the problem of comparing the taxes of one central government with those of another raises serious problems which cannot be solved readily. Difference in definition of national income, weaknesses of the estimates, tax deductions and allowances, purchasing power and living standards, and differences in date at which the fiscal year begins, all make exact comparison extremely difficult. All these factors enter into the question of the comparative tax burden, and unless given consideration tax comparisons will be misleading.

On his recent return from Great Britain, Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau in a press conference declared that Americans were paying only half as much income tax as residents of the United Kingdom and Canada. He cited figures to show that a married man with no dependents earning $1,000 a year would pay 1.5 percent in the United States and 5 percent in Britain; earning $1,200 he would pay 1.8 percent in the United States, against 8.7 percent in Britain; and so on progressively through the higher brackets until he reached the figure of $100,000, on which he stated the American tax would be 69.4 percent against the British tax of 83.8 percent. However, under the recent salary-limit order, the rate on an income of $100,000 derived entirely from salary is 75 percent and on

an income from salary in the amount of $500,000, under the same Executive order, the rate is 95 percent instead of 88.1 percent.

If the comparisons stop there, the conclusion would not only be misleading but absolutely inaccurate. These figures apply only to Federal income-tax rates and as a measurement of tax burden they fail to take account of the heavy State and local taxes—including State income taxes—in the United States. Individual income taxes, with rates ranging from 1 to 15 percent are levied in 34 States and the District of Columbia. Thirty-three States also levy corporation income taxes, with rates ranging from 1 to 8 percent. England has no such duplicate systems of income taxes.

In addition, the United States has heavy State and local taxation of real estate, gasoline, retail sales, business franchises, and so forth. In Great Britain the local taxes are relatively small.

The General Counsel and tax expert of Secretary Morgenthau's Department know this. Because just prior to the Secretary's aforesaid statement, in an address before the National Lawyers' Guild, New York City, on September 26, 1942, Mr. Randolph E. Paul, General Counsel, United States Treasury, stated:

> The best available estimates all agree that the tax load on persons with incomes under $1,000 approximates one-fifth of their income.

This one-fifth, or 20 percent, is a far cry from the 1.5 percent cited by Secretary Morgenthau.

The man who pays a 6-cents-a-package tax on cigarettes, or a 5-cents-a-gallon tax on gasoline, or many similar additional indirect or hidden taxes knows this, too.

The Secretary should have definitely said he was dealing only in comparative income-tax figures. Far more appropriate for comparison are tax loads of Englishmen and Americans.

The British Government collected 90 percent of the total tax collections of that country in the fiscal 1941–42, whereas in the United States, the Federal Government in 1941–42 collected only 61 percent of the total taxes. With the increased rates in the 1942 revenue measure, it is estimated that the Federal Government will collect about 67 percent of all taxes and local governments about 33 percent in the current fiscal year.

Differences in living standards must also be considered in any comparison of this kind. The general level of incomes and living costs in England is much below that of the United States. Evidence as to the lowered scale of incomes in Great Britain may be obtained by comparing the average weekly earnings in the 16 major industries covered by the Ministry of Labor statistics with the average of 27 major industries in the United States, as compiled by the National Industrial Conference Board. This indicates that the average British industrial workman receives, for a 52-hour working week, an annual rate of around $1,060, upon which his income tax would be about 5 percent, according to the figures cited by Secretary Morgenthau, whereas the average American factory worker, for a 43-hour working week, receives about $2,060 per year, on which his income tax under the new rates would be about 9 percent.

The difference in income standards and living costs in the two countries is reflected also in the fact that the number of persons in Great Britain having large incomes by American standards is smaller than in this country. The comparisons often cited of the number of persons having incomes over $25,000 after taxes are not in themselves proof that taxation of the upper incomes is heavier in England than in the United States. Such a statement is misleading, for the number of persons having incomes over $25,000 before taxes is likewise much smaller in Great Britain than in this country.

Furthermore, corporate dividends in the hands of the individual in England are not subject to the normal income tax as in this country. Besides, if the income of the individual shareholder is less than his exemptions, the British Government allows him a refund of the tax paid by the corporation. Our tax system allows the individual no credit for the tax paid by the corporation.

The effect of this is to give the British recipient in the low and medium brackets a decided advantage over the American. In the brackets of $100,000 and upward, an American shareholder of a corporation already paying excess profits taxes finds that the corporate and individual income taxes together take 99 percent or more of any increase in corporate earnings, approximately the same as the British tax.

In other respects—notably in the absence of heavy local taxation, in the exemption of capital gains, and in the treatment of corporate dividends, life insurance premiums and pension contributions—the British tax system is less severe than ours.

Specifically, any comparison of the amount paid out in taxes must be measured either on a per capita basis or as a percentage of the national income—the only two bases upon which it is possible to make a fair comparison between tax burdens in different countries.

On a per capita basis some authorities place the tax burden as high as $317 in this country. This includes income taxes, both national and State, and all other taxes, hidden or otherwise. The same authorities place the per capita tax burden collected from the people of Great Britain on the same basis of computation at approximately $184.

In a preliminary report prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress recently, the taxes reduced to a per capita basis were given as $191—Federal alone—in the United States and $187 in Britain. In practically all estimates the per capita tax burden in England is sustantiaally the same. If the State, local, and other taxes were added to the $191 estimate—Federal—of the Legislative Service, the total per capita burden in this country would be approximately $260. This estimate, further, does not include the increased taxes under the 1942 revenue measure.

In submitting his recent report to Congress, containing a budget of $109,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year, the President disclosed the expectation that 34 percent of the budget cost from current revenues was assured by present legislation. He was, of course, referring only to the Federal budget. Add to this tax collections from other units of government and the percentage of national income collected in taxes will be clearly above any estimate of British taxes measured by the same yardstick. Further, the President asked that revenues be increased to about 50 percent of the budget.

It is significant that in replying to a recent statement pointing out that the tax burden of the United States is heavier than that of Britain, Mr. Geoffrey Crowther, editor of the London Economist, writes:

> The per capita comparison of taxes paid in the United States and in Great Britain is correct in the formal sense that the figures come out that way. * * * But the only thing they prove is that the United States is a very rich country.

To most of us our tax payments mean considerably more than "that the United States is a very rich country." Correct information about our tax burden will prevent waste and extravagance that will ultimately destroy the basis which has enabled us to become "a very rich country."

First things must come first. Before we can pass fair and just tax laws like for example a pay-as-you-go plan we must first dispel the idea that Englishmen comparatively already pay more than we.

Let us do away with the constantly recurring fallacy that the Englishmen bear a heavier tax burden than we.

Production of Synthetic Rubber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following House Concurrent Resolution 13, adopted by the Fiftieth General Assembly of Iowa:

> Whereas this Nation is now engaged in a world-wide war which has brought about a tremendous demand upon our transportation facilities; and
>
> Whereas it is recognized that a serious problem has arisen relative to the continuation of our transportation facilities because of the shortage of rubber, and our Government has urged, as a result of investigations and conclusions reached by the Baruch committee, a development of synthetic rubber to alleviate the shortage; and
>
> Whereas it is a desire of this State to cooperate in every way possible with the Federal Government and its committees and to make available its surplus commodities which are essential in the manufacture of synthetic rubber; and

Whereas in the State of Iowa raw materials are available for the manufacture of alcohol used in the production of synthetic rubber; and

Whereas it would be economically advantageous to erect factories for the production of synthetic rubber in the area where protein byproducts are urgently needed for animal feeds: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That Rubber Administrator William M. Jeffers and our two Senators, Hon. GEORGE A. WILSON and Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE, and our eight Congressmen, be urged to use their best efforts to help unsnarl the present situation relative to the production of synthetic rubber from agricultural products; that such plants be located in the surplus crop area, including the State of Iowa, to the end that our State, Nation, and humanity be benefited and also to the end that this war be brought to a successful and more rapid conclusion; be it further

Resolved by the house, That copies of this resolution be mailed to Vice President Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard, Rubber Administrator William M. Jeffers, Senator Guy M. Gillette, Senator George A. Wilson, and our eight Members of the House of Representatives and that this resolution be spread upon the house and senate journals of the Fiftieth General Assembly of the State of Iowa.

J. F. MILLER,
C. G. GOOD,
On the part of the House.
HARLAN C. FOSTER,
On the part of the Senate.

Letter of R. V. Fletcher, Vice President, Association of American Railroads, in Regard to Railroad Expenditures for Advertising and Attorneys' Fees in 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from R. V. Fletcher, vice president of Association of American Railroads:

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1943.

The Honorable JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE MANSFIELD: In the course of your remarks in the House of Representatives on February 4, in which you discussed the proposed Florida barge canal, the Honorable FRANCIS D. CULKIN, interposed to say, as shown on page 623 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and referring to the railroads, "They have spent some $31,000,000 last year for advertising and probably $100,000,000 for lawyers."

I take this occasion to say that the advertising expenses of all class I railroads for the year 1941 amounted to $11,257,281. To this should perhaps be added a figure of $687,844, expended by the Association of American Railroads in magazine advertising, making a total of $11,945,125. We do not have the figures for 1942 but I am convinced that the expenditures will be no greater than in 1941 and perhaps less.

I should like to explain also that under advertising, according to the accounting rules of the Interstate Commerce Commission are included the expenses of printing and distributing timetables, folders, maps, etc. This figure covers all of the class I railroads in the United States and falls far short of $31,000,000.

With respect to amounts paid to lawyers, the Interstate Commerce Commission has a classification of account entitled "Law Expenses." This includes the salaries of all attorneys, special fees, salaries of stenographers and clerks, expense of litigation, and items of a similar character. The total figure for the class I railroads of the United States for the year 1941 is $15,226,689. I am quite sure that 1942 will not exceed that sum or, if so, by a very small amount. There are 133 class I railroads in the United States, and I submit that the expenditures mentioned are very reasonable, in view of the magnitude of the industry and the responsibilities that rest upon the advertising and law departments

If the proprieties would permit you to insert this letter or the substance thereof in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should take it as a great personal favor. I have no other effective way to correct an error of this kind.

Very truly yours,

R. V. FLETCHER.

The Meat Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO
PACKING & PROVISION CO.,
San Francisco, February 4, 1943.

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The entire meat situation has become so desperate that unless a program of relief is immediately worked out, this plant, together with many other plants, cannot continue to operate.

We enclose a clipping from the Oakland Tribune purporting to give a congressional program for alleviating the situation. This program does not get at the crux of the situation, as it is no longer a matter of a sufficient quota or rationing, but a matter of the live price being too high to process meat and then sell at present ceilings. This holds true whether meats are sold to Government agencies or for civilian use. In our opinion, a raise in ceiling prices alone will not solve the problem, because as soon as ceilings are raised the live price rises due to black markets and other conditions. What appears to us as necessary is a live-price ceiling, together with a dressed-price ceiling, so that there is sufficient margin to operated.

No one, we believe, is interested in a large profit, but we cannot operate at a loss and expect this industry to survive.

We also enclose a copy of a telegram received last Saturday from the Office of Price Administration and our reply thereto. This needs no further explanation.

The sincere efforts of our Congressmen are needed to help work out a solution of the meat situation.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO
PACKING & PROVISION CO.,
EDWIN HEINSOHN, *Vice President.*

The Dies Committee and Its Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I wish to talk briefly with regard to the resolution for a continuation of the Dies committee.

I have been solicited by several constituents in my district to oppose this resolution, and have likewise been solicited by a larger number of individuals and organizations to support the same. Consequently, I have given careful thought to such requests as well as to the work of the Dies committee, and after very careful analysis of all of the facts that I have been able to obtain relative to the activities and results obtained by the Dies committee, it is my considered judgment that such committee should be authorized to continue its work and that funds should be made available for such purposes.

This committee, during its entire existence, has spent less than $500,000. It has taken considerable evidence relating to the subject that it was created to investigate. This evidence has been of unestimable value in exposing and bringing to justice within our country those subversive elements that would stab us in the back in time of national emergency, and when unity and cooperation is so essential for the preservation of our form of government and for the perpetuation of the traditions of which we are so justly proud. I have studied and read the reports of the Dies committee to the Congress of the United States. I believe such reports to be authentic. It is laudable, and an outstanding achievement, that such committee has developed information and evidence that has been supplied to the various agencies of government, including the Attorney General, and has been largely responsible for the apprehension and conviction of bundists and other public enemies and seditionists. The various agencies of government have requested of the Dies committee, and have been supplied by it, a vast amount of information. A partial résumé of this valuable service indicates that the Treasury Department—Internal Revenue, Secret Service, and so forth—have asked for and have been supplied with 26,000 of such requests; the State Department 2,361; the War Department 9,397; the Justice Department 11,894; Civil Service Commission, 50,843; Office for Emergency Management, 9,269; Work Projects Administration—Federal

Works Agency—4,828; and local police in the cities of New York, Chicago, and Washington, 1,963.

This committee has also very clearly justified its existence by bringing to light the activities of Communists in Government employment; the activities of Japanese in the United States; the activities of the Axis movement in this Nation; developed a constructive and informative probe of alleged anti-Semitic activities; it has developed information that has aided in the conviction of G. Wilhelm Kunz, national fuehrer of the bund, as well as other bundists, including Auhagen, Zapp, and Tonn. It has conducted investigations that have resulted in the denaturalization of a number of persons, including Hans Ackermann and others.

This record is to be highly commended. It is constructive. It is in accord with the purposes for which the committee was created. By its record, it shall be known.

The Dies committee has established a splendid record of constructive service, and in view of this, and of the numerous requests that I have had from my constituents that I support the resolution for the continuance of such committee, as well as the respect that I have for its ability to continue this record of achievements, designed to preserve our constitutional government and our traditional institutions, I feel it imperative that this committee shall continue its work, and I shall accordingly support it.

Life of the Nation Depends on Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the National Grange Monthly entitled: "Transportation Is Vital":

TRANSPORTATION IS VITAL—LIFE OF THE NATION DEPENDS ON IT—THE SITUATION CLEARLY EXPLAINED

The chairman of the committee on transportation was State Master E. T. Taylor, of Idaho, who had devoted much time to the subject and whose report covered the general transportation situation very fully. Reference was made to the tremendous strain under which all transportation systems at present are working, while the urgent necessity for keeping such facilities up to the peak of efficiency was emphasized; especially assigning of equipment and rails for the railroads and sustaining of truck operations at maximum efficiency. Continuing, Chairman Taylor's report said:

"The needs of the hour have demonstrated fully that all forms of transportation fill a most essential place in the ability of this Nation to carry on its internal economy and at the same time help prosecute a successful war. The position heretofore taken by the National Grange, of demanding that each form of transportation be permitted to fill its own field with as little hampering as possible by undue regulation, is now being clearly sustained by the great needs of the hour. Rivers, now used as never before to carry heavy loads from the Great Lakes to the Gulf and to the Atlantic, and from the interior to the Pacific ocean, have demonstrated beyond any question that they supply a most needed and efficient service."

Among the recommendations of the transportation committee which the session adopted were the following:

"That the National Grange reiterate its historic position of demanding the free and untrammeled encouragement of all means of transportation that lead to increasing efficiency throughout the Nation.

"That the railroads be allocated all necessary equipment and rails to efficiently carry on their part of the general transportation effort of the Nation in this emergency.

"That truck transportation be given replacements of equipment parts and supplies to such an extent that trucks may be able to carry on their part of the general war effort.

"That competition among transportation types, both in rates and services, be maintained; but not an attempted placing of all agencies of transportation on a common level, whose results would be to reduce efficiency, lessen initiative and delay the adoption of modern and improved methods.

"That care be exercised that in the present war period regulations must not be so restrictive as to strangle and possibly destroy transportation on the highways of the Nation. There is danger in times of war that methods of transportation may be so entangled in regulations and red tape that the menace of the latter to the public welfare may exceed the benefits alleged to be derived. When the war is over all wartime regulations should be entirely removed, or so greatly relaxed that their later removal may be facilitated."

The subject of spare tires for farm trailers was carefully considered by Chairman Taylor and his committee, and the fact brought out that while under present regulations a passenger car may have five tires, a trailer can have only the two or four necessary for its actual wheels. The difficulties so entailed were emphasized and the session adopted the committee recommendation that this inconsistency in tire regulations be straightened out as soon as possible.

The committee further recommended "that the National Grange go on record as insisting that tires shall be made available for farmers' cars and their trucks to properly handle the necessary business of farm operations in the production, delivery, and marketing of produce; as well as sufficient gasoline to permit the farmer to deliver his products in the channels of trade—otherwise food distribution will be seriously handicapped."

A note of warning was sounded by the same committee concerning the abandonment of many branch railroad lines that can no longer be profitably operated. This paragraph is from the comprehensive committee report:

"Without the use of adequate safeguards to protect those in territory to be abandoned by rail transportation, production will inevitably drop and it is the recommendation of the transportation committee that the National Grange present the entire matter of abandonments to the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the War Production Board, and to the Office of Defense Transportation, endeavoring to have safeguards placed in the proceedings that authorize the abandonment of lines; with the recommendation that the National Grange oppose the abandonment of any means of transportation unless such safeguards to reinstate them after the emergency is over are included in such authorizations."

Rebuke to Politicos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, while there is always room for honest differences of opinion, it seems to me that entirely too much is being said in this country about French politics.

Furthermore, it seems to me that all good Americans who wish to write or speak on this subject should first read, and take to heart, the following article by William Philip Simms:

REBUKE TO POLITICOS

(By William Philip Simms)

In the light of Prime Minister Churchill's unmistakable rebuke of the politicos who have been making trouble in north Africa, the real friends of France hope French politics will now be laid aside for the time being so that General Eisenhower can get on with the war.

President Roosevelt had already given his word that the regime in north Africa was purely temporary, that the situation was steadily improving, and that the whole idea was to defeat Hitler, then let the people of France decide for themselves what they want. Yet the hullabaloo only seemed to increase.

Now Mr. Churchill has added his voice. Fresh from conference with British, American, French, and Moslem leaders, he reported to the House of Commons on Allied chances in north Africa.

"Some people are busily concerned about the past records of various French functionaries whom the Americans have deemed it expedient to employ," he said.

"For my part I must confess I am more interested in the safety of the armies and in the success of the operations soon to be again advancing to an important climax.

"I shall, therefore, not take up the time of the house with tales of how these Frenchmen acted in the forlorn and hideous situation in which they found themselves when their country collapsed.

"What matters to General Eisenhower and to our troops who in great number are serving under him in this vast area with a population of 90,000,000, 90 percent of whom are Moslems, is first a tranquil countryside.

"Secondly, secure and unimpeded communications to the battlefront which is now steadily developing in Tunisia."

This is typical Churchill language. It has all the earmarks of understatement. Its meaning, nevertheless, is clear, and the reproach to those who have been keeping the north African waters muddied is not less stinging because of its moderation.

In paying tribute to Harold MacMillan, British Resident Minister in north Africa, Mr. Churchill indirectly endorsed the American diplomatic representative there, Robert Murphy. Mr. MacMillan, he said, "is a real solver of problems" and is "taking an increasingly heavy burden from the shoulders of the Commander in Chief (General Eisenhower)." Mr. MacMillan has only recently made occasion to announce publicly his complete agreement with Mr. Murphy.

If, after all this, the row over Gen. Henri Honore Giraud's interim regime in north Africa continues, one will have to search deeper than any of the reasons thus far advanced.

General Giraud has proved his selfless patriotism as completely as any Frenchman alive. He had proved it by deeds. He has said, time and again, that his job will be done when the Axis has been defeated and France is free again.

He has asserted that whatever he does now, in north Africa, is but temporary; that he does what he does to preserve the order so vital to Allied victory. Mr. Murphy and Mr. MacMillan have said the same thing. Now Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill round it out with their endorsement.

What more do the critics want? Not to believe in Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill, General Eisenhower, General Giraud, and the rest is not to believe in any of the United Nations' war aims—in the Atlantic Charter or anything British and American leaders have done or said.

If they are betraying us—which I, for one, do not for a moment believe—then we are indeed in a bad way.

The Post-War Relationship Between Government and Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, recently the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] inserted in the RECORD, under the heading of "Government by bureaucratic mandate," a statement concerning certain employees of the Federal Government and, among them, listed Commissioner C. J. Durr, of the Federal Communications Commission.

In order that anyone interested might have the benefit of Commissioner Durr's statement I requested authority to include in full the talk delivered by him before the American Economic Association on January 5, 1943. However, the Public Printer advised me that the manuscript ran over two pages and, for this reason, it would be necessary to again request permission of the House for its inclusion. Not desiring to place the Government to this extra expense, I am, under my own remarks pointing out what I believe Commissioner Durr was outlining.

Mr. Durr is former General Counsel of the Defense Plants Corporation and when he stated, "We see in operation a new kind of profit system which is not capitalism and a new kind of private enterprise which is not based on private initiative—a system in which the Government provides the capital and takes the financial risk, while business is paid a management fee for the hire of its organization, and in which the manufacturer furnishes the technical skill, ingenuity, and organization ability, while the Government provides the market and says what and how much is to be produced,' he certainly was not advocating future Government control of business but he was stating an actual reality because anyone familiar with the preparedness program today knows that it is being operated exactly as stated by him. Whether it be right or wrong, the Government had to finance these new plants in order to produce war material and it was authorized by Congress.

I believe that the majority of the Members of Congress agree with his statement that there will be many economic problems to be faced after the war is over and that there are at least two general objectives:

First, the minimum of unemployment and the highest obtainable general standard of living; and second, the preservation of our democracy.

I find nothing in Mr. Durr's statements which in the least infer that any agency of Congress could, or should, repeal acts of Congress by bureaucratic decree. Instead of government by bureaucracies, Mr. Durr suggested that—

While such delegation is essential if Government if to function with the speed required to meet our present-day problems, but it carries with it the need for close congressional supervision to assure that the policy laid down by Congress is not defeated under the guise of administrative action.

Certainly Mr. Durr cannot be classed as a bureaucratic official when he makes a plea for more contact between administrative officials and the Congress. He suggests that while—

The requirements that heads of agencies appear before appropriations committees to justify their requests for funds is an indispensable check, but is not sufficient to establish the relationship which should exist; nor is it enough to require the filing of periodic reports and occasional appearances before congressional committees to testify on pending legislation. A relationship of a more continuous and less formal nature is required * * * a system of conferences between the agency heads and the subcommittees should then be arranged in which the activities and problems of the agencies can be fully discussed. Such conferences would serve to check any inclination on the part of an agency toward arbitrary action and to dispel the fears of Congress that the agency is attempting to usurp legislative powers.

I assure the gentleman from Michigan that Mr. Durr does not wish to destroy private enterprise. He is an outstanding, patriotic citizen and is himself a product of our private business enterprise. His family by hard work and honest business principles have built a large, successful wholesale drug business. While Congress should be jealous of its legislative rights, we have nothing to fear by reason of bureaucratic decrees from officials of Commissioner Durr's type.

Creation of a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, adopted by the Fiftieth General Assembly of Iowa:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fiftieth Legislature of the State of Iowa (the State house of representatives concurring therein), That—

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, House Bill No. 997 and Senate Bill No. 216 to create a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army, and

Whereas there is a definite need in this war emergency for capable handling of drugs, medicines, and pharmaceutics which are used in the treatment of diseases of our boys and girls in the armed forces; and

Whereas at the present there is no law providing for the creation of such a Pharmacy Corps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Fiftieth Iowa Legislature (the house concurring therein), That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to put forth every effort to see these two bills enacted into law; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committees of the Senate and House, and to the congressional delegation of Iowa.

FRED CROMWELL.
LUKE VITTETOE.

Progressive Republicanism—Our Heritage From Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. CHARLES N. LAFOLLETTE, of Indiana, delivered at Winston-Salem, N. C., on February 13, 1943:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Republicans of North Carolina, normally I do not like apologetic introductory remarks; on the other hand, when a speaker is honestly impressed by circumstances which cause him to approach a subject and an audience with a feeling of humility, it is probably proper for him to say so if he would be candid and frank.

I never have been able to approach the life of Abraham Lincoln without a feeling of inadequacy either to review or discuss that life or to draw conclusions pertinent to present-day problems from it, and each time as I go to the voluminous sources of information available to anyone who wishes to investigate the actions and written or spoken words of Abraham Lincoln the resolute character and splendid logic and charitable, understanding simplicity of the man renew my sense of inadequacy.

Tonight, in addition, I feel the added burden which every man younger in age and in the service of the Republican Party and of his Government should feel when called upon to substitute for one whose service to his party and Nation far outweigh his own. I do not hope that I shall be able to bring to you the clarity of thinking nor the oratorical fervor of the Senator from Maine, the Honorable RALPH O. BREWSTER, who has been prevented by reason of the requirements of his

work as a Member of the United States Senate from filling the engagement to speak with you here tonight. I only offer you, in exchange, candor and an earnest desire to serve and a fervent belief that a Republican Party, following a course which is true to and worthy of the high moral purposes and belief in the dignity of the common man which accompanied its birth and found its fullest and greatest fruition in its first martyr President, Abraham Lincoln, is today the only hope for the preservation and evolution of American democracy.

It is my abiding belief that both before and after the appearance on earth of the Christus, the revelation of the nature of God in the form of the man, Jesus of Nazareth, great souls have appeared from time to time on the earth revealing, not fully as did Christ, the ultimate character and capacity of man for godliness, but approaching this revelation by the simplicity of their characters and the greatness of their souls. It is rarely given to these men in their time to be understood or their greatness fully comprehended by their contemporaries, and furthermore, although they are marked by simplicity of character and capacity for fundamental thinking which appears to be childlike in its directness, yet like a light shining through the many facets of a diamond, their impact upon society, upon culture, and upon thinking is so varied that one who wishes to study it is at times confronted by such numerous evidences of greatness that they make the task of picking or choosing from them infinitely difficult.

Since I believe also that no speech commemorative of the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln is justified unless the speaker and the listeners draw a lesson from his life and declare a firm and resolute determination to live up to that lesson, I shall limit myself to a discussion of but one of the many immutable truths disclosed by the democratic philosophy of life which he gave to us by his words and by his conduct.

Abraham Lincoln understood and believed the great truth inherent in the Christian ethic and in the Anglo-Saxon concept of democracy, namely, that the dignity of the individual, the greatest freedom for mankind is found in government by rule or by law and not government under the personal, unhampered fiat of any individual, no matter how omnipotent his judgment or beneficent his intentions.

Speaking before the Young Men's Lyceum of Springfield in January 1838, at the age of 29, this man, self-educated so far as book knowledge is concerned, but conditioned in his understanding by a boyhood of toil, softened only by the simple pleasures of the poor, revealed his tremendous understanding of this great truth, saying:

"When I so pressingly urge a strict observance of all the laws let me not be understood as saying that there are no bad laws or that grievances may not arise for the redress of which no legal provisions have been made. I mean to say no such thing, but I do mean to say that although bad laws, if they exist, should be repealed as soon as possible, still while they continue in force, for the sake of example, they should be religiously observed. So also in unprovided cases, if such arise, let proper legal provision be made for them with the least possible delay, but till then, let them, if not too intolerable, be borne with."

This is a great analysis of the necessity for rule by law, together with the candid statement of the obligations which it imposes. It is proper therefore tonight that we firmly resolve to reaffirm our belief in its truth and that we dedicate ourselves as Republicans to its observance, with all of its implications.

You will note that the foregoing statement of principle falls into two categories, neither of which we can ignore if we would be true to our resolution. First is the necessity, in order to insure to the people of this Republic the freedom of action which the individual can obtain only under law, that we accept the laws as they are written, but that we will not hesitate to repeal any one of them, when an open, factual examination of their effect upon our society or our economy, proves that it no longer serves the best interest of the majority of our people.

This declaration of Lincoln does not have in it anything of grandfather worship. It pays no tribute to the reactionary who would accept existing law and defy all efforts to change it, merely because either the facts in existence at the time it was enacted or the understanding of the people with reference to the subject matter it was designed to treat, made it then appear sufficient to do the job for which it was enacted. Lincoln's understanding of the duty to observe law was greater than that. He says that: "Bad laws, if they exist, should be repealed as soon as possible" and the duty to observe them is founded only on the implied determination of those who make the laws to repeal them speedily and promptly after it is demonstrated that they have become burdensome to the majority of the people, that they no longer apply to the laws of economics, as presently revealed, or that they are not suitable to a changing concept of morality of the people.

For we must remember that democracy carries with it the right of the people to make mistakes, the right of the people to desert, temporarily, if they will, the immutable truths of Christianity and democracy, and that no law pronounced by the people at one time will hold the people to a standard of economics or ethics which, wisely or not, they have abandoned or deserted. But there must be law, and it is the obligation of the people to accept a law governing their changing standards and concepts, and it is the duty of a political party to forthrightly change the law if necessary, but in order that democracy might be saved and the opportunity for freedom preserved, we must not repeal law by Executive fiat, and as Lincoln Republicans we must fight against every person, every concept, every teaching which for the purpose of expediency or temporary popularity would lead the people of this country to accept the idea that the easy way, the expedient way of Executive fiat, decree, or order can ever do anything except ultimately destroy democracy.

If our people forget that freedom can only be enjoyed under law and place their faith in an idolatrous freedom destructive belief in the omnipotence of individuals, then we will trade our birthright for a mess of pottage. For it was not idly revealed to us: "That man can not live by bread alone." The false, materialistic, leader-worship philosophy is the one, which is inherent in every totalitarian concept of government in the world today and it was the deliberate designed, intentional creation of a personal leadership concept in Europe which made the dictatorships of Europe possible and which so completely destroyed any capacity of European peoples for an understanding of the ethics inherent in a democracy, that it is admitted, by every thinker upon that problem, that the principles and ethics of democratic government will have to be taught as a new science and a new ethic to millions of Europeans after the end of this war.

Now let me say that it is my opinion that the Republican leadership and the Republican rank and file of America are convinced that when this war is over, the people of America cannot withdraw or shirk the burden of world cooperation which is pragmatically presented by the fact that this civilization cannot remain on the face of the earth if men all over the world shall fly at each other's throats recurrently every 25 years. But if there is to be peace in the world, it must be peace under rule and peace under law, and I ask the people of America tonight, who do you think will produce a world-order dedicated to rule by law and not to rule by personal fiat, a Republican Party, remaining true to the teachings of Abraham Lincoln as announced in 1838, or HENRY WALLACE and the New Deal Party who, consistently since 1933, deliberately and with design have scoffed at the truths inherent in Anglo-Saxon, Bill of Rights democracy and have deliberately, with intent and solely to satisfy their own lust for power, promulgated by every spoken word, by the medium of the radio, by the medium of the moving pictures and through a host of press agents, serving a political party, but paid at the public's expense, built up the leadership ideology which is so rife in America? The identical ideology which every student of mass psychology knows is the underlying force which has destroyed democratic processes and government throughout Europe.

We have been discussing that part of Abraham Lincoln's philosophy of law observance which dealt solely with the duty to repeal bad laws. Lincoln's understanding of rule by law was all inclusive, however, and we fail to understand his meaning if we do not also pay some attention that that part of his philosophy which enjoined upon democratic governments the duty to enact new laws, for he said further:

"So also in unprovided cases, if such arise, let proper legal provision be made for them with the least possible delay, but till then let them, if not too intolerable, be borne with."

The tremendously significant language in this part of Lincoln's speech are the words "if not too intolerable, let them be borne with" for they implied a complete and thorough understanding of the right of people to revolt if their governments do not provide laws which meet the awakened consciousness of people and which provide rules of conduct which meet the new thinking and the new demand of people. Lest anyone be shocked by my statement that people have an inherent right to revolt against their governments which do not keep step with the people's enlightened, progressive thinking and demands, let me remind you that that is the tradition of America, that there would have been no America if our forefathers had not only recognized, but insisted upon this inalienable right of all people.

On the 4th day of July of every year we celebrate the Declaration of Independence, but it is true that as nations progress and particularly as they progress in material wealth, they have a tendency to forget their history and to ignore the forces which brought them into being. In theory, at least, there is no group of Americans whom we revere more than we do those courageous men who signed the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, but while we profess to revere them, we need occasionally to be shocked back into remembering the things that they then said which have caused us to make that day a national holiday. Have we not forgotten perhaps this language of that instrument?

"That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."

And is it not well that we remember again that the "ends" referred to were what our forefathers called "certain inalienable rights—Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness"?

The remarkable thing about Abraham Lincoln is that even at the age of 29 he analyzed the great truth there stated and had the capacity to state it more simply, when he said "in unprovided cases—if such arise, let proper legal provision be made for them with the least possible delay, but till then, let them, if not too intolerable, be borne with." For he says that if the occasions which call for new

laws arise that they should be met and that they should be borne with "if not too intolerable."

What do we learn from this analysis of the teachings of Abraham Lincoln and the Declaration of Independence, which is the tradition of all true Americanism, namely, this—that any political party which would serve people and preserve a form of government and thus avoid revolution and produce change in an orderly manner under law by evolution must be factual in its approach, must be unblinded by prejudices, and must have the courage to face new concepts, to analyze them, and to transmit them into being by laws adopted through democratic processes by the elected representatives of the people. Laws which the people will respect, which will remove any injustices which are intolerable, to the end that evolution may be possible and revolution rendered reprehensible.

Perhaps for one so newly elected as a Republican Representative to the Congress of the United States, I may be charged with presumptuousness in pointing out to you the historical heritage of this Nation and of this party and drawing the conclusion therefrom, which I consider to be inevitable—that if the Republic Party is to continue to honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln it must accept the implications of his life and his doctrine and without equivocation answer the cry of the people for redress of economic or political wrong, but answer it by the enactment of laws and rules through the Congress of the United States, which the Constitution makes the representative body of the people of this country.

However, I am determined to face the consequences of the charge of presumptuousness because I am driven to risk this charge by reason of a deep and abiding belief in democracy; by reason of an inherent abhorrence of dictatorship, autocracy, or bureaucracy, no matter how benevolent may be its declared intention; by reason of the fact that I find no hope today in America for orderly progress under law except through a Republican Party rededicated to the traditions of this Nation and the progressive understanding of the true meaning of democratic processes revealed to it by Abraham Lincoln.

I have no hope for the preservation or the extension of democratic government under the New Deal. I am convinced that it is completely saturated with the sense of its own importance, with an overweening, unmitigated, and unjustified belief that its superthinkers are the only people in America who have any knowledge of economics or of government. Because of this intellectual arrogance and because of its long tenure in power, the New Deal from the top to bottom has gradually lost confidence in democratic processes. Having glutted itself on power, which is more heady and more destructive of character and decency than heroin, it is the New Deal's intention and design to force upon the people its own ideas as to the path which America shall take in the future; without ever making a forthright statement of its purposes; by intrigue and deviousness; without debate and by the cheapest form of political debauchery of the electoral processes.

Being thus convinced that democracy will be destroyed by the New Deal, I am driven to the conclusion that the Republican Party must be the instrument by which true democracy, economic as well as political, may be brought into being in America. As such, it must be a party of affirmative action, a party with the program to solve material questions so satisfactorily that the people of America will no longer be tempted to surrender their personal and political freedom at the price of temporary and fleeting material gain. I do not now claim that I have the wisdom or the knowledge to offer a plan, but I do believe that the alternative to the New Deal's designed plan, to hand out such material benefits as it thinks the people are entitled to receive—is a method of economic democracy, which will give to all people a sufficient share of the wealth created by our industry and agriculture.

If this is done then the people, having that share available to them, may by cooperative action, involving the use of their own money; involving the making of their own plans (with its concurrent responsibility to accept with good grace their own mistakes and failures); may by their own voluntary cooperative action work out their own social and economic destiny and not be required to accept a scheme forced upon them by political superthinkers, whom the people have neither the power to elect or to remove.

I am convinced that my hopes and prayers for the Republican Party are traditional and consistent with the philosophy of the greatest Republican, yes, the greatest American of all times, Abraham Lincoln.

To commemorate the birth of a man by lip service is a form of hypocrisy to which I am sure the Republicans of North Carolina will not be a party. If we would revere the memory of a man, then we must firmly resolve to conduct ourselves so as to be worthy of his martyrdom. Standing on the field at Gettysburg, on November 19, 1863, a tall, gaunt, burdened, saddened man arose and spoke these words:

"That from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion."

Republicans of North Carolina, the words of the man whose memory we revere tonight reveal to us our duty and our destiny.

Director Eastman Favors Barge Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Hon. Joseph B. Eastman, Director of Transportation, with reference to barge construction for the movement of petroleum:

OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D. C., February 13, 1943.

Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, House Rivers and Harbors Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE MANSFIELD: I read with natural interest the newspaper accounts of your recent letter to Mr. Roy Miller, vice president of the Intracoastal Canal Association, in which you discussed the delay in the barge construction and conversion program.

After reading these statements, it seemed to me that in justice to my associates in the Office of Defense Transportation, who have devoted a great deal of time and effort to expediting this program, you should know that this office has backed these proposals strongly and done everything in its power to hasten their approval and implementation.

May I refer you first to the Interim Report on Barges, released by the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, January 14. I am enclosing, second, a chronological recapitulation of the progress of the barge construction-conversion program and the part played by the Office of Defense Transportation in that progress. There is considerable more which might be added to this recapitulation, but it is limited to activities which can readily be substantiated.

It is also a matter of public record that I personally have urged, in general, an expanded use of our waterways during the past year.

Very sincerely yours,
JOSEPH B. EASTMAN,
Director.

CHRONOLOGICAL RECAPITULATION OF PROGRESS OF BARGE CONSTRUCTION-CONVERSION PROGRAM

In April 1942 the Office of Defense Transportation sent to the War Production Board for approval the report of Regulated River Carriers' Committee, Regulated River Carriers, recommending a barge construction program. No answer was received.

In May, Mr. Roosevelt appointed a committee to study the problem of increasing the use of intercoastal and intracoastal waterways for the movement of petroleum.

A technical subcommittee of this group worked night and day to prepare a report on it and submitted it to committee about June 10–15.

June 26: Committee recommended following construction program to the President:

(a) 500 wooden barges, 6,000-barrel capacity each.

(b) 100 wooden hull tugboats, 600 horsepower each.

(c) 21 steel hull towboats, 2,000 horsepower each.

(d) Installation of an 8- or 10-inch trans-Florida pipe line from Port St. Joe to Jacksonville.

(e) Provision of such additional terminal facilities at Port St. Joe, Panama City, Jacksonville, Cairo as may be necessary.

(f) Conversion of some 259 dry cargo barges to petroleum carriers.

(g) Granting of adequate priorities for the procurement of power units for the above-listed powerboats, and for the steel and other critical materials required for equipment and terminal facilities. These to provide movement of 50,000 barrels of fuel oil per day from Texas to Illinois for transshipment to East, 50,000 barrels fuel oil per day Texas to Florida for transshipment, and 35,000 to 50,000 barrels per day gasoline and other products Texas to Florida.

July 31: Sam Husbands, president of Defense Plant Corporation, informed Donald Nelson that President had approved the program.

August 7: Meeting of Requirements Committee of War Production Board, attended by representatives of various agencies. Due to representations of Navy that lack of Diesels and steel plate was slowing down urgent Navy programs, committee postponed decision on new construction, but authorized conversion of 259 privately owned steel bulk cargo barges.

August 14: Meeting of Requirements Committee of War Production Board, attended by representatives of various agencies. Representative of Bureau of Ships in Navy asserted that most likely source of Diesels was General Motors Corporation, and that General Motors could not supply them for some time.

August 21: Meeting of Requirements Committee of War Production Board, attended by representatives of various agencies. Balance of program denied.

Conversion program proceeded under Defense Plant Corporation, its agent being Inland Waterways Corporation.

Meanwhile Office of Defense Transportation continued its study to ascertain whether engines could be made available to power the tug and towboats necessary to haul the 500 wooden barges, construction of which War Production Board Requirements Committee had held in abeyance.

September 17 Office of Defense Transportation informed Defense Plant Corporation that 250 horsepower Diesels available and recommended that Office of Defense Transportation and Defense Plant Corporation jointly urge War Production Board to proceed with program for construction. Inland Waterways Corporation survey indicated steam engines could be obtained, said Office of Defense Transportation.

September 19, Defense Plant Corporation recommended that matter be reopened and study be made of possibility of using steam power for towboats. Defense Plant Corporation made no recommendation regarding Office of Defense Transportation proposal to use smaller Diesels for tugs.

Proposal to use steam engines for towboats reviewed by Facilities and Construction Program Branch of War Production Board, which concluded that even with highest priority the 21 towboats could not be completed until February or March 1943 might conflict with Navy and maritime programs, and anyway could not be finished until too late to affect winter oil shortage.

Program Adjustment Committee of War Production Board decide to request Defense Plant Corporation to reopen program sometime in spring of 1943.

October 9, 1942: Requirements Committee of War Production Board accepted this recommendation and advised Defense Plant Corporation of its decision.

October 13: The program having been—at least for the time—rejected by the Requirements Committee, the Office of Defense Transportation requested the Requirements Committee to authorize the construction of at least 3 towboats, 5 tugboats, and 25 barges. Request rejected.

November 1: Donald Nelson became personally interested when he learned that a project of Eastport Marine Construction Co., of Jacksonville, Fla., being held up. Project called for construction of two experimental wooden oil barges for moving petroleum in Atlantic Intracoastal Waterways, approved by War Production Board September 25.

November 3: Meeting in office of Glenn Taylor, Office of Defense Transportation. Considered proposal to use gasoline engine built by Chrysler, known as the sea mule, as substitute for Diesels. Representatives of Office of Defense Transportation, Inland Waterways Corporation, and Office of the Chief of Engineers voiced "strong opposition," the Office of Defense Transportation already having reported that more suitable equipment, steam engines, and small Diesels would be available. Agreed, however, that sea mule be given test by inland waterways.

Developed during the meeting, that on occasion of previous denial of program by War Production Board requirements committee the Diesel engine section of War Production Board shipbuilding division had not been consulted as to the availability of Diesels. Representatives of this section informed the conferees that there were some small Diesel engines available—as Office of Defense Transportation had advised Defense Plant Corporation on September 17—and that steam engine manufacturing capacity was also available—as Office of Defense Transportation had recommended on basis of inland waterway survey.

November 5: Another similar meeting in Taylor's office, representative of Diesel engine section corroborated this information, after check, then suggested towboat program be resubmitted to requirements committee.

November 9: Program resubmitted to requirements committee by Defense Plant Corporation, as agreed upon at meeting November 5 in Taylor's office.

November 16: Meeting called by Wayne Johnson; War Production Board representatives suggested shifting of towboat equipment from less essential cargo to movement of petroleum as means of expediting barge program, whereupon Mr. Taylor stated that every available tank barge was in service and that the conversion program was not being held up by lack of motive power. Mr. Taylor also stated that during the winter months additional towboats would become available when northern routes would be frozen. In view of this, War Production Board representatives urged immediate conversion of the entire 259 steel barges so that the anticipated increased power could be efficiently utilized. Taylor explained 21 new towboats needed to permit conversion and use of remainder of original 259 barges reported available for conversion. Explained that delay in conversion due to final restrictions imposed by Defense Plant Corporation, which minimized possibility of using additional available shipyard capacity. Johnson urged Defense Plant Corporation be asked to expedite.

November 27: Mr. Nelson (1) asked Jesse Jones either to modify contract restrictions or proceed by letters of intent to expedite conversion, (2) asked Mr. Joseph B. Eastman to take drastic steps to increase petroleum deliveries by barge.

November 30: Mr. Nelson asked Ferdinand Eberstadt, chairman of Requirements Committee, to take barge construction program personally in hand.

December 9: Office of Defense Transportation given status of a claimant agency and thus was put in stronger position to submit claims and recommendations for projects requiring materials.

Immediately the Office of Defense Transportation, in consultation with Defense Plant Corporation, United States Engineers, Petroleum Administration for War, and the Stockpiling and Transportation Division of War Production Board, completed the revised construction program taking into consideration availability of all materials and engines.

December 14: Five days after Office of Defense Transportation made claimant agency, Mr. Eastman submitted program again to Program Vice Chairman Eberstadt.

December 15: Meeting held by Requirements Committee, Office of Defense Transportation representatives present. John Fennelly, chairman of Program Adjustment Committee, reported on consideration of the program by the Adjustment Committee the preceding day, and recommended that equipment and material be made available subject to revision if Navy Department and Maritime Commission should establish interference with their essential programs. Representatives of the Petroleum Administrator's Office, at this point, strongly urged that the program should be carried out and described it as a vital link in the over-all petroleum transportation system. The chairman of the Requirements Committee informed the conferees he would approve the barge construction program and assign it an AAX-3 rating. No dissent.

December 18: Meeting in office of Taylor, Office of Defense Transportation. Complete procedure determined for construction program.

Fortune Magazine Explains Why There Is No Limit to Federal Deficit Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Fortune magazine has come out and boldly stated the reason back of the contention that is made in certain quarters that there is no limit to the amount of deficit financing the Government can undertake; that the reason for this is that Federal laws forbid holders of Government securities from collecting and that, therefore, the Government does not have to pay its debt.

I quote from page 6 of Fortune's Supplement, December 1942:

FALLACIES OF DEBT

The commonest objection to a policy of government spending arises from the fear of public debt. To some extent this fear is grounded in a theoretical misapprehension: That public debt is like private debt, and that if the Government continually spends more than its income it will go broke or cause inflation.

This analogy is false so long as the productive capacity of the Nation is maintained, the debt is internally held, and the Government retains its taxing power. For with production flowing since the interest on the debt is paid to residents of the country, the Government can always recover an equivalent sum in taxes, no matter how huge. There is no court to which a citizen can resort for bankruptcy proceedings against a truly sovereign government whose financial responsibility he has ceased to trust. It used to be thought that gold provided such a recourse; but the exchange value of gold, as the United States learned in 1934, can be obliterated by a truly sovereign state overnight.

Keep Japanese in War Relocation Centers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the United States of America, together with its allies, is now engaged in a world-wide holocaust of the utmost intensity and is fighting for its very existence as a free country against the totalitarian or dictator governments of Germany, Italy, and Japan; and

Whereas the former large number of Japanese living in the West Coast States of California, Oregon, and Washington presented many problems of sabotage and other acts detrimental to the well being of the United States, which fact was recognized by the Congress; and

Whereas all of the Japanese, both alien and American born, have been evacuated from the west coast of the United States to relocation centers in the interior by order and under direction of the Army, and are now stationed in relocation centers under control of the War Relocation Authority, which action was taken for the defense and security of this Nation; and

Whereas the citizens of this area and the west coast were and are in entire sympathy and accord with this action and commend the Army authorities for the manner in which said evacuation was conducted; and

Whereas it has now come to the attention of various citizens throughout this area that the War Relocation Board contemplates some action in the immediate future toward

the release of certain of these Japanese evacuees from the aforesaid relocation camps to continue with educational pursuits or for employment and residence elsewhere, without provision for proper surveillance and control, as indicated by the following form letter from the War Relocation Authority that has been received by citizens of this area, which said letter is quoted as follows:

"———— has given your name as a reference in connection with an application to leave a relocation center of this Authority for employment, education, or residence elsewhere.

"We should appreciate it if you would give us your opinion of this individual with respect to such matters as to the extent of Americanization through education and upbringing, general standing and reputation in the community, and occupational abilities. If you have ever employed the applicant, a statement concerning the quality of the work performed for you would be helpful.

"An addressed envelope which needs no postage is enclosed for your reply"; and

Whereas a meeting of citizens who had received this letter and all citizens interested in this vital problem was called in this area for the purpose of considering what action if any be taken in regard to this matter, at which were present representative citizens from all walks of life, including the various service clubs, lodges, American Legion, farming area groups, businessmen, and public officials, at which meeting it was determined that immediate protest should be made to the proper authorities against this contemplated procedure; and

Whereas it was the unanimous opinion of this assemblage that such a policy was inimical to the best interests of the welfare and defense of the United States of America for the following reasons:

1. Following Pearl Harbor and for the defense of the west coast against attack and sabotage the Army wisely moved the Japanese from the Pacific coast. To now permit them to return to their former habitat would subject us again to the danger of serious sabotage and difficulty in defending our shore line in the event of attack.

2. Due to the temper of the American public since the dastardly attack at Pearl Harbor we feel that it would be detrimental to the best interests of the Japanese themselves to allow them to return for residence on the west coast, and that difficult additional policing problems would be presented thereby in effecting their safety.

3. It is impossible to distinguish between loyal and disloyal Japanese. We are in no position to judge the emotions of the Japanese inasmuch as they have maintained their own schools and religion, and, in many cases, dual citizenship with their main allegiance to the Emperor of Japan.

4. If Japanese were allowed to return to this area we could not expect the cooperation of present agricultural or industrial laborers already engaged in the war effort if they were called upon to work with Japanese evacuees.

5. To allow young Japanese to leave relocation camps for educational purposes in our colleges would be unjust and inequitable as it affects our own American boys who have been taken out of college and are so loyally serving their country in the armed forces to the detriment of their education and employment.

6. It is the unanimous opinion of this assemblage that these Japanese should be contributing substantially to the war effort but we feel that it should be in areas removed from the Pacific coast and by group movement under full and proper control and supervision by the Army. In no event should they be disbursed throughout the country without proper provision for absolute surveillance and control: Now, therefore, be it, and it is hereby

Resolved, That the Japanese, both alien and American born, be retained in relocation centers for the duration unless they are placed under direct and absolute supervision and full control of Army authority and engaged in the furtherance of our war effort.

This resolution adopted this 9th day of February 1943 by the Citizens' Committee, Kings County Area.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution was adopted by the people in Kings County, Calif., and signed by the executive committee of that group. It expresses their feeling as well as my own toward the War Relocation Authority releasing native-born Japanese from the relocation centers for education or residence elsewhere. Such a policy is not conducive to the best interests, welfare, and defense of the United States of America, nor is it just or equitable as it affects our own American boys who are so loyally serving their country in the armed forces to the detriment of their education and employment.

The Farm Labor Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the problem of hired help on the farm is serious. Each month sees an increasing number of good efficient farm workers either entering the armed service or taking employment in war industries. The Army and Navy, of course, need more men, while war workers, be they men or women, are likewise in demand. But taking a too large percentage of such employables from the farms will bring us dire results. With what help still remains and due to the lack of essential and necessary machinery to do with, our farmers will be hard pressed to meet the ever-increasing production goals set by the Department of Agriculture.

Selective Service, War Manpower, and Department of Agriculture leaders are now aware that we have almost reached the saturation point in drawing men from the fields. One difficulty that still confronts the average farmer is that although he now has a preference for remaining at home filling the essential job on the farm, he still feels a strong patriotic urge to enter the service when called.

The draft board may even request that he remain at home to do his work, but the individual who does so ofttimes finds him the target for sly remarks that he is a draft dodger and is shirking his duty to his country. For several months past I, along with others, have been suggesting that some sort of recognition or emblem be given to the patriot who, remaining at home or on the farm, is doing a full-time job in helping to win the war.

One of the papers in my district, the Lincoln Evening Courier, under date of February 5, carried a splendid editorial on this very subject and, in this article, expresses far better than I am able to do, the necessity for giving thought to this whole matter. I trust the membership will find time to read the editorial in full.

The editorial follows:

FORGOTTEN FARM FRONT SOLDIER

This is a plea for official public recognition of the most universally forgotten soldier on the home front.

He is the young farmer of draft age who, although his heart may yearn for the uniform of his country, is subjected to slurring remarks because the Government has ordained that he shall remain at home and produce food for war.

Without him the war could not be long fought nor the peace ever be written. Food is as essential as ammunition. Without food we would have no armies.

Our Government cites outstanding war plant workers for civilian Distinguished Service Medals, and awards E pennants to factories that produce war products, even down to the processors of cereals. But thus far the farm hand who is frozen to his job for the duration—not a lucrative job compared to the war-plant wages he is forbidden to earn—more likely than not gets unmerited abuse from his neighbors all because he is helping fight the war where his Government tells him to fight.

It is earnestly recommended to the United States Government that it authorize and design for issue a suitable lapel insignia to be awarded through selective service boards to such forgotten soldiers on our wartime farms as qualify for this recognition. This design might conceivably combine the national colors, the V and a plowshare or other agrarian symbol that could be as proudly worn as is the divisional or corps shoulder insignia of a soldier.

The Logan County selective service board is 100 percent in accord with this movement, which it suggests be adopted nationally. If not, it proposes to adopt a similar insignia of its own for award to the many patriotic young Logan County farmers whose preference is the armed services but who are obeying orders.

We have talked to many of these young men, deferred to farm a specified number of needed land production units. They are not interested in medals. Most of them desire to carry guns. One of them was recently the life of the party en route to induction center, happy at last that he could leave the farm and become a soldier. Turned down by Army doctors he could scarcely keep back the tears. His only consolation was: "Well, I guess dad will be glad to see me back."

Consider what a youth such as this thinks when he hears the whispered word "slacker." There are scores of such in this community and in every community. The draft boards know their case histories intimately.

Let us provide this insignia without delay so that the forgotten soldier in the food production line may go about his assigned task with his head lifted a little higher, his chin up and his mind serene in the knowledge that the world knows he is under orders and is being a good soldier.

Farm Labor Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK NICHOLS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, our farmers will produce the food we need to carry on to victory, if they possibly can. But our farmers are confused. They read in the papers that farm workers are to be given deferment by the Selective Service system, but it just doesn't work out that way.

I am putting the following letter into the RECORD in order that the officials in charge of our manpower problem may know what the situation is in my home county. Mr. Milam M. King, who wrote me the letter, is a leading citizen who knows the people and their problems intimately, and the experiences he has had attempting to help farmers should be of benefit to those responsible for our present situation.

Mr. King's letter:

In re: Farm Labor and Selective Service.

DEAR JACK: There seems to be quite a bit of confusion here as well as in Washington regarding the farm-labor situation.

Brother McNutt and others are advocating the working of women and children on farms (which if he doesn't know) has been more or less the practice among especially our tenant farmers down here from time immemorial.

He also advocates that the people from town go out and help with the farm work, which we are all willing to do, but if the farmers pay us according to what we would actually be worth, at least until we got in condition, very few of us would be worth the salt in our bread.

It is not a matter of being willing or not willing, as I think all of us are willing to do anything in reason or possible to win the war, but the point is, that our men have been drawn from the farms until the farm-labor situation is pitiful.

It is going to take all the encouragement and coaxing that is possible to get a lot of the farmers to plant their normal crops. We are taking the position here that every farmer should plant all the food crops that he can possibly get in, whether he can see his way clear or not, on the question of labor to till and harvest. We are telling them that some way will be provided for help for harvesting the food crops. It seems to me that we will have to get them to go a lot on faith and a lot more on hope, and by all means, not to get discouraged or give up before planting.

With all this, however, something must be done to improve the farm situation. Most of our younger men have been taken into the armed forces. The remainder have gone into defense work. They are not to be blamed, when our Selective Service System for months has been deferring defense workers and taking farmers. Not just farm hands but farmers. I know of several in this county who in 1942 farmed as much as 200 acres, had a tractor, a bunch of cows, and other livestock, and really produced a large surplus for market, who were called into service and had to sell out and quit farming.

One fellow, about 30 years old, had a sale that netted nearly $2,000. He went in through the draft, bought a house in town, put the rest of his money into War bonds, and moved his 75-year-old father and 49-year-old sister in the house in town and went to the Army. There just wasn't anyone else to carry on, and there was nothing else left for him to do.

I know of another boy, about 20 years old, who drove the tractor for his dad, age about 60. The father has about 80 head of beef cattle and yearlings, farms about 250 acres, a lot of which was peanuts, corn, and other feed for the livestock program. The father is able to get around but under doctor's orders not to drive the tractor on account of heart condition. He has tried for 2 months to get a hand but is unable so far to do so. He tried to get deferment for the boy but was refused. They filled out all proper and necessary blanks to show their activities in the farm and livestock production program. The local board refused deferment. The boy obtained waiver to enlist, and the recruiting service refused the enlistment unless the local board certify that he was not engaged in work as an essential agricultural worker. He went back to the board and again asked deferment, in view of the fact that the recruiting service could see that he was needed at home. The local board again refused deferment, telling him that he could go in as a volunteer or the next week through selective service, and the boy, wanting to pick his branch of service, enlisted. The local board gave him a certificate showing that he was not an essential worker in agricultural pursuit.

The State selective-service headquarters say the local board is supreme on matters of deferment, yet the local board says that it takes so many units to qualify and off the boys go. They have taken so many off the farms, that now they will, of course, get criticized if anybody is left in the same age group and will be accused of taking one farmer's son and leaving his neighbor's son. All the single fellows now, except the 18- and 19-year olds have gone, except a few who have not been able to pass examination and those in defense plants.

The Army authorities take the position that unless a soldier is 38 years of age or over there is no authority for a release or discharge. We have just received a letter from one of the camps to this effect. The boy went to his lieutenant, captain, commanding officer, and chaplain and all gave him the same advice, and advised him that there was no authority to effect his release.

No doubt the Army is right about the matter as, if the local boards, who are neighbors and home folks send a fellow and the Army spends months in training him, it does seem a useless procedure to send him back to the farm.

On the other hand, if a mistake was made in the beginning, there ought to be some way of remedying it.

I have spent half of the past 6 months, and so has Judge Reubelt and other advisory board members, filling out requests for deferment of agricultural workers and farmers, who were not deferred, and advising farmers that their sons already in the Army could not under present regulations be released or discharged.

From 2½ years' experience in the draft set-up as an advisory board member, I would not recommend any promiscuous or general release of either farmers or any other class of workers from the Army.

I would recommend the following:

First. A speed-up of the release of men over 38 years of age, as this is already the law, and we have a number of applications in by farmers who have offered and will provide good jobs for them as soon as they are out. This machinery needs to be put into high gear.

Second. Automatic deferment of all farm workers, not yet called.

Third. Take all men in defense work, who were raised on the farm and working as farm workers as late as December 31, 1941, and if they are 38 years of age or under, give them an opportunity to immediately return to farm work, or as an alternative that they be drafted at once. A lot of these will go back to the farm, and they should be given deferment so long as they remain actually engaged in farm work.

Fourth. Raise the workweek to 48 or 56 hours. The President and you and a lot of fellows, including the farmers, are working a lot longer than 40 hours, without any raise in pay, and lengthening the workweek for industry will help a lot, although this is a problem that is hard of solution.

Fifth. It might be well to provide for release of soldiers for farm work, in cases of emergency, provided proper safeguards can be thrown around the same, but this will be hard to work out; and

It may be that arrangements could be made for groups of soldiers to work in the general vicinity of the camps where located, although from a practical viewpoint this also will be hard to work out.

If you can give us any information on whether it is possible under present rules to obtain a release of a soldier under 38 years of age, it will be appreciated.

Trusting that you will forgive me for making this letter so long, but assuring you that the farm situation is very serious, and that a lot of the farmers are getting discouraged with the conflicting statements of Hershey, McNutt, Wickard, and others, I am,

Your friend,

MILAM M. KING.

Future Role of Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARTER MANASCO
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including therein an address by Mr. Croil Hunter, president of Northwest Airlines, delivered on January 11, 1943, at the Pennsylvania Hotel, New York City. It cannot be successfully contended that Mr. Hunter wants to surrender all rights in the air, but he is practical and knows that if we want to fly American planes over foreign territory we must permit air carriers of other nations to fly over certain designated routes in our own country. After reading Mr. Hunter's address, you will be convinced that the time to consider post-war aviation problems is now, not after carriers of other nations have closed the door to American air carriers:

Any discussion on the future of air transportation must of necessity cover only the high lights and be a summary of salient facts that have been forcibly brought out recently.

You gentlemen are primarily concerned with distribution of goods of all kinds to the public and in transportation since it plays an important part in that distribution, not only because the cost of the transportation is reflected in the cost of the articles, but because new markets for certain types of merchandise are made possible by the kinds of transportation serving them. In other words, items such as dungeoness crabs from Puget Sound, orchids, gardenias, and other flowers, as well as tree-ripened fruits from the west coast, find new markets in the Mid-

west and the East only because they can reach those markets in good condition within a few hours after leaving their source. Northwest Airlines has conducted experiments on special rates for those commodities that have proven that a profitable volume can be obtained on rates that approach a competitive basis with other transportation. It is obvious that retail distributors will benefit from high-speed air transport, as they will be able to quickly replenish their stocks and change their inventories rapidly, as is sometimes necessary, due to public demand.

To date we have had only a slight indication of the effect this may have on the manufacturers, the jobbers, and the retailers, as the cost of air express has been relatively high, and the effect of large-scale air transport has not been felt.

It certainly is conceivable that present passenger fares will be reduced from the current rate of around 5 cents per mile to 3 cents per mile, or even less, and that air cargo rates may be reduced from the present 80 to 90 cents a ton mile to 15 or even 10 cents a ton mile. With the vastly accelerated war development of larger, more efficient aircraft, the utilization of the very greatly expanded production facilities, and the enormous number of personnel trained during this war period, direct flying costs will be substantially lower. It is certain that as costs are reduced, traffic volume will be increased and thus make such changes possible.

When we consider that present rail-express rates average from 11 to 18 cents per ton mile, first class less-than-carload freight shipments from 7 to 8 cents per ton mile, and motor truck rates 3 to 4 cents per ton mile, it is certainly clear that air cargo rates will be competitive and that a substantial amount of tonnage now moved by rail express and less-than-carload freight will be diverted to air, as well as some which is now carried by motor truck. A diversion of even half of such high-grade cargo, now carried by surface transportation, will require a fleet of some 25,000 to 30,000 airplanes, as compared to a maximum of 350 planes used in commercial service before about one-half were requisitioned by the Government. This does not include the additional number that will be required for carrying all first-class mail and for carrying Pullman and other first-class railroad passengers by air. Probably even such tremendous expansion will not absorb the present productive capacity but, together with private flying, will serve as a potential cushion against violent readjustments during the period of transition to follow the war. Furthermore, it will provide a powerful bulwark for our national defense by constantly maintaining a reservoir of aircraft and trained personnel for any future emergency.

Diversion of cargo from other forms of transportation should not be a matter of great concern to surface carriers because it will be a gradual process. In fact, the expansion of air transport alone creates a great deal of business for the railroads. During the past year Northwest Air Lines paid the railroads over $275,000. In the meantime, air transportation will develop much new business and open up new areas now inaccessible for trade, which will create a great deal more business for the other forms of transportation. Just consider how areas in Central America and in Alaska have been made accessible by the mobility of the airplane and its capacity to disregard terrain difficulties that made pioneering by construction of highways or railroads too slow and expensive. Air transportation will bring into the channels of trade many of the products and resources of hitherto undeveloped regions as well as make new markets and communities to be later served by railroad and highways.

While we are all interested in how the momentous developments and changes now going on will affect us individually, and they are proper subjects for discussion and postwar planning, there are several problems of even more immediate interest which I should like to touch on: First, air transportation in the war effort; second, aviation as an influence for lasting peace; third, how aviation can aid in averting a post-war economic collapse.

The Air Transport Command of the Army Air Forces and the Naval Air Transport Service are utilizing airplanes to transport supplies and munitions to all our allies and battlefields in this global war and to bring back casualties and strategic materials. The air lines are currently operating many Army and Navy transport planes from this country to far-flung theaters, conducting operations that a year ago would have been considered impossible. In addition to this, they are performing other services for the armed forces, as well as operating domestic commercial air lines taxed to capacity with priority passengers, cargo, and mail, all vital in the war effort. It is hoped that with the steadily increased production of transport aircraft and with the more urgent needs for them in the combat zones relieved there may may be some available for augmenting the air lines' present inadequate air line fleets.

It is our conviction that, just as the airplane has been a terrifically destructive force in this war, it can be an equally powerful constructive force in bringing about a new world civilization. With the kind of thinking and planning now being done by some of our foremost statesmen, we can hasten the end of the conflict and immediately progress toward new business horizons.

Vice President WALLACE recently said, I quote, "The situation in the world today is parallel in some ways to that in the United States just before the adoption of the Constitution when it was realized that the Articles of Confederation had failed and that some stronger union was needed. Today, measured by travel time, the whole world is actually smaller than was our little country then.

"Item 7 of the Atlantic Charter proclaimed the freedom of the seas. In the century ahead of us, however, airports throughout the world will be even more essential to the maintenance of a stable peace than Suez, Gibraltar, and the Panama Canal were in the past. The use of these far-flung air bases by the United Nations can do more than prevent war, however. It can tie the peoples of the earth together. It can assure increasing economic opportunity for humble citizens throughout this modern world where science is bringing us ever close to each other."

A world federation, such as he envisions, knows no artificial boundaries nor barriers except for purposes of local policing and administration. Likewise, in the ocean of air, these are no boundaries or barriers over either land or sea. To permit unnecessary and artificial restrictions to interfere with freedom of travel, the exchange of goods, services and courtesies between the countries of the world, would be like taking away from our Congress the exclusive power, granted by the Constitution, over interstate commerce, and would seriously retard progress toward the goal we all seek.

To Mr. Pogue, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which governs all foreign and domestic air transportation in this country, we must credit equally advanced thinking when he stated, I quote, "Our future plans must call for a large measure of freedom of the air internationally as we have had freedom of the seas. Aviation has shrunk the world to manageable proportions. No longer will there be continents or parts of continents isolated or unreachable. Our own United States, which many of us in the Middle West were taught to think of as being isolated from the rest of the world, protected by the two greatest oceans in the world, must face the fact that our isolation is ended forever.

"Aviation will broaden our understanding of all the world's people. We will have the means of rubbing shoulders with everyone from everywhere. This is new. This is important. The 'Air Age' will make possible the extension of the good-neighbor policy to all people. It will change civilization and, I firmly declare, it will contribute mightily toward the cause of an enduring peace."

The adoption of a policy of freedom of the air and its addition to those freedoms guaranteed by the Atlantic Charter would, in my opinion, be a boon to the war effort and to the peace to follow.

It was gratifying to see a press release from Washington recently that stated that the United States is going to seek an understanding on commercial world air-line rights in the post-war world before the end of the war and that no treaty is necessary to establish sound principles and that, therefore, there is no point in waiting until after the war to reach understandings. The policies the United States will advance involve three fundamentals:

"1. Establishment of the 'right of innocent passage' through the air over any foreign country. The principle means that nonmilitary aircraft could fly over any country, so long as they abide by the regulations made by that country for its own commercial aircraft.

"2. Establishment of the 'right to free landing' on the airports of any foreign country to refuel or for technical reasons. This principle means that nonmilitary aircraft could use foreign airports so long as they did not pick up passengers or discharge them, and so long as they complied with regulations.

"3. Establishment of the principle of 'freedom of the air.' This principle means any country could license commercial aircraft to engage in commerce between its own country and others, or between two or more foreign countries.

"A parallel, negative principle is that commercial aircraft would not be permitted to engage in 'intranational' commerce except in their own country. In other words, foreign planes could not pick up passengers or freight in New York and land them in Chicago, and our planes could not pick up passengers or freight in London and land them at Liverpool."

Minnesota's Gov. Harold E. Stassen's proposal for the organization of the United Nations of the world contemplates the administration and regulation by the United Nations Council of international airports and air routes under which the right of flight, airways traffic, radio beams, coordination, and dissemination of weather data would be governed. Such airports would be policed by the United Nations Legion to be established by the Stassen proposal.

Governor Stassen said also that our country has renounced post-war rights in airports we are now building all over the world with lend-lease funds, but that rights should be reserved now for the benefit of the United Nations to provide the basis for such international control.

This would be a logical extension of the principle of freedom of the air and provide a method of insuring its continued effectiveness.

There has been some concern among our allies and neutrals over the advantage that our country will have in international air routes by reason of our present military operation. Undoubtedly the adoption of the principle of freedom of the air would reassure them that we seek no advantage, and that as soon as hostilities have ceased, they will be enabled to develop their own transportation systems. As a matter of fact, such an understanding now would, in many ways, clear the atmosphere as there is great immediate need for additional international commercial air transportation. Mail, medical supplies, blood plasma, mica, and other vital and precious metals and materials need to be exchanged, and the time element is of greatest importance. Civilian as well as

military personnel on vital missions could utilize such service, and the morale and confidence of our allies would be constantly strengthened thereby.

The problem of averting a world-wide post-war depression and the predicted great challenge to our economic system after the war can and will be met by the planning that our military as well as civilian leaders are now doing. Certainly, with ample manpower and facilities of production released for constructive effort and with the prompt and full utilization of technological advances, there will be plenty of everything for everybody. It then becomes only a matter of securing an equitable distribution. If we can solve the seemingly insoluble problems of conducting a world-wide global war at a tremendous cost in money, property, and lives, we should be able to solve a relatively simpler problem of finding the means of distributing throughout the world food and goods to save lives, and to provide a new basis on which to rebuild. We have the unity for conducting the war and we will have the unity for preserving the peace. Truly, a smaller, more understanding and better world will be brought about by the benefits of the air age.

Rhymes or Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable W. Arthur Simpson, chairman of the Old Age Assistance Commission of Vermont. Speaking before the Lions Club of Burlington on February 8, Mr. Simpson said:

Life magazine for January 18 contains the following significant statement:

"A democratic statesman is, of course, tied to his people. And yet, because the ties are never absolutely rigid, he always has a fundamental choice. He can choose (1) to express the will of the people, right or wrong; or (2) knowing that he is better informed, to press his convictions, not alone with fine words, but with tough argument, deeds, and the acceptance of political risks. It is arguable that either of these courses is admissible. But the tragedy of the last decade lies in the fact that our leaders sought to straddle both of them. Like the President when he signed the fatal Neutrality Act, they have acted one way and talked another. The White Book itself is a gigantic straddle. It justifies itself for doing what the people wanted by proving that the Department knew all along that what the people wanted was wrong."

I might talk shop to you today on a number of subjects, old-age assistance, the maple industry, livestock judging, or how to cook a steak, but I have purposely chosen a challenging topic and will say some things which are controversial because in the words of Woodrow Wilson, "I am seeking only to face realities and face them without soft concealment."

It is an encouraging sign that people are talking about the sort of world we are to live in after the war. It is well to have Utopian ideals even if they must eventually be formulated along more practical lines. The overwhelming majority of the American people realize that the United States must assume some definite leadership in world affairs when this terrible conflict is terminated. The idea of "living unto ourselves" is outmoded but will be vigorously promulgated by isolationists notwithstanding our great expenditure of lives and treasure. We have in this country two prominent groups, some in the administration steadily going to the left and some in the opposition firmly resolved to restore the old order. We desperately need a practical common ground for those realistic enough to see that sacrifice, hard living and sound thinking are what is needed in a post-war world. Out of the problems of war and the problems of peace, new political alignments and new political parties have usually emerged. It is likely that history will repeat itself.

This is the year when war will really begin to hurt us, when casualty lists will be greater, when taxes will be higher, when rationing will be tougher and our whole life must be one of sacrifice and toil. The easy times are over. Democracy has been interpreted as the right to do as we please and serve our own interests but the time for that is gone, not to return in our generation. For as long as we can foresee, democracy demands that every man give all that he can. Young men must learn to be soldiers. Business must give up its profits.

If we are not to fail, even the farmer must sacrifice his individuality. Labor must forget its rights and remember its duties. Personal advantages and social gains must go into the melting pot. We must discipline ourselves to the fact that the problems of the peace will be infinitely greater than the problems of the war.

As yet we have a pathless roadway to world peace. We must do our fair share toward an intelligent, farsighted, and general adjustment of the social and economic conditions of the world so as to insure, if possible, that this great conflict will not be repeated. But we must remember that the Old World was trying to live in an airplane age under social wrongs and impossible political conditions established in a foot-soldier era. Human nature being what it is, we cannot expect any millennium. America is a country whose example may yet make the world safe for democracy. But to achieve a semblance of order in a war-torn world will require strength not softness. Any program of deliberate permanent impoverishment here for the benefit of the rest of the world will not be accepted by the American people. Uncle Sam can be neither a Shylock nor a Santa Claus.

We have some important domestic problems. The endless circle of rising farm prices, higher living costs, and increased wages has not yet been broken. Inflation is still a grave and imminent danger. We are reaping the harvest from sowing the seeds of class prejudice and neglecting the cultivation of individual and community responsibility. We have established an expensive and irresponsible bureaucracy which is wasting the substance of the American people and undermining the American form of government. To bring it within bounds and under control in the post-war days will be one of our greatest problems.

An attempt is about to be made to vastly expand social reforms through further liberalization and extension of the Social Security programs and much has been said about the Beveridge plan, which has recently been advanced as a post-war program in Great Britain. The Beveridge plan proposes a system of old-age pensions for those above working age and benefits to those of working age not gainfully employed. Benefits would include children allowances adequate for subsistence without other means, unemployment benefits for an unlimited period, old-age pensions as a matter of right, widowhood benefits, industrial disability benefits, payment for other disability and rehabilitation, medical treatment, including hospital, dental, ophthalmic, and convalescent homes for the whole family, and burial benefits at death.

These "cradle to the grave" programs would be financed by security contributions from all employees under contract services, all others gainfully occupied, including employers, traders, independent workers of all kinds, and housewives. Employers of persons under contract service would also contribute, and an additional amount would be contributed from the National Treasury.

The cost of this stupendous program, although providing payments which would be deemed inadequate by our own social reformers, is, of course, an item of concern to the British people, and it is uncertain whether it could be financed except in periods of great prosperity and vast employment. This, of course, is the question which has not yet been determined for our social-security programs in the United States.

The theory that contributions should be increased during periods of prosperity in order to establish a large reserve for periods of adversity seems sound in theory, but if a government is spending more than its income, as all nations are doing today, and the reserve is spent for armies, navies, armament, and other expenses as it is in this country, there will actually be no reserve when depression comes except as contributions may be made by those employed or by new taxation for an already heavily taxed people.

Any system of this nature is dependent on continued contributions to the fund to meet the Government IOU's. In the broadest sense of the terms, wealth is essential to welfare. I doubt if you can have social security by taxing the capitalistic system out of existence and reducing the wealth of the Nation to the least common denominator. Already some of our less ambitious but very liberal State programs of public assistance are running into financial difficulties incidental to the war where gasoline rationing is causing curtailment of horse racing, dog racing, parimutuel betting, and other activities from which revenue has been secured. It is fortunate that we have been less ambitious but more practical in Vermont.

The United States faces many financial problems with heavy taxation, tremendous debts, and the expense and difficulty of feeding our allies and the peoples of the countries we occupy. Both the Social Security Board and the National Resources Planning Board have prepared suggestions for the President and Congress, and they are known to be somewhat similar, and the cost of either plan would be 10 percent of the Nation's pay roll. This on top of a Victory tax of 5 percent which may be increased, a pay-as-you-go income tax of perhaps 20 percent to 30 percent for the lower brackets, local and State taxes, together with the possibility of a sales tax would virtually place all Americans on a low-subsistence level. We are engaged in the most expensive war in history. We must keep our present social programs sound if they are to endure.

For several years we have been living under the phantasy that we could borrow ourselves into prosperity. With the number of taxpayers increased from 7,000,000 to 44,000,000, a lot of people are going to learn for the first time that waste comes out of their own pockets. The Treasury and the Congress have been reluctant to face the facts in regard to income-tax payments which millions will be paying for the first time. The Ruml plan has caught the attention of the country. If, as alleged, millions will default under the present tax program, certainly they cannot pay double taxes this year. Even a layman can understand that the Treasury will gain rather than lose by the adoption of the Ruml plan and there will be severe political and financial repercussions if it is not adopted.

We all want to gain a greater future for America, but we cannot destroy a great proportion of the material wealth of the world or expand it in powder, shot, and shell without severe economic aftermaths and a long period of rebuilding and reconstruction. This has been the experience of all the ages. I am not a pessimist, but a person does his fellow citizens no service if he paints the future in terms of a life of milk and honey.

Life means change, and this is not the first time the human race has been faced by an emergency. We are, however, destined to bitter disappointment if we think that freedom from want will rise full-fledged from the ashes of this great war. It will require long years and many generations to turn the entire world into the single, large, and prosperous workshop, regardless of language, race, or previous condition of ancestral glory, which it is ultimately destined to be. I have no fear for the future of America if we face it in the spirit of our pioneering forefathers who had no thought in mind that the conditions of life ought to be anything but a challenge or that the rewards of life could be possessed except through valiant effort.

We must become more industrious, more practical more prudent, and we must build our cooperative society to higher and higher levels. The pattern for the cooperative state has not yet been established although it has been visioned by a few great men of the ages. We do know that the spread between the producer and consumer must be narrowed and that labor must have a real and tangible stake in industry.

Our deep and abiding faith in the ownership of land will be intensified by our present experiences. Some of our natural resources must be the property of all the people. Our great allies, the Russians, have demonstrated that love of home and country is not the exclusive possession of any one nation or established under any one form of government.

So far as America is concerned it seems apparent that if free enterprise and the democratic way of life are to survive, it must be through the elimination of prejudices, hatred, and class advantages and through cooperative communities and states established on Christian principles.

Freedom from want cannot be forced on a democracy or given a democracy. It must be won by them. Winning it needs courage, faith, sense, national unity—courage to face facts and difficulties and overcome them, faith in our future and ideals, freedom, the fair play for which century after century our forefathers were prepared to die.

This is the social security which the world of today and the world of tomorrow so urgently needs.

Shortage of Cattle Feeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK NICHOLS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
Oklahoma City, February 10, 1943.

Hon. JACK NICHOLS, M. C.
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JACK: I believe there is more complaining and disappointment in Oklahoma over the shortage of cottonseed cake, cottonseed meal, cottonseed hulls, peanut cake, and soybean meal than any other one thing. All of these items as you know are used for feeding cattle, and coupled with the shortage of them plus the 15-day limitation of supply, is making a situation that is most aggravating in Oklahoma. It is our understanding that thousands of tons of cottonseed hulls have been ground up for fertilizer, which in general is the cause of the shortage. Unless we can get some relief on feed it will be impossible for many stockmen in the State to get their cattle through the winter, let alone fatten them out for March and April sales.

Jack, this is really serious here, and I hope something can be done that will bring about a correction of this situation soon. The people just cannot understand why there is a shortage of these items when there was such a large crop of all of them last season.

Sincerely yours,

JOE C. SCOTT.

Air Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, in his annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1834, Postmaster General Barry said:

The celerity of the mail should always be equal to the most rapid transition of the traveler.

Postmaster General Barry was but restating the historic policy of the Postal Service from the time of its inauguration under the direction of Postmaster General Benjamin Franklin.

From the birth of our Nation to the present, officials of the Post Office Department have both encouraged and utilized the most rapid means of communication between the far reaches of our country, recognizing always that with the increasing speed of mail delivery the greater well-being of the Nation was insured. Postmaster General Barry succinctly outlined the logic of this policy in that same annual report when he wrote:

That which shortens the time of communication, and facilitates the intercourse between distant places, is like bringing them nearer together. While it affords convenience to men of business, it tends to counteract local prejudices, by enlarging the sphere of acquaintance. It perpetuates existing friendships, and creates new ones, by which the bonds of union are strengthened, and the happiness of society promoted.

The stage coaches carrying mails were given the right-of-way over all other traffic that their speed might be increased. The Federal Government stepped into the road-building picture by designating certain highways as post roads and these were always more highly improved than other routes to insure greater speed. Over great distances, where further time could be saved from that required by the stagecoach, such institutions as the Pony Express came into being, encouraged and utilized by the postal authorities so that the mails might more closely knit our Nation into a single unity. The invention of the steam engine made the railroads and steamships a possibility, and notwithstanding the tremendously increased cost, the Post Office Department almost immediately transferred the mails to these faster means of communication. And finally, when through American ingenuity and invention, the airplane became a reality, it was the postal authorities of this Nation which took the world lead in the experimentation, encouragement, and final usage of the airplane to annihilate distance that more rapid means of intercommunity communication might be a fact.

Somewhere in the consciousness of the race it seems there has always been the knowledge that some day, by some means, man would conquer the air that he might quickly communicate with his fellow man in far-distant places. The ancients referred to Mercury as the winged messenger of the gods and symbolized him with wings upon his feet. Today that subconscious knowledge of mankind has become a reality. It has become a fact in the generation in which we live. It is a far cry from those ancient days when the runner carried the message of the Battle of Marathon to this twentieth century epoch when it is possible for any citizen of this Nation to reach any point on the earth's surface within 60 hours—only 2½ days. Many of us probably fail to fully comprehend the full meaning of this.

It is only 160 years since those initial balloon experiments at Paris when Benjamin Franklin was asked by a skeptic as to what good a balloon could be. Franklin's reply, "What good is a newborn baby?" eloquently portrays the great depth of his vision. Franklin thought of the mastery of the air in the terms of balloons, but the "new-born baby"—aeronautics—has now grown up. It has donned long trousers. It is about to reach its majority, its full manhood, its power for good or ill, its maturity. It behooves us now to exercise the same foresight and vision of those early pioneers. Its great strength must be utilized in every possible manner for the good of the people. H. R. 1012 should speedily be enacted into law that we might further strengthen and aid civilian aviation, but further than that, as speedily as the planes can be built, the transition from other means of postal communication to that by air should be effected.

No other single branch of government has such an important bearing upon the well-being and contentedness of our civilian population. Speed of communication by personal correspondence with loved ones in distant places is an essential prerequisite of happiness. There should be no premium upon that speed of communication. It should not and must not be necessary to pay a surcharge to hasten the delivery of that important letter. The Postal Service is a service for the people, by the people, and of the people. The general transportation of

the mail by the fastest means possible should and must be available to the most humble of our citizens at the same price as all other mail.

Cost of operation should not be the sole yardstick. Indeed, if we again refer to the history of the Postal Service and congressional appropriations and acts relating to it, we find that cost of operation has always been secondary to speed of delivery.

The first railroad was built between Baltimore and Washington in 1828. In the next few years a limited number of miles of railroad track was laid over rights-of-way connecting eastern metropolitan areas. In 1836 Congress seriously considered a huge—for that day—appropriation of funds to be given outright to the railroads to finance their development. The interest from this appropriation was to be designated as the payment to the railroads for carrying the mail. Later, in 1841, when the railroads were in serious financial difficulty, the Postmaster General gave new impetus to this proposal.

For a very brief period Congress limited the payments to railroads for mail transportation to a sum not in excess of 25 percent more than the cost of transporting the mails over the same routes by stage coaches, but recognizing the value of the more speedy communication by railroad, in 1839 Congress ignored these limitations and permitted payments to increase to a maximum of $300 per mile. This permitted payments by the postal authorities to be increased by from 25 percent to 300 percent above that paid for stage coaches.

The railroads continued to expand over the face of the country. In 1857 and 1858 no less than six new railroad routes were established. In addition to encouraging railroad expansion by land grants, rights-of-way and other emoluments, the Federal Government paid these new railroads more than $2,000,000, although the postal revenue amounted to some $300,000. Again, when two new railroad routes were established for transporting the mails in 1865, following the Civil War, while the revenue received was only $24,000, the Government paid to these railroads $750,000.

Congress has always recognized its responsibility to the people with reference to the mails. The Committee on Ways and Means of this House of Representatives, 98 years ago, in 1845, reported:

> No doubt is entertained as to the obligation of the Government to lay hold of the best and most rapid methods of transmission. It is not without reflection that this committee insists on the principle that it was the duty, as well as the right, of the Government, to avail itself even at heavy additional expense, of the powerful agency of steam for the purpose of accelerating the mails.

It is no less the duty of Congress today "to avail itself, even at heavy additional expense, of the powerful agency" of airplanes "for the purpose of accelerating the mails." Indeed, today the duty is greater than it was in 1845.

Today the speed with which all mail is transported and delivered has a far greater influence upon the economy of our Nation than it did in 1845. We live in an era when speed is a prerequisite to success. The speediest possible intercommunication between distant points is essential to the greatest economic benefits.

Repeatedly Congress has met its responsibility in connection with advancing the country's interests in postal legislation affecting air mail service. The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 declared that all air routes shall be considered as post roads. It further declared that it should be the duty of the Postmaster General to transport mail by air by certificated air carriers, "to the extent required by the Postal Service." It is now the duty of Congress to extend the "requirement of the Postal Service" to include the transmission of all mail by air as speedily as the airplanes can be constructed. It must provide for all necessary new air routes and the redistribution of necessary postal employees, such as those in the Railway Mail Service.

I have introduced into the House of Representatives H. R. 1720, which directs the Postmaster General to institute air-mail service for all first-class mail and parcel post, without a surcharge for such service, when the use of airplanes for its transportation will speed up delivery of the mail. The present practice of requiring a surcharge for air-mail service lends itself to discrimination against the poor and needy, while the well-to-do have no objection or little objection to it. My bill eliminates this tendency toward discrimination. It places all mail on an equal basis, in accordance with the national policy established more than a century and a half ago—to use the speediest means of transportation for all mail. The bill does not require this transition immediately. It directs this new service be made effective as quickly as possible. It cannot be accomplished overnight. Too many technical problems must be worked out in more or less detail.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, more than 31,000,000,000 pound-miles of air mail was transported in the United States by domestic air lines. This amounted to only about 5 percent of the total first-class mail in the United States. To increase the amount of first-class air mail alone to approximately twenty times as much as it was during that fiscal year will require careful planning on the part of the postal authorities, for there can be no interruption in service. It will require the construction and operation of a very large number of new cargo-carrying airplanes, and it will require the construction of hundreds of new airfields throughout the United States. It probably could not be made fully effective for every community until after the end of the present war.

To carry this program into effect during the post-war period will provide employment for thousands of persons now actively engaged on war work, who will then be seeking new forms of employment. In a community such as the district which I represent in Congress, as well as to almost every other congressional district in the country, this will be a great economic blessing. It will help to insure the economy of our people over the post-war period of transition. But this is only a temporary benefit as compared with the larger and perpetual gains which it will bring.

Oklahoma, situated geographically as it is, will be brought closer to the great metropolitan areas of the east coast and the west coast. The people of Oklahoma and the people of New York and California will understand and appreciate the problems of each other to a greater extent. Air transportation of the mail will bring the towns and cities and farms of Oklahoma, and every other State in the Union, the benefits of closer sociological and economic ties with the people of the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards. Every county in the State of Oklahoma will have at least one airport where both fast mail planes, as well as other cargo- and passenger-carrying planes, can land and take off. Many small towns and communities in Oklahoma, as well as those of other States, may well develop into important cities through the progress thus insured by air travel and communication. Feeder airlines into great terminals will bring air service to thousands of smaller communities, particularly cities and towns under 100,000 population, where air service is not now available. Where these lines intersect the routes of other airlines, terminals will be established which lend themselves to an ever-growing economy for the community. In the very smallest of these communities, there will probably only be an air pick-up service, but in the larger, these greater benefits will come to all the towns and cities of Oklahoma, and its 47 sister States.

With such a huge volume of mail as is carried in the first-class mails, the tremendous value of such an interlocking network of air routes over the entire country cannot be estimated. The increased cost will be negligible. Even under the present system, military secrecy prevents the American people from at this time knowing the part played by the civilian air transport companies in protecting the United States at the outbreak of this war. But with an air system as extensive as this plan will require, the impregnability of America shall be assured. Thus future wars will be stopped before they have begun.

Had it been possible to have carried this plan of air-mail service into effect 6 or 8 years ago, it is very probable that the present world situation would have been materially changed. Instead of having to wait until we could produce the planes required, we would have had thousands upon thousands of cargo-carrying planes already available to transport troops and supplies to far-distant battlefields on a moment's notice. The bottleneck that has been created by the shortage of steel for the construction of ships to carry materials on the surface of the seas would have been avoided, and a much larger proportion of that steel would have been available for more direct military uses. The greatest insurance we can have against future wars, aside from a huge Army, Navy, and military airforce, is a huge civilian air-transport system in constant use transporting mail.

Artists for Victory

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1943

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of this House to what in wartimes has often become the forgotten group. Those are the artists of the country. Right after the war a group in New York organized themselves into Artists for Victory, and that group has a national membership totaling over 10,000. They have an exhibit of war posters in the National Gallery and have invited the Members of Congress, the Senate and House of Representatives, to come in any time Wednesday after 3 o'clock to see this exhibit and to meet with some of the artists. I hope as many of you will be able to attend as possible.

Artists for Victory, Inc., was organized immediately after the outbreak of war by 26 art societies in New York, with national membership totaling over 10,000 artists, and was dedicated to assist the country with all its resources and talents to the winning of the war. It is a nonprofit corporation, its officers serving without compensation and its staff comprising voluntary workers. It embraces every field of the visual arts, namely, painting, sculpture, mural painting, scenic painting, architecture, landscape architecture, interior decoration, and all the kindred arts and crafts.

For the first time in the history of American art, all the different art groups have joined together, moved by patriotism to their country, and are working together harmoniously and effectively with but one object in view, complete victory and lasting peace.

Among the noted members of the board of directors are: Hobart Nichols, president, and president of the National Academy of Design; J. Scott Williams, acting president of the Architectural League; Paul Manship, sculptor; John Taylor Arms, etcher; Gifford Beal, painter; Arthur Crisp, mural painter; Irwin D. Hoffman, painter and etcher; and Julian Clarence Levi, architect.

The first activity conducted by Artists for Victory was the national sculpture competition, for the purpose of procuring a stirring monument to our aviators, that would be used as a shrine for patriotic activity. The heroic figure of an aviator, by Thomas LoMedico, was chosen by a distinguished jury of selection, including sculptors and high-ranking officers of the Air Corps, and is now on exhibition at the great Artists for Victory exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum.

Because cultural values are apt to be obscured during a period of all-out war such as we are undergoing at the present time, Artists for Victory inaugurated the greatest exhibition of contemporary American art ever held in this country, so that one of the great ideals for which we are fighting will be kept alive for our people. This exhibition was conducted with the collaboration of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, which turned over its entire museum to this display, and devoted $52,000 for purchase prizes to this exhibition, which was opened in December 1942 and will continue until the end of February 1943. This activity has been of tremendous value to the country in keeping alive the spark of cultural achievement which the brute forces are endeavoring to destroy throughout the world.

THE NATIONAL WAR POSTER COMPETITION

Of immediate and direct service to the Nation has been the national war poster competition, conceived and conducted by Artists for Victory, Inc., for the purpose of obtaining inspirational fighting posters on the vital issues of the war. A plan was evolved to enlist support from private industry for prizes and reproduction of the prize-winning posters and others. This was obtained from R. Hoe & Co., Inc., world famous as manufacturers of the Hoe rotary newspaper press—which is now devoting its resources to the war effort exclusively—who underwrote the expenses of the competition, offered four prizes—$1,200 in war bonds—and guaranteed large-scale reproduction of their prize-winning posters. The Council for Democracy of New York sponsored four more prizes and the International Business Machines, Inc., the ninth prize. O. C. D. agreed to distribute the reproduced posters. The Museum of Modern Art participated by agreeing to hold an exhibition of selected posters from the competition.

The inspiration for this competition was the President's first war message on the state of the Union to the Congress on January 6, 1942. After careful analysis, a competition circular was written on 8 themes which seemed suitable for poster rendering. This was issued to over 25,000 artists throughout the country. They did not know that the President's message was the source of inspiration. They simply were moved by a desire to help, for the prize offerings were inconsequential. Artists for Victory depended for its appeal not only on public approval from Mr. Elmer Davis or from the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, Jr., or from Mr. Donald Nelson, but also on the spontaneous enthusiasm of the artists themselves responding to the call expressed in the circular, which reads, in part:

There's a job for artists in this war. It's a vital job and it must be done.

This is the situation. Time is still against us. Our enemy has made tremendous gains while we have only begun to fight. There is a very real danger that we may lose this war.

Our armed forces are all over the world, but they need more support from us. Our valiant allies, Russia, China, Britain, are fighting powerfully and courageously, but they, too, need more support from us. It all falls back on us here on the home front. It's our war—everybody's war. And that means—more production, more work, more sacrifice, more participation. We think we are doing a lot, but we've got to do more—a lot more.

This is the story that must be brought home to the American people. It's been told before, but it needs to be told again, over and over. Words alone can't do it. We have to see it. We need to get a clear picture in our minds of this menace to our lives and our liberty. We need to see what we're fighting for. We need to see what to do about it.

And that's your job in this war—a job that only an artist can do.

The response from the artists from every part of the country was magnificent. Over 2,200 posters were received, and all those that have seen them have been deeply moved by these stirring expressions of patriotism. Mr. Edward A. Jewell, the noted art critic of the New York Times said, on reviewing the first exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art:

There are posters that should be reproduced at once and put in circulation to help us finish our war. In a word, this is the best contemporary poster exhibition I have ever seen.

How completely the themes selected and the slogans suggested to the competing artists succeeded in capturing the spirit contained in the President's message is evidenced by the following letter of commendation to the president of Artists for Victory from the Commander in Chief himself:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 16, 1942.

DEAR MR. NICHOLS: I have seen the report by Artists for Victory on its national war poster competition. It is proof of what can be done by groups whose ordinary occupations might seem far removed from war. More than 2,000 war posters were produced by the artists of the country, not as a chore that they were asked to do but as a voluntary, spontaneous contribution to the war. The very name of your organization is symbolic of the determination of every man and woman in every activity of life throughout the Nation to enlist in the cause to which our country is dedicated.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

By means of exhibitions such as the one now being held at the National Gallery, which will be sent on tour to at least 20 key cities throughout the United States, Artists for Victory will bring the powerful messages contained in these posters to millions of our people. Already well over 100,000,000 repetitions of these posters have appeared in magazines, newspapers, and periodicals, such as Life, the New York Times, and other papers in many cities, and in trade and art publications.

Artists for Victory is about to launch a program reproducing 50 of the best posters from the national war poster competition in miniature form, as a page of war labels, and expects to print and distribute over 500,000,000 of them, so that their important messages will reach every man, woman, and child in the country. Used on correspondence, on packages, on pay envelopes, and in many other ways, Artists for Victory feels that its war poster labels will be a truly great contribution to our country at war, for they will serve to keep before our people the vital issues of the war.

Get Rid of the Japs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in line with the appeals that I have been making with reference to the Japs in this country, I am inserting a letter which I received from the Native Sons of the Golden West and also the resolution to which that letter refers.

I hope every Member of Congress will take time to read this letter and also this resolution; for they point out one of the grave dangers that now confronts this Nation and which we must not leave as a burden to our children.

The matter referred to follows:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *February 13, 1943.*
Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Sacramento Parlor, No. 3, Native Sons of the Golden West, at its meeting February 12, 1943, unanimously adopted the accompanying petition.

We sincerely hope it will have your careful attention and that you will endeavor to have enacted legislation that will end for all time the "peaceful invasion" of our country by the Japanese.

Our members are convinced that all Japanese in this country and its possessions should be confined in concentration camps and the camps should be placed under strict military control. To do otherwise is to invite disaster.

Sincerely,
JAMES M. HANLON, *President.*
J. F. DIDION, *Secretary.*

Sacramento Parlor, No. 3, Native Sons of the Golden West, is grieved and shocked to learn of the proposal to enroll in the United States Army a unit composed of so-called citizens of the United States of America of Japanese ancestry.

Members of Sacramento Parlor are firmly of the opinion that the Constitution of the United States of America does not confer citizenship on any person of Japanese descent born in this country, therefore there are no "citizens of the United States of Japanese ancestry"; they also are of the belief that all Japanese regardless of protestations otherwise, inherently are loyal only to Japan, and they are thoroughly convinced that the enrollment of a United States Army unit composed of Japanese will be inimicable to the welfare of the State of California and the Nation, and will undoubtedly create a dangerous threat to a proper and adequate defense of this country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Sacramento Parlor is strenuously opposed to the formation of a Japanese unit of the United States Army and hereby respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States of America to exercise its prerogative and nullify the declared intention of the War Department to organize and enroll such a unit; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this petition be sent the Secretary of War, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, the chairman of the House of Representatives Military Affairs Committee, and others.

Office of Personal Catastrophe Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to establish an Office of Personal Catastrophe Loans in the Disaster Loan Corporation, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The purpose of this bill is to afford a means whereby citizens who have suffered disabling injury or disease which requires the individual to use a prosthetic, orthopedic, or other appliance or device, to enable such person to return to useful and gainful employment, may apply to the Office of Personal Catastrophe Loans and, upon proper certification as to character and need, be enabled to borrow funds essential to procure such appliances or devices.

This measure has been introduced at the request of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., national headquarters of which organization is suite 1365, National Press Building, Washington, and officers of which are Paul A. Strachan, president; Jesse D. Gross, first vice president; Chester C. Hadden, second vice president; Harry J. Goldberg, third vice president; Millard W. Rice, fourth vice president; Ralph A. Collins, fifth vice president; John Millon, sixth vice president; Duane DeSchaine, secretary; and Edwin E. Maczkowske, treasurer.

I also want to say in this connection that Mr. Paul J. Campbell, president of the famed Fraternity of the Wooden Leg, and Miss Augusta B. Weaver, secretary of that fraternity—the latter being one of my constituents—first projected a similar idea about 3 years ago, and I hope the present effort on behalf of the approximate 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 disabled, in this category, as represented by the endeavors of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, will bear early fruit.

The Job Ahead for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1943

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, minority leader of the House of Representatives, at the Lincoln-McKinley banquet of the Buckeye Republican Club of Columbus, Ohio, on Thursday evening, February 11, 1943:

I come to this Lincoln Day celebration of the Buckeye Club with many fond memories. I recall the fine singing of the club which entertained the 1916 convention at Chicago when Ohio presented, as its favorite son, Theodore Burton. At every convention your organization has had a conspicuous part, and I am sure it will be so in 1944.

When my close personal friend, your able and distinguished Representative, invited me to speak at this meeting, I was happy to accept. I wanted to be able to testify personally as to the fine work JOHN VORYS is doing in the Nation's Capital. He is an important member of Ohio's able delegation, which is helping to fight the battle for constitutional government and the preservation of our sane American way of life. I wanted the chance to thank Ohio for its excellent service to the Nation in returning such an overwhelming Republican verdict last November. You gave courage to the forces of real Americanism everywhere. And I was happy to come so I could pay tribute to your Governor. The great record of John Bricker here in Ohio has been one of the factors in making this Commonwealth a citadel of republicanism. That same record has made him an outstanding figure.

This Lincoln Day gathering is held in the midst of a war which has engulfed the whole world. This war is the first concern of every patriotic American. We must be prepared to make every sacrifice—even of life itself—to preserve our priceless heritage of a free America. We must wage this war with unstinted vigor, and full efficiency, and win the earliest possible victory.

We Republicans in Congress have given our full and complete support to the war effort. We will continue to do so, of course, until the ruthless, arrogant Axis Powers have been decisively defeated and the danger to our security and to our way of life has been definitely removed.

Because we want this war to go forward effectively, we demand that it be fought as an all-American and not as a partisan war. Appointments like that of Edward Flynn have but one effect. They discourage morale and gravely weaken the confidence of the people.

One more thing that doesn't help the war effort is the putting of "lame duck" politicians from all over the country into fat, lucrative Federal positions.

What makes these appointments all the more disturbing is that the "lame ducks" have positions in which they have power to decree the life or death of industry and to control the future of the individual citizens. Putting "lame ducks" in positions of power over an electorate which has just rejected them for office is not building for national confidence.

Congress should end this abuse.

Today we have in the House of Representatives 209 Republicans. This is a formidable force and restores to the Nation once more a balanced Government. No longer can bills be rushed through, under the lash of some bureaucrat's whip. Congress is determined to function as a coequal, independent part of the Government. The rubber-stamp days are over. And, if I am any judge of the sentiments of the American people, they are profoundly glad of that.

The citizens of the country are looking to the 209 Republicans in the House to take a decisive part in preserving our constitutional form of government; to watch carefully the use by the bureaucrats of the great powers given them to prosecute the war, and to see that they are used judiciously and fairly; to save private enterprise, and to separate from the Government pay rolls some of the vast army of political straphangers. I recognize,

of course, the majority of those employees are hard working and patriotic. I am referring to those who are on the rolls chiefly for political purposes.

The people are disturbed over the arrogance and the growth of the bureaucracy which sprawls all over the country, and which today embraces more than 3,000,000 employees. This is 3⅓ times more than the number on the rolls in the period of the First World War. This bureaucracy rides roughshod over the people, showering upon them voluminous questionnaires, and insisting upon restrictions and regimentation that retard rather than promote the war effort and impose unnecessary hardships upon the American people.

We Republicans in Congress will carefully scrutinize the operations of these bureaucrats and the appropriations which they request. We will keep them in bounds.

And when this war is over and we have won a decisive victory, we will make certain the powers given to the bureaucrats are returned to the Congress. We do not want this country to be permanently regimented and controlled by a Washington bureaucracy.

This great army of Government employees is a heavy drag upon the taxpayers, but that is not the worst. It means wasted manpower at a time when the Nation cries for the full use of all its manpower to win the war, and it means, because of duplication, a confusion that is deadly destructive.

Any businessman who has been forced to go to Washington, hat in hand, to beg some concession that he might be able to keep his business going, knows the endless confusion and chaos.

A columnist has told wittily of the popular pastime in Washington of memo writing. A businessman travels thousands of miles, tells his story to some clerk who has a speaking acquaintance with the assistant secretary to the secretary of the man who will make the decision. The clerk writes a memo for the chief and the businessman returns home to await action. That is about all that ordinarily happens—the businessman waits.

It is no wonder the columnist says there are two classes of bureaucrats in Washington, those who write memos and those who throw them away.

Well, we have been a patient people. We have hoped that if we waited long enough, everything would come out all right. Now we must do something about it.

Up to date, the present set-up has certainly been no improvement over the war council which was in effect in the first war.

In the first, major activities were directed by a war council, which brought together the major administrators, the Cabinet, and the President. Here were ironed out the conflicts, and here the broad policies were established.

Most of the other countries have had such a system, and it might well end some of our confusion if we returned to that method of control.

If we had had proper administration of war efforts, at least we would have avoided the failure to provide sufficient fuel oil to keep the people of the Eastern States warm, and we would not have permitted 14 months to lapse without making a single pound of synthetic rubber.

One of the sources of danger to our representative form of government is the abuse of the so-called blank checks. It is easy to yield to the temptation to have a large free sum available to use in the event of an emergency. But when these moneys are used to evade the will of Congress, it is a deadly blow against the people's Government. Even though the motive might be fine, the result is the same. We are losing our American Government by balanced checks and tending more and more to a government by blank checks.

The Pentagon Building in Washington was estimated to cost $35,000,000, and Congress appropriated that sum. The final expense was over $70,000,000, and the balance came from blank-checks funds. No more space was acquired, but less, yet the cost was doubled by the bureaucrats, who ignored the wishes of Congress—and this action was premeditated. This has happened frequently.

Another flagrant abuse was the restriction of salaries to $25,000 per annum. Congress refused to adopt this policy—rejecting several suggestions. In spite of this congressional action, the bureaucrats put it into effect by a regulation. Now, of course, only a few people were affected. The number involved is not the point; it is the spirit and purpose, the violation of principle, back of the action. If Congress can be defied and its will set aside, then representative government is being strangled; the people will have lost control; and we will have bowed to totalitarianism in the form of rule by bureaucracy. We do not want such a condition here in America. I pledge that the 209 Republicans in Congress will be a mighty force to fight for the continuance of the American way of government.

One of the tragedies of the war is the destruction of thousands of small business concerns which have perished, and the thousands more which are struggling along—hoping against hope that through some miracle they may survive.

Many of these businesses might have survived if a determination motivated some of our bureaucrats to let them live. If it were not for the demands of Congress, the mortality rate in business would by now have been much larger.

From the first, we Republicans in Congress have fought to save the small businessman. We set up the first committee to protect his interests; and that move forced some action by others. Recent reports are that he is going to get a better break in the days ahead. If this be true, it will be a victory for sanity and common sense. America must have these small concerns to give employment to millions of workers. We will especially need them in the days following the end of the war. When victory comes and the fighting forces return from the war fronts, we will desperately need small business enterprises to provide the civilian jobs to keep this country from collapse and economic chaos. The time to prepare to avoid a depression after the war is now; and one way to avert a depression is to permit these small concerns to live.

While we devote our attention to the supreme task of winning the war, and sustaining our economy and our way of life, we must consider carefully and try to prepare for grave problems which will come with the dawn of peace. These will be critical days for America and the world. Unless we have clear aims, the power of idealism and justice will be swept aside as they were at Versailles.

Over 100 agencies, both private and official, are studying post-war plans. Congress which eventually must pass on the plans has lagged behind. We in Congress must take our full part in post-war planning and it is not too early to start.

We have paid a heavy penalty for our neglect of aviation before the war; we must make certain we do not repeat our mistake as far as peace is concerned. Control of the international aviation routes of the world will be eagerly sought by every big nation following the war. The United States must maintain its air position. It will mean more trade and prosperity to our country and it will be a powerful factor in our ability to contribute to world peace. To promote our world aviation position I am asking Congress to name a special Committee on Aviation and I hope to be successful, as we must tackle this great problem intelligently.

There are those who view the future with pessimism. I do not share these sentiments. I believe we can make the future the golden period in American history. We can build here a better civilization for humanity.

We must act wisely. We must act unselfishly. Most of the woes of mankind come from selfishness and greed. Through avarice, we pave the way for destruction and disaster. Let us, as a people, follow the teachings and the precepts of Abraham Lincoln. If we do, the future will be secure for our own country, and we can then help to make the future secure for the rest of the world as well.

When this war is ended there will be only one nation to which the world can turn with hope and that is the United States of America. Our task will be monumental.

We must preserve our freedom and our way of life here in America, and we must contribute to the upbuilding of the rest of the world. Our contribution to the world will, in a large measure, depend upon how well we sustain our own prosperity, and our own representative Government.

As we did at the end of the First World War, we will find, when peace comes, a hungry devastated world. From the storehouse of plenty which we then must have, America must help these people to feed and sustain themselves. We must aid in rescuing them from starvation and despair. We must help to build goodwill as the foundation for a new and greater world prosperity and world peace.

In every great crisis, when there has been a need for reconstruction and sound administration, the people of this Nation have turned to the Republican Party—and they have never found their confidence misplaced.

There is every sign that history will repeat itself. This party of Lincoln will be given in 1944 the task of rebuilding and revitalizing America, and of leading the world to better days.

We will be under a great responsibility. We dare not—we must not fail. Let us go forward with faith and confidence, and, in the words of the immortal Lincoln, "with malice toward none, with charity for all."

Power Companies Say "Nonprofit" Means "All Expenses Plus 6 Percent"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, from the Southwest power pool, which is now bleeding Uncle Sam on war contracts, just as its member companies have been bleeding the people of Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Missouri for years, comes the strangest idea of nonprofit I have ever heard expressed.

The Federal Power Commission was investigating the rates charged by the pool to the Government's big aluminum plant in Arkansas. When the F. P. C. attorney finally got them cornered, President C. Hamilton Moses, of the Arkansas Power & Light Co., testified under oath that "nonprofit" means "all expenses plus 6-percent return on investment." He did not use the word

"legitimate" at all. He did not say "legitimate investments" or "legitimate expenses."

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on this subject:

POWER POOL'S "STRANGE IDEA ABOUT PROFIT" REVEALED AT FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION HEARING

A Federal Power Commission lawyer got a rather unusual definition of the term "nonprofit" from C. Hamilton Moses, president of the Arkansas Power & Light Co. and moving spirit in the pool created by 10 privately owned utilities, to supply electricity to the Government's new aluminum plant at Lake Catherine, Ark. According to Moses, "nonprofit" means "all expenses plus a 6-percent return on investment." Moses, whose pool is selling power to the Government at a rate considerably higher than that being charged by the Rural Electrification Administration-sponsored Ark-La Electric Cooperative, said he believed it was his patriotic duty to keep public power out of the area. And for that reason, apparently, he was ready to make this "nonprofit" rate. He is still chagrined because the War Production Board granted Ark-La priorities for the construction of a transmission line while it denied materials for such a line to his pool, which had planned to reach another Government power dam now under construction.

Obviously it would be indefensible if the Government exploited a wartime emergency for the development of public power when the required power could be more speedily obtained from existing private sources at a reasonable rate. A correspondent of the Post-Dispatch, however, has previously pointed out that there was not sufficient electricity in the area, and the power pool apparently undertook to fill the order because it believed it could obtain extra power from a public source. This and the unusual definition of a "nonprofit" rate, together with Moses' view of his patriotic duty to keep out all public power, make it all too clear that the utilities' pool was trying to do business as usual. Apparently it was interested not only in getting the aluminum-plant business but also in avoiding post-war competition from a public power system in an area that will be crying out for industrial development—an area which, if furnished with reasonably cheap electricity, holds forth even more promise for the future than the Tenessee Valley Authority area.

The Tanker "Itamaraty"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, in an article appearing in the Baltimore American, of January 17, 1943, comment was made that for more than a year the *Itamaraty*, a tanker with a capacity of 50,000 barrels, has been moored at the foot of Commerce Street while a legal battle over her drags through the courts. The article states that Secretary Ickes, as Petroleum Coordinator, had been requested to take a hand so that the vessel could be used to haul badly needed oil from producing to consuming areas.

Under date of February 1, I asked Admiral Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, and Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, for information. I have his reply dated February 10, 1943, and under unanimous consent, I insert that reply in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 10, 1943.

Hon. SCHUYLER O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BLAND: In your letter of February 1, you asked to be advised about the circumstances surrounding the vessel *Itamaraty* which has been moored for some time in Baltimore.

The *Itamaraty* is a tanker of former Norwegian ownership. It was built in 1916 at Wilmington, Del. The vessel was badly damaged by fire at Charleston, S. C., early in 1940. It was abandoned by the owners to Norwegian underwriters and Norwegian registry was then canceled. The Boston Metal Works Co. purchased it from the underwriters for $60,000, and after one other transfer of ownership, the vessel was sold to the Salisbury Shipbuilding & Yacht Co., Inc., of Salisbury, Md., for $17,000 on January 29, 1941. The Salisbury Shipbuilding & Yacht Co. sold the vessel to Jose Padilha Nunes Coimbra, a Brazilian, and made repairs on the vessel, taking a mortgage upon it in the amount of $265,000. Coimbra sold the vessel to Lloyd Brasileiro, a steamship line controlled by the Government of Brazil.

The vessel has been involved in litigation because libels were filed by the Salisbury Co. in connection with its mortgage indebtedness and by others in connection with other matters. Contrary to the newspaper reports, however, it is not the litigation which has been responsible for keeping the vessel out of service. If arrangements for acquisition of the vessel or its use on reasonable terms could have been made with Lloyd Brasileiro, release from the court would not have been a serious obstacle. To date, however, acceptance by Lloyd Brasileiro of terms of acquisition or use which would justify the great expenditure of manpower, material, and time required to put the vessel in commission has not been forthcoming.

Our surveyors have thoroughly examined the vessel. On the basis of their report, it is estimated that it would cost not less than $800,000 and probably close to $1,000,000 and require 125 days to put this vessel into condition as a crude oil carrier, or $1,175,000 and 200 days to put the vessel into condition as a clear oil carrier. Lloyd Brasileiro has been unwilling to accept less than $900,000 for the vessel in its present condition. At this price, considering the extensive repairs required, I believe the diversion of manpower and materials from other necessary repair work or from new vessel construction would not be warranted. We are, however, continuing our efforts to get the vessel back into operation on some mutually acceptable basis. Indeed I have just made another offer which is under consideration by Lloyd Brasileiro at the moment.

I appreciate the opportunity you have given me to clarify the position of the War Shipping Administration with respect to the *Itamaraty*. If you desire any further information available to us about the vessel, I shall be very happy to supply it.

Sincerely,

E. S. LAND,
Administrator.

Freedom of Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1943

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, as an indication of what the American public is thinking today I am including in my remarks a brief letter which appeared in the Hollywood Citizen-News recently, and was also reprinted in the Los Angeles Times. The letter emphasizes the importance of freedom of enterprise which has been one of the great factors in building the United States. While wartime has necessarily greatly restricted the freedom of manufacturers and individuals throughout the Nation, yet it is most important that this freedom should be maintained in the country in the post-war period if our Nation is to remain a democracy.

The letter to which I refer follows:

To the EDITOR:

Thousands of manufacturers and other businessmen have already failed, due to war. Many more are quite likely to become war casualties, or approach the verge of failure, before the war ends.

It has been suggested that we add a fifth freedom to the other four: freedom of enterprise. With unhampered free enterprise what better form of social security could be devised than to extend long-term loans to businessmen after victory has been won. By such protected subsidies to thousands of businessmen instead of gifts to millions of individuals, the former would be in a position to employ the latter. Indeed their amortized loans should be based on this premise.

Surely a majority of taxpayers would welcome this plan, rather than have a rebirth of alphabetical control. Moreover, fighting men will desire real jobs, not makeshifts, when they return.

Paternalism of the past few years has been generally destructive of morale, if we except aid to the needy aged, who probably require more than they have received.

If we are to promote the building of character in the American way we should adopt a common-sense plan to perpetuate freedom of enterprise.

EDWARD C. WRIGHT.

No Compromise Is Possible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel of February 13, 1943:

NO COMPROMISE IS POSSIBLE

The suggested compromise of the President's $25,000 salary ceiling decree, to make it apply only to salaries fixed since Pearl Harbor, is an even more discriminatory measure than the original.

Mr. Roosevelt's order discriminated against all persons capable of earning more than an annual salary which would leave $25,000 after payment of Federal taxes.

The so-called compromise would discriminate between such persons.

The latter discrimination is more objectionable than the first.

It fixes an arbitrary date, before which the right of unrestricted income is assured to some people and after which the same right is denied to other people.

Inevitably this benefits older and established people, and discriminates against younger people without regard to merit or increasing earning power.

By this compromise, for instance, the old, established motion-picture stars could continue in the high-pay brackets while the rising young actors and actresses would be prevented from earning their just and adequate compensation.

The same rule would benefit the older, established executives in business and industry and discriminate against the rising young generation of executives.

Why should there be discrimination against the younger generation for this purpose?

Why, indeed, should there ever be discrimination in law for any purpose?

The Congress twice refused to authorize the salary ceiling measure when the President suggested it.

The Congress should adhere to its sound and just position on this issue.

It should not change its position merely to save the President's "face" and permit him to continue with socialistic experiments by putting the congressional seal of approval on the principle of salary limitation which the President ordered by decree after Congress originally and repeatedly refused to take such action.

Of course the President's decree limiting salaries was a frank and blatant social experiment.

It was an exercise of war power, but had nothing to do with the war.

It reduced rather than increased Federal revenues.

It compelled violation and abandonment of private contracts, made in good faith and with all expectation and intention to perform the duties called for and to compensate them as agreed.

It was a direct application of a socialistic device long advocated by the Communist Party for the acknowledged purpose of destroying the American system of free enterprise.

No American political party ever proposed such a device.

The Congress consistently and properly spurned it.

Why should there now be acceptance of it or compromise with it in any form?

The truth of the matter is that there is no such thing as compromise with the principle of salary limitation. If some of the people are subjected to salary limitation now all of the people ultimately will be. And if a salary ceiling of $25,000 is accepted now, what is to prevent further concessions to Communist objectives—to be attained of course through much lower ceilings, low enough to wipe out all free enterprise and individual incentive?

The Congress must stand resolutely against this socialistic experiment if it is to remain an American legislative body committed to the maintenance of American principles and American institutions.

Who's Robbing Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1943

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to extend my remarks, I am including the following letter written by Mr. G. G. Alexander of Van Buren, Ark., which was published in the Southwest Times-Record at Fort Smith, Ark., in the issue of February 7, 1943. This letter entitled "Who's Robbing Whom?" not only exposes some of the unfair tactics being used in an effort to discredit agriculture but shows the reaction of an intelligent, patriotic American to the type of assault referred to.

The letter is as follows:

I accompanied Mr. Floyd Cannady, Crawford County farm agent, to a Regional Farm Bureau meeting at Fort Smith last Friday. A membership drive is being conducted throughout the State to get new members for the Arkansas Farm Bureau. We have at the present time 25,000 members and want 42,000 by the end of the present drive. We have 600,000 members in the United States and we want 1,000,000.

A number of our farm families are Farm Bureau families. We would like to see all of them in this farm organization. It would not be possible to tell you in dollars and cents just how much good membership in this organization has brought you and you might not be able to say yourself. There are some things you can't figure on a dollar-and-cents basis.

And there is evidence that the farm people need to get together and pool their interests. It seems to some of us that since agriculture is the basic industry and all the people must, in one way or another, depend upon what the land produces for a living that farmers would not need to fight for fair treatment and for justice. The whole State of Arkansas is agricultural and depends principally on farming, fruit growing, and stock raising for a living. And farmers only ask a fair return on their labor and their investments in land and machinery.

But here comes a magazine with Nation-wide circulation carrying the picture of Edward O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau, underlined with the words something like this: "This is Edward O'Neal, who represents the farmers who are robbing the American people." Wouldn't that jar you? And even the Department of Agriculture at Washington seems more consumer-minded than farmer-minded, judging from the way the Department of Agriculture is being conducted. If this keeps on, we may need several champions like Edward O'Neal in Washington to keep the President, Congress, and the Department of Agriculture from killing the goose that lays the golden eggs.

That editor's remark was a gross injustice to Edward O'Neal and a libel on the farmers of America. That guy leaned back in his swivel chair and thought he had told his readers a fact when actually it was fiction and false. I bet that same man thinks cows have teeth in both jaws and that peanuts grow above ground on bushes.

A man in St. Louis thought that farmers were getting rich because he had to pay $2.60 for an 8-pound rooster. It looks that way, but brother, it just ain't that way. That was an Arkansas rooster and the farmer got 75 cents for him when he took him to the local poultry man. A truck picked him up and took him to Fort Smith where a truckload was taken to St. Louis and sold to the wholesaler, who sold to the retail trade and the retailer sold him to the consumer. What happens? The Department of Agriculture says "We must put a ceiling on farm products." The consumer is considered but the producer is ignored. In case of loss who loses? Not the retailer, not the wholesaler, not the trucker of chickens but the farmer. He bears the loss because he can bear anything. You see he is robbing the people.

Agriculture, industry, and organized labor have their problems. Of these three agriculture seems to be in the "dog house" but we do not intend to remain there indefinitely.

Computation of Overtime in the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1943

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "A Simplified Method of Computing Overtime in the Postal Service," a brief and concise explanation of Senate Joint Resolution 170, compiled by Albert F. Waite, legislative representative of Local 186, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Sioux City, Iowa:

To arrive at the correct conclusion in computing the amount of overtime pay received by the postal clerks, now that they get overtime pay (?), it becomes necessary to delve into the mysteries of higher mathematics, astronomy, hieroglyphics, sesquipedalian verbiage, and congressional thought.

Senate Joint Resolution 170 says we get time and a half overtime. Time and a half of what? We get, say $1.03 an hour straight time, but we also get 87 cents an hour overtime, which in itself is a problem for Solomon. Also we get 10 percent night differential, or about 94 cents an hour, or still less than straight time. So we ask how they guess at overtime, and we are told to take 360 as a basis. Why 360?

Well let's take 360. It is a good round number. It is the number of degrees in a perfect circle and forms the basis for a grand old runaround. It may also explain why folks in Washington have been going around in circles for, lo, these many years.

So we have our 360. Next take 8 and multiply. Eight is formed by putting one circle on top of another, so that makes three circles, signifying the three run-arounds or brush-offs the Postal Service has had in 3 years. So one circle times two circles is still nothing, which most of us suspect we still have.

However, scholars tell us that 360 times 8 equals 2,880. Now my numerologist tells me that 2,880 is also a mystic number. It represents the number of years ago the Jews were first mentioned in the Bible. It was the total number of votes Franklin Delano Roosevelt received in Maine; and it is exactly the number of apples necessary to make 72⅔ gallons of applesauce. Now we are getting somewhere, for we discover that .729 is the

answer obtained when 2,880 is divided into $2,100, so we arrive, finally, at the basis on which they compute our overtime; but it is still a lot of applesauce.

And now, so help me, in the new Seventy-eighth Congress, if good old JIM MEAD doesn't come out with a bill to give us a straight bonus, and the bill is numbered S. 360. I tell you there is something prophetic about that number, and a dollar to a pre-war doughnut we are going to get somewhere with it.

We request our good friends on the various Senate and House committees to give this S. 360 a lot of study. We ask that they report it on the floors of the Congress in as short a time as possible. We ask our congressional friends to boost it along to a favorable passage. Why? Thousands of men—good men—are leaving the service because they cannot make enough to support their families. We do not want this overtime bill, which we know was a stop-gap measure. Why penalize the Government? Overtime should be used when and where needed, and not for the purpose of allowing employees to earn more money to meet increased living costs without regard to the needs of the service.

The Food Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1943

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, the growing seriousness of the food situation throughout the country is crying more loudly for redress each day. Unless some definite program is adopted in the immediate future to solve the existing difficulties we may witness a complete break-down of the entire production and supply of foodstuffs throughout the Nation.

The difficulties which industry is meeting in its efforts to try to solve this problem are not lessened any by the refusal of the Office of Price Administration to in any way adjust or relax the existing regulations. So likewise the failure of the Department of Agriculture to bring about any coordinated program between itself and the O. P. A. only adds to the confusion.

As an indication of the difficulties of the present situation I am including in my remarks a copy of a letter which was written by Mr. Sam H. Greene, of the California Dairy Council, to Mr. E. W. Gaumnitz, of the Board of Economic Warfare, who is likewise a member of the Food Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Agriculture. This letter is indicative not only of the problem confronting dairy products, but also is typical of the meat problem and other commodities.

The letter is as follows:

CALIFORNIA DAIRY COUNCIL,
San Francisco, Calif., February 3, 1943.

Mr. E. W. GAUMNITZ,
Member, Board of Economic Warfare,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: I was glad to get your letter of January 22, written after you had seen my open letter to Secretary Wickard. Here are the answers to your two questions:

1. No response of any kind has been received.

2. I think it is possible for the industry to work out a comprehensive program but cannot predict that it will be done. Nevertheless, I shall make a very strong effort to do that very thing. Council will have a sort of executive meeting at the Biltmore Hotel Thursday and Friday, February 11 and 12, to which responsible leaders of all branches of the industry have been invited. Even before your letter arrived it was my intention to present the situation very much as you have described it.

Discussion: I feel confident that we are not getting anywhere by running to Washington for adjustment of problems in the piecemeal way our people have been going. One time a delegation of market-milk people take their troubles to Washington. Before they leave, another delegation arrives to talk about producers' difficulties. Then the evaporated milk people arrive, and so on. I can't see that we are making any progress in this way. However, the fault is not entirely that of the dairy industry. In my opinion, those in Washington who are responsible for planning the controls which we all recognize must obtain in times like the present are fully as much to blame.

To start with, I feel that the Government program is being administered under two conflicting philosophies. It is, of course, possible to have cheap (comparatively) food. It is also just as possible to have abundance. The point is, we cannot have both at the same time. Yet, we have Office of Price Administration operating under the cheap food philosophy and the Department of Agriculture working upon the theory of abundance. And they don't seem to get together.

Office of Price Administration puts a ceiling price on a commodity at the consumer level, apparently without realizing the effect of that ceiling upon production. Market milk is an example in point. Quite some time ago Office of Price Administration put a ceiling upon the retail price of market milk. No ceilings were put upon prices of hay or concentrates. There was a ceiling on farm labor wages but Secretary Wickard took it off and labor costs out here began to advance immediately. As I see the picture, higher prices are not needed to stimulate production but control and stabilization of all factors which affect prices are imperatively needed. If this does not occur, the people of this country may not have to pay much higher prices for their food than they are paying now but there will be progressively less of it at those prices.

Retail prices for milk, in California anyway, need not have advanced to their present level if adequate control of the labor and feed factors had been exercised at the time the first Office of Price Administration retail price ceiling was established. That was months ago and we are still without proper control of the two factors which constitute fully 85 percent of the cost of producing milk.

Within the week the director of the California Department of Agriculture has had to order milk distributors in the Los Angeles and San Diego markets to pay milk producers the equivalent of 1 cent per quart above the previous authorized producer price but Office of Price Administration refuses to raise the retail-price ceiling, notwithstanding that distributors' margins in California are regulated by the Bureau of Markets. In Imperial County the producer price was raised equal to 2 cents per quart with no adjustment of distributor prices there.

To summarize—if we have cheap food, there won't be much of it. If supplies are abundant, they will not be cheap. Suppose the aircraft and ship-building industries had been required to operate throughout 1942 under controls and directives comparable to those under which agriculture operated, plus a ceiling price which the Government would pay for ships and planes. What would have been the output of planes and ships? Who can explain how food production can be speeded up under a program which is in direct reverse to that under which production of planes and ships was speeded up?

Please do not interpret this as an argument for an ascending price spiral. It should be possible to determine fair-price levels and then put into operation controls of factors affecting cost of production. That would supply to producers all inducements necessary to increase their production.

There is one other thing, Ed, which I think is wrong—that is the practice of issuing a single order to be applied uniformly in the 48 States and the situation under which no discretion is allowed to regional and local area representatives of Federal agencies. Every least little thing must be referred to Washington for decision. That consumes much time and energy which can be much more usefully employed. Can it be that there are not 48 men in these United States with sufficient experience, judgment, and reliability to make decisions in accordance with varying conditions from the Nation-wide standpoint without going beyond the general over-all national program?

As long as these conditions prevail I do not believe we can settle down to the job of producing more and still more food and of processing and delivering that food in the most efficient and economical ways that can be devised.

I shall report to you promptly the result of our meeting in Los Angeles.

With all good wishes,

SAM H. GREENE,
Manager.

Vox Populi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mrs. E. E. Dunston, a war mother who lives in Los Angeles, Calif., which is entirely self-explanatory, and recommend its reading by all in the Government:

FEBRUARY 9, 1943.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HINSHAW: As a war mother and a loyal American, I hope there will be a thorough investigation of the lease-lend expenditures under Mr. Harry Hopkins. When we read that lipstick, rouge, rayon hose, and cotton sheets were among the articles used by Mr. Hopkins to buy the good will of African chiefs, it seems to us he has forgotten he is still not head of the Work Projects Administration. We are righteously indignant when we read this and then read that our boys in the South Pacific are still fighting against tremendous odds, and still the old story comes back of an enemy "five to one over us." Fulton Lewis said over the air nobody in Washington expected Vandegrift to hold Guadalcanal with the little he had to hold it with. Why didn't he have everything he needed? We've certainly spent enough billions; we are being taxed enough.

We read of the thousands of tanks and planes given Russia at the expense of our own men in the Pacific, and then Russia will not even give us bases from which to bomb Tokyo. If she won't help us now when she wants things from us, she certainly will not after she has made peace with Germany. Stalin's holding off from conferences with Churchill and Roosevelt shows that he has no notion of cooperation beyond the help we can give him. It indicates he will go his own way after the war.

But China would cooperate. I think it is a shame the way we are letting China down.

There is certainly a lot of mismanagement somewhere. At the stores they tell you there is not only no wool but that soon rayon will be off the market. Yet we read that lease-lend sent rayon hose to Africa. If people cannot have enough fuel, they should have warm clothes and heat-producing food. Yet the Government is cutting down on all three. We are told to economize, yet we are given nothing with which to economize. We are told to make our own clothes, yet we can no longer buy sewing machines, needles, nor, in many cases, cloth. We are told to repair things, and yet the materials and tools with which to repair have been taken out of production. We are told to raise victory gardens, yet they will furnish us neither enough seeds nor enough seed potatoes. The stores are putting in flower seeds instead of garden seed. You can't raise a family on petunias or eat carnations.

They tell us to eat vegetables to save meat. But vegetables must be seasoned (a) either with butter, (b) milk or cream, (c) or meat stock. All three are going off the market. We are told to use butter substitute, and even it is to be rationed—and send butter to people who never have eaten it. Why not send them the butter substitute?

We are told to make nourishing soups. But how can you have nourishing soups without milk, butter, or meat stock? We are told to save our skillet fats. But how do you get skillet fats without meat?

I think we need some good common sense in government. I hope this Congress will insist on that ingredient.

We have no sympathy with the grandiose plans for a super-super world Work Projects Administration after the war managed either by Mr. WALLACE or any of his school. We know who is expected to foot all the bills of such a project. Already we are seeing how impossible it is for a nation of 130,000,000 to provide food, clothing, and arms for some 600,000,000 people. We would come nearer doing it, of course, if we had wiser, more practical men at the head of our affairs, although even then it would be a physical impossibility.

We could wish, too, that so important a conference as Casablanca had been conducted less theatrically. It had too much the atmosphere of a Cecil de Mille premiere.

We depend on Congress to maintain a free people. Do not fail us.

Mrs. E. E. DUNSTON,
A War Mother.

Wainwright Shipbuilders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the J. A. Jones Construction Co., building ships at Panama City, puts out a weekly publicity paper and morale builder called the Wainwright Liberator.

It is excellently edited; and from its issue of January 16, which has come to my hands, I am glad to quote the following editorial which appears on its front page:

To Our Shipbuilders:

We are stealing time.

It is dishonest, because we are taking something that does not belong to us.

It is the property of something much larger than any individual, this shipyard and all of the shipyards.

It is a priceless asset of our country in a time of the greatest stress. It belongs to liberty and to freedom for which we fight. It belongs to the men in the armed services. It belongs to our women and children and to generations unborn.

We are stealing time every minute we absent ourselves from duty here in Wainwright Yard.

The minutes, the hours, and the days that we take off when we should be on the job cannot be lightly dismissed. One has no right to say, "If I take a day off it is all right. All I lose is a day's pay. I make enough to afford that."

With wages as they are too many can afford to lose a day's pay.

But there is a vast difference between losing pay and stealing time. One is shiftless. The other is dishonest.

None of us has the right to take time off at the expense of the man who is fighting, probably giving his life, so that in victory and peace we may take time off, and honestly, to do with as we please.

But as he fights now our soldiers and sailors expect us to work. If he quits fighting, unless he is a casualty, he faces a firing squad. It is going to be right hard for him to understand—and for you to explain—that all you get is a loss in pay.

It is his time that you are stealing, not yours. It belongs to everything that we in America hold dear.

It does not matter that our record for lost time is better than some yards except to enable us to say that we are not as bad as the other fellow.

We are real people, real Americans here as we realize the gravity of what we do when we steal the time that belongs to our country, to freedom, and to the brave people who are giving their lives for it, no man or woman who is physically able to work will stay away.

H. V. APPEN,
General Manager.

Mr. Speaker, these patriotic remarks are pertinent; they should be engraved upon the hearts of every person working there, from the highest to the lowest.

The Cruiser "Pensacola"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the Members of Congress the great work done by the cruiser *Pensacola*, participant in every major action during the first year of war in the Pacific. Named for Pensacola, Fla., the Annapolis of the air, the gallant deeds of the *Pensacola* are followed with keen interest throughout Florida and the Nation:

"PENSACOLA'S" TOUGH SPIRIT COMMENDED

(By Wendell Webb)

SAN FRANCISCO, February 10.—The workhorse of the Pacific—battered, proud, and game to the last inch of her plates—finally came into her due at Pearl Harbor yesterday.

She is the gallant cruiser *Pensacola*, participant in every major action of the entire first year of war in the west, on which I sailed as a war correspondent for thousands of miles to the Coral Sea and in the thick of the action in Midway.

She was singled out as symbolic of our Fleet's "unflagging spirit"—I rode her once when she was little more than a cargo ship, almost alone carrying desperately needed supplies to bases in the far southwest, yet the pride of her crew never wavered.

It was said, too, she carried on "without rest or overhaul"—she safeguarded the first convoy to Australia, stayed at sea months at a time in the most perilous waters of war, and roared defiance in the face of heavy punishment in the fourth battle of Savao last November 30, long after she was due for drydock and repair.

She was cited for "brilliant work"—I was on her when she tried desperately to work in close to the *Yorktown*, her guns blazing, to save that valiant carrier from destruction by aerial torpedoes at Midway.

Her respite finally came at Savao: "With fires so serious on board that her entire mainmast was a mass of flames, with one engine room flooded and her ammunition exploding, she saved herself to fight again."

The words are those of Vice Admiral William L. Calhoun, commander of service force, Pacific Fleet, in his address at Pearl Harbor, where 44 heroes—the *Pensacola's* and others—were cited yesterday for valor in action.

Three times Axis radios reported she had been sunk.

She was old, as combat ships go—12 years. She was crowded, and some said, outmoded. Her normal complement of men was far exceeded under the new needs of war. She needed many things.

But there can't be built into a ship the elements that made up the *Pensacola*. Officers and crew like that are born. I've seen some of them reading Bibles in the shade of 8-inch guns in the hell-hot Tropics; others knocking down flying fish with frying pans for extra bits of food; still others writing, drawing, painting, and arguing in the precious off-watch hours—and then break into thunderous cheers when the call to action sent them pell-mell to their posts of battle.

To an officer and to a man they rate with the tops in the Navy at sea.

In the wardroom of that ship is a great chart of the Pacific. In it are pins, one color for bases held by the Japanese, and another color for Allied posts.

I shall never forget the sadness of that shipboard that night of last May 6 when the pin for Corregidor was changed. I can think of no higher honor than to be on that ship when that pin and others once more are put in place.

The Real Silver Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, there is

inserted herewith a radio broadcast which was delivered over station KHQ entitled "The Real Silver Scandal":

My friends of the air, in taking a few moments to present the facts concerning the Government's purchase and use of silver as money in contradiction of the many misleading statements appearing in some of the most influential and widely circulated publications in this country, I am reminded of the old saying that "no man is so blind as the man that won't see." Every citizen in this country has a vital interest in silver and its use in the national currency system. Congress in an effort to strengthen and stabilize the value of our money and restore prosperous business conditions throughout the country has enacted legislation that provided for the additional use of silver in our currency system. The facts concerning the purchase and use of silver by the Government is public information and these facts are available to anyone that will take the pains to obtain the daily financial statement of the United States Treasury and copies of the Treasury's circulation statement of United States money and the monthly bulletin of the Treasury. These reports come to the desks of the Congressmen and Senators regularly and go out to the banks and financial institutions throughout the country.

Ever since the Silver Purchase Act was passed and the Government started buying silver and putting silver money in circulation there has been a determined fight by certain interests to secure the repeal of this legislation and the retirement of our silver money.

The war emergency is being seized upon by these opponents of silver now augmented by other selfish interests as an excuse to return to their attack on this monetary program of the Government with greater fury than ever.

There appears to be a well-financed campaign directed to first securing the repeal of all laws authorizing the purchase and use of silver as money and then the retirement of all forms of dollar-silver currency in circulation and replacing it with irredeemable paper Federal Reserve bank-note currency. In the long and sustained campaign of misstatement and misrepresentation waged by the opponents of silver and publicized through the medium of the press, there appears two recent articles in publications of nation-wide circulation in which the assault on silver is renewed, and the Senators of our Western States are accused of obstructing our war effort. It is even charged that there is a silver scandal.

My friends, every one of us should be interested in the facts concerning an issue so vital to the welfare of our country.

Contrary to what the opponents of silver would have us believe the Treasury reports show that the Government has actually made a profit on the silver it has bought, revalued and placed in circulation as money amounting to $816,900,000, and if the balance of the silver the Treasury has bought and has on hand was used for money the Government would make another profit of $1,019,000,000, see Silver Seigniorage tables, page 78, September Treasury Bulletin.

We know that the American people are in desperate need of money to finance the war and at the same time to furnish our allies around the world in their urgent need with food and war materials in their fight to bring the war to an early and successful conclusion. We know that in making our sacrifice to win the war we are shouldering an unbearable interest load and willingly accepting ever-increasing taxes that consume our substance—and while we are willingly doing all this, we know our Government has on hand, paid for and ready to use, the money equivalent of $1,700,000,000 in money metal ready and authorized by law to be converted into money and put into circulation without further expense other than engraving the necessary silver certificates—money that can be used in paying Government expenses and to supply the currency needs of business.

We know that while the Nation has been and is losing the use of this interest-free money, the Federal Reserve banks have been permitted to inflate the currency by issuing and lending into circulation the record-breaking amount of $2,500,000,000—to be exact, on April 1 there was $9,056,131,060 Federal notes in circulation which had been inflated by issuing an additional $2,596,432,600 new money in the last 7 months to make the grand total of Federal Reserve notes outstanding on November 1 of $11,652,563,660—Treasury circulation statement March 31–October 31.

My friends, there is a silver scandal, a scandal of a different kind than these money despoilers would have us believe. It is a scandal that 65 economists, the supposed leaders of financial thought and education in this country, would stoop to be a party to such deception to further the interest-collecting schemes of financiers against a people already overburdened with an intolerable interest and tax load.

When we come to analyze the silver situation and the effect of the Government silver-purchase program we find that under the mandatory provisions of existing law the Treasury has bought large quantities of silver at a profit and balanced its books by putting half of this silver, amounting to almost $2,000,000,000, into circulation as money in paying Government expenses, money that flowed into the channels of trade and business to supply a part of the money needs of the country.

The other half of the Government silver, amounting to 1,320,474,530.4 ounces with a dollar value of $1,707,281,135.24 (Treasury statement, November 4), has been left idle and unused because the mandatory provisions of the law simply provided that—

"The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to issue silver certificates in such denominations as he may from time to time prescribe in a face amount not less than the cost of all silver purchased under the authority of section 3, and such certificates shall be placed in actual circulation."

The Secretary of the Treasury has repeatedly stated there was nothing in the law that prevented the use of this second half of the Government's silver as money in the same way the first half was used.—Senate Silver Committee hearing, page 677, paragraph 9.

While this money metal, paid for and ready for use, without cost to the taxpayer, has been forced into a slacker position through influences that we are unable to fathom, the shortage of critical war metals in this country where the bulk of the world's silver is in reserve—we do not hear anything about the need of silver for the war industries of our allies who are bearing the brunt of the war and manufacturing far more war equipment than we are—has presented these would-be despoilers of the people's money with a grand opportunity to renew their attack and accomplish their questionable purpose in a plan advocated by a leading Washington newspaper, always hostile to silver, when it said in an editorial:

"Now, if ever, the silver bloc should prove vulnerable to assault."

The results of this attack were immediate and planned to be devastating on the Congress. The assault on the western Senators impugning their motives was spread through the columns of some of the most widely circulated publications in the Nation by the selfsame propagandists that have been flooding the mails of the Members of the House and the Senators continuously with misleading propaganda against silver. Even before the silver legislation was enacted, now with the shortage of critical metal in the war emergency as an excuse they pounce upon silver again calling it a slacker metal in a renewed effort to carry their point and drive the Congress to repeal the Silver Purchase Act, when in fact the Secretary of the Treasury with the sanction of the western Senators has made available all the unobligated silver the Government owns amounting to 46,000 tons for the use of our war industries in an agreement reached April 8 with the War Production Board.

The first allocation of the 46,000 tons of this silver was made on May 6. The delivery of the first silver was started on June 29 and now 6 months after the silver was allocated—November 11—the war industries have been able to take delivery of only 14,000 tons.

All the needs of silver for consumptive use of the war industry are being more than taken care of by the allocation of foreign silver being imported into the country at the present rate of 100,000,000 ounces per year. The commercial users of silver are being permitted to buy our domestic silver at the statutory price of 71.11 cents per ounce which is not subject to priorities on allocation. The Office of Price Administration price regulation permits the purchaser to add the cost of freight to the price paid for silver which in many cases gives the commercial users of silver for industrial purposes an advantage over the Treasury which is deferring its purchases to these users.

This practical solution of the use of silver in our war industries has spoiled the plans promoted at such heavy expense by these self-seeking profiteers and their paid propagandists.

We are told in a recent article in an influential publication with Nation-wide circulation of the disastrous effect on poor China of doing the identical thing that these so-called economists are attempting to persuade us to do here. I quote from the article Silver Scandal, published in the October 31 issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

"It forced China off the silver standard and onto an incontrovertible paper currency—a 'managed' paper currency which is exacting terrible penalties from her in the form of fantastic high prices for commodities and services at the very time she is fighting for her life against Japan."

What a deadly parallel our patriotic economist brings to us in his disinterested effort to trap the American people into the use of fiat money by persuading them to dispose of their silver stocks held for the redemption of the only redeemable paper in existence in this country. Paper money that has been accepted in good faith by our citizens with implicit trust in their Government and its promise to redeem every dollar in silver certificates with silver dollars on demand.

In dealing with this attempt to discredit and discard our silver money let us remind these patriotic economists that silver money under the standard of bimetallism has built America. Every foot of territory in these continental United States was acquired by the Union when we were using silver as money—the Louisiana Purchase, the Florida Purchase, Texas, and California, the Gadsen Purchase, and Alaska. Silver money worked then and it is working now. Let these propagandists prove to us that there is anything wrong with it. The greatest era of development of any country in the world's history occurred in our own United States during the period when we used both gold and silver as money under a bimetallic standard.

Now we are engaged in a great war and the world must readjust itself to peace and international commerce when the war is over. Let us return and take up the program placed on our statute books by the wisdom and foresight of the statesmen who guided America through its greatest period of development. Let us place this sound financial basis under the political and business structure we must build when the war of liberation in which we are now engaged is won. Let us brush aside these carping critics with their selfish motives and carry forward the con-

structive program placed in our statutes and never repealed:

"SEC. 311. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts."

Bimetallism is the only plan that will ever give our country a sound monetary system and provide for a stable and workable international exchange.

Clamor Without Reasons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1943

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Rules Committee reported out a proposed amendment to the House rules establishing a separate committee on commercial aviation. The effect of this resolution would be to take jurisdiction of this subject from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which wrote the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and place it in an unknown and inexperienced committee in the middle of the war.

Another effect of the adoption of this resolution would be to destroy the unified legislative control of our interstate transportation agencies which has been established by this House through a consistent effort extending over 8 years.

This editorial was written by Wayne W. Parrish, who is the editor and publisher of one of the magazines most representative of aviation thought in America.

Formerly in favor of a separate committee, this magazine is convinced that such committee is not desirable at this time.

The editor particularly indicates the weakness of the arguments presented in the debate in the House in favor of such a committee:

Some of those who are working behind the scenes for such a committee never lifted a finger when the committee was badly needed a few years ago. Those who struggled through the hard and lean days of the late 1930's are now willing to let existing committees continue to carry the ball.

Especially the committee which now handles civil aviation.

It is further stated that so far as the air transport industry is concerned, the present committee is eminently satisfactory.

The editor points out that a special committee may be singled out as a target as fostering one transportation industry above all others and its work largely nullified as a result.

It is asserted that the speeches in the House in favor of a special committee were completely void of any real understanding of our big aviation problems.

The text of the editorial is as follows:

CLAMOR WITHOUT REASONS

The current debate in the House of Representatives on the proposed standing committee on civil aviation is an interesting commentary on the shifting sands of time. Four years ago almost every aeronautical organization, and quite a few companies and individual leaders in aviation, were on record strongly advocating standing committees in both the House and the Senate.

Today when no less than eight resolutions have been under consideration in the House, and the minority party has given a special push to the proposal, there is a rather astonishing lack of interest on the part of aviation. General feeling runs from complete opposition to indifference to mildly favorable support. Few are openly and actively endorsing the legislation.

Perhaps 3 days of debate in the House itself have given us the clues to this lack of interest. In all of the discussions on the floor the only clear-cut speeches made were by the opposition. The proponents seemed clear on only one thing and that was the need for the standing committee. But they failed to give reasons. At least they failed to give one-two-three reasons supported by solid facts and opinions why there should be a standing committee solely for civil aviation. There was a lot of talk, a great deal of generalization on and off the subject, but no real basic presentation.

Perhaps subsequent debate will bring out some strong points, but in the early stages the chairmen of three committees opposing the creation of the new civil aviation committee made their pleas stand up quite well. There was shrewd, canny, and politically wise CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of Naval Affairs. There was ANDREW J. MAY, Kentucky, chairman of Military Affairs, and there was CLARENCE LEA, California, the able, experienced, and powerful chairman of the important Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, who engineered the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 through the House. These men are against a new committee devoted to civil aviation, and whether or not their reasons are sound, they made a much stronger case than those favoring the resolution.

Several years ago in these columns we strongly advocated a standing committee on civil aviation. Today we aren't as anxious to express an opinion as we are to point out the changing tides of aviation. There is much to be said for a special committee to handle aviation problems, but the time may have passed for this. Some of those who are working behind the scenes for such a committee never lifted a finger when the committee was badly needed a few years ago. Those who struggled through the hard and lean days of the late thirties are now willing to let existing committees continue to carry the ball, especially Mr. LEA's committee which now handles civil aviation.

As far as the air-transport industry is concerned, Mr. LEA's committee seems to be eminently satisfactory for the majority. The railroads and bus lines have no special committees in Congress. Why should air lines? It is possible that a special aviation committee would be singled out as a target, as fostering one transportation industry above all others, and its work largely nullified as a result.

Military and naval aviation will always be handled by military and naval affairs committees. As for civil aviation itself, embracing nonscheduled flying, one begins to question whether a full committee would be desirable in the end, for the future of nonscheduled aviation may largely depend upon its being left alone with a minimum of regulation and handling. There is no committee in Congress for automobiles or pleasure boats.

Only in the field of international air policy is there need for definitive action, but here again one may question whether the basic job belongs to a special committee of Congress. If the debate in the House in January is any criterion, our international air relationships will not be helped by opening up all of our national reactions to the world in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The speeches in the House were completely void of any real understanding of our big aviation problems. Much loose talk found its way into print. More than one Congressman who spoke in favor of the committee revealed his utter lack of knowledge of the subject he was trying to talk about.

There are some good arguments for a standing committee on civil aviation. But judging from the House debate, we'll feel much more secure in knowing that aviation problems will continue to be handled by various existing committees as in the past. Until there are enough men in Congress who really know what they're talking about when they discuss aviation, and until they can present solid constructive arguments in favor of a committee, our interest, and the interest of a large phase of aviation, remains very passive. Perhaps it's just a matter of being too late to set up an aviation committee. We needed a committee 5 years ago. We're not so sure we need one now—at least not until we hear some sound reasons expressed in the House.

Work of the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the work of the United States Maritime Commission in the production of ships has been nothing less than amazing. Mistakes have been made and only the Omnipotent and Omniscient could have avoided mistakes. There has been waste, as there has been waste in every branch of the Government. War is waste, and the compelling need for immediate action must bring waste. Comparison with previous records shows a marvelous situation. In the last war we did not reach our peak until 10 months after the armistice. In September 1919, 814,886 deadweight tons of ships of all types—steel, wood, concrete, and composite—were delivered. That was the peak then. Very few, if any, ships were completed in time for war service.

What is the situation now? We have smashed all world records, and we have not yet reached our peak. We are now 400,000 tons per month ahead of our

highest record established in 1919. Today our ships are 30 to 40 percent larger than the ships that were built during the previous World War.

During the last war average deliveries took about 7 months per ship. During December 1942, a record number of Liberty ships, 82, was delivered, and the average time per ship from keel laying to delivery was only 55 days. Compare this with the record for completion as late as January 1942, the first month after Pearl Harbor, when three Liberty ships were completed. They required then about 241 days each.

The record for December 1942 was marvelous. We placed in service 121 ships of 1,199,300 deadweight tons, which exceeded the best previous month's record, which was September 1942, when there were placed in service 93 ships of 1,016,112 deadweight tons. Contrast this with the year 1941, when for the entire year only 95 ships of 1,088,000 tons were completed, or in other words less than in the month of December 1942. The result is that in the space of 1 year, construction of ships was increased more than 700 percent.

In 1942 American shipbuilders completed a prodigious job. All world records were broken and there were placed in service 746 ships, which included 542 Liberty ships, 62 tankers, 62 of the Commission's long-range standard C types, 55 cargo ships for the British, 5 coastal freighters, 5 ore carriers, and 15 special type ships.

In a statement issued by the Chairman of the Commission and the War Shipping Administrator, he said:

> Every world record for merchant ship construction was broken in 1942. At no time in history, not even during the peak of the great shipbuilding program of the last war, when 5,500,000 tons were delivered in 12 months has any country ever built as much merchant tonnage in a single year.

That statement of Admiral Land cannot be challenged. These facts constitute a monument of patriotic and loyal service which no amount of criticism or accumulation of mistakes can ever mar or destroy.

In addition to that record the details of which I hope to insert in the RECORD, there were built many other smaller ships of special type and class, about 800 as I recall, which are not included in the total of 746 ships mentioned above.

When our original goal of 8,000,000 deadweight tons of shipping was set for 1942, I believed it unattainable, for that meant 8,000,000 deadweight tons of merchant shipping, and our largest and most experienced existing shipbuilding plants were diverted from merchant construction to naval construction. The Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., in my own district, one of the largest construction yards in the world, repeated the experience of service in the previous World War, when its facilities were turned over entirely to naval construction. Not only did the Commission face the task of building an unparalleled number of ships but also of creating the facilities for building those ships with builders and workers who were inexperienced and unskilled. Never in American history has the American spirit manifested itself more courageously, more loyally, and more devotedly than did those men who planned and built those ships.

They achieved the unbelievable. They surpassed the goal of 8,000,000 tons and turned out in 1942, 746 ships, aggregating 8,090,800 deadweight tons, and in addition the vessels of smaller or special type which I have mentioned. This splendid achievement was not performed in any one geographical section of this Nation. The west coast built 368 vessels of 3,888,400 tons, or 48.06 percent, of the national tonnage total; east coast, 272 ships, 3,089,500 tons, 38.18 percent; Gulf coast, 97 ships, 1,010,400 tons, 12.48 percent; and Great Lakes, 9 ships, 102,500 tons, 1.27 percent.

There have been notable performances, such as 7 days in a special demonstration job to illustrate what could be accomplished through prefabrication, yet the Commission has been more interested in attaining a general reduction in the building time for all yards.

The progress made on Liberty ships has been one of the most amazing aspects of the entire ship construction program. About 65 percent of our program has been devoted to this 10,500-ton carrier. It has been necessary to set up 18 yards to build the 1,500 Liberty ships contracted for 1942 and 1943. Practically all Liberty ship yards started from scratch and barren water fronts and swamps have been converted into plants employing thousands.

These builders, inexperienced and unskilled, have done an unparalleled job. The ships they have built are carrying men and munitions, lease-lend material of all kinds to all parts of the world. These ships are manned by heroes far beyond the reach of calumny and detraction. They have given to the cause of America hours exceeding all other groups. They have declared that the ships shall sail, and their one thought upon their return to safety is to face the supreme dangers of the sea that they may do their part in carrying their flag to victory. They have but one aim and that is to win the victory. They will win.

By way of illustration of what has been done let me call attention to the following facts:

Bethlehem-Fairfield and Oregon Shipbuilding yards each delivered 1 ship late in December 1941, but otherwise the Liberty yards did not come into production until 1942. They first had the task of building shops and shipways and housing workers. Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, Portland, Oreg., led the Nation in 1942 with the delivery of 113 Liberty ships representing 1,219,300 deadweight tons. Not far behind was the California Shipbuilding Corporation, Wilmington, Calif., with 109 Liberty ships of 1,175,900 deadweight tons.

On the east coast, Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., of Baltimore, Md., was the leading producer with 77 Liberty ships of 830,400 tons. This yard would have delivered over 100 ships also, but, as it was reaching its peak, a considerable portion of its facilities was diverted to a special type of construction for the armed services. The North Carolina Shipbuilding Co., of Wilmington, N. C., delivered 51 Liberty ships of 549,600 tons.

In the Gulf area Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, Houston, Tex., produced 32 Liberty ships of 345,300 tons; and Delta Shipbuilding Co., Inc., of New Orleans, constructed 28 Liberty ships of 302,200 tons.

Only some of the most productive have been mentioned, but the detailed statement which I append will show the details.

Of course, there is great interest in tankers. That construction also set records in 1942. The delivery was 62, and December set a new monthly high—10 tankers. The Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., of Chester, Pa., turned out 7 in December and was the leader in the tanker field with 41 ships of 673,400 tons. Bethlehem-Sparrows Point Shipyard, Inc., Sparrows Point, Md., delivered 13 of 197,400 tons.

All honor to the Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, the American shipbuilders, the workmen in these yards, and the personnel, licensed and unlicensed, upon the seas for the wonderful work of 1942. In the latter part of 1937, the Maritime Commission began its long-range building program which called for 50 new ships a year for 10 years. At that time there were but 10 yards with 46 shipways in the United States capable of building 400-foot ocean-going vessels. Much of that capacity was used by the Navy. Today the Maritime Commission's program is employing more than 60 yards with more than 300 ways for the construction of large merchant ships. This increase of more than 600 percent in our shipbuilding capacity would not have been possible if the ground work had not been laid. The Congress worked well when in 1936 it enacted the Merchant Marine Act which made this possible. We were wiser than we thought.

In working out the distribution of work throughout the Nation, the Maritime Commission wisely considered the heavy concentration in such large yards as Hog Island in the last war, which caused congestion. The Commission sought to avoid this, and adopted a policy of distributing construction geographically to concerns throughout the country. This was done long before the general acceptance of "spread the work" policy. In fact, it found its origin in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which provided certain differentials to aid construction on the west coast, so as to provide for construction there also. The result now is that the Commission has yards in 24 States on the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts and on the Great Lakes, while 1,200 factories in 32 States are producing materials for ships.

We face now a new task. We have surpassed the objective for 1942. Our effort for 1943 is to more than double what has been done. Will we reach that goal? I answer in the words of John Paul Jones, "We have just begun to fight." Yes, we will attain it.

January 1943 is the second month in which more than a million tons was added in 1 month to the fleet. Our figures

for January 1943 are 106 vessels, totaling 1,008,400 deadweight tons. The temporary decline in January from December's high of 121 ships aggregating 1,199,300 deadweight tons was attributed to shortages of steel and of the higher type propulsion equipment, as well as severe weather conditions which affected production, particularly in the northern yards.

The average building time of Liberty ships was cut to 52.6 days in January as compared with 55 days in December, and this marks the thirteenth consecutive month that American shipbuilders have cut the building time of these vessels from keel laying to delivery. The three ships delivered a year ago in January 1942 averaged 241 days.

The work goes on. The work will go on until victory is won. In the race of competition between yards, seeing which can do the most to win this war, absenteeism will diminish. We have just begun to fight.

The production in 1943 exclusive of about 800 ships of smaller size and miscellaneous types was as follows:

Shipyard	Number of vessels	Type of vessel	Deadweight tons
Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., Mobile, Ala	18	Liberty	194,200
American Shipbuilding Co., Cleveland, Ohio	2	Ore carriers	36,800
Bath Iron Works, Bath, Maine	2	C-2 cargo	15,100
Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., Baltimore, Md	77	Liberty	830,400
	11	Special type	25,300
Bethlehem-Fore River Yard, Quincy, Mass	3	Tankers	45,400
	1	C-3	9,900
Bethlehem-Sparrows Point Shipyard, Inc., Sparrows Point, Md	13	Tankers	197,400
	3	P. and C	27,100
California Shipbuilding Corporation, Wilmington, Calif	109	Liberty	1,176,000
Consolidated Steel Corporation, Ltd., Wilmington, Calif	5	C-1 cargo	46,300
Delta Shipbuilding Co., Inc., New Orleans, La	28	Liberty	302,200
Federal Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Kearny, N. J	2	Tankers	33,800
	11	C-2 cargo	102,000
Great Lakes Engineering Works, River Rouge, Mich	3	Ore carriers	54,500
Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, Mobile, Ala	4	C-2 cargo	41,400
Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, Houston, Tex	32	Liberty	345,300
Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation, Pascagoula, Miss	5	C-3 cargo and P. and C	53,200
Kaiser Co., Inc.:			
Swan Island, Portland, Oreg	1	Tanker	16,600
Vancouver, Wash	2	Liberty	21,600
	4	Special type	9,200
Leathem D. Smith Shipbuilding Co., Sturgeon Bay, Wis	3	Coastal cargo	8,400
Marin Shipbuilding Division, W. A. Bechtel Co., Sausalito, Calif	5	Liberty	54,000
Moore Dry Dock Co., Oakland, Calif	3	C-2 cargo	20,100
North Carolina Shipbuilding Co., Wilmington, N. C	51	Liberty	549,600
Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, Portland, Oreg	113	do	1,219,400
Pacific Bridge Co., San Francisco, Calif	1	Coastal cargo	2,800
Pennsylvania Shipyards, Inc., Beaumont, Tex	10	C-1 cargo	74,100
Pusey & Jones Corporation, Wilmington, Del	5	do	37,500
Richmond No. 1 (formerly Todd-California), Richmond, Calif	25	British	252,500
	30	Liberty	323,800
Richmond No. 2, Richmond, Calif	63	do	679,400
Seattle-Tacoma Shipbuilding Corporation, Tacoma, Wash	3	C-3 cargo	27,000
South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation, South Portland, Maine	12	Liberty	129,500
Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa	41	Tankers	673,400
	6	C-2 cargo	57,200
Todd-Bath Iron Shipbuilding Corporation, South Portland, Maine	30	British	303,000
	2	Liberty	21,600
Walter Butler Shipbuilders, Inc., Superior, Wis	1	Coastal cargo	2,800
Welding Shipyards, Inc., Norfolk, Va	2	Tankers	31,300
Western Pipe & Steel Co., San Francisco, Calif	4	C-3 cargo	39,700
Total	746		8,090,800

The Grapes of the President's Wrath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GIFFORD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Basil Brewer, from the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times:

THE GRAPES OF THE PRESIDENT'S WRATH

On October 3, 1942, the President issued an Executive order reducing salaries of executives and others in the United States to a maximum of $25,000 after Federal taxes.

The order was issued under a bill which the President had demanded and which Congress had passed, "to prevent inflation."

Wages and salaries of all except the $25,000 class were frozen; that is, in general, and could not be increased over a September level.

No other salaries or wages except this $25,000 class were reduced by the Executive order.

In the same Executive order, employers were forbidden to reduce salaries or wages of any receiving less than $5,000 per year.

Harsh penalties were provided for violation of the order, and an attempt was made, by Executive decree, to deny the right of appeal to courts.

MYSTERY OF THE ORDER

It is now clear this strange and unusual order had no direct connection with inflation control.

It is known Congress included no such authority in the inflation bill.

Senator Brown, the President's representative in the Senate, stated the bill contained no such authority.

On four or more prior occasions, Senate and House had refused to grant the President similar power.

The order was not a revenue measure, for it will reduce the Federal income—perhaps by millions.

The order is unjust, discriminatory, probably unconstitutional.

Why was it issued?

THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

For a year or more, before the President had espoused the so-called $25,000-income limitation, this had been a plank of the Congress of Industrial Organizations platform.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations had borrowed the plank from the Communist Party, whose machinery Lewis had used in organizing the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

In the same platform of the Communist Party of 1928 was a demand for the abolition of the United States Senate and the United States Supreme Court.

From its Communist associations, past and present, the Congress of Industrial Organizations has taken much of its social and political philosophy.

It also has acquired, from Communist association, propaganda technique, political talent, and membership discipline.

All of these had made the Congress of Industrial Organizations a powerful ally, a difficult and dangerous foe, as the President and his advisers were quick to see.

It was no handicap, in the President's eyes, that the Congress of Industrial Organizations' democracy was a bit synthetic and tainted.

The President himself had been known on notable occasions to be opposed to taking the American Constitution "too literally."

Adoption of the Congress of Industrial Organizations' $25,000 limitation plank by the President and propagandizing it from on high was not lost on the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

It made good stuff for the leaders with the members, illustrating, among other things, their close relationship with the President.

Mrs. Roosevelt espoused the Congress of Industrial Organizations' limitation idea and added the weight of her propaganda to the movement.

During the long ordeal on the 1942 tax bill, Counsel Paul, of the Treasury, repeatedly urged the $25,000 income limitation.

About this time Attorney General Biddle made a remarkable statement to the effect, "This is a labor Government, and you might as well recognize it."

At that time we were at war, and the Government presumably represented all groups without discrimination or distinction.

It could not properly be called a labor Government, for the American Federation of Labor was not included.

So close had the relations of the President and the Congress of Industrial Organizations become by the time of the Congress of Industrial Organizations' Boston convention last year that almost every resolution adopted on political or war matters resounded with loyal hosannas "To our great leader, President Roosevelt."

THE CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS' TRADE

By midsummer the President was being catapulted into a situation of extreme gravity.

It was not entirely not of his own making, as history will record.

But it was to test the warmth and solidity of his newly cemented friendship with the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Because of the delay in needed freezing legislation, inflation was getting out of hand.

Responsibility, of course, was divided between President and Congress.

Congress, needled by farm constituents and bitter criticism of labor strikes from home, refused further farm price freezing until the President would take his hands off vetoing needed labor and wage legislation.

The President, anxious as always about his labor political fences, wouldn't give in to Congress.

Caught between runaway inflation threat, on the one hand, and the need for labor cooperation on wage freezing, plus the need for political support, particularly from the Congress of Industrial Organizations, on the other—

The President made a typically Roosevelt trade, or "meeting of the minds," as he would call it.

Labor, which meant the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the highly organized, efficiently organized group, which usually could "deliver" its membership, "would cooperate" on wage freezing, if the President would give it the salary limitation, the $25,000 plank from the Congress of Industrial Organizations platform.

That this was the agreement is substantially admitted by Economic Director Byrnes himself, in his 1942 Herald-Tribune Forum speech, in which he says the $25,000 limitation was necessary to secure labor's acceptance of wage freezing.

This seems to be clearly confirmed by a much overlooked statement in the President's message to Congress of September 7.

This was the speech in which the President demanded farm price freezing legislation from Congress, by a given date, with the threat of taking things into his own hands.

Only two points required legislation, according to the President, "an adequate tax program, and a law permitting the fixing of price ceilings on farm products at parity prices."

Number three of the President's seven-point program—"stabilize the remuneration received by individuals for their work," required no legislation, he said.

Obviously, agreement had then been reached with labor, the agreement which Byrnes said could not be made without $25,000 limitation of salaries.

Obviously "labor" here meant only the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

For the American Federation of Labor was opposed to the $25,000 limitation, President Green having declared against it in a Senate hearing.

THE SCREWS ON CONGRESS

The agreement with labor made, there could be no slip-up allowed.

Cooperation of labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, on wage freezing was at stake.

The President's prestige and support from labor was at stake.

But, more than these, here was the President's chance to put the screws on those he hated most, the big business leaders who had fought him and whom he had fought all the New Deal years.

Only Congress stood in the way; first the screws must be put on Congress.

If he failed, he still had a card, which he had referred to in his inflation message.

He could take matters in his own hands, in which case he said "when the war is won, the powers under which I act (those granted or not granted by Congress) will automatically revert to the people—to whom they belong."

But he much preferred, he said, to put the matter through Congress, the constitutional way.

But before the bill should be presented to Congress there must be pressure from the public—on Congress.

So the showmen of the administration got together—and a good show was planned.

On September 7, 1942, the Congress had heard from the President of impending disaster from inflation, of which they well knew.

But on the night of September 7 they were stunned to hear Congress was charged, point blank, by the President with being to blame for the impending disastrous inflation.

Moreover, the President was taking no chances. Congress was flatly told that, while the President preferred the constitutional process—

If the Congress didn't act within a dated time, he, the President, would act.

With devastating "logic," the President said if the country was being invaded, the country would expect him to act, law or no law.

That since American soldiers were fighting on every foreign front, it was equally important that he act with or without Congress.

The stunned Congress, threatened as had never before been done in history, went to work on the bill.

Congress didn't make the deadline; it did make many changes in the President's bill.

But there was one little clause which it didn't change—enough.

In a bill to freeze wages and farm prices "to prevent inflation" about which the President addressed the country, there was the following clause:

Section 4:

"*Provided*, That the President may * * * adjust (raise or lower) wages or salaries to the extent that he finds necessary in any case to correct gross inequities and also aid in the effective prosecution of the war."

Senator VANDENBERG and others smelled a mouse here.

VANDENBERG offered an amendment, which was carried, specifying that it should be understood the President should not use the authority of the bill for pet social reforms, such as the "$25,000 salary limitation" which the Senate had often refused to pass.

Senator Brown, the President's sponsor of the bill, accepted the amendment, at the same time assuring VANDENBERG the bill did not permit the salary limitation.

Senator Brown then said, cryptically—and here is one for the psychologist—"I will say to the Senator (VANDENBERG) that the representatives of the two large labor organizations agreed with the view in the committee" (that "$25,000 salary limitation" was not authorized).

The Congress of Industrial Organizations may here have been questioning whether or not the President could, under this clause, make good his promise on the $25,000 salary limitation.

But the President was in no such quandary, he was determined to act, as he said, whether or not he had the authority.

And the regulations may already have been prepared which would attempt to deny the courts to anyone disposed to question the legality of the President's order.

Both Senate and House, in reference to this clause, acted with certain naïveté, including Senator VANDENBERG's inconclusive amendment, possibly still somewhat shell-shocked by the President's attack.

Also, the purposes and intentions of both Senate and House being well known, and the President's representative's word given, both Houses should have been able to depend on that word.

But in less than 24 hours after the bill was passed, the rules and regulations evidently drawn in advance, the President issued the directive, including the "$25,000 salary reduction."

THE SCREWS ON THE EXECUTIVES

Having issued the salary order under the clause "to aid in the prosecution of the war had lost no time in putting the screws on the and to correct gross inequities," the President business executives and other large salary recipients.

There is a principle of law older than America which says the law must be clear—that the accused may know what he has done which is charged to be unlawful.

In the President's order, and in the Treasury regulations which followed, it is impossible for an employer to know what salary he may legally pay, or what the employee may legally receive, under the "$25,000 salary reduction" rules.

The order restricts the salary, after Federal taxes and without any further credits, to $25,000.

But there is a clause in both the order and the Treasury regulations which permit an employer to pay, and an employee to receive, additional amounts "to prevent undue hardship."

It is this hardship clause, and the regulations which follow, which really put the screws to the business executives of the country who are affected by the President's order.

Additional sums may be allowed the executive, under the regulations, for the following purposes:

Charitable contributions "under certain circumstances," insurance premiums, fixed obligations, and Federal taxes of previous year.

But in every case, the order says, the executive "must establish to the satisfaction of the Commissioner (of Internal Revenue) that, after resorting to other income from all sources (other than salary), he is unable, without the disposing of assets at substantial financial loss, resulting in 'undue hardship,' to meet the above obligations."

In other words, the higher salaried executive, under the President's order, may be compelled to discontinue his charities, default on his debts and Federal taxes, default on life insurance premiums, or become a supplicant at the desk of the Commissioner, pleading for additional salary to "prevent undue hardship."

This is putting the hard in hardship.

This is the complete control of big business in America which the New Deal has been reaching for for years.

It controls by controlling the body and soul of the leading business executives—by the cat-and-mouse operation of the so-called hardship clauses of the salary-reduction order.

No wonder the President and the Congress of Industrial Organizations wanted this salary-reduction order.

No wonder he demanded it, though it had no relation to inflation.

No wonder he wanted the order, though it reduced Federal income tax receipts.

No wonder he would act, even though Congress did not.

But this was not all, nor even the worst.

An attempt was made, and still stands, to deny the right of appeal to the courts.

With the President's approval, the Director issued the following order:

"Any determination of the Commissioner is final, and not subject to review by the tax court of the United States or by any court in any civil proceedings."

This was modified, inconclusively, in a provision which permits appeal to courts on question of law, but on finding of fact the Commissioner's discretion and order still is final.

The executives thus so unfairly and unlawfully attacked by the President include many on whom the country must depend to produce the weapons to win this total war.

VETERANS—OF CLASS WARFARE

A profound and tragic circumstance is that this war of survival was projected upon America on the heels of 10 years of class warfare.

There can be no question of the President's sincerity or loyalty in the war effort, nor of that of his official family.

But many of the President's official family, and to some extent the President himself, are veterans of class warfare.

The methods and technique of class warfare do not fit—the hates and prejudices carried over do not belong—in the total war America now faces.

More than all else combined, this explains the confusion of the public mind in the war today, and the vulnerability of the public mind to attack of the enemy, without and within.

Tainted with nazi-ism and communism, where it flowered, class warfare is based on the thesis that most people are fools or of low mentality.

The American people, trained in 150 years of popular government, are neither ignorant nor fools.

It is doubtful if the New Deal class-warfare program ever deeply impressed more than a small minority of the American people.

With sons and daughters on every front, and casualties mounting, the people are in deadly earnest in the war.

The familiar class warfare appeal leaves them disturbed and shocked.

Missing generally in the propaganda of the administration is the thing which always has sustained America at war, a deeply spiritual note.

It is fair to say the American people, with sons dying on all fronts, ache more for frankness and honesty from Washington than for anything—or for all else.

The real American people today at war would trade 100 administration attacks on wealth and business for 1 deeply spiritual speech like Lincoln's at Gettysburg, or a heartfelt prayer such as Washington's at Valley Forge.

And don't let it be said the American people confuse either one of these, Lincoln at Gettysburg or Washington at Valley Forge—with Vice President WALLACE's quart of milk for all humanity—or even the four freedoms.

It should be said, in brutal frankness, the absence of the spiritual note in the New Deal and class warfare propaganda is no coincidence.

In the Nazi and communistic soil from which it sprung, there is no place for religion—it is in the way.

"JUSTICE" BY JUSTICE BYRNES

There is a line of thought in Washington that former Justice Byrnes was drafted from his new Supreme Court seat, with the idea he could get along with, handle Congress better.

This may well be, for the new Economic Director, who has charge, among other things, of the salary reduction order, undoubtedly is personable and popular.

Such would be the type of man selected for such a task.

But Byrnes' selection does not change the character of the sorry task the President handed him.

Nor does Byrnes' action add to his luster as a justice.

As Supreme Court Justice, Byrnes added his voice and vote to the newer tendency of the court to construe the law according to the way Congress intended the law to be construed.

It was under this legal thesis that Byrnes voted with the union and against the Government in the racketeering case of the United States Government against Local 807 of International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

This meant Justice Byrnes voted that Congress had not meant to include the truckers or other unions in the punishment for racketeering in interstate commerce.

But, in his first act as administrator, he approved the salary reduction scheme of the President though he knew both Senate and House had not intended to approve it—had in fact many times refused.

In the same administrative act, Byrnes declared no decisions on the salary reduction order could be appealed to any court, not even to the tax court.

Later this was amended to permit limited appeal to courts on law only, not on the facts.

Byrnes also, of course, issued the cat-and-mouse provisions of the so-called hardship cases, which are so drawn as only the stoutest executive heart would resist.

Seldom has an executive administrator, even under the present administration, attempted to construe the provisions of a bill, contrary to the will of Congress, as Byrnes did in the salary regulations.

Seldom, if ever, has an administrator in any administration or in any democracy attempted to prevent appeal of a citizen to the courts by adding, in the regulations, a forbidding clause.

How slender was the excuse must be clear to the former Justice himself.

The excuse is that Congress must have intended the Administrator to forbid appeal to courts in the regulations, because Congress had not forbidden it to be done.

EQUALITY OF SACRIFICE

In his defense of his salary-reduction order, the President has said it promotes greater equality of sacrifice.

Of course, there is no such thing in war or peace; this merely is a clever propaganda phrase.

In war, whoever looks for or is appealed to by equality of sacrifice is prepared neither mentally nor morally for any sacrifice.

The sacrifices of the American boys who died and are dying in the hell holes of the Solomon Islands, New Guinea, and north Africa cannot be equalized or mitigated.

God only can equalize the sacrifices of war, and only He in His own way.

The surest reward for those who go, and those who shall return, is to retain—not to destroy—the principles of democracy, which have made America great and for which we and they fight.

The President's salary reduction order violates every fundamental principle of democratic government.

A SACRIFICE FOR THE PRESIDENT

The President has made great sacrifices in the war.

He might well make for himself, and for the country at war, one more, perhaps a very great sacrifice—

Forget his prejudices and hates, of class warfare days—exorcise himself of his genius as a class warfare propagandist—

Remove from important posts in the country's war effort those veterans of his class warfare, who are falling down on the job and confusing and frustrating the American people.

The President has said we must arrange that the soldiers who return from war must have jobs.

That is important, and it must be done if humanly possible.

But it would be a sad hoax for the returned soldier, if through a destroyed or doctored democracy, the soldier returned to a W. P. A. job—

If he returned just in time to attend the funeral or survey the bones of Horatio Alger.

Only the United States of America has an Horatio Alger—

Fabled but real symbol—that from poverty—through honesty, intelligence, and hard work, American youth may forever find opportunity and reward—limited only by themselves.

An Investigation To Help Win the War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Des Moines Register of January 28, 1943:

AN INVESTIGATION TO HELP WIN THE WAR?

We see that some Senators who started clamoring awhile ago for a congressional investigation of the Lend-Lease Administration have now modified their attitude considerably.

After the Lend-Lease Office had issued a full report of its expenditures for military and other materials and had told where and to whom the stuff went, the original idea of refusing to provide adequate funds for the continued functioning of Lend-Lease evaporated.

That was bound to happen, for the lend-lease operations are so vital a part of the whole war effort that it would make no more sense to start choking down on them than it would to start choking down on the production of fighting planes.

One of the Senators who is anxious for the investigation to go on explains now that the purpose is constructive—that there is no intention of crippling lend-lease by refusal of appropriations, but that the purpose is to dig into the exact relationship of Harry Hopkins to the lend-lease operations.

Hopkins, it will be recalled, was once the head of Lend-Lease, and he retains a vague and probably a rather nominal relation to it.

Because of Hopkins' status as Presidential adviser and because of his several visits, on special assignments, to foreign countries, it is a fair guess that he still serves in some degree as a connecting link between the Lend-Lease Administration and the President.

The President obviously has to have intermediaries; he can't himself attend to everything directly.

But, whether this be good guessing or poor as to Hopkins' present thin relationship with Lend-Lease, it seems pretty obvious that what the Senator is after in his demand for continued probing is to find some way of turning the debate toward Hopkins rather than toward the vital nature of lend-lease operations and the "cleanness" with which they have been conducted.

So many people in the country have an antipathy for Hopkins that this might be politically advantageous.

That, at least, appears to be the theory.

In short, what is now proposed is that a congressional committee, consisting of men who certainly have no time to spare, should divert its energies from things calculated to help the war along and turn them to a fishing expedition in the hope of discrediting somebody or something by belaboring Harry.

We were going to wind up by saying resignedly that "boys will be boys." But then we thought of how magnificent boys are, on Guadalcanal and elsewhere, when a great challenge comes to them. So we guess we'll paraphrase the old saw to read, "Good haters will be good haters," and let it go at that.

New Deal Farm Muddling Cutting Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Louis Bromfield from the Washington Daily News of February 17, 1943:

NEW DEAL FARM MUDDLING CUTTING FOOD PRODUCTION

(By Louis Bromfield)

MALABAR FARM, LUCAS, OHIO, February 17.—We are witnessing an extraordinary spectacle—that of the richest nation in the world facing a catastrophic food shortage. Unfortunately, we are not only witnessing it; we are participating in it.

This senseless calamity, with all its grave repercussions upon the war effort and the future of the world, is happening in a country which is not only agriculturally one of the richest areas on the earth's surface but normally one of the best equipped with modern machinery.

Only a few days ago the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee said: "The question of food production has become desperate." It has become so largely because nothing whatever was done in the beginning, or at any time since, to make an adequate plan for food production. On the contrary, very nearly every possible handicap has been placed upon the production of more food and even of maintaining the normal supply.

And, until the situation became too grave and explosive to be concealed any longer, the public was not allowed to know how bad it was.

MISLEADING STATISTICS

The administration and the Secretary of Agriculture kept it concealed by issuing some misleading statistics and by not issuing other statistics, in the vain hope that "something would turn up" to save the situation—a policy practiced all too often in Washington by the administration and the bureaucrats.

Well, nothing has turned up. Not even last year's excellent crop season served to cancel out the stupidities, fumbling and neglect of those who should have known what was coming e"en before Pearl Harbor, and should have done something about it. So we face a food catastrophe.

The elements which have brought about this crisis are simple:

1. The situation was far more grave than the public has been allowed to know.

2. The Secretary of Agriculture, who was given charge of the food problem, has proved himself incompetent. He has taken no effective measures, and even at this late date he is offering no effective plan, but only absurdities such as $100,000,000 subsidies and dream armies of volunteer, ignorant and untrained women and children workers.

3. Nothing at all has been done to help the farmer over the three obstacles which prevent him, despite all the patriotism and goodwill in the world, from achieving maximum production. These are lack of skilled labor, lack of machinery, and lack of fertilizer and semiskilled labor.

LABOR QUITS FARMS

High industrial wages have drained away the skilled farm labor. The Army also continues to draft irreplaceable skilled labor, essential if the farmer is to produce food beyond his own immediate needs. Not only is nothing being done to help this farm labor crisis, but the Army's inroads are making conditions worse every day.

Machinery, regardless of Agriculture Department figures, is almost impossible to obtain. Even to get a spare nut or bolt a farmer must spend long hours of precious time filling out forms, traveling miles on irreplaceable rubber and then waiting weeks.

No nitrogen fertilizer is available, and other fertilizers have become more and more difficult to obtain.

Farmers want no part of Mr. Wickard's absurd $100,000,000 subsidy. What they want is labor, machinery, and fertilizer to do their job and produce honestly as much as they can. Certainly taxpayers do not want $100,000,000 more tossed into the already fantastic expenditures of a muddled campaign along the whole home front.

The dream army of 3,000,000 unskilled workers can be of practical use only in areas where there are "flash" crops of fruits and vegetables. Even there such an army is not too valuable; it will cause loss or damage to 10 percent to 20 percent of crops. To dairymen, poultrymen, livestock growers, and on farms with expensive machinery, temporary unskilled labor is of no value. What is vitally necessary is skilled, experienced labor available 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

MUST CUT PRODUCTION

Without that, hatcheries must cut production or close. So must poultrymen and dairymen, as many thousands already have. To talk of increased production under present conditions is nonsense, and it is criminal to go on deceiving the Nation's people with promises that more food will be produced this year than last.

The only official figures on the situation come from the Secretary of Agriculture, recently—Heaven knows why—made food czar, or in hand-outs by his press agents, or in statements to newspapermen who do not and cannot understand fundamental food production problems. There are, of course, the Secretary's periodical speeches, telling the American people that they must learn to do without, and the farmers, already working 16 hours a day under great handicaps, that they must work harder and put their women and children into the fields.

No figures are given out about the hundreds of thousands of acres of soybeans, potatoes, and corn still unharvested. None are given about the soybeans that cannot be marketed because the Secretary, when urging farmers to plant more last year, overlooked the fact that soybean processing plants are limited in capacity.

All one needs to do is to look out of a train window on any considerable journey through the Middle West to see hundreds of thousands of acres of corn, soybeans, and potatoes still unharvested because there is no labor.

WASTEFUL METHODS

These soybeans and potatoes will not be harvested now. They are finished. Much of the corn can only be hogged down by turning swine into the fields—a wasteful, uneconomic method of feeding.

Farmers must work and plan from 6 months to a year ahead. They cannot suddenly increase production in midseason. We lost 1942 on the food-production front, and now we have lost 1943 because no practical, sensible plan has been offered, but only mountains of questionnaires, drafting of skilled farm labor, and shortage of machinery.

It is insane to expect the farmer with unharvested crops still in the field to lay out large sums in midwinter on beginning a new crop which he has been given no hint of a valid assurance that he will have labor or machinery to harvest.

Slicing of Bread by Bakeries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to acquaint the membership of the House with the status of my efforts to induce the Food Distribution Administration of the Department of Agriculture to rescind that provision of its General Order No. 1 which, since January 18, has prohibited the slicing of bread at the bakeries.

My impression at the announcement of this provision was that it would inevitably result in waste and loss far greater than any savings which the responsible officials may have contemplated when the order was formulated. Accordingly, I undertook to examine all the facts available in the matter. The further I have gone into the matter, the more certain I am that my first impression is absolutely correct; the more sure I am that the prohibition against bread slicing at the bakeries is just another exercise in privation and hardship, devised by dictator-minded little men to condition the American people for total submission to bureaucratic government.

When Congress delegated to the Executive the extraordinary authority to make rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of the Price Control Act, it was intended that the most meticulous care would be used to avoid unnecessary burden or hardship upon the American people. Indeed it was intended that this power would not be used arbitrarily or short-sightedly, or for the selfish interests of any person or industry but for the common good and in furthering the war effort.

From my inquiries into the subject to date, I have compiled evidence which I believe is already sufficient to prove to this Congress that this particular provision is an improper and unwarranted use of the extraordinary authority granted to the Executive by Congress. I shall not, however, burden you with a documentation here, for I fully expect to secure further facts on important phases of the subject to support my contentions.

In the meantime, however, I hope all Members will interest themselves in the following outline of the case.

On February 5, I addressed a formal protest against the ban to Roy F. Hendrickson, Director of the Food Distribution Administration. Although I have not as yet received written reply or acknowledgment, I have, both before and since that date, talked personally on the subject with responsible administration officials, including Mr. Hendrickson and his superior, the Secretary of Agriculture. Early verbal reports from the administration indicated that the sole savings contemplated in the provision was in the waxed paper which is the common bread wrapper. Since then, it develops that the provision was intended as a gesture to the baking industry, the pious hope apparently being that the bakers would be able to scrimp out some little savings on packaging to compensate for the squeeze in which they find themselves between the advancing costs of raw materials on the one hand and a rigidly fixed ceiling on their sales prices on the other.

In conceiving the slicing ban and in imposing that provision of the general order the Food Distribution Administration has acted perfectly in the bureaucratic manner. Because no one will quarrel with a desire to conserve materials, I have been perfectly willing to accept the Administration's conclusion that paper and paraffin, the bread-wrapping materials, should be used more sparingly. I do object, however, to the arbitrary conclusion that the only way to cut down on wrapping materials is to cut out slicing. Why is it that in this

instance, as in thousands of others, the Administration acts arbitrarily? Why is it that the Administration invariably refuses to follow the perfectly natural and common-sense course of inviting the industries involved to work out material-saving methods? If we really must save, say half of the wrapping materials formerly used, why does not the Administration say to the bakers, the paper mills, and the packaging-machine builders, "We simply must reduce the amount of paper and wax heretofore used in bread wrapping. You may have just so many days to whip this problem."

Nothing so simple and reasonable apparently ever occurs to a bureaucrat, however. His mind works in a particular kind of a groove, from which he seldom, if ever, sees more than a fraction of any problem. The Administration in this instance, for example, apparently was unaware of, or indifferent to, the very real wastage of previous food values and the loss of even more precious manpower. The mechanical bread slicer is an almost ideal machine operation. The slicer is an integral part of the packaging machine which wraps the bread with an absolute minimum of human labor or attention. The baker even retrieves the crumbs from the slicer, which have a commercial value which almost exactly offsets the mechanical costs of the slicing.

Now the Administration arbitrarily would discard that ideal operation and substitute for it a laborious, occasionally dangerous, and generally unsanitary hand operation which demonstrably will waste millions of man-hours of time every day. I can prove to any reasonable person, also, that in the aggregate the order will bring about the waste of an impressive amount of valuable foodstuff.

My contentions may probably appear picayune to a person who thinks of this bread-slicing ban in terms of the trivial inconvenience and loss of time or food in the individual household. If they are unconcerned about the penny's worth of bread, or the 2 or 3 minutes' time lost in the individual kitchen, they may see the thing a little differently if they will multiply those items by some 30,000,000, the number of American homes. Or if they prefer, I am willing to assume that the aggregate time wasted in private homes could not, or would not, be otherwise profitably employed. Limiting the loss strictly to the thousands of restaurants, hotels, and institutions, however, there is definitely a serious wastage of manpower involved in hand slicing precisely at a time when we are so desperately short of this precious asset.

In the flood of waste and bungling, in the veritable tidal wave of bureaucratic rules, regulations, and directives, I am willing to admit that this one item is comparatively trivial. I would not, therefore, persuade anyone to lose sight of our large national problem of fighting our way back to sanity to follow in too great detail this or any other single item. However, unlawful and unnecessary bureaucratic directives, no matter how trivial they may seem, are actually steps toward autocracy and tyranny. If Congress is to serve as the guardian of freedom and the people's rights, we must remain constantly alert to and ready to challenge such unauthorized edicts. I do hope, therefore, that I may have enough of your interest and active assistance to force the withdrawal of this particular directive.

Ruml Pay-As-You-Go Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH MRUK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a letter from the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce on the Ruml pay-as-you-go tax plan. I personally favor the principal of pay-as-you-go plan:

BUFFALO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Buffalo, N. Y., February 15, 1943.

The Honorable JOSEPH MRUK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MRUK: I am writing to give you the views of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce on the proposals now before the Ways and Means Committee with regard to a pay-as-you-go plan for collection of Federal income taxes.

The chamber is definitely of the opinion that some method must be adopted to enable the present high income taxes to be paid as the income is earned. It is necessary if hardship to taxpayers is to be avoided and if the revenue needs of the Treasury are to be met.

Of the plans which thus far have been advanced, the chamber favors the principle of the so-called Ruml plan. With respect to that plan, the chamber desires to bring to your attention three specific points:

A. It strongly supports Mr. Ruml's position that in omitting the collection of taxes on 1 year's income, the omission should apply uniformly to all taxpayers. The alternative proposals, which have been heard from a variety of sources, that the collection of the taxes should be omitted only as to that part of a taxpayer's income falling within the lowest brackets is obvious class legislation and is so patently unjust that the proposal should not be seriously entertained.

B. The chamber favors supplementing the Ruml plan with a withholding tax to facilitate the collection of taxes on those incomes as to which withholding is feasible. The chamber is not unmindful that taxpayers are likely to regard withheld taxes as the equivalent of a cut in income rather than a tax on income, thus inviting demands for increased salaries and wages, which might seriously jeopardize the steps now being taken by the Government to prevent inflation. It is felt, however, that this is a risk which must be taken in the face of the paramount need of revenue to finance the war, and that some reliance must be placed upon the patriotism and common sense of taxpayers.

C. The chamber is of the opinion that Mr. Ruml's proposals for dealing with so-called windfall cases, or those cases where taxpayers have unusual and nonrecurring income in the year 1942, may be materially simplified. It would seem that substantial justice would be done to all taxpayers if they were obliged to file complete returns for both years 1942 and 1943, and be required to pay a tax upon that year's income which is the larger. This would accomplish Mr. Ruml's objective of advancing the tax clock by 1 year, thus placing all individual taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go basis, and, at the same time, would automatically take care of windfall cases.

We find it difficult to understand the Treasury's opposition to the principles of the Ruml plan. The opportunity of using the Ruml plan to derive greater revenues for the Treasury at an earlier point of time than would otherwise be the case, is so apparent to most careful students of the Ruml proposals that one would expect the Treasury's hearty approval, rather than its opposition.

The suggestion of the Treasury's General Counsel to the Ways and Means Committee that the Ruml plan invites inflation is too transparent to be given serious consideration. It must be clear to all observing persons that a negligible proportion of taxpayers have saved any part of their 1942 income to meet taxes payable in 1943. Furthermore, since the Treasury expects to take thirty-five or more billions of dollars from the American people in taxes in 1943, it is difficult to see how the fight against inflation is jeopardized merely because 1943 income is used as a measuring stick for the 1943 tax rather than 1942 income. The Treasury realizes no less in taxes.

Nor is any realist impressed with the Treasury's argument that the adoption of the Ruml plan will involve the Treasury in a loss of a $10,000,000,000 asset. This argument is sheer sophistry. The fact is that the Treasury's books are on a cash basis, and that taxes on 1942 income are not carried as an asset anywhere. The truth is that the Treasury expects to realize a certain number of billions of dollars from taxpayers during the year 1943. The realization of that expectation does not depend upon the taxation of 1942 income. The same amount of taxes and more can be as conveniently raised by using 1943 income as the tax yardstick.

Any attempt to draw an analogy between the financing of the Federal Government and a private business enterprise is wholly fallacious. The Federal Government can afford to forego using 1942 income as a yardstick for 1943 taxes, since through its constitutional power of taxation it is free to raise the same amount of income cut of 1943 income, or by imposing sales taxes, or some combination of taxes. A private business enterprise, on the other hand, by foregoing all accounts receivable for the year 1942, suffers a loss without any means of recoupment.

To the above observations, we desire to add one more having to do with the whole Internal Revenue Code. The Revenue Act of 1942 was the culmination of a trend over a great number of years toward a highly complex tax law. We feel the complications of the law have gotten out of hand. We are of the view that simplicity and clarity have become in themselves virtues which ought to be given consideration even at the expense of other factors. This is not to say that in these times a tax law may be as brief and as simple as it was 30 years ago. We do feel, however, that the English language still permits the drafting of revenue laws in terms which are free of ambiguity, and, at the same time, understandable to persons of normal intelligence.

We will appreciate your giving consideration to the views which we have expressed, and also be grateful to you if you will see that these views are transmitted to the proper member or members of the Ways and Means Committee and to Mr. Stamm's joint committee staff.

Very truly yours,

KARR PARKER,
President.

The $25,000 Salary Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Endicott (N. Y.) Bulletin:

THE $25,000 SALARY LIMIT

The House Ways and Means Committee, after receiving a communication from President Roosevelt, in which he asked that legislation to rescind his Executive order limiting salaries to $25,000 be delayed, has acquiesced to Mr. Roosevelt's request temporarily.

The President, in a letter to Chairman DOUGHTON, said that he would send the committee a full report on his reasons for wishing the present $25,000 salary limit to continue.

When wages and salaries were frozen in the country at their existing levels last fall, President Roosevelt went a step further and made $25,000 the top net salary that any citizen can receive.

He did this, knowing that such a proposal had been considered by Congress after he recommended it and shelved as contrary to the American way of life.

We have no special brief for the man who receives a salary of some $67,000 which, after taxes, leaves him $25,000, but we do maintain that anyone who earns $67,000 and has $25,000 left after taxes certainly deserves that portion of it.

Without the President's Executive order making this $25,000 limit effective, the man who receives a salary up into the thousands of dollars is taxed very, very heavily, as the tax on a $67,000 income indicates. The 1942 and previous income-tax laws passed by Congress see to that.

Mr. Roosevelt, however, despite opposition from Congress, decided that he knew better than the people's elected representatives, and proceeded to make this limit effective by Executive order.

Our position in the matter is this: No one in this country should have his earning power limited to any fixed amount, but, when large salaries are earned, the recipients should be made to pay large income taxes—proportionately much larger than those in lower income brackets. That by the way, is exactly what our income laws do today.

It is one thing to require a man to pay large income taxes by law and another to have the President order a salary limit under the guise of war.

If a corporation does not pay an executive more than $67,000 which gives him $25,000 net salary after taxes, it pays income taxes on whatever it might have paid the executive above this amount.

If the executive's salary is $100,000, then the executive himself pays the income tax above $67,000 instead of the company. What, we ask, is the net difference from the Government's point of view? The answer, if made fairly, obviously is none.

If Mr. Roosevelt feels a $25,000 net salary is the limit today, perhaps our next President or Mr. Roosevelt at a later date might decide that it should be half this amount. No, that definitely is not the American way.

Recapture of a large part of big salaries through taxation is fair enough, but to have salaries limited to any fixed amount by decree or even by law is nothing more than socialism.

We've always maintained anyone, from the most humble circumstances, could be President of these United States, and likewise that this same person could rise from humble circumstances to a position of wealth if he had the ability and the will to work that hard.

That is the true American way.

Your Federal Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Capt. William J. Pedrick, collector of internal revenue, second New York district, over station WOR, on Wednesday, February 3, 1943:

First of all, I want to extend my very grateful thanks to station WOR for making these next 15 minutes available to me so that I can have a chat with you regarding your Federal income-tax return.

Now, I am not going to enter upon any technical discussion with you as to the requirements of the law but I am going to answer the question most asked today, "Do I have to file an income-tax return?" I will tell you that every single person whose gross income for 1942 from all sources was $500 or more, or as much as $9.62 per week, must file a return. Widows, widowers, divorcees, and married persons separated by mutual consent are classified as single persons. A married person living with husband or wife throughout the year, if his or her gross income together with any income of the spouse, was as much as $1,200 a year, or $23.08 per week, must file a return. A joint return may be filed by husband and wife, if they so elect.

The tax may be paid in full at the time the return is filed or in four equal installments, but the first installment must be paid on or before March 15.

It is estimated that the present Revenue Act makes it possible for 52,000,000 individuals to share the tax burden this year, and this figure is a considerable increase over 1942. This statement in itself will bring home to everyone within the hearing of my voice tonight a realization of the gigantic task that faces the collectors of internal revenue throughout the United States and its territories.

It is mainly for that reason that I come before you tonight to make an appeal to you to determine as soon as possible, if you have not done so already, whether you must file a return. If you must file such a return, then I ask you to obtain the necessary income-tax blank from the collector in whose district you are employed or reside. Then, after you have obtained this form, acquaint yourself with the general instructions accompanying the form. If you need any other help or advice in connection with your return, we ask that you immediately consult your collector's office. You will find our office a helpful place to visit in connection with any of the problems that may be yours concerning your income-tax return.

Now, I want to stress the fact that the offices of the collectors of internal revenue are available for the use of every taxpayer. I want to stress the fact, too, that we collectors of internal revenue are not as bad as we have been painted. We are just as human as you are and we collectors and every member of our staffs have to pay income taxes, both Federal and State, just as you do, upon the income we receive. After all, taxes are nothing new in the world. From Colonial days, taxation has been of vital importance to our country, even as it is today.

The men and women who make up the staff of a collector's office have been thoroughly trained and form an organization that can furnish to the taxpayers any of the information and assistance they need in relation to the problems that are theirs concerning their Federal income taxes. What's more, the men and women who make up the staff of the collector's office have a full and complete realization of the problems that confront the taxpayers, particularly the taxpayers who will file for the first time this year. We urge those of you who will file a return and pay a tax for the first time this year to take advantage of my invitation and come to the collector's office, for we will help you in a friendly and solicitous way.

There is one thing that I want everyone to remember and that is that the funds necessary to finance the cost of the war and the cost of running the Government can be secured only in two ways—from the loan of our money to the Government through the purchase of War bonds and other securities, and from the outright payment of our funds to the Government in the form of taxes.

Now, I said before that the job of a collector of internal revenue is a gigantic one and particularly in these war days it is one of great responsibility. I am sure no one listening to me tonight will object if I tell you that in my district in New York City, which embraces the area from the Battery to Twenty-third Street, from the Hudson River to the East River, last year approximately 830,000 internal revenue returns were filed, an increase of about 29 percent over 1941. My office collected in all forms of governmental taxes and paid to the Treasury of the United States during 1942, $1,214,308,630.45, which represented an increase in collections of about 78.6 percent over 1941. It is anticipated this year that my office will have a 30-percent increase in internal revenue returns, which means that we will have filed in my office at the customhouse over 1,000,000 returns from individuals and corporations in 1943.

I am sure you will be interested when I tell you that this vast sum of money collected in my district, the second New York district, makes it the first billion-dollar-tax-collection district in the United States, and I want to take this occasion to pay public tribute to the men and women of my office who served their Government so well in the collection of this vast sum of money.

Therefore you can appreciate why tonight, in making this appeal with all the sincerity that I can command, I ask everyone in this hour of our Nation's peril to realize that it is not only vitally important but clearly patriotic that every person required by law to file an income-tax return and pay a tax perform that duty cheerfully, accurately, and before March 15 if possible. Remember, March 15 is the deadline when your return must be filed, and I am sure that when that date arrives no collector will find anyone who has not responded eagerly and willingly to the Government's requirements to finance the war to total victory.

All of us know that there is no person in the country who is not affected in one way or another by the war, by the successes or failures of our armed forces, by the hardships, adventures, and achievements of our loved ones in the armed forces, and by the economic measures of rationing and self-sacrifices necessary to make possible the success of our cause. I know, as we all know, that the cost of the war effort is placing upon the Nation the greatest financial burden in

its history, and this burden rests upon you, upon me, and upon the millions of citizens in our country. We know what the war has cost the United States since Pearl Harbor and we know that the cost thus far is more than the entire cost of our share in the First World War, which was less than $41,000,000,000. But sacrifices mean nothing to us when the security of our Nation is at stake and when the lives of our loved ones have been taken as the price that must be paid to secure victory.

I have a personal appreciation of the sorrow and changes that have come into so many homes during this war because I served my country as a member of the armed forces in the First World War. As collector of internal revenue now, I have an appreciation of the task that confronts my associates and myself in obtaining the funds from every taxpayer necessary to equip our armed forces to bring about, as our beloved Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, said, "an unconditional surrender" by our enemies.

So, these are the thoughts, ladies and gentlemen, that I want to leave uppermost in your minds tonight. You are now responding to a patriotic and urgent plea by our Government. Let's not worry ourselves with the sacrifices that we must make in order to pay our income taxes, but let us face the situation like the loyal, upright, red-blooded Americans that we all are.

With the complete realization that the offices of the collector of internal revenue for the Second New York District at the custom house will be taxed to the utmost, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the Honorable Guy T. Helvering, has authorized the opening by us of a branch office at 265 West Fourteenth Street, the northeast corner of Eighth Avenue. In addition, we are opening an annex across the way from the customhouse in the Produce Exchange Building, all for the purpose of making it possible through these additions to give every help and consideration to the taxpayers who will file their returns in the Second New York District, and reduce their inconvenience to a minimum.

In addition, deputies from our office and internal revenue agents are being assigned to the various banking institutions, insurance companies, and large business establishments throughout our district to offer every possible assistance to employers and their employees in connection with their income-tax returns. This efficient and well-informed group of deputies and agents has been schooled in the provisions of the income tax law and they will assist and instruct any and all taxpayers in the preparation of their returns. With such expert advice, every taxpayer will be assured of all the deductions, exemptions, and credits which the law permits.

Summing it all up, I want to say that everything possible is being done by the collectors of internal revenue not only in New York City but all over the United States and its Territories to help you to have a complete and sympathetic understanding of the present revenue act. In return, it is not asking too much of you to give us your cooperation by appreciating the enormous burdens that are placed upon us in enforcing the law. We ask you to help lighten our burden—

First. By filing your income-tax return and making payment of your tax in full or one-quarter thereof as soon before March 15 as is possible.

Second. If you have not as yet obtained your form, do so right now.

Third. Go to your collector's office for any assistance you need in the preparation of your return. Our office at the Customhouse or at Fourteenth Street and Eighth Avenue is ready to serve your needs in every possible way.

Fourth. Remember, the security of your country is at stake, the safety of your home and your loved ones is in peril. Win this war we must, no matter what sacrifice we are forced to make in order to accomplish that purpose.

Thank you, and good night.

Building for a Better America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts, minority leader of the House of Representatives, at the annual Lincoln Day dinner of the Republican Club of Allegheny County, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on Friday, February 12, 1943:

Whenever I come to Pittsburgh, this beehive of industry in one of the greatest industrial States in the Union, I always realize anew what our American way of life has done for the American people.

Your great factories, mills, and mines, your beautiful homes, your many fine churches and institutions of learning, all eloquently tell of the progress of an industrious and thrifty people. The American system of equal rights, equal opportunity, equal justice, free enterprise, and a fair deal to all, has made possible this marvelous expansion and progress.

We are fighting a great world war to preserve our freedom and our opportunities. We must be as ready to fight for these priceless blessings when they are threatened at home as we are to protect them from foreign foes.

There is no division in the resolute determination of our people to press this war vigorously to a successful conclusion. The American people demand, and we Republicans support the demand, that the war be fought efficiently and without regard to partisanship. This can be done only when we place in the key positions men and women selected because of their ability and merit, and not on the basis of personal or partisan favoritism.

While outstanding men of great ability who could aid tremendously in the war effort are forced to sit on the sidelines, appointments like that of Edward Flynn and the many "lame ducks" do not build public confidence nor create a patriotic fervor for the most determined war effort. Patriotism is based not only on love of country, but on confidence in government as well.

The most essential requirement for the successful prosecution of the war is good public morale. High morale exists only when there is absolute faith on the part of the people in the integrity and capacity of the managers of the war effort.

This is why we demand the most capable men and women be selected for the important posts, and the blunderers, and "court favorites" be relegated to the side lines.

Efficient prosecution of the war can shorten its duration and save thousands of brave Americans. The sooner we can win total victory the better chance we will have to save our way of life.

We Republicans join wholeheartedly and without reservation, of course, in the war against the Axis Powers. We are determined, as are all loyal Americans, to preserve our constitutional system of government and to restore legislative prerogatives to the Congress. We do not intend to permit our system of free private enterprise to be displaced by some form of socialistic economy. We do not intend to have our free representative Government dominated by scheming, self-seeking bureaucrats. We do not intend to permit them to ride roughshod over the American people.

We intend to restore control of the Government to the people and to curb this rapidly expanding bureaucracy by ending the reckless granting of blank checks. The people are dangerously close to losing their system of free government when a bureaucrat can put into effect, on his own initiative, regulations which Congress has turned down. This has happened frequently in recent months.

Congress pointedly refused to limit the salaries men and women could earn. This was not because of the limit of $25,000. Congress knew only a few persons wou'd be directly affected by that figure. But a vital principle of freedom is involved. If any bureaucrat can establish a $25,000 limit, there is nothing to prevent him going further and placing the limit at $5,000 or $2,500.

We cannot put a ceiling on the earning capacity of the individual without putting a ceiling on opportunity. We would stifle expansion and progress. We cannot destroy the fruits of special inventive and managerial ability without destroying the jobs they create for other people. The inescapable result would be the end of progress for all. If Government must take the greater portion of higher-bracket earnings, let it be done through the constitutional method of heavy taxation. Let us not destroy the priceless right of all poor and humble boys and girls—the opportunity to go forward.

Congress has turned down numerous projects only to find later that these projects have been built with blank-check funds. This is not only a defiance of the Congress, it is a direct blow against our constitutional form of government. If these power-mad bureaucrats can defy Congress and get away with it, we have traveled a long way on the road to dictatorship. We don't want that kind of a government—not even a benevolent dictatorship here in America.

The people should, and will, support the Congress in its determination to end the dangers of the blank-check appropriations. Our American system of government of checks and balances can be saved only by retaining in Congress the control of the public purse. That is the key to control by the people over their Government and their governors. Only by that control can our "government of the people, by the people, for the people" be protected and maintained.

We see all about us an arrogant bureaucracy, striving to build itself to unprecedented size and power by gnawing at the foundations of our free representative system of government. The size of our army of civilian employees is a shocking national scandal, and each day hundreds more are being added to the lists. Let's have a reducing diet for this bulging bureaucracy.

In Washington there are thousands of employees with almost nothing to do; and yet throughout the country, in all lines of business, there are constant appeals for more workers. Now, I know the rank and file of these employees are patriotic; they want to help their country. The trouble is with the bureau chiefs who keep creating unnecessary

jobs and needlessly enlarging their personnel in order to buttress their power, importance, permanency, and demands for more and bigger appropriations.

All over the country there is a steady expansion in the number of governmental employees. Each new agency thinks it must proceed at once to set up organizations which reach into every nook and cranny of this great land of ours. Even more unfortunately, they are staffed, in many instances, with New Deal politicians, who hold the power of life or death over many an industry and who can control the future of the individual citizen.

We fought and won the First World War with a civilian staff of 900,000. Today we have a civilian army of 3,000,000, and the list expands with every rising sun. The yeast of partisan politics is still making the dough for the New Deal favorites.

Shall we allow this system of tax, spend, and elect to continue? We have halted the elect part of the plan. Let us, with popular support, halt the destruction of a Nation from a top-heavy, extravagant, reckless bureaucracy. Let us, here at home, be true to our sacred obligation to the men and women in the armed forces—our obligation to protect within the free constitutional government, the free-enterprise economy, the free society, the Bill of Rights they are battling on the fighting lines to protect. The American people, with God's help, will keep that covenant.

The foundation of our republican form of government and our American way of life is free speech, free press, and, in these latter days, free radio. These free avenues of public information and intelligence are so essential the founding fathers of this great Republic placed them first in that great charter of human liberty, the Bill of Rights.

In a great war there must be, of course, some modification and adjustment of these inalienable rights. That adjustment must be fair, and it must be equal. We must not give any one individual or any one group an unfair advantage over others.

We must make certain that the need for censorship is not abused or carried to excess. The people who are guaranteed freedom under their Constitution are ready and willing to sacrifice temporarily some of their privileges to aid in winning the war. They do not want to have their devotion to the war effort used to deprive them of information they should have.

The people are entitled to have all the information possible about the war and the internal affairs of their country consistent with military necessity.

In their unshakable devotion to free speech and free press the people are deeply and properly suspicious of the motives of the bureaucrats in any action such as the suit instituted against the Associated Press. The people fear—and they have good reason to fear—that if the bureaucrats win it the triumph might well be a deadly blow to all our freedom. As the publisher of a small newspaper which has a wire service other than the Associated Press, I cannot agree with the monopoly plea of the Government, but I am concerned about the threat it brings to a free press.

The problem of taxation is tremendously difficult. High taxes are inevitable. The heavy costs of war, and the reckless waste of the last 10 years make it imperative that a large share of the workers' wages shall go to pay for governmental expenditures.

Taxes must be just and equitable; otherwise they become deadly dangerous. They must not be punitive, or used to confiscate the peoples' property. They must not destroy our system of private enterprise. We Republicans believe the emergency demands some pay-as-you-go system of tax collections.

On the foundation of an ever-expanding private enterprise system we can build more jobs and better jobs for the American people. And by building a better civilization here in America, we can contribute vastly more to making the world a better place to live in.

Now, a word about industrial conditions:

This is not a time for labor and capital, employees and employers to quarrel. Their interests are one. If capital is discouraged, employment becomes stagnant. If labor were crushed, the industrial system of America would fall, and capital would be unproductive.

Men and management are inseparable partners in productive enterprise. Together they have made America the arsenal of freedom. Both have rights and the rights of each must be respected. We uphold the right of labor to earn good wages, to have a reasonable workweek, and to share fairly in the prosperity of industry. We uphold the right of capital to reap a fair return on risk, investment, and skillful management. These rights are a fundamental part of our American system. They are an indispensable part of any successful system of human progress, spiritual and material.

The Government has a right to regulate and to prevent any force from exploiting the people. The Government must be ready to prevent any attempt by any segment of capital or labor to abuse their great power.

With both groups realizing they have a fundamental obligation to the American people to work together efficiently and fairly, we will come safely through the many perils which now beset our industrial system. I am convinced that 99 percent of business and industry is fair and honest. I am convinced that the same is true of labor. We must regulate the 1 percent without penalizing the honest 99 percent.

In recent months there have been some who want to picture the American farmer as unpatriotic. There is not a word of truth in the claim, of course. There is no more important, energetic, and patriotic class of citizens in the Nation than the tillers of the soil. We are coming to appreciate the farmers' importance. This Nation would starve and the war effort would collapse if the American farmer failed to do his part.

He can be depended upon to work long, hard hours to produce the food and fibers to feed and clothe our people, our armed forces, and our allies. The farmer has the respect of the Nation. It is his right to receive a fair return for his work and his investment. He must have it.

The farmer is not to blame for our shortages of food and clothing. He has had his labor drafted. He has been denied new machinery to make up the deficiency in manpower. He has been beset by governmental regulations and demands. But through it all he has held his balance and kept his hand to the plow.

As we see the dreadful, dangerous food shortages in every country, we realize more fully the folly of the New Deal farm policy of scarcity.

We remember, with regret, the millions of little pigs which were killed some years ago; the herds of cattle which vanished because they could not be profitably maintained; the sugar and other crops farmers were prevented from raising. All these would look mighty good right now.

The acute shortage in rubber, gasoline, and foodstuffs, together with the confusion revealed in the administration of these commodities, has forced me to conclude we could profitably return to the idea of the war council which prevailed in the First World War.

There was careful coordination between particular fields. Topping all was the War Council embracing the major administrators, the Cabinet, and the President. These met regularly and here could be ironed out the conflicts and the broad policies established.

With this coordination there should be less bungling, less confusion, and more progress in getting to the people more of these necessary commodities.

We must, as fully as possible, ponder the problems and plan for the days which will follow the war. It will be a changed world, and will present many new probems. Many old ones will be vastly aggravated.

America was caught unprepared for war; we must be prepared for the peace. We must try to evolve plans to make sure that when the millions of men and women come back from the war, or leave factories no longer needed for war production, they will find good jobs at good wages available. This is a paramount obligation we owe to those who are serving in the armed forces and working in the production army for the winning of the war. It is a paramount necessity because, unless we can achieve the rapid reemployment in peace of those now engaged in war, our national economy will collapse, and free government will fail.

That is why I have insisted that we must not allow the small business enterprises to be wiped out. Those many thousands of small concerns providing the means of livelihood of millions of people are vital to our whole economy. They are absolutely required to provide work for our civilian population not now engaged in war activities and to maintain the morale necessary to winning the war.

We must sustain the small business structures of America if we are to avoid some form of state socialism.

Now another point needs consideration:

A mighty factor in developing a new world commerce will be the air routes of the world. Other countries are keenly alert to the future importance of aviation in world trade. We in the United States must not lag behind. That is why I have advocated the creation of a House Committee on Aviation to make sure America does not lag. Commercial aviation must play a leading part in winning the peace as military aviation must play a leading part in winning the war.

The opening of the World War found us unable to cope, at first, with the air forces of the Axis Powers. Let us not neglect adequate preparations for American aviation relating to world commerce. We are spending many millions of dollars for landing sites and bases. Now is the time to plan to utilize some of these bases and to prepare for a powerful American world fleet of commercial airplanes. A nation powerful in the air, in the years ahead, will be the nation with the most powerful influence for peace and plenty in the world. We dare not—we must not—lag. Our security and our prosperity depend upon our position in world aviation. We must not let any other nation outrank us in the air.

While engrossed in the serious task of winning the war, we must plan for the critical days of peace. What we do here in America will, in a large measure, shape the destiny of the world. Ours will be a great responsibility. We must not shrink from the path of duty. We must begin to think and plan for these post-war days. One hundred and thirteen agencies, including governmental agencies, are setting up post-war plans. Congress, which must be the final judge of plans, must not neglect to keep itself fully informed.

We want to help the world and we can be more generous and intelligent in our aid if we emerge from this awful conflict a sound, solvent, free America.

This gathering of Americans interested in a great patriotic party dedicated to the Constitution, to relieving the burdens of the people, and to the preservation of the ideals of a great people is held on the birthday of an immortal American whose name shines with greater luster with each succeeding year.

Abraham Lincoln was the founder of the Republican Party. He dedicated himself and his party wholly to the services of the Nation. He saved the Union; he made all labor free. He enriched the life of every man.

Lincoln will ever be the inspiration and the ideal of our party. In these history-making days the American people have lodged in us a great trust. We have a mandate from these millions of voters. We will cooperate fully in the winning of the war. We will save constitutional government in the United States. We will rescue the people from the injustices and recklessness of an arrogant bureaucracy. We will keep strong and active free speech, free press, and free radio. We will help to plan and to build a foundation on which, under our American system of government, our way of life will be preserved, and more happiness and more prosperity for the average man and woman guaranteed.

May God bring to us an early victory over the ruthless Axis Powers so we can plan for brighter days to come with peace.

And in honor of the sacred memory of our martyred Lincoln, we devoutly pray "that this Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Lend-Lease Outline of Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Des Moines Register of January 17, 1943:

LEND-LEASE OUTLINE OF STRATEGY

What Correspondent Richard Wilson calls the "staggering magnitude" of American lend-lease aid to our allies was pictured Monday in Lend-Lease Administrator Stettinius' report to Congress. And in that report is the story of our strategy in this war.

It is clear from the figures that the really heavy flow of goods—munitions, food, and everything else—went first to Britain. There was every good and natural reason for this. Back in the spring of '41 it was still a serious question whether the British Isles could hold out. That was our most desperate concern. So urgent was this that, for short periods and with regard to specific items, Britain may even have been given preference over our own armed forces then in training.

Gradually, of course, Britain's strength became such that she was safer. She at least had an even chance against any attempted invasion. We had now begun a trickle of stuff to Russia—though probably only a trickle. Then came Pearl Harbor, and for a little while we had to rechannel into the Pacific some goods that had been planned as lend-lease.

This flow to Australia and India has continued, but all the while our production was increasing enormously. The Libyan campaign was in the offing, and we now poured tanks and planes and food into Egypt for Montgomery's army. As the necessary supplies accumulated there, we were able to divert more and more to Russia. It now appears that, at least in the last few months, we have really been "going to town" on aid to Russia—both as to weapons of war and food—in addition to equipping our own African expeditionary force.

The lend-lease record, in short, is a story of where the pressure was greatest, and when. The goods have gone, at any given time, where they were needed most—or, if they were desperately needed simultaneously in several spots, they simply had to be allocated in proportion to the severity of the various needs.

As Mr. Stettinius says, we shall find the means to get to China, also, the arms that she needs. But that has to wait on two or three more crucial theaters—one of them, perhaps, still ahead of us in Europe.

No Time Should Be Lost in Enacting H. R. 1749

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, America has only now gotten fairly into its stride in the prosecution of this war, but already we are beginning to build up a record of shameful neglect of the men and women we call into the fighting services.

Unless this Congress takes immediate action to remedy the situation, the time can easily be foreseen when the wrath of thousands of soldiers and sailors and of a shocked public will descend upon us.

I refer particularly to those men who, after being accepted into the armed services, are discharged upon the development of mental trouble. They are discharged from the Army and Navy and sent home without any thought or provision as to their care. They are sent into their home districts where, in many cases, there are no facilities for their proper treatment.

They are denied care by the Federal Government, which must accept the responsibility for their difficulties but which shunts them off on State and county governments inadequately prepared to accept a responsibility which they should never have in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, day before yesterday there came to this House, with a favorable report from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, H. R. 1749, a bill which would have taken care of this situation, a bill which would have placed the veterans of this war under the same protection as the veterans of other wars of this country.

Possibly because some Members of the House do not know what already is happening in this war, action upon the bill was delayed. That delay should not be prolonged. There should be no further postponement of consideration of this humanitarian legislation, introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

I want to urge the chairman of the Veterans' Committee to try again to get action at once on this bill and I plead with the Members of the House to consider the bill and pass it.

The bill merely extends to veterans of the present conflict the same provisions for medical and hospital treatment, care, and burial benefits as veterans of other wars. It makes that provision simply by adding to the definition of those who may receive such care those who serve in the present war.

We cannot wait until after this war is over to make such provisions. The men are already coming back, are already being discharged. They are the Nation's responsibility. We cannot say let them wait until we are through fighting this war before we give them any consideration.

Let me quote to the House a paragraph from the report of the Veterans' Committee:

> Many cases have been brought to attention, warranting immediate action of the Congress, where veterans, after being accepted for active service, have by change of environment and due to active service become seriously disabled and in need of treatment. In some instances they have been sent home without necessary care, and, not infrequently in mental cases, retained in jail pending transfer to a State institution. In some cases adequate care is not available. The Federal Government must assume its just obligation to care for these distressing cases, having taken them into the active service in the first instance.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that we are accepting into the armed services men who on the surface appear to be perfectly well, both mentally and physically. They are given thorough examinations by physicians and by psychiatrists. These examinations presumably are most searching.

Yet, already some of these men, scarcely more than boys in most cases, are developing into mental patients. Some of them, despite the fact that they could probably have gone on leading normal civilian lives, suffer complete mental breakdowns after only a few days of the impact of military life.

Although they may have been in military service for only a few days, that military service is just as surely the cause of their difficulties as it would be had it extended over a much longer period.

These men, then, are properly the obligation of the Government as to care and treatment. Yet the report of the committee shows that instead of their being taken care of in Government hospitals and at Government expense, they are being sent home—some of them to spend their time in jails because no other place is available for their accommodation.

I have reports from a county in my own district which cites four specific instances in which such cases have been turned back to the county and State authorities for care and treatment. I have no doubt the same condition prevails in the districts of many of my colleagues.

This cannot be permitted to continue. If it goes on for only a little longer, the situation will get entirely out of hand as the number of such men discharged grows.

It is therefore imperative and urgent that this House at once pass the Rankin bill, H. R. 1749.

The Honeymoon Is Over

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the era of bureaucratic evasion or defiance of the congressional will is coming to an end. Apparently the Congress has determined, in response to the demands of the people, to reassume the powers over the Government which it never should have relinquished.

The people have come to recognize that there is urgent need for the Congress to examine the budgets and operations of the widespread, powerful, and self-contradictory political bureaucracy which has been built up within the last 10 years. In order adequately to do this the Congress needs an expert staff of specialists to keep it informed as to how these agencies are operating, what they are doing, how they are spending the appropriations, and what their objectives are. It is unfortunate, especially in a time like this, that the Congress cannot always depend upon it that the bureaus are pursuing the ends they say they are, or seeking the objectives that some of the bureau heads blandly assure Congress are being sought.

It is obvious now that it is foolish for the Congress to rely upon each bureau's own estimate of its requirements, because every clear-thinking person knows that the foremost aim of most bureau chiefs is to broaden their organizations, increase their own prestige, grab more power, and try to entrench themselves more firmly in their places in the public service.

Because of these facts, the House of Representatives has recently set up new agencies of investigation to keep it informed of what the bureaucracy is doing.

It is admitted by even friends of the administration that Congress must establish a closer examination and check on the stream of administrative orders which now regulate the lives of the people. Some of these orders have been issued in defiance of the expressed will of the Congress. Others have been issued under evasive and distorted interpretations of congressional acts. This has been carried to the point by the bureaucrats that Congress now faces the alternative of reasserting its powers over the Government on behalf of the people or of giving way to Executive supremacy. Many members are recalling the wise words of Thomas Jefferson when he declared that it makes little difference whether a dictatorship is of a single man or of a hundred or two hundred men; it is dictatorship none the less, and inevitably means destruction of the Bill of Rights and the liberty and privileges of the people.

The Congress must and it will assert its power to restrain the usurpation of legislative functions by the different bureaus and agencies of the Government. This does not mean that these committees will go on "fishing expeditions" simply to embarrass the bureaucrats. It does mean that these committees are going to engage in the very serious business of determining whether or not an arrogant bureaucracy has grown reckless in its expenditures of the public funds, designing in its administration of the laws, evasive of the congressional will, and defiant of the peoples' desires to an extent that bodes ill for our American system of government.

There is no point in blinking the fact that the present trend is leading to a definite issue between the legislative department of the Government and the Chief Executive over their respective powers. There can be no question that the national interest demands that neither side encroach upon the other. Certainly the Congress cannot be accused of encroaching upon the prerogatives or the functions of the executive department. It is to be regretted that the same cannot be said of the executive department, and the bureaus, agencies, and departments under it.

The people demand assurance, and only the Congress can give this assurance that the bureaus and departments will not use the war effort for the purpose of building up an impregnable, arrogant, and dictatorial bureaucracy, but that, contrariwise, the bureaus and departments of the Government will be used to promote efficiently and effectively every necessary war effort.

The Congress is determined to see that this is achieved and the people may be assured that these new developments constitute a definite move back to a government of checks and balances, with only the necessary war powers vested in the Chief Executive and his subordinate officers for the purpose of winning the war and the duration thereof, and no longer.

Our American system will triumph in the end, thanks to the people of the country who spoke so clearly and so forcefully on last November 3.

Address of Frederick E. Hasler, President of the Pan American Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Frederick E. Hasler, president of the Pan American Society, at the thirty-first anniversary of the founding of the society, celebrated at a luncheon at the Bankers Club, February 15, 1943:

This is the one happy occasion in the year when the Pan-American Society has the opportunity and honor of greeting all of its friends in the Consular Corps at one time. It is good to see so many familiar faces and to extend a warm welcome to new ones.

Today also happens to be the birthday of the society, so this luncheon in reality is a double festivity. We pay tribute to the never-failing cooperation, devotion, and assistance to our cause of the members of the Consular Corps and at the same time express our lasting debt to the far-sighted, sincere men who organized the Pan-American Society. I would that all of them were alive today that they might see the fruits of their labors, as evidenced in the solidarity of the Americas in the struggle for the preservation of our right to live as free human beings, as God intended we should.

It is just 31 years ago today that our society was founded. The scene of its birth was the great hall of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, just a stone's throw from here. Today, when most of the world is aflame with war, it is interesting to look back on that time.

Three days before the Society was formed, China had become a republic—and its first president, Dr. Yuan Shi Kai, was elected on the same day the society was organized. One of the greatest maritime disasters in history occurred that year—the sinking of the *Titanic* with a loss of some 1,500 lives off the Newfoundland coast on her maiden trip from Southampton to New York. The old Equitable Building, on the site of the great fireproof structure we now are in, was destroyed by fire that year.

With the exception of a 3 months' war in the Balkans—in which Turkey was in conflict with Montenegro, Bulgaria, Servia, and Greece—the year 1912 was one of peace. That conflict was of little concern to the Western Hemisphere. With thousands of miles of ocean dividing us, Europe's frequent internal political squabbles, as we were wont to call them, were of only passing interest to the Americas. Smugly we reasoned that distance made us immune to anything which might happen in the Old World.

Two years later the First World War broke out and when several of the American republics became involved, we began to modify that view slightly. It was not until the present world conflict got under way that there was any general acceptance of the view that the Atlantic Ocean no longer was a guaranty of security to us. And Pearl Harbor brought the same tragic disillusionment to us in regard to the Pacific.

Today, with the war in its fourth year and distance being constantly shortened by the amazing developments in air transport, all of our American republics, in common with other free countries, know that there can be no security in any part of the globe until international terrorism is forever destroyed.

Everything we love and hold dear is at stake—the freedoms our forefathers won for us, our democratic form of government, our homes, our very lives. Small wonder then, that the Americas are united in spirit and purpose. The war and common danger have forged the peaceful bond of pan-Americanism—voluntarily entered into for the common good and preservation of freedom in all the republics of the Western Hemisphere—into an instrument of mighty potency to help destroy the barbaric forces which threaten not only pan-Americanism, but freedom, righteousness, and decency throughout the world.

The secret of the strength of pan-Americanism lies in its unselfishness. It seeks nothing for itself, but only for the members of its family. It accords equal respect to the smallest and largest and concedes no privileges to one nation over another. It has neither a favorite son nor a prodigal son in its family. Like a proud father, pan-Americanism wishes all in the family to live in peace and to grow strong and prosper.

I believe the war has strengthened the faith of every American nation in pan-Americanism and we must set ourselves to the task of making certain that this faith grows even stronger when victory is ours and we return to the ways of peace. We all know when things are going along smoothly that nations—like individuals—are apt to ignore the other fellow's troubles and forget to lend a helping hand. This must not happen when the war is over.

War conveys the thought of armed conflict, but this is not necessarily so. The last war did not end in November 1918—the armed conflict did—the intervening years up to September 1939, witnessed one economic disaster after another. Many of these could have been averted had we, who talk so much about our love of freedom and belief in democratic principles realized that the preservation of these blessings calls for our constant effort and sacrifice to prevent their being taken from us. We speak glibly of peace—but the record of each era of peace over the past centuries shows it to have been but a breathing spell in preparation for another armed conflict.

If we really believe in democracy, then let us be realistic and recognize that to prevent some other "ism" raising its ugly head to destroy it, we must individually and collectively dedicate ourselves wholeheartedly to prove its workability and efficacy. The countries here represented today and all other liberty-loving nations must continue to stand together—our lines of economic and military strength unbroken—firm in our faith and courage and determined to work for the common interest of all.

If the peace we are fighting for and will win is to be made lasting, it must be based on broad, humanitarian principles, recognizing that freedom of intercourse and exchange in trade matters are fundamental.

Even before the present conflict began, we had made some progress in this direction under the leadership of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull, but it was too little and too late. Trade barriers, the deadliest economic weapon of blind, selfish nationalism, had created unrest, jealousies, and hatreds which plunged the world into war.

Our Under Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles, speaking last Friday at the opening of the Office of War Information exhibits at Rockefeller Center, emphasized this point with his usual directness, going straight to the heart of the problem. He said:

"There could be no surer road to disaster, no surer means of bringing about unmitigated havoc in the future than for the United Nations to enter the post-war period as rivals and opponents in their commercial and financial policies, rather than as collaborators in a common task of seeking and achieving international economic stability and general well-being."

At this point it is pertinent to call attention to the fact that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which has enabled President Roosevelt and our State Department to break down several of the trade barriers between the United States and foreign countries, will expire on June 12 next. That date is only 4 months off and I am ashamed to say that already selfish trade interests and isolationists in Congress—indifferent to the welfare of the Nation and blind to the fact that they are sowing the same seeds which helped to bring on this war—have started a movement in opposition to the renewal of the trade act.

This movement must be stopped at all costs before its virus is allowed to create suspicion abroad of the sincerity of our policies in regard to international trade and thus implant the germ of disunity among the United Nations. We must all realize that what adversely affects our neighbors reacts to our detriment.

A continuance of the Trade Agreements Act is not only essential to the speedy and successful prosecution of the war, but to the peace we shall write after we win the war. No better instrument has yet been devised than the mechanism under which the act has operated since its enactment in 1934. It has lowered excessive trade barriers and improved our commercial relations with twenty-five other countries. It may well serve as a pattern to implement the principles of mutual trade aid agreed upon in the Atlantic Charter.

The world scene looks brighter today than it did at our luncheon last year. Then the black shadow of Pearl Harbor hung heavily over us. Now the tide of battle has turned and the enemies of the free nations are everywhere in retreat. A year ago the end of the war appeared far away. Today we are hopeful that the conflict may end much sooner than we expected.

So let us go forward into another year with courage and determination that, come what may, we will be faithful to our trust, faithful to the memory of the immortal heroes of all free countries who gave their all that we might be privileged to give our all to preserve and hand on to posterity the precious crown of free men.

The Voice of Puerto Rico—the Insular Legislature and All Political Parties Oppose the Present Government and Join in Support of the Resident Commissioner

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the unanimous consent of the House, I am inserting an editorial published February 11, 1943, in El Mundo, leading independent daily newspaper of Puerto Rico. The Insular Legislature and all political parties oppose the present government and join in their aims for self-government and freedom:

THE VOICE OF PUERTO RICO

The Legislature of Puerto Rico passed unanimously last night a joint resolution containing a formal demand for the solution of the political status of the island.

The declaration, solemnly concurred in by all and each of the groups represented in both chambers of the legislature, states: "That the Puerto Rican Legislative Assembly, in the name of and as representative of the people of Puerto Rico, through this joint resolution sets forth before the President and the Congress of the United States the right of the people of Puerto Rico to end the colonial system of government and to decide freely through special open and democratic elections the permanent political status of the people of Puerto Rico as soon as possible, immediately if practicable." It declares furthermore: "That if the President and the United States of America deem it necessary to wait until victory is achieved and the framing of the structure of peace begun, the people of Puerto Rico shall wait, with patriotic resignation, until that decisive moment to achieve their natural desires."

Last night's agreement, authorized by the unanimous vote of the legislative chambers, is the patriotic culmination of a movement recently launched to appeal to Washington, in the name of all Puerto Rico, for the right to authorize our people to decide in special free elections their final political status.

The union of all political parties in subscribing to this demand in the legislative assembly is, in effect, a manifestation of the desire felt by all Puerto Ricans to express a sacred sentiment, the sentiment of a people which aspires to define itself. The accord among all groups represented in the chambers in agreeing to this demand, which will soon be presented to Washington, is an expression of the solemn and formal will of the people of Puerto Rico manifesting itself through patriotic solidarity.

The joint resolution passed last night by the chambers is the unanimous expression of all the men whom the people trusted with their mandate in the last elections. The voice of Puerto Rico speaks in that resolution, through each and all of the men who constitute our legislative assembly, and Puerto Rico speaks also through the voice of its Resident Commissioner in Washington, Mr. Bolívar Pagán, whose speech on Labor Day, September 7, 1942, was a demand for the solution of the political status. From that speech we take the following declaration, which, in our opinion, constitutes the best endorsement of the Resident Commissioner to the resolution adopted last night by the chambers:

"Above all the transitory problems of Puerto Rico towers one, primordial and fundamental, which gives origin to many other which are not within the hands of the Puerto Ricans to solve. And this problem is that of the disputed right of the people of Puerto Rico, of the collective right of our island, natural and imprescriptible, granted by God to all men and all peoples: the right to our liberty. God created this island, over the sea and under the sky it was placed by Him for the Puerto Ricans, and we Puerto Ricans should govern our island and be the masters of our destiny.

"After 44 years—nearly half a century—under the flag of the United States, which drove out the descendants of the original settlers and civilizers of this island, Puerto Rico still suffers an intolerable and provisional regime, which is now outmoded, and against which it is time that all Puerto Ricans rebel spiritually. We are governed by an organic act, or insular constitution, which was drafted not by the Puerto Ricans but by a Congress not elected by Puerto Rican voters.

"That organic act was not submitted to the people of Puerto Rico for either approval or consent. That organic act organizes a government of three powers supposedly independent of each other. But the government of Puerto Rico is a tripod, headed by an executive chief, who is practically a viceroy of the colony, who can assume dictatorial powers in this country, and who can govern against the expressed will of the Puerto Ricans and tyrannize over us, abusing the patience and even the weakness of this country. No Governor of any State of the Union, nor even the President of the United States himself, can assume the tremendous powers which the Governor of Puerto Rico has. This man, with his tremendous powers over the life and destiny of our country, is not elected by the Puerto Ricans. The legislative power granted to Puerto Rico is a delegated and curtailed power. The bills approved by the two chambers elected by our people require, in order to become law, the approval of a third chamber—the most powerful one—that of the Governor of Puerto Rico, who is not elected by our people, and the Governor's veto over the laws of the people is practically absolute. The judicial branch cannot be elected by our

people because that is expressly forbidden by the organic act. It is incredibly true that in the organic act—a supposedly democratic law—the election of the judges who dispose of the property, the freedom, and even the lives of the people is expressly forbidden. Against that regime—against that intolerable and ad interim colonial status—my party stands also. To end this regime—a regime not in keeping with the capability, the civilization, and the natural rights of the Puerto Ricans, as well as to discuss and face the fundamental economic problems of Puerto Rico—my party is ready and willing to form, in a fraternizing effort with all the Puerto Ricans, an entente cordiale with all those Puerto Ricans who cherish the same ideals and purposes that would insure the liberty and the welfare of the people of Puerto Rico."

The entente cordiale proposed by the Resident Commissioner in his speech of Labor Day was yesterday solemnly proclaimed in the unanimous agreement of the legislative chambers. Now the united voice of Puerto Rico is heard in Washington, full and potent, in its demand for right and justice. Yesterday history was made in Puerto Rico.

Silly, Eh?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in a recent edition of the New York Times:

SILLY, EH?

Air-raid wardens, auxiliary firemen, nurses' aides, city patrol corps. Silly, eh?

Just a bunch of grown-up people still playing Boy Scout, isn't that what you said? What's all the excitement about? They're fighting on the other side of the world, not here.

Silly, eh? Sure, about as silly as the telegram the Johnsons got the other day—

"We regret to inform you * * *."

Wasn't that a scream?

Charlie Johnson, the kid you wished good luck to—the kid who loved to play "sojer"—seems like only the other day * * *.

You won't be seeing him again.

It's kind of maddening to think that Charlie died so that you could go on shooting off your mouth, unmolested.

But he was just a kid. What was a kid like Charlie doing in a far-off place like Buna?

What was he doing?

He was doing what you haven't even got the guts to think of doing.

No, don't give up any of your valuable time after hours—you work hard down at the office; you need that little nap after you've tucked away that seven-course dinner.

What more can you ask of a fellow? Didn't you finally give in to putting 10 percent of your hard-earned dough in War bonds? What else do they want?

Don't be an air raid warden or an auxiliary fireman, or join the city patrol corps—only a bunch of silly jerks would think of giving their time and effort to something that concerns your hide (and how right you are).

But it's not you and your pals that they're concerned with—it's your kids, your wife, and your home that they want to protect—that they'll know how to protect just in case we should be bombed. And that's no harebrained impossibility, either.

Your neighbors don't have much respect for you now. But they could have—plenty.

And you know how, too.

A little thing like dropping in at your precinct or firehouse tonight could fix it.

Hell, they're not that particular. Guys like you are generally O. K. once they get set straight about some things.

O. K., after your dinner, but drop in.

Standing Committee on Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter addressed to me from Gill Robb Wilson, director of aviation of the State of New Jersey. This letter is especially significant in the light of the discussion which is now current and so much in the forefront, not only in our country but throughout the world. Mr. Wilson, who is also president of the National Aeronautical Association, is, in my opinion, one of the foremost authorities in the world on the subject of aviation, since he acquired his knowledge in a practical way during the last World War as a flier. He has been a pioneer of the industry, having done considerable work in the advancement of the aviation cause.

This Congress is considering the creation of an aviation committee, and I feel that Mr. Wilson's letter will be of inestimable value to all of the Members of the House, and to the people of our country.

The letter follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION,
Trenton, February 16, 1943.

The Honorable FRANK L. SUNDSTROM,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I observe two divergent viewpoints active in the National Congress. One is headed up in a move to create a standing committee on aviation, while the other is headed up by a move to create current legislation. Both movements are interesting and encouraging in that they show an awakening to the significance of aviation in its long range implication to the Nation. This is healthy and wise and I have a great personal respect for the leaders of both viewpoints.

For at least a decade I have been eager to see standing committees on aviation and I am familiar with all of the excuses as well as with all of the reasons for the lack of such a committee. It has always seemed to me that the existence of a standing committee would provide the Congress with a continuing body of information on the comprehensive picture of aviation. It has so many ramifications that only by an over-all understanding can the Congress hope to wisely deal with the component elements of the subject. I have watched year after year one or other particular interest urge its viewpoint on various committees of the Congress and have had a deep sympathy with the attempts of the Congress to judge on the various matters, which was extremely difficult because of their lack of background. Unlike some people, I have an abiding respect for our national legislative body and have always felt that if they had the facts, all of the facts, they would produce sound judgment and vision in law

I don't believe the Congress can adequately deal with the subject of aviation without a standing committee.

Now, as to the current legislative proposals proposed by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Commission, I can understand their eagerness to meet aviation development with sound legislation. The tenor of the proposed legislation in some respects amazes me. The proposal to capture for the Federal Government the complete destiny of aviation is a turn toward the European viewpoint, where aviation is considered an instrument of government rather than a fresh development in the field of free private enterprise. The Federal Government never has and never can either regulate or promote the complete picture of aviation. In seeking to take over the airports of every nature the Federal Government is invading the police power of the States. It is not true that all flying constitutes either a hazard or a potential hazard in interstate commerce. It is not true that safety demands that the Federal Government assume all of its jurisdiction. Moreover, in its current state of development, I question the timing of current legislation.

There are some features of the proposed legislation which appear excellent. The promotion of aviation education is very sound. The proposal of the Government to carry all mail by air is likewise sound. The proposal to study the cargo possibilities of aviation is sound. In other words, the timing of legislation which studies and promotes the overall subject of aviation is apt, whereas the timing which proposes more regulation is, in my judgment, premature.

Mr. LEA, Mr. BOREN, Mr. WOLVERTON, and others of the committee considering this legislation have always done a fine job and I would certainly do nothing to discourage their efforts, violently as I am opposed to certain of the viewpoints presented in the original draft of their current bill.

I do hope the Congress will get together on the entire matter because there is much more of the Nation's post-war destiny involved in how the Congress deals with this situation than meets the eye. I hope you will make aviation a matter of your deep and continued interest and if in my humble way I can be of any assistance, please feel free to call on me. I have no axes of any kind to grind.

As always,

GILL ROBB WILSON,
State Director of Aviation.

The Opening Weeks of the Seventy-eighth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave extended me by the House, I am inserting in the RECORD herewith an article by me which appeared in the Feb-

ruary issue of the Republican magazine, published in Chicago, Ill.:

THIS MONTH IN CONGRESS

(By KARL E. MUNDT, United States Representative from South Dakota)

In responding to the invitation to write the January copy for This Month in Congress, I realize I am accepting a difficult assignment. The opening month of any Congress is marked by a paucity of important debates or significant legislation. January 1943 is no exception to the rule. In fact, the uncertainty of the New Deal high command, caused by its devastating setback in loss of Members in the House, has served to emphasize the delay incident to the bringing in of important legislation and to slow down even more than usual the joining of issues on important matters of domestic policy. Thus far the administration has hesitated to bring forward any legislative proposals of importance.

As a result of the foregoing situation, a reporter reviewing This Month in Congress is confronted with the fact that most of the happenings "on the Hill" during January 1943 were either of such importance that the press and the radio have fully and adequately covered them or they were of such comparative unimportance that it is unnecessary to devote much time to them in a monthly résumé. Ordinarily, so much happens in Congress every month that readers relying solely upon the daily press and the radio, fail to comprehend the complete picture, but if additional details are necessary to a better understanding of the congressional scene at this time, they are details of personalities, political maneuvering, policies, and kindred items, rather than details gleaned from congressional hearings, debates, or legislation. Let us therefore look at the first 3 or 4 weeks of the Seventy-eighth Congress in an effort to outline the future from some of the facts of the present rather than trying to analyze activities of the present from the standpoint of what has preceded it.

First big impression one gains from study of the Seventy-eighth Congress—and while most of the observations of this article are based upon an analysis of the House, they are in large part equally true of the Senate—is that the New Deal is a dead cause insofar as the legislative branch of government is concerned. New dealism, per se, does not seem to have enough active and influential supporters left in the House, for example, to form for it a decent funeral entourage, to say nothing of giving it the crusading support to which it was accustomed in former Congresses. Of course, the Democratic Party is in control of the House, but the New Deal phalanx has lost all control of the Democratic Party as represented by Representatives in Congress. Election of Frank Walker as new Democratic national chairman indicates that new dealism may still control the party machinery of the Democratic Party just as it assuredly controls the executive departments and many of the emergency set-ups, but insofar as the men and women elected by the people to serve in Congress are concerned, New Dealism has hit a 10-year low point.

Example in point: Executive (New Deal) pressure forced the selection by the Democratic Ways and Means Committee of VITO MARCANTONIO, American Laborite of New York City, as a member of the important House Judiciary Committee as a demanded pay-off for the faithful "water-carrying" which American Laborites in New York have always provided for New Deal candidates in the Empire State. What happened? In a special caucus held for the purpose, the majority membership in the House (Democratic) rejected the Executive (New Deal) mandate and refused to confirm MARCANTONIO as a member of the Judiciary Committee. The rejection was definite and overwhelming.

Not even a face-saving gesture was permitted the administration. The answer was "No." It was a clarion signal that Jefferson Democrats, constitutional Democrats, southern Representatives, growing uneasy under the strange philosophies being developed under their traditional Democratic label, and just plain Democrats, cognizant of what the folks back home are thinking, had had enough of the collectivistic doctrines of new dealism. The vote was not against MARCANTONIO the individual; it was against the extremely leftist New Deal philosophy which he espoused. The shotgun marriage which the President sought to effectuate between new dealism in the American Labor Party and the Democratic majority in the House failed to eventuate because the Chief's gun was lightly loaded and previous experiences had convinced Democratic Members that the repercussions of the gun were more dangerous than its discharge.

Other examples? Examine any daily issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There you will see many speeches and comments by good Democratic Congressmen, and by even a few "prodigal-son new dealers" who have wandered back home, in which Senators and Representatives serving as Democrats give caustic criticism against bureaucracy in general and against bureaucrats in particular. They "tear passions to tatters" against restrictions and regulations of Government boards, bureaus, commissions, agencies, authorities, committees, alphabetical set-ups, and what will you. They sometimes outdo Republican Members in their protestations against directives, pronouncements, regulations, provisions, and the other mandatory utterances of the bureaucratic powers they were formerly so eager to create. Some Members, while still preaching new dealism in theory, are among the most outspoken in their criticism of it in practice. They boast about the recipe, but they beg off from eating the cake.

What some new dealers in and out of Congress still fail to realize is the inevitable and inseparable relationship between bureaucracy and New Dealism. There can be the former without the latter, but the latter can never get beyond the day dreams of unsophisticated idealists without the former. Bureaucracy is the machinery by which the New Deal formula of solve-it-all-in-Washington proposals must operate. There is no other substitute. For any or all of the New Deal patterns-for-perfection to operate, they must be implemented by bureaucrats. Thus the centralization of authority which accompanies war provides a preview of what would obtain in peacetime if New Deal theories were generally put into practice. And even the new dealers are getting jittery about the way in which the machinery works. Senators and Representatives generally, and a vast majority of the American public, without regard for politics, are willing to endure what degree of bureaucratic management is necessary for the winning of this war, but they yearn for the day when the country can be given back to the people and they rebel against any thought of perpetuating the principle of bureaucratic domination in Federal Government. Thus new dealism in Congress is at low ebb, but practical opponents of collectivistic government must keep a weather eye on the executive departments, where the taste of power has at times been found to be exceedingly savory and where new dealism still has many of its disciples sitting in positions of control.

Incidentally, even in the executive branch, new dealism seems to be more vigorous and hopeful among the innumerable emergency establishments of the past 10 years than among the conventional governmental departments. Perhaps this results from the fact that the average age of Cabinet members is now 65, and the spirit of youthful exuberance and enthusiasm seems to be waning with the passing of the years and the definitely oldish nature of the present Cabinet. Even in the legislative branch of government the average age of Republican House Members is lower than that of Democrats, and the once proud claim of the new dealers that theirs was "an appeal to youth" sounds a bit hollow when checked against the actual ages of their clan.

WOMEN IN GOVERNMENT

Not only is the Republican Party more closely identified with the youth of America from the standpoint of both age and idealism today than is the Democratic Party, but from the standpoint of its recognition of the important part which women play in modern government the Republican Party clearly outdistances the closed corporation which today displays the Democratic emblem while bitterly embroiled with intraparty strife.

There are six Republican women members of the House, one Democratic. Each of the Republican women came upon her own power in districts where the party and the people select their own candidates, and none represents a machine district where some politically sagacious boss might nominate and elect a woman simply for its political effect. All of the six Republican women have been given important committee assignments by their party colleagues. In placing CLARE BOOTHE LUCE on the Military Affairs Committee and MARGARET CHASE SMITH on the Naval Affairs Committee, the Republicans have given an impressive recognition to the valiant part which women are playing in the armed forces of this modern war which is completely lacking on the part of the Democratic Party. FRANCES BOLTON and EDITH ROGERS serve on the important Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, where they play their part in helping to shape post-war policies and current programs. JESSIE SUMNER of Illinois serves as a very active and effective member of the Banking and Currency Committee, giving recognition to the fact that the women of America rank high in the amount of investments and finances they control. WINIFRED STANLEY, glamorous newcomer from New York State, has been appointed to the following committees, where her experience and ability will permit her to exercise qualities of leadership: Civil Service and Patents. The Civil Service Committee is presently engaged in a far-reaching and important investigation of the manpower situation in Federal offices. The Republicans of America are today definitely more liberal and modern in their attitude toward women in politics than are the Democrats.

JOE MARTIN LEADS WITH VIGOR

Popular and able minority leader of the House, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., is again demonstrating his capacity for leadership and his ability to lead a minority group with such skill and tact that it frequently achieves results usually obtainable only by a majority. Efforts of New Deal columnists and commentators, currying favor with administration bigwigs by peddling their poison pellets, have failed dismally in their program attempting to create disunity and rancor in Republican ranks in Congress. Never have Republicans in both the Senate and the House been more united. Sly attempts to revive the archaic verbiage of "isolationism" or "interventionism" have completely collapsed as New Deal disciples of disruption have endeavored to array one group of Republicans against the other. There are no isolationists among Republicans in Congress if the term implies a desire to hold back in the war, to settle for less than victory, or to deprive our fighting forces of everything they need to finish the job. There are no interventionists among Republicans in Congress if

the term implies a desire to have America permanently or perpetually involved in foreign wars or to maintain armies of mercenary soldiers forever fighting in support of expanding American interests whether they be territorial ambitions to create an imperialistic empire or financial interests to force our trade upon reluctant people by the bayonet and the sword. Republicans all want to win this war decisively and conclusively. Republicans, all, want to see war banned from this earth as a device for settling disputes. Republicans, all, want to do what they can to help make sure that this time "these sacrifices shall not be made in vain" but that permanent peace may this time follow war.

Thus JOE MARTIN does not lead a party unit divided by pre-Pearl Harbor distinctions or preconceived post-war deductions, but he heads a group of 209 Americans proud of their heritage, devoted to their party, dedicated to their country's welfare, and eager to extend America's power for good to as many people as sound reasoning indicates is plausible and possible. Republicans in the House are fortunate in this respect as contrasted with the Democrats; Republicans have only one leader with whom to confer—JOE MARTIN. Democrats must confer with SAM RAYBURN, the Speaker; with President Roosevelt, the Chief; and with Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK, the floor manager; and with numerous self-appointed leaders of the diminishing but sometimes defiant New Deal bloc both in Congress and in executive positions. This comparative singleness of purpose which "JOE MARTIN's gang" maintains in the House augers well for the future—the country may expect that on numerous occasions during the next 2 years, on domestic issues, the Republican attitude will prevail in Congress.

WHAT OF 1944?

Political-minded Washington talks much about what may happen in 1944. Fourth term tip-offs seem to be apparent in the President's frantic but futile attempt to put MARCANTONIO on the House Judiciary Committee, in his successful effort to find places for all lame-duck Democratic Senators and Representatives repudiated by the people last November but rescued for the administration in January, and in his insistence that Ed "Paving Block" Flynn be sent safely to Australia as Ambassador where his efforts to create good will may be much less impressive than his success in contributing to good will in New York politics by absenting himself from the country. Another fourth-term tip-off stems from the continuation of the President's passion for preventing any of his party contemporaries from attaining positions of popular prominence. He does not object to their becoming prominent if it is in a position surrounded by unpopularity, but after 10 years in office he continues to be successful in sabotaging the efforts of any of his helpmates to develop a personal following or to become a Presidential possibility.

Republicans in Congress and throughout the country were greatly cheered not only by the remarkable gains made in the number of Republican Governors, Senators, and Representatives elected, but by a number of auxiliary facts. Great gains were made throughout the country in the number of State legislators elected under Republican banners. Country courthouses, also, made vast strides of increase in their Republican population. Enough candidates for the House of Representatives were defeated by less than 1,000 votes to have given the Republicans a majority if these photo-finish decisions had gone Republican.

Most recent and in some ways most convincing evidence of the resurgence of republicanism in this country was the by-election held in the Sixth Missouri Congressional District on January 12 to fill a vacancy caused by death. In that election Republican MARION T. BENNETT was elected by a majority of 14,000 in a normally Democratic district against the same opponent whom his father (the late Philip A. Bennett) had defeated by only 7,700 in the November 3 elections. The January 12 election polled 30,000 votes less than the one held November 3, making MARION BENNETT'S greatly increased majority all the more convincing. His father won in November with 55 percent of the votes; MARION BENNETT won in January with 62 percent of the votes. The Sixth District in Missouri is a typical American voting district except for its proverbial Democratic leanings; it has 11 counties and comprises a population of laborers, farmers, small business people, and typical American city dwellers. The remarkable Republican increases between November 3 and January 12 against the identical Democratic opponent knocks into a cocked hat the professional alibi artists who expressed deductions of wishful thinking after the November elections to the effect that an earlier commencement of the African campaign and earlier appointment of manpower and food administrators would have prevented the Republican landslide. Obviously, the national swing toward the Republican Party is based on more fundamental and deep-set convictions.

As this month in Congress comes to a close, Congressman JOE MARTIN'S drive to bring about the creation of a permanent standing committee on aviation in the House seems likely to succeed. It may well have become a fait accompli by the time this article appears in print. Although opposed by the Democratic chairmen of several important House committees as well as some other vigorous opponents from Democratic ranks, the indications are that our minority leader's suggestion will be adopted and that once again Republican leadership and Republican thought will have contributed to the modernization of Government. Similarly, proposals by Congressman DIRKSEN, of Illinois, for streamlining the work of the House Appropriations Committee and the procurement of additional expert technicians to help with the committee tasks, as well as the suggestion by Senator NYE that Senate and House Appropriations Committees create a joint group for the purposes of consultation and strategy, seem to be well on the road to final approval.

The Seventy-eighth Congress seems determined to be a peoples' Congress. It gives real hope of demonstrating to the world that legislative government can meet the challenge of our times.

A Bill To Grant to the Chinese Rights of Entry to the United States and Rights of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like every Member to study the provisions of H. R. 1882 and join with me in my efforts to give to our noble allies of China deserved recognition.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of H. R. 1882 and a letter to Madame Chiang Kai-shek:

[78th Cong., 1st sess.; H. R. 1882; in the House of Representatives, February 17, 1943; Mr. KENNEDY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization]

A bill to grant to the Chinese rights of entry to the United States and rights of citizenship

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Chinese Citizenship Act of 1943.

SEC. 2. Chapter 7 of title 8 of the United States Code Annotated, known as the Chinese Exclusion Act, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 703 of chapter 11 of title 8 of the United States Code Annotated is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 703. Same; race.

"The right to become a naturalized citizen under the provisions of this chapter shall extend only to white persons, persons of African nativity or descent, and descendants of races indigenous to the Western Hemisphere: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall prevent the naturalization of native-born Filipinos having the honorable service in the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard as specified in section 724, nor of former citizens of the United States, who are otherwise eligible to naturalization under the provisions of section 717, nor of Chinese."

This act shall take effect immediately.

FEBRUARY 17, 1943.

Madame CHIANG KAI-SHEK,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAME CHIANG: To the first lady of China, and, by universal acclaim, one of the greatest women in the world, our proud and wholehearted welcome.

We welcome you also, as a daughter is welcomed by her foster-mother, to the land where you received an American education, where you spent years far more carefree than those of late, and where, by your charm, your modesty and your intellectual attainments, you won the hearts of so many. And now, both for yourself and as a flaming symbol, your unflinching courage and patience and faith, through 5 years of relentless aggression and horror, arouse the admiration of liberty-loving people the world over.

The bomber, while it has destroyed boundaries, has shortened distances. Today we can, like Samuel Johnson, "survey mankind from China to Peru" with the twist of a radio dial, and with agony and resolution in our hearts.

You Chinese are a nation of 450,000,000 souls. Your land is about one-third larger than ours. Several millions of you, including the President himself, are Christians. You have a cultural background of more than 4,000 years. Today you have compulsory education at the age of 6, and your hundreds of universities, colleges, and technical schools exchange brilliant students with our own.

You are brave and stoical, industrious, honest, and honorable. Save for one minor interruption, we have always been at peace with you. During the difficult period of the settlement of our West, the importation of cheap Chinese labor brought with it a wave of alarmed misunderstanding and prejudice on the part of some of our people. There was no justification for this fear. Even under the 1930 census there were only 46,129 Chinese people in our country. We have more

than that number of European refugees in a few months.

Since February 12, 1912, China has been a member of the family of republics. I take this auspicious occasion, in your gracious presence, as an indication of my unbounded admiration of a nation's courage which has amazed the world, to introduce this day a bill to grant to the Chinese rights of entry to the United States and rights of citizenship. A people which have shared with us the common danger, and will share with us the eventual victory, a people which have earned our friendship, our gratitude, and our respect, have by the same token surely earned our franchise.

Long live the Chinese Republic!

I have the honor to remain, dear madam,

Respectfully yours,

MARTIN J. KENNEDY.

Silver Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to present for the consideration of the Members of the House an illuminating article from the pen of Leon Starmount, explaining the use of silver in our monetary system and the contribution of the silver miners to the finances of our Government and their contribution of the critical metals to our Nation's war effort:

SILVER SUBSIDY?—TAX IS THE WORD

(By Leon Starmont)

A Washington dispatch says western Congressmen defended the existing silver legislation on the ground that mines producing war metals must have the "subsidy" on their silver byproduct in order to stay in operation at all.

The reasoning is O. K., but the language is faulty.

I admit writing on silver as an advocate rather than a mere reporter. I'm a bimetallist. I still believe that Bryan was right in 1896.

There used to be three principal monetary theories—the single gold standard, the gold-and-silver standard, and the greenback or "managed currency" theory, which always results in inflation.

Gold standard advocates are about as extinct as the dodo.

We now have a managed currency, managed by muddlers, who preach about the dangers of inflation but who can't understand that inflation is the inevitable result of their monetary madness.

Return to the single gold standard being impossible by almost unanimous admission, the only sane course for the United States is a return to the old bimetallic system which served during the first 100 years of this Republic.

Metal money is "hard" money. It cannot be run off at will on printing presses, like Federal Reserve notes and other fiat currency. It has to be dug from the dirt with powder and steel and sweat, and often the producers dig at a loss.

Gold and silver, under the old bimetallic system—which America inherited from the British system devised by Sir Isaac Newton in the seventeenth century—had a relative value of 16 to 1. That means, roughly, that all the gold in the world balances in value all the silver in the world, production being roughly in that ratio.

F. D. R. back in 1932 gave assurances to the West that he was a friend of silver. That's one reason he was nominated for the Presidency.

But the administration has been shilly-shallying with silver ever since. Instead of remonetizing the metal at its former value prior to 1873 ($1.29 an ounce), the administration put through a lot of half-hearted measures, and finally committed the greatest folly of all—placing a bonus on gold, which still exists.

The United States would normally produce more dollars in silver than in gold. Remonetizing silver would help Americans, including Canadians and Latin Americans, whereas the gold bonus helped Russians and South Africans more than it helped inhabitants of the Western Hemisphere.

The old ratio has been scuttled by paying an 80-percent bonus for gold and charging the silver miner a seigniorage (tax) of 45 percent. Adding insult to insanity, gold mining is now prohibited while the bonus price remains.

Also, the country is short of virtually all metals needed in the war effort.

Silver is ordinarily mined along with lead, copper, and sometimes zinc. Gold is more likely to be mined for itself alone.

The bonus on gold produces no metal for the war.

But the seigniorage on silver actually prevents production of metals needed to win the war.

Whether the eastern Congressmen who now want to reduce the silver miner's fraction of his dollar understand the situation or not, they are damaging the war effort. It is not necessary to suspect them of being tools of Hitler or Tojo. The probability is that their campaign is backed by the silverware manufacturers of New England, who have a vested interest in seeing the price of silver lowered at the mine.

It will be a bad thing for America if the price of silver is put so low that more copper and lead mines are compelled to close.

It would be much more sensible to pay the miners the full dollar value of the silver they produce—$1.29 an ounce—and stop the gold bonus.

Incidentally, that would enrich Latin America and make the southern republics real friends of the United States forever.

Address of Secretary Ickes at Testimonial Dinner for Former Senator George Norris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered last Friday evening by Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, at a testimonial meeting for Senator George Norris, under the auspices of the Union for Democratic Action, at Orchestra Hall, Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have left a frantically busy office and traveled 700 miles so that I might join with you tonight in paying honor to one of the outstanding liberals of history. At its best, mine is but an inadequate effort to prove the esteem that I have for him, and to express my admiration for the courageous fight that he has made, often against overwhelming odds. That the occasion coincides with the birthday anniversary of a great liberal of another generation gives this event an air of unusual significance. A meeting in honor of George Norris on Abraham Lincoln's birthday is no ordinary event. Both of these Middle Westerners represent the noblest traditions of our civilization.

Consider their dates. Abraham Lincoln was born in the last year of Thomas Jefferson's Presidency. George Norris was born in the first year of Lincoln's Presidency. And George Norris, the foremost living liberal, is still with us, still bravely fighting, as he has for the last half a century, for American causes, the causes of liberalism. Jefferson, Lincoln, Norris form an arch that spans the history of American democracy.

As a member of the chorus of liberals "whom the blows and buffets of the world have so incensed that I am reckless what I do to spite" it, I am proud to take part in this public tribute to three great Americans who scorned to place their own political idealogies ahead of their country's interests.

The names of Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and of George W. Norris are synonymous with the liberal causes of their times. George Norris will continue to carry the torch of truth into the byways of our national life, and wherever the well-being of the common man is at stake, there he will be found, fighting, throughout the useful years that lie ahead of him.

It was even while George Norris was striking his first lusty blows for liberalism and fair play out on the prairies of Nebraska, that State and local progressive groups, particularly in the Middle West and the Northwest, and generally speaking within the Republican Party, began organizing seriously for freedom—freedom from corruption in public office, freedom from the crimes of monopolies, freedom from the ravages of reaction. Those were the stirring days of Teddy Roosevelt and of Fighting Bob La Follette, of John P. Altgeld, and of another crusading Nebraskan, William Jennings Bryan.

As a young man I tried to attune myself to the liberal spirit that animated all of them.

Here in Chicago the stand-out names were George E. Cole and Hoyt King and Edwin Burritt Smith, Raymond Robins and Graham Taylor, Walter L. Fisher, and the lovable William Kent, who had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives from California with the then Congressman George Norris of Nebraska. John Harlan and Charles E. Merriam were outstanding leaders in more than one smashing battle against the political gangs. On the distaff side there were Jane Addams, Mary E. McDowell, Margaret Dreier Robins, Harriet E. Vittum, Ellen Gates Starr, Agnes E. Nestor, and Helen Culver, to name just a few.

Chicago was fortunate, too, in those days in the possession of a circle of wealthy men

who, in addition to prosperous purses that would fly open when a liberal cause cried out, also had penetrating visions and deep humanitarian instincts. These passed the ammunition to the younger volunteers who manned the trenches. Numbered in the group were Charles R. Crane, Julius Rosenwald, LaVerne W. Noyes, Victor Lawson (also a great and clean-hitting editor), Delavan Smith, the Jones brothers—David and Thomas, and Cyrus and Harold McCormick and their sister, Anita McCormick Blaine, and others. This audience knows that in Chicago there are McCormicks and McCormicks. The generous, liberal-minded McCormicks will not be confused with the colonel in his tower who I do not misdoubt, hard pursed though he is, would more willingly contribute, and that generously, to a Gerald L. K. Smith than to any movement to advance the cause of the common man. Here in Chicago we know that where "McComic" sits is the foot of the table.

Chicago is a tough city with the proverbial digestion of an ostrich. Even so "edgy" a job as sharpening its teeth on such unpalatable, blood-thinning diet as the Chicago Tribune doesn't seem to dull its gusty appetite. I have noticed a great change for the better in the patient since, through the good offices of Marshall Field, Chicagoans have been getting every day more and more true vitamins from the Sun.

Chicago, believe me, will ever be first in my heart. It was my political cradle out of which I fell more than once, head first. Where else could I have had such training? I love Chicago because it knocked me about and taught me to take it as well as to dish it out. I am proud of Chicago because it has something that is to be found in no other place in the world. I do not, as you might suppose, refer to its lake front or its drives, its universities or its packing plants, its skyline or its parks or its museums. All of these things are monumental, but great as they are they pale as an undone clambake before an epicurean revel when compared to the one and only Col. Robert Rutherford McCormick—"Bertie McComic" to those who really know him—a combination of Bim Gump, Major Hoople, Dick Tracy, Lord Plushbottom, and Superman without his supersuit.

In an ordinary city, say like New York or London, it isn't any trick at all to find an engineer spotted in an office here, and a great lawyer squatted in an office there, a diplomat in this corner, a master military strategist in that one, a publisher up yonder. But do you realize that in Col. Bertie "McCosmic" you have all of these professions and vocations wrapped up in one man? Think of the office space that it saves, and the food in these days of rationing.

If it's advice that General MacArthur needs on jungle fighting, all that he has to do is to call Colonel "McComic" and he will get a hair-trigger answer. If the problem is one of engineering, call Chief Engineer "McCosmic" for help. If you are having trouble with the civil authorities of Tanganyika Territory, appeal to the Honorable Bertie "McComick," the statesman. If you run afoul of the law, speak to Judge "McComic." Handy little gadget, this "McComic" person. Can you visualize the greatest strategist since Napoleon squatting before a map of the world, making up his mind what Stalin and Chiang Kai-shek and Eisenhower, to say nothing of Admiral King, should do next?

Most of us except Bertie seem to think that they are doing a pretty good job as it is.

Bertie, as I have said, is a lawyer. He is so listed in Who's Who. He spent a year or thereabouts at the Northwestern University Law School, was admitted to the Illinois bar, and almost immediately became the front name in one of the biggest law firms in Chicago. It was the firm that then or subsequently did the law work of the Chicago Tribune so that Bertie was able to work both sides of the street. That was about the time that I was given my Illinois license to practice law after having studied like the devil for 3 years. The answer may be that Bertie shouted down the Walls of Jerico. In any event he has been providing a remarkably complete legal service. In addition to being a prosecuting attorney he has also served as judge and jury handing down decisions prepared by his editorial writers and cartoonists and even by his reporters. He is, in other words, and among many other things, a one-man judicial system.

In 1923, during Harding's delectable administration when anything could have happened and much did, Bertie, the hero of Cantigny (farm), was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for executive ability while in active service some 5 or 6 years previously. The last time that I really had a good look at him, which was in Paris in the summer of 1918, he was suffering, so he told me, from a slight shell shock. I never realized that that thing hung on so long, or that it amounted to distinguished executive ability.

Bertie's silences are eloquent. Turning again to Who's Who, we find the legend "Awarded D. S. M." with nothing to show that it was ex post facto the war by several years. It took a Republican Secretary of War under Harding and the Ohio gang to discover that the publisher of a big Republican newspaper that had supported Harding had distinguished himself as an "executive" somewhere back in 1917 or 1918. Apparently the hack who wrote the citation didn't know of the supreme military accomplishments that "McComic" himself was later to set forth with such modesty in a letter that he wrote to J. H. Sawyer, Jr., on February 20, 1942. In that letter he said: "You do not know it, but the fact is that I introduced the Reserve Officers' Training Corps into the schools; that I introduced machine guns into the Army; that I introduced mechanization; I introduced automatic rifles; I was the first ground officer to go up in the air and observe artillery fire. Now I have succeeded in making that the regular practice in the Army. * * * I forced the acquiring of the bases in the Atlantic Ocean."

The letter does not say so in so many words, but it is fair to assume that on the seventh day the colonel rested.

But there's a good reason for Bertie's confessed greatness. Look at the stock from which he sprang. Frequently he reminds the world of it in an editorial proclaiming that his grandpappy, Joseph Medill, created the Republican Party, and, I quote, "was largely responsible for making Lincoln President."

Now you see what I am getting at. If it hadn't been for Grandpappy Medill there wouldn't have been a Lincoln's birthday to celebrate, and we wouldn't be here tonight. Furthermore, there wouldn't have been a Bertie "McComic" to talk about as the precise opposite of George Norris and that would have made me very unhappy.

If my memory doesn't betray me, George Norris has been called Communist and Red and radical and crackpot more times than most men now living. That is because he has been a target for Tory darts longer than most of us. During his more active years on the firing line he was what Congressman MARTIN DIES, of Orange, Tex., would have branded in an hour and 40 minutes' speech as an "irresponsible, unrepresentative crackpot." As a Member of Congress who enjoyed as much immunity as Mr. DIES, but who scorned to use it in the same way, George Norris didn't happen to come within the DIES range, which makes a difference.

On this anniversary of the birth of Lincoln, who was later to be elected President by Bertie "McComic's" grandpappy, it is fitting that we compare the humane philosophy of George Norris with the buffooneries of those Fascist-minded bubble dancers whose names have lately been making front-page news, especially the front pages of the New York-Chicago-Washington newspaper axis—the New York Daily News, the Chicago Tribune, and the Washington Times-Herald.

One of these, Congressman DIES, particularly objects to being called a Tory. I can't blame him for that because a Tory is a Fascist at heart, or vice versa—a Fascist who puts his fascism ahead of everything else. Mr. DIES thinks that there should be a law prohibiting any criticism of Congressmen, but if he wants to call someone outside of Congress an "irresponsible, unrepresentative crackpot," that is a matter that rests entirely with him. If he finds himself too far out on a limb, there is always his immunity behind which to sneak.

Mr. DIES has recently propounded some profound questions to Congress. The first one goes something like this: "Fellow Congressmen, are you for Congressmen or are you for executive departments?" Congressmen, of course! That's a silly thing to ask after all. The next question is a little more complicated, but still quite simple. It goes like this: "Does the 'so-and-so' work for a bureau?" Obviously, if the answer is "yes," then the man Mr. DIES is talking about is a "crackpot bureaucrat." Mr. DIES used to call officials of the administration, which he hates, Communists and radicals. These flexible phrases have snapped back in his face so many times that he has recently thrown them back in the rubbish pile where he found them. But make no mistake about it; he has not changed the words of his song of hate because he has by any chance changed his motives. He is still out to crush the tiniest spark of liberalism or tolerance that may flicker before his bloodshot eyes. The only reason that he has shifted from "Communist" to "crackpot" is that his colleagues in Congress have too often seen that a "Communist" to Mr DIES is anybody who doesn't believe that Mr. DIES is the one and only protector of our political virtue.

Now, difficult as it is to prove a negative, the people whom DIES has pilloried can generally prove that they're not Communists. But how can anybody prove he's not a "crackpot"? Even Mr. DIES.

A splendid fellow member of his alleged, nonexistent, nonfunctioning, orphan-child committee, which Mr. DIES never consults, had this to say of the Congressman's latest effusion:

"The standard set up by the gentleman from Texas in his speech was not that of whether or not a person is a Communist, but rather whether or not they fell into a certain category which the gentleman characterized as 'crackpot.'"

Incidentally, this member of the alleged committee has just resigned. Congressman SADOWSKI, of Michigan, put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the other day some character witnessing for Mr. DIES. Here they are: George Sylvester Viereck, convicted agent of Nazi propaganda said:

"I have the highest respect for the Dies committee and sympathize with its program."

Fritz Kuhn, bund leader now in prison said: "I am in favor of it (the Dies committee) to be appointed again and wish them to get more money."

William Dudley Pelley, native Fascist leader now in prison, said: "I founded the Silver Legion in 1933—to propagandize the same

principles that Mr. DIES and this committee are engaged in prosecuting right now."

James A. Colescott, imperial wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, said: "DIES' program so closely parallels the program of the Klan that there is no distinguishable difference between them."

I would be misleading you if I gave you the impression that Mr. DIES' new vocabulary of sin includes only the word "crackpot." Another sinful fellow is the "bureaucrat." And anybody who is employed by the executive agencies is a bureaucrat—at least so long as Mr. DIES doesn't endorse the executive branch of the Government. J. Edgar Hoover's splendid men, who trapped and shot it out with escaped members of the Touhy gang here in Chicago and who find and arrest the saboteurs and fifth columnists whom MARTIN DIES always misses, are "bureaucrats." The thousands of civil servants of the Hoover and Coolidge administrations are no longer civil servants; they're bureaucrats—an alien, hostile race which must be uprooted.

These people, then, against whom Mr. DIES fulminates are to be destroyed, their characters despoiled, their careers ruined, their lives blasted, without even a kangaroo-court trial, not because they are Communists or even crackpots, but because they believe in the liberal and humanitarian policies of the New Deal. This is their high crime.

I have an abiding faith in America. Neither the antics of MARTIN DIES nor the fulminations of the New York-Chicago-Washington newspaper axis can make me believe that we will allow such sinning against democracy to continue. Indeed, there has already been a revolt in Congress against the despicable tactics of Mr. DIES. About 10 days ago, he came back to visit Congress to put on his annual melodrama. Hissing through his teeth, rending the air with blood-curdling yelps, freezing the very marrow of our bones with his tales of fearsome, ferocious Government clerks who read the New Republic, he called upon the great Congress of the United States to smite them down—all of the 38 on his list.

Several interesting things developed. One was that Mr. DIES wanted more money for that shadow of a committee which never meets and which is never consulted. Another was that 4 of the 38 persons accused had gone into the armed services without asking leave of Mr. DIES. One of these is trying to advance from a volunteer buck private to the parachute troops. He used to work in the Interior Department and Mr. DIES is demanding that I fire him. Mr. DIES will have to go and see his top sergeant. One is in north Africa where I hope he can go about doing his hazardous job without knowing that Mr. DIES' hot breath is on the back of his neck. One lady on the list who had been in the Government service for 25 years reached the retirement age some months ago, and is no longer with the Government—but perhaps Mr. DIES can find out about this if he gets another appropriation. One could really expect him to telephone those "crackpot bureaucrats" in the Civil Service Commission to find out.

Mr. DIES has already gotten $495,000 as of the close of business on this date. It has been used in character assassination of anyone within reach whom Mr. DIES suspects of believing that Government should promote the welfare of the people. I am sorry to say that he will undoubtedly get more, but I have a feeling that he will never again stride quite so lustily and balefully across the stage, shooting at clay pigeons. Congress has come into its own, and it has given evidence that it will not be roused to lynch law, even by Judge Lynch himself come to life.

I cannot adequately express my profound gratitude to the Members of the House of Representatives who resolutely refused to allow themselves to be stampeded by Mr. DIES' passionate appeal to strike down 38 people who had never been heard, indicted, tried, or convicted. These Members of Congress were no more motivated by sympathy with Communists than I am myself. They dared to oppose what appeared to be an irresistible tide of passionate hate because they believe in due process of law, in fairness, and decency—the qualities that are America. Many of them are men with whose political and economic views I disagree; but I honor them from the bottom of my heart for their courage and decency, for their refusal to allow political considerations or passion to lead them into participation in an assault upon the foundations of our Constitution. So long as the majority of Congressmen are of this caliber—whether they be Democrats or Republicans, conservatives or liberals—we need not fear for our Nation or for the future of the people of the United States.

When Congress voted against the legislative lynching of human beings without trial or proof, it wrote again the precious charter of civil rights. I doubt if it could do anything that would rate it higher in the esteem of the American people. Some time ago, in a speech in Boston, I deprecated the disposition in some quarters to ridicule and inveigh against Congress. I pointed out then that, after all, the Congress is the keystone of the arch of our constitutional liberties. I am glad that the Congress has shown that it realizes this. And I am sure that, just in the degree that it accords decent, considerate treatment to all of the people, so it will receive the honor that will be its due.

And so, as the ritual says of marriage: "Liberalism is an ancient and honorable estate." In spite of the Martin Dieses and the Bertie McCormicks and all of their hangers on and relatives—"giants" all—the fight for liberalism goes on. Like any other organism, man either grows or he perishes. And this is true of the mass as of the individual. So it ought to be an inspiration to any man to be called a liberal, as I know that it has been to George Norris, even when the term is used sneeringly or opprobriously, whether on the floor of Congress or in the pages of the New York-Chicago-Washington newspaper axis.

Let me try to clarify what I mean by liberalism. The word is hard to define, it represents an attitude, a state of mind, rather than a specific philosophy. Liberalism is an ideal which goes under various labels. Sometimes liberals call themselves progressives, sometimes Democrats, sometimes Republicans, sometimes Populists. It does not matter. The label is nothing—the point of view is everything.

Teddy Roosevelt, from whom I was privileged to learn many things, including how to battle with zest in a political cause, defined a progressive as a "genuine champion of the people" who "wars against all crookedness and injustices and unfairness and tyranny." I think that is a good definition. Woodrow Wilson, another liberal, said that a progressive is "one who insists on recognizing new facts, adjusting policies to facts and circumstances as they arise." That, too, is a good definition. Lord Morley, the English liberal, said that liberalism means respect for the dignity and worth of man, the pursuit of social good against special interests, and the love of reason, mercy, and justice. This comes pretty near to a definition of Christianity, too.

But however we describe a liberal, we generally recognize him by his deeds or words. A man's fundamental, long-range attitude toward life and the world fixes him permanently in the esteem and opinion of his fellow men. We all know—we don't have to prove it or define it—that George Norris is a liberal and that he could never do anything basically antiliberal or antidemocratic. On the other hand, we also know that Robert R. McCormick is an enemy of liberalism, no matter what he may possibly say or do. We do not have to be told that an individual like MARTIN DIES could quote Jefferson and Lincoln until he cracked his vocal chords, but he would still be what he is fundamentally—a hater of liberalism.

Liberalism will have its supreme test when the time comes to launch a democratic peace, for then it will be opposed by a few powerful newspapers, by mighty cartels, and by unscrupulous agitators. If these evil forces are not overcome, then the peace that will be made will not be worth the paper upon which it is written. It is my hope that the peace we shall write at the end of this war will embody those ideas and principles upon which America was founded and to which George Norris has unwaveringly adhered.

Chicago liberals join with others like-minded, in all parts of this Nation, in pressing into the hands of this great man, whom we have met tonight to honor, the responsibility of leading the liberal democratic cause of Jefferson, Lincoln, and George Norris, realizing as we do how important a part liberalism must play in the writing of the peace that will follow this war if it is to be a peoples' peace.

For my part, I firmly believe that there can be no hope for a just and, therefore, a permanent peace, but only the certainty of a greater and more horrible war unless the understanding to be arrived at, after we have won the victory, shall have the radiance that only humility and understanding and concern for the well-being of the common man everywhere can give to it. These are the qualities of George Norris, who now and for many years hereafter will give to us the strength and the inspiration to fight the good fight.

Nine Years of the Tennessee Valley Authority

REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago on yesterday the Tennessee Valley Authority made its first contract for the sale of power to the city of Tupelo, Miss., my home town, to be distributed by the municipality at the yardstick rates.

That was the beginning of a new day for the electric light and power consumers of America.

At that time the domestic consumers in Tupelo were paying a maximum of 10 cents, and an average of 7½ cents a kilowatt-hour for their electricity, which was being purchased by the power company from the Government at Wilson Dam on the Tennessee River wholesale for less than 2 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Last year, 1942, the domestic consumers in Tupelo paid a maximum of 2½ cents, and an average of 1 cent a kilowatt-hour—while the city was, and is now paying more than twice as much to the Government for it as the power companies were paying 9 years ago.

Not only has the Tennessee Valley Authority proved its worth to the Nation in time of war, but it has set an example that has brought power rates down throughout the Nation. It is the father of our rural-electrification program which started in the district I have the honor to represent.

The T. V. A. has been the main yardstick, the principal influence that has forced reduction of light and power rates in every State in the Union, and its example has enabled us to develop a rural-electrification program that is now serving millions of farmers who saw no hope 9 years ago of receiving such service.

While these reductions have taken place, except in the immediate area served by the T. V. A. and other public power developments, the American people are still overcharged on an average of 100 percent for their electric light and power.

At this point I am inserting four tables for the year 1941. I hope every Member of the House and of the Senate will examine these tables carefully and note the tribute his people are required to pay in overcharges for their electricity.

Table No. 1 shows the amount of electricity used in each State, the amount paid for it, and then shows that the overcharges, compared with the T. V. A. rates, the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the Bonneville rates, and the Ontario, Canada, rates amounted to more than $1,000,000,000 a year:

TABLE 1.—*Total electric sales, 1941*

State	Estimated sales data for 1941			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours (thousands)	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	331,357	2,545,137	$30,532,100	$21,094,704	$9,437,396	$15,361,546	$15,170,554	$16,180,207	$14,351,893	$18,811,074	$11,721,026
Arizona	108,515	613,915	11,567,000	5,345,376	6,221,624	4,075,559	7,491,441	4,152,597	7,414,403	4,726,281	6,840,719
Arkansas	199,201	602,556	15,377,100	8,032,422	7,344,678	6,122,581	9,254,519	6,233,668	9,143,432	7,101,066	8,276,034
California	2,445,787	10,474,742	185,901,900	140,646,219	45,255,681	105,269,495	80,632,405	108,443,943	77,457,957	125,716,323	60,185,577
Colorado	266,933	713,380	19,896,900	10,651,474	9,245,426	8,309,432	11,587,468	8,303,550	11,593,350	9,363,912	10,532,988
Connecticut	535,207	2,095,114	48,879,500	25,995,427	22,884,073	20,103,423	28,776,077	20,285,550	28,593,950	22,747,907	26,131,593
Delaware	69,678	304,249	6,256,700	3,391,978	2,864,722	2,571,852	3,684,848	2,632,453	3,624,247	2,978,740	3,277,960
District of Columbia	170,847	668,525	12,521,200	9,809,532	2,711,668	8,203,375	4,317,825	7,807,625	4,713,575	8,671,228	3,849,972
Florida	406,830	1,149,334	37,260,900	16,202,844	21,058,056	13,103,358	24,157,542	12,783,811	24,477,089	14,086,327	23,174,573
Georgia	409,545	2,224,722	37,362,900	22,683,962	14,678,938	17,451,180	19,911,720	17,672,521	19,690,379	19,954,577	17,408,323
Idaho	135,222	746,906	10,832,100	6,445,980	4,386,120	5,099,953	5,732,147	5,053,346	5,778,754	5,593,064	5,239,036
Illinois	2,173,063	9,527,693	196,992,700	108,071,707	88,920,993	82,908,988	114,083,712	84,233,609	112,759,091	95,090,390	101,902,310
Indiana	934,373	3,726,227	77,966,600	44,781,246	33,185,354	33,942,625	44,023,975	34,735,643	43,230,957	39,511,918	38,454,682
Iowa	608,223	1,717,350	42,431,900	23,113,271	19,318,629	18,457,796	23,974,104	18,184,657	24,247,243	20,313,116	22,118,784
Kansas	416,079	1,170,004	28,990,300	15,927,903	13,062,397	12,630,304	16,359,996	12,502,455	16,487,845	13,937,004	15,053,296
Kentucky	402,896	1,330,544	28,822,000	17,382,894	11,439,106	13,221,649	15,600,351	13,496,680	15,325,320	15,314,113	13,507,887
Louisiana	335,552	1,529,348	28,360,500	14,398,188	13,962,312	11,071,700	17,288,800	11,200,902	17,159,598	12,706,910	15,653,590
Maine	232,008	904,523	17,713,000	9,627,496	8,085,504	7,199,743	10,513,257	7,438,260	10,274,740	8,484,094	9,228,906
Maryland	452,079	2,740,152	44,291,900	26,053,005	18,238,895	19,248,556	25,043,344	20,056,042	24,235,858	23,148,140	21,143,760
Massachusetts	1,342,386	4,062,658	108,537,100	53,820,409	54,716,691	41,430,325	67,106,775	41,944,415	66,592,685	47,167,890	61,369,210
Michigan	1,498,922	6,644,439	127,817,900	72,739,312	55,078,588	57,381,163	70,436,737	57,039,517	70,778,383	63,434,310	64,383,590
Minnesota	648,331	2,019,911	49,102,800	27,389,782	21,713,018	21,592,569	27,510,231	21,475,902	27,626,898	23,838,749	25,264,051
Mississippi	185,151	577,471	13,094,000	7,115,860	5,978,140	5,444,151	7,649,849	5,521,743	7,572,257	6,275,700	6,818,300
Missouri	836,985	3,032,715	63,161,000	37,801,943	25,359,057	29,350,875	33,810,125	29,527,585	33,633,415	32,747,842	30,413,158
Montana	122,454	1,602,270	14,974,900	10,103,122	4,871,778	7,142,213	7,832,687	7,676,867	7,298,033	9,106,778	5,868,122
Nebraska	300,235	720,018	19,725,100	11,244,012	8,481,088	8,838,791	10,806,309	8,838,228	10,886,872	9,808,807	9,916,293
Nevada	30,271	148,295	3,153,200	1,648,819	1,504,381	1,298,804	1,854,396	1,290,127	1,863,073	1,457,024	1,696,176
New Hampshire	152,259	448,481	11,630,600	6,059,443	5,571,157	4,622,102	7,008,498	4,714,019	6,916,581	5,306,282	6,324,318
New Jersey	1,313,723	4,476,231	114,845,200	54,818,743	60,026,457	42,705,814	72,139,386	42,827,855	72,017,345	48,030,192	66,815,008
New Mexico	63,809	168,321	5,542,900	2,224,753	3,318,147	1,819,833	3,723,067	1,758,361	3,784,539	1,958,462	3,584,438
New York	4,126,169	17,348,371	356,560,200	178,390,943	178,169,257	136,934,509	219,625,691	139,036,853	217,523,347	157,171,157	199,389,043
North Carolina	510,946	3,227,943	47,298,600	31,589,462	15,709,138	22,899,864	24,398,736	24,193,658	23,104,942	28,299,317	18,999,283
North Dakota	97,394	172,963	6,871,300	3,162,473	3,708,827	2,616,042	4,255,258	2,513,495	4,357,805	2,734,360	4,136,940
Ohio	1,966,514	9,983,380	172,343,500	106,363,959	65,979,541	80,619,678	91,723,822	82,505,874	89,837,626	93,783,025	78,560,475
Oklahoma	366,000	1,138,114	28,314,800	15,113,137	13,201,663	11,491,187	16,823,613	11,727,279	16,587,521	13,337,002	14,977,798
Oregon	330,979	1,438,846	23,331,600	16,480,542	6,851,058	13,113,638	10,217,962	12,959,812	10,371,788	14,344,332	8,987,268
Pennsylvania	2,553,146	14,138,647	235,859,000	143,371,377	92,487,623	106,197,371	129,661,629	110,542,232	125,316,768	126,990,721	108,868,279
Rhode Island	216,498	767,328	18,702,200	9,582,267	9,119,933	7,148,325	11,553,875	7,395,526	11,306,674	8,471,609	10,230,591
South Carolina	211,959	1,671,280	22,332,400	15,080,995	7,251,405	10,903,660	11,428,740	11,530,769	10,801,631	13,514,416	8,817,984
South Dakota	100,026	209,196	7,405,300	3,381,599	4,023,701	2,766,417	4,638,883	2,672,617	4,732,683	2,947,909	4,457,391
Tennessee	423,468	3,675,947	35,296,700	29,535,951	5,760,749	21,945,419	13,351,281	22,791,071	12,505,629	26,189,375	9,107,325
Texas	1,101,479	3,954,230	86,474,700	47,322,625	39,152,075	36,690,699	49,784,001	36,927,966	49,546,734	41,770,205	44,704,495
Utah	141,107	986,057	13,778,900	8,427,826	5,351,074	6,251,301	7,527,599	6,497,822	7,281,078	7,445,318	6,333,582
Vermont	95,142	279,895	7,562,300	4,042,161	3,520,139	3,094,888	4,467,412	3,140,758	4,421,542	3,549,228	4,013,072
Virginia	466,433	1,945,319	39,420,200	22,558,015	16,862,185	17,394,513	22,025,687	17,584,388	21,835,812	19,818,720	19,601,480
Washington	568,387	4,379,701	44,145,100	33,416,407	10,728,693	25,920,826	18,224,274	26,085,709	18,059,391	29,403,245	14,741,855
West Virginia	325,502	2,321,859	33,770,700	20,710,301	13,060,399	14,773,374	18,997,326	15,816,706	17,953,994	18,572,928	15,197,772
Wisconsin	825,689	2,993,298	63,827,900	36,429,824	27,398,076	28,158,175	35,669,725	28,388,046	35,439,854	32,091,483	31,736,417
Wyoming	51,232	128,305	4,084,200	1,930,714	2,153,486	1,548,557	2,535,643	1,518,701	2,565,499	1,688,960	2,395,240
United States	31,605,991	139,445,910	2,660,921,500	1,541,512,404	1,119,409,096	1,176,528,198	1,484,393,302	1,197,841,420	1,463,080,080	1,359,511,530	1,301,409,970

Table No. 2 gives the figures for every State in the Union on the residential consumption of electricity, and shows what the residential consumers of each State paid for their electricity in 1941, and the overcharges they paid according to the T. V. A. rates, the Tacoma rates, the Bonneville rates, and the Ontario rates.

TABLE 2.—*Residential electric service, 1941*

State	Estimated sales data for 1941			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours (thousands)	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	251,035	309,925	$8,316,900	$5,630,541	$2,686,359	$5,081,626	$3,235,274	$4,649,147	$3,667,753	$4,391,323	$3,925,577
Arizona	90,042	101,747	4,055,000	1,739,595	2,315,405	1,573,340	2,481,660	1,439,525	2,615,475	1,358,425	2,696,575
Arkansas	154,089	122,682	5,446,000	2,603,188	2,842,812	2,352,672	3,093,328	2,151,170	3,294,830	2,031,358	3,414,642
California	1,793,676	1,763,059	55,907,600	36,899,016	19,008,584	33,320,930	22,586,670	30,469,642	25,437,958	28,792,414	27,115,186
Colorado	208,636	169,844	7,326,700	3,861,171	3,465,529	3,487,509	3,839,191	3,187,115	4,139,585	3,018,600	4,308,100
Connecticut	465,640	493,778	19,013,100	10,019,904	8,993,196	9,050,236	9,962,864	8,270,699	10,742,401	7,833,397	11,179,703
Delaware	59,894	59,247	2,539,500	1,211,342	1,328,158	1,094,525	1,444,975	1,000,563	1,538,937	944,694	1,594,806
District of Columbia	145,069	174,740	4,314,900	3,577,052	737,848	3,231,860	1,083,040	2,951,392	1,363,508	2,791,740	1,523,160
Florida	324,728	389,494	15,929,100	7,008,804	8,920,296	6,339,782	9,589,318	5,798,192	10,130,908	5,479,610	10,449,490
Georgia	344,253	432,052	13,419,600	8,118,858	5,300,742	7,340,521	6,079,079	6,709,800	6,709,800	6,347,471	7,072,129
Idaho	109,462	191,170	4,868,400	2,765,251	2,103,149	2,497,489	2,370,911	2,283,280	2,585,120	2,156,701	2,711,699
Illinois	1,830,705	1,735,304	67,339,700	38,383,629	28,956,071	34,679,946	32,659,754	31,716,999	35,622,701	29,966,167	37,373,533

TABLE 2.—*Residential electric service, 1941*—Continued

State	Estimated sales data for 1941			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours (thousands)	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Indiana	747,974	693,486	$27,074,000	$14,944,848	$12,129,152	$13,482,852	$13,591,148	$12,345,744	$14,728,256	$11,668,894	$15,405,106
Iowa	472,106	406,913	16,672,900	8,669,908	8,002,992	7,836,263	8,836,637	7,169,347	9,503,553	6,769,197	9,903,703
Kansas	330,937	285,607	12,062,500	6,236,313	5,826,187	5,633,188	6,429,312	5,150,688	6,911,812	4,861,188	7,201,312
Kentucky	328,737	283,288	10,135,500	5,969,810	4,165,690	5,392,086	4,743,414	4,935,989	5,199,511	4,662,330	5,473,170
Louisiana	280,949	221,686	10,101,700	4,879,121	5,222,579	4,404,341	5,697,359	4,030,578	6,071,122	3,808,341	6,293,359
Maine	191,651	152,882	6,957,600	3,200,496	3,757,104	2,887,404	4,070,196	2,643,888	4,313,712	2,497,778	4,459,822
Maryland	370,363	355,192	13,017,100	7,588,969	5,428,131	6,846,995	6,170,105	6,261,225	6,755,875	5,922,781	7,094,319
Massachusetts	1,151,290	885,943	42,324,500	20,358,085	21,966,415	18,411,158	23,913,342	16,845,151	25,479,349	15,914,012	26,410,488
Michigan	1,306,521	1,515,277	47,703,700	30,053,331	17,650,369	27,143,405	20,560,295	24,805,924	22,897,776	23,470,220	24,233,480
Minnesota	533,414	567,631	19,638,900	11,351,284	8,287,616	10,251,506	9,387,394	9,387,394	10,251,506	8,857,144	10,781,756
Mississippi	142,297	133,216	4,273,500	2,376,066	1,897,434	2,145,297	2,128,203	1,961,537	2,311,963	1,854,699	2,418,801
Missouri	682,532	651,736	23,840,100	13,731,898	10,108,202	12,396,852	11,443,248	11,347,888	12,492,212	10,728,045	13,112,055
Montana	103,366	109,713	3,910,500	1,966,982	1,943,518	1,779,278	2,131,222	1,626,768	2,283,732	1,536,827	2,373,673
Nebraska	246,028	212,292	8,597,700	4,608,367	3,989,333	4,161,287	4,436,413	3,808,781	4,788,919	3,602,436	4,995,264
Nevada	25,012	31,939	1,222,600	561,173	661,427	506,156	716,444	463,365	759,235	437,691	784,909
New Hampshire	130,542	105,117	5,221,200	2,281,664	2,939,536	2,057,153	3,164,047	1,884,853	3,336,347	1,780,429	3,440,771
New Jersey	1,113,812	900,531	43,567,500	20,781,698	22,785,802	18,777,593	24,789,907	17,165,595	26,401,905	16,207,110	27,360,390
New Mexico	51,914	41,641	2,065,900	840,821	1,225,079	758,185	1,307,715	694,142	1,371,758	656,956	1,408,944
New York	3,483,676	2,740,796	124,391,300	62,568,824	61,822,476	56,598,042	67,793,258	51,746,781	72,644,519	48,885,781	75,505,519
North Carolina	412,918	382,095	13,119,800	7,583,244	5,536,556	6,848,536	6,271,264	6,271,264	6,848,536	5,917,030	7,202,770
North Dakota	74,498	70,470	3,055,000	1,460,290	1,594,710	1,319,760	1,735,240	1,206,725	1,848,275	1,139,515	1,915,485
Ohio	1,649,732	1,682,587	57,969,100	36,520,533	21,448,567	32,984,418	24,984,682	30,143,932	27,825,168	28,520,797	29,448,303
Oklahoma	286,950	227,119	10,813,400	5,060,671	5,752,729	4,574,068	6,239,332	4,184,786	6,628,614	3,957,704	6,855,696
Oregon	272,019	446,102	10,015,500	6,950,773	3,054,727	6,289,734	3,725,766	5,748,897	4,266,603	5,438,417	4,577,083
Pennsylvania	2,175,618	2,069,066	81,169,800	44,156,371	37,013,429	39,854,372	41,315,428	36,445,240	44,724,560	34,497,165	46,672,635
Rhode Island	188,736	125,905	6,590,400	3,024,994	3,565,406	2,728,426	3,861,974	2,497,762	4,092,638	2,359,363	4,231,037
South Carolina	170,216	183,972	5,977,400	3,616,327	2,361,073	3,269,638	2,707,762	2,988,700	2,988,700	2,827,310	3,150,090
South Dakota	76,887	67,043	3,075,300	1,423,864	1,651,436	1,285,475	1,789,825	1,174,765	1,900,535	1,110,183	1,965,117
Tennessee	355,831	511,241	11,128,100	8,980,377	2,147,723	8,112,385	3,015,715	7,422,443	3,705,657	7,010,703	4,117,397
Texas	884,850	751,124	31,676,500	16,091,662	15,584,838	14,539,514	17,136,986	13,304,130	18,372,370	12,575,571	19,100,929
Utah	125,351	139,632	4,695,500	2,667,044	2,028,456	2,408,792	2,286,708	2,202,190	2,493,310	2,080,107	2,615,393
Vermont	76,660	73,928	3,292,400	1,471,703	1,820,697	1,326,837	1,965,563	1,214,896	2,077,504	1,149,048	2,143,352
Virginia	388,826	405,460	15,256,300	8,207,889	7,048,411	7,414,562	7,841,738	6,773,797	8,482,503	6,407,646	8,848,654
Washington	470,007	824,162	16,186,200	11,945,416	4,240,784	10,796,195	5,390,005	9,873,582	6,312,618	9,323,251	6,862,949
West Virginia	263,476	215,660	8,747,800	4,758,803	3,988,997	4,295,170	4,452,630	3,927,762	4,820,038	3,717,815	5,029,985
Wisconsin	640,143	676,459	22,555,300	12,721,189	9,834,111	11,480,648	11,074,652	10,488,215	12,067,085	9,924,332	12,630,968
Wyoming	42,505	35,947	1,649,600	758,816	890,784	684,584	965,016	626,848	1,022,752	592,206	1,057,394
United States	26,025,513	25,123,900	938,228,600	522,197,975	416,030,625	471,732,591	466,496,009	431,399,096	506,829,504	407,781,922	530,446,678

Table No. 3 gives the figures for each State on the commercial consumption of electricity, and shows what the commercial consumers in each State paid for the electricity they consumed in 1941, and the overcharges they paid according to the T. V. A. rates, the Tacoma rates, the Bonneville rates, and the Ontario rates:

TABLE 3.—*Commercial electric service, 1941*

State	Estimated sales data for 1941			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours (thousands)	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	39,251	216,632	$5,538,900	$3,190,406	$2,348,494	$2,608,822	$2,930,078	$2,492,505	$3,046,395	$3,013,162	$2,525,738
Arizona	16,271	88,114	2,955,200	1,309,154	1,646,046	1,066,827	1,888,373	1,022,499	1,932,701	1,235,274	1,719,926
Arkansas	33,949	116,100	4,633,500	1,964,604	2,668,896	1,603,191	3,030,309	1,529,055	3,104,445	1,848,767	2,784,733
California	375,267	3,118,781	58,544,300	36,941,453	21,602,847	30,150,315	28,393,985	28,745,251	29,799,049	34,833,859	23,710,441
Colorado	37,801	200,521	6,368,500	3,056,880	3,311,620	2,490,084	3,878,416	2,369,082	3,999,418	2,878,562	3,489,938
Connecticut	64,299	418,970	13,475,000	5,632,550	7,842,450	4,594,975	8,880,025	4,392,850	9,082,150	5,309,150	8,165,850
Delaware	8,728	44,773	1,339,000	603,889	735,111	492,752	846,248	471,328	867,672	569,075	769,925
District of Columbia	25,761	461,526	7,281,000	5,569,965	1,711,035	4,557,906	2,723,094	4,368,600	2,912,400	5,264,163	2,016,837
Florida	69,414	396,870	14,389,300	5,410,377	8,978,923	4,403,126	9,986,174	4,201,676	10,187,624	5,093,812	9,295,488
Georgia	62,199	386,145	10,962,900	5,284,118	5,678,782	4,308,420	6,654,480	4,122,050	6,840,850	4,988,120	5,974,780
Idaho	19,203	167,096	3,236,400	1,605,254	1,631,146	1,304,269	1,932,131	1,242,778	1,993,622	1,508,162	1,728,238
Illinois	262,765	1,441,215	50,127,800	23,961,088	26,166,712	19,599,970	30,527,830	18,797,925	31,329,875	22,657,766	27,470,034
Indiana	109,928	625,602	18,549,500	9,460,245	9,089,255	7,716,592	10,832,908	7,382,701	11,166,799	8,922,310	9,627,190
Iowa	95,941	508,393	16,231,900	8,326,965	7,904,935	6,801,166	9,430,734	6,508,992	9,722,908	7,856,240	8,375,660
Kansas	58,626	417,277	9,838,000	4,948,514	4,889,486	4,033,580	5,804,420	3,856,496	5,981,504	4,673,050	5,164,950
Kentucky	50,466	208,926	6,880,300	3,632,798	3,247,502	2,965,409	3,914,891	2,834,684	4,045,616	3,426,389	3,453,911
Louisiana	48,052	302,051	9,539,400	3,825,299	5,714,101	3,109,844	6,429,556	2,976,293	6,563,107	3,605,893	5,933,507
Maine	30,656	97,080	3,411,600	1,572,748	1,838,852	1,279,350	2,132,250	1,217,941	2,193,659	1,477,223	1,934,377
Maryland	55,252	120,111	8,164,600	4,482,365	3,682,235	3,665,905	4,498,695	3,510,778	4,653,822	4,237,427	3,927,173
Massachusetts	183,444	729,195	28,624,200	11,134,814	17,489,386	9,073,871	19,550,329	8,673,133	19,951,067	10,505,081	18,119,119
Michigan	173,461	1,345,584	36,596,600	18,664,266	17,932,334	15,224,186	21,372,414	14,565,447	22,031,153	17,639,561	18,957,039
Minnesota	97,037	432,355	14,943,500	6,948,728	7,994,772	5,663,587	9,279,913	5,394,604	9,548,896	6,545,253	8,398,247
Mississippi	29,993	119,326	4,140,500	1,767,994	2,372,506	1,440,894	2,699,606	1,374,646	2,765,854	1,664,481	2,476,019
Missouri	124,607	629,331	19,180,800	9,951,835	9,228,965	8,132,659	11,048,141	7,787,405	11,393,395	8,908,592	10,272,208
Montana	17,207	90,684	3,150,800	1,496,630	1,654,170	1,216,209	1,934,591	1,159,494	1,991,306	1,405,257	1,745,543
Nebraska	42,791	165,201	6,103,600	3,204,390	2,899,210	2,612,341	3,491,259	2,502,476	3,601,124	3,021,282	3,082,318
Nevada	5,103	71,513	1,323,100	590,103	732,997	481,608	841,492	460,439	862,661	557,025	766,075
New Hampshire	18,502	62,936	2,422,800	1,070,878	1,351,922	874,631	1,548,169	835,866	1,586,934	1,010,308	1,412,492
New Jersey	195,142	884,074	37,128,600	13,923,225	23,205,375	11,361,352	25,767,248	10,841,551	26,287,049	13,143,524	23,985,076
New Mexico	11,547	73,393	2,753,200	1,037,956	1,715,244	845,232	1,907,968	809,441	1,943,759	980,139	1,773,061
New York	596,470	2,911,049	104,325,300	41,417,144	62,908,156	33,801,397	70,523,903	32,445,168	71,880,132	39,121,988	65,203,312
North Carolina	69,730	336,440	10,078,400	5,593,512	4,484,888	4,555,437	5,522,963	4,353,869	5,724,531	5,271,003	4,807,397
North Dakota	21,083	70,685	2,964,100	1,236,030	1,728,070	1,004,830	1,959,270	963,333	2,000,767	1,161,927	1,802,173
Ohio	216,878	1,304,846	37,710,000	20,778,210	16,931,790	16,969,500	20,740,500	16,253,010	21,456,990	19,646,910	18,063,090
Oklahoma	54,452	202,868	7,469,900	3,361,455	4,108,445	2,733,983	4,735,917	2,606,995	4,862,905	3,159,768	4,310,132
Oregon	45,685	405,213	7,760,700	4,586,574	3,174,126	3,740,657	4,020,043	3,577,683	4,183,017	4,322,710	3,437,990
Pennsylvania	320,200	1,519,474	46,045,900	22,838,766	23,207,134	18,648,590	27,397,310	17,819,763	28,226,137	21,549,481	24,496,419
Rhode Island	26,406	95,909	4,210,000	1,713,470	2,496,530	1,393,510	2,816,490	1,326,150	2,883,850	1,608,220	2,601,780
South Carolina	32,401	136,088	4,591,700	2,465,743	2,125,957	2,011,165	2,580,535	1,919,331	2,672,369	2,323,400	2,268,300
South Dakota	21,497	79,661	3,180,800	1,348,659	1,832,141	1,100,557	2,080,243	1,049,664	2,131,136	1,272,320	1,908,480

TABLE 3.—*Commercial electric service, 1941*—Continued

State	Estimated sales data for 1941			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours (thousands)	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Tennessee	54,716	339,305	$6,939,100	$5,169,630	$1,769,470	$4,218,973	$2,720,127	$4,031,617	$2,907,483	$4,878,187	$2,060,913
Texas	164,400	1,044,106	28,378,200	13,820,183	14,558,017	11,266,145	17,112,055	10,783,716	17,594,484	13,025,594	15,352,606
Utah	13,052	92,297	2,820,100	1,288,786	1,531,314	1,049,077	1,771,023	1,001,136	1,818,964	1,212,643	1,607,457
Vermont	13,406	57,343	1,899,500	847,177	1,052,323	689,519	1,209,981	655,328	1,244,172	797,790	1,101,710
Virginia	62,763	377,738	11,214,300	5,259,507	5,954,793	4,295,077	6,919,223	4,115,648	7,098,652	4,967,935	6,246,365
Washington	69,179	849,986	12,928,900	8,920,941	4,007,959	7,278,971	5,649,929	6,968,677	5,960,223	8,416,714	4,512,186
West Virginia	37,852	150,719	5,235,700	2,654,500	2,581,200	2,167,580	3,068,120	2,094,280	3,141,420	2,507,900	2,727,800
Wisconsin	109,977	669,541	17,941,400	9,616,590	8,324,810	7,858,333	10,083,067	7,517,447	10,423,953	9,078,348	8,863,052
Wyoming	7,166	44,942	1,588,600	698,984	889,616	568,719	1,019,881	543,301	1,045,299	657,680	930,920
United States	4,299,976	24,627,985	725,117,400	354,185,352	370,932,048	289,031,093	436,086,307	276,474,102	448,643,298	333,759,425	391,357,975

Table No. 4 gives the figures for each State on the industrial consumption of electricity, and shows what the industrial consumers in each State paid for their electricity in 1941, and the overcharges they paid, according to the T. V. A. rates, the Tacoma rates, the Bonneville rates, and the Ontario rates:

TABLE 4.—*Industrial and other electric service, 1941*

State	Estimated sales data for 1941			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours (thousands)	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	41,071	2,018,580	$16,676,300	$12,273,757	$4,402,543	$7,671,098	$9,005,202	$9,038,555	$7,637,745	$11,406,589	$5,269,711
Arizona	2,202	424,054	4,556,800	2,296,627	2,260,173	1,435,392	3,121,408	1,690,573	2,866,227	2,132,582	2,424,218
Arkansas	11,163	363,774	5,297,600	3,464,630	1,832,970	2,166,718	3,130,882	2,553,443	2,744,157	3,220,941	2,076,659
California	276,844	5,592,902	71,450,000	66,805,750	4,644,250	41,798,250	29,651,750	49,229,050	22,220,950	62,090,050	9,359,950
Colorado	20,496	343,015	6,201,700	3,733,423	2,468,277	2,331,839	3,869,861	2,747,353	3,454,347	3,466,750	2,734,950
Connecticut	5,268	1,182,366	16,391,400	10,342,973	6,048,427	6,458,212	9,933,188	7,622,001	8,769,399	9,605,360	6,786,040
Delaware	1,056	202,229	2,378,200	1,576,747	801,453	984,575	1,393,625	1,160,562	1,217,638	1,464,971	913,229
District of Columbia	17	32,259	925,300	662,515	262,785	413,609	511,691	487,633	437,667	615,325	309,975
Florida	12,688	362,970	6,942,500	3,783,663	3,158,837	2,360,450	4,582,050	2,783,943	4,158,557	3,512,905	3,429,595
Georgia	3,093	1,406,525	12,980,400	9,280,986	3,699,414	5,802,239	7,178,161	6,840,671	6,139,729	8,618,986	4,361,414
Idaho	6,557	388,640	2,727,300	2,075,475	651,825	1,298,195	1,429,105	1,527,288	1,200,012	1,928,201	799,099
Illinois	79,593	6,351,174	79,525,200	45,726,990	33,798,210	28,629,072	50,896,128	33,718,685	45,806,515	42,466,457	37,058,743
Indiana	76,471	2,407,139	32,348,100	20,376,153	11,966,947	12,743,181	19,599,919	15,007,198	17,335,902	18,920,714	13,422,386
Iowa	40,176	802,044	9,527,100	6,116,398	3,410,702	3,820,367	5,706,733	4,506,318	5,020,782	5,687,679	3,839,421
Kansas	26,516	467,120	7,089,800	4,743,076	2,346,724	2,963,536	4,126,264	3,495,271	3,594,529	4,402,766	2,687,034
Kentucky	23,693	838,330	11,806,200	7,780,286	4,025,914	4,864,154	6,942,046	5,726,007	6,080,193	7,225,394	4,580,806
Louisiana	6,551	1,005,611	8,719,400	5,693,768	3,025,632	3,557,515	5,161,885	4,194,031	4,525,369	5,292,676	3,426,724
Maine	9,701	654,561	7,343,800	4,854,252	2,489,548	3,032,989	4,310,811	3,576,431	3,767,369	4,509,093	2,834,707
Maryland	26,464	2,264,849	23,110,200	13,981,671	9,128,529	8,735,656	14,374,544	10,284,039	12,826,161	12,987,932	10,122,268
Massachusetts	7,652	2,447,520	37,588,400	22,327,510	15,260,890	13,945,296	23,643,104	16,426,131	21,162,269	20,748,797	16,839,603
Michigan	18,940	3,783,578	43,517,600	24,021,715	19,495,885	15,013,572	28,504,028	17,668,146	25,849,454	22,324,529	21,193,071
Minnesota	17,880	1,019,925	14,520,400	9,089,770	5,430,630	5,677,476	8,842,924	6,693,904	7,826,496	8,436,352	6,084,048
Mississippi	12,861	324,929	4,680,000	2,971,800	1,708,200	1,857,960	2,822,040	2,185,560	2,494,440	2,756,520	1,923,480
Missouri	29,846	1,751,648	20,140,100	14,118,210	6,021,890	8,821,364	11,318,736	10,392,292	9,747,808	13,111,205	7,028,895
Montana	1,881	1,401,873	7,913,600	6,639,510	1,274,090	4,146,726	3,766,874	4,890,605	3,022,995	6,164,694	1,748,906
Nebraska	11,416	342,525	5,023,800	3,431,255	1,592,545	2,145,163	2,878,637	2,526,971	2,496,829	3,185,089	1,838,711
Nevada	156	44,843	607,500	497,543	109,957	311,040	296,460	366,323	241,177	462,308	145,192
New Hampshire	3,215	280,428	3,986,600	2,706,901	1,279,699	1,690,318	2,296,282	1,993,300	1,993,300	2,515,545	1,471,055
New Jersey	4,769	2,691,626	34,149,100	20,113,820	14,035,280	12,566,869	21,582,231	14,820,709	19,328,391	18,679,558	15,469,542
New Mexico	348	53,287	723,800	345,976	377,824	216,416	507,384	254,778	469,022	321,367	402,433
New York	46,023	11,696,526	127,843,600	74,404,975	53,438,625	46,535,070	81,308,530	54,844,904	72,998,696	69,163,388	58,680,212
North Carolina	28,298	2,509,408	24,100,400	18,412,706	5,687,694	11,495,891	12,604,509	13,568,525	10,531,875	17,111,284	6,989,116
North Dakota	1,813	31,808	852,200	466,153	386,047	291,452	560,748	343,437	508,763	432,918	419,282
Ohio	99,904	6,995,947	76,664,400	49,065,216	27,599,184	30,665,760	45,998,640	36,108,932	40,555,468	45,615,318	31,049,082
Oklahoma	24,598	708,127	10,031,500	6,691,011	3,340,489	4,183,136	5,848,364	4,935,498	5,096,002	6,219,530	3,811,970
Oregon	13,275	587,531	5,555,400	4,933,195	622,205	3,083,247	2,472,153	3,633,232	1,922,168	4,585,205	972,195
Pennsylvania	57,328	10,550,107	108,643,300	76,376,240	32,267,060	47,694,409	60,948,891	56,277,229	52,366,071	70,944,075	37,699,225
Rhode Island	1,356	545,514	7,901,800	4,843,803	3,057,997	3,026,389	4,875,411	3,571,614	4,330,186	4,504,026	3,397,774
South Carolina	9,342	1,351,220	11,763,300	8,998,925	2,764,375	5,622,857	6,140,443	6,622,738	5,140,562	8,363,706	3,399,594
South Dakota	1,642	62,492	1,149,200	609,076	540,124	380,385	768,815	448,188	701,012	565,406	583,794
Tennessee	12,921	2,825,401	17,229,500	15,385,944	1,843,556	9,614,061	7,615,439	11,337,011	5,892,489	14,300,485	2,929,015
Texas	52,229	2,159,000	26,420,000	17,410,780	9,009,220	10,885,040	15,534,960	12,840,120	13,579,880	16,169,040	10,250,960
Utah	2,704	754,128	6,263,300	4,471,996	1,791,304	2,793,432	3,469,868	3,294,496	2,968,804	4,152,568	2,110,732
Vermont	5,136	148,624	2,370,400	1,723,281	647,119	1,078,532	1,291,868	1,270,534	1,099,866	1,602,390	768,010
Virginia	14,844	1,162,121	12,949,600	9,090,619	3,858,981	5,684,874	7,264,726	6,694,943	6,254,657	8,443,139	4,506,461
Washington	29,201	2,705,553	15,030,000	12,550,050	2,479,950	7,845,660	7,184,340	9,243,450	5,786,550	11,663,280	3,366,720
West Virginia	24,174	1,955,480	19,787,200	13,296,998	6,490,202	8,310,624	11,476,576	9,794,664	9,992,536	12,347,213	7,439,987
Wisconsin	75,569	1,647,298	23,331,200	14,092,045	9,239,155	8,819,194	14,512,006	10,382,384	12,948,816	13,088,803	10,242,397
Wyoming	1,561	47,416	846,000	472,914	373,086	295,254	550,746	348,552	497,448	439,074	406,926
United States	1,280,502	89,694,025	997,575,500	665,129,077	332,446,423	415,764,514	581,810,986	489,968,222	507,607,278	617,970,183	379,605,317

Electricity can be supplied to every consumer in America—residential, commercial, and industrial—at the T. V. A. rates, the Tacoma rates, the Bonneville rates, or the Ontario rates, without loss on legitimate investments. It can be supplied to every farm home in America at those rates without loss on legitimate investments.

You will note that in 1941 the American people used 139,445,910,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy. As I pointed out on the floor a few days ago, there are 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of annual production of hydroelectric power now going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries that should be developed and used for the building of a richer and brighter America.

It could all be developed and distributed at the T. V. A. yardstick rates, or less, and the entire investment paid out of the revenues within a generation. It would not be a burden upon the Federal Treasury.

High-power lines could be extended into every agricultural section and distribution facilities extended to every home, giving every farmer of this Nation electricity at or below the T. V. A. rates, and in such abundance that he could enjoy every convenience in his home now to be had in the larger towns or the congested cities.

This would add more to the farm life of America than anything else that could be done.

In my opinion, that is just as sure to come as the night follows the day, and the sooner it comes, the better it is going to be for the future peace, happiness, progress, and prosperity of our great country.

Bureau Crazy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a commentary on the S. E. C. proxy rules taken from the editorial page of the Washington Post this morning. I hand you herewith the article referred to, and I wish to say that this editorial is an able presentation of the factual situation developing out of the S. E. C.'s headlong grab for power. The title given this editorial itself speaks eloquent truth in its implication. I commend this editorial to the thoughtful consideration of every Member of Congress:

BUREAU CRAZY

The excesses of bureaucracy are becoming so pronounced that the people—even at the risk of being "pettifoggers"—are looking more and more to Congress to give them relief. The latest example is the proxy rules promulgated by the Securities and Exchange Commission. As if disturbed by the fact that the Securities and Exchange Commission seemed to have settled into a back seat for at least the duration, that body last August proposed to revise the rules governing the relations between American corporations and their stockholders. Of course, the ostensible object was to protect the stockholders and to assure perfect democratization of the American corporation.

But, so far as we had heard, there had been no agitation from the stockholder for Securities and Exchange Commission intervention. At least, when Mr. Milton V. Freeman, a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission legal staff, was questioned on the point, he admitted that the Securities and Exchange Commission had received only 25 complaints. This from America's army of stockholders. But bureaucracies have a habit of knowing much better than the people themselves what is good for them, and the Securities and Exchange Commission acted on such an assumption. It first tried to create a hullabaloo, in the form of a demagogic statement by Chairman Ganson S. Purcell, that "the proxy device has been sadly prostituted" and that "we see more and more today instances of management feathering its nest at the expense of its stockholders, as well as that of the Government." Then the rules came out of the Securities and Exchange Commission, but the authority for them was immediately challenged in a bill submitted to Congress, which, however, died when the Seventy-seventh Congress adjourned.

Now new rules have been put out which are in part even more objectionable than their predecessors. In them the Securities and Exchange Commission provides that no matter what kind of crackpot proposal is made by a stockholder, that proposal must be summarized by the management and circulated to the stockholders along with the remainder of the proxy material. The waste of paper is a minor objection to this regulation. So is the drain on the time of industrial managements which are now immersed in warmaking. What makes this particular rule noxious is the fact that under it a management will be compelled to circulate to all stockholders matters which may simply be vicious or libelous.

A sampling of the proposals which any big corporation gets in its mail shows that by no means all the ideas coming from the country's 10,000,000 stockholders are significant or even material. They may simply be scurrilous. Yet under these proxy rules the management would have to circulate them. In so doing, incidentally, it would help to frustrate one of the primary purposes of the Securities Exchange Act, namely, the prohibition of the dissemination of misleading or untrue statements to security holders. For the persons making statements under the auspices of the corporation itself would not be subject to penalties under the act.

There are many other details which the new rules call upon the corporation to circulate with their proxy solicitations. They may have only a collateral connection with the running of the corporation. They put a responsibility upon the directorate not contemplated in the original act. The result will be to add considerably to the harassment of managements and the labors of company staffs, both of which are not only working at high speed on war assignments but are also handicapped by depleted office personnel.

But the main objection to the Commission's latest essay into regulation is that the new rules constitute a strained construction of the proxy powers given to the Securities and Exchange Commission. The Commission is attempting to extend its jurisdiction not only over the solicitation of proxies but over "any request to revoke a proxy or not to execute a proxy" by defining these transactions as being the "solicitation of a proxy." It is also attempting to assert jurisdiction over the solicitation of proxies other than in interstate commerce or by use of the mails. If for no other reason, Congress should take note of this latest instance of "government by decree."

Address of Hon. Maury Maverick Before the Holland Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Maury Maverick, one of our former colleagues in the House and, in my opinion, one of America's outstanding public servants. Mr. Maverick is at present Director of the Governmental Division, War Production Board. His speech was delivered before the Holland Society of New York at the Pennsylvania Hotel, New York City, February 8, 1943:

Mr. President, members, and guests of the Holland Society of New York, tonight I am sure we all have a deep feeling of the historic importance of this occasion, even though neither king nor queen nor solemn minister plenipotentiary is present. We meet in a tragic moment of history—a moment in which the members of the Holland Society, who are the male descendants of the Dutch who settled in America before 1675, represent the symbol of Holland, which is a heritage of blood and iron in the cause of freedom.

Neither bloody tyrants nor the mighty waters of the sea have ever mastered the Dutch. The people of Holland made of honest labor a glory, for by work they conquered the sea.

It should be remembered now that the word "commando" came from the Dutch, who with their commandos flung back the Spanish invader centuries ago. With the help of God and their stout hearts, so also will they drive the murderous Nazis from their lands. [Applause.]

PROUD OF DUTCH TRADITIONS

You can, therefore, be honestly proud that you have the background of the heroic Dutch traditions. But, in addition, Americans, all of us, are proud that we have the tradition of America, from the Magna Carta of England on through the Declaration of Independence until today, standing united with all the civilized world until we have attained victory.

Personally, I also have a deep feeling of pride in addressing you tonight. The late Honorable Augustus Van Wyck, one of the honored presidents and founders of your society and a distinguished judge of the Supreme Court of New York, was my father's first cousin.

When I returned as a wounded soldier to this great country of ours from the battlefields of France in 1919, he met me at the boat. I shall never forget the kindness and attention he showed me at that critical time in my life when I was a young and rather worried fellow, 22 years of age.

So you can see your president, Bill Van Wyck, not only has the blood of the ancient Dutch in his veins, but he is also of the Maverick clan—and pardon the family pride—maybe that is the reason you like him for his rugged and kindly qualities. Anyhow, we know him and like him in Texas, as do the people here in New York; so he must be a pretty good man. [Applause.]

NEW AMSTERDAM BECOMES NEW YORK

And now for a historically correct story. It tells how Peter Stuyvesant and his crew got done in by the Mavericks, almost 300 years ago; how one morning the Dutch in this neck o' the woods woke up and found the Mavericks had changed the name of the place to New York.

Sam Maverick, an ancestor of mine some 10 notches up the line, who lived in Massachusetts, found that the Dutch had very good land; so in the year 1661, he wrote a letter to Lord Clarendon over in England, concerning what was then New Netherlands; and how many ships and cannons it would take to conquer the place. And what stuck most tenaciously in Clarendon's mind was Sam's statement that:

"The land is exceeding goode" and also the low-down on how the English could gain possession of this island.

And so Sam Maverick was made a royal commissioner among four others, the others being Richard Nichols, who is known for having married a daughter of Anneke Jans; George Cartwright, and Sir Robert Carr.

Then in September 1665, after several months of intrigue and plenty of good battleships for that day, the English swooped down on the Dutch and the place became New York City under the banner of Merrie England, although it was possessed by the Dutch for a few years thereafter.

The Mavericks soon left New York; but a century and a half later, my great aunt left South Carolina for school in New York and married Alderman Van Wyck, the grandfather of the president of your excellent and distinguished society.

THE FLAG OF HOLLAND FLIES OVER PARLIAMENT HOUSE IN CANADA

And to bring our story of Holland up to date—I was in Canada the other day when the Princess Royal was born in a public hospital, like an ordinary child. A day or two later I visited the Parliament House. High above the tower of Parliament flew the flag of Holland—it was not hung on a wall for decoration, but floated in majestic dignity from the very top, in recognition of the sovereignty of the Dutch, where never before has flown anything but the mighty symbol of the British Empire and Dominion of Canada.

What did this mean?

It meant many things, but more than anything else, it recognized the trust of the United Nations in each other, and the respect we all have for a little nation that will never say die. [Applause.]

And now since we are after all Americans, let us speak of what the Dutch have given to our own Nation, the United States of America. This can be shown in three ways—each related to the other, and I call them, first, the influence of Dutch principles of government; second, actual aid given us in the time of our Revolution; and third, the imprint made by those of Dutch descent on the United States today.

HOLLAND WAS FEDERAL REPUBLIC, LIKE UNITED STATES

As early as 1579, there was the Dutch Republic, or the United States of the Netherlands, a federal republic even as our Union is today, with written charters and a constitution.

In this republic were seven states, each with equal representation in the senate, even as our States have today. And the republic was based on a declaration of independence.

During the days of our American Revolution, the Dutch were our loyal friends. Much has been written about French aid to the Colonies, and it was great, but the Dutch were equally as loyal.

DUTCH FIRST TO FIRE SALUTE TO AMERICA

The first salute to the American flag on the high seas was ordered to be fired by the Dutch Governor, Johannes De Graff, in the port of St. Eustacius in the West Indies in honor of the Declaration of American Independence, a copy of which was brought into that port by an American ship, the *Andrea Dorea*. This salute was no idle gesture, for the British almost destroyed the city soon after. And I hope that we, in this city of New York, in the sight of the Statue of Liberty, will be the first to fire a salute to the brave Dutch on the day when the Nazis are driven out of that courageous little country—and then we will fire another salute, and that's when we have blasted hell out of the Japs, and the power of both the Japs and the Nazis is destroyed forever! [Applause.]

But to go on—in 1779, the merchants of Amsterdam, Holland, raised money and built a man-of-war of the first line for the American Colonists which they christened the *Indian*. This vessel rendered great service to the Americans and was rechristened the *South Carolina*.

DUTCH GAVE JOHN PAUL JONES SANCTUARY

Also, in the same year, our great and famous sea fighter, John Paul Jones, commanding the *Bon Homme Richard* in English waters, captured the *Serapis* and other British prizes and sailed past the island of Texal, to a port on the northwest coast of Holland where he was welcomed with great rejoicing. The British demanded the surrender of Jones, but the Dutch refused, and aided him. At the same time, the Dutch lent us money when we needed it badly.

MANY FAMOUS AMERICANS OF DUTCH DESCENT INCLUDING THE PRESIDENT AND MANY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The numbers of Americans of early Dutch descent who have distinguished themselves simply cannot be counted; the names coming out of the great State of New York are legion. But there have been three presidents—Theodore Roosevelt, who, by the way, was first elected Governor of New York by a very small margin over another good American of Dutch descent, Augustus Van Wyck, your past president; Martin Van Buren; and that other friend of humanity and war leader in these dangerous times whom we all follow and admire, our present President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. [Applause.]

There have been members of Congress by the dozens; I can think now of Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan; Senator Van Nuys, of Indiana, and Representative Jerry Voorhis, of California; Representative Albert Vreeland, of New Jersey; Representative Melvin J. Maas, also a colonel of the United States marines; Representative James E. Van Zandt, of Pennsylvania; and Representative Jay LeFevre, of New York. Also in the field of public service we should mention former Governor Van Wagoner of Michigan and Clarence Dykstra, president of the University of Wisconsin and past city manager of Cincinnati.

In the field of learning, we have Carl Van Doren, and Van Wyck Brooks, both Pulitzer prize winners in the field of literature; also Hendrik Willem Van Loon, Robert Livingston Schuyler, the eminent historian, and many others in all walks of life such as Gladys Swarthout of the Metropolitan Opera, and Cecil de Mille of the motion-picture industry.

GREAT AMERICAN GENERALS DUTCH STOCK

But of good Americans of Dutch ancestry, I think tonight of one of the world's greatest soldiers, one who lived and fought through 5 months of the hell on Guadalcanal, Maj. Gen. Alexander Vandergrift, of the United States marines. [Applause.]

I have only given a handful of names; had I the time, I could give you the names of hundreds more.

And now, my friends, having tied the past into the present, let us bear in our minds, indeed let us burn it into our hearts and souls, two simple things we must remember, fight for, and die for, if necessary; first, to preserve democracy and strengthen it in America; and second, to help maintain order and free government throughout the world.

WE MUST MAINTAIN LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT AND FREE ENTERPRISE

We must realize, of course, that industry, modern industry, and machines, have brought Herculean and gigantic strides not imaginable in the mind of men even a quarter of a century ago, much less centuries ago in our constitutional history. Nevertheless, the principles of justice and democracy, the right of man to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, the right to pursue a business, the right to live a normal life in an organized society must and shall be preserved. In this Nation we shall maintain free enterprise, but at the same time we must have an intelligently functioning government so that when our soldiers, sailors, marines, coast guardsmen, merchant marines, shipworkers, and laborers return they will be accorded simple justice and a chance to make a living.

We must not come out of this war with a centralized government that has attained a military victory on the one hand while on the other local self-government and the rights of the State governments are all but gone. We must maintain liberty, local self-government, and the rights of States now and for the future.

I am frank to say that we cannot attain this and then maintain balance merely by denouncing bureaucracy, for most of the men and women who work in Washington are patriotic Americans and not mere bureaucrats; they come from all walks of life, from big cities, small towns, and villages all over America. Like you, they are working hard trying to win the war. One thing we must do is to work out an intelligent and sound relationship between the Federal Government and the States and local governments. That is a problem we must solve if democracy is to endure in this country. Unfortunately, we haven't solved it yet. Indeed, problems are never solved, and of course we know eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. [Applause.]

THERE ARE 160,000 LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN UNITED STATES

The close working together of the State governments and the Federal Government in Washington, with all the 160,000 local governments of school districts, cities, towns, counties, townships, and the like, has not been as successful as it should be under modern conditions and the stress of war. The reason for this is twofold: First, America has been too busy making a living, and, second, the war came so fast and found us so unprepared that the Federal Government had to move ahead without developing proper relations between all agencies of government.

The result is suspicion and misunderstanding. From the States, officials cry aloud about the evils of bureaucracy and centralized government. At the same time, some officials in Washington are too prone to talk patronizingly of State and local governments and their officials. Some Federal officials are not familiar with public reasoning, nor the thoughts and customs of the people. There is a tendency on the part of some Federal officials to look down on all other public officials, as being what they call "beneath the Federal level," and such smug Federal functionaries regard others in State and local governments as "politicians." This attitude is dangerous in time of war: it will be equally or more dangerous after the war when as a nation we must meet and solve the multitude of problems caused by the demobilization of our own military forces, as well as the tens of millions of soldiers all over the world, all of which will affect our problems here in America.

WE MUST RETURN TO PEACE PRODUCTION AFTER WAR

Speaking alone of the United States of America, we know the problem of converting back to peacetime production with all of the attendant and critical problems will, no doubt, prove even more difficult than our problem of converting into war production has been. The job cannot be done by any single agency of business or government; we must have a partnership of the Federal, State, and local governments; local rights must be respected; and people who understand localities must have the responsibility for their localities.

There is a very good reason why we should have a strongly functioning Federal Government—to protect our Nation, of course. If we have a lot of big plans for the world, we first must put our own house in order, and be able to fight, trade, and act not only decisively, but wisely. Even if we win the war from a military viewpoint, let the soldiers return to idleness and discouragement, with the world also sliding into chaos, war will come again in a short time.

PLANS MUST BE MADE NOW FOR PEACE

George Washington said, "In time of peace, prepare for war"—and what we must do now, is to prepare for peace in time of war, if the peace is to be an improvement on what we call war.

Let us remember that after the last war, the world suddenly decided that peace had arrived simply because man had for the moment stopped fighting on the field of battle and the guns and cannon were quiet. No more tragic mistake was ever made in the history of mankind.

Peace does not consist simply in an absence of war. This is a negative concept of peace; it makes a peace a state of idleness and inaction. And, because our thinking has been so largely negative, we have never known true peace.

Think with me of what will happen when the fighting of this war is over. Think with me of the day when unconditional surrender has been accepted by or forced upon the aggressor nations of this war. When this unconditional surrender occurs, and it must be unconditional surrender, then our country has, and the United Nations have, the greatest responsibility any nations ever had in the history of the world. Complicated, cruel, world-shaking readjustments will take place. Here in America, we cannot shut our eyes and say we will build a big Army and Navy and just sit tight; that will not be possible.

WE FACE LONG, HARD STRUGGLE

Frankly, there is a lot of talk about killing lots and lots of people—I mean our enemies—after the war, a war which we have not yet won. But the answer is, we have a long way to go; hard, sad years are ahead of us, and when the war ends, even though we prepare for the end of it, and for the peace, the shock will be so terrific that we cannot realize it now. In a world bled white, our millions will come home; and think of it, in Germany are at least 25,000,000 young people born since the last war that know nothing except the killing business, and who never have had jobs.

Therefore, we Americans must try to realize the world shock to come; we must learn now the art of government and getting on together. And if we can work together after the war as we are working together in this war now, we can build a permanent peace.

WE MUST WIN THE WAR, PREPARE FOR PEACE

We know right now that nations and peoples will be upset and for many there will be catastrophic, world-wide depression, worse in some nations and areas than others. But let us bear in mind that this time we of the United States may have a more serious depression and of greater length than ever before if we fail to prepare for the peace.

So let us ask: Will we allow the war to end without preparation? Will we forget that in our prayers today we pray for success in war so that tomorrow will bring the dawn of a new life in which there can be peace?

Democracy in this Nation did not grow strong without careful planning and peace will not burst forth tomorrow simply because war is over. Even as we must establish enduring partnership between the Federal Government and the State and local governments, so we must work for a relationship between the peoples and nations of the world which will insure peace. [Applause.]

And so I say quite frankly when this war is over, if we want true peace, we must have an association or league of nations. We must not go back to the isolationism and dream world of yesterday because we know it always has and always will lead to war. The words "League of Nations" have a sour taste because people think immediately of the failure of the last League of Nations. But if we are to have peace—I mean any enduring peace at all—we must have a league of nations to enforce the peace. We must remember that our own constitutional and Federal Government did not spring, like Minerva, full grown from the brow of Jove. Our own Constitution goes back to the days when the rude Anglo-Saxon tribes began to meet in their hundreds; it gained strength at Runnymede, where the Magna Carta was wrested from King John; it developed through the Petition of Rights, the Bill of Rights, the common law, the charters of the American Colonies. It failed somewhat in the Articles of Confederation; but then finally came our Constitution, which wrote down the constitutional essence of the past, and as a model for the future; and furthermore it has been successful except for the Civil War for a century and a half. And so, thinking of the World Court in The Hague, Holland, and the League of Nations in Geneva as "articles of confederation" which failed, let us try again and determine that this time we will succeed in building an association of nations or a league of nations which must and shall guarantee justice and world peace and security.

HOLLAND SET EXAMPLE FOR WAR AIMS

Indeed, what has been true of our own Constitution is equally true of any plan for a union or association of free nations. The pattern of world association must grow out of our previous failures and also much planning and thinking; its success can come only through experience and use. We must begin to prepare the way now.

Tonight then, let us swear to continue the fight for freedom until it is won. Holland did so for long and sad generations; that little nation sets an example in its power for good and order over the world, even though its homeland is now under the heel of the Nazi invader.

FEEL THE PRIDE OF BEING AMERICANS

Let us then tonight think of our sons out on the seven seas, up in the air, and on the far lands of every continent of the world; let us tonight, as fathers when we go home, kneel and pray for the thousands who have already died for us, for their own children, and for this great United States of America. Let us feel beating in our hearts the pride of being Americans; let freedom ring in our souls, let our hearts and minds work but for one goal, victory for freedom, democracy, the right to work, peace, and security. [Applause.]

There is added a partial list of the members of the Holland Society now serving in the armed forces. It has been impossible to obtain all the names.

THE HOLLAND SOCIETY OF NEW YORK MEMBERS IN THE ARMED FORCES AS OF FEBRUARY 8, 1943

Lt. Col. John Bevier Ackerman, headquarters, Army Air Forces, Washington, D. C.

Pvt. Richard H. Amerman, Company A, Military Police, Replacement Training Battalion, Fort Ontario, N. Y.

Lt. John De Witt Blauvelt, Corps Area Finance Office, Governors Island, N. Y.

Capt. William Russell Bogert, Headquarters Squadron, United States Marine Corps, Quantico, Va.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) John Le Foy Brouwer 4th, United States Naval Reserve, care postmaster, New York.

Flying officer Ogden Brouder 3d, commanding officer of the Lethbridge Ferry Squadron, Rockcliffe Airport, Ottawa, Canada.

Lt. Bailey Brower, Corps of Military Police, Army of United States, Zone of Interior, Philadelphia, Pa.

Lt. Comdr. Raymond S. Crispell, Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla.

Lt. Comdr. Joseph Rodman Drake de Kay, Bureau of Ships, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

Arthur Edwin Du Bois, United State Army.

Lt. Garret James Garretson 2d, One Hundred and Fourth Division, United States Army, Camp Adair, Oreg.

Alfred Hasbrouck, Headquarters Company, Three Hundred and Ninetieth Infantry, Ninety-eighth Division, Camp Breckenridge, Ky.

Pvt. Joseph O. Hasbrouck, Army Air Corps, Three Hundred and Fifty-third Fighter Squadron, Hamilton Field, Calif.

Capt. Clarence P. Hendricks, Office of Mississippi River Commission, Vicksburg, Miss.

Capt. Walter E. Hopper, Jr., headquarters, Basic Infantry Replacement Training Center, Fort McClellan, Ala.

Lt. Eugene Hotaling, aide-de-camp to Major General Hobbs, United States Army, Camp Blanding, Fla. (The University Club, New York (mail)).

Lt. William C. Keator, Jr., Fourteenth Photo Squadron, Army Air Base, Colorado Springs, Colo.

Lt. Donald B. Kipp, United States Naval Reserve, Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R. I.

Capt. John E. Ostrander, Jr., Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department, general inspector of naval aircraft, Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio.

Lt. William Adriance Poillon, United States Naval Reserves, Charleston, S. C.

Hon. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States, Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, White House, Washington, D. C.

Lt. Col. James Roosevelt, Marine Corps.

Lt. Col. Elliot Roosevelt, United States Air Corps, north Africa.

Lt. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., United States Navy, Casablanca.

Lt. John Roosevelt, United States Navy, California.

Ensign Henry Frelinghuysen Schenk, United States Navy, communications, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Kenneth W. Schenk, foreign duty with United States Marine Corps.

Capt. Myron P. Schermerhorn, United States Naval Reserve.

Maj. Oliver J. Schoonmaker, United States Army.

Aviation Cadet Richard Austin Springs, Jr., United States Army Air Corps.

Commander Steadman Teller, Bureau of Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

Lt. Col. Andrew Ten Eyck, School of Military Government, Charlottesville, Va.

Lt. Comdr. William G. Terwilliger, Medical Corps, United States Naval Reserve.

Capt. Lee D. van Antwerp, Medical Corps, Borden General Hospital, Chickasha, Okla.

Lt. Comdr. Peter Van Brunt, United States Naval Reserve, Washington, D. C.

Pvt. David T. L. Van Buren, First Air Force, Quartermaster Corps, Mitchel Field, N. Y.

Lt. Arthur Brown Van Buskirk, One Hundred and Nineteenth Quartermaster Battalion, Army Post Office 972, Seattle, Wash.

Sgt. Arthur A. Van Cleef, Sixty-eighth Bomb Squadron, Forty-fourth Bomb Group, in England.

Lt. Comdr. William H. Vanderbilt, United States Naval Reserve, New York Office of Coordinator of Information.

Lt. Halsted Billings Vander Poel, United States Navy.

Brig. Gen. George L. Van Deusen, commanding officer, Fort Monmouth, N. J.

Lt. Col. Elliott Vandevanter, Corps of Engineers, St. Louis, Mo.

Lt. John Francis Van Deventer, United States Naval Station.

Lt. Comdr. Paul Beery Van Dyke, Medical Corps, United States Naval Reserve, Camp Peary, Williamsburg, Va.

Lt. Col. Charles Rutan Van Etten, United States Army Reserves, salvage expert, War Department, Office of the Quartermaster General, Washington, D. C.

Warrant Officer Eugene van Houten, mine layer *Baird*, care of postmaster, New Orleans, La.

First Lt. Eugene Merritt Van Loan, Jr., Four Hundred and Twenty-third Armored Field Artillery Battalion, Fort Benning, Ga.

Robert C. Van Ness, United States Army.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Duncan Van Norden, United States Naval Reserve, Jacksonville, Fla.

Lt. Hoghland Van Norden, United States Naval Reserve, London, England.

Staff Sgt. Norman Wyckoff Van Nostrand, Jr., Company D, Ninety-second Armored Reconnaissance Battalion, Twelfth Armored Division, Army Post Office 262, Camp Campbell, Ky.

Ensign William Parks Van Nostrand, United States Naval Reserve.

Gerrit Wessel Van Schaick, United States Army.

First Sgt. John Wyckoff Van Siclen, Camp Bowie, Tex.

First Lt. Raymond Van Tassel, United States Army, Corps of Engineers, 1201 North Kensington Street, Arlington, Va.

Lt. Col. Horace S. Van Voast, Jr., care of postmaster, New Orleans.

Lt. William O. Van Wyck, Jr., United States Army, Company C, Fourth Infantry, care of postmaster, Seattle, Wash.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Peter Van Dyke Voorhees, district assistant law officer, United States Coast Guard, New York City.

Sherman P. Voorhees, United States Army.

Maj. Albert L. Vreeland, United States Army, Chicago, Ill.

Col. Herbert H. Vreeland, Jr., headquarters, Field Artillery Reserve Training Corps, Fort Sill, Okla.

Robert Harding Vreeland, United States Coast Guard.

Lt. Theodore De Mott Vreeland, United States Marine Corps.

First Lt. Daniel E. Westervelt, Twenty-seventh Division, One Hundred and Sixth Field Artillery Battalion, Battery C, care postmaster, San Francisco, Calif.

Robert S. Westervelt, apprentice seaman, United States Coast Guard, Manhattan Beach, N. Y.

Pvt. Stanley Westervelt, Nine Hundred and Eighth Engineers, Headquarters Company, Air Force, Hamilton Field, Calif.

Pvt. Daniel W. Wynkoop, Battery D, Second Battalion, Fort Eustis, Va.

Lt. William I. Zabriskie, United States Naval Reserve, Fort Williams, Portland, Maine.

Suppression of Subversive Activities

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, also that my remarks be extended in the RECORD, together with a clipping from the Times-Herald of February 18, 1943.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I offered an amendment to this House aimed at amending the penalty clause to cope with those who advocate and engage in subversive acts for the overthrow of our Government by means other than force or violence.

I discovered the amendment as submitted was too all-inclusive, and I gladly withdrew it. This does not mean that I have in any way abdicated my firm conviction that some penalty clause should be added to take care of those groups or individuals who would overthrow our form of government by any and all means short of force or violence.

This clipping from this morning's Times-Herald fully illustrates the idea which I had in mind:

OKLAHOMA COURT REVERSES CONVICTION OF COMMUNISTS

OKLAHOMA CITY, February 17.—The Criminal Court of Appeals today reversed the convictions of three members of the Oklahoma Communist Party and directed further proceedings.

The court reversed convictions of Mrs. Robert Wood, Allen Shaw, and Eli Jaffee. They were convicted in Oklahoma County District Court on charges of criminal syndicalism.

Judge Dick Jones, presiding justice of the criminal court, held that the prosecution had failed to prove that the Communist Party advocated overthrow of the Government by violence.

The opinion further held that failure of the lower court to give any instructions to the jury on whether Communists actually advocated overthrow of the Government by force, and if so, whether the actions of the defendants constituted a danger of unlawful acts being committed in the near future, made the convictions invalid.

Mr. Speaker, in view of my belief in the principle herein involved as substantiated by the article just read, I sincerely hope and trust that some of you or any of you who possess a legal mind or who have had experience in drafting legislation will take it upon yourselves to frame and introduce the necessary legislation to correct this omission in the penalty clause. It is my humble opinion that if our Government is ever overthrown from within the initial step to reach this objective will not be taken by force and violence.

Why an Army of 7,500,000 Men?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, pursuant to the permission granted me today, I present for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Why an Army of 7,500,000 Men?" written by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and published in the Republican, the national party magazine, for February 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

WHY AN ARMY OF 7,500,000 MEN?

(By Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., of Massachusetts)

Late last autumn the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff appeared before the Military Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House. During the course of their remarks they discussed the projected figure which the War Department General Staff has fixed as the total strength of the Army, to be reached by December 31, 1943. Ever since that time certain persons have been rising to challenge the figure of 7,500,000 men, as among other things, a "mass army" far larger than the Nation needs to fight its greatest battle.

It happens that I am a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate. I have also been fortunate enough on various occasions to talk with both Secretary Stimson and General Marshall about the Army. For their judgment, thoroughness, and soundness I have the most complete respect and, so far as I know, this feeling is shared by Americans everywhere. Why, then the sudden opposition to a by-no-means excessive figure which has been reached by our military leaders after the most mature and exhaustive study of all pertinent facts?

Evidently General Marshall would like an answer to that question, too. Speaking before the National Association of Manufacturers in December, he had this to say: "Every manufacturer present tonight has been involved in planning. It is indispensable to your business, as it is to ours. But that word 'planning' suggests a public reaction which gives me considerable concern. That is, a feeling in some quarters that we are building too large an Army—that we could not transport it to active theaters even if we had it—in short, the belief that we do not know what we are doing or where we are going."

General Marshall's concern at some of the irresponsible criticism is certainly justified. It must be very discouraging after laboring with a staff of advisers through the most complicated consideration of the Nation's manpower, shipping and industrial potentials, as well as every other statistic bearing upon the size, movement, and supply of the Army, to have the results challenged by men who can have access to only fragments of the necessary figures. It is not only discouraging, it can even be dangerous in this most crucial period of the war to raise doubts of our military leadership.

THE AXIS ARMIES

It is high time the arguments against an Army of 7,500,000 men were examined in the light of figures and calm reason and dispelled once and for all. To do this it is necessary to enter the twilight zone of half truth which has surrounded this controversy and examine all the arguments. Most of the critics—being special pleaders of one sort or another—have been careful to avoid this course. By raising a hue and cry over one set of figures or another, they have sought to focus attention on fragments of the problem and thereby cloud its full consideration.

There is no better place to begin than with the charge that an Army of seven and a half millions is shockingly large and that no such force could be required to defeat our enemies. Of course, the first answer to this is that an Army is large or small in relation to the size of the forces it must oppose. In other words, if a nation goes into battle it must be reasonably sure that it has a large enough force to stand a reasonable chance of victory.

The best figures we have on the size of our European enemy indicate that Germany, Italy, and the satellite Axis Nations have marshaled nearly 500 divisions. The Secretary of War is authority for this figure and for the corollary statement that the Japs have 85 divisions in the field. In the face of these figures the startling fact remains that the Army which we plan to put into the field, added to the total forces of the United Nations, will still not equal the number of superbly trained divisions of our enemies. Does this suggest that we are building too large an Army for reasonable assurance of victory?

In following this line of criticism there has been considerable use of the phrase, "mass Army." I take it this term is meant to suggest that an over-all force of seven and a half millions must, of necessity, be poorly trained—intended to crush the enemy by the

sheer weight of its numbers rather than by its skill.

Of course, anyone who has ever talked with an American soldier about the kind of training he receives for battle knows how preposterous is this picture of a cannon-fodder army. It was equally preposterous when, a few weeks ago, various newspapers enthusiastically hailed as highly significant a statement by M. Pierre Cot, France's Minister of Aviation from 1936 to 1938, and recommended it to our military leaders as confirmation of their claim that a large army could not be effective.

Said M. Cot in speaking of the France which Germany conquered in 1940: "We had an army of men rather than an army of machines. We mobilized too many men in the army and not enough in the factories. As a result, instead of having a small highly mechanized army, we had a large and very poorly equipped one."

It is difficult to understand the logic of this remarkable statement. France was fighting no "cannon-fodder" army. Germany loosed a huge, highly mechanized army on his nation in the spring of 1940, and no matter how efficient a force M. Cot's small mechanized army might have been, it could not have stood up against the overwhelmingly greater force of the German enemy.

Similarly, to conquer the Axis this nation must possess not only a large, highly mechanized army, but one which is superbly trained in all the modern technique of war. There has never been a thought in the minds of our military leaders of anything else. The fact is that American divisions which are already tested in battle have proved superior to any troops which opposed them.

The success of the American soldier in battle is due to no mere accident of birth or inheritance. It stems from the fact that his military leaders have given him not only superb weapons, but a long, vigorous, painstaking course of instruction in battle tactics. When a division emerges from this period of training—and it takes at least a year to train a division—it is an integrated team of technicians, skilled in the intricate combat maneuvers by which it outwits the enemy, facile in the use of the multiple weapons which are every American soldier's armament today.

BREAK-DOWN OF FIGURES

The nonsense of a "mass Army" reveals itself further when our force of 7,500,000 is broken down into its broad component parts. General Marshall made such an analysis last fall before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate. Fully 2,200,000 men will constitute the Army Air Forces, the great sky fleet which has already done such magnificent work in every theater of operations. Our Ground Forces—the Infantry, Artillery, Cavalry, Armored Force and other commands which fight on the ground—will absorb a total of three and a third millions. The Services of Supply, in which are included all those branches whose task it is to furnish transportation, supplies, maintenance, and housekeeping, will comprise about 1,000,000 men. The remaining million will be engaged either in training others or in being trained themselves for later assignment to combat units or as replacements.

This is the Army of 7,500,000 men which must fight a crafty and long-trained foe in every quarter of the world. Too large? I do not believe so in the light of these figures. A mass Army? If space permitted, each of the broad components I have mentioned could be broken down still further to show how they are formed into combat teams of specialists in destruction. This is no rabble horde of men with muskets. It is equipped with all the magnificent weapons for which industry has received such deserved praise. It is trained to a keen edge of battle efficiency. This is no mass Army. It is the genius of America on the march.

PROBLEM OF TRANSPORT

But can we transport these men to foreign theaters thousands of miles away? That is another of the arguments proposed against our Army of 7,500,000. Some of the critics contend that there is not shipping available to move such a force in 1943. And of course the answer to this is that our military leaders have no intention of sending 7,500,000 men overseas in 1943.

The President has announced that we already had more than a million men in foreign theaters at the close of 1942. Through this year of 1943 the transports will be slipping out of our ports, filled with fighting men. I do not know how many our General Staff proposed to transport. The figure is the most guarded of military secrets. But I know how the figure was reached, and that is the important consideration.

The Army has supervision over the deployment of our merchant shipping. The War Department knows where every ship is located that flies a United Nations flag. Its officers know the probable losses among these ships due to enemy action. They know the numbers of them which are required to maintain every American force now quartered in some distant portion of the world. To no one else are these figures available.

It is a preposterous accusation that our military leaders have projected an overseas army without adequate consideration of the means whereby it can be deployed. Quite the reverse is true. However many men it would have liked to put overseas in 1943, the War Department General Staff based its figures on the capacity of the ships that could be made available. The Army's training program was thereupon integrated to a schedule which would prepare the proper number for transport this year.

I have already said that more than a year is required to train a division. It is obvious, therefore, that the men who are taken into the Army during 1943 would never leave this country until some time in 1944, even if the shipping to carry them was waiting in our harbors. Nor will all of this Army of 7,500,000 men be sent overseas at any time. Vast problems of supply must be administered in this country, and we cannot make the error of leaving our shores unguarded against the possibility, however remote it may now appear, of invasion by air or sea.

Then there is the manpower argument—the statement that this Nation cannot muster seven and a half million men for the Army, supply them from our industrial establishment, and still maintain the civilian population as producers. I do not know what statistics may be used to bolster this contention. The most conclusive figures I have been able to find indicate that the total established for our armed forces—Army, Navy, and Marine Corps—is well within our potential of manpower, without drawing heavily upon the great pool of womanpower which has shown itself so eager to do a man's job in industry.

The statement that we cannot find these men for our Army without breaking down our national economy simply will not wash in the light of figures. Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, the distinguished military writer of the New York Times, analyzes the situation this way: "The triple job of expanding the Army to such a size, of providing arms and equipment and food for our allies and of maintaining at least a sufficient production for civilian use to prevent the impairment of a war economy, is one which undoubtedly will tax American strength. But according to the best possible figures and the beliefs of most of the leaders who have given the subject exhaustive study, the triple job can be done. But it can be done only if some 65,000,000 people out of America's total population of 135,000,000 serve in the armed forces or work on farms or in factories or in other jobs."

NEED WE FIGHT?

Finally, there is the argument that it would be more efficient—and I have no doubt more comfortable—if we were to equip our allies from the arsenal of democracy we maintain and let them do the fighting for us. I do not think this can be a very popular argument, but I have heard it and I think it should be answered.

I have already had something to say about training, and it is apparent that only expertly trained men will be effective in this war. If there existed among our allies enormous trained reserves, ready for battle but lacking weapons, we might have to scrutinize the argument more closely. But battle training can be given only with battle weapons, and the simple fact is that there are no trained legions in the world which could use our weapons much sooner than we ourselves.

Our British allies and our Russian allies, it is safe to suppose, are even now mobilized to the extent of their manpower. Some of their men are still training, to be sure, but the manpower is mobilized, and it is being supplied with American weapons as fast and efficiently as we know how to send them. So are the other United Nations who stand at our side in this struggle. There is no intention of reducing our flood of weapons and ammunition to these Allies. But I believe they would be the last to contend that this struggle could be won without our manpower, too. I repeat: all the strength our side can muster will not equal the men the Axis can throw into the scales against us. Victory, under these circumstances, depends on the mobilization of all the forces of all these United Nations, backed by such a limitless arsenal and such overwhelming superiority in the skies that we shall at last bring our enemies to their knees.

This great effort requires the heart and soul of every American. We shall be giving far less as long as we permit ourselves to be drawn into irresponsible debate on such a vital concern as this. We are constantly warned to refrain from spreading rumors which may help the enemy by lowering national morale. This whole controversy about the size of the Army belongs to that same pattern of rumor. I have an idea that it is very comforting to Hitler in Berlin and to Tojo in Tokyo to see our own press and public men appear as unwitting Axis advocates by contributing to this kind of disunity.

Most of the criticism is not, I think, willfully subversive. I believe it is, in the main, one more evidence of the American love for "experting." We have grown so accustomed to our so-called experts who diagnose national ills, fancied or real, in the press, on the radio, and from public forums that we—and no doubt, they—forget what irreparable harm may be wrought by spreading half-truths as inside information. Here is a slogan I propose for every American. It is neither smart nor patriotic to cry havoc about the Army on which we must depend for our survival.

Income Per Year and Per Capita of Persons Not on Farms and Persons on Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following table from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture:

Income per year and per capita of persons not on farms and persons on farms

Year	Person not on farms		Person on farms				
	Yearly income per person not on farms	Daily income per person not on farms	Yearly net income from agriculture per person on farms	Daily income of person on farms	With Government payments added, 1933 to date		Ratio nonfarm income to farm
					Yearly	Daily	
1910	$482	$1.32	$139	$0.38			
1911	468	1.28	123	.34			
1912	483	1.32 $1.33	135	.37 $0.37			3.59 to 1.
1913	521	1.43	137	.38			
1914	482	1.32	141	.39			
1915	502	1.37	137	.38			
1916	579	1.58	157	.43			
1917	638	1.75	259	.71			
1918	670	1.83	305	.83			2.20 to 1.
1919	762	2.09	321	.88			
1920	875	2.40	266	.73			
1921	718	1.97	120	.33			6.00 to 1.
1922	715	1.96	154	.42			
1923	812	2.22	181	.49			
1924	788	2.16 2.20	182	.50 .58			3.79 to 1.
1925	810	2.22	224	.61			
1926	856	2.34	217	.59			
1927	818	2.24	211	.58			
1928	828	2.26	223	.61			
1929	870	2.38	224	.61			
1930	760	2.08	172	.47			
1931	605	1.66	115	.31			
1932	442	1.21	75	.21			
1933	417	1.14	91	.25	$95	$0.26	
1934	487	1.33	99	.27	112	.31	
1935	540	1.48	144	.39	158	.43	
1936	626	1.72	165	.45	170	.47	
1937	670	1.83	192	.53	197	.54	
1938	621	1.70	154	.42	164	.45	
1939	657	1.80	154	.42	171	.47	
1940	716	1.96	161	.44	179	.49	4.00 to 1.
1941	825	2.26	237	.65	254	.70	3.23 to 1.
1942 [1]	1,014	2.77	369	1.01	389	1.06	2.60 to 1.
AVERAGE							
1910-19	$559	$1.53	$185	$0.51			3.00 to 1.
1920-29	809	2.22	200	.55			4.04 to 1.
1930-39	583	1.60	136	.37	$143	$0.39	4.10 to 1.

[1] 1942 preliminary and subject to change.

The headings are self-explanatory. The record covers 33 years. The first column shows the yearly income per person not on farms. The second column shows the daily income of these individuals. The third column shows the yearly income per person on farms, and the fourth column shows their daily income. For the period 1933 to 1942 there are Government payments to agriculture and these have been added to give the total yearly and daily income per person on farms. The final column shows the ratio of the nonfarm income to the farm income.

Source U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Peanuts for Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, under leave extended me, I call attention to the following two letters from the Department of Agriculture, of February 15 and 16, and the summary of price-support programs referred to:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1943.

HON. STEPHEN PACE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PACE: This is in response to your request for information about the price support programs for agricultural crops and products in 1943. The enclosed Summary Statement of Price Support Programs for 1943 together with the mimeographed statement Information on the 1943 Production Goals Arranged by Classes of Commodities and press releases Nos. 986, 1029, 1287, 1298, 1368, 1374, 1461, 1475, 1509, 1530, 1571, and 1573 show this information.

In addition you asked that we discuss the programs for oil-seed crops. The principal oil seeds produced in this country are cottonseed, flaxseed, peanuts, and soybeans. Cotton seed represents a secondary source of income incident to the production of cotton and production of seed is dependent upon production of cotton. Flaxseed, peanuts, and soybeans represent a primary source of income and production is influenced directly by prices. The value of each of these oil seeds for crushing into oil is determined mainly by the price of oil and meal obtained from the seed. Since the oils from peanuts, soybeans, and flaxseed are marketed in competition with and represent the smaller part of the total supply of fats and oils, their price depends upon the general price level for fats and oils.

With the discontinuance of imports from Pacific areas and with increased war demands for food and feed, peanuts, soybeans, and flaxseed represent the best source for increased production of oil needed to meet civilian and military requirements. In order to obtain increased production it seems advisable to offer prices which assure a satisfactory market for farmers who are asked to grow the crops.

The price support levels for flaxseed, peanuts, and soybeans have been fixed with this in view, and we believe they will result in fair returns to farmers for each of the crops. The harvested acreages in 1942 and the 1943 goals for flaxseed, peanuts, and soybeans are as follows:

	Harvested acreage, 1942	Acreage goals, 1943
Flaxseed	4,691,000	5,500,000
Soybeans	10,800,000	12,000,000
Peanuts	3,690,000	5,500,000

The last 5-year United States average yields of oil and meal per acre for peanuts, soybeans, and cottonseed are as follows:

	Oil	Meal
	Pounds	*Pounds*
Cottonseed	70	205
Peanuts	215	310
Soybeans	170	910

The yields of oil and meal from soybeans grown in the same areas as peanuts are much less than the United States average yields.

When consideration is given to total requirements for all agricultural products and to capacity to produce these products, it seems advisable to try to make a greater increase in the production of peanuts than in the production of flaxseed and soybeans. Our domestic supply of flaxseed for crushing into linseed oil, in view of the available supplies and the nature of the oil, does not need to be increased as much as the supply of peanuts for crushing into oil.

In setting up the goal on soybeans this year full consideration was given the situation as to crushing capacity in the main producing area and the need for shipping soybeans for crushing in other areas. Peanuts, on the other hand, can be grown throughout most of the Cotton Belt without endangering production of other crops needed during the war. Cottonseed-oil mills can be used to crush the peanuts into oil.

These are some of the reasons which make it desirable during the war period to encourage maximum production of peanuts and we hope that production this year will exceed the goal of 5,500,000 acres which has been established.

Very truly yours,

J. B. HUTSON,
President.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAMS FOR 1943

CROP OR PRODUCT AND PRICE SUPPORT

Flaxseed: $2.70 per bushel basis No. 1 flaxseed at Minneapolis (approximately 93 percent of parity on January 15, 1943).

Peanuts: 85 percent of parity.

Soybeans: $1.60 to $1.75 per bushel (105 to 115 percent of comparable price on January 15, 1943).

Olives for oil: Average grower price of about $123 per ton for all oil olives.

Hogs: 90 percent of parity but not less than 13.25 cents per hundredweight average for good to choice butcher hogs weighing 240 to 270 pounds at Chicago.

Chickens (excluding broilers or chicks weighing less than 3 pounds live weight): 90 percent of parity.

Turkeys: 90 percent of parity.

Eggs: 90 percent of parity but not less than 30 cents a dozen in spring and early summer and 34 cents a dozen for annual average.

Milk: 90 percent of parity but not less than 46 cents per pound for butter; 12.5 cents per pound for roller—and 14.5 cents per pound for spray—process dry skim and comparable price for evaporated milk; 27 cents on standard moisture and 27¼ cents per pound on low moisture-content cheese; condensed milk

and evaporated $4.10 per case 48–14½ ounce f. o. b. buyer's customary receiving point.

Potatoes: 92 percent of parity but not less than specified prices for certain grades in commercial areas.

Canning vegetables: Snap beans, corn, peas, tomatoes, beets, carrots, pumpkin, and squash for processing and cabbage for kraut: Price support through certification of canners who agree to pay not less than specified prices to growers. (See release No. 1461, January 28, 1943.)

Dry beans (designated commercial classes): 90 percent of parity, but not less than $5.60 per hundredweight for United States No. 1 and $5.45 per hundredweight for U. S. No. 2 beans in bags.

Dry peas (designated varietal types): 90 percent of comparable price, but not less than $5.50 per hundredweight for U. S. No. 1 and $5.25 per hundredweight for U. S. No. 2 in bags.

Dried fruit: Apples, apricots, peaches, pears, prunes, and raisins: To be announced.

Sugar beets: Approximately $11 per ton of beets.

Wheat, rice, corn, cotton, and tobacco: 85 percent to 90 percent of parity unless growers disapprove quotas in a referendum.

Barley: Loans slightly higher than in 1942 at a level equal feeding value in relation to corn.

Grain sorghum: Loans slightly higher than in 1942.

Hemp for fiber: $30 to $50 per ton, depending on grade.

Hempseed: $10 per bushel, 90 percent germination and 98 percent purity.

Gun naval stores: Loans at 90 percent of parity; purchases at 95 percent of parity.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1943.

Hon. STEPHEN PACE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PACE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 8, in which you inquired concerning the detailed information used in preparing the comparison of the output of meal and oil per hour of labor required in the production of cotton, peanuts, and soybeans that appeared in the press release of the Department of Agriculture on February 6, entitled "Wickard Asks Cotton Farmers to Plant Full Allotments After Meeting War Goals."

The comparison carried by the above press release was prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and was based, as stated, upon average United States per-acre yields for cotton, peanuts, and soybeans for the 5-year period 1938–42. The amounts of labor required in growing and harvesting an acre of each of the three crops also represented average United States requirements. The average per-acre yields of cottonseed, peanuts, and soybeans, as well as other pertinent data, are summarized below:

Crop	Average 1938–42 yield per acre, United States (1)	Oil recovered per 100 pounds of seed (2)	Meal recovered per 100 pounds of seed (3)	Production of oil per acre (1×2)	Production of meal per acre (1×3)
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
Cottonseed	455	15.5	45.0	70	205
Peanuts	733	29.0	42.5	213	312
Soybeans	1,134	15.0	80.0	170	907

In presenting the per-acre production of oil and meal for each of the three crops in the press release the above data were "rounded" to the nearest multiple of five.

To obtain the production of oil and meal per hour of labor required in growing and harvesting the three crops the following labor requirements per acre were used: Cotton, 95 hours; peanuts, 60 hours; soybeans, 12 hours.

By dividing the quantity of oil and meal recovered per acre from each crop by the amount of labor required in growing and harvesting an acre of the respective crop one obtains the production of oil and meal per hour of labor expended, as shown in the following table:

Crop	Man-hours required per acre	Meal—yield		Oil—yield	
		Per acre	Per man-hour	Per acre	Per man-hour
		Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
Cotton	95	205	2.1	70	0.7
Peanuts	60	312	5.2	213	3.5
Soybeans	12	907	75.6	170	14.2

Inasmuch as the 1942 data included in the averages used in these calculations are preliminary, final figures may vary slightly from those shown here.

Differences between the amounts of labor required in the production of an acre of each of the three crops arise because of the practices and operations followed. The operations involved in the production of cotton and peanuts are quite similar up to the time of cultivation. Cotton, though, requires more hoeing and chopping than peanuts, with the result that preharvest operations on cotton involve the need for about 10 hours more labor per acre than the preharvest operations on peanuts. Even though considerable hand work is necessary in the harvest of peanuts, not nearly so much is required as is needed in the harvest of cotton. Cotton picking involves straight hand work while the harvest of peanuts can be carried out with the aid of some machines.

Because the comparison in the press release was based on averages for the United States, the amount of labor required in the production of an acre of soybeans was weighted heavily by the situation that exists in the Corn Belt, where a large proportion of the soybeans are grown for harvest as beans. In this area, of course, all operations involved in the growing and harvesting of soybeans are highly mechanized with the result that only a small number of hours of labor are necessary in the production of the crop.

It is recognized, of course, that so far as per-acre crop and oil yields are concerned, the national averages for soybeans are not applicable to 10 important cotton-growing States. The 1937–41 average yield of soybeans in the Agricultural Adjustment Agency's North Central Region—where the bulk of production has been concentrated in the past—was 19.4 bushels per acre, whereas, in 10 important cotton-growing States the average yield was only 10.5 bushels, or 8 bushels below the national average and 8.9 bushels below the average for the North Central Region. Assuming that the oil content of southern-grown soybeans is the same as the national average, per-acre yields in 10 important cotton States would be brought down to 94 pounds of oil and 504 pounds of meal, or 44 percent less than shown in calculations made on a national basis. It may be pointed out, however, even though the oil content of soybeans grown in certain southern areas may compare favorably with the older producing States, use of hydraulic equipment may result in a lower oil outturn than in northern areas where the solvent process or expeller type press is used.

It is clear from the foregoing that, even though cotton is a labor-intensive crop compared with peanuts and soybeans grown for beans, its production involves the need for considerably less machinery, particularly at the time of harvest. When a peanut thresher or a combine is not available on the farm and cannot be obtained because of lack of capital or because none is available on the market, some farmers would find it more convenient to grow cotton than to grow peanuts or soybeans. Such machines are available, however, on a custom basis and their use could be obtained by small farmers.

We trust that this information will help answer your questions. If additional facts are necessary, we shall be glad to give further assistance.

Very truly yours,

C. D. WALKER,
Acting Director, Southern Division.

Scarcity of Meat

REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am in the anomalous position of a New Dealer and firm supporter of this administration, who is now getting up on this floor to criticize and complain of the regulations of an agency which I helped to create and which I feel has done, and can do, fine work in preventing inflation and keeping the cost of living down. I refer, of course, to the Office of Price Administration.

I previously spoke on this floor in support of my colleague, Mr. O'TOOLE, who has a resolution calling for an investigation of the meat situation which exists today.

The people in my district are complaining to me that they cannot obtain meat except at exorbitant prices, and after a thorough investigation I reluctantly have come to the conclusion that this is all the fault of the Meat Division of the Office of Price Administration with its packer influences.

"Johnny Doughboy Comes First!" This is emblazoned in bold type, across the

top of a full-page magazine advertisement. And then, in the body of the advertisement, it tells the world that "Johnny Doughboy and all the men in our armed forces come first with the meat-packing industry."

Now, I am confident that this public proclamation of packer patriotism will be comforting and reassuring to those of us on the home front who are determined that the men of our fighting front shall have nothing but the best; that it will prove a source of gratification and relief to parents whose sons are with the armed forces, as well as to members of the armed forces themselves; and who may feel that the poor packers have been misjudged in the past, and really, at heart are generous, altruistic, superpatriots giving their all to the war effort, without regard to cost.

But before we become downright hysterical, before we go completely overboard for the big-hearted packer, let us take stock of the real situation.

The packer deals in meat. That is his business. Through the years he has perfected ways and means of getting meat to the consuming public in volume and with expedition. Who else, then, could we expect to get meat to Johnny Doughboy but the packer? And if Johnny Doughboy did not come first with the packer, and the war should be lost, there would not be any packer—at least under the present set-up. And let us not delude ourselves for a minute with the fact that the packer himself is unaware of the fact.

The packer, too, deals in profits. If he did not, he would not remain in business very long. And you can be certain that if, as he tells the world, "Johnny Doughboy comes first," Mr. Packer is being well paid, indeed, for placing Johnny Doughboy in the preferred category. As far, then, as his flag-waving advertisement is concerned—so what? Other industries are doing the same thing and saying little or nothing about it. What do we have packers for, if their facilities are not available to our troops during a national emergency? And is the effort extraordinary, in any degree, when they are working to save their own skins and investments?

But there happens to be another phase of the packer effort that isn't being publicized in bold-type, full-page magazine advertisements; that which is concerned with the current meat shortage and with his failure and refusal to sell meat to those in distributive channels that normally get it to the civilian population. I refer to his refusal and failure to sell meat to his competitors—the meat processors and wholesalers. They supply the corner butcher, who in turn, gets the meat to our dinner-tables. The packer, under the auspices and protection of O. P. A. meat regulations refuses to supply meat to hundreds of processors and wholesalers. Why? Because this superpatriotic industry—the packing industry—is taking advantage of the war, and of crack-brain regulations, hatched by a combination of theorists and packers at O. P. A., to liquidate competition; because, under authority of these regulations he is able to, and does, take advantage of monopolistic possibilities and is slowly but surely, driving his competitors—the nonslaughtering processors and wholesalers—completely out of the meat picture. Many of these processors and wholesalers have been in business for half a century serving their communities faithfully and honestly.

Thanks to satellites and packer officials, graciously loaned to O. P. A., the packer now has the ball—the meat ball—and unless the Government or Prentiss Brown intervenes immediately—he's going to freeze it, until every vestige of competition is eliminated. And how did he get the ball? How did the packer acquire a monopoly he has been striving unsuccessfully to acquire for years? The answer can be found within the erudite halls of O. P. A. Packer officials loaned to O. P. A. administer the meat regulations. Packer lobbyists haunt the meat section of O. P. A. daily. Packer pressure and packer influence, are everywhere apparent. Under such circumstances how can the packer lose? The situation so far as the processor of wholesaler is concerned is that he has three strikes on him, before he even opens his mouth, to explain his side of the picture to the O. P. A.

Not so long ago a high official in the Department of Agriculture whose division concerns itself with meat, attempted to justify the discrimination against the processors and wholesalers in a letter to a member of the industry, as follows:

> It was assumed that the packers * * * would generally follow their usual practices in the distribution of meats that were available for sale to civilians in this country.

I submit that, assuming anything about the business ethics of the packers is concerned, is the quintessence of credulity. One might just as well assume that Hitler would abide by the terms of a trade agreement or a nonaggression pact, as assume that the packers would follow usual practices, when the cards were arranged so that enhanced revenue was in prospect.

As a matter of actual fact, at a meeting held at Agriculture concerning the situation, one of the packers was quite candid and stated, in substance, "I appreciate the fact that the situation generally is inequitable so far as processors are concerned, but the regulations have dumped an El Dorado in my lap and I'm going to town until the Government issues regulations that tell me the show is over."

Two weeks ago, a conference was held at O. P. A. relative to the meat situation, with a view to finding some way out of the mess. Processors and wholesalers were present and so were the packers, or their lobbyists. The processors and wholesalers carried the despairing air of condemned men, pleading for their lives. The packers sat back, with big complacent, self-satisfied smirks—they did not have anything to worry about, they are in. And they said little because they did not have to; their former associates, now at O. P. A., said it for them. And if a processor or a wholesaler directed an embarrassing question at a packer, an O. P. A. official obligingly furnished the answer, or changed the subject. That illustrates how far you can get in the meat division of O. P. A. unless you know the packer password.

Last week I talked with one of the officials at O. P. A. who seems tc be trying to do an honest, sincere job. He is one of the professors and the pedagogues down there who are honest, if slightly impractical—and they are no match for the guile and duplicity of the packers. But this official admitted that a plan submitted by the processors and wholesalers, providing equitable allocation of available meat, was workable and that officials at Agriculture, off the record, thought well of it. Then, when I inquired why he did not do something about it, he answered, "That's a matter for another division here—the Rationing Division—and the Rationing Division is opposed to it."

And who runs the show in the Rationing Division, pray? Who is the official there who says yes and no to matters of that character? Mr. John Madigan, with a 20-year background as an official of Armour & Co., one of the so-called Big Four of the packing industry. Mr. Madigan, a packer from away back, holds the reins; and Mr. Madigan is the gentleman who firmly and consistently refuses to budge from his opposition to a plan that contemplates equitable allocation; to a plan that will pry the packer loose from the unholy strangle hold that, thanks to O. P. A., he now exercises over the meat industry; to a plan that will restore meat to normal distributive channels and get the meat on our dinner tables that has not been there for weeks and, in some cases, months; a plan that will eventually eliminate the black market because with meat available there will no longer exist the scarcity that creates the demand that in turn brings the bootleg market with its bootleg prices.

Whenever you are looking for information at O. P. A. and your subject is meat, you are almost certain to run into a packer. There is Mr. Madigan, of Armour; Mr. Waller, of Swift; Mr. Wood, of Cudahy; and a Mr. Stone, of a packer subsidiary, Kroger chain stores. And, believe it or not—although processors control about 39 percent of the meat distributive set-up, and although wholesalers have been in the meat business for more than half a century—there is not a nonslaughtering meat processor or wholesaler in any capacity in the Meat Division at O. P. A. They have adopted a practice there recently of designating what are known as consultants who are called in at infrequent intervals to consult with the keymen on projected or proposed measures. But this doubtful designation or concession to the processors and wholesalers, from what I can ascertain, is of little or no value to those industries, so far as securing a square deal. A consultant generally is one of the more influential men in the industry who is supposed to be flattered by being called to Washington to sit in on matters that generally already have been decided upon. His opinion, I am informed, carries about as much weight as that of the twentieth vice president of

a large corporation. The packer writes the regulations which are designed to destroy competition, by keeping meat away from nonslaughtering processors and wholesalers and thus forcing them out of business. The packer administers the regulations and by refusing to do anything about the shameful and iniquitous situation resulting therefrom, maintains the packing industry in an impregnable monopolistic position. Processors and wholesalers are closing their doors all over the country by the score. I have heard from old, established houses—big houses before the era of O. P. A.—that have been compelled to fold up because the packer saw to it they did not get meat. And we can be sure that the packer, despite the pious protestations of concern by his public-relations men, will continue to see to it that they do not get meat until all are out of business and he has the field to himself.

The packer alibis for the present situation are, first, the necessity under O. P. A. regulations to give a discount of 50 cents per hundred pounds of less-than-carload-lot sales to wholesalers; and second, the "black market." The packer, however, fails to state that the discount is not required in sales to processors, and the latter are among his major competitors, and, of course, have not been receiving meat from him. It might be of interest here to note the fact that when the meat-restriction order was prepared by the packer coterie at O. P. A., quotas for slaughterers—packers—were arranged so that only those physically slaughtering were entitled to the same. Now anybody who knows anything about the meat industry is familiar with the fact that many hundreds of legitimate processors hire others to do their slaughtering. For this specious reason they were held not entitled to quotas and left to the tender mercy of the packer. Today, as a result, many are out of business; many others on the way out. Soon, if relief is not forthcoming, the packer will have the field entirely to himself. However, as less meat will be available, due to lend-lease, and meat allocated to the armed forces, the branch houses of the packers will not sell to any new small retail butchers. These butchers, who previously purchased their meat from the wholesaler, who is now being forced out of business, will not be able to get any meat for their customers, people of my district and yours, who in turn will either have to buy their meat in the "black market" or do without.

The "black market" is the direct and natural outgrowth of the O. P. A. regulations and meat restriction order. Whenever the Government, as with the prohibition law, takes it upon itself to set a ban against a commodity for which the demand is general—that demand is going to exist—law or no law, regulation or no regulation—and there will always be people for whom the temptation of vast profits is too great. And there will always be people who, faced with ruin, as the result of ill-conceived, unnecessary, and stupid regulatory measures—as the O. P. A. meat measures—will try to salvage their business and their investments through channels that are not in accord with such measures. I am not condoning the "black market," but I do insist that, so far as meat is concerned, there never was a need or an occasion for it. And I submit that were it not for O. P. A., there would be no "black market."

What a spectacle all of this presents in a Government where everybody is supposed to enjoy equal opportunity! What a sad commentary on the fifth amendment to the Constitution which guarantees the security of property to all citizens of this great Nation! What food for contemplation, for investigation, and for possible prosecution for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. The material is there. Plenty of evidence exists. And it is time that there was action against an unwholesome situation that cries to the high heavens of monopoly and defiance of Federal law.

Lincoln and the Problems of This Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at a Lincoln Day dinner sponsored by the Manitowoc County Republican Club, held at the Lincoln Park Field House, Manitowoc, Wis., on February 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We come tonight to renew our faith in the Republic and to gain new strength and guidance from the life of Abraham Lincoln, who also had faith in the Republic and who gave his life for its preservation.

His period was a decisive time in the Nation's life, even as this hour in which we live is a decisive period in the life of the Republic and the world. It is a period when we need men with a strong spirit to carry on and through to victory in war, and victory in peace. We must stand steadfast in the liberty wherewith this people has been blessed.

The national ideals which Lincoln fought for are being ravaged internationally. The hopes men died for during Lincoln's day are being despoiled. The battle for freedom and free man is not yet won. We are met in a spirit of grim reality. The campfires are still burning. The torch of freedom is still aflame. Human liberty is still at stake. Lincoln's was a sacred task. Ours is a sacred task. His thought was to save the Union and to enshrine freedom. Ours is to preserve the Union and freedom. That is our objective today, and all of our energies must be focused on that objective.

From the life of Lincoln, especially during his war years, we can glean helpful aids and direction for our personal guidance and guidance as a Nation in this critical hour. It will be remembered that when Lincoln came to the Presidency the country was unprepared for coming events, even as we were at the time of Pearl Harbor unprepared. Lincoln, however, had not been in office. He had not had, as the Chief Executive of the Nation, information, inside information, as to what was going on, or funds to prepare.

Lincoln took office in March 1861 and Fort Sumter was attacked on the 12th day of April. Then followed the war, and in the following months we sustained losses at Bull Run, Wilson's Creek, and Ball's Bluff. But the faith of this man would not falter.

In the first months of this war we sustained serious losses at Pearl Harbor, Wake Island, the Philippines, and the loss of over 500 ships; the loss of Kiska Island in the Aleutians, more than 60,000 casualties.

And we have also witnessed brilliant victories by our forces at Midway, Guadalcanal, Africa, Solomon Islands, and the Buna area of New Guinea.

While some military and naval men have stated that there is a possibility of peace coming through the defeat of the Axis in 1943 (and I hope they are right), I am not that sanguine. In Lincoln's time there were those who were going to take Richmond and subdue the Confederacy in a few months, but it took over 4 years of hard fighting to accomplish that result.

We are now engaged in a great world struggle, and I believe a realistic analysis of the situation is as follows: Germany is still economically and militarily formidable with very little likelihood of economic collapse in 1943, though she has passed her production peak. She is being pushed back by the magnificent efforts of the Russians, but she has extended her submarine effort to where the Allied Nations are losing 1,000,000 tons of shipping a month and equivalent supplies. This presents a very critical situation.

Japan is definitely stronger than a year ago in raw materials and within reach of a powerful and entrenched economic position except for a major weakness in shipping. In 1942 Germany captured the Maikop oil fields, increased the efficiency of her industry, took a million tons of grain from the Ukraine and from occupied territory took large numbers of workers and a great deal of machinery which was transported to Germany.

On the other hand the Axis by our invasion of Africa lost north African supplies of phosphate, edible oils, fruits, and grain supplies. Moreover, Germany's communications system has deteriorated and been seriously bombed. While Germany has passed its peak in production, the United Nations have not reached theirs. But we must remember that on the defensive Germany, providing her morale holds, can survive for a long time.

Japan has not reached her production peak. She now possesses raw materials for a greatly expanded economy, but she faces difficulties in a production expansion program. In the Far East we have cut sharply into Japan's merchant shipping tonnage, and if we continue our attacks by air and by sea, we can weaken Japan's chances in 1943 of making full use of the raw material she has looted in her conquest.

As I see it, peace is not just around the corner. We can look forward to a long time of sacrifice before the war is over. During this period we can well turn to Lincoln time and time again, and learn from his life lessons which will help us see this thing through.

As individuals we must in this critical hour strengthen our souls and toughen the fiber of our being. And now, as individuals, what can we learn from Lincoln that will help us personally today?

1. Well, he learned to govern his own mortal spirit. He hated nothing but wrong—not individuals. He learned the value of having human safety valves in his daily work with people.

(a) He knew the value of maintaining a sense of humor—even in the midst of the greatest crisis.

(b) He knew the value of prayer—of communing with his Maker. Listen to his words: "I have been driven many times to my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that of all about me seemed insufficient for the day."

(c) He knew he had to live with himself, so he treated himself squarely. He was temperate in his habits, kindly and considerate of others. He knew if he dealt dishonestly with another, he cheated himself—of self-respect, of peace of mind.

(d) He never returned evil for evil. If another slandered him, he didn't retaliate. He spent no time on the littleness and meanness of his fellow men.

(e) Though he often sustained defeat, he never accepted defeat. He always came forth from that experience stronger and wiser and with more understanding.

(f) He was never intolerant, bigoted, nor did he have time for class hatred or rancor. His thinking was ever in an upward direction. He possessed that great quality of loyalty—loyalty to the cause of the Union, loyalty to proved values.

Let us stop and illustrate a few of these points we have made. We have said that he knew the value of maintaining a sense of humor. Those were critical days that Lincoln faced, and you remember that he reached out and surrounded himself with the best brains the country possessed. They were his Cabinet. And when the months stretched by and there were defeats, these wise men, men with college degrees after their names—lawyers, financiers—these men sat around the Cabinet table with set visages, with minds closed with fear, minds inoperative, if you please—then Lincoln would tell a story.

He knew that these minds were no good to him in the shape they were in. He had to loosen them. He had to get them into operation.

He was wiser than all his advisers. Lincoln had traveled the hard road. He had learned in the school of experience. He was born in obscurity and reared in poverty. He had struggled for an education. He knew people.

While at first he was unskilled in statecraft, he had become a great debater, a master of the English language and logic through self-education, and he soon became the statesman. And in this procedure of getting self-educated, in the school of hard knocks, he never forgot the imperative need of maintaining judgment under all circumstances, and he knew that when times were critical judgment was needed more than ever before.

And he knew also that there was one—his Creator—who was ever present and available in time of trouble, and so he communed with Him for strength and guidance.

No man in American history was as maligned as Abraham Lincoln. Yet in the midst of a storm of abuse and vilification, he carried on the Nation's battle patiently (in the midst of intrigue, jealousy, and treachery). He could take no time from his daily tasks to answer the slander. He said, "The things with which I deal are too great for malice."

Let me repeat, he possessed a saving sense of human and an abiding faith in God. His humor was wise and witty comment—good stories—and he found release for his taut nerves and his overworked brain in a good story and a good laugh.

Most of us can learn from Lincoln how to govern ourselves, how to make life more worth while, how to make a contribution in this great period to the life and welfare of the Nation of which we are a part, how individually to be fitter to meet the problems before us and better able to meet the responsibilities of citizenship.

As we face coming events in a world which is contracted—made much smaller by the inventions of man—I believe we as a nation can also gain a great deal of direction and guidance from the life of this great American. In this period when we have a great deal of loose thinking and indulge in a great many loose, seductive phrases, let us learn from Lincoln a few basic truths. Lincoln said "Property is the fruit of labor, is a positive good in the world. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when he builds it." Here is a "nugget" of wisdom, answering all the seduction of communistic and socialistic talk.

We are today fighting slavery in a very real sense. We are fighting the slavery of the Axis and we are fighting other kinds of slavery. We are fighting for freedom from economic slavery. Lincoln is the direct opposite of Hitler's entire philosophy.

Lincoln believed in the institution of private property. He said, "If there is one thing which can prove to be the well of heaven by external nature around us, without reference to revelation, it is the proposition that whatever a man earns with his hands and with the sweat of his brow, he shall have the right to enjoy in peace."

We are heading toward a new emancipation period and it will be well for us to bear in mind the same doctrines which motivated Lincoln's proclamation of emancipation.

In the post-war period we might well recall Lincoln's beliefs on a representative democracy. He did not believe in a government clothed in paternalistic functions. He said, "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do it all, or cannot do so well, in their separate or individual capacities. In all that people can individually do for themselves, the Government ought not to interfere."

There is much talk now of a peace plan. When that time comes when we must think in terms of reconstructing a world, let us bear in mind that we shall need clear thinkers, sane thinkers, just thinkers, men who can see through the problem and find the solution—and this can only take place when we follow the directive of Lincoln, "With malice toward none, with charity for all."

He saw that it was not with politicians or officeseekers, but "with you, the people, the Union, and the liberties of this country shall be preserved to the latest generations." He knew the people had to think this problem through. In 1863, in the dark hours, he said: "Let us not be oversanguine of a speedy, final triumph—let us be quite sober. Let us diligently apply the means, never doubting that a just God, in His own good time, will give us the rightful result." That was good advice then—it is very good advice for all of us to heed now.

And again listen to the words of this great commoner: "The struggle of today is not altogether for today. It is for a vast future also. With a reliance in Providence all the more firm and earnest, let us proceed in the great task which events have devolved upon us."

With that clause, "Let us proceed in the great task which events have devolved upon us," and the concluding sentence of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, "That this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth," we have the direction and guidance of that great soul, indicating how this people shall proceed to meet and handle the new and the greater problem of world reconstruction and world peace.

Lincoln as a statesman always kept his head and he kept his mind on the objective. You will remember he said, "One war at a time," when England's minister was edging toward war, and during the Civil War, when others lost sight of the need for the Union, he carried on—otherwise we might have had another continent of many nations.

Lincoln was always a Union adherent, and he knew that in union there was strength. He believed in collaboration, in getting folks to pull together. He saw the need of cementing the fragments of a once broken Union. He saw this so clearly that he was adamant. Thank God for his vision. And he proceeded to perform "the great task which events have devolved upon us."

So we must proceed in the great task which events have developed upon us with caution and judgment and see to it that this Government shall not perish from the earth.

I believe that the concensus of the people of this country is that they want their servants to plan, and execute a plan, whereby it shall be humanly possible to prevent great world wars from coming upon the world again. I believe that the people of this Nation want our Government to explore the possibilities of some kind of an organization between nations with teeth in it, to enforce peace.

Lincoln would face this situation fearlessly—this new situation. Remember his words spoken to Congress in 1862. They are meant for us today. I quote: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country." Here he speaks like a prophet of old—giving direction to the people.

I believe if Lincoln were with us today he might say something like this: "When this war is over, the occasion will be piled high with difficulty, but we must rise with the occasion. The situation we face is entirely new, but we must be ready with new vision to meet the problems of this new day. We must disenthrall ourselves from the limitations which would interfere with our doing the big job that is before this people."

Whether an ordered world is to be established and maintained, when the war is over, will depend in a large degree on the wisdom, the common sense, and the policy of the leadership and the people of the United States.

I feel sincerely we must not fail this critical and challenging hour in the world's history. We must clear away the confusion and the rubbish which surrounds us and go forth to fulfill our destiny. We must win through to victory and then we must shape a peace plan that must be workable, practical, and lasting. It must be rooted in democratic principles. While there are those among us who contend that peace depends on economic action, there are others who say it is a question of social security and social justice; still others see the importance of spiritual forces, claiming that the world must be reeducated and there must be a revival of basic religious values; and others say it is a question of getting all peoples acquainted with the value of democracy and the growth and respect for law.

We, fellow Americans, must never forget that we are living in a changing world and that the question of maintaining a world order and peace depends to a large extent upon the power lodged in the coordinated effort of nations. We in America maintain our police force and our Federal Bureau of Investigation. We know the need therefor.

So in a world league, as long as man is man, power to enforce order must be lodged in the proper authority. Even the Master said, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's"—recognizing that worldly matters must be taken into cognizance.

When I speak of power lodged in the international organization which may come after the war, I realize that the use of power or misuse thereof presents a problem of the first magnitude.

We in America feel we have solved that problem by a system of checks and balances in government.

The good Samaritan had power—the power of kindliness, of the right kind of service. He had "wine and oil and cash" and the knowledge as to how to use them.

The personnel of the league which will be created must embrace men who not only possess great administrative minds and capacity, but men who possess the attributes of the great Samaritan, men who kindle hope and destroy fear, who are charitable, fearless, understanding, merciful, men who would heal the hurts of the world.

If this organization were so staffed, it would function as an international guardian—aiding the minor peoples to grow to adult stature.

We have done that job in the Philippines, bringing that people up in knowledge and ability to where, when the war is won, self-government will be their lot. The loyalty of the Philippine people in this war toward this country demonstrates the quality of American statesmanship. In the years since we went into the Philippines, we have acted, by and large, for their good. We have aided in building that people in stature and wisdom.

We have heard much said about isolation, but no one has ever suggested that we should build a Chinese wall around this country. The question now is, How far shall we go to seek to prevent a repetition of another world war? It must be conceded at the outset, considering the psychological, religious, intellectual, social, and political condition of the various races of the earth, that it would be impossible to amalgamate them into a world state—at least for a long time to come.

But there are peoples and nations, ready and willing—people who think alike, who feel we must reach out as our fathers did in 1787 to attempt a solution to the world's chaotic condition.

We know that when this war is over, the world will not be cleansed of those evil forces which make for war. There will be no opportunity to put into effect a great many of the Utopian and visionary schemes which have been advanced. Our problem is to create a plan and we must ever bear in mind that the plan must fit a complex world which is ever changing and has to deal with nations and groups—and their capacity, and will, to fit into the plan.

Consequently, with our eyes on the past and aware of the experiences of history, let America go forward searching out the way for a world's good, but constantly on the alert and on guard—aware of the dangers within and without which might threaten her very existence. No matter what kind of a post-war world we find ourselves in, or the kind of a post-war organization in which we may find ourselves—whether it be a federation of the democracies, a system of regional arrangements, a league of nations, or a new balance of power set-up—let America see to it that she is adequately fortified against any emergency that may arise. By that I mean America should be in possession of the outlying islands bordering on America and the Caribbean, she should have adequate sea and air bases throughout the globe, adequate military, naval, and air power, ever bearing in mind that America, if she lives up to her destiny, should be the lighthouse of the world, lighting the way for other nations so they will follow and live and prosper in peace.

On the subject of looking after our own, let me quote the Apostle Paul, "If any provide not for his own, especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." I believe this statement is applicable in a national sense. We Americans who owe so much to America must provide for our own. This poses the question, How best to provide? We must see to it that this lighthouse of ours, this beloved America, does not trade away her great economic and political treasures for a mess of international pottage. We must keep her free and safe and able ever, not only able to provide for and protect her own, but to be the great Samaritan among the nations of earth.

A new world awaits us after the war. We, as a people, are learning in wartime to put forth in teamwork the energy of a united people. If we follow through in peace the lessons we have learned in war, the sky is the limit.

Let us have the faith of a Lincoln, the integrity of a Lincoln, and the vision of a Lincoln. Then indeed will we march forward in the world of tomorrow, meeting squarely the great destiny that is America's.

The Cult of Competency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting, able, and important address on the subject The Cult of Competency, delivered by H. W. Prentis, Jr., president of the Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa., at the midwinter commencement of the University of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia, February 6, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am deeply sensible of the honor accorded me by President Gates, the trustees and faculty, in inviting me to speak at this midwinter commencement. I propose to discuss "The Cult of Competency."

The Greeks said: Know yourself; the Romans, be yourself; the Christians, give yourself. The cult of competency—as our fathers knew and practiced it—fused these three swords of the spirit into the great instrumentality that set them free. To remain free, we, their descendants, must pay the same price they paid. For freedom, as many wise men have pointed out, is not a gift from heaven. It must be won and rewon by every generation for itself. It is not ours for the asking, as so many complacent Americans seem to think. It is ours only for the taking—through competent personal effort in support of the eternal principles on which it rests.

The way to freedom has always been a rough and arduous road. It is not for weaklings. It has never remained long under the feet of those who seek first, last, and always a full stomach—at the price of a questing mind and an unfettered soul! Only a competent people can build the temple of self-government. And only a competent people can keep it standing. The floods of economic depression, the frosts of class cleavage, the ice of apathy and the winds of demagoguery, are potent forces of social erosion which are never at rest. Only through constant renewal of knowledge, faith, and practice of the principles of republican self-government by a competent citizenry, can the edifice of liberty be kept intact. As Montesquieu reminded us 200 years ago, popular self-government is the most difficult of all forms of government to maintain but it yields strong men who are willing to pay the cost, the priceless blessings of liberty.

To preserve itself, a representative democracy should, therefore, guard and encourage individual competency with every means at its command. For only intellectually competent men can fully discharge the responsibilities of citizenship, weigh new proposals of government against the lessons of history, and vote intelligently. Only physically competent men can create the wealth required to produce a rising standard of living, foster education, and finance necessary government activities. Only morally competent men will support religion, assist the incompetent, succor the unfortunate, and exercise the self-restraint necessary to preserve our free institutions. Our fathers had none of the current mystical faith in the power of government—composed of men no better, no worse on the average than the rest of us—to solve all their problems. But they did have the virtues par excellence of free men—courage and self-reliance. So the representative democracy they devised, based on the cult of competency, had as its cornerstones: The right of the people to choose their own rulers; the right of all men to free speech, free assemblage, and free conscience; the right of all men to work freely at lawful vocations of their own choosing. If, through intellectual, physical, or moral incompetency, we permit any one of these three fundamental rights to be undermined, the ultimate fall of the American Republic is as inevitable as the failure of the many other attempts at popular self-government which have had their little day and gone down into the night of history.

To be intellectually competent, a man obviously must have a storehouse of facts, the ability to think straight, mental humility, and a certain sense of the fitness of things that we in business call good judgment. To the three R's of the primary grades, "reading, 'riting, and 'rithmetic," he must add the R's of higher education—receptivity, reflectiveness, resourcefulness, resoluteness, and responsibility.

If I were asked to pick out the one paramount blessing of a college education, I think I should place mental humility above all others.

* * * * * * *

I do hope that you have followed at least one subject beyond its elementary stages to a point where there has come upon you with the burst of an exploding shell, an overwhelming sense of your own mental limitations, because that is the attitude that produces mental humility—the spirit of constant inquiry. As Cowper said: "Knowledge is proud that it knows so much; wisdom is humble that it knows no more."

When it comes to public affairs, how many of us who are college and university graduates are intellectually competent? Speaking from my own experience, I know that, although I received a bachelor of arts degree from a State university, I was never taught anything specific about the foundations of American freedom, nor was it ever made clear to me that our various liberties—political, intellectual, economic, and spiritual—stand or fall together.

* * * * *

The fact of the matter is that we Americans have been so engrossed ever since the Civil War in economic affairs that we have simply not been interested in government. Hence the study of the liberal arts—history, political philosophy, and religion—has gone largely into the discard. Thus quite unwittingly we have cut ourselves off from the sources from which American liberty stems. Most of us, in fact, no longer understand the creative spirit that brought into being the free society in which we live. So we are

prone to accept the Mellin's food of political pabulum served us in predigested form by commentators, columnists, and politicians, without ever doing any very serious thinking on public questions on our own account.

For example, what does the phrase "American democracy" mean to you? The word "democracy" does not appear anywhere, you know, in either the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution. Yet it is on everybody's tongue today. How do you define it? Is it—as so many people seem to think—merely the toleration of any vagrant idea about government that may enjoy the support of a current majority? Again let me ask, What is your considered judgment of the statement of Vice President WALLACE last November when he said, and implied that he thought so himself, "Some in the United States believe that we have overemphasized what might be called political or Bill of Rights democracy"? If you disagree, are you intellectually competent to refute his assertion?

Here is still another case: Inferring that the system of checks and balances of the American Republic is outmoded, Attorney General Biddle claimed in a recent speech about democracy that "the misuse of power is neither more likely nor more necessarily harmful in the case of the Government than it is in the case of the other social organisms where power has been or may be lodged." What do you think of that? The writers of the Federalist Papers would not agree, I am sure. Certainly, no social organism but government has jails to put people into when it does misuse its power. Incidentally, if you have not read the Federalist Papers, by all means do so. Those 87 newspaper articles by Hamilton, Madison, and Jay—written for popular consumption in 1789—are still the best explanation of the philosophy underlying the American Republic that I have found anywhere.

The men who set up this Nation were intellectually competent to defend the principles on which it was founded. If we are to preserve it, we must prove worthy of our heritage by emulating their example. The collectivists among us are never idle. They constantly chip away at the foundations of our free institutions. So every intellectually competent citizen should be equally alert, analyze every new governmental proposal in the light of history, and decide for himself whether or not it fits into the fabric of our system. Otherwise we may find ourselves eventually with only the empty shell of the Republic that our gallant soldiers and sailors are now fighting to preserve on land and sea and in the air and in the waters under the sea.

When I speak of physical competency, I am not thinking of mere bodily strength but rather of the ability of a man to take care of himself and those dependent on him without subsidies from government or any other source. That characteristic—the spirit of self-reliance—is an essential ingredient of popular self-government. The preservation of a representative democracy hinges directly on the willingness of the people to decide public questions on the basis of the general national welfare—not on narrow considerations of individual or group selfishness.

If men are not themselves economically competent, but are the wards of the State, how can they avoid dealing with public questions on the basis of self-interest? Furthermore, without a financially competent citizenry, how can we hope to maintain our two-party political system? The party in power is in position to use public funds for political propaganda. Financial support for the opposition can only come from private citizens, and without intelligent opposition, the democratic process is self-defeating. Obviously also, private business cannot exist without constant accretions of new capital. Unless the financially competent are in position to furnish it, the State must supply it, and when government becomes the primary source of capital funds, national socialism automatically displaces representative democracy. The church and our private educational and philanthropic institutions would be lost without the support that competent individual citizens furnish them.

Economic competency thus plays a very vital part in a republic of free men. In fact, James Madison said: "The economic foundation of the American political system is the protection of the differing and unequal capacity of men to acquire and use property." Yet in recent years in the name of social reform, many serious obstacles have been placed by government in the path of the competent citizen. Under the added impact of war, these handicaps have now reached such proportions that unless young people like yourselves see to it that they are ameliorated as soon as peace comes, the American Republic will be in serious jeopardy. When I was growing up as the son of a school principal, any man who could put aside, say, $20,000 in savings and life insurance for his family was considered to have accumulated a tidy fortune. Invested at 6 percent, it yielded an annual income of $1,200, which purchased probably as much as $2,000 will buy today. Assume that starting from scratch, a young man can save $20,000 today—a real task in the face of mounting taxes. Invested at 3 percent—about the maximum safe rate—this sum would yield $600 a year. Taxes would take a bit out of that, but after the war, with the creeping inflation now in progress, even $600 will probably not have the purchasing power of more than half that sum.

One of the finest instincts of a normal man is his desire to provide for the financial future of himself and his family. Hence, the situation I have just described, which strikes at the roots of personal incentive, is rightly a matter of deep concern to every thoughtful American. The preservation of our freedom and national well-being—including economic security for the unfortunate—depends directly on the continuation of reasonable financial opportunity and reward for the competent. Consider the plight of the one-third of our population who allegedly are ill-nourished, ill-housed, and ill-clad. In the last analysis, who but the competent among us can help that situation? Of course, government can tax away the savings of the competent of this and past generations and distribute them, but eventually when this accumulated fat is gone, where is new productive wealth to come from in a free society, if not from the ingenuity, initiative, and thrift of the competent? It is, therefore, high time, it seems to me, for believers in American liberty to raise their voices in behalf of the two-thirds of our citizens who have proven competent to take care of themselves, and thus show some concern for the original "forgotten man" of William Graham Sumner—the quiet citizen who paddles his own canoe day in and day out, marries and raises a family, meets his bills promptly, pays his taxes, supports his church, contributes to the community chest, fights for his country when need arises, asks nobody to protect him from "cradle to the grave," and thereby does his quiet bit to maintain the American Republic for his children and his children's children. If this be social treason, make the most of it. As Somerset Maugham said: "If a nation values anything more than freedom, it will lose its freedom; and the irony of it is that if it is comfort or money that it values more, it will lose that too."

Paradoxically enough, the release of initiative and enterprise made possible by popular self-government ultimately generates disintegrating forces from within. Again and again after freedom has brought opportunity and some degree of plenty, the competent become selfish, luxury-loving, and complacent; the incompetent and the unfortunate grow envious and covetous, and all three groups turn aside from the hard road of freedom to worship the Golden Calf of economic security. The historical cycle seems to be: From bondage to spiritual faith; from spiritual faith to courage; from courage to liberty; from liberty to abundance; from abundance to selfishness; from selfishness to apathy; from apathy to dependency; and from dependency back to bondage once more.

At the stage between apathy and dependency, men always turn in fear to economic and political panaceas. New conditions, it is claimed, require new remedies. Under such circumstances, the competent citizen is certainly not a fool if he insists upon using the compass of history when forced to sail uncharted seas. Usually so-called new remedies are not new at all. Compulsory planned economy, for example, was tried by the Chinese some three millenniums ago, and by the Romans in the early centuries of the Christian Era. It was applied in Germany, Italy, and Russia long before the present war broke out. Yet it is being seriously advocated today as a solution of our economic problems in the United States. Its proponents confidently assert that government can successfully plan and control all major business activity in the Nation, and still not interfere with our political freedom and our hard-won civil and religious liberties. The lessons of history all point in exactly the reverse direction.

Under compulsory national economic planning in Germany before the war, was there freedom of the press? Ask any newspaper man. Was there freedom of suffrage in Italy? Ask any hardy soul who underwent the castor oil treatment at the hands of fanatical Fascists. Did the farmer preserve his freedom in Russia? Ask the kulaks. What happens to labor unions under planned economy? Ask the former labor leaders of any Axis nation. Is academic freedom permitted? Ask the intellectuals in exile. How about freedom of worship? Ask the clergy of Germany and Russia. Well, then, can we not apply compulsory planning to a part of our economy and leave the rest to private business? Stalin says, "No," and so does Douglas Miller in his famous book about Hitler. That is the record. "Power over a man's support is power over his will," the Federalist Papers sagely observed in 1789. Yet I venture to predict that if we ever do lose our freedom in America it will be due to public ignorance of the perils involved in outright government planning and control of our economic life. All of which again demonstrates that freedom can only be had by competent men who understand the basic principles of self-government and who recognize that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

It has long been recognized that education which does not mold the soul of man while it is fashioning his mind is lethal poison for the individual and social dynamite for the body politic. In the original charter of the Acadamey and Charitable School in the Province of Pennsylvania, from which this university sprang, the hope is expressed that it "may prove a nursery of wisdom and virtue," and your first provost said that "there is yet one science necessary to complete all the rest—the science of Christianity and the great mystery of Godliness."

Popular self-government as we know it in America had its origin in the religious concept of the sacredness of the individual soul, and the existence of certain inalienable natural rights conferred upon man by Almighty God. Certainly, therefore, one need not argue the essentiality of moral competency to our continued existence as a nation of freemen. The voluntary assumption of social

stewardship is in a very literal sense the keystone of liberty. And it requires a high degree of moral competency to fit men for such responsibility.

As Justice Brandeis said: "Democracy is a serious undertaking which substitutes self-restraint for external restraint." In other words, if men do not conduct themselves of their own volition with due regard for the rights of others, they invite public coercion. We saw that process at work in the years before the war in the well-nigh endless multiplication of governmental controls designed allegedly to bring about social justice. Many of these measures were justified, but few would have been enacted if we had had the moral competency to conduct ourselves in accordance with the basic tenets of the Parable of the Good Samaritan, the Sermon on the Mount, and the Golden Rule. The history of freedom, we must never forget, is the history of limitations of governmental power—not its extension.

Henri Bergson, addressing the French Academy in 1914, said: "Science * * * equipped man in less than 50 years with more tools than he had made during the thousands of years he had lived upon earth. Each new machine being for man a new organ—an artificial organ—his body became suddenly and prodigiously increased in size, without his soul being at the same time able to dilate to the dimensions of his new body." That was 30 years ago, and we still have the same problem confronting us. It cannot be solved by the spawning of more laws and regulations—if we are to keep our freedom. Its only solution lies in the development of adequate moral competency—a task in which there can be no evasion of individual responsibility on the part of any citizen who truly loves his country. In his last published article, The Road Away From Revolution, written practically on his deathbed, Woodrow Wilson said: "The sum of the whole matter is this, that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually."

With all of the sorrow and disruption that war is bringing into our lives, there is a certain grim privilege in living and participating in a great crisis in human history. According to a French philosopher, "When God erases, He is preparing to write." Our first task, of course, is to win a complete military victory. And we shall do so—never fear—thanks to the superb bravery and sacrifice of our armed forces and the production miracles now being wrought by American industry.

When peace comes, we shall possess more manufacturing facilities, more new materials, more skilled labor, a greater pent-up demand for goods, a larger reservoir of spending power, than we have ever had in our history. With such resources to work with, it will be the responsibility of the rising generation—such as you who graduate today—to take up the task of building the America of our dreams: an America in which the physical standards of living will be raised to new levels; an America in which religion, education, culture and recreation will be still more widely diffused; an America in which the cult of competency will not only ensure the maintenance of freedom within our own borders, but will work hand in hand with all peoples of good will to bring to pass that halcyon day when "nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." We can gather new courage for the latter task if we always remember this: Man has been making and using weapons for a million years; conscience dawned upon him only 5,000 years—160 generations—ago.

The cult of competency was forged in the crucible of persecution and tyranny. We have taken it for granted. We have never seen it put to the test it is undergoing today. Now in the midst of world catastrophe, we are coming to realize anew that there is something in life greater than knowledge and bigger than security; something which, with all our organized learning, we have not fully captured in books; that something which in the past has caused men to sacrifice all to attain some part of it. Some call it liberty, some freedom. Maybe its best designation is that it is the dignity of the individual in the sight of God and man. Some define it in terms of faith, and others as human brotherhood. But of one thing I am certain. It is the priceless ingredient of life. Whatever it is, it is of both the heart and mind, not a complex quality to baffle science, but a simple thing to assuage men's souls. It is the quality of being a man. With that concept Aristotle spurred Athenian youth; and it was that, no doubt, which illumined Socrates' mind as he talked the great simplicities to his students under a fig tree in far-distant days in ancient Greece. Its quest has filled the ages ever since. Its attainment in a fuller sense is the only thing that will make tomorrow worth the living. Its achievement is a ringing challenge to you young men and women of the class of 1943—the latest novitiates of the cult of competency.

Civilian Morale, and How We Can Improve It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able, interesting, and timely address by the Honorable Robert H. McNeill, an outstanding and prominent practicing attorney of the city of Washington. The address was delivered at the invitation and before the members of the Civitan Club of the city of Washington on January 26 of this year at the Mayflower Hotel. The subject of the address is Our Civilian Morale, and How We Can Improve It.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CIVILIAN MORALE, AND HOW WE CAN IMPROVE IT

An accepted definition of morale is: "Moral condition; that mental state which renders a man capable of endurance and of exhibiting courage in the presence of danger."

We must all admit that, assuming this definition to be accurate, our morale is not what it should be, and can and must be improved.

I believe the definition is accurate.

If and when our morale is high, as it must be, if we are to meet any great crisis, we must first be "capable of endurance." We must be fired with a zeal that accepts hardships and deprivations without complaint. For, as Ruskin has said, "There is no excellence of utmost performance until we have put forth our greatest effort."

Second. We must be able to not only have but to exhibit courage in the presence of danger. This implies not only the acceptance of hardships, but actual danger without flinching. It means that we must keep our chins up when we hear of reverses in the air, on the seas, or at the battle fronts, and let all those we meet see that we are neither frightened nor downhearted.

I have defined in a few sentences what morale is. I have done this to be sure that the word, as I shall discuss it, is not misunderstood.

It is now logical to discuss whether or not we have a morale which renders us capable of endurance and of showing courage in the face of disaster. I fear we have not. Certainly there is no doubt but what this quality in our people could and must be greatly increased and improved. Perhaps we will not know with certainty until some real crisis strikes our country, a crisis that brings the conflict to our shores. Perhaps then and then only will we learn whether we can exhibit a subconscious courage which we must have if we are to give adequate support to our boys in the service.

But to learn by this uncertain means might be disastrous. If the test should overwhelm us, and we should be unable to meet the test from lack of mental, physical, and moral preparedness, the damage would be irreparable.

So we owe it to ourselves, and to the brave boys and men and girls and women in the zones of superlative danger to make certain, if and when the tests of endurance and courage come, that we meet them unflinchingly.

To make us sure of ourselves, we should be able to answer this question: Have we the iron in our blood to say "Right in the Führer's face," that no matter what comes, "we can take it"? No matter what comes, we will be able to meet the situation? Meet it with the royal courage of our Scotch and English cousins when the battle of London imperiled the very existence of the British Empire? Or, conversely, are we so uncertain of ourselves that we might meet the exigencies of the war as France met them, with an utter collapse of the French Government, as well as the power and endurance of the French people?

What tests are necessary to give us certainty of ourselves? Do we need to do anything we are not doing to make our assurance of endurance and courage doubly sure? What can we do, as suggested by my topic, to strengthen and improve our morale? Or what may we leave undone, or what reforms would we make in our past performances, what methods should we revise, to better the spiritual and physical courage of our citizens in the greatest of all world crises?

What I shall say of criticism I hope will not be misunderstood. It is intended to be constructive. Surely with six nephews in the Army and Navy and my only son in the Army what I say could not be thought other than sympathetic with our Nation's purpose to win a glorious and speedy victory over our enemies.

These are some things we should not do as we have done them:

1. We should in the future, as we have not always in the past, make our plans for civilian activities and defense with more deliberation and foresight. There should be careful study of our necessities and then logical plans made to meet them. I believe we will agree that in many cases involving our civilian morale we have suffered from loose thinking and ill-advised planning and that results have been frightfully disappointing and disturbing. How serious they may have been cannot be told now. This may only be known if and when some serious testing time comes.

2. We should take our civilian responsibilities more seriously. Thus far in Washington I fear Mr. Average Citizen has thought more of his rights and a danger that he might have them prejudiced, than he has about his responsibilities and their cheerful performance. I fear I must admit my own fault here. But surely by now when we are reading of tragedies by land, sea, and air we

must have had it brought home to us that our country and its liberties and the sacred privileges it has granted us, are in peril and that the home front, in real truth, is as necessary a line of defense as the battle grounds of Guadalcanal and Russia and prospectively Germany are lines of offense. And if we fail here there is no hope that our soldiers and sailors can succeed over there.

Former President Hoover puts the picture in the following words:

"The people must work longer and longer hours at harder and heavier labor. Movement is restricted. Rationing, price and wage restrictions are inevitable. Regimentation becomes steadily more onerous and economic dictatorship grows increasingly as war goes on.

"On the spiritual side, grief stretches into every family, emotions become more fragile and intolerant; criticism, freedom of speech, become more and more frozen.

"All these forces are multiplied in civilians by terror of attack from the air and destruction of their industries."

Brig. Gen. Eric Fisher Wood presented our dangers in an address at Camp Bragg, N. C., 2 or 3 days ago, in the following graphic language:

"In my opinion, and in conclusion, I personally make this prediction: That before this all-out war is over German battle action will be seen here on our home front along and behind our Atlantic seaboard—to include your own historic State of North Carolina."

Do those pictures of dreaded conditions make our duties look really serious obligations? I know you men of Civitan, whose chief objective is the betterment of life for yourselves and others, must agree with me that we must change our attitude of complacency to one of willingness to serve even though it means sacrifice.

3. While we must not criticize for the sake of embarrassing those in power, nevertheless we have a duty to punish incompetency, graft, or complacency in public officials. We must do this with firm resolution and iron courage. We must not mollycoddle stuffed shirts or brass hats. These times demand their retirement from all power and their replacement by men of strong wills, stout hearts, and level heads, who know their duties and dare perform them, whether it affects friend or foe. The only criterion for public service now—and surely that applies to us all—is one of surrender of our own ease and complacency that we may aid the common defense of our country and support to the limit our fighting forces, who are fighting and dying every hour of every day and night in the air, on the battlefields, on the sea, and under the sea.

4. Yes, I repeat, we should be quick with constructive criticism of undue complacency or wasteful incompetency. On the other hand, when we find in a position of power, in our home defense, some man or woman possessed with outstanding ability or fired by a zeal to do his or her whole duty, we should encourage them by giving them every support in our power. We should show them that the people, as a whole, know how to appreciate loyal and sacrificial public service and that they are as quick to regard loyalty as they are to condemn disloyalty or incompetency in these days of trial and tragedy.

The emergence of incompetent men may be expected even in peacetimes. And, of course, they will arise and push forward during the excitement and rush of war emergencies. Likewise, the strong men and women will emerge, too. Some of them have already appeared and stand out sun-crowned, with their heads above their fellows, glorified by deeds of valor which will outlive the marble or bronze statues we may build in their memories in a later generation. Today is the birthday of one of these great figures.

Just 10 months ago Gen. Douglas MacArthur was ordered from Bataan to Australia by our Commander in Chief. By submarine and plane he went through the enemy-infested waters on the long, arduous, and hazardous journey to Australia with his heroic wife and little son sharing his perils. There he began to make plans for the extermination of the treacherous Japanese in the vicinity of Port Moresby and Guadalcanal. Now those jobs have been just about finished and 15,000 Jap carcasses prove how thoroughly the work was accomplished.

As grateful Americans, let's recognize this amazing result by sending birthday greetings to this great American soldier. And let's show the same spirit of appreciation to our civic leaders, whenever and wherever they may arise, and show the same zeal in civic effort as General MacArthur has in his war efforts. By doing this we will build and build quickly a higher and more efficient civilian morale and give to our fighting forces the conviction that we are behind them at all times and with all of our strength and that, no matter what fate betides us or them, we will not let them down.

The Fluid Milk Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement covering the fluid-milk situation, presented by representatives of the International Association of Milk Control Agencies before Federal Government officials on February 15, 1943.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The subcommittee represented here today was appointed at the annual meeting of the association held in Richmond, Va., last October, and was enlarged at the meeting of the association held in New York City on February 10. This subcommittee represents and is authorized to speak for the State milk-control agencies of the following 16 States: Alabama, California, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Virginia.

At the meeting of the association held in New York City this subcommittee was directed to present the present fluid-milk situation to the Federal agencies concerned, namely, the United States Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration. We are directed to present the critical situation prevailing in fluid-milk production and to point out that a ceiling should not be placed upon producer prices at the present time, at least not until cost-price inequities have been corrected and the principal production cost items have been definitely placed under control. Secondly, we are directed to suggest to the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration that the State milk-control agencies are in a position to help them in the development, administration, and enforcement of any necessary controls over fluid-milk production and distribution.

With respect to the first point, we believe that it will cause extreme hardship upon many fluid-milk producers in various localities of the country if producer prices are frozen to January levels. Based upon the reports presented by the representatives of this association at the meeting held on February 10 in New York City, and also based upon information given by dairymen and executives of fluid-milk associations at both the New England Milk Producers' Conference and the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation held in New York City on February 11 and 12, there was presented uncontroverted evidence that fluid-milk producers in many localities of the country are faced with very critical and unsatisfactory production and price problems which require immediate attention. It appears that in many localities the January prices and, for that matter, the prices prevailing for several months preceding January were out of balance with production costs. This situation came about in several ways.

In some instances producer prices were too low when the Office of Price Administration wholesale and retail ceilings went into effect last May, and since that time producers have not been able to obtain adjustment in these prices. In some instances, particularly in those States in which milk-control acts are effective, producer price increases were in process at the time the Office of Price Administration ceilings became effective. In some States adjustments have been made, but in others the State agency has not been successful in obtaining approval for adjustments in wholesale and retail prices which would in turn permit increases in producer prices. In some instances producer prices were adjusted but have again become unbalanced because of a lack of adequate control over the prices of the principal items entering into the cost of production, such as hay, grain concentrates, the wages of milkers and other farm help, the cost of farm equipment, transportation rates, and other similar items.

There are a few localities in the United States in which it appears that producer prices are reasonably satisfactory and are in reasonably good balance with costs of production. Producers in these few areas are not greatly aroused over the proposed price ceiling order. However, in all of the other States and especially in those localities in which the situation is critical the fluid milk producers are greatly disturbed and will oppose the issuance of this order by every means available to them.

It is not difficult to understand why producers in such areas are so greatly disturbed. In many of the States in which milk control acts are operative efforts have been made for many months to obtain Office of Price Administration approval upon producer price adjustments but in many instances relief has not yet been obtained. The freezing of producer prices upon the basis of January levels means the freezing of prices below the costs of production of a very large proportion of producers in each of these localities. By cost of production we do not refer either to average costs or the highest cost of any producer. We mean the necessary costs of enough reasonbly efficient producers whose fluid milk production is required to provide a reasonably adequate supply to consumers in each of the localities affected. Thus such a price-freezing order would have a disastrous effect upon both the fluid milk producers affected and also upon the available supplies of milk and upon the consumers in the cities to which this milk is supplied. Producers who are not wholly dependent upon milk production for their livelihood will gradually shift over to the production of other crops and commodities in which prices are more satisfactory, in some cases due to Federal subsidy payments. Producers who are wholly or largely dependent upon fluid milk produc-

tion for their livelihood will cease the production of fluid milk as quickly as they can and they will either get into other types of agriculture or they will accept employment in defense industries in which they have reason to believe that their net income will be more satisfactory.

In some instances producers will shift their deliveries from areas of low prices to areas of higher prices provided the transportation facilities are such as to make this possible. From the standpoint of consumers and the country as a whole this means a substantial loss in fluid milk production and in the case of certain large urban and industrial communities it means that practically the entire fluid milk supply will be shifted to other communities or may be discontinued entirely.

You may doubt that the imposition of the ceiling upon producer prices will cause such serious consequences. We who are closely in touch with the producers and the public in these several States are convinced that the result may even be more serious than we have expressed. If these conditions take place, there will be many thousands of angry and disappointed farmers and there is much talk of widespread strikes in fluid milk production in the various sections of the country. It means that millions of consumers will be angry when they find out why their milk supplies have been curtailed or destroyed. It means a loss of vital food and vital food-producing capacity which is so necessary to a successful prosecution of this war.

We ask you in all sincerity whether it is necessary for the Federal Government to cause such conditions? We ask you furthermore whether you are prepared to accept the consequences of such measures? Frankly we doubt the necessity for any such conditions and we believe there is no need for agencies of the Federal Government to place themselves in the position which will result from such measures.

Now what can be done to alleviate this situation? We ask that you give your earnest and immediate consideration to the following proposals:

A. Place positive control over all of the principal items entering into the cost of fluid milk production such as hay, grain concentrates, the wages of milkers and other dairy farm workers and supplies;

B. Adjust fluid milk prices to producers wherever it is necessary to bring them into line with production costs as defined herein. In this connection you are advised that many States already have the necessary cost-of-production data and the others can obtain such information quickly either through their own facilities or from the State extension service. Positive authority to do this should be given to the several regional offices of the Office of Price Administration;

C. Essential distribution economy measures should be put into effect as quickly as possible and any actual savings should be utilized in the adjustment of producer prices so as to reduce the upward adjustments in wholesale and retail prices. These must be on a regional, State, and area basis because of fundamental differences in distribution. Very few economy measures could have national application;

D. In instances where distribution savings are not possible producer price increases should be made immediately through increases in wholesale and retail prices;

E. Incentive payments should not be considered as adequate relief to producers who are now receiving less than production costs. Incentive payments would serve as an inducement to producers to produce more milk in 1943 than they did in 1942, but where there is a critical maladjustment between present producer prices and present producer costs of production, incentive payments will not correct the situation in time to enable the producer to continue in production. Furthermore, if present producer prices are not adequate, it is unlikely that the addition of an incentive payment in order to bring forth added production will correct the maladjustment;

F. We suggest again to both the representatives of the Food Distribution Administration and the Office of Price Administration to avail themselves of the data, knowledge, and experience of the personnel in the several State milk-control agencies both in the preparation of proper ceiling prices and in the development, administration, and enforcement of any distribution economy measures which may be undertaken.

We find it necessary to say to the representatives of the Office of Price Administration that much of the misunderstanding and many of the difficulties which have been experienced heretofore are caused by a lack of trained milk marketing economists in your agency, particularly in your regional offices. It is asking too much to expect that persons trained merely in general economic theory without any business experience or knowledge of the fluid-milk or dairy industry would be able to take over and handle satisfactorily the immediate problems of fluid-milk production and distribution. Unless this situation is corrected we do not see how our present problem can be relieved nor do we see how future problems can be avoided. We recognize that the Federal agencies concerned will doubtless wish to have their own staffs for various reasons but there is not need for the Federal agencies to set up and maintain large milk-control staffs in the States in which there is an adequate staff in the State milk-control agency. We are prepared to offer to you our facilities, our knowledge, experience, and personnel in order that a sound program and procedures may be developed without the waste of manpower, time, or expense.

The National Labor Relations Board and War Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it has been suggested to me that, as a matter of public information, the letter published in the Washington Star of February 12, written by John P. Frey, president, Metal Trades Department, American Federation of Labor, be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I believe this letter is of sufficient interest to justify its inclusion in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD ASSAILED BY LABOR SPOKESMAN—FREY DENIES WAGNER ACT REQUIRES INTERVENTION IN KAISER SHIPYARDS

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

I have been out of the city and just now has your recent editorial concerning the National Labor Relations Board's case against Henry J. Kaiser come to my attention. You agree that a serious situation is presented, but contend that the trouble arises from the Wagner Act, and that the National Labor Relations Board cannot pursue any other course than it is pursuing, a course which already has caused a slackening of production in the Kaiser yards at Portland, Oreg., and which, if persisted in, inevitably will lead to a tragic period of turmoil, agitation, bickering, and consequent disruption of vitally needed war production.

The Board's attitude that it is forced to take the action it is taking is an amazing attitude; an attitude that has not been convincing to the representatives of the war production agencies who have importuned it; an attitude that is utterly wrong. It is based on a provision in the Wagner Act that an employee is guaranteed the right to join an organization of his choosing. The Congress of Industrial Organizations was not in existence at the time of the passage of the Wagner Act. The provision manifestly was intended to protect the employee against being forced into a company union. That was the intent of the provision then, and the Board knows that it is the intent of the provision today. The fact is that the Board has invariably so interpreted the provision when the American Federation of Labor was the petitioner. But it is also an outrageous fact that the Board, from the inception of the Congress of Industrial Organizations has conceived one of its principal functions to be the advancement of that organization against the federation. This it is seeking to do now. It is seeking to do this, not through any defect in the Wagner Act, but through an arrogant abuse of its authority to administer that act.

You must not fall into the error of thinking or be misled by the Board into believing that its action was forced by unrest in the yards. Mr. Kaiser stated in New York a few weeks ago that the morale of his employees was at the highest. Manifest disgruntlement and uncertain morale now are developing.

The action of the Board came solely on the representation of the Congress of Industrial Organizations shipyard workers' organization that they should be given the opportunity to organize these workers. They claim no substantial organization on the Pacific coast now. Out of some 400,000 of such workers they claim only 18,000. On the other hand, we have had agreements with the Pacific coast shipbuilders for some 35 years.

The arrangement which we have now came through the stabilization agreement which we established in the spring of 1941. It was established under the supervision and at the urging of Government agencies concerned. At one time when there was some question as to whether our unions would accept it, President Roosevelt urged them to do so. The heartfelt desire for this stabilized set-up was due, on my part, and on the part of others, to the troubles which existed in this industry in World War No. 1.

In pursuing our cooperation with the President we accepted, at Chicago in 1942, less wages than we were entitled to under the increased-cost-of-living provision of our contracts, in order not to endanger the inflation structure. We are the only organization to respond to the President's request for an around-the-clock, continuous use of available equipment and tools.

A few weeks ago the citizens of Portland gathered at a testimonal dinner to pay tribute to the miracles of production which Edgar Kaiser and his father had accomplished. To this dinner, to add its meed of praise, the Maritime Commission sent its representative, John Carmody. Mr. Carmody said that no small part of the Kaisers' success was due to their employee relationship. A few blocks away the National Labor Relations Board was prosecuting the Kaisers for "unfair labor practices."

In the utterly untenable position in which the board has found itself, it has so grossly misrepresented the case as to reflect either

rank incompetence or complete insincerity. It is not a case of simply ordering an election in a plant where labor relations are not yet stabilized. This is a deliberate attempt to tear up agreements of long and definite standing and to leave the workers with no agreement of any kind, leaderless over a period of from 6 months to a year—the period which the board has indicated it would give the Congress of Industrial Organizations union an opportunity to organize them. During that period there would be the usual campaign of misrepresentation of both us and the employer; there would be bitter organizational strife.

Speaking for the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor alone, we did not come into being via the sit-down strike. We have been long in existence. We have survived political parties and crackpot movements, and we will continue to survive them. We have not the slightest apprehension about the type of campaign the National Labor Relations Board would subject us to.

But our determination, first, is not to let the country be subjected to it, and secondly, not to permit a group of bureaucrats to take from us that which we had long before the Wagner Act or the National Labor Relations Board came along, the right to negotiate a contract with an employer, if we could. From the old order in which the employer continually was being damned for not negotiating with a union, the Board now wants to damn him if he does and damn him if he doesn't. It seeks to create an utterly impossible situation for him.

I often doubt that the professional propagandists realize that organized labor has sons in the armed forces along with the sons of others and that these sons will be coming back along with those sons whom we are told intend to destroy organized labor. Anyway, that is the fact. And the sons of organized labor do not want the structure which they and their fathers and their grandfathers built up over a period of 60 years torn down in their absence.

Bear in mind, as serious as is the test around the Kaiser shipyards, it is but a skirmish planned by the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the Board to spread out into an embroilment involving the Nation's shipbuilding industry as a whole.

The paramount question before the public at this time is whether the Board's action in stimulating raiding on the part of the Congress of Industrial Organizations will help the production of ships or hurt it.

JOHN P. FREY,
President, Metal Trades Department,
American Federation of Labor.

A Slugged Citizen, 400 Disfranchised Voters, 3 Sluggers, and a 3-cent Fine

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, since the November 1940 election, I have been cooperating with the good people of McMinn and Monroe Counties in my district in an effort to restore the freedom of the ballot in those two counties.

Force and fraud in those two counties in 1938, 1940, and 1942 have supplanted free and lawful elections. The majority of the election commissioners have repeatedly appointed men to hold elections in the various precincts who have violated every law of the State of Tennessee and of the Federal Government on the statute books for the protection of the right of a voter to cast a ballot and have it counted as cast.

The law of Tennessee provides for a secret ballot. It is unlawful for any election official or other person to open a voter's ballot or, in any other manner, to rob him of the secrecy of the ballot.

In all elections held in McMinn County in 1938, 1940, and in 1942 these offending commissioners have had the ballots printed on paper so thin and transparent that the officers of election could see how each and every voter marked his ballot.

The law of Tennessee provides that candidates for public office and the county chairman of the Democratic and Republican Parties in each county shall have the right to appoint watchers to watch the conduct of the election and to witness the count of the ballots. Any elector also has a legal right to watch the count. In the teeth of these statutes, regularly appointed watchers and voters who attempted to watch the count of the ballots in these two counties have been thrown out of the polling places by armed force and violence, and the armed officers then conducted the count behind locked doors. In many instances the officers of election have opened the ballots of voters to see how they voted. In other case, legal voters have been denied the right to vote and driven from the polling places with pistols and blackjacks.

One wholesale fraud repeatedly resorted to by these parties is to mark hundreds of ballots, under the pretense that they are the ballots of absentee voters, and put them in the ballot box. In doing this the election officials use the names of hundreds who never lived in either county, dead men, nonresidents, and convicts in the State penitentiary.

In the November election of 1940, at the Claxton precinct in McMinn County, where 400 voters desired and intended to vote, the election officials, by the use of deadly weapons, drove voters from the polls, and at 10 o'clock on the morning of the election closed the polls and carried the ballot box to Etowah, miles away, thereby preventing the electors of that precinct from voting.

Through the vigorous efforts of the Attorney General of the United States and his assistants here in Washington a Federal indictment was returned against these offending election officials. This indictment was based on sections 51 and 52 of title 18 of the United States Criminal Code.

The Department sent one of its ablest trial attorneys to Chattanooga to assist the district attorney in the trial of the case. The jury found three of the defendants guilty under section 52 of the Code. This section of the Code provides that one found guilty of violating it "shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

On the Saturday after these men were convicted their friends met in convention in Athens, Tenn., and criticized the Department of Justice for indicting and prosecuting them. Both before and after their trial and conviction it was openly stated by those associated with them in this violation of the law that they would not be punished, that the case had been fixed. The Department of Justice sent its representative from Washington to Chattanooga to oppose the motion for a new trial made on behalf of the defendants. And on Saturday, February 6, Judge Leslie R. Darr, the Federal judge before whom the case was tried, overruled the defendants' motion for a new trial, fined them 1 cent each, and suspended their sentence of a year, put them on probation for 2 years, and thus virtually turned them loose.

He knew about the violations in McMinn County and referred to the repeated violations of the election laws in McMinn County and to the use of the blackjack and pistol in holding elections in that section. He then placed his blessing on the convicted offenders, fined the criminals a penny each, said they were men of good character, and, in effect, told the people of that county who had been robbed of their votes, blackjacked, and driven from the polls at the point of a pistol, to go to hell.

What he did that day was not done in a corner and it cannot escape the light of what Woodrow Wilson called pitiless publicity.

The Knoxville Journal, of Knoxville, Tenn., on its editorial page of February 9, has this to say of the value Judge Darr places on the right of a Tennessee citizen to vote:

TRIVIAL FINE IMPOSED IN M'MINN CASE SHOULD AROUSE CITIZENS' INDIGNATION

The privilege of voting in a general election in Tennessee is now worth, on the appraisal of the Federal courts, something less than 1 cent.

This follows from the verdict of Federal Judge Leslie R. Darr, who on Saturday handed down sentence in the cases of three citizens of McMinn County convicted of depriving citizens of the right to vote by the simple expedient of closing the polling place of which the defendants were in charge. It is true the court also threw in, besides the fine of 1 cent against each of the defendants, a 2-year probation sentence, which it is assumed will be expected to keep the boys from repeating their offense during the 2 years just ahead.

In all seriousness, however, the public can well ponder the quality of mercy employed in this sentence when it is thrown into relief against the stupendous war effort in which this country is now engaged, presumably in an effort to preserve this country's institutions and, among them, the right to a free ballot. The trivial sentences meted out were justified, in press reports, by the fact one of the defendants is now in the armed services and two others are in defense industry.

On the same theory either service in the armed forces or holding a job in some war industry could be with equal justice used as a defense against conviction on charges of theft, arson, or murder. It is disappointing in the extreme to have a Federal court assume a position which, by implication, says to the public that, for the duration of the war, crime has a completely different status from that it occupies in time of peace.

In the area in which these citizens were deprived of their right to vote by the defendants in this case, it is true that there is no such thing at the moment as the right

to vote. It is a right which is completely at the whim of the Burch Biggs political organization. The sentence handed down by Judge Darr is exactly in line with the value put upon the franchise by Mr. Biggs and his machine; it is the kind of sentence one would have expected Mr. Biggs himself to have handed down, with a jovial smile, if he had been on the bench.

But this wasn't Mr. Biggs appraising the value of a voter's ballot in McMinn County—it was a judge clothed in the sancity of the Federal bench. We are indignant at the view the court took of this election fraud and we hope others will be. If his verdict breeds no indignation, then this talk of fighting a world war to preserve our own constitutional rights is all eyewash.

Post-War Planning

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, anticipating post-war conditions that will face those who are presently in the armed forces of our country, when they return to civilian life, I introduced on the first day of this session of Congress, a pay continuance bill, H. R. 5, which provides for the payment to those in the armed services their base pay for 1 year after their honorable discharge.

In line with that anticipation of post-war conditions, I have been collaborating with our former colleague, Hon. Alfred F. Beiter, of Buffalo, and today I have introduced a post-war planning bill similar to the bill introduced by our colleague, Mr. Beiter, during the closing days of the last session.

This bill is proposed in order to make effective recommendations made by the President 2 years ago in two of his messages to the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, that is, his annual budget message of January 3, 1941, and his special message of March 17, 1941. Reduced to its simplest terms, the intent of this bill is to provide a form of insurance against a post-war emergency when large public works and improvement programs may again be necessary to provide employment for idle men and resources. By authorizing the appropriation of funds to prepare now the plans and specifications for the projects that ought to be included in such a program, this bill assures that if the post-war conditions should so require, a public works and improvement program could then be undertaken rapidly and without delay.

The provisions of the proposed legislation are grouped into four main parts: First. A declaration of policy by the Congress of the principles to be established by and the scope of the bill, along with the necessary definitions, citations, and so forth. Second. Title I which authorizes the appropriation of funds for allotment to Federal agencies for plan preparation heretofore or hereafter authorized by law. Third. Title II which authorizes the appropriation of funds for advances to State and local governments for plan preparation. Fourth. Title III which sets forth certain conditions to govern the making of allotments or advances under the authorizations and provides for the administration of the proposed legislation.

A detailed explanation of the provisions of the bill follows:

1. DECLARATION OF POLICY

The bill opens with a declaration of policy which makes clear that the intent of the Congress in enacting the proposed legislation would be to provide during the war for the preparation of those plans that would be necessary for undertaking public works and improvements in the post-war period as a means of assisting in providing employment opportunities and demands for industrial products when the Nation's men and machines are demobilized at the end of this war—section 1. From this policy declaration arises the citation of the proposed legislation, "First Post-War Planning Act of 1943"—section 2.

Furthermore, it is specifically stated—section 2—that the authorization conferred by this bill would remain in force for a period not to exceed 6 months after the termination of the present war. It is obvious that by then the proposed legislation will have accomplished the purpose stated in the opening declaration of policy.

It should be particularly noted that the declaration of policy does not commit the Congress to appropriating funds for the construction of any project planned with the funds made available under this proposed authorization. The bill does not state that it is to be the policy of the Congress to undertake a large program of public works and improvements in the post-war period to offset the unemployment problems caused by demobilization. Rather, the adoption of the policy declared in this bill means that if the Congress, in its wisdom, decides when the war is ended that one of the ways to assist in employing men and resources as they are demobilized is by expanding the construction of public works and improvements, plans will be ready. Then, if the Congress so legislates, men and materials can be put to work more quickly than would be the case otherwise.

Often in the past, many months have elapsed between the making of appropriations for a large program of public works construction and improvements and the beginning of actual construction and employment on the site. This delay has been occasioned by the time necessary to carry out the preliminary surveys, studies, and investigations, to arrange for financing, to acquire land, to advertise for and receive bids and award contracts, and to organize operations.

This bill is proposed in an effort to help shorten this period of delay between the appropriation or allotment of funds and the beginning of construction by reducing to a minimum the delays that have been caused in the past in carrying out preliminary surveys, studies, and investigations and making detailed plans and specifications after the Congress has appropriated money for the immediate construction of a project. The reduction of delays by a rescheduling of preliminary operations calls for advance planning to be undertaken long before the need for an expanded program of public works becomes apparent. And the key to such planning lies in the advance provision of funds for the conduct of surveys and investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects proposed to be undertaken at a future date.

Also on the basis of these advance plans, the Congress would have more accurate data upon which to evaluate the merits of public-improvement proposals.

To provide funds some years in advance for the survey and engineering work involved on public projects presents, of course, the hazard that costs will be incurred on many projects that may never be undertaken. To the extent that this would occur, the procedure would be inefficient. However, the hazard is not particularly great if the financing of this preliminary work is properly administered. For example, the details of such planning and designing should not be carried beyond the safe point where possible advances in technology might make obsolete the plans and specifications so prepared.

Exercise of sound administrative judgment should reduce to a minimum the losses involved. In any event, however, the losses that might come about could quite properly be considered as low-cost insurance against a post-war emergency. The cost would, without question, be far less than the cost of being caught unprepared.

2. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Section 3 of the bill defines its scope in terms of the activities and agencies that will be concerned. The term "plan preparation" is defined to cover those planning, engineering, and architectural operations in connection with a project that carry it up to an appropriation stage. These preconstruction operations will not include the acquisition of land nor the institution of forms of legal proceedings so as to condemn and take land. "Federal agencies" is defined so as to all inclusive as is the term "State or local agencies."

3. AMOUNT OF AUTHORIZATIONS

The bill proposes two authorizations of appropriations for plan preparation: First, $25,000,000 to be allotted to Federal agencies, and second, $75,000,000 to be advanced to State or local agencies. The discussion of procedures and methods for making such allotments and advances will be covered a little later in this statement. What is important at this point are the figures themselves.

Several assumptions can be made as to the cost of plan preparation. To show the different amounts involved, the accompanying table has been prepared.

This table attempts to show the estimated cost of plan preparation in terms of the percent of the total construction cost of projects for various volumes of public-works construction. Thus, for example, to prepare plans for $500,000,000 worth of public construction, assuming an estimated average cost of plan preparation of 3 percent of the projects' total cost, would cost $15,000,000; if the plan preparation were estimated at 5 percent, its total cost would be $25,000,000; and so forth.

Cost of plan preparation as percent of projects' total cost

	Cost of plan preparation when total cost of projects is—				
	$500,000,000	$1,000,000,000	$2,000,000,000	$3,000,000,000	$4,000,000,000
Percent of projects' cost:					
1	$5,000,000	$10,000,000	$20,000,000	$30,000,000	$40,000,000
1½	7,500,000	15,000,000	30,000,000	45,000,000	60,000,000
2	10,000,000	20,000,000	40,000,000	60,000,000	80,000,000
2½	12,500,000	25,000,000	50,000,000	75,000,000	100,000,000
3	15,000,000	30,000,000	60,000,000	90,000,000	120,000,000
3½	17,500,000	35,000,000	70,000,000	105,000,000	140,000,000
4	20,000,000	40,000,000	80,000,000	120,000,000	160,000,000
4½	22,500,000	45,000,000	90,000,000	135,000,000	180,000,000
5	25,000,000	50,000,000	100,000,000	150,000,000	200,000,000
5½	27,500,000	55,000,000	110,000,000	165,000,000	220,000,000
6	30,000,000	60,000,000	120,000,000	180,000,000	240,000,000

Assuming then that if as a matter of national policy, it was desired to have enough plans prepared in advance for the post-war period to cover an average prewar year's public works construction, such plans should cover about $3,000,000,000 worth of work, with about one-fourth of such an amount for projects to be constructed and owned by the Federal Government and about three-fourths for those to be constructed by State and local governments. Assuming further that the plan preparation would cost, on a Nation-wide average, about 3½ percent of the total cost of construction, the resulting total cost of post-war plan preparation would then be estimated at a little more than $100,000,000.

Therefore, the proposed bill proposes the authorization of appropriation for plan preparation of $25,000,000 and $75,000,000 for Federal and for State and local public construction, respectively. Obviously, while there may be some disagreement as to whether these amounts are too large or too small, it appears that, as a minimum, plans should be available for undertaking not less than $3,000,000,000 of Federal, State, and local public works in the post-war period.

4. FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS

Title I of the bill authorizes an appropriation of $25,000,000 for plan preparation by Federal agencies for public works to be constructed and owned by the Federal Government. It is important to note that no planning activities can be undertaken with funds provided by this authorization unless such activities have heretofore been, or hereafter should be, authorized by law. No Federal agency can prepare plans by reason of its having funds allotted to it under this authorization unless that agency is already authorized to prepare such plans.

Furthermore, the proposed authorization would not supplant or duplicate the activities of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, or the Federal Works Agency. Nor does it create additional Federal agencies. Rather, the bill authorizes—section 101—an appropriation for plan preparation which the President can allot to existing Federal agencies, thus utilizing the existing planning and engineering facilities of these agencies.

The next question that arises is: How much public construction and improvements should be planned for? From the estimates of the Department of Commerce covering public-construction activity during the past two decades, it appears that Federal public-works construction activity—excluding work-relief construction—averaged as high as $675,000,000 annually, while public construction of State and local governments, including that done with Federal aid, averaged as high as $2,300,000,000 annually.

There is need also for coordinated planning and survey work by Federal, State, and local agencies, so that one agency is not working in ignorance of the proposals of another. For example, if one agency is planning a road system or studying a school-building program, and a Federal agency is planning a water project which may flood certain areas or render them unsuitable for use, it is the better part of wisdom to make sure that no new roads or schools are planned for an area which eventually may be flooded. Better yet, the road, school, and water planning should be only segments of a coordinated or joint over-all planning effort for the area involved. Section 102 of the bill states that in making allotments to Federal agencies for plan preparation, preference shall be given to just such coordinated or joint planning efforts.

Lastly, this title of the bill carries a specific statement—section 103—to the effect that none of the provisions of this title shall be deemed to interfere in any way with the conduct of the civil functions of the Army Corps of Engineers. Some fears have been expressed previously that an authorization for post-war plan preparation would usurp the functions of the corps. Section 103 should remove all doubts on that point.

5. STATE AND LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS

Advances of funds to State and local agencies for plan preparation are authorized in title III, section 301, of the bill. These advances are of two types: First, repayable, and second, nonrepayable; and the bulk of such advances should be of the repayable type.

The repayable advances—section 202a—would cover the making of detailed architectural and engineering plans and specifications, and surveys and investigations for specific State and local public works projects, such as a school, a bridge, a city hall, and so forth. It is specifically stated that these advances must be repaid to the Federal Government at the time when the State or local agency which has previously received the advance appropriates the funds or otherwise receives the money to build the project. This means that the bulk of the $75,000,000 authorized for advances under this title of the bill will be eventually repaid to the Federal Government.

The nonrepayable advances (sec. 202 (b) which should constitute the smaller proportion of the advances made under this title, would cover the more general survey, planning or programming operations. For example, before plans can frequently be prepared for an individual school building, a school plan for an entire city or county must be laid out. City, county, and State planning commissions have been developing comprehensive master plans covering such functional fields as transportation, water and sewer systems, and land use. The Los Angeles County Planning Commission has, for example, recently published a master plan of highways and a master plan of land use as parts of a comprehensive plan for the regional district. The Pulaski County, Ark., Planning Commission has developed highway and water resources plans for that county. The comprehensive master plan of the New York City Planning Commission covers many important government functions. In a growing number of cases, the planning agencies are developing local comprehensive plants at the request of communities faced with need for complete programs for redevelopment.

But even the nonrepayable advances authorized by section 202 (b) must be accompanied by the proper cooperation in the way of sharing costs by the State or local agencies to which they are made. The bill provides that such Federal advances could not be in excess of 75 percent of the total of such general plan preparation cost, and that no such advance could be made if the State or local agency's minimum share of 25 percent were less than what it has spent on the average for such general plan preparation during the 3 years immediately preceding. This would work as follows:

Suppose that a city had been working on a new general street and transportation plan and had spent $10,000 on it for the past 3 years. Another $40,000 would be required to complete this general planning work. Under the provisions of the bill the advance of 75 percent, or $30,000, by the Federal Government would leave the city's contribution as $10,000, and since this would be the average amount the city had spent the 3

years immediately preceding, the Federal advance would be made providing, of course, that the city agreed to contribute its share of $10,000.

These provisions for local cooperation also assure that no State or local agency will try to cut its general planning expenditures by transferring the burden to the Federal Government.

State and local autonomy in plan preparation is specifically provided for in section 203. It should be particularly noted that the bill does not propose Federal control of the design and planning work of State and local governments. Also, it does not propose that the Federal agencies should create staffs to replace the staffs of such State and local governments. Section 203 specifically guards against these possibilities, as well as any attempts to defraud the United States by misusing the funds.

Requests from State or local agencies for advances are to be referred to the appropriate Federal agencies for their review and comment before they are approved by the President—section 201. A request for preparing plans for a local public-housing project might, for example, be referred to the National Housing Agency, for a street to the Federal Works Agency, for a hospital to the Federal Security Agency, and so forth. These agencies would then review such requests before Presidential action; also, at the time such an advance was approved, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget would then designate a Federal agency, or agencies, to follow through on the planning work undertaken under the advance to make certain that no such advance is misused.

These provisions for administration are such as to assure that Federal agencies which are specialists in particular fields of State and local public works undertakings are utilized to the utmost in the administration of this proposed legislation.

6. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The allotments and advances made under the authority of this bill should be for that type of plan preparation that must be undertaken if the water, land, and forest resources of the Nation are to be developed and put to their best use; if our future highways and airports are to be properly located and of the size necessary to carry the anticipated traffic; if the blighted areas of our cities are to be rebuilt; if the proper kinds and amounts of housing are to be provided; and if our public-health services, our public buildings, and our welfare institutions are to be located and designed to provide a maximum service with a minimum outlay. Accordingly, and in order to assure that proper type of plan preparation, section 301 provides that such allotments or advances can be made only if they are for planning a project which, when constructed, will be in accord with, or are for developing, a long-term plan for community, State, regional, or national development. Provisions are also included for authorizing the President to make such allotments and advances subject to such further terms and conditions consistent with the intent and provisions of the proposed legislation as may be necessary.

At this point there is one thing in connection with the administration of this bill that should be emphasized. It may appear at first reading that the authority provided in this bill would be too broad in its scope. The scope of the bill is not so broad when it is remembered that it provides for planning only—not for construction, nor for the authorization of construction. Any legislation which is designed to deal with almost 100 construction agencies of the Federal Government, 48 State governments, 3,000 county governments, and 16,000 city, town, and village governments must of necessity be flexible. Otherwise, its administration becomes almost impossible.

Furthermore, in order that the Congress may be kept well informed as to the operations under the proposed legislation, provision is made—section 302—for current reports on a quarterly basis as to the details of the allotments or advances made. This appears to be the best way for the Congress to be aware at all times of the way in which the legislation would be administered, and it also provides a suitable safeguard for the broad authority delegated to the President in this bill.

Finally, the bill authorizes the appropriation of funds for the administration of the proposed legislation—section 303.

Farm Production Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLISON D. SMITH

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the press by Louis Bromfield and a letter addressed to me by Mr. W. E. Cummings, of Willard, Ohio, member of the executive committee of the Ohio Marketing Quota Protest Association.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSERTS WICKARD HAS BUNGLED FARM PRODUCTION—HITS AT SUBSIDIES AND DREAM ARMIES

EDITOR, PLAIN DEALER:

SIR: It seems to me that the time has come for someone to state a few plain facts about the grimness of the food situation in the United States.

1. The situation is far more grave than the public has been allowed to know.

2. The Secretary of Agriculture, who was given charge of the food problem, has proved himself incompetent, he has taken no effective measures whatever although the gravity of the situation should have been apparent to one in his position long before Pearl Harbor. He is offering no effective plan even at this date, but only absurdities such as $100,000,000 subsidies and dream armies of 3,000,000 volunteer, ignorant, and untrained women and children workers.

3. Nothing whatever has been done to help the farmer in solving the three obstacles which prevent him, despite all the patriotism and good will in the world, from achieving maximum production. These are in order; skilled labor, machinery, fertilizer, and semi-skilled labor. High wages in industry have drained away the unskilled labor. The Army continues to draft the precious and irreplaceable skilled labor, needed if any food at all is to be produced beyond the farmer's immediate needs. Not only is there nothing done to help the acute labor problem, the inroads of the Army on skilled labor are making conditions worse every day. Machinery, regardless of Department of Agriculture figures, is impossible to obtain. Even to get a spare nut or bolt it is necessary for a farmer to spend long hours of his previous time filling out forms, traveling miles on precious rubber and then waiting weeks before the nut or bolt is obtainable.

No nitrogen fertilizer is available and other fertilizers become more and more difficult to obtain.

No farmer wants any part of Mr. Wickard's absurd $100,000,000 subsidy. What he wants is the labor, machinery, and fertilizer to get his job done and produce honestly as much as possible. Certainly no taxpayer wants another $100,000,000 item carelessly tossed into the already fantastic expenditures of a hopelessly muddled campaign along the whole of the home front.

As to the dream army of 3,000,000 unskilled workers, they can only be of any practical use in areas where there are flash crops of fruit and vegetables. Even here such an army is not too valuable and is certain to be the cause of 10 percent to 20 percent loss or damage of crops. To the dairymen, the poultrymen, the livestock raisers, to the farm equipped with expensive machinery, temporary volunteer labor is of no value whatever. What is needed and vitally necessary is skilled, experienced labor 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Without it, hatcheries must curtail production or close, poultrymen and dairymen must cut production or go out of business. Many thousands all over the country have already done so. The talk of increased production is nonsense, and it is criminal to go on deceiving the people of the Nation with the idea that more food will be produced next year.

The only figures on the situation come from the Secretary of Agriculture, recently promoted (Heaven knows why) to the post of food czar, or in hand-outs by press agents from his office, or in interviews to newspaper men who do not and cannot understand the fundamentals of food-production problems. There are, of course, the periodical speeches of the Secretary of Agriculture, telling the people of the United States that they must learn to do without, and the farmer, already working 16 hours a day under great handicaps, that he must work harder and put his women and children into the field. No figures are given out concerning the hundreds of thousands of acres of potatoes, corn, and soybeans that are still unharvested in the field. Nor are any figures given concerning the soybeans that cannot be marketed because when the Secretary of Agriculture urged farmers last year to plant more soybeans, he overlooked the fact that there was a limit to the capacity of soybean processing plants. All one needs to do is to look out of the window of a train on any considerable journey through the Middle West to see hundreds of thousands of acres of corn, soybeans, and potatoes still unharvested because there is no labor.

Farmers must work and plan anywhere from 6 months to a year ahead. One cannot suddenly increase production in the middle of the year. On the food-production front we lost the year 1942, and now we have lost the year 1943 because no practical, sensible plan

has been offered but only mountains of questionnaires, the drafting of skilled farm labor, and a shortage of machinery. In making plans ahead, a farmer must lay out anywhere from $200 upward into the thousands according to the size of the food-producing unit he operates. It is impossible or insane to expect a farmer with unharvested crops still in the field to lay out large sums of money to begin again in the midst of winter. Nobody has given the farmer the least hint of a valid assurance that he will have labor or machinery to harvest next year's crop.

It is no wonder, then, that one hears, as I have heard—good, honest, patriotic farmers say, "I and my family are all right. We will eat. When the city people haven't enough to eat maybe Washington will do something about the situation." He is at the end of his tether. And, my friends in the city, you are going to go without enough to eat—certainly you are going to go without butter and eggs and cream and meat because your Government in Washington has done nothing to help farm production problems to be solved. At the very moment I am writing, farmers' sons and young farmers, authentic, vital, skilled labor are being drafted into an army already too big to be fed except at the expense of civilians on the home front.

That is the immediate picture, but its effects are much more far-reaching. They touch the future of the Democratic Party, the future of liberalism, and the future of the world. At this very moment another big commission is being set up under the able direction of ex-Governor Lehman, of New York. Its purpose is to feed the people of the liberated countries. The question is, With what? We are not even feeding ourselves and our own Armies. "Food will win the war and dictate the peace," Mr. Wickard keeps repeating. Again the question is, What food? Without food all the ships and tanks and planes and soldiers are worthless. And what a job there is before us in a starving world.

Certainly no political party and not even this administration can say to the American people, "You must do without so that we can feed starving Europe." Food, I venture to say, is the most important item in the whole war program today, ahead of arms, or soldiers, or planes, or tanks, or what you will. And still nothing is being done and still skilled labor is being drafted from the farm.

It is a curious fact, hitherto unremarked so far as I know, that the whole production program is in the hands of a junto of politicians from Indiana—Paul V. McNutt, Claude Wickard, General Hershey, and Clifford Townsend. Together they add up to an Indiana political machine with prodigious ambitions. I think, however, that we need not worry about their ambitions. If things go along the home front as they are going now, there will not be a Democratic farm vote north of the Mason and Dixon's line. I doubt if there will be a Democratic Congressman elected from north of that line. The Democratic Party will be deader than the Republican Party has ever been.

From a Democrat who once believed that the New Deal was a program instead of merely a gigantic improvisation carried on from day to day and week to week at the expense of American citizens.

LOUIS BROMFIELD,
Lucas, Ohio.

OHIO MARKETING QUOTA
PROTEST ASSOCIATION,
Willard, Ohio, February 13, 1943.

ELLISON D. SMITH,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I was in Washington of the week January 11, 1943, had 45-minute conference with these following Congressmen: FRANCES BOLTON, WALTER BREHM, CLIFF CLEVENGER, FRED SMITH, ED O. MCCOWEN, ED ROWE, HOMER RAMEY, EARL LEWIS, P. W. GRIFFITHS, HARRY JEFFREY, C. BROWN, J. H. MCGREGOR.

I am sending you a clipping that we have printed in papers of a circulation of 333,569. Also, at present are circulating throughout Ohio thousands of questionnaires that are signed statements by farmers that actually grow foods for the Nation. Not buyers, warehousemen, or processors, asking Congress to cut us food growers loose from the damnable triple A and we will produce food to the limit to win this war. Wickard is nuts and a plain fool. If you give him any more power he will starve the people to death as sure as I am writing this to you. We want none of your triple A subsidies or anything pertaining to this ignorant food control; give us fertilizers, machine parts, enough and on time, we will then be able to get you enough food. Thousands of brood sows have walked the plank to the packer that should be raising pigs. Farmers are short of help, short of equipment, parts, and fertilizers.

The beef feeders here are not feeding beef this winter. Beef is going to market at 800 pounds that should weigh 1,200–1,300 pounds, just a hot feed no finish. Thousands of tons short of what you want to feed the people. Where are you going to get it? Here is where we make it, not at Windy Wickard's desk.

If you want the truth wire me and I will bring the evidence you want signed by the farmer, producer, who grows food at a loss. I am for you till hell freezes over in regard to this investigation. What do you desire?

Yours truly,

W. E. CUMMINGS.

A Great Judge Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, recently there resigned from the Supreme Court of Florida one of the great judges of that State and one of the greatest justices of the Nation, Judge James B. Whitfield. A fitting editorial in tribute to Judge Whitfield appeared in the Gazette, of Kissimmee, Fla., on October 17, 1941. I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GREAT JUDGE RETIRES

Upon hearing of the announcement of the retirement of Judge J. B. Whitfield the Gazette importuned Hon. G. P. Garrett, a former member of the Kissimmee bar, to write an editorial about Judge Whitfield. We are grateful to Mr. Garrett for the following effort:

"The recent announcement by Judge J. B. Whitfield of his proposed retirement from the bench of the Supreme Court of Florida at the conclusion of his present term of office marks the ending of the judicial career of a great Florida judge.

"At the conclusion of his present term, Judge Whitfield will have sat upon the bench of the Supreme Court of Florida longer than any other man in the history of the State, and will, in fact, have had a longer tenure of judicial office on one court than any Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, not excepting the venerable Chief Justice Roger B. Taney who holds the record for length of tenure of that august Court.

"However, it is not mere length of service that points up Judge Whitfield's career on the bench of the Supreme Court of Florida. On the contrary, it is more important to note that Judge Whitfield's character, ability, and views have, over the span of his years of service, influenced the development of the jurisprudence of the State more potently than have those of any other single judge. Judge Whitfield has molded our Florida constitutional law and is primarily responsible for the strong and uncompromising attitude of our Florida court in upholding all statutes where they do not plainly contravene the constitution of the State. Strangely enough, or so it seems if one does not hark back to first principles, this man of innate coinservatism, by holding firmly to the democratic tenet of the tripartite division of the powers of government and the right of the legislature to experiment boldly within constitutional limits, has placed Florida in the forefront of the progressive jurisdictions among the courts of the several States. As a contemporary of Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, but working independently of him, and in another sphere, Judge Whitfield has exposited and enforced in Florida much the same broad and generous view of legislative competence as that advocated by Mr. Justice Holmes. In the cases of both Holmes and of Whitfield, this philosophy has stemmed from the deep innate belief of these two judges in democratic processes and in the fundamental common sense of the common American citizen and his elected representatives.

"In like manner, Judge Whitfield has, so far as in him lay—and that means with great power and effect—kept the Florida law in all fields developing in accordance with the changing ideas of the times, yet smoothly integrated with the lanes of communication leading to the ancient ways of the common law and the fundamental principles of self-government enunciated in the Florida Constitution of 1885, to which he has always wholeheartedly given loyal allegiance.

"In evaluating Judge Whitfield's contributions to the jurisprudence of our State, we must not fail to pay respectful homage to his stern and humble intellectual integrity, uncorroded by vanity, his quick and comprehensive mental grasp, his brilliant perception of the whole of each intellectual problem with which he grapples, and his broad and all-inclusive concern with the present and future of Florida, its men and women, be they mites or be they mighty.

"The judge has always been lavish in his service to his State and his advice has been, and still is, sought and, many times, followed by the successive Governors, administrative officials, and legislators. The bar as a whole has found the judge so approachable in all matters not relating to pending litigation, and so friendly and so interested in the personal problems of each of his brother lawyers that they all swear by him and have a genuine affection for him. Were he to ask a further term even at his present great age, all the bar would endorse him enthusiastically, and he would be not only unbeatable but unopposed.

"Judge Whitfield has had a distinguished career. Born November 8, 1860, in Wayne County, N. C. His father, Judge Richard A. Whitfield, a Confederate soldier, moved to Florida in 1863 and in 1896 was elected county judge of Leon County, which office he held until his death, November 28, 1906.

"James B. Whitfield graduated with the degree of LL. B. in 1886 at the University of Virginia and entered the practice of law

at Tallahassee; was private secretary to Gov. Edward A. Perry in 1888; elected county judge of Leon County in November 1888; elected clerk of the supreme court of Florida in March 1889; appointed State treasurer in 1897 by the Honorable W. D. Bloxham, then Governor of Florida; elected State treasurer in 1898 and 1900; appointed attorney general of Florida in February 1903; appointed a justice of the supreme court of Florida February 15, 1904, by Gov. W. S. Jennings, reelected successively, his present term ending in January 1943; chosen chief justice in 1905, 1909, 1935; presiding judge since 1925; appointed by Governor Martin as a member of commission to prepare the Compiled General Laws of Florida, 1927, the other members being Senator Pat Whitaker and Representative William T. Hendry; author of numerous State statutes, including law of 1913 providing for the election and appointment of United States Senators from Florida, and the general election law of 1895 authorizing the use of the Australian ballot system now in force in this State. See chapter 1328, acts of 1895, chapter 6471, acts of 1913. See Who's Who.

"Best of all, we are able to report, from personal friendly association with Judge Whitfield, that he has far from exhausted his capacity for service to the State. His mind is still keen and unimpaired, his interests are still as wide and varied as ever, and his marvelous knowledge of State political and judicial history is to be imperishably memorialized in a book of reminiscences and recollections on which he has been engaged for a long time, and to the completion of which he will now be able to apply himself with the added leisure of retirement."

Editorial Comments on Expansion of Social-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix several editorials from leading American newspapers favoring consideration now of an expanded program of social security in the post-war period.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of January 24, 1943]

THE OLD INCENTIVE IS STILL THERE

One of the arguments used against social security plans, as Lord Halifax noted in a speech the other night discussing the Beveridge report, is the assertion that such plans tend to diminish individual self-reliance. The British Ambassador replied to this very effectively, saying for one thing that this tendency is no more likely to be developed by social insurance than a tendency to recklessness by automobile insurance. But meanwhile a fact has come to light which is at least equally as persuasive as Lord Halifax's remarks.

An official of our social security system has reported that at least 600,000 Americans who could have retired and received social security benefits at the end of 1942 preferred to stick to their jobs. Moreover, about 43,000 who had retired and were receiving benefits have given them up and gone back to work. Obviously, our social security system has done nothing to the self-reliance even of older people who might have some reason for feeling they were entitled to take it easy after years of toil.

The reason they have failed to retire or have gone back to active life is a very plain, old-fashioned one. The war, of course, has given everyone a special desire to be useful, but at the very bottom of this activity of older workers is the simple fact that they can make more money working and enjoy a considerably higher standard of living than social security benefits allow. This would be as true in any going industrial society in peace as it is in war.

Nothing that exists or has been responsibly proposed in our country, nothing that exists in Britain or is proposed in the Beveridge plan, produces or contemplates a level of government benefits which anyone outside of the utterly lazy and shiftless fringe which no scheme of rugged individualism ever succeeded in eliminating would prefer to the pay of useful employment. If a peacetime economy can be devised that makes jobs anywhere nearly as prolifically as war makes them, there'll be no need to worry about the worker's incentive. It is there; it is in our people. The far greater danger to it lies in such gaunt, terrible despondency as was produced during the depression of 1929–33 under a system of private enterprise too little regulated and cushioned.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of February 6, 1943]

FREEDOM FROM WANT

Our soldiers, sailors, and marines, who stand ready to make any sacrifice which may be necessary to the safety and security of this Nation, are anxious that the country should return the compliment when the war is over.

Men in the fox holes of Guadalcanal, or on the boiling North African desert are meditating on their positions in post-war America. Many of them suffered through the depression years and they do not wish to experience another siege of want and hardship. They don't think that would be fair—and they are right.

Social adjustments which must come after the war if there is to be freedom from want are being considered now, while the end of the war is not nearly in sight. And this is the proper time for such considerations—it is a problem which can't be solved overnight or in the congressional cloakrooms.

Back of all current deliberations is the "cradle to grave" thought by which sweeping changes would be made in the existing social-security program—it would be expanded to include many new social services and, of course, the contributions would necessarily be higher. New benefits would include hospitalization and doctor's care; maternity care; an effective, uniform plan of unemployment insurance, and, in general, a broader coverage.

Strategy on the home front must be mapped out right away—to prepare for the day when millions of Americans will take off their uniforms and return to civilian life, righteously expecting to enjoy their constitutional privileges of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These privileges cannot be denied those who fought to preserve them for the Nation at large.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of February 1, 1943]

SOCIAL SECURITY

It is easy to form a false opinion of a group of people by assuming that a small segment is representative of the whole. We have no right to believe that because we are acquainted with, say, a few Italians of low mentality that the whole Italian people are the same; or that when we meet a group of highly intellectual Russians that all Russians are of the same type.

From his scanty knowledge of welfare work, the average citizen is liable to get the idea that most underprivileged persons are unworthy, that because he has met only the unworthy ones. Persons experienced in this work know that by far the greater majority of those who have fallen upon evil days are deserving of help.

There is prevalent an opinion that social insurance is weakening to the morale. Lord Halifax, discussing the Beveridge plan for England, said recently that social insurance is no more destructive of self-reliance than automobile insurance makes reckless drivers.

Undeniably there are certain persons who have never worked and never will, preferring an uncertain charity and consequent low standard of living to physical and mental exertion. Some of these are incurable; some if properly encouraged and helped could and would make their own way.

In support of this argument is the fact that 600,000 Americans once on relief rolls or receiving social security benefits have discarded these things and gone to work. Even 43,000 who had, because of age or disability, retired under the social security system have found new opportunities and are working. Our social security system has had little permanently enervating influence.

The war has opened up vast opportunities to people who not long since were living in a state bordering on poverty. Hundreds of thousands have taken advantage of the opportunities presented because it meant better living conditions and a chance to do something to help win the war. This proves that the best sort of social security is enough jobs to go around.

This is largely a problem for industry and we may hope that it will be solved by industry after the war, with such assistance from government as may be necessary but no more. It is ridiculous to say that nothing but war can make prosperous conditions. A peacetime economy can be devised that will take care of almost all the suffering and want in the world, and it is strictly and directly up to industry to set up the plans, both for the good of humanity and for the good of industry itself.

Of course we shall always have the lazy and shiftless fringe of society that stands out so prominently as to cause poorly informed persons to form a fallacious opinion of the whole. It is the duty of government to solve that phase of the problem as well as that of those who are physically and mentally incapable of producing their own living.

There is little to fear from any wide and comprehensive plan for social security provided it is conceived realistically by persons fully experienced and is not permitted to become the tool of politicians. If industry takes the initiative this can be done.

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune of January 28, 1943]

SOCIAL SECURITY TO SURVIVE ALONG WITH FREE ENTERPRISE

Quite a number of years ago, when medical science, as it is known today, was in its innocence, there was a prejudice within the profession against the use of anesthesia on the grounds that pain was a necessary part of the patient's cure. These worthy practitioners fought the employment of hypnotic drugs and pain-relieving specifics during surgical operations on the grounds that such technique was flying in the face of Providence.

Today in the realm of social science may be found a school of thought which might be the counterpart of these early physicians. It is the profound belief of such social philosophers that free enterprise and relief of economic suffering among the underprivileged cannot exist in the same social

structure, holding that they are in fact antithetic.

Operation of social security programs in both Britain and the United States before the war and plans for continuing, or even enlarging them, in the peace period, seem to offer rather practical refutation of this theory. In both of these countries free enterprise has flourished and probably will continue to flourish in the post-war period. Under dictatorships there exists a type of social security—at least theoretically—but it is of much poorer quality than that found in the free enterprise nations.

America intends to keep free enterprise after the war but it does not follow that Americans are going to give up social security advances in the reconstruction period of the peace.

[From the St. Louis Post Dispatch of January 8, 1943]

A BETTER UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

There has been a good deal of talk in Washington recently, in advance of the new Congress, that the President should not "rock the boat" by proposals to extend social security benefits or other such domestic enterprises. This pointed chatter, presumably, comes from people who never liked the New Deal anyway, and who now have two arguments against it, one, that there is no time in war for human progress, and the other that the Republican victories in November are a repudiation of New Deal methods.

Mr. Roosevelt has heard the talk, and, in his address to Congress yesterday, took very sharp notice of it. He was describing what the men in the armed forces are thinking and, of course, these thoughts are all-important, because upon these men the whole destiny of the United States depends. Mr. Roosevelt says the men at the front, as well as the people at home are wondering what kind of country this is to be after the war. They are wondering if they will have to stand in soup line or, perchance, sell apples at the street corners as they did in the depression years.

So the President said we must arrange our economy to make it possible for the returning soldiers, as well as every other person who wants to work, to find full employment after the war. This does not mean that everyone is to be on the Federal pay roll, or on some super Work Projects Administration, but that Government, industry, and business together must find the means to provide a way of earning a living for every man and woman who is required to earn a living.

When he gave the assurance that the Government would play its part in this fundamental task, the President said rather icily: "I have been told that this is no time to speak of a better America after the war. I am told it is a grave error on my part. I dissent." There was no mistaking how strongly the President feels on this point, which he linked with the third of his four freedoms—freedom from want. But he could not feel more strongly than the people themselves—both those at home and those in the armed forces.

There are two main things the people want, the President said. One is assurance that they will be able to make a living in post-war America and the other that, after the war a decent and durable peace will be established. What is wrong about those aims? If the people cannot have aims like that and have them clearly recognized by their leaders, they are going to suffer a loss of morale—and that, in war, is deadly.

If the wiseacres around Washington think the November elections presage a major change in the direction of American domestic policy they will find they are mistaken. If they think that all advances to better the lot of the average man must be suspended until the war's end, they are likewise mistaken. England knows better. The Beveridge report, with its sweeping attack upon the miseries of humanity, has been received over there with tremendous acclaim, and human nature in the United States is no different.

The people want a full and complete answer to the question: "What are we fighting for?" The answer will put steel in the arm of every fighting man and devotion in the heart of everyone. Mr. Roosevelt gave part of that answer in his fine address of yesterday. He said: "I shudder to think of what will happen to humanity, including ourselves, if this war ends in an inconclusive peace, and another war breaks out when the babies of today have grown to fighting age."

Well may he shudder and well may all the leaders of all the nations shudder if the lessons of the last war and the last peace have not been learned. We won the last war but lost the peace. In the train of the last war came not only world-wide misery because of economic dislocations, but an era of savage dictatorships. This time, as the President declares with all the fervor at his command, it must and will be different.

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror of January 9, 1942]

INCLUDE EVERYONE

When Congress tackles the job of revising the social security program it should cover every worker, as President Roosevelt has suggested. Not a single individual—farm hands, domestics, chauffeurs, and all other groups not now protected—should be left out.

[From the San Diego Tribune of January 2, 1943]

IMPROVED SOCIAL SECURITY

While the present system of federally established social security probably will go down in history as an outstanding marker of the Roosevelt regime, it still leaves much to be desired. For example, neither it nor the system of unemployment insurance provides for aid to workers in cases of illness or other disability, which makes specially interesting the proposals by Chairman Arthur J. Altmeyer of the Social Security Board, reported from Washington on New Year's Day.

These include benefits for permanently disabled workers and their dependents, irrespective of worker's age, and similar in amount to old-age benefits; also benefits for workers temporarily disabled through illness or injury, and for their dependents, payable for a stated period and in amount similar to unemployment benefits; and financial aid with regard to hospitalization costs incurred by insured workers or their dependents.

Other important features are embodied in the Altmeyer recommendations, but just as it was deemed expedient not to attempt too much for a beginning when the first social security legislation was proposed, so it might be wise not to attempt too much at a time when extending it. The fewer the complications the stronger the appeal, and the least opportunity for effective opposition. Also, the whole subject of nationalized social security is a very large one, and the step-by-step procedure, while slower, is much less likely to lead to costly blunders.

Nearly everyone will agree, however, on the necessity for the extended benefits outlined above. As to added costs which would have to be met by the beneficiaries, what better time could there be than now while earnings are high? Moreover the added benefits could fairly be regarded as another form of savings, and the cost to the workers charged up under the head of thrift. It would be another way to absorb excess spending power, and decidedly to everybody's advantage.

Post-War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Consult the Average American About the Post-War World," written by Robert Moses and appearing in the February issue of the Reader's Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSULT THE AVERAGE AMERICAN ABOUT THE POST-WAR WORLD

(By Robert Moses)

The strategy of psychological warfare calls for increasing emphasis on post-war objectives in order to lift up the hearts of our own young fighting men, encourage our allies, foment revolts in the invaded countries, and drive a wedge between the Axis peoples and their leaders. Hence, statesmen send up trial balloons, and publicists, preachers, and editors present noble, sublimated and usually quite impractical plans for a post-war paradise.

It is high time that architects of the new world seek the opinion of everyday American citizens, for no one who speaks without their authority will have much influence at the peace table. What do our middle-of-the-road people think? This is the great majority which, if politicians only knew it, longs for nothing more dramatic than sure and steady progress under dependable leadership on the as yet pathless journey to world peace.

Few Americans, after the war, would turn a deaf ear to the demand for food, medicine, and rehabilitation of stricken countries, or refuse to do our fair share toward an intelligent, farsighted and general adjustment of world political and economic conditions so as to promote tranquillity and a decent existence for all who merit it.

Yet complete post-war internationalism has few supporters when its implications are fully explained. There are no doubt substantial numbers who would like to revive the League of Nations under some other name, but certainly only little groups of earnest thinkers believe in union now with all the democracies, in political amalgamation with the British Empire, or in one hemisphere government of the Americas. We have developed immense respect for the Russian people, not, however, to be confused with admiration for Communism. Russia as a nation of people of many strains who love their own soil and fight like demons to keep it has no threat for us, but most of us regard international Communism as a real menace. Moreover, we don't think much of the chances of guaranteeing the "four freedoms" in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

It is the fashion at the moment to rail against imperialism without analyzing its virtues. The bonds which bind the dominions and colonies to England may be shadowy, but they are stronger than iron in the British family, as demonstrated again in this war. Atlantic Charter or no Atlantic Charter, the British Commonwealth isn't going to be liquidated by this or any other

prime minister. And by the way, is there in actual existence any better model for a really successful family of nations? Again, speaking of imperialism, who shall say that the East Indies natives, once rid of the unspeakable Jap, will not welcome back those same shrewd, decent Hollanders, who governed them honorably before and promise them wider suffrage in the future? Imperial bonds of the invisible kind are not confined to secular governments. Catholics everywhere look to the Throne of St. Peter at Rome as the rock upon which their church is founded. The glib American critic who cannot comprehend the British Commonwealth, the Dutch colonial system, and the Roman Catholic Church, because he can't see the links that bind their constituent parts, doesn't really know this world.

When post-war planners say we must have an end of nationalism and think in global terms, I begin to have doubts about them. After love of God, family, and friends, the finest and most enduring emotions are those of patriotism. In patriotism all of these loyalties are in fact wrapped together:

"My native country, thee,
Land of the noble free,
Thy name I love.
I love thy rocks and rills,
Thy woods and templed hills;
My heart with rapture thrills
Like that above."

There are no doubt rare individuals who can sustain an equal affection for all mankind, but it is as yet too remote an ideal for the average fellow. If we lose this war, we shall be slaves. If we win, shall we not jealously guard the American institutions which gave us victory, and make them impregnable?

The average American has no Messianic complexes. He simply doesn't believe we are anointed to do over the world in our own image and to force our civilization on all mankind. The American is too shrewd and humorous to be a true fanatic. He believes in the improvability if not in the perfectibility of mankind. He has a notion we haven't as much to contribute to the rest of the Globe as some of our post-war experts believe. Commodore Perry, who sold Western civilization to Japan, may not have done so brilliant a service as we once thought. He simply grafted American business on an ancient oriental barbarism. The hybrid appeared in its true colors at Pearl Harbor.

It took over a century and a half, including a war between the States, to establish American democracy. Is it likely, ask hard-headed, common-sense Americans, that a successful world democracy can be created overnight?

On the economic side, let us call the roll of the uncompromising free-traders who would level tariff barriers. The noes would have it. Shallow thinkers spout: "The war has annihilated distance. The world has shrunk. Therefore men's differences will disappear as they see more of each other, freely exchange their products, and discover how foolish and insubstantial are the barriers which have separated them." But is there anything in past human experience to support this oratory? Unless the groundwork of interest and sympathy is carefully laid over a long period of years, closer association may increase animosities as it often does within families and wherever people live in close quarters.

How many of our voters would open the gates to unlimited immigration of all races? The number would surely be small. Does any well-informed person honestly believe that American labor, in order to lift up the underprivileged of other lands, will permit any substantial lowering of our own standards of living and wages or repeal our existing workmen's laws? The question answers itself. The fact that many of our unions are labeled "international" does not mean that they have as yet shown any lively interest in working people beyond our borders. Will the average American businessman give up his advantages in home markets in the interest of better control of foreign commerce? It may happen, but it will take a long time.

Will our farmer give up good prices and parity with labor to bolster international agricultural theories? The farmer is at heart our toughest individualist. He can be persuaded in this direction, but it will be a slow process and coercion will simply make him back up. We can't at this stage expect him to adopt as the first article in his creed the new slogan of a quart of milk for every human.

If, when the last gun is fired, we find ourselves with a flourishing synthetic-rubber industry, dependent on oil, grains, and wood for its basic alcohol, with many employees in modern plants, is there anyone so guileless as to believe we shall lightly shut down this new industry in order to rebuild that of the East Indies, even if there is a price differential to conceal or make up? Not without a real battle in which some highly vocal and influential groups will be heard from. Rubber, after all, was sneaked into the East Indies from South America, and we don't propose to be caught again without this basic necessity in our own hemisphere.

Who can say dogmatically that we shall have a resumption of internationalism in the arts when the war ends? The belief that things of value are found only in foreign parts has been bombed out of existence. We may yet unearth acres of diamonds in our own back yard and in the process discover America.

We hear almost hysterical demands that we solve immediately our own color problem as the price of cooperation in other quarters of the globe. No true friend of the Negro will advocate a course which would precipitate another civil conflict here and set back the clock which is moving ahead slowly, painfully but steadily, on the journey to racial amity on which President Lincoln started it. So wide is the gap between our pretensions and practices in this field that our war censors refused to let responsible foreign correspondents cable abroad the obvious explanation of the poll-tax filibuster in the Senate. In order to bolster up our demands for complete racial equality abroad we simply denied the existence of a color problem at home.

The average American soldier wants a decent job and an opportunity to get ahead when he returns. There is nothing to show that our boys are going to come storming home, as we are told by some post-war philosophers, chanting the Atlantic Charter.

Why did a great cheer go up all over the land when Henry Kaiser made his speech about new frontiers in industry? Because it had something magnificently American in it. It struck a chord which had not vibrated in this country for years, the chord of independence, confidence, and ambition. It was the note of new frontiers, the pulse of the virile American who doesn't look to a paternalistic government to coddle him and solve all his problems.

There are indeed new frontiers, not of geography, but of the spirit, frontiers of invention, industry, transportation, trade, housing, recreation, agriculture, and labor open to women as well as men, boundless opportunities in a country which is neither old, nor weary, nor disillusioned, a country whose example may yet make the world safe for democracy.

We end, therefore, with the only possible conclusion—that the American people are middle-of-the-road folk. They will assist in world reconstruction. They will help police enemy countries until international banditry is stamped out. Even policing is no simple matter. The role of international policeman is not a happy one. He is bound to incur the hatred of those on probation, and gets little thanks from those he protects. In time the slogan will be heard, "Bring our boys back home."

We will go along with feeding the starving and undernourished everywhere, binding up the world's wounds, canceling debts, and making loans, perhaps with some kind of league and world court which do not require the surrender of our sovereignty and which frankly separate ultimate from immediate objectives, with moderate tariff barriers not involving the lowering of our living standards, and with immigration restricted in order to prevent the rushing in of the vast hordes who will attempt to seek escape from painful readjustments abroad.

Our people will favor cooperation with other nations in the many benefits to be derived from improvement of communications, but they won't give up nationalism. They will be for sufficient American armament to insure respect, and for an internal economy which will not again make us dependent on others for vital needs. They will be for spreading democratic doctrine by example rather than by forcing conformity upon those to whom democracy is still a new experience. Does any sane person seriously contend that with the signing of the peace our armed forces should be quickly reduced to skeletons and stripped of appropriations and respect? Not after this war. This time we shall be more prudent. We shall not disarm until we see how sincere the rest of the world is about the new Utopia.

Narrowness, selfishness, meanness, and stupidity, all defects of human character and education, have made the mess we are in, and it can't be cleaned up by those who will actually sit at the peace conference—including, in addition to real statesmen, war-weary politicians and diplomats, international dreamers, liberated victims of horror bent upon punishment and revenge, and crafty apologists for the aggressors. World democracy may be conceived and dedicated at the end of this war, but it will take decades of patient and unremitting devotion to make it endure.

We need not wait for the armistice to discover that middle-of-the-road folk are in the great majority. No good purpose is served by misrepresentation of American sentiment, either along the line of extravagant pledges of cooperation such as President Wilson made in good faith after the First World War, and which our people promptly repudiated, or along the line of a cold rebuff of every altruistic proposal which recognizes with the poet that the thoughts of men become widened with the process of the suns.

Uncle Sam is neither a skinflint nor a fool. The middle road in world affairs may not be melodramatic, but it has always looked good to him. He knows this at least—that in the long run he will win the widest respect by refusing to overpromise, and by being scrupulously careful to keep his word. He knows we are not yet ready for the parliament of man, the federation of the world. Yet he prays for the day when the priest, the evangelist, the philosopher, the teacher, the good man and woman of every race and clime may find a straighter and smoother way to the common goal of the spirit which knows no geographic, political, or economic boundaries—the goal of the Sermon on the Mount, the Golden Rule, and the brotherhood of man.

Meat Shortage in California

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, one reason California is short of meat is due to the existing freight rates and the desire of the California packing houses to process their own meat. My predecessor, the Honorable Harry B. Coffee, has frequently in the past called the attention of Congress to the freight rates on fresh meat to the west coast. To ship live animals from Omaha to San Francisco costs $1.10 per hundredweight and to ship fresh meat costs $2.68 per hundredweight. Fresh meat from Omaha to New York is $1.25 per hundredweight. The rate on live animals is 92 cents per hundredweight.

These unreasonable rates on fresh meats to the rapidly expanding markets on the west coast is a handicap to the livestock industry in the Midwest. The present rates discourage the slaughtering of livestock in the Midwestern States. Space in refrigerator cars is most important. Therefore, the rates on dressed meats to the west coast should be drastically lowered if such products are to be shipped to the west coast. This is not in the best interest of a war effort or the Midwest where they produce an abundance of livestock.

There is no justification for such a high rate on fresh meats to the west coast as compared with the rates on fresh meat to New York City.

The Office of Price Administration and the Agriculture Department are now considering the placing of a ceiling price on livestock. If such action is taken, it will further discourage the raising of beef cattle in western Nebraska. The cattlemen of Nebraska do not want a ceiling price upon their products. If those in authority want to discourage the black market in meat, they should place a retail ceiling price on the sale of meat.

Nebraska has more cattle on feed and on their prairies than ever before. A great abundance of a fine quality of meat will be produced. Remove the barrier in the form of excessive freight rates and California will receive more meat.

[From the Omaha World Herald of February 12, 1943]

WHY CALIFORNIA IS HUNGRY

California's near famine, particularly with respect to meat, continues. It has reached the stage where it is affecting the production of war materials. For, complains the Governor of that State, even "workers in many vital industries are unable to purchase sufficient meat."

And that is only less serious than if the Army itself were underfed and undernourished.

The scandalous aspect of this situation is that it is not a natural result of unfortunate conditions, but is created by law and its administration. Washington is responsible for it. Maladjustments in freight rates are the answer.

To ship livestock from Omaha to San Francisco costs $1.10 per hundredweight. But to ship fresh meat costs $2.68 per hundredweight. Two and one-half times as much for fresh meat as for stock on the hoof. If the livestock were processed near the source of its production, and the finished product shipped at a reasonable rate, meat would move to the west coast.

To New York the rate on fresh meat is only $1.25.

At heavy expense to California consumers and to Midwest processors the effort has been made to build up a packing-house industry in California. Jug-handled freight rates have been the instrument. With price ceilings on the west coast only $1.75 above the Omaha base, and the freight rate $2.68, the shipper to the west coast must lose the difference, with ice charges imposing an additional loss.

So California goes hungry, while at the same time the Midwest livestock and packing industry suffers because of livestock shipped to the coast to be processed, if shipped at all, when it could be processed at home at a large economic saving.

Harry Coffee, president of the Union Stock Yards Co., when in Congress repeatedly called this inequitable situation to the attention of Congress. He has pressed as well for remedial action on various boards and commissions at Washington, and has urged that State railway commissions join in presenting a complaint to the Interstate Commerce Commission. His continuing efforts deserve the united support of the Middle West producers and processors as well as of west coast consumers, both of whom are injured by cockeyed rates, rules, and regulations.

Asylum for Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me over station WNEW Sunday, February 7, 1943:

American tradition lists many noble names that sought refuge in our shores and became part of the American legend. George Washington's grandfather was a political refugee. The fight for freedom of conscience led William Penn to the prisons of England from whence he fled to the New World. Tom Paine, who dared pen The Rights of Man, fled twice to this country, once from England and once from France in the days of the French Revolution and our own fight for independence. Out of Ireland as religious refugees came the forebears of Woodrow Wilson. And among the forty-eighters, who fled the Prussian junkers then, as men do now, were the fathers of Justice Brandeis and Adolph Ochs. My own grandfather came over with Carl Schurz in 1848.

The fight for freedom continues through the ages, the upward struggle of mankind, and now, once again, refugees fleeing death and oppression seek asylum with the right to live, work, and pray.

Under date of January 28, an all-party delegation in both Houses of the British Parliament appealed to the British Government to save the Jews from annihilation at the hands of Hitler and his satellites. It is very encouraging to note that Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden stated that conversations were progressing continually among the United Nations with a view "to expediting the victory and restoring liberty to the enslaved peoples of Europe at the earliest possible moment."

Measures were also formulated in a meeting of peers and members of the House of Commons with the Archbishop of Canterbury for the following purposes:

1. Approach the German Government through the proper channels with the proposal that Jews under German control be allowed to leave.

2. Announce that the British Government, its dominions and colonies, and other Allied Nations, including the United States, will offer refuge to Jews.

3. Provide facilities for transporting Jews.

4. Encourage neutrals to help in receiving them.

Deputy Prime Minister Attlee gives the encouraging statement in answer to the questions asked by several members of the House of Commons, "that his Government is now working on certain practical proposals to aid Jewish refugees and that his Government intends to bring about an end to Hitler's mass extermination of Jews."

It is hoped that all these good intentions will result in some international agreement whereby Jewish refugees fleeing the Nazi scourge can find asylum. It is hoped also that the United States will not shirk its responsibility in this regard—its responsibility to common humanity.

The world stands aghast at the massacre of a people whose only crime is that they are of the same race in which Christ and his Apostles were born.

The voice of America in international affairs is most potent. That voice should not be silent. In an attempt to hold back the flood tide of Nazi cruelties and atrocities against Jews, the matter cannot be tossed aside as is being done by some benighted ones that it is a Jewish question and, therefore, no affair of ours. The attitude was displayed in many countries now suffering under the Nazi heel. The Czech in self-deception said that, then the Poles, then the French, and what was a Jewish problem became a world problem, and western civilization now finds itself almost at the brink of destruction.

The question might well be asked, How can we be of concrete help?

Among other things, the administration can broadcast warnings by short wave to the people of Germany and Italy holding them and their leaders responsible for the atrocities visited upon the Jews.

Political and financial aid might well be given by the United Nations to Jews who have succeeded in escaping the Nazis. A temporary "open door" might be attempted by Great Britain and the United States by way of giving temporary shelter as "visitors" at least to those escaping from Nazi-dominated territories. Requests coupled with financial aid can be made by the administration of the neutral countries that they be liberal in granting passports or immigration visas to the escaping Jews. Such a visa could be made valid for, say, a short period of 2 years. Food, medicine, and clothing to succor the Jews could be given to neutral countries like Turkey, Ireland, Switzerland, Sweden, and pan-American nations on the condition that they agree to grant asylum to Jewish refugees.

Vichy-inspired decrees now operative in parts of Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia must be summarily abrogated. There would be no purpose served either in military or political strategy in the maintenance of any of these restrictions.

Both England and the United States must redefine their immigration policies.

It is well in this connection to quote the resolution adopted by the Church Peace Union comprised of clergymen and laymen representing various religious denominations:

"We urge further that havens of refuge and asylum be provided in all the free countries of the world, including the United States, for such Jews as can be rescued from the hell of Fascist Europe. We urge that the United Nations give their immediate thought and attention to the possibilities of Palestine as a present place of refuge for some of the Jews now living in deadly peril. We recognize that Palestine as a home land cannot solve all the problems of the Jews, but we urge that consideration be given to the policy of opening this country to large-scale immigration at the end of the war; thus permitting the persecuted either to settle in their former homes or to reconstruct their lives in the ancient land of their fathers. We join all civilized mankind in a demand that in the post-war world there be established a political, economic, and social status for Jews and Judaism consistent with the requirements of decency and democracy; that Jews shall be freemen; and that the Jewish tradition shall be free to fulfill itself."

Many protests have been made against the Nazis. We can protest to high Heaven. We can express horror at the Nazi cruelties, but such should be a mere prologue to the acts of real relief that should follow. We in this country might set an example. Our immigration is limited to 150,000 a year. That number is divided into national quotas. The British and German quotas comprise well nigh two-thirds thereof. Of the 65,000 Britons admissible each year, only 962 immigrants came in last year. Two hundred and forty-four came from Scotland and 36 came from Wales. The balance of the quota numbers for Great Britain went to waste. The German quota is 27,370. Less than 20 percent of this was used, and more than 80 percent went to waste. Most victims of Nazi oppression hail from those countries that have pitifully small quotas.

Note the annual quotas from the following countries:

Belgium	1,304
Estonia	100
France	3,086
Hungary	869
Latvia	236
Lithuania	386
Poland	6,524
Rumania	377
Russia (this includes European and Asiatic Russia)	2,712

Significantly, if all the visas were granted for which applications had been made and are now pending, the total number of immigrants would still be only 10 percent of our pre-war immigration quota.

I would not increase the total quota for all nations. I would leave it at 150,000. I would simply rearrange the size of the quotas or rooms in the edifice of immigration. I would reduce somewhat the size of the room of Great Britain and the size of the room of Germany proportionately. I would make larger some of the other rooms.

Great Britain is a far greater offender than we are when it comes to the exclusion of immigrants, particularly Jews. Both the homeland and the commonwealths, the Crown colonies and the mandated territories are hermetically sealed against refugees. Only a mere trickle goes into Palestine.

Chaim Weizmann in the January 1942 issue of Foreign Affairs states there is room in Palestine for 400,000 more Jewish families, making a total of 2,000,000 souls.

Legal immigration, assured by the MacDonald White Paper of 1939, permits entrance of 75,000 Jews in a 5-year period. It is deplorable that thus far only 45,000 immigration certificates have been granted.

It might be well for the western nations to reach an agreement together with all the countries in this hemisphere to accept a reasonable number of refugees of all faiths, let us say, 10,000 for larger countries like Brazil and Canada, 7,500 for Mexico, especially Lower California, Argentina, 5,000 for Venezuela, Chile, etc. There is no gainsaying that the realization of freedom from want will necessitate the economic reeducation of all countries, certainly a broadening of social concepts. In this reconstruction, Jews in their asylum will have much to offer. For example, Jewish refugees in this country have added immeasurably to our economic worth. They have not subtracted; they have added to our wealth. It is interesting to note that the figures of the Foreign Property Control show that, exclusive of the capital of a few rich immigrants, a maximum of $1,500,000,000 has been brought in since 1933. In New York City these refugees have created scores of new industries. It is reported by the Committee for Selected Studies that 150 immigrants have recently brought 150 new trades to the United States and are now making articles which were formerly imported, such as fine leather goods, gloves, perfumes, Karlsbad wafers, Viennese knitted goods. As a result of the establishment of glove manufacturing, we need no longer look to Europe for our supply of gloves. Diamond cutters have transferred their business, together with their special skills, from Belgium and Holland to the United States. All these businesses have given employment to Americans.

It is interesting also to note that our greatest periods of prosperity have been the periods of greatest immigration. Our periods of depression have been the periods of lowest immigration. Whenever we have had large mass immigration, the number of available jobs has continuously increased and prosperity dawned upon us. With the decline of immigration there has always been the decline in business activity and economic stagnation.

Remember, it was our immigrants who tunneled our mountains, built our highways and bridges, dug the coal and precious metals out of our mines. They were the hewers of stone and carriers of water. They made America great.

Then, there is also Alaska. A few years ago a plan was offered providing a refugee settlement there. The climate is not as cold as one would imagine. It has a population of 72,524 as reported in the last census taken in October 1939 in an area of 586,400 square miles. Great opportunities are open for the development of the territory. At its worst, it would be better than Poland or Rumania. It is worthy of investigation. Certainly, Alaska is rich, with its untold, untapped natural resources. A reasonable number of refugees could easily be assimilated.

It is disheartening and sorrowful to speak of Jews being shunted off in this manner, but we must be realistic—any port in the storm.

Assuredly, at the peace conference tables duly accredited representatives of the Jews shall be permitted a place. The plea of the Jew in a post-war era must be recognized. His status must be well defined. Righteousness, decency, and democracy should be the guiding posts to the end that Jews may be freemen in the countries in which they live. They too like all peoples must be accorded the "four freedoms" without let or hindrance.

Enlightened minds must help alleviate the terrible conditions that may again arise to confront the Jews. It is not only necessary to incorporate in any peace treaty or treaties the obligations of nations to give the Jews equal rights with others, but some international police force must be devised to enforce these human rights accorded the Jews. Clauses alone have appeared in covenants heretofore. But they have been mere empty promises. Repudiation and evasion of these rights must be prevented. I repeat this must be so not only for Jews but for all minority peoples.

The Jews returning to their homes in Central Europe (if homes remain unshattered) will find themselves still insecure. Disturbed economy of these countries ravaged by Hitler will indeed not be helpful to the Jews. They again may be the whipping boys and scapegoats. They will again be blamed for all the ills of the land. They will always remain unwanted. As Dr. Philip S. Bernstein says in a current issue of The Nation, "They are driven about like the last dying leaves before the chill winds of winter."

Meat Restriction Order No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I recently have had some correspondence with many people back in my district who are engaged in processing meat and who do not slaughter for their own use and are being discriminated against by the present operation of Meat Restriction Order No. 1. This whole problem is very clearly set forth in the following letter from John S. Weaver, a manufacturer of Lebanon bologna, of Lebanon, Pa. The O. P. A. informs me that it is impossible from a practical standpoint to equalize the present arrangements. However, inasmuch as the continuation of the present order will force these small processors and also wholesalers, similarly situated, to the wall, I feel that it is imperative that some just and satisfactory method be developed at the earliest possible moment.

The letter follows:

LEBANON, PA., *January 7, 1943.*

Hon. JOHN C. KUNKEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KUNKEL: I respectfully direct your attention to the unnecessary action taken by the Office of Price Administration in the regulation concerning the nonslaughtering meat processors and wholesalers of our country, and urge you to exert every effort to correct the inequities arising from the monopolistic channels through which meat is now being forced to flow to the public.

I fully realize the necessity for meat restriction order No. 1, which limits the slaughter of meats for civilian use to a percentage of the corresponding period of last year. Our armed forces must be fed, no matter whom it may affect.

However, the language of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (title L, sec. 2 (h)), provides:

"The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices, or methods or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act."

I feel that the order, as it has worked in practice, definitely is contrary to the intent of Congress, in that no allocation of meats to

the wholesalers and processors has been made. The restriction applies only to slaughterers and enables them to direct the flow of the meats which they have killed through any channels they see fit within the permitted percentage.

The slaughterer is thereby allowed, and he is taking advantage of the loophole, to direct the distribution of meats through channels which he controls and the nonslaughtering processor and wholesaler is left without any merchandise to distribute.

If the regulation is to conform to the Emergency Price Control Act, under which it was promulgated, and if the free-trade spirit of American democracy is to prevail, the order must be amended so as to equitably allocate the available supply and the slaughterer must be directed to sell his civilian supply to the wholesalers and processors with whom he did business in the corresponding base period in the same amounts sold in the base period, less the required deduction for the armed forces.

In the event the slaughterer is killing for the exclusive use of the armed forces, or if for any other reason he cannot supply the wholesaler or processor, then he must be forced by regulation to return to the wholesaler and processor the quota to which they are justly entitled in order that they may present it to another slaughterer to the end that meat may once again be allowed to be distributed through its normal outlets, as it has for the past 50 years.

I solicit your immediate assistance in stopping the un-American monopolistic practices now being engaged in due to the meat restriction order.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN S. WEAVER.

Smaller War Plants Getting Into Action To Help Smaller Manufacturers and Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Small Business of the House, in December 1942, insisted that the Smaller War Plants Corporation Board be reorganized and gave our reasons therefor. Since that time, Col. Robert Wood Johnson has been placed in charge, and it is my personal belief that Colonel Johnson, if given the cooperation and power heretofore possessed by Mr. Lou Holland and his board, will fully carry out the wishes of Congress in passing the act. Mr. Holland has resigned and the board is now being reorganized with Colonel Johnson as chairman.

As evidence of the start that is being made by Colonel Johnson, I desire to insert herewith an article appearing in the New York Times, February 17, 1943, as follows:

THIRTY-FIVE-BILLION-DOLLAR GOAL FOR SMALL PLANTS—COLONEL JOHNSON IN TAKING OVER WAR PRODUCTION BOARD TASK, SAYS THAT CONTRACTS MUST BE SPREAD—PLANS DECENTRALIZATION—JOB MUST BE DONE ON INDUSTRIAL FRONT, NOT IN WASHINGTON, SAYS NEW OFFICIAL

WASHINGTON, February 16.—Small plants should have at least $25,000,000,000 to $35,000,000,000 worth of war production work this year, Col. Robert W. Johnson, new vice chairman of the War Production Board which has charge of spreading work to smaller war plants, said today.

Colonel Johnson, in taking over what has been termed the political hot seat of the war production effort, said he had every confidence that he could achieve a speedy distribution of war work to the small plants. He said that in order to get aid to small plants quickly, redistribution of contracts which had already been let would have to be the approach utilized by his agency, along with the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and big business itself.

"We can't think in terms of business to come," he continued, "because many contracts already awarded run well into 1944. The job is to spread the present work."

Colonel Johnson said the Smaller War Plants Division of War Production Board, which he will head, would decentralize its operations.

"This job must be done on the industrial front, not here in Washington," he continued. "We are going out and look for small plants that can be drawn into the war effort. We are going to use persuasion where necessary to convince any holders of prime contracts who are reluctant to subcontract that they must do so. Also, if necessary, we will use the powers given us by Congress under the smaller war plants legislation to compel those who still resist to subcontract."

When a government reaches the point where it is placing orders for 65 percent of the productive capacity of the nation, Colonel Johnson continued, its procurement divisions become more than a simple purchasing department.

"Responsibilities go well beyond mere order placing," he continued. "The procurement office of a nation operating as we are, under a wartime economy, actually is writing the 'economic ticket' for the Nation. Orders cannot be bunched with certain suppliers or groups of suppliers merely because it is easier to deal with big organizations. The welfare of small business must be taken into consideration."

PUTS OBLIGATION ON BUSINESS

Mr. Johnson said that the course of wisdom for large business under present conditions was to support its smaller competition. He conceded that this viewpoint had been difficult to put over because of the natural tendency of any businessman to get and hold as much business for his company as possible.

"This isn't necessarily due to avarice on the part of the businessman," he continued. "Set it down rather to a 'cultural lag.' By that I mean that the business executive trained for 10 years or more in the stiff competition of the depression era finds it hard to adjust himself to the great change that war brings in the rules of competition he knew during peace times."

Colonel Johnson added that he was confident that businessmen could be convinced of the necessity of keeping smaller plants in a healthy condition through a greater sharing of war work. Once big businessmen on one hand and war procurement officers on the other are convinced of the practicability of aiding small business through greater distribution of contracts, he said, the success of the project would be assured.

NEW YORK SITUATION BETTER

Colonel Johnson said he foresaw few difficulties in the New York City area. He reported, for example, that plans were now going forward to subcontract the building of components for wooden "jeep" bodies in wood-working plants in the metropolitan area.

"Our major difficulty in New York City lies in the wood-working and metal-working shops," Colonel Johnson said. "We think we have licked the problem of the word-working plants but are still trying to find some branch of the war-production effort into which we can bring the metal-working establishments."

Discussing the operational plans of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, set up by Congress and given a $150,000,000 appropriation to be used in helping finance small plants taking war orders, Colonel Johnson said that it will make loans outside the types which banks normally cover.

Representatives of the Smaller War Plants Division in the 12 regional and 132 district offices of the War Production Board, he said, will have authority to grant loans up to $25,000 without reference to Washington, to help small plants set themselves up for war work.

The Committee on Small Business of the House made a report February 15, 1943. It is 80 pages, House Report No. 126, Seventy-eighth Congress, and copies may be obtained from the document room.

O. P. A. Food Stock Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the following press release was issued jointly by the Office of War Information and the Office of Price Administration for the Tuesday morning papers, February 16, 1943. It refers to matters to which I have heretofore addressed remarks on the floor of the House:

The Office of Price Administration is fully aware that many American families customarily keep their pantries well stocked with canned goods and the deduction of point stamps from War Ration Book No. 2 for these surpluses is in no sense a "penalty," Paul O'Leary, Deputy Administrator in charge of rationing explained today.

"The deduction of canned goods ration points to cover excess stocks on hand is being looked on by some as a sort of penalty for having put in these supplies," Mr. O'Leary said. "We deduct the points, all right, but it's not a penalty. It is simply the fair way of including excess stocks now on pantry shelves as part of the ration of the family that possesses them. It simply would not be fair to let those who have stocked up for their future needs have a full ration in addition to all that's in the pantry.

"The ration point allowances that the Office of Price Administration is making available for March purchases are based primarily on supplies of canned foods which are now in canners' and wholesalers' inventories. If a large additional supply is in the hands of housewives, so much the better.

"We shall not know how large this home supply is until consumers register during the period of February 22 to February 27. However, if it is as large as we hope, it may be possible for Office of Price Administration to increase the consumer's ration allowance.

"The consumer who has more than his 5-can allowance of canned foods will report his excess stocks, but he will keep his canned goods supply. However, he will not be able to buy as many additional cans as the consumer who has less than five cans in his possession at the start of processed foods rationing.

"Under the order, no more than half of the stamps in War Ration Book No. 2 may

be deducted for any one ration period for excess stocks. If all points were taken from the ration book the consumer would not be able to buy any canned goods. That would be all right if his present pantry stocks of canned goods were varied, but many pantry stocks are not varied. Consequently, it was necessary to make some provision so such a consumer could buy the things he doesn't have but will need.

"Consumers will not be required, of course, to report stocks of their home-canned foods."

Mr. Speaker, while the O. P. A. says that "deduction of food stamps from War Ration Book No. 2 is in no sense a penalty," nevertheless up to one-half the stamps in the book may be deducted from the books of the householder who buys from the stores and who does not do her own canning, if the householder carries that much of a stock of canned goods.

I wonder whether Mr. Paul O'Leary, Deputy Administrator, thinks that stores of more than five cans is excess stocks. Evidently so, for that is the limit, after which deduction of stamps commences. I invite the Members to reread the press release at this point.

If the O. P. A. order does not force the householder who has been provident to reduce stocks ultimately to a five-can-per-person limit I am as yet unable to see any other answer. This is not the time to reduce stocks in the householder's larder in defense areas certainly—stocks of those who may not have them should be built up and those who are in need might well be aided in so doing, as was done several years ago by the Swiss Government. I would rather see stocks of canned goods in the pantries of those who live in defense areas than in the warehouses.

Mr. Speaker, the five-can limit is far too low for persons living in areas that are subject to possible invasion. That limit should be raised to at least a 2-week supply and householders in such areas should be encouraged to maintain such a supply at all times so long as the Japs are a threat to our shores.

I submit herewith a list of food stocks that was suggested to the householders as an emergency measure by the California State Council of Defense not long after Pearl Harbor. The O. C. D. has since distributed other lists in my district, as I am informed. This list is only for 3 days' emergency supply for a family of four. Multiplied by five, it would serve for 2 weeks. Is that too long a period? I think not. It might prudently be expanded to a month's supply or more.

The list follows:

EMERGENCY GROCERY RATIONS

The California State Council of Defense Nutrition Committee recommends that you store and keep in your larder the following stock for emergencies. It is planned to be sufficient to provide for the average family of four for 3 days:

Six 12-ounce cans meat.
Three No. 4 packages processed cheese.
Two 1-pound tins dried milk, or nine tall cans of evaporated milk.
Five 10-ounce packages shredded wheat, or three 1-pound packages of whole wheat, or two 13-ounce packages of any whole-grain cereal.
One 1-pound tin of cookies.
One 1-pound tin of coffee.
One-fourth pound tea.
Twelve bouillon cubes.
Three No. 2 cans baked beans.
Six No. 2 cans mixed vegetables.
Two small cans chocolate sirup.
One 8-ounce can powdered lemon juice, or six No. 2 cans orange, grapefruit, or tomato juice.
Four 1-pound packages dried fruit—apricots, peaches, raisins, figs, etc.
Small bottle French dressing.
One gallon sterile water in glass.

Mr. Speaker, the five-can-limit order of the O. P. A., while unnecessarily restrictive, yes, dangerously restrictive in defense areas, will accomplish but one thing of importance all over the country. And that one thing is very like some other results had at other times when the public was coerced.

It will make liars and lawbreakers out of millions of American housewives. You could not hire enough snoopers to snoop in the pantries of all our homes, and you would need new laws before trying it.

Every woman who is a mother, and most of those who may not be, have the acquisitive and hoarding instinct. It is as natural to them as it is to ants, squirrels, and bees. It is part of our heritage from our prehistoric ancestors. It is the instinct which has brought the human race to greatness through saving and building for the future. You cannot submerge that human instinct by a mere order. You can appeal to the reason and patriotism of those who have excessive stores, but you cannot accomplish a reduction of stores by order—not in this country while it yet remains free.

National Aeronautic Association, Through Its President, Strongly Endorses Proposal for Standing Aviation Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following endorsement of the need now for a standing House committee on aviation, received by myself a few days ago from Gill Robb Wilson, on behalf of the National Aeronautic Association, which organization is composed of more than 15,000 members:

The significance of military aviation in war is a foreshadow of the importance of commercial aviation in peace. In war or peace, aviation is a decisive factor of our sovereignty.

No single subject should be more continuously understood by the National Congress. It is my conviction that had the Congress known the full significance of aviation for war and peace, the aggression of the Axis would have been checkmated in its inception.

It is my understanding that the purpose of standing committees in the Congress is to provide an adequate, orderly, and continuous body of information, and I have observed with deep appreciation how subjects continuously under one committee receive the most statesmanlike treatment.

No reason less than a direct and open statement by the military and naval authority that the creation of a standing committee would interfere with the war effort should prevent the creation of the same. I have no reason to think they would not desire such a committee but inject the deference to their viewpoint because of their unusual responsibility at this time.

The National Aeronautic Association has long and constantly sought standing committees or a joint committee on aviation in the National Congress, particularly because of a quenchless faith in that body to produce sound decision if it has the full information.

Victorious Risk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Globe of February 10, 1943:

VICTORIOUS RISK

The Japanese have given up Guadalcanal. This winds up victoriously the first American offensive to reverse the tide of the war in the Pacific. Many feared that the Guadalcanal venture was a premature risk. By launching the Solomons campaign at the very moment when we were amassing the vastest armada in history for the occupation of north Africa our command showed its capacity to take the risks by which wars are won. Heroic success in New Guinea and a stirring victory at sea have companioned the conquest of Guadalcanal.

This triumph wrested from severest handicaps is a moral tonic that will have lasting effect. For greater risks lie ahead. The British press greets the return of Winston Churchill with demands that the Russian victories be exploited by a prompt blow at the Axis in Europe "that the enemy may not gain breathing space for recuperation to carry on the struggle into another year."

Against this urging that the Allies take a considered risk to shorten the war, Mr. Herbert Hoover argues before a Senate committee that "we should not try to do too much too fast." Because "time runs in our favor," he would let up on the pace of war lest the strain overburden our economy.

"There is a limit to our capacity," he says. "We must, at least, prepare for a long war—at least, 3 more years, including the defeat of Japan." Mr. Hoover sees us winning a war of attrition and he says the chances for victory in Europe will become greater in 1944 than in 1943. But the strain of war may be measured in other terms than its immediate burden. To save a year of war may be worth enormous temporary strain and it may at the same time save much that Mr. Hoover holds dear. War cannot always be fought by the principles of the soundest economics and the most stable production. Total war is terrifically destructive of sound economics and of social stability. The capacity of a people to meet its strain includes many imponderables that do not readily reduce to the mathematical equations which Mr. Hoover suggested to the Senate.

What Mr. Hoover really is saying is that he does not believe we can win the war in Europe this year so we should change our

pace to a longer run. But the greater danger may be in letting the war last. There is not merely the danger that the Japanese will consolidate their Pacific gains, but the more subtle danger that the warpings by war of our whole economic and social structure will become so fixed by time as to be well nigh ineradicable. Is the American temperament and the dynamics of the American society as suited to the slow attrition which Mr. Hoover proposes as to a mighty surge of effort to finish the job?

The Russian victories have already been decisive for the final result of the war. The enormous wastage of the Russian campaign has weakened the Nazis fatally. The question is how soon and by what measures the war can be brought to a close. The strategic situation must be determining in this. Victory is often won by capacity to exploit the unexpected opportunity. To throw in all its power at the strategic moment our command may have to risk temporary dislocations of the home economy so as not to take the greater risk of losing the chance for decision.

To Mr. Hoover the bottleneck in our shipping is an argument to regulate the size of the Army and the measure of our 1943 campaign to that bottleneck. Mr. Grenville Clark, seeing the same shipping bottleneck, says it must be solved even by sharp change in our social organization, to keep our production abreast of military necessity.

What both Mr. Hoover and Mr. Clark, from their different psychological approaches, have done is to sharpen the issue of meeting the severe drain upon production in certain critical areas, notably on the farms and in metals. These are difficulties that will rapidly grow more acute unless decisively and adequately met. Some changes in deferment policy may be needed. This is not an insoluble problem. But it is of great usefulness to bring it to insistent public attention as Mr. Hoover and Mr. Clark are doing, before it seriously weakens our capacity to supply all the vast requirements of war.

Catholic Action Against Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have secured permission to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing on the front page of the Jewish Review, of the issue of February 11, 1943, relating to the Catholic parochial schools' fight against bigotry.

The prelates of the Catholic Church have been in the foremost ranks of those who have looked with horror upon the persecution of the Jewish race. All good Catholics have at all times deplored the terrible injustices perpetrated against men and women of the Jewish faith.

Therefore, it is not surprising that the Catholic University of America has published school readers, for use in the Catholic parochial schools, which are primarily focused against anti-Semitism and other forms of racial discrimination.

I strongly recommend the reading of the following article by all those who are interested in the cooperation of the people of every race, color, or creed in the fight against racial discrimination and intolerance.

The article follows:

CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS FIGHT BIGOTRY BY TEACHING STUDENTS RELIGIOUS, RACIAL TOLERANCE; ACTION PRAISED—NEW TEXTBOOKS FOCUSED AGAINST ANTI-SEMITISM—BACKING POPE PIUS XI

NEW YORK.—In 2,500 Roman Catholic parochial schools here and elsewhere in the country pupils are being taught religious and racial tolerance and the principles of Christian social living by means of a series of textbooks which have won the praise of many persons prominent in combating discrimination.

The eight grade-school readers, known as the faith and freedom basal reading series, were published recently by the Catholic University of America. They have been adopted, approved, or required for use in more than 28 dioceses and archdioceses and are in experimental use in about 65 of this city's 150 parochial schools.

Willard Johnson, assistant to the president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, praised this innovation as "the first and only example of this type of education ever attempted."

THESE ARE OUR PEOPLE

"The books are primarily focused against anti-Semitism," he said. "We want the Jewish people to know they aren't fighting their battle alone."

Johnson particularly praised book V, These Are Our People, written by Sister M. Thomas Aquinas, O. P., M. A., and Mary Synon, and illustrated by Dale Nichols and Corinne Malvern.

Written in simple narrative style, its theme is that this Nation has been built, and still is being built, by people who have come from many lands and have made themselves and their children Americans.

"You can find in book V examples of the desire for tolerance among nationality, racial, and religious groups," Johnson said.

"WHAT IS NEW YORK?"

In the opening pages of the book, children of various national origin answer the question, "What is New York?"

To one of them it is "a cook with a high white cap in a kitchen with shining pots and pans" and to another "a hurdy-gurdy because it is gay and noisy and bright." The children finally agree:

"New York is a place where all people, no matter from where they come, give the best they have and friendliness and cooperation in community action by persons of different religions and races.

"The Cintons go to the Episcopal Church of St. Barnabas, the Pages and Martins to the Baptist Church, the Merritts to the Presbyterian Church facing Webster Park, Ruth Levy goes to the Jewish church, called a synagogue. After school and on Saturday afternoons, all of them play together on the lawn or in one of their homes. * * * They go together to community flag raisings and Arbor Day celebrations and harvest festivals, and all cheer for Greenfield at basketball and football games."

Frequent illustrations showing white, Chinese, and Negro boys mingling, and persons of various races working together, help to tell the story.

The Faith and Freedom readers, some still in process of publication by Ginn & Co., were prepared in answer to the plea of Pope Pius XI for "teaching to counteract a rising tide of materialism throughout the world."

The National Blacksmith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a poem by one of my former constituents, Mr. L. W. McWane, entitled "The National Blacksmith":

THE NATIONAL BLACKSMITH

Under the authority of the W. P. B.,
The national smithy sits;
Alas, his latest horseshoe decree
Is giving our farmers fits,
As to our hardware stores
A drastic ruling he transmits.

"Shift the shoes on the horses' feet,
To save a large amount of wear;
Don't drive often to the county seat,
Don't drive to any county fair;
Use the horses only for necessary work;
Don't drive for pleasure anywhere."

"Shift horseshoes like a spare tire,"
Says the executive with a Harvard degree.
This has aroused many a farmer's ire,
May cause a national catastrophe.
That this foolish order he will rescind
Is our very strong and earnest plea.

A Guest of the Nation—Madame Chiang Kai-shek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the New York Herald Tribune and the Washington Post:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 18, 1943]

A GUEST OF THE NATION

Madame Chiang Kai-shek, who arrived in Washington yesterday and went to the White House as the guest of President and Mrs. Roosevelt, is today the guest of the Nation. It seems almost superfluous to say that she is welcome. The American people are likely to be almost too insistent upon opportunities to show how tremendously they admire her personally, how deeply sympathetic they are with China, and how appreciative they are of the fact that for nearly 5 years her people fought civilization's war with Japan alone and are still carrying a share of the burden that is out of all proportion to their military resources.

Madame Chiang's primary mission here was to recover her health. After 3 months in a New York hospital, she is well, but her strength is limited and her public appearances and social contacts should be limited, too. It is to be taken for granted that she

has another mission to this country, besides the care of her health, and that she will characteristically, refuse to consider the service of her country of secondary importance. It has become increasingly evident lately that China has been much distressed by the time which the United States and her other allies seem willing to give Japan to consolidate her hold upon her conquests and to wear down the morale of the conquered peoples. They have had 5½ years of this war, and while the end of it may be in sight, they want to feel that they are moving toward it; and the frequently reiterated statements in the West that victory in Europe must come first have had a most depressing effect. It will presumably be Madame Chiang's mission to convey this feeling to the American people.

She will do this diffidently because the Chinese, individually and as a nation, have a horror of inflicting their woes and wants upon others. To explain baldly here what China needs and wants may, therefore, save her an exhausting indirect approach.

Without any consultation of Madame Chiang's personal views it can be stated on good authority that what is wanted in Chungking from the United States is a balanced American fleet of 500 planes and 5,000 tons of cargo a month by way of India to supply and maintain that fleet at full strength. China needs everything—money, food, clothing, medicines, artillery, tanks, and all kinds of munitions—but China expects and asks nothing which it is now physically impossible to deliver. Opinion in Chungking agrees completely with the opinion recently voiced here by members of General Chennault's staff, that 500 planes adequately maintained could drive the Japanese Air Force from China's skies, could make deadly inroads upon Japan's power to fight elsewhere by bombing her industries and shipping, and could cover an offensive by China's land forces that would end in defeat for Japan's armies on the Asiatic mainland. With this relatively small American contribution to the venture, China is ready to stake all her manpower upon it; and it is felt in Chungking that the world situation may never be more favorable to the success of that venture than it is now.

The American people will very ardently wish Madame Chiang to believe how fully they appreciate all she is and all she has done. No testimonial of esteem will be half so convincing as a token of this country's appreciation of China—just 500 planes, let us say, to put several million men in action against our own dangerous enemy.

[From the Washington Post of February 18, 1943]

MISSIMO

In our midst today is one of the most distinguished women of this generation, Mrs. Chiang Kai-shek, wife of China's Generalissimo. She is not an official personage. She did not even come on an official mission, having sought medical treatment for a hurt back, which the New York medicos, it is to be hoped, have cured. But the ceremonies which will be held in the Capital to honor China's first lady testify to her status among the leaders of the United Nations. Congress will doubtless look upon "Missimo," as she is known throughout China, as one of the voices of Free China. There is no role which could get more acclaim from our legislators, as was demonstrated during the President's last address to Congress, when the mention of China aroused particular enthusiasm. In American eyes Free China has become a great power with a title to determine the next world polity gained from its outstanding services in the extinction of world tyranny.

Women acquire greatness either as individuals or as helpmeets, seldom as both. Mrs. Chiang is great as a woman of state and as a wife, and it is difficult to say where the one stops and other begins. Sometimes the job she has done as the spouse of the "Gissimo" is obscured in the comment on her own abilities. It is, however, her chief title to fame. In Chiang Kai-shek she met her destiny as well as China's, and the two immediately became a formidable team. It is no depreciation of the Chinese leader to say that she rounded him out to take his place as a world no less than as a Chinese statesman. No woman can be said to have dedicated herself to her man with the devotion of Mrs. Chiang Kai-shek. She put ceaselessly at his service the education of a cosmopolitan, the sagacity of a member of the famous Soong family, and the fruit of her own natural gifts.

With this dowry the generalissimo has grown in wisdom and influence. His experience with the world has been limited to Japan. On his marriage he knew neither the West nor any of its languages; neither Westerners nor their civilization. Mrs. Chiang became his personal foreign minister, teaching him the Western ideas which she had imbibed at Wellesley College, acting as his interpreter in his Western contacts. But that was the most obvious of her contributions to her husband. In the best womanly as well as advisory sense she was his guide, counselor, and friend in all affairs of state. At the same time she took off his shoulders some of the responsibilities which he had to bear as the regenerator of his country. The measure of her statesmanship in this respect was her recognition of the importance of aviation. For a time she superintended China's air arm. So she grew with her husband, giving and receiving strength, and there could be no higher tribute to any woman.

In another respect Mrs. Chiang Kai-shek is unique. She combines feminine charm and understanding with the vitality and directness which are supposed to be masculine traits. All the Soong sisters, in fact, are renowned for their good looks. There are three of them, though each has her own individual style. The eldest is Mrs. Sun Yat-sen, widow of the father of the Chinese Republic, whose face has a spiritual quality which, coupled with her gentleness, is enchanting. Mrs. Chiang's beauty is as salient as her quick and alert mind. The youngest is Mrs. H. H. Kung, who is perhaps the most Chinese in her appearance as in her mental process. But, of them all, Mrs. Chiang knows the trade of being a queen, and she will be welcome today in her own and her husband's behalf as well as China's.

Muddling Is Out When a Son Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by E. A. Evans from the Washington Daily News of today:

MUDDLING IS OUT WHEN A SON GOES

(By E. A. Evans)

This is written by a man whose only son, aged 18 years, 1 month, and 12 days, went away this morning to join the Army.

I went with him as far as I could in the chilly dawn. We waited together, not talking much, in the bare assembly room of the draft board in the basement of a dingy old school, until a brisk corporal came in and read a list of 70 names, one of them my boy's.

I saw him square his shoulders and walk out to a big waiting bus, and I looked after that bus until it vanished far down the street on its way to the induction camp in Virginia. And it wasn't all pride—though it was that, too—that swelled up in me and hurt my throat.

Then I walked to the office, trying to think about a subject that has claimed much of my attention as a newspaper writer—the squabbles and confusions and muddles of the war effort on the home front.

But somehow my thoughts were not quite the same as they had ever been before.

HE'S HEARD IT ALL

I have heard it said that these things are inevitable in an undertaking so vast, under a President whose genius is for great leadership, not for the details of efficient organization; that somehow the weapons and the food will get produced, in spite of muddling; that it's useless to worry about a War Production Board row, or a failure to solve the manpower puzzle, or a fumbling attack on the problem of food production.

I have heard all that, and have resented it rather mildly, believing that these things would cost me higher taxes, delay for a while the day of victory, and prolong the little inconveniences of wartime.

Today I know that whether Mr. Roosevelt provides or fails to provide a better home-front war organization may mean a whole world's difference to my boy's mother and to me.

Mr. Nelson, Mr. Wickard, Mr. McNutt, and the other so-called czars are not doing as good a job as needs to be done. I don't so much blame them, for they are victims of a system, or a lack of system, that is not their fault. They have no means of going to the President regularly and frequently with the conflicts and differences bound to rise among them; no way of getting his prompt, firm decisions—and no man except the President can make many of the decisions that are imperative.

JOB FOR EXPERTS

The size of the Army and Navy, for instance. I have little right to an opinion about that, for I don't and shouldn't know the grand strategy. Congress shouldn't attempt to settle it, for most Congressmen can't know much more about it than I do. It shouldn't be left to the generals and admirals, for they think first, and properly, only about getting as many men as they can possibly need.

Only the President, the civilian Commander in Chief, whose duty it is to know all about both the military and the home-front requirements, can determine the size of the armed forces to my satisfaction.

If he says 11,000,000 men this year, with my boy as one unit among them, all right with me. But then I want him to make some more definite decisions. This country can put 11,000,000 men into uniform, and equip them and supply them, and grow the food to keep the war won after they win it—but not unless many things are done that haven't yet been done.

I don't want Mr. Nelson wasting his time on rows with the Army and Navy. I don't want Mr. McNutt and Mr. Wickard fiddling away precious days on phony manpower and food-production schemes. I don't want confusion in Washington. I want the quarterback to run the war-organization team and keep it working as a team, and see that every member understands and obeys the signals.

HE'S ONE OF US

Yes, that's asking much of the busy President. But I know now how much I have

to lose. If Washington muddling prolongs the war one minute, and that minute means my boy doesn't come back, victory, and all the fine things Mr. Roosevelt promises for this country and the world after victory won't mean much to me.

There must be many millions of people in America—parents, wives, brothers, sisters—who feel as I learned to feel this morning when my son went away. With the induction rate rising to 12,000 a day, their number must be growing.

We can be the most powerful bloc in America—a pressure group of people who are willing to go hungry and cold and ragged, if necessary, and who ask nothing for ourselves except that the Government be organized to win the war quickly and bring our boys home safely.

I hope we can make the President understand what we want. And surely we can, for, after all, he's one of us.

Ruml Pay-As-You-Go Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Herald of February 7, 1943:

RUML PLAN ALL RIGHT JUST AS IT STANDS—CONGRESS NEEDS TO BE PRODDED TO STOP ARGUING AND ADOPT IT

(By Bill Cunningham)

Here is a time to uncork your fountain pen and tell Washington that you want something, and no more fooling about it.

That something is the Ruml pay-as-you-go income-tax plan—as it stands, unimproved, uncompromised, and undecorated with a lot of theoretical filigree sawed into it by a lot of cellar bench political tinsmiths. Tell them you not only want the plan, but that you want action on the plan. Some of the master minds say they can't get to it before July.

What's the matter with tomorrow?

United States taxpayers are carrying the load of the Nation, the war, and the world. There are only 27,000,000 of them. Figuring two persons behind and dependent upon each taxpayer, that's 87,000,000 people. As matters stand, all these are in debt to the Government for last year's taxes. Taxes have taken a terrific rise; with some, incomes have taken a terrific drop, and with most, they've been frozen in place.

INSTALLMENTS NOW EXCEED CURRENT CASH

Economic paralysis is almost a certain result, unless something quick and sensible is done. The people want to know what they'll have to pay now. They want, furthermore, to know how they can pay now. If the present system continues, there won't be enough courts in the United States to handle the bankruptcy cases working three shifts per day. If the Government wants to jail delinquents, it'll have to use the school houses to hold them all. It'll have to call for volunteers to man the banks and handle the War bonds cashed in.

Theory, or whatever, to one side, and the occasional citizen who has conscientiously saved enough of last year's earnings to pay this year's taxes, regardless, most of the people in this Nation always have paid this year's tax installments out of this year's earnings. The installments now, and from now on, with millions, will exceed what can be spared from current earnings to meet them.

That applies to people who've been paying income taxes all along, many of them salaried people, whose incomes haven't increased and won't increase. And there's the new defense-plant element, now taxable this year for the first time. Millions of them likewise are caught in the wringer for various reasons. Some didn't know. Some were extravagant, tired of being poor and unable to withstand the temptation to spending high, wide, and handsomely, as it came in. Some were so deeply and uncomfortably in debt that they felt obligated to bale themselves out before attempting anything else. The net result is the same.

The Ruml plan offers a sensible, workable, saving solution. It's as simple as a problem in sixth-grade arithmetic. It was first proposed by the gentleman as far back as last July and was promptly given the cold-water treatment by the Washington "wonder workers," who, nevertheless, blushed violently in private because they hadn't thought of it themselves.

But not even the killing 13-to-3 vote of the Senate Finance Committee could lay it away for keeps. Certain Senators of intelligence, such as CLARK of Missouri and BYRD of Virginia, refused to let it die. Businessmen's associations began to take up the fight for it. The public rallied to its resuscitation. Press and radio began to speak.

If public demand ever was registered clearly for something, it was in this case. The Ruml plan is now before the House Ways and Means Committee, the initial and routine step for placing action on it up to Congress again, and Ruml himself has been testifying before that august body most of this past week.

HIGH TIME FOR A VOTE—A "YES" VOTE

The House Ways and Means Committee is headed by ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, a hard-shelled North Carolinian who has carefully saved up his own tax money and who figures that everybody else should have done the same thing. With typical congressional genius for twisting a straight line into a Chinese puzzle, the committee has wrought a marvelous tangle up to the moment.

The time has come to tell them to quit drawing pictures, to quit trying to give a simple melody a fancy orchestration, to get themselves and their persimmon thicket ideas out of the way, and just vote—but to be sure that that vote reads "Yea."

The Ruml plan is very simple. Here it is in his own words:

"Let us turn our tax clocks ahead 1 year. Its as simple as daylight saving. The taxes we have paid last year out of our 1942 incomes are taxes on our incomes received in 1941. We can best solve the problem now by recognizing these 1942 payments to be taxes on 1941, as they really are; and by beginning 1943 by paying on 1943, thereby dropping the year 1942 out of the tax calendar entirely."

Here's the situation its shooting at:

Everybody who pays an income tax in this Nation always is in debt to the Government. The bad part about it is that its last year's debt, with another rolling up. He can never get out from under, and never feel himself even with his bills. If anything happens to his income, he is instantly in bad trouble.

Multiplied millions are in bad trouble now, because, under the present system, with taxes mounting as they are, a man's income must keep mounting if he hopes to keep even with them, and few incomes are mounting. They aren't mounting and won't mount, especially with the great salaried middle class. In fact, all wages of all sorts have been frozen by law.

Theoretically, each citizen should have done what the eminent Mr. DOUGHTON has done, which means put aside last year's surplus as it came in, in order to pay the year-late taxes on it. Factually, few people in this country ever have operated that way. Thanks to this inherently faulty system, most people have done it just the other way 'round. The fault lies in the way the bill originally was drawn back in 1913, but it didn't make any particular difference then. Taxes were low—1 percent minimum, 7 percent tops, with a $3,000 exemption for single persons—and very few people were affected, anyhow.

INCOME SHRINKAGE MEANS TROUBLE

Many couldn't operate as the aforesaid Mr. DOUGHTON has done, even if they'd wanted to. All financial lives may not be as smoothly ordered as his. But even if they'd tried, and the writer is one who has, there's no guaranty of success. No one really knows or can know how much to hold out, because the rates change every year—and always upward. The man automatically in trouble, no matter what system he uses, is the one whose income shrinks, often without warning, leaving him with heavy taxes to pay on an income that's no longer income—something that he earned a year ago but doesn't come even close to earning now.

Here's what the Ruml plan proposes to do about it:

It will wipe the old slate clean, declare everybody free of income-tax debt, and start everybody off anew and even, as of his past January 1 on March 15, or whenever—that date's probably too close upon us now—each citizen, as he always does, will file his first return and make his first payment, as usual. In figuring how much to pay, he'll estimate his expected income for the year to the best of his ability. This will be done by declaring his 1942 income and noting any changes, actual or expected.

He'll make his regular payments on that basis, and at the end of the year, if he overestimated or underestimated the amount of his income, he will duly note the fact upon his first return of the following year, 1944, and make the necessary financial adjustment. Since this first return of 1944 obligates him to declare his 1943 income, the Government's check upon his honesty is complete, and that return, at one and the same time closes out his account for 1943 and opens the new one of 1944.

He's even with the board at all times. He knows where he's going. There's not trouble, possibly unforseeable trouble, waiting for him next year—the sort of trouble that may force him to cancel his life insurance, sacrifice his home, or take his children out of college.

The objection that comes to mind first is, "How can we fight a war and forget a year's taxes?" Many critics have balked over the term "forgiveness"—"forgiveness of 1942 taxes." Many mistakenly see the Treasury sitting empty-handed for a year. The latter is a complete misconception, the former merely an argument over terms. What difference does it make whether you call them "1942 taxes," "1943 taxes" or "millennium taxes"? They start coming in on the same date and in just the same way. The Treasury won't be empty-handed, nor have to wait at all. The only difference is that the installment will be based on current income rather than that of a year ago.

TAX LOAD IS MERELY BEING SHIFTED

If it's objected that this is simply some fancy fenagling, and that, at rock bottom, the taxpayer still is getting out of his 1942 taxes, at a time when the Nation needs all the money it can get, the answer is that the charge isn't true. The load merely is being shifted so a man really can carry it. The taxpayer doesn't get out of anything. He's still paying this year on the basis of what he made last, but instead of being a year behind him in collection and waiting for him to die to settle up, the Government is even with him and he is even with the Government.

If it's argued that this may mean a dangerous drop in national revenue, on the possibility that this year's income, per capita, isn't as large as that of 1942, the answer is that the most careful estimates fail to reveal the existence of any such condition.

The other objections are almost altogether technical.

The Treasury offers four. They are: (1) The plan complicates administrative difficulties. It says it will require two returns and two sets of computations to determine 1 year's tax. (2) It says the plan should be linked with some provision for collection at the source (taxing it out of the taxpayer's pay envelope). (3) The Treasury wonders if it wouldn't promote inflation. (4) It wonders if it would provide equal treatment for all taxpayers, and questions how it would handle financial windfalls, such as bequests or unexpected profits that might accrue to individuals.

The answers are easy: (1) The double computation charge, in theory, is true. In fact, however, it isn't, because all entries are made on the same return—that "first one of 1944." (2) Go ahead and collect it at the source. What difference does it make where and how it's collected, so long as it is? (3) The inflation bugaboo is theoretical, and anyhow it's the bunk. Under the Ruml plan, the only people who's suddenly find themselves with more liquid money than they anticipated, would be the few—the very few—who, in companionship with Representative DOUGHTON, saved up enough cash to meet this year's payments. That automatically classifies them as thrifty folk and not spendthrifts. It's the spendthrifts who are the handmaidens of inflation. (4) The equal treatment is automatic, and as far as the windfalls are concerned, Ruml has three simple suggestions to take care of that. They are: (a) Don't cancel the income tax on capital gains. They are not recurring income and can easily be separated out of the plan. (b) Provide a special death tax to recover windfalls through inheritance. (c) In all cases where claim for credit exceeds a specified sum—say $10,000—take an average of 3 years, thus determining the fair normal income, instead of a windfall income.

The principal Treasury objection really is that it didn't think of the plan first.

Labor objects to the plan. It wants the low-income groups excluded. Then there are the unctious and self-nominated big brothers of the largely mythical poor who when taxes are mentioned, start up automatically like a swamp full of frogs droopily honking in snoring monotone their dreary and democratically unprivileged threnody: "Soak the rich, soak the rich, soak the rich."

NO REASON WHY ANYONE SHOULD BE SOAKED

In the second place, there are almost no rich left to soak, but in the first, taxes in a democracy never were intended to be a bludgeon useful for belaboring and paralyzing a particular class. They're supposed to be money collected evenly and as painlessly as possible from all solvent citizens, no matter what their livery, for the common purpose of running the Government.

There's no reason why anybody should be soaked, and certainly none why anybody should be exempted. This is all our Nation. We all enjoy its privileges and are partners in its responsibilities. Everything earned in it should be tithed for its support. The poor man should give his dime, the well-to-do his dollar, the rich their hundreds and thousands.

Some of the volunteer economists have come up with what they profess to see as fearful consequences. A man with a net income of $1,000,000 they say would get back $854,000, or more than three times his war taxes to date, whereas a man with a $3,000 net taxable income would get back only $324 out of his total war taxes of $469.

What's "get back"? And how many people in this country have a net taxable income of $1,000,000?

To be sure, there might be some individual bugs to be worked out of the plan after it actually was applied, but its vast benefits to every stratum of our set-up would more than compensate for these many, many times over. And what are these?

ELIMINATE TRAGEDIES

Millions of war workers are up against an income tax for the first time, and millions of these have made no provisions for paying them. Suppose their plants suspend, as some do. Suppose they're sick or hurt and the wages suddenly stop. Suppose the house burns or something happens to take their ready money. Suppose the war suddenly stops. They are saved the double calamity of loss of income and last year's tax bill still to be met. It's always to be remembered that Uncle Sam doesn't wait. The mahogany must be decorated on the date specified.

In the middle brackets, countless personal and family tragedies will be eliminated. Bankruptcies will be saved, homes kept as they are. Here's an added item and an important one. Many able and useful citizens anxious to go into war work would be freed. The war effort and American industry in general would be freshened and speeded up in many cases, undoubtedly, by the retirement and pensioning of venerable workers and executives who are holding on largely to pay their income taxes, who are never catching up, and who, under the current system, never will catch up.

In the upper brackets, this plan will make much less practical difference than some of its critics are claiming. In common with the rest of the citizenry, as long as people in these brackets receive income, they'll pay income tax on it. If they die, what otherwise would have been payable as tax income is subject to estate taxes in their highest brackets.

Maybe the not altogether familiar name Ruml puzzles some people. Perhaps they'd like to know more about who he is and where he came from, all at once. Perhaps they're inclined to question his credentials as a financier.

FORESOOK THEATRICALS

That can be easily handled.

The name is Beardsley Ruml, and he's a product of Dartmouth College originally out of Cedar Rapids, Iowa. He was of the class of 1915 at Dartmouth, and although a brilliant student, he is mostly remembered in the New Hampshire institution as the librettist of several exceptionally successful musical comedies. Walter Wanger, the movie mogul, was his classmate and close personal friend. Wanger was the producer and director of these campus classics. Ruml wrote the book and the lyrics.

Wanger went into professional theatricals after both were graduated, but Ruml, although the professors of the era predicted a bright career for him on Broadway, entered the University of Chicago to study for a degree of doctor of philosophy, which he received. Dramatics he put away permanently as just a pleasant college memory.

In 1921 he accepted a post in New York as assistant to the president of the Carnegie Corporation. A year later he was appointed director of the Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial Foundation. This portfolio he held until 1929, and since he has held trusteeships in the Foundation and in the Nelson Rockefeller Museum of Modern Art.

But in 1929 he returned to the University of Chicago as dean of social sciences and professor of education. He was there 2 years, when he was invited back to New York to become treasurer of the huge and world famous department store of R. H. Macy & Co. He was likewise made a director of the New York Federal Reserve Bank and later was elected chairman of the board.

Today he is head of Macy's and head of the New York Federal Reserve Bank.

CREDENTIALS REAL

Thus, his credentials are unchallengeable. They pale, as a matter of fact, those of the head of the agency that has quibbled over his plan, Secretary of the United States Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr. Although the Morgenthau name instantly conjures up connotations of financial majesty, it was the current Mr. Morgenthau's father, not himself, who was the financier.

The present Mr. Secretary cared nothing for, and had been entirely unaffiliated with, finance when he was presented with his Cabinet post. A thwarted architect, he was a gentleman farmer and estate-neighbor of the Roosevelts near Hyde Park, when Mr. Roosevelt asked him to eschew his squash and tomatoes and take the most important and trickiest financial assignment in the world.

Of the two, Ruml is the gentleman with the record. The public doesn't know him. He's never sought the limelight. He's not looking for anything. The situation is a little strange because his plan has had more publicity than its author. That's because, not being a public figure, and not desiring to be one, he has violated primer rule No. 1 for public figures, which is "See your press agent every day and your photographer twice a year." Ruml has no press agent, and he doesn't take a very good picture.

Get out the fountain pens.

Write to Mr. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON. He's a Representative, which means his office address is the House Office Building, Washington, D. C. Write your Senators and Congressmen. All the Representatives can be reached in care the House Office Building; Senators, in care the Senate Office Building.

And here's a tip on how to write these gentlemen in fashion they pay most attention to. Write your letter in long hand. That's the sort they stop and look at. It doesn't have to be long. In fact, one page is best. But lace it in there. Tell 'em what you want and that you don't want any stalling.

Without your help, some cock-eyed compromise with the Ruml idea seems probable—and probably around midsummer or early fall. Tell 'em the original plan looks sound to you, that it doesn't need any congressional improvement, and that without any more fiddle-faddle from a lot of jimson-weed Websters who like to see their names in the papers, you want it passed.

You'll help save your Nation if you do.

Pour it on 'em.

Farmers Not Benefited by O. P. A. Milk-Price Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a telegram received from the United Dairy Farmers, Michigan Division, showing that the freezing

order of the O. P. A. and raise in the price of retail milk in Detroit and other Michigan markets does not go to the producers or dairy farmers:

FLINT, MICH., *February 15, 1943.*

Hon. GEO. A. DONDERO,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

On behalf of the dairy farmers in Michigan we wish to protest the latest order issued by the Office of Price Administration freezing the price of milk to the farmer at January levels. Office of Price Administration raised the price of retail milk in Detroit and other Michigan markets and consumers are now paying from 1 cent to 1½ cents more per quart for their milk. This means added profits to the dealers and forces the farmer to keep producing below the cost of production. As there is already a national milk shortage this order will further curtail milk production and is a serious threat to the war effort. Such irresponsible actions on the part of Government bureaus in discriminating against the farmer can only lead to a food shortage that may well cause us to lose the war. We urge that you use your influence in the Congress to demand that the Office of Price Administration rescind this order and give the farmers an opportunity to produce food for victory.

RALPH H. MARLATT,
National Director,
JOHN V. JOHNSON,
Michigan Director, United Dairy Farmers Division, District 50, United Mine Workers of America.

Formation of Japanese Unit in the United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

SANTA MONICA BAY PARLOR, No. 267,
NATIVE SONS OF THE GOLDEN WEST,
Santa Monica, Calif., February 15, 1943.

Hon. WILL ROGERS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Santa Monica Bay Parlor, No. 267, of the Native Sons of the Golden West, at its meeting February 9, unanimously adopted the accompanying resolution.

Members of our organization are of the unanimous opinion that the matter of loyalty to the United States of America on the part of persons of Japanese ancestry, whether American or Japanese born, is to be seriously doubted. Further, we feel that this sentiment is shared by the majority of the citizens of the State of California.

We therefore present this resolution with the hope that it will receive your most favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

HECTOR P. BAIDA,
President.
ELDRED L. MEYER,
Past Grand President.
LEE CONGER,
Past President,
WILLIAM DELKENER,
Trustee.
Committee.

The members of Santa Monica Bay Parlor, No. 267, of the Native Sons of the Golden West are grieved and shocked to learn of the proposal to enroll in the United States Army a unit composed of men of Japanese ancestry.

The members of Santa Monica Bay Parlor are firmly convinced that the enrollment of a United States Army unit composed of Japanese will be inimicable to the welfare of the State of California and of the Nation, and will create a dangerous threat to a proper and adequate defense of this country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Santa Monica Bay Parlor, No. 267, of the Native Sons of the Golden West is strenuously opposed to the formation of a Japanese unit of the United States Army, and hereby respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States of America to take such steps as may be necessary to prevent the organization and enrollment of such a unit; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this petition be sent to the Secretary of War, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, the chairman of the House of Representatives Military Affairs Committee, and others.

Civil Aviation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has just reported H. R. 1012, a bill further to develop a sound civil aviation industry for America's future.

This bill is a constructive and foresighted proposal, anticipating future problems, building soundly upon experience, and providing the means for clearing the decks for a great post-war development which will help in assuring the strong America for which we are now fighting on far-flung fronts.

FORESIGHT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Ever since the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce began dealing with civil aviation matters over 20 years ago it has sought to blaze a new trail in the legislative handling of an industry's problems. In connection with shipping, utilities, rail and motor carriers, securities regulation, and many other of the great economic issues with which Congress has dealt during the last 50 years, it has often been the attitude of Congress that legislative action should correct evils rather than forestall them in advance. In civil aviation, however, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has always tried to look ahead, to anticipate problems, and to prepare the industry for future development rather than to correct barriers and faults after they have grown up.

Rare in the annals of any legislative body is there to be found legislation as farsighted as were the Air Commerce Act of 1926 and the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. The former provided a basis for Federal development and safety regulation of civil aviation long before there was any pressing need. The latter provided an economic charter for an air transport system at a period in the development of that system when the evils of rate discrimination and other evils with which we have dealt in connection with other common carriers had not arisen. In both cases we were looking ahead, following the advice of the simple old rule that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

The new bill, H. R. 1012, now proposed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, is conceived in the same spirit which has so consistently inspired the Committee in the past in dealing with civil aviation. Again we are looking ahead, hoping by foresighted action today to avoid, for this industry, serious problems in the future.

There are many constructive proposals in the bill which will be discussed at length in the days to come when the bill is fully considered. At this time, however, I would like to touch upon two of the more outstanding steps which the bill proposes in order that the Congress may be fully acquainted with the matter.

CONTRACT CARRIER BY AIR

One of the most important of the bill's provisions would add to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 a new title providing for the economic regulation of contract carriers by air. This is a subject which was considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce long ago. In 1937 and 1938 when the Civil Aeronautics Act was being drawn, we realized that the problem of the contract carrier would sooner or later become a serious one. The committee's experience in dealing both with motor carriers and with water carriers had given us a deep insight into the important question of the proper relationship between common-carrier transportation and contract-carrier transportation. And even as early as 1938 we were aware that in the air there had begun to develop an amount of contract carriage which, in relation to other air traffic, was very substantial indeed. As a matter of fact, it was estimated, long before the present war, with its restriction upon the miscellaneous use of aircraft, that there were transported through the air by noncommon carriers probably as many passengers every year as were transported over the regular air lines. While it has been particularly difficult in the past to get reliable information concerning the amount of property transported by air on a contract basis, it is reasonable to assume that in this field as well, contract air carriage has been substantial.

The committee did not, however, feel in 1938 that the time had come for providing economic regulation for the contract carrier. One of the principal reasons for our decision to withhold economic regulation of contract carriage at that time was our realization of the substantial administrative problem that such regulation might entail. Because of our committee's long and intimate experi-

ence in the field of transportation, we are in a peculiar position to understand and appreciate the important administrative problems that are involved in any regulation of this sort. We knew, for example, that in undertaking the regulation of contract carriers by motor vehicle in 1935 our Government had been faced with a very serious administrative problem. With this experience in mind, we thought it best in our 1938 legislation, where we were providing for an entirely new administrative agency, not to complicate its problems while it was still in its infancy with economic regulation of contract carriers.

But at no time has the committee neglected the necessity for keeping close watch of the situation. It has constantly been our firm resolve to provide for regulation of this nature at the earliest date that would seem to be feasible in the public interest.

During the past year two developments occurred which led those of us who were particularly close to the situation to conclude that the time had come when action on the problem of contract carriage might properly be considered.

In the first place, the Civil Aeronautics Board, during the course of the year, had succeeded in disposing of most of the accumulation of problems, notably those involving rates of air-mail compensation, which had been dumped in its lap shortly after it began its work. During the first 3 or 4 years of its administration it had, moreover, accumulated a substantial experience with the peculiar problems of aviation which meant that it had settled in the main its general pattern of administrative procedure for the aviation industry. From an administrative standpoint, therefore, it appeared that it would be entirely consistent with the public interest to add further to the Board's duties.

The second development during the past year is related to the war. In a matter of only a few days after Pearl Harbor our armed forces were beginning to call upon the air lines for important special transport services. In only a few weeks after that day of infamy it became apparent that the transportation of cargo and personnel by air would receive a tremendous impetus as a result of various contract arrangements with the armed services. And as the year wore on we found repeated indications of the fact that many airplanes built for the Army and Navy would be used in the transportation of military cargo and personnel and that the war would rapidly develop many types of airplanes more suitable for the transportation of persons and cargo than any airplanes available 2 or 3 years ago.

These facts indicated, in turn, that immediately upon the termination of the war there would be generally available a tremendous number of aircraft which within a very short time could be put into commercial service, and that if we were not ready prior to the close of the war with a set of proper legislative controls which would adequately deal with the problem of contract carriage by air, we might well find almost overnight that the entire aviation industry would be plunged into economic chaos. Schooled as our committee has been in seeking to look always forward, the conclusion we came to was that action now is imperative.

It seems moreover that we would be able during the present period, and before a great many conflicting interests had appeared, to work out a wiser and more perfect piece of legislation than if we waited.

Accordingly the chairman of our committee, when in December of this past year he announced that further legislative measures in the field of civil aviation should receive early consideration, included as an important item among those measures that of proper regulation of contract carrier by air.

We were fortunate indeed in having available to us expert advice from the staff of the Civil Aeronautics Board in drafting a measure to serve as a basis for discussion. We were fortunate moreover in knowing something of the experience in the field of regulation of contract carriers by motor vehicle. Prior to the adoption of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 we had held extensive hearings in which we had been thoroughly schooled in the general problem of contract carriage. And since then, and notably in considering the Transportation Act of 1940, we had been able to appraise the results of the type of regulation which Congress adopted in the Motor Carrier Act. With this background of experience we were shortly able to redraft the relevant provisions of H. R. 1012 and to report to the House a proposal which merits, we feel, early adoption.

In this proposal we follow the same general pattern of regulatory controls which has been evolved by our committee for motor and water carriers. We provide that the contract carrier must have a license, we provide for regulation of minimum rates, except in foreign commerce, we provide that rates, practices, and so forth, must be set forth in public schedules properly filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board and must be adhered to by the contract carrier. We provide further for appropriate regulation of interlocking relationships, incorporating for contract carriage the same provisions on this subject that are applied in the case of the regular air carriers and which we worked out in 1938 as a result of our long experience in transportation.

We have not, however, simply taken blindly the provisions of the Motor Carrier Act, or of any other legislative precedent. We have made distinct improvements in the proposal placed before the Congress over any similar legislation heretofore adopted regulating contract carriage. Notably among these improvements is a provision for exemption from all, or a portion, of the regulation of any air contractor, or class of air contractor, for such periods of time as the Civil Aeronautics Board may find proper in order to avoid undue administrative burdens. This exemption provision reflects a lesson which we had learned from dealing with contract carriers by motor vehicle. Through wise application of such an exemption provision the Civil Aeronautics Board will be able to adjust the regulation during the earlier years so as to avoid becoming bogged down in needless work which accomplishes no particular public good.

Another distinct improvement over other legislation in the field of contract carriage is to be found in the provision of the bill to the effect that contract carriage should be conducted under bilateral written contracts covering a regular series of movements. This provision reflects principles developed by administrative decision in other fields which seemed to us sufficiently fundamental to be incorporated into the legislative framework.

Another important provision of the bill relating to contract carriage is to the effect that the Civil Aeronautics Board in administering the law is to keep in mind the need for maintaining a proper common-carrier system. Unless this principle is adhered to—and here again we have learned from our long experience in transportation—irreparable harm might be done to an air-transport system built up over many years at great cost to the Government and the private investors. In this provision we reflect a philosophy which has consistently inspired the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from the very beginning in dealing with civil aviation—a philosophy that conservation and development should be our point of view rather than mere regulation. And we should take care at all times that our great common-carrier air system is properly conserved. For it is upon that system that the demands of the future will fall most heavily—the demands of peacetime commerce as well as wartime traffic.

EXTENDED FEDERAL JURISDICTION OVER CIVIL AVIATION

Now, if I may, I would turn to another provision of H. R. 1012 of particularly outstanding importance. I refer to those provisions which have the effect of extending Federal regulation to all commerce by air whether between points in the same State or between points in different States. Again, the long experience of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in other fields of transportation has been drawn upon as a basis for so legislating as to enable civil aviation to avoid evils and to develop without having to undergo the trial and tribulation which have so often plagued transportation in other fields.

Our committee has been deeply concerned for many years with the problem of interstate trade barriers in the field of transportation. In the case of rail and motor transportation, regulation started, generally speaking, in the several States before Congress acted. The result is that a State-Federal pattern of regulation has grown up which in some instances may not be altogether sound. Appreciating the serious problem of interstate trade barriers in the case of surface transportation, we provided in

the Transportation Act of 1940 for a special investigation of the problems of surface carriers by the Transportation Board of Investigation and Research. That Board is now gathering data which may enable us, in the case of surface transportation, to take steps toward solving, in some degree at least, the problem of interstate trade barriers with regard to land and water transportation.

In the case of air commerce, unlike surface transportation, the States generally have provided, thus far, comparatively little regulation. The only regulation of any consequence is Federal regulation. However, if we are to learn from experience in other fields, in dealing with civil aviation we should provide now against the possibility of the creation of interstate trade barriers in the future. And in the opinion of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce it is most important, in dealing with civil aviation, that we bring to bear constantly the lessons learned from transportation in other fields. It is only by keeping constantly in view those lessons learned from actual experience that we can hope to save civil aviation from the mistakes and the unnecessary burdens that have so often impaired the development of other transportation enterprises.

With this principle in mind it has seemed to the committee most proper that in H. R. 1012 Federal regulation should occupy the entire field and that now, in advance, we should take preventative steps which will forever avoid for civil aviation the restrictions, the costs, the confusion of interstate trade barriers.

Furthermore the speed of an airplane is such as to make it unlikely that there will ever appear to any substantial extent intrastate commerce in the sense that we are familiar with in other fields. By motor transport a trip of a couple of hours will cover only 60 to 80 miles. By rail a trip of a couple of hours will cover only 70 to 80 miles. However, in the field of aviation a trip of a couple of hours will cover today anywhere from 300 to 600 miles and in the not too distant future we can anticipate airplanes which in 2 hours may cross even the great State of Texas at its widest point.

When we add to this fact the further fact that airplanes are not confined to specific highways, as are railroads and motor vehicles, but, especially in times of bad weather, may readily get many miles off a normal path, it is the obvious course of wisdom that regulation should be completely and exclusively a Federal matter.

The fact is that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in drafting the Air Commerce Act of 1926 actually provided for a large measure of Federal regulation in the intrastate field. Again, in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 a very substantial measure of intrastate regulation was provided for. And throughout the last 20 years our committee has kept constantly in mind the ultimate necessity for vesting in a Federal authority full and complete power of regulation and development.

In this aim we have been inspired not alone by the economic and safety considerations which I have mentioned. We have been inspired also by the peculiar relationship of civil aviation to the national defense. Our President made this relationship clear when in 1939 he said of civil aviation that "hardly another civil activity of our people bears such a direct and intimate relation to the national security as does civil aviation." One of the several reasons for this peculiar relationship is that our civil aviation resources must be always ready for instant mobilization to serve the needs of national defense in time of emergency. Experience under the gallant MacArthur in the hell holes of New Guinea within the past few months demonstrates in the most dramatic fashion what strength can be added to our military arm in the future by adequate air-transport facilities. Appreciating this new truth of military science, and, fortunately for the welfare of our country, looking into the future, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in 1938 drafted a law which in no small degree is responsible for the air transportation which has been available to our armed forces during the past critical year even in the four corners of the earth. Our flag flies proudly over Henderson Field today solely because there were transport airplanes available. And those planes were available because, by virtue of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 the air lines of this country were able to order their manufacture 2 or 3 years ago.

Again, the importance of devoting civil air transport facilities to the use of war has been demonstrated compellingly in the great epic of the Burma Road. The United Nations today maintain a tenuous lifeline to the gallant Chinese defenders of democracy only because a few precious transport aircraft taken from the civil airways of our own country can fly hour after hour over mountain and jungle, through monsoon and typhoon, between Calcutta and Kunming. And again, had it not been for the development of air transport planes and pilots on our civil airlines made possible by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, a great military necessity could not be met today. And long ere this there would have flickered out the last faint hope of gallant millions in the Chinese Republic who one day, thanks to air transportation, will be able to march side by side with our doughboys in the conquest of a foul and dastardly enemy.

These lessons we must take to heart. Never again must we fall victim to the pious and complacent hope that a victory of our arms means an end of threats to our national security. After this war is over we must maintain our resources and our facilities at all times unimpaired for preserving international security and goodwill, and to this end no instrument can be more effective than the vast development of civil air transport facilities available for instant mobilization at a moment's notice.

But we can assure facilities thus available only in case there is complete Federal jurisdiction. We can never afford, for our country's security, to allow the development of artificial regulatory barriers within our Nation which will weaken civil aviation or impair our ability to mobilize it under a single governmental authority.

EARLY ADOPTION OF H. R. 1012 DESIRABLE

Counseled then by experience, applying to the uncharted future the lessons of the past, H. R. 1012 has been drafted by the committee to deal with these fundamental problems. Without now attempting to survey the several other extremely important provisions of the bill, to which I will address myself at a later date, it is enough to point to the matter of contract carriage and extension of Federal jurisdiction to indicate the importance of this measure and the need for its early enactment.

Cooperatives and a United Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address of Hon. Leland Olds, Chairman, Federal Power Commission, at first annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, January 20, 1943, St. Louis, Mo.:

Rural electric cooperatives were conceived by our great President before the country envisaged the possibility of war. They were designed to assure millions of unelectrified farms a share in the modern civilization which had showered its blessings chiefly upon our urban communities. They were designed to help in righting a balance which was tilting ever more surely against rural life, the great reservoir of vigorous manpower and womanpower. They were a part of the great peacetime program of a President who considered it his duty to make the affirmations of the Declaration of Independence something more than a slogan in terms of the life of producers throughout the land.

Now we are engaged in a great war to test whether the principles of democracy can survive. And it is a test of democracy in much more than a military sense. It is testing the ability of democracy to utilize the technology and resources of the modern world more effectively than any other form of government. Some people associate that test solely with our ability to put the greatest productive power in history behind our boys who are bearing the terrible burden of the fighting. But I tell you the real test will come after we have won the victory, because democracy must show its capacity to assure economic as well as political freedom and enable the people to enjoy the richness of life which our resources offer, or the democracy which we have won in the war will be destroyed in the peace.

To be victors in this great test of democracy we must be a united nation. The words "United States" must symbolize something more than a union of geographical areas. They must symbolize a union of millions of individuals, farmers, and farm laborers, industrial workers and managers, technical men and educators, all the scores of occupations through which the country conducts its business of living, into a great human brotherhood. Men and women of all occupations must have a sense of identity of interest so

that the entire national being becomes one great family. It must have the kind of unity which can be expanded to include men and women of every race and culture and religion throughout the entire world. For that alone can assure the enduring peace for which we are today sacrificing our all.

Unless we can achieve a more Christian world our battle is lost and must be fought over again by each generation. And the place to begin achieving a more Christian world is here at home as the basis for a united nation. We are far from that Christian unity now. Consequently, as a people, we are falling short of our full strength in the struggle to preserve democracy.

The great economic powers in this country, those that oppose the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Bonneville Administration, and the Arkansas Valley Authority, and the enfranchisement of labor, see in the great war-need for unity an opportunity to serve their private interests. They blatantly laid out their program in an issue of the Electrical World, and are reiterating it in thousands of newspapers and magazines. They said the Germans and the Russians fought well because they had a faith to fight for, and that, if the American people were to fight well, they must also have a faith.

The utility interests offered generously to give America a purpose, a faith, a belief to fight for—and to educate the American people into that belief. What did they offer, what are they offering in their gigantic commercial advertising campaign which must be costing millions of dollars of rate payers' money? They offer "private enterprise" by which they mean an end to R. E. A.'s and T. V. A.'s and Wagner Acts, and all other efforts of the people to control their economic lives and destinies. Private enterprise, as the term is used by such business propagandists, means the opposite of economic democracy.

Over a period of nearly 10 years, the Roosevelt administration has been establishing the basis for a greater unity in the country than had ever before been achieved. For it was proceeding on the principle that the people have the democratic right to control the use of their resources, and that the object of all plans for the use of resources must be a secure and ample life for all who work as well as for those rendered unable to work by physical handicaps or old age.

That program won the allegiance of a greater majority of our people than had ever before been united in a common bond of brotherhood and purpose. On the principles of the New Deal we could have had unity in winning the war and unity in establishing a peace which might end all wars for many generations. But the interests which tend to create disunity in the country by denying economic democracy, by enthroning not man but profits, by promoting the worship of Mammon, seem more intent on winning the war for themselves than on winning the war for democracy. They would use the war to destroy the movement which would have democratized the use and enjoyment of the country's resources.

Their great campaign for private enterprise is a campaign to reverse the Rural Electrification Administration and Tennessee Valley Authority trend—a campaign to destroy the very roots of the great unity of purpose which was moving to assure the democratic use of the country's resources. If that campaign succeeds in controlling the political pattern of the next 10 years, it will represent a set-back for that basic democracy for which tens of millions throughout the world are fighting.

For we are fighting to achieve a world which belongs to the people who live in it. Any other purpose will promote future wars, greater wars, until our entire civilization falls before the furies which man's selfishness has unleashed.

What have we to oppose to this malign campaign, the last stand of the devil of self-interest against the great upswing of the common interest? My answer is, We can oppose it with the most potent force in all the history of mankind, the principle of Christianity, not merely preached, but practiced. And I answer further that the essential principle of unity, which will enable man to inherit the earth, is implicit in the rural electric cooperatives.

You, representatives of more than a million farms, who have organized on a cooperative basis to assure your families the elementary modern right to electric service, have embodied in your organization the principle of unity. In the words of Jesus, "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." Blessed are they who adopt as the principle of their efforts to use God's gift of resources, not selfishness, not individual quest for riches and power, but cooperation which unites men in sharing those resources rather than divides men in the effort to out-share their fellows.

Twelve years ago I had the privilege of accompanying on a tour throughout this country a great Irishman, the late George Russell, or "AE," to use his pen name. We were seeking to call the Nation's attention to the vital importance of the cooperative spirit as the revitalizing force in rural life.

"AE" had spent some 30 years as an organizer for the Irish Agricultural Organization Society, which had gone far to establish cooperation as the basic principle of farm organization in Ireland. On the basis of this experience he wrote one of the great books of modern times, The National Being. He was thinking of the little island, Ireland. But I want you to think with me of the implications of his book in terms of the national being of the America we love.

"AE" conceived of each people as engaged in the great task of building a civilization. He understood that great civilization must rest on a spiritual base, on national ideals, and that democracy requires that all the people join in the discussion and creation of these ideals. He would have shuddered at the thought that national ideals could be manufactured by private utilities and sold to the people like chewing gum by elaborate advertising. He would have hailed the national ideals coming into being through the rural electric cooperatives.

"AE" saw that the building of a great civilization must be related to the divine order of the universe, and that this involves two things; freedom of the individual and cooperation with one's fellows in developing a sense of identity of interest, of common purposes, of interdependence, and solidarity. These, combined, he saw as constituting real democracy.

"AE" said that, in terms of these principles, the world has yet to see a democratic state, for democracy must be economic as well as political. He pointed out that the present autocracy of industry is as firmly seated on its throne as former kings or aristocracies ruling by military power, because production today is only for purchase and sale by private interests which are independent of control by producers or consumers. As a result the people have neither freedom nor identity of interest, the two essentials of democracy.

Where economic power is settled, he declared, there is also political power. Therefore, a real democracy must be a democracy carrying on its own business. He said:

"The civilization we create, the social order we build up, must provide for essential freedom for the individual and for solidarity for the Nation. Now essential freedom is denied to men if they are in their condition servile * * * disguise it as we will, our present industrial system is practically a form of slavery for the workers * * * the old slave could be whipped. In the new order the wage slave can be starved."

He continued:

"We can buy labor, which means we can buy human life and thought, a portion of God's beings, and make a profit out of it. By so selling himself the worker is enslaved in a thousand ways. The power of dismissal of one person by another at whim acts against independence of character, or the free expression of opinion in thought, in politics, and in religion. The soul is stunted in its growth, and spiritual life made subordinate to material interests. To deny essential freedom to the soul is the greatest of all crimes, and such denial has in all ages evoked the deepest anger among men."

"AE" saw in the cooperative form of business organization—the basic principle of your rural electric associations—the essential foundation on which to build a noble civilization, preserving at once the freedom of the individual and the sense of interdependence which, combined, form the essential substance of democracy. Later, I shall discuss some of the practical examples and accomplishments of your form of business organization. But, before doing so, I want to suggest the importance which "AE" attached to rural life as the life source for such a civilization. To preserve this life source against the forces of selfishness and materialism fostered in great exploiting cities, he depended on cooperative organization.

Looking at the great stretches of history, he saw that absorption of life in great cities is the danger that threatens the modern state. History shows that a civilization not rooted in healthy rural life dies. He said:

"The country is the fountain of the life and health of the race, and thus organization of the country people into cooperative communities will educate them and make them citizens in the true sense of the word—that is, people conscious of their identity of interest with those about them. It is by this conscious sense of solidarity of interest, which only the organized cooperative community can engender in modern times, that the higher achievements of humanity become possible. * * * it is necessary for the creation of citizens—for the building up of a noble national life—that the social order should be so organized that this sense of interdependence will be felt."

And then, looking ahead to the building of a civilization as a task as long as the rearing of a medieval cathedral, he says:

"The creation of a rural civilization is the greatest need of our time. It may not come in our days, but we can lay the foundations of it—preparing the way for the true prophet when he will come. The fight now is not to bring people back to the land but to keep those who are on the land contented, happy, and prosperous, and we must begin by organizing them to defend what is left to them—to take back, industry by industry, what was stolen from them."

"AE" saw in the cooperative movement a vast turning movement heavenward in which men would become habituated to the thought of common action for the common good. He saw it as the great cure for the conflict of personal interests which is today destroying the unity of nations.

Now this new democratic civilization which "AE" envisaged, resting as all secure civilizations must rest on a healthy rural base, is not just a theory, the dream of a dreamer. It has been slowly growing for more than a generation within the old orders of European states. It has been growing within our United States. After the defeat of the economic autocracy, culminating in Hitler's Fascist state, it will continue to grow as a

practical embodiment of man's inherent sense of unity and interdependence.

Before turning to some practical examples of that growth, however, I want to point out that, although this democratic civilization will rest on a healthy rural base, it must be created by farmers and industrial labor working together with a united purpose. Workers on the land and in the industrial centers must realize their interdependence if they are to create the united Nation which will not only win the war but also offer greater security and greater abundance to the men, women, and children who constitute our people.

One of the subtle movements of today which is false to democracy, serving the purposes only of those who enthrone profits above man, is the movement which is sowing seeds of discord between agriculture and labor. This movement is designed to undo the progress which both farmers and workers have made under the New Deal. It is based on the well-known principle "divide and rule."

A final thought from "AE" will show how a prophet of rural civilization, who was also organizer of many rural cooperatives, viewed the relationship between farmers and city labor. He said:

"The farmers' industry, if we consider it closely, is the most democratic of any in its application to society. The produce of the farm, in its final distribution, is divided into portions more or less equal and conditional in quantity by the digestive powers of an individual. The wealthiest millionaire cannot eat more bread, butter, meat, vegetables, or fruit than the manual laborer would eat if the latter could afford to get such things * * * It appears to be the interest of the farmer to support any urban movement whose object is to see that every worker in towns is remunerated so that he, his wife, and his children can procure as much food as they require."

He also pointed out that it is to the interest of both groups, through cooperative organization, to reduce the spread in price between what the consumer pays for food and what the farmer receives. To achieve this unity of interest he worked to develop the joint control of the economic process by farm producer cooperatives on the one hand and urban consumer cooperatives on the other.

And here let us pause to note the very important fact that the low average incomes of industrial labor before the war was a significant factor in our lack of preparedness for war on the agricultural front. Today the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, who is also Food Administrator, has a tremendous problem of allocating on his hands primarily because perhaps a third of our population was unable to afford a sound diet before the war.

Today we hear of shortages of milk, shortages of butter, shortages of meat, etc., where only yesterday we were listening to complaints of surpluses in almost all of these farm products. I recall my visits to northern New York during the 1930's. Upstate New York is a land of dairy farmers. The New York dairy farmers were hard hit because they could not find a profitable market for their milk. The metropolitan area urban population could not afford to consume the fluid product and the competitive situation involving butter, cheese, and other manufactured milk products reduced the farm price of milk to levels which did not reimburse the farmer for his costs of production.

We are told that the shortages of today which have succeeded the surpluses of yesterday are due to the requirements of the Army and of lend-lease. But a far more important cause is the increasing purchasing power of workers with higher incomes. I am convinced that lend-lease is taking little more than we would have sought to export to maintain the market for farm products in time of peace, and that the Army ration does not materially exceed what healthy workingmen should have consumed in time of peace.

Furthermore, I know that the mobilization of the country's production for war has, for the first time in a quarter of a century, provided urban labor with family incomes adequate to purchase a healthy diet, including, particularly, sufficient supplies of fluid milk, butter, and meat. As a result, we find suddenly that we have not sufficient farm production to meet the demand.

I recall a statement I read during the attempts to curtail farm production in the 1930's—I think it came from the Department of Agriculture. That statement was to the general effect that if the average American family could afford a first-class diet there would be no need for curtailment of farm production, but, instead, the need for an increase of 40,000,000 acres in the land under cultivation.

No, the organization of the country's economic life which kept perhaps a third of our urban population at or below the subsistence level, was not only a blow to the prosperity of the agricultural population but also a weakness in our preparation for the war which is now upon us. We must not let it happen again, and the democratic civilization which can grow out of the principle established in our rural electric cooperatives is the cure.

I chose as my subject "Cooperatives and a United Nation" because I am convinced that we must have a united Nation to win the war and to build the civilization which will help assure continual peace after the war. And I am convinced that such unity of purpose must be founded on the democratic conduct of an ever larger sector of the country's economic life on a cooperative basis. As long as we assume an attempt to create unity on the principle of "every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost" we are doomed to failure.

The press is today full of stories of conflict rather than unity; conflicts over the attempt of farmers to secure what they consider a just price for their products; conflicts over the attempts of labor to secure higher wages or recognition of their partnership in business; conflicts over the attempt to make effective a limitation of $25,000 a year on personal incomes; conflicts between public and private power interests over the use of copper; conflicts between the efforts of Government to expand the production of certain critical materials to meet war needs and monopolies who fear the competitive effect of such expansion after the war.

Such conflicts, militating against national unity, could not occur if cooperation and social responsibility were the basic principles of our business system. So I want you to look with me at some of the effects of the development of cooperative enterprise in other countries before the war.

I wonder how many of you realize the extent of the cooperative world before the war; how cooperative societies all over the world, organized on the same principle as your rural electric cooperatives, numbered their memberships in the tens of millions and engaged in almost every form of business except what we term today the heavy raw-material industries. I wonder if you realize that they were providing solutions for many of the economic problems which are increasingly troubling modern industrial nations and at the same time creating a sense of social responsibility pervading whole peoples and generating a sense of unity which would otherwise have been impossible.

In 1936 President Roosevelt gave a group of us an opportunity to study cooperative enterprise in a number of European countries. We visited countries with a combined population of about 125,000,000, or somewhat less than that of the United States. Consumer cooperatives in these countries had a membership of about 12,000,000, representing nearly an equivalent number of families, while agricultural cooperatives reported a membership of about 3,500,000 farmers. All told, cooperative business totaled about $2,350,000,000, which, in terms of the purchasing power of their money, as compared with ours, would probably be equivalent to nearly $5,000,000,000 in the United States.

Including all the individuals in the families of cooperative members, the societies served at least 50,000,000 people, averaging about 40 percent of the population of the several countries. These families are sharing in the democratic conduct of business enterprises which are serving their needs. And, incidentally, they are assuring the conduct of such enterprises in accordance with principles which mean the best possible conditions for producers, whether on the farm or in the shop. For the democratic organization of business is based on organization of farmers into cooperatives controlling the processing and marketing of their products, organization of labor into unions embodying partnership in the production and distribution processes, and organization of consumers into retail societies controlling a sufficient portion of industrial production to prevent artificial price fixing by monopoly.

This combination assures the full development of the essential identity of interest between producers and consumers, for the producers are themselves also consumers represented in the control of consumer societies. If as consumers they exploit producers, or vice versa, they are only exploiting themselves.

I would be talking on into the night if I attempted to describe all the operations of these European cooperatives that I think would interest you and provide suggestions for your future efforts to assist in the creation of a more united America. For many of these, like the cooperative dairies, we have splendid counterparts in the United States, as, for instance, the Land O' Lakes Creameries. And I do not want you to overlook the fact that we have a strong and growing cooperative movement in the United States, which we should all put our shoulders to the wheel and build on. But as yet in this country we have not progressed so far as the people in these other countries in recognizing cooperative enterprise as a means of assuring democratic control over the business system without the necessity of expanding the functions of Government.

Time will not permit me to describe the ways in which the farmers in these countries have established their control of the primary processing and marketing of farm products, or in which consumers have used their combined purchasing power and savings to operate factories for the production of such commodities as flour, crackers, bread, soap, rope, clothing, shoes, rubber shoes, tires, furniture, electric light bulbs, cutlery, fertilizer, and even farm machinery, when necessary to assure the lowest possible prices. So I will have to conclude this talk with a brief reference to certain broad implications of cooperative activity which are recognized in the countries I visited as providing the basis for a new democratic civilization and a new national unity.

In the first place, I would like to quote the foreign secretary of the Swedish Cooperative Union, then postmaster general of Sweden, who saw in cooperative enterprise an adaptation of the old, self-sufficing family economy of earlier rural life to the modern machine age. He said:

"While everyone else openly proclaimed as an essential to human existence that individuals should strive with might and main to win each to himself the utmost possible gain at the expense of others, cooperatives set up as their lode star that households should work in harmony together so that, by good organization and machinery, they might procure all common benefits possible without in the slightest depriving anyone of the results of his own labor."

He continued:

"This will, as has often been said, introduce a modernized form, adapted to present economic conditions, of the old family economy, under which the members of the family labored, not to produce a profit, but to obtain the material products required to meet the needs of the family and its members."

In the second place, I want to point out that, by banding together on a cooperative basis to obtain the material products required to meet their needs, families retain control of their purchasing power and their savings instead of turning control of this combined purchasing power and savings over to the small proportion of the population which uses it to dominate the economic system as a means to vast personal fortunes. Cooperative societies in Europe have found that the savings of members provide more than enough capital for such expansion in the field of production as they require.

In the third place, cooperative enterprise provides a sound basis for establishing price yardsticks in many fields of production and distribution besides the electric field in which your rural electric cooperatives are a most successful example. In effect, cooperatives can reintroduce competition in any field in which monopoly or trade agreements are determined to maintain artificially high prices. Thus, the head of the Bank of Finland said:

"It is important to keep real competition alive to prevent a single group in the country from gaining a monopoly position. The cooperative movement has, in effect, reintroduced competition on a basis which is effective in terms of modern large scale business. It has made distribution more efficient and has materially reduced retail margins. The resulting almost automatic control of prices has rendered government interference with private business enterprise unnecessary.

"Cooperative competition favorably affects the entire national retail price structure, even in lines of trade where the cooperatives have not yet been particularly active. The mere knowledge that the cooperatives would enter a particular field, if prices were too high, acts as a deterrent against price pegging. As a result Finland has the lowest distribution costs and the lowest prices of any country in Europe."

In the fourth place, I want to call attention to the view of Hugo Vasarla, managing director of the great agricultural cooperative wholesale society of Finland, who sees cooperative enterprise as the only complete expression of what America terms "scientific management" in trade. He points out that cooperation offers a system in which there is only one point of exchange between producers and consumers and in which no ulterior considerations interfere with the complete organization of distribution in the interest of human welfare. Defining scientific management as "more economic activity," he says:

"When we speak of 'more economic activity' we must look at the word 'economic' from the social point of view, not from the individual's point of view. If a businessman puts a higher price on his products and thus gets a greater profit this arrangement is economic from his point of view, but is not scientific management because it does not imply that social means of production are being used more efficiently. On the contrary, it means that one factor of production, that is to say, the businessman himself, requires a larger part of the total cost of production, without adding anything to the national output.

"In cooperative distribution where the principle of service in accordance with the members' interest forms the foundation of activities, the case is otherwise. All cooperative societies are founded on a conscious belief that some part of the economic life is not organized, from the social point of view, as efficiently as it ought to be, and the aim is to bring about this higher degree of efficiency."

Thus, through the growth of cooperative enterprise, we reach the ultimate in economic activity because men work together to use the gifts of God in terms of a common purpose rather than with conflicting purposes.

In short the growth of cooperative enterprise offers not only the most Christian and the most democratic but also the most scientific basis on which to build our American civilization. It offers not only the most satisfying experience of freedom but also the highest embodiment of that interdependence which constitutes society. The experience of working together overflows into the broader life of the people creating a greater sense of national unity. This is true even where cooperatives handle only one-tenth of the business turn-over; for the effect of cooperative enterprise is to develop a sense of social responsibility in private business which brings it close to cooperation interpreted in its broadest sense.

To return to "AE" prophet of this great concept of "National Being" and his conception of cooperatives as more than a series of organizations for economic purposes, I will conclude with his words:

"We hope to create finally, by the close texture of our organizations, that vivid sense of the identity of interest of the people, which is the basis of citizenship, and without which there can be no noble national life. Our great Nation-States have grown so large, so myriad are their populations, so complicated are their interests, that most of them really feel no sense of brotherhood with each other. We have yet to create inside our great Nation-States social and economic organizations which will make this identity of interest real and evident and not seem merely a metaphor, as it does to most people today."

And again:

"If we concentrate our efforts mainly on voluntary action, striving to make the cooperative spirit predominant, the general will would manifest itself through organizations flexible and readily adjustable to the desires of the community."

That is the challenge to you who are met here today and to the Nation as a whole. The building of such a civilization as "AE" describes is not only the noblest but also the most adventurous of undertakings. It offers the generations now alive their counterpart of the building of the foundations of America by generations of pioneers who have passed on. And I come here today to hail you, members of rural electric cooperatives throughout the land, as the new pioneers who are taking up where our forefathers left off, carrying forward the true American tradition.

Your vision of this goal and your efforts to achieve it will mean much to the unity of the Nation in its great struggle to preserve the democratic way of life. And the general acceptance by all interests of the validity of that vision, including the broad purposes represented by President Roosevelt's social objectives, would constitute the greatest guaranty of ultimate victory.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, there was recently a $5-per-plate dinner at the Mayflower Hotel to discuss the threat of inflation.

Walter Winchell has been retired by Secretary Knox to the "inactive" list. Most Members of Congress feel he should have been listed "in action," to give the ether waves a rest.

In the First World War, 58 percent of the worker's dollar went for food. In this war only 28 percent of that dollar goes for food, yet time and a half for overtime goes marching on and up as hours are extended.

The hearts of America go out in sincere sympathy for our boys fighting in Africa, in particular, and the others everywhere in the cold, the warm, and on the treacherous seas.

The President's special budget wanted $100,000,000 "for incentive payments to producers" to be paid for by the taxpayers to keep the price of food down to consumers. Farmers do not like this artificial respiration.

Thurman Arnold, a legal genius, was jerked from the battlefront of trust busting to the idle security of a circuit judgeship against his desire. Monopoly from the blue-eagle days has coasted along.

Not since the visit of Queen Elizabeth in June of 1939 has any woman left a deeper impression on Washington than Madame Chiang Kai-shek. She undoubtedly is more important to her country today than any other woman in any land is to hers.

The O. W. I. with its half dozen leaders spoke to and answered questions at the weekly meeting of the secretaries. The questions asked were fully equal to those heard generally in regular committee hearings, which qualify them as the men behind the men behind the guns.

Women in the national life are having a better day. The six minority Members of the House are discussed and compared daily by the men Members. All quite thoroughly agree that all the women rank high. The able MARY NORTON of the majority is sick, having been unable to attend a day this session.

Gen. Pat Hurley looks the real soldier, and has had a wide experience in all recent wars, as well as extended activities in administrative and business life. From an orphan and a mule driver in a coal mine, he typifies the best of the American way.

The Problem of the Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to two letters I have received from prominent farmers in the Twenty-first Illinois District with reference to current farm problems arising from manpower shortages on the farm.

The first letter is from Mr. Kenneth Stringfield, rural route No. 1, Dawson, Ill., and the second letter is from Mr. A. R. Booth, of Springfield, Ill., both in Sangamon County.

I commend these letters to every Member of the House as they accurately reflect the situation in the Midwest farm belt, which must be corrected immediately if American agriculture is to make its just contribution to our war effort.

The letters follow:

DAWSON, ILL., *February 13, 1943.*

Hon. EVAN HOWELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOWELL: The Government has, by act of Congress, set a parity price on various farm commodities. The parity price on corn is 99.6 cents per bushel. Yet a ceiling of 87 cents per bushel has been clamped on corn in this area. That is a flagrant violation of the letter of the law. While many industrial workers other than farmers receive a 30-percent increase in wages (recently proclaimed 48-hour week), the corn farmer has been prohibited from receiving the price on his product as provided by law. What is wrong?

We farmers want no incentive or subsidy payments. What incentive do we need other than the knowledge that every day's work hastens victory? And why should we want subsidy payments that serve only to increase the size of the national budget, national debt, and burdensome taxes? We know only too well that the debts must be paid, and we know from where taxes must come. Aside from that, do we not need every available Government penny to pay for this war? We want only fair prices that enable us to stand on our own feet—dependent on no one.

A 48-hour week has been proclaimed for industry other than agriculture. With that 48-hour week goes time and a half for 8 hours—thus increasing the wage of those affected workers by 30 percent or more.

We, as farmers, are exerting our best efforts to meet our Nation's food-production goals, and we expect to see that they are met if it is at all within the realm of human possibility. In the summer months we average 16 working hours per day—a total of 96 hours per week of the hardest kind of labor. Frequently, that 96 hours stretch to well over 100. Tell me when the farmer has received or demanded time and a half for those 56 overtime hours. When has he or will he receive a wage increase of 30 percent?

How can we be expected to meet those food-production goals with inadequate machinery and no skilled farm labor available? How can workers be expected to remain on farms when they compare that 48 hours, time and a half for overtime in other industries with the 96 hours of work required on the farm plus the low wages we are forced to pay? How can we compete with factory wages when our operating costs have leaped out of sight of the price we receive for many of our products? How can we meet our taxes? How can we buy bonds when we receive compensation that covers only operating expenses and feed cost, but not labor? These are some of the questions we farmers are asking.

No one realizes more thoroughly than the farmer the dangers of inflation. No one realizes quite so thoroughly that inflation is here now. I am not economist, but it seems to me that the wide discrepancy between the income of agriculture and other industries serves only as an aggravating factor.

What steps can you, as our Congressman, take to help clarify and correct this situation?

Yours truly,

KENNETH STRINGFIELD.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *February 15, 1943.*

Congressman EVAN HOWELL,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you as one in whose hands, we the people, have placed the responsibility of guiding the destinies of this Nation.

First, allow me to qualify for writing this letter. I am a farmer, farming over 1,500 acres of my own land, feeding cattle, and raising hogs on a partnership basis. I have served on the board of directors of the Sangamon County Farm Bureau for several years, and have served on some of the important committees. I am also serving on a local draft board. I am fully aware of the problems which agriculture faces and the forces which are not in sympathy with agriculture. I also realize the pressure from other groups which you are under, and you have my full sympathy.

I am not going to be able to equal my 1942 production in 1943, due to labor shortage. Due to the seriousness of this situation, the element of time is a most important factor and immediate steps should be taken to correct it for production in 1943—also 1944.

Statisticians tell us that agriculture has lost more farm workers to war plants and industries than to the armed forces. That holds true in Sangamon County. We have hundreds working in two ordnance plants, and manufacturing plants engaged 100 percent in war work. At the ordnance plants the farmers were given preference to coax them to manpower the plants and they are still there.

To head off the crisis which is fast developing in agriculture, for Heaven's sake, why not a short cut to save precious time? There is a direct line from the War Department to the personnel director in every plant. Tell them to call in every former agricultural worker and tell them it is back to the farm or in the Army. That would give immediate relief.

If officials still desire to bring up the Mexicans from the South and the Japs from the West, along with using high-school children during vacations, and short training courses to make workers with sufficient knowledge to operate big producing farms, and any other plans which they might have which will take months and months to get under way, it still won't furnish the concrete help as the type of personnel I am suggesting be released immediately.

Let me tell you, the farmers with whom I have had occasion to be are fast getting a defeatist's attitude in regard to results and have just about resigned themselves to make the best with what they have in the way of labor and machinery and let it go at that, which spells only one thing: Still less production in 1944, as the die is cast for 1943, which we know will be lower than 1942.

Why not use the short cut or one similar? I ask you for action and results—but chiefly, results now.

Yours truly,

A. R. BOOTH.

Pay-Roll-Savings Plan for the Purchase of War Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana:

House Joint Resolution 1

Resolution recognizing the necessity of public officers and employees of the State of Montana, and all of its subdivisions, adhering to and participating in the pay-roll savings plan for purchase of War bonds, expressing the determination of the legislative assembly to adhere to such plan in the present session and urging upon all public offices, departments, institutions, and stations of the State of Montana and its subdivisions regular participation in and adherence to said plan until final victory is achieved.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the Senate concurring):

Whereas any slackening of a total and intense war effort on the home front delays the day of victory and increases the cost in human life and suffering of our fighting forces, and those of our allies; and

Montanans have demonstrated their resolute determination to fight through to complete victory by furnishing to the land, sea, and air forces a very high proportion of the State's manpower, and also by vigilant participation in all of the war efforts, whether for increased food, increased metal production, salvage collection, civilian defense or for any other requirements; and

Montana in December 1941 after the foul attack on Pearl Harbor, and again in December 1942 led the Nation in War bond purchases on the basis of income; and

There exists not only the world-wide menace of external enemies bound to destroy us, but also the internal and vicious enemy on the home front called inflation, which enemy left Montana's economy in sore straits for many years after World War No. 1, and if unchecked will work greater ruin in these days; and

This twenty-eighth legislative assembly clearly recognizes that the stupendous cost of war must be paid for by every citizen and that the generations now alive must carry the immediate share of these costs, as well as the sacrifices on the fighting front, and that no hardship should deter public officers and employees of our State, counties, and cities from regular participation in War bond purchases through the pay-roll-savings plan of the State of Montana: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the Senate concurring), That every member of the house and of the senate of this twenty-eighth legislative assembly is respectfully urged to subscribe to the State pay-roll-savings plan; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be distributed to every State office, department, institution, and station, and to every county, city, and school district throughout the State of Montana, and that all officers and employees of all thereof be, and they are respectfully urged, fully and promptly, to participate in pay-roll-savings plans; and be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof, duly authenticated, be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Senators and Representatives from the State of Montana in the Congress.

GEO. S. O'CONNOR,
Speaker of the House.
ERNEST F. EATON,
President of the Senate.

The T. V. A. and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if I have ever rendered any service to the people of this country worthy of note, it has been in helping to create and develop the T. V. A., and to spread rural electrification throughout the country.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address by Hon. Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, at a conference of T. V. A. power distributors, at Chattanooga, Tenn., on February 16, 1943, showing what the T. V. A. is doing for that great section of the country:

We are in the midst of a great war which will determine whether man is capable of building and preserving a democratic civilization. Hundreds of millions of men and women are involved in that war, either in the armed forces or in the mobilization of entire economic systems to provide the armed forces with the weapons and supplies of modern war. The Tennessee Valley Authority is playing a great part in the total mobilization of America which will help to win that war for the democratic principle.

But the relation of Tennessee Valley Authority to democracy, to the defense of democracy, to the building and preservation of a democratic civilization is far more fundamental than that. For, in the last analysis, the survival of democracy will depend upon devising institutions through which peoples can rule their economic system. That means we must achieve economic democracy in order to preserve political democracy.

Economic democracy is as fundamental a part of the American tradition as political democracy. It has constituted the vitality of our heritage of freedom. Americans are first, second, third, or fourth generation descendants of men and women who flocked to this country because in the homelands propertied and privileged upper classes held the populations in economic servitude, as well as in political subjection. They were attracted across the sea to America as the land of economic opportunity, as well as political liberty.

Some of you may recall that one of the greatest among the founders of the American form of government, Thomas Jefferson, put it tersely when he said: "Widespread poverty and concentrated wealth cannot long endure side by side with democracy."

It is in terms of this great American tradition that I want to talk about Tennessee Valley Authority and democracy, for I am convinced that in the Tennessee Valley Authority principle the country has found a way to build and preserve a glorious democratic civilization.

And I am going to amplify the statement that the Tennessee Valley Authority principle offers a sure way to preserve our traditional democracy by asserting that it provides a means of reversing the powerful trend of the past generation toward centralized control of the country's economic life by an all powerful corporate bureaucracy. This trend has been steadily substituting great monopolies for the thousands of small community business enterprises. It was through such small enterprises American democracy characteristically sought its "daily bread" from a God who has endowed our land with such abundant resources.

The vast, centralized business bureaucracy which has been engulfing the essential American tradition is as different from the principle of free private enterprise as are any of the "isms" which are today so vociferously condemned as un-American. It threatens to supersede the American system as truly as fascism or national socialism superseded the earlier economic order in Europe.

And here I want to call attention to a series of reports from a Senate committee which is giving the truest expression of the American tradition to be found in recent official documents. I refer to the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of American Small Business, with Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, as chairman. In its report of January 18, 1943, the committee said:

"The resolution establishing this committee was passed before war struck America. It was born of the realization that for several decades we had been facing a national trend toward centralization of American business and industry. Business and industrial institutions engaging in Nation-wide operations had vastly increased, and the smaller concerns with home-town control and management were disappearing through consolidation or inability to meet the monopolistic pressure and financial power of these larger institutions.

"Prior to the present war this trend caused serious alarm, and studies and efforts had been under way to stop the trend and encourage decentralization of business. It has become generally recognized in this country that small business is fundamental to our system of free competitive enterprise and that the trend we had been following would eventually lead our country to a complete abandonment of free enterprise and the building in its place of a totalitarian system like that of Germany."

The committee recognizes that it has been assigned "the broad problem of devising plans by which small business may be preserved in the American economy."

A solution of this problem is of primary importance in terms of the very life of the civilization which we are building. For the development of huge corporations, under centralized financial control, has reversed the natural order which should govern the conduct of business enterprise. The country's business is no longer seeking a just wage for serving the consumer needs of the people, but is seeking maximum profits through exploitation of those needs. This reversal of the natural order, of the balance between production and consumption, has introduced the economic instability which is the greatest threat to our way of life.

If our civilization is to survive, we must find a way to restore the balance, so that our young men and young women, as they come out of school, can look forward to continuity of employment in the useful work of transforming the country's wealth of resources into a rich life for all. And I am convinced that restoration of the balance, of the natural order of business, must begin on a local basis.

We must progress from a balanced community to a balanced regional economy and from a balanced regional economy to a balanced national economy.

This progress, it may be noted in passing, may be greatly facilitated by a planned regional abundance of low-cost electricity. For electric power offers every community the possibilities of modern technology in production and distribution. Each community, each group of communities, composing a region, can thus encourage local production enterprises to employ its own people to provide for its own needs. With local ownership and management, such enterprises are the small businesses which belong to the American tradition of private enterprise.

But, before going further, we should recognize that individual farms may be considered as the premier American small business enterprises, and that there should be a natural linking up of small farms with small industrial and distribution enterprises in each region to assure a permanent and healthy American civilization. We must make effective the identity of interest, which should join farms, local stores, local industries, and local labor organizations, if the American tradition is to win against big business bureaucracy. This will require organized effort in each region.

If this identity of interest can find practical expression we will not only have saved small business but in the process we will have found a democratic way to cure chronic unemployment, lack of opportunity for youth, and lack of a profitable market for farm products while a third of our population live chronically below the decent subsistence level. In short, we will have found a democratic way to enable our people to make the fullest possible use of their resources.

Failure to go forward along this line will mean that our days of democracy will be numbered. For some form of totalitarian regime will appear as the one alternative to a people seeking a reasonable assurance of economic security.

From this point of view let us look for a few minutes at what the Tennessee Valley Authority principle has to offer.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is essentially a regional, not a national agency. Its management is located in and has identified itself with the region which it serves. It is vested with appropriate powers and the flexible corporate type of organization necessary to enable it to assist the people of the region in marshalling their resources. In the language of its 1941 report:

"On the watershed the Authority is enabling the people to reclaim and revitalize many thousands of acres of their forest and agricultural lands. In the laboratory intensive research is uncovering new opportunities for taking advantage of native resources in the every-day business of earning a living. Working with the people and through their institutions, the Tennessee Valley Authority is perfecting new cooperative techniques for solving region-wide problems that overrun established political boundaries."

In short, although the Nation provided the capital for starting the Tennessee Valley Authority, and is being well repaid in the tremendous contribution the Tennessee Valley Authority is making to the war effort, the enterprise belongs essentially to the people of the region. It is your agency for coordinated planning of the use of your resources. It is enabling you to lift your economic life to new levels which will assure higher standards of living for farmers and wage earners as well as sustained prosperity for local business institutions.

You gathered here are close to the practical working of this great forward step in the democratic solution of our economic problems. And yet, as a basis for some suggestions which I have to make, I will touch briefly on certain aspects of the Tennessee Valley Authority which are illustrative.

In the first place, the application of the Tennessee Valley Authority principle has unquestionably restored the distribution of electricity to "home-town control and management," to steal a phrase from the Senate Committee on Small Business. This gathering is witness to that fact. Communities, whether composed of farmers in rural areas

or homes and small business in urban centers, now control and manage the electric business of the Valley.

In the second place, this home-town control of the business of supplying electricity has gone far toward eliminating discrimination against small customers in charges for electricity. In parts of the county where home-town control of electric supply does not prevail, big business get electric rates which are disproportionately low, as compared with rates charged small business, because big concerns can threaten to build their own power plants unless furnished electricity at cost.

To the extent that power costs are a factor in the survival of business enterprise, the Tennessee Valley Authority principle has definitely tended to right the balance in favor of small business.

In the third place, the Tennessee Valley Authority principle is assuring the survival throughout the valley of what I have termed "the country's premier small business"—the individual farm. And I use the word "survival" advisedly. For the continued vitality of this basic American institution rests not only upon perpetually renewed fertility of the soil but also upon the possibility of maintaining a standard of living comparable with any that the resources of the country have to offer.

Here I do not need to elaborate on what is being accomplished by the people of the Tennessee Valley in the way of reforestation, control of erosion, improved fertilizers and soil utilization, the application of electricity to farm operations, and the processing and preservation of farm products. But I do want to recall the way in which the Tennessee Valley Authority principle is bringing about these improvements. For I believe that it illustrates the way in which democracy must increasingly go about the solution of its economic problems if our free enterprise system is not to be superseded by some mammoth collectivism, whether corporate or political.

So I call your attention to two or three quotations from recent Tennessee Valley Authority reports. They reflect a cooperative method involving all economic interests in the valley, which I believe must be carried much further and ultimately extended to other valleys throughout the country. Thus, I read that:

"In order to carry out a valley-wide program in private as well as public land, the Tennessee Valley Authority has enlisted the cooperation of thousands of individual farmers together with that of the State institutions serving their varied needs. The farmers, selected by their neighbors, test Tennessee Valley Authority fertilizers under actual farming conditions, under the technical guidance of their agricultural extension services. The tests involved making adjustments toward sustained productivity in crops, livestock, and other farm enterprises."

And again:

"In many communities, neighboring test-demonstration farm operators combine their farms into area demonstrations. In this way farmers on small watersheds act together in planning readjustments otherwise not practical in respect to land use and cropping systems, livestock, and other factors."

And again:

"To encourage farm practices that will contribute directly to better living and higher income, farm implements particularly suited to this region are being devised; improved methods of processing and preserving fruits, vegetables, meats, and other marketable farm products have been developed. Through demonstrations, trade journals, and other appropriate channels, the results of these investigations are passed on to private enterprise under conditions that insure wide distribution of new wealth and new opportunity."

And finally:

"It is believed to be apparent that the problems and opportunities confronting the Authority cannot be dealt with separately by the individual efforts of the Authority or any other public or private agency. They can be dealt with successfully only if the efforts of Federal, State, and local agencies on the one hand, and those of private citizens and landowners, on the other, can be joined through a single administrative and cooperative technique. The Authority, a flexible corporate body, is in a position to provide the element of unity and leadership through which separate and oftentimes ineffectual efforts are brought together, strengthened, and employed to the best advantage of the region as a whole."

It would be possible to go into some detail to show how the new methods and improved processes have provided opportunities for small businesses in the valley, both manufacturers and distributors. It would be possible to show how the progress already made has enabled the valley to become more nearly self-sufficing. It would be possible to speak of the advantage to farms and small business enterprises, resulting from the opening of the Tennessee River as a waterway, offering the economies of water transport to thousands of shippers and receivers of freight in hundreds of communities.

But today I want to concentrate your attention on the method which democracy has found in the Tennessee Valley Authority principle for its own preservation, for the preservation of the essential American way of life. And I want you to consider with me the urgent need for the extension of that principle to the ultimate welding of the individual interests of many regions, into one free commonwealth. For democracy must be cooperative in all aspects of its life and we must explore our institutions to find the levels at which such cooperation can be attained.

Now what is the essential principle of the Tennessee Valley Authority approach to sound regional economy? I think you will agree it includes (1) the bringing back to the valley of the control of its own resources; and (2) planned cooperation of all agencies, public and private, in the use of those resources for orderly economic and social development. In short, it offers the people of a region a democratic procedure for promoting the "general welfare."

The results are most obvious in the field of electric power. The development of the region's power supply is no longer in the hands of men responsible to holding companies which were little more than departments of a centralized financial bureaucracy dominating the flow of capital into business enterprise throughout the country. Instead, the operation of the valley's power system is controlled locally, in terms of policies designed to serve the primary purpose of increasing the economic well-being of the people who live in it.

Similarly, the region's supplies of fertilizer are no longer dominated by great chemical combines whose control could be traced back to the same financial center as that which dominated the region's power supply. Instead, there is experimentation with the use of the valley's own resources to restore its fertility, to develop it as the "happy valley" of Ruskin's King of the Golden River fantasy.

So, also, the control of the agricultural life of the valley need no longer rest in the hands of great packing, milling, and grocery combines whose control of the national food markets once forced the individual farmers to crowd the soil for money crops without replenishing it. Under Tennessee Valley Authority leadership you have combined to redeem your way of life by balanced farming and local preserving and processing of its products.

All these things mark progress. But you must go much further in the application of the Tennessee Valley Authority principle before you have created a well-rounded, balanced regional economic life; before you have fully recaptured control of your business from the financial bureaucracy and assured the healthy continuation of the American tradition of freedom in your valley.

In past public addresses I have emphasized the importance of cooperative enterprise as the most democratic and Christian form of business enterprise. I have pointed out how cooperative enterprise begins with the local cooperative store, controlled by consumers, or with the local farm marketing organization, controlled by producers. I have shown how these local cooperative business enterprises join to form the cooperative wholesale organizations which serve them. I have called attention to the fact that these cooperative wholesale societies command enough purchasing power and enough consumer capital so that they can undertake production whenever this is necessary to break artificial monopoly prices.

I have cited instances in England, Scotland, Ireland, Sweden, Finland, and Denmark to show how this democratic control of business enterprise restores business to its proper function of service to communities, assures prices which enable people to purchase more goods, develops a sense of brotherhood which unites producers and consumers in the pursuit of a common end, and finally brings private enterprise to a realization of its social responsibility. And I want to reiterate my profound belief that economic cooperation offers the most practical basis for the survival of democracy in the world. For democracy must be spiritual as well as economic and political. It can only persist through a way of life based on the principle that all are the children of God.

But today I want to say that progress toward cooperation in each country must proceed in accordance with its history and its traditions. And as we look back to our American tradition of the independent farm and the small business, before the days of the giant corporations ruled by financial bureaucracy, we must recognize that there was a powerful community cooperative spirit running through our early history, whether it was in the early Colonial period, or in the days when pioneers crossed the mountains and opened up the Mississippi Valley and the far West. There was great individual freedom, succeeding because freemen cooperated in the building of a nation such as had never existed before, a nation founded on equality of opportunity, unhampered by hereditary wealth or power.

So we can envisage the development of cooperative civilization in America, proceeding through the assumption by the people of each region of responsibility for the restoration of vigorous small-business enterprise under home-town control. And it is my conviction that this regional responsibility for the recreation of small business can be undertaken by a natural extension of the Tennessee Valley Authority principle into all phases of a region's life.

In working out this extension of the Tennessee Valley Authority principle, each community, each group of communities forming a region must assume conscious responsibility for its economic life, nurturing and supporting the institutions and agencies which serve it. There must be loyalty to the farmers producing the necessary agricultural products, loyalty to the small industries producing necessary manufactured products, loyalty which assures them a market in spite of the blandishments of national advertising by great corporations representing economic bureaucracy. In short, each community, each region, must constitute itself as an economic democracy taking thought for providing its small business enterprises with the necessary

market and the capital required to undertake and continue their particular line of service.

We have precedent in America for such regional economic democracy. I will mention briefly one example.

In Arizona, during the depression which followed the last World War, an engineer suggested transforming the grumbling, about how badly off they were, into action to do something about it. So the Arizona Industrial Congress came into being. It was a purely voluntary organization with a board of directors from six industrial divisions, including agriculture, business and finance, livestock, mining, the professions, and public utilities. It went to work.

Time will not permit a discussion of what the Industrial Congress did to relieve the 1921 depression in the State. But I do want to touch briefly on its working policies and then mention a few recent illustrations of its practical procedure. In its Annual Report for 1929 the Congress says:

"The formation of the industrial congress at the end of 1921 was due to a growing realization that the affairs and well-being of any one industry, section, or group of people have a direct effect on the well-being of all other industries or groups. The relationship between the diverse activities of production, distribution, financing, and consumption has been so complex that no activity can stand alone. The prosperity or adversity of one link quickly affects the fortunes of all the others. Therefore each has a very definite interest in the success of its neighbors.

"Having established the interrelation of industry, the industrial congress applied it to a cooperative and coordinated effort for the benefit of all of Arizona, and hence to the benefit of each resident. Six basic policies were adopted which have guided the operation of the clearing house ever since:

"1. To help all existing organizations to function most efficiently for their individual members.

"2. To create markets nearest the point of origin for all products and to retain all business possible in local or State channels.

"3. To determine the amount of excess production over local needs and distribute this excess.

"4. To encourage highest quality of production and service to minimize effects of outside competition by quality, not price cutting.

"5. To crystallize public sentiment on constructive problems by presentation of facts and exchange of ideas between organizations.

"6. To help ourselves and our State by creating a loyalty to home institutions * * *."

According to the report:

"Since the industrial congress was formed an average of more than $20,000,000 worth of business has been kept in Arizona each year, which formerly went outside the State."

Facing the implications of the 1929 stock crash, the report says:

"Obviously, Arizona people have in their own power the maintainng of their economic future. The use of Arizona products, the keeping of all expenditures in the home community and State, the giving of preference to home firms and home labor are vital factors in assuring continued sound growth."

Looking over the accomplishments of the industrial congress in 1929 for illustrations of its work, I find the following:

Work continued in extending State-wide markets for Arizona flour and feed milled from Arizona wheat. Local flour mills were aided. Merchants and housewives were appealed to to use Arizona flour.

Efforts were made to assist Arizona eggs to compete with those shipped in.

Steps were taken to promote the growing of truck crops to take the place of those sent in from outside the State. Arrangements were made for local sales of a wide range of vegetables and other farm products.

Aid was given, with the cooperation of the banks and financial institutions, to expansion of a number of manufacturing and distributing industries and to establishment of several new ones.

Local iron and steel works were assisted in getting Arizona business.

The Congress helped maintain State markets for dairy products, beverages, brooms, mattresses, and many other products of Arizona manufacturers.

The Congress assisted a new Arizona garment manufacturing company to obtain markets for its products throughout the State.

The Congress assisted Arizona bakeries in meeting the competition of nationally advertised cakes shipped into the State from outside. According to the report: "This affected not only hundreds of bakery employees, but farmers and other lines of business as Arizona bakeries spend hundreds of thousands of dollars for Arizona flour, milk, eggs, and other products."

But I think I have given you enough illustrations to suggest that the people of communities and regions can organize cooperatively to foster the economic institutions and agencies which represent the common life. I would only add that, to assure full realization of economic democracy, organized labor must participate with all other economic groups in the realization of the common objectives.

And I see such regional cooperation as the full flowering of the Tennessee Valley Authority principle. With purpose and drive behind it, I am convinced that this principle can reverse the trend toward centralized economic bureaucracy and thus preserve the traditional form of small enterprise, whether in agriculture, industry, or trade, which has been characteristic of American democracy.

The business and industrial system had its origin in the service it rendered the community in which it originated. But as larger and larger units developed more and more removed from the local communities a new class of businessmen arose who realized that if plants could be combined under one control the communities would have to accept such service as they offered at the prices which they demanded. Profits took precedence over service and economic democracy was on the way out.

The Tennessee Valley Authority principle offers the way to restore service as the primary objective of business in a democracy. And the cooperative ideal which illumines it opens infinite vistas of democracy, broadening into a future in which people can no longer be made the sport of economic forces loosed by men driven by greed for wealth and power. Whether the progress in this country will follow the standard cooperative line or will transform our community and local business enterprises into new types of cooperation, the end must be the same if democracy is to survive. The people must control their economic life. Only in that way can the concept of American liberty, expressed in the Declaration of Independence, retain its fundamental significance in terms of the spiritual value of each human soul.

That, as I understand it, is what we are fighting to preserve.

The Manpower Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Albert L. Cox delivered to New York Board of Trade, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, October 21, 1942, and two letters from Mr. Cox:

My fellow countrymen, the most critical problem confronting our world today is the best use of the manpower of the United States. For what concerns our people concerns the people of the United Nations. As citizens responsible for a splendid heritage, as men responsible for the continuance of the principles of liberty upon which this Nation was founded and upon which it has existed, we can't lose this war. We can consider no other outcome but victory. To lose means the end of all that we hold dear. To use the manpower of our Nation to the best advantage is of paramount importance. Unless we so use it, victory may evade our grasp, for in the world today there is nothing so cheap as human life.

To accomplish the end we seek, three things are necessary. First, a willingness to make any sacrifice. Our people have shown that there can be no just criticism of the spirit in which they entered and in which they are carrying on this war.

Second, as great a number of trained soldiers and sailors as may be necessary to accomplish our mission. This objective we have every reason to believe can and will be reached.

And third—of equal, and perhaps of greater, importance—is the matter of supply. And when I say supply, I mean not only munitions of warfare but the actual necessities of life.

It is to the third objective that I shall address myself for the reason that we are not only confronted with the problem of supplying our own people but, as well, the peoples of our allies.

Shortages of supplies of every sort are now being felt, rationing is upon us, and these shortages are increasing from month to month. We must so plan that no breakdown comes from within. How heinous it would be to train and to send overseas great armies of men which we could not supply. How disastrous it would be to so handle our own affairs as to be unable to continue to supply the armies and the peoples of the other nations who are fighting side by side with us.

From China and from Russia daily come the cries of those harassed people, asking, begging, beseeching, and even demanding that we furnish them with the equipment for their armies, which we have promised. There is no lack of manpower in China. There is no lack of manpower in Russia. We must take full advantage of the men our allies are providing for the fighting fronts, and provide them with the tools to make them truly formidable.

At present we have more than 4 million men in our Army. Of these, less than a million have been transported to the battlefronts of the world. We have soldiers in this country who have been in training for 1½ years and more as combat troops. There is grave danger that, in such long training periods, troops will grow stale and homesick and become overtrained. And more to the point, these men have become wholly consumers.

Our supply line to western Europe is 3,000 miles each way; to Australia, 7,500 miles from San Francisco; to Egypt, 14,000 miles from New York by Cape of Good Hope; to India, 12,000 miles via the same route; and to Murmansk, 5,400 miles from New York. We may assume, then, that men, equipment and supplies will have to be transported an average distance of at least 4,500 miles. The amount of tonnage required is out of proportion to what we now have. In considering such sea lanes, the probability of loss must not be overlooked. Admiral Land said here on Monday, "We can't lick the submarine menace, though we may be able to ameliorate it."

A survey of the factories and farms shows an alarming shortage of labor today. At the rate men are being called to serve in the armed forces, the shortage in the near future will reach a critical stage. Today the United States is on a war production basis more than three and a half times as large as in the pre-Pearl Harbor month. August war production rose 8 percent over July. But the alarming feature is that it lagged 14 percent behind forecasts. Is it wise to permit a further reduction of labor on the farms and in the factories to impede our efforts toward victory?

Secretary of War Stimson has put the Army's manpower needs for 1943 at 7,500,000. The estimate for the Navy and the Coast Guard will exceed a million. With the knowledge that under present conditions we are not reaching the production we need, how can we hope to reach anything but disaster if we seek to take from farm and factory the men necessary to reach such figures?

I don't question the military authorities when they state that so many men are needed in our armed forces. I only question the manner in which the men are to be trained. I do say that we have reached the point where we cannot safely take more skilled workmen from our factories and more farm labor from our farms. We cannot be prodigal with human skill and with human energy when we face intelligent and resourceful foes.

We can accomplish the desire of the military authorities and at the same time conserve our farm and factory labor by inducting the men necessary for the armed forces, but by training these men at their home stations in such fashion that their services in the factories and on the farms will not be lost. Instead of concentrating our future selectees in large training areas and sending them hundreds, even thousands, of miles from home for their preliminary training, such training, intelligently planned and covering the development of a soldier up to field training and the hardening process, can be done efficiently while the soldier continues to live and to work at home. Under such a program, further loss of production from farms and factories alike would be stopped. The men involved would continue their civilian pursuits while receiving training in military fundamentals. Much the same plan can be employed as has for so many years been used in the training of our National Guard divisions, which now and always have made a splendid record for themselves. As the troops in camp reached the point of being moved overseas, the smaller training cadres at home stations could be sent to camps for the intensive training necessary before actual combat. While the home training was being absorbed other employees could be trained to take the place of the skilled workmen in the factories soon to be sent to combat. Then, too, colleges can be made adjuncts of our armed forces and give such military training as is required to the younger men.

This is not a revolutionary plan, but, instead, a method of training which has proved to be efficacious and worth while. The uniforms, the rifles and other munitions, the tanks and other necessary vehicles, and the cadres of instructors would be no more than are necessary in the large training camps. Armories have been built all over this land, where the men could report in the evenings and on week ends for their uniforms and equipment and to receive their training. The country is filled with men who have had much service, who would make excellent drill masters, and who would glory in the opportunity that was theirs to so engage their time.

With the short time at my disposal, I do not attempt to go into the details, but merely to express what seems to me and to many to whom I have spoken to be a real solution of a problem that is critical.

"Even a defective plan, boldly and resolutely carried out," says Field Service Regulations, "is far better than the hesitating search for the ideal."

We have no time to waste if we are to eat and if we are to win this war.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *November 6, 1943.*

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR HAROLD: I write to you, knowing you to be just as interested as President Roosevelt, General Marshall, Don Nelson, Harry Hopkins, Paul McNutt, or any other American in winning this war. Of paramount importance in its successful determination is the proper use of our manpower. In our Army today we have approximately 4,500,000 American men, of which number only 800,000 have been transported beyond the bounds of these United States. In addition to the 3,700,000 remaining men, the Secretary of War states that during 1943 it will be necessary for us to have 3,000,000 more. With our present shipping facilities and with the accomplishment of the most roseate forecasts of our shipping authorities, we will not be prepared to send out of this country in the next 2 years more than 3,000,000 men and to keep them supplied with the necessities of life and the required munitions of war.

We hear much of a second front being opened. A second front can be opened in Russia or in China, or in both, without sending an American soldier to either place. Both Russia and China have ample manpower and are only asking us for the necessary supplies to equip their soldiers. To make these soldiers of our allies truly formidable we must provide them with the proper tools.

A survey of the factories and the farms of this country shows an alarming shortage of labor today. If we continue to call men from the factories and the farms, the shortage in the near future will reach a critical stage. By taking more men from the farms we are endangering our food supply; by taking more men from the factories we are so curtailing production of war needs that we will continue to be unable to carry out our promises to our allies, as well as to provide for our own armies.

I don't question the military authorities when they state that 7,500,000 men must be trained for our armies. I do say, however, that these men can be as advantageously and as efficiently trained, insofar as their fundamental training is concerned, at home as in the large camps. If our selectees are inducted and, instead of being sent hundreds and even thousands of miles from home, are given training much as the National Guard for so many years has received, they will not be taken from their productive work in the factories and on the farms until such time as they may be needed for more intensive field training and the hardening process. In almost every community armories have been provided and, where there are no armories, armory facilities can be almost immediately made available, where the men can assemble at nights and over week ends to secure their uniforms, their equipment, and their training. No more uniforms and other military equipment, tanks, field pieces, and other vehicles, will be needed than are needed if the men are segregated in large camps. Training cadres can be even more easily provided than they could for the guard in our days of peace.

I propose no revolutionary plan, but a program which has proved to be efficacious and worth while and which is absolutely necessary if we are to escape the Scylla of food shortage and the Charybdis of insufficient matériel of warfare.

In order to make this short enough for you to read, I am omitting much that might be said, particularly with reference to the length and danger of our foreign supply lines and the continuing submarine menace. We are in no danger of invasion. Our men can certainly be kept on a productive basis until such time as the 3,500,000 men now in training in this country are being shipped overseas. Some such program must be promptly adopted if we are to eat and if we are to win.

Very sincerely yours,

ALBERT L. COX.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 10, 1943.*

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR HAROLD: I have been following with great interest your various statements with reference to manpower in this Nation. The proper solution apparently is getting nowhere fast. For fear that you do not recall a letter I wrote you the first part of last November, I take the liberty of enclosing a copy. My thought is that the proper use of American manpower is so inseparably intertwined with the armed forces, with agriculture, and with industry, that much more would be accomplished towards its solution than has been to this time if a joint meeting of the House Committees on Military Affairs, Agriculture, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce, could be held, to which would be invited representatives of the armed forces, representatives of industry, and representatives of agriculture.

There is a grave danger that the continual enlargement of our armed forces will so pauperize agriculture and industry as to reduce below the point of safety the production of farms and of factories. Such an eventuality would, of course, defeat the very purpose for which our armed forces are being trained. At the same time, it is not to be forgotten that a considerable disservice is being done our country by the snatching from the colleges for induction of men who otherwise would be graduated in a few months. Particularly is this true when the preliminary training can just as well be given at the colleges during those next few months as in the large camps of concentration.

To such a meeting as suggested above would, of course, too, be invited the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, Manpower Commissioner McNutt, and other interested public officials, as well as unofficial observers such as Bernard Baruch, and others. Such an effort would not be wasted, as much good would undoubtedly result from such a meeting of minds.

My command of combat forces in World War I, coupled with more than 20 years interested service as a Reserve officer in attendance upon Army schools and Army camps, makes me realize the extreme seriousness of our situation.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT L. COX,
Brigadier General, Reserve.

Address of Alfred H. Cosden, President of the Union League Club, New York City

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Union League Club of New York City was founded in 1863 by a group of men who bound themselves together to de-

fend and uphold the National Government and the Federal Constitution. This was during a crucial period of the country's history when it was in the throes of the Civil War. Since that time the ideals of this group of men have been kept fresh, and on the occasion of the eightieth annual meeting of the club Mr. Alfred H. Cosden, the president, made an address stressing the responsibilities and opportunities of citizenship. His remarks on bureaucracy, on the responsibilities of those left at home, and his comments on the duties of Members of the Congress are sound and worthy of the consideration of the House.

The address follows:

We are in the midst of the fourth war in which our patriotic old club, as an organization, and its members individually, have loyally defended the National Government, the National Constitution, and the unrestricted right of every citizen to freedom of opportunity and of opinion.

There has been no faltering step by our club since its founders far back in 1863 pledged themselves to uphold those principles which in 150 years have created a Nation capable of carrying the heavy burden of a battle-scarred world. That is an achievement that our new dealers planning to destroy the old would do well to keep in mind, for it has no parallel in government and industry in all history.

Our club has stood many tests of its willingness always to do its share in every crisis. Today, along with the rest of the world, it faces its greatest trial.

We have many members actively engaged in combat service and sons of many of our members are similarly engaged.

One of our members—Lt. Comdr. Hallsted L. Hopping—gave his life in defense of his country while leading his flying squadron over the Gilbert and Marshall Islands on January 31, 1942.

I ask that we now rise for a moment in silent tribute to him and to all others engaged in the great struggle.

There is a duty for those of us who are left at home—one that must not be ignored or treated lightly. That duty is to see to it that when peace comes our flag will continue to be a recognized symbol of freemen, upheld by our Constitution in their individual right to work, to advance in life, to express their own opinions and to achieve their own ambitions in their own way provided that way does not interfere with the equal rights of others.

That is the sovereignty of citizenship and nothing else must ever prevail in this land. The survival of our Republic depends upon it.

There are two opposing theories of government and of way of life in our country today.

One theory is known as bureaucracy; it contemplates government management of all business—not government regulation under the law but government management.

The regimentation of all our people.

The control of all property and of every individual's income.

This theory is organized with New Deal captains at Washington constantly seeking new ways, new authority, and new invasion into the field of free enterprise.

That sort of thing in foreign countries is called dictatorship.

The other theory of government is set forth in our Constitution. It is our American way. It puts responsibility upon the people. It not only fixes the bounds of individual liberty but protects it within those bounds. The keeping of our constitutional government depends upon the willingness of our people to defend it.

Liberty has never been easily won or easily kept. Our forefathers fought to gain it. We must do no less to keep it. Every battle for it has been worth all that it has cost. As individuals, we should take our place and do our part. There is much to be done, for our form of government, our industries, and our traditional way of life are challenged.

In a government of 130,000,000 people, living in such a vast territory, with diversified interests, some inequalities must continually arise and should be corrected.

Some of the reforms established by the so-called New Deal were needed and have been helpful. They may some day be modified, but they will never be repealed.

The real menace has not come from any effort to correct but from a purpose to remake our Government—to reclassify and regiment our people—to take free enterprise out of industry, and the method of doing it was intended to be as offensive as the acts themselves.

The opportunity to restore government "by consent of the governed" rests upon their willingness to work for it. The rights and interests of the people are ready to be liquidated when attention to the duties of citizenship ceases and we put childlike faith in a Government composed of men no better qualified than ourselves to conduct it.

As to the war, we will do well to allow our military and naval experts to plan and conduct the fighting.

As to our economy, our social life, our political problems, and our freedoms, we must never surrender our right to speak for them at all times and under all conditions.

We must always have courage to defend the kind of government we want and the spirit to go on record against the kind we do not want. If our appeals are made in the right temper and with tolerance, they will be heard and respected.

The war will be won on the batlefronts, but only with the full support of the home fronts.

The peace will be won by the home front alone and what we do now will determine the kind of peace it will be.

Our boys must not return to find that while they were winning the war we lost the peace they believed they were fighting to keep.

As a people we must realize that it is our duty to work, save, give to the utmost, and cheerfully do without. Winning the war is our first consideration. Until then, nothing else matters.

One of the greatest assets—if not the greatest—for winning the war is the good will of the people at home, and the way to secure that good will is to treat the people as partners in the great undertaking and not as serfs of government.

Let us do our full share and try to convince our Government officials that our Capital City was designed to be the heart and protector of our institutions, not the breeding place of fantastic theories, vicious prejudices, social revolution, and the enemy of free enterprise and the people's rights.

We should help them to understand that it is difficult to treat people as subjects and expect to keep their confidence, and that all people capable of understanding and being trusted are not living in Washington.

If we show courage and determination we might arouse the administration to appoint ment of proven ability, men without political ambitions, as heads of our war production and organization and leave them alone with their duties. We cannot secure efficiency with one eye on the factory and the other eye on election day.

We might try to convince them that it is unpatriotic to carry on a social revolution and fight a world war at the same time.

Perhaps some of our Government officials could be persuaded to believe that swaggering, flippant, bullying talk to citizens has caused much ill will and accomplished no good.

That spending public money to create a grateful mood on election day is debauching the American electorate.

That one bureau created to control another, and then another bureau created to control it, only confuses, confounds, and delays winning the war.

That we cannot control inflation without ceilings on farm products and wages any more than we can keep flies out of a house by closing the doors but leaving the windows open.

We might ask them what our Government would do if a soldier or sailor, working 10 or more hours daily for $52 per month and risking his life, walked out of his job and refused to fight unless given more pay, shorter hours, and better living conditions, and why our Government allows the stay-at-homes, who receive many times that amount and work only 8 hours per day, to walk out of their jobs at will.

Perhaps we could help them to understand that threatening weather keeps people at home and that it does the same thing with the dollar—that no nation can make progress when its citizens are afraid of their government.

We must encourage free discussion, helpful criticism, and healthy ferment. They ultimately find expression in national leadership. That is the surest way to preserve liberty and insure the blessings of a free people.

These are just the plain, simple things that all of us might work for with some hope of accomplishment. After all it is the plain, simple things that make life worth living and the world worth living in.

Food for Our Army, Our Allies, and Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me before the food division of the Merchants and Manufacturers Association:

We had a farm problem back in the 1930's and it was very real. Today we have a "food problem" and it is very real, too. But there are some important characteristics that distinguished one from the other, and these ought to be clarified for those who persist in looking backward to conditions as they were a few years ago.

The farm problem of the 1930's was a composite picture of swirling dust storms, starving cattle, foreclosed mortgages, milk strikes, and migrant workers looking for work that was not to be had. It was also a picture of 30-cent corn, 5-cent cotton, and enormous surpluses of farm products. It was a nightmare for the farmers, but it hardly touched the rest of us for we still had plenty to eat.

The food problem, on the other hand, affects every one of us. From the farmer's standpoint it is a picture of shortages of labor, materials, and transportation—all of which tend to keep the farmer from producing more. From the standpoint of the Nation as a whole the picture is one of actual food shortages, rationing, and ever-increasing demands upon a food supply that is no longer

ample—a supply that is no more than adequate, even with careful management.

It is evident that we shall have a food problem rather than a farm problem for the duration. Last year food production exceeded all previous records, but there were no surpluses. Nobody knows how much food will be produced this year, but of one thing we can be sure—there will be no surpluses.

Most serious threat to food production in 1943 is the shortage of manpower. During the past year it is estimated that about half a million farmers went to war—that another million took jobs in war industries. And recent industries indicate that this trend is continuing. According to the Department of Agriculture figures the total number of workers on jobs January 1 was 8,171,000, including family and hired workers. This is the smallest number for any month since 1925.

The metal shortage has hit the farmers a terrific blow and the record food crop of 1942 was produced with fewer tractors, plows, cultivators, and other tools than they have heretofore had.

Transportation has been and continues to be a serious bottleneck. Submarines have made it tough for the coastwise ships, forcing them to travel in convoys; gasoline, tire, and driver shortages have eliminated thousands of trucks for the duration; and the railroads are now expected to cope with all this additional traffic.

Despite these handicaps, the farmers are being asked to produce more. This year the Department of Agriculture is asking for 122,000,000,000 pounds of milk—about the same as in 1942; for 25,700,000,000 pounds of meat—16 percent more; 28 percent more chicken meat and 15 percent more turkey meat; 8 percent more eggs. The acreage goals for vegetable-oil crops, feed grains, dry edible beans and peas and potatoes are higher.

Food that is produced must be distributed, and that immediately brings up the question of where it is to be distributed. Of course, it must be assumed from the start that the armed forces will have all the food they want, where they want it, and when they want it. But civilian supplies must be maintained, too, if this country is to be the arsenal of democracy. And we cannot leave our allies out of the picture. All three of these major drains upon our food supplies must be considered in the light of the total war effort.

The total quantities of food required for our armed forces cannot be disclosed; that would be information helpful to enemies always looking for a clue to our growing strength. But I can tell you that it takes nearly a ton of food a year for every soldier, sailor, and marine. It takes twice as much meat and dairy products as each man ate in civilian life. It takes energy foods and vitamins for the best-fed fighting men in the world. The armed forces are expanding at a rapid rate, too, and that means more and more food.

Thus far, civilians in this country have fared rather well. Coffee and sugar have been rationed but nobody has suffered. And our supplies of these foods have been very much larger than those of our allies. Now shortages of meat, butter, milk, and canned goods are cropping up. But supplies of these foods also have been much larger than those of our allies.

The problem of shortages must be dealt with first of all by rationing. It is only natural that we should shrink from the word "rationing," because this always has been the land of "surpluses." But under a rationing system, adequately administered, three desirable ends are attained. First, rationing divides the available supply in such a way that every consumer has a share—and rationing should go a long way toward eliminating the local shortages of foods that have been reported from various parts of the country. Second, it arrests undue consumption and waste. Third, it assures the Government that urgent food requirements will be met. Under a system of price control, and taking into consideration the current demand and supply situation, rationing of more foods is inevitable.

I have been making some inquiries about the food program and find that the Food Distribution Administration has established machinery for dealing with temporary local shortages. Under the plan, State and area food industry committees are being organized to receive and investigate complaints of shortages. Where the complaints are verified, the committees will arrange for the movement of supplies to the area affected.

Undoubtedly more needs to be known about the quantity and quality of foods required by civilians so that "shortages" can be properly measured—so that minimum food standards can be set up. Do we really know, for example, whether 13 pounds of butter per capita per year is enough for civilians? Do we know whether 1.8 pounds of meat per adult per week is enough, or should it be more?

During the depression years many people were out of work and reduced their food consumption to very low levels. They had to. But since they were not working—therefore using less energy—they were able to reduce food consumption without doing too much harm nutritionally. But the situation is different today. A large part of the population is busy in steel mills, aircraft factories, shipyards, and other war work. This brings up another question: Should laborers in defense factories, men who are doing the hardest kind of physical labor, be asked to maintain a diet at the same level as that of an office worker, say? Or should the patient in a hospital or other institution receive the same quantities of food as the office worker? We would all wish to avoid undue hardships on the part of the population.

It was my privilege yesterday to discuss this phase of the problem with Dr. Russell Wilder, a member of the staff at Mayo Clinic, who has been granted 6 months' leave of absence to carry on this wartime work for the Food Distribution Administration. Dr. Wilder comes to the Food Distribution Administration with many years of experience in the field of nutrition, and his work is expected to have an important bearing on the allocation of food among the armed forces, civilian population, and allies. I was glad to learn that he and his associates will focus on the nutritional problem the resources of outstanding workers in the field, rather than initiating research projects of their own.

Food waste will be seriously considered. It is known, for example, that food waste totals about 300 pounds a year per person, and that much of the waste consisted of fats, root vegetable tops, the outer stalks of celery, the outer leaves of lettuce, and the like. We all throw away foods of this kind in normal times, but these are not normal times and we must mend our ways. A new food conservation branch will work on this specific problem.

This branch also will promote substitution of less scarce foods for those unavailable for civilian consumption. We must learn that we can fight as well on codfish as on oysters, as well on cabbage as on artichoke, as well on skim milk as on cream. New foods are in the picture—vegetable proteins, for example. Mix soya or peanut flour in bread to the extent of 10 percent of the wheat flour and the protein value of the bread is increased four times. Mixed with pancake flour, soya flour makes one griddle cake as rich in protein as two used to be. In ground-meat products, even chemists cannot easily tell how much is meat and how much is soybean or peanut grits. Other foods will be developed as time goes by, for the civilian population must be fed.

The civilian population includes the school children, and the Food Distribution Administration, through its Civilian Programs Branch, will administer the school lunch program, together with other public food programs that may be developed. Millions of children over the United States have received school lunches made up in part of foods purchased through the Surplus Marketing Administration, and the results, measured in terms of health and happiness, have been worth while. Many who can afford plenty of wholesome food do not always realize that a growing child needs three full meals a day. It has been surprising to find, too, that millions of youngsters fail to drink enough milk and that a great many don't drink milk at all. So the school lunch and school milk programs should, for the conservation of health, be continued as long as possible.

But we must not forget that our allies must have food, too, even though there are people in this country who question the quantities of food we are shipping to the fighting fronts in Russia, Britain, India, and other parts of the world. It is all right to send food to our soldiers, these critics argue, but let those other fellows scratch for themselves.

The other night Raymond Gram Swing answered their argument effectively, I think. Mr. Swing said, "If anybody cares to argue against lend-lease as a means to a common victory, he really puts himself in the position of advocating that America win the war by itself. For example, if he should say, 'Don't send butter to Russia,' he would be saying, 'Don't strengthen the Russian soldier to fight the Nazis, but strengthen only our boys. Let our boys whip the Nazis.'" This expresses the basic principle of the lend-lease program. If our food will help lick the Axis, let's send the food.

How well are we doing in the way of feeding other nations resisting aggression? One pound of meat from every 10, 2 eggs from every dozen, 1 cup of milk from every gallon, 1 pound of cheese from every 4, 1 bale of cotton from every 12, less than 1 slice of bread from every loaf—these, very roughly, are the proportions of foodstuffs and other agricultural commodities that were purchased in 1942 to help supply the Allied Nations, our own war-threatened Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska, and the invasion victims and prisoners of war which the American Red Cross is assisting.

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of dehydrated foods in our overseas food program. Thousands of tons of shipping and storage space are saved by sending concentrated foods to our soldiers and allies abroad. Since most foods contain from 10 to 90 percent water, the removal of this water means that 1 ship carrying concentrated products can do the work of from 5 to 10 ships.

Nearly all the dehydrated food produced in the United States in 1942 went for Government requirements. Army purchases during the year are estimated at 50,000,000 pounds, and the Food Distribution Administration bought 350,000,000 pounds. Greatly increased quantities will be required by both the armed forces and the Food Distribution Administration in 1943.

Dehydration and the other forms of food processing required to carry on the total food program effectively makes it imperative that the Food Distribution Administration work closely with the processing industry, and the organization should be commended for setting up a processors branch to consider the day-to-day problems of processors and to do something about them.

I am also told that difficulties pertaining to critical materials and equipment, new processes, packages and containers, and expansion and conversion of plant facilities, will be handled by the facilities branch. One of the principal difficulties facing proc-

essors is that of getting materials. They may be willing and ready to embark on a job of egg drying, for example, and then not be able to obtain stainless steel. The facilities branch will act upon the request for priorities for this material; that is, the branch will decide whether the plant is needed, how much stainless steel is needed, and then pass its recommendations on to the War Production Board.

Wholesalers, retailers, brokers, restaurants, and other food distributors have troubles all their own and these will be handled by the wholesalers and retailers branch. This branch will work with industry advisory committees in presenting the total food program to them and will provide a central point of contact in Washington for all food distributors.

I also find that there is a Manpower Branch in Food Distribution Administration and that this agency will develop plans and programs for full utilization of manpower in the food industries and will help solve some of their manpower difficulties.

Any marketing program—and practically every other activity in the field of marketing—is dependent in one way or another on transportation. We must bring about more efficiency in the movement of farm goods and the Food Distribution Administration, through its Transportation and Warehousing Branch, must keep an eye on transportation problems in general—at least on those problems that have a bearing on food. The food produced and processed but unable to reach a seaport because of congested port facilities, can never help us or our allies win the war. Needless duplication of delivery routes in our cities constitutes an enormous drain on manpower, gasoline, and rubber.

Definite progress has been made in bringing about more equitable freight rates. In 1941 the railroads requested a 10-percent increase in all freight rates "in order to make it possible for them to get sufficient revenue to meet the 10-percent wage increase that had been granted their employees," but the Interstate Commerce Commission decided that the rates on agricultural products should be increased only 3 percent. Obtaining a 3-percent increase on farm products instead of the 10 percent asked for resulted in a saving of more than $50,000,000 a year in the transportation bill for farm products.

Last month the Department of Agriculture petitioned the Interstate Commerce Commission to eliminate the freight increases on agricultural products completely. The Commission has not yet acted on the request, but a hearing already has been held on the matter.

The Compliance Branch might be called the police department of the gumshoe office of the Food Distribution Administration. It will look into the matter of black markets and will otherwise act to prevent speculation, profiteering, holding, and fraud in all phases of the work on the Food Distribution Administration. It will administer the Commodity Exchange Act, and will set up accounting systems for agencies cooperating in Food Distribution Administration programs.

There are nine Commodity Branches with the responsibility for initiating and carrying out programs dealing with distribution economies, price support, procurement, and regulatory work. These branches already had charge of the administration of various regulatory statutes, including such acts as the Packers and Stockyards Act, Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act and the Cotton Futures Act. But the war emergency requires broad action so the Department, through these Commodity Branches, is expected to exercise a more rigid control of the food industry than is necessary in peacetime.

You of the food distribution business are in a vitally important position in the food program and I am confident you will do your part. In the solution of your problems you are entitled to ask the consideration which Food Distribution Administration and the Congress are expected to give those businesses with new and unexpected war obligations.

The Food Distribution Administration has a tremendously important mandate from the Government. There will be some grumbling about the food distribution program I have discussed here today, and I will probably do my share, but grumbling has always been America's right and privilege. In one sense it might be called the safety valve of democracy. In any event, as long as we grumble, but still cooperate with the war effort to the utmost, we can be sure that the state of the Nation is in a very good state indeed.

Views of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives on Price Subsidies to Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, there is widespread interest in the controversy over the proposal of Secretary Wickard to make incentive payments to farmers for the production of vital foodstuffs. Officials of leading farm organizations have insisted that the use of subsidies in place of fair prices in the market place be discarded. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a statement submitted on February 12 before an Appropriations Subcommittee by Ezra T. Benson, executive secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives:

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives is composed of farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative associations engaged in the marketing of farm products and purchasing of farm supplies. Our member organizations are distributed in all of the 48 States with farmer memberships in excess of 2,000,000 distributed in practically every county.

The council has repeatedly expressed itself officially in opposition to cash subsidies to farmers in lieu of a fair price in the market place. Our member organizations and individual farmer members have often expressed themselves in similar vein.

For several months the council had a committee on inflation studying farm prices and related problems. The Honorable John D. Miller, former president of the council, was chairman of the committee. In making a report to the delegate body in late September 1942, among other things, they said:

"Some suggest that the prices of food should be kept low, with farmers so subsidized by the Government that they can maintain and even expand production.

"Our answer to this is that in paying taxes to provide funds for such subsidies, the people are paying higher prices for food, the distinction being that they are paying in different proportions.

"Further than this, subsidies have a demoralizing effect as tending to make the beneficiaries more subservient to Government officials in order that 'thrift may follow fawning.'

"The vast majority of farmers abhor subsidies but insist that they should have living prices for their products.

"There is now a world shortage of foods, and although in this country because of several bumper-crop years there is a surplus of foods, one short-crop year may exhaust our present food reserves."

On the question of price ceilings and subsidies the most recent action of this council was that made jointly with the other national farm organizations. This policy is as follows:

"We reaffirm the position of our respective organizations in offering our fullest cooperation to the Government in carrying out sound means to prevent inflation.

"We again affirm our conviction that price ceilings on some war-essential agricultural commodities as presently applied, under the condition of agriculture's continued disparity with war industry and labor, discourages their production. This promotion of scarcity, in addition to threatening the Nation's food supply, releases inflationary forces of the most vicious character.

"We demand that whenever Government imposes agricultural price ceilings, its officers and agencies exercise their responsibility and authority to approve only such price ceilings as will neither discourage nor prevent increased production.

"Furthermore, we insist that the use of subsidies in place of fair prices in the market place be discarded."

For many years the relationship between agriculture and industry has been unfavorable to the farmer. During all of this period the Government has sympathetically endeavored to provide needed relief. We have not always approved the methods used, but the objectives, we believe in the main, were to offer constructive assistance to producers in their unfavorable relationship with other economic groups. However, farmers cannot understand the present insistence on the part of their Government for price subsidy programs in lieu of a fair price in the market, at a time when an increased production of food and fiber products is demanded and when consumers have the highest purchasing power of record. Farmers are fundamentally opposed, because of the very independence of their nature and the character of their occupation, to receive subsidies from their Government. In spite of the shortage of manpower, farm machinery, and other production supplies, and the multitudinous orders and regulations under the price-ceiling program, they are willing and anxious to produce to the maximum if they can only see their way clear to do so through a fair price for their products. They wonder why it is, with the present high purchasing power of consumers and the unprecedented Government debt, that the Government is not willing that they be paid for their products direct rather than through cash subsidies. Farmers do not want inflation, but they do feel they are entitled to a price which will assure maximum production of food and fiber so badly needed in our war effort.

We believe that this committee and the Seventy-eighth Congress are in a position to do more to build the much needed morale among farmers in this country and restore faith in the democratic processes of our Nation than has been true for many years. Farmers will respond wholeheartedly to sound and vigorous leadership.

The following excerpt from a letter received this week from one of the prominent cooperative managers of the country is typical of the many which reach us in almost every mail:

"While the shortage of manpower and production supplies is most critical, I am certain that the delay in Office of Price Administration orders, also the general feeling by producers that Office of Price Administration price ceilings do not reflect comparable returns with industry and labor, is doing more than any other factor to discourage farm production and jeopardize our Nation's future

food supply. Farmers are definitely opposed to subsidies and believe that consumers should pay fair prices for farm commodities, especially in view of the highest purchasing power in the history of our country.

"I just wish you could sense the rising sentiment among farm people against the bureaucrats at Washington. It seems to me the hope of our country lies through this reaction, which I trust will bring sufficient pressure upon Congress to stop the efforts of the Washington social reformers who are using the war as an excuse to further their pet theories."

The food outlook is not encouraging. Records show that for 6 consecutive years 1937–42 the aggregate yields of crops per acre in the United States exceeded any year in history prior to this period. We, of course, all hope for a continuation of the recent record-breaking crops, but such a hope is not a safe basis for wartime planning. This is especially true in view of the shortages of farm labor and machinery and the extremely favorable yields during recent years.

We believe that farmers do not want cash subsidies and it is our recommendation that they be eliminated. We believe that the price-control act of October 2, 1942, should be enforced and that modifications which the act provides should be made in maximum prices "in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes." Prices, we believe, should be established without delay at levels that will stimulate the production of essential foods. We believe that guaranteed favorable minimum prices will be more easily understood by farmers and are likely to be more effective than the more complicated incentive payments. We believe there is no adequate economic justification for the general use of subsidies and that these should be eliminated together with acreage controls. Unless this is done, we believe that we will, in large measure, fall in our food-production program. This may cause us to lose the war, or at least, delay victory.

Air Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Senate Concurrent Resolution 16 adopted by the Fiftieth General Assembly of Iowa:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 16

Whereas the Congress of the United States has before it for consideration House bill 1012 and Senate bill 246 affecting air commerce; and

Whereas air commerce (air lines) represents a minor part of civil aviation and private flying and fixed base operations represent a major part of civil aviation whose operations are not interstate in character and therefore are of no concern of the Federal Government, the pending legislation would deny to the States their inherent rights to govern within their own State and would seriously jeopardize private flying and fixed base operations; and

Whereas by applying the intent of this legislation to other forms of transportation our national economy would be seriously affected; and

Whereas there is no immediate need for this legislation as the President of the United States is vested with full power under the Defense Act to regulate all aircraft, civilian or otherwise, if necessary; and

Whereas those men who are serving their country in the various branches of service are unable to voice their sentiments or opinions on this proposed legislation at this time, and they are the persons who have contributed more to the development of aviation and are entitled to their place in aeronautics when and if they return from active duty; and

Whereas, there is ample time for such legislation to be considered in the future since consideration has not been given future developments and improvements which will change methods now used in the regulation of aircraft: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the State Legislature of Iowa respectfully requests that no action be taken on the above-mentioned bills or any similar bill or bills by Congress until the present war is over and peace is established; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Clerk of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the clerk of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of Congress and to each of the Iowa Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Address Before Lithuanian Allied Organizations of Western Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. SCANLON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following address delivered by me to the Lithuanian Allied Organizations of Western Pennsylvania on the occasion of their twenty-fifth anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, on Sunday, February 14, 1943:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I accepted with a great deal of pleasure your kind invitation to come here today to address you. I have many close personal friends in the Lithuanian Community of Pittsburgh and I see many of them in this gathering here before me. The Lithuanian-Americans of Pittsburgh, as individuals, and as a group, have always been among our City's most valuable citizens. I consider it an honor to have been asked to come here to address you on this the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Proclamation of Lithuanian Independence. It is just 25 years since the Council of Vilnius issued its historic Pronouncement proclaiming the reconstitution of Lithuania as an independent democratic republic. Modern Lithuania and all her sovereign rights, and all her magnificent national, cultural, commercial, and industrial advancement stem from that famous declaration. What the Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776, is to Americans, the Declaration of February 16, 1918, is to Lithuanians.

February 16, 1918 marked the end of a tragic era. It marked the end of 150 years of oppression and national humiliation. It marked the successful end of a magnificent struggle by a proud valiant people to throw off the yoke which for heart-breaking decades bound them in national serfdom. It marked the day of triumph which enabled them to stand forth in their true guise—a nation of free men—Lithuanians.

February 16, 1918 was the turning point in the modern history of your ancient country's existence. All true friends of Lithuania exulted in her triumph and looked forward confidently to her future. It was the dawn of the new day and the people and the leaders of Lithuania went forth to rebuild their cherished land with pride in her ancient greatness and with boundless confidence in her ability to take her proper place among the nations of the world.

For 22 years thereafter Lithuania's national policy was that of peaceful collaboration with other countries. She became a member of the League of Nations. She established good neighbor relations with Germany. She signed a peace treaty with Soviet Russia. She was instrumental in bringing about the signing of the treaty of the Baltic Entente with Latvia and Estonia. She worked persistently to improve her relations with Poland. All that Lithuania desired from her neighbors and from the nations of the world in general was their good will and the right to be left in peace in order to advance her own national development.

For 22 years the citizens of Lithuania and Lithuania's sons and daughters of Lithuanian Descent all over the world worked long and hard to reestablish the prestige of the old country. Her leaders strove to improve the economic situation. The ancient language was revived and developed. Enlightened agricultural laws were passed and land ownership reform was inaugurated. Commerce and industry were developed. The country prospered. Modern Lithuania had risen again to a place in the world where she matched her former high position of ancient times. It was a nation of which all of you—all of us—could be proud and Lithuanians and the friends of Lithuanians were justly proud of Lithuania.

Then came the tragic events of 1940. The proud little Baltic Nation saw her prized independence and all her hard-won economic and cultural development snatched from her once again by a powerful aggressor. In a certain sense this is a sad occasion we are celebrating today. We are celebrating today the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Lithuania's Independence at a time when the cause of a free and independent Lithuania seems as hopeless as it was in those dark days when those 20 heroes of Vilnius set their pens to the ringing proclamation of 1918 that the Independent State of Lithuania, founded on democratic principles, was an existing fact that the world would have to deal with in the future. These are indeed hard times for Lithuania. The terrible events of 1940, 1941, and 1942 have brought again to your fatherland the old, old story of black oppression and blood and tears, but there is nothing final or irrevocable in this present situation. Dark days are no novelty to Lithuania or to the Lithuanian People. The lesson of the Past is still before us. Lithuania in the past has proved not once, but a dozen times, that her people could not and would not be subjugated and could not and would not be enslaved by warring neighbors. A nation which has courageously in the face of stupendous odds battled through the centuries against one powerful nation after another without yielding one single solitary inch in its determination to be free can and will rise again.

No student of history, no one who has read or been told of the indomitable struggle of the Lithuanian people for truth and liberty can have anything but the most sincere admiration for and confidence in the people of your Baltic Nation. No one can doubt your eventual triumph over the present oppressors of your country. Lithuania will rise from these days of blood and strife and will strike

down those who have sought to bind her and will stand forth once more as a free people.

My friends, I have no hesitancy in standing before you as a prophet today and declaring that the day is not far off when the present oppressor of the Lithuanian people shall be beaten and ground into the dust and that Lithuania, a free republic, a liberated Democracy, will once more take her proud place among the nations of the world.

Remember the ancient Lithuanian motto: "Be what may, Lithuania will always stay." Long live Lithuania!

Creation of a Civil Aviation Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me yesterday to extend my remarks on the subject of civil aviation, H. R. 1012, and the importance of creating a standing committee in the House to consider legislation relating to civil aviation, I submit the following:

As one who earnestly advocates the creation of a standing committee to consider legislation affecting civil aviation, I want to say that this is not a new idea on my part. In the opening weeks of the Seventy-sixth Congress I submitted a resolution asking for the creation of such a committee. I state this to indicate that it is not my thought that this committee should be created primarily to deal with post-war aviation.

I would like to direct the attention of the Members of the House to H. R. 1012 and to the Report 124 which accompanies this bill. H. R. 1012 was introduced on January 11 by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This bill proposes to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended. I had assumed, and so advised interested constituents, that hearings were not likely to be held on this bill until the decision had been made by the House as to the need of creating a committee on civil aviation. I found I was in error when I returned to Washington last Monday, after spending 3 days in my district. I learned that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee had reported this bill out favorably the previous Saturday. The brief hearings on this important bill were held by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on the very days that the Rules Committee was holding hearings on House Resolution 23, asking for the creation of the Committee on Civil Aeronautics.

The first two or three pages of Report 124 advances arguments in favor of leaving aviation legislation under control of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. There seems to be something about aviation that gets into one's bloodstream. The subject is so challenging, and once one gets interested in it, it is extremely difficult to forget it. I can well understand that the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee who have been dealing with aviation legislation would desire to continue their activity. However, I do believe that this subject is so broad and of such great importance to the country that it deserves and should have the full attention of a standing committee of the House.

Pages 4, 5, and 6 of Report 124 contain, in my humble opinion, one of the strongest arguments that can be advanced for the creation of this proposed committee.

It is proposed in H. R. 1012 that the Civil Aeronautics Board carry on a continuing study of aviation development, with a view of formulating "a national policy for civil aeronautics," and that this Board shall, once a year for the next 5 years, report back to Congress its recommendations. This, I believe, is continuing a dangerous practice that has grown up in our Federal Government during the past few years. We hear a good deal of criticism of the bureaus and bureaucrats downtown, but in this act we propose to strengthen at least one bureau—the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Is there any reason why a committee of Congress should not hold hearings and, as a result of these hearings and study, formulate a national policy for civil aeronautics? Why should not a committee of Congress hear representatives of airplane-engine manufacturers, of air-line operators, of airplane manufacturers, of civilian private flyers, and the aviation commissioners from the several States? If we could secure testimony from this group, the Congress itself could formulate its own policy.

I do not know that anyone has criticized the way the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has dealt with aviation in this country. I know many representatives of large units of the aviation industry have said that the 1938 act was a life saver for the industry, but I also know that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is one of the most important and busiest committees in Congress. In one session of Congress it may bring out an important railroad bill; in another session it can bring out an important bill relating to inland waterways and perhaps in a third session, something dealing with our communications system. The aviation industry has grown to such a size and is now of such importance that it actually needs just about the full attention of a substantial number of men in this House, and I am sure we would have no difficulty in finding at least 15 men who would be willing to undertake the needed study and who would devote their best efforts to aiding in the growth of aviation.

If such a committee is set up, it may not be long before the new committee would decide that matters relating to rate making should be considered by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. In the not too distant future I would personally like to see the relationship between the proposed Aviation Committee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee about the same as that which exists between the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fishery Committee.

I am not going to take the time today to discuss, section by section, the provisions of H. R. 1012, but I would like to point out that several of our State aviation commissioners feel that the adoption of this bill, as reported by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, would seriously interfere with the proper State control of purely intrastate flying. On my desk I have a letter signed by Thomas H. Lockhart, Commissioner of Aeronautics for the State of Connecticut, in which he states:

> A hearing should be afforded all parties that would be affected by bills such as these (H. R. 1012 and S. 246).

He further states:

> These bills would extend Federal control over all air space and infringe upon the sovereign rights of the States.

I am sure no member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee would deny that H. R. 1012 raises a serious constitutional question—a question that should have serious consideration by both the House and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

It will doubtless be argued, when House Resolution 23 is under consideration, that we have too many committees in the House of Representatives now. That may be true but, if true, certainly progressive steps should not be rejected simply because a needed corrective measure has not been taken. I am thoroughly convinced that the establishment of a standing committee on civil aeronautics in this House will have a very definite advantageous psychological effect on the whole aviation industry in all of its separate branches throughout the United States.

In closing, may I urge upon every Member of the House to contact whatever representative of this great industry he has in his district and obtain from him an opinion as to the importance and advisability of creating the proposed new committee.

With these remarks I submit an editorial by Al Williams, one of the greatest flyers the United States has as yet produced:

IT'S A JOB FOR CONGRESS

(By Al Williams)

A recent report speaks of "supersecret meetings * * * to plan a tremendous expansion in world-wide air routes." Prominent in these supersecret meetings to determine who is going to run what international air line, and where, were Lord Halifax, representing Great Britain; officials of our State Department and Army and Navy air-cargo divisions, and air-line officials (headed by smart, suave, Pan-American Airways president Juan Trippe).

Did it ever occur to anyone that these supersecret meetings are dealing with business that belong essentially to Congress?

International air line rights, routes and privileges for the post-war period are the foundation for control of the post-war political and economic world. We now are standing at approximately the same position in history as those empire builders some centuries ago who laid out sailing-ship trade routes.

Examine the commercial and financial interests involved in the allocation of international air lines.

The present air-cargo transportation system, now carrying essential munitions, has been wholly underwritten as a war project. Will the results of this underwriting be turned over to our own commercial interests, carte blanche, to be operated as profit-earning enterprises?

Another pressing problem which must be solved is just which of the American air lines now operating over British-owned territory, or from and to British-owned air bases, will the United States relinquish after the war? These are problems which must be solved by Congress. And it seems logical that Congress should be in the deals being planned now.

When this war ends there will be no sale of carloads of military planes as there was in 1918. There will be thousands and thousands of bombers that can be readily converted to cargo-carrying planes, to say nothing of the additional thousands of cargo planes.

It is all very well for the big business interests to meet now and as many times as they please to discuss and plan the post-war aviation world, but it seems essential that a specially authorized committee of Congress should be devoting its full time and ability to representing the rights of the American people in the coming postwar air age.

The air scramble is on and Congress should be right in there pitching. The mightiest factor in postwar international relations will be air transportation, and that is essentially the business of the Nation.

Implementing the Atlantic Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech delivered by me before the Foreign Policy Association of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia, February 13, 1943:

Probably at no time in the history of this country has our Congress faced so grave a responsibility as confronts it today. In the Revolutionary War we fought to create the Union. In the Civil War, we fought to preserve the Union, and in this war, as in the last war, we are in my opinion, fighting to extend the Union.

Now don't misunderstand me. I am not saying this as an imperialist. For the Atlantic Charter, to which I subscribe, forbids territorial aggrandizement. Nor am I saying it as an advocate of so-called Union Now. For I don't believe in any union forged in the stress of war. I'm saying it as, I hope, a realist who believes that the united efforts of the United Nations should not be confined to the war but should be carried on into the peace. Which means that our Congress has in effect assumed international responsibilities, the sound handling of which is bound to affect the whole future of the world and not this Nation alone.

The current Congress has been called the Victory Congress. It is my pious prayer that it will indeed be the Victory Congress. But victory means peace and the solution of the problems of peace are by the very nature of things far more difficult than the solution of the more forthright problems of war.

While I can't speak for Congress in this regard, I can, as a Member, speak with some authority of it—and certainly I can give you the conclusions and the program of an active Congressman.

In the first place, if you agree with me that the problems confronting us are world problems, that the local, or shall we say national, and international problems are so interwoven as to be almost indistinguishable; if you agree with me that this war is being fought to extend the union of peoples everywhere, then I think you will agree with me that the first step Congress should take to handle this world situation is to set its own house in order.

I hate to use the term "streamline" because it has so often been abused, but it does seem to me that in these days when the leaders of nations cross continents and oceans in a few hours to confer, and when events happen with breath-taking rapidity, the first job Congress faces in preparing itself to function for modern democray is to streamline its own organization.

I tell you that if representative government is to be preserved and the powers of a parliament under the modern tempo are to be retained, Congress must be prepared to function rapidly. The alternative is the granting of extraordinary powers to the Executive in order to save time in a so-called emergency. And that is not the democratic process.

Nor is the speed of current war events a temporary emergency, my friends. It is permanent. It is the future whether in war or peace. In the last war we thought we had done a monumental job if we marched 12 or 15 miles a day. Today, in battle, an advance of 50 miles is commonplace, with motorized and air-borne troops. We read that almost daily in the papers.

Democracy must be streamlined if it is to hold its own. Nor need it lose one iota of its democratic effectiveness in the process. On the contrary it will increase it. The basic trouble in Congress is that its committee structure, its procedure, in fact its very modus operandi, are paced at a tempo 150 years old.

You may well ask what all this has to do with implementing the Atlantic Charter?

Well, let me say this my friends—if our Congress isn't set to the modern tempo, if it isn't prepared to move with speed, the victory is going to find us left at the post when peace is signed, and the Atlantic Charter will become merely a memory.

Now, as to the Atlantic Charter—if some of you have been as confused as I occasionally have been as to what is involved therein, I think it would bear a brief review before I suggest how to implement it.

In the first place, remember that beyond military necessity, it is the only document signed by all the United Nations, which expresses any concrete peace aims whatsoever.

In the second place, its principles were first enunciated by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill in a battleship conference off the coast of Newfoundland on August 14, 1941, before the United States of America had entered the war—that is almost 4 months before Pearl Harbor. It was proclaimed by us in time of peace. It has since been signed by 29 nations, four of the most important on January 1, 1942—that is to say, the United States of America, Great Britain, China, and Russia. The most recent to adhere were Iraq and Brazil.

And finally it is not to be confused with the Four Freedoms contained in a speech by President Roosevelt in this country although two of the four freedoms—freedom from fear, and freedom from want, are contained in the charter.

The charter itself contains eight points. And for the purpose of the conclusion of my speech, I would like to review them.

1. No territorial aggrandizement.

2. No territorial changes without the consent of the peoples involved freely expressed.

3. The right of all peoples to choose their own government, with sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

4. With due respect to existing obligations all nations to have access to trade and raw materials needed for economic prosperity.

5. Fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved labor standards, economic adjustment, and social security. (This is, of course, freedom from want.)

6. After final destruction of the Nazi tyranny the establishment of a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries and will provide assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want. (Freedom from both fear and want here definitely expressed.)

7. Such a peace to enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

8. All of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as for spiritual reasons to abandon the use of force. And since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten or may threaten aggression outside of their own frontiers that pending establishment of a wider and more permanent system of general security the disarmament of such nations is essential and that the signatories will aid and encourage all other practical measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

That is the Atlantic Charter. Verbiage, I have heard it said. Of course, it is verbiage as it stands. In spite of 29 or more signatories. But it contains the framework of the future. It is shall we say a signed letter of intent as the basis for a future contract. And if you believe in it, as I do, and as I believe most Members of Congress do, what should be the first steps to be taken by our own Congress to make it effective?

It stands to reason, of course, that much of it will have to be implemented after victory. It stands to reason, also, that some of it, so far as this country is concerned, is self-evident. For instance, it has been a constant and open policy of this country for nearly 50 years not to seek territorial aggrandizement. This takes care of point No. 1, so far as we are concerned. The so-called Kellogg-Briand pact, subsequently reiterated by Secretaries Stimson and Hull, also established as our foreign policy that this Nation would not recognize territory taken by aggression in violation of existing agreements. That takes care of the second point, so far as we are concerned.

But there are certain things that can be done now. And there is one first step in this connection which I consider all important.

You will remember that during the last war President Wilson enunciated 14 famous points as the basis for future peace. Our allies generally adhered to them. The United States of America through the Congress which had not been consulted alone held out. I don't want this to happen again.

I call upon President Roosevelt to present to the Congress now his own legislative program for implementing the Atlantic Charter. Delay on this score might well prove disastrous. Not that I think Congress will be found in the end obstructionist. On the contrary. But because history has proven that ignorance has all too often caused fatal fumbling of the ball. The President has given us an Atlantic Charter. Let him now give us an American Charter, which will specify our own contribution to the cause.

In the meantime there are some things which I believe the Congress can itself initiate in this regard. I offer them to you as suggestions—as action which I myself advo-

cate as a sincere supporter of the Atlantic Charter.

I have already covered the first two points in the charter. The third point must wait until after victory except for the declaration of intent contained in the charter. We are in no position to guarantee such things until we have won the war.

But there is a contribution we can make here and now to placing ourselves in a position to making such a guaranty. That is to winning the war. The Congress can and must renew the so-called lend-lease laws, now up for renewal. And I believe I am safe in saying that they will do so—and promptly.

On the fourth point Congress will shortly be called upon to take a very definite and vitally important stand. I'm speaking now of the right of all nations to have access to trade and raw materials needed for economic prosperity. Sometime in April probably the Congress will be asked to renew the reciprocal trade agreements we now have with various nations of the world. It is my considered opinion that should we fail to renew these agreements we will be creating inevitably causes for future conflict. It may sound strange for a member of the Republican Party, popularly or perhaps unpopularly known as the high-tariff group, to come out for these agreements. But remember that the origin of the Republican tariff policy was tariff for protection of infant industries, and it is my conviction that my party will return to first principles on this point and will support the renewal of these trade agreements, which in fact are in no way necessarily a contradiction to Republican tariff policy. Certainly I will support their renewal.

As to point five, which involves improved labor conditions and social security there is much I could say, if I had the time, and there is much Congress can do, if it will, and it is my firm conviction that it should. On the first score, that of labor, and I am on the Labor Committee of the House, and was the Labor Party, as well as the Republican Party candidate in the last election—let me say this—that I have supported in the past and shall continue to support in the future American labor's hard and often heartbreaking struggle to achieve a proper and profitable position in the American social structure. I have opposed and shall continue to oppose all raids on labor's hard-won rights. But I am most earnestly convinced and shall act accordingly that the only guarantee of improved labor conditions in this country is for Congress to require and labor to accept corporate responsibility in the same way that every membership organization in our community accepts it—with all that such responsibility implies. I believe that Congress should act in this session to require such responsibility, which I am sure would cure all alleged existing labor evils. And that Congress should correspondingly defeat all reactionary attempts to otherwise harass American labor.

That increased social security is not only important to world peace but to our own economy and the preservation of the system under which we have so long prospered seems to me self-evident. I have studied the so-called Beveridge plan, introduced for consideration in Great Britain, and I believe it to b excellent—for Great Britain. It is well worth our studying here. But I submit that plans which are pertinent to comparatively small areas like the British Isles, Denmark, and Norway cannot be successfully applied without wide change and adaptation in so vast an area as the United States of America, where living costs vary so widely. No simple Federal yardstick is going to work equitably. Some system of home rule devolving upon the States must in my opinion be worked out. I believe that Congress in this connection can and should set up a commission to report as promptly as possible on this problem—a commission to include not only Members of Congress but recognized authorities from various sections of the country.

Action on point No. 6 can in part be immediate and must in part be postponed until after victory. This is the point involving freedom from fear—that is the threat of future wars. Immediate action can certainly be taken by Congress in this connection by amending the Selective Service Act to provide permanent military training for all our young men for at least a year in certain age groups, thereby serving notice on the world that in cooperation with the United Nations or without we are prepared to preserve the peace by force if necessary. I advocate such action by Congress. We have already served notice that in building a two-ocean navy we have this in mind. And Congress is now considering a special civil aviation committee, which I sincerely hope it creates, as a source of peace protection.

You may say that such a suggestion nullifies the eighth point of the Charter which looks to reduction in armament. This is not true. Local police forces are often reduced, obviously should be reduced as State and national police protection is increased. So our national armed forces can and should be reduced as soon as a permanent international police force is set up. And I am not advocating a large standing Army—but a large reserve force—which has been a definite American policy too often ignored.

I have omitted point No. 7—the freedom of the seas. That has been an American policy since the War of the Revolution. I think it is covered by our gradual creation of a two-ocean Navy this Congress has already acted upon.

In conclusion I can only add this. We are on the road to victory, which means that we are on the road to peace. How permanent that peace is to be depends not only on me and my colleagues as Members of Congress, but on you as citizens of the greatest and strongest Nation on this earth. Your active support or your active disapproval are paramount in the problems that confront us. I'm not begging any question. I am saying that, if you do not crystallize your opinions and express your desires, your Representatives in Congress, whatever their vision, will be feeling their way in the dark. National sovereignty we need not, we must never yield. National sacrifices both for our own permanent benefit and for the welfare of the world we are going to have to make. As I heard a young Harvard valedictorian say at Cambridge less than a year ago, on this very subject:

"A peace to be durable must be endurable."

Not only Congress and the United Nations but you and I and all men and women of good will must see to it that at long last we obtain and maintain a peace that is both durable and endurable.

Feeds for Livestock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, adopted by the Fiftieth General Assembly of Iowa:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 8

Whereas stock feeders in Iowa are finding it difficult and in many cases impossible to obtain oil meal, cottonseed meal, soybean meal, tankage, and similar feeds so necessary in feeding and finishing livestock for market; and

Whereas where available these must generally be purchased, if at all, at increasingly exorbitant prices in mixtures and compounds generally known as commercial stock foods; and

Whereas the difficulty in obtaining these necessary feed substances, at reasonable prices in the usual forms, is seriously slowing down and discouraging the production of meat so necessary to the war effort; and

Whereas it is being commonly asserted and believed that this situation does not arise from an actual shortage of these products so much as by manipulation and preferences which might be prevented and removed by national authority: Be it, therefore

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Iowa (the house of representatives concurring), That we call upon the Congress of the United States to institute such investigation of this subject as may be necessary to determine the fact and fix blame, if any, and pass legislation, if any is required, to correct the situation complained of; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of Agriculture and to each member of the Iowa delegation in Congress.

It Is Not Less, But More, Production We Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the provision of this bill that will permit farmers to feed excess wheat to their own livestock and poultry without the payment of penalty. I also trust the provision permitting corn grown in excess of the program to be made into ensilage without penalty will be approved.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried on prior occasions to secure the adoption and passage of similar legislation. The House committee did not see fit to support me. It is gratifying at least to see the commitee bring this legislation to the floor with apparently little opposition from its membership.

This thing of requiring a farmer to pay 49 cents a bushel on so-called excess wheat that he feeds to his own livestock and chickens does not now and never did make good sense. I do not think you will find very many farmers who favor that feature of the law. It is a matter that has caused more dissatisfaction among farmers generally than almost anything else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to go one step further. My amendment would repeal that portion or section of the law that requires a farmer to pay a penalty to the Government on wheat grown in

excess of the quota assigned him by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency. At present the penalty is 49 cents per bushel. This year, I am informed, it will be more, possibly 54 or 56 cents; this by reason of increase in prices.

My amendment does not limit the present law with respect to other subsidy payments or benefits. In other words, a farmer who chooses to raise a little more grain than the limit set by the A. A. A. will not have to pay a penalty; and he will not, however, receive soil conservation payments, 85-cent parity loans, or insurance benefits. The latter should be penalty enough under the A. A. A. program. I have fixed it this way so that I may not be charged with crippling the farm program. I think it is pretty severe to penalize a producer for raising a little extra grain in these times.

Mr. Speaker, Government agencies are fixing ceiling prices on wheat products. Prices and quotas are being placed on meats and other foods. Then another agency limits the production of food by imposing penalties.

Mr. Speaker, in my State of Kansas, in 1941, the farmers were required to pay penalties in the sum of $5,194,822 for raising too much wheat. The money was put in escrow. Since then about $2,000,000 has been refunded where farmers reduced their production to make up for it. Last year the Government collected about $763,000, of which $40,000 has, thus far, been refunded. I do not have the figures for all the States, but it is estimated to be about five times these amounts.

Mr. Speaker, our Government and countries in other parts of the world are asking for more and more food. People across the seas are in want at this present hour. We are bound to come up short within the year. Some will say that at present we have a surplus of wheat. If so, it is a good backlog. One year's crop failure, under our present demands, would wipe out all our surplus. When this crisis is over, the demand will be greater than ever. Our allies are asking us to increase our supplies and we have agreed to do it.

Mr. Speaker, it does not make very good sense to tell the farmer he must produce more food with less help and less machinery, and hold prices down, and then say if he exceeds a goal on this most important food, he should be penalized for doing it. That is not the American way of doing things. If there ever was a reason for doing the sort of thing that was done in the past, that reason or excuse is gone now. Prices were exceedingly low when these things were put into effect. Food was abundant. Not so now.

Mr. Speaker, our food supplies are dwindling every day. The demands on the farmers and producers are going to press harder from week to week. The American farmer has a tremendous responsibility right now. He will meet that challenge, notwithstanding the handicaps that confront him. You can bank on that. Mr. Speaker, all the American farmer asks for is a square deal and somewhere near an even break. Why not give it to him?

Forty-eight-Hour Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARD JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. WARD JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, once more Congress has been bypassed by the executive department of the Government by the issuance of a law at the direction of the Chief Executive, compelling employers to work their employees 48 hours per week and pay them time and a half above 40 hours.

With the British working more than 50 hours a week, and workers on the continent of Europe working even longer, and the Japanese exceeding the longest European workweek, this order extending hours of work was welcomed by the people of the Nation.

Such a law, however, should have been enacted by Congress and should have been surrounded by some exceptions that would overcome the dangers that have arisen because of the order as made.

In the first place, the order applies to all employers and not to just those engaged in war work. Secondly, it is highly inflationary as it increases the wages of employees now working 40 hours a week 30 percent and will greatly add to the cost of production, to the Nation's terrific war bill, and the taxpayers' stupendous burden.

In addition, this order means that many more so-called small businesses must close. Their overhead cost of doing business will be so increased that they cannot stay in business, because the price of the merchandise or services that they sell to the consumer is controlled and there is no indication of any raising of these ceilings on the part of the O. P. A.

The increase in hours per week should have been made with the provision that the workers would get the same rate of pay for the additional hours that they were already getting for 40 hours. Then in cases where these rates of pay are too low they could be increased, but there is no reason today for penalizing any employer by making him pay time and a half because he works his employees more than 40 hours per week.

We have a great shortage of manpower and the penalty clause in the 40-hour-week law was to spread employment and discourage the employers from working any employees more than 40 hours per week.

This problem should be given immediate attention by Congress and a law enacted at the earliest possible date, overruling the Executive order increasing the workweek to 48 hours with time and a half above 40 hours. The workers are willing to work these additional hours and few of them will request a 50 percent bonus for each additional hour they work. They are too patriotic to make such a request during these wartimes, when the Federal debt is rising to such extremes that it cannot possibly be paid off for many generations.

An excellent editorial on this question appeared a few days ago in the Long Beach Press-Telegram, of Long Beach, Calif., and I recommend the same to every Member of this Congress.

The editorial follows:

BUSINESS FIGHTS FOR LIFE

For the first time in the 10 years of its domineering existence the New Deal bureaucracy at Washington is forced to fight for its life, and it is about time, for, unless the bureaucracy is killed or curbed, American business will be killed.

It is literally and demonstrably true that the life of the business of this country is at stake in the battle now being fought under the dome of the Capitol in Washington, and the meal tickets of America's millions of workers also are at stake, for without business there would be no jobs.

This is the issue in the impending struggle of which an advance skirmish was fought yesterday in the House of Representatives with the adoption of two resolutions to give Congress, composed of the elected spokesmen of the American people, the means of resisting the march of bureaucracy whose aim is overthrow of the constitutional and representative government inherited by Americans of this generation from their forefathers, and the substitution for it of a government of administrative decrees, all having the evident purpose of destroying individual business enterprise and putting in its place an American New Deal version of totalitarianism.

Fortunately, the American people last year sensed the bureaucratic drift toward a species of totalitarianism and with their votes in the congressional election in November 1942, registered a protest and an awakened determination to stop the bureaucrats' encroachments and to restore the constitutional processes of government. The membership of the House as now constituted has a strong antibureaucracy majority, though some of the Members of the majority are Republican and some Democratic in party affiliation.

This all-American majority yesterday voted 294 to 50 to adopt the proposal by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, old-school Democrat of Virginia, to create a special committee, of which SMITH will be chairman, with authority to investigate every action, regulation and directive by any executive agency of Government.

In particular, the committee will have the power to inquire into the question of what statutory authority, if any, there was for the recent directive requiring compulsory time-and-a-half overtime pay for hours of labor above 40 hours a week. The committee may—and should—conduct investigations throughout the United States.

Business interests in all parts of the country should demand congressional investigations, for unless they stand up and fight soon for their economic lives, they and the American system of free enterprise are doomed.

The establishment of a 48-hour working week repeatedly has been urged by this newspaper and by the American press generally for many months. It is a war necessity that workers in war industries work longer than 40 hours a week, and Economic Stabilization Director Byrnes' recent order of a 48-hour week was a step forward, but it is too rigid in its indiscriminate application to business and industry, regardless of war needs, and it is wrong and dangerous in its provision that hours worked over 40 hours a week shall be paid at the rate of time and a half.

Addition of 8 hours to a working week of 40 hours and payment for the additional 8 hours of labor at the rate of time and a half

is a 30 percent increase of labor costs. It is an impossible burden for many institutions.

Many businesses have been compelled by war conditions to quit. A 30-percent increase of labor costs will force many more to quit. They will not be able to meet an overstuffed pay roll. They will close up shop, not because they want to, but because they have to, and their contribution to the Nation's economic life will cease, their workers will be thrown out of employment.

A consideration that should appeal to all responsible officials charged with the duty of financing the Government's war effort is the heavy loss of Government revenue that results when business institutions paying high income taxes are driven out of existence. Every business house that has to close its doors is cutting down the Nation's win-the-war fund.

This battle concerns every business house in the country and all of the men and women dependent upon business for a living. They are urged to get into the fight before it is too late and back up their Congressmen on the firing line in Washington—the Congressmen who are struggling to save this country from bureaucrats who never were elected to office by the people and never had to meet a pay roll.

Production of War Material in Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Senate of the State of Missouri:

Senate Resolution 26

Whereas many Missouri communities are faced with dire economic distress and virtual abandonment due to the failure of national governmental agencies to use the natural resources and manpower of great areas of our State in the war program to the end that our population and economy be stabilized; providing employment near the homes of our people and thereby preventing the current migration of our population to the metropolitan areas where they are now being drawn by lucrative positions in war plants concentrated in those areas; and

Whereas there are no governmental installations in the whole northern section of the State of Missouri and only four in the southern section, thereby leaving an area greater than that of any of the New England States with the exception of Maine, and having a population greater than that of at least four States in the Union, without any governmental installation of any kind; and

Whereas such Government contracts and installations in the war program in the State of Missouri have been concentrated in the metropolitan areas of St. Louis and Kansas City, the skilled labor from these inland sections has been taken from our communities and farms to live in crowded and less wholesome env'ronmental conditions causing acknowledged housing shortages and because of such concentrations resulting in increased living costs and the needless disruption of homes, thereby increasing the social problems in these metropolitan areas; and

Whereas the facts disclose that by every comparison our sister States have been more favored than the State of Missouri as for example:

In the dollar valuation of war contracts per dollar of manufacturing activity in the States as of 1939 Kansas was awarded contracts in the amount of $16.39 for every dollar of manufacturing activity which she had before the war. Nebraska received contracts equivalent to $6.38 for every previous dollar that she had in manufacturing before the war. Arkansas received $6.06. Oklahoma received $6.02. But Missouri received contracts equivalent to only $2.91.

In the all-over value of war contracts thus far awarded the national per capita average is $710.85. Our sister to the west, Kansas, has received from a bounteous Government in war contracts a per capita average of $1,083.21 as compared with a per capita average in Missouri with her two large cities included of $452.24.

As of September 30, 1943, war contracts had so changed the rank of our States in their relative manufacturing positions that we find Kansas advanced 15 places in the rank of manufacturing among the States.

Oklahoma has bettered her position six places among the 48 States, Arkansas and Nebraska likewise are in an improved rank and though Missouri has always been farther advanced in manufacturing than any of these she has, during the same period, fallen from her former position so that she has lost five places in her manufacturing rank with the other States; and

Whereas Missouri is unselfishly furnishing her share of her youth to the Nation's armed forces and desires further to place her manpower and other resources to work in the war effort, and it seems incredible that such vast resources of men and natural materials cannot be employed within the area, not only to stabilize the present economy of the State but to provide a great employment opportunity for our young men in the service when they return after victory; inasmuch as such installations could then be converted to peacetime operations as now planned in the sister States which have thus far been favored; and

Whereas it has been the enunciated policy of our National Government to provide every possible means of securing the production of war matériel with a minimum of disruption and dislocation of the family life, the foundation of our democratic way, it then seems to us reasonable that more careful consideration of sites, facilities, labor, and resources of this State should be given by the agencies of our Government in Washington charged with the responsibility of locating these essential war enterprises: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-second General Assembly of Missouri, That we call upon the elected representatives of the people of our State in the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and upon such other of our citizens in Washington as now hold offices of high trust, upon our elected State officials, and upon the commercial and civic leaders of all sections of the State that they act in concerted unison to bring these facts and these conditions to the attention of the President of the United States and to all departments and agencies of the Government dealing with the problems of securing war matériel, the acquiring of facilities, the establishing of training bases, and the installation of war production units, to the end that the great State of Missouri may contribute in larger measure to the war effort and that her people and her resources may be fully utilized in speeding our Nation's effort to victory; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be placed in the hands of our representatives in Washington, our elective State officers, and the appropriate departmental, commercial, and civic executives as set forth above.

Daylight Saving

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED C. GILCHRIST

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa State Legislature has passed a concurrent resolution asking a repeal of the wartime daylight-saving bill. A number of States are doing the same thing and are repealing the law of Congress, insofar as it applies to their State. This law is certainly a bad thing for the farmers of this country. I have received almost a bushel basket full of letters and telegrams from farm people who point out their objections to this law and show the hardships that it brings down upon farmers and farm communities.

We are told that Joshua commanded the sun and said, "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, moon, in the valley of Ajalon," and we are told that the sun stood still and the moon stayed until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. The Good Book then goes on to say that there was no day like that before it or after it. But these prophets who believed there would never be a day like that again had never heard of and did not know about the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States.

I have also good reliable authority in Mother Goose Rhymes to say that the cow jumped over the moon. This is undoubtedly true, and I have seen pictures and mural decorations showing the cow in the very act. But somehow or other the cows on our farms and dairies in Iowa do not have command over the moon and the sun and they do not care to jump over any celestial bodies but insist on getting up in the morning daylight and not in the middle of the night. And then again they know that the best time for milking does not come at 5 o'clock sun time, and they prefer to be milked in the cool of the evening and not at a time that will interfere with the golf tournament or the pari-mutuel betting out on the horse-race track.

It just does not make sense to believe that hogs prefer to get up in the dark of a cold wintry morning before the sun is up. They do not want to eat their proteins during darkness when burglars are busy, nor do they wish the electric lights to be turned on in advance of the good old ordinary Christian time for eating hog food. They know that it is hard to put any gain upon hogs during extreme cold weather, and they prefer to associate with each other in their nests and warm each other's backs and not go out into the snowdrifts of a cold wintry morning in northern Iowa until after the sun is up.

Then the dew has something to do with it. This is not a pun. During haying and harvesting our farmers cannot work until after the dew has disappeared. In corn husking a farmer cannot go out too early into the wet and frosty and

cold cornfields but should wait until the sun is about an hour high before husking his crop. Schools, especially in winter, should not be expected to open at 8 o'clock in the morning. The old-fashioned 9 o'clock opening is much better and is quite soon enough. A vast amount of farmers in my State live within consolidated school districts, and the new war time compels the children and the whole household to rise in darkness. Then after the kids have eaten their bacon and eggs—and I mean bacon and eggs in Iowa—they have to stand in the snowdrifts and signal the school busses with horns and flashlights, and finally make it to the school just about dawn and 1 hour earlier than it was ever intended. The whole thing is "haywire." It causes great hardship and great inconvenience and loss. It requires much more power and the burning of much more electric lights. It inconveniences almost everyone in the farm communities and in the farm States.

The fact is that railway trains and mail time dominate our clock. The hired man always wants to get off at 6 o'clock p. m. so that he can change his overalls and put on his other shirt and go down to the depot to see the 7:15 train come in. Social life goes according to clock time. The hired girl or maid insists on clock time. I always go to church, and the young people go to the movies and to dances, according to Big Ben. So, then, we farm people are compelled to obey the injunctions of Congress at whatever cost.

We must comply with the hour hand on the dial at whatever inconvenience. We must consider that the sun is at its meridian height at 1 o'clock p. m. and not at high noon. Astronomical time and gastronomical time agree that noon is the time for eating dinner on the farm.

This is all a hallucination. It does not save power. It does not add to the war effort and it simply makes trouble. The legislatures now in session all over our country are passing resolutions against this unnatural war time regulation, and I now attach hereto the concurrent resolution passed by the house of representatives in the Iowa State Legislature at Des Moines, and report that a bill is now pending in that State to do away with this ill-born and unholy child of congressional parentage. I have always opposed such a measure and voted against it.

Ohio, Georgia, Michigan, and perhaps other States have already passed laws, and Iowa is about to, and I have the honor to now attach the concurrent resolution referred to.

House Concurrent Resolution 17

Whereas daylight working hours are a vital factor in the preparation and harvesting of crops, the feeding of farm animals, and the production of all farm commodities; and

Whereas the new wartime known as daylight-saving time since its establishment has proved to be wasteful rather than timesaving; and

Whereas in these days of dire need, every possible hour on the farm must be used for the production of vital foods; and

Whereas the factories engaged in war production are largely on a 24-hour-per-day basis, and those not thus engaged are largely on a short-day basis of work; and

Whereas because of these conditions this change in time has not resulted in the saving of electric power and fuel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That we respectfully petition Congress of the United States to repeal the act known as daylight-saving time, chapter 7, second session, Public Law 403, Seventy-seventh Congress (S. 2160), which was approved by Congress January 20, 1942, and which establishes a standard time for the United States 1 hour earlier than mean astronomical time, and by this repeal permit agriculture to operate with a greater degree of efficiency; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the two Iowa Senators and the eight Iowa Members of the House of Representatives, and that they be thus petitioned to use all their influence and best offices that this change in time may be made and put into effect before the heavy farm work season begins.

Petition of the Titusville (Pa.) Landlords' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a petition received from the Titusville Landlords' Association, of Titusville Pa. This petition sets forth ample reasons why, in the opinion of the landlords of Titusville, their city should not be included in the area where rents either were or were likely to become exorbitant or to tend toward inflation. To this petition were attached the signatures of 125 owners of property occupied by tenants. It follows:

The Honorable R. L. RODGERS,
Congressman from the Twenty-ninth District, State of Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the following landlords of the city of Titusville, Pa., hereby petition you to intercede for us in securing release from the oppressive measures of the Federal rent regulations for the following reasons:

1. The rent-control program was launched to prevent further increase in rent where rents already were tending toward inflation. Titusville is not one of those areas.

A rent survey in July 1941, at the request of the Office of Price Administration and conducted by Work Projects Administration, disclosed: First, that but 16 percent of the residential units of Titusville has increased in rent over the period from March 1940 to June 1941; second, that the rise in rent in that 16 percent of our dwellings was but $2.64 per month; third, that the average rent for all residential units was but $16.45 per month.

It has been the custom in Titusville for many years to lease dwellings on a monthly basis extending over a 12-month period dating from May 1. This being the case, the rent of March 1, 1942 (selected, arbitrarily, as the date for determining the maximum rent) establishes the legal rent of 84 percent of our dwellings as of March 1940, the survey having shown that the rent of June 1941 in those dwellings was the same as that of March 1940, and the rent of June 1941 having carried over to May 1, 1942, by our system of leasing. Inflation begins where fair return ends. Our rents were frozen before we had climbed out of the deflated darkness into the sunshine of fair return.

2. The cost of labor and building materials required for repair and replacement have increased greatly since March 1940. Rents fixed as a maximum in 1942 on the same level as of 1940 are, consequently, much lower relatively than those of 1940, and at a time when living costs are much higher (foods up 42 percent).

3. The rent regulations permit of increases upon seven conditions which are stated in the "landlords' petition for increase in rent above the maximum." These stipulations would appear to alleviate some of our difficulties, but they fail to function because of the peculiar interpretations given them when they are submitted to the local area office.

For instance, conditions *a* and *d* may have been submitted by the petitioner. A small increase is granted on the basis of condition *a* but condition *d*, just as valid and required as a floor before condition *a* can function properly, is ignored.

4. Landlords were particularly hard hit during the depression. A substantial decrease in rent was necessary to match the deflated purses of the tenants. Worse, when tenants reached the point where deferred payments only were possible, the landlords' income all but disappeared; indeed, in many cases, it did disappear entirely when tenants found it necessary to remove to another locality and payments remained deferred.

Nevertheless, in that trying period, when Uncle Samuel was begging for a shot in the arm, many landlords, taking advantage of lower costs, spent hundreds of dollars in the improvement of their properties. The low rentals did not provide funds for such expenditures and obligations were undertaken on the assumption of the dawning of a more prosperous day. But with that day came Government control and rents here were frozen at the low rates of 1940, 1939, 1938, and even earlier. Under rent regulations the landlord is compelled to keep his properties in standard condition or suffer a further reduction in his rent. At depression levels rents could not provide for maintenance. Now, at those levels, under conditions of higher costs, rents provide less in the way of maintenance. The landlords' obligations are bound to grow heavier instead of lighter. We become alarmed when we ponder our condition when all the rest of the world is free from want.

5. Taking funds from the deflated purse of the landlord and placing them in the inflated purse of the tenant defeats the purpose of rent control. The landlord thereby is prevented from the purchase of war bonds which he might otherwise have purchased and the tenant spends that amount, not for war bonds but for whatever he desires that the restricted markets provide, thus adding to the inflationary evil instead of curbing it. Moreover, while penalizing the landlords who were slow to make even moderate increases in their rents it protects, if it does not encourage, those who began early to get their due.

6. Rents on Sunset Heights, the defense housing project in this section, range from $28.50 per month for three- to $34.50 for five-room units. This is a gross rental which includes, by way of services, water rent and electricity, a kitchen range and a Kelvinator refrigerator, an individual furnace-like heating unit (but not the fuel) and cabinet sink.

Not all of our dwellings are equipped with all these services, but some are. In lieu of some, or in addition to some or all of these utilities, we offer less cramped living quarters (larger rooms, greater in number, less units in one building); porches, sun parlors, laundries, and garages, of which there are none on Sunset Heights; and a vastly superior location which factor has ever been important in determining the value of property and of its desirability for renting purposes.

Sunset Heights is difficult to reach, especially in winter; it is more distant from schools, churches, shops, and the business section. While winds blow furiously in winter and very few trees provide shade in summer on the hilltop, our small city, in the valley below, is not only better protected from the biting winds of winter, but trees, of which we are justly proud, provide adequate shade in summer.

The rate of rent on the Government's own dwellings, surely, may not be considered inflationary; yet its average of $31.50 per month is 91.5 percent higher than the average permitted us by the Office of Price Administration.

Certainly, fairness demands drastic changes here, else a tragic future looms before those landlords, the sum total of whose investments is in rented properties, acquired through many years of toil and strict economy.

Shelter is as important in the winning of the war as food, clothing, and labor, yet it is demanded of us that we house tenants who are receiving unusually high wages at the extremely low rate they, or others, paid us when jobs were scarce and wages were unusually low.

The landlords of Titusville believe in fair rent control. We desire to curb inflation. But we are convinced that the Office of Price Administration policy based on maximum rent is not working fairly here and that instead of curbing inflation it is contributing to it. To us, the present policy seems a measure to help tenants at the expense of owners instead of a policy to stabilize prices. We ask that a policy of fair rent be substituted for the present policy, for, in a locality where the same rent extends over a period of 12 months, it is impossible to establish fair rents by a rule designed for areas where rents, changing from week to week or from month to month, could and did rise constantly to heights that were becoming alarming.

Respectfully submitted.

TITUSVILLE LANDLORDS' ASSOCIATION,
F. EDITH PALMER, *Secretary.*

Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1943

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the current week the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Claude R. Wickard, told a congressional committee that he had asked the War Department for Army help in certain crop situations. He indicated that he planned to renew his request. "Farmers," he said, "need to be given assurance before they begin planting that there will be sufficient manpower to bring in their crops."

Farmers in my congressional district share the Secretary's concern at this time, and I am in receipt of the following telegram from the Passaic County (N. J.) Board of Agriculture:

PATERSON, N. J., *February 17, 1943.*
Congressman GORDON CANFIELD,
House of Representatives:

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture, Claude R. Wickard, has asked for greatly additional supplies of farm produce for domestic consumption, armed-force needs, and lend-lease requirements; and

Whereas the farmers of this county have already lost many of their skilled farm laborers to the armed forces and are faced with the possibility of losing more of these skilled laborers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That you be hereby notified that the Passaic County Board of Agriculture wishes you to thoroughly investigate the possibility of the release of members of our armed forces for necessary agricultural work, and do everything within your power to alleviate this critical situation.

RESOLUTION COMMITTEE, PASSAIC COUNTY BOARD OF AGRICULTURE.
CHARLES HESS, *Chairman,*
ARTHUR BUTT,
CHESTER J. KEULAN.

Address of Hon. John J. Dempsey, Governor of New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith the text of an address delivered by Hon. John J. Dempsey, Governor of New Mexico, before a joint meeting of the House and Senate of New Mexico on February 4, 1943.

This address deals with the problems faced by an average State in attempting to take care of its obligations to the aged and infirm.

It presents the opinions of a former Member of this body on the subject of public assistance.

The address follows:

Mr. President and members of the sixteenth legislature, I have today sent a special message to the House urging immediate passage of the so-called tobacco tax. The need for this measure should be apparent to everyone. There have been certain objections to this bill from some pressure groups. That is to be expected. There are always these well-fed, selfish groups willing to close their eyes so they cannot see the hunger of others.

In presenting this measure I am placing before you the means to alleviate certain conditions which are becoming more acute by the minute. I am thinking now particularly of those people who have devoted a lifetime of service to their country and their State and who now, in their old age, through no fault of their own, find themselves without income and without the means of earning a livelihood. These people will not be with us very long.

Most of them have led honorable and useful lives. They are proud, and their pride in many cases grows greater as their income decreases. They would prefer to starve with their heads held high than to humble themselves by publicly asking for charity. The State, through its old-age assistance program, can provide for these people, if sufficient funds are available, and at the same time permit them to retain their self-respect.

I know many of these old folks. They have been honored in their lives. They will be honored again when they die. They would prefer to have food upon their tables than flowers upon their graves. It is true that on their passing resolutions praising them may be passed and presented to their bereaved families. In some cases statues may be erected, statues of their likenesses on iron horses. Let us not, by vote, make it necessary to say it is too bad they died of starvation.

Besides the needy aged there are two other classes of deserving people who will benefit by this bill. They are the needy blind and the dependent children.

Those who are blind have lost only one of their five senses.

While they go through life in darkness, they suffer as acutely as the rest of us from the pangs of an empty stomach. It is a matter of statistics that most cases of blindness occur among the poor. The amount of help the State is giving the blind is very limited. Some receive as little as $6.25 a month. To their other troubles should not be added the fear of hunger and the feeling that New Mexico does not care what happens to them. While we cannot restore their sight, we can brighten their lives by assuring them of enough to eat and something decent to wear.

Our children are not only the most precious possession of the family, but of the State as well. If our democracy is to remain strong, our children must grow up with healthy bodies and keen minds. It is well enough for us to say that in America every person is born equal under the law and in the sight of God. But that saying rings hollow unless we also provide that every child shall have proper nourishment, adequate clothing and the right to education.

When Work Projects Administration closed down, the hot lunch program for our common schools, which had been staffed by Work Projects Administration labor, was threatened with extinction. I have asked the Department of Public Welfare to temporarily take over this program. Qualified physicians have told me that the improvement in the health of children who receive those hot lunches is amazing. I am sure that none of you would want to see this program discontinued.

Through our program of aid to dependent children we are trying to provide these things. I wonder if there is any man in New Mexico who would lift his infamous voice and say that this is wrong. I do not believe there is. This is one program that has universal support. But we must give it more than lip service. We must show by our actions that our hearts approve the sentiments that our lips express.

There has been much misunderstanding about old-age assistance. Many people have the impression that any person above middle age can receive a pension. I would like to clear up that misunderstanding. The Federal Government and the State have laid down strict rules governing the granting of old-age assistance. A person to be eligible to receive help from the State must be at least 65 years of age and, in addition, he must be in need. The amount received by the individual varies. Each case is investigated and the need determined.

The grant that is finally made is in no way a pension. It is assistance only, and, should the individual's income from private sources

increase sufficiently for him to care for himself, State aid immediately ceases.

The State, with Federal help, at the present time is making available for the use of this group an average of $19.13 per person. One-half of this $19.13 is paid by the Federal Government, the other half by the State. Until the present time, this money was supplemented by food stamps, and each 50 cents could buy 75 cents worth of goods. That has been changed. Food stamps will not be available after March 1, and these old folks will no longer be given special consideration at the stores. Living costs have advanced from 15 to 25 percent.

Also, due to the closing of the Work Projects Administration sewing project, the needy people of this State will no longer be able to obtain clothes from this source. This means that another burden has been added to the hardships which these people face.

The hardship upon them is far greater than it is on the wage earner because they are already reduced to the necessities of life and they have no place to cut except from their meager food ration and their more meager allotment of clothes.

We should bear in mind that the average amount these old folks receive is only $19 a month. When this amount was supplemented by food stamps, it brought approximately $29 worth of commodities. With cost of living up, and with food stamps no longer available, this $19 has shrunk in purchasing power until it will buy only as much as $15 would buy 8 months ago. This fact alone should show the imperative need for greater relief for these people.

While I have used $19 as the average amount paid out in old-age assistance, since that is the information given me by the Department of Public Welfare, I understand that some members of the legislature do not agree with that figure. They contend that the average is nearer $9. If that is true it is all the more reason why something should be done promptly to relieve the hardships suffered by these old folks.

We have before us today a means of providing them with the necessities of life. If you enact the tobacco tax, sufficient revenue will be obtained to meet these immediate needs. This tax is purely a luxury tax. There is no additional tax added to the necessities of life, nor will there be. The proposed tax is similar to those already in effect in Texas, Arizona, and Oklahoma. Those people who do not want to participate in it are not compelled to do so. I do not presume that many users of tobacco will stop smoking, but they can save the amount of the tax by cutting down slightly on the consumption of tobacco or by smoking their cigarettes a little shorter. If this tax becomes effective, and you have it within your power to make it so, we can, through both Federal and State assistance, increase payments to the aged people of this State to an average of approximately $30 per month, in those cases where needed. This means the Federal Government pays $15 and the State pays $15. Such an increase will give them the feeling of security to which they are entitled.

We should remember that for each dollar the State puts up for assistance to the aged, the Government matches it with a Federal dollar. There has been some grumbling and discontent with the public welfare department's administration of old-age assistance. The legislature now has this department under investigation and if any incompetency or any mal-administration of funds is discovered, I shall correct such condition insofar as it is possible. I have been advised by the Finance Director of the Department of Public Welfare that the administrative costs for the entire department at present are less than 12 percent of total funds expended. On this basis, if the committee found that the entire administrative costs could be eliminated, there would still be insufficient funds left to care for the State's unfortunate people. I hope that this investigating committee will find ways to effect economies in the operation of this department, so that the money saved can be applied to the assistance of this group.

With the facts that I am giving you now, you can see the immediate need for this legislation and I sincerely trust that you will familiarize yourself with this bill and then act on it as soon as possible.

In my message to the legislature on January 12, I called attention to the probability that the revenues available to the Department of Public Welfare will be reduced $360,000 for the next fiscal year. Some people have been inclined to doubt that statement. They feel that because State revenues did not decrease during 1942, they will not decrease this year. People who argue that way live in a fool's paradise.

During the next fiscal year we expect to lose $360,000 from the liquor and compensating taxes. It is true that collections from the liquor tax went up last year. But that fact makes it only the more certain that they will decrease next year. Liquor is rationed. Many merchants saw rationing coming and they laid in a good supply—on which they paid the tax. Now they can no longer buy liquor freely in the market. Revenue from this source will inevitably decrease.

Rationing will also affect income from the compensating tax. And when these decreases come, it will mean that the needy aged of this State will have to decrease their already slim store of food. I do not know how all you legislators feel about this, but I, for one, do not propose to allow these aged people to starve in a land of plenty.

For the past few years America has been the arsenal of all those countries throughout the world that want and are willing to fight for democracy. Through lend-lease we are feeding large groups of the people of those countries. I do not mean that we are feeding their armies alone, but their civilian populations as well.

This is being done at the same time that food for our own hungry people at home is getting more and more difficult to obtain. I have no objection to feeding the hungry people abroad, but while we are feeding them let us feed our own people at home.

My faith in you is such that I believe you will not want to be known as a group who saw the Federal Government provide for the people of foreign countries food of a kind not known to them before and then fail to provide for those at home.

In recent months the price of labor has been raised, the price of farm commodities has been increased; provision has been made to clothe, feed, and finance the people of foreign lands. Now the question is rightfully asked, what has been done for the needy of our own country, and what do we plan to do for the needy of New Mexico? Let me tell you what has been done to these people. There has been taken away from them the clothes they formerly obtained through Work Projects Administration sewing projects, and the surplus foods which they were formerly permitted to purchase through the Surplus Commodity Stamp Act. While these things have been taken away the cost of their living has increased to such an extent that their purchasing power has been reduced 50 percent.

Since I have been Governor I have had an opportunity to see many of these old people who are in need of public assistance. Their cases in most instances are pitiful.

It is appalling that here in America—here in New Mexico—we have a large group of citizens, numbering more than 5,000, whose economic condition has sunk to zero and who are on relief at the present time. Old people whose shoes were worn out have come into my office asking a pittance to keep body and soul together.

In England in the midst of bombings, with their limited food supply and other privations, they are talking now about a program to provide security for everyone from the cradle to the grave. Here in a land of plenty, where we have felt only minor annoyances of personal sacrifice, we quibble about voting a few pennies to provide some of the necessities of life to a small group of our needy citizens.

I do not have the privilege of voting in the legislature, but were I so privileged I would be anxiously waiting for my name to be called so I could vote in the affirmative on this bill. I ask you in the name of humanity not to fiddle while the people starve. We should remember that there are more than 5,000 people in need of greater relief from the State and many more who should be receiving this relief, but for whom we cannot now provide.

The remedy is provided in the bill which has now been introduced. It is before the legislature. It now becomes your responsibility.

For every day this tax bill is delayed you are depriving these dependent people of more than $2,000 per day.

I know there are paid lobbyists who will try to defeat this bill. They are living at prominent hotels, feeding well, and entertaining lavishly. They are not willing to give up three puffs on their cigarettes to help feed the old people of this State. You should give these lobbyists the kind of brush-off that their selfish motives deserve.

It is significant, I believe, of the feeling of the people of New Mexico toward this bill that not one voice has been raised against it. The people recognize the obligation we owe to our needy aged, to our blind, and to our dependent children, and they are ready and willing to fulfill that obligation.

When you come to consider this measure I ask you to remember that something near adequate assistance to the needy is not a matter of politics. It is not a matter of charity. It is a matter of human decency.

With you lies the responsibility. With you lies the power to bring about this necessary assistance to these needy people. May you be guided as your conscience dictates.

The Challenge of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent address delivered before the Rotary Club of Wilmette, Ill., in my congressional district, by Rabbi Charles E. Shulman, now chaplain, U. S. N. R. His subject The Challenge of Tomorrow poses the pertinent question: "What Are We Fighting For?"

The address follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF TOMORROW

(By Rabbi Charles E. Shulman, North Shore Congregation Israel, Glencoe, now chaplain, United States Naval Reseve)

Much has changed in America since Pearl Harbor. Much more will have to change before we realize the tremendous implications of that single act of Japanese aggression which plunged this country into its second war in a quarter of a century. Our external

world is different now. Our homes are lonelier because of the absence of our youth. Rationing has affected our habits to a considerable degree. Transportation needs have altered our accustomed means of travel and brought us closer to our hearths. And the constantly intruding inconveniences remind us daily that we are engaged in a struggle with an enemy more ruthless and cunning than ever confronted this Nation. But our internal world is not much different than it was a year ago. We still follow our pursuits. We still chart a familiar pattern of life easily recognizable as that belonging to the immediate past. We still trust to a future which is not adequately conceived nor properly visioned. And we are but dimly aware of the vastness of the conflict now engaging our world.

VICTORY PRACTICAL CERTAINTY

Americans are quite certain that we shall defeat the Axis in battle. They have good grounds for their certainty. Quite apart from the great productive capacity of our Nation is the determination of freemen to protect their heritage. And this is mightier than the strongest armies of dictators. But Americans are not quite so certain about what we are going to do with the victory once we gain it. One public official voices the belief that we are fighting for a bottle of milk for every baby in the world. Another person in a public address declares that he is not fighting for a bottle of milk for every Hottentot and a Tennessee Valley Authority project in the Danube valley. In between these points of view are doubt, confusion, and bewilderment. It is not enough to get on with the war. It is also necessary to consider now, while we are in the heat of battle, what kind of world can emerge from this all-enveloping conflagation.

When a patient is ill there are two courses of action necessary. One involves the effort at immediate cure. The other involves the plan for the convalescence. Each is complementary to the other. Without convalescence there may be a relapse which may prove to be fatal. The world is sick now. And we are desperately striving in an all-out effort to cure the malady. We are performing an act of bloodletting. Thousands now under arms may have to give their lives before the disease of fascism is eliminated from the world body politic. But what of the convalescence? Is it conceivable that there will be complete strength and balance in the world structure after this type of war which regiments every life as well as every purse among men? Unless we allow for a decent kind of recovery, it may well be that we shall be plunged into another conflict after this one. In fact, warnings have already been sounded by such outstanding Americans as Pearl Buck concerning this very danger. Speaking at a Nobel award dinner just recently, this noted author called attention to the dangers inherent in our lackadaisical attitude toward the post-war world. The Atlantic Charter, she said, made certain promises. Those promises are already half-forgotten. If this war is not a war for the liberation of all peoples everywhere, then we might as well face the prospect of another struggle immediately afterward.

MUST HAVE TRUE VISION

Pearl Buck is not the only American who has been thinking of the post-war world. Many are wondering whether we shall have better intelligence in meeting the aftermath of this struggle than we had 25 years ago. They are fervently hoping that we shall be able to do what we did not do yesterday: Build adequately for world security and peace. Our free people must understand clearly what we are fighting for in order that we may finally be rid of the fears and frustrations that hinder world tranquillity. We must be possessed of the true vision of a better world before we can be true to ourselves and to those who seek hungrily after the liberties from the reservoir now beyond their reach. We are fighting for a decent opportunity for every inhabitant of the earth to live out his years usefully and freely. We are fighting to establish the "century of the common man" as the Vice President of our country has so eloquently phrased it; for a bottle of milk for every baby and more.

We are also fighting for a happier environment for every child, for a dream for every youth, security for the middle-aged, and tranquillity for those old in years who may end their existence on earth as a shock of corn ripe with maturity. And if we have nothing better to offer the world than the recent statement of an American manufacturer that he is not fighting for a bottle of milk for every Hottentot, nor a Tennessee Valley Authority in the Danube Valley region, we are certainly expending an enormous amount of our manhood and treasure in pursuit of an empty cause. We shall not eliminate wars by such philosophy any more than we eliminated wars in the past. We shall not be saved tomorrow unless our entire world is a safe place for the children of men. We shall not know prosperity unless the poor of the present hour are enabled to increase their standards of living and we shall not know the friendship of other peoples unless and until we ourselves are disposed to be the friend they ardently desire us to be.

There are three large general factors that have to be met with wisdom and sanity before we shall be able to order our world tomorrow in security and peace. The first of these is the economic factor. Before specialists like Keynes and others can establish their theories about economic well-being there must first be an elemental understanding of the needs of world society. This general subject, like so many others, frightens the average man who is little concerned with the question of economics outside his area of livelihood. Yet there can be no hope of a kindlier, peaceful world without a comprehension of the universal need of satisfying hunger and procuring shelter and obtaining the opportunity to labor creatively and productively. It should be relatively easy for a person to put himself in another's place. But it is so hard to imagine the existence of those beyond our immediate circles of employment that it becomes a prime deficiency in any society and constitutes a great stumbling block to a better world. We in America have had evidence of this truth. Steinbeck's Grapes of Wrath is more than the story of a single family tossed about in the ocean of poverty. It is also an account of the influence of the machine upon human life.

It is the tale of hunger and want and helplessness in a world of relative plenty. It is an indictment of a civilization that values human life too little and property too much. And if this is so in blessed America how much more true is this in other areas of the earth which are under the guidance of the United Nations today? What shall we say of India, where 100,000,000 people are born and die without having sufficient for their basic needs? Or of the European lands where millions brought into the world have known only grinding poverty and toil? Is it conceivable that we can meet the challenge of tomorrow without taking into account the simple justice that should give bread to the hungry and shelter to the underprivileged?

MUST DO SOME THINKING

We ought not to be awed by economists. We ought rather to treat them as the architects of world activities. And as we tell our architects what specifications we desire in building a home so ought we to instruct our experts in economics to design for us the patterns that shall fit our conceptions of a better economic order. But first we must do some thinking on the subject ourselves. We must determine what ought to be done to safeguard the general economic security for mankind. This security will most certainly not be gained by indifference to the wants of those outside our limited sphere of life. Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek challenged the United Nations recently with regard to this problem. He said: "There will be neither peace nor hope nor future for any of us unless we honestly aim at political, social, and economic justice for all peoples of the world, great and small * * *."

The world tomorrow will not be so tolerant to economic blindness as it has been in the past. If purchasing power will be necessary to absorb the future output of our factories and mills, the peoples of the earth will have to be given the opportunity to obtain such power. So a bottle of milk for every Hottentot and a Tennessee Valley Authority in the Danube Valley may be something more than a starry-eyed adventure in humanity. It may be a rich economic investment that will bring prosperous returns to those who can see its implications in the changing universe. And those who will not see should be reminded of the dangers inherent in our modern communications. The world peoples have been drawn ridiculously close together by the airplane and the radio. It is no longer possible to speak of China or India as places too remote for our consideration. We shall either understand them as friends or face the possibility of meeting their hostility in days to come. We now have the time to choose the manner in which we shall live with them in this little world shrunken to such small dimensions.

NEED TO UNDERSTAND POLITICS

A second factor in the challenge of tomorrow is the political structure of society. Here in our own country we are still terribly immature in our understanding of politics. The average man thinks that "politics" means the Kelly-Nash machine or some other tightly knit oligarchy controlling the ballot for its own selfish ends. He has become accustomed to hearing the term associated with such notions as graft, self-interest, and the like. There is not much hope of building the kind of government that shall truly meet the ideals of our noble constitutions unless we change our attitude toward this much-abused word. Aristotle called man a political animal and thereby gave us the clue to the great possibilities for social organization that is suggested in the term. Man, he said, has the capacity to impose his own order upon nature. He can direct his animal herd instincts until they become manifest in the form of what the Greeks called the "polis," or city. In this organization, planned and directed, man functions by laws. A law is no more than an agreement on the part of the individual to give up certain selfish instincts for the common good. The numbers of men who can live thus determine the kind of civilization in any given age. At the present time there is no law in Axis-controlled countries. There is only the whim of members of a party or oligarchy.

MUST IMPROVE KNOWLEDGE

Therefore there is nothing but primitivism and animal savagery manifest in those lands. When free people do not exercise their right of the ballot, when they are indifferent to their communal responsibilities, when they lack civic spirit, when they see romance in law, they degrade the term "politics" to the shoddy concept that is prevalent among so many people today. And because they understand so little of the possibilities of their own

community growing by law they find it extremely difficult to imagine a league of nations controlled by international law. Yet they will have to improve their knowledge of politics if they expect to realize their hopes of international peace tomorrow.

The various suggestions and plans now offered for the society of nations should be given serious attention by every citizen of our country. If we expect to trade with nations, we shall have to have better association with nations. We shall have to deliberate with them about common laws that can be accepted and respected by people the world over. We can no longer afford the luxury of splendid isolation. Twenty-five years ago we turned our backs upon the world. One hundred thousand of our youth had died in a war "to make the world safe for democracy." Billions had been expended in defeating the legions of the Kaiser. We decided to divorce ourselves from the nations. And we found to our dismay that in a shrunken universe we cannot live apart. This war is a clear answer to our attitude of yesterday.

RELIGION VITAL FACTOR

A third factor dealing with the world of the future is religion. This is not limited to any particular church or denomination. It is not described in any particular Bible or creedal document. It is rather to be found deep in the heart of mankind. It is the ultimate capacity to see others as we see ourselves, hoping, aspiring, and meeting with disappointment. It is the recognition of the spirit in man that can make the whole world kin. As politics is concerned with the external organization of society, so religion is concerned with the internal organization of mankind—the soul of humanity, as it were. There is so much that men share that it will behoove us to look for the common properties of the world peoples. This does not mean giving up our cherished beliefs. It does mean that we must see different peoples as we see the composition of a symphony orchestra. The various instruments contribute to a great harmony. So, too, can the various beliefs and attitudes be harmonized to constitute the symphony of the spheres.

It is the tragedy of our time that, possessing so many channels of information and education, we yet hug our prejudices and our bigotries so closely. We are suspicious of those not of our faith, our church, our creed. We find it difficult to believe that the word "communion" has greater implications, when viewed with godly spirit, than the narrow interpretations we place upon it. There is a story told of two Negroes who were in conversation about their religion. One wished to persuade the other to join "the army of the Lord." The other insisted he was a member of this army. Asked what denomination he espoused, he replied "the Baptist group." His friend answered, "You are not in the army, you are in the navy."

NO PLACE FOR SMUGNESS

The world tomorrow will not permit us to live comfortably within the smugness of our particular beliefs. It will not permit us to harbor prejudice against Jew or Protestant or Catholic or Hindu or Mohammedan. It will demand of us that we meet God's greater law, the recognition that true fatherhood of God demands brotherhood of man. Once we can rid ourselves of our narrow prejudices and our blind intolerance of the consciences of others, we shall be better able to direct our thoughts to the economic and political means of achieving that society envisaged by the prophet of old, where we shall walk in the ways of God, where each man in our universe shall dwell safely under his own vine and fig tree and there shall be none to make him afraid.

Governor Bricker's Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1943

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the speech of Gov. John W. Bricker, of Ohio, at the annual State Lincoln Day dinner, under the auspices of the State Republican Executive Committee, in Nashville, Tenn., on Friday, February 12, 1943:

We assemble today to honor the life of a great American. We do this in no partisan sense. In our reverence for Lincoln, his life and character, we are joined by the millions who have accepted him as their true exemplar. To the downtrodden of the world, yes, to all who love liberty, he personifies the virtues of this Republic and its opportunities, unlimited by class or creed.

Born in lowly estate and living his early life in utter poverty, he rose to the most exalted place in the history of our country. His rise was not by conquest, by trampling over the oppressed, or by taking the lives or even property of other people. He rose not with conqueror's strides, but step by step in public service under the law, always devoted to the system to which he was born and ever striving to maintain it. He felt his paramount duty was to save our constitutional system and all the blessings it had brought to our people. He did not seek by revolution to destroy that which had gone before. He came at the time of a great crisis, and out of the dangers of that crisis he built more firmly the foundations of a republic.

The wisdom of his leadership lives today in a united Nation which possesses an opportunity to do good, as is given to no other people on earth. Our Nation today faces another crisis. Tonight we gather together in confidence that the Republic can wage war without destroying itself—that it can face danger and at the same time strengthen our democratic institutions—that it can prevent abuses without destroying the system of free government.

During the recent years we have seen a wave of absolutism sweep over many nations of the world. It has had its reactions here. There are actually persons in America today, a small but very vocal minority, who believe that we cannot govern ourselves. They believe that we must have superimposed upon us a benevolent autocracy. They forget that such a system soon ceases to be benevolent. This group is represented by the order-writing, regulation-preparing younger intellectuals who have generated within themselves a sense of superego, and who believe that they are chosen to lead mankind to the promised land. They know little of the actual conditions of life. They have never lived very fully. They know little of the loyalty or the aspirations of our people. As a result we are living today in the midst of a confusing exercise of power.

A lot of these bureaucrats who have read much and lived little are especially contemptuous of elected representatives of the people. They are against the established order. They are determined to break down State lines and local government. We even find some in high places who are unpatriotic enough to use the war as a means of imposing their peculiar philosophy of un-American government upon our people. They claim patriotism as the motive. But they are not patriots who would destroy that for which our boys now are fighting and dying at the far outposts of the earth.

We have seen many evidences of this increased trend to centralize power in the last few years. Two desperate attempts were made to take away from the States the control of unemployment compensation. It is in most States wisely and efficiently administered.

The States of the Union were called upon in the early days of this war to set up the machinery for local rationing. An excellent job was done under the leadership of Frank Bane, now executive secretary of the Council of State Governments. The authority was placed in the hands of people, close home—in the local communities. It was then taken over by the National Government with highly paid executives. The offices were taken away from the local communities. People were forced to go great distances and often met boards that knew very little of local conditions. The citizen generally did not know his board. The latest move has been to break down the State territorial designation. Local offices are set up within the populous communities directly responsible to Washington.

The same trend is shown in civilian defense. A definite understanding was reached in the very beginning by the representatives of the States through the executive committee of the Governors' Conference and the director of civilian defense. That vital program was to be operated and administered through the State organizations. All States complied with the understanding and created either defense councils or administrative departments to carry on civilian defense work. Then the office of Civilian Defense at Washington set up over the States regional directors who, by and large, have been more harmful than helpful in the program. The major effort of these district agents of civilian defense apparently has been to take credit for everything that is done and blame the State organizations for not doing more. Too often these district representatives have tried to use defense councils as propaganda agencies.

In the field of agriculture a central bureaucratic control, through an unsound program, brought about the plowing under of corn and the killing off of hogs. This was to bring about abundance and prosperity. The travesty of it all is that people in some parts of the world are starving at this hour. Even we are not going to have enough to eat in America, the most productive land on earth. The soundest lesson taught by this absurd effort is that there is no individual or group wise enough to ordain the future and especially to regiment agriculture in this country.

Our whole agricultural effort in Ohio throughout the years has been for better production, more of it with less effort, conservation of soil and resources and the building of a better rural home and community life. Upon the foundation of a sound production program, with all the help possible, we must face the food crisis with determination. We have at home increased the appropriation for farm agents throughout the State. We have given more money for work at the experiment farm. The agricultural college has taken a leading part in building up production both of livestock and of all grains. We are now organizing our Victory gardens for the coming year. We expect this production to be substantial. Farmers in our Nation are producing more and more with less and less—less help and less machinery. Time and again we in Ohio have appealed for help, as also have farm organizations and agricultural departments over the country. We have urged loosening up of restrictions on machinery and administration of the draft with an idea of saving some farm labor. This has been hammered home throughout the land. At a late

hour recognition is being given to this most serious situation.

State and local governments have not been utilized by the national administration to the extent of their ability or authority in the war program. If Washington is interested in preserving representative government, it should be intent even in war, on strengthening and utilizing it and building it for the services of rehabilitation after the war.

We in Ohio—in civilian defense and in all other phases of our State government organization—have attempted to strengthen local government. We have given to local elected officials their proper authority. They are doing a good job.

Prosecution of the war is the paramount responsibility of the National Government. War does strengthen centralized power. But it does not concern one level of government alone. It affects every State, every community, and it reaches into every home. During war we should forego criticism, even if it is justified, unless such criticism helps the war program. But when we can help it is our patriotic duty to speak out.

We are involved in such a mixture of social reforms and regimentation for political power in the conduct of war that the party in power cannot unscramble it. That unscrambling job will be the responsibility of the Republican Party.

There are 1,000,000 more civil employees on the Federal pay roll today than in the First World War. We have but 22,500 State employees in Ohio and that includes all State highway employees. Yet there are 90,000 Federal employees in our State. I say to you that such a bureaucracy is not necessary even in wartime. Many from this overloaded Federal pay roll could better help by serving in the armed forces or by working on farms or in factories. Then they would be really producing. We are doing the job in our State with fewer employees and we haven't asked for military exemptions for State employees.

Democracy lives by discussion of issues. It is strengthened by just criticism. The representative system of government lives and grows when there is public interest. Free discussion and public interest are more essential in time of crisis than at any other time. We are rendering a patriotic service tonight not alone in honoring a great statesman, but in discussing the issues of the war and our responsibilities in the whole program.

The Republican Party has a dual task at this time. We must do everything within our power to aid in the conduct of the war and to bring about complete victory at the earliest moment. We can do that through constant attention to the problems involved—the support of sound principles and criticism of unsound experiments.

We must give all help to the industrial program so that arms and armament output may be kept at a peak. We must encourage farmers everywhere to produce to the limit so that our soldiers may be fed and our allies helped.

We can help also by a sane, sound administration of the affairs of government locally. Then there will be confidence in the institutions of representative government—confidence that we will not lose here at home that for which the boys are fighting abroad. The importance of our effort here is realized in the knowledge that Republicans are in power in one-half the States.

The Republican Party has a second great duty to our people. It should give them the right to decide not alone on public officials, but also on principles, policies, and issues. As long as it doesn't give aid, comfort, or material assistance to the enemy, the American people are entitled to know the details of the conduct of the war. They should be advised as to the amount of materials and food furnished to the other countries in the war program, the consideration for it and what cooperation we might hereafter expect as a result of these noble contributions. There should be an open and free discussion of the conduct of the war. That is the best assurance for strong support of a sound war program. The American people ought to be enlightened on the bungling policy of this administration in local affairs.

What is the ultimate goal of the New Deal? These facts and a discussion of them should not be beclouded by any discussion of a post-war world and what we are going to do for the other peoples and nations of the world.

No one today knows when the war will be won. We cannot foresee the relative part to be played by the respective victor nations. We cannot imagine the conditions of the defeated or overrun countries. It is well to think about it, to discuss it, but not as a cover-up for other failures. This is no time for name calling or wisecracks. Because one wants an open and free discussion does not mean that he is interfering with the conduct of the war. Because one is interested in America and does not think it proper to superimpose our ideas upon the other people of the world, does not mean that he is an isolationist in any ulterior sense.

The Republican Party never has been and is not now going to become a "me too" party. It doesn't need a receivership nor attorneys for the receivership to profit in its liquidation. When the two-party system in America is gone, liberty is gone. When a free discussion of public issues is suppressed in this cauntry, we have gone the way of the totalitarian systems we are fighting to destroy. We can render a great service simply by preserving our Republic, by giving the people the right to intelligently pass both upon candidates and upon issues.

Let us think a little bit about post-war problems. America cannot reach out a helping hand unless America is strong. We cannot give to others unless we have something to give. We cannot inspire a love of liberty in others unless we maintain it here. We cannot bring to the downtrodden of the world a better life unless we ourselves possess a better way of life. So for reasons both selfish and unselfish, we must keep America strong, free, prosperous, and a wholesome place in which to live.

The American has been an individualist. He will remain an individualist as long as the constitutional Republic endures. But he is cooperative as well as self-reliant. Our philosophy of government is that the important thing in life is the individual with his capacity for growth, service, and enjoyment of life. Government is instituted for him. If our Government fails to recognize the worth of the human soul or the place of the individual in society, it has failed in its real purpose. We are fighting to maintain that respect for human worth.

I can envision, if we do our full duty, a post-war America where private enterprise is secure, where the individual will be willing to venture, and where the hope of reward for individual enterprise, fearlessness in industry and in sciences will outweigh the fear of losses.

It is that spirit of venture—of taking a chance—that has built America. Without it we cannot go forward. With it we cannot fail.

I can envision a post-war America wherein we will have met the needs of society, protected property and its use, but without the past abuses. I want to see a post-war America wherein creative genius has its rewards, wherein the inventive ability of our people is utilized and fully protected. I want my Nation to reach out a helping hand to all those who are in need and who cannot take care of themselves, but without perpetuating the causes of poverty and distress. I want my post-war America to be a nation free from the confusion and the inequities that come from centralized control and bureaucratic authority over every phase of life and business activity.

There is one great lesson that stands out as a result of the necessary price-control and rationing programs. It is that we must get away from it when the war is won. It has proved to us the efficiency of the free-enterprise system of production and distribution, which has brought us more of the goods and blessings of life than any other people have enjoyed. It has been done without Washington domination, without overhead authority, without central planning or consumer regimentation.

The great mass of our people want to work and earn their living. The great mass of laboring people want the opportunity to save some money, to start a small business, and to build it into a big business with their own hands and brains. That is the living spirit of America that we must not destroy.

When the war is won, I have no doubt of the future of America, under the established system of meeting the needs of our people, unless we are sold out by selfish leaders.

In one of his hours of deep despair, I hear Lincoln say: "We gained democracy, and now there is a question whether it is fit to survive. Perhaps we have come to the dreadful day of awakening and the dream is ended; if so I am afraid it must be ended forever. I cannot believe that ever again men will have the opportunity we have had." But his hopes revived and he envisioned later the dawning of a great day for America.

Not long ago, a chemist for one of the greatest industrial concerns of the world told me that he had two jobs to complete. One was to perfect a system of water purification for farm homes and small communities. The other was to develop on the farms a crop from which fuel to drive automobiles might be distilled.

With soybeans, cornstalks, sweetpotatoes, and peanuts being used to produce everything from wallpaper to automobiles, there is opportunity for a more complete cooperation between rural and industrial America than we have ever before enjoyed. That means the ultimate spreading of the rewards of our creative ability among many more classes of people.

The development of the science of chemurgy challenges the imagination. A small appropriation was made by our legislature 2 years ago for research in the field of dehydrating foods. Of course great plants are doing it all over the country now, but this was with the thought that every farm should have its own processing plant. It was to be built at the cost of about $50. Such processing reduces the weight and size of the produce from one-fifth to one-tenth of the original without destroying its food value. Lighter materials are being used in all sorts of manufacturing processes. They are more easily carried. We can now see the great cargo planes that will fly the skies carrying these things when the war is over and the bombers have been grounded. The nations of the world will be brought closer to our shores. Europe will be almost as close in a commercial sense as New York is to Nashville. South America will be but a hop. The nations of the world must learn to live close to each other. True, points of friction will be multiplied, but they must be solved. We now have within our hands the mechanical power to destroy ourselves unless is is properly used. The American philosophy of life—to live and let live, to live and help live—must be the code of concord of the nations of tomorrow. One of the fundamental doctrines of such an international relationship must be that each nation is permitted to choose its own

government. We do not intend to have any other nation tell us what kind of government we shall have—we are satisfied with ours. We can go forward under it. Neither should we try to impose our will as to how they are governed upon other peoples of the world. If they become republics such as we are let it be because our successes are worthy of their emulation and our light is a guide to their development.

National Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD 2d

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of national manpower, delivered by me on February 20 and broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The subject that is now engrossing the attention of Congress is how our national manpower should be distributed for the successful conduct of the war and for the preservation of our national economy and the maintenance of the morale of our people. Five major factors enter into the solution of this problem. They are: Food, armed forces, munitions production, production for war and civilian use, and transportation.

The joint Chiefs of Staff have been given the right to determine, subject to the approval of the President, the size of our armed forces, including the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps. Through the Selective Service Act the power to draft the number of men wanted for combat service has been granted. The War Production Board been given the power to arrange for the production of all the instruments of war, commonly called munitions. Wages of workers in munitions-production plants have been made high enough to draw workers from other fields of activity.

The workers in civilian and agricultural production are subject to the draft of the armed forces and the competition of Government-sponsored war-production plants.

The most important phase of transportation is our shipping facilities. The war is being fought across the seas. To maintain an army for foreign service larger than can be transported, together with its equipment and supplies, to Europe, Asia, Africa, and the islands of the seas, is not a desirable use of our greatly needed manpower.

Food is the most vital of all the factors in any program for the conduct of the war. The selective service has drawn from the farms 804,000 workers. More than two million other workers left the farms in 1941 and 1942. Most of them probably went to work in munitions and industrial plants.

It has been officially announced that single men, subject to the draft, have been practically exhausted and that hereafter it will be necessary to draft married men, regardless of the size of their families. Many of those men will come from farms if farm labor is not entirely deferred from the draft.

On January 1, 1943, there were about 7,000,000 men in our armed forces. The present program contemplates increasing our armed forces this year approximately 4,000,000. When that is done, our armed forces will have about 11,000,000 soldiers, sailors, marines, and Coast Guards. About 1,000,000 more men will be required to replace men in our armed forces who are eliminated through casualties and attrition. That will increase to 12,000,000 the number to be drawn from registrants between 18 and 38. The War Production Board has announced that 1,800,000 more workers will be needed this year to produce munitions. Thus we find that approximately 7,000,000, including the number of women who may go into munitions production, will be required during this year. Where are they to come from without seriously impairing the operations of the group from which they are taken? There are but two reservoirs from which they may be drawn; one is civilian workers and the other is agricultural workers.

It is likely that the lure of high wages in production plants will continue to drain the farms not only of hired labor but of countless farm operators. The average monthly earnings of factory workers on December 15, 1942, was $161.08. This figure is based upon a 40-hour week. Adding the 8 hours overtime at time-and-a-half pay, the average monthly earnings are increased to $209.40. The average wage for farm workers without board on January 1, 1943, was $62.43 per month. It thus appears that the factory worker will earn this year $2,512.80, while the farm worker, who gets no overtime, will earn $749.16 for his year's work. With this disparity in earnings, how does any reasonable person expect the farmers and hired workers to remain on farms when the producers of munitions will be calling for 1,800,000 more workers at earnings three to four times as much as the farm worker can hope to receive? Remember, the farm operator must take chances on droughts, floods, insects, and other physical causes beyond his control. He may wind up the year's work with few, if any, commodities to sell.

Secretary Wickard has testified that an increase of about 30 percent in the production of foods is necessary to meet the home-front and lend-lease requirements. He further stated that such increase would not then be sufficient to meet all the demands. The lend-lease program contemplates doubling the quantity of food that it exported to our allies last year. That will take about one-sixth of the total food production of this country and more if production is below normal.

Soldiers in the course of their active training and service work eat much more than they do in civilian life. They are entitled to an adequate amount of the very best food available. We must remember, however, that each increase in the size of the Army increases the requirements for additional food production.

I have supported the war program from the time the special session of Congress was called in 1939 to repeal the Embargo Act. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee I have supported all appropriations requested by the administration for national defense. The time has arrived when some decision should be reached on whether the United States is in position to raise armed forces as large as any country in the world, except Russia, and at the same time provide for both an abundant arsenal and overflowing granary for our allies. Can that be done without destroying the morale of our people? Nothing would be more dangerous or more destructive to our war effort than placing a burden upon our people which they are unable to carry. It might result sooner or later in a negotiated peace without requiring unconditional surrender by our enemies.

The joint Chiefs of Staff have not decided how many men should be inducted into our armed forces in 1944. It is unfortunate that Congress and the people have no information on so important a part of our war activities—with less than a year before the effective date. If the current rate of increase in our armed forces continues next year we may look for an armed force of 15,000,000 men. By the end of this year the Army expects to have 2,700,000 men overseas and 5,500,000 in this country, making a total of 8,200,000. The other branches of our combat services will have more than 2,500,000.

The hoarding of unneeded men in camps in this country should be avoided. We should take advantage of the productive activities of every man who is eligible for induction, until there is actual need for his training for military service. With millions of men in Russia, China, Great Britain, and Africa ready to fight if they had the equipment and supplies, we should concentrate our efforts on production of food, guns, tanks, and aircraft with which to equip and supply them. The Russians are begging for food. They insist that half of each cargo sent to them shall be food.

All sources of information indicate a substantial reduction in food production this year. We must take every available action to change an evident decrease in food production to an increase.

Forty Senators have joined in sponsoring a bill to defer farm workers from the draft. Thirty Senators have joined in sponsoring a bill to furlough farm workers now in the Army who are still in the United States to work on the farms this year.

The reports of disaster to American soldiers in Tunisia, if true, disclose that our soldiers were at great disadvantage and thousands have lost their lives because of the lack of adequate and sufficiently effective war equipment. Whether that sad catastrophe resulted from a shortage of shipping facilities or insufficient production of needed fighting equipment, the consequences are the same. The lesson is: More production; more production of all the needed implements of war. The present rate of withdrawing men from production to increase the armed forces should be stopped. The number now engaged in munitions and food production should be increased. It seems to me that the commonsense, practical solution of our manpower problem is to adjust the size of our Army to fit our production problems and also the granary and arsenal requirements of our own country as well as our allies.

America and Its War Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me last Friday night at Raleigh, N. C., which was broadcast from station WPTF.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

March 4, 1933, just 10 years ago, was a dark moment in American history. On that day we embarked on a fateful era. We were then at war with an insidious, cruel, economic monster known as the depression.

Today, just 10 years later, we find ourselves in the midst of another grave era in our history; engaged in a life-and-death struggle with two of the most powerful enemies ever known to mankind, Adolf Hitler and Hirohito.

Truly, we now face the gravest crisis that ever confronted us as a Nation. World War No. 1 with all of its attendant horrors and sufferings was nothing as compared with the danger which now threatens our form of government—yes, even our very existence, all as the result of the brute force and power which was stored up over the years in the hearts and minds of the rulers of Japan and Germany.

This is a global war, a war of the greatest complexities due largely to its dimensions. No country in the world's history has ever attempted to do what we have been called upon to accomplish and to do what we are doing. This is truly a war of logistics and dimensions. The best of military strategies and planning developed from the experiences of the First World War are now obsolete and of no value whatsoever. The day of the untrained soldier has passed. The soldier of today must be trained and skilled in all of the mechanics of modern, mechanized warfare. Without this training he is not only powerless but valueless.

This war is being fought tremendous distances from our bases. In order to engage the enemies we must transport implements of modern warfare, such as tanks, planes, etc., thousands of miles. This transportation must be made through waters infested with enemy submarines manned by skillful and determined crews. These are but some of the hardships which confront us today in our efforts to wage total war on our common enemies.

However, I am glad to report to you that after a slow start we are rapidly moving into "high gear," and once our peak has been reached there will be no stopping us. There are some who will tell you that America is not "war conscious"; that many Americans are not doing their part and are not taking the war seriously. These statements, to my mind, are an insult to 99 percent of the American people and are a reflection on the intelligence of those who make them. It is true that some few are still thinking industrially and in keeping with the times prior to December 7, 1941, when the Japs attacked Pearl Harbor, when many left their benches and shops and walked off their jobs. I refer to those who are engaging in unwarranted strikes in war industries while their fellow Americans are engaged in battling the enemy on many fronts. This is no time for strikes in war industries. These strikes are so far-flung and so little publicized that only a few are aware of the tremendous handicap that they are placing on our war efforts. I am sure you will be interested in the following figures taken from the records of the War Labor Board:

For the year 1942, the first full year of our participation in World War No. 2, we find in plants engaged exclusively and entirely in war production there were 1,359 strikes, 96 of which occurred alone in the month of December 1942. We learn further that during 1942 a total of 568,312 men were involved in these strikes. This represents a total of 2,095,294 man-days lost from war production in 1942.

In addition to strikes, our war effort also faces another serious problem in what is known as "absenteeism." In the month of December 1942 alone, 16,000,000 work hours were lost to vital war industry and war production due to absence from work, and only 3 percent of this staggering total of man-hours lost was represented by absence from work because of illness. Those strikers and those who without good cause absent themselves from this work are reflecting discredit and creating national criticism of all labor. This is not fair to the millions of loyal, patriotic workers who are striving with all their might and muscle to produce arms for our soldiers.

Labor has advanced and made great social gains in the last quarter of a century only with the support of all the people, and unless labor puts to an immediate end every form of strike, absenteeism, or tie-up in war production, that same public sentiment will take from it, perhaps forever, some of those deserved gains.

Organized labor must clean house of its professional racketeers and their un-American demands. If it fails to clean house, then the Congress of the United States will be forced to do so through legislative enactment. I, for one, notwithstanding the fact that I have, ever since becoming a Member of the United States Senate, supported consistently legislation favorable to organized labor, shall not hesitate to vote for legislation which will put to an end these practices which are impeding our war efforts.

In March of 1942, 1 year ago, I advocated the passage of legislation which would outlaw strikes in war industries, abolish the 40-hour work week in war industries, and which would accord to every American citizen the right to work in defense industries without having to pay some labor racketeer for the privilege of making the tools of war for his son or for the son of some other American father or mother. I am regretful to advise you that my suggestions then fell on deaf ears.

Today in Washington, Your Nation's Capital, the Halls of Congress are literally a beehive of activity. Congress is determined to restore to the people a Government by legislative enactment as provided for by our Constitution, and to remove from the hands of certain bureaucrats in Government the broad powers, authority, and autocratic rule which they have taken unto themselves.

The subject which is causing most of your national legislators the most concern is the mammoth question pertaining to the Nation's manpower and its relation to the size of our armed forces; industrial production, and, last, but not least, to the continued operation of our farms and the producing of that vital necessity—food.

There are many Members of Congress who are fearful that our manpower is not sufficient to provide an Army and Navy of 11 million and at the same time continue our lend-lease commitments as well as provide food for our civilian population. These are indeed vital questions. Hearings are now being conducted by the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, as well as the Senate Committee on Agriculture. I am hopeful that as a result of the testimony which will be secured from these hearings that legislation will be passed which will solve this great manpower problem, preventing the stripping of our farms of farm labor, which is so necessary for the production of food, thus guaranteeing an unbroken flow of food supplies to our armed forces overseas, to our fighting allies, and our civilian population.

You can obtain an idea of the tremendous problem of manpower by analyzing a statement made only a few days ago by Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt, when he stated that approximately 12,000 men, the equal of one infantry division, are being drafted every day into the military service. If that rate of induction is continued for the rest of this year, 1943, you will see the creation of at least 325 new divisions of United States troops. Then the question naturally presents itself—what is to be done with all of those soldiers? Certainly not all of them, hardly half of them, can be transported abroad in the next 2 years to increase our armed forces over there.

The induction of such a large number of men into the armed services will have a tremendous effect on the civil side of American life. Already whole industries are being classed as nonessential and thousands have been forced out of business and have closed. It is reliably reported by those who have made a study of the manpower situation that by the end of this year 10 out of every 14 able-bodied men, 18 to 38 years of age, inclusive, will be in uniform. The War and Navy Departments tell us that we must have in the armed forces 11,000,000 men and women by December 31, 1943. This figure is the minimum. There are some who contend that 11,000,000 for the armed forces is excessive and that their induction will seriously cripple and interfere with our efforts to produce this year's farm crops, carry out our war program commitments, and maintain our national economy. I shall support the recommendation of our military and naval leaders because they have the facts. They are familiar with our absolute needs. They know what the grand strategy is. We have to have faith in some one. We are depending on them. This country can put 11,000,000 in uniform, equip them and suply them, and grow the food to keep the war won after we win it—but not unless many things are done that haven't yet been done. It is my opinion that in these critical times we must have confidence in our duly constituted military and naval heads. We should stand by them as long as we have confidence in them, and when we lose it, we should remove them.

Yes; the manpower problem is a stupendous one and it will require the study and intelligent analysis of everyone in Government if we are to work out a solution whereby we will not find ourselves proceeding with a top-heavy, unwieldy, and unsound program.

In 1942 there was produced in this country a tremendous volume of war materials, such as planes, tanks, antiaircraft guns, munitions, and merchant shipping. This production was encouraging, but we did not reach the goal outlined and requested by the President immediately after our entrance into the war. If we are to improve our production and obtain the desired results in 1943, a production figure which will far outstrip the combined Axis Powers and which will mean an early and complete victory, then every man and woman in these United States must work a little harder in 1943 than they did in 1942; they must work longer hours in 1943 than they did in 1942; and there must be absolutely not a single hour, not even a single minute, lost as a result of any strikes, absenteeism, or misunderstandings whatsoever on the part of labor or industry or anyone. Only by hard work and unstinting, unselfish effort and sacrifice on the part of every man, woman, and child in this country can we reach our goal of complete victory in 1943 or early in 1944.

Knowing that every patriotic North Carolinian will do his or her utmost in this victory drive, I wish to join you in a pledge of unselfish sacrifice in the interest of our country. We are willing to go hungry and cold and ragged, if necessary, and who ask nothing for ourselves except that the Government be organized to win the war quickly and bring our boys home safely.

Only unity, hard work, and sacrifice will bring victory and permit the generations that follow us to say: We did avenge Pearl Harbor.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, the able senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] recently gave his views on rural electrification in an impromptu presentation before the recent meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association held in St. Louis, Mo.

At the request of the association, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska on that occasion be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST GO FORWARD

Mr. ELLIS, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I asked Mr. ELLIS to be sure and mention the fact that I was not included on the program when plans of the convention were made; otherwise, I would have come prepared with a text and would have given it to the young lady down here and to the newspapers to read in detail. As it is, I am here impromptu, and I am going to speak to you just a very few minutes in that way.

I well remember 2 years ago when I became a freshman Senator from the ordinary business, industrial, and farm life out in Nebraska; we had a session with John Nance Garner, a great character. He told us that when we started talking too much, he would know that we were on our way out. So, I am going to be rather brief. [Applause.]

Another statement I have heard a good many people make is that "speaking is a habit." Too much speaking is a bad habit.

But it has been a genuine pleasure to have had the opportunity of mingling with this group of people in a convention, that, I think, is making history. Mr. ELLIS said last evening that messages had been received from more than half of the 531 Members of Congress, including the House and the Senate; messages to this, the first convention of an organization of farmers interested in the extension of electricity and its accessories to the farm.

I think that is very unusual. I doubt if it can be matched any time, anywhere, by such a unanimous response. I accepted the invitation that was sent to all of the members alike, and I came in person rather than to send a message or letter of acknowledgment to the association.

I had two very special reasons for being here. First, I wanted to join with you in doing honor to the distinguished citizen of Nebraska; yes, one of the outstanding citizens of our country—Senator Norris. [Applause.]

Second, I represent, in the Senate, one of the leading agricultural States, and I am a farmer myself. Nebraska, perhaps, comes the nearest of any State in the Union of being exclusively agricultural. We have no other source of wealth in Nebraska; we have no mines; we have just begun to discover a trace of oil down in the southeast corner of the State. We have no timber, no forests. We don't join the oceans or the lakes, where we can add fishing to our income. In fact, practically everything that we get in Nebraska comes directly from the soil or the processing of those articles for consumption elsewhere in the Nation.

Naturally, I should want to mingle with a group of people like those assembled here, whose lives are dedicated to work in agriculture and things that are closely akin to it.

This association is purely rural. Your name begins with the word "rural." Your objectives are all rural. I am not unmindful of the fact that in my own feeble way I must endeavor to carry on as best I can the splendid service in agriculture that has been made by my former colleague in the Senate, one of the most distinguished leaders in the Nation.

Where, may I ask you, could I spend 2 or 3 days to better advantage than right here in this group of people? I am glad I came. I have met a lot of fine people, men and women from the farm communities, interested in building better homes and a greater America.

Residents of towns and cities have their community building projects, their chambers of commerce, their Rotarys, their Kiwanis Clubs, their community chests, Young Men's Christian Associations, city parks, swimming pools, yes, even their municipal light plants; any or all of which give them the opportunity for that urge for community service that all good, genuine Americans should have.

We farmers cannot join in many of those civic affairs to give vent to that patriotic urge for community service. Farmers are too busy with their regular work. They have to stick on the job almost day and night. The farmer's opportunity for community service comes mostly through some form of cooperative action, the cooperative grain company, the cooperative oil company, the cooperative creamery, yes, through the Rural Electrification Administration and organizations like the one represented here.

I am delighted to say that the cooperative movement in connection with the bringing of electricity to the farmers has undoubtedly made the most rapid growth of any cooperative organization.

The Rural Electrification Administration, known as such, is less than 7 years old. Yet, I know of no movement that can compare with it in real accomplishment for the betterment of conditions of those on the farm, or that has done more real good for the farmer and his family.

I did not realize fully until I came here from Washington this week and saw the attendance from the many States how great an interest has been developed in Rural Electrification Administration, and I doubt if my experience has been any different than would have been the experience of many others who are Members of the Congress of the United States had they been able to attend.

I want to congratulate and commend the men who have been so successful in handling the tasks of carrying on the Rural Electrification Administration—carrying electricity to the farms of America. It is really a great work and it must continue. With the interest of the individuals, as shown by the splendid turn-out of the cooperative members, there is no doubt that the Rural Electrification Administration will continue to grow and prosper until every rural section in our Nation may have the blessings of electric service at their door.

As a member of the Finance Committee of the Senate, beginning with the present session of Congress, I will be one of the group that will have to do with the recommendation to the full Senate the sources of the money with which we will operate Rural Electrification Administration in our Nation during the next biennium.

The Finance Committee of the Senate compares with the Ways and Means Committee of the House. But a great deal of the research work and the hard day-by-day labor in connection with the seeking of those funds will fall on the members of the Finance Committee.

There are three sources, as I see it now, for obtaining those essential funds. Of course, one will be taxes, with which we are all familiar. Another will be through Government borrowing programs, and I think most of us are quite thoroughly familiar with that source of money for operating the Government. We are all purchasing our share of bonds, or should be, and I think most everybody is.

There is a third source talked of a great deal down at Washington, and that is the collection of loans which are due the Government. Now, that covers a wide range.

In a hurried glance over the list the other day, I counted between 50 and 60 organizations who are using Government funds on a loan basis in one form or another. Of course, the largest one at the moment is the lend-lease, and we are all sympathetic with the cooperation which we are giving our allies through the operation of that fund. [Applause.]

But naturally there comes the thought: Will some of the necessary funds sooner or later be returned from that source? But more especially at the moment are we concerned with what income the Nation may get from the return of loans that have been made to something like 50 or 60 domestic set-ups here in our own country.

As one Member, and speaking only in the capacity of an individual, may I say I don't think there will be the slightest occasion for urging the collection of loans that have been made to the building up of the Rural Electrification Administration organizations of the Nation or any similar organizations. [Applause.]

I am not ready at the moment to indicate to anyone the organizations that might have to curtail their operations, but I am quite certain in my own mind that those who are rendering service similar to that rendered by you good people gathered from all the nooks and corners of the rural communities of this Nation, need worry in the least as to not being backed in the continuation of the splendid work you have been doing. [Applause.]

Your executive secretary gave me a subject: We Must Go Forward. We must go forward, of course, and each of us must do our part. I think the greatest contribution to the building up of our Nation comes from the rural community.

I presume you are familiar with the statement, common among those who make a specialty of reading statistics and reports of research organizations, that the total national income runs about seven times the agricultural income of the Nation. During the depression years, when our total national income was down around the $50,000,000,000 mark, the total farm income was around seven billions. It is running two or three times that amount today, and as a result the total national income likewise has increased accordingly. That should be reason enough that we in America should back every movement which will tend to increase the income and the pleasures of living on the farm.

Now, I will use one illustration in my own life, with your permission. My people homesteaded in Nebraska when I was about 5 years old—in southwest Nebraska, the same county in which our good friend Senator Norris settled when he came to Nebraska.

I lived in a sod house. I wasn't very old, but I certainly can remember some of the hardships through which the family passed. I didn't realize it at the time, but I can appreciate them now.

Electric current is not yet delivered in any of the farm homes of this area. It is one of the best agricultural areas in the country, but for some reason electricity hasn't gotten out there. It is way out in the southwest part of the State. I can see the opportunities at first hand that come to this organization.

I myself am operating several farms and doing an extensive livestock feeding operation in the county right where my people took me a good many years ago without the use of any electric current except that which we make ourselves on the farm. We are the ones most urgently advocating the extension of service to us.

I give you that just as one example why I can appreciate the Rural Electrification Administration perhaps a little better than some who come from older settled communities where electric service has been available for so many years.

I said at the outset that one of the reasons I came here was due to the respect I have for my former colleague and our distinguished citizen. Last evening in this room, your group paid tribute to that great American, beloved Nebraska citizen, Senator Norris—a well deserved tribute because he is not only Nebraska's leading citizen but his record of accomplishment in public life places him in the top rank as a great American. He has

always been, is now, and will be the outstanding champion of the rights of the common man.

There is no honor that can possibly be bestowed upon Senator Norris but would be richly deserved. I believe there is not a man in public life today whose record of accomplishment excels that of this good man.

The country owes Senator Norris more than it can ever repay. His continued and persistent efforts to obtain cheaper electric power, alone makes for him a foremost place as a legislative champion of the rights of the common man. It is given but to a few men to have such a place in the hearts of his countrymen, or to have such a record of accomplishment as has had Senator Norris.

I know I have voiced the wish and the hopes of millions of Americans when I say sincerely our prayer is that he may live many years to see the result of his efforts for the betterment of his fellowmen [Applause.]

Two or three of the speakers last evening made comparison to Abraham Lincoln when speaking of my former colleague, and the thought came to my mind of a book which I read on the life of Lincoln when I was a young man, by Hezikiah Butterworth, and the closing chapter had these words:

"His monument ennobles the world. He stands in eternal bronze in a hundred cities, and why? Because he has a heart to feel, because to him all men were brothers of equal blood and birthright, because he had faith in the principle that right makes might."

Now, may I, in closing, repeat the portion of that as applied to my good friend, the former Senator from Nebraska: "Because he has a heart to feel, because to him all men have been brothers of equal blood and birthright, because he has had faith in the principle that right makes might." [Applause.]

"Anything May Happen"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask that an editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel, of February 13, entitled "Anything May Happen" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"ANYTHING MAY HAPPEN"

Arthur Krock, ace Washington columnist for the proadministration New York Times, has recently raised the question of why the size of the proposed American Army—fixed upon when the Russians were desperately at bay—should now remain the same, in the administration's mind, when the Germans have suffered major reversals in Russia.

No argument for so enormously expanding our military and naval forces can now controvert the fact that "without food all the ships and tanks and planes and soldiers will not be very effective."

Nor can any such argument for military and naval expansion produce the escort vessels required for the safe transport of so great an armed force as the New Deal high command continues to insist upon—particularly in view of the fact that, as Mr. Krock says, "as the Army is increased, the skilled manpower on the assembly lines diminishes."

Mr. Krock indicates that the New Deal high command is convinced that "to assure the kind of peace that will prevent a new war, the United States must have overwhelming military strength behind its delegates to the peace conference."

Moreover—and we are sure you will find this interesting—Mr. Krock interprets the administration's view to be as follows:

"A victorious Russia, master of Europe, may need more than the sermons of Henry Wallace to refrain from seeking too high a price for its contribution, heavy with blood, suffering, and glorious fortitude."

Indeed, Mr. Krock feels that this might be "an answer calling for serious consideration."

We agree. It does call for serious consideration.

Among other things, this answer raises a new question: The question of whether the New Deal high command is now chargeable with "red baiting" because it dreads the prospect of a triumphant Communist Russia blustering and bellowing and pounding the "peace" table.

Beyond that, it raises the question of whether the administration may, on the other hand, be entertaining some suspicions that all is not precisely as it may appear along the Russian front—or at least reckoning with the perhaps remote possibility that Stalin might settle with the Nazis as soon as Stalin felt that he had obtained all that he wanted for Russia.

But, even beyond that, it raises the question of whether, having defeated Germany (with or without Russia's continued aid to the bitter end), the New Deal would be disposed to invoke the threat of another war—against Russia if Russia should show some hesitancy about unreservedly accepting the specifications set out in the New Deal's own blueprints.

Whatever may be the answer to one or all of those questions, one quite substantial fact remains. And Arthur Krock states it:

"If the obstacles to the production of food, matériel, and shipping grow to the height envisaged by men of wisdom (albeit civilians), and if the Army should stick to its plan, the result can only be a failure to reach both goals: (1) The planned size of the Army, providing overwhelming military strength to enforce a lasting peace; and (2) a home economy sound enough to sustain even the reduction forced by circumstances."

Mr. Krock asserts that among the civilians who believe that such an unhappy prospect is at least conceivable are "some of the highest officials of the War Production Board."

Even leaving entirely out of the reckoning the perils confronting food supply, these officials reportedly "see in the Army programs a reduction of the civilian economy to levels below the points of essential morale and military effectiveness."

In a recent appearance before the House Military Affairs Committee, Lt. Col. Francis V. Keesling, chief liaison and legislative officer of the Selective Service Bureau, said that his office regularly takes the view that "there's always the possibility that anything may happen."

There is, of course, much to be said in favor of such an attitude.

For that very reason it would seem that the high command should make room in all its plans for every conceivable possibility.

It might, for example, keep in mind the possibility, however remote, of a termination, in the not-far-distant future, of Russo-German hostilities.

It might reckon with the possibility, however remote, that Russia might be cut in on a deal whereby she would take over most of Poland, a large hunk of the Balkans, and possibly some long-yearned-for warm-water ports well to the south.

In such an eventuality (bearing in mind, also, the fact that Russia and Japan are still at peace and still maintaining apparently cordial diplomatic relations), there might be on or two further possibilities.

Germany, freed from the necessity of defending herself against Russia, might throw a terrific blitz across the Mediterranean, send our forces reeling back across Algeria and Morocco to the very shore of the Atlantic.

At the same time, Germany might send another heavy column down through Spain at the west end of the Mediterranean; and, if Russia should return to a status of neutrality (or even support Germany, as in 1939–41), the new show of friendliness between Russia and Turkey might turn out to have been the harbinger of still more bad news for us at the east end of the Mediterranean.

Now, if the high command does always reckon with the possibility that anything may happen, we assume that it is taking account of just such dire contingencies as those here mentioned.

If such a situation should develop, it may be argued, then we should have need of greatly increasing the number of our troops in north Africa (not to mention the Pacific).

But the question still remains: How are we going to get them transported, in the present status of our shipping facilities; and what good will six or seven million men do over here if we merely take them out of productive employment and lodge them in training camps?

Avoidance of World War No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article entitled, "How Can We Avoid World War No. 3?" written by William Henry Chamberlin and published in The Progressive of February 22, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW CAN WE AVOID WORLD WAR NO. 3?

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The deeper we get into the war the less the administration seems disposed to announce any positive war aims. When the Axis was on the offensive all over the world, there was a reasonable case for the proposition that it was idle to speculate too much about the future of the world when we could not expect to have much voice in the matter until there was a turn in the military tide.

Now that this turn in the military tide has come, the time is certainly ripe for a political and moral offensive, to accompany our military offensive. There were two occasions during the last month when a broad statement of war objectives would have been appropriate. One was the President's message to Congress. The other was the Casablanca conference. Nothing that could remotely be regarded as a plan for a new democratic world order emerged on either of these occasions.

About all that Mr. Roosevelt saw fit to say about post-war organization for peace was that "the Axis Powers must be disarmed and kept disarmed and they must abandon the philosophy and the teaching of the philosophy which has brought so much suffering."

The distinguished conferees at Casablanca were equally uncommunicative about the type of world which will emerge as a result of the United Nations victory. There was simply the demand for unconditional surrender. About imperialism, about equality of economic opportunity as between nations, about self-determination, about the possibility that the Axis countries, purged of regimes bent on militarist domination, may be associated on equal terms in world political and economic organization, not a word.

AN ABSURD PROPOSITION

Now the idea that the future peace of the world will be assured by putting the Germans, the Italians, and the Japanese in jail and turning the lock reaches a high point of absurd naïveté. It would assume (1) that no other countries ever had been or ever could be responsible for aggressive war and (2) that there are no causes of internal and international friction that will not disappear when the Axis powers are put under jail sentences of indeterminate duration.

It is difficult to understand how anyone with a reasonable knowledge of history or contemporary world affairs could subscribe to either proposition. When France, under Louis XIV and Napoleon, was the most populous and strongest state in Europe, it was just as aggressive, just as much of an international nuisance as Germany was under the Kaiser or under Hitler. The sad truth of the matter is that in a community of nations where force is the only ultimate arbiter the strongest power is under great temptation to abuse its strength.

Throughout the nineteeth century the nightmare of British diplomacy was the steady forward movement of Russia in the Balkans and the Near and Middle East. Asia has known other conqueror races quite as formidable as the Japanese of the present time.

The elimination of the aggressor powers of the last decade, if unaccompanied by a drastic program of political and economic reform, looking to a progressive diminution of inequality between peoples, offering peaceful means of satisfying legitimate economic aspirations, providing for progressive all-around disarmament as causes of fear and distrust are removed may be only the prelude to new and more desperate struggles among the survivors in the arena.

THE TRAGEDY OF VERSAILLES

The failure to announce any positive, constructive peace program at a time when the turn of the military tide gives fair assurance that the United Nations will be able to implement such a program recalls the discouraging results of our participation in World War No. 1.

Then, as now, America's principal stake in the conflict was the creation of a peaceful and orderly world. President Wilson, in his Fourteen Points, laid down a fairly promising blueprint for the realization of such a world. But, whether because of pre-occupation with the technical problems of the war or because he did not fully believe in his own eloquence, Wilson made surprisingly little effort to learn whether the Fourteen Points were loyally accepted by the European Allies.

The negotiations at Versailles showed that they had not been so accepted. One of the best wisecracks of that time was to the effect that Wilson had won the Nobel Prize for mathematics; he had made fourteen equal zero. The Fourteen Points were replaced as a basis of a settlement by the secret treaties, the very existence of which Wilson had been serenely ignorant.

The wisest and most farsighted observers, like Maynard Keynes, predicted, with Cassandra-like accuracy, that Versailles had sown the seeds not of peace but of war. A good deal of nonsense has been written to the effect that all the blame for the breakdown of peace between the two wars lies at the door of the United States.

We could have been justly reproached if a peace settlement based on Wilson's ideals had been concluded and we had turned our backs on it. But I do not think America can be fairly criticized for refusing to underwrite a powder magazine, for repudiating responsibility for a settlement which was flagrantly out of line with the war aims which we had professed.

SOURCES OF POTENTIAL DANGER

Now we see a disquieting repetition of this process. We have committed ourselves to certain principles, expressed in the four freedoms and the Atlantic Charter; Mr. Welles and Mr. WALLACE have even said some hard words about imperialism. But the administration seems to be making less and less visible effort to implement these principles, to obtain their general acceptance just at a time when a vigorous political offensive would raise the popular prestige of our cause in Europe and in Asia and might appreciably shorten the war.

The greater the degree of physical involvement in the war the less, apparently, is the impulse to think about the world after the war or to show the people any objective beyond the elementary one of beating the enemy.

There are already two danger spots which may, after a longer or a shorter interval of time, witness the outbreak of World War No. 3. There is the apparent failure to find a basis of full understanding and agreement with the Soviet Union. One of the concrete results of this failure is to be found in Yugoslavia, where the forces headed by Gen. Draja Mikhailovitch, who enjoys the support of London and Washington, are in conflict with a partisan movement which is sponsored by Moscow.

RED EXPANSION VERSUS BRITISH POLICY

It is very difficult at this distance to pass judgment on this situation; but its potential danger is obvious. Suppose that, with the weakening of Hitler's military power, this year or next year, Russian troops enter Yugoslavia from one direction while an Anglo-American invasion force simultaneously comes into the country. A hairtrigger situation might ensue, in which great restraint would be necessary on both sides in order to forestall a clash.

We have been pouring lend-lease supplies into Russia—2,600 airplanes, 3,200 tanks, 81,000 trucks, and jeeps during 1942—and no doubt the recent Russian military successes were facilitated by these shipments. But there are some political questions, important for the future good relations between the Soviet Union and the western democracies, in connection with which Stalin is apparently imperturbably puffing away on his pipe and saying nothing.

There has been no indication that the Soviet Union will give up its policy of supporting Communist Parties in other countries. This is a minor issue in time of war, but may well be a major irritant in the years after the war. Even now it gives Russia a certain advantage in what might be called the war of propaganda.

Last summer, when Russia was being hard pressed militarily, Stalin had only to press a button and Communist groups and sympathizers in other countries launched a campaign for a second front in Europe. It is easy to imagine what would happen to any group of Russians who started to demonstrate in favor of some military move specifically designed to aid the other United Nations.

The future location of Russia's western frontier is another subject, important for the future peace of Europe, on which we have very little light at the present time. Does the right of self-determination apply to Latvia, Lithuania, and Esthonia; are these little Baltic republics to be allowed to hold a free plebiscite before the question of their inclusion in the Soviet Union is decided?

I suspect that by the time the war is over only a few obstinate quibblers for the unconditional value of the "four freedoms" everywhere will offer any objection to the reestablishment of the Soviet frontier of 1941, including the Baltic countries, eastern Poland, Bessarabia, and Bukovina. But is this to be the limit of Russia's westward expansion? We do not know.

What we do know, however, is that if the process of Russian expansion through the setting up of Soviet republics should go on indefinitely the unfailing British opposition to any power which seemed likely to dominate the Continent would reassert itself.

CHALLENGE IN THE FAR EAST

Another part of the world where the situation at the end of the war will be very delicate, and will call for generous, farsighted statesmanship, is the Far East. America, Great Britain, and China now possess a common objective, the defeat of Japan. To achieve this objective will require big Anglo-American naval and air forces, along with a better equipped and better trained mass army than China disposes of today.

When Japan is knocked out, what kind of policy will we pursue toward China? Will we do the big and generous thing, abstain from any kind of military pressure, hand over to China the administration of the foreign residential areas which were wrested from China during the imperialist rampage of the nineteenth century, ask for our citizens no other privileges than they enjoy in any other friendly country? Or shall we yield to the temptation to use our very great armed strength to force on China some thinly disguised new set-up of privilege and exploitation?

LET'S NOT FUMBLE OUR CHANCE

What about Hong Kong, for instance? This rocky island was taken from China by Great Britain after a conflict that has gone down in history as the Opium War, although British historians do their best to convince their readers that the practice of smuggling opium into China by British traders was not the main issue at stake. It seems doubtful whether a nationalist China will be willing to see a foreign power in possession of an island that dominates the southern approaches to China. But Mr. Churchill has served notice on the world that he proposes to hold what he has.

We could not impose our conception of perfect justice on the world after the war, even if we possessed the key to perfect justice, which we probably do not. Other countries will have a good deal to say in the post-war settlement.

But it seems doubtful today whether we are employing all the leverage that we possess from our growing military power and our relatively vast economic resources on behalf of the kind of peace settlement that would give some promise of enduring.

A clear statement of American war aims would have a tonic effect at home, in the Axis countries, in the occupied lands. If Wilson had been tougher before and during the Paris negotiations, World War No. 2 might have been staved off. Let's not fumble any chance of averting World War No. 3.

Acquisition of Island Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD two editorials, the first from the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, entitled "America Needs British Bases," the second from the Lynchburg (Va.) News, entitled "Island Bases." Both these editorials support the point that in connection with our lend-lease and general program the bases in the West Indies should be secured by the United States now.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press of February 12, 1943]

AMERICA NEEDS BRITISH BASES

Senator TYDINGS' proposal that Britain transfer to the United States in fee simple the island bases now under 99-year lease is so fair we believe it will appeal to the British.

Doubtless there are some Britons, just as there are some Americans, who object to giving up an acre of sovereignty, regardless of any larger gain. Fortunately for Britain, no such short-sighted sacrifice of her interests prevented Prime Minister Churchill from allowing us to develop those expensive bases for the protection of both countries. He considered the destroyer exchange a very good bargain for his country, as it has proved to be.

Now that Britain has turned over to the United States the security bases for the western Atlantic, which Britain could not carry adequately, there is no good reason why it should not be a permanent rather than a lease arrangement. To the British the difference, in fact, must be very small. But to us it is large because our future security is more desperately involved in those neighboring bases.

One lame objection to a British transfer of the bases in fee simple is that such discussions would be embarrassing now and might better wait until after the war. But if such an obvious agreement cannot be reached in the moment of our common peril—to quote another practical Churchillian maxim—how can we get together when the immediate danger is past?

The Senator also wisely suggested that it might be well to straighten out the title of some of the islands of the Pacific.

Today the United States is carrying most of the responsibility in the Pacific, not because we want to but because we must—Britain and our other allies insist that we do so. No more proof is needed that America, in the future, must have the sea and air bases to protect the Pacific—bases with which America might have prevented this Jap war.

Since Britain depends upon us to protect the western Atlantic and the Pacific, she logically should be willing to give us the tools—which in this case are the bases—just as we gave Churchill the tools he asked and more.

[From the Lynchburg News of February 15, 1943]

ISLAND BASES

The proposal, most strongly advocated by Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland, that we negotiate now for the permanent control of the island bases we now hold under 99-year lease, deserves serious and immediate consideration. No matter how much of a squawk the idealists, who are mostly just sentimentalists, put up, no matter the risk of some offense to our allies, such a grave problem in our future security should be worked out at the most advantageous moment. That moment is now.

During this war and after this war, the security of the United States depends upon outposts where sufficient sea and air power may be based to protect our mainland against attack before an enemy can reach the mainland. That is the only type of effective defense against air attack. These outposts must be in the Atlantic, in the Pacific, in the Arctic Ocean, and they must be in the Caribbean Sea. They must be far enough from our shores to be effective as interceptor positions, yet they must not be too near to the air bases of other nations, so as to be easily subject to the attack of land-based aircraft.

To mention only a few, as typical, such bases as we now have on lease like the ones in Bermuda, Newfoundland, Trinidad, Greenland, would need to remain permanently subject to our control and use. And in the Pacific such additional island bases to those now used by us as the Marianne, Pelew, and Caroline groups, under mandate to Japan before the war and now serving as bases for Japan in their offensive and defensive operations.

Obviously we will need to obtain the rights to establish and maintain bases on islands to an extent enabling us to be linked by air, in easy stages, to overseas friends, for the purposes of peacetime travel and commerce and, in time of danger, to facilitate mutual aid against mutual enemies. Such an island chain to the Philippines and to China and to Australia is essential in the Pacific. The securement of such island air bases as links in every direction with our sure friends is necessary. Not only are these bases essential for security but they will contribute greatly to the drawing together of friendly nations into a closer harmony, and gradually of influencing hostile or semihostile nations into more friendly attitudes.

As air travel increases and it become completely clear to what an extent all nations are vulnerable to all other nations possessed of air power, the disinclination for war should grow, else men will need to be even more stupid than the past has shown them to be. Until that educative process can become effective, it is imperative that we protect ourselves by securing strategic bases for utilization of the most powerful defensive measure, air power. We look to our friends for bases—and look, now, while the stress of war makes people see plainly what is needed and see plainly the need for giving as well as seeking concessions.

For nations traditionally and actually friends, there is no reason not to trade whatever things are promotive of mutual security. That we are delivering great wealth to our friends in the form of leases in perpetuity on certain island air bases is nothing to cause important friction. Friends, as well as enemies, need at times to bargain firmly under the circumstances of the most favorable opportunity.

For the sort of future world all decent nations hope to see there is no reason why its realization should not come more swiftly by the guaranty of security for nations like the United States and those nations certain to continue to be her friends. The establishment of such security is not narrow nationalism, but common sense. Only strong, secure nations can bargain and plan for the security for all. The United States must be secure in order to play its full part in the post-war program of education for a world peace. If obtaining this security, in the form of island bases from friendly nations, creates some irritation that cannot be helped, the irritation must be risked and endured for the attainment of so vital a result.

Feather-Bed Working Rules on Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very impressive letter printed in the New York Times of yesterday as well as in other newspapers of the country. The letter is written by Mr. Elisha M. Friedman and appears in the newspaper under the heading "Railroads Viewed As Factor in Manpower Problem." The subtitle is "Feather-Bed Working Rules Are Held To Be Grossly Extravagant Both in Man-Hours and Pay Rates to the Detriment of the War Effort."

The facts set forth in this letter startled and incensed me. The practices exposed could not be defended in peacetime and they must be denounced under existing conditions. I hope the letter will be read by Members of the Senate. I am placing it in the RECORD in order that it may be circulated throughout the country.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROADS VIEWED AS FACTOR IN MANPOWER PROBLEM—FEATHER-BED WORKING RULES ARE HELD TO BE GROSSLY EXTRAVAGANT BOTH IN MAN-HOURS AND PAY RATES TO THE DETRIMENT OF THE WAR EFFORT

(The writer of the following letter has had a varied experience in labor relations, in business administration, and in investments. He was on the staff of the War Finance Corporation, lecturer at New York University, and wrote several economic works, including Labor and Reconstruction in Europe. He was on the organizing committee of the Amalgamated (Labor) Bank with Sidney Hillman, Leo Wolman, and others, and has for many years been a member of the American Association for Labor Legislation and other prolabor societies. He revealed labor waste on railroads to the subcommittee on railroad bankruptcy on H. R. 10387 (1938), and to the House Committee on Interstate Commerce on the omnibus railroad bills (H. R. 2531 and H. R. 4682, 1939). Since 1938 he has been writing on the evils of "feather-bed" rules. He spent some time observing railroad operation in Europe. He is now a consulting economist.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

We are in the midst of the gravest crisis in our history. Our country and our lives are at stake. We need all available manpower and we need it now.

The Government is trying to use the Nation's manpower to the full. But its task is not being faced candidly. The shortage in manpower is not due solely to the lack of available workers. Indeed, that shortage is due in part to the deliberate effort of labor unions, by rules and devices, to prevent men from working full time. Thus surplus employees, unnecessary in their jobs, become

unavailable for work. This is a new form of hoarding; of keeping idle and unused services badly needed elsewhere

How absurd to talk about total mobilization, compulsory service, shifting labor to distant cities, while men on the job all over the United States are wasting time under union orders. Such policies do not help to win a war. The war will be won in spite of such policies, not because of them.

NEW APPROACH NEEDED

However, the crisis is compelling a more realistic approach. Public opinion is becoming aroused. The union leaders who put country above union are increasing in power.

The railroads suffer from unique devices to make work. These devices hamper wartime transportation. These devices also reveal a basic defect in the manpower policy of the Government. The Government listed the shortages of railroad labor as of September 15, 1942. Otto S. Beyer, director of the Division of Transportation Personnel of the Office of Defense Transportation, stated: "Considerable numbers of vacancies were reported in junior train and engine service positions, including 2,565 vacancies for brakemen and 827 for firemen. Only 30 vacancies were reported for conductors and 116 for engineers."

Mr. Beyer talks about "increased railroad traffic" and "need for increasing the number of workers" but he says nothing about increased use of the hours of idleness enforced by "feather-bed rules" and other fake-work devices.

This writer attempted to get an estimate of the manpower waste on the railroads and the annual cost. He directed his inquiry to an important source of railroad information and the reply was: "The subject of labor waste is closely connected with the manpower problem but this body avoids controversial matters of this nature."

IDLE TIME PAID FOR

What do the official figures show? Form M-300 (1941) of the Interstate Commerce Commission shows "Straight time actually worked" and "Straight time paid for." The difference is time paid for and not worked. Mr. Beyer's shortages are as follows: 0.1 percent for conductors, 0.3 percent for engineers, 2.4 percent for firemen, and 4.3 percent for brakemen.

But form M-300 shows that these approximately 250,000 men in group VI-B, train and engine service, were idle about 22 percent of the time and were paid for idling. It shows a surplus or waste of over 100,000,000 man-hours, or 50,000 man-years, for 1941 in one sector alone due to one cause. These men could, if they worked full time, easily make good the shortage that Mr. Beyer cites. Nay, more, thousands of these trained men could be released to make ships, tanks, planes, and guns.

Exact figures are not available, but on a rough guess it is probable that in all labor sectors and due to all causes there is a total waste of railroad labor of about 200,000,000 man-hours a year or about 100,000 men a year. In wartime such waste of precious manpower is really sabotage.

Not a single word has been uttered by any Government official on this subject. These union restrictions persist not only with their connivance, but with their approval.

The Director of Manpower is seeking to conserve manpower. But the Government refereees dealing with railroad labor squander manpower. The make-work rules on the railroads have become increasingly onerous. In fact, in the last decade Government referees have invented curious principles which extend and multiply such rules. These have become known as feather-bed rules or the equivalent of a soft snap in ward politics. The railroad workers who benefit most from these rules are those in the train and engine services who operate the trains.

A fertile source of wasted manpower is the "dual basis of pay." The engine and train service employees are paid on this basis. Under the rules, the employees may be paid either on the basis of piece-work—miles—or on the basis of time—hours worked. They are paid by the method which produces the higher result. A day's work is 100 miles for all freight train service crews. Often a crew can do 100 miles in four hours. But the wage therefor is a full day of 8 hours. However, if the 100 miles requires 10 hours, the crew receives overtime rates of time-and-a-half after the eighth hour. This is like a game of "heads I win, tails you lose." On a fast train workers figure their wages by miles and on a slow train by hours.

SPEED PROFITABLE

As train speeds increased, the crews can often earn three or four days' pay in one day of work. If these men worked every day, the annual salary of some of them would be equal to that of a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or $12,000 per annum. The rate is $24,000 a year on the Union Pacific's Streamliner, the Santa Fe's Super Chief and the Milwaukee's Hiawatha.

Such annual wages would become a public scandal. Therefore, the operating brotherhoods introduced limitations on mileage or output. In other industries, such limitation is termed "soldiering" or "ca canny." For example, on the run from New York to Washington, passenger engineers are limited to 10 days a month, and firemen to 9 days. During the rest of the month they are idle. Three times the number of men must be employed. What a waste of manpower in a war crisis!

Suppose the chauffeurs on city busses or the motormen on subways were paid by the mile at the rate set in 1880 for drivers on horsecars.

Another fertile source of wasted manpower are the "feather-bed rules" which distinguish between work on the road and work in the yards. The basic idea is that each group of workers has a monopoly of a small section of the job. Therefore, the crews of road trains may not perform any switching work whatever.

CREWS KEPT ON

With the rapid changes in our dynamic economy, traffic may shrink at one point. Switching crews then become unnecessary. However, under the "feather-bed rules" the railroads may not discontinue the switching crew. If a road crew should do any switching, its members are paid a full day for a few minutes of switching work. But in addition the yard or switching crews who are not present must also be paid another day's pay for "not doing" this few minutes of work. Railroads in order to avoid paying double wages must therefore maintain switching crews in idleness all day waiting for a few minutes of switching work. What an artificial separation of duties.

Manpower is also wasted through the "starting time rules." The regular yard crews must start at strictly limited hours. For instance, on three shifts, the first crew must begin at 8 a. m., the second at 4 p. m., and the third crew at midnight. There is a 90-minute leeway before these times. But, if the traffic requires that a switching crew be on hand 30 minutes before the limit some absurd results follow. The crew is paid 1 day at regular rates for the early half hour, plus 1 day at overtime rates of time and a half. Thus for 1 additional half hour of work, the additional wage paid would cover 12 hours.

These "feather-bed rules" for starting time do not apply to the railroads' competitors—busses, trucks, and ships, which operate more efficiently and cheaply. Therefore, traffic leaves the rails. Therefore, there is less work for the railroad crews. This is a crazy form of hara-kiri for the railroad workers. Imagine a department store operating on the same absurd system. Department stores are free to call their employees to begin to work at any time. Stores arrange to have the peak of employment at the hour of peak buying by customers. If the department stores were limited by "feather-bed rules" as to starting time, either they would have to charge more for their merchandise or the stores would go broke.

WORLD WAR RULES

What was the origin of these absurd rules? During World War No. 1 the United States Railroad Administration encouraged rules which required each operation to be broken down into monopolistic categories, the exclusive property of one craft. When the railroads were returned to private ownership after the war, the managements tried to modify these restrictive rules. In this controversy over the national agreements, the then existing United States Labor Board decided against the railroads and in favor of the unions. Therefore, today, in World War No. 2, during a crisis and a serious shortage of manpower, these cockeyed rules still persist.

How did these rules become so pervasive and pernicious? In recent years the situation has been rendered infinitely worse. The reason was the 1934 amendment to the 1926 Railway Labor Act. The instrument was the National Railroad Adjustment Board. This Board interprets existing agreements on the complaint of the employees. These interpretations are strained. They rest on strange principles. They require that unnecessary workers be employed. In numerous cases it has granted awards or heavy penalties against railroads for not employing such unnecessary workers. The Board's fantastic interpretations often go far beyond the intent of the working rules as originally written. Nor could such interpretations possibly be accepted in new negotiations or contracts between men and management.

BACK-PAY CLAIMS

Thus, in distinguishing between road work and yard work, the board has established the principle that where a yard crew was discontinued, because little work was left, a member of the yard crew may claim back pay for many years equal to the amount he would have earned if the work had continued. In one of these cases, the members of the yard crew, on whose behalf the union had filed claims, could not be found without great difficulty. On search, one was found to be a farmer, another had become a postmaster, and a third was in jail. In another case, where even after search the men could not be found, the railroad, in order to comply with the order of the adjustment board, told the local chairman of the union, "Here, take the money, and divide it as you like."

In another case, a decision of the board produced the following absurd result: A fireman made a round trip totaling 50 miles, out-bound with passenger cars and returning with freight cars. The board awarded the fireman 3 days' pay; 1 day's pay for the 25 miles out-bound in the passenger service, 1 day's pay for backing the engine to the turntable, and a third day's pay for bringing a freight train home over the same 25 miles. The entire trip took much less than 8 hours. After the board made this award, every other fireman on that run was granted the same "gravy," retroactive for 3 years.

In the National Railroad Adjustment Board, the railroad labor unions have a new kind of supreme court—a court of last resort. But it does not function under standards of American judicial procedure. The railroads are not permitted to see the employee's claim before they answer. No evidence is taken. There is no cross-examination. The parties to the dispute may not appear before the referees who decide the case. Nor may their lawyers. No transcript of the proceedings is permitted. No stenographer may be brought in. The atmosphere

is secret. The public is not admitted. The press is rigidly excluded. The proceedings are similar to the seventeenth century star chamber. The procedure of the adjustment board has thrown court processes back three centuries. Is this a court or an instrument of coercion?

COURT HAS CASE

An important case is now pending in the United States Supreme Court to determine whether railroads may have legal relief in the regularly constituted courts, whether they can arrest the proliferation of further rank "feather bed rules," and whether a drumhead court martial—the Adjustment Board—will replace our legal procedure.

A lower court has held that the railroads cannot appeal from the decision of that board. Thus they may not have relief. Thus the board has absolute power to require the employment of all the additional and unnecessary employees that the unions may choose to demand. Thus the board becomes the court of final appeal—the highest in the land.

Why should the railroads be subjected to such methods? Why tolerate and encourage such an indefensible waste of manpower in this acute crisis of manpower, to say nothing of injuring investors and consumers, who must foot the bill? Has not the time come for sober labor leadership? Should not labor's statesmen heed the admonition 40 years ago of Louis D. Brandeis? He said:

"Their action (of labor unions) is frequently arbitrary, the natural result of the possession of great power by persons not accustomed to its use. * * * They need something to protect them from their own arbitrariness. The employer and the community also require this protection. The success of labor unions as well as their usefulness to the community would be much advanced by measures which tend to make them more deliberate and less arbitrary, and more patient with the trammels of a civilized community. The unions should show that they are in full sympathy with the spirit of our people whose political system rests upon the proposition that this is a government of law and not of men."

Is not this the hour to give effect to this prophetic utterance? Have not all three branches of our Government, legislative, judicial, and executive, a duty in this crisis? Courage is the essence of statesmanship. Expediency merely defers dangers. Often compromise courts ultimate disaster.

ELISHA M. FRIEDMAN.

NEW YORK, *February 16, 1943.*

Nomination of James V. Allred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, with reference to the nomination of James E. Allred to be a judge on the fifth circuit court of appeals I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, one from the Shreveport Times entitled "Louisiana Ignored," and a second from the Washington Post entitled "Political Holiday."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Shreveport Times of February 20, 1943]

LOUISIANA IGNORED

President Roosevelt's nomination of former Gov. James V. Allred, of Texas, and District Judge Curtis Waller, of Florida, in filling what is fundamentally a Louisiana vacancy on the United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals bench can only be interpreted as a direct affront to the people of this State and as disregarding their natural and recognized rights for representation in their own individual branch of the second highest Federal court in this Nation.

In nominating these two men the President has disregarded the counsel and desires of the two United States Senators from Louisiana and in naming Allred he has selected a man known to be offensive to both of the Senators from Texas. He has thus taken a direct slap at four United States Senators, only one of whom has opposed the President's political philosophies to any great extent.

In addition, these nominations—if confirmed by the Senate—will give the six-State fifth circuit court a make-up of two judges from Texas, one each from Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi, and one—Judge Waller—who now makes Florida his home but who was a Mississippian until a few years ago. The effect will be two Mississippians as well as two Texans.

There will be no representation of any kind from Louisiana, the sixth State in the district.

In making these nominations the President has selected men whose background is filled with factional political atmosphere. Senators OVERTON, of Louisiana, and O'DANIEL, of Texas, have charged that the selection of Allred was made as the pay-off for a political debt incurred when Allred resigned a life job as Federal district judge in Texas to be the candidate of the President's political faction in the Texas democratic senatorial primary—in which he was defeated by O'DANIEL. In addition, Senator O'DANIEL states that it was understood when Allred quit the bench to run for the Senate nomination that "he would get another judgeship if defeated." Politics—factional rather than merely partisan—appears also on the Waller side. He left Mississippi to become the law partner in Florida of the present United States Senator PEPPER, ardent backer of the President's factional political philosophies. It was while he was Senator PEPPER's partner that he was appointed to the Federal district bench. Now, with Senator PEPPER'S backing, he is nominated for elevation to the post of Florida's representative on the fifth circuit court, although actually a Mississippian by birth and by background.

The fifth circuit court and all other Federal circuit courts were created so that citizens appealing Federal cases from the lower Federal district courts could be heard by a judicial body which devoted its activities solely to the section in which the cases before it originated. While law does not specifically provide that each State in a Federal circuit must be represented on the circuit bench, it is fundamental justice that this should be the case. That is especially true of Louisiana, for Louisiana operates under the French civil code, whereas the other five States in the circuit operate under the English common law. If the President's nominations are confirmed by the Senate, there will be no judge on the fifth circuit, which includes Louisiana, who has had any experience as lawyer under the civil code of Louisiana.

Such a condition obviously would be unfair to the entire State of Louisiana, and certainly would present a continuing possibility of abrogation—intentionally or unintentionally—of the rights of citizens to fair and informed judgment of their acts under their own recognized and legally accepted code.

When Circuit Judge Foster, of Louisiana, died—the principle that the bench of the fifth circuit court should include a judge from each State in the circuit was recognized by Congress. It increased the number of judges from five to six, to correspond with the number of States. That was done at a time when Florida and Louisiana both lacked representation on the circuit's bench, and it was understood by all that the purpose was to give Florida representation and at the same time retain Louisiana's. Confirmation by the Senate now will give Florida representation with a part-Mississippian and will leave Louisiana without any representation through selection of Allred for the other vacancy.

If the charges of Senators OVERTON and O'DANIEL are true—that the selection of Allred was the pay-off of a political debt—then the Federal judiciary may become not only a dumping ground for political debts but a means of increasing or maintaining purely factional authority and power inside a single political party. If Federal judgeships are used in the manner in which Senator O'DANIEL implies is the case, then there is the question of whether the Hatch Clean Politics Act is being encroached upon, for that act specifically bars such things as "understandings" about political appointments in return for political service. Above all else, nominations and appointments to the Federal judiciary of the United States should always be ultraclear of the slightest tinge of purely political reward.

[From the Washington Post of February 20, 1943]

POLITICAL HOLIDAY

Misuse of judicial robes as a reward for political service stands out with undisguised blatancy from the nomination of former Gov. James V. Allred, of Texas, to be a judge of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. Judge Allred was first rewarded for political services rendered to the New Deal when he was appointed to the Federal district bench before his term as Governor had expired in 1938. Last year he resigned from the court to plunge into politics once more as the New Deal candidate for the office of Senator from Texas. He was decisively beaten by Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL. Now President Roosevelt has handed him his second reward—a promotion to the circuit court of appeals.

It was freely predicted during the Texas campaign that, since Mr. Allred was simply carrying the ball for the President in an effort to unseat Senator O'DANIEL, he would be fully rewarded for his efforts. In fact, it was evident at that time that Judge Foster of New Orleans would not be physically able to return to the bench. Did this prospective vacancy on the fifth circuit court give Judge Allred added incentive to lay aside his robes and lead a political foray? In any event, he did jump from the Federal district bench into a political campaign as a "yes" man for the President and is now catapulted to a higher judicial post for his trouble.

The practice of appointing lame ducks and defeated candidates to judicial posts is in itself bad enough. We cannot expect to maintain an expert, independent, and high-minded judiciary if judgeships are handed out as political rewards to men who have been repudiated by their own constituents. But the customary "lame duck" appointment is a model of impeccability compared to this outrageous use of the Federal bench as a haven for a politician who resigns at the psychological moment to champion the political cause of his benefactor. As a protest against this gross abuse of the appointive power, the Senate would do well to inform Mr. Allred, through a rejection of his nomination, that he cannot play the game of off-again-on-again with the United States courts, as if they were a political band wagon.

Transfer of Jews From Rumania to Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a dispatch published in the New York Times on February 13, 1943, as cabled from London by C. L. Sulzberger.

Mr. Sulzberger reports that the Rumanian Government is willing to free 70,000 Jews so that they may be evacuated to Palestine. I believe the obstacles mentioned in the report can be overcome. I maintain, Mr. President, that there is a need for immediate action on the part of the Government aiming at the salvation of the millions of European Jews whom the Germans threaten to annihilate. Vigorous action on our part will result not only in rescuing these 70,000, but it will also be proof of our eagerness and determination to stop the barbarous plan for mass slaughter of the Jews of Europe which, according to State Department reports, has already claimed the lives of more than a million men, women, and children.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUMANIA OFFERS TO TRANSFER JEWS FROM TRANS-DNIESTRA TO THE ALLIES—PROPOSES REMOVAL OF 70,000 OF 185,000 IN DISTRICT—BID FOR EASING OF APPROACHING RETRIBUTION IS SEEN IN PROJECT

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

LONDON, February 12.—The Rumanian Government has communicated to United Nations officials that it is prepared to cooperate in transferring 70,000 Rumanian Jews from Trans-Dniestria to any refuge selected by the Allies, according to neutral sources here.

This proposal, which was made in specific terms, suggests the refugees would be conveyed in Rumanian ships, which would be permitted to display the insignia of the Vatican to insure safe passage.

According to the proposal the Rumanian Government indicates it is prepared to release the Trans-Dniestrian Jews, who would first be transferred to Bucharest, where they would be accommodated in specially designated buildings until the evacuation. The Rumanian Government has initimated that shipment to Palestine would be most convenient.

According to the proposal the government would levy a tax of 20,000 lei on each refugee to cover traveling expenses. It was said that the Bishop of Bucharest and the Papal Nuncio would insure adequate supervision of the transfer and arrange for use of Vatican insignia.

SERIOUS OBSTACLES TO PLAN

It appears there has been no decision by the United Nations regarding this plan. It is far more complicated than it would appear on the surface. First, it would be dangerous to receive large numbers of refugees from any enemy country because of the ease with which spies could mix with the emigres.

Second, now that the Arab-Jewish situation in Palestine has been considerably calmed during the past 2 years, it would be risky, some circles say, to stir up the latent discord, which would have repercussions in the entire Moslem world between Morocco and India.

Third, numerous great difficulties are involved in mass transferrals. The shipping question would be serious if a more distant haven than Palestine were chosen.

Observers here believe the Rumanian project is evidence that the Rumanian Government is no longer confident of an Axis victory and is trying slowly to work into the United Nations' good graces and lessen the retribution that is to be exacted on all enemies, especially those who were responsible for inflicting suffering on the innocent.

AREA INVADED BY AXIS

The Trans-Dniestria territory is between the Bug and Dniester Rivers. It was invaded by the Axis arms during the first summer of the Russian war. Prime Minister Ion Antonescu began the deportation of Jews to that area, starting with those not born in Rumania before 1919. By last August Radu Lecca, Rumanian Commissioner for Jewish Affairs, announced that 185,000 Jews had been settled there. Labor camps and concentration camps for Jews were established.

The settlement of Jews in that province contradicted General Antonescu's earlier pronouncements that Trans-Dniestria would be made a model Rumanian home. His conceptions do not admit Jews as Rumanian subjects. There is suspicion that he foresaw the probability that Rumania would not be able to keep Trans-Dniestria.

The Rumanian Government announced last October that there would be no more evacuations to Trans-Dniestria and claimed that those already sent there "were persons who had asked to be allowed to leave Rumania."

Washington, First President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a very excellent poem entitled "Washington, First President," from the pen of Mr. Horace C. Carlisle.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, FIRST PRESIDENT

Washington, first both in war and in peace,
  Master supreme of the sword and the pen,
Was, long before his untimely decease,
  First in the hearts of his own countrymen.
Character fashioned his boyhood and youth,
  Not so much through the restraints of the rod
As through his love for the eternal truth,
  Verified in the great Volume of God.

Washington, back in his earlier teens,
  Laid for his future a practical plan,
Using his every available means,
  Growing in favor with God and with man—
He became master, deservedly so,
  Of every great task that he tried to do—
And through experience he'd come to know
  That, with God's help, he could carry it through.

Washington had a sweet mother, and she
  Poured her best self into his budding life—
He, to her God, learned to pray at her knee—
  And kept it up, in the midst of the strife
For independence, that had to be won
  'Gainst proud old England, in spite of her boast—
And, as he prayed, "Not my will, Thine be done,"
  England surrendered, and her fight was lost.

Washington, when independence was won,
  Went to Mount Vernon, his haven of rest;
But, ere his surcease from toil was begun,
  And peace, renewed, reigned supreme in his breast,
He was called back into service again,
  And eight more years he courageously spent,
Serving his countrymen who, in refrain,
  Hailed him their choice as their first President.

Washington, great both in peace and in war,
  Shines upon history's pages today,
As the most lovely illustrious star
  That ever scattered the darkness away—
Throughout the dark Revolution's long night,
  Briskly and brightly and bravely he shone,
With a reflected, most marvelous light—
  Pillar of fire through the night for his own.

Washington loved both the church and the state—
  He loved them both from the depths of his heart—
But knew that both of them could operate
  In greater harmony, if kept apart.
If, throughout all wisdom's realm we should search
  Out the real cause that makes both of them great,
Love is the power that governs the church,
  Law is the power that governs the state.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Starving a War Industry

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington News today there is an editorial entitled "Starving a War Industry." For many months I have made every effort possible to bring to the attention of the Government the need for the production of food and to make such production a primary war industry. The editorial expresses so many of my thoughts that I often have expressed during the past 6 months that I have asked to insert it in the RECORD.

It is as follows:

STARVING A WAR INDUSTRY

On page 5 today you will find the first of two articles by Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard in reply to charges made last week by Louis Bromfield, novelist and operator of a big Ohio farm, who charged that the Government had failed to take effective steps to avert a catastrophic wartime food crisis.

We can't pretend to know as much about food production as either of these distinguished practical farmers who disagree so vehemently, but we are certain of two things:

First, that Mr. Bromfield stated pretty accurately the feeling of a great many other farmers, from whom we've heard before and since his articles were printed.

Second, that Mr. Wickard has not been asleep on his job, but has been and is making a sincere effort to help farmers increase food production.

It is not altogether Mr. Wickard's fault, but we think it is his and may be the country's great misfortune that what he is trying to do is not giving American agriculture as a whole the means and the assurance it needs for a tremendous task.

Food production is a war industry—perhaps the most fundamentally important of them all. On it depend our hopes for winning the war quickly and keeping it won.

But agriculture has never been and is not now being treated as a war industry. The plane factories, the arsenals, the shipyards are not being starved of skilled workers, machines, and materials. Agriculture is.

Irreplaceable skilled labor has been drafted from the farms without much evidence of plan or forethought. Other skilled labor has been tempted away from the farms by high wages, short hours, and overtime pay in war plants under Government policies which farmers feel are unfair to them. The 8,369,000 persons employed on farms at the beginning of this month—only 1,731,000 of them being hired hands—represented the lowest February total on the Agriculture Department's records. Yet the farmers are being urged to grow more food than ever before.

They have high crop prices, but their costs are also high and rising, and many of them feel that their only hope of doing their job under present conditions is in still higher prices. That would mean higher food costs, higher industrial wages, a nonstop inflationary spiral and home-front disaster to everybody; and higher crop prices won't hire skilled farm labor that isn't available. But we believe the farmers will insist on getting higher crop prices through Congress unless they are given immediate assurance of—

1. Enough skilled labor on the farms.
2. Enough farm machinery and repair parts.
3. Enough fertilizer, of good quality.

The Government's past mistakes are water over the dam. Correcting their consequences will be difficult now, but it is not quite too late to begin treating agriculture as the basic war industry it is. That demands more than planning by Mr. Wickard. It demands overall planning at the top of the War Government, with the Armed Forces, the War Production Board, the Selective Service, the Manpower Commission, and other agencies cooperating effectively with Mr. Wickard, and with President Roosevelt giving the necessary orders and making the necessary decisions to insure that they do.

We think that is the only sure way to avoid a food crisis, and the only way to prevent a disastrous inflation.

The Intracoastal Canal System

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEX GREEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I call to the attention of the House an editorial carried in the Washington Times-Herald February 20. I am advised also that one of the large New York newspapers carried a similar editorial last Saturday.

The editorial follows:

OIL FOR LAMPS OF AMERICA

Harold L. Ickes is in the papers again with prognostications that "there is little or no hope additional amounts of gasoline, fuel oil, and kerosene can be made available in the near future" for civilians.

"The allied overseas operation," says Mr. Ickes, "may double or treble the amounts of oil and gasoline now being shipped to our armed forces on all fronts and potential fronts. Hence, Mr. Ickes thinks the entire Nation must go short of these essential commodities for the duration.

This is the familiar "It can't be done" state of mind of the typical bureaucrat.

Gen. Charles P. Summerall, as reported in detail in yesterday's paper, has a different and more appealing idea. General Summerall says, without ifs, ands, or buts, that the present excessive, unfair and growing shortage of petroleum products on the eastern seaboard can be stopped within 10 months. That would mean toward the end of next December—at which time, if things go on as now, the eastern seaboard will be a good deal worse off for fuel oil and gasoline than it is in February.

General Summerall at present is chairman of the Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida; also president of The Citadel, noted South Carolina military college.

He commanded the First Division in France in World War No. 1, and later the Fifth, Ninth, and Fourth Army Corps. He was Gen. Douglas MacArthur's predecessor as Chief of Staff of the Army (1926–30), and always was known for his practical engineering and construction talents.

General Summerall habitually knows what he is talking about, or he does not talk.

BEYOND THE SUBMARINES' REACH

What he is talking about this time is early partial completion of the much discussed and well begun Florida ship canal. This early New Deal project was begun in 1935 under the supervision of Lt. Col. (now Lt. Gen.) Brehon B. Somervell, and some deep gashes were cut in the north Florida terrain.

The route runs from Jacksonville to Port Inglis. Summerall wants the ship canal completed to the extent of making it deep and wide enough to float good-sized oil barges towed by Diesel-powered tugs.

Do that, he says, and we forge the last important link in a chain of inland waterways connecting the entire eastern seaboard as far north as Bordentown, N. J., with the big Texas oil port of Corpus Christi. This would be of immense help; but a short pipe line built to strike up through New Jersey from Bordentown would throw the stuff right into the New York metropolitan area. That would be one short sea run across Apatachee Bay, off northwest Florida, far up in the Gulf of Mexico; but if a handful of Navy escort vessels couldn't keep this sea jump subproof, then our Navy is not as good at fighting submarines as the available evidence shows it to be.

General Summerall and his ship-canal authority associates state that the job could be completed in 10 months, at a cost of $44,000,000, with "existing and available equipment and without consequential amounts of so-called critical materials or manpower."

Why don't we go ahead with it, then?

We can, any time Congress appropriates the necessary funds. All the spadework has been done. The route is laid out, and Somervell finished a considerable part of the ditch before Congress got tired of the ship-canal project and cut off its money. The barge-canal project was approved by Congress last August.

Since that time, it has reposed in the bosom of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, being opposed by some railroads and some large oil companies. All that is needed to go ahead is the $44,000,000 appropriation—a piece of small change in these days of war budgets hitting one hundred billions a year.

Here is a plan, on the face of these facts, to relieve the critical fuel-oil and gasoline shortages which have partly crippled the vital Eastern States' civilian economy this winter, and which will do us still more injury next winter unless remedied somehow. The overseas fighting almost unquestionably will take more and more petroleum products via Atlantic ports; more and more tank cars will break down, and will be repaired more slowly because of shrinking manpower in railroad shops.

We hope public opinion throughout the industrial East may be aroused to demand that Congress make the necessary appropriation without further delay—and keep on demanding it until we get action.

Mr. Speaker, these editorials emphasize the eminent war necessity for immediate completion of the across Florida link of the present barge canal extending from Texas to New Jersey. These editorials rise above selfish interest and endeavor to present this necessity from a high American war-essential standpoint. I hope my colleagues will keep in mind that the desire of the war officials of the Federal Government to complete this project is not one of interest and aid to only one State. It is one in the interest of necessary oil, sulfur, lead, and other war manufacturing needs in all of the 17 eastern seaboard States of our Nation.

It goes even farther than that. It is clearly indicated that the gasoline and oil which will pass through this barge canal after it is completed will be sent to the battle fronts to be used by our armed forces in airplanes and other war machines.

The present oil and gasoline shortage in these Eastern States may be gravely intensified 1 year from now. Also, my colleagues, 1 year from now, unless this barge canal is constructed, you may well anticipate a most serious and hazardous lack of sulfur and other war materials to feed our eastern war factories. I deem it the high duty of Congress to appropriate funds immediately for construction of this vital link in the coastal canal system.

Eminent engineers in the War Department and in civilian life say it can be constructed in 10 months. I am advised that one or more private contracting firms will take contract and give bond to complete the project in 10 months, and at a cost not greater than that estimated by the Army engineers.

Gentlemen, the responsibility is yours.

Bond Sales in Theater Lobbies Aid War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, the publication known as the Belvoir Castle, of

Fort Belvoir, Va., is inspiring to those who read it. The paper is a morale builder for those boys in the service. Corp. Joseph Neatrour, of Johnstown, Pa., who is a member of the staff editing this publication, has written a very interesting article in this issue entitled "Bond Sales in Theater Lobbies Aid War Effort":

Those War bond booths in the lobby of movie theaters all over the 48 States are as an important asset to the United States Treasury Department as the boxoffice is to the theater. Matter of fact, a War bond booth is synonymous with the theater and has gained as much prominence as the boxoffice, literally speaking too, as evidenced by the daily cortege eager to purchase bonds and stamps before and after the movie.

The bond booths have swelled the Treasury Department's coffers. The daily receipts from the Washington area alone have even been instrumental in making somber Secretary Morgenthau smile with unprecedented delight. Had it not been for the foresight of the movie people to install these booths, at their own cost, Mr. Morgenthau would be burning more midnight oil in a desperate attempt to find some lucrative means to swell the sale of bonds and stamps. Without this daily income at the movie theaters our estimable Secretary might even be stewing and fretting at another rebalance of the Budget. At any rate, let it suffice to say that the receipts from the movie booths are keeping the Treasury Department's bookkeepers busier than ever, and making the Secretary's Herculean task a little lighter.

A recent survey of the people who are passing their ammunition in the form of bonds and stamps revealed that there is a high percentage of servicemen. Mr. Carter Barron, Loew's division in the Washington area, instigator of highly successful bond campaigns and procurer of celebrities for the President's birthday ball and other charitable drives, said that the servicemen constitute a high figure in the purchase of bonds and stamps. He said, "Very often servicemen purchase $50 and $25 bonds. This example surely ought to stimulate civilian purchase."

Mr. John J. Payette, Warner Bros.' Washington zone manager, also energetic in promoting charitable drives and cochairman of the Washington theaters bond campaign, said, after one of his unique bond drives, "The soldiers, sailors, and marines were practically the backbone of the drive. The servicemen set an example for all of us and it should encourage a higher sale of bonds." Another showman who has been cooperating with Uncle Sam's multiple drives, Mr. Hardie Meakin, of the Radio-Keith-Orpheum circuit, testified that a heavy percentage of his bond and stamp receipts were purchased by servicemen. Mr. Meakin said, "A majority of the servicemen invest their change in stamps, and it is a common occurrence when they purchase $25 bonds. The example set forth by our servicemen should be an impetus for civilians to buy more bonds."

The servicemen know that buying bonds means bye-bye Axis. He also knows that purchasing bonds is an investment in the future—the future of those loved ones he is fighting to protect. He knows that in this country it is a privilege to buy a bond—to make an investment in his country. He realizes that bonds buy the esentials of warfare. He knows that by loaning his money to the Government he is, in turn, insuring his own chances of survival, not only in battle of war but also in the battle of life that comes after peace.

National Resources Planning Board

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices, I voted against the elimination of the item recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for the continuation of the National Resources Planning Board.

I felt then as I do now that it was the only planning board doing real post-war planning.

I would ask the Members on both sides of the aisle to read the portion of the Independent Offices Subcommittee hearings which refers to the National Resources Planning Board, beginning on page 50 of the hearings. The information brought out at the hearings will show that the National Resources Planning Board has been in contact with the planning boards of the different States, cities, municipalities, and civic organizations throughout the country to prepare a program to meet the emergency after the war. That is what the American people are asking for today.

I hope the Senate will restore this item affecting the National Resources Planning Board and the House will approve the Senate's action. By so doing it will assure the American people that we are preparing for any emergency that may exist after the war.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 19, 1943]

A BLOW TO PLANNING

The House chose a curious time to strike out the National Resources Planning Board. That agency's work is more important now than at any period in the decade since its creation. We cannot afford to repeat the experiences of the depression years, when we proceeded planlessly to improvise one expedient after another in the creation of "made work." Certainly we shall be most neglectful of our responsibility if we approach the complexities of the post-war era without plans for meeting every contingency that thoughtful men can anticipate.

Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, always an able foe, led the attack against the Board with his condemnation of its "duplication." Scores of Federal agencies are engaged in the work of planning, he said. Why should this agency be doing what is being done in almost every other Federal agency?

The Board was established originally to deal with the very situation emphasized by Mr. DIRKSEN. For while almost every agency is to some degree engaged in planning, their plans are correlated only through the National Resources Planning Board. The real duplication exists between the planning of other agencies, and a chief function of the Board is to eliminate the wastefulness of duplication by preserving the best features of overlapping plans. The National Resources Planning Board duplicates the planning work of other agencies in the sense that the Budget Bureau duplicates the Budget planning in other agencies. It reviews and attempts to fit the various parts into an integrated whole.

In the year of its creation as the National Planning Board, 1933, as an agency of the Public Works Administration, there was one State planning agency. Largely as the result of the Board's leadership, there now are 44 State planning bodies and many county and municipal agencies. Many projects that exist on paper now, to be launched at the appropriate time, owe their origin to the work of the National Resources Planning Board, and most of them bear some relation to national plans and other local plans because of the Board's effort to fit them into a national picture.

Certainly the Board exercises a function which is of value to the Nation, not duplicated by others. If it is overstaffed or wasteful in its expenditures, the remedy for such evils would lie in a judicious reduction in appropriations, not the arbitrary elimination of the agency itself and the disruption of its work. The action of the House undoubtedly will be carefully reviewed by the Senate Appropriations Committee and some compromise reached which will command greater respect as a measure of real economy.

Radio Speech Over Station WNBF, February 20, 1943, by Hon. Edwin Arthur Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech delivered by me on February 20, 1943, over station WNBF:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, last week it was a real source of pleasure for me to return home for a day. I had not been back since election time. I have been so busily engaged in the work of the new Congress that I just haven't been able to come home.

One of the unfortunate circumstances attending my job is my necessary absence from the Thirty-fourth District and my compulsory presence in Washington. I say that not because I dislike being in the busy Capital. To the contrary, I enjoy it thoroughly. There is something new here every day; swiftly changing events and scenes produce a wellnigh irresistible attraction for me here.

But the one drawback which counteracts almost everything else is my having to remain so long away from my friends back home. This brings on a nostalgic feeling that is hard to overcome.

I suddenly realized this even more sharply when I came back to the Capital after last week end. Saturday evening, you will recall, I participated in an important Army-Navy E award ceremony made to the Stowe Manufacturing Co., of Binghamton. Ordinarily, I do not make trips to keep speaking engagements during these tense days. But a patriotic occasion such as the one I mentioned is different. I just had to avail myself of the

opportunity presented to me so that I might pay my respects to typically patriotic men and women laboring for victory in war industry.

Speaking of defense work, I am brought to mind of the increasing presence and activity of women in this vital line. On Monday, the House paused for a few moments to memorialize that pioneer of women suffragists, the late Susan B. Anthony. It was my privilege to contribute to this occasion and I take liberty now to read to you my statement made to Congress in connection with equal rights for women. I quote: "Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay my tribute to one of the foremost pioneers of women's suffrage, Susan B. Anthony. In connection with this great lady's work, it is interesting to note that the battle for equal rights for women still goes on. This battle is now being waged by the National Women's Party, among whose leaders are numbered several distinguished women in my congressional district.

"I was interested in the remarks of one of the other speakers about women's contribution to defense and war industry. I had the privilege of talking not long ago with an entrepreneur who told me that women are capable of doing better work in war production than men, because they are more conscientious; they are more careful, and they are more interested in their work. Therefore, they are making a vital contribution and can take the place of the men in defense plants who are called to war.

"Fortunate it is for the Allied side that our women are assuming a more and more prominent part in the war effort. They are taking over men's responsibilities on the home front, thus assuring America of adequate fighting forces.

"On this day of commemoration of the life of Susan B. Anthony, I salute the women of our country and pledge to them my unqualified support of their cause in attaining equal rights in a society in which they have always shouldered an equal share of burden and hardship."

On the same day, there was brought up on the unanimous Consent Calendar a bill to train 4-H boys and girls to aid in the enormous food for victory production program. This measure provides for a definite course of action to make possible the participation of American youth in work which cannot be accomplished now because of farm-labor shortages. Unfortunately, a member on the majority side objected to the 4-H bill and it was laid on the table where it will remain until brought up by the Rules Committee. This will cause serious delay to solving the No. 1 problem of the Nation.

If letters from the farmers I represent are any indication of what is going on all over America, the words of warning I gave the House some weeks ago will seem prophetic in the not too far distant future. In spite of specific provisions with respect to the deferment of farm labor and farm owners in the draft law, boards are still being ordered by Selective Service officials in Washington and Albany to disregard this whole question. Every day I receive a whole batch of frantic letters pleading for a solution to the farm dilemma. One farmer wrote me that he had just purchased a large additional tract of land for the sole purpose of raising crops. He had gone into considerable debt simply because he was motivated by a patriotic desire to help his country. Then, things began to happen. First, his sons were drafted, then his hired hands went to nearby defense plants to earn 200 percent more money than he could pay them. To cap the climax, he finds himself called up for the Army. He has no alternative but to lose his farm, hold an auction and sell his livestock. This farmer is face to face with ruin. His family will be forced to the city to live in misery and his farm will be abandoned.

But this farmer's unhappy fate is of little consequence when compared to that of the Nation he has been serving. Who will take his place to rebuild the dairy herd that has been sold and slaughtered? How will his deserted farm be utilized to produce food for freedom? From whence will come the knowledge of sound farm management which this drafted farmer worked so hard to accumulate?

The answers are simple. They are all the same. There will be no food produced in 1943 if some power does not soon prevail to stop this insane and wholesale drafting of the farm population. When I read of the auctions in every rural newspaper I take, when I peruse discouragingly the hopeless letters written to me as a last resort, when I think of all the obstacles that have been placed in our farmer's way while he is struggling so valiantly for our cause, I fear it is even now too late.

It is hard to contemplate what will be the outcome. Those in authority have some pretty ambitious plans for the people of this country to pursue. We are told that our allies must be fed on top of our armed forces. Then there is the little matter of keeping our own people nourished as well. To me this is paramount. You cannot win the war abroad while you starve the folks back home. But how are you to accomplish any of these tasks if you put all the farm brains and brawn in the Army? American farms are like American industry; they must be run by private enterprise and individual initiative. In Axis-held countries collective farms with serflike labor produce a meager diet under the direction of overseers appointed by the Government. Collective farming will never work in America. It will be as unsuccessful as American industry under state control. We are headed that way, however, and I expect to be on hand to say, "I told you so." So much for agriculture.

When I was back home just about everybody I met urged me to vote for a pay-as-you-go income tax. My answer is that I am in absolute agreement with this idea. Practically everybody has to pay an income tax for 1942. No matter how high his salary or how low his wage, everybody is worrying as to how he will pay his tax on March 15 under the present system. Somehow Congress has got to find a solution. In my opinion, the only possible way is to pay as you go. Let's not be forever burdened down with last year's tax bill hanging over our heads.

Frankly, I am worried. The Ways and Means is marking time, and there is less than a month left now in which to enact pay-as-you-go legislation. If March 15 comes and no action has been forthcoming, a lot of people will face plenty of trouble from the Government because of inability to meet their tax obligations. Therefore, some relief must be brought about.

In behalf of the people I represent, therefore, and with a sense of the seriousness this situation will create, I have written to my colleague Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Ways and Means Committee, pointing out the danger of further delay and strongly urging immediate enactment of some form of pay-as-you-go income tax legislation along the general lines of the Ruml plan. I quote from my letter to Mr. DOUGHTON:

"Hon. ROBERT DOUGHTON,
"Chairman,
"Ways and Means Committee,
"House Office Building,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: Because of the increasing demands I am receiving from the people whom I represent in Congress, I am writing to urge you most emphatically to do everything you can in behalf of enactment of a pay-as-you-go plan for income-tax payments.

"The dead line of March 15 is fast drawing near. Many people back home have frankly told me they are unable to meet their income-tax payments and are despairing over what they are going to do.

"There is no question in my mind, after having talked with men and women in every walk of life, that the public is overwhelmingly in favor of paying income taxes currently. Most of them seem to favor the plan proposed by Mr. Beardsley Ruml.

"Honestly, the only hope I see for almost everyone I represent is have your distinguished committee to report out a pay-as-you-go tax bill at the earliest opportunity and for the House to proceed immediately with the consideration of this measure. Only by this early action can the country possibly be put upon sound footing and not jeopardize the only precarious economic position of every man, woman, and child in America.

"Realizing full well the arduous task the Ways and Means Committee is facing, but nevertheless feeling moved to write you my findings from discussion of this subject with the folks back home, I will close, voicing the fervent hopes that by the time March 15 comes all income-tax payers will be placed on a reasonable pay-as-you-go basis.

"Respectfully,
"EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
"Representative, Thirty-fourth District."

Before I close my discussion tonight I want to bring one point to you married men who are about to be calle ' into the service. Please bear in mind that your dependents will be eligible for allotment money to care for them in your absence. You owe it to your wives and to your children to see that they are looked after while you are away. Remember, your wife is eligible to receive $50 a month; your first child, $12 a month; and each of the other children, $10 a month. My suggestion is that you do not wai' until after you have been shipped away. Make application for your allotment just as soon as you can. Then there will be little or no delay in your loved ones receiving their just due for your patriotic service to Uncle Sam. If I can help either you or your families with your problems, I will be very pleased to do so. Feel free to drop me a line if you have difficulties at all with any department in our Government. These departments are there to serve you. You, the people, are their masters. As your Congressman, I pledge to you my entire efforts to see that the bureaus and agencies of your Government perform and function as your servants. Don't fail to write me or get in touch with me in Washington if you have any problems or complaints with which I can assist you.

Thank you.

The Labor Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Executive Club News of February 9, 1943, published weekly by the Executives' Club of Chicago, carries the full text of an address delivered before that organization by Mr. Maurice R. Franks, on the

subject The Labor Front. Mr. Franks is editor of Railroad Workers Journal, the official organ of Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc. He is also the national business agent of this union. Mr. Franks is personally known to many Members of the Senate. I consider him to be one of America's outstanding labor leaders. I have read this address, and it is worthy the attention of every Member of this body. Therefore, I request unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer that printing the address is estimated to cost $135.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LABOR FRONT

(By Maurice R. Franks)

I am genuinely pleased to be here today, and there are real reasons for my pleasure. One of these reasons is that I am thoroughly convinced you are a sincere audience—people willing to get at the truth of a situation, even though the ideas of the propounder may not coincide with yours. These complimentary remarks are not being made right from the start just to get on the good side of you. They are prompted through a letter I received from your President, Dr. Haake, which I will quote in part:

"May I suggest that you do not try to say anything just because it might please our members. We are anxious to get at the truth, and I have the greatest admiration for those men who talk forthrightly and say what they think needs to be said, regardless."

This statement of Dr. Haake's is ample proof to me of the caliber of audience I am now addressing. I am further pleased to be here today because when one from my walk of life is invited to express his views to members of the Executives' Club of Chicago, which, as I understand it, is comprised of business executives, it is positive proof that labor relations are on the upturn. Not many years ago a laborite would have been somewhat of an oddity in a meeting such as this. The general opinion was that business executives and labor executives were natural-born enemies. A study of this enmity proves this condition was promoted mainly through lack of understanding between these parties—by failure to do just what we are doing here today, meeting on common ground for common interests. And why shouldn't business executives, the workers, and their executives exchange ideas? To put it another way, why shouldn't the partners of industry be friendly? The progress and prosperity of these parties are affected by the actions of either.

FACTS

At this point I am going to take full advantage of Dr. Haake's suggestion by being frank and calling a spade a spade. Anyone who preaches or promotes hatred between employers and their employees is nothing more than a radical or selfish racketeer. Employers who believe workers are not entitled to decent compensation and working conditions are not only selfish but very shortsighted and greatly responsible for our present chaotic industrial situation. On the other hand, labor leaders who do not recognize managerial and executive ability are not only unfit to lead but are enemies of organized labor, industry, and, in fact, enemies of our country as a whole.

We of labor must recognize and respect the God-given endowments of initiative, inventive, and executive ability. Without these there cannot be industry and without industry there cannot be workers and, needless to say, without workers there cannot be unions. To brand the possessor of these endowments as an economic royalist—an enemy of the worker—is not only unfair but un-American.

Then, again, what right has an employer to impose upon those not endowed with his abilities? It is not the worker's fault that the Almighty did not see fit to endow him with the same abilities as his employer—and it is not his fault that he must depend for his very existence on the ability and integrity of his employer.

Now, gentlemen, I have just told you some cold facts, and if we are to hope for peace in industry, whether we be employer or employee, we must face these facts. We of labor must realize that those who create employment are entitled to a reward which will promote initiative, inventive, and executive ability. To discourage these faculties is to encourage industrial turmoil. Men who have the ability to create and manage industry should always bear in mind that the success of their creation and management can only be accomplished through the help of those not so fortunately endowed.

BACKGROUND

Many people have asked me how I came about my views on labor relations. Well, just to keep the record straight, I will give you a brief background.

I have been in the labor movement since the age of 19, as a railroad worker, committeeman, delegate, business agent, and editor, and these capacities have brought me in contact with many workers and many employers. This experience has taught me that, irrespective of what part we play in this industrial structure—whether we be employer or employee—we are partners in industry and partners in a common cause; a cause to promote the posterity of mankind. We all have a definite responsibility and if we are not to shirk our task we must all realize that in the final analysis we are just human beings—we must all give and take.

I did not come here today to express my views, expecting them to be wholly in accordance with your point of view, because after all, gentlemen, I am a unionist and believe in the true principles of unionism as taught to me by wise and genuine unionists. Yes, I have written many items condemning certain unionists and certain industrialists, but what I have done has been in the spirit of uplifting a movement I have great respect for.

ORIGIN OF UNIONS

Did you ever stop to consider that unions, as we know them today, would be practically unnecessary if it were not for the fact that we have unscrupulous and selfish industrialists who don't give a tinker's dam about their workers' welfare; who care not whether workers and their families eat and sleep? The selfish and racketeering employers are really the promoters of unionism. If all employers were just, there would be no necessity for workers to band together as an assurance of justice.

Before the coming of unions, workers had no guaranty of honest treatment. Prior to this system, workers were compelled to do the bidding of their employers and, in some instances, were jailed if they disobeyed. "Employers" is a mild word to use—"masters" would define their attitude more correctly. It has always seemed a pity to me that all those endowed with industrial abilities are not also blessed with humanitarian instincts. If this added gift existed in every case, there would be no real reason why workers should pay a toll to be treated as humans. Unions would be nothing more than educational and fraternal societies for workers.

Industrial history reeks with unfairness to workers. Fifty years ago the majority of employers, whether they realized it or not, were unfair to their workers. They did not allow them a decent livelihood. Fortunately, this condition has been greatly improved in recent years, and this improvement can be largely credited to union activity. Workers are no longer required to work 16 hours a day for meager existence. The average working man of today working 8 hours, receives enough compensation, whether organized or not, to allow him a decent livelihood. Thrifty workers can and do own their own homes with all conveniences and enjoy such luxuries as the market has to offer, and I could go on and on with other advantages unattainable to workers 50 years ago. Whether we realize it or not, conditions for the workers have been improving. Comparison as of 50 years ago is laughable, which brings out this point:

When workers operate under better working conditions, with fair hours and adequate pay, they automatically become important consumers of their own production and are the real promoters of prosperity, not only for themselves, but likewise for the employers as a whole.

NEED OF MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING

Wise business executives know commodities must be consumed by the very people who produce them. To underpay the consumers is to curtail production. Visualize industry if the automobile were only attainable by the wealthy; the telephone, radio, electric lights, etc. Why, there are not enough wealthy people in this Nation to keep any one of these industries operating for more than 2 months out of a year. Therefore, it becomes apparent that workers must be well treated, and I believe most employers appreciate this fact today.

If employers of yesteryear were unfair through ignorance or conditions of that time, it is not the fault of the present generation of honest employers. We are not living in the past, but in the present and for the future. The mistakes and abuses of the past should be credited to experience, and belong to history. If industry as a whole is to go forward, we must meet conditions of today and tomorrow, and operate accordingly. Employers and employees must operate in unison. There must be harmony. The abuse of either is the concern of both.

To hear many employers talk, unions are an evil—something to be done away with. And to hear many of our so-called labor leaders, all employers should be put in jail. I agree that some unions are an evil and should be done away with and that some employers should be put in jail. Their actions call for confinement. And many of our so-called labor leaders should be their cellmates. But to say that just because one employer is a crook, all employers are crooks is as narrow-minded as saying that just because one labor leader is a racketeer, all labor leaders are racketeers. Records prove the majority of men responsible for industry are honest, and by this same token, the majority of workers and their leaders are likewise honest. This being the case, why should the majority be persecuted for the shortcomings of the minority?

Most of our industrial strife can be charged to the system under which we operate—a system which must be changed if we are to have peace and harmony in industry. The National Labor Relations Act came into being for the purpose of ridding industry of its crooks by setting up a code of ethics as a foundation toward this objective. Well, I don't know who was whispering into Senator WAGNER'S ear when he drafted this law. It seems to me that in place of prosecuting the crooks of industry, it plays a major role in persecuting the very people it was supposed to help.

THE WAGNER ACT

I told you I was going to call a spade a spade. Well, here it goes! The preamble of the National Labor Relations Act, or the

Wagner Act, as it is often referred to, starts out with a beautiful thought. To quote it.

"An act to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce."

Since the enactment of this law, we have had more industrial unrest than was ever experienced in the history of this Nation. And why? Simply because the Labor Act functions on the assumption that most employers are crooked and all labor leaders honest. If you think I don't know what I am talking about, just listen to sections 7 and 8, quoted from this act:

"SEC. 7. Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities, for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

"SEC. 8. It shall be an unfair practice for an employer—

"(1) To interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7.

"(2) To dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization or contribute financial or other support to it."

These sections are in no uncertain language. They are absolutely conclusive and have been validated by the United States Supreme Court as the legal means of procedure in accordance with the intent of the law. Now, let us enforce it and see what we have.

COERCION

First of all, under the Labor Act, according to these sections, it automatically becomes unlawful for an employer to dominate any labor organization; but when he signs a contract calling for him to compel every employee within his establishment to become a member of the union, whether or not it is the workers' choice of collective bargaining, even though a majority of the workers have so signified, I maintain this is nothing short of coercion on the part of the employer, because the Labor Act specifically states that employees may bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing.

Call it what you may—a closed shop or union maintenance—it is nothing less than the "yellow dog contract" in reverse, which has been outlawed. When the yellow-dog contract system was in effect employees were deprived of the right to earn a living for belonging to a union. Samuel Gompers and every honorable labor leader fought this system on the premise that it was unconstitutional to deprive a man of his living because of his union affiliation. Therefore, it is unfair to deprive one of a living for not belonging to a union. I also maintain it is more serious coercion on the part of labor leaders who make it mandatory for employers to sign such contracts, which are in direct opposition to section 7, because unless they do sign they are labeled "unfair to organized labor," which means trouble.

To top that off, employers, under the check-off system, agree to collect the union dues, making them the unpaid treasurers of the union. If this isn't contributing financial or other support to unions, I would like to know what it really is, because without the collection of dues under this system it is quite doubtful that some of these so-called unions would be able to exist. Obviously, the collection of dues through the check-off stands out as a very significant contribution to unions, or a very direct violation of section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act.

INEQUITIES OF THE LAW

There is no doubt in my mind but what Senator WAGNER intended the Labor Act to be an instrument of promoting harmonious industrial relations. But whoever his advisers were, they certainly went to great lengths in selling the Senator a "bill of goods." They must have been great salesmen, but they surely lost sight of one fact, and that is: You cannot pass laws to make crooks turn honest, or chiselers quit chiseling. And any law condoning such inequity will eventually have to be stricken from the statute books.

On the surface, the Labor Act was supposed to bring peace to industry, and yet it creates a condition of continual turmoil. It places employers and their employees in a position of disharmony. When this law is strictly interpreted, it tells the employers they dare not influence their workers, even though it may be for their betterment. And I am going to tell you right here and now, it's a hell of a condition, especially during this war period, when the partners of industry are prohibited from exchanging ideas for the promulgation of mutual interests. Believe me, chiseling and racketeer labor leaders have, and are, taking great advantage of the language incorporated in the National Labor Relations Act. They have not tried to sell the employers, the workers, and the public on the merits of unionism, nor have they tried to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce.

There is no doubt that we need a Labor Relations Act to guarantee the natural prerogatives of the workers and employers, and until we do get such a law with teeth, there is little chance of diminishing the causes of labor disputes. The time was never more opportune than right now.

DANGER SIGNALS

The wise men of today are saying that we must not only win this global war, but we must also win the peace. Just how can we have peace in this world when faction is fighting function? The amount of man-hours lost since Pearl Harbor on account of unnecessary strikes is beyond tabulation; precious hours which could have been utilized for building vital war materials to defeat our enemies; hours that are now floating on a river of blood from our heroes who might have been spared, had they the means at the proper time. What kind of a people are we who put profits and unnecessary demands beyond the lives and security of those gallant men in the armed services? Are we going soft? Have we lost confidence in our democracy by listening to a lot of Nazi propaganda? Or are we just plain blind to the fate which lies ahead should we lose this war? Whatever the answer is, we had better awaken right now and do a right-about-face unless we want to be saying to ourselves, "Remember democracy"!

Please do not get the idea that I am against workers receiving just treatment, or against the workers' right to stirke for better working conditions. I am an ardent promoter of workers' rights, but I also believe circumstances alter cases, and this war must be won or all of labor's gains will have been for naught. This also applies to employers. Unreasonable wages, working conditions, and profits can be the means of us losing this war. Then what will we have gained? The big total of nothing. We lose our democracy and our American way of life to a bunch of cutthroats who would be happy to place us all in slavery—workers and employers alike.

UN-AMERICAN

Any labor leader or business executive, who willfully promotes an unnecessary strike, is not fit to be classed as an American, and there should be some legal process to safeguard honorable workers and honorable executives from the maneuvers of this class.

If the National Labor Relations Act had been more carefully drafted, it could be playing a major role right now in protecting industry from racketeers; but unfortunately, this act, as we all well realize, is not functioning as originally intended. So it becomes apparent that something must be done in lines of legislation which will produce the fullest measure of protection to the workers, their employers, the public, and our country as a whole.

In the forepart of this address I pointed out two sections of the Labor Act which are weak. And if we were to analyze the entire act, I could show you several more weak points. I am not an alarmist, nor am I one to judge the multitude by the shortcomings of a few, any more than I would condemn an entire family just because of one "black sheep." In other words, there is no reason to destroy good unions simply because we have bad unions. Common sense tells me the vast majority of workers are honest and since they comprise the major part of unions, then, too, the great percentage of unions are made up of honest men. And since most labor leaders are from the rank and file, they, too, are, by and large, honest. The same can be said of the employers.

NEED OF PROTECTIVE LEGISLATION

Therefore, what we need in lines of legislation today is not restrictive but protective legislation which will guarantee the natural prerogatives of honest workers and employers.

Most people I come in contact with have no real objection to good unions operating on a basis of responsibility. As a matter of fact, many employers, who were dead enemies of unions prior to contractual arrangements with them, are today stanch supporters because they have found out unions can be highly beneficial in expediting business. These same men would be the first today to step forward to block any move unfair to organized labor. The main objection to unions is not against the rank and file or its just demands, but against the racketeer leaders who do not hesitate in wrecking an industry to attain their selfish and mercenary objectives. The main reason that nothing tangible has been done along the lines of fair legislation is that the people who could bring about a beneficial change have been fearful of "sticking out their necks"; fearful of being accused of "grinding an ax" for their own personal gain. To my way of thinking, this is almost cowardice because, unless someone goes on the offensive, we will never enjoy peace in industry.

I represent about the smallest labor organization on the railroads, known as the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc. We have given considerable thought to the necessity of sensible legislation that will not make "fish" of one industry and "flesh" of the other. We have been, for the past several years, active in this movement and for our activity we have been at times accused of being antiunion, hirelings of employers, and yet, in spite of these accusations, we are today carrying on the fight and we intend to keep it up until something tangible is accomplished. While we may be a small body of men numerically speaking, we do have the courage of our convictions, and we stand ready to fight for them. We have confidence in the principles of honest unionism, and demand that these principles be respected. But when we see unionism desecrated by racketeers, masquerading as labor leaders, we believe the time has come for the courageous to speak right out; to "hew to the line and let the chips fall where they may." However, there are other organizations who would, no doubt, like to declare themselves as we do, but unfortunately do not feel they are in a position to do so.

Don't let anyone tell you the American Federation of Labor and its leaders are all wrong, or everyone connected with the Congress of Industrial Organizations is a crook. This is not a fact. The great majority of the members and leaders of these organizations are good, honest Americans, willing to act honorably; but their present plight of rivalry acts as a barrier. If the American

Federation of Labor makes a move for the betterment of unionism as a whole, the Congress of Industrial Organizations is reluctant and claims they are just "grinding an ax to chop off the heads" of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and vice versa.

Fortunately, our little organization is independent; not affiliated with either the American Federation of Labor or the Congress of Industrial Organizations. This automatically places us in an ideal position to offer improvements, because we are a body of men with experience in the labor movement. Our organization is comprised of members from the various railroad unions—men who have been in the actual labor union movement averaging better than 20 years each—men who have come from within the ranks as railroad switchmen, trainmen, conductors, clerks, train dispatchers, and so on. And the majority still hold membership in the respective unions of these occupations. We realize something must be done toward the alleviation of the present chaotic condition or the real enemies of organized labor will step in with drastic restrictive legislation which will spell the abolishment of this worthy movement.

THE POWER OF FRANCHISE

Up to the present time every move made toward the amendment of the National Labor Relations Act has bumped into a disparaging condition in Washington, simply because the political set-up down there has been lopsided. The American public has been treated as mere puppets by politicians, who seemed to be under the impression that the voters of this Nation were subordinate to political office holders, instead of the reverse. But the picture changed last November, and November 3, 1942, will always be remembered as a red-letter day in these United States, because on that day the voters really "saw red" and ousted many "flannel mouths" from their seats in the House of Representatives and the Senate. The public used the only real weapon they have, and a good one at that, to safeguard the principles of our democracy. They simply exercised their franchise. And if enough red-blooded Americans will let their wants be known to the new Congress, this year should mark the beginning of a new era of democracy in these United States—and it's about time.

QUESTION PERIOD

Question. What changes would you make in the Wagner Act?

Mr. FRANKS. I would make changes in the Wagner law aimed at getting at the cause of labor troubles instead of merely getting at the results. I believe I would ask for about an eight-point amendment as follows:

1. Only citizens of the United States of America or the Dominion of Canada would be eligible to hold elective office in any labor union.

2. Labor leaders would be men from within the ranks with adequate experience in the occupation represented by the union.

3. All persons responsible for the funds of the union would be adequately bonded by a responsible and independent bonding company preferably a corporate bond.

4. All members of labor unions would be rendered a financial statement at least once per annum attested to by a certified independent public accountant.

5. No part of a union's funds would be contributed to any politician or political party seeking office unless by specific authority of a majority of that union.

6. I would make a direct amendment of section 7–A which reads at present "Employees shall have the right to self-organization to form, join, or assist labor organizations," etc. I would add one word as an amendment to that section. Employees shall have the right to self-organization to voluntarily form, join, or assist labor organizations, etc.

7. Workers would not be required to join unions for the right to work.

8. No strike would be considered legal until the lapse of a "cool off" period.

Question. Would labor leaders support the proposed changes in the Wagner Act, or would public officials be afraid to support them on account of political consequences?

Mr. FRANKS. I believe if the proper means of dissemination were obtainable, such as the press and radio, to give this question a thorough airing whereby the constituents of labor leaders and the constituents of the Congress would be able to study the facts, that both of these constituencies being honest by and large, would put enough pressure behind the labor and political leaders to force the issue to a satisfactory conclusion.

Question. Should labor unions be incorporated?

Mr. FRANKS. I favor the incorporation of all big business.

President HAAKE. But that wasn't the question, Mr. Franks.

Mr. FRANKS. It is my understanding that the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations collectively have around 12,000,000 members, with a minimum dues of $1 a month, which grosses $12,000,000 a month, or $144,000,000 a year, which is big business in any language.

The National Resources Planning Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Blow to Planning," published in the Washington Star of February 19, 1943. The editorial deals with the action of the House of Representatives in withholding appropriations for the National Resources Planning Board. I am sure the action was mistakenly taken.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BLOW TO PLANNING

The House chose a curious time to strike out the National Resources Planning Board. That agency's work is more important now than at any period in the decade since its creation. We cannot afford to repeat the experiences of the depression years, when we proceeded planlessly to improvise one expedient after another in the creation of "made work." Certainly we shall be most neglectful of our responsibility if we approach the complexities of the post-war era without plans for meeting every contingency that thoughtful men can anticipate.

Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, always an able foe, led the attack against the Board with his condemnation of its "duplication." Scores of Federal agencies are engaged in the work of planning, he said. Why should this agency be doing what is being done in almost every other Federal agency?

The Board was established originally to deal with the very situation emphasized by Mr. DIRKSEN. For while almost every agency is to some degree engaged in planning, their plans are correlated only through the National Resources Planning Board. The real duplication exists between the planning of other agencies, and a chief function of the Board is to eliminate the wastefulness of duplication by preserving the best features of overlapping plans. The National Resources Planning Board duplicates the planning work of other agencies in the sense that the Budget Bureau duplicates the budget planning in other agencies. It reviews and attempts to fit the various parts into an integrated whole.

In the year of its creation as the National Planning Board, 1933, as an agency of the Public Works Administration, there was one State planning agency. Largely as the result of the Board's leadership, there now are 44 State planning bodies and many county and municipal agencies. Many projects that exist on paper now, to be launched at the appropriate time, owe their origin to the work of the National Resources Planning Board, and most of them bear some relation to national plans and other local plans because of the Board's effort to fit them into a national picture.

Certainly the Board exercises a function which is of value to the Nation, not duplicated by others. If it is overstaffed or wasteful in its expenditures, the remedy for such evils would lie in a judicious reduction in appropriations, not the arbitrary elimination of the agency itself and the disruption of its work. The action of the House undoubtedly will be carefully reviewed by the Senate Appropriations Committee and some compromise reached which will command greater respect as a measure of real economy.

United States Sugar Supply Outlook Alarming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the situation confronting those to whom we must look to produce beet sugar during the coming year is rapidly becoming critical. For weeks officials representing the Sugar Section of the Agriculture Department and those representing beet farmers and manufacturers have carried on negotiations with a view of bringing about conditions under which farmers can produce without loss this vitally necessary crop. Little progress apparently has been made. Those from the Sugar Section are following their usual tactics of delay after delay. As I ponder this situation my mind recalls a well-known figure of ancient Rome who fiddled while Rome burned. When one realizes the necessity for an immediate settlement of this question he wonders if the bureaucrats are not indulging in the same pastime.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I offer the following timely article by Lamborn & Co. It discusses the sugar question in a most instructive and interesting way:

UNITED STATES SUGAR SUPPLY OUTLOOK ALARMING

As students of the sugar situation, we daily grow more apprehensive about the sugar supply prospects for 1943. The situation is rapidly approaching the danger point.

Here we are well into February and yet, up to this writing, no contract agreement has been developed for the production of sugar beets. True, the Government, beet growers, and beet processors have been in meeting for weeks, but no satisfactory program has been forthcoming. Valuable time is being lost, which will affect materially the size of the 1943 United States sugar-beet crop.

The difficulty seems to lie in the fact that whereas the farmers received on the average $9.50 per ton in 1942 for sugar beets they, because of higher costs all along the line including labor, are now asking $12 per ton of beets. For them to secure this amount, either one of two things must happen—an increase in the ceiling price of sugar enabling the farmer to get a higher return, or new "incentive" subsidies that will bring the results to the farmers up to their desired figure. The Government has not as yet, as we understand it, been able, or is not yet convinced that it is necessary, to work out a program which would place sugar beets in a competitive position with certain other farm products and warrant the farmers' growing beets.

As an example of the time and production being lost—normally, in California, beet acreage is contracted for in December and by this time 40 percent of the crop has been planted. This year, to date, the contracts have not been written and only a fraction of the usual acreage has been planted to sugar beets. In the Rocky Mountain and eastern beet areas there should have been formulated ere this a satisfactory contract under which the farmers and beet processors working in cooperation could line up and make plans for beet-sugar production during the coming campaign.

Of great importance in beet production is the fact that since farmers plan their year's production much in advance and have already received the Government programs on other commodities such as beans, tomatoes, potatoes, etc., acreage that would normally go into sugar beets is already being switched to other crops. Two things that cannot be left until the last minute are the planning for sugar-beet production and the planting of sugar beets. Every day's delay in the accomplishment of a final contract under which beet farmers and beet processors may operate with the approval of the Government means valuable and needed sugar production lost forever—at a time when sugar production is essential as never before in our country's history. Obviously, quick, decisive action is imperative. Without it, the current meager household ration may be threatened; home canning and preserving—the results of conscientious home workers' efforts—may be materially reduced, and commercial sugar allotments for those making vital food products, i. e., bread, cakes, candies, etc., may be substantially curtained.

Also we should add here that in view of the scarcity of farm labor at the present time it is most unfortunate that the sugar-beet program is not progressing simultaneously with the crop programs on beans, potatoes, tomatoes, etc., since it is well known that the most efficient use of labor in beet areas is attained by the laborer's dividing his time among these several crops. In other words, when beets are not grown where they are normally grown, much valuable time of the laborer will be lost, which otherwise would naturally be utilized.

In view of the conditions described, it is our considered opinion that this year we may witness the production of one of the smallest beet-sugar crops in years. In fact, it is quite possible that beet-sugar production may be shockingly low. The beet industry in its most auspicious days never produced more than 1,775,000 short tons refined sugar. The 10-year average production of the beet industry is 1,450,000 tons. During those years there was no serious labor problem. And sugar beets were not up against other "incentive crops" generally.

If we add to the deplorable situation described above the probability that lend-lease will siphon off from this country during the current year a tremendous quantity of sugar, if no concerted effort is made to move more sugar into the United States from offshore areas than was imported in 1942, and if we add the probability that we will have a smaller production this year in the domestic cane fields because of labor difficulties and competition of other crops, it does not take much perspicacity, imagination, or understanding to realize that the 1943 sugar supply situation will be drastically cut as compared with 1942. It is for this reason that we repeat that positive, decisive, and quick action must be taken on the entire sugar program.

In 1942 there was an amazing crop of those who professed to believe, and publicized the fact, that sugar is not an essential food. They led the public to believe that sugar is a frill and a furbelow, that it is a luxury, that it is merely something that pleases the palate. They went contrary to the facts that standard fine granulated sugar is one of the purest foods on the market, inasmuch as its sucrose content approximates 100 percent; that as a food it provides a high energy value per unit of weight; that it is one of the cheapest foods on the market.

Their lack of knowledge cost the United States public millions of dollars in 1942 in lost fruits and vegetables—the produce of farms and orchards that went to waste and rot, because there were not at the time of harvesting completely adequate sugar supplies to enable the housewife to do her usual preserving and canning. Their lack of knowledge has since been evidenced by a press report to the effect that Secretary Wickard's Food Distribution Administration has met with members of the National Confectioners Association to work out a program for the diverting of a larger amount of the already curtailed civilian candy supplies to workers in essential industries. The press report further states that "in accordance with suggestions of Government officials, wholesalers and jobbers are being requested to divert a still larger portion of their limited supply to war-plant workers. Under this informal priority arrangement, candy would be allotted about like this: Armed forces, lend-lease, defense workers, other civilians."

Government officials, through the press and the radio, are exhorting the public to create victory gardens this year—to can and preserve foods as never before in order to offset as much as possible the reduction in the food supplies from normal sources available to the civilian population because of the diversion of tremendous quantities of the commercial pack to the Army, the Navy, and lend-lease. President Roosevelt, in his statement of January 12 to the Nation's farmers said, "Food is a weapon in total war—fully as important in its way as guns or planes or tanks. * * * We of the United Nations also are using foods as a weapon to keep our fighting men fit and to maintain the health of all our civilian families." Secretary Wickard has said, "Food production is war production." The perfect twins in any food conservation plan are fruit and sugar, vegetables and sugar, and one is as important as the other, since in the preservation of these foods, sugar is indispensable.

Certain departments of the Government, in their effort to cooperate with the public in the matter of victory gardens, canning, and preserving, etc., are taking steps to assist in this great campaign. For example, according to recent press dispatches, "The War Production Board is preparing to give full cooperation to families who want to escape the limitations of point rationing of canned goods by preserving their own food this summer when there is expected to be an abundance of fresh fruit and vegetables. Two orders relating to home canning are now before the War Production Board, and are expected to be approved soon. One would permit a very substantial increase in the manufacture of pressure cookers of the type used for home canning and the second would permit an equally substantial rise in the manufacture of closures—the metal tops or clamps used on preserving jars."

Also in the same article, the statement is made, "Increasing the volume of home canning, advocates of the orders have contended, will bring other substantial economies in critical materials. It will reduce the amount of wasted or spoiled local produce, ease the strain on transportation facilities, make more of the commercial pack available for military and lend-lease use and increase the food supplies available for civilian use next winter."

Is it not futile to talk on the one hand about the growing of greater food crops and on the other hand not to provide amply for a supply of sugar necessary to can and preserve the resulting produce?

It is fervently to be hoped that the sugar supply situation in the United States will not be handled in such a fashion that next May or June when the canning and preserving season will be in full blast, an emergency will have been permitted to develop whereby, in order to provide sugar for preserving and canning, it will be found necessary to reduce either the household ration or the institutional and industrial allotments. This would be robbing Peter to pay Paul. It would be not only unnecessary but manifestly a disservice to the public as a whole. Furthermore, such foods as may be available for the home front will require more sugar to make them palatable.

Incentive payments to farmers for extra production of certain foods have already been announced—but not for sugar. As a vital food needed by the Army, our allies, and last, but by no means least, by the home front, there is no reason why sugar should take second, third, or fourth place in relation to other food commodities, especially at a time when farm labor costs are high. Naturally, the farmer is going to grow that product for which he receives the greatest reward.

Since sugar today is one of the cheapest food commodities on the market from any standpoint, if not the cheapest, and since it has tremendous value to the public in producing energy, it is our opinion that no policy should prevail which discourages the production of sugar. If an advance in the price of sugar to the consumer is necessary to make it possible to secure the proper amount of sugar production, then let's have it.

Let's be quick and decisive about it before it is too late.

LAMBORN & CO., INC.,
By ODY H. LAMBORN.

FEBRUARY 8, 1943.

Recruiting New Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave the extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an order of the Civil

Service Commission regulating the employment of persons for the Federal civilian service:

UNITED STATES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1943.

Memorandum to the heads of all executive departments and independent establishments.

From the members of the United States Civil Service Commission.

Subject: Federal recruiting policies.

The United States Civil Service Commission has operated during the past 2½ years with a single purpose in mind, namely, to make available to the departments and agencies of the Federal Government the best qualified personnel in the shortest possible period of time.

During these 2½ years Federal employment has grown from less than 1,000,000 to more than 2,750,000, and it has been necessary to place nearly 3,500,000 persons on the Federal pay roll in order to fill new positions and to make replacements in old positions. Whenever such a rapid rate of expansion and turnover takes place, speed is absolutely necessary, and as between quality and speed, primary emphasis must, of course, be placed on speed.

Normal personnel turn-over will cause many who are now on the Federal pay roll to leave; others will be drafted; replacements will have to be made to fill such vacancies. Furthermore, additional activities and new responsibilities for some of the war agencies may cause some additional personnel expansion in the future. As a result, monthly placements in the Federal service will for some time need to be continued in large numbers.

Nevertheless, we believe that (a) the overall manpower situation and (b) the interests of sound administration require that, in the future, the primary emphasis must be on the quality of the Federal Government's personnel rather than on the speed with which personnel transactions are made. Speed must continue to be a factor. There is no more excuse for unnecessary procedures and paper work today than there was the day after Pearl Harbor. But, too much speed in the handling of personnel transactions can result, if the wrong persons are put in jobs, in serious inefficiency and a consequent slowing down of the war program.

The Commission has recently taken several positive steps to meet this situation. Federal recruiting policies and practices have been revised in the light of the present personnel situation within the Government and of the national manpower situation. There follows a statement of recruiting policies which have been adopted by the Commission and which are effective immediately or on the dates indicated. Detailed changes in war service regulations to incorporate these policies are attached:

STATEMENT OF PERSONNEL RECRUITING POLICIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

1. Requisitions for personnel: Good management dictates that each requisition for personnel serve in effect as a certification—

(a) That all the positions covered by the requisitions are essential to carrying on the work program of the department in time of war; and

(b) That funds are available or definitely will be available to cover the salaries of the positions included in the requisitions; and

(c) That so far as is known the work to be carried on by the incumbents of the positions covered by the requisitions will not duplicate other activities carried on either within the department or in other departments.

Many agencies have previously had personnel and budget procedures which carry out this policy. This has not been true in all agencies.

Each agency should immediately see that proper relationships are established between its personnel and budget offices, and that appropriate procedures are adopted to insure that each personnel requisition submitted to the Civil Service Commission has met the three tests indicated above.

Henceforth the Commission will assume that each requisition has been reviewed and meets the tests above outlined.

2. Notification of all vacancies: The Commission must be currently advised, through the submission of requisitions, of all vacant positions which an agency needs to have filled by persons not now working in the agency.

Only by knowing the total personnel requirements of the Federal Government can the facilities of the Commission be used effectively in recruiting and placing the best qualified personnel. Furthermore, unless the Commission has this information, it will be unable to adequately represent the needs of Government agencies in connection with its membership on the War Manpower Commission.

3. Rejection of requisitions for personnel where it would be virtually impossible to obtain persons with desired qualifications. Where a personnel requisition from a department or agency sets forth qualifications which are, in the judgment of the Commission, too exacting in the light of the requirements of the job and of present labor market conditions, the Commission will return the requisition.

In taking this action, the Commission will indicate its willingness to work with the department or agency in developing some other solution, such as the development of a training program and the recruitment of the necessary trainees for this program.

4. Referral of requests for personnel to the Bureau of the Budget. Whenever, in the judgment of the Commission, a requisition for personnel raises questions as to the duplication of like and similar work in other agencies and other issues which fall within the jurisdiction of the Bureau of the Budget, it will provide the Bureau with a copy of the requisition. The Commission will, however, continue its efforts to fill the requisition unless requested not to do so by the Bureau of the Budget.

5. Inventory of pending requisitions. The Commission, in cooperation with representatives of each agency, will immediately take an inventory of all pending personnel requisitions with a view toward—

(a) Canceling all of those which do not have to be filled under present conditions;

(b) Canceling those where, in the judgment of the Commission, qualification requirements are so exacting in the light of the requirements of the job and of present labor-market conditions that it would be virtually impossible to find persons with the desired qualifications; and

(c) Adding requisitions for any vacancies not previously submitted to the Commission.

6. Inter-agency transfers: In filling requisitions for personnel, first priority will be given to qualified employees already in the Federal service. Especially will this apply to those who may, by order of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, represent excess personnel where presently employed. Every effort will be made to utilize fully present employees of the Government before new employees are brought in from outside.

7. Coordination of recruiting:

(a) All efforts of the Federal Government to recruit personnel must be coordinated to assure—

(1) That efforts of the Civil Service Commission and of the departments and agencies to develop sources of supply of qualified personnel do not represent overlapping or duplication of effort;

(2) That, consistent with the policies of the War Manpower Commission, no potential sources of personnel for positions which must be filled in the Federal Government are left untapped;

(3) That individuals who file applications for employment with the Federal Government are assured fair and impartial consideration whenever positions for which they are qualified are filled anywhere in the service;

(4) That the selection of individuals for appointment in the Federal service is based solely upon merit and fitness for the position in question and without regard to personal, political, religious, racial, business, fraternal, social, or other affiliations.

(b) The Commission will exercise its legal responsibilities for directing all recruiting efforts in the executive branch of the Federal Government as follows:

(1) The Commission recognizes that at times it needs the advice and assistance of the departments and agencies in developing sources of supply of qualified personnel.

The Commission will, therefore, from time to time, call upon the departments and agencies for assistance in developing these sources of supply.

When the agencies believe that they can be of material assistance to the Commission in developing sources of supply, they should present their plans in writing to the appropriate representative of the Commission. This presentation should include statements as to the occupations involved, the methods by which sources of supply are to be developed, and in what geographical areas the contemplated sources of supply are located. The Commission will then indicate its approval or disapproval of the plan. It will not approve any plan which represents a duplication or overlapping of effort or which violates policies of the War Manpower Commission.

If activities looking toward the development of sources of supply are carried on without the prior approval of the Commission, the agency conducting such activities will be regarded as violating the Commission's war service regulations.

(2) Any current efforts to develop sources of supply which do not conform to the provisions in (1) above must be discontinued immediately.

(3) No department or agency of the Federal Government shall give any publicity to its personnel needs through the press, magazines, over the radio, or otherwise, without the express prior approval of the Commission or its authorized representatives, and after such approval, only in accordance with the applicable rules and regulations of the Office of War Information.

The Commission will in turn not give approval to any such programs and will not itself publicize the personnel needs of the Federal Government unless such publicity is in accord with the policies and procedures of the War Manpower Commission.

The Office of War Information will cooperate with the Commission in the enforcement of this policy.

(4) Applications for appointment to positions subject to civil-service rules or war-service regulations which are mailed to any department or agency in Washington, D. C., shall be transmitted without delay to the Civil Service Commission.

Any person calling on a department or agency located in Washington, D. C., in connection with the obtaining of employment shall not be called upon to fill out an application but shall be referred to the Civil Service Commission's interviewing unit located in room 144, in the Eighth and F Streets corner of the Tariff Commission Building. The only exceptions which will be made to this rule will be in the case of arrangements which are worked out under the provisions of (1) above.

In the field service applications received in any manner by any department or agency

shall be transmitted without delay to the appropriate office of the Civil Service Commission.

These regulations are being put into effect so that applicants may receive consideration for employment in agencies other than those which they happen to contact, and so that their qualifications may be available for use wherever they are most needed in the war program.

(5) Wherever possible, agencies are urged to delegate to the Civil Service Commission authority to select personnel on their behalf. However, the Commission will not undertake to fill orders under such a delegation of authority unless the order gives complete information as to working conditions, including hours of employment, recreation facilities or programs offered by the agency, any special arrangements for living quarters of new employees, arrangements for loans to new employees prior to receipt of salary, employee-counseling programs, medical and dispensary services, in-service training opportunities, and any other information which would assist in the recruiting activities.

(6) When a department or agency and the Commission act together in carrying on a recruiting program it is referred to as a joint recruiting program. Under such circumstances the agency designates a representative authorized to make final selections for appointment, who, together with a representative of the Commission, travels in the field making appointments on the spot.

In the future, agreements for joint recruiting programs will ordinarily be confined to shortage occupations in technical, scientific, and professional categories, and will be made only when, in the judgment of the Commission, such a procedure will be of assistance in meeting the personnel needs in question.

Effective 2 weeks from the date of this communication, all existing joint recruiting programs will be canceled unless extended under provisions of this section.

(7) Where departments and agencies do not engage in joint recruiting programs with the Commission, and where they have not delegated to the Commission authority to select personnel, the Commission, in response to requisitions, supplies the agency with the names and supporting documents of persons who, in its judgment, are qualified for the positions.

An agency occasionally knows of exceptionally well qualified individuals whom it desires to consider for appointment to specific positions. The names of such persons may be suggested to the Commission in submitting a requisition or for the purpose of filling a pending requisition.

The Commission is under no obligation to include on a certificate the name of a person so suggested, and it will not certify such a name unless, in the judgment of the Commission, the individual suggested is among the best qualified and available persons known to the Commission.

The Commission will not normally certify the name of a person proposed by an agency unless and until it has had a minimum period of 2 weeks in which to certify qualified applicants in response to the requisition.

Under emergency circumstances the Commission may shorten the time period specified in the paragraph above, and the Commission may require a longer time period in the event of doubt as to the qualifications of the proposed appointee and in the temporary absence of other better-qualified candidates.

8. The heads of all executive departments and independent establishments are requested to notify all of their appointing officers in the departmental and field services of the policies set forth in this memorandum.

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
LUCILLE FOSTER MCMILLIN,
ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
United States Civil Service Commissioners.

Sabotaging American Trade Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following timely and pertinent editorial from the San Francisco Examiner. I do this with the hope that the House of Representatives will act speedily and favorably on the resolution recently introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Many sins are committed under the guise of national emergency, but this is no time to attempt to socialize industry or fair-trade practices just to satisfy the dubious objectives of some of our misguided bureaucrats.

The editorial follows:

SLY ATTACK AIMED AT AMERICAN TRADE PRACTICES

Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, has introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives calling for an investigation of the purported intention of Government agencies to prohibit or restrict the marketing of commodities under established brands.

This investigation should be made immediately, and with utmost vigor.

It would be dishonest and malicious exercise of Executive war powers to destroy the identity of marketable commodities.

It would render long-established and respected trade names utterly valueless, and would make it difficult and costly, if not actually prohibitive and impossible, for the American system of private enterprise to resume its normal functions after the war.

How could it help the American people in this war to compel them to buy unbranded goods, or goods so branded as to conceal the name of the maker?

Since it would not contribute to the war effort, what is its purpose?

Representative HALLECK suggests the answer:

"Some of us have discovered," he said "that our suspicions were well founded in regard to the activities of certain bureaucrats in these temporary war agencies.

"The Members of Congress have little confidence in the assertions of certain individuals that they are using the vast powers granted to the Executive strictly for war."

That can only mean one thing.

There is an element in our bureaucratic Government which wants to destroy the brands by which the people know and buy commodities because it wants to destroy private enterprise.

The method would surely work.

It would most certainly undermine private business and industry to have the identity of commodities lost.

Millions of dollars have been spent in constructive, informative, and useful publicity to make branded commodities familiar to the people.

Great business and industrial institutions have developed from the public's purchase of goods under this system.

Not only mass production, but quality production and inexpensive production have resulted.

And the public has been enabled by this system to know what goods it can trust, and in which makers of goods it can have confidence.

Socialistic, collectivist, and Communist elements in government have opportunistically seized upon the emergency of war, and upon the sudden and excessive grant of war powers to executive and administrative agencies, to accomplish the destruction of private business.

Representative HALLECK says what the American people well know.

"Brands have a public value," he declares. "By long experience the housewife and the ordinary citizen have learned that certain brands are satisfactory and that these brands guarantee a desired quality.

"It is disservice to the housewife and to all citizens to deprive them of these guides to intelligent purchasing of goods. The brands must be protected."

The investigation Mr. HALLECK proposes is necessary and urgent.

It will help the war effort, by assuring the American people that the way of life for which they are fighting will be preserved.

It will assure them that when peace is restored they will be able to resume their normal progressive and productive ways, which is their desire. Congress should not merely investigate the danger to which Mr. HALLECK points, but should promptly erect every safeguard against it.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following discussion by me on the American Forum of the Air broadcast, Sunday, February 21, over the coast-to-coast Mutual network:

The power to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements by the Executive will expire next June. We are to debate tonight whether or not the act shall be extended. I favor extension of the act, first, because the principle is fundamentally sound. Secondly, because the principle has been tried and its worth proven. And thirdly, because if, in the midst of this world crisis, we repudiate this principle of international cooperation, it will, I fear, be construed by all other nations of the world as an indication that when the war is over we plan to return to isolation and maintain an armed camp pending the commencement of World War No. 3. The issue goes to the heart of our attitude toward a post-war world.

It is my firm belief the American people are as much interested in an enduring peace as they are in winning the war. Trade between nations and access to the natural resources of the world are the essence of international cooperation and the antithesis of the "globaloney" philosophy.

In his Farewell Address, Washington stressed the importance of international harmony, and liberal intercourse with all nations—"diffusing and diversifying by gentle means," he said "the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing." There could be no gentler and less forcing method of

diffusing the streams of commerce than reciprocal trade agreements.

Daniel Webster stressed the importance of an international viewpoint in his first Bunker Hill address, delivered just 50 years after the close of the Revolutionary War.

The principle of trade agreements is not new. It was employed in a Republican administration by Secretary of State James G. Blaine. It was employed by that great tariff framer, William McKinley, who, as President, negotiated a series of reciprocity treaties, but not one of which the Senate would ratify. With that bitter experience in mind, McKinley in his last speech delivered at Buffalo said:

"The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not."

The passage of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act in 1930 caused reprisals and the erection of trade barriers against us that stagnated our foreign trade. To meet that problem in 1934 we followed the wise and able leadership of Cordell Hull. We turned to the old principle of negotiating trade agreements, carrying forward in such agreements the fundamental principle of most-favored-nation treatment, sponsored by Woodrow Wilson as 1 of the 14 points on which he sought to base an enduring peace, and carried forward into the Tariff Act of 1922 by an honored Secretary of State, Charles Evans Hughes.

The principle of reciprocity is endorsed by economists, the press, and many business and agricultural leaders, because it is an economic and not a political issue.

I challenge my distinguished opponents to show tonight that the American people are opposed to international trade. If we favor international trade, why reject the only practical plan which has been developed? I know it is hard for those who in the past opposed the plan to change now, but Mark Twain said:

"Do right. That will gratify some people and astonish the rest."

Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert the following resolutions, adopted at the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

It is fitting that on this day on which we commemorate the birthday of the Father of our Country that we give some thought to the peoples of other nations who are seeking the freedom for which we and the United Nations are fighting.

The following resolutions were adopted at the commemoration of the silver anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania, held on the 14th day of February 1943, at the Webster Hall, New York City, under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Council of Greater New York:

"Whereas the President of the United States in his report to the Nation on February 12, 1943, pledged that it is one of our war aims, as expressed in the Atlantic Charter, that the conquered populations of today, the overrun countries, shall again become the masters of their destiny; that there must be no doubt anywhere that it is the unalterable purpose of the United Nations to restore to conquered peoples their sacred rights, and that the right of self-determination does not carry with it the right of any Government anywhere in the world to commit wholesale murder or the right to make slaves of its own people or of any other peoples of the world—which pledge of our President we understand to mean the unalterable policy of our Government to be realized regardless of the constitutional or strategic forms of subterfuge that may be designed to veil an attempt to perpetrate or to perpetuate aggression in any part of the world; and

"Whereas the Atlantic Charter is accepted in the declaration of the United Nations as a set of principles guiding the post-war policies of the democracies, and the people of the United States are in complete agreement with these commitments of their Government, and are waging war against the Axis Nations with full faith in the realization of these commitments; and

"Whereas the territorial integrity and the political independence of the sovereign peoples of Lithuania, and of her Baltic neighbors, were deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors in violation of its freely assumed treaty obligations and in collusion with the Nazi masters of predatory aggression by devious processes; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States, continuing to stand by the principle of the rule of reason, of justice, and of law in the relations between nations, unequivocally condemned, in its statement of July 23, 1940, the intervention of a great power in the domestic concerns of its weaker neighbor nations, and never recognized the lawless aggression perpetrated by devious processes, to wit, the use of threats and compulsion; the ill-disguise of farcical 'elections' at the point of a million of Red Army bayonets; the invalid 'resolutions of joining membership in the Soviet Union' by self-styled puppet 'people's representatives,' including in their number the ranking diplomatic Soviet officials transformed into delegates of the overrun countries where hitherto they had represented the Government of the Soviet Union; and the promise of the right of secession from the Union contained in the Stalin constitution; and

"Whereas the sovereign people of Lithuania reaffirmed their original declaration of independence by an armed insurrection in June 1941, directed against both the Soviet and the Nazi invaders, at a heavy loss and destruction of national wealth and manpower in battles and through mass deportations of innocent people; and

"Whereas the insurrectionist troops were disarmed and the provisional insurrectionist government of Lithuania was disbanded by the Nazi invaders, the peoples of Lithuania, and of her Baltic neighbors—resuscitated and sustained by the Atlantic Charter as the promise of the democratic world to protect and to restore their freedom and the political independence—though driven into the underground, continue their unrelenting resistance against the forces of aggression and oppression; and

"Whereas the Nazis, disregarding the fact that the provisional Lithuanian government abrogated all bolshevistic confiscatory and oppressive decrees of the Soviet invaders, not only restored those confiscatory communistic decrees in all pauperizing effect but introduced additional measures of tyranny, depredation, and decimation of families, the razing of villages, and wholesale deportations for slave labor in Germany, corruption of morals, systematic looting of the national wealth, black-out of all cultural, educational, administrative, judicial, and social functions of a civilized nation, and extermination of native Jews; and

"Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union is a signatory of the Declaration of the United Nations and, by a separate treaty with Great Britain in May 1942, renounced any intention of territorial aggrandizement and interference in the domestic affairs of a liberated Europe, in line with Premier Stalin's statement of May 1, 1942, in which he disowned a purpose to conquer any foreign territories or people or to impose his country's 'will and a Slavonic regime on the other enslaved people of Europe who expect help' from the United Nations; and

"Whereas we, as free and loyal American citizens, are doing all within our power and resources on the domestic front, and members of our families are fighting on the seas to keep open the convoy routes and on the active fronts to liberate the mankind and to resume life in accordance with the principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter, which also motivate and sustain the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian underground resistance against all oppression: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we reaffirm our unwavering adherence to, and the unshakable faith in the enforcement of, the Atlantic Charter and the Declaration of the United Nations, embodying the war and peace aims of our Government and people, and we urge our fellow citizens to intensify their war effort; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we appeal to the Governments of the United Nations to admit the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into full membership in the family of the United Nations and to provide facilities for the politic agencies and representatives of those republics to organize their governments in exile and their armed forces for waging a victorious war against the Axis tyranny; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we appeal to both Houses of Congress of the United States to enact by resolution the declaration of policy outlined in the Declaration of the United Nations, so that the world may know that our country intends to keep on fighting with all its determination and with all its resources of wealth and manpower for our aims and our ideas in the world that is to come after the imminent victory of the democracies; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we express our profound admiration for the courage and endurance of the Russian people in defense of their own homeland, and that we appeal to our Government to use its good offices with the Government of the Soviet Union in procuring the liberation of Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian deportees, among whom there are many of our relatives, so that the liberated Baltic exiles would have an opportunity to fight for the liberation of their native lands under their own national flags of independent Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That, in order to give untrammeled opportunity for self-expression, to prevent any repetition of predatory temptations to victimize the Baltic peoples, and to preclude any misrepresentation of the will of the self-determining sovereign peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, we appeal to our Government to provide, on conclusion of war operations, for the occupation of the territories of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—including the Vilnius and Klaipėda (Memel) territories and the Lithuanian section of East Prussia—by the military and naval forces of the United States and of the British Commonwealth of Nations, supplemented by national armies of the Baltic Republics; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we petition our Government to permit the formation of a Lithuanian unit within the Army of the United States, composed of Lithuanian citizens and of Americans of Lithuanian descent, as a symbol of the determination of the American people to restore the freedom and independence of the Baltic States, and for a more effective use in the Baltic theater of war; and be it finally

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be printed and mailed to the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and Members of both Houses of Congress of the United States; to the resident Ambassadors and Envoys of the United Nations; to legations and consulates of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in the United States, Great Britain, the British Dominions, Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Uruguay, Portugal, Switzerland, and the Vatican City; to the American Red Cross; and to the press.

"Rev. NORBERT PAKALNIS,
"Chairman.
"CONSTANTINE R. JURGĖLA,
"Secretary."

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an article which I wrote and which was published in the February number of the National Republic, on Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln grows greater with the ages, and it is well that we reflect upon his life and character in these troublesome days.

The article follows:

HE GROWS GREATER WITH THE AGES

(By Hon. Raymond S. Springer, Representative in Congress from Indiana)

Abraham Lincoln. The mere mention of his name creates an unexplainable solemnity which permeates the area within which it is heard—men and women who may be girded by frivolity before those magic words are uttered become transformed into solemn and serious beings—nations and people alike revere the sacred memory of that humble citizen, that country lawyer, that soldier, that lawmaker, that humanitarian, that man who was the sixteenth President of the United States of America.

More books have been written about him than any other man in the history of the world, and every American knows the life, the work, and the achievements of this illustrious character; the people of foreign countries are entirely familiar with his unparalleled accomplishments and the children of every land and every clime have studied the noble life of this great American.

Lincoln, who was born in abject poverty in the great State of Kentucky; who, during the formative period of his life, resided in Spencer County, Ind., and who attained fame in his mature years while living in the State of Illinois, journeyed along the road of life from the humblest log cabin to an everlasting abiding place in the heart of all humanity. He overcame the greatest obstacles that could beset any man and carried upon his shoulders a burden that weighed down the meditations of the world.

He started life with but little encouragement. He was very poor. His education was greatly limited. He was awkward and unkempt. Yet his life, as all lives, had as a starting point the question of decision, and before him was the far-away mountain heights of ambition. His path was long and tortuous. His course led through the dark and dismal swamps of indecision and over the rough and rugged hills of disappointment. Looming ahead in his pathway was the jagged cliff of discouragement which appeared to be impossible to surmount. Then, too, the fatal abyss of lost hope no doubt presented itself as he approached the cross roads of temptation and the rivers of sorrow. But Lincoln faced them all, he never faltered. Courage, fortitude, sacrifice, sympathy, love—all these are the price of greatness; they lie in the heart of man.

The safest and most substantial capital on which one may begin life is good health and sound morals. With these a permanent failure is almost impossible. Money cannot buy them. When one is in close partnership with industry and thrift, success is assured and the wealth of the world is within his reach. This was the capital with which Lincoln began his life. Thus he started forward to attain his ambition.

Lincoln's father was a woodsman who could neither read nor write; his mother was an orphan girl; their one-room cabin was constructed of rough-hewn logs and on the banks of Nolan Creek, in desolate Hardin County, Ky., where he started life's journey. We leave them in those squalid surroundings, but suffice it to say that they suffered untold hardships. They were in the wilderness where nature only greeted them and where the suffering of those on the frontier cannot be estimated. They were blazing the trail upon which others might follow them. When Lincoln was 7 he trudged along with his little sister, his father, and mother from the Kentucky wilds into southern Indiana where with an ax they cut their way through the dense forests to start life anew. It was in the savage wilderness of Little Pigeon Creek, in Spencer County, Ind., that they felled trees for a new cabin. The bare earth which turned to mud at wintry thaws, provided the floor; there were no windows for ventilation or to let the sunshine in and not even a door to shut out the sleet and snow. Here the Lincolns lived; here they slept; this was their home.

The greatest sorrow of Lincoln's life came to him while thus they lived. As he sat at the bedside of his mother, stricken by fatal disease, she gave him her final benediction. "Be good to your father and sister. Be kind to one another—and worship God."

When his mother had gone away they tenderly laid her to rest upon a beautiful mound not far from their home—this spot is now one of the shrines in Indiana. Lincoln suffered greatly because of the loss of his mother. She left the impress of her sainted life upon him—she had beautified his soul and inspired his future years. Long afterward, when the great weight of national responsibility rested upon him, Lincoln bowed his head and called her "My angel mother."

Life's lessons are not all learned in a college or university. Poverty, toil, suffering—these are the schools of discipline, and the man who passes through them obtains an education that all the educational institutions of the earth could not give. The book of nature does not teach the conjugation of verbs—it teaches the conjugation of life. It may not master the tongues of dead languages, but it does master the tongues of a thousand living languages—the language of the heart, the hand, and of good common sense. It may not lead to a doctorate in science, but it does lead to the highest degree within the power of man—the degree of strong character.

The backwoods is the university that made Lincoln. Here he learned the lesson that few men ever learn—how to bear the burdens of life without complaint, and how to overcome them. We think of Lincoln, today, as he at the age of 10 walked 9 miles a day to and from the little log schoolhouse in the woods, which school he attended less than 1 year. We think of him as he read and studied before the open fireplace, using a wooden shovel for his slate and charcoal as his crayon. Thus a new world was revealed to him—the world of knowledge Within his humble home there had never been a newspaper, a magazine, or a story book. It is written that he borrowed books from the neighboring settlers, walking great distances in order to obtain them. This was his education. He was a giant standing 6 feet 4 inches high, strong and powerful with a heart like an oak and possessed of good common sense—he was ready to fight every problem with destiny.

We might trace the course of this great man as a rail splitter, a deck hand on a ferryboat, a captain in the Black Hawk War, as an unsuccessful country merchant, a member of the State legislature, a lawyer, and a citizen, but this would only tend to lengthen this story. In every walk of life he was exceedingly humble, he was thoroughly honest, he possessed an excellent character, he was tireless in his effort to make progress, and he was a fine neighbor, a devoted husband, and a kind father.

As a lawyer he was highly successful. His progress at the bar was noteworthy. He was a worthy foe for any antagonist. He was keen of mind and strong in his argument. His sound logic won many victories. He was elected to Congress, but he served only one term—that service was terminated by reason of the domination of selfish and adroit politicians in his congressional district. We might follow him through the Lincoln-Douglas debates, his defeat for the United States Senate, and his subsequent success in securing the nomination and election as the sixteenth President of the United States. Victory crowned his supreme efforts. He was undaunted by his many defeats.

When Lincoln departed from Springfield, Ill., to travel to Washington to assume the Presidency, the affection of his home people—the rich and the poor alike—was evidenced by their unfaltering expressions of faith in him. He was destined never to return to his home again. He faced serious problems, because 10 Southern States had not cast a ballot for him, and they refused to abide by the election, although he received a majority of almost 1,000,000 votes. He faced a paralyzed trade, banks had suspended, the National Treasury was almost bankrupt, and the Southern States began to secede. Many people became bewildered at the grim forebodings of the end of the Republic. Huge mobs were formed in Boston against the abolition agitators, charging them with bringing on the disaster. Tumult reigned generally throughout the land. This was the crisis he faced.

The final test of a man's ability is for him to meet and solve great responsibilities. The calm dignity of Lincoln during the storms of violence that were surging about him perplexed the people. He did not repent of having been elected to the Presidency, nor did he apologize—neither did he heed the warnings that were flooding upon him from all parts of the country begging him to resign or to compromise. He was threatened with assassination, and "that he would never live to enter the Nation's Capital." In completing his journey to Washington, he left his family at Harrisburg, Pa., and he traveled in

a day coach, over night, as a common passenger—unknown and unrecognized—into the Nation's Capital.

When, on March 4, 1861, he was inaugurated as President, he lifted the weight of a crumbling Republic from the shoulders of a man withered and bowed with age, President Buchanan. As Lincoln stood there pledging himself to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution and the Union, the vast multitude assembled listened intently for every word he might utter—and thus he spoke:

"I am loath to close," he said. "We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."

The tragic days of the Civil War came nearer. At the very outset clamor and intrigue surrounded him. "Let the Union slide," shouted the Abolitionists. "Let the South go her way. The North can take care of itself," cried the financial powers. Lincoln heard the discourse, yet he made no reply. He was charged with the great responsibility, yet he betrayed no emotion of anger toward his accusers. Whether it was to be war or peace, union or disunion, life or death, he took the powerful burden wholly upon his own shoulders, with the simple words that whatever the task might be—"I must do it." Lincoln stood stalwart to save the Union—to save our Nation.

The tragic days of the Civil War weighed heavily upon him. The anguish he suffered could never be known, yet his expressions evidenced the solemn emotions which were within him. On New Year's Day, 1863, when he signed the Emancipation Proclamation, he was firm in his conviction that he was right, and when his signature was finished he gazed into space—as it were, he was looking into the future.

Lincoln was nominated for a second term by the Republican Party in 1864, in the face of a disturbed and irritated people. He was elected by the people at the general election and he was inaugurated on the 4th day of March 1865. As he spoke his closing words, at his inauguration, he said:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have won the battle and for his widow, and his orphan; and do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among races and with all Nations."

On that April day, in 1865, the war was ended. The camp fires were left to smoulder into ashes and two great armies sheathed their swords. Along the highways moved regiments of men—no longer foes, but citizens of a common country. The rattle of artillery—the rumbling wheels of ammunition trains—all in the pageant of peace—echoed through the streets. Lincoln stood and gazed upon them. He was happy that the war was ended. The long days and nights of bloodshed were over, and the days of peace and love had dawned. The miracle of a reunited people had been performed. Above it all loomed the tall, strong figure of one man—Abraham Lincoln.

On that tragic and fatal day—April 14, 1865—when the assassin's bullet found its mark—Abraham Lincoln fell a martyr to a cause. He had preserved the Union—he had welded together the fragments of our Republic—his work was finished. A cabinet member, who was present at Lincoln's death, exclaimed:

"Now, he belongs to the ages."

We call his name again: "Lincoln." The world pauses.

Kings may come and kings may go; nations may rise and nations may fall; military glory and political eminence may flare for their moment and then die away; men may erect beautiful monuments to their memory; genius may leave its marvels behind; masters may build their powerful institutions—but there is only one living force that pulsates throughout the ages and that is the heart of man. Lincoln knew no malice, no envy and no glory—but he loved his fellow men and he was the most humble among them.

When this great life went out—when Lincoln passed into the great beyond—the sun dropped over the hills. The twilight bathed the blossoming foliage and gathered the darkened shadows about his tomb. The world lost a simple, honest man—and immortality had made the gain. From every nation and from every people—from the farm and bench and monarch's chair—came tributes of his greatness; for years and decades they have been coming, and they will continue to come as long as memory shall last and men shall love an honest heart!

This is the true Lincoln—the Lincoln that we know! This is the Lincoln that the generations to come will know. The blinding war has passed. The Republic has been preserved. God gave Lincoln to us. In memory we clasp the hand of this great, strong, homely man among men. This is the Lincoln the world loves—the common heritage of all races and times—the man with a heart big enough to hold the whole world!

The Recollections of Washington—Memoir of the Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an article entitled "The Recollections of Washington—Memoir of the Mother," which was in the Encyclopedia, a weekly paper published at Yorkville, S. C., on Saturday, July 1, 1826. I felt that my colleagues would be interested in this account of President Washington and his mother:

THE RECOLLECTIONS OF WASHINGTON—MEMOIR OF THE MOTHER

There are some of the aged inhabitants of Fredericksburg, who well remember the matron as seated in an old-fashioned opened chaise; she was in the habit of almost daily visiting her little farm in the vicinity of the town. When there she would ride about her fields, giving her orders, and seeing that they were obeyed. An agent to whom she had given directions as to a particular piece of work varied from his instructions in its execution; the lady, whose coup d'oeil was as perfect in rural affairs as that of her son in war, pointed out the error; the agent excused himself by saying that "in his judgment the work was done to more advantage than it would have been by his first directions." The lady replied, "And pray, who gave you any exercise of judgment in the matter? I commanded you, sir; there is nothing left for you but to obey."

Her great industry, with the well-regulated economy of all her concerns, enabled the matron to dispense considerable charities to the poor, although her own circumstances were always far from rich. All manner of domestic economies, so useful in those times of privation and trouble, met her zealous attention, while everything about her household bore marks of her care and management, and very many things the impress of her own hands.

In a very humble dwelling, at the advanced age of 82, and suffering under an excruciating disease (cancer of the breast); thus lived this mother of the first of men, preserving unchanged her peculiar nobleness, and independence of character.

She was continually visited and solaced by her children and numerous grandchildren, particularly her daughter, Mrs. Lewis. To the repeated and earnest solicitations of this lady, that she would remove to her house and pass the remainder of her days; to the pressing entreaties of her son that she would make Mount Vernon the home of her age, the matron replied, "I thank you for your affectionate and dutiful offers, but my wants are few in this world, and I feel perfectly competent to take care of myself." Upon her son-in-law, Col. Fielding Lewis, proposing that he should relieve her in the direction of her affairs, she observed, "Do you, Fielding, keep my books in order, for your eyesight is better than mine, but leave the executive management to me."

One weakness alone belong to this lofty minded and intrepid woman, and that proceeded from a most affecting cause. It was a fear of lightning. In early life, a female friend had been killed at her side while sitting at the table, the knife and fork in the hands of the unfortunate, being melted by the electric fluid. The matron never recovered from the shock, occasioned by this distressing incident; on the approach of a thunder cloud, she would retire to her chamber, and not leave it again till the storm had passed over.

Always pious, in her latter days her devotions were performed in private. She was in the habit of repairing every day to a secluded spot, formed by rocks and trees near to her dwelling, where, abstracted from the world and worldly things, she communed with her Creator, in humiliation and prayer.

After an absence of nearly 7 years, it was at length on the return of the combined armies from Yorktown, permitted to the mother again to see and embrace her illustrious son. So soon as he had dismounted, in midst of a numerous and brilliant suite, he sent to apprise her of his arrival, and to know when it would be her pleasure to receive him. And now, reader, mark the force of early education and habits, and the superiority of the Spartan over the Persian school, in this interview of the great Washington with his admirable parent and instructor. No pageantry of war proclaimed his coming, no trumpets sounded, no banners waved; alone and on foot the Marshal of France, the General in Chief of the combined armies of France and America, the deliverer of his country, the hero of the age, repaired to pay his humble duty to her whom he venerated as the author of his being; the founder of his fortunes and his fame. For full well he knew that the matron was made of sterner stuff than to be moved by all the pride that glory ever gave, and all the pomp and circumstances of power.

The lady was alone, her aged hands employed in the works of domestic industry, when the good news was announced, and it was further told, that the victor chief was in waiting at the threshold. She bid him welcome by a warm embrace and by the well remembered and endearing names of his childhood; inquiring as to his health, remarked the lines which mighty cares and many toils had made in his manly countenance, spoke much of old times and old friends; but of his glory, not one word.

Meantime, in the village of Fredericksburg, all was joy and revelry; the town was crowded with the officers of the French and American Armies, and with gentlemen from many miles around, who hastened to welcome the conquerors of Cornwallis. The citizens got up a splendid ball, to which the matron was specially invited. She observed that although her dancing days were pretty well over, she should feel happy in contributing to the general festivity, and consented to attend.

The foreign officers were anxious to see the mother of their chief. They had heard indistinct rumors touching her remarkable life and character, but forming their judgments from European examples, they were prepared to expect in the mother that glare and show which would have been attached to the parents of the great in the countries of the Old World. How were they surprised, when the matron, leaning on the arm of her son, entered the room. She was dressed in the very plain, yet becoming garb, worn by the Virginia lady of the old time of day. Her address always dignified and imposing, was courteous, though reserved. She received the complimentary attentions which were paid her without evincing the slightest elevation, and at an early hour, wishing the company much enjoyment of their pleasures observed that it was high time for old folks to be in bed and retired, leaning as before on the arm of her son.

The foreign officers were amazed to behold one, whom so many causes contributed to elevate, preserving the even tenor of her life, while such a blaze of glory shone upon her name and offspring; it was a magnanimity of which the European world furnished no examples. Names of ancient lore were heard to escape from their lips, and they roundly declared, "if such are the matrons in America, well may they boast of illustrious sons."

It was on this festive occasion that General Washington danced a minuet with Mrs. Willis. It closed his dancing days. The minuet was much in vogue at that period, and was peculiarly calculated for the display of the splendid figure of the chief, and his natural grace and elegance of air and manner. The gallant Frenchmen who were present, of which fine people it may be said, that dancing forms one of the elements of their existence, so much admired the American performance, as to admit, that a Parisian education could not have improved it. As the evening advanced, the Commander in Chief, yielding to the general gaiety of the scene, went down some dozen couple, in the entre dance, with great spirit and satisfaction.

Previous to his departure for Europe, in the fall of 1734, the Marquis de Lafayette repaired to Fredericksburg, to pay his parting respects to the mother, and ask her blessing.

Conducted by one of her grandsons, he approached the house, when the young gentleman observing, "There, sir, is my grandmother," the Marquis beheld working in her garden, clad in domestic made clothes, and her gray head covered by a plain straw hat, the mother "of his hero, his friend, and a country's preserver." The lady saluted him kindly, observing, "Ah, Marquis, you see an old woman; but come, I can make you welcome to my poor dwelling, without the parade of changing my dress."

Much as Lafayette had seen and heard of the matron before, on this interesting interview he was at once charmed and struck with wonder. When he considered her great age, the transcendent elevation of her son, who, surpassing all rivals in the race of glory, "bore the palm alone," and at the same time discovered no change in her plain, yet dignified, life and manners he became assured that nature had not cast this distinguished woman in an ordinary mold, and that the Roman matron could flourish in the modern day.

The marquis discoursed on the happy effects of the Revolution and the goodly prospects which opened upon regenerated America, stated his speedy departure for his native land, paid the tribute of his heart in his love and admiration of her illustrious son, and concluded by asking her blessing. She gave it to him, and to the encomiums which he had lavished upon his hero and paternal Chief, the matron replied in these words: "I am not surprised at what George has done, for he was always a very good boy."

Immediately after the organization of the present Government, the Chief Magistrate repaired to Fredericksburg to pay his humble duty to the mother preparatory to his departure to New York. An affecting scene ensued. The son feelingly remarked the ravages which a torturing disease had made upon the aged frame of the matron, and addressed her with, "The people, madam, have been pleased, with the most flattering unanimity, to elect me to the Chief Magistracy of these United States, but before I can assume the functions of my office I have come to bid you an affectionate farewell.

"So soon as the weight of public business, which must necessarily attend the outset of a new government, can be disposed of, I shall hasten to Virginia, and"—here the matron interrupted with "and you will see me no more; my great age and the disease which is fast approaching my vitals, warn me that I shall not be long in this world; I trust in God that I may be somewhat prepared for a better. But go, George, fulfill the high destinies which heaven appears to have intended you for; go, my son, and may that heaven's and a mother's blessing be with you always."

The President was deeply affected. His head rested upon the shoulder of his parent, whose aged arm feebly yet fondly encircled his neck. That brow on which fame had wreathed the purest laurel virtue ever gave to created man, relaxed from its lofty bearing. That look, which could have awed a Roman senate in its Fabrican day, was bent in filial tenderness upon the time-worn features of the venerable matron.

This great man wept. A thousand recollections crowded upon his mind, as memory, retracing scenes long passed, carried him back to the maternal mansion and the days of juvenility, where he beheld that mother, whose care, education, and discipline caused him to reach the topmost height of laudable ambition; yet how were his glories forgotten, while he gazed upon her whom, wasted by time and malady, he should part with to meet no more.

The matron's predictions were but too true. The disease which so long had preyed upon her frame completed its triumph, and she expired at the age of 85, rejoicing in the consciousness of a life well spent, and confiding in the belief of a blessed immortality.

In her person the matron was of the middle size, and well proportioned; her features pleasing, yet strongly marked. It is not the happiness of the author to remember her, having only seen her with infant eyes. The sister of the Chief he perfectly well remembers. She was a most majestic looking woman, and so strikingly like the brother that it was a matter of frolic to throw a cloak around her, and placing a military hat on her head, such was the amazing resemblance that on her appearance battalions would have presented arms and senates risen to do homage to the Chief.

In her latter days the matron often spoke of her own good boy, of the merits of his early life, of his love and duty; of the deliverer of his country, the Chief Magistrate of the great Republic, never. Call you this insensibility? Call you it want of ambition? Oh, no; her ambition had been gratified to overflowing, in her Spartan school, she had taught him to be good—that he became great was a consequence not the cause.

Thus lived and died this distinguished woman. Had she been of the olden times statues would have been erected to her memory in the Capitol, and she would have been called the mother of Romans. When another century shall have elapsed, and our descendants have learned the true value of liberty, how will the fame of the paternal chief be cherished in story and in song, nor will be forgotten her who first bent the twig to incline the tree to glory. Then, and not till then, will youth and age, maid and matron, aye, and bearded men, with pilgrim step repair to the now neglected grave of the mother of Washington.

The Right of Congress To Remove an Employee From Government Pay Roll

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1943

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, the resolution now under consideration provides for the appointment of a subcommittee within the Appropriations Committee to further investigate or reinvestigate the evidence and charges recently submitted in the report from the Dies committee alleging that there are a number of persons on Government pay rolls who are affiliated or associated with an organization or organizations that advocate the overthrow of our Government by force or violence. I shall not attempt to enter into a detailed discussion of the merits or demerits of the resolution, because it has quite a "sprinkling" of both, but will confine my remarks to a discussion of the basic principle involved in the actions of Congress already taken on the matter in issue.

In 1938 the Congress created what is known as the Dies committee, and charged it with the responsibility of investigating subversive organizations or influences in the United States—organizations designed to destroy or overthrow our system of government—it being provided that the committee should make an annual report of its findings to Congress. Later by appropriate action Congress provided that a person who advocates or is a member of an association that advocates the overthrow of our Government by force or violence is not eligible for appointment to a position in the Government service.

In the report referred to evidence was submitted to justify the charges or allegations made by the committee. Believing the evidence was sufficient to justify the conclusion of the committee relating to one William Pickens the House of Representatives on last Friday approved an amendment to the bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department which provided that none of the funds carried therein should be used to pay the salary of this particular employee.

Apparently it is the idea of some that the committee provided for in this resolution will serve in a semijudicial capacity and review the evidence upon which the House acted and report its findings back to the House for further consideration, it being alleged in debate

that the authority of the Dies committee is limited to an investigation or examination and a report of its findings only and that the Congress has no authority to act upon such findings and remove anyone from a Government pay roll by refusing to make appropriation for his salary until he or she, as the case may be, is tried and found guilty by a court of competent jurisdiction.

It was argued at length when the amendment referred to was considered that Congress did not have the right in the first place to refuse the appropriation, but in case it did have the right it was insisted that such right should not be exercised until charges are preferred in a court of competent jurisdiction and the person found guilty. These points were ably argued by several of the best informed men of the Congress who are also rated among the ablest lawyers of the country. The arguments were made against the amendment when adopted and have been reiterated today in support of this resolution, but as no one has attempted to show specifically the right or power of the Congress to remove anyone from a pay roll of the Government I shall address myself to this side of the question for a few moments. Of course, I concur in the able arguments made justifying the action of the House in adopting the amendment, some of which have been reiterated today, but as already stated, I shall use my time in an effort to show that Congress acted within the scope of its authority.

Although it is quite proper to inquire whether Congress has the right in passing an appropriation bill to state specifically that none of the funds shall be available to pay the salary of any particular person, the answer may be found in a long-established policy that exists in your Appropriation Committee. To illustrate, when the chief of a bureau or Government agency submits to Congress a request for an appropriation and such request is referred to a subcommittee to take testimony and hear the justifications the committee has always exercised the right and invariably inquires as to the number of employees to be paid out of the funds to be appropriated, including the type of work in which they are engaged.

The committee has the right to inquire and frequently does make inquiry as to the name and sex of the individual employees, and frequently exercises the right to inquire into the background, the qualifications, and the peculiar fitness, if any, of an employee; this right or power has never been denied and is exercised practically every day.

Therefore, if the Congress has the right through its appropriate committees to demand such evidence it certainly has the right to refuse appropriations to pay the salary of one or all persons engaged in a particular type of work, and if it has this right I see no reason why the committee could not even name the party or parties to be paid and, on the contrary, it would have the right to exclude one or all as it may see fit and call them by name. Or, if upon appropriate inquiry, the committee feels that the qualifications or services of an employee is not satisfactory, essential, or beneficial, it would have the right to refuse an appropriation to pay his or her salary and to give its reasons therefor. Now, if a subcommittee acting for the full committee in the Congress has the right to make inquiry and decide upon the qualifications or fitness of employees and to refuse appropriations therefor, certainly the full committee of the Congress and the Congress itself would have power equal to or superior to that of the subcommittee.

The question in issue here is whether the Congress has the right or power to say that a particular person named shall be taken off the pay roll because there is evidence that he is affiliated with an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, or the question could be stated by asking whether Congress can take affirmative action and remove him from the pay roll by refusing to make the necessary appropriation before such person is tried and convicted before a court of competent jurisdiction. My thought is the Congress clearly has the right and I do not think it infringes upon the constitutional rights of anyone. To illustrate further, we often refer to our constitutional right of free speech and insist that the Constitution guarantees to every American citizen freedom of speech. We admit this but under a law enacted by Congress more than half a century ago a person may be removed from the pay roll of the Government if in the exercise of the right of free speech he engages in political activity, and before being removed he does not have to be tried or convicted in a court. That is, if a person in the Government service openly goes out and espouses the cause of a candidate for office or openly undertakes to defeat a candidate for office the courts have held that this is not a violation of the Constitution but it is held with equal clarity that it is not an infringement upon the right of free speech for Congress to provide that a Government employee shall not engage in political activity, and when such person is removed from the pay roll because of political activity, which has frequently been done without having to first carry the matter to a court for judicial determination, it is not a violation of the Constitution. Some of those dismissed have appealed to the courts which have invariably held that while the Constitution guarantees a person the right of free speech it does not guarantee a person the right to be on a Government pay roll and that the Congress has the right to fix the conditions incident to employment.

Under the Constitution, a person may have a right to join an organization which advocates the overthrow of our Government but the Constitution does not guarantee such an individual a job, and the Congress has the right to say that if a person belongs to such an organization he or she may not be entitled to a position in any agency of the Government, and it has the right to say that he or she may be removed when convinced by sufficient evidence that he or she is affiliated with such an organization and there is no law whatsoever making it necessary first to submit the evidence to a court for judicial determination. The chief of a bureau or head of a department or the Congress itself may remove such individual by refusing to request or to make appropriation for payment of his or her salary.

Congress has said by its action that no money appropriated under certain acts should be used to pay the salary of anyone who advocates or belongs to an organization that advocates the overthrow of our Government by force or violence, and when the chief of a bureau is convinced from evidence that a person employed thereon has been or is identified with such organization such chief not only has the right and power but is charged with the responsibility of discharging such employee and he does not have to wait for a trial in court to do so, and if the officer fails or refuses to dismiss such person when sufficient evidence showing his affiliations is presented, then the Congress has the right and power to refuse to appropriate the funds to pay the salary of such person and has the right to name such person, if necessary, and a judicial determination of the facts is not a condition precedent. The Congress not only has the right to remove these people when sufficient evidence is submitted, but it is its responsibility to do so when the administrative officers fail or refuse to act.

Your Appropriations Committee carried a provision in every appropriation bill passed by the Congress last year to the effect that none of the funds therein should be used to pay the salary of any person who advocates or belongs to an organization that advocates the overthrow of our Government by force or violence. It was the duty, therefore, of those charged with the responsibility of employing people in the several agencies of the Government not to employ persons who belong to such organizations and it was their duty to remove them when sufficient evidence was shown as to their guilt. You cannot blame these people for accepting the jobs. The law did not place any prohibition against receiving the money. The inhibition is against paying it. When no attention was apparently paid to the law and a committee authorized by the Congress and acting within the scope of its authority now comes back to the Congress and says, "Here is a person, here are two persons, or here are 38 persons on the Government pay roll who are identified with an organization or with two or more organizations which advocate the overthrow of our Government," and submits sufficient evidence in support of the charge, then Congress not only has the right but it has the responsibility of saying whether further money shall be appropriated to be used in paying these salaries.

It has been argued here for 2 or 3 days that these people should first be given a trial in court, but the argument is not well founded. As far back as 1867 Congress passed an act making the punishment by dismissal from the service of an officer or employee of the Government who requires or requests any workman in a navy yard to contribute or pay

money for a political purpose, but no trial was made necessary to dismiss the employee.

In 1870 it was made unlawful for an officer, clerk, or employee to solicit funds to be used in the purchase of a gift for any superior officer in the service, and no trial by law was necessary.

In 1884 it was made unlawful for a clerk or employee to make a gift to a superior officer, and no trial was necessary to dismiss him.

The Pernicious Activity Act requires no trial in court to justify a dismissal from the service.

The same is true of the Hatch Act, passed only a few years ago, and the law which provides that funds appropriated therein shall not be used to pay the salary of a person affiliated with an organization that advocates the overthrow of our Government by force or violence, does not contemplate a judicial determination of the facts as a condition precedent to the removal of such persons.

I cannot think the argument was made for the purpose of affording the 38 persons already referred to an opportunity to set up an alibi, or to suggest to the proposed committee to accept their plea of confession and avoidance and then let the matter drop, but it was argued and suggested here today that even though these people were at some time identified with a subversive organization they may now make complete denial of their affiliations if opportunity were afforded by saying that they made a mistake or that they were misled and would then give assurance that they are now thoroughly loyal and devoted to our democratic system of government. No doubt the ones who made the argument are correct in their guess, for I am satisfied each one would now claim to be a devotee of democracy for, according to the report referred to, all of them are now drawing handsome salaries and the chances are the amounts they are receiving is larger than their share of this world's goods would be under their communistic theory of distribution, and they would, therefore, not hesitate to reverse themselves and profess absolute loyalty to the American system of government.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that it is not a crime under our statutes to be a member of a subversive organization but Congress has said by appropriate action that membership in or affiliation with such an organization is sufficient evidence to disqualify a person for employment in the Government service and the position I am taking is that when dependable evidence has been submitted to a department showing that a person employed therein belongs to such an organization the department head has the right and power to discharge such person without first having the matter judicially determined, and if the department fails to act the Congress has the right as well as the responsibility to remove such person from the pay roll and that no further trial or judicial determination is necessary and it was not contemplated by the Congress in making provision for such removal.

Congress and the People's Mandate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me over the Blue Network from Washington, D. C., on Saturday evening, February 20, 1943:

This is the first time I have spoken over a Nation-wide radio hook-up since the political revolution last November 3, when the American people issued a mandate to the Members of Congress to stop the New Deal march to collectivism, regimentation, and dictatorship and to restore representative and constitutional government in the United States. This the Congress has already begun to do and the American people can be assured that we will do a good job, let the chips fall where they may. I am glad to avail myself of the courtesy of the Blue Network to express my appreciation and gratitude to thousands of Americans who wired or wrote me from outside of my congressional district on my reelection against the combined opposition of the New Deal, the Communists, the American Labor Party, left-wing and radical newspaper and radio commentators, and some rabid interventionists.

In spite of the fact that I won a three-cornered primary campaign by a three-to-one vote, my election took on the semblance of a national or international campaign in which more outside money was spent against me than was collected and used by the Democratic National Committee throughout the Nation.

Much to my surprise, I found when I returned to Washington that the same type of smear campaign had been waged against more than a hundred Members of Congress who had been noninterventionists before Pearl Harbor. Practically everyone of them was reelected. This disgraceful and un-American type of political campaign, conceived in falsehood and steeped in venom and personal abuse, constituting a national conspiracy to unduly influence a free election, was organized by left-wing New Deal and Communist sources to defeat every Member of Congress—Republican and Democrat—who voted their convictions to keep America out of war unless attacked.

If I have made mistakes of judgment or in voting, it is because I love my country too much and not too little. I yield to no American in my devotion to our free institutions and constitutional government. I know of no yardstick except what is best for America in peace and war.

I have never impugned the motives of sincere interventionists who wanted us to enter the war before Pearl Harbor, and always upheld their right as American citizens to express their views openly and freely. When war came, all Members of Congress, with one exception, voted for war and have supported all war measures since. I thought the prewar controversial issues between interventionists and noninterventionists were sunk at Pearl Harbor, and that Republicans and Democrats and interventionists and noninterventionists were united and marching shoulder to shoulder and fighting and dying to win total victory. But evidently there are still some fanatical interventionists and internationalists left who are willing to sacrifice national unity and play Hitler's game by seeking to revive these issues.

Aging Nicholas Murray Butler in a recent speech virtually accuses 100,000,000 Americans who sought to keep out of war unless attacked as having caused the war and the death of ours sons in battle. Could anything be further from the truth? Eighty percent of the American people were, in 1941, by every poll taken at that time, for keeping out of war and against all acts that would provoke war with Germany, Italy, or Japan. No, Mr. Butler; there is no blood on the hands or conscience of any noninterventionist in Congress or back home among the American people. If you want to find the bloodguilt you will have to look elsewhere.

I plead with you and your interventionist fellow travelers not to raise such issues in the midst of the greatest war in our history. They will only create discord and disunity and impede our all-out war efforts. There will be plenty of time after the victory has been won. Let us get on with winning the war and not open up the floodgates of bitterness and wrath over pre-war issues. The American people voted their resentment at such discordant tactics in the last election.

I have offered, in the Congress, a three-point war program which, if carried out, will expedite winning the war. I feel certain that the American people want to get the war over, with the least losses and as quickly as possible. With that in view, I urge three separate and distinct acts by our Government.

1. The creation of a supreme allied war council, as we had in the last war, composed of representatives from the United States, Great Britain, Soviet Russia, and China, with equal rights for all to plan, coordinate, and carry out the final victory campaign and to prepare for the peace to follow. There should also be military representatives from all the conquered territories.

2. To increase our efforts to supply China with a much larger share of our lend-lease weapons, particularly airplanes.

If there is any nation that has earned the respect and admiration of the American people, it is China, which, with 3,000,000 poorly equipped soldiers, has been fighting Japan for 6 years. Why not arm and equip 10,000,000 additional Chinese fighting men? Why not build numerous airfields and provide China with 1,000 fighter planes and 1,000 bombers to enable her to take the offensive? Why not concentrate on getting airplanes to China; when that has been solved, the bombing of Japanese cities, war industries, and shipping will begin.

Why not persuade Soviet Russia, now that she is defeating the German armies, to permit American planes from Alaska to land on Soviet airfields in Siberia and continue on to China? We have furnished over a billion dollars of lend-lease supplies to Russia, and she might at least be willing to reciprocate to that extent without even asking the use of her airfields to bomb Japan.

3. Place General MacArthur in supreme command of all the allied forces in the far Pacific.

He has the confidence of the American people, who know him as the ablest, the most brilliant, and most experienced fighting general in our Army. Give General MacArthur the armed forces, airplanes, and ships and he will find a way to open up the road to China and Tokyo. Inadequate forces mean inadequate attacks on small islands and outposts of the Japanese Empire. The island-hopping campaign began 6 months ago, and might go on for 6 years without reaching the heart of Japan. We have been merely bruising the fingers or outer edges of the Rising Sun Empire.

The American people want to bring the war to an end by defeating and crushing our enemies. Japan not only started the war but took the Philippines from us, and the

American people are beginning to ask why do we not get on with the war; why do we not bomb Japan?

Why does not President Roosevelt place General MacArthur in supreme command and furnish him with sufficient troops, airplanes, and ships to open up an all-out campaign on the Japs before they become entrenched in their new possessions and exploit their natural resources in oil, rubber, metals, and food to develop and expand their war industries? Is there any sound reason why General MacArthur, our greatest fighting general to date, is not given supreme command and an army of a million or more men, supported by a huge air force, and the Navy? The American people have faith in General MacArthur, and believe he would drive the Japs out of Burma, Borneo, and Sumatra and carry the fight to the heart of Japan.

The Congress was thrilled by the soul-inspiring address of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek appealing for more aid to China. Let's find a way to do it.

It would be foolish for us to permit ourselves to imagine that our difficulties and tribulations will be over with the war. No one wants final and total victory more than I, and the quicker the better. Our troubles hitherto have been largely domestic. From henceforth they will be global or world wide.

The Republicans, or minority, in Congress have given the President all-out, loyal support on all war measures. No President has ever had such complete support from the opposition party as has been freely given by the Republican Members of Congress since war was declared. However, that does not mean that the minority Members should be gagged and not express their views on international issues, on the conduct of the war, or on the peace afterward, particularly when practically everyone in America, in Congress and out, is asking himself the same question—what are our own war and peace aims, and those of our allies, the British Empire and Soviet Russia?

We Americans applaud the heroism and gallantry of the victorious Russian Army. We are determined to supply the Soviets with increasing quantities of lend-lease weapons and food. The Russian Army has made terrific sacrifices in blood and lives, yet continues to have an unconquerable spirit. It has borne the burden of the fighting, and has been the only army to defeat Hitler's legions. It deserves unstinted praise and credit.

That does not mean, however, that we should embrace Communism in America, or refrain from asking our ally, Joseph Stalin, what his objectives are in Europe and Asia. Now, while we are engaged in a common cause to defeat the Axis Powers, we should have the unquestioned right to know what we are fighting for in Europe and Asia. We should be willing to place our own cards face up on the table, and should have the right to ask Great Britain, Soviet Russia, and China to do the same. Certainly any such proposal could not disrupt the unity of the United Nations, who are determined to fight through to all-out victory.

In fairness to Joseph Stalin, he did not influence our entrance into the war, and is under no obligations to us except for lend-lease food and weapons. The one question, however, that is apparently uppermost in the minds of those interested in post-war problems and the maintenance of world peace is what are the designs of Stalin the inscrutable. He is the sphinx; and he alone can solve the riddle in our minds.

It is a sheer waste of time discussing peace terms and European or Asiatic rehabilitation until Stalin makes known his views. Until he does all the rest is conjecture and "globaloney."

There is nothing I would not do to help secure a just and lasting peace, because if we do not this war and our sacrifices—and the loss of our sons—will have been in vain. We Americans are united in our all-out efforts to win the war as quickly as possible and with the least casualties. We have a right to know exactly what we and our allies are fighting for. The time to find out is now, in the midst of war in a common cause.

After the victory has been won, and the stress and uncertainty of battle has disappeared the war objectives may change with startling rapidity. Let us get on with our all-out war efforts to attain total victory and unconditional surrender of the Axis Powers—but, let us make sure that after we have won that the fruits of victory are not snatched away and another world war built on its ruins.

The time has come for plain speaking. Most Americans expect Germany and Italy to collapse within a year or 18 months. Until we know the British and Soviet war and peace aims it is sheer nonsense to discuss post-war problems regarding Europe and Asia.

One thing is certain—we have no imperialistic designs on either Europe or Asia. If we are to be the arsenal for democracy, and to largely feed Europe and finance the war, I submit that the American people have a right to know the war and peace aims of all our allies, and our own.

I am fearful, unless we take a firm stand now for freedom, democracy, and self-determination, that it may be too late, thereby sowing the seeds of another and more disastrous war that will overwhelm civilization, religion, and free institutions throughout the world.

Those of us who went through the heat of the last campaign know the temper of the people. They are willing to fight and sacrifice, and to give everything to winning the war, but I am convinced that their mandate last November also included a demand for fearless leadership, which will safeguard our own institutions, reestablish representative and constitutional government, make constructive plans to provide employment for our returning soldiers, and strive for a just and permanent peace throughout the world.

We, in the Congress, cannot evade these duties and responsibilities.

George Washington, the Citizen-Soldier-Statesman

REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, no people have ever become great and remained great who failed to honor their heroes or cherish their traditions.

I therefore congratulate the Congress in dedicating this day to the honor and memory of George Washington, the Father of Our Country, and I concur in the action of the House today in observing this hour. It is a great inspiration to know that there will be groups of American citizens, running into the millions, who will assemble themselves today in every State, city, village, and countryside throughout the Nation to pay appropriate tribute to that great American citizen, great soldier, and great statesman, George Washington, and to rededicate themselves to that system of Government and other institutions created and established under his leadership.

Time and words are insufficient to enumerate or properly evaluate the many virtues found in his life as the model citizen in time of peace, a great general in time of war, and a great President in both peace and war. It is well recognized that no one man contributed more to the successful outcome in the revolution for freedom and independence than George Washington; few wielded a greater influence in securing the adoption and ratification of the Constitution of the United States than George Washington; and certainly no one contributed more in setting up, clarifying, and crystallizing the people's desire and ideal of a government than did George Washington. Governor Lee, of Virginia, is reported to have characterized him as being "first in peace, first in war, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

The private and public life of Washington shou'd be an inspiration to every American citizen, particularly those in public life, because Washington was one, "who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not." However, of all men in public life in our country from the beginning to the present time I cannot think of one who was criticized, vilified, abused, maligned, slandered, and libeled more than Washington. His personal character and integrity were frequently and mercilessly attacked. His good faith and ability both as a soldier and a statesman were subjected to malicious attacks by jealous minds and spiteful tongues. It is reported that even his Vice President and successor, John Adams, failed to recognize his courage and ability to ignore his selfish and jealous critics, and publicly referred to him on one occasion as "an old muttonhead," but to show that Mr. Adams was not expressing the opinion of the American people we are told that on the inauguration day of Mr. Adams the throng who attended the inauguration left the new President alone to follow Washington as he retired from the inauguration ceremonies to cheer and applaud him as he proceeded across the Potomac and turned his steps to Mount Vernon, where he was to spend the remaining years of his life, conscious of the fact that he had fought a good fight and never abused the confidence reposed in him by the people.

Washington well recognized the difference between criticism and abuse. He was not afraid of constructive criticism because it rarely comes from one's enemies. Criticism from an enemy usually consists of vilification and abuse, neither of which commanded his attention for the reason that they seldom came from men of irreproachable character, integrity or loyalty. He acted upon the theory that vilification and abuse are more often the product of a jealous, envious, selfish, distrustful person—a person whose conduct will bear watching in both private and public life and, therefore, not entitled to recognition. Washington welcomed criticism from his friends; he subscribed to the observations of Poor Richard, who said:

Our friends are those who tell us of our mistakes and help us to mend them.

Washington rarely ever replied to his critics except when they challenged his integrity or loyalty; his theory was that if he made an error there was no better reply to make than to correct it, if possible, and if the criticism or accusation were untrue time would soon prove its falsity and instead of dignifying his accuser with an explanation he gave him the silent treatment.

When the Jay-Grenville Treaty between the United States and Great Britain was under consideration one of his critics expressed himself as follows:

How long is this to be borne with? How long are we to submit to the exertions of a set of men among us who wish to prostrate us at the feet of Great Britain and barter away everything freemen hold dear? Is there not one propitious gale to kindle the embers of expiring liberty again to consume its conspirators? Disguised moderatists, forbear. Freemen are slow to anger, but when aroused moderation and forbearance may forsake them.

After the approval of the treaty the following is reported to have appeared in the Aurora, one of the critical newspapers of that period:

If ever a nation was debauched by a man, the American Nation has been dabauched by Washington. If ever a nation has been deceived by a man, the American Nation has been deceived by Washington. Let his conduct, then, be an example to future ages; let it serve to be a warning that no man may be an idol, let the history of the Federal Government instruct mankind that the mask of patriotism may be worn to conceal the foulest designs against the liberty of the people.

What will posterity say of the man who has done this thing? Will it not say that the mask of political hypocrisy has been worn by Caesar, by Cromwell, and by Washington alike?

He was openly and publicly charged with theft, one of which was summed up and expressed as follows:

General Washington went to the Treasury—some future President may go to the bank—the one step will not be a jot worse than the other.

* * * * *

If truth or reason or the public debt had been at all consulted, the House would have begun by asking the Executive why he took from the Treasury $1,100,000 without their leave and in contempt of the Constitution.

Thomas Paine, after he had left the United States and become a citizen of France, addressed a communication to the President, part of which is as follows:

And as to you, sir, treacherous in private friendship and a hypocrite in public life, the world will be puzzled to decide whether you are an apostate or an imposter; whether you have abandoned good principles or whether you ever had any.

The only reply or reference by Washington to these criticisms that I have been able to find is incorporated in a letter addressed to Governor Lee, of Virginia, in 1796, when he said, in part:

That there are in this, as in all other countries, discontented characters I well know, as also that these characters are actuated by very different views. Some good, from the opinion that the measures of the General Government are impure; some bad and (if I might be allowed to use so harsh an expression) diabolical, inasmuch as they are not only meant to impede the measures of government generally, but more especially to destroy the confidence which it is necessary the people should place (until they have unequivocal proof of demerit) in their servants, for in this light I consider myself whilst I am an occupant of office; and if they were to go further and call me their slave during this period, I would not dispute the point with them. But in what will this abuse terminate?

For the result, as it respects myself, I care not. I have a consolation within me of which no earthly efforts can deprive me, and that is that neither ambition nor interested motives have influenced my conduct. The arrow of malevolence, however barbed and pointed, can never reach my most valuable part; though, whilst I am up as a mark, they will be continually aimed at me. The publications in Freneau's and Bache's papers are outrages on common decency, and they progress in that style, in proportion as their pieces are treated with contempt, and passed over in silence by those against whom they are directed. Their tendency, however, is too obvious to be mistaken by men of cool and dispassionate minds, and, in my opinion, ought to alarm them, because it is difficult to prescribe bounds to their effect.

The daily walk and conversation of Washington testify that he was one of our greatest citizens. Although not a military genius, his leadereship of the Continental Army for 7 years under the most trying circumstances, according to historical records, demonstrated his ability to command the confidence and loyalty of an underfed and poorly clothed army, and his final success after having overcome the doubts and fears of many leaders proves that he did not have a peer as a military strategist in this country, and the fact that he stabilized the greatest system of government recorded in all time is evidence sufficient to definitely conclude that this country has had no greater President. However, Mr. Speaker, I shall call upon those who knew him personally or had a better opportunity than I to testify as to his elements of greatness and will submit their evidence in support of my conclusions.

Thomas Jefferson, who served in his Cabinet as Secretary of State and later became a successor in office, referred to him in these words:

His integrity was most pure, his justice the most inflexible I have ever known, no motives of interest or consanguinity or friendship or hatred being able to bias his decision. He was indeed in every sense of the words a wise, a good, and a great man.

Alexander Hamilton, who also served in his Cabinet, referred to him as "a very honest man."

Washington Irving is reported to have declared:

The character of Washington may want some of those poetical elements which dazzle and delight the multitude, but it possessed fewer inequalities, and a rarer union of virtues than perhaps ever fell to the lot of one man. Prudence, firmness, sagacity, moderation, an overruling judgment, an immovable justice, courage that never faltered, patience that never wearied, truth that disdained all artifice, magnanimity without alloy. It seems as if Providence had endowed him in a preeminent degree with the qualities requisite to fit him for the high destiny he was called upon to fulfill—to conduct a momentous revolution which was to form an era in the history of the world, and to inaugurate a new and untried government, which, to use his own words, was to lay the foundation for the enjoyment of much purer civil liberty, and greater public happiness, than have hitherto been the portion of mankind.

The fame of Washington stands apart from every other in history; shining with a truer luster and a more benignant glory. With us his memory remains a national property, where all sympathies throughout our widely-extended and diversified empire meet in unison. Under all dissensions and amid all the storms of party, his precepts and example speak to us from the grave with a paternal appeal; and his name—by all revered—forms a universal tie of brotherhood—a watchword of our Union.

Nearly a century and a half have passed since the death of Washington and there has been sufficient time for the unbiased and unselfish mind to properly evaluate his life and services to his country, and to my mind Henry William Elson, the historian, quite accurately summarizes his virtues and the elements that contributed to his greatness in the following words:

His popularity, like that of other public men, had its ebb and flow, its light and shadow, but at length it has settled into a steady stream of light, which the years have no power to dim. For half a century after his death Washington was regarded as little less than a demigod, and only through the telescope of modern historical criticism has the real Washington been presented to the world. We now know that he was a man, a real human being, with robust good sense, with much claim to genius, but also with many of the foibles and limitations of other men. He was almost devoid of wit and humor and of personal magnetism. Possessed of a strong temper, he kept it under masterly control. He was an avowed Christian, and his deep religious convictions formed the basis of his character and guided his daily life; but he was not demonstrative nor emotional. Though never familiar, he was always courteous; his manner was dignified and reserved, his face usually calm and reposed. His popularity was won, not by a captivating manner nor a conscious effort, but by his unswerving devotion to duty, and his high, unselfish motives.

What is Washington's rank among the world's greatest heroes? He was a successful commander of armies and he displayed much genius, but among the world's great captains he cannot be placed in the very first rank. As a statesman he must again take a second place. Wherein lay Washington's greatness? He was not dashing nor brilliant nor original. His greatness consisted for the most part in his lofty motives, in his extraordinary sound judgment, and his unlimited courage when standing for a principle that he believed to be right. His patriotism was as pure as sunlight, and no element of selfishness entered into his motives. In all his public career he never made a serious mistake. As our first President he held himself above party lines, and amid the contending tempests of political passion he stood like a mighty oak in a storm; and his conservative strength was essential to the life of the infant Republic.

Washington was exactly fitted for the position in which Providence placed him. Had he been a greater genius, he might have misused his power; had he been a weaker man, he could not have succeeded. Had he possessed the ability and ambition of Napoleon, our country would have become a

military government and a monarchy. Had his ability been of mediocre rank, it is doubtful if independence could have been won. Washington was precisely the man the times called for, and he did a service for humanity that deserves the homage of every age and every nation.

A New Standing Committee on Aviation Unnecessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the establishment of a new standing committee on aviation is unnecessary and unwise at this time. The reasons advanced in an editorial of the Washington Post, of today, entitled "Aviation Needs" are so sound and logical that I wish to include the same as part of my remarks, and recommend its careful consideration by the membership of the House:

AVIATION NEEDS

The proposal coming before the House this week for the establishment of a new standing committee on aviation would add to the legislative anarchy which is now impeding the work of Congress. What is required is not more committees, but fewer. The Senate and House together have 80 standing committees or little ministries which control legislation in their respective spheres. Those committees are loosely integrated. The result is that they are the prey of lobbyists and pressure groups, and Congress is thus frustrated from giving first attention to major legislation. If some of the existing committees were combined, and the whole integrated in some way—such as by the formation of a central committee—Congress would be in that much better position to reassert its influence, and to concentrate instead of dissipating its energies.

It is on this major ground that we base our hope that the House will not add to the confusion of its machinery by voting for another committee. That should be enough to damn the project. But the arguments in favor of a standing committee on aviation are weak in themselves. Representative LUCE, who spotlighted the proposal last week, tied it up to the problem of international airways. But what we do abroad in our air relations with the world is a problem primarily for the Executive. The President will make the agreements that are necessary, subject, of course, to senatorial ratification.

There is likewise no substance—indeed, there is a libel—in the argument that the existing Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which includes aviation in its jurisdiction, has not done well for aviation. This is contrary to the patent facts. Of all the committees of Congress, none is more efficient than the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and no chairman of a committee is more hardworking, more impartial, and less sensitive to pressuring than Representative CLARENCE F. LEA. This is the testimony of the aviation industry itself.

In point of fact, Representative LEA'S committee has played a notable part in the development of aviation. It has been so consistently in the lead that its members may be properly described as aviation pioneers and trail blazers. Actually, the committee began to study the problems of civil aviation back in 1923, and that study led to the Air Commerce Act of 1926. Yet in 1926, and certainly in 1923, civil aircraft was in the barnstorming cradle, and there were no air lines as we know them today. The act, though far ahead of the times, laid down a pattern which is still being followed without basic change. The committee was equally forehanded in pushing the economic regulation of the aviation industry, and its research and investigation took form in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Yet the innuendo is sometimes heard that the Lea committee does not have enough time to devote to aviation. Certainly it has the time and, what is even more important it has the experience. Aviation would suffer greviously if it were divorced from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and given to a new and inexperienced committee composed of pseudo-experts. The proposal would thus impair the efficiency of the industry as well as of the House of Representatives.

Purchase of Domestic Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in the confusion that exists concerning facts about silver and the purchase of domestic silver by the Treasury, it is refreshing to have first-hand information from a real mine and smelter operator, giving us the real facts and the viewpoint of the miner as presented in the letter inserted herewith from J. B. Haffner, the manager of one of the largest lead-silver mines in the West, located in the district I have the honor to represent:

BUNKER HILL & SULLIVAN
MINING & CONCENTRATING CO.,
Kellogg, Idaho, February 12, 1943.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMP: I have your note enclosing CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the proceedings and debates on Friday, February 5, 1943.

Judging from all the noise made by the enemies of silver, one might think that the so-called bonus or subsidy paid to domestic producers of silver would in a large part be responsible for the mounting national expenditures and mounting national debt. We may, for the sake of argument, consider that the silver miners are being paid a subsidy and take a look to see what it amounts to. The domestic production of silver during 1942 was approximately 54,000,000 ounces. When the Treasury pays the domestic producer 71.11 cents per ounce and the world market price for silver is 44.75 cents per ounce, the domestic producer thus receives a bonus or subsidy of 26.36 cents per ounce, or $14,234,400 for the 1942 production. With the wheat growers receiving an annual subsidy of $50,000,000, the cotton growers receiving another subsidy of $50,000,000, the petroleum industry receiving a subsidy of $250,000,000, which may be increased to $400,000,000, it seems indeed that Representative CELLER'S pot-bellied mine owners are being treated rather shabbily.

When we also call to mind that the National War Labor Board directed the mine owners to pay an additional $1 a day to the 60,000 nonferrous miners, which amounts to approximately $18,000,000 per year, it appears that very little profit is left for the mine owners.

Yours sincerely,
J. B. HAFFNER, *General Manager.*

War and the 40-Hour Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM M. RUSSELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, the Executive order a short time ago in setting 48 hours as a regular workweek, but providing that the last 8 hours should be paid for at the rate of time and one-half, did not help the situation with reference to the manpower problem at all. In my opinion it has made bad matters worse and only serves to bring about disunity and more unrest with the people as a whole of our country.

To the logical mind it appears that in order to secure the patriotism of labor organizations, they must be paid for the same. When millions of our citizens are making sacrifices during this war, it occurs to me that patriotism manifested this way should be indulged in by all of our citizens. As long as certain classes are favored either by law or Executive decree, it will not bring about unity in our country.

On February 11, 1943, there appeared in the Dallas Times Herald of Dallas, Tex., an editorial discussing this decree in a logical manner and fully explaining the feelings and opinions of most of the people of our country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I set out this editorial in full:

WAR AND THE 40-HOUR WEEK

The President's latest manpower order amounts to official recognition that the 40-hour week law is impracticable in time of war when the Nation must exert every ounce of its working energy and when sacrifice should be made by everybody.

When the 40-hour week law, with its time and a half for overtime and double pay for Sundays and holidays was enacted, millions of breadwinners were idle and the demand for goods of all kinds was at a low ebb.

The theorists who devised the 40-hour law argued that, by shortening the work period of all employees, places on pay rolls would be made for job seekers. And, to encourage management to hire additional workers, instead of working its present personnel long hours, high rates for overtime were fixed.

But the war, which the theorists did not foresee, soon nullified the original arguments for the 40-hour week. It wiped out unemployment by causing jobs to become more numerous than job seekers.

Yet, although the condition which gave rise to the curtailment of the work period disappeared, labor took the position that it was entitled to the overtime pay that the 40-hour standard afforded. In short, a law that was intended, by the theorists, to distribute among many a limited number of

jobs, became practically a bonanza for the organized workers in defense industry. Much of labor began working more than 40 hours, but the heavy overtime rates continued in effect.

War industry, financed at the expense of the taxpayers, paid the overtime rates. It could not remain on a 40-hour-week schedule and meet its production quotas. In other words, a law that was intended to create more jobs made it necessary to pay a premium to labor when jobs became plentiful.

As a result of this the major portion of the enormous increase that the war has caused in the national income has been received by employees in war industry, while the millions of workers in so-called nonessential industry and in agriculture enjoyed very little or no increase in income.

All this has meant that, while the war has brought unprecedented prosperity to some workers, it has brought serious hardship upon many others. While the buying power of some workers has gone up, the buying power of others has gone down.

Since the 40-hour law was a depression measure, it should have been repealed when the depression ended, but the portion of labor benefited by it would make no concession. As a result of this the war has required sacrifice by millions while at the same time it has meant inflated prosperity for others.

The President's order leaves the 40-hour week as the basis for overtime payment. It does not wipe out the glaring disparity between war industry wages and the pay of workers in so-called nonessential industry and agriculture. It may increase production, but it does not relieve the unfair condition that has been caused by the retention of the 40-hour week. But now that the inappropriateness of this depression period law to the wartime situation is officially recognized, the way is paved for real corrective measures.

"Feather Beds"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorial:

"FEATHER BEDS"

While the United States is engaged in a fight for its life, and the Government becomes more and more concerned about a shortage of manpower—

Painters' unions in various cities impose restrictions on the use of spray guns in order to slow down jobs.

A local of the teamsters' union requires that every truck entering the New York metropolitan area have a local driver in addition to the driver already employed.

Engineers on many fast passenger trains work only 10 calendar days a month, for which they receive 48 basic days' pay.

In various cities the electrical union requires that if any temporary light or power is to be used on a construction job there must be a full-time maintenance electrician who shall not be permitted to do any construction work.

In some cases plumbing unions install prefabricated piping only if the thread is cut off at one end of the pipe and new thread is cut at the job site.

In Chicago employers cannot bring in truck cement mixers unless they hire extra men to stand around and watch.

In many theaters a full crew of scene shifters must be employed even in plays where there is no change of scenery.

These are typical "feather bed" restrictions. There are many thousands like them. In the present search for manpower nobody is doing anything about them.

On the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an article by Dorothy Thompson relating to a recent speech delivered in this House:

ON THE RECORD—MRS. LUCE'S SPEECH READS LIKE "DOUBLE TALK"—CONCEPTS OF "FREEDOM OF SKIES" ARE CONFUSED

(By Dorothy Thompson)

I had a bad conscience after commenting on CLARE BOOTHE LUCE'S maiden speech in the House of Representatives from reading merely the excerpts in the press. So I read it entire in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Now, I must confess that I don't know what she was talking about. I don't know what she means by "freedom of the skies" and by "sovereignty of the skies." Though she debates in behalf of the latter against the former, she debates without definitions, and her descriptions, in lieu of definitions, are entirely misleading.

Mrs. LUCE describes "sovereignty of the skies" as "the policy adopted by most nations at the Versailles Conference * * * sovereignty over a nation's own territory and denial of free access to its airports." The denial of "free" access does not mean the denial of "access." That would be patent nonsense. If our planes did not have access to airports situated in other countries, how could we fly anywhere? It means that we have access under certain regulations, as others have access to us under certain regulations. But, under the nature of things, nations strive to bring the various regulations into conformity under international law. To prevent anarchy in the air, such regulations need to be reciprocal and universal.

LIMITED CONCEPT

"Sovereignty of the air" is, therefore, a limited concept that applies to the passage of planes over national territories and to the use of national airports.

"Freedom of the air" is not incompatible with this concept of "sovereignty." It applies to that portion of the air which is international highway—the air over oceans, which constitute nine-twelfths of the globe's surface. Freedom of the seas means the right of all nations to traverse the high seas on equal terms. Freedom of the air over the seas means exactly the same thing. It is freedom of international highway.

Now, if it was Mrs. LUCE'S intention deliberately to confuse these two concepts and present them as incompatible with each other, one can only wonder what her purpose may have been. If her speech filled some with a certain degree of alarm, it was because she seemed to mix up in it still a different concept of "sovereignty of the air"—different from the one described above and expressed in existing international rules. That was apparently the idea of American sovereignty, or supremacy in the air all over the globe.

Mrs. LUCE said: "We beg them (the Army and Navy) not to fritter away our best chance of winning the peace—which is post-war civilian as well as military control of the air."

Whose air? Our own over the United States of America in the sense described above? When and by whom has that ever been challenged? By no one, ever. But Mrs. LUCE says: "We have invested hundreds of millions of dollars via lease-lend in terminal facilities, communications, weather control and air transport craft in foreign countries."

HER MEANING UNSTATED

Mrs. LUCE does not state outright what her meaning is in referring to this fact. But the context of her speech certainly implies, if it implies anything, that these facilities, built for the United Nations, as part of a common effort to defeat a common enemy, must be retained by us to give us an unquestionable commercial and military competitive advantage over our present allies after the war is over.

She points out that the Axis Powers will doubtless be completely knocked out of any competition by total air disarmament, including the right to manufacture civilian planes. That leaves Britain, America, and Russia in the field, and America must have the advantage, otherwise we shall have lost the peace.

If any program for wholesale big business competition for supremacy in the global air is followed, either by Britain or us, we shall certainly have that World War No. 3 to which Mrs. LUCE also refers. For Mrs. LUCE is correct about one thing: "An air commerce program complementary to and coordinated with military defense is vital for the future." No one can disentangle commercial and military aviation. That is why, as H. G. Wells was one of the first to see, the Federal and cooperative control of the air, under global rules, is essential if we are of firm intention not to have that next war in the world horror series.

Mrs. LUCE'S speech is not in the least clear, and she can easily challenge Representative J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, to "give a precise quote in which I said America must control the skies of any other nation." There is no precise quote. It is not a precise speech, but a lot of American century double talk. But if Mrs. LUCE wants to be taken seriously she ought to make a precise statement of what she does mean. The function of words is to convey meaning.

I like Mrs. LUCE and supported her candidacy for the House. But I didn't support Mr. Sam Prior, who first brought her name forward, played an active role behind the scenes in her campaign, and is vice president of Pan American Airways. I would say to Mrs. LUCE: CLARE, be yourself.

Return to Standard Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a senate concurrent resolution introduced in the Senate of the State of

Indiana memorializing Congress to restore standard time to the Nation at least during that portion of the year between the 1st day of October and the 1st day of April of each calendar year:

Whereas in the inscrutable wisdom of the powers at Washington the clocks of the Nation have been advanced 1 hour; and

Whereas for some reason the sun has not accelerated correspondingly; and

Whereas with war industries working 24 hours a day no possible advantage accrues from the advance in time; and

Whereas said change of time is a distinct handicap to the agricultural production of the Nation; and

Whereas during half of the year it necessitates groping in the 2 hours of predawn darkness with which an uncooperative nature shrouds the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress be hereby memorialized to restore standard time to the Nation at least during that portion of the year between the 1st day of October and the 1st day of April of each calendar year.

Postal Employees' Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the magazine America in the issue of February 20, 1943, on the subject of post-office employees' pay:

OVERWORKED AND UNDERPAID

Since the days of Ben Franklin no one has heard of a wealthy post-office employee. The average postal worker is apt to go hungry unless he or his wife is an expert in economics. But he cannot hold out much longer, for his salary today is exactly what it was in 1925. And the new taxes eat into that.

His road has been rough. In 1932 all postal workers were given a month's furlough, without pay. In 1933 the Government exhorted all private employers to raise wages, and then, to give them a good example, cut the wages of its own employees by 15 percent. A few years later 10 percent of this cut was restored, and finally Congress was shamed into restoring the other 5 percent. The postal worker then found himself where he had been in 1925. He is still on that spot, wistfully watching the increases granted by Federal boards to employees in private industry who can strike.

Government employees must take what is offered, and like it, or get out. That is exactly the policy which the predatory corporations enforced in the darkest days of the laissez-faire age. The Government employee may not strike. He may not walk out. He may not picket. He is deprived of his right to bargain collectively. If he tries to better his condition by engaging in politics, he falls under the ban of the Hatch Act. Hence, the politicians recognize no special duty to the Federal employee. His defenseless condition, which entitles him to special protection, only makes him in their eyes a victim whose cries may be safely disregarded, since they are the cries of the helpless.

Not every Federal employee is an overworked and underpaid drudge. This description does, however, fit about 40 percent of them. Of the remaining 60 percent, at least half could be dropped, with benefit to the Government. But the Abou ben Adhem of the underpaid and the overworked is the postal worker. A bill for his relief might well be the first step to that sane and humane labor policy which the Government has yet to adopt or even to consider seriously, for the welfare of its millions of employees.

Dismissal of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Federal Employee, issue of February 1943, setting forth the regulations relative to the removal of employees from the Federal service:

FEDERAL DISMISSAL PROCEDURE

The volume of suggestions which are cropping up at the present time to the general effect that some more summary procedure is needed to rid the service of unfit Federal employees indicates that a restatement of the procedure governing such removal seems to be called for.

Since the act of August 24, 1912, went into effect, the following rules have governed removals:

"1. Reasons to be furnished: No person in the classified service of the United States shall be removed therefrom except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of the service and for reasons given in writing, and the person whose removal is sought shall have notice of the same and of any charges preferred against him and be furnished with a copy thereof, and also be allowed a reasonable time for personally answering the same in writing; and affidavits in support thereof (regarded as applying to the answer of the accused employee); but no examination of witnesses nor any trial or hearing shall be required except in the discretion of the officer making the removal; and copies of charges, notice of hearing, answer, reasons for removal, and of the order of removal shall be made a part of the records of the proper department or office, as shall also the reasons for reduction in rank or compensation; and copies of the same shall be furnished to the person affected upon request, and the Commission also shall, upon request be furnished copies of the same."

The act of June 28, 1940, provides a modification of the above procedure as applying to civilian employees of the War, Navy, and Coast Guard, as follows:

"* * * During the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist, the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555; U. S. C, title 5, sec. 652), shall not apply to any civil-service employee of the War or Navy Departments or of the Coast Guard, or their field services, whose immediate removal is, in the opinion of the Secretary concerned warranted by the demands of national security, but nothing herein shall be construed to repeal, modify, or suspend the proviso in that section. Those persons summarily removed under the authority of this section may, if in the opinion of the Secretary concerned, subsequent investigation so warrants, be reinstated, and if so reinstated, shall be allowed compensation for the period of such removal at the rate they were receiving on the date of removal: *And provided further*, That within 30 days after such removal any such person shall have an opportunity personally to appear before the official designated by the Secretary concerned and be fully informed of the reasons for such removal, and to submit, within 30 days thereafter, such statement or affidavits, or both, as he may desire to show why he should be retained and not removed (sec. 6 of the act of June 28, 1940, 54 Stat. 679)."

For civilian employees who are serving their probational period of either 6 or 12 months, as the case may be, the removal procedure is as follows:

"* * * If and when, after a full and fair trial, the conduct or capacity of the probationer is not satisfactory to the appointing officer, the probationer may at any time thereafter during this period be so notified in writing, with a full statement of reasons, and this notice shall terminate his service."

In the leading case of *Taylor* v. *Taft, Secretary of War* (24 App. D. C. 95,) the court held:

"The courts have no jurisdiction to review the action of an appointing officer in removing an employee. The right of appointment necessarily involves the right of removal. This power is absolute, except insofar as restricted by Congress. The Civil Service Act limits the power of removal in no respect, except for the single cause of failure to contribute money or services to a political party. An employee's fitness, capacity, and attention to his duties are questions of discretion and judgment to be determined by the heads of the departments. Such questions are beyond the power of any court."

It is clear from the authorities above quoted that any civilian employee who, after being given a fair opportunity to demonstrate qualification, cannot be adjusted so as to perform work of a satisfactory standard can be removed from the service without either difficulty or delay.

The National Federation of Federal Employees will continue, as always, vigorously to insist that employees not be subjected to arbitrary, unfair, or capricious disciplinary action, but a smoothly operating system whereby the service can be rid of its unfit is most necessary in the interest of all worthwhile employees.

Nothing better serves to bolster morale than the knowledge that proper levels of performance must be maintained.

There can be no doubt that the establishment of positions of directors of personnel is still viewed with skepticism in many quarters and unless personnel officers fully live up to their responsibilities, this skepticism will be, if anything, heightened. A great disservice to the whole Federal personnel structure will be the result.

The Ramspeck investigation by all means should call for detailed reports as to the extent to which directors of personnel are insisting not only that capable employees should receive the benefits of their good work but that the unfit are cleared from the Federal rolls.

Food for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I place in the

RECORD a statement on our food situation made by the Honorable Loyson G. Troth, secretary of the South Dakota Citizens for Victory Committee, and former State secretary of agriculture. Mr. Troth's statement follows:

OUR FOOD SITUATION

We are close to a food Dunkerque. We have lost our food production goal for 1943, because no practical program for its success has been made. Secretary of Agriculture and Food Czar Wickard's slogan "Food will win the war and dictate the peace" is inspiring, but what food? Slogans do not win wars or feed the starving. His pipe-dream army of 3½ million city men, high-school girls, and children to plant and harvest is a mirage. Inexperienced labor will aid in flash crops, fruits, vegetables, etc., but not too much.

On our highly mechanized poultry, dairy, livestock, and grain farms we must have men trained to operate and service expensive machinery, not for a few hours, a few days, but 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Even now we are rationed, are told to begin tightening our belts, that our so-called surplus will disappear almost overnight. (Which is only too true.) Mr. Wickard's suggestion that farmers loan their machinery is impractical. Nearly ever farm must have its machines working on the same days.

One day's delay often spells the difference between a bumper crop and a failure. Our farm machinery quota is 53 percent of prewar years. It should be 153 percent. No one thing would do more to ease our farm labor shortage than would giving the farmer adequate farm machinery. General Marshall says he will not release the trained farmers now in camp. We pin our faith of an early victory on the military genius of General Marshall. Do we ask him to win with untrained, half-equipped men? Is it any more sane to ask the farmer to reach production goals while we hamstring him by draining his trained help, refuse replacements for obsolete, worn-out machinery that should be in the scrap drive?

LOYSON G. TROTH,
Secretary, South Dakota Chapter, Citizens for Victory.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith a copy of a resolution adopted by the State Board of Public Welfare of the State of Montana for the consideration of Congress:

Whereas the present maximum payments made under the Federal Social Security Act for matching benefits given by States for aid to dependent children are now $9 per month for the first child and $6 per month for each additional child; and

Whereas the maximum amount provided for by the Federal Social Security Act of matching State aid for old-age assistance is $20 per month per individual; and

Whereas it appears that a discontinuation of Work Projects Administration projects and the discontinuation of the food-stamp plan and a possible discontinuation of commodities under the food-distribution program will increase the need for aid for individuals within this State unable to provide all of the necessities of life for themselves; and

Whereas it appears that one of the purposes for the giving of aid to dependent children is to keep the family intact and that wherever there are one or more dependent children in a family that the mother is, in practically all cases, unable to support herself, and is in need of aid either Federal, State or county for that purpose: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the State Board of Public Welfare of the State of Montana, That the Federal Social Security Act be so amended as to provide for a matching of funds advanced by the State and county up to $40 per month for the mother and the first dependent child, and providing for $12 thereafter for each additional dependent child; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made a part of the minutes of this meeting and the facts set forth herein be brought to the attention of our Senators and Representatives in Congress and that a copy be forwarded to each Senator, each Representative in Congress and to the Governor of this State.

The Nebraska Farmers' Union Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Chris Milius, president of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative State Union of Nebraska:

FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE STATE UNION OF NEBRASKA,
Omaha, Nebr., February 19, 1943.

Mr. CARL T. CURTIS,
Congressman, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: At our Farmers' Union State convention, held February 10 and February 11, our legislative committee, which is composed of one man elected by the members of each organized county, presented the following five resolutions dealing with national legislature, which were unanimously adopted. I trust that this will give you some guidance as to how our members feel about national legislature.

1. We, the legislative committee of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of Nebraska, recommend that this convention repeat its request of a year ago asking the Congress of the United States to outlaw all strikes as sabotage against the war effort of the United States.

2. We ask that Congress enact pay-as-you-go taxation.

3. We call upon Congress and our fellow citizens to realize that a lower standard of living as evidenced by increased living costs is a result of increased taxation and war, and when any group gets increased wages to pay such increased living costs, they have only passed on their share of the burden to some other group. We therefore condemn pay increase legislation as a shift of the war cost onto agriculture, the industry that has historically borne the major financial loss incurred by war.

4. We recommend a large draft of Federal employees into the actual war effort, a 48-hour week, and an actual draft of workers into vital industries as a solution to the manpower problem. We favor Mr. Rickenbacker's suggestion that workers so drafted, who serve honorably in industry, be given proper recognition.

5. We urge that price ceilings in agriculture be fixed high enough to permit adequate production without the use of subsidies.

The members of the Farmers Union of Nebraska have never asked for any special privileges, and we do not wish special privileges granted to other groups. All that we ask is that we may have a free and open field in which to build the cooperative movement.

Here's hoping that you can see your way clear to work with us on the above recommendations. We shall be pleased to hear from you at any time on all important legislation which concerns the farmer.

Thanking you very kindly for your interest, I remain

Yours very truly,
CHRIS MILIUS, *President.*

Frances Willard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me in Statuary Hall on Thursday, February 18, 1943, in the memory of Frances Willard, under the auspices of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the District of Columbia:

Madam President and friends who commemorate the memory of Frances Willard on this the forty-fifth anniversary of her passing, it is very fitting that during these dark war days our thoughts turn to higher things of life. Here in Statuary Hall encompassed about with the likenesses of so many of our founding fathers it is significant that we pause before the statue of the only woman represented here. All around us are figures of stalwart sons and, here, a frail woman. Since the dawn of history women have contributed their equal share with men in the advancement of Christian civilization.

Frances Elizabeth Caroline Willard was the daughter of teacher parents. Education, next to religion, played the most important part in their ideals of life. Circumstances made it necessary for the Willard family to leave their native State of New York and journey westward, stopping first in Ohio and then in Wisconsin.

Early in life Miss Frances displayed talents of leadership, and for many years taught in schools and colleges. It is not surprising to find this young Puritan woman soon becoming a crusader in the cause of temperance. From a subordinate position our subject became the president of the Woman's World's Christian Union. Along with her fellow workers the cause of woman's suffrage as well as other rights for women were sponsored and promoted.

Ordinarily the services of our women are more to be appreciated and more readily utilized in peacetime than in war. Modern war, however, has called to service in many capacities members of the fairer sex, and all through the ranks of our armed forces today

are found talented and beautiful women performing essential services in our country's cause for freedom. The poet Joaquin Miller has appropriately given us these lines:

"The bravest battle that ever was fought!
Shall I tell you where and when?
On the maps of the world you will find it not;
'Twas fought by the mothers of men.

"Nay, not with cannon or battle-shot,
With a sword or noble pen;
Nay, not with eloquent words or thought
From mouths of wonderful men!

"But deep in a walled-up woman's heart—
Of a woman that would not yield,
But bravely, silently bore her part—
Lo, there is that battlefield!

"No marshaling troops, no bivouac song,
No banner to gleam and wave;
But oh! these battles, they last so long—
From babyhood to the grave.

"Yet, faithful still as a bridge of stars,
She fights in her walled-up town—
Fights on and on in the endless wars,
Then, silent, unseen, goes down.

"Oh, ye with banners and battle-shot,
And soldiers to shout and praise!
I tell you the kingliest victories fought
Were fought in those silent ways.

"O spotless woman in a world of shame
With splendid and silent scorn,
Go back to God as white as you came—
The kingliest warrior born!"

May the memory of this good woman, who did so much for the cause of humanity, particularly with reference to sobriety and decency, be forever preserved, perpetuated, and transmitted to the generations yet to come.

Wild-Life Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, at your invitation and on request of several Members of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], chairman of the Select Committee on Wild Life Conservation, spoke at some length on the occasion of the approval by the House of a resolution renewing that committee for the Seventy-eighth Congress. That was on January 21. At the conclusion of his remarks the gentleman placed a poem, which he has since told me he regarded as one of the finest he had ever read, but he did not know the author's name.

The poem was The Cowboy's Prayer. Its author is Badger Clark, poet laureate of the State of South Dakota, a fellow townsman of mine and a close personal friend for more than 30 years. I sent him a copy of the RECORD containing the anonymous poem and received the following characteristic comment:

Thank you very much for the section of the RECORD containing The Cowboy's Prayer. Even if it was an extension and even if the gentleman didn't know the name of the author, I have the exultant knowledge that I've "made" the magazine with probably the most exclusive list of contributors in the country.

The old prayer was written 37 years ago next summer, but it seems to be going strong yet. Just lately it has had something of a boom. An article in an Arizona magazine about me, in December, quoted it. Another in a Texas stockman's publication, at the same time, by Howard Biggar, quoted it. Several people wrote of hearing it over the radio about Christmas, and now it pops up in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

You need not trouble to attach the name of the author. Half of the people who know it think it anonymous, and that doesn't bother me, so long as it keeps in circulation.

I am identifying the author, however, in this way, at the request of the gentleman from Virginia, and at his suggestion am giving the following additional information:

Badger Clark was the son of an early South Dakota circuit rider and presiding elder in the Methodist Church. He attended the public schools and spent a year or so at Dakota Wesleyan University, which did not rate him highly as a student, but many years after he left the institution called him back to receive the honorary degree of doctor of letters. Some of his young manhood was spent in Cuba and much of it on the western range.

The Cowboy's Prayer was written in Arizona and was among the first of Clark's poems. It appears in Sun and Saddle Leather, his first collection of poems Written for Mother, a mother who sent his first verses to the old Pacific Monthly, in which they were printed much to his surprise. That volume, combined with the later Grass Grown Trails, has gone into a sixth edition. A later collection is entitled "Sky Lines and Wood Smoke."

Clark's father served in the Civil War and spent his last years as chaplain of the National Soldiers Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, Battle Mountain Sanitarium, at Hot Springs, now a facility of the Veterans' Administration. Of his father, he has written:

My father could mix his prayers and his shooting
And he was a rare true man in his generation.

Like most poets, Clark has written of war and peace. A poem that came during World War No. 1, The Fighting Swing, included these lines:

Once again the regiments go marching down the street,
Shoulders, legs, and rifle barrels swinging all in time.
Let the slack civilian plod; ours the gayer feet
Dancing to the music of the oldest earthly rhyme.

* * * * *

Left! Right! Eat and fight! Dreams are blown to bits.
(Here's the Old Guard back to life, bound for Austerlitz.)
Drop the soft and quit the sweet; loose the arms that cling;
Blood, dust, grapple, and thrust—back to the fighting swing.

He lives in a home he made with his own hands, deep in the heart of the Black Hills, at the foot of Mount Cooleidge. From the top of the mountain he can see the Bad Lands National Monument. He has caught the weird spell of the Bad Lands with these words:

No fresh green things in the Bad Lands bide;
It is all stark red and gray,
And strewn with bones that had lived and died
Ere the first man saw the day.

* * * * *

The place is as dry as a crater cup,
Yet you hear, as the stars shine free,
From the barren gulches sounding up
The lap of a spawning sea,
A breeze that cries where the great ferns rise
From the pools on a new-made shore,
With the whip and whirr of batlike wings
And the snarl of slimy, fighting things
And the tread of the dinosaur.

He is at his best in his western verse. The much discussed Government film, The Plow That Broke the Plains, was not more graphic than Clark's poem on The Rains, written 20 years before there was a Great Plains committee. Here are some lines from it:

Did you ever see a springtime in the home range of the sun,
When the desert land is waitin' for the rains?

He asks.

* * * * *

It's sun and sun without a change the lazy length o' May
And all the little sun things own the land.
The horned toad backs and swells himse'f;
The bright swifts dart and play;
The rattler hunts or dozes in the sand.
The wind comes off the desert like it brushed a bed of coals;
The sickly range grass withers down and fails;
The bony cattle bawl around the dryin' water holes,
Then stagger off along the stony trails.

* * * * *

But last across the sky line comes a thing that's strange and new,
A little cloud of saddle blanket size.

* * * * *

Have you seen a mountain stretch and rub its eyes?
Or bare hills lift their streamin' faces up and thank the Lord,
Fairly tremblin' with their gladness and surprise?
Have you heard the 'royos singin' and the new breeze hummin' gay,
As the greenin' ranges shed their dusty stains—
Just a whole dead world sprung back to life and laughin' in a day.
Did you ever see the comin' of the rains?

Members on this floor have often remarked on the products of the small town. They could quote Clark:

For while the city struts in pride
And trumpets far its loud renown,
The men who govern, there, and guide
Are children of the little town.

That is the small town's latent power—
Some name upon its schoolroom page,
The future hero of the hour,
The future glory of an age.

'Twas always so; 'twill always be—
Small town, the great folks' starting place;
A small-town boy in Galilee
Rerouted all the human race.

The gentleman from Virginia could find many a poem fit to accompany his inspiring remarks on wildlife conservation in Clark's collections. The Buck, Deer Trails, Romeo Elk, Tiger Lilies,

Dancing Pines, and Quaking Asp suggest the range.

Courage for today will be found in the poem that many think is Clark's masterpiece, The Job, from which are these excerpts:

But God, it won't come right. It won't come right!
I've worked it over till my brain is numb.
The first flash came so bright.
* * * * *
The soul, the fiery vital part
To give it life, is what I cannot get. I've tried—
You know it—tried to catch live fire
And pawed cold ashes.
* * * * *
Did it come at you with a rush, your dream, your plan?
If so, I know how you began.
Yes, with rapt face and sparkling eyes,
Swinging the hot globe out between the skies,
Marking the new seas with their white beach lines,
Sketching in sun and moon, the lightning and rains,
Sowing the hills with pines,
Wreathing a rim of purple round the plains.
I know you laughed then, while you caught and wrought
The big, swift rapturous outline of your thought.
And then—
Men.
I see it now.
O God, forgive my pettish row!
I see your job. While ages crawl
Your lips take laboring lines, your eyes a sadder light,
For man, the fire and flower and center of it all—
Man won't come right!
* * * * *
Why don't you quit
After your patient centuries
Fresh starts, recastings, tired Gethsemanes
And tense Golgothas, he, your central theme,
Is just a jangling echo of your dream.
Grand as the rest may be, he ruins it.
Why don't you quit?
Crumple it all and dream again! But no;
Flaw after flaw, you work it out, revise, refine—
Bondage, brutality and war, and woe
The sot, the fool, the tyrant and the mob—
Dear God, how you must love your job!
Help me, as I love mine.

The gentleman from Virginia, using Clark's Cowboy's Prayer to conclude his plea for the out-of-doors, did not misplace his trust. I close with these lines from Clark's I Must Come Back:

I dread the break when I shall die—
Not from my human friends, for they
Are shifting shadows such as I
And soon will follow me away—
But from my earth, that still must swing,
Slow shimmering on from spring to spring,
Through all the years when I am gone.
How many loving clouds will fold
The piny peaks in tender mist;
What sunsets turn the sky to gold
And distant plains to amethyst.
What sparkling winter days will loose
The chuckle of the chickadee
Among the silent, snowy spruce—
And I shall not be here to see!
* * * * *
No, when the waning heartbeat fails,
I ask no heaven but leave to wend,
Unseen, but seeing, my old trails,
With deathless years to comprehend,
My earth, the loveliness of you,
From all your gorgeous zodiac,
Down to a glistening drop of dew.
I must come back! I must come back!

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme pride that I insert in the RECORD as a part of these remarks an address of Hon. Harry Slattery, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, delivered before the first national convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association at St. Louis, Mo., on January 19, 1943.

I say that I insert this speech with extreme pride, for the reason that it answers the critics of our rural electrification program, which I have been sponsoring for many years.

As I have said on the floor of the House before, we started this program of rural electrification in the district which I represent, back in 1933 and 1934, before the present Rural Electrification Administration was even created. When the law was passed creating the Rural Electrification Administration, this program was adopted and extended to every section of the country, or as far as the funds allotted at that time would permit.

In the Spring of 1938 I secured the adoption of an amendment for the first $100,000,000 to be expended for rural electrification during the next fiscal year, and followed that up with similar appropriations for the next 2 years. The result was that rural electrification began to grow by leaps and bounds, until there is now hardly a county in the Nation that is not reached.

As soon as this war is over, or as soon as the scarcity of strategic materials is overcome, or as soon as strategic materials are made available, we expect to renew the drive to electrify every farm home in America, at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

But the point Mr. Slattery drives home is the fact that this program is self-liquidating. It will pay for itself within a reasonable term of years without loss to the Federal Government, and will add untold billions of dollars to the wealth of this Nation, to say nothing of the boundless benefits it brings to the farmers and their families in providing them with comforts and conveniences, as well as relief from drudgery.

Mr. Slattery's address follows:

I appreciate very greatly the honor of your invitation to speak at the first national convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. The purpose of this convention—to organize the efforts of the Nation's rural electric cooperatives and their million members to use their power to produce food for victory—cannot be overemphasized because of its importance to our armed forces, to our allies overseas, and to our civilians at home. In the words of Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture and Food Administrator in charge of the Nation's food program, "Food will win the war and write the peace." Food is a munition of war, and I hold the greatest hope and confidence that out of this convention of your association and the plans formulated here there will come positive and substantial contributions to the production of food and to savings in farm manpower by the cooperative members represented by you.

While the primary responsibility is production for war and that must continue until we have won a lasting peace, the occasion of this first convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is particularly significant in another important respect. It marks the beginning of another stage in the progress of rural electrification in the United States. Six years ago the foundation for such an organization was not present simply because most of your cooperatives did not then exist. At that time there were strong predictions of dire and dismal failure in store for the future of rural electric cooperatives. With your permission I should like to read some excerpts from the prediction of an outstanding spokesman of the private utility industry as to the probable course of the Government's rural electrification program and the future of the cooperatives that you represent here today. Bear in mind that this prediction was made only 6 years ago in the proceedings of the Third World Power Conference held in Washington in 1936 at which were gathered the most eminent technical power authorities from nearly every country in the world. The excerpts are from a paper entitled "Rural Electrification in the United States" by Hudson W. Reed, of the United Gas Improvement Co. In the preface of his paper he states:

"Every economic depression brings forth its panaceas for improving economic conditions, often more harmful than constructive. This is so, not because of the undesirability of the objective but because political expediency and enthusiastic experimenting, untempered by experience and mature judgment, are all too often the motivating forces. Let us trust that on this problem, at least, those who are working for the further advancement of rural electrification, both within and without the electric industry, will be guided more by the practical requirements of the rural dwellers themselves, and their ability to assume the additional financial obligations involved, than by a laudable, though utopian, ambition to remake rural life."

After a discussion of a few early electric cooperatives, Mr. Reed states:

"We are witnessing today another drive to encourage the building of cooperative lines. The mere fact that the Government is financially and otherwise encouraging such enterprises is no indication that they will be more successful than in the past. It may again take some time for it to be realized that inexperienced and poorly organized farm groups cannot hope to operate as cheaply and efficiently as well-trained and highly specialized utility organizations. * * *"

Please remember, I am quoting from Mr. Reed. Continuing, he states:

"The Rural Electrification Administration plans to have the cooperative lines amortize their investment over a period of 25 years, on the supposition that the lines will be clear of all incumbrances by that time. This plan, of course, will add considerably to the over-all cost of operation, and will thus discourage the complete acceptance of service so essential to the success of rural lines. Moreover, it is quite doubtful if the ordinary run of farm line will produce enough revenue, after the maintenance period starts, to permit the amortization payments required by the Rural Electrification Administration. * * *

"The history of Government operation or sponsorship of such projects, here and elsewhere, indicates that over and over again the taxpayers have had to pay the losses incurred. There is nothing in the present plan to indicate that history will not again repeat itself."

In the words of a former Governor of the State of New York—"Let's look at the record."

Particularly, let us look at the financial record of your cooperatives and the manner in which they are meeting their financial obligations that Mr. Reed, the spokesman of the private industry, was so sure they couldn't meet. Let us examine those predictions of 6 years ago in the light of today.

First the prediction, "It may again take some time for it to be realized that inexperienced and poorly organized farm groups cannot hope to operate as cheaply and efficiently as well-trained and highly specialized utility organizations." I think the best possible reply to that dire forecast in this convention with representatives from nearly all of the 800 Rural Electrification Administration financed systems that now have 377,000 miles of line in operation in over two-thirds of the counties of the Nation. Who but a well-organized group could respond to this call to provide food for the war and the world?

To the prediction that "The history of government operation or sponsorship of such projects here and elsewhere, indicates that over and over again the taxpayers have had to pay the losses incurred," and that "There is nothing in the present plan to indicate that history will not again repeat itself," I know that every one of us is proud of the financial record of this program and the financial status of your systems, because, in the final analysis, financial stability reflects a sound operating condition essential to the continuance of adequate service on an efficient and low-cost basis and to continued progress toward our goal of universal rural electrification. Let us then examine the figures. By the end of October 1942 all borrowers of Rural Electrification Administration funds had interest and principal payments due under their contracts in the amount of $26,370,287. That is no small amount to pay by your systems which were described by Mr. Reed as "inexperienced and poorly organized farm groups." The total payments may, therefore, be considered as short of amazing. In contrast to this total amount due of $26,000,000, the systems had made interest and principal payments totaling $34,391,419. At that time advance payments on principal amounted to $8,350,305. In other words, your systems are 30 percent ahead of the repayment schedules of the loan contracts.

This does not mean, of course, that every system is current in its accounts with the Government. On the same date—the end of October 1942—delinquencies over 30 days amounted to $234,942 or slightly less than 1 percent of the total amount due. I am sure that all of us are justly proud of the fine financial record shown by these figures. Inasmuch as these complete figures are as of the end of October, let us see what the payments were during November and December.

First of all, I should like to point out that during recent months advance payments have been in the neighborhood of $600,000 per month. The advance payments during November reflected a continuance of this level totaling $618,431. But here is the surprise. During the month of December, however, advance payments jumped to over $1,000,000, the exact figure being $1,096,132. These figures indicate that when the final adjustments are made the total advance payments will probably be in excess of $10,000,000 as of January 1 of this year.

As fine as these figures are they do not reflect the total financial picture of your systems. Not only have your systems made approximately $10,000,000 in payments in advance of the loan contracts but also your systems have invested considerable amounts of money in Government bonds and still have substantial funds on deposit in banks. Our records indicate that your systems now hold something over $5,000,000 of Government bonds and have nearly $7,000,000 in operating funds in banks.

Because of the contention that only certain sections of the country could afford the luxury of electric power—I recall that Mr. Reed described it as "laudable, though utopian"—I think that it will be of interest to examine the pay-out status of your systems on a regional break-down. We recognize, of course, that every section of the Nation has its particular problems and that some sections have developed more rapidly than others in the construction of rural power lines. With these limitations in mind, let us look at the status of interest and principal payments on a regional basis. Our records for the end of October 1942 show that the systems in region 1 were 31 percent ahead of their contract schedule; region 2 was 45 percent ahead of schedule; region 3 was 35 percent ahead of schedule; region 4 was 29 percent ahead of schedule; region 5 was 41 percent ahead of schedule; region 6 was 34 percent ahead of schedule; region 7 was 4 percent ahead of schedule; region 8 was 24 percent ahead of schedule; region 9 was 7 percent ahead of schedule; region 10 was 22 percent ahead of schedule; and the Tennessee Valley Authority region was 38 percent ahead of schedule. As I have already stated, for the entire Nation, your systems are 30 percent ahead of schedule. These figures should remove doubts from anyone's mind that rural electrification cannot be had on a widespread basis in every section and every corner of the country.

If there are still any doubts in anyone's mind—including Mr. Reed's—as to the overall financial soundness of the Rural Electrification Administration program, there is another significant piece of evidence that will be of interest to all of you. The unconvinced critic may still argue that while your systems are paying their debt service at a rate of 30 percent ahead of the contract schedule, their earnings aren't just that good. Again, I think we should look at the record. First of all, the Rural Electrification Administration publishes each year for the benefit of the public a report on the operations of every borrower of public funds from the agency.

An analysis based on the three monthly operating reports received from your systems prior to October 1942 reveals perhaps the most striking evidence of the upward trend toward the financial stability of this program and of the efficiency of your systems. Computing maximum debt service on the basis of total advances to your systems on September 30, this analysis of operating reports shows that 267 Rural Electrification Administration borrowers had net income equal to, or in excess of, the estimated debt service at the maximum rate of amortization provided for by the loan contracts. The significance of this figure of 267 is particularly great when it is noted that only 16 of the 267 borrowers were then required to make maximum debt-service payments. The difference between these two figures shows that 251 borrowers are now earning income equivalent to their debt service at maximum rates, although their maximum debt service will not become due and payable for 1, 2, 3, or 4 years. This figure of 251 borrowers relates only to borrowers with current net income equal to or larger than maximum debt-service requirements. Many other systems are making substantial progress toward this figure, and we anticipate that the net income of many of them will reach their maximum debt-service level ahead of loan-contract schedule.

On the basis of the stability indicated by these figures your cooperatives acting individually in your local communities and collectively through your national association are in position to make a substantial contribution to the national food program which is under the leadership of the Secretary of Agriculture and to render valuable service to the Nation's immediate task of winning the war and a lasting peace. Already your cooperative organizations have demonstrated their ability to serve the war programs of their communities.

In addition to the vital service to farms for food production and for alleviating rural manpower shortages, your systems are serving many other types of war loads and rendering other essential community war services. A recent incomplete survey shows that there were over 1,300 direct war loads, 165 construction war loads on borrowers' systems, and about 3,000 industrial and manufacturing loads. A survey in December 1942 showed that 61 percent of the systems served war loads other than farms, such as Army camps, airports, and ammunition bases. Another type of commendable service that has impressed me very much is the work of your cooperatives in community campaigns, such as for scrap metal and the use of your cooperative headquarters for rationing boards, Red Cross, selective-service boards, and other related war activities.

The war work being done by your cooperatives and your cooperative members and the plans you are developing at this first convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association for complete mobilization of your facilities for war constitute a true symbol of democratic institutions in action. The organizations that you represent are in a very real sense community-owned and community operated for the purpose of public service. I am confident that your cooperatives have demonstrated beyond any question of doubt their financial stability as operating enterprises and their ability to carry through to a successful completion the plans of this convention for full utilization of their power to produce food for victory.

Statement of Minnesota Dairy Industry Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Minnesota Dairy Industry Committee, at its annual meeting at St. Paul, Minn., on February 12, adopted a statement which sets forth in a fair and rational manner the case for agriculture. The statement calls attention to some of the inequities and hardships with which agriculture must contend and it is being inserted in the RECORD in the hope that all Members of both Houses will take the time to read it, to be followed by remedial action.

The statement follows:

"Food will win the war and write the peace," so declared Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, in urging farmers of the United States to expand agricultural production enormously.

If this statement be true, and we believe that it is, anyone familiar with the recent trend of events must have great concern lest this country fail to achieve its ends. The unpleasant fact is that if food will win the war, we are in great danger of losing that war.

If the war is lost through the lack of that vital necessity which is food, the fault will rest squarely upon the shoulders of Government officials charged with the administration of the food and manpower program.

No Government decree, no Presidential directives, no law passed by Congress can cause

grain to grow or cows to give milk. Men must work with their hands to produce and process the food needed by this Nation and our allies. Workers on farms must be paid for their work. The pay must come from the food and fiber they produce. The recent Presidential order to increase by 12 hours per week the pay of employees in war and industrial plants, an order that in many cases will add 30 percent to pay-roll costs, will further drain workers from farms into industry. The recent order of Director Byrnes freezing farm prices at less than the necessary levels means that farmers will have less, rather than more, income from which wages can be paid.

As proof of this assertion, there is need only to point out that the national income in 1942 is estimated at approximately $117,000,000,000. Less than 10 percent of this income accrued to agriculture, despite the fact that farmers represent some 23 percent of the population of this country.

The farm manpower situation has been aggravated rather than improved by recent governmental action. The situation will become even more hopeless if the Government further extends its excursions into the farm manpower field by subsidizing the farm wage through paying the difference between what farm labor demands and farmers can pay. Farm labor must work under the direction of the farm operator, not under codes developed by swivel-chair production strategists at the National Capital. The food-production situation is too serious to trust to the mercies of dreamers. Dreams will not produce food.

Until this Nation departs from the use of money as a medium of exchange farmers also must have money to meet the demands of farm labor and the demands of the tax gatherer and the sellers of farm supplies. This income must come from the sale of farm products. Farm prices must be adjusted to permit farmers to use money for the things that only money can buy.

There is nourishment neither for the body nor the mind in the orders and counter orders, the directives and misdirectives, that flow from Washington in an appalling stream. No decree, although signed by the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and adorned with the great seal of the Republic, will prepare a seed bed, sow the crop, nor furnish the trained, competent workers needed to do the job. Farmers must be free to produce if this Nation and our allies are to be fed. Farm price ceiling must be fixed in accord with facts rather than the dreams of dreamers or the wishes of wistful politicians.

Subsidies cannot help, they can only complicate and aggravate, a situation that is alarming, and from indications of the past few weeks, is becoming increasingly acute.

We must look to the Congress to take immediate action in the hope that a balanced production of war needs may be had—arms, ammunition, ships, planes, clothing, and the fundamental human need, food.

MINNESOTA DAIRY INDUSTRY COMMITTEE,
D. T. CARLSON, *President*.

Civil Aviation

REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, from the time of the first legislative activity affecting civil aeronautics, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has had jurisdiction of civil aviation matters.

Now it is proposed to strip this experienced committee of its jurisdiction and to create a new standing committee on civil aviation.

Any assertion that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has lacked vision or has neglected civil aviation could be made honestly only by one wholly ignorant of what has happened in civil aviation in this country. The record of the committee for both foresight and timeliness of action is unmatched.

This committee began in 1923 to study the problems of civil aviation with a view to immediate legislation. That study led to the Air Commerce Act of 1926. It must be remembered that in 1923 and even in 1926 there were hardly any civil aircraft, and there were no air lines as we know them today. Civil flying was largely barnstorming, and there was little of that. Yet the committee proposed a bill in January of 1924 that would have covered nearly every phase of civil aviation development, even including provisions on such advanced matters as jurisdiction of crimes committed on an aircraft and civil liability of common carriers by air for shipment of property. The act finally adopted in 1926 was somewhat narrower, but it did contain full provision for the development and safety regulation of civil aviation, Federal construction of airways, and other matters. That act, far ahead of the times, laid down a pattern which is still being followed without the need for any basic change. Under it our civil aviation early became, and has always continued, the safest in the world.

As early as 1935 the committee began work on full economic regulation for the industry. In that year the gentleman from California, Chairman LEA, introduced a bill to carry out the recommendations of the Federal Aviation Commission and to set up a separate aviation agency. Again the committee was ahead of the times. It was ahead of the Congress. It was ahead of the President, and it was ahead of the industry, as those with some knowledge of the history of those days know full well. But it kept on, and in 1937 and 1938, after patiently working out the differences of opinion among the several executive departments, it succeeded in getting complete agreement on a bill for both safety and economic development and regulation under a new Civil Aeronautics Authority. That bill became the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

Under, and because of, that act our civil aviation has grown and prospered. Let no alarmist mislead you. There have been innuendoes recently in the Halls of Congress that our civil aviation leadership in the world has been lost. Such innuendoes are vicious propaganda and render a disservice to our country. Not only are they false—worse, they cast unmerited discredit upon the Civil Aeronautics Board and the aviation industry. The fact is that our civil aviation in quality and quantity of service leads the world by a wide margin. And it does so because the Civil Aeronautics Act made it possible for the industry to be economically as well as technically strong. No informed person denies that fact. The industry unanimously recognizes and acknowledges it.

But our committee did not stop in 1938. In 1939 we recommended to you the Civilian Pilot Training Act which Congress fortunately adopted. We recommended broadening that act in 1942 to include mechanics and other aeronautical technicians and again Congress agreed with us. The result was the biggest civilian pilot training program in the history of the world beginning in 1939.

Again in 1940 this committee opposed the reorganization of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the abolition of the Air Safety Board. And again the House, at least, agreed with us.

Also in 1940 this committee kept civil aviation out of the Transportation Act of 1940, assuring its independence under its own administrative authority, despite a strong effort in certain quarters to break down that independence. And in the forwarder's legislation in 1941 and 1942 we took further steps to assure that transportation by air would develop under an air authority.

Throughout this entire period the committee has kept closely in touch with the Civil Aeronautics Board and with the aviation industry, and both have recently testified before us that there has never been a legislative need which we have not met promptly and satisfactorily.

Furthermore, on such matters as airport zoning and the economic regulation of contract carriers by air and complete Federal regulation throughout the air space we have long been active. These matters were discussed and considered by the committee in 1938; some of them, indeed, as long ago as 1923. But we have not felt until now that the time for further legislation had come—and neither had the Civil Aeronautics Board nor the industry recommended such steps until the end of the year. When deliberate proposals, worked out for us by the Civil Aeronautics Board staff of experts, were presented to us we acted, and we acted promptly, as reflected in H. R. 1012, recently reported by the committee.

This is not a record of neglect. It is a record of close attention, and foresighted and successful leadership. With 20 years' experience—experience which is, indeed, unique in the Halls of either House and probably in the halls of any legislative body in the world—we have acted wisely and well. We know we have acted wisely and well because the record of actual accomplishment in civil aviation has confirmed our action in every case. We have, it is true, proceeded without fanfare. We have avoided sensationalism. We have worked closely with the governmental and private interests most affected. We have worked quietly and diligently. And we have produced results.

So much for our past record. It stands for all to see on its own merits as the

most constructive of all legislative programs for civil aviation among the nations of the world.

Now what of the future? Are we too busy to deal with the problems of civil aviation? Are we prejudiced, consciously or unconsciously, in favor of older modes of transport? There is nothing in the record to so indicate.

It is true that our committee does not propose to keep the aviation industry constantly on the legislative griddle. There is nothing that could be so harmful to the industry. It has, indeed, pleaded with us in the past to avoid doing that very thing. Understanding the industry's needs and history, and understanding as well the temptation to meddle too much with aviation because of its dramatic qualities, we have responded to those pleas. We have sought to avoid keeping the industry's representatives constantly before our committee and constantly preoccupied with legislative proposals. That policy we shall continue to pursue. Unless such a policy is pursued civil aviation may be mortally wounded.

But we are not too busy to give attention to any problem which calls for attention. We created in the last Congress a standing subcommittee on aviation matters and we have enlarged that subcommittee this year. Our record of prompt action on aviation matters is the best demonstration of our willingness and our ability to deal with these questions whenever they arise.

Now what of the suggestion that we may be prejudiced in favor of other modes of transport within our jurisdiction? Again, the record disproves the charge. One need look no further than the Transportation Act of 1940 to find proof of our concern for civil aviation's independence. Despite strong recommendations to cover regulation of air transport into that act, we did not hesitate for a moment to reject those recommendations, firmly and decisively, and without particularly bothering the industry with the matter.

The fact is that we wrote into the Civil Aeronautics Act a policy and a specific provision against control over air carriers by other types of carriers which is just as strong as, if not stronger than, that written into the Motor Carrier Act. See second proviso section 408 (b) of Civil Aeronautics Act. And the Civil Aeronautics Board has properly construed that provision very strictly.

Moreover, our committee even excluded air transportation from the scope of the investigations by the Board of Investigation and Research, so convinced were we that the air-carrier system should be appraised in the light of its own peculiar problems.

And, in 1938, we provided that civil aviation would be developed under a separate agency instead of being thrown into the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Prejudice against civil aviation? The charge is foolish. No instance in our record betrays such prejudice. Every act of our committee shows, on the contrary, keenest concern that civil aviation be developed as fully and as rapidly as possible.

Now what will happen if a separate committee on aviation is established?

In the first place you will be throwing away the benefits of over 20 years of intimate experience. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has the perspective which experience, and experience alone, can give and which the aviation industry needs if its problems are to be handled with sympathy and understanding. That committee knows what has been happening not only yesterday or last year, but ever since aviation started. It knows what the fundamental needs and problems are; it knows enough not to be carried away by some passing event of the moment.

In the second place, if a separate committee on this one subject is created, you will be inviting a rash of legislative activity which can do great harm to the industry. Before the industry's problems were fully consolidated into one place in 1938, civil aviation was gravely harmed by constant new legislation and legislative proposals. Since then it has received the stability that has permitted sound growth. But if a new committee be established with nothing else to do, there is the greatest danger that this industry will be in a perpetual investigation, with perpetual legislative activity, keeping it perpetually on our doorsteps.

In the third place, if a new committee is established, you will lose the great benefits of the coordination of transportation policy which we gain through one transportation committee of the House. This industry is rapidly approaching the point where it will encounter many of the same types of problems which other modes of transport have encountered. In such matters as regulation of rates, issuance of securities, relations between contract and common carriers, mergers, and consolidations, it is essential that this industry be treated on a fair basis, as compared with the treatment to other carriers, that tested and tried fundamentals of policy be applied to it, that we avoid some detour into the speculative areas of unprecedented controls. Problems such as these are the great problems of the future so far as air transportation is concerned. If you do not maintain some consistency with the treatment found sound in other modes of transport, you may ruin the aviation industry in its dealings with its competitors.

Moreover if you set up a separate committee it is inevitable that you will promote a clash of interests as between the several modes of transportation. The aviation industry, relatively small as it still is, is hardly in a position where it should be exposed to such a clash. You will be necessarily driving the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the position where it will have to be an advocate for surface transportation, whereas today its responsibility is to see to it that aviation is treated fairly and that all forms of transportation are coordinated. You will be making the floor of Congress a forum for constant conflict between aviation, on the one hand, and the interests of rail, motor, and water carriers on the other, instead of having, as you do today, a committee which is the partisan of no special interest. You will subject the aviation industry to attacks from powerful surface interests which today the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can and does control and prevent, as our experience with the Transportation Act of 1940 demonstrates.

Therefore, with a record of accomplishment which is enviable in its vision and its competence, let the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce remain as it is—the experienced and judicious guardian of the Nation's civil aviation. And with progress in the 5 years to come such as we have seen during the 5 years since the Civil Aeronautics Act was adopted, you may be sure that America's civil aviation will remain—as it is today—the foremost among all the Nations of the world.

The Farm Labor Problem

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, today America has three armies: Its fighting men, its war-plant workers, and its farmers. To win the war depends on all three. You can be sure that the farmer will do his part—working long, tedious hours, from before dawn to late at night. To do his job the farmer expects to work on Sundays, on Christmas, on New Year's Day, on every holiday.

The farmer does not ask for special favors, flag waving, or medals.

But he does need farm help. He does need equipment. He does need a fair share of the American dollar.

And, most of all, the farmer needs an understanding public.

I personally know farms where this year there will be 20 acres of corn as against 60 acres last year; 10 acres of wheat as against 30; no chicks as against 500 or a thousand; no pigs as against 25; and where much corn and soybeans are still in the field.

Many herds are being disposed of. It is getting late to do anything about it. Good farmers have already made their plans for their 1943 production.

The greatest limiting factor in these plans is no help and their inability to get equipment, as well as needed repairs for equipment.

I include as a part of my remarks the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of Friday, February 12, 1943:

GIVE THE FARMERS MORE WORKERS

Louis Bromfield is not only a famous novelist but a practical farmer who is alarmed by the threatened food shortage and disgusted with official Washington's blundering failure to meet and solve the farm labor crisis, and he is not alone.

In a vigorous letter to the New York Times, Bromfield charges that the food situation is far more grave than the public has been allowed to know and that Secretary of Agriculture and Food Administrator Wickard, who has proved himself incompetent, is offering no real farm solution even at this late date, but

only absurdities such as $100,000,000 subsidies and dream armies of 3,000,000 volunteer ignorant and untrained women and children workers.

Farmers of eastern Pennsylvania, southern New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland right now are at their wits' end wondering where they'll get the help to plant and harvest this year's crops, look after the chickens, and milk the cows. Their problem is multiplied all over the country, on large and small farms.

The problem is, in the main, twofold—scarcity of farm labor and lack of farm machinery. These two prime pullbacks, along with fertilizer shortages and countless marketing difficulties, today imperil America's ability to feed not only its huge Army and its civilians but its needy allies.

Because of bungled planning and downright incompetence in Washington, thousands of tons of food rotted in the fields last year. As one instance, farmers were told to grow more soybeans. But, Mr. Bromfield says, Secretary Wickard overlooked the limitations of existing soybean-processing plants. Many acres of soybeans, as well as potatoes and corn, are still unharvested.

In the last 2 years hundreds upon hundreds of farms have been liquidated because they couldn't be operated. Dairy herds in vast number have been broken up. Food is counted upon to win the war. But, viewing the prospect of decreased production, we may well ask, "What food?"

All this time experienced farm help is being drained off into munition plants, and all this time young, able farm workers are being drafted into the armed forces. And all this time the brass hats of the Army and Navy go on demanding bigger and bigger fighting services, in spite of the fact, disclosed by Senators investigating the manpower situation, that it is not planned to send more than 5,000,000 men overseas.

Farming today is a specialized, mechanized job. Inexperienced boys or white-collar workers, transferred to farms, could wreck valuable machines. Such machines are irreplaceable now.

We believe, with Bromfield, that the vast majority of farmers want no part of Secretary Wickard's latest $100,000,000 tax-boosting subsidy. They want to produce food to help win the war. To this end they want experienced farm workers and farm machinery.

A way must be found somehow to put able workers back on the farms, even if draft regulations have to be modified and some men shifted from munitions factories; and to get vitally needed machines on the farms, even if there has to be a revision of priorities for their manufacture.

There is no more momentous problem before the country than this. A grim food shortage looms. Food will win the war—but first we must see to it that farmers have enough workers and machines to produce the food.

Farm Food Production

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the farm-food-production problem of this Nation must be met squarely. If it is not, we will be forced to pay the terrific price of hunger. This is no time for Pollyanna statements on food production. Action must be immediate or it can be truthfully said, "We were too late and produced too little."

The present short-sighted policy on the part of the Government in dealing with several phases of this problem must be corrected. Every worth-while farmer wishes to produce as much in 1943 as he can possibly handle. The amount produced will be determined by the amount of available farm labor, the amount of farm machinery that can be purchased, and the assurance that the farmers will be given a satisfactory price for their commodities.

The farm-labor problem is a most serious one, and Secretary Wickard's plan for recruiting 3,000,000 men, women, and children from the cities as labor supply for the farmers will not solve the problem. The farmers know they must have men and women who are experienced in farm work and willing to work with farmers from daylight to dark, not city people accustomed to an 8-hour day. No one can legitimately blame farm help for going into industry with the present high wage level and shortened hours.

The Department of Agriculture has consistently urged the Office of Civilian Supply to release an additional quota of strategic material necessary for the manufacture of farm machinery in order that the farmers may be in a position to produce more crops with less labor. The Office of Civilian Supply in the War Production Board continues to bungle this machinery increase. Not only have the farmers suffered from a shortage of labor and a lack of farm machinery but now they are being insulted by the promise of subsidies in lieu of fair prices. There is no question about it; the farmers are bitterly opposed to price subsidies. It was regrettable to hear Mr. James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization, state that farm prices must be maintained at their present levels even though subsidy and incentive payments must be used. At a time when our national income is the highest in history, certainly farm prices should be allowed to reach parity or cost of production. Farmers want no more regulations, no more bureaucratic interference, and no more complicated forms to fill out. Let us give them an intelligent understanding of their problems in order that they may win their battle of food production for this war-torn world.

Voluntary Farm War Corps

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I placed in the hopper today a bill to create a Voluntary Farm War Corps. I have been working on some sort of measure of the kind for over a year but only recently have I felt that legislation could be passed. The bill I introduced a few minutes ago provides that the Secretary of Agriculture be authorized and directed to establish this Voluntary Farm War Corps. It is obvious that women will undoubtedly be used in service on the farms, if we are to produce enough food to feed the country and to feed our soldiers. If they are to be so employed, they must receive some training. We are all horrified today to have heard of the suggested food shortage. Nothing is more necessary, if we are to win the war, than to keep up the strength of the soldiers and the strength of the people in the United States. The health of the Nation must be preserved. All will agree to that. The bill may have to be changed and amended, but I commend it to the Members of the House and suggest that a measure of this sort should be passed in order that we may train women properly for the service, and also to allow young persons to be seasonably employed under very careful supervision.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to establish a voluntary war farm corps for voluntary service on the farms of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to establish and organize a voluntary war farm corps to serve with the Department of Agriculture of the United States for the purpose of aiding in the successful prosecution of the war by relieving the manpower shortage in skilled farm labor.

(b) The following persons shall be eligible for voluntary enrollment in the corps:

(1) Boys in good physical health who have attained the 16th anniversary of the day of their birth and who have not attained the 18th anniversary of the day of their birth.

(2) Women in good physical health who are not less than 16 years of age.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe the form of oath which shall be required of all enrollees of the corps at the time of enrollment. He shall provide for seasonal and yearly enrollment of boys and women in the corps. He shall secure, whenever possible, the cooperation and assistance of all voluntary and Government farm agencies and associations in furthering the work of the corps.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall appoint a person who is familiar with farm problems as director of the voluntary war farm corps and shall also appoint for duty with the corps such additional personnel as he may deem necessary for the proper administration and supervision of the corps and for the training of the enrollees.

(b) The Secretary shall establish camps with suitable living quarters for enrollees of the corps and shall furnish subsistence to all enrollees which shall conform, so far as practicable, to the subsistence of the Army.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall establish and maintain at the voluntary war farm corps camps schools for the purpose of training enrollees as efficient farm workers and may employ such civilian instructors as he may deem necessary to provide such training.

(b) Upon completion of the training provided for in subsection (a) enrollees in each camp shall be available for employment as farm workers by farmers whose land is sufficiently near the camp to permit the enrollees to live in the camp. Compensation for such employment shall be paid to the enrollee by his employer.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture shall furnish enrollees of the corps with uniforms, headpieces, shoes, and such other accessories

as he may deem necessary. The responsibility and accountability of the enrollees for individual clothing and accessories, and for organization equipment and supplies, shall conform, so far as is practicable, to the laws and regulations pertaining to the Army in like cases.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall provide medical and dental service, hospitalization, medicines, and medical and hospital supplies for each enrollee of the corps for injuries, sickness, and disease during the time such enrollee is actually serving his enrollment.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for leave, for travel, and for the payment of travel allowances.

SEC. 7. The enrollees of the corps shall be subject to such disciplinary regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, including provision for the punishment of major infractions by summary discharge from the corps.

SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

A Tribute to a Brave Ally by a Motion Picture Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently I was chief speaker at a city-wide mass meeting at the Shrine Auditorium in Los Angeles, sponsored by representatives of the motion-picture industry at Hollywood, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of the Soviet Union. This was on the same day that former Ambassador Joe Davies, Vice President Henry Wallace, Senator Claude Pepper, and others addressed similar mass meetings throughout the country.

The meeting at Los Angeles was beautifully arranged and superbly staged. Everything went through like clockwork. A vast throng of 6,000 people paid admission to get into the great hall. Leading motion-picture figures and representatives of all classes of society, including Army officers, sculptors, musicians, and intellectuals of every degree were present and participated.

One of the outstanding short talks was that made by the charming Miss Dorothy Comingore, whom many will recall as the feminine lead in a production which I regard as one of the outstanding motion pictures of all time, namely, Citizen Kane, which starred Orson Welles, a Mercury production. Miss Comingore is unusual in many ways, being very versatile. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include hereinbelow the address delivered by Miss Dorothy Comingore on that occasion:

Miss COMINGORE. When I was asked to speak on moving pictures, I hesitated. I wondered whether this was the time to speak about an industry that for so long has been accepted as an escapist. Then I read about the Moscow conference and I read some of the speeches made there. And I read about a Shakespeare festival that had been held recently in Russia. While the tanks and the planes and the people of Russia are locked in horrible warfare, these conferences were held. They have struck at fascism with every weapon, including the theater, moving pictures, fiction, music. All these have been forged into weapons of democracy, and their artists are fighters for democracy. We, in Hollywood, are faced with the same problem. We have done a great deal and we must do more. The soldier is never asked, How much will you give? In her address to the Moscow conference, Zoya Fedorova, the star of The Girl From Leningrad, said, "Let all our work, all our aspirations, all our thoughts, all the force of our art, be directed toward one great purpose—the freeing of mankind from the bloody nightmare into which Hitler's Germany has plunged it."

Let me, on behalf of my fellow workers, reply to our friends in the Soviet Union. We are with you in this struggle against Hitlerism. We are with you because we are faced with a common enemy. More than that, we are united in a bond of understanding and lasting loyalty. We know that yours is a great country and that your people lead the armies of civilization against brutality. We pledge ourselves that when this war is done and when our people have achieved final victory, that we, the peoples of the United Nations, will remain united with you so that mankind will never again be in danger. In that genuine spirit we, the workers of Hollywood, greet the artists of the Soviet Union, in gratitude, in respect, and with all our love.

The theater is an older art than the film, but both these allied arts draw their strength from our common heritage of culture and freedom.

Training of Aeronautical Technicians and Mechanics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, just as the aviation industry itself is comparatively new, so the techniques and problems which have developed are new.

Among one of the most important problems of aviation is the careful and proper training of pilots, technicians, and mechanics. Not alone has it been necessary to develop new methods of instruction, but also, the very nature of that instruction covers many different fields of endeavor. There must at all times be a constant flow of new experts into the industry. This necessitates educational programs among the public at large, in order that the youth of the land shall develop a deep interest in aeronautics, and the further training of these young men and women in the many different phases of aeronautical employment. Thus will be developed a reservoir of air-minded and air-interested youth to fill the various vacancies which continuously occur and to expand our civilian air transport system to meet the growing needs of the Nation.

With the coming of peace, thousands upon thousands of young men trained in all the various phases of military aviation will be restored to civilian life. These men will in large measure want to continue their association with aviation by seeking employment with the various air transport companies. Military aviation is quite another matter from civilian aviation. Short periods of special training should be provided to effect their transfer most quickly and to the greatest advantage, not alone for themselves but also for the aid their availability will bring to the industry as a whole.

H. R. 1012 makes provisions for extending the training program now under the Civilian Pilot Training Act, which will expire on July 1, 1944, and gives to the Civil Aeronautics Board the authority to expand this program in accordance with our ever-growing need, by both the development of its own training schools, or the utilization, under contract, of the training facilities of privately owned and operated schools throughout the Nation. This is an excellent provision of law, for properly administered it will insure that constant flow of new blood into the industry to meet its requirements.

One of the pressing needs of our country in the period immediately following this war will be during the period of transition to a peacetime economy, to find employment for the millions of our young men who will be discharged from the Army. Every conceivable means should be developed to aid them in finding employment in those industries where their individual skills can be best utilized. The importance of this cannot be overemphasized. While every industry will have to absorb its requirements of manpower from these youths, because of the highly technical nature of aviation, requiring special skills, we should immediately take whatever steps are necessary to encourage those best qualified to turn to aviation for their livelihood. Thus, the double purpose of attracting young men and women to the industry and aiding in providing a cushion against economic depression due to lack of employment is provided by this bill.

In Time of War Prepare for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, while we are in war many thoughtful people are making plans for a permanent peace and enduring international relations. Many recognize the fact that any plan for enduring peace and harmonious international relations must rest on the firm foundation of a sound and stable monetary system.

The history of money and the plans to provide the money function on a stable basis is ably presented by Mr. Frank Lilly, of Spokane, Wash., which

I submit herewith for the consideration of the Members of the House:

IN TIME OF WAR PREPARE FOR PEACE WITH A WORLD GOLD - SILVER - BASED MONETARY SYSTEM

(By Frank Lilly, Spokane, Wash.)

The obvious truth of the old adage, "In time of peace prepare for war," was largely overlooked by the United States and most of the United Nations. As a result of this neglect a war, which probably could have been prevented by preparedness or in any event won quickly, has spread throughout the world.

We must not now also make the mistake of failing in time of war to prepare for peace. The First World War was won by the Allies, but, having failed to plan and prepare for an enduring peace, the peace we fought so hard for was lost within a generation.

THE CAUSE OF WAR

The real underlying cause of all of the major modern wars has been economic. The liberty which the American colonists fought for in the Revolutionary War was fundamentally the economic liberty to establish home industries and to trade with other colonies and countries. Selfish interests in England sought to prevent these activities by law and finally by force of arms. The moral aspects involved in slavery were incidental to the fact that slavery gave the South economic advantages over the North.

In other words, wars are primarily the result of economic pressure and the greed for power by selfish nations and groups of individuals who covet commercial advantage and territorial domination. Liberty, Freedom, Democracy, Lebensraum, Pro Patria, and Asia for Asiastics are war's shibboleths and clanging cymbals.

THE LOVE OF MONEY

In the Bible (Timothy 6: 20) we find these words, "For the love of money is the root of all evil," and, "all," of course, includes war which is an outstanding evil, being antigod, antichrist, and antisocial.

It is not money in itself that is the root of all evil, but the love of it, which is quite a different matter. Money is not, therefore, the cause of war but rather the selfish love of it that engenders the greed which leads to sharp practices in the manipulation of monetary exchange and money in behalf of favored groups or nations.

PRICES FIXED IN LONDON

Until recent years the prices of all of the leading metals and most of the commodities of the world were fixed daily in London by small but financially powerful groups who were able to control the rate of exchange on the pound sterling (originally silver) which was then tied to the gold standard. Thus they bought and sold largely on their own terms, a practice which yielded them enormous profits at the expense and to the disadvantage of producers and manufacturers of the United States and other leading nations.

Such artificial control of money makes both international and national business uncertain and unsafe and ultimately results in stagnation and depressions. These in turn breed internal and external economic friction and stress, and finally lead to war.

THE BASIS FOR LASTING PEACE

We want to believe that moral and spiritual ideals are the determinative factors in world and national affairs, but practical experience has proven that even the most enlightened and cultured nations have not been able to measurably eradicate poverty and its related evils, crime, sickness, suffering, etc. There is unfortunately too much realistic truth in the old sayings, "Money makes the world go 'round," and "Money talks."

The best and surest basis—possibly the only one—for a lasting peace in the world probably rests in a monetary system which would eliminate artificial control of money and monetary exchange by selfish groups and provide an equitable basis for commerce among all the nations of the world.

How can this be accomplished?

The answer is really quite simple. Eliminate the greed which is engendered by the possibilities of illicit profiteering inherently involved in a controlled or managed monetary currency.

THE MEANING OF MONEY

It should be noted that the real meaning of the word "money" is minted coinage. Minting originated primarily as a means of marking or stamping the purity or "fineness" of the gold and silver metal.

The Hebrew word translated into money in the Bible is "keseph," meaning silver, which in Genesis, 23: 16, is referred to as "current money with the merchant." Gold is the translation of two words, "betsar," meaning wealth, and "zahab," shining; and neither word is ever used in the sense of money. Incidentally, the first mention in the Bible of the relative value of silver and gold indicates a ratio of approximately 7 to 1.

CURRENCY IN MANY FORMS

When centuries later paper representing specific quantities of gold and silver in the vaults of Lombard bankers became "current money with the merchant", the stage was set, so to speak, for the paper currency that, because it could be increased or decreased by political and banking groups, has invariably brought panic, poverty, and wars to every country which, confusing paper currency with real money, has built its monetary house on a foundation of shifting sand (paper) without a backing of gold and/or silver. Such so-called money is nothing more than a promise to pay, and this too often in history has proven no more than a promise.

The average man is apt to reason that, if paper or any of the many other things which have been used as currency—tobacco, fish, salt, hides, iron, sea shells, playing cards, cattle, shrunken human heads, etc.—will buy what he wants, it is at any rate just as good as money, so what? Sawdust looks like bran and can by chemical treatment be made to taste like bran, but it cannot give the same results as bran in the milk pail or at the creamery.

GOLD AND SILVER FAVORED

There is a reason why gold and silver have been the favored forms of money throughout the civilized world from time immemorial. They fulfill better than anything else the qualities required in a medium of exchange and as a storage of value. Man can, as the early Romans did, use cattle as a medium of exchange, but it was impossible, or in any case inconvenient, to send a bull from Rome to Naples in exchange for a purple robe, and besides the bull might die of old age on the way.

The essential qualities of an ideal general medium of exchange are:

1. Permanency: Gold and silver are unaffected by any natural elements.

2. Transferable: Unlike most other forms of wealth, such as land, buildings, forests, cattle, etc., gold and silver can be easily transferred over long distances.

3. Limited in quantity: Gold and silver are not so abundant as iron, copper, aluminum, etc., and at the same time they are not so scarce as platinum, indium, and germanium.

4. Storage of value: Gold and silver have relatively stable inherent values in terms of the money and effort which are involved in their production.

Gold and silver seem to have been destined by Nature to perform as a medium of exchange in the money of commerce the functions carried on by the red and white corpuscles in the blood of the body. Note that although the blood appears red some of its chief functions are served by the numerous but less conspicuous white corpuscles. Just as blood would not be blood except in color and would not sustain life without the white corpuscles, so a money which does not include the important white metal, silver, in addition to gold, does not make for healthy commerce.

NATURAL GOLD AND SILVER BASE HAS NEVER FAILED

It is significant that no monetary system whose values were based upon both gold and silver in their natural ratio of production has ever failed. Without exception, failures and panics have been the result when selfish groups have succeeded in establishing an artificial ratio between the two metals or in eliminating one or the other of the metals.

Man could, by the way, get along after a fashion with one eye, one nostril, one hemisphere of the brain, one hand, and one leg, but Nature gave him two for adequate functioning. Commerce and industry can function to some extent with only one money metal, but Nature probably knew what she was doing when she provided two such metals—gold and silver.

SILVER-GOLD PRODUCTION RATIO NOT 16 TO 1

There is a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding over the ratio of gold and silver in nature. It is the general belief that the ratio of silver to gold production is 16 to 1 or even higher. As a matter of fact, the ratio from 1493 to 1942 has averaged only about 12½ to 1. We do not, of course, know exactly what the ratio was prior to 1493 but the relative value of the two metals in the leading countries of the Old World ranged from 2 to 1 to 13 to 1 which gives a mean average of 7½ to 1, or approximately the same ratio as indicated in early Biblical history.

The highest silver production in history, totaling approximately 274,000,000 ounces, was at a ratio of only about 6½ to 1 on the gold output of that year (1940). Incidentally, the value of the gold at $35 an ounce was nearly $1,000,000,000 more than that of the silver on the basis of 35 cents an ounce.

From 1493 to 1520 world production of silver and gold averaged 8 to 1. In the decade 1851 to 1860 the silver-gold ratio averaged only about 4½ to 1. The highest production ratio during the last 50 years was in 1897 and in 1901 when the ratio was 14 to 1; and the lowest was in 1934 and 1940 when the ratio was approximately 6½ to 1.

GOLD PRODUCTION RATIO ONCE 60 TO 1

In the United States gold production to silver has been as high as 60 to 1 when, in 1850, the gold output was 2,414,121 ounces to 39,513 ounces of silver. This was the result of the discovery of gold in California, and it is of interest to note that some of the leading financial authorities of Europe and the United States contended that because of the great increase in production gold would lose its value and must, therefore, be demonetized. Gold was as a result demonetized in Austria, Germany, and Holland which during the fifties closed their mints to gold and adopted the single silver standard.

It goes without saying that demonetization of either gold or silver decreases the purchasing power of people, causes the natural law of supply and demand to become largely inoperative, creates stagnation in world markets, idleness of factories, unemployment, lower wages and still lower commodity prices—all of which brings monetary panics and the economic stress and strain that sets the stage for war.

UNITED STATES MONETARY PANICS

Every one of this country's numerous monetary panics (1833, 1837, 1857, 1862, 1869, 1873,. 1884, 1890, 1893, 1907, 1920, 1932, and 1937) were the result of one or more of the following conditions:

1. Inflation of bank paper currencies which were not adequately backed by gold and/or silver metal reserves.

2. Worthless bank paper currencies pyramided upon real estate or other nonprecious metal assets and credits.

3. Gold or silver price discrimination and manipulation.

4. Demonetization of silver.

GOLD PRICES NOT STATIC

Most people will find it hard to believe that the present price of $35 for gold compares with the London equivalent of $4.38 an ounce in 1250, $9.73 in 1470, $14.60 in 1542, $24.33 in 1690, and $20.67 in 1825 and up to 1933. In the meantime gold had sold in New York at as high as $165 an ounce in United States paper currency on September 24, 1869, largely as a result of the fact that gold, along with silver, had passed out of circulation in 1862. Gold has averaged $22.14 an ounce since 1492, and silver 89.6 cents, with a high of $2.34.

GERMANY MADE SECOND MISTAKE

After joining with Austria and Holland in the mistake of demonetizing gold, Germany in 1872 remonetized gold, but at the same time made its second mistake in demonetizing silver. This was done on the fallacious assumption that the influx of silver which had been coming from the Comstock lode in the United States would in time make silver practically valueless as a monetary metal. One after another of the European countries followed Germany's mistake in demonetizing silver, and 1873 the United States established the gold standard by demonetizing silver.

BIMETALISM PREVAILED FOR CENTURIES

Previous to the demonetization of gold the world had been for centuries on a bimetallic basis in which the value of silver and gold was at a ratio of from 2 to 1 in early Egypt, 4 to 1 at about the time of the discovery of the New World, and around 12 1 at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Until 1818, when England set about to weaken Napoleon and France, whose precious metal holdings were predominantly silver, there had never been a law discriminating against silver in favor of gold. The 16-to-1 ratio of the two metals, which was the resul of England's action, has never been attained by the world's silver and gold output, public opinion to the contrary notwithstanding.

Germany, in demonetizing silver in 1872, sowed the seeds from which it finally reaped, in 1914, the First World War. Germany simply did not have enough gold on which to maintain its place in the sun of the world's industry and commerce, and the resulting economic stress in Germany and among its Balkan neighbors set the stage for Sarajevo and the war.

In that war, as in all major wars of modern times, silver proved to be a war metal, for in war international demand for hard money increases and the metal reaches or passes 16-to-1 parity without any legislative help. At the beginning of the war in 1914 silver was selling around 50 cents an ounce; in 1917 it reached $1.08½ an ounce; in 1918 it sold as high as $1.38 in London and $1.37½ in New York; and maintained an average of around $1 an ounce during 1920.

SILVER ARTIFICIALLY DEVALUED

Subsequent events are recorded in the following statement made in April 1939 by the late Walter Trent, monetary research expert, of Washington, D. C.:

"When the Great War was over the Federal Reserve System coordinated a remarkable and sensational plan to devalue silver with England's various efforts for the same purpose. The history connected with the second major period of silver devaluation is of vital importance because the United States and the rest of the world never have recovered from the disastrous effects of the totally unwarranted sale of American silver dollars in November of 1919 and December of 1920, as engineered by the United States Treasury officials in concert with the Federal Reserve and the Oriental subsidiaries of three Wall Street banks. The operation was explained as one to 'regulate exchange' or to 'protect the melting of United States subsidiary coins.' There was no regulation of exchange; there was nothing but destruction of exchange and monetary values resulting from the operation.

"The regulation of exchange is of necessity a two-directional operation, but in this case the direction was one way only and vertically downward. When the drive started, subsidiary silver was below its legal monetary value and never had been above same; at the end of the drive, silver was only one-half of its monetary value. The inevitable result was world-wide deflation, and the foundation was laid for all the wars which have since resulted.

VALUE OF GOLD ARTIFICIALLY INCREASED

"The second period of silver devaluation started in 1919 when silver was at its highest point since demonetization and ended in 1932 when its price reached the lowest point in all history at 23.2 cents per ounce. At this point more than 80 percent of the value of half of the metallic money in the world had been destroyed by the few who controlled the other half and without making any monetary substitution or replacement to those who had suffered the losses. The equivalent of these losses automatically became added to the value of gold. The United States was the outstanding loser and England was the principal expectant beneficiary, but it has culminated in the disintegration of England's famous gold standard.

"Because of the intense attack made upon silver by driving down its price from 132.83, a monetary high point in 1920, to 64.78 cents in December, and together with the fact that Hong Kong made unusually large shipments of gold to the United States, more than required to pay in full for all of this silver sold in the Orient during the latter part of 1919 and 1920, the object of the undertaking appears to have been more to smash the price of silver than to 'regulate exchange' or merely to 'protect the melting of United States subsidiary coins' as set forth in the selling contract. This so-called regulation of exchange was a one-way operation and the most vicious and disastrous monetary manipulation ever conceived and executed. The present chaotic state of world economy and finance is in a large measure an aftermath attributable directly to that misguided operation."

GLOBAL WAR FOLLOWS

The present global war has served to emphasize the truth of the foreging statements and also the fact that the leading nations of the world are interdependent. Thus, that which affects one affects all to a greater or less degree. It was inevitable that an 80 percent reduction in the value of half the metallic money of the world would eventually result in world-wide repercussions and war.

Those who directed the monetary policies of the United States and England should have borne in mind that the more than a billion people living in the Far East cannot in the very nature of things deal in paper money, for no widespread banking facilities exist in those areas. Gold is too valuable a money for those people to either hoard or use in trading. Then, too, the experience of both the Chinese and Indian people with paper currencies has been disastrous to them.

The increase in the price of gold from $20.67 an ounce to $35 without a corresponding increase in the price in its sister precious metal, silver, was equivalent to putting a big wheel on one axle of a small-wheeled wagon. The wagon will run after a fashion but the passengers and load will be subjected to severe jostling even if they are not thrown out.

SILVER CHEAPEST IN ALL HISTORY

Silver, which has been produced at a rate of only about 7½ to 1 during the last decade, was selling at the so-called world market price of around 35 cents (prices fixed by U. S. Treasury, 35 cents; and 35⅜ cents by Office of Price Administration officials) on a basis of around one one-hundredth t 1. In other words, 1 ounce of gold at $35 bought 100 ounces of silver—more silver than at any previous time in all history. (Silver sold as low as 23¼ cents an ounce in 1932, but gold at the then price of $20.67 an ounce would buy only about 88 ounces of silver.) The present United States price of 45 cents an ounce for foreign silver was established September 1, 1942.

A man can walk no faster nor farther than his weaker leg will permit. If the two metals are not proportionately strong in relative value, the monetary system limps and lags and finally collapses. If the value of either gold or silver is weakened, the purchasing capacity is correspondingly reduced; and no legislative legerdemain can alter the fact.

NEITHER GOLD NOR SILVER TO BECOME VALUELESS

The Axis-inspired propaganda to the effect that gold will become valueless if Germany or Japan win this war is nothing short of ridiculous. On the other hand, silver seems likely to become more valuable regardless of who wins or loses for the very simple reason that most of the nations of the world will be practically denuded of monetary gold of which we already have about 70 percent, and they will, therefore, trade with those countries that will give them the best terms on the silver of which they own approximately 70 percent.

As previously pointed out, the price of silver passed parity of 16 to 1 in reaching $1.37½ an ounce during the First World War, when gold was $20.67 an ounce. An equivalent price, on the basis of $35 an ounce for gold, would be $2.33 an ounce for silver, which, by the way, is 24 cents less than the figure of $2.67 an ounce at which silver circulated in the British Empire at the beginning of the present war. A production ratio of 7½ to 1, with gold at $35 an ounce, gives silver a value of $4.80 an ounce, which is 17 cents less than the figure of $4.97 at which silver circulated in Germany and Rumania in August 1939. The average circulating value of silver coinage in the 10 leading nations of the world was at that time $2.53 an ounce.

NOT ENOUGH GOLD

Exact figures on the amount of gold in the world that might be made available for monetary use are not known, because we do not have accurate figures on production except during the last century. Estimates of the amount run from around $35,000,000,000 to as much as $50,000,000,000 on the basis of $35 an ounce. Approximately 90 percent of this amount is owned by only about 10 percent of the world's population.

Now, if the 10 percent of the people who own 90 percent of the gold do not have any more of the metal than they need, it is apparent that the 90 percent of the population (nearly 2,000,000,000 people), who have only about 10 percent of the gold, do not have enough to maintain their fair proportion of the industry and commerce of the world. Moreover, the fact that every former gold-standard country in the world, including the United States, has now been forced off that standard is proof that there is not enough gold.

NOT ENOUGH SILVER

Because throughout the ages there has been a larger proportionate use and consumption of silver to gold in the commercial arts and industry, there is probably no more than 10,000,000,000 ounces of silver in the world that could be made available for monetary use. Now, if $50,000,000,000 of gold is not

enough to maintain the world's economic equilibrium there certainly is not enough silver alone to do so, even if the 10,000,000,000 ounces of silver were valued at $5 an ounce.

Also, if 90 percent of the world's $50,000,000,000 of gold is no more than enough for 10 percent of its population, it follows that 70 percent of the world's silver (about 7,000,000,000 ounces) now valued, on the basis of a so-called world price fixed by the United States Treasury and the Office of Price Administration at less than $3,500,000,000 cannot at this value possibly be enough to sustain the economy of 90 percent of the world's population. It is no wonder, therefore, that India, for example, should manifest some distrust in the intentions of England and the United States, as our past actions in pulling selfish monetary strings speak louder than our present words.

BOTH GOLD AND SILVER NEEDED

If there is not enough of either gold or silver, it is merely good common sense to utilize both. We use both our right and left hands in playing, working, and fighting, and a good left is, in any case, the next best thing to a mighty right. Thus it should be with the two metals—gold the mighty right and silver the good left—that Nature has given the world to use as money in its industry and commerce.

Gold is in some respects best fitted to do the heavy work of international commerce, and silver the lighter work of national trade and industry. There is no reason, however, why both cannot be teamed to pull together in both international and national trade.

If the world's commerce requires a monetary base of $100,000,000,000, which seems conservative in view of mounting war debts, this could be achieved by giving all of the silver of the world the same value as all of the gold that can be made available for monetary use. If a base of only $75,000,000,000 is required, then the 10,000,000,000 ounces of silver could be given a value of $25,000,000,000, or only half of the gold value.

In this connection, it is important to bear in mind that there would be no point in raising the price of either metal to a figure that would supply the required monetary base, because that would only throw the economy of the world's leading nations and peoples more out of balance than it has been. No; this is a job for both metals to do on a 50–50 basis, and the job cannot be done by strengthening one precious metal "hand" to the neglect of or at the disadvantage of the other. Both gold and silver are needed.

CAPITALISM NOT IN DANGER

Propaganda of the Axis Powers suggesting that communism will replace capitalism in the event of Russian victory and that the need of money can largely be eliminated by barter are mere nonsense. Russia reverted to communism because of its extreme lack of gold and silver capital and has been swinging back to capitalism as it has acquired the necessary precious metals through the development of its mines and in its trade with the oriental nations. There is no lack of ample gold and/or silver to sustain capitalism in most of the United Nations, and no country has ever turned to communism except when forced to do so by lack of capital.

Barter is no more than a temporary expedient which has invariably failed because other things being equal countries and individuals prefer to trade with the countries whose firms can settle any trade balances with gold and/or silver. No country resorts to barter except for a lack of capital.

WHAT ABOUT INFLATION

Inflation such as occurred in Germany and Russia after the First World War will inevitably follow the present war in those countries which have insufficient gold and/or silver unless, before peace comes (not after) an international plan for world-wide metallic money system is initiated. Such a plan, by the way, might in its effect upon India and China bring this war to an end sooner than any other factor.

TIME IS SHORT

The time to do this is now, and a good precedent has been established by the fact that Great Britain, Holland, and the United States have already entered into an agreement renouncing extraterritorial rights in China. Incidentally, China's territorial rights will be of little or no advantage to her if, as in the past, the value of her silver money is controlled by small groups in the financial centers of London, Amsterdam, and New York.

A fair and reasonable price for China's silver would probably help that country more in its fight with Japan than anything else that could be done. China has the men to do the job but is handicapped in the value of its money. A fair price for silver might also bring India wholeheartedly into the war.

In the matter of money as in so many other things relating to the war and the peace to follow, the world looks to the United States for leadership. We cannot and must not evade our responsibility and we should begin by putting our own financial house in order.

As an initial step toward that end, we should immediately restore gold to its rightful place along with silver in our own monetary system The leading United Nations will in time follow our example and the United States dollar sign can be made the symbol of honesty and fair dealing throughout the world.

NEED OF MONEY WILL BE ACUTE

The world's need of money will be acute when the war comes to an end. Without enough real money chaos will result. Managed currency cannot meet the needs of an enduring peace because such a currency can and will, sooner or later, be mismanaged because it is essentially nationalistic and selfish.

A return to some form of gold and silver bimetalism as a base for a world monetary system is necessary, and it seems inevitable. This system must provide a common monetary denominator which would be agreed upon by all leading nations so that the money would be recognized as "current money with the merchant" at full value and with no discount or premium in any nation. Such a system can be built and must be built on the two precious metals, gold and silver, if the world is to have the balanced and equitable economy to sustain an enduring peace and the four freedoms.

"Ring out old shapes of foul disease,
Ring out the narrowing lust of gold;
Ring out the thousand wars of old,
Ring in the thousand years of peace."
—*Tennyson.*

Social Security for Hospital Workers

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, in his address to the Congress on the state of the Union, at the opening of the Seventy-eighth Congress, President Roosevelt spoke of the necessity of extending and expanding social-security legislation so that every citizen of this country, from the time of his birth until he passes on, would be free from the specter of want. I do not believe that it is incumbent upon the Congress to leave untouched this great question of social security merely because we are now engaged in a mighty conflict in order to obtain, among other freedoms, freedom from insecurity not only for our own country but for the people of the world. Among the groups of workers who are denied the benefits of the Federal Social Security Act are the men and women employed in most of the hospitals in the United States. They are now fighting for their right to qualify for social-security benefits under the terms of the act. I take this opportunity of presenting a discussion involving the case of a hospital worker who is seeking to qualify for social-security benefit payments. I am including herewith copies of correspondence exchanged between the Bureau of Internal Revenue and Mr. Ward Coley, general business agent of the Building Service Employees International Union, Local No. 6, of Seattle, Wash., and copy of the letter addressed to the senior Senator from the State of Washington, the Honorable HOMER T. BONE, from the Acting Commissioner of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I also include a copy of the decision of the appeals council of the Social Security Board. On the basis of this decision the Bureau of Internal Revenue is now reconsidering its earlier decision holding that the Maynard Hospital, of Seattle, was not liable for the collection of social-security taxes:

SHIRLEY V. BRANDT *v.* THE MAYNARD HOSPITAL

(By Ward Coley)

On November 26, 1941, Shirley V. Brandt, a member of the Building Service Employees International Union, Local 6, of Seattle, Wash., wrote to John J. Corson, Director of the Federal Social Security Board in Washington, D. C., and stated that she was appealing for a hearing on her rights to obtain social-security benefit payments while employed at the Maynard Hospital.

This case has developed into one of national prominence because of the fight being made in Seattle, Wash., to have the workers in hospitals brought under the provisions of the Federal Social Security Act. The hospitals throughout the Nation have constantly fought against payment of social-security benefit taxes for workers in the hospitals.

Following the appeal of Shirley V. Brandt for social-security benefits, in which she was represented by Ward Coley, vice president of Local 6 and international representative of the Building Service Employees International Union, a vigorous and spirited fight has been carried on to this time in an effort to get workers in Seattle hospitals covered by the Social Security Act.

A hearing was finally held before Shirl Blalock, referee for the Social Security Board on the west coast. The facts in this case are worth reading by every Congressman and every person in America who is interested in freeing some of our people from want.

The facts in this case proved that the Maynard Hospital of the city of Seattle, did less than one-half of 1 percent charitable work. And yet upon the claim of being a charitable institution, this hospital is exempted under the Social Security Act. The Shirley Brandt case has met with bitter op-

position from the hospital authorities and also from the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

A decision was handed down by Joseph E. McElvain, Chairman of the Appeals Council of the Social Security Board in Washington, D. C., on July 2?, 1942, denying the charity plea of the hospital and ruling that Shirley Brandt's old-age benefit record be credited with a certain amount of money earned at the Maynard Hospital.

The cooperation of Frank Messenger, of the Federal Social Security Board of Seattle, has been of tremendous help in this matter. He typifies an official of the Government who is not interested in protecting the big people but in giving all workers an honest break and a new deal. It is regrettable that throughout the Nation more men in responsible offices of the Government do not do as Frank Messenger has done.

This case is one of major importance to the people of America who believe in honesty and in the truth. The Maynard Hospital is typical of hospitals throughout America. Only a few of them are charitable institutions. Most charity cases, if caught in time, are sent to the county hospitals. The decision handed down by the Social Security Board proved that the Maynard Hospital did not operate for charity but for profit and as such should come under all of the provisions of the Social Security Act and should pay unemployment insurance and taxes as any other institution which comes under the heading of a corporation operated for profit.

Finding new sources of tax revenue is one of the major problems confronting Congress at the present time. Corporation taxes, inheritance taxes, and other taxes have been altered at various times in the hope that the changing of rates would bring in vastly increased Federal receipts. We now have Victory taxes. At the moment we are having difficulty in finding additional sources of tax income.

In passing I would like to point out that we have overlooked a source of taxation that holds promise of yielding considerable revenue. I refer to the possibility of taxing those institutions which compete directly with business enterprises and yet are exempt from Federal taxation under the guise they constitute charitable, educational, religious, and nonprofit organizations. No doubt some of these groups are legitimately entitled to be tax exempt. Many of them, however, deserve close scrutiny.

Coming back to hospital workers again, I believe the Shirley Brandt case represents the first instance wherein a hospital worker in America has had the powerful backing of trade union leaders and organizations who believe that those men and women who do hospital work are entitled to a fair hearing on their employment and Social Security problems. Those who own the hospitals have always been given consideration.

When the Bureau of Internal Revenue made a decision some time ago that hospitals should be exempt from the taxing features of the Social Security Act, certainly hospital workers were not given very much consideration.

I think you will agree with me that primary attention was given to the arguments advanced by the organized hospitals of America and the organized professional groups so intimately connected with their operation and existence. In the Shirley Brandt case this decision has been challenged and the brief presented in behalf of Shirley Brandt provides abundant proof that the men and women who labor in the hospitals of the country are entitled to social-security benefits.

Within recent weeks the Bureau of Internal Revenue has handed down a decision stating that in accord with previous decisions a particular hospital in the city of Seattle is not liable for taxation. The Social Security Board doesn't agree. The conclusions of the Board are so clear that I do not understand how any honest person or group of persons could find it possible to disagree with the findings of the Social Security Board referee in the Shirley Brandt case.

I hope that everyone who is interested in extending and expanding the benefits of the Social Security Act to include more and more working men and women, will take time to read the decision handed down by the Social Security Board in the case of Shirley Brandt. It is one of the most convincing and conclusive documents prepared by a Government agency that I have had the pleasure of reading.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue, on the basis of this brief, should have decided that the Maynard Hospital comes under the Social Security Act. For too long in America workers like Shirley Brandt have been denied the opportunity of appearing in their own behalf before the boards and bureaus that make these decisions, in order to protect their interests. The great corporations of America are always well represented. But unless the worker has an excessive amount of fortitude, he is seldom heard. I would like to congratulate the Building Service Union, Local 6, of Seattle, Wash., for fighting this case so vigorously. They have made this fight to protect workers in the hospitals of America.

NOVEMBER 4, 1942.

Mr. WARD COLEY,
General Business Agent,
Building Service Employees
International Union, Local No. 6,
Seattle, Wash.

SIR: Reference is made to your letter dated October 17, 1942, relative to the status, for Federal employment-tax purposes, of Miss Shirley V. Brandt, who apparently is a member of your union, with respect to services performed for Maynard Hospital, Inc., Seattle, Wash.

You refer to a decision rendered by the appeals council of the Social Security Board relative to the applicability of the provisions of section 209 (b) (8) of title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, to the services performed by Miss Brandt for Maynard Hospital, Inc. Apparently you have interpreted such decision as being determinative of the status of the hospital and of Miss Brandt for Federal employment-tax purposes, and you request information relative to the collection of such taxes from the hospital.

The records of this office disclose that a power of attorney has not been filed authorizing you to represent Maynard Hospital, Inc., or Miss Brandt before the Bureau in employment-tax matters. For that reason, the question of the employment-tax liability of the hospital with respect to the services of Miss Brandt may not be discussed with you.

It may be stated that the decision of the appeals council of the Social Security Board does not render the hospital liable for Federal employment taxes. The liability of the hospital for such taxes, however, is directly affected by the status of the organization for purposes of the Federal income tax, which question is presently under consideration in the Bureau. When a determination is made, the hospital will be promptly informed.

Respectfully,

GEO. J. SCHORNMORE,
Deputy Commissioner.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 4, 1942.

Hon. HOMER T. BONE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated October 26, 1942, with which you enclosed a letter addressed to you on October 20, 1942, by Mr. Ward Coley, general business agent, Local No. 6, Building Service Employees International Union, Seattle, Wash., together with a copy of a letter addressed to this office by Mr. Coley on October 17, 1942, relative to Federal social-security and employment taxes.

In his letter addressed to this office on October 17, 1942, Mr. Coley refers to a decision rendered on July 25, 1942, by the Appeals Council of the Social Security Board holding that Maynard Hospital, Inc., Seattle, Wash., was not organized and operated exclusively for charitable purposes within the meaning of section 209 (b) (8) of title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, and, therefore, the services performed for that corporation by Miss Shirley V. Brandt (who apparently is a member of Local No. 6, Building Service Employees International Union) constituted "employment" for social-security benefit purposes. (The provisions of such section are identical with the provisions of sections 1426 (b) (8) and 1607 (c) (8) of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, respectively.)

Mr. Coley appears to have interpreted such decision as being determinative of the status of Maynard Hospital, Inc., and of Miss Brandt for Federal employment-tax purposes. Mr. Coley advises that the corporation has not reported and paid employment taxes with respect to the wages of Miss Brandt and other employees and requests an explanation of the failure of this Bureau to collect such taxes. In his letter addressed to you on October 20, 1942, Mr. Coley refers to correspondence previously had with this office concerning the status, for employment tax purposes, of Mr. Lyle Higby with respect to services performed at the Empire Building, Seattle, Wash., and states that the Bureau has failed to make a determination in that case. You request to be advised in the matter.

You will recall that in office letter of January 13, 1942, you were advised that before the bureau can make a definite ruling concerning the status of Mr. Higby, it will be necessary that certain evidence be presented. Inasmuch as the suggested evidence was not received, this office has not taken any further action. If Mr. Higby is desirous of obtaining a definite ruling with respect to services he performed at the Empire Building, this office will give further consideration to the matter upon the submission by Mr. Higby or his duly authorized representative of evidence as outlined in office letter addressed to you on January 13, 1942.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue is charged with the duty of administering the provisions of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (formerly titles VIII and IX of the Social Security Act), while the benefit provisions of the Social Security Act are under the jurisdiction of the Social Security Board. The rulings of either agency are not necessarily followed by the other, and neither agency is bound by the other's determinations. Consequently, the ruling of the liability of that corporation for employment taxes.

On September 2, 1942, the collector of internal revenue, Tacoma, Wash., transmitted to the Bureau a copy of the decision of the Appeals Council of the Social Security Board, referred to above, with a request for a ruling as to the status of the Maynard Hospital, Inc., under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. Since this Bureau had previously held that the Maynard Hospital, Inc., is exempt from Federal income tax under section 101 (6) of the Revenue Act of 1936, the provisions of which are identical with the provisions of sections 1426 (b) (8) of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, respectively, the collector at Tacoma has not requested the corporation to pay employment taxes. This Bureau, however, is reconsidering its prior ruling in the matter. When a determination is made, the collector at Tacoma will be advised as to the status of the corporation for both income- and employment-tax pur-

poses. The collector will in turn inform the corporation of the ruling.

The letters submitted with your communication are returned, copies having been made for the files of this office. A copy of this letter is also enclosed.

If further correspondence relative to this matter is necessary, please refer to A&C:RR:1-WTL.

Very truly yours,

NORMAN D. CANN,
Acting Commissioner.

IN THE CASE OF SHIRLEY V. BRANDT, CLAIMANT, SHIRELY V. BRANDT, WAGE EARNER, SOCIAL-SECURITY ACCOUNT NO. [redacted]

JULY 28, 1942.

Miss SHIRLEY V. BRANDT,
Seattle, Wash.

DEAR MISS BRANDT: There is enclosed herewith a copy of the decision of the appeals council on your claim for a revision of your wage record. This decision holds that you were employed by Maynard Hospital, Inc., from October 23, 1940, to December 1, 1941, in the dietary department, and that you were paid wages in the amounts enumerated in the decision for the various quarters. It is, therefore, the decision of the appeals council that the wages mentioned in the decision be credited to you on the wage records of the Social Security Board.

It is believed that the conclusion reached is clearly explained in the decision. If, however, you have any question with respect to this decision, it is suggested that you contact the nearest field office of the Social Security Board.

If you disagree with the attached decision and desire a review of the same, you may file a civil action in the district court of the United States in the judicial district in which you reside within 60 days from this date. For your information as to the action in the district court, your attention is directed to section 205 (g) of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1939.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST R. BURTON,
Acting Chairman, Appeals Council.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD,
OFFICE OF APPEALS COUNCIL.

DECISION OF APPEALS COUNCIL—CASE NO. 12-135

IN THE CASE OF SHIRLEY V. BRANDT, CLAIMANT; SHIRLEY V. BRANDT, WAGE EARNER, SOCIAL-SECURITY ACCOUNT NO. [redacted]

Claim for wage-record revision

On August 24, 1941, Shirley V. Brandt, hereinafter referred to as the wage earner, requested information from the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance of the Social Security Board as to the amount of wages reported for her social-security wage account by Maynard Hospital, Inc., of Seattle, Wash. The hospital had not reported wages for this wage earner and the Bureau, after investigating, determined that the services performed by the wage earner were excepted from employment by section 209 (b) (8) of the Social Security Act, as amended. The wage earner was notified of this determination and requested a reconsideration by the Bureau. The reconsidered determination of the Bureau affirmed its initial determination. The wage earner requested a hearing before a referee of the Social Security Board which was held on March 19, 1942, at Seattle, Wash. The wage earner and her representatives were present at and participated in the hearing. This case is before the Appeals Council on the certification of the referee due to the unusual question involved. Due notice of the certification has been given the wage earner.

The issue before the Appeals Council is whether the services performed by the wage earner for Maynard Hospital, Inc., are excepted from "employment" by section 209 (b) (8) of the Social Security Act, as amended. Her services are excepted if it is found that Maynard Hospital, Inc., hereinafter referred to sometimes as the hospital, is a corporation "organized and operated exclusively for * * * charitable * * * purposes * * * no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual * * *." (Sec. 209 (b) (8) of the amendments of 1939.)

Maynard Hospital was originally known as the Martha Washington Hospital. The Martha Washington Hospital, a private institution of 93 beds, became financially involved to such an extent that a receiver was appointed. Prior to November 3, 1933, the Hospital Holding Co. was incorporated for the purpose of purchasing the Martha Washington Hospital. On November 3, 1933, a court order was entered which consummated the sale of the building and equipment by the receiver for the Martha Washington Hospital to the Hospital Holding Co. The articles of incorporation of the Hospital Holding Co. were subsequently amended to change the name of the company to Maynard Hospital, Inc.

The incorporators of Hospital Holding Co. were 6 practicing physicians of Seattle, Wash. Hospital Holding Co. was incorporated under the laws of the State of Washington relating to charitable organizations, with a capital stock of $100, represented by 100 shares with a par value of $1 each. The governing body is the board of trustees, which the articles of incorporation provide shall be composed of 8 members, 2 of whom shall be the mayor of Seattle and the chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of King County, Wash., acting ex officio. The other 6 trustees comprise all the stockholders, each of whom is a practicing physician. It appears that the 2 ex officio members have never attended any board meetings or otherwise participated in the management of the hospital.

The articles of incorporation of Maynard Hospital, Inc., as amended, contain the following provisions:

"ARTICLE II

"The capital stock of this corporation shall be $100, divided into 100 shares of the par value of $1 per share, and that no part of the net earnings of the company shall ever inure to the benefit of, or be payable to, any shareholders or stockholders of the company, or any individuals, and that said company, which is organized and operated as a charitable company under the laws of the State of Washington, shall be so operated during its entire period of existence.

"ARTICLE III

"The objects and purposes for which this corporation is formed are:

"To carry on the business of a hospital, surgery, sanatorium, drug store, and other institutions for the care and treatment of the sick, aged, infirm, and other persons, and to establish and maintain a school or schools for the training of nurses for the care of the sick;

"To accept public donations or private charity for the support, in whole or in part, of the corporation, and to devote all of its income and profits, after paying the expenses thereof, to the purposes of this corporation; * * *."

Article V of the bylaws provides as follows:

"ARTICLE V—PURPOSE

"Section 1. The sole purpose of the organization of this company is as follows:

"(a) To acquire and operate that certain hospital known as the Martha Washington Hospital, situated in the city of Seattle, Wash., as a charitable hospital.

"(b) To apply the income of the hospital to pay its operation, and all net earnings of the hospital, and any gifts which may be made to it, to aid and assist those without funds in need of hospital services free of charge, and to have as many free beds in said hospital as the funds of the organization will permit from time to time."

The organization and operating expenses at the outset were met by loans in the amount of $1,200 from each of the six incorporators. These loans were subsequently repaid. Whether the incorporators received interest on their loans is not shown. The purchase price to the receiver was $137,160.56. The terms of sale did not require any cash payment at the time of transfer. A first mortgage was given to secure the purchase price which was to be paid at the rate of $1,000 per month. The hospital apparently saved $17,145.14 by refinancing. The mortgage indebtedness had been reduced to $26,580 at the time of the hearing, March 19, 1942. In 9 years the hospital has paid approximately $90,000 on mortgage indebtedness and has paid from sixty to seventy-five thousand dollars for new equipment and improvements in addition to its operating expenses. This total of from $150,000 to $175,000 paid on the purchase price and for equipment and improvements in addition to meeting current operating expenses during the 9-year period has come entirely from the receipts from patients of the hospital as there have been no contributions, charitable trusts, nor additional capitalization.

Statements submitted by the hospital reflect the following details with respect to its operations during the years 1937-41:

Year	Full-pay patients	Part-pay patients	Non-pay patients	Amount paid by patients	Discounts, allowances, bad debts and charity accounts
1937	2,409	112	12	$201,734.25	$16,087.78
1938	2,560	115	15	216,455.99	12,678.56
1939	2,589	200	9	221,445.87	15,062.98
1940	2,644	210	20	237,786.92	11,825.42
1941	2,735	220	13	254,720.75	10,912.87

Since the heading given to each column above is taken from the records of the hospital, an explanation of the meaning of each heading, as brought out in the testimony before the referee, follows:

Full-pay patients: This column does not include all who entered with the expectation that the full rate would be paid. Instead, it comprehends only those who did in fact pay the full rate. Thus, if a patient failed to pay his entire bill, irrespective of whether for financial or other reasons, he was classified as a part-pay patient, if part of the account had been paid, or as a nonpay patient if he had made no payment. When employees of the hospital were given free hospitalization, they were considered nonpay patients, and when dependents of physicians were given reduced rates—not because of inability to pay, but because it is customary to give such persons reduced rates—they were listed as part-pay patients. Similarly, where the hospitalization was pursuant to reduced rates which were fixed for the King County Medical Service Bureau or under the Industrial Insurance Act of Washington (for which rates were fixed by the State), the patients were listed as part pay.

The column "Amount paid by patients" indicates the amount actually paid by all patients. There is no indication of the value of services rendered free or at a reduced rate because of inability to pay as distinguished from refusal to pay. In fact, there is some question as to just what would constitute hospitalization at a reduced rate because of inability to pay. For instance, it is contended on behalf of the hospital that patients hospitalized through King County Medical Service Bureau or under the Washington Industrial Insurance Act were given special

rates as a public service. It is pointed out that the rate given them is much less than the cost to the hospital of rendering the services. On the other hand, the president of the hospital testified:

"A. They (the State and King County Medical Service Bureau) will tell you how much they will pay you, and you take it and like it, and the price that they ask you and insist that you do this work for is much less than you can do it for. That is both for the State and the K. C. M. S. B. (King County Medical Service Bureau).

"Question. But you take them, nevertheless?

"Answer. You have to take them because the doctors that come to the hospital insist that you take them."

This indicates that such patients are hospitalized not as a public service but as an accommodation to the doctors by giving them a place to practice.

Patients who could be considered actual charity patients numbered 13 in 1940. The charges for these patients totaled $1,998.70. The charges ranged from $6 to $885.90. The latter charge was for a patient of one of the trustees of the hospital. The charity patients in 1941 numbered 8 and the total charges were $1,159.77. It appears, therefore, that during the years 1940 and 1941 the amount paid by patients totaled $492,507.67 and the amount entered on the books as charges against charity patients totaled $3,158.47. During the same years it appears that there were 5,842 patients of which 21 could be considered actual charity patients. Furthermore, it appears that many of the so-called charity patients were taken, not from a desire of the hospital to be of service to them because of their poor financial condition but rather because they were admitted as emergency cases and once they had begun to be treated at the hospital could not be removed until physically able to do so. It also appears that on several occasions the hospital transferred charity or nonpay patients to King County Hospital so that it would have room "for a few that could pay."

The hospital emphasizes its service to patients sent to it by the Masonic Service Bureau and the Washington Children's Home. It appears that the Masonic Service Bureau desired some hospital to which it could send border-line cases. Apparently such cases are those in which there are no immediate funds but "there is always the possibility that after recovery payment will be made as ability permits." A letter from the secretary of the bureau appealing to the hospital to accept the border-line cases states: "In the ordinary cases of destitution, with previous acceptance of charity, use is made of the facilities provided by the county." It therefore appears that the hospital had reasonable expectation of being paid for the services rendered such patients. The list of charity accounts for 1940 includes two patients from this bureau with a total charge of $321 and for 1941 one patient with a charge of $263.35.

With respect to patients from the Washington Children's Home the list of charity accounts for 1940 and 1941 shows four patients in 1940 with total charges of $25, and no patients in 1941.

In determining the question before us consideration must be given to the regulations of the Social Security Board. Section 403.815 of Regulations No. 3 provides, in part, as follows:

"Services performed by an employee in the employ of an organization of the class specified in section 209 (b)(8) of the act are excepted.

"For purpose of this exception the nature of the service is immaterial; the statutory test is the character of the organization for which the services are performed.

"In all cases, in order for an organization to be within the statutory classification, the organization must meet three tests:

"(1) It must be organized and operated exclusively for one or more of the specified purposes;

"(2) Its net income must not inure in whole or in part to the benefit of private shareholders or individuals; and

"(3) It must not by any substantial part of its activities attempt to influence legislation by propaganda or otherwise.

"Corporations or other institutions organized and operated exclusively for charitable purposes comprise, in general, organizations for the relief of the poor. The fact that an organization established for the relief of indigent persons may receive voluntary contributions from the persons intended to be relieved will not necessarily affect its status under the law."

The first question to be decided is whether Maynard Hospital, Inc., was organized and has been operated exclusively for charitable purposes.

While for some purposes the charter or articles of incorporation of an organization may be considered as determinative of the purpose of the organization, we are of the opinion that these instruments are not conclusive in arriving at a determination of the question before us, in view of the purposes of the Social Security Act. Even if the articles of incorporation were conclusive they do not require the hospital, in the instant case, to render any service without compensation or at a reduced rate.

Article V of the bylaws, quoted above, states policies of operation indicating charitable purposes. Bylaws are generally considered as rules and regulations adopted by a corporation to regulate, govern, and control its own actions and affairs and its stockholders, directors, and officers with relation thereto and among themselves in their relation to the corporation and may, of course, be changed from time to time as may be found necessary or desirable. They hardly have the standing of a charter or the articles of incorporation, and for the above reason we do not believe they are conclusive. Serious doubt is cast on the statement in the bylaws that the purpose of the corporation is to acquire and operate the hospital as a charitable hospital by the testimony of the president of Maynard Hospital, Inc. When questioned as to the purpose of purchasing the hospital, he stated: "The objective was a place to send our patients to with all graduate nurses." When asked, "and they [the incorporators] organized this corporation so that they might have a satisfactory place to which to direct their patients and practice as a physician," he answered, "That is correct." The record of operation of the hospital strongly supports the statement of the witness as to the prime purpose of Maynard Hospital, Inc. We seriously doubt that the hospital was organized for charitable purposes. It is unnecessary, however, to rest our decision on this one phase of the question. Even if the hospital was originally organized for charitable purposes, it must also have been operated exclusively for such purposes.

It will be noted that the above regulation classifies charitable organizations, generally, as those organized and operated "for the relief of the poor."

It may be argued that the term "charitable" should be given a broad interpretation so as to apply to "almost anything that tends to promote the welldoing and well-being of social man (*Guld* v. *Washington Hospital for Foundlings*, 95 U. S. 303). Many courts have given a broad meaning to the term, particularly when construing charitable trusts or uses as not confined merely to the relief of the poor. However, in view of the fact that Congress used the term in the exception under consideration in an enumeration of classifications also containing the terms "religious," "scientific," "literary," and "educational" indicates that the term "charitable" is used in a restricted sense. As the court stated in *Schuster* v. *Nicholls* ((D. C. Mass. 1927), 20 Fed. (2d) 179):

"The plaintiff argues that the word 'charitable,' as used in the statute, is not to be confined to mere relief of poverty, or distress, or almsgiving, but that it carried a wider signification which embraced any purpose which had for its end the improvement and promotion of the general welfare. * * *

"This broader definition would undoubtedly obtain in any equity court dealing with a charitable trust within the intent and purview of 43 Eliz., chapter 4, which, for the purposes of defining charitable uses, is, in some jurisdictions, at least, accepted as a part of the common law.

* * * * *

"The position of the word 'charitable' in a sentence including religious, scientific, and educational purposes, all of which would be regarded as charitable purposes under the statute of 43 Eliz., points irresistibly to the conclusion that Congress was here using the word 'charitable' in its more narrow and restricted sense, as signifying those corporations which were organized and maintained exclusively for eleemosynary purposes."

This view was also followed in *Gund's Estate et al* v. *Commissioners* ((C. C. A. 6th, 1940), 113 F. (2d) 61), and in *Christgau* v. *Woodlawn Cemetery Association*, Winona ((Minn., 1940), 293 N. W. 619).

Applying the term "exclusively" which appears in section 209 (b) (8) to the restricted meaning of the term "charitable" we are of the opinion that a corporation, community chest, fund, or foundation must render a substantial amount of service to the poor on an eleemosynary basis in order to bring itself within the exception under consideration. In our opinion the record in this case will not support a finding that Maynard Hospital, Inc., has rendered a substantial amount of service to the poor on an eleemosynary basis. It appears from its own records that much less than 1 percent of the work of the hospital was directed toward serving those without funds. The hospital has reduced its purchase price indebtedness from $137,160.56 in 1933 to $28,394.21 as of December 31, 1941, by payments of $91,621.21 and saving by refinancing of $17,145.14. It has also invested between sixty and seventy-five thousand dollars in improvements and equipment during the same period. The appraised value of its building is $211,326.85 and equipment is valued at $56,834.55. As of December 31, 1941, its liabilities, in addition to the balance of the purchase price of $28,394.21, were $15,783.14. This creditable record of accomplishment, from a business standpoint, was achieved entirely on the receipts from patients of the hospital as there have been no contributions, endowments, or other outside financial assistance received by the hospital. This record of accomplishment negatives the hospital's contention that it has been operated exclusively for charitable purposes. When asked as to why the hospital had not had more charitable cases the president stated: "The cost of doing business was such that we have been in the red quite a few times."

On the other hand, this record of accomplishment of the hospital supports the statement of the president of the hospital that the hospital draws its patients from "the great middle class." As to the poor, he testified:

"Well, we have a regular county hospital which they can go to, but nevertheless we do, as every other hospital does, take care of more or less charity cases and part-pay cases."

We have found no decisions directly in point, but the following four cases involving the coverage of employees of hospitals and hospital associations have been decided under the social-security-tax provisions and State unemployment compensation laws. (*Hasset* v. *Associated Hospital Service Corporation*

(C. C. A., 1st, 1942), 125 F. (2d) 611, certiorari denied, 62 S. Ct. 1043; *Smith* v. *Reynolds* (D. C. Minn., 1942), 43 F. Supp. 510; *Virginia Mason Hospital Association* v. *Larson* (Washington, 1941), 114 Pac. (2d) 976; and *In re Mendelshon* (App. Div. 1941), 31 N. Y. Supp. (2d) 438.)

The Hasset and Smith cases considered the liability under Federal social-security taxes of hospital associations operated for the benefit of members. That situation is distinguishable from the problem here under consideration, which involves a hospital apparently open to the public. However, the court in the Hasset case used language indicating that in order to be a charitable organization within the meaning of the social-security-tax exemption, it is necessary for a hospital organization to treat at least some persons free or at less than cost and in the Smith case the court pointed out:

"It is reasonably accurate to state that the word 'charity' means a gift without any hope on the part of the donor, based on legal or moral right, of any material benefits being realized therefrom by him. Webster's New International Dictionary states that 'charity' means, among other things, 'whatever is bestowed gratuitously on the needy or suffering for their relief; an eleemosynary foundation or institution; an institution founded by a gift and intended for the use of the public, as a hospital, library, school, etc.' A charity is a gift without material regard or consideration, and this holds true whether the same was prompted by ulterior motives or not. For definitions of 'charitable institution' and 'charity,' see *County of Hennepin* v. *Brotherhood of the Church of Gethsemane* (27 Minn. 460, 8 N. W. 595), and *Jackson* v. *Phillips et al.* (14 Allen 538, 556, 96 Mass. 539, 556). A charitable institution is one established, maintained, and operated for the purpose of taking care of the sick, without any profit or view of profit, but at a loss which has to be made up by benevolent contributions."

The Virginia Mason Hospital Association case involved the question whether employees of that hospital were covered under the unemployment compensation laws of the State of Washington. Although it was contended in the brief of the commission of unemployment compensation that less than 1 percent of the hospital's activities consisted of rendering service to indigents and that its treatment of diabetics was pursuant to a trust fund separate from the hospital, the court did not discuss the extent of charitable services rendered, but summarily stated:

"Assuming, without deciding, that, to be entitled to the exemption claimed, appellant must render to the public a certain amount of free service, we are of the opinion that the record sustains appellant's contention that a sufficient amount of such gratuitous service has been rendered, in the form of free hospitalization to some charity patients, the care and treatment of adult and infant diabetics, and care and treatment of children from the Washington Children's Home, and the acceptance and treatment of emergency cases."

The remainder of the court's opinion dealt with the question whether, because the members of the hospital also had a private clinic, there was an inurement of net earnings to such members.

The Mendelshon case involved the question whether employees of Doctors' Hospital, Inc., were covered under the unemployment compensation laws of New York State. Although that hospital apparently had no income other than the revenue from fees charged by it, about 8 percent of the total number of its patients were indigents and the officer in charge of admitting patients had authority to admit up to 25 free patients. The hospital also performed all of the laboratory work for the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor and treated emergency cases in the neighborhood without making any charge therefor. The court held the association to be exempt under the provisions of an exception similar to the subsections here under consideration, but did not specifically discuss whether its holding was based upon the eleemosynary activities of Doctors' Hospital, Inc.

The court stated that "the use of the words 'charitable purposes' in the labor laws by the legislature must be presumed to have been in accordance with their well-established meaning." The court, however, did not discuss the fact that in the labor laws the word "charitable" was not used by itself, but was used with the words "religious," "scientific," "literary," and "educational." Two of the five justices dissented from the majority opinion, one of whom stated:

"I am unable to find that the appellant has by affirmative proof established that it is entitled to the exemptions provided by statute. It may well be that by erecting and operating a hospital it has to some extent lessened the burden of government, nevertheless, it is not extending its charitable services to all of the members of the community and its charity is limited to a very small proportion of bed patients and with the specific requirement that such charity patients so-called shall secure a certificate from a doctor to the effect that he is receiving no pay from that particular patient. Finally, the reception of such patient in any event is contingent upon the availability of 1 of the 14 beds set aside for charitable purposes. May it be said that under such circumstances the primary and exclusive purpose of the appellant is the free administration to charity patients? We think not. Clearly a hospital may claim exemption where it administers in part to pay patients and in part to patients unable to pay. Here, however, we are confronted with the fact that at best but a very small proportion of the hospital facilities are afforded charity patients and the obtaining of such facilities is contingent upon the availability of a comparatively small number of beds and upon a doctor's certificate that professional services will be rendered without fee."

We are of the opinion that there can be no fixed standard of operation which can be applied to all hospitals in determining whether they are operated exclusively for charitable purposes. What constitutes "substantial" service to the poor on an eleemosynary basis will depend on the facts of each case. [It would appear reasonable to require that a hospital claiming the benefits which are accorded a charitable hospital should be primarily interested in serving those who are unable to pay.] As the Court said in the case of *O'Brien* v. *Physicians' Hospital Association* ((Ohio, 1917), 116 N. E. 975, L. R. A. 1917 F. 714):

"The fact that it may receive pay patients, without losing its character as a public charitable hospital, does not authorize it to receive pay patients in such numbers as to exhaust its accommodations, so that it cannot receive and extend hospital service to the usual and ordinary number of indigent patients applying for admission under proper rules and regulations of the board of trustees—excepting, of course, the cases it has no facilities for handling, as described and defined by the evidence in this case. The first concern of a public charitable hospital must be for those who are unable to pay. If, after taking care of these, it still has further accommodations there can be no objection to making use of the same for pay patients in order to increase the fund which may be at its disposal for the benefit of the poor. It may be, however, that it cannot always nicely measure these demands. It is sufficient if it conforms its conduct along the lines of its experience as to the ordinary and usual demand made upon it by charity patients, provided, always, that it act in good faith and consistent with the purposes of its organization."

The facts in this case cannot, in our opinion, support a finding that Maynard Hospital, Inc., was organized and operated exclusively for charitable purposes. [We find, therefore, that Maynard Hospital, Inc., was not organized and operated exclusively for charitable purposes within the meaning of section 209 (b) (8) of the Social Security Act as amended.] Therefore, the services rendered by Shirley V. Brandt for this hospital were rendered in employment as defined by section 209 (b) of the Social Security Act, as amended. This finding makes it unnecessary to consider whether any of the net income of the hospital inured in whole or in part to the benefit of private shareholders or individuals.

The record shows that Shirley V. Brandt was employed by Maynard Hospital, Inc., from October 23, 1940, to December 1, 1941, in the dietary department, and that she was paid wages in the following amounts in the quarters indicated:

1940: Period ending Dec. 31	$118.90
1941:	
Period ending Mar. 31	203.90
Period ending June 30	221.90
Period ending Sept. 30	222.30
Period ending Dec. 31	133.14
Total	900.14

It is the decision of the appeals council that the above wages be credited to the wage earner on the wage records of the Social Security Board.

APPEALS COUNCIL, SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD,
JOSEPH E. MCELVAIN, *Chairman.*

Dated July 25, 1942.

Securities Act of 1933 and Securities and Exchange Act of 1934

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to request granted by the House, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and as a member of the subcommittee thereof to consider securities legislation, I desire to submit for the RECORD a statement made by the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the securities subcommittee thereof, dated February 21, 1943, which bears directly on the future committee action on this most important subject, with special reference to the proxy rules recently promulgated by the Securities and Exchange Commission:

HEARINGS ON PROXY REGULATIONS

CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, today announced the purpose of his committee to begin hearings as to the regulations recently adopted by the Securities Exchange Commission concerning proxies.

Mr. LEA stated that widespread complaint had been made against the regulations on the ground that the requirements are unnecessary and unduly burdensome, expensive, and unnecessarily consume the time of the employees badly needed by the companies

affected, many of which directly engage in war activities.

Further, Mr. LEA said, "in the face of these complaints our committee thought it desirable to give the businessmen a hearing to determine what, if any, immediate action should be taken by our committee to relieve business firms of any unnecessary hardship imposed upon them by such regulations.

"Without prejudging the action of the Commission in imposing these regulations on business concerns at this time, I think I speak the general sentiment of our committee members when I say that while the committee would be disposed to support the Commission in any action taken which was warranted from the standpoint of war needs or clearly justified from the standpoint of maintaining the integrity of corporate action, we look with disfavor upon any effort of administrative agencies to take advantage of the war situation to impose questionable reforms or any burdensome innovations during wartime which are not clearly justified on the ground of necessity."

Mr. LEA, as chairman of the committee, appointed a subcommittee to consider the proxy matter and other subjects relating to the Securities Act and the Securities Exchange Act. This committee is a continuation of a similar committee in the last Congress. Members of the committee as newly formed are Mr. LEA, chairman; Messrs. CROSSER, BOREN, PRIEST, HARRIS of Arkansas, NEWSOME, WOLVERTON of New Jersey, REECE of Tennessee, BROWN of Ohio, LEONARD W. HALL, and WINTER.

Extensive hearings on proposed amendments to the Securities Exchange Act were held in the last session of Congress. This testimony has all been carefully assembled and indexed and a synopsis made of the arguments for and against each proposed amendment.

The principal work of the subcommittee will be to take up the consideration of this legislation with the view of preparing a bill to present to this Congress embodying such amendments as the committee finds warranted.

Congressman JAMES W. WADSWORTH, who took an active interest in these subjects during the last Congress, has ceased to be a member of the committee on account of his appointment to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. However, he still maintains his interest in this program.

What's Wrong?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave already granted to me, I include as a part of my remarks a letter I wrote to Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard under date of January 14, 1943, and the reply thereto, over the signature of Under Secretary of Agriculture Paul H. Appleby, dated February 18, 1943.

It is little wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the people generally are disturbed and disgusted with the administrative officers of our Government, when you realize that more than a month elapsed before a reply is given to a letter from a Member of Congress urging that prompt action be taken to relieve a situation as acute as was the meat and butter shortage in my home State of Rhode Island during the middle of January. And up to now, that situation has not improved.

The letters follow:

JANUARY 14, 1943.

Hon. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Since I talked yesterday with Mr. Raymond F. Hendrickson, Director of Food Distribution, regarding the terrible shortage of meat and butter in the State of Rhode Island, I have received many more communications from wholesalers and processors of meat, as well as retailer market men, pleading urgently that you take immediate action to allocate a sufficient supply of meat to Rhode Island so that retailers and consumers may obtain equitable distribution.

It may interest you to know that my secretary, at my request, has just spent 2 weeks surveying the situation back home for me and has found that butter is so scarce that people stand in long lines in subzero temperatures, sometimes more than a block long, waiting to obtain a half pound or a quarter pound of butter, and in many instances fail to obtain even that small amount.

The population of my district is very bitter at the news reports that millions of pounds of butter are being released and most of it is being shipped abroad to Allied Nations. It is their contention—and I agree with them—that instead of shipping butter abroad and practically compelling our own citizens to use oleomargarine we make the butter available here at home and ship the oleomargarine to our allies.

The meat shortage is so acute that most of the stores have absolutely none for sale. A few of them have a small supply and will sell only to their regular customers, and while refusing to sell it to others laugh in their faces. Others who have a small amount for sal are violating ceilings to the point where a lady whose husband is ill and has been ordered by the doctor to take only beef tea made a diligent search of several stores in the hope of obtaining steak, and in only one instance did she find that steak was available and that was rump steak at $1.09 per pound.

In view of this information, which represents only a part of the picture, I strongly urge that you take steps immediately to make available to Rhode Island an amount of beef and other meats in fair proportion to the supply normally available.

Your prompt advice as to the action you take in this matter will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

AIME J. FORAND,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, February 18, 1943.

Hon. AIME J. FORAND,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FORAND: This is in reply to your letter of January 14 relative to allocating meat supplies to wholesalers and processors, and other matters pertaining to the distribution of food.

New England has always been a deficit meat area. Before the adoption of price controls, the interaction of supply and demand moved meats from surplus producing areas to deficit areas. Now that ceiling prices have been adopted for meats, normal distribution has been upset because packers find it possible to sell at ceiling prices in the surplus producing areas most of the meats they have available for civilians. Under these conditions some other means must be found to move meats into deficit areas, but it must be recognized that any steps adopted will be more or less makeshift.

The substantial reduction in the quantity of meat available for total civilian consumption as compared with a year ago is not generally realized. All of us are agreed that the strictly military demands and lend-lease requirements must be provided for. This has reduced supplies for civilians, but not to a harmful degree from a nutritional standpoint. The pressure from civilians is increase by high incomes and a decreasing amount of goods and services to buy.

We believe that rationing will result in a more equitable distribution of meat to consumers; however, it will not solve all of the distribution problems at the wholesale level. We are considering all angles of this problem in an effort to find a practical and equitable means of distributing meat supplies, but we do not expect to be able to distribute meat through all handlers who were previously in this business, even though they may have been quite necessary in the meat distribution trade in normal times.

Our interpretation of the spirit and operation of the Lend-Lease Act is that we share our commodities and matériel with our allies. This naturally involves sharing some commodities for which we may have a preference. In the case of butter, shipments during 1942 amounted to approximately 17,250,000 pounds out of our estimated production of slightly more than two thousand million pounds. Practically all of this butter went to Russia. Shipments of oleomargarine and edible oils in 1942 exceeded the above quantity of butter many times.

We are referring your letter to the Price Division of the Office of Price Administration, since it contains information relative to ceiling prices, which are administered by that office.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. APPLEBY,
Under Secretary.

Federal Tax on Municipal Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert a letter received by me from the Honorable George A. Quigley, mayor of the city of New Britain, Conn.

Mr. Quigley has vast experience as a municipal executive and has devoted a great deal of time and study to municipal finances. I am sure that his observations will be of immense value.

The letter follows:

CITY OF NEW BRITAIN,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New Britain, Conn., February 9, 1943.

Hon. B. J. MONKIEWICZ,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: I am writing you regarding the matter of the possible taxing of municipal bonds by the Federal Government.

This is a matter of much concern to municipalities where large industrial plants are located.

The municipalities will face in the very near future serious financial problems. We have in New Britain approximately 15,000 war workers who have arrived here from all parts of the country during the past 2 years. They will present a serious problem in postwar days when the factories will retool and return to normal lines of production.

Thousands of these workers will be thrown out of employment and be a charge upon the city for a period of between 6 months to a year. In addition to these workers we will have after the war between four or five thousand men returning from the service; another unemployment problem.

All industrial municipalities will face this problem.

Any increase in taxation imposes an additional burden on real estate and when we know that 75 percent of the cost of government is borne by real property any increased burden is conducive to the destruction of home ownership.

Instead of adding to the burden of the realty owner means must be found to secure another source of revenue for municipalities other than the tax upon real estate.

"While the President's formal message to Congress said little in a direct way about taxing State and local securities, his 'seminar' sessions with financial writers prior to the Budget message left no doubt at all of the administration's persistent determination to bring about a change. The argument wasn't new but a repeating of the charge that no taxation for these bonds was inequitable and offered to the wealthy an escape from taxation. In addition, the President still seeks for the elimination of the income from investments received over and above the $25,000 net salary ceiling. If this were achieved the method might conceivably work out an indirect means of taxation for exempt securities." (From the Bond Buyer, January 16, 1943.)

Speaking of Secretary Morgenthau's plan for new tax sources, Time magazine of January 23 said that—

"He counts strongly on three proposals Congress turned down last year—taxation of State and municipal bonds * * *."

Referring to the 1943 tax bill, the Bond Buyer, in its Washington letter, said that the Treasury Department "* * * has several proposals that it wants inserted in the tax bill, one of which is the provision for taxing State and local bonds." And further: "There is a school of fiscal experts here who seek the elimination of present provisions relative to these securities as a nearly last final step to control of State and local taxes and finances."

* * * * *

With personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. QUIGLEY,
Mayor of New Britain.

Workers' Revolt Averted by Work Projects Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Denis W. Delaney, from the Boston Traveler of February 19, 1943:

WORKERS' REVOLT AVERTED BY WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION — CHIEF DELANEY GIVES COLD, HARD FACTS ABOUT ROOSEVELT'S GREAT RELIEF PLAN

(With war industries taking every available man, the Work Projects Administration has been dissolved by act of Congress. During the middle thirties this agency provided work for millions of persons and made available many roads, buildings, and other public improvements. In the paragraphs that follow Denis W. Delaney, State administrator of the Work Projects Administration, tells what the agency has meant to the State and the Nation.)

(By Denis W. Delaney, State work projects administration)

When the wild orgy of financial and industrial speculation came to an inglorious end in October 1929, the Nation went into an industrial nose dive that soon found 13,000,000 in the ranks of the unemployed, which condition continued for 4 long weary years of suffering and want, with no sign of relief until March 5, 1933, when President Roosevelt, 24 hours after taking the oath of office, closed all the banks of the country, after 4,617 banks had closed their doors, involving over $2,000,000,000 of the savings of the men and women who toil, thus preventing bloody days in our great industrial centers.

Come with me for a moment into one of millions of American homes as they were on March 4, 1933. Not the home of a dissolute, but that of a God-fearing, hard-working head of a large family. Father's head bowed on the table in despair, no fire in the stove, no food in the cupboard; the mother huddled in the corner with her kiddies, all thinly clad, with faces pinched from hunger and cold. At that moment, when there seemed to be no relief, someone came through the front door without knocking.

TAXPAYER TO RESCUE

That someone was you, the American taxpayer, and when you had gone, there was fire in the stove, there was food in the cupboard, the children were warmly clad and those of school age were back at school, the only hope for the perpetuity of our institutions of Government, the school; the father was out at honorable dignified relief work and mother was humming an old tune as she went about her work. Multiply that scene by millions and you get some idea of what conditions were, at that time, after nearly four awful years, in this, the richest country under God's sun.

Overnight there came into being the greatest humanitarian program the world has ever known.

In the 10 years since that program became effective over 10,000,000 different persons—men and women—have been upon the pay roll of the relief program doing work which they can be proud of all their lives.

RECORD OF WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Their labors and skill have left their record all over the United States.

Everywhere one goes you travel over roads and bridges built and improved by their hands. Our children in a thousand towns and cities go to schools that they have constructed, enlarged, or made safer and better than they were before.

In a great many communities the water we drink comes to us through mains laid by them. They have done a vast amount of work to improve the health of the Nation; they have dug drainage ditches through malarial swamps; they have served in thousands of clinics and helped to give immunizations and medical or dental treatment to hundreds of thousands of people, young and old, who would not otherwise have had it; they have fed millions of undernourished school children; and they have made garments with which to clothe millions of families in need.

In our great catastrophies of Nature, when flood or hurricane has devastated some region, they were the shock troops of disaster; they were on the scene swiftly, and in thousands, to carry on night and day the work of rescue, of sanitation, of rehabilitation; they brought food and clothes; they cleared the roads, burned the debris, prevented the spread of disease. Never in our history has help been brought more promptly or adequately to stricken communities than by them in the great Mississippi-Ohio floods and the New England hurricane.

CRISIS OVERCOME

They have taken their part in every form of useful community service; they have taught the illiterate to read and write; they have brought educational advantages to people over school age; they have helped our educational system to meet the needs of the American masses. Among them were technically trained workers who assisted our State universities in every kind of scientific research. Among them were musicians, artists, and writers who used their talents in the service of your communities.

All this work is work that your communities have wanted to have done, work that they needed.

In the prosecution of that immense program, over $16,000,000,000 have been poured into the homes of those in need, and through those homes into every channel of trade throughout the Nation, and just one practical question: "Without this tremendous Nation-wide rehabilitation program, what would have been the condition of this country when we were faced with the emergency that took us into the bloodiest inhuman conflict the world has ever seen?"

We of this generation can never fully realize or appreciate what has been done since March 5, 1933, but the children of generations yet unborn will read in their schoolbooks how their ancestors of this day and age met and overcame the greatest crisis this Nation ever faced, in the same spirit and sacrifice that our ancestors met and overcame the great test of their day, out of which came this Nation of ours, the greatest thought in government that ever came from the brain of man, justice and equality, under law, which for 166 years has been the beacon light to all civilization, the harbor of refuge for the oppressed peoples of every land, and which stands today as the only hope of the civilized world.

Our country has on many occasions seen desperate conditions that have tried the hearts and souls of its citizens, at times almost to despair, amid wars, pestilence, rebellion, and financial and industrial desolation, but we have always come through, as we will in the present crisis, with a better understanding of our great heritage and a renewed pledge that, under God, we shall maintain, at all costs, the precious boon of democracy that has been handed down to each generation to carry on, and that this Republic, under God, shall continue as the abiding place only of those who believe in a government of law, where all the problems affecting the welfare of the people will continue to be settled by the ballot and not by the bullet.

Is Pickens a Communist?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL ELLISON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Baltimore Afro-American of February 20, 1943:

IS PICKENS A COMMUNIST?—TWENTY-ONE ACCUSATIONS BY DIES IN CONGRESS COVER LESS THAN 1 PERCENT OF THE PICKENS RECORD

The House 2 weeks ago, by a teller vote of 163 to 111, passed a resolution providing that no part of the Treasury appropriation under

consideration should be used to pay William Pickens, whom the Dies committee charged with Communist affiliations.

Dr. Pickens, former National Association for the Advancement of Colored People secretary and one time dean of Morgan College, is now a $5,600-a-year Treasury Department specialist in promoting sales of War bonds and stamps.

Tuesday of last week the House reversed the Pickens ouster by a roll call of 267 to 136. Between Friday and Tuesday a lot of Congressmen found out who Dr. Pickens is. Edgar G. Brown constituted himself a committee of one to call on a number of them. Constituents at home sent letters and telegrams to others.

In addition, the only colored Congressman, William DAWSON (Democrat, Ill.), took the floor for his maiden speech, in which he declared he had "known Pickens for 40 years; he is not a Communist and has never knowingly affiliated himself with a Communist organization."

When the Illinois Congressman said that "those who make the charges do not know Pickens as I do," he made a strong impression on the House, which passed a resolution directing a subcommittee to grant Pickens and 37 others a chance to establish their innocence. This hearing will be held soon.

TWENTY-ONE ACCUSATIONS AGAINST PICKENS

DIES read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 21 instances of what he called Dr. Pickens' affiliation with Communist-front organizations. Here they are:

1. 1927—William Pickens, one of four United States delegates to the World Congress of League Against Colonial Oppression and Imperialism in Brussels, Belgium.

2. 1927—Pickens wrote articles for three issues of the Daily Worker.

3. 1927—Pickens was a member of the Hands Off China Advisory Committee.

4. Pickens named on letterhead as member of organizing committee of All-America Anti-Imperialist League.

5. 1929—Pickens on letterhead as member of National Committee of International Labor Defense.

6. 1929—Pickens delegate to World Congress of League Against Imperialism in Frankfurt, Germany.

7. 1931—Pickens sponsor of Prisoners' Relief Fund, organized by Labor Defense.

8. Pickens on letterhead as member of United States Congress Against War.

9. 1933—Pickens and Browder leading speakers at meeting of United States Congress Against War, termed by Attorney General a Communist-front organization.

10. 1933—Pickens named to National Convention of United States Congress Against War.

11. 1933—Pickens one of two vice chairmen of American League Against War and Fascism—its program, sabotage of national defense in peace and war.

12. 1938—Pickens addressed mass meeting of Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.

13. 1939—Pickens contributed article for New Masses, alleged Communist Party publication.

14. 1939—Pickens lectured at Workers' School, official school of Communist Party.

15. 1940—Pickens speaker at mass meeting of American Rescue Ship Mission (Communist).

16. 1940—Pickens signed statement issued by Council for Pan-American Democracy in behalf of a member of Communist International.

17. 1940—Pickens spoke for United Spanish Aid Committee

18. 1940—Pickens signed petition of National Federation of Constitutional Liberties in behalf of an imprisoned Communist.

19. Pickens on letterhead of American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

20. Pickens one of sponsors for Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights.

21. Pickens sponsor of American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.

DIES said that this 16-year record of Dr. Pickens leaves no doubt about his close collaboration with the Communist Party and its front organizations.

THE AFRO DISAGREES

The DIES exposé of Pickens is remarkable, not for what it says but for what it leaves out.

First of all, Dr. Pickens for 22 years was branch organizer, traveling secretary, lecturer, and forum speaker for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in the course of which he traveled hundreds of thousands of miles and spoke frequently every day. He also wrote for the Associated Negro Press.

If, out of 6,000 speeches and 1,000 news articles, Mr. DIES finds only 21 instances in which Pickens spoke or wrote for the Communists, the percentage is less than 1 percent.

To judge Pickens correctly it would be far better to discover what he did in the 99.7 percent of his speeches and writings.

SOME OF DIES' CHARGES ARE ERRORS

Besides, Mr. DIES isn't correct in his 21 accusations. For example, Afro files reveal that Dr. Pickens attended the 1929 Anti-Imperialism Congress in Germany representing the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, not the Communists.

The Pickens membership in the International Labor Defense mentioned by DIES in 1929 consisted of sending this body a donation to help in its fight to free the Scottsboro boys.

"If the devil was planning to defend those boys," said Pickens to the Afro in 1931, "I would have abetted the devil." At the same time, he condemned the Communists for publicizing his donation. Answering the question then whether he was a Communist—this war in 1931—Mr. Pickens said, "Gosh, no. I catch enough hell just being colored."

Afro files also show that Pickens supported the Socialist, Norman Thomas, for President in 1936 and the Republican, Wendell Willkie, for President in 1940.

If we judge Pickens by the places at which he has spoken and his associates on the speakers' platform, we can convict him of membership in every denomination and every political party.

MRS. ROOSEVELT ACCUSED

The Communist affiliation which Mr. DIES charges to Pickens is akin to that which Congressman LAMBERTSON, of Kansas, imputed Monday to Mrs. Roosevelt, who spoke before the National Youth Conference 3 years ago and entertained some of its leaders at the White House.

Congress spent the better part of 2 days on the Pickens case, but the time will not be wasted if it is utilized to convince DIES that the real agents of enemy powers are not people like Pickens, Mrs. Roosevelt, and Mary Bethune, who was also on the Dies list.

Shall We Subsidize the Farmer?—Is It Not Really Subsidizing the Consumer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an editorial from the Missouri Farmer, by F. V. Heinkel, president, calling attention to the fact that while many farmers believe subsidies are a good thing for agriculture, it is dangerous for agriculture to live under ceilings that are fixed below an equitable parity and accept the difference in subsidies, particularly at a time when the Nation's income is the highest in history and people are more able than ever before to pay what farm products are worth. I quote:

COMING EVENTS CAST THEIR SHADOWS BEFORE THEM

Some things have been happening in Washington lately which should give the Nation's farmers much food for thought. We should not only take a look at these things as they appear on the surface, but we should also look beneath the surface and try to determine for ourselves what implications might be hidden there, and which might one day emerge to plague us.

A few days ago the Secretary of Agriculture announced an extensive program of incentive payments to farmers totaling approximately $100,000,000, designed to obtain greater production on certain food crops vitally needed for war purposes; and, he hinted, there will likely be millions more forthcoming.

I do not doubt the Secretary's sincerity. He sees the broad picture, the global war which we must win regardless of the cost, and he sincerely believes that "food will win the war and write the peace." But I do wonder if, in his eagerness to obtain results, the proper procedure is being used?

I have felt for a long time that all which is necessary to obtain food production to the fullest is to pay the farmer cost of production, give him some machinery to produce with, leave some of his sons at home who understand farm work to help him, then leave him alone.

No class of people want to win the war more earnestly than farmers; they are sacrificing their sons the same as other people are; their liberties are at stake, and it is a well-known fact that farmers value their liberties, exercise them more freely, than do many other classes of the people; while, in addition, farmers are extensive owners of property which they stand to lose if we lose the war, and from this standpoint alone they have incentive enough to produce all the food they can at this critical time. Incentive payments, therefore, it seems to me, are actually a reflection upon the farmer's patriotism—it would have been better to have called the payments subsidies to consumers, which in fact they are.

The daily press stated a few days ago that Congressman CLARENCE CANNON of Missouri made the Secretary admit that the $100,000,000 incentive payment is not an incentive payment to farmers at all, but rather a subsidy to consumers, and a few days ago the Congressman, who is chairman of the powerful Appropriations Committee, took the matter to the House floor.

"Mr. Speaker," he said, "the Department of Agriculture has announced unexpectedly a new subsidy policy under which a bonus is to be paid to farmers from the United States Treasury, in the form of incentive payments. The Department states that the payments would be subsidies to the consumer rather than to the producer. In other words it proposes to pay a part of the grocery bill of certain classes of people and charge it to the taxpayers.

"The amount mentioned by the Department to start the program is $100,000,000, but estimates indicate that the amount required would be from $150,000,000 to $200,000,000, and Departmental spokesmen who discussed the subject when it was before the Committee on Appropriations last year said that car-

ried to its ultimate conclusion it would require billions.

"On the testimony submitted by the Department when the subject was before the committee during consideration of the price-control bill in the last session the committee not only disapproved such a policy but incorporated in the Office of Price Administration bill a provision that no part of the funds therein appropriated should be used for subsidies in any form. That provision was approved by the House and is now a part of the law.

"It is therefore a matter of surprise that the Department should without notice and without consultation with any congressional committee, suddenly announce that these payments will be made. The only method by which funds can be secured for the purpose is through appropriation by Congress and the announcement by the Department, carried in every metropolitan newspaper and over every radio channel, is tantamount to announcement that Congress will reverse its decision and repeal the policy incorporated in the law and provide money at the direction of a Government bureau. * * * It is not only an encroachment on the constitutional prerogatives of the Congress but it is a proposal to take a vast sum from the Treasury to pay a part of the cost of living of certain consumers at a time when the consumer's income is the highest in the history of the Nation and when every available dollar is needed for the prosecution of the war."

CLARENCE CANNON is not only one of the ablest men in Washington, but during his many years in Congress he has proved his friendship for agriculture many times. When William Hirth was in Washington fighting for the McNary-Haugen bill as chairman of the famous Corn Belt committee, he had no greater helper than this distinguished Missourian. And so when such a man as he speaks out on the subsidy question, is it not time for farmers to wonder?

But Congressman CANNON is by no means the only critic of subsidies—practically every farm leader in the Nation has taken a stand against them, and this fact also should provoke serious thought among farmers; for I know all these men personally, and know that they are sincerely and courageously standing forth for what they believe to be the best interests of agriculture.

Not long ago John Brandt, president of Land O' Lakes Creameries, one of the most successful groups of cooperatives in America, recently denounced subsidies as inflationary. He said: "In these times when all benefit or subsidy payments cannot be paid from current Government income, but require additional borrowing for the full amount of these payments, which still further increases the public debt, there is nothing more inflationary than the payment of subsidies."

Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, an organization composed of 350,000 of the Nation's dairymen, denounced subsidies at our recent State managers' meeting as "the aspirin that cures the administrator's headache,' and declared "It is a subtle, poisonous something which demoralizes the body politic * * * which makes the recipient weaker in will and a great deal more dependent upon the subsidy giver."

A few days ago Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange; Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, and Ezra T. Benson, executive secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, issued a joint statement on the subject of subsidies. Here is what they said:

"We are unalterably opposed to the use of subsidies in lieu of a fair return in the market place. The Department of Agriculture has announced a program of so-called incentive payments for the production of certain crops. We insist that these payments as now projected are nothing but subsidies disguised. Despite repeated protests, it continues to be the policy of the administration to restrict returns to farmers by ceilings and to attempt to compensate them by subsidies with their attendant uncertainties. For the first time in 20 years, normal adjustments in the national economy, if permitted to function, would put the farmer on an equal basis with American labor and industry.

"We warn that any economy which does not pay the cost of its food bill will inevitably collapse. If this situation persists, we consider it a grave danger to the Nation. We insist upon price-control policies which will assure maximum production as the best protection against both inflation and hunger. * * * Finally, we recommend that immediate assurance be given American farmers by the Congress and the administration of their intention to preserve agriculture as an independent and self-supporting industry."

But there is something else that ought to cause us as farmers to ponder the subject of subsidies—the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court, highest authority in our land, and from whose decision there is no appeal, no relief short of changing the Nation's Constitution itself! Remember the 49-cent wheat penalties a couple years ago? Every wheat grower does. Well, one Roscoe C. Philburn, an Ohio farmer, appealed to the courts for relief, contending his constitutional rights as a citizen were violated.

He denied that the Federal Government, under the Constitution, had a right to interfere with his farm operations, that when he planted his wheat the penalty for excess marketings was 15 cents a bushel and that just about the time the wheat was ready for harvest the penalty was raised to 49 cents. This, he contended, deprived him of his property without due process of law, which is forbidden by the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

But the Supreme Court pointed out that the Government was maintaining wheat prices by subsidy payments, and said: "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes!" If it seems strange to some farmers that the Nation's ablest farm leaders, and friends of agriculture in Congress, should oppose the payment of subsidies to farmers in lieu of a fair price for their products, here is one everlastingly good answer, and right from the Supreme Court!

It is another way of saying that "He who pays the fiddler calls the tune." It is another way of saying that when farmers accept subsidies, they must submit to regulation, must obey rules laid down by bureaucrats in Washington.

I believe that the subsidy givers in Washington are sincere, and I know that many farmers believe subsidies are a good thing for agriculture. But it does seem to me that it is dangerous for agriculture to live under ceilings that are fixed below an equitable parity, and accept the difference in subsidies, particularly at a time when the Nation's income is the highest in history, and people are more able than ever before to pay what farm products are worth.

Here are some questions every farmer should turn over in his mind, and do it often: If the country can't afford to pay what farm products are worth today, can we ever expect to receive fair prices for them any time in the future? If we must live partially on subsidies now, how can we possibly live without them after the war ends? If it is true, as the Supreme Court says it is, the Government can "regulate that which it subsidizes," is there any future ahead of us as farmers except regulation and low income if we keep on accepting subsidies? I we continue to accept subsidies in lieu of fair prices, will we not have relinquished our liberties, and having done so, will we not have practically reduced ourselves to the status of peasantry?

F. V. HEINKEL,
President, Missouri Farmers Association.

Room 21

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay public tribute to the boys and girls of room 21, Central Falls High School, for their fine cooperation with our war effort

The 28 students in room 21 stand out today as the outstanding class not only of my congressional district but, I believe, in the country as salesmen of War bonds and stamps for Uncle Sam. These patriots have sold in 5 months $14,419.50 worth of stamps and bonds, an average of $514.98 per pupil.

To each and every one of them I say, Well done; we are proud of you.

Dual Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana:

House Joint Resolution 3

Resolution to the Congress of the United States to initiate proper action and legislation to determine the identity and forfeit the citizenship of those holding a dual citizenship in any other country and prohibiting such citizenship

Whereas the war in which the United States is engaged has focused attention upon certain traitorous and disloyal elements in the citizenship of this country which have used their technical citizenship as a cloak behind which to promote and carry out these disloyal designs; and

Whereas attention has also been focused on nationals of foreign countries who have regarded their primary and real loyalty to the country of their origin and their American citizenship as only a necessary convenience in better securing the material and political advantages which this great Nation holds forth; and

Whereas these elements have been weakening factors in the unified body of loyal American citizens believing in the traditions and principles of the American democracy; and

Whereas an outstanding evidence of the existence of these elements has been the acceptance of a dual citizenship status by acknowledging allegiance to the sovereignty of their native country, particularly among the Japanese, German Bundists, and Italian Fascists; and

Whereas foreign countries have held forth such dual citizenship status for their nationals in this country for the purpose of retaining their sovereignty and jurisdiction over said nationals and for the purpose of commanding their loyalty and obedience in peace and in war; and

Whereas this war has made us aware of the necessity of scrutinizing more carefully our citizenship in order that by infiltration of disloyal elements our democratic processes are not perverted from their original purposes and used against our own interests; and

Whereas the safety and protection of the American democracy requires the immediate weeding out of said disloyal elements and the forfeiture of, and exclusion from, American citizenship of those nationals of other countries practicing dual citizenship or for whom dual citizenship is held out: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Montana, That the Congress of the United States be, and the same is hereby memorialized to institute proper action and legislation; (1) to determine the identity of those persons in this country of Japanese ancestry or otherwise subscribing to citizenship or making themselves amenable to the sovereignty of any other country; (2) to forfeit the American citizenship of such persons, and (3) to prohibit any person now or heretofore holding or exercising a dual citizenship from being or ever becoming an American citizen; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from Montana.

The Cruiser "Biloxi"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday February 23, 1943

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, today, at the Newport News shipyards in the State of Virginia, there was launched another warship as the latest addition to our ever-growing Navy—already the most powerful in the world. With her powerful guns and most modern equipment, this ship will be another important factor with which the enemies of America will have to reckon in their vain effort to control the mastery of the seas.

But to some of us the launching of this great implement of warfare was something more than an addition to our fleet, for it carried with it into the waters of the Atlantic a great deal of sentiment for the people of the great State of Mississippi and revives the historic legends of the city for which she was named, for this proud ship which will sail the high seas under the Stars and Stripes bears the name of *Biloxi*. This last word in United States naval fighting craft slid gently down into the water at high noon today. It was christened by the charming wife of the former mayor of the city of Biloxi, Mrs. Louis Braun.

The launching of this good ship brought about the fruition of the dreams of Mississippians generally and of the citizenship of Biloxi particularly to have one of Uncle Sam's cruisers named after this historic city. Several years ago in response to the expressed wishes of the citizenship of this community, the late and lamented Mississippian, Pat Harrison, and I sought this action by the Navy. And today all Mississippians are proud of the fact that for the first time a United States cruiser has been named for a Mississippi city.

The quaint little city whose name this proud warship bears has the distinction of being one of the first settlements of white people in the Mississippi Valley. It was founded by Monsieur D'Iberville in 1699 under direct authority and in the name of the King of France. And today may be seen a boulder and a cross marking the approximate spot of this little city where the Frenchmen first stepped from their boats to the mainland. At one time Biloxi was the capital of a vast region of this country extending as far west as the Yellowstone National Park. The flags of France, Spain, England, the Southern Confederacy, and the Stars and Stripes have all responded in the past to the gentle breeze which blew from the Gulf of Mexico on the shore of which the city is built.

All hail this newest addition to our mighty fleet! May this proud ship's voyage on the global waters be as resplendent and inspiring as the heritage of the beautiful little city whose name she bears.

Address of Theodore Granik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address delivered by Theodore Granik, founder and director of the American Forum of the Air, at the commencement exercises of St. John's University School of Law in Brooklyn, N. Y., on February 4.

The citation awarded to him recited that Mr. Granik had been an "outstanding student at St. John's University School of Law from 1926 to 1929"; while still a student, organized the forum; served from 1934–37 as assistant district attorney of New York; counsel for the United States Housing Authority from 1937 to 1941; helped write the law creating the much-needed Smaller War Plants Corporation; the first alumnus of the school of law to win a place in the current edition of Who's Who in America. "The board of trustees of St. John's University," the citation concluded, "taking cognizance of the remarkable achievements of a loyal son, devoted father, and distinguished public servant, is happy to confer the honorary degree of doctor of laws."

Mr. Granik's address follows:

Reverend Father President, members of the faculty, graduates, and friends, you are most generous in bestowing an honor without equal in my life. I accept it as a challenge to carry on through the trying months ahead.

A commencement speaker is, I believe, supposed to open the eyes of the graduates to the broad vistas lying ahead.

A decade and a half ago my classmates and I sat in your chairs. We were the children of fortune—or so we were told. We were stepping out into a life brimful of opportunities.

That was the golden summer of 1929. Prosperity was everywhere. We were to walk right out and help ourselves.

Yes; we were born of the boom. But before the year was out—in less than 4 months—we learned otherwise. The bubble burst—and we were left rubbing the soap from our eyes.

What followed might be called the road back—except that the signposts have been scattered and confusing.

You ladies and gentlemen today are also born of the boom. Production figures are even higher than in 1929. Money abounds. Billions have made millions almost small change. Yes; and life is even richer in opportunities—but right there the comparison must end.

The fruits are on the trees. For most of you, however, the picking must be postponed.

There's another job to be done—there's a war which must be won—and most of you doubtless will be doing your share within a very few weeks.

This course you have completed may have been just an interlude before your call to duty.

You must have wondered, particularly through the trying last few months, whether your studies and your sacrifices for them have not been in vain. What, you may ask, is the importance of the law in a world ruled by the gun?

Dictators smirk at laws and rights. Even democracies suspend laws when disaster threatens.

In the final analysis, when the biggest issue is at stake—the issue of survival, of existence—when that is at stake, the law is forgotten and brute force decides.

Yes, that is true. Books are no answer for bullets. Canons—with a single "n"—are of little effect against tanks.

Why, then attach any significance to a degree in the law or in any other field? Why should not all education be abandoned and the students taken en masse into the armed services?

To that I can best answer that ours is not an education for death. Ours is a system of teaching and of learning to make and to live a better and a fuller life in the epoch which must follow war.

Perhaps the word "epoch" is reserved for historians; it may be out of order to prophesy an era. That criticism I will chance because we have every reason to expect a better world with the next peace—certainly better than the two dizzy decades which followed Versailles.

And, if it is a better world, it will be so only because men make it so. It will once again be a world of laws and rights founded on treaties which we hope to make the greatest legal documents of all time.

Sweet are the uses of adversity. For 23 years America was at peace with the world—and seemed to care not a whit about peace.

Now we have been at war for 14 months and, even above the battle cries from Rabaul to Rostov, the call for peace is heard 'round the world. Without losing sight of the task at hand—and it is a tremendous task—men of all continents look ahead to the durable peace of which our President speaks.

Our feet are set firmly on what Archbishop Spellman of New York has called The Road to Victory. No longer do we stumble along the road back. This time the highway markers are clear—only the distance is in doubt.

But the archbishop bids us look beyond the immediate goal of military victory.

"Freedom is not a commodity that once possessed is never lost," writes the archbishop. "But it will be inevitably lost for us unless it is cherished, fought for and preserved in the same way in which it was proclaimed and won in the beginning."

There you have it. All too long, especially since 1919, we figured that money could buy anything on the commodity market—but the most coveted possession, freedom, was not so easily to be had.

Now we know that we did not appreciate it when we had it. We are giving our lifeblood to reestablish that freedom. And, once we have traversed the road to victory, we must be determined to preserve that liberty.

Why didn't we think of this last time? What reason is there to expect that we will, at long last, profit by these most-costly mistakes?

Well, suppose we look back to the last time. President Wilson enunciated in his 14 points a program which coincides largely with President Roosevelt's "four freedoms."

Yes, we did fight last time, too, with a purpose in mind. Unfortunately, however, that purpose—those 14 points—all was forgotten in the excitement of the comparatively quick armistice.

Mind you, up to the fateful eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month the people of the world believed in the establishment of controls and agencies which would keep the peace once it was so dearly won. There were no Gallup polls then, but historians tell us that at that moment the American people favored some such organization as the League of Nations and World Court.

President Wilson sailed to France to implement that popular sentiment—to achieve a peace treaty which would eliminate the causes for war.

But suddenly a change came over our people. We wanted to get back to normal—mind you, not to plan for a better world, but just to return to the pre-war status. The ticker tape and confetti we showered on the returning soldiers and sailors became a film, a curtain which closed to our eyes what was going on beyond our shores.

President Wilson worked on, little aware of this change of sentiment. When he came home 6 months later with the best peace he could effect—although we know now that it was not a perfect peace by any means—when President Wilson brought that treaty home he found his own countrymen aloof—yes, even hostile—to the terms.

We never did ratify that treaty. In fact, it took a resolution of the Congress in 1921 to declare that the state of war with Germany no longer existed

Why such aloofness, such hostility? Well, the American people barely knew what had happened at Versailles. Correspondents were on the scene. They did their best to cover a difficult assignment. However, most of what was written into the treaty was worked out behind closed doors.

The finished product was dumped into the world's lap. It was now beyond the stage of discussion and debate. Take it or leave it—and leave a world still torn asunder. The people had to accept the treaty as it was, a whole entity full of holes, or forget about peace. Part of the world accepted, part demurred. And the holes remained.

We do have reason to believe that this will not happen again. The world is sadder, but the world is wiser. Education has become more widespread. You enter this afternoon a growing company of college-trained thinkers. The printing press and the camera refresh the mind with new reflections. And we now have radio.

Private tutors gave way to private schools. Private schools made way for our great public-school system. But transportation remained an impediment to the universality of education. Now, with radio, we have bypassed this handicap.

Suppose for a moment that we had had radio in 1919. Whatever happened at Paris and at Versailles would have become public knowledge within a few hours. There would have been sessions behind closed doors; we still have them today. But eventually the diplomats would have had to come before the microphones to tell the world what was happening, what was proposed, what were the advantages and the disadvantages. Even the most astute politician could not have remained in hiding too long.

Would that have made any difference? Well, at least the American public would have known what was being written into the treaty. It would not have been necessary for President Wilson to stump the country, outlining the benefits of the League of Nations to unlistening ears at scattered whistle stops.

I can't claim that radio at Versailles would have changed the course of the world's history. But radio would have brought these men—Wilson, Lloyd George, and the others—to the world so that the people could weigh their words. Nothing is so persuasive as the human voice.

One afternoon at Gettysburg a gaunt, towering figure spoke out:

"We highly resolve * * * that these dead shall not have died in vain. * * * That government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

It was a Presidential address, but most newspapers paid no more attention to it than to any other cemetery oration.

A few months ago another President spoke out:

"We are united in seeking the kind of victory that will guarantee our grandchildren can grow and, under God, may live their lives free from the constant threat of invasion, destruction, slavery, and violent death."

Those words gave fresh courage to a nation burdened by the greatest war in history. Those words gave fresh life to our sister nations throughout the world who fight with us.

I make no claim that radio will win the war. It has been called the secret weapon, but it hasn't achieved any military victories that I've noticed in the official communiques.

If radio could have won the war, it would have been won long ago—by the Axis. The dictators are past masters in the use—or, I should say, the abuse—of radio. They employ it as a black-out—to black out independent thought. We of the democracies, however, insist on radio as a torch to enlighten the whole world.

Yes, radio can be used and has been used by devilish minds as well as by those more saintly To guarantee its use for the greatest good is the task of men of education; men and women like yourselves, who are trained in the law and who know about the imposition of limitations and guaranties and safety measures.

It is from that standard known as the law that human privileges are elevated to the dignity of human rights. Law embraces the accumulation of capital, the elevation of labor, the improvement and cultivation of the land. It means the continuous order which is the only parent of personal liberty and political right.

Justice which enthrones man and destroys tyrants. When gales of prejudice, alarm, and hysteria sweep through the land, the lawyer must be stalwart in the defense of freedom of speech, freedom of worship, and freedom of the press and radio—yes, and freedom of assembly—even when popular will is inclined otherwise. These are our foundation. They must never be lightly considered or temporarily shelved.

I am convinced of radio as a means of winning the peace. But, you ask, why not wait until after the war to worry about that?

If we are to achieve a just peace—the durable peace—we must prepare for it now. We must act today, for today we stand united; tomorrow even the slightest disagreement may tear us asunder.

If the horrors of Coventry, the bloodletting at Leningrad, the carnage on Corregidor—if these do not stir a positive yearning—a demand—for world order, then, indeed, humanity is hopeless and nothing can save it.

And how are we to act?

We must work toward getting a public opinion which not only is vaguely sentimental toward a peaceful world and some kind of force that is going to keep the peace, but a public opinion that is willing to count the costs and make up its mind to stand those costs.

There are many who would do nothing about the peace until after arms have been laid down. They see no need for discussion, let alone action, at this time. They feel that all problems will be solved in due course if we but let them simmer.

If that be so, what should we do about French north Africa? Simply permit the pot to simmer and the mixture to thicken in the darkness of a hands-off policy? Has not the glare of publicity, largely accomplished by radio, brought out what might well have become a cancerous growth in the very sides of our fighting men?

Now, by all means, is the time to consider and to discuss the conflicting forces in north Africa. Whatever commitments are made, even though they be called only temporary, will have a tremendous effect on the post-war settlement.

And what about the small countries like Yugoslavia? If we adopt simply a stand-off attitude and let the status quo remain until after the war, we are simply closing our eyes and dreaming of the return to normal. That is precisely what the previous generation did in 1919.

Meanwhile the strife goes on within Yugoslavia between the Partisans and the Chetniks—and both of them fighting against the Axis. What is the status quo here? With whom are we to deal? With the government-in-exile in London or with the Partisans in the Balkan hills?

That situation must be studied today. We must hear the facts and we must think them through before we act.

Largest of all is the problem of what to do with Germany. Only last Sunday on the American forum several of the Nation's foremost literary figures discussed that very question: Shall we blame only the Nazis? There is a decided difference of opinion as to whom to hold to account for the bloody decade of Hitlerism. Shall it be only Hitler and his henchmen, the Nazis generally, the Junkers of Prussia, or the German people as a whole?

Certainly that forum provoked discussion among Americans—a broad discussion, as the telegrams and early letters show. Americans are by no means agreed on what should be done. But they are agreed on one thing. They do want to hear these problems discussed now, so that they can think them through now.

And the people's thoughts—public opinion—does have a tremendous effect on government in a democracy. It may not achieve at once what it sets out to do, but the driving force of public opinion is a constant spur.

You graduates, especially trained in the law, have the ability to appreciate the higher values, the goals toward which mankind strives. It is for you to use your training, your experience in the shaping and directing of public opinion in the difficult days which lie ahead.

As counselors of law, you will become factors in your communities. Service in the armed forces may delay this for a time. But the degree you receive here today stamps you

as potential leaders in all walks—and in all uniforms.

You will have an important part in helping to fashion public opinion for a durable peace. Your ideas will be accepted with greater weight because you will be steeped in the law.

Yours will be the true era of opportunity—not so much the opportunity to get rich quick and live off the fat of the land, but the opportunity to help make America and the world the grand place that the preceding generation did not care to plan for.

The road ahead does, then, look brighter to men and women with a vision based on education. You can now gather about you the forces for good throughout the world, with the help of the press, the camera, and the radio.

It is to you that the little people look to leadership to a better world, little people like the Yugoslav partisan named Peter, who left his wife to fight in the woods against the Nazis.

On his body several weeks later was found a letter Peter had written to his unborn son, from which I quote:

"May you seek always and strive always in good faith and high courage, in this world where men grow so tired.

"Keep your power to receive everything; only learn to select what your instinct tells you is right.

"Keep your love of life but throw away your fear of death. Life must be loved or it is lost; but it should never be loved too well.

"Keep your delight in friendship; only learn to know your friends.

"Keep your intolerance; only save it for what your heart tells you is bad.

"Keep your wonder at great and noble things like sunlight and thunder, the rain and the stars, the wind and the sea, the growth of trees and the return of harvests, and the greatness of heroes.

"Keep your heart hungry for new knowledge; keep your hatred of a lie; and keep your power of indignation.

"Now I know I must die, and you must be born to stand upon the rubbish heap of my errors. Forgive me for this. I am ashamed to leave you an untidy, uncomfortable world. But so it must be.

"In thought, as a last benediction, I kiss your forehead. Good night to you—and good morning and a clear dawn."

Benefits Under Railroad Retirement Act Exempt From Income and Victory Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSF OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, practically every Member of Congress has retired railroad men in their district and has received inquiries as to whether annuities and pensions under the Railroad Retirement Act are subject to the Federal income and Victory tax.

The following information was released by the general counsel of the Railroad Retirement Board and discloses that railroad-retirement annuities and pensions are exempt from income and Victory tax.

For the information of my colleagues I am herewith inserting a copy of the memorandum prepared by the General Counsel of the Railroad Retirement Board:

MEMORANDUM

CHICAGO, ILL., *December 29, 1942.*

To: The Board.

From: The General Counsel.

Subject: Taxability under the Revenue Act of 1942 of annuity and pension payments made pursuant to the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937.

Several inquiries from various sources have been made as to whether or not annuity and pension payments made pursuant to the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 are subject either to the general income tax imposed by the Revenue Act of 1942 or to the Victory tax imposed by section 172 of that act.

I am attaching a copy of a memorandum addressed to me by Mr. A. H. Myers, of my staff, which contains an analysis of the provisions of the income tax in question, and on the basis of that analysis and the express exemption contained in section 12 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, it is my opinion that annuity and pension payments made pursuant to the Retirement Act are not subject to either the general income tax imposed by the Revenue Act of 1942 or the Victory tax imposed by section 172 thereof.

There is also attached a copy of a letter addressed to Mr. Latimer by the Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue in which the opinion is likewise expressed that annuities and pensions received pursuant to the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 are not subject to the Victory tax imposed by section 172 of the Revenue Act of 1942 and therefore should be excluded from gross income in computing the Victory-tax net income.

JOSEPH H. FREEHILL,
General Counsel.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 16, 1942.

The Honorable MURRAY W. LATIMER,
Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Reference is made to your letter of November 12, 1942, in which you request to be advised as to whether the annuity and pension payments made pursuant to the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 307) are subject to the Victory tax under the provisions of section 450 of the Internal Revenue Code, as added by section 172 of the Revenue Act of 1942.

Section 172 of the Revenue Act of 1942 designates the Victory tax as a "temporary income tax on individuals," and section 451 of the Internal Revenue Code defines the term "Victory tax net income," as used in section 450 thereof, to mean gross income (excluding certain items not material herein) less certain expenses and other specified allowable deductions. Section 22 (a) of the code sets forth the general definition of the term "gross income" and under section 19.22 (a)-1 of Regulations 103, promulgated thereunder, it is stated that "gross income includes * * * income derived from any source whatever, unless exempt from tax by law."

Based on the specific provision of section 12 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 regarding the nontaxability of annuities or pensions paid by the Railroad Retirement Board under the act, it was held in I. T. 3115, Cumulative Bulletin 1937-2, page 62, that such payments were not subject to income tax in the hands of the recipients.

Accordingly, the annuities and pensions received pursuant to the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 are not subject to the Victory tax imposed by section 450 of the code, as amended, and should be excluded from gross income in computing the Victory tax net income.

Respectfully,

———— ————,
Deputy Commissioner.

MEMORANDUM

CHICAGO, ILL., *November 18, 1942.*

To: The general counsel.

From: Mr. A. H. Myers.

Subject: Applicability of the provisions of the Revenue Act of 1942 (Public Law 753, 77th Cong., 2d sess.) upon the benefits provided by the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this memorandum is to attempt briefly to ascertain whether or not the Revenue Act of 1942, approved October 21, 1942, affects benefits payable under the Railroad Retirement Act or the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act by the levying of an income tax on such benefits. In the consideration of the problem, rulings of the Income Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue are reviewed in order better to understand the treatment for income-tax purposes of the benefits granted by the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Also, the applicable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, the regulations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and the amendments made to the Internal Revenue Code by the Revenue Act of 1942 are cited. Save for the specific sections referred to herein, all other provisions of the new revenue act appear irrelevant to the present inquiry. It should be noted, however, that at the present time the complete hearings of the House and Senate on the 1942 Revenue Act have not been printed, so that it is impossible to know definitely what was or what was not before Congress in the enactment of this law.

PROVISIONS OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Section 12 of the Railroad Retirement Act states:

"No annuity or pension payment shall be assignable or be subject to any tax or to garnishment, attachment, or other legal process under any circumstances whatsoever, nor shall the payment thereof be anticipated."

A like provision is present in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, section 2 (e):

"No benefits shall be assignable or be subject to any tax or to garnishment, attachment, or other legal process under any circumstances whatsoever, nor shall the payment thereof be anticipated."

RULINGS OF THE INCOME TAX UNIT OF THE BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Prior to the Revenue Act of 1942, the Income Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue had ruled, in several decisions, that payments made under the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1934 (I. T. 2842, XIV—1, C. B. 43), of 1935 (I. T. 3069, 1937—1, C. B. 59) and of 1937 (I. T. 3115, 1937—2, C. B. 62) are not subject to Federal income tax in the hands of the recipients in view of the express prohibitions contained in each of the acts against taxing such payments.[1] Although no ruling has yet been made by the Income Tax Unit under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, the conclusions reached therein appear equally applicable to that act for like reasons.

Even without such a specific prohibition, the Income Tax Unit had ruled that payments made by the Federal Government under the Social Security Act of 1935, either as lump sums (I. T. 3194, 1938—1, C. B. 114; I. T. 3229, 1938—2, C. B. 136), or by a State agency on account of unemployment (I. T. 3230, 1938—2, C. B. 136) are likewise not subject to Federal income tax, and, further, that none of the Federal benefit payments made under the 1939 amendments to the Social Security Act are subject to such tax (I. T. 3447, 1941—1, C. B. 191).

[1] The prohibitions referred to were similar to the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, quoted above.

In view of the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act expressly prohibiting taxation of benefits, as quoted above, the question presented is: Were those provisions, together with the foregoing ruling of the Bureau of Internal Revenue under those acts which were predicated upon them, affected by the subsequent enactment of the Revenue Act of 1942, either expressly or impliedly? Since an examination of the Revenue Act of 1942 reveals no express changes made in either the Railroad Retirement Act or the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, the inquiry is actually restricted in scope to ascertaining whether any change has impliedly been made in those acts, bearing in mind that amendments or repeals by implication are not favored in the law. A reading of the Revenue Act of 1942 fails even to disclose any change arising by mere inference.

The only sections of the revenue act which might remotely be claimed to have wrought any change upon either the Railroad Retirement Act or the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act appear to be those relating to the definition of "gross income," its inclusions and exclusions. The remainder of this memorandum, therefore, is addressed to a discussion of the possible inclusion or exclusion of benefits provided by the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts as gross income under the internal-revenue code as it existed up to the effective date of the Revenue Act of 1942, as well as thereafter. The purpose is to ascertain (1) whether without express tax immunity such benefits would have been taxable as being included within the definition of gross income in the Internal Revenue Code prior to the enactment date of the 1942 Revenue Act; (2) whether the conclusions reached in (1) were changed by the Revenue Act of 1942; and (3) if changed, whether these changes are operative upon the express tax-immunity sections of the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE AND BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE REGULATIONS

In the foregoing decisions of the Bureau of Internal Revenue pertaining to the Social Security Act and its amendments, which act contains no express taxing prohibition, no reason was assigned for the conclusions reached. However, a reference to the Internal Revenue Code and the regulations promulgated thereunder by the Bureau of Internal Revenue will, it seems, supply this omission, and, in addition, will reveal the character of the payments made under the Social Security Act. Such payments are, by analogy, similar to benefits payable under the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts.

Section 22 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code provides, in part:

" 'Gross income' includes gains, profits, and income derived from salaries, wages, or compensation for personal service of whatever kind and in whatever form paid * * * and income derived from any source whatever. * * *"

The Bureau of Internal Revenue regulations 103, section 19.22 (a)-2, state: "* * * retired pay of Federal and other officers, and pensions or retiring allowances paid by private persons or by the United States are income to the recipients * * *. However, so-called pensions awarded by one to whom no services have been rendered are mere gifts or gratuities and are not taxable." Under section 22 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code,[2] gifts (save for the income from such property) are expressly excluded from gross income. It, therefore, appears that the payments, whether denominated annuities or pensions (as under the Railroad Retirement Act) or insurance benefits (as under the Social Security Act), made under the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, or the Social Security Act, are gifts or gratuities not awarded for services rendered to the Federal Government, and consequently are not taxable income.

Nor does it appear reasonable to hold that the mere denomination of such benefits as insurance or annuity payments in these acts operates to bring them within any of the exceptions to the exclusions from gross income found in section 22 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code. This provision removes from the operation of the exclusions to gross income the proceeds of certain insurance or annuity contracts. In other words, it includes in gross income specified amounts received from certain types of insurance policies or from annuity contracts. The gratuitous character of the payments under the Railroad Retirement Act and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act negatives the existence of a contractual obligation which might make the foregoing inclusions applicable.[3] Moreover, the fact that in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act the amounts paid by the employer are styled contributions[4] would not seem to destroy the gratuitous nature of the benefits payable under that act so as to bring them within the annuities contemplated by section 22 (b) (2), despite the ruling in I. T. 2842,[5] decided under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1934. It was there held that the amount of the contributions paid by an employee through deduction thereof from the employee's compensation was to be included in the gross income of the latter, without reduction.

The language of that decision stating that the transaction was to be regarded "as though the employee had actually received the compensation in full and thereafter expended * * * it as his contribution toward the purchase of an annuity payable to him upon his retirement," must be considered with reference to the particular statute there involved, namely, section 23 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code. That section relates only to the allowance of a deduction from gross income for taxes paid or accrued. Hence, though the contribution payable was held not to be a deductible tax, within the meaning of section 23 (c), it does not appear reasonable completely to divorce the language from the particular problem there presented.[6]

In passing, section 22 (b) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code may be observed, providing, in effect, that amounts received through accident or health insurance or under workmen's compensation acts as compensation for personal injuries or sickness, plus the amount of any damages received either by suit or agreement on account of such injuries or sickness, shall not be included in gross income and shall be exempt from taxation. Section 113 of the Revenue Act of 1942 amends this code section by adding that amounts received as a pension, annuity, or similar allowance for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the armed forces of any country shall likewise be excluded and exempt. It is evident from a reading of section 113 that the amendment was enacted to exclude additionally under section 22 (b) (5) only such disability annuities as might result from injury or sickness in military service and which theretofore had been included in gross income. It is believed that this addition to the exclusions from gross income was not intended impliedly to change or affect in any way other types of pensions, annuities, or similar allowances having no relation to disability resulting from military service. It would be unreasonable, it seems, to impute to Congress an intention to enlarge inclusions in gross income of other types of pensions or annuities having no relation to disability resulting from military service and not otherwise included in gross income, merely by reason of the specific exclusion from gross income of pensions or annuities awarded as the result of disability suffered in the armed forces. A construction of section 113 which would imply such an enlargement of the definition of gross income would be strained, indeed. Therefore, it is believed that section 113 is inapplicable to any disability annuities or pensions under the Railroad Retirement Act, since (1) such annuities or pensions are not awarded "for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the armed forces of any country," as prescribed by the above amendment; and (2) they are otherwise excluded from gross income as gratuities under section 22 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

From what has been said, it follows (1) that the benefits payable under the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act were not included in gross income under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; (2) that they are likewise not included in gross income under the Revenue Act of 1942; and (3) therefore the Revenue Act cannot be considered operative in any way upon the specific provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act expressly exempting such benefits from all taxes, State or Federal. Consequently, being excluded from gross income for Federal income-tax purposes, the benefits are not taxable as income in the hands of the recipients.

VICTORY-TAX PROVISIONS OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1942

An important temporary addition to the Internal Revenue Code, expiring with the cessation of the present hostilities, was made by the Senate in the Revenue Act of 1942. This addition, called a Victory tax, is part of the individual and corporation income-tax laws, constituting subchapter D thereof.

The term "Victory-tax net income" is defined[7] as gross income (excluding, however, certain specified items which would otherwise be included in the general income-tax definition of gross income), minus 13 specific deductions comprising, in the main, most of the deductions permitted by those sections of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, relating to the computation of net income for general income-tax purposes.[8] The term "gross income," as used in this definition, is not itself specifically defined in the Victory-tax provisions. However, as has already been noted,

[2] The amendment made to this section by sec. 111 of the Revenue Act of 1942 is not material here, since the change relates only to what is or is not taxable income from property acquired by gift, etc.

[3] The addition made to this section of the code (in cases of transfers of annuity or insurance policies) by sec. 110 of the Revenue Act of 1942 has no bearing upon the instant discussion.

[4] See sec. 8.

[5] XIV-1, C. B. 43.

[6] In this connection also see Report No. 2668, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 75th Cong., 3d sess., p. 8, and Report No. 2164, Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, 75th Cong., 3d sess., p. 8, referring to the contributions collected by the Board as "taxes."

[7] See sec. 172 of the Revenue Act of 1942.

[8] An exception is made in any taxable year for persons earning $3,000 or less who elect to make returns and pay the tax under the schedule provided in supplement T of the Internal Revenue Code. In that event, "Victory net income," is defined merely as "the gross income for such year," without further qualifications and without any deductions therefrom.

the Victory tax is but a part of the general income-tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. In addition, (c) of the enacting clause of the Revenue Act of 1942 recites: "Except as otherwise expressly provided, terms used in this act shall have the same meaning as when used in the Internal Revenue Code."

Hence, in view of this specific provision as well as in view of the fact that the Victory-tax sections are an integral part of the general levy of an income tax on individuals, it seems fair to conclude that gross income, as used in the Victory tax (with the exception of the express additional exclusions contained in the Victory-tax measure itself), means gross income as used in section 22 (a) and (b) of the general income-tax provisions. Consequently, it may be said, speaking generally, that what was not included in gross income in the latter sections is not included in gross income under the Victory tax; so that benefits under both the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act are excluded equally from all the provisions of the Federal income- and Victory-tax laws.[9]

CONCLUSIONS

It is, therefore, believed that the benefits payable under any of the Railroad Retirement Acts, or under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, are subject to neither the Federal income taxes imposed under the Internal Revenue Code or under the amendments made therein by the Revenue Act of 1942, nor to the Victory tax on incomes provided in the Revenue Act of 1942, because:

1. The benefits, being inherently gratuitous in nature, are excluded from gross income, under the Internal Revenue Code and the Revenue Act of 1942, as well as under the regulations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the decisions of the Income Tax Unit of that Bureau.

2. The express provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act against taxing such benefits still prevail, since it does not appear that these prohibitions have been impliedly or expressly repealed by any subsequent enactments.[10]

[9] An examination of the reports of the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance, as well as of the conference report on the Revenue Act of 1942, fails to disclose any expression contrary to the conclusions reached in this memorandum.

[10] In a wire addressed to Mr. David B. Schreiber, Assistant General Counsel, Railroad Retirement Board, dated November 3, 1942, from A. M. Kobrick, it was stated that the Bureau of Internal Revenue was of the opinion that the Victory tax was probably not applicable to annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act.

Production of Sponge Iron and Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana:

Senate Joint Memorial 8

Memorial to the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the establishment at Great Falls or some other site in Montana of a suitable plant or other facilities for the recovery and production of sponge iron and other strategic minerals from the proven iron ore deposits in Cascade, Judith Basin, Fergus, and Meagher Counties, Mont.

To the President of the United States and to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas we are engaged in a war of survival, the duration of which effort is at the present time uncertain; and

Whereas public recognition has been given to the fact that the success of that effort is at present jeopardized by the lack of sufficient iron and steel scrap to operate our steel mills at capacity; and

Whereas enormous deposits of high-grade low-phosphorus content iron ore do now, and for more than 50 years have been known to exist in Fergus, Judith Basin, Meagher, and Cascade Counties, Mont., suitable under modern metallurgical methods for the economic production of high-grade sponge iron; and

Whereas sponge iron is a suitable and natural substitute for scrap; and

Whereas natural gas and coal deposits in unlimited quantities are known to exist and are now being produced in areas immediately adjacent to said iron ore deposits in ample quantities and with ample reserves to justify the erection of a necessary mill or mills for the production of not only sponge iron, but pig iron and steel if deemed advisable; and

Whereas the people of and industries in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Wyoming, Montana, South Dakota, North Dakota, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, and Alaska, have suffered industrial retardation directly affecting their standard of living from a lack of iron and steel products by virtue of exorbitant freight rates and the concentration of the iron and steel industry of the Nation in the area tributary to the Great Lakes; and

Whereas development contemplated hereby would provide homes, employment, and a better standard of living for hundreds of thousands of our citizens now serving and to serve in the armed forces of the United States upon their resumption of civil life; and

Whereas the feasibility of such a plant has heretofore been recognized by the following authorities, among others: N. H. Weed, of United States Geological Survey, Fort Benton Folio (No. 55) in 1899; Little Belt Mountain Folio (No. 56) in 1899; United States Geological Bulletin by L. G. Westgate in 1920, entitled "Iron Ore Deposits Near Stanford, Mont."; report by Dwight R. Woodbridge (M. E.), 1916, entitled "Iron Lands in Litttle Belt Mountains"; and numerous other publications by geologists and mining engineers of national repute: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That an iron and steel plant or other suitable facilities be erected at Great Falls, or some other convenient point in Montana, for the production of sponge iron and such other iron and steel production as the war effort and economy of the country may require for the development of the iron ore bodies known to exist in Fergus, Judith Basin, Meagher, and Cascade Counties, Mont.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State, and to any other Federal boards, bureaus, commissions, or agencies executing or exercising duties and functions consonant with the tenor of this memorial.

Pay-As-You-Go Income-Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Council of the City of Columbus, Ohio:

Resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to adopt the Ruml plan, or some form of pay-as-you-go income tax plan

Be it resolved by the Council of the City of Columbus, That this body hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to adopt the Ruml plan, or some form of pay-as-you-go income-tax plan; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee; also to Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives; also a copy to Hon. JOHN VORYS, Congressman from this district.

New Dealers Are on Their Way Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GIFFORD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by L. C. Hall, from the Wareham (Mass.) Courier:

NEW DEALERS ARE ON THEIR WAY OUT

(By L. C. Hall, editor, Wareham Courier)

The Democratic Party is again showing signs of life. It was Al Smith who said that the New Dealers found the Democrats in swimming and ran away with their clothes. That was something like 10 years ago and they have been without them ever since, with hardly a struggle to get them back again until quite recently.

The New Dealers have been running the show; not that they outnumber the Democrats or can outvote them, but they have been in possession of all the plums and have been able to distribute them where they would do the most good.

By using the Democratic Party as a vehicle to start them on their journey the New Dealers gained the power to make the old-liners dance to the merry tune they played and for a long time were cocks of the walk, with the real Democrats playing second fiddle and being beholden to them for the crumbs which were parceled out in the form of patronage and benefits.

Surrounded and bewildered, yet somewhat appeased by holding the nominal position of party in power, the old Democrats gave way to the New Dealers and gave lip service to their doctrines, much as the Vichyites in France were forced to embrace nazi-ism and follow Darlan or be left out in the cold in a dreary political world which they had little part in shaping.

Though they still held to their doctrine of State rights, of adherence to the Constitution, and the theory of government by those governed, they made only feeble protest when the most sacred tenets of the Democratic Party were ignored and government by decree rather than by law was forced upon them.

They saw Huey Long boldly announce his dictatorship of the sovereign State of Louisiana, they saw the Tugwells, the Cohens and the Cochrans, Hopkins, Frankfurter, and their left-wingers practicing their planned economy and using the Federal Treasury as a Santa Claus grab bag doling out subsidies and benefits to all the faithful who followed them into their land of dreams.

The Democrats of the solid South were flattered and catered to and given their crumbs of patronage to keep them quiet and make them meekly submit to all that had previously been obnoxious to them. They were in a state of exaltation over the thought that at long last they could give the Yankees and the Wall Streeters their come-uppance, despoil the rich northerners, and gleefully put them in the place to which they believed they belonged.

It was the era of special powers and privileges—an era during which submissive groups of farmers and laborers made their laws and worked their wills against hated capital, against industry, and all who were thrifty and provident.

The New Dealers found their opportunity in the depression which had hit the people hard, and the idea that borrowed money distributed in the right places could become the weapon by which voters could be kept in line became a political gospel that was hard to counteract.

It must not be assumed that Jeffersonian democracy was fooled. It was merely lulled to sleep by the soothing sirup that was ladled out in high-sounding phrases and plausible promises which always smacked of philanthropy and reeked with good intentions. A strange and weird procession of coattail hangers found their way into Washington—crackpots and opportunists—intent on making the most hay while the sun shone. They were looked upon askance by their more stalwart party members, but they could always be depended on to vote as the New Dealers wanted them to and never to ask embarrassing questions as to the soundness of any legislation that bore the New Deal label.

This went on through two administrations which saw most of the New Deal objectives accomplished. It saw Congress reduced to a nonentity which did nothing but endorse legislation which had the White House seal of approval. The cost of government doubled. Laws were passed which built up an army of bureaucrats and almost doubled the number of Federal employees. Blanket policies were written and blank checks were authorized, and those who questioned the wisdom of allowing such great grants of power to be at the disposal of appointed officials were blasted with ridicule and were called economic royalists and accused of living in the horse-and-buggy days.

It was not the war alone that brought the Democratic Party to its senses and sowed the seeds of dissension which are now being manifested. It was fear for the ultimate welfare of the Nation and the socialism or naziism which seemed likely to result if a halt was not called to the ruthlessness with which the Constitution was being ignored.

The New Dealers, masquerading as Democrats, but ignoring the principles of the Party, reached their zenith and were on the way out when the war intervened to give them a new lease of life and to continue them in power for another 4 years. In our foreign relations they never played a very important part and they have never shown much statesmanship and certainly little financial ability. They held strange and weird ideas about the part that money could be made to play and the necessity of employing private capital and brains in order to secure production.

They never concerned themselves much about taxes, or who would ultimately have to pay the bills which they contracted, so long as money could be borrowed and they had the privilege of shoveling it out.

Now all this is changed. The policy of restricted production, of planned scarcity, and of bonuses and benefits no longer can prevail. Billions of dollars must be raised, and the people must be taxed to obtain it, and it can now readily be seen that he who dances must pay the fiddler. Down into every man's pocketbook must go the fingers of Government, and money earned no longer is the property of the owner.

The reign of the New Dealers came to a sudden end when the bombs fell on Pearl Harbor and we had to take an inventory of our national assets to find out how far they could be stretched to cover the necessity of fighting a global war.

Today we have need of practical men in Government, and they are not to be found in the ranks of the New Dealers. Old, practical Democrats are coming to the front and are demanding a reversal of their policies and a return to the day when Congress, representing the people, had a specific function of its own and the will to perform it.

There are three real parties in the country today—the idealistic and dictatorial New Dealers, the Democrats, and the Republicans. Today the Democrats, the real followers of Jefferson, and the Republicans, stemming from the immortal Lincoln, are not very far apart in their conception of a constitutional government capable of carrying on a major war and winning it. Upon questions of fundamental principle we may expect to see the Republicans and the stanch Democrats standing shoulder to shoulder to bring about victory, and after that has been achieved standing together for the rebuilding of an economic system which will be equal to the task of restoring democracy, which has been all but lost during the years when the New Dealers were chasing rainbows in the hope of finding a pot of gold at the end.

Strangely enough it is the Democrats of the South who are shaking off the incubus they have been carrying on their backs. They are the ones who are bringing fear and consternation into the ranks of the heretofore dominant New Dealers. They are refusing to remain rubber-stamps and are proposing statesmanlike laws to restore the Government to the people and give them back their independence.

They are questioning the authority of the bureaucrats to usurp the powers of Congress, they are asking how the money they appropriate is being spent and are demanding efficiency and economy in the administration of our domestic affairs. They are questioning the fitness of appointments made solely on the basis of New Deal rewards for the faithful and are learning to vote with the Republicans when the occasion requires it.

In fact, many of them have never been New Dealers at heart, but were forced into a false position by expediency. They will continue to support the President in all his war efforts and policies, as will the Republicans, but they reserve the right to vote according to their convictions when they feel the welfare of the Nation demands it.

Operation of the O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an exchange of correspondence between myself and the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, Hon. Prentiss M. Brown:

JANUARY 18, 1943.

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: First of all, let me congratulate both you and the country on your having assumed the arduous duties of administration of the Office of Price Administration. All fair-minded persons recognize that this is perhaps the most difficult and positively the most unpopular job that we have in the whole country at the present time. You will have many friends, however, as you undertake it and a great many of these will be on Capitol Hill.

I am writing this letter to make certain suggestions about the operation of the ration program, all of which are based upon the experience of local boards. For the sake of clarity I will number these suggestions.

1. From time to time the chairmen of local boards, or perhaps better yet, the executive secretaries of local boards, from all sections of the country be called to Washington to consult with you and your immediate subordinates about the operation of the program. From them the best possible information about the solution of the problems which arise from time to time could be obtained.

2. The general program for handling gasoline for farmers and particularly for farm trucks, which has been outlined by Mr. Jeffers, the rubber administrator, should be adopted so as to simplify that problem and to definitely place decisions regarding gasoline allotments for farmers out in the hands of local county war boards rather than in some far distant office.

3. It is absolutely essential that all types of forms, applications, and questionnaires, as well as instructions to the local boards, be simplified to the maximum possible extent. Not only have the people generally been unable to understand some of these forms, but local boards themselves have been swamped with the amount of work that must be done in filling them out.

4. It is absolutely essential that rationing of meat and certain other food products be instituted at the earliest possible moment in order that there may be equitable distribution of the supplies that we do have for civilian use. The people will not complain about shortages provided they know that the entire population is sharing and sharing alike.

5. It is, however, equally essential that no ration program be put into effect until sufficient material is prepared so that local boards will not run out of necessary forms and materials.

6. Most local boards are in desperate need of additional clerical help and the pay of at least a portion of these people should be increased. The work that they are doing is as important as any work in our whole country at the present time, and yet many of these people are working for far less than they could obtain in other positions which are less

responsible and on the whole less important. There should be sufficient funds to enable local boards to have adequate quarters and sufficient heat for their buildings. Instead of designating the executive secretary of the boards as the chief clerk, the designation should be either changed back to executive secretary or else he should be designated as an office manager. I do not believe that Congress will be inclined to be at all niggardly with necessary funds for the purpose of enabling local boards to function adequately.

7. There should be the maximum possible decentralization of authority so that local boards acting within the framework of broad general policy can deal with local problems without fear, and so that problems on a somewhat higher level can be in a greater number of cases handled by regional and State offices instead of so many things having to come back to Washington for determination.

I am sending you herewith a copy of some suggestions drawn up by Mr. Donald Myrick, chairman of the War Price and Rationing Board of Santa Barbara, Calif., with which suggestions I know many of the boards in the California area are in full agreement.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY VOORHIS.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1943.

The Honorable JERRY VOORHIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your congratulations upon my appointment as Administrator and for your constructive suggestions for the improvement of our rationing program.

I have investigated the matters you brought to my attention, and I list the results of my investigations below:

Suggestion No. 1: On January 26, a meeting with two chairmen, one or two executive secretaries, and three field liaison men was held to discuss a forthcoming rationing program. This meeting was arranged through the Field Organization Branch at the request of the Rationing Department. It is the hope of the Field Organization Branch that we may establish an advisory committee of men from the local boards.

Suggestion No. 2: The general program for handling gasoline for farmers and particularly for farm trucks seems to be outside of the jurisdiction of the Office of Price Administration.

Suggestion No. 3: The Field Organization Branch is entirely convinced that for effective working of the Office of Price Administration program in the field, the suggestion of simplified forms, applications, and questionnaires should be followed even though this may open the way to occasional injustices.

Suggestion No. 4: The Office of Price Administration agrees that rationing of all essential scarce items should be instituted to insure each of us a fair share of the country's supply of goods. Twelve rationing programs are now being administered by the Office of Price Administration and the list of articles which must be rationed will undoubtedly grow as the months pass and new shortages become imminent.

The Office of Price Administration, however, does not determine that a particular commodity is to be rationed. It is the function of the War Production Board, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Food Administrator to make these determinations. This Office must be prepared to undertake the rationing of any commodity when the necessary authority is given.

Suggestion No. 5. The speed with which we have usually had to launch new rationing programs in order to conserve scarce materials, has often made it difficult for us to get all the materials into the hands of local boards in advance of the start of the program. In that respect I believe that the members of the rationing boards who have communicated with you on the subject have a most justifiable complaint.

We believe, however, that in pending programs we have been able to anticipate requirements to make it possible for materials to be in the hands of the boards sufficiently in advance of the start of the program, to enable them to be familiar with their duties.

Suggestion No. 6. There appears to be much evidence of the need for additional clerical help in many boards even to carry on the present work load. However, in order not to exceed budgetary limitations, we have been forced to depend to a large extent on voluntary assistance. It is our hope that Congress in this session will appreciate the mountainous task undertaken by the local boards and the need for some paid employees at that level.

Suggestion No. 7. We are attempting to decentralize authority more and more but are taking out of the local boards matters dealing with specialized groups such as institutional consumers and manufacturing plants.

I hope for your continued interest and cooperation in the program of the Office of Price Administration. I will be pleased to hear from you in reference to any other matters which may be brought to your attention concerning our administrative problems.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator.

Death by Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently an editorial appeared in the Saturday Evening Post which gives expression to sound observations and logical conclusions relative to the tax situation. Our beloved country is faced with a distinct danger in the multiplication and overlapping of taxes, brought about by the operation of governmental burdens, one concentric within the other, and often seeking to tap the same sources of tax revenue. I commend its reading to all thoughtful Americans.

I have introduced a resolution in Congress entitled "House Joint Resolution 56," for the purpose of creating a commission on tax integration, the object of which commission would be to gather essential helpful data and to bring in recommendations for legislative remedy, the effect of which would be to clarify and eliminate the confusion in our tax structure.

The National Council of Real Estate Taxpayers, with home office in Chicago, of which the executive secretary is the genial and brilliant Larry Holmes, in referring to the editorial from the Saturday Evening Post herein below quoted, in an official bulletin issued by the organization, says:

With its priceless sense of timeliness The Saturday Evening Post printed the editorial cited below at the time Congressman JOHN M. COFFEE'S joint resolution was being introduced in Congress to effectuate exactly that coordination of city and State tax structures with Federal requirements for which the editorial points the imperative demand.

Nothing need be added to the potency of the Post editorial arguments. As a matter of fact, not only the Post but other thoughtful journals and some newspapers are all agreed in this demand for a complete overhauling of the archaic and inefficient tax structure. So are many State and local public officials, United States Treasury officials, President Roosevelt, and others.

The Saturday Evening Post editorial is as follows:

The statement that taxation is an instrument for social change is no news to owners of real estate in the average American city. As the harassed property owner disconsolately orders his house or business property torn down to make way for a parking lot, he needs no further proof of the dictum that "the power to tax is the power to destroy." Anybody who sees whole areas of valuable property in cities like Boston, Chicago, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, or San Francisco condemned to unproductive use has no difficulty in understanding the social consequences of haphazard tax policies.

Although tax schedules on real property reflect the confusion of municipalities confronted with new demands for money and without a clear conception of how to get it, the real evil at this stage of the economic cycle is overvaluation of property for purposes of taxation. In some communities tax assessments are double or even triple the best price that the assessed property will bring in the market. Some authorities estimate that business property must set aside 25 percent of its gross income for local taxation; residential-property taxes average about 15 percent of rental value.

Merely to state it this way is to suggest one trouble with municipal taxation: it bears too remote a relation to the income-producing or, as the English put it, the "annual" value of property. A building assessed at $100,000 20 years ago is psychologically fixed in the assessors' minds at $100,000, despite the fact that it may be producing so little income that the owner will have to give it up altogether if required to pay taxes on any such valuation. In England, real estate is taxed exclusively on its rental value because the income-tax principle guides all conceptions of taxation. It is unlikely that such a solution would be possible for the United States, but some means of taking greater account of the productive value of property, as well as its capital value, would be helpful.

Other remedies which have been tried or suggested in various cities include local sales taxes, maximum limitation on real-estate taxation, pay roll taxes like that levied in Philadelphia, and economies in local administration. The last suggestion has seldom produced important results and, in cities facing demands for extension of services to meet increasing populations of defense workers, curtailment of spending becomes a forlorn hope.

Nevertheless, few will contest the cogency of the argument that unless we want our cities to continue planlessly toward a point where every house is a potential parking lot in a town with no reason to park, something must be done to coordinate the tax structures of cities with State and Federal requirements and to make real-estate taxes bear some relation to municipal development.

National Resources Planning Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include the following broadcast by John B. Hughes, in which he discusses the action of the House in eliminating the appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board:

As the world waits expectantly tonight for new war developments, President Roosevelt has just issued an order making a 48-hour minimum workweek the policy of the Nation, to aid the national mobilization in view of 1943 war plans, which call for an invasion of Europe in what Economic Director James Byrnes called one of the greatest military operations ever planned in history.

The 48-hour week will be applied wherever necessary in areas where the Manpower Commission considers the labor shortage critical. Manpower Chief McNutt promptly applied the order to 32 critical labor-shortage regions, from Bath, Maine, to San Diego, Calif.; from Portland, Oreg., and Seattle, Wash., to Panama City, Fla.

In these areas the mandatory 48-hour week applies to all employees, not just in war-material plants—all workers. It will be extended to other areas.

But this order is not all that it might seem. While a minimum 48-hour workweek is mandatory, the 40-hour-week wage rules prevail, requiring overtime pay for the additional required hours.

Thus it is clear that while more production may be achieved from a depleted manpower, it will cost the Nation more—costs of labor in designated areas will run 10 percent more at the maximum, and many workers will receive an increase of 30 percent in wages at the maximum. But, of course, if it helps solve the manpower shortage and increases production it can probably be considered worth the cost.

To many, it will seem a move far short of the need—a move that evades the fundamental issues.

In the hours preceding Mr. Byrnes' discussion of national economy in wartime, the House Appropriations Committee came forth today with a recommendation which may have far-reaching consequences on the future of our national economy. America as we know it is the result of growth. Like life itself it is a continuing, uninterrupted process, and like life it is subject to the influence of changing conditions, situations, and influences.

In the beginning there was a continent to be had for the taking, a continent filled with the wealth of running waters, forests, mineral resources, and the richness of dark earth that split to the plow and gave forth abundantly at the urging of rain. Such was the land which fostered a nation, a nation in which free enterprise bloomed only because it was underwritten by government. In a manner of speaking it was collectivist aid that insured the national development of individuals. There was free land or cheap land for the farmer, the miner, the lumberman, the railroad builder. Everyone enjoyed subsidy in one form or another, protective tariffs to maintain profits, wages, and farm prices, even the attitude of laissez faire was a form of subsidization.

The New York Times on Sunday, January 31, printed an excellent column explaining what it called our "fraternal, paternalistic, collectivistic record," and stated that even the rugged individualists of business were less apt to march to power "over the bodies of weaker competitors" than they were to invite the opponent in "on the ground floor of a nice little trust."

There is a vast difference between freedom to exploit and freedom to produce, and the American era of freedom to exploit either material or human resources came to a thunderous close in the crash of 1929. Before the New Deal was voted into office we had begun to recognize that the day had passed in which we could afford the ungoverned exploitation of our resources. The system of free enterprise as we had known it had collapsed; it had failed in the face of changing condition and circumstance, and American Government was faced with the task of rehabilitating the Nation. Business and capital and labor and the farmer, all of them were very glad to let Government assume that task. In 1931 there was created a Federal Employment Stabilization Board, which later gave rise to the National Resources Planning Board in response to the recognition that the freedom to exploit would have to be changed to a freedom to produce.

For some years the National Resources Planning Board has been under fire from congressional critics, despite the fact that the Board was attempting to survey our national resources, human and material, to suggest plans for the proper development of our resources and to achieve the economic restoration for which we have been striving since 1929. The Board functioned as a service of information for the Executive and legislative branches of Government.

Today critics of the Board were probably pleased to hear that the House Appropriations Committee voted to abolish the National Resources Planning Board by refusing to grant it any funds for the coming fiscal year.

In arriving at its decision, the Appropriations Committee took exception to testimony submitted by members of the board, and heard two witnesses, one for it and the other against it. The witness testifying favorably for the Board was Beardsley Ruml, chairman of the New York Federal Reserve Board and author of the Ruml pay-as-you-go tax plan. In less than 100 words Mr. Ruml gave his reasons why it was desirable to continue the National Resources Planning Board, which is now one of the key Government agencies working on post-war planning. The Appropriations Committee pointed out that 157 other agencies are engaged in such planning, and Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, said, "we are going to be fairly bewildered unless we get" the planning "properly localized and coordinated." Such coordination was one of the goals of the National Resources Planning Board.

Testifying against continuing the Board, Representative F. C. SMITH, of Ohio, was highly critical of the pamphlets and reports published by the Board during its existence. Mr. SMITH stated, and I quote: "The National Resources Planning Board already speaks of 'modified free enterprise with its voluntary employment, its special reward for effort, imagination and improvements, its elasticity and competition,' and the 'rise of the national state with its economic programs.' The Board is not only unnecessary, but it is unquestionably dangerous to constitutional government. Its stated aims, methods, and means of executing its purposes follow closely the patterns of Russian communism, nazi-ism in Germany, and fascism in Italy."

Now, that is a very serious charge to make against an agency which for 10 years has devoted itself to the better development and use of our resources, and has been concerning itself with our future. Aside from the fact that Mr. SMITH implies his own disapproval of competition and special rewards for effort and imagination, his charges of totalitarianism should have spurred the House Appropriations Committee into making a greater investigation of the Board. More witnesses should have been called and more testimony taken. So far as I can determine from an examination of the Board's aims and purposes, there is nothing about them that smacks of communism or nazi-ism, or fascism. So far as I can determine, the Board seeks an extension of basic American principles along lines that fit the conditions and circumstances of these times and the foreseeable future.

The Board's post-war planning agenda includes plans with private enterprise, which include the encouragement of private initiative to seek a maximum production of goods and services by private enterprise in the post-war world, Government aids and controls to provide an economic climate in which private enterprise, particularly industry and agriculture, may operate free from monopolistic practices.

Perhaps the best explanation of the Board's aims can be found in the report on the Board submitted to Congress a year ago by President Roosevelt. In that report the Board spoke of our national freedoms and rights, and I quote: "We look forward to securing, through planning and cooperative action, a greater freedom for the American people. Great changes have come in our century, with the industrial revolution, the rapid settlement of the continent, the development of technology, the acceleration of transportation and communication, the growth of modern capitalism, and the rise of the national state with its economic programs. Too few corresponding adjustments have been made in our provisions for human freedom. In spite of all these changes, that great manifesto, the Bill of Rights, has stood unshaken 150 years, and now to the old freedoms we must add new freedoms and restate our objectives in modern terms. These are the universals of life:

"Freedom of speech and expression, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. Any new declaration of personal rights, any translation of freedom into modern terms applicable to the people of the United States here and now, must include: One—the right to work, usefully and creatively through the productive years. Two—the right to fair pay, adequate to command the necessities and amenities of life in exchange for work, ideas, thrift, and other socially valuable service. Three—the right to adequate food, clothing, shelter, and medical care. Four—the right to security, with freedom from fear of old age, want, dependency sickness, unemployment, and accident. Five—the right to live in a system of free enterprise, free from compulsory labor, irresponsible private power, arbitrary public authority, and unregulated monopolies. Six—the right to come and go, to speak or be silent, free from the spyings of secret political police. Seven—the right to equality before the law, with equal access to justice in fact. Eight—the right to education, for work, for citizenship, and for personal growth and happiness; and, nine—the right to rest, recreation, and adventure; the opportunity to enjoy life and take part in advancing civilization. These rights and opportunities we in the United States want for ourselves and for our children now and when this war is over. They go beyond the political forms and freedoms for which our ancestors fought and which they

handed on to us, because we live in a new world in which the central problems arise from new pressures of power, production, and population, which our forefathers did not face.

"Their problem was freedom and the production of wealth, the building of this continent with its farms, industries, transportation, and power; ours is freedom and the distribution of abundance, so that there may be no unemployment while there are adequate resources and men ready to work and in need of food, clothing, and shelter. It is to meet this new turn of events that the declaration of rights is demanded. But in formulating these new rights, we are not blind to the obligations which go with every right, obligations of the individual to use well his rights and to insist on the same rights for others, and obligations of the community to support and protect the institutions which make these rights actual. We believe that the American people are ready to assume these obligations and take the private and public action they impose." (From the National Resources Planning Board Report submitted to Congress in January 1942.)

Rather than enter a full-blown debate with Representative SMITH as to whether or not the aims of the Board are communistic, fascistic, wishful thinking or day dreaming, let me suggest to you that you can decide for yourselves whether or not the Board deserves a continued place among the organizations studying post-war problems for the sake of our national survival. National Resources Planning Board pamphlets may be obtained through the Office of the Superintendent of Documents in Washington, D. C., at a cost of 5 cents a piece. Pamphlets are available on housing, transportation, employment, better cities, and on post-war planning. After reading these and other Board documents, then you can decide for yourselves whether the Board is a danger to constitutional government, or an attempt to expand and build a better America in accordance with the principles by which we have lived since 1787.

Address of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker Before New York State Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker before New York State Legislature, Albany, N. Y., February 22, 1943:

To the Members of the Legislature of the Great State of New York:

What a proud moment for all of us to revere the birthday of the Father of our Country, whose spirit still leads us in these trying days in the fight for the life of this Nation, which he founded.

In coming to you tonight, I am not unmindful of the exceptional honor, and I accept it not as an individual or personal tribute, but as a tribute to a symbol, to which I have contributed in my humble way.

The symbol that has made America great—inspired throughout the generations by our forefathers, and which has woven its way through the history of these great United States like a golden thread, comprised of imagination, individuality, self-reliance, initiative and, last, but not least, eternal but simple faith in the Supreme Being.

As all of you have either heard or read of my Pacific mission, there is little need of my dwelling on that subject with the exception of stating that after visiting with General MacArthur's boys in New Guinea—Port Moresby, Buna, and Gona—I returned to Australia, and then through the Fijis to Guadalcanal, a veritable hell-hole, as the rainy season had just started.

Henderson Field runway is a metal strip that has been bombed and shelled for months, and is also the airplane graveyard of the Pacific, not only for enemy planes, but our own as well.

Dugouts were filled with mud and water. Men were working in jumpers without shoes or socks. Marines and soldiers were in the fox holes with billions of mosquitoes. Malaria was prevalent, as was diarrhea.

Here you will find a Catholic priest, Protestant preacher, or a Jewish rabbi—all preaching the simple faith of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews alike.

Oh, men and women of America, if you could only understand what our boys—your boys and mine—are going in these hell-holes throughout the Pacific and the burning sands of Africa, that your way of life may be preserved, and the character that has made this Nation great may be carried on, you would not worry about 8 hours a day—overtime—or double time for Sundays and holidays, for this is a life and death struggle for the welfare of this Nation.

Without victory social security, old-age pensions, wage-and-hour bills will mean nothing.

France had her slow-down and sit-down strikes—had her social legislation, which I am not against—but they failed in the realization that without work and without producing something of value, they could not last.

Today, they are serfs and slaves of Hitler's horders. Millions of men, women, and children are starving That goes for Holland, Belgium, the Scandinavian countries, Bataan, Corregidor, Hong Kong, Singapore, and the Philippines.

Accept your responsibilities with the privileges that you are enjoying. Remember patriotism without service is a hollow word.

Make this land your land, so that it will be a livable place for your children at it has been for you, and make it the right kind of place for your boys to return to. Recognize your obligation to the heritage you enjoy, by being a citizen.

And to those 5,000,000 aliens who have failed to accept the responsibilities of citizenship of this Nation, but who came here to enjoy its fruits and privileges, apply tomorrow for your first papers and the responsibilities that go with them—if not, go back to where you came from.

Do not let these boys come back from their graves in these hell holes scattered throughout the Pacific, and other parts of the world, and from the depths of the seven seas—do not let them come back and plague you for having failed in your obligation on the home front to give them more and more of everything that is needed to hasten a final victory.

For we have the need to conduct ourselves now so that we can look those others in the face when they come home again—those who live to come home.

I know you realize that I have said—and I say again—we have in the past several years spent billions of dollars to destroy self-reliance, initiative, imagination, and individuality, trying to plan the lives of 130,000,000 people by a superior few. Now we are spending billions to recreate self-reliance, initiative, imagination, and individuality.

For once you place our boys in a fox hole in the jungles of the Pacific, or on the desert sands of Africa, they are on their own. Once you have ordered our boys as commando troops to attack the enemy at night, they are on their own. Once you have dropped parachute troops behind enemy lines, day or night, they are on their own. Once you place a man in the cockpit of a plane and send him into the blue above, he is on his own. Once you put our boys into the tanks against the enemy, they are on their own. Once you put an officer into the front line, leading a group of our boys into the face of enemy fire, he is on his own.

It is imagination, individuality, self-reliance, and initiative that are going to win this war for America—not only on the field of battle but on the home front as well.

For, bear in mind, that when this war is over—pray God it will be soon—there will be more rugged individualists come back to America from the four corners of the world than we ever had at any one time in our history—and I thank God for that.

As I have said before, if necessary to make us appreciate our duties, bring back the troops from the hellholes of the world, place them in the factories—take the war workers, particularly those single men without dependents from 18 to 38 years of age, and place them in the fox holes with the filth, vermin, diarrhea, malaria, and the Japanese, and I will guarantee you that our production will be increased, and much of it doubled, within 30 days.

We would have no more feather bedding—no more slow-downs—no more restrictions on effort.

The perpetual slow-down in war industry caused by absenteeism—particularly in the aircraft industry where it exceeds an average of 10 percent—is probably the most flagrant abuse of our obligation since Pearl Harbor.

In the Boeing factory alone, the day following Christmas, 26 percent of the employees were absentees, and our aviators in those hellholes are crying their eyes out for only a few more Flying Fortresses.

In the Douglas plant there was an absenteeism of 11,000 employees the day after Christmas—a shocking and deplorable condition.

It is not the loss of individual man-hours that is so deadly, but the accumulated loss of thousands of hours on the production line of other employees caused by individual absenteeism which, during the past year, has run well into hundreds of millions of man-hours.

Cut this absenteeism in half and our fighting forces throughout the world will be grateful, as it will add sufficient planes and parts, and other weapons for their use to hasten final victory, and save the lives of untold thousands of our boys.

There is no absenteeism in the fox holes in the jungles of the Pacific or the burning sands or mud holes of Africa, for if attempted there they would get a bayonet in their bellies from their buddies.

We hear a lot nowadays about the shortage of manpower hours. It is not the shortage of manpower hours that is slowing up the badly needed production of our war weapons and supplies. No—but it is the shortage of productive manpower hours, for again none of us are producing so much that we cannot—all of us—produce a little more.

There are still millions of old men and middle-aged women unemployed by war industries who would gladly and conscientiously contribute if given an opportunity.

Give us back that old-fashioned American incentive and love of country, and we will produce enough war weapons to turn heaven and hell upside down on the head of Mussolini, Hitler, and Tojo.

For experienced production men—and, thank God, we have many—know from actual results that those manufacturers who have retained the incentive plan report that their experiences under actual production conditions prove to them that they would lose 50 percent effectiveness if their employees were on the straight 40-hour week and hourly rate.

Further, these same manufacturers also report a noticeably lower absenteeism in their plants than in plants where only hourly rate men are employed.

Certainly, the experience of years of "know how" by men who have been honest with labor should be worth listening to in this country's need of productive manpower hours.

Let our labor leaders become leaders in fact as well as name, and take advantage of the great opportunity that is theirs and ask Congress to repeal for the duration only that section covering the weekly hours of the wage-and-hour law, but use the present hourly rate as a basis for pay or wages.

Why don't these labor leaders omit monthly dues and initiation fees now for the duration for all union members—particularly in view of the fact they have millions in their coffers.

Or better still, collect the dues and initiation fees and purchase war bonds for their membership on a monthly basis in order that they, too, can claim equality of sacrifices.

For again experience has proven that manufacturers in many industries who are operating on the incentive plan are showing a conservative increase in production per manpower hour of at least 33⅓ percent over those operating under the wage-and-hour law.

This would give us an increase of 5,500,000 extra workers among the 16,500,000 now employed in manufacturing on a 48-hour week without overtime. This increase in productive manpower hours would not only take care of the estimated 2,100,000 employees that will be needed to take care of increased war production, but would leave free 3,400,000 men, now on the pay rolls in manufacturing, for farms or other needed essential services.

For these unbelievable facts are true. If 12 men work 10 hours a day instead of 8, they gain 24 hours—a day and a night. If 12,000,000 men work on the same basis, they gain 1,000,000 days and nights.

Assuming 300 work days to a year, the total gain of those men—in one day—is 3,333 work years, the equivalent of 3,333 men working 24 hours a day for a year or 10,000 men working 8 hours a day for a year.

Those figures seem unbelievable—but they are true. Figure it out for yourself. Let the men who are walking out of war production plants at the end of 8 hours of work figure it out.

The most valuable weapon we can develop is time—precious hours and days which will speed production of ships and planes and all the munitions of war. That is the biggest advantage which Germany and Japan had over us—the time to prepare for war.

Time is the essence of our victory. That is why the enemy seeks to war on civilians—to destroy production time.

Men who destroy time by refusing to work are equally as effective in their result as a completely successful air raid by the enemy.

The hideous part of our time destruction is that it is being done by men who call themselves loyal Americans. They do not seem to realize that by their very acts they are putting themselves, their families, their liberty, and freedom in peril.

If they can't understand that, then a way must be found to make them understand. We must gain time.

For minutes are lives—they're falling—brave American boys—soldiers, sailors, marines, and aviators—yes; even civilians.

And we think of them—when we think of them—as men killed in war. But back somewhere in a home, someone has lost a father, a son, a husband, or a brother. Back somewhere, hearts are broken—the complete and deadly total of all that war can do has been done to them. Perhaps you know some of them as friends and neighbors.

Those men are going to continue to fall, and the sorrow will continue to spread until we do something about it. The longer the war continues, the more boys will fall. That is the story of war. It kills—and kills—and kills.

Can't you see what it all means? Surely we are fighting treacherous, ruthless foes to protect our country, and to preserve our liberty. But every hour of effort, every Defense bond we buy, every bit of material we save, everything we do right now can be measured in lives.

Time—what we do now—that is the important thing. Every day we move closer and closer to victory; every hour we save, yes, every minute we cut from the length of the war, means lives—lives of our American boys—boys who will not be killed because the war will have ended.

What further inspiration do we need to do something about it—now?

For it may be "somebody's boy." Somebody held him in her arms not so many years ago, dreaming her dreams about him. Now he's fighting grimly for his life against the treacherous Japs in the Philippines.

Somebody guided his first toddling steps, guarded him safely to school. Now he's dodging death in a whirling plane as he drops bombs over Burma.

Somebody pridefully spoke of "his son"—watching him make a touchdown. Now he's running the gantlet of Nazi subs—convoying ships to Europe.

Two somebodies watched him graduate—to start the serious job of life. Now his serious job is a fighting marine—on a lonely Pacific island.

His name? It's "Somebody's Boy." His address? "Uncle Sam's fighting forces." He's out there "somewhere" on a battle line, fighting—and dying—if need be—for us.

Somebody's prayers are following him—pleading that he may return. Maybe he will—maybe he won't. If he dies—he'll die for us.

He's "Somebody's Boy." Isn't that enough? Can we refuse to work to the limit—to sacrifice to the uttermost—to buy War bonds until it hurts—to do anything and everything within our power to back him up?

What can we do that compares with all that "Somebody's Boy" is doing—for us?

Why should not our Congress show the common sense and intestinal fortitude now and clarify our labor laws so that millions of innocent men and women will have the same protection from our Government as do the racketeers?

Let America come back to the fundamentals that made it great. Let us all be realists instead of emotionalists, sentimentalists, or selfish, greedy human beings in this hour of our country's need.

Or must we wait until hundreds of thousands of the cream of our youth—sons, brothers, husbands, and fathers—have been slaughtered and wrecked—mentally or physically—before we recognize our duty?

Yes, I am opposed to overtime pay for a 48-hour week during this life-and-death struggle.

In times like these I do not approve of overtime pay for a 48-hour week with present high wages, except for those men in the fox holes, swamps, jungles, deserts, and the frozen north of the Aleutians, and Iceland, for they are the men making the supreme sacrifice.

For there is little reason why those of us back home should not expend every effort and energy—if not for our boys in uniform, then at least to save our own skins.

Give the millions of honest men and women in this country an opportunity to do their best; they ask no more.

And to the labor leaders who are so prone to criticize so feebly, I say petition your Government for the privilege of flying to the hellholes of the Pacific and the battlefields of north Africa and see for yourselves, as I have; then, and then alone, will I listen to you, for I have earned my right to citizenship.

And to those few scumunistic, synthetic Communists in labor, commerce, and government, who are so prone to smear, I say go back to Russia where you will find millions of men and women willing to die and starve for their country in turning Hitler's hordes from their land; there you will find how transparent you are.

Or, better, yet, those of military age, get into Uncle Sam's uniform and pay your share of the obligation for the privileges you are enjoying; go to the hellholes of the Pacific or the battlefields of north Africa and learn to use bayonets on the Germans, Italians, and Japs, where your smearing will do some good.

We hear a lot nowadays that in this war there must be "equality of sacrifice."

The phrase is false and demagogic—a hollow mockery. With what bitter laughter it must have been greeted at Guadalcanal, in New Guinea, and Tunisia.

What sacrifice can you or I, or any man or woman in America, make that deserves to be mentioned in the same breath with the sacrifice of the boys in the hellholes of the Solomons?

Who dares to talk of sacrifice when he reads of the bodies of our young men being crushed under the weight of German tanks into the mud of Africa?

Yes, sacrifice—by putting a little of your swollen pay into the safest investment in the world. Sacrifice—by not taking your family out for a ride on Sunday afternoon. Sacrifice—by keeping your home only 10 degrees warmer than the homes of England. Sacrifice—by agreeing not to strike—but, of course, you can stay away from the job as many days as you want.

This is what you read in your daily newspapers and hear on the radio, which will have its day of reckoning when the war is over and the boys come home.

We are fighting to distribute the blessings of freedom to everyone—everywhere—all over the world. We are in a great and bloody crusade to export four freedoms, one of which is the freedom of speech.

Yet freedom of speech at home is rapidly diminishing. It is not being forbidden by law. It is not being crushed out by a Gestapo. No, it is being subjected to much more subtle restraints and pressures.

The Nazis and the Fascists long ago showed us the way to discourage unwelcome free speech. Strangle it by wrapping it in the flag. Smear it to death by crying aloud that it is an attack on the Fuehrer, that it gives aid and comfort to the enemy, that it promotes disunity.

That is the modern technique for getting rid of troublesome free speech.

Yes, the 10 original amendments—the so-called Bill of Rights—of our Constitution are still as sound and godly as the Ten Commandments.

Because I have protested against the abuses of a minority of the labor movement, it is charged that I am against organized labor. No charge could be more false.

My whole life record refutes it. The thousands of letters of thanks that I am receiving from men and women in the rank and file of the unions would be an overwhelming answer—if any answer were needed.

I am not attacking unions. I am attacking a cancerous condition in our body politic—the attempt to impose one code of conduct on the mass of Americans, and a different—special code for the benefit of the privileged few.

The demand for real sacrifice is from the inarticulate mass of American fathers, mothers, and daughters, while special privileges and licenses are granted to the labor racketeer—the labor profiteer—and the labor loafer.

I say you cannot have national unity unless the leadership of the Nation sets an example of unity, and that leadership should include industry, labor, and Government.

You cannot demand that the mass of common folk shall think only of winning the war if the aristocracy of labor unionism is thinking only of more dues and more power—

and the inner clique of bureaucracy is thinking only of a fourth term.

Any administration that demands unity must begin by setting an example of unity. Any administration that talks of equality of sacrifice must honestly mean sacrifice by all, not sacrifice by the many for the financial and political advantage of the few.

I claim that I am a real friend of labor, and that the men who are attacking me are labor's enemies.

They are enemies of labor in the same way that a little clique of selfish men were the enemies of the New York Stock Exchange, or the utilities. The number of crooks in Wall Street was small, but the vengeance of an outraged people did not discriminate.

The many, who were honest were destroyed along with the dishonest few. And New York City has lost its great financial business.

New York City's population is shrinking—its stores and offices are vacant, hundreds of thousands of its people are out of work, all because honest business has been penalized in punishment of the wicked few.

The offenders among the utilities were comparatively few. Yet billions of dollars of the savings of thrifty middle-class Americans have been wiped out of utility bonds and preferred stocks because the sins of the privileged few were visited on the unoffending multitude.

What has happened to the stock exchange and the utilities is going to happen to the unions. The storm of public resentment is rising. If you want a measure of how fast it is rising just listen to the cries of pain and anger that come from the self-appointed labor leaders in reply to my public remarks.

They cry because they know that what I say is true. They know that millions of Americans are aroused, and when the long-suffering, patient American public is fully aroused, woe to the men or the cause that has called forth its anger.

The racketeer is not something that just happens. He grows out of a rotten condition in public life. Al Capone was a thief, a gangster, and a murderer. But Al Capone was not a cause. He was a result. He grew out of the greed and lust for power of a corrupt political machine.

There would have been no Al Capone if there had not been protection from the politicians of the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois.

There would be no union profiteers, no union abuses if it had not been made clear by our public authorities that there is today one standard of justice and public decency for the common man and another standard for the union few.

I speak on behalf of the millions of honest men and women in unions who want their unions to stand clean and respected before the bar of American public opinion.

I speak on behalf of the future leaders of the United States—our boys in Africa, in Australia, in Guadalcanal, New Guinea, the Aleutians, Iceland, England, China, and India.

I say that this bloody war can be won only if we at home show that we deserve to have it won. Only if we have the intestinal fortitude to throw out the profiteers—punish the shirkers—and demand that there shall be a single, not a double, standard of justice in the United States—an even distribution of sacrifice on the home front imposed with a degree of political courage at home comparable to the moral and physical courage being shown by our men abroad.

And while I am on the subject, I noticed a few days ago the anouncement of the declaration of the War Manpower Commission to 29 occupational groups that even though they may be fathers of five or six children, they must find war-important jobs by spring or face induction.

Here again I am shocked to find that our officials in Washington have omitted challenging a group known more commonly as labor racketeers of the "graft" age and I spell it with a "G" and not a "D."

And I reiterate again, that our Congress should see fit to introduce and pass such legislation, to first—upon his release or discharge, any member of our armed forces can be employed by any employer without having to join any organized labor unions. Second—upon his employment, he shall have equal voting rights with any other employee in any union in any employee and management plan of the employer. Third—his seniority in relation to other employees of draft age should date as of the day he enlisted or was inducted into this country's service.

I definitely feel that our situation here at home is most serious, and that by such legislation our Congress could free honest labor from those racketeers and parasites that are right now hindering the effort of our workers to do the best they can to win this war. Such legislation will insure all the members of our services an equal opportunity right now as well as after this war is over with those who stayed at home in industry.

What better bonus could we give our servicemen than the elimination of their having to buy the right to work in their own country on their release or discharge from the service.

Why should they have to pay exorbitant membership fees demanded by those unions working under a closed-shop agreement? And what better bonus could we give them than to eliminate their having to pay dues for the privilege of keeping their job?

Briefly, why shouldn't a man's honorable discharge or release from the service of his country be all he would henceforth need as a union card when he returns to work for himself and his family after having worked for all of us so willingly and risked his life in our behalf? For there will be millions of young men returning home who have never had a job or who have never been forced to pay tribute to men who never did an honest day's work in their lives.

We all must realize that this war we are fighting is a total war. It is a war in which all of us can get hurt—for which all of us will have to pay, and in which all of us will have to work and fight—in order for all of us to win.

Save the Nation for those boys when they return because of our acts and efforts will they judge us.

Yes, of course, buy bonds—buy to the limit—if you believe in this land. Buy a stake in its future so that when this horrible catastrophe is over you will not be the first one crying for relief.

Yes; I know I have been accused of being the representative of the National Association of Manufacturers, the automotive industry, the America First Committee, and even accused of being a Fascist. Frankly and sincerely, I represent no person or persons—group or groups—color or creed—nor have I any political ambitions. I speak for myself alone, but echo the sentiments of millions.

And again I frankly state that I much prefer to break bread with Henry Ford, the Fisher brothers, the K. T. Kellars, of Chrysler, and the Charlie Ketterings of General Motors—for here are men who have come from the soil and given the world one of the greatest gifts humanity has ever received in history—the automobile.

Yes, I would rather sit down with these men than with those who are living in the laps of luxury at the expense of the sweat and toil of millions of honest men and women.

Let us give these millions of young men inducted into the uniform of these great United States an opportunity on their return to again join the union of Americanism.

And to Congress, I say again—face the facts and show the traditional American intestinal fortitude by legislating this cancerous element from our midst.

Why should these racketeers be immune from reporting their incomes or paying taxes on their tributes from the millions? Why should not our Congress bring about compulsory incorporation, public accounting of their funds, and forbid political contributions from their ill-gotten gains, if they are honest in their intentions?

If honest in their intentions, why are they so viciously fighting the Hobbs bill in Congress, which proposes to make labor unions subject to racketeer laws—the same as all other groups?

No, I am not a labor hater. I believe in honest labor unions who are doing their darnedest to turn out the weapons we need.

I have been laboring for 40-odd years—since I was 12 years of age—in many lines of endeavor. I come from humble parents. I know the value of honest labor. I have served labor as well as employer.

And I know just how serious the situation is from the thousands of letters I have received from men and women in many industries from all parts of the United States—both union and nonunion—who have urged and pleaded that I bring the facts before the public before it is too late.

And to those millions of honest men and women war workers goes my heartfelt thanks; but to those whom the shoe fits, I say wear it.

For there is nothing of material value that any of you or anybody has on the face of this globe that I want, with the exception of 10 more years of life with my mental and physical faculties to help preserve the freedom and standards of living dedicated to us by our forefathers for our children and our soldiers when they come back—and only God can give me that.

Let us be able to say, "We, too, were there." When what is left of the boys who come back bearing honorable scars and tell of their ventures at the cannon's mouth, let's be able to say, "We, too, were there. Our sacrifice of dollars was there in the transportation of food, air and tank protection that helped to bring these young men safely and proudly home."

We can't all be in uniform. We can't all shoulder guns or pilot planes, tanks, or ships. But we can all fight—and must.

"I can never hide myself from me,
I see what others can never see,
I know what others can never know,
I never can fool myself, and so
Whatever happens I want to be
Self-respecting and conscious free."

There is no need to say much more. When those boys come back, bringing with them only the memories of the boys who will never come back, no one of us can hide from himself and his conscience. We did our part—or we didn't. There is no middle course.

If we were in the production plants, we did our best, counting neither hours nor profit—or we didn't.

We bought War bonds to the very limit of our ability—or we didn't.

We gave to the united war work fund generously—we helped in the Red Cross—we joined in civilian defense—we fought as hard as we knew how—or we didn't.

For each of us there will be the one challenging question—"Am I self-respecting and conscious-free?"

Or, because of our failure, will we be plagued with the thought—"Did he die too soon?"

For when epitaphs are carved in granite, the carver uses a chisel. But the epitaph on a soldier's grave can be carved another way. It can be written by the "chiseling" few.

"Died—too soon"—because help was too little or too late. Only the recording Angel will mark that record—only the recording Angel and the conscience of the guilty will know who really wrote it.

Use up that rubber—if you will. Forget the boy who died out there—fighting for you—when his tank bogged down for want of rubber.

Hold on to the money that might have bought War bonds. Forget the boy who died in Africa—fighting for you—because he ran out of munitions.

Roll out the red tape—drag the production line—measure the hours of work. Forget the boy on the Solomons who died—fighting for you—while he waited for the help that never came.

Pile up the food and hoard it—if you will. Forget the boy who died out there—fighting for you—because the food you hoarded never reached him.

Do these, and a thousand more—back home in comfort and safety. But—when you do—you take your chisel in hand and carve above the grave of an American boy—"He died—too soon."

For what price social security from the cradle to the grave—if we dig our own graves in advance?

Incorporation of Labor Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, while I realize that the heads of many labor organizations at the present time are opposed to incorporation, I am convinced as a result of many contacts and the more enlightened opinion of those charged with the leadership of labor organizations that such steps as provided for in H. R. 1781 would in the last analysis prove most helpful to the permanent organization of labor and its standing throughout the country. I know that such action would have the approval of large numbers in the rank and file of labor organizations, whose voices cannot be heard today.

In this connection I point to similar provisions in the British law and would refer you to a statement made as far back as 1902 by the late Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, which was as follows:

> The growth and success of labor unions * * * as well as their usefulness to the community at large would be much advanced by any measures which tend to make them more deliberate, less arbitrary, and more patient with the trammels of a civilized community. They need something to protect them from their own arbitrariness. The employer and the community also require this protection.

I submit herewith the provisions of H. R. 1781, which I introduced in the Congress on February 10:

H. R. 1781

A bill to require labor organizations to incorporate and file annual financial reports

Be it enacted, etc., That the term "labor organization," when used in this act, means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

SEC. 2. Every labor organization shall become a body corporate as provided in this act. The officers of each labor organization shall make, sign, and acknowledge, before any officer competent to take acknowledgment of deeds, and file in the office of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia, to be recorded by him, a certificate in writing, in which shall be stated—

First. The name or title by which such labor organization is to be known.

Second. The term for which it is organized, which may be perpetual.

Third. The purposes and objects of the organization.

Fourth. The names and addresses of its officers for the first year of its corporate existence.

SEC 3. When the certificate provided for in section 2 has been filed, the labor organization shall be a body corporate, and may, in its corporate name, sue and be sued, grant and receive property, real, personal, and mixed, and use such property, and the income thereof for the objects of the corporation. Members of the corporation shall not be personally liable for the acts, debts, or obligations of the corporation.

SEC. 4. A labor organization incorporated under this act shall have the power to make and establish such constitution, rules, and bylaws (including rules and bylaws defining the duties and powers of its officers and the time and manner of their election) as its members may deem proper for carrying out its lawful objects, and amend, add to, or repeal such constitution, rules, and bylaws to such extent as its members may deem proper.

SEC. 5. A labor organization incorporated under this act shall, on or before the 1st day of March of each year, make and file with the office of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia a complete report of its financial activities during the year, including in itemized form, among other things—

(a) The total amount and the various types of corporate incomes, including particularly the amounts received in the form of admission fees, dues, and assessments from members and others; and

(b) The names and salaries of all officers, whose aggregate compensation from activities on the part of labor organizations total more than $5,000.

SEC. 6. Section 2 (5) of the National Labor Relations Act (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 29, sec. 152 (5)), is amended to read as follows:

"(5) The term 'labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, incorporated under the Labor Organizations Incorporation Act, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work."

SEC. 7. Section 6 shall take effect — days after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 8. This act may be cited as the "Labor Organizations Incorporation Act."

Federal and State Milk Orders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by the Wayne Co-Operative Milk Producers, Inc., Fort Wayne, Ind., at its annual meeting on February 16, 1943:

Whereas the Federal and State milk orders have been of much benefit to the producers in the way of stabilization of prices; and

Whereas the said orders do create orderly and uniform marketing of fluid milk, inasmuch as all producers do receive the same price for their product: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Wayne Cooperative Milk Producers, Inc., do hereby mandate the board of directors to keep said Federal and State orders in full force and effect at all times; that they do not relinquish said orders without the consent of the members, given in a general meeting held for that purpose.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME

We earnestly request the appropriate governmental authorities immediately to give favorable consideration to the repeal of daylight-saving time. We are firm in the belief that any useful purpose served has long since passed and its continuance is proving a handicap rather than a help in the country's mutual war effort.

LABOR

In view of the shortage of labor on these dairy farms, caused by wage inducements in our defense plants and the drafting of our boys into the military service, it is going to greatly curtail our operations on the dairy farms and since the dairy farmer is in need of technical labor to perform his operations it is very essential that these boys be left on the farms because of their experience in the work. Dairy farmers cannot operate with inefficient labor and be expected to produce according to schedule set for 1943.

SUBSIDIES

We are uncompromisingly opposed to the policy of subsidies in whatever guise, whether it be to the producer, the processor or handler, or the consumer. We believe it to be the most unequitable means of gaining the objective of thwarting inflation or of stimulating production. We do not want to be classed as graspy or greedy but do want what is equitable as between dairy farmers' prices and labor prices.

FREEZING OF DAIRY PRICES

We do not in any way favor the freezing of prices of fluid milk to the dairy farmer. The spread may be wide enough between the cost of dairy feeds and the prices received for fluid milk at the farms. In our production area we produce most of our grains and roughage, and the prices on these commodities are so low that we must produce them at a loss and therefore must have more money for the fluid milk or quit business which many have already done. This will mean much less production for the year 1943. We believe that with the present prices labor is receiving, and the inflated pay rolls of labor, and the fact that practically all labor is being employed makes it imperative that our prices should not be frozen at this time.

CONSCRIPTION OF LABOR

We will oppose the conscription of labor which comprehends the rigid freezing of either farmers or farm hands on the farms. Not only would such a scheme reduce the farmer, his family, and his help to the feudal state of "serfs of the globe," a step back to the days of serfdom, not so many years removed, but it would breed so much dissatisfaction and discontent among agricultural workers, by freezing existing inequalities between farm and industrial labor that malcontent, shirking of work, and inefficient production would be the inevitable result. It is one thing to freeze manpower in the military force where strict discipline is the rule, and quite another to impose similar conditions on civilians. To attempt it will subject us to the very thing we are fighting to keep out of this country.

PARITY PRICES

We heartily commend the action of December 3, 1942, of the United States House of Representatives in its unanimous passage of legislation requiring the Department of Agriculture to revise parity prices for all farm commodities to include all costs of labor. We reiterate our position, supporting the principles of such legislation and again call for a complete revision of the outmoded method of computing agricultural prices on a depression parity formula.

PUBLIC RELATIONSHIP

Since the success of our association depends entirely upon the relationship which exists between the members and the management of the association we recommend that the officers and directors increase their efforts to bring about a closer relationship by such educational program or other method as may bring about the required results.

FARMERS AND THE WAR

In this sorrowful day with the whole world cast in the shadows of a terrible war, it is the supreme desire of our milk producers, farmers, their families, and our organization, to contribute our full measure to the successful prosecution of the war.

The personal sacrifice of those who have given their service to the military forces deserves the unqualified support of their government, the people at home, and every economic group.

Our heartfelt sympathies go out to those families who may have sons on the combat fronts who have made the supreme sacrifice that we at home may continue to enjoy the liberty and the standards of living that we have purchased at such great sacrifices during the birth and throughout the life of our Nation.

Such support does not foretell, however, complete subjugation to the will, which may well be a whim or caprice, of an administrative agency in its regulation of civilian and private activity under the stress of war conditions. It is only through finding fault constructively that the errors impeding the prosecution of the war may be corrected. And living in a Republic as we do, we feel, that under our democratic processes, it is our duty to point out such errors while simultaneously contributing the fullest extent of our abilities to assist in the rapid and successful conclusion of the war.

To this cause then we pledge our fullest support to the program of production to the end that the boys in the service and we ourselves may not suffer on account of lack of production of a sufficient quantity of wholesome foods.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

At this, the close of our ninth annual meeting, we desire to convey our sincere thanks to our board of directors, members, management, and employees who have worked so diligently to make the Wayne Cooperative Milk Producers, Inc., and this meeting the success they have been and also the chamber of commerce who has been our host.

LOUIS J. HOUK,
President.
E. S. CHRISTEN,
Vice President.
KENNETH L. STICKLER,
Secretary-Manager.
RAY W. BAUER,
Treasurer.
LAWRENCE LINVILLE,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

The Life and Services of Joseph J. Sinnott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, when Joe Sinnott left us I was in the hospital, from which I have but recently returned. I could not be present in the flesh when he was laid to rest, but I was present in the spirit. I am gratified that on the day following his eighty-second birthday I had the privilege of joining in the tributes paid by his friends to his distinguished service in the House of Representatives. What I said then is doubly true now. I said to him then:

All the time Joe Sinnott has been here, he has rendered distinguished, eminent, and faithful service. He has been untiring in his attention to Members, new and old, regardless of party affiliation. He has been courteous at all times and sometimes under the most trying circumstances. He has been diligent to his duties, coming to the House often when his friends felt he should have remained at home. He has never failed in his duties. He has been an example and an inspiration to all of us. Virginia loves him. When I am no longer a Member of this House, but shall have gone, as sooner or later each of us must go, I shall be flattered if it can be said of me that I served always as faithfully, and performed my duties always as well as Joe Sinnott served and performed his duties here.

Joe Sinnott has now passed into the Great Beyond. When I came into the Hall of this House to qualify, on the 3d day of July 1918, he was the first to meet me, to wish me well, and to offer me that help which I so much needed and which he continued to give me to the day of his death. He helped me. He helped every new Member. He was kindly. He was loving. He was true. He knew the rules and the procedure of this House, and he was wise in its history, its traditions, and its practices. He was always jealous of its prerogatives.

I say again, as I said on the occasion of Joe's last birthday, that it is my hope—yea, my prayer—that when I go I shall have approximated in fidelity and diligence the service rendered by Joe Sinnott. If so, I shall be content.

Joe went as he would have wished to go—from his work here to his reward yonder. He went as I would have had him go—faithful to the last, without even 1 day when he should fail to appear for attention to his duties here.

Had it been my privilege to look upon my dear friend in his last sleep, my farewell would have been, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Joe deserves his rest, and He who knows all and orders all things well will see to it that his rest is sweet.

Americans Must Emulate Washington To Win Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Edwin Wilson, editor of the Brooklyn Eagle, which appeared in that newspaper on February 22, 1943, entitled "Americans Must Emulate Washington To Win Victory":

AMERICANS MUST EMULATE WASHINGTON TO WIN VICTORY

"America has furnished to the world the character of Washington," said Daniel Webster. "And if our American institutions had done nothing else, that alone would have entitled them to the respect of mankind."

Today the reasons for Washington's greatness are not obscure. He may not have brought to the revolutionary cause the turbulent spirit of a Samuel Adams; he may have been less distinguished as a statesman than Thomas Jefferson; his military generalship may not have been as brilliant as that of Robert E. Lee. But no American in our history as a nation has brought to a crisis qualities of character and courage surpassing those of Washington.

It is inspiring to Americans in this time of great emergency to picture Washington at many points of his career—as a young soldier in Braddock's expedition, as a farmer who loved the land, as commander of the armies of the Continental Congress, leading what often appeared a forlorn hope, as the first President, riding to New York for his inauguration, as a tired old man, badgered on all sides by his enemies and longing for the peace of Mount Vernon.

At all times the selfless character of Washington shone luminously, but never so impressively as at Valley Forge. It was here, and not at Trenton or Princeton or even Yorktown, that Washington won his greatest victory. It was won against a captious and meddling Congress too weak to help him. It was won against the conspirators among his own generals, the traitors and the deserters, the men of little faith who were ready to quit. It was won over his own spirit, which was hard pressed by despair.

This was not a victory of generalship, of intellect, or of resourcefulness. It was a victory achieved through force of character—character which symbolized perfectly the

spirit of the men who fought and bled and starved and froze for the establishment of a nation which again witnesses dark hours.

That victory of the spirit must be won again by Americans who, until recently, had come to take their country for granted, assuming that it would always be secure in its freedom, always isolated from the danger of aggression. If that victory is to be won, all Americans must emulate that courage of the soul that was Washington's sword and shield.

Increased Pay for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to two letters concerning the subject of the salary of postal employees. These letters are typical of many which I have received from every part of New York State and from many other States as well. Certainly the excellent service so faithfully rendered by the postal employees should be rewarded by the immediate passage of legislation to provide for an increase in salary.

NEW YORK CITY, *February 20, 1943.*

Hon. WINIFRED C. STANLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: I am writing in the dual capacity of a voter in your district and an employee in the United States Post Office and asking your utmost cooperation on consideration and eventual passage of H. R. 1366.

Since the sharp rise in the cost of living, I have been unable to meet expenses, and know that this bill would permit for a much better way of life for myself and my family.

I sincerely urge, therefore, that you attend the hearing to be held February 23, 1943, on behalf of myself and my fellow workers.

Very respectfully yours,

MILTON B. BERMAN,
Subcarrier No. 5369.

JANUARY 27, 1943.

Miss WINIFRED STANLEY,
Congresswoman from New York,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MISS STANLEY: I am appealing to you for your support of H. R. 1366, the $300 bonus for post-office employees.

My husband has been a letter carrier for 37 years, and it has not been easy sledding, raising a family of five children on a carrier's small salary and no salary raise since 1925.

As woman to woman I know you can understand our position, with the ever-increasing cost of living, taxation, etc.

We are patriotic and want to buy our share of bonds, but without a change I don't know how long we can keep it up.

I do all my own work and have made many sacrifices, yet I try to be optimistic.

I am very proud of what our women are doing these tense days of unrest.

I will sincerely appreciate anything you can do in supporting this much-needed bill.

Hopefully and gratefully yours,

Mrs. R. E. STEPHENSON,
Kansas City, Mo.

Production of Crude Oil in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, under date of February 17, 1943, Hon. Charles W. Lyon, speaker of the California State Assembly, wrote me as follows:

As temporary chairman of the interim legislative committee on State-Federal cooperation in petroleum, I have been instructed, after a meeting duly held by said committee, to forward to you the enclosed resolution, which was unanimously passed by the committee at a meeting held on February 15, 1943.

The resolution follows:

Resolution for consideration of the assembly interim oil committee

Whereas California is one of the principal oil-producing States of the Union, and the present productive capacity of California's oil fields is being severely taxed to supply the existing demands of our armed forces and essentia civilian activities; and

Whereas, it is clear that the demands of both our armed forces and civilian activities are increasing and will continue to increase; and

Whereas it is common knowledge that the cost of labor and materials has greatly increased in the past 18 months, during which time there has been no increase in the prices of crude oil paid to producers; and

Whereas it is essential to the promotion of increased production and the discovery of new oil reserves that substantial increases be had in the prices of crude oil and for allied products: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this committee, That the Office of Price Administration and the Honorable Prentiss Brown, Director thereof, be and they are hereby urged to forthwith recognize the need for the encouragement of further and greater production of crude oil and new discoveries thereof through increases in prices paid to the producers of crude oil, and that they forthwith direct a reasonable, substantial increase in prices for all crude oil produced in California and the products of crude oil, in order to avoid a serious and critical shortage in the available supplies of such products; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Petroleun. Administrator for War and to all Members of Congress from California and that they be urged to use their best efforts to bring about reasonable, substantial increases in the prices of crude oil in California and the products derived therefrom.

St. Lawrence Seaway Project Proved by Events To Be a Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks there has not been much discussion about the development of transportation rivers and harbors projects in the United States, and this includes the St. Lawrence seaway project. Just to keep the records straight, let me say that the march of events has shown that numerous projects including the St. Lawrence seaway have been proved by events to be a necessity. Throughout the past years, had the United States developed its waterways and transportation system, literally millions of dollars would now be saved to the American taxpayers in reduced costs of transportation of war materials, to say nothing about the transportation economies which do not have a direct relation to the war effort.

Just to keep the records straight again, it is a fact that during the Seventy-seventh Congress, which convened January 3, 1941 and which ended on December 16, 1942, the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives held extensive hearings on numerous waterway projects in the United States and reported out a bill authorizing these improvements by the War Department engineers. Included in this bill was the Florida barge canal and also the St. Lawrence seaway and hydroelectric development project.

Speaking generally, it is correct to say that the railroad interests of the country opposed the bill sponsored by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives. There was a powerful lobby, including railroad interests, composed of selfish and sectional groups, which flooded the United States with propaganda not only against the St. Lawrence seaway project but against numerous other projects. In order that honor may go where honor is due, the spearhead of this powerful lobby consisted of railroad interests and they spent millions of dollars in lobbying against the St. Lawrence seaway project. They overlooked no section of the United States in their efforts to influence public opinion, which in turn had a direct influence on Congress. They were temporarily successful and the rivers and harbors bill, which included the St. Lawrence seaway project, was never permitted to come on the floor of the House for a vote by the administration leaders.

Lest I be charged with partisanship for the economies that come through cheap waterway transportation, I submit herewith an article by Ernest Lindley in the Washington Post for February 22, 1943, which deals with conditions in Florida and at the same time calls attentention to the St. Lawrence seaway and hydroelectric development.

The article by Mr. Lindley is as follows:

A BAD INVESTMENT TURNS GOOD

Back in 1935, the President persuaded Congress to appropriate $4,000,000,000 for work-relief during the next fiscal year. In those days, many people considered $4,000,000,000 a large sum for a government to spend, even the Government of the United States. Much of this money went to small projects—some extremely useful, others less so. Some of it was allocated to large works.

Among the large public works items to which the President allocated work-relief

money was the Florida ship canal, from Port Inglis to Jacksonville. For years the digging of this canal had been urged by some groups and opposed by others. One of the several questions in controversy was whether it was economically justifiable. Any project that could not pay for itself, directly or indirectly, was supposed to be economically unsound. According to some thinking, any project that was not directly "self-liquidating" was unjustifiable.

By these standards it was hard, if not impossible, to show that the Florida ship canal was a sound investment. But we had then the idle men, machines, and materials to build it. If you deducted from the cost only what you would have had to pay the manpower involved to sit in idleness on a dole, the canal would not cost much. But in those days it was more popular to think in terms of dollars than in terms of men, machines, and materials. People who tried to show that the Florida canal was a justifiable investment of national emergency were widely ridiculed. Even those who argued that it might be a good thing to have in time of war were denounced as propagandists for the left wing of the New Deal.

A beginning was made on the Florida ship canal under the supervision of an Army engineer, who is now Lieutenant General Somervell, chief of the Army's Services of Supply. But then the economy bloc in Congress stepped in and stopped the work. This achievement of the economy bloc was widely hailed as a triumph over waste and boondoggling. A few tens of millions of dollars were saved, and some manpower, machines, and materials left in idleness. But for that victory of the economy bloc, the Florida ship canal would have been completed long before Pearl Harbor.

Then we would have had an inland waterway passage all the way from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Trenton, N. J., except for one short jump in the Gulf of Mexico. The Florida canal could have been made wide enough to take open-water craft, thus cutting off a good many miles on the run to the Middle Atlantic and New England seaboard—miles which became extremely costly when the U-boats struck in the early month of 1942.

Now, Maj. Gen. Charles P. Summerall, former Chief of Staff, urges that a canal wide enough to take inland waterway barges be completed at once. He says this can be done in 10 months at a cost of $44,000,000.

General Summerall, having retired from the Army, is now chairman of the Florida Ship Canal Authority, so that in this case he speaks as a special advocate. The canal can be completed without using critical machines and materials. But we are now up against a manpower shortage. Whether manpower should be used now to punch through the canal General Summerall urges may be doubtful. But it can no longer be doubted that the failure to dig the canal some years ago when we had plenty of manpower was a costly mistake.

The same kind of mistake was made about the St. Lawrence seaway and hydroelectric development, and numerous other smaller projects. Some are badly needed now, others would have been useful at any time. The time to make these improvements in the national plant was when we had a surplus of manpower, materials, and machines. Then they would have cost literally nothing. Now they would cost heavily because they could not be built without sacrificing other things that are essential.

Such costly mistakes as the failure to build the St. Lawrence project and the Florida ship canal when we had a surplus of men, materials, and machines will be made as long as we have in Congress and public office men who cannot see ahead to think in terms of the national economy.

It was profligate waste not to use the resources which we had to improve the national plant. In the final reckoning, the economy bloc of the prewar period may prove to have cost the Nation many hundreds of thousands of times what it thought it was saving.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the statements by this writer cannot be successfully controverted. It was a tragic mistake for the Seventy-seventh Congress to fail to pass the rivers and harbors bill. It was a mistake which has cost the Americans in the years gone by untold millions of dollars because of the higher transportation rates they have had to pay due to the lack of development, industrially, agriculturally, and economically, in the United States, which has invariably resulted favorably, where economies of cheap water transportation have been permitted.

The failure to pass this legislation was a mistake from the standpoint of the people who own stock in the railroads of this country. Anxious to stifle competition, the representatives of the railroads adopted the short-sighted policy of preventing any development, so far as our domestic economy is concerned, which would not give the railroads a monopoly on transportation. They need a new viewpoint. It is not possible in connection with these remarks to point out the industrial and other developments which have come about in this country in every instance where increased and cheaper transportation facilities have been provided. It is correct, however, to say that such developments have taken place and a sensible optimism would justify the assertion that development of the St. Lawrence seaway project and other projects would increase the amount of freight for transportation by the railroads and would help the railroads instead of working an injury to them.

Those of us who favor the development of our water-transportation system have no desire to injure other means of transportation. We recognize the great value of railroad transportation and its advantages in our domestic economy. At the same time, we know that Mr. Lindley is correct in the position that he takes in this article.

Atlantic Coast Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, all of the Members from the Atlantic Coast States who are interested in fishery problems will be interested in certain recommendations made in a recent report to the Congress by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission established by the States of the Atlantic seaboard with the cooperation of the Council of State Governments under an interstate compact assented to by the Congress of the United States, Public Law 539, Seventy-seventh Congress.

This report will be printed as a committee document. The portions which I believe will be of particular interest to Members of Congress and to the public generally are as follows:

The commission thereupon voted to approve the recommendations in principle and directed the executive committee to prepare and adopt a resolution urging each of the States to proceed along these lines. The resolution as adopted by the executive committee is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That in view of the necessity for adequate statistics covering the fisheries of the various Atlantic Coast States, to provide a basis for rational programs for conservation and management of these valuable natural resources, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission approves the recommendations submitted by the Fish and Wildlife Service for State statistical programs adequate to provide these statistics, and urges the legislatures of the several States to provide the administrative agency charged with the conservation of their marine fishery resources, with the authority, personnel, and funds required to carry out the provisions of this program."

Pursuant to the requirements of the compact, this resolution, accompanied by duplicate copy of the reports of the Fish and Wildlife Service, was thereupon transmitted to the members of the advisory committee, with a request that they report their comments in writing to the commission prior to its meeting on December 10, 1942, in Baltimore. These comments uniformly recognized the need for and in general were favorable to the action recommended. Minor differences of opinion were reported, as was to be expected. For the most part these indicated the need for thorough educational work among the fishermen before such a system was established in any State. In general the comments also stressed the importance of adjusting the system of catch statistics to be adopted by each State to the needs of that State, while at the same time providing basic data reasonably comparable in form to the data to be gathered in other States.

After reviewing in detail the comments from the advisory committee as contemplated by the compact, the commission at its meeting on December 10 reaffirmed the resolution previously quoted and directed its transmission to the Governors and legislatures of the several States.

The additional powers, if any, the personnel required in each State, and the estimated costs of establishing and operating the State systems have been worked out separately for each State by the representatives of the Fish and Wildlife Service in cooperation with the fishery authorities in each State. Because this material differs in detail from State to State, it is not included herein, but will be made available to the executive and legislative authorities of each State by the State officials who collaborated in its preparation. The commission hopes sincerely that its first recommendation to the member States will merit their approval and adoption, and that as soon as may be expedient each of them will establish an adequate State system of catch statistics, and where necessary provide the additional funds and personnel required to maintain such system.

IV. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY PANELS ON PARTICULAR SPECIES

1. STRIPED BASS

For the consideration of the Governors and Legislatures of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland,

and Virginia. The commissioners from these States only constitute the panel on this subject and therefore have authority to make recommendations thereon.

This panel respectfully submits to the Governors and the legislatures of the States above named the following summary of its findings and recommendations:

(1) Biological facts

(a) The annual reproduction of striped bass is highly variable, and is characterized by occasional large year classes which the fishery must draw upon over a period of years in order to provide sizable annual catches.

(b) The rate of growth of the striped bass is such that rapid increases in weight are made through the first, second, and third years when the lengths of such fish were from 0 inch to 16 inches.

(2) Economic and wartime considerations

(a) Since the stock of striped bass is limited and very completely utilized by the fishery, it is highly desirable to permit individual fish to attain the highest weight practicable in order to insure the maximum poundage yield. The adoption of the 16-inch limit by the States that have employed this measure has resulted in material economic benefit to the commercial fishermen in those States.

(b) During the war emergency, with food supplies becoming an increasingly important weapon in winning the war and the peace to follow, it is highly important that continuing yields from each fishery be provided for at the highest possible production level.

(3) Recommendations

Since the establishment of a size limit seems to be an effective management device for insuring maximum continuing yield in view of these biological, economic, and wartime considerations, the panel recommends:

(a) That all States having the 16-inch-to-the-fork-of-the-tail limit or its equivalent, as recommended by the Fish and Wildlife Service, continue this limit.

(b) That all States having a smaller size limit endeavor to increase that limit upward toward the recommended 16-inch limit.

It is suggested that this be done by cooperative consideration of this problem between those in the fishing industry, the sports fishermen, the conservation and legislative officials, and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

2. BLUE CRAB

For the consideration of the Governors and Legislatures of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina. Only commissioners from these States joined in these recommendations.

This panel respectfully requests:

(1) That the States now having statutes limiting the taking of sponge crabs retain such protective measures.

(2) That the conservation authorities in Maryland and Virginia, in cooperation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, continue to study the blue crab, and, if possible, to evolve a satisfactory joint program adjusted to the peculiar distribution of this species in the Chesapeake Bay area.

(3) That the Governors and legislatures of these producing States and those of the consuming States be asked by statute to prevent the sale of immature crabs, namely, peelers less than 3 inches in shell measurement, soft crabs below 3½ inches, and hard shells below 5 inches, and to thank the States of New York and Pennsylvania for their cooperation in this direction.

(4) That the Maryland Legislature enact and the Governor give approval to a statute giving to the Maryland Department of Tidewater Fisheries the same discretionary power with respect to the crab fishery now possessed by the corresponding department in Virginia.

To Keep Them Fighting We Must Keep Them Eating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a poem by Mr. Walter Wells Collins, from South Carolina, who is in charge of a program on WINX, here in the city of Washington, going on the air each Saturday evening at 10 o'clock.

There is a lot of truth in this poem, and I am sure that it will be read with a great deal of interest, not only by the Members of Congress, but by thousands of people who have the privilege of reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

TO KEEP THEM FIGHTING WE MUST KEEP THEM EATING

Down on the farm, day or night,
They're doing their bit to keep our boys fed right,
Many are sacrificing, and it's not much fun,
Carrying two rows at a time instead of one.
Since so many farms now face induction,
It's hard for farmers to make their usual production,
And if our soldiers get hungry, the only excuse
Will be our farmers lack sufficient labor to produce.
I think more and more everyday
Of something I heard Congressman FULMER say:
"If we praise the Lord and pay farmers for what they make,
They'll keep passing the food without mistake."

The Nation's Meat Supply

REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Secretary of Agriculture, obviously for the purpose of inducing the raising of more wheat for livestock feed and providing more food for freedom, announced the removal of all marketing quotas on wheat. For the same purpose, Mr. Speaker, the next logical move would be for the Secretary of Agriculture to relax or remove quotas on cotton for the duration of the war.

In recent weeks many references have been made here about the shortage of protein feeds in different sections of the country. I should like to emphasize the acuteness of the shortage in the section of the country I have the honor to represent. In many areas the meat production is in proportion to the protein feeds that are available for livestock growers.

Mr. Speaker, I represent an agricultural and livestock area from which hundreds of thousand of sheep and cattle are sent to the Nation's markets each year. That being an important source of the Nation's meat supply, the importance of the livestock industry there is not confined to the individual producers. The normal meat-producing capacity of the great agricultural and livestock-raising section of southwest Texas is now being seriously threatened by an acute shortage of protein feeds. For the first time in years, if not in his lifetime, the average farmer and ranchman cannot go to town and get cottonseed meal or cake to keep alive, to say nothing of fattening, his livestock. Unless relief is afforded at once, the livestock loss there will be terrific and the loss to breeding stock alone will be felt for years to come.

Among the scores of telegrams, telephone calls, and letters which I have received directly from the farming and ranching country have been messages from Dolph Briscoe, W. B. Sherrill, Roy J. Davenport, Joe W. Watson, J. A. Hardin, Jr., L. S. R. Clarke, H. Ray, Paul Dornbusch, Dicke Bros., Harold W. Pinkus, B. A. Byars, John Wagner, C. C. Heard, Fred J. Horner, Earl Wakefield, E. D. Kincaid, and Bob Davis, all of Uvalde; Senator Houghton Brownlee, chairman of Texas Senate feed-shortage investigating committee; Horace Fawcett, J. C. Netts, and C. B. Wardlaw, all of Del Rio; R. Wilbur Brown, Ray Willoughby, J. E. Blackwell, W. I. Marschall, Jess Elrod, J. C. Deal, Louis R. Hall, and Phil H. Lane, all of San Angelo; W. H. Dameron, ranch experiment station, Sonora; E. A. Kemp, Mullin; E. I. Miller, Rocksprings; R. C. Brooks, C. M. Kilgore, Lila Salyer, Brownwood; James A. Iles, W.R. Terry, Frank Weed, Sr., John Tyra, I. D. Gazaway, J. T. Bownds, and Jack J. Tampe, all of Utopia; Mrs. E. T. Abbott, Russell Callan, Menard; D. D. Tate, S. P. Rahl, S. P. Sullivan, Claude Dickerson, L. H. South, J. C. Cochran, Elmer Berry, E. T. Fairman, Annie Coleman, and Hollis Blackwell, all of Goldthwaite; J. A. Millikin, of Sabinal; Walter J. Marwitz, of Priddy; Mrs. Grace O'Harrow, of Christoval; Walker Ragsdale and Conrad Holekamp, of Junction; W. R. Garrett, of Kerrville; G. R. White, of Brady; C. D. McMillan, of Mason; Mrs. H. H. Mitchell, of Valera; Frank J. Gulley, of Rowena.

These messages which I have received have been no part of an inspired or organized campaign of disgruntled money grabbers. The appeals come from ranchmen, farmers, dairymen, poultry raisers, feed dealers, credit-institution executives—the big and the little people who know the problem because they are in agriculture, not on the sidelines.

In recent weeks I have conferred with various agencies in the Department of Agriculture with the view of determining the cause of this shortage and the possible location of any protein feeds that could be sent into that section. Those officials have shown a sincere concern

and anxiety over the situation. In that connection, I have requested the Secretary of Agriculture to have an investigation conducted to determine if any surplus of cottonseed can be found, and have requested that immediate steps, as may be necessary, be taken to have available soybean meal or cake—and I understand there is an undetermined amount still held by the farmers—sent immediately into the stricken areas to help stop the loss of livestock and thereby help protect a portion of the Nation's meat supply.

The condition which I have described has been growing in seriousness for several weeks. The producers must have protein feeds to keep their stock alive and provide milk for the young. And this shortage exists notwithstanding the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has recently reported that in 1942 10,762,000 acres of soybeans were planted, compared with 5,881,000 acres in 1941; 3,690,000 acres of peanuts in 1942, compared with 1,914,000 in 1941; 4,402,000 acres of flaxseed in 1942, compared with 3,275,000 in 1941; and 23,310,000 acres of cotton, compared with 23,132,000 acres the preceding year.

We are faced with this acute shortage notwithstanding this vastly increased acreage in protein feeds that was planted last year. The present shortage, we are told, is evidently due to increased feeding and consumption over the country. In Texas the National Cottonseed Products Association reports that it has been impossible for the mills to supply the cake and meal demanded. In Texas alone, from August 1, 1942, to February 1, 1943, 21,000 more tons of cottonseed meal and cake, taken from hold-over stock piles, have been moved into the feeders' hands than was produced in that season. Texas mills, which usually supplement their supply from mills in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi say they can no longer get relief from that source, except in small amounts, and that shortage is due to increased local demands in those localities.

Mr. Speaker, assuming that the shortage of protein feeds at the present time is not due to a hoarding in some quarters, and is due to what is described as the greatest livestock feeding program that the United States has ever had, it follows that steps must be taken and taken now to provide for vast increases in all types of protein feeds in order that an even more serious shortage may not occur next winter. It has been the announced policy of the Department of Agriculture to discourage the production of cotton, especially of short staple, which is common in our section, and to encourage the raising of more soybeans and peanuts. There can be no question about the high protein value of soybeans and peanuts, and it is indeed important that the farmers be encouraged to grow more and more of those things. But peanuts can be grown and harvested in limited localities, depending on the type of soil. The question of the adaptability of the growth of soybeans in many sections, including most of Texas, so far as quantity of production is concerned, is as yet uncertain. I am informed that North Carolina is the only cotton State where cottonseed will not produce more oil per acre than soybeans. Therefore, the nearest solution that can at this time be offered to in some measure avert the future shortage of protein feed is to permit and encourage the raising of more cotton.

Cottonseed feeds have been tried and tested by the feeders and they know from experience they can depend on it. The farmers of the South know how to raise it. They have been raising cotton all their lives. They have the land that will grow cotton and they have the farm machinery made for cotton-raising purposes. Their only real handicap for greatly increased production would come from the shortage of experienced farm help, which is indeed serious. The farmers in those sections, on the other hand, are not experienced in raising soybeans and peanuts. The farmer does not have some of the necessary machinery and harvesting equipment and he lacks experience in producing these two new crops that are to him, in many localities, new and untried.

And cotton, Mr. Speaker, is every bit a war crop. Every 500-pound bale of lint cotton produces 400 pounds of cottonseed meal, 240 pounds of hulls, in addition to 130 pounds of cottonseed oil and 78 pounds of linters. The linters are used to produce ammunition for the Army and Navy and the cottonseed hulls may be used in the manufacture of synthetic rubber. The Quartermaster Corps of the United States Army recently described cotton lint as "second only to steel as the most vital war material." Soybeans and peanuts, even though their increased growth should be encouraged everywhere, will not furnish a pound of these essential war materials which I have just referred to.

Many of the oil mills in Texas are today closed down and many others are running only half capacity because of shortage of feeds. Because of the acute protein-feed shortage the lives of thousands upon thousands of livestock are being imperiled. The loss even now is extensive. The dairy and poultry industries are suffering. Several dairies have reported to me that their production has dropped from 25 to 50 percent.

From all of such losses, not just a locality but the whole Nation suffers.

Let us strike a blow now at this food-shortage monster that stalks our land. The planting season is approaching. Let us encourage the raising of more cotton and more peanuts and more soybeans. This is no time for experimenting in untried areas. If the soil is adapted to the raising of cotton and the farmer wants to plant more cotton, then he should be permitted and encouraged to do so.

Mr. Speaker, only emergency allocations of livestock feeds can save the livestock facing this present danger. Most of southwest Texas has been hard hit by the shortage of rainfall during recent months. Only wise and immediate directing of the 1943 planting program can avert an even worse catastrophe to the food-for-victory armies on our farms and ranches.

The Rubber Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the House a rumor, spread around in recent weeks, that our synthetic rubber industry will be scrapped after the war. Dr. William J. Hale, research consultant for the Dow Chemical Co., has been widely quoted in the press as making the serious charge that the State Department has entered into secret agreements with rubber-producing countries in South America, assuring them that after the war all the plants being erected now in the United States to produce synthetic rubber will be scrapped. Naturally, if such a report were true, it would be a serious matter at a time when every pound of rubber, natural or synthetic, is desperately needed.

Upon learning of this charge, I immediately got in touch with the State Department, and I can state unequivocally that there is not the slightest foundation for the charge made by Dr. Hale, that neither the State Department nor, to its knowledge, any other agency of the Government, has either entered into or proposed any agreement or understanding of any kind with any foreign country regarding the post-war status of the synthetic-rubber industry in this country.

I desire to bring this matter to the attention of the House at this time in order that this baseless rumor may be killed off before it can do any more damage. I understand that the State Department is requesting Dr. Hale for an explanation of his statement.

I have a great admiration for Dr. Hale. I believe him to be one of the most outstanding chemists of our day. I have attended many meetings at which Dr. Hale has been the speaker or lecturer. He has given those of us from farm districts much hope and assistance in our efforts to bring out more new uses for our farm crops. Dr. Hale has made a great contribution in the farm chemurgic program. Nebraskans have much hope that we will or should have additional grain-alcohol plants and possibly some butadiene plants for the manufacture of rubber. It was for that reason that many of us became alarmed over the allegations that some secret agreement had been made by our Government which would destroy the rubber program upon which we are now embarked.

Mr. Speaker, we Nebraskans are proud of the Honorable William Jeffers, who is the director of our rubber program. We believe he is rendering a great service to our Nation at this time. I am glad to hear from the State Department that the work Mr. Jeffers is now doing will not be destroyed after the war by secret agreements.

Choose Your Partners for the Next War

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the spirit of the late Will Rogers still lives in the hearts and souls of the men and women of America. We were interested in an article written by him which was printed in the Milwaukee Journal, Sunday, April 16, 1933, entitled "Choose Your Partners for the Next War."

The prophetic vision displayed in this article should be stimulating to some of us who are honestly seeking a permanent solution for world peace.

We believe it should be preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for future reference:

CHOOSE YOUR PARTNERS FOR THE NEXT WAR

(By Will Rogers)

Well, all I know is just what I read in the newsprints. If you just read Mr. Roosevelt's daily orders to Congress why it keeps you pretty well informed on what will happen before it happens. Congress is minding just like a movie mob.

Say, this guy Hitler has grabbed off the spotlight from all the dictators. He is a dictator to end all dictators. When I was in Europe a year ago this last January, I made arrangements from London to go to Munich to see this Hitler for an interview, then some newspaper guys talked me out of it, saying, "Why he is only a flash in the pan. Before you get your interview published he will be through."

Doggone it, I wish now I had gone. I would like to see what kind of a bird he is. I don't know but what I will prance over yet and take a look at him. But he is so big now I guess I couldn't get an interview. If I did I would sure make it a nice one (all in his favor) till I got out of Germany, anyhow. For that old boy runs that country like a warden.

There must be an awful lot doing over in Europe now. Things are stirring around, kinder smells like another war. Can you imagine the Prime Minister of Great Britain going clear down just to see Mussolini? Why anytime in the past anyone who suggested such a thing would have been thought crazy. Mussolini a few years ago was one of the untouchables, so far as organized society was concerned. But the big boys are even flying to see him now. Ramsey MacDonald going down there to see him didn't help out France's peace of mind any, and now with Hitler doing a Mussolini, and Germany becoming kinda friendly, France don't look on that as being so hot either.

You know those nations over there are just like a lot of so-called society women in a small town. The minute two of 'em get their heads together, it starts all the others wondering. Each one doesn't know which other one to hook up with. They are so busy scheming and fenagling around that it's no wonder they don't get anything done at home.

France has been kinder lining up for the forthcoming festivities, signing up what nations she could. She has Poland under contract.

Then Rumania signed up with France for the duration of the next war, and one or two of those little nations that France loaned enough money for the King to get him some new uniforms. I guess we are about the dumbest nation in the world in that respect. We have loaned more money to foreign nations than anyone, but we never was smart enough to make 'em sign that they would help us out in case Mexico or Canada or some other bully jumped on us.

But when those nations over there loan money to each other there is a war clause in it.

I think Austria, too, signed up with France. No; I believe they got a better offer to go with England. Your loan value to a nation is in proportion to your war strength and also to your geographical position. Now, for instance, Japan couldn't get a dime from France. She is too far away from Germany. If Poland didn't join Germany she couldn't get any. That's why Mussolini is sitting so pretty. They join France; that gives them a mighty good loan value from any nation that don't care so much for France. If Germany had any money, Italy could borrow all of it.

Switzerland just sits there in the middle of it all and hopes for a war, so they can take care of the rich refugees from both sides. Switzerland is just like one of those board things they have in a bull ring where you can run when the bull gets after you. Holland is another one that keeps her nose clean when the European shooting starts, too. She just sells milk and butter to both sides and an occasional diamond when things are prosperous.

Spain is so far off to herself that she can't afford to pay transportation to any country she could lick.

Portugal discovered the whole world, and when there was no new worlds for a Portuguese to find, they just folded up and went out of business.

So the old war will be on again pretty soon, but this time with different line-ups, and we will all say, "Ain't it a terrible thing!" And here we will kill more on a nice Sunday afternoon on our roads than they will in the first year of war. Well, if we get in the next one, I will vote my first Republican ticket.

Overcharges for Electricity in the District of Columbia

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to a very serious situation that prevails here in the District of Columbia affecting the rates paid for electricity by the Federal Government as well as by private consumers.

On February 22, 1939, page 2539 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day, I addressed this House on the subject of the full protection of the power consumers of the District of Columbia. On February 14, 1940, page 2589 of the RECORD of that date, I pointed out the enormous stock returns of the Potomac Electric Power Co., taken from all consumers of the District. In these two addresses I completely detailed the earning and expense situation of this company, based on official documents, and pointed out the manipulated jokers in the so-called consent decree, which were evident violations of the statute creating the Utility Commission of the District of Columbia.

CONSUMPTION INCREASES

In that first address I pointed out how the Federal and District Governments were then being overcharged $459,000 per year. Since I made those studies in 1938 and 1939, the electric consumption of the Federal Government has materially increased. Official records and inquiries show that the sales to the Government in the District of Columbia between 1941 and 1942 by the Pepco increased nearly nine times. The reason for this increase is, of course, obvious.

In addition, the Federal Government is purchasing large quantities of current from the Braddock Light & Power Co. in Virginia. This latter company is a subsidiary of Pepco, and receives the current it distributes in Virginia from the Washington generating pool. The new Pentagon Building in Arlington receives service from the Braddock Co.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT THE LARGEST CONSUMER

The Federal Government is the largest consumer of these companies. The next largest consumer is the Capital Transit Co., a part of the corporate family of Potomac Electric Power Co. The kilowatt-hour use of the Capital Transit Co. is very materially lower than the consumption of the Federal Government, yet, this latter company purchases current at an average rate very much lower than the Government. This is rank discrimination, and is a violation of the statute creating the District Commission.

The last data available shows that the United States Government purchased power from Pepco in 1941 as if it were 700 different consumers, although each of these governmental outlets use nearly 60 times the current per outlet used by the average Potomac Electric Power Co. consumer. In the case of the Braddock Co., the Government purchases on the basis of 10 different consumers, including the new large Pentagon Building, which has an installation comparable with a city of about 80,000 people. From the analysis I have made, I am convinced that a fair hearing will show that the Federal Government is being overcharged by the Potomac Electric Power Co. around $750,000 annually, and the other consumers in the District around $1,250,000 annually. If these reductions were made, the Washington rates would become comparable with the rates of the T. V. A.

FAIR HEARINGS NEEDED

In spite of these outstanding facts, if the newspaper accounts are correct, the majority membership of the District Commission are acting in evident collusion with the officials of the company to suppress a fair hearing on the facts. A fair hearing is a matter of great importance at this time. To support this position, I wish to call to the attention of the House the following record which I have gathered from late developments. On February 19, 1943, the District Commission held a preliminary conference preparatory to a hearing to be held on March 2, 1943, covering the rates and charges of the Potomac Electric Power Co. At this conference the company's

representatives and the commission's chief accountant presented various computations under the so-called sliding scale arrangement adopted in 1924.

These computations allegedly set out the net return of the company for the year 1942 based on the interpretation by the company, and other hypotheses, including different tax assumptions.

BASIC COMPUTATIONS

The basic computations used at this conference set out in round numbers a net income of $5,800,000 after depreciation and taxes. The evident objective of the interested parties means that after payment of all interest and other fixed charges the net return on the common stock would be $4,100,000, which is somewhat over 45 percent return. A 45 percent return on the common shares, the majority of which is chain-owned by the North American Co., immediately suggests that the computations set out by the accountants yield rates which are not calculated to bring a fair and reasonable return to the company. Rates thus established must be regarded as unfair and unreasonable from the public viewpoint when they yield 45 percent return to the holding company. Think over such a return in the days when we are asking everyone to make the supreme sacrifice. This return is calculated after all taxes are passed back to the Government and other consumers.

At this stage of the proceedings Commissioner Hankin asked the chief accountant to make similar calculations, taking as a rate base the actual cost of the property used and useful in carrying on the company's business. On actual cost, the rate base would be about $78,000,000, compared to the $101,000,000 base which is evidently being urged by the majority of the Commission.

THE PRELIMINARY CONFERENCE

At the preliminary conference of the 19th, the company objected to a consideration of computations setting out the rate of return on the actual cost of the property. The Commission then took the matter under advisement, and on the following day the majority of the Commission issued a press release to the effect that after the rates were determined in accordance with the sliding scale—an illegal procedure—the Commission would then issue an order of investigation to determine whether the sliding scale should be continued or whether there should be any changes made in the elements going into the sliding-scale formula.

On this record it is apparent that it is the intention of the Commission to fix rates under a joker formula, which is not responsive to the requirements of the statute. Also, it seems to be the intent to prevent Commissioner Hankin from seeking any information which would test the reasonableness of the rates. Obviously, what is planned is an incomplete record in case a court review should be necessary.

With such a status, if an appeal is made to the district court, then the most the court could do under the statute would be to vacate the Commission's order and let the present exorbitant rates continue. If, however, the record were made in a fair and open hearing, then the court could remand the case to the Commission with directions to make specific findings in accordance with the evidence. This is what evidently the majority of the local commission are now trying to prevent, and thus prepare an incomplete record in case of litigation.

EXCLUDING EVIDENCE

There is only one case of record, as far as I know, where the majority of a commission or a court excluded from the record facts requested by a member of the tribunal. That was the recent gas-rate case in the District, where the majority of the Commission excluded rate-base questions asked by another Commissioner from the record. This ruling of the majority of the District Commission is entirely contrary to any accepted judicial procedure and is entirely unlawful, and constitutes an interference by two of the Commissioners with the work of a third Commissioner, in the performance of his official duties. The action of the majority Commissioners in the gas case was contrary to paragraph 97 (b) of the Public Utility Act, which gives to each Commissioner the same powers of investigation as held by the entire Commission. The action of the majority was also contrary to paragraph 48 of the public-utility law which empowers each Commissioner to administer oaths, issue subpenas, compel attendance of witnesses, and secure testimony. In case of disobedience, this paragraph places a duty on the District Court, on the application of any Commissioner, to compel obedience by proceedings for contempt. What is now going on is an evident attempt to lay the ground work for similar action on the part of the majority Commissioners in the coming electric-rate hearing. This procedure will allow the Commission to render a decision on an incomplete record. In the face of such reported acts, this is nothing but conspiracy on the part of the Potomac Electric Power Co. to violate the laws of the United States, namely, paragraphs 2 and 97 (b) of the law creating the Public Utilities Commission—act of March 4, 1913, 37 Statutes 974.

INVESTIGATION

The announcement that the Commission will at some future time embark upon an investigation of the sliding-scale formula is nothing but an evasion. The time to determine whether the sliding-scale formula yields fair and reasonable rates is when the rates are being determined, and not afterward. Besides, the Commission has in the past embarked upon so-called investigations, and whenever it appeared that the results might not be favorable to the utilities, the investigation was kept pending or nothing at all was accomplished.

TIME TO ACT

It is high time that the Congress of the United States exert itself to protect the rate payers. There are several ways to approach this problem effectively. In the interest of good administration, I suggest that the various Federal agencies that pay these electric bills and come to Congress for appropriations, should intervene in the hearings of March 2, to preserve a fair record.

In October of 1942, the President issued a statement calling attention to the importance of keeping all costs of the war program to a minimum consistent with satisfactory war progress. In this connection, he pointed out that in the case of electric power companies supplying energy for war plants or establishments, the cheapest source of power should be used. I consider the reported action of the local utility commission as a direct violation of these instructions.

I have written the President and asked that he instruct the various departments using this energy to intervene in the hearings of March 2 in order that a fair, factual record can be made, and the public interest protected. I hereby serve notice that if the utility commission still continues its announced position, I propose to introduce an investigation resolution so that this House may be further advised as to these overcharges, before one cent is appropriated for the payment of such bills. The Government and the people of this area are entitled to receive electricity at reasonable rates, and it is our duty to see that they are properly protected.

Farm Labor

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a letter received from the Kimball County (Nebr.) Labor Committee relative to the labor situation in that farming district.

It would do little good for the Department of Agriculture and this Congress to talk about increasing food supplies unless sufficient labor, farm machinery, and fertilizer is provided to the farmers.

It will be a serious mistake to take untrained individuals from the city or from the Army and ask them to operate complicated mechanical equipment on the farm. They might break up and destroy more machinery and crops than the benefit derived from their efforts. One answer to the farm shortage is to furlough the trained farm workers back to the farm.

If the present point rationing of food is an example of the shortage which is supposed to exist then certainly the people of the United States are near the starvation point. I do not believe that the point rationing as set up for food will function. It will need a great deal of overhauling and common-sense administration.

There may well be a serious food shortage in 1943. If so, there will be nothing for lease-lend to other countries nor is it possible to increase the production of

food by subsidizing the farmer. He needs help, machinery, and a fair profit.

The letter follows:

KIMBALL, NEBR., *February 16, 1943.*
Congressman A. L. MILLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have been appointed on the labor committee for Kimball County by the farmers and business people of our county. We would like to let you know how we find things with the farmers and business out here in the West. This is from a dry-land farmer.

The labor situation looks bad for farmers and other business that depends on labor. The first question when you contact a farmer is, "How am I going to get my work done without any skilled labor? My man, son, or partner has been drafted. A man without experience is almost worthless on the farm. He can't feed a pig, milk a cow, take care of chickens, and one would have to follow him to the field to see whether the tractor is working. The Government wants us to increase and use our old machinery, and it is hard to get repairs. If I ruin my tractor and can't get repairs and can't buy a new one, then what will I do? I think it would be a good time to do what I can myself and not take the chance."

Now the farmer who irrigates has the same trouble on skilled labor and he also has a bad labor situation to work out. He can go to all the expense to put in a crop and when it comes time to harvest his potatoes and beets, he can't get the necessary help. He loses a crop and his investment.

It looks to us here in the western part of Nebraska that this skilled labor should be where they can do the most good, whether it be in defense plants, Army, or on the farms.

It looks like that food plays the most important part. Food has to be there before the soldier, or as soon as he arrives on the battle front. To keep the bullets going you have to have food. With the odds the farmers have got to work under, why fool ourselves and think the job will be done.

There will likely be some idle acres. There are three Government plants within 50 miles of Kimball; the ordnance plant at Sidney to the east, the Scottsbluff Air Base on the north, and the defense plant at Cheyenne, Wyo. We are situated right in between them. When you ask a man to work for you, he almost laughs at you as he can work 8 hours per day, draws by far more money than the farmer can pay. A farmer's day is from 12 to 14 hours. Skilled labor looks like the biggest problem that is before us now to make this increased production which the Government is asking.

Sincerely,

PETRUS PETERSEN,
Potato Producer and Retailer.
A. A. REID,
County Agent, Kimball County
Labor Committee.

Aid for Small Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply concerned about the plight of our small liberal-arts colleges. In recent years the death rate among our small colleges has been appalling. In order to find out just how serious the problem is I asked the United States Office of Education to furnish me with the mortality list of our small colleges during recent years. The records of the Office of Education only go back as far as the year 1934. From 1934 to November 10, 1942, the record shows that 223 small colleges either closed or were merged with other educational institutions. Year by year, the record is as follows: 35 in 1934, 19 in 1935, 20 in 1936, 18 in 1937, 24 in 1938, 24 in 1939, 23 in 1940, 22 in 1941, 38 for the year 1942 up to November 10. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to include in my remarks the list furnished me by the United States Office of Education.

We can ill afford to lose so many of our small colleges. These small colleges, over the years, have been our principal training ground of real Americans; and we need them today, in my opinion, more than ever before. If steps are not taken to render many of our small colleges financial aid, I am afraid our war effort will bring about the closing of many more. In this connection, I want to again congratulate the joint committee for the selection of non-Federal institutions to be used in connection with our war effort, upon selecting so many of our small colleges for training schools.

The list referred to is as follows:

LIST OF HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS DROPPED FROM THE OFFICIAL EDUCATIONAL DIRECTORY, UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION, 1934–42, BY YEAR AND CLASSIFICATION

(NOTE.—In general, institutions included in this list, except where otherwise indicated, closed prior to the year specified. Information obtained from the Division of Higher Education, U. S. Office of Education.)

1934

Arkansas: Galloway Woman's College, Searcy, merged with Hendrix College; junior. Mountain Home College, Mountain Home, closed; junior.

Colorado: Fort Lewis School, Hesperus, a branch of Colorado Agricultural College; junior.

Georgia: Bowdon State Normal and Industrial College, Bowdon; teachers. Emory Junior College, Valdosta, branch of Emory University; junior. Georgia State College for Men, Tifton; college. Lucy Cobb Institute, Athens, closed; junior.

Idaho: Southern Branch, a branch of University of Idaho; junior.

Illinois: Crane Junior College, Chicago, ordered closed; junior.

Kansas: St. Mary's College, St. Marys, a theological house; college.

Kentucky: Bethel College, Russellville, closed January 1933; junior. Hamilton College, merged with Transylvania College; junior.

Minnesota: Seabury Divinity School, Faribault, merged with Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Ill.; professional school.

Missouri: Missouri Christian College, Camden Point, merged with Eugene Bible College, Oregon; junior. Ozark Wesleyan College, Carthage, closed January 1933; junior. St. Louis Library School, St. Louis, closed; professional school. Will Mayfield College, Marble Hill, closed 1932; junior.

Nebraska: Cotner College, Lincoln, closed 1933; college. Merici College, York, closed 1933; normal.

New York: Jamaica Teachers Training College, closed February 1933; normal. Maxwell Teachers Training College, closed February 1933; teachers. New York Teachers Training College, closed February 1933; teachers. St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, no reports; professional school.

North Carolina: Joseph Keasbey Brick Junior College (Negro), Bricks, closed; junior.

Ohio: Young Men's Christian Association School of Commerce, a branch of the Young Men's Christian Association, Night Law School; junior.

South Dakota: Redfield College, Redfield, merged with Yankton College; junior.

Texas: Texas Christian College, closed; junior.

Virginia: Armstrong Normal School (Negro), Richmond, closed June 1933; normal.

Wisconsin: Central Wisconsin College, Scandinavia, closed 1933; junior.

1935

Connecticut: Weylister Junior College, Milford (1 year); junior.

Delaware: Beacom College, Wilmington, a business college; junior.

Georgia: Burke County Junior College, Waynesboro, closed June 1933; junior.

Illinois: Broadview Junior College, La Grange, closed 1934; junior.

Kansas: Tabor College, Hillsboro, closed 1934; junior.

Missouri: Kidder Junior College, Kidder, closed October 1933; junior.

New Jersey: Le Master Institute, Asbury Park, closed 1934; junior.

New York: Ethical Culture School, New York, no college work offered; normal.

North Carolina: Davenport College, Lenoir, closed January 1934; junior.

Ohio: Central Theological Seminary, merged with Eden Theological Seminary of Webster Groves, St. Louis, Mo.; professional school.

Iowa: Wartburg Normal College, Waverly, merged with Wartburg College at Clinton; junior.

1936

Arkansas: Little Rock College, Little Rock, absorbed by St. John's Seminary; college.

Illinois: Bell School of Expression and Dramatic Art, Chicago; professional school. Illinois Military School, Abingdon, closed 1935; professional school.

Indiana: South Bend Law School, South Bend; professional school.

Iowa: Grundy Junior College, Grundy Center, closed 1935; junior.

Kentucky: Louisville Normal School, Louisville, closed 1935; normal.

Louisiana: New Orleans University, New Orleans (Negro), merged with Straight College, 1935, under name of Dillard University; college. Straight College, New Orleans (Negro), merged with New Orleans University, 1935, under name of Dillard University; college.

Maine: Dingley Normal Training School, Lewiston, closed 1935; normal.

Michigan: Detroit Teachers College, Detroit, now a division of Teachers Wayne University.

Minnesota: Bethel Institute, St. Paul; junior. Concordia College, St. Paul, closed 1935; junior. St. Paul-Luther College, St. Paul, merged in 1935 with Wartburg College, Clinton, Iowa; junior.

North Carolina: Weaver College, Weaverville, closed 1934; junior.

Ohio: College of the Sacred Heart, Cincinnati, closed 1935; college.

Oregon: Eugene Bible University, Eugene, closed 1935; professional school.

Pennsylvania: Gratz College, Philadelphia; normal. Teachers Training School, McKeesport, closed 1935; normal.

Tennessee: Dubose Memorial Church Training School, Monteagle; professional school.

Texas: Houston Junior College, Houston, now a division of the University of Houston; junior. Houston Colored Junior College, Houston (Negro), now a division of Houston College for Negroes; junior.

1937

Colorado: Denver Junior College, Denver, closed; junior.

Florida: Palmer College and Academy; DeFuniak Springs, closed; junior.

Illinois: Danville Junior College, Danville, closed; junior. Emerson Junior College, Chicago, closed; junior. Kendall College of Physical Education, Chicago, merged with George Williams College; normal.

Massachusetts: Springfield Normal Kindergarten Primary Training School, Springfield; normal.

Michigan: St. Mary Normal College, Monroe, closed; normal.

Missouri: Inter-County Junior College, Cameron, closed; junior.

New Hampshire: Concord Training School, Concord, closed; normal.

New Jersey: Dana College, Newark, merged with the University of Newark; college. Immaculate Conception Seminary, Darlington, professional school.

New York: Mason Collegiate School, Tarrytown, closed; junior. Seth Low Junior College (Columbia University), closed; junior.

Ohio: St. John's University, Toledo, closed; college.

Pennsylvania: Ilman Training School, Philadelphia, merged with the University of Pennsylvania; normal.

South Carolina: Brewer Normal School, Greenwood (Negro), closed; normal.

Texas: Jefferson School of Law, Dallas, closed; professional school.

Virginia: Richmond Normal School, Richmond, closed; normal.

1938

California: Lincoln College of Law, Bakersfield, closed; professional school. San Diego Army and Naval Academy and Junior College, Pacific Beach, junior college work discontinued; junior.

Colorado: Colorado Vocational College, Denver; junior.

Georgia: Bowdon College, Bowdon, closed; junior.

Illinois: Chicago Teachers College, Chicago; normal. Peoples Junior College, Chicago, junior college work discontinued; junior. Roosevelt Military Academy, Aledo, junior college work discontinued; junior.

Iowa: Decorah College for Women, Decorah, merged with Luther College in 1936; college.

Kentucky: Lincoln Institute, Lincoln Ridge (Negro), closed; college.

Louisiana: Mount Carmel Normal College, New Orleans; normal.

Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts, Waltham, merged with Middlesex University; junior.

Michigan: Detroit City Law School, Detroit, merged with Wayne University; professional school. Pontiac Junior College, Pontiac, closed; junior.

Mississippi: Granada College, Granada, suspended for current year; junior. Jackson School of Law, Jackson; professional school. Tupelo Military Institute and Junior College, Tupelo, junior-college work discontinued; junior.

Missouri: Western College, Kansas City; junior.

New Jersey: Passaic County Junior College, Paterson, now operated as a part of New Jersey State College for Teachers, at Paterson; junior.

North Carolina: Kittrell College, Kittrell (Negro), closed; junior.

Ohio: Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, merged with Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill; professional school. Toledo Teachers College, Toledo, merged with De Sales College; teachers.

Oklahoma: Bartlesville Junior College, Bartlesville; junior. Poteau Junior College, Poteau, closed; junior.

Tennessee: Nashville Conservatory of Music, Nashville; professional school.

1939

Arkansas: Missionary Baptist College, Sheridan; junior.

California: Lux Technical Institute, San Francisco, listed with California School of Mechanical Arts and Wilmerding School of Industrial Arts; junior. Miramonte School and Junior College, Atascadero; junior.

Colorado: Denver College of Music, Denver; professional school.

Georgia: Cox College, College Park; junior.

Idaho: Gooding College, Wesleyan; college.

Illinois: Chicago Law School, Chicago; professional school. Columbia Conservatory of Music, Aurora; professional school. Columbia School of Music, Chicago; professional school.

Indiana: Benjamin Harrison Law School, Indianapolis; professional school. Daniel Voorhees Law School, Terre Haute; professional school.

Massachusetts: Howard Seminary, West Bridgewater; junior.

Minnesota: Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul; professional school.

Missouri: Benton College of Law, St. Louis; professional school.

New Jersey: Essex Junior College, Newark; junior.

New York: Flatbush Teacher Training School, Brooklyn; normal.

North Carolina: Rutherford College, Rutherford; junior.

Pennsylvania: Henry Clay Frick Training School for Teachers, Pittsburgh; normal. Philadelphia Normal School, Philadelphia; normal.

South Carolina: Greenville Woman's College, Greenville, is now the woman's division of Furman University; college.

Texas: Kidd-Key College and Conservatory, Sherman; junior. San Antonio Public School of Law, San Antonio; professional school.

West Virginia: Charleston Educational Center, Charleston. Mason College of Music, Charleston; professional school.

1940

Arkansas: Jonesboro College, Jonesboro; junior.

California: Miss Fulmer's School, Los Angeles; normal.

Connecticut: Culver-Smith Kindergarten Training School, Hartford; normal. Miss Porter's School, Farmington; junior.

Georgia: State Teachers and Agricultural College, Forsyth (Negro); junior.

Illinois: Chicago Christian College, Chicago; junior. Oak Park Junior College, Oak Park; junior. St. Viator College, Bourbonnais; college.

Iowa: Cherokee Junior College, Cherokee; junior. Des Moines College of Pharmacy, Des Moines, merged with Drake University, Des Moines; professional school.

Michigan: Battle Creek College, Battle Creek; college. Detroit College of Law, Detroit, merged with Detroit Institute of Technology, Detroit; professional school.

Mississippi: Mississippi Synodical College, Holly Springs, merged with Belhaven College, Jackson; junior.

Missouri: Kansas City School of Law, Kansas City, merged with University of Kansas City; professional school.

Montana: Intermountain Union College, Great Falls, merged with Billings Polytechnic Institute, Polytechnic; college.

New York: A. M. Chesebrough Seminary, North Chili; junior. De Lancey Divinity School, Buffalo; professional school. The Knox School, Cooperstown; junior.

Ohio: Giffin College, Van Wert; junior.

Oklahoma: Oklahoma Presbyterian College, Durant; junior. Wetumka Junior College, Wetumka; junior.

South Carolina: Brainerd Junior College, Chester (Negro); junior.

Texas: Guadalupe College, Seguin (Negro); college. Randolph Junior College, Cisco; junior; Wesley College, Greenville; junior.

Virginia: Southern College, Petersburg; junior.

1941

Alabama: State Normal School, Daphne; normal.

California: Fresno Technical Junior College, Fresno; junior.

District of Columbia: Catholic Sisters College, Washington, listed under Catholic University of America, college. Washington School of Physical Education, Washington; normal.

Florida: Ringling Junior College, Sarasota; junior.

Indiana: Lincoln College of Indiana, Indianapolis; professional school.

Louisiana: Margaret C. Hanson Normal School, New Orleans; normal.

Mississippi: Mississippi Woman's College, Hattiesburg (temporarily suspended); college.

New York: First Institute of Podiatry, New York, merged with New York University; professional school.

North Carolina: Palmer Memorial Institute, Sedalia (Negro); junior.

Ohio: Alfred Holbrook College, Manchester; college.

West Virginia: Kanawha College, Charleston, merged with Morris Harvey College; junior.

1942

Alabama: Selma University, Selma (Negro); college.

Connecticut: Connecticut College of Pharmacy, New London, merged with University of Connecticut; professional school.

Illinois: Peoria Kindergarten Primary Training School, Peoria; normal.

Indiana: Normal College of the American Gymnastic Union, Indianapolis, merged with Indiana University; teachers.

Massachusetts: Mount Ida Junior College, Boulder Farm, Newton; junior.

Missouri: Kansas City-Western Dental College, Kansas City, merged with the University of Kansas City; professional school.

Nebraska: Omaha "Y" Schools (evening), Omaha; University of Omaha Law School, Inc. (evening), Omaha; professional schools.

New York: Jenny Hunter's Kindergarten and Primary Training School, New York; normal. New York School of Social Work, New York, merged with Columbia University; professional school.

Virginia: Nansemond Collegiate Institute, Suffolk (Negro); normal.

1943

Arkansas: El Dorado Junior College, El Dorado; junior.

California: Cumnock Junior College, Los Angeles; junior.

Colorado: Lamont School of Music, Denver, merged with College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Denver; professional school. Westminster Law School, Denver; professional school.

Connecticut: Bridgeport City Normal School, Bridgeport; normal. Maret Junior College, Thompson; junior.

District of Columbia: Fairmont Junior College and Seminary, Washington; junior. Gunston Hall, Washington, junior. Mount Vernon Junior College, Washington, taken over by United States Navy, will probably reopen.

Georgia: Emory Junior College, Valdosta; junior.

Illinois: Elgin Junior College, Elgin, offers 1 year of college work; junior. Maine Township Junior College, Park Ridge; junior.

Iowa: Britt Junior College, Britt; junior. Des Moines College of Law, Des Moines, sold to Drake University; professional school. Dowling College, Des Moines; junior.

Kansas: Western University, State industrial department, Kansas City (Negro); junior.

Kentucky: Bethel Woman's College, Hopkinsville; junior. Kentucky State College of

Optometry, Mount Sterling; professional school.

Louisiana: Dodd College, Shreveport; junior. St. Vincent's College, Shreveport; college.

Maine: Eastern State Normal School, Castine; normal.

Maryland: National Park College, Forest Glen, closed for duration of the war; junior.

Massachusetts: Posse School, Kendal Green; normal.

Michigan: Mount Mercy College, Grand Rapids; college.

Mississippi: Hillman College, Clinton, merged with Mississippi College; junior.

Missouri: Kansas City Junior College, Kansas City, merged with Teachers College of Kansas City; junior.

Montana: Great Falls Junior College, Great Falls; junior.

Nebraska: Hebron Junior College, Hebron, closed for duration of the war; junior.

New Jersey: Middlesex County Junior College, Perth Amboy; junior. St. Joseph's College, Princeton; college.

New York: Graduate School for Jewish Social Work, New York; professional school. Hartwick Theological Seminary, New York; professional school.

Ohio: De Sales College, Toledo, has suspended activities for an indefinite period; college.

Oklahoma: Bristow Junior College, Bristow; junior. Duncan Junior College, Duncan; junior. Sapulpa Junior College, Sapulpa; junior.

Pennsylvania: Wyomissing Polytechnic Institute, Wyomissing; junior.

Texas: University of San Antonio, San Antonio, merged with Trinity University, Waxahachie; college.

Virginia: Arlington Hall, School for Girls, Arlington, closed for duration of the war; junior.

Washington: Spokane Junior College, Spokane, merged with Whitworth College; junior.

Tax Collections

REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD H. McLEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I address myself again to the changes necessary in our income-tax procedure so that the taxes may be collected out of current income.

At the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means an effort was made to show that the demand for the adoption of the suggestion of Mr. Beardsley Ruml came from the people in the higher brackets. There appeared in the Boston Traveler of February 19, 1943, a concise editorial showing that the Ruml plan is no more a rich man's plan than it is a poor man's plan. The editorial reflects my viewpoint and I am reading it into the RECORD for the information of the House. It is as follows:

THE CLASS ILLUSION

Admittedly it is a rare piece of legislation that benefits everyone. But the Ruml plan is just such a rarity. Let us not allow rarity to become a ground for suspicion.

The Treasury officials, in their frantic efforts to calk the sinking craft of opposition to the Ruml plan, have fallen back on suspicion's oldest dodge, the class illusion.

The rich man benefits by the Ruml plan. Therefore the poor man loses.

Of course, the rich man benefits by the Ruml plan. That is why he wants it. But it is equally true that the average man and the poor man benefit by the Ruml plan. That is why they want it.

The rich man's gain is not necessarily the poor man's loss. The rich man will gain by military victory over the Axis. So will the average man, the poor man, and every decent man in the whole world.

Actually the gain of the rich man is less certain than that of the poor man. No one gains immediately unless his income in 1943 is substantially less than in 1942.

In most cases of gain, the gain comes from the fact that a man has entered the armed services since January 1. Who begrudges him the gain?

In other cases one goes on paying as always his taxes until the death which, by proverb, barely matches them in inevitability. Then comes the personal gain, and it comes not to the taxpayer but to his heirs.

But the rich man's estate pays an inheritance tax on his property, which is the larger to the extent of being free from an income-tax burden for the year of his demise. On the estates of the average man and the poor man no inheritance tax is levied.

The Ruml plan is everyone's plan.

The Critical Food Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the food situation in this country is rapidly becoming more critical. Nothing has been seriously proposed by the administration as yet which indicates there is the slightest understanding of conditions which surround those on whom we must depend to furnish the necessary foodstuffs for our armed forces and those of our allies, the American people, and such other foreign peoples as we may be able to supply from the food which will be produced in this country.

For instance, this morning, I received a letter from a wholesale hardware company which stated, in part, as follows:

There is one thing that has come up and we cannot quite understand why they do not prepare for it. For instance, they are planning for victory gardens and growing fruits, vegetables, and berries, but no provision has been made for canners. We used to buy these in enamelware that would cook at one time on the top of the stove seven 1-quart jars. Some would probably hold a few more, but if it could be standardized from 18 to 20 quarts capacity it would take care of 6 to 10 quart jars and people could get by.

With all this hullabaloo about victory gardens, the people will not be able to purchase equipment to cook the products they raise. It just does not make sense. I suppose you agree that most of the things do not make sense. It does not make sense that they are pulling off down there, but this is a serious problem. We have been scouring the country ourselves for some kind of a cooker, but from all sources they claim the Government will not allow them to make any of these items.

Mr. Speaker, I also received a letter from an old friend who at one time was one of my constituents. He has been very successful in business and some years ago acquired a plantation in South Carolina. He used this plantation for a shooting preserve. His letter is a most interesting one. It is typical of many such letters which come to my office and discloses the difficulties one faces in attempting to do his share toward meeting the demand for foodstuffs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend my remarks by printing an excerpt from the first letter referred to and to print the other in full. I commend to the Members of this House a careful reading of the same:

A great deal has been said and written of late in regard to the farm problem, and I think possibly you might be interested in high-hand information as to some of the difficulties we farmers are experiencing.

I don't know whether you know it, but when conditions began to get bad here a year ago last fall and the Government began to ask for more foodstuffs, I decided to cut out a lot of my hunting activities and convert my plantation into a producing farm in order to increase, as the Government requested, the supplies of eggs, milk, and meat. I have about 300 laying hens and want to double that this year. I have started a herd of Guernsey dairy cattle, which I am building up as rapidly as possible, and have been selling milk for nearly a year. I have also started a herd of Angus beef cattle.

I sold a good many hogs last year and expect to put at least 125 to 130 on the market this year. Grain and hay are so scarce and the price so high that the only way this program can be carried out is by raising my own food, and in order to carry out my program this year I ought to put at least 100 to 150 acres more land under cultivation.

A lot has been said about the farm labor situation and how it should be corrected. It is serious, and it's impossible for me to secure the necessary competent help, but I have not seen a suggestion yet from the long-haired boys in Washington that would meet the situation. Taking my own case, I am paying $2 a day for farm labor, which is too much, especially for the kind of colored help that we get in the South, but as long as these men can go to Georgetown or Charleston, or even to Andrews and get $4 or $5 a day, I don't see how there is anything that Washington can do that will keep these men working for me on the farm at $2 a day.

The only solution I can see, and I admit it is only a partial solution for the increasing of farm production, is for the Government to furnish the farms with the necessary labor-saving machinery, but this the Government has not been willing to do. I have tried for over a year to buy a farm tractor, because one man on a tractor, with the kind of crops I raise, will do the work of five men with mules—if you could get the mules and hire the men. The Government has allotted one tractor to this county, but this has not been delivered and another man has an application in ahead of mine, so I do not see how I am going to work my land the coming season.

The Government has restricted the amount of fertilizer that the farmers can buy. With the number of cattle I have I have a good

deal of manure and I have tried for a long time to buy a manure spreader, but none are available. One man with a manure spreader will do the work of 4 men handling this material by hand, and instead of being able to build up my land and produce more crops the manure lies in the barnyard and loses most of its beneficial quality.

When the gasoline shortage became acute I tried to buy a farm wagon as I had 2 mules and could use this in a lot of the work and save gas and oil. There is not a farm wagon for sale in the county. I talked with one dealer in Kingstree and he said he had put in his order early, that the wagons had been manufactured but the Government had frozen the output and there they lie in the manufacturer's plants and nobody getting the use of them. Small equipment such as plows, harrows, etc., are in the same situation.

As I say, I do not expect you to do anything specific about this but I thought you might be interested in hearing first hand just what those of us are up against who are trying to assist in carrying out the Government's program.

Since dictating the above I have had the following word from the plantation: "We have been trying to buy milk cans in which to ship our surplus milk to Charleston, where it is badly needed, but milk cans are rationed and not a single milk can has been allotted to Georgetown County, consequently this milk that ought to go to market is being fed to the chickens and hogs."

How Can We Get Maximum Food Production?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, coming to my desk today was a splendid article by Louis Bromfield, author, publicist, farmer, and Democrat. This article is entitled "How Can We Get Maximum Food Production?" I have seen nothing which more fully or more intelligently pictures the food situation. If the bureaucrats handling the food problem for this Government would only read, understand, and immediately and vigorously act upon the suggestions contained therein, much of the consternation and fear in the public mind would quickly disappear.

Following is the article:

HOW CAN WE GET MAXIMUM FOOD PRODUCTION?

(By Louis Bromfield, author, publicist, farmer, and Democrat)

By profession I am a writer and a farmer—a dirt farmer—living upon 1,100 acres of land which produces for the food market beef, veal, eggs, capons, broilers, lamb, mutton, wool, hogs, and dairy products. I have been concerned deeply and at first hand in the problem of food production since 5 or 6 months before Pearl Harbor.

Secretary of Agriculture Wickard tells us that we shall have sufficient food during the coming year, but he does not say what that food will be. Perhaps it will be no more than mere stuffing. Of one thing I am certain: that the American people will, one way or another, be fighting for butter, pork, beef, dairy products, eggs, and many other commodities. There are already many metropolitan and industrial areas where for days and even weeks few of these things are even available today. The situation will grow worse rather than better.

You may well ask: "How can such a condition come about in the richest agricultural nation in the world—a nation which once had the finest of agricultural equipment?" The answer is very simple: that food production, like so many other vital phases of the war on the home front, has from the beginning been ignored and passed over. There has never been any authentic, coordinated food-production program, and there is none now.

The Army and Mr. McNutt's Manpower Commission continue to take what remains of the farmer's skilled labor—that vital and irreplaceable skilled labor, without which food cannot be produced at all. There have been all sorts of vague directions issued recently about farm labor but no orders have been given; and because General Hershey refuses to accept the responsibility of acting, as he has done since the very beginning, every draft board in the country continues to function on a different basis, and skilled farm labor is at this very moment being taken off farms to put into a gigantic swollen army which we may not be able to feed. Certainly it will be fed only at the expense of the American citizenry. One would not utter a complaint about sacrifices to feed our soldiers if this were a necessity. But it need not have been. This food condition has come about only through bungling and a total lack of all-intelligent planning.

There are many things about farming which city people do not understand. One of them is that just anybody cannot be farmer and food producer. Dairy, poultry, and stock-raising projects, as well as many other things, cannot be left to unskilled labor without risking disaster, not only economically to the individual farmer but to the whole field of food production. A dairy herd can be ruined in 6 weeks by a green hand. A poultry project of many thousands of hens can be wiped out in a few days in the hands of volunteers from Mr. Wickard's dream army of 3,000,000 unskilled land workers. Expensive and complicated machinery of the kind now in use on farms cannot be entrusted to unskilled workers, especially at a time when it is difficult or impossible to obtain repair parts.

Unskilled volunteer labor, poultry projects, hatcheries, dairy and beef feeding farms must close down. There is no other alternative. Yet the Selective Service and the Manpower Commission has consistently drained the farms of skilled labor and, despite any statement to the contrary, are continuing to do so.

Also vitally necessary to food production is the whole range of supplemental dairy, poultry, and livestock feeds. There are special compounds containing specialized combinations of proteins and minerals. Without them egg production can drop as much as 75 percent. Milk production can fall off 30 percent. Without these it takes twice as long to fatten out cattle and hogs for marketing. In other words, a farm producing 200 hogs a year with the necessary supplementary feeds can produce only 100 without them. Multiply this by many hundreds of thousands of farms and you will see what an appalling effect the lack of these prepared foods can have upon the total of production. It can run into a loss of billions of pounds of meat, poultry, and dairy products, which you will have to go without. Yet these foods are growing scarcer and scarcer and in some of the richest food-producing areas, they are today unavailable, because no one has planned for these things.

I think you begin to see that food production is as complicated as the production of guns and tanks, planes and ships. Perhaps it is more complicated. Certainly it is just as vital. Yet no planning was ever done on this terribly vital home front.

I would like to give you a picture at first hand of what the average farmer is up against today. He and his wife and children are working as they have never worked before in the fields, the poultry house, the dairy. Mr. McNutt says all labor must be hired through the United States Employment Bureau. If the farmer asks for farm labor, the answer is universally "There is none"—not even a cripple, an alcoholic, a moron. A farmer, according to the size of his farm, must lay out about this time of year from $200 to many thousands of dollars for seed and fertilizer for this year's crops. You cannot blame him for refusing to put up this money with the prospect of ruining himself and his family if there is no labor in prospect for the harvest. Many a farmer, perhaps most farmers have not yet gotten his last year's crops out of the way. They are still in the field. One has only to look out of the train window on any considerable journey through the Middle West to see hundreds of thousands of acres of corn and soybeans lying in sun and mud, unharvested. Thousands of acres of potatoes frozen and rotting in the ground. Yet last year the Army which, far more than industry, is responsible for the dearth of skilled farm labor, refused to furlough men to help with the harvest. If it continues its present attitude it will refuse again this year. This is nearly the end of February. Ploughing for next year's crops begins next month. Yet most farmers still have some of last year's crops rotting in the field. In many cases where farm machinery existed last season, it stood idle because there was not enough skilled labor to operate it; stood idle while crops froze and rotted in the field. The Government has issued no statistics about these conditions.

But labor is not the only farmer's problem. If he wants so much as a small repair part, he is forced to fill in innumerable forms and drive miles on precious rubber to put in an application for the part. Now very likely after waiting anywhere from 6 weeks to 6 months while bureaucrats entangle themselves in red tape, he will be told that he cannot have the part. The piece of machinery itself will stand broken and idle while crops go unharvested. The farmer has under these conditions, no time to waste, yet he is bombarded with questions and rating forms which take from 1 to 2 days of precious time to fill out. He is threatened by prison terms and heavy fines if he does not do so. At the present moment, he is the victim of monumental questionnaires regarding labor and machinery. If those questionnaires should ever have been sent, they should have been sent out months before Pearl Harbor and not when we are full in the midst of a desperate food crisis.

It is not surprising then that you hear good, hard working, honest, patriotic farmers say, "My family and I are all right. We will eat. When the city hasn't enough to eat, maybe something, even a little, will be done."

This is the immediate picture. If that were all, it would be horrible enough—the waste, the blundering, the suffering. But this scandal, and by next autumn it will be one of the greatest scandals in American history—affects the whole future history of ourselves and of the world—even the future possibility of a decent peace. And throughout the world, millions of people will sicken and die and generations of children will grow up stunted and sickly because a frivolous and incompetent bureaucracy in the richest country in the world, did not do its job.

Pay-As-You-Go Basis for Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, among the many matters pressing on Congress for prompt attention is the suggested pay-as-you-go basis for payment of income taxes. Many suggestions have been made and people throughout the country are practically unanimous in favor of some sort of a pay-as-you-go plan of taxation.

Of course, revenue is needed in the conduct of government, and all people who are interested in legislation at this time which will permit payment of taxes out of current income recognize the fact. However, there is an almost universal demand that the law be changed and that Congress enact a pay-as-you-go plan of taxation. I hope that the Ways and Means Committee of the House will present legislation along these lines to the House so that we may give prompt consideration to the tax problem. I favor such legislation.

As evidence of the widespread interest which people are taking in connection with this problem, I set forth herein an editorial from the Carlton County Vidette, published by W. H. Hassing, of Carlton, Minn. This editorial appears in the February 18 issue of the Carlton County Vidette, and is as follows:

WILL HAVE TO DO SOMETHING

If something constructive isn't done by March 15 about putting individual income taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis, the present "back taxing" system, paying taxes this year on last year's income, will be a back-breaking load for the 20,000,000 new taxpayers who were not prepared for the tax bill passed last October, and it is bound to affect the efficiency of the Nation's productive effort. The possible repercussions after the war seem too vast to contemplate.

Pay-as-you-go income taxes mean just one thing—each one of us pays as he earns, and hasn't got a year-old debt to worry about. Three proposals have been made: (1) Pay 2 years taxes in 1 year, which would be too burdensome; (2) pay taxes on 1943 income and postpone taxes on 1942 income until after the war, which would keep us in chains indefinitely; and (3) wipe out the debt on 1942 income while we all concentrate on paying taxes this year on this year's income.

The last of these three proposals is the only workable one, as to the effects both now and after the war. A small percentage of citizens might benefit from a "windfall"—where their income was greater in 1943 than in 1942. But this would be a relatively small inequity and could be corrected by compelling revised returns in such cases.

What the country cannot stand is a hangover of income tax debt after the war. This is particularly true of people living in small communities and the farmers, whose year-to-year incomes change radically from climatic and economic conditions over which they have no control.

The question of pay-as-you-go taxes is squarely up to Congress which has shown it can act quickly when convinced the folks back home want something done. Members of Congress were elected to represent citizens, who have it in their power to give directives to their Senators and Representatives.

Among many influential organizations that have endorsed pay-as-you-go income tax legislation are the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation. Their endorsements need individual backing.

No one objects to paying a fair share of taxes, especially with the Nation at war. Millions of new income taxpayers do not yet realize what they face on March 15 under the present tax law. Pay-as-you-go taxes are merely a matter of bookkeeping for the treasury department, except in a relatively few "windfall" cases. Can we allow this to stand in the way of constructive legislation that will free our productive citizens from financial debt and worry, at a time when such burdens upon the family budget and the mind can hinder the effectiveness of war production for the forces on the fighting fronts?

The Outcry Against Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks there has been a great deal of loose and unthoughtful talk about the big "bugbear," bureaucracy. I readily agree that some governmental employees and officers have made gross mistakes and deserve criticism, but the blanket castigation of all Government employees is ridiculous and unconvincing. As a matter of fact, the great majority are conscientious and are rendering good service.

A very fair presentation of the true situation about bureaucracy was made in a radio address by Dr. Frank W. Prescott, head of the Adolph S. Ochs department of city government, University of Chattanooga. His radio address was printed in full in the Chattanooga Times of February 22.

The address is as follows:

As the impact of total war becomes increasingly severe upon our daily lives, the outcry against bureaucrats and the bureaucracy rises to a higher key and in almost ominous tone. The air waves and newspapers are full of two names, "bureaucrat" and "bureaucracy." What is this new danger from which the country must be saved? For sufficient example, I point to that interesting but seldom read compendium of human knowledge, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Appendix to which was examined for a recent 2 months for sample headlines. We are told by one commentator that the Baruch report on the rubber situation "is important as a case study in bureaucratic fumbling—in this arsenal of bureaucracy"; the present situation, to one observer, is "Government by bureaucratic mandate"; to another it is a "Manpower dictatorship"; from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News we find an example of "Washington foolishness," and in the Washington Post a "Danger of Executive lawmaking"; while far across the continent from Pocatello (Idaho) Tribune is the query raised in the matter of stopping charge accounts at filling stations, "Will this idiocy ever stop?" In stentorian tones, Hon. CLARE HOFFMAN (Michigan) says it is "time for the bureaucrats to take warning," while Mr. SHAFER, also from Michigan, rises to the occasion with "Bureaucrats fiddle while people freeze" and "bureaucrats usurp congressional authority."

Not only are we told—we have cartoons of a big, smug, well-upholstered fellow in a fancy zoot suit, living off the fat of the land, while a multitude of desperate men, women, and children hold up their hands pleading for oil, gas, tires, and a crumb of "good old sliced bakers' bread" from this newly enthroned "dictator."

If this were merely the old battlecry of the Outs versus the Ins, or a revival of the solemn warning of the late James M. Beck's book Our Wonderland of Bureaucracy, which was published, incidentally not last year, but in June 1932, we might shrug it off good naturedly as an example of grandmotherly meddling, or find it a hardy perennial type of criticism against the rising tide of governmental costs and interventions in private affairs.

But it appears that it is something more than partisan attack. We are fighting a war in the hope of making it the last world war, and we also know that to bring victory we must have unity on the home front; and we must have a willingness to accept without much coercion the inconveniences, the irritations and tightened belts that go with dwindling supplies of consumer goods and services. The importance of this sort of propaganda upon the success of the all-out food rationing that is just around the corner, a program which is designed to hold down the cost of living, check inflation and provide the essentials to the family food budget. Assuming constantly increasing pressure on decreasing supply of consumer goods from higher wages and profits, what would be the alternatives? One would be to say: "He who has the money gets the goods;" a second choice would be: "First come, first served;" and the third is "rationing." Are we to expect that the people will respond to every incident of price and supply control with the cry that "bureaucracy has run riot"?

Unless we look at this thing carefully we may be overcome by a tyranny of words. For when we are told that war makes regulation of our complex economy inevitable, we hear the appeal to unreason in blasts against bureaucracy. When reasonable suggestions looking to plans for an orderly and just peace settlement are advanced, they are met with that recently coined word "globaloney." So let us examine this new danger to our liberties and democracy from which the country must be saved.

Let me say at once that there are dangers inherent in bureaucracy. For this term means a system of government, the control of which is so completely in the hands of officials that their power jeopardizes the liberties of the citizen. The characteristics of such a regime are in contrast to the informality of small private business which reaches decisions by prompt and often unwritten judgments. In bureaucracy there is a passion for rule, delay in making of decisions and a refusal to embark upon experiment, and in extreme cases the members of the group may become a hereditary caste manipulating government to their own advantage. In a government which is so greatly increasing its scope to include approximately 90 percent of our economic life, this is indeed an important problem.

American Government is conducted on the assumption that public servants are dishonest and corrupt, and hence its chief function is to so surround its servants with rules and paper work and supervision, and by frequent rotation in office, that this innate depravity should in large degree be checked. Some of the traditional red tape is due partly to the

fact that these officials must be curbed in the public interest; moreover, the officers themselves have to rely upon an intricate maze of rules and regulations, strict adherence to which must be had to shield themselves from the drumfire of attack in congressional investigation committees, the source of much of the criticism we hear today.

Some of the admitted evils of bureaucracy, however, are not characteristic of government alone. The older and larger business corporations have been ridden with it, and some of them develop rigid bureaucratic methods. These huge business empires employ scores of thousands of people and raise and spend more revenue than a majority of the 48 States do. Large educational and religious organizations, and the vast labor unions of modern times are not free from bureaucratic problems, and as they grow older, tend to develop complacent bureaucracies. Bureaucracy is then not a thing that we can take or leave. It surrounds us on all sides. It is an affliction that seems to inhere with bigness, and we cannot abolish it without getting rid of all the big organizations, public and private, that in one way or another "regiment" our lives.

Again, unless we wish to be deceived by words, bureaucrat is not another name for civil servant. It has been charged that we have 3,000,000 bureaucrats on the pay roll—or one for every three men in the armed forces. On Armistice Day 1918 there were 917,000 civil employees. During the past year 100,000 civilian employees per month have been added to Federal employment; the figures for November 1942 were 2,750,101. Of these 400,000 civilians in Federal employment were engaged in the task of civilian administration of the war effort. A total of 1,612,257 are used in the operation of the navy yards scattered from Kittery, Maine, to Bremerton, Wash.; in Federal arsenals from Watertown, Frankford, and Rock Island. They build ships, make guns and shells, machines and equipment, arsenals and camps, operate airports and signal systems, inspect warplanes and tanks, sew uniforms and tents; chippers, caulkers, riveters, welders, boilermakers, machinists, carpenters, painters, and the whole gamut of skilled trades.

If you call every employee of the Government a bureaucrat, then you will find yourself, including letter carriers, tax clerks, forest rangers, draftsmen, and engineers of the Tennessee Valley Authority (which had at the end of the last fiscal year 39,579 workers on its rolls)—in fact, your neighbor, or perhaps your own daughter, is employed in some form of Government work. It is, in brief, a trap to catch the unwary to lump them all together as bureaucrats.

It seems established that in some places there are too many Government employees; overmanning prevailed in 1918, and it is of sufficient importance to find that the House Committee on the Civil Service is now investigating the problem of excess employment—the alleged hoarding of manpower, etc. New agencies called upon, as they often are, to administer a huge job overnight—almost without warning, as the new 48-hour-week ruling has imposed on Manpower Commission—quite humanly hire more than they need at the moment. Other nonwar bureaus attempt to hold their staffs together—a thing every business likes to do if it can—more perhaps than it should be. Bureaus, like persons, strive for self-preservation. It is a difficult, if not impossible, task to repair a boat while crossing a turbulent stream. So it goes. The department head—say, the War Department—with its 1,000,000 civilian employees, does not want to run the risk of losing men's lives and defeating essential war purposes by understaffing. We are out to win a war and we are not going to win it by lopping off a few salaries here and there. Excessive pay rolls must be watched, but cannot be completely cured, and it is not helped very much by parroting a big $5 word; in short, overemployment is not bureaucracy.

A permanent problem in modern government, here as in Europe, is how to reconcile popular government with the need for expertness. It is a problem which is being studied exhaustively in courses in public administration in most of our universities. It is one which deserves the careful consideration of all citizens who desire to see our Governments, Federal, State, and local, administered ably and impartially by trained public servants. Those who wrote our Constitution warned, in the Federalist, "how little the rights of a feeble government is likely to be respected * * * by its own constituents." Government, after all, is a human institution. But "a feeble execution of the Government * * * is but another phrase for bad execution, and a government ill executed, whatever it may be in theory, must be, in practice, a bad government," and they admonished that "the true test of a good government is its aptitude to produce a good administration." Nothing can confuse the issue more than to shout "bureaucrat" whenever we confront a public servant. And we cannot rely exclusively upon Congress to save us from the so-called bureaucracy. Congress itself needs thoroughgoing renovation of its procedures to equip it to meet the impact of the war effort, for the Congress is not organized to solve major questions of policy, its behavior is conditioned in large measure by local and regional demands and the omnipresent pressure groups. So we end where we began, we need efficient government, but we must also insist upon a government of laws administered by the right kind of men. We must have that kind of government administration to cope with the increasing complexities of the day.

Farm Labor Bottleneck a Serious Threat to Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it requires no persuasion or reference to logic to realize that food is as important a weapon in modern warfare as ammunition, tanks, planes, and battleships.

With the grim specter of starvation prevalent in Axis-controlled nations and the desperate need of our allies for tons of foodstuffs, it is readily apparent that the whole world is looking to the farmers of America with hope and expectation that the annual harvest in 1943 will provide a supply of food to feed the undernourished and starving millions who are unable to help themselves.

Plans are already under way for the spring planting of crops; yet the uncertainty of securing the necessary skilled labor to properly cultivate our farms has caused millions of farmers to hesitate to carry out their crop programs. The higher wages paid in the defense industries have lured many agricultural workers to new jobs. The reckless disregard of appeals for draft deferment for farm labor by countless draft boards has depleted the ranks of skilled farm labor to such a degree that dairy farmers throughout the Nation are disposing of registered cattle because they are unable to operate their farms. In like manner, crop farmers have been forced reluctantly to reduce their acreage program. The net result is a huge loss to the food-production program.

When you consider that there are over 6,000,000 farmers in the United States and that prior to Pearl Harbor 1,500,000 were unable to produce at capacity because of adverse conditions affecting the farm industry, you can well appreciate the devastating effect that the drafting of farm labor has wrought upon agriculture.

Despite the assertion that the employment of youths of high-school age on the farms of America may be counted upon to offset the inroads caused by the drafting of farm labor for military service, it is evident that proper consideration has not been given to the fact that farming requires skilled manpower. It is conceded that high-school boys may assist in some routine tasks during harvest time, but the proper conduct of a farm demands a skill that is only acquired through experience and environment.

The farmer is one individual in America who is not bound by any wage-and-hour law. The average farmer and his wife are obliged to work from dawn to dusk 7 days a week and their crops and cattle demand constant and painstaking attention.

In my congressional district, comprising Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties in Pennsylvania, we have some of the most successful farmers in America. These sons of the soil take pardonable pride in their farms, crops, and cattle. Many of the farms have been tilled for generations and the buildings and fields are a delight to the eye.

These industrious American citizens are imbued with a high sense of patriotism and their basic traits of honesty, sobriety, and industry have contributed greatly to the development of agriculture and the common welfare of our Nation. They have furnished food, taxes, and their sons and daughters to the armed forces in every crisis faced by this great Republic.

This war has clearly demonstrated that we must feed the peoples of the world, as well as send military supplies and manpower to the far-flung battlefronts.

The farmers of the Twenty-third Congressional District in Pennsylvania are ready and willing to increase their production but it is necessary that they receive immediate consideration for their manifold problems.

We are told that crops will suffer a decrease of from 10 to 15 percent over the year 1942. Many farmers in my district venture the prediction that the harvest of 1943 is facing a 30-percent decrease over that of 1942.

Therefore, it is recognized that we cannot afford to delay instant solution to the farm problem. Spring planting cannot wait on extended conferences or postponed programs. The farmer is willing and eager to contribute his brain and

brawn to the food-production program. He cannot function properly with teen-age boys because the pursuit of farming is not child's play. Farm machinery and implements require experienced and skilled labor. The broiling heat of the noon-day sun calls for experienced farm labor and not for seasonal help such as picking apples and sorting vegetables.

The phrase "too little and too late" which has been freely used during the present war may be aptly applied to the farm problem and especially in view of the fact that the spring planting season is upon us. It will not permit further haggling or wrangling over the farm problem.

The following editorial from the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune entitled "Food Shortage Threat" is very timely to the subject. The editorial is as follows:

FOOD-SHORTAGE THREAT

Ominous reports are being received from Blair County rural regions concerning reductions in acreage and dairy herds.

Secretary of Agriculture Wickard said the other day there were indications of a 10- to 15-percent cut, largely because of the manpower shortage. And he urged farmers to redouble efforts to surpass last year's production, despite this great handicap.

Yet it appears from extremely reliable reports in this county that the acreage reduction will be at least 25 to 30 percent under last year's. In addition, there are increasing reports that the larger farms are going to reduce their dairy herds, and one after another of the small farms faces either completely going out of production or a serious cut because of labor shortage.

Frequent authentic reports come from Blair farmers who are drafted. Selective-service boards say they are deferring farmers of reasonably sized farms. Yet the fact remains that many operators of small farms are being drafted. Individually, their farms may not be important to the food production necessary for the Nation. But, collectively, their output will be a serious factor when the figures for the year are compiled.

Charles W. Holman, Washington, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, says the Nation's dairymen fear that "a continuance of the present rate of cattle slaughter and farm abandonment is certain to bring acute milk shortages."

Present indications, said Holman, are that milk production will fall short of the 122,000,000,000 pounds of milk needed this year by "10 to 25 percent in different regions."

And, he added, dairy farmers are "alarmed over Government apathy toward the increasingly critical problems of milk production and the consequent threat to the American diet."

Discussions by farm leaders, Holman said, "revealed that farmers all over the country are disturbed because Government agencies do not recognize that the already seriously handicapped dairy industry may soon be crippled through lack of labor, rising production costs, and inadequate prices for milk."

"California," Holman declared, "reports slaughter of dairy cattle 43 percent above last year. More than 1,400 New York milk-shed dairymen have gone out of business. Richmond, Va., milk dealers are bringing milk from the St. Lawrence Valley to supply Army camps, while Virginia farmers are unable to hire help."

There obviously are still those in key positions of Government who think farm production can be regulated as readily as industrial production, and that farmers are subject to the same type of control, except for the extra wages.

Probably it is because too many people always have had the idea that farming is an easy, simple business that officials now overlook all the details that constitute farm production.

Farmers must be free of bureaucratic control; they must have intelligent direction from Government or America will risk failing the world in the major task for which we are being counted upon: to produce for the world and to feed it. And all of that goes right back to the farmer. Without him, not a wheel can turn. He is the basis of all production.

Why that fact has been ignored is difficult to understand. Yet it has.

Some machinery is to be made available to farmers. But how many can get it? In New York State alone farmers will need 300,000 new pieces of machinery this year—hayrakes, harrows, cultivators, mowing machines, hay loaders, tractors, pumps, grain drills, milking machines, and milk coolers 218,000 pieces are needed for replacement and 90,000 more to make up for the loss of farm labor.

Farmers now are wasting time fighting to get what they need, and complying with Government red tape, while they should be making plans for the year's production.

Yet, few of them can start their plans. They have no idea how they are going to get help to do it. And few feel they can lay out a program of spring planting on the strength of vague assurances of the Secretary of Agriculture that "the labor shortage will be met."

The farmers have heard that before. Now they want to know how.

Too much emphasis cannot be placed upon this problem, as we shall find out if that most desperate plague, famine, were to threaten us.

This menace may be hard to understand while we have sufficient food. Yet the scarcity is being felt in many lines of food now. How much greater may it become next year, or the next, if our food production decreases as much in all areas as indications show it will in many farm areas of America?

In addition to the Altoona Tribune editorial, I am inserting the resolution adopted by the members of the Blair County Pennsylvania National Farm Loan Association which implores Congress to recognize the gravity of the farm problem and take immediate steps to guard against the evils that are bound to follow if prompt action is not taken in aiding the farmers of America.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the farmers are faced with a great responsibility of furnishing food to the people of the armed forces of the United States and their allies; and

Whereas draft boards of the Nation are draining the farms of the available labor necessary to keep the farms in full production; and

Whereas farmers are forced to curtail production by the sale of dairy herds and reduced acreage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Blair County National Farm Loan Association shall appeal in a body to the Congress of the United States to take the necessary action to provide the required labor on the farm and especially to protect and maintain that labor by restraining the draft boards in their present tendencies which are working such hardships on the farmers and on the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary treasurer of the association shall send a certified copy of this resolution to our Congressman, JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, in order that he might be advised of the action taken by this association and be guided accordingly.

Cut in Crops in Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, more and more, our unrealistic policy of inducting essential farm workers into our armed services is becoming a grave national problem. Everywhere we hear intelligent men and women saying that food will win the war and write the peace. Then we must see to it that our ability to produce upon America's rich farming land is not destroyed through a short-sighted selective-service policy.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer has just completed a survey of 11 Ohio counties in an effort to discover just what is happening on the Nation's farms. I am presenting this information for your attention because it is of vital importance, and I congratulate the Plain Dealer and Mr. Roelif Loveland on doing a job which should be done throughout the country in analyzing farm problems on the spot:

WAR TO BRING CUT IN CROPS IN OHIO—SURVEY SHOWS LABOR SHORTAGE WILL HIT FARMS

(By Roelif Loveland)

The farm manpower shortage, caused by high industrial wages and the draft, will be reflected in lowered farm production in many Ohio counties in the coming year.

Farms have been abandoned completely in some Ohio counties; on others work will be restricted; ceilings on meat will cause fewer cattle to be produced; ceilings on milk will send dairy herds to the packing house.

Farm sales have been increased in some counties, and almost everywhere farm machinery is bringing fantastic prices. Auctioneers have succeeded in jumping nimbly over ceiling prices.

A tractor in a Crawford County sale had a ceiling price of $500. There was no ceiling price on a cultivator. The buyer paid $900 for the cultivator—and the tractor was thrown in! At another sale a buyer purchased a rooster (yes, a male chicken) for several hundred dollars above the ceiling price of a tractor, and the tractor was "thrown in" on the deal. In a Huron County sale a tractor outfit sold for nearly $1,500—far above what it cost new.

Prices at sales of farms and farming equipment are reported to be the highest in 20 years. Indeed, the highest prices are among the reasons for the increase in farm sales. And while there has been great activity in the sale of farm machinery, most of the machinery has remained in the county in which it was purchased.

POLL IN 11 COUNTIES

Plain Dealer correspondents polled 11 counties in Ohio in an effort to determine the number of abandoned farms which might be expected to develop from the labor shortage. Here is what they discovered:

Ashland: 250 farms will be out of operation; 14,000 tillable acres will lie idle. Biggest reduction will be in corn and wheat. Farm sales in the last 3 months have increased 43 percent over the corresponding 3 months a year ago. Higher industrial wages are responsible for 60 percent of farm abandonment, selective service the remainder. Manpower and machinery shortage will

handicap remaining farms. Most crops will be planted, harvested maybe!

Crawford: Crop production will be 20 percent under 1942 output; 10,000 acres have been partly abandoned. The county suffered a $250,000 soybean crop loss because of inability to harvest last year's crop. Also a $100,000 corn loss. There has been a small reduction in beef and cattle production because of high feeding costs. Sixty farm sales, including machinery, in last 14 months.

Erie: No farms abandoned, probably because Plum Brook ordnance works, south of Sandusky, has claimed much of farm land. Twenty percent of the 1942 fruit crop lost on trees. Wheat loss slightly less. Dairy cattle being cut down. Twenty public sales of farm machinery since December 7, 1941. Prices for machinery almost 50 percent over cost of new machinery when it was available.

CONSIDER JAP LABOR

Geauga: With indications of the best maple sirup crop in years, many farmers may not tap trees because of help shortage. From 5 to 10 percent of farm land has been abandoned or lessened in production. Major crop loss last year was potatoes, by blight. Since 1941 there have been between 100 and 200 auction sales, few since January 1, 1943. Geauga organizations are being sounded out on what they think about importation of Jap labor.

Holmes: 5 percent production drop predicted. Of the county's total population of 18,000, 800 ex-farmers are now in the service or war industries. Eighty public farm sales since Pearl Harbor. Holmes County farmers purchase practically everything offered at public auction.

Huron: No reduction in acreage planted predicted. Most serious 1942 crop loss was soybeans, 20 percent. Much corn still in fields, but little loss anticipated. No more farm sales since Pearl Harbor than in other years, but various items literally are grabbed by farmers who come provided with spot cash. Usual floating labor sadly missed this year. Even with a permit, the farmer has a difficult time finding a dealer who has to sell what the farmer wants to buy.

Lake: Less than 3 percent of farms abandoned. Chief crop loss soybeans. Eighty-five percent of farm operators in the county are owners. Few auctions to date.

MANY IN WAR PLANTS

Lorain: Many farmers have more money than usual, but not from their farms. They work in war plants. Ten percent of the county's 4,000 farms estimated no longer in production. Greater reduction in dairy herds indicated. Fifty-five stock and equipment sales in the last 3 months. Pegging of milk prices causing farmers to sell their herds to packers. Difficult to get farm machinery. Shortage of combines in the last harvesting season resulted in loss of 60 to 70 percent of the county's soybean crop.

Medina: No abandoned farms. Every tillable acre under production. Forty-percent loss in soybeans last year on account of weather and inability to get combines. May be some loss on corn. Will be reduction in number of cattle raised due to labor shortage and meat ceilings. Farmers cannot raise beef at present in view of rising farm costs, they say. Farm auction sales about as usual. Demand for farm machinery 200 percent greater that the supply.

Richland: No great amount of abandoned acreage, but curtailment on production of beef and milk. Grain crops may show increase. Shift of farm labor to industrial jobs hurts more than the draft.

Wayne: Less than 1 percent of farms abandoned. Decrease in hay production and dairy products expected. One hundred farm machinery sales in last year; most of machinery stayed in the county. Seventy-two percent of farms owner operated, and some older farmers are taking advantage of high prices to retire when equipment is easily salable. Farmers planning exchange of machinery and labor.

A Separate Committee for Aviation Would Create Chaotic Conditions in Transportation System of Nation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in considering the question of the establishment of a new committee to have jurisdiction over civil and commercial aviation too much emphasis cannot be laid upon the chaotic condition that would result therefrom in our transportation industry.

At the present time the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House has jurisdiction over legislation affecting all forms of transportation. This includes railroads, motors, domestic shipping by water, air carriers, and freight forwarders. Because of the competitive element, it has for a long time seemed advisable to have a national coordinated system of transportation if the best results were to be attained between the competitive modes of transportation in serving the public interest.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce over a period of years has sought to bring about such a coordinated system by a regulation of the different types and kind of transportation. This has finally been accomplished. The result has been highly satisfactory to the several industries affected and also to the public utilizing all, or part, of the different systems of transportation. Consequently, there is no demand at this time either on the part of our transportation agencies or the public for any change.

The change suggested by those who favor the establishment of a new committee on aviation, to have sole jurisdiction of aviation legislation, would be the beginning of a break-down of our coordinated system of transportation. It would produce conflict and confusion. It would not be in the public interest.

Today, there appeared an editorial in the Washington Post entitled "Vote on a Dog Fight." The unsatisfactory and destructive condition that would result from taking the jurisdiction now in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce over civil and commercial aviation, and placing it in a separate committee, is so well stated in the editorial that I am making it a part of my remarks. It reads as follows:

VOTE ON A DOG FIGHT

On the surface the proposal to set up a separate standing committee on aviation is a recognition of the supreme importance of civil aviation after the war. That is why the move has attracted support. We may agree with such a view and at the same time submit that the naming of a new committee would in fact do far more harm than good to the aviation industry. This may seem a contradiction in terms. But the truth of such an observation will be obvious after a little consideration.

Civil aviation after the war is going to have its future determined largely by its ability to meet competitive rates. In other words, it will be situated in the context of general transportation. Its problems must therefore be considered along with the problems of general transportation. That is the present position, and it has everything to commend it. Aviation and all other forms of transportation are handled by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee under the chairmanship of Representative CLARENCE F. LEA. This committee is the legislative authority and umpire, the mandate of which is to assure justice among competing carriers. It is in a position to be both a protecting and restraining power over the relations among our different forms of transport.

Never in the last 20 years, or since civil aviation came under its wing, has there been any question about the impartiality of this committee. All the leaders of our transportation systems at various times have borne witness to that fact. Those testimonies likewise show that the committee has been farsighted, wise, and constructive. Let us see how civil aviation has fared under the aegis of Representative LEA's body. The first witness is Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association of America, a society which includes all the air lines of the United States. In 1939 he said:

"With the air-transport industry forging ahead in its mission of public service, we are extremely fortunate in having as our Federal charter of regulation a new Civil Aeronautics Act, in the drafting of which the statesmanship of foresight was employed in liberal degree, and in the support of which the President and the Congress, after a patient, long-continued, and conscientious study, made an immeasurable contribution to the needs and aspirations and the future welfare of our commerce, our Postal Service, and our national defense. Already America has recognized their action as just and wise. The brake has been taken from the wheel."

Then Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, speaking after the Collier trophy was given to the air lines and to the Army for the greatest accomplishment in aviation for last year:

"This award takes on special significance at this time because it brings to light the vision and foresight of the Congress of the United States and the Government in adopting, years ago, a long-range program to foster, develop, and encourage civil aviation. Such a program, under which the air lines of the United States were developed to a degree of usefulness and efficiency unsurpassed anywhere else in the world, enabled them to be ready to help the Army solve one of the most difficult problems of the whole war."

Finally President Roosevelt in 1939:

"Civil aviation is clearly recognized as the backlog of national defense in the Civil Aeronautics Act which set up the effective machinery for a comprehensive national policy with respect to the air. Underlying the statute is the principle that the country's welfare in time of peace, and its safety in time of war, rests upon the existence of a stabilized aircraft production—an economically and technically sound air transportation system, both domestic and overseas—an adequate supply of well-trained civilian pilots and ground personnel."

What would happen if aviation were taken out of the control of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and vested

in a separate committee on aviation? Clearly that committee, left with railroads and busses, would lose its judicial attitude. It would be forced to represent railroads and busses. It would become a special pleader. That would also be the position of the new committee on aviation. This committee would represent the air lines and plead for them. So we should see on Capitol Hill the death of a truly constructive committee of Congress which has done and can continue to do yeoman service for transportation in general and aviation in particular and the birth of two competitive committees which between them could strangle impartial regulation. Those who vote for a separate committee on aviation would thus be voting nothing more than a dogfight, whether they realize it or not. That is not the way to assure the wise development of civil aviation in the new air age.

Mr. Speaker, the transportation systems of our Nation, in their respective fields, are doing a fine job. This is no time to make a change. There is much truth in the old adage, "Leave well enough alone."

The Functioning of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over the radio on February 19, 1943:

Ladies and gentlemen, today democracy, the republican form of government as we know it, the kind of government which the immortal Lincoln described as "a Government of the people, by the people and for the people," stands at the crossroads of civilization and the future.

The road to the left leads to dictatorship, totalitarian government, regimentation—a complete collapse of the republican form of government through which a people may and do rule themselves. The wiping out of a government of laws made by a free people; the complete collapse of the guaranty of freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press.

The road to the right leads to perpetuation of the Bill of Rights and the spreading to the four corners of the earth the right of self-determination and the right of the peoples of each nation in the world to determine for themselves the kind of government they want, to make for themselves the kind of laws they wish to live under without effort to compel other peoples to live under laws and conditions not of their own making.

Dictators long before Hitler have told us that a democracy cannot function with efficiency.

Haters of the rights of the individuals have made the point that the people themselves cannot rule or govern because of the necessary and bulky construction of the operating machinery of a democracy.

It has been said that the wheels of justice grind slowly but surely.

I say that the wheels of a democracy grind just as slowly but just as surely and operate in the ultimate to the greatest benefit to the greatest number.

The American people themselves have answered the question as to whether or not a democracy can function effectively in times of war. The American people themselves, using the weapon of democracy, the ballot box, answered that question last November in the selection of the membership of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The American people today, through their elected Representatives in the Congress of the United States, have continued to answer in the affirmative the question of whether or not a democracy can function effectively.

I believe it most significant to note the fact that election to the United States House of Representatives is performed under the same method and manner as originally set up by those who inspired and penned the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. In the instance of election of Members of the House, this alone is true.

The method and manner of election of the President of the United States and the Members of the United States Senate has been changed since the Constitution was adopted, but not the manner of the election of Members of the House of Representatives.

Even at the present time and under the present system the President of the United States is not elected by a popular vote of the people but through an electoral college which is composed of electors designated by the people. It is possible, and it has happened, that a candidate can be elected President and yet receive fewer votes than those opposing him. Therefore the President of the United States is not elected by the direct vote of the people.

Until a comparatively few years ago the Members of the United States Senate were elected through laws set up by the several States and not by a direct vote of the people.

The Members of the House of Representatives, since the creation of that body, have been elected directly by the people and are the people's own representatives.

It is also worthy of note that in event of vacancies in the Presidency and the membership of the Senate, provisions are made under the law whereby the vacancies may be filled without the necessity of going directly to the electorate for an expression.

In contrast, a Representative can only be elected by a direct vote of the people of his district.

Thus Members of the House of Representatives are more directly responsive to the people themselves than any other elected officials in the democratic system of government. The House of Representatives is in truth the voice of the people.

The President is elected for 4 years. Senators are elected for 6 years. Members of the House of Representatives are elected for 2 years.

What does this mean in our system of government? It means that the people, the people themselves, through direct vote, have the right to express themselves on the conduct of their Government. They do not have to wait for 6 years when they elect a Senator or 4 years when they elect a President. They have the opportunity to express themselves each 2 years, which is a short time in the life of any nation.

Conditions change; opinions vary; new issues arise in the course of events which change the minds of men.

Under a dictatorship or totalitarian system of government the only way in which to change conditions is to overthrow the dictator or revolt against the totalitarian government if it does not meet the approval of the people. Failure means death under dictatorship. Success means some new form of government, not always removed so far from the one overthrown and perhaps eventual overthrow at some future date.

In a democracy where men can express themselves through elected representatives the whole policy of government procedure can be changed at the ballot box without bloodshed or violence. Failure means only perhaps a temporary defeat. Success means a definite change in governmental policy when the elected representatives discharge their responsibility to those who elected them.

The Members of the new Congress, the Seventy-eighth Congress, therefore have a definite and positive responsibility to discharge and any unprejudiced critic or fair-minded person, I believe, will agree the present Congress is discharging that responsibility speedily and efficiently under the laws under which we operate.

The fact that the Seventy-eighth Congress, if obviously taking an opposite stand on many important issues to that taken by the Seventy-seventh Congress, is no reflection on that Congress.

The Seventy-seventh Congress was a great Congress. It will go down in history as the war Congress of this generation and a Congress which prepared America for war in the face of strong pacifist sentiment. The Seventy-seventh Congress did a good job. It will also go down in history as perhaps one of the most maligned Congresses of all time, not through any fault of its own but through the machinations of propagandists and those who in fact did not and do not believe in the democratic system of government as we know it.

The Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress conscientiously voted their convictions and what they thought were the wishes of those people who elected them to Congress. The Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress discharged their responsibility to their people in good faith. They expressed the sentiments of people who had elected them 2 years before, but in the interim the sentiments of many of those people had changed. The people had changed; not the Members who had been elected.

In November a new mandate was issued to the Representatives of the people. A new voice was heard from the people, a voice which condemned the trend to bureaucratic government; a voice which shouted from the valleys to the mountaintops against government and regimentation by unelected officials; a voice which decried government by subterfuge and directive; a voice which demanded that the laws which Congress enacted be carried out not only to the letter but in spirit, and not be circumvented by confused interpretation and deliberate misadministration.

The result of last November's election, in which the distance between the two major parties was narrowed to an almost indistinguishable line, was America's answer to dictatorship that a democracy can and does function.

There was no comfort in that election to the forces of evil and the enmies of the kind of free government in which we believe. It was a bad omen for bureaucracy which is dictatorship in a mild form and nothing else.

There was no disunity or disloyalty in that election.

It was America expressing itself and I firmly believe that as a result we have a more firm and more solid democracy today. I believe that as a result of that election we have become convinced that our kind of government "shall not perish from the face of the earth."

The new Congress is doing everything humanly possible to carry out the mandate issued by the people. The new Congress is demonstrating in every way its desire and its ability to discharge the responsibility it owes the people of this country.

This responsibility, however, is not only the responsibility of the Congress itself, but also the responsibility of those in whose hands rests a great part of the perpetuation of the democratic system of the country—the press and radio.

While the new Congress is discharging its responsibility, misunderstanding and misinterpretation of its actions can and will place it in the same unfortunate and tragic category of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

All the millions of people in this Nation can't come to Washington to participate in the conduct of their Government. They elect representatives to do the business for them and to represent them. It is the responsibility of the representatives to do the bidding of the people.

All the millions of people in this Nation can't come to Washington to see and hear for themselves the debates on the floor of Congress. They must depend on other representatives, the news reporters and the radio broadcasters, to get the news to them. The people have guaranteed free speech, a free speech absolutely essential to the operation of a democracy. That guaranty of freedom carries with it as much responsibility as the responsibility carried by those representatives who have been elected by the people. That guaranty of freedom carries with it the responsibility of fair and honest dissemination of the news.

I shall never subscribe to the choking of the microphones of the Nation or the stopping of the presses, but I shall always insist on keeping the record straight and getting the facts to the people.

If the new Congress is charged with a responsibility, then I submit that the press and radio are charged with an equal responsibility.

Recently in an open letter to the press and radio of America I had this to say, and I repeat it here tonight:

"Members of Congress are at a distinct disadvantage in presenting their views and opinions to their constituency and to the American public. They are literally in the hands of the newspaper reporter and the radio commentator. The newspaper reporter, through the newspapers of the country, has a potential field of millions of readers. The radio commentator, in my opinion, has an even greater field, because, since the advent of the radio millions of men and women depend on the radio newscast and expressions of individual commentators for their main source of news and information.

"Members of Congress, on the contrary, have a limited audience which, in comparison to the field covered by the newspapers and the radio, is most insignificant. A Member of Congress, for the better part, addresses sparsely filled galleries and has only the limited circulation of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for complete quotes.

"A newspaper reporter or radio news commentator holds the life-and-death decision over what he will report to the Nation concerning Congress. His judgment is final. His interpretation of what is news is what reaches the general public. His opinion of the value of what a Member of Congress says on the floor is what the American public receives and not, in all too many cases, of what a Member of Congress actually says or does, or what, in the final analysis, is really the important thing. The reporter is constantly on the alert for the punch lines which will make the headlines.

"It is easy to understand, therefore, the great responsibility which is charged the press and radio of America.

"In this dangerous period when representative government has collapsed almost everywhere else, when only in a democracy is a free press allowed, isn't it worth risking the loss of a few plaudits from revolutionaries and enemies of a real people's government, to do your part in bringing health and vigor, intelligence, unprejudiced, unbiased, and factual information to the public of the Nation?

"That is the question, it seems to me, that every newspaper reporter, every newspaper columnist, every radio commentator, must answer for himself, in his own conscience, and in his own sense of responsibility to the people of the Nation who depend on him for information and news for the new Congress."

America can only be kept great if we determine to keep it great.

Not only the Congress, not only the military, not only the press, not only the radio, but every man, woman, and child has a definite responsibility in the perpetuation of democracy.

If we each discharge our respective and individual responsibilities, not only our children but the children of the people of all nations and all lands, all colors and all creeds will be able to share in the great blessings of democracy which have been handed down to us and which heritage it is our responsibility to protect and preserve.

I thank you.

Pay-As-You-Go Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, SENATE,
Hartford, February 17, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM J. MILLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLER: The following senate joint resolution was passed by this assembly on this date:

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress concerning the pay-as-you-go tax plan

"*Resolved by this assembly*, That we respectfully urge our Senators and Representatives in Congress to assist in the passage of a pay-as-you-go tax plan; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the senate and the clerk of the house of representatives be directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators and Representatives for Connecticut in Congress and a copy to the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means."

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE F. BALDWIN,
Clerk of the Senate.
SEARLS DEARINGTON,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Rhode Island Should Have a Veterans' Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I introduced a bill (H. R. 1604) to provide for the erection of a veterans' hospital in my home State of Rhode Island.

Introduction of this bill was not prompted by a brand-new thought. The fact is that since 1926 I have been working for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Rhode Island—one of only two States in the Union without a veterans' hospital—and have presented bills for that purpose in every Congress in which it was my privilege to serve.

For a number of years the daily average of Rhode Island veterans in hospitals has been 400. That number is bound to increase as a result of the present war. It is, therefore, adding weight to the argument that a veterans' hospital should be established in Rhode Island at the earliest date practicable.

Little, if any, attention was given to the fact because these veterans were hospitalized outside Rhode Island their relatives and friends had to travel long distances, at great inconvenience, to be with the veterans for brief visits. The existing shortage of gasoline and rubber adds to their difficulties. It is an accepted fact that the morale of a sick person is greatly buoyed by the visits of his loved ones, and that, because of the absence of visits from those dear to him, he gets lonesome and depressed and his recovery is retarded to a marked degree.

It is, therefore, necessary that prompt consideration be given to the erection of a veterans' hospital in Rhode Island and that favorable action be taken on my bill, H. R. 1604 at an early date.

With the permission of the House I include as a part of these remarks an address on this subject which was delivered over radio station WFCI, in Pawtucket, R. I., a few days ago by Mrs. Estelle M. Clarke, legislative chairman of the Women's Auxiliary, Disabled American Veterans.

Her address follows:

Comrades and friends, as legislative chairman of the State department, Women's Auxiliary of the Disabled American Veterans of the State of Rhode Island, I am pleased to take part in this program. I believe I have chosen a subject acceptable to the general public and one that will give everyone something to think about and perhaps bring long-delayed action on an issue of much importance to us and to countless thousands who have never had to wait through anxious hours we have known.

For years, legislators, both State and national, have given friendly consideration to requests for a veterans' hospital for this State. It has been the theme for many a spirited campaign speech and each time good intentions have been sidetracked and no action taken because an impartial board decided we were within short distance of existing accommodations in neighboring States.

Today this little State has become one of the foremost in defense production. Our surrounding waters are natural shelter for seafaring craft awaiting distant detail as well as safe anchorage for storm-tossed vessels needing repair to complete voyages of mercy charted on the seven seas of the world. Thousands of servicemen pass through our borders, some remain on furlough to the limit of existing accommodations. This State has made a record for its hospitality to the youth of the Nation as they accept entertainment provided by agencies organized for the purpose.

Do you realize that our State ranks third in enlistments in proportion to its area? The State of Texas is first and again comes New England, with Vermont in second place. As our sons are sent along to distant points, we trust they receive the same treatment we try to provide here. Unity of purpose has educated the public to the standards expected by the national organization in the way of hospitality and now we consistently begin to think of our responsibility to these boys as they return from the battle fronts of the world.

Records show many reasons to have been offered in proof that this State of Rhode Island did not rate a veterans hospital, but the time is ripe now to emphasize a few good reasons why it does rate one. Lawmakers of the State and Nation, you who have known the joys and sorrows of the homes of this community and you who will have to reconcile many phases of anxiety as the months of war advance into years of peace, hear the voices of mothers of men of this generation, hear their plea for the comfort for veteran fathers as well as for their sons whom they have inspired to finish what they began.

Consider well, the national recognition of the geographic advantages of our State, of the part its broken coastline plays in the preparation for war and weigh, too, the possible recognition of our State as ideal for unwanted enemy attack. In view of this, abundant, rather than merely adequate, provision should be made for both civilian and military emergency care and hospitalization.

Our veterans of the last war have been sent to the naval hospital at Newport, and well cared for regardless of the ever-increasing responsibilities of the Navy in providing for its own. Facilities in the neighboring States have accommodated our veterans regardless of the inconvenience of approach by ambulance or common carrier. Today and maybe for some time travel is curtailed. Families cannot visit sick husbands and fathers. Everyone admits, to be sick is bad enough, but to be miles away and homesick, is a combination hard to cure.

As years pass, and periods of hospitalization have to be repeated, there always comes that last time, and what unnecessary sorrow to endure when the last hours could have been brightened, had veterans been hospitalized in a veterans hospital within reach of homefolks. The difficulty of personal adjustment during long periods of convalescence could be overcome in a large degree by local interest as comradeship survives in men when affliction has come through a common cause.

Our sons, reared in surroundings reminding them of the horrors of war and often denied the opportunities due children of this day, were not slow to grasp "the burning torch, thrown from on high, because someone somewhere broke faith." It is certainly up to us to have ready for the unfortunate of our own as well as for all others detained on our shores a modern, up-to-date veterans' hospital, the last word in care and attention provided for them and for the surviving veterans of the other wars.

In proportion to the provisions made for the conflict, plans should be in the making for the rehabilitation and care of all victims of war returning here. We must be mindful of the fact that facilities for all this will not exist in many of the war-ravaged countries with whom we have been allied in this effort to end all wars, and many cases will come up wherein a reciprocity of such care will be in order.

Mothers of service boys of Rhode Island, members of all veteran groups, let us talk this dream of a veterans' hospital for this State into a reality. Let the contagion of our zeal accomplish what has been due since the close of the last war and pushed aside perhaps because we were just little Rhode Island.

Death Penalty for Treason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the highest law officer of the United States Government, the Attorney General, after prosecuting successfully before a military tribunal the trial of eight saboteurs, six of whom were executed and two given long prison sentences, now asks Congress for legislation to give the Federal courts authority to deal severely with enemy spies and saboteurs, with power to impose the death penalty, in their discretion, on any person harboring an enemy in wartime. Death or imprisonment for life is recommended for an enemy found guilty of "hostile acts."

That military trial of the saboteurs was unique in several respects. That was the first time an enemy, in uniform of a belligerent nation, had invaded our shores, from an enemy war vessel, trained and equipped for a 2-year reign of terror. The execution was unique also because it was the first time in all the world's history that a convicted enemy spy was disposed of by electrocution.

Two of the convicted enemy agents, whose lives were spared, are now in the custody of the Federal Government. They are both said to be ready to continue to assist the Government. Under the Constitution no person can be convicted of treason except on confession in open court, or on the testimony of two witnesses to an overt act. Here are the two Government witnesses, who cannot disappear.

Fourteen alleged abettors of the saboteurs now are awaiting trial on charges of treason. If Congress grants the Attorney General, who knows better than any of us the real needs in the present emergency, the severe authority he asks, these 14 now in custody can be given a full and fair trial in the civil courts, with all their rights adequately protected.

These 14 are but the first of many whom the Government desires to bring before the courts. Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge told the American Bar Association at their annual meeting that the Government has approximately 1,700 naturalized citizens under consideration and investigation for denaturalization because of evidence "they did not, in fact, renounce absolutely and forever all allegiance and fidelity to the country of their origin." The Government, he said, has restricted prosecutions for sedition to flagrant cases only.

Both Attorney General Biddle and Assistant Attorney General Berge have pointed out that in the civil courts the present penalty is imprisonment for not more than 30 years, or a fine of $10,000, or both. They argue that:

If domestic saboteurs shall carry on large operations in destruction of vital defense industries and materials, under present law we cannot impose the death penalty even though such persons are as effective in destructive work as technical enemies would be.

Mr. Berge said:

I believe the crime of sabotage, in and of itself, should carry the discretionary death penalty, so that death in this type of case will not be confined merely to the fortuitous circumstance that in a particular case a military commission has jurisdiction.

Because I believe that there should be a permanent public record of the military trial of the saboteurs showing how all rights of the prisoners for a full and fair trial were jealously protected, even to review by the President, and to a submission of that very question to the Supreme Court of the United States, I am, under the leave granted me to extend my remarks, including an article written at my request by a veteran member of the Capitol Press Galleries:

DEATH PENALTY FOR TREASON

(By William P. Kennedy, Litt. D.)

War to the death by the United States Government against those guilty of treason is the purpose behind recommendations by Attorney General Francis Biddle to Congress growing out of his personal prosecution before a military tribunal of the eight German-born and trained saboteurs who landed in the United States last June under Nazi orders for a 2-year reign of terror. He asks that Federal civil courts be given authority in their discretion to impose the death penalty on any person harboring an enemy in wartime and that death or imprisonment be made the penalty for an enemy agent found guilty of a hostile act.

The trial of the eight saboteurs, six of whom were executed, and the other two given sentences of imprisonment for life to one and 30 years for the other, resulted from the first invasion of the United States by enemy agents in belligerent uniform from a war vessel. It disclosed a most serious menace to the United States on a gigantic scale for destruction of essential war plants, with enemy agents recruiting a treason army from within, to sear and mangle the heart of the Nation. One result of the military trial was the first execution in the whole history of the world ordered by a military court—by electrocution, rather than the historic verdict of paying the penalty before a firing squad or on the gallows.

The extreme zeal shown by the United States in giving the accused enemy agents and spies every possible opportunity to prove their innocence, even by the defense counsel taking before the United States Supreme Court the question whether any rights they might have had before a civil court had been violated, was a historic evidence of a full and fair trial, as ordered by the President.

The inadequacy of existing laws to deal with enemy agents was revealed, and so the trial of the saboteurs was before a military rather than a civil court, on charge of violating certain articles of war.

So now, after only one important treason trial was ever held before the Federal civil courts—the trial for treason of Aaron Burr, lately Vice President, at Richmond in 1807, when a Scotch verdict was given, "not guilty," on evidence presented—and only one other important military tribunal trial, that of the conspirators in the assassination of President Lincoln, this Nation is preparing to tighten up the law for a series of treason trials.

Fourteen alleged abettors of the saboteurs are, and for months have been, awaiting a trial on charge of treason. Attorney General Biddle months ago ordered United States attorneys to seek grand jury indictments, on charges of treason where the evidence warrants, of 12 of the 14 persons apprehended by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as accomplices of the saboteurs.

In submitting his request to Congress that the civil courts be given severe authority, Attorney General Biddle asked that this legislation be handled as a war security act and emphasized that its proposed objectives are to punish with appropriately severe penalties all persons who, having intent to assist the enemy, engage or attempt to engage, in conspiracy or prepare to commit sabotage, espionage, or other hostile acts. He declared his chief purpose is to close up serious gaps and defects in the existing criminal law which have become even more apparent to the Justice Department since the United States has been in the war.

The trial of the saboteurs has given the United States a new and powerful instrument to secure convictions in the proposed treason trials in civil courts. Two of the convicted saboteurs were spared the death penalty because they were willing to talk and have protested their zeal to be of further assistance to the United States in such cases. Under the Constitution, to convict anyone of treason there must be either a confession of guilt in open court or the testimony of two witnesses to an overt act. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has the evidence of overt acts. The Government now has in its custody the necessary two witnesses to the overt acts—George John Dasch, under sentence of imprisonment for 30 years, and Ernest Peter Burger, who is serving a sentence of life imprisonment.

Assistant Attorney Wendell Berge has appealed to the American Bar Association in their annual meeting at Detroit to support the desired stopgap legislation, urging that the Nation do not rely on the fortuitous circumstances that a military commission might have jurisdiction. He said: "I believe that the crime of sabotage in and of itself should carry the discretionary death penalty." He points out that if domestic saboteurs shall carry on large operations in destruction of vital defense industries and materials, under present law we cannot impose the death penalty even though such persons are just as effective in destructive work as technical enemies would be.

MILITARY TRIAL OF SABOTEURS

Before a trial commission of seven United States Army generals, appointed by President Roosevelt, eight alleged saboteurs, who had landed at night from German U-boats in two groups—one on the south shore of Long Island, near Amagansett, on June 13, 1942; the other at Ponte Vedra Beach, near Jacksonville, Fla., on June 17—went on trial on July 8. The trial closed at 12:58 p. m. on August 1. The record of the trial with the verdict of the military court was delivered to President Roosevelt at the White House on August 3 for his review. The President's approval of the findings of the military court was announced August 9, simultaneous with the death of the first of six prisoners who were electrocuted in the District Jail—the first military execution by electricity in history. Two companions, who had helped the Government make its case, and aided Federal Bureau of Investigation agents to run down accomplices in this country, were spared the death penalty. Ernest Peter Burger was given life imprisonment. George John Dasch, leader of the team of four who landed on Long Island, had his term of imprisonment commuted to 30 years, by the President's personal decision. The military court had ordered life imprisonment.

The executed saboteurs were buried in the Potters Field, on the reservation at Blue Plains, where the District of Columbia Home for the Aged and Infirm is located. The graves are marked with wooden slabs in imitation of tombstones, each bearing a number, but carrying no names.

The one outstanding precedent for this trial by a military tribunal was the trial of seven men and one woman as conspirators in the assassination of President Lincoln. On that occasion President Andrew Johnson set up a nine-member commission of officers by Executive order.

In the case of the eight saboteurs, there was another important situation to be met by the United States at war. It was the first instance of the actual landing of spies from an enemy warship.

It was first disclosed on June 27, 1942, by Director J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that eight Berlin-trained sabotage-school experts, equipped with $150,000 in cash and explosives for a 2-year terror campaign against vital American war plants, had been captured. The eight were all born in Germany and were former residents of the United States and could speak English. Several of them were former German-American Bund members, two were United States citizens, and one a former member of the Michigan National Guard. All eight had been rounded up and under arrest before any of the spectacular missions assigned to them could be executed. The arrests were all made between June 20 and June 27.

George Dasch, 39, was leader of the group that landed near Amagansett, on the south shore of Long Island. His alias was George Davis. He had served in the German Army in the World War and came as a stowaway to this country in 1922. He had been a waiter in New York and several cities on the west coast. He returned twice to Germany—in 1930 and 1941. He was the one who by turning State's evidence got a life sentence from the military court, which President Roosevelt personally commuted to 30 years' imprisonment.

Ernest Peter Burger, 36, reached the United States in 1927, worked as a machinist in Detroit and Milwaukee, became naturalized in 1933, and returned to Germany the same year. He was active in the Nazi Party as a group leader, writer, and propagandist. He was drafted into the German Army as a private. The military court gave him life imprisonment, which was approved by the President.

Those who were executed were:

Edward J. Kerling, 33, leader of the group that landed in Florida, near Jacksonville. He came to the United States in 1929, married in New York, worked for a large oil company, and as a domestic in Connecticut and New Jersey; several times visited Germany. After he return to Germany in 1940 he donned the Nazi Party uniform.

Herbert Hans Haupt, 22, was the youngest member of the saboteur group. His parents were naturalized citizens of the United States, and through them he derived citizenship. He was active in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in Chicago. He went to Mexico in 1941 and was in constant contact with German authorities before going to Japan, whence he returned to Germany aboard a blockade runner which reached Bordeaux in occupied France.

Richard Quirin, 34, came to the United States in 1927, declared his intention to become a citizen at Schenectady, N. Y., but never completed the proceeding. He married a German girl in New York, and worked as a mechanic, painter, and chauffeur. In 1939 he went back to Germany at the expense of the German Government and was employed there as a toolmaker.

Werner Thiel, 35, came to the United States as a youth. He worked as a toolmaker in large automobile factories in Detroit and in a hospital in Hammond, Ind. He was active in the German-American Bund and in the Friends of New Germany. He returned to Germany after the war started, by way of Japan and Siberia.

Herman Otto Neubauer, 32, was a merchant sailor and entered the United States in 1932. He worked in hotels in Hartford, Conn., and in Chicago, Ill. He married an American girl in Chicago. He returned to Germany in 1940 and served in the German Army.

Henry Harm Heinck, 35, entered the United States in 1936, worked as an oiler and machinist helper, in restaurants, and factories. He returned to Germany in 1939, at the expense of the German Government.

The defendants were charged with violating the eighty-first and eighty-second articles of war and the law of war. Specifications included espionage, sabotage, and conspiracy. They had been rounded up by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, brought to Washington, and lodged at the District jail.

Before the trial started Attorney General Biddle admitted that a number of complicating legal factors were involved.

Because these sabotage experts came ashore in German military uniforms (which were dug up on the sandy shore) and then changed to civilian clothes, they could be classed as spies and shot. Under the Espionage Act they might be imprisoned up to 30 years. Two of them were American citizens, which made them subject to the laws of treason, with a death penalty. Military law prescribed that a spy, on conviction, must pay the dealth penalty, either before a firing squad of 12 men, or on the gallows, according to his choice. In the case of the 6 executed saboteurs, a new precedent was established when they were electrocuted.

The trial was conducted in the assembly hall of the Department of Justice, which is usually used in training of Federal Bureau of Investigation agents and instructions for counterespionage. The chamber was most carefully guarded at all times. Special doors were built in, which were guarded by soldiers. Heavy velour drapes carefully covered every window to prevent peeping. Even the Attorney General of the United States, the tribunal of military judges, the prosecuting and defense staffs, and J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, had to exhibit special passes before being allowed to enter. Brig. Gen. Albert L. Cox, provost marshal of the District, was in charge of policing the trial.

The trial was conducted with the utmost secrecy. Only once, and then briefly, newspapermen were admitted to get a general view of the improvised courtroom. Before the trial started, the press had insisted that they be allowed to sit in the courtroom and report the proceedings. Maj. Gen. Frank R. McCoy, president of the military panel, strenuously objected. The Office of War Information sought to open the trial to newspapermen. When the general refusal to see representatives of the Office of War Information, their chief, Elmer Davis, went to the President. The only concession granted was that General McCoy would issue after each session a statement on the progress of the trial. These statements were masterpieces of brevity, consisting mostly of the hour at which the session opened and closed.

General McCoy's contention was that in the course of the trial some information might be disclosed that would be of aid and comfort to the enemy. This apparently did happen, for the President later ordered that none of the testimony or confessions made

to the Federal Bureau of Investigation agents should be made public until after the close of the war.

President Roosevelt, who announced his appointment of the military commission on July 2, stipulated that at least the concurrence of two-thirds of its members should be necessary for conviction or sentence, and the record of the tribunal must be sent to him personally for review and action. There was no recourse to the civil courts. He insisted that there must be a "full and fair" trial.

The President named Maj. Gen. Frank R. McCoy as chairman of the military tribunal, and it was he who later, accompanied by prosecution counsel, delivered the records of the trial and the decision of the trial board to the President. Other members of the trial commission were Maj. Gens. Blanton Winship, Walter S. Grant, and Lorenzo D. Gasser; Brig. Gens. Guy V. Henry, John T. Lewis, and John T. Kennedy.

The President selected Attorney General Francis Biddle to take charge of the prosecution, assisted by Oscar Cox, Assistant Solicitor General, and Maj. Gen. Myron C. Cramer, Judge Advocate General of the War Department.

The President assigned as counsel for the defense Cols. Cassius M. Dowell and Kenneth C. Royall, and Maj. Lauson H. Stone.

Just before the trial started, July 8, a special counsel, Col. Carl L. Ristine, was appointed for George John Dasch, leader of the Long Island group. It was reported that he and Ernest Peter Burger, a teammate, were aiding the Government. These two were later spared the death penalty.

Among the witnesses during the trial was Director Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and 11 Federal Bureau of Investigation agents, who played a part in apprehending the Nazi conspirators. Each of the accused saboteurs was given an opportunity to testify at the trial, on their own request, in a "last ditch" effort to save their lives. An early witness was John C. Cullen, 21-year-old Coast Guardsman, of Bayside, Long Island, who on a midnight-shift patrol of 6 miles of shore, spotted the fog-veiled arrival of the Dasch team near Amagansett, Long Island, and started the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the hunt that rounded up the eight saboteurs. He also disclosed where the group of trained saboteurs had buried their German uniforms, explosives, and other equipment for blowing up important war plants.

During a 3-day recess between the conclusion of evidence and the final argument, as a last resort to insure for all time against any question being ever raised that the rights of the accused had not been fully protected, the defense counsel took before the Supreme Court of the United States in extraordinary session, the contention whether the prisoners had been denied their civil rights, and that President Roosevelt had acted unlawfully in setting up the military tribunal. The Supreme Court had to be called back to Washington. A motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus was entered on behalf of seven of the prisoners. George J. Dasch was the only one not joining in the appeal.

Attorney General Biddle, for the prosecution, and Colonel Royall, for the defense, argued for 2 days. This argument indicated the nature of the prosecution and defense pleas behind closed doors in the military tribune trial chamber in the Department of Justice. The prosecution alleged that the eight Nazis left this country for Germany with funds furnished by the German Government. Herman Hans Haupt traveled on a German passport. They attended a sabotage school near Berlin. They then embarked from L'Orient, France, in two U-boats equipped with extensive paraphernalia and specific instructions for the destruction of important dams, factories, and other installations in this country, and plotted a 2-year campaign of sabotage to further the Axis cause.

The defense claimed the men, all former residents of the United States, were loyal to this country; that they attended the sabotage school and boarded the submarines as the only means of fleeing Germany; that they had buried their explosives in the sand after landing and did nothing to carry out any sabotage campaign; and that they were planning to report to the authorities.

Attorney General Biddle in his closing argument said the President had full authority to order that the German prisoners be tried by a military commission. As enemies, he said, they were without right to the safeguards established for the civil liberties of loyal citizens. This view was flatly denied by Colonel Royall. Citizens, enemies and aliens alike, he argued, have the privilege of recourse to the courts.

The Supreme Court announced its ruling on July 31 that the action of the President in ordering the military trial was proper. The Court found that (1) the charges preferred * * * allege an offense or offenses which the President is authorized to order tried before a military commission; (2) the military commission was lawfully constituted; (3) the petitioners are held in lawful custody for trial before the military commission and have not shown cause for being discharged by writ of habeas corpus.

The Court ruled that "the spy who secretly and without uniform passes the military lines of a belligerent in time of war to gather military information and communicate it to the enemy," or to destroy life or property, is subject to trial by military tribunal appointed by the President. Chief Justice Stone wrote the 23-page opinion. He stated that the Court is unanimous in its conclusion that Articles of War adopted by Congress "could not at any stage of the proceedings afford any basis for issuing the writ of habeas corpus" sought by the Nazi saboteurs.

Chief Justice Stone pointed out that Justice Murphy, a lieutenant colonel in the Army, is on active duty in North Carolina, and "took no part in the consideration or decision of these cases." At the opening of the Court Chief Justice Stone had called attention that his son, Maj. Lauson H. Stone, was a member of the defense staff for the eight saboteurs, and questioned his own qualification to sit. The Attorney General immediately announced that the Government was not opposed to the Chief Justice taking part in the proceedings—so he continued to sit, and eventually wrote the decision in this famous case.

The Chief Justice further explained that "Some members of the Court are of opinion that Congress did not intend the Articles of War to govern a Presidential military commission convened for the determination of questions relating to admitted enemy invaders and that the context of the articles makes clear that they should not be construed to apply in that class of cases. Others are of the view that—even though this trial is subject to whatever provisions of the article of war has in terms made applicable to 'commissions'—the particular articles in question, rightly construed, do not foreclose the procedure prescribed by the President, or that shown to have been employed by the Commission * * *."

Chief Justice Stone further said that the 1866 Supreme Court ruling in the famous case involving a civilian named Milligan was inapplicable because Milligan "was not an enemy belligerent either entitled to the status of a prisoner of war or subject to the penalties imposed upon unlawful belligerents." In the Milligan decision, the Supreme Court held that a military commission set up by the President in a section outside the field of actual military operations was invalid. •

A Congressman's Secretary Views the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, perhaps only too often we cannot see the forest for the trees.

The other day I found a letter in my mail which attracted my particular attention.

It held my interest from the very first line, and I became more interested in it as I read along. I could not help but wonder who the writer was. Well, imagine my surprise when I turned to the last page.

Who was the writer?

Well, here is the letter. It speaks for itself.

Perhaps in many of our congressional offices there is more wisdom, logic, common sense, and sound thinking and reasoning in the outer office than in the inner sanctum.

None of us have a monopoly on patriotism, out-loud thinking, or free expression. That is the way it should be in America. I believe that is what we are fighting for, and that is one of the many reasons why this letter so engrossed me.

Enough of my own thoughts and opinions. I am expressing them all the time.

Here is what somebody else thinks, and after you read this letter I am sure you will be just as impressed as I was and will agree with me that all the serious thinking about this war is not going on in the Halls of Congress, over the desks of the military, or in the plush-carpeted offices of bureaucratic bigwigs.

I submit this letter to you just as I received it on my desk:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 19, 1943.*

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is my first letter to my Congressman expressing my views on the affairs of the Nation.

No matter how serious anything might be, there is always a ridiculous side as well as an amusing side. I've listened to the radio, read the newspapers, and heard a lot of discussions about the manpower question. To me the most ridiculous question today is the quibbling and quarreling going on between our various governmental agencies, particularly McNutt, Hershey, and Wickard.

To hear Mr. McNutt, you would think it was absolutely essential for every able-bodied man in America to be engaged in the production of tools of war. To hear General Hershey, you would think it was absolutely necessary for every able-bodied man in America

to be in the armed services. And likewise, to hear Mr. Wickard, you would think that everybody in the United States and, in fact, the world, would starve to death within the next year if every able-bodied man in America doesn't get behind the plow.

I have nephews in the armed services; in fact, I have five. To my knowledge not a single person related to those boys as wives, mothers, or even sweethearts have complained bitterly about their absences. While no close relative of mine that I know of is engaged in a war plant, I believe that would work very little hardship on any of my family. My people are, strictly speaking, tillers of the soil. Down home my aged father has, no doubt, lost many of his field hands; I know that the colored boys I knew at home have gone. The last I heard of Zero, Hambone, Ike, Luther, John, and Big Boy, they were all in the Army. Yet just this past week I received a letter from my father, who is now 75 years old, saying that he was beginning to "break ground." Now, if you don't know what "breaking ground" is, having lived in the city most of your life, I'm sure that some of your colleagues could tell you what that means.

I know that the war has brought about many changes in the lives of our American people, but when I see a man 75 years old planning to go ahead without complaint and do just what he has done all of his life I can't really understand why there is so much bungling of jobs among our higher-ups. I'd like nothing better than to sit on the front porch at home for about 3 hours and hear the wise counsel of my father, and I believe he could match the wits and planning of a lot of our so-called leaders.

If there is so much food to be produced, so many tools of war to manufacture, and so many men necessary to bear the arms, why can't the men who are in charge of these various programs forget personal aspirations and get together with something that is sound and logical toward winning this war? It seems to me that a lot of people in America have grown so accustomed to taking things the easy way that they think the rest of the good red-blooded Americans feel the same as they do. They're afraid to impose drastic rationing programs for this reason.

Personally, if it means not having another new dress for the duration, another pair of shoes, or any of the other things that are bound to be rationed, I shall not be one to complain. The quicker we give up these things, the quicker we will be able to get them back for keeps.

I hesitate to write this for fear it will work a hardship on others, but if all our rationing is going to be as lenient as sugar, for example, certainly nobody in America will suffer. Since the rationing of sugar, my roommates and I have bought more sugar than we ever did before simply because we didn't want the coupons to expire without having been used.

You hear a lot about taxation. I'm certainly not complaining about the amount of taxes I will have to pay. I am not even taking any deductions. I wouldn't have many if I took them, but the savings would possibly mean $3 or $4 or even $10 to me. But why chisel on Uncle Sam?

* * * * *

Congressman, seriously, do you think it will ever be possible to get an answer to the foremost question in this letter? I know there must be one somewhere, and I'm just waiting to see which one of the big boys will give in first and admit that his particular job is not the only one in America of grave importance. The three men heading their respective jobs whom I have mentioned in this letter should tie in with one another as though they were chiseled with the finest precision instrument—and that instrument being the sincere interest of our American people at heart. Could there be a better one?

By this time, if you haven't already turned the page to see who was writing you this letter, I guess I will have to explain my purpose in writing. You know, I sit in your office everyday and see hundreds and hundreds of letters come in, and I sometimes wonder if those people had access to the public press wouldn't a lot of good come from the various suggestions. Some are not so sound; others are excellent if given to the public in general to voice as their own sentiments.

In every person's heart, I guess, there is a strong desire to contribute something worth while to the war effort. In every person's heart there is at one time or another an urge to stand on a soap box, if need be, and shout to the world their thoughts and ideas. I've seen less constructive ideas than my own in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

All in all, Congressman, don't you wish that something could be done to rectify the bungling now going on in government? Or are we going to "let George do it"?

Seriously, your secretary,

ALICE S. FISHER.

Civil Aviation—Its Development and Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, there is much consideration being given to civil and commercial aviation, its development and progress, and more especially to post-war problems. I am asking leave to insert in the RECORD a very fine editorial that appeared in the Washington Post this morning. I trust every Member of the House will avail themselves of the opportunity of reading this editorial if you have not already done so. I think it is worthy of careful consideration:

VOTE ON A DOG FIGHT

On the surface the proposal to set up a separate standing committee on aviation is a recognition of the supreme importance of civil aviation after the war. That is why the move has attracted support. We may agree with such a view and at the same time submit that the naming of a new committee would in fact do far more harm than good to the aviation industry. This may seem a contradiction in terms. But the truth of such an observation will be obvious after a little consideration.

Civil aviation after the war is going to have its future determined largely by its ability to meet competitive rates. In other words, it will be situated in the context of general transportation. Its problems must therefore be considered along with the problems of general transportation. That is the present position, and it has everything to commend it. Aviation and all other forms of transportation are handled by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee under the chairmanship of Representative CLARENCE F. LEA. This committee is the legislative authority and umpire the mandate of which is to assure justice among competing carriers. It is in a position to be both a protecting and restraining power over the relations among our different forms of transport.

Never in the last 20 years, or since civil aviation came under its wing, has there been any question about the impartiality of this committee. All the leaders of our transportation systems at various times have borne witness to that fact. Those testimonies likewise show that the committee has been farsighted, wise, and constructive. Let us see how civil aviation has fared under the aegis of Representative LEA's body. The first witness is Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association of America, a society which includes all the air lines of the United States. In 1939 he said:

"With the air-transport industry forging ahead in its mission of public service, we are extremely fortunate in having as our Federal charter of regulation a new Civil Aeronautics Act, in the drafting of which the statesmanship of foresight was employed in liberal degree, and in the support of which the President and the Congress, after a patient, long-continued, and conscientious study, made an immeasurable contribution to the needs and aspirations and the future welfare of our commerce, our Postal Service, and our national defense. Already America has recognized their action as just and wise. The brake has been taken from the wheel."

Then Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, speaking after the Collier Trophy was given to the air lines and to the Army for the greatest accomplishment in aviation for last year:

"This award takes on special significance at this time because it brings to light the vision and foresight of the Congress of the United States and the Government in adopting, years ago, a long-range program to foster, develop, and encourage civil aviation. Such a program, under which the air lines of the United States were developed to a degree of usefulness and efficiency unsurpassed anywhere else in the world, enabled them to be ready to help the Army solve one of the most difficult problems of the whole war."

Finally President Roosevelt in 1939:

"Civil aviation is clearly recognized as the backlog of national defense in the Civil Aeronautics Act which set up the effective machinery for a comprehensive national policy with respect to the air. Underlying the statute is the principle that the country's welfare in time of peace, and its safety in time of war rests upon the existence of a stabilized aircraft production—an economically and technically sound air transportation system, both domestic and overseas—an adequate supply of well-trained civilian pilots and ground personnel."

What would happen if aviation were taken out of the control of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and vested in a separate committee on aviation? Clearly that committee, left with railroads and busses, would lose its judicial attitude. It would be forced to represent railroads and busses. It would become a special pleader. That would also be the position of the new committee on aviation. This committee would represent the air lines and plead for them. So we should see on Capitol Hill the death of a truly constructive committee of Congress which has done and can continue to do yeoman service for transportation in general and aviation in particular and the birth of two competitive committees which between them could strangle impartial regulation. Those who vote for a separate committee on aviation would thus be voting nothing more than a dogfight, whether they realize it or not. That is not the way to assure the wise development of civil aviation in the new air age.

Letter of Mr. Wilfrid W. Parry, of Toronto, Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks, I include a letter addressed to Hon. W. D. Jamison, a former Member of the House, by Mr. Wilfrid W. Parry, of Toronto, Canada, as follows:

ARNOLDI, PARRY & CAMPBELL,
Toronto, Canada.

The Honorable W. D. JAMIESON,
Southern Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This letter is not an impulsive gesture but originates from your suggestion that interchange of ideas is always valuable.

As a junior member of your "Window Seat," I perhaps should be cautious in expressing my view on a subject with which you may have already dealt on numerous occasions. It is, therefore, with reservation and apology that I venture to write on a matter upon which I feel very strongly.

From your law office window you "look over the White House toward the balance of the country." Perhaps I might suggest that not only should your vision be less restricted but that rather you should acquire a telescope capable of looking farther afield. When you do you may have other thoughts occur of passing interest which it may well be your duty to express even if it offends the policy of your far-reaching publication.

(a) Turn your telescope east and look about 3,000 miles into the hearts and souls of a strange people called English. For 3 years they have made every possible sacrifice without complaint.

For 3 years they have labored all day in the factory and stood by all night as home defense against those devils of the air and messengers of death appropriately called Huns.

For 3 years they have known what it is to have the work of a lifetime blown to pieces and their loved ones broken or dead.

For 3 years they have willingly sent their sons abroad to brave the perils of land, sea, and air—and for 3 years have waited in agony to receive curt War Office notification that legions of their sons "will not grow old, as we who are left grow old."

For 3 years, supported by nothing but grim determination, they have faced sneers leveled at the "old school tie" and the "playing fields of Eton" from those some of whom face only the danger of hardening of the arteries.

(b) If you will now turn your telescope North you will discover (and it may be, for many of your readers, a discovery) a large country inhabited by a small, diverse population. Perhaps the record of the last war will justify the addition of some attribute of courage. Since pioneer days the struggle for existence in Canada has been unceasingly arduous. Living beside a mighty industrial country, we have been compelled to maintain a standard of living equal to yours or lose our people to you, this despite provocative tariffs, the necessary handicaps of wide open spaces, and the vagaries of the world price of wheat. (Incidentally, for some years we have bought more from you than any other nation.) Repeatedly in your country I hear the inference that Canada is not doing her part in today's debacle. Focus your telescope carefully and whatever the truth may be, tell your people, so that if there is injustice it may be now avoided.

North of the boundary you will find a people, handicapped by lack of numbers and actual wealth, struggling to make a great contribution to the common cause. In the hope of maintaining our liberty, our people have accepted without a whimper increasing control and vexatious restriction. Labor, without protest, accepted fixed wages a year ago although the worker might well have expected to come into his own after the meager days of the depression—business accepted, also without a murmur, the 100-percent excess profits tax as the final step in squeezing the last drop from its operations. Obediently our merchants accepted price control at a time when they would have exploited the market. Nonessential industry is being rapidly folded up and labor is no longer free to wander but must stay where the authorities dictate. As for poor Mr. John Citizen, he accepts his annoying burden with complete composure and pays and prays. All this, mark you, when you, our neighbors, were enjoying the thrill of an inflation speeded on by increasing wages and their concomitant, mounting prices.

We are not an industrial people but through trial and many errors have now a creditable record of production of necessary munitions. Canada is not a warlike nation but our best blood is already in the armed forces, the second successive generation of Canada's potential leaders, possibly to be lost to her. As for the slackers in Canada who would let their brothers fight for them, public opinion and the growing emergency will deal with this problem before very long. We are criticized for lack of "conscription." This is a long story and cannot be understood by outsiders unless the history of Canada for the past 200 years is carefully studied. The answer will be found there. Is it not really a matter of our own business—internal mechanics—in view of the fact that our authorities repeatedly advise us that we have met and are meeting the present demand for soldiers, sailors, and airmen?

We feel quite capable of dealing with our own problems in our own way, but the curse of politics (which is not confined to Canada) makes the solution difficult and not quickly attained. In the meantime, recognizing all the difficulties, perhaps someone could suggest what in Heaven's name more we can do. Believe me, if we knew anything, we would do it. Our handicap is lack of leadership for a people willing and anxious to do more and more. Criticism in high places—yes—but let it stop there lest the innocent be involved with the responsible. "Milton: Thou shouldst be living at this hour."

(c) Your telescope is now back at home, and perhaps I might have a peek through it. Your critics are internal, and as an outsider with a fair knowledge of what is being accomplished it is obvious to me that you are doing a real job, although nothing you may do will exceed the American achievement which made it possible for you to go to war a united people. In asking you to wrap our weaknesses in the cloak of our intentions and our results we, for our part, prefer to ignore the element in your country which to my amazement boasts that America has again been called in to save the world when others have failed. If failure consists of the facing of overwhelming odds by a people who stripped themselves of means of defense in order to give practical support to the idealism of world peace, the British are guilty. If failure means carrying the whole burden of defending civilization in the darkest hour of the struggle, the British have failed. No; as far as the people are concerned, despite the errors of or lack of leadership, they have done their part in saving, as Jan Masaryk has so ably said, what little remains of democracy for the world. You in the United States can't win this war any more than the British can, but together the Anglo-Saxon with his heritage and tradition of simple domestic freedom, his common language and common worship, can.

You are doing a magnificent job in your country. I saw the effort recently clean through to Brazil. Elsewhere it is or soon could be repeated until the concerted weight of all will attain victory. Your thinking public is apt to be overly critical, but should realize that fundamentally you are doing the impossible and doing it well despite obstacles. Let us ignore the beams and the motes, and with increased devotion increase the sacrifices which the times demand. Everywhere action; not talk. The war has not been won, and there is no time for complacency. Our united effort falls far short of being enough."

(d) This brings me to, I hope, a logical conclusion. We three countries are groping in our own way to end the threat to our mode of life. There have been and will be mistakes and costly errors of judgment; this is inevitable. In each country are critics of the others who can defeat the unity of purpose and effort we so much desire. This is serious. Time, in its own inimitable style, recently described the American and British soldier in the British Isles as allergic to one another. The same feeling occurs in higher places, where conservatism frequently clashes with the dynamics of mass production to endanger the foundations of our whole structure. This must be eliminated by the British and American understanding one another and making the needed allowances for viewpoint and tradition. It is your personal problem through your own medium to tell your readers, far from battle lines and immediate danger, that the Britisher's heart is sound, that his courage does not falter, and that his sacrifice cannot be measured in words nor its value to the ultimate computed. It is, as well, the Britisher's task to recognize that there is a difference in characteristics between the new world and the old, and to accept such differences as a distinction which should be encouraged, not deprecated. Anomalous, as it may seem, it was the German, Hegel, I believe, who said: "The greatest tragedies of history have not been the struggles of right against wrong, but the struggles of right against right." There is much of truth in this. Let us encourage no such tragedies. They lead to defeat and damnation.

(e) I have left Canada's part until the end. We believe that we represent the mean between the old and the new. In tradition, British; in environment, American. We believe that we, uniquely, can interpret you to the English, and the English to you. We want to take on the job, but to do so we must enjoy the complete confidence of both parties. If we are worthy, give us a chance. Build us up, and try us in any way. Tell your people about us, not disguising the weaknesses, but accentuating our virtues, if any, and our willingness to serve the good of humanity. Perhaps we can do a job. We are your neighbors and ask nothing except the chance to pull our own weight where it could be most effective. Come and study us, invite us to come and talk to you, not as propagandists but as peoples who understand one another and speak the same language. We are conscious, too conscious, of our limitations without being told from abroad, and this knowledge will remedy our weaknesses.

Keep your telescope pointed abroad in order to learn and publish the vision you obtain, not of the United States, or of Canada, or of Britain, but of a Christian crusade being fought to maintain and advance civilization, now so much obscured by the

smoke of battle and evidences of internal and external sabotage and vice.

Your work and mine must be largely personal. It is difficult to impress upon the individual that his effort counts and that as the grains of sand and drops of water each collectively make up the irresistible forces of nature, so it can be with us in the field of human endeavor. This as an ultimate can be our only adequate defense against those who would destroy us and bring back the Dark Ages.

You have a serious responsibility as an editor and a grand medium for enlisting individual support in this crusade; not to the heretofore isolated Americas but to the cause of freedom, and your work will be your greatest reward. Nothing else matters. Was it not Aeschylus who so subjectively described the value of the effort which I am so feebly trying to portray and to follow—

"The moaning of the homeless sea
The sound of streams that swift or slow
Draw down Aeonian hills and sow
The dust of continents to be."

Sincerely,

WILFRID W. PARRY.

Post-War Settlements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana:

Substitute for House Joint Memorial 3

Joint memorial to the President and the Senate of the United States of America, setting forth the wishes of the twenty-eighth legislative assembly of Montana, relative to the winning of the war by the total defeat of the Axis powers, and relative to post-war settlements affecting the peace and stability of our country and of the world, and asking the President and the Senate, as the treaty-making power in our country, to fully recognize and accept our national duty and responsibility in the reestablishment and future maintenance of world peace and order

To the President and the Senate of the United States:

Whereas young men from Montana are for a second time in a generation fighting and dying on foreign soil for the freedom and security of our Nation; and

Whereas the people of our State mindful of the fact that a Nation as large and as powerful as the United States of America will find it impossible to maintain a policy of complete isolation in a world in which distances are being cut down every day by continually improving means of transportation and communication, and hopeful that in the peace to follow our certain victory that our country will, together with the other nations, accept its full share of responsibility in the reorganizing and rebuilding of the post-war world and the safeguarding of world peace; and

Whereas realizing that the new problems our Nation will face in its task of helping to establish and maintain a just and durable peace, may require certain sacrifices, a high devotion to the cause of world peace, a united effort on the part of all citizens of the Nation, and a determination to insist on the maintenance of a free and stable order in the world regardless of race or religion: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, in regular session assembled, the senate and house concurring, do respectfully and earnestly urge upon the President and the Senate of the United States, our firm conviction that our war effort should not stop short of the total military defeat of all the Axis Powers; our belief in the vital need of our country's full cooperation and responsibility, with the other United Nations, in reestablishing order after the present war; in the maintenance of peace in the many countries where civil law has been wiped out during this war, and in the necessary use of international policing or such other means as may be required to keep such peace; in the readjustment of treaties with other nations so the world trade and commercial needs and possibilities may be encouraged and developed to the mutual benefit of all nations and peoples; and in the necessity that our country accept this inevitable change in our world relations and enter upon such new policy with the courage and determination characteristic of the United States of America and with a full confidence in the eventual solution of the principal problems ahead, to the end that American principles may benefit the rest of the world and strengthen and fortify here at home those same principles of economic and political democracy which we so deeply cherish; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state of Montana, to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, to the honorable Senate of the United States, to the Members of Congress from the State of Montana, and to each of the legislative assemblies of the several States of the United States of America.

Amendment of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana:

House Joint Memorial 1

Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting the amendment by that body of the Social Security Act of Congress so as to provide for the payment by the Federal Government of social security to city, county, and State officers and employees, and school teachers

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

Whereas the Social Security Act of Congress makes no provision for the payment to city, county, or State officers or employees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (both House concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, respectfully urged to amend the Social Security Act in such manner as to provide for the payment by the Federal Government of adequate social security to city, county, and State officers and employees, and school teachers, and thus place them in a position of equality with industrial and other employees; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be mailed by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana.

San Francisco Shipyard Labor Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Hon. Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, and my reply thereto:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 13, 1943.

The Honorable JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: I have read your letter of February 4, 1943, which you incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in reply to my letter to you of January 28, 1943. I should appreciate having this letter made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

You again refer to the refusal of Messrs. Hook, Dillon, and Smith to meet with Admiral Greenslade and General DeWitt. I am not in a position to advise you of the reasons which caused these men to refrain from meeting with Admiral Greenslade and General DeWitt. I did not learn of this until some time after the incident and, of course, had no control over it.

You ask why it was necessary for me to call Messrs. Hook, Dillon, and Smith by long distance telephone after the President had telegraphed them to comply with zone standards and the antimigration agreement.

My call was made before the telegram was sent. I did not call Messrs. Hook, Dillon, and Smith, but called Mr. Hoskins, the Department of Labor conciliator in San Francisco. The conciliator talked to Messrs. Hook, Dillon, and Smith in his office, and they requested to speak with me. They did. Certainly it was my duty to listen, particularly as they were contending that they were conforming to existing laws and orders.

There has never been any question concerning the authority of the President. His telegram, while informal, was an Executive order. In calling the Department of Labor conciliator in San Francisco I was merely carrying out my duty as the Secretary of Labor to attempt to secure effective compliance with the President's order.

You again assert that my representatives did not work in close cooperation with Admiral Greenslade and his staff while they were in San Francisco.

Admiral Greenslade has never questioned the cooperation of my representatives; in fact, as I have previously indicated, he issued a press release to the contrary. Certainly, there is no dispute between the Navy and the Department of Labor. My representatives sought the assistance of Admiral Greenslade and his staff and, as I have already advised

you, one member of his staff was instrumental in getting the machinists back to work. Their assignment was to straighten out a labor difficulty, not the Navy, and their efforts were naturally directed and successfully directed toward that end.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES PERKINS.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1943.

Hon. FRANCES PERKINS,
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MADAM SECRETARY: This will acknowledge your letter of February 13, 1943, with further reference to the San Francisco shipyard labor situation. I shall ask unanimous consent to place your communication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as requested.

It seems to be rather useless to continue our correspondence, as none of the statements contained in your communication has materially altered the facts which I presented to the House of Representatives on January 21, 1943.

Apparently we don't agree on the role of the Department of Labor as far as industrial disputes are concerned. Where shipyards are engaged in the construction or repair of naval vessels I am firmly convinced that the Navy Department's industrial relations officers are doing a much more effective job of preventing work stoppages than your Department is.

In that connection, may I call your attention to a statement contained in House Naval Affairs Committee Report No. 5 on Private Shipbuilding Companies on the Pacific Coast. On page 25 of this report, which is signed by Congressman MAGNUSON and myself, we state that "the Navy Department can play an important role in connection with both labor and management, as both have learned to depend a great deal upon the Navy's industrial relations officers."

The fact that both labor and management have reached this conclusion is because they have both found it difficult to present their problems to any other Government department and be assured that both will get a fair deal.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN Z. ANDERSON.

Gasoline Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, adopted by the Fiftieth General Assembly of Iowa, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take action necessary to effect the retirement of the Federal Government from the field of automotive taxation, with special reference to the tax on gasoline and the use of automotive units:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 17

Whereas the Federal Government in the levying of a tax on gasoline and upon automotive units has invaded a field of taxation heretofore exclusively reserved to the States; and

Whereas there has never been any direct relationship between such Federal taxes and Federal aid to the States for highway purposes; and

Whereas it appears that normal Federal aid for highways may not be continued beyond the end of the present fiscal year; and

Whereas gasoline rationing has drastically and seriously reduced State revenues for highway purposes; and

Whereas the Federal Government has sources of revenue not available to the States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of Iowa (the House of Representatives concurring) do memorialize the Congress of the United States to take action necessary to effect the retirement of the Federal Government from the field of automotive taxation, with special reference to the tax on gasoline and the use tax on automotive units, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to each United States Senator and each Congressman from Iowa.

We Must Beat Japan to the Punch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED NORMAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include the following article from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of Thursday, February 18, concerning the war against Japan.

In connection therewith, I want to say that many residents of the Pacific Northwest, notably the Honorable Miller Freeman, Seattle publisher and retired United States Navy captain, are mindful of the ever-present possibility, even the probability, of Japanese attack in force on our west coast. Indeed, Mr. Freeman for many years had warned of the Japanese aggression which came to such a shameful climax on December 7, 1941. Since the war began, these well-informed persons have been asserting, with what I believe is irrefutable logic, that we should look upon Japan as our No. 1 enemy, that we should bend our major efforts to whipping Japan first. In short, that we must beat Japan to the punch.

The newspaper article, of which I am the author, is as follows:

BLOW AGAINST JAPAN URGED

(By Representative FRED NORMAN)

WASHINGTON, February 17.—The forecast of a new and powerful attack on Japan is welcome news in the Pacific Northwest.

And with all our hearts we of that region hope that the Japs are hit before they hit us, because if they beat us to this punch it may prolong the war for years.

The yellow menace is not outdated on the Pacific coast. Since December 7, 1941, it has become a grim and terrible reality, increasing day by day.

COAST KNOWS DANGER

That's why so many people on the Pacific coast, and especially in the Pacific Northwest, wonder at the present conduct of the war. Feeling strongly that Japan is our major enemy, we cannot help but worry when we see America's major fighting forces and resources concentrated against Germany.

The west coast knows only too well that the "experts" can be wrong. It knows they certainly were wrong, even the highest of them, before Pearl Harbor. It may well be that the "experts" still are wrong about Japan and her menace to America's Pacific borders.

I am not an expert, but I pose these questions:

With Germany getting licked on the Russian and north African fronts, must not Japan create a diversion to help her Axis friends? And what better diversion could she create than an attack in force against Russia—an attack that would of necessity sweep across the Pacific in a strong, relentless thrust at our Pacific bastions?

Japan has lost a few thousand men in the South Pacific. We've lost men, too. Japan has lost some ships down there. So have we. Japan gained a lot of territory, but has lost but little. We lost a lot, and have gained back but little. With all due credit to the heroism and genius of the men fighting our South Pacific battles, we cannot rightly say, so far, that we have been fighting more than a series of holding actions. We're a very long way from Tokyo on the southern branch line.

STRIKE AT ONCE

But Tokyo is not so far from us on the northern branch line. No informed, serious-minded person in western Washington scoffs at the idea that Japan can and will attack us there. What may seem fantastic to the people of the East is an extremely grim probability in the Pacific Northwest, Alaska, and down along our western coast.

Gen. Homer Lea, the hunchbacked military genius who helped Sun Yat-sen lay the foundations of republican China a generation ago, foresaw that probability long before some of our "experts" were born.

In the Valor of Ignorance he figured out Japan's North Pacific invasion right down to the last detail. Time too soon may tell that his predictions were correct.

I believe we should strike at once at Japan from at least two directions.

We should form fronts of our own choosing instead of merely defending ourselves on fronts of Japan's choosing.

Stalin's Order of the Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the controversy now raging throughout the Allied press relative to Premier Stalin's order of the day of February 22, I am inserting that historic document in the RECORD as part of these remarks.

I am doing this for several reasons. In the first place, there were so few papers throughout this country that carried Mr. Stalin's statement in full that I believe it should go in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order that the full text may be made available to as many people as possible.

Then, too, I think it should go in the RECORD for the future convenience of Members of the House and Senate, as well as other officials and interested individuals throughout the country.

It is significant that in this statement Premier Stalin did not mention either the United States or the British Empire, nor did he refer, directly or indirectly,

to the great volume of war materials Russia has received from the United States. But he did say that "in view of the absence of a second front in Europe, the Red Army alone is bearing the weight of the whole war."

While we are ready, willing and anxious to give the Russian Army and the Russian people credit for the great fight they are now waging to protect their homes against Hitler's ruthless hordes, I cannot subscribe to the statement that Russia alone is bearing the whole weight of the war, especially in view of the sacrifices we are making, at home and abroad, and in view of the further fact that America, Australia, and China are bearing the brunt of the war against Japan, the most insidious and perhaps the most dangerous enemy that has ever threatened our civilization.

I should like to see Russia recognize the fact that Japan is the enemy of all, and give us bases near enough to Japan that we could blow Tokyo off the face of the earth, and hasten an Allied victory that would mean the safety of the entire world.

Premier Stalin's statement follows:

STALIN'S ORDER OF DAY EXTOLLING RED ARMY

Comrades, Red Army men, Red Navy men, commanders, and political workers and men and women guerrillas, today we are celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the existence of the Red Army.

A quarter of a century has passed since the Red Army was created. It was created for a struggle against foreign invaders striving to enslave our country.

February 23, 1918, when detachments of the Red Army thoroughly defeated troops of German invaders before Poskov and Narva, was established as the birthday of the Red Army.

In 1918 to 1921, in a stubborn struggle against foreign invaders, the Red Army defended the honor, freedom, and independence of our Soviet motherland, and defended the right of the peoples of our country to build their lives as our great Lenin taught.

For two decades the Red Army guarded the peaceful and constructive labor of the Soviet people. The people of our country have never forgotten the encroachment on our land, and have constantly cared for the strengthening of the might of the Red Army, and have provided it with first-class military and technical equipment, and lovingly reared cadres of Soviet fighters.

The Red Army is an army defending the peace and friendship between the peoples of all countries.

NOT CREATED FOR CONQUEST

It was not created for the purpose of conquest of foreign countries, but to defend the frontiers of Soviet land. The Red Army has always respected the rights and independence of all peoples.

But in June 1941, Hitlerite Germany perfidiously attacked our country, rudely and foully violating the nonaggression agreement, and the Red Army found itself compelled to launch a campaign to defend its native land against the German invaders, and to drive him from the borders of our country.

Since that time the Red Army has become an army of deadly struggle against the Hitlerite troops, an army of avengers of the violation and debasement perpetrated by the German Fascist scoundrels against our brothers and sisters in the occupied districts of our native land.

The Red Army is meeting the twenty-fifth anniversary of its existence at a decisive moment in the patriotic war against Hitlerite Germany and its accomplices—the Italians, Hungarians, Rumanians, and Finns.

Twenty months have passed since the Red Army began to wage its heroic struggle, unexampled in history, against the invasion of the German Fascist hordes.

LAID FOUNDATION FOR VICTORY

In view of the absence of a second front in Europe the Red Army alone is bearing the whole weight of the war.

Nevertheless the Red Army has not only stood firm against the onslaught of the German Fascist hordes but has also in the course of the war become a menace to the Fascist Army.

During the hard battles in the summer and autumn of 1942 the Red Army barred the way to Fascist hopes. Our people will remember for all time the heroic defense of Sevastopol and Odessa, the stubborn battles before Moscow and in the foothills of the Caucasus, in the Rzhev area, and before Leningrad and the most magnificent warriors in history who fought at the walls of Stalingrad.

In these great battles our valiant Red Army men, commanders and political workers covered the military banners of the Red Army with eternal glory and laid firm the foundation for victory over the German Fascist Army.

Three months ago troops of the Red Army began the offensive on the approaches to Stalingrad. Since then the initiative in military operations has remained in our hands and the temper and strength of the blows of the offensive operation of the Red Army have never weakened.

Today the Red Army in difficult winter conditions, is advancing over the front extending 1,500 kilometers and almost everywhere is achieving success.

BLOW AFTER BLOW AT GERMANS

In the north, before Leningrad, on the central front, on the approaches to Kharkov, in the Donets Basin, at Rostov, on the shores of the Sea of Azov, and the Black Sea, the Red Army is delivering blow after blow on the Hitlerite troops.

In 3 months the Red Army has liberated from the enemy territory of the Voronezh and Stalingrad regions, Chechen, Ingush, North Ossetian, Kabardino-Balkaria, and the Kalmuck Autonomous Republic, Stavropol, and Krasnodar territories, Cheresk, Karachayevska and Adigeisk autonomous regions, and almost the whole of the Rostov, Kharkov, and Kursk regions.

The beginning of the massed drive of the enemy from Soviet lands has begun.

What changes have taken place during these 3 months whence these serious failures of the Germans? Where lies the cause of these failures?

The relations of forces on the Soviet-German front has changed. The fact is Fascist Germany is becoming ever more and more exhausted and weaker while the Soviet Union is more and more developing its reserves and becoming ever stronger. Time is working against Fascist Germany.

Hitlerite Germany, which forces the war industry of Europe to work for it, until recently had superiority against the Soviet Union in technical equipment and first and foremost in tanks and planes. It was here that she had the advantage. But during the 20 months of war the situation has changed.

LISTS ENORMOUS ENEMY LOSSES

Thanks for the self-sacrificing labor of the working men and women engineers and technical experts in the war industry of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, the production of tanks and guns has increased during the period of the war.

During this time the enemy has suffered enormous losses on the Soviet-German front in war material, particularly in tanks, planes, and guns.

In 3 months of the offensive of the Red Army in the winter of 1942–43 alone the Germans lost over 7,000 tanks, 4,000 planes, 17,000 guns, and large quantities of other war material.

Of course, the Germans are endeavoring to cover these losses, but this will not be so easy to do as no little time would be required for the enemy to be in a position to make up for these enormous losses in war material. Meanwhile time will not wait.

Hitlerite Germany began the war against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics having a numerical superiority of troops mobilized and ready for battle as compared with the Red Army. It was here that she had the advantage.

In 20 months, however, the situation has changed in this respect also. In defensive and offensive battle, the Red Army since the beginning of the war has put out of commission about 9,000,000 German Fascist officers and men, of which no less than 4,000,000 were killed on the field of battle.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWELVE DIVISIONS ROUTED

The Rumanian, Italian, and Hungarian armies which Hitler had thrown on the Soviet-German frontier have been completely defeated.

In the last 3 months alone 112 enemy divisions have been routed by the Red Army, 700,000 men have been killed and over 300,000 have been taken prisoner.

Of course, the German command will adopt all measures to cover this colossal loss. But firstly the weak spot in the German Army is the shortage of manpower reserve, in view of which it is unknown from what sources this loss will be made up.

Secondly, even supposing the Germans scraped together by hook and by crook the necessary number of men, it would require no short period of time to get them together and train them. And time will not wait.

The Hitlerite army entered the war against the Soviet Union having almost 2 years' experience in conducting large-scale military operations in Europe, utilizing for the purpose the most modern means of war. The Red Army, in the first period of the war, naturally had not yet had nor could have had such military experience. It was here that the German Fascist army had the advantage.

In 20 months the situation, however, has changed in this sphere as well. In the course of the war the Red Army has become a seasoned army. It has learned to smite the enemy for certain, taking into account its weak and strong sides as is demanded by modern military science. Hundreds of thousands and millions of Red Army men have become masters of their weapons, rifles, sabers, machine guns, artillery, mortars, tanks, sapper work, and aircraft.

Tens of thousands of commanders of the Red Army have become masters in leading troops. They have learned to combine personal valor and courage with an ability to lead their troops on the field of battle, revoking stupid linear tactics and adopting firm tactics of maneuvering.

SIGN OF MILITARY MATURITY

It should not be considered an accident that the command of the Red Army is not only liberating from the enemy Soviet soil but is also not allowing the enemy to leave our soil alive by carrying out operations to surround and wipe out the enemy which can well serve as an example of military skill.

This undoubtedly is a sign of maturity of our commanders. There is not the slightest doubt that only the correct strategy of the command of the Red Army and the flexible tactics of our commanders who executed it could lead to such outstanding action as the surrounding and wiping out of the enormous Sixth Army of the Germans making up the 330,000 men of Stalingrad.

In this respect everything is not well with the Germans. Their strategy is defective, since as a general rule it underestimates the strength and possibilities of the enemy and overestimates its own strength.

They apply their tactics in accordance with textbooks, endeavoring to fit events at the front into paragraphs of their regulations. The Germans are accurate and exact in their operations when the situation allows the requirements of their regulations to be carried out. This is where their strength lies. The Germans become helpless when the situation gets complicated and does not "correspond" with this or that paragraph in their regulations but requires adoption of an independent decision not provided for in the regulations.

WARNS AGAINST OVERCONFIDENCE

It is here that their main weakness lies. These are the causes which determined the defeat of the German troops and the successes of the Red Army in the last 3 months.

It does not follow from this, however, that the Hitlerite army is finished and the Red Army has now only to pursue it to the western frontiers of our country. To think thus would mean to fall into unwise and harmful self deception. To think thus would mean to over-estimate our own strength, underestimate the strength of the enemy and to fall into adventurism.

The enemy has suffered defeat but he is not yet conquered. The German Fascist army is experiencing a crisis because of the blows it has received from the Red Army but this does not yet mean that it cannot recover.

The struggle against the German invaders is not yet ended—it is only developing and flaring up as yet. It would be stupid to suppose the Germans will give up even one kilometer of our land without a struggle.

The Red Army has before it a severe struggle against the cunning, cruel and as yet strong enemy. This struggle will require time and sacrifices, exertion on the part of our forces and mobilization of all our possibilities.

We have begun the liberation of the Soviet Ukraine from German possession, but millions of Ukrainians still are languishing under the yoke of German enslavers. In Byelo-Russia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, in Moldavia, in Crimea, in Karelia, German invaders and their accomplices still hold sway. Enemy armies have received powerful blows, but the enemy is not yet conquered. The German invaders are furiously resisting, are launching counter-attacks, are striving to cling to their defense lines and may enter into fresh adventures.

FOR CONTINUED EFFORT

That is why there can be no place in our ranks for complacency, carefree attitude, or swank.

The Soviet people are joyful concerning the victories of the Red Armies.

But men, commanders, and political workers should firmly remember the behest of our teacher, Lenin, that "the first thing is not to be carried away by victory or to swagger, the second thing is to consolidate victories, the third thing to defeat the enemy completely."

For the sake of liberation of our country from the hated enemy, for the sake of finer victory over the German Fascist invaders, I order:

1. Continually to perfect military training and strengthen discipline, order and organization throughout the Red Army and Navy.

2. Strengthen the blows on the enemy troops constantly and stubbornly and give him no chance to consolidate a defense line, to give him no rest by day or by night, to cut enemy communications, to surround enemy troops and annihilate them if they refuse to lay down their arms.

3. To fan more extensively the flames of guerrilla warfare in the rear of the enemy, to destroy enemy communications, to blow up railway bridges, to hamper the transport of enemy troops, the transport of arms and ammunition, to blow up and set fire to army stores, to raid enemy garrisons, to prevent the retreating enemy from burning down our villages and towns, to help the advancing Red Army in all ways and by all means.

In this lies the guaranty of our victory, comrades, Red Army men, and Red Navy men, commanders and political workers, men and women guerrillas.

On behalf of the Soviet Government and our Bolshevik Party, I greet you and congratulate you on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Red Army.

Long live our great motherland. Long live our glorious Red Army, our valiant Red Navy, our intrepid men and women guerrillas.

Long live the party of the Bolsheviki, inspirer and organizer of the Red Army's victories.

Death to the German invaders.

J. STALIN,
Supreme Commander in Chief.

Wheat Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to place before this body the attitude of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America with respect to the action of the Secretary of Agriculture in lifting the restrictions on the production of wheat. In a press release by James G. Patton, president of this organization, he makes the position of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union plain and clear-cut. A letter from this organization reads:

FARMERS' EDUCATIONAL AND CO-OPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,
Washington, February 23, 1943.

HON. USHER L. BURDICK,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I believe you will be interested in the enclosed press release issued by Mr. Patton, our president, today.

ROBERT HANDSCHIN,
Legislative Representative.

WASHINGTON, February 23.—James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union, today made the following comment on Secretary of Agriculture Wickard's action removing acreage restrictions on wheat.

"Removal of acreage restrictions on wheat comes in the nick of time. The National Farmers' Union has been urging all-out corn and wheat production for months as part of its over-all program for expanding 1943 food production. Today's action, together with the earlier removal of acreage restrictions on corn, means more meats, fats, milk, butter, and bread for American consumers and our allies. It will mean more bread for the starving millions in the nations we are pledged to liberate and feed.

"Now Congress must lift the limit of 125,000,000 bushels on the sale of Government-owned wheat for livestock and poultry feed at prices not more than 85 percent of the parity price of corn. Neglect and inaction by Congress has shut off this source of feedstuffs. Livestock, dairy, and poultry raisers are demanding its release. This is the same issue that deadlocked the Congress for weeks last summer before a handful of farm bloc spokesmen finally surrendered to the Nation's needs. We cannot shut off this flow of feed to our livestock and poultry farms any more than we can shut off the flow of coal and steel to our industrial war plants. Farms are war plants too."

Montana Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to insert House Joint Memorial No. 5 of the Montana State Legislature. I feel quite strongly that some uniform policy for the drafting of men into the armed forces must be put into operation immediately. The policy now in effect has caused—and is causing—great uncertainty. Married men in Montana were drafted long before married men were drafted in other States and I feel that no more should be taken until all the eligible single men from all the other States have been called. This calls for a national manpower pool and this I strongly recommend. The following memorial speaks for the people of my State:

House Joint Memorial 5

Memorial to the President and the Congress of the United States and to War Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt protesting the uncertainty of the economic status of the men now under provisions of the draft law, and urging Congress of the United States to enact proper legislation to amend the present Selective Service Act and requesting War Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt to establish, by executive order, a uniform system for inducting married men with children into the armed forces

To the President of the United States and to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled and to War Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt:

Whereas there has existed no uniform policy for the drafting of men in the armed forces by the Selective Service; and

Whereas such policy has caused much uncertainty of the economic status of the men now under the provision of the draft law; and

Whereas married men in Montana were drafted long before married men were drafted in many other States; and

Whereas in the Associated Press report of January 19, of an interview with War Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt, the uncertain status of married men with children still exists; and

Whereas we citizens of Montana do not wish a repetition of the above conditions by having our married men with children drafted in the armed forces before all available manpower in the previous classification has been drafted in the other States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of

the State of Montana (the senate concurring), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact proper legislation to amend the present Selective Service Act by creating a national pool of manpower for the purpose of selection of men into our armed forces and that War Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt be urged by Executive order to establish in the meantime a uniform system of draft as between the various States; be it further

Resolved, That no State shall be required to send married men with children into the armed forces until all States shall be uniformly required to do likewise; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives, to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana.

The McKellar Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article written by Mr. George Morris entitled "The McKellar Bill" and taken from the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., of February 22, 1943:

IN WASHINGTON WITH GEORGE MORRIS

THE M'KELLAR BILL

WASHINGTON, February 21.—Within the next few weeks Congress will go on record as to the extent it is willing to harbor subversive individuals and tolerate promotion of foreign political ideologies in the Government. Senator MCKELLAR has introduced a simple bill providing for Senate confirmation of all Government officials drawing $4,500 or more. Three classes of positions have developed in Congress. First and most potent is the administration dominated group which favors leaving all responsibility in the hands of bureaucrats and opposes any measure which would give Congress a voice in determining who is worthy of trust or confidence in directing policy according to the democratic system of America.

The other two favor the legislation but believe it should be applicable to a greater number than contemplated in the McKellar bill. There are those who insist that some of the more dangerous and subversive elements are to be found within the $3,000–$4,500 brackets, and favor confirmation of all officials drawing $3,000 or more. At least, they say, Congress should reserve the right to take a look at them, their present activities and past affiliations.

The McKellar bill provides that when an official is approved he shall have a 4-year tenure. Republicans provide the principal opposition to the 4-year provision. They insist that the Republicans are going to take charge of the Government 2 years hence and do not want certain New Dealers, who may pass superficial Senate scrutiny, hung around their neck for 2 years. Senator MCKELLAR is not opposed to lowering the salary limit for confirmation or lessening the length of the tenure provision. He is interested only in breaking the strangle hold the subversive groups have on the Government and, he says, other considerations are of minor importance.

Senator MCKELLAR has been a favorite target for bureaucrats for a long time, except for the brief period when they are asking for appropriations. As acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee he is a great favorite of the bureaucrats until they get the money. During the time they are attempting to wheedle bigger and better appropriations the subversive groups go in their holes. Having finished with appropriations, they come out like groundhogs to enjoy the sunshine of a better day and celebrate the reprieve for another year with renewed devotion to their subversive ideals.

This time appropriations are not alone involved. Senator MCKELLAR'S bill threatens the security and perpetuity of officials hostile to the American system of Government. As a consequence, there has seldom been witnessed so formidable an array of opposition. The character of the opposition indicates how accurately Senator MCKELLAR has put his finger on the sore and festering spot of the administration. President Mitchell and Assistant Chief Examiner Vipond, of the Civil Service Commission, have expressed their unalterable opposition to the McKellar bill, and have been joined by such powerful influences as Executive Secretary Kaplan of the National Civil Service Reform League and Representative of the American Federation of Government Employees Stengle.

The spokesmen for these and other similar groups insist that confirmation of Government officials by the Senate would destroy the civil service. It is admitted that the McKellar bill would interfere with the Civil Service Commission as now operated, but an appraisal of what the Commission is turning out has led many to conclude that no harm would result to the country from its destruction as it has been and is now operated. However, there is no intention of destroying the civil-service system. The effect of the bill simply would mean determination of the Senate to put an end to certification of subversive officials and employees.

The Civil Service Commission refuses to consider connection and affiliation with subversive organizations as a barrier to employment, but on the other hand appears to place a premium on such connections and apparently the greater number of such organizations a person is connected with the better chance he has of obtaining sanctuary in Government and the more power he is given to determine governmental policies. The drive against the McKellar bill demonstrates how desperately subversive groups intend to defend this practice.

The attitude of a large group in Congress is that if the Civil Service Commission is committed to promotion of subversive groups, the time has arrived for Congress to assert its opposition. Members of Congress take the position that there are enough loyal Americans to fill Government jobs and it is better to sever from the pay roll an enemy of the American system than regard a rule of the Civil Service Commission as sacred and inviolate.

The substance of the argument against the McKellar bill is this: A Government official should be able to say: "I belong to several organizations pledged to the overthrow of the American system. I have written in favor of revolution. I am on record as saying the capitalistic system has failed and should be destroyed. I am under civil service and Congress has no right to question my ideology or my right to hold my job and work for the overthrow of constitutional government."

Congress does not agree with that philosophy, Congress believes only Americans should dictate and determine American policies. Citizens should write their Congressmen and say which theory they favor.

One Opinion of the Commander in Chief's Scandal-Peddling Mouthpiece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Westbrook Pegler in his piece published February 21, known for his accuracy and truthfulness, expresses an opinion of an unreliable, gossip-peddling White House spokesman. It is as follows:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

There is something mysterious and sinister in the case of Walter Winchell, a notorious professional scandalmonger, who holds a reserve commission as a lieutenant commander in the Navy but has now been placed on the inactive list and set on the beach, so to speak, but apparently only under pressure from the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. This man seems not to have the slightest appreciation of the distinction between gossip and information. This makes him a dangerous man in the role of informant or investigator for naval intelligence or any other similar service.

Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox told the Naval Affairs Committee that he had no intention to call Winchell back to active duty. That would put a satisfactory end to an episode which has been detrimental to the prestige of the officers' stripes in the Navy if Knox's promise had not been followed by mysterious insinuations from Winchell himself, that he will continue to function in his own peculiar way. This would seem to mean that he will be sending reports on individuals, a considerable proportion of them unfounded, to naval intelligence and to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with which he has been more or less intimate by way of a personal friendship with J. Edgar Hoover.

Editors and reputable writers have a feeling that to discuss Winchell is to advertise him and inflate a vanity which often has expressed itself in overflowing tributes to himself. The newspaper business has been responsible for him and the degradation of journalistic ethics which has occurred in his time, for he has been used widely in papers which would not think of permitting any local reporter to publish comparable intimacies about local people and which would fire any local reporter who had a similar record.

But he becomes news and is no more to be ignored than any other unpleasant topic when it appears that, notwithstanding his relegation to the inactive list, he will continue to investigate what he calls the "undercover menace" and, presumably, to pass on tips to the Navy. For this suggests that the real operatives, or detectives of the Intelligence Service, will be set to snooping into the lives of innocent victims.

Mr. Knox's position in this case is not clear. As an editor and publisher he has expressed a low professional opinion of Winchell's trustworthiness as a reporter and of his ethics. Knox has said that he would not have him on his paper, the Chicago Daily News, but nevertheless he has used Winchell for official, noncombatant duties, the nature of which has not been disclosed but which, from Winchell's own remarks, would appear to have consisted of confidential investigation. Inasmuch as he would not trust this man's word about individuals in print it is inconsistent that he trust him as an informant

or investigator for the Navy, if Winchell is telling the truth about his Navy duties.

It is not speculation to observe that Winchell, since he took up patrioteering, has become an outlet for propaganda against opponents of the New Deal Party, which officials of the Government would prefer not to utter themselves.

Harold Ross, editor of the New Yorker magazine, demonstrated disqualification of Winchell for any rank in any armed service in a series of articles which cited chapter and verse and rated him mathematically. Within 1 year there appeared in print and were heard on the air three separate insinuations that Mr. and Mrs. Ross were having domestic troubles, all of them lies by a man whom the Navy, nevertheless, for some reason, has willingly or perforce, employed on mysterious duties with the rank of lieutenant commander.

Mr. and Mrs. Ross are still happily married and have never been separated.

This essay is no part of any feud, unless it can be said that a broom has a feud with dirt.

Faith in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written by Mr. E. O. Osborn, of Knoxville, Iowa:

OSBORN'S REMINISCENCE

In memory you may recall
The days that used to be
When Congress was the people's voice
In Washington, D. C.
Dictators and Commissioners
And czars of doubtful hue
Are now performing all the tasks
Our Congress used to do.
Emergencies, contingencies,
And wars provide a plan
To put our Congress on the shelf
And try the superman.
Our Government "of, by, and for"
We knew so long ago,
Like Nellie who went far away,
Don't live here any more.
Joe Congress has our confidence;
He is the man we know,
And we don't want to meet the guy
Who came to talk for Joe.

Address by the President on Washington's Birthday Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the President of the United States last Monday evening in the city of Washington at the George Washington's Birthday dinner.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDENT. Today this Nation, which George Washington helped so greatly to create, is fighting all over this earth in order to maintain for ourselves and for our children the freedom which George Washington helped so greatly to achieve. As we celebrate Washington's Birthday, let us remember how he conducted himself in the midst of great adversities. We are inclined, because of the total sum of his accomplishments, to forget his days of trial.

Throughout the Revolution, Washington commanded an army whose very existence as an army was never a certainty from one week to another. Some of his soldiers and even whole regiments could not or would not move outside of the borders of their own States. Sometimes, at critical moments, they would decide to return to their individual homes to get the plowing done or the crops harvested. Large numbers of the people of the Colonies were either against independence or at least unwilling to make great personal sacrifice toward its attainment.

And there were many in every colony who were willing to cooperate with Washington only if the cooperation was based on their own terms.

Some Americans during the War of the Revolution sneered at the very principles of the Declaration of Independence. It was impractical, they said—it was "idealistic"—to claim that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights."

The skeptics, the cynics, of Washington's day did not believe that ordinary men and women have the capacity for freedom and self-government. They said that liberty and equality were idle dreams that could not come true—just as today there are many Americans who sneer at the determination to attain freedom from want and freedom from fear on the ground that these are ideals which can never be realized. They say that it is ordained that we must always have poverty and that we must always have war.

They are like the people who carp at the Ten Commandments because some people are in the habit of breaking one or more of them.

We Americans of today know that there would have been no successful outcome to the Revolution, which gave us liberty, had it not been for George Washington's faith and the fact that that faith overcame the bickerings and confusion and the doubts which the skeptics and cynics provoked.

When kind history books tell us of Benedict Arnold, they omit dozens of other Americans who, beyond peradventure of a doubt, were also guilty of treason.

We know that it was Washington's simple, steadfast faith that kept him to the essential principles of first things first. His sturdy sense of proportion brought to him and his followers the ability to discount the smaller difficulties and concentrate on the larger objectives. And the objectives of the American Revolution were so large, so unlimited, that today they are among the primary objectives of the entire civilized world.

It was Washington's faith—and with it his hope and his charity—which was responsible for the stamina of Valley Forge—and the prayer at Valley Forge.

The Americans of Washington's day were at war. We Americans of today are at war.

The Americans of Washington's day faced defeat on many occasions. We faced, and still face, reverses and misfortunes.

In 1777 the victory over General Burgoyne's army at Saratoga led thousands of Americans to throw their hats in the air, proclaiming that the war was practically won and that they could go back to their peacetime occupations—and "normalcies."

Today, the great successes on the Russian front have led thousands of Americans to throw their hats in the air and proclaim that victory is just around the corner.

Others among us still believe in the age of miracles. They forget that there is no Joshua in our midst. We cannot count on great walls crumbling and falling when the trumpets blow and the peoples shout.

It is not enough that we have faith and that we have hope. Washington himself was the exemplification of the other great need.

Would that all of us could live our lives and direct our thoughts and control our tongues as did the Father of our Country in seeking day by day to follow those great verses:

"Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up.

"Doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil:

"Rejoiceth not in iniquity but rejoiceth in the truth."

Most of us Americans seek to live up to those precepts. But there are some among us who have forgotten them. There are Americans whose words and writings are trumpeted by our enemies to persuade the disintegrating people of Germany and Italy and their captives that America is disunited—that America will be guilty of faithlessness in this war and will thus enable the Axis powers to control the earth.

It is perhaps fitting that on this day I should read a few more words spoken many years ago—words which helped to shape the character and the career of George Washington.

"Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

"Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted.

"Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.

"Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled.

"Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.

"Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.

"Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.

"Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

"Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake.

"Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you."

Those are the truths which are the eternal heritage of our civilization. I repeat them to give heart and comfort to all men and women everywhere who fight for freedom.

Those truths inspired Washington and the men and women of the Thirteen Colonies.

Today, through the darkness that has descended upon our Nation and our world, those truths are a guiding light to all.

We shall follow that light, as our forefathers did, to the fulfillment of our hopes for victory, for freedom, and for peace.

Rationing and Increased Food Supplies

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, food rationing brings home to everyone in America that we must abandon wishful thinking and utopian planning and face stark reality.

Someone once said, "The world is only nine meals from anarchy." If we are to avert anarchy and chaos in many parts of the world, it means that we Americans must buckle our own belts a little tighter and produce a lot more.

In 1933 a plan for supplying 3,500,000 acres of highly productive food producing lands, with a much needed protection from flood and drought, was approved by the people of California. In 1935 this plan was approved and taken over for construction by the Federal Government, under the Bureau of Reclamation.

Studies and surveys instituted by them substantiated the fact that the major purpose of the project and its primary objective was to develop a supplemental water supply for the irrigated lands located in the southern San Joaquin Valley. The first appropriations for construction work on this project, the Central Valley project, was earmarked for the building of Friant Dam, from whose reservoir could be diverted the waters so necessary to the large food-producing region in that area.

That dam is built, but the purpose for which it was created is still unfulfilled, for the canals that are to eventually carry the life-giving water to the fertile farms remain incomplete or unbuilt.

This agricultural empire, with a 1942 crop production valued at close to $300,000,000, is left facing an annual drought threat, while the waters that would afford it increased vigor and protect its very life waste on to the sea.

You might ask what caused this negligence in building a dam and failing to build canals that would make possible the utilization of the waters to be supplied by the tremendous investment involved? The answer, no doubt, is made up of a number of reasons:

First. Emphasis of those in charge to building a power program developed on other project features allegedly for a major help to the war program, which, however, has fizzled out as a war contribution because only two of eight generators that were being provided for are permitted to be installed at this time. Two others were transferred to another project and construction was ordered stopped on the remaining four.

Second. Procrastination and lack of diligence.

Third. Lack of understanding of the importance of food production to the war program on the part of Government agencies having control over the allocation of materials.

The Appropriations Committees of Congress have declared themselves ready and willing to provide funds for building the irrigation canals and for the past 2 fiscal years have appropriated money with which to get the work under way, yet construction is still halted and one excuse follows another for persistent delay.

The continued volume of agricultural production in this area depends upon prompt completion of the canal system so that available water can be utilized. One hundred water wells were lost last year in this area because of failure of their underground water supply. With just about everything that our people eat under ration control or frozen from civilian use, it is time to take the handcuffs off this project.

The quantity of critical material required is only a few hundred tons of steel, and that mostly in the form of reinforcing bars, of which there is now a surplus over any military needs, according to the O. W. I.'s recent bulletin.

The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that, "given the green light," they can commence and complete the necessary irrigation works so as to enable the available water to be used by 1945. This would not only protect the very productive development that is contributing to the Nation's food basket in such substantial quantity, but its assurance would provide for increasing the production of foods and the growing of guayule for rubber.

The War Production Board, the Department of Agriculture, the War and Navy Departments, the Rubber Director, and the Director of the Budget Bureau should institute a conference with the Secretary of the Interior and the Reclamation Bureau immediately to plan for the commencement as soon as it is humanly possible for the construction program on these irrigation works.

Problems of Civilian Production

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it will be very difficult for patriotic American citizens who are sacrificing, undergoing limitations of all the things they need, and who are sending their boys—and some of their girls—to the battle lines, to understand what has happened to produce a condition disclosed by the crack-up of the War Production Board.

The American people have every right to expect that high authorities and bureaucrats who are flooding them with questionnaires, regulations, rationings, and restrictions, would at least have patriotism enough and common sense enough to compose their personal differences, their clashes over personal power and prerogatives, their personal lust for authority, and work to the common good, and the patriotic end of trying to win this war as quickly as possible with the fewest number of killed and wounded.

This spectacle of a struggle for power between the Army and the Navy on one side, and W. P. B. and industrialists on the other for control of the production of goods and services is utterly disgraceful, and the one man responsible for it is the man who could have prevented it and he has not done so; that is, the President.

The following questions must be answered for the American people:

First. Is the military psychology such that it has a proper appreciation of the needs of civilian production?

Second. Could such a possible lack of appreciation lead to military demands and denial of civilian necessities to the point of impairing production for war?

Third. Is it possible for the officials of the armed forces to determine the minimum requirements of civilian consumption, including strategic and scarce materials?

Fourth. Is it possible for military men to handle civilian production as efficiently as civilian production managers of long experience?

Fifth. Does the practice of giving experienced production managers military or naval commissions and putting them under the orders of the high command officers of the Army and Navy tend to increase or decrease their efficiency in securing civilian production, and would it tend to strengthen or impair their judgment and consequent actions in the activities of production?

The answer to the first question is that civilian production is an industrial job for which military men are wholly untrained.

The answer to the second is that there is great danger that such a situation could lead to impairment of war production through excessive front-line military demands. Judgment as to means and methods of continuous supply must be exercised on the home front, just as certainly as means and methods of battle must be decided on the fighting front.

The answer to question No. 3 is that it is entirely possible to determine the minimum requirements of civilian consumption including the critical and strategic materials.

The answer to question 4 is that it is not possible for military men to handle civilian production as efficiently as civilian production managers of long experience. It is equally true, of course, that civilian producers could not be trusted to judge of military requirements, because military operations are a field in which industrial managers have no training.

The answer to question 5 is that there is grave danger that the initiative, energy, and vision of industrialists may be sharply and disastrously limited by giving them commissions and putting them under the command of Army and Navy officers. The job of a commissioned officer is to do as his superior tells him,

whether it be wise or unwise. The job of the civilian industrialist is to choose the wisest possible method to expedite production whether military men agree with him or not.

There is another and final question which the American people are asking, and to which they demand an answer. That answer is vital to our total victory, and depending upon it will be the lives and the welfare of possibly hundreds of thousands of our soldiers and sailors. That question is:

Can we find men of sufficient stature who have enough patriotism, enough common sense, enough judgment, and enough ability to bury their personal differences, to resolve their conflicts of authority, to stifle their lust for personal power, to resolve contradictions and to turn out a job of producing the goods and services here at home to enable our men and women on the fighting fronts to win the quickest possible total victory.

If the answer to that question is not yes, then God help free America.

The answer to that question is yes, and the President can find, and he can compel, if he will, military and civilian officials to work together for the common end of winning this war as quickly as possible with the fewest losses of killed and injured.

The President must move to bring about this condition of affairs, and the people must not cease their demands that he do so. He is the only individual in the United States under present conditions who can accomplish this.

Address at Testimonial Dinner of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States to Mr. Benjamin Kaufman, of Trenton, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. LANE POWERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me by the House to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to introduce an address I made at a testimonial dinner given Mr. Benjamin Kaufman, of Trenton, N. J., one of the holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor, by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, at the Commodore Hotel, New York, N. Y., on Sunday, February 21, 1943.

Mr. Toastmaster, our honored guest, Ben Kaufman, his charming mother, his lovely wife, distinguished guests, and friends, it is entirely appropriate, during these hectic times for me to be addressing a gathering sponsored by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. No race has contributed more to the growth of this country than have those of the Jewish faith. In these times, when the foundations of freedom are threatened, not only in the United States but throughout the world, it is important for all of us to realize what a tremendous stake we have now and our forebears had before us in our country. When the guns of total war are thundering from all four corners of the earth, we are impressed more deeply with the privileges and obligations we fought to achieve and maintain in our own country.

In those battles which have shed the blood of our countrymen, the Jewish race, proportionately to the population, has done more than its share.

I wish I had time tonight to discuss with you in detail the tremendous contribution made to the cause of freedom back in the Revolutionary War by a man of Jewish faith whose name was Haym Salomon. He was the one who, when the continental cause looked blackest, came to the financial aid of the dispirited and ill-equipped Army under George Washington. We are accustomed to talk these days in billions, but in those days a hundred thousand dollars was a tremendous fortune. Haym Salomon loaned to this country the staggering sum of over $600,000—money which was never repaid.

Thus a man of Jewish faith made the largest individual financial contribution to the birth of freedom.

I wish I could tell you in detail what a proportionately large number of Jews fought as enlisted men and officers in the War of 1812, the Spanish-American War, and the Mexican War.

I wish I had time tonight to dwell upon the contribution of the Jews to the fighting armies of both sides in the Civil War. In 1861 there were approximately 200,000 Jews in this country, more than 8,000 of whom were either in the blue of the North or in the gray of the South.

During World War No. 1 there were approximately 225,000 Jews in the service of their country as fighting men, which totaled about 4 percent of our entire military and naval forces. At that time the Jewish population was only 3 percent of the entire population of our country.

Of these Jews who served in our forces, 1,100 received citations for valor. One hundred and fifty received the Distinguished Service Cross, 4 received the French Medaille Militaire, 174 received the Croix de Guerre.

There were only 78 Congressional Medals of Honor awarded during that war. Three of them went to men of the Jewish faith, and one of these men is our good friend and the guest of honor tonight, Ben Kaufman.

When the drums of war began again pounding on the ears of the world, the Jews in this country were doing their part, and more, even before Pearl Harbor. They enlisted in the British and Canadian Armies. Others of their faith were working in the campaign of Bundles for Britain, and other efforts to help those who are now our allies in the United Nations.

From the day of the stab in the back at Pearl Harbor, Jews have flocked to the colors of the United States as officers or enlisted men in all branches of the service. Many are attaining national renown for bravery and heroism under fire. Many have been decorated for such bravery. One of our neighbors, Corp. Meyer Levin, of Brooklyn, was bombardier for Capt. Colin Kelly, who sank the battleship *Haruna*. A little over a week ago Meyer Levin was killed in action, but his name will live forever in the annals of American patriotism.

When statistics for World War No. 2 are complete, members of the Jewish faith will undoubtedly be found to again have done more than their proportionate share in fighting our country's battle.

The heroism which won for Ben Kaufman the Congressional Medal of Honor is well known to all. As he did his share—and more than his share—in a heroic fashion, in World War No. 1, he is now doing more than his share again in our present struggle.

I have a unique distinction tonight, a distinction which no one on earth can equal, a distinction which makes me about the proudest man in the world—I am Ben Kaufman's Congressman.

Tax the Marshall Field Estate and Other Large Inheritances

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, during these days of trial and suffering, when everyone is being asked to serve and sacrifice, it seems to me to be an outrage that certain vast fortunes are being passed down from one generation to another in such a way as to escape any taxation at all. Many of them have been organized into what they call trusts, endowments, or foundations, in such a way as to avoid the payment of inheritance or estate taxes that fall upon the ordinary patriotic American who does not attempt to escape by any subterfuge whatsoever.

As I have pointed out before, one of the largest estates in this country is that of the Marshall Field estate in Chicago, which will probably amount to something like $200,000,000, and will fall into the hands of Marshall Field 3d, next September, and will escape the payments of any inheritance taxes at all unless the present law is changed.

As everyone knows, the money of this Field estate is now being wasted by a bunch of crackpots to publish and distribute a newspaper called PM that is constantly maligning the white people of the South, Members of Congress, and other patriotic Americans.

I hold in my hand the February 23 edition of PM, in which you will see a caricature of a number of Members of Congress hanged in effigy, together with a cartoon of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, one of America's greatest and most popular heroes, cartooned and ridiculed as a Punch and Judy dancer.

Instead of permitting this bunch to waste that vast estate, of which Marshall Field 3d never earned a dollar, to thus malign, smear, and discredit Members of the Congress of the United States and other patriotic, law-abiding citizens such as Captain Rickenbacker, I want us to place a tax on that and other similar estates commensurate with what other Americans have to pay, and turn it into the Federal Treasury to help pay the expenses of this war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a copy of the bill to which I referred; and I want to appeal to every member of the

Committee on Ways and Means to report it out as early as possible, in order that we may pass it and put a stop to these vast fortunes escaping their part of the burdens of taxation.

The bill referred to follows:

[78th Cong., 1st sess., H. R. 1927, in the House of Representatives, February 19, 1943, Mr. RANKIN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means]

A bill to impose an inheritance tax on the coming into possession and enjoyment of property transferred from a decedent and not subject to estate taxes

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 3 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER C—SPECIAL INHERITANCE TAX

"SEC. 950. Imposition of tax.

"In the case of any property which would be includible in the gross estate of a decedent under the provisions of section 811 (c) if it were not for the fact that the death of the decedent occurred or the transfer was made before June 6, 1932 (whether or not before September 8, 1916), there shall be imposed upon coming into possession or enjoyment of such property after the date of the enactment of this act by any individual citizen or resident of the United States, a tax equal to the sum of the percentages set forth in section 935 of the net value of the beneficial interest of which the possession or enjoyment was so acquired by such individual.

"SEC. 951. Gross value of beneficial interest.

"The gross value of the beneficial interest shall be determined as of the date on which its possession or enjoyment was acquired.

"SEC. 952. Net value of beneficial interest.

"The net value of the beneficial interest shall be determined by deducting from the gross value of such interest an exemption of $100,000.

"SEC. 953. Administrative provisions.

"Insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this subchapter, the provisions of subchapter A shall be applicable to the levy, assessment, and collection of the tax imposed by this subchapter."

Floors as Well as Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1943, there appeared an editorial in the Wall Street Journal relating to some of the mistakes of the O. P. A. in dealing with farm production. I can attest the accuracy of the criticism in this editorial as it relates to the production of tomatoes, because I represent one of the great tomato producing areas. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the editorial:

FLOORS AS WELL AS CEILINGS

It now appears that Government agencies dealing with food supply and distribution, having failed to prepare an orderly system of price or wage control in the early stages of war-made inflation, will be compelled to resort to price floors if the production of deficiency foods this year is to be expanded. Price ceilings have been put in the wrong places and at the wrong times; where ceilings would have helped to restrain the flight of prices without checking needed production they have not been placed.

An illustration of the former class of mistakes is the Office of Price Administration order placing emergency price ceilings over fresh tomatoes, snap beans, carrots, cabbage, and peas. Apparently these ceilings were ordered in the fear that the rationing of canned goods about to go into effect would cause consumers to turn in a rush to fresh vegetables, which are not rationed. For at least 60 days neither country shippers, terminal markets, wholesalers, nor retailers may charge for these vegetables any more than their highest prices between last Thursday and the opening of business this week.

In what position does this put thousands of growers now making plans for the season's planting or beginning to plant? They see their selling prices frozen, unless they shall be able and willing, when their crops are ripe for picking, to sell through black markets. Obviously, they won't rely upon those dubious outlets, nor will they plant to the limit with their selling prices fixed on last week's level but all their costs exposed to the inflationary forces of the day. Probably some will not plant at all.

On the other hand, grain and cotton farmers see the markets promising them the best prices in 20 years or so; no ceilings yet confront them; they feel fairly sure that their friends in Congress will prevent ceilings except at prices substantially higher than current markets. And for months the Department of Agriculture has stressed the necessity of producing more vegetable and dairy goods while holding wheat and cotton production down.

Ceiling prices, even if they were put in the right places and at the right heights, would not relieve the farm labor shortage. Secretary Wickard wants $100,000,000—to begin with—for offering farmers incentive payments to encourage them in increased production of peanuts, soybeans, flaxseed, and other war crops. Farmers express their scorn, evidently because in relation to the farm labor problem as a whole, or the machinery problem or the fertilizer problem, the hundred million would be a flea bite.

Greater volume and variety of foods we must have. Planting dates are coming nearer. Farmers are willing to take risks, as they always have to do. But they are not likely to risk personal disaster under ceiling prices for them if there is no ceiling over what they may have to pay scarce farm hands or if Office of Price Administration must continuously raise ceilings on what the farmer has to buy, because the War Labor Board continues to remove inequities or substandard conditions in industrial wage scales.

So it begins to appear that if we hope to eat sufficiently under ceilings we must also have floors.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, we last stood before the tomb at Mount Vernon at noon, January 20, 1941.

Herbert Hoover said, "Time runs in our favor," and so does Joe Stalin. "General" John McCormack differs.

The big real question is, Should we have 33,000 civilian employees drawing over $4,500, not who passes on them. The answer is positively "No."

The Farm Security's effort to extend social gains to imported farm labor is almost as funny as the way HENRY WALLACE would run the post-war world.

Harry Coffee, who left a Nebraska House seat for a chance at the Senate, winds up with a $25,000 job as president of the Omaha Stock Yards Co.

Let us make Eddie Rickenbacker President in 1944. Think of his glorious past. He came from humble parents and had to work. We need his labor leadership.

The National Resources Board and Uncle Delano went out before the 43 members of the Appropriations Committee without a single member moving to restore it.

The fact that only wooden guns and wooden men guard the top of the House Office Building is not creating any exodus below—nor are we accepting the insinuation that it is the same kind of men under the roof.

Frank Knox says, "Yes, we'll name a cruiser 'Kansas City' if Roy Roberts and you fellows out there will raise $35,000,000 to pay for it like Houston, Atlanta, and Chicago did." If the labor water could be squeezed out, we could raise the rest.

There are two Russias, the one that is our military ally there and the other one here, the enemy to our form of government. There are two Roosevelts, the Commander in Chief, whom we respect as such, and Roosevelt, the candidate for the fourth term, catering to labor's crazy leaders, prodding the bureaucrats to regiment us and purposely trying to make our country over—all with complete disdain for the size of the public debt.

Amendment of the National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to specifically exclude supervisory personnel from the term "employee."

A definite movement is under way to organize into existing unions foremen and other supervisory officials. When the present contract between the coal operators and the United Mine Workers expires on April 1, there are dangerous indications of another disastrous coal strike. One of the points at issue will be the effort to force the supervisory personnel into the closed agreement with the United Mine Workers so that the union would then sit on both sides of the bargaining table.

Under the terms of the National Labor Relations Act employees were guaranteed the right to self-organization, to

form, join, or assist labor organizations, and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing.

The term "employee," as defined in section 2, paragraph 3, of that act, was as follows:

(3) The term "employee" shall include any employee, and shall not be limited to the employees of a particular employer, unless the act explicitly states otherwise, and shall include any individual whose work has ceased as a consequence of, or in connection with, any current labor dispute or because of any unfair labor practice, and who has not obtained any other regular and substantially equivalent employment, but shall not include any individual employed as an agricultural laborer, or in the domestic service of any family or person at his home, or any individual employed by his parent or spouse.

The Congress never intended to include within the definition of "employees" those persons who occupy managerial positions and are in fact representatives of the employer. What was intended was, as stated in the preamble to the act, that "workers" should have the rights thereafter enumerated in the act.

In several decisions, notably the so-called Union Collieries decision, decided by the National Labor Relations Board on June 15, 1942, the Board held that the definition of "employees" was so broad as to permit the inclusion of managerial and supervisory employees within the definition. The result is that the National Labor Relations Board recognizes no limitation on the term "employee" and logically would have to hold that even the highest officers of a corporation were employees of the corporation for purposes of the act.

This creates an intolerable situation from the standpoint of management. If there is to be collective bargaining, there must be somebody to bargain on each side of the table. If those who are engaged in a managerial or supervisory capacity, and who presumably should bargain for and safeguard the rights of the employer, are brought within the terms of the Wagner act and may join, assist, and bargain for a labor organization, the employer has no effective means of furthering or protecting his own interests in collective bargaining.

An incident which has just occurred has emphasized that it is imperative for the Congress to clarify its intent by redefining the term "employee."

On February 20, 1943, Mr. John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, addressed to all district and local union officers of the United Mine Workers a communication. Under this instruction from Mr. Lewis to the locals of his union some 60,000 management representatives of bituminous coal companies will be taken over wholesale into the United Mine Workers of America. While Mr. Lewis' communication indicates that application blanks will be tendered these people, the fact is that they have no ready alternative but to join the union.

It is well known that the coal operators of the country are operating under closed-shop agreements with the United Mine Workers of America. Under the National Labor Relations Board's construction of section 2, paragraph 3, of the National Labor Relations Act, these 60,000 representatives of management are employees and are entitled to all the rights and benefits of the National Labor Relations Act. If, therefore, they are eligible to membership in the United Mine Workers of America, they can be forced into such membership through operation of the closed-shop clause in Mr. Lewis' contracts with the operators.

This is an intolerable situation for management, since Mr. Lewis has announced in this communication the determination to take in every supervisory employee below the rank of mine superintendent.

The issue is not confined to the bituminous coal mining industry. If representatives of management in that industry are within the terms of the National Labor Relations Act and may thus be taken over, the same thing can be done to every other industry in the country, and the theory that there can be free collective bargaining under any such conditions is pure fiction.

If Mr. Lewis succeeds in this present move, he will take in 60,000 additional members at an initiation fee of $10 per capita. This means that he will immediately secure additional revenues of $600,000. These men will then presumably be forced to pay at least $18 per year annual dues to United Mine Workers. This means additional revenues to Mr. Lewis' union of something over $1,000,000 per year. The political implications of this move are extremely serious. It is a matter of record that Mr. Lewis has not hesitated to use large sums of money for political purposes. It is understood that he now has at his disposal some $6,000,000 which could be converted to political purposes. The present move would provide him an additional slush fund of not less than $2,000,000 by the fall of 1944.

Not only should we amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to carry out what I believe was the original intention of Congress, and to exclude these representatives of management from the terms of the National Labor Relations Act, but the Congress ought now to deal with the question of whether labor organizations are to be permitted to continue to make political contributions. Under the Corrupt Practices Act no corporation can make such contributions. The same rule ought to apply to labor organizations, which today escape the provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act by remaining unincorporated.

The amendment which I have introduced deals only with the first phase of this problem, namely, the question of exclusion of representatives of management from the definition of "employees" under section 2, paragraph 3, of the National Labor Relations Act. My amendment follows substantially the language which the Congress itself adopted in providing exemptions from the Fair Labor Standards Act. In section 13 (a) of that act it is provided that—

Sections 6 and 7 shall not apply with respect to (1) any employee employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, professional, or local retailing capacity—

And so forth. My amendment would exclude from the definition of "employee" under the National Labor Relations Act those employees employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, professional, or supervisory capacity. It is necessary to include the term "supervisory" because of the very broad construction which has been put on section 2, paragraph 3, of the National Labor Relations Act, by the National Labor Relations Board. As is well known to the Members of this House, the Board holds the employee responsible for the acts and utterances not only of executive, administrative, and professional employees but of any employees whose duties are supervisory in nature or whose conduct and views might be taken by fellow employees to reflect the desires of management. I think it is axiomatic that the definition of "employee" under the National Labor Relations Act should exclude all those employees for whose conduct the employer may be held responsible under the unfair labor practice provisions of the act. That is the purpose of my amendment, which I hope will receive the favorable and early consideration of the House.

Scarcity for the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to repeal the quota restrictions and penalties against farm production.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, will free the farmer from the strangle hold the bureaucrat has on him.

I sought recognition at this time to explain my purposes in offering this legislation, but, in the meantime, I have been reading a speech that I myself made at Ada, Okla., in 1940 soon after I had voted "no" on the establishment of the program of scarcity. The arguments I made against the establishment of the program in the first place appear to me in retrospect to adequately present the case for its repeal.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend these remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the address I made at Ada, Okla., in April 1940:

The American farmer stands on the last frontier of democracy. In the chainless liberty of his thought rests the freedom of America and the hope of the world. He has successfully resisted and defied every attempt to enslave his thought or control his actions. In his hand, the sword of liberty

and justice has forever been wielded on the side of independence. He gave liberty to America. He knows what it means to call America a free land and the land of the free. Free land and free men have a meaning in the mind and heart of a farmer. He has been the hero of every battle for the rights of man that the world has ever known.

In this generation the American farmer has met with a crisis that will determine his freedom and his liberty. The bureaucrats have set up a program based on the theory that men are the pawns of a system instead of the system being the creature of men. Such a crisis is not new to the farmers of the world. "Bowed down by the weight of centuries and on his back the burden of the world" he has felt many times the crushing weight of the historic fallacy that man is the creature of government. He knows instead that government is the invention of man. His wisdom never wavers in its recognition that government's only excuse for existence rests on the protection of the rights of man and the promotion of the general welfare. The farmer is the author of every concession from autocracy. He has written every bill of rights. He is the minute man of liberty.

The Department of Agriculture with its system of paternalism has confused the farmer into an indifferent acceptance of a program that makes the bureaucrat a dictator, the farmer a serf and slave. It is forging chains for you, fetters for your children, and fixing serfdom on your children's children. Let us have the courage to face the truth.

Prosperity is not based on scarcity. No man was ever made richer because he had less. No boy was ever better educated because he stayed out of school. No undernourished child was ever nursed to health and freedom from hunger by an empty bread tray.

As long as the hand of want is extended in the world, there is no overproduction. As long as a child cries for bread, there is not too much wheat. As long as winter's icy fingers touch with death an aged woman who faces the norther's blast in tattered rags, there is not too much cotton.

Were you ever hungry? Do you know what it means to be cold? Did you ever face the rain and the chill without a coat because you had no coat? Did you ever sit down to a table without enough food to satisfy the hunger of your helpless babes? It is a terrible thing to think of the helpless, dying of hunger. Thousands are starving in China, Poland, and distant places in the world, and there are also hungry people here in Oklahoma. Here in Pontotoc County. In Ada.

The silly tripe that there is too much of the good, the necessities in life, is a lie that is mocked by the grim and tragic presence of want and misery on every hand. This very day the world in some of its parts has felt the fright of famine and seen a dying child with pallid lips suck at the breast of hunger's dead.

You want security. You want to be sure that you and yours will never be hungry, ill-clad, poorly housed, or denied medical treatment. It's just untrue to say there is too much food, clothing in the world. It isn't so.

Some day we may have sense enough to use the resources of the world as if they were really valuable gifts from Almighty God.

I want for every farmer what I want for myself and for all mankind—security. The certain knowledge that life and opportunity await the hopeful, loving, tender souls for whom you toil. That hunger, scarcity, and want shall never be the lot of the child whose cradle you watch with infinite love and tender care. That is what it will take to drive from your heart the phantom of fear. You have been afraid. You have not been certain that your children would have food, clothes, and shelter sufficient to insure their health and safety. Under the influence of fear the brain is paralyzed, and instead of bravely solving a problem for itself, it adopts the solution of another.

Let us investigate and stand by our conclusions without fear. We know that nature is governed by immutable laws. We know that prosperity is based on plenty. He who would lead us to believe that scarcity means prosperity is a Judas, a betrayer of reason. The thought that a man will have more beef by plowing up his forage pasture and turning his cattle to graze on a grassless waste is a poisonous thought.

The bureaucrat would have you believe that Jones with 1,000 acres should plant 600 and you with 10 acres should plant 6 so that Jones' three children and your five children will both have plenty and to spare. Those who quote the invented statistics, to show that 10-acre you and 1,000-acre Jones are partners in prosperity, are foolish liars. It is crafty and heartless to ensnare and enslave the innocent. No 10-acre cotton farmer ever created a surplus. If control need come, control the 1,000-acre man.

I have heard in the Congress and in the Senate debates how prosperity has been brought to the little farmer by this senseless system. Even United States Senators quote the lifeless statistics with the originality of parrots and the mental vigor of senescence.

When winter comes there are two kinds of wood piles on the farm. One kind consists of one log on which an ax can't make a respectable dent. Cluttered near this log are a few dead limbs and rotting chips. If it gets cold enough, the farmer will take a few palings from the fence or boards off the barn. The other kind of wood pile consists of an abundance of wood, cut, split, and sawed to fit the cook stove, the heaters and the fireplace, stacked in neat rows, more than enough for the coldest winter. The Secretary of Agriculture wants wood to be scarce at your house so the price will be high.

Capital alone profits from scarcity. Plenty is the only route to prosperity for the farmer and labore

Destroying production is a path to vagrancy and want. Every farmer knows that the value of land depends on what and how much it will produce. That reduced production will bring prosperity is a false promise, a false hope and will leave the farmer stranded on the barren shore of bankruptcy.

To destroy a good thing is waste. To destroy the fruit of toil is to invite hunger and want.

The bureaucrat says to the farmer: "If you would be prosperous, let the plows rust in the field, let the weeds grow, let the land lay out. Kill all the pigs, dry up the milk cow. Cook all the hens and keep the roosters. That's the way to get rich. That's the way to have plenty." Why, wreck and ruin is the only possible outcome of this fraud.

For centuries the little farmer has been robbed and plundered, and now he is asked to sign agreements that he will slowly and voluntarily starve to death.

The farmer is in peril; beset by false friends throughout our history, he is betrayed again.

This puppet partnership with the Government has come to you like a contagious and dread disease.

No words are known to my thought and tongue strong enough to condemn this program.

I do not accuse everyone of bad faith who preaches this program. Thousands of lies are told by honest stupidity and believed by innocent credulity.

There is not a factory, not a mine, not a farm in the world whose prosperity does not depend on the amount and quality of its products.

Prosperity is based on plenty. The moment we comprehend this great and simple truth, all erroneous ideas are of necessity cast aside.

I have been advised not to speak against this monstrosity called a farm program. I have been urged to speak well of it, but I will not turn hypocrite and pretend what I do not believe and hate myself forever after for being a cringing coward. I have made up my mind to say my say. I am giving you the real transcript of my mind and thought.

What is the farm bill? What does it provide? It is incomprehensible; it is unreasonable; it is impossible. Take out the dictatorship over American farmers and nothing but a vacuum remains. I oppose the Secretary because he insists on the absurd, the impossible, the senseless. He discourages self-reliance and mocks productive labor because he rewards indolence and penalizes industriousness. I oppose the Department because it is arrogant and arbitrary. I will be censured and hated by the hirelings of this billionaire prostitute called the Department of Agriculture because I have shown them to be false. Theirs will be the malice of the caught—the hatred of the exposed.

Under this program the farmer is compelled to be either a cowardly hypocrite or a slave. Coerced by fear and bribed by petty sums, the farmer has ceased to investigate the facts with which he is surrounded and ceased to reply upon himself and his own thought and knowledge. Bewildered by red tape, oppressed by bureaucracy, weary of the struggle, he gives up in despair.

The Secretary of Agriculture can (under his dictatorial power) bless the earth with harvests or curse it with famine. The farmer must kneel. He must ask the Secretary if he can plant 1 more acre, because he has only 20 acres, and they are poor acres, and he has 7 hungry mouths—and expecting another—which must be fed.

The little man is tricked and cheated, crushed and plundered. The majority of America's 30,000,000 farm people are little farmers. They are not causing a market surplus. The many toil wearily in the storm and in the sun that the few might have prosperity. The many live in huts that the few might live at ease while their tractors and many acres work for them. The many are covered with rags, and they must cringe and crawl that the few may increase their dividends.

It is preposterous to base an aid program on the land instead of the people. The richer the land, the greater the aid. It's like a Salvation Army taking up collections from the poor to disburse to the rich. It is like making eligibility for the Work Projects Administration depend on a fat bank account and a big inheritance. Any man with half sense and one eye can see that a market regulation program should be based on bales and bushels instead of acres; should be divided amongst the people, not amongst the acres. For such ideas it is impossible for me to entertain other than pity, contempt, and scorn.

Any farmer knows that one acre produces one-fifth of a bale of cotton, another one-half bale, and another one and one-half.

Acquiesce in this fallacy? I'll face the storm and the tempest but never cease to advocate what my reason dictates and my conscience bids employ.

These policies are policies of political opportunism. Opportunists have taken advantage of the confusion and discouragement of the depression to force on us a fatal policy.

The 10-bale man never hurt prices, but he is cut down to help the poor, suffering, thousand-bale man. You have 10 acres and you are cut to 6. You are expected to get prosperity out of 6 acres.

Ten-thousand-acre man cut to 6,000. Your 6 acres and his 6,000 are supposed to bring equal prosperity to both of you.

It's like a doctor talking to a 350-pound fat man and a 115-pound skinny man and he tells the fat man to cut down from 20 to 10 slices of bread a day to get healthy, and he says to the thin man "You cut down from 2 slices to one-half slice to get healthy and happy."

The Bristow Record of Friday, March 8, 1940, says editorially: "Every time a farmer turns around there is some agent of the Government at his elbow. * * * We have about concluded the farmer is too circumscribed by red tape, farm experts, and rules and regulations, and that the more these experts fool with the agricultural problem the more complicated it becomes."

I want the 100-acre farmer to have plenty; the 1,000-acre farmer and the 10,000-acre farmer can look out for themselves.

Don't imagine that price is everything.

You can't eat a price.

You can't wear a price.

You can't harness it.

You can't break land with it.

You can't plant it and it won't grow.

Only one small class of people depends on price—the speculators—the man who owns stocks and bonds and mortgages.

Prices mean something to the man on Wall Street. He can turn prices into mansions, palatial yachts, and ermine robes for chorus girls.

Price is the jewel of the mortgage holder and the speculator.

Cost, not price, is the farm problem.

Under a system of scarcity to high prices the little man has less—the whole world has less.

No farmer can afford to raise only what he can readily sell. As long as the farmer depends entirely on cash crops or Government subsidy—that long he will be poor and the money lenders grow richer.

The mortgage handler benefits from this program. A mortgage casts a shadow on the sunniest field. One dollar borrowed at 10 percent for 100 years equals $13,809; at 12 percent interest it amounts to $84,075. Interest eats night and day and the more it eats the hungrier it grows.

The United Press from Washington on March 4, 1940, pointed out that the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. was the biggest single beneficiary of the farm program. In 1937 it drew $257,095 in Agricultural Adjustment Administration benefits. More than 20,000 farmers got benefits of more than $1,000; 272 received more than $10,000 each; 595 received more than $5,000 each and nearly all the top payments went to the life-insurance compani and banks upon which have become large-scale owners of farms. (All quotations.) Ninety-six percent of farmers got less than $100. How many of you got more than $10,000 or even $1,000?

On March 9, 1940, speaking to the farmers of the Nation, the then Secretary of Agriculture said: "We do not yet have full agricultural justice * * *" but he hinted it was just around the corner where he is leading us with his program. "The farm program," he said, "has met and conquered drought, surplus, and the Supreme Court's adverse Agricultural Adjustment Administration decision." Has he conquered our drought?

This program will not last. Every wrong tends to abolish itself. It is a lie to say that prosperity is based on scarcity, and it is hard to make a lie stand. A lie won't fit a fact. It will only fit another lie made for the purpose. The life of a lie is a simple question of time.

In a country where the farmer is a free man, everybody is free. Patriotism rests on the land and happiness depends on ownership of the land by those who cultivate it. Agriculture is the permanent basis of all wealth, prosperity, and luxury.

The farmers ought to own the land they cultivate and cultivate what they own. There can be no such thing as a home unless you own it. Sixty-one percent of Oklahoma's farmers are tenant farmers. Around their firesides cluster the private and the public virtues of our Nation. The prosperity and future of our country depends on farm ownership.

Under this program farm tenancy is increasing. On January 11, 1940, the Associated Press released a bulletin from the Oklahoma Agriculture Experiment Station written by John Southern, of the Federal Bureau of Agricultural Economics, that sets out the facts affecting Oklahoma.

Under this system, every quota is a bastile, every farmer a prisoner. To you, an extra peanut is a crime. Why, I denounce it. It is an infamy no language is sufficient to express.

Do I have anything to offer? Yes. We offered an intelligent subsidy at the time the present bill was adopted. We lost by only four votes. We are spending $300,000,000 a year in these subsidies. There are 2,000,000 cotton farmers. That means we could pay $150 to every cotton farmer. So, let's pay him $30 a bale for every bale of cotton he produces up to 5 bales. Base that payment on soil-conservation practices and let him produce all he wants to, but he'll have to take a chance on the price he gets on all over 5 bales. Let's cut another $300,000,000 off the Department of Agriculture's regular appropriation to maintain its vast army of red-tape artists and raise that $30 to $60 for the first 5 bales. I think it better still to cut off $600,000,000 of the many billions consumed by the Bureaus of the Department of Agriculture. Let's raise that to $90 a bale on the first 5 bales, then if the world market price for cotton is only $40 per bale, that will give the farmer $130 a bale for 5 bales. It's the 5-bale man I want to take care of. If a man produces 10,000 bales, pay him on 5 bales and let him do what he wants to with his other 9,995. The 5-bale man needs help. The 10,000-bale man can help himself.

I have said what I want to say—good night.

The Farm-Labor Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Guy R. Erdley:

A problem, as big as the world itself, today confronts the American people, from the highest ranking official to the hobo walking the highways and railroad tracks. The labor shortage on our farms of America is the most serious problem before the American people today. We have come to realize that the problem exists, true enough, but what are we doing about it? We talk, but we do nothing.

If we do not make some effort to find a solution for it, somebody is going to go hungry. It will not be the farmer, you can bet. In the history of the United States we have never had a serious food shortage; in fact, we have never dreamed that such a condition could exist in this land of plenty. I fear that we are not yet convinced that such a condition is an absolute fact.

Our Government has appreciated the farm-labor shortage thus far only in words. The War Manpower Commission and War Labor Board together with the Department of Agriculture have been talking through the press and the microphone about that shortage but as yet have not presented any definite, workable plan. True, the Federal Government has suggested several plans, such as: Registering high-school students, shortening the school term, bringing men over a certain age limit back from the armed forces, and taking men from industry to make up the shortage.

Suggestions to register high-school students over the country to do the job have been presented. This idea will solve part of the problem but not wholly. Boys and girls of high-school age have not come to realize fully the seriousness of the situation.

I have been hiring high-school boys and girls for the past 8 years; and I have learned that they, in order to do their work on a profitable basis both for themselves and the farmer, need older people in the field with them. The farmer has his money invested in that crop and would like to get it out as would any other businessman. And if some definite plan is not worked out and made available to the farmer he will not invest any more.

The bringing of the men back from the armed forces will help but will not meet the immediate need, because enough will not be able to come back. They have a definite piece of work to do there in the training camp and on the line of fire; they cannot take time to return home to help us solve our problems.

Bringing men from industry to our farms may have its merits but it will not have any effect on the food situation on a large scale. The War Manpower Commission states that industry does not have enough help to do its job. Therefore how can we get enough help from factories to do our work. Men have been warned in the past few days to either get into essential war industry or go to the Army.

On the other hand, if the plan were practical the farmer would be unable to pay the same wages that the men could get in defense plants. They have had a taste of the big-time wages, and that leaves the farmer out of the running. Whether or not the Government orders the men back to the farms, there will be friction between that type of help and the farmer. They would accuse the farmer of being the cause of their receiving less pay for their labor. Regardless of how serious the situation may be, we cannot afford to have any friction between groups today.

I should like to take this opportunity to present a plan about which I have thought and studied a great deal. I have talked with a number of people here in Union County, Pa., about it and they thought it a good and effective plan.

First of all, we must appeal to the patriotism of the American people, especially the women of America who now realize that unless they do something they will not have enough to put on their table. The farmers of America can produce far more than the world can consume if they can get help in the form of materials and aid in the planting, caring for, and harvesting of the crops.

My plan is to take a house-to-house survey of every village, town, and city and take the name of every man and woman who is not employed—I mean the housewife or any person—man, woman, or child who can spare a day for voluntary agricultural work. They would be paid according to the prevailing wage rate. All names would be filed in a separate office in the county.

Suppose from one town we receive the names of 500 or 800 people who would like to help. A farmer needs 15 or 30 people to do a certain piece of work within a few days. He would call the central office and state his needs. The office would contact enough people in order to get the sufficient amount of help, stating the time and place these workers would be picked up and taken to

the farm. At the close of the day they would be returned to the same place.

I feel most confident that this plan will put more food in the pantry. If you can get the housewife out to do this job, it will be done and done well. It is putting the problem squarely up to the American people and giving them a chance to do something about it. We can talk and write with a flow of colorful words, but let us measure our success with food on the table.

One of the most serious problems confronting our Nation today is food. The farmers in this county can and will produce our share of food needed for our armed forces, civilian use, and lend-lease, if the labor is available. However, the farmers cannot do the physically impossible; there are only 24 hours in a day.

Union County farmers are planning on planting acreages of peas, planting more soybeans, tomatoes, and other crops to conform to the Government's plea for more produce. According to a survey, the Union County swine production has increased 25 percent.

On the other side of the picture, we have farmers cutting down on their acreage, selling milk cows (the Government has had to set up an agency to purchase milk cows so they would not be killed for beef), putting out crops and being unable to harvest them, because of lack of farm help. This is the Union County situation now.

Most Union County farmers plan their next year's crops by the first of the year; few have even been able to plan their crops as of this date, because they are not sure what farm help they are going to be able to obtain. You know that it costs the farmers dollars and cents, and labor, to plant a crop and cultivate it; that there is a real loss if those crops cannot be harvested. There were crops in Union County last year which were plowed under.

Some of the farmers of Union County want to find out what labor will be available during the spring, summer, and fall, in order to plan their crops.

The following measures have been taken by the Union County farmers:

"That the civilian defense office through its victory aids and some air-raid wardens will make a survey of all towns and villages in the county, asking for men, women, and high-school students to volunteer services for work on the Union County farms. No one will be asked to do what he is physically unable to do, but all are asked to volunteer as much time as they can. This may amount to 1 day a week, 2 days a week, or more, or so many hours each day, or every evening after supper until sundown. Those of us who might have taken vacations if this war had not come might volunteer their vacation time. Those who have Wednesday afternoons off might volunteer those afternoons."

Everyone will be paid the current wages for farm help for the work he does, by the farmers employing them.

We will have a central point set up where all farmers can call when they need farm help. This agency will gather together at a particular time and place as many of those volunteers as are needed who volunteered for that particular time, and the farmers will come in to the place designated, take them to work and return them.

The following are the kinds of work for which we wish volunteers:

March and April: Plant potatoes; plow; harrow; plant onions, peas, oats; and general vegetable gardening.

May: Tomato planting, cultivating, tractor driving, plowing, hoeing, potato cutting and spraying.

June: Berry picking, pea harvesting, hay harvesting, harvesting barley and rye.

July: Harvesting wheat, fruit thinning, weeding, cultivating, tractor driving, hay harvesting.

August: Weeding; fruit picking; general farm work; tomato picking; general harvesting of garden crops, and tomato, potato, apple, peach picking.

September, October, and November: Plowing; cultivating; harvesting corn; tomato, potato, apple, peach picking; general farm work during all months.

The information we wish the surveyors to obtain is: Names of volunteers, whether they are male or female, and whether they are high school students. Home address and phone, business address and phone, the time and amounts of time for which they will volunteer; whether they have had any farm experience (it does not matter whether they have or not, but we do wish to know their experience) and their signature to the volunteer card.

In this way the farmers of Union County will know what labor they can depend on, and will plant their crops accordingly this spring and can possibly increase their production as the Government has requested. This is a Union County project and is a matter of Union County pride for the war effort, and the defeat of the Axis.

Inland-Waterway Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. E. THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 15

Whereas Texas is America's storehouse of natural resources, producing more than half of the Nation's petroleum products including gasoline, and three-fourths of the Nation's supply of sulphur, all of which are vital and essential to the war effort, not only of our own country but of our allies as well; and

Whereas these commodities, especially fuel oil, gasoline, and sulphur, because of their bulk and comparative low value, in normal times are transported almost entirely by water and largely by ocean vessels; and

Whereas because of the hazards of ocean shipping and the lack of available ships, the movement of these essential materials has now been forced to other means of transport at an enormous increased cost to the purchasers and consumers; and

Whereas the inadequacy of other means of transportation has created an alarming shortage of fuel oil and gasoline in certain sections of the country, and particularly along the Atlantic coast, and is seriously threatening the war effort, both here and abroad: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of Texas, with the House of Representatives concurring, hereby directs the attention of the Federal authorities to the necessity of increasing and augmenting existing transportation facilities, insofar as may be possible, by a larger use of the Nation's inland waterways; and that substantial and permanent relief can be assured through the enlargement and extension of certain waterways, which improvements have already been authorized by the Congress; and particularly by carrying out the authorizations contained in the Mansfield bill, House Resolution 6999, passed at the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress and approved by the President, July 23, 1942, which provides for the enlargement of the existing Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, its extension to the Rio Grande Valley, and the construction of a barge canal across the State of Florida to form a connection with the existing Atlantic Intracoastal Canal system; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the members of the Texas delegation in the Congress, including our 2 Senators and our 21 Members of the House with the urgent request that they bring it to the attention of the proper Federal authorities.

Rationing of Canned Foods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Office of Price Administration:

The eight-point-per-can ration deduction for excess canned goods on the pantry shelf was arrived at as the fairest possible way of making these stocks a part of the family ration, Paul M. O'Leary, Office of Price Administration Deputy Administrator in charge of rationing, explained today.

The deduction of any greater number of points, Mr. O'Leary said, would have worked a substantial hardship on large numbers of persons.

Two principal factors led us to decide on the eight-point-per-can deduction, Mr. O'Leary said.

"First, and most important, we found that very large numbers of persons keep substantial stocks on hand of canned soups and the so-called No. 1 cans of vegetables. The soups usually found in these stocks have a six-point-per-can value. The average point price of the No. 1 size cans of vegetables is about seven and one-half points.

"A declaration of each individual can according to its exact weight was impossible because of the tremendous complexity of the job.

"It is true that many persons had cans of food larger than the soup and No. 1 size, and they have benefited to some extent.

"But we felt it would be better to let them benefit a little more, when by doing so, we could prevent actual hardship to these large numbers who would have suffered under a higher point deduction. Therefore, we decided on the eight-point-deduction plan."

The War in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, Members in Congress from the Pacific coast have

been urging a separate Pacific War Council.

On February 22, 1943, the San Francisco Examiner published an editorial entitled "Total Warfare Against Japan Should Be Waged Now To Reduce Pacific Peril."

I am pleased to submit the editorial herewith, as well as copy of Resolution 3152, series of 1939, of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, commending the Hearst newspapers' warning on the Japanese menace. This resolution also appeared in the Examiner of February 22:

[From the San Francisco Examiner of February 22, 1943]

TOTAL WARFARE AGAINST JAPAN SHOULD BE WAGED NOW TO REDUCE PACIFIC PERIL

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution on January 25 commending the Hearst newspapers for maintaining a policy over a period of many years which "has continually warned the Government and people of our beloved country against the Japanese menace in the Pacific."

The resolution is reprinted on this page, with natural appreciation.

The Japanese menace in the Pacific has been very real for more than a quarter of a century, and the Hearst newspapers have always urged appropriate measures against it.

The Japanese menace in the Pacific now is a challenging and frightening reality, and of course the Hearst newspapers are urging adequate and effective measures against it.

It would be comforting to be able to report that present urging of appropriate and adequate measures of war was more productive than past urging of measures of preparation.

Unhappily, there is little comfort in the actual situation.

Repeated and prolonged warnings did not prepare the United States for the long foreseen war with Japan.

Our national war policy even now, after more than a year of costly and discouraging and humiliating war with Japan, ignores the ruthless power and savage menace of the Japanese.

Let us examine the obvious and ominous facts.

The Japanese have possession of the Philippines, and of Guam and Wake Islands.

They are strongly consolidated in the rich Dutch East Indies and in the strategic South Pacific.

Moreover, they hold the vital outer islands of the Aleutians chain, which is not remote but adjacent to the North American mainland.

With the exception of valiantly and expensively and torturously won Guadalcanal and Papua, they have thus far held all their gains—which constitute a vast part of the Pacific world, enormously and inexhaustibly rich in essential war materials once held by us or by our allies to the exclusion of Japan, but now held by Japan to our exclusion.

This is grim but realistic appraisal.

It calls for employment of all military, naval, and air power we possess and can produce, in an immediate and intense effort to drive the Japanese from our Pacific islands and indeed from the very shores of our mainland.

Instead, we have employed only sufficient force against the Japanese in the Pacific to engage them locally while they were preparing behind this screen the forces and supplies for their major strategy.

The Hearst newspapers have always believed that the envious and ambitious, acquisitive, and barbarous Japanese should be confronted with overwhelming American military, naval, and air power.

This was advocated for many years before Pearl Harbor as a measure of reasonable and proper protection for the Pacific coast, which the Japanese have openly coveted for generations and which they have always wanted and intended to invade.

It is advocated now as the measure most essential and indispensable to the winning of the present war.

The Pacific coast will never be safe from Japanese invasion until Japan is completely defeated, and if the Pacific coast is ever invaded by the Japanese the United States as a whole will face occupation.

Japan is utterly confident of her ability to invade and occupy the American mainland, and a confident enemy is a dangerous enemy.

Japan has already succeeded in conquering a vast empire.

If she is allowed to entrench herself in her newly acquired empire and to develop the resources of oil and tin and copper and other war material that she has acquired in the possession of the Pacific islands, she will have the means to prolong the war indefinitely and perhaps to prevent the United Nations from ever regaining their territory and from ever invading a subdued Japan.

Furthermore, there is the likelihood that Japan might unite Asia in opposition to the Occident and include India and even China in a renascence of Asiatic power and policy.

The Asiatics have tried before to impose their dominion upon the occidental race and inevitably will try again as the course of empire wends its westward way.

We should see that this Asiatic renascence does not happen now, when the occidental races are divided among and against themselves and are thus exposed to possible oriental invasion.

The American Nation should employ its full power, its wonderful and unexampled production, its entire resources of will and energy, for the prompt defeat and destruction of Japan.

Annoyance and delay are not enough. Attrition is not enough. Total warfare against Japan is the only measure we can rely upon to reduce the special menace in the Pacific, and the main menace to our whole country.

Past errors are not easily remediable, but to persist in error is worse than folly.

We surely can make the most of our present opportunities, and we certainly should pursue a war policy against Japan recognizing our grave peril.

RESOLUTION NO. 3152 (SERIES OF 1939)

Whereas during the past quarter century the eminent American publisher and writer, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, a man with a comprehensive knowledge of world affairs and their relation to the United States of America, has continually warned the Government and people of our beloved country against the Japanese menace in the Pacific, suggesting and often imploring that appropriate measures be taken to combat such threat before it overwhelmed us; and

Whereas on December 7, 1941, the dastardly attack by Japan on Pearl Harbor and Honolulu proved to the sorrow of this Nation that Mr. Hearst's statements and warnings were based on sound knowledge of the yellow peril; and

Whereas the Honorable JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, in a splendid article written under date of January 23, 1943, for the Washington bureau of the San Francisco Examiner, owned by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, and addressed to the people of the United States of America, again emphasized the fact that immediate and additional methods be employed to effectively stay the Japanese menace to our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board of supervisors hereby commends Mr. William Randolph Hearst for his vigilance and patriotism displayed now as well as in the past in emphasizing the Japanese menace to the United States of America and particularly to the residents of the Pacific coast, California, and our city of San Francisco; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board be, and is hereby, instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to Mr. William Randolph Hearst in appreciation of his patriotic services.

Government and the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Norwich (N. Y.) Sun:

GOVERNMENT AND THE FARMER

There are several aspects of the current agricultural policy which seem to us utterly inconsistent with the threatened shortage of food and the food administration's goals of increased agricultural production.

Take, for example, the provision in the Budget for expenditures of just under $100,000,000 for subsidies for the exportation and domestic consumption of surplus farm commodities. Whatever may be said in favor of such expenditures in time of agricultural depressions they are hard indeed to reconcile with the present situation of food shortage and the far-reaching rationing of food products which impends.

There is provision in the Budget also for expenditures of $400,000,000 for "conservation and use of agricultural land resources." This, too, is a carry-over from the days of huge agricultural surpluses when acreage and production were both allotted and farmers were paid for keeping within them. It is indeed an anomaly that while one branch of the Government, even of the Department of Agriculture, is urging the farmers to step up their production and attain new all-time goals, another is subjecting them to penalties if they exceed their production quotas.

With respect to the matter of soil conservation, it may be said that, however important it may be, in the long run, it is a consideration which should be subordinated for the duration of the war to the production of adequate food and forage supplies. No realistically minded person would think in time of war of limiting steel-ingot production in order to conserve the furnaces, much less of subsidizing their owners for not wearing out their linings.

The point we are making is that some considerable part of the difficult situation that has developed with respect to food supply is due to the failure or unwillingness of the Government to abandon policies designed to meet conditions of agricultural depression and to adopt a program of maximum production.

Secretary Wickard would better make up his mind at once whether his Department is more interested in pursuing the broad policies of his predecessor in office or in putting American agriculture on a sound basis for all-out food production.

Address of Gov. Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1943, Gov. Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota, delivered an address at Evansville, Ind., at a public meeting commemorating the births and lives of George Washington, the first President of our country, and of Abraham Lincoln, its first Republican President.

I have such high regard for the forthright candor, administrative ability, and genuinely honest and inspiring character of the speaker as well as for the purposes inherent in the substance of the address and the clear, persuasive logic by which the substance was presented, that, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting it verbatim in the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, fellow citizens, I count it an honor to respond to your invitation to meet with you on this occasion of commemoration. I bring you greetings from the people of our North Star State of Minnesota. Many have been the associations through the years of Minnesota and Indiana. Thousands of Hoosiers traveled on west and participated in the opening of our territory and thus adding in 1858 the thirty-second State of the Union. In fact, that beloved dean of medicine, Dr. William W. Mayo, who established the medical center of world renown in our State, received his medical training in Indiana under Dr. Deming, one of Lafayette's prominent early medical men. Dr. Mayo graduated from Indiana Medical College, at LaPorte, February 14, 1850, and came to St. Paul, Minn., in 1854.

The now president of our University of Minnesota, Dr. Walter C. Coffey, was born in Hartsville, Ind., and the late Lotus D. Coffman, distinguished educator and president of the University of Minnesota from 1920 to 1938, was born in Salem, Ind.

My pleasure in visiting in Indiana is added to by reason of meeting here your able State chairman, Ralph Gates, and your new Representative in United States Congress, for whom I have a high regard, the Honorable Charles LaFollette.

We have assembled to honor the two greatest of Americans. One of them, on whose birth date we meet, was the first President of our country. The other, a great humanitarian, was the first Republican President of our country. Both led America in time of war. Both led through to victory in war. Both had basic characteristics and a fundamental philosophy that not only meant much to America in their day but mean much today. They are principles that are enduring and are particularly worth while to review at this hour, with our country again at war.

No one can review the addresses or writings of these two great men without being deeply impressed with the frankness and straightforward manner in which they conducted themselves. They faced burning basic issues, each in their time, and no one ever needed to question where Washington stood or where Lincoln stood. Their candor might well be one of the first lessons we draw from them tonight, as we face the vital issues of today and of tomorrow.

Next we are impressed that neither one of them was ever willing to sacrifice principle in an effort to secure an easy victory in the war. Each went through long, dark months and years of struggle. Yet there was never any indication of a wavering in their determination.

Their actions, their example, their messages would say today, first and foremost, that we must drive through to complete, decisive victory in this war, victory both for our arms and for our principles, cost what it may. There must be no weakening of our basic objectives, no dealing with the enemy, no sacrificing of principle for expediency, lest we win an easy victory that will be no victory at all. We must never forget that a victory that does not decisively determine the basic issues of this conflict will not be worthy of those many thousands of men who have already given their lives.

We can learn many lessons today from those two great Americans for the effective conduct of the war. Washington frequently emphasized the necessity of single-headed direction of a problem. In his letter to the Congress from his Valley Forge headquarters on March 16, 1778, he said:

"There is such intimate connection between the forts and the other posts and passes in the highlands and their vicinity that it is necessary for one officer to have the superintendency and control of the whole, and to be answerable for all. I. this were not to be the case but the command were to be divided, they might want that cooperation between the garrisons and the other troops, which might be essential to their preservation and to the common purpose of defense"

Both Lincoln and Washington recognized the need of keeping the people informed. They showed the true mark of greatness of being tolerant of their fellow men and willing to accept criticism even under the most adverse circumstances.

In Washington's letter to Patrick Henry, then Governor of Virginia, sent from Valley Forge on March 27, 1778, we find words of appreciation for information that Patrick Henry had sent to General Washington. Then we find this significant passage: "That I may have erred in using all the means in my power for accomplishing the objects of the arduous, exalted station with which I am honored, I cannot doubt, nor do I wish my conduct to be exempted from reprehension further than it may deserve. Error is the portion of humanity, and to censure it, whether committed by this or that public character, is the prerogative of free men."

Lincoln said, "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy."

The writings of Washington and of Lincoln also indicate that both of these great leaders began to plan the winning of the peace while they were yet waging the war. Here again is an application that should be made from their lives to our times. We should begin now, subordinate to the tasks of winning the war, but nonetheless of vital importance, to think through and plan the winning of the peace.

I hope that our Republican Party will frankly face these issues of the peace. I hope that we will frankly declare that, with the advance of science, of aviation, and radio and commerce, the walls of isolation are gone forever. Then we must proceed to work out the means and methods of establishing the bridges for understanding and for living together on this earth in the years ahead.

Would not Lincoln say today, Strengthen the union of the United Nations and hold fast to that union to win the peace as well as to win the war?

Would not Washington say today that the advances of science call for a new and higher level of Government of very limited powers, but of essential functions, to keep the peace?

Washington advised against entangling alliances with Europe's internal quarrels. But no word can be found that would advise against America taking a leadership in the establishment of a new and higher level of Government to meet the problems that the advances of travel and of communication have brought about.

In fact, in his farewell address he said: "Harmony and liberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest." His arguments to the States of the necessity of establishing the Federal level of Government, applies now with equal force to the necessity of joining with the peoples of the other United Nations of the world.

In his letter to James Madison on November 5, 1786, he said: "Thirteen sovereignties pulling against each other, and all tugging at the Federal head will soon bring ruin on the whole; whereas a liberal and energetic Constitution, well guarded and closely watched, to prevent encroachment, might restore us to that degree of respectability and consequences to which we had a fair claim, and the brightest prospect of attaining."

Relate these thoughts to the problems after victory in this war and would they not urge the gradual development of a United Nations Constitution limited in its scope to the prevention of war, to the common task of policing outlaw territories, and leaving to each of the member nations their own domestic sovereignties, their own flags, their own constitutions, their own government?

No more eloquent plea has ever been made for a sane and constructive peace, than that which came from the lips of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek when that great and gracious lady recently addressed the United States Congress. For 5½ years China has endured the agony of a cruel, a bloody, and a losing war against Japanese imperialism. China has suffered with a dignity born of nobility of spirit, in stoic solitude, the horror, the misery, and the atrocities which have been her tragic fate. China might be expected to be human enough to seek vindication and revenge. Instead China speaks to the world, of moderation and restraint, with the simple eloquence and profound philosophy which reflects her ancient culture and fundamental civilization. Through the delicate yet powerful voice of Mme. Chiang China speaks:

"We of this generation who are privileged to make a better world for ourselves and for posterity, should remember that, while we must not be visionary, we must have vision, so that peace should not be punitive in spirit and should not be provincial or nationalistic or even continental in concept, but universal in scope and humanitarian in action, for modern science has so annihilated distance that what affects one people must of necessity affect all other peoples."

We must dispel suspicions and emphasize our common purposes. China, Russia, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the United States of America, and the other United Nations are all needed to win a complete victory without weakening compromise in this war. And they will each be equally needed to secure a durable peace.

Much can be said of their differences, but much more can be said of the strength of their common purpose not only to win this war but to prevent this world-wide horror from coming again.

We should begin now to set up the machinery of lasting unity by establishing definite United Nations commissions or councils to administer United Nations interests in the transfer of food and supplies and in the temporary civil administration of conquered or liberated territories.

If we continue to maintain distinctly separate commissions of the United States of

America for civilian food and supply, and separate boards of the British, the Dutch, the Chinese, and the Russians, we make the problem of unity in peace that much more difficult to attain.

Our third application might well be to begin now to think through the governmental structure by which our common purposes with the other United Nations will be preserved and through which nations now neutral and those now our enemies may ultimately be added.

A legislative or parliamentary body as the key united for such a United Nations government might best safeguard human rights.

Obviously, such a United Nations government, as it gradually develops over a period of time, should have very limited powers, with the member nations maintaining their own domestic sovereignty and delegating to the new level of government only those activities between nations which have in the past been unsuccessfully carried on by devious diplomacy, balance of power, extraterritoriality, international intrigue, power politics, making and breaking of treaties, and recurring wars.

Such a United Nations government should enact a very elementary code of justice world-wide in scope, based upon, not nations' rights but human rights. It should include provisions for abolishing slavery, for the protection of minorities wherever they may be, and for preventing religious persecution.

A United Nations court would be needed to administer the code of justice.

Realistically recognizing man's weaknesses, should we not contemplate establishing a United Nations legion or police force to keep the Axis nations and other outlaw territories disarmed, to enforce the basic code of justice, and to support the administrative functions?

No orderly government on any level in all of history has ever been successful without a police force. This was one of the three fatal weaknesses of the League of Nations.

This does not mean that our country and the other United Nations should completely disarm. Just as the law abiding residents of the West continued to pack their own guns long after the first sheriff was installed to bring about orderly government, so we must maintain armed strength of our own in addition to the United Nations legions.

In other words, I do not suggest that we place all of our eggs in the international basket, but we should definitely place some of our eggs in continuing United Nations government. They might at least hatch something better than recurring wars, each of increasing tragedy and horror.

We could look forward over a period of years to the gradual development from this elementary machinery to the administration of the great international airways of the future, and of the gateways to the seven seas. No one need speak to Indiana about the potentialities in the air. The dramatic world-circling trip of that eminent son of Indiana, Wendell Willkie, not only made a real contribution to the United Nations cause, but carried out as it was with one airplane and one crew, it boldly emphasized the future of the air. The recent trip of the President and Winston Churchill to north Africa by air was another signpost of the future of aviation. Air tariffs, rules of the air, channels of flight, coordination of radio beams and weather data, and the maintenance of safe and stable international airports, all will require administration on a higher level than that of a single nation. The catch phrase "freedom of the air" will not be the answer. It would lead to anarchy of the air and the basic violation of domestic sovereignty. Rather must we seek the orderly use of the air and reciprocal rights to land under a new level of limited United Nations administration.

Finally, after victory, we must not seek to indoctrinate men by force with any particular philosophy of government, nor seek to convince them by force of the correctness of any certain form of government.

Rather should we seek to establish academic freedom, to open up the avenues of information and truth for the minds of men and women and little children, and have faith in the ultimate results.

Direct and appropriate punishment to the criminal leadership of the Axis and of the Quislings should be meted out but the liberated and defeated populations should be approached with malice toward none through a community of nations' attention to the problems of food, of health, and of reconstruction. This should not be on any utopian, grandiose basis, but on a practical foundation to make possible the slow, steady march of progress of self-reliant, peace-loving men.

The trade between the peoples of the world must be increased, not on a dreamer's basis, following neither high protective tariffs nor free trade, but rather through a gradual, continuous adjustment for increased commerce, with the recognition of what that will mean to standards of living and to peace.

It can well be said—what does it profit a nation, if it holds within it all its trade, and earning the jealous dislike of other peoples, sacrifices its sons upon the battlefields.

These are not objectives that can be obtained in 1 year, nor in 10 years, nor in a hundred years, but is it not the road we must strive mightily to travel? Does it not present in its broadest sense the pattern for peace and progress of mankind?

To those who scoff that efforts to apply Washington's and Lincoln's principles to problems such as these are idealistic, impractical, impossible—it can well be said that when the founding fathers of our own United States of America were struggling to devise a new method of government, the same cries of the defeatists—"Idealistic, impractical, impossible"—were heard.

Permit me to quote from a statement of the Dean of Gloucester, Josiah Tucker, in 1786, just 1 year before the Constitution of these United States, which we have taken for granted for a century and a half, was drafted: "As to the future grandeur of America, and its being a rising empire under one head, whether republican or monarchial in its form, it is one of the oldest and most visionary notions that ever was conceived even by writers or romance. The mutual antipathies and clashing interests of the Americans, their differences of governments, habitudes, and manners, indicate that they will have no center of union and no common interest. They never can be united into one compact empire under any species of government whatever; a disunited people till the end of time, suspicious and distrustful of each other, they will be divided and subdivided into little commonwealths or principalities, according to natural boundaries, by great bays of the sea, and by vast rivers, lakes, and ridges of mountains.

So stated the Dean of Gloucester 1 year before the Constitution of this country was drafted.

We now have a world-wide vision to win the war. We must keep our sights high and maintain a world-wide vision to win an enduring peoples' peace.

The vote of the people of Massachusetts on November 3, 1942, on the broad proposal looking toward world government, and the similar resolution adopted by the North Carolina and New Jersey Legislatures are encouraging developments.

We must say over and over again that men can die upon the battlefields in vain because of what happens after a war as well as because of what happens during a war. During the battle for independence we planned to win that peace.

As early as July 21, 1775, Dr. Benjamin Franklin presented a draft of a plan for the Union to the Continental Congress. We followed through at the Constitutional Convention and won the peace.

During the War Between the States, Lincoln began to plan the winning of that peace. We reverted from those plans to that shameful period of carpetbagging and almost lost the peace. Then we worked out the means of again accepting the Southern States, in keeping with human dignity, as a part of our Union, and the Nation progressed.

Our men upon the field of battle in '17 and '18 acquitted themselves well. They won a heroic, decisive victory, but—we all know—we lost that peace.

The winning of this war must come first. It must be uppermost in our minds and thoughts and deeds. Each of us must add to the total strength of America until victory comes to the United Nations.

But pray God that America shall highly resolve, that we will build the framework for our future relations to the men and women and little children of other nations of this earth, not on the shifting sands of political expedience, of blind partisanship, of narrow selfishness, but on the solid rock of basic concepts, of underlying philosophy, of eternal principles. Yet, let us build that framework where Lincoln stood.

"That these honored dead shall not have died in vain, that 'this world under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall 'gradually spread throughout' the earth."

As Washington said, at the Constitutional Convention, "If to please the people we adopt that of which we ourselves do not approve, how can we afterward defend our works. Let us raise a standard to which the wide and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

Do We Want Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mocksville Enterprise, a weekly newspaper published in Mocksville, Davie County, N. C.:

DO WE WANT PEACE?

All of us are expressing the hope for an early peace, but we have not considered what lies between us and permanent peace. Much of our hope is no more than wishful thinking because we are unwilling to contribute the things which make for peace. Military victories cannot bring a real peace, even though circumstances bring about cessation of hostilities. Peace must be put into the normal activities and relationships of everyday life and over a long period of time. Peace must be put into trade, in diplomacy, into international relationships. If keen and unrelenting competition is put into business, tariff walls into trade, lying into diplomacy, and political capital into politics, we may expect another war within a few years after hostilities cease in this one. We have the

blueprints for peace, but we insist upon hiring other architects to change plans in order to build into the structure the selfishness and greed of particular groups and divergent philosophies. The structure, if it is to be enduring and give the best accommodations to the largest number of people, must follow the blueprints of an old drawing: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Standing Committee on Civil Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Post:

NICHOLS BILL

The Nichols bill setting up a separate standing committee of Congress on civil aviation will come before the House of Representatives today. We hope the Members will vote against it. The following are our reasons:

1. It would add to the unwieldiness of congressional machinery. Already there are 80 standing committees, or little ministries, in existence. All plans for the smoother functioning of Congress begin with the proposal that there should be fewer committees, not more. Consolidation would simplify and facilitate the work of Congress. New committees with a single field of reference breed legislative anarchy and lobbying.

2. It would waste the time of the administrative chiefs in the executive branch of government. A committee on aviation would be another testimony-collecting group. Already our war administrators have to go from committee to committee giving the same evidence. It is a scandalous drag on the war effort. In peacetime the practice impairs the efficiency of government.

3. It would injure the cause and retard the development of civil aviation. The new group would be inexperienced and would offer the temptation to make political capital out of civil aviation. In place of a wise policy based on integrating aviation into the complex of transportation in general, we should have a body of special pleaders.

4. It would bring to an end the usefulness of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to transport in general and aviation in particular. For 20 years this committee has regulated air transport in common with rival forms of transport. That is the best way to regulate it. Some committee must be umpire for competing forms of transport, or the job will be thrown on Congress, since separate committees would concern themselves with pushing their particular interests. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been acclaimed by the aviation industry itself for its judicial impartiality. This committee has watched over and guided the progress of civil aviation in this country to its preeminent position today. It sponsored the Air Commerce Act of 1926 and the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. It has a very capable standing Subcommittee on Civil Aviation, of which Representative BULWINKLE, of North Carolina, is chairman. Membership includes Representatives LEA, BOREN, WOLVERTON of New Jersey, and HOLMES of Massachusetts. All of them are well known to the aviation industry as active and aggressive in their desire to further the sound development of civil aviation. Divorced from aviation, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce might become a special pleader for railroads and busses.

Our Domestic Foes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered over the radio by my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. MARTIN DIES:

My fellow Americans, we are engaged in a great struggle to preserve our constitutional government and our American way of life. To win that struggle we in Congress have pledged the lives, the fortunes, and the resources of America without stint or reservation. We are sending millions of your sons, husbands, and fathers to foreign battlefields. Already thousands of them have made the supreme sacrifice for our beloved country. Compared with their sacrifices, ours are trivial and unimportant. Even the colossal debt which we are placing upon your shoulders and the heavy burden of taxation which must be borne for decades to come do not compare with the suffering, the privation, and the inevitable loss of life which the men in our armed forces are laying as gifts of pure devotion upon the altar of America. There is nothing that we can now or ever do that will repay these soldiers of freedom. Not only the present but all future generations of freemen will be their debtors. But as tokens of our appreciation to them and their loved ones, Congress as the servants of the people must spare no effort to provide our armed forces and their loved ones with every protection which a grateful Nation can give. They must have the best that this country can afford in equipment, in clothing, in food, and everything else which will hasten the day of victory and hold to a minimum the privations, the sufferings, and the casualties of war.

The Congress has another and equally important obligation which it must discharge to our fighting men on land, in the air, and on the sea. We must make certain that, when these men return from the battlefields of the world, constitutional government and the American way of life for which they fought are still intact and unimpaired, and that awaiting them will be jobs and opportunities for advancement under a system of free enterprise which is the basis of our democracy.

If we give them the support to which they are entitled we may rest assured they will defeat the foreign enemies of democracy and constitutional government. But while they are fighting and defeating our foreign foes we at home must be equally determined to defeat our domestic foes. Before any Member of Congress can take his seat, he must solemnly swear that he will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

For 4½ years it has been the duty of our Committee on Un-American Activities to discover and unmask the domestic foes of this country. During that period we have investigated and exposed more than a hundred Nazi, Fascist, and Japanese organizations. As a result of our exposure these organizations have been compelled to fold up and discontinue their organized activities.

Many of their leaders have been indicted and convicted, largely as a result of our exposure and the evidence which we obtained. At one time we submitted to the President a list of 17,000 people who were pro-Nazi and pro-Fascist. The approximately 3,500 printed pages of our public hearings and the hundreds of pages of our reports, devoted entirely to Nazi, Fascist, and Japanese activities and propaganda in the United States, are available to any citizen who wants to know the truth about the thorough job our committee has done in unmasking the Axis foes in the United States. Our committee has also ferreted out and exposed the various Communist and Communist front organizations in this country with the result that fully 60 percent of these front organizations have been forced to discontinue. Anyone who reads the Communist publications knows that their strategy from the beginning of the committee has been an attempt to create the impression that the committee is pro-Fascist. On the other hand, anyone who has read the official newspapers of the German-American Bund, the Silver Shirt Legion, and the various other Fascist and Nazi organizations has discovered that the attempt was made to create the impression that our committee had failed to sufficiently investigate and unmask the Communist groups. Another strategy of these individuals, groups, and organizations which we have exposed is to cry "Smear." The truth is that they, not we, are the smearers, for we are merely exposing their long records of smearing our Constitution and American way of life.

Because our committee has done a fearless and thorough job against our domestic foes, whether Communist, Nazi, Fascist, or Japanese, we have naturally incurred the undying hatred of all these groups and their sympathizers. For the sixth time the House of Representatives, by a vote of more than 3 to 1, has expressed its confidence in our committee and continued us for 2 more years. The people of this country may rest assured that we will continue without fear or favor to investigate and expose all the domestic foes of this country, regardless of the brand of totalitarianism which they promote. The fact that last year we handled from Government agencies 138,000 requests for information, and that 1,600 agents of the Government came to our Washington office for information about Communists, Nazis, Fascists, and Japanese and their sympathizers should satisfy every fair American that our committee has rendered and is rendering a most useful and necessary service in the struggle to preserve democracy. In spite of the campaign of ridicule, abuse, and misrepresentation which has been conducted against us from the very beginning of our work, the significant fact remains that fully 90 percent of all the findings of our committee have been confirmed and recognized by the findings of other agencies of the Government and by the official acts of the administration in prosecuting and outlawing the various Nazi, Fascist, and Japanese organizations which we exposed long ago.

Even our critics must admit it was only after our exposure of Fritz Kuhn, James Wheeler Hill, G. Wilhelm Kunze, Manfred Zapp, Guenther Tonn, Frederic Auhagen, and William Dudley Pelley, and others, that they were convicted and sentenced to prison. And they must further admit it was only after our exposures of the German-American Bund, Kyffhauser Bund, the German Library of Information, the American Fellowship Forum,

Transocean News Service, the German Railroads Information Office, the Silver Shirt Legion, the Central Japanese Association, Japanese Imperial Veterans' Association, Japanese Military Virtue Society, Kendo groups, Japanese Tourist Bureau, Japanese Merchants' Association, Shinto temples, Japanese language schools, Italian Tourist Information Bureau, American League for Peace and Democracy, the American Peace Mobilization, and many others, that these organizations were either closed by Government order or compelled to go out of existence.

It may be generally stated that the enemies of our Constitution are all individuals, groups, trends, isms, and philosophies which advocate, teach, or threaten the destruction of the Constitution by force and violence, by subterfuge, by misinterpretation, by bureaucratic edicts, or by any other method whatsoever. In fact, the method of subverting the Constitution is not the important question. There are many forms of dictatorship and totalitarian government. But the principle which underlies all these forms is the same. By different methods they seek to accomplish the same end, which is the exaltation of the state at the expense of the individual. Under all of these totalitarian schemes the state becomes everything, the individual nothing.

As the state becomes omnipotent, the individual is reduced to a mere cog in a collectivistic machine. That machine may, conceivably, possess a terrible mechanical efficiency, but it is spiritually lifeless and therefore a curse to mankind.

The Constitution of our country embodies those great social and political ideas—individualism, liberalism, democracy, toleration—in brief, liberty. Under the Constitution the state is merely the servant of the people, limited and restricted by an elaborate system of checks and balances. Any trend or philosophy or governmental practice which tends to upset this balance and to weaken these checks threatens the existence of the system itself. In recent years there has been in every country a revival of the pagan and materialistic conception of the nature of the state. Under this conception the state has become totalitarian in many of the countries across the waters.

In our own country, there has been a steady trend in this direction. Federal bureaucrats have been gradually taking over the functions of State and local governments and transforming the latter into subservient agencies of the Federal Government. Congress and the courts of our land have lost much of their constitutional power and responsibility because some of the bureaucrats have used the blank-check appropriations made by Congress and the vast delegations of authority to the Executive as means of increasing their own power at the expense of Congress and the courts.

Being theorists, as many of them are with whom the questionnaire has long been a fad, some of these bureaucrats have flooded the country with millions of their silly, complicated, unintelligible, and altogether unnecessary question sheets. Committed, as they are, by their political philosophy to a program of more and more regimentation, these bureaucrats seem to delight in the promulgation of purely nuisance regulations which, so far as industry is concerned, act as a hindrance to production, and, so far as the individual citizen is concerned, interfere seriously with his war effort by confusing him. The right to issue rules and regulations was conferred by Congress upon the bureaus for the sole purpose of enabling the bureaus better to carry out the spirit and intent of legislative enactments, but these bureaucrats ha e used this right to formulate their own legislation and thereby to supersede Congress as the legislative authority of the Government.

Of course, we all recognize that the President and his executive and military aides are carrying tremendous burdens in their prosecution of total war against the Axis Powers. In leading this Nation to victory, the President will have the wholehearted support of every true American. In such a national emergency as that which confronts us today it is inevitable that the executive agencies of Government be greatly expanded, that tens of thousands of new civilian employees be added to the Federal pay roll. One of the deep concerns of our committee is that this situation shall not present new opportunities for un-American elements to infiltrate into the Government. We believe that our committee, with its vast files on subversive organizations, can be of immeasurable service to the Executive and to the country by identifying and exposing those radicals who would slip into Government positions in order to promote more effectively their un-American aim to convert our Government into a Fascist bureaucracy.

What I have just said about the trend toward Fascist bureaucracy and the usurpation of legislative and judicial power by some nonelected bureaucrats is now generally recognized by the majority of our people and Congress, but what is not generally understood are the reasons for this trend toward Fascist bureaucracy. There are those who maintain that Congress should never have set up these bureaus in the first place or that having established them Congress should have more clearly defined their powers. But the truth is that some of our bureaus are directed and administered by socialist bureaucrats and their "ideological pets" who use their powers and influence not to support and strengthen our system of government and free enterprise but to promote their socialistic schemes. As long as these professional planners and uplifters remain in key positions the language of congressional acts cannot be drawn in such terms or with such absolute clarity as to guarantee the administration of such acts in accordance with the intent of Congress.

These bureaucrats and their "ideological pets" who are not in sympathy with our American system will always find a way to circumvent the will of the people as defined by congressional acts.

The presence of these socialistic planners in the bureaus is not accidental. It is the result of their carefully laid plans to subvert the American form of government. These professional do-gooders long ago saw in this expansion of bureaus a long-awaited opportunity to impose their socialistic schemes upon an unsuspecting country.

As soon as these socialistic pioneers of this technique of infiltration entrenched themselves in key positions they set about to colonize the bureaus with their "ideological pets."

Speaking at a Socialist gathering some years ago, a man who now occupies a high-salaried position in the Department of the Interior explained to his Socialist listeners the importance of their infiltrating the Federal Government. He said, "They can be of enormous use to the movement as Government officials." Mark you, friends of the radio audience, this man did not say that his Socialist colleagues could be of enormous service to their country as Government officials. There was not a hint in his remarks that Government officials are sworn to uphold the Constitution. Not at all. They were to look upon Government positions as opportunities to advance a movement. They were to insinuate themselves onto the Federal pay roll in order to occupy a strategic position from which to spread an ideology which is at variance with the American system. He explained, "One good man with eyes, ears, and wits about him, inside the department, can do more to perfect the technique of control over industry than a hundred men outside." In the course of his speech, this man said frankly that their "long-time aim" was "the abolition of the profit system" and the best way to encompass that aim was to get jobs inside the Government where they could carry out a policy of what he described as "encroaching control" during a period of transition from free enterprise to socialism. Well, the speaker who explained all this to his Socialist audience years ago proceeded to act upon his own advice and got himself an $8,000-a-year job as chief of one of the branches in Mr. Ickes' Department of the Interior.

Not all of the comrades at first recognized the value of this infiltration technique. For example, I have in mind the case of a Federal official who draws $5,600 a year as a principal business consultant for one of these bureaus. Early in the life of this administration he was offered a position in the Government here in Washington. In a letter which he published under his own name he contemptuously rejected the offer of a Government position saying among other things: "I believe in the abolition of the capitalist system. I believe in the necessity of the destruction of this system of exploitation by the might of workers' organizations. * * * I decline to be even an insignificant member of a Government which, after a year of displaying its brand of social engineering, has devised such a positive, direct, and universal scheme for workers' enslavement. * * * Nor can I entertain the elaborate rationalizations with which some radicals have spun their ways into various sections of the Roosevelt administration."

Despite his original rejection of a position in this administration this Federal official later saw the light and became a convert to this infiltration technique and accepted a $5,600 salary in a post which he occupies today.

This case, however, was an exception to the rule, for most of these comrades seized their first opportunity to infiltrate the bureaus.

A few weeks ago in a speech to the House of Representatives I dealt at length with 46 bureaucrats. Among these 46 was an $8,000-a-year Government official who had the following to say in his prolific Socialist writings: "The hold of this class upon the Government of the United States must be broken by the organized might of the workers and farmers, who themselves shall take over and reorganize the Government and all the economic institutions whose interests it watches over."

Another $8,000-a-year bureaucrat ridiculed our American Government by declaring in writing that our democracy is a sham.

Another bureaucrat who draws $4,600 was a pioneer in the movement known as technocracy. In one of his technocratic works this bureaucrat advocated the abolition of money and the substitution therefor of erg certificates to be distributed willy-nilly at the rate of 20,000 a year to every member of society.

Another, who draws a salary of $4,600 a year, spent years in European nudist camps and has written numerous volumes on nudism in which he advocated its universal practice in "convent and monastery, harem and military barracks, clubs and schools."

Two other bureaucrats, drawing $6,500 and $5,600 respectively, were national officers of a revolutionary organization whose publicly announced purpose was stated on its own letterhead as follows: "It aims to inspire the workers to take control of industry and government, abolish the present capitalist system and build a workers republic."

And then there's the case of another $4,600-a-year bureaucrat who spent years building rockets to fly to Mars and elected himself

president of the Interplanetary Travel Association.

In citing these few examples, I do so not to reflect upon the great majority of Government employees who are loyal and patriotic Americans, but to illustrate the infiltration into bureaus of people who are on record against our form of government or who have affiliated and associated with subversive or "crackpot" organizations and groups. More than a year ago Congress appropriated $100,000 to be expended by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in finding out which Government employees belonged to surversive organizations and to report the facts to Congress. As one of the most efficient and reliable agencies of our Government with whom our committee works in complete cooperation, I am sure that the Federal Bureau of Investigation did a thorough job. Unfortunately, the Attorney General has heretofore refused to submit to Congress the reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation concerning the subversive affiliations of several thousand employees, including the 1,124 employees whose names and records our committee submitted to the Attorney General at his request. I have been reliably informed that the investigative agencies of the Civil Service Commission and other departments of the Government have also submitted reports on hundreds of Government employees and recommended their dismissal. On the basis of all these reports, I am convinced that there are hundreds of Federal officials and employees who should be dismissed. Only a handful have been discharged. The reason the others have not been dismissed is that certain bureaucrats who have the power to discharge have refused to do so because they do not believe that affiliation and association with subversive organizations or expressions of opposition to our form of government constitute sufficient grounds for dismissal.

From the thousands of letters and telegrams which you have sent me, I am sure that 95 percent of our people agree with me that Government employees and officials who have expressed opposition to our form of government or who have knowingly affiliated and associated with subversive or "crackpot" organization have no place in our Government, especially when there are so many millions of loyal and patriotic Americans whose records of loyal devotion to our country are beyond question or suspicion.

In my opinion no act of domestic policy would do more to aid the war effort than to bring this issue to a show-down without further whitewashing or bickering.

To dispose of this matter once and for all, I suggested several weeks ago when the President announced the establishment of an interdepartmental board to pass upon this question, that the board should be composed of representatives designated by recognized labor, veterans, farmers, and business organizations. A board so constituted would have the confidence of all of our people. Its findings would be accepted as final and conclusive and we would be assured that it would not result in another whitewash.

You, the people of America, are the employers and paymasters of your 533 elected and 3,000,000 nonelected servants in the Federal Government. You are therefore the ones to ultimately decide this question. If you believe that I am right or wrong about this question, I urge you to write me so that your views may be known in Washington.

The fight that I have made during the past 4½ years is more than a fight against subversive groups and organizations. In the larger and more important sense it is a fight for survival of constitutional government and the preservation of your God-given rights as American citizens.

Fellow Americans, the foes of our Constitution at home and abroad must be defeated.

Under the God of our fathers and the Constitution of our country America must live.

Joseph Stalin's Order of the Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. FOLGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and newspaper article:

ORDER OF THE DAY

Joseph Stalin's order of the day, issued on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of the Red army, is a document that may be read with interest and profit.

With admirable clarity, he reviewed the course of the war in Russia and set out the factors which have brought the Germans early victories and more recent defeats. Broadly speaking, they are three in number.

First, the Nazis attacked Russia when the Red army was not fully mobilized. Hence, the Germans enjoyed a superiority in manpower and in equipment, but this, Stalin said, has been reversed. He put the enemy's casualties at 9,000,000 men, of whom 4,000,000 have been killed. In addition the German losses in equipment have been tremendous, with the result, according to Stalin, that it is Russia which now enjoys superiority in men and matériel.

Second, the German Army, prior to attacking Russia, had almost 2 years of experience in large-scale warfare in Europe. This gave the enemy an advantage, but one which has been overcome, Stalin said, as the men and officers of the Red army acquired their combat experience.

Finally, according to the Soviet leader, 20 months of fighting in Russia has brought out the main weakness of the Nazis—their inability to make sound independent decisions when the fighting does not go according to plan. Stalin conceded that the Germans are accurate and exact in their operations when they can adhere to a preconceived plan of battle. But in his judgment they are fatally lacking in ability to adjust themselves to unforeseen changes in the military picture.

Roughly, this is Stalin's explanation of the great victories which the Russians have won, and he made it clear that in his opinion the triumph is exclusively that of the Red army. In view of the absence of a second front in Europe, he said, the "Red army alone is bearing the whole weight of the war." At no place in the order did he so much as mention the defeat of Rommel by Britain's Eighth Army, the campaign in north Africa, the bombing attacks on the German homeland or the never-ending battle to secure the Atlantic crossing for the shipment of supplies to Russia.

It is too early, perhaps, to say whether particular significance should be attached to this attitude, and certainly it is too early to attempt to draw any definite conclusions from it. But this is no reason to ignore what he said or what he did not say.

The same thing is true with respect to certain cryptic statements in the order. For instance, Stalin spoke of the necessity which compelled the Red army to launch a campaign "to defend its native land against the German invaders and to drive them from the borders of our country." This might be read to mean that the Russians do not intend to carry the war beyond their own borders. But Stalin also warned against the assumption that the "Red army has now only to pursue it (the German Army) to the western frontiers of our country"—a statement which lends itself to an entirely different interpretation.

These comments by the leader of the Soviets may mean a great deal, or nothing. Perhaps he is merely trying to mask his hand, and if so, he is adept at the art. The danger of jumping to premature conclusions should be avoided, but certainly when Stalin puts himself on record with such a statement, there is every reason why the people of this country should read and scrutinize it with the greatest care.

STALIN SAYS AXIS WILL BE BEATEN BY UNITED STRENGTH

Stalin told President Roosevelt today that he shared the President's confidence that the Red army's victories against the Axis "will open the path" to the defeat of their common enemy.

Stalin's reply to the President's congratulations on the Red army's twenty-fifth anniversary was announced in a Moscow broadcast.

"Please accept my sincere gratitude for your friendly message on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Red army and for your high praise of its military successes," Stalin said.

"I share your confidence that those successes will open the path to our common enemy, who must be, and will be, overwhelmed by the united strength of our countries and all freedom-loving peoples."

Effect of Lack of Manpower on Production of Dairy and Poultry Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. D. McWILLIAMS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as there is much discussion and thought given to the problems of dairying, farming, and manpower, I think it timely to insert herewith copy of a letter written by a constituent of mine, Mr. Daniel Polsky, of the Yantic Grain & Products Co., Norwich, Conn., to the Selective Service Board, Hartford, Conn.:

FEBRUARY 16, 1943.

STATE SELECTIVE SERVICE BOARD,
Hartford, Conn.

Attention: Major A. G. D.—Vernon S. Morehouse

DEAR SIR: The manufacturing and distributing of animal and poultry feeds is a vital and important essential in the war program. Much stress is laid on the necessity of producing and increasing the production of dairy and poultry products. To maintain the present rate of production—without the desired increase—it is imperative that the producing and distributing organizations be permitted to retain most of their workers.

The poultry producers of Connecticut have expanded and grown to the present high production with the manual assistance of the feed distributor. Many farms are operated by old men—crippled men—women. On the farms where able-bodied men operate, the program is dependent on the service rendered by the feed man.

As an example, a man and wife take care of 5,000 laying birds. Actually, more manpower would ordinarily be necessary, but the work applied by the feed dealer makes it possible for these two people to do the work of three people. The feed and supplies are brought to the farm by the driver of a feed truck. This driver and helper distribute the

feed to the various poultry houses on the farms, open and dump the sacks into bins. Many of these houses are two or three stories high, necessitating the carrying of the feed up two and three flights of stairs. Litter, which is an important part of the care of poultry, must similarly be delivered and distributed.

Very few of the poultry farms have vehicular equipment with which they can transport supplies to their farms. A bag of feed weighs 100 pounds. A package of litter will sometimes run to nearly 200 pounds. This requires able-bodied men to handle. Should the service of delivery and distribution of feed and supplies to the poultry farm be discontinued as a result of lack of manpower, a great deal of the production of poultry products would have to be curtailed, and, in many instances, abandoned.

While the dairy farm is somewhat better situated for vehicular equipment in obtaining his own supplies, nevertheless, his own shortage of help to carry on the present program prevents him from going to town after his supplies, so he, too, has made his program with the idea of having feed and supplies delivered to his farm.

The grain business naturally falls into two classifications: (1) the feed mill and (2) the feed distributing store.

1. In the feed mill, the process of preparing feeds begins with the unloading of sacks of feed from cars. These sacks of feed weigh 100 pounds each. A carload will contain at the present time 600 of such units. When removed from the car, they must be piled up in the warehouse. They must later on be moved to places in the mill where they are opened and dumped into hoppers for mixing. Unfortunately, like the farm, the feed mill is dependent greatly on manual operation, notwithstanding the fact that some machines do very essential work. When the feed is all prepared, it is again put up in 100-pound sacks and it requires able-bodied men to load the feed into cars or onto trucks for distribution. Replacing these men with old men, crippled men, or women is virtually impossible in most departments. In our plant, we now have about 20 women sorting, patching, and cleaning empty bags. These are replacing what was formerly done by about 15 men.

2. The general distribution of feed to the farmers in this State is done through feed dealers located at advantageous points, usually operating one to several trucks. The work at these feed-distributing stores consists of unloading carloads of feed into a warehouse or onto a truck for direct delivery to the farm. From the warehouse it is distributed via truck to the farm where, as already stated above, the driver distributes the feed to the various barns and houses. In these places he very often has to carry the feed up to levels above the ground floor, open the bags, and dump them into bins and hoppers. This is hard work and requires a strong man to do it. We know for a fact that much contraction has already occurred in the distribution, and that probably, like our own establishments, most feed dealers are operating with the smallest number of men possible. Further loss of men in many instances would necessitate discontinuing the distribution of feed in these locations.

Many farmers have made their plans this year definitely with the understanding that feed dealer service will continue. Without it, they cannot carry out the program. A great deal of the entire farm program in this State is dependent on feed dealer service, and inasmuch as this service, as already stated, consists of just hard work that can be performed only by strong men, it is imperative that serious consideration be given to this situation.

Practically all feed dealers handle fertilizers, seeds, lime, etc. These items, like feed, must be delivered to the farm, even allowing for a proportion of farmers who have facilities and help to handle these materials themselves.

At the present time, local production of eggs is the heaviest in many months. Retail prices are averaging lower than a few weeks ago. The range of prices is running from 50 to 55 cents per dozen for 24-ounce eggs. This means a pound of eggs at approximately 32 cents. Compared with other foods, there is nothing of equal value that can be obtained today. Beef, pork, and fish are high and scarce. Poultry meat, which is freely available, is comparatively cheap, and no black market exists in it. It would be unfortunate to force reduction in the production of poultry products in our State in the face of open statements that we are confronted with a very short food crop.

I sincerely hope that your board will consider seriously the necessity of deferment in several categories of the feed business at the present time. A few months from now it may be too late to prevent a general abandonment and curtailment of the animal and livestock industry.

Very truly yours,

DANIEL POLSKY,
Treasurer, the Yantic Grain & Products Co., Norwich, Conn.

Meat Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE D. WILLEY
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two letters with reference to the meat situation, as follows:

WILMINGTON PROVISION CO.,
Wilmington, Del., February 17, 1943.
Congressman EARLE D. WILLEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed find article regarding the "black market."

This company is in a terrible squeeze. Enclosed find Chicago telegram showing hogs at $15.75. Office of Price Administration price is $13.40. We will have to have some relief soon or this company will go out of business, as we cannot pay $15.75 and sell for $13.40 per hundred.

You will note on the telegram that eastern order buyers are in the market for all class of top steers, price $16.90. Every steer that costs $16.90 has to be sold in the East in the "black market," as these steers, when dressed, would cost 29 to 30 cents per pound. Office of Price Administration price on grade AA beef is $23.75.

Every retailer who buys this meat from a slaughterer has to pay at least $20 to $25 to him, or he would not be able to get any meat. This also applies to live calves, sold in your town in two auction markets, 19 to 21 cents per pound. Calves at this price would cost 30 cents per pound dressed. The highest Office of Price Administration price that anyone can charge is 24 cents.

Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard must place a price on livestock. We can't have a price on dressed meats and not a price on livestock.

Yours truly,

WILMINGTON PROVISION CO.,
MAX MATTHES, *President.*

E. G. JAMES CO.,
February 20, 1943.

We believe that most concerns in the meat industry are in full agreement with the Office of Price Administration that it is necessary to have rigid dollars and cents price ceilings on all kinds of meat in order to control inflation, and also agree with the Department of Agriculture that it is important that the farmers be encouraged to increase livestock production to the limit, realizing at the same time that the most effective factor to bring about increased production is a relatively high price on the livestock judged by the standards of the past few years.

We also believe that the chief reason which has, so far, prevented the responsible officials from putting ceilings on livestock, has been their fear that such ceilings, if high enough to satisfy the farmer, would be inflationary in effect, and that if livestock ceilings were established on the basis of the present existing ceilings on meats (and to comply with the act of Congress which specifies that a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for processing), they would be so low that they would cause dissatisfaction among the farmers and reduce the chances of increased production which is so urgently needed. It also probably has been feared that if the ceilings on meats were raised to a level comparable with a livestock ceiling, sufficiently high as suggested above to satisfy the farmer, that this, in turn, would probably create demand from labor for increased wages.

Putting a ceiling of $15.50 per hundredweight on top quality butcher hogs would probably be satisfactory to the farmers. According to the general understanding of the trade, the pork cut ceiling prices are based on a hog price of $13.65; so raising the price to $15.50 would be a raise of $1.85 per hundredweight. If this is converted back to pork cuts, as defined in ceiling regulations, combined with cheek and head meat, lips, ears, snouts, tongues, livers, and hearts, on a basis of 75-percent yield from live weight, it would require an advance on these meat items of about $2.40 per hundredweight. The situation on beef is more or less similar.

It is our opinion that when and if the meat-rationing plan goes into effect that raising present ceilings, on meat $2.40 per hundredweight would not be inflationary. As we understand it, the present tentative rationing plan calls for a maximum ration of 2 pounds per person of all kinds of meat; so that if the meat ceiling were raised $2.40 per hundredweight, it would mean that the increased cost of the meat legally obtainable by each individual by the raising of the meat ceiling $2.40 per hundredweight would be less than 5 cents per week.

Inasmuch as the average consumption of meat per individual under the rationing system will be less than it was formerly, the actual money spent for meat, even if the price is advanced about 2½ cents per pound, will be less than it was before the rationing system went into effect; so the danger of inflation would be nil. It seems to us that a plan of this kind would accomplish a number of very important objectives. It would (1) eliminate many of the violations of Office of Price Administration regulations; (2) satisfy the farmers; (3) increase production of livestock; (4) allow a great many small businessmen in the meat industry in the United States to remain in business whose existence cannot continue for long under present conditions.

We believe that most farmers are law abiding and, like most packers, would comply with ceiling regulations on livestock if they were established on an equitable basis. It must be remembered that at the present time, when farmers sell their livestock at prices much higher than are warranted by the ceilings on meat, they are not violating any law or regulation irrespective of the selling method of the buyers.

E. G. JAMES CO.,
Per E. G. JAMES.

Ruml Plan Would Benefit Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to challenge the propaganda which is being circulated that the Ruml pay-as-you-go plan will, if enacted, be injurious to the best interests of our soldiers.

It is absolutely untrue to say that the adoption of the Ruml pay-as-you-go plan would adversly affect members of the armed forces by piling up an additional burden of taxation on them when they return from the war. This contention is based on the false assumption that since the Ruml plan involves the cancelation of the 1942 tax liability, a tremendous loss of revenue will occur which will have to be made up later. The fact is, however, that no loss of revenue to the Treasury would be involved, since the Ruml plan would simply substitute 1943 incomes as a basis for assessment of 1943 income taxes instead of 1942 incomes. The revenue would continue to flow into the Treasury as usual, the only difference being that 1943 taxes would be geared to the higher level of 1943 income, which will actually result in a collection this year of thirteen billions in personal income taxes as against ten billions if 1943 taxes are based on 1942 incomes. No additional burden of taxes has to be imposed now or in the future to make up any revenue loss, since none will occur.

Instead of being adversely affected by the adoption of the Ruml plan, members of the armed forces would actually be among the chief beneficiaries. If the present year-behind collection system is continued, they will have to pay a high tax on their 1942 civilian incomes out of a soldier's meager pay, which in many cases may be less than the tax liability. If the Ruml plan is adopted, their 1942 liability would be canceled, and they would be subject to tax in 1943 only on their service pay, and in the future they would pay income tax based on their current income, whether as members of the armed forces or as civilians. In other words, the boys in the service, along with all others, would be rid of any income-tax debt.

At the present time, a single man who earned $3,000 a year in civilian life in 1942 and went into the Army January 1 as a private owes $400 tax, which must be paid out of his Army pay of $50 per month. Under certain conditions, this income-tax debt may be deferred until after the war, but it still remains a debt. If the Ruml plan is adopted, this man's 1943 tax liability will be based on his 1943 income as a private soldier, and not on his $3,000 civilian income in 1942. Thus he would owe a 1943 tax of only $5 instead of $400. Hence the soldier stands to gain tremendously by the adoption of the Ruml plan, and there will be nothing for him to make up when he lays aside his uniform and begins hunting for a civilian job.

Only the Ruml plan will get taxpayers fully current in 1943. All substitute proposals would postpone the time of getting current for at least several years, and at the same time would substantially increase taxes by carrying forward the 1942 liability and requiring it to be paid in whole or in part over a period of years in addition to current taxes. The Ruml plan is the only plan which enables taxpayers to get immediately and fully out of debt for their taxes, and immediately and fully on a current pay-as-you-go basis.

Shortage of Dairy Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter I recently received from Mr. Wayne Bozarth, a dairyman of Woodland, Wash., which states very concisely, intelligently, and with facts and figures the plight of many dairy farmers in western Washington, and which suggests a sensible, workable, logical solution not only for their trouble, but one that will directly help cure the already drastic shortage of dairy-farm products.

I would like to point out, as regards this revealing letter from Mr. Bozarth, that the figures he cites are those taken straight from his own books. They are authoritative, and I know that they are typical of the figures which hundreds and thousands of Washington dairymen are poring over in despair day and night in my district. Briefly, Mr. Bozarth draws a comparison between his production costs for 1941 and 1942, and the amount of butterfat which his herd produced. And he says:

> The fluctuations * * * reveal to me the reason why so many dairy cattle are being butchered.

These typical figures also reveal to me why so many of the dairymen in western Washington are forced to sell their herds, and why so many are going into the shipyards at high wages rather than staying on their farms to work from dawn to dark for incomes so small they cannot maintain a decent livelihood in the high-cost era of this war.

The only thing which these figures do not reveal is what the Federal Government—what the Congress—is going to do about this situation. Mr. Bozarth says:

> Give me a fair price, and I will produce the goods.

I echo that plea most earnestly. Note that he does not ask for a high price. He says "a fair price." Mr. Bozarth and the other farmers of America are going to have to get their fair prices, or the general public is going to have to exist on a whole lot less food than we even now can foresee.

The letter from Mr. Bozarth follows:

WOODLAND, WASH., *February 16, 1943.*

Hon. FRED NORMAN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As an individual dairyman, I am writing you concerning dairy farm prices. For the past 7 years, I have kept a complete set of farm records and believe I have a pretty fair understanding of the dairy situation. In making a brief comparison of 1941 and 1942 account books, I would like to mention a few facts as my records show them:

1941:

Labor	$719.50
Feed	$1,305.40
Butterfat produced---pounds	11,016.2

1942:

Labor	$1,999.60
Feed	$2,516.05
Butterfat produced---pounds	13,219.67

In producing the extra 2,203.47 pounds of butterfat, I find my receipts only $500 above receipts for 1941.

The above fluctuation in feed and labor, along with the fact that labor is almost unobtainable, reveals to me the reason why so many dairy cattle are being butchered.

A raise in farm prices must come to produce ample food for our armed forces, allies, and our own civilians. I urge you as Congressman to direct your efforts to better this situation. I do not want a subsidy payment, or so-called incentive payment, in order that I may continue in business.

The dairy industry is one of the greatest industries in the United States, and, therefore, should be self-supporting. Give me a fair price and I will produce the goods.

Very respectfully,

WAYNE I. BOZARTH.

Dangerous Ignorance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., of Tuesday, February 23, 1943, entitled "Dangerous Ignorance":

DANGEROUS IGNORANCE

Dr. T. W. Schultz, head of the Department of Economics, Iowa State College, is quoted by a press association as having said, on a recent University of Chicago Round Table broadcast, that "the Nation's most serious agricultural problem is getting the cotton-growing South to convert itself to war needs." He is also alleged to have said that "it would not hurt the war effort one iota if we dumped all the 1943 cotton crop into the Gulf of Mexico." We heard the broadcast and the press quotations jibe with our memory of the gist of Dr. Schultz' remarks. Now, surely, if ignorance be bliss, Dr. Schultz must be almost too happy to stand it.

If this attitude of one college professor was alone to be considered, it would be more irritating than important, but there is some rather substantial evidence that others more highly placed in determining matters share something of his erroneous views. In any

event, there follows part of a letter to Dr. Schultz from A. L. Ward, director of the educational service of the National Cottonseed Products Association, Inc., Dallas. Mr. Ward says:

"One hundred thousand bullets can be fired by powder made from one bale of cotton linters; and there is no surplus of cotton linters, or of munitions.

"Six hundred and forty pounds of feed products (400 pounds of cottonseed meal, a high protein concentrate, and 240 pounds of cottonseed hulls) are produced every time we produce 500 pounds of lint cotton; and there is a critical shortage of these feed products.

"Cotton will supply this year 2,200,000 tons of cottonseed meal. Every experienced livestock feeder knows protein is essential for successful and economical production of meat and milk.

"Cottonseed hulls, in addition to being a feed roughage, are an essential material for producing synthetic rubber and aviation gasoline; and there is a shortage of cottonseed hulls.

"One billion four hundred and forty-three million pounds of vegetable oil will be produced from the 1942 cottonseed crop, at a time when fats and oils are so scarce that housewives are urged to save the drippings from their cooking. Cotton accounted for 62 percent of the 1941–42 United States production of edible vegetable oils. Estimates for 1942–43 indicate cotton will account for not less than 48 percent of the total production of edible vegetable oils. The percentage decrease is due to encouragement given to soybean and peanut production. * * *

"Every one of these cottonseed products contributes directly to the war. We do not have a surplus, but a shortage of these products. Everyone knows the need for munitions; and cotton linters for making munitions have been classified by the War Production Board as among the Nation's most critical scarce materials. Everyone knows the scarcity of fats and oils, and cotton is the most dependable source of vegetable oil that can be grown in the Southeast, South, and Southwest, as well as in most years the Nation's largest source of vegetable oil. The critical shortage of protein, as furnished by cottonseed meal, is also well known; we have had inquiries from Iowa livestock raisers and feed firms seeking to buy cottonseed meal this year, despite your increased soybean production. Cottonseed hulls also are very scarce, and hulls are both a livestock feed and a raw material in making aviation gasoline and synthetic rubber."

Mr. Ward wound up by asking adequate correction of misleading impressions and enclosed an impressive number of printed items that give the true place and value of cotton in the war effort. We trust Dr. Schultz has time to explain himself after he has read the books and things. Such ignorance is dangerous and expression of it tends to cause controversies without necessity.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address on Abraham Lincoln by William J. Gross, editorial editor of the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel, delivered February 10, 1943, at Fort Wayne, Ind., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I have received an estimate from the Government Printing Office which indicates that it will cost $105 to print the address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Republicans, it will be exactly 80 years next November since Abraham Lincoln, the first Republican President and, next to Washington, the greatest of our Chief Magistrates, stood on what had been the scene of the most decisive battle of a great war, and delivered his brief but magnificently eloquent Gettysburg Address. He concluded that address with the never-to-be-forgotten plea that government of the people, by the people, and for the people might not perish from the earth.

Now, we are, so to speak, met on another battlefield of another war, to test whether that Lincolnian concept of human liberty, human dignity, and human sovereignty under God, is to be supplanted and superseded by the iniquitous proposition that government of bureaucracy, by bureaucracy, and for bureaucracy shall now sully and despoil the earth.

Lincoln, at Gettysburg, was a little less than a year and a half from victory for the Union cause—and also from his own death. It may be that we today are either nearer to or further from a similar triumph for the Republic's cause in the present conflict. It is almost certain that virtually all of us will experience, during the next year and a half, considerable pain and sorrow and suffering. It may well be that some of us are unpleasantly close to more or less personal peril incurred from our loyalty to the Republic and its highest ideals.

May we, in any case, here highly resolve that neither the storm and strife of future events, nor any regard for personal safety or convenience, shall deter us from the heaven-blessed purpose to stand fast in our adherence to Abraham Lincoln's great ideals; his shrewd, practical wisdom; his exemplary patience—and his unconquerable courage.

In the spirit of his immortal Gettysburg Address, we may appropriately emulate Lincoln's modesty, undisturbed by the reflection that the world will little note nor long remember what we do here, but sustained by the assurance that the world can never forget what has been done, and is even now being done, by unfaltering men of principle.

When Abraham Lincoln was born in Kentucky, 134 years ago this week, Thomas Jefferson was still President of the United States, and Jefferson's well-esteemed Secretary of State, James Madison, was about to be inaugurated as fourth President of the Republic. It should not be overlooked that through ut his life Abraham Lincoln, the first Republican President, was an ardent admirer of Jefferson, who is generally regarded as the founder of the Democratic Party. It may be noted, also, that Lincoln was born and reared to young manhood as a Democrat and that he was known, despite his youth, as something of a Democratic partisan.

We may, as Hoosiers, derive at least some sentimental satisfaction from the fact that while Lincoln came to Indiana as a Jacksonian Democrat, he left Indiana for Illinois as a convinced Whig at the age of 21; and that this severance of ties with the party of his fathers was the first step along the road which led him at last to prominence in the foundation of America's only successful third party thus far, the Republican Party to which you and I belong.

I do not, however, propose to discuss today Abraham Lincoln, the partisan, although it may be permitted, in passing, to note that Lincoln turned his back on the party of Jefferson because that party had already, even then, turned its back on the first principles of its illustrious founder. And it may be appropriate to add here that the people turned to Lincoln in 1860 because he and his new party stood for something. The Democrats had slumped from the libertarianism of Jefferson into a defense of human slavery; and the Whigs, the other principal party of the time, had degenerated into a largely wishy-washy, spineless group of big business spokesmen and rudderless opportunists, afraid to call their souls their own, and coldly unresponsive to the upwelling tides of deep conviction in the soul of the American public.

The road which Lincoln traveled, from the time when he became a Whig to the day when he was elected the sixteenth President of the United States, was, in more than one respect, a rough and rocky passage. His progress to the Presidency was characterized by many abusive and insulting smear campaigns directed against him. But we have time here to note no more than one or two instances.

Perhaps, at this moment, when we have so recently held congressional elections, it may be well to glance at Lincoln, the Congressman, whose remarks in the House of Representatives were assailed by the Democratic press in his home district as imbecile and silly. That same press impugned Lincoln's patriotism, and charged him with giving aid and comfort to Mexico's Santa Ana, whom we may perhaps designate as having been the Hitler of his time. Lincoln was charged by those Democratic newspapers in Illinois as being—and I quote them literally—"a slanderer of the President," a "defender of the butchery of the Alamo," and as having made "a base, dastardly, and treasonable attack upon President Polk." They called him "a black disgrace to the Seventh Illinois District," "one who has heaped odium and infamy upon the living brave and the illustrious dead," "this Benedict Arnold of our district," and so on, and so on. These are direct quotations from the Democratic press of 1848. They were provoked by Congressman Lincoln's flatfooted opposition to American aggression against Mexico under the administration of James K. Polk, who, like today's Secretary of State Cordell Hull, hailed from Tennessee.

Lincoln's vigorous attack upon the Polk administration was made in a speech in the old House of Representatives (now Statuary Hall in the Nation's Capitol). Polk's assertions of American claims to certain Mexican territory, Lincoln said, were "from beginning to end, the sheerest deception." President Polk, he said, was trying to "wring something (from the situation) in justification of himself in connection with the Mexican War." He wanted the President to answer certain questions. Here I quote Congressman Lincoln: "Let him, for instance, point out the spot on American soil where the first American blood was shed. * * * If he cannot, or will not, answer, I will be convinced of what I have more than suspected already—that he (the President) is deeply conscious of being in the wrong; that he feels the blood of this war, like the blood of Abel, is crying to heaven against him; that originally having some strong motive * * * to involve the two countries in a war, and trusting to escape scrutiny by fixing the public gaze upon the exceeding brightness of military glory—that attractive rainbow that arises in showers of blood—that serpent's eye that charms to destroy—he plunged into it and has swept on and on till, disappointed in his calculation of the ease with which the enemy might be subdued, he now finds himself he knows not where."

Then Congressman Lincoln, warming to his indictment of Polk the warmonger, exclaimed: "How like the half-insane mumblings of a fever dream is the whole war part

of the President's last message! * * * His mind, taxed beyond its power, is running hither and thither, like some tortured creature on a burning surface, finding no position on which it can settle down and be at ease."

And when Lincoln asked when would peace come, Polk did not say. The war had been going on now for about 20 months, and the President did not have "even an imaginary conception" of when it would end. No wonder, said Lincoln, no wonder the President was "a miserably perplexed man." "God grant," Lincoln shouted, "God grant he may be able to show there is not something about his conscience more painful than all his mental perplexity!" That was the speech which sent the Democratic press of Illinois into such a frothing fit of assault upon Congressman Lincoln. But do you know, today, of a single historian worthy of the name who has not pronounced upon the Polk administration's war of aggression against a sister nation the same verdict which Abraham Lincoln pronounced 95 years ago last month?

Yet, back home, in 1848, Lincoln's law partner, Billy Herndon, typical of all too many fair-weather friends and weak-spined super-respectables of the present day, immediately developed an awful case of the high jitters. He was terribly concerned over Lincoln's political future. He sent a worried letter to Washington. In a typical reply, which began "Dear William," Congressman Lincoln asked his partner: "Would you have voted what you felt, and knew, to be a lie?" Herndon was unable to answer that question, but he sent to Lincoln a new set of misgivings. Whereupon Lincoln wrote back to his law partner—this time a little sharply. "Why," Lincoln asked, "why did the Constitution give to Congress exclusively the power to declare war?" And he answered his own question in these words: "So that no one man could plunge the country into war, as kings had done."

And nobody, even among his enemies, attempted to refute his point. But, as so often happens when a man is under fire, his supposed friends ran to cover like scared rabbits. Instead of fighting back with the truth, they turned "appeasers"; they fawned upon the falsifying foes of their faithful friend. Lincoln saw all this, and, being above all things a realist, he announced that he would not be a candidate to succeed himself. He was a poor man; he had a living to make; he was a good lawyer. So he considered that a candidacy for a second term was not worth the candle.

Besides, Lincoln, knowing that he was right, could afford to wait. Several times afterward he made unsuccessful bids for public office. Weaker men might have been discouraged. But not the patient Lincoln. He could afford to wait. His hour would come. It did. Thirteen years after his blistering attack upon President Polk, he himself was President Lincoln.

And no sooner had he become President than Polk's party precipitated the bloody Civil War. It must have seemed to Lincoln that that party "just had to be fighting"—if not against some foreign power, then against the American Union itself. But still brave, still patient, still fortified by a sense of his own rightness, still unwilling to evade the responsibility of any crisis, he accepted the challenge of the rule-or-ruin divisionist Democrats and beat the secessionists to their knees.

Here let us address ourselves briefly to the 4 bitter Civil War years, contrasting Abraham Lincoln, the victor, with Jefferson Davis, the vanquished President of the Southern Confederacy.

Davis, who had been Secretary of War in the expansionist-imperialist administration of Franklin Pierce, was always characterized by a flair for the military, accentuated perhaps by a very slight dash of practical military experience. In this he exemplified the truth of Alexander Pope's reminder that "a little learning is a dangerous thing." It is not surprising that such a man was inclined to keep the military command too directly in his own Presidential hands. Davis, of course, lost the war.

Davis, as head of the secessionist South, had, as one historian declares, "neither the time to exercise effective control nor the talent to choose effective instruments"—because he tried to hang on to too much direct military supervision himself. Perhaps this point may remind some of us of one or two more recent instances.

It is noteworthy, also, that according to this same historian, Davis' "state papers show an increasing querulousness and bitterness," and we may recall that only two of Davis' original Cabinet members resigned—after quarreling with the Confederate President, as Harry Woodring, of Kansas, quarreled with President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The remainder of Davis' cabinet, on the other hand, this historian points out, "inspired only slight confidence" among the people of the South. Davis lost the war.

Now, take the Cabinet of Abraham Lincoln. "Not a single member was a personal friend or follower of the President. His choice was restricted by the need of representing every element in his party, and also every loyal section of the Union." Moreover, Secretary of State Seward, of New York, did not bring the administration either strength or confidence until Seward had been stopped from "almost wrecking the administration by his aggressive foreign policy." I wish we had time to review some of this New York Secretary of State's international swashbuckling; but suffice it to say that Abraham Lincoln made him "cut it out!"

It will bear some emphasis that Lincoln was rather slow to prosecute the war; but he was more prompt and more steadfast in making it clear that the war itself was being fought only to preserve the Union, not for other goals, whether subsidiary or in some minds paramount.

Moreover, Lincoln made the citizenry of all the loyal States feel that their destiny was wrapped up in the Union cause. He didn't make some elements in the population feel that the war was being carried on successfully despite those elements.

It is important to take notice of the very solid fact that not a few northern members of Lincoln's own party did not see precisely eye to eye with him as to the goals and objectives of the conflict. Some of these northern Republicans were frankly critical of Lincoln's policy. He knew that this was so. But every historian of consequence has recorded that no inconsiderable part of Lincoln's strength stemmed from the fact that he, unlike some of his successors, did not seek to dominate all elements in the population, or even in his own party.

I feel that we should note, also, that Lincoln never failed to regard the South—that is, "the enemy"—with "sorrow and compassion." Never once did he have resort to the base emotions of blind, dishonest hate or brutal savagery.

In their text, entitled "Growth of the American Republic," Morison and Commager declare: "Lincoln refused to let politicians worry him into ordering an advance. * * * It was the true policy of the Union to postpone offensive movements until its superior resources were really organized for offensive war. It was the policy of the Confederacy, on the other hand, to force an issue promptly." The Confederacy was defeated.

Remember that after the first Battle of Bull Run, in 1861, the South "indulged in an orgy of conceit and self-applause, which it did not get over till 9 months later." And remember the mad impulsiveness and bloody desperation of maneuvers like Pickett's charge at Gettysburg. Yes; the Confederacy was defeated.

We may also note with some interest today that after the South's "little Pearl Harbor" assault upon the Norfolk Navy Yard (on April 20, 1861) Lincoln quickly ousted his Secretary of the Navy, and turned the Navy job over to Gideon Welles, who, with a highly capable assistant, justify Morison and Commager in stating that "the Navy was now much more efficiently directed, and without costly mistakes in higher command, since the country did not force it to make rear admirals out of politicians." The Union was not defeated—thanks to the administrative genius of Abraham Lincoln.

Looking toward 1944, we may recall here that 1864 was the first time in which a modern nation in such circumstances had ever faced a general election of this kind, under a true system of suffrage. There were some fools and some misguided patrioteers who toyed with the idea of postponing the Presidential election, or dispensing with it for an indefinite period. Lincoln rebuked them. Said he: "If the rebellion could force us to forego or postpone a national election, it might fairly claim to have already conquered and ruined us." And he made this statement despite the fact that he was firmly convinced that he would be defeated at the polls by one of his own generals, George B. McClellan, the northern Democratic candidate. Lincoln was not defeated—mostly because he knew the meaning of the word "principle" and had the fortitude to stand by principle.

Now, let us have a look at Abraham Lincoln's wartime attitude toward sensational or revolutionary post-war hypotheses. He did not try to stretch the war to cover a lot of fantastic notions about the specifications of a projected Utopia.

In his first message to Congress (December 3, 1861) he said: "I have been anxious and careful that the inevitable conflict shall not degenerate into a violent and remorseless revolutionary struggle." Contrast that, if you will, with some of today's "globalist" chatter about "world revolution"—"this is America's century," etc., which comes from the lips of certain overpublicized gentlemen who for 45 years were steeped in the anti-Lincoln partisanism of the party dominated by southern bourbons, but who now dare to speak in the name of Lincoln and have the impertinence to parade themselves as the perhaps "titular" leaders of Lincoln's party.

In his biography of Lincoln, Stephenson says: "Lincoln resisted, in late 1861, a new temper which was forming, a blend of all these elements of violent feeling which war inevitably releases, the resurrection of that primitive bloodlust which lies dormant in every peaceful nation like a sleeping beast." Lincoln, in the words of this biographer, was resisting those "hundred-percent-unconditional-surrender sort of patriots, sincere in their desire to win the war, yet certain to lose it for any government that yielded to their misguided zeal."

Again, in the summer of 1862, Lincoln repulsed the various "win the peace" wolves which skulked in various types of sheep's clothing. James Russell Lowell's Biglow Papers in June of that year was tantamount to an assertion that we might "win the war, but lose the peace." It contended that the chief issue was not saving the Union but, rather, the abolition of slavery. In the famous letter to Horace Greeley (August 22, 1862) Lincoln answered this argument of an eminent New England "intellectual." Said Lincoln: "If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; and if I

could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would do that." I wish to God that another war President could see his way clear to deliver a convincing paraphrase of that general purpose of keeping first things first.

Meanwhile, let us not overlook the fact that the chief agitators for the Civil War in the North—even in advance of secession—those who had most fanatically described it as the "irresponsible conflict"—had been the same persons who had manifested a most cordial interest in remaking the country's social forms. By no means the least of the testimonials to Abraham Lincoln's greatness is the fact that he at all times kept the main goal uppermost in mind. That is a yardstick by which history can measure all Presidents.

Now, let us hasten on:

Lee surrendered his armies on April 9, 1865. Two days later, Lincoln made his last public address, in which he unfolded his reconstruction policy, embodying what one historian justly describes as "the most magnanimous terms toward a helpless opponent ever offered by a victor, for Lincoln did not consider himself a conqueror," or even a "chief of state"—but only President of the United States. In no address to civilians, by the way, did Lincoln ever refer to himself as Commander in Chief. To have done so would have been to utter a falsehood. The President is Commander in Chief only of the Army and Navy. And Lincoln, faithful to his constitutional oath, never presumed to extend the scope of his constitutional power.

On April 14, 1865, at his last Cabinet meeting, Lincoln urged that the blockade against the South be lifted; that the Nation's thoughts be turned away from bloodshed or persecution, and toward reestablishing peace. That night, a fanatical Democrat, an actor who not unnaturally sought on all occasions to theatricalize things, sent a pistol ball ripping into the President's brain. And in the rainy dawn which followed, the Secretary of War declared, concerning the victim of Booth's bullet: "Now he belongs to the ages."

Immediately, and from the same region whence had come most of the premature northern agitation for war and for social reform, there swarmed a mongrel breed of politicians, sired by abolition out of profiteering. The war had been fought—and won—for its real motives, constantly kept foremost by Lincoln. But straightway the North's "do-gooders" sought to win the peace by wreaking still further—and unnecessary—destruction upon the vanquished South. The South had been a slave to some degree of freedom. Now it was to be freed from its slavery to that freedom—only to become a slave to an alien definition of "freedom."

It was not long until this machinery of salvation became the machinery of political control in the hands of the basest elements in the Republican Party—just as, one might say, a world-wide Work Projects Administration in the hands of radical social workers could become a political machine to compel this country's adherence to a world-wide New Deal. The conquered southerners after 1865 asked only food and land. What they got, however, was something like a quart of milk and some feverish agitation for political rights as prescribed by those who had proclaimed themselves the saviors of the South. The process of orderly reconstruction which the benign Lincoln had hoped to advance was criminally retarded by the bigoted win-the-peace element which ruthlessly pressed its arrogant theories beyond all reason. Booth's bullet, calculated to help the South, actually initiated the shameless orgy of oppression and corruption which was to go down in history as our most tragic era. Booth's bullet could not have produced all this calamity without the misdirected fake idealism of eastern Republicans, who, never in sympathy with Lincoln and his midwestern point of view, succeeded only in sabotaging national unity and engendering a long-persistent intersectional bitterness.

Ladies and gentlemen, their political heirs and successors are "at it again." I call upon you, as real, honest-to-God Lincoln Republicans, to resist them with everything at your command. If our Congress should yield to these eastern seaboard elements again—this coalition of big business imperialism and left wing "social reformism"—it would be opening the way toward another chaotic Reconstruction period—another tragic era, such as that which involved the attempted impeachment of Lincoln's successor, Andrew Johnson, a maverick ex-Democrat, a man not without ability, but one unable to cope with the powerful forces which pseudo-intellectual bigotry so readily lets loose.

Already this eastern seaboard element has its carpetbaggers abroad in the land—swarming over the country, desecrating the memory of Lincoln by false pretensions to a worthiness of leadership in Lincoln's party.

Finally, we can take no more than a passing glance at the fact that under Lincoln there was no censorship of the press, and that frank discussion of both war aims and peace terms was seldom hindered during his administration because Lincoln meant what he said when he asserted: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master."

I want to read you a few lines from a personal letter received by me, the other day, from an American officer in the service:

"Unless you back home continue to protect the home front as you have been doing, we will not, when we return, recognize that which we left behind when we entered the service. To you men who labor in defense of constitutional safeguards, we at the front owe a debt of gratitude. You who are charged with maintaining our American institutions must not fail us. If you ever do, then all our trials and tribulations, resulting from being torn from our families, will have been for naught, whatever the victories in arms may bring. Until we return, carry on—even unto your own jeopardy. Truth based upon Benjamin Franklin's Prayers, and Washington's Farewell Address, and Lincoln's serene philosophy must not fail us. They will not fail us if you continue to uphold them."

That was an encouraging injunction from one of our men at the front. And may I stress his phrase: "Even unto your jeopardy." May I ask you to remember that while our boys in the battle lines are drawing upon every resource of courage, just as did Lincoln's boys in blue, we have the moral obligation to mobilize all the resources of our civilian courage on the home front.

As Congressman, as candidate for the Senate, as President, Abraham Lincoln had to endure the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune as few men in history have had to bear them. His endurance may well serve us as a model in these times, which are not wholly unlike those in which he lived. Let us take that model and again resolve "that these honored dead shall not have died in vain." Our individual lives are as nothing by comparison with the cause to which Lincoln, long years ago, so conscientiously dedicated our party. May the leaders of that party, spurning the heresies which Lincoln spurned, standing unflinchingly in defense of the ideals which Lincoln served so faithfully, hear once more down the ages his heartening words at a council of war when the cause of the Union seemed to have ebbed to its lowest level:

"Courage, gentlemen, it is almost daybreak."

Vitamins for the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release entitled "More Vitamins Needed for the Home Front," which I issued as of February 18, 1943.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANPOWER PROBE BY SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE DISCLOSES THAT DIET OF CIVILIAN POPULATION SHOULD BE PROTECTED JUST AS HEALTH OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS IS GUARDED

Unless Government agencies regulating food distribution take steps to insure an adequate supply of necessary vitamins for the home front the United States war effort will be sharply restricted, Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS of North Carolina, chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, warned today.

"For 5 months," Senator REYNOLDS said, "the Military Affairs Committee of the United State Senate has been looking into manpower problems as they affect our home front and our overseas fronts. Our hearings disclose that our basic problem simmers down to the simple statement of how many men we can feed and transport. It is apparent that we have not got the transportation to move men overseas as fast and in the numbers we would like. It is equally apparent that in order to keep abreast of the wartime demand upon our economy we must greatly stimulate food production in order to keep our armed forces overseas and our production forces at home happy and contented.

"It should never be forgotten," Senator REYNOLDS asserted, "that the men and women at home are the men behind the man behind the gun. The man on the firing line is not efficient if the man on the defense line at home is not equally efficient. Both must be well fed and happy."

Senator REYNOLDS cited the results of the recently published Foodex Test conducted by Prof. Howard W. Haggard, of Yale University, in a large eastern aviation plant, to prove that "increasingly slender rations of the civilian population, which includes the defense workers, must be fortified with balanced, synthetic vitamins and minerals or 'absenteeism' will defeat the maximum production of war matériel."

He declared that the health of the civilian population should be guarded and fortified just as the Army and the Navy protect the physical well-being of soldiers and sailors.

"Unfortunately," he said, "the shelves of our grocery stores throughout the Nation are entirely too empty of essential foods containing the necessary vitamins and minerals. Government agencies should take immediate steps to make more of these foods, as well as synthetic vitamins, available through grocery outlets," adding that "the amount of daily requirements of all vitamins and minerals that are essential should be made available to the defense worker and the civilian population in food supplement form to relieve the growing food crisis and protect and build the health and stamina of the home front."

"At present," Senator REYNOLDS continued, "we have more than 1,000,000 men overseas on 62 different fronts stretching from Iceland and the equally icy Aleutian Islands to far-away China, India, and the Persian Gulf, as well as on the numerous islands, big and little, in the South Pacific. Before the year is over the number of men and women overseas will be greatly increased.

"The War Department is doing a marvelous job in providing our overseas forces with a scientific, balanced diet. The Navy Department is doing an equally splendid job. Our soldiers and sailors are receiving the right amount of vitamins and minerals. Their physical condition shows it. But, unfortunately, our investigation shows that our industrial workers, as well as our white-collar population, on whom the Nation must depend for the necessary production of planes and tanks and guns, are not receiving sufficient of the foods which contain the essential vitamins and minerals. Survey after survey in large and small defense plants have disclosed this unhappy situation. It is a condition which must be corrected without delay. Proper nutrition for the home forces is equally as important as proper nutrition for the uniformed forces. It is essential that the diet of our defense workers be supplemented with the necessary vitamins and minerals."

Senator REYNOLDS declared that the manpower hearings of the Military Affairs Committee have disclosed that there are two ways to destroy civilian morale—lack of fuel for the body (that is, shortage of oil and coal for heating purposes) and lack of fuel for the stomach (that is, shortage of health- and body-building foods). We must guard against a break-down of civilian morale by preventing shortages of body and stomach fuels.

"Vitamin concentrates costing millions of dollars were shipped to our British and Russian allies under lease-lend because these countries appreciate their importance in bolstering up the health, stamina, and vitality of their people." Senator REYNOLDS continued, "We here in the United States are beginning to run short of some of these important concentrates and the need for them becomes more and more apparent with the forthcoming rationing of protective foods.

"Happily, provision has been made by the Army and the Navy for the scientific feeding of the armed forces but, unhappily, the home folks have been so neglected that the possibility of a balanced diet for them in the future is rapidly disappearing. Now come Mr. Herbert Hoover and Secretary of Agriculture Wickard to warn the American people that we face a food crisis next fall because of inadequate manpower to produce and harvest crops. Likewise Mr. James F. Byrnes, the Director of Economic Stabilization, informs us that the War Department is giving serious consideration to the use of soldiers to help harvest the crops.

"Under the circumstances," Senator REYNOLDS continued, "it becomes all the more necessary for the Office of Price Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the Public Health Service, and other interested governmental agencies to take steps to make available an adequate supply of the necessary vitamins and minerals to insure public health and also to keep war workers happy and contented.

"Approximately 200 processed foods, canned, dried, and frozen fruits and vegetables, fruit and vegetable juices, canned soups, dairy products, including butter and cheese, heavy cream, meats, etc., have been or are in the process of being rationed, and are becoming scarcer every day. These foods contain the necessary vitamins and minerals which Government experts, nutritional authorities, and physicians say are necessary to normal health. If the home-front consumer is deprived of an ample supply of these foods, it obviously becomes the immediate task of the proper Government authorities to make certain that the required substitute vitamins and minerals are supplied. Army and Navy nutrition authorities point with pride to the fact that men and women in uniform are kept at peak efficiency because of scientific diets. Surely the home-front army, which must produce to keep the uniformed Army in the field, also is entitled to the assistance of the Government in obtaining a scientific diet.

"In our study of manpower problems, the Military Affairs Committee has investigated the workings of the selective-service law," Senator REYNOLDS went on. "Some of the disclosures were startling. Out of 2,000,000 young men examined for the draft, 900,000 were turned down for various physical defects. Many authorities claim that 50 percent of the rejections could be attributed to nutritional inadequacies. Medical journals report that vitamin and mineral deficiencies constitute a major factor in illness and disability in this country; that the lack of these nutritional factors has been responsible for many degenerative ills which have been growing in volume year after year.

"Dr. Russell M. Wilder, of the Mayo Clinic, who is chairman of the National Research Council, in an important study of 'nutrition and national defense,' asserts that Germany built a reserve of synthetic vitamin C of over 100 tons before the war. They put the science of nutrition early to work. We, on the contrary, were caught unprepared. It is a well-known fact that as the Germans occupied European countries, the first supplies to be confiscated were foods containing vitamins and minerals. By depriving the population of the conquered countries of these protective factors, the Germans were more easily able to subjugate the spirits of the people, to break their morale, and render them listless, weak, and unable to rise and resist the enemy. Here is an example of how the science of nutrition accomplished more than bullets, concentration camps, and executions.

"The Japanese demonstrated to the world how much they can take. Their endurance enabled them to advance in the Dutch East Indies, in Burma, in the South Pacific. They eat a little rice and dried fish, but many captured Japanese had on their persons concentrated rations of vitamins and minerals which they added to the energy food they carried with them.

"Now, let us take the American defense worker, the man behind the man behind the gun. There are 16 such men behind each soldier, producing the implements of war. A large portion of them have been recruited from the former ranks of unemployed and unskilled labor. Overnight we had to create in the United States an arsenal of war materials for the world, and supply these materials not only to our own armed forces but also to those of our allies. These implements of war must be produced by men who operate the tools and the machines, and feed the production lines that turn out those implements by the millions. How well are these defense workers prepared to fill their jobs?

"Every survey of whatsoever nature so far made indicates that the workers in defense plants subsist on deficient diets. They lack the protective elements (vitamins and minerals) which are so essential for production efficiency, reduction of absenteeism and accidents, and a higher state of physical and mental efficiency to meet the strains and stresses of uninterrupted work. And now that President Roosevelt has directed a 48-hour week—20 percent more energy is required of the defense worker. Unless he receives every nutritional essential that science knows is so important to build sturdy bodies and robust, buoyant health, this extra demand upon him may well 'break the camel's back.'

"The importance of supplementing the diet of the workers with all the vitamins and all the minerals which the Government has found to be essential to human nutrition has been recently demonstrated by a large-scale feeding test conducted by Prof. Howard W. Haggard, of Yale University. The results of this test were recently described in a scientific publication in an article entitled 'The Foodex Test.' For 60 days, each worker in a large defense plant ate this vitamin-mineral food supplement containing 9 vitamins, 8 minerals, and 4 rich sources of the entire natural B complex, providing among other elements all the vitamins and all the minerals that the Government has found essential, each in amounts that meet the adult minimum daily requirements established by the Government.

"The men reported excellent results in terms of general health benefits. But more important were the figures obtained from the plant's records reflecting the following: An increase in production, a large decrease in absenteeism, a substantial reduction in spoilage of materials, increased earnings for the workers, etc. A number of other industries are today taking advantage of the same type of supplemental vitamin-mineral feeding with equally satisfactory results.

"We know what is required to give a person the nutritional elements he needs to prosper in health. Now it is our job to provide the civilian and industrial population with all the protective factors that science has made available to compensate for what rationing and food shortages may take away. It is obvious that the industrial worker must be supplied with an abundance of vitamins and minerals as a supplement, if he is to do his share of producing the implements of war. How can workers be expected to work uninterruptedly, to produce implements of war, if they are to suffer a lowered standard of health?" Senator REYNOLDS inquired. "This serious condition suggests to enterprising Americans and to the administration that bold, scientific measures must be taken to prevent this greatest of catastrophes which we face—the ruined health of the American people brought on by what may prove to be a constantly increasing malnutrition. The fact that vitamins and minerals taken away from the public through the shortage of natural, protective foods can scientifically be compensated for seems to me to open up a vista of possibilities which might well be investigated and acted upon by executive agencies of the Government instead of by defense industries.

"Under the circumstances the Government should encourage by every legitimate means a greater knowledge of and a greater use of those vitamins and minerals which will keep our war effort at peak efficiency. These concentrates should be made available as supplemental foods in grocery stores and elsewhere where food is sold. There is no mystery about vitamins. The Government has proved this in the magnificent manner it has made vitamins available for the armed forces. The same consideration should be given to the civilian population. It is equally necessary for the winning of the war."

Need for a Working Liaison Between the Senate and the Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a short address entitled "The Need of a Working Liaison Between the Senate and the Executive," delivered by me over the facilities of Radio Station WOMT at Manitowoc, Wis., on February 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, on this anniversary of Lincoln's birth when the lessons of his life have such a direct application to the great problems confronting us today, I should have preferred to speak to you about those lessons and about the heritage which Lincoln has left us.

However, since I am speaking on this same subject tonight at a meeting here in Manitowoc, it was thought desirable that I should discuss a different subject at this time.

Accordingly, I should like to discuss very briefly, a subject which I believe is of as much importance today as peace discussions were in Lincoln's day.

Today we hear a great deal of talk about various peace proposals. Our first job is winning the war, but we must also think about setting up the mechanical facilities for handling the peace treaty when we do win our righteous victory.

In other words, if it is too early to talk about peace proposals and peace objectives, it is not too early to talk about avoiding the blunders which have been made in the past.

Our Constitution provides for two peacemaking authorities, the Executive and the Congress, and all peace treaties are required, of course, to be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

A great many historians have said that the soldiers have often won a war where the peace has been lost by the statesmen. After the last World War a great many observers felt that there could never be an enduring peace for the United States unless we succeeded in working out some kind of a peace between our peacemaking authorities themselves, as provided in the Constitution.

What do we mean by that? Well, the Chief Executive, through the Secretary of State, conducts peace negotiations and arranges for a peace treaty. This treaty is then brought to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and subsequently before the United States Senate for approval.

In American history there are many examples of the friction which developed when the Chief Executive brought such a treaty before the Senate as an accomplished fact. Perhaps the principal reason for the opposition of the Senate to many of these treaties has been the fact that the people's representatives were not consulted during the negotiation of the peace. In all of our past history the executive branch has considered its function to be simply that of negotiating and producing, whereas the Constitution provides that the Executive shall have the power "by and with the advice and consent" of the Senate to make treaties.

The word which has been overlooked and which I would stress emphatically at this time is the word "advice."

In planning the peace we are going to deal in global matters. We are going to think in terms of world-wide obligations for the American people. The destiny of the American people will be tied up in the treaties which mark the conclusion of this war. It will be imperative that the people's representatives have a voice in the formulation of these treaties, rather than being confronted with a treaty which has already been concluded by the Chief Executive without consultation with the representatives of the people.

Throughout our history there has never been any machinery to insure that the representatives of the people would be consulted in the negotiation of a peace, and as a consequence throughout our history treaties have been negotiated and then presented to the Senate without any previous consultation.

In the last session of Congress and again in this session of Congress, I have suggested a change in governmental mechanics with respect to treaty making.

I haven't suggested any change which will destroy the balance of power between the executive and the legislative branch. I have suggested the creation of machinery which I believe will make it possible for the people's representatives to be consulted by the Chief Executive before and at the time any peace treaty is negotiated.

I believe that in order to obtain a more effective working relationship between executive and legislative branches, we need a foreign relations advisory council. This council should include the Secretary of State, the Undersecretary of State, and any other technicians whom the secretary might designate, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the chairman and ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In other words, we should have an advisory council which would include the experts of the State Department and the leaders on those committees of both Houses dealing with foreign affairs.

This council, of course, would be concerned with the definition and formulation of the foreign policy of the United States. The agreements of the council would have the force of an understanding between the legislative and executive branches and could well serve as guideposts in the formulation of treaties. Treaties would be negotiated in accordance with definite policies as defined by the council and then submitted to the Senate for ratification.

The creation of this council would make it possible for Senate representatives on the floor to discuss the matter with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and to get the benefit and advice of that committee before the treaty itself had been formulated and completed. It would give the Chief Executive the benefit of the counsel and advice of the people's representatives before and during the negotiation of any treaty.

All that my proposal means, is that the representatives of the people would have a voice in the creation and the writing of the treaty. I think that is a very fair proposal. The people are fighting this war and there is no reason why their representatives should not have a voice in writing the peace treaty. There is no reason why we should have a repetition of the deadlock which has almost invariably accompanied the presentation of any treaty to the Senate—and the Versailles Treaty debate is an example of what I mean.

The creation of a council such as I propose would mean that there would be less chance for serious friction between the Executive and the Senate. It would mean that there would be less chance for a deadlock or stalemate on our peace treaty. It would mean that there would be less chance for the statesmen to lose the peace after the soldiers had won the war.

This could be a splendid example of democratic government at work because it would embrace the Executive and the representatives of the people working together on the establishment of a policy. It would result in a better working relationship between the Chief Executive and the Senate.

This proposal has received favorable editorial comments all over the Nation, and I am hopeful that it will receive favorable consideration in the near future.

I might add also that it is apparent that aside from the mechanical arrangement for treaty making, there are also other places in the congressional machinery which need modernization.

Our entire budget-making procedure needs modernization (if we are to avoid financial chaos), and our entire social-security arrangements need modernization.

I have introduced proposals to create joint congressional committees to consider both of these matters. The creation of such joint committees would insure a unified coordinated all-over policy which is essential at this time—and they should result in a long-needed governmental economy and efficiency.

Above all, however, I believe it is imperative that at the present time we create a committee which will insure a sound effective working relationship between the Chief Executive and the Congress in the conduct of any peace which may come.

Col. Walter S. Drysdale's Address to the Indiana Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, there is no finer or better officer in the United States Army than Col. Walter S. Drysdale, the commander of Fort Benjamin Harrison.

He has accomplished results that are truly marvelous in the rehabilitation and development of that strategically located Army post which, largely as a result of his executive and administrative genius, is today recognized as one of the very best posts of the entire Military Establishment.

By his splendid qualities of mind and heart he has endeared himself to the people of our community and State, and in recognition of the high esteem in which he is universally held in Indiana, the legislature of our State invited him to be its guest and speaker last Monday when the two branches met in a joint observance of Washington's birthday.

Colonel Drysdale told the assembled legislators that—

If George Washington were here today he would wholeheartedly respond to rationing and the principle of Selective Service.

The heritage of freedom which we defend against the onslaughts of the Axis powers stems from the spirit and deeds of George Washington. He had an exact mind which reached the very meat of every situation. Americans must emulate him today. If he were here today his logical mind would back this war to the limit. He would reject the idea of parents who want their sons to fight at home. The war will be won on foreign battlefields.

The speaker told his listeners that this year may determine whether we win or lose this war.

We built an Army, Navy, and Air Corps largely after we were attacked. Many people do not realize the difficulty we face in making citizens into soldiers. But the citizen army

and navy have the will to fight—the will to win. These men of 1943 echo the Yank sergeant at Belleau Woods, "Come on you sons of guns, do you want to live forever?" We are building the greatest Army, Navy, and Air Corps in the history of the world. It is your fighting army. You select them, and your legislators are representatives.

At Fort Harrison we have no loafers. Every man buys bonds to the limit.

We are all familiar with the hardships that Army had to endure at Valley Forge. They faced a bitter winter with threadbare clothes, with no shoes, with little food. But despite those hardships, they complained little about rationing or shortages. They did not adopt a "me first" attitude. They knew that war meant sacrifice; they knew the price of freedom. They were glad to pay that price. Theirs is the spirit that the vast majority of our people still have today—spirit that once more will enable us to fight our way through a victory.

Our front extends from north Africa to the steppes of Russia toward Asia and the Pacific over thousands of miles of fighting front. A primary requirement in winning this war is the distribution and utilization of United Nations strength. Whether the bulk of this force is to be used first in one theater of war and later in another theater and what the strength of the principal effort should be and where it should strike is manifestly the responsibility of the Allied staff. I believe the superior talents of these military minds, utilizing all the information at their disposal concerning the strength and weaknesses of the enemy as well as our own, will result in the correct decision. And while I defend the right of any citizen to speak out, I do believe Americans may rest assured that our own military decisions will be made by our finest experts.

All eyes are fixed on north Africa today where we have suffered reverses. We cannot expect easy victory. The tide of battle may change time and time again. You legislators should tell the people that we are building up on armed forces in order that we may take the offensive in many theaters of action. Soon that offensive will start. It will mean increased casualties and greater sacrifices. We should all continue to do our utmost in winning the war whether on the battlefield, on the production line, or on the transportation lines at home and abroad, in the face of increased hardships. Every American should say to himself today, "I will avenge our dead by devoting every energy and thought to win this war."

We are an optimistic people. I have been amazed to hear people say that they expect the war to end this year. We face a long and hard struggle. However, I do not believe we should swing to the pessimistic viewpoint because we have suffered reverses.

Colonel Drysdale said that from a long series of defeats "Washington's genius and perseverance plucked the flower of victory."

He stressed the need for continuous effective effort on the home front.

Colonel Drysdale was introduced by Lt. Gov. Charles M. Dawson, who reviewed the speaker's military career and said it was fitting he should appear on the birthday anniversary of Washington.

Mrs. Otto B. Heffner sang America and then led the assembly in mass singing of Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition.

Colonel Drysdale prefaced his talk by saying that he appeared as a private citizen and not as a representative of the War Department. Many visitors were in the galleries.

Size of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a very sober and important address by the Under Secretary of War, Hon. Robert P. Patterson, delivered February 23 in Pittsburgh, Pa. I agree wholeheartedly with his statement that nothing would give the enemy greater aid and comfort than a reduction in the size of our armed forces, which was established by the careful plans of our able and experienced military chiefs to achieve victory at the earliest possible moment.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight in Europe and Africa an Axis armed force of millions of tough and battle-hardened soldiers face America and our gallant allies. They outnumber us. They have all the advantages of short supply routes.

Our own men have been in contact only with the smallest of the Axis armies—a part of its Tunisian force of less than a quarter of a million men. But the striking force of this powerful foe has already been felt by our troops. We have suffered a setback at the hands of this German Army, but not because of lack of supplies.

The German field armies are assisted by more than 1,000,000 men in semimilitary organizations, such as the military police, engineers, and supply depots, which in our Army are included among service troops.

There are also the other Nazi outfits of many kinds which seem to thrive on German soil.

Reliable sources indicate that the combined number of those in the German and Italian armed forces and those directly assisting them runs well over 13,000,000. It is evident at this point that the superiority of our enemies in the European theater is of ominous proportions.

A similar analysis in the Pacific area does not brighten the picture. The Japanese Army exceeds by many divisions the forces that the United Nations have been able to equip and place in opposition.

Yet the United Nations, and particularly this country, have the potential power to overcome this numerical superiority. These potentialities must be converted to actuality. They must be harnessed and driven toward a single goal, the defeat of our enemies. In that drive our country, the latest of the major powers to enter the war, must play the most important part. We must swing the tide of battle in our favor, not ultimately but now, this year, in 1943. Time is not on our side. We must not let this be a long war of attrition. We must not let Germany and Japan consolidate and utilize their vast conquests. We must take the offensive.

Offensive action requires superiority in numbers. This is the reason we need an army of 8,200,000, including officers, by the end of this year. The Navy, the Marines, and the Coast Guard need 2,600,000 this year. That makes a total of 10,800,000 men and women that must be in the armed forces by the end of this year. This will be less than 8½ percent of our total population. Thirteen and one-half percent of the German population is in the armed forces.

Ten million eight hundred thousand is not a figure pulled out of a hat. It is the requirement determined by those charged with the heavy responsibility of winning this war.

General Marshall says that we need so many planes and so many tanks to win the war. Is there anyone in America who would question his judgment? Admiral King says that we need so many escort ships and destroyers to beat the Axis. Is there anyone in America who would question his judgment? The expert views of our military leaders are accepted on our needs for guns and ships. Why should anyone question their judgment as to the number of men that they need to use these weapons and man these ships?

The staffs of the Army and the Navy under General Marshall and Admiral King in full possession of the facts, have made the military decision that a force this size is necessary to win the war. Our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, has approved this program. It is America's answer to the Axis. The Axis, I assure you, does not like that answer.

In making this decision full account has been taken of the ability of American industry and labor and agriculture to produce the supplies needed by our forces, by our allies, and by our civilian economy. Full account has also been taken of the ability of our rapidly expanding merchant marine to deliver soldiers and supplies overseas. The conclusion reached was that it was a hard job, but that it could and must be done.

But there are critics of the Army program who ask, "Why should we fight? Why not give more supplies to the British, the Chinese, and the Russians and let them fight for us?"

The British, with the smallest available manpower and subject to savage aerial attacks, have come nearer than any other of the United Nations to the full-time war employment of every man, woman, and child. The Chinese have been heroically fighting for 5½ years. The Russians, by brilliant tactics and with indomitable courage, have killed more Nazis than all the other United Nations combined. We should all pause today on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Soviet Russian Army to think of the tremendous debt we owe to those gallant peoples. We should give tribute to their dead, for they have sacrificed countless lives. But their manpower is not inexhaustible.

Since when has America adopted as its national policy, "Let George do it"?

This is our war just as much as it is the war of the British, the Russians, and the Chinese. We are sending supplies to the utmost of our ability to these and the other United Nations. We will continue to do so. But it will be our soldiers and sailors, and those of our allies, that will win the final victory.

Elemental truths are often the most difficult to grasp. Throughout all ages peoples have tried to avoid facing up to the reality that war is grim business; have longed for an easy war; and have hoped that somehow, some way, victory could be gained without risking too much or without experiencing the stark unpleasantness of the conflict. But all the wishing in the world does not change the nature of war and its impact on all peoples engaged in it, whether in the battle lines or at home.

The hour for realism has arrived for every American. We must brace ourselves for mounting casualty lists and reverses on the battle front, and for more arduous labors and sacrifices on the home front.

Realism must extend from the fox holes and pill boxes on the firing line to the factories and homes of America. When our country is at war, none of us can escape the responsibility of viewing the routine, as well as the

emergency duties of life, in the light of their bearing upon the final result—unconditional surrender by our enemies.

Only thus can we successfully combat the tendency to gage our war effort, not by what must be done or can be achieved, but by what, through half-heartedness, might become our self-imposed potential.

You in Pittsburgh have done a magnificent job in production for war. But you have an even heavier task ahead. You will have serious problems because of the increasing drain on your manpower. But similar problems have been solved in England, Russia, Germany, and Japan. Nonessential activities are out for the duration and these countries are fully mobilized—to a much greater extent than we. On every one rests the equal obligation to give service either in the armed forces or on the home front. Why should we suppose that we can wage war successfully without mobilizing our human resources with a thoroughness at least approaching that of our enemies and of our principal allies?

The needs of the armed forces must come first. The problems of turn-over and absenteeism must and can be solved. Each of us must work to the utmost of his capability.

We must also tackle our farm-labor problem with vigor. There are white collar workers in nonessential industries who can go back to the farms from which they came. There are victory gardens to be encouraged. More work can be done by women. Farm machinery can be pooled. Many steps can be taken to increase production on the farms.

We cannot solve our manpower problems by whittling down the size of our armed forces, by permitting one special group after another to obtain blanket deferments. The problem must be tackled at its source. Everyone wants to do his or her share to help win the war and must serve where he or she can render the best service. The decision cannot be based upon personal desire.

With vast territories and resources at their disposal, the Axis cannot be defeated by a blockade. Victory will come from decisive military action, backed by an armed force and ability so overwhelming superior that the enemy's further action will be futile.

In World War No. 1 it was our American Expeditionary Force of 2,000,000, added to the strength of our allies, that made the enemy surrender. On November 11, 1918, the Allies had 32 fresh divisions in reserve. The Germans only had 2. The Allies had a total of 213 divisions. The Germans had 185. The Germans were aware of these figures. Their ability to reason from figures is well known. They decided that they could not win, and they quit.

Now, as then, the enemy must be made to realize that they cannot win. Now, as then, we must make them see that we are going to see the job through.

Nothing would give the enemy greater aid and comfort than a reduction in our Army.

War demands sacrifices. Sacrifice is the price of victory. The American people have never failed to answer the call to duty. They will not do so now.

H. R. 1800

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters commenting on the bill I have introduced, H. R. 1800, which provides a pay-as-you-go tax plan.

Most of the comments are highly favorable. An Indianapolis friend writes:

I read with great interest the bill you have introduced on the pay-as-you-go plan. I also showed it to some 15 or 20 "boys" on the board of accounts and several members of the legislature with whom we happened to be lunching Tuesday noon. Without exception we all thought it much the simplest and fairest proposal we had seen up to now. I hope you secure the passage of this bill, as it is eminently fair and equitable and meets all the objections I have heard about letting those off easy who made more last year than they will this year. Several persons have told me they will not be able to meet their taxes if we do not have a pay-as-you-go plan. I suppose the situation is general.

I submit for consideration of the House the following editorial from the Indianapolis Times and all the other Scripps-Howard papers, and a letter from Wayne Coy, the Assistant Director of the Budget:

WHICHEVER YEAR'S TAX IS HIGHER

(Editorial in the Scripps-Howard newspapers)

In the testimony on the Ruml pay-as-you-go income-tax plan, practically all witnesses agree—

1. That the Treasury would probably collect more money under this plan, because national income is rising, and because taxes would be collected at the source before taxpayers had a chance to spend all they earned; and

2. That the taxpayers would be better off under this plan, because it would rid them of income-tax debt.

Yet the Treasury opposes the Ruml plan, the essence of which is to base this year's income tax on this year's income rather than on 1942 income.

Most of the Treasury's arguments were demagogic bombast. But the Treasury did offer one possibly valid criticism of the Ruml plan—which is that a few taxpayers who happened to have unusually large incomes in 1942, and smaller incomes in 1943, would pay a lesser tax than they should pay. A man who made a lot of money on a war contract in 1942 might be an example.

Very well, why not close this loophole? Neither Mr. Ruml nor anyone else advocates giving anybody a tax windfall. Why not provide that each taxpayer must pay his tax on whichever year's income is the larger? If he made more money in 1942, he would be taxed on his 1942 income. If his 1943 income is larger, he would be taxed on that.

Under such a formula, proposed by Representative LOUIS LUDLOW, of Indianapolis, those 60 millionaires Randolph Paul ranted about would have to pay through the nose. That should make Mr. Paul happy—though it probably wouldn't. Anyway, at the beginning of 1944 all taxpayers who could meet those terms would be out of debt to their Government.

An exception to the whichever-year-is-higher rule, we think, should be made in the case of men entering the armed services. Otherwise, a man who gives up a good civilian job and goes off to fight for his country would return home after the war owing his Government a tax debt—or if he was killed, he would leave a tax debt for his widow to pay.

That would be carrying Mr. Paul's pound-of-flesh philosophy too far.

Take the case of a man whose 1942 income was $3,000. He would owe a tax of $268.80. If he entered the Army the first of this year, at $50 a month, his 1943 income would be $600. Of that, $22 a month—or $264—would be deducted from his pay and sent to his wife. The soldier would have $336 left. It is not likely he could spare any of it to pay that $268.80 tax debt. He shouldn't have to pay. Nor should his wife—or widow.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LOUIS: Thank you for your letter of February 10, with which you sent the advance print of your bill and the accompanying statement on your pay-as-you-go tax plan. Harold D. Smith asked me to thank you also for the letter addressed to him.

Your plan is being studied by our fiscal analysts. Personally, I am in full accord with the objectives of a pay-as-you-go plan. Without shifting at least the largest portion of income taxes to a current basis, it would not be possible to establish a simple collection at the source of the income tax. Such a system appears to me essential for administrative as well as economic reasons. A special merit of your plan appears to me that it takes care of the argument that the skipping of the year 1942 as the basis for income-tax payment would give a windfall gain to those who had extraordinarily high incomes in that particular year. In your plan either 1942 or 1943 income—whichever year is lower—would be skipped as a basis for tax payment.

Personally, I am still bothered by the idea that the taxpayer has to file quarterly reports showing his income during the preceding 3 months, according to your plan. I think it will be especially difficult for small businessmen or farmers to estimate their quarterly income. I believe personally that it would be very desirable if we could reduce rather than increase the number of tax returns which must be filed.

I was very glad to see that your plan leaves the door open for an increase in rates. If one wants to prevent the advantage which the taxpayer eventually receives at some time in his life or at his death through skipping a year's tax liability, then it would be possible to increase the individual income- and estate-tax rates now to make up for this skipping of a year's tax liability.

Very sincerely yours,

WAYNE COY,
Assistant Director.

Rebate on Income Taxes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a short editorial appearing in the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., in the issue of February 19, 1943, as follows:

REBATE ON INCOME TAXES?

Those in and out of Congress at Washington who are shaping the new income-tax measure profess they have a fear that adoption of a pay-as-you-go plan for collecting the income

levies in installments or by withholding a part of salaries at the source would deprive the Treasury of a tremendous and needed sum that usually flows in by March 15.

Yet there is a simple process by which such substantial payments could be authorized and encouraged under any plan, whether pay as you go or not. It is that which has been followed for decades by county and municipal subdivisions throughout the land—the offering of a rebate for tax payments made prior to a certain date.

In these times of low-interest rates a large number of taxpayers in all probability would be glad to take advantage of a premium for the payment of the greater portion, if not all, of their income taxes on or before March 15, the first dead-line date, whether or not an installment plan is voted.

Of course, we could hardly expect the Government to offer as high as a 5-percent rebate, which is customary in many cities and towns, but the lure of a reduction of 3 percent or so probably would induce early and heavy payments by taxables in all income brackets and would supply the Government immediately with much of the revenue it needs for its continuing operations.

Steel Workers' Union Financial Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a statement in the current issue of Steel Labor, publication of the United Steel Workers of America, summarizing a 60-page financial audit of the union's accounts by a leading firm of certified public accountants. The full report, which is too long for inclusion in the RECORD, shows in the most complete detail the resources and liabilities, income and expenses, initiation fees and dues, of the international union, its districts and local unions. It is interesting to observe that this outstanding labor organization, with a membership exceeding 700,000, has been built up in the short space of 6 years. Its initiation fee is $3, and dues payments are $1 a month. The accountants' report is submitted to the membership and made available to the general public by the union's international officers:

Philip Murray, international president.

David J. McDonald, international secretary-treasurer.

Van A. Bittner, assistant to international president.

Clinton S. Golden, assistant to international president.

These leaders of the C. I. O. are to be congratulated on the publication of this statement, following the example which has been set for many years, notably, by the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, headed by Mr. David Dubinsky, of New York City.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUDIT REPORT SHOWS GROWTH OF STEEL UNION—OFFICERS OF UNION MAKE A PUBLIC ACCOUNTING OF UNION'S FUNDS

The United Steel Workers of America, as of November 30, 1942, had a net worth of $1,774,905.19, a financial report just made public by the officers of the union shows. The union has a total membership of 725,625.

Covering the period of May 1 to November 30, the audit was made by Main & Co., nationally known accountants and auditors. The report was signed by Philip Murray, president; David J. McDonald, secretary-treasurer; Van A. Bittner and Clinton S. Golden, assistants to the president.

In a letter to the membership, incorporated in the audit, the officers report that "realizing that from the very beginning the importance of maintaining proper and accurate accounting of the incoming and outgoing of funds, your officers employed Main & Co., certified public accountants, to advise, recommend and otherwise assist in prescribing the form of account controls and statements for use by the international office, as well as for use by the local unions chartered by our organization."

COVERS 60-PAGE BOOK

The audit, printed in a 60-page book, is perhaps the most comprehensive public accounting of funds ever made by a labor union.

"The extent of the accounts and entries which are required to record our financial affairs can be gleaned from the fact that our 1,800 local unions with a total membership of 725,625 account to the international office monthly."

The report is divided into six separate statements: (1) a sum total of the union's resources, liabilities, and net worth; (2) a sum total of income and expenses from May 1 to November 30, 1942; (3) summary statement of initiation fees, dues, and per capita refunds by districts; (4) statement of international office expense; (5) statement of district office expense; (6) detailed statement of initiation fees, dues, and per capita refunds by districts and local unions.

In the period covered by the audit, the union collected $3,552,342.05 from initiation fees, dues, and miscellaneous sources, and refunded to local unions the sum of $947,139.14 and expended for the operation of the international and district offices a total of $2,304,015.16, leaving an excess of income over expense of $301,187.75.

SHOWS INTERNATIONAL EXPENSES

"For the 7 months ending November 30, 1942, the expenditures of our international office amounted to $730,761.14, the nature of which is clearly shown in statement No. 4," the officers report. "The personnel of our international office is composed of 58 employees in addition to the 4 elected officers.

"In connection with the operation and maintenance of our 39 districts the international office expended $1,573,254.02, the nature of which is clearly summarized in * * * this report. It will also be noted from this statement that the regularly employed personnel of the districts numbered 561 persons. During the 7 months' period covered by this report, 2,068 members of local unions were occasionally employed to serve on committees engaged in wage scale and other conferences."

AUDIT REPORT—UNITED STEEL WORKERS

MAY 1 TO NOV. 30, 1942

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Below are printed the first 3 statements from the audit of the United Steel Workers books covering the period May 1 to Nov. 30, 1942. It was deemed inadvisable to print the entire report in Steel Labor, because it covers a 60-page book. Copies of the report have been widely distributed. Local unions are urged to make a complete study of the report at their local meetings.)

Statement No. 1

COMPARATIVE STATEMENTS OF RESOURCES AND LIABILITIES AT DATES INDICATED

Resources	Apr. 30, 1942	Nov. 30, 1942	Increase (+) or decrease (−) since Apr. 30, 1942
Cash	$1,410,156.87	$1,415,863.42	+$5,706.55
Investment securities: United States and Canadian War bonds	57,000.00	82,000.00	+25,000.00
Office funds and other receivables:			
District office funds	26,591.72	29,333.81	+2,742.09
Loans and advances to employees	1,803.16	15,713.99	+13,910.83
Loans to local and other Committee of Industrial Organizations unions	21,196.75	29,957.15	+8,760.40
Returned checks	3,622.75	2,534.00	−1,088.75
	53,214.38	77,538.95	+24,324.57
Fixed assets:			
Real estate and building		300,000.00	+300,000.00
Furniture and fixtures (net of depreciation)	45,771.59	55,792.65	+10,021.06
	45,771.59	355,792.65	+310,021.06
Total resources	1,566,142.84	1,931,195.02	+365,052.18
Less liabilities:			
Accounts and bills unpaid	81,216.94	126,846.67	+45,629.73
Employees War bond purchase fund	3,441.25	5,981.25	+2,540.00
Accrued social security and other taxes on salaries and wages	7,767.21	23,461.91	+15,694.70
Advances by Congress of Industrial Organizations	960,000.00		−960,000.00
Total liabilities	1,052,425.40	156,289.83	−896,135.57
Net worth, represented by the excess of resources over liabilities	513,717.44	1,774,905.19	+1,261,187.75
The increase in net worth since Apr. 30, 1942, represents:			
Net income, May 1 to Nov. 30, 1942 (statement No. 2)			301,187.75
Advances by Congress of Industrial Organizations canceled			960,000.00
Increase in net worth			1,261,187.75

Statement No. 2

STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENSE, MAY 1 TO NOV. 30, 1942

Income:			
Initiation fees and dues (statement No. 3):			
Initiation fees received	$394,069.00		
Less: Per capita refunds	142,282.53		
		$251,786.47	
Dues received	3,150,873.70		
Less: Per capita refunds	804,856.61		
		2,346,017.09	
			$2,597,803.56
Interest received from investments			300.00
Rentals of building		$5,700.00	
Less: Building maintenance cost		2,517.08	
			3,182.92
Gain in foreign exchange			3,916.43
Total income			2,605,202.91
Expense:			
International office (statement No. 4)			730,761.14
District offices (statement No. 5)			1,573,254.02
Total expense			2,304,015.16
Excess of income over expense, May 1 to Nov. 30, 1942			301,187.75

Statement No. 3

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF INITIATION FEES, DUES, AND PER CAPITA REFUNDS, BY DISTRICTS, MAY 1 TO NOV. 30, 1942

District	Receipts		Per capita refunds	
	Initiation fees	Dues	Initiation fees	Dues
1. New England	$6,722.00	$62,318.50	$2,240.67	$15,828.91
2. New York City	21,881.00	74,837.00	7,293.69	18,583.00
3. Utica, N. Y.	8,524.00	46,993.00	2,841.33	11,859.50
4. Buffalo, N. Y.	18,442.00	122,110.00	6,147.34	30,524.75
5. Eastern Canada		41,275.56		10,318.90
6. Central and western Canada	6,291.00	53,544.50	2,085.00	13,142.38
7. Philadelphia	24,199.00	138,246.50	8,068.35	34,630.00
8. Baltimore	8,269.00	33,724.00	2,756.33	8,839.75
9. Bethlehem, Pa.	7,725.00	37,764.00	2,477.32	9,370.75
10. Wilkes-Barre	6,340.00	45,797.00	2,113.35	11,449.25
11. Harrisburg	4,121.00	76,713.50	1,369.66	19,006.75
12. Johnstown, Pa.	2,951.00	54,566.75	984.42	13,641.69
13. Charleroi-Monessen	6,308.00	101,166.00	2,111.67	25,291.75
14. McKeesport	1,812.00	47,789.58	603.99	11,947.40
15. Homestead	27,115.00	108,902.75	15,869.34	27,970.44
16. South Side-Hazelwood	8,076.50	52,252.00	3,846.48	13,237.83
17. Lawrenceville-North Side	5,824.50	50,335.50	1,923.48	12,601.88
18. McKees Rocks	6,222.00	44,729.50	2,074.00	11,247.13
19. Tarentum	9,887.00	142,240.00	3,299.77	35,621.00
20. Ambridge	20,201.00	140,633.00	6,733.64	35,255.55
21. Sharon	8,966.00	86,820.10	2,985.33	21,757.48
22. Charleston, W. Va.	583.00	17,670.00	194.33	4,417.50
23. Steubenville-Wheeling	19,255.50	92,973.71	6,418.50	23,290.73
24. Columbus	4,142.00	32,173.35	1,380.68	8,592.75
25. Cincinnati	3,218.00	36,153.50	1,071.67	8,767.01
26. Youngstown	5,595.50	145,446.50	1,865.14	37,252.88
27. Canton	3,693.00	104,721.00	1,067.33	27,220.75
28. Cleveland	14,256.00	169,831.50	4,510.32	45,758.85
29. Detroit	10,749.00	74,977.32	3,582.99	19,183.33
30. Indianapolis	10,667.00	82,945.23	3,554.68	20,911.20
31. Calumet	35,063.00	383,224.85	14,359.67	100,033.44
32. Milwaukee	14,634.00	106,270.65	4,878.03	26,715.25
33. Minnesota and Iron Ranges	12,195.00	71,747.75	4,049.91	18,232.61
34. St. Louis	20,285.00	103,150.50	6,679.65	27,508.73
35. Southeastern	406.00	4,503.25	135.33	1,125.81
36. Southern	12,723.75	45,981.60	5,133.72	12,819.27
37. Texas	320.00	14,580.50	106.67	4,180.87
38. West coast	16,127.75	97,880.25	5,375.92	25,762.54
39. Utah	278.50	3,763.50	92.83	957.00
Sundry unchartered		120.00		
Totals	394,069.00	3,150,873.70	142,282.53	804,856.61

Washington's Birthday and the Russian Army Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] at the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Russian Army, held at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, February 22, 1943, under the auspices of Soviet Russia Today.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today is Washington's Birthday. We are assembled in celebration of an event much more closely connected with Washington and his ideals than most persons realize. For this year is the twenty-fifth anniversary of the organization of the people's army of Russia. This army, which has already done so much, is destined to be honored, as Washington's has been, as an army which brought freedom to men, women, and children in the new world now dawning.

The tyrannies which Washington struck against were those which hindered the growth and development of individual man. The tyrannies of old Russia kept the people submerged. Freed by the people's army, Russia today knows what she is fighting for. Men, women, and even children have tasted freedom. They call it good. And for it today they willingly sacrifice.

Jefferson tells us that Voltaire described the European despotisms of his day as governments where every man was either the hammer or the anvil. No wonder Jefferson's interpretation of America's mission was expressed in his own great oath, when he said, "I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Could any man describe Hitler's concept of government any better than Voltaire did? In the Nazi world could there be any person left who is not either a hammer or an anvil? In the light of a study of the American Revolution and those mighty revolutions, like the Russian, which have followed in its wake, more and more we see the unity of aim in these great conflicts. The present war, under the leadership of the democratic ideals of the Big Four, is fast aligning the world into two camps, one fighting for free men, the other for the preservation of the single-will state, which means the death of liberty and freedom.

Democracy is fast being reconceived. It is no longer a nationalist movement to accomplish some competitive purpose in a world of conflict and contest. Today democracy, as conceived by the United Nations in support of a world-wide charter defending free nations, represents a spirit of service built upon self-restraint and self-control, fighting that the processes of peace and goodwill will have a chance in the world. Democracy now seems to have but a single thought—to serve—that men, women, and children may enjoy lives economically full, culturally complete, and free from burdening concern and worry. World-wide democracy strives for the better life, internationally seeking to be a better neighbor—nationally the desire of thoughtful nations and free peoples. Surely the United Nations are fighting to bring into existence that world of which Washington dreamed when he wrote: "On these occasions I consider how mankind may be connected, like one great family, in fraternal ties * * *" and "My first wish is * * * to see the whole world in peace, and the inhabitants of it as one band of brothers striving (to determine) who should contribute most to the happiness of mankind."

World economic and physical unity is an unavoidable fact. World social, legal, and cultural unity has been more a fact than is generally realized. Writers have long tended to emphasize the differences between peoples. An entirely new picture would appear if they should undertake to point out the similarities.

It is my firm belief that in the universal acceptance of democracy we have the essential of world unity. With free peoples, in free nations where individual rights protect and enlarge the citizen and where self-restraint and united control preserve the nation, a united world is possible.

A man must enjoy at least four freedoms to be in any true sense a man. He may give over political rule to one man to make war or to many men to plan for peace. He may allow the rich or the worker in any community to have control of the common interests. But in so delegating power, he must

not relinquish the fundamental liberties on which democracy depends.

World unity does not mean a world of bliss; it means a world much like our own America, where struggle and clash of interest still prevail but where peaceful cooperation of over fifty-odd political jurisdictions makes possible a given end. The world may fast become like our own great cities, where men have complex citizenship and some no citizenship, yet all stand as individuals before the law. The world of the United Nations means merely that condition where states may pull against each other, some alone, some in regions of interest, yet all may unite for the common good.

I may see a larger and more comprehensive example of unity before I die, but I do not expect to see a better working one. I love to read of Utopias. I am a believer in the Grand Course—the millennium—but it will not come by fiat. It will come from struggle, planning, experiment, and cooperation. I am not one to despair when the world seems to falter on its way to the attainment of such an objective. It would indicate an ignorance of history to expect complete success for so great an undertaking without many an apparent failure. I have full faith in the attainment of new world unity. But this better world can never come without the development of the concept of the importance of the individual. Democracy, with Jefferson's four freedoms, is essential to such an attainment. As he held the key to the successful working of our great federation of States and distant Territories, so, I believe, he set forth the formula for successful world-wide unity of the nations.

Russia brought unity by making a union of republics. America brought unity by creating the United States where each State is guaranteed the republican form of government. Russia has united peoples successfully and so have we. World unity will follow either or both these methods.

Soviet Russia's first 25 years of history resemble our own first 25 years. The ideals of the American Revolution struck so hard at age-old injustices that of course the Revolution was misunderstood from one end of our world to the other. The Russian revolution also struck at age-old injustices, and it, too, was bound to be misunderstood.

Both revolutions today, though, can be judged in their true light by their accomplishments. Tonight we turn to the idealism behind each revolution. The sacrifices of each make insignificant every purpose except the idealistic aspirations upon which both revolutions rest.

A nation which makes the principles of lend-lease a national policy is a nation which sees farther than its own borders. A nation which recognizes the evils of a system of thought which would again enslave men, women, and children in a government where all persons must be either a hammer or an anvil is freeing not only itself but the people of the world when it drives its enemies out. America and Russia came into this war as chance allies, forced to fight back aggressive attacks. They are today fast becoming natural allies because the freedom of men, women, and children is becoming their joint objective.

In the sacrifices of the Russian People's Army and the accomplishment of its great victories the world now sees the strength of men and women united in a fight for liberty. We revere the dead, we honor the living of this great Army because we know, as Lincoln knew at Gettysburg, that the dead have not died in vain, that the Nation they represent shall have a new birth of freedom, and that these republics of many peoples shall not perish from the earth.

Donald Claude Dobbins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on February 14 last, Donald Claude Dobbins, a former Member of the House of Representatives, who lived in Champaign, Ill., passed away. He was a brilliant lawyer, a skillful legislator, and a fine citizen. A beautiful tribute was paid to him by H. Clifford Northcott, of the First Presbyterian Church, Champaign, Ill., on February 17, 1943, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the best known poem that Alfred Tennyson ever wrote he expressed his hope that when he passed from "this bourne of time and place" there would be "no sadness of farewell." Most of us admire him for such an expression and doubtless would ourselves echo that wish for the time when we leave the earthly scene. But life does not seem to be built in a way to insure the fulfillment of such a hope in the hearts of those who have known and loved us, as our hearts so eloquently testify this day. The event whose stern reality we face would be infinitely harder to bear if there were not the real and beautiful sadness in our hearts as we gather here at this altar of affection to do at least something to express our respect and love for Donald Claude Dobbins.

For one, I make no effort to conceal the sadness that wells up in my heart as I think of him whose silent form is before us. I count it part of the price that one pays faithfully for the privilege of sharing in friendship with a noble soul. But there is something more than sadness present here today. There is challenge, there is gratitude, there is hope, and we find some of it expressed in the last testament of another poet, who voiced his thoughts in these words:

"These ears can hear your words no more
However fondly you may speak.
For my sake then, with words of love
The living cheer and help the weak.

"Cherish my memory in your heart
But lest it grow a selfish thing
Make channels for a thousand streams
Of which my love shall be the spring."

The streams of memory are indeed many as we pause in sacred tribute. To me, there is the memory of D. C. Dobbins as a neighbor. For 12 years I passed his home each day on my way to my work. Naturally, we would meet and exchange greetings of one sort or another. Short stops in his house embellished our contacts. No long visits were ours, but I, like many of you, found that a sense of understanding and good will had grown up upon which I feel that both of us relied. The life of this man was neighborly in the finest use of the term. No attitude of self-satisfaction or arrogant disregard for the interests of others possessed his soul. Neighborliness, of course, possessed him in the larger contacts of his life, in business and community responsibilities, and those of us who knew him best regarded him as a true democrat.

Another stream that has flowed through and from his life is that of resourcefulness. Of some men it is truly said that they do their task well and they can do no other. They may be teachers, or physicians, specialists in scientific study, or merchants dealing with one particular product, or artisans in some one particular trade. Their temperaments, their capacities seem to limit their interests. We feel of them that the testimony of the Apostle Paul would apply when he said, "This one thing I do." But D. C. Dobbins, while he was an attorney of top rank, could do more than one thing. He could have been successful in many other fields of endeavor had he set his mind to it. He could have been a successful teacher as he started out to be in his youthful years; he would not have failed as a merchant as his record in business study amply testifies; he could have been an effective diplomat in governmental service as his record of understanding of varied peoples has shown; he could have been a great executive, as his insights and plans in postal problems so amply revealed; he could have been a creative engineer as his Jeffersonian inventiveness has shown in a hundred ways. He was always interested in politics in the highest use of that term, and served well in the distinguished place to which the people had elected him. This wide range of interests did not detract him from his chosen profession of law where in some measure he used this cosmopolitan set of interests with remarkable effectiveness both for himself and for those whom he served. D. C. Dobbins was a resourceful man.

From this life there flowed a practice of thoroughness. No shoddy work came from his hands or from his brain. I have read numbers of letters that he has written and some briefs that he has prepared, and one could easily see that they were the product of a careful and comprehensive mind. This characteristic is seen in everything that he did, whether it be in making a shelf in his basement, preparing his material for a trial at law, the planning of a house, organizing a political strategy, writing a resolution, or toastmastering at a banquet—he always did his work thoroughly and well.

From his life there flowed a stream of affection for his home and his family. While on the whole, life had sung a lovely song, there were parts in which strains of sadness were dominant. But D. C. Dobbins bid the song go on, and he found that the years brought again, as he prayed they would, new harmony and peace. He loved his home. To him it was a shrine. There can be no doubt of his appreciation of the tender care that was given him by his wife and his children. He never realized the longer hours of peace and quiet to be spent in the home of his dreams, when the rush of heavy responsibility should be shifted to the shoulders of others. But he did have the joy of giving to many who came to his home the unforgettable hospitality of a generous man. The recipients of his kindness and hospitality are here today in large numbers.

One can never fully estimate the significance of this life without recognizing the stream of helpful humor that flowed from him with cleansing power. Like another great son of Illinois, he had the unusual ability of seeing in critical situations the humorous aspects of circumstances in which he was involved or that others might be involved. This, on more than one occasion, has brought him success in his profession and satisfaction to his countless friends. It is small wonder that many of our public events sought him as a master of ceremonies who might bring to the occasion a clean, helpful, and happy spirit. In this service D. C. Dobbins was unique.

From this life flowed the blessing of a loyal friendship. I think that if his son, who knew his father so well, and whom his father loved with such manly tenderness, were to give one

descriptive word of his father, he would use the word "loyalty." D. C. Dobbins was no man to go back on his friends and loved ones when the "going" was hard.

I remember that when Mr. Dobbins returned home after his first session in Congress he said to a group of us, "I know of no session of Congress of which I would rather be a Member than this one." He was a friend of the President of the United States, and no wave of criticism, however strong, could take from him the love and loyalty he had for the man he knew and loved as a friend. Doubtless there are other political and business associates who shared in the priceless treasure of his loyal friendship.

From this life flowed the joy of work well done. In his profession he held a rightful place among the leaders. There is ample evidence that the opinions of this man always merited respect and generally received it. As I stand here today I cannot help but think of another day when I stood here under similar circumstances, when we sought to honor the memory of his brother, O. B. Dobbins. What a pair of brothers they were. Different, and yet alike. Each seemed to supplement the other.

We are grateful today for the public service that this man has rendered through various civic groups. The Rotary Club of the city will miss his sound counsel and hearty comradeship. D. C. Dobbins was a man of character. A loyal member and lover of this great church.

"Here was a man, we say, upstanding, rugged, direct, determined, honorable, strong—and yet sympathetic, gracious, gentle. For gentleness, when it weds with manhood, makes the man."

We surely need men such as D. C. Dobbins in the difficult days we face

"God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty, and in private thinking.
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large profession, and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land and waiting Justice sleeps."

D. C. Dobbins for his day was one answer to this prayer.

Address by Hon. James M. Tunnell Before Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] at a gathering of Jewish War Veterans in New York February 21, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On this date immediately preceding the anniversary of the birth of the Nation's greatest hero, who was in effect its founder, it is fitting that our minds turn back to a recognition of the honor due other heroes, other Americans who have participated in the great struggle for democracy throughout the world. It was the great struggle led by the patriots under George Washington which made democracy possible in the world. Democracy, or the rule of the people themselves, was a new idea at the time of the revolutionary struggle of the American people. The theory that sovereignty came from the people below, rather than from the rulers above, was a novel one. The success of the American Revolution led to the establishment of 21 democratic governments in the Western Hemisphere. This accomplishment was not entirely the deed of any one man. The principle of the right to govern was one which appealed to the average man throughout the world, and the formation of governments based upon that thought represented the determined, united, and effective effort of the people of the world to govern themselves.

We are met tonight to voluntarily honor a hero of World War No. 1. In doing this our purpose is not entirely to elevate this particular individual. Our purpose is to pay homage to the qualities represented by him and other American heroes. I shall not tonight commend Benjamin Kauffman, and express my admiration for his record because he is of the Jewish faith, nor because of his race. I honor him tonight because of his being a great American. You of the Jewish race have a right to a family pride in him.

I bring you greetings from a larger body, a more numerous body, the American people. America delights to honor her loyal sons, whatever their race, or whatever their religion. The heroes of our Nation should be honored not alone by the American people, but by mankind. Their acts of heroism benefited not alone their Nation, but the whole world. The effect of the heroism of American boys is world-wide. Admirers of American heroism should be as numerous as the beneficiaries of that heroism. The commander of your great organization is honored tonight by reason of deeds which he performed, of valor which he displayed, of heroism which was innate in him. Men do not perform acts of heroism for the glory which they receive. Acts of heroism are performed by men to whom such acts are natural. Being constituted as they were, believing as they did, they could have done no other. But recognition of the great qualities of heroes in past struggles is not beneficial unless such recognition results in arousing in the boys and girls of the present generation a consciousness of their interest and their stake in the great struggles of today.

We are told that the goal of the allied armies in World War No. 1 was not fully attained. I am not one of those who believe that the blood which was spilled in World War No. 1 was wasted, that the suffering that was caused by World War No. 1 was in vain, that the lives which were destroyed or wrecked by World War No. 1 were a useless sacrifice, that the tremendous expenditures growing out of World War No. 1 were without consideration. World War No. 1 represented a struggle for the same principles involved in this war. In both of these struggles we have thus far as Americans been blessed by having the struggle far removed in distance from our land. Our cities have not been wrecked by bombs, our homes have not been destroyed by shells. Our seaboards have not been invaded. People have transacted business as usual during the great struggle.

However, during a war such as this, the temper of people has been aroused. Our private lives have been interfered with. Our business in many instances has been destroyed. Taxes have been multiplied. Numerous inconveniences of war have reached to the farthest corner of our national domain. Americans resent inconveniences. Americans resent shortage of gasoline. They resent shortages of tires, sugar, coffee, shoes. Without the reasons before us as to the necessity for such rationing, resentments are aroused. We who have sons, brothers, husbands, and other connections in the armed forces of the United States are too much inclined to demand the usual conveniences and pleasures of life, and leave to our soldiers, our sailors, and our marines the burden of fighting our war. We want pleasure rides. We want to attend baseball games and other athletic contests. We resent any interference with our usual pleasures. We want business as usual. We want life as usual.

Those who disseminate information and spread the news too often try to convince their audiences that Congress is unfriendly, and that the Government of the United States is hostile. In times of stress complaints are easy. There are those in Congress who would have the people believe that our war effort is a failure, that our boys are dying in vain, that our sacrifices are neither appreciated nor are beneficial to the national effort.

Some columnists and radio artists seem to make a desperate effort to create a divided America, or an America hostile to its Government. There are those who bemoan the fact that war is costly. This certainly cannot be contradicted. Wars have always been costly. They cost in money, suffering, blood, and lives. However, in the affairs of men there come times when there is no alternative to war. Before America was attacked by Japan, numerous people by their writings and speeches opposed war. In such an argument there could be no reply. War is indefensible except as mankind for its very existence is driven to resort to that alternative. Resentment against the cost of war seems to be an objective with some Americans at this time. They count the cost of fighting. They fail to count the cost of surrender to the demands of totalitarian oppressors.

Again, we hear those who declare that the Army is too large, or is about to be made too large. I don't know how many men are necessary for the Army of the United States. Surely it is necessary that the Army be large enough to win this war, this struggle not only for the existence of the American Nation, but for the existence of liberty-loving people of the whole world. Eventually we shall have to leave the size of the Army to those who are better informed than the civilian population of our Nation can possibly be. Again, we see what appear to be studied attempts to divide the Nation over the question as to whether Giraud or DeGaulle are the proper leaders of the French in north Africa. To the most of us this is a matter of perfect indifference. We are indifferent because we do not know. The most of us who attempt to discuss this question are ignorant, not only of the qualifications of these men, but are entirely ignorant as to what is expected of them. Again, we hear the suggestion made sometimes by men of prominence and authority that there be a second front, and the Government is told when that second front shall be created, where it shall be created, and who shall command the Allied armies in that effort.

These matters suddenly become of tremendous importance, but result only in dividing the opinion of the American people. Again, we find some who demand that the after-the-war-planning shall be made now. The Allied Nations must be compelled to tell now exactly what the terms of surrender shall be when we have won the war. Every incentive must be produced to drive our enemies to greater efforts. The slightest consideration makes it plain to the dullest intellect that there could be no greater cause for the lessening of the war effort than by specific plans as to after-war policies. Each

nation, and in many instances each person interested, would have plans for such settlement. Each would have reason to believe that its particular plan should be followed. I can conceive of no greater aid to Hitler and his war efforts than to have the people, not only of America but of our Allied Nations, divided into hostile camps at this time on this question. We should avoid having the people of the whole world lessen their war effort, and strengthen their debating efforts on questions that will settle themselves later.

We have necessary work in winning this war. We must win it expeditiously, and to win it must be done unitedly. Every critic who attempts to divide tht American people on any one of these questions, or all of them, would be better employed planting a garden, carrying a rifle, or helping to produce some implements of war. The success of such critics can only be measured in the dissensions caused by the divisions of sentiment aroused among people allied with us. The real measure of the success of such efforts will be the loss of millions of American lives and the expenditure of billions of American dollars. Notwithstanding all arguments and suggestions, the American people should realize that the Congress of the United States is not so terrible as the German Reichstag. The laws of the American people, and even the rationing orders of the American Government, are not so severe as those of the Nazis. They are not so cruel as the rule of the Nazis would be if they controlled the Allied Nations today. The Executive orders of the President of the United States are not so burdensome as the persecutions of Adolf Hitler. The inconveniences caused by the orders of the democratic Government of America are insignificant compared with the planned persecutions, the planned slavery, the planned forfeitures of life and property under the totalitarian system of government.

There are American writers who never find anything good or intelligent in the Congress of the United States, or the Government of the United States of America. These writings are sometimes unfortunately credited by large elements of the American people. The dissension caused by such writers and speakers is a high price to pay for vindictiveness aimed at the Government of the United States, the Congress of the United States, or the Executive of this great Government. The ones making the greatest contribution to the German and Japanese effort to dominate the world are those who seek to weaken the confidence of the American people . their system of government.

As we read these criticisms, there comes back to us the story of Israel Putnam as he left his horse and his plow in the field, and rushed to the defense of his country. Putnam was not disturbed at that time over the cost of the war or the terms of the surrender. His country was in danger, and his life and his efforts belonged to that country. No partisanship, factionalism, or personal animosity could prevent him from giving his best, his all, to his country at that time. He was willing to give his life, and to surrender his property to free his country from a foreign yoke. What effect do senseless criticisms have upon our boys in the armed service? There are 7,000,000 of these boys who have left their homes to fight for your liberty and mine. Some of them will not return. Some of them will return maimed and less useful to themselves and their families, less able to fight the battle of life than when they left home. What do they think? How are they confused by the armchair strategists and Monday morning critics of the American war effort? Those boys are just plain American boys. They have the American boy's longing for his home, for his friends, for the freedom to which he has been accustomed. Those boys believe that they are fighting not alone for their present, but for their future. They are fighting for the great principle of self-government. They are fighting for their families and for our future. They are fighting for the future generations of liberty-loving people. They will perform feats of heroism so long as they believe that their cause is just.

When Benjamin Kauffman performed those feats of heroism which have caused him to be held as an example to American youth, he was not worrying about the cost of the struggle. He was not worrying about the second front. He was not concerned about the debates in the peace conference. He was not concerned about what particular Frenchman should be controlling the French people in any of their territories. He was doing his plain duty as a loyal American citizen, as one who was not looking selfishly to his own security, but was willing to risk all that God and nature had provided him in the human impulse to aid a friend, to aid his struggling country. In short, Benjamin Kauffman was just being himself, a true American.

Let those of us who are not at the fighting front remember that we must win this battle at home. Let us realize that the inconveniences we suffer are infinitesimal compared with the misfortunes and persecutions planned for us and for all mankind by those who would remove the Statue of Liberty, those who would wipe out all for which the Statue of Liberty stands. Our enemies seek to destroy freedom not alone for this generation, but for all future generations. The struggle in which we are engaged is severe, it is costly, but it is necessary. This generation is not willing to sacrifice the fruits of the efforts of its ancestors for a thousand years and surrender to slavery its posterity for untold generations. There have been wars which had their origin in desires for greater territory. There have been wars which had their origin in efforts to increase trade. There have been wars which were fought for the freedom of the seas. This war had its origin in race and national hatreds. I am one who believes with the poet that, "There is a destiny which shapes our ends, rough hew them how we will."

It matters not how strong the armies of Hitler may be. It matters not how great the fury of the Japanese shall be. No movement based upon hatred of other people, whether it be based on anti-Semitism, or as with the Japanese hatred of the whole white race, but the God of destiny which has shaped the progress of mankind, the development of its civilizations, its religions, will not and cannot in harmony with His eternal plans, permit such principles to triumph. And of all the nations involved in this struggle, America stands preeminent as the embodiment of democratic principles, as well as being the arsenal of democracy. America has been, and will through countless ages remain, "The land of the free, as well as the home of the brave."

Address by Roberto Ladd at Meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Roberto Ladd, a citizen of our sister Republic of Mexico, at the first annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association held recently in St. Louis, Mo.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

First of all, I am going to extend to you my pals from Latin America: José A. Cadilla, Rolando Franceschini, Puerto Rico; Manuel Papelo and Alfredo Bebin, Peru; José A. Rivas, Panama; José A. Ordoñez, Ecuador; José O. Vilela, Brazil; Jorge Arias, Guatemala; Mario Gil, Uruguay.

Mr. Ellis, distinguished guests, members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and members of the Rural Electrification Administration staff, meeting with you is pleasant for myself and for my colleagues from Latin America, who have designated me to express our appreciation for this opportunity. We have come to this country for a year to learn about your progress and methods of extending electric power to people who work the land. Today we can see and talk with you who have actually directed the work of building and operating electric distribution systems and you who, as public leaders, brought into being and supported the Government program on which the new line-extension activities are based.

Eight of us are here today. I speak not only for them, but also for 10 others who are out of town and cannot be here, when I say we thank you for inviting us.

I can best express what I want to say to you by talking of my own country, Mexico, because, of course, I know my country better than any other one.

It is difficult to speak about recently developed electrification of Mexico in a country such as the United States where there are well-established techniques; it is even more difficult to point out what has been done without lifting or humbling the gains.

We are in 1936. The problem in Mexico is evident. It is useless to deny; it is the problem of the land—to better and to modernize its agriculture. This problem entails a sociological aspect of great interest. I will state it like this: It is necessary in Mexico, as in other Latin-American countries to civilize the land. That sentence is probably surprising and may be misunderstood. What I mean to say is that it is necessary to bring to the land the advantage and the comforts offered by the city, wherever it is possible.

In this task of civilizing the land, of lifting the cultural level and the standard of living among country people, no little share belongs to the contribution of modern technical developments and essentially that of rural electrification. Another phase of this problem is the important fight against absenteeism—the outrageous growth of cities, the terrible phenomena of swollen slums, where the country people destroy their health in abandonment and laziness, and feel their primary virtues being eaten away by the corrosion of most abject vices.

This is the inevitable consequence of the flight from the motherland to the artificial life of the city. It includes not only the loss of strength from contact with city vices but removal of capital that could have borne fruit in the motherland.

This absenteeism does not enlarge the cities except in mere mass and it weakens the land. The only way to fight against absenteeism is to civilize the land. This means to bring water, sanitation, schools, and much badly needed electricity, making possible the radio, wholesome shows, recreation, happiness of living. Thus, the country people will have not only the advantages of the city but their own conservative stability, just as the sturdy tree which seems to have grown from deep roots.

We had another problem. The large power companies, foreign enterprises mostly, had been providing electrical service for a long time but only in these areas of maximum density and to the industrial centers. There

came a moment, however, in which their power capacity was not able to satisfy the voracious hunger of the new industrial demands, not even to supply the needs of the growing population. These big utilities, due to the prevailing social development, as they said, were afraid of investing large amounts of capital and, therefore, only maintained their old installations.

The solution of these problems constituted an enormous social and political program. Many aspects of this program had already been initiated. There were schools and more schools—schools which specialized in raising the intellectual and moral level of the natives. A start had been made toward the agrarian reform to bring about a greater stability of the rural people; however, there was lack of a Government agency to take care of a program of national electrification. This agency was constituted by a Presidential decree in 1937.

The Federal Commission of Electricity immediately began to organize the work and to develop the first technical and economic design to bring electricity to the land, to the cities, and to industry. Now it is working building power plants, lines everywhere—working slowly due to the circumstances, but it is going toward the goal.

Every one of the other Latin-American countries has similar problems. Some of them, like Chile and Brazil, are already constructing power plants while others are developing plans for this purpose. All of them are doing something. The details may differ, the laws may vary, the obstacles of some may be relatively harder to overcome; but the purpose is the same—to electrify even the most remote place in each of the respective countries. There is now a new army in every country in America to defeat the shadows. You are the leaders in winning this battle.

Now the Rural Electrification Administration has stretched a friendly hand to all the other countries in America, giving the opportunity to every one to acquire training in your methods and to see how you are solving your problems. Last year there were only 8 countries represented; this year there are 14. Now all of us know much more of the others' problems.

This is a family working together, one branch in each country whose goal is to light up the continent.

In Behalf of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Post-Dispatch of St. Louis, Mo., of January 28, 1943, dealing with the work of the Senate Small Business Committee.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN BEHALF OF SMALL BUSINESS

The dramatic events of the last several days have obscured an important report to the Senate by one of its special committees. This is the Committee on Small Business, headed by Senator MURRAY of Montana, and its report includes five recommendations, which may be summarized as follows:

Small business must be more effectively used in war production.

Small business must be more effectively used in meeting essential civilian needs.

Small business requires assistance in adjusting to certain war conditions.

Small business needs better access to capital.

If small business is to make its maximum contribution to American life, the Federal Government must improve its approach to small business problems.

Senator MURRAY and his colleagues on the committee—Senators MALONEY of Connecticut, ELLENDER of Louisiana, MEAD of New York, STEWART of Tennessee, Democrats, and CAPPER of Kansas and TAFT of Ohio, Republicans—do not rest on these generalities. They have specific proposals for making them real so the lot of small business may be improved forthwith.

What has happened in the field of production for war everyone knows. The vast bulk of the orders has gone to relatively few large companies. Small business has been left outside. The result is that many little companies have been forced to close, and this, in turn, has caused economic distress in small communities which range from coast to coast.

The Small Business Committee suggests the possibility of the establishment of a War Minerals Director with statutory power to coordinate the activities of the various Federal agencies engaged in the discovery, development, production, importing, and financing of metals and minerals. This would be for the purpose of breaking present restrictions imposed by the available supply of critical and strategic materials, on the amount of munitions which can be produced in this country and upon the number of small plants which can be put to work on war production.

The specific recommendation with respect to the second point, more effective use of small business in meeting essential civilian needs, is also on the same broad scale. Here the committee puts forth the idea of legislation for a civilian supply administrator within the War Production Board with full authority and responsibility to determine civilian needs and to take such steps as may be necessary to meet civilian needs. If these needs can be established and protected, then small business will have its proper work to do on the home front.

No one who is not in small business can appreciate what the war economy has done in the way of raising problems with regard to leasing, mortgaging, inventory and such matters. The Murray committee plans legislation to help in these readjustments. Looking on beyond war to the peace which will follow, it proposes to investigate fully the need for an improved system of providing equity capital as a means of aiding small business in the post-war period.

There is nothing of charity in this report. It does not regard small business as the poor relation of big business. It does, as the report itself in effect says, take small business spokesmen at their word: They want no doles or hand-outs, but a chance to do their part as producers in our economic democracy.

Neither is the report overly critical of the war effort. The Senators who sign it know the forces in a period like this which tend to centralize production. But they also keep their eyes lifted for the long view. Thus, they make the sound point that "those who are planning the war and building the future of our country ought to put the Nation's existing capacity to maximum use for production now, rather than to continue building magnificent factories which are likely, after the war, to be leased or otherwise disposed of to large corporations."

This is typical of the vision which characterizes the work that Senator MURRAY and his fellow committee members have done. It is unlikely that a sounder comment on Federal administration has been spoken since we went to war than in these words from their report:

The Government is the creation of the people, and it should live among the people. Our vast country cannot be administered by "directives" from Washington, D. C., or by any group of people, no matter how well-intentioned, who sit behind closed doors and neglect to take the people into their councils. Every small businessman knows that the Government must be taken to the people and the people to the Government.

Music in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and timely article entitled "Music in War." The article is by Mrs. Margaret Banks, music director for radio station WBIG, of Greensboro, N. C. In requesting unanimous consent for the printing of the article, I take this opportunity to state that Mrs. Banks, music director of station WBIG, knows whereof she speaks. She is an accomplished pianist and organist, a composer, a teacher, and is director of one of the South's finest musical organizations, the WBIG Concert Ensemble. She is vitally interested in war work, and has two sons in the service, one at Annapolis and one in the Army Air Corps.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Flags flying and bands playing are the inevitable accompaniment of war. Our President himself has said, "Let's have more bands playing," bringing home the responsibility which falls to musicians in this world conflict. Music is a true keystone of morale. What medium can compare with a military band in bringing a light to the eye, a squaring of the shoulders and a spring to the step? Wars have always been waged to music. That deep, thrilling roll of drums—what is that but music? What strikes more courage to the heart, what calls out more valor in the blood than the clear sweet music of the bugle call? In our own American history music has swelled high and proud above the wars; and out of the battle tumults were born the strains of The Star-Spangled Banner, Columbia, the Gem of the Ocean, The Battle Hymn of the Republic, and Over There. One of our most heroic pictures is that of the blood-stained, marching trio—the drummer, the fifer, and the bugle boy.

But music is not vital to the battle lines alone. In this people's war, this war of the workers and the women and even the children, music is needed as never before to build morale—that great, intangible factor which determines the course of wars and the destinies of nations. The welder in the war plant—he catches the martial, blood-rousing strains of The Victorious Eagle, and goes at his work with new strength, knowing this is his fight, too. The widow hears her radio pouring forth the melody of This Is Worth Fighting For, and as she listens to the words her heart tells her that her boy over there is not fighting in vain.

Music is elemental in this war. It has a job to do, a mighty job. It must give voice to the war cry of a nation; it must strike fire in lukewarm hearts, rouse the placid, soothe the wounded, hail the fighters. Because we are more populous than ever before, we need more music, more far-reaching musical facilities. And for the same reason we have developed those facilities. The development of radio and the phonograph brings music to thousands of homes that it could not have otherwise reached. With our splendid inventions of records and transcriptions, music can come now into all sectors; any home can follow the President's appeal and "have more bands playing."

Music today has many voices. But it must use the wonderful mediums at its command, else progress lapses and morale declines. Nothing is more stimulating than to hear a network program of the great military bands of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. And transcriptions of those bands can mean much to Americans all over the country. Often they reach sections where the original band could never be heard.

Through these transcriptions program directors and music directors have a valuable contribution to make to society at war. So also have the musicians themselves, who as a class have always responded generously to their country's needs. At a time when the war spirit of a nation cries out for expression, they will not let us down. Music, we say, has a job to do.

And music is doing the job. Some of our greatest living composers have done their best work in martial music and patriotic tunes, and in addition they have contributed the financial gains derived from this music to benefits for the armed services. Musicians everywhere should follow their examples in serving, without self-interest, the needs of wartime America. What more can the individual musician do than to give his best? And no less than his best is required in this present day. He has never had wider facilities for being heard, nor more appreciative audiences to hear him. I am proud to be a musician, proud to have a needed service to render; and I am proud that through radio music reaches to the humblest home, as well as the more fortunate, at this time. For music, restful as well as inspiring, is needed now.

Petty Anglo-American Differences To Be Avoided

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave tc extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter by Thomas W. Lamont, reprinted from the New York Times of February 14, 1943:

PETTY ANGLO-AMERICAN DIFFERENCES TO BE AVOIDED — TEMPERAMENTAL APPROACH TO VARIOUS QUESTIONS, BOUND TO OCCUR AMONG NATIONALITIES, ARE SET FORTH AND EXPLAINED IN DETAIL

(The writer of the following letter is chairman of the executive committee of J. P. Morgan & Co., Inc. For the last 25 years he has urged American cooperation in international affairs as the only means of promoting world peace. In 1919 at Paris he was the representative of the United States Treasury on the American Commission to Negotiate Peace. He is a trustee of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and of the Academy of Political Science.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Several months ago, at a time when the differences in economic and religious views between Americans and the Soviet Government seemed perhaps a damper on complete cooperation on our part, the New York Times was good enough to print a letter from me urging that, as Russia had again become our ally, as in World War No. 1, it was vital for our own sake that we should render her all possible support. Our public no longer needs exhortation to work with Russia. The valor and unparalleled achievements of their armies have done that job.

Today the scene shifts. Now I am being asked whether I am not concerned about a reported deterioration of good will between America and Britain. My answer is "No." Under the pressure of great events, petty differences of opinion and approach are sure to arise. And we cannot expect two great and independent nations like the British and ourselves, both reared in the tradition of the utmost freedom of thought and of speech, to live together in a perpetual honeymoon. But on the fundamental issues we think and act alike. Because, however, a stable post-war world will depend vitally upon a consistent Anglo-American relationship, suppose we examine the situation.

OTHER EMPIRES

Our first complaint seems to be about the British Empire. Its American critics strangely enough overlook entirely such aggregations of territories and peoples as, for example, the French, the Belgian, and the Portuguese Empires, with their vast reaches and conglomerate peoples in Asia, the South Seas, and the Indian Ocean, in northern and equatorial Africa. It is the British Empire that our American reformers wish to wrench apart.

In this connection Ambassador Hugh Gibson is letting me quote what he said only the other day: "The only trouble in Anglo-American relations is a question of definitions—in fact, the definition of one word—namely, 'empire.' In the minds of most Americans this word connotes a predatory government bearing down upon helpless peoples; whereas the British definition of the word is entirely different. In their minds it means 'a school of government that inevitably leads to self-government.'"

Now, like most of my countrymen, I am a regular Fourth-of-July American. I hold no brief for the British. They frequently, like ourselves, make grievous mistakes in judgment and sometimes in action. Yet can any fair-minded person gainsay this: Wherever overseas either their flag or ours is carried does not the world find civil law and order existent, and also over the years a steady improvement in hygienic and living standards, a quickening in political self-consciousness and progress in the Anglo-Saxon conception of justice for all.

In the history of the human race few peoples have shown an aptitude for the art of government. Let me add that over the last 30 years I have traversed the international highways somewhat, on one errand or another, and, though always on the watch for the "outs," I have ever been impressed with the intelligence and devotion shown by the British civil servants in handling vast native populations in bad climates and in good; the efforts for better health conditions; the diligence and sympathy shown in study of language and local tradition.

GRADUAL EVOLUTION

Certainly it is not necessary to point out that the growth of the British Empire has over 2 or 3 centuries been a matter not of aggression but of gradual evolution. On this point let me commend to interested persons not only the late Lord Lothian's notable utterances, but particularly Sir Alfred Zimmern's volume, The Third British Empire, a careful analysis of the growth and of recent years the rapid progress in self-government that the nations under the British flag have made.

It is merely the A B C's of history to say that as far back as the time of Queen Elizabeth it was clear that the enterprising, fearless, yet on the whole peace-loving British people had to gain their livelihood largely through overseas trade. And because Britain has generally been able to maintain freedom of the seas, all the other trading nations of the world, including preeminently ourselves since 1815, have reaped the benefit of that policy.

So to those friends who, with seeming good will, have suggested that the British slough off many of their dependencies and strategic outposts, may I ask these questions?

Where would the world be today if, in September 1939, Gibraltar had belonged to Spain, Malta to Italy, Suez to Egypt, Ceylon to some Eastern power, the Falkland Islands to Argentina, and so on through the whole list of strategic outposts that are the pressure points of great empire? Where should we be without the bases England turned over to us in Newfoundland, Bermuda, and Trinidad? The critics of the British are tireless in their denunciation of British laxity at Singapore and Hong Kong. But what they lament is not that Great Britain possessed these bases but that she failed to defend them successfully.

If America herself has no intention—which God forbid—to take over by herself the safeguarding of all these critical points here, there, and everywhere; if we realize that most of the local peoples are wholly without the means to defend their lands; if we know, as we do, that those strategic points are among the chief ends that bloodthirsty Germany and Japan have for years been striving to secure; then why in the world does any of us suggest the dissolution of the British Empire—that empire for whose survival we prayed so fervently in the black days of 1940–41?

OUR FATE INVOLVED

Yet, even in that dark twelvemonth when Germany's bombs blew Britain's cities to bits and invasion seemed imminent, how many of us Americans understood what would befall us if the British Isles fell to the barbaric invader? Not only would the strategic outposts have fallen, but Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa—no one of them could have held out by itself. For today they constitute, in Sir Norman Angell's words, part of "an association which alone has enabled them to survive." Each part is dependent on the whole. That is why each one of that great union is today fighting with such loyalty and desperation.

And what plan do our anti-British friends offer for the preservation of our world interests and our own land, as an alternative to ever closer and friendlier cooperation with the great Anglo-Saxon nation across the Atlantic? If Britain were to be crippled, can we then lean securely on Russia? On China? On the other United Nations?

Certainly with Russia and with China we and the British must have the closest collaboration. Our only hope for a stable post-war world is for these, the four greatest potential powers of the world, to work in harmony together with the United Nations. Both America and Britain are already committed to that course. But veritable con-

tinents as both Russia and China are, vast and resourceful, neither has the sea power to give great aid in maintaining the freedom of the ocean highways. Of course, that is true, too, of the other United Nations, courageous and determined as they are.

HISTORY'S LESSON

Now, at this critical juncture in world affairs, we are driven back to the lessons of history as we have read it for centuries. That lesson is: Without the power there can be no authority. It would be the act of madmen to demand that all backward peoples be promptly cut loose from their present moorings, and directed each respectively to construct a democratic state of its own to fare as best it could in a world from which aggression has, through some unique form of gigantic international machinery—as yet existing only in the imagination—been banished, and the world thus set free from the thing it loathes.

When almost 3 year ago General Smuts wrote to me predicting that the war would "become world-wide and reach to the uttermost points of the earth," he added: "This is a gigantic struggle, a war in the souls of men, an immense conflict between light and darkness, evil incarnate trying to subdue the divine principle in the hearts of men." (Then he added: "Much will in the end depend on the attitude and the action of the United States. The last reserves of our human causes are in your great country, whose fine inner impulses are known to me.")

If we visualize in those terms this great turning point in the history of the world, this crisis of war and peace that is confronting America and all civilization, if we understand the vital necessity of our taking the right turn and avoiding the wrong one, then we shall be the readier to overlook the lesser annoyances furnished by our allies, the ineptitudes or even the wrongheadedness at time of some of our English friends; remembering that we have our own idiosyncrasies and that our world policies for the 20 years following World War No. 1 were little to be proud of.

BOTH SIDES RESPONSIBLE

Further, let me emphasize that our British friends must realize that for such present-day surface differences as exist between us we are not alone responsible. Let them search their own hearts. Let their public men and our own, let the private citizens of good will of both our countries, seek out the causes of existing misunderstandings and find a way to correct them. Let the British also, if you please, have more faith—even if they feel that by past events it may not be fully justified—in our post-war intentions and in our effective cooperation.

At this present day of writing there must be upward of 1,000,000 of our American soldiers in training all over England, in northern Ireland, and fighting side by side with the British forces. When they have fought the good fight and have returned home, will there be serious cleavages between our boys and those British Tommies? No; all such differences will surely have been left behind, forgotten in the great crusade to put an end once for all to Germany's century-old dream to rule the world. And those young Americans, those British, Scotch, and Irish troops will feel that they have all had a common and a glorious heritage, be it in the anguish and sacrifices of a Valley Forge or on the rain-soaked fields of Waterloo.

The American people have almost always been fighting in behalf of liberty—first, to gain our own freedom in 1775, then again in 1812 to keep it, to free the slaves in 1861–65, to liberate Cuba in 1898, to repel the Teutonic onslaught in 1917, and now again to preserve ourselves from German and Japanese conquest over us. As we look back over this century and a half we can see the long muster roll of those countrymen of ours who in all those wars fought and died to keep men free.

Today in serried ranks they are standing behind our fighting lines. And who can deny that the invisible spirit of those brave and eager souls yet lives, that it is with our own soldiers and sailors and airmen today as they face the foe on land and sea and in the air? So, we Americans of all others can never forget that in the darkest days of 1940 and 1941 it was only British courage and the blind faith of free men that saved the world from a Hitler-ruled Europe and a convulsion of our own American structure to its very foundations. Nor that England, already hard pressed and unprepared for armed conflict in the Far East, nevertheless declared war on Japan the moment Japan made war on us.

COLLABORATION NECESSARY

So I end on the same note on which I began: In the conduct of this war, of course, and equally in the post-war world, America's only salvation is to work in close collaboration with our British friends. Such policy is no new thing for us. In the last century it was the British Government that, after the first enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, stood firmly by us in the maintenance of that declaration of ours for the Western Hemisphere; this later, in the face of the German Kaiser's promises and threats. Witness, too, the German squadron's attempt to interfere with Admiral Dewey at Manila Bay in 1898. It was a British admiral who thwarted that effort.

Thus, whenever the outer world has turned against either of us, America and Britain have stood together. It was not chance but an inevitability that in the far greater peril of Britain in 1917 and again in 1941 we finally were found fighting side by side.

Have we now learned the lesson? Or shall we insist on some other Pearl Harbor in another quarter century? Whether we like or dislike individual Englishmen, whether we think they are inclined to high-hat us or not, whether we look upon ourselves as innocents abroad and easy marks for the English trader—or, on the other hand, monarch of all we survey; nevertheless let us remember that as long as the British and we pull together, not in a political union, nor necessarily with formal treaties, together with the collaboration of Russia and China and with a due regard for the equal rights of all other nations; with the earnest endeavor that at every point they should work as fellow partners in our enterprise, that is our only chance of avoiding a repetition of today's tragic events.

MUTUAL RESPECT

And on neither side of the water let us take ourselves too seriously when occasional differences arise between us. The mutual respect, the forbearance, and the understanding that we have for each other spring from common roots deep in the past, roots so intimately interwoven and united in history that no man can sunder them. We can work together because of our common acceptance of certain fundamentals—our instinct for justice and fair play, our preference for an orderly world where each branch of the human family may work out its own salvation in its own way, our convictions that individual enterprise and democracy are inextricably dependent each upon the other.

Finally, the English are the people with whom we share our fundamental religious convictions. These beliefs of ours were brought to the New World with our forebears at Jamestown and Massachusetts Bay. We have followed the way as they followed it. We have looked forward, as they looked, to a city not built with hands. We, like them, through all our vicissitudes, have had this faith of the spirit that in building our own great Nation of freemen we help create out of the world's tragic present a noble future.

THOMAS W. LAMONT.

NEW YORK, *February 9, 1943.*

The Stabilization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, D. C., February 13, 1943, which was released for the morning papers on the 23d of February.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last Tuesday I made a radio address in which I announced that the stabilization program adopted by the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, and the President's Executive Order would be firmly maintained. I intended to exercise all the powers of government which are vested in me, to hold prices and wages at the levels prevailing on September 15 and to prevent any further increase in the basic and essential cost of subsistence living.

I am aware of the magnitude of the task. The workers, the farmer, and the businessman all want to avoid the evils of inflation, but when each of them feels the pressure of total war on his own standard of living, he will find it difficult to believe that others are not in some way profiting from the sacrifices asked of him.

I realize that I will incur enmities. That is important only because it will lessen my effectiveness. But I know I will fail in my task unless I have the strong and energetic support of an informed public opinion. Not for myself, but for our country I ask you to help me get that support.

There is scarcely an aspect of the struggle against inflation, whether it be wage control, price control, profit control, or rationing, in which public understanding and public opinion are not as important as any law or regulation.

I have no doubt as to the basic willingness of the American people to make the sacrifices and to accept the hardships that total war requires. But I am not so certain that all of them have sufficient understanding of the specific needs and requirements of total war.

Let me cite one recent and relatively unimportant example. Last Tuesday morning it was announced that I was to make an address on inflation. A rumor immediately spread that I was to follow up Sunday's announcement of shoe rationing with an announcement of clothes rationing. In a number of cities people rushed to the stores hoping to beat the rationing gun. Here is another. I was told by a gentleman here tonight of hearing a woman at a party in a city I will not name boast of the large quantity of meat she had in cold storage.

Such things should not happen. At this stage of total war there should be an unwritten code voluntarily observed by all patriotic citizens that such things are not done. There should be a feeling of shame if one is caught violating that unwritten code. At this stage of total war it should be the habit of our people to be buying no more goods, rationed or unrationed, than they need. Rationing should be regarded as a device, not for keeping necessities from the people, but for insuring that necessities are equitably shared by the people.

You may think that the Government has not done all that it should to cultivate among our people the habits of living appropriate to total war. But it is difficult, at best, to determine just how far a free government should go in directing the opinions and habits of its people. While our Government has no desire to imitate the practice of Herr Goebbels, I am sure that Mr. Elmer Davis will welcome not only such suggestions, but such criticisms as you may wish to offer on the conduct of the Government's public relations in wartime.

But whether the Government should do more or less there remains in this field a large and important part to be performed by a free and responsible press.

Negative criticism can be helpful to our war effort and to our country. The pointing out of errors and blunders helps us to correct them.

But negative criticism even though literally honest, and literally justified, may actually be hurtful to the war effort and to the country, particularly in wartime. That does not mean that the Government should suppress all negative criticism of that character. Suppression never has been, and never will be, the policy of this free America. But a responsible press should be most vigilant to see that its negative criticism does not have effects far different from those intended. And it is not always easy for a publicist who has selected his target to realize that he may be destroying along with his target, something that is very dear to him. Like William Tell he must be careful that aiming at the apple, he does not strike his own son.

Let me explain more specifically what I mean. The organization of our total war effort in both its military and civilian aspects is a stupendous undertaking. The total organization for total war is a complicated business. It cannot be made simple. Scold the bureaucrats and brass hats as we do, we need them. Without bureaucrats and brass hats we cannot win a total war.

Who are these bureaucrats? If by the term is meant the heads of the war agencies, we have Stimson and Patterson, Knox and Forrestal, in the Army and Navy; Ickes and Davies in charge of oil, Jeffers and Dewey in charge of rubber; McNutt and Hershey in charge of manpower; Lew Douglas, Land, and Eastman in charge of transportation; Brown and Wickard in charge of prices; and Nelson, Wilson, and Eberstadt in charge of war production. Many of them never entered a bureau until this war. They come from varied occupations—they come from both political parties. Because they are human, they make mistakes. But their tasks are difficult, and after we indulge in the American pastime of criticizing public officials, we must agree that on the whole they are doing a pretty good job. Whatever you may say about them, you cannot fairly characterize them as long-haired starry-eyed new dealers.

And who are these brass hats who are frequently held up to scorn? It is generally pointed out that the term does not refer to the rank and file of the Army and Navy, but solely to the high-ranking officers. Those officers, with few exceptions, come from the regular Army and Navy. In no country on earth is the commissioned personnel secured by a more democratic system. They are sent to the Naval Academy or Military Academy by appointment of the Congressmen and Senators. They come from homes and city apartments. They are just as good or as bad as are the people of the United States. For 25 years in legislative life I have come in contact with the commissioned personnel. I have never heard an officer of the Army or Navy express views about a partisan political question. They are neither Republican nor Democrat. They are just Americans. And to win this war we need these brass hats. In combat and in convoy the Navy has been doing a great job. In the days to come we will have greater reason to be proud of the leadership of Admiral Leahy and Admiral King, and I confess my confidence in the ultimate success of our cause is due in great measure to my confidence in the military genius and statesmanship of General Marshall.

You may think some one or more of these military and civilian leaders deserve criticism and should receive it. Of course, you should be free to see that they get it.

The real danger I wish to guard against and hope you will warn against is the undermining of public confidence, not in this or that official, but in all Government and all administrative machinery. We must not let the public in a critical period of total war lose confidence in the necessary administrative instrumentalities of total war. That is why I asked you to remember William Tell.

Rationing, price-control, wage-control, profit-control, cut deep into the lives of millions of our people. They are not and cannot be made easy to administer. The diversified economic life of a great nation does not lend itself to simple classification. Easily understood rules may be least adaptable to hardship cases.

We should criticize what we think wrong. But before we fly into criticism, we should pause to consider whether we could devise a fairer system or rule to take care of our own difficulties, and the difficulties of our fellow citizens in a different part of the country. When we get really angry about something, I wish we would give the ink on our script time to dry before we print. We should consider whether our speeches and editorials will direct the thinking of our listeners and readers to help win the war or merely make them futilely angry with their Government.

Perhaps I am a special pleader. It is difficult for most of us not to overappraise our own tasks and problems and to underestimate the tasks and problems of the other fellow. But I shall run the risk of being called a special pleader to suggest that in the consideration of the questions bearing on the economic stabilization program, we should be particularly careful to take into account the claims and difficulties of others. When to keep down the cost of living we must hold down prices, wages, and profits, and tax everybody till it hurts, we are likely to be suspected of being more eager to hold down the other fellow's prices, wages, or profits, and to raise the other fellow's taxes more than our own. The labor press will be suspected of being more interested in keeping down prices and profits than in keeping down wages. The farm press will be suspected of being more concerned with holding down wages and industrial prices than farm prices. The business press will be watched to see whether they are quite as concerned to tax the big fellow as the little fellow and whether they are as anxious to hold down business as they are to hold down wages and farm prices.

It is important to remember that we are all going to feel the squeeze of total war, and we will all be looking for the mote in the other fellow's eye. In fighting blocs and special interests we must be above the suspicion of having any bloc or special interest of our own.

I have noticed that some people entertain the view that I missed the mote in my own eye when I spoke about the 48-hour week last Tuesday night. They argue that of course the 48-hour week is necessary to increase production and to make the most effective use of our manpower. But they contend there is no justification for recognizing existing rights to overtime pay. They overlook, however, the fact that it would have been difficult if not impossible to order a 48-hour week abolishing overtime pay without risking an even greater threat to our stabilization program than that alleged to be involved in overtime payments.

Many of the key war industries are already working a 48-hour week or better. For example, average hours worked per week per worker in November 1942, in 5 important war industries were: Machine tools 52.8 hours, firearms 49.2 hours, machine shop products 49 hours, shipyards 48 hours, aircraft plants 48 hours. The well-paid workers in these key war industries are already getting time and a half for time over 40 hours.

Under the Stabilization Act passed by Congress on October 2, it would be impossible to take away the existing right to overtime pay unless it was compensated by an increase in basic hourly rates. The Act forbids a decrease in wages below the highest paid between January 1 and September 15, 1942. Congress did not forbid a decrease in "hourly rates." It said "wages" and lest there be misunderstanding said "wages" and "salaries" should include "additional compensation on an annual or other basis." Congress further said no action should be taken inconsistent with the Fair Labor Standards Act.

It is said that if we could not decrease the wages, we could increase the basic rates. An increase in basic rates in these high-wage war industries would provoke irresistible demands for pay increases in lower-paid industries. It would upset our whole wage structure and greatly aggravate the difficulties of post-war wage readjustments. The overtime requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act do not apply to farming, retail stores or purely local intrastate industries. But many nonwar industries would probably have to meet the increased basic rate in order to hold even a minimum labor supply. A condition, not a theory confronts us. Whether we like it or not, in time of peace, overtime payments became a basic part of contractual relations between industry and labor and to reform them now would require profound industrial readjustments. In the midst of total war we should not tamper with the rules of the industrial system unless it is clear that a change is vitally necessary to help us win the war.

We need a minimum 48-hour week to make the most effective use of our manpower and to increase production. The more effective use of manpower resulting in increased production is an aid in the fight against inflation. On the other hand time and a half for overtime for those not now working overtime has unquestionably a certain inflationary effect. But we cannot treat those workers not now getting overtime differently from those now getting it. To increase the basic hourly rate of those now getting overtime would affect the whole wage structure and have a much greater inflationary effect than to pay overtime to those not now getting it. We must curb the excess purchasing power resulting from overtime payments just as we must curb the excess purchasing power of all groups, labor, agriculture, and business, by higher taxes and by more enforced and voluntary savings.

The Italian army which surrendered in Cyrenaica had weapons but no food. We must have increased food production.

But food prices are high. The farmer is getting a fair and liberal return on his crops. To increase farm prices would increase the cost of living, necessitate wage increases, and upset the whole stabilization program.

But to expand the output of food crops the farmer must incur added costs. We must compensate the farmer for those added costs.

The only way to secure increased output from the farmer and to compensate the farmer for his added costs without disrupting the whole stabilization program is to make incentive payments to the farmer for increasing his output. In my judgment that is not subsidizing either the farmer or the consumer. It is simply purchasing war production which we need because of the extraordinary war demands. That is what we are doing when we pay a price above the regular market price to get the mining companies to produce more copper and other critical metals from high-cost mines.

If we increase farm prices we shall have to pay higher prices to the farmer who produces less, as well as to the farmer who produces more. If we are to pay higher farm prices we will be faced with irresistible demands for higher wages. If, on the other hand, we make incentive payments to the farmer, we will only have to pay for the extra war production we obtained and we will not have to make wage increases.

I hope that you will be willing to help me explain to the farmer and to the country the advantage of incentive payments to the farmer in order to secure the necessary war production. Our fighting forces must have adequate food when the great offensives begin. Now bear witness I have not asked anyone to write a Senator or Congressman. Of course, I can't help it if they read the newspapers.

I welcome criticisms of the stabilization program made with a view to making it work. But the man who says "stabilization cannot work, inflation is coming anyway, let us grab what we can" is like a slacker on the field of battle who says "the enemy is coming; let us run and save our hides." I believe that unless we stand together against the enemy and inflation we shall all lose our hides.

During the coming year no one of us can afford to be dogmatic about our own opinions. We cannot afford to refuse to do our part on the team just because we are not the captain or because the captain has not accepted some of our suggestions.

The press can by its criticism help the Government iron out the kinks in the stabilization program. It can help the public, by its informed discussion, understand what the stabilization program really is. But there are other ways equally important by which the press can help in the fight against inflation. All wisdom is not centered in Washington. All direction cannot come from Washington.

The root cause of inflation is the fact that we cannot produce in wartime all the goods and services we need or would like to have. To protect ourselves against inflation we must avoid using or buying more than our equitable share of available goods and services. We must not try to outbid or outsmart one another to get more than our share of the limited supplies. We must cultivate simple living.

Simple living can be made attractive and pleasant. And the press can do much to make simple living popular. It can teach the housewife the nutrition value of foods that are available. It can tell her how to prepare plain but well-balanced wartime meals. It can develop healthful pastimes for the leisure hours of war workers which will cost little and make little drain on our limited civilian supplies. In short, the press can teach the people how to live under wartime conditions. It can teach them to wear it out—eat it all—make what you have do.

The press can help root out the black markets. In the past the press has often done yeoman service in breaking up rackets and corrupt gangs which prey upon the people. The Pulitzer prize has many times been given for such service. I hope the prize goes this year to the newspaper which does the most outstanding job in stamping out the black markets that prey upon our people. Black markets do not give the people food they would not otherwise get. Black markets hold the people's food for ransom.

Prentiss Brown, the Price Administrator, is doing what he can to abolish the black markets. But he cannot get the men and has not the money to police every town and village. But every community must organize to protect itself against the bootleggers. The fight against inflation is not simply the government's job. It is the job of all the people. In this work the press can play a vital part. Instead of letting a violation of the law become the "smart" thing to do, you can make it a shameful thing to do.

The costs which we impose on ourselves to maintain economic health and stability are small compared with the sacrifices made by those who are bearing the brunt of the battle.

We cannot restore the lives lost on the battlefield. We cannot make whole those maimed and dismembered by the enemy. But as a nation we can actually gain from the economic deprivations and hardships we impose on ourselves during the war. We cannot presently use the money we receive to keep our accustomed standards of living because the goods and services necessary to maintain those standards are not available. If we attempt to use our money to maintain our accustomed standards, we destroy the value of our money. But if we save and live frugally we can regain and improve those standards after the war is over.

When goods are scarce and frugal living is the order of the day, we can help ourselves and the Nation by paying off our private debts. In many directions we have made a good beginning. In the last 17 months since the Federal Reserve Board began to regulate consumer credit, the then outstanding consumer credit of nearly $10,000,000,000 has been reduced by more than a third of what it was. Farm real-estate indebtedness is also being retired at an accelerated rate. Over $10,000,000,000 of farm real-estate indebtedness was paid off in 1941, and it is estimated that even a larger amount was paid off in 1942.

The present situation is dangerous because of the threat that consumers will try to use their increased incomes for consumer goods and services when there is an inflationary gap of some $16,000,000,000 between their incomes and the available supply of consumer goods and services. We can help close the gap by paying our debts and by saving voluntarily, but to complete the job we must have higher taxes and compulsory savings.

I must differ with the people who believe that because it may cause serious inconvenience to our civilian population, we must be careful not to try to do too much at this time and who tell us that we can win the war in 1944 as well as 1943. If any one of you saw your 19-year-old son in a fight which meant his death or the death of his enemy, you would not hold your punches in the belief that you could win that fight tomorrow just as well as today. You would not count the cost or the inconvenience. You would risk all to end that fight now. Well, your sons and your neighbors' sons are in that kind of fight. If I know the spirit of America, it is that we not only must win the war, but we must win the war quickly.

While I would not postpone until 1944 fighting the enemy, I would postpone until 1944 fighting among ourselves. My plea is that we stop fighting each other and start fighting the enemy.

The coming year is going to be the hardest, toughest year our generation has had to endure. But we can make it, if we will, one of the most glorious years in our history, a year which all future generations of Americans will remember with pride and reverence.

The House of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting address on the subject The House of the Future, delivered by Bror Dahlberg at a private dinner in Washington on February 3. We are thinking now of the post-war period, and groping for an outlet for our capital, industrial capacity, and idle labor. This address points to one solution. I am sure that the address will be of widespread interest to America.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When primitive man emerged from the slimy ooze and first stood erect upon the earth, he felt two desires and needs—food and shelter.

In these he wanted little more than the beasts which shared that strange dim world with him; food to satisfy his hunger, a pile of brush or a cave for safety and shelter from the rain and the cold.

But somewhere along the procession of the forgotten centuries one of our remote ancestors felt a stirring in his half-formed mind.

He sought, in his groping way, to make a better shelter, to find a more comfortable, more convenient cave.

Instead of accepting the first available place when night fell, he chose a particular cave or made a crude roof of branches in a location that pleased him.

He and his woman and his offspring returned to it from the wanderings of the day, gathered together in it the handful of things they used.

He planned a home.

And in that moment civilization was born.

Since then man has gone far and done much, but always with one objective—better living.

Irrespective of its many ramifications, better living is a phrase that can be reduced to a diagram.

It is a series of concentric circles, widening as each grows from the one below.

And it has a center; that center is the home.

Today we are engaged in a terrible war—a war to protect the American freedom, the American way of living, the American home.

But let us take comfort from the fact that all widespread wars have been followed, as if through the compassion of Providence, by forward leaps in human progress. So it will be with this war.

After the strife and suffering is over, we can look forward with assurance to a richer, happier life. The wonders that are just at the horizon for us to reach out and grasp would take all evening to enumerate.

So I will stick to my subject, the home, the house of the future.

When one says "house" he covers a wide range—from the hut to the castle, but tonight I am thinking of a machine-made, mass-production house for that large proportion of our population that has never before been able to own or live in a decent house.

When Hitler's tanks rolled across the borders of Poland, the housing industry for hundreds of years had been putting up homes in the same laborious cut-and-fit fashion. The lesson of the spinning jenny—the simple home-made machine that first enabled 1 man's hands to do the work of 10 and then of hundreds—had taught other industries the virtues of mass production, but not the housing industry. Other industries had learned to turn out vastly improved products at greatly reduced costs, but not the housing industry. The American of modest means was the envy of the world because he enjoyed an abundance of food, clothing, transportation, medicine, recreation. Even luxuries, because of their abundance, became necessities. The average American, thanks to mass production, lived like a king—except for his castle. His house was a relic of the stagnation of progress, unless he was fortunate enough to be in the top-quarter-income group.

This is not an all-out indictment of the housing industry. It has, of course, accomplished much but it has been handicapped and hamstrung by the ponderous nature of the building process, with its complicated array of materials and methods, its lack of coordination, the prevalence of restrictive practices and requirements of labor and of capital, of municipalities and of States, the feudalism of crafts, of outmoded building codes, the absence of standardization—all frozen by traditions going back beyond the memory of living man.

Many builders looked ahead and made plans. New construction methods and new materials were developed, tested, and improved. But neither the industry nor the public were ready to abandon tradition. There is a time for everything but, for the house builder, it did not come—until war struck the hour.

Now the industry has awakened with a rush and is shoving into oblivion its former antiquated, cumbersome, and wasteful ideas, methods, and materials. There they will be buried with the kerosene lamp, the Belgian paving block, the iron hitching post, and other relics of the past. Although house building has only recently begun shedding its hide-bound traditions, it is rapidly making up for lost time. The war shattered precedents in the building field as well as on the battlefield. Its ruthless demands made it imperative that the builder learn the lesson of the spinning jenny and learn it quickly and well.

After the war we must cope with the demobilization of millions of the men now serving in the armed forces and more millions engaged in the war effort. We will have to find jobs for these millions. We will not endanger the peace won with the blood and toil of the Nation by permitting our economy to drift into mass unemployment. At a horrible cost in lives and treasure, we are learning that unemployment has been and ever will be the stepping stone of Hitlerlite barbarism to power.

Ladies and gentlemen, I submit that home building, one of the great industries of the Nation, offers one vast, almost virgin field for the steady employment of millions of American workers, the initiative of free enterprise and the investment of capital. This—provided various obstacles are gotten out of the way. The removal of these obstacles would be greatly facilitated by adequate Federal legislation.

For years there has been a crying need for the construction of decent, comfortable homes for families representing almost two-thirds of the entire population of the United States.

As never before, we are conscious of the need of lower cost and better housing. Crowded city slums and dilapidated, antiquated houses on the farm, stand an ugly reproach to our lack of initiative.

Let a few figures tell the tale.

In 1940 there were 37,327,000 dwelling units in the Nation. Half were in need of major repairs or baths or both. Out of more than 7,000,000 farm houses, only 2,200,000 had electric current, 6,000,000 had no running water, 6,500,000 were without baths.

A recent survey shows that more than 2,000,000 farm dwelling units are unfit for human habitation. In Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas the average value of farmhouses is less than $500.

In the summer of 1941 the Federal Housing Coordinator estimated that in order to house the urban population properly we should build 1,600,000 nonfarm units annually for a period of at least 10 years.

But the low-cost house is at long last here. Thousands of such homes for war workers have been built, utilizing new construction methods and materials. Erection has been speeded up, manpower has been conserved, and costs have been reduced. Many of these dwellings are more attractive, more convenient and comfortable, and more durable than many houses of greater cost built by traditional methods. The best of them are advance glimpses of the post-war dwellings that will revolutionize the housing industry after the war.

Let me tell you a little about one house of a particular type.

This particular house has 4½ rooms and is suitable for a family of four. The combination living room and dining alcove is more than 21 feet long. Sunlight pours in through large and decorative picture windows. The two bedrooms are compact, but planned to permit pleasing and practical placing of furniture. The house is completely equipped with up-to-date bathroom and facilities, with central heating, modern lighting, electric stove, oven, refrigerator, hot-water heater, double sink, and ample built-in cabinet spaces.

The walls are composed of a single material, 1$^{9}/_{16}$ inches thick, a multiple function product which replaces the 8 to 10 separately applied materials that go into a traditional wall, such as siding, sheathing, insulation, building paper, lath, several layers of plaster, wallpaper, and paint.

The roofs are built of another multiple-function product, an entirely new unit which insulates, has the required structural strength, and affords complete protection from the elements.

In comfort, convenience, and economy of upkeep this new house is superior to a traditional dwelling of the same size. It is in no sense a temporary or emergency structure. It is built for permanence, is attractive, well proportioned, and thoroughly livable.

This type is simply one out of many and I am mentioning it merely to show the trend that is developing.

People are apt to think that mass production necessarily means that all homes must be identical in appearance, shape, and size. This is not so. Many basic materials and construction methods will be uniform but the prefabricated sections will permit flexibility in architectural design and the houses themselves can be varied to suit individual requirements and tastes.

As an example, only a few miles from here, near Baltimore, is an entire village of these houses—ranging from one-family, single-story, to a six-family, two-story, and to huge Army barracks, all built with the same uniform methods and materials. Right here in Washington are developments of two-story multiple dormitories, likewise constructed with the same basic methods and materials, etc.

The materials and construction techniques used in the low-cost field also will be used in post-war medium-priced homes. These, however, will be larger in size and will include many additional improvements and innovations already on the drawing boards; such as movable walls that open a side of the house to the garden or change the size and shape of rooms to provide extra space for entertaining or for temporary sleeping quarters for an overnight guest. Electrostatic installations will dust, sweep, and sterilize every room, and mechanical servants will take over most housekeeping tasks.

Climate-proof construction will guard health, shut out summer heat and winter chill and reduce heating costs. Air conditioning will provide fresh, tempered air adjusted to the season, or the press of a button will deliver the aroma of alpine firs, the invigorating dry air of the desert, or the soft night breeze of the tropics. Invisible artificial illumination will be automatically controlled by variations in the amount of daylight. These are but a few of the "miracles" which science and industry are prepared to deliver, and at a reachable price.

A fantastic dream? No, a coming reality. In this day, "fantastic" has lost its meaning. A thing is called fantastic, impossible, and suddenly—there it is.

Let me repeat that after the war, houses will be available at prices within the reach of all, so that every family that wants one may have a comfortable, suitable home.

Naturally, there are going to be many ways to build houses. My illustrations are intended for just that—illustrations of a beginning of the new building era, in which constant changes and improvements will occur. Just as the first automobile was really an expression of the mode of transportation, not at all representative of the ultimate article. As a matter of fact, after all these years, the ultimate article in automobiles has not yet been reached—and perhaps but only remotely approached.

The principal thing is to resolve to properly house the American people and then earnestly and energetically get about it.

In the transition period immediately following the war the housing industry must develop a new spirit—the spirit of a crusade with a goal—satisfactory homes for all. Only in this way can the industry bend itself to mass production and at the same time provide jobs for many millions of workers.

We can then look forward to homes for everyone amid fresh air and sunshine, free from the smoke and dust that drench our industrial centers.

We will be able to improve our health and lengthen the lives of ourselves and our children. Everybody will work but the hours will be shortened. There will be leisure for recreation and culture, for outdoor sports, vacations for every man, woman, and child. But let us never forget that all men can live in abundance only when all men produce in abundance.

Of course, more will have to be done than merely build houses. They will have to be placed. Suitable land and living centers will have to be created. Increased and faster transportation facilities provided—aerial highways, better train and car service, shuttle airplane routes, and all the things that go toward making not only the communities themselves but their reachability and livability.

But all those activities will only increase the Nation's plant and provide added constructive work for the people.

In this new world the underprivileged, provided they are truly underprivileged and not

merely indolent, shall not be denied assistance and provision. Doles and social security in some form and under proper circumstances will have to supplement private endeavor. But never in the ages that have gone and never in the ages that are to come will those things ever be the substitute for work and thrift.

As clearly in the future as in the past shall the edict be: "As a man sows, so shall he reap."

And in building up ourselves and our homes we will be good neighbors, help wherever we can, do our full share and perhaps even more toward the reconstruction of other nations, but let us not get too dizzy, taking on as our own individual job the task of raising all the rest of the world up to the American standard of living. Personally, I do not believe we can do it; certainly not in this generation nor the next, and certainly not without danger of pulling down our own.

It seems to me that after the war our first major duty will be to our own Nation, our own people, to see to it that the slums and the poverty around us here be banished from these our United States.

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief tribute to Mme. Chiang Kai-shek written by Pliny A. Wiley, a talented writer of Wichita, Kans.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MME. CHIANG KAI-SHEK

She spoke and all our Congress heard
This voice from China's ancient land
While truth and logic graced her every word
Of flawless English all could understand.

She spoke and Washington's great power
Inclined to hear and answer to her call;
Inclined to help this woman of the hour
Whose eloquence and diction had won her hearers all.

She spoke and our Republic gave
Her rapt attention to the very end
And vowed to send across Pacific's wave
All aid and comfort to our Chinese friend.

She spoke and mankind understood,
Heedless of color, race, or creed,
Her plea for world-wide brotherhood,
Humanity was crying in its need.

—PLINY A. WILEY.

No New Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will be called upon within a few days to make a very important and far-reaching decision affecting the future of aviation in this country.

Because there may be a limited time to debate the so-called Nichols resolution that proposes to set up a new standing committee of the House to handle legislation affecting civil and commercial aviation, I deem it proper to call the attention of the House to a few fundamental and bed-rock phases of that proposal.

In the first place let me say, Mr. Speaker, that no extraordinary gifts of vision or wisdom are necessary in order to realize the great importance of aviation today, and its still greater importance when the world returns once more to the pursuits of peace. The universal acceptance of that importance is in some measure responsible for the fact that the House has before it the consideration of the Nichols resolution.

But let us examine further into the reasons for the consideration at this time of this proposal.

The circumstances which bring this matter now to our attention are superimposed upon a presumption that a legislative job needs to be done, and the further presumption that there does not exist in the House adequate legislative machinery to do an adequate job.

I can see no other justification for such a proposal. Such a presumption that there is legislation that should be enacted, and that there will be additional legislative matters in the future for which the Congress is not prepared, can be logically based only on specific evidence that the committee which has handled, and is now handling, such legislative matters is either unable or unwilling to function, and that the national welfare and interest, insofar as aviation is concerned, has suffered and is likely to suffer in the future.

Mr. Speaker, congressional interest in the development of aviation dates back a good many years. The first bill to be introduced on the subject was S. 1344, introduced in the Senate in 1893 by Senator Cockrell. That bill authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to pay $100,000 to any inventor who would perfect a machine that would transport 5 tons at a speed of 30 miles per hour. The money was to be paid after a demonstration before a committee to be named by the Secretary of War.

In 1926 the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported, and the Congress enacted, the Air Commerce Act. Section 2 of that bill, enacted 17 years ago, authorized the Secretary of Commerce to foster air commerce in accordance with the provisions of the act, to encourage the establishment of airports, civil airways, and other air navigation facilities.

That act, and the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, are the work of the present committee of this House, which has for more than a score of years regulated air commerce as a part of an integrated national transportation system. The Civil Aeronautics Act has been hailed as a long-range and foresighted policy of this Congress to foster, develop, and encourage civil aviation.

It was so described very recently in hearings on another bill before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, by a number of witnesses. It has been called farsighted legislation by Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association of America, and the foresight of Congress in its passage has been praised by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker.

If then that committee which has studied the over-all picture of aviation for many years, has not fallen down on the job in the past, but on the other hand has brought to the House long-range and farsighted legislation, what reason have we to believe that it cannot continue to do so? We have never found, to my knowledge, any better way of judging the future but by the past. And the ability of the present committee to handle legislation dealing with aviation in the future, if measured by its accomplishments, cannot be doubted or disputed.

A great deal has been said here in the last few weeks about the future of aviation with respect to foreign nations. There have been rhetorical questions posed at times by those who apparently were more interested in language than logic and who refused to allow facts and realities to cramp their style, all implying that the Congress, by legislation, could and should step into the broad and delicate field of international relations and make secure certain air advantages for the United States.

But I have not yet been privileged to hear one specific suggestion of what can be done in a legislative way that has not been done or cannot be done by the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is not a complex one. It is very simple. And I hope that when Members are called upon to make so vital a decision, they may be able to reduce it to the proposition that inheres in the proposal, and realize, as I stated in the beginning, that it is merely a question of whether there is now a legislative job that needs to be done for which there is no legislative machinery. If there is, then we should have another committee. If on the other hand, the record of the past justifies the belief that whatever the problems of the future may be, the present committee is able to meet and solve them, then we do not need any new committee. Every Member in this House I believe will agree that we have too many committees already.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to add here a word about the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the able and distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEA]. It is extremely doubtful if any Member of this House has given longer and more thorough study to the whole field of aviation than the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA]. That study began when he was appointed a member of a special committee to study and investigate war aviation during World War No. 1. It has not ended.

In addition to filing a 70-page report on aviation dealing with production and operations, the gentleman from California, Chairman LEA, made a number of recommendations to the Congress

looking toward the improvement and development of both military and civil aviation.

So comprehensive was that study and report, Mr. Speaker, that it has since been used by military authorities in the War College for reference.

Sometime prior to the passage of the Air Commerce Act of 1926, the gentleman from California, Chairman LEA, was a member of the Lampert committee appointed by the House to investigate aviation. It was from the late Billy Mitchell that the Lampert committee received much information and many suggestions.

When the committee was ready to write a report, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] was unanimously chosen to write the main body of the report, which contained many recommendations for the improvement of aviation, some of which subsequently were incorporated in the Air Commerce Act of 1926, and still others in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

In 1935 Mr. LEA introduced in the House comprehensive legislation for the regulation of air commerce, and in 1938 he was chairman of the subcommittee which wrote the Civil Aeronautics Act.

I have referred to this long period of interest and activity on the part of Chairman LEA in order to bring to the attention of the House the fact that the present House committee handling aviation legislation is under the chairmanship of a gentleman who has given years to the study, and who in fact was "dipping into the future" on this subject long before many of those among us today had received any special vision.

I wish that time might permit me to discuss also the long and careful study given these problems by such distinguished gentleman as Major BULWINKLE, Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey, Mr. CROSSER, Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts, Mr. REECE of Tennessee, Mr. BOREN, and other members of the present Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Suffice it to say in this connection, Mr. Speaker, that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is composed of members who have given long years of study to this problem, and of other younger Members who have a high regard for the importance of civil and commercial aviation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me sum this matter up by saying that we should reach a decision on this proposal for a separate committee on the basis of what is best for the future of aviation in the United States.

Let me emphasize once again that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is now and has been for many years the legislative authority for all forms of transportation. In that role the committee has promoted and protected and, at the same time, restrained and regulated carriers, and leaders of the various transportation systems have attested to the impartial and the judicial attitude of the committee in its efforts to integrate all systems of transportation into a constructive whole.

If legislation pertaining to commercial and civil aviation be now taken from that committee and turned over to an entirely new committee, it will be the first step toward tearing down the general transportation system and would, in effect, result in competing committees of the Congress in which circumstance there would forever inhere the possibility that each would become the special pleader for one or another interest or group of interests in the transportation system.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, after careful examination and complete analysis of all that is involved, the House will defeat the Nichols resolution.

Federal Use Tax on Automobiles Should Be Repealed

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under existing law the levying of the automobile use tax on motor vehicles is unjust and an unwarranted burden on the automobile owners of the Nation.

It is estimated that there are over 27,000,000 automobiles in operation throughout the United States, but due to the driving ban a great percentage of these vehicles are used only in essential driving for occupational purposes. As a result, the Federal use tax is an added burden on transportation facilities so necessary in the successful prosecution of the war.

The various States have depended to a marked degree on the revenue from motor vehicles to maintain and construct our modern highway system that is being used to good advantage in overland transportation. Such punitive legislation as the Federal use tax on motor vehicles tends to discourage the ownership of motorcars, and with the reduction in revenue from gasoline and other excise taxes incident to the restricted operation of motor vehicles the States and the Federal Government are faced with a huge loss of tax revenue from the forcing off the highways of millions of motor vehicles. The large number of car owners who have recently disposed of their motor vehicles or who have placed them in dead storage is proof of the fact that unsound and unjustifiable taxes such as the Federal use tax has a punitive effect in depriving taxing authorities of other revenue accruing from the operation of motor vehicles.

When Public Law No. 250, embodying the Federal use tax on motor vehicles and boats was passed in the Seventy-seventh Congress, there was a feeling that every effort should be made to provide tax revenues for national-defense expenditures. Since millions of motorists have since abandoned their cars by sale or by storage it is increasingly evident that the $5.00 use tax has served no useful purpose, but is in reality acting as a deterrent in collecting gasoline and other taxes that follow the operation of motor vehicles.

Idle cars should not be subjected to a so-called use tax if for no other reason than the fact that the individual motorist is paying for something from which he receives no benefits. This situation is repugnant to the American concept of fairness and justice.

In a sincere desire to free the American motorist from this unjust form of taxation and to release the popular form of automobile transportation from the ill effects of burdensome and unsound legislation I have introduced a bill to repeal section 3540 of chapter 33-A of Public Law No. 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, which provides for a tax upon the use of motor vehicles and boats. I feel certain that thoughtful attention to the gross injustice the Federal use tax has caused the American motorist should prove sufficient urging to the Members of Congress to support my efforts to repeal this obnoxious and unwarranted tax on the car owners of the Nation.

The Agricultural Crisis

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, there was a meeting last night in the House Agricultural Committee room of some fifty members who represent agriculture. The action taken by these members, I feel, will largely solve the shortage of farm help and farm machinery. These members will meet again in the House Agricultural Committee room at 10:30 Saturday morning. Every member of this House who is interested in agriculture is cordially invited to attend and participate in this meeting.

The time for debating the agricultural crisis has passed. The time for action has arrived. We know that agriculture, because of conflicting "directives and Executive orders," has been all but wrecked and the Nation's food supply endangered. What we need now is action, not more debating. Democracy has arisen from its slumber—the Congress of the United States is in action. We, the representatives of the people, are no longer going to stand idly by and permit disaster to engulf our Nation.

There has been altogether too much censorship, too much concealment of governmental blunders and too many executive sessions for the good of the Nation. What little the bureaucrats know, or what Congress knows, the peo-

ple, their masters, have a right to know. These blunders are due to the fact that the administration is top-heavy with book knowledge and woefully lacking in experience and common horse sense.

There are too many book-educated specialists from Harvard and Columbia Universities. Some of these are more foreign-minded than American-minded. They would substitute the Hitler form of government for the American. They believe in regimentation, in bluff, and in bluster. They threaten to get tough and to crack down on the people. They have caused the civilians unnecessary hardships and have hindered the prosecution of the war.

We are at war. This war does not belong to a little clique of bureaucrats, it belongs to all of us. It is not a social event for glamour girls and boys or for the international four hundred. It is a war in which our sons are giving their lives so that the form of government known to George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln may survive.

There are some things going on here in Washington that are not healthy for democracy. There are many men in key positions that are stifling the Nation's war activities. These have arrogantly made themselves the bottlenecks through which the Nation's energy must flow. Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, are aware of this. They sense something that is un-American—that is foreign. There is a suspicion that these bureaucrats are interfering with the conduct of the war. War is the business of generals and admirals—just as farming is the business of farmers—not of bureaucrats. There is danger ahead. We must become more united, more determined and more serious about this war.

The men who are responsible for this farm crisis are not the men who do the fighting. They lay awake nights figuring out new one-man-made laws—directives. On February 12, Lincoln's Birthday, the Federal Register for this session, which contains the Executive and administrative orders, and is printed in the same size type and on the same size pages as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, contained 1870 pages, while the proceedings of the Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which contain the speeches by the Senators and Congressmen for the same period, total only 935 pages—just one-half. How long can we as a nation survive under such confusion and conglomeration of Executive and administrative orders.

These men are now talking of training the city girls and boys to operate the farms. They are going to supply the Nation with food through school children. Is this the first step to collective farming? Will the farm sons, when they come home, find their places taken by pretty maidens? The whole thing is absurd but it is also dangerous. The President owes it to himself to clean house. If he does not do this, Congress will have to do it for him. The Nation's life is at stake.

The solution of the agricultural problem is not a partisan problem. It is not a Republican or a Democratic problem. It is an American problem. Therefore, on behalf of the 50 Members that met last night, I again invite all the Members who are interested in the solution of this problem to meet with us in the House Agricultural Committee room at 10:30 Saturday morning. You may rest assured that Congress is going to protect the Nation's food supply.

All-Out Effort for War in Government Agencies

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of appeal by the administration to industry and to business for an all-out effort; that we do everything possible to see that our manpower and all our facilities are used to provide a maximum amount of war supplies and materials for our fighting forces.

We all agree that everything must be done to reach a maximum goal of furnishing supplies and materials that are so much needed at this very hour. Farmers and producers are being asked to bend their energies and power and their time to see that all possible food may be produced to meet the demand for our increasing armed forces and for the hungry people abroad, as well as to supply all our civilian demands. They are asked to do it under the handicap of shortage of manpower, machinery, and equipment.

You can be assured the American farmer is going to meet that challenge to the very limit of his ability and he is not going to spare any hours or any energy in his effort to meet that demand to prevent the food crisis that is facing us at this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the thing I want to suggest is that our administration likewise make an appeal to its own departments of Government, to the heads of the various agencies, bureaus, and other groups, as well as those who are employed thereunder; ask them and demand, if you please, that they cut out each and every agency and activity that is not absolutely necessary in the present crisis. Appeal to those in charge of employment, ask them, and demand that they use only such employment and such assistance as is required to carry on their work. Not with a view of crippling any important agency or department, but with a view of making it more efficient and workable, and then appeal to those employed in the Government to bend their energies just a little more in the accomplishment of the tasks that are set before them. Make them realize that they are responsible for a job that does affect the prosecution and the winning of the war and see to it that they are doing everything they can to accomplish that task. Why not have the administration find out about absenteeism in Government just the same as anywhere else. If there is no absenteeism, all right; but if there is unnecessary absenteeism, let us cure it. If there are people in the Government who are not contributing as they should, then release them.

The pay for services is, of course, the important thing, but along with that is the realization of a piece of work well done which contributes in this hour of need.

An Outstanding Editorial

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding editorials of this war appeared in the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal on last Monday, February 22.

It consists largely of a letter from a small boy to the editor of the Commercial Appeal, and the editor's reply. In my opinion it will go down in history alongside of the famous "Virginia" editorial on Santa Claus that appeared in the New York Sun many, many years ago, and has been republished with every passing Christmas.

I am inserting this editorial as a part of these remarks.

The matter referred to follows:

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

We received a letter from Fred Vaughn, Jr., today. We get a lot of letters, but we thought you would be especially interested in this one. We were. Fred writes like the kind of boy that comes to mind when we think of the American boy.

CANTON, MISS.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: I asked my daddy to find out where to send my pet dog, so Uncle Sam can use him, as I understand he needs dogs like him. He is a fine German police dog, 1 year old, smart as a whip, and he weighs around 75 pounds. I will send him to Uncle Sam free if you will tell me who to send him to. I am a second-class Boy Scout, and I want to help whip the Japs, and I know Jack will eat them up if you sic him on them or do anything you tell him to do. I am 13 years old and in about 2 years, if the war is not over I will join the Navy and help my six uncles that are in the Navy and Army. Write me real soon or print it in the paper I read every morning.

Yours truly,

FRED VAUGHN, JR.

DEAR FRED: First, let me answer your request. I have told several branches of the service about Jack. They have had many dogs offered to them, and they are busy now trying to arrange places for them. When they need Jack, they will get in touch with you. All of them thank you. They think you are a fine boy. So do I, Fred.

I know what it means for a boy to offer to give up his dog. I have three little boys, too, and they have a dog they love dearly. I am not so sure they would be as unselfish about Brownie as you are about Jack. But they are younger than you are, and lots of younger boys are going to be less selfish now because of your offer to give Jack to Uncle Sam. Lots of us older folks, too. God bless you, Fred, and let us hope that in "about 2 years" you will be thinking about school, and hunting, and fishing; of baseball, and games and what you are going to be when you grow up and not about going off to war.

Let us hope we are all striving as best we know to make a peace endure so that little boys can grow and dream in a world without war-mad dictators. Thanks again for your letter, Fred. If Jack does go we know he will be everything you say he is and he will be a credit to you. You and Jack have done more than you know for the war effort already.

Your friend,

THE EDITOR.

Interest on Federal Land Bank Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a petition of the Ottawa County National Farm Loan Association, of Ottawa County, Ohio, urging the Congress to permanently reduce the rate of interest on Federal Land bank and/or Land Bank Commissioner loans to 3½ percent:

We, the undersigned members of the Ottawa County National Farm Loan Association, of Ottawa County, Ohio, and borrowers from the Federal Land Bank of Louisville, Ky., hereby petition Congress to permanently reduce the rate of interest on Federal Land Bank and/or Land Bank Commissioner loans to 3½ percent.

A. F. Pierson, Oak Harbor, route 1; Norman La Cumsky, Port Clinton; George Engel, Elmore; George W. Wahlers, Port Clinton; John Lorenzen, Clay Center; Otto Harmeyer, Clay Genoa; Wesley Windisch, Oak Harbor, route 7; Wm. Hoffman, Oak Harbor; Adolph Engel, Elmore; Otto Riemann, Graytown; John Dubbert, Port Clinton; Lester H. Smith, Oak Harbor, route 1; Andrew C. Friedrickson, Williston; Raymond C. Bloom, Oak Harbor, route 2; R. A. Barnholt, Port Clinton; John Genzman, Oak Harbor; Edward Buehler, Oak Harbor, route 1; Mrs. Edward Buehler, Oak Harbor, route 1; Emma Lentner, Martin; Henry Jess, Graytown; Arthur Sandrock, Graytown; Emil Dressler, Wayne; William Nissen, Martin; Henry Rofkar, Port Clinton; Fred Sandrock, Graytown; Louis W. Blausey, Martin; George Sekerka, Toledo; Alvin Engler, Oak Harbor; Adrian Lau, Curtice, route 1; Mrs. Ted Hopfinger, Oak Harbor, route 2; Mrs. Frank Hopfinger, Oak Harbor; Mrs. William Nissen, Martin.

We Need Home Rule on Public Power

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to explain as clearly as I can the purposes of my bill, H. R. 1899, which I introduced recently, and which was referred to the Rivers and Harbors Committee, of which I am a member.

This bill, briefly, would require the Federal Government to sell the entire Grand Coulee project to the State of Washington, and to sell the Bonneville project jointly to the States of Washington and Oregon.

For the information of all concerned, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of this bill:

H. R. 1899

A bill to authorize the sale to the States of Washington and Oregon of the properties owned by the Federal Government in connection with the Grand Coulee and Bonneville projects

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Government, acting through its duly constituted agency or agencies, is hereby empowered and shall, when the condition of section 2 is complied with, sell and deliver the Grand Coulee project, located on the Columbia River in the State of Washington, including the dam, power generation and distribution facilities, and all other physical properties in connection therewith, owned or held under lease by the Federal Government at the time of the transfer, to the State of Washington or its duly constituted public agency or agencies, and/or the Bonneville project, located on the Columbia River in the States of Washington and Oregon, including the dam, power generation and distribution facilities, and all other physical properties in connection therewith, owned or held under lease by the Federal Government at the time of transfer, to the States of Washington and Oregon jointly, or their duly constituted public agency or agencies.

SEC. 2. Compensation to be paid the Federal Government to its duly constituted agency or agencies shall be the net cost of the project or projects set forth in section 1 less depreciation reserve, if any is existing at time of transfer. Such amount of compensation shall be paid in revenue bonds backed by the income of the aforesaid project or projects, or in cash, or a combination of both as may be mutually agreed upon by the parties to the transfer or transfers.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe in home rule on public power. The legislature of my State recently passed Initiative No. 12, and it is now law under an emergency clause. I actively supported this initiative, and I greatly appreciate the hundreds of letters and telegrams from my district which endorse and approve my work for it. This measure allows the commissioners of public-utility districts in my State to combine for the purpose of acquiring privately owned power systems. I presume it also permits them to combine to acquire publicly owned systems, such as the Federal Government's Grand Coulee and Bonneville projects. This initiative is a mighty step forward in bringing about home rule—control by the people of the State over their hydroelectric resources.

My new bill, H. R. 1899, is the final step toward complete, independent home rule of these resources.

I believe that the Pacific Northwest, after the war, will see the greatest and most healthful growth of any part of the Nation. I believe this will be brought about largely by the combination of vast amounts of cheap power with the region's incalculably rich ore, timber, oil, and other resources. I believe, too, that my new bill may prove to be the key which will unlock the door to this future prosperity.

One reason it helps insure this prosperity is that, through local and independent control, the States will be able to set rates for power so low that the industries which need such power—the light metals industry, for example—will be attracted to the Pacific Northwest.

My bill provides that Washington and Oregon can take over these Federally owned power projects by paying the Federal Government in revenue bonds, which would be a lien on the revenues of the projects; or they could pay in cash; or in a combination of cash and revenue bonds. Let me emphasize here that there would be no obligation on the taxpayers at all. No higher taxes could result from this bill. In fact, the State taxes would decline as more taxable wealth would be created in the form of new industries.

Mr. Speaker, I know, and every well-informed person in the Pacific Northwest also knows, that Grand Coulee and Bonneville will pay out. Already, the revenues from these two projects aggregate more than $10,000,000 a year. By July, according to official estimates, the revenues will run about $18,000,000 a year. Before long, we can safely estimate that these revenues will amount to $20,000,000 a year, probably more. To date, according to the official figures, Bonneville has cost about $160,000,000. Grand Coulee has cost a similar amount. Neither one is completed, but already they are earning about 6 percent on the Government's investment.

I imagine that when the question is asked, Who will buy these revenue bonds? the bankers and the bond houses and the insurance companies and, yes, the small, individual investor, too, will give a quick and satisfactory answer. They will be glad to have the chance to buy these bonds; and the States will have, through these bond sales, an immediate and plentiful supply of hard, cash money to hand the United States Government in exchange for Grand Coulee and Bonneville.

Parenthetically, I might point out that this embodies a somewhat revolutionary idea. It has been the custom during the past 10 years for the United States Treasury to pour out money, not take it in. My bill will reduce the national debt by the $300,000,000 or so which the States will pay for these projects. I see in this not only a cash gain for the Federal Government, but a definite anti-inflationary

effect. The banks are overloaded with money. They want good investments. These revenue bonds would be one of the finest investments they could find. Therefore this purchase by the States of these Federal projects would take some $300,000,000 or more out of circulation, which surely is anti-inflationary, and would reduce the national debt by a similar sum, which again is anti-inflationary.

There is another aspect to this matter which deserves mention. Under Federal control and ownership, the revenues derived from the operation of Grand Coulee and Bonneville will never be more than the proverbial drop in the bucket as compared to the total cost of operating the Federal Government.

But, Mr. Speaker, these same revenues—these profits which would be available once the revenues for power sold had paid off the bonds of the State purchasers—could in a comparatively few years be used to reduce the taxes of the people of the two States. Perhaps within a generation these great projects, under State ownership, would become, in some degree, the mechanical taxpayers of the States, relieving the burden on the human taxpayers.

I want to make clear that I do not want the Federal Government to lose by this transaction. Neither do I want the Federal Government to make a profit at the expense of the States. There is a fair price to be reached; and it can and will be reached, in justice to both Nation and State.

I want to point out, also, that the public-utility districts of Washington State already have proved their ability to function efficiently and profitably and fairly—and I maintain that they thereby have proved that they are capable, through combining the brains and abilities represented on the boards of commissioners, of operating these huge power projects of Grand Coulee and Bonneville with efficiency and profit and fairness.

In a general way, I view the Pacific Northwest's power situation thusly: Public power is in the ascendancy. In building Grand Coulee and Bonneville, the Federal Government in a great degree has gained the control over power in my State—a control which was once exercised from the Nation's financial center. Financial control of the holding companies has been succeeded by political control by the Federal Government.

I do not believe the people of Washington State, or of any other part of the Pacific Northwest, like this new political control of their hydroelectric resources any more than they liked the financial control of the private power hierarchy.

If neither Federal Government control, from 3,000 miles away, nor Wall Street control, also from 3,000 miles away, is desirable, what alternative is left? Mr. Speaker, I believe my new bill provides the answer. I believe my bill contains the only and the best alternative—that is State control.

Let me add this: My bill, H. R. 1899, is an enabling act. Before its purposes can be accomplished, the States of Washington and Oregon must set up their agencies to take over these Federal projects; they must work out the financing, through sale of revenue bonds or otherwise; and they must hand the United States Government a sum equaling the net cost of the projects before they are transferred to State ownership.

Therefore, it is up to the people of the States, through their public-utility districts' commissioners, or through whatever means they might choose, to take advantage of the new day in public power which I believe my bill offers to the Pacific Northwest—to acquire, in short, the blessings of independent home rule.

Fulton Lewis, Jr., on Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Fulton Lewis, Jr., made on the evening of Monday, February 22, 1943, over the Mutual network and WHN in New York City:

To begin with tonight, the original announcement of point schedules for the new point-rationing system which goes into effect on March 1 was greeted in congressional circles here today with considerable criticsm and very little commendation. It was not a partisan political matter at all. Much of the heaviest criticism came from Democratic Senators and Congressmen. Some of the approval and support came from Republicans, but the balance was decidedly on unfavorable side.

One of the commonest criticisms is that the economics professors in the Office of Price Administration—and they are still in there—Mr. Prentiss Brown has not cleaned any of them out—have undertaken far more than is necessary; that they apparently are rationing, just for the sake of rationing; that it's an orgy of Government regulations, in which the home economics theorists and the people who write Government pamphlets on dietetics and nutrition and such things are having a fine time making guinea-pig experiments on a helpless American public.

The comparatively few supporters said that the public ought to be willing to accept this rationing system with a smile and undergo any hardships that are entailed by it, in order to provide the necessary food for our armed forces and for our partners in the war.

They said it is necessary to put this rationing system into effect, and the Government wouldn't be doing so unless it were necessary. With the first half of that argument, I think everyone will agree—the part about everyone being willing to put up with any hardships that may come along. As a matter of fact, that already has been demonstrated, time after time all the way through this war.

With the second half of it—that the rationing would not be going into effect, unless it were necessary—there was considerable rebuttal, led by Senator LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas. He said that the reason for the canned goods shortage is that the Government would not allow the canneries to operate at capacity last year; crops that could have been canned rotted in the fields; the farmer was unable to get enough labor to harvest many of his crops, even if there had been canning facilities available and permission for the canneries to operate. He said, to quote him exactly—

"We're going to continue to have bungling like this as long as the bureaucrats continue to issue foolish edicts. I suggest that we put into the Government people who know how to produce food."

Senator BUSHFIELD, of South Dakota, said that if there is such a break-down in food supply, as the Office of Price Administration has said, it's a break-down of distribution and Government administration, and the unsound administration of the Office of Price Administration.

Thus far, I've been unable to find any supporters, who are willing to come forth with a rebuttal of the rebuttal, but maybe I'll be able to get some, tomorrow.

From the standpoint of generalities, the angle that seems to be causing the greatest concern, is the fact that to all intents and purposes, this means that a large part of the Nation, which has been eating out of cans, is going to stop eating out of cans. There are those in Government circles who say, smugly, that it'll be a good thing. That's unfortunate, because those people are not put in office to decide what's good for the American people, or what is not good for them—even if they were so omnipotent as to know, which, I assure you, they're not. But those expressions are not official, and I don't believe for a moment that they are any real part of the motive force behind this point rationing system of canned goods.

There is one vitally important point, which no one seems to have taken into consideration at all, and that is the fundamental unsoundness of the mathematics, by which this canned goods rationing scheme was arrived at.

It's easy enough to sit down with a bunch of statistics, showing that last year the public consumed so many million cans of food, which, divided by the number of people, leaves an average of this many cans to the individual. Then, this year, you have less than 50 percent as many cans available, so you cut the last year's average for the individual accordingly, and that's the number of cans that each American citizen is to be allowed under the point rationing system. That's quite simple mathematically. My little 11-year-old daughter, Betsy, can do it, and I think possibly that Fulton Lewis, the third, who is only 7, could figure it out. But while it looks fine on paper, it doesn't work out in practice.

The simple fact is that there's a vast difference in the needs of various people, so far as canned goods are concerned. In great metropolitan districts the individual is forced to depend very heavily on canned goods. It isn't because he wants to; he has no other choice. It's the only way he can get the food that he has to have to live. On the other hand, in most of the rural communities of the Nation the families don't consume 5 percent of the canned goods that a city family will use. They do their own canning of their own garden produce. They have their own winter garden crops on the farm. So actually the fundamental premise of the whole thing is false. There is no average consumption of canned goods for the average American citizen, and when you divide the entire available supply up, and allow everyone to have the same amount, you give part of the population a lot more than it needs, and another part only a small portion

of what it really has to have in order to get along.

Four cans of food per month for the average individual in New York or Philadelphia or Boston is just inconceivable. Four cans for a great many farm families is infinitely more than they'll ever want or need.

However, maybe that little quirk will be worked out.

It does suggest, however, that this point-rationing system is not necessarily foolproof. It's true it has worked in England. Let's hope it works here. But we seem, here in this country, to have gotten into a habit of rushing over to England and finding that England is doing this or that or the other thing and then rushing back here and nothing will do but that we try the same thing just because England is doing it. In this particular case, for example, there's a great deal of difference between our problems and the problems that exist in England. There's a great deal of difference in conditions.

England is a tiny little country, in which the eating tastes and the appetites of the people are fairly homogeneous. That's not true here at all. England is a small country geographically, and it's comparatively simple to do a policing job. That's not true here.

Most important of all, in England, the Government, actually owns the food, it has physical control of the food, and so point rationing there is a system by which the Government tells the pubic how much it can have of this or that or something else. In this country, the Government does not own the food. The point rationing system here is merely a matter of the Government serving as referee between private individuals who have the food and those who consume it, and the problem of policing that, and preventing black market operations, is appalling.

In the registration, which began today all over the Nation, there were several bad trouble spots that showed up. One is the little question of your declaring how much coffee you had last November, not how much you have now. It's true, the Office of Price Administration said last November to make a note of it. Most of those notes have been lost.

One ration official told me this afternoon that people are turning in old ration books, and getting new ones, for members of the family who have gone in the service. There's no way in the world for the ration boards to know what those cases are.

But the only thing to do is to give it a fair and honest trial. Then, if it fails, we'll try to find out why, and what can be done about it.

The House Ways and Means Committee is going to give its final approval, probably tomorrow, to the new legislation to increase the national debt limit from $125,000,000,000 to $210,000,000,000. But more important than that, included in that legislation as an amendment, is the provision to abolish President Roosevelt's limitation of $25,000 on all salaries for the duration of the war.

That amendment is being sponsored by Representative WESLEY DISNEY, of Oklahoma. It has the overwhelming support of the Ways and Means Committee. Informal polls of the House of Representatives show that it will be overwhelmingly approved there, and preliminary polls show the same thing in the Senate.

Furthermore, the President's compromise proposal, which he sent to the committee, in a letter, late last week, has been royally ignored. The committee seems to have decided, definitely, on the Disney plan, and that is what's going through.

The reports as to just what the Disney plan will do, have been quite confusing. I have had several interviews with him, to try to get the thing absolutely straight, and here's the story.

In the first place, it doesn't affect wages in any way—only salaries, within the technical definition of the Treasury Department—and, therefore, it does not affect the existing rulings and policies of the War Labor Board, on wage scales, or the Little Steel formula, or anything of that sort.

So, remembering that it is confined strictly to salaries, the first thing it does is to freeze all salaries above $25,000, at the level at which they stood on December 7, 1941, the day of Pearl Harbor. Anybody who was making more than $25,000, after payment of taxes, on that date, is allowed to make exactly that same amount and no more, for the duration of the war.

For people who made less than a net of $25,000 before Pearl Harbor, it removes all limitations of raises and salary increases since that time except that the regular Treasury regulations against unreasonable salary raises will apply; they have always applied, for that matter; and also, no raises can be given under any circumstances, which bring the individual's income above the $25,000 figure after payment of taxes.

So the effect is to place a ceiling of $25,000 net on all wages that have been, in the past, under that; and for all salaries over that figure in the past, to freeze at the level of December 7, 1941.

Urging Mayors and Supervisors to Appoint Farm Employment Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter I have sent to all mayors and supervisors in my new and old congressional districts, urging them to appoint farm employment committees in order to establish a reservoir or pool of all available manpower to help the farmers in the labor crisis with which they are confronted and will be increasingly so this spring and summer.

Time is of the essence, and I believe that if such committees are formed immediately, and the proposed program is put into effect throughout the country now it would be of assistance in solving the main problem of the farmers, lack of manpower, and help avoid a serious food shortage.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1943.

I am writing to ask the mayors of the cities and supervisors in the towns in Orange, Dutchess, Putnam, Rockland, Sullivan, and Delaware Counties, to appoint committees on farm employment and inaugurate a campaign to enlist high-school boys and girls from 15 to 18 and all other qualified unemployed or part-time workers to engage in farm work and help replace the labor taken from the farms by the draft and the inducement of high wages in the war industries.

The Nation faces a serious food shortage for the first time in its history. Farming is as much a war industry as a munitions plant. Food is as essential as weapons. We might even borrow or lease-lend arms from Great Britain, but not food.

As a Member of Congress, realizing that even the American people may go hungry this fall, I urge all physically qualified unemployed, as part of their war contribution, to help out this spring and summer on the farms. I suggest to the mayors and supervisors that they include on the farm employment committees the superintendent of the local high school, the secretary of the chamber of commerce or board of trade, an official of the Parent-Teacher Association, and representatives from civic and social clubs and of labor and agriculture.

These committees, if they are to be effective, should be organized immediately and have a survey made of the need for labor on the farms in the vicinity and compile a list of eligibles. After the completion of this survey and the hours, type, and conditions of farm labor and wages are known it will probably be necessary to enlist the support of the local newspapers and radio to put on a gratuitous campaign. The way to begin is to begin, and the time is now.

I also appeal to all patriotic people wherever possible to start planning a Victory garden this spring. My office at 157 Broadway, Newburgh, N. Y., in charge of Capt. Arthur E. Brundage, will furnish or mail anyone a copy of the Department of Agriculture booklet on Victory Gardens, free of charge upon request.

The American people are willing and ready to make every sacrifice to win the war, and nothing is more important than producing food for our armies, ourselves and for our allies, and feeding the starving women and children in Greece—and, if I had my way, also in France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, and Poland.

The farmer is the forgotten man in America. He has large investments in land, buildings, equipment, and in flocks and herds, works from dawn to dusk, is burdened with taxes, and ekes out a precarious living. If he is forced to abandon his farm and slaughter his herds it means a more serious food shortage, and a diminishing trade for the small merchants in the rural communities.

Trusting you will accept my suggestion in the spirit in which it is offered, and assuring you of my utmost cooperation, I am, with kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

Address of Hon. Charles M. LaFollette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] before the Indiana Committee for Victory, Columbia Club, Indianapolis, Ind., February 23, 1943:

I believe that the Indiana Committee for Victory is concerned with but one primary problem, as its name implies, a full and complete victory over our enemies in this war

and, of course, like all Americans, to whom the loss of life and the shedding of blood is abhorrent, it is interested in victory being obtained as speedily as possible. I also believe that this committee has in mind a definition of the term "victory" which encompasses the idea of a final, successful defeat of the armies of our foes ending in their unconditional surrender and involving no peace which does not include as a condition of surrender, the surrender of our enemies at the same time to all of the nations alined with us against a common enemy or enemies. At least on that phase of the question, that is my definition of the term, which I will make even more specific by saying that victory over Germany and Italy means a surrender by Germany and Italy, not only to the United States and Great Britain and the other allies who are not actively participating in the European theater of the war against those two enemies, but that it also must include the unconditional surrender of Germany and Italy to Russia. Likewise, victory over Japan must mean not only surrender by Japan to ourselves, Great Britain, and the other allies not actively participating in the Pacific theater of the war, but also a complete surrender of Japan to China. Any other definition of victory, in my opinion, would be tragic. My thinking presupposes that Russia will not make a separate peace with Germany and that China will not make a separate peace with Japan. I am not only willing to stand or fall on these two presumptions, but I think that it is a matter of military necessity that any person being a Member of the Congress of the United States discussing this war and ultimate victory must so declare his belief, because to do otherwise is to provide fuel for those who would spread disunity between the nations fighting Germany and Italy and likewise between the nations who are fighting Japan.

Again, while on the subject of victory and this war and our relations with Russia in the conduct of it, I want to express my disapproval of the agitation which has sprung up almost overnight in America that this Government as a result of lend-lease operations should immediately, by treaty or otherwise, demand of Russia at this time, that Russia, not being at war with Japan, should grant to the United States airplane bases in Siberia from which we could bomb Japan. Such thinking ignores completely the present diplomatic and military consideration, particularly military. Leaving aside all questions of what Russia should do after the defeat of Germany, if that defeat should come before the defeat of Japan—as it probably will—at the present time, the granting by Russia of airplane bases to the United States in Siberia would be a breach of Russia's nonaggression pact with Japan and would turn loose on Russia's back an attack by Japan which could have no other effect than to lessen the capacity of Russia to maintain her pressure upon Germany at the fullest weight of its present strength. I say this because it must be obvious that a Russia fighting Japan in the East and Germany in the West could not be as strong against Germany as a Russia fighting only in the West. And, consequently, a Germany relieved of the maximum Russian pressure on Germany's East could concentrate more of her power in Western Europe, which, in turn, would make any offensive effort by this country increasingly difficult to accomplish successfully and would result in a greatly magnified loss of American life and the shedding of American blood.

I mention this fallacious thinking because I have received in my mail a demand of an American mother that we should immediately demand of Russia bases from which we can attack Japan. I am informed that similar letters have been received recently by other Congressmen. I believe inherently in democracy and democracy presupposes that the best way to defeat untruths is by an open discussion of all questions. It is my positive conviction that any action on our part at this time which would precipitate a Japanese attack upon Russia in Siberia would cause a flow of American blood in western Europe of tremendous proportions. Believing that, I am glad to have this opportunity to publicly state the reasons from which my belief springs. Because, after all, democracy again demands that a person should not only state his position but the reasons upon which it is based, in order that those who hear him or read after him may form their own opinions as to the correctness of the conclusion stated by a speaker by analyzing the factual basis out of which his conclusions arise.

Without meaning to pat myself on the back for doing that which I think I am obligated to do, I would like to digress in my thinking enough to say that the tragic disunity which has arisen in America and the nerve-shattering screaming which is still going on in America arises from the failure of those who speak publicly to lay their arguments before the people dispassionately so that reason, and not emotionalism, may be the motivating force of our decisions.

I do not profess to know what Russia will do about Japan after Germany is defeated. I am only convinced that it is against America's interest at present, and it is against the interest of the men who are fighting this war and their loved ones that we do anything which would precipitate a Japanese attack on Russia before Germany and Italy are defeated; but I do think that I am correct when I say that from purely selfish reasons Russia knows she cannot expand her Siberian territory to its fullest extent with a powerful, hostile Japanese Empire in her way. It has been my observation that the Russian has been the greatest realist in this war, which matters not to me as long as we in America can profit by that realism. Relying on this Russian realism, I am willing to gamble that the extent of cooperation which the United States will receive from a Russia freed of a German enemy on her west will be immeasurably greater than any which we would obtain by a present effort to force an issue which, at this time, would have disastrous effects upon America. To that extent, I think I am being a realist and motivated purely by selfish national interests.

It is also my opinion that this committee for victory in its concept of victory contemplates not only a military victory but also a courageous hope for a post-war international order which would afford people at least a hope of solving or suppressing the causes of war and the prospects of 25-year cycles of war, and a post-war internal economy for America which will solve for us, under the capitalistic philosophy the problem of equitably distributing newly created wealth among those who are willing to work and to make a contribution by their work, either with their hands or with their brains, to the democratic country, having a democratic economic life as well as a democratic political system. Believing, therefore, that this idea of victory includes these two aspects of victory, I believe it is proper to discuss and to lay bare before you my thinking upon each of these aspects.

I believe that I have always attempted to avoid sailing under false colors in discussing problems, either privately or publicly; I see no reason for abandoning a good habit today.

I do not profess to be a student of specific methods or plans for solving international affairs or problems. Therefore, although I may disappoint you, I shall not advance any specific plan of international cooperation which should be adopted after this war is over. However, I have reached certain conclusions as to the necessity for this country to adopt a policy which includes an attempt to arrive at a solution of these problems, and because my conclusions are probably the simple thinking of a plain man trying to reason out for himself his own conclusions, I am offering them to you with the hope that they may have an appeal to you and to others.

I served in the last war, enlisting when I was 19, 2 days after war was declared. I was not mustered out until February 1919, 22 months after I enlisted. I was not under fire, although overseas part of that time, and I have never made any claims that I was a hero or that I have had any personal experience involving personal pain or suffering received in battle. As far as the last war is concerned, my record only showed that I volunteered, that I was willing to serve, and that I went where I was sent when I was sent, which is about the only prerogative that an enlisted man has in any man's army.

However, I note that practically 25 years after the last war, we find ourselves attacked by Japan and in a position of having war declared upon us by Germany and Italy. This result has arisen despite the fact that during that whole 25-year period, we had constantly attempted to immunize ourselves from the world and world problems on the theory that by so doing, we could avoid being involved in world wars. When I am thinking rationally and not being swayed by my emotions, I accord to all people an honesty of motive and purpose, for the reason that if I expect to have the same respect paid to me, it is incumbent upon me to wholeheartedly accord to others that which I demand for myself.

Consequently I want to make it clear that I do not approve of any attacks made upon anyone who approved of a policy of immunization impugning their motives or their patriotism. Such attacks do not constitute argument, and they do not contribute to national unity or to the solution of national problems. On the other hand, it is proper argument to analyze the results of policies for the purpose of determining their efficacy in guiding the further policies, either of individuals or of nations, and anyone who would personalize such a discussion and consider it as an attack upon his motive would in turn be lacking in the capacity to impersonalize issues, which is so essential to free discussion.

From December 7, 1941, to January 3, 1943, I believe that at least a dozen of the finest sons of the most law-abiding, hardworking parents in my community sat across my desk and asked me to write letters for them so that they could become members of either the Army, Navy, or Marine Air Corps. In addition, while I served as an appeal agent for one of the draft boards in my county, hundreds of fine boys and the wives and parents of many of them consulted me about their problems arising out of the operation of the Selective Service System. Today over a million men and boys like these are out of the continental United States and have fought and died, are fighting and dying, and are preparing to fight and die on the waters of the earth and the land and surfaces of the earth. This is the finest young manhood of a country which, honestly and in good faith, attempted to avoid war by withdrawing from all international involvements and which, furthermore, as part of its national policy, declined to advance any ideas or to participate with other nations in attempting to solve by international action economic and political problems from which wars spring.

In my opinion, the facts which I have reviewed lead any person, capable of rational thinking, to the conclusion that the policy which has been in effect for the last 25 years did not save the lives of these boys involved, from which we must conclude that this national policy, if continued after this war, will again reap a harvest of loss of young

manhood, sorrow, pain, anguished womanhood, and blood-letting on so gigantic a scale as to make anyone with any capacity for an imaginative understanding of human suffering shudder with anguish and terror. I do not attempt to judge the reactions of others, but I, for one, am determined, without regard for the political consequences to myself which might be inherent in my decision, to follow my conviction that a continuation of such policy would be tragic.

I think that my reasoning is sound. In the field of logic I believe it is sustained by what is called pragmatic proof; in the language of the street, the city drug store, the country store, the field, in short, all meeting places of common men, it is sustained by what is called common sense.

Again, I think perhaps I am selfish in my thinking. I now have left to me one daughter, 15 years old. I do not want her to face, if possible, 25 years from now, the anguish which the mothers or wives of men in service are facing today and which my mother faced 25 years ago. I do not know what men want, but it is inconceivable to me that women can want anything except a courageous attempt to solve this problem. For theirs, after all, is the final great sacrifice.

Remarking again that I do not propose any specific plan, I am going to attempt to analyze for a few minutes some of the objections raised against those who would try to evolve some workable international system, which I consider to be the only hope mankind has for avoiding recurrent wars.

It is said that some plans involve a relinquishment of part of our sovereignty as a Nation. What is the purpose of governments out of which sovereignty arises? All of our American thinking says that the purpose of government is to provide the fullest measure of prosperity, order, and peace from interference by other men or nations to the common man. What price sovereignty if it fails to do this. What justification for pure national sovereignty can we offer the common man, if there is inherent in pure national sovereignty the threat that he or his children must pay the price of their lives or that the raw materials or the labor of a nation, out of which wealth is produced, shall be wasted every 25 years until the common man is eventually impoverished by recurrent wars. As I analyze it, this is demanding a sacrifice at the altar of pure nationalism as sacrilegious and terrible as any human sacrifice ever demanded by any pagan priest throughout the history of man. Understand again that I advocate no system, I do not profess to say that in order to avoid wars the surrender of the concept of national sovereignty is necessary, but I am asking those who preach national sovereignty as though it were some form of deity to justify the welter of human sacrifices which they demand shall be made at the altar of their deity. It seems to me that those who demand such sacrifices have the burden of justifying it.

Again there are those who say we cannot afford the expense of maintaining a military system necessary for us to carry out our share of the responsibility of policing in any international agreement. To those who would say this, I am willing, for the purpose of argument only, to forget about human life and the tenacity with which the most unfortunate or the youngest human usually fights to hang on to it—and I have seen people die; I am willing to forget, for the purpose of argument, the heartaches of wives, mothers, and fathers.

For the purpose only of meeting this argument of cost upon the pure materialistic basis of cost, I am willing to leave out all human elements and equations, and I ask, What is more costly than war? I ask, What is more wasteful of the resources of a nation and the labor of its people than war? I ask, How many years would it take for the cost to us of maintaining an armed force or our part of an international armed force necessary to preserve peace to equal the more than $200,000,000,000 which this war is going to cost? I ask anyone who believes that the premiums he pays for insurance against the destruction of property are an economic necessity for the maintenance of his business why he would oppose a governmental cost which partakes of the nature of a payment of a premium against the loss involved in war. And if you would say to me, "How do I know that the payment of this cost would prevent war, so that all of the cost paid would not become waste, if, despite all plans, war came nevertheless," I think it is logical to point out that many of us continue to pay insurance premiums all our lives and many of us never suffer any property loss. We pay them not in the expectation of loss; we pay them against the contingency of loss. We pay them willingly while we hope that there will be no loss.

There are others who say—and rightfully—that the causes of war are economic; that there is necessarily involved in any plan of curing international economic maladjustments the ideas of free trade, or at least an adjustment of the concept of custom or tariff barriers, and that this would involve disastrous economic readjustments in our own country and a lowering of the American standard of living. My answer to this opposition is twofold.

I have listened carefully in the last 2 months to the arguments and the discussions of people who are not dreamers, of people who have dealt with problems of international finance, who believe, or are hopeful, that this problem can be solved by raising the standards of other peoples up without destroying our own.

I will not quote names, but some of the people who believe that this can be done, or who are at least willing to tackle the problem in the humane hope of avoiding war, are people who have dealt with great wealth and they are men who have enjoyed the confidence of and been in the employ of those who have owned or managed great wealth. But, be this as it may, let us not forget a human being can sleep in but one bed at one time, that it is impossible to live in but one dwelling at one time; that the average individual who is not a glutton demands only plain food, properly prepared, but three times a day. And I call to your attention again the fact that for years in this country, under a complete nationalistic policy with reference to trade, too many of our citizens have not enjoyed these simple wants. Much that we have grown to accept as a part of our concept of living standards in the final analysis are the luxury wants of a soft people. And I ask again whether we are justified in offering a blood sacrifice every 25 years at the altar of this thing which we call the American standard of living?

Lest any man misquote me or draw implications which are not present in what I have said, I do not advocate the lowering of the standard of living to any extent which would involve hardship or the loss of those things which are necessary to the maintenance of the complicated mechanical and materialistic civilization which we have built, but I believe that I have conditioned myself by my own thinking to the point where I think that I speak honestly when I say that if it were necessary to do so, I would be willing to make such a sacrifice for any plan which had in it a reasonable hope for my child to be freed from the scourge of war.

I have brought all of these questions up, and particularly the latter one, deliberately with the hope that they might provoke discussion, because I think that there are many people today who classify themselves as liberals or who profess to speak for working people, whether it be in factories or on farms, who are advocating internationalism without presenting to the people the possibilities that, in order to adopt a policy which has the hope of avoiding war, they must surrender some of the things to which they have been accustomed or to which they are attached. I think these things should be discussed fully and completely and openly now, in order that all of the people of this country may make their decision after having had presented to them all of the rational, unemotional arguments upon this question which its proponents or those who oppose it can produce or offer. I say this because I have an abiding belief in democracy, and I am opposed to any person who, by indirection, by withholding argument, or by holding forth only the favorable possibilities of any question and withholding the dangerous possibilities, would gain his point and embark this country upon a policy which the people were not prepared to accept.

Although I believe firmly, as you doubtless know from my arguments here today, that the return of America to a policy of attempting to immunize itself against international problems would be tragic, I would rather accept such a decision made by the masses of the American people after a full, honest, factual, unemotional discussion of this question than to have thrust upon our people that which the superthinkers and pseudo liberals who at heart despise democracy think is good for them without giving the opportunity to the people to adopt a contrary policy. As far as I am concerned, I would rather see people adopt a policy directly opposite to my beliefs, after full democratic debate, than to have a policy adopted with which I was in accord slipped over on people without benefit of debate.

I have just touched upon, and I desire to close, with a little further emphasis upon the thing which has been most persuasive in drawing me back into political life than any other thing in America today. This is my abiding belief that a philosophy is abroad in America, which has seeped down into the masses, which will certainly destroy human freedom and eventually destroy material well-being if it is not fought now to the fullest energy which every freedom-loving American possesses. That is this—that we have abandoned the philosophy that the end never justifies the means; we have abandoned forthrightness; we have stooped to chicanery and emotionalism in political arguments and campaigns until we reached the peak in the campaign of 1940, which almost split the American people into class groups, at a time when the condition of the world demanded national unity more than anything else.

I refuse to accept the philosophy that people need an advance in their economic well-being or in things material at the expense of loss of the American concepts, middle class though they be, of decency and honor in government and in public debate. We have applauded demagoguery as a people, we have failed to repudiate intellectual dishonesty and deliberate attempts by cleverness and indirection to repudiate or destroy the American concept of government, with its immutable truth, that a system of checks and balances, such as we have, is the only system yet devised by man which, if adhered to, will insure people against personal or bureaucratic dictatorship. Remember that dictatorship, no matter how omnipotent its wisdom or beneficent its purpose, is incompatible with the Christian concept of the dignity of the individual and the immortality of the individual soul.

But it will not do to rail against this definite and positive threat against American democracy unless this democracy produces an economy which satisfies the demands of the majority of its people. This demand for positive action requires that we understand once and for all, that the economic doctrine of scarcity will never produce an adequate supply of goods to satisfy the legitimate de-

mands of those who are willing by their efforts to obtain a fair share of those goods. This, in turn, demands that labor shall cease concentrating on producing less goods per man and adopt a philosophy of producing the greatest amount of goods consistent with an effort which is not destructive of health and demand in return for the adoption of that philosophy a greater share of the wealth so produced. It demands, in turn, that invested capital shall not monopolize raw materials, inventions, or markets purely for the purpose of selfish capital returns, but that it, in turn, shall permit materials and inventions to have a free flow through our economy so that the greatest amount of goods may be produced out of the capital invested or the assets held, again in order that more wealth may be produced to be shared equitably among people.

We must quit talking about industry and labor and realize that industry encompasses capital and labor and that labor is a part of industry and furthermore that as the result of our national policy with reference to labor and the construction placed by the Supreme Court upon the legislative enactments, which this Nation will not repudiate, that labor has ceased to be a commodity, but that it has taken upon itself as a result of this legislation and the construction placed upon it many of the attributes of property.

When we reach the point where we are willing to face all of the economic implications involved in this evolution, whereby labor has changed from a status of a commodity into the status of porperty, then labor will realize that as the owner of property, in the form of its job, it owes a responsibility to the whole community in its handling of that property, which was not present when labor organizations had the sole characteristic of private associations selling a commodity. When we realize the full implication of this change in the status of labor, then the managers of industry will realize that in addition to that which we formerly called capital there is present in industry a new kind of property, the property right in a job which the Supreme Court by its decisions has declared to be the nature of labor. It is only out of a realization of the full implications inherent in this changed status of labor that we can create an economic democracy which will justify the hopes of those of us who believe that democracy, as a philosophy, offers the only hope to mankind for personal and economic freedom.

Today we have in industry two kinds of property: The plant, the equipment, and the working capital, which we always understood was property, and the vested interest of labor in its job, which neither the managers of capital nor the leaders of labor have yet recognized as property or at least by their conduct do not indicate that they have recognized the fact. Consequently, we are attempting to operate industry with one group of managers, chosen in theory by the stockholders, through their directors, and another group of property managers, the leaders of labor, chosen again in theory by all of the owners of that property right, a condition which makes most pertinent Abraham Lincoln's celebrated admonition: "A house divided against itself cannot stand."

I ask you to pay strict attention to the fact that I did not invent the idea that labor now has many of the characteristics of property. This is an evolution produced by national legislation and the construction placed thereon by the Supreme Court of the United States, the only thing that I am doing is to call your attention to this fact that this condition exists. I offer no solution today to the problem presented by this dual ownership of property now present in industry because I have not thought the problem through to any conclusion satisfactory to myself. But, I do claim the courage of my convictions to point out the problem for the purpose of provoking discussion. For it is only through discussion that this democracy should solve its problems.

Aviation Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which would add a new title to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 providing for air and war-risk insurance and reinsurance.

The bill authorizes the Civil Aeronautics Board to provide insurance covering war risks, for citizen air carriers, or citizen contract carriers by air, where such insurance cannot be obtained on reasonable terms from private companies or where advisable for military reasons.

So far as reinsurance is concerned, the Board would be authorized to reinsure any United States insurance company on account of any air risks, whether or not arising from war.

Generally speaking, this bill is modeled upon the Marine Insurance Acts of 1940 and 1942, which were adopted to meet the severe insurance problems of our merchant marine.

In the case of our carriers by air, there are insurance problems comparable to those faced by our merchant marine, although hitherto such problems have not been as acute. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has for some time been giving serious thought to the whole problem of aviation insurance. Particularly in the case of reinsurance, a very large part of which has always been handled in foreign markets, there is a serious question whether the situation is entirely consistent with our best national interests. In H. R. 1012, recently reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, provision is made for conferring on the Civil Aeronautics Board important powers of investigation regarding the aviation insurance market, with provision for reports to Congress on the subject.

The bill which I have today introduced would, of course, go somewhat further and provide for the actual administration of an insurance fund by the Civil Aeronautics Board where necessary in order to protect our national interest. It is hoped that this bill may serve to crystallize further consideration, both by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and by the Civil Aeronautics Board, of the possible desirability of an insurance program for air commerce similar to the program which Congress has already adopted for our maritime commerce.

A Serious Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ZEBULON WEAVER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Asheville Citizen, of Asheville, N. C., under date of February 19, 1943. This is a daily paper published in my home city.

It is my desire to call attention of the membership of the House, both Republicans and Democrats, to a situation which is fast developing and which is discussed so ably, so sanely, and so constructively in this editorial.

Disunity in the House of Representatives and constant irritation between the House and the executive departments, both of which are charged with the duty of winning this war, are equally disastrous. Constructive criticism, in a temperate vein, of course, is always desirable, but this war cannot be won and cannot be promoted through the use of criminations and recriminations.

It is not my purpose at all to say there should not be constructive criticisms, but the people of this Nation are interested in winning this war, and they are, and will be, impatient with constant discord between its Congress, its Commander in Chief, and the departments charged with executive duties in the situation which now confronts us.

For this purpose, I am anxious that the spirit and sound common sense of this editorial be considered by my colleagues.

The editorial referred to follows:

A SERIOUS CONFLICT

Congress and the President stand dangerously at loggerheads on a number of issues. Twice in the past few days the Legislature has rebuffed the Executive over matters of utmost concern to the war effort. On one occasion, that involving House elimination of funds for the National Resources Planning Board, Mr. Roosevelt struck back sharply, even testily, in his press conference.

This controversy ought to be of serious moment to the public. In daily contacts there is more and more evidence of bad blood between certain elements of Congress and the executive departments. It threatens to clot and obstruct the even-flowing, orderly processes of government, a most morbid condition in wartime.

The fault does not lie wholly with either branch. Conflicts of authority are not untypical of our democratic system in a period of protracted crisis. They seem endemic to America when there is a strong President in the White House. The present crisis is aggravated by the close balance of political power and sectional restiveness in Congress as well as by the inflated war agencies.

Unfortunately, some of the outward manifestations of this controversy are picayunish and even remote. Congressmen criticize executive personalities, and they respond in kind. The cry of "bureaucrat" (and what is big government but bureaucracy?) is raised to confuse issues and mask familiar

designs—such as, for example, Senator McKELLAR'S perennial civil-service raid.

In the executive departments, on the other hand, there is often too much of a disposition to govern by directives. This is anathema to the Congressman, and understandably so. A large Republican minority, which would not dare criticize the military conduct of the war, exploits antagonism at home to discredit the majority party.

At the highest level, of course, there is little real personal bitterness. For this the country may be thankful. But the two branches of government persist in sowing dragons' teeth of discord in their functional relations.

The people want a strong President; they also want a strong Congress. One would be nearly fatal, as was the case a few score years ago, without the other. It is time for unity to manifest itself in Washington—unity through understanding and respect for separate prerogatives; through tolerance and even-tempered dealings; through recognition on all sides of the tripartite principle of government which makes this country at once the most unique and the most powerful in the history of nations.

Price Ceiling on Irish Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

SHAFTER, CALIF., *February 25, 1943.*

Congressman ELLIOTT:

I am asking once more to please try and increase the Irish potato ceiling for Kern County. I am a grower of potatoes in Kern County and finance some of the other growers but I am not asking this from a dollars-and-cents standpoint as far as I am concerned as I have other income and if I made any money out of these potatoes I would have to give it right back to Uncle Sam. By the reason of the ceiling price of $2.15 it is definitely shown here that the growers who have seed ready to plant that has not been dipped in corrosive sublimate which would make it unfit for consumption are selling this seed for commercial use. These potatoes would have planted from two to five thousand acres. But this is not the worst thing that is happening here since this ceiling has been placed on potatoes. The bankers and other financing agencies that have advanced money to the growers can't see how the grower is going to be able to repay them therefore they are refusing to advance these growers any more money and the grower cannot cultivate and irrigate his potatoes as they should be. So it is causing a much greater reduction than is shown in actual acreage planted. If he cannot irrigate and cultivate his potatoes at the proper time he certainly cannot make the yield he would have otherwise. Also the last report is that there will be no incentive payments. Frankly with the way conditions are here today unless the ceiling is increased I believe that the actual pounds of potatoes will be from one-fifth to one-fourth less than they would have been had the grower felt he would have a chance to make a living wage.

CAMP WEST LOWE FARMS.
S. A. CAMP.

Rent Control Abuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have received a great deal of correspondence from constituents protesting the operation of the present rent-control provisions of the Price Control Act. Hardly a day passes but that some constituent writes me calling attention to abuses that are occurring in the administration of this law. Not only is it detrimental to the landlord, but the tenants are made to suffer because of peculiar twists in the regulations. Under unanimous consent, I am submitting herewith copies of two letters received by me today to be inserted in the RECORD. This is a matter which every Member of the House should be interested in. The time has come for the Congress to take action in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I also include as part of my remarks a portion of a circular issued by the Office of Price Administration, November 1942, entitled "Rent Control":

FEBRUARY 24, 1943.

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Anticipating the expiration of the rent ceiling regulation, the present form of which will terminate in the immediate future, I am concerned in stressing the grave inequalities which have resulted from the blanket application of the regulation. Many such irregularities have come to my attention besides those which I have experienced myself and doubtlessly many letters, similar to this one, have reached you from your constituents.

One of the decidedly unfair results of the regulation has been the inability of the property owner to adjust rents which were far too low because of consideration for the tenant who, in most instances, had not entirely recovered from depression circumstances, and therefore was being helped along by the property owner.

I have several such pieces of property on which the rents were not increased proportionately before March 1, 1942, because I felt that such adjustment could be made later during the year when the tenant had paid his fuel bills and had taken care of other obligations. It is only human to try to help people through their difficulties and it seems unfair that one should be penalized when these difficulties have been adjusted and when the tenant would be able to pay a just return for the accommodations given him.

One of the most glaring instances in my experience is that involving an eight-room house with a double garage on which I am receiving $26 a month rent whereas adjoining property of no greater value and with no greater facilities is renting from $35 to $38 a month. Naturally when one considers the investment, the taxes, and cost of maintenance, it can readily be understood that the rent does not in any way protect the owner. Yet under the present regulation nothing can be done about it.

The only thought motivating this letter is that some flexibility should be written into the rental ceiling regulation so that adjustment might be made in glaring cases of unfairness.

From past experience, one cannot help but observe that any adjustment made in favor of the property owner doubtlessly will not be made retroactive to cover losses suffered under the present regulation. Too much of our legislation is being predicated seemingly upon the assumption that an individual who has accumulated a few honest dollars must necessarily be vicious and, therefore, should be penalized or even victimized.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS B. SANDERS.

FEBRUARY 23, 1943.

The Honorable LAWRENCE SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: This letter is to call attention to the operation of the bureau for rent control, under the O. P. A., as it appears in Beloit.

By way of introduction—I am a retired member of the Rock River Methodist Conference, have lived here about 3 years, have invested my savings in three very good homes, and am trying to manage it for the good of the cause of defense and to make a safe investment. But the points I mention herein are of a general nature, inspired by flagrant violations of justice, involving others chiefly, and such as you might take interest in as a Member of Congress. If you are not on committees of this kind and want to refer it to such Members of Congress as you wish, it might do some good simply to give a vision of the general effect of the Henderson code for rent control.

You know the code referred to. But I have wondered whether Congress had a chance to know the circulars that the bureau circulates, one of which I send you to show—that they are trying to operate the law by whipping landlords for the amusement of tenants, thus dividing classes. But the worst result is the litigation and domestic troubles, between families, which naturally arise because of arrogance of tenants after they see that they are the controlling power over property in all respects. It is incurable because of loss of power of eviction, through the Henderson code. Tenants are always supported by the local board of rent control. It is turned into a political movement, even connected with tenure of offices, and one of my tenants declares that there is to be no Presidential election in 1944 on account of the war.

I overheard an old man talking in the office about his rents, which the Board had reduced. He was getting $20 per month. He couldn't pay taxes, and so forth. He was told: "We are not to blame for your bad bargains." But they are to blame for that man's financial embarrassment.

A lady called up one of the boards, asking that he come up and see if her property was worthy of a higher rent. She was answered, "If I come and estimate it lower than it rents at present, you will have to take it." This is a common reply to petitioners.

While the political effort is to please tenants, yet it is often the tenant that suffers. One tenant appealed to the Board for lower rent and got it, of course. But the owner moved into the premises. The tenant tried in scores of places to get a house. The fact that she had appealed to the Rent Control Board, left the best citizens saying, "She got what she deserved."

Well, these are just straws to show the currents here. It would be a terrible dilemma if this system should continue for a long duration.

I have been delighted at the disposition of the present Congress to correct bureau abuses. These items are not offered formally, but the country is full of them.

It would be all right to fix rents, but not fix persons. The renting prices could be

fixed for an area without any effort to guarantee a continuous tenure of tenants. This town is rushed in defense projects. Hundreds of Federal houses have been built. Many of them stand vacant. These renters love to squat in nice homes, carouse, sabotage the property, turn on heat furnished by owner and open the windows full height, for reprisal, and the Henderson code forbids any relief. The ordinary methods of eviction should be allowed to prevail.

If possible, there should be some local power for appeal, that is not related at all to that bureau. Of course it would be foolish to appeal to any appointee of the bureau. I do not need to enumerate to you or a congressional committee the many dangers in a bureau. They are all involved.

I am not well enough acquainted here to enter legal effort or other steps that might be taken by some legislative body. I think I could cite important members of the real-estate board or businessmen of the city who could guide anyone interested in relief from bureaucratic troubles.

Very truly yours,

W. A. KISHPAUGH.

EXCERPTS FROM RENT CONTROL CIRCULAR, OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

WHAT TENANTS MUST KNOW IN AREAS UNDER FEDERAL RENT CONTROL

No matter what living quarters you rent—in a house, apartment, hotel, or boarding house, parking space in a trailer camp or a bed in a dormitory—the rent you pay is subject to Federal rent regulations.

"Question. I am a paying guest in the home of friends. Is my rent under control, too?

"Answer. Yes; if your community is under Federal rental control, charges made for any kind of living quarters are affected."

As a general rule, you do not have to pay more than the rent paid on the maximum-rent date (in the case of hotels and rooming houses the highest rent in the 30 days ending on the maximum-rent date). In most areas this date is March 1, 1942.

"Question. How will I know what date has been set for the house or rooms I rent?

"Answer. The rent director's office for your area will tell you the exact date."

An exception to the general rule applies when substantial improvements have been made in the premises.

"Question. What does substantial improvement mean?

"Answer. It means adding, for example, a bedroom or an extra bath * * * fixing up the attic so it can be used as living quarters. It does not mean repairs such as fixing the roof, new wallpaper, or repairing plumbing."

You must not pay more than the maximum legal rent even if you want to do it.

"Question. My rent now is more than it was on the maximum rent date. How do I get it reduced?

"Answer. The next time your rent is due simply offer your landlord the legal rent. You do not need anyone's permission. The reduction is automatic."

You may not be evicted by your landlord for any reason until the area rent office is notified.

"Question. My landlord wants me to get out because he is selling our house.

"Answer. As soon as a notice of eviction for any reason is made, you should notify your area rent director. In the event of a sale, your landlord cannot force you to move without giving you 3 months' notice."

You cannot be charged extra for some service formerly included in the rent.

"Question. My rent used to include water and heat. Must I pay extra for them now?"

"Answer. If they were part of the rent on the maximum-rent date, you cannot pay extra for them now."

When an area is put under rent control, the area rent director will send to each tenant a copy of the landlord's legal registration showing the rent he claims was being paid on the maximum-rent date.

"Question. Suppose that statement is incorrect; what do I do?

"Answer. Notify the rent director at once, giving him the correct facts."

Landlords must show each new tenant the official copy of the rent registration showing the legal rent for the accommodations rented.

"Question. What if I am moving into a newly built house that has never been rented before?

"Answer. The landlord must register the rent he charges you within 30 days after renting. You will receive a copy of the landlord's registration from the rent director."

WHAT LANDLORDS MUST KNOW IN AREAS UNDER FEDERAL RENT CONTROL

You must file an official registration statement with the area rent office covering all dwelling quarters for which you collect rent.

You must keep posted in all rooms of hotels and rooming and boarding houses a schedule of legal rents for different numbers of tenants and for different terms of occupancy.

You may petition for an increase of rents or a reduction of services under special circumstances.

You cannot evict a tenant without notifying the area rent office even if the lease calls for vacating the premises at the termination of the lease.

You must file a form if there is a change in tenancy of houses and apartments, obtain the new tenant's signature to it, and show him a copy of the registration form.

You must give the tenant a receipt for his rent if he wants it; he can legally refuse to pay rent unless you do.

If you sell your house to someone other than the present tenant, you must have received from the buyer at least 33⅓ percent of the purchase price before the rent director will issue a certificate permitting the eviction of the present tenant at the end of 3 months.

You must make a separate charge for meals furnished with a room. You cannot require a tenant to take meals as a condition of renting the room unless you did so on June 15, 1942.

If you charge more than the legal rent, the tenant may sue and you may have to pay triple the overcharge as damages to the tenant. For violations of the rent regulations you may also be punished by a maximum fine of $5,000 or 1 year's imprisonment, or both.

Absenteeism

REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we fear most those diseases for which we know no cure. Strikes were once running high fever in our defense plants. That was before the war. War was a tonic that reduced that fever. But for this new epidemic, absenteeism, which is taking a death toll of 20 destroyers for every 1 that we lost to the strikes, we have not yet sought the remedy. Our economic and industrial authorities have not even put the germ under the microscope. And the deadly toll, in ships, in planes, in tanks, goes up and up. For the latest period on which figures are available, the month of December, our naval and maritime shipbuilding program alone showed an absenteeism of more than 23,000,000 man-hours. In that same month the rate of absenteeism in 81 shipyards was 8 percent. As against this, a job absence of 3 percent is considered normal in peacetime.

But I am not going to becloud this thing with statistics. Forget the man-hours and the man-days. Just picture a fleet of 20 destroyers—ghost ships, the ships that never came true—and you will have a better idea of what this disease has cost us in 1 month. It took the Germans and the Japs 2 months, the months of October and November, to sink half that many destroyers. And it took from them an even greater toll of their own warships—ships the like of which our ghost fleet will never sink. Visualize 27 submarines or 38 of those highly effective destroyer escorts which we need so urgently now to guard convoys. These are the ships we could have built with the man-hours we lost in 1 month. These are the ghosts that will never go in there fighting to back up our men in the Solomons or in Tunisia. These are the measure of that process of corrosion which is eating into our war effort.

Lives will be saved if we attack the contagion of absenteeism the sure way. Let us discover the cause. Unless we do that, we, too, shall have to depend on sheer luck for a remedy; and we cannot afford to be unlucky. We know that 9⅓ out of every 10 of our war workers show up regularly on the job. What makes that other two-thirds of a worker fail. Is it "Monday morning sickness"? Too much good time over the week end? Is it unwise management? Is it illness?

I say quite frankly that I do not know, and until I find out facts, I am not ready to advance opinions. And I say further that I am not ready to accept the opinions of anyone else—management, labor, or Government—until they are backed up with facts. We are told that our workers should go more often to the dentist—by a Government official who has been singularly unable to put teeth into his own program for the allocation of manpower. We hear all sorts of suggestions, and orations from sources which are equally bankrupt of fact. The cure is always drastic, but it is the other fellow who always has the disease.

When we know what causes absenteeism, we shall know how to treat it. When we know that a man between the ages of 18 and 38 is unable or unwilling to do what his country asks of him on the ship ways or in the munitions plants, we have the means of giving him another opportunity on the battlefield. To help win this war, in the way that each of us can give our best, is the rightful privilege of every American. If, for whatever cause, any worker in our war plants is being denied that privilege, it should be restored to him, even, if need be, by

ending his deferment from Selective Service.

With the purpose in mind of determining the cause of absenteeism, in each individual case, man by man, and thus enabling the Nation to decide for each man the way in which he shall serve best, I have introduced this measure and believe when enacted into law it will have a very wholesome effect on the production front of America.

Civil Aviation

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 23, proposing to set up a new committee on aviation, is, I am told, to come before the House at an early date. I hold here two letters in regard to House Resolution 23, received yesterday, which I think would be of interest to the Members of the House. One is from the executive secretary of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, which represents 20 different organizations connected with the railway industry, and the other is from Mr. William Green. They both express in very strong terms their opposition to House Resolution 23. They take the very broad ground which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has repeatedly taken—that it would be very unwise to set up a new and untried committee at this time.

The letters are as follows:

RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 24, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT CROSSER,
Member, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The House Committee on Rules has reported out Resolution 23, which takes from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce its jurisdiction over legislative matters relating to civil aviation and air transportation.

We have learned that the air-line pilots for whom the Air Line Pilots Association, an American Federation of Labor affiliate, is the representing organization, are seriously exercised about the possibility of this resolution receiving favorable consideration. We are told they and the other crafts and classes of workers in the air-transport industry feel very strongly against having their legislative problems removed from the well-informed and thoroughly experienced Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and given to an entirely new and separate committee, the legislative abilities and policies of which are at best only conjecture.

As you well know, the air-line pilots and all other air workers were brought under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, almost 7 years ago, on April 10, 1936. According to all reports, both the air-line industry and the air-line employees are well pleased with the way this law has functioned in air transportation.

The railway workers share the concern of the air-line pilots and other air workers over the removal of any of the legislative prerogatives now vested in the experienced and well-seasoned Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and placing them in an entirely new and separate committee completely unseasoned and certainly inexperienced.

To divide the jurisdiction of legislative matters to the extent of vesting the jurisdiction of each mode of transportation in a separate congressional committee is both illogical and thoroughly impractical. It would only tend to create confusion in the legislative and regulatory realm of transportation generally.

Railway labor has always insisted that all forms of transportation be subject to the authority of one legislative committee and no more so that the views of the same legislators may be applied impartially to all branches of transportation and not have views of different committees affect the different forms of transportation which are all really nationally interrelated. The reasons for this are self-evident. Quite obviously, if one branch of transportation is to be given an exclusive committee of Congress, then each of the other branches could not be censored for wishing to be similarly recognized.

The Railway Labor Executives' Association, therefore, join the air-line pilots and their coworkers in opposing this obviously wrong trend toward multiplicity and confusion in the handling of the legislative problems of transportation by voicing its determined disapproval of House Resolution 23.

Your opposition and that of your colleagues to this measure will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

J. G. LUHRSEN,
Executive Secretary.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., February 18, 1943.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEA: It has come to my attention that an attempt is being made to take from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which you are chairman, the jurisdiction over legislative matters relating to civil and commercial aviation, including air-line transportation.

In view of the splendid way in which your committee has been handling civil aviation problems resulting in our country's civil and commercial flying assuming a place second to none in world aviation, I see no reason for any such changes as are being proposed. There appears to be little or no good reason to take the jurisdiction over civil aviation legislative matters from your committee and place it in the hands of a new legislative committee, the members of which may be well-meaning and sincere but, certainly, they will not have the broad and complete grasp of the commercial aviation picture as do the veteran legislators of your committee. Could it be that this move is primarily to create another committee so someone may have, what they deem, better committee assignments, or to enhance some other form of political expediency? Civil flying has in the past suffered considerably from the intervention of politics and it seems likely that this move may be similarly tinged.

The air-line pilots are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, as are other groups of laboring people in civil aviation. Certainly what is not in the best interest of the industry cannot be in the best interest of the laboring people of the industry. The pilots and other air workers see no good reason for taking the jurisdiction over legislative matters affecting civil aeronautics from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I might add, I have always respected the advice of the pilots on matters of this character because I have through the years found it to be sound.

The American Federation of Labor, therefore, is strongly opposed to the passage of House Resolution 23, which takes jurisdiction over commercial aviation legislative matters from your well-experienced and thoroughly seasoned committee, where it is being handled most satisfactorily, and turns it over to a new committee which can only be regarded as inexperienced in such matters and whose actions would certainly be extremely unpredictable. In other words, this seems to be another one of those cases where it would be far better to leave well enough alone and not take a chance, especially with a matter that is as important to the country as civil and commercial aviation at the present time, with particular reference to air transportation.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

The War in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I join with other Congressmen from the Pacific coast in demanding that the military and naval leaders of this country pay special attention to the war in the Pacific. Especially do we demand attention to the Alaskan area. Remember, Singapore was supposedly invincible, but it had its Achilles heel. Alaska is the Achilles heel of America, and Japan knows it.

I received a very interesting report from William T. Foran on this question. Dr. Foran after being graduated from the University of Washington in 1921 with a bachelor of science, majoring in geology, went with the United States Naval Coal Commission to Alaska, where he did geological work in the Matanuska Valley. On his return in 1922, he went with the Midwest Refining Co. in Wyoming, where he was in production engineering work. During 1923 and 1924 he served with the United States Geological Survey, again going to Alaska to do geological work on the Alaskan naval petroleum reserve No. 4 in the northwestern part of that Territory. In 1925 he joined the foreign staff of Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and until 1936 was on geological work in Argentina and Bolivia. From 1936 to 1941 he was with the Iraq Petroleum Co. in the Near East, spending most of his time on geological work in Iraq and making his headquarters at Mosul, Bagdad, and Basrah. At present he is geologist for Filtrol Corporation of Los Angeles.

I am going to quote Dr. Foran's report in full, because I think it is important to learn why Japan would like to have Alaska. I am sure you agree that Dr. Foran's background is sufficient evidence

that he is qualified to write on this subject:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 24, 1943.*

DEAR MR. POULSON: This will acknowledge your letter of January 20 regarding naval oil reserve No. 4 in northwestern Alaska.

In 1922 I was on the geologic staff of the Alaskan Naval Coal Commission under the direction of Capt. O. C. Dowling. During that operation considerable money was spent in the development of bituminous coal for fuel in anticipation of a war in the Pacific. Just 1 year later I was again appointed as geologist to study the structure and stratigraphic qualifications of naval oil reserve No. 4 in northwestern Alaska, which was established as a protective measure in case of war in the Pacific.

After two seasons of study in the reserve we found evidence of the most positive nature in the live seepages of naphthalene base oil at Cape Simpson and Dease Inlet. Our explorations also showed the rocks to give evidence of containing petroleum possibly at intervals throughout a thickness of at least 8,000 feet.

I am quite certain that no private oil company would allow such a setting to go untested for so many years. And, if the Navy had turned the development of the reserve over to a private concern, would the Navy not have demanded an immediate test on the most favorable-looking structure, as is the practice in all domestic and foreign oil development? Since the very event for which this oil reserve was established has now arrived—war with Japan—it is difficult to understand why, after a year of conflict in the Pacific, steps have not been taken to develop this promising structure.

If the source is shallow the oil could be produced with portable rotocore drills. For this reason the Japanese could fly in the necessary equipment to produce and, just as the Nazis did at our Kirkuk field in Iraq, erect a small plane-transported refinery.

In April 1941 the Germans, with a small fleet of transport, fighter, and bomber planes, flew from Rhodes to Kirkuk, Iraq, conquered the country, took over the oil fields, and erected a small brass portable refinery there. They held the region for 1 month against the entire British forces in the Near East.

In the summer of 1939 a group of Japanese with planes flew a "good will" expedition to Nome, Alaska. Is it not possible that this good-will junket was made also for other purposes? Nome, by air, is only 1 hour from the petroleum reserve.

It is possible, under existing conditions, that this area, like many others now in Japanese hands, could be transformed into a formidable oil-field air base during this war.

From my past experience in foreign oil production and development, it is my private opinion that this area, for defensive purposes, should have been tested with the drill at least 15 years ago. During this inactive interim no less than three major oil companies have approached me for information regarding the terrain lying outside the reserve. Unfortunately for the private concerns, the Navy possesses the terrain with the most positive evidence of petroleum.

I should say that it is of the greatest importance that for strategic reasons the Navy should set about the task of testing this area at the earliest moment possible or throw the land open to private interests, which would welcome the opportunity to develop and produce oil for the Bering Sea and Yukon markets and for a group of Navy bomber or fighter bases in northwestern Alaska and the Bering Sea. The production of oil in this region would also greatly stimulate the opening of economically potent northwestern Alaska to peacetime exploitation and commerce. Otherwise, this region will surely remain in its present undeveloped status.

The climate of this region, which is similar to that of Montana and Dakota, is suitable to all-year activity. Ocean transportation is of only seasonal duration, due to the narrows at Bering Strait, where the spring ice clogs on its way to the Arctic. This congestion, which is generally thought to be the result of subzero temperatures, is actually caused by the two Diomede Islands lying directly in the narrowest part of the strait. By utilizing present-day aviation facilities this matter is of slight importance.

This 35,000 square mile Alaskan petroleum reserve was acquired at the same time as the Teapot Dome altercation. It is apparent that for strategic and economic reasons, the testing and development of the Alaskan reserve is of infinitely more importance to our present war effort than the overpublicized Teapot Dome development was in its time.

Thank you for your interest in this matter. If I can be of any further service, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Yours respectfully,

WM. T. FORAN.

Stoppage of Strikes in Defense Industries

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

PETITION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION ON HOUSE FLOOR

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today placing on the Clerk's desk petition No. 2, providing for the discharge of the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of H. R. 147, introduced January 6, 1943, which provides that it will be a crime for two or more persons to conspire together to stop, prevent, delay, or slow up work in any national defense industry or in Government service. A large number of Government workers are engaged in work in war and defense industry.

This action was taken after my failure to obtain a hearing on this proposal, since it was first introduced November 24, 1941. At that time, during the Seventy-seventh Congress, the number of the bill was H. R. 6088. In this Congress, the Seventy-eighth, it is H. R. 147.

The bill is as follows:

H. R. 147

A bill prohibiting certain acts interfering with the national defense program or with normal Government activity, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for two or more persons to conspire together for the purpose of preventing, stopping, hindering delaying, or interrupting any work or service necessary to the national defense program, or for the purpose of preventing, stopping, hindering, delaying, or interrupting any work or service essential to the normal operation of the Government of the United States, or of any department, independent establishment, or other agency thereof.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of any agency of the United States dealing with labor, or with the wages, hours of labor, or working conditions of employees, to recommend to the President any changes in such wages, hours of labor, or working conditions which it deems necessary to remedy any condition unfair or inequitable to employees in any employment necessary to the national defense program.

(b) Upon receiving any such recommendation the President, if he deems such action necessary to remedy such condition, shall issue an order directing the employer of such employees to take such action as is necessary to so remedy such condition. If within a period of 30 days after the issuance of such order, such employer fails to take action in compliance with such order, he shall be guilty of a crime and punished as prescribed in section 3 hereof.

SEC. 3. Any violation of section 1 or 2 of this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to prohibit any person or persons from organizing for the purpose of petitioning or making representations to any officer or agency of the United States or of any State, and nothing in this act shall be deemed to prohibit any person from quitting any employment.

It will be noticed that it includes the stopping or interrupting of work in connection with the national defense program and also any normal operation of the Government.

The bill protects the workers in section 2 (a) and 2 (b) by leaving the question of inequities or hardship or unreasonable conditions up to the President of the United States to adjust. It will, therefore, be impossible under the bill for any employer to take advantage of his workers.

It will also be noticed that the bill does not prohibit any person from quitting any employment. It does, however, prohibit two or more persons from conspiring together to stop or delay work.

The crime of conspiracy is easily proven in any court and there should be no trouble about the enforcement of the act.

The penalty provided is not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both such fine and imprisonment.

A VOTE IN HOUSE IF 218 MEMBERS SIGN

If 218 Members of the House sign the petition, the bill will automatically come before the House for consideration and for a vote. It is my hope that all of the Members of the House, who are in favor of stopping strikes in war industries for the duration, will consider signing this petition at once.

It is a reflection on our lawmaking body for us to compel men to serve on the battle fronts, on all the seas and continents on earth under the most painful and crushing conditions and yet permit people here in our own country to conspire together and stop of delay the life lines of materials and supplies that are going to our servicemen.

The Committee on the Judiciary is the only committee of this House that has the power and authority to properly deal with this question. The scope of any other committee is limited and cannot deal adequately with the problem.

I am asserting my parliamentary right to file this petition and it is my sincere hope that this question will be brought out on the floor at an early date for consideration and action. These strikes must be stopped and it is the duty of Congress to see that they are stopped.

The Antiracketeering Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of January 29, 1943]

TO STOP UNION RACKETEERING

One of the first bills of the new Congress to receive committee endorsement is that of Representative HOBBS, of Alabama, to make labor unions liable for prosecution under the Federal Antiracketeering Act. Since Mr. HOBBS has been identified with repressive measures, including the so-called concentration-camp bill, his sponsorship will probably lead some persons to conclude that the present bill is antilabor and so should be defeated.

This conclusion would seem to be supported by the statement of Representatives CELLER, of New York, and LANE, of Massachusetts, that such legislation is not needed and that they therefore will file a minority report. Perhaps some will also be disturbed by the fact that the committee vote on the bill was in executive session without hearings.

To get at the merits of this situation it is necessary to go behind appearances. In the first place, virtually the same bill was the subject of public hearings last year, at which labor leaders had full opportunity to state their views. It was reported out by the House Judiciary Committee, only to be held up in the Rules Committee. Thus, while action in open committee may have been preferred, it cannot be said that the undisclosed vote or the failure to conduct hearings shut off adequate discussion.

Second, CELLER and LANE to the contrary notwithstanding, the Hobbs bill or some bill doing about what it does was made necessary by the 6-to-1 decision of the Supreme Court, which held that the Antiracketeering Act did not apply to labor unions. This was the case of New York Local 807 of the Teamsters' Union, in which the Federal Government sought to punish the union and certain of its members for undisputed racketeering practices in connection with the loading and unloading of transport trucks in New York. The facts clearly showed that, in some cases at least, truck drivers paid union "loaders" solely to protect themselves from violence. There were instances in which these union members did not even go through the motions of earning wages.

Chief Justice Stone, who was the lone dissenter, could see no reason whatever for exempting unions from liability for racketeering. His careful reading of the law showed him no immunity through the union card against the penalty for shake-downs which any other guilty person would be required to pay. And while Justice Byrnes said the law did not cover labor unions, he literally issued an invitation to Congress to pass a law which would bring unions under racketeering regulations. Had not Congressman HOBBS introduced his bill, some other Member doubtless would have taken the same step.

The plain fact of the matter is that labor itself has missed a real opportunity. Labor should have realized that this situation would be corrected sooner or later and that labor had nothing to lose and much to gain by taking the initiative. It should have thrown out all its racketeers long ago. Had it done this, the Teamsters' Union in New York could not have engaged in shake-downs under threat of violence. Then there would have been no Supreme Court decision putting the issue up to Congress. Having defaulted in the first instance, labor now stands back and permits legislators such as HOBBS, of Alabama, to take the lead.

What difference does it make whether racketeers are union members or not? Racketeering is racketeering. We think Chief Justice Stone was right and that the law did apply to unions, but since he was overruled, we now think Congress has an obvious and urgent duty to perform in closing this big hole in Federal criminal law.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of February 19, 1943]

WHY DOESN'T LABOR WRITE A BILL?

Joseph Padway, general counsel for the American Federation of Labor, told the House Rules Committee that the bill of Representative HOBBS to extend the Federal Anti-Racketeering Act to cover shake-downs and threats by labor unions and their members is a threat "pointed straight at the very heart of organized labor." Describing the bill as loosely drawn, he said that its supporters "are determined to crush the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out their legitimate objections."

Let's assume that Mr. Padway is right, that the backers of the Hobbs bill are gunning for trade-unionism. Then why has labor not had its friends in Congress introduce a bill which will bring labor racketeering within the Federal law while at the same time protecting labor's rights? The Supreme Court decision in the New York truck unloaders case made legislation in this field inevitable. If labor does not sponsor a reasonable bill, it has only itself to blame if an undesirable bill is introduced.

Mr. Padway, as general counsel, should know something about bill drafting. Why doesn't he get out his pencil and paper? That would be more impressive than an excited statement to a congressional committee.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun of January 30, 1943]

PUTTING THE UNIONS BACK UNDER THE ANTIRACKETS LAW

Last March 2 the Supreme Court held that the Federal antiracketeering law did not apply to behavior which the Chief Justice described in a dissenting opinion as follows:

"Members of [the teamsters'] union * * * lay in wait for trucks passing from New Jersey to New York, forced their way onto the trucks, and by beating or threats of beating the drivers procured payments to themselves from the drivers or their employers of a sum of money * * * said to be the equivalent of the union wage for a day's work. In some instances they assisted, or offered to assist, in unloading the truck, and in others they disappeared as soon as the money was paid without rendering or offering to render any service. * * *"

The present Director of Stabilization, Justice Byrnes, was then a member of the Court, and he wrote the majority opinion. He did not deny the essential truth of the Chief Justice's description of what had happened. He simply argued that the history of the antiracketeering law showed that Congress had entered into a deal with the labor unions whereby the unions were to be excused for obstructions of interstate commerce which, in others, would come under the ban of the Antiracketeering Act. Perhaps a little appalled by his own finding, Justice Byrnes went on to suggest that Congress might yet wish to undo this union deal.

Representative HOBBS, of Alabama, at once introduced a bill which would bring the unions under the same antiracketeering law which applies to everybody else, and the House Judiciary Committee has now reported this bill favorably. Certainly it ought to pass. While a rash of ill-considered and punitive bills directed against labor would be unfortunate, a bill outlawing labor robbery and extortion in interstate commerce, as Mr. HOBBS' bill does, would assuredly seem the irreducible minimum of new legislation required in this crisis.

For Mr. HOBBS' bill has special wartime aspects. Not merely would it outlaw racketeering obstructions to commerce which might affect the passage of war goods, insofar as it strikes at the particular kind of racketeering indulged in by the teamsters' union in the case of last March 2, it has obvious, if limited, bearing on the manpower situation.

For, note that the purpose of the union tactics described by the Chief Justice was to force the payment and sometimes the actual employment of two men where one man could do the necessary work. In discussing this practice, Mr. Justice Byrnes defended its legality under the Antiracketeering Act by describing it as the kind of normal procedure among labor unions which was exempted, in his view, by the deal into which Congress entered with the unions. Mr. Justice Byrnes went on to cite the stand-by by which Mr. Petrillo forces employers of musicians to hire more musicians than they need as a typical union practice whose legality was quite unquestioned.

Whether the Hobbs bill as now reported by the Judiciary Committee would outlaw the Petrillo stand-by practice, whether it would apply generally to the "feather-bed" demands of various unions that more men be hired than are really necessary, we do not know. But plainly such a law, enabling employers to hire only the men they need would make other men available for useful work in a time of drastic labor shortage. To some slight extent, then, Mr. HOBBS' bill may provide—or at least suggest—a way to a more economical use of manpower. Certainly, in this aspect, as well as in its main purpose, his proposal will interest Congress.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal January 30, 1943]

LET SENATE GET TO WORK

A long anticipated congressional movement to place needed curbs on certain abusive labor practices may have gotten under way when Representative HOBBS, of Alabama, introduced a measure which would make unions subject to Federal antiracketeering statutes.

Representative HOBBS, who has fathered most of the important internal security laws in effect, says that his measure is intended specifically to close legal loopholes which led the Supreme Court, in the New York trucking case, to rule that unions cannot be prosecuted under existing antiracketeering laws.

The Hobbs bill provides an imprisonment penalty of 20 years and a fine of $10,000 for anyone interfering with the movement of goods in interstate commerce by robbery or extortion.

The House Judiciary Committee, of which Representative HOBBS is an influential member, has approved the bill, and it will go to the floor. It is an excellent and needed restriction upon that group of unionists who resort to force and violence to compel certain categories of workers to become union members, but it is not all-inclusive and it does not aim to bring to an end all of the labor abuses now being practiced.

The real work to that end must be done in the Senate, and a good place to start, if a majority of the Congress are serious about wanting to remove abuses by selfish unionist groups, is with the now rarely discussed Smith bill, which the House passed but which continues to gather dust in a Senate hideaway.

The Smith bill proposes certain sweeping and long overdue amendments to the somewhat iniquitous Wagner Labor Relations Act. The Hobbs bill would remedy a specific condition. The Smith bill would remove those inequities from the Wagner Act which have so severely penalized American industry and which have actually encouraged unionist activities of a war-obstructionist nature. The whole Senate has never had an opportunity to consider it because, the moment it was introduced, its opponents successfully routed it to a committee which would oppose any sort of labor-control legislation.

Now that Representative HOBBS, however, has broken the ice in the new session, perhaps some Senator with courage will be inspired to force resurrection of the Smith bill. The signs are encouraging, in any event.

[From the Sea Coast Echo (Bay St. Louis, Miss.) of February 19, 1943]

TIME FOR CORRECTION

During April and May 1942, hearings were held before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee of the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, on H. R. 5218, H. R. 6752, H. R. 6872, and H. R. 7067. The intent of these several bills was to bring labor unions under the regulation of antitrust statutes and within the provisions of the antiracketeering law of 1943. The bills were bitterly fought by the labor unions on the ground that they would handcuff labor in bargaining with employers.

Anyone who reads the testimony or looks at the pictures included in the record, would be horrified by the waste and destruction that was caused by strikes and boycotts involving farm products in 1941. Trainloads of citrus fruits in southern California are shown dumped into canyons or on the ground because of packing house strikes and secondary boycotts.

Farmers who worked a year to raise, irrigate, cultivate, harvest, and ship the crops, then worked days to dump them because of secondary boycotts.

The Hobbs bill, one of the measures which organized labor attorneys violently objected to, does not even mention the word "labor"; it does make guilty of a felony anyone who in connection with any act affecting commerce "obtains or attempts to obtain, by the use of or attempt to use or threat to use force, violence, or coercion, money or other valuable consideration"; or who "commits or threatens physical violence to any person or property" in furtherance of such plan. Could a bill seeking protection of the public in this manner be truthfully called a threat to "peaceful" labor activities?

Since those hearings early in 1942, our Nation has seen inexcusable work stoppages in all manner of industries—either by order of labor leaders or by so-called wildcat strikes. The public has suffered and our armed forces have suffered, and the perpetrators of such outrages have gone unpunished, and have even gained in their power to call strikes, slow up production, or create work stoppages as they see fit.

Congressman HOBBS, of Alabama, on January 6, 1943, introduced H. R. 653, which seeks to remedy conditions shown in the hearings held in 1942. Correction of such vices is no attack on organized labor. No group in this Nation should be permitted to cause such depredations and loss to the public as shown in the 1942 hearings without just punishment such as would be meted out to any willful lawbreakers or promoter of antisocial acts.

[From the Washington (D. C.) News of February 24, 1943]

THE HOBBS BILL

The Hobbs bill may contain something dangerous to the rights of honest labor, though we haven't been able to find it. The bill doesn't mention unions. It says that whoever obstructs interstate commerce by robbery or extortion, or conspires to do that, or attempts to do that, or uses or threatens physical violence with intent to do that, shall be guilty of a felony.

It says, also, that any person who uses physical force or intimidation during the war to obstruct orderly transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of persons or property, of troops, munitions, war supplies, or mail, shall be guilty of a felony. This is purely a war provision, said by Transportation Director Eastman to be essential to carrying on the war.

The objection of labor leaders is to the words "whoever" and "any person." These inclusive words would subject officers and members of labor unions, the same as anyone else, to Federal prosecution for obstructing interstate commerce by robbery or extortion, or for using violence or intimidation to prevent movements of troops and war materials.

We believe officers and members of labor unions should not have special license to obstruct interstate commerce by robbery or extortion. The Supreme Court, however, thinks that Congress intends otherwise. Hence the Hobbs bill, an attempt to get the intent of Congress made plain in law.

The bill is now before the House Rules Committee. Some Congressmen contend that the committee should hold public hearings on it and give labor leaders an opportunity to show what's wrong with it. We agree, although labor leaders had that opportunity at extensive hearings on an almost identical Hobbs bill before the House Judiciary Committee last year.

If labor leaders can point out anything in the bill that endangers the rights of any honest worker, the bill ought to be changed. If their objection is merely that they don't want Congress to put any restraint on racketeers who prey on the public under the cloak of unionism, the bill ought to be passed.

Prohibiting the Mailing of Packages to Soldiers Overseas

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have made it a point to investigate the order recently made prohibiting the mailing of packages to soldiers overseas except upon permission of the soldier's commanding officer. I endeavored to get some information on this when the Post Office appropriation bill was before the House a short time ago; at that time I could not get any satisfactory information.

I find that there is a discrimination being made as to the different branches of the service. The Army Postal Service order provides that soldiers outside the continental limits of the United States cannot receive packages or their home-town newspapers except upon written approval of their commanding officer.

The Navy Department on the other hand has issued an order limiting the size of packages but has placed no restrictions on the sending of packages or home-town newspapers to men in the Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard. Packages to men in the Navy, Marines, or Coast Guard must weigh not more than 5 pounds, nor be more than 15 inches in length or 36 inches in length and girth combined.

I object both to the Army Postal Service order of January 15 and the discrimination which has resulted.

You can well imagine how long it would take for one of the servicemen who is overseas to finally get the package or newspaper he wants from home, if he must first go to his commanding officer and get a permit, mail the permit home, and then wait for the package or newspaper to get back to him.

The morale of our Army is important. It is the fighting morale of our men which will win this war. If we have ships to send cargoes for propaganda purposes all over the world, we should have space to send packages and newspapers to our men in service.

I recognize there are difficulties in transportation overseas but I also know how much these packages and newspapers from home mean to the morale of the boys in service and I am concerned about the morale of our fighting forces when I speak on this subject.

I hope my colleagues, particularly the Military Affairs Committee, will recognize this situation which exists under the present set of circumstances and immediately investigate the present order discriminating as to the men in the Army.

I also include herein an excerpt of an editorial from one of the newspapers of my district which exemplifies the feeling there is as to this asinine restriction:

Recent regulations make it practically impossible to send the home-town newspaper to men in overseas service.

This paper has had hundreds of readers among the men overseas. Again and again word has come back of the great appreciation of these men when the paper, perhaps a month or 6 weeks old, finally comes through. You can't understand how it cheers them up unless you have been there.

If the reason for restrictions on mailing such papers was one of transportation and delivery, one would not be disposed to murmur. However, the tone of the Post Office order implies that the papers thus sent are not wanted by the men at the front; that publishers are trying to force them on unwilling subscribers. That we know could not be further from the truth.

In some cases the paper is sent to the soldier by father, mother, or other relative, regularly paid subscriptions. In some places, such as Trimont, the commercial club paid for subscriptions to all men from that vicinity. At Ceylon the Herald sent a free subscription to men from its reader families.

Now it is practically impossible to send a paper to the man in Africa, Australia, or elsewhere overseas. He has been getting it more or less regularly. Suddenly it stops coming. He waits a while, then writes home, "The paper isn't coming any more. Please see about it."

The home folks come to the office, ask what's the matter. They are informed, and the next step is to write to the boy and explain that he must ask for the paper in writing, get the O. K. of his commanding officer, before it can be sent. When this is done, the written order and O. K. must be sent to the newspaper publisher, and then the paper can be sent again, the written and O. K.'d order kept on file to have on hand when the snooper comes around. In the meantime months have passed, no news from home, the soldier's spirits drop, and a lot of mischief is done because some postal brass hat made a fool rule.

Please, Congressman, not on account of us publishers, but for our fighting men's sake, get this damn-fool order set aside so the boys over there can again have the news from home to cheer them in their difficult task.

Of course, such subscriptions pay the publishers no profit, rather imposes a loss, but nearly all publishers have gone out of the way to use features especially for the men in service.

Proposed Aviation Legislation, H. R. 1012

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, much has been accomplished in the last several years toward fostering a knowledge of aviation among the Nation's youth. One of the most fortunate steps which this country took in the pre-war days was the adoption of the Civilian Pilot Training Act, which was reported to the House by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which made it possible for many thousands of our young men and women to receive basic flight training. As the War Department has several times acknowledged, the Civilian Pilot Training Program proved of tremendous assistance in enabling this Nation rapidly to develop a great military air force when the international emergency arose.

In looking ahead to the post-war world, it is important that we carry forward still further a program under appropriate Government leadership that will result in the widespread acquisition of aeronautical skill and knowledge among our youth. For while the airplane was first invented less than a generation ago, the science of aeronautics has already revolutionized warfare and in a great post-war development which will certainly come, that science will equally revolutionize our future peacetime society.

To assure the present and future generations of Americans an aviation policy and to have them become familiar with the airplane, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has recently reported a bill, H. R. 1012, which includes, among many other constructive provisions, the basis for carrying forward a long-range program of aviation training and education. This provision appears as section 14 of the bill, which proposes to add two new sections to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. One such section would write into our permanent law the provisions of the Civilian Pilot Training Act, now a temporary measure, covering the training not only of pilots but also of other aviation technicians and mechanics. In addition, it is proposed that the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics would be directed to promote a broad program of aviation education in the school systems and otherwise, and further to encourage the formation of aeronautical clubs and other aeronautical activities with a view toward familiarizing the participants with aeronautical skills and techniques.

If these proposals are adopted by the Congress, many helpful and constructive activities among the Nation's youth can be encouraged. Let me refer briefly to one type of activity which can be of special importance.

Among the most important lessons for American youth to learn is that of sail planing or gliding. Contrary to a belief which seems prevalent in some limited quarters, the dangers attendant in the use of gliders are very limited. It is very rare that one reads of serious accidents involving gliding in the past, either here or abroad. The reason for this is very apparent. A glider does not travel with the speed of an airplane. There is no engine attached to it as a means of propulsion. One truly sails along on wings when gliding. The speed of a glider amounts to only 25 or 30 miles per hour, either in landing or on the take-off.

During recent months American boys have been performing an excellent service in making model planes for spotting practice.

During peacetime, boys, and even girls, have had great delight in making model planes which have been flown through the air with motive power developed through a rubber band. In some instances, children of more wealthy parents, and even some adults, have built model planes with miniature electrical motors attached to them. All of these interests have shown the general air-mindedness of our American youth. Boys soon tire of these models and they should be graduated when between the ages of 13 and 16 to more active interests related to air. In gliding they can learn to soar through the air and not only gain the psychological factors of activity to stimulate interest but also the opportunity for developing initiative and judgment.

Prior to their famous flight at Kitty Hawk, the Wright brothers built gliders and conducted more than 1,000 glider experiments with actual flight. They gave credit for their experiments to a German experimenter, Lilienthal, and another, a Frenchman, Chanute, for their interest in the matter. Their actual plane for the first flight was essentially a box-type glider with a motor attached to it.

Prior to the First World War there were many gliding clubs in Germany, but with the advent of the powered airplane glider interest abated to some extent. Under the terms of the Versailles Treaty, Germany was denied the use of motored planes. Immediately, almost before the ink was dry on the treaty, under the direction of Oskar Ursinus, a civil engineer and editor, a revival of glider soaring developed. German enthusiasm spread so rapidly that in 1920 a national gliding and soaring contest was held at Wasserkuppe in the Rhone Mountains. Schools were opened to teach pupils gliding and soaring. Blueprints of tested models were made available at very nominal cost to encourage boys in their teen ages to build their own gliders. The Deutscher Luftfoht Verband, an aviation society which had been formed before the Wright brothers' initial flight, aided in the revivification of interest in gliding, and advanced soaring schools were opened. Inspectors were stationed all over Germany, and at nominal cost a group of boys who had built a glider could have it officially inspected. Thus, at little cost, gliders were made available to all of the youngsters of the nation, the poor as well as the rich.

Schools were operated along the line of summer camps for boys in Germany. Students learned discipline through community activities. They lived in barracks, ate in mess halls, participated in calisthenics, and competed in various sporting activities. They flew their gliders when weather permitted, and when this was impossible learned through lectures. Certificates of proficiency were given. Expenses were kept at a minimum.

Boys went back to their home communities, where clubs were formed. Interest was carefully stimulated by decisive planning.

The result of all this was that the entire youth of the German Nation not only became air-minded, but they enjoyed the thrills and experiences of soaring. They learned the principles of flying without a motor. When Hitler finally came into power he had a nation of young men and boys who had been glider-trained. Between the years 1935 and 1939 alone more than 120,000 German boys were glider-trained. The testimony of Gen. Ernst Udet, the one man who has been largely responsible for the building of the German air force, was that the best German fighting pilots came from among the 250,000 to 300,000 young Germans whose initial training was in gliders and sailplanes.

The youth of Poland trained along somewhat similar lines, but in a more limited manner, and the suddenness with which the German attack overwhelmed their country prevented them from displaying their ability until those who

escaped were enrolled in the Royal Air Force of Great Britain. The value of their training in glider flying has since been abundantly demonstrated.

The United States should benefit by what has been accomplished in these and other countries. We have in this country the finest educational system in the world. We have boys whose aptitude for flying has already been proved. The speed with which we have been building up our air force since Pearl Harbor has been one of the amazing contributions of our war effort. We must look to the future now and develop the native American genius of our youth to meet the problems of the future. Steps should now be taken, without further delay, to see to it that American boys all through their teen age shall fit themselves to meet the problems of tomorrow.

No finer pleasure can be enjoyed by any boy than to learn to glide. While at play he learns self-dependence, self-confidence, and self-initiative. It keeps his mind mentally alert at all times and trains him to think with the speed of lightning. Let us give him the opportunity. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has the technicians to develop standard plans for gliders which can be economically produced in the home or workshop of most American youths. These plans should be made available. Our educational system should encourage the initial efforts. The pleasure of it will carry these boys through. In doing this we shall build the foundation of our future as a peaceful nation and have the most able pilots and aeronauts of the world.

I call to your attention these provisions of H. R. 1012 and ask you to study the bill carefully so that when it is brought to the floor for your consideration you will be in a position to aid in formulating a great aviation policy and to aid in enacting into law the best aviation legislation for our Nation.

The Antiracketeering Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of February 20, 1943]

RACKETEERING ISSUE

The controversy which is developing around the Hobbs bill to bring unlawful labor activities within the scope of the Federal antiracketeering law seems to be generating more heat than light.

In a decision last March the Supreme Court held that Congress had not intended to apply the racketeering law to unions. At the same time, however, the Court suggested that Congress might appropriately deal with this question through legislation, and that is what Mr. HOBBS is asking his colleagues to do.

Involved in the Supreme Court's decision were the activities of certain members of the Teamsters' Union in the New York area. The evidence showed that these union members lay in wait for trucks coming into New York, forced their way onto the trucks and, by beating or threatening to beat the drivers, exacted payments of sums of money equivalent to the union scale for a day's work. In some instances the union men assisted or offered to assist in unloading the trucks; in others they simply took the money and disappeared. Since the law provided an exemption for "legitimate" union activities, the Court held that Congress had not intended to cover practices of this sort—a view which brought from Chief Justice Stone the dissenting observation that "such theories would render common law robbery an innocent pastime." It was to overcome the effect of this decision that Mr. HOBBS offered the amendment now under consideration, which, as he describes it, would make the racketeering statute applicable to "anyone who unlawfully interferes with interstate commerce, whether he carries a union card or not."

Spokesmen for organized labor have denounced the Hobbs proposal in its entirety. In the opinion of Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, it is nothing more than a subterfuge to eliminate the language now in the bill which protects legitimate labor activities. And Joseph A. Padway, general counsel for the American Federation of Labor, contends that what the bill really does is to limit labor's peaceful and ordinary activities. It is safe to assume, however, that neither of these men believes that the conduct ascribed to the teamsters is either a legitimate or a peaceful and ordinary form of labor activity. Yet, taking at face value their opposition to the Hobbs amendment and their failure to propose any alternative, it is difficult to escape the impression that what they really want is to preserve the racketeering law as interpreted by the Court, which would have the effect of granting a continued immunity to the worst sort of labor practices.

It may be, as Representative WALTER has suggested, that the Hobbs proposal is not the best remedy. Perhaps it is so broad that it might be applied to the detriment of legitimate labor activity in the real sense of that term. But if this is the case, spokesmen for labor would render greater service to their own cause and to their country by suggesting constructive changes instead of relying on inflammatory denunciations of the one effective change that has been proposed. Particularly in this period of wartime stringency, labor leaders ought not to be demanding the perpetuation of abuses which waste the Nation's manpower and exact a toll of millions of dollars from those who want to work.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World Herald of February 22, 1943]

NO COMPLIMENT TO LABOR

The Hobbs bill, now pending in Congress, is the center of a good deal of acrimonious and—to an outsider—mysterious wrangling.

Although it appears to be a wise and fair measure, various left-wing sympathizers in the House of Representatives are fighting it with all the tenacity at their command.

What is the Hobbs bill? It proposes simply and only to make the Federal antiracketeering law applicable to labor organizations as well as to other Americans.

At the present time unions are exempted from the provisions of the act. That exemption was upheld by the Supreme Court in the case brought by Thurman Arnold against Local 807 of the Teamsters' Union of New York.

Perhaps a review of the Local 807 case would throw a little light on the Hobbs bill. The teamsters resented the fact that truck gardeners were bringing their own produce into New York City. So some of these union leaders turned highwaymen.

The rest of the story can be told in the words of the dissenting opinion delivered in the case by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court:

"Members of (the teamsters' union) * * * lay in wait for trucks passing from New Jersey to New York, forced their way onto the trucks, and by beating or threats of beating the drivers, procured payments to themselves from the drivers or their employers of a sum of money * * * said to be the equivalent of the union wage for a day's work. In some instances they assisted, or offered to assist, in unloading the truck, and in others they disappeared as soon as the money was paid without rendering or offering to render any service. * * *"

Those facts are not disputed. The court differed only on the question of jurisdiction. The majority ruled that no law had been broken. These men are unionists, it said in effect, and they are specifically exempted from obeying a law which applies to all other men and women in the land.

The Hobbs Act would repeal that exemption.

The self-styled friends of labor who are opposing the act definitely are not complimenting the great, responsible and respectable labor movement. The essence of their argument is that unions cannot flourish without the help of thugs and extortionists. That is a slap at legitimate unionism, and a challenge to America's common sense.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 22, 1943]

PASSING THE AMMUNITION

There seems to be no rhyme or reason in the decision of the House Rules Committee to hold up the Hobbs bill. That measure—it is aimed solely at racketeers who obstruct interstate commerce by means of robbery or extortion—has had careful study by the House Judiciary Committee. Extensive hearings were held last year, and additional hearings will doubtless be conducted when the bill reaches the Senate. It has been fully explained to the Rules Committee. Chairman SABATH's insistence that additional hearings be held before the measure is sent to the House floor thus appears to be plain obstruction.

Tactics of this sort help to undermine the confidence of the people in the ability of Congress to legislate promptly and fairly. The chief function of the Rules Committee is to give important legislation the right-of-way to the House floor. Whenever it becomes an instrument of obstruction, it not only defeats the purpose for which it was created but also passes the ammunition to the critics who insist that Congress is 150 years behind the times in its organization.

[From the Selma (Ala.) Times Journal of February 16, 1943]

HOBBS BILL JUSTIFIED BY COURT RECORDS

As hearings opened Tuesday before the House Rules Committee on the Hobbs antiracketeering bill, aimed at elimination of abuses by labor extremists, it appeared that there was a strong chance for final enactment of the legislation, largely because union leaders have failed to present a convincing case against it to counteract evidence of need of corrective action.

Instead of seeking to show that practices which inspired drafting of the legislation can and will be corrected without congressional action, union spokesmen are basing bitter opposition upon the general thesis that the Hobbs bill is an attempt to smear organized labor, even while denying existence of evils that are a matter of court record.

Typical of this attitude is the stand taken by Labor, Washington-printed weekly news organ of the railroad brotherhoods. Labor expresses the hope that the House committee will bury the bill, on the contention that "it is not honest" in that it does not seek to remedy an evil.

With the assertion that "American labor has done nothing to merit such infamous treatment," the Washington paper claims that the Hobbs bill "places trade unions and trade-union leaders in the same category as Al Capone and other vile gangsters."

"Trade unions are as honestly conducted as chambers of commerce, bar associations or fraternal organizations," continues Labor. "Labor leaders are as honest as Members of Congress or any other group. If Mr. HOBBS questions that statement, we will welcome a more detailed comparison.

"But Mr. HOBBS will say members of some trade union are interfering with interstate commerce. We do not know of any union which is doing anything like that, but if Mr. HOBBS has information to sustain his charges, we would respectfully suggest that he submit it to the prosecuting officials in the State affected. He will find there are a score of laws to deal with such criminal acts.

"If Mr. HOBBS is going on the theory that State officials are dishonest or refuse to enforce the law, he should have the courage to say so. For our part, we refuse to believe State officials have fallen to such low estate.

"We repeat, the Hobbs bill is not aimed at an evil, but is designed to smear the American labor movement and is unworthy of serious consideration by Members of the House," the brotherhoods publication concludes.

To us, expression of such an attitude by the organ of the railroad brotherhoods is disappointing and we trust that it does not reflect the opinion of the masses of conscientious and alert workers who have made their union the criterion for excellence in the ranks of organized labor.

To deny knowledge of practices at which the bill is aimed is to admit ignorance of the entire proceedings in a New York truck case which was carried by the Federal Government into the Supreme Court, where a verdict in favor of the unions involved was returned upon the grounds that provisions of the law barring interference with interstate commerce do not apply to labor organizations. There was no ruling upon guilt of interference with truck shipments, to require use of members of local unions operating in delivery areas; the entire case was decided on the technicality of whether or not the accused individuals were subject to the law upon which prosecution was based.

The Hobbs bill, in belief, intends to make union members subject to laws governing other enterprises to the extent of expressly forbidding practices which plainly entail racketeering. To accomplish this purpose, it redefines the definition of "robbery" and "extortion" to bring within their legal meaning the taking or obtaining of money or personal property from another "by means of actual or threatened force or violence, or fear of injury."

In the light of these facts it appears that Labor is blindly attributing to all unions and all union members the merits, virtues, and restraints that have won for the brotherhoods their enviable place in public esteem. At a time when organized labor is in pressing need of policing from within its own ranks, this appears to be an unfortunate attitude, one that might eventually result in justification for charges of attempts to smear labor as a whole.

As long as the responsible unions like the brotherhoods cannot see faults within organized labor to remedy, all corrective action to eliminate abuses offensive to the public must come from outside sources and that is not to the interest of any union worker anywhere.

[From the Alabama Farm Bureau News of February 1943]

HOBBS BILL TO DELIVER FARMER FROM RACKETEERS BEFORE HOUSE

The bill by Representative SAM HOBBS, of the Fourth Alabama District, to deliver farmers from the racketeering tactics of some labor groups is now before the National House of Representatives and will be brought to a vote as soon as its sponsor and supporters can obtain a rule making it a special order.

Here is an example of what the bill would stop if enacted:

When a New Jersey farmer drives a truck loaded with produce up to the New Jersey mouth of the Holland Tunnel which gives access beneath the Hudson River to New York City, he is stopped by a union man. He is then forced to take on a union driver. When he arrives in New York he must employ a union man to unload his truck. It makes no difference that the truck may be his own property; that he raised the produce himself; that he himself is in the driver's seat; he has to pay a tribute to a union and a high tribute, too, before he can sell his produce in New York City.

The Hobbs bill would put an end to such racketeering.

The Montgomery Advertiser recently carried the following dispatch from Washington:

The long-rumored congressional drive for legislative curbs on some labor practices got under way as the House Judiciary Committee approved a bill to make unions subject to heavy penalties under Federal racketeering statutes.

The measure, seen in some quarters as the opening wedge for outright antistrike legislation, was sponsored by Representative SAM HOBBS (Democrat), Alabama, who said it was aimed specifically at closing legal loopholes which led the Supreme Court, in the New York trucking case of 1942, to rule that unions cannot be prosecuted under the racketeering laws.

Describing the bill as the "best ever presented to Congress," HOBBS said it provides a maximum penalty of 20 years' imprisonment and a fine of $10,000 for anyone interfering with movement of goods in interstate commerce by "robbery or extortion." These acts were defined to mean the securing of property from another "with his consent induced by wrongful use of actual or threatened force or violence or fear under color of official right."

The committee approved the measure in closed session over opposition of Representatives EMANUEL CELLER (Democrat), New York, and THOMAS J. LANE (Democrat), Massachusetts, who said they would file a minority report. CELLER said the language is so broad and drastic that it could be construed to outlaw strikes at a time when organized labor is "doing a pretty good job" of adhering to its voluntary no-strike pledge.

HOBBS, however, insisted it is aimed only at correcting practices such as those in the New York trucking case, in which members of the American Federation of Labor Teamsters' Union removed nonunion drivers from trucks at the entrance of the Holland Tunnel and replaced them with union drivers.

The Supreme Court ruled in the case that unions cannot be prosecuted under the anti-racketeering statute because of a provision exempting disputes involving the question of wages between bona fide employees and employers.

HOBBS says his bill stands a "perfect" chance for passage. A similar measure died in the last Congress in the face of strong opposition from labor. But the current Congress, angered by the recent strike in the Pennsylvania anthracite fields, has indicated it will be receptive to curbs on union activities.

Misinformation About Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS], manifestly through lack of accurate information, made some misleading statements to the House regarding aviation.

I shall correct some of them here:

First. The gentleman said that a contract between the air lines and Railway Express Agency provides that the Railway Express shall fix the rates that the air lines will charge for the transportation of air express, subject only to the approval of the Board.

The gentleman is misinformed. The contract does not provide that the Railway Express Agency shall fix the rates but, on the contrary, provides that the air lines will fix the rates. Heretofore, this rule was subject to one limitation which, however, has been eliminated by action of the Civil Aeronautics Board as hereinafter explained.

Second. The gentleman also said that under existing law the air lines entered into a contract with the Railway Express Co.

This is inaccurate. The contract between the air lines and the Express Agency was not made under existing law but was entered into prior to the enactment of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

Third. The gentleman also stated:

> The existing law provides that every such contract (that is between air lines or air lines and others) must be filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board and that before any contract shall have legal force it must be approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Further, the gentleman states that if section 29 of H. R. 1012 were adopted—

> The contract between the American Railway Express Agency and the air lines of the United States will become legal unless it is positively disapproved by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Neither of these statements is correct.

Existing law requires that such contracts be filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board; that they be disapproved if contrary to public interest; that otherwise they be approved; and if approved they will not be subject to the antitrust

laws. The present law does not provide that the contract will have no legal force until it is approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Civil Aeronautics Board has followed this construction of existing law.

Section 29 of H. R. 1012 merely provides that if there is an order of disapproval it becomes unlawful to carry out the contract. Under existing law if the antitrust laws, or any other legal restraints, would make a contract illegal, those restraints apply until and unless the Civil Aeronautics Board enters an order of approval. The same thing would be true if section 29 of H. R. 1012 is adopted.

Fourth. The gentleman also states that under section 29 of H. R. 1012—

> Any contract entered into by an air line with any other person, or any other individual, or corporation does not, under this bill, even have to be filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The gentleman is mistaken. Section 29 of H. R. 1012 provides that any contract effecting air transportation between air lines, or between air lines and other types of carriers, shall be filed to the extent required by order or regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Fifth. The gentleman also states that section 29 of H. R. 1012 means:

> That contracts could be entered into indiscriminately and never have to be filed with the Board, and would be legal and beyond the antitrust laws until the Board could find them and compel their filing and finally disapprove them.

This is untrue in two respects. In the first place, the antitrust laws would be applicable except where a contract is approved by the Board. Manifestly, therefore, if a contract were not filed the antitrust laws would be applicable. In the second place, since the Board would have full power by general regulations, as well as by order, to require the filing of contracts, the gentleman's statement that contracts could be entered into indiscriminately and never have to be filed, assumes that the Civil Aeronautics Board is both incompetent and guilty of bad faith, an indictment of the Civil Aeronautics Board wholly without the color of justification.

Sixth. The gentleman also states that H. R. 1012 is—

> A bill which would, if enacted into law, permit the railroads of this country to throttle and stifle the expansion of the air lines.

This is a groundless conclusion. It is based on the gentleman's misapprehensions as to the present law and the proposed amendment, to which I have already referred.

Seventh. The gentleman also states that if H. R. 1012, containing section 29, is adopted—

> You can wrap the air lines of this country up in a package, tie a red ribbon around it, and deliver it to the railroads; and I challenge a refutation of that statement.

This statement is as erroneous as is the misinformation on which it is founded. Section 29 was in the bill as introduced. In the bill as reported it was modified pursuant to suggestions from the Civil Aeronautics Board and the air-transport industry. It is folly to allege that the committee in adopting suggestions from the Civil Aeronautics Board and the air-transport industry has delivered them to the railroads.

Eighth. Throughout the gentleman's speech, he appears to be primarily concerned with the change in the procedure proposed in H. R. 1012 for filing and acting upon contracts under section 412 of the Civil Aeronautics Act. The provisions in H. R. 1012 that the gentleman is so concerned with were suggested to the committee by the Civil Aeronautics Board and by the representative of the air transport industry.

My conviction as to the interpretation of the proposed section 29 and as to the facts concerning the railway express agency contract, as above stated, are further confirmed after advising with attorneys of the Civil Aeronautics Board and of the Air Transport Association.

It is perfectly manifest that no such ill consequences as the gentleman predicts could occur to the air lines without connivance with the railroads on the part of the Civil Aeronautics Board and of the air lines in utter disregard of the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act and of their own interests.

I will now discuss certain of the gentleman's remarks in more detail.

In commenting on section 29 of H. R. 1012 as reported to the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] stated:

> The air lines entered into a contract with Railway Express wherein they agreed that Railway Express should have a monopoly upon the gathering of air express.

The air lines did enter into such a contract but they advised the Board on February 22, 1943, that they were amending the contract to eliminate the monopoly provision. Amended contracts eliminating this provision have already been filed with the Board by American Airlines and Eastern Air Lines and the Board has been informed that contracts with the other air lines will be in within a few days.

As I have said, the gentleman from Oklahoma has asserted that the Railway Express Agency fixes the rates that the air lines will charge for the transportation of air express.

This statement is clearly wrong. The contract between the air lines and the Railway Express Agency specifically provides in section 8 thereof that the air lines are to fix the rates which are to be included in the Railway Express Agency tariff for transporting air express. That tariff is filed with and regulated by the C. A. B. Up until recently, the contract provided that these rates could not be reduced by the air lines to a point below twice rail express rates. However, this provision has never come into operation because the air lines have never fixed rates which come even close to twice that of the railroads. The air lines on a number of occasions have refused to reduce rates when the Railway Express Agency has asked them to. I understand that the present express rates fixed by the air lines are approximately seven times the rail-express rates. Nevertheless, on February 22, 1943, the air lines and the Railway Express Agency informed the Board that they were revising the contract so as to eliminate this twice-rail-rate provision. Under the present rate provisions of the contract, if the air lines want to and the Board has no objection, air-express rates may be reduced to a level equal to those of the railroads or below.

The gentleman further said, as we have noted above, that—

> If section 29 of this bill (H. R. 1012) is adopted, the contract between the American Railway Express Agency and the air lines of the United States will become legal unless it is positively disapproved by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

As I have said, this statement misinterprets H. R. 1012. Section 414 of the Civil Aeronautics Act says that if a contract is approved the parties are relieved from the antitrust laws. Unless a contract is specifically approved by the Board, the parties are subject to the antitrust laws. Section 414 has not been changed or in any way affected by the new bill. The only thing the new bill does is to make it clear that the Board can prevent the parties to a contract such as that with the express agency from carrying it out if they find that the contract is adverse to the public interest. Thus section 29 of the bill would further implement the Board's present power of regulation. For even though a particular provision of such a contract does not violate the antitrust laws, an order of disapproval will make the provision unlawful if H. R. 1012 is adopted.

Mr. NICHOLS also criticizes section 29 of H. R. 1012 on the ground that carriers would not be required to file contracts. This is wrong. The amendment merely gives the Board power to permit carriers to refrain from filing contracts the Board does not want to see. The Board can require them to file all contracts or may state specifically what contracts it does not want filed. The only purpose of the amendment is to eliminate an administrative burden on the Board and the air lines.

So that the House may be fully informed, the following description of the proceedings by the Civil Aeronautics Board with respect to these contracts between Railway Express Agency and the air lines should be set out. The contracts were entered into in 1936 and 1937. After the Civil Aeronautics Act was passed, they were filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board under section 412. In the latter part of 1939, the Board started a proceeding to determine whether they should be approved or disapproved as adverse to the public interest. Prehearing conferences were held with the parties and they showed that an extended proceeding would be required. In November of 1941, T. W. A., Eastern, American, and United requested the Board to postpone this investigation indefinitely because of the emergency

conditions then existing and because they had organized a corporation, Air Cargo, Inc., for the purpose of conducting an exhaustive study and survey of the present and future possibilities of transporting cargo by air. This request was granted by the Board but in November of 1942, the Board, being concerned over the existence of certain provisions of the contract proposed that the parties cancel the existing contracts and revise them. The Board stated that the contracts would have to be revised as follows:

1. The provisions of the present contracts in section 4 which provide that "the air company agrees that during the time in which operations are carried on under this contract it will not accept express business, as described above or otherwise, from any party other than the express company, * * *" must not appear in the new contract or must be amended so as to eliminate the prohibition against acceptance of express business from persons other than Express Agency. This does not necessarily mean that the air carriers must make provision to handle express matter directly.

2. The provision of the present contracts in section 4 which provide that the express company will not make an agreement with another air carrier for a similar service without giving the air carrier notice thereof and permitting the air carrier to provide a comparable or better service, must not be inserted in the new contract or must be amended in such manner that they will not permit one air carrier to prevent or delay the extension of the facilities and service of Railway Express Agency to a competing carrier.

3. The provision in section 8 of the present contracts that the express company "shall not be required without its consent to establish air-express rates less than twice the existing first-class rail-express rates between the same points unless required by law" must not be inserted in the new contract or must be amended in such manner that the establishment of air-express rates will not be dependent in any way upon the rail-express rates.

4. The provision of the present contracts in section 20 which provides that "the express company shall not during the period of this agreement enter into the air-express transportation business by operating its own aircraft in competition with the air company" shall not be included in the new contract.

On February 22, 1943, counsel for the express agency and counsel representing the air carriers notified the Board that they had agreed upon revisions of the contracts in line with the suggestions of the Board. On February 24, American Airlines, Inc., filed a revision to the original contract between it and Railway Express Agency, and on February 25, Eastern Air Lines, Inc., filed a similar revision of its original contract. The other air lines are in process of filing the same revisions in each of their contracts.

There is no secrecy about the source of information concerning these questions. It is all within the provisions of the law and the official public records of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act are carefully prepared with a view of preventing the air lines from being subjected to sinister control by any competing agency. The Civil Aeronautics Board in its decisions and administrative acts have manifested a clear purpose to give vitality to the provisions of this law.

Aliens in Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some remarks I broadcast over the radio last Friday night, February 26, on a Nation-wide hook-up, on the subject Aliens in Labor.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, tonight I have the pleasure of addressing you, not as a foe of labor nor a labor baiter, but as a sincere friend of labor. I am firstly interested in those things which are for the good of all Americans and not those things which favor any group or groups, whether they be labor groups or otherwise. My voting record since becoming a member of the United States Senate has been strongly in support of legislation favoring organized labor.

I have always been the friend of the laboring man. By that I mean the man who is affiliated with organized labor, as well as the man who is not a member of any labor organization or union. I speak tonight in behalf of the great mass of laboring men throughout the length and breadth of this nation who are affiliated with organized labor as dues-paying members.

Strikes in war industries during actual war are alien to the philosophy of the patriotic American laboring man. This includes sit-down and all other forms of strikes.

Absenteeism in war industries during time of war is likewise alien to the philosophy of the patriotic American laboring man.

Many of these strikes and also many man-hours of labor lost as a result of absenteeism is due largely to ideologies and "alienologies" injected into the rank and file of the American laboring men by non-American citizens, aliens who are officers of many of the locals and chapters of labor unions and labor organizations.

Recognizing the destruction wrought by alien labor agitators in this country, and particularly those affiliated with unions, and having favored over the years the absolute ban upon immigration and the influx of refugees, I believe that no union or labor organization should be permitted to have as an officer of that union or organization anyone who is not an American citizen.

At this point let me say that I agree with our Army and Navy officials that law-abiding aliens should not be barred from employment as a result of our present manpower shortage.

In line with confining the officership of any labor organization to American citizens, I likewise am opposed to any labor union or organization having as an officer any American who has been deprived of his citizenship as a result of his having been convicted of a felony.

Of course, I recognize that the mere suggestion upon my part of the enactment of legislation which I deem to be for the betterment and benefit of labor will subject me to criticism and immediately bring forth the charge that I am a labor baiter. When 7 years ago I called for the registration and fingerprinting of all aliens, they charged that I sought to interfere with civil liberties. Then when 5 years ago I introduced a bill to stop all immigration into this country, those same critics charged that I was an alien baiter. I realize, my friends, that no public servant can be free from criticism if democracy is to continue and to live, and criticism, I believe, at this time during this war is necessary if organized labor in this country is to continue.

I assume to speak for the hundreds of dues-paying members of labor unions throughout the country who have spoken to me personally in reference to my resolution and for thousands of dues-paying members of labor unions who have advised me that they favor my Senate Joint Resolution No. 9, which calls for the registration of labor organizations with the Secretary of Labor at Washington.

This resolution would require the registration of all labor organizations with the Federal Government, at which time the president of that organization or authorized officer would be called upon to provide the Labor Department with the following information:

1. The name of the labor union or other labor organization;
2. The address at which it has its principal office or does business;
3. The names, titles, and salaries of its officers;
4. The initiation fees charged each member;
5. The annual dues charged each member;
6. The assessments levied against its members during the past 12-month period;
7. The limitations on membership;
8. The number of paid-up members;
9. The date of the last election of officers;
10. The method of election of officers;
11. The vote for and against each candidate for office at any election held during the past 12-month period; and
12. The date of the last detailed financial statement furnished to all members and the method of publication or circulation of such statement (if any).

My resolution would require that each and every labor organization make public and provide its members with a financial statement at least once a year, setting forth the amount of initiation fees and dues paid into that organization, as well as its disbursements. Every corporation is required to furnish its stockholders with an annual statement relative to its financial condition. Why should not all labor unions be required to furnish their members with an annual report as to their financial conditions.

My resolution further provides that it shall hereafter be unlawful for any labor union or other labor organization which is required to register with the Department of Labor to have as an officer or agent any person—

1. Who is not a citizen of the United States;
2. Who is a Communist, Fascist, or member of any Nazi bund organization;
3. Who has been a member of or affiliated with any Communist, Fascist, or Nazi bund organization within a period of 2 years prior to the date of the enactment of this resolution;
4. Who is ineligible to hold public office, or
5. Who has lost his rights to United States citizenship by reason of conviction of a felony.

The enactment of this resolution, in my opinion, as a friend of organized labor, would benefit not only labor itself as a

whole, but would be of personal value to the dues paying members.

In connection with the subject of dues I need only to call your attention to the recent coal mine strike in Pennsylvania which was brought about as a result of an attempt on the part of certain union leaders to assess additional dues against their members. This strike involved thousands of miners who struck as a protest against labor leaders attempting to raise their dues to the extent of 50 cents per month.

The economic and political power of labor organizations has increased tremendously within the past several years. Not so long ago the bargaining power of unions was frequently below that of the employers. Today that situation is reversed. Employers even in huge corporations are at a disadvantage as compared to union representatives at the bargaining table. Let there be justice and fair play for both labor and industry.

Many labor leaders as a result of the political powers they have obtained over the past several years may succeed in blocking sound labor legislation written by sincere friends of the movement in this the Seventy-eighth Congress, but if they do succeed in blocking my proposed legislation and that of other Members of Congress who are friendly to labor, then the probabilities are that a later and less friendly Congress may enact restrictive legislation written by foes of the labor movement.

It is my sincere opinion that the enactment of my Senate Joint Resolution No. 9 will to a large extent bring to an end the misunderstandings which now exist between organized labor and industry.

In view of the fact that the main issue before the American people today is that of manpower—labor—which affects all of the American people during these critical days of war, I am desirous of hearing from both capital and labor, heads of industries, and workers, as to their respective views on this all-important proposed legislation. If industry and workers are interested I hope they will write me their views, and I will send them copies of my resolution. Address Robert R. Reynolds, United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

Billionaire Business Enterprises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER T. BONE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some figures dealing with the size of certain business organizations in the United States, which appear in an article by Gilbert E. Busch, United Press staff correspondent.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLIONAIRE BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

(By Gilbert E. Busch, United Press staff correspondent)

NEW YORK, August 17.—The United States now has a total of 32 billionaire business enterprises whose aggregate assets of more than $67,000,000,000 are the greatest in history, a United Press survey disclosed today.

In sharp contrast to the last World War period when there were only 6 companies in the billion-dollar class with assets amounting to less than $10,000,000,000, the 32 members of today's roster of companies—with assets of $1,000,000,000 or more—constitute the largest membership yet recorded for this exclusive club, the survey showed.

Total resources of the present members, based on statistics for the 1941 year end or later, are $67,565,206,898 compared with $64,385,220,313 for the same companies at the close of 1940. Last year there were 30 companies in the billion-dollar class, 28 each in 1939 and 1938, and 20 in 1929. Only 3 of the billionaires—each a bank—listed smaller assets than a year earlier.

All of the big-business companies are engaged in the war effort in one way or another—from production of munitions and war supplies to the transportation of materials and troops and financing of the war program itself through the investment of funds in Government bonds.

The Bell System, comprising the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and subsidiary and affiliated companies which operate 80 percent of all the telephones in the country, maintained its number one spot as the greatest public utility enterprise in the world with assets of $5,893,765,919; a greater total than that for any other American company.

Metropolitan Life Insurance, with assets of $5,648,074,196, was in second place, followed in sequence by six banks or insurance companies. The list also includes six railroads, and two electric utilities.

The gigantic United States Steel Corporation, whose production alone represents about half of all the steel capacity of the Axis in Europe and Japan, stood in twelfth place with assets of $2,045,021,088.

General Motors Corporation, actively engaged in turning out various war materials, was fifteenth with assets of $1,747,250,191, while E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., producer of chemicals, munitions, and nylon and other vitally needed substitutes, made the list for the first time with assets of $1,069,399,343.

Reports of the leading banks and insurance companies disclosed heavy investment of funds in United States Government securities. The 10 banks on the billionaire list had more than $8,000,000,000, or nearly half of their total resources of $19,929,414,000, invested in Federal bonds, while the 8 "member" insurance companies held more than $5,000,000,000 of Government securities, or almost one-fourth of their combined assets of $21,236,813,472.

At the 1940 year-end the banks had more than $6,000,000,000 of their combined assets of $19,097,366 invested in Government bonds, while the insurance companies held about $4,250,000,000 of Government bonds compared with aggregate assets of $20,052,885,475.

In their respective fields, United States Steel, General Motors, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), Chase National Bank, Consolidated Edison, the Bell System, and the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. are the greatest business units in the entire world from the standpoint of wealth.

The Associated Gas & Electric Co., barred from regular membership in the club because it is in court receivership, continued as a nominal member, however, listing assets at the end of 1941 amounting to $1,043,325,684 against $1,035,303,162 a year earlier.

Of the 32 billionaires, 2 had assets of more than $5,000,000,000; 1 above $4,000,000,000; 2 above $3,000,000,000; 7 above $2,000,000,000; and the remainder above $1,000,000,000.

Following are the members of the Billion Dollar Club with their total assets at the end of 1941, or later figures where available, compared with the 1940 year-end:

Company	Assets, 1941	1940
Bell Telephone System	$5, 893, 765, 919	$5, 484, 988, 929
Metropolitan Life Insurance	5, 648, 047, 196	5, 357, 791, 636
Prudential Insurance Co.	4, 556, 085, 000	4, 263, 955, 000
Chase National Bank	3, 869, 464, 000	3, 824, 403, 347
National City Bank, New York	3, 128, 264, 000	3, 095, 466, 387
New York Life Insurance Co.	2, 987, 269, 000	2, 869, 735, 000
Equitable Life Assurance, New York	2, 740, 635, 508	2, 564, 466, 180
Guaranty Trust Co., New York	2, 587, 712, 000	2, 718, 966, 014
Pennsylvania Railroad	2, 452, 661, 536	2, 396, 141, 517
Standard Oil Co., New Jersey	2, 202, 351, 739	2, 071, 537, 919
Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association	2, 143, 202, 000	1, 817, 535, 186
United States Steel Corporation	2, 045, 021, 088	1, 854, 585, 741
New York Central Railroad	1, 881, 883, 298	1, 841, 612, 380
Continental Illinois National Bank, Chicago	1, 864, 564, 000	1, 620, 004, 121
General Motors Corporation	1, 747, 250, 191	1, 535, 916, 373
Southern Pacific Co.	1, 586, 742, 527	1, 560, 876, 879
Mutual Life Insurance Co., New York	1, 541, 952, 000	1, 484, 904, 000
First National Bank of Chicago	1, 476, 687, 000	1, 238, 291, 927
Northwestern Mutual Life, Milwaukee	1, 439, 890, 000	1, 359, 000, 000
Consolidated Edison System	1, 403, 618, 197	1, 383, 148, 373
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry	1, 344, 861, 460	1, 317, 729, 827
Central Hanover Bank	1, 337, 117, 000	1, 398, 058, 666
Bankers Trust Co., New York	1, 336, 855, 000	1, 579, 523, 715
Baltimore & Ohio R. R.	1, 265, 906, 720	1, 228, 785, 532
Union Pacific R. R.	1, 250, 666, 269	1, 212, 351, 082
Commonwealth & Southern Corporation	1, 168, 019, 473	1, 140, 884, 152
John Hancock Mutual Life, Boston	1, 166, 498, 365	1, 054, 369, 632
Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford	1, 156, 436, 403	1, 008, 664, 027
Manufacturers Trust, New York	1, 136, 819, 000	1, 050, 459, 262
Cities Service Co. System	1, 086, 831, 666	1, 067, 786, 492
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.	1, 069, 399, 343	934, 892, 276
Chemical Bank & Trust Co.	1, 048, 730, 000	958, 388, 741
Total	67, 565, 206, 898	64, 385, 220, 313

The Housing Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address I made to the National Association of Housing Officials at Richmond, Va., on February 24, 1943, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Housing officials and friends of housing officials, I appreciate the opportunity to meet with you and discuss the question of postwar housing. I have felt for some years that there should be a thorough investigation of the entire housing program by a Congressional Committee, with the view to determining a definite plan over at least a 10-year period, and the extent of government participation. I have introduced resolutions in previous years, but they were aimed primarily at the confusion of Government agencies, and since they were deemed to be, therefore, critical of the administration, I

made little headway. The confusion between agencies has been somewhat reduced now by the President's order consolidating all of them into the National Housing Agency, and I believe that the attitude of the majority in Congress is now very different, and that they welcome the opportunity to study the housing program.

It might be thought that the attitude of the House toward the National Resources Planning Board indicates a hostility to postwar planning at this time. I do not so construe it, however. The House is not so much opposed to planning as it is opposed to the kind of planning they know the present National Resources Planning Board will engage in. You only have to read their reports to realize that they accept without question the thesis that Government spending may be unlimited, and that deficits are a blessing in disguise. In short, they are planning on a thesis which a great majority of the Congressmen disagree with. Congress feels very strongly that it desires to do its own planning. Furthermore, I believe that planning should be much more specific, and deal thoroughly and adequately with a series of special subjects. The National Resources Planning Board engages in a kind of global planning, which provides interesting reading, but hardly gets the country to the point where action can begin.

There are a number of reasons why we should now make plans to deal particularly with the housing situation. The President, on February 24, 1942, acting under the authority vested in him by the first War Powers Act, consolidated all the functions of Federal agencies in the National Housing Agency. This consolidation, however, is only made for the period of the war, and when the war ends various agencies revert to their original position. It is highly desirable that Congress enact a permanent law determining definitely the status of the various agencies dealing with housing and the form of Government organization best suited to handle the problem. I certainly am committed to no particular form. It might be found desirable to continue the present set-up indefinitely or it might be found desirable to create some new kind of Government department to take over the job. In any event, we cannot continue with the confusion and competition which existed among Government bureaus prior to the war.

In the second place, we have proceeded with defense housing hastily to deal with emergency situations. Housing has been constructed by many different agencies. As to some of this housing, it is provided in section 4 of the National Defense Housing Act that it may be sold and disposed of as expeditiously as possible, but that no part of such housing, unless specifically authorized by Congress, shall be conveyed to any public or private agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons of low income. We should now determine whether emergency housing should be retained or sold, whether it should be destroyed or operated as public housing. It is desirable that we know exactly what housing is available and determine its future.

But, above all, it is essential to make a definite plan for at least 10 years after the war. I do not believe that Congress has ever made a complete study of the housing situation. Hearings have been held, but they have usually been held for the purpose of promoting a particular plan of residence construction. We have had hearings to support the United States Housing Authority plan of public housing. We have had hearings to justify Federal Housing Administration. We have had hearings on the Federal home-loan banks and the building and loan association financing. I have long thought that we should undertake a study of the entire problem, without prejudice and with open minds, to determine how best the people of the country can be adequately housed within a period of 10 years. Public opinion certainly demands that we create a condition where the minimum of sanitary housing be made available to every citizen, with adequate light, air, and essential conditions to raise a healthy family. Furthermore, no kind of public works program can provide the employment which can be brought about by adequate home building, and the problem of unemployment will be our most serious economic problem after the war, as it was before. Furthermore, it is my own opinion that nothing can contribute so effectively to the permanence of a democracy as home ownership by as many people as can possibly afford it.

There is still some opposition to Government action in the field of housing, but I would not propose a congressional study if I did not believe that housing is a proper field for Government action and Government subsidy. As you all know, there has been a good deal of talk in the House of Representatives against any Government money for housing. I believe, however, that this is due to hostility to a specific plan of housing, namely, that advanced by the United States Housing Authority, and that any comprehensive plan prepared by a congressional committee will not meet with the same opposition. Our committee will have to determine how far Government action or subsidy is necessary.

Since we are definitely committed, and both parties are definitely committed, to a continuation of free enterprise in this country, it is obvious that any plan should provide that housing be supplied as far as possible by private industry, and Government action authorized only in fields where successful results from private industry can no longer be expected. In short, I believe the purpose of the study should be to develop an over-all plan to provide housing for the entire United States for the next 10 years, and determine to what extent Government shall participate in providing it. I believe the Government can well afford to devote a very substantial sum every year to promote housing. I should like to know, however, just how large that sum is going to be, and feel reasonably confident that if that sum is provided for 10 years, all the people in this country will be well housed.

We now have a wide basis of experience. Some of the projects undertaken may have been useful as experiments, and yet impossible to extend to cover the entire field. I should like to determine how many houses ought to be provided in order that at the end of 10 years the entire population may be adequately housed. I should like to determine how much of this must be public housing and how much must be subsidized by loan or otherwise. Great improvements have been made in the construction of housing, and great economies. We have information available today which has not been available to any prior study, and the study should be made now if we are to be ready for the peace when it occurs.

Housing is one branch of social service. It is affected by the change in public sentiment, demanding that every man who is willing to work have a minimum of food, clothing, shelter, and medical attention. I feel, however, that we must be careful in supplying this more or less gratuitous assistance to the poor, that we do not destroy the system of incentive and reward for ability, diligence, and thrift which has been so typical of America. In my opinion, our progress has been due to the fact that any man in this country, by his own efforts, might provide a living for himself better than that of his less diligent neighbor, a better education for his children, and a better provision for his family after his death. That system has made the Americans the hardest workers in the world, and the work which they have done, their ingenuity, their persistence, and their genius have made this country today the most powerful country in the world.

In applying Government gratuity in the field of old-age pensions, of unemployment compensation, of relief and of housing, we must be careful to retain the essentials of that incentive system and reward for work. We should not raise up the man in the lowest income group to a point where he is better off than another man who has worked harder and better, but relied exclusively upon the products of his own labor and thrift. If we give an old-age pension to every man who reaches 65, regardless of how much of a loafer he may have been all his life, then I believe we should do something for the man who has worked harder, built his own home, and saved his own money. It takes a lot of saving to produce the same amount of money which is now to be gratuitously distributed as a $40-a-month pension. If we are going to give a noncontributory pension, I believe we should abolish the means test at least for men having incomes under $3,000 a year.

The same principle applies to housing. We should not give a man subsidized housing simply because he earns less than a thousand dollars a year, unless, first, we can give the same housing to every man in that income group who desires it, and second, somewhat better housing to those who earn say between $1,000 a year and $2,000 a year. The same relative position should be maintained between people in different income groups.

After all, in the long run the man who earns $2,000 earns it because he is a better man, or an abler man, or a more diligent man than the man who earns $1,000; and if the $1,000 man is to be subsidized, then some assistance must also be given to the class next above him, so that the relative position of the two is still maintained. To many, equality of income is apparently a goal. I believe that equality of income would absolutely destroy the whole basis of American success and American happiness. What we must maintain is the incentive to work.

It may be that under our system the rich are too rich and the poor are too poor. Measures to tax the rich by heavily progressive income taxes and measures to subsidize the poor are reasonable means of reducing the margin, but they should be carefully administered so that the relative position is still maintained. That is my objection to the $25,000 salary limit at the top, although I do not object to a 90-percent or a 92-percent rate on income in the upper brackets. What a man has left should have some relation to the income which he had before, reflecting in the long run the value which other people have placed upon his services and his character.

Of course, if we undertake to subsidize not only the lowest income group but also the groups somewhat higher up, it will make the program more expensive. That seems to me of relative unimportance. If the expense is unbearable, then we will have to reduce the subsidy to the lowest income group and all along the line. The only way, however, that we can sell such a program to the people, the only way that we can justify an increased burden on the taxpayer, is to make a definite plan, estimate its cost fairly, and make the entire goal so attractive that the people will see how essential it is for happiness and right living in the United States of America.

Committee on Aviation

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I rise to ask the in-

dulgence of this House, but I do ask it today to express my support of H. R. 23, a resolution to set up a permanent committee on aviation.

This resolution can in no wise be construed as a party matter. It was fathered by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma, JACK NICHOLS, who sits on the other side of the aisle. It has the support of the distinguished minority leader. It comprehends merely the setting up of an internal committee in this House with a view to perfecting our functions.

The resolution appropriates no money. It sets up no bureau. It creates no patronage. It establishes no refuge for lame ducks.

There have been some objections on the part of my colleagues to the adoption of this resolution. We should, however, before we express our disapproval, stop to consider the reasons that brought this resolution into being.

There is not a Member of this House who but foresees the aviation problems which will in the future confront this body. Even now they appear of such magnitude as to cause us in prudence to support this measure.

Why should we not now select from out of our midst a group of men who will be free to devote their every talent to postulating the problems of aviation, of the present as well as of the future.

The need for a committee on aviation is a necessity born of these times. It is altogether beside the point to say that the establishment of this committee is in any sense a critcism of the splendid work which has been done through all these years by the subcommittee of the House committee which has handled these matters.

That committee has never had experience in or has had to do with the multitude of problems which will face the new committee.

The Interstate Commerce Committee, as we all know, has to do with legislation affecting the rates, charges, regulations, and general conduct of things pertinent to canals, railroads, telephone, telegraph, power, gas, busses, and so forth. Here is a new function—born of these times.

The trade barriers which have plagued our economic development at every State border must not today be linked to or permitted to throttle the air services of this Nation if we are to have freedom of the air in these United States.

Are we of this body here and now going to attempt to deny that the aviation industry is not one of the biggest industries in our Nation today?

Think of the billions of dollars voted here in this Congress to develop aviation in these last 12 months.

Think of the millions we are now spending out of the Treasury of the United States to develop air research—think of the mile upon mile of aircraft factories we have built; of our production of 60,000 war planes per year. It takes no vision whatever to see that the war production of 60,000 complicated fighters and bombers could easily be expanded to an annual production of a quarter of a million planes for use in civil aeronautics in the post-war period.

What of the more than a million now employed in our aircraft production industry to say nothing of the 2,000,000 pilots, navigators, and ground crews that we have spent billions in training in what they regard as their future vocations and means of livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, do you not think that there will be enough aviation problems to engage the exclusive time of a few Members of this House instead of joining them together with hundreds of other post-war problems having to do with the already pressing work of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee?

Any man who projects his mind into the future can see the present committee bogged down in the future with the solution of the problems of existent industries without being burdened further by the problems of the newer industry of aviation.

Talk to any boy in the Air Service today. One of them now in a fighter squadron in Africa told me he would like to get into a bomber. "Why?" I asked. "Because they, more than fighter planes, are like the passenger and cargo ships that will fly the air when the war is over."

Talk to the men and women who run the presses, the riveting hammers, the arc welders in the production plants.

They will tell you that the air is waiting for passengers as well as freight service to "move upstairs" when peace comes once again.

They know full well that with the coming of peace, the products of the machines and plants which now employ their services will be free to bring all the good people as well as good things of the whole world to the factory, the farmside, or the city home in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, some day we shall see a huge freight carrier roll out of its hangar. Its engines will roar and its pilots will send it climbing 8, 9, or 10 miles into the stratosphere where now our highest-flying ships are unable to go.

Chicago is closer to London, England, by air, than it is to Miami, Fla., by rail. The flying time it takes to reach either Bombay or Chungking by air today is less than it takes to reach Los Angeles on the fastest continental train.

Here in this very House we are closer by plane to Berlin or Leningrad than we are to Buenos Aires.

We are fighting this war today on the newly discovered and recognized global geography. Already through the clouds of war is to be seen the new world of which the Wright brothers dreamed when they made their first conquest of the air at Kitty Hawk. When they finished that flight little did they dream of the colossal engine of destruction that would one day sail in the sky over their native America.

Mr. Speaker, we should stop short of nothing to anticipate the aviation needs of tomorrow! Believe me when I tell you that when the peace is won there is no force in all this world that is going to tie the American flyer to the ground. A new industry has been born. We ought now create the finest body possible to foster and protect it to our own Nation's economy and security.

The establishment of this new committee by way of the adoption of H. R. 23 constitutes one of the most progressive pieces of legislation that can be passed by this body.

It transcends the establishment of the Committee on Appropriations as distinguished apart from that of the Ways and Means.

Let us do all to secure this new industry that is possible and adopt this resolution.

Fuel-Oil Rationing

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last I received a letter signed by Mr. Joel Dean, Director of the Fuel Rationing Division of the Office of Price Administration, stating that within the next few weeks his division will be working on a fuel-rationing plan for the season 1943–44 and asking me for "ideas, suggestions, or criticisms" from the people in my district with the view of helping the O. P. A. to decide fair and constructive measures governing oil rationing.

Goodness knows there is much to criticize in the O. P. A., but, accepting this action on its face value, it comes like a ray of sunshine which brings the hope that at last the executive branch of the Government may be eager and willing to ask advice from the Members of Congress who are in constant touch with the people throughout the country.

This attitude is constructive and I trust will meet with the hearty cooperation of all my colleagues with the ardent hope and prayer that this may be the dawning of a new day when cooperation will be encouraged and nourished between the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

More evidence of this willingness to consult on a friendly basis will do much to iron out misunderstandings and create a better atmosphere in which to carry on the main job of the Nation—the winning of the war.

I attach hereto the full text of the letter which I received from Mr. Dean:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1943.

The Honorable JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: During the next few weeks we will be working on the fuel-oil rationing plan for the season of 1943–44. To do this, we need suggestions from every important group which has been in direct contact with actual users of fuel oil in the rationed area.

We know that your constituents are constantly in touch with you and that many of them may have communicated with you about fuel-oil rationing. From this source and from your own knowledge of the problem, you may have some suggestions which will aid us in formulating the plan for next year.

If you can find time to give us your ideas, suggestions, or criticisms in a letter, it would

be of great help to us; or, if you prefer, we should be glad to have a staff representative call upon you at your convenience.

We assure you that your suggestions will receive our sincere consideration.

Very truly yours,

JOEL DEAN,
Director, Fuel Rationing Division.

Aid for Agriculture

REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of any plan to aid American agriculture or the allied industries which process or distribute the products of agriculture, I hope that we may be constantly reminded and aware of the fact that each State has a well-integrated department of agriculture—long established and fully aware of the capabilities of their farmers to produce and alert to the many things which hamper them. It is my hope that we will take full cognizance of these existing State agencies in any administrative design for helping the farmer in this hour.

The farmer needs outlets, even now, and anything which hampers the processors unduly, hampers the farmer also.

Here is an excerpt from a letter I received this morning:

You are familiar with the Cedergreen frozen fruits and vegetables, and what an asset they have been to our valley.

Here is something I received direct from their office manager and I know that he has not overexaggerated any statement that he made.

Now that food rationing has been put into effect, here is what he is required to do by some governmental agency:

1. Make an inventory of all processed fruits and vegetables now on hand, and show their point value.

2. Report all products processed in the future and show their point values.

(NOTE.—Please bear in mind that point values can be changed overnight, as products become abundant or scarce, whichever may occur.)

3. All invoices covering goods sold must show their point value as well as their cash value. This requires a change in accounting forms, and filing systems as well.

4. All governmental forms, on which he must make his reports, are 14 inches wide, which is too wide for the ordinary typewriter. He cannot purchase a typewriter with a wider carriage because they have all been taken off the market.

New office files are unobtainable.

New adding machines are unobtainable.

New calculating machines are unobtainable.

He cannot obtain any more office help, because the Army engineers hired all the clerks and stenographers in town, and at higher wages than have been paid for similar work in the past.

He cannot raise the wages of his present help to meet the scale set by the Government offices, because the wages of his present help was frozen October 1 of last year.

This is just a sample of his present grief from the office end of the business. And when it comes to producing, harvesting, and processing the 1943 products, where is he going to land?

Here is a product that does not require valuable tin or other metals as containers, and is serving a real purpose in our food economy, and yet the very Government that is so willing to collect taxes from his business and income, is going to force him out of that business soon if this keeps up. The more I see of the troubles of the small businessman, who is really the backbone of our industrial life, the more I am convinced that somebody is going to have to stand up for him, or he will go out of existence. But the more I write, the madder I get, so I had better quit.

I doubt if the regulations referred to above conserves either food, or manpower or speeds us in the direction of victory. I believe that a greater recognition of the agricultural departments of the several sovereign States can correct many of these things.

Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, as I said the other day, is one of the outstanding heroes of this age. He has been a godsend to America, and in my opinion God Almighty protected him and carried him through his recent ordeal in order that he might live and help save America and American institutions.

I notice that today the Communist Daily Worker has inferentially attacked my efforts to invite Captain Rickenbacker to address the Congress. In its issue of February 26, the Daily Worker says:

Heavy pressure behind the scenes is being turned on Chairman SABATH, of the House Rules Committee, one o. the two liberals on the committee, in an effort to get immediate hearings on a resolution inviting Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker to address the House.

It also virtually invites people throughout the country to contact their Members of Congress against my resolution inviting Captain Rickenbacker to address us.

Also, the alien-infested seamen's union says its members are going to follow him in order to —

prove to the American people who has earned a better right to citizenship, we or Captain Rickenbacker?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it will not be hard for the American people to decide that question.

Manpower on the Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to call to the attention of the House the part that the Agricultural Committee has taken in apprising the various Government agencies of the seriousness of the farm-labor situation which is becoming more acute each day.

I want you to know that the Committee on Agriculture was cognizant of the approaching dangers and, under the leadership of our able chairman, Hon. H. P. FULMER, hearings on farm labor and production were held on September 23, 25, 27, and October 2, 1942. At that time the Secretary of Agriculture, the Director of Selective Service System, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, and heads of various other agencies presented their views to the committee.

Surveys of farm conditions in various parts of the country were made and a report, with specific recommendations, was made by the Agricultural Committee. This report and recommendations will be found on pages 122 and 123 of the hearings, as follows:

We find that, while the Nation has ample food and fiber supplies at the moment, it is very likely that within or before another 12 months a critical shortage will exist as to many necessities of life.

The present ample supplies are due to (1) the accumulation of surpluses during the last several years, (2) the wholehearted response of the farmers to requests for increased production in order to meet war needs, and (3) an exceptionally favorable growing and harvesting season.

The present supplies will be rapidly consumed, by our armed forces, by our civilian population, and by the enormous requirements of our allies. Few people have any comprehension of the magnitude of shipments of food to our allies or the shipments which will be required in the future. The demands for our armed forces and allies will increase, rather than diminish.

The farmers of the Nation are ready, willing, and anxious to produce to the utter limits of their capacity. We concur in the statement of Mr. Donald Nelson that "the farmers of this Nation have done a job not equaled by any other group."

But the mere willingness or desire of the farmers will not bring forth abundant crops. They must have ample trained help on their farms, ample tools to work with, and prices sufficient to at least cover the cost of production and living expenses. Today they face 1943 with none of the three.

Instead of ample help, the farmers are finding it necessary, on account of shortage of labor, to sell their farms, their livestock, and their dairy herds. Many crops are going to waste in the fields for lack of help and machinery to gather them. This shortage of labor on the farm has been brought about by (1) the inducement of high wages and

short hours in industrial plants and on defense projects; (2) the drafting for military service of essential and trained farm workers and operators, even to the last man on the farm; and (3) to the voluntary enlistment of our farm boys, moved by their patriotic impulses and the glamor of military service.

Instead of ample tools to work with, the farmers are told that farm implements and machinery will be rationed. Very little has been made available, and it now appears that limited repair parts is all they can hope for. On the other hand, a reasonable amount of labor-saving machinery and equipment would be most helpful in meeting the labor shortage.

With regard to prices, while the farmer is forced into a labor market in competition with high industrial wages, he is told that he will encounter unalterable opposition in trying to include this increased labor cost in the price of his commodity. Every item entering into the cost of production has increased by leaps and bounds, yet it seems that our urban population expects the farmer to continue to produce at pre-war prices.

FINDINGS

1. We recommend that directives be issued immediately to local draft boards to place in deferred classifications men essentially engaged in the production of vital food and fiber supplies.

2. Our investigation discloses that the greatest exodus of workers from the farm has been caused by the inducement of high industrial wages. No one can expect a worker to stay on the farm at a wage of $30 to $60 per month when he can receive as much as $100 per week or more in an industrial plant or on a defense project. Ceilings on farm commodity prices prohibit any substantial increase in farm wage rates. The Government pays the bill for industrial production and we observe that the War Labor Board is daily adjusting industrial wages upward. Either farm prices must be raised so the farmers can compete in this labor market or else industrial wages must be brought to the same comparative level of farm wages.

3. We are convinced that the various agencies connected with the war effort have not shown proper appreciation of the importance of agriculture in winning the war. When requests have been made for materials for the manufacture of farm machinery, the reply has always been that such materials were needed for war production. The time has come when these agencies should recognize that necessary food and fiber is war production, and now that the shortage of labor has become so acute immediate provision should be made for supplying the farmers of the Nation with necessary farm equipment, machinery, and repair parts.

4. Our committee was astonished to learn that, up to date, there has been no comprehensive survey of the manpower of this Nation and of the requirements to successfully carry on the war. We strongly recommend:

(1) That a definite determination be made as to (*a*) the total number of armed forces which the manpower and industry of this Nation can support and sustain; (*b*) the able-bodied manpower needed to support such armed forces and civilian population; and (*c*) the manpower available for such purposes;

(2) That all needs be rated according to their respective importance for the winning of the war;

(3) That an appropriate priority system be established for the allocation of the available supply of manpower.

5. The farmers in every part of the Nation do not know how to plan for 1943 crops. Contracts must be made, material must be secured, fertilizers must be bought, seed must be ordered, months in advance. Utter confusion exists today on every farm, every ranch, every dairy. We appeal to the President and the several administrative agencies to act and act now, so the farmers may know whether to plan and how to plan.

6. Price ceilings can protect the consumer only so long as there is something to price. They may easily and quickly bring about such shortages that supply will be many times more important than price. We, therefore, recommend that maximum prices be fixed and ceilings be adjusted so as to encourage abundant production. Very little rationing of farm commodities will be necessary if the producers are encouraged, and they should not be required to produce at a loss.

It is hoped the Price Administrator and the Director of Economic Stabilization will respect and carry out the intent of the Congress in establishing maximum ceiling prices, which prices should reflect at least the farm prices prevailing during the period specified by law.

7. It is our definite conclusion that the hundreds of United States Employment Offices spread across the Nation have contributed a great deal toward the present critical farm labor shortage. They have acted as labor recruiting offices for industrial plants and defense projects. They have advertised the scale of high wages as an inducement for recruits and have drawn hundreds of thousands of farmers and farm workers to the industrial centers. They have not hesitated to cooperate with labor solicitors who have gone out on the farm to entice away the workers.

8. We see little hope in replacing trained farm labor with city workers. Their lack of knowledge of agricultural production would, for the time being, hinder rather than help production, and the long hours and little pay on the farm offer small inducement to the city dweller.

9. Neither can we gain much encouragement from the suggestion of the mass migration of large groups of the farm population (the Secretary of Agriculture has suggested 2,000,000 families) from the so-called submarginal areas to other sections of the Nation. The problem of transportation, housing, habits of life, and the love of home, school, church, and friends would seem to present obstacles which would be insurmountable.

10. Feats of courage and service beyond the requirements of duty are disclosed quite frequently and are promptly and very appropriately recognized by the award of medals. Industrial plants, managers, and workers are very properly given public commendation for some special feat of production. But there is no glamor on the farm. It would seem the farmer is expected as a matter of course to toil on from dawn till dark to provide the food and fiber to feed and clothe our armed forces, our civilian population, and our allies. Is it any wonder that our young men seek the field of glory and glamor? Maybe a few million hungry stomachs will awaken the people and programmers to a better understanding and appreciation of those who till the soil.

Mr. Speaker, if these recommendations had been followed when they were made last October, we would not have the critical manpower problem we have today. The Agricultural Committee has most assuredly lived up to its responsibility.

United War Aims and Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject United War Aims and Strategy, delivered by Lothrop Stoddard February 14 last and broadcast over the radio.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The big story of the week has not made the headlines. Yet, to me, at least, its momentous implications for both the character of the war and the nature of the subsequent peace dwarf all the other weeks' happenings into relative insignificance. I refer to a Russian pronouncement on war aims and foreign policy which, though technically unofficial, is undoubtedly official in character and is intended to inform and to warn Russia's allies and associates of certain things the Soviet Government has in mind and plans to do.

The pronouncement in question is an editorial which appeared in the February 8 issue of Pravda, the organ of the Russian Communist Party, and known to be the informal mouthpiece of Joseph Stalin. This editorial, in turn, was based upon an article written by Constantine Brown, my colleague on the Evening Star, which appeared in that paper on January 21. Mr. Brown, in the course of an objective survey of Soviet war aims, listed Bessarabia and the Baltic states, and intimated that, owing to their disputed international status, their eventual disposition would logically be discussable among the United Nations in the peace settlement which would follow their victory over the Axis Powers.

This line of reasoning roused Pravda's ire. "Constantine Brown," says the editorial, "kindly presents us with Bessarabia on behalf of unknown Americans. Why should he not make a generous present of California or Alaska to the United States? Do there not exist curious persons who are ready to present to the Soviet Union parts of the latter's own territory, as, for instance, the Baltic republics? These persons pretend not to know that the basic law of our country (the constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) has fixed the ties between these republics and the other union republics, and that the Red Army fights for the honor, independence, and integrity of our state."

The implications of this editorial are as startling as they are disquieting. Among other things, the editorial asperses the competence of our State Department and flatly contravenes the principles of the Atlantic Charter, to which the Soviet Government has itself formally subscribed. This is an unpleasant topic, and it is unfortunate that it should have to be discussed at this crucial period of the war. But Soviet Russia has itself raised the issue, and I shall try to show why the Soviet contention cannot be ignored and allowed to go by default.

Before going further into this unhappy matter, let me make certain things clear. Nothing that I am about to say should be misconstrued as implying any dimunition of wartime aid to the Soviet Union. We owe the Red armies a deep debt of gratitude for

their heroic struggle against the common Nazi-Fascist foe, and we should continue in close coordination until the enemy is decisively beaten. Yet we are fighting not only for a military victory over common enemies but also for a stable, constructive peace. Such a peace can be made only on a basis of substantial justice and security for nations and peoples, great and small. That is certainly set forth in the Atlantic Charter, which is officially proclaimed and generally accepted, both here and in Britain, as the ideological pattern for a new and better world order. This frightful ordeal we are passing through is not supposed to be a mere struggle for power. Fundamental moral principles are assumed to be involved. And because this is so, any betrayal of those principles is likely to lose us the peace, even though the war be won.

Bearing all this in mind, let us examine the factual background behind the Pravda editorial and its thesis. In late August 1939 Hitler and Stalin astounded the world by their mutual nonaggression treaty which is widely assumed to have given Nazi Germany the green light for its invasion of Poland and the European war that ensued. Hardly had the German invasion begun when Stalin struck Poland from behind, occupying nearly one-half of that unfortunate country. And this was merely the first of a series of Soviet aggressions. Two months later, Stalin launched a wholly unprovoked attack on Finland, universally reprobated here and in Britain at the time. After a gallant resistance, Finland was compelled to conclude a peace which left her virtually at Russia's mercy. Then came the turn of the Baltic States—Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. They had formed part of the old czarist empire, but had never been Russian in blood, language, culture, or religion. When czardom collapsed in communistic revolution, these countries declared their independence, became members of the League of Nations, and demonstrated their fitness for national life by becoming progressive, liberal democracies. In June 1940 Soviet Russia presented these helpless little nations with an ultimatum requiring them to receive Soviet garrisons in their key points. Once the Soviet garrisons were installed, the legal governments were replaced by unconstitutional regimes handpicked from local Communists, and rigged "plebiscites" were conducted "requesting" admission into the Soviet Union. Concurrently, all patriotic elements were terrorized, and most of the upper and middle classes were brutally "liquidated," largely by wholesale executions and mass deportations to Siberia or other distant parts of the Soviet Union. In Latvia alone, documented evidence assembled by diplomatic representatives of the exiled government shows that some 200,000 persons were thus dealt with—10 percent of the entire population. Needless to say, private property was generally confiscated and the Baltic States were thoroughly communized. Almost simultaneously with those proceedings, Rumania was forced by an ultimatum to hand over its provinces of Bessarabia and Northern Bukowina, where similar consequences took place. Parenthetically, it may be remarked that, while Bessarabia had been part of czarist Russia, Northern Bukowina had never belonged to the czardom, having been part of the old Hapsburg Empire.

Those forced Soviet annexations were condemned here and in Britain almost as roundly as the attack on Finland. In conformity with our established refusal to acknowledge the fruits of aggression, our Government has never recognized those territorial changes, and still maintains diplomatic relations with the representatives of the Baltic States. So, when Pravda ironically alludes to "curious people" who may question the changes, it certainly gives a backhanded slap to President Roosevelt, the State Department, and the bases of our foreign policy. As a matter of fact, not even Britain, despite its wartime alliance with Soviet Russia, has recognized those annexations, though it has tactfully softpedaled the matter.

Pravda tells us that the whole business is settled, that it is not even discussable, and that we had best forget it. But we cannot forget. The ghosts of those murdered democracies haunt the minds of thinking men, and will haunt the halls of the conference eventually assembled to frame a peace based on security and justice. Also, let us clearly understand that more than the Baltic States is involved. Hitherto, Joseph Stalin, the unquestioned master of Soviet Russia, has sat in the depths of the Kremlin with truly oriental silence as to his war aims. Now, for the first time, he lets us see what is in his mind. And it is a disquieting glimpse, because it would seem to reveal, not the principles of the Atlantic Charter, but traditional realpolitik. Well, if that be so, what about Finland, Poland, the Balkans, Turkey, Persia, and perhaps other lands as the Red armies sweep from victory to victory, and the power and prestige of the Soviet Union grows by leaps and bounds? Yet our leaders and statesmen are pledged to those principles to the hilt. For instance, only night before last, President Roosevelt, in his address before the White House Correspondents Association, voiced our war aims with his customary eloquence. "Every American," said he, "fights for freedom. And today the personal freedom of every American and his family depends, and in the future will increasingly depend, upon the freedom of his neighbors in other lands. Unless the peace does justice to the whole human race, the germs of another world war will remain a constant threat to mankind. There must be no doubt anywhere that it is the unalterable purpose of the United Nations to restore to conquered peoples their sacred rights. The right of self-determination included in the Atlantic Charter does not carry with it the right of any government to commit wholesale murder or the right to make slaves of its own people or of any other peoples of the world."

Now those words of our President either have a specific and general application or, in the larger sense, they mean nothing—except, eventually, bitter disillusionment for us Americans, similar to our cynical frustration a generation ago, when Wilsonian idealism embodied in the 14 points was watered down by secret treaties, sordid bargains, and, above all, by a double standard as between victors and vanquished. The American people are promised that the blunders of Versailles will not be repeated. They are pledged a better peace, and they are cheerfully making the heavy sacrifices asked of them to win, not only the war, but the peace as well. Americans will demand that the peace settlement measure up to specifications. If it does not do so, disappointment and disillusionment will inevitably engender a deep-going popular reaction. That reaction may be labeled "isolationist," but it will be a different sort of isolationism from that of last time. A generation ago, it was pacifist in character. Disgusted with foreign commitments, Americans thought they could crawl into their shell and be let alone if they minded their own business. That fond illusion has been pretty well destroyed, or it certainly will be when huge casualty lists come in and when drastic taxation and rationing have ground our living standards down toward the privation level. After those grim experiences, Americans will not be disposed to sacrifice and to subordinate their sovereignty to any international set-up unless they can be reasonably sure it means security and stability. In default of that, they will remain heavily armed and ready to protect themselves in an unstable world. This means that the new isolationism will be nationalistic and militant.

Soviet foreign policy will largely determine whether America is to be cooperative or militantly isolationist. Stalin is said to desire large-scale American aid in the rehabilitation of his country. But Stalin should be made to realize that he cannot have it both ways. If his foreign policy is antagonistic to the principles for which we are fighting, he cannot expect us to play ball with him. International cooperation must cooperate, otherwise it is a delusion and a snare—which is unlikely to fool a war-wise America.

All this means that it is high time for the so-called United Nations to get together on war aims as well as on grand strategy. Thus far, they have done neither. Stalin has been fighting his own war in his own way. And, judging by the first glimpse of his mental processes given us by Pravda, he is planning his war aims on similar lines. Unless his views and methods can be harmonized with those of the western Allies, the chances of post-war cooperation are slim. As already remarked, it is most unfortunate that this issue exists, because the war is as yet far from being won, and any divergencies of viewpoint will be exploited by Axis propaganda. Yet a hush-hush attitude is foolish, because the issue is irrepressible. Indeed, it is Stalin himself who has brought it to the fore by his Pravda challenge. Henceforth it is up to our statesmanship to show Stalin that his interests are best served by an international settlement based on genuine, all-around justice and security. If they can't get him to see that, we might as well prepare ourselves for the alternative.

Report by the Agricultural Colleges and Universities in the Various States Concerning the Serious Shortage of Farm Labor in the Various States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and the permission granted me to insert therein excerpts from the reports of the various agricultural colleges and universities in the various States, giving information concerning the shortage of farm labor and the serious position that the farmers are now in, at a time when we need to increase farm production, I am doing so, believing this information will prove to be of great interest to the Members of Congress, in that this report will give them definite information about the serious farm-labor problem in their respective States.

The House Committee on Agriculture has been working for quite some time, with the various departments and agencies connected with our war efforts, especially the Department of Agriculture, with the hope that we might be able to have them work out and agree to a definite coordinated program whereby farmers and their coworkers would not be drafted, and even at this late date we have been doing everything possible to have them stop the drafting of men from the farm. However, it appears that each

agency is going right ahead with its own program without any regard to just what it is doing to some other agency or program in connection with our war effort.

If those agencies are not going to get together and work together on a cooperative, helpful basis, then, as far as I am concerned, it is up to Congress to pass legislation that will do the needful and that will put an end to all of this confusion and high-handed proceedings on the part of these various agencies including the operations of the Department of Agriculture.

The excerpts follow:

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA,
Reno, Nev., February 13, 1943.

The policies being followed by the Federal Government regarding trained agricultural leaders in the college of agriculture is really tragic and is going to have disastrous repercussions on food production in this country in the immediate future. * * *

This is certainly an extremely short-sighted policy, and if it is permitted to continue it will result in a tragedy which will make Pearl Harbor seem very insignificant in comparison.

ROBERT STEWART,
Dean, College of Agriculture.

NEVADA STATE FARM BUREAU.

Milk production down 29.4 percent in January of this year as against last year, due to labor shortage. Directly no dairy labor or field labor, and indirectly to the sale of cows, and farmers going into adjacent defense industries, because of lack of labor to operate.

Beef-feeding operations down 40 percent due to labor shortage. * * *

Unless labor situation improved anticipate 20 percent less hay production. More cattle will be sold in fall of 1943 because there will be no hay to feed them. Ten percent loss in hay crop last year in the feed value of the hay because it was not harvested at proper time.

Three thousand cattle just sold because of no labor to feed them.

Lack of labor will result in reduction in weight, as this labor necessary to round out the cattle. Lower weights prevailing this spring and unless the feed is exceptionally good on range the loss of weight will not be made up by market time. * * *

The percentage of reduction compared with normal production will be from 25 to 40 percent. Farmers confused with ceiling prices and newspaper stories about draft, asked to produce and increase his dairy and poultry products, and then no market. Ceiling prices do not take into consideration costs of labor. Feeling of uncertaintly as to future. Large operator with 2,000 acres planning to cut hay in windrows, feed cattle, sell them, and then go into a defense job for the duration. Many hens and cows going into meat.

FLORENCE B. BOVETT,
Executive Secretary.

THE RHODE ISLAND STATE COLLEGE,
Kingston, R. I., February 13, 1943.

There are a number of cases where dairy farmers have dispersed their herds because they cannot get labor. They would rather continue in the dairy business if it were possible.

The poultry raisers are hesitating about starting as many chicks as usual because labor is short, and now they are faced with the possibility of not securing feeds with the proper protein supplements necessary to develop their birds.

The potato raisers are definitely delaying the ordering of seed and fertilizer. They had the sad experience last fall of not being able to get all their potato crop out of the ground. They insist that they are not going to go to the expense of raising this crop again and then not be able to harvest it.

Certain vegetable growers have reported that they cannot plant and take care of the acreage required in the production goal program. They will be glad to do their part if they can have the required labor.

CARL R. WOODWARD.

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE,
Orono, Maine, February 13, 1943.

The farm-labor situation in this State is extremely serious. Two-thirds of those leaving our farms have been attracted to our shipyards and defense industries because of high wages paid and the other third have been called by selective service. In the latter instance, there was little appreciation either by the Federal administration or by our local selective-service boards of the importance of food at the outset of our participation in the armed conflict. Consequently, many skilled farm workers left to accept positions in defense industries and were drafted by our selective-service boards.

Farmers certainly are hesitating or unable because of restrictions to buy fertilizer or to expand their livestock and to some extent are holding up other farm operations. They face an indefinite situation as to the supply and quality of labor necessary to harvest the increased crops and care for the added livestock they otherwise would be able to manage.

* * * * *

A. L. DEERING,
Dean, College of Agriculture.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI,
Columbia, February 13, 1943.

We have just completed through the agricultural experiment station a survey of over 8,000 farms in Missouri representing typical areas in the State and dealing with the farm labor situation. The data show that 15.5 percent of the actual farm operators (not laborers) have left the farm since 1941, going into war industries, selective service, and other activities. During the same time 12.4 percent of the actual farm laborers have left the farm. If we group these together and include 439 women who have left these 8,000 farms for work elsewhere, we have a total labor loss of 25 percent since 1941, which probably is a fair average for the State.

* * * Livestock expansion is four to six times the expansion in feed grain and roughages in prospect for 1943 as compared with 1942. Most of this is due to a prospective farm labor shortage. The farmer and his family can do the livestock work but will not be able to get the crops grown in sufficient quantities. Moreover, the labor left on farms will be less effective in 1943 than in 1942.

Farmers are expecting to buy more feed than last year, probably double the amount. This will probably not be enough even if it were available for purchase, which does not seem to be the case at this time.

M. F. MILLER,
Dean and Director,
College of Agriculture.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
Clemson, S. C., February 13, 1943.

As to the number of additional workers needed during the next planting and cultivating season as compared with the estimated supply, 14,000 farmers stated that they would need 50,545 additional workers and had an estimated supply of 33,031 workers. The 50,545 is stated as needed in addition to the estimated supply.

The number estimated additional needed workers during the next harvesting season (the time of which varies from county to county) was 87,441. * * *

You will notice that in answer to question (1) every county except Dillon says that the farm labor has been appreciably reduced by the military requirements and by the drawing away of farm labor by industrial labor requirements. Much more labor is being taken away from the counties because of the attraction of industrial wages than by the military requirements.

You will also note that in answer to question (2) that practically all counties estimate a reduction in crop production on account of this labor situation ranging up to 40 percent. * * *

Another matter that has been mentioned was the fact that some members of a labor family would not work on the farm because other members are drawing high wages in industry and send enough money home for support for them without work.

D. W. WATKINS, *Director.*

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS

STATE OF ARKANSAS, *February 13, 1943.*

Two main factors have contributed to our difficulties: High wages paid by industry have attracted a large number of agricultural workers away from the farms; and Selective Service is drafting many workers at present. The proportion is about four and one-half workers going into industry to each one taken by Selective Service.

Farmers of the State are hesitating, even at this late date, to make plans for the raising of crops and livestock which would involve more than their own individual family labor. We believe production will be cut unless something is done immediately to alleviate the situation.

There is a very confusing element in the picture at this time with reference to Governmental assistance on farm labor. The Farm Security Administration is in the State recruiting farm labor to go into Midwestern States to work on dairy farms. They are also recruiting farm labor to go to Florida to work in the fruit harvest. This is very disturbing to our farmers and further convinces them that certain Government agencies are interfering with rather than trying to help out with the labor situation.

A clear-cut labor policy needs to be stated by the Government and especially by some agency other than the Farm Security Administration in order for farmers to have some definite assurance of a stable labor supply. The program must be simple and straightforward before farmers of the State are going to accept it. They are tired of red tape and of complicated rules and regulations.

AUBREY D. GATES,
Assistant Director.

MISSISSIPPI STATE COLLEGE,
February 13, 1943.

Appreciable reduction of farm labor reported from 82 counties. Of the loss, 55 percent was from Delta and south Mississippi and 52 percent from other counties reported going to industrial work. Average estimated reduction of crops due to labor shortage in Delta 13.8 percent; South Mississippi, 22 percent; southwest Mississippi, 16 percent; and Brown Loam (or central Mississippi), 18.5 percent. * * *

A reduction of acreage that will be cultivated was reported by all but 4 of 82 counties. Estimated such reduction ranged up to 50 percent for Pearl River and Hancock Counties on the coast. Delta counties up to 13.5 percent. Estimated reduced production due to all existing conditions for Delta, 17.2 percent; south Mississippi, 24.3 percent; and Brown Loam, 19.2 percent. * * *

G. D. HUMPHREY, *President.*

COLORADO STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND MECHANIC ARTS,
February 13, 1943.

With respect to sheep, there was a considerable selling off of ewes in the mountain regions last fall because the supply of Mexican herders and other sheep herders had already been severely depleted by offers of industrial work at higher pay and by recruitments into the armed service. This accounted in large measure for the low prices of ewes on the Denver market for a time last fall. As there was very little sale for breeding ewes on other ranches, the ranchmen wanted to curtail the size of their operations rather than expand.

The situation just now with respect to spring crops is that there is quite a bit of hesitation to going ahead with operations in the case of sugar beets. This now is only partly a price proposition, as the recent adjustment has improved this angle of the problem. However, last year in this area the United States Labor Office and the sugar-beet companies gave rather definite assurance to farmers that there would be enough labor to take care of the beet harvest. A large acreage was put out; there was a favorable growing season, but for a time a wet, difficult, harvesting season. The actual labor supply available proved to be short of that which was needed; even with closing down the college one week and using high-school students in addition to college students, there was still an appreciable shortage of labor for beet harvesting. Consequently, the beet growers are a little more careful in accepting the idea that somewhere, somehow, labor will be furnished. Many are now trying to get a hired hand or two with families which he can use for beet harvest labor later in the season. * * *

It is the general uncertainty, a considerable part of which perhaps cannot be avoided, that makes some of these farmers question whether they can depend upon what they are being told about having plenty of labor for them and that they don't need to worry about that. * * *

ROY M. GREEN, *President.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT,
February 13, 1943.

There is in the State of Vermont a very serious shortage of farm labor, so serious, in fact, that a large number of dairy herds have been decreased in size or completely eliminated through sales to packing houses. A second shortage which is at the present time quite serious is the lack of protein feeds which affects both the dairy farmer and the poultry husbandman.

JOHN S. MILLIS, *President.*

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
February 13, 1943.

There is a shortage of year-round skilled hired men, which will tend to reduce the production of milk. Very few of our permanent farm laborers are employed through the United States Employment Service. However, in the week ending February 3, 1943, the United States Employment Service offices in this State had requests for 132 married men and 322 single men to work on farms. The service had only 20 married men and 26 single men available for consideration by farmers making these labor requests.

The Wisconsin agricultural situation cannot be remedied by Government financial incentives for more production of milk, except insofar as such incentive payments might be helpful in enabling farmers to pay wages that would more nearly equal those paid in industry. About 60 percent of the persons leaving Wisconsin farms have gone to industry and 40 percent into the armed services. We regret to say that the drain on farm labor by Selective Service has not entirely ceased as yet. * * *

Canning crops and sugar beets are not being contracted for in the amounts desired because of the uncertainty of the labor supply. The potato acreage of Wisconsin is not likely to reach the assigned goal, largely for the same reason.

CALEB CLARK,
Acting Dean and Director.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURAL AND HOME ECONOMICS,
STATE OF VIRGINIA,
February 13, 1943.

There is a serious farm labor shortage in practically every county in Virginia, and there will be at least 15 percent less farm laborers on our farms in 1943 than there were in 1942 unless something is done to alleviate the situation. The agents estimate that 32 percent of the labor which has left the farms in their counties has gone to our armed forces and 66 percent has left the farm to take in industry. * * *

From surveys recently made throughout Virginia the average farmer in this State in 1942 lost more than $100 worth of farm products due to the fact that they could not harvest their crops on time. We still have a considerable amount of unshucked corn in the fields. * * *

If our farmers could be relieved of the many complicated rules and regulations and be given definite assurance of sufficient labor to harvest their crops, both their spirits and production would be materially improved. It is hard for a farmer to understand why he and members of his family should work from 10 to 12 hours a day for current farm wages when they can go into industry and earn more than twice as much for an 8-hour day with time and a half for overtime.

JNO. R. HUTCHESON, *Director.*

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE.

Idaho's major farm enterprises livestock products, rural crops, and special war crops such as peas and beans. Labor situation regarded as very serious, particularly for harvest season. Immediate action needed.

E. J. IDDINGS.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA,
February 13, 1943.

Farmers in this State do not have in sight adequate help for April and the succeeding spring and summer months, to say nothing about the much heavier fall labor requirements. Even so, farmers tend to go ahead in the preparation for another crop year because there is nothing else for them to do. Some are proceeding on a smaller scale, however.

Farm morale became progressively worse during the 1942 fall season, when labor shortages were felt severely. Last year's crops have not all been harvested. Those who have succeeded in getting their 1942 crops picked are feeling better now but morale will likely become low again if labor remains extremely difficult to get or if wages become very high.

GEO. W. BARR,
Head, Department of Agriculture, Economics, and Rural Sociology.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY,
February 13, 1943.

Questionnaire every county agent in State shows in majority counties great concern on part of farmers regarding labor and machinery situation. Large majority farmers indicate necessary competent labor unavailable in sufficient numbers to enable them to make increased acreage this year. Definite feeling less acreage will be under cultivation. * * *

Assurance of availability of labor at price they can afford to pay undoubtedly would increase production.

H. L. DONOVAN, *President.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE,
February 13, 1943.

Farm-labor conditions most acute in areas contiguous to Army camps, war industries, and reservoir construction and clearance areas on Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers. These areas are contiguous to the best and most productive lands in the State. * * *

Manpower on farms has declined 25 to 30 percent and in some areas more than this. Of this decline, on the average, 30 percent has gone into armed services by volunteering and through Selective Service and 70 percent into industries, 66⅔ percent war industries and 33⅓ percent nonwar industries. War industries have also taken many farm women and children.

Chief reason farm workers have left because farm labor pays $1.50 to $1.75 per day and average wage war industries about $6 per day and nonwar industries about $3.50 per day. * * *

As result depletion of labor, farmers generally shifting from cultivated crops, vegetables, fruits, etc., to those requiring less hand labor, pasture, and hay crops, hogs and cattle for example. Farmers in vegetable and canning crop areas not going to plant acreage planted last year or goals set for State unless assured labor available for such crops as these. Labor conditions very critical now and becoming more so from week to week. In view of the fact this labor is already gone, it is difficult to know from where it can be replaced. Due to depletions in farm labor, estimated production in 1943 will be 15 to 25 percent less than in 1942 unless corrective measures are taken at once, and it is almost too late for the 1943 crop year. Food situation will be very critical by end of 1943 and early 1944.

C. E. BREHM, *Director.*

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
February 14, 1943.

In all sections of Illinois, farmers are very much concerned about the farm-labor situation. In practically all counties the number of farm workers has been appreciably reduced by men going into the armed forces and into industrial employment, and there has been very little replacement of these farm workers. * * *

Most competent observers are of the opinion that unless an unusually favorable growing season prevails in 1943 the shortage of labor will result in lower crop yields and lower production even though the acreage planted is equal to that of 1942. It is also the general opinion that the labor shortage is more likely to result in a reduction in livestock production than in a reduction in crop production. * * *

From the standpoint of maintaining high production, probably the most serious aspect of the present situation is the adverse reaction of farmers in general to their inability to secure adequate labor and to the many complicated rules and regulations affecting production and prices. Due to a number of factors, many farmers have a defeatist attitude with respect to their production efforts. * * *

Farmers have also reacted adversely to what they consider control of farm prices while wages are not under comparable control, and particularly to such regulations as the 40-hour week in industry while farmers are asked to produce more with less labor.

Another source of adverse reaction of farmers is the operation of the Selective Service. With few exceptions, local boards have operated in a manner acceptable to the community in filling the quotas sent to them. In many agricultural counties, however, a large proportion of these quotas must be filled by farm boys and farm hands, and as the farmers see it, the system of deferred classification for farm workers is not actually operat-

ing. In areas where many farmers have sons in the service there seems to be developing a widespread feeling that no distinction should be made between the boys that have already gone and the ones that remain.

Furthermore, this attitude in the communities is reacting on the young men of draft age, and they are unwilling to remain on the farm and have their neighbors think that they are unpatriotic or "yellow." It appears that the only way to keep these necessary farm workers on farms is for Selective Service to refuse to take them into the armed forces. In other words, if farm boys are to be kept on farms they must be frozen in that occupation. Unless something of this sort is done, food production will suffer in 1943, for these trained workers cannot be replaced.

H. P. RUSK,
Dean and Director.

AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

RESOLUTION 1—AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Whereas agricultural workers are being pirated by industry; and

Whereas some local draft boards fail to give enough consideration to directions from Selective Service; and

Whereas the shortage of manpower for agriculture is curtailing the food-production program: Therefore be it

Resolved by the American National Livestock Association in annual convention in Denver, Colo., January 15–16, 1943, That we urge the War Manpower Commission to provide more effective control of pirating of agricultural workers by industry, and that Selective Service provide mandatory deferments of agricultural workers.

RESOLUTION 2—FURLOUGH AND INDUCTION OF KEY MEN

Whereas our food-production program is curtailed due to manpower interference; and

Whereas many key men of agriculture have volunteered or been inducted into military service: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the Secretary of Agriculture as food administrator to secure return through furlough of these key men and to urge the adoption of a plan of induction that will provide for assignment to agriculture of key men, and also provide a form of identification that will show their service in a capacity as important as bearing arms.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE,
Lafayette, Ind., February 15, 1943.

We have been making a survey in this State and reports from 86 of our 92 county agents indicate that about 1 out of every 10 farmers is really up against it so far as the labor situation is concerned for 1943, and it is safe to assume that the situation will be much worse in 1944. The present estimates indicate that from 5 to 15 percent of the crop land will not be cultivated in 1943, and assuming normal weather conditions our feed crops will be from 10 to 25 percent short of 1942. In the intensive crop areas where canning crops, etc., are produced, the farmers are hesitating to plan for the necessary production because of the labor situation, and some of the restrictions that affect labor for operating canning factories is also responsible. Hundreds of thousands of tons of good tomatoes rotted in the fields in this State last season that should now be in cans. As the matter stands today, I would say that our prospects for the acreage of canning tomatoes and other canning crops is about 20 to 25 percent short. Contracting acreage for the growing of hemp in this State is seriously hampered because of the labor situation. About 80 percent of our total farm production in this State comes from about 40 percent of our farms. Some of the people down in Washington call them the big farmers, even though most of them are operating farms of from 120 to 240 acres in size. Many of these farms are mechanized and require skilled operators for the tractors, combines, mechanical pickers and other such equipment. Selective Service has already removed too many of these essential men. * * *

Congressman FULMER, the situation is serious and a dry season in the Corn Belt, such as we had in 1936, would create a critical condition that would rock the foundations of this country. We are all very much concerned and are doing everything we can with the limited funds available, but you won't be able to explain crop restriction, unwise Selective Service procedure, etc. to hungry people in 1944. The next few months are vital. Decision and action are necessary now. * * *

I want to take this opportunity to thank you for the fine help that you have always given agriculture in the past.

H. J. REED,
Dean and Director.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
University Farm, St. Paul, February 13, 1943

It is our judgment that our farmers intend to make every possible effort to get the crops in the ground. But they are greatly concerned about their ability to carry through the year because of the farm labor situation. Without question this is the most serious problem facing our farmers, and next in line are farm machinery, farm supplies, and transportation. * * *

Minnesota is one of the large surplus producing dairy, hog, and poultry States. Farmers are doubtful whether production at present levels can be maintained because of a lack of skilled labor, or labor of any kind for that matter. The scarcity of protein feeds is another serious situation that will limit output unless a solution is found. Under normal conditions Minnesota farmers are large employers of farm labor. The 1939 census reports 95,174 farms employing help at some season of the year. Since then large numbers of the most skilled help have left the farms for the armed forces and industry. Consequently, the demand in 1943 will be much greater than in a more normal year, such as 1939. * * * The setting of goals and the signing of intentions by farmers to produce does not insure that the production will be forthcoming. * * * Farmers are very skeptical about any material assistance in obtaining additional farm labor in any volume.

W. C. COFFEY, *President.*

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, N. Y., February 16, 1943.

The shortage of farm labor is likely to reduce appreciably agricultural production in this State this year unless farmers are given more assurance than they have had to date that essential workers will be deferred from the armed forces and not drawn into industrial jobs. The difficulty in getting seasonal farm help last year makes farmers reluctant to expand production of cash crops in 1943, unless prices are assured which will remove some of the risk of loss from unharvested acres. Dairymen are most concerned about year-round farm help which already has been seriously reduced in this area. Farmers producing cash crops such as cabbages, potatoes, beets, carrots, onions, and other market vegetables are concerned about the shortage of essential workers to operate expensive equipment throughout the growing and harvesting season, and about the anticipated shortage of pickers as the crops mature. In many areas they must compete for this help with wages that approximate the earnings in nearby industries. * * *

The important factors holding up farming operations in New York are the uncertainties of labor, prices of farm products, machinery, feed, and the increasing number and complexity of regulations. The relative importance of each of these factors varies with different types of farming, nearness to industrial centers, and particular commodities. Farmers must be assured the Government recognizes that labor is essential for agricultural production. This can be done by the establishment of a national policy immediately, and the development of a workable plan to alleviate the critical labor shortage. Plans proposed to date by the United States Department of Agriculture are so complicated and wrapped up in red tape that the planting season will be over before these plans can be applied effectively.

EDMUND EZRA DAY,
President.
CARL E. LADD, *Dean.*

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE,
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,
February 16, 1943.

Last October the Agricultural Extension Service made a survey of the farm-labor situation in Delaware. This labor survey was made through the use of the neighborhood leader volunteer system. Each neighborhood leader was requested to report on labor conditions pertaining to his farm and the next four farms down the road. In this manner, every community was represented, and every type of farm, large and small, was also represented. The survey represented approximately 10 percent of the farms in the State. The 1942 farm-labor conditions were compared with those of 1940, and the results indicated that the farm-labor supply lost through selective service was about 6.9 percent of the 1940 total, and the loss to industry was about 18.3 percent of the 1940 total. Some of the labor lost to selective service and industry has been replaced from other sources during 1942, and, therefore, the total net loss to selective service and industry was about 20.6 percent. * * *

More recently we have asked our county agents for an indication as to conditions in their respective counties, and the summation of their observations is as follows: That agricultural labor lost to selective service is about 8 percent, and that agricultural labor lost to industry has increased to about 20 percent; that there will be a reduction of from 10 to 15 percent in the production of general farm crops throughout the State. There has been no replacement of year-round regular farm labor in the State.

GEORGE L. SCHUSTER,
Dean and Director.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
Durham, N. H., February 15, 1943.

It is estimated that 20 percent of the commercial farm operators are greatly disturbed and concerned about the labor situation. These operators are delaying definite decisions and commitments with respect to their 1943 production plans until they have a more definite assurance that labor will be available. This feeling of insecurity is heightened by the confusion in regard to uncertainty of securing adequate feed-grain supplies, fertilizer, and other supplies.

A few individual dairy farmers, especially operatives of large herds, are now greatly handicapped and may have to sell if arrangements are not adequate.

The question of farm labor is getting pretty bad and unless something is done to help out the situation, there will be a lot of good herds disposed of in the near future.

FRED ENGLEHARDT,
President.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY,
New Brunswick, N. J., February 16, 1943.

A farm economist observed: "The farmers want to know who is in charge. They don't care who harvests their crops, just as long as

they can have some assurance that there will be harvest hands available."

The situation is probably most acute on dairy farms, where the loss of skilled labor has been more keenly felt than in other types of farming. Dairymen feel, too, that existing price ceilings have effectively tied their hands so that they cannot compete in the labor market with the State's many war industries. Next on the critical list are the vegetable farms. Observers are in general agreement that the most to be hoped for in New Jersey is maintenance of the 1942 acreage of vegetables unless the many existing uncertainties can be speedily clarified.

The dairy situation is very, very serious. Production, which increased steadily from January through July 1942, began to fall off in August and has been declining ever since. Dairymen are very much discouraged by the price situation and the shortage of skilled labor. Milking cows are going to be butchered in record numbers, principally because their owners feel that they cannot get labor to keep them in production.

Growers of vegetables are very much worried. Labor is the chief object of concern. In general, very few of them are planning to increase their acreage. A decrease is more likely.

Poultrymen are ordering chicks up to the capacity of our hatcheries. They are worried about labor.

ROBT. C. CLOTHIER,
President.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY,
Columbus, February 15, 1943.

The situation in Ohio which relates to farm labor and necessary farm supplies is rather serious. Our young men from the agricultural areas have been taken into the armed forces and into industry to such an extent that farm production is bound to suffer during the coming season.

In many sections farmers are actually planning to cultivate less acreage, due to the fact that they cannot secure the necessary labor or the necessary machinery or both; and as a result they will not buy the supplies of seed and fertilizer that they would use in a normal season.

As a result of shortage of labor and the gloomy outlook for production, quite a number of farms are being sold and their operations discontinued under the present management. In a newspaper published in my home town there were nine such farm sales advertised yesterday.

HOWARD L. BEVIS, *President,*
JOHN F. CUNNINGHAM, *Dean.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Lincoln, Nebr., February 15, 1943.

There is a consensus of opinion that the farm labor situation here will be critical this year. Nebraska has on the average relatively large farms and uses considerable seasonal labor.

A recent State survey indicates that fully 25 percent of the farm labor once available has been drawn into defense work or into the armed forces. A part of the group were actual farm operators, a number of them having sold their equipment when they were called for service. The majority, however, were what is spoken of as farm labor. This survey indicates that food production in Nebraska, with climatic conditions equally favorable to last year, will be down something over 10 percent. * * *

We can make the positive statement now that there will be reduced agricultural production in Nebraska this year, the extent of which cannot yet be determined.

W. W. BURR, *Dean.*

NORTH DAKOTA AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE,
Fargo, February 13, 1943.

This State's farm-labor situation, in my particular judgment, real acuteness will come not so much with the seeding situation as it will with the management of herds and flocks of poultry and livestock and with the always acute harvest situation of all crops.

H. L. WALSTER,
Dean and Director.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK,
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Fargo, February 13, 1943.

Farm labor is reported as having been materially reduced in every reporting county by farm workers joining the armed forces or leaving the farms to work on industrial or war production. * * *

It appears that there will be no material reduction in small-grain acreage and flax, but that there may be a reduction in row crops and summer fallow in some of the counties.

In most of the counties, no great concern is shown about the possibility of getting the crops seeded except for corn and flax. However, a great concern is evidenced over getting the crops harvested, particularly so in regard to the supply of harvesting machinery and the labor needed at that time.

E. J. HASLERUD,
Director of Extension.

GREATER NORTH DAKOTA ASSOCIATION,
Fargo, February 13, 1943.

The total population of the State is today under 600,000. From this State there has gone to the armed forces and to the defense plants approximately 70,000, or more than 10 percent of our entire population, which represents the best of our able-bodied working force. The number in defense work and in the armed forces are just about 50-50.

In the small rural communities, practically all able-bodied men do more or less farm work during the year. They either own farms, their fathers own farms, and they do farm work during the rush seasons of the year. For the farmers themselves, they have lost their boys to the armed service and their hired men to the defense work. This has created a serious labor shortage on our farms and the damage has been done. Regulations to defer these men that commonly worked on farms can help only to a very limited extent as a very high percentage has already gone and there are no reasons for thinking they will return to farm work during the duration. * * * Farmers do not rate very highly the proposals by which it is intended to replace trained farm help with all sorts of labor from the cities. This type of help is found useful only in spade, hoe, and pitchfork work. These men from the cities can neither handle horsepower equipment nor mechanical equipment, and farmers are very reluctant to attempt to use this type of labor with their equipment. On that account all of these proposals that people from the cities are going to be sent out to do the farm work will amount to very little.

B. E. GROOM,
Secretary.

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
February 16, 1943.

From a survey last week among our county agents, it appears that production of dairy products in Connecticut will probably be about 5 percent less in 1943 than in 1942. This is mainly due to two reasons: (1) Scarcity of labor, and (2) lack of satisfactory price. The unsatisfactory price contributes to the labor shotrage because farmers are unable to compete with our war industries.

The farm labor situation will continue to be serious because industry in Connecticut is taking on large numbers of additional employees.

Some farmers are changing from dairy production to the raising of more potatoes in order to save labor. Some dairy farmers are also quitting business entirely because of labor shortage and unsatisfactory returns. A considerable number of cows from these farms are being slaughtered.

E. G. WOODWARD,
Dean and director.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
Athens, Ga., February 16, 1943.

The farm labor situation in this State is definitely acute. It is progressively becoming more difficult with the continued loss of people from the farm both to industry and the armed forces. This steady stream of persons from the farm places our farm operators in an extremely uncertain position with respect to plans for farming in 1943. Farmers are, of course, doing the best they can under the circumstances, but a great deal of their planning has to be done subject to uncertainties that may cause major changes in operations at most any time. This situation prevailing just before planting time is one of the most serious problems facing farm people.

Preliminary indications with respect to early vegetables are that the acreage of these crops will be less than in 1942. Plans for these crops are mostly made in December.

The heavy rainfall in January and February which delayed early operations, coupled with the shortage of regular farm labor, will make it impossible for farmers to prepare as much land for planting and cultivating as 1 year ago and get the 1943 crop in on time.

The cultivated acreage in this State in 1943 will likely be 15 percent less than in 1942 and total farm production 23 percent less this year than last. These reductions will be due to both farm labor and equipment shortages.

STATE OF OHIO,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
February 16, 1943.

H. R. 1728 appears to aim at the very heart of a serious shortage of farm labor. The damage resulting from promiscuous draft of farm laborers into the armed forces has gone on to the point that recovery is most difficult. Vast quantities of last year's crop of corn and soybeans remain unharvested in the fields and yet we are now on the very threshold of preparing the soil for a new crop. The real capable trained men who could have saved the day by being left where they were have been taken by Selective Service, in spite of any argument we could produce as to future danger of shortage of food supply. Now the farmers are forced to sell their dairies and reduce field planting from sheer necessity.

JOHN T. BROWN, *Director.*

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Pierre, February 15, 1943.

Wish to state that it is true that farm labor will be extremely scarce during the next crop season, due to the selecting and volunteering of farm labor and farmers' sons and the more favorable wages and hours paid to laborers in other defense industries. Last year the farm labor situation became more and more acute month by month as the harvesting and haying progressed.

In my opinion the labor situation will be even more serious in 1943, unless some drastic action is taken to restore trained and competent farm labor to the farm.

Your committee is to be highly commended for your courageous action on these matters.

E. H. EVERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Boise, February 6, 1943.

Labor was an important factor in 1942, and is going to be more serious this year. Statistics show 400,000 farm laborers left

the farm in 1942, many of them since harvest was completed. To produce more foodstuffs with less labor, when we were very short last year, is out of the question. We must get this help back. We haven't anything yet to offer to induce them to come back. We cannot compete with war industries with wages. If these men are even drafted back on the farms, I don't believe they will be much help because of the high wages and short hours they have been working, they will be unwilling to work farmer hours. The only chance I see of getting them back is if food gets short and too hard to get in some of these crowded centers. Then they may come back on the farm to get something to eat.

HARVEY SCHWENDIMAN,
Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND COMMERCE,
STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
Jackson, February 16, 1943.

It seems to me that this is a fair approach to the situation that confronts the American farm today, and unless something is done to stabilize farm labor, I fear that there are going to be many disappointed high officials on the amount of foods produced in 1943. I fear they have not realized the seriousness of the situation, and should the weather conditions be abnormal with the other conditions as they are, this country would face a serious situation.

SI CORLEY,
Commissioner.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE,
State College, Pa., February 16, 1943.

The majority of farms in Pennsylvania are classed as general farms; that is, having several sources of income. Roughly, 70 percent of our cash income is from dairy, poultry, and eggs, hogs, beef cattle, and sheep. The other 30 percent of the income is from cash grains, hay, potatoes, tobacco, apples, truck crops, and miscellaneous.

The labor required on these farms producing the major part of our income is skilled labor hired by the month or year. It is the type of labor that is most scarce and no replacements are available. Replacements cannot be recruited and trained in a few weeks to assume the responsibility of caring for and feeding livestock and operating expensive farm machinery. If the drain of this type of labor from farms is not stopped and a new supply provided, there will be a curtailment of agricultural production this year.

At present hired men beyond 38 years are leaving farms quite rapidly for industry. These men can make this shift without endangering their draft status. Also, we are finding more evidence each week that the farmers beyond 50 years are definitely planning to reduce both acreages of crops and numbers of livestock to what they can handle with the family. They say that they have had to work too hard this past year, and they cannot physically stand the long hours and the pressure. Many of them are developing heart trouble and high blood pressure.

At farm sales and cooperative auction sales, it has been noticed that heifers and calves are largely being purchased by the butchers. The prices are so high that the farmer feels that he cannot pay the price and carry them until they come into production. With all these cow replacements and cull cows going to the butcher there is only one thing that can happen, and that is reduced numbers of cows in milk production.

Market gardeners have not as yet bought their supplies of seed and fertilizer, because they are shy of the year round supply of labor which they must have. The general consensus of opinion is that there will be marked decreases of production this year if the labor supply is not made adequate even with normal growing weather. With unfavorable weather, total production will be another 10 to 20 percent less.

R. D. HETZEL, *President.*

MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE,
East Lansing, February 16, 1943.

I would like to advise you that from a recent survey made by our farm management department covering 210 farms, selected at random, in three counties our survey shows that 57 percent of the 1942 work on the farm was done by the farmer himself, 32 percent by his family, and 11 percent by hired help. Farmers indicated that one-half of our hired help which they had last year was not expected to be available for 1943. This, together with sons which have left the farm for military service, equalled 6 percent of the total labor force on the farms. One-third of these farmers said they did not have enough help even in 1942. Three-fourths of the farmers expected to have the same labor supply in 1943 as last year. Some of the other one-fourth lost as much as half of their labor force and indicated that experienced replacements were not available. Generally, those having a labor shortage were the larger farmers where the heaviest production took place. * * * Farmers' morale is needed today more than ever before and some of the seemingly thoughtless and misinformed regulations that are now confronting farmers is not adding to their morale.

ERNEST L. ANTHONY,
Dean of Agriculture.

MONTANA STATE COLLEGE,
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,
Bozeman, February 15, 1943.

Lambing time: Montana is an important sheep State. The 1940 census of the United States credits this State with over 3,000,000 head of ewes and lambs. Outside of some farm flocks most of these sheep are grazed in bands of 1,000 to 1,200 head, with a single operator exercising supervision over one to 15 or 20 such bands. Sheepmen are anticipating serious losses of lambs and ewes at lambing time, due to the shortage of experienced men. Anticipated losses will mean less lamb and mutton and also less wool in the months ahead.

Cattlemen expect the labor shortage to affect their operations most through the season of harvesting hay and other feed supplies.

Sugar-beet labor: There is a rather strong opinion prevailing that the acreage of sugar beets to be planted in Montana in 1943 will depend quite largely upon the amount of experienced beet labor in sight at planting time this spring. Estimates based on the amount of experienced labor now in sight place the acreage of sugar beets in Montana for 1943 at 20 to 25 percent less than was planted in 1942. Incidentally, the sugar-beet crop is the major crop in Montana which would influence the use of commercial fertiliezrs.

Harvest time: It should be emphasized that because of serious overlapping of farm and ranch operations, such as weeding beets and beans, harvesting and threshing small grains, harvesting both tame and wild hay, the harvesting of sugar beets and potatoes, and the planting of winter wheat, the most critical spot in the 1943 farm and ranch labor situation will occur during the summer months or through the harvest period. We not only anticipate serious losses of war crops due to labor shortage at harvest time but in addition the loss of feed crops through delayed harvesting may result in serious losses to livestock producers late in 1943 and into 1944. These losses will further decrease the available supplies of beef and lamb and also wool.

Every indication at present points to a serious labor shortage on the farms and ranches in Montana in 1943. After the experiences of 1942, the producers of sugar beets will be very much inclined to plant sugar beets in accordance with the labor in sight.

Pleas from producer groups made as early as April 1942, calling for the protection of the supply of experienced farm and ranch labor before the ranks were depleted went unheeded.

CLYDE MCKEE,
Dean and Director.

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE,
Manhattan, February 15, 1943.

Discussions which I have had with farmers as recently as last week (Farm and Home Week here) indicate increasing apprehension among farmers regarding aggravated labor shortages. Several farmers who, by extraordinary effort are able to carry on their winter operations, expressed to me their fear that they will not be able to cope with the situation when, in addition to the care of livestock, corn cultivation, haying, and small-grain harvest occur at approximately the same time next summer. Naturally there is considerable doubt among farmers about the possibility of maintaining production at 1942 levels, to say nothing of increased production.

F. D. FARRELL,
President.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE,
Baton Rouge, La., February 16, 1943.

In regard to the farm labor situation and the factors contributing to the shortage, I wish to comment as follows:

First. We have just completed a survey of this situation covering the whole State of Louisiana. While this survey was not a house-to-house canvass, we did contact something like 840 communities in the State through our agents.

Second. The survey indicates that there will be a 25-percent reduction in crops during the year 1943 due to:

(1) It seems to be impossible to replace labor which has left the farm.

(2) Farmers are hesitating to make plans due to the uncertainties which exist.

(3) The proposed program of transferring city people to farms doesn't meet with approval due to the fact that the farmers are skeptical as to the ability and sincerity of such people who have not had farm experience.

The above are some of the reasons why we predict that there will be a shortage of production for the year 1943. I might state frankly also that it is the opinion of a large number of farmers that they have been discriminated against in this whole program.

J. G. LEE, Jr.,
Dean, College of Agriculture.

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND MECHANIC ARTS,
Brookings, S. Dak., February 16, 1943.

In this State it seems to be the general opinion that the farmers will be able to put in a crop, but the most serious labor shortage may be expected to occur at harvest time.

The general estimate is that there may be a 10-percent decrease in production due to labor shortages, and some of these other factors I have mentioned.

LYMAN E. JACKSON,
President.

NEW MEXICO COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND MECHANIC ARTS,
State College, N. Mex., February 15, 1943.

Farm labor in this area will be inadequate to meet the demands made upon the farmers for production during the coming year. * * * It has been estimated by our county agents and other agriculturists that production will be not higher but lower for the coming year than it was for the year just past for the reasons stated above.

J. W. BRANSON,
Dean of the College.

OREGON STATE COLLEGE,
CORVALLIS, *February 16, 1943.*

In most cases farmers are increasing acreages of essential crops. Seeding dates are far enough ahead so farmers can defer final decisions pending developments in the labor situation.

Farmers are worrying about farm labor and trusting that Federal authorities will take the necessary action to meet the situation.

At the present time the labor situation is most acute with big sheep and cattle ranchers and on dairy farms where year-around experienced men workers are required. The work cannot be done by women and children.

Farm wages are going up faster than farm prices as evidenced by the fact that farm wages advanced 260 percent of the 1935–39 average, while farm prices have advanced 187 percent for the same period.

The pressure for agricultural labor is particularly acute in Oregon because the agricultural areas are adjacent to large forests which are also at a peak demand for labor. In addition to this, we are in the center of a great defense work concentration devoted principally to shipbuilding and airplane construction extending from southern California to Seattle. Also new training bases for the military forces which have been recently constructed are taking civilian labor for operation of these bases, thus creating intense competition for available manpower.

A. L. STRAND, *President.*

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY,
Morgantown, February 16, 1943.

Mr. Bradford, of our department of agricultural economics, sent letters to 225 West Virginia dairymen just a few days ago, asking for a reply on the number of men needed to carry on their work during the coming year. To date 82 replies have been received from 17 counties in the State with the following results: These 82 dairymen report that they need and would gladly hire, if available, a total of 66 full-time men. In addition, they will need some part-time help during the busy season. If these replies are typical of labor needs on commercial dairy farms throughout the State, it is apparent that the labor situation on dairy farms is already critical. The marketing of female cattle has increased very greatly in the past several months, and many dairymen have gone out of business. The serious labor situation last fall is going to be far more serious this year, and all agencies are making every effort to try to provide for the situation well in advance of need.

Members of the staff of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics are now working in one of these areas and find that there is very little labor which could be called upon or recruited. A good many workers have already been recruited in this State by the United States Employment Service and transferred to other States for work, and that recruitment is still going on. However, Mr. Bradford's impression is that it is going to be increasingly difficult to recruit workers from these areas because of the fact that most of the able-bodied workers have already gone.

C. E. LAWALL, *President.*

ALABAMA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
Auburn, February 17, 1943.

SUMMARY OF FARM LABOR SURVEY

(1) Has farm labor in your county been appreciably reduced by farm workers joining the armed forces (of any kind) either as volunteers or as selectees; and by leaving farm for industrial work? Answer yes or no. Estimate percent of farm workers gone to armed forces and percent to industry.

All 67 county agents answered "yes" to the first part of this question. On the last part they estimated 41 percent to armed forces; 59 percent to industry.

(2) If your answer is "yes" please state percent you estimate crop production will be reduced this year by labor losses.

About 21 percent.

(3) Has there been any replacement of farm labor in your county? If so, how does number of replacements compare with workers leaving farms last 2 years?

Fifty-eight counties replied "none"; 9 replied "very small," or "neglibible."

(4) Is there a shortage of farm implements in your county in such quantity as to materially affect production?

Forty-nine counties replied "yes"; 10 "no"; 7 "small"; 1 did not reply.

(5) Do other causes exist which are likely to reduce production? If so, to what extent? What are they?

All answered "yes." They list inadequate fertilizer, feeds, implements, wire, and insecticides. Many mentioned price ceilings with which farmers are dissatisfied. Tires and trucks were also listed.

(6) Will there be an acreage reduction in cultivation as compared with last year? If so, to what extent?

The answer to this is 16.5 percent.

(7) Compared with normal production, what percent of reduction, if any, do you estimate will result from all existing conditions?

The answer to this is 23.4 percent.

P. O. DAVIS, *Director.*

ALABAMA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
Auburn, February 20, 1943

Farmers need to retrieve labor losses in addition to holding what they now have. Likewise, farmers must be given enough equipment, fertilizer, and feed. They produce most of their feed but many must buy certain protein feeds that are obtained through manufacturing processes. * * * Since the war began, England has increased her food production by 50 percent. By rationing, economizing, and adjusting they now produce two-thirds of what they eat, whereas before the war they produced only one-third. They made farming No. 1 in rewards, in opportunities. Their farm wages are higher than industrial wages. In the United States, on the other hand, farm wages are only a minor fraction of industrial wages and there are other farming handicaps due to relative wages. * * * No other group of people are more patriotic; and farmers will do the very best that they can with what they have and their opportunities. But maximum production cannot be attained on patriotism alone, or patriotism with prices of farm products substantially below the level of fair competition with other groups.

P. O. DAVIS, *Director.*

MASSACHUSETTS STATE COLLEGE,
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
Amherst, February 19, 1943.

The farm labor supply, so far as permanent year-round help is concerned, is very critical. Experienced help is not available at any price and it is very difficult to find even inexperienced year-round workers at prices which farmers can afford to pay. So far as seasonal workers are concerned, we feel that we will be able to carry on reasonably well because of the large urban population which supplies large numbers of high-school youth and other types of workers.

The labor supply has been reduced considerably in every county. Approximately one-third have joined the armed forces either as volunteers or as selectees and about two-thirds have left the farm to work in industry.

It is commonly estimated that the production of farm products will be reduced from 5 to 40 percent, depending upon the commodity. In Bristol County the fresh vegetable production will probably be reduced from 30 to 40 percent and it is also estimated that market gardening in Plymouth County will be reduced by about 20 percent and cranberry production by 25 percent.

In most of the counties there will be some acreage reduction in cutlivation unless some very definite relief is in sight immediately.

Farmers are hesitant to buy seed and fertilizer and to make plans for planting because they do not see the labor for caring for the crops and harvesting.

One of the important things that makes it difficult to keep farm workers on the farm is the feeling on the part of many people that all young men should be in uniform and that a farm worker who asks for deferment is apt to be called yellow.

ROY E. MOSER,
Extension Economist, Farm Management.

UTAH STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE,
Logan, Utah, February 16, 1943.

From contacts with farmers in farm meetings recently attended in several counties of the State, and in rather close contact with farm groups in Cache County, it appears that we shall have difficult problems in securing certain types of farm labor. There will be some tendency to plant crops which require less labor, such as substituting pasture and grains for sugar beets, although it is quite probable that hand labor for sugar beets can and will be recruited from small towns in the rural areas. It will probably be more difficult to secure labor to take care of a herd of dairy cows, a flock of chickens, to irrigate, and to operate farm machinery. Farm boys who are accustomed to this type of work are being taken by the selective service in large numbers.

ELMER GEORGE PETERSON,
President.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND ENGINEERING,
Raleigh, February 23, 1943.

Reports from 96 counties indicate crop acreage reduction this year 11 percent and a 16-percent decrease total production. Main cause lack of labor. Many counties report practically no single men left on farms. Of those leaving 60 percent gone into industry, 40 percent to Army.

I. O. SCHAUB,
Director of Extension.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA,
Gainesville, February 13, 1943.

As you no doubt are aware, Florida is now in the midst of the harvesting season of fruits and vegetables, and without question the State at this time has an inadequate supply of labor for all of its agricultural and related activities. This shortage presumably is due to selective-service requirements, wage differentials resulting in a further heavy drain from farms to the better paying war industries or governmental activities, and in some areas to refusal of labor to work full time. This last in some sections is reported as a very serious factor, and that with full-time work the labor shortage in

such areas would be eased considerably. Recently it has been reported that in some sections complete harvests of vegetables and fruit crops will not be possible and that in the Everglades the sugarcane harvest is far behind schedule. Dairies are also affected. * * * Farmers cannot but feel uncertain as to future acreages and crops they may be able to plant and harvest. With Florida, the labor situation is only one of several factors. Fertilizer shortages appear in the offing (fertilizers are vital to our production) and crate material supplies of some types are becoming inadequate. Probable future deficiencies in farm-machinery replacements are also causing concern, and further increase of mechanization to replace or augment labor does not seem possible. Gasoline and tire restrictions also have a definite bearing, but the conditions affecting their procurement seem to have improved somewhat within the past few weeks.

JNO. J. TIGERT, *President.*

Address of President Manuel Quezon to His Countrymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address recently delivered by President Manuel Quezon, of the Philippine Commonwealth, on the anniversary of his departure from Corregidor. This speech was sent over the short-wave radio to the Filipino people by President Quezon. It is full of encouragement and patriotism and its valuable admonitions are applicable to our own country. I think it is a speech which is very well worthy of being printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My beloved countrymen, one year ago today I began my long odyssey which started from Corregidor and ended in this great capital of the United States. It is now my duty to report to you on what we have accomplished during this year.

I do not have to tell you that from the first day of the invasion of our country by Japan, the Japanese have directed their propaganda at convincing you that Japan is our friend and liberator. Your answer, our answer, has been to fight them to the bitter end. The flower of our youth died side by side with their American comrades in defense of our country, our liberties, and the American and Philippine flags.

The surrender of Bataan and Corregidor did not end that epic struggle. Even the broadcasts from Tokyo that now and then tell of the stern and cruel measures taken by the Japanese Army in the Philippines against Filipinos reveal that our people have not accepted defeat, and as best they can, they are still fighting the invaders at whatever cost.

But Japan is bent upon winning your good will by every possible device—if she can. Knowing that independence is the cause for which our forefathers fought and died; knowing, too, that we have stood by America because she has made good her pledge to make our people free and independent, Japanese propaganda has been insistently telling you that you must not have faith in America, and that the independence of our country will only come from Japan.

In line with this policy of deceit, Premier Tojo, at the last session of the Imperial Diet, has again reiterated his statement made last year that Japan is ready to grant independence to the Philippines. Assuming that tomorrow Japan was to declare the Philippines an independent nation, what would that mean? It would merely mean that the Philippines would be another "Manchukuo"—a government without rights, without powers, without authority. A government charged only with the duty to obey the dictates of the Japanese rulers. After the tragic end of Korea's independence, in utter disregard of a solemn pledge to respect it, it would be worse than folly to rely on any promise made by the Japanese Government.

Vis-à-vis Manchukuo and Korea, let us go over our association with the United States:

Coincident with the organization of civil government in the Philippines in the early years of the American regime, the Filipino people enjoyed, for the first time in their history, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of worship, and all the other freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. Neither the President nor the Congress of the United States could deprive the Filipinos of these rights, for they were under the protection of the Constitution of the United States itself.

With the help of the United States, we made steady progress in every field of human endeavor and rapid advance in the practice of self-government. At last America gave us complete autonomy on matters affecting our domestic affairs, preparatory to the establishment of the Philippine Republic which was set for the Fourth of July 1946. We were a happy and prosperous people when Japan, without the slightest provocation on our part, brought sufferings, death, and havoc, and destroyed every vestige of freedom in our country.

But our sacrifices have not been in vain. By our decision to fight by the side of the United States, by our heroism, and by our loyalty to the American flag, we won a battle greater than we lost. Our decision and our heroism have won for our people real freedom for all time.

You know what President Roosevelt said in his proclamation to the Filipino people on December 28, 1941. These were his words: "I give to the people of the Philippines my solemn pledge that their freedom will be redeemed and their independence established and protected. The entire resources in men and materials of the United States stand behind that pledge."

Not only that. President Roosevelt has, in effect, already given the Philippines recognition as an independent nation.

On my arrival in Washington, he rendered me honors due only to the heads of independent governments. He met me at the railroad station with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Interior, members of the Supreme Court, and other high officials. Mrs. Quezon and I were his official guests at the White House.

He has recognized our right to take part in the Pacific War Council with Great Britain, China, the Netherlands, and the self-governing Dominions of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The President of the United States himself presides over the council table.

In the name of the Philippines, I am a signatory to the Atlantic Charter. We are one of the United Nations. And whether the war is over before or after July 4, 1946, the date fixed for the establishment of the Philippine Republic, I am certain that we shall have our own representation in the peace conference.

Japan now promises you independence. That promise means less than nothing. Our independence is already a reality, since the President of the United States, by his several official acts enumerated above, has given recognition to the Philippines as possessed of the attributes of full nationhood. The only thing lacking is the formal establishment of the Philippine Republic. This cannot happen until our country is liberated from the invader—until you, my fellow citizens, can exercise your full right to elect the officials of the Government of the Republic.

On January 6, 1941, President Roosevelt said:

"In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

"The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

"The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

"The third is freedom from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understanding which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.

"The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor anywhere in the world."

Those are the Four Freedoms for which we fight. They will come after the victory of the United Nations. When that glorious day arrives, the Filipino people will enjoy the blessings of these four freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear. The first two need no elaboration. You have known and exercised them before this war began. But, in the past, the other two have only been the hope and the ambition of our people.

Now we can look forward to these human rights with the assurance of their realization after the war. We shall secure for every Filipino the satisfaction of the basic human needs which are the rights of all men—food, clothing, and shelter, and economic opportunity. With the help of the United States, we shall rebuild our ravaged land, and make of it a prosperous member of the family of free nations.

President Roosevelt and I have already agreed that studies be made now for the economic rehabilitation of the Philippines, so that we shall be ready to proceed with the gigantic task of rebuilding our country as soon as the enemy is expelled.

As for the fourth freedom—the freedom from fear of aggression—we have before us not only the commitment in principle of the United Nations but also the pledge of the Government of the United States as given by President Roosevelt in his proclamation to the Filipino people. In furtherance of this pledge, President Roosevelt has authorized the State Department to discuss with me the question of our future security and of the safeguarding forever of the mutual interests of the United States and the Philippines in the Pacific area.

I give you my solemn assurance that the Philippines is not being neglected. The President, the Congress, the American people, are doing and will do everything in their power to redeem you as soon as possible from the heel of the invader.

I have been authorized by the President of the United States to tell you that the text of

this broadcast has been submitted to him, and that "he is very glad to authorize me to make the statements concerning United States policy which are contained in this broadcast."

My beloved countrymen: You know that day and night I can only think of you, of the day of your redemption and my return to our beautiful islands. I would not be here, I would not have left you for a moment, I would have been sharing with your sufferings and your hardships if I did not feel that I could only be of service to you by my being free from the clutches of the enemy.

Do not despair for your liberation is certain. It may take time, but it will come. Meanwhile, don't let the Japanese fool you. Use your wits and beat him at his own game. Above all, you must continue to have faith in America who has kept faith with every nation, and especially with us. Our bond of friendship tempered in the heat of battle, will last beyond the war and into peace of freedom, general well-being, and safety that will follow it.

God bless you and keep you all.

Address of Under Secretary of War at Dinner of Produce for Victory Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson, in Pittsburgh, Pa., on Tuesday, February 23.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight in Europe and Africa an Axis armed force of millions of tough and battle-hardened soldiers face America and our gallant allies. They outnumber us. They have all the advantages of short supply routes.

Our own men have been in contact only with the smallest of the Axis armies—a part of its Tunisian force of less than a quarter of a million men. But the striking force of this powerful foe has already been felt by our troops. We have suffered a set-back at the hands of this German army, but not because of lack of supplies.

The German field armies are assisted by more than 1,000,000 men in semi-military organizations, such as the military police, engineers, and supply depots, which in our Army are included among service troops.

There are also the other Nazi outfits of many kinds which seem to thrive on German soil.

Reliable sources indicate that the combined number of those in the German and Italian armed forces and those directly assisting them runs well over 13,000,000. It is evident at this point that the superiority of our enemies in the European theater is of ominous proportions.

A similar analysis in the Pacific area does not brighten the picture. The Japanese Army exceeds by many divisions the forces that the United Nations have been able to equip and place in opposition.

Yet, the United Nations, and particularly this country, have the potential power to overcome this numerical superiority. These potentialities must be converted to actuality. They must be harnessed and driven toward a single goal, the defeat of our enemies. In that drive our country, the latest of the major powers to enter the war, must play the most important part. We must swing the tide of battle in our favor, not ultimately, but now, this year, in 1943. Time is not on our side. We must not let this be a long war of attrition. We must not let Germany and Japan consolidate and utilize their vast conquests. We must take the offensive.

Offensive action requires superiority in numbers. This is the reason we need an Army of 8,200,000 including officers by the end of this year. The Navy, the Marines, and the Coast Guard need 2,600,000 this year. That makes a total of 10,800,000 men and women that must be in the armed forces by the end of this year. This will be less than 8½ percent of our total population. Thirteen and one-half percent of the German population is in the armed forces.

Ten million eight hundred thousand is not a figure pulled out of a hat. It is the requirement determined by those charged with the heavy responsibility of winning this war.

General Marshall says that we need so many planes and so many tanks to win the war. Is there anyone in America who would question his judgment? Admiral King says that we need so many escort ships and destroyers to beat the Axis. Is there anyone in America who would question his judgment? The expert views of our military leaders are accepted on our needs for guns and ships. Why should anyone question their judgment as to the number of men that they need to use these weapons and man these ships?

The staffs of the Army and the Navy under General Marshall and Admiral King, in full possession of the facts, have made the military decision that a force this size is necessary to win the war. Our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, has approved this program. It is America's answer to the Axis. The Axis, I assure you, does not like that answer.

In making this decision full account has been taken of the ability of American industry and labor and agriculture to produce the supplies needed by our forces, by our allies, and by our civilian economy. Full account has also been taken of the ability of our rapidly expanding merchant marine to deliver soldiers and supplies overseas. The conclusion reached was that it was a hard job, but that it could and must be done.

But there are critics of the Army program who ask, "Why should we fight? Why not give more supplies to the British, the Chinese, and the Russians and let them fight for us?"

The British, with the smallest available manpower and subject to savage aerial attacks, have come nearer than any other of the United Nations to the full-time war employment of every man, woman, and child. The Chinese have been heroically fighting for 5½ years. The Russians, by brilliant tactics and with indomitable courage, have killed more Nazis than all the other United Nations combined. We should all pause today on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Soviet Russian Army to think of the tremendous debt we owe to those gallant peoples. We should give tribute to their dead, for they have sacrificed countless lives. But their manpower is not inexhaustible.

Since when has America adopted as its national policy, "Let George do it"?

This is our war just as much as it is the war of the British, the Russians, and the Chinese. We are sending supplies to the utmost of our ability to these and the other United Nations. We will continue to do so. But it will be our soldiers and sailors, and those of our allies, that will win the final victory.

Elemental truths are often the most difficult to grasp. Throughout all ages peoples have tried to avoid facing up to the reality that war is grim business; have longed for an easy war; and have hoped that somehow, some way, victory could be gained without risking too much or without experiencing the stark unpleasantness of the conflict. But all the wishing in the world does not change the nature of war and its impact on all peoples engaged in it, whether in the battle lines or at home.

The hour for realism has arrived for every American. We must brace ourselves for mounting casualty lists and reverses on the battle front, and for more arduous labors and sacrifices on the home front.

Realism must extend from the fox holes and pill boxes on the firing line to the factories and homes of America. When our country is at war, none of us can escape the responsibility of viewing the routine, as well as the emergency duties of life, in the light of their bearing upon the final result, unconditional surrender by our enemies.

Only thus can we successfully combat the tendency to gage our war effort, not by what must be done or can be achieved but by what through half-heartedness might become our self-imposed potential.

You, in Pittsburgh, have done a magnificent job in production for war. But you have an even heavier task ahead. You will have serious problems because of the increasing drain on your manpower. But similar problems have been solved in England, Russia, Germany, and Japan. Nonessential activities are out for the duration, and these countries are fully mobilized—to a much greater extent than we. On every one rests the equal obligation to give service either in the armed forces or on the home front. Why should we suppose that we can wage war successfully without mobilizing our human resources with a thoroughness at least approaching that of our enemies and of our principal allies?

The needs of the armed forces must come first. The problems of turn-over and absenteeism must and can be solved. Each of us must work to the utmost of his capability.

We must also tackle our farm-labor problem with vigor. There are white-collar workers in nonessential industries who can go back to the farms from which they came. There are Victory gardens to be encouraged. More work can be done by women. Farm machinery can be pooled. Many steps can be taken to increase production on the farms.

We cannot solve our manpower problems by whittling down the size of our armed forces, by permitting one special group after another to obtain blanket deferments. The problem must be tackled at its source. Every one wants to do his or her share to help win the war and must serve where he or she can render the best service. The decision cannot be based upon personal desire.

With vast territories and resources at their disposal, the Axis cannot be defeated by a blockade. Victory will come from decisive military action, backed by an armed force and ability so overwhelmingly superior that the enemy's further action will be futile.

In World War No. 1, it was our American Expeditionary Force of 2,000,000, added to the strength of our allies, that made the enemy surrender. On November 11, 1918, the allies had 32 fresh divisions in reserve. The Germans only had 2. The allies had a total of 213 divisions. The Germans had 185. The Germans were aware of these figures. Their ability to reason from figures is well known. They decided that they could not win, and they quit.

Now, as then, the enemy must be made to realize that they cannot win. Now, as then, we must make them see that we are going to see the job through.

Nothing would give the enemy greater aid and comfort than a reduction in our Army. War demands sacrifices. Sacrifice is the price of victory. The American people have never failed to answer the call to duty. They will not do so now.

Congress Needs Public Relations Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress Needs Public Relations Bureau," from the Norristown (Pa.) Times-Herald of February 15, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS NEEDS PUBLIC RELATIONS BUREAU

Congress, at last, is waking up. Congressmen are asking, "What's wrong with Congress?" and "what must be done about it?" The diagnosis by the best minds in Congress is that the National Legislature is suffering from a loss of prestige due to a progressive atrophy of function. It started way back in the opening days of the New Deal, when a whole series of emergency measures, drafted in haste by the Executive, were dumped into the lap of Congress for rush passage to meet the banking crisis. Ever since it has just been emergency and crisis Government all or most of the time. The atrophy of congressional functions has now reached the acute stage of near-paralysis, what with the tremendous war-caused aggrandizement of executive powers.

Congress has lost none of its constitutional powers. It has lost practical control over public policy and administration simply because it has lost influence over public opinion. Congress no longer informs or forms public opinion on public issues. The remedy for this loss of function is simply to resume lost functions. The way to resume is to resume. To do this, however, Congress will need to equip itself with new instrumentalities of research, public relations, and publicity or propaganda to match those now monopolized by the Executive branch for its exclusive service and ends.

A STRONG CONGRESS NEEDED

The way the American Government is now being run, Congress has but two real functions. One is to pass laws and the other is to vote money—in both cases to carry out the decisions and policies, not of Congress, but of the President. This is not as it should be. The theory, which is now the practice, that the President decides and Congress enacts; that the President initiates and Congress appropriates, is un-American.

Separation of powers as between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches is the keystone of the American republican system of government. The corollary of separation of powers is that the legislative branch must be just as effective as the Executive in forming and informing public opinion and in determining public policies. A legislature which merely ratifies the decisions and implements the policies of the Executive is little different from the legislatures of Soviet Russia or National Socialist Germany.

The fact that Congress still has certain legal or constitutional checks of an extreme character such as the power of the purse or the power of impeachment is now of no practical significance. As a practical matter, Congress, for two reasons, cannot exercise these powers. For one reason, the Executive controls public opinion, having a virtual monopoly over the means of propaganda. For another reason, the exercise by Congress of its constitutional power to check the Executive by refusing to appropriate money or enact laws for the prosecution of the war would be to invite national defeat in time of war. If the choices of Congress are either to sabotage the war effort or go the way of the totalitarians, then it is obvious that the latter course is the one likely to be taken. The two extremes of either obstructing the war effort or going totalitarian should be ruled out. The republican form of government, however, can be preserved only if Congress makes itself as influential as the Executive in the formation of public opinion and public policy.

LET CONGRESS SHOW LEADERSHIP

If the system of checks and balances is to be upheld, if the American republican form of government is not to be converted through war into a permanent dictatorship—remember, dictatorships never die a natural death—then Congress must resume its functions of discussing public issues in a way to make such discussion decisive in forming public opinion and shaping national policy. If the Executive submits to Congress for rubber-stamp enactment a measure against which there develops a majority opposition in Congress—corresponding in all probability to the division of opinion in the country—and if, at the same time, the Executive goes to the people with all the propaganda resources now at his command while Congress remains practically powerless to get across to the people its views, it is a foregone conclusion that the congressional opposition must collapse—to the discredit of the legislative branch and to the further enhancement of the prestige and power of the Executive.

The test of power as between Congress and the President is not what the Constitution says but what, as a practical matter, each branch can do to influence public opinion. If the executive branch has a virtual monopoly of propaganda or the means of access to the public mind, then republican government is dead and our legislature is little different from that of the totalitarian states.

The problem is a practical, not a legal one. The big question is how to restore atrophied functions of Congress. In the days when the American system of republican government was set up there were no radio and no press such as we have today. In those days the debates of Congress were news. They were also subjects of popular interest and debate. Down to 1933, Congress exerted leadership in America over public opinion and policy formation. The Executive had no advantage over Congress in bidding for the ear of the public. Now all that is changed. What has done it has been a perpetual state of emergency and a radiophonic President.

Congress must now reckon with emergency and the radio as constant factors and with the President, whose fourth term campaign is now under way, as a possible perennial. The idea that crisis government is temporary and that Congress will come back into its own when the emergency is over is somewhat naive. The emergency which made the New Deal has become the war emergency. The war is expected to merge into a new era of American intervention everywhere to police, feed, supply, and reorder the entire world. Thus one state of emergency follows another. This being the outlook, Congress must finally face the problem whether under a permanent emergency and a permanent President it is to become a permanent rubber stamp or whether it is to resume its function as one of the three coequal agencies of a republican form of government.

PUBLIC OPINION FORMATION

To fulfill its functions of forming public opinion and shaping public policy, Congress needs two kinds of technical assistance. One is expert or technical research and advice. The other is equality of access with the Executive to the public mind. To say that Congress, the same as the Executive, has the benefit of all the agencies and agents of Government may sound plausible but it is simply not true. Nor would it be correct to say that Congress has equal access with the Executive to the public mind. Whenever the President makes a policy decision or advances a specific proposal, the Executive departments and agencies cannot supply critical Congressmen or a congressional opposition with material to make up a case against what the President wants.

Senator Byrd's committee reported that, at the time of Pearl Harbor, there were 2,895 full-time Government public-relations employes and 31,618 part-time workers on the pay roll at a cost to the taxpayers of $27,769,940. Since our entry into the war these totals have grown to fantastic proportions. The Executive now has a magazine called Victory financed by the Government and expertly prepared by Elmer Davis' Office of War Information. Charges have been made in Congress that this house organ of the President has already opened his campaign for a fourth term.

MATCHING PRESIDENTIAL PROPAGANDA

Congress can discuss intelligently and oppose effectively before the bar of public opinion the policies and proposals of the President only if Congress has technical facilities roughly comparable to those commanded by the President. It is obviously out of the question to place at the exclusive service of Congress a corps of experts in all fields of Government activity equally numerous and well equipped as those at the command of the Executive. But, if Congress appropriated in the fiscal year 1942 some $27,000,000 for public-relations services for the Executive, it could surely authorize at least $10,000,000 in this war year for presenting fairly and adequately to the American people the discussions and views on public issues of their elected representatives.

In the complete absence of appropriate technical assistance for Congressmen, the attempt, even of a Congressional majority, to criticize, modify, or oppose certain executive policies can only tend to discredit Congress as well as fail of its purpose. The reasons are too obvious to need statement.

Lacking proper technical resources for examining public policies and proposals of the Executive and for publicizing criticism and opposite views, many Members of Congress are forced to confine themselves to such criticism as their meager facilities allow them to make. The results, naturally, are bad for congressional prestige and more helpful than harmful to the Executive.

Criticisms by Congressmen of the administration which are inadequately or unfairly presented by the press or radio to the public, or which are promptly smothered with contradiction or distortions by the administration's public relations experts, are bound to hurt the critics in the long run far more than the administration. The public, it must be recognized, does not, in any significant number, read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It gets only such ideas of congressional debates and speeches as the press and radio reports are meant to convey.

In the give and take of congressional debate these days, the congressional spokesmen or legmen of the White House always take

the floor of Congress or the air waves of the Nation with carefully prepared proposals, drafts of legislation, statements of policy, and propaganda while the opposition usually has to extemporize on the basis of inadequate knowledge and with the aid of wholly inexpert technicians in the arts of propaganda, the press, and the radio.

Whenever the President wants to address the Nation he has at his service a series of Nation-wide hook-ups. Such addresses and the slightest utterance of the President or any one of his myriad Executive agents are featured in every newspaper from coast to coast. Congressmen, as individuals, and the two Houses of the National Legislature, as the highest institutions of representative government in the country, have no such practical access to the public mind.

GIVING CONGRESS' SIDE

Quite a few Congressmen are experts in certain fields of public administration such as foreign affairs, military and naval affairs, taxation and fiscal policy and the various branches of the now growing governmental control of American life. And many Congressmen are experts with the written or spoken word. But most of them are rank amateurs in modern propaganda. The professional politician of pre-New Deal days is now almost extinct. The professional politician of today knows how, in the words of the celebrated phrase of a famous New Dealer, "to spend and spend and elect and elect." The professional politician of today is an expert in spending and propaganda. To their credit, Congressmen, by and large, are experts in neither. They sign the checks. But they also vote the tax bills. They get the blame for the taxes. The President gets credit for the spending.

The point is that we now have a professional Executive and an amateur Congress. If Congress is to resume its functions, it must make a professional approach to the current problems of government. The system of checks and balances cannot be preserved with a Congress of amateurs trying to check a professional and permanent President, ably supported by a cast of professionals in spending and propaganda.

There is nothing wrong about Congressmen, as individuals, being amateurs in politics; amateurs over the radio; amateurs in propaganda and public relations; or about their not being experts in the many branches of public administration or total war—which now happens to be the chief business of the American people. Congress would not be representative if its Members were not amateurs in propaganda or just plain people. But there is nothing but a lack of imagination to stop Congressmen from hiring experts and professionals to help them hold up the legislative end against the monstrous encroachments of the executive bur aus of every sort and description.

There is no need to go into details as to technique. It would be a comparatively simple matter for Congress to recruit as many experts as it voted money to pay appropriate salaries and equip with requisite facilities for their tasks. At least that is what they do for the executive branch.

RADIO TIME FOR CONGRESS

One of the most important musts for Congress is to buy time over Nation-wide radio hook-ups every week. This time could be allotted as between the two parties and different Members more or less as is now done with memberships and chairmanships of the many Senate and House committees. Speakers for different congressional points of view could be selected and allotted time by party caucuses. The programs and the speeches themselves could be and should be professionally prepared with the aid of experts—experts both on the subject under discussion and in the technique of writing and radio presentation. As it is now, neither the press nor the radio is to blame if the Executive has all the advantage over Congress in the matter of access to the public mind. Propaganda by the Executive is professional in quality. The pronouncements of too many Congressmen on public issues are, quite simply, inadequate.

Congress must recognize that it has a function of public enlightenment and a responsibility to preserve the traditional balance of power between the legislative and the executive branches of Government. Congress must recognize that in this technical age the performance of its tasks in these respects calls for professional assistance. The legislative branch should remain representative, and, hence, largely amateur in composition. But in public relations methods it must, like the Executive, go professional. Otherwise, with a professional Executive and an amateur Congress we shall lose what is most fundamental in the republican form of government, namely, a free, independent, and powerful legislative.

Monopoly and Desecration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MOORE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Oklahoman entitled "Monopoly and Desecration."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONOPOLY AND DESECRATION

While the President has stirred partisans to an infantile frenzy by comandeering the radio time of both Lincoln day and Washington day the people as a whole remain undisturbed. The average citizen cares next to nothing whether the political harangues which fill the air on the birthdays of Lincoln and Washington come directly from the White House or from the throat of some Republican orator. Let the partisans fight this mimic war of the air lanes and settle it in their own partisan way.

Of course, the President can banish all Republican speeches from the radio perpetually by the simple process of exercising the monopoly on radio time that the broadcasting companies have given him. He can broadcast a speech every time a Republican arranges for a broadcast and in that way keep the Republicans off the air forever and a day. He did just that on Lincoln's birthday and he monopolized a part of the time on Washington's birthday. But if he should undertake to make his monopoly perpetual, popular resentment, if nothing else, would compel the broadcasting companies to withdraw the monopoly they have so generously conferred. The people simply would not stand for a perpetual discourtesy. The Republicans' fear that the two-party system is endangered by the President's course is considerably exaggerated.

But this controversy concerning the Presidential monopoly of radio time brings to mind another phase of these birthday celebrations. Isn't there something cheap and measurably revolting in the action of Democrats in borrowing the name and fame of Washington to boost the sale of $100 plates to replenish a party treasury? The collection of $100 each from suckers who should be investing their money in Victory bonds is of extremely doubtful propriety, but it is even worse to borrow the name of the Father of Our Country and use it as a means of fattening a partisan war chest. Isn't the staging of that Belshazzar's feast in the hour of national peril even more to be censured than the action of the President in monopolizing radio time?

Nor is there overmuch to be said in favor of the Republican partisans who employ the name of Lincoln for the purpose of stirring partisan fervor and augmenting partisan prospects in the subsequent campaign. It is a poor tribute to the patient American who saved the Union to give him a partisan cap and clothe him in a partisan livery. Possibly the men who would convert the name of the martyred President into a party bauble have forgotten the fury with which Republican partisans fought Lincoln while he was saving the Union and how quickly they discarded his humane policies as soon as he was dead. Not until they discovered that he was the idol of his people did they begin to celebrate his birthday.

We remain unexcited when politicians wrangle over who shall use the radio and who shall not. But we do regret the constant desecration of birthdays that should be regarded with more reverence. The best that can be said for these partisan extremists who try to convert into party trade-marks names that are almost sacred is that none of them has ever tried to place a party tag on the name of the Galilean.

Rickenbacker Challenged by Fellow Hero of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article under the date line "New York, February 28," entitled "Rickenbacker Challenged by Fellow Hero of War," published in the Philadelphia Record of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICKENBACKER CHALLENGED BY FELLOW HERO OF WAR

NEW YORK, February 28.—Capt. Howard Y. Williams, St. Paul, Minn., one of Minnesota's World War No. 1 heroes and field director of the Union for Democratic Action, headed by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, challenges Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker in an open letter.

"Don't let them use you, Eddie, to divide the American people, to set soldiers against workers," Captain Williams says. "The American heroes in the shops and factories and on the farms have the same stuff in them as the boys in the hell-holes of the Pacific. Don't sound retreat for heroes on any front."

PRETTY MUCH SAME

"I cannot let your attack on civilian workers go unchallenged. Men do not change materially when they take off overalls for a uniform. They are pretty much the same men. Of course, war tests men in a severe way. Like every other great crisis in life, it makes some men and breaks others.

"You know by experience that almost every regiment has its 'lazy-bones,' its cowards, men who are afraid to die, who are 'yellow.' But, thank God, most soldiers do their stuff and have the qualities of heroes.

"Well, Eddie, the men in the factories are the same kind of men as those in the armies. They are the brothers, fathers, friends, and neighbors of the men in the armies. Some are lazy, just as in the ranks of the soldiers. Some are inefficient, some shirk hard tasks and long hours. But the bulk of civilians, just like soldiers, are hard-working fellows doing their best, working 48 to 60 hours a week."

PAY IS DISCUSSED

"You emphasize the fact that soldiers are risking their lives for $50 a month. It is a pitiful amount and yet the fact is that, with their meals and clothes and family allotments, it is greater financial security than thousands of them have known in civilian life.

"Why do you want to drag all workers' pay to this level? Why not let this wealthiest country raise soldiers' pay at least to the level of workers? Where do you get the idea that men in the factories should work for $50 a month, while managers should not be limited to $67,000 a year, lest it curb their incentive? Don't we all need incentives and shouldn't we all make comparable sacrifices?

"Do you believe, as you indicated in your Detroit speech, that post-war America should guarantee the open shop although it has taken years of real struggle on the part of workers' organizations to eliminate, at least partially, this denial of majority rights? Do you believe that the Wagner Act should be abolished?

"You have found in the aviation industry that by associating yourself with other leaders in the industry, you have greatly benefited by this same association in should not benefit by this same association in fited. What makes you think that workers unions? Just as we, war veterans, have banded together in the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans to protect our comrades, so workers organize themselves to protect and strengthen their standards of living. What is the difference, Eddie?

"You do not want soldiers on their return to join unions. What would you think of a man who said he wanted to fight the Japs but wouldn't join the Army and wanted to be a free lance? Just as soldiers ought to join armies to be effective, so workers should join unions; and businessmen, trade associations; and lawyers, bar associations; etc. Some trade unions do have racketeers, just as industries have their Insulls and Whitneys, and just as some regiments have cowards and traitors, but our job is not to do away with unions, industries, or regiments, but to clean out the misfits."

VIEWS ON ABSENTEEISM

"Do you believe that absenteeism, a practice condemned by all, is exclusively the fault of labor unions, or labor leaders? Or do you believe, with the Office of War Information, that absenteeism is a complex phenomenon with a multiplicity of causes, including bad working conditions, inadequate housing and transportation facilities, sickness, etc.?

"Now, Eddie, don't bet short on the American people. In the trenches, in the factories, on the farms, in the offices, they measure up to the crisis. I know you do not mean to follow Hitler in creating second-class citizens, but that is what you are doing, nevertheless, in seeking to set soldiers against workers. Don't let them drag your great military record in the mud in this way. In unity there is strength. Don't let them use you to divide the American people."

DECORATED IN FRANCE

Captain Williams went to France in the summer of 1917 as a first lieutenant in the Tenth Engineers and was among the first 25,000 American soldiers to land in France. He was promoted to captain, cited by Gen. John J. Pershing for conspicuous bravery and decorated by the French.

The men of his regiment dedicated the regimental history to Captain Williams in recognition of his outstanding leadership.

Under Gov. Elmer A. Benson, of Minnesota, he served as director of the Division of Soldier Welfare for several years, supervising the spending of more than $1,000,000 a year in service to disabled war veterans.

Joint Committee on War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, February 21, 1943, entitled "Congress's Two Glass Houses," and I ask that immediately following the editorial there be printed in the RECORD Senate concurrent resolution 1.

There being no objection, the editorial and concurrent resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 21, 1943]

CONGRESS' TWO GLASS HOUSES

The ancient committee system of Congress is visibly breaking down under the unparalleled burdens of total war. Instead of creating a single central over-all committee to coordinate its other committees and to frame a single coherent policy, Congress has been forming new special committees to do what many of its existing committees are already supposed to do. There are increasing jurisdictional disputes among these committees, increasing struggles for power among them, just as there are among the administrative agencies.

Some Congressmen are becoming uneasily aware of this. A few days ago, following a squabble concerning the particular committee to which a bill should be referred, Senator LUCAS of Illinois rose to declare that he was greatly disturbed over the fact that the Senate, while constantly complaining about bureaus and bureaucrats performing duplicate functions, was doing the same thing itself. He warned his colleagues, in effect, that they should not throw stones at bureaucrats as long as their own house was made of glass.

It is a timely warning. Reform, like charity, must begin at home. Congress must unify its own command first. It must put its own two houses in order before it can hope successfully to tackle the administrative agencies.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on War Problems (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee"), and to be composed of six Members of the Senate to be selected by the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives to be selected by the House of Representatives. Not more than three of the members of the joint committee selected by the Senate, and not more than three of the members of the joint committee selected by the House of Representatives, shall be from the same political party. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a special study and investigation of the problems arising out of the war under existing and future acts of Congress; to confer with the President, and with the various departments and agencies of the Government, from time to time, with respect to such problems; to consult with other committees of both branches of the Congress, and to report to the Congress from time to time, together with such recommendations with respect to legislation as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $——, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

The Size of Our Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] from Washington, D. C., over the Columbia coast-to-coast network, on February 25, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow citizens, the size of our armed forces is a fundamental factor which governs all strategic decisions of the war. The authority for making these decisions has properly been placed upon the joint chiefs of staff of the United States Army and Navy—General Marshall and General Arnold, Admiral Leahy and Admiral King, because of their professional ability and their background of training and experience.

These distinguished military leaders have planned an armed force for 1943 and 1944 of approximately 11,100,000, which includes an army of 8,208,000. The President, as Commander in Chief, has approved this plan and has publicly announced the strategy based upon it. This calls for the conclusive defeat and unconditional surrender of the Axis Powers in Europe and Africa as quickly as

possible, while maintaining an active war of attrition against Japan until such time as we are free to concentrate on her conclusive defeat and unconditional surrender.

This basic and vital decision as to the size of the Army was reached by the reasoned judgment of these military leaders after a year of exhaustive research and detailed consideration of the best information available regarding strategy, available shipping, training time, production possibilities and manpower. All these factors were given due consideration.

Proposals are now being advanced to disrupt this strategic plan of the United Nations for an early and conclusive defeat of the enemy, by drastically cutting the size of the Army by over 2,000,000 men in 1943.

These proponents following the Honorable Herbert Hoover take a defeatist viewpoint and say that no way can be found to mobilize the country's resources of men, food, and other materials to support an Army of the size determined necessary by our military leaders. They mean that no way can be found without reorganizing agriculture as we are reorganizing industry, without men and women on the farms and in the towns working harder and sweating more, and without the people generally tightening their belts and submitting to the rationing of many more things. And so these critics propose to take the easiest way out now, no matter what the future risks may be. This is the easiest way to solve the problem. It is also the easiest way to lose the war.

I appreciate the fact that we are face to face with a very difficult agricultural situation, resulting from men leaving the farms at an alarming rate. But the proposed plan of cutting down the Army ignores 5 important points:

1. This problem will not be solved by reducing the size of the Army. More men have left the farms to go into industry than to join the Army. High paid war industry will still draw labor from the farms.

2. Reducing the Army will lengthen the war.

3. Lengthening the war will mean more bloodshed for our sons, brothers, and husbands and more sacrifices for all of us in the long run.

4. We can produce the necessary food and build the necessary Army at the same time, if we do a job of mobilizing our manpower and rationing our food comparable with what our allies are doing.

5. Until everything else has first been done to make the most efficient use of all available labor, the whole conduct of the war and the safety of the country must not be jeopardized by cutting the size of the Army.

That the safety of the country would be jeopardized is clearly demonstrated by an analysis of the strategic plan which calls for an Army of 8,208,000 officers and men by the end of 1943.

Over the globe, the Axis Nations have 162 more Army divisions than the United Nations, not including the United States. The United States planned Army for 1943 provides for a total of 100 divisions. If these could all be used in Africa and Europe, the United Nations would still be outnumbered in these theaters alone by 62 divisions. A cut of 2,200,000, as now proposed, would mean that divisions already organized must be disbanded. This in turn would mean abandonment of basic strategic plans and a complete disruption of our military effort, since troops to be shipped in 1944 must be trained in this country this very year.

"But," ask those critics, "why do we need a standing army of 5,500,000 in this country doing (as they say) nothing, while there is so much work on the farms needed to be done?" Let us see why.

At the end of 1943, over 2,000,000 destined for services overseas will have had less than the minimum amount of 1 year's training required. These are the men who will be shipped to combat service in 1944. There will be 257,000 officers and enlisted men in officer and specialist training schools and in universities and colleges. There must be kept also a strategic reserve against such grave contingencies as any attempted enemy invasion of the west coast of North, Central, or South America. There must be kept also a reserve of special service troops trained and ready to undertake such missions as the reconstruction of recaptured ports and other facilities. Finally, with this reserve, the Army must also perform all the tasks incident to the training of the millions of men to be shipped overseas and to the operation of bases for supplying, equipping, and maintaining all these armies, over 5,000,000 of which will eventually be overseas, with suply lines which in some cases are over 12,000 miles long. These reserve and base forces amount to 1,250,000 in 1943, which it is planned to reduce to 500,000 in 1944.

It is apparent that reduction in the planned strength of the Army must inevitably result in either or both of two situations in 1944. Either we will not have enough trained combat soldiers to make full use of our shipping capabilities and thus prevent bringing the war to a speedy and successful conclusion, or we will have to send soldiers abroad who are not fully trained for battle and accept the staggering losses which may result, or both.

It is true that the agricultural program of this year requires an increase in the production of certain crops over that of last year. But a reduction in the number of men to be inducted into the Army during 1943 is not the way to solve the problem. On the contrary, a labor report of the Department of Agriculture shows that there were only 100,000 fewer workers on the farms last December 31 than a year previously. Yet, the armed forces were expanded by almost 5,000,000 during that period.

The principal cause of reduction in the number of farm workers is the high wages and better living and working conditions of war industry. There seems no way of stopping this flow of farm workers to industry except by some law such as is in effect in England and Canada, mobilizing manpower so that its maximum efficient utilization is made available to winning the war.

One-third of the farms of this country produce only 3 percent of the total crops of the country. On the other hand, another one-third produce 64 percent. Obviously the employment of labor on most of our farms is ineffective and inconsistent with the demands of war for efficient production. Agricultural reorganization is needed in peacetime. How much more in wartime! Various practical remedies have been proposed and should be considered and I am sorry I have not the time to take them up one by one now. Of one thing I am sure: All other steps should be taken before cutting the size of the Army determined essential for the earliest possible defeat of the enemy.

Foremost among these critics is Mr. Hoover. He twice has attempted to predict the military future of the United States upon the basis of his analysis of the country's economic ability to produce all the things necessary for total war, while raising, training, and shipping an American Army overseas to defeat the German Army. In fact, it almost seems that, in preparation for his testimony before a Senate committee the other day, he had dug out of his dusty files an old discredited statement of his, and offered it as just the thing for the present emergency. A fortnight ago, on February 8, he released to the press a summary of his testimony given before the Appropriation Committee's Subcommittee on Manpower, of which I am a member. It is interesting to compare this with his memorandum to Colonel House on October 27, 1917, of which I have a copy. Mr. Hoover has apparently learned very little about warfare in the intervening period of a quarter of a century. The parallels between what he says now and what he said then are so striking that I am going to quote a couple of them to you:

Now he says: "If we attempt too much on the military side, we may commit the fatal error of overstrain on the home front and thus damage our effectiveness in ultimate victory." Then he said: "I feel apprehensive of a great danger overhanging this country if we should place a million and a half of men at the front."

Now he says: "There is a limit to our capacities and resources, great as they are. With 1 year of war, strains on the home front are already evident. We have impending decrease in production of meats and fats." Then he said: "Furthermore, the assembling of millions of men under arms here is undermining the foundation of our productive capacity, and it is in our productivity of food and munitions that the safety of the world must rest."

Mr. Hoover doesn't think we can do it now. He didn't think we could do it then. Yet it is common knowledge, admitted by our 1918 allies and enemies alike, by the German generals, Von Hindenberg and Von Ludendorff, and by our own General Pershing, that it was the presence of 2,000,000 fresh American soldiers in France, with others arriving at a rate of over a quarter of a million a month, which was directly responsible for the defeat of the German armies in November 1918 The Allies would have been defeated in 1918 if the United States had followed Mr. Hoover's advice. They will suffer defeat or stalemate if they follow his advice now. Yet there are those who are urging us to do that very thing.

It is ridiculous to suppose that the United States, with a population of more than 135,000,000 persons, fighting a war for its very existence, cannot mobilize 11,000,000, or only 8 percent of our population, for this purpose, when Germany has mobilized 12 percent and Great Britain 10 percent. Those who now propose to reduce the size of the Army miss these vital points: That we are engaged in a total war of survival; that total war by its very nature strains the civilian economy to its limits; and that our strategic plans call for an early and conclusive termination of this war by doing all that we can as soon as we can. If we are not willing to mobilize our manpower this year so as to build the essential army while producing the essential materials and food, if we sacrifice one essential of early victory to another, we inevitably prolong the war. This means additional hardships and sacrifices for all of us, and above all, additional and unnecessary bloodshed for our troops.

If we cripple the Army and prevent it from accomplishing its mission in 1944 because we are unwilling to mobilize the home front in 1943, we will be committing a terrible blunder in which I, for one, am unwilling to have a part.

"In Soiled Ermine"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MOORE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Oklahoman entitled "In Soiled Ermine."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN SOILED ERMINE

Every impulse of common honesty supports the contention of Senator MOORE that judicial positions never should be used as the means of paying political debts. Respect for the judiciary as such suffers greviously when politicians are appointed judges to reward them for political errand running or because they have contributed generously to some candidate's campaign fund. Who can possibly respect a judge as a judge when everybody knows that he is lacking in judicial fitness and was clothed with the ermine simply and solely because he served as a rubber stamp in a congressional position or paid more than anybody else to bring about the election of a United States Senator?

An aggravated case of judicial prostitution is that of Allred of Texas, for this is the second time he has been given a judgeship as a political reward. For reasons of political strategy he was appointed to the district bench. For political reasons he resigned his judgeship and made an unsuccessful race for the United States Senate. Now he is made a judge of the circuit court as a reward for quitting the bench to carry the New Deal banner in a losing battle for the Senate. Yes; that is an exaggerated case.

The battle waged by Senator MOORE and those who agree with him that the judiciary should be kept above reproach might very well be extended beyond the political cheapening of the judiciary. It should extend to the appointment of lame ducks who have been repudiated and cast out by the people. One by one the Senators who were weighed and found wanting have been appointed to high positions in the Government. Ere long the last of those who have been pronounced faithless by popular vote will have been taken care of. Herring of Iowa and Schwartz of Wyoming have been taken care of within the last 3 days.

This recall of the "lame ducks" from political oblivion is more than the mere appointment to office of men who have been pronounced unfit by the people who know them best. It is a contemptuous slap at the people who did the repudiating. It is a truculent announcement to the people of Oklahoma and Michigan and Iowa and Texas and Wyoming: "We'll show you who is running this Government. We'll give you what we want to and you can like it or lump it." Every one of these "lame duck" appointments follow the profane ejaculation of Commodore Vanderbilt, "The people be damned."

Not within 75 years has it been so important that the people have faith and confidence in their governing authorities. Some measure of our country's success in this war depends upon the people's confidence in the men who rule. But how can the people have confidence in departments that are headed by men who have been voted unfit and incompetent and unworthy by the people who know them best? Would it not be well for our Christian rulers to consider the words of the Koran "He who appoints a man to office when a better man is available commits a crime against society and the state"?

Address of Clarence B. Kelland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM DITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address of Clarence B. Kelland delivered on February 15, 1943, at Charleston, W. Va., on the anniversary of Abraham Lincoln.

I want to draw for you some conclusions from the widespread and conclusive Congressional elections of last November. Those elections marked the rolling in of a great wave, but I am happy to say to you that it was not so much a wave of Republicanism as it was a wave of Americanism.

The people of the United States selected the Republican Party as an instrumentality through which to express its alarm and its resentment. It selected the Republican Party as its scourge with which to lash the money changers from the temple of democracy—money changers who were palming off upon this Nation the counterfeit currency of State Socialism, printed upon the printing presses of totalitarianism and fascism, using printers borrowed from the ranks of communism, in exchange for the pure gold of the American way of life.

The people of the United States made use of the Republican Party for this purpose because it knew that that party was the only instrumentality left upon God's footstool through which this Republic could be preserved, this Republic which is based upon human integrity, human initiative, human ability, and decent human ambition. They utilized our party because they had come to see clearly that only by using it as an organized force could they preserve private property, the savings of the people, the life insurance, and the privately owned shops and stores and mills and factories and farms of the people. Because, only if the Republican Party were placed in power could they hope to restore and perpetuate the right to work and to save for security and comfort in old age. Because only through the Republican Party could they hope to secure to themselves and their descendants the right to opportunity, the right to improve their social and economic positions, the right to work at jobs selected by themselves in places where they wanted to live. Because, only through the intervention of the Republican Party could they avert complete regimentation of their lives and their earnings. Because only by relying upon the Republican Party could they hope that the United States might continue in the future as it has been in the past a land devoted to human freedom, the safety of the home and of the right to worship God each in his selected way, the right to speak your mind upon any subject unterrified by the shadow of the concentration camp; the right to look any man, no matter what his name or his station, in the eye and tell him to go to hell.

So I say to you that this wave that crashed down upon the New Deal was not a Republican wave but a wave of revived, stalwart, desperate Americanism, resolved that this Republic should live and not die.

We must deserve—we Republicans—this confidence the American people have placed in us, and we must see to it by our right and patriotic actions and words that this confidence shall not be withdrawn.

We must see to it that our intelligent diligence in winning this war, in fighting it to crushing victory shall deserve the applause of the people; we must see to it that our plans and projects for a just and lasting peace shall be marked by statesmanship, broad love of humanity, understanding of the problems that will face us; that these plans and projects shall be practical, concrete, specific.

We cannot shirk our responsibility to our sons and grandsons; we cannot shirk our responsibility to our great allies; we cannot shirk our responsibility to the teeming populations of the remotest corners of the earth.

But in assuming that responsibility, we Republicans must be true to the trust that is reposed in us by the people, and in being true to that trust we must see to it that we shall embark on no course, adopt no plan, follow no impractical vision that shall break so much as one tiny point from any star upon our flag, or tear one tiny rent in any one of its thirteen stripes.

We must not cede or surrender one inch of our sovereignty as an independent Nation. We must not cede one ounce of our independence as a state. We must see to it that, until the end of time, the United States of America shall continue to be the United States of America, unimpaired, undiminished, independent.

We must cooperate with other nations as a full partner, but we must not merge our identity with any other nation. We must collaborate and not amalgamate. In what we do we must act as the United States of America, and not as an arm or a leg or a head or a foot of any other state or superstate which shall be dreamed up for our undoing. One and indivisible and independent we must remain to follow our own great destiny, first for the good of this country which we love, and secondly for the benefit and advantage of our neighbors.

Only by following this course can we retain and deserve the trust and the confidence that have been placed in us.

I am just a little sick of global thinkers, those leaders of personally conducted tours through the nebular hypothesis. I have talked with them hoping to learn, and I have come away confused. I am a little sick of our leading global thinker, Mr. WALLACE. I speak in the language of the dairy farmer because milk seems to be one of his obsessions.

Every time Mr. WALLACE freshens he gives down a gush of the milk of human kindness.

And, while we are on the subject, how does Mr. WALLACE or anyone else hope to give a quart of milk to everybody in the world when the mishandling of manpower already has caused the slaughter of a million dairy cows? Does Mr. WALLACE believe the skeletons will give milk? Or do our global thinkers who ask that the United States shall feed the world when peace shall come, believe the wheat and corn can be supplied by acres compelled to lie fallow because no one is there to till them? Are they ambitious to feed the hungry with jimsonweed? If your children ask for bread, shall ye give them a soap bubble?

Now the milk of human kindness is a charming fluid to talk about, but if you could give a quart of it to every human being on this planet, he still would starve. There is no nourishment in it. You can't churn it into butter, you can't convert it into cheese, and you can't feed it to hungry babies. It is intangible. It is beautiful as an ideal, but it doesn't stick to your ribs when you are hungry.

The trouble with our global thinkers is that they don't bother about butter or cheese or any of those silly practical matters, they simply dip their pipes into a suds of the milk of human kindness and blow bubbles. They're bubble blowers. And what is a bubble? A bubble is a thin skin of grease with nothing inside it. Poke it with the practical finger of logic and it pops and you can't even find a wet spot on the floor. They want to destroy the enemies of liberty, the oppressors of the world, with soap bubbles. Imagine the consternation of a Nazi tank division if a platoon of global thinkers lined up and bombarded them with soap bubbles, even made from the very finest grade of the milk of human kindness. You can't overthrow an iron tyranny with ammunition out of a fairy tale. You've got to shoot practical bullets.

Global! It's a curious, manufactured word, made up for the occasion. I know the word globular. It means something round, like a ball. But global; global is something immense including all the world in one glittering ball of idealism, covering all the world with a soap-bubble film. And the thinnest thing on earth is the skin of a soap-bubble. Anything real and solid can break through

it and never even realize it has been in a "rassle."

You can't imprison a wicked idea inside a global soap bubble; it will break out. You can't shut Nazi tyranny or greed or cruelty inside a soap-bubble, you have to shut it within an unbreakable wall of steel. You can't shut any kind of human selfishness or evil inside a film of grease because human selfishness and evil are very concrete and practical things. You've got to be definite and practical and powerful about the prison you make; its walls must be strong and unscalable.

We have got to remake the world insofar as it shall prove practical to do so, but you can't remake a world if you use nothing for tools but a clay pipe and a saucer of soapsuds.

To achieve we must face facts and work within the framework of reality.

The world has just been given a spectacle at once inspiring and disturbing. Especially disturbing it must be to global thinkers. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill met in Africa. The leaders of our two remaining great democracies. Undoubtedly they met to discuss the condition of the world and what could be done to mend it. They could not think or discuss or act in a global manner. To be global you must take in all the world, but they could not take in all the world. Something definite and specific stopped them from including all creation. They were stopped at the national boundary of Soviet Russia, and they were stopped at the national boundary of our other great ally, China. Mr. Stalin is doing the thinking and acting for Russia, and doing it very efficiently indeed. Mr. Chiang Kai-shek is doing the planning and acting for China, and doing it heroically. There are 150,000,000 of people and countless acres of the earth's surface in Russia and possibly 500,000,000 of human beings and other countless acres of the earth's surface in China. And neither of these great political entities was present or represented. Therefore, such global thinking as was done had to be very limited indeed, because two of its most important factors were missing, and not cooperating. I'm afraid that's what our global thinkers are going to butt their bewildered heads against.

You can't work out a global plan without having global cooperation.

We must scramble out of this swimming pool filled with the milk of human kindness and get our feet set on firm ground, and to aid in finding a solid place for us to stand I ask a few pertinent questions.

1. Can the United States alone formulate, implement, and carry into operation any plan for a better and future world?

2. Will it be possible to make any post-war scheme without the cooperation of our allies, who up to the present moment have borne most of the brunt of this war? Can anything be accomplished without the consent and the assistance of Great Britain, Russia, China?

3. Global post-war planning concerns itself with India and the British possessions and commonwealths. It seems to concern itself with lessening the power and diminishing the possessions of the British Empire. England is our ally, fighting for us as we are fighting for them. Are we, then, as a reward to England for service rendered, to strip her of her means of livelihood? And will she consent to it? In other words, is England fighting this war in order that the British Empire shall be abolished, or is she fighting it to preserve the British Empire? Will England willingly collaborate in any plan of ours for Great Britain's diminution? As I understand it Mr. Hitler is fighting this war for this very thing among other objectives. What is our position to be with respect to this? It presents a stumbling block to global thinkers.

4. Russia is achieving tremendous victories against our enemies; victories that may be decisive. Up to the moment Mr. Stalin seems inclined to fight his war in his own way, accepting what help we can give, but handing out little information about his doings or his future plans. Very well. Should Mr. Stalin win the victory for which we all pray, he will drive out the Nazis. He will overrun middle Europe including Finland, Latvia, Esthonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania. Maybe even a part of Germany itself. Now then, having these territories in his possession, what is he going to do with them? And whatever he decides to do, what are we going to do about it?

5. We have two other allies, submerged but still alive—Holland and Belgium. Both of these little nations have vast possessions outside their national boundaries. Belgium in Africa, and Holland in the East Indies. We are fighting in part to rescue them from Nazi tyranny. But having rescued them are we going to strip them of their possessions, their principal means of livelihood and leave them impoverished? Millions of the submerged peoples of whom we speak inhabit their colonies and possessions. What are we going to do about that? Will these little countries rise up and call us blessed if we deprive them of all that makes it possible for them to live in decent prosperity? It's a hard question.

6. Fallen France possesses a colonial empire greater in area than continental United States. I don't know the present status of France. It is rather confused whether they be friends, enemies, or a hybrid mixture of both. But we started out as allies. What about the French empire? Are we going to take it away from her? Will France be able to rehabilitate herself if she be denuded of her north African possessions? Will she thank and applaud us, or would she sit back and plan for the day when she might rise to military might again and take them back? I'd hate to be a global thinker and have to answer this one.

7. There's Dakar. We have been told that Dakar is a dagger pointed at the heart of the Americas. We appear to be in possession of it. I for one do not like to have a dagger pointed at the heart of America Well, what about Dakar? We've got it. Will we keep it? And what will England and France and all the rest of Europe have to say if we do? If, in the post-war world we feel it necessary for our safety to erect a Gibraltar there on the shores of Africa. The point will be discussed at the peace table. What will be the decision? How will our answer to it affect the future peace of the world?

8. There are the French possessions in the West Indies adjoining the Panama Canal. What are our plans regarding them? This question does not seem to loom large at the moment, but we will hear more of it. What will be the answer?

9. What about the freedom of the air? What does that mean? Does it mean that the airplanes of foreign nations shall be allowed to roam the air over the United States? To go anywhere at will? Carrying with them, possibly, the tools of the spy. Photographing, mapping, and charting the country, infiltrating, interfering with our domestic traffic, becoming domestic competitors of our own air lines? Or should their landings be confined to coastal airports with the requirement that they shall enter and clear as do surface vessels plying the high seas? We've got to work out this one.

These are but a few of the questions I put to our global thinkers, but they have no answers to give. And practical, definite answers are going to be required. These answers are not going to be found by dreamers and "do gooders," but by practical men, men of all the nations involved. The decisions reached will not be the fruit of any all-embracing plan but of months of negotiation and discussions, of offers and counteroffers, of dickering and trading. It is not simple.

In 1775 we started a long war to give to the United States, independence. We even wrote a document called the Declaration of Independence, which was eloquent and conclusive upon the subject. Are we fighting the war of 1943 to give it back again? I doubt if the American people will approve that form of global charity.

The world could not exist without ideals. All human progress is the result of ideals, but no ideal ever made an advance without concessions. I do not discount nor abhor the dreamers of this world—unless they be dreamers of a very practical kind, acting with the technique of revolutionaries to destroy this Republic. I honor and respect the dreamer—the honest, wholesome dreamer—who sees a vision of beauty and struggles toward it with a song upon his lips. I have been a dreamer. It is because I dream dreams that I have tried to serve in the field of politics. But I am a dreamer with lucid intervals.

When we look toward a post-war world we must dream. Life would be intolerable in these days if we did not turn our eyes upward. We must each see for ourselves a world that is perfect, that is serene, in which there is justice and happiness for all. We must envision a world where every man shall be rewarded with what is justly his, and no man shall be enslaved, or cheated, or maltreated. We must look forward to a possible world in which nations shall deal in friendship and honor and justice with other nations, and peace shall be the first desire of every heart.

But the millennium is not to be reached in a single bound. We must travel toward it by short stages, halting for breath and refreshment. It will be a long and wearisome journey and there will come days or months or even years when we shall bog down in some slough of despond. We must not hope to reach perfection in 1 day's march, but every night we must be happy if indeed we have made perceptible progress. We must keep our faces toward our mountain top, and many of us will have fallen by the roadside when it is yet far distant.

Let us then attack our world problem in this spirit, dreaming our great dream, but, as practical men, making each day's progress as successful as our powers permit. Go as far as we can and give thanks for the progress we have made. If we cannot accomplish all let us accomplish as much as we can. But let us be honest with ourselves and practical, estimating the distance and the difficulties, and not ruining all by grasping for too much.

Even Almighty God required 6 days to make the world. We are men, not gods; we shall require more days than 6 to remake it.

Paul Scharrenberg, Until Recently a Legislative Representative of the American Federation of Labor in Washington, Is Honored by Appointment to a High Executive Post by California's Governor-Elect Earl Warren

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, while his many Washington friends are rejoicing over Gov. Earl Warren's appointment of Paul Scharrenberg to the high post under the government of the State of California of director of industrial relations, a fitting recognition of long

years of faithful public service, his departure from Washington is a matter of extreme regret to those who knew him well enough to have properly appraised and accurately evaluated his unusual personal qualities, those personal qualities which have so endeared him to us all.

Because he is leaving Washington to assume great responsibilities in a field in which he is especially qualified by experience and training to render an exceptional service to the people of the State of California, Paul Scharrenberg's departure, though regretted, is accompanied with the congratulations and good wishes not only of his personal friends, but of all of those who, through official contacts, have come to appreciate his disinterested devotion to the causes that are just.

Though Mr. Scharrenberg has become known to most of us on Capitol Hill during the 8 years of his residence here as a very able and intelligent legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor, his older friends happily recall his extended service as secretary of the California State Federation of Labor, during which he continually enjoyed the respect of both capital and labor, of employer and employee alike, an esteem that only one who wills to be fair to all could possibly achieve.

Though one of the busiest of men of the labor movement, Paul Scharrenberg has devoted much of his energies to the public service. During the long period of his residence on the West Coast, he has been able to find time in a very crowded life to serve on San Francisco's City Planning Commission, 1930–1936; upon California's Commission of Immigration and Housing, 1913–1923; and upon the California State Harbor Commission, 1927–1930.

Not only has he been called upon for exceptional service by the various Governors of the western commonwealth in which he has maintained his home for so many years, but Presidents of the United States have time and again availed themselves of his widespread experience in labor relationships, his exceptional talent for conciliation. During World War No. 1, President Woodrow Wilson appointed him United States Commissioner of Conciliation and, later, as a Presidential delegate to the National Industrial Conference, which was held at Washington, D. C., in October 1919. In November of 1934, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, recognizing his extraordinary abilities, appointed him a member of his advisory council on economic security, and, in 1936, designated him as the United States labor delegate to the Twenty-second (Maritime) Session of the International Labor Conference, which was held at Geneva.

So, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Scharrenberg leaves us to enter the service of his beloved State of California rich in that experience which is so essential to the attainment of the success which his many Washington friends so earnestly desire him to achieve, a culminating outstanding success in public administration which all of us are confident will be his. Though we will miss him exceedingly in the lobbies of our legislative halls, in the committee rooms of the Congress, and in the corridors of our public buildings where he has been for so long a familiar and most welcome figure, his leaving, though regretted, will be with the realization that that which is Washington's loss will be California's gain.

And because I feel that their inclusion as a part of my instant remarks would be appropriate under the circumstances, I ask permission, Mr. Speaker, to include several editorial expressions from western newspapers, from the Fresno Bee, the Stockton Record, the Sacramento Bee, the San Francisco News, the Modesto Bee and the Los Angeles Citizen, papers which reach my desk regularly, but a few, of course, of the many that have been written in commendation of his most recent appointment by Governor Earl Warren, but all, as it happens to be, that I have at hand.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the Stockton (Calif.) Record of January 21, 1943]

SCHARRENBERG WELL CHOSEN

Gov. Earl Warren has made another excellent appointment in naming Paul Scharrenberg, veteran labor official, as State director of industrial relations. The Governor is fortunate in getting the services of this nationally known American Federation of Labor leader who will sacrifice higher remuneration in Washington to accept the post in Sacramento because it enables him to return to California.

Scharrenberg has a long record of accomplishment as a conciliator and a worker in behalf of laws for the protection of laboring people. He is thoroughly familiar with the obligations facing him as chairman of the State industrial accident commission.

Previous Governors, including Hiram W. Johnson, William D. Stephens, and James Rolph, availing themselves of the Scharrenberg services, named him to important agencies. As United States labor conciliator on the west coast in World War No. 1, he proved his capacity. Presidents Wilson and Roosevelt called him to Washington to serve on advisory conferences.

Paul Scharrenberg's temperament, sense of fair play, and wide experience make him a man to inspire confidence in the capacity in which he will serve under Governor Warren.

[From the Fresno Bee, Sacramento Bee, and Modesto (Calif.) Bee of January 28, 1943]

NAMING OF SCHARRENBERG DOES CREDIT TO WARREN

Paul Scharrenberg, one of California's outstanding labor leaders, has been appointed director of the state department of industrial relations and chairman of the industrial accident commission by Governor Earl Warren.

By reason of his long experience and high standing in the State generally, Scharrenberg is well equipped for this particular niche in the Governor's cabinet.

For many years he was the secretary-treasurer of the State Federation of Labor, a post he left in 1935 to become the Washington legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor.

His active interest in public affairs goes back to the time when he joined in the movement to elect Hiram W. Johnson as Governor and was an influential figure in the group known as the Johnson Progressives, which redeemed the State from political domination by the Southern Pacific.

He also was an early member of the State immigration and housing commission, established during the Johnson administration to obtain better housing for casual workers.

During his long public service he has accomplished much for the welfare of labor in California. For one thing, he had a great deal to do with the adoption of the progressive labor laws which have made the State a leader in social legislation.

A progressive in politics, he has at the same time established a record of wise and sound approach to labor issues and problems.

His choice for his new work will be widely approved.

It is another excellent appointment by Governor Warren.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) News]

ANOTHER GOOD CHOICE

Governor Warren continues to make good appointments. His selection of Paul Scharrenberg as director of the department of industrial relations will be received with favor throughout the State, we believe.

For 27 years Mr. Scharrenberg was secretary-treasurer of the State federation of labor, a post he left in 1936 to become Washington representative of the International Seamen's Union. He also was editor of the Seamen's Journal, official organ of the sailors' union.

As a labor leader he has been regarded as a conservative, but in politics he was progressive, alining himself with the reform movement of HIRAM JOHNSON and the Lincoln-Roosevelt League of the early 1900's. He was an early member of the State immigration and housing commission after its creation.

Judging by his past performance, he may be expected to be a vigorous and aggressive administrator in the post Governor Warren has assigned him.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Citizen]

PAUL SCHARRENBERG NAMED DIRECTOR OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

The announcement Wednesday of this week from Sacramento that Gov. Earl Warren had appointed Paul Scharrenberg to be director of the California Department of Industrial Relations will be received with considerably more than satisfaction by thousands of Californians. This news will be welcomed by thousands of Paul Scharrenberg's friends in the American Federation of Labor movement in every section of the State for several reasons, among which is that now he will return to the State where he served its people and the labor movement so ably and unselfishly for so many years. They have reason to believe also that it will be as Paul Scharrenberg wants it to be—to be back again in California.

Under the Department of Industrial Relations there are several divisions. One of them is the Division of Industrial Welfare, whose chief is Margarete L. Clark, of this city. While it is believed Governor Warren will replace Mrs. Clark, who was appointed by Governor Olson, the new executive refused to make any comment.

There have been few men in the labor movement in this State who have been or are as well and as favorably known as the former secretary-treasurer of the California State Federation of Labor. While the Bay area was his home for many years and San Francisco was his headquarters, most of the principal industrial centers of the State with reason may claim to be favorites of his because he was so intimately acquainted with their problems, the workers' problems. These friends overlook the fact he knew and knows the problems of labor in every section of the State. They used to see him quite frequently working in their midst to prevent some anti-union ordinance or State bill from being imposed upon them. It was because of this that for a quarter of a century he could be

found any place where the interests of labor were attacked by interests.

His career reads like that of the organized labor movement in this State. From a member of the American Federation of Labor Seamen's Union he became a member of several San Francisco and State of California commissions, and for 25 years secretary-treasurer of the California State Federation of Labor. Certainly, as Governor Warren said when he announced the appointment of the position to which Paul Scharrenberg has been appointed calls for a man of wide and varied experience. It, also as the Governor said, requires a union man because in addition to being director of the Industrial Relations Commission, he will be chairman of the California Industrial Accident Commission, whose head should be a man from union labor. As chairman of the California Industrial Accident Commission, Paul Scharrenberg will be called upon to administer and apply the many phases of the State's industrial-protection program.

He served on the City Planning Commission of the city of San Francisco for several years and from 1913 to 1923 was a member of the California Commission on Immigration and Housing. After World War No. 1 President Woodrow Wilson appointed him a member of the National Industrial Council, and in 1934 he was a member of President Roosevelt's Social Security Commission.

Of course, a better qualified person for director of industrial relations and its varied activities could not be found than the Governor's choice. The new appointee always has been deeply interested in labor laws and particularly those which are designed to protect workers and to improve and safeguard their lives. He has devoted many years at this work in several fields. He has the experience and interest and the wealth of observation obtained by wide travel. And, in addition, he has the confidence and the respect of organized labor without qualification or reservation, and of business and industrial leaders. And, of course, he has the trust of the new Governor.

If Governor Warren continues to appoint men to State positions which have to do with the workers with the same consideration for the purposes for which the positions were created as he has shown in this selection, his administration should set an example for the Nation. The new director has served his city and county with distinction, and for 25 years held the high office as secretary-treasurer of a State federation of labor which had to battle almost continually against great and powerful combinations of interests determined to prevent the advancement of organized labor. His record of achievement in this latter position speaks eloquently of his ability as a leader and an executive.

Since leaving the position with the California State Federation of Labor, Paul Scharrenberg has been legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor in Washington, D. C. During his years in this position he has been assigned to this State and to Los Angeles by President William Green upon several occasions to advise and direct labor in its defense against such measures as the Los Angeles Proposition No. 1, which was defeated a few years ago. He has served the American Federation of Labor movement in other sections of the country under direction of President Green.

Some of his close friends said after learning of the appointment they knew Paul Scharrenberg had a desire to return to this State if he could at the same time continue to be of service to organized labor and the workers and to his State. He has been called back, and even though it will mean a sacrifice in remuneration because of the lower salary, he will be back with the literally thousands of friends and former associates. He will be back with his people, and they will welcome him.

This labor paper rejoices that Paul Scharrenberg is to be back in California. Although he is competent and able to discharge any duty entrusted to him, it still seems that he belongs back here. We say, welcome, Paul, we'll be happy to see you.

It is not known just when he will be able to assume his new duties in Sacramento, but it was indicated it would be just as soon as he could arrange his affairs in Washington.

A Standing Committee on Aviation Should Not Be Established

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my opposition to this Resolution 23 to the House of Representatives, proposing to establish a separate Committee on Aviation. I oppose, Mr. Speaker, this resolution sincerely and with all of the effort at my command. I feel that it would be a great mistake to the future of aviation in this country and throughout the world. It is my honest conviction that such a proposal at this time is most unwise.

As you know, I am one of the new members on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, having gone on the committee at the beginning of this session. As you, my friends, know, this is my second term in Congress and a great many of you know of my continued interest in becoming a member of this great committee. Some, no doubt, will say, Mr. Speaker, that because of my membership on this committee and its having jurisdiction over aviation legislation in this House, that I am opposing this resolution. Some, no doubt, will say that I take my position because it is a personal matter. Let me say to you, my colleagues and friends, that I am human and have personal feelings as does every other Member of this Congress. To be sure, I have a personal interest in opposing this resolution, but I can assure you that my opposition reaches far beyond and above personalities. If I did not believe, Mr. Speaker, that I had far greater reasons than merely personal ones that this resolution should not prevail, I would be man enough and honest enough to myself and to the future of this country to take a different position. Let me give you some of the reasons.

In the first place, the operation of our Government is one of the greatest and biggest businesses in all the world. It is the people's Government and therefore it is everybody's business.

Members of this Congress on both sides of the aisle have complained from the well of this House and have bitterly exclaimed to the high heavens that we are having too many agencies, too many with authority in this Government having overlapping jurisdiction, and that because of this fact it is becoming so terribly congested and inefficient. By the same token, do we not have too many committees in this House with overlapping authority, causing confusion and congestion and delay as well as controversy, making us as a House of Representatives, servants of the people of this great land, more inefficient in the consideration of legislation destined to guide the people of the United States? Too many committees in this House having jurisdiction over the same fundamental problems will inevitably produce harmful results and at the expense of the American people.

Another reason why I am fundamentally opposed to this resolution and why I think it is most unwise is because civil aviation is a form of transportation, just as the waterways, just as the highways, just as the railroads, and I challenge anyone in this House to deny that we should have uniformity in all of our transportation systems; and to fail in having a unified and coordinating transportation program will retard the progress and the development of all forms of transportation, including, my friends, civil and commercial transportation. We have come a long way in the last few years toward unifying the transportation of this country, and if we establish a jurisdiction over aviation it is just as logical that this House should establish a committee with jurisdiction over railroads, another committee with jurisdiction over waterways, another with motor transportation, and so on; and where, I ask you, is there any logical or sound basis in establishing such a precedent and claim it to be to the best interest of the American public?

To be sure we are all interested in the development and the progress of civil and commercial aviation. To be sure we are all interested in post-war aviation. I think it would be a great mistake for any Member of this House to say that they are any more interested, if you please, in the progress and development of aviation than any other of his colleagues. Yes, if we did not look to the future and see the vast possibilities in the development of aviation in this country and throughout the world, we would be derelict in a duty to the people of this country. Therefore, you cannot say and it has not been said that the members of our committee are not aware of the possibilities and the importance of the future of civil aviation. You cannot say that the members of this committee are any less interested in the future of this great industry than would be the members of a standing committee on this one particular form of transportation alone.

Another important reason to me that such a resolution should not prevail is that in my opinion no good reasons have been advanced why such a committee should be established. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and every Member of this House, Why should there be such a committee established? I know there has been a lot of talk. I know there has been much said about the problems and the future of aviation and, in all due regard to those who advocate this resolution, in my opinion there has not been ad-

vanced to this House and to the country, if you please, any basic or fundamental reasons why such a committee should be established.

On the other hand, one of the most basic and fundamental reasons that I can give this House why it should not be is to observe what the present committee, having jurisdiction over the subject, has done for aviation in the past. I say to you, you can judge more what will be done in the future by any committee, if you will look to the history and actions in the past of that committee.

There are many members on our Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, who have been serving on that committee for many, many years. Men who are experienced in all forms of transportation, men who have given study and pioneered, if you please, the aviation of this country. We have the chairman of that committee, whom everyone acknowledges to be one of the finest and ablest men in this Congress. A man, I say to you who did not become interested in aviation yesterday, or last week, or last year, but a man who started his study in the development of aviation 25 years ago, in the Halls of this Congress. A man who prepared the report in 1919 composed of some 60 or 70 pages and presented it to this Congress on the vast possibilities and the future of aviation—a report as I understand, being followed today by the Army and Navy in this great conflict. Yes, the chairman of this committee was one of those who with years of study gave to this country the Air Commerce Act of 1926, and with additional years of study, gave us the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Other members of this committee are Major BULWINKLE on the majority side, VIRGIL CHAPMAN, and on the minority side, your own able Representative Mr. WOLVERTON, Mr. HOLMES, Mr. REECE, and, yes, your own Mr. HINSHAW, and others on the committee, who have given years of study and, I say to you, my friends, who have produced results to the problems of aviation. Yes, it is undenied this committee has functioned well in the past and I say to you again, you can judge the future actions by the past.

Is it then wise to substitute the experience of the men on this committee for an inexperienced committee and, more particularly, at a time when the future of aviation has passed the pioneer days—at a time when we are at war and the world full of flames and at a time when you and I know not what the future of this conflict is going to bring to the peoples of this world? I say to you, it would be a mistake. If ever a time when this important problem needs men who have shown themselves to be true blue—men who have delivered, men who are experienced from years and years of study—it is now.

One of the most desirable features of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is the nonpolitical attitude. I understand, throughout the years, the actions of this committee have been solely toward the interest of this great Nation and politics laid aside. I regret—I sincerely regret, Mr. Speaker—that there are those in this House who have made such an important matter as civil aviation a political issue. I would not impugn the conscientious motives of any person, and the efforts of any personal convictions should be followed, but I say to you if we are going to let our actions in this House, on a serious question and issue as we have here today, be based on a political question or issue, to my mind, it is to be sincerely regretted.

Many of the aviation industries in this Nation have expressed their opposition. Many people and organizations who know something about the problems of aviation have expressed opposition to this resolution. The Airline Mechanics' Association and the Airline Pilots' Association have also expressed themselves that this resolution should not prevail. In the February 15, 1943, issue of American Aviation, the independent voice of American aeronautics, it has this to say:

> In all the discussions on the floor, the only clear-cut speeches made were by the opposition. The proponents seem clear on only one thing, and that was the need for the standing committee, but they fail to give reasons. Several years ago in these columns, we advocated a standing committee on civil aviation. Today, we aren't as anxious to express an opinion as we are to point out the changing tides of aviation. There is much to be said of a special committee to handle aviation problems, but the time may have passed for this. Some of those who are working behind the scenes for such a committee never lifted a finger when the committee was badly needed a few years ago. Those who struggled through the hard and lean years of the late 1930's are now willing to let existing committees continue to carry the ball, especially Mr. LEA'S committee, which now handles civil aviation. As far as the air transport industry is concerned, Mr. LEA'S committee seems to be eminently satisfactory for the majority. * * * We needed a committee 5 years ago. We're not so sure we need one now at least not until we hear some sound reasons expressed in the House.

Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, President of the Air Transport Association of America, stated before the committee a few days ago:

> The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which resulted from this committee's deliberations over a period of 2 years, was without question, a farsighted piece of legislation. As a matter of fact, the industry in 1938 was practically broke. Some companies would have failed in just a few months, had you not so timely passed the bill as you did. Today the industry's foundation is much more secure. Before the bill went through, our industry could hardly borrow a nickel from anyone. But since then, the bankers have begun to lend generously and what is very important, one of the first loans we obtained was from the insurance fraternity. The great contributions which the industry has been able to make and is making to our Nation at war are an enduring memorial to your leadership.

What sounder reasons could be advanced in opposition to the resolution?

Let me give you, the Members of this House, and to the American people, a story related by Colonel Gorrell of a fact accomplished only through the wisdom and actions of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, by giving to this House the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Colonel Gorrell said:

> On the Sunday following Pearl Harbor I had a telephone call from the War Department. I hopped into a cab and reached the War Department in a few minutes. The War Department said it wanted certain troops flown to a certain place abroad, a distance of many thousands of miles, without the enemy finding out about it. We were supposed to fly to three points, all of which were vital. In less than 5 minutes after the request was given to us, by lifting the telephone and calling the proper places in our system, our airplanes that we wanted to use were notified during flight and by radio to land. Those airplanes landed at the proper place and discharged their passengers and cargo. We had them at the point of assembly of the troops before the troops had packed their equipment and were ready to go. We flew the troops on those planes nonstop to the borders of our country—so that the enemy spies could not find out where they were going—and then on to their destination. It took less than 5 minutes to select the planes and to order those planes to land. Plans for all such movements had been prepared during peace and were ready. In general, the thing clicked. The plans formulated in 1936 and 1937 moved along without a hitch. I doubt very much if the enemy knows where those troops are today, and I think the enemy will be surprised when he comes in contact with them, if he does.

I do not believe that this House in the light of all sound and basic reasoning, in the light of facts that are not contradicted, in the light of a challenge to produce some sound reasoning that such a committee should be established, and yet no basic or sound reasons given, in the light of experienced men, who have given broad policies, which have developed our aviation industry, yes, my friends, I do not believe in the light of all these facts that this House can afford to let a resolution as offered here today prevail. I urge, my friends and colleagues, that for the future of aviation, that for the development and continued progress of aviation, and in the interest of our boys fighting in the far-flung theaters of war throughout the world, and in the interest of the people of the United States and of the world, that on this resolution you vote "no."

Proposed Aviation Legislation, H. R. 1012

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from David L. Behncke, president, Air Line Pilots' Association.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 28, 1943.*

HARVE TIBBOTT:

House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

The pilots that man our country's air liners domestically, hemispherically, and globally are against Resolution No. 23. They have every confidence in the fitness, willingness, and ability of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to continue to deal successfully with the legislative problems of civil aviation and air transportation, both foreign and domestic, fully as well in the future as they have in the past to keep our

country's civil flying in the forefront of world aviation. I respectfully invite your attention to a letter mailed you Saturday, February 27, which discusses this very important subject more in detail. The pilots, all of them, will be most deeply appreciative for your help to defeat Resolution No. 23 in the best interest of the industry, the public, and the working people in the industry.

DAVID L. BEHNCKE,
President, Air Line Pilots' Association.

Newsprint Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to protest against the order restricting the use of newsprint paper in this country. The effects of this order are called to our attention in a most forcible manner by the following editorials appearing in Colorado newspapers.

I think the least we can do for our boys in training camps is to make daily newspapers available. Because of this order the boys in camps adjacent to Colorado Springs will be denied this opportunity as is explained in the editorial from the Colorado Springs Gazette:

NEWSPRINT AND THESE PAPERS

You got a six-page paper on Saturday afternoon, and you are getting a six-page paper this morning, and that is the work of Washington. We don't like to publish a paper such as this, and we would never do it on our own initiative. The initiative is passing to Government. We don't like, either, to yield a part of our editorial page to other use, as we are preparing to do. We prefer to provide as much interpretative and background material as possible to balance the news ration. We will continue to do so within the limitations imposed, though you may find it in unaccustomed places.

The limitations take the form of restrictions on newsprint. There is no shortage of newsprint, and the Canadian industry, which supplies 80 percent of the United States market, is showing concern over loss of business it readily can handle. That is the work of governments. Ottawa doesn't say anything, but Washington attributes it mainly to lack of transportation. There is transportation in first-class mail cars for tens of thousands of tons of paper carrying press releases and illustrated matter that unnumbered Government agencies urgently request the newspapers to print. The paper shortage doesn't run to Government or Government's demand for newspaper space. Were that met, this would become strictly the Government Gazette.

If there is need for conservation in wartime—and there is and in all things—it is a need imposed upon all alike. It runs to government as well as to business and the individual. Government has sacrificed nothing, and with respect to the matter under discussion, it has not even imposed newsprint restrictions equably. We are operating under one of those strange formulas peculiar to Washington. A publisher who uses less than 25 tons of newsprint a quarter is automatically exempt, whether he publishes a newspaper or a glorified handbill. He is asked for no contribution to the war effort. Publishers using large quantities are limited to 100 percent of the newsprint used for net paid circulation in the comparable quarter of 1941, plus a percentage for waste. If a paper has had no increase in circulation or business in 2 years it is called upon to make no paper savings but rather can, and probably does, have more paper now than it actually needs. We have such instances nearby.

Government, thus, is not asking everybody to reduce paper consumption by a fixed percent, but expects to make its full savings at the expense of the papers which have grown in the last 2 years. Under this formula, The Gazette and The Telegraph become prize goats. Our circulation is up 50 percent. We are expected to use no more newsprint than was required to produce a third fewer copies in 1941. Provision is made for appeal in cases of undue hardship but the appeal failed to provide relief. We were granted half relief, like the farmer given gasoline to haul his produce to market but none to get back home on.

We are faced with two courses—to reduce the size of our papers or to cut off circulation. In an effort to comply with the order, we have reduced the size of our papers by as much, perhaps as 20 percent. There is a point beyond which we cannot carry that process and still produce a newspaper or be left with the means to do so. We are at that point. The alternative, then, is to cut off circulation, but our increased circulation is, for the most part, attributable to military developments here. The bulk of it goes into Camp Carson and Peterson Field. The Army looks upon the newspaper as a morale builder. It wants men to read and be informed. It doesn't want to lose daily newspaper service. Government doesn't want to give us enough newsprint to provide that service.

That is the problem handed us. We are conserving newsprint now to the utmost of our ability and we will continue to do so whether other now practically exempted users are required to do so or not. We will continue to publish the best papers we know how to publish and to provide the services our readers have come to expect of us over a long period of years. Forced to a choice we will continue to publish those papers for the people of Colorado Springs. It will be a matter of deep regret if we cannot continue to serve the Army or the numerous war agencies which have come to us, but the decision is not ours. It rests in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Pueblo Star-Journal refers to the shortage of newspapers at Colorado Springs, and cites the wasteful methods now being employed by our Government. It is time for Congress to call a halt to such extravagance.

GOVERNMENT EXTRAVAGANCE, A NATIONAL DISGRACE TO ANY COUNTRY ENGAGED IN WAR

The Federal Government is cuttng down on the supply of newsprint paper for all daily papers; and believe us, none of them are wasting a single pound of it. They can't afford to under present price and supply conditions.

The Star-Journal and Chieftain were shown a bundle of posters, size about 8 feet by 12 feet, printed in colors on one side only, of course, received by a merchant in Pueblo and which were sent by air express at a cost of $84. These posters if used at all would be good any time before March 1. They were received 10 days before that date.

Again we gasp at a story told us by the head of a government agency in Pueblo. The man said he frequently receives circulars and posters, usable within any reasonable time, which must wait until a Saturday when they can be put out by patriotic Boy Scouts free. But, get this, one recent lot which came by air express cost $280 and had to wait until Boy Scouts could deliver them free. All air express charges are prepaid, otherwise shipments would not be accepted for the reason that the consignee has no funds with which to pay shipping or distribution charges.

And then get this one. In Colorado Springs the Government has placed about 40,000 men in Camp Carson and at Peterson Air Field. These men want newspapers. They want the Colorado Springs Gazette published in the morning and they want the Colorado Springs Telegraph published in the evening.

But can they get them? They cannot. The publishers of the Gazette and Telegraph feel that their first duty is to their regular and permanent subscribers. The circulation of these two papers has increased about 50 percent. The Government has cut the supply of newsprint paper 10 percent under the quantity of paper used in the first quarter of 1941.

What is the result? For the first time in 50 years these two newspapers have had to reduce some of their daily issues to six pages in order to supply even their normal increase in circulation in their city population. (Seems to us we have heard of the same thing taking place in Italy.) Circulation in the two Government camps has been practically eliminated.

The Government, however, expects the Gazette and Telegraph to continue to donate thousands of dollars in space in printing information about scores of Government activities, which the Government wants the people to have, about 90 percent of which has already been covered by the three major press associations.

This also shows how the Government wastes white paper, employees' salaries, cost of printing and mailing and other incidentals, and still the chair warmers 'n Washington continue to issue directives, propaganda, questionnaires, etc., by the trainload.

The Colorado Springs situation is no doubt only one of many others where the Government has sent many thousands of men for training purposes, which is all right. But, what the publishers of the Gazette and Telegraph are complaining about, and with which we agree 100 percent, is the inconsistency of the whole program. While the Government is demanding that every individual not only buy bonds and stamps, but also agree to economize and cut their normal food supply 50 percent, the Government itself spends money like the proverbial prodigal son, and then expects everybody to take it under the blanket of patriotism.

We're all patriotic to the limit, but we respectfully submit that the Government itself should first set an example for economy which it is demanding everybody else should practice.

Hospitalization for World War No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, the passage of H. R. 1749 by the House and similar action by the body at the other end of the Capitol and its approval by the President are needed to meet a bad situation, under which many boys now leaving the Army and Navy with honorable discharges are denied needed hospitalization. The situation was discussed at

some length in the hearings of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices, when General Hines, Director of the Veterans' Administration, was before us. Under permission granted by the House, I place excerpts from those hearings in the RECORD at this point:

General HINES. Now, there is a type of patient that has caused considerable difficulty, probably to the Congressmen of various districts, and that is brought about by the neuropsychiatric cases who have gone in, but somehow have been missed, for the fact that they have been generally mentally disabled, not due to service and have been discharged, and their parents notified, or even maybe a relative notified that the man was going to be discharged.

Mr. CASE. I have three cases that have come to my attention recently, General, of that type; one was tubercular.

General HINES. They are very distressing cases and it is something that will have to be worked out. And I am satisfied that it will probably require starting earlier in providing hospitalization than we may have hoped to have started, with the neuropsychiatric nonservice group, for this reason:

You notify a mother and a father, say, that their boy is going to be discharged and tell them to take this boy when he gets out and put him in an institution, when they may feel that he was perfectly all right when he went into the service or possibly they did not realize that he was a mental case of some kind.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And you can assume that if he had remained in civil life he would not have suffered the ailment for a good many years but the mere taking into the Army services might have had a bad effect and cause the condition to come on that may never have arisen for years and years.

General HINES. Yes. And you can take many strong men and put them through the rather intensive training, it does cause some of them to break, if they are of a nervous temperament, their nervous system may have been overtaxed.

Mr. WOODRUM. That would almost be in line of duty.

General HINES. Yes; and it should be. We have found in some instances even though the services have discharged these men as having a disability not incurred in line of duty, we have found them in line of duty because we take into account the points that the Congressman has just made, the change of environment.

A Member of Congress recently called my attention to the case of a man who worked in a plant up in New York State, who had been working along there for 5 years, at least steadily and got along perfectly all right. He was drafted and within a very short time broke down. The Army had not discharged this man from the hospital; they did a good job; they kept him in the hospital. But they had notified his parents that this man should be taken out and should be treated in a State institution.

Mr. CASE. One of the cases I have in mind is of a man who had been in the service for 14 months and they discharged him and said it was because of disability he had before he came into the service and they notified his parents that they were shipping him home, that it was their responsibility; and the parents were not in financial condition to take care of him.

General HINES. We have pursuaded them not to do that any more and they are not sending the boys home, and we get these cases before they are discharged.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now, General, take the second type of case. I have three types in mind. The second type of case, in my judgment, would be a border-line case, where there has been a boy inducted, and may be drilled for only 2 weeks and he developed an aggravated heart condition. Then he is kept in the hospital for 6 or 7 months and finally they discharge him. Now, cannot they well say it is an aggravation due to the military service, and are you authorized to take that kind of case?

General HINES. No; we are not authorized to hospitalize that type of case unless we make a finding that the disability was in line of duty. And I believe, in handling these cases, we have been a little more liberal than the Army or the Navy in their determinations.

Mr. CASE. We passed a bill in the House, as I recall, to take case of those cases?

General HINES. That is right.

Mr. CASE. And it went over to the Senate. I introduced one bill along that line and I think Mr. RANKIN introduced one, and the Veterans' Administration report said that would be taking those cases earlier than they took them after World War No. 1. I always felt they overlooked the fact that after World War No. 1 we already had the national soldiers homes, and that cases with an honorable discharge, could go into the national homes.

General HINES. Following World War No. 1 we did start to take case of the cases we are talking about earlier than the general run of cases, and it will be my position, if I can get the Budget and the President to agree with me in reporting on the same bill, to modify that to the extent of taking in, as they did before neuropsychiatric and tubercular cases, where the State institutions are not prepared to take those men. The State institutions are generally crowded now.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1749 not only makes these cases of so-called pre-service origin eligible for hospitalization but takes care of the WAAC's also, as it should. When the Army or the Navy accepts a man or woman for service in the armed services, the burden of proof should be on the Government to show that disability later on was not service connected. Certainly the veteran is entitled to feel that it was brought on or aggravated by service. The national homes offered this hospitalization to the soldier in World War No. 1, and the boys and girls who serve today deserve equal consideration.

Louis Bromfield Writes on the Grimness of the Food Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter from Louis Bromfield, one of the best known writers in America and an actual dirt farmer, who charges ineptitude on the part of the administration in handling the entire food situation in the United States. I was much impressed by Mr. Bromfield's letter to the New York Times, as a clear, realistic statement of the farm problem, and believe it should be read by every Member of Congress.

The statement follows:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It seems to me that the time has come for some one to state a few plain facts about the grimness of the food situation in the United States. The following things are perfectly apparent:

1. That the situation is far more grave than the public has been allowed to know.

2. That the Secretary of Agriculture, who was given charge of the food problem, has proved himself incompetent, that he has taken no effective measures whatever, although the gravity of the situation should have been apparent to one in his position long before Pearl Harbor. He is offering no effective plan even at this late date, but only absurdities such as $100,000,000 subsidies and dream armies of 3,000,000 volunteer ignorant and untrained women and children workers.

3. That nothing whatever has been done to help the farmer in solving the three obstacles which prevent him, despite all the patriotism and good-will in the world, from achieving maximum production. These are in order: skilled labor, machinery, fertilizer, and semiskilled labor. High wages in industry have drained away the unskilled labor. The Army continues to draft the precious and irreplaceable skilled labor, needed if any food at all is to be produced beyond the farmer's immediate needs. Not only is there nothing done to help the acute labor problem, the inroads of the Army on skilled labor are making conditions worse every day. Machinery, regardless of Department of Agriculture figures, is impossible to obtain. Even to get a spare nut or bolt it is necessary for a farmer to spend long hours of his precious time filling out forms, traveling miles on precious rubber and then waiting weeks before the nut or bolt is obtainable.

FERTILIZERS HARD TO GET

No nitrogen fertilizer is available, and other fertilizers become more and more difficult to obtain.

No farmer wants any part of Mr. Wickard's absurd $100,000,000 subsidy. What he wants is the labor machinery and fertilizer to get his job done and produce honestly as much as possible. Certainly no taxpayer wants another $100,000,000 item carelessly tossed into the already fantastic expenditures of a hopelessly muddled campaign along the whole of the home front.

As to the dream army of 3,000,000 unskilled workers, they can only be of any practical use in areas where there are flash crops of fruit and vegetables. Even here such an army is not too valuable and is certain to be the cause of 10 to 20 percent loss or damage of crops. To the dairymen, the poultrymen, the livestock raisers, to the farm equipped with expensive machinery, temporary volunteer labor is of no value whatever. What is needed and vitally necessary is skilled, experienced labor 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Without it, hatcheries must curtail production or close, poultrymen and dairymen must cut production or go out of business. Many thousands all over the country have already done so. The talk of increased production is nonsense, and it is criminal to go on deceiving the people of the Nation with the idea that more food will be produced next year.

DETAILED INFORMATION LACKING

The only figures on the situation come from the Secretary of Agriculture, recently promoted (Heaven knows why) to the post of "Food Czar," or in hand-outs by press agents from his office or in interviews to newspapermen who do not and cannot understand the fundamentals of food production problems. There are, of course, the periodical speeches of the Secretary of Agriculture telling the people of the United States that they must learn to do without, and the farmer, already working 16 hours a day under great handicaps, that he must work harder and put his women and children into the fields. No figures are given out concerning the hundreds of thousands of acres of potatoes, corn, and soy beans that are still unharvested in the field because there is no labor. Nor are any

figures given concerning the soy beans that cannot be marketed because when the Secretary of Agriculture urged farmers last year to plant more soy beans he overlooked the fact that there is a limit to the capacity of soybean processing plants.

Farmers must work and plan anywhere from 6 months to a year ahead. One cannot suddenly increase production in the middle of the year. On the food production front we lost the year 1942 and now we have lost the year 1943 because no practical sensible plan has been offered but only mountains of questionnaires, the drafting of skilled farm labor, and a shortage of machinery. In making plans ahead a farmer must lay out anywhere from $200 upward into the thousands, according to the size of the food-producing unit he operates. It is insane to expect a farmer with unharvested crops still in the field to lay out large sums of money to begin again in the midst of winter. Nobody has given the farmer the least hint of assurance that he will have labor or machinery or fertilizer for next year's crop.

It is no wonder then that one hears, as I have heard, good, honest, patriotic farmers say, "I and my family are all right. We will eat. When the city people haven't enough to eat maybe Washington will do something about the situation." He is at the end of his tether. And, my friends in the city, you are going to go without enough to eat—certainly you are going to go without butter and eggs and cream and meat because your Government in Washington has done nothing to help solve farm-production problems. At the very moment I am writing, farmers' sons and young farmers, authentic, vital skilled labor, are being drafted into an Army already too big to be fed except at the expense of civilians on the home front.

That is the immediate picture, but its effects are much more far-reaching. They touch the future of the Democratic Party, the future of liberalism and the future of the world. At this very moment another big commission is being set up under the able direction of ex-Governor Lehman, of New York. Its purpose is to feed the people of the liberated countries. The question is, "With what?" We are not even feeding ourselves and our own armies. "Food will win the war and dictate the peace," Mr. Wickard keeps repeating. Again the question is, What food? Without food all the ships and tanks and planes and soldiers are worthless. And what a job there is before us in a starving world!

PEOPLE NOT AMENDABLE

Certainly no political party and not even this administration can say to the American people, "You must do without so that we can feed starving Europe." Food, I venture to say, is the most important item in the whole war program today, ahead of arms, or soldiers, or planes, or tanks, or what you will. And still nothing is being done and still skilled labor is being drafted from the farm.

It is a curious fact, hitherto unremarked so far as I know, that the whole production program is in the hands of a junta of politicians from Indiana—Paul V. McNutt, Claude Wickard, General Hershey, and Clifford Townsend. Together they add up to an Indiana political machine with prodigious ambitions. I think, however, that we need not worry about their ambitions. If things go along the home front as they are going now there will not be a Democratic farm vote north of the Mason and Dixon line. I doubt if there will be a Democratic Congressman elected from north of that line. The Democratic party will be deader than the Republican party has even been.

The writer of this letter is the proprietor of a 1,100-acre farm in Ohio producing eggs, chickens, hogs, beef, wool, lamb, and dairy products in quantity. He knows farm problems intimately and is in contact with farmers all over the country.

From a Democrat who once believed that the New Deal was a program instead of merely a gigantic improvisation carried on from day to day and week to week at the expense of American citizens.

LOUIS BROMFIELD.

LUCAS, OHIO, *February 5, 1943.*

The Independent Bank Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by W. Emil Placek, a prominent banker of my district, before the Special Senate Committee to Study Problems of Small Business Enterprises:

Gentlemen, many rapid and startling changes are taking place in our economic system—the growth and expansion of chain stores, chain and branch banking—which cause us to wonder just how far this centralized distribution and centralized credit will go. Those of us who believe in individual initiative and free enterprise shudder when we we see this consolidation and centralization taking place before our very eyes. The small businessman and country banker wonder whether this trend will continue, or whether we may hope for a reversal of this policy.

To combat this centralized policy many individuals within the Government and outside the Government believe that the proper method to fight that policy is to have the Government enter into business to protect the consumers and establish various agencies to furnish capital and enter into the loaning or credit field in competition with free enterprise. Small business is, therefore, caught between these two philosophies, and unless some other method can be devised small business and country banking are on their way out. My investment in land and farming enterprise is more than three times greater than my investment in banking, and I should, therefore, know the problem of both. Approximately 12,000 of the 15,000 banks have less than two million deposits; therefore banking, especially country banking, is small business.

In order to give the committee a clearer view of the problems of the country banks, I shall dwell upon the difficulties of my own institution and those of my neighbors. Prior to 1933 our bank made a large number of real-estate loans, which we sold to local investors, charging a commission on such loans. We are not now permitted to make and sell such real-estate loans. We loaned money to farmers, deriving a revenue therefrom, which are now carried by the Production Credit Associations, Farm Security Administration, Emergency Feed and Seed loans, and Commodity Credit Corporation loans. The United States Government bonds which we carried in our portfolio bore interest at 4¼ percent, and we now get less than 2 percent. With numerous governmental agencies actively competing with country banks, just where can we find new additional revenue to make a modest return on our investment. Frankly, I am so confused that I cannot answer that question. Shall we liquidate and leave the community without banking facilities, or shall we carry on at a loss, hoping that things will change for the better? We hope that you gentlemen, with your great wisdom, will find a solution to our problem. In our own bank, during the last 6 months of 1942, on a capital structure of $172,000, we made a net profit of $928, or slightly more than ½ of 1 percent. With deposits of $2,000,000, we have $1,100,000 in cash. All of our loans to all the businessmen and all the farmers in our community amount to $169,500, of which amount less than $75,000 are strictly loans to farmers (copy of our bank statement is attached).

We are told by the Agricultural Department and the Farm Credit Administration that it is necessary to revive the regional Agricultural Credit Corporation so that the farmers may get the necessary credit to raise food for freedom. With prevailing prices for farm commodities, the farmer does not need, nor does he want credit. His main problem is labor and equipment. Regulation "W" precludes us country bankers from obtaining installment loans, because the sale of cars, electrical equipment, and other articles are prohibited and farm machinery is rationed.

Occasionally some individuals within the Government, and outside the Government, make the satement that the Government loaning agencies are necessary because the bankers made such a poor job of it during the years of 1929 to 1933. On behalf of the country bankers, I deny the charge. You gentlemen know what happened when the Federal Reserve banks called their loans in 1928 and 1929. Farm commodity prices took a headlong dive downward, and to make matters worse, the Comptroller of the Currency and 48 State banking examiners demanded that such loans be liquidated or charged out. With corn down to 10 cents per bushel, and hogs at $2 per hundred, it was criminal to ask the farmers to pay up. With orderly liquidation of charged out notes of farmers, our record shows that over 95 percent were paid in full. The record also shows that numerous banks that were thrown into receivership paid the depositors in full. True, there were some banks that did not pay out, but that in many instances was due to the fact that large city banks, in their greed for profits, loaded them up with worthless foreign bonds and bankrupt railroads' and bankrupt utilities' bonds. Whether the subsidized governmental loan agencies are necessary is fully answered by a resolution passed by the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation on June 18, 1942, to wit:

"After an exhaustive study by the committee set up to study the effect upon agriculture of the proposal that the Production Credit Administration be extended to take over the responsibility of the banks to the local community, we recommend that the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation take the stand that the Production Credit Administration be restricted to supplemental agricultural loans on the basis originally set up.

"We find that the Nebraska farmers as a whole are not demanding expansion of activities in production credit association but that Nebraskans desire that local banks be allowed wider discretionary power in granting sound agricultural credit."

A. G. Black, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, in his report for the year 1941 says that in 1940 there were 337 full-time production credit associations field offices, and at the end of 1941 there were 515 full-time production credit association field offices. This is an increase of 53 percent. Just what emergency existed in 1940 requiring this enormous increase? Possibly the resolution introduced by Senator WHERRY calling for an investigation may disclose the reason.

The country bankers are not asking that production credit association be abolished.

All we ask is that the subsidized capital of $120,000,000 be returned to the United States Treasury, and if not returned to the Treasury, that they be compelled to pay interest on the money, the same as banks were compelled to do on the money borrowed from Reconstruction Finance Corporation for preferred stock. Certainly there is nothing unreasonable in that request. The production credit associations should furnish their own capital the same as cooperative creameries and cooperative farm elevators.

During 1942 the banks of Saunders County, Nebr., paid real and personal taxes amounting to $9,708.96; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation assessments of $4,317.28; capital-stock tax of $983.75; or a total of $15,009.99

The production credit association, a subsidized governmental agency operating in this county, paid no taxes, deposit-insurance assessments, nor capital-stock tax. How long can country banks meet that kind of competition?

During 1942, 13 country banks in Nebraska liquidated, all except 1 because of unfair, subsidized governmental competition by the production credit associations and other agencies. When the country banks, in which mostly farmers are stockholders, are liquidated, what is going to happen? Either socialized credit from Washington or branch banking. I assume the American people want neither.

The same situation exists in other States. Read the attached letter from the directors of the Medicine Bow State Bank, Medicine Bow, Wyo., and you will realize what the country banks are up against.

The following news item was carried by the Associated Press:

"MARIONVILLE, MO., December 22.—The presence of Government agencies loaning money to farmers and businessmen is causing the Bank of Marionville to close, bank officials said. They announced that the bank will pay depositors in full.

"Officials said the institution was in excellent financial condition, but, because of lack of loan demands, the board of directors decided to suspend business. The bank was organized 56 years ago and will pay out approximately $300,000 to depositors."

Still another news item carried by the Associated Press:

"ARKANSAS BANK LIQUIDATED—BLAMES UNITED STATES COMPETITION

"STEPHENS, ARK.—The stockholders of the Bank of Stephens here voted to voluntarily liquidated their bank as of February 27, 1943. The directors say that the bank operated at a loss during the year 1942, and they were unable to compete with Government loan agencies. At the close of business December 31, 1942, deposits totaled $389,000, with loans of only $9,000. Capital is $30,000. Stephens will be left without banking facilities."

The Government furnishes the free subsidized capital, and the large city banks furnish the money by purchasing debentures of the Federal intermediate credit banks, who in turn discount the notes of the production credit associations, who are directly in competition with country banks. The strange thing about this vicious circle is the fact that the large city banks use the money on deposit with them by the country banks, and thus furnish the most vicious competition for their customers—the country banks.

If the country banks are to be saved, it is necessary that something be done without delay. The country banks hope that your committee will give prompt consideration to the problems confronting them.

Respectfully submitted.

EMIL PLACEK,
President, Country Bank Division,
Independent Bankers Association.

Quinine Pool by the Druggists of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to the service being rendered by the American Pharmaceutical Association, 2215 Constitution Avenue, Washington, D. C., a national nonprofit, professional body of pharmacists, pharmaceutical educators, law-enforcement officials, research workers, and others interested in the protection of public health and the prevention and treatment of disease.

With the fighting fronts of the war centered in the world's worst malaria-infested areas—North Africa, the Solomon Islands, Burma, India, and China—the Army and the Navy are appealing to the retail pharmacists and hospital pharmacists of the country to contribute their stocks of quinine and other cinchona alkaloids for the use of men in uniform. It is estimated that there is more than 100,000 ounces of these vital antimalarial drugs on the shelves of prescription rooms and dispensaries throughout the country, and the invasion of Java and other islands of the Dutch East Indies by the Japs last February cut off practically the entire supply of these drugs to the United States.

Acting on the appeals of the armed forces, Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, on the recommendation of Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, has appointed the American Pharmaceutical Association the agent of the Government to collect the quinine and other antimalarial drugs which pharmacists contribute, and the association has established a national quinine pool, under the sponsorship of the War Production Board and the Defense Supplies Corporation. The pool has been set up in the association's headquarters, the American Institute of Pharmacy, 2215 Constitution Avenue, this city, and pharmacists from all sections of the country are expected to flood it with quinine.

In a six-page folder being mailed to every retail pharmacist and hospital pharmacist in the United States, the War Production Board calls attention to the fact that stocks of these drugs have been frozen since early last year by a conservation order which prohibits their use except for the treatment of malaria. Since this disease is endemic in but a few States, thousands of ounces of these drugs are tied up on the shelves of prescription rooms and dispensaries, especially in States where there is little or no malaria.

In a letter to Fred J. Stock, Chief of the Drugs and Cosmetics Section, Chemicals Division, of the War Production Board, Brig. Gen. Larry B. McAfee, Acting Surgeon General of the United States Army, states:

The National Research Council, after due consideration of the quinine stocks of the country, has recommended that all such stocks now held by retail druggists throughout the country be pooled under the control of the Defense Supplies Corporation. The Surgeon General has for a long time been aware of this serious situation and heartily recommends such procedure. It is my belief that the druggists of the country will comply and assist the war effort in this manner.

I hope that every pharmacist in the nonmalarial areas of the country who has any quantity of quinine or other cinchona alkaloids on hand in his prescription room or hospital dispensary, no matter how small that quantity may be, will contribute it to the National Quinine Pool for the use of the armed forces. It is not often that an individual in civilian life has the opportunity to make such a vital contribution to the prosecution of the war; to give something that money can't buy; and to place in the hands of the Army and Navy a substance of great strategic value.

Rear Admiral Ross T McIntire, Surgeon General of the United States Navy, in a letter to the American Pharmaceutical Association, states:

I am addressing this letter to you with the request that you place it before the pharmacists of the Nation. It is, frankly, an appeal for help to meet the needs of the armed services for quinine to be used in combatting malaria.

Right now our forces are meeting the enemy in parts of the world where malaria is very prevalent: Guadalcanal, New Guinea, China, India, Burma, and North Africa. Future operations against the enemy will most certainly require our men to fight in malarious regions in which it will be necessary to supply them with antimalarial drugs in order to maintain their fighting efficiency.

In anticipation of the need for antimalarial drugs, the Government established a large stock pile of quinine in pre-Pearl Harbor days and has encouraged a great increase in production of atabrine. Although atabrine is a very valuable antimalarial drug, there are many individuals in whom quinine is still the drug of choice and in certain cases it is life-saving and cannot be replaced by synthetic drugs. Our medical officers are using the synthetic antimalarial drugs whenever it is possible to do so, but the need for more quinine is becoming increasingly urgent as the number of men fighting in malarious regions increases and the stock pile dwindles.

Consequently, the armed services must have every ounce, every gram of quinine procurable and we are asking the pharmacists of the Nation to help our fighting men by donating their stocks of quinine and other cinchona alkaloids to the Government. Each donation of quinine will be a direct contribution to the winning of the war.

The mission of the Medical Department of the Navy is "to keep as many men at as many guns as many days as possible." Will you help us in carrying out our mission?

CERTIFICATE FOR PHARMACISTS

Pharmacists who contribute their quinine to the national quinine pool will receive a V-certificate in acknowledgment. The certificate bears the statement:

We have contributed our stocks of quinine and related cinchona derivatives to the national quinine pool to be used to combat malaria among the armed forces fighting the Axis enemy in tropical areas.

Commenting upon the project, Dr. E. F. Kelly, secretary of the American Pharmaceutical Association, said:

The association welcomes this opportunity to pool its staff and facilities with those of the war agencies of the Government and has tackled this, one of the greatest projects ever undertaken by organized pharmacy in the United States.

Every agency of the profession of pharmacy is placing the full weight of its efforts behind this quinine drive. State pharmaceutical associations are canvassing their members and utilizing their State journals and bulletin services in an effort to develop as near 100 percent participation as possible. State boards of pharmacy have enlisted their inspectors in the drive and on their calls on pharmacists they are urging the prompt shipment of contributions. The schools and colleges of pharmacy of the country are asking their students to make personal calls on pharmacists in their neighborhood in behalf of the drive and they are also aiding in the task of collecting stocks from State, county, and local health and welfare institutions. The hospital pharmacists of the country are playing a real part in the project and the pharmaceutical journals are lending their unstinted editorial support to the drive. The representatives of manufacturers' and wholesalers' organizations are lending their support. The profession of pharmacy seeks to double the amount of quinine which the Government thinks can be obtained from the pharmacies and dispensaries of the country. We know the quinine is there and we are sure that pharmacists are going to flood the Nation's Capital with it.

The Late Gen. Carey F. Spence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Gen. Carey F. Spence on Sunday afternoon, February 21, Knoxville, and the State of Tennessee suffered an irreparable loss. He was one of Tennesee's most distinguished men, and throughout his long and useful life filled a large place in the life of Knoxville, where he was born and resided until his death.

He was the son of Dr. John F. Spence, a distinguished Methodist minister, a native of Ohio, and a Federal soldier, who came to Tennessee at the close of the Civil War and married one of the daughters of William C. Carey, a leading citizen of Campbell County, Tenn., and a man who played a large part in the public affairs of that county before, during, and after the Civil War. The town of Careyville, built on the "free soil," the farm and home of William C. Carey, derives its name from the maternal grandfather of General Spence. Dr. John F. Spence was chancelor of Grant University at Athens, Tenn., and afterward founded and was chancelor of the American Temperance University of Harriman.

As a boy and young man, General Spence attained national reputation as an athlete, and as a runner was a member of the first United States Olympic team. He was halfback on the University of Tennessee football team, and organized and played on the old Knoxville Reds baseball team.

He loved outdoor life, was a fine wing shot, owned many fine bird dogs, and was one of Knoxville's most constant fishermen, a sport he was engaged in when he died.

As a soldier, he wrote his name high on the Volunteer State's roll of fame. He came up from the ranks and was a self-made soldier.

On the declaration of War with Spain he volunteered, and was made a first lieutenant and regimental adjutant of the Sixth United States Volunteer Infantry. He was promoted to captain while in Puerto Rico. After the war he became colonel of the Third Tennessee National Guard Regiment. While in command of this organization he, with his regiment, was ordered to the Mexican border in 1916, where he served a year.

When the Third Tennessee was taken into Federal service in 1917, it was designated the One-hundred Seventeenth Infantry and became a part of the Thirtieth Division.

As colonel of this regiment, he trained it both in this country and in France and in Belgium. The One-hundred Seventeenth participated in the drive that broke the Hindenberg line and hastened the end of the war. General Spence was given a special citation by General Pershing and was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal. He was appointed brigadier general by President Harding and assigned to the Eighty-First Division headquarters.

He was public spirited and gave generously of his time and money in the upbuilding of Knoxville and east Tennessee. He sponsored the monument in front of Knoxville High School commemorating the dead of the One-hundred Seventeenth. He was a former city councilman for more than a decade, had served as vice mayor, safety director, postmaster, and president of the old board of commerce. He was a member of Rotary, American Legion, Spanish-American War Veterans, Elks, Loyal Legions, Sons of the Revolution, and numerous other organizations.

General Spence was in his second term as a trustee of the University of Tennessee, was vice chairman of the State defense commission. As a trustee of the university, he made a large contribution to its growth and upbuilding.

He was a member of the Second Presbyterian Church.

General Spence was devoted to his soldier boys. In him they knew they had a never-failing friend.

When I first came to Knoxville to practice law, an employee of the general who had served in France came to me and disclosed that he was in default to his employer in the sum of $1,200. A bonding company was his surety. I told him that there was but one man in the world who could save him from prosecution at the hands of the bonding company if it had to pay his shortage, and that was General Spence. I talked to the general about the matter and, without any hesitation, he said to me:

This boy served overseas and saw service in battle. I know what that sometimes does to a man. I am going to let him work on until he can get another job, and I will treat his defalcation as my loss and never collect it from the company.

And this he did, and this is just one incident of his loyalty, devotion, and generosity in always looking after his war comrades.

General Spence is survived by his widow, the former Miss Hannah Crook, of Baltimore, to whom he was married in 1900; one son, Shirley Carey Spence, of Louisville, Tenn., and one daughter, Mrs. Eleanor Spence Thomas.

His was a busy, useful, inspiring life, and Knoxville is a better city for his having lived and labored in it. He was full of years and full of honors and is among that "immortal few who were not born to die."

Transportation of Mail by Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, no agency of the Federal Government is closer to the personal and home life of our people than is the Postal Service. It is particularly gratifying, therefore, that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has wisely written into the first section of H. R. 1012, recently reported, a provision that the Postmaster General and the Civil Aeronautics Board shall investigate and report to the Congress concerning the feasibility and advantages of transporting all classes of mail by air wherever it will speed delivery.

Some may question the advisability of a policy of carrying all mail by air, but certainly there can be no sound opposition to investigating the feasibility and advantages of such a procedure and reporting thereon to the Congress.

Every postal administration from the time of the first Postmaster General, Benjamin Franklin, down to and including the present, has recognized the psychological importance, the economic value and the increased well-being that accrues to American citizens as a whole through the use of the most rapid means of transporting and delivering mail.

In early days when the stage coach was too slow, mail was carried over long distances on horse-back. The Pony Express, starting from Missouri and ending at the Pacific Coast, is the classic example. A journey that took 8 to 10 weeks by stage coach was cut to 21 days. With the development of rail and steamboat transportation, and notwithstanding the increased cost to the Government, all mail was almost immediately transferred to this faster mode of conveyance in accordance with a definite policy to speed up delivery.

Within a very short time after the Wright brothers flew their first airplane at Kitty Hawk, N. C., the Post Office Department was busy conducting experiments in the transportation of mail by this twentieth century means of conveyance. It continued these experiments throughout the period of the First World War. Finally, when an appropriation of only $100,000 was granted in 1918, the Department, in cooperation with the Army, took the initiative, and on May 15 of that year the first regular air-mail route was established between New York and Washington.

Notwithstanding the surcharge for mail sent by air, the phenomenal annual increase in the use of domestic air-mail facilities eloquently testifies to its many advantages. From 16,009 revenue-miles flown in 1918, they increased to 2,805,781 miles in 1927 and 39,958,771 miles in 1937. In the 5 years following, the use of air-mail facilities continued to grow in increasing amounts until in the year 1942, 89,410,021 revenue-miles were flown. Our foreign air-mail service has grown even more sharply, relatively speaking.

With the tremendous aeronautical technological advances which have already been made since we entered the war, it is possible to construct great cargo planes far beyond the expectancy of a year ago. With the further technological advances in manufacturing methods, these planes will be produced by mass production methods far more economically than heretofore. In any case, the historical policy of the Postal Service from its inception should be maintained—the policy of using the fastest means possible to transport the mails.

Under our democratic system, government exists for the people. No other single factor of government so welds together the different sections of our vast Nation as does the Postal Service. The speedier the delivery of mail, the stronger is that welding process. The Postal Service has played an important part in unifying this great Nation. Let us take steps now to further cement that union by strengthening the tie that binds and investigate the possibilities of using the finest air system in the world—the American air transport system—for the transportation of all mail of all classes wherever delivery would be speeded.

Ship Production Imperiled by Attitude of National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD and to me, from Mr. Charles J. MacGowan, vice president, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Iron Shipbuilders and Helpers of America, American Federation of Labor, and Mr. W. A. Calvin, vice president, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Iron Shipbuilders and Helpers of America, American Federation of Labor, in which these gentlemen have described the prejudicial attitude of the National Labor Relations Board against the organizations comprising the American Federation of Labor, and the effect of such attitude on the industrial peace and harmony so absolutely necessary to our successful prosecution of the war.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 24, 1943.*

Hon. JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
United States Senate.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
House of Representatives.

GENTLEMEN: The purpose of this communication is to direct your attention to certain deplorable conditions which, if permitted to continue uncurbed and unchecked, may result disastrously in the affairs of this Nation and our war effort.

It is an accepted fact that the success of our combat forces and those of the united Allied nations may be measured by our ability to construct naval and cargo vessels to police ocean shipping lanes from the Arctic to the South Pacific Oceans, thereby guaranteeing an unrestricted continuous flow of the implements of war and troop reinforcements to the armies of the United Nations, which are now engaged in a life and death struggle for the preservation and perpetuation of the principles of democracy, decency, and Christianity. The shipbuilding organizations of the American Federation of Labor have responded wholeheartedly to the construction demands which have necessarily been made upon the American shipbuilding industry. This is clearly indicated by the attainment of the unprecedented record of the completion of 8,000,000 tons of new ships during the year 1942.

While the above-mentioned construction record is without precedent or parallel, our program for the shipbuilding industry in 1943 is 15,000,000 tons of new ship construction, and obviously if we are to successfully meet this inescapable obligation to our Nation, we must have industrial tranquility, coordination, and team work.

Unfortunately, the possibility of the attainment of industrial accord is now menaced by the substitution of industrial dissension and dislocation. This threat is entirely attributable to the apparent prejudicial attitude of the National Labor Relations Board against the organizations comprising the American Federation of Labor.

On the Pacific coast where ship construction was abandoned shortly after the conclusion of World War No. 1 and only a nucleus personnel retained in privately owned and operated shipyards for repair service, the American Federation of Labor organizations maintained their agreements with shipyard operators, and when confronted with the necessity of constructing ships under the provision of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and subsequently upon the demands of a nation involved in war, these organizations were in a position to safeguard the shipbuilding industry on the Pacific coast against possible interruptions to the continuity of operations because of the agreements which guaranteed the employer against stoppages of work because of industrial disputes and because of the provisions of the agreements denying employment to agitators, saboteurs, and other undesirables, whose purpose it is to disrupt and dislocate harmonious industrial operations.

In the interest of uniformity of wage and working conditions in the shipbuilding industry which would have the salutary effect of discouraging migration on the part of workers from one yard to another, because of the inducement of higher wage rates, the American Federation of Labor shipyard organizations on the North Pacific coast actually reduced their wage rates in order that the shipbuilding zone standards established by the shipbuilding stabilization committee for the Pacific coast zone might become a reality.

It was doubtful whether or not the rank and file of our membership would ratify this agreement, because of the sacrifices which they felt called upon to make, but the President of the United States in a public appeal urged both the workers and the shipbuilders to ratify the stabilization agreement.

Further monetary sacrifices were voluntarily made by the A. F. of L. organizations on the Pacific coast in the interest of stabilization through the medium of reducing holiday and overtime compensation from double time to time and a half. The Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee's agreement, which was first negotiated on the Pacific Coast, and which embraces all construction shipyards from the Mexican to the Canadian borders, was used as a model for the establishment of similar stabilization zone agreements on the Atlantic coast, the Gulf coast, and in the Great Lakes area. On the Pacific coast in the shipbuilding industry there was but one composite labor organization recognized as the proper and exclusive bargaining agency for all shipyard employees. That was the American Federation of Labor. However, a recently created labor organization known as the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, an affiliate of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, has recently attempted organizational efforts in all shipyards, not only on the Pacific coast, but in all of the zones coming within the jurisdiction of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee. The customary practice of this dual labor organization is to petition the National Labor Relations Board upon some flimsy charge of discrimination against an employer to invalidate the agreements between the management and the American Federation of Labor, with the thought in mind of substituting in lieu thereof, the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America.

Under the provisions of existing American Federation of Labor agreements with shipyard operators, the shipbuilding industry of the United States during the past year exceeded all previous world records. An example of these phenomenal construction achievements is the launching of a 10,500-ton vessel exactly 4½ days after the laying of the keel.

The National Labor Relations Board is today conducting hearings at Portland, Oreg., to determine whether or not the agreements between the Kaiser Co. and the American Federation of Labor are collusive agreements. Whether or not these agreements should be set aside and the Kaiser Co. ordered by the National Labor Relations Board to operate its plants upon an open-shop basis for an indefinite period of not less than 6 months, during which time the Industrial Union of Marine Shipbuilding Workers of America will be afforded an opportunity of conducting an intensive organizing campaign.

The purpose of this campaign could only be to raid the membership of the American Federation of Labor organizations, and the result of such a campaign will constitute nothing less than industrial disaster.

Obviously, if the Congress of Industrial Organizations affiliate is sustained in the Kaiser yards by the National Labor Relations Board and an organizational campaign is initiated, the American Federation of Labor

will be compelled to conduct a counter-campaign, and with industrial warfare prevailing in any industry, production schedules are bound to suffer.

While this communication elaborates upon the developments in the Kaiser shipyards on the Pacific coast, similar charges have been filed by the Congress of Industrial Organizations against shipyard operators in Portland, Maine, Savannah and Brunswick, Ga., Providence, R. I., Jacksonville, Tampa, and Panama City, Fla., New Orleans, La., Evansville, Ind., Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay area in California. Therefore, this Nation is confronted with the fact that an agency of the Government, the National Labor Relations Board, is actively contributing to the efforts of dual labor organization and their communistic allies to disrupt and destroy harmonious industrial relations in the transcendently important shipbuilding industry.

This combination of evil forces by their attack upon Democratic American institutions, such as the American Federation of Labor, are unquestionably, knowingly or otherwise, aiding and abetting Adolf Hitler and his world gangster associates in their attempted destruction of world democracy.

The fruits of this policy are already manifesting themselves in a decided drop in production in the Pacific coast yards. We have urged our people not to let this controversy disturb them to the extent that production would be impaired. But regardless of our appeals, the resentment in the minds of our people runs so deeply that when they have met all the contributions above enumerated to the successful shipbuilding program, to which it should be noted that the Navy Department, the United States Maritime Commission and the War Production Board are all secondaries and parties thereto, but to now find another agency of Government undertaking to destroy this contribution to the Nation's security is something that the workers, the business people, and all segments of society on the Pacific Coast simply cannot understand. And it is not idle to assume that instead of ship production being increased to meet the 15,000,000-ton requirement that it may seriously and materially fall below the production of 1942. It is tragic to contemplate such a situation, and we are bringing these matters to the attention of Congress, as we have already exhausted every other avenue available to us.

It is not betraying a confidence to say that every procurement agency in Washington, including Justice Byrnes and Mr. Harry Hopkins, has appealed to the Labor Relations Board to cease and desist and terminate this tragic farce, but so far the Board remains adamant.

As a manifestation of its desire to contribute to the war effort, the American Federation of Labor proposed to the Congress of Industrial Organizations that they mutually agree for the duration of the war to refrain from initiating organizing efforts or campaigns in industries where either the American Federation of Labor or the Congress of Industrial Organizations have already executed agreements with management. This constructive proposal of the American Federation of Labor was flatly and definitely rejected by the Congress of Industrial Organizations' shipbuilding organization.

Trusting that these transcendently important matters will be accorded your careful consideration, we are

Very truly yours,

CHARLES J. MACGOWAN,
Vice President, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Iron Shipbuilders and Helpers of America.

W. A. CALVIN,
Vice President, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Iron Shipbuilders and Helpers of America.

The Just Powers of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Municipal Bond Club of New York on February 26, 1943.

In this epochal struggle between liberty and despotism, it is well for us to realize that liberty is not just a word to window dress a patriotic speech. If you doubt that liberty is a vital, real, and tangible thing, ask yourself, What has a German to live for? What have the French to live for if they have no hope for the return of liberty?

We who have so long taken freedom for granted must not when cataclismic events rush upon us with breathless urgency forget that freedom is a real and solid thing.

Now, when all democracy faces a tragic but vital demand for self-defense, is a good time to consider that democracy is clear in its meaning, understandable in its nature—and above all that it is right.

The world today is divided into two groups of nations; the one where the people control the governments, the other where the governments control the people. The essential, the fundamental difference rests on the fact that nations where liberty lives are dedicated to the proposition that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed.

This crucial struggle between liberty and despotism is a fight for the survival of governments where the people rule. This conflict is a test whether governments conceived in liberty and dedicated to the principle that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed or whether only dictatorial government shall endure.

We would like to think that the people of Italy and of France—if they were free to make a choice—would choose to end both the tyranny and the war. But they cannot choose—the people do not control their governments, but the governments control the people.

That is the difference between the Axis and the democracies—that is the soul of the struggle.

In nations where freedom is and liberty lives, the people rule.

In America, "We the people" are preamble to the very thought of government.

When an American looks into the mirror, he is face to face with his government.

That thought is index to the challenge I bring you.

It is fundamental to a comprehensive understanding and true appreciation of the American system of government that we clearly realize and always remember that in our democracy the source of all authority and the court of last resort is—the people.

We the people are the sovereign power. The will of the people is the supreme law of the land.

The American Government was created by a direct compact entered into by the people themselves. In the ultimate sense the Constitution itself is but fountain head and not the source of power. Rather than a government granting the people a bill of rights the people granted the government a bill of powers, not delegating to government an irrevocable franchise for power, but rather a loan returnable on demand to the grantor—the people.

The fee simple title of ownership of American Government is with the people. The Constitution is a deed of possession and not a bill of sale.

We should not fail to recognize the complete reversal in the theory of government that America gave the world when "We, the people" did hereby establish, etc. This bore the recognition that a sovereign power exists above the power of every bureau and bureaucrat, every department or official, court, or constitution. Above all, the institutions of government, with powers to modify them at pleasure or destroy them at will, is the sovereign—the people.

This puts squarely up to every citizen the necessity to realize the truth that democracy depends on his individual selfless effort and determination.

Democracy doesn't just happen. It is organized, preempted, captured by concentrated common sense, established and maintained by endless endeavor.

Let us say this much to ourselves, not only with our lips, but in our hearts, let us each say, "I myself am a part of American democracy, I myself must accept responsibility, I will constantly, fervently sustain our democracy." This is a program worthy of freemen and in this program is a plan of hope.

In freedom's cause America has opened up a battle front that stretches round the world. Like one continuous chain the soldier and the gun make up one front that circles all the world. In many and different areas, in several and sundry climes the sons of America stand guard against the Axis hordes. In remote islands, on distant shores, in the mountains, in the deserts, in the swamps, Americans are on the march. Some say that MacArthur's men are on one front, that Africa is a second, that China is another, and still a fourth lies all the length of Russia's wintry plains. But in a larger sense these fronts are one. One vast united front against the Germans and the Japs and all their puppet states.

Is there, then, a second front? Yes; there are two fronts. On one we fight to free the nations now enslaved; on the other to keep free nations free.

My brother stands guard on the desert sands. Will you stand guard at home for him?

He related the story of the school boy on his induction day who sat under the apple tree in his back yard with him and reminded him of the parading flags before Europe's royalties reviewing stand, "where our flag blue, red, and white did not dip, but with staff raised high to the smiling sky declared proud independence to all the world. He is dead now, and every American could well kneel at his grave. His hands were raised to hold the flag of freedom in the sky. He is the hero of the world, and where'er he lies the spot like every spot where man has died for men is sacred ground. His every heartbeat was a drumbeat of love of freedom, his every thought was fortification for the domestic way of life."

The lamp of liberty shines out on the battle front in our soldiers' hands, but what of the lamp at home? Is it so of the lamp in our window that through the wars night awaits their return and lights their way home?

I may not say much here, but I hope to say it plainly, bluntly, and boldly.

The most charitable thing that I can say about our achievements on the second front, the home front, is that democracy is in a fast disorganized retreat. While our Military Establishments are building up a record of accomplishment that is all and more than we could expect or hope anticipate, our civilian citizenry is playing harlot to opportunism and parenting the illegitimate offspring of totalitarianism itself.

It was with considered judgment and the voice of truth that I said when an American

looks into the mirror he is face to face with his Government. Let's look into the mirror. A multitude of warts and pimples and ulcers called bureaus and board and czars stand out like festers on a poisoned body.

If you have the intestinal fortitude—we in the West are realistic people; we prefer to call things by their right name, so I prefer to say g-u-t-s—if you have the guts, you will get at the serious job of doing something about all this. First, let's recognize that thousands of businesses have leaned on the Government as on a crutch. This puppet partnership with government is like a dread contagious disease.

We will have to glance quickly at all the skeletons and frame and system if we are to see the picture of our Government of today.

The vast price-control set-up—what is it? Take out dictatorship and nothing but a vacuum remains. The Labor Department: Someone has aptly and correctly said that Ma Perkins is the only woman who has been "In Labor" 8 years and hasn't delivered yet.

What of that billionaire prostitute called the Department of Agriculture? Under the farm program every quota is a bastille, every farmer a prisoner, an extra peanut a crime. What has the bureaucrat done to the farmer?

1. He told him to kill all the hens and keep the rooster.

2. He told him to kill all the pigs and dry up the milch cows.

3. He bribed him to let the land lay out, and the plows rust on their fields.

4. He ordered the sugar beets plowed up, and the corn, and the wheat and the cotton.

On March 9, 1940, speaking to the farmers of the Nation, the then Secretary said: "We do not yet have full agricultural justice * * * " but he hinted it was just around the corner where he was leading us with his program. "The Farm Program," he said, "has met and conquered drought, surplus, and the (Supreme Court's adverse A. A. A. decision)." I had voted "no"—not only "no" but "hell no" on that bill to regiment the farmer, and in April 1940 I made a public speech on the farm program too. I said "This program will not last. It is a lie to say prosperity is based on scarcity and it is hard to make a lie stand. A lie won't fit a fact. It will only fit another lie made for the same purpose. The life of a lie is a simple question of time."

Mark you, I did not charge everyone who preached regimentation to the farmer of bad faith. Thousands of lies are told by honest stupidity and believed by innocent credulity.

Yes, sir; our farm program was based on a program of aid to the land. The richer the land, the greater the aid. It was like the Salvation Army taking up collections from the poor to disburse to the rich.

You know they said there was too much cotton. The 10-acre man never hurt cotton prices but he was cut down to help the poor suffering 10,000-acre man. The 10-acre man was cut down to 6 acres, the 10,000-acre man was cut to 6,000 acres. Your 6 acres and his 6,000 acres were supposed to bring equal prosperity to both of you.

They really fixed up the farmers. Every time a farmer turns around there is a bureaucrat at his elbow.

The farm program with its quota system is absurd, it is impossible, it is senseless. Coerced by fear, bribed with petty payments, bewildered by red tape, oppressed by bureaucracy, weary of the struggle, tricked and cheated, crushed and plundered, the only marvel is that the farmer has not yet given up in despair.

Yes, sir; the czar of agriculture can (under his dictatorial powers) bless the earth with harvests or curse it with famine. The farmer must kneel. He must ask the Secretary if he can plant 1 more acre because he has only 15 acres and they are poor acres, and he has 7 hungry mouths—and is expecting another which must be fed.

There is not a factory, not a mine, not a farm in the world whose prosperity does not depend on the amount and quality of its products.

Destroying production is the path to vagrancy and want, but the farmer was betrayed and on him was perpetrated this fraud. Under the whiplash of penalties and the scourge of pressure, the bureaucrats forced the farmers to sign agreements to slowly and voluntarily starve to death. I wish I had time to tell you what I think of the Department of Agriculture. No words are known to my thought or tongue strong enough to condemn their program. Suffice it to say that the apostle who would preach that scarcity builds prosperity is a Judas betrayer of reason.

Let's glance at business saddled with questionnaires, strangulated by red tape, free enterprise that for a hundred and fifty years has met and solved American problems expires in a grasping threat of a questionnaire rebellion.

He here told a story of economists representing bureaucrats' social standing like coon dogs and social standing amongst the Tar Heels in Georgia.

An inventor brought to aid our rubber problem the idea of tubeless tires. I knew he wouldn't get anywhere. I told him his idea was too simple for a bureaucrat to understand it.

The Securities and Exchange Commission: There is the great pretender. Not satisfied with the already too many powers granted by Congress, it takes on the assumption of vast powers not authorized. It seeks to rule by arbitrary edict and dictation. Their proxy rules are the crowning act in the tragic farce of bureaucratic folly.

Now, let's take the War Production Board:

No, you take them. I want no part of them. They are making a burlesque out of the Nation's war efforts. They inspire me to hope we can declare a moratorium on bureaucratic asininity.

1. There has grown up in the executive branch of the Government a slick practice by tricky lawyers of so torturing the meaning of single words or phrases out of their accepted and common meaning as to endow the bureau heads with powers completely beyond anything the Congress intended when it passed the acts.

2. There has grown up concurrently—or rather as two parts of one apparent scheme—two practices. One has been for the bureaucrats to evade or defy the clear mandates of the Congress and attempt the kind of legislation they want by decree because they have known they could not secure such legislation by congressional enactment. The other practice has been to decry the Congress, to belittle its importance, to accuse it and abuse it and generally to carry on a propaganda to discredit the Congress with the people. The reason for this is that the Congress is the people's special instrument of control over their Government and their public servants. If the bureaucrats and those with a design to overthrow our Constitutional representative form of government, of free enterprise economic system, and our free society could persuade the people to lose confidence in the Congress it would be an easy matter to separate the people from their control over Government and to reduce them to a state of regimentation by bureaucratic decrees issuing from Washington.

3. These slick legal tricksters in the departments have developed a technique by which they endeavor to secure congressional enactment of legislation under the absolute assurance that the phraseology of the legislation they seek will not permit certain things to be done or will not authorize certain policies to be enforced. As soon as they can get the legislation passed these tricksters immediately reverse their position, break their solemn promises to the Congress, violate their assurances of the meaning and intent of the legislation they have secured and proceed to do the very things they have time and again promised the Congress they would not do. Let me give you a list of instances:

a. Promulgation of the Securities and Exchange Commission proxy rules, December 18, 1942: After assurances to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission that no extension of the Commission's powers was sought or intended.

b. In 1939 Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada, was assured that legislation touching the Civil Aeronautics Administration would not result in the Administration being moved. Immediately after the legislation was passed the Civil Aeronautics Administration was put under the Department of Commerce and its usefulness greatly impaired.

c. The National Labor Relations Board received a mandate from the Congress to get rid of a man who was named by the Dies Committee as a Communist and sympathizer with subversionists. The National Labor Relations Board renamed the unit in which he was employed in order to conceal his continued employment for a year. After his retirement from employment in the National Labor Relations Board was forced he recently showed up as an employee of another department of the Government.

d. In 1935 when the National Labor Relations Board Act was under consideration, Senator WAGNER, of New York, sponsor of the act, repeatedly asserted that the fifth provision of section 8 of the act, which imposes a duty on employers to bargain collectively with their employees, would not require that an agreement must be reached. The National Labor Relations Board has repeatedly declared since that unless an employer does come to terms with the union he is in violation of the act.

e. You will recall that in January of 1935 Secretary of the Interior Ickes instructed the oil companies to follow the provisions of the National Industrial Act to prevent the sale of distress oil on the market. That section of the act was declared void. The oil companies under instructions from Mr. Ickes followed its provisions and were later sued and penalized by the Department of Justice. Thus one department of the Government was compelling industry to follow instructions for which they were penalized by another department of the Government.

f. The attitude of these bureaucrats is typified in the statement of Milton V. Freeman, assistant solicitor of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Freeman was revealed recently by the Dies committee as an official or a member of a communistic or communistic front organization. As assistant solicitor of the Securities and Exchange Commission he was chiefly responsible for drafting onerous and impossible proxy regulations which would make it possible for officials of corporations to be compelled to purvey libel. On January 27, 1943, in Philadelphia, Freeman in newspaper interview carried in the New York Times on January 28, admitted this danger but declared that since most libelous charges are falsehoods that the Commission had a right to frame a provision granting immunity from prosecution for libel to the person or company committing the libel by placing the responsibility on the security holders who made the charge. When it was suggested that to this construction the Securities and Exchange Commission would be undertaking to make laws in a field apart from its province as defined by Congress, Freeman asserted:

"We do make the law. If this regulation is valid, it supersedes all laws that are contrary to it."

This amounted to a bold assertion on the part of this bureaucrat that agencies created by the Congress could by decree repeal previous acts of Congress which might be found in conflict with any decree such bureau or commission might desire to issue.

4. There is nothing new, of course, about this notion on the part of bureaucrats that they have superseded the Congress. They have been preaching such doctrines for several years. I have in my hand [displaying a memorandum] a compilation of statements from different officials of the administration which shows that such declarations as the one I have just quoted to you from Milton V. Freeman are entirely in keeping with the plan and program of these bureaucrats. They have stated so many times that no one can controvert it, that the Congress must give up its functions and turn them over to these bureaucrats and simply vote blank checks, blank taxes, and blank powers to them to run the country.

5. If anyone doubts that there has been a definite propaganda to destroy the confidence of the people in the Congress read what Speaker SAM RAYBURN said at Muhlenberg College:

"There is a studied effort to destroy the faith and confidence of the American people in their elected representatives."

6. Fulton Lewis, Jr., has stated over the Mutual Network that:

"For some months now, there has been a definite, unmistakable trend to smear and discredit and ridicule your machinery of self-government—the Congress of the United States. I cannot say it is a campaign or a deliberate plot, because I cannot prove that. But I do say that the smearing and discrediting and ridiculing is going on just the same, and the ultimate results are just the same. These attacks on Congress as Congress—on Congress as a whole—are certainly open to suspicion in that they have systematically been based on the grossest sort of misrepresentation, actual lies, and distortions of fact, which have gained such headway that they find their way into leading editorials of reputable newspapers, columnists, radio commentators."

7. It is exactly this kind of sharp practice and tricky maneuvers by slick lawyers in the various agencies and bureaus of the Government which are undermining our constitutional system and processes. Unless it is curbed this practice inevitably will result in the destruction of the efficiency of our Government by checks and balances and will leave constitutional government an empty shell—merely a name—while the substance will have been gnawed away by these termites boring from within.

8. Every tenant of good government has been prostituted by these bureaucrats who are more intent upon cementing themselves to their jobs, entrenching themselves in their salaries and consolidating their powers than they are upon the welfare of the Nation or the winning of the war.

9. Treason is not too strong a word by which to designate anybody who will take advantage of the Nation's peril, who will so far betray those men and women on the fighting lines who are nobly offering to make the supreme sacrifice for their country in order to overturn our American system of government, economy, and society, in the hope of finding in the junk remains of the ruins places of profit and power.

10. There is no question but that the acts of Congress could be administered well, efficiently, and beneficially if the will so to administer them were present in the hearts of these bureaucrats. There is likewise no question that the most carefully drawn acts of the Congress not only have been but can be maladministered, distorted, and made to operate with ill effect instead of with good effect when the designing bureaucrats, aided and abetted by lawyers who specialize in evading the congressional will and intent, start out to maladminister such congressional acts. The answer is not to be found in making more laws and in trying by legislative acts to curb these maladministrators. The proper thing to do is for Congress to find a way to throw them out on their necks—clear them out of the corridors and offices of the Government—and replace them with men and women who have an honest love for America, an honest love for our constitutional processes, an honest love for our governmental system of checks and balances, an honest love for our traditions of freedom, an honest love for the Bill of Rights. Such men and women can be found by the multiplied thousands to take the places of these schemers and plotters who are more intent upon wrecking the Government by subterfuge than they are upon winning the war by honest administration.

11. Everyone of these maladministrators hidden away in the bureaus and agencies of the Government who is thus operating to destroy our American system is sticking a knife into the back of every man and woman on the fighting lines at the front.

12. Our danger—our very great danger—is that we are not dealing with people who are merely mistaken in their policies. We are dealing with people who are following these policies by design and with a full knowledge of what the results of such policies will be.

13. They must be rooted out and replaced with honest American citizens if we aim to save our governmental system and win the peace after we have won the war.

These are not all men who come from the less fortunate economic groups. Many of the power grabbers are from the ranks of big business.

The dollar a year men—most of them are overpaid at a dollar a year. Some are great men doing a worth-while job, but most of them use the cloak of patriotism to conceal motives strictly selfish—just as patriotic as a picket line. And let me pause here to say of the labor racketeers that in my judgment there is just one place for a racketeer, and that's in Alcatraz.

Are justice, reason, independence, freedom, and liberty to become exiles from America? Is the time to come in America when like Italy, like France, like Germany—a man's government will become his worst enemy?

That question the American people alone must decide.

At the present moment our Government is bureau crazy. Five hundred thousand civilian employees of the Federal Government alone, and they rule America. Rule it by edict, by arbitrary dictation, by regulation, and regimentation. A government of men who never stood at election and are responsible to no one.

Czars and bureaucrats who conceive themselves, by divine right, I suppose, to be masters of the people.

Bureaucrat—that's the proper word. It is a term of contempt; a term of scorn. The bureaucrat has proven himself to be a tyrant and unjust judge. Sincere only in vanity, jealousy, and arrogance. We must make it unpopular to be a bureaucrat.

We must give some thought to keeping democracy in America secure.

That is a national issue, and to you, my fellow Americans, it is also a personal problem.

Bureaucracy as a system has created an impossible burden of Government hirelings which, if compared to a beehive, constitute a class of drones too numerous to be supplied by the joint efforts of all the workers.

Rule by arbitrary edict is not debatable in America. It is not to be tolerated. It must be resisted. To entertain any thought of toleration on this score is utterly unsuited to the mind of a free people. If we are resolute, vigilant, and determined, the American system of government will endure the ages while dictators abroad and bureaucrats at home come and go.

The day is already here when more laws are made by Executive orders from the bureaucrats than by congressional legislation. What can you do about it? Well, you here today are more in number than those who created the Constitution.

The name American, which belongs to each of us in our national capacity, has embodied in it an individual and common ownership of liberty. We, the people, must sustain liberty. We must maintain on the home front the vital principle that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed.

We are holding one of the two fronts in this world at war. As we have reasoned here together, if you have decided what it is you would be willing to give your life to defend, then go out and defend it. Defend it here and everywhere. Defend it today and every day. Defend it against Hitler and the Mikado. Defend it against the bureaus and the bureaucrats. Defend it constantly, and defend it eternally.

(NOTE.—The Congressman spoke extemporaneously and too rapidly at times to transcribe every word he said.)

Price Policies on Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by C. T. Revere:

SUPPLEMENTARY COTTON LETTER

If one may judge from the attitude and the action of Congress, it is rather clearly foreshadowed that price policies on farm products for the time being will be determined by the intent of the lawmaking body of the Nation rather than by directives or interpretations from the various bureaus.

The issue behind the overwhelming passage by the Senate of the Bankhead bill prohibiting the deduction of payments in the determination of ceilings and parities should not be construed so much as a declaration in favor of higher prices as an assertion of principle involving the question of arriving at a logical price formula. The market price is a certificate of value, and any attempt to camouflage or conceal this value is a subterfuge that is shorn of all benefits when it comes to paying the bill, for someone has to pay it.

There is no doubt about the evidence of a rising revolt against what has come to be regarded as bureaucratic domination. Secretary Wickard is reported to have espoused subsidies on the ground that the Government could not afford to "lose control of the farms."

Yet, why should farming be controlled from Washington? Such a suggestion carries the implication that the leaders of the party now in power have gone far afield from the doctrine proclaimed by its sainted founder. For was it not Jefferson who said, "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread"?

And if one may assume from the rationings, the ceilings, the penalties, the threats, and the dire predictions emanating from the planning potentates who have guided and controlled our farm policies over the last decade and who are now battling with the crisis thus provoked, Jefferson, to the chagrin

of his opponents for once may have been proven right.

It perhaps would be premature to indulge in price forecasts implied by recent Washington developments. The Pace bill, calling for inclusion of farm-labor costs in computation of parities and ceilings, and the reintroduced Brown bill on approximately the same subject still await enactment.

The outcome of the new crop will depend more on labor supply than designated acreage.

However, when it comes to the price of cotton and other farm products, one enigma remains unsolved. Why this rancor against the "profiteering" tiller of the soil and the Pecksniffian concern for the "exploited consumer," who, we are told, is riding on the top of the income wave? Why hand out $2,000,000,000 in incentive payments to alleviate his lot? If this is a subsidy, who gets it? Aren't we running into a case of mistaken personalities, subsidizing the consumer instead of the farmer by making it possible for him to use his enlarged buying power to purchase at actually lower prices?

Query: How does this operate to prevent, check, or control inflation?

C. T. REVERE.

FEBRUARY 26, 1943.

Problems of a War President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Owen L. Scott, from the Washington Sunday Star of yesterday:

PROBLEMS OF A WAR PRESIDENT DISCUSSED

(By Owen L. Scott)

President Roosevelt today finds himself in an amazing position. The President is shouldering the immense burdens that go with leadership in two wars being fought simultaneously. Yet that task as commander in chief is beginning to look like simplicity itself compared with the task of leading warring groups at home.

The President's own official aides are fighting one another like cats and dogs. A coalition of Democrats and Republicans in Congress is sitting up nights trying to figure out ways to make Mr. Roosevelt's task more difficult. At the same time, there is a scramble on the part of farmers and workers and, in some cases business groups to try to get rich out of the war, regardless of the consequences.

How the President stands up under the burdens that fall upon him as a result of these situations is very much a mystery. Yet he does. He manages to remain cheerful. He is keeping his temper. And, despite the efforts to trip him up, he is accomplishing very many results, including the one of getting on with the wars against Germany and Japan while at least maintaining his own in the various domestic wars at home.

That, at least, is the appraisal of the situation that is being made by disinterested observers here.

There is agreement that this situation probably is without precedent. This is true because the task of being President today is far more complicated and far more exacting than in any previous war. No other present-day war leader is confronted with quite the problems that President Roosevelt faces. In Germany and Japan and Russia there are absolute dictatorships, where rulers need deal with few, if any, political problems. In England there is a political truce that relieves Prime Minister Churchill of most political problems.

In this country, however, the domestic political and economic problems seldom have appeared more acute. Mr. Roosevelt must take time off from his war leadership to wrestle with those problems. In doing so, he discovers that there is a coalition in Congress that delights in making his task more difficult. This coalition, in turn, rests upon two bases, one a determination to make sure that the President doesn't intrench himself sufficiently to seek and obtain a fourth nomination, the other a desire to satisfy voter groups who want to obtain some special advantage during the war.

The two most acute domestic problems are those concerning utilization of manpower and those affecting the strong wartime trend toward inflation.

In trying to deal with the first problem, Mr. Roosevelt discovers himself doing battle with Congress. Many Congressmen, even a majority, insist that the Army this country is building is too big. They are seeking ways to prevent the drafting of farmers and to return to the farms men already drafted. They are balking at use of the Selective Service Act on a "work or fight" basis, although that use was accepted in the last war when demands for men were far less acute than now. They want to find some way to fight a painless war—one that will not upset homes or inconvenience very many voters.

In trying to deal with the second problem, Mr. Roosevelt likewise discovers himself doing battle with Congress. It almost certainly will require a White House veto to prevent Congress from assuring still higher prices for farmers. Farm prices today are 98 percent above the average of the 1938–39 year. The President may not be able to prevent a removal of controls that now limit salary increases. If those controls go, then workers will have an almost irresistible argument for taking off wage controls. Congress is balking at drastic further increases in taxation of personal incomes. Yet the amount of income in the hands of individuals in this country is beginning to reach astronomical proportions.

The President's veto power may enable him to win some of these developing battles in Congress. In the meantime, however, he is having to devote time and attention to an effort to head off action in order to avoid wholesale vetoes that would only aggravate the growing rift between the Executive and Congress.

Two forces are operating to complicate the President's problem.

The first of these forces grows from the normal desire of people to avoid the kind of sacrifice that war requires if it is to be fought successfully. People don't like to be drafted, if that means a break-up of homes, and they do like to get rich quickly, if that opportunity opens. Both of those likes and dislikes now are at work.

The second of the forces is political. Politicians suspect that President Roosevelt is going to seek a fourth term. There are powerful groups even in his own party which strongly oppose another term for the President. They are seeking now to build the base for opposition to him next year if he should be put forward by his friends in another draft-Roosevelt move. Mr. Roosevelt might solve several of his problems if he would say that he would under no circumstances accept a fourth nomination. The President cannot say that without an effect on his war leadership.

The result is that President Roosevelt finds himself in a very difficult position and one that is not likely to become easier as the months go by.

Union Labor Situation Improved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Roger Babson, entitled "Union Labor Situation Improved":

THE CLOSED SHOP

(By Roger W. Babson)

UNION LABOR SITUATION IMPROVED

For some years I have felt that the so-called "union security" clause would inevitably follow "collective bargaining." I say this because the "closed shop" has some justification however much employers naturally resent it.

Stockholders already have a "closed shop." That is one stockholder cannot act apart from the others except once a year at a stockholders' meeting. If a stockholder does not like the policy of the company, he can sell his stock and get out. The same privilege is granted to all members of a closed shop labor union. If they don't like their job, they can resign and work elsewhere.

Stockholders always have been represented by their president, who exclusively speaks for them, which is what the labor unions have had to fight for. Both groups should equally have the right to employ outside counsel. Hence, when looked at impartially, the labor union members are not asking for any more privileges than stockholders now have. The big question is whether or not the labor union officials are as wise, fair, and frank as the company officials.

My real purpose this week is to show readers that this "closed shop" or "union security" clause, for which labor leaders are now fighting, may be a blessing in disguise to employers and investors. This I say because the War Labor Board is now asking that unions, to which it grants this "security clause," must comply with certain rules and make reports the same as is required of the employers. It also believes that strike votes should be by secret ballot of the entire membership involved.

The General Chemical decision of the War Labor Board was very hopeful. Here an American Federation of Labor union was denied any form of union security or closed shop because the union called a strike in violation of the national no-strike agreement. The opinion of Dean Wayne L. Morse, of the War Labor Board in this case should put heart into discouraged employers and investors.

The case of the Western Cartridge Co., at East Alton, Ill., was even more hopeful. Here the War Labor Board, in a unanimous decision, took away an already existing closed shop clause because the union did not play fair. After 6 months of good behavior the union may apply for a return of this security clause. In the case of the Pontiac plant of

the Yellow Truck & Coach and Manufacturing Co., the closed shop was granted with the understanding that it will be revoked unless strikes are eliminated.

Of course, labor is now having a honeymoon. However, this does not worry me as all honeymoons come to an end. This will especially be true after the war is over when there will be an oversupply of all kinds of labor, instead of a shortage. The laws of action and reaction and of demand and supply apply to wages the same as to prices.

If the military—instead of the politicians—make the peace terms, which I hope they will, they also may then put an end to racketeering labor leaders. In fact, the chances are 50-50 that the Army and Navy, after the war, will continue active operation of certain factories, shipyards, and food supplies as long as necessary to give work to returning soldiers and sailors. Frankly, I would rather see the military in charge of unemployment and relief than to have half-baked new dealers. These latter, however, I think are already on the way out.

I am not writing in the interests of employers or union labor; but rather solely in the interest of the people of the United States and Canada. As far as the closed shop may result in greater justice, well and good; but when it is abused, so as to handicap any entire industry or community, then it becomes treason. This explains why the anti-racketeering bill, approved by the House Judiciary Committee last year but sidetracked by the Rules Committee, has been reintroduced. This would make the work of labor racketeers "robbery and extortion in interstate commerce" and hence a Federal offense.

After the war, the "good old days" will be gone for both union labor and profiteering employers. If any group then interferes with what is best for the Nation as a whole, that group will be swept aside. Otherwise, we will lose the peace, after we win the war.

Readers must not be fooled by talk about this war necessarily "ending all wars and bringing peace forevermore." This is impossible as long as present easy living continues in America. Furthermore, to let down the tariff bars with our present wasteful pleasure-loving and security-seeking ways would necessitate lower wages and longer hours. Hence, after the war we will be faced by a most serious dilemma which will compel employers and wage workers to bury the hatchet and cooperate.

The solution of post-war business problems will come only by union labor, private capital, farm owners, and all other groups following Jesus' teachings and working for the good of all. We must either work longer and harder, or else! Just now, during this war, we can fool ourselves that two plus two equals five or more; but after the war, two plus two will again equal only four.

Delegation of Power to Securities and Exchange Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Daily Bond Buyer:

BOREN BILL CURES UNLAWFUL DELEGATION OF POWER TO SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION—WOULD RESTORE POWER TO DEFINE OFFENSES TO CONGRESS, "WHERE IT BELONGS"

(By David M. Wood, of Thomson, Wood & Hoffman, New York)

The bill which has been introduced by Congressman BOREN (H. R. 1502) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to make it clear that the statute does not confer upon the Securities and Exchange Commission the power to regulate transactions in exempted securities, has directed attention to the provisions of section 15c (1) of that act. This section reads as follows:

"No broker or dealer shall make use of the mails or of any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce to effect any transaction in, or to induce the purchase or sale of, any security (other than commercial paper, bankers' acceptances, or commercial bills) otherwise than on a national securities exchange, by means of any manipulative, deceptive, or other fraudulent device or contrivance. The Commission shall, for the purposes of this subsection, by rules and regulations define such devices or contrivances as are manipulative, deceptive, or otherwise fraudulent."

This section is a penal statute. The courts have held that a penal statute must define the offense with certainty so that the citizen may know exactly what is unlawful. It has been said that,

"The test to determine whether a statute defining an offense is void for uncertainty (1) is whether the language may apply not only to a particular act about which there can be little or no difference of opinion, but equally to other acts about which there may be radical differences, thereby devolving on the court the exercise of arbitrary power of discriminating between the several classes of acts and (2) the dividing line between what is lawful and what is unlawful cannot be left to conjecture." (16 Corpus Juris, p. 68.)

When this test is applied to the above-quoted section of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, it produces some remarkable results. The first sentence of the section, which purports to define the offense, is by no means free from ambiguity. If the word "fraudulent" does not modify the words "manipulative" and "deceptive," it declares acts to be criminal in their nature, which, theretofore, did not constitute crimes either at common law or under statute, and it is evident from the regulations which the Securities and Exchange Commission has promulgated and proposed to promulgate under the authority of this section, that the Commission does not regard the word "fraudulent" as modifying either the words "manipulative" or "deceptive." On the contrary, it appears to construe the section as making a crime of acts which do not involve fraud. But what are these acts? What is a deceptive device? Does the failure of the seller of securities to disclose the amount of securities he is trying to dispose of constitute deception?

Must he disclose the price he paid for them to avoid the crime of deception? Must he show how long he has been offering the securities for sale? Must he advise the buyer of pending legislation which he fears may affect their value or marketability? If the dealer is the buyer is he required to inform the seller of facts which have induced him to offer to purchase the securities, such as his knowledge that they can be sold at a price above his bid? Must he disclose his best price? Is bargaining ruled out? Is a dealer under the same obligation to his customer that a trustee is to his beneficiary? The act does not so declare, but the very indefiniteness of the term "deceptive" has brought about an assertion by the Securities and Exchange Commission that a dealer in securities now occupies a trust relationship to his customer. Did Congress intend, by the use of this indefinite terminology, to create a new relationship between a buyer and seller of securities?

So construed, the section is so indefinite that it is probably unconstitutional. A more reasonable construction is that the words "manipulative" and "deceptive" are modified by the word "fraudulent," so that it is only manipulation or deception which involves fraud that constitutes the offense. The legislative history of the section supports this construction. In the year 1938 the Securities and Exchange Commission sponsored an amendment to this section so that it would ban fraudulent, manipulative, and deceptive devices, and in the hearings on the bill before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, it was admitted by a representative of the Securities and Exchange Commission that the purpose of the transposition of terms was to extend the scope of the act and to extend the powers of the Commission. Congress, however, refused to amend the act in the manner requested, so that it would seem that the more reasonable construction of this section is that the word "fraudulent" modifies the words "manipulative" and "deceptive." Under this construction the act would probably be sustained by the courts, for fraud is a well-defined term at common law and the section would then define the offenses with reasonable certainty.

But if the act defines the offense with sufficient certainty to apprise the citizen of the acts, which are declared to be criminal in their nature, then what purpose is served by conferring upon the Securities and Exchange Commission the power to define them? This would be a power to define that which is already defined. Such a power is an absurdity. Certainly under this interpretation of the section the second sentence is unnecessary and should be repealed, as is proposed by Congressman BOREN.

On the other hand, if the section does not itself define the acts which are to constitute crimes, and power must be vested in the Securities and Exchange Commission to define them, it is obvious that the crime has not been defined by Congress but by the Securities and Exchange Commission. As Congress has no power to delegate to an administrative bureau the right to enact penal legislation, under this interpretation, the entire section is unconstitutional and void.

Another possible interpretation of the section is that Congress has declared all the defined transactions to be crimes, but until the Securities and Exchange Commission has promulgated a regulation specifying particular transactions as punishable under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the section is inoperative. This construction of the section, however, gives the Securities and Exchange Commission the power to grant immunity from punishment for offenses defined as criminal by Congress, until it sees fit to declare the offenses punishable under the act. It may suspend the operation of the act or put it into effect, in whole or in part, as it sees fit. This is nothing less than the conferring upon the Securities and Exchange Commission a blanket power of legislation. Such a construction would likewise render the section unconstitutional.

That Congress has the power to delegate to an administrative agency the power to promulgate regulations to carry out the expressed intent of Congress is beyond question, but the congressional intent must be clearly expressed and standards must be prescribed for the guidance of the agency in issuing its regulations. This section, however, does not purport to give to the Securities and Exchange Commission the power to adopt rules and regulations to administer a law enacted

by Congress. It gives it the power to make the law itself. If the second sentence of the section has any meaning at all, it confers upon the Securities and Exchange Commission a power of legislation—the power to declare acts, which were not theretofore criminal, to constitute Federal offenses, punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both.

We are, therefore, led to one of three possible conclusions:

1. The section does not define with certainty the criminal offenses punishable under it, and it is, therefore, unconstitutional in its entirety.

2. The first sentence of the section does define with reasonable certainty the offenses, but the second sentence gives the Securities and Exchange Commission the power to declare the section operative as to such of the condemned acts as it shall specify. Under this interpretation, the second sentence is unconstitutional.

3. The first sentence of the section does define the offenses with reasonable certainty and it is operative whether or not the Securities and Exchange Commission promulgates any rules or regulations under it, in which case the second sentence is surplusage. It serves no purpose and should be repealed.

Congressman BOREN is, therefore, manifestly right in taking the position that the second sentence of this section should be repealed. His position is that with the repeal of this sentence the power to define the offenses "will revert to Congress where it belongs." Indeed he might have gone further and stated that Congress had no constitutional right to attempt to confer this power upon the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Nelson Seen Figurehead in War Production Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Star:

NELSON SEEN FIGUREHEAD IN WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

(By David Lawrence)

Donald Nelson has virtually abdicated as Chairman of the War Production Board. He now is only a figurehead, and full power has been assumed by Charles E. Wilson, who holds the title of Executive Vice Chairman. Mr. Wilson has been a severe critic of the Army and Navy organization and has been accepted enthusiastically by certain labor politicians and left-wingers as being sympathetic to their purposes.

This makeshift arrangement—and most of President Roosevelt's decisions have been makeshifts in handling the production side of the war—merely means that the Nation must wait till tens of thousands more American boys are wounded or killed for lack of equipment and reinforcements and must wait till many more billions of dollars of precious war production are sunk by submarines before there is a realistic attitude in Washington toward the major problems that lie between us and victory.

Theoretically the business of making war is that of the Army and Navy. But not in America. Here the Army and Navy must sit submissively and patiently waiting for politics-as-usual, business-as-usual, labor-as-usual, and intrigue-as-usual to be exposed to public view before the American people learn about the scandalous situation which is epitomized so frequently nowadays as the "battle of Washington."

REFUSE TO FACE FACTS

The fight between the Army and Navy on the one hand and the so-called civilian economy on the other hand is nothing more nor less than a refusal of business, labor, politicians on Capitol Hill and in the administration to face the facts of total war. Instead, the administration allows inner conflicts to drift on and on in the deluded hope that somehow the victory can still be won by an America "only ankle deep in war."

The crying needs of the hour are more escort ships for the Navy, more bombers for North Africa and the Pacific, more cargo-carrying ships to transport fighter planes, repair parts, octane gas, and supplies for our overseas forces.

Distrust as between the War Production Board and the Army and Navy is a tragic commentary on the lack of a coordinating influence in Washington that all factions and groups should believe in and serve. One would think to listen to press conferences and arguments among high-ranking civilians that the Army and Navy were enemies of the people or that they were wholly without knowledge of guns, planes, or supplies.

"If the armed services," writes a businessman, who is a partisan of Mr. Nelson, in a letter to this correspondent, "could get out of their heads that they know anything at all about production that is not 20 years behind the times and concentrate their efforts on fighting the enemy, we would see a more effective use of critical materials, a greater output of war materials and more Germans and Japs under the sod."

SUPERFICIAL VIEW

This is quoted, not because the source is particularly well informed, but because this comment represents the superficial view which runs through the War Production Board attack on the military that now has been taken up by some Congressmen and Senators who want to control production to no small degree because it means they will have a voice in the contracts their constituents will get.

Wearing the uniform today in the Army and Navy supply services are some of the ablest men private industry ever had. But when they wear a uniform they think in terms of reports brought back from the front from flying officers who see the defects in equipment experienced at the battle front, or naval officers who know what is needed to go through submarine packs. The Army ordnance and Navy ordnance are two of the most efficient production activities in America.

There are inefficiencies in every big organization and the Army and Navy are not immune from them. But the big alibi in War Production Board is the excuse that the Army and Navy don't tell them their requirements months in advance, when, as a matter of fact, Hitler and Hirohito never tell us where and how they will conduct their offensives and thus our Army and Navy have to meet constantly expanding or changing situations—a circumstance which the civilian minds of the War Production Board, eager to refrain from stepping on the toes of the civilian economy, do not like to face.

Some day the American people will demand that there be an end to the dilly-dallying in the War Production Board and other civilian agencies and that the conduct of the war from production line to battle line be placed completely in the hands of General Marshall, Admiral King, and Admiral Leahy. These men are not interested in politicians or politics but only in saving the mother of somebody's son from unnecessary loss in a war already unduly prolonged, considering the resources and manpower of the United Nations.

The Flying Fortress Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of February 27, 1943:

THE FLYING FORTRESS STRIKE

America was more than startled, it was shocked, by the sudden walk-out at the Boeing aircraft factories of the Seattle area. On top of that was the still worse threat to call a general strike in the west-coast airplane plants if the War Labor Board did not hand down a favorable decision on wage demands within a specified time.

The union announcement, virtually an ultimatum to Government, was delivered in the manner of a man holding a gun at the other fellow's head.

Walking out of an aircraft factory now, especially one that makes the Flying Fortresses, is like a strike on a battlefield. The difference, if any, is one of location only. Building these planes on which victory depends is as much a part of fighting America's battles as is the flying of them.

People had not thought that American workers, no matter what their grievance—and these employes do have a grievance—would be quitters like that and tell Hitler and Hirohito to keep on coming. But it can happen here.

The grievance itself is a long and complicated story. It started back in 1941, when a strike occurred in the North American Aviation Corporation plant in southern California. The officials at Washington were quick to send the Army into North American and compel the workers to return to their jobs. Then, with its characteristic temporizing, the administration gave the strikers about everything they had asked.

The raising of the rates at North American made it necessary to increase wages in all the other southern California plants. Result, the plane workers in California were getting higher pay than similar workers in the Seattle district, although there was little or no difference in the factors that determine these wages. More muddling by the Roosevelt fixers.

To make matters worse, the Seattle area developed a big shipbuilding industry, with a starting rate of 95 cents an hour. Boeing workers continued to start at 62½ cents. They were now outclassed by both the southern airplane plants and the shipyards. They did not have a fair deal.

Months ago conciliators of the Department of Labor went West to straighten these matters out. They seemingly were meeting with success when Washington officials, interested only in the economic stabilization program,

interfered and upset the apple cart. Finally, the whole problem landed in the lap of the War Labor Board.

As matters stand today, this Seattle situation adds up to the result that usually flows from indecision, compromise, and bungling. But that does not give the Boeing workers the right to strike while building Flying Fortresses or to hold a gun at somebody's head.

These workers may not have had justice, but their type of performance leads to worse than injustice. It is a bid for a dictatorial regime of forced labor, the setting aside of all civil rights, the getting of work done by the iron-fisted methods of the Army.

Make no mistake about it, the Fortresses, the Liberators, the Dauntless dive bombers, and all the other warplane types of the west coast, will have to be built. A general strike out there would be a challenge that would have to be met with the sternest hand this Nation has yet shown in the war.

It would seem at the moment that wiser heads are to prevail. The warning of the War Labor Board that it will not even hand down a decision "unless the workers remain loyally at their jobs" has had an effect. The International Association of Machinists, American Federation of Labor parent of the Boeing local, takes the right stand that no worker must leave his job, even though protest meetings are held by those not on shift.

Meantime, there will be opportunity to solve the problem. Government should realize that it ought to act promptly because it has been a factor in creating the situation. And workers must be made to understand that they don't strike in aircraft factories in wartime.

Resolutions Adopted at Wartime Business Conference of Mississippi Press Association in Jackson, February 19 and 20, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

Be it resolved by the Mississippi Press Association, in session at Jackson, Miss., February 19–20, that:

1. That the Mississippi press continue to lend every possible cooperation with our Government in its efforts to win the war against tyranny and aggression.

2. That we recognize the full import of the economic restraints of the war and that we pledge anew every effort to cope with the manpower shortage, the paper shortage, and in such ways as will be promote the interests of the war effort.

3. That we deplore the growing abuses of bureaucratic rule, that we recognize a loss to the democratic way of life when bureaus prosecute so-called "reforms" under the guise of winning the war, that we give full recognition to the dangers to democracy wrought through Government agencies not dealing directly with the war but who work their reforms while waving the banner, "Let's Win the War."

4. That we recognize the need of an informed press but that we acquaint ourselves with the fact that a bureau release or the utterances of government paid press agents are not to be accepted as the only source of information.

5. That we express our fear of the growing tendency toward communism or state socialism in America.

6. That we give full recognition to the freedom of the press in America, that we not be restrained merely because utterances may be stamped as unpatriotic, because they are contrary to the policies of certain bureaus, that we reassert the need of public informative and interpretative discussion to maintain our freedom, that we recognize the imperative need today of a courageous press, outspoken, articulate, aggressive, and unbowed before the iron hand of bureaucratic rule.

7. That we express our approval of the efforts of Congress to reestablish the legislative arm of our government, and that we condemn the efforts of the United States Senate to offset the courageous efforts of the House; that we consider the emergency of the hour of more vital consideration than petty party politics; that we frown upon the efforts of the United States Senate which leans toward government by decree as contrasted with government by legislative approval.

8. That we request the Post Office Department to rescind its order requiring written requests from soldiers in foreign service, before newspapers can be mailed to them, for the reason that the most appreciated thing the overseas soldier receives is his home town paper. Be it further resolved that our Members of Congress be requested to take up this matter direct with the Postmaster General.

9. That we deplore the tendency of the manpower group to contend there is a manpower shortage while they maintain a 40-hour week. The additional 8 hours at time-and-a-half is an added burden to the war program and one that is completely unnecessary because the majority of the laboring men would be glad to work that additional 8 hours as an evidence of their love for our armed forces, and their sincere wish that every effort of every American shall be bent toward victory. We recognize that the great overwhelming majority of the members of labor unions are patriotic citizens; we deplore the fact that labor union leaders are doing such a grave injustice to their country, and urge the American press to wage a campaign of education showing labor union members how they are being victimized by their racketeering leaders.

10. That inasmuch as newspapers are an essential industry it would be absurd for either the American or Canadian Governments to place the newsprint industry on a nonessential basis and strip it of the manpower needed to provide newspapers with adequate newsprint supply.

11. Whereas in the past one or two printshops in Mississippi have intimidated candidates for State office by threatening them with boycott on the part of voters who belong to labor organizations, unless they have the union label on their campaign literature; and whereas such a situation is extremely unfair in view of the fact that of 138 newspapers in the State less than 4 percent can use the union label: Then be it

Resolved, That the members of the Mississippi Press Association that operate job shops, go on record as agreeing that any candidate who uses only literature bearing the union label, out of proportion to the representatives of union shops, that such publishers will refuse to give any free space to such a candidate.

The above resolutions were unanimously adopted by the convention as a whole and were submitted by a special resolutions committee, consisting of J. L. McCorkle, chairman, Hazlehurst Courier; Maj. Frederick Sullens, Jackson Daily News, and Mrs. Mary D. Cain, Summit Sun.

Address Before Real Estate Board of the Bronx

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. MERRITT of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the dinner of the Real Estate Board of the Bronx, held Saturday, February 27, 1943, at the Hotel Commodore:

As a representative at large elected by the people of the entire State of New York, I am deeply concerned with its future and with the future of all of the municipalities which comprise it. The greatest of these is our own city of New York.

As one who has engaged in the real estate and insurance business with an office in Queens County, I have had daily contact with the difficulties of real-estate ownership during those years before the war.

All of us are aware of the steady decline in business and realty values in New York during the depression years.

During those years of depression it seemed that New York City would lose its unique position as the nerve center of our Nation. As industry faltered, with the consequent rise in unemployment, real estate values declined, and serious vacancies occurred.

That other factors before the declaration of war were driving business from New York, despite the protests of you far-sighted gentlemen and other real estate, financial, merchant, and investment associations is something we cannot delve into at length now. These conditions could have been corrected but were not.

The opportunity is now here to bring back many of these lost enterprises and industries and we must recoup these losses by enlarging our program to necessitate their return later.

We are not trying to close the barn door after the horse has left, but rather keep the barn door open, put in feed, and coax the horse back.

Proud of its large manufacturing resources;

Proud of its universities and other schools, its cathedrals, churches, museums, libraries;

Proud of its hotels, skyscrapers, subways, and bridges;

Proud of its harbors, rails, and waterways;

Proud of its pivotal position in the activities of commerce, industry, and finance;

Proud of its citizens, their energy, and astuteness, and their desire to get things done;

It moved me deeply to notice that the declaration of war and war activities, continued the gradual decline of the business and increased the removal from New York of industry, machinery, equipment, and labor to other production centers.

New York has always been the center for production, for finance, and for distribution of civilian consumer goods. It has ranked first in the manufacture of clothing, printing and publishing, fur goods, millinery and lace goods, bakery products, sugar refining, jewelry, manufactured gas, and has competed in many other trades including slaughtering and meat packing, and malt liquors.

Its fine harbors and railroad facilities handled the great bulk of tonnage coming to the United States, arranged for distribution to all parts of the Nation, and through them passed over 34 percent of the country's production to be shipped abroad.

Its banks, trust companies, and life insurance companies financed not only the operations of the industries of the city and State, but the major portion of the Nation's requirements. Many foreign governments could not have thrived had not our great and able investment houses obtained the necessary credits to enable them to do business here.

The faith of the people of the Nation and peoples throughout the world in the investment policies of our life insurance companies is proven by the ever increasing number of their policyholders.

These and other factors have made New York City great. Recognition of them has made it imperative for business and industry—not producing within our area—to maintain offices and staffs here to enable them to properly conduct their business, and to formulate their policies of operation.

When we all realized that the Nation must gird itself for war, it was expected that the tremendous facilities and power of this great metropolis would be the hub upon which much of the war energy would expand its activities.

Here we had plants that could go into immediate operation or could be easily converted for war use; small businesses and factories that could produce by amalgamation or pooling; office facilites for governmental agencies; ample hotel and housing facilities; a fine harbor; abundant schools, hospitals, places of worship, and theaters; numerous parks, beaches, and recreational centers; and well-functioning, cheap transportation facilities. The time and money that could be saved for the war effort and those employed in it by the use of our transportation facilities alone would be immeasurable.

No one doubts the true patriotism and definite desire of every New Yorker to help rid this earth of the scourge of the worshipers of Hitler, Mussolini, and the so-called Son of Heaven.

When the Treasury called for money, the people of New York gave it—yes—as much as the rest of the Nation combined gave to it, by subscription or otherwise.

When the Nation called our men to arms, our boys responded; yes—as a ranking member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I tell you that New York can be proud of its men who responded so nobly and so well, fighting and dying gloriously, as did Sergeant Levin from Brooklyn, and we know we can find many unsung heroes from the colleges and homes of the Bronx fighting grimmer battles now, and this time for a greater cause.

Our plants and factories begged for an opportunity to join in producing the implements of warfare.

Our women were splendid in their effort to assist. Many sought work in defense plants. Finding none in New York they left the city and found, elsewhere, poor housing facilities, and burdensome living costs. Many returned and are now SPARS, WAVES, and WAACS.

Men, likewise, left New York, seeking employment in war plants elsewhere, became disheartened by living conditions for themselves and their families, returned and sought employment here.

And that is what we want. That they seek and find employment here, in gainful and honest work, in the all-out war effort, and with the advantages of all our facilities here for that purpose.

Fair enough is it, yes, and in the spirit of sacrifice and honor: take our money, our men, our women, win the war—but let us help, let us help because we can help more.

Why build towns, and houses, and waste valuable materials when we have the facilities here—already built.

Why remove our labor, skilled and unskilled, when they can be used here, when the plants and factories here in our metropolitan area can do the work.

It is well to say a billion dollars of work was given to New York during November and December, and that in 8 months the unemployed were in number from 400,000 to 250,000 persons. It was good work. It took many months of calling the numerous Washington bureaus to get the effort started and I know many people and organizations like your own who were clamoring for a policy of sending work and agencies to New York. It took a long time before people realized that the large surplus labor of New York should be used; that the plants and factories could be pooled; that agencies could operate efficiently from New York.

But there are still 250,000 unemployed and much vacant usable space in New York. What a waste of manpower hours. New York must receive greater consideration. The other day I observed that a $20,000,000 deal was consummated for small plants near Grand Rapids, Mich. It is a pooling plan. Good. But let's see more of it here.

Why build more office buildings, more plants, schools, hospitals, with new sewers, new waterworks, new telephone and telegraph systems, and create new war centers when we have the facilities here? We have said that in Washington for a long time.

At last we see the service groups and executive departments have moved. I am reliably informed that most of the good warehousing space of any appreciable size in and about New York has been or is about to be taken by governmental authorities. Some agencies have moved in to stay and more will be coming, and those here and to come will of necessity expand as our potential strength is gradually realized and the logistics required to facilitate its operations are increased. War orders are coming to New York and should be increased.

I felt that the proper step in the right direction was being taken when many contracts were let for clothing and other military wearing apparel to New York concerns. These factories could not produce satisfactorily the vital death-dealing arms of war. But the soldier as well as the civilian must be fed and clothed. New York has in peacetime met the greater portion of the civilian requirement. There appears no logical reason to order uniforms, shirts, shoes, gloves, ties, blankets, and other required articles elsewhere for the service than where they were produced or fabricated for the same men and women when they were civilians before the outbreak of the war.

If the strategy of the war effort requires that certain work we can do here be done elsewhere, then more civilian consumer goods production should be diverted here from elsewhere. I believe our factories and facilities here could serve or be made to serve the entire Nation and the armed forces in its requirements for fabricated and finished goods, clothing and foodstuffs.

If all our small business and plant facilities were pooled, and all our light manufacturing space fully used, unemployment would be eliminated.

I know that while other light manufacturing areas in the country are rapidly expanding, plant facilities in New York are still unused. I am informed that the metal product manufacturing trade occupies close to 13,500,000 square feet of space in New York of which over 1,500,000 is in the Borough of the Bronx. It is within my knowledge that many of the concerns applied for war work. I understand only 60 percent of the plants are at work, very few on more than one shift. It is my firm belief that any small plant owner, who lives with his plant and machinery, whether it be in the metal trade, or any other trade, has sufficient ingenuity to convert his machines to war effort of some kind. He should be able to do it for the greatest business on hand, the fight for the right to run his business for himself and his dependents.

If we can accomplish this; if we can put all these plants to work; if we can successfully pool the small businesses and factories for the war effort; if we can expand our production of fabricated and finished goods, food, and clothing; if we could further tax the ingenuity of our manufacturers to convert for war purposes; if we continue to emphasize our facilities of housing, office buildings, transportation, and recreational centers to attract Government agencies here; if we continue to impress the attributes of our harbor and warehouse facilities upon the authorities.

We can bring the horse back.

We can foster the return of the skilled and unskilled labor that left to work elsewhere and who are living in trailer camps and temporary shacks and who sleep in two and three shifts per bed.

We can eliminate all the unemployment.

We can attract back the business that left.

We can healthfully prepare for an anticipated post-war period of prosperity. Let us keep fighting for that purpose. Let God grant us that that fight will aid us to eliminate these termites who endeavor to destroy our ideals and culture. When that greater fight has been won, may the city enjoy an era of full production and commercial activity.

I know of the efforts you and your allied organizations are making to accomplish this. After long and strenuous effort you have been fairly successful. But more can be done. Let us all work together for this common cause and I know that by concerted effort we can and will be successful.

Poles Renew Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Tribune:

RUSSIA REFUSES TO GIVE UP RICH POLISH AREA—CHARGE SOVIET STAND OPPOSES FOUR FREEDOMS—VIEW MOSCOW CLAIMS WITH GRAVITY—POLES RENEW DEMAND

(LONDON, February 26.—The Polish Government in exile through its national council made a second successive claim tonight for restoration of the 1939 Polish borders. The council endorsed a resolution expressing a desire for cooperation with Russia, but declared in a statement: "The integrity of territory of the Polish Republic in her frontiers of September 1, 1939, and her sovereignty are inviolable and indivisible.")

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 26.—A most emphatic claim to rich industrial and agricultural areas of prewar Poland was circulated by the Soviet Embassy today.

In its official information bulletin the embassy printed an article originally published in Pravda, Moscow newspaper, laying claim to the region of Lwow and territory bordering White Russia.

Thirteen days ago the Soviet Embassy bulletin published a territorial claim of the Soviet Union to Bessarabia (formerly a part of Rumania), Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

The issuance of the claim, under official auspices, aroused deep interest in diplomatic circles. It was regarded as an official pronouncement of policy by the Soviet Government.

(Polish leaders in United States angered by Russia's stand. Sumner Welles, Assistant

Secretary of State, says United States seeks post-war planning now. Page 4.)

SEE FOUR FREEDOMS DENIED

Some declare that the two claims advanced by the Russians are in direct defiance of the terms of the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms proclaimed by President Roosevelt.

The Atlantic Charter, signed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill in August 1941 said that the United States and Great Britain are not seeking territorial aggrandizement, and expressed the belief that all nations of the world "for realistic as well as spiritual reasons must come to the abandonments of the use of force."

The four freedoms, promulgated by the President, are freedom from fear, freedom of speech and expression, freedom of every person to worship God in his own way, and freedom from want. Freedom from fear has been interpreted as guaranteeing the territorial integrity of smaller nations.

In running contrary to these expressions of allied policy, the Soviet territorial claims were viewed here with utmost gravity.

MAY REQUEST STATEMENT

It is expected that Britain and the United States will demand a statement from Russia on her war aims. In various announcements Premier Josef Stalin has said he would push the invading army out of Russia, with the implication that he would go no farther.

Pravda's article, in which Russia's new claim was expressed, was written by Alexander Korneichuk, member of the supreme soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic. The claim that Bessarabia, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are legally a part of the Soviet Union was made in an editorial in the same paper, written by David Zaslavsky, one of its editors.

Korneichuk made it plain that Russia intends to hang on to the Polish Ukraine and the area bordering White Russia which were taken from Poland under the German-Russian partition of Poland in 1939.

TAKES DIG AT POLES

"Only a hopeless fool can believe," Korneichuk wrote, "that Lwow and the population of the western regions of the Ukraine are waiting" for return to Polish rule.

"The population of the western regions of the Ukraine will reply to the puffed-up Polish gentry, who have not learned anything, with an old Ukrainian proverb: 'Don't waste your strength, friend—sink to the bottom.'

"The Polish gentry think that the Ukrainian people should not have their own state, that only the Polish people have a right to be united in their own state, that the Ukrainian people have only one 'right'—to be divided between various states."

The Polish government in exile has said that "so far as the question of frontiers between Poland and Soviet Russia is concerned, the status quo previous to September 1, 1939 [the date of the invasion of Poland], is in force."

High Cost of Living Demands Increase of Pensions for Retired Railroad Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the increasing cost of living, which is now 25 percent greater than in August 1939, I have introduced a bill providing for a 10 percent increase in annuities and pension benefits payable under the Railroad Retirement Act.

It is revealed that at the close of business January 31, 1943, there were 129,257 annuitants and 25,688 pensioners receiving benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act. The average monthly annuity check is $66.01 while that of the pensioner is $59.01.

While it is true some annuitants and pensioners receive a sum above the average there are thousands of recipients whose monthly check is less than $50.

It does not require a prolonged study in mathematics or accounting principles to recognize the indisputable fact that in this day and age it is impossible to eke out an existence on fifty-nine or sixty-six dollars a month. The huge increase in the cost of living is evidence in itself that privation and in many cases actual want is prevalent in many annuitants' and pensioners' homes.

During the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses efforts have been made to liberalize the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act. Many bills have been introduced but they have lingered and died in committee. We have been told repeatedly that a study was being made of the Railroad Retirement Act with the thought of safeguarding the financial structure of the annuity and pension system.

The recipients of railroad retirement benefits have been patient and have exhibited a desire to understand the need for such a study of the finances of the retirement system. However, the present rate of benefits will not provide the bare necessities of life, and it is urgent that favorable consideration be given to increasing all annuities and pensions by a flat 10 percent.

It should not be necessary to increase the employer or employee contributions in order to put this 10 percent increase in effect. It is proposed to pay its costs out of the general funds of the Treasury. When the benefits that will accrue through the modest increase of 10 percent are recognized I am certain that the cost of such procedure will be amply justified.

Therefore I sincerely hope that at a time when all wages are being increased in every walk of life that we take the time to realize the plight of annuitants and pensioners under the Railroad Retirement Act and move to assist them by giving favorable consideration to this legislation to increase their benefits by 10 percent.

The legislation is as follows:

A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, to provide for a 10-percent increase in annuities and pensions

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) The annuity shall be computed by multiplying an individual's 'years of service' by the following percentages of his 'monthly compensation': 2.2 percent of the first $50, 1.65 percent of the next $100, and 1.1 percent of the next $150."

SEC. 2. Section 6 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "the same rate as" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "a rate equal to 110 percent of the rate of."

SEC. 3. This act shall be effective with respect to annuities and pensions payable on the first day of the first calendar month beginning not less than 30 days after the date of its enactment and thereafter.

Essentiality of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, recently there have been certain rulings and proposals as to cutting the newspaper print allowance for newspapers. There have even been certain other actions tending to interfere with the free functioning of our free press. Many people contend that there is no shortage of paper today such as would require that the allowance to newspapers be cut. While I am not familiar with the statistical position on this particular commodity, nevertheless the recent action—as a result of efforts on the part of a group of Members of Congress—in postponing the second cut substantiates this claim.

Undoubtedly the Government itself is the worst offender in the matter of wasting paper. The Treasury, the Office of War Information, and the Office of Civilian Defense and many other agencies send out quantities of material, the value of which it is difficult for the average layman to discover. Most of it appears to be sheer propaganda. The Treasury's publications duplicate the publicity given them by the newspapers and can scarcely be expected to reach anyone who does not read some newspaper. If there is a paper shortage, surely the Government itself should set an example on conserving paper.

Actions speak louder than words. You can scarcely have a free press if the newspaper publishers do not get the paper on which to print their publication. When it comes to words, however, our top Government officials are very strong in praising the free press, the work it has done for the war effort, and the necessity of such an institution in maintaining our form of government. Also many rulings by Government agencies made in the past bear out this contention.

The Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers' Association has prepared a short selection of rulings and statements over a period of time by various Government bureaus and agencies and various top officials in the executive branch of the Government and I include this summary herein.

I add my voice strongly to those who believe that a free press is necessary to the maintenance of a democratic form of Government:

OFFICIAL VIEWS

SELECTIVE-SERVICE RULES NEWSPAPERS ESSENTIAL

Selective Service headquarters has classified newspapers as being among "the list of civilian activities necessary to war production and essential to the war effort," and the term "newspapers" includes "all the business of getting out a newspaper." (Ask draft boards to refer to Occupational Bulletin No. 27, as amended, dated January 23, 1943).

THE POSITION OF SELECTIVE-SERVICE HEADQUARTERS

K. D. Pulcipher, major, specialist, Manpower Division, Selective Service System, in a July 1942 letter to Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers' Association:

"It has been the policy of this headquarters to recommend deferment of many newspaper and radio executives. This has been particularly true where the newspaper was the only news publication in a community or where the radio was the main source of information in a given area. The maintenance of public morale and the dissemination of information to the public, keeping it advised of the progress of our war effort, is considered, by this headquarters, to be of high importance. We, therefore, take the position that the cases of all registrants engaged in vital occupations in the newspaper and radio industry should receive serious consideration."

NEWSPAPER REPORT OFFICIAL

The Office of Price Administration has requested newspapers to print the new consumer declaration form in full so that consumers may clip copies of the newspapers and fill in the form. The Office of Price Administration announces that "filled-in newspaper forms will be recognized as official."

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD RECOGNIZES IMPORTANCE OF NEWSPAPERS TO THE WAR EFFORT

Stephen E. Fitzgerald, Office of War Information, War Production Board, in a letter to American Newspaper Publishing Association, August 7, 1942, stated:

"Mr. Nelson has asked me to answer your letter inquiring about the urgency standing of newspapers in the war economy.

"Not only the selective-service headquarters, but the War Production Board has officially recognized the importance of newspapers to the war effort, through their inclusion in the general maintenance and repair order and in others permitting the use of scarce materials to the extent necessary for printing and publishing."

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION RECOGNIZES IMPORTANCE OF SPEEDY DELIVERY OF NEWSPAPERS

Effective January 2, 1943, an amendment was issued to Gasoline Rationing Regulation 5–C so that circulation supervisors or others engaged in maintaining the wholesale distribution system of newspapers are given preferred mileage classification. Office of Price Administration said, "This allowance was made in recognition of the unusual hours during which newspaper distribution supervisors must work, and of the importance of speedy delivery of newspapers."

NEWSPAPER RATES EXEMPTED FROM PRICE CONTROL LAW; OTHER ORDERS

Section 302 (c) (4) of the price control law exempts from the term "commodity" rates charged by any person engaged in the business of operating or publishing a newspaper, periodical, or magazine, or operating a radio broadcasting station, a motion-picture, or other theater enterprise, or outdoor advertising facilities.

Administrative order, April 30, of Office of Civilian Defense, makes official provision for special insignia to permit newspaper reporters and photographers to carry on essential services or duties during the course of a black-out or raid.

Newspapers were included among 20 industries given an A-10 priority rating for repair, maintenance and operating supplies in September 1941. Later this rating was extended to include "printers and publishers," and later still almost every concern was given the right to use the A-10 rating.

Newspapers were included among the essential community services in Order L–16 to curtail consumption of electric power in the southeastern area of the United States in November 1941. The order was never put into effect because the necessity for curtailment was eliminated, but the order included exemption for newspapers as essential.

CUT IN FUEL OIL DOES NOT AFFECT NEWSPAPERS

Petroleum Administrative Order No. 3 prohibits deliveries of fuel oil to any commercial, industrial, or governmental consumer for purposes other than space heating or hot water, except to a list of exempted users of fuel oil for other than space heating or hot water included on schedule A of the order. In the list of exempted users are newspapers.

It will be noted that Petroleum Administrative Order No. 3 recognizes newspapers as a part of the public communications services, as does the War Manpower Commission, which classified communications services, including newspapers, as one of the 35 industries essential to the war effort.

BOARD OF WAR COMMUNICATIONS DEFINES NEWSPAPERS AS ESSENTIAL PUBLIC SERVICE

Newspapers and press associations have received a priority rating, No. 3, for long distance telephone calls in an order issued by the Board of War Communications, effective November 1, 1942, No. 3 priority goes to "Important governmental functions; machinery, tools, or war materials for war plants; production of essential supplies; maintenance of public services (including newspapers); supply or movement of food; civilian defense or public health and safety."

STATEMENTS OF OFFICIALS

"AN ESSENTIAL PART," SAYS COMMANDER IN CHIEF

President Roosevelt: "The observance of National Newspaper Week after 10 months of war affords an opportunity to rededicate ourselves to the freedom that is as vital to us as our daily bread—the freedom to think and speak and write the truth as we see it. Our free press has not only survived—it is an essential part of the steadying ballast which enables our ship to ride the storm."

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Donald M. Nelson, Chairman, War Production Board, in a telegram to P. N. P. A. in October 1942:

"I feel that the Nation owes the newspapers a debt of thanks for the invaluable service they have rendered through the Newspapers United Scrap Metal Drive."

On the same subject, he added a few days later:

"The job that the newspapers have done is absolutely unprecedented in this country. It has been magnificent. * * * The whole campaign has been a major contribution to the war effort."

Mr. Nelson again:

"We fully appreciate that the press is an institution as well as an industry—an institution which is absolutely essential in a democratic community, especially so in time of war."

On another occasion

"Newspapers are essential to the war program."

Before the Association of National Advertisers in New York, November 11, 1942, Mr. Nelson stated that in ordinary times advertising has an indispensable place in American life, and added that advertising has an essential role to play during wartime. He said:

"Advertising, I must repeat, is an essential part of our communications system. We dare not destroy or cripple that communications system in wartime, and we have no remotest desire to do so. Indeed, precisely because some of the functions of that system must be restricted in time of war, the proper exercise of the remaining functions becomes more important than ever. Our civilian economy is not a lot of separate pieces, scattered helter-skelter over the landscape—it is all one thing, an integrated whole which operates to keep the Nation itself functioning. Every job is important. The jobs change, as war comes, to be sure—but they are still jobs the country needs, and the job of advertising is far from least among them."

ON A PAR WITH WAR INDUSTRIES

Paul V. McNutt, Chairman, War Manpower Commission, stated, February 10, 1942:

"Essential civilian activities are on an equal plane with basic war industries in our war effort."

FROM A FIGHTING GENERAL

Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the Pen and Pencil Club, Philadelphia:

"Tell its members from an old soldier at the front that the pen is still mightier than the sword."

Gen. Douglas MacArthur again:

"There has been nothing more astonishing in the progress of war, which is really the application of the mechanics of force to human nature, than the position that public opinion occupies. One cannot wage war under present conditions without the support of public opinion, which is tremendously molded by the press and other forms of propaganda."

NEWSPAPERS AND THE SCRAP DRIVE

Robert W. Wolcott, American Industries Salvage Committee:

"I wonder how many of you realize that the newspaper scrap metal drive is the only war effort which the Government asked the American people under the leadership of the newspapers to carry through without Government participation or sponsorship. I know of no more heartening demonstration of the power of a free press."

NEWSPAPERS FOR QUICK ACTION

Statement made by Office of War Information in its national fuel conservation program, November 10, 1942:

"The Office of War Information is turning to the newspapers of the country as a quick, effective medium to which those who have fuel conserving services to offer can advertise them. With winter near there is need of immediate action."

PRICE CONTROL AID LAUDED

Leon Henderson, until recently Office of Price Administration Director, in a message to the newspaper advertising executives meeting in Columbus, Ohio, June 1942, praised the newspapers' efforts in explaining the price-control program.

WILLIAM M. JEFFERS ASKS AID OF NEWSPAPERS

William M. Jeffers, Rubber Director, sent this telegram to the American Newspaper Publishers Association in October 1942:

"We must start saving rubber now. A voluntary campaign must be started to save precious rubber until Nation-wide rationing can be effected. The newspapers constitute one of our most direct and effective channels to the American public. Therefore I am asking all newspapers, weekly and daily, to put before their readers at once the urgent need for saving rubber."

NEWSPAPERS MUST PLAY A LEADING ROLE

Dr. J. K. Galbraith, Deputy Administrator, Office of Price Administration, speaking at the Inland Daily Press Association luncheon, February 18, 1942:

"Surely no one can now doubt that every energy must be trained for the full and complete mobilization of our economy for war. The job, I hardly need tell you, is one in

which the newspapers of the country must play a leading role—for we can only succeed on the basis of public understanding and support. * * * The newspapers of the country have already done a magnificent job in bringing home to every American the importance of saving. The sale of Defense bonds is a tribute to this effort."

VITAL AND EFFECTIVE

R. F. Ashenfelter, Pennsylvania director, Office of Price Administration:

"The importance of America's free press in government 'of the people, for the people, by the people' has never been more evident than now. Particularly vital and effective has been its work of public education on the price control, rent control, and rationing program of the Office of Price Administration, all of which require the understanding and cooperation of every citizen."

AN ESSENTIAL FABRIC

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State:

"From the days of Peter Zenger, when the cause of liberty was tried and won, * * * a free press has been, and rightly so, a sacred American institution, an essential fabric in our democratic way of life."

USING FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AS WAR WEAPON

Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the United States Treasury:

"In the teeth of Axis propaganda drives, the overwhelming majority of American newspapers are keeping the public informed of the real issues of this war. By reporting the news as completely as it can be printed within the limits of national safety, they have checkmated enemy propaganda intended to demoralize and mislead our people. They are using the freedom of the press to help fight the war of the free peoples. They know that a free press cannot survive unless this war is won.

"Beyond this, we at the Treasury have special reason to thank the press, as well as pay tribute to it. [With a public spirit that is beyond all praise, the newspapers of the country have given invaluable help to the Treasury Department's War Savings program.]

"Every part of the press and all classes of newspaper workers, from apprentices to foremen and from office boys to executives, have helped the Treasury in its job of financing the war. And I should like to thank especially the newspaper boys of the Nation, whose sale and delivery of over $56,000,000 in War Savings stamps during the past year is an outstanding achievement."

THE WAR DEPARTMENT'S VIEWS

Maj. Gen. A. D. Surles, Director, Bureau of Public Relations, War Department:

"The contribution that the press of America is making to victory is something in which the newspaper profession and the country as a whole can take deep pride."

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE SPEAKS

Justice William O. Douglas, United States Supreme Court:

"We are fighting a people's war and therefore we need a free, a vigilant, and a well-informed press to help lead us. We as a people know no substitute for a free press. Certainly government cannot provide one. In the absence of a free and vigorous press we would face disintegration in time of peace and defeat in time of war."

COULD NOT WIN WITHOUT NEWSPAPERS

David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority:

"A newspaper makes no munitions, fires no guns, flies no fighting planes. And yet so mighty a weapon is the press that if we were a country without newspapers, we could not win the war."

THE GOVERNOR DEPENDS UPON THE NEWSPAPERS

Gov. Edward Martin, speaking at the 1943 annual Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers' Association convention luncheon:

"I am depending upon the newspapers of the Commonwealth to carry the story of Pennsylvania's important part in the victory program into the homes of all residents of the State."

HAVE SHOULDERED INCREASED BURDENS

Former Governor James:

"Unselfishly newspapers have shouldered greatly increased burdens in assuming the responsibility of promoting the war effort by bringing to public attention the part that each individual must play in the ultimate victory."

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE DIRECTOR FOR PENNSYLVANIA

Col. B. F. Evans, acting director, Pennsylvania Selective Service Headquarters:

"I know that as far as Selective Service is concerned, the newspapers of this Commonwealth have done more than words can describe to help make this great effort successful."

CIVILIAN DEFENSE ADVANCED BY NEWSPAPERS

Dr. A. C. Marts, former executive director of the Pennsylvania Council of Defense:

"I wish you would convey to the members of your association my sincere and deep appreciation for the splendid help which the newspapers of this State have given to the civilian defense program. It has been literally worth millions of dollars, judged by the standards of value, and has been an essential factor in instructing the people of Pennsylvania in the various phases of the home front."

"THEY HAVE COME THROUGH MAGNIFICENTLY"

S. K. Stevens, Pennsylvania State historian, September 29, 1942:

"The pages of the newspapers have performed indispensable functions in our war for the American way of life. * * * Both the State and Federal Governments have called upon the press of Pennsylvania for publicity and special war services, and in every case they have come through magnificently."

ESSENTIAL IN CANADA

Canadian Press dispatch from Ottawa, July 14, 1942:

"Newspaper men have been listed under section 15 of the National War Service Regulations. This section provides that from time to time the War Service Minister may furnish to Selective Service Board lists of industrial or servicing activities deemed to be essential to the successful prosecution of the war. An employer engaged in any activity so listed is termed a war industry.

AN ACTIVE COMBATANT

Herbert Morrison, British Home Secretary and Minister of Home Security:

"In this great struggle for the survival of a free civilization, the free press has a part to play not as a mere spectator but as an active combatant."

Our Profiteers of Scarcity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Milwaukee Journal of February 5, 1943. I believe the subject of "cartels," so ably discussed by Thurman Arnold, should be preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for future reference:

OUR PROFITEERS OF SCARCITY—CARTEL MANAGERS ALREADY ARE MAKING PLANS FOR POST-WAR MONOPOLIES IN NEW MATERIALS WHICH WOULD ASSURE HIGHER LIVING STANDARDS FOR ALL ON COMPETITIVE MARKET, THURMAN ARNOLD DECLARES

(By Thurman Arnold in the American Mercury)

As the hopes of victory grows, the managers of our domestic and international cartels—the holders of special economic privileges responsible for many of our shortages today—are busy planning for a post-war world. The vast new production created by the war endangers the established price structures on which their future dividends depend. New light metals, new forms of transportation, new techniques may make huge investments obsolete. And so the cartel leaders of the world are preparing to protect the system of high prices and low turnover, restricted production and controlled markets against new post-war enterprise.

The revival of cartel arrangements—at home and internationally—is today the greatest menace to full employment and full production after the war. It threatens the fair exchange between the products of the farm and the products of industry. It threatens the security and the job tenure of the common man. Yet average Americans know little about cartels and it is time they woke up to the seriousness of this problem.

The shortest way of defining a cartel is to describe it as a small ring of private individuals who get substantial control over the production or distribution of some basic material or some necessity of life. Consumers can always refuse to buy luxuries. But the man who needs a roof over his head or a pair of spectacles must pay the price, however high, and the manufacturer who is being deprived of light metals like magnesium or aluminum, or of plastics, is compelled to build his product out of obsolete materials.

The aim of the cartel is to prevent outsiders from producing and distributing, except on the terms which the cartel dictates. They want control of production and distribution so that new enterprise will not come in and create what the cartel managers consider a surplus. Cartels operate within one nation or extend their control through many nations, often through the whole world.

ON VERGE OF NEW INDUSTRIAL AGE

We are on the verge of a new industrial age—the age of light metals—which may bring a higher standard of living than the world has ever known, with better housing, better transportation, more abundant food. We will get these higher standards only if we allow competitive forces to pass the savings of these new techniques on to consumers, free from the control of the domestic and international cartels.

For example, suppose it costs $500 to plaster your house. Then a new chemical or metal product is invented which makes a stronger and more permanent wall than plaster and it costs only $250. The new product will make obsolete many manufacturing enterprises; it will displace labor. But if the saving is passed on to the consumer, he will have $250 to spend for a bigger house, or any one of the number of myriad consumers' wants. The labor displaced by the new product will soon find employment in new industries which this extra $250 in spending power will create.

Suppose, however, this product (as is actually the case in most new building products) is controlled by a cartel. The cartel price will probably be $490, low enough to drive out

plaster and still make a maximum profit on the new board. The $250 in labor and in manufacturing is destroyed. Only $10 of increased purchasing power is released. The consumer has lost $240 in purchasing power. Thus a situation of permanent technological unemployment is created which requires Government relief. The taxes levied to pay for that relief will more than take up the $10 saved by the consumer. Eventually the consumer must buy less meat, the farmers demand subsidies, and that requires new taxes. We reach in the end an irreducible minimum of 9,000,000 unemployed, deficit financing, a mounting public debt, want in the midst of plenty.

Of the myriad actual instances of this sort of thing, I have space for only a few.

The tobacco cartel, after paying heavy Government taxes, in some years made more net profits than the entire gross price which the farmers of the Nation received for their tobacco crop.

Tin containers take about 15 to 25 percent of the entire wholesale price of canned food.

Fire and marine insurance companies in the United States receive a billion dollars in premiums from property owners and pay back less than $400,000,000 in losses.

The total effect of the cartel system was indicated by the President in his monopoly message of 1938. Of all the corporations reporting, he said, less than 5 percent owned 87 percent of the assets of all of them; one-tenth of 1 percent owned 50 percent of the combined net income; 4 percent earned 84 percent of the total net profits.

EXPLAINING HIGH COST OF FALSE TEETH

A small but amusing example of the whole process is the price of false teeth. A cartel with domestic and international connections controls a substance called methylmethacrylate. It has a variety of uses, including plastic glass, and is the best material for dentures. The cartel sold this product to commercial users for 85 cents a pound. The price fixed to dentists (prior to an antitrust investigation) was $45 a pound. By using a different trade name, the cartel pretended it was a different product. It is in this sort of control that we have the root of permanent technological unemployment and the shutting down of the wheels of commerce.

But there is another angle of the cartel problem, apart from the consumer's dollar. It is the actual slowing up of efficiency—the holding of new processes off the market. Cartels have plenty of money for scientific research. They do not try to prevent new inventions; they try to control them. Their aim is to prevent others from suddenly introducing a new process which will make old machinery obsolete or will suddenly expand production and break established prices. They do not try to stop industrial progress; they try to get a corner on it.

Fluorescent lighting, for instance, can probably save the consumer one-third of his present bill. But for years the cartel used every effort to keep it from consumers until (1) they had complete control of the new processes and (2) they could get their money out of the obsolete method.

As another example, 34,000,000 people in this country need spectacles, yet they cannot buy them at present prices of $12 to $20 a pair. Those prices are maintained by control of a distribution system through patent pools recently attacked by the Department of Justice. The method is simple. Those who are willing to distribute spectacles on an efficient mass production basis are called chiselers and enemies of the public health. They are prevented from getting lenses.

Take a brief glance at the cartel in rubber. In 1926 Standard Oil of New Jersey, afraid of competition from synthetic gasoline, set out to get world control of its production through control of patents. The German dye trust wanted control of synthetic rubber also by the control of patents. Standard Oil of New Jersey and the Germans formed an international cartel and pooled the principal patents. In the gasoline field Standard controlled; in the chemical field, which included rubber, the German dye trust controlled. What was the result in the case of a single product like buna rubber? Today we know how desperately such rubber is needed, but we also know that under the former type of cartel control buna rubber was made a high-cost specialty. On February 1, 1940, after the war emergency was fully realized, a document from the files of Standard Oil reads as follows:

"A high royalty rate (7.5-cent pound) is fixed so as to make the operation practical for the rubber company only so long as the product is used as a relatively high-cost specialty."

You cannot control prices unless you restrict production. You cannot restrict production without depriving a nation of wealth in peace, and of strength in war.

In the new industrial age, transportation is going to be more abundant; fuel will be cheaper; airplanes, trains, and automobiles will be lighter and stronger; drugs and medical supplies will be more plentiful; chemical substitutes will replace expensive clothing and expensive housing. The average American consumer will have more money to pay for food; meat will again be a daily article on everyone's diet. Farmers' products will be exchanged for the products of industry. But all this is subject to one qualification—domestic and international cartels must not be permitted again to restrict production and destroy the value of the consumer's dollar in the exchange between the products of the farm and the products of industry.

SHORTAGES ONLY IN MATERIALS CONTROLLED BY PROCESSORS

Antitrust enforcement is not aimed at big business; it is aimed at the destruction of cartel management of big business. The protection of a big business which owes its size to efficiency and not to restrictive agreements or patent pools is important in the defense of the rights of the humblest citizen.

There is a deadly parallel between the degree of concentration of industry and the acute shortages of raw materials today. Aluminum, copper, and steel have been the most closely controlled metals in the past. They are first on the list of shortages announced by the War Production Board to date. In the textile industry, there are uncounted thousands of small producers and manufacturers and there are few shortages. In the food industry, millions are engaged in production; there are no shortages except in those articles where the processing has been tightly controlled by a small ring—canned goods, meats, fats, and oils.

The great majority of men responsible for business production—the technicians, the salesmen, the plant managers, indeed, everyone connected with the actual turning of the wheels—is interested in doing the best job of which machinery is capable. But a powerful minority, the aristocrats of cartel bureaucracy, has been manipulating corporate privileges, legislative privileges, and patent privileges to prevent the economics of mass production from benefiting consumers; they have sought to stabilize prices, to restrict production in their own enterprises, and to prevent new production by new enterprises. In effect, they have been sabotaging production.

These men cannot have their way if the public is aware of the problem. But if the public is asleep they may be able to get control of the vast new production created by the war and turn our peace into a morass of technological unemployment caused by restricted production.

An Ode to the Table

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Morton Lockritz, of 440 West End Ave., New York City:

AN ODE TO THE TABLE

(Written to the table upon which the peace treaty of World War No. 2 will be signed)

O' table of peace, what shall you see
When the carnage gives way to tranquillity?
Nations shall tremble at your feet,
And at your head the victors shall sit in all their glory.

But at your sides there shall be ghosts,
Ghosts of men who have tried this before.
Famous men: Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau and Hindenburg.
You will hear the ghosts whisper and hear the men shout.

The whispers: "Don't make our mistakes,"
And the shouts: Who knows what they will be.
Do you, table of future peace?

You, O' table of happiness and sorrows shall be well guarded.
Guarded by other ghosts; young ghosts,
Fresh returned from heroes graves,
From Libya, Stalingrad, and Guadalcanal.

Dead heroes of other wars have told them, "Be alert, for what is written on that table decides whether you have died in glory or in vain as we did."
So you, table of mighty things to come, think this:
Your destiny is guarded by an unconquerable army;
Know then, you shall see greatness.

Men from many countries will visit your future home:
The Allies, the Axis, and the victims of one or the other.
They shall dissect this enemy and build up this ally;
They shall kill the old and bare the new.

The victors shall do this and more.
But who shall be the conqueror and who shall be the conquered?
Tell me, O' table of treaties, armistice, and future peace,
Which shall we be?

—*Morton Lackritz.*

FEBRUARY 1943.

The Empty Cornucopia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the

Chicago Daily Tribune of February 24, 1943:

THE EMPTY CORNUCOPIA

After weeks of spasmodic meat shortages, after publication of the Office of Price Administration ration schedule which admittedly is designed to cut down consumption of canned, dried, and frozen foods by 57 percent, Americans still find it difficult to believe that there is any real reason why they should go hungry.

The bureaucrats in the Department of Agriculture admit that the situation is "plenty serious." We may not see the food riots that have been predicted by William Garfitt, executive vice president of the fruit and vegetable trade association, but every housewife learned months ago that shopping for food had ceased to be a picnic.

But is this not the best-fed country in the world, the country which all those bureaucrats who now admit the gravity of the food situation have been telling us would have to feed most of the rest of the world? Is the American cornucopia a myth or are its contents being wasted by mismanagement?

We know that the same planless planners who are proclaiming America to be the larder of democracy have been doing all that anyone conceivably could do to hamper agricultural production. Farms are stripped of labor for arms plants and the Army and Navy. Joe Weiner, a city lawyer, cuts the supply of machinery for American farmers to the bone while boosting the quotas for lend-lease export. The price formulas of the Office of Price Administration theorists threaten beef raisers with bankruptcy and force them to market their stock half fattened.

These evils on the production side are beginning to be widely recognized, and Congress probably will move to correct them soon. But what is happening in the field of distribution and consumption?

Washington authorities have been active in promoting the story of a vast black market in meat. This is supposed to obscure all of their own sins of omission and commission by turning the public wrath against an unidentified group of racketeers. There undoubtedly is a black market. Its extent is problematical, but the reason for its existence is plain. It is the insane price policies of the Office of Price Administration which have forced many dealers to do business on an illegal basis or do no business at all.

There are also abnormal drains on our food supply, principally those of lend-lease and of the Army and Navy. For some reason the administration seems to be ashamed of its lend-lease activities. Misleading statistics have been released, such as those quoted in all sincerity by a spokesman for meat retailers, who said that only one in 500 pounds of fresh meat goes for lend-lease. Lend-lease uses virtually no fresh meat; the shipments are of canned, smoked, or dehydrated meat.

Actually, the Department of Agriculture has reported, 1,564,584,000 pounds of beef, pork, and lamb were purchased for lend-lease in 1942 out of a total production in the country estimated by the Department at 21,700,000,000 pounds. How much was shipped abroad is not known. The estimate of production is probably too high, but, even so, lend-lease purchases took one pound in every 14. Furthermore, they were greatly accelerated in the second half of last year, so the present ratio probably is considerably higher. We did not start shipping meat to Russia in any considerable quantity until midyear, but pork purchases, most of which the Russians got, were 9.8 percent of the total 1942 pork production.

Army and navy purchases are another important factor in all food markets. No one will dispute the right of the fighting men of this Nation to the best food, and all they need, but that does not excuse extravagant and excessive purchasing by office soldiers. When an organization is given a blank check, as the Army and Navy have been, there is an understandable tendency to guard against any failure of supply by accumulating excessive reserves.

The administration should be required, as a first step toward solving the food shortage problem, to give Congress a complete and accurate statement of its food purchasing activities. The contention that such figures are a military secret, if anyone is so presumptuous as to raise it, is obvious poppycock. The Army and Navy should be required to report, lend-lease authorities should be required to report, and former Governor Lehman should be required to tell whether he is filling warehouses for the purpose of buying votes in a post-war choice of president of the world.

Committee on Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. NEWSOME

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, the creation of a special committee on aviation has a great appeal to the imagination.

The idea intrigues the mind, for all of us realize the supreme importance of aviation in our planning for the future.

Important not only to the future commerce of our country and the world, but to the preservation of life itself.

War has shown its destructive force.

Peace will prove to us that we have destroyed both time and space in our relation with other nations.

Aviation and radio, with the practical development of television, will change living conditions throughout the world.

How these things grip the imagination. Think of it—instant communication any place in the world, with your breakfast in New York and dinner in London or Paris.

Nothing can stop these developments.

Nothing can force them any faster than the natural developments of competitive engineering, design, and experience can produce them.

We all hate cancer, but no legislation can prevent it. Neither can legislation create the airplane of the immediate future.

Legislation can do only a few things for the development of air transportation. It can recognize basic principles and pass laws that will be sympathetic, intelligent, and helpful toward the adoption of a long-range program that will foster, develop, and encourage and stabilize air transportation.

Because civil aviation is part and parcel of our transportation system, its development must be encouraged along understanding lines of the needs of the entire transportation field, and air legislation must be in relation to all of the other forms of transportation.

I repeat that the creation of this special committee on aviation appeals to my imagination, but I must oppose the creation of such a committee for the following reasons:

I take this position from a strictly practical and business viewpoint.

Having been here for only 2 months, and having come only after the completion of a rather long and trying campaign, I feel that I still reflect the realities of the people back home.

I have not been here long enough to acquire either a Washington or congressional viewpoint.

I speak with none of the authority or knowledge which should come with time and experience.

I am not familiar with the aims, ambitions, or interests of the other Members.

I do not have, as yet, pride of committee, or any position of power or influence.

Because of these things, I view this matter objectively, and I believe completely without heat, prejudice, or personal interest.

As a practical man, nothing seems more completely impractical and illogical than the division of jurisdiction in legislative matters in the transportation field.

This idea, brought to its logical conclusion, would mean a separate committee on aviation, a separate committee on trucks and busses, a separate committee on railroads, and a separate committee on handling waterways.

Such action by this House would destroy the harmony and relationship between the component parts of our transportation system, and in place of creating stability and efficiency both in rates and operation, it could only cause uncertainty, fearfulness, and confusion.

The creation of more standing committees is contrary to the need of the Congress and will not improve the efficiency of the Congress.

What I think we need are fewer committees that are better coordinated, and which are set up for the purpose of stopping overlapping and conflicting authority, and to the end that jurisdictional disputes may be held to a minimum.

To justify its existence this special Aviation Committee would have to be active, and this would result in prolonged hearings and piecemeal legislation, much of which would have no relationship to the field of transportation as it exists.

You agree, I know, that a definite relationship and harmony must be maintained in the various fields of transportation, and this is especially necessary in the fierce competition of normal times in freight and passenger rates and traffic.

Without such harmony in relationship the entire field of transportation would be reduced to chaos.

Admitting as I do the importance of air transportation to our commerce and to our national defense, by the same reasoning would I advocate the creation of a special committee on radio and television, a special committee probably upon the chemical industry.

Both the chemical and radio industries will be vital to our future commerce and vital to our national defense.

I have heard the argument that this special Aviation Committee should be

made up of those Members of the House who not only have a vital interest in aviation but who have some specialized knowledge of its problems.

I cannot accept such reasoning as being sound. It is not the answer to good legislation.

It is evident that a whole committee so made up would have a tendency to become delegates for a particular industry rather than Congressmen representing the public interest.

My experience also teaches that the most bitter disagreements on fundamentals can come in groups that are technically trained or who have special interests.

Having only recently been appointed on the Interstate and Foreigin Commerce Committee, I have been impressed with the way in which this committee works.

They work upon the basis of merit and fact, and not politically or sectionally.

By working in such a way, they are making a definite contribution to the national welfare and to the development of all commerce.

Only under such consideration can aviation be developed without the vicious and bitter and mean opposition of its competitors.

I have heard criticism in this House by many different Members of the Congress about the strike situation.

Many of the strikes have been caused by the jurisdictional disputes of the different unions, and this has been bitterly condemned.

The recent labor troubles that loomed in Kaiser's shipyards were an illustration of jurisdictional disputes between labor unions.

And yet here is the House of Representatives of the United States engaged at this time in a similar jurisdictional fight for political position and power.

It has been argued that the views of the leaders of the air industry have not been determined on this question.

And I agree that they should be consulted.

But what intelligent businessman would come before any committee and testify his honest belief when those who had complete power over his future operations were engaged in a fight to see who would control his industry.

Having no way of knowing which group might win, I feel sure that his testimony would be entirely neutral. Human nature fears reprisals.

According to the testimony which has been heard so far from the industry and from those interested in the industry, it has been said by them that the legislation which is now in effect and that which is pending satisfactorily cover their needs.

There are four major unsolved problems about which the Committee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce is fully informed.

The first of these four is international air commerce, and it is obvious to all that legislation cannot solve this. It depends entirely upon the treaties made with foreign nations by our State Department.

Second. The constitutional question involving control of the air over the States of the Union. (See committee report, 1926, pp. 33–53.)

Third. The zoning of private property for safety within the jurisdiction of municipalities, cities, and counties.

Fourth. The establishment of some uniformity in liability and compensation insurance.

These four problems are under study by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It is my judgment that it can best be handled by this committee.

The American Federation of Labor, in a letter signed by William Green, its president, makes this statement.

The American Federation of Labor is strongly opposed to the passage of House Resolution 23, which takes jurisdiction over legislative matters in commercial aviation from your well-experienced and thoroughly seasoned committee, where it is being handled most satisfactorily and turns it over to a new committee, which can only be regarded as inexperienced in such matters and whose actions would certainly be extremely unpredictable.

I feel sure that this House will not create this special committee on aviation after they have considered the matter from a practical and logical standpoint and have eliminated from their minds any political or partisan considerations.

Shall the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Program Be Extended?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the discussions which occurred at the Shoreham Hotel, in Washington, D. C., on February 21, under the auspices of the American Forum of the Air, a program which was broadcast to the country over the facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System, I made a brief statement in criticism of what I regard as the maladministration of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, a criticism which I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hope that that which I then had to say may be helpful to the membership, which will shortly be called upon to determine whether or not this delegation of legislative authority to the State Department shall be continued.

The statement referred to follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, the reciprocal-trade agreement idea, compelling in its appeal to the imagination, is but another of those sloganized ideals which, in practice, falls far short of that which the use of the words imply.

So high were builded the hopes of the American people, it will be shocking to them to learn that, as a consequence of the abuse and misuse of the legislative powers which the act delegated to the State Department, the idea of reciprocity among nations and agreement between countries can no longer be regarded other than a sham and delusion.

Yet that is the lowly status to which the idea of reciprocal trading by agreement, conceived in the loftiest idealism, has been degraded by those to whom the administration of the act has been confided.

In line with the characteristic abuse and misuse of other legislative powers which the Congress has heretofore delegated to the executive branch of the Government, the powers delegated to the State Department in the Trade Agreements Act are now utilized merely as a convenient cloak for slashing tariffs by subterfuge, as a sugar-coating for a bitter economic pill with which our confirmed internationalists are dosing an unsuspecting public.

And how has all this been accomplished by these pretenders to law observance? How have these starry-eyed, crystal-gazing internationalists, those who would level all state and national boundaries and create on the wreckage of our modern civilization a beautiful dream world in which property and persons would be permitted to move and be moved from place to place without limitation or restriction, been able to approach so closely to the objective upon which they have set their hearts—the merging of all national economics in one great free trade area?

It was by the simple device of ignoring an express injunction in the Trade Agreements law itself, of ignoring an express mandate from the Congress, that the will of the American people as expressed in their National Legislature has been defeated.

Despite the fact that the intent of the act was to prevent generalizations of agreed-to tariff reductions to countries that discriminate against American commerce (and every important country in the world is by policy and act constantly discriminating against our commerce), these inspired gentlemen of the State Department blandly and contemptuously and upon their own responsibility wrote into the act the principle of "unconditional most favored nation treatment," the principle which immediately became the death sentence of reciprocity, the executioner of the agreement-between-nations idea, the destroyer of all of that which we had hoped to achieve through reciprocal trading.

By the unauthorized interjection of this international formula, every so-called reciprocal trade agreement became just an instrumentality by which every concession in the American market which we, in an agreement-in-form, had extended to a single country was further extended to include every one of the 109 customs units of the world, to include all of the 58 nations of the world, save one, Germany, no one of which had extended to us any concessions in its own market whatsoever.

Because of the "reading into the Trade Agreement Act of the most favored nation clause, Japan, a non-agreement country, was able to avail herself of all of the tariff slashes we made in agreements with nearly 30 other nations without making a single concession in her market to the United States in return. She just hopped on the gravy wagon and paid not a nickel for the ride.

And the boys who "planned it that way," call this reciprocity.

By this unauthorized application of the "most favored nation" principle, "Yankee horse-trading" went out the window. Its mere announcement is quite enough to make

David Harum, that much loved character of fiction, turn over in his grave. For indeed, by its interjection, all hope of achieving reciprocity in trade between nations perished.

No wonder that so many speak of Uncle Sam as uncle sap. No wonder that those of us who believe that Uncle Sam is entitled to at least a 50–50 break now and then are opposing an extension of this misused and grossly abused delegation of legislative authority. It is high time that the Congress take back, recapture, if you please, its constitutional prerogatives and reassume its age-old legislative responsibilities.

And as a confirmed believer in reciprocity, not only in trade but in every international relationship, I'm for doing it and doing it right now.

Sacrifice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, much has been said since Pearl Harbor about "sacrifice." I often wonder if those who recently walked out of the coal mines in Pennsylvania while easterners shivered for the lack of fuel really know of the meaning of the word. I likewise and more especially refer to the more recent walk-out of the workers in the Boeing aircraft plant of Seattle—they who are the builders of the Flying Fortresses, not the pilots, gunners, or bombardiers thereof. Let him who would walk out on unauthorized or unnecessary strike, or unnecessarily absent himself from civilian work and duty while his neighbor freezes for lack of fuel, while his banner is carried by America's young sons on the battle fronts of the world, while these young sons bleed and die, take stock and ask of himself the question, "Am I really making a sacrifice"? Let him read the following editorial reprinted in one of the newspapers of my district:

I AM THE AMERICAN SOLDIER

"I am a mother's son. I am the pride of a family and part of a home. I love my life as you love yours. I am youth in years and experience in life, yet I am a gambler, betting the highest stakes a man can wager—my life. If I win, you win; if I lose, I have lost all. The loss is mine, not yours; and there is a grieved mother, a saddened family and a broken home to which I can never return.

"I ask only for the Godspeed and support of my Nation in return for laying upon the altar of my country my all. For bravery and blood will you furnish bullets and bread? Will you pawn your shekels if I pawn myself? Will you bet your gold while I bet my blood? Will you hazard your wealth while I risk my life? I am the flower of a Nation's manhood, the glory of a noble race. I am the American soldier. I am the boy in the trenches."—Kansas City Star.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to the policy of "work or fight."

Air Pilots Vigorously Oppose Establishment of New Committee on Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from David L. Behncke, president, Air Line Pilots Association, vigorously opposing the establishment of any new committee on aviation in the House that would take jurisdiction over the subject away from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, February 27, 1943.

Hon. EVAN HOWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOWELL: Resolution No. 23 to create a new and separate committee on civil and commercial aviation is on the calendar awaiting action by the House.

When a measure seriously affecting the development and regulation of air-line transportation, both domestic and foreign, is before the lawmakers of the Nation, those most vitally interested, the air-line pilots and the other masses of air workers, would indeed be derelict in their duty if they did not let Congress know their feelings on so important a subject. When a subject so important and so far-reaching in its effects is up for a decision it is almost sure to be clouded by the usual fog of misinformation and distortion, inadvertent or otherwise, obscuring the true issues. Then, too, there is always the question: What is and what is not political expediency?

If we, the Nation's air-line pilots, can help to clear away this fog and help to present the true picture to you, whose vote may decide this vital question, then we shall feel we have at least done our part in the best interest of a great new industry to which we have contributed so much.

Resolution No. 23 proposes to amend the rules of the House as follows: "To rule X add '40 B. on Aviation, to consist of 21 members.' To rule XI add '40 B. to Aviation, other than appropriations therefor, including all commercial and civil aviation.'"

At first glance, it would seem to be assumed from the resolution introduced by Representative JACK NICHOLS that we have no House committee for the consideration of measures relative to civil aviation and air transportation. This is not true. There is such a committee, thoroughly seasoned and well experienced—the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which now has complete jurisdiction over all civil aviation and air-transportation legislation. The members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee are outstanding Members of Congress, able, and of long experience in the regulation of all forms of transportation, including that by air. This committee's jurisdiction extends to air, rail, bus, and waterways, and it has considered well the problems of civil aviation, and air-line transportation. It has legislated wisely and thoroughly in this field to place our country's commercial air transportation irrefutably in the No. 1 position in world aviation.

Outstanding examples of this committee's work are: (1) The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 which is, without question, the greatest civil aeronautics regulatory law ever enacted; and (2) title II of the Railway Labor Act, the provisions of which have developed peaceful and harmonious relations between employer and employees in the air-line industry.

Air safety is the life blood of the industry. Let us review very briefly what the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has done about this all-important subject.

In 1938 this committee sponsored, and was successful in securing, the enactment of provisions of law creating the Air Safety Board. This action on the part of Congress abruptly stopped the most terrible series of air-line accidents ever experienced on the air lines, costing many lives. There followed a period of 17 months with not a single air-line accident and no loss of life—a world's air safety record.

Then came Reorganization Plan No. IV which, among other things, threatened to destroy the Air Safety Board. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee lost no time in springing into action and, with outstanding aggressiveness, bitterly fought the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. IV in the interest of safeguarding human life on the air lines. Congress agreed with this committee and Reorganization Plan No. IV was defeated in the House on May 8, 1940, by a comfortable plurality. Unfortunately, Reorganization Plan No. IV was approved in the Senate on May 14, 1940, by a narrow margin, but only after strong intervention.

Since that time there have been again many crashes and much loss of life. To say that the efforts of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee have saved many lives, including those of the pilots, in air transportation is putting it extremely mildly.

Yet, we are told that the pilots don't know what the issues involved in Resolution No. 23 are all about. They not only know these issues, but the safety of their human cargo and their own lives are involved. Certainly, no group of men could have a greater interest. Their interest is the same as that of the public, because the lives of the public and pilots are as one when an air liner goes aloft.

Quite naturally we all have ideas of our own, expound different theories, and ofttimes our arguments may become heated but, in the final analysis, the results obtained are the real answer to any question. Our country's air line transportation development and commercial aviation generally have resulted in the most highly developed planes, power plants, aids and related equipment in the world, and these developments are destined to be the deciding factor in the present war. Even our enemies have feverishly copied these advancements. Surely all this could not have happened under an improper and neglected civil and commercial aviation legislative program—a program that has always been through the years under the jurisdiction of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Why, therefore, should it be proposed to take the jurisdiction of aviation from this veteran group of legislators, who have legislated wisely and well to obtain this kind of result, for the purely experimental notion contained in the Nichols Resolution No. 23 which is wholly untried and purely speculative.

The people in the industry, those who do the flying and servicing of the planes, in other words, those who perform the work and are the real backbone of the business of air transportation, say that if this move is successful and Resolution No. 23 is approved, then civil and commercial air transportation legislative problems will be taken from the hands of the real aviation legislative experts of Congress—the members of the

Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Due to the war, commercial aviation, especially air transportation, is at the moment passing through dangerous channels. The real truth of the matter is that civil flying has gone to war. Certainly now is not the time for the industry to change legislative pilots. Commercial aviation is primarily speedy transportation. Eliminate the transportation aspects and there will be nothing left but a vehicle of the sportsman. Let us not forget that air transportation is only one part of our country's transportation system. We have railways, we have busses and trucks, and we have the ocean-going and inland waterways—all interrelated and vital to the best interest of the Nation. In the past some parts of our railroad system have been referred to as strips of rust. It's a different story now. We are in a cruel and relentless war and where would we be without our well-developed rail transportation system? Where would we be without our busses and trucks? Where would we be without our air transportation? The plain truth is that without all of our modern transportation facilities we would be whipped.

All transportation is nationally interrelated, all necessary, and the legislation for and regulation of each mode bear a definite relationship nationally to all the other modes. The legislative problem of all are now dealt with in one committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, and that is the way it should be. Common sense enables us to realize this.

Why, then, should we take one branch of transportation from this veteran, seasoned, and thoroughly experienced transportation committee and place it in an entirely new and separate committee on civil aviation and air-line transportation? It is just as reasonable to say that we should have a standing railroad-transportation committee of Congress, a standing bus and truck committee of Congress, and a water transportation committee. Instead of having one committee dealing with all transportation legislative problems, we would then have a multiplicity of congressional committees on Capitol Hill, all dealing with separate branches of transportation. The conflicting results are not difficult to visualize.

We already have plenty of conflict among governmental regulatory agencies. Are we to add to this by creating the same situation on Capitol Hill? The pilots and the people in the industry say, "Heaven forbid."

Domestic air transportation in the past has generally been subsidized by the Government. Beiause of wise legislative policies of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the greater part of this development is now self-sustaining and paying dividends into the Federal Treasury. For the fiscal year ending June 1942, it is estimated that the Post Office Department's Air Mail Division will have writtten $8,000,000 on the black side of the ledger.

There are certain problems in the field of intercontinental flying that must be solved in much the same way as the problems of domestic air-line transportation have been solved. There is not the slightest doubt that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is fully capable of meeting every problem in the foreign field of air transportation. They are already well on their way to the solution of these problems.

It would certainly be a calamity to take from the thoroughly tried and highly experienced Interstate Commerce Committee the jurisdiction over civil, commercial, and air transportation and place it in the hands of a new committee wholly inexperienced.

Consider who are on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The six top-ranking Democrats are: CLARENCE F. LEA, 26 years a Member of Congress; ROBERT CROSSER, 26 years; ALFRED L. BULWINKLE, 20 years; VIRGIL CHAPMAN, 15 years; MARTIN J. KENNEDY, 12 years; and LYLE H. BOREN, 6 years. The six top-ranking Republicans are: B. CARROLL REECE, 20 years a Member of Congress; CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, 16 years; PEHR G. HOLMES, 12 years; CHARLES HALLECK, 8 years; CARL HINSHAW, 4 years; and CLARENCE J. BROWN, 4 years.

Chairman LEA has passed the quarter century mark of congressional service, as has his veteran committee colleague, ROBERT CROSSER. Both of these men's records are well-known to the Members of Congress—and so reads the roster of this powerful and thoroughly experienced transportation committee, on which is represented a grand total of 214 years of legislative experience.

One point more and I shall end this letter. When I say all branches of civil flying and air transportation have gone to war, I speak of facts. A large percentage of air-line pilots is in uniform. The same is true of officials, owners, and mechanics. Even the greater part of the commercial air-line equipment has gone to war. Many of our airmen are flying global routes, transporting men and material to the armed forces fighting on our far-flung battle fronts. The prime interest of the pilots and other air workers is to win the war, but when they left and when they write, it is always on the theme, "While we are away don't let them tear down nor destroy what we have built up—the pre-war civil aviation legislative and regulatory set-up. This is what we are fighting to preserve."

In closing the pilots plead, "Don't be misled by high-sounding speeches discussing highly imaginative notions, and theorizing on post-war aviation." Post-war aviation, global and intercontinental in nature, will be limited strictly by reciprocal arrangements with other countries. In other words, our foreign air-line transportation system will expand in proportion to the number of foreign air lines we permit to land on our soil.

Private initiative and privately invested capital will do the rest. No matter what happens we need our experienced aviation legislators. The pilots say, "Keep them on the job and we shall have little to worry about."

The pilots—more than 3,000 of them—who man the country's air lines from coast to coast, and to some 40 foreign countries, over both oceans (domestically, hemispherically, and globally), respectfully urge you to vote against the Nichols Resolution No. 23 and keep our country's civil and commercial aviation moving ahead on a sound footing and with the greatest possible degree of air safety.

The air-line pilots have appealed to Congress in the past for aid in their problems and their pleas have never fallen on deaf ears, but never before have we brought a more important subject before the country's legislators.

Your help in defeating what the pilots regard as the most destructive and illogical move ever attempted will be long remembered and thoroughly appreciated by each and every one of them.

Respectfully yours,

AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
DAVID L. BEHNCKE, *President*.

Friend of Dairymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here a resolution adopted by the Tennessee Jersey Cattle Club in their convention at Nashville, Tenn., February 19, 1943.

The resolution which follows pays a well-deserved tribute to my friend and distinguished colleague, the Honorable JAMES MCCORD, who for more than 30 years has worked untiringly in the interest of improved dairying practices in Tennessee:

Whereas this organization has had the pleasure and honor of having the advice, leadership, and services of the Honorable JIM MCCORD for many years—during 10 of which years he served the organization as its president, he represented it in the councils of the State and the Nation with both distinction and honor to the breeders and dairymen of Tennessee; and

Whereas the Honorable JIM MCCORD has had the unanimous and unqualified endorsement of the people of his Fifth Congressional District in being nominated and elected without opposition to Congress; and

Whereas he has been named on the Agricultural Committee of the House of Representatives, on which committee he is preeminently qualified to render distinctive and meritorious services both to the Nation and to the people of his home State; and

Whereas his presence in Congress will reflect honor and distinction to our renowned State of Tennessee: Therefore be it

Resolved by this organization, That the State of Tennessee and the Nation be congratulated on having a man of such varied experiences and unsuual abilities to serve in the Halls of Congress and that the Honorable JIM MCCORD be felicitated upon this and many other honors that have come to him in his long useful and unselfish life for the public.

Secretary Wickard Replies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the New York Times of February 23, 1943:

SECRETARY WICKARD REPLIES—CITES DEPARTMENT RECORDS IN DISSENTING FROM MR. BROMFIELD'S STATEMENTS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your Letters to the Editor department carried on February 11 a statement from Louis Bromfield presenting an array of charges against the Government's management of the wartime food-production program. Since his outburst is directed primarily against me, I would like to match some of his statements with the recorded facts:

1. Mr. Bromfield says "that nothing whatever has been done to help the farmer in solving the three obstacles which prevent him, despite all the patriotism and good will in the world, from achieving maximum production. These are in order: skilled labor, machinery, fertilizer, and semi-skilled labor."

As early as September 1941—before the war broke out—I warned of the prospective shortage of farm labor, and in a speech at New York September 24, 1941, I said: "I have an idea that most farmers' sons and hired men on the farms today can serve their country

best wearing overalls instead of a khaki uniform." At the same time I mentioned the shortage of farm machinery.

MEXICAN LABOR ADMITTED

Furthermore, I think an impartial examination of the record will show that most of the steps taken to alleviate the farm labor situation have been taken at the instance of the Department of Agriculture, directly or indirectly. In July 1942, I went to Mexico City and while there helped to negotiate with the Mexican Government an agreement which permitted the entry of Mexican workers to help out our hard-pressed farmers. This was one of the first specific steps taken to do something about the shortages of farm workers, and the program developed as a result of it included the movement by the Department of Agriculture of domestic workers from one part of the country to another. This program, in many areas, enabled the harvesting of crops produced in 1942.

On occasion after occasion I have called attention, publicly and privately, to the seriousness of the farm labor situation.

2. Mr. Bromfield says that "He (the Secretary of Agriculture) is offering no effective plan even at this late date, but only absurdities such as $100,000,000 subsidies and dream armies of 3,000,000 volunteer ignorant and untrained women and children workers."

I would like to discuss the so-called dream army first. By this, I take it, Mr. Bromfield refers to our plans to mobilize season workers, emergency harvest workers, and year-round workers for agricultural production. The President recently approved a program, which is being submitted to Congress, under which we hope we can enlist more than 3,000,000 men, women, and children for farm work in 1943, and we hope they will to a large extent replace the loss of skilled workers and regular workers. I realize that these workers will not be as effective as the workers that already have been taken from the farm, but I wonder what Mr. Bromfield would have me do. Nothing? Or is it sensible to do the best we can with the labor available even if that means the mobilization of untrained men, women, and children?

STUDENTS IN DEMAND

Every year we have depended upon millions of school boys and girls and other unskilled people to help us harvest our crops. They have always done a good job. We are going to try to get even more of these workers this year because we are planning to produce more. Mr. Bromfield apparently fails to realize that we, as every other nation in war, find ourselves short of manpower and therefore have to use all available sources if we are to do our job.

3. Mr. Bromfield's reference to "absurdities such as $100,000,000 subsidies" is supplemented by this additional statement: "No farmer wants any part of Mr. Wickard's $100,000,000 subsidy."

I suppose that Mr. Bromfield is referring to a program which recently went to Congress providing for incentive payments for increased production of peanuts, soybeans, flaxseed, and other war crops.

I think Mr. Bromfield will agree with me that production costs for farmers are increasing, due in large part to some of the very factors which he mentions. Either we attempt to offset these higher costs and get vital production by raising farm prices, and as a result, ceiling prices on food, or we must offset them by some such method as incentive payments. I think, therefore, that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not attempt through payments to get the farmers the increased returns they need to produce.

4. Earlier, I quoted from Mr. Bromfield's statement that nothing had been done to help the farmer with regard to farm machinery.

The farm machinery story is a long and, from our standpoint, a painful one. In June 1942 the Department proposed a farm-machinery program for the year beginning October 1, 1942, which proposed new farm machinery amounting to approximately 50 percent of that manufactured in 1940 and repair parts amounting to approximately 150 percent of 1940. This proposal had been approved by the Farm Machinery Branch of the War Production Board, but, after considerable discussion, the War Production Board itself approved a program under which the new machinery manufactured would approximate about 23 percent of 1940 and repair parts about 130 percent of 1940.

Recently the War Production Board approved a program under which the manufacture of approximately 40 percent of the farm machinery manufactured in 1940 and approximately 167 percent of the repair parts will be permitted for the year ending October 1, 1943, although due to the long delay the program will be late.

5. Mr. Bromfield says, "On the food production front we lost the year 1942 and now we have lost the year 1943 because no practical, sensible plan has been offered but only mountains of questionnaires, the drafting of skilled farm labor, and a shortage of machinery."

So far as 1943 is concerned, we must wait and see, but I think the record shows that Mr. Bromfield's statement that "we lost the year 1942" is, as he would phrase it, absurd. In 1942, for the third successive year, the farmers of the United States broke all high records for production. In 1942 farmers exceeded the previous high records of 1941 by about 12 percent. In 1942 farmers of the United States exceeded production for the 1935–39 period by 27 percent.

REFLECTION ON FARMERS

I think Mr. Bromfield's statement that we lost the year 1942 on the food production front is a reflection upon the farmers of this country who achieved a record production in the face of the very same obstacles that are causing such bemoaning on Mr. Bromfield's part.

6. Mr. Bromfield says: "No figures are given out concerning the soybeans that cannot be marketed because when the Secretary of Agriculture urged farmers last year to plant more soybeans he overlooked the fact that there is a limit to the capacity of soybean processing plants."

Mr. Bromfield's statement that in urging farmers to plant more soybeans in 1942 I overlooked the fact that there is a limit to the capacity of soybean plants also is not true.

The Department proposed a fats and oils program in March 1942, and at that time Dr. F. F. Elliott of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics headed a committee which called attention to the fact that the soybean processing capacity would not be able to crush the increased acreage called for in our production program. At the time the program for increased production of soybeans was drawn plans were made to ship soybeans to the South and to other areas where there might be excess processing capacity. Thus far contracts have been signed to crush more than 12,000,000 bushels of soybeans in plants that ordinarily crush cottonseed or peanuts, and additional quantities will be crushed out of the soybean area as the beans are harvested.

7. Mr. Bromfield says that "no nitrogen fertilizer is available, and other fertilizers become more and more difficult to obtain."

Our records indicate that we will have 440,000 tons of nitrogen for the 1942–43 season as compared with 420,000 tons for the continental United States in the 1941–42 season. Mr. Bromfield might ask why we do not have more nitrates for farmers. There are two reasons.

In order to have more nitrate we would either have to take shipping away from the supply lines for our armed forces in order to bring in nitrate from Chile, or we would have to take nitrogen away from the manufacture of explosives.

REPAIR PARTS AVAILABLE

8. Mr. Bromfield says, "Even to get a spare nut or bolt it is necessary for a farmer to spend long hours of his precious time filling out forms, traveling miles on precious rubber, and then waiting weeks before the nut or bolt is obtainable."

Again Mr. Bromfield is in error. Farmers are not required to fill out forms before purchasing material for ordinary repairs such as nuts and bolts. When they are available these materials may be sold by the hardware stores and other stores without restriction or form filling.

I am willing to admit frankly that I have made mistakes and that I will make others as time goes on. My capacity as a public official also is a matter of opinion, but I do insist that I know something about farming and that I know what farmers are up against with regard to production in 1943. As a farmer, I am face to face with some of the difficulties Mr. Bromfield mentions, and from the reckless nature of his charges I am confident I know more about the actual situation at both ends of the line than he does.

Mr. Bromfield says that he has heard "good, honest, patriotic farmers" say that they were all right and they would eat, and that when the city people did not have enough to eat, "maybe Washington will do something about the situation."

I do not believe this represents the sentiment of the majority of farmers, and the majority are good, honest, and patriotic farmers. The farmers of this country will not be satisfied with producing enough for themselves and their families. As they have always done, they want to produce enough for the country and, above all, enough to feed our soldiers and win this war. Speaking from my experience as a farmer and my experience in Washington, I know that despite all the difficulties thus far experienced, and the unknown difficulties which lie in the future, farmers will respond to their Nation's call to produce all they can.

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture.

WASHINGTON, *February 17, 1943.*

"Today on Congress There Lies Heavy the Greatest Responsibility in All Its Long and Great History"—James Truslow Adams

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because of the timely nature of the subject which he discusses, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which I have just received from Mr. James Truslow Adams of Southport, Conn., a letter, the reading of which will be very helpful, I feel quite certain, to the membership of this body who will so soon be called upon to consider legislatively the President's unprecedented Executive order limiting salaries.

Mr. Adams' letter, aptly entitled "A Firebell in the Night," follows:

A FIREBELL IN THE NIGHT

Hon. BERTRAND W. GEARHART,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN GEARHART: In 1820 Thomas Jefferson said of the passage of the Missouri compromise that it startled him like "a firebell in the night." It did so because its brazen tongue rang out the news that a great national and constitutional crisis was approaching

Occupied with war, and endeavoring to unify our effort to win it, we Americans of today have again been startled by a "firebell in the night," the amazing letter of the President to Chairman DOUGHTON of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. To many it appears as one of the most pernicious and dangerous communications ever transmitted from the Executive to the legislative branch of government. It is of vital importance to every American, but in part its contents are the more immediate and primary concern of Congress, and in part of the citizens themselves.

It is for Congress to consider its economic implications. The limitation of all incomes, net after taxes, to $25,000 is not anti-inflationary. That has been shown. It is not a new revenue measure, for Colin F. Stam, expert of the joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, reports that official Treasury figures show that it will result in a loss of $110,000,000 of taxes to the Treasury. Such, and other technical financial problems are in the domain of our elected representatives in both the Houses.

What concerns the citizen is the appeal in the letter to class hatred when the need of the time is for unity; its misleading suggestions, such as that anyone in the Nation is now getting a net salary of $500,000; its comparison of such a falsely assumed income with that of the $600 of a soldier, whereas nothing is suggested as to the inequity of real income of labor at home in safety as contrasted with the pay of the soldier at the front; its plan of coddling home labor at the expenses of the soldier who risks his life and the executive who has the responsibility for invention and for organizing the vast turn-over of industry from civilian to military use; its demagogic and alliterative appeal in such a phrase as "coupon clipper" when the Treasury is appealing to all to become "coupon clippers"; in a word, its setting of class against class by means of misrepresentation to many of those who will read it without knowledge.

Above all, however, the letter is the concern of the citizen because of its open threat to our whole form of government which has been based on the separation of powers. The theory of that separation has been well understood, as balanced between the executive, the judicial, and the legislative departments. Today the President, owing in part to his unexampled years of tenure of office, has made not only a majority of the Supreme Court but also a great majority of all Federal judges his appointees. Congress, for a while, largely abdicated its functions, which it handed over not merely to the Executive but to his petty minions, the devisers of rules in innumerable boards and commissions.

The President asked Congress for legislation limiting incomes to $25,000. Congress disapproved and declined to pass any such law. Then the President, making use of a verbal loophole, which leaders of Congress had been assured he would not use for the purpose, made his own law by "Executive decree." Now he tells Congress he will "rescind" his decree if they will pass the law he demands. Already largely in control of the courts, having assumed many of the functions of Congress, he now publicly intimates that he has the whip hand over that body which is to do his bidding, or else.

I do not know what the reactions of the Members of Congress were, but I believe that that of the average old-fashioned real American, conversant with the history and theory of government of his country, was that he had been slapped in the face. "What is the use", he asked himself, "of electing nearly 500 Members of a Congress, at a salary of $10,000 a year each, to legislate for us, if their wishes are flouted, on the one hand, and they are merely told, on the other, how to vote, by one man?" If the Executive can control the courts and the Congress, then what are we fighting this war for?

Other peoples, with far longer political experience and as much love of liberty as our own, are thinking the same thoughts. A few years ago a lord chief justice of England wrote in his book, the New Despotism, that—

"Of all methods of administration, that is worst whereby real power is in the hands of one set of persons while public responsibility belongs to another. * * * It is a method, as all experience shows, well calculated to encourage the performance of acts which either set of persons, if they had both the responsibility and the power, would be astute to avoid."

Recently another Englishman has written that—

"Next to the supreme calamities of abandoning the Christian religion, or defeat in war, none could be greater than that Britain and America should become regimented nations. The lights would indeed go out. A mericiful Providence has given the Americans a sense of the dangers. But in Britain there is cause for anxiety. The nation must beware lest the deadly influence of some un-English creeds sap our strength."

As we in America indeed so blessed by Providence? Are we so sure of our future? Are we too sure? When we hear the "firebell in the night," are we to turn over and go to sleep, murmuring "it's not my house," or rise and gird ourselves to fight what may yet become a conflagration that shall consume all which we have held dear?

As individual citizens we cannot all write letters or articles. We cannot march en masse to Washington. We have elected our Members of Congress—Senators and Representatives alike—to legislate wisely but, above all, we count on them to preserve those institutions for us and our children which in the past have made America free and great. Today on Congress there lies heavy the greatest responsibility possibly in all its long and great history. On it alone can we count.

I have done my modest best both by written and also many unwritten words, to maintain unity and to forward the national effort for victory. I shall continue to do so, but there are occasions so momentous that they force a man to speak even when he would rather keep silence. I cannot assume to speak for all America, but I am confident that I do speak for a very much larger number of Americans than perhaps even Congress itself realizes, when, with all the fervor of patriotism I possess, I beg the Members of that body on behalf of myself and the other citizens who have elected them to their posts of responsibility and national duty, to resume into their own hands those powers which are theirs under our form of government and which, duly exercised, can alone preserve us as a nation of free, self-governing, and self-respecting men.

We still have the right of petition, and this is the petition which I am convinced is in the minds and hearts of millions of your constituents, "Win us freedom by victory over our enemies; and preserve that freedom afterward by a government of laws and not of men and minions."

Sincerely yours,

JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS.

Don't Make Aviation a Political Football

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as an indication of the deep concern that is becoming evident among the friends of aviation as a result of the effort being made to strip the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in these critical times of all jurisdiction over civil and commercial aviation and place it in a new and untried committe, I include as part of my remarks, under the leave granted to me, a well considered viewpoint expressed by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star on Friday, February 26, 1943.

HOUSE FIGHT SEEN HARMING AIR INDUSTRY—POLITICAL FOOTBALL LIKELY TO FOLLOW COMMITTEE SHIFTS

(By David Lawrence)

With all the importance that civil aviation has achieved already and is likely to attain in the post-war world, some overzealous though well-meaning friends of aviation have started a controversy in the House of Representatives which can hardly result in any benefit to the industry or to the progress of aviation itself.

The plan brought forward is to create a separate committee in the House devoted to civil aviation which now is handled by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Such a new committee would not, of course, encroach on the handling of military and naval aviation by the House Military and Naval Committees but would endeavor to separate civil aviation from consideration along with other forms of transportation.

If the war has demonstrated one thing it is the unfortunate effect of the peacetime tendency to overdepartmentalize and thus separate functions that ought to be coordinated or unified. There is a difference between specialization within limits under unified supervision and the grant of coordinate authority to a unit which then becomes responsible to no general command. If anything there is more and more need to integrate related units under a single head so as to get the proper interplay between them.

In the case of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, a subcommittee on civil aviation has been created which specializes in aviation, but the work of this arm of transportation is reviewed in the light of experience with other forms of transportation—an excellent arrangement.

"What will happen if a separate committee in the House on Civil Aviation is created?" was the question asked of Chairman LEA, Democrat, of California, who has presided so long over the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

"In the first place," he replied, "you will be throwing away the benefits of more than 20 years of intimate experience. The committee on intrastate and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has the perspective which experience can give and which the aviation industry needs if its problems are to be handled with sympthy and understanding. That committee knows what has been happening not only yesterday or last year but ever since aviation started. It knows what the fundamental needs and problems are; it

knows enough not to be carried away by some passing event of the moment.

STABILITY NEEDED

"In the second place, if a separate committee on this one subject is created, you will be inviting a rash of legislative activity which can do great harm to the industry. Before the industry's problems were fully consolidated into one place in 1938, civil aviation was gravely harmed by constant new legislation and legislative proposals. Since then it has received the stability that has permitted sound growth. But if a new committee be established with nothing else to do, there is the greatest danger that this industry will be in a perpetual investigation, with perpetual legislative activity keeping it perpetually on our doorsteps.

"In the third place, if a new committee is established, you will lose the greatest benefits of the coordination of transport policy which we gain through one transportation committee of the House. This industry is rapidly approaching the point where it will encounter many of the same types of problems which other modes of transport have encountered. In such matters as regulation of rates, issuance of securities, relations between contract and common carriers, mergers and consolidations, it is essential that this industry be treated on a fair basis, as compared with the treatment to other carriers, that tested and tried fundamentals of policy be applied to it, that we avoid some detour into the speculative areas of unprecedented controls.

CLASH OF INTEREST

"Problems such as these are the great problems of the future so far as air transportation is concerned. If you do not maintain some consistency with the treatment found sound in other modes of transport, you may ruin the aviation industry in its dealings with its competitors. Moreover if you set up a separate committee it is inevitable that you will promote a clash of interest as between the several modes of transportation.

"You will subject the aviation industry to attacks from powerful surface interests which today the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can and does control and prevent, as our experience with the Transportation Act of 1940 demonstrates."

The issue is to be voted upon in the House next week and at last reports the Republicans, who originally were among the enthusiasts behind the proposal, were beginning to see that no constructive purpose would be served by making the aviation industry the football of politics.

Ruml Plan as a Post-War Safeguard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

CORPORATIONS AS WELL AS INDIVIDUALS SHOULD BE PLACED UPON A PAY-AS-YOU-GO BASIS AS OUTLINED IN THE ORIGINAL RUML PLAN

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the advantages of paying the income tax on a pay-as-you-go basis, both psychologically and for purposes of better fiscal management, have been set forth at great length by those who have studied the subject carefully. The main objection so far advanced to this plan is that the Treasury would lose some revenue and that taxpayers would be forgiven some tax liabilities. A careful analysis of the situation, however, shows that any incidental loss to the Treasury will be more than offset by better tax collections and collection methods, without increasing the burden on this account to any taxpayer. In other words, the Federal Treasury would lose no revenue and the taxpayers of our Nation would be on a current basis, which would eliminate income-tax debt and do it without loss of revenue and with no additional burden on any taxpayer.

If the Government would not lose any revenue through the operation of the Ruml plan, neither would the taxpayers as a unit save any taxes by it. The Ruml plan would not in the long run forgive the whole body of taxpayers any taxes whatever; it would merely affect to some extent the individual incidence of taxes. It merely changes the basis of assessment on each taxpayer from his 1942 income to his 1943 income.

The fact that the Government would not lose any money is difficult for many persons to grasp. However, it's merely turning the clock forward—or, in this case, the whole calendar forward.

Take any period of years and divide it up in groups of 5 years, 10 years, or 50 years, the Government will collect taxes for that number of years and collect them each year. It does not matter how the years are labeled on the calendar. In the coming 5 years, it doesn't matter whether the Government collects taxes on incomes of 1942–3–4–5–6, as under the present system—or on the incomes of 1943–4–5–6–7, as under the proposed system. The Government is interested in totals, total national income. The average total over a series of years would yield probably higher taxes under the proposed system than the existing one.

We all remember the farm foreclosures and general records of business in the early twenties and after 1929; the men who lost their farms, businesses, and savings because values fell while debts remained the same, hence there is no need to dramatize the situation. We all remember likewise previous wartime earnings and recognize the wisdom of the merchant and banker who made people pay up currently.

After this war is over there will doubtless be a strong veterans' lobby, followed by a demand for forgiveness of the accrued taxes charged against the soldier. The amount involved will be small and the demand will have much merit, hence will probably be granted. As soon as that is done, other organized groups like war workers may likewise demand a forgiveness of accrued taxes. Of course, this demand will be without merit, considering the great disparity between a soldier's pay and a war worker's pay, yet Congress may probably bow to such organized demands and write off hundreds of millions in tax claims. The rest of the taxpayers will be pursued relentlessly.

It is significant that the American Institute of Accountants recently considered the Ruml plan in its entirety and were requested for an opinion as to whether the Treasury would lose any money. These accountants state:

Since the United States Treasury operates on a cash receipts basis, there is, in our opinion, no reason to suppose that the receipts from taxation of individuals in 1943–44 would be any less if the pay-as-you-go system were adopted than on the present basis. Furthermore, over a long period of years it is likely that the income of this country will increase and the receipts under the pay-as-you-go system would be greater with the same tax rates than under the present system.

If the wisdom of adopting such a plan for individual income taxpayers is so obvious it is equally true that the same treatment should be accorded to corporations in paying their income taxes.

Corporations are not the ultimate beneficiaries of corporate income. Corporations receive income for the benefit of their stockholders. Under existing laws, corporations no longer dare accumulate any substantial part of the net income remaining to them after the payment of normal taxes; except such portion as is reinvested in plant facilities, expansion, and so forth. Examination of the conduct of the large corporations in this country in this respect over the last 6 years—that is, since January 1936—will disclose that the income retained by them and not distributed to stockholders is relatively a very much smaller percentage of their total net income than in any preceding period.

Most corporations are now dependent directly or indirectly upon war work. When the war ceases, their incomes will drop, and they will not simply be thrown into the red; they will be plunged into the red. Whenever this occurs, if they have staggering tax bills for the previous year, many of them will be forced to close down because they simply will not be able to meet their enormous pay rolls and pay their unprecedented back taxes, during the readjustment period from wartime work to peacetime work.

Here is a typical letter received from an employer:

We are deeply concerned about the tax situation and desire to urge that if the Ruml plan is adopted in its proposed form, it should be made to apply to the employer as well as to the salaried employee. The employer should be permitted to pay monthly or quarterly out of his earnings on a pay-as-you-go basis.

The case of our company illustrates the need for some such program of taxation, and we believe it is typical of many such concerns.

This company is engaged fully in war production. The increasing of our production entails large expenditures for expensive machinery and expansion of our plant.

If the war should end suddenly and we should be required to pay our income taxes on the preceding year it will take all of our profits to pay the income taxes and we will have nothing left except our plant and equipment set up for war production. It will be practically valueless for any other purpose, and our original capital together with our earnings will be tied up in a worthless plant. Under the present set-up, we see nothing but bankruptcy ahead when the war ends. If a program could be worked out along the lines of the Ruml plan, it would permit us to pay income taxes out of our current earnings. The Government will be the gainer in the long run. We would like to enlarge our plant with the addition of much more required equipment so as to meet the demands of the armed forces, but it is simply impossible to expand our production and invest additional capital when we know that the plant and its equipment will be of practically no value when the war ends. If the Government has to levy upon and take over the plant for income taxes due when the final settlement is

made, there will be a loss to the Government as well as a loss of our entire capital investment.

This is such a serious matter to this concern and to similar establishments throughout the country that we urge upon the Ways and Means Committee the adoption of the Ruml plan in such form that it will apply to the employer and the manufacturer of war products and we feel that it should be enacted speedily so that we can properly determine our future course.

The situation undoubtedly applies to many small corporations, partnerships, and individual employers in all parts of the country.

The adoption of the Ruml plan in the case of corporations would definitely meet what seems to be the two main objections so far advanced by the Treasury Department.

The Treasury says that the death of an individual taxpayer would mean a loss to the Federal Government. Theoretically, at least, a corporation never dies—at least so long as it is solvent and making money.

Secondly, corporations are large pools out of which the Government can collect very cheaply and easily large sums of taxes. Put on a current basis, these sums would be most helpful to the Treasury Department at a time when its requirements are most urgent. Likewise, it would enable corporations to pay these heavy taxes out of current earnings and therefore best able to meet their tax obligations.

Without the benefit of legislation, many corporations are at present trying to provide for tax obligations out of their current earnings by the purchase of tax warrants. These warrants are bought periodically during the year as employers estimate what their tax obligations will be. Would it not simplify things very greatly for the Treasury Department to apply these sums used in the purchase of tax warrants to the current tax obligations of the employer? It would certainly eliminate a great deal of bookkeeping, records, printing, and other expenses. So far nobody has advanced any sound basic objections to placing corporations on the same footing with individuals in paying their income taxes.

Address of Mr. William E. Leahy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very splendid speech delivered by Mr. William E. Leahy, of Washington, D. C., on February 4, 1943, before the Washington Cosmopolitan Club, at which time Mr. Leahy was presented the Distinguished Service Medal and Citation award by this club, which award is annually conferred upon the citizen performing the most outstanding civic service during the year. This medal was presented to Mr. Leahy in recognition of his devotion to duty as director of selective service for the Distict of Columbia:

Dr. Biggs, most surely it would impinge upon hypocrisy if I did not say I am most signally honored by this conferral upon me of the Distinguished Service Medal and citation of this great civic group who have gathered themselves together in the Cosmopolitan Club of Washington, D. C. I accept this honor so graciously bestowed, with full appreciation of its implications and sincere humility in the conviction of my own unworthiness of its reception. The contribution which I have tried to make in this awful hour of our Nation's crisis has been so insignificant in comparison with the utter sacrifice so many others have laid upon the altar of our country's freedom that in retrospect the thought occurs that in justice it should go unnoticed. My poor effort has been as the tiny ray a little candle casts to shine in that brilliant effulgence reflected from the united response to the call of patriotism made by our people, a people who know that today the destiny of all civilized life itself as translated into our democratic processes hangs in a perilous balance and that all democracy is looking anxiously to us, the people of America, to see that the torch of liberty still held high aloft shall never be extinguished or even diminished in the light it sheds as the world's last hope of decency and of honor. My tribute is to all those who have accomplished such remarkable and unselfish work in the administration of the Selective Service System—to that army of our citizenry who now for over 2 years of the effective operation of the law have toiled voluntarily and without compensation. My tribute is to the members of our 6,500 local boards and our boards of appeal, who have seen the dusk gather in their offices, factories, and on their farms after a day's work has already been finished, only to travel through the heat of a hot summer's night or the cold of a winter's storm, to their local boards and there for hours carefully study and analyze millions of questionnaires, each to determine in his own oath-bound conscience the correct classification of registrants subject to selection for service in the armed forces of our country.

My tribute is to those thousands of American lawyers who again voluntarily and without compensation dedicate to Selective Service the prime of their professional skill and experience in acting as advisers or appeal agents for registrants, to aid them in correctly filling out those millions of questionnaires or informing them of the law and its regulations in order that they may know their rights and exercise them in the truly democratic administration of this most important and far-reaching legislation.

My tribute is to those thousands of American doctors who have toiled so generously for hours in our hospitals and in their offices, examining registrants in their preliminary tests, again voluntarily and without compensation, giving so liberally of their busy hours and from their patients that the machinery of Selective Service might move on inexorably toward its objective, the production of an efficient complement to our armed forces with a minimum rebound upon our civilian population in the tax-paying bracket when this war is won. To all of these men our city and our Nation owes a debt of genuine gratitude and of thanks. Their names will perhaps never be known and their fame never written, but one day when history writes across the page of time the deeds of the humble and the poor, someone, I hope, will dip his pen in the ethereal blue of that canopy which tents our country and write high amid the stars at least the results of their unsurpassed and unsurpassable achievement.

And then, too, my tribute is to the mothers of our boys, those grand, those courageous, those noble women who suffer in silence as they stand beside the train or the bus while their sons are leaving, for what, where, why, who knows? Does one of them question? Does one ask why? Alone, so alone she stands. No hysteria, just alone, a good-bye, a wave of the hand, and then the dew which sorrow chills upon an aching heart melts into a teardrop on her kerchief, as she sobs, silently. But her heart is strong. Flesh of her flesh, blood of her blood, life of her life, he goes, just another soldier, just another sailor; but the great heart of our American mother is big enough to give and then big enough to take. God bless our American mother.

And lastly my tribute is to our boys. Day after day they go. There somebody's sweetheart stands. He loves her so. To him the mists of yesterday, just before they lifted, wafted a halo above her brow, but he must go. And there's that wife, that sister, father, friends, it's all the same. A kiss, a hand shake, and they are off. They are off to do the toughest job which history will ever record. They are off in the privilege of fighting to make life worth living for those who are to come. They are off to save for us the the right of free speech, the right to worship God as each thinks He should be worshiped, the right to live as freemen, to work, to think, to love as freemen. They are off to save America, the world, its civilization and God's graciousness to man. My tribute to them. God protect and save them insomuch as some good men must die that other men and women may live. Somewhere, somehow, in the inscrutable omniscience of Providence, his precious soul and being will be enshrined in some sarcophagus of fame and devotion which will enrich all posterity and make of the American doughboy and sailor the exemplification of true Christian charity and love.

Dr. Biggs, I finish as I began. My appreciation of this honor transcends expression, and I but assure you and through you your club that my care from now will ever be that nothing I do in that much of life which still lies before me shall ever be done to tarnish this medal, but rather that some day the Cosmopolitan Club of Washington may feel the same depth of pride in having conferred this great honor upon me that I feel now in its humble reception.

And So We Are Warned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial which appeared in the Daily News of Fort Lauderdale, Fla. The editorial follows:

AND SO WE ARE WARNED

The bigwigs of the New Deal Party are laying a barrage of intimidation against all opponents. The leader of this attempt to scare the citizens is that distinguished "pig killer," HENRY WALLACE, who last night cried at the New Deal $100-a-plate dinner, attended by New Deal beneficiaries, "that the American people will have little patience with any

political party which puts partisan advantage above the national welfare."

WALLACE is the last man who should have said that. What have the new dealers ever done in Washington other than put their political advantages above general welfare? What was the President's purpose in spewing other people's money all over the landscape of every State in the Union just before every election when he wanted himself and his crowd to be elected? In almost every act, every word, the record of profligate waste of the people's money on an unprecedented scale is written in every county and hamlet of the Nation.

Now these men, the President and the Vice President, stoop to such cheap stuff as to accuse the Republicans of evil designs. This writer is a Democrat, a Southern Democrat, a State's right Democrat, but not a new dealer, and to him it is apparent that the new dealers are actually frightened by the wave of anti-new dealism that is sweeping the country. They sing out in alarm, attempting to frighten the populace by the cry of wolf. In plainer words, Mr. WALLACE accused the Republicans of a will to steal the New Deal's modus operandi and nobody believes that.

The people have already rejected it. And the President lashed at "those who have forgotten the precepts of truth in their utterances." We wonder if he remembers his statements about Pearl Harbor casualties and how he pledged the people that the casualties in men and ships were no worse than he stated, and how later the official naval statement was not in accord with his declaration on his honor to the people of the country.

Some people remember the President once promised the mothers of America that no American boy would be sent by him to fight on foreign soil, and look now at the picture.

Soon the American people are to know hunger and Mr. WALLACE wants them to forget his massacre of the pigs in 1933 and 1934 and his orders to lay waste the fruits of the land. Mr. Roosevelt hopes the reputed short memory of the people will have washed out his various statements that we're short of the whole facts. And the President turns to the Bible frequently in that Monday night speech. Well, they all do, that is the politicians, when they feel bereft of the trust of the people. It is the last staff upon which the politicians lean to befuddle and fool their listeners. It is an old trick, much worn and bedraggled and little befitting the man who should nobly wear the dignity of the Presidency. It is the trick to don the cloak of martyrdom.

All those speeches at this $100 dinner, which was a useless waste of food, because everybody reporting there at the time had finished dinner earlier, or if not, had been lallygagging over cocktails, were strictly New Deal propaganda. It is the way of official Washington, and moreover, the patrons were largely contractors, politicians, and official employees who were keeping their records in order by contribution of $100 and attending.

They form a poor part of the public, but perhaps on this occasion properly, for so poor a fabric of propaganda as the President and Vice President wove for public apparel. And the President said: "Would that all of us could live our lives and direct our thought and control our tongues as did the father of this country." Most everybody wishes that the President could do just that. If he had done so, we wouldn't be following England and Mr. Churchill to prevent the liquidation of the Britsh Empire.

And do the people appreciate this withholding of the sinking of two United States ships and the loss of 850 men early in February until a day of patriotic memory when the President and Vice President can minimize the significance by speeches to a $100-dinner crowd?

Twenty-five Thousand Dollar Salary Limitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, in my community there is a unique organization made up of well-educated individuals from all walks of life who meet periodically and have one of their members lead a discussion on an important topic of the day, after which there is an open forum with no restrictions on opinion or method of presentation of opinion. It is not my privilege to name the organization nor the individual who presented the following discourse, but the subject covered at one of these meetings was entitled "The $25,000 Salary Limitation Is Vicious in Principle."

I have requested the author to prepare for extension into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his remarks, thinking that every Member of Congress would be interested in this very frank analysis of one man's opinion:

Before getting into the subject assigned to me, "The $25,000 Salary Limitation Is Vicious in Principle," I want to bring you a short chronological review of the $25,000-a-year idea, as we know it today.

Salary limitation has, of course, long been a basic demand of the communistic doctrine of leveling off—of those who see in such a move the possibility of hastening the breakdown of the capitalistic system and the bringing into being of a Utopia wherein the less efficient and less ambitious benefit as much as those of us who are willing to work, accept responsibilities, and plan for the future.

In the present instance, it was crystalized into definite form early in 1942, largely by the leaders of the Congress of Industrial Organizations under the claim it was necessary to guard against undue payments to individuals from profits from war-generated business, and as a matter of mass morale.

The public first heard about it when it came as one of the major points in the President's message to Congress on April 27, 1942. It was included in the explanation of the general item of salary limitations in this equality of privilege program as one of the important means of stopping the rise in the cost of living and the prevention of inflation.

Ambiguous and nebulous in form, the idea was quickly promoted by catchwords and quickly spoken phrases. It was picked up by demagogues and crackpots as a Presidential endorsement of a powerful weapon against capitalism.

Congress thoroughly canvassed the idea, calling upon Treasury experts and others for facts and figures. The almost unanimous opinion of the committees of both houses was that the idea offered nothing of value to aid in the controlling of the rising cost of living or with which to stop inflationary trends, and, more important, was actually detrimental insofar as revenue production from taxes was concerned.

The next important date to remember is September 7, 1942, when, in his "do it or else" message to Congress, the President said, "We can rightfully expect the fullest cooperation and self-restraint only if the tax burden is being fairly levied in accordance with ability to pay.

"This means that in the higher income brackets the tax rate be such as to give the practical equivalent of a top limit on an individual's net income after taxes approximating $25,000."

Please keep in mind the fact that the President said net income after taxes and not salary. The broad terminology used here is clear, although, to the unthinking person or to those who are orally or visually unobserving, it might sound like a limit of $25,000 on salary.

This is particularly true to the mass of people whose sole income is what they get in their pay envelopes. Income to them is considered only in terms of personal earnings. They know little of the other kind of income.

My friends heard all about it the evening of September 7, 1942, when, with deep feeling and just the right emphasis, the air waves carried the President's fireside chat to what is reputed to be the largest single audience which has ever listened to one person at one time. This was the chat in which the President, among other things, said, "today I have also advised the Congress of the importance of speeding up the passage of the tax bill. I have told the Congress once more (emphasis on the once more) that all individual incomes after payment of taxes should be limited effectively by further taxation to a maximum net income of $25,000."

Note the phrase "individual income after taxes should be limited by further taxation to a net income of $25,000." The President was speaking of net income after taxes and not salaries, or salary limitations.

Congress fixed the next date to remember, namely, October 2, 1942. This was the date of the anti-inflation legislation establishing the President's right to issue general orders for the stabilization of prices, wages, and salaries affecting the cost of living and for the stopping of inflation.

Then on October 3, 1942 (elections were still more than a month away) the President established the Office of Economic Stabilization. In this he laid down the broad principles and rules for the stabilization of prices, wages, and salaries.

On October 27, 1942 (a week or so before elections) Director of Economic Stabilization James F. Byrnes issued directive No. 6228, sections 1002:18 through 1002:22, inclusive, to cover the matter of salary limitations to a net of $25,000 after taxes.

You are asked to specifically note that this is a directive, and not a law passed by the Congress.

This directive establishes a basic theoretical figure of $67,200 as being the figure for net taxable income based on salary which will result in a net income after taxation of $25,000. A careful reading of the directive shows, however, that the $67,200 is not the net taxable income to be considered but the net taxable value of the salary which would result in a net of $25,000 after taxation.

The movie publicity men, you will recall, jumped on this at once as the ceiling for salaries. They like most persons, had not read directive 6228 and the sections 1002–18 through 1002–22. Hedy Lamar's lawyer read it though. That's why Hedy is making them pay her the $82,000 her contract calls for.

The directive says, "this latter amount ($67,200) is the maximum amount of salary which an employee would be permitted to receive for 1943, provided he is not entitled to further allowances under sections 1002.19 to 1002.22 inclusive."

Please note—provided he is not entitled to further allowances under sections 1002.19 to 1002.22 inclusive.

And that is where the matter rests right now.

The 1942 tax schedules are applicable to full 1942 total incomes regardless of salaries.

The new directive is to be applied only against 1943 salaries.

Now, let us go back a few weeks. A day or so after I was asked to cover this phase of the $25,000 salary limitation, I managed to find an empty chair in my favorite barber shop for a much-needed and overdue hair trim. As I sat there I had to listen to a very animated discussion of this matter by the occupants of the other three chairs—they were evidently friends, or, at least, seemed to know each other. The sum of the entire discussion was that the actual knowledge of the whole idea added up to about zero and might be stated as one did, "Well, I'm ——— glad that no so-and-so big shot can get more than $25,000 a year, at least for the duration, and maybe forever."

This prompted me to wonder just how much better the understanding of the members of this group might be of subjects which had received so much publicity and which held so potentially great an influence on the future of the American way of living for which we are told we are fighting.

A simple questionnaire was developed in which six statements of fact were given together with four statements of opinion. These were all on a yes-or-no-answer basis. This went to 25 names selected at random from the roster. Twenty-one of the 25 came back.

The returns were graded and here are the scores: On the six factual statements for, very obviously the expressions of opinion were not graded.

Four rated 100 percent—one of the four openly admitted he was guessing at three of the six. Three missed only one. Four missed two, eight missed three and two missed four. Rated as school children are with 75 percent as a passing grade, two-thirds of the class flunked.

Forgetting for the moment that this matter was handled as an executive directive after Congress had thoroughly and fully expressed itself as opposed to such a move and had not provided for it, but holding to the statements on the questionnaire, let me take them one at a time giving you each time to form your mental answer before I give the full answer. I am sure that when you have heard the statements and the answers you will agree that this matter was not only vicious in principle but in conception and in implementation.

Incidentally, an evaluation of the returns into obvious groups of Democrats, Republicans, and those who are above and beyond either, shows a surprisingly accurate cross section representative of the group as a whole.

The statements and their answers. Each was prefaced with—The $25,000 salary limitation—

1. Provides a fixed limit on all salaries paid. Answer: No.

The directive under which this will operate provides, "An amount of salary in addition to the basic salary described in 1002:18 ($67,200) will be permitted in certain circumstances to allow the employee to maintain his customary contributions to charitable institutions etc., described in section 23o of the code. Such additional amount of salary will be permitted if the employee establishes to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that after resorting to his other income from all sources he would suffer undue hardship in maintaining his customary contributions out of the basic salary ($67,200) allowed in the preceding section."

"What constitutes undue hardship in this and all following sections, through 1002–22 is dependent upon all the circumstances in each case.

"Income from all sources means income which is exempt under the Federal tax laws."

The other directive provisions covered in 1002:20, 21 and 22 provide for other allowances to be added to the basic figure in event the payment of them would set up undue hardship. These include insurance premiums contracted for prior to October 3, 1942—Federal taxes on 1942 income and general operating expenses and other fixed obligations.

Thus it is easily seen that the fixing of the ultimate gross salary is entirely dependent upon an individual's ability—with the help of a mathematician and a lawyer—to prove undue hardship.

2. Is a law enacted by Congress or part of a law. Answer. No.

It is true that technically it is the result of permissions granted by Congress. However, it is a use of such permissions in ways never intended by Congress. Senators and Congressmen directly concerned with the raising of taxes for the highest budget ever set up in the history of the country were highly indignant at the way in which the President, through the Director of Economic Stabilization, had done directly what the Congress had kept from doing after careful consideration and study had shown it would be highly detrimental to the taxation program.

There are in Congress at the present time (January 28, 1943) several moves designed to offset the whole idea by direct legislation.

3. Directly affect only a matter of some 3,000 individuals. Answer. Yes.

Director Byrnes speaking before the New York Herald Tribune Forum on November 16, 1942 said, "The so-called $25,000 salary limitation actually affects only those having a salary in excess of $67,200. That salary limitation in 1942 would affect only 3,000 persons."

True, it does directly only affect some 3,000 persons who have salaries above $67,200 but, and this is another of the vicious elements in the subject, it does, if permitted to stand, affect every citizen and particularly the public who have been led to believe it limits salaries to $25,000 when it does not.

4. Permits deductions from income not permitted to all income taxpayers. Answer yes.

It does it in the form of allowances to the basic $67,200 as previously stated—insurance, Federal taxes, fixed obligations, all based on a nebulous undue hardship provision.

There isn't a man in this room who wouldn't like to be able to add his insurance, his Federal taxes, his fixed obligations to his income-tax deductions and I am sure that there isn't a one of us to whom the payment of these necessary costs of maintaining our American way of life are not becoming actual "undue hardships."

5. Covers only income from salaries? Answer: Yes.

The directive says nothing about incomes from other sources except as they concern ability to pay allowed obligations without undue hardship. The directive dos not limit incomes but only income from salaries and then only under very broad interpretations.

6. Is, or will be a major factor in stopping inflation? Answer: No.

Dr. Harley Lutz, professor of Public Finance, at Princeton says, in a recent report on this subject, "The answer to the major inquiry, namely, the contribution of the salary limitation plan to the closure of the inflation gap, is that it will make no contribution large enough to be measured on any practicable scale. The contribution would be microscopic, infinitesimal, of no practical significance whatever. It is the smallest kind of tack hammer being used to drive the largest gage spike."

I have not touched on the academic question of the limitation of personal incentive which has always been considered the driving force which carried forward the American tradition of rewarding personal effort and initiative. This is a phase for someone more erudite than I in the handling of philosophical vewpoints. It is, however, a major element indicative of the viciousness of the directive when matched against the much-heralded "four freedoms."

The four expressions of opinion are now given, not necessarily as my opinions but simply as a matter of securing expressions of the thinking of the group.

1. It was put into effect as a political expedient.

Ten said yes, nine said no, and two did not answer.

The timing of it together with the vast amount of erroneous publicity which followed immediately could only have a salutory effect on the mass of voters who were lead to believe the powers that be were again soaking the rich to help the poor.

Late in November R. S. Rukeyser, an economic commentator speaking on Town Hall of the Air opposite a representative of the Congress for Industrial Organizations, said, "Accordingly I am compelled to conclude that it is not primarily an incident in the war against the Axis but is an episode in internal class warfare."

2. It deliberately misleads the group it was intended to mollify.

Since it does not limit salaries to $25,000 as most of these people believe, will not serve to aid in maintaining prices and stopping inflation, and, since by decreasing taxes from this group through the permitting of formerly taxable deductions, it increases the tax load on the mass public. Obviously it deliberately misleads the mass public for whose consumption it was set up just prior to election time.

3. It is sound in principle and practical in operation and application.

Only 5 said yes, 13 said no, and 3 did not comment.

As a directive which makes each case of proving "undue hardship" "dependent upon all the circumstances in each case," makes the whole thing so ambiguous and so subject to misinterpretation as to make the actual operation of it highly impractical if not impossible with any degree of equity and fairness even among those whom it so patently favors.

4. It is vicious in principle.

Six said yes, 14 said no, with 5 giving qualifying answers.

This is the last opinion and I leave the answer to you individually in the light of the information which has been made available to you.

In closing let me say I have endeavored to stay away from getting bogged down in a lot of economic theories or the quoting of voluminous statistics which usually go with a subject such as this as I have preferred to stick to those factors which do give fundamental principles of living.

I fully realize I may have changed your thinking but little for you who are new dealers will still carry the torch, you who are anti-new dealers will still seek a chance to apply the torch, and you who belong to that group above and beyond either, will continue to seek ever bigger and better axes to grind.

However, if I have to some extent made it possible for fewer than two-thirds of you to flunk a simple test in this vital subject, the time and effort you have put in listening to me will have proven to be worth while. Thank you.

If You Want Food Production, Lumber Must Be Made Available for the Farmers

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, every person in the United States has become food

conscious. For more than 2 years, I have repeatedly tried to impress this Congress and various Government agencies with the facts concerning the critical situation in regard to farm machinery, lumber, and other equipment and the loss of manpower on our farms. Much of the damage has already been done, but even at this late hour the Government of the United States must see to it that every agency removes all rules and regulations which are retarding and destroying the production of food.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my remarks by including portions of a letter that I have received in reference to the lumber situation. You will notice that it speaks of the need of lumber for brooder houses. Perhaps the consuming public does not realize how vital this is in the effort to keep food on their table. A thousand baby chicks purchased from a hatchery can within 4 months provide the Nation with more than 3,000 pounds of food. With proper care, by that time they should weigh between 3 and 4 pounds, and with proper equipment and proper care the loss ought not to exceed 10 percent. However, this cannot be done without lumber for brooder houses and other like equipment.

It is in the interest of every housewife in America for her to insist that the farmers be provided with farm machinery, lumber, and other equipment, and that the man-power situation on our farms be immediately and drastically cared for.

The portions of the letter which I include are as follows:

TABLE ROCK LUMBER CO.,
Table Rock, Nebr., February 24, 1943.

MR. CARL T. CURTIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN:

* * * * *

There is one thing that is being overlooked that has more to do with the production of food than any other thing, that is being unable to secure lumber for the building of brooder and poultry houses, farrowing houses, and fencing for hogs, and repairs for necessary buildings.

We are equipped to build and deliver to the country all buildings of the above class, have been compelled to turn away 12 parties who wanted brooder houses and they are not going to order chickens until they get them. There are about the same number that wanted three pen hog houses. If we had been able to furnish these, it would mean the production of a good many chickens and the saving of a good many pigs.

What is true here is true at other small yards as there was a party here the other day that had been to five different yards and could not buy lumber for a hayrack, neither could we furnish it.

We have been trying to place an order for lumber and shingles since the middle of November and have not got the job done yet.

The mills all have the same story: The Government is taking 80 percent of the lumber which only leaves 20 percent for the civilian use (of that 20 percent only about half can be of use for tight buildings like brooder houses) they say that they have orders on file for from 300 to 400 carloads and do not care to take on any more orders until they can get their order file somewhere near cleaned up.

It seems that the big boys are doing a little better but not very much. This is going to be awful if it does not change in a short time. Think we will have to close in another month.

Don't know as there is anything that can be done about it but we think that it is just as important as farm labor.

From a standpoint of food production, a man with a tractor will do just as much work now as five would do a few years ago with horses if they will put in as many hours as we used to.

Some of the larger yards that have a little Government contract are getting more lumber than they know what to do with and they are selling for other purposes than what their rating calls for.

Please investigate what we have written you and see if there is not some way that the little fellow can get a little lumber.

Yours very truly,

ELMER D. WOOD.

Intracoastal Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Mr. J. H. Ross, president of the Inland Water Petroleum Carriers Association, eastern division of the United States. Mr. Ross is perhaps our highest authority on matters pertaining to shipments of petroleum and its products:

INLAND WATER PETROLEUM
CARRIERS ASSOCIATION,
New York City, February 18, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Many thanks for the copy of your speech delivered in the House on February 4 relative the canal across Florida from the Gulf to the St. John River. It is enlightening, instructive, and full of authentic facts as far as it goes, but in my candid but humble opinion I do not think it goes far enough.

I am strong for the immediate construction of this canal but when we reach Trenton, where do we go from there? The acute shortage of oil today is in New York and New England and these areas are the heaviest consumers of industrial, bunker, and domestic oils, as well as of gasoline, therefore the Intracoastal Waterway should extend from Corpus Christi to Boston for in New England hardship and suffering through the shortage of fuel oil is acute and even in New York both industrial and domestic oils are causing a severe hardship and many industries and homes are unable to obtain sufficient supplies. The "missing link" across New Jersey is the obstacle to getting supplies of petroleum products into New York and New England and will continue until this short canal is constructed.

The dredging of the South River, which is a tributary of the Raritan, to a depth of 15 feet has been completed I am informed, so that if a 15-foot barge canal is to be constructed from the vicinity of Bordentown on the Delaware River to the vicinity of Sayreville on the Raritan River, the length of the proposed canal, by using the improved South River, can be reduced to 25 miles, and I feel that it should be constructed irrespective of railroad opposition.

I would like to quote you from a talk I made in Philadelphia last October in connection with the shortage of fuel oil on the Atlantic seaboard.

"It will be interesting for you to know that the 17 Eastern States normally use about 1,600,000 barrels of petroleum products daily, and that under normal conditions about 95 percent of this quantity is brought from the Gulf in ocean tankers. The remaining 5 percent is delivered by pipe lines, tank cars, and barges. About June 1941 the Coordinator of Petroleum inaugurated tank-car shipments from suppliers to the Eastern States and by September of this year these shipments had reached a high of 856,710 barrels daily.

"The differential in freight rates between tank-car shipments and tank vessel shipments is about 2½ cents per gallon and involved an extra transportation cost of $400,000,000 per year. Price adjustments involving an increase of approximately 2½ cents per gallon were arranged by the Coordinator of Petroleum with the Office of Price Administration, and these were put into effect and continued until Federal Loan Administrator Jesse Jones agreed to assume this extra cost as a proper war charge against the Public Treasury. So that at the present moment the necessity of using railway transportation in lieu of water transportation involves a minimum cost to the taxpayers of the United States of approximately $400,000,000 per year.

"At the present time there is being delivered into the eastern area of the United States approximately 1,250,000 barrels of oil a day. Of this figure approximately 800,000 barrels is being moved into the area by tank cars at an average freight rate of approximately $1.40 a barrel; 75,000 barrels a day via the Great Lakes and the New York State waterways at an average freight rate of 84 cents a barrel; 64,000 barrels via pipe lines at an average rate of 65 cents a barrel; and about 35,000 barrels via the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers in conjunction with either pipe lines or tank cars from the Pittsburgh area to the eastern seaboard at a cost of $1.40 a barrel. Roughly, this total is about 974,000 barrels and the average weighted freight rate is $1.30 a barrel. By multiplying 974,000 barrels by the average rate of $1.30 we have $1,266,200, the cost per day, and multiplying this amount by 365 days we have the total cost per year of $462,163,000.

"'There is still being received on the Atlantic seaboard by tankers approximately 250,000 barrels per day with a fixed maritime freight rate of 40 cents on gasoline to 48 cents on heavy bunker oil. The excess cost which is being absorbed by the Public Treasury in the form of a subsidy, amounts to the difference in delivery cost between the present means of transportation and that formerly delivered by tank vessels at a cost below 40 cents per barrel, whereas present average transportation cost is $1.30 per barrel. The present total costs of getting petroleum products to the east coast amounts to $462,163,000 as compared to the cost of shipments by approved tanker rates, if tank vessels are available, amounts to $197,173,000 which indicates that approximately $264,990,000 is the excess cost being paid as a subsidy by the taxpayers of this country.

"In July 1942, the Coordinator of Petroleum announced that a shortage of fuel and heating oils in the States on the Atlantic Seaboard actually existed. He stated—

"'Fuel and heating oils in storage in the East are only about half of what they were at this time a year ago. And, although summer is the period during which inventories are normally built up for winter, we have not been able to build them up this year. All of you know the reason; the fleet of some 300 tank ships, which used to bring about 95 percent of the oil to the East, has been

reduced to a fraction of its former size by transfers to military service and through destruction by enemy submarines. It has been impossible to replace those ships with tank cars, pipe lines, barges, lake tankers, and trucks, in spite of the fact that your Government, the petroleum industry and the transportation companies have done, and will continue to do, all in their power to move more and more oil east. And so, although no man can make any valid predictions in wartime, there is no assurance, as of today, that you will have enough fuel and heating oil to supply your next winter's supply. On the contrary, the prospect, as of today, is that your supplies will be substantially restricted. It is possible that there may be some days when both distributors and consumers will be without fuel and heating oil.'"

"It is generally conceded by military experts and others with a recognized knowledge of the subject that we have a long, hard war ahead of us and there is no prospect that American tank ships can be, for some time to come, diverted from their present military activities to any great extent for coastal service. According to the best information available from unofficial sources, approximately 496 ships have been sunk in the Atlantic by Axis submarines through torpedoes or gunfire; a number of these vessels are tankers, and as a result of these losses, it is generally conceded that the shipping shortage constitutes the greatest bottleneck of our national war effort and of the shipment of economic supplies to the East coast States. A conservative estimate of the cost of the 496 ships lost amounts to approximately $600,250,000. The amount of cargo lost through these sinkings may be estimated at 2,500,000 tons and while it is difficult to estimate the value of this cargo, it may be safely stated as $250,000,000—making a total financial loss on this account to $850,250,000.

"Our coast line from Eastport, Maine, to Key West, Fla., was inadequately defended, except for several ports where seacoast fortifications existed, and some 35 years ago the founders of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, recognizing this condition, proposed the construction of an inland protected waterway along the Atlantic coast from Boston to Miami. At the present time, this waterway is partly completed and is in operation. It permits vessels loaded to a 9 foot 6 inch draft to move through its channel from Jacksonville, Fla., to Norfolk, Va. Between Jacksonville and Miami, the draft is limited to 6 feet. From the Virginia Capes to Trenton via the Chesapeake Bay, the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, and the Delaware River, there is a 27-foot channel. Between New York Harbor and Boston, there is a deep-water channel through New York Harbor, Long Island Sound, the Cape Cod Canal, and Massachusetts Bay to Boston. The continuity between the Virginia Capes and Massachusetts Bay is stymied by the lack of a connecting link between the Delaware River and New York Harbor. There is now pending in Congress a bill to provide for the immediate authorization and construction of the New York Bay-Delaware River section of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway between Bordentown, N. J., on the Delaware River, to the vicinity of Sayreville, N. J., on the Raritan River, which if completed, would provide a continuous inland waterway between Miami, Fla., and Boston, Mass. It would also provide an inland waterway route to every port of the Hudson River, every port on the New York State canal system and every port on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River for economic purposes, as well as military.

"For military purposes, it will afford a protected inland water route connecting the Norfolk, Washington, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston Navy Yards, shortening the distance between the New York and Philadelphia Navy Yards by 150 miles and that of the Norfolk and Washington Navy Yards with the New York yard by 100 miles.

"Surveys have been made and reports submitted by the Army engineers in connection with the construction of this canal. However, its construction at the time was disapproved on the grounds that it was too costly, not urgently necessary, or economically justified at the time these reports were reviewed. The estimated cost of construction varied from $20,000,000 for a 12-foot lock channel to approximately $200,000,000 for a 27-foot-depth channel. However, all reports conceded that this canal was essential for the completion of a continuous interior waterway, the intraccastal canal, between Boston and Miami.

"With the attack on Pearl Harbor, conditions changed instantly. National defense plans became war plans—a paramount issue. and transportation, both commercial and military, became a serious and difficult problem in the new light of events, and still is. The Atlantic Ocean became, and still is, infested with enemy submarines that have taken an appalling toll in ships, their cargoes of essential material, and of human lives.

"If the so-called missing link is constructed between Bordentown and Sayreville, there will be then available a connecting and protected waterway immune from submarine attacks and the hazards of the sea encountered on the outside route. It would permit vessels to enter it at the Virginia Capes and proceed to Boston. The capacity of vessels using this route will be determined entirely upon the depth of the channel and inasmuch as the controlling factor is the depth of the channel in the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, namely, 27 feet, there is no apparent good reason why the missing link should not be the same depth. If you will take the cost of the vessels lost on the Atlantic coast between the Virginia Capes and Cape Cod that might have used such a channel, also the value of the cargoes which were lost through the sinkings of these vessels; consider the number of lives lost, the delay to our war efforts and the hardships and suffering resulting therefrom, together with the $400,000,000 minimum annual differential in transportation costs that Federal Loan Administrator Jesse Jones agreed to assume as a proper charge against the Public Treasury, I am constrained to the opinion that you will agree with me that the amount involved in the construction of this canal is not too costly either as an economic measure, a war measure, or on humanitarian grounds. I also believe that you will agree with me that it is now urgently necessary and that in the postwar period when low freight rates will be essential for our economic stability, it will prove economically justified.

"If this connecting link had been constructed in accordance with the original recommendations and had been completed before December 7, 1941, it would have proved of inestimable value to the Nation from both a military and an economic viewpoint.

"It would have eliminated the necessity of coastwise vessels using open waters of the Atlantic for the entire distance between the Virginia Capes and Massachusetts Bay. It would have released naval and coast guard vessels, and air forces from patrol duty along this stretch of the Atlantic and would have permitted of them being diverted to other waters for duty where enemy submarines were active to augment the small patrol forces in such waters apparently unable to wholly eliminate the submarine menace. It would have saved many ships and lives and now it would serve to practically eliminate all danger of the fuel shortage on the Atlantic Coast.

"I have attended several hearings before governmental agencies in connection with this project and on each occasion I particularly noticed that practically the only objections to it were raised by the railroads or their affiliates and associates. In the event of further hearings on this project during the duration, I seriously doubt whether under the conditions, even the railroads will offer serious objection. It is my personal conviction that in view of what this proposed canal means to the Nation, both from a military standpoint and an economic one, any effort to defeat it would be very, very close to an unpatriotic act."

You will readily realize how well I am acquainted with the leading part you have taken in the development of our inland waterways and harbors, and how much time and effort you have devoted to this cause. Therefore, I feel that you will recognize that this letter is not meant as a criticism of anything contained in your speech, but rather a suggestion that you please go a little further if you are in accord with my views when, and if the opportunity presents itself, and urge that we make our great intracoastal waterway a 100-percent artery of commerce that can definitely meet all the requirements of the purpose for which it is constructed.

Very truly yours,

J. H. Ross, *President*.

Switch of Aviation Control Protested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D. WINTER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial that appeared in Labor on Saturday, February 27, 1943:

SWITCH OF AVIATION CONTROL PROTESTED—RAILROAD LABOR CHIEFS OBJECT TO NEW COMMITTEE PROPOSED IN HOUSE

The Railway Labor Executives' Association this week added its voice to the growing opposition against a proposed bill to set up a separate congressional committee to deal with legislative matters affecting civil aeronautics.

The bill would take control of aviation out of the hands of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which heretofore has had jurisdiction over all forms of transportation.

Last week the American Federation of Labor Air Line Pilots' Association protested against the transfer, and this week the Railway Labor Executives' Association, in a letter to congressmen, declared that "railway workers share the concern of air-line pilots over removal of any of the legislative prerogatives now vested in the experienced and well-seasoned Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and placing them in an entirely new and inexperienced committee."

"To divide the jurisdiction is illogical and would only tend to create confusion," the rail labor chiefs said.

Mr. Speaker, the above editorial although short is nevertheless important in the fact that it points out that all classes of labor both in and out of the aviation industry have taken a stand against any change in the rules of the House that would take jurisdiction over aviation away from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce where it has been long and satisfactorily handled.

The Mourner's Bench

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following column written by my able predecessor, the Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, is well worth reading by all:

THE MOURNER'S BENCH

Mr. Jay Franklin, left-wing newspaper columnist, has made a confession of faith so honest and straightforward that it deserves attention. Like St. Paul on the Damascus road, he has seen a great light. Tons of facts and figures left him unconvinced, but a father's affection for his young daughter awakened him to the values of the competitive enterprise system and the daughters inherent in state monopoly.

Mr. Franklin wanted to send a birthday telegram to his daughter. The telegraph company told him that the Government had requested it not to accept anniversary telegrams due to the congestion of war business. With this ruling Mr. Franklin has no quarrel, but it got him to thinking what would happen if the war controls are carried over into peacetime, as is being planned by many in the New Deal.

As he says, "It may surprise some readers of my column and shock others to read that I am at last convinced that free enterprise for private profit is essential to human liberty. * * * The more I thought about it the more I realized that the only real protection of my right to send family telegrams and other things, which express my personal freedom, was the fact that Western Union and other privately owned business groups stood to make a profit out of my individual desires. Suppose, for example, after the war we were to adopt a Fascist system, with government ownership of communications and basic industries. Suppose that such a government decided that every man, dollar, and ounce of material that could be spared must go into a great national rehousing program and that, therefore, the inmates—I will not call them citizens—of the United States must not be allowed to send telegrams, make telephone calls, or indulge in 'pleasure driving.'"

As he says, such a government will not be interested in making a profit on sending a birthday message to his daughter or selling him gasoline to take his family out for a Sunday afternoon drive. Such a government would be interested only in "production for use" which is the noble-sounding task of communism. Profit would not interest them. There would be no companies competing for the right to sell him gasoline.

"For," as Mr. Franklin continues, "when the government steps in it is a monopoly. With the government writing the rules—which means some little guy in a bureau whom nobody knows and nobody can remove—it does me no good to go from one telegraph company to another."

Mr. Franklin is cordially welcome in the ranks of those of us who have been fighting to prevent complete government control over the lives of men. Even Russia is apparently abandoning communism and adopting the profit system as a reward to incentive. Skilled workers are being paid more than unskilled and ambitious men more than lazy men.

We are learning that the so-called benefits of collectivism are paid for at a heavy price; that there is no way to preserve freedom when Government becomes the economic master of men.

I hope Mr. Franklin will go on and point out that there are still plenty of people in Washington, D. C., who are planning on postwar Government ownership of communications, not only telegraph and telephone companies, but railroads, trucks, air lines, and water carriers. Recently the National Resources Planning Board, headed by the President's uncle, issued a voluminous study in which certain of its staff indicate that Government ownership of transportation is their ultimate goal.

Free enterprise has not always fairly distributed the plenty it has created, but the totalitarian state has created no plenty to distribute. When our soldier sons return from many foreign fields, it is my guess that our way of life is going to look mighty good to them and that they will oppose those who would create in this country the kind of government they risked their lives to overthrow abroad.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, as that which he then said relates to a legislative subject which the Congress will soon be called upon to consider, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief statement which Dr. John Lee Coulter, nationally known economist, and, incidentally, one of the greatest living experts on foreign trade, made during the course of the discussions which were had under the auspices of the American Forum of the Air at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D. C., on February 21 last, a statement which, I feel quite confident, should have the careful consideration of the membership of this body and of the country at large as well.

Dr. Coulter's statement follows:

Since the founding of our Republic, we of the United States have kept an eye on the people, resources, and products of all other nations, and have adopted policies intended to develop the largest volume of international trade—both export and imports—consistent with the building up of a prosperous nation with the highest attainable living standards. Most agitation, having for its purpose to arouse hysterical opposition to so-called trade barriers, is political phrase-making propaganda.

Although the United States accounts for only a scant 6 percent of the world's population, we provided more than 15 percent of all exports, and received more than 12 percent of all imports moving between nations during the recent period of prosperity before the advent of the world depression, reciprocal trade agreements, and World War II. In other words, we were responsible for two or three times our relative share of all world trade—in spite of the fact that this country has vast natural resources, a tremendous range in climate and other advantages which ordinarily would justify a country in striving for an extreme degree of self-containment.

Leading statesmen of our nation, from the days of President McKinley on down to the days of President Taft, consistently explored the possibility of negotiating reciprocal trade agreements but few such arrangements were ever completed, generally because of the desire of foreign countries to acquire special advantages from us. As a result, during the first 150 years of our national existence, we depended almost wholly upon direct legislation by Congress, supplemented by political and commercial treaties with foreign powers.

Over a long period I have advocated, and continue to advocate, the largest possible volume of both export and import trade consistent with national prosperity at home. I have also advocated, and continue to advocate, the desirability of reciprocal trade agreements consistent with the primary responsibility of Congress to lay down basic laws governing domestic and international affairs and the responsibility of the Senate to pass on all treaties with foreign nations.

In line with these long-time views, I would advise another extension of the Trade Agreements Act, with specific provision to the effect that "Executive agreements are inferior to acts of Congress and treaties" and that "nothing contained in agreements may either repeal, amend, or destroy basic principles embodied in acts of Congress or existing treaties."

Under this method of procedure, trade agreements could review and revise a multitude of rules and regulations developed for the supervision of international trade, including minor adjustments in tariff rates and other items. On the other hand, trade agreements could not modify sanitary policies, monetary systems, social-security legislation, price-parity programs, and laws enacted "to prevent the formation of monopolies, trusts, and restraint of trade" and "to preserve the free private enterprise system, with equal opportunity for all in this country." Provision should be made for prompt court review of any point covered in a trade agreement and immediate cancelation whenever any point is found to contravene acts of Congress or existing treaties.

Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Opposes New Committee on Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the Members of the House of Representatives by John T. Corbett, national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, opposing the establishment of new committee on aviation, and requesting that jurisdiction over such subject be continued in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

WASHINGTON, D. C

Members of the House of Representatives, United States Congress, Seventy-eighth session:

This is written as a request that the proposed creation of a House Committee on Aviation shall not receive your support.

The following is respectfully submitted for your consideration:

Public Law No. 785, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, contains a declaration for a "National Transportation Policy." The act contains provision for the creation of a spe-

cial board of investigation and research to investigate the relative economy and fitness of the different kinds of transportation agencies which provide interstate commerce services, with a view of determining the service for which each type of carrier is especially fitted—or unfitted, and the methods by which each type of carrier should be developed so that there may be a national transportation system adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense. That board of research and investigation was appointed.

We believe that board should be permitted to complete its work before there may be action taken by the Congress to create a new Committee on Aviation.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has done an exceptionally good job for aviation. The far-seeing policies adopted in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, under its sponsorship, contributed incalculable benefits to the support of our war effort. America now leads the world in commercial aviation.

It is unlikely that any newly formed committee could give the transportation industry, including the aviation industry and the country, that degree of assurance that all agencies of transportation are in dependable hands as the present committee.

It has been noticeable that in past years aviation suffered by frequent changes in the laws governing its administration. It would appear unwise now, in the midst of war, to experiment. We feel that the committee, whoes fitness for the work is a demonstrated fact, should be left in charge. That which helps transportation helps toward victory.

We trust you will aid in defeating House Resolution No. 23. Thanking you for your assistance, I remain

Very truly yours,

JOHN T. CORBETT,
National Legislative Representative,
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

Imperialists of the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address made by me over the Blue Network on Saturday, February 27, 1943:

I believe a sober analysis of Representative CLARE LUCE'S presentation of the problem of air sovereignty is very much in order because its dangerous doctrine is so attractively adorned with pert prose that without painstaking examination and deliberation we may credit it with a logic it does not possess and with a strength of argument it lacks.

The intricate problems of international air traffic must soon be solved. Assuredly, international rules must be adopted for the control and regulation of the air lanes. If such air channels remain uncontrolled or ill defined, commercial air rivalries between nations might conceivably lead to new and more terrible wars.

"We want to fly everywhere," the gentle lady from Connecticut has stated. Certainly. But so does Russia, England, China, Holland. No nation worth its salt can be shunted aside. The world's air cannot be cut into national segments like so many acres of land. We cannot set up sovereignties of the air with national rights guarded by invisible, yet impenetrable, barriers extending from the land below to the skies above. There must be "freedom of the skies," just as Vice President WALLACE envisaged it. Not absolute freedom. That would mean chaos, but freedom within responsible bounds in accordance with "open covenants openly arrived at."

The gentle lady from Connecticut is concerned about the debates in the British Parliament wherein certain members of the House of Commons demanded a greater place in the sun for Britain, demanded "freedom of the air," but with England in ascendancy. Of course, England has her jingoists like Lord Londonderry, as we have ours. Demagoguery is not confined to America. The gentle lady from Connecticut need not be frightened by demands made by some swashbuckling legislators either on the Thames or on the Potomac.

"Freedom of the air" means give and take—reciprocal agreements. But "he who runs" may "read" into the gentle lady's remarks that (1) the United States should have a sort of super sovereignty in the air and that (2) now is the time to capitalize our economic and military advantages as a creditor nation to bring it about.

There are fire eaters who screech that the United States should act the shylock and demand its pound of flesh. I am sure the gentle lady from Connecticut deprecates such rapacity, but her words give comfort to the imperialists and give comfort to the Sir Lucius O'Triggers.

"Freedom of the air" in the Wallace sense simply means "right of innocent passage with right of free landing" but in conformity with domestic regulations. It would mean, for example, that a British plane flying from London to Australia could fly over our territory and make essential stops at LaGuardia Field or at San Francisco for refueling and/or for landing passengers and freight originating outside the United States. But it would not mean that the British Overseas Airways Corporation could pick up passengers or cargo in New York for delivery in Dallas or Los Angeles. Equally so, our "freedom of the seas" precludes the Cunard Lines from plying a coastwise trade or picking up cargo at New York and carrying it through the Canal and depositing it at San Francisco.

A hundred or so reciprocal air treaties were in effect before the war. They are probably a hodgepodge. They must be revised and made reciprocally fair and just in accordance with the importance and air-mindedness of the sovereign nations. Of course, there will be some bargaining as to rights and privileges. That cannot be avoided. One would be Utopian to imagine otherwise. But such arrangements cannot—must not—be a cutthroat aerial nationalism or sovereignty. Otherwise the charge now often heard of British imperialism will be hurled at us for our air imperialism.

We may gain more from freedom of the skies than from the gentle lady's sovereignty of the air. Take a globe and you will see that the United States is not the air center of the world. The great land masses are elsewhere. If we wish to span or girdle the globe eastward or westward or across the Arctic span, we must fly over many foreign lands and alight at many alien airports. Their owners need our permission to cross our air far less than we need their consent. Therefore, we are not in such a strategic position to drive a hard bargain while the British Commonwealth, for example, with its widely scattered dominions and colonies may have more to offer and thus more to demand.

Maybe it were better that we lend attentive ear to Mr. WALLACE and his so-called idealistic freedom of the air rather than to the gentle lady from Connecticut with her altogether too realistic sovereign of the air, with its underlying isolationist implications.

Not so very long ago, in 1940, the gentle lady from Connecticut wrote with devastating vehemence against the principle of isolationism, urging that the war was our war, that we were complacently trying to live alone and like it when—and I quote the gentle lady—"we were all headed toward a tragic world, which is to say, a war world where men have decided to die together because they are unable to find any way to live together." I should like you to keep in mind "live together." What could she have meant there but mutuality and reciprccity? I should like you to remember as well that in mourning the fall of France she decried the weakness of its people and assailed the people of France with—and these are her very words: "They did not really care about democracy, but about their own nation." I repeat, "their own nation." And all her persuasiveness and all her eloquence previously dedicated to international cooperation she now dismisses with her newly minted "globaloney." Was it "globaloney" when with patent sincerity she wrote: "I found out what I, anyway, mean by democracy. I mean what the Declaration of Independence meant by it—'liberty and justice for all.' And when the Declaration of Independence said 'for all' it did not mean merely for United States citizens, it was written before there was a United States of America, before there were Americans." Shades of Vice President WALLACE!

Lest I be accused of reading into her text what Mrs. LUCE never intended, I shall use, wherever possible, her exact phrases.

There is within her text a curious mingling of isolationism and imperialism, a plea for insulated American thinking apart from the rest of the world, and at the same time a challenge for world domination by America. "We do not expect," she says, "and do not want one inch of territory outside our own possession. We desire neither to grab other people's land nor to dominate any race on earth." That she says with one breath and with the other—and I quote—"the masters of the air will be the masters of the planet, for as aviation dominates all military effort today, so will it dominate and influence all peacetime effort tomorrow." Ours must be the unquestioned sovereignty of the air over our territory with "denial to free access to its airports," she maintains and reasons that that will insure peace.

"If we fail," she goes on to say, "to answer the question of American air sovereignty intelligently, although the United Nations will win the war, America can lose the peace." Surely she cannot mean that we are embroiled in a war today that is none of our business, that we are not part of the United Nations fighting a common foe, that American destiny is not part of the world destiny? What ill portent of distrust, envy, and commercial jealousy lies beneath the smooth balance of her sentence? It augurs ill for the unity we have sought with "blood, sweat, and tears" to build. It is well, she would have us believe, to unite to kill and be killed, but such unity, such international meeting of the minds—a give and take—will not serve to live and let live. At the present moment we are all locked in a death struggle and in its midst the voice of a Representative of these United States, charming as that voice may be, belies the hope of a world to cooperate in peace as in war—a voice that urges us to become the gargantua of the air—and I will add the envy and thus the hatred of all nations.

It was with dismay that I heard her ironic clause, "Deeply as we trust our British allies today and tomorrow, and as we may, I hope, trust our Russian allies tomorrow and today." Perhaps, unwittingly, but nonetheless damagingly she drew a wedge between us and our allies.

We must beware the enchanting voice of the gentle lady lest barrier built upon barrier

result not in what is now called "friendly rivalry" but in a lust for power and an unleashed commercial and diplomatic sprint for supremacy. Is that a guarantee for peace?

What weapons of war we can produce, what impregnability of defense we can imagine and execute, what doctrine we can announce of "freedom of the seas," "sovereignty of the air," what neutrality laws we can pass are of no avail in a world shrunken in size by man's ingenuity. The world's woes are our woes, and we have not been able to stand apart in splendid isolation inhabiting an ivory tower. "Seek not to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

As I have pointed out above, prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, the gentle lady from Connecticut did not speak of impregnability did not urge that we barricade ourselves behind what instruments of defense we could devise.

We could not survive in a world of darkness, she told us. The conscience of America must not sleep, mankind was larger than nations. Whence came this sudden change of heart? Why this call for retreat when in the midst of global, yes, global war we stand united in purpose, in action, and in hope.

I should like to make mention of a portion of Mrs. LUCE'S maiden speech which touches at wisdom. She states that a vast area of peace aims cannot be at present precisely defined. "The fixing of territorial boundaries," she says, "the stabilization of currencies, the integration of economies, the establishment of tutelage of those democratic European governments with which the United States and Great Britain and most of the United Nations would certainly prefer to deal, even plans for post-war policing and disarmament are questions which all await the ukase of the master of Moscow and the gallant conqueror of Stalingrad. Not until we know whether we are to meet and confer with iron-hearted Stalin, or like-minded men, on the Vistula, or on the Rhine, or on the Seine, or at the Great Wall of China, or on the Yellow River, or in Tokyo, can we, or our other allies, realistically plan a post-war world."

If we are to admit with the gentle lady from Connecticut that air sovereignty is the most potent and significant factor in the post-war world, is it not related with problems of territorial boundaries, the stabilization of currencies, the integration of economies, post-war policing, and disarmament? If "masters of the air will be the masters of the planet," how in the name of inelectable logic can we "realistically" plan our "sovereignty of the air" now, plan it, what's more, without knowledge of what our allies will do, what the "master of Moscow and the gallant conqueror of Stalingrad" will do, what China and Great Britain will do? In other words, every phase of the post-war world must be marked out at the conference table, but not the problem of aviation which must, she contends, affect every vital phase of our Nation and internation existence. That, she would have us believe, belongs to the narrow national table with "devil take the hindmost." The rare intelligence that is the gentle lady's has taken a journey around the world and moved no farther than her back yard.

Air problems belong with those to be found at the treaty tables, not to specific pressures of North Dakota, New York, Connecticut, Lancaster, Shanghai, or Moscow.

It is precisely the fact that the gentle lady from Connecticut is a woman of intelligence, ability, and possessed of a compelling personality that we, as a Nation, cannot afford to allow her statements to go unchallenged when, so obviously, they travel backward to match the cynicism and myopic vision of American leaders in the fatal peace year of the first World War. As a world power of the first magnitude, America, by this time, must have learned her lesson that she is not a thing apart, that in serving her own interests, the stability of the world is of prime importance and that fences and "no trespassing" signs do not make good neighbors.

Frankly, as between a neophyte and a philosopher, I am willing to select HENRY A. WALLACE. It is not the first time in history that the idealists and crusaders have been maligned and held up to ridicule.

It is not as if we have been asleep, either, on the question of the place of aviation in the post-war world. Last month, President Roosevelt appointed a committee of admitted distinction to study our international air policy under the chairmanship of Adolf Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State. On that body will be found Robert Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air; Artemus Gates, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air; Wayne Chatfield Taylor; L. Welch Pogue, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board; Thomas Burke, Chief of the Divisions of Internation Communications; William Burden, Lt. Comdr. Malcolm Aldrich, and Col. Harold Harriss. Certainly, an imposing array of experts is present. We await the committee's report eagerly and I, for one, sincerely trust that it will not follow the restricted reasoning of the gentle lady and her followers. We have not ignored this vital phase of post-war planning; we ask that its treatment be statesmanlike and not politician-wise.

Remember, we do not subscribe, and never will, to a theory of a master race and while we do not wish to subordinate our interests to those of other countries, we must, therefore, realize that international cooperation is the answer. Assuredly, we have the self-capacity to achieve a true unity and thus to decry with President Roosevelt "the skeptics and the cynics who say that we must always have war." Can nation distrustful of nation bring about an enduring peace? Which is the better assurance—reciprocity or barriers? The answer is important. On that may depend your life and the lives of your sons.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the gentle lady from Connecticut this past Wednesday issued a statement to the press wherein she somewhat reverses the stand she took on the floor of the House. Like the daring young man on the flying trapeze, she floats through the air with the greatest of ease—from one side to the other. Because of two important factors, (1) that her original statement is a matter of official record in the House and she is not thus "on record" as having reversed it and (2) her latest utterances have not achieved the wide publicity accorded her "globaloney" sentiment, I have deemed it important to try in some measure to clear the "air."

Relationship Between the Air Lines and the Railway Express Agency

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] has made further references to the relationship between the air lines and the Railway Express Agency, in which he repeats his charge of a sinister connection. In doing so he again makes certain inaccurate statements in the correction of which the House will be interested.

RATE REGULATION IN CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT

In the first place we should have clearly in mind the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act with respect to air express rates. These provisions are apparently overlooked by the gentleman.

Section 404 of the act imposes the duty to establish reasonable rates. This duty is in all respects like the duty applicable in other fields of transportation. Section 403 requires that the rates be filed with the C. A. B. in public tariffs. Section 1002 (d) provides that the C. A. B. has full power to question the reasonableness of rates, to hold hearings either upon complaint or upon its own initiative, and thereupon to fix the reasonable rate. And section 1002 (g) provides that when a rate change is filed, the C. A. B. may suspend the rate and hold a hearing concerning its lawfulness, and, if the facts warrant, fix the rate before the rate change goes into effect.

These provisions of law control any private contract or arrangement. They are exactly like the regulatory provisions under which the Interstate Commerce Commission and many other regulatory bodies, Federal and State, have long regulated the rates of common carriers in this country. Therefore, there is, in the case of air express, no lack of governmental power to assure reasonable rates, and actually to fix them. The power of the C. A. B. is plenary. No contract of carriers can deprive it of its authority and duty to require reasonable rates.

RATE PROVISIONS OF AIR-LINE EXPRESS AGENCY CONTRACTS

The gentleman has made repeated references to the contracts between the air lines and the express agency, especially as regards rate fixing. In his speech of February 26 he stated that the express agency fixes the rate to be charged to the public. In his speech of March 1 he shifts his position and says that the agency controls the rate. He is inaccurate in both speeches.

Section 8 of the uniform contract, which each air line has entered into with the agency, provides specifically that the air line will establish the rates for express. The only qualification now operative is that when one air line proposes to establish a rate which would affect service over another air line, the matter may be referred to a traffic committee representing all the air lines. The decision of that committee is final, except that a rate change between points served by more than one air line is not to be made without the consent of the air lines concerned. Of course, any rate so fixed is subject to change by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The express agency has no representation on the traffic committee. And there is no instance known where the agency has failed to carry out its contractual obligation to abide by the rates fixed by the air line or, in the cases where the traffic committee has been called upon to act, by that committee.

The gentleman from Oklahoma now argues that since the volume of express traffic over each line determines the relative voting power of each air line on the air lines' traffic committee, and since the

express agency routes the express traffic, the agency somehow controls the air lines. It is somewhat difficult to follow his reasoning. However, the gentleman should understand that section 17 of the uniform contract provides for division of traffic among the air lines on "a fair and equitable basis," and that the express agency shall keep adequate statistics and records relating to the division of traffic, with the air line having the privilege at any time of inspecting such records. In addition the contract gives each air line extensive rights to audit and review the agency's operations.

Consequently there is no reason for any air line not to be fully informed concerning any favoritism of which the agency might be guilty, nor is there any reason for the air line not to be able to secure correction of any such favoritism. In such circumstances, to speak of the routing of traffic as meaning that the express agency controls the number of votes each air line has in relation to its associate air lines, and therefore controls the traffic committee which has limited powers respecting rates, and therefore controls the air lines' rates, is a process of reasoning that borders on the far-fetched.

EXPRESS AGENCY HAS NO CERTIFICATE UNDER THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT

I understood the gentleman to say that the express agency has received a certificate of convenience and necessity from the Civil Aeronautics Board under the Civil Aeronautics Act. I have not read his remarks, and I hope I misunderstood the gentleman. For if he made such a statement, he again reflects the grievous misinformation which someone has supplied him.

The fact is that the Civil Aeronautics Act was so drawn that the express agency would receive no grandfather certificate, and the C. A. B. long ago expressly denied, in a published decision, the agency's right to a grandfather certificate. The C. A. B. has not passed on any further application for a certificate for the express agency, and the agency does not now have and never has had a certificate. On the contrary, the C. A. B. is now in the midst of an extensive investigation to determine whether the express agency should continue to handle air express. It will not pass upon an application for a certificate until that investigation is concluded. And when it does it will have to consider the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act, which contain very restrictive standards respecting railroads or other types of carriers engaging in air transportation.

Moreover, the gentleman from Oklahoma apparently has not been told of the provision of the contracts under which any airline is privileged at any time, upon 6 months' notice and by unilateral action, to cancel the contract and thus to exclude the express agency from the air-express business over the airline's route.

EXPRESS AGENCY'S EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS BEING ELIMINATED

The gentleman spoke of the express agency's monopoly. It is true that the air-express contracts, entered into prior to the adoption of the Civil Aeronautics Act, provided that the agency would have an exclusive right to hande air express for the air lines. However, on November 2, 1942, the Civil Aeronautics Board informed the air lines and the agency that this exclusive provision would have to be eliminated. The parties to the contracts have so agreed.

LEVEL OF EXPRESS RATES

The gentleman has compared the level of air-express rates in this country with the levels of air freight and express rates in Canada and Central America. He failed to note the entirely different operating conditions, the entirely different equipment, the entirely different wage and hour standards, and many other differences between the air express service here and the services to which he referred.

Moreover, in both Central America and in much of the Canadian air transportation in question, there is no means of transportation except by air—which means, of course, that bulk traffic can be transported under the most favorable conditions.

But in Canada air-line operations comparable to those in this country have a rate level very different from the low figures the gentleman quoted. On Trans-Canada Airlines, the only Canadian air line really comparable to our air lines, the rates for air express are somewhat higher than those in this country. And on the run between Edmonton and White Horse, one of the heaviest air-cargo routes in the Dominion, the rate charged, according to late information received from the Canadian Board of Transport Commissioners, is also higher than the air-express rates in this country.

As I pointed out in my remarks included in the Appendix to the RECORD, the air-express rates have been established by the air lines. I am not defending them. But the fact is that they have been maintained at a level roughly comparable, on a pound-mile basis, with the rates charged for air-passenger transportation.

SECTION 29 OF H. R. 1012 DOES NOT LEGALIZE CONTRACTS WITH EXPRESS AGENCY

The gentleman from Oklahoma again suggests that section 29 of H. R. 1012 legalizes the contracts between the air lines and the express agency. The gentleman misunderstands the meaning of the section. If he will read that section of the bill along with the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act which the bill amends, he will see that his fear is groundless.

Section 29 of H. R. 1012 empowers the C. A. B. to make such a contract, or any provision thereof, illegal by an order disapproving it. But this does not mean that the contract is necessarily legal in the meantime. If the contract violates the antitrust laws in any respect, the existing Civil Aeronautics Act provides that there is no relief therefrom until the C. A. B. issues an order of approval. That is provided in Section 414 of the present act, and H. R. 1012 does not modify that section in any way.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT FULLY PROTECTS AIR TRANSPORTATION

Under the contracts with the express agency, there is no question that the air lines are fully able to protect themselves from any conflicting interests of the railroads in the express agency. The air lines establish the rates, and they can cancel the contracts at any time. But if, for some reason, it were to be assumed that the air lines were not to resist the incursion of railroad interests, but were to act against their own interests, the Civil Aeronautics Act will protect the public interest. For, under the act, the C. A. B. has full power to regulate and to fix the express rates. And, under the act, the C. A. B. has full power to deny to the express agency any right to engage in the air express business if the public interest so requires. And if section 29 of H. R. 1012 is adopted, the C. A. B. will have the additional power, by an order of disapproval, to make unlawful any provision of the air line contracts with the agency whether or not such provision might violate the antitrust laws.

VIEWS OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD AS TO MEANING OF SECTION 29 OF H. R. 1012

Since the gentleman from Oklahoma has been so concerned with the provisions of section 29 of H. R. 1012, and since the Civil Aeronautics Board administers the Civil Aeronautics Act, I have thought that the gentleman and the House would be interested in the advice of the general counsel's office of the Civil Aeronautics Board concerning the effect of that section in the light of the provisions of the existing Civil Aeronautics Act, and particularly section 414 of that act. A letter from that office follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, March 1, 1943.

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your inquiry as to whether section 29 of H. R. 1012 as reported to the House could be regarded as relieving the parties to a contract of a type referred to in that section from the antitrust laws unless and until the Board specifically approves such a contract.

Section 29 of H. R. 1012 amends section 412 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Section 412 now requires the filing with the Board of certain types of contracts to which air carriers are parties. The Board is required to disapprove any such contract if it finds the contract to be adverse to the public interest or in violation of the Civil Aeronautics Act and to approve the contract if it does not find the contract to be adverse to the public interest or in violation of the act.

Section 414 of the act provides as follows:

"Any person affected by any order made under sections 408, 409, or 412 of this act shall be, and is hereby, relieved from the operations of the 'antitrust laws', as designated in section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monoplies, and for other purposes', approved October 15, 1914, and of all other restraints or prohibitions made by, or imposed under, authority of law, insofar as may be necessary to enable such person to do anything authorized, approved, or required by such order."

Thus if the Board approves a contract under section 412, the parties to the contract are relieved from the antitrust laws insofar as may be necessary to enable them to do anything authorized, approved, or required by the order of approval. During the period of time between the filing of the contract and the Board's action on it, the parties are subject to the antitrust laws and if the contract is disapproved, the parties, of course, are not relieved from the antitrust laws.

Section 29 of H. R. 1012, among other things, adds a new subsection to section 412, providing as follows:

"(c) In the case of a contract or agreement between an air carrier indirectly engaged in air transportation and an air carrier directly engaged therein, affecting the terms and conditions pursuant to which the former utilizes the facilities or services of the latter, an order of disapproval under subsection (b) of this section shall, effective upon such date as may be fixed in such order, make unlawful the carrying out of such contract or agreement in the respects specified in such order."

This new subsection would include a contract between the Railway Express Agency and the air carriers because under the act the Railway Express Agency is an air carrier indirectly engaged in air transportation and the contract between that agency and the air carriers provides the terms and conditions under which the Railway Express Agency uses the facilities of the direct air carriers. Under the new subsection, if the Board were to disapprove such a contract between these parties, it would be unlawful for them to carry out the contract. Under the present law, if the Board were to disapprove such a contract, this order would not have the effect of making the carrying out of the contract unlawful. Thus, the effect of the section is to confer upon the Board an additional power to regulate relationships between direct and indirect air carriers.

This new provision inserted by section 29 does not have any effect upon the application of the antitrust laws to the parties to a contract. As is indicated above, section 414 of the act is the one which relieves the parties to an approved contract from the antitrust laws and H. R. 1012 contains no amendment to that section. Section 414 still provides that in order to relieve the parties to a contract from the antitrust laws, the contract involved must be approved. It might possibly be argued that since the new subsection makes unlawful the carrying out of any contract or agreement which has been disapproved, the carrying out of the contract or agreement prior to disapproval is legal. Such a construction would be unsound in view of the plain terms of section 414 which provides that the Board must take action to approve the contract before the parties are relieved from the antitrust laws.

For the reasons above set forth, it is concluded that section 29 of H. R. 1012 does not affect the application of the antitrust laws to contracts existing between the Railway Express Agency and the air carriers.

Sincerely yours,

S. G. TIPTON,
Assistant General Counsel.

George Washington Dinner Address by Eugene B. Casey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on last Friday evening Hon. Eugene B. Casey, Special Executive Assistant to the President of the United States, delivered an address at the Washington Day dinner at Albuquerque, N. Mex. I have had an estimate made of the approximate cost of printing this address in the RECORD, and the cost will be $105. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am extremely happy to be here tonight. Even a brief visit to New Mexico somehow gives one a renewed confidence in this Nation's ability to do the hard job which lies ahead. I believe that out here where the spaces are wide, where the handclasp is firm and the eye is steady, one can truly find the new courage of people. Out here you can see in the faces of people the progress we have made, all uphill, after the terrific impact of Japan's treacherous stab.

New Mexico is today a strategic area—a true arsenal of democracy. But it is a strategic area, and it is an arsenal of democracy because it produces not only fighting men but fortifications of the spirit.

I know, and all Washington knows, that New Mexico is a fighting State. Here you will find none of those disastrous doubts and sickly fears that plague many of our countrymen. Here you will find no Cliveden set of appeasers—people who would do business with Hitler. Here you will not find constant criticism of our Government, criticism aimed at destroying our national unity and diverting us from our great and solemn purpose—the total defeat of the Axis.

New Mexicans have always been honest, straightforward, straight shooting. New Mexicans have always taken part in the struggles of this Nation. During the Civil War many of New Mexico's sons served in forces of the Union. The same is true of the Spanish-American War, when New Mexicans formed an appreciable part of Roosevelt's Rough Riders. The World War found New Mexicans serving on the front lines with distinction, and certainly the present struggle is witness to the patriotism of New Mexico. Some of the outstanding achievements of American arms have been effected by native New Mexicans. The pages of American military history written by the Two Hundredth Coast Artillery, Antiaircraft Unit, of the New Mexico National Guard at Bataan and Corregidor cannot possibly be forgotten. For you New Mexicans the memories of your heroes of the past is a torch that lights the pathway of the future.

As you all well know, the history of the United States finds its beginnings here in New Mexico. It is now more than 400 years since Francisco Coronado led the first expedition into this territory, and thus laid the groundwork of future colonization. With the advent of American occupation in 1846 New Mexico became a part of our Nation and was admitted to statehood just 31 years ago.

New Mexico and her people have played an important role in the development of the New World ideal. The two great civilizations of the Western Hemisphere meet here in New Mexico and it is here that a solid friendship between the United States and Mexico, based on mutual respect and understanding, is taking place. Nowhere is this friendship more strikingly demonstrated than right here. I believe that you people here are most keenly aware of the significant fact that Mexico is helping the United States and the United States is helping Mexico. We are next-door neighbors, and good neighbors, and we have joined hands in the great fight of the United Nations to keep the world free.

From this spiritual fountainhead of good-neighbor policy have come great political leaders with whom every New Mexican is familiar: The Otero, the Chavez, the Larazola, and great scholars, scientists, and statesmen.

As today you are proud of your men on the fighting front, so too you can well be proud of your men on the legislative front in Washington.

Over a period of 10 years of service in the United States Senate your own Senator HATCH has won for himself and New Mexico national recognition. His judgment is sound, and leaders in the Senate and in the administrative branch of the Government are constantly seeking his counsel. His seniority has gained him the chairmanship of the Public Lands Committee, a committee which has tremendous interest to you people of the West.

The problems of the public domain are many. Senator HATCH's intimate knowledge of those problems has been of untold value to users of the public domain. More particularly, he has aided in the research and development of minerals, including oil and gas, and the proper conservation of grazing and forest lands.

I have personal knowledge of his activities as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture. I have had occasion to confer with him many times on farm problems and farm legislation. I know that his colleagues respect his judgment when it comes to dealing with farm commodities. I know also that those administrative officials charged with the responsibility of administering farm legislation seek and respect his opinions in connection with agricultural problems.

As third ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee he is constantly at work on legislation which comes before that important group. You people here in New Mexico have intimate knowledge of his ability as a lawyer and jurist. That experience which he gained here in your great State has stood him in good stead during his period of service in the United States Senate.

Water is the lifeblood of New Mexico and most Western States. As a member of the Senate Committee on Reclamation your Senator HATCH has taken a leading part in promoting and developing irrigation, reclamation and power projects. Currently he is serving ably also on the so-called Truman committee, which, as you know, has performed outstanding service to the country in the investigation of our war program.

I don't know whether his friends here in New Mexico fully appreciate the outstanding record of achievement Senator HATCH has gained through his many years of service in the Congress. Those of us who are fortunate enough to observe his activities in Washington know and appreciate CARL HATCH for his ability, his statesmanship, and his unswerving loyalty to the principles for which he stands.

To provide the perfect balance and complete representation for the many phases of life in this great Southwest, you have repeatedly elected and reelected to the State legislature, to the United States House of Representatives, and to the United States Senate that sterling veteran and native New Mexican, Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ. It was just a few miles south of here that your junior Senator was born of proud, honest, but humble parentage. He received his early education in the very schools of this city. What finer, more accurate and mature background could have been provided him to represent the great sovereign State of New Mexico? For 15 years he has intensely, fervently and accurately mirrored your philosophy in Washington.

Senator CHAVEZ has distinguished himself in this Nation's Capital, and created an enviable record by his advanced thinking on all social and labor legislation. As chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee, he labored long and successfully in behalf of western water development. It was during his term as chairman in the Seventy-third Congress, his second moratorium bill for all reclamation districts was passed, together with authorization for a survey by which construction costs for power development and flood control were to be removed from the debt-ridden backs of your farmers.

He vigorously worked for the ratification of the treaty for the improvement of the Caballo Dam, and engaged in preliminary discussion whereby the Rio Grande canalization project was launched. It was his cogent argumentation that won the support of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and the Army engineers. The Alamogordo Dam project at Carlsbad was another project in which he actively interested himself.

Always Senator CHAVEZ has been champion of the under dog, and it was by authority of his amendment that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bought most of the bonds of the bankrupt Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, and thereby offered a ray of hope to the farmers who were threatened with the loss of their lands.

New Mexico has sent to Washington a humanitarian of whom they may well be proud—yes, of whom the Democratic Party is proud.

It has been my high honor to know for many years both Senators HATCH and CHAVEZ, and know them to be two of the most able, distinguished, and honored gentlemen in all Congress.

Both Senators, as well as your two Representatives, spoke to me before leaving Washington, and all expressed keen regret at their inability to be here with us tonight. Indeed, it is only the truly great burden flung upon their backs by the additional labors of wartime that precluded their attendance. Each asked me individually to convey to you their greetings, their regards, their regrets, and their love.

Congressman CLINTON P. ANDERSON made so good a name for himself in the Congress during his first term that he was rewarded by being selected as a member of the powerful Appropriations Committee in the Seventy-eighth Congress. Not only is this the first time that a House Member from this State has served on the Appropriations Committee, but I wish to point out that Congressman ANDERSON'S presence on this committee will prove most important to New Mexico in the days of reconstruction yet to come after the war. It is interesting to note that every publication which classified the votes of Members of Congress as a guide to the 1942 election gave CLINTON ANDERSON a clean bill of health for voting right every time on every international issue. I say that this type of farsightedness and vision is necessary in the present-day world, and the voters of this State can be proud of Congressman ANDERSON'S record. I would also like to stress the fact that seniority in Congress is a great advantage to a State, and that the holding of important positions in the committees by your State is due to the fact that the Southern States keep good, proven Members in Congress when they have them.

About your new Congressman, ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, I can only say that he has stepped into his task with an amazing sense of responsibility and obligation. In the period of only a little over a month he has been assigned to six committees: Irrigation and Reclamation, Public Lands, Indian Affairs, Mines and Mining, Claims, and Insular Affairs. The first four are of a great importance to your State. The Claims Committee will bring him in contact with a large number of the membership, and the Insular Affairs Committee, to which he was assigned because of his knowledge of the Spanish language, will be important in acquainting him with problems of the Spanish-speaking people, a good many of which are not unlike problems touching the Spanish-speaking people of the State of New Mexico.

These four Representatives of your State are united behind our leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Today their ranks are closed, they are marching arm in arm, they are fighting shoulder to shoulder. They have dispelled the clouds of uncertainty and disunity. Today the visibility is excellent. The skies and the horizon are clear. They shall go on together to victory and peace.

New Mexico has enriched the executive departments in Washington greatly by the able, forthright, honest, and courageous men that have been called from here to serve. Typical of these is your sterling and capable Governor, Jack Dempsey.

I know that the overwhelming majority of you must feel as I do: That in this emergency our democracy has again justified itself. We can take justifiable pride as well as vast comfort from the fact that the man who leads this Nation in this global war has not only our own support, but the trust and confidence of what is left of freedom and democracy in every part of the world.

It is that belief in freedom and democracy that makes this war bigger than any of us. What have been our concerns for years are swept away in each sea, air, or land action. In every American city and town, the children of all the races of the earth are bound together as one people, driving ahead on all the lines which make up the war effort of a country like ours. It is our duty to serve that people, not only the segment of one particular group but the whole people. These 13 months of war have told a story of democracy and the unity of the most diverse people on the earth as no other event in our history. It is the duty of every American citizen to serve that unity.

I realize full well that there are some groups in the Nation who have never paid more than mere lip service to that unity. I can see in some of the current attacks on the administration, on the President and all that he stands for, symptoms of a resurgent toryism. In the dark days of last spring and last fall when defeat was staring us in the face, the Tories slyly stayed in the background and we were promised a brave, new united America if we did our duty and won the war. But with the first sign of victory all this changed, and toryism blooms again in full flower. As long as the cause of the United States appeared in doubt, the voice of toryism was quiet and apologetic. But now that we have started the uphill grind we see a marked revival of the spirit of Tory reaction. And so today, behind the scenes, the powerful interests are staking out their claims and are again putting up their barricades against social progress. These are the interests who did not want anything new in 1933. These are the interests who do not want anything new after the war. In the shadow and chill of defeat their toryism wilted somewhat, but it will become more and more active and insistent with every victory.

Now, these lip servers of democracy who are forever looking backward to the time of what was called Coolidge prosperity, would like nothing better than under the guise of war emergency to destroy the New Deal and all that it has meant to the common people of America. It is these people who, by resisting all economic and social changes gave us the locust years of the hungry 20's and rebuilt the slum world which was fit not for heroes, but for Hitlers.

It is these people who have ignored the perils that threatened our country in the late 20's and the following years. They are the ones who would like to forget that the United States then stood on the brink of economic, if not political, chaos in November 1932. They are the people who could not hear the voice of the people. They are the people who ignored the people's vote. They are the people who could not believe that the Nation wanted a new regime under the leadership of a far-seeing President. I need not reconstruct that period to you. With that situation you are all familiar.

After the election in November 1932 there followed a period of rehabilitation, of strong positive action that forms a bright chapter in the history of our Nation. No man can challenge this simple statement.

No comparable period in history can match the achievements in the fields of social progress, secured under the wisdom, the foresight, the courage of our President, during the past 10 years.

Write it down as the glorious decade in which the friendly hand of the Government in Washington reached into every humble American home to bring security and confidence to families stricken with adversity and dismayed by the fears of fresh disaster.

I am told that it would be a serious error of judgment on my part to discuss our party's record of social achievement in the last decade. It is not my intention nor is it my desire to initiate political bickering—to raise new and unimportant controversial issues. But I am not going to permit the opposition, designedly furthering their own political progress, to select issues most agreeable to their own purposes. I do not propose to permit them to justify their continued campaign of destructive crticism on the basis that it is essential to the prosecution of the war. No doubt they would gladly forget our record of the past decade. The American people will never forget it.

In the years before 1933 our country was powerful and proud; but in our pride we had forgotten the homely things that make and keep a nation strong. We had forgotten that if a nation itself is to endure, the common man must be kept strong, and proud of himself, his home, his family.

From behind the clouds of uncertainty and defeat arose the spreading rays of a new dawn unveiling the promise of a brighter, a happier day.

Then and there opened a new horizon; then and there began a program for the solution of the vast and fundamental problem of social security. Other nations had advanced beyond us in that field. Then came action.

Forty-one million wage earners and their families are now assured protection against destitution in the late years of their lives. Forty million workers now enjoy unemployment insurance. The blind, the dependent children, the physically handicapped, are sheltered under the protecting wing of government. Means have been established to improve public health. The working conditions and standard of living of the workingman have been improved. Crop planning and other agricultural developments have been instituted. Huge power projects have been developed. Over 600,000 miles of roads have been constructed and improved; thousands of bridges, schools, libraries, air fields, and parks have been built. Farm and home owners have been relieved of the onerous burden of mortgages long past due; electricity has been brought to rural areas; slums cleared; a Federal housing program instituted; bank deposits guaranteed; the security and investment markets safeguarded.

These advances were secured under the direction of our Democratic President, by Democratic majorities in the Congress, and by capable administrative officers in every State in the Union. I tell you again and again that the record is a glorious one. No; not even a Judas Iscariot could deny it.

The party which has stoutly defended the political rights of State communities proved that it could also become the greatest champion in American political history for the human rights of the whole community. This party led our Nation from economic confusion and social division to a unity of national sentiment and ideas unparalleled in the annals of our country. True, we made mistakes in procedure; under pressure of critical human needs we sometimes improvised and we had to change certain methods and alter our emphasis to sail on a balanced keel.

The Democratic Party believes that human welfare is the true goal of decent government. The Democratic Party has emphasized the responsibility of government for human security—it will continue to emphasize it. The Democratic Party has adapted its methods to the changing needs of our individual citizens and of our Nation—it will continue to do so. The Democratic Party believes that for the protection of our international freedom it is necessary to proclaim the God-given freedoms of humanity—it will continue to believe so.

We have taken this stand and performed this service for the American people under a Democratic administration. Now it is our job to see that there are no interruptions, no stepping back from the program we have founded. I am convinced that if we are to maintain the wise and humane administration which President Roosevelt has achieved we must defend it with spirit at least equal to that with which they are now being attacked. I believe we should lift the lid off democracy and concentrate on the freedoms, the liberties, the rights, the securities, and the ideals of the Roosevelt administration.

When we get right down to it, what we must expound and defend is the administration and the program of President Roosevelt. The issues before all right-thinking Americans can be made clear and simple, if we stick to this great historical advancement. The question with which we must face the enemies of this advancement, the doubters, the malicious, is: "Do you or do you not believe that a better division of the fruits and comforts of life, justice for labor, assurance of the security which our abundance is able to provide, is inalienable to the American way of life?" Essentially the challenge to the New Deal must be met by a better New Deal, by a stronger New Deal, by more social and economic planning. It cannot be met by mere protestations of love for the American way of life as exemplified by the Republican Party and the National Association of Manufacturers. The challenge to the Democratic administration must be met by an administration not too strong for the liberties of its people and not too weak to maintain our existence as a Nation devoted to freedom, to humanity, and justice.

Today we live in the midst of a dark chapter in our Nation's history, but it is in dark times—times like these—that we lean most heavily upon the traditions and lessons of the past.

On this occasion the memory of one of the greatest of all Americans is strong. George Washington lived in dark days for this Republic. But from the darkness which engulfed him he drew strength to struggle toward the light.

Just as surely as we know that the vigorous new life of spring follows the dead snows of winter, the life of Washington tells us that all is not lost and that brighter days lie ahead. This is going to be a long war for us. Yes, at least twice the length of World War No. 1. Put no stock in the wishful thinking of victory in 1943. We will have cause indeed to thank a merciful God if our Thanksgiving dinner of 1944 is eaten at peace.

To say that we will win is no naive optimism. We will win. We can lose in only one way and that is by underestimating our foe and the size of the job that lies ahead. You people of the State of New Mexico are not doing that, and I can report to you that the leaders of your Government in Washington are not doing that either.

Your President and the leaders of your armed forces are on guard—make no mistake about that—just as vigilantly on guard as General Washington at Valley Forge. They are determined to hold until that day when our fully mobilized strength may be applied in ending forever the sort of menace that hangs over us tday.

If the situation in north Africa looks dark and I do not attempt to gild the picture in the slightest degree, we may honestly ask ourselves if it is darker than the Valley Forges which Washington faced many times during the birth agonies of this Republic. Is our outlook more hopeless today? Are we, with our limitless resources not capable of doing what Washington accomplished virtually with his bare hands and dauntless will? Washington's message to his troops in 1776 might well be the charge of General Eisenhower to his veterans in Africa today: "The fate of unborn millions will now depend, under God, on the courage and the conduct of this Army. We have, therefore, to resolve to conquer or to die. * * *"

My message is that American heroism is not dead. American determination to live under the "four freedoms" of President Roosevelt is as strong as it was in Washington's day.

Washington fought to give validity to the Declaration of Independence. We fight the same battle, but today we are acutely aware that in a world dominated by the airplane, the radio, and the motorcar, freedom cannot live in isolated islands of democracy surrounded by turbulent waters of despotism. We know that democracy and freedom cannot merely be enjoyed; that they must be defended and made so strong they are unassailable. So today we fight to preserve the Declaration of Independence at home within the framework of the Atlantic Charter because we realize that when freedom dies anywhere in the world it is threatened everywhere in the world.

We know now that when freedom is taken away from Norwegians, Danes, Greeks, Poles, Chinese, Belgians, Russians, and Frenchmen, that our own freedom is in jeopardy, even if their freedom is of a somewhat different variety from our own. If freedom is established on a sound, world-wide base, it is secure here. If it topples elsewhere, it may fall here.

The eyes of the world are upon the American Nation. They look to our people for leadership from the morass of its seemingly imminent defeat. By the grace of God, we shall win. Yes; with the divine guidance and Providence of a just God, we will win. Let us go back tonight to a humble church in Richmond, Va., in 1775, to the words of Patrick Henry for inspiration: "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!"

Tonight we rededicate ourselves to the defense of democracy, the survival of liberty, and the perpetuation of freedom. I use the words of the Declaration of Independence:

"And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Our Soldiers in the Armed Forces and on the Production Line Want Spectator Sports

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, there has been much controversy in the press and on the radio over the question of spectator sports. Shall we continue or shall we discontinue spectator sports for the duration? Whether baseball and football are to continue for the duration is now in the hands of those men in Washington who are directing the war effort. It should be a frank decision, made promptly without provoking any further discussion one way or another. At the very inception, let me state that my paramount interest and concern is the prompt and successful prosecution of the war. My record in the Seventy-seventh Congress clearly substantiates this statement.

However, I do believe that the continuation of professional baseball and football will materially aid in the success of our war effort for many reasons. First, the daring courage, initiative, and fighting spirit exemplified by our baseball players on the diamond and our football players on the gridiron are invaluable qualities now displayed by our fighting men and can be attributed as one of the major reasons for the success of our soldiers, sailors, and marines on the battlefronts of the world. Further, the game offers healthful relaxation to the soldiers in camp, those home on furlough, and to the men in industry producing the implements of war. All come under the heading of morale, and morale has always proven to be one of the most important factors in any war.

Colonel Thomas, of the United States Army, said:

> We need sports, as we don't want any slump in the morale of the workers to come through their being denied relaxation at sports events. Cut out the games and where will people go? You can't work them like machines without relaxation. We've got to keep up sports.

To substantiate my conviction, I have been conducting a poll among many of the soldiers, sailors, and marines in the services of our country and also by personal interview with men on the production front in the Thirtieth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I represent and which district is known as the heart of the arsenal of democracy. The Westinghouse Electric Co., the largest battleship armor-plate plant in the world; the Homestead Steel Works; Carnegie-Illinois Steel Works; McKeesport National Tube Co.; Christy Park Shell Plant; Edgar Thompson Steel Works, of Braddock; Pittsburgh Steel Foundry Corporation & Copperweld Steel Co., of Glassport; the Firth Sterling Steel Co., of McKeesport, are all located in my district. I visited these plants and asked these workers how they felt about spectator sports. In my poll conducted to date of more than 1,000 men over 90 percent of the men both in the armed forces and on the production front favor the continuation of professional baseball and football.

My district is a typical cross-section of America, and if the results of this poll indicated sentiment to the contrary, I would urge Government officials to drop all spectator sports for the duration. But, on the other hand, the poll overwhelmingly proves the desire for the continuation of spectator sports. To our soldiers on the battlefronts who are fighting for us and are willing to make the supreme sacrifice in this war, baseball and football offer many moments of happy relaxation. To our soldiers on

the production fronts, it grants them relief from the war burden they are shouldering. The many letters I have received from soldiers, sailors, and marines, and from war workers, makes it evident to me that spectator sports are invaluable as a morale builder in this time of national emergency.

Naturally, headline stars who are in the age limits will be in the service where they should be, but even if oldtimers must be brought out of retirement and many of the younger married men required to spend some of their time working in defense plants, the game should go on. Spectator sports are still a part of the government program in Germany, Russia, and Italy. In America we have greater reason to see that sports are never permitted to die. It is apparent that the men now overseas and many of those who have returned from Guadalcanal and other parts of the globe, yearn for a radio report about a baseball or a football game.

Happy soldiers make better fighters, just like contented workers make better production men. It is my firm conviction that soldier and civilian morale demands that the Government permit spectator sports to continue for the duration.

Eligibility of Chiropractors for Medical Corps Commissions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 1), 1943

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received by me, under date of February 9, 1943, from Dr. William S. Voorhees, of Plainfield, N. J., dealing with the question of making chiropractors eligible for commissions in the Medical Corps of the United States Army.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAINFIELD, N. J., *February 9, 1943.*

Hon. W. WARREN BARBOUR,
United States Senator from New Jersey,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Recognizing you as the champion for the rights of the entire citizenry of New Jersey, I appeal to you to urge upon War Manpower Commissioner McNutt, as well as Secretary of War Stimson and Secretary of Navy Knox, to classify chiropractors eligible for Medical Corps with regulatory commission.

I may state that New Jersey Medical Act now makes it mandatory for chiropractors to pass a medical examination, in addition to a chiropractic examination; therefore, chiropractors who qualify for a license to practice in New Jersey have higher education and training than plain ordinary medical doctors. New Jersey recognizes chiropractors as medical doctors, for they cannot obtain a license unless they qualify both as medical doctors and chiropractors, but chiropractors do not practice medicine and practice only the chiropractic method of healing. In many other States the same law is in vogue. In other words, to be a chiropractor you must pass the test for medical doctor's requirements and also chiropractic examination.

More than 26,000,000 persons in United States depend upon chiropractic for their health. The late John D. Rockefeller, Sr., who lived to be nearly 100 years old, owed his longevity to chiropractic. A Daytona Beach, Fla., chiropractor was his health counselor. Whenever medical science and all other healing agencies fail, patients go to chiropractors as the last resort, and in 99 out of 100 cases get well. The records also show that many medical doctors who get sick and cannot get well by means of drugs, medicine, or surgery go to chiropractors to get well.

As president of American Health Association, as executive director of National Spinographic Society, as official representative of International Chiropractors' Association, I appeal to you, and through you to the membership of the entire United States Senate and House of Representatives, to find a way to urge upon Mr. McNutt to classify chiropractors eligible for commission in same status as medical doctors, thus enabling chiropractors to render their chiropractic service to the armed forces. The chiropractors and their followers combined represent at least 10,000,000 men and women of voting age. We need health freedom and unification of all recognized health agencies to help win the war.

Thanking you and trusting you will do your utmost and level best to use your influence with Mr. McNutt, particularly, to solve this problem, I am

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM S. VOORHEES, D. C.

National Resources Planning Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 1), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from editorials in support of the continuance of the National Resources Planning Board, which is carrying on valuable work in post-war planning under the direction of the President.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times of February 18, 1943]

In war, decisions must be made quickly, sometimes by guess. We know that peace and reconstruction will bring great problems. We have a little time to plan to meet those problems. We can and should use the services of such a body as the National Resources Planning Board.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of February 19, 1943]

The refusal of the House of Representatives to vote a mere $415,000 for the continuation of the National Resources Planning Board is disturbing, if not ominous. It smacked more of partisan intransigeance than of the reassertion of independent judgment, for it just is not good judgment to spurn a guide into an uncertain future.

Of course, every agency from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of War is thinking about some post-war program. But if nothing is done to start the work of the National Resources Planning Board going again in an ever more efficient way, we are probably headed for the chaos of too many plans, which may be almost as bad as none at all.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean of February 19, 1943]

This important agency seems destined, however, to be the victim of its own innocent name. Planning—a most reasonable word, a most reasonable practice, a most commonplace virtue in reasonable people—has been most intentionally smeared in America. Oddly enough, it has been most jubilantly smeared by those persons and interests whose well-fed existence is the result of planning, as they themselves would be the first to proclaim and the last to deny.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Record of February 20, 1943]

The President wanted to give the board $1,400,000 to plan a backlog of public works to provide jobs after the war for men and women leaving the armed forces and munitions factories.

Getting ready for post-war problems now will save the Nation billions of dollars in time and in preventing unemployment, the President said at his press conference Tuesday.

Yet the House of Representatives the next day sustained the Appropriations Committee in cutting out the $1,400,000 appropriation for the board—a trifling sum compared to our war expenditures.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Age-Herald of February 18, 1943]

Mr. Roosevelt said that both time and money can be saved by advance planning. That is an obviously valid point, assuming the planning is soundly executed. It is certainly false economy of the most short-sighted kind to withhold funds for such planning, it would be defeatism unworthy of America for Congress to take the general attitude that we cannot expect effective planning. The President expressed the view that very large sums can be saved through intelligent work along these lines. We agree. And we most earnestly hope that the backwardness of the House Appropriations Committee will be reversed before it is too late.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun of February 18, 1943]

President Roosevelt's remarks about the attitude of Congress toward the National Resources Planning Board can be summed up in the old saying, "penny wise, pound foolish." The Board, as the President pointed out, is working on blueprints for demobilization. It is charting the details of public works that will be needed to prevent the inevitable post-war depression. It is working out plans for the shift of war industry to civilian markets, and for the quick and steady reduction of civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments, the Office of Price Administration and War Production Board and other war agencies. Such things can't be done overnight. They require months or even years of technical preparation.

The stability and progress of America demand that Congress restore the appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times of February 18, 1943]

Defeat of President Roosevelt in the first round of his fight to keep the National Resources Planning Board alive is a victory of spoilsmen, not of statesmen who would improve economy.

The National Resources Planning Board represents the national economy front against the go-getter class whose members' slogan is, "For myself alone and after me the deluge."

[From the Miami (Fla.) News of February 19, 1943]

Apparently the House is not interested in cushioning the inevitable shock to our economy that will come with the end of the war, the demobilization of millions of soldiers and the folding up or conversion back to civilian production of thousands of war industries. To look ahead and try to prepare against the inevitable day of chaos is regarded as visionary.

The House and the country will live to regret this action. The city of Miami, to cite a very practical instance that is not in the least visionary, will have cause to regret it also. It is the National Resources Board that has been laying out a tentative program of public works to be built after the war, among which is the Virginia Key harbor project.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune of February 18, 1943]

In citing the need of the National Resources Planning Board and urging its continuance, one doesn't enter the lists as a proponent of bureaucracy. The whole point is that an agency which can stand on its own performance shouldn't be needlessly sacrificed in a spirit of political reprisal. For the money allotted to it, the National Resources Planning Board is one of the best investments of public funds in our whole governmental system.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee of February 18, 1943]

The President's position is a sound one.

It should be understood that this Board, at comparatively small expense, is seeking to find ways and means to cushion the Nation's transition from war to peace with the least possible dislocation of the Nation's economy.

It has set up committees—whose members are men of note in their special fields—to conduct studies relating to the better use of our land, water, and power resources; the improvement and correlation of our transportation systems; the application of new scientific knowledge to industrial production; and the listing of local, State, and Federal works projects which might provide jobs for the wage earners when defense output slacks off.

[From the Richmond (Va.) News-Leader of February 19, 1943]

The decision of the House Appropriations Committee to give no money to the National Resources Planning Board should not and probably will not stand. Much excellent work has been done by the Board.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Times of February 19, 1943]

The National Planning Board's promptings are largely responsible for the new awareness of this problem and for a reasoned approach to its solution. The National Resources Planning Board has encouraged cities, States, unions, and industries to study the future and prepare to meet it. It is the keystone to the planning arch, the general headquarters of a nation which realized that without planning we are sure to run into a catastrophic Pearl Harbor of peace.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of February 19, 1943]

The House chose a curious time to strike out the National Resources Planning Board. That agency's work is more important now than at any period in the decade since its creation. We cannot afford to repeat the experiences of the depression years, when we proceeded planlessly to improvise one expedient after another in the creation of "made work." Certainly we shall be most neglectful of our responsibility if we approach the complexities of the post-war era without plans for meeting every contingency that thoughtful men can anticipate.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun of February 18, 1943]

Yet we believe it would be an error for the Congress to abandon completely the notion that we have need of an agency charged with the business of working out, from the Federal point of view, the nature of the program of public works which will almost certainly be necessary in the post-war readjustment period. The National Resources Planning Board has been working on such a program. For good or for ill, it has suggested methods of approach to the problem. Some of the ideas of its spokesmen have sounded pretty silly. Some, on the other hand, have made sense and will have an influence in the formulation of whatever program we finally adopt.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch of February 18, 1943]

Thus the House Appropriations Committee in Washington has thrown out the request of the National Resources Planning Board for $1,400,000. At present the primary work of this agency is to make plans and store up projects against the day when millions of people will be released from war service and war employment, and when hundreds and thousands of plants stop work on war goods. Then, while men and machines are seeking new employment in peacetime production, there may be a gap into which the Government will have to step.

To call planning against that day "superboondoggling" as did Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, is simply to reveal incapacity to comprehend what is happening in the world. It is penny wise and pound foolish to risk economic and social chaos at the end of the war in order to indulge anti-intellectualism by "saving" $1,400,000 now.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune of February 18, 1943]

Now it is well established that the National Resources Planning Board is a Government agency which has been doing a useful and needed job; not only has it been engaged in designing projects for the future but its officials have been and are being consulted daily on matters relating to war-production projects, particularly with reference to the natural resources and potentialities of the various sections of the country. And it can be said without fear of contradiction that the whole war-production effort would not be so much out of balance, would be more efficient and the errors of overconcentration in certain areas would have been avoided if the advice of the National Resources Planning Board had been accepted and acted upon by those making war-production decisions.

[From the St. Cloud (Minn.) Times of February 22, 1943]

The House Appropriations Committee in Washington has thrown out of the Budget the request of the National Resources Planning Board for $1,400,000 to carry on its work. The research work upon which this agency is now engaged is to make plans and store up projects against the day when millions of our soldiers will be released from war service and men from war employment and when hundreds of thousands of plants will stop work on war goods. Men with wisdom and foresight know that while men and machines are seeking new employment in peacetime production, there is going to be a gap into which the Government will have to step.

Now if we are going to win the peace, we have got to start right now and make our plans.

[From the Engineering News-Record of February 25, 1943]

PENNY-WISE AND POUND-FOOLISH

Congressional moves to bar appropriations for the National Resources Planning Board in an effort to reduce Federal expenditures during wartime have been characterized by President Roosevelt as "spendthrift." There are many who will share this view with the President.

The Board now is engaged on one of its most important tasks—post-war planning of public works—and already it has stimulated local and State governments in the preparation of plans and specifications for work that can be undertaken as soon as the war ends. Having been a witness to the confusion that existed in the early days of P. W. A. and other work-relief activities the Board has preached, and is now putting into practice, the philosophy of programming public works in advance of need.

Unfortunately, the Board talked so much about great social problems as to create an impression among Congressmen and others that its chief objective was the advancement of social changes that many believe to be visionary and impractical. This impression has obscured the real value of the factual information to be found in many of its studies.

One of these studies, Our Cities—Their Role in the National Economy, is worthy of special mention. This provided one of the most complete analysis ever made of urban trends, needs, handicaps, and recommendations to retain existing community values. Although this report was made prior to the war, it represents today one of our most valued documents to aid in planning the post-war rehabilitation of our cities. Other reports, likewise, contain much of the necessary, basic information for work to be undertaken in the future.

Because of the continuing value of its past activities, the undeniable importance of its present contributions, and the potential promotion of worth while future undertakings, Congress should not now indulge in the penny-wise, pound-foolish action of curtailing the work of the National Resources Planning Board. The only justification for such action would be a proposal by Congress to establish a comparable agency that would be more directly responsible to Congress for its acts than is the present Board.

The Nation needs an agency that can do some long-range thinking with respect to post-war developments and can coordinate not only the planning of Federal, State, and local agencies with respect to public-works construction in the post-war period but also can integrate the thinking of both private and public agencies with respect to the major economic problems that will face us after the war is won.

NO CHECK ON THE WAR EFFORT

Views expressed in Congress with respect to abolishment of the National Resources Planning Board are but a reflection of a view that frequently finds expression in the statement, "Why spend time now in post-war planning; let's win the war first." All will agree that our major objective now should be to win the war, but winning the war and planning for peace are not mutually exclusive.

Everyone cannot have a direct share in winning the war by serving in the military forces or by working in a war plant; some must carry on essential civilian operations, and these people can and should be giving a lot of thought to the post-war period. Unless we do that thinking we will not be giving our men in the armed forces the full support they deserve, for in addition to supplying their immediate physical needs for food, clothing, shelter, and munitions of war, we must give them the moral support that will come from knowledge that we are preparing to provide them with peacetime jobs when the war is over. We can do that only by farsighted planning for a sound post-war economy.

The advanced planning for post-war highway work now being done by State highway departments serves as a good example of what may be accomplished without slowing the war effort.

There are many engineers and architects in private practice who can hardly be expected to be absorbed in the immediate war effort for one reason or another. These men could render a useful service to post-war rehabilitation of the Nation's economy if provision were made for their employment by local or regional agencies that should be putting their advance planning into tangible form. Expenditures made for plans and specifications today will speed the rate at which men can be released from the armed forces or from war industries with assurance that peacetime jobs are ready for them as they are released.

Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received from the Northeastern Retail Lumbermen's Association:

NORTHEASTERN RETAIL
LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
ROCHESTER, N. Y., *February 24, 1943.*

JAY LEFEVRE,
Twenty-seventh District, New York,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Ruml pay-as-you-go tax proposal is of more than passing significance to you.

Congress is now determining whether or not this principle will be adopted as the basis of tax payments from now on.

Essentially the Ruml plan has for its purpose the placing of income taxes on a current basis and the elimination of a continuing accumulated tax debt. Indirectly it is felt by many students of the subject that it will be extremely useful in maintaining the integrity of our income tax system by reaching the highest possible level of collections.

The tremendous income tax burden to be placed on hundreds of thousands of people for the first time this year and the enormous increases to be experienced by those already paying income taxes has not as yet made its full force felt. It is generally accepted that tax delinquency will be high unless some means is taken to put payments on a current basis. The vast majority of individuals live up to their income and few "save for taxes" which are accruing.

High tax delinquency inevitably means higher assessment on tax paying individuals.

The Ruml plan, proposed by Mr. Beardsley Ruml, treasurer of R. H. Macy & Co., New York, and chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York is no tax panacea. It is not designed to perform a tax miracle. It does not establish any new system. Instead it will have the effect of putting every tax payer on a current basis—paying his taxes as he goes along; not accumulating a debt which easily might be beyond his capacity to pay in another year.

As business men and as citizens, we have a substantial stake in tax policies. The Ruml plan has much to offer and is a sound, sensible approach to this all-important problem.

The following excerpts of questions and answers taken from a radio interview with Mr. Ruml will serve to elaborate on certain fundamentals of the plan he proposes:

"Mr. RUML. In order to accomplish the desirable objective of getting our income taxes on a current basis, I suggested to the Treasury in March of last year and to the Senate Finance Committee in July a plan which I called the pay-as-you-go-income-tax plan. This plan is to be applied to individuals, not to corporations. The first problem is how to get our personal income taxes on a current basis without paying 2 years' taxes in 1 year.

"Mr. BRYSON. Can that really be done?

"Mr. RUML. The answer is as simple as daylight saving. Let us turn our tax clocks ahead 1 year. The taxes we have paid last year out of our 1942 income are taxes on our incomes, received in 1941. We can best solve the problem now by recognizing these 1942 payments to be taxes on 1941 as they really are, and by beginning 1943 by paying on 1943, thereby dropping out the year 1942 from the tax calendar forever.

"Mr. BRYSON. But that sounds like forgiving everybody 1 year's taxes. Is that what you mean?

"Mr. RUML. Not exactly. The tax year of 1942 is gone but not forgiven. I want to stress particularly that the essence of the plan is to make a change in the method of assessing personal income taxes. That change is to assess this year's tax against this year's income. By this change in the method of assessment, the taxpayers go on a current basis and accordingly at the same time they are income-tax debt free. Much confusion has been caused by referring to this change as the forgiving of 1 year's taxes. "Forgiving" is a term which I have never used in describing the plan. It suggests, and wrongly, that this year the taxpayers will have a year in which they pay no taxes and that the Treasury will have a year in which it gets no revenue. Nothing could be further from the truth. Our thinking will be clearer if we think of the plan as a change in the method of assessing income taxes. When we turn the tax clock ahead, we do not stop the clock.

"Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Ruml, last week at his press conference President Roosevelt said that he thought "we are all in favor of getting on to a pay-as-we-go basis," and that a "lot of people think the only way to do it is to forgive the individual either all or a portion of 1 year's taxes * * * but it means the poor old Treasury is out of pocket just that much money." I think we would all like to have your explanation of how we can turn the tax clock ahead as you suggest without hurting the Treasury.

"Mr. RUML. First of all, Mr. Bryson, I feel sure that when the President referred to the Treasury, he was not speaking about the old gray building that sits on Pennsylvania Avenue just east of the White House. Nor do I think that he meant the people who work in the building, all the officials and civil servants, who from one point of view are also the Treasury. No; I think he referred to the Treasury as the financial agency of the Government. The Treasury is to the people as a pocketbook is to an individual, an instrument of utility but not an end in itself. And so it is the financial soundness of the Government and, in a special sense, the economic well-being of the country that we must be certain to protect.

"Mr. BRYSON. That is right. How do we provide for that?

"Mr. RUML. The answer to the question is that we shall all go along paying our income taxes, only they will be on a current basis. The Treasury will also go along getting its revenues. The only difference is that when a taxpayer dies or ceases to receive income he will not owe a tax as he does under the present system. Reduction of tax payment by the taxpayer as a result of setting the tax clock ahead occurs only at some future date, when and as the taxpayer's income ceases or declines. The reduction is therefore spread over the whole lifetime of the present income-taxpaying generation, and occurs beneficially for each taxpayer at the time when his income fails. As for the Treasury, the Treasury has never considered taxes receivable as an asset, and accordingly they can be written off the balance sheet of the Government without the change of a single penny.

"Mr. BRYSON. Then there really would be a reduction in the long run. What would it amount to, say, for a generation of taxpayers?

"Mr. RUML. If we study the consequences of the plan over the generation we find that since the loss would be spread over a period of some 35 to 50 years, the gross amount of $8,000,000,000 estimated as tax liabilities on 1942 income would amount to an average of only $180,000,000 to $220,000,000 a year. The first big loss would come, if at all, in the year of a post-war depression, and it would occur as a timely adjustment both for the economic welfare of the Nation and for the help of each individual taxpayer whose income has suffered reduction. Another way of looking at it is that the loss over a generation would be about the same as one month's current expenditure. It seems a small cost to achieve a basic income-tax reform, preserving the integrity of the income-tax system, making possible other badly needed wartime tax measures and affecting beneficially 27,000,000 citizens.

"Mr. BRYSON. Let us take a concrete case. Here is a married man with one dependent that made $2,400 in 1942 and who makes the same amount in 1943. What would he pay under the present plan and what would he pay under pay-as-you-go?

"Mr. RUML. This taxpayer would pay $129 under pay-as-you-go, exactly the same amount as under the present system, only it would be a tax on his 1943 income instead of 1942. At the end of the year, he would be free of income-tax debt instead of owing a year's taxes as the present system requires.

"Mr. BRYSON. Suppose this man's income dropped because of lay-off so that in 1943 he only had $1,900 instead of $2,400. What would his tax be?

"Mr. RUML. His tax would be $42 in 1943 instead of $129 as under the present system and still at the end of the year he would be free of income-tax debt instead of owing a year's taxes as he does under the present system.

"Mr. BRYSON. Do I understand that if the pay-as-you-go plan goes through, we will all have to make an income-tax return and a quarterly payment on March 15 just as under the present system?

"Mr. RUML. You certainly will. The pay-as-you-go plan provides for identically the same declaration on March 15 as the present system. The only difference is that it is a tentative return for 1943 instead of a final return for 1942. But this means you will owe nothing for last year, and what you are paying on March 15 is a payment for tax on your 1943 current income."

Most important of all, tell your Senators and your Congressman how you feel about this proposal. Write them today. Urge their careful consideration and action at this time, and without complicating the picture by pyramiding both 1942 and 1943 taxes into a single year's payments.

A letter in your own words, telling them you like the Ruml plan, that income-tax payments should be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis now, and that you wish them to support such a plan is urgently needed now.

Will you do it, in your own best interest?

Yours very truly,

PAUL S. COLLIER,
Secretary-Manager.

War Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution as passed by the Unicameral Legislature of Nebraska on the 23d day of February 1943 relative to wartime.

Daylight-saving time has caused much confusion in this country. It has served no real or good purpose. It is not possible by Presidential proclamation, by an act of Congress, or by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States nor by changing of the clocks to add to or take away 1 minute from daylight or darkness.

The sun and the moon still rise and set on the same old schedule. The farmer of Nebraska works from daylight until dark. If they worked 40 hours a week with time and a half for the next 8 hours, there wouldn't be much food produced.

I urge this Congress to take steps to do away with the so-called daylight-saving time. We are at war and God still rules the universe and will do so until the end of time.

The resolution follows.

Resolution 9

Resolution opposing war time

Whereas daylight working hours are a vital factor in the preparation and harvesting of crops, the feeding of farm animals, and the production of farm commodities; and

Whereas laborers and office workers are, under the new war time, compelled to go to work, and children are compelled to go to school, during the winter months while it is still dark, with a consequent increase in the use of electricity; and

Whereas the new war time, since its establishment, has proved to be wasteful, rather than time saving: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the Legislature of Nebraska in Fifty-Sixth Session Assembled:

1. That the Congress of the United States is urged to repeal the act establishing war time, commonly known as daylight saving time.

2. That a copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed by the clerk, be sent to each Senator and Representative from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States.

Dogs in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a transcribed broadcast delivered by me over radio stations WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and WMAM, Marinette, Wis., February 28 on the subject Dogs in War:

This afternoon, I am going to digress a bit from my usual topic of happenings in Washington and talk to you about Dogs in War. Practically from the dawn of history, dogs have always played some part in practically every war. Even in the days of the Knights in Armor they had dogs in armor campaigning with their masters.

In the First World War, all the major countries used dogs in war for various purposes. This was especially true of the French and Germans.

As the political dogs of war began to growl back in the 1930's, the Germans and the Russians, particularly, launched upon an intensive program of training dogs for war; until at the outbreak of hostilities, it has been reliably reported that the Germans had a canine army of around 100,000 thoroughly trained dogs. The Russians had a canine army of 50,000; and prior to Pearl Harbor, it has been reliably stated that the Germans turned over to the Japanese some 25,000 trained dogs, which they have since used to good advantage.

Unfortunately, it appears that the British, Dutch, and ourselves, being essentially peace-loving countries, had not gone in for any such elaborate training programs for either dogs or dog handlers and, therefore, the results of our joint backwardness made themselves immediately felt in the Japanese invasion of the Malay jungles against the Dutch and British and later manifested themselves against our own Marines in the South Pacific. It can, perhaps, be reliably stated that no little part of the Japaneses' successes in overrunning the stanch British and Dutch defenders of the Malay jungles can be attributed to the Japanese dogs of war. In turn much of our own embarrassment in the South Pacific might likewise be attributed to dogs. It is known that our own Marines hurriedly asked for, and received, a relatively few dogs which in turn aided in the routing of the Japanese from Guadalcanal; and recent news releases showed some of our tired and valiant band of Marines returning from that war center with their valiant but all too few Marine dogs of war. We have all been very much intrigued by the various stories and illustrations appearing in papers illustrating the various ways in which our soldiers camouflage themselves to avoid enemy detection but there is no way in which anyone can hide himself from the keen smell of a trained war dog. The British and Dutch found that out and we are learning it—to our sorrow.

And so we find that the dog, whom poets of the past and present have called man's best friend has been playing his patriotic part in serving his patriotic masters on all fronts in this greatest of all wars.

Now some of you may wonder just how these dogs play their part and just what manner of training they receive. We have often heard the statement made that our troops in all branches are trained as task forces—meaning that they have been trained especially to accomplish certain tasks. And so we find when an invasion task force starts out, it usually has its naval and air task force assigned to it to protect the troop and material laden transports; it has its Navy and Coast Guard men assigned to the difficult task of transporting the beachhead landing force, which occupational force in turn has its own previously designed task to perform. Likewise, we find that the dogs themselves are trained to accomplish certain tasks under fire or on patrol. For instance, dogs assigned to the Signal Corps are frequently sent out with reels of wire on their back which unwinds as they go along to a predetermined outpost. Likewise these dogs are trained to carry written messages back or, perhaps, in turn to transport relatively small quantities of ammunition to beleagured outposts. Then following a battle—in this war as in the last—dogs operating under the Red Cross are used as bearers of first-aid supplies to the wounded in foxholes or shell holes. Dogs can find and succor the wounded at night as well as in daylight.

In addition, of course, up in the cold, frozen regions of the north countries, the dogs of the sled are performing war functions perfectly normal to them in peacetime.

And then we have another category in which dogs are performing a most important duty in our war effort. I refer particularly to the dogs which are on guard duty and patrol duty on airports, Army posts, docks, factories, warehouses, sea coasts. Recently it was my great pleasure to visit the Coast Guard dog patrol training center established last fall on the Widener estate in Elkins Park, just outside of Philadelphia. There Lt. Peter A. B. Widener, the famous Philadelphia sportsman, turned over to Uncle Sam's Coast Guard, free of charge, his remarkable training facilities for his own kennels of German Shepherd dogs and which has, of course, been tremendously enlarged. Lieutenant Widener was one of the first large-scale importers of German Shepherd dogs in this country, not only because of his interest in that particular breed of dogs but because he had the foresight to understand their future value should this Nation unfortunately ever again become involved in a major war.

At the Philadelphia center, under the direction of Lt. Theodore Kapnek, one of the outstanding trainers of the country, they now have facilities for training about 200 of these German Shepherd dogs at one time. Each dog is trained to be handled by each of two Coast Guardsmen. It takes about 30 days to train the Coast Guardsman to properly train his dog and likewise it takes about 4 to 6 weeks for the man to properly train his dog. These particular dogs are being trained primarily for shore patrol duty, which they perform normally only at night. It has been conservatively figured by the Coast Guard that one Coast Guardsman on shore patrol with his dog is equivalent to seven individual patrolmen without a dog. This is because of the fact that when we are seeking to keep saboteurs off our shores or away from our water-front structures, the keen nose of those dogs can detect the presence of a stranger up to 200 yards away. When on patrol and he detects a stranger, the dog immediately puts his patrolman on his guard by a muffled growl or slight whine, or perhaps, a perking up of the ears coupled with a slight tug of his leash.

Immediately his keen nose leads the patrolman to his suspect. The dogs are trained to instantaneous obedience and will not attack unless commanded. I saw those dogs attack a trained athlete weighing some 200 pounds—a former heavyweight boxing champion who was dressed in a heavily padded suit—and, believe me, I don't want any of those 75-pounders leaping at me, because "they don't

mean maybe" when their master tells them to take the offensive. Naturally, they immediately leap for the right hand, which usually is apt to contain a gun, but from then on they go to work until commanded to cease the attack. Then the normal procedure is for the Coast Guard patrolman to tell the dog to watch the prisoner while he goes to summon help, or perhaps the dog is instructed to watch the prisoner while he is being led in for questioning. The dog does exactly that. He measures his prisoner off, and as long as the prisoner behaves, he is safe from attack, but let him make one false move and the dog is on him quicker than a flash, and that attack on him is much more vicious than the original capture.

If the Coast Guard's estimate is correct—and it is based pretty much on factual experience—then don't you see that if the Coast Guard can provide a force of say 10,000 dogs, each with 2 handlers, those 20,000 men can release for active sea duty thousands of additional trained Coast Guardsmen who would otherwise be needed to perform the same amount of antisaboteur patrol protection or guard duty. Likewise to be more conservative we might perhaps estimate that the German's canine army of 100,000 dogs for guard duty in the occupied countries, for patrol duty, outpost duty, etc., has permitted them to release at last a manpower army of 500,000 trained soldiers for the fighting fronts. I should again remark in passing that in the Coast Guard work these dogs operate only on the night patrols. Each dog works a 4-hour shift with one of his handlers, and then, perhaps, is off for 4 hours and might work a second 4-hour shift with his other handler. Meanwhile, of course, both of the handlers would take their usual 4-hour trek on patrol duty or guard duty during the daylight hours without the dogs, who are permitted to rest during that time.

These dogs in Philadelphia are being beautifully trained and they certainly are enjoying for the time being at least a most pleasant environment. One or two dogs share huge wire kennels at least 6 by 10 feet in size; sleep on elevated platform beds, well padded with clean cedar shavings and have their individual drinking cup. They feed on a carefully well-balanced, scientific ration. A staff of veterinarians insure their maintenance of good health and finally the Coast Guard handlers themselves become so closely attached to their dog that free hand-outs of tidbits taken from the Coast Guardsman's own meal or, perhaps, purchased at the nearby hot-dog stands are the rule rather than the exception.

The dogs come to the Coast Guard voluntarily from patriotic citizens all over the country. The Coast Guard wisely dignifies the patriotic service which the dogs themselves are called upon to perform by giving them an individual enrollment application blank to be filled out by the owner in the dog's name. I want to read you this application blank at this moment:

"ENROLLMENT APPLICATION, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD DOG PATROL

"To the COMMANDANT OF THE COAST GUARD:

"I hereby apply for enrollment, for active service, in the Coast Guard Reserve, for the duration of the war, as a Coast Guard dog for patrol.

"I submit a picture, herewith, as well as answers to the following questionnaire:

"1. Breed.

"2. Name.

"3. Age."

And, incidentally, the Coast Guard take for training only dogs which are at least one year old and under five years old.

"4. Sex.

"5. If bitch, are you spayed?"

This question of sex is immaterial to the Coast Guard, but the reason this latter question is asked is because they are carefully selecting the breeding of all the female dogs possible in order to develop their own specially bred line of dogs. The public in turn is being asked to volunteer to raise these puppies until they become a year old at which time, if the war has not then been won, it is understood the year-old puppies are to be turned over to the Coast Guard on demand. I am told, incidentally, that the public response in Philadelphia has been so instantaneous to this Coast Guard request that they are unable at this time to begin to supply the demand and, consequently, have a long waiting list of prospective puppy-raising volunteers.

"6. Shoulder height."

Of course, these Coast Guard dogs all are pretty good-sized dogs, but at Front Royal, Va., where the Army is conducting a very extensive training program of dogs intended not only for Army use but also for each of the other branches, including the Coast Guard, they take dogs of several other breeds and while they originally took dogs with a shoulder height of 18 inches, they have since raised the minimum to 20 inches.

The seventh question is—weight. Most of these Coast Guard dogs for patrol that I saw in Philadelphia weigh between 50 and 75 pounds and, of course, by accurate feeding are kept at their best fighting weight. The question is: "Are you registered with the Kennel Club? If so, what is your number, and registered name"? Question 11, "Are you in good health"? 12, "Have you had distemper?" "Are you nervous?" and "Are you afraid of gunfire?" Obviously, neither a highly nervous or a gun-shy dog makes a steady or valuable dog on patrol. Question 18, "What is your attitude toward strangers?" I don't know that this makes any particular difference excepting—as I pointed out previously—all these dogs are trained to work strictly on command of the handler and attain their viciousness on command. Then questions 19 and 20. "Are you a good watch dog, and have you had any obedience training?" Then, of course, they ask for a general outline of a dog's disposition, training background, special habits, or other useful information. And then the agreement reads: "I hereby agree, if accepted, to perform active service without pay or allowance, other than subsistence. If in the event, after trial, I am found to be unsuitable for the work required of me, I wish to be returned to my owner or leave my further disposal to the discertion of the United States Coast Guard." And finally, "If I am available after the end of the war, I wish to be returned to my owner or leave my further disposal to the discretion of the United States Coast Guard." And then the application is signed with the dog's name and the owner's name and address. If the dog is enrolled he gets a beautiful formal certificate of enrollment which his master can properly display with patriotic pride in his home. As a means of further identifying the dog's patriotic service to his country, the Coast Guard now has under consideration the tattooing of the Coast Guard insignia on the inside of the dog's ear, together with his enrollment number.

Yes; the dogs are playing a big part in this war and there will be other dog fights in this war than those about which we read in the skies.

Need for Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the address of the Honorable Prentiss M. Brown, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, before a meeting of the Technical Association of the Pulp and Paper Industry, New York City, February 18, 1943, on the occasion of the presentation of a medal to its founder, Mr. Harry Fletcher, of Michigan. The address is as follows:

Thank you, Harry Fletcher, for that very splendid introduction. I shall always consider it a matter of great pride to recall the words that you said upon this occasion. The last time I was in this hall was in 1924 at the preconvention banquet before the famous McAdoo-Smith scrap in Madison Square Garden. As I look over those on my left and those on my right and those in front of me, I do not see any faces who were here that night.

I was requested by the chairman of the Democratic National Committee—the new one—to make the speech at the Jackson Day dinner on Washington's birthday next week in Washington. Knowing that I had this obligation, I decided to try to find a substitute and avoid that speech if I could. So I suggested they request a gentleman who lives in the Hudson Valley near Poughkeepsie, and who is temporarily more or less, a resident of Washington at the present time, and he has decided to substitute for me. So I do not have that obligation, and I think he will take care of the situation pretty well down in Washington.

I am glad this is Michigan Day, because I live in Michigan, have lived there all my life, and I am glad to be talking to people who are familiar with the timber, lumber, and pulpwood business. I was born within earshot of the forests where the hack of the ax and the whine of the saw were heard as they drove through the maple logs. I recall that my first athletic sport as a youngster was running the logs on the bosom of Lake Huron. I had a great deal of success in doing it as a youth, but I tried it again last summer, and I found that the logs were smaller and the man was bigger, with disastrous results.

As a lawyer I think I know more about lumber law and lumber litigation than I do of any other subject. The name of Fletcher is a great name in Michigan. I heard the name Gilchrist. That likewise is a great name in Michigan. A little community in my small county of Mackinaw was named after the first Gilchrist, closely connected with the great lumbering operations that were carried on in the Mackinac Straits regions. I have followed it with interest, and I have been intimately connected with it, and I am most happy, therefore, to meet you here today.

In this job of Price Administrator for the Nation I have what I think is a most unique personal situation. So far as I can recollect, I am perhaps the first man who handled legislation creating an office, fought the battle for the law of October 2, 1942, which gave vitality and power to that office, and then by a queer quirk of fate and the verdict of the people of Michigan, was taken out of the Senate and given the responsibility for administering the law that I wrote. So if it fails, I think to a greater extent than any other time in history the responsibility is mine.

I have a sense of difficulty—I think that is the best word—in meeting this situation. The consumers in the United States have never been organized. We have large organizations who do present the consumer viewpoint like the labor unions, but they are primarily producers. We have organizations of the women, such as the League of Women Voters, a great independent organization which gave me great help in the passage of these two pieces of legislation. But they do not exert and apparently cannot exert the

same pressure and power down in Washington as do the great producer organizations. So my job is principally one of resistance.

I sit day after day listening to the requests of people who want me to do something, many, many times with justice on their side. I have to sit there and represent those people who never come near and so often those whose voices are silent when their interests are so vitally affected. Only yesterday I had to turn down my good friends, the Senators and many Congressmen from Texas, Arizona, Florida, and California, in what was a pretty strong demand for a substantial rise in the price of citrus fruits. I had to resist my good friends from North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, Florida, Delaware, and others of the great early potato-producing sections of the country and say "No" to their request for higher prices.

I guess I had better not go into the question of print paper prices at the present time. It might be a little bit unfortunate. I may say that I spoke to the Association of Newspaper Editors only last Saturday, and I didn't say anything there. So I am playing square between both of you. I inflict a speech on each. When that issue comes before us we will decide it on the merits and under the law in accord with what I think to be the principles of fairness and equity in the interests of the people of the United States.

This price control job is one which needs public support. We have strong powers of resistance, but we need your support. We need the support of all Americans, because one is inclined, when he hears so continually the requests of those who produce, to be overborne by their arguments. I want to point out to you in the little while that I will take today the crux of this situation.

When we passed the first price control law there was in it no substantial control nor machinery set up for the purpose of stabilizing wages. The result was that while the general principle was laid down, the farm producers of the country urged, and with considerable justice, that since wages were not strictly stabilized and controlled we ought to let farm prices go somewhat beyond the figure which farmers and farm leaders and legislators, interested primarily in farm prices, had for many years considered to be a fair and equitable formula—the formula commonly known as parity.

Subsequently, with great reluctance, those of us in charge of the legislation consented to a higher parity than that which had long been established. It became apparent during the summer of 1942 that the system would not work, that we did not have sufficient control. Thereupon ensued the President's Labor Day message, and the law of October 2, 1942, which definitely and certainly fixes the general level of prices and wages as of September 15, 1942, with certain necessary and equitable exceptions, as the standard of wages and prices throughout the country.

Today, the principle of that law, which is a just and equitable act, is being assailed on both sides—farm prices and wages. Two movements are in Congress at the present time—the Pace amendment which would redefine parity upward, and the movement in the Senate which I do not yet believe has been framed into a bill, but which will be before the Senate before very long, by which there will be eliminated from the calculation of farm and food prices the payments which the Government has been making for 10 years to the farmers in the calculation of farm prices. Either one of them will do us great injury. The two of them together will just about wreck the control of food prices in the United States.

My good friend to my right, Mr. Mead, who sits on the War Labor Board and who is a member with me of the Byrnes stabilization committee, knows that at the present time the foundation of the drive for higher wages, particularly in the bituminous coal fields—which is the big opening wedge—is based upon the probability of the passage of these two farm measures in the House and the Senate, which would ruin price control.

I say to you with some knowledge of the subject, experience with it for the past several years, and as the responsible sponsor in the Senate of both bills—the latter one of which I wrote myself—with that background of knowledge, if we break through the price structure as it is today the wage structure will inevitably be broken through, and we will face in this country the most dangerous domestic situation that this Nation has ever faced. It would be equal to a tremendous defeat on the military front.

These measures must not pass. There must be, and I am confident there will be, on the part of those in charge of the administration a determination that we cannot accede to the demands in the bituminous-coal situation to the effect that the Little Steel formula be junked. The great city of Detroit, the greatest center of war production in the United States in southeastern Michigan, is totally and wholly dependent upon the continuing everyday production of bituminous coal. There must be no strike and there must be no compromise. We must meet this issue squarely and fairly. If we do, I am satisfied that the American people will back the Chief in that effort, and I am satisfied that in the end we will win out in the battle on the farm front. We cannot now stop to make adjustments which many might think are necessary to bring about economic justice in the United States. We never have achieved it, but we have come much closer to it than in any nation of the world.

The theory back of the October 2 act was that we were to take things as they are, with adjustments to cure gross inequities and stand by that principle. As far as the Office of Price Administration is concerned, we will stand by that principle. If they cut our appropriation and throw us out of Washington, nobody, Harry, in a personal sense, will be happier than I to go back to the blue waters of Lake Huron and the great forests of northern Michigan where I would like to be.

You know that I, in the eyes of the general public, was defeated, because I fought the battle of October 2 and carried that ball through. I think I was never quite so thrilled as I was in the days immediately following when the general public, the press, and the President commended my effort.

There was published by a man, at some expense, a full page advertisement in the Washington Post, commenting upon the battle I then made. I think, and I thought then, that it was far more important that the stabilization law should pass than that Prentiss Brown should stay in the United States Senate.

If one can throw aside the feeling that we all have—to use a trite, common phrase—that "we hate to lose," I would have been very glad to go back to northern Michigan and stay. I thought that was what the people of Michigan told me to do last November. I fully intended to stay there. Well, I had to go back to Washington to vote on a few measures. When I returned, I was summoned to go "downtown." I had been there many times before, and I had been the subject and object of the marvelous art of persuasion that the President has. I succumbed again and am now Price Administrator. I well recall an earlier trip down. Senator Harrison, who was the chairman of the great Committee on Finance, where I did much of my work, knew that I was inclined against the reciprocity treaties. The vote in the Senate was going to be close. I had a good speech prepared against the proposition. (I am sure "Pat" suggested my visit.) I was invited down and saw the Chief at about 11 in the morning, and by 12:30 I was on the floor of the Senate, urging the adoption of the reciprocity agreements.

It was not always so. As my Michigan friends well know, there were many times when my powers of resistance were somewhat more firm, as on the Supreme Court issue, where many people gave me some credit for aiding in the eventual defeat of the bill, and on many other measures, where it was a question of conscience.

That leads me to what I think is the heart of what I have to say today to this audience. From 1933 through 1940, there were many times when I was in sharp disagreement with my party, with my Chief, and in those days of peace, I did not hesitate to express my views. For example, I was the only Democrat on the House Banking and Currency Committee to vote against the elimination of the gold clause in the United States Government bonds. I was one of seven who voted against it in the House and though generally I was in agreement with the philosophy and the platform of my party, I exercised the right of an independent American to differ when I considered it necessary to do so. As the days came on and the storm clouds in Europe became darker, as we approached the days when foreign policy was under discussion, I caught hold of myself one day and said, "My country is in peril. The American people have chosen a leader. In 1940 they chose him under the most extraordinary circumstances in our history, the breaking of the third-term tradition." I was minded against it. All my training as a lawyer, my belief in tradition and precedent, was against it, but I thought that in that crisis we should retain experienced leadership, and we did. The American people decided that way. I then said a thing which has been used not only throughout my State, but by representatives of the other party throughout the Nation, and it was the statement which I repeat here, that in matters of foreign policy and in the conduct of the war I am going to follow the Chief, even when it is against my own better judgment.

I say to you now, and I say it in all seriousness, and I say it as one whose political future is behind him, that I have never known a time when there was so much disunity in the Congress of the United States, when there was so much backbiting and fighting between the American people over inconsequential things. It extends much further, to our allies in this great war. How much was said by many, some in the Congress itself, about England and her ambitions and her desire to win material things out of this war, forgetting that from those terrible June days of 1940, when mighty France fell before the onslaughts of the German hordes, down to that June day in 1941 when Germany attacked Russia, the citadel and fortress of England stood alone against what I fairly say are the hosts of evil in this world. Britain saved our civilization.

Regardless of what may be called flyspecks on her past and regardless of the natural ambitions that nations and governments have to acquire additional territory, trade, and so on, in the future, I say to you that that was one of the most heroic achievements in the long history of world civilization.

Today that same spirit seems to exist with many. You see it in the attitude of some on the Dies committee of the House of Representatives against that powerful and potent force that is beating back the German hordes on the plains of Russia today. I hope all of us will realize that unity in spirit is necessary; that we will remember that the great foes are that Nazi military bund and junta which on three occasions in the lives of the men and women who are present today have broken the peace of the world, and the criminal assassins of Japan; that it is necessary in the days of the future that these great nations who are now united together must stand

together. And, my good friends, they won't if this backbiting, this under-the-table talk, these criticisms of the war effort of our allies and our friends are continued, if these seeds of disunity which have been sown are permitted to nurture and grow and live and become powerful elements in our life.

We are one of the great "have" nations of the world. We probably have less by way of territorial ambition than any other great nation in the world. But, my good friends, the Russians are much like us. There are 160,000,000 of them. They have the most extensive territory in the world. They have tremendous resources, and their objective, as stated definitely by those in charge of their Government, is to retain what they have. I don't mean by that either our Nation in its demand for air bases, or other nations who are with us in their desires for better protection, may not for some years to come, for some decades to come, require some territory. But they know, and we know, from the bitter experience following 1918, that selfishness, aggrandizement, national selfishness will only result in a war in which your grandchildren and mine will again be engaged in deathly struggle.

Finally, I plead for that unity here in the country itself. On the domestic front, in the emergency agencies, one of which I head, we need the support of the American people as a whole. In the matter of the carrying on of the war, to be specific, in the matter of the determination of the size of our Army and the necessity for troops in the field, in the air, and on the ships, I want to leave it to the military authorities, and I think the Congress and the people should get behind them; I am afraid that at the present time they are not.

We need a rebirth of that spirit of unity. We all deplore the temporary losses in North Africa—which have depressed many of us in the last 2 or 3 days—where our land forces for the first time are in active combat with the enemy. But out of it, my good friends, may come a realization that Joe Stalin and his army can't win this war alone. Out of it may come a realization that there is a lot of venom and power in the Nazi snake yet. Let us not become too complacent. Let us not feel that we can again enjoy the American sport of fighting each other. Let us march on behind the Chief together to victory.

Lincoln's Fame Is No Postscript

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Morgan, from the Boston Sunday Globe of February 7, 1943:

LINCOLN'S FAME IS NO POSTSCRIPT—POLITICIANS GUESSED HIM WRONG, BUT THE PEOPLE AND THE INTELLECTUALS TOOK THE MEASURE OF HIS GREATNESS WHILE HE LIVED

(By James Morgan)

The late Justice Holmes recently has been cited as a witness that Abraham Lincoln was not rated a great man until long after his death. That raises a question of more than antiquarian interest. For there is a general and persistent belief that often we entertain greatness unawares, which inclines us to hesitate in winnowing the chaff from the wheat in public life lest posterity get a laugh on us. It will be profitable to inquire on this opening day of the week of Lincoln's birthday whether Lincoln's generation really did make a wrong guess on him.

Certainly the political people generally were fooled. That caused many of them to make a lot of trouble for Lincoln in his time and much for themselves in aftertime. But he forewarned them in his second annual message to Congress: "We cannot escape history. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation." The wrong guessers and marplots of that day are remembered now only for the purpose of supplying the shadows in the background of a heroic figure.

Yet it must be said for those luckless fellows that Lincoln was nominated only because he was a supposed second- or third-rater, who would not draw the fire of the opposition as it would be drawn by more shining targets. The silence in which he remained wrapped in a remote village throughout the campaign of 1860 deepened the impression, with Wendell Phillips impatiently demanding, "Who is this huckster in politics? Who is this county court advocate?"

THE STRANGER IN WASHINGTON

No President-elect until then ever had entered Washington so much a stranger as this one-term ex-Congressman, who publicly admitted, "I hold myself without mock modesty the humblest of all the individuals who have been elected President of the United States."

Nor did he look the star part which a seemingly freakish destiny had cast him to play in the great drama that impended. He was not of the Websterian manner, which remains to our day the pattern for the stuffed shirts who strut and fret their hour upon the stage.

Even John Hay, whom the new President brought on with him from Illinois to be a secretary, seems not to have penetrated this disguise of greatness. For we find young John, who was eastern educated and an assumed sophisticate, longing to escape from an association with this unsuspected immortal.

Horace Greeley made no bones of telling Lincoln to his face in what low esteem he was held by beginning a letter to him with this candid salutation, "You are not considered a great man." All Washington took it for granted that one of the two great men in the Cabinet, Seward or Chase, would run this "simple Susan," as Samuel Bowles of the Springfield Republican sized him up.

Seward and Chase factions in Congress wrangled for years over the project to rescue Lincoln from the supposed domination of the one or the other, and there were many who wanted to deliver him from the domineering Stanton. "He might appear to go Seward's way one day," Grant said, "and Stanton's another, but all the time he was going his own course, and they with him. It was his gentle firmness in carrying out his own will without argument, force, or friction that formed the basis."

SLOW START ON A FAR JOURNEY

There is much to be said in extenuation for those behind the scenes who undervalued Lincoln, always an inefficient administrator. When the first Charles Francis Adams came to discuss foreign policy with his Chief before departing for his post as Minister to England, he carried away from that last meeting with him the picture of a "shabbily dressed man" who "slouched into the room" in "worn slippers" and talked mostly about the Chicago postmastership. Adams never was to realize that he was saved from receiving his passports in London by Lincoln's common sense and native tact in toning down Seward's protest to the British Government against the recognition of the Confederacy as a belligerent.

"I may go forward slowly," Lincoln said, "but I never walk backward." No one had a clearer or stronger grasp than he of the issue confronting the country. But he was not, nor was anyone else, quick to rise to the proportions of the struggle over that issue. Once events had lifted him to the level of it, he himself lifted the occasion to the loftier level of the universal principles set forth in the Gettysburg Address and of the soul-searching, spiritual vision that illumined the second inaugural.

POPULAR INSTINCT PROPHETIC

At the approach of the time to nominate a candidate for President in 1864, the almost unanimous voice of the political fraternity was "for anyone but Lincoln," which collided, when the delegates came to the convention, with the voice of the people "for no one but Lincoln."

To the two extremes of our national life, the commonalty and the intellectuals, belongs the honor of having been first to mark the moral and mental growth of the man and to appreciate his rare natural qualities for leadership. The judgment of history on him was anticipated by the instinct of his own plain people. However they wearied and faltered in the long, indecisive war, their attitude toward the President himself was not so extravagantly overstated by an enthusiastic westerner in the line at a White House reception, who declaimed, "Out our way the people put their trust in God and Abraham Lincoln." The secondary object of that tribute replied with the admission, "My friend, I am inclined to think they are half right, at least." There is credible testimony to the popular affection in the very title of the song, We Are Coming Father Abraham, Three Hundred Thousand More.

POETS AND PROPHETS

Emerson was in the forefront of the intelligentsia in revising the estimation of Lincoln. Lowell did not lag behind the sage of Concord in acclaiming the "unknown man whom a blind fortune, as it seemed had lifted from the crowd to the most dangerous and difficult eminence of modern times."

Within a week of Stanton's turning from the deathbed of his Chief and hoarsely whispering, "Now he belongs to the ages," Emerson pronounced a eulogy which time has not amended:

"Old as history is, and manifold as are its tragedies, I doubt if any death has caused so much pain to mankind as this has caused. * * * We might well be silent, and suffer the awful voices of the time to thunder to us. * * * By his courage, his justice, his even temper, his fertile counsel, his humanity, he stood a heroic figure in the center of a heroic epoch. * * * He is the true history of the American people in his time * * * father of his country, the pulse of 20,000,000 throbbing in his heart, the thought of their minds articulated by his tongue."

Lowell's Commemoration Ode at Harvard followed in a few weeks with its now time-tested prophecy:

'Standing like a tower,
Our children shall behold his fame,
The kindly-earnest, brave, far-seeing man,
Segacious, patient, dreading praise, not blame,
New birth of our new soil, the first American."

The theme inspired Whitman to write what my gifted colleague, Lucien Price, ranks first in elegiac literature, When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloomed:

"A sprig with its flower I break
* * * * *
For the sweetest, wisest soul of all my days * * *"

Longfellow, Whittier, Bryant, Dr. Holmes, all laid their wreaths on the bier, while from across the Atlantic the funeral chorus was swollen by Tom Taylor in his apology for London Punch:

"Yes, he had liv'd to shame me from my sneer,

* * * * *

To make me own this hind of princes peer,
This rail-splitter a true-born king of men."

Lincoln's fame is no postscript of history. True, it has continued to spread abroad, until Lloyd George could say at the dedication of the statue of the American President at Westminster:

"In a few moments we shall see unveiled before our eyes a presentment in bronze of the best known historical face in the Anglo-Saxon world, in fact one of the few best known faces in the whole world. He is one of the giant figures, of whom there are very few in history, who lose their nationality in death * * * they belong to mankind."

Posterity cherishes but it may not flatter itself that it discovered the greatness of this embodiment of the American way of life, this prophet of government by the people, which is now again under fire, who stands as the supreme justification and the symbol of an equal chance for all men everywhere.

Wagner Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Catholic Action of the South of February 18, 1943:

BACK TO INDUSTRIAL FEUDALISM?—WARNING TO AMERICANS

The Wagner Labor Relations Act is the greatest measure of industrial and even social reform that has been enacted by the Congress of the United States in all its history. It is the culmination of a movement for economic freedom and democracy which has been in progress for decades. It has been sanctioned by the best sources of public opinion in the United States, including the church and outstanding representatives of our colleges and universities. Its opponents are the same old benighted forces whose representatives place profit above democracy and humanity and refuse to recognize that our Government, economic as well as political, is, and of right ought to be, "of the people, by the people."

The right of employers to organize and bargain collectively has never been disputed by workers. Employers have exercised it in the form of corporations, some of them of gigantic proportions, and in the organization of merchants, manufacturers, and industry-and-commerce associations. The same right of association for labor has been disputed for decades—how violently and inhumanly is shown in the volumes of the La Follette committee—by our antisocial type of employer, and, therefore, it was necessary to enact the Wagner Act to protect the worker in his free exercise of that right.

Today, this type of selfish employer, who makes it so hard for the majority of upstanding, decent employers, believes, he says, in the Wagner Act in principle (it is the law of the land), but he denies it in practice. He tried to get around the law for years by trying to emasculate it by many amendments and, fortunately for democracy, he failed. Now, ever hopeful, through various antilabor proposals coming before the Congress, headed by the Hobbs antiracketeering bill, he is trying to kill the Wagner Act in effect, weakening it piecemeal by a multiplicity of separate measures, so that if the first, the Hobbs bill, passes, all the others will pass more easily, and what he failed to do by a frontal attack, he will accomplish in this indirect manner.

Adolf Schickelgruber, alias Hitler, believes in telling lies big and often enough that, by constant repetition, his victim's mind will finally succumb to the falsehood. Those who would throw us back to industrial feudalism at any cost use the same trick via the press and radio, and, by unwearying repetition, have made the expression, "labor-leader racketeers" almost a household word for many gullible people who now instinctively identify that epithet with the average poor worker who joins a union and elects himself capable leaders.

So now we have the old plot with a new title, "Repeal the Wagner Act," has become a more respectable-sounding antiracketeer act.

The defeat of the Hobbs bill is of the utmost importance, both because of its intrinsic evils, and because its fate is going to have considerable influence on the outcome of the many other similar antilabor measures that clutter up the congressional hopper. There is no need for such a bill, since the present Federal and State laws adequately cover all real racketeers. The Hobbs bill adds nothing to it, but it does contain a new method of destroying labor's strength and labor's organizations. It outlaws "extortion," which it defines as a "means of obtaining property from another with his consent, inducted by wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear." This definition allows of the widest interpretations, and has, in the past, been so interpreted in many courts, to contest the legality of ordinary union activities. Ordinary picketing, even peaceful persuasion, have been condemned as "force" or "violence." To prohibit employees from that kind of "violence" would raise, in Federal law, the ghosts of many much-criticized injunctions issued by courts of equity against legal activities of labor organizations, ghosts which it was supposed Congress had laid low in the Norris-LaGuardia Act. With such definitions, what is to prevent a union-hating employer from claiming that a shop steward used "actual or threatened force or violence" or "fear" to collect union dues?

Enactment of the Hobbs bill, or of other discriminatory measures following in its trail, would be reprehensible enough and dangerous enough in peacetime. Now, while America is engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the powerful, godless Axis, to enact such bills would be simply playing with dynamite.

It would constitute a serious, perhaps a fatal, blow to national unity, indispensable to a victory over Hitler; by demoralizing patriotic American workers, who, according to all responsible authorities, are doing a splendid and unselfish job in their war effort, it would make serious inroads in our constructive national labor policy, with a consequent interference with full war production.

Strong, free unions are a necessary element in the church's social teaching based on class cooperation, and fighting such unions, under the guise of fighting racketeering, would only intensify the class conflict so dear to the hearts of the Communists, and play right into the hands of these un-American and undemocratic elements. The people of New Orleans and of the South should take advantage of this golden opportunity to serve the Nation's true interests by opposing, through their elected Representatives, all disruptive antilabor proposals in the present momentous session of Congress. (Rev. Jerome A. Drolet.)

Farmers Want Fair Market Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, although there is considerable confusion in Washington over the agricultural situation and the threatened shortage of food, American farmers can be relied upon to do everything within their power to meet this phase of the war challenge. Producers are facing numerous problems which are extremely discouraging, but they are making plans on the basis of getting maximum yields of essential crops.

Idaho farmers favor S. 660 to insure equitable price levels for food products. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a brief statement of the Idaho Farm Bureau Federation in support of this legislation:

We are opposed to the use of subsidies to consumers in lieu of fair prices to farmers. Incentive payments are in reality subsidies to the consuming public, which are offered to farmers in order to avoid paying higher prices to farmers. The average nonfarm family is now paying but 22 percent of its total earnings for food—the smallest percentage on record. It does not seem sound economy for our National Government to pay large sums in incentive payments when the wages of labor will today justify paying higher prices to assure ample production.

Farmers want fair prices in the market place instead of subsidies. Crops on which incentive payments are to be made are crops on which we have or will have acute shortages. When there is a shortage of a crop there is no difficulty in raising the price. Farmers in the past have received payments for crops in addition to the market price because the surplus of the crop in question held the market price below the cost of production. There is no justification to pay such incentive payments on commodities that will demand a cost of production in the open market. The best way to obtain production is through an incentive price and not an incentive payment.

The incentive program which the United States Department of Agriculture has proposed is unfair to farmers. To hold down prices to consumers through subsidizing the cost of producing food, at a time when consumers are well able to afford to pay the entire cost, is unfair to farmers. Not only will farmers be subjected to criticism of the public because of these subsidies, which will increase our national debt and tax burdens, but farmers will be placed in a disadvantageous position in the post-war period when these subsidies will cease and prices will recede.

Senate bill 660 would make it mandatory that fair prices be allowed to secure the production of much-needed agricultural products.

They Shall Not Die—Proposals for Aiding the Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, last night a monster demonstration was staged at Madison Square Garden at which 21,000 persons were present; 10,000 more listened in the street outside and hung upon the words of the speakers carried through the microphone. Many more were turned away from this interfaith meeting held in protest of the terrible atrocities of the Nazis against the Jews in Europe and elsewhere.

Some immediate action of the United Nations is essential in order to save as many as possible of the 5,000,000 Jews in Europe from extermination. Two million have already been liquidated through hangings, shootings, lethal gases, starvation, and all manner of mass executions and pogroms. People of all faiths assembled last night to inveigh against these outrages, Nazi rapine, rape, murder—this blood bath of Jews. Religious, civic, political, and labor leaders added their voices to the utterances of outraged humanity.

Joining in support of the demonstration from across the seas came messages of the Archbishop of Caterbury, Cardinal Hinsley, Archbishop of Westminster, Chief Rabbi J. H. Hertz, of Great Britain, and Sir William Beveridge.

This Stop Hitler Now demonstration was under the joint auspices of the American Jewish Congress, of industrial organizations, and other Christian and Jewish bodies. Dr. Stephen S. Wise presided.

An 11-point program of suggested action was adopted, which will be submitted to the President. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; Sir Norman Angell; Bishop Henry St. George Tucker, presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church in America and president of the Federal Churches of Christ in America; Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, secretary of the Church Peace Union, and Dr. George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College, spoke in support of the protest and the need for action in order to save the Jews from destruction by the Nazis.

Governor Dewey addressed the meeting by radio from Albany. From Washington came radio addresses by Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas and Senator Robert F. Wagner. Wendell L. Willkie proclaimed in a message that practical measures must be formulated and carried out immediately to save as many Jews as possible.

Messages of strong sympathy were read from Viscount Halifax, British Ambassador, who assured the audience Great Britain was determined that the United Nations' declaration condemning the unbelievable Nazi atrocities against the Jews will be followed by practical action. He stated as a first step that the British Government has completed negotiations with the Bulgarian Government for the purpose of giving asylum to 4,000 Jewish children and 500 adults who shall leave Bulgaria to come to Palestine and that Great Britain has undertaken to receive in Palestine 29,000 Jewish children with a proportion of adults by March 31, 1944.

Dr. Wise deplored the delay in taking immediate steps by the United Nations by way of rescuing Jews and giving them asylum.

I herein set forth the resolution adopted, the words of which I make my own:

First. Through the intermediation of neutral agencies, the German Government and the governments of states it now partly dominates or controls—such as Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary—should be approached with the view to secure their agreement to the release of their Jewish victims and to consent to their emigration to such havens of refuge as will be provided; and that such neutral states as are in a position to enter into direct discussion with the German Government be urged to make similar representations.

Second. The United Nations should take steps, without delay, to designate and establish a number of sanctuaries in Allied or neutral states to serve, under agreed conditions, as havens of refuge for those Jews whose release from captivity may be arranged for, or who may find their way to freedom through efforts of their own.

Third. The procedure that now prevails in the administration of existing immigration law in the United States, which acts as deterrent and retardation of legal immigration under the established quotas, should be revised and adjusted to the war conditions and in order that refugees from Nazi-occupied territories may find sanctuaries here within such quotas.

Fourth. Subject to the maintenance of national security, Great Britain should be asked to provide for receiving a reasonable quota of the victims escaping from Nazi-occupied territories and to provide for their accommodation for the duration.

Fifth. The United Nations should urge the republics of Latin America to modify such administrative regulations that now make immigration under the law extremely difficult and to endeavor under existing immigration law to find temporary havens of refuge for an agreed number of refugees.

Sixth. Overriding pre-war political considerations, England should be asked to open the doors of Palestine—the Jewish homeland—for Jewish immigration, and the offer of hospitality made by the Jewish community of Palestine should be accepted.

Seventh. The United Nations should provide financial guaranties to all such neutral states as have provided temporary refuge to Jews from Nazi-occupied territories. The transfer of such refugees to the designated sanctuaries should be encouraged to continue to provide accommodation for such refugees as may come to them over the borders of Nazi-occupied territory, the United Nations giving adequate financial guaranties to such states for the feeding and maintenance and eventual evacuation of such refugees.

Eighth. In view of the fact that planned mass starvation is the design of the Nazi regime in its inhuman warfare, the United Nations are urged to take steps without delay but with due regard for the economic warfare being waged against the aggressor states, to organize through neutral agencies for the feeding of the unfortunate victims who are doomed to linger under Nazi oppression.

Ninth. It is submitted that the United Nations should undertake to provide the financial guaranty that may be required for the execution of the program of rescue here outlined.

Tenth. The United Nations are urged to establish an appropriate intergovernmental agency to which authority and power shall be given to implement the program of rescue here outlined.

Eleventh. It is further urged that steps be taken without delay to implement the declared intention of the United Nations to bring the criminals to justice, to appoint a commission to assemble the evidence on which the trials shall be based, and to establish the procedure of such a tribunal—in the name of humanity—for the sake of that cause which the armies of democracies have risen to defend.

The Old Home Town—Chelsea, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Boston Sunday Post of February 28, 1943, by Bob Coyne:

THE OLD HOME TOWN—CHELSEA

(By Bob Coyne)

What a century had built vanished in smoke on Palm Sunday, 1908. Due to a strong gale, the flames spread rapidly and at nightfall the city was a waste of smouldering embers, with about 18,000 of its people homeless. Nothing remained except a blackened area, with here and there a broken wall rising out of the debris to mark what at dawn had been a thriving community.

Scenes of heartbreak and tragedy as panic-stricken people sought to save what they could! Eye-witnesses said that it seemed as though everyone tried to save a mattress. Two men were observed carrying an upright piano, and when the cloth backing started to burn they put the piano down and one played There'll Be a Hot Time in the Old Town Tonight.

Few settlements have known so many changes as Chelsea. The homestead built by Samuel Maverick about 1625, the first permanent house in the Massachusetts Bay Co., and the trading post that Maverick established in Winnisimmet, formed the beginning of Chelsea.

Maverick sold his vast holdings to Governor Richard Bellingham, who changed laws that conflicted with his conduct and gave the dignified Puritans many a shock. When he was gathered to his fathers, he left as his last gesture of the self-assertion of Bellingham a will that was not only a torment to legal minds but also a hindrance to the early advancement of Chelsea.

ONCE A SUMMER RESORT

The Bellingham purchase transformed Chelsea into an agricultural community, and the coming of the ferry changed it to a very popular summer resort. But when shipping and manufacturing took over the water front, the residential section was forced back and the population became very congested. The rustic, scenic beauty of Chelsea passed as it became an industrial city. Today, in spite of reverses, it is progressive and industrial and decidedly cosmopolitan.

Chelsea has many historic spots. The Thomas Pratt house, not far from the site of the Maverick homestead, was the beginning of the Pratt regime, seven generations of whom have lived in Chelsea. The Bellingham-Cary is another, once occupied by the irascible governor, later by Samuel Cary. In it Washington quartered the last outpost of the left wing of the Continental Army.

Chelsea was honored by a visit from Lincoln. While campaigning for Taylor and Fillmore, he spoke at Gerrish Hall. Describing the event, a newspaperman wrote: "The Whigs of Chelsea held one of those meetings which do good to the inner man. The Honorable Abraham Lincoln made a speech which for aptness of illustration, solidity of argument, and genuine eloquence would be hard to beat."

Chelsea, with a water front of over 4 miles and excellent railroad connections, has much to offer the manufacturer. Its industries, important and diversified, include elastic webbing, boots, shoes, and paper stock. In addition there are large packing plants, shipbuilding and cooperage factories.

OLD CONCERNS

Among the oldest concerns is that of Cabot, Inc., pioneers in chemical research. The founder, the late Samuel Cabot, with a degree in coal tar chemistry from the University of Zurich, organized a company to manufacture pitch and other byproducts of coal. Due to Cabot's experiments, the creosote shingle stain was introduced, the first stained shingle and the only one with a genuine stain. The younger Cabot has invented a certain compound of pigments which has advanced the company in the manufacture of paints.

Everlastic, Inc., one of the three top-ranking concerns in the production of elastic webbing used in clothing, novelties, and for surgical purposes, was organized by the Martin brothers, who were among the most public-spirited citizens in the history of the city. Atwood & McManus, another old firm, specializes in box manufacturing.

One of the most interesting concerns is the spice mill. Set back in the marsh there is a quaintness about it, a suggestion of days long past. For almost two centuries it has occupied that site and day after day has turned out its quota of spice. After 200 years of continuous service, it is the oldest tide mill in America, perhaps in the world.

The most amazing feature of Chelsea is found in the long list of notables who were born there or have had some connection with the city. Horatio Alger, Jr., son of the first postmaster, wrote volumes primarily of poor boys who rose to fame. His own struggle to succeed may account for his epitaph which he himself dictated: "Here lies Horatio Alger, Jr. Well, what of it?"

As a child, Mildred Aldrich lived near the marine hospital. The World War found her in the country near the Marne and within the sound of the guns she wrote Told in a French Garden, Hilltop on the Marne, and On the Edge of the War Zone.

The Soldiers' Home, on Powder Horn Hill, for many years known as the Highland Hotel, was taken over by the Federal Government many years ago as a home for war veterans. It was partly torn down and a hospital added. Today it is a large institution, entirely under the jurisdiction of the State since 1934, as a home and hospital combined, with a nurses' home built across the street from the main hospital. The latest and largest addition was built in 1936. Lawrence F. Quigley, for many years mayor of Chelsea, is its present commandant, and is extremely popular with the veterans, to whom he is devoted.

GREATEST GENIUS

The greatest genius connected with Chelsea is Dr. Vannevar Bush, president of Carnegie Institute, appointed chairman of the technical defense research committee by President Roosevelt. Dr. Bush, who was educated in Chelsea, married Miss Phoebe Davis, of that city. He has written numerous books on scientific subjects, and invented the "thinking machine," which solves problems in higher mathematics. For a time he was dean of engineering at Tech and is at present consulting engineer of many scientific schools. His is one of the most celebrated names in the world of science.

Joseph Crosby Lincoln is another native of Chelsea, who married a girl of his home town. The name of Lincoln has very much a Cape Cod air; he has captured the picturesque beauty of the Cape and the character of its people and built wonderful tales about them. He has done it so successfully that many think of him as a real Cape Codder.

E. Phillips Oppenheim gave Chelsea a real romantic interlude when he followed the Hopkins family to America. But the judge thought his prospects too uncertain and refused to permit him to see his daughter. However, the young man's persistence won the judge and Miss Elsie Hopkins became Oppenheim's bride.

The most outstanding figures in Hollywood hail from Chelsea. Louis B. Mayer, of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studio conducted a junk business in Chelsea for a number of years. Famous as a director is Hamilton McFadden, whose father was a Chelsea minister. Jacques Renard, whose family resides in Chelsea, is famed as an orchestra leader. These are but a few of many who have gone from Chelsea to high places and far places.

It is doubtful if Louis de Rochement, producer of the March of Time and director of The Ramparts We Watch, could produce anything more amazing than the story and the notables of his own native city—Chelsea.

Manpower and Farm Machinery Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following letter which I have written to Hon. HAMPTON P. FULMER, chairman of the Committee of Forty-eight, with reference to the manpower and farm machinery problem:

MARCH 1, 1943.

Hon. HAMPTON P. FULMER, M. C.,
Chairman, Committee of Forty-eight,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FULMER: I am one of those who was in attendance last Saturday at the meeting of Representatives from the agricultural States assembled to devise ways and means of meeting the manpower problem and the farm-machinery problem as they involve our food-production program.

The manpower problem on our farms is very acute and the planting season is near at hand. Our farm boys subject to induction into the armed forces should be deferred immediately so that they may assist in planting and harvesting the crops this year. Those farm boys already in the service and stationed within the confines of the United States should be granted furloughs until after the harvesting season.

The need for farm machinery and repair parts is also very acute. All restrictions on farm machinery and repairs should be removed at once. A farmer cannot work without his tools and the Government cannot expect him to produce food without them. Repair parts are difficult to obtain and unless immediate arrangements are made to supply such repair parts, we are likely to find a general break-down in the midst of the harvesting season.

The Government asks our farmers to produce and produce and in the same breath takes their manpower and farm machinery from them. Our farmers are ready and willing to proceed with the food program if they can get some cooperation from the Government in this emergency. It is all right for the Government to suggest an increase in food over our 1942 record production, but let's then make it easier for our farmers to do so.

The farmer just now is working under too many Government regulations and they must be removed and modified immediately. If food will win the war, give the farmer the equipment and help he needs, put him on a parity with other industries, and he will do everything possible to feed the world.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
Member of Congress,
Eighth District of Iowa.

Administration Attitude Toward Beet Sugar Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 1), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter from Mr. E. W. Rising, executive vice president of the Western Beet Growers Association, with reference to the attitude of the administration toward the beet-sugar industry.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN BEET GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1943.
Hon. JOHN THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I desire to call your attention to some things that I find hard to understand.

The decision of the administration to keep the lid clamped down tight on sugar prices, refusing to permit the consumer to absorb a small increase to cover increased production costs, is certainly hard to understand.

For 2 months, representatives of beet growers, processors, and the Government negotiated regarding prices and conditions for 1943 beet sugar production. The growers and processors suggested that the price of sugar be advanced to cover the increased labor and other production costs—this would have meant an increase of perhaps 15 percent or something under 1 cent per pound in retail prices of sugar. Representatives of the Government said "No," we must keep living costs down.

Why consumers could not afford an extra 50 or 60 cents per person per year, particularly in view of the fact that right during the negotiations plans were announced for increasing the work week from 40 to 48 hours, which means increasing the contents of the pay envelope 20 to 30 percent, has not been explained. To state the matter in another way, let us consider the case of a worker whose rate of pay is 75 cents per hour, earning $1,500 or more per year, or the $1-per-hour head of a family earning better than $2,000 a year. Going on a 48-hour basis with time and a half for overtime means an increase of 30 percent, or $450 and $600, per year for these workers. For the family of 4 using 60 to 70 pounds of rationed sugar per person, the increased cost of living would have been increased perhaps $2.50 per year—certainly not a large item out of increased earnings of several hundred dollars per year. Still we were told that we must not increase living costs—to do so means inflation. So all I can say is we do not understand some things.

The growers and processors asked the Government to set a price of $12 per ton for beets of 16 percent sugar content. The requested price would have been about $2.50 per ton over 1942 prices. It was thought that $12 per ton for 16 percent beets would be comparable with prices offered for other needed farm products, and would have covered all increased labor costs in connection with producing beet sugar in 1943. On February 10 the Secretary of Agriculture announced that the Commodity Credit Corporation would offer to buy beets from the growers at about $1.50 per ton over 1942 prices. This additional price is considered an "incentive payment;" however, it is doubtful whether this payment is sufficient to make beets as profitable as other crops requiring less labor. The amount proposed is certainly the minimum that will permit the farmer to grow beets in 1943. No provision has been made to take care of increased processing costs. It is my understanding that some processors made money in 1942 and that others did not. It therefore appears that processors that made money in 1942 will be asked to take a smaller profit in 1943 and those who lost money in 1942 will be expected to absorb larger losses in 1943. This is another strange proposition and again I say I do not understand.

It is generally conceded that 1941 deliveries of sugar were considerably in excess of actual consumption, so that there was at the beginning of 1942 excess sugar in many homes and manufacturing plants. Without question this extra sugar helped materially in tiding over during 1942 and making sugar rations take care of actual need. Excess sugar has now been consumed and we start 1943 under entirely different conditions. We desire also to point out that in 1942 hundreds of tons of strawberries and other early fruit went to waste because sugar was not available for canning. Now that we are about to start rationing many articles of food, there will certainly be a big increase in home canning, that is, if sugar is made available.

We are reducing the quantities of candy and sweetening of foods and have been attempting to convince people that they do not need as much sugar as they have used heretofore, but observation does not lead me to believe that many people are sold that all of these measures are really assisting in the war effort. The American public demands high energy food, in order that they may be able to produce the ships, the planes, the munitions that are needed to win the war.

It is certainly time that we stop relying entirely on the advice of planners, economists, and good-neighbor enthusiasts, and consider known facts, such as that there is no other food—considering costs, ease of distribution to homes of mechanics and laborers employed in war industries, members of our armed forces, and all classes of civilians—that can possibly take the place of sugar. We should become just a little alarmed over the fact that under plans so far announced we are not likely to produce anywhere near as much sugar in the continental United States in 1943 as we produced in 1942.

Why the consumer does not make his demands known before it is too late, I do not understand.

Very truly yours,

E. W. RISING,
Executive Vice President.

Pennsylvania Food Production Committee Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the crisis facing Pennsylvania agriculture has received recognition by leading farmers, distributors, and processors, with the result that a Pennsylvania Food Production Committee has been formed to assist farmers in overcoming handicaps that threaten to interfere with the increase of acreage of essential crops so necessary for victory.

The committee met in Harrisburg, Pa., on February 16 and adopted a statement of policy and principle on the vital subjects of farm manpower and farm machinery.

I am in hope that the Members of Congress will take time to analyze the principles of the Pennsylvania Food Production Committee program.

Since the food situation is extremely grave it is necessary that immediate attention be given to this important and vital problem which directly affects the winning of the war.

The statement of policy and principle is as follows:

MANPOWER

1. Agriculture to be classified immediately as an essential war industry.
2. Drainage of farm manpower to cease—"farm manpower" in this and following items to include skilled labor for implement dealers and transporters and distributors of farm products and supplies.
3. Reassign to farms critical help now in armed forces and reallot to farms critical help in war industry.
4. Create an attitude of public recognition and respect for the inherent worth of the contribution being made to the war effort by essential workers engaged in food production.
5. Effectuate a complete coordinated program for the recruiting, training, housing, and transportation of harvesting labor.

MACHINERY

1. Agriculture to be classified immediately as an essential war industry.
2. That immediate steps be taken to have an adequate supply of machinery and repair parts made available to farmers through their accustomed dealers.
3. That all county machinery quotas shall be reexamined to determine if allotments have been made according to need—and that where counties have received in their quotas some machinery not required in those counties, such machinery shall be allotted to other counties having such need.
4. Determine the tools that are needed for spraying and harvesting 1943 crops and take immediate steps to commence their manufacture. Point out the irreparable damage caused by machinery shortage that it is now too late to produce and start now on 1944 production. Get allocation of 1944 materials set back to July 31, 1943.
5. Appoint within each county at least one dealer with blanket priority rating for essential repair parts high enough to secure them immediately.
6. Campaign to educate appropriate public officials to appreciate that increased production requires increased machinery.

Need More Cottonseed Meal to Offset National Protein Shortage Threat in 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the protein shortage is one of the most serious problems confronting the American people, and while there is already a shortage, it promises to become greater in 1943.

This shortage applies not only to the South but to every section of our country. The raising of soybeans and peanuts will not solve the problem.

Out of every bale of cotton, we can secure 400 pounds of precious protein feed, to say nothing of the 240 pounds of cottonseed hulls, another byproduct largely fed to dairy cows and beef cattle.

One of my constituents sent me an article by Mr. Victor Schoffelmayer, agricultural editor of the Dallas Morning

News, upon this subject, and under leave granted, I submit same herewith as a part of my remarks, as it contains important facts and figures upon this subject:

NEED MORE COTTONSEED MEAL TO OFFSET NATIONAL PROTEIN SHORTAGE THREAT IN 1943

(By Victor Schoffelmayer)

America faces a serious protein shortage. Protein is the basic life-stuff in either animal or vegetable food, without which man can neither fight nor live.

Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard startled the country the other day when he asserted that by next fall this country might have a shortage of 2,000,000 tons of protein feeds. Such a shortage could have serious consequences upon the results of a Nation-wide drive to produce more food, especially dairy products and meat. It could impair our war effort.

High-protein food is essential to victory. Proteins are an important part of a soldier's meat diet. Protein supplies energy and general good health and high spirits.

The threatened protein feed shortage is especially disheartening to Texas farmers and livestock feeders, because Texas farms could easily have raised all the protein feed necessary to supply its own livestock by simply restoring some of the lost Texas cotton acreage as may be necessary.

Instead the Secretary favors the Corn Belt States—Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Ohio, and others—by upping the soybean acreage from 10,500,000 to 12,000,000 acres. Our cotton, however, is to be cut still further, although Texas along with with cotton production, leads the Nation in the production of the very beef cattle which are to supply a large part of the meat protein for our fighting forces, our allies, and our people at home. Texas also has 1,400,000 dairy cows, whose milk is an important source of protein.

Although the South's peanut acreage also is to be increased by 500,000 acres, this increase is too small to produce appreciable quantities of protein cake or meal. It seems that the 1942 peanut crop, an all-time record high, either is not reaching the mills, is still in storage on farms, or has suffered undetermined damage in some manner, because latest mill reports indicated a 22-percent reduction of oil in spite of an 118-percent increase in crop.

Experts point out that for every bale of cotton now not grown we lose 400 pounds of precious protein feed, to say nothing of the 240 pounds of cottonseed hulls, another by-product largely fed to dairy cows and beef cattle.

As Texas farmers and livestock interests look at the matter, it would seem as if the same privilege to become and remain self-sustaining in the matter of essential protein feed should be extended to Texas and the other Southwestern States as well as to the Corn Belt.

When it was discovered that not enough protein feed will be available to supplement the large corn crop, Corn Belt farmers were urged to add 1,500,000 acres to the soybean goals for 1943. That, it is estimated, will put Corn Belt corn and Corn Belt soybeans in balance from a livestock feeding standpoint. Why not put Texas grain sorghums (same feeding value as corn) into balance with our home-raised protein meal from cottonseed and thus keep our farmers on a self-sustaining basis in feeding their millions of beef and dairy cattle and sheep?

As matters now stand, Texas and Oklahoma cotton oil mills are only half busy, because of the reduction of the Texas cotton crop from around 5,000,000 bales to 3,000,000 and a proportionate reduction for its sister State.

It must be understood that not all Texas cotton-oil mills are busy with soybeans or peanuts, simply because the former crop has been designated to a few selected mills, and peanuts are largely grown in the sandy areas. Cotton, however, is grown on every soil type, heavy or light, as any Texas farmer knows.

Texas, as the Nation's greatest livestock State, with 7,500,000 head of cattle and 10,000,000 sheep, needs a minimum of 1,250,000 tons of protein meal of from 41 to 45 percent quality.

Texas cottonseed crushing mills, with an annual capacity of nearly 3,000,000 tons, as shown in a recent survey by Dr. A. B. Cox of the Bureau of Business Research, University of Texas, is now reduced to crushing only about 510,000 tons of cottonseed cake and meal, and perhaps 100,000 tons of home-grown peanuts and northern soybeans, all of which add up to less than one-half of the State's mill capacity.

We have all heard of the national vegetable oil shortage—how farmers are to raise more oilseed crops—flax, peanuts, and soybeans—to make up for the nearly 2,000,000 tons formerly imported from all over the world. We are not sure that we will be able to supply our needs and those of our fighting forces under the allotted acreage. It may take several million acres of cotton to make up the difference.

Cotton is a drought-resistant crop, suited to many marginal types of land. Peanuts are not adapted to stiff clay, and soybeans seem best adapted to the Corn Belt so far, until we develop varieties suited to Texas and the South.

Flax seed is a winter crop for limited areas of the Gulf coast. About other oil crops, such as safflower, castor beans, perilla, sunflowers, and others, we hear almost nothing this year. So why not give cotton some added consideration on the theory that it may take all our sources of oil and protein to overcome the threatened shortage? Let us not get caught short another time. It could be disastrous.

Future of Organized Labor in Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, herewith I am inserting in the RECORD an outspoken article written by George Q. Lynch, president of the Pattern Makers League of North America, and appearing in the Pattern Makers Journal for January 1943.

His appeals to the labor movement and his warning against dependence upon government are, in my opinion, important, especially coming from a labor union official.

Democracy will never be safe without a free, strong, labor movement. True friends of labor have an obligation to see that that movement remains truly free in every sense of that word.

The article follows:

THE FUTURE OF ORGANIZED LABOR IN FREE ENTERPRISE

(By George Q. Lynch, general president, Pattern Makers League of North America)

A world war is being waged to determine whether our people shall be governed through democracy or ruled by totalitarianism. An appraisal of the future status of organized labor in America, under a system of free enterprise, therefore, rests upon the premise that the United Nations will win the war and that the democratic concepts of the Atlantic Charter will govern the peace. Free enterprise and free trade unions can exist only in a free democracy.

In the matter of democratic freedom, it is well to remember that America started with high-sounding abstractions which required more than a century to establish in part. From the Bill of Rights in 1791, through chattel slavery to universal suffrage in 1920 was a long haul.

Since 1932 the tempo has been accelerated, and in less than one decade we established more freedom and security for the common man than during the preceding century and one-half.

Most of these social gains have received public approbation. They will remain part of our future politico-economic life for the reason that once a human right has been established in America, it has never been repealed.

The one statute still under public scrutiny and debate is the National Labor Relations Act which created the National Labor Relations Board. Because the National Labor Relations Act will be the pivot upon which free enterprise and free trade unionism will be made to turn during the post-war period, it might be well to first review the circumstances which led to its enactment. An important parallel with respect to labor may evolve.

The National Labor Relations Act, approved by President Roosevelt July 5, 1935, declared it to be the policy of the United States to protect workers against the inequalities of bargaining power inherent in so-called free enterprise.

This law canceled the long-assumed God-given right of free enterprise to hire and fire at will. It also terminated the ludicrous right of a billion-dollar corporation to bargain with an individual employee with respect to wages, hours, and conditions of employment.

This affirmative action by Congress grew out of the new capitalism of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. During the 1920's free enterprise, as represented by Wall Street and the banking fraternity, went on a debauch—aided and abetted by representatives of government. Under the preceding "new freedom" of Woodrow Wilson, trade-unions had grown in strength and influence. The "new capitalism" required destruction of this influence. Therefore it was promptly vitiated by Attorney General Daugherty and the Ohio gang. Then followed a national policy of low wages and increased wealth production. Of the $9,000,000,000 additional yearly wealth produced, approximately one-half billion went to the workers. The balance was used to bolster fictitious stock values. During the 1928 Presidential campaign Al. Smith "took a look at the record" and warned of the dangers of increasing unemployment and surplus production. "The greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Hamilton" countered with reassuring statements. Wall Street and the banking fraternity continued to handle the savings and investments of the American people with wild abandon. Those objecting to the tie-up between government and finance were dismissed with the accusation that they lacked confidence and were "selling America short."

Then came October 1929. Millions of American families lost their homes and their life savings. America was in the bread line, and financiers were labeled "banksters."

The reality of the 1930's did two important things. It exploded the long-standing theory that self-discipline and self-regulation are fully adequate to protect the public interest against the sinister ambitions of organized minority groups. Second, it ushered

in the New Deal which imposed sound restrictions upon the offending irresponsible group, and enacted social gains legislation aimed to establish a balance of power between organized capital and organized labor for the purpose of eliminating costly and cruel industrial strife and increasing purchasing power.

The National Labor Relations Act was promptly christened labor's Magna Carta. It was to serve as the spearhead in establishing new concepts in national economy. The future of organized labor in America will depend largely on the use or abuse of these new concepts.

The Board began to function under many handicaps. It is traditional in America that grants of human rights are followed by the evils of a carpetbagging period. The National Labor Relations Act was no exception.

America was still in the throes of industrial depression with an estimated 11,000,000 unemployed and discouraged. This made fertile soil for the seeds of communism. Men without hope will sell their birthright for a mess of pottage or a pot of message. The Communists' message was: "Sovietize American industry."

Moreover, the eighteenth amendment had been repealed and the alkie runners and beer barons found themselves without employment sufficiently lucrative to maintain their modus vivendi. The Communists and the gangsters were the carpetbaggers who pervaded the ranks of labor, bringing with them their plenary of related morals, ethics, and disrespect for law.

Also in October 1935, at the American Federation of Labor convention, John L. Lewis placed a shot on the nose of Big Bill Hutcheson that sounded around the labor world. Like the shot at Sarajevo it also served as a declaration of war. Labor divided on the issue of craft versus industrial unionism. The Communists and racketeers entered through the breach and affiliated according to desired objectives. The Communists went industrial and advanced by the sit-down. The racketeers went craft and adhered to the shake-down. The labor war was on and the National Labor Relations Board was in the middle.

The Board had some difficult tasks to perform in the circumstance. For 150 years the workers in American industries had no rights which employers were bound to respect. Upsetting a tradition of long standing required unusual acumen. Injecting a labor civil war did not simplify matters.

The Board's record speaks for itself. In 1935 there were approximately 4,000,000 organized workers. In 1942 the reported membership is well over 10,000,000.

Employers did not permit this to happen without opposition.

The record shows that over 250,000 employees have been discharged for union activity. The Board caused the employers to compensate these employees in excess of $3,000,000 for the loss of pay they suffered as a result of this discrimination.

Many Board orders in unfair labor practice cases were litigated by employers. In 7 years Board orders have been enforced in full or with modifications in 289 cases out of a total of 345 decisions passed on by circuit courts, which in the same period have denied Board orders in only 56 cases. Also there were 639 Board decisions in unfair labor practice cases entered in the circuit courts of appeals by consent decree. The workers now have some rights and the Board and the courts are protecting their newly acquired rights. Since July 1935, the National Labor Relations Board has disposed of 45,254 cases involving a total of 7,560,952 workers.

The Board's accomplishment in protecting these rights has won the approval of workingmen who work. The criticisms, threats, and nagging on the part of some labor leaders arise from a problem which these same labor leaders have been unable to solve within their own ranks—jurisdiction.

The point of contention raised by some labor representative is that the Board discriminates against the crafts. The clear answer is that many so-called craft organizations are as much craft in fact as John Lewis' district No. 50.

Dan Tobin's teamsters' union, for example, which threatened to call for the repeal of the Wagner Act because the Board is unfair to his craft, takes in membership a miscellaneous group of workers which include such husky teamsters as stenographers and department-store sales girls.

Such unions appear before the National Labor Relations Board in the morning requesting a craft unit. On the same afternoon they appear in another case requesting an industrial unit. If the Board adheres to a policy and denies either request, it is accused of bias and of defeating the legitimate expansion of the union.

The over-all administration of the act, however, has brought every-day democracy into industry where previously much despotism and tyranny existed. It is assuring workers that Government will protect their legitimate aspirations to have a voice in determining wages, hours, and working conditions, which are an essential part of their daily lives. It has given a new meaning to democracy in America.

This new meaning implies corresponding labor responsibility. From 1887 to 1932 the American labor movement rejected Government intervention in employer-employee relations. Samuel Gompers took the position that what Government gives Government can take away. His position over the years, at least, had all the virtues of consistency.

The National Labor Relations Act, however, was sponsored by Senator WAGNER with American Federation of Labor indorsement.

Under its provisions and administration, organized labor has become big business. It is a mutual organization with 10,000,000 policyholders. Without passing on the merits of the "check-off" and "maintenance of membership," it is factual that hundreds of thousands of workers must pay a tax to unions as a condition of employment. This by direction of Government in decisions rendered by boards created by Executive order. The fees, dues, fines, and assessments paid into unions by these workers run to substantial millions of dollars each year.

Organized labor should, therefore, orient its position and face the facts in this matter of Government labor collaboration. It should not make the mistakes of the beneficiaries of the "new capitalism" by ignoring public interest and public opinion.

Successful unions can be operated under procedures consistent with good public interest. The Pattern Makers League publishes complete financial reports, it has no check-off of dues, no racketeers, and did not wait until June 1941 to be right with America for a wrong reason. Ninety percent of the pattern makers in the United States and Canada are voluntary members of our league.

Many other unions are equally democratic and financially responsible. These labor organizations have not forgotten that unions are only a means to an end. That end is better economic and social conditions for the members. Some larger unions promote education, art, and healthful recreation. Others have splendid homes for aged members and pay substantial benefits to members in need. All these things are endangered in a lust for power or gain by a few union officials.

Substantial evidence of impending danger to organized labor was contained in the records of the last Congress. The incoming Congress portends an even greater threat to organized labor and without reference to merits. Organized labor therefore must put its house in order. To avoid drastic regulation it must voluntarily be American, and it must be clean. This is not a purist viewpoint but an observation based upon cold experience with American democracy in action.

Be it remembered: Free enterprise and free trade-unionism exist today in only two nations with important influence in world affairs. Organized labor in the United States and Great Britain are properly demanding full participation at the peace conference. The competency of American labor leadership is being presently tested at home.

The American people are overwhelmingly in favor of the free enterprise system and a democratic way of life. They have pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to preserve democracy at home and restore it abroad. The members of organized labor are producing with brain and brawn the weapons of war in quantities that will astound the world and assure victory.

A high type of labor leadership will be required to represent this American spirit and properly protect labor's newly acquired rights.

Can organized labor supply such leadership? The answer must come from labor.

Civil Aviation Committee Would Imperil War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, coming, as I do, from southern California, the center of the plane manufacturing district on the Pacific coast, I am really concerned by any legislation that affects the welfare of this important industry.

We have heard in the past 3 days much oratory by those who support House Resolution 23, to establish a standing committee for the sole purpose of considering legislation which affects aviation. I repeat, we have heard much oratory, but I must say that in my opinion this oratory has been devoid of logic and permeated with personal ambition and the immature judgment of many who support it.

The importance of aviation is not minimized by its inclusion in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee any more than the other departments of transportation—namely, railroad, shipping, trucking, and so forth. We have heard no complaints from the aviation industry as a whole, of lack of consideration or discrimination on the part of this great committee. Let me pause here to pay a tribute to the membership of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and its able chairman, my distinguished colleague from California Mr. CLARENCE LEA.

The average time of service of the members of this committee is 14 years and under its leadership the greatest system of transportation the world has

ever known has been developed. This committee included and protected the development of the greatest civil and commercial air service in the world.

Where, may I inquire, in all the world, even in nations where civil aviation has been subsidized by government funds, has such an air system developed? And finally, my friends, it is most untimely to project into our transportation control during these critical times, a division or confusion of direction in our transportation system. The chairman of our Naval and Military Committees have spoken against it, and certainly their advice is not to be ignored at this time.

In my opinion, it would be unwise to trust to new and untried hands this vital part of our war effort. I shall vote against the resolution to establish a separate standing committee on aviation.

Civil Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, it has been said on the floor of the House that we had at the outbreak of war but a paltry number of transport airplanes, and it has been implied that somehow or other the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was at fault in the prewar days in failing to make provision for a much greater fleet of transport planes which could be availed of in an emergency.

It is true that the war found our civil air transport system, domestic and foreign, with only about 500 transport planes. But that system was far greater than the system of any other country and the fact is that, because of the foresighted provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 there had been a tremendous increase in the capacity and the mileage of our air transport system during the 4½ years preceding Pearl Harbor. The fact, furthermore, is that, because of the advance planning and the advance orders for transport airplanes which the commercial air lines had been able to make because of the Civil Aeronautics Act, our armed forces were able, beginning in the latter part of 1940, to take over orders for many transport aircraft which were in process of fulfillment and to reap the advantages of going assembly lines. Indeed, the air transport industry has been able actually to turn over to our armed forces more transport airplanes than were used by Hitler for transport purposes when he conquered Holland.

This country did not have enough of anything to meet the challenge of war. No country ever has had enough of anything to meet war's challenge. But it must be said, in all honesty, that we were better prepared to meet war's demands in the case of our civil air transport system than in the case of almost any other activity, civilian or military.

Of course we are not satisfied with the number of transport aircraft which we had in 1942. But let it not be forgotten that as early as 1940 the air-line industry had been able to plan for an expansion which would virtually have doubled its fleets of aircraft by the end of 1942 had it not been for the intervening necessities of our military aviation and that of our allies. And the plans which the industry made and put into execution 2 or 3 years before Pearl Harbor redounded to the benefit of our military effort and that of our allies exactly as effectively as though the airplanes had actually been delivered to the air lines in the years of peace and then turned over to the uses of war.

It is not accurate, therefore, to say that the efforts of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had led to only some 500 civil transport aircraft by Pearl Harbor. If there is to be a true measure of the benefits which the military and our allies have derived from the program of expansion which the Civil Aeronautics Act made possible, it would be more accurate to double that figure of 500.

But the contribution to the war effort made by civil aviation is by no means limited to the mere matter of airplanes made available for war purposes. To no small extent, as a direct result of the Civil Aeronautics Act, the civil air lines have been able, in cooperation with the armed forces, to pioneer a great worldwide transport system, an achievement so notable that it led to the award of the Collier Trophy to the air lines and to the Air Forces only a few weeks ago.

In addition to these contributions, the air lines have been able to maintain to an extraordinary extent their regular common carrier services. We have heard much of the necessary curtailment in our civil transport service as a result of the war. But the rumors which have been circulated are often gross exaggerations. It is necessary only to examine the maps showing the routes and volume of service still in operation, which are available at the Civil Aeronautics Board, to see the real facts. Through increased efficiency in the employment of aircraft and through redoubled efforts the air lines, domestic and foreign, despite a curtailed fleet, have been able to maintain an air transport system which is still far greater than any other nation possessed even at the peak of their peacetime development.

So the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and the work of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have borne fruit for our Nation at war, an invaluable harvest has been enjoyed, a harvest of transport aircraft and of expanded civilian organizations. No other nation has reaped a comparable harvest. And at vital points and at critical moments on far-flung battle fronts during the last year this harvest made it possible for America to stem and turn back the tide of aggression.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been wise and forward looking in its legislation on the problem of aviation. It has done and will continue to do a great job.

Labor Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, supplemental to a report made by a subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee in which we recommended a stabilization of present labor agreements on the Pacific coast shipyards, an able presentation of a recent case involved for the side of those advocating an election in one instance has been submitted to me by the following letter. It should be read with the recommendation:

INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Camden, N. J., February 25, 1943.

Congressman WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Naval Subcommittee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My attention has been drawn to the newspaper accounts of a report on shipyard production recently issued by your subcommittee. I particularly welcome your emphasis on the capacity of the shipbuilding industry to increase its production enormously. The Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, of which I am national president, has repeatedly asserted this fact during the past years, and our efforts have been devoted to achieving this goal.

Reports reaching our national office substantiate fully the concern expressed by your subcommittee over many of the methods employed, particularly in western shipyards. The misleading headlines, designed for publicity purposes, whatever effect they have on the general public, have a disintegrating effect on the morale of shipyard workers. The workers know that the sensational keel-laying to launching times are of little importance. We know that what matters is the time from the start of construction to the day when the ship is ready to go into commission.

Another factor which has been minimized, if not overlooked, is the number of man-hours used on the job. It has been brought to our attention that there is a criminal waste of manpower in many of the yards which have been credited with the most extravagant miracles of production.

It is also our experience that harm resulting from competition between many of these new yards far outweighs the benefits. The time has surely come when the beneficial results of cooperation and the spirit of pulling together should be used in the war effort.

While agreeing with so much of your subcommittee's report, I am concerned by the statement that your subcommittee proposes that all closed-shop contracts should be frozen for the duration of the war. In many of the newly established shipyards the employers entered into collusive back-door agreements with certain unions long before

the employers had engaged a fraction of their total work force. Cases are now pending before the National Labor Relations Board in which it is asked that this unfair labor practice be outlawed, and that the employees, in accordance with the American way, be given the right to choose freely their own representatives.

It may be that your committee has been given the impression that all existing closed-shop contracts should be frozen in the interests of achieving maximum production. This is a totally false and unsustained opinion circulated by special pleaders. Chairman Harry A. Millis of the National Labor Relations Board has stated that Board hearings "have not had the effect of interfering with war production," and he has further said "they have the effect of allaying tensions in the plant and quickly resolving any matters which might occasion or contribute to industrial unrest."

It has been the invariable experience of our union that the existence of unfair labor practices and the toleration of them are, on the other hand, serious hindrances to all-out war production. When a large number of workers are denied the right to choose freely their representatives, their morale is low, and it is difficult to build up the enthusiasm necessary to achieve maximum production for our victory over fascism.

The contention that closed-shop contracts of this character result in industrial peace is plainly contradicted today by the situation in the Kaiser yards. During recent weeks an acrid and revealing rift has occurred in the boilermakers' union, the dominant American Federation of Labor union in the yards. A recent election resulted in the defeat of the old leaders, who decided to ignore the election results and retain office. The rival and successful faction has brought suit to obtain possession of the union offices. Suits are also pending in the Oregonian courts to force the old officials to give an accounting of union funds.

This split in the union reflects the existence of widespread discontent in the rank and file of Kaiser workers. The workers find that their union officials, in return for the high initiation fees and high monthly dues, do nothing to remedy grievances which arise in both their work and in their living conditions. The grievances on the job relate to numerous causes of dispute, particularly the question of the classification of men for the work which best fits their ability, and of the provision of the necessary safety measures and the safeguarding of health. The war emergency has given unions the responsibility also of improving the general living conditions of its members. The Oregon workers justly complain that their union fails to concern itself with the improvement of housing conditions, transportation problems, the provision of health facilities in the community, and the provision of recreational facilities.

I think it is mainly as a result of these unsatisfactory industrial relations that the full benefits of labor-management cooperation in improving production has not been achieved. It is my belief that in the cooperation of labor and management in joint production committees lies the remedy for many of the evils to which your committee has referred.

I am enclosing with this letter a copy of the report of a conference held by our union last August on joint production committees. We have followed this out recently by further conferences and hope soon to be able to issue a more developed program. If it is still possible we would appreciate it if you could permit representatives of our union to appear before your subcommittee to present our views.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN GREEN,
President.

Who Are They Fighting?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the scurrilous and contemptible remarks and charges made on this floor about the Chief Executive, about the patriotic sons of the President, about Harry Hopkins, and other high administration officials are made without reserve or scruple. They are always made with impunity under congressional immunity. When their base falsity and viciousness are exposed there is not the decency to retract and to apologize.

I, therefore, present a timely editorial from the Charleston Gazette under date of January 22, 1943, which coincides with my viewpoint:

WHO ARE THEY FIGHTING?

The Seventy-eighth Congress got under way in a highly patriotic atmosphere. Partisanship, animosities, and personal ambition were to reman shelved throughout the session, in fact for the duration of the war. That was the announcement and a gratified people breathed easier.

We say here and now that the attitude of the Old Guard has not changed. We fear that it will have the strength to overpower the Members of Congress who are truly patriotic. We have every reason to believe that it will soon be bent on nothing else but to snipe, obstruct, and sabotage whenever it sees a chance for personal gain or advancement. The hate Roosevelts are by no means dead, and sleeping not at all.

Already vitriolic statements and utterly unfounded accusations are being hurled. Puerile and false were the accusations that Mrs. Harry Hopkins received a costly piece of jewelry from Lord Beaverbrook; that the Roosevelt boys obtained their Army commissions and military honors by orders from Washington while they slept. These are but two examples of many scattered snipings that are in the making while the boys back of the line load up the big guns.

What is disturbing thoughtful and apprehensive people now is whether the present Congress is really going to fight the Axis or Roosevelt. They know that if Congress goes in for the latter activity our war efforts must suffer. They know that to fight Roosevelt would aid the Axis. Roosevelt is our Commander in Chief.

"I have the information," Representative WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON, of Kansas, is quoted as saying, "that he (James Roosevelt) was jerked from Guadalcanal immediately after the marines entered that place. Early in December, a second son, Franklin, left the battle front in north Africa and spent 4 days in a Philadelphia hospital with a slight cold. I am asking, is it true that two sons of the President have been jerked from the battle fronts by the Commander in Chief?"

That is an outstanding example of the littleness of a "hate Roosevelt." James was hospitalized last fall for a stomach ailment that almost proved fatal once before. Franklin was suffering severely from catarrhal fever. Both have served valiantly in the fighting zones, risking their lives daily. LAMBERTSON lolls comfortably in an easy chair in Washington.

There will be more of it. Wait until momentous matters vital to the winning of the war come up for consideration. Then the clans will gather and the real shooting will begin. There will be interminable delays and complicated moves to tie the hands of the Commander in Chief regardless of the effect that will have on the progress of the war. Politics, political revenge, will be the main objectives; the war will come second, if at all.

No, the Old Guard in Congress will not be fighting the Axis; it will be fighting Roosevelt, the Commander in Chief.

A Draftee's Farewell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Mr. L. D. Cotham, of Monticello, Ark.:

A DRAFTEE'S FAREWELL

The other day I got a letter
And it had these words to say:
"You are ordered by your draft board
To report without delay,
For your Uncle Sam's in trouble,
As he's in an awful scrap
With a German and a 'Dago,'
And a little yellow Jap."

As my "Uncle" says he needs me,
I'll be leaving right away,
So I'm packing up my baggage,
To be ready any day;
And perchance I do not see you,
Ere I catch the bus or train,
I'll be saying good-bye fellows!
Till I get back home again.

When we whip that surly German,
Beat the "Dago" to his knees,
Then we'll turn our whole attention
To the little Japanese;
And the licking that we'll give him,
Will be one he won't forget,
And he'll ne'er again betray us
With a sneak attack I'd bet.

We will fill a date with Hitler,
Mussolini, and Tojo,
So will make a trip to Berlin,
Then to Rome and Tokyo;
But it's now farewell good neighbors!
As my grip I've got to pack;
So just keep the home fires burning,
For I'll soon be coming back.

—*N. D. Cotham.*

MONTICELLO, ARK.

St. Louis Boy Most Decorated Enlisted Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to me, I include an

article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 13, 1943, concerning Staff Sgt. Kenneth A. Gradle, whose parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles J. Gradle, reside in my congressional district. This story depicts the success of this young man during the present war, and the recognition he has received which warrants the newspaper in classifying him as the "most decorated enlisted man." The article follows:

Staff Sgt. Kenneth A. Gradle, son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles J. Gradle, 514A East Gano Avenue, who has received the Silver Star for valor three times in addition to other decorations, became, so far as is known, the most decorated United States enlisted man in the war yesterday when he was awarded four more citations, bringing his total to nine.

His latest awards were made by Maj. Gen. Robert Olds at the Rattlesnake bomber base at Pyote, Tex. Every member of the Nineteenth Bombardment Group, the Nation's most honored unit of aerial fighters, was proclaimed a hero as the unit was dispersed for new war assignments as instructors.

The men of the Nineteenth, including Sergeant Gradle, each received an inch long blue bar in token of their valorous service, with gold laurel leaf symbolic of the four unit citations received by the group in a year of campaigning.

General Olds also pinned four silk streamers to the unit's flag, each denoting a phase of its battle against the Japanese in the Philippines, Java, Australia, Milne Bay, New Britain, and the Solomons. More than 1,000 officers and men were welcomed by General Olds into his command, the Second Air Force, as instructors for men in training to bomb the enemy.

Sergeant Gradle, who was on the plane which flew Gen. Douglas MacArthur to Australia, twice received the Purple Heart for wounds suffered in action. His first wounds were received at Pearl Harbor.

His medals for valor were awarded for bravery under fire as a radio operator in Flying Fortresses. One was in recognition of an engagement in which his crew fought off 10 Japanese Zero fighter planes over the New Guinea mountains. In an hour's fight, four enemy planes were shot down.

With one engine disabled, the aileron cables shot away and the hydraulic system out of commission, the bomber returned to its base after firing more than 3,000 rounds. Sergeant Gradle suffered a head wound. He previously had been decorated, on June 12, for bravery in a Pacific battle.

On another occasion, for which he was decorated, Sergeant Gradle was on a photographic mission over Rabaul, New Britain, when his bomber was attacked by four Zeros. Sergeant Gradle manned a machine gun and aided in knocking down two of the enemy planes. Although badly damaged, the bomber returned to its base.

Sergeant Gradle, 22 years old, enlisted in September 1939. He visited his parents last Christmas.

Committee on Civil Aeronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I wish I had time, today, to trace for you the establishment and growth of the aviation industry in the United States. It would read like a Horatio Alger story of success.

For all practical purposes the industry was born during the First World War. Its leaders have been almost without exception, young men—men of vision, men who have been able to overcome obstacles that would have floored a less determined group. Some of its leaders were enlisted men or "shavetails" of World War No. 1. Many of them are graduates of Annapolis and West Point.

By and large this industry grew and expanded throughout 10 years of depression. What a godsend it was, when the war clouds gathered in 1939, that we had an aviation industry built on a firm foundation. When this war comes to its victorious conclusion, it will be possible to make further great strides in civil aeronautics.

Today we are asking that it be recognized by the creation of a House committee on civil aeronautics—a committee to which the industry may come with its many problems. This afternoon we are called upon to decide whether or not the House will create such a committee to consider legislation affecting civil aeronautics. It is my considered judgment and opinion—arrived at only after long and serious study of the problems connected with the development, growth, and control of the aviation industry—that the creation of this proposed committee will have a beneficial, practical, and psychological effect on the future of civil aeronautics.

During the recent hearings on H. R. 1012, every witness was asked whether or not the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee had failed to approve any legislation beneficial to the aviation industry. In each case the answer was correctly given that the committee had done a very fine job on aviation legislation. However, I want to point out that none of these witnesses, representing air lines and other organizations, vitally interested in aviation were asked their opinion as to the wisdom of creating a standing committee to deal with civil aviation legislation.

There is something fascinating about aviation—it challenges the imagination of all of us. Once the virus gets in the blood stream it is next to impossible to remove it. Realizing that to be true, I am not surprised that many of the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee are opposing the creation of this new committee on civil aviation. During the past 3 weeks nine members of this committee have extended their remarks in the RECORD, all in opposition to the creation of the new committee. In fact, this opposition makes up the major part of the expressed opposition.

It has been said by some who oppose this progressive change that the members of the new committee may be unable to withstand the pressure that may be put upon them by those who will have an interest in the legislation that will be referred to the committee on civil aviation. Does anyone here know who will be selected to serve on the proposed committee? I have confidence in the leadership of both parties in this House. I have confidence in the members of the Democratic Ways and Means Committee, and I have confidence in the members of the committee on committees on the Republican side, who select the members of all of our committees. I believe they will select a strong and capable committee—a committee well equipped to deal with the problems of civil aviation.

With all due respect to the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I cannot agree that the members of this committee are any more honest, patriotic, or able than are the members of other committees of this House. I have great faith and respect for the integrity and ability of my colleagues; they are a great cross section of the men and women who have made this Nation strong.

It has been said that the members of the Civil Aviation Committee would become special pleaders for aviation. Is that dangerous? The members of the Military and Naval Affairs Committees could be called special pleaders for our Army and Navy. I would certainly hope that the members of a civil aviation committee would do everything proper to aid in the development and advancement of aviation.

Perhaps there are angles and cross sections of this discussion that I know nothing about. Frankly, I am at a loss to understand why the Washington Post, for example, should write four editorials within the last 2 weeks in opposition to the creation of this proposed committee. No other newspaper has paid so much attention to an administrative matter.

Last week I placed a telegram in the RECORD, emphatically recording four important units of the aviation industry as approving the creation of a committee on civil aviation. I quote the last sentence of that telegram:

> We believe proposed committee essential to progressive development of aviation and advancement in the public interest.

I have talked with several private flyers, with air-line pilots and with State aviation officials about this resolution, and I have yet to meet one of them who opposed it. I am aware of the opposition of the president of the Air Line Pilots Association, but I have not, as yet, been informed as to why he has had a change of heart since 1939. I might also ask what important units in the aviation industry opposed the creation of this proposed committee.

Who can say that civil aviation is an unimportant side line—that the proposed proper development is not sufficiently important to merit the serious thought and study, followed by full committee action on the part of 21 Members of this Congress? Do you desire, as is now proposed, that the C. A. B. formulate and declare our aviation policy, or will you have such a policy formulated by the Congress and administered by an Executive agency?

In closing, may I plead with you to forget personalities and decide this question solely on its merits for the best interests of the United States and the aviation industry itself.

If my judgment means anything to you, or if you have not had time to study this proposal, I urge you to vote "aye" when the roll is called.

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on March 2, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, Norwich, and the Thirty-fourth District, although a cold spell never lasts very long in Washington, the weather can be bitter, the wind chilling to the bone and the atmosphere damp and piercing. For this reason, 20 above zero in the Nation's Capital often seems colder than 20 below in the southern tier of New York State. The past few weeks have been good examples of this strange fact.

However, the snowstorm is soon followed by the sun here in Washington, and balmy days always come close upon the wintry wind. Therefore, the weather in general is delightful in every season but the terrifically hot summers.

Inside the House of Representatives, the atmosphere has been tempestuous ever since the new Congress convened. The debates have been the most heated and lengthy of any time of my service in that body. I believe this is a good thing. It proves that Members of Congress are awake to the impatience and dissatisfaction of the people back home. It shows that citizens the country over are looking to their Congress to make themselves heard and to reflect their feelings made clear in last November's elections. This enlivened Congress is aroused because the folks it represents are aroused and they are writing to let their Congressmen know about their opinions. And why not? Is not Congress the last bulwark of a free people's heritage? Is not Congress the most direct expression of the people's will, especially the House which has to stand every 2 years for reelection in its entirety?

The people have no other chance to express their united will except during elections. They are largely inarticulate because they do not have the means of speaking out against abuse of power and encroachment upon their rights by a chosen few. Therefore they usually register their protests at the polls and give vent to their feelings in the American way.

They cannot begin to remedy all the evils, all the iniquities that exist in administration of their Government, but if their elected representatives give heed to their spoken will at the polls and analyze the vote, a great deal of correction may be brought about. The sad part of it all is that the people are not able to reach certain appointive officials in the Government who are often more responsible for odious policies and rules than elective officers. But the difference is that the voters can lay their hands upon the legislators.

Before long a welcome spring will be peeping into up-State New York. With it there will be presented an opportunity for every available person to lend a hand in the food-for-victory production program. The young people are going to carry a large share of responsibility for raising food next summer. There is hardly a farm in our whole section that has sufficient labor to continue operation. Most of the men have gone to war. The women are in war plants.

It's up to the boys and girls of teen age. Frankly, I believe they will do a wonderful job. I feel that every available young person should pledge himself or herself to work a few hours a day on a farm. Certainly this will do them no harm. To the contrary, they will gain a lot thereby. They will build strength and health in the outdoors. They will learn to do basic farm work, knowledge of which is invaluable. But, most important, the young people of America will save their country from starvation and will win the war thereby.

As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I have had a chance to study some interesting testimony and accurate statistics. On the basis of this information, I am gravely concerned for the Nation's food supply next year. I do not believe we are going to have enough to eat, even with the drastic steps that have been taken to ration our available food supply. Too many men have been drafted from the farms, too many experienced farm managers and owners have sold off their farms because things have been made too tough for them by those who should be helping them. Where is the farm labor coming from? Where are the brains to guide that labor if it is obtained coming from? I have asked myself these questions again and again.

Some feel that one solution to this threatened food shortage might be in the limited drafting of teen-age boys and girls for light farm work. One professor of a rural school in Broome County told me recently that several large crops of turnips and other vegetables were actually saved by the young people of his school who went out last fall in large numbers to nearby farms and took the harvesting into their own hands. Why couldn't this be done with other phases of farm work? I believe it can be done and I sincerely believe that young America can do more to help the war effort by performing light farm work than in any other way. Certainly there is more need for them here than anywhere else.

Every day brings its usual quota of letters to my Washington office from wives and dependents of men in the service. These letters ask me many questions on the whole subject of allotments. Many folks don't even realize they are eligible to receive money from the Government to take care of them while their sons and husbands are fighting for Uncle Sam. Remember this: If your husband has been drafted you are entitled to at least $50 a month. If you have a child you are entitled to receive $12 more a month and $10 a month more for each additional child. If you are a mother or father, dependent upon your soldier or sailor son, you are also eligible for allotment money. I can help you get this money if you have encountered any difficulty or if you don't know how to get it. Remember, the people who are employed in the Government, State government, Federal Government, are your servants; your tax money is paying their salaries. I feel sure the majority of them are aware of this fact and that they will give you courteous and considerate service.

Ever since our Constitution was written, people of all races, creeds, and colors have found security and comfort under its all-protecting safeguards. Our American Constitution, written by some of the wisest men in world history, guarantees equal justice to all men whether they be Jew or gentile, Catholic or Protestant, white or colored. All men have the same desire for freedom, for security, for the pursuit of happiness.

Likewise, under our Constitution, all men have been assured of the right to vote. This is the greatest weapon they can possibly have against tyranny and oppression. This matchless privilege is the cornerstone of all American freedom. It is safe to say that as long as free men and women are permitted to register their approval or protest at the polls, we will be guaranteed our freedom and that freedom will be perpetuated.

Unfortunately, there have been certain barriers placed in the way of segments of our population which have deprived for many years millions of American citizens from the privilege of voting. I refer to the obnoxious poll tax which is to this day in effect throughout several States. Although having to pay a poll tax does not appear to be a factor in excluding people from the polls, nevertheless it keeps countless numbers away from the ballot box because of their inability to pay this tax. In the South, it prevents both poor whites and colored from participating in the privilege of voting which the Constitution pledges to every American citizen.

I say to you that it is high time to repeal all poll-tax laws. It is high time we awoke to the fact that this is America and everybody is entitled to equal treatment whether he be white or black or whether he embraces one religion or another. I look forward to casting my vote in Congress as I did last year for the anti-poll-tax bill when it comes before the House. This will tend to abolish for all time the un-American practice of denying some folks the right to vote while others are allowed to go ahead unhindered. I welcome the chance to support this anti-poll-tax bill. I know my friends back home will join with me in approving this action. I will have more to say on this subject as time goes on.

Let's get back to the subject of food for victory a moment. We will soon be face to face with the seriousness of food rationing and with a real lack of food supply on the home front. Then, the hue and cry will be to plant victory gardens on a grander scale than ever before. Last year a lot of people planted gardens and I presume they are consuming many vegetable items which they raised in the summer. I suppose the little back lot garden has saved more than one family from going hungry, particularly if they canned and preserved some of the produce from it.

At any rate it is safe to say that practically everyone will be interested in home cultivation this year. We have seen just enough evidence of threatened shortages and we don't want to be the unlucky ones. We don't want to be caught short next winter when canned foods of all kinds will probably be very scarce.

So let's all interest ourselves in the possibility of a victory garden. They're simple enough to plant and to keep up with proper direction and a little albow grease. As you probably remember, I was able to assist many victory gardeners with complete information last year and the year before that. I sent out at written requests several thousand Victory Garden booklets. These were found invaluable to persons interested in raising food for their own needs.

I wish to announce that I will send to anybody back home who will write me a copy of the Victory Garden booklet which, as you know, is the latest and best information on how to plant and raise a successful garden plot. I regret that I cannot make these available to groups due to a limited supply. I will, however, take care of as many individual requests as possible. Be sure to write me immediately so you may be assured of this splendid data on victory gardens. Remember also that I have a great deal of excellent agricultural data contained in a thousand other bulletins. There will be an

increased demand for these but you are most welcome for this information on general farming, livestock and all sorts of crop planting and raising. My only desire is to see you folks back home adequately provided for and equipped with the knowledge to go about raising your own food supply during these days of scarcity. Please let me know if I can help you.

Establishment of a Jewish Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1943, there appeared a full-page advertisement in the New York Times, placed by the Committee for a Jewish Army of Stateless and Palestinian Jews, of which I have the privilege of being a member. This ad calls for action, not pity, toward stopping the wholesale slaughter of the Jewish people in Europe. I am in total agreement with my fellow members of the committee that too much has been said and too little done.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the advertisement so that it may become part of the permanent record:

ACTION, NOT PITY, CAN SAVE MILLIONS NOW—EXTINCTION OR HOPE FOR THE REMNANTS OF EUROPEAN JEWRY?—IT IS FOR US TO GIVE THE ANSWER

Daily, hourly, the greatest crime of all time is being committed. A defenseless and innocent people is being slaughtered in a wholesale massacre of millions. What is more tragic—they are dying for no reason or purpose.

The Jewish people in Europe is not just another victim in the array of other peoples that fell prey to Hitler's aggression. The Jews have been singled out not to be conquered, but to be exterminated. To them Hitler has promised—and is bringing—death.

It is a satanic program beyond the grasp of the decent human mind. Yet it is being carried out. Already 2,000,000 of the Jews in German-occupied Europe have been murdered. The evidence is in the files of our own State Department.

The Germans dared to undertake this process of annihilation because they knew that the Jews are defenseless; that the Jews are forgotten and deserted even by the democratic powers.

The Germans believe that the United Nations, indoctrinated by 20 years of anti-Jewish propaganda, are to a great extent apathetic and indifferent to the sufferings of the Jews. They believe that for crimes committed against the Jews no retaliation on behalf of the governments or armed forces of the United Nations will be carried out. They know that there is no instrument of power and force on this earth with which the Jews can fight back to avenge their dead and save the remaining millions.

Of what avail are the statements of sympathy and pity and promises of punishment after the war? Since the perpetrators of these slaughters are to be punished for the murders they have already committed, then they can lose no more by further murder.

Such mere statements of sympathy and pity are to the Germans proof that their judgment of democracy's attitude toward the Jews is justified, and in their criminal minds they understand them as "carte blanche" to go on with the slaughter.

What can be done?

What is necessary is to impress the Germans that the governments of the United Nations have decided to change their present policy of passive sympathy and pity to one of stern and immediate action; that they consider the cessation of atrocities against the Jews are an immediate aim of their military and political operations. Under this premise vigorous United Nations' intervention to save European Jewry would become a matter of course. Exactly as it would be if it were American or British civilians who were being killed in a systematic campaign by the Nazis, the whole of the forces of these great democracies would be utilized to find an immediate and effective solution.

The inauguration of such a new policy on behalf of the United Nations would logically result in enabling all those Jews who have managed to escape the European-German hell to fight back. The first dictate, therefore, would be the immediate approval of the demand for a Jewish army of the stateless and Palestinian Jews—an army 200,000 strong.

Suicide squads of the Jewish army would engage in desperate commando raids deep into the heart of Germany. Jewish pilots would bomb German cities in reprisal.

A Jewish army would imply a call to arms of all stateless Jews living in North Africa so that they may participate in the immiment invasion of the European continent.

A Jewish army would immediately give a decisive moral relief to the agonized Jews of Europe. Their psychology of despair and helplessness would be transformed into one of hope for revenge and survival. A Jewish army will give a meaning to their sufferings—to their death.

They will then realize that they cease being helpless victims and become partners in the global struggle for a better world, in which their survivors will live in freedom and equality as all other human beings.

The Jews of Palestine and the stateless Jews want to fight * * * as Jews. They want to prove to Hitler, and to the world, that the Jews can be more than "the persecuted people" * * * that Jews can die in other ways than through murder. They want the right to fight for the world's freedom, under their own banner.

To die, if needs be, but to die fighting.

Of course, these are not all the practical proposals which the human mind is capable of conceiving. It is unfair to ask for a single solution to such a disastrous problem. What we must realize is that it is our duty not to resign ourselves to the idea that our brains are powerless to find any solution; not to resign ourselves to the idea that the forces of democracy are too weak to enforce such a solution.

Remember when a few thousand British soldiers were put in chains by the Germans? How swift the retaliation? And how practical.

The Germans chained no more British soldiers.

Remember when a tiny town in Czechoslovakia was horribly "punished"? How swift the hurricane of world indignation that answered.

There have been no more Lidices.

Remember when small and encircled Sweden opposed vigorously and stubbornly the expulsion of Norwegian Jews. The Germans abandoned their plans.

The Jews of Norway are still there.

The American sense of justice and decency and American ingenuity must also find ways to overpower the diabolical plan to exterminate the Jewish people. It must find a way now, before millions more perish.

It is, therefore, our primordial demand that an intergovernmental commission of military experts be appointed with the task of elaborating ways and means to stop the wholesale slaughter of the Jews in Europe. This must be done now, before the greatest homicidal maniac extends his policy of extermination to other peoples; before he dares introducing poison gas and bacteriological warfare.

Remember that for years the Germans rehearsed on the Jews what they later practiced on other peoples. Therefore we have decided to launch an all-out campaign to save European Jewry. We will spare no efforts and have no rest until the American public will be fully informed of the facts and aroused to its responsibilities.

We believe in the overwhelming power of public opinion as the greatest, if not the only, power in democracy. Governments in democratic countries like the United States and Great Britain can act only when they feel sure that they are backed by a powerful movement of public opinion. We plead with everyone to help and to cooperate in this sacred campaign we have launched. Join in this fight, write to your Congressmen, contribute to our work, so that this message may be carried to every city and hamlet in the United States as is being done in Great Britain. You are part of the collective conscience of America; this conscience has never been found wanting.

Air Attack on Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, of Gary, Ind.:

PUBLIC SHOULD DEMAND AIR ATTACK ON GERMANY BE STARTED AT ONCE

In The Air Offensive Against Germany, just off the press, Allan A. Michie, at present a roving editor for Reader's Digest, gives convincing proof that this war can be won from the air in 1943 if the proper plans are made and carried out.

Does it make any difference what Michie thinks? Hasn't there been too much interference by civilians in military affairs and wouldn't it be better to let the military run the war?

Yes, we think it does make a difference what Michie thinks because his thought is the result of the facts he has learned about the air war at the air front in England. And there is still no reason to believe military men do not make some terrific blunders.

Michie explains why he got started on the line of thought that resulted in writing his book. He was sitting in the home of Air Marshal Harris in England looking into a stereoptican machine at pictures of the damage inflicted on German cities by the Royal Air Force. He was amazed at what he saw. There before his eyes was the answer to the question: Can Germany be defeated from the air?

To prove his point Michie presents in his book 24 pages of official photographs taken by the Royal Air Force following bombing attacks on German cities. They are merely samples of thousands of such pictures but they show conclusively that cities can be knocked out of the war.

But Michie was not satisfied so he contacted all the leaders of the British and American air command in England and got their views. The further he went the more convinced he became that the job could be done and ought to be done.

So he began to ask why the all-out air offensive against Germany has not been started. It has been announced several times that 1,000-plane raids were to be started and kept up until Germany surrendered but only 3 have ever been carried out.

Michie discovered the airmen wanted to do the job but they have never been furnished bombers in anything like the required number. When the three raids were made every available bomber was pressed into use even though some were not fit for such use.

To enable the combined Royal Air Force-American bomber commands to bomb Germany with 1,000 planes whenever the weather permits over a period of several months it would be necessary to assemble 3,000 heavy bombers and be prepared to make good a loss of 600 planes a month.

That is a large order and the Royal Air Force is not able to handle it. British production of 4-motored bombers is not much over 200 a month and it would be necessary for us to supply a large part of the original bomber force and make good most of the losses.

But what of it, you say? If we can win the war that way why don't we get started without a day's delay?

That is where we get into difficulties. Planes are needed everywhere and there aren't enough for anywhere. Indeed it is a fact, as any military man will testify, that there can never be enough planes, or enough of anything, as long as the war lasts. Every commander always wants more than he has of everything.

Thus it is that our bombers instead of being sent to England to beat sense into the Germans are dissipated by being flown to a dozen or two dozen fronts and possible fronts. Of course they are needed on every front but it just stands to reason they cannot be based in England if they are sent to Alaska, China, Guadalcanal, New Guinea, Australia, India, Iran, Iraq, Eritrea, Egypt, Tunisia, Russia, Iceland, Panama, Hawaii, and other islands and over the oceans.

Our production of four-motored bombers will be in the neighborhood of 1,000 a month sometime this year according to Michie and it must be getting close to that number now, so there is no doubt about our ability to supply the planes if we decide the war can be won by an air offensive from England.

It is one of the basic principles of war to use equipment where it will accomplish the most toward victory even though other fronts are weakened by this concentration. We have the bombers but they must be sent to England and kept there if this offensive is to be started and kept going.

One of the chief difficulties in getting it started lies in the inflexibility of the military mind. Generally that mind has been taught to look upon the airplane as an auxiliary to ground troops and to the Navy; therefore it is very difficult to accept the idea that the main job of knocking out Germany can be accomplished by the air force and the auxiliary job of occupying the country then left to the ground troops.

This inflexibility is seen in the continued use of our bombers now based in England as a day attacking force. Michie says the Royal Air Force has learned conclusively that day bombing won't work; the cost is prohibitive. But it seems to make no difference to us what the British have learned, we go right ahead doing some day bombing around the fringes of Germany and training our bomber crews in day bombing.

Michie says the Royal Air Force command is flexible. It has experimented with all kinds of bombing and fighting and has learned not only the right tactics but how to build the right planes. He says that both our fighters and bombers are inferior to the British machines. British bombers have been built largely for night bombing because it has been learned from experience that the most damage to the enemy can be done then at the least cost.

Yet despite what the British have learned in 3½ years of fighting and bombing experience we go right on training our bomber crews to fly in daytime and building bombers to be used in the Pacific instead of in Europe.

British four-motored bombers carry up to 18,000 pounds of bombs while our similar machines carry about a third as much. Furthermore our bombers are no faster than the British. Michie says our big bombers were great stuff a year or two ago, but that we have lagged in developments, while both Britain and Germany have been forging ahead.

Nevertheless Michie says our bombers can be adapted to night use and our bomber crews can be trained for that purpose. It will be necessary to train them in England and if the air offensive is to start this year, the training ought to start immediately.

Here is a problem of the war which continues to bob up every few months, and every time it is presented the evidence accumulates to indicate we are losing our main chance to win the war this year and to save tens of thousands of American lives.

It would seem that only a demand from the American people can open the military mind to a test of this tempting way to win the war. If it were merely a civilian idea, we would hesitate to give it so much importance, but inasmuch as it seems to be fundamental with both our own bomber command and that of the Royal Air Force, we think it is worthy of support.

Indeed, there is every reason to think that the German defeat in Russia is closely connected with the terrific destruction that Royal Air Force bombs have caused in Germany. The productive and transportation systems of the Reich have suffered a tremendous blow. Now we have the chance to increase that blow to the point that German production and German transportation will be stopped.

Then the German Army will be unable to fight—indeed, it will quit long before that stage is reached if it becomes apparent that the complete destruction of Germany will result unless there is an unconditional surrender.

When Peace Comes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered last night before a fraternal organization composed entirely of employees of the Veterans Administration.

The occasion of this meeting coincided with the twentieth anniversary of the appointment of Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines as Administrator of the Veterans Administration. I was happy to pay tribute to him and his associates.

My address follows:

Mr. Carroll, General Hines, and members of the Craftsman Club of the Veterans Administration, at the outset I must express the hope that you do not regard my title as too ambitious. I have chosen the subject, When Peace Comes, in order that many worth-while topics may be eliminated from consideration here tonight and reserved for other days and other speakers.

With my restricted subject, there will be no need for saying those things which come under the general head of "flag waving." It can be taken for granted that we all appreciate the contributions of the men in our armed services all over the world, that we rejoice in their victories and their bravery under fire, that we have undying and eternal faith in them and in their commanders, and that we count them able to bring us through to final victory.

Likewise, we can tonight pass quickly over those efforts which look to the writing of a just and lasting peace, for that is outside our subject. We are all cognizant of the many minds now turned in that direction. Hardly a day goes by without someone calling us to our two great tasks: the winning of the war and the writing of the peace. There is slight chance that we as a Nation, or that this group, comprising servants of the Government, can forget those problems, even if we fail in any phase of their accomplishment.

My concern is that we may focus so sharply on these major tasks as to exclude other important considerations—just as it is the concern of many serious students that we may strive so mightily to achieve our present military goals that we may again win the war and lose the peace. We fought a generation ago to make the world safe for democracy; and then entered this war at a time when democracy, in Europe at least, had reached its lowest ebb.

Therefore, it may not be inappropriate for the purposes of this discussion to regard the war as on its way toward a safe conclusion. If Hitler were to win, it would seem that 1942 was his year to do it. Time now runs heavily on our side—time and a glorious Russian offensive. If aid can come quickly to China, if Africa can be cleared in another month, if India does not fall apart over Gandhi, then we have a right to feel confident of both the war and the peace that is to follow.

My interest tonight is the returning veteran and that agency of the Government that will serve him. You men have allied your lives with that institution. You have been dealing with veterans and the problems of the veteran for 20 years, and your distinguished leader, Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, has tonight completed 20 years of service as head of the Veterans Bureau and its successor, the Veterans Administration.

I pay tribute to General Hines! How any man could hold the same high administrative position in this city of bickering and strife for 20 years, I do not know.

When I see the captains and the kings depart, the Eberstadts and the Hendersons come and go, then I know that 20 years as the head of an agency that deals in claims and controversies should go down in the record books linked with the span of athletic vigor of a Bill Tilden or the mental tenacity of an Oliver Wendell Holmes.

I view that long continuity as evidence of his administrative ability and of the soundness and honesty of his actions and ideals. Incidentally, it is a tribute to those of you who have been his comrades in arms during that endeavor. God give him health and strength for the greater responsibilities that may yet be his.

When peace comes, what will be his task?

What will be the function of this agency, the Veterans Administration? What will be

its future? Every man in private business has a right to ask that of the institution or factory or agency in which he serves. Have you asked that of your public employer? Have you asked it of yourself, and then tried to answer your question in the terms of your own life and experience inside this Administration? If you have not, isn't it time?

We ought to talk about this now, before there are complications. After the war, when peace comes, our duties are going to get all mixed up with our debts. The present anxiety over a pay-as-we-go income tax policy is only a tip-off to the ferments that will be working within the Congress as we face the tasks of reconstruction. Wherever we turn, there it will be: a sort of "Face on the Barroom Floor," $200,000,000,000 of national debt. It will color every conversation. It will affect legislation. We may have a solemn referendum on what we will do with it or about it. Before that, we should spend a little time thinking about the veteran himself.

Another thing we must not overlook is the effect of that debt on our national thinking. The burden of taxation will have been too heavy for too long. It will be resting on sore backs. A people in the spiritual upsurge of war are willing to sacrifice and to bear their burdens without grumbling. But once peace comes and the badge of patriotism is erased from their sufferings, they look for an easing of the load. Most of us were alive when the last war ended, and have not forgotten those days.

We might as well expect and discount it now; economy will be popular after the war. Taxes will be forced down. Income taxes will be lightened after World War No. 2, as they were after World War No. 1. The same reasons will be attractive: "Free this money for private enterprise; turn business loose to rebuild itself and make a job for the veteran."

As a stimulant to such ideas there will be the beckoning of a new economic world. New industries will offer rich prizes to adventure money. Processes developed by the necessity of war will be available for the commerce of peace. There will be light-metal plants and synthetic-rubber factories. Aviation stocks will boom. American flying boats will compete with American merchant vessels for the shipping of the world. The motor industry will whir with the fabrication of the new cars, trucks, busses, and a jeep for every farm. We will be busy, and every commercial association and institution will clamor that the Congress lift the "dead hand of oppressive taxation from the throat of American business." You have heard that song before. You will hear it again, and in response to it an economy wave will sweep through every governmental activity.

As proof, may I point out that after World War No. 1, it took 5 years to bring this Government to a point where a real program for the investigation, care and hospitalization of veterans could get rolling. We need not have that 5-year spread again. We have a Veterans Administration organized and capable of any expansion that future needs may require. Now is the time to plan its program.

What will the picture be? To begin, draw on your memories or your imaginations to guide you as you estimate what will happen when peace comes. As a nation, we stand committed to an overseas force of four and three-quarters millions and a total force that is likely to run as high as 11,000,000. You must take these huge figures and project them against the background of World War No. 1—against an A. E. F. that numbered only 2,000,000, and an armed force that totaled four and three-quarters millions. That is your first clue.

But we must remember that in dealing with people, our problems seem always to grow in geometric rather than arithmetic proportion. When we have 30 children in a 1-room school, a lone teacher can handle the job; but give us 300 children and we do not merely build 10 rooms and employ 10 teachers. We must then have a superintendent and a principal and a janitor and a football coach. We must have assembly rooms and science halls and athletic fields and field houses. On the student side, we have a school paper, class officers, and a student council, and finally, we have that intangible and highly important thing called a school spirit. Three and three makes not six but nine when humans are involved, and the administration of veterans affairs is no exception to this rule.

So our first problems will grow out of the hasty and massed demobilization or discharge of several million veterans. Johnny will come marching home in numbers, the like of which we can hardly visualize, and almost at the doorway of his native land, he will begin the contacts with veteran facilities and administration that will recur and remain through the rest of his life.

First of all, he will need and want a job. We are committed to the effort to return the veteran to the job he left. But can we? He has gone into the armed services at a period of peak employment. He is likely to return to an industrial picture that will be confused by the cancellation of war contracts and by plants that will be closed as they are retooled and redesigned for peacetime production. The job may be gone; and if we believe what the small business committees of Congress are telling us, the old employer may also be gone. This nationwide transition from military to civilian production could well require a period of several months and possibly a year with the attendant loss of employment to both veterans and nonveterans.

Again the veteran may return to find a new competitor for the jobs that are open—the girl he left behind him. She has deserted the mulberry bush that he sang about as he left, and has moved into the swing shift at Lockheed. She is driving the laundry wagon that he used to drive. Sunday's Washington papers carried an ad asking for women drivers on retail milk delivery trucks. Sawmills of the Southwest have found that women can do certain tasks in their box factories and specialty mills better than men ever could. Labor unions have admitted them as members, and there they have acquired seniority rights in expanding industries. Johnny Doughboy will find them in the skilled labor market when he comes marching home.

You will not handle as much of this as the United States Employment Service will, but it will complicate your problems.

So much for the veteran who returns hale and hearty with his eye on a job. The Veterans Administration, however, will be face-to-face with that great body of returning soldiers, sailors, and marines who are discharged with a physical impairment. Consider that problem in the light of past wars.

For instance, Col. Leonard P. Ayres, in his statistical summary for the War Department on the First World War, had this to say:

"Of every 100 American soldiers and sailors who took part in the war with Germany, 2 were killed or died of disease during the period of hostilities. In the Northern Army during the Civil War the number was about 10. Among the other great nations in this war, between 20 and 25 in each 100 called to the colors were killed or died."

This meant, so far as our armed forces of 4,750,000 were concerned, that we lost approximately 130,000 men in the service, 55,000 by battle death and injury, and 75,000 by disease. We had, in addition, 230,000 battle casualties.

Had our World War No. 1 deaths been on the basis of those of our Civil War, they would have approximated 650,000, with many more casualties resulting only in wounds. If our casualties had been on the same basis as the other great nations engaged in World War No. 1, they would have approximated from 800,000 to 1,000,000 dead, with a corresponding increase in wounded.

We were fortunate in that war in having undefended coasts on which to debark our troops, and in having a stabilized battle line from which to launch our offensives. Had we had to fight for our landings against enemy-held shores, our casualties would undoubtedly have been far greater than we experienced.

I do not claim to be the possessor of special inside information, but I think that most of us believe that the historic meeting in Africa between President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill and their technical advisers will result in an all-out offensive action of great magnitude and terrific force against the Axis forces in Europe at some time during this year of Our Lord 1943. There is no doubt in my mind that the heavy blows we will then deal against our enemy will bring the end of the war much closer to the unconditional surrender we are all determined upon winning.

But we cannot attain this hard conquest without paying the price it will exact. What this price may be can be only surmised, but we know it will be a heavy one—heavy in money, material, and men. Victories won on the field of battle are always costly, but on the extended scale which we must anticipate in order to win with the least sacrifice of time they will be accompanied by heavy casualties.

How can we estimate this price we must pay for victory?

We know that casualties on the Russian front have been extremely heavy. German casualties have been estimated to be in excess of 4,000,000, while the Russian casualties have been estimated as exceeding that number. Regardless of their accuracy, and assuming that these figures only approximate the losses involved, they illustrate clearly how great the casualties may be when huge armies get down to actual fighting with the deadly modern weapons of war.

I would think that no man could make an accurate estimate of what our losses may be in Europe and Africa, as no one can surely predict the course of the various land campaigns which lie ahead of us. But of this I feel absolutely sure. If we are to win this war by actual fighting, we must expect the largest casualty lists in our military history. I hope that they may be not nearly as great as the losses suffered by the Russians and the Germans. But we know that they will be very great—and that they will bear some proper relation to the millions of our men who will compose the huge armies which we are training, arming, and transporting overseas for the reconquest of the European Continent.

The losses I have referred to have to do with our prospective European and African campaigns. But we should not forget that we must anticipate sea losses as well, in the transport of supplies, and to sustain the life lines of the fighting forces of the United Nations, and of the civilian population overseas.

To these must be added the prospective losses of great magnitude which may result when, with Hitler conquered, we turn all-out against the Japs, and destroy forever that fanatical nation's military power. No one can calculate what the price in casualties may be before the conquest of the vast Nipponese Empire, but all of us realize that it may be very great. The Chinese military losses against that enemy now run into millions, while their civilian losses and refugees are almost astronomical in number. Against the Japanese our slogan will be "uncondi-

tional surrender," and we will pursue that objective relentlessly until it is attained.

What must our planning for that type of warfare include? On the basis of World War No. 1 experience an armed force of 11,000,000 in World War No. 2 will produce 1,000,000 veterans eligible to compensation for service-connected disabilities. From the standpoint of hospitalization alone we face a tremendous task. We know now that 24 years after World War No. 1 a total of 100,000 hospital beds has been deemed essential adequately to serve veterans of that war, and it is reasonable to assume that if the same consideration is given veterans of World War No. 2, hospital facilities will have to be tripled to accommodate all veterans eligible to hospitalization, even taking into consideration the diminishing rate from World War No. 1.

Not only will the Veterans Administration handle the problem of the million who will be entitled to compensation and perhaps the quarter of a million who may need some form of hospitalization, but it must handle through some sort of a contact force the millions who will come streaming into veteran facilities in search of authentic and unselfish information. The veteran will want to know about benefits and pensions. He will want to know about his insurance and how it may be converted, increased, reduced, or amended. He may have changes in the beneficiary. On all these questions he must go to the Administration that has been doing this work for 20 years and has within its ranks the people who understand how best to make the situation simple and acceptable.

Look again at the insurance problem. On last Saturday, February 27, 1943, the Veterans' Administration had received 7,352,500 applications for $46,605,013,609 of insurance. The average policy was for $6,600, a sum vastly larger than the average policy purchased from life-insurance companies doing a private business. All this has been handled in 2 years and, by the very nature of the speed with which these policies have been sold, we know that there must be thousands of corrections to make, millions of policy forms to be explained and an unending procession of changes of address and detailed correspondence which will tax the facilities and many times the patience of everyone connected with the Veterans Administration.

Let me return again to the employment phase. I have said that employment offices will be swamped with the stream of discharged and demobilized servicemen. This is a problem that the Congress and the country must face and must meet, at least partially, by measures advocated by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and other veteran groups and which involve these five points:

1. An orderly, systematic plan of demobilization after the termination of the war; releasing personnel of the armed forces in accordance with ability of government and private industry to absorb them.

2. Continuation of the pay, within reasonable limitations, of all discharged personnel for a period of 6 months after discharge to bridge the gap of adjustment from military to civilian life.

3. Enforcement of the provisions of the Selective Service and Training Act which require employers to reinstate military personnel to their former jobs.

4. Strengthen veteran preference laws of Federal and State Governments, and extend veteran preference to all positions where Federal or State funds are used in whole or in part.

5. Government financial assistance to industries converting from military to civilian production to speed the transition.

Finally, there remains at least one gap in the program which will need to be plugged. It may be one among many, but surely it is one of the most important. We may give employment opportunities to the veteran who can return to his old job. We may persuade women to relinquish their wartime tasks and return to the types of work and to the homes from which they emerged. We may give insurance advice and service to all who apply. We may make adequate provisions for hospitalization and for the payment of compensation for service-connected disability, but the job is not done.

There remains in any adequate handling of the veteran problem the task of a vocational rehabilitation training program. It will take on unprecedented size. After World War No. 1, the veteran facilities received 197,000 applications for vocational rehabilitation, and of these who applied 130,000 were completely and fully trained. This time, depending, of course, upon the length of the war and the difficulty of landing on European shores, the Veterans Administration easily faces a total of a half million applications for vocational rehabilitation. Surely in that we will do ourselves an injustice if we do not rely upon and make the fullest possible use of the experience which the Veterans Administration has gathered in the past 20 years.

We need at all times to bear in mind a resolution passed by the American Legion at its twenty-fourth annual national convention approving the principle of the Voorhis bill (H. J. Res. 291 of the 77th Cong., and H. J. Res. 36 of the 78th Cong.), which is now before the House Committee on Labor. In it, Mr. VOORHIS, one of the most liberal, intelligent, and upright Members of the House, proposes the establishment of the National Commi 'on for Post-War Reconstruction. He has followed the recommendation of the American Legion and made provision for three veterans on the Commission, which shall have for its purpose "the development of a practical program for the continuous full employment of all Americans able and willing to work," a goal which would greatly simplify the problems of the Veterans Administration. I commend the Voorhis resolution to your study and thought.

Before I close I would like to insert into this discussion some ideas of my own that may or may not have any relationship to your administration. There appeared in Harper's Magazine for July 1942 an article dealing with the future political power of the Army. What will these veterans do, these 11,000,000 men when they come back to their privilege and responsibility as citizens? What will be their ideas and ideals, their aims and their aspirations toward the future of the America for which they have hazarded their lives?

We have been striving to make America the arsenal of democracy. Each month we look at production figures and from them, we know that America is turning out guns, tanks, planes, ships, trucks, jeeps, and every instrument of war in unbelievable numbers. We know that the great industrial power of America has been thrown in behind the Russians, just as we hope it will soon come to the further aid of the Chinese. We are proud of our arsenal.

But it is one thing to be the arsenal of democracy and something else to be the example of democracy. These boys who return to their tasks or to their lack of employment opportunities may constitute a future political power. Left to themselves without a government that seems to appreciate their sacrifices and their endurances, they could quickly drift into an army of discontent that in its final analysis would be neither helpful to them nor to the Government they have protected. It is, therefore, the responsibility of every branch of the American Government to join with you who are in the front lines to see that the handling of this veteran problem contributes to the welfare of America and the continuation of its democratic institutions.

Let me illustrate what is in my mind. Within the past few days both the Senate and the House of Representatives have passed what is known as the Columbia River Basin Act. In this legislation the Congress expresses its intent to use that great body of water held back by the Grand Coulee Dam, not only that it may be harnessed for the development of electrical energies to turn the wheels of great industrial projects but also so that it may be poured out across a million acres of land to help make 100,000 homes for men who will be returning from the war.

We must never forget the story of the American frontier—how it stood there, millions of acres of fertile land, waiting to receive the energies of the restless souls in previous generations. It mattered little whether a man liked his employment opportunities in a factory, because if he became dissatisfied with his wage or his working conditions, he could go to the prairies of the West, and in a sod shanty or log cabin find a habitation for his family and an opportunity for his children. The frontier as we have known it in America has passed. We have driven the buffalo from the great plains and have absorbed these areas into our farm lands. Where now can the restless and dissatisfied turn?

If they must remain within the confines of cities, almost under the shadow of the factories where they have sought and not found that American equality for which they have fought, then they may develop into a political force that could imperil some of the institutions which have grown and prospered while they have been in service. But if there still remains in this country an avenue of escape, if there still remains a competitor for the services of men in the great out-of-doors, if there exists under these great projects that we have been developing, an opportunity for the returning soldier, then we will have demonstrated the final blessings of a true democracy.

At the San Francisco Exposition there was an exhibit built on prophesy and called The Industrial West. It was designed to show how, with the development of water power, great communities could be built up at Grand Coulee, at Bonneville, at Boulder Dam, and at dozens of other sources of cheap electrical power. The war has rushed us closer to that goal. We have for the first time begun the development of industries based upon our light metals—aluminum, magnesium, and a host of others. We have now started synthetic-rubber plants to free ourselves from dependence on far-away sources of a raw material so essential to an America that rolls on wheels. We have spotted the west coast with factories producing giant planes that can bring America into a completely new eminence in the romance of world commerce.

I need not call the roll of technological and industrial advance, nor do I need to repeat the history of these great water-power projects that are so closely keyed to our mineral and metal advances. I only hope to suggest that part of the treatment of the veteran is to minister to his physical infirmities, but that is only part. On us all there remains a responsibility to bring him back into a civilian life that can challenge his imagination, utilize his energies, and permit him to preserve at home that democracy which he is so successfully defending on foreign shores.

The Veterans Administration in this endeavor will be the most important contact in this whole program, and so to General Hines and those of you who serve with him, I give you the slogan of Ulysses that you may carry it with you into your greatly expanded tasks and opportunities—that slogan which presses us unceasingly forward and bids each of us "To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

Annual Broadcast of the Rainbow Division Veterans' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. FAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the Rainbow Division veterans' tribute to Gen. Douglas MacArthur on Washington's Birthday, February 22, 1943, over the National Broadcasting System.

Through an unavoidable occurrence the broadcast was not sent over the New York network. It follows:

OPENING REMARKS BY MAJ. WOODALL GREENE, FORMER COMMANDING OFFICER, ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTEENTH TRENCH MORTAR BATTERY, FORTY-SECOND DIVISION, AND NOW SERVING WITH CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE, ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Rainbow Division veterans and friends, once more, through the generosity of the National Broadcasting Co., this annual broadcast of the Rainbow Division Veterans Association is on the air to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of our first entrance into the front-line trenches in France during the great World War.

This is the second anniversary broadcast since Pearl Harbor and today you will find a great many Rainbow veterans back in the armed forces again giving their best efforts and experience to their country.

These veterans, headed by our great and courageous leader, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, are too numerous to mention by name on this program, but a typical example of the effort and spirit of the veterans of the whole division is portrayed by the One Hundred and Seventeenth Trench Mortar Battery, of Maryland.

This battery, all volunteers, 95 percent of whom were under 22 years of age, won the respect of their comrades in the division during the last war, receiving citations, commendations, and decorations, has also taken this war in their stride.

Many of them, including that fine officer and soldier, our first battery commander, Col. Robert J. Gill, are again in service, and the others almost to a man are engaged in some form of war work, all willing and eager to go all out in their effort to save those principles they once fought so gloriously to preserve.

Your next speaker, the Honorable JAMES H. FAY, needs no introduction in Rainbow circles; a private in the famous One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment, better known as the Sixty-ninth—the fighting Sixty-ninth—with an enviable record as a soldier and in spite of the fact that he lost a leg in the Battle of the Argonne Forest, Jimmy is still fighting. At the present time he represents the Sixteenth District of New York City in Congress. It gives me great pleasure to present Congressman FAY, who will speak from New York.

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES H. FAY

In his radio address on the evening of Lincoln's Birthday, the President outlined perhaps more graphically than ever before the extent of the war in which we are engaged, and so by suggestion indicated what our inevitable victory will inevitably cost in American lives. At about the same time Secretary Stimson warned us that the news from Tunisia may be bad before it is good. In the middle of last week distressing news came from Tunisia, although, thank Heaven, our reverses seem to have been less critical than we feared.

Thus, in 1943, we have had a grave prelude to the now traditional yearly tribute to the Rainbow Division. But that makes our tribute tonight all the more appropriate. In these perilous times it is good to reflect upon the new hope which the Rainbow Division injected into the serious situation in which the democracies found themselves in 1918. It is good to recall the symbolic significance of that truly great aggregation which concentrated the fighting spirit of all of our 48 States into a single unit in the seemingly impossible path to victory in the Argonne Forest.

It is inspiring to know that the symbolism in the honored name of the Rainbow Division is even more profoundly meaningful today, when the fighting spirit of all of our States is deployed on every continent and in every sea.

The figurative rainbow which the patriotism of our 48 States arched over the Atlantic in 1918 now encircles the globe and again is destined to play a vital part in turning defense into offense and offense into triumph. The Rainbow Division, the name as well as the fighting aggregation itself, was the creation of one of the great military figures of this hour, our own Gen. Douglas MacArthur, to whom we pay heartfelt tribute tonight. A leader in whose own character and personality is embodied the spirit of the celebrated military unit which he brought into being. We may say this in all sincerity, not alone because of his soldierly qualities, but also because wherever he goes, wherever he is at this moment, he carries with him the deep-rooted confidence of all who contributed their sons and their colors to the Rainbow Division 25 years ago. We cannot even attempt this evening to call the roll of the great sons of this division. But, as a New Yorker, I must mention at least one. The late Maj. Gen. Alexander E. Anderson, who fought with MacArthur in the First World War, who commanded the Sixty-ninth Regiment of New York up to the opening of this war, and who died only a few months ago in line of duty as commander of the Eighty-sixth Division, passing away with one hope and aspiration in his heart, that once more he might have the privilege of leading a unit under MacArthur's command. Great memories are evoked by this evening's tribute, but not memories alone. Greater than our memories is the reassuring fact that the spirit of the Rainbow Division is alive, in action, on the march, throughout the world at this very hour.

I have the honor of introducing a former judge advocate of the Rainbow Division who is now Coordinator for the Inter-American Defense Board. The next voice you will hear will be that of Maj. Gen. Blanton Winship, United States Army (retired), from Washington.

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. BLANTON WINSHIP

Comrades, there is no Forty-second Division today, as expressed during the First World War by the selection from different parts of the country of special units to compose a division that will represent the thought and spirit of the different sections so represented, but there are thousands of men who served in the Forty-second Division scattered throughout our armies that are now fighting in different parts of the world. And there are thousands more of the sons of members of the Rainbow Division that fought so valiantly and effectively in the great World War who are now in this even greater World War. That spirit, I am sure, is now carried by all of these representatives of the old Rainbow Division. MacArthur, whose energy, courage, and brilliant mind, coupled with the deepest study of military subjects, which has consumed practically all of his time, I know, for the past many years, stands at the head of an army today that carries with it the spirit of the old Rainbow Division. His quality of leadership, combined with all of his other capabilities, his facility in attracting the devotion and admiration of his men and his combative spirit will, we believe, lead him into many victories in the great field in which he is now playing such a large part.

Look at what Summerall has been doing since his retirement as Chief of Staff, and we can well marvel at his accomplishments in carrying on the traditions of The Citadel of South Carolina, which run gloriously back for many years and which expressed themselves in the leadership of its graduates on many fields of battle. He is a hard and objective trainer of men, a man of wonderful energy, deep study, and determination that will not countenance obstruction to his plans. He has added in numbers, equipment, and in every way to the extension and rounding out of an institution already steeped in traditions and spirit that will carry out through the stress and strain of campaigns and battles that these young men will have to meet in the war that we are fighting today.

Comrades, let us not forget on this occasion the great French leader, General Gouraud, the great friend and admirer of our division, who went to America to visit in various parts of the country the elements of that division. I put him on the ship at Le Havre, when he turned his face toward America, and then heard from him on his return his impressions of our country. He was a great soldier, built in heroic mold, and wholly devoted to the service of his country. His spirit and that of the other Frenchmen with whom we fought will march with that of our old division and its descendants now on the field of battle and furnish an inspiration to the French who are now fighting with us, and a lively attraction for those others who are planning to throw their fully extended support against the hated enemy of mankind and of all the natural instincts of the world in which we wish to live. Time will not permit calling the roll of those of the Forty-second Division who have given splendid accounts of themselves in the field of battle and in their many pursuits of life. The spirit of the Rainbow Division must not only be strongly represented in those who are fighting in the front lines, but by all of those who, back of the lines, must see that they have the support of our Nation to the *n*th degree. We will be proud, I know, when the roll of those who have descended from the fighters in that division is called and the final accounting is given of the service they have rendered their country. Let us all put our shoulders to the wheel to give every encouragement to those fine fellows who are representing us throughout the armies in the field today.

Now I desire to introduce to you a distinguished member of the Rainbow Division: Albert Hoyt, national president, Rainbow Division Veterans, who served with the One Hundred and Sixty-sixth Infantry, Ohio.

REMARKS BY ALBERT HOYT

Good evening, I have a message from Gen. Douglas MacArthur, which I shall now read:

ALBERT HOYT,
National President,
Rainbow Division Veterans,
Cleveland, Ohio:

Twenty-five years ago the Rainbow entered the trenches to start a long battle career the fame of which still echoes wherever military men gather. And today, on my battle line, the sons of those men of a quarter of a century ago greet me just as did their fathers so long ago. In their brave young hands you need have no fear that our old glories will fade or be forgotten. They are worthy sons of fighting fathers.

MACARTHUR.

Thank you, General, for your message. In your own words: "It was 25 years ago tonight,

the days of old have vanished tone and tint; they have gone glimmering through the dreams of things that were. Ghosts in olive drab and sky blue pass before our eyes; voices that have stolen away in the echoes of the battlefields no more ring out. The faint, far whisper of forgotten songs no longer floats through the air. Youth, strength, aspirations, struggles, triumphs, wide winds sweeping, movements, vividness, radiance, shadows, faint bugles sounding reveille, far drums sounding the long roll—the rattle of musketry, the still white crosses! And tonight we are met to remember."

Yes, gentlemen, tonight we are met to remember, and to send our greetings to Rainbow veterans all over the world, through the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co., whose courtesy makes this broadcast possible. Especially do we send our greetings to those of our comrades who still suffer from wounds as a result of Rainbow service.

As a combat unit of the United States Army, the Rainbow Division no longer exists.

Its purpose was the exemplification of the citizen soldier, who having rendered military service in time of war returned to the pursuits of civil life. In the language of the inscription on the division monument on Long Island: "Its mission fulfilled, it vanished to appear no more, but its name and fame will live to hearten future generations to answer its country's call."

Although Rainbow does not now exist as a division, many of its veterans, still inspired by the dauntless valor of its old commander and comrade, General MacArthur, again serve the Nation in military posts from the South Pacific to northern Africa. The first American soldier to land in northern Ireland was a Rainbow veteran. Another veteran of the Rainbow was in Africa many, many months ago.

Tonight we are met to remember. To remember for a little time and then say farewell until we meet again. And to you, General, wherever you go, whatever your lot, our enduring love and affection go with you, and abide with you always. Until you return, godspeed. "Only those are fit to live who are not afraid to die."

The Loyalties of Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the thoughtful attention of my colleagues the sensible stand taken by the British Labor Party toward the proposal of the Communist Party of Great Britain to become an affiliate. The British Labor Party decided that since the primary loyalty of the Communist Party was to the Communist International, and that means Soviet Russia, British Labor could not join hands with an organization that received its orders from a foreign government. This point is brought out so well in the following editorial taken from the Chicago Tribune of February 25, 1943, that I include the same with my remarks, and recommend it for careful attention:

THE LOYALTIES OF COMMUNISTS

The attempt of the Communist Party of Great Britain to affiliate itself with the British Labor Party has been rejected by the Laborites with the statement that the Communists' primary loyalty is given to the Communist International—i. e., to Soviet Russia. The Labor Party supported its position by quoting the constitution and rules of the Comintern that obedience must be given unreservedly to that body by all branches of the party in nations outside Russia.

The British Labor Party concluded from the facts that the British Communists therefore would be unable to fulfill their pledge to accept the decisions and discipline of the Labor Party's executive committee. "It is plain," the Laborites said, "that in any conflict of view or policy between the British Labor Party and the Communist International, the view of the latter body would prevail as far as the British Communist Party is concerned."

The Labor Party, in other words, knows that Communists in Britain do not give their primary loyalty to their own country but to Moscow, and that they are not to be considered in any sense as members of a purely British political movement, but as revolutionists in the service of a foreign government with a program for world expansion. The British Laborites refuse to bring a Trojan horse into their midst to work from within at their own downfall and to exploit them for the benefit of alien masters.

The Labor Party has had the courage and common sense to recognize the Communists for what they are and to describe them in plain-spoken language. The British Laborites are not deterred by the fact that their country is in a war alliance with Russia. They are not afraid of hurting Stalin's feelings by refusing to accept everybody and everything connected with Russia with wild enthusiasm. They know that the war and the political and social program of bolshevism are entirely separate and distinct.

This realism of perception can be commended to a great many Americans who feel obliged to swoon into the arms of communism every time they contemplate the successes of the Red army—which, be it said, is fighting for Russia and for nobody else. Those Americans who have recently discovered an affinity for communism place a wholly mistaken emphasis upon our obligation as allies to Russia. We are no more committed to accept communism than Stalin is bound to accept republican government as a consequence of the existing partnership in arms.

Yet, from hearing some people talk, it might be thought that Representative DIES is traitorously damaging the cause of the Allies every time he does exactly what the British Labor Party has done—which is to call a spade a spade and a Communist or fellow traveler an agent at the service of a foreign government and an alien philosophy. If the British can afford to recognize their native Communists for what they are, we in America should have no hesitation about doing the same thing with all necessary vigor.

First Things First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Washington Post, Tuesday, March 2, 1943:

FIRST THINGS FIRST

The revolt against the excesses of our bureaucracy which is now raging in equal excess in Congress is basically a reflection of the hostility which is reported from the country at large. The Farm Security Administration seems to be a particular target. Farmers in the Southwest object to what they call Farm Security Administration dictation of wage contracts for imported labor. And it was the controversy between the farmers and the Farm Security Administration that accounted for the delay in picking the whole of the long-staple cotton in the Phoenix district. The Tucson Star caustically comments, "The insistence of the Farm Security Administration in placing social reform ahead of getting an agricultural job done is the underlying reason why the long-staple cotton is not fully picked."

The rights and wrongs of this dispute are not so important as the fact that the dispute is evidence of a general feeling that bureaucratic officiousness is throttling the war effort. Obstructionism by other administrative agencies also is charged. It is said to account for the hampering of other efforts to repair Arizona's labor deficiencies as a result of the drain to Army camps and war factories. In order to get Mexican labor for round-ups of the cattle upon which the country depends for its meat, the ranchers had to prove to the immigration authorities that the work of a cowboy was skilled labor. This they did from an opinion by Attorney General Biddle. Not satisfied with this statement, the Immigration Service then attempted to impose a literacy test on the Mexican cowboys, who cannot even read Spanish.

The country has long been aware that winning the war is our No. 1 job. Everything else is secondary. Now it is obviously under the impression that its own effort is clogged from Washington by the harassment of a bureaucracy addicted either to red tape or to preoccupation with the wartime opportunity of pushing New Deal ideas. This latter possibility was envisaged, it will be recalled, by no less a person than Attorney General Biddle at the beginning of the war. He told a select group of New Dealers that, regardless of the war, they must keep up the political fight for the "liberalism" of the New Deal. Those who so insist upon putting politics above production in this war are incurring a serious responsibility. This newspaper has protested time after time against the military invasion of civilian domains. But there will be no help for military encroachment if the civilian bureaucrats act in the way they are reported to be acting in Arizona.

Absenteeism: The New National Malady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the March 1943 issue of Fortune magazine:

ABSENTEEISM: THE NEW NATIONAL MALADY

Absenteeism is the term used to describe the chronic but brief and occasional failure of workers to show up at their jobs. It is currently on the increase throughout many sections of our war industry. It is lowering output at a time when we have completed the basic planning and organization for our

war economy, and are moving into its third major stage: the most efficient use of materials, machines, manpower.

In the months ahead, absenteeism may become as familiar a word as subcontracting, conversion, rationing, or price control. At the moment, the central fact about absenteeism is the lack of information about it. Even its definitions may vary from region to region, and from plant to plant. In some places "legitimate" reasons for absenteeism, such as the need to attend a funeral, are separated colloquially from such illegitimate reasons as nursing a hangover; in still other places the term is applied to every sort of nonattendance, whatever its origin; and it is this meaning of absenteeism that is used here. No adequate over-all figures exist concerning this phenomenon. The available evidence is in surveys and records from scattered sources. While such statistics prove no thesis, they are like the cap of an iceberg, warning of greater unseen peril.

What we already know is appalling enough. In 1942, in new-construction shipyards turning out both naval and cargo vessels, the man-hours lost through absenteeism alone would have built better than four ships a week, or 208 annually, or 2,000,000 tons, equal to about 25 percent of last year's total merchant ship construction. Recent reports from 9 major industrial centers disclose that from 5 to 15 percent of the workers directly engaged on war production are daily being marked absent—as compared with peacetime estimates of a normal 2 percent. Yet the crucial effect of absenteeism on high regular war output may be only partially indicated by figures on the number of workers who didn't punch their clocks on any one day. In one Detroit plant, which manufactures motors for the armed forces, 6,000 men and women are employed. Recently 250 failed to appear for their shift in the block-milling department, a key operation. As a result, total production over this 8-hour period fell 50 percent.

The causes of absenteeism are as various as human behavior and the cures are equally complicated. Herewith we present a brief scrutiny of both, aware that there are no easy answers.

CAUSES INSIDE THE PLANT

Material shortages that may force the shutdown of a department, or a whole factory, or lack of tools, or blueprints, or new instructions, or slow-moving supplies, or other interruptions and slackening in the production pace may implant in the worker's mind the conviction that since so much time is being lost anyway, it doesn't matter if he does go fishing. The sight of completed tanks or guns on railroad sidings or of planes long finished still in the adjacent flying fields also undermine the worker's sense of urgency.

So, too, does the practice of hoarding employees against probable draft depletions, or pending expansion, or some future ultrabusy stretch. When 15 people are on tap to handle a job that needs only 10, they all tend to loaf a little, to regard themselves as not too essential. There have been many occasions when half to three-quarters of a crew or section simply didn't turn up, sometimes when most needed, each truant assuming that Joe or Bill could pinch hit for him since, what the hell, the shop was already overmanned.

Wage-rate differences for the same skill in the same city or industry, greasy-spoon cafeterias, foremen who play favorites—all such irritants encourage going A. W. O. L. to "shop around" for jobs that look more desirable. Too many overtime hours and lack of vacations induce the "I just don't feel well" fatigue that is a widespread source of absenteeism.

CAUSES OUTSIDE THE PLANT

Sickness, whether personal or in the family, accounts for probably half of all absences. Factory wives take time off to care for their husbands, and vice versa; either may do so to attend the children, down with colds. There is no one else to do it. The household servant, even for workers who could afford one, is the vanishing American. She, too, is wearing a welder's mask instead of an apron; and so is the convenient relative to whom the children previously could be entrusted and who could be depended on to market and mend and sort the laundry. Day nurseries and other child-care enterprises, with a few exceptions, are still being planned.

Bad housing, with as many as six men sharing a small room in a flat, a shack, a trailer; or with perhaps three of them rotating their sleep on a "hot" bed, contributes to absenteeism by more than mutual exposure to contagion and nervous irritability. Often workers skip a morning to search for better living quarters nearer their jobs. They thus hope to eliminate waiting for bus or trolley, which may require 2 hours to bring them to the gate, or riding in a car pool that doesn't arrive when the driver is laid up with grippe, or cannot obtain gas or a new tire.

High wages, despite the steady rise of prices, now enable many workers to earn more in 4 days than they formerly received in a week. Even after bond buying and other saving they still have extra funds. In other times after paying back debts they probably would have put this money in installments toward a car or radio, no longer available or fast dwindling along with other consumer goods. And this in itself prompts the housewife to insist that her husband help her select the new bedroom suite—there are only a few left at the furniture store, and she doesn't see why she has to decide everything; he has to live with it, too, and she can't help it if the store's not open nights; and to end all this, he knocks off for the afternoon.

Homesickness leads out-of-town workers to spend their spare cash on a trip to see the wife and kids, or the old folks, or the girl friend, and this often means stretching the week end through Monday and Tuesday. Among the younger single men, with a new wondrous jingle in their jeans, uncertainty over their draft status inspires binges, on the theory that they're going to get their meed of felicities before induction. It is, as a rule, this group that suffers "24-hour pneumonia" after pay day.

Excessive drinking is not a primary source of absenteeism among the overwhelming majority of workers; rather it is an attempt to escape from the discontents that foster absenteeism. To be sure, there is always the sprinkling of good-time Charleys and anytime Annies and other congenital irresponsibles. They exist on a plane of raw random appetites, of jive, and pulp magazines, cheap movies, and cheap gin. They are the "take it easy, fella, you'll get by with it" exponents of absenteeism at bowling alley, tavern, dance hall, poolroom.

Linking the plant and the community influences that make for absenteeism is the fact that for labor today it's a seller's market. This situation enhances the worker's feelings of importance as a person, but not necessarily as a producer, even when he helps to fashion the final weapons of war. It is this failure of the worker to appreciate the momentous character of what he is doing that remains, in moral terms, the most significant cause of absenteeism.

Only a minority of alert managements have done much to curb absenteeism. Against all the difficulties of scarce and irregular supplies of materials and manpower they are trying to smooth out their production scheduling to keep everyone busy; to bring wage scales into balance with those paid elsewhere for the same function; to improve the worker's nutrition by better lunchrooms, and advice on preparing food for dinner pails or meals at home. And to combat fatigue and overstrain, with their resulting absenteeism, some managements are changing their basic week to conform with recent British and American findings that 7 days, even of only 7½ hours each, tend to be more exhausting than a 6-day week of an average 9 hours daily, so long as the total doesn't exceed 54.

WHAT IS BEING DONE ABOUT IT?

Other companies are moving to extend plant medical care to the employee's family; to assist workers in finding decent rooms; to keep after public-utility corporations and commissions to improve transportation; to persuade storekeepers and ration and selective service boards to stagger their hours, and keep open at times that will enable employees to perform routine errands of personal existence; to cash checks at the plant itself, eliminating journeys to the bank way downtown, or to the nearby saloon.

The practice of sending the chronic absentee to the medical department for a check-up may divulge some easily curable complaint, or dispel the psychogenic type of "illness illusion" found among badly adjusted employees, or merely explode falsehoods. A cards-on-the-table talk by supervisor or shop steward is sometimes very helpful. Some firms rely more upon attendance contests, modeled after bingo games or similar lotteries, awarding winners a jackpot of War bonds or a Florida vacation; or upon house-organ stories and pictures of enemy horrors, or upon visits of sailors who have been torpedoed, or pilots who have been in aerial combat, to identify the plant's own product more closely with the war; or upon registered letters to the absentee from such characters as the Tokyo Kid, who is, of course, "so joyful" over delays in fashioning an engine or laying a keel, or upon "payment" of wages in Nazi marks, and a long list of related devices.

Such techniques can be of value up to a point, but they generally fall short of their goal. Of course, the most gifted and competent management, working alone, cannot banish absenteeism. Employers must have the constant advice and active cooperation of employees; of the unions, which on the entire question are mainly sterile when not somnolent; of war production drive committees, some 350 of which out of 2,000 are just waking to the implications of absenteeism; and of the municipal, State, and Federal governments. Thus far, neither labor leaders, Government officials, directors of research foundations, nor business executives are devoting to this problem the attention it deserves. When questioned about it they are inclined to pass the buck around, with alacrity and élan. Labor and Government spokesmen in particular display a propensity to dismiss absenteeism as a local affair that can be best handled out there in the provinces. While absenteeism is local in its manifestations, it is national in its derivations and effects. Its eradication, therefore, demands national leadership and national direction from the War Production Board or War Manpower Commission or other agencies acting with management and labor.

WHAT COULD BE DONE?

In a national policy to rectify absenteeism, a first step should be to differentiate legitimate absenteeism from other varieties, using national criteria acceptable to employers and workers. These criteria, among other things, could serve as the basis for punitive action against persistent truants by joint labor-management courts. Clear, detailed records on absenteeism, nationally uniform, should be kept by every war plant. Such data could be drawn upon by a central reporting system, set up in the proper agency, to compile and codify a case book of origins diagnosed, treatments prescribed, and results observed. Summaries of this material, as well as complete histories of industries and areas, could be made available to enable Seattle to apply

measures already tested and found effective in Baltimore.

At all times, however, the primary obligation for correcting absenteeism must rest with the people in the local plant and community. They can look to Washington for guidance but should not expect it to carry the whole load, nor seek to use it as a whipping boy for the dereliction of their own duties.

In taking practical steps, we must face the bitter truth that absenteeism is not alone a symptom of faulty planning in procurement, in the allocation of manpower, in programs for health and housing and recreation. It also reflects a deep-seated national malaise, a mood of passive patriotism, the desire and delusion that we can wage an easy war in our factories or on our farms and in our offices.

We still lack an articulation of concrete war aims and peace purposes, and a program for their fulfillment, that would stir us and sustain us and prepare us to rise to our responsibilities. Without this basis for building a strong national morale, too many workers, and too many other people altogether, will continue to see minor inconveniences as major privations. Only when men feel that they have a stake in a venture, and can participate in making it succeed, do they cease to indulge themselves, and brush aside discomforts, and ignore hardships to keep striving toward their destination. Absenteeism, in large measure, marks the absence of this kind of faith, a faith for fighting.

The Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1943, the first annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association was held in St. Louis. This is a new organization comprising representatives of rural electric cooperatives throughout the United States. Our former colleague, Hon. Clyde Ellis, late a Congressman from the State of Arkansas, is executive manager of this new organization. Mr. Steve C. Tate is president. Executive offices of the association are maintained in the Columbian Building, Washington, D. C.

One of the notable addresses delivered at the convention was that made by the distinguished friend of public power, Mr. D. L. Marlett, executive assistant tc Dr. Paul Raver of the Bonneville Power Administration, and directly connected with the Bonneville Dam and the generation of electric power on the mighty Columbia River. The speech contains a splendid and comprehensive review of public power and its potentialities, with particular reference to Federal enterprises in the Pacific Northwest.

The address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and members of the convention, at this, your first national convention, I am glad to bring you the greetings and best wishes of the Bonneville-Grand Coulee Power Administration. Our administrator, Paul Raver, was sorely disappointed because he could not be here with you. I can assure you he would have been here but for pressure of business vital to the national war program. For I know that he views this movement of yours as basic and fundamental in a great democratic movement for public and cooperative power throughout the Nation, of which we in the Northwest are just a small part.

The great principles and vision of our beloved and distinguished Senator Norris govern the administration of Bonneville-Grand Coulee Power Authority in the Pacific Northwest. The same principles that are set forth in your Rural Electrification Administration Act, the same principles that are set forth in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act also apply to the administration of Bonneville and Grand Coulee.

These mean rural electrification, electricity for every farm home—not only electricity for every farm and home but the greatest possible utilization of electricity in each farm and home so that the living standards and production can be increased.

And finally, it means lowest cost electricity in the form of distribution through public and cooperative agencies, such as you yourself operate.

I didn't come prepared to give you any official address. Besides I probably couldn't say too much because I might give away the talk of Secretary Ickes tonight, but I would like to leave with you a few thoughts.

The first is that the Bonneville-Grand Coulee Dams have been put to work to win the war. I wonder if you realize the magnitude of the program during the past 3 years? From a small beginning of some 86,000 kilowatts of capacity in 1940, we have grown to 626,000 kilowatts today; and that will be doubled again to over a million two hundred thousand kilowatts within a year.

I might add that we have informal advice that probably that program will be enlarged again with the approval of the War Production Board.

Now, I recall 3 years ago, when we first went out to the Northwest, there was much talk about those great "white elephants," Bonneville and Grand Coulee, on the Columbia River. There was not even any thought of the amount of capacity we have installed today, or the amount that we will have installed within the next year. Yet, only 2 weeks ago, in one of the largest newspapers of the Northwest, in Portland, there were a large cartoon, and editorial, which showed Bonneville and Grand Coulee not as "white elephants" but as "work elephants" hauling a great industrial program, and the editorial called not for restriction of capacity but for further expansion of more capacity to add to the national war effort.

Our 600,000 kilowatts have been overloaded on an average of some 15 percent in order to meet the extraordinary war demands. Our program involves 95 percent of our capacity committed to war production and war loads of various sorts. What are these loads?

Senator POPE told you yesterday that Tennessee Valley Authority is producing some 50 percent of the aluminum for the United States. That is a fine record, and we don't begrudge the Tennessee Valley Authority of it at all. Besides, they had a much earlier start than we. But we are glad to add to that figure of 50 percent another 25 percent from the Northwest.

Just think of it. The Tennessee Valley Authority and Columbia River Valley producing some 75 percent of the aluminum program for the Nation's war effort. That is how public power is helping to win the war. Not only aluminum, but we can name a number of other vital industries in the war effort—magnesium, ferro-alloys, calcium carbide, and various other electro-metallurgical and electrochemical products. Yes; and shipbuilding. Our power helps Mr. Kaiser in his electric-welding process to produce a ship a day in three great yards of the Portland area. That is where the Bonneville and Grand Coulee power is going today.

But our job is just beginning. Not only must we win the war of production, but also to really win the war we must win the peace after the war. With that in mind, already the program is under way to develop the Northwest area; to bring about maximum farm production and maximum industrial production; to see that these war plants at Bonneville and Grand Coulee are used to win the peace, to raise our standards of living, to bring about those blessings from electricity with which we are all familiar and which will help us in this post-war period.

I have in mind also a survey that was just recently completed and in which I think you would be interested of what is supposed to be one of the best electrified counties in the State of Oregon. That survey showed that 5 percent of the farms were using an average of some 10,000 kilowatt-hours per year, but that 95 percent of farms were using only an average of 1,000 kilowatt-hours per year.

Obviously, there is a great market for expanded use of electricity on the farms. In fact, if we bring about an increase in consumption from some 1,800 kilowatt-hours per year in the Northwest to 5,000 or even 10,000, we will need not only Bonneville and Grand Coulee but several more dams on the Columbia River.

There is no reason why that should not be done. We must plan now for post-war expansion and post-war use of existing facilities so that we will win the peace, raise our standards of living, achieve full employment, and have a market for the products of the farm.

The third point I would like to mention is this: We all know who was responsible for these great projects in the Northwest, the Tennessee Valley, Grand Coulee Dam, and all other public projects that have been started since 1933. They began in the grass roots, with the support of the people and organizations like yourselves.

We know that you picked up the great vision of Senator Norris and brought about the approval of construction of these dams and that it was through your efforts and the efforts of your representatives in Washington that we were able to complete the dams and to build, for example, some 2,000 miles of high-voltage transmission lines in the Northwest; to be prepared for war; and to be prepared to win the peace after the war.

That is why our Administrator, Dr. Raver, has viewed this movement of yours as so important to the public-power program and he wishes to extend to you our fullest cooperation because he realizes that we are all blood brothers in one common, great, democratic movement. [Applause.]

Pay-As-You-Go Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a résumé of H. R. 2042, a copy of the bill, and a detailed analysis of the bill by sections. This bill provides for pay-as-you-go tax

collections on current income and includes withholding provisions:

I. RÉSUMÉ OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAX BILL

I am introducing a new pay-as-you-go tax bill which, if enacted into law, would carry into effect the suggested plan I offered in the Ways and Means Committee a short time ago. The basis of this bill is the Ruml plan and it provides that personal income taxes shall henceforth be assessed against current income and paid out of current income.

If this bill is enacted into law the revenues of the Government would be fully protected. All taxpayers having taxable incomes would pay income taxes during 1943 and subsequent years as long as we have a Government and as long as income taxes are collected. There would be no carry-over of past liabilities.

The plan would be a direct benefit to the Government as personal income-tax payments would be paid into the Treasury as the income is earned. Tax payments would be geared to current income and the Treasury would be assured of this revenue. The personal income-tax payer would be relieved of his present tax liability from the previous year so as to be able to pay current taxes out of current income. Under the bill he would be out of debt for his income tax when he loses his job or retires or dies.

There is no class distinction in this bill as all personal income-tax payers are treated alike. The tax clock is moved ahead 1 year for everybody. No effort is made to collect 2 years' taxes in 1 in order to get the taxpayers current.

In short the bill provides:

First. Personal income taxes shall be assessed against current income and paid out of current income.

Second. The 1942 personal income tax liability would be abated. Except, in order to prevent the possibility of windfalls, persons having an income in excess of $20,000 would pay personal income taxes for the year 1943 based on the income of 1942 or 1943, whichever is the higher. Taxpayers whose 1942 income is less than $20,000 shall pay taxes on their 1943 current income, in lieu of their 1942 tax liability. The figure $20,000 is used as it is at this point that the income-tax payments begin to exceed $5,000.

Third. The income-tax return filed on March 15, 1943, based on 1942 income shall be regarded as a tentative or presumptive return on 1943 income. However, taxpayers would be permitted to file one or more supplemental returns during the year, at their option, in order to reflect increased or decreased income. Thus there would be a maximum of flexibility in adjusting payments to earnings.

Fourth. Where a taxpayer had insufficient 1942 income to be required to file a return on March 15, but anticipates a taxable income in 1943, he may file a tentative return on March 15, or any later quarterly period, based on expected income for the year. Final adjustment would be made the following March 15.

Fifth. Provision is made for quarterly payments of personal income-tax liability where it is not practical to withhold under the regular weekly or monthly withholding plan. This takes care of those whose income does not come mainly from wages and salaries and those whose liability is in excess of the amount withheld at the source.

Sixth. The bill provides for the collection of the income tax at the source as of July 1, 1943. Deductions would be made out of pay envelopes at the rate of 20 percent of amount received in excess of the personal exemption and credit for dependents. Amounts withheld at the source would be set off against the taxpayer's quarterly installment next due. This 20-percent withholding would cover the net liability under the 6-percent normal and 13-percent first surtax bracket rate, and the present 5-percent withholding for the Victory tax. Taxpayers whose tax liability did not exceed the amount withheld would have no quarterly payments to make.

Following is the text of the bill H. R. 2042 as introduced by me on March 2. A detailed analysis of the bill is also included:

II. TEXT OF H. R. 2042

A bill to provide for the payment currently of individual income taxes

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) this act may be cited as the "Current Payment of Individual Income Tax Act, 1943."

(b) Meaning of terms used: Except as otherwise expressly provided, terms used in this act shall have the same meaning as when used in the Internal Revenue Code.

SEC. 2. Relief from double payments in 1943.

(a) General rule: Except as provided in subsection (b), the liability of any individual (other than an estate, trust, or nonresident alien) for the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code upon such individual for the taxable year beginning in 1942 is discharged, except that any payment made prior to June 15, 1943, on account of such liability shall be treated as a payment on account of the tentative tax for the taxable year beginning in 1943.

(b) Special rule where 1942 net income $20,000 or more: In case the net income shown on the return of an individual (other than an estate, trust, or nonresident alien) for the taxable year beginning in 1942 (adjusted for any mathematical errors appearing on the face of the return) is $20,000 or more, subsection (a) shall not apply. In such case if the tax under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code shown on the return of such individual for taxable years beginning in 1942 (adjusted for any mathematical errors appearing on the face of the return) is greater than that shown on his return for the taxable year beginning in 1943 (similarly adjusted), the liability for the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code upon such individual for the taxable year beginning in 1943 is discharged. If the tax under such chapter shown on the return of such individual for the taxable year beginning in 1942 (so adjusted) is not greater than that shown on his return for the taxable years beginning in 1943 (similarly adjusted) the liability for the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code upon such individual for the taxable year beginning in 1942 is discharged, except that any payment made on account of such liability shall be treated as a payment on account of the tentative tax for the taxable year beginning in 1943.

(c) Use of term "taxable year": For the purposes of this section "taxable year" shall not include any period of less than 12 months.

SEC. 3. Tentative tax.

(a) Tentative tax and payment thereof: Section 56 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to payment of tax) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(i) Tentative tax—

"(1) Definition: For the purposes of this section, the tentative tax of an individual (other than an estate, trust, or nonresident alien) for any taxable year shall be considered an advance payment of the tax for such taxable year and be whichever of the following amounts is applicable:

"(A) Tentative tax computed on basis of return for preceding year: Except as provided in subparagraph (C), in case a tentative return has not been made under section 51 (e), an amount equal to the tax shown on the return for the preceding taxable year (adjusted for any mathematical errors appearing on the face of the return), minus the credit allowed by section 31 (relating to taxes imposed by foreign countries and by possessions of the United States) for such preceding taxable year; or

"(B) Tentative tax computed on basis of tentative return: In case a tentative return has been made under section 51 (e), an amount equal to the tax which would have been imposed under this chapter for the preceding taxable year on the basis of the net income and credits against net income included in such tentative return, minus the credit that would have been allowed under section 31 (relating to taxes imposed by foreign countries and by possessions of the United States); or

"(C) Tentative tax computed on basis of tax withheld at source: If no installment of the tentative tax computed under subparagraph (A) has been paid and no tentative return has been made under section 51 (e), the amount of the tax withheld at source under section 466;

except that if such taxable year begins in 1943 and the second sentence of section 2 (b) of the Current Payment of Individual Income Tax Act, 1943, is applicable, the tentative tax for such taxable year shall be zero.

"(2) Time and manner of payment: The tentative tax for any taxable year computed under paragraph (1) (A) or (B) shall be payable in four installments, the first of which shall be paid on the fifteenth day of the third month following the beginning of the taxable year. Of the remaining installments one shall be paid on the fifteenth day of the sixth month, one on the fifteenth day of the ninth month, and one on the last day of the twelfth month, following the beginning of the taxable year, except that any installment of the tentative tax may be paid, at the election of the taxpayer, prior to the date prescribed for its payment. The amount of any installment shall be the excess, divided by the number of remaining installments (including the installment in question), of the tentative tax over the amount of the previous installments thereof paid under this paragraph.

"(3) Tentative tax not applicable in respect of certain short taxable years: A tentative tax shall not be payable for any taxable year the taxable year next preceding which does not begin in the preceding calendar year.

"(j) Refund of excessive tentative tax: If the tentative tax paid for any taxable year exceeds the tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year, the excess shall be credited or refunded in the same manner as an overpayment made on the date prescribed for the payment of the tax for such taxable year. For the purposes of this subsection, if the tax withheld at source under section 466 is credited against any installment of the tentative tax, the tax so withheld shall be considered to have been paid as tentative tax."

(b) Credit of tentative tax against tax imposed: Chapter 1 is amended by inserting after section 35 the following new section:

"SEC. 36. Credit for tentative tax paid.

"The amount of the tentative tax (provided for in section 56) paid for any taxable year shall be allowed as a credit against the

tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year."

(c) Willful failure to pay tentative tax: Section 145 (a) is amended by inserting before "tax" wherever appearing therein "tentative tax provided for in section 56."

(d) Making of tentative return permitted: Section 51 (relating to individual returns) is amended by striking out subsection (e) (cross-reference) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(e) Tentative returns: Any individual (other than an estate, trust, or nonresident alien) on or before the 15th day of the third, sixth, ninth, or twelfth month following the beginning of the taxable year, or on or before any two or more of such dates, may make a tentative return for the taxable year, which shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, stating specifically the items which he estimates as the items of his gross income, deductions, and credits against net income for such taxable year, and such other information for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this chapter as the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary may by regulations prescribe. Except for the purposes of section 145 (c) (relating to penalties for making false return) and section 55 (f) (1) (relating to penalties for disclosing information contained in return) such tentative return shall not be deemed a return for the purposes of this chapter.

"(f) Fiduciaries. For returns to be made by fiduciaries, see section 142."

(e) Substantial underpayment of tentative tax: Section 294 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to additions to tax) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(3) Substantial underpayment of tentative tax: If the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for any taxable year (other than the tax imposed by section 466) upon an individual (other than an estate, trust, or nonresident alien), minus the credit allowed by section 31 (relating to taxes of foreign countries and of possessions of the United States), exceed 120 percent of the tentative tax for such taxable year paid during such taxable year, there shall be collected as part of the tax an amount equal to 6 percent of such excess."

(g) The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

SEC. 4. Withholding of tax at source on wages.

(a) Status of taxpayer: Section 465 of the Internal Revenue Code (defining terms used) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(f) Status of taxpayer—

"(1) Married person: The term 'married person' means a person with respect to whom a withholding credit certificate (provided in section 466 (h)) stating that he is married and living with husband or wife is in effect.

"(2) Head of family: The term 'head of a family' means a person with respect to whom a withholding credit certificate stating that he is the head of a family is in effect.

"(3) Dependent: The term 'dependent' means a person designated in a withholding credit certificate in effect under section 466 (h) as a person dependent upon and receiving his chief support from the taxpayer and either under 18 years of age or incapable of self-support because mentally or physically defective, excluding as a dependent, in the case of a head of a family, one who would be excluded under section 25 (b) (2) (B)."

(b) Requirement of withholding: Section 466 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the requirement of withholding) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Requirement of withholding: There shall be withheld, collected, and paid upon all wages of every person, to the extent that such wages are includible in gross income, a tax equal to—

"(1) Wage bracket withholding: If the pay-roll period of the employer with respect to such person is weekly, biweekly, semimonthly, monthly, or quarterly, the excess of the amount determined in accordance with the table in subsection (c) applicable to such period over the withholding credit allowable under this part, or at the election of the employer, the excess of 20 percent of each payment of such wages over the withholding credit so allowable.

"(2) Percentage withholding: In cases to which paragraph (1) is not applicable, the excess of 20 percent of each payment of such wages over the withholding credit allowable under this part.

Paragraph (1) and (2) shall not be applicable in any case provided for in section 143, except in the case of wages paid to residents of a contiguous country who enter and leave the United States at frequent intervals."

(c) Withholding credit: Section 466 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the withholding deduction) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Withholding credit.—

"(1) For the purposes of subsection (a), the withholding credit shall be the amount determined under the following schedule:

If the pay-roll period is—	The withholding credit shall be—		
	Single person (not head of family)	(1) Married person with respect to whose spouse withholding credit certificate of a married person or head of a family is not in effect, or (2) head of family	Married person with respect to whose spouse withholding credit certificate of a married person is in effect
Weekly	$2.15 plus $1.50 for each dependent.	$5.10 plus $1.50 for each dependent.	$1.50 for each dependent.
Biweekly	$4.25 plus $3 for each dependent.	$10.15 plus $3 for each dependent.	$3 for each dependent.
Semimonthly	$4.60 plus $3.20 for each dependent.	$11 plus $3.20 for each dependent.	$3.20 for each dependent.
Monthly	$9.15 plus $6.40 for each dependent.	$22 plus $6.40 for each dependent.	$6.40 for each dependent.
Quarterly	$27.50 plus $19.25 for each dependent.	$66 plus $19.25 for each dependent.	$19.25 for each dependent.
Semiannual	$55 plus $38.50 for each dependent.	$132 plus $38.50 for each dependent.	$38.50 for each dependent.
Annual	$110 plus $77 for each dependent.	$264 plus $77 for each dependent.	$77 for each dependent.

"(2) If a pay-roll period in respect of any wages is not specifically provided for in paragraph (1), the withholding credit shall be that allowable in the case of 52 weekly pay-roll periods (computed from the beginning of the calendar year) divided by 365 and multiplied by the number of days in such period (including Sundays and holidays)."

(d) Wage bracket withholding: Section 466 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to wage bracket withholding) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Wage bracket withholding: If the pay-roll period of an employer with respect to an employee is weekly, biweekly, semimonthly, monthly, quarterly, semiannual, or annual, the amount of tax to be withheld, collected, and paid upon the wages of such employee shall be determined under the following tables:

FOR WEEKLY PAY-ROLL PERIOD

If the wages are over—	But not over—	The amount of the tax to be withheld shall be the excess of the following amount over the withholding credit
$0	$10.60	20 per centum of the wages.
$10.60	12.00	$2.25
$12.00	14.00	2.60
$14.00	16.00	3.00
$16.00	18.00	3.40
$18.00	20.00	3.80
$20.00	22.00	4.20
$22.00	24.00	4.60
$24.00	26.00	5.00
$26.00	28.00	5.40
$28.00	30.00	5.80
$30.00	32.00	6.20
$32.00	34.00	6.60
$34.00	36.00	7.00
$36.00	38.00	7.40
$38.00	40.00	7.80
$40.00	45.00	8.50
$45.00	50.00	9.50
$50.00	55.00	10.50
$55.00	60.00	11.50
$60.00	65.00	12.50
$65.00	70.00	13.50
$70.00	80.00	14.50
$80.00	90.00	15.50
$90.00	100.00	16.50
$100.00	110.00	21.00
$110.00	120.00	23.00
$120.00	130.00	25.00
$130.00	140.00	27.00
$140.00	150.00	29.00
$150.00	170.00	32.00
$170.00	190.00	36.00
$190.00	210.00	40.00
$210.00	230.00	44.00
$230.00	250.00	48.00
$250.00		52.00 plus 20% of the excess over $250.

FOR BIWEEKLY PAY-ROLL PERIOD

$0	$21.20	20 per centum of the wages.
$21.20	25.00	$4.75
$25.00	30.00	5.50
$30.00	35.00	6.50
$35.00	40.00	7.50
$40.00	45.00	8.50
$45.00	50.00	9.50
$50.00	55.00	10.50
$55.00	60.00	11.50
$60.00	65.00	12.50
$65.00	70.00	13.50
$70.00	80.00	15.00
$80.00	90.00	17.00
$90.00	100.00	19.00
$100.00	110.00	21.00
$110.00	120.00	23.00
$120.00	130.00	25.00
$130.00	140.00	27.00
$140.00	150.00	29.00
$150.00	170.00	32.00
$170.00	190.00	36.00
$190.00	210.00	40.00
$210.00	230.00	44.00
$230.00	250.00	48.00
$250.00	270.00	52.00
$270.00	290.00	56.00
$290.00	310.00	60.00
$310.00	350.00	66.00
$350.00	390.00	74.00
$390.00	430.00	82.00
$430.00	470.00	90.00
$470.00	510.00	98.00
$510.00		106.00 plus 20% of excess over $510.00.

FOR SEMIMONTHLY PAY-ROLL PERIOD

If the wages are over—	But not over—	The amount of the tax to be withheld shall be the excess of the following amount over the withholding credit
$0	$23	20 per centum of the wages.
$23	28	$5.10
$28	33	6.10
$33	38	7.10
$38	43	8.10
$43	48	9.10
$48	53	10.10
$53	58	11.10
$58	63	12.10
$63	68	13.10
$68	73	14.10
$73	80	15.30
$80	90	17.00
$90	100	19.00
$100	110	21.00
$110	120	23.00
$120	130	25.00
$130	140	27.00
$140	150	29.00
$150	170	32.00
$170	190	36.00
$190	210	40.00
$210	230	44.00
$230	250	48.00
$250	270	52.00
$270	290	56.00
$290	310	60.00
$310	350	66.00
$350	390	74.00
$390	430	82.00
$430	470	90.00
$470	510	98.00
$510		106.00 plus 20% of the excess over $510.

FOR MONTHLY PAY-ROLL PERIOD

$0	$46	20 per centum of the wages.
$46	56	$10.20
$56	66	12.20
$66	76	14.20
$76	86	16.20
$86	96	18.20
$96	106	20.20
$106	116	22.20
$116	126	24.20
$126	136	26.20
$136	146	28.20
$146	156	30.20
$156	166	32.20
$166	180	34.60
$180	200	38.00
$200	220	42.00
$220	240	46.00
$240	260	50.00
$260	280	54.00
$280	300	58.00
$300	350	65.00
$350	400	75.00
$400	450	85.00
$450	500	90.00
$500	550	100.00
$550	600	110.00
$600		120.00 plus 20% of the excess over $600.

FOR QUARTERLY PAY-ROLL PERIOD

$0	$138	20 per centum of the wages.
$138	150	$28.80
$150	170	32.00
$170	200	37.00
$200	230	43.00
$230	260	49.00
$260	300	56.00
$300	350	65.00
$350	400	75.00
$400	450	85.00
$450	500	95.00
$500	550	105.00
$550	600	115.00
$600	700	130.00
$700	800	150.00
$800	900	170.00
$900	1,000	190.00
$1,000	1,200	220.00
$1,200	1,400	260.00
$1,400	1,600	300.00
$1,600	1,800	340.00
$1,800	2,000	380.00
$2,000	2,500	450.00

FOR QUARTERLY PAY-ROLL PERIOD—continued

If the wages are over—	But not over—	The amount of the tax to be withheld shall be the excess of the following amount over the withholding credit
$2,500	$3,000	$550.00
$3,000	3,500	650.00
$3,500	4,000	750.00
$4,000		800.00 plus 20% of the excess over $4,000.

(e) Section 466 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credit for tax withheld at source) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Credit for tax withheld at source: The tax withheld and collected under this part shall not be allowed as a deduction either to the withholding agent or to the recipient of the income in computing net income. The amount of such tax, however, withheld and collected during any taxable year shall be allowed—

"(1) Credit against installment of tentative tax: As a credit against any installment of the tentative tax payable under section 56 (i) (2), but only to the extent of the amount of the tax so withheld evidenced by a statement or statements furnished the employee under section 469 and accompanying the remittance of such installment.

"(2) Credit against tax under sections 11, 12, and 450: As a credit against the tax imposed by section 11, 12, or 400, and by section 450, but only to the extent of the excess of the tax so withheld and collected over the portion thereof allowed as a credit under paragraph (1).

"(3) Special rule where 1942 net income $20,000 or more: In case such taxable year begins in 1943 and the second sentence of section 2 (b) of the Current Payment of Individual Income Tax Act, 1943, is applicable, as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year beginning in 1942."

(f) Withholding credit certificates: Section 466 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(h) Withholding credit certificates.—

"(1) Requirement: Every employee receiving wages (as defined in section 465) shall furnish his employer a signed statement, in such form and containing such other information as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, relating to his status for the purpose of computing the withholding credit. Such statement for the purposes of this part is called a withholding credit certificate. Such certificate shall take effect as of the beginning of the first pay-roll period which begins after the furnishing of such certificate to the employer, and shall continue in effect with respect to such employer until superseded by another such certificate.

"(2) Failure to furnish: An employee receiving wages (as defined in section 465) with respect to whom a withholding credit certificate is not in effect under paragraph (1) shall, for the purposes of computing the withholding credit be treated as a married person with respect to whose spouse a withholding credit certificate is in effect."

(g) Quarterly receipts: Section 469 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Every such employer shall also, at the request of any employee, furnish to such employee in respect of his employment during the portion of the calendar year not covered by any previous statement furnished the employee under this subsection, a written statement showing the period covered by the statement, the wages paid by the employer to such employee during such period, and the amount of the tax withheld and collected under this part in respect of such wages, except that the employer shall not be required to furnish to an employee at the request of such employee any such statement more frequently than once every 3 months in any calendar year."

(h) Penalties applicable to employees: Section 470 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to penalties) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(d) Penalties in respect of withholding credit certificates: Any individual required to supply information to his employer under section 466 (h) who willfully supplies false or fraudulent information, or who willfully fails to supply information thereunder which would decrease the withholding credit, shall, in lieu of the penalty provided in section 145 (a), upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both."

(i) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall take effect July 1, 1943.

III. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS OF H. R. 2042

The first section provides that the bill may be cited as the current payment of Individual Income Tax Act, 1943, and provides that terms used in the bill are to have the same meaning as when used in the Internal Revenue Code.

PREVENTION OF DOUBLING-UP OF TAX PAYMENTS

The bill provides for current tax payments only by individuals. Section 2 contains the provisions relating to the manner of transition from the present system to a pay-as-you-go system. Since the bill requires that the tax assessed against the income of any year is to be paid currently during that year, it is necessary, in order to prevent the doubling up of tax payments in 1943, to abate 1 year's tax liability. This is effected under section 2 (a) of the bill by the discharge of the 1942 liability. Section 2 (b) provides that if the reported net income for 1942 was $20,000 or more and the 1942 tax reported by the taxpayer was greater than the 1943 tax so reported, the 1943 tax is to be abated instead of the 1942 tax. Thus the possibility of windfalls by reason of the necessity of abating 1 year's tax liability is avoided.

TENTATIVE TAX

Section 3 amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the payment each taxable year of a tentative tax for that taxable year. Subsection (a) amends section 56 of the code to define the tentative tax for any taxable year. The tentative tax is either first, the tax shown on the return for the preceding taxable year, minus the foreign tax credit; or second, the tax shown on a tentative return which the taxpayer is permitted—though not required—to file; or third, the tax withheld at source on salaries and wages. The taxpayer may treat the tax shown on the return for the preceding year as the tentative tax during the first quarter or first two or three quarters, and then switch to a tentative return basis, or he can begin by filing a tentative return and if he desires file superseding tentative returns each quarter; or he may treat the amount with-

held at source on his wages or salary as the tentative tax, if he has not filed any tentative return and has not paid any installment on the basis of the return for the preceding year. Later in the year he may switch from this basis of computing the tentative tax to a tentative return basis. In other words, the utmost flexibility is provided to reflect true current income and adjust the payments accordingly.

The taxpayer whose income consists almost entirely of wages or salary and who is not above the first surtax bracket—estimated to be approximately 70 percent of all individual taxpayers—will undoubtedly decide to treat the amount withheld at source as the tentative tax, for by doing so he will not have to make any tentative returns or pay quarterly installments on the basis of the return for the preceding year. If during the course of the year, however, he gets an increase in wages or salary so as to put him above the first surtax bracket, or gets some dividend income, he will undoubtedly make one or more tentative returns later in the year, and pay the remaining tentative tax on the new basis.

The taxpayer whose income consists of amounts not subject to withholding will either use the previous-return basis or the tentative-return basis in computing his tentative tax. If his income does not vary widely from year to year he will undoubtedly compute his tentative tax on the basis of the return for the preceding year. If his income does vary substantially he will compute his tentative tax on the basis of one or more tentative returns, or will begin the year computing his tentative tax on the previous-return basis and later in the year switch to a tentative-return basis.

TIME AND MANNER OF PAYMENT

If the tentative tax is computed on the basis of the return for the preceding year or on the basis of a tentative return, it is payable in four installments, one on the 15th day of the third month, one on the 15th day of the sixth month, one on the 15th day of the ninth month, and one on the last day of the last month, of the taxable year. Because the taxpayer is permitted to change the method of computing the tentative tax, the installments may not be equal. Thus a rule is prescribed for computing the amount of any particular installment. The amount of any installment is the excess of the tentative tax, as last determined, over the amount of the previous installments, divided by the number of remaining installments.

OVERPAYMENT OF TENTATIVE TAX

If the tentative tax paid for any taxable year exceeds the tax imposed for the taxable year, the excess is to be credited or refunded in the same manner as an overpayment made on the date prescribed for paying the tax.

CREDIT AGAINST TAX IMPOSED

The tentative tax paid for any taxable year is allowed as a credit against the tax imposed for the taxable year.

TENTATIVE RETURNS

Any individual, on or before the 15th day of the third, sixth, or ninth, or the last day of the twelfth month of the taxable year, or on or before any two or more such dates, is permitted to make a tentative return which is to state the items which the taxpayer estimates as the items of his gross income, deductions, and credits against net income for the taxable year. The effect of making such a return has been discussed above in the explanation of the tentative tax.

SUBSTANTIAL UNDERPAYMENT OF TENTATIVE TAX

In order to require the taxpayers with wages or salaries above the first surtax bracket or with income from sources other than wages and salaries, keep their tax payments reasonably current, either by using the previous return basis or the tentative return basis of computing the tentative tax, it is provided that if the final tax liability for the year exceeds 120 percent of the tentative tax paid during the year, there shall be collected as an addition to the final tax an amount equal to 6 percent of such excess.

TAXABLE YEARS TO WHICH APPLICABLE

The amendments made by section 3 of the bill—relating to the tentative tax—are to be effective only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

WITHHOLDING AT SOURCE ON SALARIES AND WAGES

Section 4 of the bill amends the Code to provide for withholding at the source on salaries and wages a tax at the rate of 20 percent of the excess of the salary and wage payments over 110 percent of the personal exemption and credit for dependents. The additional 10 percent is included as a tentative allowance for deductions. This rate is sufficient, in the case of those liable to income tax, to collect at the source the entire income tax of taxpayers whose income consists almost wholly of salaries and wages and who are not above the first surtax bracket—estimated to be about 70 percent of all taxpayers—as well as the Victory tax liability of such taxpayers.

DETERMINATION OF FAMILY STATUS OF EMPLOYEE

Section 4 (a) amends section 465 of the code by adding three new definitions. "Married person" is defined as an individual with respect to whom a withholding credit certificate — explained below—stating that he is married and living with husband or wife is in effect. "Head of a family" is defined as an individual with respect to whom such a certificate is in effect stating him to be the head of a family. "Dependent" is also defined in terms of the character of certificate which is in effect. Thus the employer is not put to the task of ascertaining whether a particular employee is in fact married, or the head of a family, or has in fact one or more persons dependent upon him. The employer simply looks to the type of certificate the employee has filed with him and is not liable for withholding the wrong amount if it transpires that the certificate does not correctly state the employee's status.

REQUIREMENT OF WITHHOLDING

Section 4 (b) amends section 466 (a) of the code (relating to the requirement of withholding). The employer is given the option of withholding either on the straight percentage system—the excess of 20 percent of each payment of wages over the withholding credit—or on the wage-bracket system under which there are specified amounts withheld on wages within stated ranges, as shown in the tables inserted by section 4 (d) of the bill. In this respect the bill follows the withholding provisions of existing law.

WITHHOLDING CREDIT

Section 4 (c) of the bill inserts in section 466 of the code a new table under which the employer can compute, for various pay-roll periods, the amount by which the tax to be withheld is to be reduced on account of the various combinations of family status of the employee. These combinations are for: First, single person, not the head of a family; second, married person with respect to whose spouse a withholding credit certificate of a married person is not in effect, or the head of a family; third, married person with respect to whose spouse a withholding credit certificate is in effect; and fourth, dependents. A married person with respect to whose spouse a certificate of a married person is not in effect gets the full benefit of the $1,200 exemption for a married person, plus 10 percent thereof. A married person with respect to whose spouse a certificate of a married person is in effect is subject to withholding upon a gross basis, since the spouse of such person is getting the full benefit of the $1,200 personal exemption. Thus husband and wife can determine which one is to take the benefit of the personal exemption. A person with respect to whom no certificate at all is in effect is subject to withholding upon a gross basis, and in this respect is treated, in determining the amounts to be withheld, as a married person with respect to whose spouse a certificate of a married person is in effect.

WAGE BRACKET HOLDING

Section 4 (d) inserts in section 466 of the code new tables for employers who desire to withhold on the wage bracket system. Each table is for a specified pay-roll period. In the first two columns are found the various wage ranges, and in the last column is found the amount from which is to be subtracted the withholding credit to determine the tax to be withheld. The employer will find it very easy to combine these tables with the table showing the withholding credit into one table, so that his pay-roll operators can readily determine, without any computations whatever, the exact amount to be withheld in any particular case.

WITHHOLDING CREDIT CERTIFICATES

Provision is made for the filing by employees with their employer of statements of their family status. The statements—called withholding credit certificates—are to be effective with respect to pay-roll periods beginning after the filing. If during the year a new statement is filed, it of course will supersede any previous statement. A penalty is prescribed for making false or fraudulent statements in the certificates and failing to furnish information which

would reduce the withholding credit. As previously stated, if no certificate is filed, the employer is required to withhold from the employee on a gross basis.

CREDIT FOR AMOUNTS WITHHELD AT SOURCE

The tax withheld at source during any taxable year is allowed as a credit—

First. Against installments of the tentative tax, but only to the extent of the amount withheld which is evidenced by receipts furnished by the employer and accompanying the remittance. The requirement that the receipt accompany the remittance is necessary to enable the collector to know what has been withheld at the source.

Second. Against the tax imposed for the year, but only to the extent that the amount withheld has not been allowed as a credit against the tentative tax.

Third. Against the 1942 tax liability in the case of those persons described above whose 1943 liability is discharged in lieu of the 1942 liability.

RECEIPTS BY EMPLOYER

Under the present law the employer is required once each year to furnish the employees with receipts showing the amount withheld from their wages or salaries. Since under the bill the amount withheld is allowed as a credit against installments of the tentative tax and since these installments are payable quarterly, the bill also requires the employer, at the request of any employee, to furnish the employee with quarterly receipts. Such receipts will be needed only by employees whose salaries or wages are high enough to put the employee above the first surtax bracket and by employees who have income in more than insignificant amounts from sources other than salaries and wages, and thus the additional burden on the employer of furnishing quarterly receipts will not be substantial.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The new withholding provisions are to take effect beginning July 1, 1943.

Time Runs in Our Favor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to print a letter from a friend, I am submitting the following. This is a very able dissertation by a prominent and experienced American friend of mine, who lives in New York City. It is an answer, and a complete answer, to the attack the floor leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, made a few days ago on ex-President Herbert Hoover. I trust that all those especially who resented the implications made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] will read this for a full and complete answer and vindication; and for those who might have been inclined to agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], I recommend that they may read it for the sum total of the truth:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 27, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAMBERTSON: A Democratic Member of the House of Representatives—not a new dealer—has been good enough to send me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, in which the speech of Democratic Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, alternately defaming and belittling Herbert Hoover, was printed. The Democratic Congressman wanted me to read the speech as an example of how panic-stricken New Deal leadership in the House is these days.

Hypocritical expressions of personal respect for Mr. Hoover, with which Congressman MCCORMACK interlarded his speech, could not hide the fact that he made an uncalled for venomous and vicious attack on our greatest living American.

Until the New York Times of February 24 printed a full page advertisement inserted by the Communist Party, giving the text of a speech made by Comrade Earl Browder, it appeared that Mr. MCCORMACK was attacking Mr. Hoover simply because his judgment in a debatable matter of public policy did not hew to the New Deal line. That the New Deal dreads Mr. Hoover's utterances and envies him his great influence with American citizens of all political persuasions, has long been obvious. But after reading the statement of Comrade Browder, a former felon pardoned because of political expediency, it now is clear that the attack on Mr. Hoover by Mr. MCCORMACK was definitely a part of the New Deal-Communist program of well-timed vilification of those who have the courage and foresight to disagree with their policies. It is a matter of general comment throughout the country that the New Deal-Communist front on major public policies is identical.

Mr. MCCORMACK'S attack on Mr. Hoover was followed so closely and identically by the Communist Party in its New York Times advertisement that it is not too much to charge collusion between the New Deal and Communists in these wild statements and malicious innuendoes about that great man. The net result, of course, has been to make additional friends and admirers for Mr. Hoover.

In Mr. MCCORMACK'S speech on the floor of the House, where he has immunity from legal consequences in making slanderous or libelous remarks, he objected to the statement credited to Mr. Hoover, in which alluding to the war, he said, "Time runs in our favor." Mr. MCCORMACK said that such a statement "is to take a position in favor of negotiated peace, or unadulterated appeasement." He said other and nastier things, which you probably heard or read, but which it is not necessary to repeat in this letter. His statement that Hoover takes a position in favor of appeasement or negotiated peace is complete utter rot. How can the thought of appeasement or the inducing of a slackening in our war effort be related in any way to Mr. Hoover's statement?

Further, how could Congressman MCCORMACK escape the fact that time runs in our favor? Is not the United States growing in military strength in every branch in every theater of war and general all-round strength on every front—except those parts of the domestic front dominated by the New Deal—with each passing day?

Can it be said by any competent observer—even in the camp of our enemy—that Nazi Germany, which the administration has rightly or wrongly proclaimed our No. 1 enemy, that Germany is growing stronger with the passage of time and the continued heavy depletions it is suffering in men, material, and morale?

Premier Josef Stalin, Russian dictator, affectionately called Uncle Joe by many new dealers, must be considered as one who knows something about this war and the time element involved in winning it. He said in his order of the day, in commemoration of the Red Army's twenty-fifth anniversary, "The fact is, Fascist Germany is becoming more and more exhausted and weaker and weaker while the Soviet Union is more and more developing its reserves and becoming ever stronger. Time is working against Fascist Germany." Would Congressman MCCORMACK say that in those words Mr. Stalin is taking a position in favor of negotiated peace or unadulterated appeasement?

Will Mr. MCCORMACK now arise in his place in the House and denounce Premier Stalin as he had previously denounced Mr. Hoover for an expression of the same opinion? No, he will not. Not this year or any other year. There is no New Deal necessity for smacking Mr. Stalin down but the new dealers do feel there is political necessity to try to diminish the stature of Herbert Hoover.

If war-torn and ravaged Russia is becoming ever stronger and the dictator of its government believes that time is working against Fascist Germany, it would certainly appear, as Mr. Hoover said, "Time runs in our favor." Our favor means in favor of a nation whose losses in men and materials, as great as they have been to date, have been insignificant as compared to Russia's. Even Mr. MCCORMACK must agree that while Germany is growing weaker—even though far from exhausted—our strength is just beginning to be felt. That is what our Commander in Chief and our competent military leaders tell us.

Mr. MCCORMACK'S speech, obviously carefully prepared, was not the heated outburst of a moment, coming out of the hurly-burly of debate in which men do not always have opportunity to carefully weigh their words. If it could be accounted for by a momentary loss of temper, it might be forgiven, although not overlooked. The speech attacking Herbert Hoover was a "set" speech. Its text was premeditated and thought out well in advance of its presentation. Ever the constant and germane interruptions of Congressman JOSEPH MARTIN did not deter Mr. MCCORMACK from continuing with his carefully prepared text. One wonders who asked Mr. MCCORMACK to make the speech, and which of the administration's ghost writers, sitting on a soft bureaucratic cushion and subsisting on taxpayers' money, turned it over to the distinguished New Deal House leader for parrot-like rendition. The speech couldn't have been prompted by Harry Hopkins or some other nonelective official in high place, could it?

It is not hard, of course, to determine the reason for New Deal petulance, which exhibits itself every time Herbert Hoover is called on to perform a needed and laudatory public service. All too often to suit the New Deal Mr. Hoover is completely right and the New Deal is tragically wrong. That great man has a backlog of successful practical experience in dealing with the very matters—food production and distribution—that the New Deal is fumbling and bungling at the expense of a patriotic but angry, distrustful, disgusted, and aroused American public.

Mr. Hoover's recent appearance before Senator JOHN BANKHEAD'S subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and the forthright way in which he analyzed and gave solutions for the pressing problems inherent in 1943 food production, was too well received on both sides of Capitol Hill and by the American public to be at all palatable to the New Deal.

Numerous Democratic Senators, not of New Deal persuasion, have made enthusiastic public acknowledgment of Mr. Hoover's splendid

contribution toward the solution of the acute problem of feeding ourselves and our Army, while we are feeding armies and the civil populations of those allied with us in this life and death struggle. It is clear that the administration does not want Herbert Hoover, talking from the largest mass feeding experience any man in recorded history has ever had, and from his experience as Food Administrator in the First World War, to raise his voice against bungling and inefficient New Deal planning and administration.

Most well-informed Americans, and particularly those who saw him meet and master many emergencies in the First World War, believe that if Herbert Hoover had been placed in charge of food production and distribution activities this phase of our war program would not have developed into a maelstrom of confusion and mismanagement, bordering on the disgraceful.

A less partisan administration—one that actually wanted the national unity it is constantly calling for in the Halls of Congress, in the press and over the air—would long since have endeavored to requisition the services of Herbert Hoover for the most important emergency post in our entire war-making program. However, the New Deal believes that all experience gained B. T. N. D. (before the New Deal), even though that experience was as capable public servants, is utterly valueless.

It is disgusting, and a matter of real concern to millions of citizens, that even at this late date the new dealers continue their efforts to smear Mr. Hoover in the Charles Michelson tradition. The unlamented Michelson may be gone, but the aroma of his tactics lingers on. The time is long past when the smearing of Mr. Hoover by New Deal "yes men" is given any credence by the American public, which has had ample time in which to properly evaluate his service to our country and to mankind the world over. The Hoover smear formula is outdated and outmoded. This latest attempt, mouthed by Congressman McCormack, and seconded by "Comrade" Earl Browder, reached scurrilous and nauseating depths when his remarks were falsely but not at all cleverly construed as contributing to a program of appeasement. If Mr. McCormack's horizon was country-wide, he would know that Mr. Hoover's friends and admirers in the Democratic Party, as well as in Republican and nonpartisan ranks, have increased by millions, while New Deal prestige has fallen to an all-time low. Of course, he has made no friends among Communists. His viewpoints and his unswering allegiance to the system of free enterprise are not calculated to win him friends there.

There can be no denying that New Deal prestige has fallen to a 10-year low. I refer Mr. McCormack and other new dealers to the election of November 3, 1942. Taking the country as a whole, the vote cast against New Deal candidates was considerably greater than the vote cast for them. In fact, the Democratic Party can thank the new dealers for making it the minority party, which it was actually proved to be by the balloting on November 3. The greatly increased majority by which Congressman Bennett of Missouri was elected, after the death of his greatly mourned father, at a special election in mid-January of this year, gives further attestation to the fact that the current is running with swifter irresistibility than ever against the new dealers and their left-wing associates.

New Deal desperation is great. Mr. McCormack dared not attack the majority of the American people who voted against the New Deal on election day. In that he profited by Winchell's mistake. You remember Winchell, Congressman. He is the hand lotion salesman who is an active, inactive, active, inactive officer of the United States Naval Reserve, who shouts in anguish every time the American people show disregard for his intemperate mouthings. So, too wary to attack the American majority, Mr. McCormack gives outlet to his frustration by attacking an outstanding member of the opposing political party, who, over the years has had the courage and foresight to oppose iniquitous attempts to force collectivism on a free people. Well, Congressman McCormack will find the public heavily armored against the blanks he is shooting.

Mr. Hoover's place in the hearts of his fellow Americans is too secure to be disturbed by intemperate and sneering attacks from the leader of a very tenuous House majority.

Mr. McCormack's position these days must be one of great humiliation. He is a majority leader without a majority he can call his own. He is finding that new dealers can no longer drive Jeffersonian Democrats, who believe in orderly Constitutional processes, into shotgun weddings with them on matters legislative. Day after day his leadership suffers galling defeat. He is unable to command, in fact, a majority that exists on paper. His title is a hollow one.

When the voters sent dozens of new dealers into political oblivion on November 3, they freed dozens of other Democratic Congressmen of the fear of reprisals from the New Deal if they didn't stultify themselves and do as they were told. And in passing it may be said that it isn't the voters' fault that so many defeated new dealers are finding their way back to Washington and on Government pay rolls. Those responsible for reviving "lame ducks" will soon be dead political ducks themselves. The November 3 election, to put it mildly, made the majority over which Mr. McCormack presides, a less tractable one. He is finding that the House of Representatives is intent on recovering and retaining the constitutional powers that he, as majority leader, in the recent past, so blithely and on order turned over to an organized New Deal bureaucracy.

By now Mr. McCormack must know that the majority of voters no longer trust the New Deal. The voters want the administration to go forward efficiently with the prosecution of the war. They want the administration to clean house and eliminate many thousands of arrogant, inefficient, bungling bureaucrats. They want the administration to stop pitting class against class in America. Mr. Wallace, to the contrary notwithstanding, we are not yet all middle class. The voters want the administration to quit truckling to labor leaders at the expense of all of the rest of the public—including the men in uniform. They want it to actually practice some of the unity it preaches.

The voters want the administration to quit immediately its continuing effort to collectivize the American people, 130,000,000 of whom are being used as guinea pigs in experiments in stateism. Most of all, the voters want the administration, from the White House down to the most inconspicuous bureaucrats, to quit playing politics in this time of national peril and permit the 1944 elections and the maneuvering for a fourth term to wait until 1944. What's more, Mr. Lambertson, the American people are going to see to it that these wants are fulfilled. Until the New Deal gets in step with the rest of the country Mr. McCormack will continue to be the House leader of a diminishing and unmanageable so-called majority—pending the time he and his ilk are dispossessed in 1944.

New Deal shortcomings cannot be covered up with reckless and unwarranted attacks on Herbert Hoover and others who exercise the American right to speak their minds on the vital problems of the day. Responsible statesmen, with the interest of their country at heart, should not have time for that type of cheap by-play. Attacks on Mr. Hoover merely highlight New Deal ineffectiveness and spleen.

If Mr. McCormack and his New Deal followers in the House do not see the error of their ways they will continue to play, under the roof of the Capitol Building, the same role the dummy guns play on the roof of the House Office Building. Those dummy guns, which until recently you thought were potent enough to protect Congressmen, looked efficient and effective. But it developed they were impotent. They have no fire power. They couldn't cause an extra flutter of the wing of a Washington starling. Under the New Deal House leadership has descended to dummy status. That leadership pulls the trigger and lo, nothing happens. It has no ammunition.

With kindest personal regards to you, an American legislator who never hesitates to fight the enemies of constitutional government and who always has plenty of ammunition, I am,

Faithfully,

Raymond S. Richmond.

A Backward Step for Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been called to the fact that there is a bill pending before the Legislature of Arkansas that would permit municipalities to own and operate their electric power systems. I was surprised to learn that the house had voted adversely on that measure; and I feel that its action in the matter was prompted by a misunderstanding.

Arkansas has every natural resource necessary for the generating of electricity—coal, gas, oil, and water power. Yet her people pay among the highest rates and enjoy about the lowest per capita consumption of any State in the Union.

In 1941 the people of Arkansas used 602,556,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $15,377,100. Under the T. V. A. rates, the cost would have been $8,032,422, or $7,344,678 less. Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the cost would have been $6,122,581, or $9,254,519 less. Under the Bonneville rates, the cost would have been $6,233,668, or $9,143,432 less. Under the Ontario, Canada, rates, the cost would have been $7,101,066, or $8,276,034 less.

Thus it will be seen that the ultimate consumers of electricity in Arkansas paid anywhere from $7,344,678 to $9,143,432 too much for their electricity during that year.

I know it will be charged by the opposition that the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Tacoma Light and Power System, the Bonneville Administration, and the Ontario, Canada, Power Commission pay no taxes. That is a mistake as to all of them except as to the Ontario Power Commission.

The Tennessee Valley Authority pays taxes to the States and to the counties

in which it operates, and the municipal distribution systems pay money in lieu of taxes into the town or city treasuries, to say nothing of the free services rendered. But suppose the T. V. A. and these municipal systems paid no taxes at all and rendered no free services, then compare these rates with the rates paid in Arkansas and see what the overcharges would be.

The record shows that in 1936, the last year for which the figures are available, all the taxes paid, cash contributions made and free services rendered by both the public and private power concerns in the State of Arkansas amounted to only $1,345,034. Take that amount from the $7,344,678 overcharges paid by the electric light and power consumers in Arkansas during the year of 1941, according to the T. V. A. rates, and it will leave a net overcharge of $5,999,644, or approximately $6,000,000, in round numbers—which would be an average of $80,000 for every one of the 75 counties in Arkansas, or the value of 800 bales of cotton to the county, on an average, at 20 cents a pound.

Take the amount of the taxes, $1,345,034, from overcharges according to the Tacoma rates amounting to $9,143,432, and it will leave a net overcharge of $7,798,398. That would amount to an average of more than $100,000, or the value of 1,000 bales of cotton, on an average, to every county in Arkansas. And yet the Tacoma municipal system pays a higher percentage of taxes, or money in lieu of taxes, or a larger amount compared with the amount of electricity used than do the private power concerns in Arkansas.

I was surprised to note that some of the representatives from the rural counties voted against this measure on the theory it would merely help the incorporated towns. That is a mistake. Wherever we have reduced light and power rates to the consumers within the municipalities of an area it has resulted in a reduction of light and power rates to the people living in the rural districts, and municipal ownership of the power facilities has aided us greatly in extending power lines to the farmers throughout the surrounding territory.

You may say that I do not represent the people of Arkansas in this House, and that I should not be interested in this proposition, but I am interested in it from a national standpoint, and I know that unless the municipalities of Arkansas are permitted to own their light and power systems, it will be impossible to break the stranglehold the utilities now have on the people of that State.

Arkansas is rich in natural resources of all kinds, and if permitted to use those resources for the benefit of the people of Arkansas, they will have spread out before them the most high, exciting, gratifying prospect that ever confronted the people of any nation or any clime.

But if this action on the part of the legislature of that great State is to stand, it will blast the hopes and check the progress of the people of that proud commonwealth, perhaps for generations to come—to say nothing of its effect on the rest of the Nation.

Address by Walter Myers at the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association Luncheon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, Walter Myers, the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, a brilliant son of Indiana and an outstanding Democratic leader of our State, was the guest speaker of the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association at its annual meeting in Indianapolis on February 27. His speech was received with the greatest enthusiasm.

By unanimous consent of the House, I present his address for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was as follows:

The last time I addressed the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association and its friends the world was at peace. The Republican Party was in power in State and Nation. The Democratic Party that went down fighting for its principles as always was seeking to come back and put those principles into practice for the national health and the general good. For the Democratic is the only political party that has survived from the earliest days of the Republic and acted as pallbearer at the funerals of fathers, grandfathers, and great-grandfathers of the Republican and other parties too numerous to mention. Democratic leaders had faith in those party principles even as today, and the Democratic editors were to a great degree mouthpieces of that faith.

At that time there was doubt and uncertainty, chaos and confusion, decay and dissolution in national affairs. After a cruel and inhuman war that sapped our resources and stymied our production for civilian uses, the Henry Cabot Lodges and the James E. Watsons sabotaged a common peace with the Allied nations and made an insubstantial treaty of their own. Out of supplying pressing needs for things that had been curtailed by war, there came an inflated prosperity, a prosperity that burst like a bubble and left not even gas behind in 1929. Factories stood idle. Farmers could not sell their crops and produce, and therefore could not meet payments on their mortgages. Millions went hungry for want of a job. Banks broke by the thousand. The savings of lifetimes became nothing but red figures on a ledger sheet. There was misery and suffering unequaled in all the country's history. About the only money to be made was in the administration of bankrupt estates. The Republicans who had always boasted of jobs for everybody, fat pay envelopes and full dinner pails were as helpless as a catfish in a cornfield. Their gills opened and shut. They flopped around. Dirt stuck to their hides. But they did nothing constructive to relieve the situation. The people of the country, not for the first time when they got fooled, came to the mourner's bench, prayed for the remission of sins, and turned to the Democratic Party for salvation. They elected Franklin D. Roosevelt to guide their destinies and apply that faith which these Democratic editors had for so long a time been uttering like empty cries resounding in a wilderness.

Here in Indiana as late as 1940 when backsliding began to set in, Henry F. Schricker was elected to become one of the greatest Governors the State has ever had. He, your able State chairman, Fred F. Bays, and the members of the Democratic State committee have kept their heads—and best of all their political integrity—when all around them seemed to be losing theirs.

The fateful years since 1932 are written in the record. In an inaugural speech long to be remembered, President Roosevelt banished fear and restored faith and confidence in our financial institutions. Banks quit going broke and what was such a disastrous commonplace in the administration of Mr. Hoover became a rarity, almost not recurring. President Roosevelt got the wheels of factories moving. He provided jobs. He aided agriculture. He laid plans for security. He applied the principle of Thomas Jefferson that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights and that, as a part of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the rights and obligations of the many mean more than the rights of a few who demand their rights but pass the obligations on to someone else.

Just as the Nation, under this kind of leadership, was emerging from crisis, an Austrian paperhanger by name of Adolf Schickelgruber went berserk. Like a bully strutting down the street and beating little boys, he blitzkrieged weak and defenseless little nations. With him a blitzkrieg was to knock the boy down with a billy when he wasn't looking and then jump on him after he was down. Of course, if all the little boys had ganged up together, they would have stopped the bully. But they didn't and the bully grew with what he fed on to become the most criminal, horrid, and repulsive monster of all time. As water seeks its own level, so he sought his own kind. He found the vulture Mussolini waiting to dip his beak in the blood of his neighbor's bodies and the slimy serpent Hirohito-Tojo wriggling through jungle, marsh, and sea to strike with his fangs and swallow down the work of other men's hands while claiming a fake blood kinship with the rising sun.

Schickelgruber the unspeakable had plans for world-wide conquest, world-wide domination, world-wide slavery, and world-wide rule by a master race of monsters like himself. In his mind's eye, the jump from the hump of northwest Africa to the hump of northeast Brazil was but another step in his pilfering progress. To realize the extent of his machinations and plotting, note the attitude of Argentina standing alone in South America at the present time while all her neighbors have rallied to the banner of righteousness.

President Roosevelt saw the shadows of coming events and felt the increasing chill of their shade. He caused the Nation to be organized for defense—for defense, never for aggression. He secured bases in the Atlantic from Iceland to Trinidad. He began to build a navy and an army. He established selective service. He put his hand to the wheel, stepped on the gas and was off to break in that new machine with which to defend against brutality, treachery, and infamy.

Then came a gray day in Washington. The low-hung clouds of a Sunday morning bespoke a drab, impending gloom. It was December 7, 1941. While emissaries bowed and scraped and smiled like the villians that they were, the Jap serpent struck his blow of undying infamy at Pearl Harbor. History records no more treacherous, sneaking, and revolting act.

Our answer was heard wherever men have ears to hear. Today the reveille of the American soldier goes with the dawn around the world and wakes up patriots who fight for liberty and justice wherever tyranny threatens even as their fathers fought at Belleau Wood and along the Marne or their forbears at Lexington and Yorktown. Bataan, Wake Island, and the sea battle of the Solomon Islands inspire Americans to look through tears with solemn pride. The jungles of South Sea Islands cannot choke, the deserts of an-

cient Africa cannot wither their tenacious purpose. They will break the back of the serpent. They will wring the necks of the Hunnish black eagle and the vulture.

Yes, we are in a war. It is a war of defense, a war not of our own choosing, a war which we sought to avoid to the last syllable uttered by hypocrites while their fellow conspirators were bombing Pearl Harbor. To win this war calls for our lives, our fortunes, and our honor. To ourselves we must be true. Americans never will be slaves, and win we will or die.

To win is to call for sacrifice, inconvenience, stint, and dislocation of our habits. Think of the chunk of time that is being sliced from the lives of our men who will come back. Think of eternity for those who will not. Think of the cost, the burden of debt. All this has been thrust upon us. We must meet it like the free people that we are and propose to remain. We are going to sustain those principles of Thomas Jefferson as they apply to all men everywhere. Then if they fail, the fault is in themselves and not in us.

We must think straight. These boys of ours will be coming back some day. When they do, they are going to run this land for at least a generation. Who has a better right to preserve the Nation's principles in time of peace than those who fought to protect them in time of peril? It will not be a matter of pressure groups nor a fight between labor and capital. It will be those who fought for all the people demanding government for all the people by all the people.

On this same day our Republican brethren whom we regard as being no less patriotic than ourselves are being addressed by Col. Robert H. McCormick, great publisher—of the Chicago Tribune—great critic, and the greatest fault finder on earth. If, as, and when he gets to heaven, he will probably find fault with the flowery beds of ease. On that score, a million years in any kind of a bed might become—shall we say, monotonous?—especially with the kind of bedfellows that politics makes. Which might pose the further question whether editors and politicians ever get to heaven and to occupy flowery beds of ease at all.

The colonel must have started looking for motes in his brothers' eyes at birth. He has been at it ever since. He is a great political amphibian. For if he has no Democrats to find fault with, then he turns his attention to Republicans, many of whom had been Democrats for a long time but never found it out until 1932. Every now and then he gets so confused or disgusted, as the case may be, and he and the Tribune—the colonel and the Tribune are Siamese twins—supports a Democrat for mayor of Chicago, which proves that occasionally he does know a good thing when he sees it.

The colonel has announced that he will speak on the subject A Newspaper's Responsibility to Its Readers. By the way, can any of you editors tell me what is the world's greatest newspaper? Ergo, I take it that the colonel will talk about his alter ego, "the Trib," if that is not being too intimate.

Well, I read the "Trib"—the colonel will doubtless say I'm a better man for a' that—and since the days when Herbert Hoover was a great humanitarian, I notice that the colonel's pet of pet peeves has been President Roosevelt. He has been finding fault with him ever since he flew to the Democratic convention, invaded his city, captured his bailiwick, and eventually received the unconditional surrender of his stronghold in 1932.

His newspaper, in whose columns a long time ago I saw Democrats referred to as "the great unwashed," suddenly sent our party to the laundry and began to cartoon Democrats in caps and gowns. The lowliest Democrat, by inference, must have had at least one college degree. He even endowed our rank and file with university ideas. The smug old Republican who used to be depicted in a Prince Albert coat and carrying bags of money must have lost his shirt in the depression of 1929, for the colonel began to dress him up in overalls or a shoddy sack suit and gave him the alias, John Q. Public. He published able editorials about idle factories but never suggested how to get smoke clouds pouring out of their chimneys. He fought windmills for the farmer, but failed to point out a better market for his crops. He deplored as only "the Trib" can deplore the foreclosure of mortgages, but never mentioned a method to get them paid off. He shed heartfelt tears over the hungry who could not find work, but he presented no plan to get them jobs. He wrung his literary hands over busted banks and vanished savings, but proposed no way to stop the disaster. He wept plantively about national misery, but provided no blueprint to get comfort or security. His squeal rose high above the shrill staccato of those innocent hogs that the then Secretary of Agriculture WALLACE consigned to a carefree eternity.

The colonel was inclined to blame it all on President Roosevelt. So his twig had been bent. In the preceding administration he had been blaming a few things on President Hoover—there were no Democrats in office to blame things on then—but a blame on Hoover as to a blame on Roosevelt was as a mustard seed to that of an alligator pear which "the Trib" would punctiliously call an avocado. When President Roosevelt did something of which the colonel really approved, I bet it made him so mad that he could have bitten a ten-penny nail in two—or should I have said bit? "The Trib" once tried to reform spelling but seems to have lost its enthusiasm in trying to reform the Roosevelts. When a still repentant people reelected F. D. R. President by the votes of every State except Maine and Vermont—well, they were all out of step but the colonel, even in Illinois, the sphere of his greatest influence. You can understand—it's not much fun being a drum major and not out in front of the band.

Came the war, as the novelists would say. The colonel had been anti to a lot of things in his time. But his favorite aunt of antis was the war. It took Pearl Harbor to make him follow the flag outside the continental limits of the United States. The colonel got out and dusted off his commission, unfurled his flag, polished his sword, and rhetorically declared that those who live by the sword should perish by it.

The colonel has never told us just where to strike the enemy or when or how. He has never said whether we need bases for defense or where or how to get them. He has not showed how to get an army without selective service. He has not devised a way to finance the war without high taxes or a big national debt. He has not proved how to supply our armed forces without a highly organized industry and agriculture here at home.

He has complained of official blundering at Washington. Of course, mistakes have been made. What nation ever won a war without making mistakes? But the President has a way of correcting them. All of you have noticed that big mistakes are usually followed by an exchange of letters. One begins, "Dear Mr. President: I hereby resign." The other, "Dear Jake or John or Jimmy" (as the case may be): "You don't know how much you will be missed."

Furthermore, President Harding, Senator Lodge, Senator Watson, and their kind made a mistake which, in my opinion, permitted this present World War. If they had not prevented our country from making a common peace with the Allied Nations, if a common front had been maintained, not even the intuitioned Schickelgruber would have dared to break faith and attack. If those half-finished warships costing hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money had not been sunk in the ocean, we would have been that much nearer to a two-ocean navy in 1941. Again, has anybody heard of anyone asking for a C card for those two cars which Mr. Hoover was going to put in every garage to match those two chickens in every pot? The colonel may say that what Presidents Harding and Hoover did were not mistakes, that the gremlins did it.

Now, if Colonel McCormick has a better mousetrap than President Roosevelt, the world will tramp a path to his office instead of to the White House and the royal heads of Europe would be checking their crowns and ermine coats in the Tribune Building in Chicago. The same would be true even if the colonel had nothing more than a better flypaper. The old adage still holds that molasses catches more flies than vinegar. But to catch nefarious Nazis, vulturous Mussolinis, and jingo Japs with neither conscience, honor, nor souls, it takes ships, planes, tanks, guns, bombs, supplies without end, and above all that indomitable leadership that inspires indomitable courage in those who bear the brunt and toil in the heat of the day. Barbed invectives, split infinitives, blood-curdling adjectives, and venomous editorials never yet have won a war. Constructive criticism is what counts and officials in Washington welcome constructive criticism, fresh ideas, and new viewpoints. Such is one of the fundamental purposes of a free press in a free country. Fresh ideas are more powerful than secret weapons because they enable the President and his administration to formulate sound and winning policies. With sound policies based on mature judgment and backed up by a united people we cannot fail.

At this moment isolation is determined by events, conditions, circumstances, and forces over which we have no control. Suppose great powers should attempt to isolate us? There might come a time when we would have to fight for national existence. In fact, we are fighting for self-preservation and national existence at this very moment. Suppose Schickelgruber and Hirohito won this war. Can you not see what they would do to a rich land like this? If you think your tax burdens are heavy now, imagine what they would be in such a case. Schickelgruber came into power whining about the injustices of the Versailles Treaty. As soon as he got into France, he levied taxes on the French people that made the treaty makers of Versailles look like pikers. Look what he has done in Holland, Denmark, and Norway who had nothing whatsoever to do with the Treaty of Versailles. There is only one way open—we must win this war if it takes every one of us and everything we have.

At another critical time in the history of our country the wise old Benjamin Franklin said that we must hang together or hang separately. The Jap and German concept is freedom for the dictator, slavery for everybody else. We are fighting for our homes today just as much as if the battles were being fought in our back yards. Homes are something more than mere houses and yards. They are our ideal of what goes to make life worth while. Our peace and happiness is our greatest good. Our country's flag is the emblem of peace for all our homes and happiness together.

What is it that makes Americans fight to the last and die for such an ideal?

It is the springtime shaking the odors of its buds and blossoms on the morning air. It is autumn splashing every hue and color on frosted leaves about to go to sleep. It is a summer cloud casting a fleeting shadow on a field of waving grain, or a cornfield locking the golden sunshine in its ears. It is a gray sky shivering into snow at Christmas time.

It is the work of busy men and women at their daily tasks. It is the horse whistle of the night express, the whirr of an airplane at a dizzy height or the zoom of an automobile going up the road. It is the plowed furrow and the smell of fresh soil, the fragrance of new-mown hay, or perhaps the smell of a stable. It is a weary country doctor returning from a visit in the night. It is mother in her kitchen and the aroma of coffee and frying bacon. It may be just a piece of angel's food cake.

It is the memory of a lot of little things that makes our boys fight like demons on the far-flung fronts. Perhaps initials carved on the bark of a beech, a dogwood blooming in the underbrush or a haw tree in a shady lane. It may be a handshake on the street or a pat on the head of a neighbor's child. It may be the echo of a church organ that has died away these many years or the droning voices of children saying their lessons in school—long ago. It may be just a little mound on which a kindly nature has woven a coverlet of grass and flowers. It is all of our substance, part of our being and the memory of our lives. That is the vibrant spirit, that is the unseen flag whose fluttering folds wave in the inmost heart and inspire me to do and die that others may have freedom more abundantly, as they have died on every battlefield from Lexington to the hills and shores of North Africa.

That spirit knows no politics, no race, no creed. To it we dedicate our all in the fervent hope that when the tumult dies we shall still be rich in the souls of our millions living and proud of the deeds of our noble dead.

Mme. Chiang's Speech in Madison Square Garden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek reprinted from the New York Times of March 3, 1943:

To all my friends in America, including those of you who have come here to listen to me this evening, I wish to express to you my heartfelt appreciation of your concern for me and your thoughtfulness for my well-being, which you have so generously demonstrated in various ways during my illness and convalescence.

I wonder whether I can convey to you how deeply touched I am that so many people from every section of America have taken the time and trouble to send me messages of affection and good will. I wish I could acknowledge every one of the many thousands of letters and telegrams which I have received. But since this is impossible, will you not let me take this opportunity to thank you one and all?

I wish, too, that it were possible for me to accept your invitations to visit your States, cities, colleges, churches, and other organizations. To my regret, however, my doctors will not allow me to do all that you so wish me to do, and which I would so like to do. But I know that you will understand the wisdom of their decision when you consider that 11 weeks is but a short time in which to recover from the strain of 6 long years of war, and that I must conserve as much as possible some strength to enable me to continue my work in China.

THOUGHTS IN HOSPITAL RECALLED

Since I came out of the hospital many of you have asked me to give my impressions of America. My reply has been that, whatever impressions I have gained are not deep and comprehensive enough to enable me to give a really worth-while answer. I think nevertheless that you may be interested in sharing with me some thoughts which surged through my mind during my convalescence. Mind you, they are thoughts only, not erudite opinions and conclusions formed after deep and prolonged study. I can only hope that, such as they are, they will touch a responsive chord in your hearts and will prove helpful in your own thinking.

We live in the present, we dream of the future, but we learn eternal truths from the past. It would be just as irrational for a man to claim that he was self-made as for a nation to believe that it could be self-sufficient. Nations and individuals are but links between the past and the future. It would be interesting and valuable, therefore, for us to consider the deep meaning which lies behind the Chinese proverb: "Watch the cart ahead," in our endeavor to avoid the pitfalls in which former civilization, dynasties, and systems have fallen.

Those pitfalls are many, but one of the deepest and most omnivorous is pride. That pitfall has swallowed many whose arrogance led them to think that they could safely and permanently defy mankind's deep-rooted sense of justice and right-dealing. Figuratively speaking, it was only yesterday that Herr Hitler said: "No human power can ever oust the Germans from Stalingrad." Where are those Germans today?

JAPANESE BOAST CITED

Again, in July 1937 Prince Konoye said: "We shall bring China cringing to her knees within 3 months." How many 3 months have elapsed since he said that? And China still fights on.

Those utterances by two of the most deeply dyed aggressors were inspired by unrighteous pride run absolutely mad. But there is another kind of pride, a rightful pride, which my countrymen possess. I am reminded of two little Chungking incidents which bear testimony to the pride to which I have alluded. After the first of the terrible bombings to which Chungking was thereafter increasingly subjected, free congee (rice gruel) centers were established for those of our people whose homes had been demolished and reduced to charred ruins, and who consequently were unable to prepare their food.

Many declined to accept this help on the ground that they had suffered no more than others and preferred to fend for themselves. It was only when they were told that they were entitled to the food since they were contributing their share in the national effort to combat aggression that they were prevailed upon to accept any at all.

Again, when the generalissimo and I placed our cars at the disposal of the organization charged with the evacuation of civilians in view of the bombings, as soon as the évacuées learned to whom these cars belonged, they refused to ride in them on the ground that our duties to the Nation were too important to be impeded.

APPRECIATES AMERICAN AID

It is this kind of pride that governs our people's attitude toward America today. We are genuinely and warmly appreciative of the assistance that the American people have given to our effort in the common cause. It is not only since my visit to your beautiful country that we have become aware of the affection and friendship which your people have for ours. Throughout these heartbreaking years, when we have been daily faced with the hardships which the people of an invaded land have to suffer, we have been heartened to carry on by the knowledge of your sympathy.

I have received innumerable letters and messages from your people in large cities and in small country towns—from businessmen, farmers, factory workers, professors, ministers, college and high-school students, hard-working mothers, and even little children. Contributions large and small have poured in; some people sent money orders of one or two dollars and even less, and oftentimes accompanied by the wish that they could do more. These gifts spelled real sacrifice on the part of the givers, and in the eyes of our people they were multiplied a thousandfold and illuminated by the beauty of the spirit of the donors.

We thank you wholeheartedly for what you have done and are doing for our suffering people, all the more because in this present world struggle we are giving unstintingly the flower of our manhood and everything else we have in contributing our part in this titanic fight for a free and just world. I say all this because I feel that you are entitled to know how the Chinese people today think and the national characteristic upon which that thinking is based.

REVIEWS ANCIENT HISTORY

Without necessarily possessing a very profound knowledge of the history of the world, we can take warning from the fate of the Roman and Persian Empires and the ephemeral system established by Napoleon. Rome, in the earlier days, had liberal enough political ideas. Perhaps you will recall that in the second century in the year of our Lord a Roman recorder wrote that the laws of Rome only became effective because the people delegated to the senate the power to make them. The imperium or power admittedly rested in the people.

The august title of imperator under the Republic signified no more than the present-day title of "general," and was bestowed by the soldiers upon their victorious leaders. The honors conferred upon Augustus as prince of the senate by the Romans in reality far transcended any honor claimed for monarchs some 2,000 years later in accordance with the theory of the divine right of kings. Thus we see that the power of the leader stemmed from the people, and to claim divine rights and privileges was usurpation of the natural rights of men.

All the peoples in the Roman Empire could become citizens. Some of the emperors even were Syrians or sprang from other foreign origins. There was no racial discrimination as we have it today. The Armenians and other tribes of the so-called barbarian world of that day were accepted, and welcomed as allies of Rome, and not as subject peoples. This broad and practiced concept of the Romans was, I think, the chief cause for the Roman Empire lasting for over a thousand years.

TYRANNY, DICTATORSHIPS LINKED

On the other hand, tyranny and dictatorships have been proven to be short-lived. We ask ourselves why is it that the ancient Persian Empire only remained at its comparative zenith for a few centuries, while the high tide of the Napoleonic era only lasted for a few decades?

We read that Sapor, the Persian Emperor, after defeating the Romans, used the neck of Valerian, the Roman Emperor, as a footstool for mounting his horse. Was it this cruelty and arrogance of the conqueror toward the conquered which contributed to the fall of the dictatorships whose leaders strutted about in a frenzy of exhibitionism during their short day as invincible conquerors and masters?

Let us contrast this with the Chinese way of life as shown in the following historical incident: During the period of the Three

Kingdoms in China, Kuan Kung, a valiant warrior, met Huang Tsung, also a brave warrior, in single combat. With a sweep of his long sword, Kuan Kung cut off the forelegs of his opponent's steed. Horse and rider both toppled to the ground. The vanquished warrior awaited his doom with resignation. The victor, Kuan Kung, however, extended his weaponless hand and cried: "Arise. My sword falls edgeless against a dismounted and unarmed foe."

DARK AGES LAID TO ROMANS

To return to the Roman Empire, its final fall was due, among other things, to the sybaritic and effete practices indulged in by the Roman people. In the declining days of the empire they hired others to do their fighting, while they themselves wallowed in sensualism which culminated in the total eclipse of the Roman Empire in the west. On the heels of the fall of this empire followed the Dark Ages in Europe with all the attendant evil results. To safeguard ourselves against retrogression into another dark age is, I feel, the greatest task now confronting the United Nations.

Whether the principles of freedom, justice, and equality for which we are fighting will be able to stand the strain and stress of the times is a question depending largely on ourselves as individuals and as nations. Convicts are subject to coercion, but it must be remembered that they have proved themselves to be antisocial and had first committed crimes against society. Their exclusion from their fellow men is but a logical consequence of the necessity for expiation, whereas slaves or subject peoples arrive in that estate often through no fault of their own.

The Axis Powers have shown that they have no respect for anything but brute force, and such being the case, they logically hold that conquered peoples should become shackled slaves. They lack the imagination to visualize the fact that a man may be enslaved physically but cannot be controlled in his thoughts and in his innate desire to be free. Nor do they recognize that, if people are deprived of responsibility, there can be no real discipline, for indubitably the highest kind of government is maintained through self-discipline.

TELLS OF RESOLVE TO FIGHT

Nor are they imaginative enough to realize that unrest, however ruthlessly suppressed, will continue to create situations which successive riotings and reforms cannot ameliorate, leaving in their wake only bitterness and determined hatred of the oppressor. The implacable underground hostility of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Low Countries, and France, and the indomitable resolve to keep on fighting as shown by your people, and by my people, and by the peoples of Britain and Russia, attest incontrovertibly to this fact.

The world today is full of catch phrases. Men often pay lip service to ideals without actually desiring and working for their fruition. Fascist Italy has sometimes claimed to be an organized, centralized, and authoritative democracy. Nazi Germany on occasions has also called itself a democracy. Do we of the United Nations wish to follow in their footsteps?

The universal tendency of the world as represented by the United Nations is as patent and inexorable as the enormous sheets of ice which float down the Hudson in the winter. The swift and mighty tide is toward universal justice and freedom.

In furtherance of this tendency, we in China have bled for the last 6 long years to demonstrate our repudiation of the inert and humiliating philosophy that a slow, strangling death is the more merciful though some people in other parts of the world maintain that the absence of hope would prevent the acrimony of a losing fight and leave man's nature untrammeled to compose itself to the mercy of God.

We shall hold firm to the faith that nothing short of race annihilation will ever prevent any people from struggling against wanton domination, whether economic or political. Are we right?

TWO THEORIES ASSAILED

Again, there are peoples who are obsessed by the fear that the stage of economic stagnation has been reached; there are others who preach totalitarian-tinged doctrines of economic autarchy. If we accept these theories, then we must all be self-sufficing, for when any of us lack raw materials and labor, instead of obtaining them through legitimate means of trade and commerce, we would have to resort to the brutalities of invading our neighbors' territories and enslaving the inhabitants.

In reality, neither theory is possible, for the vast and rich unindustrialized hinterlands of China alone would bear witness to the obvious falsity of the former theory. The processes of history, composed of sequence—coexistence and interdependence—just as people in society are inevitably entwined through common interests, common efforts, and common survival, prove to us the folly of the latter theory.

What are we going to make of the future?

What will the revalescing world, recovering from this hideous blood-letting, be like?

The wisest minds in every corner of the world are pondering over these questions, and the wisest of all reserve their opinion. But without letting temerity outrun discretion, I venture to say that certain things must be recognized. Never again must the dignity of man be outraged as it has been since the dawn of history.

SAYS STRENGTH IS A TRUST

All nations, great and small, must have equal opportunity of development. Those who are stronger and more advanced should consider their strength as a trust to be used to help the weaker nations to fit themselves for full self-government and not to exploit them. Exploitation is spiritually as degrading to the exploiter as to the exploited.

Then, too, there must be no bitterness in the reconstructed world. No matter what we have undergone and suffered, we must try to forgive those who injured us and remember only the lesson gained thereby.

The teachings of Christ radiate ideas for the elevation of souls and intellectual capacities far above the common passions of hate and degradation. He taught us to help our less fortunate fellow-beings, to work and strive for their betterment without ever deceiving ourselves and others by pretending that tragedy and ugliness do not exist. He taught us to hate the evil in men, but not men themselves.

Finally, in order that this war may indeed be the war to end all wars in all ages, and that nations, great and small alike, may be allowed to live and let live in peace, security, and freedom in the generations to come, cooperation in the true and highest sense of the word must be practiced. I have no doubt that the truly great leaders of the United Nations, those men with vision and forethought, are working toward the crystallization of this ideal, yet they, too, would be impotent if you and I do not give our all toward making it a reality.

CHINESE EXPERIENCE RETOLD

Over two thousand years ago, during the feudal period, when many little kingdoms coexisted in China, there were two conflicting theories: the principle of imperialism, or lien-heng, and the principle of concerted effort, or hoh-tsung.

The originator of the principle of imperialism, or lien-heng, connived to swallow up the six weaker states by the state of Tsing. The originator of the concerted effort, or hoh-tsung, on the other hand, advocated the union of the six weak states for mutual protection against their dominant neighbor Tsing.

The central idea was, in the event of aggression by the state of Tsing against any of the six states, the others were under moral obligations to come to the assistance of the invaded state. Unfortunately, the six states were lukewarm toward this idea of united effort and did not take any pains for its support, with the result that gradually, one by one, the weaker states were destroyed by the strong state of Tsing. Do we want history to repeat itself?

At the present day I should like to point out that we often use the term "community of nations." If we would only pause to think for a moment, we would realize that the word "community" implies association not of voluntary choice but of force of circumstance. We should, instead, think of ourselves as a society of nations, for society means association by choice. Let us, the United Nations, which have come together by choice, resolve to create a world resting on the pillars of justice, coexistence, cooperation, and mutual respect.

Selfishness and complacency in the past have made us pay dearly in terms of human misery and suffering. While it may be difficult for us not to feel bitterness for the injuries we have suffered at the hands of the aggressors, let us remember that recrimination and hatred will lead us nowhere. We should use our energy to better purpose so that every nation will be enabled to use its native genius and energy for the reconstruction of a permanently progressive world with all nations participating on an equitable and just basis. The goal of our common struggle at the conclusion of this war should be to shape the future so that "this whole world must be thought of as one great state common to gods and men."

Vallejo Rent Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Francisco Chronicle of January 31, 1943:

VALLEJO RENT STORY—CIVIC LEADERS PRESENT THE ARGUMENT FOR LANDLORDS—ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF A CITY SWOLLEN BY WAR RECITED

(By Ralph Rivet)

VALLEJO, January 30.—The story of Vallejo is not a story of a city waiting for naval heroes to return to gouge them for exhorbitant rents and prices.

But there is a story here. A story of accomplishment and achievements written under the most adverse conditions in California, perhaps, in the whole Nation, and it is a story which reflects to the everlasting credit of Vallejo and its citizens.

It is a story of a town of 30,000 persons ballooning into a city of 90,000 in a year and a half, the story of a community of average

Americans doing everything in their means to help their fellow Americans.

It is a story written by thousands of skilled mechanics who have set more production records in their work at the Mare Island Navy Yard than any other similar group of mechanics in the Nation.

It is the story of skilled artisans who fashioned, among the hundreds of vessels they have launched, a craft so sturdy that she fought and won when by all the rules of warfare she should have been sunk. For the U. S. S. *San Francisco* was built here.

It is the story, too, of hundreds of these navy yard families taking other families into their homes—people from Arizona, Oklahoma, Missouri, South Dakota, Indiana, Kansas, Texas, and practically every State in the Union.

Because these Vallejoans wanted the extra income from the rent? Not when they have had steady employment for years and years. Not when they face no uncertain financial future.

MOST LANDLORDS NOT PROFITEERS

They took them into their homes because there was no other place for these incoming families—men, women, and children—people brought here at the request of naval authorities to build and repair ships of war.

They took them into their homes because Vallejoans don't let fellow Americans sleep in the street or in their cars.

But Vallejo knows there are abuses and wishes it had the power to correct them—abuses which fester and grow with the endless tide of incoming workers. And at the same time Vallejo is proud of the fact that a vast majority of its landlords are not profiteers.

In fact, so proud is it of its record that Vallejo will match it with any war-swollen city in the State.

For out of 3,000 complaints and petitions on file at the local Office of Price Administration, rent division, only 33 resulted in compulsory rent reductions and 72 other cases were set up for proceedings.

What of the other 2,895 cases?

They were petitions from landlords, in the most part, who sought the redress they were entitled to under the price law.

They were petitions from landlords who objected, for example, to renting a house to a family and then having rooms rented out to as many persons as could be crowded in and the nonproperty owner proceeding to make a young fortune out of the place which the real owner was renting at a fair figure.

Who is a typical Vallejo landlord?

THE MAHONYS ARE TYPICAL

Well, you could point to H. G. Mahony, 151 Daniels Avenue. He is a woodworker in the navy yard, has worked there for years and years. His wife is a stenographer. When it became almost impossible to hire stenographers here she agreed to go back to work. She is now employed with the Solano County Planning Commission.

The Mahonys have two places. They have a little house and a larger one. They raised their two sons in the larger home. But when the boys went away, they moved into the little house, which had been vacant for years and years. The larger place they rented to a family which needed it more than they.

Of course, they would be more comfortable in the larger place. They obviously don't need the money. But with their two boys gone, there isn't so much need for room now.

One boy is at the University of California and soon will be in the service.

The other is Capt. Grattan (Grant) Mahony, who won the Distinguished Flying Cross fighting with MacArthur in the Philippines and on Bataan, the boy who battled Japs from Manila to Java, from New Guinea to Bombay, who now leads a fighter wing over the Burma Road.

Another typical Vallejo landlord? Well, there is the ——— family, who live on the edge of town in a big, new house. They have two separate upstairs bedrooms.

The rooms are reserved for Navy personnel off ships in port, officers or enlisted men, whoever calls first, like the officers and men of the *San Francisco*.

And the price of these rooms? They cost exactly nothing. The family will not accept money from servicemen for the use of the rooms, the linens, towels, or the breakfast Mrs. ——— prepares for them every morning.

Vallejo is unbelievably crowded. An actual count shows the normal population concentration of 98 persons inside the city limits rising to the fantastic figure of 278 per city block.

YARD WORKERS ALSO FIND NO HOMES

Vallejo knows that returning naval heroes do not always find accommodations here.

But neither do 17,000 Mare Island employees who still are commuting from distances up to 60 miles in Navy busses because there are no houses for them.

Neither do some 1,500 family men living in what are called single men's dormitories while their families live hundreds or even thousands of miles away because there are no homes to be found here.

Vallejo tried mightily to provide living quarters for all. It spent over $14,000,000 in home construction in 1941, and was well on the way to match that figure in 1942 when the War Production Board and other Government agencies halted all private building except in rare instances.

Vallejo pioneered in the field of controlling rents. In 1938 the city went before the State legislature to get a rent control law, but failed. Its efforts were opposed by the California Apartment House Owners' Association.

Long before a compulsory price-control bill was passed by a reluctant Congress, Vallejo had taken the lead in controlling rents here. It had formed a volunteer fair rents committee, which investigated any cases of profiteering brought to its attention and succeeded in eliminating many abuses.

But the Office of Price Administrator finally came into existence and put an end to this volunteer committee, which had had abnormal success without the whip of fine or imprisonment.

Virtually the last act of the volunteer fair rent committee was to recommend that the fair rent date in Vallejo be established on January 1, 1941, instead of March 1942, as is the case for the majority of the San Francisco Bay Region.

VALLEJO REQUESTED LOWER RENT CEILING

Patriotically and unselfishly, Vallejo invited a lower rent ceiling than the rest of the bay area.

And when objections were raised to the procrastination of the Office of Price Administration here, which let hundreds of cases stack up on desks simply because it had no procedure to follow after the petitions and protests were filed, when a minority group of landlords threatened to strike because they could not get a hearing, when they could not exercise the American right of squawking to those in authority, they were chastised.

The Vallejo Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution condemning their actions.

Just as it knows there have been individual cases of abuse here, Vallejo also knows that it is powerless either to halt those abuses (that's the job which the Office of Price Administration hasn't done yet during its months of existence), and Vallejo knows the solution to more houses lies not in this city.

Its people cannot build more private homes. Federal regulations will prevent that.

The only hope is for continued construction of Federal housing projects. There are now more than 9,000 Federal housing units here now, and more coming.

But 9,000 or even 12,000 housing units won't care for 60,000 extra people plus the many transient Navy officers and men who come here for a few weeks or months while their ships are being repaired.

As it did in the World War, when Vallejo writes the final chapter to its story of war accomplishments, it will say to the world: "Match this, if you can."

Political Strategy Toward Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Italian-American Labor Council:

The Italian-American Labor Council, which represents hundreds of thousands of organized workers, both American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, was formed for the main purpose of contributing to our war effort under the slogan already endorsed by the President of the United States, that "America's victory is Italy's freedom."

Our goal is the triumph of democracy which cannot be achieved without the complete destruction of the military and political power of totalitarianism.

Now that every sign is pointing to an early battle for Italy, our duty toward America and our faith in its ideals, as well as our feelings of sympathy for the enslaved people of Italy, compel us to urge our Government not to place any confidence in men and groups which have been identified with the Fascist regime and its wars.

We don't know for what reason a group of Italian Fascist generals, prisoners of the British, were recently brought to the United States, and we don't see any useful value in the Office of War Information's publicity on short-wave broadcasts in mentioning the presence of those Italian generals in our land.

These generals, having been associated with all recent Fascist war adventures, in Ethiopia, Spain, and Lybia, represent in the eyes of the liberty loving people of Italy the worst features of fascism and the most humiliating shame that fascism ever brought to Italy as a nation.

The intelligent political strategy toward Italy that we urge is that our Government give every assurance to the innocent people of Italy that the territorial integrity of the Italian nation be respected and that the Italian people be free to choose their own form of government, without any possible danger of further totalitarian violences and oppressions.

This kind of policy, the only kind fitted for a great democracy like America, must carefully exclude any compromise with Fascist groups and avoid the mistake of nursing the idea that Mussolini's defeated generals might have a useful role in the liberation of Italy.

We warn our Government that any new kind of "Darlanism", if applied to Italy, would be a costly mistake for our country and for the future of democracy.

We don't want Italy to go from a dictatorship to another dictatorship. We want Italy to be as free as our beloved America.

Resolution of Jewish War Veterans Post, No. 45, of Hartford, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following copy of a resolution adopted by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Hartford Post, No. 45:

Whereas it is the opinion of Hartford Post 45, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, that Commodore Uriah Phillip Levy, one of the most famous figures in early American history, should have a ship of war named after him; and

Whereas the 22d day of April 1943 will be the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of his birth; and

Whereas it is fitting and proper that such a ship of war be named on his birthday to honor the man who at the time of his death was the highest ranking naval officer; and

Whereas he was chiefly responsible for the abolishment of corporal punishment; and

Whereas he was captain of the U. S. S. *Argus*, which destroyed 21 enemy ships in the War of 1812: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Hartford Post 45 requests the honorable Representatives of our State of Connecticut in the Congress of the United States to exert all possible influence in their power to decide that a ship of war be so named "Uriah P. Levy."

Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Italian-American Labor Council:

The speeches by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker follow the long line of reactionary attacks on trade-unions and the attempt by labor to maintain labor's living standards in this country.

Labor is proud of its production record. The words of President Roosevelt, of the heads of the Army and Navy are eloquent testimony to labor's untiring efforts to speed planes, tanks, and guns.

Yet the reactionary forces seek this opportunity to tear down labor's hard-won standards. This is the meaning behind the current attacks on labor. First it was that labor was not working enough hours; the Department of Labor exploded this canard. Then comes the cries of absenteeism, though recent reports of the War Manpower Commission and the Office of War Information show that absenteeism here is less than in England, much less than in the last war, and 9 out of 11 reasons for absenteeism can be placed at the door of the employer. Yet the attacks are unrelenting. The smallest stories about labor are magnified into great crimes. Yet the misdeeds of employers are ignored.

Now Captain Rickenbacker, tours the country accusing labor of shirking a job, though he tells America that we should not place a $25,000 ceiling on incomes because it would rob employers of their incentive. Does Captain Rickenbacker mean that industrialists are not patriotic?

We recognize the heroism of Captain Rickenbacker. Yet this gives him no right to speak on subjects of which he knows little. To Captain Rickenbacker we say: the boys in the foxholes of Guadalcanal and the sands of Tunisia are American union workers.

Also, a few companions of his plane who found death in the Pacific Ocean were union men, both of the American Federation of Labor and of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. While they fight on the battle fronts their living standards back home will not be torn down. Several million trade unionists are in the United States Army. They left to join the Nation's Services leaving behind decent living standards they worked hard to achieve and maintain. We back home will not permit reactionary elements to destroy what these men, now fighting have spent years to build.

Burning a House To Roast a Pig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Merlo Pusey, from the Washington Post, of March 2, 1943:

BURNING A HOUSE TO ROAST A PIG

(By Merlo Pusey)

Down in Mobile, out in Seattle, Detroit, or Buffalo, or right here in Washington, there will soon be enacted little dramas like the following:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION DIRECTOR. I am informed, Mr. Thomas, that the employees making farm tools in your factory are working only 40 hours a week.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right. We went on the 40-hour week after Congress passed the Fair Labor Standards Act penalizing longer hours by requiring time and a half pay for all hours worked over 40.

DIRECTOR. Don't you know that the President has now proclaimed a 48-hour week in areas where labor is scarce? We are in a war. Everyone must work longer hours.

Mr. THOMAS. But I can't put my plant on a 48-hour week now. My contract with the union forbids work beyond 44 hours.

DIRECTOR. The provisions of that contract restricting hours of work have been set aside.

Mr. THOMAS. Has the requirement for payment of overtime for all hours over 40 a week also been set aside?

DIRECTOR. No. You will have to pay your men time and a half for the extra 8 hours a week.

Mr. THOMAS. But that will mean a 30-percent increase in pay. It will force me to pay about 8 percent more than I am now paying for the same number of hours worked. Will the price ceiling on farm tools be lifted to take care of these higher costs of making tools?

DIRECTOR. That's up to the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. THOMAS. Will all of my competitors have their manufacturing costs similarly increased?

DIRECTOR. No. Only those operating in war-boom areas.

Mr. THOMAS. That is gross discrimination. By what authority do you tell me I must break a contract with my employees, which was made in conformity to an act of Congress, and risk bankruptcy by increasing outlays for labor while the prices of my products remain fixed?

DIRECTOR. My authority comes from the regional director, and he gets his authority from War Manpower Commissioner McNutt.

Mr. THOMAS. Has Congress passed a law which permits Mr. McNutt to tell employers not doing war work how many hours their employees must work?

DIRECTOR. No. An order was issued by the President, and I have been instructed to enforce it. I forbid you to hire any workers for this plant, no matter how many leave for other jobs, until you get on a 48-hour week. If you don't get into line right away, I'll have to ask the War Production Board to put you out of business by denying you steel.

This sort of procedure is so foreign to American experience that it cannot possibly go unchallenged, even in wartime. Citizens of this country are accustomed to the enforcement of law. The vast majority of them have a deep-seated respect for the Constitution, for acts of Congress, and for the administrative authority of the executive agencies. But they are not accustomed to obeying confused, illogical, and unfair orders from minor officials which seem to run counter to the law on the statute books. And by attempting to enforce such orders this great democracy is running the dangerous risk of arousing contempt for all law and authority.

If we are honest with ourselves, we must admit that there is not very much difference between the methods about to be employed by the War Manpower Commission to achieve a 48-hour week and the methods employed for similar purposes in Germany, Russia, or Spain. Of course, the penalties to be applied here will be less severe. Violators will not be shot or thrown into concentration camps. But employees may be deprived of their jobs and employers may be put out of business for refusal to comply with the orders of minor officials acting without any direct claim to authority from our legislative body.

The habit of democratic rule is a precious heritage. Lack of that habit in Germany and various other countries, as Guglielmo Ferrero has ably shown, is the basic cause of the chaos in the world today. For when democratic practices are forsaken in the interests of expediency, or when faith in the principles of democracy is undermined, totalitarianism necessarily creeps in. And totalitarianism leads ultimately to terrorism and war to strengthen its own precarious powers.

There is no excuse for the United States even to approach the entrance of this road to disaster. The 48-hour week and every other adjustment that is needed to win this war can be attained by the normal, routine method of passing the appropriate legislation. There is no excuse, even in wartime, to burn down the house to roast the pig. It is time to realize that every time a corner is cut to bypass Congress we are weakening the habit of democratic rule, which after all is the only foundation on which this weary world can hope to build a lasting peace system.

Letter From the Honorable John O'Connor to the Honorable Alfred M. Landon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent given me by the House, I desire to place in the RECORD a copy of a letter from the Honorable John O'Connor, of New York, to the Honorable Alfred M. Landon, former Governor of Kansas, under date of February 19, 1943. Mr. O'Connor has given his consent to the placing of this copy of the letter in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 19, 1943.*
Hon. ALFRED M. LANDON,
Topeka, Kans.

DEAR GOVERNOR: Your Lincoln Day Speech, again, sounded a note of warning to our people, that unless the "real Democrats" and American-thinking Republicans get together in some "coalition," we will be led "down the same disastrous primrose path which Hitler led his people."

That some such path has been plotted by the first lieutenant, Vice President WALLACE, and "his fellow travelers," is as plain as the proverbial nose. Tennessee Valley Authorities on the River Don—Milk Routes in Burma—that's the agenda of "the starry-eyed." Surely, your people, "out where the West begins," never dreamed they would live to see the day when they had to listen to such tommy-rot, mouthed by the "globaloney" slicers.

But whether the "path" resembles the one trod by Shickelgruber or the blood-stained road travelled by Stalin, is debatable, as is also your reference to "Nazi New Dealers."

There is no question but what President Roosevelt personally entertains all the notions and ebullience of the current dictator, but Mr. WALLACE and many of "the fellow travelers" are more disposed to be passengers on the "party line" of Communism. At least it smells that way, around Washington.

It was for that reason that the President, in his most recent radio "report to the Nation," was meticulous not to even mention the word Communism, while be blatantly assailed Nazi-ism and Fascism. The deliberate omission was not for the purpose of saving the feelings of Mr. Stalin. The "Commies" in our country were the ones that must not be offended, at any cost.

You probably also enjoyed his profuse description of the "Pettifogger," and you undoubtedly had the same reaction as most people I have met, that it was an apt, a perfect, administrative family description—"befogging the truth," etc., etc.

In 1940 the Republicans missed one chance for coalition, although it was presented to them most attractively. They had the permission to nominate, for Vice President, one of the best loved Democrats in the Nation.

If the Republicans feel so cocky about the elections of 1942 that they miss the next opportunity for a coalition, in 1944, they may rightly be charged with being greatly responsible for the dynasty which will follow, the fourth term or a crown prince, and which will irretrievably engulf us in nazi-ism or communism—it matters little which.

While our great ally, Great Britain, is keeping both feet on the ground and turning from the threat of Stalinism to that much-maligned conservatism, we are heading fast the other way. Political statistics, in New York City and elsewhere, demonstrate this radical trend of certain voting groups, who, in great numbers, are jumping on the leftist political wagon, which they believe will lead the parade—because the starry-eyed radicals are now up in the driver's seat.

If the Republicans continue to take the hoggish attitude—as to the job of Vice Presidency, because of the accompanying patronage of two or three clerks, for instance—your party will take its place alongside the survivors of the Democratic Party of Jefferson and Jackson and Cleveland and Wilson and kneel at the wailing wall while the parade of the pink donkeys and vermilion elephants passes by.

Among the real Democrats there are a score or more of Americans, such as, for instance, Mr. James A. Farley, General MacArthur, Mr. Harry H. Woodring, a dozen Democratic Senators, such as George, Byrd, Clark, and others, who would do honor to a coalition.

If the Republican Party saw fit to include one of these outstanding Democrats on its official ticket, the same candidates could be placed on a Democratic ticke in most States, to be voted for on election day. If that is letting the "cat out of the bag," the New Dealers might as well know it right now, if they are brazen enough to suggest a fourth term or a selected successor.

Such great unselfish leaders like yourself and Mr. Hoover still buoy the hopes of those of us who have not yet entirely dispaired of our country's domestic future.

With great appreciation, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JOHN O'CONNOR,
Former Congressman.

A Soldier's Life on Guadalcanal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RANULF COMPTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following letter from a first lieutenant in the United States Army on Guadalcanal, which was written to his mother, one of my constituents. His younger brother, a private in the marines, of whom he speaks, without identifying him, in the latter part of the letter, was in the landing force on Guadalcanal, was there 5 months, and is now in a hospital "somewhere."

Personal passages in the letter have been deleted, but I think what remains should be a lesson to all Americans. It follows:

JANUARY 31, 1943.

DEAR * * *. From about 10 a. m. until 2:30 p. m. it is 130 in the shade. We run around in cut-off slacks and sometimes nothing. We are all as black as ink now. One merely has to sit still and the sweat literally runs off. We eat 2 meals of questionable character a day. At night we must wear slacks and shirts because of the malaria mosquitoes. We take atabrine tablets to combat the ravages of the fever which we all get sooner or later. I spent Christmas day in the hospital with the "trots," which were awful. New Year's Eve the Japs bombed us and not for the last time. One has the most helpless feeling when a Jap bomber is over head in the dark. We all have fox holes right by our beds (beds, hell) so we can jump into them at a moment's notice. They are about 4 feet deep and long enough to lie face down in. We cover them with logs and dirt to stop falling shrapnel (we hope). Though I have been bombed more than 50 times my stomach still ties itself into knots when I hear those bombs whistling toward me. Yes, they make a rushing sound and you break out in a clammy sweat and think "Dear God, where is it going to hit?" They have come too close for comfort many a time. Sometimes we are up all night with raids, and then have to work all day. Of course we are bombed and strafed in the daytime too, but I don't mind that, because you can see and shoot back. Also our Air Corps can go after them in the daytime.

Another pest are the Jap snipers, who are numerous. These are scary but more fun as they only snipe in the daytime when we are working. You can hear the "pop" of their rifles, then the bullet goes "zing" and you know they are shooting at you from some nearby tree in the jungle. They are damn clever at camouflage, but are "stinko" shots, so we play hide and seek with them until one of us gets knocked off. So far so good for Richard.

Here there are no stores, no movies, no women (black or white), no United Service Organization, no stage-door canteen, no nothing. The amusement angle is nil. We are too busy working and trying to stay alive. The Government gives us our cigarettes and a little hard candy once in a while. Still the only complaint I have ever heard is about the people back home. Here the men live weeks at a time in mud or dust, clutching their rifles for their lives. No baths, no shaves, no clean clothes, underwear rotting on their bodies, clothes wet at night and scorching hot by day. Noise, mud and blood, screams of agony, nerves shot to hell from fatigue and strain. What's wrong at home? Is everyone too busy stealing a little extra coffee or gas—too interested in their own personal comfort or the entertainment of the boys back at home? No; it's not fair. The American soldier can always find amusement for himself if he has to. The money wasted back there could be much better spent on guns, ships, and planes. God, how we need planes! Ask any marine or soldier or sailor who has dodged bombs or shells or subs what they think of these things. I haven't blown my top. Maybe I've overemphasized. But I have seen lads from 18 years old get blown up, men with legs gone, with hands blown off, pain and misery in their eyes. Still no complaint. They are not sorry they did their bit and more besides, and are only sorry they are out of it. So help me God, I wish everyone back home could see the ones who are really in this war. No, I am not shell-shocked or sorry for myself. I'm not trying to get sympathy from anyone, because I have had it a lot easier than a lot of others. I'm still whole and alive. Yes, I have changed. Bud put in 5 months of this hell. I saw him before he left. We talked it over. He is an old man at 18. Not cracked up, but the childish fun of that age completely obliterated by sight of death and pain. Don't spend your money on amusements for soldiers. Save their lives with guns and planes, that's what we want out here, and a little note once in a while of love and praise. It means so much and costs so damn little. I hope I haven't exaggerated but you can't exaggerate premature death. I am not a flag-waver, and I don't want to be a blow-hard, but something must be done about the misguided energy back home.

DICK.

The Country Speaks: Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the March 1 issue of the Christian Science Monitor relative to the wonderful showing made by the people of Rock Springs, Wyo.

Much has been said regarding the complacency of the people on Main Street toward the war. I venture the statement that the people of the State of Wyoming, whom I have the high honor to represent, are as alert as any in the Nation.

Sweetwater County in Wyoming is typical of the great melting pot of America, for there 31 different nationalities are represented. They are industrious, hard-working, intensely patriotic citizens. Their complete willingness to cooperate in the defense program and their liberal purchase of bonds speaks louder than words of their cooperation in the war effort.

Seven hundred and fifty of the 3,500 coal miners of that community are now in the armed forces.

I think that the following article from the Christian Science Monitor is commendable in many ways, but I feel that the statement on absenteeism in the coal mines of that area does not show the whole picture. Nearly 25 percent of the coal miners from that county are in the armed forces, and they are, in the main, the strong, virile young men. They have been replaced mainly by inexperienced workers from Arkansas and Oklahoma. While they are willing, they are unable to stand the strain of the laborious work in these mines. This and other factors not attributable to the miners themselves have increased the rate of absenteeism. While, as the writer of the following article states, the absenteeism rate there is low compared to other industries, I am certain that these percentages are increased by reason of the large number of young miners taken into the armed forces and the inexperienced imported workers.

While many of these folks are naturalized citizens, still they have a deep love for their adopted land. Their boys are fighting for that land. They are cooperating to the utmost and for that they are entitled to great credit.

The editorial follows:

THE COUNTRY SPEAKS: WYOMING

HIGH RANK IN CIVILIAN DEFENSE

(By Seldon Menefee)

You wouldn't expect thinly settled Wyoming and especially Rock Springs, a town of some 10,000 persons just east of the Continental Divide, to be greatly concerned about the immediate dangers of the war. Yet this State and town rank among the best in the Nation in the intensity of their war and civilian defense work.

Sweetwater County is 140 by 100 miles in size—as big as some New England States, and has less than two persons per square mile. Yet 15 percent of its people are active in civilian defense organizations—twice as large a proportion as that for the entire country. When there is a practice blackout, lights go out not only in Rock Springs but in the irrigated districts and sheepherders' camps 100 miles to the north.

In December, 65 percent of all local defense councils in Wyoming turned in reports on their activities—a higher percentage than any of the nine States of the Northwestern Office of Civilian Defense region, from Missouri, Kansas, and Minnesota, to Montana. The same month Wyoming exceeded its $1,400,000 War-bond quota by $244,000. Sweetwater County's quota was $136,000, but its citizens bought $183,000 worth of bonds.

The local civilian defense director, Harold Tannehill, gives credit for this impressive record to the people of Sweetwater County. But it is easy to see that he has been the "spark plug" in the county's defense effort. This month he is resigning—to go into the Army.

WOOL, COAL, AND RAILROAD CENTER

Rock Springs is one of the richest small towns in the country, though you wouldn't guess it at first glance. Hemmed in by the barren foothills of the Rockies, 6,200 feet above sea level, it is cut in two by the prosperous Union Pacific Railroad, which gets its coal from rich captive mines nearby. It is the leading wool-shipping point in the country, as well as a railroad and coal center.

The town is noted historically mainly for the insurrection against Chinese laborers which took place there in 1885. The Union Pacific had brought 600 Chinese in from the west coast to replace white miners at lower wages. The displaced workers rose to vent their wrath against the helpless coolies, burning their homes and driving them into the hills.

The Chinese were brought back under National Guard protection, but today they have been replaced in turn by Slavic, British, and Scandinavian mine workers who now outnumber people of American parentage in Rock Springs. Of 797 members of the Old Timers' Club, which consists of workers who have worked for 20 years or more in the Union Pacific coal mines, only 285 were Americans in 1940. There were 115 of Slavic nationalities, 80 Austrians, 62 Finns, 61 Englishmen, and 47 Italians. Forty-seven nationalities are represented in the county, and 31 in the Old Timers' Club.

The children of these immigrants now predominate in the schools, and are as fine a looking group as you can find anywhere.

A DEMOCRATIC STRONGHOLD

Rock Springs is strongly unionized by the United Mine Workers and the Railroad Brotherhoods. It is the one Democratic Party stronghold in the State. All elected officials in Sweetwater County are Democrats and many of them are union men.

The miners and railroaders are buying bonds almost unanimously under the pay-roll allotment plan. The carpenters' union has spent so much for bonds out of its local treasury that it is now hard put for funds. The Union Pacific Coal Co. itself has been contributing to War bond sales by offering a prize of a $1,000 War bond monthly at a lottery, in which 675 out of 2,900 Union Pacific miners were eligible last month by virtue of perfect attendance on the job.

The absentee rate in the one mine for which figures were available has averaged 7½ percent, rising to 12½ percent on Christmas week. This is considered bad in Rock Springs, but it looked good to me alongside of figures I had seen for the aircraft and shipbuilding industries on the west coast.

The Union Pacific and Rock Springs are booming today. On the average, one train every 6 minutes passes through this railroad center. The miners are working 7 days a week. To supplement the labor supply, at least 60 women workers are being used on the tipples, grading and sorting coal after it has come from the mines. In addition, some 300 families have been brought in, mainly from Arkansas, and are being housed temporarily in boxcars near the mines.

Rock Springs doesn't need to be told that there's a war on. It is already doing all it can to help win that war.

Col. K. B. Bush

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a short biographical sketch of Col. K. B. Bush, a former resident of Quincy, Ill., which appeared in the November 5 edition of the Daily Empire, Juneau, Alaska; and his opening remarks at the dedication of the Alcan International Highway, November 20, 1942:

[From the Juneau (Alaska) Daily Empire of November 5, 1942]

WHITEHORSE, YUKON TERRITORY, November 5.—Col. K. B. Bush, of Quincy, Ill., has arrived in this Klondike region settlement to be Chief of Staff of the Northwest Service Command, which has recently been established by the American Army to operate the Alaskan Highway and other supply routes to the North Pacific area.

Colonel Bush brings to his new post widespread Army experience, including service under fire in the First World War and administrative supervision of the Civilian Conservation Corps in the States of Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin for more than 5 years.

In August of this year Colonel Bush married Miss Ida Giltner, of Parsons, Kans., daughter of a pioneer family in that State. Mrs. Bush is now at Parsons with her parents.

Colonel Bush is 49 years old. He was born on May 4, 1893, in Danville, Ill., but shortly afterwards his family moved to Quincy. There he grew up and attended school. He went to the University of Illinois at Urbana and graduated in 1916 as a civil engineer. A year later Bush answered the call to the colors and went overseas with the Fourth Infantry. He participated in six major engagements and came out with the rank of captain after 21 months of service in France.

Following the war, Bush commenced on a career in the Regular Army which was to take him into all regions of the United States and across the globe. He served at Camp Funston, Camp Meade, Plattsburg Barracks, and with The Adjutant General's Office in Washington, D. C. He assisted in setting up

the administrative machinery in The Adjutant General's Office for handling the soldiers' bonus, and he served a tour of duty in the Philippine Islands.

In 1932 Bush was with the Sixth Corps Area headquarters in Chicago, and when the Civilian Conservation Corps was organized a year later he was active in the undertaking. From April of 1933 until May of 1938 he had charge of Army activities in the Civilian Conservation Corps camps in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan. During this period notable advances were made by the Civilian Conservation Corps in conservation, reforestation, and fire control. Many miles of roads and trails were constructed in the three States.

In 1938 Bush again joined the Adjutant General's office in Washington, and during 1940 and 1941 he was assistant to the War Department representative with the Civilian Conservation Corps. After serving at Fort Knox and Fort Benning as Adjutant General of the I Armored Corps he went with that organization to the desert in southern California and assisted in the establishment of the desert training center.

In July he was ordered to duty in The Adjutant General's office in Washington, where he received his present assignment.

As chief of staff of the Northwest Service Command, Bush has had supervision of the establishment of the administrative machinery for operating that organization. The command has been placed in charge of all roads, railways, inland waterways, pipe lines and other routes of transportation which serve Alaska. It controls all American Army projects in western Canada.

Colonel Bush's mother, Mrs. C. J. Bush, still lives in Quincy, Ill.

OPENING REMARKS OF COL. K. B. BUSH, CHIEF OF STAFF, NORTHWEST SERVICE COMMAND, MASTER OF CEREMONIES AT DEDICATION ALCAN INTERNATIONAL HIGHWAY NOVEMBER 20, 1942

All of us who take part in this brief ceremony today are merely the representatives of others. I wish it were possible for every man who has worked on the highway to participate. Those here in this imposing wilderness are the symbols of countless thousands who have made this undertaking a reality. Some of us represent the American Army. Others represent civilian workmen and contractors. Others represent the Canadian and American Governments, which have authorized the great project that we are privileged to undertake. Still others represent the splendid military forces of our sister nation responsible for our security.

We are opening formally the Alcan Highway in a wilderness—at Soldiers' Summit above Kluane Lake in the solitudes of the Yukon Territory a few miles southeast of the Alaskan border. For that reason today's ceremony must be plain and simple. Yet I think there is not a person present who fails to realize its significance, both in this time of strife and in the peace which is to come. This road will not only influence the course of the present world struggle but will be a vital force in the future history of this part of the Northern Hemisphere.

I count myself honored to take part in this dedication today and I am sure that all of us share this feeling. Before starting the ceremony I take this opportunity to express the appreciation of the commanding general of the Northwest Service Command and of the rest of us to the men who have erected tents and barracks here, who have hauled in supplies, who have cooked meals, and who have otherwise pushed back the wilderness a little farther so that this ceremony could be held. I also thank the many distinguished guests who are present for joining with us in dedicating this great international road.

If You Cannot Pay Tax on March 15: Steps To Be Taken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "If You Can't Pay Tax on March 15: Steps To Be Taken," which appears in the current edition of the United States News:

IF YOU CAN'T PAY TAX ON MARCH 15: STEPS TO BE TAKEN

What must a man do if he can't pay his income-tax installment due March 15? This question will have a real meaning soon for many.

A surprisingly large number of new taxpayers think that if they don't pay they will have to go to jail. They are wrong. The man who can't possibly pay isn't going to jail—not if he files his tax return on time; not if he plays square with the Government.

But he will have plenty of trouble with the Government after March 15. In one way or another, the Government is going to make every effort to collect the bill.

First thing to be done by anyone who can't pay on March 15 is to go into a sort of one-man caucus and ask a few searching questions: How can I raise the money? Haven't I a savings account I can tap? Haven't I anything, such as securities or possessions I really don't need, that I can sell? Can I borrow the money?

If the answer to all those questions is "No," then:

Next thing to be done is to make out your tax return—just as if you had the money to pay—and mail it not later than March 15 to your collector of Internal Revenue. Instead of a check for the amount due, enclose a letter to the collector admitting the debt and telling him why you can't pay it.

That is important—very. It is what lawyers call prima facie showing of the taxpayer's good faith, of the lack of intent or desire to defraud the Government.

Then wait. As soon as the collector gets around to the return, the taxpayer will be invited by letter to call at the collector's office. This invitation should be heeded promptly. The taxpayer should take with him full information as to all he owns and all he owes. He will be required to give such information to the collector. He will be required to make oath as to its correctness.

The taxpayer's examination by the collector will be searching and thorough. It may last several hours. What the collector does then will depend largely on the taxpayer's job status.

If the taxpayer has a job, the collector's answer will be easy: The taxpayer will have to pay by regular installments each pay day; he will have to arrange with the collector as to the amount, sign an agreement and live up to it.

If the taxpayer hasn't a job, but has some income from a pension or other source, he will have to pay out of that income the amount of the regular installments to be arranged with the collector.

If the taxpayer has no income, but owns anything of value, the collector can, if he wishes, levy on the taxpayer's possessions and sell them to satisfy the bill. Chances are the collector will not do this immediately, but will require the taxpayer to report his status at intervals, will give the taxpayer a reasonable amount of time to make good.

If the taxpayer has no income and no possessions, the tax debt will be kept hanging over him for a time, and, after a considerable period, may be abated; that is, written off the Government's books. Chances of this, however, are rather remote. It happened to less than one-half of 1 percent of income taxpayers over the last 22 years, to less than one-tenth of 1 percent last year.

Opinion among some Members of Congress is that a large number of taxpayers will default next March 15; that they have made no provision for paying taxes; that they have spent their big wages freely and will not have the money when taxes are due. This is not the opinion of Treasury officials.

"I think," says John L. Sullivan, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in charge of tax affairs, "that the overwhelming majority of the American people are convinced of the necessity for high taxes and will pay them willingly; that they will recognize the great need of the Government and will make a greater effort than ever before to pay their taxes promptly."

Special consideration is given, under the law, to men in the armed forces. If they can show that they can't pay without undue hardship (because of being taken from well-paying jobs by the draft, for instance), they will be given at least a 6 months' extension for filing returns. Full information on this and other tax regulations applying to men in service is posted by the Army and Navy Departments at all military and naval camps, reservations, and other places.

For civilians, the important thing to remember is to file the tax return not later than March 15. Penalties are imposed for not doing so: 5 percent of the tax for a 30-day delay, 5 percent for each 30-day delay thereafter until the penalty amounts to 25 percent (at the end of the fifth month).

But there is no penalty (except for fraud) when a return is filed unaccompanied by an installment of the tax. Interest at 6 percent is charged, however, on the amount due and unpaid.

A married person who made more than $1,200 last year—or a single person who made more than $500—who thinks he can avoid filing a return and paying a tax is regarded as just plain dumb by the Treasury. The chances are 100 to 1 that he will be checked up, made to pay the tax plus penalties (5 percent for negligence, 50 percent for fraud, in addition to those already named).

It may take time, but the tax collector will get him. For, among other things, all wages, salaries, and rents paid in those or larger amounts last year must be reported to the Government.

Prepare for the Transition Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, of course the first job of the Congress and the country is to win the war. All effort to accomplish other things must be subjugated to this one objective. However,

such consideration as is possible must be given to the problem of meeting the economic situation that is bound to be created by the return to civil life of the millions of men and women now engaged entirely in the war effort. At the moment the country is almost entirely on a wartime economy. Following the war it is going to be very difficult to return to peacetime economy without great discomfort and even distress on the part of many of our people. Every effort must be made now to absorb and lessen the shock which we know is coming. I cannot urge too strongly the duty of the Congress to proceed at once in preparation for that transition period.

Indeed, various groups, clubs, and organizations throughout the country are already urging specific action that might affect certain industries and groups after the war. This morning I am in receipt of copy of resolutions passed by the Jackson County, Mich., Service Dads Club, which resolutions accentuate the matter of which I have just spoken. The fathers of the men and women now in the service of the Government are becoming concerned, and the views of this group of this new organization are significant and are indicative of many more resolutions that are to follow. Therefore, pursuant to the privilege given to me by the House, I include these resolutions as a part of my remarks. They are as follows:

We, the legislative committee of Jackson County Service Dads Club, do hereby request that you take immediate action to provide adequate funds and enact proper legislation during this session of legislature so that ample provision may be made for all servicemen and women honorably discharged or on leave of absence from such armed forces to provide for them during the period of transition from military to civilian life.

We recommend that a much broader construction be placed upon our unemployment compensation laws to enable everyone who has contributed to this fund to receive benefits.

We likewise urge you to give careful consideration to a bonus plan providing for any man who may not be eligible under unemployment compensation and further urge that a complete integration of these two plans be worked out so that all will receive equal treatment.

We especially call attention to the fact that many boys entering the service have never had employment but believe they should not be penalized in their efforts to make a successful return to civilian life by reason of lack of former employment.

True To Form

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "True To Form" from the National Tribune.

TRUE TO FORM

In time of war, communiques from theaters of action cannot always contain good news. Especially is this true in wars as extensive as this one for which our country had so little preparation that we started almost from scratch. Beginning only 15 months ago with a small standing army, some new trainees, a navy inadequate for a single-ocean war and a merchant marine that had been going down hill for two decades. America has responded magnificently. So have its citizen soldiers, sailors, and marines. As the armed services have had their ups and downs, civilian enthusiasm has ebbed and flowed, yet our citizens have performed miracles and our men in uniform have lived up to the highest traditions set by our soldiery from Revolutionary days to the present hour.

Victory has been ours in both Atlantic and Pacific areas. We have also suffered grievous defeats. With every loss of consequence a mantle of despair has settled over many of us and choking lumps have risen in the throats of all who cherish in their breasts the hope of early peace. Each stunning defeat meted out to our enemies gives rise to a swelling joy in the belief that the Axis hordes have reached the zenith of their power and that the vengeance of heaven and a determned people is wrathfully falling upon them.

How often have most of us sat back smugly to reflect that America has never lost a war, and, in that thought, have been unprepared for military set-backs that will come as certainly as night follows day. When reverses have been announced, how frequently have many of us reproved ourselves for begetting a generation of spoiled kids that cannot be expected to stand up under the burdens of war. And how utterly weak we have been to profane our minds with such ridiculous thoughts.

The men who are actually fighting this war were fairly free to do as they pleased in civil life. Particularly is this true of the younger offspring, but they are not the slap-happy lads turning night into day to suit their social whims as some have pictured them, nor are they victims of greed and lack of restraint as others have accused. The change-over from soft carefree life to drab military existence, we are officially told, has not always been easy but, when put up against the hardest taskmaster and strictest disciplinarian a people can know—total war—they have responded as splendidly as any of their forbears who handed down to them the moral and ethical standards that have caused them to truly demonstrate their capabilities.

That tendency to independence in pre-war days has bred self-reliance. Seemingly aimless visions have conceived the brand of imagination so necessary in this sort of war. The doubtful leaning to unrestraint has given birth to an initiative and individuality that augur ill for the enemies who face these men, and latent in them has always been that courage and stamina, inherited by idealists, that serves as a bulwark of strength as they come to grips with resourceful foes. These qualities will see them through and maintain them when they return later to an America that will expect them to assume their responsibilities in shaping the post-war world.

No generation of any people has ever before achieved the wonders of production that Americans have accomplished in World War No. 2. Battleships, planes, merchant bottoms, tanks, guns—everything—have been built in unheard-of quantities. Supplies of every description have gone to far corners of the earth to clothe, feed, and arm our friends and Allies. In little more than a year an Army of more than 5,000,000 men has been raised and equipped. The Navy and other services have increased in equivalent numbers. Over a million are overseas. Sixty-five points on this globe are garrisoned by American servicemen and are being supplied by millions of tons of shipping. And while America has been forging ahead, America's goods have stopped the enemy in his tracks and has thrown him back. These are accomplishments.

But we still have our constitutional gripers, our alarmists, our shirkers, and we do not refer to those who contribute objectively to good government by condemning the thoughtless or by censoring administrative confusion; a good housecleaning is in order. We mean the complaining I-told-you-sos, who grumble because it took 6 months to clear the Japs out of Guadalcanal and who ran to cover because a Rommel blitz worked in Tunisia. Another look at the record is the antidote for doubters.

It did take months for our men to clean out that island thousands of miles down there in the Pacific. With little enough training, our lads, many of them direct from the farm, city slums, and office desks, destroyed a far superior force of fanatical, well-trained jungle fighters. There and elsewhere college students, clerks, and high school cadets left their stripped-down Fords for Grumman Wildcats, Flying Fortresses, and Liberators to rain death and destruction on would-be conquerors. Bayonets, submachine guns, and grenades in a matter of months replaced the baseball bat and football in the hands of sports-loving youths and family men, because liberty and the right to live are far to be desired over slavery. Mere boys have gone to their deaths at Midway and in the South Seas for an ideal. History has been written at Pearl Harbor, in the Aleutians and the Philippines, and not a single son of Nippon has touched our mainland.

Our sailors and merchant seamen have fought the seas, the best Nazi warships, and Axis submarines to deliver supplies and machines of war to Russian allies. In uniform and out they have convoyed the greatest armadas of all times from England and from these shores to establish a foothold in Africa, an expedition so amazingly successful that it will nullify for all time the ambitions of Hitler and Mussolini on the dark continent. From the sure safety of a cloistered life in comfortable homes, American civilians have conquered the hellholes and the pestilence of the Solomons and the Burmese jungles, and they have learned the sands and mountain fastnesses of Africa.

All over the globe America's men are matching their skill against the best flyers that can be put in the air by self-termed master races and are driving them from the skies. Everywhere—by sea, on the land, in the air—they have met the enemy's best in ships, in tanks, in planes, and in shock troops, and the toll they have taken far exceeds their losses. These, too, are accomplishments.

In the words of the Commander in Chief, "Our men in the field are worthy of the great faith, the high hopes, we have placed in them. That applies as well to the men of our Navy, without whom no American expeditionary force could land safely on foreign shores."

Those words of Mr. Roosevelt are the epitome of a nation's faith. When our people fret and parents grieve, may they remember them, and may they take comfort from the knowledge that Americans today are running true to form. They are worthy sons of worthy sires, preserving the ideals and principles that others too have fought and died to save. May we be deserving of their sacrifice.

H. R. 1749

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Nation is grateful to this House for its prompt action in passing H. R. 1749, a bill to place the veterans of the present war under the same governmental protection as the veterans of former wars. I hope that similar expeditious action will be taken by the other body so that the shocking neglect in the care of disabled men now being discharged from our Army will be remedied.

I congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation for their promptness in bringing this humanitarian legislation before the House, and I am grateful to the membership of the House for having permitted this bill to pass by unanimous consent. The action taken is evidence that every Member of Congress is desirous of seeing to it that the men who are fighting this war are to be given just treatment.

As I pointed out 2 weeks ago, there are many men who, after being accepted in the armed services, are now being discharged upon the development of mental trouble. They are being sent home by the Army and Navy without any thought of, or provision for, their care. In hundreds of cases there are no facilities for the proper treatment of these men. Many have been confined in jails while others have been placed in State institutions as public charges. In my own congressional district there are at least a dozen such cases.

At the present time there is a young man from my congressional district being cared for at Walter Reed Hospital here in Washington, but arrangements have been completed to discharge him from the Army and to send him back to Michigan where he will become a burden on his own community and the State. This young man, because of crowded conditions, will be required to await his turn to be received in a State hospital where he can be cared for. There is no reason under God's heaven why this boy should not be afforded the benefits of Government institutions where, under favorable conditions, he may be rehabilitated. It ill becomes any government which has been playing Santa Claus to the whole world to evade its responsibility to its own defenders.

Aside from failure to care for these boys in Government institutions, and thus bring them under properly planned rehabilitation programs, this Government today is guilty of acts that could be termed criminal in connection with discharges that are being written. Every effort is being made by the War Department to refuse these men service-connected disability discharges.

It must be remembered that when these men were accepted in the armed services they passed mental and physical tests. They were given thorough examinations by physicians and by psychiatrists and were deemed physically and mentally fit for service. Yet, because of strenuous training programs and the horrors of modern warfare, these men "cracked up" and became mental patients. All of them, no doubt, would today be leading normal civilian lives had they not been accepted for service. It would be difficult for anyone to show that their mental break-downs have not been entirely due to their impact with Army life. Surely this Government cannot escape the responsibility of caring for these men and giving them every benefit to which they are entitled. Who is there to deny that these men are a proper obligation of the Government?

As I have stated before, these conditions cannot be permitted to continue. It is imperative that the other body take immediate action to enact the Rankin bill, H. R. 1749.

What Price Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wheeling Intelligencer of March 2, 1943:

WHAT PRICE PEACE?

The man in the street, groping for an understanding of the problems likely to face this country when the war is over, is apt to get more confusion of thought than enlightenment from a study of the outgivings of our various global planners, official and otherwise.

Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. WALLACE, and several other of the top flight, envision a world of milk and honey and good fellowship brought into being by the harmonious action of the presently united nations.

Mr. Welles, of the Department of State, and presumably his chief, Mr. Hull, are more impressed, apparently, by the realities of national interest, and thus less enthusiastic over the global picture, though leaning heavily on the doctrine of free, or almost free trade.

Mr. Willkie, while belonging to the same general school of international thought, keeps injecting embarrassing questions about the colonial policy of some of our associate planners, that of England in particular.

And now comes Secretary Knox with the—to us at least—amazing proposal that the United States undertake the acquisition of military bases all over the world for this country's protection!

There isn't any question about what Mr. Knox means. He makes that perfectly clear. "I don't think we ought to be grabbing for territory," the Secretary of the Navy explains. "All we are interested in is having military bases in which we have final and complete control in a military sense." And apparently he isn't talking solely for himself, as he was supporting, to quote the Associated Press, "a view put forward at the Capital that the United States should begin now general discussion about permanent bases."

To us, the implications of this proposal are both amazing and appalling. It seems not only to fly directly in the face of the doctrine of peace and prosperity the world over by united action, but to go far beyond anything ever suggested by the most ardent isolationist in the way of independent, stand-alone American action. Either that, or it is the most fantastic assignment of world policing ever thought up for Uncle Sam.

Beyond all of this, the scheme, on its face, contemplates a wholly impractical enterprise. Under it, we are to undertake the maintenance and complete control of military bases "all over the world." How, it would be enlightening to know, does Mr. Knox propose maintaining, holding, and using these bases in time of actual need? We had some experience at the outbreak of this war in holding military bases. And they weren't small bases scattered all over the universe, but American strongholds. Pearl Harbor was supposed to be unassailable. The Philippines were not even worrying us. Yet despite the benefit of a year of warning that Japan was preparing to do just what she did on December 7, we suffered a major disaster at Pearl Harbor, and lost the Philippines and other outposts.

What, then, would be the task confronting us were we to establish military bases all over the world?

The more our global thinkers talk and plan, the clearer it becomes that the sensible course for this country to pursue is to make certain first of the military protection of this continent with such outposts as are necessary to this continental defense, and then to take such part as we reasonably can in any rational plan of international organization for peace.

Address of Hon. George D. Aiken, of Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I am extending my remarks to include an address delivered by the Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN, the junior Senator from Vermont, before the General Assembly of the State of Vermont on February 24:

Ten years ago today, I stood in this place as presiding officer of the House of Representatives. The Nation then was facing an economic crisis. Our banks were closed. Our people were out of work as well as out of money. The people of the great metropolitan centers were on the verge of panic, quite in contrast to the citizens of our State. Then the Vermont Legislature went to work earnestly, fearlessly, and sensibly to meet the crisis. How well that job was done is known to all Vermonters and to many far beyond the borders of our State. During the intervening years no State has conducted its affairs more soundly than has Vermont.

Now we face another crisis invoving not alone a possibility of economic disaster, but one from which might come drastic changes

in government, in social, moral, and even religious standards as well.

Today's crisis sweeps far beyond the borders of our own land, and has intermeshed our own fortunes with those of the people of all lands, of many races, colors, and creeds.

The little State of Vermont may play a vital part in determining the outcome of our present world involvement. As a Vermonter I feel I have every right to boast of the fact that the maintenance of the best ideals of government by the relatively small population of our State has given confidence and hope to the people of States many times our size.

I know the people of Vermont and I know that in this present crisis they will meet all issues that come before them with the same determination that they have shown before. They will avoid hysteria, reason calmly, and fight their way through to the finish.

I shall speak to you today of those things which are vital to our everyday life at all times, but even more so in times of war. I do not know the best methods of fighting war in New Guinea, Africa, or the Ukraine. Since I have been in Washington, I have felt that I could be of greater service by devoting my every effort to maintaining American ideals, American standards of social welfare, American freedom of government, and American opportunities for all our folks who live on farms and in our villages and cities.

America fights on many fronts today, in the South Pacific, in Alaska, in Africa, in the Far East, in the skies over Germany and France, and on the waters of the seven seas. Nowhere on all these battle lines is a fight being waged which equals in importance the battle being fought in the United States for the preservation of our own freedom of government and freedom from want and fear.

Day after day I receive letters from our boys who are in other lands. They are optimistic about the battles they are fighting, but they are apprehensive about the battle front at home. They expect us to hold the lines here until they return. They want to come back to a country as free as when they left it, not to a country governed like the ones they are giving everything they have to defeat.

The magnitude of our task is appalling. As a nation of 130,000,000, we have undertaken not only to be the arsenal of democracy; we have also undertaken to guarantee the food supply of the world's 2,000,000,000 inhabitants. Of all our major allies, only China is self-sufficient for food. We are undertaking to carry freedom from fear and want to all peoples. We are undertaking to raise, train, and equip the greatest armed forces the world has ever known.

The task we have assumed is Herculean. If we accomplish it, an historical precedent will have been established. If, while accomplishing it, we lose the freedom which has been our boast since the days of Ethan Allen, our military victories will mock us for generations to come.

Though small, Vermont is playing a part in this struggle far out of proportion to her size. The war is being fought with machines to a greater extent than any war was ever fought before. The great industrial centers of war production would find it difficult to carry on as they are doing, were it not for the machine-tool indlustry of our State, which is doing a remarkably fine job under efficient and patriotic leadership.

Great cities depend upon the farmers of Vermont for that most useful and most necessary of all foods, fluid milk.

It is generally conceded that air power will win this war, and here in Vermont we will find the last word in aeronautical instruction.

I doubt if any State exceeds in percentage our enlistments in all branches of the armed services. I am sure that the per capita war effort of Vermonters in all activities is not excelled by any other State.

Let me now speak in more definite terms. First is the matter of food. Without food armies will not have strength to fight. Without food a civilian populace cannot produce mechanical equipment. Without food to give to the starving people of other nations, we cannot gain national friendships which we must have in this hour.

Last week at Senate hearings a score of witnesses testified to the desperate condition of the dairy industry. This week we have heard the same story from fruit and vegetable growers. Thousands of letters from all types of farmers in every State are in agreement with those witnesses who have been before us.

They all tell of an utter lack of sympathy and understanding on the part of high officials in the executive department of Government. They have little complaint to make of regional and local officials of Government agencies, but rightfully put the blame for the present agricultural confusion on the policy makers at the top.

In all frankness I will tell you that the Office of Price Administration and other agencies of Government are carrying out directives given to them by the White House. Yet, regardless of the utter lack of understanding and the apparent prejudice against agriculture emanating from the top of our Government, we in Vermont and the farmers of the entire Nation know that we must produce to our utmost limit to keep famine from stalking through the land.

We must produce food in spite of the obstacles that discourage us. We must produce food for the people who live near home so that we will be as independent as possible in this respect. Let every farm family and every village family produce this year crops that will sustain life without calling upon other regions. I don't know yet how we will preserve this food. We must can all we can and quick freeze all we can. Your representatives in Washington will do all they can to help you get greater facilities. It is an uphill fight. The great industrial concerns are given every advantage over the people of farm and village, but we will keep up the fight just the same.

There is little likelihood that much farm machinery will be made available this year. There will be an increased shortage in grains for feeding, particularly proteins. Millions of tons of proteins grown last year at the request of the United States Department of Agriculture are rotting in the fields because another agency of Government would not grant harvesting machinery.

Transportation problems will become more difficult. Rolling stock on railroads is wearing out.

Synthetic rubber is not being produced in any quantity. Its production has been delayed by those who would maintain financial advantages by gambling that it will not be needed. Our Special Committee of the Senate will continue fighting for the production of synthetic rubber. We may attain some measure of success if fully backed by public opinion.

Oil and gas shortages will continue for the duration of the war, so motor travel and motor trucking must be reduced to a minimum. The fuel situation will probably be more difficult next winter. Although a new pipe line may increase shipment to the Atlantic coast materially, I expect this increase will be largely required by the Army and Navy.

Other obstacles lie in the path of those who are expected to produce food. First among these are the shortage of farm labor and prices fixed so low that only the most efficient farmers can produce at a profit.

Add to these obstacles which might be expected during any war, the tendency of Federal emergency agencies to overwhelm our farmers with arbitrary rules, regulations, forms and questionnaires and we have an accumulation of seemingly insurmountable difficulties.

Many official actions, instead of increasing our food supply tend to decrease it. Some of these officials know what to do but are prevented from doing it. Others haven't the slightest knowledge of agricultural production, yet they are given control over it.

The Department of Agriculture is given the responsibility for the production of food, but the Office of Price Administration and the War Production Board are given authority over prices and manufacture of machinery. Thus they are enabled to curtail food production and that is exactly what they are doing.

Shortage of farm labor is one of the critical problems of our Nation. A million farm boys have gone into the Army. Many more than this number are employed in industry at wages three times what the average farmer can pay. The result of this exodus from the land is an acute shortage of men to raise and harvest crops.

Several solutions have been proposed. Bills now before Congress would compel the Army to furlough men for farm production. Another bill would absolutely prohibit the drafting of any more men from the farms. Neither of these bills is likely to solve the problem to any great degree.

There are now left on all the farms of America only about 400,000 single men between the ages of 18 and 38. If every man between these ages was taken from our farms today, the armed forces would not gain over 250,000 able-bodied recruits. This small number is only a fraction of what is required to produce food in sufficient quantities. Most of these able-bodied farm youths will find their way to the armed forces, law or no law.

The President has suggested that he might order soldiers to assist in harvesting crops. This may afford some assistance to fruit growers and potato growers, but it will be of little help to the dairy industry which requires regular help the year around.

It does not look now as if we can expect much assistance to farm production either through further deferment of farm boys or release of men from the Army. It is entirely probable that the 2,600,000 married men between 18 and 38 now living on farms will be deferred at least until the end of the year. This, however, will not increase our supply of farm labor. It simply means it will not be further decreased until after another crop year has passed.

In all probability more inexperienced city labor—mostly women and children—will lend farmers what assistance they can. Men and women who formerly lived on farms but who now reside in villages will undoubtedly help out as much as they can, but the problem of transportation will be a handicap here. A broad look at the situation tells us that a steadily diminishing supply of farm labor is in prospect.

As to replacing farm hands with machines, this would help if machines were available. Here we have a conflict of Federal agencies which is not only hurting our prospects for more food but is causing farmers to lose still more faith in the promises of Government.

As an example of what I mean, I will point out that the Department of Agriculture promised farmers of the Midwest a good price for soybeans last year and farmers of the South a good price for peanuts. When the War Production Board failed to make machinery available for harvesting and processing these crops, the Nation lost the food and oil which would have been provided and the farmers lost still more confidence in the promises of Federal officials.

I reiterate that of all obstacles placed in the way of agricultural production, utter confusion, seasoned to a high degree with incompetence and high-handedness, in Washington, is the greatest obstacle of all.

As I have said, I see little hope for new farm machinery for this year. If the material were available, few farmers with self-respect would buy such machinery under the terms prescribed by Washington and no banker would lend a penny for this purpose. At least I would hesitate, though I have great confidence in the good sense and sound judgment of our county farm rationing committees, to spend my own money or to borrow money to buy machinery when I would have to enter into a binding contract containing the following provisions, and I quote:

"I hereby agree, in consideration of the transfer for value of said new farm machinery and equipment, and for other good and valuable consideration, that all my right, title, and interest in and to the afore-mentioned new farm machinery and equipment shall immediately vest in the United States upon the happening of the following conditions, namely: (i) (A) that there has been determination by the county farm rationing committee in writing that I am not complying with or conforming to, or have failed to comply with or conform to, the uses to which I stated in my application that I would put said new farm machinery and equipment, or to the agreement which I signed in said application, or to any other statements set forth by me in said application; or (B) that there has been a determination by the county farm rationing committee in writing that I made a false statement in preparing said application, or that I did not make in good faith any statement or agreement signed by me in said application; and (ii) that there has been a determination by the State Board in writing that such vesting is necessary to protect the best interests of the United States."

And if I were a banker I would certainly hesitate to accept any machinery or equipment as security for a loan, knowing that it had been purchased subject to any such agreement. Certificates for the purchase of farm machinery or equipment contain a contract such as I have just quoted, which the farmer must sign before the dealer can sell to him.

I spoke of a shortage of feeds and fertilizers. The shortage of dairy feed has already been felt in Vermont. So far, Vermont has been very fortunate in getting our share of what is available. Millions of tons of soybeans, cottonseed and peanut meal are rotting on the ground today because harvesting and processing machinery was denied. So far, wheat and barley, oats and corn have been available in sufficient quantities and at fairly reasonable prices. I doubt if even this condition will prevail much longer.

The grain farmers are having their difficulties the same as dairy farmers. Some people are enjoying a false confidence in our stock of cereal grain. They have been given to understand that we have a supply which would last for years. That is not true. I doubt if our surplus will last much more than through this year, and we cannot import supplies from other nations. Argentina used a large part of last year's crop of corn for fuel. This year their crop is very short. Western farmers will find it more profitable to feed grain to hogs and beef. Our only supplementary supply of grain lies in the 400,000,000 bushels of wheat stored in Canada.

Dairymen in New England may expect either higher prices or shorter supply of grain by next fall, probably both.

The fertilizer situation is also getting worse. Stocks of nitrates are being rapidly consumed. The requirement that mixed fertilizers be applied will not appeal to farmers who believe their land requires a single element. Neither will the attitude of Federal officials that fertilizer may be bought only by those who follow Government directions and grow what they are told to grow, to sell it at a price they are told to sell it for be a very strong incentive to freeborn American farmers.

There is justification for Federal regulation to a certain extent, but when officials who never had any experience at all with production, finding themselves in the position to exercise authority fail to stop at the point where justification ends, then farmers are naturally and properly filled with resentment.

For years American agriculture has stood between the people of America and the totalitarian form of government, and today it seems that in some quarters the production of food is a secondary aim to breaking the political independence of these farmers.

In the face of these circumstances, when the Federal Administration finds itself unable to deal fairly with farmers and expresses a determination to create a dependent agriculture even at a time when the very existence of our Nation depends upon our food supply, our natural instinct is to raise just enough for our own communities and let the rest of the world go. We must not let this instinct prevail. So far as it is humanly possible, we must overcome every obstacle and produce to the limit of our ability.

Let every farmer produce all he can for the people of our country and for the world, but let us first of all make sure that the people of our own State will have enough to eat. Let us produce all we can of those things which will give a balanced diet independent of other regions. Let us save what we produce through drying, canning, curing or quick freezing. We shall have to do these things in the face of foolish orders.

The Office of Price Administration has advised me that it will not allow sugar for the purpose of curing meats on the farm. The War Production Board denies priorities for the small amount of metal necessary to save large amounts of food in quick freezing plants.

Much talk has been made placing the blame for our misfortunes upon labor. Repeal of labor laws is being urged upon Congress. It is represented that strikes are prevalent and that labor is not producing for the war effort as it should do. Such loose talk is at variance with the facts.

It is true that wages in industrial plants holding war contracts are far out of line with the income of farmers, small businessmen and white-collar workers. It is true that some plants are operating on a wretchedly slow basis. It is true that some plants have been on a 40- to 44-hour-a-week basis. It is undoubtedly true that racketeering has flourished and profiteering prevailed in too many quarters. Slow production is often caused by a shortage of materials, or poor management, by get-rich-quick concerns unfamiliar with the product they have contracted to produce. Short weeks have been the result of material shortages or hoarding of labor by firms which anticipated later expansion.

To say that labor as a class has lain down on the job is as cruel as it is false. At no time in history have so many employees produced so much with so little loss of time.

Every industrial employee's family has its members in our armed forces. To think that they would lie down on producing for the safety of their own boys is ridiculous. To hold up individual racketeers as symbolic of all labor is unjust.

We can find intentional and unintentional saboteurs in all walks of life—in labor, in industry, in farming, in the professions and in political offices, but the percentage is very small. We are all Americans and ought not to waste time looking for the mote in the other fellow's eye. We have a war to win—a world to feed.

Since the war began the problems of small industries, merchants and other businessmen have been intensified and magnified. A special small business committee of the Senate has worked constantly on this program for 2 years.

Vermont has felt a serious impact from the situation. High-wage industries to the south of us have enticed our workmen. I have seen no indications that the Office of Production Management and its successor, the War Production Board, have been prejudiced against small industries except they have naturally followed the line of least resistance and that line has led to their giving a few gigantic corporations a very large percentage of orders which have been placed by Government war agencies.

The Government naturally cannot come into a community, build or expand a plant, put it in operation, supervise it, and turn the profits over to local people. The local folks themselves must take the initiative. Unfortunately, we have had too many communities in Vermont where labor and housing are available but where other local conditions do not invite the placing of war orders by the Government.

Last July the Smaller War Plants Corporation was set up for the express purpose of placing orders as far as possible in smaller communities and with smaller industries. Since then this agency has succeeded in diverting about $800,000,000 worth of orders to small businessmen throughout the country. A few of Vermont's smaller industries have profited somewhat. I understand that this agency hopes to decentralize Government orders still further. I believe that some Vermont communities may still enjoy a larger measure of war prosperity if they will assume the responsibilities that go with it.

Small businessmen and manufacturers, however, will find the path ahead pretty rough. There is bound to be a greater draft of labor, which up to now has been deferred. Plans call for drafting nearly as many men in the next 12 months as have been taken into the armed forces since October of 1940.

As I have said, I don't believe transportation is going to be any better. The fuel problem is likely to be more difficult and unless there is some relief from Government rules, regulations, questionnaires, and other nuisances; unless some way is found to make supplies and materials more readily available, more people will be put out of business through no fault of their own during the next 2 years than were forced into failure at the height of the depression. A large number of businessmen who have been paying income taxes up to the present will cease to be taxpayers in the near future.

The problem of the local merchant is also serious and will likely become more so. Diminishing stock of salable goods will reduce his income. Nuisance orders and regulations will harass his peace of mind. If we could pry loose from Federal agencies the right to construct a large number of quick-freezing locker plants and food processing equipment, I can see where our local merchants could remain in business, make a living, and perform valuable services to their community, helping to make each community more nearly self-supporting and less likely to encounter the dread spectre of famine which is now stalking over the horizon. It seems so terrible, so needless that incompetence and impracticality in the war agencies, and obstinacy and resentment over political defeats in higher quarters, should bring our mighty Nation to the verge of this horror.

I am not sure but what large numbers of people from our cities will have to be transplanted to the rural areas where they can be of some help in producing food, save transportation, and live more closely off the land.

The picture I have drawn for you is dark, but I believe it is true and I believe that my neighbors want to know the truth. I believe that all America wants to know the truth

and that our people don't want the truth to be rationed as if it were a commodity to be handed out in appropriate quantities from time to time.

There are bitter days and bitter years ahead for us, but never for one moment do I lose faith in the people of my country and particularly in the people of my State. We will bear the scars inflicted upon us for a generation to come, but we will come through this fight with our colors still flying. We will win our battles on other continents and some day our boys will be back to this country, a land of free people, and find that we have kept for them the freedom they are fighting to bring to others.

Meat Packing Report of Committee on Small Business of the House Discloses Astounding Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time a copy of the report on meat packing, which was agreed to by the Committee on Small Business of the House, composed of the following members: ALFRED L. BULWINKLE, North Carolina, EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York; J. W. ROBINSON, Utah; HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington; CHARLES A. HALLECK, Indiana; WALTER C. PLOESER, Missouri; WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, Wisconsin; and myself, as chairman, on February 25, 1943. A copy was furnished to the departments concerned. It is self-explanatory:

MEAT PACKING REPORT

It is essential to the successful prosecution of the war that the Nation have a maximum production of meat animals and meat products in order that the needs of our armed forces, of the civilian population, and of our allies may be met. Shortages of meat will adversely affect morale, and substantial and continued shortages may actually interfere with the conduct of the war. The preparation for consumption of the increased production of livestock is dependent upon full utilization of the slaughtering and dressing facilities of the packers and the plants of processors of meat products. The packing industry consists of a few very large concerns and of hundreds of smaller concerns.

The committee has conducted hearings to determine the causes of the present shortage of meat and the accompanying black market. Witnesses representing meat packers and processors, the Department of Agriculture, the Office of Price Administration, and livestock producers were heard. On basis of the testimony of these witnesses, the following conclusions are justified:

1. The natural shortage of meat for civilian consumption which has inevitably resulted from the large demands of our armed forces has been aggravated by a price "squeeze" to which the packers have been subjected under the wholesale ceiling prices established by the Office of Price Administration. Under these ceiling prices the packers are said, for example, to be losing from $2 to $4 per hog slaughtered.

2. The shortage of meat has also been aggravated by a quota system imposed by the Office of Price Administration under which quotas for civilian sales are granted only to slaughterers and none are allowed to other processors. Under this quota system the nonslaughtering processors are dependent for supplies upon the willingness of slaughterers, in most cases the largest packers, to share their reduced civilian quotas with them.

3. A continuance of the present price squeeze on the packers may well force as much as one-third or more of the packing concerns of the country to discontinue operations because of heavy losses.

4. The ceiling prices established by the Office of Price Administration apply on purchases by the Government and its armed forces. The maintenance by Government edict of below-cost prices on products which the packer must supply on compulsory Government orders is un-American and cannot be too severely condemned.

5. The squeeze in prices on legitimate sales and the discriminatory quota system have resulted in the worst black market in meats in the history of the country. The black market is injurious in three ways: (1) It provides in the markets meat from animals which have not been adequately inspected, if inspected at all, and subjects the population to the risk of eating diseased meat; (2) black market prices are so much above the ceiling prices as to operate in a substantial way to defeat the purpose of legislation directed against inflation; and (3) it places a penalty on honest operation of packing plants and processing plants and places a premium on dishonesty because of the enormous profits which result from black-market operations.

6. The Office of Price Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture have adequate legislative authority to correct the maladjustment and injustice now in the meat industry, but they have not worked in close cooperation and have differed on important questions of policy.

RESTRICTED OPERATIONS OF PACKING PLANTS

The War Manpower Commission has recognized that meat packing is an essential industry. The Department of Agriculture has emphasized the need for all existing packing plants in order to slaughter and prepare for consumption the large production of livestock which is necessary and is being encouraged to meet the needs of the armed forces, the civilian population, and our allies. A very substantial part of these facilities are threatened, however, with the necessity of discontinuing operations growing out of the losses suffered under the price maintained by the Office of Price Administration. The present shortage in meat supplies is substantially explained by the small volume of operations of many packers. The losses of the companies increase with the volume of business and in order to minimize losses while continuing to operate, many plants have reduced their slaughter to a minimum. One concern, which presented a witness to the committee, is slaughtering only 900 head of hogs per week, whereas its normal volume is 3,600 head. A representative of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butchers Union, of the American Federation of Labor, testified that because of the bad price situation the packers have reduced employment to only 28 to 30 hours a week. The members are receiving only guaranteed minimum wages and are threatening a holiday—not against the packers but against the price squeeze suffered by their employers.

THE PRICE SQUEEZE

The Price Control Act of 1942 was amended October 2, 1942, to provide:

"That in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing."

This amendment has not been heeded by the Office of Price Administration. The evidence before the committee, including specifically that of representatives of the Office of Price Administration charged with the fixing and administration of meat prices, is convincing that the present prices do not provide a "generally fair and equitable margin." The Chief of the section charged with the establishment of meat prices guessed that from 20 to 40 percent of the industry would be unable to continue in business at present Office of Price Administration prices and present livestock costs. The pork prices now outstanding were established on basis of the cost to the packers of approximately $13.50 per hundred pounds, Chicago average. The prices of hogs at the time of hearing in mid-February was $15.75. At this cost for hogs there is no margin for packers. They are, in fact, losing from $2 to $4 per head slaughtered. The situation on beef is not so severe; but here also there is a failure by the Office of Price Administration to provide, as required by the Price Control Act, a fair margin. The beef prices now maintained by the Office of Price Administration are approximately $1 per 100 pounds below the normal margin and the loss of typical packers ranges from 57 cents to $3.75 per head slaughtered, depending on quality.

CONCLUSION

The record before the committee contains no satisfactory explanation of the long-standing failure of the Office of Price Administration to accord to meat processors the fair and equitable margin required by the Price Control Act. Unless the packers are assured such fair margins, the Nation is faced with increasing meat shortages and the possible loss of as much as one-third of the present plants. This problem has been allowed by the Office of Price Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture to remain unsolved, although they have been aware of it for several months. There is as between the Office of Price Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture a regrettable lack of joint effort. The committee has made clear to the officials concerned that the present situation cannot be permitted to continue and that an immediate correction of the situation is necessary in the public interest.

Captain Williams Answers Captain Rickenbacker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker has been making numerous speeches throughout the country discussing labor and what he regards as the shortcomings of the workers in war industry. Much publicity has been given to Captain Rickenbacker's jeremiads against civilian workers. Little publicity has been given to the refutations of these charges made by prominent citizens.

Because I believe it worth while that the country may be apprised of the feelings of others on the subject who take

issue with Captain Rickenbacker, I am inserting herein a statement made by Capt. Howard Y. Williams and issued by the Union for Democratic Action. The statement is as follows:

Capt. Howard Y. Williams, of St. Paul, Minn., one of Minnesota's World War No. 1 heroes and field director of the Union for Democratic Action headed by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, challenges Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker in an open letter, "Don't let them use you, Eddie, to divide the American people, to set soldiers against workers. The American heroes in the shops and factories and on the farms have the same stuff in them as the boys in the hell holes of the Pacific. Don't sound retreat for heroes on any front.

"I cannot let your attack on civilian workers go unchallenged. Men do not change materially when they take off overalls for a uniform. They are pretty much the same men. Of course, war tests men in a severe way. Like every other great crisis in life, it makes some men and breaks others.

"You know by experience that almost every regiment has its lazybones, its cowards, men who are afraid to die, who are yellow. But, thank God, most soldiers do their stuff and have the qualities of heroes.

"Well, Eddie, the men in the factories are the same kind of men as those in the armies. They are the brothers, fathers, friends, and neighbors of the men in the armies. Some are lazy, just as in the ranks of the soldiers. Some are inefficient, some shirk hard tasks and long hours. But the bulk of civilians, just like soldiers, are hard-working fellows doing their best, working 48 to 60 hours a week.

"It is because this is so that men in the factories and on the farms see that this is a fight to preserve democracy as against autocracy and were enlisting in such numbers that the Government had to stop enlistments in order to maintain production of the instruments of war. In the conquered countries also it is the trade unions that are leading the underground fight against fascism.

"Because of my admiration for you as a soldier I as another soldier want to ask you, Don't you think that these men who are staying at the less conspicuous tasks because of their patriotism have also gained their right to citizenship as much as you or I? Over the months, they are working just as hard as any heroes in the Solomon Islands would work at the same job. Would you disenfranchise all but the few hundred thousand members of the armed forces who have seen active service?

"You emphasize the fact that soldiers are risking their lives for $50 a month. It is a pitiful amount, and yet the fact is that with their meals and clothes and family allotments it is greater financial security than thousands of them have known in civilian life. Why do you want to drag all workers' pay to this level? Why not let this wealthiest country raise soldiers' pay at least to the level of workers? Where do you get the idea that men in the factories should work for $50 a month, while managers should not be limited to $67,000 a year, lest it curb their incentive? Don't we all need incentives and shouldn't we all make comparable sacrifices?

"Do you believe, as you indicated in your Detroit speech, that post-war America should guarantee the open shop although it has taken years of real struggle on the part of workers' organizations to eliminate, at least partially, this denial of majority rights? Do you believe that the Wagner Act should be abolished?

"You have found in the aviation industry that by associating yourself with other leaders in the industry you have greatly benefited. What makes you think that workers should not benefit by this same association in unions? Just as we war veterans have banded together in the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans to protect our comrades, so workers organize themselves to protect and strengthen their standards of living. What is the difference, Eddie?

"You do not want soldiers on their return to join unions. What would you think of a man who said he wanted to fight the Japs but wouldn't join the Army and wanted to be a free lance? Just as soldiers ought to join armies to be effective, so workers should join unions; and businessmen, trade associations; and lawyers, bar associations; etc. Some trade-unions do have racketeers, just as industries have their Insulls and Whitneys and just as some regiments have cowards and traitors, but our job is not to do away with unions, industries, or regiments, but to clean out the misfits.

"Do you believe that absenteeism, a practice condemned by all, is exclusively the fault of labor unions, or labor leaders? Or do you believe, with the Office of War Information, that absenteeism is a complex phenomenon with a multiplicity of causes, including bad working conditions, inadequate housing and transportation facilities, sickness, etc.?

"Now, Eddie, don't bet short on the American people. In the trenches, in the factories, on the farms, in the offices, they measure up to the crisis. I know you do not mean to follow Hitler in creating second-class citizens, but that is what you are doing, nevertheless, in seeking to set soldiers against workers. Don't let them drag your great military record in the mud in this way. In unity there is strength. Don't let them use you to divide the American people."

Captain Williams went to France in the summer of 1917 as a first lieutenant in the Tenth Engineers and was among the first 25,000 American soldiers to land in France. He was promoted to captain, cited by General Pershing for conspicuous bravery, and decorated by the French. The men of his regiment dedicated the regimental history to Captain Williams in recognition of his outstanding leadership. Under Gov. Elmer A. Benson of Minnesota, he served as director of the division of soldier welfare for several years, supervising the spending of over $1,000,000 a year in service to disabled war veterans.

We Must Learn To Take It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, a total or global war imposes restrictions and deprivations upon the civilian populace of any belligerent country. Our own beloved country has never been subjected to regimentation heretofore, though it must be recognized it will be unavoidable henceforth for the duration. All of us are prone to kick and grumble. We are a peace-loving people and have been accustomed, more or less, to live our own lives without too much regard for the needs of our neighbors, but we must learn to grin and bear it. We must tighten our belts and reconcile ourselves to doing without a great many items we have heretofore regarded as necessary to our happiness and very existence.

An editorial in the Kent News-Journal, of Kent, Wash., the editor of which is John L. Fournier, an outstanding citizen of rural King County, discusses the subject in a recent issue of that paper. I include it herewith:

LET'S QUIT GRUMBLING AND TAKE IT IN STRIDE

Rationing is now just coming into its own in this Nation and henceforth the people of this country will know the true meaning of a war economy that is demanding the limit of the production of our farms and factories. It is destined to directly affect every man, woman, and child in the Nation, and as rationing increases, coupons will become more valuable than money and the man in the street becomes an equal to the man in the castle—as far as purchasing power is concerned. It is a great leveling process that is certain to affect social and economic trends of the future.

Rationing bids fair to become a bogey because of its many complications, its annoyances, its far-reaching restrictions upon the activities of the average citizen. It is, however, a small price to pay for democracy. Its particular forms may be momentarily unpleasant and unpopular, but it is nevertheless the only solution for the problems of war-created shortages.

Comparatively speaking, the American people have little to complain about. There are no dire or drastic shortages; the average war-ration of the average American would be unparalleled bounty for the starving peoples of Europe.

We are not hurt; we like to complain and grumble because we are so doggoned independent that we resent anything that even slightly regiments us in our individualistic actions. We are like the little boy with a dental appointment—the anticipation is more painful than the tooth pulling.

Because we are Americans we mumble and grumble, but by the same token we shall eventually put aside our gripes and settle down to the job of taking the thing in stride, with final conviction that rationing is a fair and democratic method of distributing our products to all the people.

Fifth Columning?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Henry Davis Nadig from the Keene Evening Sentinel, of Keene, N. H., for February 26, 1943:

FIFTH COLUMNING?

Hitler is doing very well in the United States.

And without a doubt he knows it. His minions here, his spies and fifth columnists, are no doubt keeping him in close touch with fifth column progress.

Hitler is doing better than you think—because we are falling for the oldest foible of human relations—the readiness to pick flaws in somebody else.

Astoundingly prevalent of late is a penchant for picking flaws in this or that member of the United Nations.

Do we think we're being smart, or what?

Don't we know this sort of thing is just what Hitler is trying to promote?

Can't we be big enough to overlook the natural feelings of other nationalities, forget

any apparent inconsistencies for the time being and look at the larger, more real and more important issue—prosecution of the war to a victorious conclusion?

England is interested in England? Russia is looking out for herself? Who are we looking out for?

(Only we are beginning feebly to see that we can't look out for ourselves without at the same time helping out the other fellow, too.)

Aren't we able to have a healthy and healthful skepticism without bruiting it all over the place in the form of petty wonders and worries and questionings about the motives of this, that and the other move or utterance from one or more of our fellow United Nations?

Apparently not. Apparently we must learn our human relations the hard way, the way we always have. Apparently we must learn by experience, not by observation and record.

From the rostrum and from columnists and commentators, from editorial writers are coming bits of fault-finding with Britain, with Russia, and sometimes with other countries on our side, remarks that goad the public into confusion and subtly question the ultimate intent of the nation that may be the object of comment.

This is the subtlest form of aiding and abetting the cause of the enemy. This is fifth-columning at its slickest and least recognizable form.

Yet such speaking and such writing, more's the pity, is usually done genuinely and with sincere concern for the country and for the United Nations.

Having overcome to a large degree our erstwhile American gullibility, are we not now going over to the other extreme? Aren't we putting a premium on skepticism, on doubting?

And in so doing, aren't we undermining not only the cause of the United Nations but also our own cause which is so inextricably tied to the United Nations ideal, to the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms"?

What did Stalin mean in his recent Red Army speech? What did he mean in any one of several statements you could pick out and start to pick to pieces?

What did Churchill mean when he spoke of the British Empire and its maintenance recently?

What does Mr. Roosevelt mean when he says this, that, or the other? Or what do the heads of the alphabetical agencies in Washington mean in their many and varied pronunciamentos?

In large measure what they mean is a matter of how clear a thought and how fair a spirit you bring to the listening and the reading. You can—and you do—do your own interpreting. (Or you let some speaker or writer do it for you and take it for your own.)

A minister recently wrote in a letter to an editor that personally he wouldn't trust either Stalin or Hitler.

Therein lies the whole crux of the matter.

Nobody is asking anybody else to trust Hitler or Stalin (or Churchill or Roosevelt, for that matter) personally.

What we are being asked by the United Nations, by the implications of the world concept we are bringing into fact, is that we trust our leaders—those of our own country and those of our brother countries—impersonally.

Can't we ever grow out of a 1900–1925 mental state? Can't we get down to modern times? Can't we give enough stuff to the ideal and the objective to bury the sense of pettiness and personality? Can't we supplant this with a fervor for friendship that recognizes faults but that melts them into the background and makes the good things lessen their effect?

A friend, it has been said and quoted again and again, is a feller what knows yer and what likes yer just the same.

That's the spirit we have to bring about among the United Nations. It's the spirit that doesn't deny frailties but elicits the good factors to such a degree that understanding and good will make progress together.

It's time we stopped playing into Hitler's fifth column by publicizing so much of the kind of stuff he likes to see.

The Importance of Defining the Essentiality of the Textile Industry in the War Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an industry vitally essential to our war effort, the second largest in the country in the value of its products in normal times, and one which is faced with drastic consequences through displacement of labor and curtailment of raw materials unless the Government takes the necessary steps to safeguard its continuance.

This industry is concerned with one of the three basic needs of human life—food, clothing, and shelter. It affects the lives of every citizen. I refer to the textile industry.

This industry can be divided into two parts, one dealing with natural fibers and the other with synthetic fibers.

The natural fibers—cotton, silk, and wool—require only the use of mechanical equipment to convert them into yarns and fabrics, whereas the synthetic fibers must be manufactured and require raw materials, as well as mechanical equipment. This part of the textile industry is known as the rayon industry.

The use of cotton in the textile industry is governed by the availability of equipment to convert it into yarns and fabrics, and increasing the growth of cotton will not alleviate its shortage or increase its use in textiles.

On the other hand, the production of rayon has been restricted and curtailed not because of equipment shortage but because Government agencies have not made the essential raw materials available for its production.

During the past 20 years the rayon industry has grown from the position of producing an artificial silk largely used for ornamental purposes to that of producing a basic textile fiber of equal importance to wool, silk, or cotton and having a very definite and essential place in civilian needs. In the period immediately preceding the outbreak of war, when the diplomatic situation between the United States and Japan became such that imports of silk from Japan were halted by Government order, the rayon industry was called upon to allocate a substantial part of its production to industries whose livelihood had formerly depended on the unrestricted use of silk.

With the entrance of the United States in the war, the rayon industry was called upon to supply increasing quantities of its output for direct war purposes. For example, more than 100,000,000 pounds have been or are now being diverted for the production of automobile tire cord. Again, increasing quantities of rayon have been requisitioned for the production of various types of parachutes, the quantities for this purpose running into many millions of yards. Large production has gone to other uses, such as insulation, linings, signal panels, and many other uses.

The necessities of war have cut into the normal civilian supply to which rayon would ordinarily fall to such an extent that it is estimated by some of the leading producers that in the current year there will be available for civilian purposes not more than 40 percent of the amount of rayon available for civilian uses in 1941. Even this limited goal can only be attained if the necessary raw materials and manpower are made available to the rayon producers.

The present situation is one that calls for immediate action. On one hand, the War Production Board, realizing and acknowledging the essential qualities of rayon, diverts a substantial share of the production to direct war uses, thereby reducing markedly the quantity available for civilian use; on the other hand, the Board refrains from taking the necessary steps to make available to the industry the raw materials needed to assure the continued production of rayon.

The Board apparently overlooks an essential factor distinct to the rayon industry, which is that rayon is produced by a continuous process and must be operated 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, without interruption. The Board seems also to have overlooked the fact that the production of yarns for war uses is dependent directly upon the production of yarns for civilian use, and that eliminating or restricting civilian production must inevitably hamper or completely obstruct the production for war uses.

In connection with the activities of the War Production Board it would appear that its efforts have been confined solely to using present production facilities, where possible, in direct war uses, while neglecting completely the balance of facilities not so used. While this effort is understandable, judged strictly on the needs of the armed services, it must inevitably result in failure, if it destroys our civilian morale.

In total war it is just as essential to provide for the well-being of civilians who are engaged in war production as it is to provide for the man at the front. The war front is an extension of the civilian front. It is of great importance to the war effort that ample food and clothing be made available to the men and women engaged in war production, so that they will not be discouraged from exerting every effort to meet and surpass production schedules. We should not lose sight of the fact that in the last war

the collapse of Germany began behind the lines, and that her soldiers were not beaten until the home front had weakened through the deprivation of the common necessities of life. Now in this war we find ourselves confronted with the same danger in this country.

To see the situation in its proper perspective, we must bear in mind the experiences of England and Canada with this problem in the present war. In England, as in America, great emphasis was placed on the production of direct war materials. In order to accomplish this, labor was transferred from all industries, including the textile industry. It was not long before authorities realized that there were not sufficient textiles to clothe the people, and steps had to be taken to invoke the Manpower Act and transfer workers directly out of war industries to the textile mills. Thus the stamp of essentiality was placed upon an industry which, only shortly before, had been deemed nonessential.

The problem as to whether an item in wartime is essential or nonessential is one that can be determined—in practical terms—only after all of the factors have been weighed. This has been evidenced by the experience of Canada in meeting the problem of absenteeism in war industries. After exhausting all the appeals to patriotism, the authorities concluded that the only effective way to deal with the problem of absenteeism was to provide the workers with the necessary incentive.

They found that men and women tired rapidly of working for money whose only value to them appeared to represent savings or tax payments. The serious problem of absenteeism was a direct outgrowth of this situation. The solution to the problem was simply to provide the opportunity for these workers to convert the dollars they earned into something tangible, the value of which they could estimate, such as clothing. Consequently, the Canadian textile industry was granted a high manpower rating and has been kept operating at capacity, not only as a means of properly clothing the people, but also as practical aid in reducing the loss of production due to absenteeism.

Evidence of the importance of the rayon industry in the economic life of this country was given in a message sent last month to producing firms by the Director of the Textile Clothing and Leather Division of W. P. B., Mr. Frank L. Walton. On February 13 he said:

> Urgently request you increase your production all possible for more production needed for military and essential civilian needs. We expect to channel all production into most essential usage and all extra production you can make will help the war effort.

Despite these signs of awakening recognition of the importance of the textile industry as a whole, it would appear that little effort has been made by the various Government agencies to properly safeguard our homefront. While it is true that there is an Office of Civilian Supply, in practice its operation seems to be to glean such scraps as might be left on the table of war production and then allocate them to civilian needs. This Office of Civilian Supply should be called upon to define what steps it has taken to guarantee that an adequate supply of clothing materials will continue to be available for civilian requirements.

There appears to be one school of thought which contends that to win the war, civilians must be forced to do without. In total war, such an attitude begs the question in my opinion and serves only as a cloak to cover inability to deal with the situation as a whole. It is my belief that it can only result in chaos. This attitude can only be justified on the grounds that we have convinced ourselves beyond a shadow of a doubt that the war will be over in 6 months. Since no responsible person dares entertain any such hope, it follows that we must be prepared to provide for the civilian needs for a long period of sustained effort. If we wish to avoid disintegration on the home front, we must safeguard efficiently our civilian needs.

In order to accomplish this, we must first recognize the essential contribution of the textile industry to our war efforts on both the fighting front and the home front. We must assure this industry adequate supplies of raw materials and manpower to maintain this effort. Unless this is done, the loss to the country may be irretrievable.

H. R. 1867

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the National Association of the Physically Handicapped, I introduced H. R. 1867, and, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the provisions of that bill as drawn:

H. R. 1867

A bill to provide a revolving loan fund in the Disaster Loan Corporation, to which worthy citizens may apply for loans to procure prosthetic, orthopedic, or other appliances or devices, to enable such citizens to become wholly or partially self-supporting, and thus contribute to needed manpower to win the war

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established an Office of Personal Catastrophe Loans in the Disaster Loan Corporation, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. "Personal catastrophe" shall be defined as an injury, or disease, which requires use of a prosthetic, orthopedic, hearing, or other appliance, to enable the individual affected to return to useful and gainful employment.

The Office of Personal Catastrophe Loans shall be funded with the initial sum of $5,000,000, to be supplied by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from funds not otherwise allocated.

Said fund shall be established as a revolving loan fund to the herein-described persons, who, upon proper application by the individual, and certification by the properly designated official, may thus be afforded necessary relief. In each instance the individual shall have free choice of the appliance best suited to his or her personal needs, with the only proviso that it will fit him or her for useful and gainful employment.

No loan may be made without certification that the individual applying is worthy, of good character, and without the instant means of independen action.

There shall be secured from each certified applicant a note and pledge, to make repayment month by month, when employed, with interest at a rate not higher than 2 percent per annum.

The Office of Personal Catastrophe Loans is authorized and directed to utilize the personnel and facilities of existing loan agencies of the Disaster Loan Corporation and Reconstruction Finance Corporation in passing upon all applications.

The personnel of the Office of Person Catastrophe Loans shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, and the expense of the office shall be paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

This act is effective upon date of passage.

Lend-Lease Makes Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by the National League of Women Voters:

Lend-lease helped the United States before Pearl Harbor.

Thanks to the impetus lend-lease gave to production of war supplies we were not caught flat-footed when war came.

Plants and shipyards were already humming and expanding after 9 months of lend-lease activity. Our capacity to produce was much greater than it would have been otherwise.

Lend-lease helps the United States carry war to all fronts.

Russians have attacked the enemy in American-built planes.

Chinese have struck at Japanese-occupied territory in American fighter planes.

Britons have smashed at Rommel's forces in General Sherman tanks.

Indian factories have turned steel into shells with American tools.

Lend-lease gives to the United States as well as takes from it.

Britain rushed antiaircraft guns to the Panama Canal and sent barrage balloons to guard the California coast when the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor.

Two-thirds of the warships and transports used in our north African landings were furnished by Britain—160 British Spitfires, 100 miles of portable airfield runways, 130 reconnaissance boats, over a half million antitank mines and grenades.

Australia and New Zealand are facing serious food shortages in order to feed American troops.

Australia has supplied 26,000,000 pounds of meat, 20,000,000 pounds of potatoes, 25,000,000 pounds of fruit, 5,500,000 quarts of milk.

New Zealand has supplied 16,000,000 pounds of meat, 1,500,000 dozen eggs, 2,000,000 pounds of butter, 3,000,000 pounds of sugar.

Britain has turned over 16 hotels to the United States for Army headquarters staffs—hotels fully equipped, heated, and staffed. Our troops are housed in barracks heated 5 degrees above the temperature permitted to the English troops.

Our troops in India, Egypt, the Middle East, north Africa, Iceland, and the Fiji Islands are receiving supplies from our allies. Great Britain is furnishing food, fuel, medical supplies, and millions of blankets and socks; is providing our troops with transportation, housing, hospitals, airfields, repair depots, etc.

Lend-lease money is spent in the United States.

Much lend-lease money has gone to American farmers, laborers, and businessmen who have produced the food, the planes, the tanks, and other supplies.

Five hundred and fifty million dollars of lend-lease money has been spent to build and expand American plants—Ford tank and aircraft engine factories at Willow Run, Dearborn, and Highland Park; the Chrysler tank arsenal; the Boeing, Douglas, Bell Aircraft; various shipyards.

Lend-lease money has helped to develop American processes for dehydrating foods. Eggs, milk, and meat are being shipped in powdered form to our troops and allies, saving vital shipping space for tanks, planes, guns.

Lend-lease is not the major cause of our food shortages.

Chief causes of food shortages have been increased size of the Army and Navy (a soldier eats 25 percent more than a civilian); increased civilian demands, due to higher incomes.

Only 7 percent of United States food output in 1942 was exported under lend-lease—1943 demands will be much higher. Percent of some products lend-leased was high, others low. For example:

United States supply:	*Percent*
Meats	5.0
Butter	.7
Cheese	23.0
Eggs	10.0
Canned vegetables	.8
Canned fruits and juices	1.7

LEND-LEASE BUILDS FOR THE FUTURE

Lend-lease has contributed to the winning of the war. Lend-lease is paving the way for the future. As part of a larger policy concerning lend-lease repayments 10 countries are already pledged to work with us for better economic relations. The lessons of cooperation learned through lend-lease will help in working out the even harder problems of peace.

The Lend-Lease Act expires in June 1943 unless the Congress takes action to renew it. Most congressional criticism is being aimed at the methods of repayment (to be made in kind, in property, or other benefits) and comes from those who want to collect the full balance on accounts due in dollars or in benefits measurable in dollars, such as territory, air bases, etc.

It would be rash to the point of disaster were the Congress to attempt now to strike a bookkeeper's balance in settlement of lend-lease.

In what coin shall we measure the value of the Greeks who died of starvation, of the Poles who were shot by firing squads, of the Chinese whose country has been ravaged, of the millions of dead and wounded Russians, of the English who lived underground or in darkness through countless days of bombing?

The Tax Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial from the New Haven Register of March 3 which puts the blame for our present muddled tax situation right where it belongs—on Congress and the United States Treasury.

We join in the appeal to taxpayers to be prompt in filing March 15 returns and paying the first installment on their taxes, but we in the Congress are setting a particularly bad example of promptness by our failure to take some decisive action to resolve our present tax problems.

There is a particularly apt remark applicable to the present fuddle-duddling of the House Ways and Means Committee, but suffice to say that most of Congress and 40,000,000 taxpayers want some quick action. Each one of us is willing to pay his just debts to the Government, but we would like to know how, when, and how much. It is purely nonsense to even consider some of the proposals over which time is being wasted. Let us be honest, simple, direct, and fair, and let us adopt the Ruml plan—now.

Here is the editorial:

UP THE WRONG TREE

A United States Senator and a Member of the House of Representatives went on the air with the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury last night in an appeal, sponsored by the Department of the last-named spokesman, for prompt payment of Federal income taxes due the 15th of this month. They placed promptness in payment on a basis of keeping faith with the men on the far-flung fighting fronts. It was said that citizens are falling behind last year in filing their returns and making payments.

There is no question about the desirability of prompt return filing and taxpaying. Any thoughtful person will hope for that and urge it. Yet the question may be raised whether the Washington congressional and departmental spokesmen are not barking up the wrong tree.

One reason why paying is slow this year traces straight back to the departments represented in this appeal for promptness. Although the individual income on which taxes, now due, were to be levied began in January, it was well into the fall before the Congress and the Treasury fixed the rates at which the taxpayer was to pay. The year was practically five-sixths gone before he knew how much he should lay aside out of current earnings. The money was gone.

To make that clear is not merely to make a point, for the record, of past official dilly-dallying and pulling and hauling and, by the Treasury, persistent injection of extraneous schemes which were well known to be quite unacceptable to the Congress. A purpose is to point out that in those same quarters from which now comes the call for promptness, to keep faith with the soldiers, there is taking place some of the same procrastination that is at the bottom of the currently deplored delay.

Present indications are that decision on the real issue of collection on the Ruml plan of pay-as-you-earn taxation is being postponed until July, and the issue of rates for this year along with it. That means that the taxpayer again may not know before late summer or autumn what his true tax liability will be for this year or next year, whether he is going to have to save for some of it or if it all will be taken from him before he gets it. Confronted with the consequence of delay the official procedure is to persist in delay.

As noted above, promptness in payment is indeed most desirable. No thoughtful person would think of counseling anything but that. But at the same time it would be more appropriate, and more constructive, if instead of hounding the taxpayer there were some hounding of the agencies which refuse to tell the taxpayer what is going to be demanded of him, in time for him to adjust his way of living so as to be able to pay up.

The citizen of moderate means who, not until within 4 or 5 months of the due date, is told that his tax liability is to be jumped three or four hundred dollars or more would like to keep faith with the men on the fighting front, if that is the basis it is to be put on, just as much as the next man. But as the adage goes, you can't squeeze honey out of an onion. The point is that to date there is not much assurance that the situation will be much better, as a result of official action, next year than this.

The Poll Tax Must Be Abolished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over the National Broadcasting Co., February 26, 1943:

On January 6 the present Congress went into session. Since then the American people have witnessed their best interests defeated time and time again. Each week has brought about one or more action on the part of the House and the Senate which has been a negation of the things for which Americans are fighting and dying. For instance, during the past week the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives eliminated from an appropriation bill $2,973,000 for the care of children, $2,454,000 for manpower control, $3,068,000 for wartime education, and $1,200,000 for maternity aid.

It is very difficult to conceive of a more serious blow against our home front than these eliminations. This means the refusal to care for the soldiers' wives who are about to become mothers and the denial of care for the children of mothers who are loyally fighting in the battle for production in the war factories and defense plants all over the Nation.

This tragic condition in the legislative branch of the Government is not mere accident. It is the continuance of a policy applied to every phase of the war effort, a

policy which may bring about a plan of taxation whereby the burden will be placed disproportionately and inequitably on the shoulders of labor and small businessmen, a blind policy of discrimination and un-American practices against loyal racial and religious groups, Negroes, Americans of Italian extraction, Puerto Ricans, Jews, and Catholics, which makes it impossible to tap this tremendous reservoir of manpower in the interests of achieving the unconditional surrender of our Axis enemies. This same policy is the basis for a daily offensive in Congress against American labor.

Again, I say that this policy and activity in Congress is no mere incident. One of the main responsible factors is found in the vicious and undemocratic poll-tax system. The poll tax is a device which has brought about the disenfranchisement of nearly 10,000,000 adult voters, about 6,000,000 of whom are white and approximately 4,000,000 are Negro. It has made it possible for Members of Congress to be elected in primaries and general elections where the total vote cast in some districts has not exceeded 2,000 votes. Let us bear in mind that Congressmen from States where the poll tax does not exist have been elected by voters participating in the elections—primary and general elections—numbering from 40,000 to a half a million. The reason for the small number of votes cast in poll-tax districts must be attributed primarily to the requirement for the payment of a poll tax. In 7 remaining poll-tax States citizens must pay for the privilege of voting sums of from $1 to $3 a year. In some of these States these annual poll taxes are cumulative for periods of 2 and 3 years and in others for the period from the age of 21 to the age of 45. Thus, it is sometimes required of a voter that he pay sums ranging from $4.50 to $36. Just think what such a large sum means to a poor farmer whose whole family annual income in many cases is less than $150. Think what this means to a family with 3 or 4 voters—who may have to pay sums as high as $50 or $75 if they wish to vote in an election. It is this tax—looming as so large a part of the small cash income of millions of families in the poll-tax States—that makes for such a small number of voters in election districts in these poll-tax States.

Therefore, you can readily see that undemocratic elections make for undemocratic representation. Men elected in voting constituencies of 2,000 can never be as responsive to the people of their districts as Congressmen and Senators elected from districts where there is no restriction on the elective franchise. Undemocratic representation makes for repressive and reactionary legislation. Every observer on Capitol Hill in our Nation's Capital will readily agree that in the main, with several notable exceptions, Congressmen and Senators who are beneficiaries of the poll-tax limitations are in the vanguard in the denial of win-the-war legislation for the home front. It is no secret that the opposition to the President's program for the limiting of salaries to $25,000 a year during wartime, for genuine price control and effective rationing, as well as to other essential measures in the President's seven-point economic program—that this opposition comes to a considerable extent from those who have been elected in poll-tax districts.

It is no secret that those who are beating the war drums against the working man and working woman, who make up the vital regiments in our battle for all-out production are likewise to a large degree representatives of poll-tax districts.

The abolition of the poll tax will, therefore, remove the system of elections which makes it possible to have in Congress a good number of Representatives who are the proponents of a policy which, if successful, will prove disastrous to the President's and the American people's plan for victory.

There is another very important aspect to this problem which in this world-wide war is the very foundation stone of victory. In peacetime the struggle for the abolition of the poll tax is part of the great fight begun in 1776 by our forefathers for the extension of the blessings of democracy to everybody, irrespective of race, color, or creed. Jefferson said it and the American people affirmed that proposition in the Declaration of Independence—that all men are created equal. There were no exceptions, either in the Declaration or in the minds and hearts of the patriots who gave birth to this Nation founded on this creed. The abolition of the poll tax is the continuance of this fight begun in 1776 and carried on by Lincoln in 1860. That is the character of the fight in peacetime.

In this war the effects of anti-poll-tax legislation extend beyond our own borders. Not only will the abolition of the poll tax lift the morale of the 13,000,000 loyal Negro Americans in this country and thereby forge that national unity which is so essential to victory, but it will be living evidence and reaffirmation to our United Nations Allies and to the colonial peoples in India, Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean of our earnest and high resolve to win the battle for a free and democratic world. The best demonstration of our sincerity to extend democracy all over the world is for us to extend it now, before the war is over, to everyone within our own borders.

I assure my friends that this is not force legislation against the South. We in Congress have heard from thousands of fine Southern people of all races and creeds, who understand the vital issue involved in the fight to abolish the poll tax, and who want to see it through. This is legislation intended to benefit the whole American people—South and North, East and West. The abolition of the poll tax is a cause supported by all branches of the labor movement—Congress of Industrial Organizations, American Federation of Labor, and the railway brotherhoods. It has the overwhelming support of church people—Catholic, Protestant, and Jews—of women's organizations, of organizations of Negro people and other minorities.

For these reasons I have felt it my duty to make the fight for the abolition of the poll tax in this session of Congress. I introduced my bill (H. R. 7) to abolish the poll tax on the very first day of this session. The bill has not been reported out of the Judiciary Committee. It, therefore, becomes necessary to file with the Speaker of the House a petition to discharge the Judiciary Committee in order to secure a vote on anti-poll tax legislation. To validate the petition it must be signed by 218 Members of the House of Representatives. This petition will be filed Friday, March 5.

It is up to the American people who hear me tonight to let their Congressmen know that they wish them to sign this petition. It is up to you who hear me to give your support to this effort to bring democracy to our whole people. In carrying out this fight against the poll tax I feel that I am continuing the battle begun by my former colleague, the late Lee E. Geyer, of California, whose untimely death last year was so deeply felt by the whole American people. In this great fight I have every confidence that I am carrying out the mandate of the American people to give the best that I have to the cause of national unity, victory, and freedom. I thank you.

France Is With Us Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the dinner tendered by the French Chamber of Commerce and the French Institute of New York to the French north African naval and military missions at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, Wednesday, March 3, 1943:

Probably at no time in the history of the world has the cause of freedom been so hideously and so seriously threatened as today. Certainly at no time in the history of the world has the cause of freedom meant so much to so many. I doubt if anyone anywhere questioned the heart of France in this cause. Howsoever events may have temporarily clouded this fact; howsoever circumstances may have caught the cause of freedom unprepared in France and temporarily imprisoned it; tonight proudly and gloriously we welcome here in New York, in the persons of gallant French soldiers and sailors united with us in what has become, in fact, a sacred war, evidence that the French people, wherever free to act, are determined to fight not only for the freedom of France but for the freedom of all peoples everywhere.

In the midst of the strain and stress of our united war effort; in the midst of our inevitable concern; in the midst of our tears and our sacrifices, tonight we can afford to pause and rejoice. France, la belle France, is with us again.

I doubt if you who are French realize the full import of that message to us who are Americans. We have never doubted you. The record stands and cannot be denied. Your ships in our port; your soldiers and sailors in our streets; your flag flung from our balconies; your anthem sounding in our halls; your men fighting side by side with ours today in battle, has completed a picture that to us was tragically incomplete without you. Thank God you have come.

And now that you are here, my friends, now that again, as so often before in our history, you are fighting with us side by side, I hope you will let an old friend of France speak frankly to you in deep affection.

It is part and parcel of the strategy of our common enemy, the Axis Powers, to create divisions amongst us—to divide the United Nations.

They have spread rumors that England, who bled and sweat, and wept at Dunkerque is out to do us in at the peace table. You will perhaps be told that by ignorant people here. It is not true.

They, these Axis Powers, have never ceased to whisper that Russia will sign a separate peace and will fail to live up to the Atlantic Charter which she signed. It is not true.

They, these Axis Powers, have repeated and repeated that we have failed China. It is not true.

They, these Axis Powers, have cried everywhere that the Anglo-Saxon peoples intend to possess the world. It is not true.

And now they are trying to divide the French. And they cannot. Unless, my friends, in wicked indifference to the importance of the cause which you have joined there are Frenchmen still free to act who seek political power rather than victory.

We in America refuse to recognize these divisions—either amongst the United Nations collectively—or within any member of the United Nations group specifically.

And so we refuse to recognize divisions amongst the French.

This fact is important. Surely our cause is worthy of unity. And surely any man who imperils that unity directly or indirectly is serving our enemies.

The day before yesterday, General Giraud publicly adhered to the Atlantic Charter. The third point in the charter pledges:

"The right of all peoples to choose their own government, with sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Is there to be division of the French in the restoration of that right? Is not our cause a common cause as our enemy is a common enemy?

I think you know the answer. I think you realize as deeply as I do that there must be no division in our ranks. That the would-be creators of any such division, whether French, British, Chinese, Russian, or American are wittingly or unwittingly traitors to our cause.

Your great warships are here to join with ours in the battle of the Atlantic. They are manned by gallant Frenchmen. Our fight is their fight, and their fight is our fight, as in the fight of your soldiers in Africa. Their contribution to freedom is a glorious one. And if there be any who try to persuade them to the contrary, if there be any who would divert them from the clear duty of manning these ships or forming these regiments in our common cause, let such people, whatever their nationality, beware. And I say this, not only as an American, but as an elected representative of the American people and a member of the present American Government.

We have been called the arsenal of democracy. We are the arsenal of democracy. In a few days the American Congress will renew the so-called lend-lease agreements. I pledge you that the Congress will not countenance split lend-lease to foreign internal political factions. Our watchwords are, and must remain, Unity, Victory, and Liberty.

There is one great leader of the United Nations who has spoken so forcibly on this point that in conclusion I cannot do better than to quote him. Rebuking a quibbler, he said:

"This is a people's war. If the present quarrel with the past, there will be no future."

Frenchmen, we welcome you to our cause.

Marxist Turns Realist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and timely editorial which appeared in the Beloit News, of Beloit, Wis., on March 1, 1943:

A MARXIST TURNS REALIST

Post-war planners should not miss Arthur Koestler's article in a recent New York Times magazine. They need not accept what he says merely because he has said it. But the views which he expresses do have weight because of their source.

Koestler, a "leftist intellectual," has changed his mind about why the United Nations are fighting and what the now occupied countries want after the war.

Like others of his school, he had thought that we were fighting for a generality known as democracy and against a generality known as fascism. He had regarded this as a struggle for a new world that would be "liberal" in the Marx-Engel sense of that many-faceted adjective.

Says he now: "The nearer victory comes in sight, the clearer the character of the war reveals itself as what the tories always said it was—a war for national survival, a war in defense of certain conservative nineteenth century ideals, and not what I and my friends of the left said it was—a revolutionary civil war in Europe on the Spanish pattern."

Mr. Koestler is grieved about this. Already the barrage of dead cats has begun flying in his direction, the belittling charges that he is just a "tired liberal," a defeatist. But in any event he is not a renegade. He just faces what he believes, sorrowfully, are facts.

Another way of looking at the situation is that we really are fighting for democracy—not the intangible generality, but the specific benefits. After looking over the alternatives, we have reassured ourselves that, with all its faults, we prefer this capitalistic system to Marxism.

We are fighting for our countries. Even the Russians now concede that their magnificent struggle is for Russia, and not for the Red version of totalitarianism. The Germans are fighting for a greater Reich, not for the principles of nazi-ism.

Yet when we of the United Nations win, we shall have enabled democracy and its child, the system of individual enterprise, to survive yet a while longer.

And why not? Democracy promises us what we want. The school of liberalism to which Mr. Koestler belonged would have given us what it thought to be best for us. We prefer democracy.

Bureaucrats

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the remarks of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from North Carolina, Major BULWINKLE, who so fervently from the majority side inquired as to whom Members of the minority were referring when they asked for a curtailment of activities of bureaucrats, it might appear to some that he had been doing a Rip Van Winkle stunt during the last few years.

In my judgment, however, the gentleman is fully aware that the reference was to those fuzzy, wuzzy, wooly, ideologists, those star-gazing, crystal-ball observers who have, lo these many years, been trying to solve the food problem by killing little pigs, lessening the number of cows, plowing under cotton, restricting the acreage of wheat, corn, and in brief, preaching the doctrine of scarcity, which they seem to feel would make us all fat, happy, and prosperous.

We were referring to those who tell us that we must be not only the arsenal but the granary of the world, that we must and we can feed all the civilian population of the world, our own folks, our Army, and the armed forces of the world, even though our farms are stripped of the men and women who ordinarily cultivate them; even though our farm machinery is sent to South America; even though the farm workers are enticed to leave the land by the high wages offered in munitions factories.

Under the term "bureaucrats," we include those who may have a high degree of book knowledge, who may be very desirous of making the whole world better, as we all are, but who have no practical knowledge, no real solution of the difficulties which confront us. We mean, too, those impracticable individuals who refuse to accept the existence of facts which confront us, who insist that while we are in this war, which involves our national existence, much of our time and our energy be devoted to social reforms, so-called, instead of to practical operations which mean the defeat of our enemies.

It is quite true, as the gentleman from North Carolina, Major BULWINKLE, said, that there are so-called Republicans in this administration but they are not real dyed-in-the-wool Republicans. They are men who formerly believed in the doctrines of the Republican Party, but who evidently have been taken up into the high places, shown the promised land of political advancement, become followers of the New Deal theories and then by the President placed in positions of authority such as were given to Secretary of the Navy Knox and Secretary of War Stimson. They are not real Republicans. They have joined the ranks of the new dealers.

Allotment of Food to Schools by the Surplus Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to another case of what I believe to be, under the present dire food shortage, downright criminal activity by the Surplus Commodity Credit Corporation.

In a certain place in my district just before the first of the year, the local representative of the Surplus Commodity

Credit Corporation contacted the local school authorities for the purpose of ascertaining the allotment of food for the school. It appears the school authorities felt they could do without food given out by this Federal agency. Upon being urged, however, by the representative of this agency to apply for an allotment of food, the authorities reluctantly gave in and agreed to accept 3 pounds of butter a week and asked for 3 or 4 pounds of English walnuts.

Within a few days they received a notice that their allotment of butter for January would be 100 pounds, or 8 times more than they had ever used in any one month in the past. They refused to accept this and pointed out the foolishness of this type of allotment and were cut to an allotment of 3 pounds per month. The walnuts were sent, and instead of 3 pounds of whole English walnuts, which they had expected, and for which they had applied, they received approximately 25 or 30 pounds of English walnut meats.

With the short rations of butter and other foods, no words are too strong to condemn this sort of activity, and it seems to me that the Congress of the United States is charged with the responsibility of abolishing, root and branch, even the possibility of such a devilish thing like this to take place.

Increase of Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, we are at war. This conflict must be financed. To do this requires that money be collected through taxation or as a loan through the sale of war bonds.

We are on the eve of collecting more than $33,000,000,000 under the 1942 Revenue Act. Also the Treasury is preparing to borrow $13,000,000,000 by means of a bond-selling campaign, scheduled to begin April 12, 1943.

It is, in my opinion, the imperative duty and the inescapable responsibility of the Congress to inform the taxpayers of the country, without delay, what their increased tax burden is to be and by what method it is to be discharged.

Unless the present tax snarl, as well as the uncertainty now existing, is promptly straightened out and the whole situation clarified, the consequent hindrance to the sale of War bonds will create a major disaster. The taxpayer dare not invest in War bonds until he knows with certainty what his tax liability is to be during the coming year. If he is to be faced with a doubling up of 1942 and 1943 taxes, regardless of whether or not the liability for 2 years' taxes is spread over 5 or 10 years, his ability to buy bonds will be limited to the amount of money available to him for the purchase of bonds after he shall have met his tax liability.

If, as a result of congressional delay, the taxpayer is unable to know what his liability is to be, then he will hesitate to purchase War bonds during the April bond-selling campaign. What will this uncertainty in the mind of the taxpayer lead to? It will mean that the Treasury will have to appeal to the commercial banks to buy bonds to finance the war. This, in turn, will create and put new money into circulation to bid against the limited supply of goods available, thus fostering the very inflation the Treasury has sought to prevent by draining off purchasing power through taxation.

It is an imposition upon the taxpayers, who are willing and anxious to finance this war, to strip them of their spending power while at the same time defeating this sacrifice on their part by manufacturing new money to nullify such deprivations as they may make, in the way of taxes, to stop inflation.

It is my opinion that there is no substantial reason why the Ways and Means Committee should not relieve the public mind of all uncertainty as to when and how the taxes are to be collected throughout the year 1943 and, furthermore, to inform the taxpayers as to the extent to which taxes will be increased by the doubling up of the 1942 and 1943 taxes, if such is to be the procedure. It is obvious to those who are familiar with the situation throughout the country that such doubling up is an impossibility for the average taxpayer.

The Federal tax burden of $33,000,000,000 will be heavy enough, especially when coupled with $12,000,000,000 of State and local taxes, without piling on five or ten billions more in a doubling-up process. It must be kept in mind constantly by those who have the slightest interest in the taxpayers—who, after all, in the final analysis constitute the Government itself—that President Roosevelt has requested $16,000,000,000 more to be added to the thirty-three billions, plus twelve billions of State and local taxes. Does any person familiar with present conditions throughout the country believe that to this load there can be added a doubling up of taxes without a serious impairment of the credit of law-abiding citizens who have always made every effort to meet their bills, especially their obligations to the Government?

I wish to say here and now that I have listened patiently to plan after plan presented to the Ways and Means Subcommittee, of which I am a member, each of which has sought to grant some degree of so-called forgiveness or abatement of the 1942 tax liability but in each and every one of these plans, except one proposal, there is a doubling up, and furthermore the desirable objective of making all taxpayers current is not achieved. The one which does not double up the tax payment in some degree is the so-called Ruml plan, which is embodied in two measures introduced in the House by Hon. FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas.

The first Carlson bill, House Joint Resolution 17, has been superseded by a new measure, H. R. 2042, which includes a provision for withholding at the source on wages and salaries. Under both measures, complete abatement of the 1942 tax liability is provided, therefore eliminating any doubling up of taxes. Moreover, this is the only plan that has been presented to the committee which makes all income taxpayers fully current. This would be accomplished by abating the 1942 tax debt and treating all income-tax payments made in 1943 as being in discharge of the 1943 liability. The Carlson bill embodies the only plan that completely relieves the income taxpayers of an overhanging tax debt to the Government in the event of the taxpayer's death or loss of earning power through any cause whatsoever.

In the interest of financing this all-out war, and in the interest of the overburdened, conscientious, and patriotic taxpayer I deplore this delay in adopting a plan that will relieve this whole situation, the Carlson bill, H. R. 2042.

Factory Management and Maintenance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Montagnes, Canadian correspondent, Factory Management and Maintenance, in the issue of February 1943:

CANADIAN PLANT HALVES WILLFUL ABSENTEEISM

(By James Montagnes)

When absenteeism through holidays, sickness, and absence without permission reached the figure of one in every eight employees late last summer, the management of John Inglis Co., Ltd., Toronto (Bren guns, Boys antitank rifles, Browning aircraft machine guns, marine engines, and boilers) decided to take drastic steps to cut the absenteeism of their 12,000 employees. In a 12-week campaign, from August 30 to November 21, with teamwork and a departmental competitive spirit, absenteeism was cut in half after 9 weeks. Lessons were learned that have been applied, and it is expected that the lost-time average throughout the entire plant will not stray far from 7 percent.

The campaign got under way with every employee being given an 8 by 10 folder in three colors, with illustrations of starving Greeks, on the theme that "Lost Time Is Subtle Sabotage." Included was a pamphlet on how the campaign was to be run, the teams in which the various departments were divided. From each department scouts were picked, given badges and a list of names. It was their job to check each day the names on their list, find out who was present, or if absent why, and whether with or without permission. On the return of each absent employee the scout asked him or her to fill out a slip with reasons for the absence. Not everyone filled these slips out, but from those returned with reasons 60 percent signed their names and clock numbers, although this was not necessary. The reasons given included much humor, satire, and some abuse, but from them it was possible to learn major causes and formulate remedial plans.

It was found that the majority of the girls (about half the total employees) were absent because of fatigue (two 10-hour shifts), plus lack of time to do their shopping; to get away from their one-room existence and have some

recreation; to go back to the home town for a few days; that men were mainly absent through sickness, shopping with family, or just loafing.

About this time an order to double the production of Bren guns forced the company to change over to three 8-hour shifts. Absenteeism started to drop, although not sharply, as workers had time to shop but did not have as much money to spend. The company also provided the girls with a recreational center under a capable physical education director; pointed out to all employees that the 3 plant doctors, 4 hospitals, and 20 trained nurses were on hand to give them aid as soon as they felt a cold coming on, that the plant's dietitian would help in planning healthy meals.

Large departmental charts were set up in each of the 56 departments to show absences of men and girls, with or without leave. At all main exits large charts showed absenteeism records by main plant divisions. After 3 weeks these charts began to pay dividends, and there was keen rivalry among departments and plant divisions to keep their absence percentages down. Absent employees were reminded with stickers and stuffers in their pay envelopes, and colorful posters throughout the plant bore the slogan "the little gal (or little man) who wasn't there."

In the pamphlet that explained the workings of the campaign, it was stated: "It is neither possible nor proper that there should be any monetary awards offered to the victors in the performance of a simple duty—pride of achievement is what must spark us all through this campaign."

Silver flags were presented weekly to the department which showed the lowest absence percentages. These presentations were made in the President's office by high officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, who told departmental representatives what their work meant to the fighting men. Well-known people presented monthly gold flags, and Wendell Willkie was guest of honor at the presentation of the final winning flags. Internationally known personalities, such as United States Labor Secretary Perkins, Canadian Labor Minister Mitchell, film and radio stars, United States Army and Navy officers, and United States civilian-defense workers in uniform toured the plant, gave the employees a contact with many well-known people. The Canadian Army and Navy were hosts to girls from winning departments, took them on tours of their barracks and ships, showed them where the work they were doing fitted into the fighting picture. The semimonthly employee paper, the Shotgun, kept news of the lost-time campaign up to date with stories and pictures from all departments.

All these factors helped in creating good fellowship among the employees, made them realize what absence from their machines meant to the general war effort and especially to the fighting men. Over 400,000 hours were salvaged during the drive.

Lend-Lease Administration—or Loose End?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when we received the report on lend-lease operations from the Lend-Lease Administrator and found that by Executive order he had been authorized by the President "to exercise any power or authority conferred upon the President" by the Lend-Lease Act, I thought that the Lend-Lease Administration had charge of all matters connected with furnishing war materials to other countries and acquiring war materials from them. I find this is not the case. On the last day of our hearings Mr. Stettinius furnished a supplemental statement on this subject, which is very interesting, and is found on page 337 of the hearings.

On February 26 I received a letter from Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson giving a list of Government agencies handling exports and imports of war materials. The committee felt this arrived too late to be included in the hearings. This letter and the last statement of Mr. Stettinius show that at least eight different Government agencies and bureaus are exporting war materials, and at least five are making emergency purchases of war materials abroad. The Lend-Lease Administration has apparently no control over furnishing munitions to other countries or purchasing munitions from other countries. It has apparently no control over ships or shipping space. The State Department negotiates lend-lease agreements. According to Mr. Acheson's letter and Executive Order 9128 to which he refers, the Board of Economic Warfare is engaged in the import and also the export of strategic goods and materials, and handles reciprocal aid and benefits, except for munitions. Under Executive Order 9177 the Departments of War, Navy, Treasury, and Agriculture—including corporations operated by it—are authorized "to make emergency purchases of war material abroad."

These last-minute clarifying statements by Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Acheson have left me more confused than ever as to just who sends out war materials to other countries and just who brings in materials to aid in our war effort. The Lease-Lend Administration instead of controlling this appears to be the "loose end" administration, which takes care of the odds and ends that are not covered by other Government agencies.

With the thought that these two statements may be helpful to other Members in understanding lend-lease operations, I call attention to Mr. Stettinius' statement, which is already available in the committee report, and, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the letter from Mr. Acheson:

FEBRUARY 25, 1943.

The Honorable JOHN M. VORYS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. VORYS: At the time of the recent hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House you asked me to furnish you with a statement showing (1) the Government agencies engaged in purchasing goods abroad for import into the United States and (2) the Government agencies engaged in exporting, or controlling the export of, goods from the United States to foreign countries. This letter is in response to that request.

1. Importing agencies: I enclose copies of Executive Orders No. 9128, of April 13, 1942 (together with the President's clarifying statement of May 20, 1942), and No. 9177, of May 30, 1942. You will see from order No. 9177 that the Departments of War, Navy, Treasury, and Agriculture (including corporations operated by it), and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (including its subsidiaries) are authorized "to make emergency purchases of war material abroad" and to request its admission free of duty pursuant to the act of June 30, 1914. Under the other order, as you will observe, the Board of Economic Warfare has important responsibilities with reference to the direction of purchases of materials abroad for import in connection with the war effort. These are the principal agencies operating in this field. The Department of State does not itself buy goods abroad for import, but it and its officers stationed in foreign countries do, of course, advise with the other agencies concerned and endeavor to assist their operations.

I am advised that the Lend-Lease Administration does not buy goods abroad for import into the United States. It does, of course, participate in arrangements for reciprocal lend-lease.

War Production Board, as order No. 9128 points out, and also the Combined Production and Resources Board and the Combined Raw Materials Board indicate their needs and views from time to time to the purchasing agencies. I am advised, however, that they do not engage directly in purchases abroad for import.

2. Exporting and export controlling agencies: The chief Government agencies engaged directly in the export of goods from the United States are the Lend-Lease Administration and the agencies which participate with it in the execution of the Lend-Lease Act, namely, the Departments of War, Navy, Treasury, and Agriculture and the Maritime Commission. The Department of State, of course, endeavors to assist the work of these agencies, but it does not itself procure goods for export, or export them.

It will be realized, of course, that the Departments of War and Navy ship large quantities of arms, munitions, and supplies to the United States forces overseas. These shipments, like the small shipments of office equipment and the like occasionally made to other official agencies of the United States abroad for their official use, are not commonly classified as exports.

The Office of Exports of the Board of Economic Warfare is engaged in the export of goods and materials connected with the development in foreign countries of sources of strategic materials. The Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs is also engaged in the export of materials to the other American republics to develop certain projects, mainly cultural in their nature, which are intended to create good will between the United States and the other American republics.

Exports not made by Government agencies to destinations other than Canada are now subject to export control. There are two systems of licensing depending on the character of the commodity to be exported.

Exports of arms, ammunition, and implements of war as those terms are defined in proclamations issued pursuant to section 12 of the joint resolution of November 4, 1939, are licensed by the Secretary of State except in cases of lend-lease shipments or those to the armed forces. Depending upon the destination such licenses are either specific or unlimited. Exports of helium, under the act of September 1, 1937, and tin-plate scrap, under the act of February 15, 1936, are also licensable by the Secretary of State. A copy of the regulations on these subjects is enclosed.

All other articles offered for export from the United States by private persons are subject to the Export Control Act of July 2, 1940, as amended, which is administered by the Board of Economic Warfare. While all such articles are subject to export control, individual export licenses are, in some instances, not required for each individual exportation. Many materials may be exported to certain

destinations under general or unlimited licenses.

Procurement in this country of all articles of either class, for export, is of course subject to the control exercised by the War Production Board and other agencies over the procurement of articles and materials in short supply.

I hope the foregoing gives you the information that you need. It is not absolutely exhaustive; indeed, I assume that many Government agencies, in the course of their ordinary operations, import or export special items. No doubt the Department of Agriculture imports seeds and plants for experimental purposes, and the Smithsonian Institution undoubtedly has foreign subscribers for its scientific publications. I assume you do not wish an exhaustive listing of all such incidental cases, and indeed I would not know how to make it. The agencies listed above are those which, according to my best knowledge, are now engaged to a significant extent in buying goods abroad for import, or in exporting goods, or in controlling exports.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,
Assistant Secretary.

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, last January the Akron Beacon-Journal, a daily newspaper in Ohio, printed a story based on certain interviews with military men from the Akron area who had returned from service in the Southwest Pacific. The story concerned an allegation that merchant seamen in the Guadalcanal war area had refused to unload vital cargo on Sunday.

A subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee made a complete investigation of the charge and came to the general conclusion that the newspaper went far afield in drawing the inferences created by the story, and that the said story was based on little or no factual evidence but on inferences and broad conclusions. It was categorically denied by Admiral Halsey, commander in chief of the southwest Pacific forces, Major General Vandegrift, in charge of the operations on Guadalcanal, and the Secretary of the Navy.

The story was played up in reprints of newspapers throughout the Nation, and unfortunately there was created in the public mind a feeling of suspicion against the part the entire merchant marine has played in the war effort. Because of this, it is only fair and proper at this time, for the purpose of the record, that we insert in the RECORD the splendid and patriotic part that the merchant marine has played in this war.

American merchant marine losses in dead and missing during the first year of the war totaled more than 3,200—3.8 percent of the total number of merchant sailors—compared with a rate of ¾ of 1 percent for the armed services.

America's 70,000 seamen delivered the goods, and showed patriotism, courage, and devotion to duty.

A recent report by Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the War Shipping Administration, declared:

First. American seamen are loyal and efficient.

Second. About three-fourths of the off-shore merchant seamen are always at sea—in the front line.

Third. Willingness of sailors to brave bombs and torpedoes was shown when 100,000 persons responded to W. S. A.'s call for experienced seamen.

Fourth. Actual pay for the average able seaman or fireman, figuring his board and room, is approximately $57 a week; about what a second-class rigger earns in a shipyard.

Fifth. W. S. A.'s Labor Relations Division, which investigates all reports of infractions of discipline, found practically all such incidents occurred in ports, and were the result of the continued strain under which seamen work.

Sixth. Despite an expected increase in enemy attacks on our merchant shipping, greater percentage of survivals is expected in 1943 because of more escort vessels, better armed ships, more and improved safety devices, and more experienced crews.

Land said there was little chance of missing seamen turning up. By counting all 3,200 as dead, he added, the number could be equal to the total dead, killed in action of the Army, Marine, and Coast Guard combined.

The latest official combined casualty list, issued as of January 6, covered those killed in 13 months, while Land's figures covering the lists gave these totals of those listed as dead: Army, 2,193; Marine Corps, 1,201; and Coast Guard, 51. Land did not include the Navy's dead, which were listed January 6 at 4,657.

An Agricultural Employee Speaks Out on the 40-Hour Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter written by a certain Government employee, whose name I am not disclosing, in reference to the overtime pay bill passed by this Congress for the benefit of Government workers. I sincerely hope that the Committee on the Civil Service will take due notice of this man's letter. The letter is as follows:

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of a mimeographed sheet through which membership in the agricultural branch of the National Federation of Federal Employees is being solicited.

This sheet recounts some so-called achievements of this organization, and claims credit for the part it played in broadening and strengthening the principle of overtime pay.

In my opinion, it is little short of criminal for any organization in time of war to devote its time to interests that are wholly selfish. It is particularly reprehensible that employees of the Government department should support an idea that is as obnoxious to the group whose interest these employees are supposed to serve, as is the principle of overtime pay to the farmers of America.

Recently a high official of the Manpower Commission suggested that to feed the Nation, its armed forces, and its allies, farmers would need, during the emergency, to work not 60 to 80 hours, as in the past, but up to 100 hours per week. Farmers of the West do not resent that suggestion, but do you members of the National Federation of Federal Employees think these farmers are happy to know that United States Department of Agriculture employees have occupied themselves lobbying for a 40-hour workweek for themselves? As I see it, this is a poor way to win a war.

I regret that at one time I paid dues to your organization. The overtime-pay measure in which you take pride has done more to disrupt the field work of the Department and to dissatisfy its field personnel than any measure that has come to my attention in 35 years of Department experience. In my opinion, you would do well to lend your support to its repeal when the temporary period expires April 30.

Very truly yours.

There Is Now a Cotton Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "The Cotton Surplus, a Fact or Fancy" by A. B. Cox, reprinted from Texas Business Review of the Bureau of Business Research, University of Texas, volume XVII, February 1943:

Cotton is a world commodity. Its two major products are cotton lint and cottonseed. Much is being said about a surplus of lint cotton. What are the facts? On December 31, available data indicate there was on hand in the United States about 17,500,000 bales of lint cotton. Consumption, exports, destroyed, and so forth, from January 1 to July 31 will approximate 7,800,000 bales, and that will leave a carry-over of about 9,700,000 bales in the United States.

As a lump sum, that is a lot of cotton, but cotton is not consumed in lump sums, and the new crop will not be available for use in quantity for nearly 2 months after August 1. At the rate of present consumption in the United States and export, there is need, therefor, for a total carry-over in mills and channels of trade on August 1 of from 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 bales of cotton supply of the qualities being consumed and exported in the interim.

Estimates based on Government statistics and sales by merchants indicate that on December 31 there were about 1,600,000 bales of cotton in the country shorter than seven-eighths inch. It is possible that 1,500,000 bales of this cotton will be in the carry-over July 31, and a large part of it may be con-

sidered as surplus in terms of United States consumption, though the bedding industry may take much more than indicated and some of it may have to be used in explosives.

The total supply of seven-eighths and twenty-nine thirty-seconds inch in the United States on December 31 was about 4,200,000 bales, and consumption is now at the rate of about 140,000 bales per month. If sufficient supplies of other staples of proper grades were available, there would probably be a carry-over of this cotton of over 3,000,000 bales, some of this can and probably will be substituted for fifteen-sixteenths inch.

The total supply of 15/16- and 31/32-inch staple cotton on December 31 was about 2,000,000 bales. Should takings for these staples for the remainder of this year continue at the rate of the previous 5 months of about 330,000 bales per month, the supply of them would be exhausted.

On December 31 the total supply of 1 inch and 1 1/32-inch cotton was about 6,300,000 bales. The disappearance of these staples is at the rate of about 320,000 bales per month, and the indicated carry-over July 31 is about 3,000,000 bales.

On December 31, the supply of cotton of 1 1/16 inch and over amounted to about 3,400,000 bales. Disappearance of this cotton is at the rate of about 285,000 bales per month and the indicated carry-over July 31 is about 2,200,000 bales.

Viewed from the standpoint of staple lengths only, there seems to be an ample supply of all qualities except fifteen-sixteenths and thirty-one thirty-seconds inch and a possible surplus of cotton seven-eighths and under and possibly some of the staples 1 1/8 inch and over.

The cotton supply is even tighter than indicated above due to grade distribution. The great majority of American mills installed their equipment to manufacturing medium grade and staple lengths. The indicated carry-over of cotton by grades July 31, 1943, is as follows: Strict Middling and above, about 2,400,000 bales; Middling, 1,500,000 bales; Strict Low Middling, 3,400,000 bales; and Low Middling and below, 2,200,000. The monthly rate of disappearance by grades is about as follows: Strict Middling and above, 110,000 bales; Middling, 490,000 bales; Strict Low Middling, 350,000 bales; and Low Middling and below, 120,000 bales. The surplus grades are apparently Low Middling and below and Strict Middling and above.

The excess supply of cotton in the United States, July 31, when measured in terms of United States consumption and an additional disappearance for the year of 1,500,000 bales, will not exceed 4,000,000 bales, and the bulk of that is low-grade short-staple cotton in the hands of the Government.

Experience after the last war, when we had a similar accumulation of low-grade cotton, showed there was a tremendous demand in Europe for that cotton immediately after the war closed, for they wanted the cheapest cotton they could buy. Advices indicate that so far not many cotton spindles in Europe have been destroyed.

If we take into account the whole world demand for lint cotton including the first year after the war, we really have a deficit of some four to five million bales instead of a surplus.

Those who know the peacetime demands of Europe and the warring countries like Japan for cotton know that a supply of eight to ten million bales of cotton above our requirements could not only be disposed of but that it could be made one of the most powerful forces at our command in shaping the peace.

The shortages of cottonseed products is becoming alarming. Big bonuses are being paid for the production of vegetable oils from other crops not nearly so good as cottonseed oil. The dairy industry in Texas is suffering from an acute shortage of feed, especially high proteins, such as is supplied from cottonseed meal. The Government has taken all linters for munitions, and that is not enough to supply the demand.

Would it not be wiser to do something about the shortages in important qualities of lint cotton and of cottonseed products, rather than worry too much about a little low-grade short-staple cotton which can be disposed of readily to great advantage to us when the war ends?

Senate Ratification of Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental purpose of reciprocal trade agreements is to break down international trade barriers. It is believed that the protection of the competitive situation of American products, without extending that protection to the inefficient units of an industry, can be arrived at more scientifically by the trade experts of the Department of State, Department of Agriculture, and Department of the Interior—who unite in formulating a trade agreement—with the aid of the United States Tariff Commission, than by the tariff experts of the Congress. And it necessarily follows that you make more headway in breaking down foreign barriers by demanding a trade concession when you grant one than you do merely by lowering your own barrier.

One method of defeating the consummation of reciprocal trade agreements is to insist upon Senate ratification, recently termed by Robert H. Patchin, a New York Republican connected with the Grace shipping lines, as the "kiss of death."

The power to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements will expire on June 12 next. When the House takes up the resolution to extend that act, we may again be met with the demand for Senate ratification. In view of that fact, the following comment by Richard L. Strout, Washington correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, on the attitude of great statesmen of the past from both political parties, is pertinent:

"TWO-THIRDS" HURDLE

(By Richard L. Strout)

Will the Senate reject the peace treaty of World War No. 2 as it did for World War No. 1?

Alone of all nations in the world, the United States requires a two-thirds Senate majority for ratification of any peace treaty—a provision which meant the rejection of the 1897 Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain, despite a favorable vote of 43 to 26; the Versailles Treaty for the League of Nations, despite a majority of 49 to 35; the 1927 Commercial Treaty with Turkey, despite a majority of 50 to 34; the 1934 St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty with Canada, despite a majority of 46 to 42; and the 1935 Treaty to Join the World Court, despite a 52 to 36 majority vote in favor.

So serious is the threat of this two-thirds rule treaty hurdle—such as is exercised, according to one authority, "by so small a minority in no other legislative body of the world"—that bills for constitutional amendments have been introduced by Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, Democrat, of Iowa, Representatives PAT CANNON, Democrat, of Florida, and J. PERCY PRIEST, Democrat, of Tennessee, who point out that with 42 State legislatures sitting this year quick amendment might be secured.

Other Congressmen urge similar action, either to permit ratification by a straight congressional majority, or by a majority of both Senate and House instead of Senate alone. Josephus Daniels has urged amendment, denouncing "the archaic provision in the Constitution," and alleging that the defeat of the Versailles Treaty, when a Senate majority favored it, was a "crime against humanity."

COMMENT BY AUTHORITIES

Here is what authorities have said about the two-thirds rule in the past:

Richard Olney, Secretary of State under Cleveland, after rejection of the British Arbitration Treaty: "The Senate * * * is steadily encroaching (as a means of) humiliating the Executive and of showing to the world the greatness of the Senate."

John Hay, Secretary of State under McKinley, after stating that five or six foreign matters could be settled "honorably and advantageously," but that the Senate could pass none under the two-thirds rule, commented: "To such monstrous shape has the original mistake of the Constitution grown in the evolution of our politics."

Theodore Roosevelt declared that the individual Senators seemed to consider "the prerogatives of the Senate as far more important than the welfare of our country."

George W. Wickersham, Attorney General under Taft, said Senate encroachments had made the treaty-making power "so complicated as to be unworkable."

Wilson called the Senate's treaty-making power the "treaty marring" power.

In a book on Treaties Defeated by the Senate, W. Stull Holt concludes that "a deadlock between the President and the Senate involving a really critical foreign problem may end in ruin."

John W. Davis, as candidate for President in 1924, indorsed a plan to substitute a majority for a two-thirds vote. William Jennings Bryan urged association of the House with the Senate in such a vote.

The two-thirds rule was originally adopted by the Philadelphia Convention, eight States to three, the decision being aided by certain States afraid the others might give up by treaty navigation on the Mississippi or Newfoundland fishery rights. Madison's motion to except treaties of peace from the two-thirds requirement for ratification was at first accepted by the convention, then rejected.

Many nations after World War No. 1 modeled their constitutions after the United States, but none adopted the unusual majority requirement for treaty ratification.

Foreigners rarely understand the two-thirds rule, which may upset a treaty after months of negotiation by the United States Executive.

The Senate's insistence on the right to accept part of a treaty but reject other parts throws open the whole treaty for renegotiation, which threatens an impassable obstacle when several nations have joined in the treaty, which can then be reopened by each one.

"The rule's most calamitous effects are psychological," declares J. H. Haynes in his book The Senate of the United States. "In the Senate it heartens any tiny group * * * to attempt delays and bargaining to persuade enough colleagues to join them to make a 'recalcitrant one-third plus one.'"

This is the hurdle that a peace treaty faces after World War No. 2—just such as kept America out of the League in World War No. 1.

With 96 Senators in all, only 33 would be needed to block any treaty the Executive had to offer.

A prominent Republican Senator recently was reported to have said he did not believe "any decent treaty" could get through the Senate at the present time.

CARNIVAL OF LOGROLLING

While not intentionally gloomy, many Senators already point out the comparative ease of getting 33 Senators to block ratification of a far-reaching peace treaty when various elements hostile either to Russia, to Britain, to participation in any foreign affairs are united.

Certainly anyone acquainted with the Senate would expect that with feelings as high, tension as great and views as divided as they are apt to be after this war, the hurdle of a two-thirds vote is apt to produce a carnival of logrolling and competitive offering of legislative favors on either side, to get the few uncertain members who may very well determine the issue.

The fight, it must be remembered, will not turn upon getting a simple majority. If a simple majority were all that is needed this country would now be in the League of Nations, and the present war, according to at least some writers, would not have occurred. At one point in the League battle the Senate had a simple majority to enter. What is needed is a two-thirds majority. Mankind's fate may once more hinge on whether that ancient hurdle can be negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, the comment of McKinley's Secretary of State, the distinguished John Hay, is especially pertinent, as he painstakingly negotiated a series of reciprocity treaties for President McKinley, not one of which the Senate would ratify. Theodore Roosevelt had the same experience with the Senate in seeking ratification of the McKinley reciprocity treaties after his succession to the Presidency. President Theodore Roosevelt kept up that fight until 1903, when he finally abandoned it in disgust. His successor, President Taft, then attempted to secure ratification of just one reciprocity treaty negotiated with Canada, and he likewise failed to secure Senate approval. Should the plea be made again for Senate ratification of reciprocal trade agreements, let no one be deceived as to its meaning and purpose.

Allied Pool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of Thursday, March 4, 1943, entitled "Allied Pool," relating to the unanimous report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on bill H. R. 1501, providing for a 1-year extension of the Lend-Lease Act:

ALLIED POOL

Without a dissenting vote the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has voted a 1-year extension of the Lend-Lease Act. After reading its report we feel there will be equal unanimity when the bill comes before the full House. For the committee disposes of all the prejudice and misunderstanding which have fastened on lend-lease. It sheds light where there was ignorance. Figures are given in place of guesswork. If all that lend-lease had done was to shore up our allies while we were converting ourselves into a military ally, it would have been amply justified. But that has been by no means all. The process of conversion was in itself of great value to this country in readying our factories for the task of equipping our new citizen army. And now that we and our allies are actually fighting in a common cause, lend-lease has become not a gift but a pool. It has been metamorphosed from a means of connecting other nations with our arsenal of democracy into an instrument for sharing our respective resources.

This is the most striking feature of the House committee's report. Reverse or reciprocal lend-lease is becoming as important as lend-lease proper. No less than $2,500,000,000 was expended by our Army in France and Great Britain in the year and a half we were in the last war. In this war our total dollar purchases in Britain for 1942 did not exceed $1,000,000. Britain has supplied all manner of equipment and material to our Engineer Corps, our Quartermaster Corps, our Signal Corps, our Ordnance Department, our Air Force. The list of things would fill a page. This reciprocal aid was especially valuable in facilitating our north African offensive.

"The British supplied to the American troops over 38,000 tons of ammunition, artillery, 25-pounder guns for a complete division, 80,000 tons of coal, over 2,000 tons of British rations, 30,000 tons of engineering equipment, and a substantial number of balanced medical units, each of which included enough medical supplies for 100,000 men for 30 days. The British also furnished 168 Spitfires, airfield runways, bombs, ammunition, 600 ambulances, reconnaissance boats, and 41,000-bed hospitals." All the other allies have likewise rendered reciprocal aid. The details are given in the House report, and the committee concludes, "The spirit of cooperation evidenced by the Lend-Lease Act has been reciprocated in full by countries providing aid to the United States."

It would be interesting to set off all these forms of assistance against each other as an easy way of demonstrating this metamorphosed lend-lease. Witnesses testified, however, that the job would be a huge manpower problem in itself. Maj. George Spiegelberg, recorder of the General Purchasing Board of our Army in the European theater of operations, told the committee that our Army Engineers Corps had estimated it would require half a division of trained personnel to place valuations on materials received as reciprocal aid. He said, "The United States Army in the United Kingdom has received from the British not only articles and equipment but a great variety of services and facilities, including all United Kingdom communications, all transportation into and within the United Kingdom, and heat, power, light, water, and gas, which present exceedingly difficult problems of valuation. On stations occupied both by British and United States troops no records are maintained as to whether the articles issued on the stations are delivered to United States or British troops, and particularly in the case of shared airfields the problem of allocating value would also be very difficult." Perhaps the most significant index to the quantity of aid rendered by the British is in terms of ship-tons and deadweight tons. Here Major Spiegelberg supplied a figure. And it astonished and impressed the House committee. He estimated that the goods transferred during the 7-month period ended December 31, 1942, totaled 1,121,786 ship-tons. Construction materials made available totaled 595,375,000 deadweight tons, and by June 1943 it is estimated that these construction materials will involve an expenditure by the British Treasury of $560,000,000.

In a word, we have become, in Mr. Churchill's words, "all mixed up together" in our contributions to the liberation of mankind. Isn't this tribute enough to our partnership, our unity? Perhaps at some future time we may be able to affix valuations to what we have given and what we have received. In the meantime the record speaks for itself without the help of the dollar sign. It will disabuse the minds of those people who through ignorance or malice have thought that this country was being played for a sucker as a result of the instrumentality of lend-lease. Those who made such assertions in malice did the enemy's work. They out-Hitlered Hitler in trying to drive a wedge in the freedom front. Those who repeated the cracks out of lack of knowledge ought now to be chastened.

Even without a penny of reciprocal aid, we should have been well repaid. Listen to Mrs. LUCE's testimony: "In my humble opinion lend-lease, which is a tangible policy, dealing with material elements—and the gallantry of the British after Dunkerque which is an intangible matter to be dealt with only in the realm of spiritual factors—are the two things which have saved America untold grief. The British—and Russians and Chinese and our other allies—do not need to vote on the extension of their gallantry—our democratic processes require that we vote on the extension of lend-lease. Both, I believe, will be continued without question." May the House check that observation with resounding acclamation. A mere majority is not enough the tell Hitler that all that we have and are is engaged in this titanic conflict.

Government Tire Prices

REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, no doubt other Congressmen, as I am, are receiving letters from their constituents complaining about the prices the Government is paying for the tires which it commandeered.

I hold in my hand here two checks in the amount of 20 cents, each written by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in payment of tires which the receivers of these checks claim were worth $4 and up. I have reason to believe these people are telling the truth and I agree with them that this is an outrage.

Incidentally, I want to call to the attention of Congress title 18, section 293 of the United States Code, which forbids the Government to write a check for less than $1 and subjects the officer writing such check to a fine or imprisonment or both. The section of the law referred to will be found in an editorial from the News-Sentinel, Fort Wayne, Ind., as follows:

TWENTY CENTS A TIRE

For that extra tire that you turned in last November or December, when the Government ordered that you give up all tires in excess of five, under penalty of losing your gasoline ration, the chances are exactly 2 to 1 that you have received, or will receive a check for no more than 20 cents.

Or you may receive defense stamps in that amount—if you indicated on your turn-in blank that payment in that form would be acceptable.

Offices of the Defense Supply Corporation at Washington and in the States are reported as having been flooded with complaints from motorists who have received checks ranging from 20 to 50 cents for tires which they thought—or knew—were good for many thousands of miles of additional driving.

Some of the letters are described as blistering, some as sarcastic, some as downright vulgar. And in not a few cases, the Government's checks have been sent back by disgusted motorists, with the remark: "You can keep the change."

If the tires you turned in were new tires, forehandedly acquired before dealers' stocks were frozen at the time of Pearl Harbor, your payment is supposed to be the ceiling price fixed by the Office of Price Administration for sales of the same grade of tire to eligible purchasers.

New tires, however, constitute only a very small fraction of the millions of casings gathered in by the Defense Supplies Corporation. Of the used tires acquired from reluctant motorists, two-thirds have been "found" by Government inspectors to be "good only for use as scrap."

Used tires which these inspectors "find" to have "some further usefulness" are supposed to be paid for on the basis of "ceiling prices," minus the value of the mileage already consumed.

The two-thirds that are pronounced as "good only for use as scrap" command no more than the "scrap price" of 1 cent a pound; and the check sent in payment usually amounts to 20 cents.

Incidentally, when the Defense Supplies Corporation sends you a 20-cent check for that tire which you would pay many times 20 cents to have back again, it is doing something which you, as a citizen, could be fined or jailed for doing.

A Federal statute, first enacted in 1862 and revised in 1909, provides:

"No person shall issue, circulate, or pay out any note, check, memorandum, token, or any other obligation for a less sum than $1, intended to circulate as money or to be received or used in lieu of lawful money of the United States; and every person so offending shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both."

While the Defense Supplies Corporation is a "person" within the meaning of the law, its lawyers contend, however, that the prohibitions of the revised Civil War statute, quoted above, do not apply to agencies of the Federal Government.

Nor does there appear to be any case in which a private person has been actually prosecuted for having issued a check for less than $1.

If the householder writes too many checks for fractions of a dollar in payment of small bills, he is generally well lectured by his bank, for the cost of handling such checks is generally in excess of the bank's service charges. But we are unable to discover that public authority has ever imposed a fine or jail sentence upon such an offender.

The cost to the Federal Government of handling one of its checks—whatever the amount—has been estimated at $5, including costs of printing, distribution, charging, and canceling. So even if you get only 20 cents for your tire, the remittance has actually cost the whole body of taxpayers (including yourself) no less than $5.20.

By the way, a considerable number of persons who, in good faith, turned in their idle tires will receive no check at all, and no defense stamps, either; for, in many thousands of cases, the tags carrying the names of owners became detached from the tires before they reached the warehouses.

In such cases, the Defense Supplies Corporation will make a settlement only if the owner is able to produce his receipt from the Railway Express Agency—usually on the basis of the average scrap value of 20 cents a tire. And in many instances, of course, these receipts have long since been lost or mislaid—so in cases like that somebody has obtained rubber without any cost whatsoever.

Members of Salem (Pa.) Grange Offer "Feed Ourselves" Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, there is no group more interested in solving the farm problem than the American farmer. He realizes that food is an important weapon in the conduct of any war.

At the present time every possible effort is being made to arouse the American people to the consciousness of an impending food shortage. Every vacant lot is being surveyed with the hope that some industrious and patriotic American will convert it into a victory garden.

In Du Bois, Pa., in my congressional district, Salem Grange, comprising a group of Clearfield County farmers, has appealed to the Du Bois Board of Trade to assist them in a program to feed the people of that area by community cooperation in a plan to increase crop production. The plan as outlined in a recent article appearing in the Du Bois (Pa.) Courier reflects the attitude of the average farmer in America. It exemplifies the patriotic impulse of the farmer and his willingness to give more than mere lip service to our plan for victory.

I am inserting the article from the Du Bois Courier in the hope that it may convey to the people of America the fact that the farmer has initiative and a sincere desire to employ his talents and energy in an effort to avert the threat of a food famine which if unchecked is destined to greatly hamper our attainment of the common objective—an early victory and a lasting peace. The article appearing in the Du Bois (Pa.) Courier is as follows:

SALEM GRANGE IS READY TO ATTEMPT TO FEED DU BOIS—CHALLENGES BOARD OF TRADE TO COOPERATE IN MOVE TO SOLVE FOOD PROBLEM

The members of the Salem Grange, at their current meeting on Friday night, issued a challenge to the Du Bois Board of Trade to join them in a feed-ourselves plan of supplying the Du Bois community with food through cooperative farming and marketing that would release hundreds of tons of food now shipped here so that it could be used to supply the needs elsewhere.

The plan provides for the development of the surrounding farming territory to its fullest production. The membership of the grange is comprised of farmers of Sandy and Brady townships who indicated their willingness to undertake the job of feeding Du Bois, if they get the kind of cooperation they would require from this community.

They adopted a set of resolutions covering the situation and emphasizing not only the advantages that would come in the way of developing the nearby farming areas and the solution of local food supply problems but the additional advantages that would come from the release of shipping services now required to transport the great cargoes of food annually shipped into this community from Chicago and the other great food centers.

The resolutions adopted by the Salem Grange are as follows:

"Whereas the people of Du Bois obtain their beef and pork from Chicago and other livestock markets, shipping it into a most excellent livestock district, thereby compelling allocation of much war-required rail and truck transportation; and

"Whereas this applies equally to produce and other foods constantly being shipped in from the West, South, and other States, for the support of a people whose food needs can and should be produced in their own home district, thereby releasing vast amounts of supplies and transportation facilities for the pressing war needs; and

"Whereas it is now recognized that only food will win the war—and we are pledged to furnish sufficient to supply our own Nation and far more than twice that amount for the Army, Navy, and Allied Nations who fight in every continent for the freedom of our own people, in which we face a catastrophe unequalled in all history; and

"Whereas as their contribution in patriotism to their country and to winning the war, the least that the people of Du Bois, Sandy and Brady Townships can do will be to feed themselves, an aid to the war beyond computation otherwise; and

"Whereas the Du Bois agricultural district is comprised of family-size farms, in nowise equipped for production of large Government and foreign supplies, but can produce sufficient meats, dairy, poultry, fruits, and vegetable needs to feed the entire district,

"Therefore, Salem Grange, comprised of farmers of Brady and Sandy Townships, recognizing the peril faced in food shortage, and their desire to aid the Government to the utmost in its war needs, hereby agrees to undertake the production of sufficient food, including beef, pork, dairy products, poultry, fruits and vegetables, to supply people of Du Bois and vicinity under the same restrictions and at the same prices imposed by the Government: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That Salem Grange recommends full cooperation of its members, and solicits all other farmers to this meritorious work; and

"*Resolved*, That Du Bois Board of Trade, representing the merchants and people of Du Bois, are hereby challenged to accept and join in working out this program; and it is further

"*Resolved*, That these resolutions be published in Du Bois Courier, The Profile, and Post-Dispatch newspapers.

"Passed at meeting of Salem Grange February 12, 1943.

"AMOS S. KORB, *Master.*

"ESTHER KRACH, *Secretary.*"

Fate of the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Fate of the Republic," delivered by Col. Robert R. McCormick before the Indiana Republican Press Association, in Indianapolis, Ind., on Saturday, February 27. I believe this to be one of the most timely speeches and believe it should be carefully read, studied, and analyzed by every true American:

It is inspiring to remember that this territory in which we live was conquered and annexed by the State of Virginia; that we were a part of Virginia in its age of greatness when it furnished most of the great intellects to the country, when it originated the constitutional provision for the freedom of the press:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

If it were not for those words, this meeting, if held at all, would be held under control of the Federal gestapo, which tried to control the annual meeting of the Associated Press last April.

Everybody tells us we are engaged in a terrible war. I agree; but I no longer fear for the outcome. Awful things may happen all over the world, but danger does not threaten our shores any longer.

I was deeply troubled after Pearl Harbor when I knew all our ships in the harbor were on the bottom; that the Island of Oahu was weakly held, and none other of the Hawaiian Islands was garrisoned; and that most of our military equipment had been sent to England.

How weak we were at that time has been told by Leighton McCarthy, the Canadian Minister to the United States, who said publicly that Canadian Bren guns, an inferior type of weapon unknown to our soldiers and of a difficult caliber from ours, had to be flown from Toronto to Hawaii after the disaster at Pearl Harbor.

Which reminds me that in 1916, when Carranza ordered the invasion of Texas, and the National Guard was mobilized to protect that State, our Army had no machine guns, and I had to get the consent of the British Embassy to obtain them from American factories manufacturing them for England.

If the Japanese had been able to change their long-laid plans to take the empires in the southwestern Pacific, and instead had sent their entire navy, air force, and a sufficient army, they could have overwhelmed the Hawaiian Islands. From there, at that time, a landing on the mainland might have proven as disastrous as Homer Lee had predicted it would be 34 years ago.

Our salvation lay in the Japanese meticulous general staff plans in which every individual and every piece of equipment was specifically assigned to a particular mission. The plans had taken on a momentum which could not be rapidly changed, when the attack on Pearl Harbor succeeded beyond expectation.

Thus it was that the long-prepared Japanese campaign to the south was carried out as planned, with even more perfect success than had been expected. All the empires in the Pacific which we had gone to war to save fell, but in falling gave us time to recover from our early terrible naval and military blunders.

The situation today is that our factories have staggered the imagination of mankind in providing military equipment, while the bureaucrats of the Shipping Board, and the Communist seamen's unions have so delayed shipping that whatever plans for "globalonal" campaigns may be undertaken, cannot possibly move men and material out of the country fast enough to again denude us of defenders.

We know also what some of us knew, or were sure we knew, before the war: First, that armies cannot be landed on this continent in the face of land-based bombers, and second, that trained Americans are the best troops in the world. We beat the Germans in 1918 after they had beaten the Russians, British, and French, and in 1943 we have beaten the Japanese, who have never been beaten in any battle by Russians, Germans, or British.

In view of these demonstrated facts, it seems unlikely that an invasion of our homeland will be attempted and that, if it shall be attempted, it will be exterminated.

I am, therefore, as I say, not afraid of catastrophe in the war. I am, however, afraid, and deeply afraid, of the destruction of our republican form of government under excuse of war.

The Democratic Party is so ridden by communism in Washington and by the alliance of crime and politics in the cities that if our Republic is to be saved, it will have to be saved by the Republican Party, and if it is saved by the Republican Party, it will be saved by western leadership.

I believe that the East can be led to support Republican principles against communism and royalism, but the East is too diluted by diverse foreign interests to provide such leadership itself.

For centuries the great city of New York has been the borrower of European capital to lend in the West and South. The borrower is servant to the lender. New York has long been accustomed to look up to Europe and to look down upon the West and South. Rich New Yorkers have accepted the aristocratic way of life, marrying their daughters into aristocratic European families and accepting with servile exaltation this quasi left-handed alliance with the nobility.

So infatuated are they that they will risk everything they have and everything we have to be allowed to curtsy to royalty. Moreover, they also have foreign investments they wish to protect, investments upon which they can live if American investments are destroyed; so they are not greatly concerned with our fate.

And they are powerful. Their loans are found in every city and every State. They control most of the periodical press. They dominate a large percentage of the eastern newspapers. They own a number of western newspapers, to my knowledge, and undoubtedly others that I know not of.

They are importing foreign ideas and foreign phrases into this country. They talk of the Cliveden set, appeasement, fifth columnists—terminologies that have no place in American life.

People who use them are not American minded.

Nowhere has the gap between wealth and poverty been so great as in New York. The pearls and mink coats of Park Avenue are worn hardly a block away from the safety pins and rags of Avenue A. Such a contrast was bound to bring discord. The poverty-stricken, finding no solace in the only American political institution they knew—Tammany Hall—have turned to the doctrines of Karl Marx, and for leadership to Russia. Their hope, their purpose, is to overthrow our Republic and succeed it with communism. The military situation in which Communist Russia is fighting Nazi Germany gives them an opportunity to mask their bloody designs under the cloak of patriotism.

Strangely enough, these two social extremes of New York have combined to combat Americanism and people of the social and economic status of most Americans. Their idea is that after they have deluded and destroyed the Americans they can fight it out for the spoils.

The same source has used them in the smear campaigns that have disgusted Americans. The same source has used them in the effort to discredit, dominate, and destroy the Congress of the United States in order to create an executive dictatorship.

We of the old Northwest Territory, conquered by Virginia and organized by the United States, are so passionate in our patriotism that it is hard for us to realize that the older sections of the country, whose history goes back before the Union, are not overly ardent for what they call nationalism.

Let us recall certain events in our history. New York State never adopted the Declaration of Independence. Delaware did not join the Union until after the Constitution was in effect. In the treaty of 1785 Secretary of State Jay was willing to concede to Spain the exclusive navigation of the Mississippi River for 25 years, although it flowed past the States which were to be Tennessee and Kentucky, and flowed through the Northwest Territory. As soon as the Federalist Party lost power Senators Pickering, from Massachusetts, Plumer, from New Hampshire, Tracy, from Connecticut, and Roger Griswold, Congressman from Connecticut, and other New England Federalists, were plotting with the British Minister to secede from the Union.

During the War of 1812 the New England States held a convention at Hartford, at which secession was considered.

After the War of 1812 the eastern delegates to the peace congress were willing to give England the right to navigate the Mississippi River, then an entirely American river from source to mouth.

The annexation of Texas was delayed for years because New England threatened to secede if Texas should be annexed, and Texas was not annexed until its annexation was joined with the reoccupation of Oregon, demanded by the Western States.

During the administration of President Jackson South Carolina proposed to disregard a revenue law adopted by Congress. Disunion was only postponed twice by the Missouri compromises, and secession came in 1861, at which time Mayor Fernando Wood, of New York, proposed that the city also secede. During the Civil War troops had to be withdrawn from the front to occupy New York City, seething with riots in resistance to conscription.

Have you ever paused to consider that our Civil War was the only civil war in history in which the defeated rebels were not massacred? It was General Grant, one of us, born in Ohio and given to the Army by Illinois, who signed the most humane and Christian capitulation in the history of the world. He was consciously dealing with fellow American citizens, not with revolting subjects.

Now the citizens everywhere are being softened up for communism. The alleged need for all these priorities and rationings is not explained to the American citizens. Their cooperation is not asked. They are being told what to do under dire threats. I am profoundly suspicious of all of these usurpations. In the one that I know as much about as any man alive, newsprint paper, there is no shortage. The pretended shortage we showed

up as a fraud, and compelled the reduction in allotment to be withdrawn.

An official of the Office of War Information has boasted that news will be treated like steel and oil. Another official has put newspaper delivery in the same class with the delivery of beer. Shrinking news reports in our papers show that even now these boasts are not idle.

All the powers of Government are being used "to purchase up submission and to overawe resistance." I stand before you as a living witness of governmental tyranny. The attacks upon me have been many, persistent, vicious, and futile. One-half of a Chicago Tribune paper mill has been closed down as a punishment for newspaper integrity. The whole mill would have been shut down but for the valiant protests of the population largely dependent upon it.

Remember that the policy has been announced to attack all dissidents for dissent by using any criminal law that can be stretched to apply to them.

One of the principal complaints of the Declaration of Independence was, I quote: "* * * for transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offenses."

The Constitution provided that "the trial of all crimes except in cases of impeachment shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed."

The sixth amendment to the Constitution says: "In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed."

In 1909 Delavan Smith and Charles R. Williams, owners of the Indianapolis News, were indicted in the District Court of the District of Columbia, and an order was issued for their removal to the District of Columbia for trial on an indictment for criminal libel.

In concluding that the defendants should not be sent to Washington for trial, Judge Anderson said: "To my mind, that man has read the history of our institutions to little purpose who does not look with grave apprehension upon the possibility of the success of a proceeding such as this. If the history of liberty means anything, if constitutional guaranties are worth anything, this proceeding must fail.

"If the prosecuting officers have the authority to select the tribunal, if there be more than one tribunal to select from; if the Government has that power and can drag citizens from distant States to the Capital of the Nation, there to be tried, then, as Judge Cooley says, this is a strange result of a revolution where one of the grievances complained of was the assertion of the right to send parties abroad for trial."

Our Constitution said: "Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act or on confession in open court."

In the face of all of these constitutional provisions, 28 individuals from all parts of the country were indicted in the District of Columbia last July by using the law of conspiracy which circumvents them all, and the law of sedition, which circumvents the constitutional definition of treason. In spite of the sixth amendment, which says: "The accused shall enjoy a speedy trial," the date of trial has not been set 7 months afterward. Of these indictments, Senator TAFT, of Ohio, one of us, has written to Attorney General Biddle. Senator TAFT's letter follows in part:

"I have been a good deal concerned about the omnibus character of the indictment returned here in Washington against 28 individual defendants, alleging a conspiracy to corrupt the armed forces of the United States and otherwise sabotage the war effort. I have no doubt that many of the men indicted are guilty, but I have very serious doubt whether there was even the shadow of a conspiracy between many of the individual defendants.

"I write to make a personal appeal to you that you direct an impartial and thorough examination of the individual status of each of the 28 men, to determine whether there is any real evidence to connect him with the others or with any conspiracy.

"The Federal procedure in conspiracy cases is so general that I have known several cases where men were covered in without any real proof of a connection with the guilty parties. I know that if the facts show a lack of any connection with a conspiracy you will not hesitate to order a dismissal of any individual.

"I feel quite certain that the general discouragement of seditious activity will be better served by the conviction only of those who are guilty. It can only redound to the credit of the Department of Justice if the greatest care is exercised in weeding out the innocent parties from the dragnets which it is often necessary to spread in time of war, and if their civil rights are carefully protected."

This letter was not answered.

Concerning one of the defendants, Judge William H. Holly of the First District Court of Illinois said: "I have serious doubts as to this defendant's guilt. And it is difficult, I grant you, without great means, to defend oneself in a foreign jurisdiction. However, the Supreme Court has left me no jurisdiction here. I shall have to uphold the removal order of the commissioner."

I do not know any of the defendants, but I do know that they cannot receive a fair trial in Washington, for one Washington paper, the Post, which has been actively working with the prosecution, and some New Deal broadcasters have gone to every excess in trying to prejudice the jurors who will be called for the trial.

After the war Europe and Asia will not want America's intervention unless to furnish a mercenary army of "Hessians" to enforce their own decision, in which we will have no more influence than we have in saving Gandhi, imprisoned without trial.

Already we have learned that the Atlantic Charter is not to be extended to the Pacific and that the "four freedoms" do not include freedom of religion. I cannot conceive that the most virulent of our internationalists will dare to agitate for an army to enforce abroad the slavery which we abolished at home 75 years ago, nor to persecute the followers of the Christian religion.

I am deeply concerned lest in pretended humanity a treaty be foisted on us which will destroy our Republic. A New Deal newspaper owner, a prominent leader of the international set, has written a letter in which he says that we will have to give up a part of our sovereignty after the war. What part of our sovereignty, I ask? The right to declare war? The right to make treaties? The right to raise and equip armies? The right to trial by jury? The right to a hearing by a grand jury before indictment, which I found so valuable? The right not to be transported overseas to be tried for pretended offenses? Yes, that is what is planned for us under the disguise of vague phrases of world-wide Utopias.

How, you will say, can we be deprived of any part of our sovereignty without a constitutional amendment, which would require the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of both Houses of Congress and the approval of three-quarters of the States, acting either through their legislatures or their special conventions? Such consent, obviously, could not be had.

It will be attempted in another way—an insidious, dishonest, and perfidious way.

Article VI of the Constitution says in part: "All treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land."

This administration has already shown, when it could not control the two-thirds vote of the Senate, it would try to ratify a treaty by a bare majority vote of both Houses.

A treaty ratified by two-thirds of the Senate or by a bare majority of both Houses, or perhaps only by that new fiction—the war powers of the President—is the dastardly method by which it is planned to subvert our Constitution and destroy our liberties.

We must be vigilantly on guard to prevent the Republican nominee for President from being picked by his opponent; that certain delegations be not bribed by the appointment of more Republican politicians into the New Deal Cabinet; that telegrams sent from smoke-filled rooms to businessmen all over the country, urging them to coerce their delegates to that convention, be treated with contempt; that the galleries of the conventions be not packed for the Democratic choice for the Republican nominee for President. This plan, or its Siamese twin, is to be pulled again.

Yes, my friends, the responsibility for saving this country rests upon us, because it will not be undertaken elsewhere.

The obligation rests upon all of us—upon editors and publishers to distinguish between propaganda and facts—upon our Senators and Congressmen to carry the torch of freedom into the Halls of Congress and expound our American principles there—upon every individual who comprehends the problem to explain it to his neighbor—and upon that neighbor to work with the zeal of a true convert.

The fate of the Republic depends on our courage and our constancy. But why should we be appalled? Are we not the successors of the men who wrote the Constitution and who wrote the Bill of Rights? Are we not the descendants of the men who saved the Republic once before in the great Civil War?

Our predecessors look down upon us and bid us, in the language of Abraham Lincoln, one of us, to be highly resolved that "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Address of Hon. William S. Bennet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following speech by the honorable William S. Bennet, a former Member of this House from the State of New York:

The real topic of this talk is The Christian in the War. That being so, it is perfectly proper to take a text, and as the subject is broad, I take three texts. They are: Psalms 127, verse 1: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that built it"; Proverbs 29: 18: "Where the vision fallest, the people perish"; John 15: 5: "Without Me we can do nothing."

This is an incorrigibly religious country and that fact is not accidental. Dr. Jones a couple of months ago pointed out in a sermon that our country is exceptionally fortunate because those who were seeking gold in the new land went further south, while those who

were seeking freedom to worship God or some similar high purpose, landed on our continent. Thus we had the Pilgrims and the Puritans in New England, the Quakers in Pennsylvania, and the Catholics in Maryland, all of which migrations were related in a greater or lesser degree either to freedom of worship or greater freedom of worship.

Sometimes even our best statesmen forget our religious foundation. Theodore Roosevelt, while President, issued an Executive order to take the motto "In God We Trust" off the coinage. I have forgotten the reason. The country, probably to his amazement, resented this powerfully and vocally, and in a short time the Congress by unanimous vote of both Houses, put the motto back on the coins, where it still remains.

On this foundation of strong religious faith which necessarily meant men and women of virile minds and deep convictions, the colonists for 150 years before the adoption of the Constitution worked out by a process of trial and error the kind of government best suited to our country. The Bill of Rights is no accident. Part of it the colonists brought over as the result of hundreds of years of struggle for human rights in the British Isles, which gave us the Magna Carta, the English common law, and those statutes which are sometimes referred to as the British Bill of Rights. By the painful and somewhat humiliating method among us Protestants of persecuting each other at times, and sometimes the Quakers, we found out that everyone in this country is entitled to freedom of worship.

Here in Mount Vernon as the result of the historic Zanger trial in Eastchester, where St. Paul's Church now stands, we established rights of free speech and a free press. Other portions of the Bill of Rights are based upon the wrongs and injustices the Colonists had endured (which are set out in the Declaration of Independence) and which they took steps to prevent occurring to anyone, citizen or friendly alien, who lived in this country after the adoption of the Constitution.

In a broad but very real sense all of this was based on religion. The people of this country never forget God. Sometimes the leaders do, and sometimes some Christians, and so do the advanced radicals of all shades who make plans on the basis that man in his finite capacity can solve his problems alone. But the real leaders of thought never forget God. I will give but four illustrations, two from the Constitutional Convention and two from the time of the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.

Up to now we have had no greater crises than these. Unquestionably, at the Constitutional Convention George Washington stated a great principle. Some historians place its saying at the beginning of the Convention, other at its close, and both may be right, because Washington may have said it more than once, and probably did. I shall treat it tonight as Woodrow Wilson treats it in his history. Wilson says that the delegates were slow in arriving to attend the Constitutional Convention, that for several days none was present except the delegates from Pennsylvania and Virginia. Virginia had sent a strong delegation, possibly the strongest in the Convention, headed by Washington. During the days when the two delegations were waiting for a quorum to assemble, there was much discussion among them and those whom they met as to what should go into the Constitution, some of it based wholly on expediency, that is, the inclusion of matters not sound in themselves but plausible and believed to be popular, and which would be included in order to get votes. Washington sat during one of these discussions and closed it by saying: "How can we recommend to the people that in which we do not ourselves believe? Let us erect a standard to which the wise and the prudent can repair. The event is in the hands of God." The Convention took the advice of Washington and erected such a standard.

The oldest man in the Convention was Benjamin Franklin, then in his eighty-second year. He had served in the Continental Congress, which drafted the Declaration of Independence, and was probably, because of his long public service, both at home and abroad, the leading statesman of the country. At the time of the Convention he was Governor of Pennsylvania. In June Mr. Franklin arose one day and addressed the Convention on the subject of opening the sessions with prayer. His entire address is most interesting. It will be recalled that the Convention sat behind closed doors and that its proceedings were not officially reported. Several members, however, took notes, among them James Madison. It is very evident from the context that (after hearing Franklin's remarks) Madison asked him to reduce them to writing with care, and that Franklin did. Among the sentences which he thus wrote are:

"I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men.

* * * * *

"If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid?"

Neither can a sound peace be framed without it either.

The assassination of Abraham Lincoln in 1865 threw the Nation into great distress and anxiety. The pregnant sentence which has come down in connection with this period is that of James A. Garfield, uttered in a speech in New York City: "God reigns and the Government at Washington still lives."

The Congress was in recess in April 1865 when Lincoln was assassinated. The next session commenced the first Monday in December 1865. Its first act, of course, was to take steps to determine the best way of recording its horror at the assassination and of recognizing in some suitable fashion the life and service of the late President. To that end a joint committee was appointed, on which served Senators and Representatives from every State then represented in the Congress. They arrived at the conclusion that the most fitting thing would be a memorial address on the occasion of Lincoln's next birthday anniversary, February 12, 1866. Naturally, they gave anxious thought to the selection of the proper man. Edward M. Stanton was the first choice, but ill health prevented. The choice that they then made is a tribute to the institutions of our Government.

Each House of the Congress was Republican by more than two-thirds majority. It would ordinarily be assumed, therefore, that the Speaker chosen would inevitably be a Republican, particularly as there were many prominent Republicans. But the choice fell on a man of 65 whose political activities had always been largely opposite to those of Mr. Lincoln, who had been appointed to public office by President Van Buren, had been Secretary of the Navy in the Cabinet of President Polk, who later appointed him Minister to England. He was, however, a life-long opponent of slavery, and, a resident of Massachusetts when the Civil War came, strongly supported the Union cause. The man chosen was George Bancroft, the historian. He had delivered some years before the memorial address on the death of President Jackson. He was chosen regardless of his political ideas because in the sober judgment of the committee he was the outstanding American scholar. Through his long career as an author he had been renowned for his ability to assemble facts and to state them accurately. The first sentences of his memorable address are:

"That God rules in the affairs of men is as certain as any truth in physical science. On the great moving power which is from the beginning, hangs the world of the senses and the world of thought and action. Eternal wisdom marshals the great procession of the nations, working in patient continuity through the ages, never halting and never abrupt, encompassing all events in its oversight, and ever effecting its will, though mortals may slumber in apathy or oppose with madness."

This is the statement of a mature American historian on a great occasion, and states accurately the American position.

As we cannot ignore God, if we are serious-minded, to what duty does that point Christians? That depends on whether we believe this to be a righteous war. We here in the Chester Hill Church so believe. Almost universally the American people also so believe.

To Protestant Christians the most humiliating thing is the absence of virile statements from our great denominational conventions and assemblies. Have there been such? If there have been, why do we not now recall them? Our Jewish fellow citizens have not been remiss. I could fill pages with earnest, sincere, and passionate words from rabbis and officers of Jewish congregations.

On November 14, 1942, every cardinal, every archbishop and bishop of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States of America joined in the following brief statement:

"Some nations are united in waging war to bring about a slave world, a world that would deprive man of his divinely conferred dignity, reject human freedom, and permit no religious liberty. We are associated with other powers in a deadly conflict against those nations to maintain a free world. This conflict of principles makes compromise impossible."

The American Council of Christian Churches on September 29th adopted and made public a resolution of which the following portions are pertinent:

"1. The American Council of Christian Churches pledges its undying opposition to all forms of totalism, whether they be of Nazi, Fascist, or Communist, and affirms its allegiance to the principles of democratic, representative government, as expressed in the Constitution of the United States.

"2. That the war in which we are engaged is just and righteous, that it is our duty to prosecute it with all our powers until victory is won, that in so doing we serve the cause and purposes of God himself. The council calls on all connected with it and upon the people of America to support the Government with money, prayer, and service."

The American council, however, does not represent to exceed 350,000 Protestant Christians. Any father can send either or both of these resolutions to his son in a battle area as a clear statement of the purpose for which the son is fighting.

The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in the United States adopted the following resolution:

"We are convinced beyond any room for doubt that the external conditions will be vastly more favorable to working for Christian social objectives in the event of the military success of the United Nations than in the event of their defeat * * *. No thoughtful Christian, therefore, can be indifferent to the outcome of the war.

"We recognize that, whatever the issues of war may seem to be, there are some sincere Christians who believe that force is never permissible to resolve them. The Federal council, in adopting this resolution does so without denying the right of Christians to hold that position recognized by the Oxford conference of 1937 as one of those which true Christians may hold."

The Oxford conference of 1937 took the position that three attitudes were truly Chris-

tian: (1) Complete pacifism; (2) the duty to fight in a just war; (3) the duty to fight unless a person is certain that his country is fighting for a wrong cause.

No father will ever send that resolution to his son in a battle area as an inspiration. Either the Federal council should correct its resolution or the denominations should ignore it and announce their own, or else the position of the American council must be accepted as that of leadership of American Protestant thought, which thought is unquestionably overwhelmingly that of all but an infinitesimal percentage of American Protestants. The leadership in this contest must be Christian leadership, not only for its effect on the war itself but for what comes after the war. Our neighbor, Rabbi Kagan, of the Sinai Temple here in Mount Vernon, at our October meeting demonstrated to us that Hitler's ostensible attack on the Jews is really an attack on all religions. There is no question that the Jews are with the war effort, but they are few in number. There are two and a half billion people in the world of whom at no time were more than 15,000,000 ever Jews.

The preponderance of Christian leadership is on our side. The British Isles, the British Commonwealths, and the United States are Christian; Chiang Kai-shek, the great Chinese leader, is a devout member of the Methodist Church and a praying Christian. We cannot claim Christian leadership for anyone in power in Russia. As Stalin frankly says, "Our ideologies are diametrically different." On the other side the three leaders, the Emperor of Japan, Mussolini, and Hitler, are pagans. I do not overlook that Mussolini and Hitler are nominal Catholics, but no one charges them against the Catholic Church. They give it merely lip service and both are essentially pagan.

In Germany, as the statement of a young German soldier read by Dr. Jones in the pulpit last Sunday shows, the Government is using every effort to bring up its young people as pagans.

Is Christianity worthy to lead? The answer is emphatically "yes." It has not wholly failed anywhere. There is a great difference in not entirely succeeding everywhere and not wholly failing anywhere. In Germany the unanimous testimony of the Jewish refugees who have succeeded in fleeing from that country is that they know of no instance in which a Jew has been able to escape from Russia except through the assistance received from Christians, some of whom, incidentally, were members of the Nazi party, and even officeholders under that party. In giving a great deal of this assistance Christians risked their property, their liberty, and even their lives. Christians in the subjugated countries have been standing out against Hitlerism. In the January 15, 1943, issue of the Netherlands News Digest I find this typical note:

"Word of the death in a German concentration camp of the Reverend Arnold van Lierop, editor of the Catholic Wereld Post and former chaplain in the Netherlands armed forces, was received in London on January 2. Father Van Lierop's death, which occurred on November 27, was reported in the Amsterdam Catholic daily, De Tijd."

There are many similar incidents in relation to Protestant Christians. In Japan there are many Christians some of whom are generals. The Japanese soldiers have been guilty of gross, barbarous, and unmentionable atrocities which the world can never forget. It is a fact, however, that no groups under the command of Christian generals have perpetrated such atrocities. As to Italy there appear to be no definite incidents.

Where Christians in Axis and subjugated countries have done the acts and have shown the conduct which I have briefly recorded, Christianity has not failed. Some of it is the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew in applied form. All of it is true Christianity.

As this is a righteous war, Christians have the right to assume leadership.

Furthermore (1) ours is the only religion which has representative groups, larger or smaller, in every country among the United Nations, (2) ours is the only religion whose applied principles (shared in this regard by the Jews) form the basis for universal liberty and freedom.

We shall win this war. I shall not be surprised if each and every German army surrendered before December 31, 1943. No one, of course, can say that such a happy event will occur so soon, but it is within the bounds of reasonable possibility. The German people are being rapidly sobered by events. When two views are widely and firmly held by them they will cease fighting. These are, the universal acceptance by them of the fact that they cannot possibly win; the other, that if they do surrender, they will not be made the victims of widespread merciless massacre and oppression. Russia in the east and the United States, Great Britain, and France to the west and in Africa, are demonstrating to them that they cannot win. Stalin has done the United Nations' cause a great service by announcing forcefully and repeatedly that he is fighting Hitlerism and not the German people. Everyone knows that the United Nations are not fighting the German people. The Germans have been guilty of barbarous atrocities. Nevertheless, Rommel's soldiers when they surrender are not massacred. They are treated as prisoners and that will continue to occur in connection with every surrender. This is a war in which there is no necessity for an armistice. It does not fit into the picture. We are fighting on so many fronts that all that we can accord to any army which surrenders is unconditional surrender. After an army has unconditionally surrendered its soldiers will be well treated, but that treatment will be because of our own recognition that it is proper and not as a condition of surrender.

As these armies surrender, two duties will be immediately incumbent on us. There will probably be 300,000,000 starving people in the world. The United Nations must, by supplying them with food, save as many as possible of them from death. The other duty starts at the same time; that is, we must police the countries of which the surrendering armies are nationals.

Fortunately, the United States has a policy in relation to this. As unanimously adopted by both Houses of Congress and approved by President Taft on June 25, 1910, the principle was stated as follows:

"Resolved, etc., That a commission of five members be appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war."

Naturally the wording of that principle will have to be changed, but the principle itself is the American way. When we have restored some measure of order in the Axis countries and the subjugated countries have reorganized themselves we can meet at the peace table. Hate must not go to the council table. What we can do there can be simply stated. We cannot impose our own ideas of what is best in government on any one of the 31 other United Nations. We can insist that the Axis Powers reorganize themselves in such a manner that they shall cease to be a menace. We can afford to give all the peoples of the world the opportunity, if they desire to avail themselves of it, of choosing for themselves through their own forms of government as high a level of freedom and liberty as they deem necessary or desirable and as they can sustain and maintain. We should go no further.

As Christians we have the basis of all good government expressed by Jesus of Nazareth. He was asked what was the first and great commandment, and His reply is historic:

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the laws and the prophets."

Interestingly enough, those words are two quotations, the first from Deuteronomy and the other from Leviticus. Added to, and in line with that saying, are the Golden Rule and the Sermon on the Mount. We can say to the whole world that governments founded on these principles cannot, if the principles are adhered to, ever fail. And we can say it to ourselves just as strongly as we can say it to any other nation.

I have not spoken much about the Japanese. That may be a long war. They are fanatics who, as far back as recorded history goes, have never lost a war. They may fight to the last to prevent losing this one, but they will lose it. And our peace with them when it is signed will go to the extreme limit to make certain that, as far ahead as we can see, that particular people will not be a menace to peace.

Two things I have not discussed—world economics and our own domestic situation.

A Jewish friend of mine said to me the other night: "Christianity is the only thing which will assure a lasting peace and Christianity has never been tried." Jesus, who quoted portions of the Jewish Scriptures as the great commandments, is the Christ who on those divine principles taught the Golden Rule and preached the Sermon on the Mount. Jew, Christian, and men of all other faiths must recognize that, except as both world peace and world economics are based on these principles, there will be no enduring peace and no sound world economics.

Our domestic situation meshes into the world situation. Nevertheless, even if the world as a whole will not seek peace and pursue it, our people will not ignore God. On the living rock of an enduring faith the abiding strength of a united people will maintain inviolate the strong fortress of our Constitution and with this protection continue unimpaired and unmarred the American way of life.

The American Red Cross, Our Greatest Ally in War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, our Commander in Chief, military and naval personnel, educators, and spiritual leaders everywhere recognize the American Red Cross as a single outstanding organized agency in this war-torn world that brings relief to the suffering and misery of downtrodden and oppressed peoples everywhere. The American Red Cross

is the only agency permitted to visit and help your boy who might be a prisoner of war. The American Red Cross is the only agency permitted to visit the terrain of the enemy. Yes; the American Red Cross is our greatest ally in war and peace.

I am happy to include in my remarks an editorial that appeared in the McKeesport (Pa.) Daily News on Tuesday, March 2, 1943:

THE RED CROSS

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, our commander in Africa, pointed out in a message to the American people yesterday a division in responsibility in war areas that makes crystal clear the importance of the Red Cross.

"Each of you has a brother, son, husband, or very dear friend serving somewhere in the armed forces," the general stated. "The American Red Cross is the single organized agency that brings to that man those things that have no place in official equipment tables but do so much for his well-being and morale."

In other words, the military organization of our Nation looks out for the soldier, sailor, or marine as a fighting instrument. The Red Cross looks after his needs as a human being.

To itemize the services of the Red Cross to the men in uniform would require columns of space. However, a few are illustrative.

The Red Cross supplies care and comfort to the wounded. It maintains recreational centers and canteens at the battle fronts and in foreign cities where Americans are stationed. It acts as a contact between the fighting man and his affairs at home. It supplies the sympathetic understanding in individual problems so necessary to those who have been taken from their private lives, dressed in uniforms, and placed in the hardest jobs men ever undertook.

Such a program requires a great deal of money. This the Red Cross asks this week in a war-fund drive with a goal of $125,000,000 in the Nation. McKeesport's share of that effort is $65,000, which is double the amount sought locally in the first wartime campaign a few months after Pearl Harbor.

McKeesport has already proved that it fully appreciates the great work of the American Red Cross by shattering all national records in the blood-donor drive. However, there is a need of pointing out fully the responsibility that falls upon every one of us to see that the Red Cross has adequate means to carry on in the biggest assignment in its history.

A few facts and figures are pertinent. We all know the work of the Red Cross nurses. But do we know, for instance, that in the first year after Pearl Harbor the Red Cross recruited 21,400 nurses to meet Army and Navy needs? We have been aware of the work of the Red Cross in making surgical dressings. But do we know that the production of these bandages has grown to the amazing rate of 500,000 an hour? And do we know:

That 3,000,000 articles have been made by the Red Cross for men in service?

That no sector of our many battle fronts lacks canteen and recreational service sufficient for all men stationed there?

That blood plasma, obtained in drives such as the recent one in McKeesport, has already saved thousands of lives and is now moving steadily and efficiently to all points of need?

That Red Cross nurses' aides are on duty in all the major hospitals of the Nation, filling the gaps in service left by those who have heard the call to duty at the fighting fronts?

That the Red Cross is operating an inquiry service as a communication link between war victims of various nations, including the prisoners of war?

That the Red Cross resources stand mobilized on the home front against disaster and the reach of war?

It is customary in appeals for money to point out the results of the public's failure to contribute. This type of argument furnishes a kind of balance sheet on which the individual can weigh the importance of his giving against the situation that would pertain if he failed. This is not necessary in the Red Cross drive, in our opinion, because of this one simple, clear fact. We cannot fight this war without the Red Cross. Therefore, we must in our own interests support it generously.

Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, referring to the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation and appropriation of Government funds for this agency, I am in receipt of strong protests against the manner of operation of two Production Credit Corporation offices in western New York. I understand that these offices are soliciting farmers to take away loans from country banks, a practice not conforming with the true functions of the P. C. A. set-up as the P. C. A. and the R. A. C. C. are to operate only where a farmer cannot obtain a bank loan. This is unwarranted competition and is costing the taxpayer large sums of money. In this connection I submit herewith an article from the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, the contents of which I commend to your attention:

THE AX FOR THE SMALL-TOWN BANKER?

Assurances come out of Washington from time to time that the Government is glad to let private business do any job that it is willing and able to handle. Small-town bankers wonder why this policy doesn't apply to them Through one of its agencies, the Government is actively competing with them and trying to take away their customers.

This Government-fostered competitor is the Production Credit System, a division of the Farm Credit Administration. Its origin goes back to the early 1930's, when agricultural areas were in difficulty from depression and drought. Many farmers were unable to provide the security, required by State and Federal banking regulations, for the short-term loans by which much of the annual crop production and feeding of livestock are financed. Such loans commonly comprise one of the country bank's main sources of business. In setting up the Production Credit System, the intention of Congress was plainly to supplement the existing banking resources and to finance farmers unable to get credit or obtain it at a reasonable cost.

But production credit did not long confine itself to this purpose. Rather guardedly at first, then openly, it became a competitor of the country banks for the general type of farm accounts. Now it seeks the cream of these short-term loans, as demonstrated by the growing size of individual loans made by it.

In this competition it has some formidable advantages. Operations are carried on through so-called cooperative associations, composed of farmer-borrowers. Each member is required to take stock equal to $5 for each $100 or part of that amount he borrows. They are not, however, true cooperatives—of which much that is favorable can be said—since they are Government nurtured and supervised.

An association obtains its loan funds from a Federal intermediate credit bank, another division of the Farm Credit Administration, on the security of its members' notes and its capital and reserves. The bank rediscounts the paper and sells debentures to investors. These have back of them the original security plus the capital and reserves of the intermediate credit bank and the sanction of the Government. As a result, they command a low rate of interest. At last report, production credit was paying 1½ percent for money and charging its farmer borrowers 4½ percent. The difference is used to pay operating charges and to establish reserves.

Unlike the country banks, production credit pays no taxes. In fact, it enjoys use of taxpayers' money through retaining a considerable amount of the original capital invested by the Treasury. It also has another signal advantage which the country bank cannot afford. This consists of liberal and persuasive advertising, promotion, and publicity, prepared by skilled writing men in Farm Credit Administration employ. Moreover, in proportion to the volume of loans, it is staffed beyond the capacity of a private institution to maintain.

Production credit now has 530 active local associations and, according to its own claims, is prepared to serve every agricultural county. In Iowa—certainly not a State in any farm distress at present—it has 46 offices. In addition to the personnel in full and part-time offices, production credit carries a large number of local representatives, application takers and inspectors, at a time when manpower is at a premium. Many of these, bankers charge, are actively soliciting business from farmers whether they are being adequately served by local banks or not. Almost any country banker can recite instances of long-standing customers being weaned away from him by this means.

Any doubt that production credit is out of the substandard farm-loan field and is strictly competitive with country banks was removed by a recent announcement. This told of a new $200,000,000 Government loan fund being set up by the Department of Agriculture to help farmers lacking credit resources to increase production. This also, it was stated, is not intended to compete with other lenders, but "to supplement such other sources of credit where needed," production credit being named among these other sources.

Country banks generally are able and willing to take care of all the short-term farm-loan business that comes up to banking requirements. Many of them now have deposits of record volume. They are taking generous amounts of Treasury issues to finance the war and are devoting their facilities to the sale of War bonds to the public. Some of the local uses of their funds have dwindled because of the war restrictions on small-town business. This makes more serious any inroads on their short-term farm loans at this time. Their unimpaired facilities will be required when the post-war recovery begins, for they are an essential part of the machinery of any going community, serving a variety of local needs that no Government agency can fill.

The independent banks fought off a series of attempts to fasten a branch-banking system on the Nation. Now the small-town independent banks find themselves in a struggle with a bigger branch-banking system under Government auspices. No one outside the inner circles knows whether the incurable urge of a Government agency to expand or some other motive is back of the development. An official reason has never been given to the public. One is certainly due.

Authentic Report of Marvelous Work Done by Higgins Boats in Guadalcanal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hope Ridings Miller from the Washington Post of January 28, 1943:

TWO MEMBERS OF UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, JUST BACK FROM FAR-FLUNG BATTLEFIELDS, TO TOUR SOUTH WITH VISITS TO DEFENSE PLANTS

(By Hope Ridings Miller)

Straight from the fox holes of Guadalcanal and the slit trenches of Algeria came stories of suffering, privation, courage, and victory that had members of the congressional Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries sitting on the edges of their chairs at a meeting the past week.

The Coast Guard officers who told those stories were given first-hand reports. One, Warrant Machinist James D. Fox, was the second American soldier to land on Guadalcanal on that historic day of August 7, 1942, when United States forces, who were later to be bait for the Japanese, headed toward the Pacific island that was to become the hottest spot in the global picture. The other, Chief Boatswain's Mate Hunter A. Wood, had been in the first spearhead of attack in Algeria, and was a member of the initial American landing force in that theater of war.

Both are now on vastly different tours of duty. Early this week they will leave Washington for a trip through the South and the Middle West, to visit numerous defense plants. There's a very special reason. The United States Navy wants defense workers throughout America to hear from men who have served at the front just how much every man at the machine can do to help alleviate the suffering of the man behind the gun.

Sailors and soldiers cannot strike. They cannot demand higher wages, better hours, and more pleasant working conditions. In the bivouac of battle every man is expected to do his duty * * * and every man does. Frequently—as in the darkest days of the siege of Guadalcanal—adequate food supplies come up missing. "For more than 3 weeks we lived on stuff we took from the Japs—rice and barley," said Fox. "Just rice and barley, infested with worms. We didn't brush them aside. They were our only fresh meat."

Often, as during that time when the first Allied army landed in Algeria, with no air force support, sailors and soldiers so weary they dropped in their tracks had only the sand beach for a bed, or a hastily dug-out trench, with guns mounted atop as their only protection. "We didn't bother about our own comfort," said Wood. "We had a job to do * * * and we did it."

Both Fox and Wood are expert raconteurs. Having smelled battle smoke over and over again; having come so close to death day after day for weeks on end; and having seen many of their buddies killed before their very eyes because there were not enough planes, guns, and supplies to protect them, each one has a dramatic story to tell, and he omits none of the drama in the telling.

I heard each relate a few of his front-line experiences by way of table talk at a dinner given by Representative and Mrs. Boykin at the Washington Hotel the other evening. Seems Mr. BOYKIN first heard the story at the committee meeting I mentioned some time back, and he wanted a few of his friends to have the same privilege. They did, that very evening, while venison killed on that famous Boykin game preserve in Alabama was served up as the piece de resistance. There was wild rice, too; but perhaps few guests noticed, as I did, that one person turned it down. He was Fox, the man who had eaten nothing but rice for weeks on Guadalcanal. "I simply can't look another grain in the face," he whispered later. "Not even when it's wild."

Representative BOYKIN'S avid interest in accounts brought home by Fox and Wood will have quite an important effect on the tour they are taking through the South. A number of Alabama, Florida, and Louisiana defense plants not originally on their schedule have been included at BOYKIN'S suggestion. Telephone wires to the South from BOYKIN'S Capitol Hill office have been sizzling ever since the genial gentleman from Alabama attended that exciting committee meeting before which Wood and Fox appeared. "I want those boys to have every attention possible, while they're in my section of the country," BOYKIN said. "They deserve it; they've had a tough time of it—as many of our other boys have. And I'd like for every civilian-defense worker in America to hear their stories."

"The one man in the South I want especially to see is Andrew Jackson Higgins," said Fox. "I want to tell him, face to face, that Higgins' landing boats such as we had at Guadalcanal are the best in the world. They do everything but talk; honest, they do!"

Both Fox and Wood will have a chance to tell Higgins what they think of his boats, and more than likely, they'll have a chance to talk to workers in shipyards all along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico.

Addressing mass meetings will soon be an old story to them; for already they have had plenty of practice since they started their tour up Boston way a month ago. It was there that they talked before a throng of 20,000 at a celebration of the President's birthday.

"You ought to write a book" is the plea thoughtlessly tossed out by almost anybody when a person begins to recount unusually thrilling experiences. If Wood and Fox can write half as well as they can talk, they owe it to posterity to put their pens to paper—at once.

Fox could turn out chapter on chapter about those frightfully feverish days when his Coast Guard unit, struggling to unload 30,000 tons of cargo, faced an attack by 47 Jap torpedo bombers. He would tell how, for 6 weeks, the men on Guadalcanal struggled through 122 bombings and 60 sieges of shellings from Jap ships; of how American servicemen had little or no sleep for a month; of how they slipped from fox hole to fox hole, spotted Japs in trees—Japs who had tied themselves there and were camouflaged so only the keen of eye could see them; and of how he was in one group that was knocked completely out of its base by Japanese artillery.

"But I'll tell you one thing," said Fox, who has won all sorts of prizes as a crack shot himself, "those Japs don't know how to handle their guns as well as our men do. We shot 'em down like grouse, and when we couldn't find any more Japs to aim at, we fired revolvers at Jap airplanes. Didn't do much good, but it took the tension off our nerves."

He is convinced the war with the Japanese will be long and arduous. "Don't let anybody tell you it'll be over in a year," he warned. "Those Japs will never surrender. They just have to be killed—all of them."

For 90 days Fox was in the heat of the Guadalcanal siege. He lost 38 pounds in those weeks before the United States supplies got ashore. "Then, when our stuff did come in, and we opened it—what do you think was the first thing we found? Rice!"

An attack of malaria curtailed his experience on Guadalcanal, and after a sojourn in an outpost hospital, he was shipped back to the United States. "But I want to get back to the front as soon as possible," he said. "We've still got a mighty hard task ahead of us."

Wood feels the same way about it. The ship on which he saw hard duty on the way to Algeria is back at sea once more, "and I wish I were on her," he averred. And then, mention of her reminded him of a few grim experiences back in November when the first band of Allied troops were landing—with no supporting air force—in North Africa.

"The troops we took in," he said proudly, "are now fighting Rommel, and doing a swell job of it. But back in those days we often wondered whether we'd ever get our men and supplies on ground at all. And then he told how members of the Coast Guard carried supplies from ship to shore, "made our way through water up to our necks"; of how debarkation maneuvers were begun and finished with extreme difficulty; of how the first landing was made in a thick fog; and of how the horizon was red with gunfire and the sky roared with German dive bombers. "But that Coast Guard crew was a bunch to be proud of," he continued. "Coming out of that amphibious task force vessel was a group of the toughest fighters you ever saw. Not a one welshed on the job."

Perhaps the most harrowing experience in Wood's memory centered around the sinking of the aircraft carrier *Avenger*. His own ship was in convoy, returning with British troops, and was a day away from the Strait of Gibraltar. He was on duty—the 12-to-4 a. m. watch—when the *Avenger*, about 100 yards away, was torpedoed. "Flames leaped 250 feet high when her gas tanks exploded. She broke in half and men and planes were thrown into the air. I can hear their screams yet."

Well, that just gives you an idea of what those two Coast Guard officers have to tell civilian war workers throughout the country. From a vast fund of thrilling experiences that have come their way in the past 6 months, each has culled enough impressive memories to talk about from now until doomsday. I've touched only briefly on the scores of stories they told me in comparatively brief interviews. But in the next 2 weeks thousands of defense workers over the South will hear what these two men have to say about life on the far-flung battle fronts, where protection and safety depend on supplies made by defense workers at home—and where, in the face of the foe, there can be no strikes for higher wages, shorter hours, or more pleasant living conditions.

A Sensible Pay-As-You-Go Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, on two previous occasions in this session, I have advocated a pay-as-you-go income-tax plan. With the cost of this war almost prohibitive, it is mandatory that this Congress enacts a sensible tax plan, and

I am happy to include in my remarks a sound pay-as-you-go plan submitted by an able executive and an outstanding American of my district, John A Krut, of McKeesport, Pa.:

McKEESPORT, PA., *February 25, 1943.*
The Honorable SAMUEL A. WEISS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following is a suggested plan which I believe could be used by the United States Treasury Department in connection with pay-as-you-go income-tax proposals.

Hold the 1942 taxes of an individual as a tax liability and forgive 25 percent of these 1942 taxes per year for each of 4 years beginning with the year 1943. The unforgiven tax would be held as a tax liability against the estate of the individual in case of his death before having paid taxes for the years 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946.

For example:

PRESENT PLAN

	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	Total
Individual's tax	$10,000	$15,000	$15,000	$15,000	$15,000	$70,000

SUGGESTED PLAN

Individual's tax		$17,500	$17,500	$17,500	$17,500	$70,000
Amount forgiven, 25 percent of 1942 taxes		2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	10,000
Estate tax liability	$10,000	7,500	5,000	2,500		

TOTAL TAX COLLECTIONS

	1 year	2 years	3 years	4 years	5 years
Under present plan	$10,000	$25,000	$40,000	$55,000	$70,000
Under proposed plan:					
From individual		17,500	35,000	52,500	70,000
From estate in case of death	10,000	7,500	5,000	2,500	
	10,000	25,000	40,000	55,000	70,000

If the taxpayer lives for 5 years, he will have made up in payments of higher taxes in the years from 1943 to 1946 the full amount of the 1942 taxes forgiven.

If the taxpayer should die at any time prior to 1947, his tax payments plus the unforgiven taxes on 1942 income payable by his estate will be exactly the same amount as he would have paid under the present tax plan.

The advantages of this proposed plan would be:

1. Eease of adoption of the pay-as-you-go-plan.
2. No double taxation in 1 year.
3. No loss to the Treasury.
4. No windfall wealth to an estate in case of an individual's death.

If you should like to have further information concerning this suggestion, I should be glad to write you in answer to questions you might raise.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. KRUT.

Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, Ghandi should have been here and started with us March 1.

Lend-lease was conceived in March of 1941, just 9 months before Pearl Harbor.

What will it profit us to gain the whole world and lose our own soul (democracy)?

Edsel Ford's plane flew my colleagues from Detroit back to Washington in 110 minutes.

Willkie is our secret political weapon against Republicans. (Congressman JOHN RANKIN, of Mississippi.)

Between extending lend-lease to her and saving Australia, England should give us Bermuda.

The "social gains" in Farm Security's program for imported farm labor seems to be uppermost.

A headline says, "LaGuardia urges death for meat racketeers." Why did the Little Flower wait for the meat fellows?

After 10 years of it, F. D. R. looks real well—seems to be enjoying it all immensely.

Handling difficulty, making the best of bad messes, is one of life's major businesses. (Harry Emerson Fosdick.)

From Reader's Digest of March we depict Truth for the above and Falsehood for the one below.

It is the former isolationists who now demand a system of collective security. (Anne O'Hare McCormick.)

The Supreme Court decided that Maloney was the full brother of ground meat in thin skins. Is the court of last resort coming back?

The fourth of March in the odd years reminds the older House Members that George Norris' Lame Duck Amendment shortening their service 2 months ultimately was just another Victory tax.

The F. S. A.'s announced plan to move 50,000 farmers from the hills of Kentucky, Tennessee, and surrounding States to the Middle West will constitute the third front and will have to wait until the marines return.

Mr. Willkie's Shoes Are in the Ring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN A. DAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of March 2, 1943:

MR. WILLKIE'S SHOES ARE IN THE RING

Wendell Willkie's mouthpiece, the New York Herald Tribune, says he is going to be a candidate for the Republican nomination in 1944. His shoes are unlaced. Almost any day now they will be tossed into the ring along with his socks, and the transformation of the Wall Street lawyer into the barefoot boy from Indiana will again have been accomplished.

The announcement is interesting as disclosing that Mr. Willkie continues to take himself seriously. Travel has broadened him. Since his return from a round-the-world trip in an Army plane, Mr. Willkie can say "Willkie is wonderful" in Russian, Chinese, Arabic, and Persian, as well as in his native Hoosier accents. Nobody can accuse him of having wasted his time or the Government's equipment. He was a mighty busy man all the time he was gone.

Nevertheless, the loyal opposition has been having an uphill pull. The people just don't seem to be interested in him. They don't care much whether his shoes are on or off. The barefoot boy tried to push Mr. Dewey into limbo, and now Mr. Dewey is Governor of New York, and Mr. Willkie isn't. He tried to purge Congress of its most stalwart Republican Members only to see them returned triumphantly. He sought to make the Republican Party indistinguishable from the New Deal Party, only to see the Republicans make their greatest gains where the opposition to this nonsense was strongest. The election last November was as much a rejection of Willkie and his imitation New Deal as of Mr. Roosevelt and the original article.

With all of these evidences of his popularity to sustain him, Mr. Willkie is now undertaking to tell the Republicans of the country that they must support him for the Presidency because only he can win. Evidently it is true that when you've got "it" your best friends won't put you wise.

International Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, whatever the future holds for this country, whatever changes the fortunes of war will bring to the English-speaking countries, one thing is certain, there must be a change in the plan of our monetary system. What that change will be will depend on the wisdom of our statesmen and those of the Allied countries.

Much has been said and written on the subject of money. In the existing confusion concerning silver and the place of metal in our monetary system, I desire to present for the consideration of the Members of the House an article by Mr. Sidney Norman, a prominent mining editor of this country and of Canada, concerning the world wide remonetization of silver and forecasting the international monetary system of the future. He reports:

WORLD-WIDE REMONETIZATION FEAR BELIEVED RESPONSIBLE FOR ANTISILVER ONSLAUGHT

(By Sidney Norman)

Readers of current literature have doubtless noticed the concerted onslaught now being made in prominent newspapers and magazines alike, upon the supporters of silver in the United States Senate referred to as the "silver bloc," and in some directions even as virtual saboteurs of the war effort. The silver legislation, by which the domestic price of the metal is held at 71.11 cents and the coinage value at $1.29 an ounce, is also characterized by these authorities as preposterous.

Who are these authorities? The very number and similarity of the diatribes seems to furnish proof positive that they are part and parcel of a well-oiled campaign of propaganda, and it does not overtax the imagination to determine where self-interest in this particular case lies.

The contumely heaped upon these Senators from the Western States, alleged to be defying a nation, is manifestly based upon untruth and is quite unfair. None are owners of silver mines, but they do represent a vast majority of the people of the entire West, not only in the sneer-zone silver States but in the agricultural States as well. Throughout this great area the conviction is general that metallic is the best kind of money; that it is necessary in trade, and that since gold has been nationalized and its possession banned by law, there is little, if any, hope of that metal ever again circulating freely.

SILVER A BYPRODUCT

In order to gain a true perspective of the matter, it is well to remember, first, that there is but one important so-called straight silver mine north of the Mexican line and that even it produces a fair amount of lead and other metals. To say that the silver-producing industry supports only one-half percent of the silver States' population and only one twenty-fifth of 1 percent of the total United States population, as stated in a recent editorial in Colliers, merely proves that figures may be made to lie, and emphasized the length to which the propagandists have been driven to find arguments that may possibly sound plausible to the uninitiated, but which, to those with even a bowing acquaintance with facts, are simply ridiculous.

Everyone who knows anything of metal-mining, also knows that silver is almost wholly a byproduct of copper, lead, and zinc. They also know that but for the supporting price of silver, the supply of base metals for war purposes, even now desperately short, would have fallen far below the present wartime volume, which has only been achieved by utter disregard of economical practice and of the emaciated conditions in which producing mines must be left when they face the normal peacetime levels of production.

The statement that silver is now required as a war substitute for other metals, particularly copper, is not all the story by any means. If it were, the best answer would be that the metal, not used as backing for silver certificates, is being freely used for electrical and other equipment for which it is adaptable under the lend-lease plan. Now, however, the monometallists and the silver fabricators demand that the metallic backing to more than 16 percent of the United States currency be sold and the country left with none but fiat money.

PAPER MONEY IS SUSPECT

War has rendered paper currency suspect the world over and the consequent demand for metallic money is greater now than at any time in history. A few months ago it was announced that Britain was in the market for 2,500,000 ounces of silver monthly for coinage purposes and similar demand has come from such countries as Iran and Iraq, not to mention India, which, as history shows, was saved from imminent revolution in the First Great War by 200,000,000 ounces of silver borrowed by Britain from United States and supplied, only in the nick of time, by melting down a large part of the silver dollars then on hand in the Treasury. Only a few days ago, the Secretary of the Treasury announced that he is ready to lend-lease supplies to United Nations Allies for coinage purposes. Britain and Australia are specifically mentioned as insistent applicants for loans. Thus, is history repeating itself.

INDUSTRIAL USE VASTLY INCREASED

Industrial use in the arts has also largely increased. Last year's consumption, in the United States and Canada, has been estimated at 80,000,000 ounces, compared with 40,000,000 in 1941, while for 1942 it is estimated that 130,000,000 ounces have been absorbed. Part of this amazing increase may be due to withdrawal of gold from circulation and general use. It is, of course, quite obvious that silversmiths would be specially favored by a low price for the metal, though, even now, they hold their fabricated wares at anywhere from 100 to 500 percent above the price of the raw materials. That explains why they have been made the spearhead of the present attack. The identity of the powers behind the throne can be guessed when it is borne in mind that it is easier to control the financial affairs of nations when one metal is established as the ultimate measuring value, rather than two.

WHERE IS THE DIFFERENCE?

Raising of the price of silver to 71.11 cents an ounce and setting of the coinage value at $1.29 was no more revolutionary or "preposterous" than raising the price of gold from $20.67 to $35 an ounce. As a matter of fact, the latter increase drained gold from every corner of the globe into permanent burial place in the United States, just as was predicted at the Senate silver hearing in 1939. It also vastly increased the demand for silver by making its extended use inevitable. Silver is now as much a part of the United States monetary system as gold. No one has yet proposed that gold be substituted for copper or any other metal needed for war purposes, though it might be quite as adaptable as silver in many directions. Perhaps that would be treason, or sacrilege, or something.

'TWAS PLANNED THAT WAY

Friends of silver in the Congress, led by the late Senator Key Pittman, of Nevada, looking forward to world remonetization, planned well, foreseeing events that have since transpired. With United States in a predominant position when world peace is arranged, holding 80 percent of all the gold above ground, and billions of ounces of silver, there is not much doubt but that the latter will be restored to its ancient monetary place, and quite irrespective of what becomes of the gold standard. It is not likely that gold will ever be allowed to circulate freely, though the accumulated supply may be used by a credit-extending world bank. Billions of paper currency now in circulation in Europe will become worthless. The confidence of beggared millions will only be restored by hard money.

SILVER GREAT NATURAL ASSET

Quite apart from all arguments, pro or con, one big fact will remain incontrovertible—silver is one of the great natural assets of North America, which produces about 65 percent of the annual world supply. Mexico stands first, United States second, and Canada third among nations of the world. With production of South America added, silver production becomes a practical monopoly of the Western Hemisphere. Why should it not be shared for the benefit of all the world?

If this war is ever to be paid for, if we are ever to carry out grandiose plans for world recovery and betterment, if, in fact, this waterlogged old world of ours is ever to go back upon an even keel, every nation on earth will be called upon to use its every resource to the ultimate limit and a money recognized as such everywhere must be provided to stimulate trade and easy intercourse. Gold is out, probably for all time. What other substitute is there but silver?

CANADA HAS BIG STAKE

Silver has been a money metal from the beginning of time and is still used solely as such by more than half the inhabitants of the earth. No nation has greater proportionate stake in its future than Canada. It will be a happy day for her when she casts off any outworn ties that bind and joins wholeheartedly with other nations of the Americas in restoring full value and world use to one of her great natural assets.

She would not lead. Now, she will be compelled to follow.

Administration of the Wages and Hours Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, during a previous term in this House as a member of the Labor Committee, on which committee I still serve, I gave considerable attention to the Fair Labor Standards Act, popularly known as the Wages and Hours Act. I was a member of the conference committee which drafted the act in its present form.

We were much concerned with the problem of unfair competition in various States where decent wages are paid resulting from goods manufactured at low wages in other States. However, we were aware of the fact that certain activities were of a purely local nature and did not burden or harass the channels of interstate commerce. Many of these local activities were in the retailing trades and in service establishments, such as laundries, hotels, restaurants, barber shops. There was no need and perhaps no constitutional power to interfere with these local enterprises. It seemed good statesmanship to leave to State and local governments the problems and responsibility of handling these

local services and trades which do not substantially affect the stream of interstate commerce.

We provided, in fact, that even those establishments of this character which happened to be near State lines and thus serve customers in different States were exempt from the act so long as the major portion of the business was within the State. We felt that if more of the business was outside the State than in, sufficient effect on the other State might result to require some control of wages and hours.

However, there was no intention to draw a line between some of these local service establishments because of the kind of customers served. For example, laundries have always been considered service establishments. There is a definite local area served. Most laundries, I am told, do work for restaurants, or barber shops, or hospitals, or hotels, or stores. But they are still laundries, and as such service establishments.

I have gone back to the RECORD of the debates, and I find that Congresswoman NORTON, from my own State, and chairman of the committee, assured the House that all such service establishments were exempt from the act.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Seventy-fifth Congress, on page 7299 of volume 83, we find this question and answer:

Mr. DEMPSEY. May I ask the gentlewoman from New Jersey whether by the wildest stretch of the imagination, or regardless of any possible administrative interpretations, this bill can in any way affect such business as that of the local groceryman, druggist, clothing store, meat dealer—any merchant in fact—laundry, hospital, hotel, or even transportation companies operating solely within a State?

Mrs. NORTON. Absolutely not.

As I have already pointed out, the act went further and provided that establishments of this character may do up to 50 percent of their business outside the State and still be exempt from its provisions.

In view of these facts, I was considerably shocked when a constituent of mine—a responsible leader in his community, a good employer, and more than complying with the laws of my State—called to my attention the following ruling of the Wage and Hour Division which in effect held:

A laundry which does 25 percent of its dollar volume for customers such as barber shops, hotels, restaurants, hospitals, or similar customers, loses the exemption which is available to other laundries doing less than 25 percent of such work.

I wrote to Mr. Walling, the Administrator of the Wages and Hours Act, and asked whether this interpretation was actually enforced by his agency. He replied at once stating that he was "very much inclined to the view that all laundries, regardless of whether they do so-called commercial work or not, were intended by the Congress to be exempt * * *." He pointed out that the ruling was made by his predecessors and that a court case was then pending on the very question.

Mr. Walling further stated in his letter of July 2, 1942:

Regardless of the outcome of the litigation, I am inclined at the present time to think that our interpretation should be revised in this regard.

Only a few days later I learned that the Federal court where the litigation was pending had ruled that all laundries, regardless of kind of customers, were service establishments. I assumed that Mr. Walling would follow the procedure he himself had suggested and revise the interpretation to conform to the intent of Congress and the decision of the court. However, I made no further effort to see if in fact the ruling was corrected.

About 6 months later, in February of this year, my attention was called to the fact that the employee involved in the earlier litigation had appealed to the circuit court. Of course, any litigant has a right to pursue his own remedy as far as he chooses. But, to my amazement, the Wage and Hour Division had requested permission of the circuit court to file a brief as a "friend of the court," although the Wage and Hour Division was not in any official way participating in the case. It may well prove, however, that agents of the Division have been encouraging the appeal of the suit.

I have examined the brief which the Government filed as a "friend of the court," and I discovered that it contained a statement that the Administrator urged the court to draw a distinction between various laundries because of customers served. Moreover, it reminded the court very solemnly that "the interpretations of the Administrator, while not binding, are entitled to great weight."

Immediately I communicated with Mr. Walling and asked whether he was not misleading the court in representing that he was of one opinion, although he had written me he held an opinion directly contrary. A reply on February 22, 1943, assured me that Mr. Walling still feels very strongly that the interpretation is wrong, but he cannot change it now because employees are relying on it, even to the extent of filing suits.

I am today replying to Mr. Walling's courteous but evasive letter. I am asking him if he has given any thought to the fact that this interpretation—which he concedes is contrary to the intention of Congress—will invite other employee suits, put employers to the expense of litigation, burden the courts, and most dangerous today, create enmity by workers against their employers in the mistaken belief that they are being unlawfully deprived of the benefits of this act.

The various letters exchanged between Mr. Walling and myself are such clear exhibits of dangerous administrative practices that I believe they should be spread before the Congress in full text. It is a sorry story when a public official charged with the administration of a law of the Nation urges upon the courts an interpretation which he himself believes to be contrary to the intention of the Congress which created the law and the agency:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 1, 1942.

L. METCALF WALLING,
Administrator, Wage and Hour Division,
United States Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WALLING: Mr. Robert Skinner, a laundry operator in my State, has called to my attention a ruling by the Wage and Hour Division, which has caused great distress to members of the laundry industry.

The ruling denies to some laundries the benefits of section 13 (a) 2 of the Wages and Hours Act on the tenuous argument that some of their customers are hospitals, barber shops, hotels, etc. I helped draft the act and served on the conference committee which wrote the act in its present form. I can assure you that it was the intent of the committee to exclude service establishments, including laundries, so long as the majority of business is within the State. There was no intention to draw a line between laundries based on the customers served.

I would appreciate your courtesy in examining this matter with Mr. Skinner. I am confident that it is your desire to see that the rulings of the division properly reflect the purposes of the act.

Very truly yours,

FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION,
New, York, N. Y., July 2, 1942.

Hon. FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARTLEY: I had a very pleasant conference today with Mr. R. B. Skinner, Mr. George H. Johnson of the American Institute of Laundering, and Mr. Stanley I. Posner.

I advised them that I am sympathetic to their difficulties, and that I feel for the next 2 or 3 months, pending the decision by the courts of litigation involving this very point, I cannot make any modification in our present interpretations. I believe that relatively little hardship will be imposed by this short delay in considering modification of the present interpretation of the law regarding laundries and service establishments which was issued by my predecessor, General Fleming.

I am very much inclined to the view that all laundries, regardless of whether they do so-called commercial work or not, were intended by the Congress to be exempt, as you definitely state, and regardless of the outcome of the litigation I am inclined at the present time to think that our interpretation should be revised in this regard. I am sure you will understand, however, that it is extremely awkward for me to take any stand during the pendency of litigation in the courts which is inconsistent with the position which has officially been taken in our brief. I am, of course, thinking only of the intrastate service establishments, as the law clearly states that even service establishments are subject if they do the greater part of their business across State lines.

I appreciate very much your bringing this matter to my attention.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

L. METCALFE WALLING,
Administrator.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1943.

Hon. L. METCALFE WALLING,
Administrator, Wage and Hour Division,
United States Department of Labor,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WALLING: Early in July I was visited by a constituent, Mr. Robert B. Skinner, who discussed with me the problems of laundries and linen supply companies under the Wages and Hours Act. Your division had taken the position that laundries doing some part of their work with commercial customers such as restaurants, barber shops, or boarding houses, are not within the exemption of section 12–A–2 of the Wages and Hours Act as service establishments.

At my request you conferred with Mr. Skinner and discussed the problem with him. On July 2, 1942, you wrote me, "I am very much inclined to the view that all laundries, regardless of whether they do so-called commercial work or not, were intended by the Congress to be exempted, as you definitely state, and regardless of the outcome of the litigation. I am inclined at the present time to think that our interpretation should be revised in this regard." You suggested further in your letter that a case was then pending and you thought it best to wait for the disposition of that case before issuing your revised interpretation. Needless to say, it was very gratifying to me to receive such a candid assurance that it was the intention of your agency to take no position inconsistent with the intent of Congress when it passed the legislation.

I am considerably disturbed by certain facts which have been called to my attention in the subsequent developments on this question. I understand that the case pending at the time of your letter to me was decided shortly thereafter and the decision of the court completely sustained the position concurred in by you, that Congress intended laundries and linen-supply companies should draw no distinctions based on the type of customers served. It seems to me that this would have been a proper occasion for you to make the modification contemplated in your letter of July 2.

I am now advised that the employee-plaintiff has appealed from the lower court decision to the circuit court of the United States. The Wage and Hour Division asked and received permission to file a brief in this case as a friend of the court. I have before me a copy of the Government's brief, in which it is stated that you contend that certain laundries doing work for industrial or commercial concerns are not within the exemption provided by section 13–A–2 of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In the brief you called to the court's attention the fact that your interpretations "while not binding, are entitled to great weight."

It seems to me that your brief either innocently or deliberately will result in misleading the court. Your brief states categorically that you are of one opinion, whereas your letter to me of July 2 states with equal assurance that you are of a different opinion. The court obviously has no way of realizing your actual state of mind and will undoubtedly place great reliance on the interpretation which you state represents your opinion of the meaning of the law. Although I am not a lawyer, I question the propriety of such representations to the court.

I realize that any employee has a right to ask the courts for assistance in obtaining the benefits of this act. I believe that your division on proper occasions can and should intervene in cases where an interpretation by the Department is challenged. Here, however, your Department is intervening to assist an employee in connection with an interpretation which runs counter to the intent of Congress. I believe that immediate steps should be taken by you to withdraw this brief and make known to the court your opinion that revised Interpretative Bulletin No. 6 no longer expresses the position of the Wage and Hour Division.

Very truly yours,
FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
WAGE AND HOUR AND PUBLIC
CONTRACTS DIVISION,
New York, N. Y., February 22, 1943.

Hon. FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARTLEY: I have before me your letter of February 16, 1943, in which you request that I withdraw the brief which has been filed by the Division as amicus curiae in the case of *Lonas* v. *National Linen Service Corporation.*

As my letter of July 2, 1942, indicated, I have personally felt very strongly that the word "service" as used in section 13 (a) (2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act is not limited by the term "retail" appearing in the same section. When I became Administrator I inherited, as it were, certain interpretations of long standing, among them the interpretation as to laundries having their principal dealings with commercial enterprises. These interpretations have been relied upon by employees, even to the extent of filing suits. While I am inclined to disagree with some of these older interpretations, as I am in the case of the interpretation to be placed on the word "service," I am under somewhat of an obligation not to interfere with litigation already commenced.

The matter was further complicated by the fact that in the case of *Miller* v. *Lawson,* decided on September 17, 1942, the Court held that a laundry which obtained only 14 percent of its business from four manufacturing companies was thereby deprived of the benefits of the exemption in section 13 (a) (2) of the act. It is the feeling of my legal advisers that this case sustains the interpretation which was made by my predecessor. In addition, they also feel that certain expressions of the courts, including the Supreme Court itself, lend strength to the interpretation.

These facts have been put before the circuit court of appeals in the case of *Lonas* v. *National Linen Service Corporation* for the purpose of clarification, and it is for this reason principally that the brief has been filed. I shall be inclined to an immediate clarification of interpretative bulletin No. 6, including the interpretation of the term "service establishments" if the circuit court of appeals sustains the district court in this matter.

In the meantime, after writing you, I discovered that the Lonas case was in a sense agreed upon by my predecessor and the company as a test case in lieu of injunctive proceedings. I might say that pending decision by the circuit court the division is not making inspections of laundries.

Sincerely yours,
L. METCALFE WALLING,
Administrator.

MARCH 4, 1943.

L. METCALFE WALLING,
Administrator, United States
Department of Labor, Wage
and Hour Division,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WALLING: I have your letter of February 22, in which you reiterate your conviction that laundries are "service establishments" regardless of the kinds of customers served. However, you ignore my question whether you are acting fairly in representing to the court that you hold a different interpretation. That was the principal point of my letter.

You mention a case of *Miller* v. *Lawson,* which your lawyers feel sustains the interpretation of your predecessor. I am not a lawyer. I looked at that case to see what it says. It concerns a laundry which performed some manufacturing operations, including dyeing bedspreads, which were shipped in interstate commerce. Certainly any employee engaged in this work is subject to the wage-hour law. Otherwise the manufacturer of those bedspreads would have an unfair advantage over other manufacturers of bedspreads in other States. But this manufacturing operation is not laundry work, and frankly I can't see how it has any relevancy to the matter about which I am concerned.

The courts are today handling many more cases than heretofore. They are likely to place considerable weight on the fact that you, as the person charged with the administration of the law, interpret the provision one way rather than another. Indeed, your brief solicits this result by the statement that your interpretations, "while not binding, are entitled to great weight."

Bluntly stated, you are asking the courts to adopt an interpretation which you have repeatedly advised me you believe to be contrary to the intent of Congress. How can this be called seeking clarification?

It seems to me that your agency, in your name and with your consent, is deliberately attempting to lead the courts into error. This is the pattern of administrative self-aggrandizement which I shall vigorously oppose wherever I find it.

As Administrator, it is your duty to establish the policies, and direct the enforcement of the Wages and Hours Act. If your predecessors issued an interpretation which is contrary to the intent of the law, you have the duty and should have the courage to modify the ruling. The intepretation in its present form will invite other employee suits. It exposes employers to the expense of litigation, and the enmity of their employees who may be led to believe that they are being deprived of the benefits of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Various courts both Federal and State (including one State supreme court) have already ruled that laundries are service establishments.

I have written you my view based on my close relationship to the law during its legislative course that there was no intention on the part of Congress to draw a line between laundries based on customers served, so long as the majority of the business is within the State. You have stated your unequivocal agreement that such was the intent of Congress. How can you, under these circumstances, urge the courts to a contrary interpretation?

Very truly yours,
FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.

Ten Years of Roosevelt

REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a tremendous shock when I read an editorial in one of the Washington papers that has been assailing and attacking the President and all

those who have tried in any way to aid and cooperate with him in his efforts to bring about an early victory of the war.

Going back 10 years ago in his great efforts to bring about the rehabilitation of our country from the worst panic in the history of the Nation, which occurred under Hoover's administration, when 18,000,000 people were without employment, men working for $1 a day and women for $3 and $4 per week, and millions of people suffering from want of food, clothing, and shelter, when business was on the brink of bankruptcy, when wheat was selling for 29 cents a bushel, corn for 17 cents, cattle and hogs at 3 cents per pound, and cotton at 5 cents per pound, I vividly recall that due to the courageous action of the President there was a gradual improvement and people were returned to work by the establishment of many agencies to help in the reconstruction and rehabilitation. Within a short period of time when most of this was accomplished under the President's direction, a number of newspapers began to attack him and to find fault with his aims and efforts. Not only that, but when it was evident that a conspiracy was hatched between Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese war lords to destroy and undermine the democracies of the world and the President in conformance with the duties imposed upon him under the Constitution called attention of the Congress to the dangers which were threatening the country again, a large number of the newspapers, instead of aiding and assisting the President, saw fit to unjustly assail and criticize his efforts. The Washington paper to which I have alluded was one of them, and therefore, as I have stated, I was tremendously shocked when I read the editorial in this morning's Washington Times-Herald "conceding, we believe, that he strove valiantly to repair the battered home economy, and won a considerable measure of success."

Mr. Speaker, yes, actually giving him credit for accomplishing good. Consequently, with such concession by the Times-Herald those who have stood by the President will be satisfied that their support has been justified. With the full reading of the editorial, my shock was tempered to pleasant surprise, and I humbly under the leave given me, include it in the RECORD in its entirety, as follows:

TEN YEARS OF ROOSEVELT

Today is March 4, 1943; and on March 4, 1933, Franklin D. Roosevelt was first inaugurated President. A picture of him on that occasion appears on the right-hand side of this page along with a picture showing how he looks today.

Mr. Roosevelt came into office in the middle of a domestic crisis which was in no way of his making. He galvanized the Nation into a mood to fight the panic with his memorable statement: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

Even those who in the 10 years since that day have disagreed with Mr. Roosevelt on his foreign policies must concede, we believe, that he strove valiantly to repair the battered American home economy, and won a considerable measure of success.

Perchance, Mr. Speaker, the hope may be entertained that even the Times-Herald and other newspapers may some day in the near future recognize and approve the soundness of the President's foreign policies.

Ruml Plan in Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article appearing in the Evening Bulletin, of Philadelphia, on March 1. This article is written by Carl W. McCardle, of the Bulletin staff, in Ottawa, Canada:

HOW CANADA PAYS ITS WAR BILL—RUML PLAN OF INCOME TAX WILL BE ADOPTED THERE—EIGHT MONTHS OF LAST YEAR'S LEVIES ARE EXPECTED TO BE CANCELED UNDER PROGRAM FOR SHIFT TO COUNTRY'S OWN PAY-GO SYSTEM

(By Carl W. McCardle)

OTTAWA, March 1.—Even with the temperature 37 degrees below zero, as it was here the other day, a frost-bitten taxpayer from the United States can find comfort in Canada.

For Canada is getting ready to put into effect the Ruml plan—or what amounts to the same thing.

Thus Canada is stealing another march on the United States, which is still stalling on the question, with Congress enmeshed in talk and the Treasury Department in theories.

The Dominion has been working gradually into its own version of Beardsley Ruml's idea of collecting present taxes out of present income and letting the Government bookkeeper forget about the taxes on last year's income.

In changing over officially to the Ruml way for 1943, Canada will probably cancel approximately 8 months of the 1942 taxes. The taxpayers already have paid their taxes on the other 4 months of 1942. So the new system will be installed without any overlapping double taxes. In devising an easier means for the taxpayer to carry his burden Canada doesn't believe in breaking his back at the very start.

The swing to Ruml is accordingly to be done sensibly and without fuss. It is characteristic of Canada's realistic approach to all its wartime problems. This generally has consisted of grabbing the problem firmly by the wind-pipe then determining if more severe treatment is necessary.

Canada, for example, has prices and wages pegged at something near a balanced level and to date has kept that insatiable demon of war, inflation, at bay. But some weeks ago the cost of living was inching upward. The Government didn't call out the Northwest Mounted. It simply jumped on the prices with both feet. Now the cost of living average is tending downward, not up.

This direct method of doing things is in line with the series of experiments with which Canada has more or less pioneered to withstand the shocks of a wrold upheaval upon its economy.

EXCITING LABORATORY

Canada's Government these days is a rather exciting laboratory where men are constantly at work to try to achieve certain aims. These are to spare no expense or sacrifice in winning the war but at the same time to see to it that the people won't have to go on paying for the war till kingdom come and also making sure that in relieving future generations the people won't have to go to the poorhouse now.

The Government is quite proud of its success to date. And the people you meet are on the whole satisfied with the way things are going—they are living comfortably despite the stresses and strains on their finances, and are even saving money for the rainy days they anticipate after the war is over.

So an American correspondent in Canada has much to write home about.

A few nights ago, sitting in on a debate in Parliament on the conduct of the war, I heard a member of Prime Minister Mackenzie King's opposition deliver a powerful speech urging that the Ruml plan be established in Canada.

"There isn't a man or a woman in Canada who isn't in favor of the Ruml plan," he declared.

He apparently didn't know that the Government already is busy mapping out the procedure under which a Ruml scheme will be set up. I was told that within a month or so, maybe by April 1, the Minister of Finance could be expected to announce the formal adoption of a Canadian Ruml plan. Of course, it was added, anything can happen between now and then to upset the apple cart.

NONE IS WORRIED

None of the officials I've talked to is worried in the slightest about letting 8 months of 1942 taxes slide; if the Dominion government were losing any appreciable revenue thereby it wouldn't be done. These men cannot understand the widely advertised fears which seem to afflict United States Treasury specialists and some congressional leaders over the "forgiving" feature of Ruml's plan. In fact, Canada feels very sure of its ground concerning the Ruml plan, because it has had its income tax on a pay-as-you-go, collect-at-the-source basis since September 1942.

About all Canada has to do, therefore, to have a Ruml plan is to call it by that name. The taxpayer will notice no difference whatever. He will pay his taxes just as he is paying them now, although conceivably he might after the next budget pay still higher taxes.

"The canceling of some taxes isn't a barrier to the Ruml plan," one official said to me. "But you do have to get your machinery going to handle it. That's the only obstacle. First you have to begin collecting taxes at the source. And then you have to go over to a pay-as-you-go basis. We've done each of these in turn and now we're prepared for all-out Ruml."

INITIAL STEP

As an initial step toward ultimate full collection of income taxes at the source, Canada in 1940 imposed a national defense tax. The rate was 2 percent on total incomes above $600 for single persons, and $1,200 for married persons. It was deductible from all salaries, wages, and dividends at the source. And it was in addition to the regular income tax which, incidentally, was boosted enormously over the previous year—the tax of a married man earning $3,000 was increased, for instance, 500 percent.

In 1941 the national defense tax was raised to as much as 7 percent. Again it was merely supplemental to the regular income tax which, again, was increased drastically—on a $3,000 income it was doubled.

After this experience in collecting at the source, Canada decided in 1942 to collect all, or at least 90 percent, of its income tax in

that way. The national defense tax and the regular income tax were combined.

For the national defense tax the employer had to have his employees file information showing their complete status, whether they were married, whether they had children, etc. So the employers had that data. But to avoid any complexity, the Government abolished all exemptions for married persons. Instead the taxpayer was given a credit of $150 if he was married and $80 for child.

TABLE OF DEDUCTIONS

Employers were given by the Government a detailed table setting forth flat sums they should deduct on an income in each of the various categories.

It wasn't complicated. It was, indeed, very simple. If a man worked by the day, so much was taken out of his daily pay; if he worked by the week, so much was taken out of his weekly pay; if he worked by the month, so much was taken out of his monthly pay, and so on. For other types of wages and salaries, quarterly installments were required.

These payments started last September. That is, the tax year began then and extended to September 1943, when the taxpayer was to fill out his income-tax return, at which time any adjustment on his side or the Government's side was to have been made.

In other words, Canada's taxes started becoming due in September of the same year for which they were payable instead of the following April, as had been the case.

Since the Canadian payments beginning last September were for 1942 taxes and were being taken from 1942 income, it could be said that from September to December, Canada was then on a Ruml plan. But that wasn't the case, really. For 8 months of 1943 payments were yet to be applied to 1942 taxes.

HOW IT'S TO BE DONE

Now, how is Canada to change to a present-taxes-out-of-present-earnings system? As it was explained to me, it will be about as follows: One of these days—March 31 was mentioned as a guess—the Minister of Finance will declare that the income tax payments made from September through December—4 months—will be applied to 1942 taxes, and the remainder of 1942 taxes will be forgotten.

It will be stipulated further that all income tax payments made since January 1943, and for the rest of 1943 will be applied to 1943 taxes. The 1942 income tax return which was to have been filed in September will be filed soon after the announcement of the canceling of the 8 months of the taxes. The slate for 1942 will be clean.

And as easily as that, Canada will be on the Ruml plan.

Opponents of the Ruml plan in the United States have charged that it would benefit the very rich. Canada acknowledges that it probably does, for this reason: a very rich man operates rather on the order of a corporation, and most likely he has the money already set aside out of his yearly profits to pay his income tax. Now if that tax is canceled he will be in pocket that amount he saved. Canada has thought some of making a distinction concerning the very rich. But it has about reached the conclusion that administratively it may be more bother than it's worth, and ultimately the government will get that money in taxes anyway.

There may be a measure of consolation for United States taxpayers in knowing the size of the income tax the Canadians are having to pay, according to the 1942 schedule.

WHAT HUSBAND PAYS

Let's look in on the Canadian equivalent of our old friend John Doe, who is married, but has no children. Say his income is $1,500 a year. In 1940 his tax was $30. In 1941 it was $75. In 1942 it was $217. (Of this sum $108 is refundable to him after the war.) Say his income is $3,000. Before the war his tax was $45. In 1939 it was $50. In 1940 it was $208. In 1941 it was $400. And in 1942 it was $885 ($300 refundable after the war). Say John's income is $5,000. Before the war his tax was $177. In 1939 it was $200. In 1940 it was $604. In 1941 it was $1,000. And in 1942 it was $1,878 ($500 refundable after the war). Finally, say John's income was $10,000. Before the war his tax was $784. In 1939 it was $882. In 1940 it was $2,336. In 1941 it was $3,080. And in 1942 it was $4,762 ($1,000 refundable after the war).

A word about this refundable phase of the tax program. It is, of course, a form of compulsory saving. That being so, payments on established contracts for life insurance, pension, and retirement benefits, and principal payments on house mortgages were accepted in lieu of the refundable portion of the tax. The maximum refundable portion of the tax is $800 for a single person, $1,000 for a married person without dependents, and $1,200 for a married person with two dependents. Persons over 65 are relieved of the refundable portion of the tax. Abnormal medical, dental, and hospital expenses in excess of 5 percent of the total income are deductible from the taxable income.

ADJUSTMENTS FOR SAFETY

All these adjustments are recognition of the danger that, in trying to tax increased incomes sufficiently, small and moderate stable incomes may be overtaxed at the expense of savings.

There are few gaps in the Canadian tax fabric. It has a 100-percent excess-profits tax. Under this provision no corporation can have, after taxes, more than 70 percent of its pre-war standard of profits. Moreover, there is an 8-percent manufacturers' sales tax. There is a 25-percent luxury tax on such items as jewelry, silverware, etc. Taxes on beer and spirits are more than twice the pre-war level. The tax on cigarettes is at the rate of 16 cents on 20 cigarettes. The tax on soft drinks is more than 50 percent of the manufacturers' price. And there are provincial taxes besides. In the Province of Quebec there is a general sales tax of 4 percent.

Canada is financing the war close to the vest. I was discussing this with a man here, who said: "See here, if you want to know about our finances and fighting inflation and that sort of thing, go to see Dr. W. A. Mackintosh. He's the brightest man on government finances in Canada."

I found Dr. Mackintosh in his office in the so-called east block of the Parliament buildings. He is a man of medium height, baldish, and he looks at home in heavy tweeds. He is one of the Prime Minister's brain trust. The brain trusters here bear little resemblance to the breed in Washington. The think boys here are hard and practical.

PRACTICAL BRAIN TRUST

The official position of Dr. Mackintosh, who is on leave from Queen's University, where he is professor of economics, is Special Assistant to the Deputy Minister of Finance. He is also chairman of the United States-Canadian Joint Economic Committee, and vice chairman of the Advisory Committee on Economic Policy which advises the Prime Minister and the Cabinet on economic and financial matters.

I asked Dr. Mackintosh what Canada was doing to stave off inflation.

"There is always some inflation in wartime," he said. "You can't help it. If your economy is going all out, you certainly have inflation. That's bound to happen when you have full steam up. The question is whether you are controlling it.

"So far we've kept in check the major effects of inflation. We've done it by pretty drastic fiscal measures—apart from stiff controls on prices and wages—including very severe boosts in taxation and a vigorous insistence on borrowing from the public rather than the banks."

I remembered what the president of one of Canada's great banks had told me. He had said:

"In Canada we go right to the people and get them to buy bonds. We have big national drives like your Red Cross drives. Our borrowing is done that way. It isn't done by taking some bankers out to lunch, as I believe it is in a country not so far away from here.

POINT OF SYSTEM

"The point is this," he added, "if you have $1,000 in a bank, and the Government comes along and borrows that $1,000, then you both have the same $1,000—you still have it, and the Government has it. The $1,000 is doing the work of $2,000. That's inflation."

I asked Dr. Mackintosh to tell me something about Canadian borrowing.

"In 1939 at the outset of the war," he said, "Canadian industry and agriculture were relatively depressed. Unemployment was substantial and had been increasing. The war in prospect was a war of machines and obviously called for a great increase in industrial output and a great expansion of industrial plants in a country in which the primary and processing industries had hitherto been predominant. So we had to stimulate capacity operation and a major industrial revolution. We deliberately created some inflation to give a lift to our economy by borrowing $200,000,000 from the banks.

"Between then and May 1942, we went to the banks for only limited contributions. The remaining borrowing by which the funded debt and treasury bills of the Dominion have increased from $3,433,000,000 at the end of August 1939, to $5,866,000,000 as of March 31, 1942, has been entirely from the Canadian public. For example the number of individuals participating in our last loan was 1,628,000, which is, I think, about 35 percent of the gainfully employed population. The greater part of the loan total comes from regular pay-roll deductions.

SEVEN HUNDRED AND NINETY MILLION DOLLARS FROM BANKS

"In this last year, 1942–43, Canada will have borrowed approximately $2,500,000,000. Of that only $790,000,000 will have come from the banks. And we will have another public loan drive in May and we will then pay off a large part of the $790,000,000." In reading these figures it should be kept in mind that the wealth of the United States is 15 times that of Canada and the population 11 times greater.

An indication of how thoroughly Canada is geared for war can be seen in this: Government expenditures in the fiscal year 1942–43 aggregated $4,500,000,000. Of that $3,800,000,000 went for war. The 1943–44 budget hasn't been brought forth yet. It is estimated that it will total around $5,500,000,000. Of that it is expected some $5,000,000,000 will go for war.

Against the expenditures of $4,500,000,000 last year, the Government's total revenue was about $2,250,000,000. So Canada is paying for the war at least half by taxes, the rest by borrowing. The Government, however, is determined to follow as far as may be practicable a pay-as-you-go policy. And when it borrows it wants to borrow still more from the public, still less from the banks. That has been a sturdy armor against inflation. Without it, according to one economist here, Canada's formula of controlling prices and wages could not have been maintained.

Wendell Willkie Is Off on a Fast Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the biggest news story of the year, not associated with the World War, was printed on the first page of the Indianapolis Star last Sunday. It announced definitely that Wendell L. Willkie is a candidate for the 1944 Republican Presidential nomination, and that his name will be entered in the 13 States having State-wide primaries for the selection of delegates.

Credit for putting over this stunning "beat" is due to Everett C. Watkins, Washington representative of the Indianapolis Star and an outstanding member of the corps of Washington correspondents.

Mr. Watkins' high reputation in journalistic circles is a sufficient guaranty of the accuracy of this announcement. The fact, however, that the story has not been even faintly denied by Mr. Willkie or anyone authorized to speak for him is further proof that the story is indubitably true.

The authenticity of the story is generally accepted in Washington and New York, where it has set tongues to wagging at a lively rate. The New York Herald Tribune, a strong pro-Willkie paper, hailed the story as authoritative, and editorialized on it most interestingly. In Washington the Indianapolis Star article has had the politicians running around in circles all week. The suddenness of the announcement is what made it so startling as it had been thought that Mr. Willkie would remain silent until about the time of the convention and then "storm the works." In the cloak rooms the birth of the Willkie boom has been hailed with loud acclaim by some Members, mingled with occasional groans from Republican Representatives and Senators who had been hoping that the baby would never be born. It has been the one political topic most talked of all week, not even taking second place to the pyrotechnical mention of President Roosevelt's fourth-term boom from the steps of the White House. Democratic Members of Congress have found enjoyment in twitting their Republican congressional brethren who ordinarily would be expected to make some sort of oratorical floor outburst over such an important event. The Democratic Members crack a mean smile when they say that the Republican Congressmen are too busy with their committee work to make the announcement. They chuckle when they say that this is a busy time for the committees. On the whole, in all of the upsurge of talk caused by the Star article, Willkie is credited with being a powerful contender for the Republican nomination and now that he is definitely in the race a good many of the wiseacres in and around Congress are so confident he will be nominated that they already are speculating on his running mate.

Mr. Watkins' story in the Indianapolis Star is so interesting and so fraught with portentous political implications that I have asked for and have secured permission to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

Wendell L. Willkie, whose candidacy for next year's Republican Presidential nomination may be taken for granted without any formal announcement from him, will fight for the popular vote in every State where delegates are named in primary elections.

His campaign headquarters will be based in his home State of Indiana, most likely at Rushville.

Mr. Willkie's name will be entered in the 13 States having State-wide primaries for selection of delegates.

Approximately 475 of the delegates to the national convention are named in primary elections.

Mr. Willkie, it may be stated authoritatively, will make a vigorous, whirlwind campaign in the primary States and will make a completely organized campaign in States where delegates are elected in district and State conventions.

NO PUBLIC STATEMENT

Mr. Willkie is making no public statement about 1944. His supporters say that at this early date he has not decided what he wants to do, but those acquainted with the Willkie mind and the general political situation assert he will be an active, aggressive candidate for renomination and forecast that the primaries will demonstrate that the popular vote is favorable to Willkie. Willkie's partisans believe he would make a clean sweep against a less-known candidate in primary States.

Mr. Willkie is sure that President Roosevelt intends to seek a fourth term. He is confident that, if Republicans give him a second chance, he can end Roosevelt perpetuation in the White House. Willkie's close friends here, pointing to the fact he received 22,304,755 votes in 1940 and asserting their belief that he has gained in prestige and popular favor with the man on the street, if not with politicians, go so far as to declare Willkie would offer Republicans more assurance of success in a battle against the "champ" than any other Republican mentioned. It is the belief of Willkie supporters that he would command support of more anti-New Deal Democrats than any other Republican.

NOW SEASONED CAMPAIGNER

Some Republicans have the thought that a Republican 1944 victory would be assured with almost any man as the nominee, but Willkie's intimates combat this with the rejoinder that, with the country still at war, a power argument would be made for President Roosevelt being continued in office, even for a fourth term now that the third-term tradition has been violated, and that it would take a Willkie, with popular appeal and now a seasoned campaigner, to be a Republican wartime winner. Mr. Willkie, by his recent travels to the war theaters of Africa, England, Russia, and China, and through his own overseas service as an artilleryman in World War No. 1, has gained an experience, say his partisans, that qualifies him to carry on the war and then the peace terms if elected to the Presidency next year.

The primary States in which Willkie probably will make a fight for delegates are California, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and New York, where primaries may be held by congressional districts. Ohio may be an exception—Willkie probably would defer to Gov. John W. Bricker in the primary of his home State, though Willkie has supporters in that State, where he once lived at Akron.

EAGER FOR HOOSIER AID

Mr. Willkie naturally is eager to have the full support of the Hoosier State. Indiana is important to him. There are indications, according to visitors, that he gained a new and increased favor on his recent visit to his native State. He would be a candidate of the Middle West, a Hoosier candidate.

Present indications are that his chief opponent as a candidate will be Governor Bricker, of the adjoining State of Ohio. Indiana's lone President was Benjamin Harrison, but Ohioans tauntingly recall that Harrison was born in Ohio.

Bricker is a popular, efficient Governor of Ohio, but he has been reticent in expressing his views on national or world affairs. Willkie, frank and outspoken, has expressed his views on almost everything. Some of the Willkie views have divided support. It remains to be seen which is the better political strategy—Bricker's silence or Willkie's frankness.

It is the thought of Willkie partisans that the 1944 nominating contest will resolve itself into a fight of Willkie against the field.

HAS CHANCE IN NEW YORK

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey and Mr. Willkie are not political bedfellows, but Willkie's friends assert that Dewey would not or could not maintain a "priority" on delegates or "ration" them out to different candidates. Willkie's friends think that no one man can control the 90 delegates of New York. One of the reasons no one can control or deliver New York delegates en bloc is that national delegates from the 43 congressional districts are elected by primary vote. The State convention elects the four delegates at large. But it would be in the numerous congressional districts where Willkie delegates would be entered in the primaries. It would likely be Willkie delegates against uninstructed delegates.

The Willkie partisans declare that the congressional district primary votes in New York would give him the support of at least from one-half to two-thirds of the State's 90 delegates.

A Tribute to the Five Sullivan Brothers Who Were Lost Together in Battle at Sea

REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, In the course of a few days Americans of Irish birth or descent will observe the birthday of St. Patrick, patron saint of Ireland, a holy man noteworthy for his achievements as a missionary of Christianity, as well as for robust pugnacity in his encounters with the pagans of his day. Of legendary patrician birth, al-

though reared in the menial occupation of a slave, it was he who placed the shamrock on the flag of Ireland as an illustration not alone of the Christian dogma of the trinity but as a perpetual earnest to the courage and patriotism of the men of Ireland in whatever climes and countries their enterprising steps have led from that day to this.

Mr. Speaker, I do not arise at this time to pay a tribute to St. Patrick. That will be attended to in his church throughout the land, and in the meetings of hundreds of assemblages of Irish-Americans in the United States on March 17. But in anticipation of those ceremonies and in renewal of the loyalty and exalted devotion of Irishmen everywhere to the land of their allegiance by birth or naturalization, I desire to offer a tribute to those five Sullivan brothers whose simultaneous sacrifice on the altar of liberty occurred November 13 last when they sank into a sea of glory with the U. S. S. *Juneau* as the result of enemy action.

These brothers, sons of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas F. Sullivan of Waterloo, Iowa, were Francis Henry Sullivan, coxswain; Joseph Eugene Sullivan, seaman, second class; George Thomas Sullivan, gunner's mate, second class; Madison Abel Sullivan, seaman, second class; and Albert Leo Sullivan, seaman, second class.

All five enlisted in the Navy on January 3, 1942, at Des Moines, Iowa, asking to be assigned to the same ship. Their deaths came within a year of their enlistment, and their enlistment came within a month of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, which, in bringing death to a boyhood pal of the five, brought also the spectre of war and peril to that little American community of Waterloo. I do not say that these boys deliberately planned to give their lives to their country. I do not believe any soldier or sailor does that. But they knew that their enlistment involved their death if the need and occasion should arise. And they counted the cost and freely accepted the chances and fortunes of war. Their parents gave them in the same sense as did Katherine Mary, the wife of the only married one, Albert.

Mr. Speaker, in the early part of January of this year, Senator GILLETTE of Iowa communicated with the Chief of Naval Personnel and received a reply which he caused to be entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 14, 1943, in which was set forth with tragical simplicity the story of the Sullivan family's sacrifice. Up to that time, partly through the necessity of naval secrecy and partly, I apprehend, by uncertainty whether the ship and all her complement of men and officers were really lost, the facts had been withheld.

When that story of simultaneous fivefold sacrifice became widespread, with its appeal to the heartstrings of our millions of actual and potential sufferers, the great heart of the Nation was profoundly touched. Finding a symbol in the death of the Sullivans, who like many another sailor or soldier, under many another name, poured out that last full measure of devotion, the Honorable Arthur W. Sullivan, register of the probate court, sitting in Boston, Mass., wrote asking me, as a member of the legislative branch of government, bearing the historic name of Sullivan, to act as an honorary chairman of a committee, to work for the erection of a shrine, or cenotaph to be erected and devoted to the memory of these five brave boys. I accepted that honor and I commend the movement to the Members of this House, as well as to Americans everywhere. Mr. Arthur F. Sullivan, who may be addressed in care of the First National Bank, Boston, Mass., is treasurer of the fund, and Mr. Thomas J. Sullivan, the librarian of Cambridge, Mass., is secretary. Mr. J. A. Conry, a former Member of Congress, now residing at the Cosmos Club, Washington, D. C., is one of the active promoters of the movement.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that this movement will stir and evoke a particular response from those bearing the proud name of Sullivan. They have already given proof that they will not alone support the movement with their contributions, in even so small a sum as a dime, or multiples thereof, but will consider themselves as severally constituting a committee of one to solicit a like response from all other Americans. This proposal is addressed to all citizens, irrespective of name or race or creed—Americans knowing but one flag, the Stars and Stripes; Americans knowing but one allegiance, fealty to our common country; Americans knowing but one distinction and duty—those of the patriotic citizen.

But, Mr. Speaker, for the inspiration of those who may meet on St. Patrick's Day, I cannot refrain from here paying a tribute to the name of Sullivan as connoting the highest in American loyalty and sacrifice throughout the colonial and national history of our people. I do not do this to single out Sullivans by name or the name of any other family as representing a preferred or distinctive quality of one class or group, but rather as furnishing a proud illustration of that devotion that has at all times characterized the rank and file of our people. I realize that after death I cannot ennoble those brave Sullivan brothers. "We cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow" further this clay lately animated by the Sullivan spirit. We must ennoble ourselves. Our poor tribute is but a recognition and a record. Nothing that we can say will make them sleep the more serenely, nor will even our forgetting, trouble them more. With the poet Gray we may well ask: "Can honour's voice provoke the silent dust, or flattery soothe the dull, cold ear of Death?"

The Sullivan name appears early in American history. In the latter part of the seventeenth century a Sullivan family participated in the siege of Limerick and in 1720 we find them settling in New Hampshire and Maine. A John Sullivan, son of a Southworth, N. H., schoolmaster, sat in the Continental Congress in 1774 and 1775, seized Fort William and Mary in Portsmouth Harbor, served in the siege of Boston as a brigadier general under Washington, on through the Revolution; was Governor of New Hampshire for three terms and United States judge from 1789, the founding of the United States, until 1795.

James Sullivan was Governor of Massachusetts in 1807 and 1808, member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and a founder of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Jeremiah Sullivan, of Virginia, was a major in the War of 1812, and was instrumental in making Indianapolis the capital of Indiana, where at this time Reginald Sullivan is mayor of the city. Peter John Sullivan, of Philadelphia, was a major in the Mexican War and later, in 1869, President Johnson named him Minister to Colombia, South America. All along the Atlantic seaboard, all through the great West the name of Sullivan appears in the rosters of Congressmen, Governors, mayors, captains of industry, transportation, and production heads. There has not been a railroad, turnpike, canal, steel mill, gold mine, or mercantile house from the colonial era to the present day that has not at some place or time been graced by the name of Sullivan and there never has been a time when our country called for men for the common defense that Sullivans have not appeared wearing the uniform of their country or to be noted in the battlefield and military cemeteries throughout the broad expanse of our land.

Mr. Speaker, throughout our history it was necessary only to follow the plume of the Sullivans, like the helmet of Navarre to find the spot of the hottest fighting, the coldest and most final of sacrifice. It may be that these five Sullivan brothers, reading only the history of their country, feeling only that America was a roof over their heads to keep out the baneful light and storm of foreign and unhealthy ideas, only four walls to keep out destructive enemies and keep in the love of home and fireside; going about their humble occupations, true to their family, their faith, their community, State, and Nation, did not at all times display consciousness of their great heritage or the full glory of all that is contained in the words "freedom" and "America." We do not know what moves in the minds of men. But we do know that when the time came to act, to give expression to that which reposed so unobtrusively in them, they acted.

The quality of a state is reflected most surely in the conduct of its citizens and, conversely, by the standard set by these Sullivans and all the rest that have gone down to the sea in ships or stared sightless on the battlefields at the eternal stars; the quality of our state stands out and will continue to stand out, high, clear, pure, and noble.

On the reverse of the great seal of the United States is an uncompleted pyramid and the words "Esto Perpetua," meaning "Let it be perpetual." That remains our aspiration. The strident sergeant in the First World War, inviting his

men to do or die with the bitter cry, "Do you want to live forever?" spoke better than he knew. In another and a truer sense these Sullivans may have heard the far-off echo of those words when they enlisted January 3, 1942. They may have heard them echoed again on the decks of the *Juneau* November 13, 1942. Who knows? But of this we may be assured as to the Sullivans, as well as the Smiths, the Cushings, the Cohens, the Constantines, the Meyers, the Knutsons, the Janoschkas, and all the rest that have gone out on that wonderful adventure and have made that supreme sacrifice—they have lived, they do live, and they will live forever.

My prayer is that the souls of the departed heroes have long since commingled with the army of God and that they are today members of the celestial host; that the sounding of taps but came unto them as any other bugle call; that their spirit responded as ardently as their bodies had to the calls they heard in the Navy; and that when they awakened to "Attention" in the world beyond they gazed happily upon the gracious features of the Commanding Officer of us all.

Tables and Notes on Estimates of Minimum Civilian Consumer Requirements

REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, believing that it will be interesting to the people and to the Congress to know just how far down the administration believes it can drive the standard of living of the American people, I present figures submitted to the Director of Economic Stabilization by the Office of Civilian Supply.

These are the so-called bedrock requirements prepared by Mr. Joseph L. Weiner, with whose record, since his coming from Russia, most of the Members of the House are familiar. It will be recalled that this is the same Mr. Weiner who recently insisted upon a 40-percent curtailment of newsprint over the protests of the newsprint experts of the war agencies.

I have no intention of commenting at length upon Mr. Weiner's latest masterpiece. I think the figures he adduces are in themselves ample comment.

I would point out, however, that only yesterday Mr. Weiner was loud in his condemnation of our citizens who, fearing that clothing sales were about to be stopped, went to stores to try and buy essential supplies. For this they were soundly berated by Mr. Weiner, just as they have been by others both in and out of public office, but closely connected with the administration. Perhaps the fears of these people are groundless, as their attackers say. But I submit that the publication of such figures as Mr. Weiner has prepared, one of which supposes a cut of 27 percent in the requirements of clothing, are not likely to eliminate the fears of the American people and reduce panic buying. You cannot stimulate such buying by the constant reiteration of scarcity warnings and then decelerate it by calling those that heed the warnings traitors.

Just before inserting Mr. Weiner's figures I call attention to the fact that he purposes the total elimination, under his bedrock scheme, of "monuments and tombstones." I regret that this elimination is total. It should reserve at least one monument to be erected to commemorate this latest asininity.

I dislike to incur the costs of publishing Mr. Weiner's bedrock report and tables in the RECORD, but inasmuch as he has refused to release them to Members of Congress, while at the same time permitting one newspaper to have them, I ask consent that the following report, as published in the New York Times, be included as a part of my remarks:

TABLES AND NOTES ON ESTIMATES OF MINIMUM CIVILIAN CONSUMER REQUIREMENTS

WASHINGTON, February 20.—Following is the text of preliminary estimates presented by the Office of Civilian Supply of the War Production Board to James P. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization, aiming to show just how heavy and extensive the slashes in civilian goods might be in the last extremes of a total war:

I. SCOPE AND CHARACTER OF ESTIMATES

1. Scope of estimates: The attached tables present the estimated requirements for goods and services of civilian consumers alone, not the total of all requirements for civilian goods and services of all types. Specifically, this means that the estimates do not include the requirements for civilian-type goods and services needed by the armed services or for export; nor do they include the requirements for repair and maintenance, operating supplies and construction of business, agricultural, governmental, or institutional establishments.

On the other hand, the estimates do include allowances for the requirements of members of the armed services when on leave (when they are effectively civilians).

2. Concept of minimum civilian consumer requirements: The estimates of minimum annual civilian requirements presented in the attached tables are set at such levels that in a long war, it is believed, curtailment below these levels would detract more from the prosecution of the type of war we now seem likely to have to wage that it would help by releasing materials, labor, or other resources. That is, they represent the estimated supplies required to maintain a level of civilian health, efficiency, and morale which would maximize the total war effort when all resources not used in supplying civilians are used for military and export purposes. This concept of the minimum does not apply to every individual item shown in the detailed tables, but does apply to the total for each functional group of such items. In making the estimates of minimum requirements for each functional group the situation with respect to production, inventories, and other aspects of supply was not considered, since the objective here is to estimate minimum requirements alone. In cases where any one of several specific products may substantially satisfy a given consumer need, however, the probable relative scarcities and costs of the resources required were taken into account in making choices as among such products. In particular, it was assumed that in a long war labor will become an acutely scarce factor of production. Account was taken of the need for maintaining morale, especially in the provision of such things as recreation, tobacco, and beverages.

A certain amount of arbitrariness was involved in making numerical estimates of the levels of minimum essentiality as defined above, particularly for products which are nonnecessities on a strict basis but which form an important part of normal consumption habits. This arbitrariness, however, is inevitable.

The estimates of minimum civilian requirements here presented are not as low in most cases as the bedrock requirements which would be formulated in a situation so desperate as to involve the siege and blockade of this country. The latter extreme assumption was not used because of the unlikelihood of our having to face such conditions during the present war. On the other hand, the estimates are lower in many cases than those offered in the present programs for civilians' supply in 1943. Although some of the latter programs do provide for curtailment to minimum levels (notably in the case of many of the metals); a number of the 1943 programs are still of the residual type, especially where labor is a major factor of production. That is to say, the quantities of materials, goods or services remaining after military and export requirements are met are expected to be more than sufficient in 1943 to cover minimum civilian consumer requirements on any definition. In such cases, failure to use the full amount of the residual quantities for civilian purposes would not only be pointless but in some cases would actually be harmful, since such failure would entail unnecessary unemployment and a lowering of morale.

3. Relation of the estimates to resource use: The estimates of minimum requirements relate to consumption by civilians, and cannot be regarded as production requirements. The difference is important in the case of commodities of which substantial inventories now exist. Curtailment of consumption from current levels to the proposed minimum levels would not in every case release resources for other uses in proportion to the amount of the curtailment. Current consumption of distilled spirits, for example, is coming entirely out of inventories.

4. Relation of the estimates to control of distribution: One important assumption underlying the estimates of minimum requirements is that procedures can be established which will assure an equitable distribution of the curtailed quantities of goods and services provided for in the estimates. Such distribution controls would presumably entail rationing at the consumer level. If such controls of distribution were not actually provided, then maldistribution of supplies, inventory accumulation, and excessive buying by individuals in the higher income brackets would make it necessary to supply more than the stated requirements, in the aggregate, in order to insure that each individual's minimum needs were provided for. It obviously follows that any attempt to put the attached minimum program into effect will greatly lengthen the list of goods which have to be rationed, and will correspondingly increase the administrative task of rationing. The cost of such rationing in terms of manpower has not been allowed for in setting up the present estimates. The practical feasibility of implementing the proposed distribution has also not been taken into account.

II. COVERAGE OF THE ESTIMATES

The coverage of civilian consumer requirements has been as complete as the currently available data and the limitations on available time would permit. It is proposed to submit revisions of the estimates as new data become available. In general, goods and services are included on the basis of

total supply needed, without restricting the measurements to that part of the total which is customarily paid for directly out of individuals' cash income. For example, supplies of food, clothing, and housing which are customarily provided by employers to employees as a wage or salary payment in kind are included. This is the usual practice in making measurements of consumers' income and expenditure. Food and firewood produced and consumed on farms are also included, as is the businessman's own consumption of the goods in which he deals. This again follows the usual statistical convention. The full rental value of housing service "consumed" by home owners is included; the more familiar measure of the "cost" of owner-occupied housing is shown as a subtotal. In addition to the conventional measurements of expenditures for medical and educational service, which are shown as subtotals, the value of such services rendered without direct charge to consumers by governmental and nonprofit institutions is included in the totals for these services.

On the other hand, no attempt was made to estimate the requirements for certain categories of individual cash outlay. Personal taxes are not conventionally classed as expenditures. Expenditures on foreign travel, gifts, and items of family business such as life insurance, interest payments, and union dues have not been included in the attached tables.

Various classifications of consumer expenditures have been revised in recent years. For the present purpose a classification now being used by the National Income Unit of the Department of Commerce is the most satisfactory, and this classification has been employed as the framework of the present report. Certain exceptions, however, must be noted. In the case of housing, as already pointed out, our estimates include not only rental payments and the cost of owner-occupied housing but also the imputed net rental value of owner-occupied houses. A second exception is the purchase of cooking and heating apparatus for replacement in owner-occupied dwellings, which is shown as a separate commodity category by the Department of Commerce but which in our estimates is included in the cost of maintenance of owner-occupied houses. Third, foods and beverages are here shown at their commodity value. A separate estimate is given of the value added by preparation and service in restaurants and institutions. Fourth, for medical care and education we show the total value of such services, not only the part paid for directly by ultimate consumers.

III. LIMITATIONS OF THE ESTIMATES

It is important that the following limitations be kept in mind at all times:

1. Because of differences in the coverage of the estimates described in the preceding paragraphs, the grand total estimated figure for minimum civilian requirements shown in the attached summary cannot be compared directly with other existing estimates of consumer expenditures.

2. The annual dollar-value estimates are expressed in terms of 1941 prices, costs, rates and the like, and hence are in effect measures of the minimum quantities of goods and services required relative to 1941. This technique affords a convenient method of measuring changes on a physical basis, but obviously does not permit direct comparison with the current expenditure and income situation.

3. The estimates are not strictly uniform in concept and method, primarily because of limitations imposed by the character of the available data. It is, therefore, essential to consult the rules on individual tables.

4. For most of the categories, the essential types of individual products within each category have not been itemized and specifications have not been given. Itemization and specification await further work on standardization and simplification of products. In any case, essentiality of need is measurable only in broad functional categories. Because of the interchangeability of many products falling under any given functional category, there are often no absolute requirements for any particular product considered in isolation; the requirement is only for the category as a whole. Therefore, the proportions in which specific items should be provided must be based on considerations of relative scarcity rather than of the specific need for any one item. Like all other generalizations, this last statement is subject to significant exceptions, but it remains true that in almost every fundamental category the area of substitution is very wide.

IV. CONTENT OF THE TABLES AND NOTES

The tables and notes presented below are organized as follows:

1. The first table is a summary of minimum civilian requirements by principal groups of goods and services, classified in four major categories perishable commodities, semidurable commodities, durable commodities, and services. The table shows actual consumption in 1941 at 1941 prices, estimated minimum annual requirements at 1941 prices, and the percentage relation between the two. Nineteen hundred and forty-one is the latest year for which adequate data on the individual component items of the service groups were available. For this reason, 1941 is used as the basis for the comparisons.

2. The next table is a supplement to the summary table. For a number of commodity and service groups, the dollar volume of consumption for each group as a whole in 1941 was obtainable and is shown on the summary table, but data on the consumption of the individual component items of the group could be obtained only for 1939. In such cases the minimum annual requirements for the individual component items were compared with 1939 consumption at 1939 prices, and are shown on this basis in the detailed tables referred to below. The supplement to the summary table shows, for the reader's convenience in using the detailed tables, the relation between the minimum annual requirements for each such group as a whole expressed in 1939 prices, and the same requirements expressed in 1941 prices.

3. The remaining tables, Nos. 1 through 43, give the composition and bases of the several estimates in as much detail as available information permits, and where possible show the individual components of each group. The table numbers correspond to the items on the summary table. As already indicated, wherever the available data permit the tables use 1941 consumption as the basis for comparison. In the majority of cases, however, it was necessary to use 1939 consumption as the basis for comparing the requirements for the individual components. In these latter cases the data for the individual components are subject to some error because the 1939 consumption figures expressed at manufacturers' are not adjusted for exports, imports, or inventory changes. Those errors will be corrected to some extent in revised tables to be prepared shortly. All figures given at retail prices, however, reflect actual consumption after adjustment for foreign trade and for inventory changes:

SUMMARY.—*Minimum civilian consumer requirements for foods and services, at 1941 prices*

	Actual consumption in 1941 [1]	Minimum annual requirements— At 1941 prices [2]	Minimum annual requirements— As a percentage of consumption in 1941
PERISHABLE COMMODITIES	*Mil. of dol.*	*Mil. of dol.*	
1. Food	15,944	*11,447.2	71.8
2. Beverages	4,447	2,321.0	54.9
3. Tobacco and smoking supplies	2,270	*1,707.2	75.2
4. Drugs and medical supplies	745	*519.0	69.7
5. Toilet preparations	570	*268.0	47.0
6. Cleaning and polishing preparations	460	*245.6	53.4
7. Nondurable printed matter	615	*192.8	31.3
8. Stationery and writing supplies	176	*58.4	33.2
9. Miscellaneous household paper products	254	*45.9	18.1
10. Nondurable toys, games, etc	230	*56.3	24.5
11. Manufactured illuminating and heating products	939	*580.2	61.8
12. Nonmanufactured fuels	906	680.4	76.2
13. Fuels and lubricants for cars	2,653	1,061.2	40.0
Total perishable commodities	30,209	19,193.2	63.5
SEMIDURABLE COMMODITIES			
14. Clothing and accessories	6,780	*4,341.0	64.0
15. Shoes and other footwear	1,510	*1,032.3	68.4
16. Personal furnishings	210	*57.3	27.3
17. Dry goods and notions	630	*328.6	52.2
18. Semidurable housefurnishings	900	*262.1	29.1
19. Replacement tires and tubes	230	*212.4	92.3
20. Parts, etc., for passenger cars	370	*166.4	45.0
Total semidurable commodities	10,630	6,400.1	60.2
DURABLE COMMODITIES			
21. Household furniture	1,230	341.4	27.8
22. Floor coverings	440	*56.3	12.8
23. Miscellaneous durable furnishings and equipment	713	*202.8	28.4
24. Washing and sewing machines, refrigerators	613	*22.7	3.7
25. Electrical appliances	260	*3.6	1.4
26. China, glassware, tableware, utensils	784	*159.5	20.3
27. Radios and phonographs	500	*12.5	2.5
28. Musical instruments	84	*2.4	2.9
29. Clocks and watches	240	*2.1	0.9
30. Jewelry and sterling ware	440	*0	0
31. Books and other durable printed matter	289	*84.6	29.3
32. Writing equipment, durable	70	*.3	.4
33. Ophthalmic, surgical, orthopedic appliances	266	*219.7	82.6
34. Wheel goods, durable toys, and sports equipment	391	*56.0	14.3
35. Monuments and tombstones	65	0	0
36. Luggage	81	23.5	29.0
37. Passenger cars and boats	2,579	0	0
Total durable commodities	9,045	1,187.4	13.1

[1] Source: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for all items except beverages, housing and lodging, medical care and death expenses, and education. Estimates for these 4 items were prepared in the Office of Civilian Supply. The estimate for food was adjusted as explained in the footnote to table 1.

[2] Figures without an asterisk (*) are transcribed directly from the individual tables (which are numbered to correspond with the item numbers in this table). Figures with an asterisk (*) are transcribed from the supplementary table attached to this summary, for reasons explained below.

SUMMARY.—*Minimum civilian consumer requirements for foods and services, at 1941 prices*—Continued

	Actual consumption in 1941	Minimum annual requirements— At 1941 prices	Minimum annual requirements— As a percentage of consumption in 1941
SERVICES	*Mil. of dol.*	*Mil. of dol.*	
38. Housing and lodging	11,414	*11,573.3	101.4
39. Preparation and service of meals and beverages	3,639	3,275.0	90.0
40. Care and repair of attire, etc	1,119	957.4	85.5
41. Personal appearance and comfort	653	386.7	59.2
42. Consumer-operated transportation	815	518.6	63.7
43. Purchased passenger transportation	1,568	2,125.8	135.5
44. Household utilities and communication	2,444	2,174.1	89.0
45. Medical care and death expenses	3,955	3,529.0	89.2
46. Education	2,695	2,400.5	89.1
47. Recreation	1,987	1,200.1	60.3
48. Household maintenance	1,410	1,085.0	77.0
Total services	31,699	29,225.5	92.2
Grand total, goods and services	81,583	56,006.2	68.6

Wherever possible, requirements were estimated directly at 1941 prices in the detailed individual tables. In the case of the commodities listed above, however, this was not possible. Totals for each group at 1941 prices were obtainable, but the detailed information for the component items of the group which is needed as a basis of estimation was available only for 1939. For these commodities, therefore, requirements were estimated at 1939 prices in the detailed individual tables, and the total for each group was adjusted as shown above before being carried to the summary table. This procedure was the only one which permitted a uniform comparison of requirements with 1941 consumption for all groups in the summary table:

Supplement to summary tables

	1941 index of retail prices, 1939=100 [1]	Minimum annual requirements— At 1939 prices [2]	Minimum annual requirements— At 1941 prices [3]
		Mil. of dol.	*Mil. of dol.*
1. Food	111.7	10,248.2	11,447.2
3. Tobacco and smoking supplies	106.9	1,597.0	1,707.2
4. Drugs and medical supplies	101.8	509.8	519.0
5. Toilet preparations	103.5	258.9	268.0
6. Cleaning and polishing preparations	101.1	242.9	245.6
7. Nondurable printed matter	103.4	186.5	192.8
8. Stationery and writing supplies	101.5	57.5	58.4
9. Miscellaneous household paper products	104.9	43.8	45.9
10. Nondurable toys, games, etc	104.5	53.9	56.3
11. Manufactured illuminating and heating products	107.5	539.7	580.0
14. Clothing and accessories	108.7	3,993.6	4,341.0
15. Shoes and other footwear	105.9	974.8	1,032.3
16. Personal furnishings	104.3	54.9	57.3
17. Dry goods and notions	106.4	308.8	328.6
18. Semidurable housefurnishings	108.9	240.7	262.1
19. Replacement tires and tubes	104.0	204.2	213.4

[1] Source: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.
[2] Transcribed from individual tables.
[3] Transcribed to the summary table. Reasons for the adjustments shown above are explained in the note accompanying the summary table.

Supplement to summary tables—Continued

	1941 index of retail prices, 1939=100	Minimum annual requirements— At 1939 prices	Minimum annual requirements— At 1941 prices
		Mil. of dol.	*Mil. of dol.*
20. Parts, etc., for passenger cars	111.0	149.9	166.4
22. Floor coverings	115.7	48.7	56.3
23. Miscellaneous durable furnishings and equipment	110.8	183.0	202.8
24. Washing and sewing machines, refrigerators	102.0	22.3	22.7
25. Electrical appliances	103.8	3.5	3.6
26. China, glassware, tableware, utensils	106.7	149.5	159.5
27. Radios and phonographs	103.6	12.1	12.5
28. Musical instruments	116.5	2.1	2.4
29. Clocks and watches	105.8	2.0	2.1
30. Jewelry and sterling ware	123.2	0.0	0.0
31. Books and other durable printed matter	99.9	84.7	84.6
32. Writing equipment, durable	100.0	0.3	0.3
33. Ophthalmic, surgical, orthopedic appliances	102.5	214.3	219.7
34. Wheel goods, durable toys and sports equipment	103.5	54.1	56.0
38. Housing and lodging	101.8	11,368.7	11,573.3

TABLE 1.—*Minimum civilian consumer requirements for food*

[Values in millions of 1939 dollars excluding values added in preparation and service of meals]

	Consumption in 1939	Minimum annual requirements— Value, at 1939 retail prices	Minimum annual requirements— As a percent of consumption in 1939
Dairy products, except butter	2,701	2,539	84.0
Lean meat, poultry and fish	3,781	3,100	82.0
Eggs	679	536	79.0
Dried beans, peas, nuts	197	244	124.0
Fats, including butter, bacon, salt side	1,772	1,134	.0 64.0
Sugars and sirups	1,194	525	44.0
Cereals and breadstuffs	1,667	1,950	117.0
Potatoes	334	324	97.0
Tomatoes and citrus fruits	818	622	76.0
Leafy, green and yellow vegetables	671	530	.0 79.0
Other fruits and vegetables	1,414	1,075	76.0
Flavorings, ice, gum, dog food, etc	496	397	80.0
Total, at retail prices [1]	15,724	12,976	82.5
Total, at cost to consumers (1939 retail prices) [2]	12,423	10,248.2	82.5

[1] Price estimates based on data supplied by Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Home produced food valued at retail prices prevailing in locality.
[2] Differs from retail value in that home produced food is valued at farm prices. Differs also by various errors of estimation, since the 1939 figure is adjusted to agree with Department of Commerce total for food, meals, and beverages after deducting estimated value added in preparation and service, and estimated consumption of beverages. Department of Commerce figures do not include value of food served without charge in institutions. Requirements for beverages are shown in table 2; for preparation and service of meals and beverages, in table 39.

NOTES ON TABLE 1. METHOD OF ESTIMATING MINIMUM FOOD REQUIREMENTS

The quantity of nutrients provided for represents a technical minimum below which health would be impaired. The foods selected are, in general, a combination which will provide the required nutrients at the lowest cost to consumers and, at the same time, will require least labor, critical materials, and facilities.

These requirements were determind on the basis of: (A) nutritive standards of the National Research Council, and (B) low cost diets recommended by the Bureau of Home Economics in the Department of Agriculture. The council's standards specify the minimum amount of various nutrients (proteins, fats, vitamins, etc.) needed daily in order to keep an average person in good health. The Bureau's low-cost diets indicate the specific amounts of low-priced foods that will provide these nutrients on an annual basis. In arriving at the estimate of bedrock requirements certain adjustments were made in the diet recommended by the Bureau in order to base the diet on foods low in labor, processing, and distribution cost, as well as low in retail price. Some changes in the amounts of individual foods suggested are possible, but any changes must be compensated by changes in other groups in order to supply the overall nutrient requirements.

In the preparation of the bedrock requirement, it was assumed that foods are to be distributed equitably to civilians, with due allowance for age and type of work. Consequently, no allowance was made for the possibility that low-income families would not purchase a full share. A bedrock diet allows no leeway for excessive consumption by any group in the population. Unless distribution is controlled by rationing and subsidized consumption of the more expensive foods, low-income families will bear a more than proportionate share of the curtailment of supplies from present levels.

The following criteria were used in determining the amounts of individual foods in the bedrock diet:

Fats and oils; sugar: The level suggested by the Bureau of Home Economics was used.

Flour and cereals; dry beans; peas and nuts: The relatively high level suggested by the Bureau was adjusted downward on the basis of (a) ability to produce these annual crops and (b) the relative amount of animal proteins and vegetable proteins required in the diet. The level suggested is about 20 percent above recent consumption. A higher level would overbalance the proportion of proteins obtained from vegetable sources and would be in excess of production (farm and processing into finished foods) facilities.

Vegetables—Potatoes and sweetpotatoes; tomatoes and citrus fruits; leafy green vegetables; other fruits and vegetables: The level suggested by the Bureau was adjusted downward in the light of prospective labor supplies, and transportation facilities. To a certain extent various groups of vegetables are interchangeable. Requirements for the more stable items (such as potatoes) were set at higher levels than those of the more perishable items (tomatoes and leafy green vegetables).

Dairy products: The level suggested by the Bureau is considerably in excess of the amount that has been or can be produced, and was adjusted downward. The extent of this downward adjustment was limited by the fact that milk is the most important source of calcium in the diet. The level suggested (approximately the 1935–39 consumption) provides consumers with the same amount of calcium as in pre-war years. Even at this level calcium is one of the nutrients in which the diet is deficient.

Meats and eggs: The level suggested by the Bureau was adjusted upward to offset the downward readjustments made in dairy products. This change provides the animal proteins that would have been obtained from dairy products, if the Bureau's recommendation had been followed. The requirements for meats and eggs are the amounts needed to round out the diet, providing necessary ingredients not obtained from other foods. This level provides for more proteins than required by the National Research Council dietary standard, but it was necessary to have an above-standard amount of protein in

order to obtain the thiamin and niacin which are contained in meats.

It was not possible to set up a requirement for each food group to provide the exact amount of each of the nutrients called for by the Council's standards. The varying nutrient composition of individual foods precludes this. The requirements provide for more protein, vitamin A, ascorbic acid, and thiamin than the Council's standards because any reduction in the intake of foods from which these nutrients primarily are obtained would reduce the amount of other nutrients already below standard. It provides less calcium than required, because a full requirement would necessitate a record consumption of dairy products, a high labor cost item. The deficit indicated for riboflavin and niacin reflects the fact that their primary source is milk and meat—high labor cost items. Part of this deficit can be eliminated without increasing consumption of meat or milk by the substitution of whole wheat for white flour, and by enrichment of bread and flour with calcium salts. This shift would increase riboflavin to 2.1 milligrams and niacin to 18.1 milligrams. Enrichment of bread and flour at higher than present minimum standards would offset the deficit in niacin but not in riboflavin, since a shortage of this product exists.

A complete comparison of the bedrock diet with British consumption is not possible from data now available. Information is available on one or two foods, such as meats. An official of the British Food Ministry indicated that British meat consumption now averages 31 ounces per capita per week. It is not known whether this amount includes all fresh fish and poultry in the diet but in any event this represents a per capita consumption of 101 pounds per year. The bedrock figures here presented allow 104 pounds of meat, poultry, and fish per capita on an annual basis.

In the preparation of the bedrock requirements for food, it was assumed that foods are to be distributed equitably to civilians, with due allowance for age and type of work. With proper control of distribution through rationing and other means, the bedrock requirements would provide sufficient nutrients for an adequate diet with lower total food consumption over a long period of time. If such controls are not put into effect, the bedrock diet will be much too low since no allowance will be made for the probability that all consumers cannot purchase a full share. Thus the burden of lowered consumption will be placed disproportionately on low-income families and a mad scramble will result among the entire body of consumers for the total supply of food which, under these conditions, will be inadequate.

In the first table given below, the annual per capita requirements of the bedrock diet are compared with those of low-cost diet "B" of the Bureau of Home Economics. In the second table the nutritive value of the bedrock diet is compared with the standards set by the National Research Council.

Nutritive value of rock-bottom diet recommended by Office of Civilian Supply compared with standard of National Research Council

	National Research Council's dietary standard [1]	Nutritive value of civilian supply rock-bottom diet
Energy—Calories	2,800	2,802
Protein—Grams	66	83
Calcium—Grams	0.90	0.78
Iron—Mg.	12	13
Vitamin A—I. U.	4,700	4,866
Ascorbic acid—Mg.	70	80

[1] Average daily requirement per capita.

Nutritive value of rock-bottom diet recommended by Office of Civilian Supply compared with standard of National Research Council—Continued

	National Research Council's dietary standard	Nutritive value of civilian supply rock-bottom diet
Thiamin—Mg.	1.6	1.9
Riboflavin—Mg.	2.3	1.6
Niacin—Mg.	16	14

Bedrock diet compared with low-cost diet "B" of Bureau of Home Economics

[Pounds per capita]

Food group	Low-cost bedrock diet	
	Bureau of Home Economics	Office of Civilian Defense
Dairy products	[1] 534	[1] 388
Eggs	23	29
Flour and cereals	246	232
Potatoes and sweet potatoes	129	150
Dry beans, peas and nuts	29	20
Tomatoes and citrus fruits	[2] 82	[2] 68
Leafy, green, yellow vegetables	[2] 186	[2] 68
Other fruits and vegetables	[2] 156	[2] 156
Fats (including bacon and salt pork)	47	47
Sugar and syrups	52	52
Lean meat, poultry and fish	83	104

[1] Nutritional equivalent of dairy products expressed in pounds of whole milk.
[2] Includes 5 percent allowance for waste between retail market and kitchen preparation.
[3] Includes 10 percent allowance for waste between retail market and kitchen preparation.

TABLE 2.—*Minimum civilian consumer requirements for beverages*

[Values in millions of 1941 dollars, excluding values added by service in bars and restaurants]

	Consumption in 1941	Minimum annual requirements—	
		Value at 1941 retail prices	As a percent of consumption in 1941
Beer, draft	907	590	65.0
Beer, packaged	1,103	717	65.0
Wine	213	138	65.0
Distilled spirits	645	6	1.0
Nonalcoholic beverages	864	562	65.0
Coffee	400	260	65.0
Tea	77	39	50.0
Cocoa	18	9	50.0
Total	4,227	2,321	54.9

Beer and wine: Experience in other countries has indicated that these beverages have a value in sustaining morale both to civilians and to the armed forces. Because of the recommended heavy cut in distilled spirits, the average curtailment for alcoholic beverages as a whole is greater than the 35 percent indicated for beer and wine.

Distilled spirits: Requirements provide for medicinal uses only. Because existing distilling facilities have been converted to war use and because critical materials would be needed to expand facilities, over-all requirements for alcoholic stimulants can be met more efficiently through the consumption of beer and wine as a substitute for spirits.

Nonalcoholic beverages: The reduction of 35 percent of the 1941 consumption of nonalcoholic beverages is related to the quantity of sugar suggested in the bedrock requirements for foods. Allowances also have been made for a reduction in the amount of sugar used per gallon of the product in order to arrive at the indicated requirement.

TABLE 3.—*Minimum civilian consumer requirements for tobacco and smoking supplies*

[Values in millions of dollars at 1939 prices]

	Consumption in 1939	Minimum annual requirements—	
		Value at 1939 retail prices	As a percent of consumption in 1939
Cigars	[1] 246	209	85
Cigarettes	[1] 1,310	1,114	85
Smoking, chewing, and snuff	[1] 373	317	85
Pipes, holders and parts	[1] 12	10	85
Total, at final cost to consumer	1,941	1,650	85
Total, adjusted [2]	1,879	1,597	85

[1] As estimated by the Office of Civilian Supply.
[2] To agree with estimate of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for 1939.

The minimum requirements for tobacco products and beverages from the standpoint of physical necessity or the maintenance of health is zero. However, experience of other countries engaged in the war has indicated that substantial quantities of these products should be made available to the civilian population for the maintenance of morale. Requirements for tobacco are set at 85 percent of consumption in 1939. This quantity is considerably lower than the heavy consumption in 1941 and 1942. It is believed that the reduction can be made successfully through prohibition of use to young people and rationing of supplies to adults.

TABLE 4.—*Minimum civilian consumer requirements for drugs and medical supplies*

[Values in millions of dollars at 1939 prices]

	Consumption in 1939 [1]	Minimum annual requirements—	
		Value at manufacturers' prices	As a percent of consumption in 1939
Packaged medicines	171	115.5	68.0
United States Pharmacopoeia and National Formulary	30	45.0	150.0
Patent or proprietary medicines advertised to public	141	70.5	50.0
Drugs for prescriptions	137	130.3	95.0
United States Pharmacopoeia and National Formulary	55	68.8	125.0
Proprietary brands	82	61.5	75.0
Rubber products and miscellaneous sundries	19	9.5	50.0
Surgical supplies	19	19.0	100.0
Sanitary napkins	16	20.0	125.0
Total at manufacturers' prices	362	294.3	81.3
Total at final cost to consumers (retail prices)	627	509.8	81.3

[1] Source: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Packaged medicines. Packaged medicines are of two kinds. They include "official" drugs, that is, drugs listed in the United States Pharmacopoeia and National Formulary which are sold in ready packaged form and cover such items as epsom salts, senna leaves, castor oil, etc. They also include the so-called patent or proprietary medicines, advertised to the public under trade names. If the use of "official" drugs is increased sufficiently, the use of branded products which

are in most cases prepared from "official" drugs but marketed under fanciful titles and names and at inflated prices can be correspondingly reduced. The statement of minimum requirements in this field is predicated upon such action and is entirely logical in view of the facts.

Drugs for prescriptions. Prescriptions of medical practitioners call for "official" drugs, that is, drugs listed in the United States Pharmacopoeia and National Formulary and also for proprietary brands of such drugs and other drugs not yet listed in the "official" standards. There can be no substantial reduction in prescription drugs since medicine prescribed by physicians must be considered as essential to maintenance of health. However, physicians can be educated to write for drugs by their "official" titles and avoid prescribing proprietary brands of drugs except in case of necessity, such as the absence of an adequate "official" equivalent of a proprietary product. The increase in prescribing of "official" drugs will result in a corresponding decrease in the prescribing of branded products, thus making any great reduction in consumption of prescription drugs unnecessary.

Rubber products and miscellaneous sundries: Orders of the War Production Board covering the use of rubber for various purposes have already reduced consumption of rubber products and miscellaneous sundries in the health supply field. A reduction greater than that proposed would result in hardships because of inability to provide necessary products for essential services.

Surgical supplies: This heading includes items such as gauze, bandage, adhesive tape, and the like. Standardization or conservation programs will in themselves effect some reduction in the number of items available in this field. It would not be advisable to go beyond the reduction indicated in table 4, since this group of surgical supplies ranks high in the field of essential and emergency medical supplies. The reduction proposed is justifiable only on the basis of conservation and rigid elimination of waste.

Sanitary napkins: Keeping this item at 125 percent of 1939 consumption figures represents the minimum at which it should be held for comfort, health, and morale, since consumption is now running well above that level. With women entering industry to a greater extent each day, it is not possible to revert to the time when improvised methods and materials served the purpose of the sanitary napkin.

TABLE 5.—*Minimum civilian consumer requirements for toilet preparations*

[Values in millions of dollars at 1939 prices]

	Consumption in 1939 [1]	Minimum annual requirements—	
		Value at manufacturers' prices	As a percent of consumption in 1939
Shaving and toilet soaps	71.0	47.6	67.0
Razor blades	18.0	15.3	85.0
Dentifrices	27.0	10.8	40.0
Combs and hairpins	3.3	.8	25.0
Toothbrushes	7.7	6.9	90.0
Face powder	25.0	12.5	50.0
Perfume and toilet water	35.0	4.5	30.0
Creams and shampoos	24.0	12.0	50.0
Lipstick and rouge	8.0	5.6	70.0
Dyes	1.7	.2	10.0
Deodorants	5.6	3.9	70.0
Lotions	7.6	3.8	50.0
Other toilet preparations	33.1	8.3	25.0
Total, at manufacturers' prices	247.0	132.2	53.5
Total at final cost to consumers at retail prices	484.0	258.9	53.5

[1] Source: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Shaving and toilet soaps: See note on soap accompanying table 6.

Razor blades: Consumption of razor blades has increased since 1939 and minimum requirements of 85 percent of 1939 consumption therefore represents an even greater reduction of current consumption. The serviceability of razor blades can be extended. This saving is offset in part, however, by the greater use of razor blades because more men are now employed in factories and offices where good appearance is necessary to sustain morale.

Dentifrices: Dentifrices are largely intended to clean teeth. Their antiseptic value, if any, is of short duration in the mouth. While they assist cleansing, they are not essential for this purpose if a tooth brush and such commodities as salt and bicarbonate of soda are available. There is tremendous physical waste in the use of these products, in addition to their lack of importance. The allowances proposed will cover essential needs, provided they are interpreted to include substitute mixtures of salt, soda, and chalk.

Tooth brushes: Tooth brushes are essential to keep teeth clean and healthy. No great reduction in use can be planned, especially in view of cuts to be made in the use of dentifrices.

Cosmetics: Psychiatrists maintain that cosmetics serve to counteract fatigue and that a dressing room in a factory may improve efficiency to the extent of 10 or 15 percent. British experience substantiates this contention. At the beginning of the war the manufacture of cosmetics was restricted to 25 percent of peacetime production. It was discovered that the civilian population was growing depressed and war-factory records were steadily declining. When cosmetic stations were established in the industries the production curve soared upward immediately and increased numbers of women came flocking to the war factories for work. The effect was so striking that the restricting order for the Nation as a whole was relaxed to 50 percent of the peacetime level. A recent regulation orders that girl workers in British munitions factories shall wash and reapply cosmetics three times a day as protection against infection and discoloration. Cosmetics are supplied for the purpose by the Government.

The relative amounts of the different kinds of cosmetics—powders, perfumes, lipsticks, rouges, dyes, deodorants, etc., are based on answers to questions on essentiality in surveys made by the Office of Price Administration and other agencies.

TABLE 6.—*Minimum civilian consumer requirements for cleaning and polishing preparations*

[Values in millions of dollars at 1939 prices]

	Consumption in 1939 [1]	Minimum annual requirements—	
		Value at manufacturers' prices	As a percent of consumption in 1939
Soap	174	116.6	67.0
Insecticides and related chemicals	40	32.0	80.0
Miscellaneous cleaning and polishing preparations	51	15.3	30.0
Total, at manufacturers' prices	265	148.6	56.4
Total, at final cost to consumers at retail prices	433	242.9	56.1

[1] Source: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Soap: Under the British ration system the annual consumer consumption will average about 13 pounds per capita; this is about as low as the British think they can go. On this basis we are suggesting a basic per capita figure for bedrock civilian consumption of 15 pounds. On the basis of a population of 127,000,000 persons, this would indicate a total consumption of 1,905,000,000 pounds. This represents 67 percent of the estimated consumption in 1939. In this connection it should be pointed out that these estimates are for the requirements for soap by ultimate consumers on a retail level. Actually the production of soap is inseparably connected with the production of glycerin, and the requirements for glycerin are most likely to control the industry.

Insecticides: The dollar volume of household insecticides has increased considerably since 1939. Insecticides are important to prevent spread of disease. Therefore it is not advisable to restrict their use to a great extent. A reduction to 80 percent of 1939, equivalent to 67 percent of 1942, is considered the minimum. This reduction is possible chiefly in the field of fly sprays by a more judicious use of these products.

Miscellaneous cleaning and polishing preparations: Shoe polish, a very small part of the total, should remain at 100 percent.

TABLE 7.—*Minimum civilian consumer requirements for magazines, newspapers, and other perishable printed matter*

[Values in millions of dollars at 1939 prices]

	Consumption in 1939 [1]	Minimum annual requirements—	
		Value at manufacturers' prices	As a percent of consumption in 1939
Newspapers	306	122.4	40
Other periodicals and miscellaneous	166	33.2	20
Total, at manufacturers' prices	472	155.6	33
Total, at final cost to consumers at retail prices	565	186.5	33

[1] Source: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce

Newspapers: It should be pointed out that final cost to consumers is of doubtful value in measuring the amount of newspapers or periodicals delivered to a civilian economy. Circulation revenue in 90 percent of the volume of this business is of minor importance to the primary objective of supplying media for advertising. However, to afford a comparable index of dollar values over the pre-war period of 1939, the above percentages and values may be accepted as indicating the great falling off in variety of publications offered for sale under a shrinking economy in which advertising expenditures will not justify the existence of a great many borderline profit makers in the newspaper and periodical fields. The shrinkage to 40 percent of pre-war newspaper sales would reflect curtailment in the amount of paper (and reading matter) contained per copy as well as declines in circulation. Measured by newsprint consumption, requirements for newspapers would be 20 percent of 1939.

Magazines: It is obvious that the proportion of magazines devoted purely to entertainment allows them to shrink to a greater degree than newspapers without affecting the public interest. For this reason, magazines can drop to a 20 percent level as against the 40 percent level considered a minimum for newspapers in terms of final cost to consumers.

TABLE 8.—*Minimum civilian consumer requirements for stationery and writing supplies*

[Values in millions of dollars at 1939 prices]

	Consumption in 1939 [1]	Minimum annual requirements—	
		Value at manufacturers' prices	As a percent of consumption in 1939
Papeteries	10	0	0
Greeting cards	30	2.1	7.0
Stationery, tablets, etc.	23	18.4	80.0
Ink, adhesives, erasers, etc.	10	8.8	80.0
Wooden pencils	6	4.0	67.0
Pen nibs and pencil leads	2	1.0	50.0
Total, at manufacturer's prices	81	34.3	42.3
Total, at final cost to consumers at retail prices	136	57.5	42.3

[1] Source: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce

Papetries: Consists of packaged envelope and paper combinations which can be entirely eliminated.

Greeting cards: Curtailment based on standardization and simplification which would limit unit weight to that of a postal card, correspondingly reduce value, and eliminate all except Christmas cards.

Stationery and tablets: In spite of increased essential needs for paper in wartime for use in correspondence and household management, it is felt that a curtailment of 20 percent can be accomplished through elimination of waste. Taken together with papetries, the reduction (by paper content) would be in the neighborhood of 30 percent.

Nibs and pencils: Reductions based on War Production Board program determinations.

Ink: Correlated with paper curtailment and some shift in usage from pencils to pens.

TABLE 9.—*Minimum civilian consumer requirements for miscellaneous household paper products*

[Values in millions of dollars at 1939 prices]

	Consumption in 1939 [1] at manufacturers	Minimum annual requirements—	
		Value prices	As a percent of consumption in 1939
Facial tissue and handkerchiefs	12	0	0
Toilet paper	15	16.5	110.0
Toweling and napkins	5	1.3	25.0
Wrapping and miscellaneous paper	94	9.4	10.0
Total, at manufacturers' prices	126	27.2	21.6
Total, at final cost to consumers at retail prices	203	43.8	21.6

[1] Source: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Facial tissue would be eliminated and substituted by coarser materials. Toilet paper for civilian use has increased considerably since 1939, and would be still further increased when other items are curtailed or eliminated; could probably be held down to 110 percent by reducing wastage. Toweling and napkins would be restricted to hospital and emergency use. Wrapping and miscellaneous paper would be almost eliminated as a household item. Wrapping paper would be by reuse and all fancy papers would be out.

TABLE 10.—*Minimum civilian consumer requirements for nondurable toys, games, and sports supplies*

[Values in millions of dollars at 1939 prices]

	Consumption in 1939 [1]	Minimum annual requirements—	
		Value (at manufacturers' prices)	As a percent of consumption in 1939
Cartridges	28	1.1	4.0
Fireworks	3	0	0
Rubber balloons	2	0	0
Nondurable toys	9	9.0	100.0
Games	9	6.3	70.0
Baseballs	3	1.5	50.0
Golf and tennis balls	7	3.5	50.0
Playing cards	10	7.0	70.0
Film	16	0	0
Fishing supplies	9	1.8	20.0
Total, at manufacturers' prices	96	30.2	31.5
Total, at final cost to consumer at retail prices	171	53.9	31.5

[1] Source: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Cartridges, fireworks, rubber balloons, film: These goods require critical materials. The small requirement for cartridges is to supply the needs of those dependent on hunting for part of their food supply.

Nondurable toys: These goods are needed for children's recreation and welfare, will not require critical materials, and can be produced by noncritical labor.

Playing cards and games: More people in industry, and longer working hours will reduce the time available for this kind of recreation.

Gold, tennis, and baseballs: With conservation in use of materials and greater care to avoid losses, essential needs for healthy outdoor recreation can be provided with purchase of balls curtailed by about one-half.

Fishing supplies: Minimum civilian consumer requirements include only supplies such as lines, hooks, and bait. These will be used with existing equipment for recreation and for obtaining food in some rural areas.

TABLE 11.—*Minimum civilian consumer requirements for manufactured illuminating and heating products*

[Values in millions of dollars at 1939 prices]

	Consumption in 1939 [1]	Minimum annual requirements—	
		Value at manufacturers' prices	As a percent of consumption in 1939
Matches	16	12.8	80.0
Candles	7	5.6	80.0
Christmas tree and flashlight bulbs	7	1.1	15.0
Flashlight batteries	10	2.5	25.0
Light bulbs	14	9.8	70.0
Fuel and illuminating oils	197	187.2	95.0
Coke and briquets	50	20.5	41.0
Total, at manufacturers' prices	301	239.5	79.6
Total, at final cost to consumers at retail prices	678	539.7	79.6

[1] Source: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Matches: Eighty percent consumption of matches represents a reduction of about 30 percent from the amount which would be consumed under normal conditions at the present time and is based on greater economy of use.

Candles: A certain proportion of the general consumer use is for decorative purposes, but a very large part is for emergency use—to care for interruptions in electric services black-outs, etc. The volume is very small and in a sense the industry has been on a rock-bottom basis for many years.

Christmas-tree and flashlight bulbs, flashlight batteries: Minimum requirements for Christmas-tree bulbs are zero; for flashlight bulbs and batteries requirements provide replacements for use in coastal and rural areas only.

Light bulbs: The curtailment is based on Standards Products Committee determination and will be achieved by reducing the number of lighting units per household.

Fuels: Estimates are based on an assumed reduction in average house temperature from 71° to 60°. It is assumed that 5,000,000 barrels per year will be converted from oil to other fuels. See notes on table 12.

TABLE 12.—*Minimum civilian consumer requirements for nonmanufactured fuels*

[Values in millions of dollars at 1941 prices]

	Consumption in 1941 [1]	Minimum annual requirements—	
		Value at cost to consumers	As a percent of consumption in 1941
Coal	750	562.5	75.0
Wood	156	127.9	82.0
Total, at final cost to consumers	906	690.4	76.2

[1] Source: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Requirements are based on an assumed reduction in average house temperature from 71° to 60°. Of the total value of wood consumed in 1941, $106,000,000 worth was cut and burned on farms.

Minimum requirements for the various fuels, compared with previous consumption, are shown in the following table in physical units:

	1939	1941	Minimum
Fuel oils (million barrels)	134.2	162.6	127.3
Coke [1]	8,244.0	7,409.0	3,346.0
Coal:			
Bituminous [1]	67,239.0	64,748.0	49,550.0
Anthracite [1]	28,927.0	27,896.0	20,338.0
Wood (million cords)	68.0	71.0	57.6

[1] Thousand tons.

TABLE 13.—*Minimum civilian consumer requirements for fuels and lubricants for passenger cars*

[Values in millions of dollars at 1941 prices]

	Consumption in 1941 [1]	Minimum annual requirements—	
		Value at retail prices	As a percent of consumption in 1941
Gasoline and lubricants	2,653	1,061.2	40

[1] Source: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

It is assumed that the present gasoline-rationing system provides 87,200,000,000 intracity vehicle-miles per year, with an average occupancy per trip of 1.8. By increasing the average occupancy to 2.9 in local travel,

the same number of passenger-miles could be provided with only 54,000,000,000 vehicle-miles. Adding the 50,000,000,000 vehicle-miles of intercity travel provided under the present rationing system, we obtain a total minimum requirement of 104,000,000,000 vehicle-miles, which is 40 percent of the corresponding 1941 figure. For further details, see notes accompanying table 20.

TABLE 14.—*Minimum civilian consumer requirements for clothing and accessories*

[Values in millions of dollars at 1939 prices]

	Consumption in 1939 [1]	Minimum annual requirements—	
		Value at manufacturers' prices	As a percent of consumption in 1939
Men's and boys'—			
Coats, except fur	95	77.9	82.0
Suits	371	289.4	78.0
Jackets and trousers (except work)	108	100.4	93.0
Work clothing	169	182.5	108.0
Shirts (except work)	149	108.8	73.0
Underwear	73	54.0	74.0
Hosiery (men's)	76	54.0	71.0
Suspenders and garters	10	7.0	70.0
Women's, girls', children's and infants'—			
Coats, except fur	229	192.4	84.0
Suits, skirts and jackets	109	79.6	73.0
Dresses and blouses	595	452.2	76.0
Aprons and uniforms	22	17.2	78.0
Sportswear (except bathing suits) [2]	25	20.8	83.0
Underwear	122	89.1	73.0
Corsets, brassieres, etc.	83	49.0	59.0
Hosiery	331	228.4	69.0
Not separately classified by sex:			
Gloves and mittens, fabric	43	43.4	101.0
Bathrobes and lounging wear	39	17.2	44.0
Knitted outerwear	70	56.0	80.0
Nightwear	89	63.2	71.0
Bathing suits	71	11.1	65.0
Bathing caps	2	1.0	50.0
Other hats and caps	172	120.4	70.0
Fur coats and other fur products	129	38.7	30.0
Leather clothing	21	4.2	20.0
Leather gloves	24	4.8	20.0
Leather belts	15	3.0	20.0
Textile apparel, not separately reported	220	154.0	70.0
Total, at manufacturers' prices	3,408	2,519.7	73.9
Total, at final cost to consumer at retail prices	5,404	3,993.6	73.9

[1] Source: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and Census of Manufactures.

[2] Includes slacks, ski and snow suits, and polo shirts used also for purposes other than sports, particularly by children.

NOTES ON TABLE 14—APPAREL (EXCEPT WORK CLOTHING)

In determining minimum requirements, all consumers with family buying power of above $1,500 were permitted only the per capita purchasing rate of the $1,000–$1,500 group. Those with lower buying power were left at their normal rate of purchase.

The per capita purchases of apparel items for men, women, and children were obtained from the Consumer Purchases Surveys of 1935–36. These were taken first for 3 income groups, namely, less than $500, $500–$1,000, and $1,000–$1,500. The per capita purchases for the higher income groups then were computed for all important clothing items. These basic data were extracted for the many regional and city-size groups covered by the surveys so that differences in the location as well as income were represented. The per capita data were then weighted by the estimated 1942 population, classified according to location and income, with deductions for the military personnel.

A further adjustment was made in the 1942 population distribution to take care of the increase in the cost of living that has occurred in 1942 as compared to the base period, 1935–36. In consequence, the population weights represent a classification on the basis of real income or buying power in 1942 rather than dollar earnings. In terms of 1935–36 buying power approximately 46 percent of the 1942 population come within the group with real income of less than $1,500, while only 39 percent are actually earning less than $1,500. This difference is due to a rise in the cost of living in 1942 over that prevailing at the time of the surveys of approximately 16 percent.

In applying these population weights to the per capita data all consumers with family buying power of above $1,500 were permitted only the per capita purchasing rate of the $1,000–$1,500 income group. Those with less than $1,000 buying power were left at their former and lower rate of purchase. Moreover, no extra provision was made for young unmarried men and women. Although these individuals normally buy more clothing than older and married persons within the respective income groups, the per capita purchases of married persons were used for the entire adult population.

All of the estimated clothing requirements were compared with quantities of production, as reported by the census for 1939, and usually for earlier census years back to 1933. Various improvements were obtained by these comparisons. Thus, a number of items reported by the census, such as washable service apparel, slacks, polo shirts, etc., were not reported in the consumer purchases survey or were lumped into categories that were not clearly identifiable or were too broad for use. In those instances requirements were determined or adjusted on the basis of production data in 1939 and earlier years. The determinations were according to the degree of essentiality as indicated by budgetary studies and sales data as well as by differences in demand for similar garments by income groups, as reported in the consumer purchases surveys.

WORK CLOTHING

Unlike most types of apparel, demand for work clothing is mainly a function of occupation rather than income. In consequence, it was impossible to apply the $1,000–$1,500 standard to work clothing.

The estimates of work clothing minimum requirements, therefore, were based on production in 1939 and 1941 in relation to the number of potential users—namely, male manual workers and boys of age 6 or over. Production in those years was divided by the estimated number of these work-clothing consumers in order to obtain per capita purchases. Aggregate garments required as of 1942 were then calculated by multiplying the population of work-clothing consumers, as here defined, by their per capita rate of purchase in 1939. Although the 1941 rate of purchase was substantially higher, the 1939 rate was regarded as a minimum requirement.

ADJUSTMENTS FOR INCOME DISTRIBUTION AND CHANGE IN QUALITY

Unlike the requirements for other products, the figures shown for clothing do not reflect absolute need but are a mixture being asked on a limitation of purchases of upper income groups to levels of absolute need and an estimate of the actual subminimum purchases of the lower groups in 1942.

If no allowance for this subminimum buying power had been made, the aggregate requirement would have been about 5 percent higher.

There is another adjustment which ought to be made, and which would approximately offset the error just mentioned. The percentages given reflect only relative requirements without taking into account the effect on value per unit of conservation and simplification orders.

Therefore, due to these offsetting errors the stated figures may be accepted as reflecting actual value of requirements in constant dollars, on the basis of absolute need, assuming an equitable pattern of distribution independent of buying power.

BRITISH CLOTHING BUDGET COMPARED WITH UNITED STATES MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

The data on the British clothing budget presented in the following table were obtained from Mr. William Onslow of the British Board of Trade in Washington. The fact that the British allowances are lower in many categories of apparel may be accounted for by differences in the climatic conditions, the durability of apparel, and the national consumption habits of the two populations. Difficulties of obtaining strictly comparable age groups also account for many discrepancies.

British clothing budget compared with United States bedrock requirements

Garments	British clothing budget	United States minimum requirements	British clothing budget	United States minimum requirements
	Garments per head per year—			
	Men		Boys	
Overcoats	0.23	0.10	0.64	0.23
Raincoats and waterproofs	------	.08	------	.04
Suits	.36	.45	.75	1.20
Odd jackets and blazers	.16	.28	.31	.33
Shorts and trousers	.51	2.24	1.72	1.77
Pull-overs, sweaters, etc.	.16	.32	1.0	1.07
Overalls	.33	1.21	------	1.03
Shirts	1.92	4.49	2.25	2.87
Nightwear	.17	.36	.52	.84
Underwear	2.16	2.24	2.25	2.96
Socks and stockings	4.44	9.86	6.31	9.77
Footwear	1.89	1.7	3.75	3.43
	Women		Girls	
Coats	0.34	0.26	0.38	0.41
Raincoats and waterproofs	------	.03	------	.02
Costumes	.09	.07	------	.01
Odd jackets, blazers	.01	.02	.21	.02
Skirts and slacks	.32	.45	.38	.30
Gym tunics	------	------	.32	------
Dresses	1.11	3.34	2.03	3.10
Blouses, jumpers, cardigans	.85	.56	2.15	1.33
Aprons and overalls	.94	.55	.09	------
Nightwear	.3	1.04	.53	1.21
Corsets	.48	------	------	------
Bodices	------	1.08	.44	------
Brassieres	.24	------	------	------
Underwear	2.84	3.02	4.26	4.02
Socks	.59	------	------	------
Stockings	6.74	9.19	------	9.77
Stockings and socks	------	------	7.5	------
Footwear	2.18	2.18	4.29	3.43

Source: War Production Board—Office of Civilian Supply, "Minimum civilian requirements for clothing" (Oct. 28, 1942), and "British clothing program."

March Anniversaries—Address of Former Senator James A. Reed on Speaker Champ Clark

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, March is a month of important anniversaries. Among those important anniversaries cherished in the future will be that of

the victory of General MacArthur and his brave men in the Southwest Pacific on yesterday, March 4.

March 2 was the anniversary of the Declaration of Texas Independence.

Tomorrow will be the anniversary, I believe, of the fall of the Alamo, which occurred on March 6, 1836. Colonel David Crockett, who lost his life there, was my mother's great-uncle. So that is one anniversary I never overlook.

On March 7, 1850, Daniel Webster delivered his famous speech at the other end of the Capitol. On that day our former Speaker, Champ Clark, of Missouri, was born.

Twenty-two years ago today memorial services were held in this chamber for Speaker Clark, and over his remains were made two of the ablest addresses I have ever heard. Hon. James R. Mann, of Illinois, one of the truly great men with whom I have served in this House, said one thing that impressed me as much as any other sentence I have ever heard uttered about any man. He said that while Champ Clark had his ideals in the clouds, he always kept his feet on the ground.

Senator James A. Reed, of Missouri, made what I thought was the most eloquent address of its kind I had ever heard. When Senator Reed had concluded, the man sitting next to me asked what I thought of it. I said I thought it was the only oration of its kind I had ever heard that measured up to Robert G. Ingersoll's speech at his brother's grave.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include that short address by Senator Reed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Senator Reed's address follows:

The SPEAKER. An address will be delivered by Senator Reed, of Missouri.

Senator REED. A wonderful stream is the river of life. A slender thread emerging from the mysterious realm of birth, it laughs and dances through the wonder world of childhood. Its broadening currents sweep the plains of youth between the flower-decked banks of romance and of hope. A mighty torrent, it rushes over the rapids of manhood and breaks in foam upon the rocks of opposition and defeat, then glides away across the barren, sterile fields of age until it is engulfed and lost within the waters of the eternal sea.

The robes of royalty, the beggar's rags, the rich man's golden hoard, the pauper's copper pence, the jeweled diadems of princes, and the thorny crowns of martyrs alike are swept by the same ceaseless tides.

The miracle of birth, the mystery of death remain the unsolved problems of all time. The shepherd philosopher who three thousand years ago upon the Syrian plains observed the procession of the planets and contemplated the decrees of fate was as wise perhaps as is the wisest of today. He only knew that standing here upon this bank of time his straining eyes could not glimpse even the shadowy outline of the farther shore. He could only behold the white sails of receding fleets; ships that sail out, but never come again. He only knew that at the grave's dread mouth all men must cast aside the burden of their honors and their griefs; that man takes with him only that which he has freely given away; but that even death may not despoil him of the riches of service and self-sacrifice.

Measured by that standard, he who sleeps today bears with him to the tomb a legacy so rare that even envy is compelled to pay the tribute of admiration.

His long life was devoted to the public weal. Upon his country's altar he placed his wonderful natural talent, the zeal of his youth, the energy of middle life, the wisdom of old age.

With tireless brain he wrought to promote the general good, with sympathetic spirit he labored to lift the burdens of sorrow from the shoulders of the oppressed. His heart cried out for all who trod adversity's harsh road. He explored every avenue of learning and burned his candle late into the night that he might gather for them the lore of other countries and of other times.

The fires of patriotic love for home and country consumed his very soul. He faced each task with the heroic courage of those who do not count the cost. His character rested upon a foundation laid deep in human love.

Champ Clark lives because his works live. He lives because he helped to defend and keep secure the Constitution that preserves our rights. He lives in the Declaration of Independence, whose principles he nurtured with a tender and fearless affection. He lives because he helped liberty to live. Men who have so achieved never die. In ever-widening circles the influences of Champ Clark will be felt, and deeper and yet deeper the tender love the people of his State have borne for him will sink into their hearts.

As time runs on and the historian surveys the picture of these troubled days there will arise in it no figure more heroic than the rugged form that lies so still today.

He was the best beloved of Americans.

How cold are words. Let me speak of the man as my friend. For 30 years I have known him intimately. I watched his course through all the storms of life. How big and brave and rugged was this man. He met each danger like a brave soldier. He never flinched from any task. He stood square-fronted to the world.

They say that he is dead, but we who gaze upon his marble brow must realize the man we knew does not lie here today. The soul that made him what he was cannot have been destroyed.

To his family I cannot speak; but of them let me say in all the world I never knew so much of filial affection, of wifely tenderness, of fatherly love as was manifested in his home. They must find consolation in the memory of this glorious man.

Soon he will sleep in the soil of his beloved State. As it enfolds him, the very clods that touch his coffined clay will be blessed with the love he bore for the old Commonwealth of Missouri.

Effect of Repeal of the Present Federal Silver-Purchase Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, while few people outside the mining industry appreciate the burden that has been placed on our second largest basic industry by social-security payments, increased wages, and Government taxes, I am sure all of us appreciate and understand the vital importance of the products of our mines in the successful prosecution of the war in which we are now engaged.

That the Members of the House may have for their information a financial report direct from one of the important mining operations in the district I have the honor to represent, there is inserted herewith a letter addressed to the Rocky Mountain Metals Foundation from Secretary L. J. Randall, Coeur d'Alene Mines Corporation, explaining the situation:

FEBRUARY 10, 1943.

Mr. JAMES A. WHITE,
Director, Rocky Mountain Metals Foundation,
Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: Relative to the subject of repeal of the present Federal silver-purchase program, it would seem that opposing eastern Senators might well be impressed with the actual facts concerning the resultant effect on United States production of strategic metals vital to the war effort, which could be easily determined by a subcommittee from a compilation of metallic production and financial reports of our mining companies.

Income-tax returns are due March 15, 1945. Why not publish a request that mining companies submit certified statements of production and net profits for the year ended December 31, 1942, in order that this compilation might be made?

The Coeur d'Alene Mines Corporation is a typical example of a so-called silver mine. Our 1942 production and net profit was as follows:

	Pounds	Tons
Silver (1,586,460 ounces)	99,154	49.572
Copper	3,133,000	1,566.500
Antimony	1,840,000	940.000

Net profit before Federal and State income taxes, $217,950.

Had we been forced to operate at the present world price of 44¾ cents per ounce on silver or 25.875 cents less than the present gross smelter return, we would have suffered a loss of $192,546.52 for the year ended December 31, 1942, computed as follows:

Net operating profit (70.625 cents per ounce on silver)	$217,950.00
Less loss in gross smelter return if forced to accept a decrease of 25.875 cents per ounce of silver (1,586,460 ounces at 25.875 cents)	410,496.52
Loss	192,546.52

Needless to say, our mine must immediately close if forced to operate at the present world price of silver. The question is, "How seriously would the closing of mines throughout the United States dependent on a gross smelter return on silver of 70.625 cents per ounce affect the war effort?

The Engineering and Mining Journal and the Metal and Mineral Markets issue of January 28 estimates that 54,000,000 ounces of silver were produced within the United States during the year ended December 31, 1942. Let us assume that approximately one-half, or 27,000,000 ounces, of our 1942 production were produced by so-called silver mines and marginal strategic metal mines that would be forced to close in the event silver was reduced to 44¾ cents per ounce.

From the above table of production, you will note that we produce 1.97 pounds of copper and 1.16 pounds of antimony, or a total of 3.13 pounds of strategic war metals,

to each 1 ounce of silver produced. The ratio of marginal zinc-lead mines would be much higher. Let us assume, for calculation purposes, that for each ounce of silver of the 27,000,000 ounces of silver referred to in the above paragraph that the Government would lose, they would also lose 3.13 pounds of strategic metals, or an aggregate total loss of 84,510,000 pounds of strategic metals (3.13×27,000,000 ounces of silver).

There is no way of determining the accuracy of my computation except by actually compiling the production records of mines which would be forced to close in the event of the repeal of the Federal silver purchase program.

However, it would seem that an actual compilation of production records of mines dependent upon a price of 70.625 cents per ounce on silver should be made before final action is taken by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

The opposition contends that the war-production program is losing the domestic production of approximately 54,000,000 ounces of silver vital to the war industries.

Mr. A. C. Stevenson, chief electrical engineer of the Hecla Mining Co. informs us that a pound of silver has only 6 percent more electrical conductivity than a pound of copper. He states further that this statement may be easily checked from Government tables on electrical conductivity of the various metals which shows silver at 1.06 as compared to a specific conductivity of 1 for copper. As stated above, the total United States production of silver for the year 1942 was only 54,000,000 ounces, which converted, equals 1,690 tons of silver. Our little mine, with a production of 1,566 tons of copper, produces nearly this equivalent in conductivity from copper alone as would be gained by using the entire 1942 United States production of 1,690 tons of silver as a substitute for copper.

Yours sincerely,

L. J. RANDALL,
Secretary, Coeur d'Alene Mines Corporation, Wallace, Idaho.

What the Navy Is Doing for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Small Business of the House, I was requested to secure from the Navy Department information as to efforts being made to assist small business in compliance with the known will of Congress, as expressed in the Murray-Patman Act (Public, No. 603), which also created the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

This statement discloses many accomplishments in the direction of helping small business and in the manner contemplated by Congress. It is my personal opinion that the Navy Department is making a sincere effort to aid small business in every way possible in the war program and I am willing to predict that future reports will disclose that my prediction is justified.

Under Secretary of the Navy the Honorable James Forrestal furnished the report requested. It is as follows:

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, February 23, 1943.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: The Navy is happy to comply with your request for a summary of what it has done to facilitate participation in its procurement program by smaller business enterprises.

In placing orders for matériel the Navy has tried to distribute business to smaller companies to the greatest possible degree—strategic urgency of its needs being considered.

This program started in January 1941 and has continued at an accelerated rate.

Passage of the Murray-Patman Act, Public Law No. 603, has further stimulated this principle of contract placement which has resulted in a broad reconsideration of our procurement policy with the end in view of awarding greater numbers of contracts to smaller firms and urging larger prime contractors to farm out more of their jobs with smaller subcontractors.

The primary objective of the Navy Department has been and must continue to be to obtain as quickly as possible the material and equipment required for the fleet. All other considerations affecting procurement must, under conditions of grave necessity, fit into, yet not dominate our thinking in carrying out that policy.

Urgent necessity has made it mandatory that the maximum possible production be secured. Circumstances have not permitted production for future requirements alone.

While that urgency still exists, increased production now has made possible more careful scrutiny of procurement planning and of the facilities made more readily available by Public Law 603.

Passage of that act in June 1942 found the Navy with an integrated organization already in existence in most of the War Production Board offices throughout the country, manned with officers capable of aiding in administration of this statute from a Navy point of view.

The Navy has felt that seeking out and developing new sources of production among the smaller plants throughout the United States achieved two objectives:

(a) Facilities thus added increased the volume and speed of production.

(b) Flexibility of the Navy's procurement program improved, since smaller plants can be adapted more readily to rapidly changing war requirements than can an organization comprised only of large facilities built for single-purpose production.

By direction of the Under Secretary, the Navy Smaller War Plants Section was established in the Industry Cooperation Division—a Navy unit previously dedicated to spreading prime and subcontracts to smaller business.

Almost daily, conferences were held by Mr. Holland and cognizant Navy officers both at War Production Board headquarters and in the Navy Department to develop a workable program.

Liaison officers were then appointed in each bureau of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to work with the Smaller War Plants Section of the Navy and to act as contact officers in matters of interest to the Smaller War Plants Division, War Production Board. This system of liaison officers has proven quite satisfactory. The War Production Board Smaller War Plants Division, however, advised that in some instances it did not receive information regarding proposed procurement in time to locate companies and give them an opportunity to study specifications and have their bids submitted by the closing date.

It was decided, therefore, to reorganize and strengthen the system. On January 18, 1943, at the direction of the Under Secretary of the Navy, the chief of each important procurement bureau designated an officer of adequate rank as procurement coordinator, whose duties are to examine the needs of the bureau in order to select simple items on which the Smaller War Plants Division of the War Production Board can take prime contracts.

These officers and their assistants also are directed to study more complicated items to determine in turn the parts which can be subcontracted. Such information is then turned over to the War Production Board Smaller War Plants Division for distribution to the field.

The Smaller War Plants Division of the War Production Board has been invited to place representatives in each of the procurement bureaus of the Navy Department and has done so in the Bureaus of Ships, Supplies and Accounts, Ordnance, Medicine and Surgery, and Yards and Docks. Free access has been given by the various bureaus to these representatives on future requirements. The Bureau of Supplies and Accounts has submitted $67,000,000 worth of simple stock items to the War Production Board Smaller War Plants Division. From this list the Smaller War Plants Division is to select products it considers suitable for taking as a prime contractor. It is being asked to distribute the remainder to manufacturers selected by its regional and field offices. It is anticipated that the Smaller War Plants Division can thus place at least 20 percent of this procurement.

To spread work to smaller plants, Navy procurement bureaus assist prime contractors to locate companies as subcontractors. Pressure is exerted upon prime contractors to encourage subcontracting to the greatest possible degree.

At the direction of the Under Secretary, educational conferences have been held in every naval district in the country for the purpose of reexamining Navy procurement practices in conformance with Public Law No. 603. These were attended by the chiefs of each field agency and presided over by district commandants.

Regional and district executives of War Production Board Smaller War Plants Corporation have participated in the sessions, as have representatives of the War Production Board, Washington office. Mr. Lou Holland, Director of Smaller War Plants Corporation, attended the fifth naval district meeting at Norfolk.

Approximately 400 naval officers, including 1 vice admiral, 17 rear admirals, 84 captains, 51 commanders, and 98 lieutenant commanders took part in these field sessions.

In most instances, War Production Board field agencies have been asked to appoint liaison engineers to assist naval officers in this effort. Where practical, Navy field agencies have invited Smaller War Plants field divisions to assign men to these Navy area agencies in an effort to expedite carrying out the agreements reached at these meetings. Already there is flowing from this cooperation, distribution of jobs to companies specified by the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

It is believed that these meetings have produced a practical working arrangement between the Navy and War Production Board Smaller War Plants Corporation field agencies best suited to meet the varying needs of the different regions of the country.

The Industry Cooperation Division's naval advisers, located in War Production Board field offices, are particularly valuable in continuing this liaison work with the War Production Board Smaller War Plants district and regional representatives.

They regularly visit prime contractors' plants. Through discussions with inspectors of naval material and managers of these plants, they learn of available subcontract items, enabling them to suggest new business possibilities to small manufacturers.

A check of daily reports indicates that over 1,000 manufacturers were interviewed in

Washington by the Industry Cooperation Division from March to September 1942. In order to make a check of contracts and subcontracts obtained by the companies interviewed, a sample of 220 companies was selected at random. These manufacturers were located in 34 cities throughout the country, ranging from Portland, Maine, to Los Angeles and Minneapolis to Dallas. Naval advisers telephoned each of the 220 companies and found that 162 companies or 73 percent had obtained either prime contracts or subcontracts for war work since the date of the interview, while 60 percent of the companies had received prime or subcontracts for Navy work since the date of the interview. The results of the survey plainly indicated that many relatively small manufacturers can assist naval production if they are properly advised as to the most effective procedure in seeking subcontract or prime contract work.

A typical operation of a regional office is exemplified in the case of the Sperry Gyroscope Co. In September 1942 representatives of this company came to the Navy and requested aid in locating 75,000 tooling hours. The New York naval adviser furnished the Sperry Co. with a list of 27 nearby companies that had tooling facilities, and within 1 week the Sperry Co. was making use of these plants in the manufacture of jigs, fixtures, and tools.

On December 8, 1942, the Under Secretary of the Navy issued a directive to the Commandants of United States Marine Corps and United States Coast Guard and all bureaus of the Navy, inspectors, supervisors of shipbuilding, and naval advisers, directing that all possible aid be given to prime contractors to stimulate subcontracting.

Attached to this directive was a letter prepared by Mr. Lou E. Holland, then head of the War Production Board Smaller War Plants Division, and signed by Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board; Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War; and James V. Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy.

In that communication intensified subcontracting was urged and specific instructions were issued to these officers to assist prime contractors to—

(a) Reexamine their commitments.

(b) Comb out every part that warrants subcontracting consideration (reserving the tough ones for their own manufacture).

(c) Clearly define the shop elements of each part or assembly.

(d) Promptly supply the War Production Board area office nearest the originating plant sufficient job data for their needs in mobilizing the required facilities.

NAVY INDUSTRIAL COOPERATION PLAN

In September 1942 the Navy Department began an experiment to assist small business in obtaining Navy contracts for simple stock items. Since December it has been in operation in War Production Board districts 1 to 5. Early in February it was extended to cover all War Production Board regions except 8, 9, and 10, which areas will be covered in the near future.

Briefly, the plan has two purposes: (1) To assure an adequate number of qualified bidders for Navy negotiations through the medium of the War Production Board's facilities and the assistance of the naval advisers. (2) To provide for spreading contracts over more of the smaller plants.

Under the plan, the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts daily sends copies of all invitations for competitive quotations on simple stock items to naval advisers in War Production Board field offices. Necessary drawings and specifications are available to interested bidders. Prospective bidders are qualified by War Production Board Smaller War Plants engineers and approved by naval advisers as to their ability and willingness to submit a bid and produce the equipment or materials required on schedule. The naval advisers assist small plants in the preparation of bids and interpretation of specifications, drawings, and general requirements.

Bids received from small plants through the Navy Industrial Cooperation Plan are carefully considered and continued effort is being made to award contracts to qualified small manufacturers even if it is necessary to pay a higher price.

The Bureau of Supplies and Accounts has decided to award most of this procurement to firms approved and suggested by Smaller War Plants field agencies.

Through operations of this plan, the Navy is developing reserve facilities for supplies and helping to preserve small plants as an essential part of American industry.

After contracts have been placed, the Smaller War Plants Division of War Production Board agrees to provide industrial engineering and arrange financial aid to contracting firms where needed.

DIESEL ENGINE PARTS

Scarcity of parts for Diesel engines presents one of the Navy's most difficult problems today in the procurement field. Because of the complexities of the engineering and machine skill necessary, this portion of Navy procurement normally would not be considered suitable for Smaller War Plants.

However, in December the Navy called in Mr. Holland and asked his assistance in locating additional facilities. Conferences were held by Admiral Cochrane, chief of the Bureau of Ships, and his assistants with the result that Mr. Holland and his Smaller War Plants engineers already have found several likely sources to aid in this program.

VALVES

Location of facilities for making valves also is a serious Navy problem today. War Production Board Smaller War Plants Corporation, working with the Bureau of Ships, is currently searching for additional sources and has suggested facilities which may be of great aid in this effort.

SUBCONTRACTING NAVAL SHIPBUILDING ITEMS THROUGH THE SMALLER WAR PLANTS DIVISION OF WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

In addition to the general plan to screen procurement, the Bureau of Ships has inaugurated a new program whereby the War Production Board Smaller War Plants Division has set up a shipbuilding section in its Production Service Branch.

For the time being this unit operates from the War Production Board regional office in Boston, and confines its activities to the New England and metropolitan New York areas. The program is to be extended to other naval districts agreed upon by the Bureau and the Division. Under this plan the Chief Engineer will study plans, specifications, and schedules in order to select specific items which are suitable for manufacture in smaller plants.

The Division recommends subcontracting facilities to prime contractors employed by the Bureau of Ships. The prime contractor then makes his own inspection and negotiates contracts with those recommended companies which he approves. If recommended companies are not approved by the prime contractor, the Smaller War Plants Division Chief Engineer offers alternate facilities until all parties are in agreement.

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE SUBCONTRACTING

In the Bureau of Ordnance the picture has changed radically—and in favor of smaller manufacturers. For every dollar spent with large manufacturers (companies rated over $1,000,000) in the last 6 months of 1939 on supply contracts, $20 were spent during the last period for which figures are available—July 1, 1942, to October 31, 1942. Yet, for every dollar spent with smaller manufacturers (companies rated less than $500,000) in the last 6 months of 1939, $220 were spent July 1, 1942, to October 31, 1942—and this represents a 4-months' spending in 1942 as against a 6-months' spending in 1939.

Admiral Blandy, in a report prepared for the Under Secretary, has estimated that as of January 1 the Bureau of Ordnance is utilizing approximately 24,000 companies, both small and large, for subcontracting for the Bureau's needs. Most of these companies are of the type that require assistance from the War Production Board smaller war plants organization.

SUBCONTRACTING IN NAVAL AVIATION PRODUCTION

Here is a specific example of broad contract distribution in naval aviation construction. The Consolidated Aircraft Corporation had on August 14, 1942, 1,677 different vendors and subcontractors, and among these was the Parker Appliance Co., which, in turn, had subcontracted to 307 vendors and 59 subcontractors. In addition to these sub-subs, Parker was investigating 203 additional subcontractors, and had rejected 108, of whom 81 could not do the work due to inadequate equipment or inability to work in close tolerances. Fifty-four companies had declined to subcontract with Parker due to no capacity being available. This illustration shows that naval aircraft contract distribution goes down into thousands of plants and benefits millions of workers.

CRITICAL TOOLS SERVICE

The Under Secretary, on October 29, 1942, directed that existing prime and subcontracts be examined with Smaller War Plants Division of War Production Board to determine the possible extent of additional subcontracting thereunder of products suitable for placement with plants recommended by War Production Board. Addition of machine tools was not to be authorized where corresponding operations could be handled by subcontracting.

Inspectors of naval material and naval advisers, under this system, have refused to endorse many applications for new machine tools. This has correspondingly effected an increase in subcontracting to smaller plants.

A plan is in preparation whereby all pending orders for new machine tools will be reexamined, and if machine-tool capacity is already available in the area, the order for the new machine tools will be denied.

Mr. Walter Wheeler, director, War Production Board Region, No. 1, at the Boston meeting, December 29, 1942, stated that an extended and tight reexamination of pending machine-tool orders would, in 60 to 70 percent of the cases, reveal machine-tool capacity to be available within a reasonable area.

The Navy is constantly intensifying its efforts to secure additional work for small plants in cooperation with the Smaller War Plants Division, War Production Board. In addition to working directly with the procurement bureaus in Washington, it is working through the naval advisers who are stationed in War Production Board regional and district offices.

The enactment of Public Law 603 has aided the Navy Department in liberalizing its procurement policy toward greater decentralizing the placement of its contracts.

There is appended hereto a report of the Bureau of Ordnance, dated February 4, 1943, which should serve as an example of the trend toward greater utilization of the productive capacity of smaller manufacturing enterprises.

JAMES FORRESTAL.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, February 4, 1943.

MEMORANDUM

To: Lt. (Jr. Gr.) J. W. Davis, Jr., room 1210.
Subject: Recapitulation of contracts.

1. The following is a recapitulation of contracts entered into during the periods indicated:

	Manufacturers whose assets are more than $1,000,000	Manufacturers whose assets are between $1,000,000 and $500,000	Manufacturers whose assets are less than $500,000
Supply contracts:			
July 1, 1939, to Jan. 1, 1940	$51,902,867.82	$1,807,432.44	$370,926.37
Jan. 1, 1942, to July 1, 1942	1,244,513,671.64	251,929,640.52	56,780,570.92
July 1, 1942, to Oct. 31, 1942	1,034,017,115.37	77,239,252.38	81,531,722.91
Facilities contracts:			
July 1, 1939, to Jan. 1, 1940	60,858,884.50	365,174.66	(1)
Jan. 1, 1942, to July 1, 1942	115,868,350.14	19,445,041.27	2,313,205.94
July 1, 1942, to Oct. 31, 1942	11,796,432.86	3,406,021.67	29,854.00

[1] No contracts.

R. DAHL,
Lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve.

Shortage of Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently discussed the man-shortage problem as it relates to food production in California, and took as my basis the operation of one farm. I showed where the shortage this year on just this one farm would consume the total rationing points of my entire district for 2 months.

Now, I am inserting in the RECORD a report from the California Department of Agriculture further enlarging on this subject by showing the estimated crop loss in the entire State of California for 1942. This further illustrates the point that this is the time for action and not words, because there is a certainty that this loss will not be reduced this coming year unless something is done immediately to alleviate the cause:

CALIFORNIA COOPERATIVE CROP REPORTING SERVICE,
Sacramento January 20, 1943.

ESTIMATED CROP LOSSES IN CALIFORNIA DUE TO FARM-LABOR SHORTAGES—1942

In response to requests from several groups identified with the State's agricultural industry, the staff of this service has prepared estimates of the losses of California crops during 1942 that may be directly attributed to farm-labor shortages. These are shown below for the crops already harvested, and in which sizable losses of this character have occurred.

Such estimates do not have the same degree of reliability as estimates of total production. They must be based upon collective opinion and partial checks, carefully weighed and appraised. The usual sampling methods are not generally adapted for use in determining distribution of losses where several causes are involved. This is especially true with regard to labor shortages as a causative factor since there has been a tendency to exaggerate such losses. While it would be possible to obtain fairly accurate records of losses from specified causes by making repeated farm-to-farm surveys for this purpose, it is obvious that such procedure would be prohibitive in cost. Furthermore, losses of crops frequently result from a combination of causes, and at times it is difficult for even the producer to accurately evaluate the separate causes of losses.

It is well to bear in mind that some loss is sustained each year in the production and harvesting of perishable crops. Losses estimated herein as assignable to labor shortages apply to those over and above such usual harvesting losses or abandonment, and to losses sustained at other critical periods of crop development.

Some losses attributable to labor shortages doubtless took place in crops other than those listed, but such were small in relation to total production of each, and a reasonably accurate appraisal of them is extremely difficult. Additional intangible losses, represented by reduced grade, quality, and price of products, were sustained because of inadequacy of labor. Again, the net income of producers was further reduced in many cases by excessive expenses in securing and maintaining labor crews, as turnover in farm labor during the past season was unusually high.

Loss of production directly resulting from evacuation of Japanese during the spring of 1942 is excluded from these estimates.

Crop	Harvested			Estimated losses due to farm-labor shortages	
	Quantity	Unit	Total value	Quantity	Value
Apricots	208,000	Ton	$14,331,000	5,000	$344,000
Cherries	27,000	Ton	3,996,000	3,000	444,000
Cling peaches	417,000	Ton	24,394,000	4,000	234,000
Bartlett pears	212,000	Ton	13,610,000	2,000	128,000
Prunes	174,000	Ton (dry)	24,360,000	900	126,000
Plums	66,000	Ton	5,108,000	6,000	464,000
Asparagus	79,960	Ton	10,907,000	700	80,000
Celery	5,905,000	Half crate	9,556,000	100,000	180,000
Strawberries	2,472,000	6-quart crate	2,809,000	360,000	405,000
Canning tomatoes	798,600	Ton	14,744,000	130,000	2,405,000
Sugar beets	2,339,000	Ton	15,204,000	200,000	1,300,000
Total					6,110,000

Estimates for similar losses for cotton, olives, and walnuts not yet available. (The estimated aggregate value of major California crops harvested in 1942 amounted to $769,000,000.)

In addition to those listed, losses were sustained in cotton, olives, and walnuts due to scarcity of farm labor. Cotton and olive harvests are still in progress, and the results of usual gleaning of walnuts is not yet known. Losses in the cotton crop are represented by unharvested cotton, and by reduced quality of lint and seed due to winter weather damage. Much cotton is not yet picked, and total losses in this crop that may be sustained can yet amount to greater value than that of any other crop shown in the table.

Reducing these estimates of crop losses to a common denominator of values reveals that only a small part of the total fruit and field crops of the State was lost. To date the heaviest loss took place in canning tomatoes. However, had not extremely favorable weather conditions prevailed throughout the harvesting season, losses certainly would have been much heavier.

GEORGE A. SCOTT,
Principal Agricultural Statistician.

Florida Barge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending in the Committee on Appropriations a bill (H. R. 1353) introduced by Congressman HENDRICKS of Florida, which provides for an appropriation of $44,000,000 for the construction of the Florida barge canal which was authorized by Congress last July.

It is imperative that this bill receive prompt and favorable consideration of the committee and that it become law without delay if we are to avoid a repetition of the hardships and inconveniences suffered this winter by the people of my home State of Rhode Island, as well as those of the other New England States.

Reliable construction men assure us that the decline of so-called war-production construction is making available all labor and equipment necessary to complete this project in 8 to 10 months. This would permit use of the canal to transport petroleum products to New England in time to be of real help to our people before the middle of next winter.

It must be borne in mind that the shortage of petroleum products in Rhode Island this winter was so severe that many manufacturing plants had to close for several days, the health of school children was jeopardized by inadequately heated school buildings, and business and office buildings were put on a 5-day week by the State Government.

The people of Rhode Island are patriotic and gladly make every sacrifice to help the war effort. They should not, however, be made to endure hardships that can be avoided.

Immediate action by Congress in providing the necessary funds and the prompt execution of the construction work by the Petroleum Administrator's Office would go a long way toward solving our fuel-oil problem.

Under the permission granted me, I include as a part of these remarks a resolution on the subject which was

passed by the Rhode Island General Assembly. The resolution follows:

House Joint Resolution 693

Joint resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Rhode Island to use every effort to have passed by Congress the necessary appropriation making funds available to complete the barge canal across Florida in order that oil may be brought by barges from Texas to New Jersey and transshipped there to New England and other northeastern points

Whereas there is now pending in the House Ways and Means Committee in Congress a bill appropriating $44,000,000 for the construction of the Florida barge canal as a practical way of helping assure a more adequate supply of fuel for New England and other northeastern points next winter; and

Whereas all that is necessary to complete the route from the oil field area to New Jersey is the barge canal across Florida, tying together the two existing waterways; and

Whereas construction of the canal was authorized by vote of Congress last July, but the beginning of work awaits the passage of the appropriation making funds available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they hereby are requested to use every effort to have passed by Congress the necessary appropriation making funds available to complete the barge canal across Florida in order that oil may be brought by barges from Texas to New Jersey and transshipped there to New England and other northeastern points; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of State to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States.

What Procurement Division of Treasury Is Doing for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert in the RECORD at this time a letter which I, as chairman of the Committee on Small Business of the House, have received from the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, which embodies a statement on what that Division has done in aiding small business. It discloses a small-business consciousness. It is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 10, 1943.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. PATMAN: As requested in your letter of January 19, 1943, I am pleased to give you the following statement on what the Procurement Division has done in aiding small business.

The policies of the Procurement Division had previously been liberalized under the First War Powers Act, enabling it to negotiate contracts in lieu of formal advertisements. Under this changed procedure the Procurement Division was in a position to conform to the intent of the Murray-Patman Act with few additional changes.

On January 24, 1942, a section in the Procurement Division was established to effectuate the policy of spreading the business in keeping with an order issued January 14, 1942, permitting a departure from the usual method of procurement and permitting contracts to be executed with as many contractors as possible, equipped to meet required specifications at varying prices within reason. As a result of this broadened policy the Procurement Division spread business among many distressed manufacturers.

Illustrative of the action taken by the Procurement Division to spread business under the lend-lease program and related war activities was the wide distribution of orders with respect to the following purchases:

Commodities	Extent of distribution	Total of purchases
Lumber, plywood, and veneers	215	$25,000,000.00
Copper tubing	9	2,595,666.00
Hard tools, reamers, and drills	125	6,144,324.79
Blankets	19	1,982,468.00
Bolts, nuts, screws, rivets, and washers	36	2,393,180.50
Abrasives	38	6,871,096.82
Cable	42	8,873,030.19
Handle blanks	9	292,389.22
Razor blades	12	220,025.00
Hot water heaters and tanks	19	1,693,793.55
Shoes	25	896,654.66
Cotton yarn	16	1,210,663.25
Clothing	35	1,826,832.50
Gloves	6	326,275.00
Tires, tubes, and flaps	33	20,454,936.94
Textiles	50	7,334,042.44
Space heaters and furnaces	36	3,333,029.02
Lavatories, fittings, and trims	17	1,363,263.56
Water closet combinations	7	1,237,227.50
Kitchen ranges	16	1,715,291.00
Wood water closet seats	3	120,000.00
Bath tubs and fittings	13	2,176,783.00
Medicine cabinets, bathroom	5	143,920.00
Refrigerators	10	3,072,299.02
Lighting fixtures	4	169,500.00
Kitchen sinks, laundry trays, and combinations	20	2,675,765.17

In cooperation with the War Production Board, the Procurement Division has sponsored and encouraged the use of Victory model desks, which eliminated the use of critical materials and have many other advantages from the viewpoint of furnishings for the war period. Many of these contracts were placed with furniture companies not previously manufacturing desks, and they would have otherwise suffered from lack of business. Normally the requirements for desks could have been fulfilled by 10 suppliers, whereas our orders were distributed among 72 suppliers, involving $10,724,380.

A similar approach was made in the case of electric-fan requirements, whereby a Victory model, stripped of critical materials, was purchased from several firms at an average price of $6.05, as compared with the peacetime standard fan average cost of $14.98.

A further effort has been made to encourage prime contractors to enter into subcontracts, where practicable, with some success.

The War Production Board, through its Smaller War Plants Division, has established an office in the Procurement Division Building to act as a contact office for the purpose of reviewing requisitions received under the lend-lease program. This review is followed by recommendations for purchase from plants needing relief and capable of producing the required material or equipment, and every reasonable effort is made to comply with the recommendations. When it becomes evident that a recommended plant is not adequately equipped to produce the required product, or too distantly located to meet delivery requirements, the matter is referred to the contact office, and only after consultation and complete agreement is the purchase made from other sources.

That office was established during October 1942, and within the period of 3 months from November 1, 1942, through January 31, 1943, a total of 116 awards were made to small war plants recommended by that office, aggregating a total of $14,424,114.61.

Through this coordination of effort, it pleases me to state that in the January report is reflected the fact that 90 percent of the dollar volume of business recommended for placement with small war plants has been accomplished.

It is the disposition of this department to continue to exert every effort to accomplish the intent of the Murray-Patman Act.

Sincerely yours,

D. W. BELL,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

Why We Are Fighting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Why We Are Fighting," delivered by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] in Washington, D. C., on February 18, 1943, and broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System, in Washington.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A few weeks ago a young soldier from a country home in my State, while on a short furlough in Washington, called by my office for a brief visit, and told me he believed he was on his way to a port of embarkation.

As he left my office he turned to me and said, "Senator, I am proud to go and do my part, but I am wondering if this awful war is another search for the end of the rainbow of world peace, to be forgotten after the war is over and we are left on the field of honor thousands of miles away from our homeland; or shall we find definitely the treasured goal of lasting peace; or will my little boy have to face another death struggle when he reaches manhood? My father lies in Flanders Field."

Later, unable to dismiss the soldier boy from my mind, I talked with one of my colleagues. He said I should have assured the soldier that if we view from a position high enough, the ends of the rainbow meet forming a perfect circle, and that in this war we are fighting on a higher plane for a sustained peace around the entire world, and that we will find the goal of our efforts where the ends of the rainbow of our hope meet at the peace conference.

Not long ago we celebrated our twenty-third Armistice Day, but during another world war. November 11, as a national holiday, has been correctly named an "armistice," just a cessation of world hostilities for less than one generation.

During the closing days of World War No. 1, the American people were undoubtedly in accord with the essentials of Woodrow Wilson's 14-point plans for a sustained world peace, but after the stress of battle died away, our own United States Senate refused to ratify the treaty. We made a separate peace with our common enemy. The League of Nations was doomed to failure from that day.

Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill cannot state any set of war or peace aims nobler and better, nor more eloquently than did Woodrow Wilson. Then, if the 14 points did not inspire the establishment of a permanent international government to enforce peace, why expect the 8-point Atlantic Charter to do better?

No statements of war aims nor peace aims will avail if not backed by the people themselves. The Atlantic Charter must be understood and sanctioned definitely by the members of the United Nations before an armistice is signed in this war. Is it possible that it will be another case of winning the war, but losing the peace?

We have learned a useful lesson—that among the democratic peoples of the world there should be a closer bond than the mere possession of a common enemy for the duration. There can be no question that the way to cement our common interest is to cooperate as closely in peace as we are required to cooperate when the emergency of war is upon us. Especially must this apply to our loyal pan-American neighbors, who, too, have fought and died for their liberties. They must be a party to any sustained peace plans to guarantee the Western Hemisphere and the world against another world war.

It will be infinitely easier to reach a common agreement on the practical measures required to carry out the essentials of the Atlantic Charter during these months in which the United Nations are joined together in the common struggle than if the search for that agreement be postponed until after the war is won, when the blessings of peace, even temporary, have returned.

Lord Halifax recently asserted that "Mankind will march to little purpose unless we try to achieve a better way of life in the future for all men, irrespective of who they are or where they live."

Very recently Dr. Wei Tao-ming, Chinese Ambassador, expressed the view that "When victory comes after the present war, we must continue to hold together, steadfast and unwavering, in order to win the peace."

Now that we know it, why can't we tell the American people that we, the people, and not the Versailles Treaty makers, were mainly responsible for the collapse of the former plan for world peace? History must ultimately record the truth that the American people were not willing to risk the trouble and expense necessary to see that the Versailles Treaty should succeed before the whole world.

It is infinitely more practicable and economical to assume our share in effectively sponsoring a plan for insuring world peace than to again suffer the horrors of another useless war of blood, sweat, and tears.

People of all countries know we are not a warlike Nation. We covet not the lands nor the possessions of any nation on earth; we expect no reparations nor territory of any enemy at the close of this war. We have not only favored international justice, we have shown our faith by working for it in principle.

Through modern methods of communication and transportation, countries are much closer commercially, socially, and economically than were the Thirteen Original States when Washington cautioned us against foreign entanglements. The world has thus grown so small that we are our neighbor's keeper whether we admit it or not. When our neighbor is in trouble, we are in trouble, for if he is subdued by a ruthless enemy, we have to suffer with him.

Perhaps there are some Americans who are isolationists out of prejudice or mere obstinacy; many no doubt take that attitude through indifference as to the true nature of our responsibility. This certainly accounts for the isolationism of most Americans. In peacetimes the average American—secure in his own freedom—is naturally indifferent as to how other nations or peoples may govern themselves. He wants to be let alone.

Since the birth of our Nation the American people have acquired political and economic powers faster than they had ever been acquired before by any other peoples. What we either did not know, or chose to ignore, was that vital political power is never acquired without the simultaneous requirement of a commensurate responsibility.

In our world of the future we must learn that those who have the power to keep the peace have the responsibility to keep the peace, regardless of their personal preference. The power alone imposes the responsibility. Those on whom it is imposed may try to deny it or evade it, but they cannot abolish it. If they do, their own and our punishment is as inevitable as the night follows the day. If they avoid the responsibility to keep the peace, there will be no peace for our people nor the world. If there is no peace, there can be no freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom of speech, nor freedom of religion.

Peace will reign in this world only where and when the preponderance of the free independent nations of the world is definitely committed to the support of law and order. The United States, when this war is over, will no doubt possess an unprecedentedly large share of all the military power remaining in the world. If that power is not committed to the support of international law and order, we may look for another world war within the next generation.

National self-complacency as we have known it in the twenties and thirties must not become dominant in this country again. The old idea that we are so removed from international strife and dictators that nobody will attack us was blown up at Pearl Harbor.

Democracy is not property. It is not a shore line, nor an island possession, nor maritime commerce. It is an ideal founded on centuries of trial and error in attempts at self-government and free intercourse between nations. For us it is the basis of our American way of life, and when that is no longer safe nothing we have is safe.

We have our faults, and they are many, but the obsession that we are a master race is not among them; and once the people of America decide that it is their duty to support and aid in enforcing law and order throughout the world, they will do just that.

Let us resolve that the awful sacrifice we are making in the present war shall not be bargained away at the peace table. Let it not be said that we failed to keep the faith with those who fell at Pearl Harbor, Midway, Morocco, and Bataan.

History has already recorded that we failed to keep the faith with our men who fought to make the world safe for democracy on the soil of France and Belgium in the last World War, and our sons may soon sleep with their fathers who fell in Flanders' fields.

The American people are not afraid of the Axis Powers. We were not afraid of the Kaiser 25 years ago. We are not afraid of the combined forces of Hitler, Hirohito, and Mussolini now. We must assume the responsibility that definitely rests upon us and our gallant allies to make the world safe for democracy, and to keep it so. The responsibility is both dangerous and expensive. Nevertheless, it is ours. We can try to repudiate it, but we cannot avoid it. Repudiation will inevitably bring a repetition of the punishment we and our sons are enduring now for having repudiated it more than 20 years ago.

We are again fighting for peace—a sustaining peace—not alone for our own America but for peace-loving peoples everywhere. A nobler cause never sprang from human breast, and a nation dedicated to such a holy cause can never die.

Function of Tax Dollars in a War Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, at the request and invitation of the Secretary of the Treasury I made a brief radio statement last Tuesday evening respecting the function of tax dollars in a war economy. I ask that my statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to join my able friend, Congressman KNUTSON, and the distinguished Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Sullivan, in their vivid sentiments in behalf of total American fidelity to total war in order that we may achieve total victory as swiftly as possible. Total fidelity on the home front—no matter what it costs—involves an easy price compared with the risk and sacrifice, yes the blood and death, which are the coin in which our fighting sons pay for their love of our common heritage. But this total fidelity at home is absolutely indispensable to victory abroad. Total home fidelity in maximum war production, in the conservation of essential supplies, in the purchase of the bonds that buy the bullets, in the payment of hard taxes, in the relatively easy abandonment of some creature comforts, and in devoted singleness of purpose to win—this total home fidelity is our civilian contribution to the colors; our civilian partnership with the men who face our enemies on land and sea and in the air; our civilian duty to our citizenship; our civilian privilege as Americans; our civilian date with destiny.

Total war means that all our resources in men, machines, money and materials, beyond what is needed to maintain minimum civilian needs, must be devoted to waging war. This includes, of course, prudent allocations to make certain that our war economy in munitions and in food is adequately sustained along with adequate manpower at the fighting front. But it means, over all, that more than one-half of everything we as a Nation can produce must be devoted to waging war. It means that everyone among us must enlist, each in his own way, for the duration. I am confident that those of us upon the home front will need no exhortations to these ends. We need only to know the truth. Then we shall sustain our soldiers and sailors and marines. We will sacrifice our comforts to their needs. We will sacrifice our needs to their comforts.

Tonight, my friends, Congressman KNUTSON and I are glad to cooperate with the Treasury Department in emphasizing one vital phase of this challenge which comes to its next deadline on March 15—taxes. It is never a pleasant subject at best—and yet I wonder. If there's an exhilarating thrill for us in news of brave American triumphs at the fighting front, we are entitled to an exhilarating thrill when we pay our fighting taxes on the home front, because our taxes go to war. Every tax dollar answers reveille. Tax dollars fought at Guadalcanal. Tax dollars bombed Tokyo. Tax dollars are bivouaced tonight in Tunis. Tax dollars will march on Rome. Tax dollars will be in that

immortal Berlin parade. Without them there could be no Army, no Navy, no armada of the skies. Without them unbridled inflation would drive our homeland to economic suicide. Without them needlessly and inhumanely accumulated debts would curse our children's children. Tax dollars are patriots. Tax dollars are buddies to the American Expeditionary Force. Tax dollars are not just "taxes." They are not just "dollars." They wear the uniform of freedom. They step to the music of the Union. They salute the Stars and Stripes. Under such circumstances who cares to say that paying taxes should not be a proud privilege for proud Americans who crave a part in victory?

We in the Congress are under obligations to write a new 1943 tax bill which will equalize these burdens so far as is humanly possible. In my view, we are under obligations to put taxes on a pay-as-we-go basis. We are under obligations to reduce expenditures to the last possible degree not inconsistent with the war effort. We are under obligations to simplify tax methods. You may be sure of every possible effort in these directions. But nothing we do can make war inexpensive; and nothing we do can affect your obligation to file your return and make your first quarterly payment by next March 15. If there are subsequent changes in the tax law to your advantage, you will be wholly protected by subsequent readjustments. But there is no recourse now except to report and pay between now and March 15. That is our indispensable job on the home front. To fail it would be to fail our fighting sons and to fail our sentry post. There will be no failure, my fellow countrymen, because we are all enlisted in this war for our triumphant Republic.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, one of the best speeches I have been privileged to read lately is the address delivered by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] at the first annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Inc., at St. Louis, Mo., January 19, 1943. Rural electrification has no better friend in the Congress than the junior Senator from Georgia, who is chairman of the subcommittee on agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations. He has rendered most valuable service in the cause of rural electrification. I ask unanimous consent that the very enlightening address delivered by the Senator from Georgia be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, this is a high privilege which I enjoy in being permitted to take part in this significant meeting. I have been gratified to see so many of my constituents from the deep South demonstrate their profound interest in all that pertains to the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration by their presence here today. There are some real farmers in this gathering. The Rural Electrification Administration has shown for once and all what farmers can do on a cooperative basis.

I recall many years ago hearing of an alleged farm meeting which was called in my State. A large program was planned. Many high-powered speakers were invited. The farmers, as usual, were at a very low ebb, and this meeting was called to solve all the farm problems. After the meeting was under way and the dinner had been consumed, the speaker was up addressing himself to the question of "What is Wrong with the Farmer." All of a sudden there was a great commotion out at the door. The confusion grew so great the speaker had to desist. It threatened the entire meeting. Finally quiet was restored, and one of those who was sitting near where the commotion started said, "Go ahead, Mr. Speaker, it is all right now, that was just a fool farmer trying to get into this meeting." [Laughter.]

This is a real farmers' organization. This is a significant meeting of this great group of representatives of cooperatives sponsored by the Rural Electrification Administration. For the first time, you have gathered to combine all the power which under our democratic system of government resides in the members of these cooperatives, in presenting a common front, a common front to retain the gains which you have made heretofore, and to close up ranks as we press forward at the very earliest opportunity to our objective of making electricity available to every farm home in the United States and in assuring the lowest possible rate to every farm consumer. [Applause.]

In my humble judgment, the historian of the future in covering the events of the past 10 years will point to the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration as one of the really great strides which our Nation has made in its entire existence in building a real democracy. [Applause.] Too high tribute cannot be paid to that great American Progressive, George W. Norris [applause] for his unremitting efforts in bringing this organization into existence.

We who have been interested in this program since its inception realize how fortunate we have been in the caliber of the men who have headed the Rural Electrification Administration. It has been my pleasure and privilege to know each one of them personally, and each and every one of them were imbued with a love of the work that they were doing; they were unafraid of criticism and they were men of ability and capacity. We have been fortunate in the personnel of the several boards of directors of all the cooperatives with which I am familiar. And the fact that such great strides should have been made by the several cooperatives in 45 of our States bears tribute to the zeal of each of you who are taking time off from your own private affairs here today in order to make plans for the future.

In peacetimes we look upon the program of the Rural Electrification as a power for democracy. Private enterprise had grown too timid to venture out on the farm. It had not had the vision to span the mountains and the plains, to go down the valleys and across the rivers to bring electricity to where the farmer lives This program was founded in that vision. The farmer has been producing food and clothing for us all in the present while compelled to live in the past. [Applause.] He lived in a world, a world which enjoyed more blessings of science and progress than any had ever imagined or visualized but a few years ago but by the very force of circumstances he was compelled to live in darkness and in drudgery. Our object is to bring him into the light and leisure that is common to our civilization. [Applause.]

This program has shown the boys and girls who were seeking a way to leave the farm that life may be pleasant there, that they may enjoy the radio and the leisure to read, to improve themselves, and thereby become better citizens and contribute more to their Government.

Democracy is rooted in the soil. Without a vigorous, a happy rural life, the institutions of democracy cannot survive, and this great program has contributed more than any other thing of which I know to give the rural life the incentive to carry on and to keep agriculture as our fundamental vocation and bulwark of our democracy from perishing from this civilization of ours. [Applause.]

We have a service now that, as other inventions of science such as television and others we cannot envision today, can be had in the homes of people everywhere. The boys and girls and the people on the farm will enjoy them even as do their city cousins. One would not have thought a brief period ago the first meeting of the representatives of these cooperatives would be held in response to the call of the country to make plans for contributing to the success and victory in a great war that is vital to our existence as a people.

This war has caused us to temporarily desist from the full culmination of the Rural Electrification Administration program. That is one of the many sacrifices that is required of us. The pressure of war legislation has caused us to be unable to bring to passage before this time of the Rankin-Russell bill, of which I am proud to be a coauthor with that stout fighter for rural electrification, Congressman JOHN RANKIN from Mississippi. [Applause.] It has been laid aside, of course, temporarily, and I use that word advisedly. At the very first opportunity it is our intention to endeavor to press it to passage.

The splendid record of repayments recited here by Mr. Slattery shows that no sounder investment has been made by any of the loaning agencies of Government than the loans that have been made by the Rural Electrification Administration, but the rural cooperatives are entitled, as a matter of simple right, to a better interest rate and to a longer amortization of these loans. [Applause.]

A few months ago when men talked of the American way of life we envisioned a new radio, a new automobile, a little larger bank account, a better suit of clothes, a better house, plenty of food. When we consider the dire fate which has overtaken the conquered people of Europe we realize all too well that those things are only incidental in the American way of life. We realize that unless we are willing to forego temporarily some of those luxuries we have enjoyed as the richest people of the earth, that we may suffer the humiliation and the debasement of other people, and we are called upon to battle to the very death for the simple rights for Americans and for our posterity to hold up their heads as freemen.

The one supreme effort before the American people today is, of course, to win the war at the earliest possible time and with the smallest possible loss of life and of wealth. Every American citizen must dedicate himself to the relentless prosecution of this war until the final victory is achieved. The war effort is paramount, whether on the fighting line, on the production line, on the farm, on the home front. We have no time now for business as usual, politics as usual, strikes as usual, or for, indeed, the accustomed life of this country, until we have been assured that the policy of enslavement by force represented by the Axis thugs and bandits have been forever crushed and forever buried. [Applause.]

There can be no compromise with the forces of evil which threaten us. One might as well undertake a compromise with a rattlesnake as with either Hitler or Hirohito. They must be crushed and crushed completely. No sacrifice is too great to enable us to achieve that end. The stake in this contest, as we all know, is whether we shall remain as freemen or be slaves.

When we were attacked at Pearl Harbor the first reaction of our people was to seek to get on a war footing. In the haste and

confusion of that hour we thought only of machinery. We knew that war had been mechanized, and we discussed war in terms of planes and tanks and motorized infantry and motorized artillery. We thought of it as moving forward propelled by gasoline. We devoted all our time and our talents and our energies to building the machinery, and in our haste we overlooked certain fundamental facts, and we forgot about things to which we were accustomed but which were just as essential to the waging of successful war. This meeting here today is to in part take up that slack. It is to mobilize the leadership represented by you men and women here into a nucleus to carry on the production of farm commodities, that are just as essential to the successful conduct of war as planes or tanks or any other of the modern machinery of warfare.

That great captain, Napoleon Bonaparte, once stated that an army moved forward on its stomach. And here today, despite the motorization of war, we find that all of the planes and all of the tanks and all of the motorized equipment on earth will avail us nothing unless the men that operate them are properly fed and are properly clothed. That is one essential requirement of waging warfare successfully which has not changed with time.

Little did we realize when we passed the legislation creating the Rural Electrification Administration that we were forging such a mighty weapon of warfare. We are now faced with a real crisis in farm production in this country. The attractive wages of industry have caused a great migration from the farm. The Army and the Navy have taken their toll of farm labor. At this period, when requirements of lend-lease are greater than before, when it is necessary to secure more food and clothing for our increasing Army than ever before in our history, we find that farm labor has been seriously depleted; that farmers are having great difficulty in obtaining the necessary machinery, fertilizer, and other things necessary to make crops; and this critical situation in which our country finds itself is a challenge which the American farmer must meet today.

Food is, indeed, an offensive weapon of war today. As Mr. Slattery quoted the Secretary of Agriculture, food will win the war and food will write the peace. It is known everywhere that the hope of securing food and clothing was a mighty factor in the ease with which our forces took over a great part of French North Africa. The hope of securing food and clothing produced by the farms of the United States keeps alive the spirit of resistance and inspires the flickering light of hope in the hearts of all of the conquered people of Europe today.

With this great handicap of labor, the American farmer will, in my opinion, rise in this emergency and will supply the needs of the Nation, and in this great accomplishment power which is furnished by the Rural Electrification Administration will be an important factor. The Department of Agriculture estimates that almost 2,000,000 active farm laborers have left the farms within the past 18 months, either for industry or for the Army and Navy. The difficulties are great. But, the stakes are high, and the contribution to the welfare of your country will be inestimable.

The Congress has been somewhat derelict in not taking the proper steps to keep the labor on the farm. Everyone of us should have known it was impossible for any farmer to compete with the wages that are being paid in industry today. Some of us have felt that farm prices were too low to furnish an incentive for production as well as to enable the farmer to meet the cost of his production. Those difficulties, to those who love freedom, who are descended from those who were able to wring freedom from the hand of tyranny, will be but an incentive to greater efforts.

The farmer may well be the unsung hero of our victory in this war. No poet will sing hymns to his fortitude and to his unremitting labor. No medals will be pinned on the farmer's breast. They do not even award the farmer an E for excellence in production as they do those who work in defense industries, although I think they surely should. There should be some recognition of his superhuman effort. [Applause.] I made that suggestion to the Secretary of Agriculture some months ago. I was interested in reading the paper today to see where somebody else had made a similar suggestion but he had coupled his with the idea that we send around stars from Hollywood to the farmers to display these badges and pin the badges on the farmer's chest. [Applause.] That may meet with a hearty response on the part of the farmer, but all these stars had better look out for the farmer's wife and I suspect the farmer would rather have the farmer girl with pink cheeks to pin the badge on him. [Applause.] Whether he secures this honor or not, the farmer will have the consciousness in his own soul of having made a real contribution to the salvation of his Nation.

I do not share the optimism of some of those about this war. Our men are performing superhuman feats on many fields of battle. American soldiers are stationed throughout the world, more than 100 places outside of continental United States, and at 30 or more of those they are at death's grips with the enemy. But we have just now begun to fight, and I fear that the hard road to final victory will be longer than some of the experts think. It will be a great tragedy if the idea is implanted in the minds of the American people that this war is just about over, because if those experts should be wrong, if we should relax in our efforts, considering the character of the foe with which we contend, that relaxation could be fatal.

We know that the American soldier in this war, that the Axis leaders said was soft, has lived up to the finest traditions of American heroism. They have proved again, on sea and sod, that they could meet their God in a manner that becometh men. We on the home front must be worthy of the courage of those on the battle front. [Applause.]

Even though the farmer does not have the panoply and the fanfare that may attach to some, he will not in this emergency let his sons or the sons of his neighbor or the sons of any American mother down. He will give his all to furnish the elemental necessities of war. Those of you who have believed in and fought for the rural electrification program as a powerful instrument to spread and to entrench democracy are confident that as a weapon of war it will be even more powerful in bringing the final victory to the flag that we all love. I thank you. [Applause.]

A Decade of Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared reviewing the 10 years of the Roosevelt administration in the matter of legislation and executive policies, both in our domestic and foreign relations. The title of this compilation is "A Decade of Achievement."

There being no objection the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When Franklin D. Roosevelt was inaugurated as President of the United States, on March 4, 1933, the country was suffering from an unparalleled depression. Agriculture, banking, industry, and labor—in fact, every group of the American people—had passed through nearly 4 years of present distress and fear for the future. The physical and mental strains of such conditions were intensified by the lack of any program, policy, or leadership which gave the slightest hope of recovery.

With the very first official acts of President Roosevelt, it was evident that the people had chosen a bold and vigorous leader, with a public-spirited policy and a carefully considered program. On the first business day following his inauguration he declared a national banking moratorium—a move which had the immediate effect of preventing widespread bankruptcy. When Congress met at his summons in a special session beginning on March 9, it endorsed the President's program by adopting on that same day an Emergency Banking Act which both reflected his policy and enabled him to take immediate measures toward the restoration of financial confidence.

Between March 9 and the date of adjournment of the special session of Congress, June 16, 1933, a body of emergency legislation was enacted which brought immediate relief to practically every person in the United States and laid a foundation for positive future action that could—and did—restore general prosperity. For this magnificent achievement the credit belongs primarily to President Roosevelt, though a large share may be claimed by the Congress for laying aside petty considerations and personal motives and cooperating with him for the good of all the people. A mere outline of the emergency legislation shows the scope of the President's program; over 10 years of experience with the laws in question and with later laws suggested or supported by the President have demonstrated that the program was not merely comprehensive, but sound, practical, and constructive.

BANKING AND FINANCE

In practically all the States, it was found necessary to proclaim "bank holidays" in order to deal with the spread of financial panic, hoarding, runs on banks, and bank failures; yet conditions grew worse rather than better. The Emergency Banking Relief Act, which gave the President emergency powers over all banks, foreign exchange transactions, and the export or hoarding of gold or silver; authorized the reopening of sound banks and the reorganization of others; and gave to the Federal Reserve banks enlarged powers as to note issues and loans, had an immediate tonic effect. It was followed by the Banking Act of 1933, by certain financial provisions contained in the Farm Relief Act, by the Securities Act, by the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act (title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act), by the Home Owners' Loan Act, and by an Insurance Companies Act authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to subscribe for the preferred stock of insurance companies and to purchase their capital notes. Taken together, this body of legislation restored financial stability, provided much-needed credit to farmers, home owners and businessmen, and gave protection to investors. The favorable results were felt in all social groups, from the banking interests to the man threatened with foreclosure of the mortgage on his home or farm. Hope and help for all were provided by a program meeting the strictest tests of economic soundness.

THE BUDGET AND ECONOMY MEASURES

The unbalanced Budget of the United States had given rise to much uneasiness. President Roosevelt decided that, despite necessary and unavoidable expenditures for emergency purposes, great savings might be made in general operating costs. The Economy Act of 1934 placed limitations upon payments to war veterans, suspended automatic increases in the salaries of public officers and employees, provided for an actual lowering of such salaries not to exceed 15 percent—based on decline in living costs—and made a 15-percent reduction in the salaries of Members of Congress. It also opened the way for further economies through the reorganization of executive departments.

In order to increase revenues, the rates of taxation were increased in certain instances, and various new taxes were imposed. The act amending the National Prohibition Act permitted the manufacture and sale of beers and light wines, and taxed the same. A number of reemployment and relief taxes were imposed by the National Industrial Recovery Act.

By these measures, a surplus of receipts over general expenditures was obtained, although general expenditures included the servicing of loans floated for emergency purposes. In addition, it was necessary to make more than $7,300,000,000 of expenditures beyond revenues for emergency purposes. In other words, economy measures balanced the normal budget and cared for the servicing of loans. Extraordinary expenditures were made which helped to restore economic normalcy and were thus essentially capital investments.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Unemployment (Reforestation) Relief Act, which was effective for a 2-year period, attacked the pressing and dangerous problem of widespread unemployment. It authorized the President to provide for the employment on public works such as afforestation and flood prevention, of unemployed citizens of the United States; and to furnish such persons with housing, subsistence, clothing, medical attendance, hospital care, and a cash allowance. The Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933 provided that a Federal Emergency Relief Administration should be set up for 2 years, to cooperate with States in the relief of unemployment by making grants to each State equal to one-third of the amount spent by it or its subdivisions for the same object. Provision was also made for certain adjustments. The National Employment Service Act provided that a new system of public employment offices should be established. The Federal Government was to administer these offices in cooperation with the State Governments.

Another important measure for the relief of unemployment was contained in the National Industrial Recovery Act which (among other provisions to be discussed later) set up a Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works to carry out a comprehensive program including the following features: Construction and improvement of public highways and buildings, conservation and development of national resources, housing construction and slum clearance, naval construction, and other public works. Grants up to 30 percent of the cost might be made to States, municipalities, and other public bodies in aid of such projects. Provision was made in the National Industrial Recovery Act for aiding persons to purchase subsistence homesteads. This entire program employed on useful enterprises men who would otherwise have suffered the disintegrating effects of long-continued idleness, and who would then have had to be maintained at the expense of the public without being able to render any return; it also "primed the pump" of business recovery by distributing purchasing power without entering into competition with the producers.

INDUSTRY

The National Industrial Recovery Act sought, among other purposes, to give those engaged in any branch of industry an opportunity to cooperate in regulating that branch. This was to be done through the formulation of codes of fair competition by the trade associations or groups of producers in a given industry. The President was authorized to approve such codes upon application to him, if he found that the associations or groups so applying imposed no inequitable restrictions on admission to membership therein, that they were truly representative of the trade or industry concerned, and that the codes were not designed to promote monopolies or to eliminate or oppress small enterprises. Certain labor provisions, to be discussed later, were to be contained in every approved code. Approval by the President made the provisions of the code the standards of fair competition for the given trade, industry, or subdivision thereof; and any violation of such standards was to be deemed an unfair method of competition in commerce, within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

LABOR

The most important measure taken for the immediate benefit of labor, except for the provisions to relieve unemployment, was title I, section 7, of the National Industrial Recovery Act. This section provided that every code of fair competition issued under the title should contain the following conditions: (1) That employees shall have the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and shall be free from the interference, restraint, or coercion of employers of labor, or their agents, in the designation of such representatives or in self-organization or in other connected activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection; (2) that no employee and no one seeking employment shall be required as a condition of employment to join any company union or to refrain from joining, organizing, or assisting a labor organization of his own choosing; and (3) that employers shall comply with the maximum hours of labor, minimum rates of pay, and other conditions of employment, approved or prescribed by the President.

AGRICULTURE

The Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act which constituted its title II, and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, together with various financial measures already mentioned, and the provision for aid in the purchase of subsistence homesteads, constituted a broad and well-balanced program for the relief of agriculture. It was the purpose of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to raise the income of farmers, by restricting agricultural production until better prices could be obtained for farm products, and by eliminating many wastes in distribution. In addition to making special arrangements for the benefit of cotton farmers, this law authorized the Secretary of Agriculture: "To provide for reduction in the acreage or reduction in the production for market, or both, of any basic agricultural commodity, through agreements with producers or by other voluntary methods; and to provide for rental or benefit payments in connection therewith or upon such part of the production of any basic agricultural commodity required for domestic consumption, in such amounts as the Secretary deems fair and reasonable."

Basic agricultural commodities were defined, for the purposes of the law, as meaning wheat, cotton, field corn, hogs, rice, tobacco, milk and milk products and any regional or market classification, type, or grade thereof. The Secretary of Agriculture was required, however, to exclude any commodity from the operation of the aforesaid provisions during any period, upon finding after due notice and hearing to interested parties, that the conditions of production, marketing, and consumption were such that the law could not be administered to the end of effectuating the declared policy. A processing tax was authorized upon any basic agricultural commodity (to be in effect upon the taking of prescribed action by the Secretary of Agriculture), at a rate equal to the difference between the current average farm price for the commodity and the fair exchange value for the same, or at a rate which would prevent accumulation of surplus stocks and depression of the farm price of the commodity.

RESULTS OF 1933 LEGISLATION

In the decade which has passed since this program was enacted its basic soundness has been self-evident. It has needed modification in certain details, naturally; furthermore, a few of its features were emergency measures which lapsed after a certain length of time. But it is not too much to say that the good results of the program were felt immediately. The American Federation of Labor claimed that some 15,400,000 persons were unemployed, not counting persons on emergency relief work, was reduced to about 5,821,000. The number of bank suspensions, by order of either the supervisory authorities or the directors, dropped from 3,379 in 1933 to 976 in 1934. New financing, including issues of Federal land banks and Federal intermediate credit banks, had dropped to $722,000,000 in 1933; but rose to $1,403,000,000 in 1934. Despite a few seasonal and other fluctuations, the upward movement was steady and sure. Not merely was confidence restored by the President's far-sighted program; a solid basis was laid for the return of prosperity. Most of that program, though introduced in a period of emergency, is of permanent importance.

DEVELOPMENTS OF 1934–38

In 1934 a series of important financing measures, advocated by the President, carried forward the work of financial stabilization. The Gold Reserve Act, the Silver Purchase Act, the revisions of the income tax in the Revenue Act, the Reciprocal Tariff Act, the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, the Corporate Bankruptcy Act, and the Farm Bankruptcy Act were all designed to keep both public and private finances on a firm basis. The credits needed to give confidence and start the wheels of trade and industry turning were provided through the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, the Home Owners' Loan Act, the National Housing Act, and the Loans to Industry Act. Among the other major measures of 1934 were the following: The Jones-Costigan Sugar Stabilization Act, the Bankhead Cotton Control Act, the Jones-Connally Farm Relief Act, the Tobacco Control Act, the Taylor Grazing Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act of 1934, the Collateral Security Act, the Security Exchange Act, the Communications Act, the Public Utilities Review Act, the Railroad Retirement Act, the Vinson naval parity bill, and the Philippine Independence Act. Particular attention should be paid to the last two, since they reflect the long view and a statesmanlike grasp of world affairs which have been of measureless benefit to this country.

In 1935 another group of very important laws was passed, with the support of President Roosevelt. The Social Security Act provided for helping the States to support the needy aged; assist the unemployed; relieve needy dependent children, and mothers with their children; provide health-service agencies; make arrangements for the vocational rehabilitation of the disabled; and assist the blind. Here again, in a single law, there is

seen an achievement toward the public welfare, of monumental proportions.

The National Labor Board, which had been created by the President in 1933, for the purpose of mediating and arbitrating in certain controversies between employers and employees, had been succeeded in 1934 by a National Labor Relations Board. The National Labor Relations Act of 1935 created a new National Labor Relations Board as an independent agency, with power to issue orders enforceable by the courts. In less than three months this Board had rendered 21 decisions, and its subsequent activities have been numerous and important. As an agency for the settlement of industrial disputes, thus cutting down strikes and lockouts, the establishment of this board alone is a social service of inestimable value. The scrupulous fairness with which it has performed its responsible task is shown by the fact that in the vast majority of cases where one of its decisions has been appealed, and the matter has come before the Supreme Court, its action has been upheld. President Roosevelt may well be proud of this agency and its work.

Still other great events marked the year. The Guffey-Snyder Bituminous Coal Stabilization Act was passed; the Wagner-Crosser Railroad Retirement Act and the Frazier-Lemke Farm Mortgage Act took the place of the earlier acts in the same fields, which had been overthrown by the Supreme Court; the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1935, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, the Soil Erosion Act, the Banking Act, the Petroleum Act, the Motor Carrier Act, the Public Utility Holding Company Act, the Doughton Debt Limiting Act, and several other laws, all contributed greatly toward the recovery of social and economic prosperity.

The year 1936 is important because of its aid to agriculture. Since even the amended Agricultural Adjustment Act had been overthrown by the Supreme Court, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act was designed to take its place in providing aid to farmers. The Cotton-Tobacco-Potato Repeal Act, the Tobacco State-Compact Act, the Farm Mortgage Amendatory Act, and the Rural Electrification Act, all helped the agricultural population in one way or another.

The Mississippi River Flood Control Act, the Omnibus Flood Control Act, and the Flood Compact Act, all helped the country at the same time that they helped the unemployment situation. The Government Contracts Act, the so-called Anti-Strikebreaker Act, and the Merchant Marine Act, advanced the interests of labor. Other important laws passed during 1936 include: The National Housing Amendment Act; the Ship Subsidy Act; the Price Discrimination Act; the Commodity Exchange Act; the Army Air Corps Aeroplane Act, the Air Corps Reserve Act, the Tin Protection Act, the Neutrality Act, and the Unlisted Securities Trading Act.

In 1937, the new Bituminous Coal Act was passed, creating a National Bituminous Coal Commission. The Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, and the Carriers' Taxing Act of 1937, provided benefits for a part of the labor group. The Housing Act was designed to aid in correcting the "shortage of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income."

The Farm Tenant Act, the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, and the Farm Credit Act of 1937, all were of direct benefit to farmers. Various other laws carried forward the general program.

In 1938 several laws provided for further expansion of credit to private borrowers. Among these laws were the Commodity Credit Act, the National Housing Act of 1938, and the Recovery Loan Act.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 provided crop insurance for wheat growers, required the Commodity Credit Corporation to make loans on wheat, cotton, or corn crops under certain conditions, and provided for parity payments to farmers raising wheat, corn, tobacco, cotton, or rice, to make up any deficiency in a grower's income arising from decline of the purchasing power of a given unit of his crop.

Further help for the unemployed was given by the Work Relief and Public Works Appropriation Act of 1938. The Fair Labor Standards Act provided minimum wage levels and a normal workweek (with overtime pay for extra hours), in the case of persons engaged in interstate commerce or in enterprises affecting interstate commerce.

The Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act afforded protection to consumers along lines indicated by modern scientific developments.

The Naval Expansion Act was passed in response to the President's recommendation contained in his message to Congress delivered on January 28, 1928. Here the President pointed out the fact that other countries were renewing the active building of warships, urged a 20-percent increase in the naval building program of this country, and requested that building be commenced on two battleships during the calendar year. The act as passed authorized great expansions. The Naval Personnel Act and the Naval Reserve Act were also passed in 1938.

THE WORLD-WAR YEARS

The regular session of Congress in 1939 ended on August 5, before the outbreak of the World War, yet there are definite indications that the President realized the imminence of the conflict, for at least a dozen bills supported by him which were passed at this session were designed to strengthen this country along miltary lines. These include: the Military Appropriation Act, the Supplemental Appropriation Act, the Naval Appropriation Act, the Naval Public Works Act, the National Defense Act, the Naval Air Base Act, the Strategic War Materials Act, the Naval Auxiliary Vessel Act, the Naval Aviation Reserve Act, the Panama Road Act, the Battleship Act (which provided that five battleships be modernized), and the Military Reservation Act. Those who say lightly that the United States was taken unaware and was totally unprepared when the war came need only to look at this list of laws, all passed before a single shot had been fired in Europe, to realize their mistake. Thanks to President Roosevelt, great steps were taken to secure the safety of this country more than 2 years before we entered the war.

Among the other important laws passed in 1939 were: the Agricultural Appropriation Act, the Insect Pest Act, the Relief Appropriation Act, two relief deficiency acts, the Political Activity Act, the Public Salary Tax Act, the Social Security Act, and the Unemployment Compensation Act. Economy and efficiency in Government were promoted by the Government Reorganization Act.

Business and financial interests were aided and supported by such laws as the Export-Import Bank Act of 1939, the Federal Reserve Note Act, the Public Debt Act, the Housing Act, and the Railroad Bankruptcy Act.

The special session of Congress, called because of the outbreak of the second World War, passed the Neutrality Act of 1939, which was an intelligent effort to prevent the United States from becoming involved in the war.

It is not strange that most of the important bills passed in 1940 by Congress under the President's leadership were devoted to military measures. Among them were the Military Establishment Supply Act, the Naval Appropriation Act, three Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Acts, the Army Housing Act, the Naval Expansion Act, the Naval Aircraft and Public Works Act, the Naval Building and Acceleration Act, the Defense Expediting Act, the Two-Ocean Navy Act, the National Guard Act, the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, the Espionage Act, the Foreign Credits Act, the Alien Registration Act, and the Antipropaganda Act. In view of this record, it is beyond question that the President was doing everything in his power to guarantee the security of this country against any tests that the future might bring.

But other needs were not overlooked. The Emergency Relief Act of 1940 helped the poor. At the other end of the scale business interests were assisted by the Reconstruction Finance Act of 1940, the Commodity Credit Act of 1940, and the Export-Import Bank Act. The Transportation Act, the Investment Company Act, the Political Activity Act of 1940, and the governmental Reorganization Act of 1940 were all steps in advance.

In 1941 it was obvious that further steps must be taken for the defense of the United States and the development of friendly relations with other countries. President Roosevelt supported and Congress passed a large number of acts for this purpose. The following list names only a part of them: The Emergency Ships Construction Act, the Lend-Lease Act; the two Lend-Lease Appropriation Acts; the Defense Housing Act; the Navy Auxiliary Vessel Act; the Defense Public Works Act, the Naval Facilities Act, the Defense Highway Act, the Navy Local Defense Ship Act, the Naval Ship Alteration Act; the Midshipman Increase Act; the Emergency Cargo-Ship Act, the Defense Housing Insurance Act, the Vinson Priorities Act; the Defense Entry and Departure Act, the Bland Ship Requisitioning Act, the Reconstruction Finance Act (which gave the Reconstruction Finance Corporation authority to organize corporations to produce, manufacture, and deal in strategic and critical material), the Alien Visa Act, the Petroleum Pipe Line Act, the Military Service Extension Act, and the Property Requisitioning Act.

The day after the attack upon Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt asked Congress to declare war upon Japan, and Congress did so. This action was soon followed by declarations of war upon Italy and Germany.

Within a few days Congress had passed the Act to Remove Restrictions on Service, the First War Powers Act, and the Draft Act.

In the face of all the evidence it is clear that President Roosevelt neither involved the Nation in the war nor allowed it to be found defenseless. Long before the war broke out in Europe he had seen that it was coming and had led the country in a great program of defensive armament. He had done everything within the power of a human being to prevent the involvement of this country in the war; but when war was forced upon us, thanks to his foresight, we were prepared.

Even in that year of stress, the general interests of the country were not overlooked. Among the nonmilitary laws enacted in 1941, the following may be mentioned: The Corn and Wheat Market Quota Act; the Sugar Quota Act; the National Cattle Theft Act; the Bituminous Coal Act; and the Federal Coal Mine Inspection Act.

In 1942, the President's leadership resulted in the passage of a very large amount of useful and necessary legislation, a large part of which was devoted to furthering the war effort. Some of the laws passed in this field are: The Navy-Marine Corps Enlisted Strength Act; the Air Raid Attack Act; the Navy Shipbuilding and Repair Act; the Navy Public Works Act; the Navy Ordnance Act; the Women's Army Auxiliary Act; the Women's Naval Reserve Act; the SPARS or Women's Coast Guard Reserve Act; the so-called "Teen-Age Draft Act"; the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act; the Naval Expansion Act of 1942; the West Point Act; the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act; the Second War Powers Act; and the Florida Canal-Pipe Line Act.

Related laws that should be mentioned are: The China Aid Act; the China Appropriation Act; the Foreign Agents Registration Act; the Defense Housing Act of 1942; the National Housing Act Amendment; the War Housing Appropriation Act; the Defense Workers Housing Act; the Marine War-Risk Insurance Act; the War-Risk Insurance Act; the War-Risk Insurance Fund Act; the Merchant Marine Emergency Act; the Daylight Saving Act; the Interstate Meat Packing Act; the Nationality Act; the Commercial Air Pilots Act; the Armed Forces Absentee Voting Act; the War Damage Insurance Act; and the Public Debt Act of 1942.

The Price Control Act of 1942 and the Anti-Inflation Act are designed to stabilize the economic situation and to prevent the disastrous inflations that have usually accompanied wars in the past. The "Victory Tax" and other tax measures are designed to help in financing the war by a method which will also serve as a further check upon inflation.

The Railroad Reorganization Act; the Small Business Act; the Municipal Compositions Act, amendments to the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act; and the Soil Conservation Act, and the Farm Loan Interest Act—all aided various interests in ways which also contributed to general prosperity.

A MAGNIFICENT RECORD

This great body of legislation is but a fraction of President Roosevelt's achievements. Other useful laws have been passed at his suggestion or with his support. Although some of these were emergency laws, expiring after a certain time, a large number are of permanent value and will remain on the statute books.

It is not possible here to make more than a brief reference to the President's administration, which is outstanding in its combination of ability, economy, and devotion to the public good. The President has engaged in the public service an administrative personnel consisting of highly qualified, public-spirited men and women of whom their country may be proud. He has reorganized the executive departments in the interests of economy and efficiency, and has succeeded in both objectives. It is true that he has spent large sums of money, but the returns in public benefits are beyond computation. Every dollar has brought the greatest possible return—and this, rather than a cutting down of outlay by failure to take necessary action, is the final standard of economy in government. By any measurement of efficiency, President Roosevelt's administration must be pronounced a success.

Even the difficulties and confusions which naturally accompany a rapid expansion of administrative functions—and the President has been confronted with such a situation twice; first, when immediate Government action was the only remedy capable of saving this country from economic ruin; and, again, when the United States became threatened by and involved in the greatest war in all history—even these extreme tests of executive ability have served only to show more clearly the President's ability to organize, to decide, and to direct. The results obtained in economic recovery, reemployment, foreign and domestic trade, preparation for war, and production of armaments and supplies are the incontestable evidence of that ability.

Finally, it must be stated that no class of people in the United States has been overlooked or sacrificed. The interests of all economic and social groups have been considered and fostered, in the President's long-range program. Those who say that the President has favored other classes but forgotten their own class are either deliberately distorting the truth in the hope of gaining some political or personal advantage, or are suffering from the short memories so often characteristic of persons receiving benefits. Under the President's program, vast quantities of capital have been provided for the stimulation of all branches of industry; banking and finance have been placed on a solid basis; especial help has been given to small business; exporters and importers have received Government loans; farmers have been assisted; labor has been helped to move forward; orphaned and underprivileged children, and the old, the blind, and the disabled have received help; special benefits have been made available to the youth of the country; the influence of anti-Semitism, that insidious weapon of near-fascists in the United States as elsewhere, has been robbed of effect; the Negro has been enabled to make progress in every field; discriminations based on race, creed, or national origin have been ruled out of the public service; women have been welcomed into public life, into the Government service, and into industry; the homeless have been enabled to obtain subsistence homesteads or low-cost houses; new opportunities have been opened to the unemployed; vast programs of public works have been set in motion, making fundamental contributions to the capital equipment of the country, and giving employment to the needy without competing with private industry.

It must be realized that while many misinformed or misguided people were declaring most loudly that another foreign war would never involve the United States, President Roosevelt was aware not only that such a thing was possible, but that the contingency was imminent. Under his leadership a program of naval expansion was initiated years before Germany struck at the peace of the world in 1939. This program was accelerated after the outbreak of the conflict, so that when the inevitable happened and we found ourselves in the war we were already past the stage of preliminary arrangements. The lend-lease program was developed and put into action, not merely as a friendly gesture, but as a move toward our national defense. The Army, the Navy, and the other armed services were enlarged under the President's close direction, with a minimum of friction and a maximum of efficiency.

The conversion of our economy to war purposes was achieved despite individual difficulties and setbacks, with a speed and smoothness that constituted striking evidence of the soundness and far-sightedness of President Roosevelt's program. No carping criticism by small-minded and selfish men can alter the facts that our warships and cargo ships are sailing the seas, our planes and bombers are in the air—yes, in the air over Germany—our guns and tanks are with our armies, and our people at home, as well as our servicemen, are well clothed and well fed.

These magnificent results are the work of a single decade. In the 10 years between March 3, 1933, and March 3, 1943, this Nation has moved out of sickness into health, out of darkness into light. Ten years ago we were facing the most terrible economic and social crisis of our history. Not only general bankruptcy but actual want threatened every class and group. Under the leadership of President Roosevelt the threat was averted, confidence was restored, and prosperity not only returned to those who had known it before, but came to stay with large numbers of our people for the first time. A war not of our making has now engulfed us, but thanks to our President's statesmanlike vision and constructive program, it has not found us unprepared; we are meeting it calmly and confidently. President Roosevelt's administration has indeed been a decade of achievement.

MARCH 4, 1943.

Maintenance of Merit System for Employees of Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I wrote the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, with reference to maintaining the merit system for the employment of the personnel of the Tennessee Valley Authority and protesting against the inclusion of engineers, chemists, technicians, and scientists of the Tennessee Valley Authority in Senate bill 575.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1943.

Hon. FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It is my understanding that on Monday your committee will take up S. 575, and I am writing you today in the hope that before a final decision is reached you will have an opportunity to give your careful consideration to the effect of this proposed legislation on the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

As you know, when Congress created the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1933 the statute was particularly designed to meet the requirements of the work the Authority was directed to undertake. Congress deliberately made its organization different from that of the conventional Government bureau or department. As the Authority's responsibilities cut across traditional jurisdictional lines, it was not included in an existing Government department, but was made an independent agency. As many of its activities were akin to those undertaken by private business, it was made a corporation, that it might have the flexibility and the authority of the corporate form through which private enterprise administers similar responsibilities. Because its boundaries were the natural boundaries of a watershed and not the artificial limitations of subject matter, its headquarters were located in the South, and through the years it has developed a decentralized administration, something new in the Federal Government. Its employees are located in the field. The Tennessee Valley Authority is not a part of the so-called bureaucracy in Washington.

All through the act Congress endeavored to lay down broad policies and then to give the Directors sufficient authority so they might be held fully responsible for the results accomplished in carrying out those policies. As on other subjects, the sections relating to personnel selection were calculated to emphasize this general policy of the statute, and, in my opinion, some of the credit for the Tennessee Valley Authority's success may be attributed to these provisions. Congress properly provided that the directors, the policy-making officials, were to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. But beyond that responsibility for recruiting, training, and organizing the staff was placed

squarely on the Board, which was in turn held accountable to the Congress for the success of the project. Section 3 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act states that the Board shall make appointments "without regard to the provisions of civil-service laws." But in section 6 Congress made certain that standards of merit and efficiency would be applied. That section reads:

"In the appointment of officials and the selection of employees for said corporations, and in the promotion of any such employees or officials, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency. Any member of said Board who is found by the President of the United States to be guilty of a violation of this section shall be removed from office by the President of the United States, and any appointee of said Board who is found by the Board to be guilty of a violation of this section shall be removed from office by said Board."

In these two sections the Congress underlined the intent of the whole statute—to create an agency which would be free of some of the Government red tape about which we complain, which would have authority commensurate with its responsibilities. We made certain that it would not pass the buck to another bureau or department in the event of failure, and that it would not be required to waste time and energy in jurisdictional disputes. It was intended that the Board be held responsible alone for the effective administration of the policies laid down by Congress.

The pending bill would destroy those statutory provisions with respect to personnel selection. It would diminish the responsibility of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board. The Congress could no longer hold the directors responsible if inefficiency or failure should occur. It would introduce the political considerations for appointment which were specifically repudiated in section 6 of the act. So far as Tennessee Valley Authority is concerned, no reason is advanced for the change proposed. No charge is made that the directors have failed to respect the statute Congress laid down, or that T. V. A. employees are not suited for the jobs they are employed to do. Tennessee Valley Authority's staff has been recruited without regard to partisan affiliations, selected and retained in employment for their competence. There has been no charge of favoritism or nepotism.

In my judgment there can be no question that Tennessee Valley Authority employees have been selected on the basis of merit as directed by section 6, and that the management of the enterprise as a whole has been efficient. The job they have done is persuasive proof of that. In less than 10 years 12 dams have been built on the Tennessee River and its tributaries and 6 more are under construction on accelerated wartime schedules. A huge steam plant has been erected and is in operation. Munitions facilities have been constructed and are now producing explosives. New types of plant foods have been developed and distributed to every State in the Union. Thousands of miles of transmission lines have been built. This public agency now operates the second largest utility system in the United States, serving more than two and a half million consumers living in the cities and towns and on the farms of the area, and providing power for major war industries—for aluminum and chemicals, principally. Over 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy will flow out over Tennessee Valley Authority lines this year, approximately 80 percent to be used directly in war production. Only a competent, well-chosen, and well-directed staff could show such a record of achievement in a decade. For accomplishment is the final test of personnel selection in government or private-industry enterprise.

This bill, if adopted in its present form, would serve notice on the very men who are responsible for those accomplishments that on June 30 their employment will be terminated and their continued opportunity for service will depend upon their acceptability to the Senate. Three hundred and eighty-eight employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority are in the salary grades affected. They have designed and constructed the dams now providing power for war needs. They run the power system and the fertilizer and munitions plants. The majority are technicians in special fields. Although they have been recruited from all parts of the country, and their operations directly affect the lives of citizens in seven States, it happens that almost 80 percent of that number are presently located in the State of Tennessee and have been residents there for more than a year. A similar situation probably would not be found in any other Federal agency. Nature made such concentration of technical staff necessary. The river must be controlled near its source. But the men who make the decisions which control the flow of water all the way down through Alabama into Kentucky, and affecting even the Ohio and Mississippi beyond—these men should never be encouraged to develop a political responsibility to a single State. They should be entirely free of real or fancied political influence or obligation.

I am writing you at length because I am greatly concerned about the success of Tennessee Valley Authority. I was one of the House managers in the conference which brought in the bill adopted in 1933, and I have kept closely in touch with the Authority's operations ever since. When the existing statute has made such an excellent record possible, I venture to suggest that it may be folly to alter its provisions. I hope, therefore, that in your deliberations your committee will have clearly in mind all these particular circumstances and the nature of Tennessee Valley Authority operations.

The newspapers have reported that the subcommittee has given consideration to the special problems of other agencies and that it is prepared to recommend the exemption of employees in Army arsenals and similar Navy facilities. I have observed no such comments with respect to Tennessee Valley Authority, however, although at Muscle Shoals in Alabama more than 3,000 men are at work in Tennessee Valley Authority plants, producing ammonia, ammonium nitrate, phosphorus, and calcium carbide. These are the materials which the men in the arsenals of the War Department turn into the implements of war. Surely Government employees doing similar work should be treated alike. I have also noted that a proposal has been advanced to exempt all employees who had acquired civil-service status prior to January 1936. Here again it should be remembered that, although Tennessee Valley Authority employees were not in the classified civil service in 1936, they were nevertheless selected under a merit system, as Congress directed, an independent merit system which many disinterested observers have called superior to the general procedures. They should, therefore, receive at least the same protection.

I urge that your committee give careful consideration to the problem. I believe you will conclude that the provisions with respect to personnel in the Tennessee Valley Authority statute were well designed to advance the purposes of the act, and that they have been faithfully administered. I do not think they should be changed, and I am deeply concerned lest in an effort to cure alleged abuses and to alter the unfortunate practices of some other agencies, sufficient consideration may not be given to the effect of such legislation on this one organization, against which, so far as I know, no such abuses or irresponsible practices can be charged, and with respect to which the traditional duty of the Senate to confirm policy-making officials is already upheld. I know that in the area of its operations Tennessee Valley Authority enjoys, and has earned, the confidence of an overwhelming majority of the people with whom it deals. There is no demand for a change in the method of personnel selection from the region most concerned. To threaten Tennessee Valley Authority's splendidly functioning organization now or to disrupt its operations for a day would do great disservice to the maximum production of war materials critically needed by our soldiers and allies all over the globe.

I should be glad to discuss this matter with you if you would like to consider it further.

Sincerely yours,

LISTER HILL.

Essential Requisites for Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Essential Requisites for Food Production," delivered by Mr. Albert S. Goss, master, the National Grange, over independent stations affiliated with the Blue Network on the Grange Hour, from Washington, D. C., on February 20, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since the dawn of history the greatest problem of mankind has been food and clothing. First, we must eat. We of the present generation of Americans have never appreciated what this means. Living in the most productive Nation on earth in the age of greatest abundance, we have come to take an ample food supply for granted. Even in this era of abundance, we have been living close to the margin of insufficiency. In fact, during our days of prosperity a large part of our population was not well fed. This is attested by the fact that when our income increased some fifteen or twenty billions in 1941 we bought 11 percent more food than during the 5 years previously (1935-39). Incidentally we used less in 1942 because we couldn't get it, and now we are brought face to face with the problem of food for the first time in the lives of most of us.

For nearly 2 years we have been trying to point out the dangers of a food shortage and what must be done to prevent it. For a year over this radio station and through every means at our command, we have been warning of the dangers ahead if we continued our shortsighted farm- and price-control policies, but for the most part our warnings have gone unheeded, or we have been called alarmists, profiteers or pettifoggers, and we have gone blindly ahead pursuing the policies which are chiefly responsible for our shortages.

Now with rationing, black markets, and real shortages at our door, we seem to be getting hysterical. Congressmen, editors, and radio commentators are talking about millions of Americans starving. There is no need for hysteria. We are going on more limited rations, and we can't eat many of the things we want, but we are not going to starve over here. Let us look the facts in the face and try to see just what is ahead of us.

America can raise enough food to feed itself and our own armed forces and feed them well. We cannot raise enough to feed

both ourselves and our allies well. The problem reduced to simple terms is two-fold.

First, how much are we going to be willing to sacrifice to aid our allies; and, second, how can we maintain maximum production so that hunger can be kept at a minimum at home and abroad?

If we maintain maximum production at home, if we do the very best we can to raise all we can, the American people generally are not going to complain too much about sacrifices necessary to supply our allies. If we don't raise all we can, if we have to make unnecessary sacrifices, and if our allies don't get all we should be able to give them, our people could and should complain Our present shortages are due almost entirely to the mistaken and short-sighted policies against which we have been warning for many months. So far these shortages have not been serious at home. Many have been inconvenienced, but nobody has really suffered. At best the inconvenience is going to become worse. Our problem is to hold it at a minimum and to do our best to prevent real suffering among our allies.

In my judgment the peak of food production has been reached and we are now on the decline. That decline can be halted and possibly put into reverse if we adopt a sound program. This means a right-about face on a number of national policies, for it is difficult to conceive of a program more effective in reducing food production than to carry out some of the policies we are now pursuing. Farmers are told that they must produce more food with less labor, less machinery, and less fertilizer. Let's be sensible. It can't be done. If we put our dependence upon fine phrases, we will have less food.

PRESENT PRODUCTION OUTLOOK

In 1941 and 1942 we have harvested the two greatest crops in history and Secretary Wickard has set up goals for the 1943 production substantially above 1942. I believe the farmers are going to give all they have in them to try to meet them. They are going to do a good job, but our chances of meeting the goals are rather poor. Unless most unusual conditions prevail, or unless there is a change in price-control policies in Washington, our chances of doing even as well as last year are pretty slim.

1. We had the best growing season on record in 1942. Under the law of averages, we cannot expect its equal in 1943.

2. We have not been able to maintain our equipment, and replacements are cut to about one-third of our 1940 level. Power machinery is badly needed. Last year we were allotted 197,000 tractors, almost but not quite enough to cover replacements. This year we are cut to 37,000.

3. We have lost over 3,000,000 men from our farms, and while the drain has been slackened, it is still going on.

4. Price control policies have been forcing many farmers out of production. They have forced unfattened beef cattle and producing dairy cows to the slaughter block at an unprecedented rate.

REMEDIES SUGGESTED

Now, what can be done about it?

1. We can't do anything about the weather. Even the Office of Price Administration can't regulate that. We can only hope and pray for the best, but we will have to take it as it comes.

2. As to equipment, we are in no position to say where the critical materials are most vitally needed in the form of equipment. It may be best to let food production go down in order to build escort vessels or airplanes. All we can do is to urge that in building an armed force we keep our economy in balance, so that we develop no weak sources of supply because of having overbuilt some segments of our total war machine. However, we should recognize that without essential equipment, food production will decline, and measure carefully the effect on our war economy.

3. There are several approaches to the manpower problem, but the one most favorably considered in some quarters is the least workable, in our judgment. I refer to the proposal to freeze the men on the farm. Not only is it un-American but an unwilling worker is not worth his hire. He can and likely will do more damage than his services are worth. We want none of it.

The two great drains on farm labor have been military service and war industry, the latter taking twice as many men as the former.

The Tydings amendment, which provides for deferring essential, nonreplaceable farm labor, will relieve the pressure of the military service if administered according to its intent.

Some relief can be expected from mobilizing and training school labor and women workers, but this could not be great at best. Some substantial help can be expected from moving farm hands with more or less experience from places where production is low to work where production possibilities are high, but such labor placement must not be surrounded with unworkable conditions.

DRAIN TO INDUSTRY

As to the drain to industry, we believe that the greatest source of relief in the farm-labor problem would be to find means for everyone everywhere to do a full day's work during the war emergency. With the average workweek in industry at less than 43 hours, farmers who work from 60 to 100 hours can see little hope of keeping farm labor from seeking war-industry jobs at war-industry wages. They believe that if everyone worked 54 to 60 hours there would be manpower enough for all. Then with farm prices on an equitable level farmers could get their share of the labor supply. They don't believe we can win the war on a basic 40-hour week, when our enemies are working from 60 to 75 hours.

Farmers view the recent 48-hour mandate with mixed feelings. It should make some more men available, but actually the increased hours at time and a half for overtime increases the wage discrepancy, and early reports indicate will draw still more men from farms. The action is a good illustration of the fallacies of the unbalanced price-control policy which underlies most of our trouble. The American public is told that two great groups are contributing to serious dangers of inflation—agriculture and labor. To prevent disaster we are told that it is necessary to freeze farm prices and wages where they are. In the next breath industrial wage rates are boosted 8⅓ percent while ceilings are clamped down to prevent farmers, merchants, and others from changing their prices to meet this increased cost. Figure it out for yourself. Forty hours at $1 an hour equals $40. Add 8 hours at a dollar and a half and you get $52 for 48 hours work or $1.08⅓, a boost of 8⅓ percent. The time-and-a-half provision was enacted into law to force employers to spread the work in times of unemployment. Now in time of labor scarcity, and with labor drawing the highest income in history, wages are given another boost to preserve social gains, with no regard to the effect on the food supply.

This takes us to the heart of the problem. There are two schools of thought with reference to handling food and inflation.

The first advocates adjusting prices to meet increased costs. This is based on the philosophy of abundance. There is no surer way to avoid inflation than to provide an abundant supply. Where abundance sufficient to control prices is impossible, rationing can be used to assure equal treatment to all. This school believes that price-fixing should be used only to prevent profiteering.

The second advocates freezing prices and using subsidies to meet farmers' increased costs. This leads to untold governmental regulation, to black markets, and to scarcity. It never has been successfully done over any extended period in the history of the world.

I will use just one illustration to show what an impossible program we are undertaking. Ceilings have been placed on milk. Milk costs fluctuate rapidly due to weather, pasture conditions, costs of feed, labor, and a thousand things. Four or five months ago the dairymen of southern California sought relief from ceilings which held their income below cost. The California Milk Control Board had all the figures, but for months could get no action. In the meantime local hay became exhausted and dairymen had to reach farther and farther for a hay supply. The price rose from about $28 to $40 a ton. The Office of Price Administration proposed to meet the situation by putting a ceiling of $30 on hay. That works all right on the economists charts in Washington, but hay can't be bought and shipped where needed at such a figure. Dairymen have to bootleg hay or sell their cows, for cows can't wait 5 months for something to eat. The result has been an enormous slaughter of dairy cows. A similar situation prevails all over the country.

The policies of the Office of Price Administration have been more responsible for food shortage than all the other causes combined, and the shortages are resulting in black-market operations which are already attaining volume approaching a scandal. We are persistently pursuing a policy of trying to do the impossible. Last Monday a representative of the Office of Price Administration flatly refused to recommend a change in milk ceilings which were below cost because it would affect the Little Steel formula.

Here we are, in the days of our greatest national income, with surplus purchasing power causing inflation nightmares, refusing to let the people pay the cost of producing their food supply, and by that action strangling production. Today the public is paying the lowest percent of its income for food of any time for which records are available. Less than 22 percent of the income goes for food, but in order to preserve so-called social gains, we are increasing our industrial wage scale 8⅓ percent and denying many lines of farm production the cost of producing the food. People with money to buy with would rather pay the cost of producing food than to go without it.

All this is being done in violation of the clear mandate of law. In the Price Control Act of October 1942, after setting up certain standards for controlling wages and prices the act says, "provided that modification shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity * * * in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes." Could any instruction be plainer? The price-control policies now pursued completely ignore the law in this respect.

Please don't misunderstand me. Farmers are not asking any blanket increase in prices. On most crops prices are all right today, but on some, particularly those involving a lot of hand labor, such as dairying, for example in many localities, they are below production costs. These commodities are comparatively few in number, but they are vital in our food supply. If we don't get enough income to pay the costs of raising and harvesting such crops, we won't have the crops. There are 25,000,000 bushels of unharvested soybeans in the fields today. The same is true of sugar beets, peanuts, and a long list of other crops. Farmers are not incurring these losses because they want to, but because they cannot help it.

The alternative to a compensatory price is a subsidy. Time will not permit an adequate discussion of this subject. Besides I have

outlined the basis of the objections of the Grange many times before. Subsidies are no cure. They are an easy way to dodge a disagreeable issue, but they lead to inflation and disaster. I'll close with one illustration. Suppose we refuse to let consumers pay the cost of producing our food and make up the difference with subsidies. At the end of the war we will have developed an unbalanced economy which would have to be brought back into balance somehow. Our enormous debt will then necessitate cutting off the subsidies. Then one of two things will happen. Either farmers will have to raise prices or go bankrupt and stop producing. If they can't get the cost of production in times of full employment and excess income, what chance would there be to raise prices with unemployment staring us in the face? You know the answer. It is chaos. Every attempt in the history of the world to pursue the course we are now pursuing if persisted in, has ended in chaos. Any nation which cannot or will not pay the cost of its food bill is headed for disaster, and America is no exception.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Rural Electrification, delivered January 19, 1943, by Hon. Steve C. Tate, of Georgia, president of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at the annual convention held at St. Louis, Mo.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENTATION OF PLAQUE AND INTRODUCTION OF SENATOR GEORGE W. NORRIS AT FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. TATE. Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Norris, Senator Norris, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, I think after hearing Abe Sorenson's fine resolution that it would be appropriate for me to describe to you this plaque which I hold in my hand.

First of all, believing that nothing but the best would be suitable for the Senator, our board of directors instructed your executive manager and myself to go to Tiffany's in New York. We went and frankly, folks, you should have seen a couple of farmers in Tiffany's. [Laughter.]

At the top of the plaque is a replica in detail of the actual picture of Norris Dam; on the left is a farm home, showing electric service lines going into the home; on the right is the barn, the barnyard with a wagon—and, boys, it is a drop-tongue wagon, too. [Laughter.] There are cows and chickens, and pigs—those things that so typify your life and my life, and that life of the Senator.

Below that is inscribed: "To the Honorable George W. Norris, from the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, in appreciation of his unselfish services in the electrification of rural America." Below that are listed your officers; myself as president; E. J. Stoneman, vice president; William Jackman, secretary-treasurer; other directors: Harry Edmonds, J. C. Nichols, Thomas B. Fitzhugh, E. D. H. Farrow, T. F. Donahue, Raymond Walker, Will Hall Sullivan, M. R. Seabrooke, and Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager, presented at St. Louis, January 19, 1943.

Senator, as a further belief in you, and that you are right, my board of directors has asked me to advise you of your election as honorary vice president of this association. [Applause.]

For a man born in the hills of Georgia, the opportunity and honor of participating in this ceremony is one almost beyond the imagination of my folks back home. The trust imposed in me as president of your association has brought with it the honor and responsibility of acting for you and recognizing the work and achievements of one of America's greatest statesmen.

Looking through the pages of history, few men, both by example and deed, have found a place among that exalted group, whose motivation throughout their lives has been the welfare of their country and the betterment of its people. In time to come, as well as today, he will be recognized as one of the greatest contributors to the well-being of his fellow man.

This meeting here tonight is in itself testimony to a great work that this man has done. Under his leadership and with the help of the other men who got the inspiration of his farseeing imagination, electric power has become a reality to the farm people of this country.

No word of mine can add to his laurels. The brightness of his diadem shines in the glow of the farm homes, from electricity made possible by his deeds. The reality of accomplishment made possible by this man in the Tennessee Valley and those other valleys served by Rural Electrification Administration surely shows the guiding hand of progress.

Senator Norris, this plaque is not given in recognition of the accomplishment made possible by you all over this country—the lines and poles serving the farm homes testify to that—but it is given as an expression of our affection. We hope that it will always remain with you and that warm spot of love that you have in the hearts of the people of this country.

On behalf of this association, it is my privilege and honor to present you this plaque, and to present you as our next speaker. [Rising applause.]

ADDRESS OF MR. TATE, REPORTING TO THE CONVENTION THE PROGRESS OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

The birth of your association is almost like fiction. As a result of copper hearings during the months of November and December 1941 before the Tarver subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, there were those of us from all sections of the country who had the pleasure of meeting and exchanging views as to the Rural Electrification Administration program and, growing out of this meeting there was expressed a feeling from all parts of the country that a national association of the cooperatives would be an ideal means of fighting for, and the mutual protection of, all the cooperatives since it was evidenced at the congressional hearing that there was a concerted private utility opposition to our program. It was not until sometime in March 1942 that the original board of incorporators met in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio. The meeting in Cincinnati was adjourned to the city of Washington, and after consultation with public power leaders in Congress and with Government officials it was decided that now was the time to incorporate your national association. At the first meeting of the directors many congressional leaders and representatives of Government agencies interested in the public power program met with the directors and gave them much encouragement in this program. At this meeting officers of the association were elected and committees appointed.

On May 11, 1942, the directors met again in Washington and received committee reports and reports as to the progress being made by the Association. It was at this meeting that the by-laws in their present form were adopted and from March 20, the date of the incorporation to this meeting in May, the Association had received initial membership fees and dues approximating $2,000. It was agreed at the meeting of the board of directors that the national program should not be adopted until a more representative membership had been obtained. At a subsequent meeting in Chicago in the last of June, there were invited certain outstanding leaders from all sections of the county to be in attendance who were interested in matters regarding the Rural Electrification Administration program. It was decided at this meeting that the Association should investigate the possibilities of an insurance program for the cooperatives which would bring about a reduction in the cost of insurance and, coupled with this, a safety program to materially reduce the accident rate, and give cooperative line insurance which had never been made available to them by existing insurance companies. At this same meeting there was discussed the matter of editing a magazine to be distributed to the individual members of the cooperatives. There was also discussed the matter of engaging the services of an Executive Manager as soon as the finances of the Association would permit, and it was decided that the Executive Committee of the board of directors should proceed from this meeting to the city of St. Louis to call on the Rural Electrification Administration officials and to proceed from there to Washington to call on leaders in Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture with a view to acquainting them all with the aims and purposes of this association.

Effective August 1, 1942, our secretary-treasurer, William Jackman, was employed on a full-time basis and an office was established in St. Louis. Mr. Jackman was requested by the board of directors to accept the new office because of the necessity of having someone thoroughly familiar with the organization and the tremendous amount of work to be done. At the next meeting of the board of directors, it was found necessary to give consideration to an executive manager, and until such time and consideration resulted in the selection of an executive manager, I was asked to devote as much time as I could spare and as much time as the job demanded and to look after the interest of the association. This I have done to the best of my ability. After full consideration of the applications submitted, and on the endorsement of high-ranking Government officials, and men in Congress who are known as public-power leaders, your directors saw fit to contract with Clyde T. Ellis, your present executive manager, on a mutually satisfactory basis, effective January 3 on the expiration of his term in Congress. He has assumed the full responsibilities as your executive manager.

The insurance committee and the executive manager and the counsel for the association made further investigation of the insurance possibilities and have laid the groundwork for two insurance companies on which Thomas Fitzhugh, counsel of the association, will report to you later in the progress of these meetings. On October 29 the officers of the association moved the offices from St. Louis to its present address in Washington, D. C. During the past year your association con-

tacted Members of Congress with reference to the Norris amendment and, while this amendment was not adopted in its original form, it was adopted in the form that no increase in wholesale or retail rates could take place without the Office of Price Administration being notified and given the opportunity to be at the hearing before such increases went into effect; and this amendment has served to protect all of you from rate increases in your wholesale rates. The amendment to P-46 will permit you to relocate lines and use material over and above essential inventory to serve farm loads which will aid in the production of food. Since March of last year it has been my pleasure to travel some 30,000 miles and meet with representatives of your cooperatives from more than 30 States. Out of the last 270 days since March a year ago, I have spent approximately 130 days away from my home on the business of your association. It is best evidenced by your response in becoming members that we are headed in the right direction.

Gentlemen, this is another little thing, we all have thoughts of mother. In my section of the country I have so often had the pleasure of visiting in farm homes and seeing the mother doing the farm chores. The introduction of electricity has brought about to that woman, that mother that we all love, the greatest development, it is making her span of life longer, because she is the backbone of our whole country, of the entire Nation. I will tell you a little story that can best illustrate what I mean.

Across the mountain from where I live there is a county known as Dawson, a great county, a great people. They used to make right smart moonshine liquor over there. I was over there about 3 years ago, and I said to a certain farm woman over there, "How are you getting along?" She said, "Steve I will tell you, I live scared all the time." I said, "What do you mean by that?" "Well," she said, "my husband and son-in-law and boys are all the time in the liquor business, and," she said, "I live scared; I am afraid they will be caught." This last year I went back to that same farm home, talked to this same woman, asked her that same question. In the meantime she had lost her husband. She said, "I ain't living scared no more." I said, "That is fine, tell me more." She said, "My boys are in a different kind of business, they are raising chickens." She said, "You all built lines in here where we can have ice and have these brooder houses and raise produce."

I leave that thought with you; that woman "wasn't scared no more." That may mean a whole lot. There are lots of other farmers I know may not be scared. But it has brought about that way of life to me, that example, for that reason, for that mother to be happy and enjoy her home and her home surroundings in a better way.

Now, I stand before you humbled today with the knowledge that I have been able to be a part of making possible this, your association; and let me say now that it will never be my purpose to see this association become the springboard of any one individual or group of individuals, and I know it is the idea of the entire board and employees that we shall at all times be amenable to the individual cooperative in conducting the affairs of your organization as this is basically a demonstration of what I call the grass roots democracy of our country. None of us are without fault, and we will make mistakes—we ask you to bear with us. We do not have at our command the fabulous funds of the Edison Institute and those alined against us. However, we do have, in my opinion, the most potent thing in America, the voice and heart of the people as expressed by the members of your cooperatives. [Applause.]

Ration and Draft Forms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received from Mr. Alvin Haas, president, Yates-American Machine Co., of Beloit, Wis. The letter so typifies a number of complaints which I have received from farmers that I shall read one paragraph from it:

You may rest assured that the above—

Mr. Haas is referring to the particular forms he has had to make out in 1 day—required a full day. Although I do not think that I am superior in any way to our farmers, my many years in business should have given me experience and training to interpret forms of this kind without the use of an attorney, but the farmer who is diligent and experienced in his work surely must have an endless amount of difficulty in keeping himself up to date on these questionnaires, forms, and everything else they must now do to operate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YATES-AMERICAN MACHINE CO.,
Beloit, Wis., February 26, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT LA FOLLETTE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Instead of writing you today in regard to tax laws, the postmastership here at Beloit and such other matters about which we contact an office such as yours, I am taking the liberty of attaching herewith a cartoon which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune today, February 26, which is rather amusing, but I think presents a condition very close to the facts.

I have one of these Wisconsin dairy farms, and I am amazed at the problems which confront the farmer. Yesterday I had to completely stop my regular efforts and have my farmer come in to Beloit to call upon our corporate counsel and with my secretary we had the following functions to perform:

1. Yesterday was the last day for filing our Agricultural Adjustment Administration Allotment Form. It is getting more cumbersome each year.

2. Although we understood that gasoline rationing was a way to conserve rubber my farm gas rationing form had to be filed, although my tractor does not enter the highway and my other gas requirements use no rubber. We are allotted a certain small amount of gasoline and then if it does not fulfill our requirements we must go back to the rationing board for further consideration.

3. My hired hand is now reaching 18 years of age. He is the brother of my farmer and deferment from draft forms had to be filled out. In addition to the regular 42-A which is used for industrial occupational exemption there is a four page form which is termed the Agricultural Supplement. This goes into every possible detail pertaining to the operation of the farm, in addition to having space provided where I must fill in an affidavit form that I, myself, my family, my in-laws—it doesn't say how far to go on this—to find someone other than the person I am trying to have exempted operate the farm during this war period.

4. I had a form to fill in which must go through the rationing board to receive proper repair parts for my farm machinery and to get some wire to fence in my pasture and hog lot.

5. It was the last day to fill out the forms in regard to rationing of food, and I had to fill in the forms so that my farm help could get coupons for the hired help's meals.

You may rest assured that the above required a full day. Although I do not think I am superior in any way to our farmers, my many years in business should have given me experience and training to interpret forms of this kind without the use of an attorney, but the farmer who is diligent and experienced in his work surely must have an endless amount of difficulty in keeping himself up to date on these questionnaires, forms, and everything else they must now do to operate.

I thought you would like to have me set forth "my day" as a farm owner and operator.

Respectfully yours,

ALVIN HAAS, *President.*

Trade and Commerce With Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made on the March of Time program over the National Broadcasting Co. last evening.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If we will look at our maps we will see that Spain lies directly on our flank in north Africa. Our supply lines by water going through the Straits of Gibraltar and the Mediterranean are within a few miles of Spain and her air fields. Our supply lines by land going through French Morocco are within a stone's throw of Spanish Morocco and its air fields. If these supply lines were cut or were seriously impaired, the lives of our boys in north Africa would be critically endangered and our whole military expedition would be imperiled.

To encourage Spain to carry out the assurances of neutrality which she has solemnly given us is of the utmost importance. To trade with her is to give her this encouragement and permit her to receive certain commodities which she desperately needs to prevent her economic collapse, and enables us to get critical materials, such as cork, mercury, zinc, tungsten, and pyrites. We very much need these critical materials, and our getting them insures that the Axis does not get them.

To trade with Spain does not give endorsement to Franco or his government. It is an important part of our military conduct of the war.

All petroleum going to Spain, with the exception of packed lubricants, has been obtained from sources outside the United States, and has been transported exclusively in

Spanish tankers. The petroleum shipments have had no effect whatsoever on the quantity of petroleum available to any consumers in the United States, and they have been such as to provide for only minimum current needs in Spain and make the accumulation of stocks impossible. No petroleum products that can be used in airplanes have been included.

The fact that the various departments of our Government are in agreement as to the details of the trade program and that the program has been approved by the Chiefs of Staff of our Army and Navy, Admiral Leahy, General Marshall, Admiral King, and General Arnold, would seem to furnish adequate and reassuring evidence that the program is being conducted with a due and primary regard for our vital American interests and for the lives of our boys.

Martin Adopts New Deal Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from this morning's Philadelphia Record entitled "Martin Adopts New Deal Idea—Plea for Post-War W. P. A. Reveals Trend." The Martin referred to is the Republican Governor of Pennsylvania, who was installed as Governor in January last.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARTIN ADOPTS NEW DEAL IDEA—PLEA FOR POST-WAR WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION REVEALS TREND

We have no intention of making this sound impertinent, but it seems to us that the education of Edward Martin is one of the more interesting stories of American political development, and maybe one of the more indicative as well.

On Monday, in his budget message to the legislature, the Governor proposed a bond issue for a State public-works program to help avert unemployment and depression after the war. The figure he has in mind is said to be between $90,000,000 and $100,000,000. It is to be increased if necessary. The money is to be used for "public projects, sanitation, roads, reforestation, and the rehabilitation of returned soldiers."

It is a little bewildering and immensely heartening to know that the first concrete suggestion for what is in effect a post-war Work Projects Administration program originates in Pennsylvania—a State where the Work Projects Administration was hated more bitterly and attacked more insanely than elsewhere in the Union.

PROTESTED IN 1933

Exactly 10 years ago, in fact, Governor Martin wrote to this paper in protest against what he termed the waste of State and Federal relief funds. His was quite a temperate letter in comparison with other manifestations of the Republican Party's mood at that time, and it was concerned with the administration of public aid rather than its principle.

But it was full of the phrases which were to become so tiresome over the next decade. He spoke of professional loafers, people who have never worked and never will, and fear for the future of the Commonwealth. Public spending had brought Pennsylvania face to face with a serious financial situation, he said, and he suggested that the State was being "stampeded into a course which may end in financial disaster." (Pennsylvania spent less than $15,000,000 on relief in that year.)

The Governor Martin who spoke to the legislature on Monday is a man of noticeably greater stature than the General Martin who wrote the letter. He has accepted the principle upon which the whole New Deal was built—a government's obligation to give every citizen a chance to work. He may believe that the responsibility is the State's, rather than the Federal Government's, but that is a point for later argument and not of major importance set against the basic change in Mr. Martin's way of thinking.

FEARS UNEMPLOYMENT

If his party in Pennsylvania follows him the State will have undergone a revolution. For he looks toward two possible periods of unemployment and does not regard bread lines, free soup, or private initiative as adequate remedies for either. The first, he believes, will come while war industries are reconverting to the production of civilian goods. And he has enough foresight to realize that the second may be delayed for 5 or 10 years by a post-war boom. But, he added:

"The employment must continue—not for 5 or 10 years, but indefinitely. It is the job of all of us—hence of government—to see that it continues."

The same sentences would have been pretty thoroughly jeered in Harrisburg awhile back if they had originated in Washington. We wonder if the local G. O. P. is aware even now of the novelty of connecting Government with the units of which it is comprised. They have talked for 10 years as though Government and the people who create it were completely disassociated.

But the Governor has done them as great a service as he plans for any returned soldiers looking restlessly for the thing they have been fighting for—security, as a minimum, and a chance to work for something better. It isn't much to ask, but it would be unjust and dangerous to withhold it. Mr. Martin is wiser than his party. We hope he is repaid by something better than accusations of boondoggling.

Testimony of Charles Diebold, Jr. Before the Senate Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the testimony of Charles Diebold, Jr., president, Western Savings Bank, Buffalo, N. Y., submitted before the Special Committee to Study the Problems of Small Business, on February 24, 1943.

I have received an estimate of the cost of printing this testimony. The cost will be $135.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL

In treating the subject of small business it is first desirable to define the phrase "small business" to an extent which will encompass the largest number of business concerns facing the various problems which I will attempt to enumerate in later portions of this statement, and which would be to some substantial degree directly affected or benefited by the remedial measures suggested to deal with those problems. For my purposes here I do not include institutions of a financial character, such as banks, insurance companies, loan companies, mortgage companies, and others not engaged in manufacturing, processing, merchandising, or servicing activities such as garages, laundries, etc. At the present time a business concern, to come within the category of small business, as I see it, is one which meets one or more of the following conditions:

1. Has invested capital including earned or contributed surplus of $1,000,000 or less.
2. Normally employs 500 employees or less.
3. Has a normal annual dollar volume of sales of $2,000,000 or less.
4. Cannot readily obtain long- or medium-term financing or equity money from financial institutions or by the sale and listing of shares of stocks or bonds on any of the country's security exchanges having fairly wide public participation, such as the New York Stock and Curb Exchanges.

It might appear that some business included in these definitions would be of considerable size and perhaps should not be classified as small business. I do so classify them, however, for the purposes of this statement. Even though they are substantial in size, when compared to some of the giant enterprises and aggregations of capital in this country today they become very small indeed. Accordingly, it is obvious that these qualifications or limitations result in the inclusion, in the group or class of business units with which this statement is intended to deal, of the greater portion of all American business.

Much statistical data has been submitted to this committee from time to time by persons well qualified to gather and assemble it relative to the number of small business concerns there are in the United States, the number of people employed by different groups within this classification, and the number of concerns which account for stated percentages of total sales by all industry. I do not presume to add to or vary the statistical information before you.

If there is anything I may be able to contribute in the way of a better understanding of the nature and importance of small business units and the many problems facing them today, my ability to do so does not stem from statistical knowledge and research, but from actual facts and case histories. These have come within the scope of my own experience and that of my business associates during more than 40 years of active practice of business and corporation law, throughout almost all of which time I have also been actively engaged in banking, being at the present time president of the Western Savings Bank of Buffalo and director and chairman of the executive committee of the Niagara National Bank of Buffalo.

THE PROFIT MOTIVE

We hear on all sides the word "profit" and the phrases "profit system" and "profit motive." Individuals and groups use them and repeat them, referring to them in connection with our own economic system and those of other nations. Due to the closely interwoven pattern of business economics and political organization or government, many people have come to form opinions concerning "the profit motive" and to think of it in terms of its political aspects, as being either desirable or undesirable, or as tolerable only when controlled or hampered to such an extent that it becomes virtually

unrecognizable as such. Most of those people or groups who have a negative attitude toward this so-called profit motive are at the same time and in common with nearly all Americans, unqualifiedly and enthusiastically in favor of more and better educational facilities so that all who desire shall be given the opportunity to learn as much about as many things as their inclinations and abilities permit. Some of the statements we hear made in connection with the "profit motive" clearly indicate, however, that there are many people who have a very confused idea about what it is, what it does, how it affects the average American citizen, and how and to what extent it should be regulated.

The profit motive is the desire of individuals to gain or to add to what they have so that they may obtain money or its equivalent to enable them to get the necessary things in life and, if possible, to accumulate something extra in the way of savings. It is no different in its operation whether the individual be a sole proprietor, running his own small business, or if he be a partner with one or more others, working together, or if he be a shareholder of a corporation who, along with others, has invested his capital in the form of cash or other assets in the desire to gain or benefit to a greater degree than by leaving it idle.

In a free country such as ours it is the reason why the laborer reports to his job; why the grocer runs his store; why the executive shows up behind his desk every morning; and why a man takes some of his savings or capital to buy shares in some business corporation which will pay him more in dividends than he would otherwise receive. None of these persons would do these things without gain to themselves unless compelled to by a dictator government.

The profit motive is fundamental. It is the mainspring and driving force of our economic system. As a result of it we have automobiles, radios, central heating systems, and the many other conveniences and comforts which have made life so much more pleasant for the average American than for the citizens of virtually every other country. Someone may say that this is a broad statement, in reply to which I say, "Can you build an automobile, or a radio, or a furnace?" Obviously the answer is "No." Some group of people got together and formed a business to manufacture or produce these articles. They thought they could be sold for a higher price than they cost to produce. They found that the more they produced and sold, the lower became their expense and overhead per unit. In nearly every case a point was reached where if prices were reduced, sales could be tremendously increased with continuing resultant improvement of the product and lowering of costs per unit, thus increasing net profit after the cost of operation to the business.

The generating force in this activity is the profit motive. The result is wide distribution and tendency toward lower prices. This process is normally accelerated by the development and adoption of new and improved manufacturing and merchandising methods discovered in the search for increased efficiency and lower costs, and by the availability of similar goods on the market sold or produced by rival concerns at approximately equal prices—competition.

REGULATION OF THE PROFIT SYSTEM

Having briefly outlined the nature of the profit motive and the activities it generates, we pass on to the question of regulating it—the necessity for this, and to what extent it should be done. There is no dispute in enlightened quarters as to the necessity of regulation. This has been recognized by the great majority of our people since the middle of the nineteenth century. The passage by Congress in 1887 of an act creating the Interstate Commerce Commission was necessitated as much by the unscrupulous and discriminatory treatment of competitive interests by those controlling the railroads as from any other specific cause.

For example, if there were two cotton mills in a particular town and the owners of one obtained control of the only railroad passing through the locality, they could, and in such cases often did, refuse to accept goods for delivery to or shipment from, the rival mill. The answer was bankruptcy or sale of the unfortunate business to the dominant interests at a fraction of fair value. This was a common story. There were more polished and indirect methods of achieving the same result, such as preferential rates, rebates, and so forth, which there is no point to discussing here because the result was the same—bankruptcy or purchase by the dominant interests at less than fair value.

In 1890 Congress passed the Sherman Antitrust Act, the main purpose and effect of which was to prevent contracts or combinations in the form of trust or otherwise from the restraint of trade and to prevent any person or persons from monopolizing or attempting to monopolize any part of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations. No one who has ever had occasion to study the effect and application of this law on the business structure and economic development of our country has any doubt as to how much it has contributed to the healthy operation of the profit system and the passing on of the benefits of increased efficiency and production to the people. It was an absolutely necessary and desirable piece of legislation. The regulation it brought has been for the good of both the people and the business system.

Congress, again looking at the business and trade picture, passed an act in 1914 creating the Federal Trade Commission, the principal purpose of which was to prevent the use of unfair methods of competition in commerce. To be sure, the act gave the Commission other specific powers, but generally this is the one most frequently exercised and for which this body is known.

Subsequently were passed the Clayton Act and the Robinson-Patman Price-Discrimination Act amending it. This legislation deals with the control on the part of manufacturers and producers of prices charged by wholesale and retail outlets, and is designed to outlaw the favoring of one customer over another in the matter of prices for goods of a similar grade and quality.

These acts of Congress and amendments to them are cogent affirmation of the importance which the people of this country and their legislative representatives attach to the maintenance of a healthy profit system and its continued freedom to develop and improve our material well-being and living standards.

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF SMALL BUSINESS

Statistics submitted at prior hearings before this committee have abundantly shown that the small business unit is the backbone of our economic system. For proof of this may I refer you to the statement of H. B. McCoy, of the United States Department of Commerce, given on the 29th day of September 1942. He said:

"Of the 184,230 establishments reporting to the Department of Commerce in 1939 more than 85 percent employed less than 50 persons, 12 percent employed between 51 and 250 persons, and 3 percent employed over 250 persons. Only 19 percent of the total number of persons employed by manufacturers worked in establishments having 50 wage earners or less, while 29 percent were workers in plants having 51 to 250 wage earners and the balance (51 percent) were in establishments employing over 250 employees. A similar pattern exists with regard to the value of products manufactured—21 percent of the total coming from establishments employing less than 51 persons, 29 percent from the 51 to 250 group, and the balance of 53 percent from plants with employment in excess of 250 persons."

From this it is apparent that the small unit very greatly exceeds in number the large. I include in the classification of small business a larger group than Mr. McCoy. It may fairly be said that small business comprises a majority of all American business enterprise measured by any standard except, perhaps, invested capital. To further corroborate this I refer to findings presented by Arthur C. Nielsen, president of A. C. Nielsen Co. and chairman of A. C. Nielsen Co., Ltd., before the Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, November 20, 1942. According to Mr. Nielsen, 61 percent of all urban families in the central United States were regular users of the nearest grocery store.

PROBLEMS FACING SMALL BUSINESS NATURALLY FLOWING FROM THE WAR

We can start right out with the bald statement that the outlook for small business under present conditions is bad. The death rate of small business units will be the heaviest in the history of our country for the duration of this national emergency in which we find ourselves today. In my opinion, this cannot be avoided. It is a natural consequence of the war economy. No one is responsible for it nor can any effective steps be taken to prevent it.

Every bit of critical material, food supplies, clothing, and fuel necessary for the maintenance of our armed forces and required for shipment to our allies must be subtracted from the total amount that would normally reach the public in the form of consumer and durable goods. This means that an increasing number of articles will disappear from retail and wholesale outlets entirely. Much of what is left will be rationed to fit the minimum requirements of the civilian population. Most of us are just now starting to get a fair idea of what this means. No manufacturer of metal goods can continue to operate his business unless he produces something for the war effort or goods designated as essential for civilian economy. No building contractor can continue to construct dwellings and other buildings unless they are designated as necessary for defense housing or manufacturing, and adequate priority preference ratings issued to obtain and permit the use of requisite materials. The grocer and delicatessen proprietor are running out of an increasing number of items normally carried on their shelves, all of which make up part of their total sales and enable them to make enough money to operate profitably. Can anything be done to prevent this condition? No. It is a direct result of the war economy and must be continued to make successful prosecution of the war possible. Let us therefore frankly recognize its existence and, in ways I will later suggest, attempt to deal with it in the most helpful way.

As in the case of goods and materials, the increasing shortage of manpower will ultimately result in the elimination of thousands of small business concerns. In many cases the owners of small establishments will be drafted into the armed service. In many others, employees are or will be drafted into service or placed in defense plants where the need for them is crucial. This will cause many proprietors to give up the ship and close their business because of the difficulty in replacing trained employees, or in many cases, the impossibility of getting any at all. Again we must recognize this condition as a trend brought about directly by the national emergency and which we cannot hope to reverse for the duration. However, I will suggest that more intelligent and considered handling of this problem would go a long way toward softening its impact on small business as a whole, and preventing the occurrence of many unnecessary distress cases.

The effect of price ceilings on small business has in many cases been most vexing.

With labor and most other costs rising, the average unit which is not engaged in war production or merchandising in defense areas where pay rolls are big and spending is brisk, and not operating, therefore, at relatively high volume, faces in many cases, ultimate serious difficulty or liquidation, unless through prompt and intelligent action from time to time, the Office of Price Administration is able to keep it out of the fatal squeeze. The difficulty with this situation is the countless number of cases in which individual small businesses suffer hardships resulting from blanket orders applied to price situations as a whole. Orders and regulations of this type tend to freeze the more efficient or larger (chain, etc.) units into a very favorable situation. Nevertheless all economic groups appear to see the necessity of price control as a preventive measure against inflation. This leads to the conclusion that the problem will be with us for the duration and perhaps even for some time after.

These conditions, directly brought about by the war effort and economy, are here to stay for the duration of the war. They cannot be eliminated and their injurious effect upon countless numbers of small business units can be minimized only to a degree. I will later make several suggestions as to how this can be most effectively done.

PROBLEMS FACING SMALL BUSINESS NOT NATURALLY FLOWING FROM THE WAR

We are now dealing with that field of problems and conditions injuriously affecting small business units brought about by:

1. Legislation unduly hampering or interfering with the healthy operation of the profit motive and profit system;

2. Unsound regulations and policies issued and adopted respectively by Federal agencies charged with the enforcement of legislation affecting business;

3. Concentration of a large percentage of war orders in the hands of relatively few concerns; and

4. Inability of small business to obtain equity money or term financing.

There are many merchandising, manufacturing, and servicing business units which can and should be safeguarded and permitted to operate in a sound and adequately profitable manner. These are the concerns which will not be compelled to close their doors by reason of the conditions or problems directly flowing from the war, such as material shortage and the others enumerated under the preceding heading. These are the small business units which fit or must be allowed to fit into the war production program and the essential civilian economy. I say that there is no more important task facing this committee than to insure the inclusion of every single one possible into this picture.

All classes of our people realize that the post-war period will be one of tremendous adjustment and will be accompanied by many grave social and economic problems. None but the chronic pessimist doubts our ability to face this period and find the answers to these problems with a united front and in the American way. We will have a tremendous national debt on which the people must pay at least interest during this period. Millions of men will be released from the armed forces and must be absorbed into peacetime pursuits and vocations as expeditiously as possible.

Small business will play a dominant part in enabling us to solve these problems. The extent to which it can do this will be determined by the conditions under which it operates from now on. It is with this ultimate result in mind that I am pointing out these problems and suggestions for their elimination or removal.

Let us consider now the effect on small business of the present tax laws embodied in the Revenue Act of 1942, more specifically those sections dealing with excess-profits tax on corporations.

The apparent purpose of this tax is to limit unreasonable corporation profits after deductions based upon:

(a) A percentage of invested capital not over $5,000,000, or

(b) 95 percent of a corporation's average earnings during the years 1936–40, which are known as the base period.

The law contains many provisions designed to eliminate hardships in particular cases and allowing considerable flexibility in choice of methods of computation, alternative credits, and deductions. This tax applies only to corporations and organizations taxable as such. It does not include business concerns operated as individual proprietorships or in the form of partnerships.

A great volume of small business has been carried on in corporate form because of the limited liability and other beneficial features, among which are greater continuity, flexibility of management, and the ability to obtain needed capital by the sale of shares or securities.

While I recognize the wisdom and necessity of regulating excess profits it seems to me that the great body of small business carried on by corporations should be accorded substantially the same latitude with respect to their net earnings as individuals or partnerships. All small business enterprises, whether corporate or otherwise, must receive fair treatment under the tax laws. Because of the discriminatory treatment imposed on the corporate form of business unit under the present excess-profits tax there is a general desire to avoid this tax. This cannot be advantageously done in cases where such a surplus has been established as would result in taxable distribution to the shareholders. For the same reason no attorney or accountant would now advise a small business enterprise to incorporate.

Furthermore, in my opinion, this excess-profits tax will not permit the accumulation of sufficient reserves, or cushion, to enable many small corporations to weather the war and post-war adjustment period and perform their proper role in restoring a healthy and productive peacetime economy. It seems to me it would be very much better both for the Government and for small business if the excess-profits tax were to be modified so as to permit small corporations to retain a greater percentage of net earnings rather than to look forward to the necessity of large scale Government subsidizing.

Under the head of "unsound regulations and policies," I desire to call your attention particularly to the following:

1. Certain practices of the Bureau of Internal Revenue having to do with allowances for depreciation of capital equipment and method of establishing salaries and salary adjustments.

This comment applies chiefly to manufacturing concerns and those generally having a substantial part of their assets invested in machinery and productive equipment other than real estate. Although these assets are now used by many concerns for a much greater part of the work week than normally, or continuously on a 24-hour day basis, the rate of depreciation has not been increased. It is obvious that this condition should be remedied.

Congress has recognized the fairness of allowing greater depreciation of facilities newly purchased for use in war production by enacting legislation allowing amortization of such facilities over a period of 5 years. The congressional intent established by this Act supports my statement.

2. With respect to officers' salaries in small corporations, we find a similar situation to that of the excess-profits tax previously considered.

Under Federal tax law there is no limit to the income an individual or a partner may receive from the successful operation of his business, while the salary or compensation of one who is a stockholder and officer in a small corporation is closely scrutinized and often reduced or disallowed in substantial part as a deductible business expense before corporate income tax is levied. A hardship is often created whereby the salary paid is disallowed after a year or more, which then requires the corporation to pay the Government a substantial tax thereon, which under present law might reach 90 percent.

It is my opinion that the present normal tax and surtax rate on individual income are sufficient to prevent any substantial tax loss to the Government.

3. Renegotiation of war contracts: Congress, recognizing the necessity of recapturing excess profits from war contracts, has enacted legislation for this purpose, delegating the duties respectively to the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Treasury, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission. Each exercises in his department discretion as to what constitutes excess profits in a given case.

Statements regarding the use of this power have recently appeared in the press and various business periodicals to the effect that the yardstick for profits on war business should be one-third to one-half of normal profits, based upon pre-war earnings, and that the 20-percent amortization permitted under other sections of the tax law would not be binding upon the renegotiating agencies, but that their allowance would be discretionary.

In a recent speech given before the General Motors Club at Buffalo, N. Y., Mr. Alfred P. Sloan, chairman of the board of directors of General Motors Corporation, sanctioned the yardstick stated with respect to profits on behalf of General Motors Corporation. This standard of determining war profits is proper and suitable for large concerns holding huge volumes of war contracts. If arbitrarily applied to small business concerns, however, it would put them out of business. This power of life and death over small business concerns must be used with the greatest care to avoid the harmful results stated.

4. Concentration of war orders in the hands of a few: Congress has recognized the existence and danger to small business in this situation by Public Law 603 of June 11, 1942, the title of which is: "an act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interest of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes."

In my opinion this law is adequate to accomplish the purpose intended. It grants the necessary power and discretion, directs that relief shall be given, provides the machinery, and retains congressional supervision of its administration. In the Buffalo, N. Y., area in recent weeks appeared newspaper articles inspired by the officials administering this law, urging small business concerns to avail themselves of help under it. I am reliably informed that many have applied for help. Upward of 150 have been recognized as distress cases requiring assistance. The local officials are earnestly endeavoring to help these cases in the spirit of the act.

The extent to which small business can and should be helped under this act is dependent on its vigorous and sympathetic administration.

5. Inability to obtain equity money or term financing: Since about 1929, it has been difficult for many small business concerns to obtain term-financing. During the early years of the depression period term loans in bank portfolios secured by fixed assets of small business concerns were frequently so unrealized as to substantially cut off this type of credit. The unhappy experience of many banks with these loans caused them to be regarded with disfavor. While this feeling in

bank circles has been dissipated to a considerable degree, it is generally the attitude of banks and their supervisory authorities that loans to small business should be based on the ability to liquidate from current assets, and that these loans should be primarily used for working capital purposes.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has come to the assistance of many small business concerns which could not meet banking requirements. Banks have participated in many of these Reconstruction Finance Corporation term loans and have not fared too badly.

Adequate financing is provided in connection with the war program in the form of regulation V loans and those methods set forth under the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act. I do not believe, however, that these types of credit furnished a satisfactory answer to the problem of term financing. It is admittedly a difficult one. A solution worthy of consideration would be the issue by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of partial guaranties of this type of loan to commercial banks operating in much the same manner as loans under regulation V.

The best way to effect the free flow of equity money, or in the strict sense, invested money, into small business is to make conditions such that small corporate enterprises may retain a fair percentage of their net earnings. Easing of the excess-profits-tax law as previously recommended would be one concrete way to accomplish this result. The Government will not have to urge people to invest their money in small business when they can profit to an extent commensurate with the risk they take.

CONCLUSION

If the profit motive, properly regulated, is given a fair opportunity to operate, that would furnish the necessary stimulus.

As I have said, however, small business in any event is facing a most difficult period. I earnestly suggest that those in positions of sweeping authority over manpower and price-fixing matters weigh carefully the effect of their public announcements and broadside statements. In many instances these appear to conflict, sometimes from day to day. To cite an example, when Mr. McNutt recently announced that married men in certain occupations must either obtain work in essential defense activities or prepare to be drafted into the armed services, a condition of near panic arose among workers of most small businesses not directly engaged in the war effort. I personally know that in the Buffalo area many of those engaged in the handling and distribution of food, without notice in many cases, left their employment for jobs in war plants. A short time later this statement was amplified by manpower authorities to the effect that married men soon would be drafted anyway.

The change-over, however, should be accomplished in more orderly fashion. More care should be exercised in these matters.

Wastage of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I present for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Labor Is Wasted" from the Daily Argus Leader of Sioux Falls, N. Dak., under date of February 27.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW LABOR IS WASTED

Our discussions of "featherbedding" in recent days have brought to light several additional examples—instances in which union regulations have resulted in the waste instead of the conservation of manpower. And in not all cases, it appears, have the unions been responsible. There have been examples in which it seemed that the contractors had no objection to a pyramiding of costs.

In order to avoid trouble, some of those who have provided information have asked that their identity be kept secret. We are prevented, therefore, from revealing the exact sources.

Before us are excerpts from a letter by a former South Dakotan now on the west coast.

"I went to the west coast to work in the shipyards," he says. "By special permission I was escorted through one of the yards. After making the tour I asked what work I would have to do. The man pointed to a man welding. I looked and said that I was no welder. Then he explained that the job I could have was that of the man standing beside the welder. I asked what he did. The answer was 'nothing.' I didn't accept the job."

"Later I found the same condition existed in other yards along the northwest coast, especially when the contractor had a cost-plus contract, It is better to have a pay roll of 20,000 men than one of 5,000.

"The employees are restless and as a result they were making finger rings and cribbage boards from chrome while on duty. In some instances they did not report for work. At one shipyard, when they had inspection, they would put the excess employees in a room until after inspection.

"One employee told me that one-fourth of the men drawing checks could do all of the work in less time than the entire crew. For illustration, to wipe a ship the electrician would have to find the lead man, who wasn't easy to find, the tinsmiths' union to cut a hole through the bulkhead. He then would have to find the lead man of the carpenter's union to build a hole through the ceiling. The ceiling was of thicker material and, thus, came under a different union. The next step was to find the lead man of the carpenters' union to build a scaffolding so he could reach his work. The small job usually took about 8 hours. It was a 1-hour job for a man with the proper tools and equipment.

"I was told also that the boards that were used for forms were not reused but instead were burned, using oil to start the fire."

Then there was the case of the South Dakota woman who obtained a job on the west coast in a war industry. With overtime, she was making $50 a week—by far the largest income she had ever had. She felt that she should work hard. She was promptly told by union representatives to do less. She replied that she was being paid well, that the material they were fabricating was essential in the war work, and that she wouldn't be a slacker. In a few days she lost her job.

Another South Dakotan told us about a group of several men who did nothing—absolutely nothing—for a period of about 2 weeks. For 5 days of each week they drew regular pay. For the sixth day they got time and one-half. For the seventh day they were paid double time.

Almost as a unit our informers say that the Middle West workers are disturbed by these tactics, while the west coast workers seem to accept them without qualms.

The Argus-Leader appreciates the possibility that all one hears is not necessarily true. It realizes also that in the rapid development of our war industry some confusion and waste are unavoidable.

Yet so many stories have been relayed to us that we feel it is the duty of Congress to make more exhaustive investigations than have been undertaken. It is well to point out that an investigation committee, whose approach is heralded by brass bands, is not likely to see these things or to hear all that it should about them.

This is war, and an all-out production program is important. That first consideration, of course, is production but not to be overlooked is the cost. Many people—people of small incomes—are digging deeply into their pocketbooks today to pay Federal taxes and to buy war bonds. Congress is the trustee of their funds. Is Congress conducting that trusteeship as it should?

Work of the Selective Service Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Job of the Selective Service Boards, delivered by me on February 13, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, at the outset, I want to extend my thanks to Commander Frank and the members of the American Legion for giving me this opportunity to appear before them and before the members of three of the Selective Service Boards here in Milwaukee.

It is most fitting that we should meet here tonight to tender our appreciation and recognition of the services rendered by the Selective Service Boards and the American Legion.

The award of Legion citations to members of the draft board is a well-deserved recognition for diligent attention to a most difficult task.

It is also fitting that the Bay View Post has been appropriately recognized with the Navy merit award for having recruited 35 Navy recruits and for having collected some 250,000 pounds of high-quality scrap metal. In so doing, the Legion has again demonstrated its ability to serve and has again made a contribution.

It may be that no Selective Service Board in America has a record which is entirely free of mistakes. Probably no court in America is entirely free from mistakes. By and large, however, the Selective Service Boards throughout our land have made a great voluntary unpaid patriotic contribution.

Throughout our land leading citizens have given freely of their time and their judgment to serve on the Selective Service Boards of the Nation. By and large they have demonstrated a high standard of integrity and an unbiased judicial approach and a sincere determination to do the best possible kind of a job.

These boards have given unstintingly of their time and have borne the brunt of

criticism which frequently might more properly have been lodged not against the individual boards but against the possible lack of a clearly-defined general policy.

The men of these draft boards have rendered an outstanding service and they deserve the commendation and the gratitude of American citizens.

The job which confronts these Selective Service Boards in the immediate future will be an even more difficult job. Recent regulations by the War Manpower Commissioner and Selective Service authorities have vastly increased the problems of Selective Service Boards. The new regulations call for a fine discrimination—a true evaluation—and rare good judgment—in evaluating the various calls made upon our manpower as dependency vanishes as a separate basis for deferment.

I know that the members of these boards and boards all over America will meet their increased responsibilities with their best possible judgment in a manner which will result in utilizing our manpower to the greatest possible advantage for the war effort.

The Selective Service Boards throughout the Nation have demonstrated, first, that voluntary, unpaid, unselfish civic leaders can frequently do a better job than any vast bureaucratic horde; second, they have demonstrated the desirability of a definite national policy geared to competent local administration.

In passing, I might say that both of these points perhaps have some bearing on a policy which must be considered in the post-war period. I am referring now to the policy of utilizing in the post-war crisis which will come after we have won a righteous victory and a just peace of carrying over into that post-war period the principle of administration geared to local needs and problems. That is something for us to think about in connection with federalized social-security proposals and Federal educational-assistance programs.

Along with the localized administration which has characterized selective service boards, it is apparent, however, that there is also a need for a clearly-defined, unmistakable national over-all policy.

Our national selective service policy has not been clearly defined, and that has been a grave shortcoming—a shortcoming for which the local boards are not responsible.

That, too, has its application in the post-war period. If we are to utilize the principle of integrating Federal programs and localized administration successfully in the post-war period, the localized program must be based on a clearly defined national policy and a clearly defined workable pattern of rules.

That brings me to another idea which I would like to leave here tonight. It is a simple idea. It is the idea that the work of the selective service systems must have a definite carry-over into the post-war period.

Let me indicate specifically how I think the selective service system itself should have its carry-over in the post-war days.

First of all, I believe that we must maintain some kind of orderly program of military training for the post-war period. I say that not in the belief that we must be a militaristic Nation, and certainly not in the belief that we should have a militaristic government.

I say that solely in the belief that we must maintain some type of training in order that we may remain at peace.

It is perhaps impossible to determine without a thorough analysis the precise type of training program which we should have. I think it is fair to say, however, that we ought to study the Swiss system very carefully because this system has so well served that little nation.

Second: I believe that we must utilize the tremendous amount of data which the selective service system has accumulated. This data represents a tremendous storehouse—a treasury— of valuable information which can be tremendously helpful in planning our post-war economy.

Long before the close of this war the War Manpower Commission and the Selective Service System should set aside a portion of its personnel for the specific purpose of organizing the selective service information so that it can be of most value to us in the post-war period.

That will mean that in the post-war period we will have a tremendous factual record—let us say in matters of health and nutrition. On the basis of these records we can determine, for example, the regional deficiencies in diet which have resulted in certain physical deficiencies in the men of one section of the country or another. The findings of the Selective Service System, coupled with the official Army records, could well be made the basis for a practical nutritional program.

In the Selective Service System and in the War Department itself we have accumulated the most comprehensive survey of American skills which has ever been made.

It is just plain ordinary horse sense that that survey of American skills, experience, aptitudes, scientific knowledge, education—can all be utilized in planning our post-war employment.

There is no reason on earth why America should face a chaotic unplanned post-war period built on the shifting sands of day-to-day expediency.

We are accumulating the data on American manpower—how much manpower is available—what its skills are, and how those skills can be applied.

There is no reason why all this tremendous storehouse of information can't be used by industry in a planned post-war employment program.

All of this information can serve to help materially in planning our sociological and economic trends in the post-war period. There is an imperative need for setting up post-war plans, at least partially, on the basis of Selective Service and Army records. That kind of planning should be begun long before the war is over. This must be a function of the War Manpower Commission working in close collaboration with the Selective Service and with the Army and Navy.

This brings me to the subject of private enterprise and Government enterprise in the post-war period.

When the war is won there will be the immediate problem of reconversion to peacetime economy; the problem of employment and getting our industrial plant retooled to peacetime requirements.

Right now we are undergoing a drastic distortion of our economy—everything serves the war effort. In the change which will occur when peace comes we must be ready to meet every impact, otherwise you may see a violent post-war inflation. Why? Because there will be a great accumulated demand for durable consumer's goods which we won't be ready to produce.

It will take time to retool and equip our industry to produce civilian goods. Therefore, we will have a condition where demand will exceed supply, more so even than now. Consequently we will probably need wartime price controls in order to prevent this chaotic, inflationary trend. Of course, as soon as we are producing consumer's goods on a scale that will meet the demand we should get rid of these controls by Government—priorities, allocations, rationing, and price.

This problem when the war ceases of placing millions of men back to work will be no small job after they are discharged from the military forces and the war production industries. During this period unemployment insurance and dismissal wages may have to be relied upon. There will have to be an efficient job-placement program. But we must think this thing through.

At this time some of the best brains we have in this country are being used to develop a long-range view of the post-war period. We expect great technical developments. There will undoubtedly be new and cheaper methods of production, new raw materials, new processes and new production, improved plant lay-outs—all of which will make for stimulation in the post-war economy. Then there will be the great national needs that will have to be met. I refer to shortage in houses, the wear-out in automobiles, the building of highways, etc., and the great international needs to be met. This would all seem to point toward a healthy post-war period for some time following the war.

However, unless we stop the operation of the business cycle which we have become acquainted with throughout our national history of depressions following prosperity, we will again find ourselves in the midst of a depression that will test our ability to survive. Personally I believe that with vision (and you will remember the statesman of old said, "Without vision the people perish") we need not perish or run into a great economic depression. The job seems to be one that calls for the utilization of the entire economic strength and brains of the Nation. Big and small business is very much aware of the challenge. Government is aware of it. Labor is aware of it.

I believe that there is ample brain power available in this country to provide the antidote against another depression, and we have the resources available. All we need is to get acquainted with the "how" to do the job. This calls for realism—the realism which will fearlessly do the thing that has to be done. We are learning two great lessons out of this war period—the lesson of coordination, playing ball together, and the lesson of being prepared. When a great people sets its shoulders to the wheel, it can accomplish most anything that it desires to accomplish. Right now we have made up our minds that Hirohito and Hitler must be defeated, and as a result this great Nation has done the impossible in production. It has also raised its economic income so that in 1943 it will probably be $130,000,000,000. That is an important point to remember in the plan which should be laid out to be ready for any emergency in the post-war period.

We have learned, I repeat, that we can accomplish in unified action what we cannot accomplish individually. In other words, in the post-war period if we should face a possible depression with the possibilities of a mass unemployment, we might have to act in unity again as we now act against the enemy, utilizing the Government as a vast balance wheel in our economy.

What do I mean—I mean that in the first place it is elementary that a large percentage of our employables be employed, either with or without the impetus of government. When they are, our national income goes up, with the resulting demand for consumer's goods making the economic current healthy and taxes available for government. To accomplish this objective we must be prepared through private or public enterprise, or both, for the occasion.

In other words, if government has to step into the picture it should only do so where it is definitely clear that private enterprise cannot be counted upon to do the job alone, and when government does step into the picture it must only do so because it is the timely thing to do—so government must likewise be prepared with plans not merely to create jobs but to create work which will result eventually in work for and by private enterprise.

Do what, you ask. Undertake public works which provide labor and stimulus to the economic current, not merely leaf-raking projects. A reservoir of public works should be built up during good times. States should

cooperate with the Federal Government in this respect.

Special thought should be given to those undertakings by Government action which "clear the way and open up opportunities for new or expanded private enterprise."

Right now we should be creating a reservoir of projects, planning for slum clearance, urban development, regional development, etc.

When government steps into the picture under the circumstances I have mentioned above, it must do its part with efficiency. Public servants who waste the public funds should be cashiered as quickly as an incompetent employee in private industry.

As I look into the future when the war is over—it may be 1 or 2 or 3 years, or more before the job is done—I do so hopefully. Wherever I go I find that the "thinkers" are in action, and when I say "thinkers" I mean men of common sense and vision. In America we are beginning to realize that this economic system of ours is man-made, that to a large extent we can shape its course if we prepare ourselves in advance. We don't have to permit the periodic recurrence of having millions of our people unemployed and with resulting suffering rampant in the land, if we just use our heads.

I believe that this generation is alert to the lessons learned out of the last great depression, as well as alert to the lessons learned at Pearl Harbor. I believe this people will remain on guard against the dangers from without as well as the dangers from within.

Yesterday we celebrated the birthday of a great American—Abraham Lincoln. He was great because he always tended to the job that was before him; great because he had developed a great sense of humor, which he used as a safety valve when critical situations faced him; great because he had faith in right and in the effectiveness of prayer; great because he was honest, humble, and a great lover of the Republic and his fellowman.

You men of the Selective Service Boards have performed your job well, and in the days that are up ahead you will "carry on" in a great and constructive manner. We are living in a great day, a great age, and we can be grateful that we have a part in performing a great job. And I know that as in the past so in the future each one of you will do your job well.

Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article I wrote for the January 1943 issue of the Newslet, a pamphlet published by the State of New Jersey Good Will Commission.

New Jersey is the first State in the Union to have created a commission of this kind. The purpose of the commission is to break down prejudice and intolerance and to build real Americanism among all its citizens.

I understand that current legislation is now being introduced in the New York and Pennsylvania Legislatures to create similar commissions. I am very proud of the fact that New Jersey, the Garden State of the Union, has taken the lead in this type of American morale building.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In these hours of great peril which face our Nation the very essence of thought in America should be unity—unity of all races, creeds, and colors.

It has been approximately 150 years since our forefathers, through their devotion and loyalty, their sweat, blood, and tears, brought into existence the Nation that has become the beacon light for all free-thinking men and women in all parts of the world. Today this cradle of liberty, composed of a cross-section of all creeds of practically all nations, faces possible extinction. It is vital that those who believe in liberty and the pursuit of happiness join forces to destroy those international gangster dictators who seek to erase the ideals of tolerance and understanding which have been ours for over 150 years.

With thousands upon thousands of our young men and women fighting at home and on the war-torn battlefields of far-flung frontiers, and on the sea lanes of the world, we who remain at home must and will strive desperately to keep alive the very principles for which they are struggling. There is no place in America today for those who would array one religious group against another; there is no place in America today for arraying color against color, individual against individual, class against class. Unless we symbolize by our actions on the home front unity for democracy, the efforts of our fighting men and women everywhere will be in vain.

There has never been a time in the history of this Nation when there has been greater need than now to prove by our actions here at home that this country stands united for the principles of our democratic form of government and the American way of life. With the whole world aflame—with the forces of destruction running amuck in all quarters of the globe—America stands as a challenge to their utter ruthlessness. The people of America must unite as one great force to combat successfully these disciples of hate and ruin.

All of us everywhere must be vigilant so that the heritage handed down to us by our forefathers may forever stand as a symbol of external hope to oppressed people the world over. Americans must and will guard the ramparts.

Lincoln Day Address by Senator Brooks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper article including parts of a Lincoln Day speech delivered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] in Kokomo, Ind., on February 12, 1943. The article appeared in the Kokomo (Ind.) Tribune on February 13, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUST WIN HOME BATTLE, BROOKS TELLS AUDIENCE—SENATOR DECLARES DOUBLE TASK IS FACED—PRESERVE BILL OF RIGHTS AND WIN THE WAR

Republicans, 500 strong, filled the Masonic Temple Friday night to honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln in one of the most impressive Lincoln Day meetings ever held in Kokomo, and they were solemnly reminded that Lincoln's fight to preserve the representative form of government is vitally important today with the Nation engaged in another great war.

United States Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS, of Illinois, making his first appearance here, moved the large gathering with a deadly serious picture of what he said is the double task of the American people.

He warned that, while we must win one war abroad, we must also win one at home. "We should not become so involved by the generalities of the four freedoms that we will lose sight of the Bill of Rights for our people at home, and we must not become so occupied with the Atlantic Charter that we will lose the precious protection guaranteed by our Constitution," he said.

MUST MAKE DECISIONS

Americans, Senator BROOKS declared, must participate to a much greater extent than ever before in decisions that a free people have to make if they are to remain free. "You are citizens of a representative government and you should let your representatives know how you feel about things," he said.

Discussing the Government's plans for 11,000,000 men in its armed forces, the Senator said he has found no sentiment for limiting the Navy in any way, since it is charged with the task of transporting overseas the men and materials needed to win the war. But, he said, he was concerned about the size of the Army for it may take too much manpower from the farms and cripple our food production.

"The problem is," he said, "can we feed our allies, the civilian populations stripped by the enemy, and an Army of more than 8,000,000 soldiers and still be strong at the end of the war? The nation with the greatest reserve of food will have the greatest influence in the post-war world. Germany cracked at home in the last war because she failed to plan for enough food. There is no use talking of a full-strength Army or a full-strength Navy without full strength of the food front. I cite this question because it is one that we all must study."

AMERICANS LOVE FREEDOM

The American love of freedom—which he said was Lincoln's foremost ideal—was traced by the speaker to the Revolutionary period of 1776. It was not until midway in that Revolution that the people realized they must have unity in their fight for independence, he said. Then he spoke of the Government the founding fathers established—having the permanent division of authority over the people in the executive, judicial, and legislative branches. "The founders so thoroughly distributed this authority they thought no single despot or family or class would ever take over absolute control of the Government," he said.

"After the Government was set up the States insisted on individual rights," he continued. "They demanded the principles which they got in the Bill of Rights.

"During Lincoln's period in Illinois the question of slavery was burning high, and it had to be settled. The Republican Party was born and Lincoln became its leader. He gave the party its greatest luster and achievement. He proved to be the qualified leader because he loved liberty and hated oppression. Lincoln's motivating force was to preserve this form of government and adhere to the Bill of Rights. The emancipation of the slaves was

one way in which he believed he could carry out the spirit of that bill."

NATION POWERFUL IN 1917

Continuing his outline of the Nation's progress, the Senator said that by 1917 "we were the freest, the richest, and most powerful Nation in the world. The Old World was in war and cried out to us to help end that war and thus end all war. It was a great appeal, worthy of a great sacrifice, and we made the sacrifice. Then came this new war—a different and more terrible one than our country has ever fought."

He spoke of the food problem in the light of his current studies as a Member of the Senate subcommittee which is examining the Army and Navy demands for more millions of men. Not only must our forces travel farther to many fighting fronts than any other nation, but we must carry food for our own troops and for the people in the conquered lands.

"Producing the ships, the planes, and supplies for ourselves and our allies as well is the most gigantic undertaking in the history of man," Senator BROOKS said. "And in addition we find the problem of food to be fast moving into first place as a weapon, not only for winning the war, but for winning the peace.

"We are in total war, remember, and although we give expression to our optimism, it may very well ultimately result in a contest that will be decided by the utter exhaustion of nations.

"Our generals demand the greatest number of men for the Army that is possible, and I suppose that if I were charged with their responsibility I would do likewise. Our admirals demand the highest standard and maximum number of men for the Navy, and rightfully so. The same is true of the Air Forces, and the Coast Guard, and the Marines.

"But when we engage in a war so vast in magnitude and distances, we must consider the production and supply of food and civilian goods for the morale of the home front as well as the fighting front.

"And it is the duty of the Congress, chosen by the people, to guard this home front not only in civilian supplies but in the production of implements and necessities of food for all purposes of war.

"No one can tell when this war will end. In the last 2 years 4,000,000 men were drawn from the farms of America, either for service in the armed forces or to work in factories. We are expected to increase our production of food by 30 percent over last year's high record crop and do it with 4,000,000 fewer men and less machinery. This is a problem that must be considered carefully lest we lose the war at home."

WAR DEMANDS ENERGY

Then, citing the enormity of the present struggle, the Senator said, "It will take everything you have in enthusiasm, energy and service to see that we win. I don't know what kind or form of sacrifice you will be called on to make—and make no mistake about it, you will be asked to make one—but I ask you to accept it with courage, confidence and good will."

"This is a killing war," he went on, "We must search out the enemy and kill him, and it will end only when he has had so many killed he cannot go on. The future seems uncertain, but we can take heart from the fact that freemen can outfight any others in the world. Our secret weapon is this initiative of freemen, and it is the world's hope. The Republican Party has a greater responsibility than ever in its history—it must keep representative government in existence, and it must hold the present Government to a strict accounting of its conduct of our welfare and destiny."

George Washington Dinner Address by Hon. Frank C. Walker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Hon. Frank C. Walker, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at the George Washington dinner held on Friday evening, February 26, 1943, at the Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I consider it an honor to be called at this time to speak to this very representative gathering of Americans of the wonder city of Detroit and of historic Michigan, where the East meets the West. Your almost miraculous achievements of the past 2 years have merited for you the distinction of being the Nation's outstanding center for mass production of the weapons of war.

You serve as an inspiration and an example to your sister States. Your fame is known in all corners of the world. I salute you, and on behalf of the administration at Washington I commend your fine effort and glorious spirit.

You have given conclusive evidence that a democracy really at work can far surpass in industrial accomplishment all of the vaunted records of the regimented nations, meanwhile retaining the rights and liberties of its people.

I repeat, it is an honor to be with you. The Nation is proud of you.

I come to you tonight as the representative of one of the two great political parties, of which you gathered here are members. My appeal, for the most part, will be directed to you and the good people of your State as citizens rather than as partisans.

In bringing you my message I am fully mindful, however, of the fact that in this grave crisis our party is the party of the majority, charged as such with full responsibility for the successful prosecution of the greatest war in history.

In a democracy the full responsibility lies with the party in power—the right to criticize rests with the opposition. That is as it should be and with the exercise of that right I have no quarrel.

At the outset, let me say I am a sincere and earnest advocate of the two-party system. To this system is attributable the fine and flourishing democracy of ours that today stands before the world as an exemplar of good government created by the will of the people.

In a democracy the will of the people is supreme Opportunity is afforded to debate, to criticize, to express opinion freely. After open discussion of the issues, the people register their will—the will of the majority, which accordingly prevails.

Following the correct American concept, the debate should be conducted on a high plane, governed by fair rules and a proper sense of ethics. To obtain a true expression of the will of the people, the conflict should be without rancor—the criticism constructive in kind. It is in this fashion that democracy functions at its best.

It is not my thought, in the days as grave as these, to launch into an attack upon those of the opposition who devote the major part of their energies to continuous criticism of this administration's conduct of the war. Let it be made clear, however, that in the main they do "protest too much." Their continued protestations make obvious their motives.

To them we give this answer: "You cannot justify your constant criticism, plainly destructive in character, by professing it is designed to aid in the prosecution of the war."

We have listened too long to these heralds of criticism and complaint.

We are not going to permit these spokesmen of the opposition to advance their own political cause by selecting issues most agreeable to their own purposes.

They would draw a film before the eyes of the citizens of America, that their vision might be dimmed. They would speak long and loudly and loftily of the errors in our efforts. They would distract us in our thinking—that we might forget the things that have been done.

But let me remind them that the vision of the American people is clear and penetrating. They are not concerned with nonessentials. The opposition would have them forget the Democratic record of the past decade. The American people will never forget it.

Let us glance briefly at the record.

Let me take you back, my friends, to the closing years of the twenties, and along to the midsummer of 1932, when the whole industrial, financial and economic fabric of the country was in imminent danger of collapse.

Let us follow the 10 years of rehabilitation that make a bright chapter in the annals of the Nation—10 years of achievement in the fields of social progress attained under the wisdom, the direction and the courage of our President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The historians of the future, with a true sense of values, will write it down as the glorious decade in which the friendly hand of the Government in Washington reached into every humble American home to bring security and confidence to families overwhelmed with adversity and stricken with the fears of recurring disaster.

Let us recall the 12,000,000, willing to work but unable to find jobs—the bread lines on the streets—the paralysis on the farms—the idle wheels and smokeless chimneys of our factories—the ominous signs on the doors of the closed banks where not even the savings of the workers were accessible.

It was a sad scene, my friends. In this country of ours—the world's greatest storehouse of treasure and resources—50,000,000 people were actually in want.

Countless billions of wealth had been dug out of our mines, manufactured from our forests, produced in our vast agricultural empire, fabricated from our superb industrial plants—yet 50,000,000 people were in want, out of work, ill-clad, ill-nourished and most of them in houses not fit for human habitation.

Franklin Roosevelt came to the White House with an understanding and a determination to put an end to this monstrous reflection upon the effectiveness of popular rule.

A Democratic administration restored the homely things that make and keep a nation strong. It had not forgotten what its opponents had forgotten. It had not forgotten that if a nation itself is to endure, the common man must be kept strong and proud—proud of himself, proud of his home, proud of his family, proud of his Government.

These humane policies relieved the most distressful period our country had ever known. Self-respect was restored to the millions who were given opportunity to work, not beg, for their daily bread.

At the close of the first administration of President Roosevelt want had been dissipated,

fear had vanished, the man and woman able and willing to work had the assurance of a pay check and the necessities of life for the family at home.

This was the situation and these the conditions when the clouds of war, long gathering, began to lower over Europe.

Following the triumph over the elements of domestic chaos and collapse, the Democratic administration was called upon to meet mighty enemies from abroad.

With prophetic foresight, the President had already utilized the power and influence of the United States in an effort to prevent the actual outbreak of war. By appeals to the rulers abroad in the early stages of the disputes and later by warning the aggressors he hoped to quench the smoldering flames, but without avail.

After the murderous invasion of the Republic of Poland, which brought France and England into direct conflict with the Nazis, all hopes for peace vanished, and when Hitler's armies swept west through Holland, Belgium, and France, the Nazi stood astride the continent of Europe.

The world was aghast at this juggernaut which rolled with murderous speed across the continent, crushing the armed resistance of great powers, smashing down supposedly impregnable fortresses as if they had been houses of cards. Nations trembled, populations in utter panic ran for shelter, but there was no shelter—the modern Attila, Scourge of God, had set out to ravage the world.

Consternation reigned in the capitals of the old world. In Washington, President Roosevelt explored every avenue for mediation, by personal appeal and the instruments of diplomacy. With extraordinary vision and understanding, he moved to meet each new development in this imponderable crisis.

Quickly there followed the acquisition of the strategic bases in the western hemisphere, the dispatch to England of destroyers vital at that moment for mutual security, the potent policy of lend-lease, the selective service legislation and other emergency measures.

With lightning speed the great industries of the Nation, all across the country, began to be converted into war plants.

All these things the opposition would have us forget, but the people will not forget.

The critics continued to condemn every step in this prudent program, just as they had found fault with every step in the great 7-year program for domestic rehabilitation.

The opposition would like to forget these accomplishments which later proved providential. They would have you forget them, but America and the world will never forget them.

The opposition fought year by year the President's consistent efforts to build an adequate navy for the protection of the hemisphere. The opposition strove to obstruct his plans for strengthening our defenses in the Pacific.

The President, for 7 years, had been insistent in his demands for increased strength in the air. For 7 years the administration had been wisely constructing air fields, runways, and hangars, utilizing the unemployed millions for much of this construction. Before the war came, the Roosevelt administration had built and improved with this labor 640,000 miles of what are now God-sent military highways.

The opposition scoffed at these precautions and these vital developments. Now that naval and air power has saved our western shores from invasion, they would have you forget that program of construction. The American people will never forget it.

When the Japanese struck treacherously at Pearl Harbor, the Democratic administration had already seen to it that arms production was rising rapidly.

Within 1 year of our entrance into the war, our negligible standing Army had grown to be the most powerful ever marshaled in a like period. Within the coming year it will surpass, in manpower and equipment on land and in the air, any military force in the world's history.

Our Nation is now what the President promised 2 years ago—a veritable arsenal of democracy. Let America's great industrial leaders themselves present the facts. Here is the record:

In 1 year our war plants gave to the armies of democracy more military airplanes than were built by Germany, Italy, and Japan combined.

In 1 year our war plants manufactured 10 times as much artillery ammunition as we produced during the entire 18 months of the First World War and 3 times the quantity of small-arms ammunition and machine guns.

In 1 year our war plants have turned out tanks and other combat vehicles, in number, 56,000.

In 1 year our shipbuilders have launched 8,000,000 tons of merchant ships.

Hitler spent 10 years in building his fearful war machine; in 2 years the unregimented efforts of the free men of the United States surpassed the arms production, not only of Hitler, but of all the Axis Powers combined.

These materials of war are now being used effectively in all parts of the world.

Your President, your Commander in Chief, has seen these things with his very eyes.

He has seen the men at the machines; he has mingled with the men and women in the factories. He knows what has been accomplished.

Your President, your Commander in Chief, not only saw these great accomplishments in production of arms, but he himself flew to the very theater of operations and witnessed the accomplishments there. And there, too, he consulted with his own and allied military leaders and formulated plans for final victory.

Returning, he brought us the message: "The only terms on which we shall deal with any Axis government or any Axis factions are the terms proclaimed at Casablanca, unconditional surrender."

My friends, this war is in no sense the age-old conflict between opposing groups of nations, for power, for territory, for trade supremacy. We want no new territory; we want no power over the affairs of other peoples. This is a war between those who respect human rights and those who flout the idea of human rights.

This war was begun coldly, conceived deliberately. It was designed to destroy all that civilization as accomplished throughout centuries of struggle toward virtue, decency, justice, and human liberty.

Each and all of the defenders of these principles were attacked. In each and every instance, the Nazi-Japanese vandals were the attackers.

The political, ethical, and religious foundations upon which orderly government rests are now being attacked.

We fight a barbarous revolutionary movement—a movement that found birth in the mind of a fanatic who defies not only the laws of civilized government, but the laws of God himself.

This is the people's war. This is not the war of any political party. The people are fighting it on the battle fronts. You here in Detroit and in every city, town, and village are fighting it. We are all soldiers in this great cause.

Against the barbarian Nazi and his brutal consorts, we are resolved to fight on to victory. When that victory is attained, we are resolved to utilize it, first as a means for restoring to the nations the rights and liberties of which they have been deprived, and second to establish such measures of justice and security as each and all, within those rights, may determine in open council, for the future peace and security of the world.

Too often in the past, when the battles were won, tired warriors laid aside their arms before they had achieved that final victory for which they fought—the victory of ideals This time our men who fought for the victory will reap the harvest of the victory.

The Nazis have sought to impose upon the world a slavery of body and soul. We will bring to them a freedom of body and soul—a peace founded on the laws of justice and of human rights. This time we shall not leave the field until the laws of human decency have been established unshakably as the pillars of a better social order.

Those principles epitomize our war aims. I cannot emphasize too strongly that our war aims are identical with our peace terms.

When a sound program for the future organization of the world has taken shape, then will come the supreme test—the test of our will—the test of our strength to win the peace as well as the war.

Into that test we will throw our full power—our moral power and, this time, if necessary, our military power—to insure the lasting peace of liberty and justice. There must be no compromise. The dead of two world wars are looking down upon us. We shall not break the faith again.

I for one shall accept the opposition's challenge and shall recount the administration's record in the public forum. I say let us stand or fall upon our record of achievement. As the party of the majority, we have for the past 10 years been charged with full responsibility for the administration of our Government. I for one am proud of our record.

The last decade has been a glorious decade in American history. No nation in all the world in a like period has made a comparable record in social advancement. No nation in a time of serious world conflict has more nearly adhered to correct principles in its attempt to avoid conflict—no nation has shown a finer spirit of unselfishness in its dealing with belligerent nations. When history is written and the story of our negotiations with Germany, Italy, and Japan is made known, the world will of necessity commend the strict adherence to correct and lofty principles that animated our every act.

My friends, I am not concerned with the critics who harp on the less important things. Let us put first things first. The discomforts and inconveniences we are all suffering are trifling against the vast background of war.

The families of those with sons and brothers in the combat zones appreciate most deeply the gravity of this war. They scan the papers with anxiety day after day. The casualty lists are more important to them than the latest gossip about rationing. The plaints of the critics stir no emotions in their hearts. But they are not despairing. They have the assurance that their loved ones are provided with the best food, the best weapons, and the best medical care ever afforded fighting forces in all time.

The critics, the complainers of Washington's day harried him through all his campaigns but, conscious of the love, the faith, and the prayers of the people, he went on to victory.

This war, my friends, is now in every home. Its shadow falls across every fireside. The people understand what it means. They understand the necessity for unity—they remember that by unity and unswerving fidelity to the Commander in Chief the republic had its birth.

They understand that by unity—unity of purpose—unity of ideals—unity of action—and unfailing loyalty to our Commander in Chief, we too will go to victory.

Address by Mr. Justice Douglas to the American Jewish Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by Mr. Justice William O. Douglas from Washington, D. C., to a meeting of the American Jewish Congress at Madison Square Garden, New York City, on March 1, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In recent decades we have seen this great civilization of ours challenged more than once. We have seen it withstand the ravages of an economic depression which served as the occasion or excuse for throwing Germany into the arms of a modern Genghis Khan. Now our society is being tested in the crucible of war—a war distinguished not only by the magnitude of its military machines but also by new techniques of terror employed by our enemies.

At such a time it is but natural that we should feel the need for a restatement of our ideals. What kind of people are we? Why are we such a disturbing and dangerous symbol to the aggressors? What is the foundation of this society which today faces the mechanized might of the totalitarian States?

The foundation of our society is the minority. It is not merely the minority based on race, creed, or color. It is first and foremost the smallest minority of all—the individual conscience. Hitler would say: "What a weak rod on which to lean in comparison with the forced unanimity of my people! How can one man dare to hold out against the state?"

We know the answer. America has always known the answer. Recognition of the smallest minority is written in blood as well as ink in our Bill of Rights. That precious document represents a great historic struggle to make men free. It is the cornerstone on which our cultural and spiritual values rest. It is a constant reminder to us that once we strike down the expression of ideas which we despise we have forged an instrument for the suppression of ideas which we cherish. We know that the constitutional safeguards of equal justice under the law are absolutely essential to the preservation of liberty. For history has shown that once persecution is unloosed on one minority, it spreads like a blight. We know that man is strong only when man is free; that man is free only when he has those inalienable rights, proclaimed by our Declaration of Independence.

America, like the individual American, has gained its great and unique strength from this respect for the smallest minority. Some of the ancients had as a symbol of unity and strength bundles of sticks which, bound together, could not be broken. That has been our symbol, too. We display it with pride alongside the oldest slogan of our Nation—E Pluribus Unum—out of many, one. We have always been a nation of minorities. No one group can control this free people.

Again and again protest and rebellion against unjustified power have strengthened, not weakened, this Nation. It has helped to create the great, united America that we are today. The Puritans rebelled against the haughty power of the Anglican Church. But when they themselves became intolerant there was a Roger Williams to challenge them. And so it has happened over and over again in the history of this country. At times it was but a single voice which later swelled into a chorus. So it was over 30 years ago when the Nation first heard the mighty voice of a great dissenter—Louis D. Brandeis. He said to those who were using financial and economic power for purposes of exploitation: "You shall not encroach upon the peoples' freedom. Power and responsibility must go hand in hand. Mankind, not the corporation, comes first."

Hitler has challenged this society of ours. In blind obedience to his pagan lust, he has wrecked the culture that has nourished our civilization for 2,000 years. Japan has challenged it in her savage defiance of any right other than that of the sword. Both are attempting to weaken us at home by wrenching at the bonds which unite our innumerable minorities into one indivisible America.

They cannot succeed. For we believe in and are dedicated to majority rule. We know that our majority is created out of minorities who know how to live together, how to work together, and how to stick together. That is our training, our tradition, our experience, our strength. That art is one of America's unique contributions to the history of government. It is that art which will not only win the war, it will also preserve the peace we earn.

Address by Polish Ambassador at State Chamber of Commerce Meeting, Rutland, Vt.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Jan Ciechanowski, Polish Ambassador to the United States, at a meeting sponsored by the State Chamber of Commerce at Rutland, Vt., on Monday evening, February 22, 1943. According to the estimate furnished by the Government Printing Office, the cost of printing the address will be $120.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The motto of Vermont, "Freedom and unity," contains all that we, the United Nations, stand for, all that we are fighting for, all that we aim to bring to the world through our victory if, true to our solemn pledge, we are determined finally to banish dictatorial domination by conquest, ruthless oppression of the weak by the powerful, insecurity, injustice, and enslavement.

That is why it is so thrilling a privilege for the representative of Poland to address a distinguished Vermont audience on its home soil.

Poland's motto has for centuries been "For your freedom and ours." I venture to think that its generous meaning is borne out by Poland's traditional readiness to fight and to die for the freedom of her own people and for that of others.

It is especially gratifying for the Ambassador of Poland to address an American audience on George Washington's Birthday. His name evokes in Polish as well as in American hearts the concept of American freedom based on human equality and justice, on the right freely to worship God, to preserve peace, and to respect the rights of the individual.

Alongside the mighty figures of your fighters for liberty his name evokes those of our Polish fighters—Kosciuszko and Pulaski, who fought for your independence and for the common cause of human happiness.

The time when your forefathers succeeded in winning independence for your great country coincides with that when Poland, perilously situated between three vast and greedy empires, was deprived of her freedom for a century and a quarter. The Polish Nation never ceased to resist oppression and denationalization and to renew its fight for freedom.

After the First World War, on the basis of the 14 points of President Woodrow Wilson, her independence was restored and her normal development was once more made possible. A great wrong had been righted. A nation of 35,000,000 regained its birthright.

Through hard work and perseverance, in the face of great difficulties, the Poles soon reorganized and rebuilt their devastated country. After only 20 years of restored independence Poland was attacked on September 1, 1939, by Germany, whose pan-German imperialism had once more been unleashed with redoubled fury by Hitler, and all that Poland had so painstakingly rebuilt and cherished was destroyed.

Poland put up a fierce struggle. She unhesitatingly met the German onslaught with armed resistance. She knew that alone she was not in a position to defend herself long against the overwhelming forces of the enemy. Her soldiers were outnumbered 5 to 1. Germany attacked with several thousand modern planes against Poland's 400. Four thousand German tanks could not be halted or destroyed by 200 Polish tanks. Poland's 2 incompletely motorized divisions were no match for Germany's 16.

And yet, it took Germany 5 weeks to complete the defeat of Poland's Army.

Thus Poland fought a regular war for over a month, retaining on her territory the major part of Germany's entire fighting forces and thereby enabling her western allies to mobilize and to organize their defense under perfect conditions of complete peace. From the military point of view the part played by Poland in that crucial first month of this war was invaluable to the common cause of the Allies. Germany's losses in the Polish campaign were so severe that it took Hitler several months to reorganize before he was ready to attack the western front.

It was in keeping with Poland's traditions to fight even against such odds. The Polish Nation has never been known to give up the struggle for its freedom and independence.

The Poles realized that the Germanic lust for conquest, reborn under Hitler's insane leadership, was once more on the rampage. They had watched the methodical and efficient preparation for this modernized version of total war. They had noted the novel forms of Hitler's so-called peaceful expansion by threat of force.

After the Rhineland and the Saar, Hitler announced that his territorial ambitions were satisfied. Then in 1938 came the turn of Austria. It was to have been a union, but once the German invasion was completed, it became an annexation.

Next came his demand for the Czechoslovak Sudetenland sanctioned by the shameful

surrender of Munich, and this was shortly followed by total annexation of the entire territory of Czechslovakia.

The die was cast. War had become inevitable. It was bound to break out as soon as Hitler attacked a nation that decided to put up a fight. Poland is proud that this honor fell to her.

Although in that initial campaign of 1939 her army was defeated, her territory occupied and totally looted, although her population is suffering inhuman oppression, torture, and extermination, the Polish people resist and fight on.

Her reorganized forces abroad on land, on sea, and in the air, fighting alongside of her faithful British ally, now number over 110,000. Thus Poland is an active cobelligerent power among the United Nations and numerically occupies fifth place in fighting strength in the United Nations camp.

Her people in Poland carry on unbroken resistance, though it has already cost the nation untold reprisals. Nearly 400,000 civilians were murdered, over 60,000 tortured to death in concentration camps, more than 1,000,000 Jews killed, over 2,000,000 people driven from their lawful homes, 1,700,000 sent to forced labor in Germany and the Government General.

And yet, the Germans have not succeeded in finding one single Polish Laval. Resistance, guerillas, and sabotage are the Polish reply to increasingly barbaric oppression.

I have briefly recounted these facts and figures about Poland in order to show what the United Nations are up against, and to stress what the total effort of a nation who, like Poland, is determined to carry on the struggle at all cost, means in terms of effort, suffering, and sacrifice.

Poland played an important part in the first crucial month of the war and, being the first to resist Hitler's aggression, she is the oldest European member of the fighting community now known as the United Nations. The importance of Poland's contribution in that initial stage of the total war which has now involved the whole world becomes even more apparent when one asks oneself: What would have been the outcome of this war had Poland not fought in September 1939?

We now realize the real motives which prompted Hitler to conclude a 10-year pact of nonaggression with Poland on the 26th of January, 1934. He knew that Poland would fight back if attacked. He required several years to free Germany from the restrictive clauses of the Versailles Treaty, to recreate a German armed force, to reunite the Reich, to remilitarize the very souls of all Germans, men, women, and children, to erect himself as the war lord and the god of the German Nation, to inspire them with a faith in their racial superiority over all other races, to instill into their receptive minds the mad idea that they had a right to rule the world by conquest, and to prepare them for the fateful hour which he had set for his attack against Russia. Hitler was decided to attack, invade, and conquer Russia in order to become the master of its great resources of raw materials which would make Germany invincible.

In his uncouth ignorance, he imagined that he could succeed in persuading Poland to join forces with Germany in an anti-Soviet campaign by promises of territorial expansion of her eastern boundaries. He hoped that he could allay her fears of a German invasion by concluding an alliance or a bargain with Poland and prevent her from arming against a probable German menace, and at the right moment make her accept his terms for a joint campaign against Russia.

That was probably Hitler's initial mistake in planning this total war. Several times, and finally in January 1939, he proposed such a plan to Poland. Poland refused to become a party to the scheme and to join Germany in an anti-Russian campaign. Then Hitler changed his initial plan and started negotiations with Soviet Russia which culminated in the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact on August 23, 1939—7 days before Germany attacked Poland.

It is interesting to realize these facts because they prove that a strong, independent, and peaceful Poland constitutes a bulwark of security for Russia against a German aggression.

Had Poland succumbed to the temptations of Hitlerite Germany, Soviet Russia would probably have been attacked in 1939 on the first day of this total war. It is permissible to think that at that time Soviet Russia was not prepared effectively to resist such an aggression.

Had Poland not chosen to fight in September 1939, the course of the war would have been different.

This first total war in human history cannot be adequately defined or interpreted by means of analytical standards of the past.

It certainly is a conflict between godlessness and religion, between freedom and enslavement, between barbarism and civilization, between dictatorship and democracy, between the rule of the jungle and legality, between might and right. We know that it is a supreme attempt on the part of pan-German imperialism fanned up to white heat by Hitler to dominate and rule the world by force. As such it appears to us, quite rightly, as the second round of the past world war. Indeed, some of us understand that although defeated in 1918 by the Allied and Associated Powers, Germany has challenged the world once more because the Allied victory of 1918 was won only on points. It is important to realize this at present, because if we do not win this second round by a complete knockout of Germany and her satellites, we cannot hope to establish permanent security and peace.

We likewise realize that complete victory is indispensable because no compromise is possible between the concept of Hitler's "New Order" based on enslavement and barbarism, and ours, based on freedom and decency. In fact, we now know that there is no alternative to complete victory.

We should have realized this long before because we tested all other alternatives in the course of the last 24 years.

We decided not to press our victory won on points in the First World War and it led us to a negotiated peace in 1919. We failed to enforce its clauses, hoping thereby to placate our late enemy. We gave him all facilities, including vast credits, in view of peaceful collaboration, and that failed because he interpreted this as a sign of weakness. We tried out a policy of appeasement by concessions which resulted in the tearing up of the entire peace settlement and, finally, culminated in the annexation and enslavement of two free sovereign states: Austria and Czechoslovakia. The appeasement policy failed because Berlin interpreted it not only as a sign of our weakness and helplessness, but as a proof of disunity and decay.

The tragedy of this total war is not only the unprecedented suffering which it inflicts on humanity. The major tragedy is that it was ever allowed to take place.

It took place because virile boldness, unity and determination, teamwork, and the active and far-sighted statesmanship indispensable for squarely facing new situations were lacking among free and peace-loving nations.

Most of us had come to regard freedom as our due and some of us refused to face the necessity of showing our determination to fight in its defense.

I realize that for those who have not seen this total war at close quarters and who have not personally experienced the full burden of its effects, it is difficult to imagine and even to believe its crude realities.

And do not make the mistake of thinking that we Poles have rejected all compromise and fight on merely out of a feeling of revenge.

On the contrary, being condemned to extermination by the German invaders, we realize probably better than any other people that every hour, every minute that this inhuman ordeal is prolonged means death and suffering and untold misery for our nation.

But we also know that the only alternative to complete victory is enslavement for all free peoples, and that we must go on fighting this total war to victory.

It cannot be won by wishful thinking. It cannot be won by hoping that any one nation, not even one as powerful and vast as Russia, can win it alone.

It will require all the guts of all freedom-loving peoples, all their resources in manpower and machinery to win this war.

We have called this war the second round of the conflict started in the last World War, and we have said that only complete victory may make it the final one.

But there is one important novel aspect of this war which we cannot disregard, because it makes it different from any other wars of the past.

Revised pan-German imperialism is led this time by an uncouth, primitive, and evil genius personified by Hitler. In comparison to the methods used by this new Germanic leader, the German brutalities of the past war appear to us as child's play. The kaiser and his war party certainly disregarded many of the laws of war. But even they showed some respect for some of the rights of civilian populations.

In this war we are faced by more than mere imperialism. We are fighting a new philosophy which we must destroy, a philosophy of unconditional and universal simplification of all human life and its problems, tending to solve everything by brute force, extermination, and enslavement. Hitler's Germany does not recognize the existence of any intricate political, economic, or social problems. It admits the existence of only one problem, the problem of unlimited power for Germany—"das deutsche macht problem"—the solution of which, by means of conquest and enslavement on a world scale is to bring about the complete automatic Germanic solution of all other problems of the present and of the future.

That is the true version of "pax Germanica."

Normally speaking, we would be justified in ignoring such an insane theory and in regarding it merely as an insult to our civilization. Unfortunately, we cannot brush aside this philosophy on the plea that it is too primitive and unenlightened to appeal to civilized communities.

It certainly is inacceptable to a world of free human beings. But the fundamental principle of that German philosophy asserts that there will be no free human beings if this war is won by the Axis Powers.

During the 10 years of his rule as Reichsfuehrer and Reichskanzler, Hitler has methodically and logically applied this simplified philosophy in practice with considerable success. As a result of this, we are now faced by a virile, savage, most active, brutal, and sadistic generation of Germans who recognize no other god but Hitler, no other policy but conquest, no other law but that of brute force. Success is not only an intoxicant. It is the most convincing of all arguments. Moreover, Hitler's ideology fits in with the Germanic ideals known to us from the writings of German philosophers and thinkers of past centuries. It is but the culmination of that school of thought.

The German philosophy of power which we are faced with is infinitely dangerous, and we have fully to reckon with it.

It simplifies all things. It solves life by death. Thus, if individuals, groups, or nations oppose the doctrine of German supremacy, such individuals, groups, or nations must be exterminated. If anything stands in the way or is contrary to its teaching, that thing must disappear. Nor is any attempt made to conceal this sinister policy.

Extermination has now become a German scientific weapon.

In the issue of June 2, 1942, of the Zeitschrift für Politik, a publication expressing the official political creed of present-day Germany, one of the so-called political thinkers of the Third Reich, Herr Werner Best, discusses the problem of what he is pleased to call grossraumordnung und grossraumverwaltung—in other words, how to introduce order and government into the enormous area of the so-called Greater German Reich, which naturally includes the conquered countries. He proclaims literally the following principles:

"Historical experience has shown that the destruction and elimination of a foreign nationality is not in the least contrary to the laws of life, provided that such destruction and elimination are complete. On the other hand, it is inadvisable and even perilous for the nation of overlords to attempt to deprive a conquered nation of its national unity and its national characteristics if simultaneously attempting to use the human element of that foreign nation for its own purposes. All nations who use foreign nationalities as servants and slaves die out racially through fusion with them."

It is well worth while to pause for a moment and consider this statement since although it appears to be normal and intelligible to the German mind, it cannot so easily be grasped by any ordinarily functioning human mind. What is meant by the statement that the complete destruction of a nation is not contrary to the laws of life? How can one reconcile such contradictions as life and death? The explanation is as simple as it is inhuman. In German mentality the complete extermination of a nation is not contrary to the laws of life, while others may be tolerated on condition that they are slaves of the German overlords; and it appears to be quite impossible for present-day German philosophers to think otherwise.

By their own statements the Germans proudly declare that they are not merely exercising the legally admitted authority of an occupying force, but are carrying out the deliberate and scientifically planned extermination of entire nations.

These first 3 years of total war have resulted in the loss of freedom of 14 European and of 5 Asiatic countries. It means untold misery, oppression, and enslavement of some 300,000,000 people.

Never before has the world faced so great a danger: The danger of the rule of prehistoric barbarism enforced by means of all the greatest scientific achievements of modern civilization.

There is no precedent in history for this sinister paradox. This time the whole future of human sanity and civilization is at stake. We have to deal with a problem not only more vast than were the problems of past conflicts, but a problem which is new and unprecedented in its complications, its depth and magnitude.

Victory will bring an end to actual fighting. But it will likewise leave us face to face with a world in rags, a world of unprecedented suffering and destitution—a world of depleted populations tortured by poverty, famine, and disease, but overcrowded by all the most primitive and all the most intricate human problems.

We might be forgiven for losing the actual armed conflict, if the forces of barbarism now facing us proved overpowering.

But we could not be forgiven if, after achieving victory, we, the United Nations, were to shirk our greatest duty jointly to face and to solve the problems of peace on new, bold lines of security, justice, and prosperity.

Our primary justification in waging total war against this insane revival of prehistoric barbarism, is our firm determination to create a new world order for free and peaceful human relations and to restore cultural progress and happiness to mankind.

The ultimate victory of the United Nations will give them the unprecedented chance to create such a peaceful world on new and constructive lines.

The active participation of the United States in this war does not only mean that our camp of nations fighting against the aggressive forces of evil has been strengthened by the addition of a mighty power consisting of vast armed forces, great wealth and almost unlimited capacity of production. Something more important has been added. A great moral force has entered the field and has assumed the leadership of a new, reorganized camp of peoples fighting in defense of the highest ideals of humanity.

In past emergencies and conflicts we have been accustomed to such definitions as: Allied Powers, or Associated Powers.

Today, on the initiative of the President of the United States, the solemn declaration binding us all, which we signed on the 1st of January, 1942, defines our camp as that of the United Nations. This definition creates an important precedent. It has a profound meaning. It is in itself a vast program. It reaches down to the very bottom of the present fight for freedom.

Alliances might be conditional, associations were but temporary. Unity among nations in a holy war for the triumph of moral principles, a war against imperialism, godlessness and lawlessness, defines a permanent partnership, a partnership not only for prosecuting war, but for establishing and safeguarding peace.

But if it is to succeed, this great inspiration of the President must be backed by every man, woman, and child in the United States and in the camp of the United Nations if it is to become an active reality, a constructive force for world rehabilitation and reconstruction.

The institution of the United Nations is conceived as a permanent partnership for victory in this war in defense of human decency, for the establishment of a just and durable peace after victory, and for the future safeguarding of such a peace.

The absolute need for permanent unity emerges clearly out of the two last World Wars and the precarious peace which separated them. Lack of unity was responsible for the tragic fact that although the Allied and Associated Powers won the last war, they lost the last peace. Lack of unity in peacetime is responsible for the rearmament of Germany, for Hitlerism and its pan-German challenge.

The lesson is clear. In our century of scientific progress and interdependence, no major war can be localized regardless where it starts. Likewise, peace cannot be locally safeguarded. In fact, war has become indivisible in the global sense of the word. Durable peace is likewise indivisible and can only be firmly established and effectively safeguarded on a world basis.

Consequently, there can no longer be any isolation from the risk of war, and its effects for any nation.

If that is the case, and I believe it has been amply proved in effect, sane logis points to the necessity of permanent unity of purpose between freedom-loving nations the world over, and their closest collaboration not only in war but especially in peacetime.

Only thus can wars be avoided.

Such collaboration, however, should be insured right now. There has probably never been so vast an opportunity for encouraging the closest collaboration among the United Nations in view of preparing them for permanent future teamwork. Moreover, the course of the war has taken on a brisk pace. Peace must not find us unprepared as we all were for war.

How can we prepare right now for the unprecedented problems of peace?

Firstly, by frank discussions among the United Nations in order to clarify their respective views on the future world peace settlement, and to eliminate all points of friction between themselves, to settle local problems and eliminate possible conflicts.

Secondly, by studying the problem of the disarmament of Germany and of the other Axis Powers.

Thirdly, by preparing and establishing a comprehensive social program for the future. Vast social problems will have to be faced as soon as the war is over. These problems will be both difficult and urgent and their timely solution will require bold statesmanship and unity.

Fourthly, by studying the great possibilities of federation of the European countries situated between Germany and Russia, as the most appropriate form and the safest guaranty of security and normal economic development. The natural instinct of self-preservation makes the European nations at present under the German yoke tend toward the establishment of international unity and close collaboration among neighboring peacefully minded peoples hitherto exposed to the threat of attack on the part of powerful neighbors.

Poland is traditionally a pioneer of federation. As far back as the sixteenth century she succeeded in establishing peacefully a federation of central European nations which endured for over two centuries.

Today Poland reverts to her traditional federative policy in the firm conviction that European security can best be guaranteed in this way. I know there are skeptical critics who contend that the creation of a federation or group of federations between Germany and Russia will be too difficult to effect. All Americans know the difficulties attendant on the establishment of the United States—that most perfect example of federation. Ad yet, all these difficulties have been gradually and successfully overcome.

Moreover, there is a distinct tendency toward federation among European nations which should be encouraged.

To Russia, concerned about her safety in the West, such a friendly and peaceful federation, under the auspices of the United Nations, would be a substantial safeguard from aggression as well as a natural link with the West.

We know now that permanent security cannot be established on the basis of a precarious balance of power or by ambiguously worded covenants unsupported by firm determination to enforce their respect.

If we are sincerely determined to establish a just and durable peace, we must firmly discourage the imperialist tendencies of the mighty and protect and strengthen the weak. The United Nations will have to stand pat on the principles for which we are fighting, refusing to surrender any of them to any pressure whatever its source.

We will have to recreate security, prosperity, and happiness in a devastated world.

Bold initiative, determination, and fearless statesmanship alone will enable us to achieve these aims.

It will be the greatest chance in history to fulfill this creative task. It will be the greatest responsibility of all.

The future of the world is in the hands of the United Nations. But success will entirely depend on their sustained unity of purpose.

Senator Brooks' Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator BROOKS' Speech," published in the February 13, 1943, edition of the Kokomo (Ind.) Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BROOKS' SPEECH

Not only because it contained a fitting, feeling, and profounudly impressive tribute to the character and works of Abraham Lincoln, whose anniversary was being observed, and not only because it presented with clearness and force an analysis of the current national crisis, but also because it was a masterful example of what is coming to be regarded as the most effective form of spoken discourse—the form that is free from obvious strivings for dramatic effects, that is persuasive without being impassioned, and convincing without being vituperative—the address by United States Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS, of Illinois, at Howard Masonic Temple Friday evening, left with the 500 listeners there an indelible and most agreeable memory.

This man, whose public career has been comparatively brief, but who already has acquired recognition as an important and most promising national figure, who bears on his body the scars of seven wounds received as a member of the United States Marine Corps in World War No. 1, and upon whom has been bestowed for gallantry in action, the distinguished service insignia of both the United States and France, stood for more than an hour before his audience here and, with magnetic presence, with a countenance that was occasionally smiling but for the most part serious, with a voice that contained a haunting cadence, with reasoned thoughts and winsome words, without gesticulation and without resort to oratorical trick of any kind, compelled its closest attention to his every utterance and completely won its confidence and engaged its admiration.

Yes, hearing C. WAYLAND BROOKS on this occasion will be an unforgetable experience for every person who was present. They know now, better than they had known before, what the global war means, how it is being fought, and how unforseeable its effects are to be. He voiced as much optimism touching the outlook as present conditions and circumstances warrant, yet he brought a hush of awed silence when he enumerated the sacrifices the world violence is going to bring, and the social, economic, and political perplexities and upheavals that are certain to follow in its wake.

Behind all the strife, lurking ominously and insistently, is the question of what kind of world we are going to find ourselves in when the war ends. There was almost a prayer that it may not be a chaotic one. It is a thought to shake the last shred of indifference and complacence out of every American soul.

There was warning—needed and emphatic warning—in the assertion Americans should not be too much beguiled by the high-scunding generalities of an Atlantic Charter, or into accepting without protest a win-the-war slogan, if it is used to glorify bureaucratic bungling.

First of all, the speaker said, there should be an unwavering determination on the part of the American people to compel their Government to maintain the liberties and rights for which the founding patriots fought, which Lincoln preserved, and which, if not retained and passed on, will make all that may have been won utterly worthless.

Yes, it was a thought-provoking discourse in every part. All who heard Mr. BROOKS on this occasion would gladly hear him again. There is need, too, that what he said be heeded—be heeded before it is everlastingly too late.

Reorganization of O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement appearing in the morning press by former Senator Clyde L. Herring:

HERRING PROPOSES REORGANIZATION OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION TO INJECT "MORE HORSE SENSE" INTO PROGRAM

(By Edwin D. Gritz)

Simplification of the entire Office of Price Administration set-up by April 1, with administrative emphasis on State lines, rather than district and regional divisions, is under serious study by former Senator Clyde L. Herring, of Iowa, who took office this week as senior assistant to Office of Price Administration Chief, Prentiss M. Brown.

Also in the works, it was learned, is the elimination of all possible red tape in the price and rationing programs by letting the public "carry the ball" voluntarily, with the Office of Price Administration assuming the role of bookkeeper rather than policeman.

Herring told the Post that "horse sense like we use in the country" will be the Office of Price Administration's policy from now on, instead of the practice symbolized by "carloads of questionnaires which will never be read or used anyway."

The new senior assistant said he planned to leave Washington some time next week for a personal survey of the field offices which, he declared, "appeared to be too numerous for efficient administration."

Although declining to describe his proposed trip as a "hatchet" tour, the Iowan said he no doubt would "help out the manpower situation" by eliminating inefficient or overlapping workers.

He said his goal was to establish strong State offices and probably eliminate all district and most regional offices. Only two or three regional offices, he said, appeared to be needed to handle such specialized problems as, for instance, scrap metal and milk.

At the present time there are 9 regional offices and 102 district offices. The approximate personnel in all field offices is 33,000 persons.

Since there are no State offices now, Herring will shift key men and personnel from eliminated field offices with an eye to keeping even that structure simple, he said. Local ration boards will not be touched, he added, but will instead get more authority to deal directly with the people instead of looking higher up whenever a special problem arises.

"We've been smothered by a mass of detail and red tape," Herring declared. "I hope to make it possible for State offices to take care of almost all save unusually special problems, when Washington will step in."

Pointing out that it was he and Brown who largely wrote the Office of Price Administration legislation, Herring said that up to now the intent of the legislation has been entirely mishandled. Granting that errors are made when organization is by emergency, he pointed out that at least from now on there would be no more cracking down on the people.

Herring, former Iowa Governor and automobile and farm implement dealer said that by now, practically everybody had been touched by the war—either by having a son, brother, or relative in the war.

"I have a son now in service in Africa," he declared. "For him, and many like him, I am determined to make this work.

"How can we kick about pleasure driving, about less meat when you get something like this from your boy?"

Then he read from a letter, dated January 6:

"Finally at midnight (New Year's Eve) we all sang "Auld Lang Syne," it said "When it was over and the last note died away we found ourselves just standing there staring each other in the face—each waiting for someone else to start a cheer or do something.

"After a cup of coffee and a sandwich (for such a 'feast' we had hoarded coffee and bread for a week) we went to bed."

Under Cloak of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Times-Union of Rochester, N. Y., March 3, 1943:

In our country one of the freedoms we have enjoyed without full appreciation is the freedom of selection. It has been left to the individual to choose what he wants from a large variety of things.

For instance, there are many different makes of automobiles, many colors and patterns of clothing, many specially prepared foods, soaps, drugs, etc. One person prefers this, and another that, for reasons of his own. It is a liberty that was established when we developed the free-enterprise system.

Under the cloak of war certain bureaucrats in Washington who want to destroy our system of free enterprise are reported to be planning to prohibit or restrict the marketing of commodities under established brands.

So serious is this threat that Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, has introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives calling for an investigation.

Representative HALLECK says:

"Some of us have discovered that our suspicions were well founded in regard to the activities of certain bureaucrats in these temporary war agencies.

"The Members of Congress have little confidence in the assertions of certain individuals that they are using the vast powers granted to the Executive strictly for war."

Millions of dollars have been spent by hundreds of industries and concerns to create products of distinctive types and qualities. Many millions have been spent to advertise these products so the consumer would be sure, when he made a purchase, that he was getting, under a certain name or brand, exactly what he wanted.

Bureaucrats are planning to destroy the basic freedom of selection and remove the protection that the public has against inferior products.

By developing widely popular brands, and thus fostering mass production, industries have been able to lower costs to the consumer. If brands should be eliminated by the Washington bureaucrats, the consumer would, in the long run, pay higher prices, be uncertain about the quality of the product, and be deprived of the freedom of getting exactly what he wanted.

Representative HALLECK well says:

"Brands have a public value. By long experience the housewife and the ordinary citizen have learned that certain brands are satisfactory and that these brands guarantee a desired quality.

"It is disservice to the housewife and to all citizens to deprive them of these guides to intelligent purchasing of goods. The brands must be protected."

We are glad that Mr. HALLECK has begun an investigation. It is to be hoped this will torpedo the bureaucratic program, which would do so much harm, be so costly to the public and bring widespread dissatisfaction.

This is just another crackpot plan to upset our way of living without in the slightest degree helping to win the war.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution on social security adopted unanimously by 200 members of the Needham Forum at a meeting in the Congregational Church, Needham, Mass., February 26, 1943, following a discussion of the Beveridge plan and America:

Whereas freedom from want is one of the objectives for which this country fights; and

Whereas a large percentage of the families in this country ordinarily receive incomes which are inadequate to sustain them on a standard of living which is compatible with decency and health; and

Whereas the economic security of the families of this country is further threatened and often shattered by such common hazards as unemployment, old age, sickness, disability or death of the breadwinner; and

Whereas these hazards will be greatly aggravated in the post-war period due to the unparalleled extent to which this country's manpower, industry, business, social, and educational institutions have been mobilized for the effective prosecution of the war; and

Whereas the Government has taken no step to preserve existing rights of men and women in the armed services to old-age and survivor's insurance and unemployment compensation; and

Whereas millions of others in the armed services have no rights to benefits under existing social insurance; and

Whereas little has been done as yet to guarantee men and women now in the armed forces of this country that after the war they shall have real jobs or their equivalents which yield enough income to enable them to support their families according to a decent standard of living: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Needham Forum, That:

1. Congress, the President, industry, and labor should jointly lay plans now to use the full resources of this Nation—manpower, plant capacity, raw materials, etc., to retain full employment after the war;

2. Congress should take steps immediately to enact legislation protecting the rights of members of the armed services in existing social-insurance programs, and to extend these rights to those persons in the armed services who are not now covered; and

3. Congress should proceed immediately to devise plans to set up machinery which will abolish want and which will safeguard every American against the major economic hazards.

Handicapped Man Entire Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Handicapped Man Entire Unit," by Saul W. Abel, printed in the January 1943 issue of the magazine Manpower Review.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANDICAPPED MAN ENTIRE UNIT

(By Saul W. Abel, informational representative, U. S. Employment Service for Pennsylvania)

In a giant war plant at Williamsport, Pa., stands a unique production line. At first glance, the long rows of busy men and machines look very much like any other production line. But get a close-up of the workers who man these machines.

First, the husky young fellow at the automatic screw machine. As you stand behind him watching him deftly feeding chunks of metal into the machine, there doesn't seem to be anything unusual about this worker. But move around to the side, and you discover he has only one eye.

Or take the chap operating an internal grinder. His machine is moving at a steady pace, and his hands move swiftly and surely about their work. In fact, you're apt to watch those hands for quite a while before you notice that one of them is partially crippled. But he has enough control there to do a real job at his machine.

Now you've got the answer. This entire line is manned by handicapped workers—32 of them. In what is perhaps the first project of its kind in America, a great industrial plant has planned a complete "handicapped" unit, has set up a production line specifically to utilize disabled individuals.

The Pennsylvania Bureau of Rehabilitation, a division of the State department of labor and industry, recruited for training most of the persons who went into this "handicapped" production line. They came from all parts of the State, ranged in age from 18 to 45, and represented a wide variety of disabilities. All were alike in one respect—they displayed an interest and an aptitude for mechanical work. Careful attention was given to physical rehabilitation before the problem of vocational rehabilitation was taken up. A series of interviews and psychological and vocational tests aided the rehabilitation officials in their selection process. Those finally chosen for training were sent to Williamsport where the rehabilitation bureau arranged for their housing and provided maintenance for them until such time as they found employment and became self-supporting.

At the Williamsport Technical Institute, most of the students had been in training about 2 months, when in March 1942 the new machines which were to form the line in the still unfinished building of the new war plant, were brought in and set up on the shop floor of the institute. The handicapped workers were placed at these machines and the line went into actual production. The trainees were placed on the company pay roll and the parts produced, if they passed inspection, went into actual use. In July the new shop was completed and the whole "handicapped" line was transferred to its permanent home. The line produces link pins for the master rod, piston pins, cam follower rollers, and other parts in which the men are required to work to a tolerance of 0.002 of an inch in diameter and 2 micro inches in finish.

The men have all advanced rapidly since they started at 65 cents an hour. One man with a hip disability is operating a buffing and polishing machine and now earns over $1 an hour. He had no job at all before he came up to school at Williamsport.

The superfinisher operator is an older man. His ear drums are ruptured, the left one rather badly, but that doesn't prevent him from turning out a full day's work at his machine. Some employers have complained that deafness is a serious flaw on a job where experienced workers frequently use the sound of a machine to detect something wrong with the progress of the work, but this operator keeps his fingers on the machine and has learned to judge from the change in vibration whether the work is passing through properly or not.

Another worker lost his right leg in a childhood accident, and wears an artificial limb. His disability forced him to depend upon the uncertain returns of a salesman. Now he operates an external grinder on the handicapped line.

The plant has a bench inspector who does an excellent job in spite of two crippled legs. Ordinarily this job requires the worker to get his material and bring it over to his bench, and then carry it along to the next worker when he is finished. Officials arranged for a trucker who works nearby to bring the work to the inspector and take it away, and now a previously underutilized worker has been transformed into an excellent productive unit.

In another division, where huge crankshafts are turned out, a towering 6-footer operates a big turret lathe. One arm is crippled and can only be raised about waist high. Since his operations at the turret lathe do not require any higher lift, this man is performing an excellent job. * * * Another works on the engine assembly line at an operation which requires fastening nuts in a very small space. His defect actually enables him to attach these

nuts at about twice the speed with which a normal worker could operate. A one-armed welder has a special welding electrode which screws right into the socket of his artficial arm so that he can perform welding operations with less fatigue than a physically normal worker.

These instances could be multiplied many times throughout the big plant where the use of handicapped persons has become firmly established as a personnel policy.

The report of management on the handicapped line is just as favorable. Their supervisor says he wouldn't exchange the boys on his "handicapped" line for many of the physically normal workers he has encountered in his years of industrial experience. He has found that handicapped workers generally display more steadiness and a greater concentration on their work The "handicapped" line has completely convinced the management of the potentialities of this source of manpower. This factory points the way to a course of action which many other employers can adopt to meet our urgent manpower needs.

Farm Security Administration and the Feeding of Mexican Agricultural Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, on a matter concerning which I believe there has been considerable misunderstanding:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 24, 1943.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. VOORHIS: You may have read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few days ago a feeding standard which had been reported to Congressman ELLIOTT as representing food requirements imposed on California growers by the Farm Security Administration for feeding Mexican agricultural workers brought into this country. Knowing of your interest in the program whereby farm workers are transported, I thought you would like to have a report on the actual situation.

I was quite astonished when I read of this reported requirement as I had no knowledge of such regulations. Naturally, I made immediate inquiry. The Farm Security Administration has made no such requirement and has not recommended such feeding regulations as those which were reported to Mr. ELLIOTT.

The document which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and has since appeared in several newspapers, is one issued by the Threlkeld Commissary Co., 111 Sutter Street, San Francisco, to its field supervisors for their guidance in feeding Mexican gang labor employed on track work for the Southern Pacific Railroad. It came into the hands of the Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation, which recently employed Government-transported Mexican labor, as a result of their request made to a Farm Security representative for any information which would be helpful to them in providing suitable food for Mexican workers. A good many Mexican workers had at first suffered gastric disturbances from United States food, and the growers have made an effort to find, both from Mexican Government representatives and others, what types of food the workers were accustomed to so that the sickness and loss of work time that diets strange to them had caused could be eliminated or at least reduced.

The Threlkeld Co. had had experience in feeding Mexican workers and had provided us with copies of its own feeding instructions. A copy of this was passed on to the Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation, which had just employed about 300 Mexican workers in the Bakersfield area, at their request. There was no suggestion that this was to be a required or even a recommended feeding regulation. After you have had an opportunity to read the menus, you will see that it is obvious that a number of the items proposed would have to be interpreted in the light of the current food supply situation. The extent to which these suggestions were adopted was entirely within the discretion of the employer.

In order to be sure that there was no misunderstanding of this gesture on our part, Mr. Laurence I. Hewes, Farm Security Regional Director in San Francisco, who has charge of the Mexican labor program, asked the Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation for their understanding of this matter. The following letter, dated February 18, 1943, was received in reply:

"FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
"San Francisco, Calif.

"(Attention of L. I. Hewes.)

"GENTLEMEN: In connection with the Mexican labor procured for us by you we wish to state at this time that there has never been any attempt by the Farm Security Administration to issue a mandatory menu to be supplied to these workers and we are furnishing them with three substantial meals per day based on our own menus.

"Yours very truly,
"DI GIORGIO FRUIT CORPORATION,
"R. S. MCKNIGHT, *Treasurer.*"

You can readily see the serious effect a charge such as this can have on the efforts on the part of the Government to provide labor for war crops in California and elsewhere, and I regret that I did not have an opportunity to give you the actual facts earlier.

Sincerely,
C. B. RAEDWIN, *Administrator.*

Service Act Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, one year ago this month I introduced in the House the first manpower utilization bill. It was based on the three primary factors of production required, funds appropriated for that production, and the available supply of manpower for the armed services and other purposes. At that time the measure was declared to be premature, and shortly thereafter a manpower commission was set up.

I do not agree that the question was premature at that time, and I am certain that it has reached the emergency stage at this time.

Under leave now to extend my remarks I desire to include a statement on the subject of a national service act, made by my friend and colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] over the Town Hall of the Air Program last week, and to include also brief excerpts from the Birmingham News and the Birmingham Age-Herald.

STATEMENT OF MR. SPARKMAN

I am one who has long been opposed to a National Service Act except as a last resort, believing that all efforts should be made toward recruiting and placing the needed supply of workers through voluntary methods. Along with Congressman BENDER and other members of the Tolan committee I signed a report back in October 1942 in which we recommended against a national service law not because we were opposed to compulsion as such but because we felt (1) that a proper effort had not been made voluntarily to provide the needed workers and (2) that the machinery for handling manpower had not been set up. I do not argue that either has yet been sufficiently done. In fact, I think that the handling of the manpower situation has been one of the worst jobs in our whole war effort.

It is my opinion that we are right up to the point where something must be done to prevent our bungled manpower problem from becoming disastrously chaotic. It is a pretty well accepted fact that our usable manpower resources for productive purposes total little more than 65,000,000. It has also been stated time after time by those who should know that by the end of 1943 we must have 65,000,000 engaged in our war effort. In other words the need and the supply are almost the same. It has become apparent that voluntary methods will not be able to operate on such a narrow margin. There must be some way to make certain that every available producer is properly placed where he can be worth most to the war effort.

The three principal users of these needed workers are (1) the armed services, (2) agriculture, (3) industry.

I know there has been considerable discussion as to the possibility of decreasing the size of the armed services. I do not share the view that we should force our military leaders to cut down the numbers they have decided, after long study and careful planning, to be necessary to win this war. After all, that is the responsibility of our military leaders and I am not willing to say my judgment is better than theirs in that respect. Therefore, I say we can expect no change in that number.

As to those needed in agriculture, I believe that one of the great mistakes made so far has been the neglect of, or indifference to, this situation. Today with only 8⅓ million farm workers—an all-time low for this season—we are faced with a threat of food shortage which becomes more real every day. Many people—unfortunately many closely connected with the war effort—have not yet seemed to understand that in winning a war bread is just as essential as bullets. Furthermore, they yet have to learn that much of the farm work calls for just as much experience and as high a degree of skill as does industry. It sounds good to hear of Army units working in crops, of a land army recruited from city folks who will give up when the first blister pops, and of school children working after school hours—it all sounds good and those willing so to participate are to be commended but it just won't work.

Industry, of course, can be cut—any of these three users of workers can be cut—but only at a price we cannot afford to pay. For most of 1942 our program kept up to schedule in production of war materials. However, for the year we failed to meet our production

schedules. Nineteen hundred and forty-three goals were originally set much higher than those of 1942, but already these goals have been reduced and yet, unless we use great care we are not going to meet even these lowered goals. Industry must have the workers needed to turn out the supplies, the ships, the munitions, and to transport them to our armed forces.

The need of a service act has recently been demonstrated by the order of the War Manpower Commission which, while failing to ask for a law giving clear-cut authority to recruit and place labor, in its dilemma attempted to use the Selective Service Act for this purpose. That act was intended by Congress and accepted by the county as the authority for raising in an orderly manner the manpower needed by our armed services and was never intended to be used as a club to force men to change jobs. It is true the present list of jobs declared to be nonessential is small and includes for the most part only those that we are willing to be so classed. But the present list is only a beginning If this is allowed to stand, there is no reason why any other job cannot be likewise classed if the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission sees fit to do so. Much better it is to have a responsible system set up by an act of the people's representatives in Congress through democratic processes and with proper statutory guidance and safeguards.

This is total war and demands total mobilization. I suppose we could win eventually with less than total mobilization—with less than our best effort—but none of us wants to try it. It would be dangerous and would be too costly, not only in time, money, and equipment, but most of all in the blood and lives of our boys. No one wants that. We want to get it over with as soon as possible and to that end we have pledged all of our resources. That includes our manpower resources. We cannot make them available in their totality without an orderly system of enrolling and placing them where most needed. To do that we must have a law and the time for it is now.

[From a column written by John Temple Graves 2d in the Birmingham Age-Herald]

Alabamians who listened in on the America's Town Meeting of the Air program Thursday evening must have been proud of their Congressman JOHN SPARKMAN. Without regard to the position he took on the question at issue, he was so obviously a man of information, quick wit, intelligence, good temper, and a will to get at the truth rather than just to win his point. JOHN SPARKMAN is first-class stuff.

[From the column This Evening written by Charles N. Feidelson for the Birmingham News]

Congressman SPARKMAN'S showing on the Town Meeting program of last Thursday night must have been gratifying to all his listening friends in Alabama. His was the only contribution to the discussion which seemed to be quite objective. A subject like compulsory national service is likely to make the best of us emotional. The other participants in the argument showed how hard it is to approach this issue on its merits only.

It is plain that Congress will soon have to enact some national service legislation. Mr. McNutt has not been successful in grappling with the manpower problem. In any case, he has antagonized Congress so much that commentators are remembering what happened to Henderson. It was prophesied in some quarters, when he took on the manpower job, that he would come a cropper. Those were, in the main, people who were not fond of him. We have here an illustration of the fact that wishful thinking is not always merely wishful.

Mr. SPARKMAN took the position that use of the Selective Service Act to accomplish any purpose other than that for which it was promulgated is objectionable, and he said that Mr. McNutt's program comes within this dubious category. Furthermore, he urged that the manpower problem be competently attacked under a charter from Congress, rather than in makeshift style under a Presidential directive.

Even those Alabamians who may not go along with Mr. SPARKMAN on this issue must feel that he held his own handsomely in this discussion. Many of us have known him as a liberal and long-headed man, from whom important work could be expected. He is already becoming a national figure. That is something for his own people to be specially proud of.

"I'm as Confused as a Cross-eyed Cat in a Rat Riot"—Dewey Carson

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Dewey Carson, American Legionnaire, of Santa Barbara, Calif., is in a sad mental state, one similar to that of millions of our fellow citizens, overawed as they are by the antics of our New Deal brethren, I am confident that that which he wrote for the Santa Barbara Sentinel of February 26 will be of interest, if not of help, to the membership in its effort to comprehend the incomprehendible—just why new dealers behave the way they do, a psychological study of no mean proportions. May I offer it for inclusion in the RECORD?

Mr. Dewey Carson's article follows:

THE WAY I LOOK AT IT

(By Dewey Carson)

Are the rest of you people thinking the way I am, or could it be that I am so fuzzy in the bone basket that words have different meanings on different occasions? I'll admit I'm as confused as a cross-eyed cat in a rat riot.

On February 22 America honored the birthday of George Washington. Now, George didn't know a Democrat from a Republican. (George wasn't confused; he just didn't give a damn—conditions being what they were.) So, we can't say that either party has any claim on the prestige of his affiliation. The Republicans celebrated the day as Republicans. The Democrats took advantage of the occasion to throw various and sundry dinners (ceiling prices barred) with the idea of enriching their political war chest. Nothing wrong so far.

Ah, but here's the rub. Every dinner had a speaker. Some of high rank; others not quite so rank. Every speaker commenced his message by extolling the virtues of Washington, followed by an impassioned plea for unity among all Americans—and then in the next breath they forget all about George, forgot all about unity and started right in giving all Republicans hell. Unity they ask for. Now, just between us, isn't that a hell of a way to get unity?

The President, as usual, made the best address. A splendid appeal—but even he had to throw in a few remarks about those bad, bad boys who didn't agree 100 percent with him. He made some remarks about modern Benedict Arnolds—which didn't add a whole lot to unity. But we'll have to forgive him those trespasses because he has the world's toughest job. However, HENRY WALLACE'S nasty cracks should be resented by every American who really wants to see Americans united in this tragic hour of our greatest struggle. Henry's pretty sore because his bid for Presidential timber recognition was "globalonized." Brother WALLACE made his bid for unity by taking a wild swing at our dollar-a-year men. He stated that a great many of our dollar-a-year men came to Washington to further the interests of their own corporations and that nearly all of those "great many" were Republicans. I repeat, isn't that a heck of a way to bring about unity? Good Lord, Hank, even with my limited knowledge and information, I could send you a list of Democratic dollar-a-year men who would make "Get-Rich-Quick" Wallingford look like a piker.

As I said in the beginning of this masterpiece, maybe I'm wacky in the bosko, but it would appear that somebody along the line had better make a determined effort to pull us together—or at least cease these senseless campaigns of disunity—and a good place to start would be in the offices of the President and Vice President.

It wouldn't be at all surprising to learn that a lot of good Republican blood has snaked its way through the undergrowth of Guadalcanal and the rice paddies of Bataan. And when the cold waters of the Atlantic closed over those 800 American boys the other day, I can't imagine that the waves picked only Democrats.

Don't you think it's about time we started pulling together and stopped our political bickering? I'm just asking the question, because as I said in the beginning, I'm as confused as a bow-legged rat in a cat riot—or just what was it I said?

The Townsend Bill Is Entitled to Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on February 2 Representative CANNON of Florida introduced H. R. 1649, commonly known as the Townsend bill.

Because of the necessity for hearings on the income-tax proposal, the House Ways and Means Committee was not in a position to hold hearings on the Townsend bill. However, on March 4, at the request of the Townsend organization, I wrote the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, requesting that hearings be scheduled at an early date. My letter to Chairman DOUGHTON is as follows:

H. R. 1649, commonly known as the Townsend bill, was introduced in the House of Representatives February 2, 1943, by Congressman CANNON and is now before your committee.

In view of the fact that the tax question may be disposed of within the next few weeks, I am hopeful that it will be possible for you to consider H. R. 1649 in view of the

Nation-wide interest in that particular legislative measure. Proponents of H. R. 1649 are anxious that an opportunity be given them to represent their case, and it is hoped that you will find it possible to schedule hearings at an early date.

With best wishes, I am.

I am certain that Members of Congress will recognize the fact that there are millions of Townsend members throughout the United States who have patiently waited for hearings on Townsend legislation during the Seventy-seventh Congress and who are looking to the present Congress with renewed faith and courage that the plight of the elderly citizens of the Nation will not be overlooked and forgotten.

We have witnessed during the past 2 years organized groups descending on Washington and clamoring for attention to legislation in which they were interested. These various groups have had their day in court and it is only fair to a group like the Townsend Clubs of America to grant the same consideration. Therefore, I sincerely hope that hearings will be scheduled as promptly as possible on H. R. 1649 in order that the millions of Townsend members in America may through their accredited representatives present their plan to abolish want and privation which are shadowing the lives of millions of our elderly citizens.

New Dealers Smearing Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Evening Star:

NEW DEALERS SMEARING CONGRESS—CRIES OF BLOCKING WAR EFFORT SEEN AS SMOKE SCREEN

(By David Lawrence)

Just about the time Congress shows signs of regaining its independence, the new dealers have started to smear the legislative body with the charge that it is interfering with the war effort.

The transparency of the charge and the motive behind it will be more apparent in the coming weeks, but it is a strange commentary on what has become almost an obsession with the new dealers, namely, that the legislative branch of the Government need not function, especially in wartime.

For nearly 10 years now the Congress has been an obedient rubber stamp for the executive agencies and now when the people in the 1942 elections expressed their protest and sent independent-minded representatives to Congress a hue and cry is raised about it by the administration's spokesmen.

It is true the Congress could theoretically by obstructive measures interfere with the war effort but as long as the President possesses the veto power it is unlikely that any proposal of that nature could become law. Many observers forget that the Chief Executive, under the Constitution, is not only more powerful than two-thirds of one House of Congress, but more powerful also than a roll call in the other House if it happens to record one less vote than a two-thirds majority.

SMOKE SCREEN ON ISSUE

Any bill which can command the two-thirds vote of both houses necessary to override a veto is likely to be a popular measure wanted by the people. Such a bill would inevitably require the support of a substantial number of members of both political parties, and it is not probable that any obstructive measure damaging to the war effort could command such a big bipartisan vote.

So the administration supporters are really drawing a smoke screen across the Congress issue and are trying to prevent that body from asserting its prerogatives and expressing its judgment on matters vital to the people. The best thing that can happen to a constitutional democracy, particularly in wartime, is to let the legislative body debate and discuss proposals for the government of the whole people. If the Congress doesn't participate in the lawmaking process and attemps are made—as has happened too often recently—to write laws by means of Government regulations with the excuse that broad powers are contained in the original statute, the confidence of the people in government is weakened.

In a war to preserve democracy, it is important that democratic institutions are not impaired. The effort to smear Congress and charge it with desiring to interfere with the war program is so palpably a ruse to divert public support from the national legislature that it ought to be labeled what it is and exposed to view.

It is signaficant that the cry of too much interference by Congress is coming almost directly from New Deal quarters. But it will neither intimidate nor swerve Congress from reasserting its legislative function.

PEOPLE'S OWN BODY

The American people will endure hardships if they are convinced these are necessary. One reason they sometimes look with skepticism on rationing rules is because they do not have confidence in the bureaus which issue the regulations. And one reason why that confidence is lacking is because the people's representatives in Congress have been ignored.

The idea that Congress is superfluous has been assiduously cultivated by new dealers for nearly a decade. Their first set-back came in the last elections and now some of them are trying to overcome the effects of that mandate by a cry of lack of patriotism. Congress has before it several proposals which should not be passed, as, for instance, any reduction in the figures on manpower set by the joint chiefs of staffs as necessary. But the debate on that particular item will do more to clarify the need and get public support for a big Army than an Executive order which has been developed in secret.

Congress is cumbersome at times and even unwieldy, but it is the people's own body and with all its defects it is still the custodian of legislative power in our democracy. And democracy is always a distasteful process to arrogant bureaucrats.

Poem by Ben Neal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, because I believe it carries a message that all can profit by, I ask consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following short poem by Benjamin Neal, the founder of the I Am an American foundation:

THE HUMBLE TUMBLE BUG
OR
THE GROUCHY GRUMBLE GRUB
(By Benjamin Edwards Neal)

Verse

If I hear it on the radio
  Or read it in the news,
I will pass it on to Flo and Joe,
  Or anyone I choose.
If I hear it on the trolley car
  Or strolling for a walk;
If I hear it at the corner bar,
  I'll think before I talk!

Chorus

The busy bee is always buzzing!
  Industrious is she!
The buzzing bee is never puzzling!
  She's feeding you and me!
How different from the chronic groaning
  Of Grumbler Number One,
Who spends the time complaining, moaning,
  'Bout how the war is run!

I'd rather be a tumble bug,
  Attending to my tumbling,
Than be a grouchy grumble grub,
  A-fumbling and a-mumbling!

The tumble bug is always tumbling,
  To keep her grubs supplied;
A humble bug, but never grumbling,
  She rolls from side to side!

Letter From Montgomery Ward & Co. to National War Labor Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I have received through the mails a printed circular from the Chicago office of Montgomery Ward & Co., under date of February 27, 1943, addressed to the National War Labor Board of Washington, D. C., which expresses views which, in my opinion, are so fundamentally sound that I request unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.,
Chicago, February 27, 1943.

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: A National War Labor Board panel has recommended that the Board issue another order against Montgomery Ward & Co. imposing upon Ward's six large stores in Denver, Detroit, and New York City:

1. A form of closed shop, called "maintenance of membership," together with a check-off of union dues from wages.

2. Compulsory arbitration of any question the union wishes to raise.

Wards objects to the proposed order for these reasons:

1. The War Labor Board is without authority. Congress, the only lawmaking authority under the Constitution, has not empowered the Board to order any employer to adopt these requirements.

2. The War Labor Board, by ordering a closed shop in this case, will be furthering disrespect for constitutional authority. The Board is attempting to assume a power to make rules and laws by executive fiat alone. The public is being deceived into believing that the Board's orders have the force of law, when in fact they have no such effect. Employees are being confused and deceived into believing that their Government desires them to join labor unions when in fact the national policy as declared by Congress is that employees are free to join or not, as they wish. Thus, the Board is destroying the very essence of democracy, the right of the people to make laws through those whom the people elect for that purpose.

3. The War Labor Board, by promiscuously granting some form of the closed shop, is destroying the laws constitutionally enacted by Congress. The Nationa' Labor Relations Act endorses, guarantees, and encourages the process of collective bargaining. The orders of this Board, however, have led the unions to abandon collective bargaining. The union in this case has rushed to the War Labor Board in the conviction that the Board will grant more than it could obtain through collective bargaining, the procedure which Congress has sought to protect and encourage. Other unions are following the same course. Thus the Board, by this proceeding and by its policies as proclaimed in other proceedings of this nature, is nullifying the public policy of the Nation as declared by Congress and set forth in the National Labor Relations Act. Laws passed by Congress, the only lawmaking authority under our Constitution, cannot legally be repealed by Executive decree.

4. The proposed order would require Wards to violate the law. It would require Wards, first, to interfere with the free choice of its employees to resign from the union; second, to give support to the union by a check-off of union dues; and third, to discriminate against employees if they resign their membership in the union, all in direct violation of the National Labor Relations Act.

5. Wards operates in a highly competitive field composed of 1,750,000 retail establishments. It is unfair to impose burdens upon Wards and not upon those with whom it is in competition. If the retail industry is to be subjected to the closed shop and arbitration requirements, they should be legislated by Congress and applied uniformly against all retail establishments.

6. The proposed order would require Wards to surrender to outside arbitrators the final decision on all matters which the union may wish to treat as grievances. Thus Wards' 60,000 shareholders would be deprived of the right to direct, through the management they select, the affairs of the corporation they own.

7. Under this "maintenance of membership" form of closed shop, employees are not free to resign from the union without losing their jobs. Wards is compelled to discharge every union member who fails to maintain his union membership in good standing (nonpayment of dues, etc.). "Maintenance of membership" is the starting phase which inevitably leads to the full closed shop and a labor monopoly.

8. The proposed order violates the fundamental principles of liberty. Liberty requires that an employee be free to join, to refuse to join, or to resign from a union without losing his job. Liberty requires that an employer be free to employ the person best suited for the work.

9. Wards has consistently defended these principles of liberty. In times of peace, Wards successfully denied all demands for the closed shop in any form. Two years ago the teamsters' union, in an effort to force a closed shop, maintained a vicious 7-month strike against Wards' retail stores and mail-order houses on the Pacific coast. Two mail-order houses and 6 retail stores were forced to close, 43 other stores were picketed, and Wards suffered damages exceeding $2,000,000. Employees were slugged, customers abused, and property destroyed. The railroads, the express companies, the truckers, and finally the United States Post Office obeyed the demands of the union and, with total disregard for their obligations to the public and in violation of law, refused service to Wards and its customers. Nevertheless, Wards, while announcing its willingness to bargain and to contract with the union, refused to compromise the principles it was defending. The strike did not end until the union, in writing, withdrew its demand for a closed shop.

Even if the War Labor Board had the authority which it lacks, it should not, in time of war, when sacrifices are demanded of all, grant to any union a privilege it could not have obtained in time of peace.

Wards has no quarrel with legitimate union practices. However, Wards strongly opposes the War Labor Board's illegitimate attempts to sabotage our laws and to socialize all industry, ostensibly as a part of the war effort.

Wards desires to continue to obey the law, to preserve constitutional government, to maintain management by ownership, to remain competitive, and to leave its employees free to belong or not to belong to a union as they wish.

In accordance with these principles Wards must reject any proposals which require it to enter into contracts which it believes to be illegal, or to surrender principles which it considers to be fundamental. In so doing, Wards is taking the course which good citizenship requires.

Yours very truly,

MONTGOMERY WARD & CO.,
SEWELL AVERY, *President*.

Resolutions of the Great Lakes Harbors Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two resolutions adopted by the Great Lakes Harbors Association at its executive committee meeting at Chicago, Ill., on Friday, January 29, 1943, which are of utmost importance not only to the people of my own State, Wisconsin, but to the people of all other States bordering upon the Great Lakes:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND OUR WAR EFFORT

The primary interest and concern of every patriotic American citizen is the winning of the war. Matters of purely domestic concern, which do not contribute to the war effort, must necessarily be subordinated for the duration. The principal purpose of this conference therefore is to mobilize the municipalities and port interests in the Great Lakes basin in order to achieve a unity of effort and objectives that will assure a maximum contribution to the Nation's need in the present emergency.

We esteem it our duty and privilege, as citizens of this great and populous area, with its tremendous agricultural and industrial production, to call the attention of the Federal Government to those unemployed resources of the Great Lakes area, which, if properly developed, will assist and augment the Nation's military effort.

As the records of the War and Navy Departments and collateral Federal agencies so abundantly reveal the several States in the Great Lakes region supply the bulk of our war production. No other area contributes so much. This is primarily a war of steel and aluminum. The production of these vital metals is largely centralized in the Great Lakes region. No other single economic factor contributes so much to the maintenance of our American way of life as the movement of ore from the hills of Minnesota to the furnaces of Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Chicago, and Detroit. This movement is almost wholly water-borne. It is made possible by the existence of our great inland seas with nearly 1,500 miles of fresh water navigation, open to deep-draft vessels.

But this great waterway already contributing so largely to the national welfare, can be made to double its usefulness if opened to the sea. A short stretch of rapids—48 miles in length—bars ships of these inland seas from access to the ocean. An American Mediterranean is kept a private pond. Meanwhile rail facilities are taxed to the breaking point and coastal warehouses from Portland, Maine, to Seattle, Wash., are loaded to capacity. An everincreasing flow of goods threatens a transportation and storage crisis.

No region in the world has greater potential shipbuilding capacity than the Great Lakes area. The steel is there; the facilities for manufacturing the necessary marine equipmpent are there; assembly can be achieved with a minimum of transportation wasted, but again a short-sighted policy in failing to remove the St. Lawrence rapids barrier prevents the construction of badly needed ships—the bottleneck of our war effort—in this section.

Both our military effort and that of our neighbor and ally, Canada, are restricted by a shortage of vitally needed electric power. This power is available in the St. Lawrence rapids, but remains undeveloped because of the opposition of selfish interests.

Our eastern seaboard faces a critical shortage of essential petroleum supplies, particularly fuel oil and gasoline. Acute distress is experienced in many communities. All this could have been avoided if the St. Lawrence seaway were open, together with the Champlain Valley cut-off. There are other winters ahead. Further delay is intolerable.

Resolved, therefore, That we request and urge the President of the United States and the Congress to give immediate attention and concern to the strategic possibility of the Great Lakes area, and particularly to the opening of a new submarine-proof northern coastline, extending from Duluth to Quebec, by the speedy approval and construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power-development project, now pending before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the United States House of Representatives.

Further resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the several Federal agencies dealing with this problem, and to Members of the United States Congress.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE.

POST-WAR REHABILITATION OF GREAT LAKES SHIPPING

Whereas the governments of the United States and Canada have requisitioned large numbers of vessels from the Great Lakes fleet and have transferred such vessels to ocean service to aid in meeting the demands of the war shipping crisis, and it is deemed unlikely that vessels so transferred will again be available for Great Lakes post-war service, due to the hazards of war; and

Whereas many important vessel services have been discontinued and many important commodity movements have been curtailed or

suspended, due to lack of vessel supply, to the disadvantage of shippers, vessel operators, and port cities of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas it is essential for the post-war economic and transportation welfare of the Great Lakes region that an adequate fleet of lake ships be maintained to serve the transportation requirements of the region, and for the sound industrial and agricultural development of this important area, and the restoration of an adequate lake shipping fleet is therefore of the utmost importance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, in view of the imperative need for post-war rehabilitation of Great Lakes shipping, That the Great Lakes Harbors Association respectfully directs the attention of the Congress and of the United States Maritime Commission to the situation which confronts Great Lakes shipping, with the request that said bodies give careful consideration to the problem of post-war restoration and rehabilitation of lake shipping; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress and the United States Maritime Commission are respectfully requested to initiate measures looking toward formulation of policies and plans for post-war rehabilitation of Great Lakes shipping, to the end that the Great Lakes area, to the full extent of its resources, may aid in the post-war period of economic readjustment.

Conservation of Gasoline and Rubber in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a statement by members of the taxicab industry of Boston, and editorials from various Boston newspapers, which indicate the cooperation which is being given in New England in the effort to conserve gasoline and rubber.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald of January 22, 1943]

BE A 100-PERCENT AMERICAN—PLEASE DON'T USE TAXI CABS FOR PLEASURE DRIVING

Director of the United States Office of Defense Transportation Joseph B. Eastman is right when he says:

"The purpose of restricting the use of private passenger cars in the eastern United States to necessary driving is being partially defeated. The purposes, of course, is to cut down on the consumption of gasoline. Obviously, nothing is accomplished if pleasure riding is merely transferred from passenger cars to taxi cabs."

OUR REPLY

We believe that victory in this war comes first and above all goals before us * * * to that end we dedicate our every effort.

Gasoline and rubber are powerful ammunition, both of which are precious commodities and indispensable to our armed forces in their forward march, on every global front to victory and freedom.

To our fighting men, to Uncle Sam, to Mr. Eastman we, an integral part of the public transportation system, in whose livelihood gasoline and rubber play an all important part, wholeheartedly and unselfishly, say "We are with you."

To the public we say in order to assure adequate transportation for essential purposes, we feel obliged to impose on ourselves the following restrictions:

1. We will not accept trips to or from places of amusement or recreation.
2. We will not waste gasoline and rubber.
3. We will not accept trips more than 10 miles beyond the corporate limits of the city.
4. We will not accept trips for commercial deliveries.
5. We will not accept trips for sightseeing.
6. We will not cruise.
7. We will conserve on other materials vital to the war effort.
8. We will observe all legal speed limits.
9. We will police our own industry.
10. We are 100-percent Americans.

We confidentially anticipate your full cooperation—the burden is on all of us.

You must be Americans. All ways and always.

This advertisement sponsored by the city of Boston Cab Association, Frank Sawyer, president, comprising the entire taxicab industry of Boston.

[From the Boston Traveler of January 26, 1943]

TAXICABS FOR NEEDFUL USE

Only such an emergency as war could make people in business pay for advertisements asking that the public confine the use of their services for essential purposes.

That is exactly what the City of Boston Cab Association has done. Pleasure riding in private automobiles has been ordered stopped, but some unthinking persons have turned right around and transferred their pleasure riding to taxicabs.

Defense Transportation Director Eastman has declared that this does not accomplish any saving of gasoline and rubber as desired in the restriction on the use of private passenger cars.

To accomplish this purpose the taxicab drivers have voluntarily promised to discourage in every way the use of their vehicles for pleasure riding.

Patriotic citizens will not ask taxi drivers to violate their pledge to Uncle Sam.

[From the Boston Globe of January 19, 1943]

FINE SPIRIT

The owners and operators of taxicabs in the city of Boston have set a stirirng example of patriotism for the entire community by their announcement of 100-percent cooperation with Director of Defense Transportation Joseph E. Eastman. In an announcement for which the cab men went right down into their own pockets, they endorse emphatically the observation of Mr. Eastman that if pleasure driving is merely transferred from passenger cars to taxicabs nothing will be accomplished toward economy of gasoline or conservation of tires.

Declaring their Americanism, the cab men have made public their agreement to restrict sharply their business, eliminating trips to places of amusement or recreation, for sightseeing, or for any other nonessential purpose.

They should be honored for placing patriotism above private profit. They should be followed by other citizens who recognize the obligation to put winning the war first on the list of things to do.

[From the Boston Herald of January 22, 1943]

LIMITED TAXIING

The war has provided a number of paradoxes, but few so striking as those advertisements asking people not to buy the goods or services advertised. When the telephone company urges less telephoning and the railroads invite less traveling, one can't help feeling that here is something finely patriotic. When local advertisers go to bat for the United War Fund and when almost any merchant says "Buy War bonds first," those, too, convey something inspiring.

So when the owners and operators of taxicabs in this city pay out of their own pockets the cost of persuading people not to hire cabs for pleasure driving they are sharing in what is becoming one of the great traditions of this war—the sacrifice of personal and corporate gain for the good of America.

The general public owes the same sort of cooperation to the edict of Defense Transportation Director Eastman against eluding the ban on pleasure driving by hiring a taxi. Such a subterfuge saves no gasoline or tires. The owners and operators have set the example of compliance.

[From the Boston Daily Record of January 21, 1943]

OUR PATRIOTIC CAB MEN

Owners and operators of taxicabs in Boston are setting an inspiring example of patriotism for the country by discouraging the use of their vehicles for pleasure driving and nonessential travel.

Joseph B. Eastman, Director of the United States Office of Defense Transportation, has stated that gasoline could not be conserved if recreational riding were merely to be transferred from passenger cars to taxicabs.

In reply, the Boston taxicab owners and operators have imposed on themselves such restrictions as: No trips beyond 10 miles of the corporate limits of the city, no commercial deliveries, no sightseeing, and no cruising.

Obviously, this means a sacrifice of private profit, but, as victory-minded men, the Boston cab men are willing to place patriotism above it.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 1, 1943]

BE FAIR TO TAXI DRIVERS

Transportation Director Eastman makes clear what honest and conscientious motorists should have known without being reminded, namely, that the aims of the ban on pleasure driving are defeated if motorists simply employ taxicabs for trips to theaters, hockey games, or bridge parties. No gasoline—or rubber, either—is saved by such evasions.

The response of the organized taxicab business to the situation is pleasing. In Boston, the entire industry has pledged itself in newspaper advertisements to refuse fares to or from places of amusement or recreation, not to accept trips for sightseeing, and not to permit the use of cabs by drivers or operators for personal, social, or recreational purposes.

In New York, Washington, and other points much visited by the traveling public, passengers must share the taxis between stations and hotels, like car-pooling war workers. At least three or four to a cab is the rule. Next to sharing a seat in a day-coach, there is nothing like the informality of a taxi ride for promoting friendliness. The trip is usually too short for concluding a sale, swapping yarns, or exchanging recipes, but by combining three trips into one it can, and does, save gas.

The taxi-using public could help by not asking drivers to violate their pledge.

[From the Boston Post of February 5, 1943]

TAXIMEN'S PLEDGE

If it's used as a means to get around the ban on pleasure driving the taxicab in any large city can go a long way toward defeating the aims of the ban. To prevent such use would be almost impossible. The Government must depend in a large measure upon

voluntary cooperation from the taxi owners themselves to halt this potentially damaging leak of gasoline and burning up of rubber.

That is why the honest, straightforward pledge of the entire industry here in Boston to observe every tenet of the pleasure driving ban, and confine the cab to essential driving, deserves the highest commendation and cooperation of the public.

It sets an example that might well be emulated by all.

Enforcement of O. P. A. Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very significant statement by United States District Judge F. Ryan Duffy, former Senator from the State of Wisconsin, which, in my opinion, will do much to clarify the attitudes of many people, including Members of this House, on the subject of enforcement of O. P. A. regulations:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, EX REL. PRENTISS M. BROWN, ADMINISTRATOR, OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION, PLAINTIFFS, VERSUS ALBERT BECKER, DOING BUSINESS AS CITY DRESSED BEEF CO., DEFENDANT.

PRONOUNCEMENT OF SENTENCE BY THE COURT

The COURT. It is highly important that every man, woman and child in this country do everything they possibly can to further the war effort. Our young men at the front, of course, are making heroic sacrifices; they are doing their part; they are doing it thousands of miles from their homes and loved ones.

At the same time while they are fighting the enemy out there, our Government is conducting a war on the home front, and we have got to be successful in that effort if we are going to win the war; and one of the most important goals that our Government has and one of the most important activities is the fight that they are conducting against inflation. We have seen, and we shudder when we think about it, the horrible effects of inflation on some other countries in years gone by, and if we are to lose the battle against inflation it might well be that the sacrifices that our soldier boys are making, and sailors, and others in the armed forces, might be in vain.

Now, I realize the packers have had a pretty tough time. I think that many of them could not, perhaps, operate except at a loss, but that is no excuse for violating the law. Undoubtedly, maybe some packers, like some tire stores, automobile dealers, and others, have to become casualties of this war. It is might unfortunate, it is regrettable, but that is no excuse for violating the law.

Apparently there are people in every community who, as the term is sometimes used, chisel as a matter of gain to themselves rather than putting first in their minds their duty to their country, and in this case I am convinced that Mr. Becker knew what was going on and that there was a deliberate effort by changing of the invoices or making the invoice appear that he had lived up to the law.

Now, we know, if we are to place any credence in newspaper reports, that the so-called black market in meats amounts to almost a national scandal, and yet one of the important elements in the fight against inflation, the fight to keep the price of living down, has been the regulations that have been issued with reference to maximum prices on meats particularly; of course, also, as to other food products.

Now, a violation of the order of this court at any time is a mighty serious matter, but a violation that is also linked up with the fight we are conducting on the home front is a much more serious matter.

I must impose, under the decisions of the Supreme Court, either a fine or a prison sentence. There have been efforts of some of the courts to place them in the alternative. The Supreme Court has recently held that that is improper.

Now, where it is a question of making money or making profits beyond the law and where an individual is personally responsible, I don't think a fine is sufficient. In the case of corporations, of course, that is about the only thing that can be done. With individuals who may be officers of those corporations or individuals who are operating under a trade name, when the evidence shows they are responsible I think that the court must, it is his duty, to impose a prison sentence.

Mr. Becker, step forward.

Mr. Becker, the judgment of this court, as you heard, is that you are guilty of contempt of court. I sentence you to be committed to the custody of the attorney general to be confined in prison in the Milwaukee House of Correction for a period of 60 days.

Bureau of Animal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, protesting against the recent reorganization of the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture:

Senate Joint Memorial 10

A memorial to the President of the United States and the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture relative to the disassociation of the several divisions of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry

To the President of the United States and to the Honorable Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture:

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana that the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture has ordered a reorganization of the several divisions of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry; and we are informed that the Meat Inspection Division has been placed under a separate administrative unit and that other separations are contemplated; and

Whereas the United States Bureau of Animal Industry has functioned as a separate unit for many years under the able supervision of Dr. John R. Mohler, the present Chief of the Bureau, and has performed its duties and responsibilities to the livestock industry in preventing, controlling, and eradicating diseases of livestock in a most efficient manner, which has included the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and other foreign plagues of livestock; and

Whereas having all the divisions of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry grouped under one administrative head especially trained in the prevention of diseases of livestock has aided in the prompt detection and eradication of many diseases that would not have been possible had these functions been operating under several units; and

Whereas the loss of the Meat Inspection Division with its large number of trained veterinarians will seriously impair the efficiency of the Bureau in promptly assembling a sufficient number of trained veterinarians to adequately cope with a threatened invasion of foot-and-mouth disease or other foreign plagues as in the past; and

Whereas diseases of livestock are known to be more prevalent under war conditions due to the movement of troops and disorganization of veterinary service; and

Whereas the period of rehabilitation following the present war will bring many new and serious problems in the control of livestock diseases, due to the return of troops and the shipment of disease-carrying media from foreign ccuntries where dangerous diseases of livestock are prevalent, but which do not now exist, in the United States; and

Whereas the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana is firmly of the belief that the increased production of beef called for under present conditions, and the prevention and control of dangerous diseases of livestock can be greatly aided and attained by having the control of livestock diseases, the inspection of slaughter animals, and the production of biologics used in the control of livestock diseases under an administrator who has been properly trained by years of experience in all these activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (and the house of representatives concurring), That we do deplore the hasty and ill-advised action that has led to the separation of the Meat Inspection Division from the United States Bureau of Animal Industry and do earnestly request the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, to reconsider such action and request that all divisions of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry remain under the direct administration of a man especially trained in the prevention of diseases of livestock; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and to the Honorable Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana.

Assistance to Refugees—Note From Secretary of State to British Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a note delivered on February 25, 1943, by the Secretary of State to the British Government.

There being no objection, the note was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[The following is the text of a note delivered to the British Government by the Secretary of State on February 25, 1943.]

FEBRUARY 25, 1943.

The Secretary of State presents his compliments to His Excellency the British Ambassador and has the honor to refer to the British Embassy's aide memoire of January 20, 1943, relating to the situation of persons fleeing from persecution for religious, racial, and political reasons and to the necessity for intergovernmental relief action in their behalf.

It is evident that the problem of the refugees in question cannot be solved in a satisfactory manner by any one of the governments of the United Nations group nor of the neutral countries. It has been, and is, the traditional policy of this country to seek every available means by which to extend to oppressed and persecuted peoples such assistance as may be found to be feasible and possible under the laws of the United States. In pursuance of that policy, this Government has been and is taking steps to extend assistance in a large measure to those European people who have been subjected to oppression and persecution under the Hitler regime. The measures of assistance afforded have assumed several forms, as follows:

1. Joint and several declarations of official attitude of condemnation of the policies and acts of the Axis Governments and their satellites in oppression or persecution of religious, racial, and political minorities;

2. The appropriation and expenditure of large amounts of public and private funds for the relief of persons in need as a result of oppression and persecution because of their racial origin or religious or political beliefs;

3. The application of the immigration laws of the United States in the utmost liberal and humane spirit of those laws;

4. The calling by the President of the United States of the first intergovernmental conference at Evian-London in 1938 for the purpose of seeking a solution of refugee problems. There may be repeated here the statement made in that conference by the Honorable Myron Taylor on behalf of this Government, as follows:

"In conclusion, I need not emphasize that the discrimination and pressure against minority groups and the disregard of elementary human rights are contrary to the principles of what we have come to regard as the accepted standards of civilization. We have heard from time to time of the disruptive consequences of the dumping of merchandise upon the world's economy. How much more disturbing is the forced and chaotic dumping of unfortunate peoples in large numbers. Racial and religious problems are, in consequence, rendered more acute in all parts of the world. Economic retaliation against the countries which are responsible for this condition is encouraged. The sentiment of international mistrust and suspicion is heightened, and fear, which is an important obstacle to general appeasement between nations, is accentuated.

"The problem is no longer one of purely private concern. It is a problem for intergovernmental action. If the present currents of migration are permitted to continue to push anarchically upon the receiving states and if some governments are to continue to toss large sections of their populations lightly upon a distressed and unprepared world, then there is catastrophic human suffering ahead which can only result in general unrest and in general international strain which will not be conducive to the permanent appeasement to which all peoples earnestly aspire."

At the Evian-London conference and through the intergovernmental committee which grew out of that conference, this Government exerted its most earnest efforts to persuade the various countries represented to provide asylum for as many refugees from the Axis countries as the laws of the several countries would permit. This Government has also approached other countries for the purpose of finding places of settlement for refugees with funds of the United States origin being made available.

5. As shown by the records of the Department of State from the advent of the Hitler regime in 1933 until June 30, 1942, 547,775 visas were issued by American diplomatic and consular officers to natives of nationals of the various countries now dominated by the Axis Powers, the great majority of which persons were refugees from Nazi persecution. Of this number 228,964 were issued in the war years 1939–42. Many more than that number of visas were authorized during this latter period, the aliens in whose behalf such authorizations were given having been unable to depart from their places of foreign residence to reach the United States. Yet, of the number actually issued, practically all of the aliens who received them during the war years 1939–42 have actually arrived in the United States and have remained here, many of them having entered in a temporary status and not yet having departed.

6. Over 5,000 visas were authorized for the admission into the United States and permanent residence here of refugee children coming from France, Spain, and Portugal under arrangements with certain private persons and organizations in the United States for their care. Visas were also authorized for the parents accompanying them, in certain cases. This Government has sought the friendly assistance of the Government of Switzerland to effect the release from France of such of these children who have not been permitted to leave France, for entry into Spain where visas may be issued to them by the American consular officers.

7. Since the entry of the United States into the war, there have been no new restrictions placed by the Government of the United States upon the number of aliens of any nationality permitted to proceed to this country under existing laws, except for the more intensive examination of aliens required for security reasons.

8. Considerable sums of money have been made available by the American Red Cross and from other American sources to the American Ambassador at Madrid for the care of refugees now in Spain pending their evacuation. A number of these refugees have already been removed to north Africa. The continuation of this movement and its extent are dependent upon military consideration.

9. The American Red Cross, and other American organizations have provided assistance for refugees who have been able to reach other neutral countries, such as Iran, and have undertaken extended feeding among children, including refugee children, in France.

10. In evacuating refugees to neutral areas, the full influence of the United States diplomatic and consular representatives has been from time to time invoked, not only with the oppressor nations but with any government concerned, on behalf of the refugees.

This Government understands that, in addition to the refugee classes under immediate consideration, the British Government has certain undertakings for the care of British evacuees and of prisoners of war. Likewise, the Government of the United States has certain similar undertakings, as follows:

1. For the successful prosecution of the war and for hemispheric safety, the Government of the United States has offered to receive dangerous Axis nationals from a number of the American republics where facilities for the internment or close safeguarding of such Axis nationals do not exist. A considerable number of such Axis nationals have thus been brought to the United States, and arrangements are being made for the receipt of more of them.

2. This Government has a number of camps in the United States, and more camps are under construction or planned for the internment or detention of civilian enemy aliens. There are being maintained in these camps thousands of such aliens.

3. This Government has also established other camps for prisoners of war which are now in use and in which, by arrangement, there will also be placed large numbers of United Nations prisoners. The accommodation of these prisoners in the United States will leave available abroad considerable quantities of food, clothing, etc., for refugees there which would otherwise be used by those prisoners abroad, while, on the other hand, the maintenance of the prisoners in the United States will result in a considerable reduction of supplies available here.

4. There have been set up in the United States a number of relocation centers, where approximately 110,000 persons of the Japanese race are being housed and maintained at public expense after removal from vital military areas.

The Government of the United States fully shares the concern expressed by the British Government for the situation of the refugees. It feels, in view of the facts set forth above, that it has been and is making every endeavor to relieve the oppressed and persecuted peoples. In affording asylum to refugees, however, it is and must be bound by legislation enacted by Congress determining the immigration policy of the United States.

The United States is of the opinion that further efforts to solve the problem may best be undertaken through the instrumentality already existing, the Executive Committee of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees. To this end it may be considered advisable in order to facilitate action by the Committee that a preliminary exploration of ways and means be undertaken informally by representatives designated by the Government of the United States and the British Government. Such exploration might be undertaken along the following lines:

A. The refugee problem should not be considered as being confined to persons of any particular race or faith. Nazi measures against minorities have caused the flight of persons of various races and faiths, as well as of other persons because of their political beliefs.

B. Wheresoever practicable, intergovernmental collaboration should be sought in these times of transportation difficulty, shipping shortage, and submarine menace, to the end that arrangements may be determined for temporary asylum for refugees as near as possible to the areas in which those people find themselves at the present time and from which they may be returned to their homelands with the greatest expediency on the termination of hostilities.

C. There should accordingly be considered plans for the maintenance in neutral countries in Europe of those refugees for whose removal provision may not be made. Their maintenance in neutral countries may involve the giving of assurances for their support until they can be repatriated, which support will necessarily come from the United Nations augmented by funds from private sources. It may also involve the giving of assurances in all possible cases by their governments in exile for their prompt return to their native countries upon the termination of hostilities.

D. The possibilities for the temporary asylum of the refugees, with a view to their repatriation upon the termination of hostilities, in countries other than neutral, and their dependencies, should be explored, together with the question of the availability of shipping to effect their movement from Europe.

It is suggested that the British and United States representatives might meet at Ottawa for this preliminary exploration.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington.

Investigation of Manpower by Subcommittee of Committee on Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a report I have made respecting the investigation of manpower by a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTIGATION OF MANPOWER BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, UNITED STATES SENATE

(Report of Senator GREEN)

THE SIZE OF THE ARMY

SIZE OF THE ARMED FORCES A STRATEGIC DECISION OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

The size of the armed forces, the relative strength of their several components and their geographic distribution are fundamental factors which govern all strategic decisions. The authority for the formulation of strategic plans and the responsibility for their success have properly been placed upon the joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States Army and Navy, Generals Marshall and Arnold and Admirals Leahy and King, because of their professional ability and their background of training and experience.

These distinguished military leaders have planned an armed force of approximately 11,100,000, which includes an Army of 8,208,000 for 1943 and 1944. The President, as Commander in Chief, has approved this plan and the basic mission and strategy upon which it was based: That is, the conclusive defeat of the Axis in Europe and Africa while maintaining an active war of attrition against Japan until such time as we are free to concentrate on her conclusive defeat.

HEAVY BURDEN OF PROOF AND GRAVE RESPONSIBILITY ON THOSE WHO WOULD ALTER STRATEGIC DECISION

This basic and vital decision was reached by the reasoned judgment of these military leaders after a year of exhaustive research and detailed consideration of the most authoritative information available regarding strategy, shipping capabilities, training time, production possibilities, and the manpower resources of the country. If the judgment is unsound, if the strategic factors considered are not pertinent, if the time specified to train units for combat is too long, if estimates of shipping capabilities are not accurate, if the production of munitions or the manpower resources of the Nation have been overestimated, then the plan for the size of the armed forces in 1943 and 1944 may be wrong. However, the burden of proof lies heavily upon any group which brings such serious charges against those responsible to the country for the formulation of these plans. Any group which undertakes to alter them in the absence of the most convincing evidence, is directly responsible to the country for any failure of such altered strategic plans and for all the disastrous consequences of that failure.

Notwithstanding this grave responsibility, proposals have been seriously advanced to disrupt strategic plans by drastically cutting the size of the armed forces by 1,000,000 or even by over 2,000,000 men in 1943. As the Army constitutes the largest percentage of the armed forces it has naturally borne the brunt of attack. The proponents of these proposals must assume the burden of proof of justifying the absolute necessity for such a cut. In doing so they must assume responsibility for the certain prolongation of the war and the possible disasters which are inherent in these proposals. They must assume responsibility if the end of 1944 finds us with insufficiently trained troops properly to face the strategic situation in 1945. They must assume responsibility if green troops are sacrificed to the battle-trained veterans of our enemies; and if divisions of the Army are not ready to sail on all transports that become available and if our continental base is undermanned to maintain and supply our overseas forces.

The military leaders are completely convinced that this size Army is an irreducible requisite of military success and that the forces not shipped overseas in 1943 and 1944 are absolutely essential to the defense of this hemisphere, to the maintenance of overseas forces and to the accomplishment of the military mission for 1945. Above all they have clearly shown that the numbers planned to remain in this country at the end of 1943 are essential adequately to train those to be shipped in 1944 on a very conservative estimate of shipping capabilities. They also have shown that the strategic reserve remaining in this country at the end of 1944 may be completely wiped out if more optimistic shipping estimates are met. Finally, they are convinced that a substantial reduction in the planned number threatens failure or, at best, a military stalemate with the enemy lasting possibly a generation.

BURDEN OF PROOF HAS NOT BEEN DISCHARGED BY PROPONENTS OF ARMY

If we determine that an Army of 8,208,000 is not justified; that the forces planned are more than the military task requires, and that there is no danger to the country in reducing this force, we are presuming to substitute our military judgment for that of the distinguished military leaders who have testified to the contrary. If we decide that it is absolutely impossible for the country to produce the food and supplies which the civilian population must have in order to survive and at the same time maintain an army of the size necessary to the country's defense, we are forced to assume the responsibility for endangering the country by lowering its armed strength below the level of safety as determined by the military experts. To come to the conclusion to cut the size of the Army we must adopt one view or the other. I do not suppose that anyone would seriously take the first view, on the basis of the conflicting, confused, and indefinite estimates presented here by the proponents of a smaller Army. To do so is to impugn either the judgment or the good faith of those to whom we have entrusted the military safety of the country. To take the second view we must be convinced that no way can be found to mobilize the country's resources of men, food, and other materials to support the necessary Army; that, in order to produce the food and supplies essential to the war effort, the only recourse is to reduce our armed forces below the minimum found to be necessary to military success by the chiefs of staff. This is a defeatist's viewpoint. We entered the war to defeat the enemy quickly. To limit the Army because we think we can't do the job is to invite defeat.

EMERGENCY MANPOWER SHORTAGES CAN BE MET OVER NIGHT—1944 ARMY MUST BE TRAINED IN 1943

There has been presented here much evidence that the job can be done with an 8,000,000-man Army and with manpower to spare. But even if manpower shortages actually do develop, which seriously threaten the maintenance of the civilian population, the food supply or the supply of overseas forces, men can immediately be released from the Army to meet such an emergency, but nonexistent combat divisions cannot possibly be created and trained overnight to fill transports which may become available or to repel an enemy attack which may be launched at us or at our neighbors. It takes, at the very least, a year to train combat units. A slash in the size of the Army in 1943 limits the job it can do in 1944 and 1945 and thus endangers the country's safety.

I have seen no evidence which convinces me that we have planned our utilization of manpower in 1943 and 1944 to such a nicety that we know now that we cannot produce essential food and munitions and still maintain an Army of 8,208,000. I have seen a great deal of evidence that we can produce them. It appears to me that the Army is the last place, not the first place, we should look for possible cuts to meet any impending manpower shortage. Certainly the manpower program of neither agriculture nor of industry has been worked out with the completeness, accuracy, and farsightedness of the Army's program. We must examine the entire manpower problem with an extremely critical eye before we decide to endanger our military safety.

TOTAL WAR REQUIRES TOTAL MOBILIZATION OF RESOURCES—THIS JOB IS NOT BEING DONE

Even the most superficial appraisal of the present military situation is enough to support the conviction that nothing short of an all-out utilization of the country's resources will be enough to insure victory in the relentless total war that is being waged against us. This means that there must be a large increase in the productive labor of the country and a severe curtailment, if not abandonment, of all industry not vital to the war effort. This admittedly requires a real job to be done by those responsible for effecting the mobilization of our agricultural and industrial resources and of our manpower.

The simplest and easiest way for them to reduce the magnitude and difficulty of this job is, of course, to reduce the size of the Army since the Army places the biggest strain on the Nation's economy and manpower. This is also the simplest and easiest way for us to lose the war. Furthermore, a cut in the Army will not alone automatically place available men where needed unless a real job of mobilization is done quickly and efficiently. Due to wage differentials, industry has been and will continue to be a far greater drain on agricultural manpower than the Army. Efficiency in obtaining the maximum productive capacity of agriculture and of industry is still at a level far below that required by the dictates of military necessity. These problems and many others should be solved before there is any justification in reducing the size of the Army.

UNTIL TOTAL MOBILIZATION IS EFFECTED COUNTRY'S SAFETY SHOULD NOT BE JEOPARDIZED BY CUTTING ARMY

The chiefs of staff have presented a reasoned, definite program of requirements. Other users of labor have not. In the absence of a total analysis of manpower demand, and until everything has been done to exhaust the productive capacity of available labor, the whole conduct of the war and the safety of the country should not be jeopardized by any curtailment in the size of the Army.

That the safety of the country would be jeopardized is proved conclusively by an analysis of the strategic considerations upon which the Army bases its plan for 8,208,000 officers and men for 1943 and 1944.

STRATEGY REQUIRES AN ARMY OF OVER EIGHT MILLIONS IN 1943.—MILITARY MISSION REQUIRES EARLY CONCLUSIVE DEFEAT OF GERMANY'S GROUND FORCES

The basic mission of the armed forces, and the broad strategy announced by the President of defeating Germany conclusively in Europe while maintaining an active war of attrition against Japan, can only be effected by bringing the heaviest possible sustained air attack against Germany in the shortest possible time in order to pave the way for a ground attack which will complete the disruption of her forces. This means that a ground Army must be mobilized and trained so that its maximum impact may be delivered in Europe as soon as possible, since there is no reasonable assurance that victory can be achieved by air power alone. Delay may mean a stalemate lasting for a generation. In the Pacific an active war of attrition must be continued against Japan in order, on the one hand, to prevent her from consolidating her gains and, on the other hand, to improve our position for the main effort against her which will come after victory in Europe.

In order to accomplish this plan, the United Nations must overwhelm the Axis air forces and muster superior ground forces at every point at which the attack is pressed against the German-held fortress of Europe.

Until the final phases, we must maintain a force in this country to eject the Japanese from the Aleutians, hold Alaska and other parts of this hemisphere against renewed invasions, and operate a base of training, maintenance, and supply for our oversea forces.

AXIS HAS OVERWHELMING GROUND SUPERIORITY

The Axis Powers have 483 divisions in the European-African theaters; the United Nations (less the United States) have but 321 and are outnumbered by 162 divisions. Japan has 86 active divisions, plus 200,000 air troops; this gives us the measure of the effort which we must make to defeat her. Over the globe the United Nations (less the United States) have a deficit of 146 divisions. Thus the Axis Powers have an overwhelming superiority in land power. This is augmented by superiority in battle-trained organizations, effective numbers, and an interior position which permits the use of relatively short land lines of communication. They are strongly contesting for air superiority and in the western Pacific apparently have naval superiority.

UNITED STATES MUST REDUCE GROUND FORCE DEFICIT AS FAR AND FAST AS POSSIBLE

China cannot bring land forces to bear against Germany. Russia and England cannot materially augment the number of their divisions even though we were able to furnish them unlimited munitions. So the only way the United Nations' ground force deficit can be reduced is by training and transporting United States ground force units.

Therefore, after due consideration to shipping capabilities, the planned army for 1943 provides for a total of 100 divisions of all types. Thus, even if all these divisions could be employed in the African and European theaters, the United Nations, in the role of the attacker in Europe, would still be faced with a deficit of 62 divisions.

PROPOSED CUT IN THE ARMY REQUIRES A CUT IN GROUND FORCES, ABANDONMENT OF STRATEGIC PLANS AND DISRUPTION OF THE MILITARY EFFORT

Any reduction in the total planned strength of the 1943 Army of 8,208,000 means that this disparity in ground troops will be increased to an extent which seriously threatens the possibility of success of the over-all strategic plan which requires that the Army Air Forces program must be pushed to a rapid conclusion regardless of all other considerations. The strength of Services of Supply units and installations must also be maintained to provide minimum support for overseas forces. In 1943 and 1944, therefore, any reductions must be effected by cutting the ground force program. There were 73 divisions organized at the end of 1942. Twenty-seven more divisions must be organized in 1943 to attain the planned 100 divisions. A cut of 1,000,000 in the over-all strength of 8,208,000 means that if the air-force program continues there will be little or no increase during 1943 in mobile ground forces. A cut of 2,200,000, as has been proposed by some, would mean that divisions already organized must be disbanded in order to maintain the Army Air Forces program and an organization of Services of Supply units sufficient to support overseas forces. This would in turn mean abandonment of basic strategic plans and a complete disruption of our military effort.

ESTIMATED SHIPPING CAPABILITY REQUIRES AN ARMY OF 8,208,000—ESTIMATED SHIPPING CAPABILITY A CONTROLLING FACTOR

The planned strength of Army overseas forces for 1943 and 1944 has been controlled by the estimates of the Combined Chiefs of Staff of our capability to transport and maintain them through 1944. Prudence dictates that sufficient trained troops be available to meet reasonably favorable shipping estimates. This number, in turn, controls the total size of the Army for 1943 since troops to be shipped in 1944 must be trained in this country this year. Improved antisubmarine methods, the success of present operations to control the Mediterranean, and increased new construction schedules all point to an improvement in the general situation which has existed during 1942. Some proponents of proposals to limit the size of the Army challenge the estimates of the Combined Chiefs of Staff of the capacity of United Nations shipping to transport and maintain troops during 1943 and 1944. This subject is the delight of professional statisticians and amateur strategists. There are so many variables involved that any figure can only represent the most carefully reasoned estimate using the best available information on all pertinent factors.

However, the combined chiefs of staff and their planning committee on transportation certainly constitute the most highly qualified agency to make these estimates since shipping capacity depends upon: The rate of loss as a result of enemy action; rate of new construction; ratio of Army use of merchant shipping to other uses; turnaround; repair and maintenance requirements; and finally, the total cargo and transport space which will be made available by our allies. All of these factors are variable and the conditions upon which an estimate is based today, may be altered radically tomorrow.

BASING SIZE OF ARMY ON AN UNDERESTIMATE OF SHIPPING WOULD BE AN INEXCUSABLE BLUNDER

The chiefs of staff must, however, base their plans upon fairly optimistic estimates. To have far more trained units ready for shipment overseas than available ships to transport and maintain them would be a mistake. To have available ships to transport and maintain troops at decisive points of action but no adequately trained divisions to send in these ships would be a gross and inexcusable blunder which might cause our defeat. At best, the prolongation of the war for a year, perhaps for many years, would be the inevitable result. Yet, the military leaders who have appeared here have clearly shown how easily this could happen if the size of the Army were reduced. Should Germany be defeated by the end of 1943, thus removing entirely the submarine menace from our shipping, the force of this argument becomes manifest to all. On the other hand, acquiescence in the checkmating of our strategic policy by the enemy's submarines carries the implication of a prolonged struggle that might be ended only by a negotiated peace instead of unconditional surrender.

PRESENT PLANS TO MAINTAIN 4,750,000 OVERSEAS MAY WELL BE EXCEEDED

General Edwards has testified that present plans are to have fighting forces overseas numbering approximately 2,700,000 men by the end of 1943 and over 4,700,000 by the end of 1944 and that these figures represent a substantial increase over those originally estimated and presented to this committee earlier in the hearings. Part of this increase was due to a reduced estimate of shipping losses for 1943 made possible by favorable developments in the submarine war during the last quarter of 1942. A further increase was justified by a reduction in demand on shipping by other users. In preparing for further such favorable contingencies from time to time, it is essential that there be at all times an adequate reserve of trained troops in the United States ready for shipment abroad. Similar revisions might occur frequently during 1943 with each revision justifying the overseas transport of numbers of men in excess of original estimates.

In the light of all these considerations, the War Department can be said to have estimated its capacity to supply and maintain overseas troops most conservatively. There are many reasons to believe that actual performance may well exceed present estimates. There is nothing in this record which would justify a substitution of some other estimate for that of the combined chiefs of staff.

THE PLANNED NUMBER OF TROOPS IN THE UNITED STATES DURING 1943 AND 1944 IS ESSENTIAL TO IMPLEMENT STRATEGIC PLAN—NEED A YEAR TO TRAIN DIVISIONS TO MEET ENEMY IN BATTLE

This country is the base of military operations wherein our armies must be trained and from which they are transported and maintained all over the world. General Edwards has testified that all Army activities within the United States during 1943 and 1944 will be concentrated toward the attainment of a single goal—the preparation of trained, equipped, and balanced forces for movement overseas and into decisive theaters of operation against the enemy at the maximum rate that shipping may permit. We have evidence that this rate is being accelerated and that more troops may be called upon to go overseas. This means large numbers must be trained early in 1943.

To insure speedy success in battle without prohibitive losses, our combat troops must be schooled, trained, and hardened to meet the enemy. The armies of our enemies, built over a period of years and by means of conscription, possess not only a high degree of technical efficiency, but now have had years of battle experience as well. Key men of the German army have been battle trained since the Spanish revolution of 1936. The entire army was based on a program of 2 years' compulsory military training. Much of that army has already had over 3½ years of battle experience. The Japanese have had considerable battle experience in China. For centuries they have built their army on a Spartan training of the individual soldier. The suicidal and fanatical zeal of enemy troops, even in defeat, has been clearly demonstrated by the Germans in Russia and the Japs on Guadalcanal. It is a grave responsibility to pit our own young men against such opponents without the most adequate and thorough

training that we can bestow. This takes time. The Army considers that 12 months is the minimum period in which a combat division can be fully trained for battle. Combat crews of our Air Forces require a similar period. It must be clearly understood, therefore, that the size of the forces we train in the United States in 1943 governs the size of the forces we will have available for combat in 1944.

Approximate distribution of troops as of end of 1943 and 1944

	End of 1943	End of 1944
Combat training	2,000,000	1,000,000
Base and Reserve	1,233,000	528,000
Schools	257,000	162,000
Ground Forces and Services of Supply	3,490,000	1,690,000
Air Forces	1,750,000	1,500,000
Defense commands	260,000	260,000
Total in United States	5,500,000	3,450,000
Overseas	2,700,000	4,750,000
Total Army	8,200,000	8,200,000

OVER TWO AND A HALF OF THE FIVE AND A HALF MILLION IN UNITED STATES IN 1943 ARE IN COMBAT TRAINING AND SCHOOLS OF THE GROUND AND SERVICE FORCES

This table shows the general distribution of troops as of the end of 1943 and 1944. It will be noted that of the five and one-half million troops in the United States at the end of the 1943 over two million destined for service overseas will have had less than the minimum amount of training required. These are the men who will be shipped to battle in 1944. In 1944 out of the three and one-half million men left in this country about a million are in training for combat service overseas in 1945. At the end of 1943 there will be 257,000 officers and enlisted men in officer and specialist training schools and in universities and colleges; 162,000 are in this category in 1944. Unless we are to send green troops into battle, this much of the Army at least must be in the United States in order to receive the requisite training and to have sufficient trained units to take advantage of the minimum shipping capabilities. This accounts for two and a half million of the five and a half million in this country in 1943. It would be criminal folly to make any cuts here.

OVER 2,000,000 MORE ARE IN THE AIR FORCES AND DEFENSE COMMANDS

Of the number in this country in 1943 about one and three-quarters million are in the Air Forces and at the end of 1944 about one and one-half million. When we consider the characteristics and range of modern aircraft, the United States itself can be considered as a combat base for all air forces whether on this continent or other continents. For example, the antisubmarine activities of the Army Air Forces, based on the United States, are actually engaged in battle. In addition to the Air Forces, during the entire 1943–44 period there are approximately 260,000 troops in defense commands necessary to the defense of strategic points in the United States. These two forces together account for over 2,000,000 more in this country at the end of 1943. No one has seriously proposed to cut either of these forces.

THIS LEAVES AT END OF 1943 ONLY 1,250,000 AS BASE AND RESERVE FOR ARMIES TOTALING 8,208,000—ONLY HALF MILLION AT END OF 1944

Out of the remaining 1,250,000 troops in the United States at the end of 1943 and the half million troops in the United States at the end of 1944, there must come a strategic reserve against such grave contingencies as an attempted invasion of the west coast of North, Central, or South America by the enemy, which would require extraordinary measures and emergency shipments to threatened points; a reserve of special service troops which must be trained and ready to undertake such missions as the reconstruction of recaptured ports and other facilities so that they can be rebuilt and exploited for further operations against the enemy; and finally, with this relatively small number, the Army must perform all the tasks incident to the training of the millions of men to be shipped overseas in the period 1943–45 and the operation of a military base for supplying, equipping, and maintaining armies totaling 8,208,000, over 5,000,000 of which are overseas with supply lines which in some cases are over 12,000 miles long. In 1944 this number is reduced to half a million.

CONSIDERING THE COMPLEXITY AND MAGNITUDE OF BASE OPERATIONS, THESE NUMBERS ARE SURPRISINGLY SMALL

A modern army's strength cannot be determined by combat ground divisions alone. There must be auxiliary and service troops to supply them at home and abroad and to perform special tasks for which combat troops are neither trained nor equipped. Combat units must have camps in which to live and train. Many of these camps approach a good-sized city in population and require the services of many men just to keep them running. As in a city, utilities must be provided, transportation and distribution systems operated, fire and police services rendered, medical and hospital service furnished, administration exercised, and the other thousands of tasks performed which are incident to any community—civil or military. In order that combat troops may devote their full time to training and because many of the services must be performed by specially trained experts, the above duties are discharged by service troops. These are charged against Army strength, although they are largely limited service or overage troops and members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps (the WAAC's). One hundred and fifty thousand WAAC's are planned for such use under present legislation limiting them to that number. If present proposed legislation is approved transferring WAAC's to the Army and removing this limit, the Army plans to use at least 375,000 or more women in these and similar tasks. All of these would be included in the 8,208,000 and so constitute no drain on the total made manpower resources. On the contrary, they leave free a corresponding number of men for industrial and farm work.

The Army must operate the ports of embarkation in the United States; must provide military police and internal security protection for vital communications and other installations; must provide guards for prisoners of war—not only our own but many taken by our allies; must operate the Alcan Highway and maintain our communications with Alaska; must furnish personnel for arsenals, proving grounds, staging areas, replacement depots, and reception centers. A constant stream of men must be passing through replacements for our overseas units. Depots must be operated at full capacity to insure an adequate flow of equipment and materials. All of these activities and many others require men whose total runs into the hundreds of thousands. Those are all essential jobs which must be done to build, supply, and maintain an Army to defeat the Germans in Europe. No one has shown where a saving can be made by cutting out any of them. They must be done.

The importance of maintaining a strategic reserve of service troops cannot be overestimated. The conquering of the Axis Powers is a step-by-step process to evict them from strongly fortified occupied areas. The enemy will completely destroy all port, transportation, and communications facilities and the like which they may be forced to abandon. These must be rebuilt to an operating condition with speed to permit of the supply and transportation of our forces for further early advances against the enemy. This will require a great number of trained, specialized troops for its accomplishment. As the enemy is blasted out of his successive strongholds, additional troops will be required to maintain law and order and assist in rebuilding and placing in operation essential facilities and utilities for the support of our forces and of the peoples of the occupied areas. These specialized troops must be on hand when needed and to insure an adequate supply their training must start now, and continue for a long period and even after the military defeat of the enemy.

BASE AND RESERVE TROOPS REDUCED TO MINIMUM BY END OF 1944

If conservative estimates of shipping capabilities are realized, the Army's strategic reserve will drop dangerously low by the end of 1944; if optimistic shipping estimates are realized, the strategic reserve will be wiped out altogether. To preserve its strategic reserve the Army has plans to recover from its training and service installations in the United States, upward of a half million men in late 1943 and early 1944 and thereby create and train additional fighting units. Such recovery will be possible at that time as peak mobilization will have been reached and passed, and the Army will be beginning to level off. This process will continue until installations and men remaining in the United States will be barely those necessary for security and for the maintenance of our armies overseas. No cut can be made here.

ONLY WAY TO REDUCE SIZE OF ARMY IS TO REDUCE TRAINING—THIS THREATENS DEFEAT

Hence, it is apparent that reduction in the planned strength of the Army now inevitably must result in either or both of two things in 1944: Either we will not have enough trained combat soldiers to exploit our shipping capabilities and so bring the war to a speedy and successful conclusion or we will have to send soldiers abroad who are not fully trained for battle and accept the staggering losses which must result. There is absolutely no justification in risking these results either of which spells defeat or stalemate. We must not take this risk if we have the manpower to do the job.

MANPOWER RESOURCES ARE MORE THAN ADEQUATE TO SUPPORT ARMED FORCES OF 11,000,000 MEN—1942 LABOR FORCE OF 60,200,000 WORKERS

The labor force of this country as of December 1, 1942, was 60,200,000 workers. The following tables show the distribution of our labor force as of December 31, 1942, and the estimated manpower requirements as of December 31, 1943:

Distribution of manpower

[In millions]

	Actual, Dec. 31, 1942	Estimated, Dec. 31, 1943
Total labor force	60.2	65.6
Armed forces	6.8	[1] 11.1
Labor force excluding armed forces	53.4	54.5
Unemployed	1.5	1.0
Employed	51.9	53.5
Agriculture	8.9	8.9
Nonagriculture	43.0	44.6
Self-employed and servants	4.0	5.0
Employees	39.0	39.6
Manufacturing	15.7	18.6
Mining	.9	1.0
Contract construction	1.7	1.0
Transportation and public utilities	3.5	3.7
Wholesale and retail trade	7.1	5.5
Finance, service, and miscellaneous	4.3	4.0
Government	5.8	5.8

[1] Includes War Shipping Administration operating personnel.

NEED 10,218,000 ADDITIONAL WORKERS FOR 1943

It is estimated that the net additions to the labor force of 1942 during the calendar year 1943 will be over 10,218,000, distributed as follows:

Augmentation for the military forces, Jan. 31–Dec. 31, 1943	3,618,000
Replacements for the military forces (estimated)	1,000,000
Munitions industries	1,800,000
Nonagricultural industry	300,000
Subtotal	6,718,000
Seasonal farm workers	3,500,000
Grand total	10,218,000

The source of the figures on distribution of manpower and estimated needs as of December 31, 1943, are from documents of the War Manpower Commission and the military services.

POTENTIAL SUPPLY OF 13,100,000 WORKERS FOR 1943

How can we meet these needs? It is estimated that the following sources of additional labor to meet our war requirements are possible and practicable without serious disturbance to the civilian economy of the country:

From less essential industry (Director, Office of Civilian Supply)	2,800,000
Decrease in construction workers (Chief of Engineers estimates 500,000 from Army contracts alone)	700,000
From unemployed (War Manpower Commission)	500,000
Normal additions to the labor force (17-year-olds not in labor force 1,785,706) (War Manpower Commission)	500,000
Women not now in the labor force (16,000,000 women without children under 16 years of age) (Bureau of Labor Statistics)	4,400,000
Saving of workers due to 48 hour workweek prescribed by War Manpower Commission (War Manpower Commission)	500,000
Rehabilitated discharged soldiers (estimated)	200,000
Seasonal farm workers, principally from the 8,000,000 boys and girls in schools and colleges, tradesmen, and workers in finance, insurance, etc	3,500,000
Total	13,100,000

POTENTIAL EXCESS OF 3,000,000 WORKERS IN 1943

While our 1943 manpower needs for additions to the military services, to industry, and to agriculture amount to 10,218,000, we have a potential supply of some 13,100,000 workers, or an excess of approximately 3,000,000.

FULL UTILIZATION OF EXISTING LABOR FORCE WOULD MAKE EVEN MORE AVAILABLE

In addition to the sources of potential workers just listed, the full utilization of the existing labor force of this country would reduce materially the requirements for additional labor. Some of the glaring deficiencies in full utilization of workers now existing in our industries are as follows:

Absenteeism

The rate of absenteeism of workers in our industrial plants is increasing very rapidly and has been estimated to be as high as 15 percent. In some of our higher paid industries the rate is even higher. A reduction of absenteeism would materially lessen the additional requirements for labor in those industries.

Turn-over of labor

The turn-over of labor caused by men in essential jobs seeking higher paid jobs is reaching startling proportions. When a man changes his job he not only loses time between jobs but also his efficiency in the new job is less at the start than in the one in which he was working. Familiar surroundings and supervisory personnel that he knows and understands tends to increase efficiency of workers.

The lengthening of the workweek from 48 to 54 hours

An effective lengthening of the workweek from 48 to 54 hours for industrial workers would increase production by approximately 10 percent without further increase of personnel. This, of course, would reduce requirements for additional workers or would make workers available for other jobs.

Increased productivity of individual workers

The efficient utilization of individual workers in war industries which have expanded very rapidly, such as shipbuilding, aircraft, and munitions industries, is far from what it should be. To a large extent this is due to poor supervision. Existing supervisory personnel staffs are not fully trained. Further, the individual workers have not been trained to their highest efficiency. Training of supervisory personnel and training of individual workers will do a great deal to increase production without increasing the working force. In some concerns, through training supervisory personnel and individual workers and through realinement of the flow of materials, production has been increased as much as 50 to 70 percent. In shipbuilding, certain shipyards are making the same type ship, utilizing less than 500,000 man-hours per ship; while in other shipyards as high as 1,300,000 man-hours per ship were required. Contracts for Liberty ships are based on the assumption that 513,000 man-hours are needed to build a ship. Contractors are paid a bonus or penalized for utilizing fewer or more man-hours of labor in constructing these ships. If we should eliminate turn-over and absenteeism, and workers worked 40 hours per week 50 weeks per year, the construction of 18,900,000 tons of Liberty ships would require only 484,785 men. At the present time we have 496,000 men employed in yards building Maritime Commission ships. At the present time it is estimated 204,000 to 304,000 additional workers will be needed this year to meet the above-mentioned program of shipbuilding. Obviously, allowance is being made for absenteeism, turn-over, and inefficiency of workers.

In many other industrial plants, estimates of labor required have been materially reduced due to better morale of workers, reduction of absenteeism, more effective utilization of existing personnel, and better alinement of flow of production. Possibilities along these lines should be exhausted before recourse is had to military manpower as the only solution.

AGRICULTURE PRESENTS THE MOST DIFFICULT AND CRITICAL MANPOWER PROBLEM BUT THE ARMY IS THE LAST PLACE, NOT THE FIRST PLACE, TO LOOK FOR ITS SOLUTION

The most critical manpower problem and the most difficult one to solve is that of providing the necessary farm workers to produce the crops necessary to feed our own armed forces and civilian population and still meet our foreign commitments. It has been charged that the Army, in determining its strength for 1943, ignored the needs of agriculture for manpower to such an extent that enough food will not be produced to go around. The evidence presented here shows that the Army has not ignored agriculture in the war effort. On the contrary, it shows that the proponents of a smaller Army are ignoring the unpleasant but vital fact that total war, by its very nature, places a most severe strain on manpower and agriculture as well as on all the other resources of the country in order to support armed forces of sufficient strength to crush the armed forces of enemies mobilized for total war. It shows that to cut the Army as a first resort to ease that strain is to admit the inability of the country to wage the total war she has entered. This is, in short, to admit defeat before we have begun the battle. This is unconscionable. Every other means of meeting this critical and difficult problem must be exhausted first. All the evidence clearly shows that this has not been done.

MANPOWER AND FOOD MUST BE MOBILIZED FOR TOTAL WAR ON A SCALE COMPARABLE TO THAT OF OUR ENEMIES' AND ALLIES' EFFORTS

It is a noncontroversial fact that we are still living in this country on a high peacetime standard with regard to everything, and particularly food. In fact, the standard of food for the civilian population is higher than it has ever been before due to the ability of the worker to purchase more and better food than ever before.

We are engaged in a life and death struggle with powerful and brutal nations who have fully mobilized all resources of manpower, food, and other materials for total war. There does not appear to be as full a realization of these facts in this country with regard to food and manpower as there is with regard to critical materials. We have established rigid controls on nonessential use and on allocations of materials. But, up to now, we have not yet begun to do these things with regard to the vital war resources of food and manpower on any scale comparable to that of our enemies nor even to that of our allies.

1943 FOOD PROGRAM CAN BE MET IF FOOD AND FARM LABOR ARE PROPERLY DISTRIBUTED

As a matter of fact, evidence presented here has demonstrated that at the present time we have ample food if it is properly distributed. Very little consideration has been given to the fact that increases in our armed forces substantially reduce the requirements of the civil population. However, we can get along with a great deal less food, both in and out of the armed forces, especially if we ration ourselves to the extent that even the English have, to say nothing of the Germans and Russians. It has been reported that English children raised under the ration system are more healthy than before rationing. The same thing is true of the health of the English worker and his efficiency. This is due to the fact that the ration is a better balanced diet than that which they were accustomed to. I am sure that the health of the people of this country would be much better if they ate a better balanced diet, and that this can be produced in adequate quantities.

It is true that the agricultural program for 1943 requires an increase in the production of certain crops over that of 1942. It is not true that a shortage of farm workers, due primarily to the expansion of the armed forces, will necessarily prevent this program from being met. Nor is it true that a reduction in the number of men to be inducted into the Army during 1943 is the way to solve the problem. On the contrary, the January 13 Labor Report of the Department of Agriculture shows that there were more than 8,170,000 workers on farms as of December 31, 1942. This is only 100,000 less than were on the farms December 31, 1941; yet the armed forces were expanded by almost 5,000,000 during 1942. Total farm production in 1942 exceeded that for 1941 by 12 percent. A recent survey of the Department of Agriculture disclosed that two-thirds of all farmers expect to meet and excel their 1942 production, despite the tightening labor situation. There have been many reports of a scarcity of skilled help for dairy and poultry farms, but total milk production during January 1943 surpassed the record established for the same month last year. Egg production during

January was also substantially higher than a year ago.

PRINCIPAL DRAIN ON AGRICULTURAL LABOR IS INDUSTRY, NOT ARMY

The principal cause of reduction in the number of farm workers is the attraction of high-paid employment in war industry where common labor receives pay varying from 65 cents per hour to $1.25 per hour, and further, time and a half for overtime and in a few cases double time for overtime. This work is in cities where living and working conditions are better. These jobs are most attractive to farm laborers who are paid as low as $1.05 a day with board or $1.35 a day without board.

Loss of manpower by the farms to the military services is secondary. To reduce the number of workers leaving the farms to enter the armed forces, Congress passed an amendment to the Selective Service Act (the Tydings amendment) which provides for deferment of workers on productive farms. This amendment has reduced the number of farm workers being inducted into the military services but it has not stopped the drift of farm labor to high paid industrial jobs. The War Manpower Commission, by an order, froze farm labor employed on dairy farms, poultry farms, and cattle-feeding farms. This measure has been ineffective due to a lack of sanctions to enforce it. Far more men left the farm to go into industry than to join the armed forces. During the period September 1941 to September 1942, 921,000 workers left the farms to enter industry, while only 694,000 were drafted or volunteered for military services. Therefore, reduction in the size of the military force will not solve the farm labor problem. As a matter of fact, it would have little effect because farm workers on productive farms are already deferred from military service and a law which would prohibit the military services from taking farm labor could do little more.

The problem of farm labor is a serious one and it must be solved but the reduction of the Army is not the way to solve it.

SOLUTION IS TO KEEP ESSENTIAL FARM LABOR ON PRODUCTIVE FARMS

The most important and most necessary step to stop the flow of farm workers to high paid industrial jobs is one which will hold the existing supply of farm workers on essential farm jobs. There seems no way of doing this except by some law such as in effect in England and Canada.

ONE-THIRD OF COUNTRY'S FARMS PRODUCE 84 PERCENT OF ALL CROPS

Another step is that farmers operating subsistence or submarginal farms could be moved to productive farms and the small subsistence farms be cultivated by the farm laborer's family, or several such farms could be cultivated by a single farmer and his family. One-third of the farms of this country produce only 3 percent of the total crops of the country. On the other hand, one-third of the farms of the Nation produce 84 percent of the farm crops of the Nation. Obviously the employment of labor on some of our farms is used most ineffectively and in a manner not consistent with the demands of war for the most efficient productivity of all resources of men and materials.

MANY OTHER STEPS SHOULD BE TAKEN WHICH WILL SOLVE PROBLEM WITHOUT REDUCING ARMY

Another step that can be taken is the immediate importation of Puerto Rican labor for farm work for the duration of the war. There are several hundred thousand Puerto Ricans unemployed and anxious to work at the present time. Mexican farm workers should be brought into the country in far larger numbers than the Department of Agriculture and the War Manpower Commission imported last year.

Another step that can be taken is the utilization of the Japanese in the concentration camps of the War Relocation Authority. Other aliens in internment camps and prisoners of war, who will be coming into this country in ever-increasing numbers, should be utilized as farm labor insofar as practicable.

Another step is a national publicity campaign to stimulate the return to the farms of farm laborers now employed in industrial plants.

Another step is an intensive recruiting campaign among workers in banks, real-estate offices, insurance offices, stores, school children, school teachers, and women not in the labor force, in small towns for work on the farms during the planting and harvesting season. This program is now being carried out by the Department of Agriculture and the War Manpower Commission.

Another step is intensification of the training program of the Department of Agriculture, augmented and assisted by agricultural training programs under the vocational educational authority of the States. This training program is necessary to increase the efficiency of our farm labor.

During the last World War a great deal of the food was raised by small victory gardens. An intensive campaign to promote the development of victory gardens and poultry raising in the back yards throughout the Nation would materially increase our food supply. Housewives and school children could tend these gardens and tend the poultry with no inroads whatsoever on the manpower supply of the country.

A greater utilization of the over 6,000,000 women living on farms but not included in the farm working force, would also help to solve the farm-labor problem during the harvest season.

Another step is providing sufficient labor-saving farm machinery by pooling such machinery in counties in order to secure maximum use. Where possible that use should be on a 24-hour basis, 7-day week. Adequate spare parts for farm machinery should be assured by the War Production Board.

THESE STEPS SOLVE THE PROBLEM WITHOUT REDUCING THE ARMY—AS A LAST RESORT TROOPS CAN HARVEST CROPS IN EMERGENCIES

All these steps should be taken before cutting down the size of the Army which the Joint Chiefs of Staff have decided are essential to their plans for defeating the enemy as early as possible. These steps are all practical and will solve the farm-labor supply for the calendar year 1943. They make possible the labor necessary to meet the food program as now set up by the Department of Agriculture.

They are no more than the dictates of modern war require and less than our enemies and many of our allies are already doing. They require no cut in the size of the Army.

The War Department has presented a plan whereby Army troops could be used to help harvest crops in emergencies even though this would interfere with their Army training. Under this plan these troops would be used as military units so that they can be adequately housed, fed, and disciplined. This does not mean that the troops of such a unit must all work on a single large farm so that small farmers could not be helped. The individual members of the military unit can work on all the farms surrounding the location of the camp of the unit.

The Army, in determining its size for 1943, has very evidently given long and serious consideration to the needs of manpower to produce the necessary munitions of war and food necessary for all our commitments, as well as to civilian production of items necessary for the health and comfort of our people. The figures presented in support of the plans of the Combined Chiefs of Staff clearly prove that we have ample manpower in this country to provide armed forces necessary to win the war as quickly as possible, to provide the workers necessary for essential industries, and for the production of the Department of Agriculture's food program. However, it is clearly apparent that manpower must be allocated and employed efficiently if we are to meet all these requirements. This will require an efficient mobilization of all the country's resources, including agricultural manpower. Failure to do so will jeopardize the winning of the war.

SOME AUTHORITIES WOULD DEFER CONCLUSIVE VICTORY RATHER THAN FULLY MOBILIZE

There are those who would so jeopardize the winning of the war by substituting their military judgment for that of the Combined Chiefs of Staff; who are willing to risk a protracted war or stalemate rather than take the steps necessary to mobilize ourselves for early and conclusive defeat of the enemy; who believe that we are not economically strong enough to wage total war on the same scale and at the same rate as our enemies. Foremost among these is the Honorable Herbert Hoover. Whatever Mr. Hoover's standing as a military expert may be, his record as an economist is known to all of us. He twice has attempted to predict the military future of the United States upon the basis of his analysis of the country's economic ability to produce all the things necessary for total war while raising, training, and shipping an army overseas to defeat the German Army. Once was on October 27, 1917, in a memorandum of which I have a copy. He did it again on February 8, 1943, when he released to the press a summary of his testimony at an executive session of this subcommittee. A comparison of these two documents[1] conclusively demonstrates that Mr. Hoover has learned very little about modern warfare in the intervening period of over 25 years. If the country had heeded his advice in 1917, it would have lost the First World War beyond peradventure of a doubt.

The parallels between what he said then and what he said now are so striking that significant excerpts from each are here set out in parallel columns:

1943	1917
"If we attempt too much on the military side, we may commit the fatal error of overstrain on the home front and thus damage our effectiveness in ultimate victory.	"I feel apprehensive of a great danger overhanging this country if we should place a million and a half of men at the front.
"There is a limit to our capacities and resources, great as they are * * *. With one year of war, strains on the home front are already evident. We have impending decrease in production of meats and fats. Yet a great increase in this production is imperative if we are to support the home fronts in Britain and Russia. And beyond that, to expand production to meet post-war famine. And if we do not do the latter, we will have no peace after victory.	"Furthermore, the assembling of millions of men under arms here is undermining the foundation of our productive capacity, and it is in our productivity of food and munitions that the safety of the world must rest. Therefore, I venture that from the point of view of proper conservation and use of the whole world's food supplies, of the maintenance of the proper productivity in munitions and their transport, and in the guardianship of our financial resources, that it should be seriously

[1] Appended in full.

1943	1917
"But overriding any generalizations, we have for the next year, and possibly two years, a bottleneck upon our military front. That bottleneck is shipping, both freighters and tankers.	considered as to whether we should make any addition to the armies in France. * * * "The figures which I possess on the available shipping in the world certainly do not bear any hope of such consummation" (the movement of armies to France) "if future losses are allowed for * * *. In the particular of the use of shipping for the movement of food, I want to impress upon you the critical necessity of moving food from the more remote markets in preference to the movement of armies.
"No one can doubt the strain in this program of 100 billions annual war expenditure. To continue that rate at the present purchasing value of money over 3 or 5 years will make dangerous strains.	"The drain upon the credits of this country is to my mind at present running to greater dimensions than the saving capacity of our people, and that we sooner or later must have relief from some portion of this charge.
"The United Nations now have a ring around the European Axis and the Japanese. From these rings we are doing an effective job of aggressive attrition to their home fronts. * * * Time runs in our favor in this war. We do not, therefore, need try to do everything all at once. The knockout blow to Germany can be delivered more certainly in 1944 than in 1943.	"I have no right to speak from a military point of view, but 2 years of fairly active mind on both sides of the front have impressed me with the fact that if the western line is impregnable to 5,000,000 men, it will be no more impregnable by the addition of another million. * * * The problem is solely one of artillery action and thereby the attrition of Germans, of our ability to outlast in the food struggle, and in the use of the new airplane reinforcements.
"Such a program might not meet the views of the generals or admirals, who of necessity look only to the maximum military activity, but it is a serious consideration that we might break the back of our people on the home front and start internal degeneration, such as is now the fate of Germany. We should not imperil it by doing too much too fast. Especially when time runs in our favor."	"I feel that we are not in this war to create the glory of soldiers, but in the defense of the whole world, and that we should submit ourselves to the place as (sic) farmers and mechanics if it is necessary for us to do so in order that we should win."

IF WE HAD HEEDED MR. HOOVER'S 1917 ADVICE THE ALLIES WOULD HAVE LOST WORLD WAR NO. 1—HIS 1943 ADVICE IS THE SAME

There is nothing new under the sun. He didn't think we could do it then. He doesn't think we can do it now. The leaders of the Imperial German Army, von Hindenburg and von Ludendorff, stated that it was the presence of 2,000,000 fresh American soldiers in France with others arriving at a rate of over a quarter of a million a month which was directly responsible for the defeat of the German Armies in November 1918. All military historians have agreed that it was only the interjection of an American army between the spearhead of the German attack and Paris in June of 1918 which turned almost certain German victory at that time into an overwhelming defeat in 5 months. The Allies would have been defeated in 1918 if the United States had followed Mr. Hoover's advice, all the evidence indicates that they will suffer defeat or stalemate if they heed it now.

The type of leadership which tells us that this country of 135,000,000 people—the richest, most highly industrialized, and most resourceful country in the world—is not economically capable of mobilizing an armed force of 11,000,000 in order to bring about the unconditional surrender of the enemy as quickly as possible—is not the leadership for total war. Germany, with a total population of less than 90,000,000 persons (including Austria, parts of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other territories added during the current war) has been able to mobilize and maintain a military force of over 11,000,000, or over 12 percent of her population. The United Kingdom has now approximately 10 percent of her population in her armed forces. Even in the last war France put more than 10 percent of her population under arms. It is ridiculous to suppose that the United States, with a population of more than 135,000,000 persons, fighting a war for its very existence, cannot mobilize 11,000,000, or only 8 percent of her population, for her military forces.

CONCLUSION

STRATEGIC PLANS FOR OFFENSIVE IN 1943–44 REQUIRE AN ARMY OF 8,208,000 IN 1943

The United Nations are engaged in combined military operations based upon strategic plans which require attacking the German Army in 1943 and 1944 with large enough ground forces to crush that army and bring about the unconditional surrender of Germany.

The enemy now has overwhelming ground superiority. The United Nations, other than the United States, are already so fully mobilized for total war that they are unable to augment their own ground forces by sufficient numbers of units to allow them to undertake this task alone. Therefore, the United States must transport the maximum number of ground forces overseas in 1943 and 1944 which available shipping will allow. While this ground force is being built up, the plans require that the foundation of German military power be weakened by an overwhelming air force. Meanwhile, an active war of attrition must be maintained against Japan, the Western Hemisphere must be protected from attack, and a base of military operations must be built up in the United States to train, transport, supply, and maintain armies all over the world.

This requires that an army of 8,208,000 be built in 1943 and maintained in 1944. Any cut in this number means a reduction in the number of ground forces and a disruption of the plan. No one except Mr. Hoover has seriously questioned the validity of these military plans as the most effective way of bringing the war to an early and victorious conclusion. To do so is to impugn the judgment of the military leaders to whom we have entrusted the military safety of the country. His validity as a military prognosticator in 1943 is disposed of by his 1917 predictions. Some have questioned the possibility of shipping the numbers planned for overseas service in 1943 and 1944. Some questions spring from a lack of full information as to all the variable factors entering into estimates of shipping capabilities. These questions have been satisfactory answered here. Others have questioned the numbers planned to be in this country in training for overseas service. Such questions spring from the lack of a full appreciation of the time necessary to train a highly technical modern army for combat with the ruthless, fanatical, expertly trained, and battle-hardened soldiers of our enemies. These questions have been satisfactorily answered. Others have questioned the numbers necessary to operate the military base of operations. This, again, is due to the lack of a full appreciation of the immensity of the global theater in which our armies are required to fight. This has been fully explained here.

All these questions are resolved by a fair and reasoned analysis of the Army's task and its plans for accomplishing it. The answer is that the plan is the only one offering any reasonable hope of early and conclusive victory and that an army of 8,208,000 is necessary to the success of that plan.

CIVILIAN ECONOMY CAN SUPPORT AN ARMY OF 8,208,000 AND STILL PRODUCE THE FOOD ESSENTIAL TO VICTORY

The only remaining question then is this: Can the civilian economy support the plan? No one has claimed that it is impossible. No one can reasonably say so in the light of what our allies and enemies have already done and are doing under complete mobilization programs. All that the critics of the plan have said is that it will place a severe strain upon our economy. They have said that it will be difficult to keep the men on the farms producing the food that we need. All of this is true. But these critics go one step further and say that the only way to keep the men on the farm is to reduce the size of the Army. This is a fatal error.

TO CUT THE ARMY IS TO PROLONG THE WAR

The large army is one of the strains and problems required by total war. The unusual demand upon agriculture is another. Both of these strains must be withstood if we are to defeat the enemy conclusively and as soon as possible. To relieve one strain by cracking the other wide open is to break the whole structure.

The war cannot be won, even with an overwhelming surplus of food, without soldiers on the enemy's ground in sufficient strength to crush him. The war cannot be won by an overwhelming number of soldiers if they and the civilian population are starved (alithough it must be said in all fairness that, while starving armies have won great victories, nonexistent armies have never accomplished such victories). We can and must both produce the food and build the Army. This we can and must do by mobilizing in 1943 and not in 1945, 1946, or 1947 on a basis comparable to that of our allies and enemies. The only alternatives are: at worst, defeat; at best, a stalemate or a prolonged struggle ending very possibly in a negotiated peace instead of unconditional surrender.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

FEBRUARY 27, 1943.

APPENDIX

MEMORANDUM FROM HERBERT HOOVER TO COLONEL HOUSE, OCTOBER 27, 1917

There are some phases of the international problem which impress me very strongly. The first is that the curtailment of food shipments from more remote markets is, in itself, a complete sign of decadent transportation and the narrowing volume of transport available to the whole of the Allied cause. Therefore, the whole transportation program needs

to be critically searched from the point of view of the available shipping and its agreed priority use.

It appears to me—

1. That priority by all transportation must be given to the movement of food, and upon the inward movement to the various manufacturing nations of materials which form the foundations of munitions and the outward movement of these munitions to the front.

2. The movement of special services such as airplane forces, engineers, etc., across the Atlantic.

3. The movement of our armies to France.

I feel great apprehension that a proper coordination and statesmanlike handling of this whole situation does not permit of the third undertaking. The figures which I possess on the available shipping in the world certainly do not bear any hope of such consummation if future losses are allowed for. These figures are, of course, subject to more drastic revision as to the use to which ships are being placed.

In the particular of the use of shipping for the movement of food, I want to impress upon you the critical necessity of moving food from the more remote markets in preference to the movement of armies. I feel apprehensive of a great danger overhanging this country, if we should place 1,500,000 men in the front, that the shipping left after they had been provided for will drive the Allied countries wholly to this market for their food supply, and that it may turn out over a lengthened period to be entirely insufficient.

In connection with this event, it is useless to sit like children and say that so long as our Army can be fed all is well. We have absolutely to feed not only the Allied armies, but the whole of their civil populations, or our Army may be enveloped in the social cataclysm in Europe, and its retreat absolutely cut off.

There is another feature to this whole matter which I think commands attention. The drain upon the credits of this country is to my mind at present running to greater dimensions than the saving capacity of our people, and that we sooner or later must have relief from some portion of this charge.

Furthermore, the assembling of millions of men under arms here is undermining the foundation of our productive capacity, and it is in our productivity of food and munitions that the safety of the world must rest. Therefore, I venture that from the point of view of proper conservation and use of the whole world's food supplies, of the maintenance of the proper productivity in munitions and their transport, and in the guardianship of our financial resources, that it should be seriously considered as to whether we should make any addition to the armies in France except to the special services that I have above referred to.

I have no right to speak from a military point of view, but 2 years of fairly active mind on both sides of the front have impressed me with the fact that if the western line is impregnable to 5,000,000 men, it will be no more impregnable by the addition of another million.

The problem is solely one of artillery action and thereby the attrition of Germans, of our ability to outlast in the food struggle, and in the use of the new airplane reenforcements.

I feel that we are not in this war to create the glory of soldiers, but in the defense of the whole world, and that we should submit ourselves to the place as farmers and mechanics if it is necessary for use to do so in order that we should win.

* * * * *

HERBERT HOOVER.

TESTIMONY OF HERBERT HOOVER AT EXECUTIVE SESSION OF SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANPOWER

WASHINGTON, February 8.—The text of a statement issued by Herbert Hoover today after he had testified before a subcommittee of the Senate investigating manpower facilities follows:

The American manpower problem involves the coordination of wide issues of global strategy and strategy for the conduct of our home front as well as our military front. If we attempt too much on the military side, we may commit the fatal error of overstrain on the home front and thus damage our effectiveness in ultimate victory. It seems to me there are three immediate factors in the problem.

First factor—the home front

There is a limit to our capacities and resources, great as they are. And in our planning we must at least prepare for a long war. Including the defeat of Japan, we must envisage at least 3 more years of war, and a prudent nation would possibly envisage 5 years.

With 1 year of war, strains on the home front are already evident. We have an impending decrease in production of meats and fats. Yet a great increase in this production is imperative if we are to support our own people without destructive hardship and at the same time support the home fronts in Britain and Russia; and beyond that, to expand production to meet post-war famine. And if we do not do the latter, we will have no peace after victory. The definite assurance of manpower and machinery to agriculture must not even be second to ships and planes.

There are evidences of future decrease in the production of oil due to lack of advance drilling. We should increase instead of decrease or the whole war machine may be hurt. Similar strains are in metal production by insufficient labor for development work.

No one can doubt the strain in this program of one hundred billions annual war expenditure. To continue that rate at the present purchasing value of money over 3 or 5 years will make dangerous strains. Reduced to our proportionate populations we are spending $8,000,000,000 to every $4,500,000,000 of the British and every $4,000,000,000 of the Germans.

If we overdo these strains we will find exhaustion and delays upon our home front. Total war is inevitably a race of exhaustion between nations. And we must make a strong finish.

Second factor—the war front

The United Nations now have a ring around the European Axis and the Japanese. From these rings we are doing an effective job of aggressive attrition to their home fronts. Germany and Italy have passed their zenith and are steadily degenerating on both the military front and the home front. They will be weaker in 1943, and still weaker in 1944. Japan cannot grow stronger; she is losing more tonnage and planes than she can construct. Russia has demonstrated her ability to at least produce a stalemate on that military front, and with aid in food and materials from us, will do more. The British and ourselves are steadily growing stronger on the military front. Time runs in our favor in this war. We do not, therefore, need try to do everything all at once. The knockout blow to Germany can be delivered more certainly in 1944 than in 1943.

Third factor—the shipping bottleneck

But overriding any generalizations, we have for the next year, and possibly 2 years, a bottleneck upon our military front. That bottleneck is shipping, both freighters and tankers. It would seem that its limitations should be exhaustively investigated, for it may present a controlling base from which many of these home-front manpower questions may be determined.

The official statements are that submarine sinkings were such that we made no net gain in the United Nations' tonnage in 1942. During 1942 we transported about 1,000,000 men and their equipment overseas. Obviously, in this task and in supplying our allies, we used our 1942 tonnage to the utmost, as witness the necessity of almost dangerous reduction of our coastal movement of oil. Imports of food, etc. In addition to transporting more men, additional tonnage must be devoted to furnishing supplies to every 100,000 sent over.

Our enlarged shipbuilding in 1943 will exceed even the present rate of submarine sinkings by an amount of freight and oil tonnage we can call X.

With increased escort vessels and other methods, we will decrease sinkings and thus gain a further amount of tonnage in 1943 which we can call Y.

It seems to me it is possible to roughly estimate this X tonnage and this Y tonnage both in freighters and tankers. We know how much tonnage it takes to transport and service each additional million men. A rough schedule of the amount of men, equipment, and supplies that can be transported month by month for 1943 and 1944 is possible for a minimum case based on X gain of tonnage and in the maximum case based upon Y tonnage.

The military authorities announce the intention to call 11,000,000 men to the armed forces by the end of 1943.

I do not have the full information upon which the shipping bottleneck can be estimated, but from such information as I have it does not seem that it is necessary to call up all of these 11,000,000 men in 1943 either to provide the men that can be shipped or to be trained for 1944. Nor do we have to manufacture munitions faster than can pass the shipping bottleneck to our armies and to our allies and to provide reserves against 1944.

Necessarily there were many unknown output factors in building production facilities and letting contracts for our munitions. We are probably producing more of some items of munitions than can be used by the men whom we can transport or that we can transport to our allies or provide reserves. If investigation develops such items, they could be slowed down, and both materials and labor devoted to other purposes, such as agriculture and mineral production. If this be the case, we can also probably greatly reduce the proposed expenditure for 1943.

THE THREE FACTORS ADDED

If we put all these three factors together of the obvious strains on the home front, that time runs in our favor in the war, the possible over-fast production of some munitions, and the shipping bottleneck, it would seem at least warranted to study a revision of our whole program of national production and supply based on the bottleneck limitation. It is possible that this would reduce the financial as well as the mineral, the agricultural, the food, and other home-front strains. In any event, we must have more labor in those fields if we are to maintain all national strength.

Such a program might not meet the views of the generals or admirals, who of necessity look only to the maximum military activity, but it is a serious consideration that we might break the back of our people on the home front and start internal degeneration, such as is now the fate of Germany. We should not imperil it by doing too much too fast. Especially when time runs in our favor.

Propaganda or Trial Balloon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks today in the RECORD, I include the following reprint from the February 1943 issue of the Bulletin of the Union League Club of Chicago, entitled "Propaganda or Trial Balloon?":

PROPAGANDA OR TRIAL BALLOON?

AN APPRAISAL OF THE NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD'S REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION AND NATIONAL POLICY

Insidious propaganda or trial balloon to test public reactions to the proposal that the Nation's railroads be nationalized?

These pertinent questions were raised concerning the monumental report of the National Resources Planning Board entitled "Transportation and National Policy" by O. W. Dynes, retired general counsel of the Milwaukee Road, in two recent talks before the club's committee on transportation. Mr. Dynes spoke as a citizen no longer connected with transportation, but with a third of a century of railroad experience. The board is attached to the Executive Office of the President and is one of the major policy-determining agencies of the present administration.

The report in question is dated May 1942 but was transmitted to the Seventy-seventh Congress by the President November 5, 1942. The document consists of 507 oversize pages, which would make an ordinary book of at least 1,500 pages. It contains, in addition to the usual letters of transmittal, a summary chapter, 16 monographs, and several good maps and graphs. Owen D. Young was chairman of an advisory committee. The authors were specialists in the different Government departments.

In reviewing the document, Mr. Dynes grouped his remarks under three main headings: (1) An evaluation of the authors and their workmanship in the preparation of the reports; (2) the case which the report makes for the nationalization of the carriers; and (3) the report as a "trial balloon" on the proposition of taking over the railroads as an emergency measure under the President's war powers.

The report quite comprehensively treats the railway, highway, waterway, airway, and pipe line services as rendered by each of those agencies. The document, in an academic sense and form, reveals the points of views of its numerous authors and has educational value. In its more important aspect, however, it has propaganda qualities capably prepared and adroitly arranged.

The most severe critic will concede the document has many commendable features; several of the monographs are unbiased, forthright expressions of their authors' views, said Mr. Dynes.

Shall the railroads be nationalized?

In general terms the report presents two theories of accomplishing economic coordination between the five kinds of this country's transportation facilities to a maximum extent not now practicable under present laws and conditions.

One of these theories would accomplish this coordination by outright Government ownership and operation. Under the other theory the coordination would be accomplished with private ownership but under a new scheme of regulation which, with radically changed laws, would vest in a super-regulatory agency plenary powers enabling it to command and compel such coordination, together with regrouping of rail carriers into sectional groups, and such consolidations as might be determined to accord with enabling new laws and with an economic national transportation policy.

The document is a completely prepared foundation for carrier nationalization by the President and it is no amateur's job. The authors of the 16 monographs, without exception, are scholarly critics of the carrier business. Some of them evidenced commendable vision in their arguments for planned reports. A few of the monographs are highly intelligent presentations of facts and conditions and give tone to the whole document. Their inclusion, as arranged, makes the report more receptive, as propaganda, by the average reader. Mr. Dynes stated that his presentation of "only a few of its interesting aspects is by no means with the purpose of damning the report with faint praise or light criticism but rather to point to its capabilities as insidious propaganda and as a trial balloon to test public reactions."

However, most of the monographs, in Mr. Dynes' opinion, lend no material support to the section by Ralph L. Dewey (p. 278, pt. I, sec. VIII), principal economist of the board, who "assumes to advise that there is a recently revived public interest in public ownership of railroads and that the advocates of public ownership are 'actuated, for the most part, not by doctrinaire ideologies but by practical considerations'."

Mr. Dewey's lack of confidence in private operation, individual enterprise, the profit incentive, and the American way in transportation is given some degree of support, particularly in respect of paternalism in American Government, by views expressed by the director of the study, Ralph J. Watkins, in his "Summary Report" and by the circumstances of the inclusion of the Dewey monograph in the document as transmitted to the President.

In the build-up for Government ownership, the author contrasts the prospective excellence of carrier management by politically appointed Government agents with his appraisal of private management as presently conducted. A norm in Europe's railroads is naively implied.

The members of the President's planning board and their director of the study have approved this monograph at least to the extent of transmitting it to the President as a conspicuous part of their three times revised document.

"If this bureaucratic policy is sound as to the principal carriers, it is sound in principle as to all of the carriers and if sound as to all of the carriers, is it not also sound as to power companies, communication companies, and others affected with public obligations?" queries Mr. Dynes.

A paradox of much interest, Mr. Dynes pointed out, lies in the fact that while some of the monographs are placing much emphasis on the importance of coordination between carriers such as railroads and truckers and are blaming the carriers as obstructors of such coordinations, another set of Government experts were building up an investigation record aimed at a criminal indictment of rail and motor carriers that had undertaken a degree of coordination. That criminal prosecution was recently suspended by an order of Judge Barnes entered at the instance of the Department of Justice. Whether the criminal investigation was timed to click with the release of a trial balloon might be a mere figment of suspicious minds.

Taking over the carriers as a war measure

The monograph on Government ownership would have little practical importance, declared Mr. Dynes, had not the whole report been timed so that it would be available advice regarding transportation conditions for action within the President's war power. The author's belabored attempts to prove his case for Government operation in wartime fall flat, in the opinion of Mr. Dynes. For instance, he is confronted with the strong argument of Joseph B. Eastman against Government ownership and operation. He endeavors to minimize Mr. Eastman's current view by citing Mr. Eastman's advocacy of Government ownership 23 years ago.

Mr. Dynes enumerates the following conditions now prevailing as among those opposing the suggested Government operation of the roads as a war measure:

The fact the railroads were in a position to do and are doing an excellent job—that dislocations would result from Government operation which, as Joseph B. Eastman has publicly said, would result in confusion of already complicated duties which those carriers are now performing—that the majority of American voters are in favor of the American way and opposed to paternalistic experimentation such as was experienced when President Wilson took over the railroads for Government operation—that the taxpayers would see they would be obliged to assume deficits—that the public debt would be substantially increased—and that there is a popular dread of politician management of the country's most important transportation agency.

Mr. Dynes concedes that intelligent, broad-minded, well balanced forward planning is highly desirable and that men capable of such planning are public benefactors. The very able Dr. Charles E. Merriam, in his frank, straightforward way, told us that the National Resources Planning Board is arranging to have a planning committee in every Government department and that each plan will be prepared with an alternate plan. We are justified in considering, therefore, that the plans are public, are for the benefit of the public, should not be secret, should be open to the public, and that interests to be materially affected by them should not be kept in the dark nor be subjected to plans in the making of which they were not consulted and were not represented.

Doubtless you will agree, concludes Mr. Dynes, that the practical politician may view such planning as promising "a consummation devoutly to be wished," and will ask—what about American democracy, the taxpayer, and posterity?

Food Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard, read at his press conference in Washington, D. C., Thursday, February 25, 1943:

From time to time I will make public the facts about the supply of food for civilians.

It is important that everyone think about the food situation of the Nation and his family in the light of these facts. I feel that the American people, if they know the facts, can be trusted to help manage their food wisely. Given the facts, they will proceed calmly and efficiently to make the adjustments in civilian use of food that are needed so American food can fight for us around the globe.

The food-supply situation today warrants neither complacence nor hysteria. I have told the American people numerous times in recent months that there is going to be enough food for essential diets in this country, provided we manage our food supplies wisely. I repeat that statement today.

I have also told the American people that it is going to be necessary for them to adjust their food buying and eating habits; that some of us who are accustomed to rather lavish eating are going to have to revise our diets downward. The time for that is now at hand. With the beginning of point rationing of processed fruits and vegetables, we enter a new phase of wartime living. It is not going to be easy. It is not going to be very pleasant. But we can enter it with the assurance that by careful management we shall all have all that we need to eat, even if we have to forego some of the food that we would like to eat.

The announcement of the point values of canned vegetables and fruits has made it clear how much—or how little—of these products will be available in the next month to each family. As I explained when point rationing of these products was announced in December, the total supply for all of us civilians will be about half as large as the large amounts we have been getting in recent years. This is because these products are required to feed our fighting men. Last year we produced more of these things than ever before. But out of the total production we have set aside nearly one-half for our armed forces, and a small amount for our allies. Apparently a good many people overlooked my report on the size of the supply of canned goods for civilians, since there was surprise when the point values were announced.

In the month ahead, those who depend on processed vegetables that they may buy with their points and the fresh vegetables in the market, should be careful to stretch their buying over the month. They should be thrifty both with their coupons and with the vegetables, both processed and fresh, which they can get. It will not be as easy during March to supplement canned vegetables with fresh vegetables as it will be later on when vegetables from northern truck crop farms and victory gardens begin to be added to the supplies now coming from the South. With the exception of carrots, vegetables will not be very plentiful during March. The recent freeze in Florida virtually wiped out the crops of green peas and snap beans and seriously curtailed the crops of lima beans, eggplant, peppers, and winter tomatoes. Reports from Texas indicate that the early cabbage crop will be somewhat light. Many people are going to have to get along with fewer vegetables in March than they have had in the past—that is unless they dip into their reserves of five cans per person and of home-canned foods.

The fruit situation is more favorable. There are plenty of oranges, tangerines, grapefruit and apples on the markets now, and more fruits will be coming along shortly. Housewives would be well advised, therefore, to make full use of fresh fruits so that they can expend their ration coupons on canned vegetables rather than on canned juices at this time.

The over-all food picture, for the year ahead, looks about the same as it has for some time. There have been some changes in civilian supply prospects since the first of the year. The most notable one was in dried peas and beans. We started 1943 with a record supply of these. But during the first six weeks of the year it became apparent that the needs for shipment to fighting fronts, and for accumulating reserves of these easily stored foods against future contingencies would take more than we had calculated in early January. Our Russian allies need 5,000,000 bags of beans out of our total of 23,000,000 bags for their troops who are breaking the back of Axis power in Europe and we have agreed to furnish them the beans. To supply our own forces, and allied forces, and build up reserves, civilians will receive about 2 pounds less per person of these foods than they did last year. The figures are 7 pounds of beans and nine-tenths of a pound of peas for 1943, as compared with 8.8 pounds of beans and 1.2 pounds of peas for 1942.

We had short notice on the increased demand for beans and peas and, in consequence, we had to move pretty quickly. There is no question that it makes sense to furnish beans and peas to Russia and to ration our civilians at an adequate level. Every victory by the Russians saves thousands of the lives of American boys and we ought to give Russia all that we can. At the same time, we must see to it that there is enough food left at home to give our civilians an adequate diet. This we intend to do but we should distinguish between enough to meet our basic needs and enough to meet the demand. Because of the vastly increased purchasing power and the lessening number of articles that can be bought, the demand for food is unprecedented and enormous. Our surveys show that even if we reserved no food for our own armed forces or our allies, civilian demand today is so high that we would buy and eat all that could possibly be produced of many basic foodstuffs.

Although people cannot buy as much as they like of everything they want, as a whole the American people are better fed now than they have ever been. Some people cannot get all the food they want, but the increase in the purchasing power of the lower income groups has enabled them to buy the foods they have wanted and needed all these years.

In 1942 we turned out more food than ever before. But as part of the United Nations' offensive we are feeding more people than ever before. We are trying for a larger production in 1943 than in 1942 in the face of rising difficulties. However, even though we overcome all the difficulties and reach the food production goals set, the civilian per capita supply of food will be less than last year's near-record civilian supply. But it will be about the same in total nutritive value as the supply in the average pre-war year. The military and lend-lease requirements in 1943 will amount to about one-quarter of the year's output. To fill these requirements civilians will hold their total consumption to about the pre-war levels. For some commodities that are the No. 1 fighting foods, civilians will cut their consumption below the pre-war levels. That is the civilians' way of fighting on the food front alongside our boys and our allies all over the world.

On the basis of present indications, the fighting front requirements of military and lend-lease use for the various groups of foods in 1943 will take the following percentages of our total output: 20 to 25 percent of the beef (virtually all of which is for American armed forces), 30 to 35 percent of pork, 25 to 30 percent of eggs, 15 to 20 percent of butter, 40 to 45 percent of cheese, 40 to 45 percent of condensed and evaporated milk, 25 to 30 percent of lard, 20 to 25 percent of other edible fats and oils, 50 to 60 percent of canned fruits, 35 to 45 percent of dried fruits, 45 to 50 percent of canned vegetables, 10 to 15 percent of wheat, and 15 to 20 percent of rice.

While sending these large supplies to the fronts, civilians will have for themselves an even larger supply than in 1942 of grains (except rice), poultry, and potatoes. The per capita civilian supply of meats, fluid milk, eggs, fresh fruits, dry beans, and peas will be about the same or slightly lower than in 1942. The civilian per capita supply of fish, cheese, fats and oils, condensed and evaporated milk, rice, commercially grown fresh vegetables, sugar, coffee, and cocoa will be lower than in 1942 and some of these supplies may even fall below the pre-war level. This is assuming that production goals for 1943 will be met.

From any angle, the wartime management of food is not an easy task. The food supply for average Americans has been so abundant that any restriction upon their purchases is a new and unpleasant experience. Administratively, the management of food presents enormous difficulties. Mistakes have been made already and mistakes will be made in the future until we learn how to do the things that must be done.

The people are full partners in the wartime management of food. They must be if the venture succeeds. Hoarding on the part of an individual means little or nothing but multiply that individual by thousands and vital food is taken away from soldiers on the battlefields, from workers behind the lines, and from the children that need it for scund and sturdy growth.

The black markets that have sprung up over the country have been compared to the speak-easies of the prohibition era. They are worse. Potentially, they represent not only lawlessness, but a threat to one of our most vital weapons of war. A waste of our food resources now will prolong the war and will cause the death of thousands upon thousands of American boys.

Furthermore, the waste of our food resources may make impossible a sound and lasting peace. In the national interest we must stamp out black markets and see to it that our food supply is fairly and wisely distributed. Every family in this land will suffer unless we manage our food supply wisely. Everyone should contribute all that he can toward that wise management.

The Farmer's War Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by N. K. Carnes, general manager, Central Co-operative Association, South St. Paul, Minn.:

[From the Co-operative Shipper of February 1943]

THE FARMER'S WAR JOB

(Address by N. K. Carnes, general manager, Central Co-operative Association, South St. Paul, Minn.)

We assemble for the twenty-second annual business session of your association at the most critical time in the history of this Nation. Today we are engaged in a world conflict to protect individual rights and liberties against the advance and onslaught of totalitarianism and dictatorship. In summing up the events of the year 1942 we find that war, bloody and realistic, has wrought fearful and dreadful havoc throughout the world. Our beloved country has stood shoulder to shoulder with its allies in an all-out effort to create

a world where peace, good will, and understanding shall eventually reign supreme. Our American men on the several fighting fronts throughout the world are upholding the best traditions of American soldiers. Our leadership in American industry and agriculture should be commended on its flexibility, its ingenuity, and its ability to get things done. It has manifested vision and imagination. It has made a production record that is envied by the entire world. Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, has made the statement that he expects to see this country alone, by the end of 1943, outproducing all the Axis nations by 2 to 1, and with the allies by 3 to 1. There is only one answer to all of this—success in our undertaking.

FACE UNPRECEDENTED TASK

While a nation at war must have guns, ammunition, and first-class armaments to carry on, food is equally as important. I am sorry, but we are just beginning the war of food, and the consequences of losing that war would be as serious as the defeat of our armed forces. American farmers face the unprecedented task of feeding this great Nation and its armies, the British and their armies, Russia, China, and the colonies of North Africa, and also the prospect of supplying an important part of the food requirements of 500,000,000 persons freed from Axis rule. President Roosevelt has set up a separate administration to provide this relief, and has appointed Gov. Herbert Lehman, of New York, to direct it. As director of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation operations in the State Department, Governor Lehman will be charged with the task of feeding the populations in countries reoccupied by allied forces.

A report released by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture shows a total farm production in 1942 12 percent higher than that of any year for which records are available. Farmers can rightfully be proud of the record they have made in serving their country during the first year of the war in which we are now engaged. The United States Department of Agriculture has released a new agricultural production goal for 1943.

Milk: 122,000,000,000 pounds; 2 percent more than last year's record production.

All meat: 25,700,000,000 pounds; a 16 percent increase.

Hogs: 13,800,000,000 pounds; a 27 percent increase.

Lard: 3,400,000,000 pounds; a 36 percent increase.

Cattle and calves: 10,910,000,000 pounds; a 7 percent increase.

Chickens: 4,000,000,000 pounds; a 28 percent increase.

Eggs: 4,780,000,000 dozen; an 8 percent increase.

Wheat: 52,500,000 acres; a 2 percent increase.

Corn: 95,000,000 acres; a 4 percent increase.

Potatoes: 3,160,000 acres; an 11 percent increase.

Will this goal be reached?

The United States Department of Agriculture in a survey of the 1943 meat-production prospects, forecast an all-time record of nearly 30,500,000,000 pounds. This production includes 25,800,000,000 pounds of pork, beef, veal, mutton, and lamb, and 4,500,000,000 pounds of poultry. The total meat production for 1942 was about 25,000,000,000 pounds. The prospects for 1943, based on reports received from producers, indicate 28 percent more poultry meat; 15 percent more pork; 7 percent more beef, and veal; and 5 percent less mutton and lamb.

Our 1943 requirements for our armed forces and lend-lease have not been finally determined, but are likely to be about 6,500,000,000 pounds. The amount of meat available to civilians will depend largely on this foreign demand. It is a certainty that meat will be rationed in the United States within the near future. The 1943 pig crop is expected to total 121,000,000 head compared with the production of 105,500,000 head in 1942. The 1943 goal for cattle and calves, as I have pointed out, calls for a total production of 10,900,000,000 pounds of dressed meat. That would require the slaughter of more than 30,000,000 head of cattle in 1943 compared with 28,000,000 head in 1942. The 1943 goal for sheep and lamb slaughter is 990,000,000 pounds dressed weight, which is somewhat smaller than the 1942 production. The sheep population is estimated at two to three million head less than a year ago. I repeat the question: Will our goal for 1943 be reached?

FARM PRODUCTION STRAINED

Those of us engaged in the field of agriculture made the prediction immediately following the sudden, ruthless, and surprise attack by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, that the condition of agriculture would become more strained and more dangerous to the success of our war effort as time passed due to our Government's plans for waging and winning the war, which seemed to minimize the importance of agricultural production. That was over a year ago, and today we can vision the shortage of vitally needed farm crops as a reality.

We find that while our Nation has ample supplies of food and fiber at the moment, the possibilities exist for the development of a critical shortage within the next 12 months. The present ample supplies are due to (1) the accumulation of surpluses, which a few years ago represented one of the major problems of our Nation; (2) the wholehearted response by the farmers of this Nation to requests by their Government for increased production of agricultural products; and (3) to an exceptionally favorable growing and harvesting season during 1942.

The present supply of agricultural commodities is being rapidly consumed by our armed forces, by our civilian population, and by the enormous requirements of our allies. Few people in America today have any comprehension or conception of the magnitude of the volume of agricultural products being shipped to our allies or the amounts that will be required in the future. The demands of our armed forces and allies will increase rather than diminish as time goes on. The past year this country exported approximately 13 percent of its agricultural production. The Honorable Claude Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture of these United States, has estimated that we will export from 30 to 35 percent of our agricultural production in 1943. This figure may have to be modified downward to some extent to prevent suffering by the civilian population here at home.

FARMERS WILLING BUT HANDICAPPED

The farmers of this Nation are ready, willing, and eager to produce to the limit of their capacity, but the mere willingness or desire of the farmers alone will not bring forth abundant crops. They must have an ample supply of skilled and experienced farm labor, an ample supply of tools and farm machinery to work with, prices sufficient to at least cover the cost of production and living expenses, and less Government interference. Today, the farmers face 1943 with none of these things.

Instead of having an ample supply of skilled and experienced farm labor to carry on, many farmers are finding it necessary, because of the shortage of labor, to dispose of their farms, their livestock, and their dairy herds. Many important crops are going to waste in the fields of this country because of the shortage of help and machinery to properly gather them. Our country's agriculture has lost more than 1,500,000 workers during the past year. This shortage of labor on the farms has developed because of (1) the inducement of high wages and short hours in the industrial plants and on defense projects (it has been estimated that 75 percent of men leaving the farms go to industrial plants and defense projects for employment); (2) the drafting for military service of trained workers and operators; and (3) to the voluntary enlistment of farm boys moved by patriotic impulses and the glamor of military service.

Today, agriculture is urgently in need of skilled and experienced farm labor, while many men qualified to fill those positions are carrying guns in our armed forces. If America is to maintain or increase its production of agricultural commodities, some of the farm boys must remain at home. I do not contend that farm boys, as such, are a privileged group and need, or should have, any special consideration. That wouldn't be right, and I am sure you wouldn't want it that way. But, I do contend that every case involving a farm boy coming before the Selective Service Board should be carefully investigated and considered by said board and the boy in question placed where he can render the greatest service to his country, whether it be as a producer of food on an American farm, or in the armed forces of these United States.

SHORT ON FARM MACHINERY

Instead of possessing an ample supply of tools and machinery to work with, the farmers have experienced a definite shortage, but have been told that farm implements and machinery would be rationed. Very little has been made available to them, and they are now experiencing difficulty in securing a limited supply of repair parts. A reasonable amount of labor-saving machinery and equipment would be most helpful in meeting the labor shortage.

On October 20, 1942, the War Production Board issued a farm equipment limitation order fixing the amount of farm machinery which can be manufactured between November 1, 1942, and October 31, 1943, to 20 percent, or one-fifth of the amount of new equipment that was manufactured in 1940. The farm people, through their leaders, have appealed for relief to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Claude Wickard, who has been charged with the responsibility for the production, processing, and distribution of food. He in turn has appealed to the War Production Board. It now appears that the October 20 limitation order may be modified so as to permit the manufacture of at least 50 percent of the 1940 production. This will help to some extent, but it will not supply all of the equipment needed.

While the farmer has been forced into the general labor market for his help in competition with high industrial wages, he has encountered unalterable opposition all the way down the line when he has tried to include the increased labor cost in the price of his commodities. This was evidenced when the anti-inflation bill was being debated in the Congress of the United States. Every item entering into the cost of agricultural production has increased by leaps and bounds; yet, it seems that our urban population expects the farmers to continue to produce and sell their products at pre-war prices. They fail to recognize that farmers are not striving for high prices, but only for prices that will give a fair exchange value for farm commodities with the products of industry and of industrial labor. They fail to recognize that if the prices for farm products seem too high, it is because high prices are necessary to establish a fair exchange value for the products of agriculture with the products of industry, and they fail to recognize that higher prices for industrial products are caused chiefly by the high wages and limited hours of organized labor. If the American farmer is given an equitable price for his products, he will meet

the competitive situation and produce to capacity.

The Selective Service Board has recently issued instructions to local draft boards to place in a deferred classification men essentially engaged in the production of vital food and fiber supplies. This should help to some extent, but it is coming at a rather late hour.

DISCUSSES PRICE CEILINGS

The uncertainties existing in connection with price ceilings for agricultural commodities have also tended to decrease production. This matter was very ably discussed by Mr. P. O. Wilson in his most excellent address delivered yesterday afternoon. The Emergency Joint Livestock Committee has always maintained that if and when it becomes necessary to apply ceiling prices to agricultural commodities to control inflationary tendencies, the ceiling price should be applied to wholesale meats rather than to the live animal. Several sets of regulations covering ceiling prices on wholesale meats have been issued by the Office of Price Administration. Many of these regulations have proved unsatisfactory and unworkable and new ones have been substituted. Recently a new set of regulations has been issued which we believe follow very closely the recommendations made by the Emergency Livestock Committee. However, all livestock men realize that no ceilings on wholesale meat products will be satisfactory if retail prices to consumers and the wages of labor are permitted to rise. To be successful, price-control legislation must be made to include not only the prices of agricultural products, but also the wages of labor.

FARMERS OBJECT TO SUBSIDIES

If definite ceiling prices are maintained on wholesale meat products despite the rise in retail prices and the wages of labor, I am very much afraid that our country will experience a great deal of difficulty in securing ample meat production. I have been told by Washington representatives that this can be handled by adding a subsidy, or bonus, to ceiling prices. The farm people, generally speaking, object to a subsidy. They realize that this is always accompanied by a loss of control to the Administration, which will result in the placing of a yoke about the neck of this generation and succeeding generations of American citizens. They realize that if the law of supply and demand were allowed to function without restriction, that the farmer would be receiving for his products higher prices than the ceiling prices plus the subsidies. They realize further that subsidies are paid by the taxpayers of this country. They also realize that farmers will be given credit for subsidies, but at the same time the labor element in our society will be purchasing its food products at ceiling prices, which really represents a subsidy to labor.

Under a subsidy program, farmers will be characterized as profiteers, privateers, treasury raiders; and as graspy, greedy, and disloyal obstructionists. Whether the subsidy be given to the farmer direct, or whether it take the form of a subsidy to consumers, the farmers, not the consumers, will be accused of the Treasury grab. If the program of subsidies rather than a fair price is to be used, it should be known for what it is—a mechanism to keep prices to consumers at a lower level—and be named for what it is—a consumer subsidy.

It is hard for farmers to understand why consumers with an income at an all-time high should expect the Government to pay part of their food bill. We have been told that the national income for the United States was approximately $117,000,000,000 in 1942. We also have been informed that the amount of goods available for purchase amounts to around $76,000,000,000. This leaves a surplus purchasing power of $41,000,000,000, a high percentage of which is in the hands of American labor. We believe that this should be used for the purchase of food and thereby encourage increased agricultural production rather than used for the purchase of other commodities, which will result in inflationary price rises.

CONTROL SHOULD INCLUDE WAGES

The farm people realize that something should and must be done to control inflationary tendencies. If we are to avoid an inflationary price rise in America that will add to war costs and post-war problems we have been told that we must adopt a program which will provide for the rationing of consumer goods, high taxes, enforced saving, and price-control legislation. I do not believe that anyone of these alone can accomplish the desired results. A combination may.

Inflation has been very simply defined as the flow of purchasing power into the hands of the consumer in excess of the quantity of goods which he desires to buy. I believe that one method to control inflation would be for our Government to encourage, rather than discourage, the increased production of agricultural commodities. The production of an ample supply is the most effective method of controlling inflationary tendencies.

I repeat, it is my considered opinion, regardless of the many things that have been said to the contrary, that if price-control legislation is to be effective it must be made to apply "clear across the board," including prices of agricultural commodities as well as the wages of labor. For some reason that has not been given me, our present administration has not been inclined to include the wages of labor in price-control legislation.

PROTESTS BUREAUCRATIC DOMINATION

There is one thing which we must realize. We cannot have an independent agriculture and at the same time a Government-regimented industry and a Government-dominated labor movement. This is just as impossible as it would have been to try to continue this country half slave and half free. If we are to maintain a free society in which to live it looks to me as if agriculture is the only section of our society which is still independent enough to furnish a rallying point against complete bureaucratic domination.

I have heard from many industrial leaders that they cannot stand out against a combination of labor and Government. I should like to point out that those portions of our pay rolls still outside of Government are in the hands of business, industry, and of farmers. Labor cannot long stand out if these pay rolls are cut off. Had the owners of the vast business and agricultural facilities of this country had the intestinal fortitude to back their managements and accept the financial losses necessary to get decent contracts, labor could never have achieved the degree of monopoly that it has today. It is my considered opinion that it is time for independent men to quit dodging the issues, to clearly analyze them, and then put up the kind of fight that free men are supposed to put up, if they are worthy of being free men.

RAPS LABOR UNION COERCION

I reiterate our position of past years of opposing, by all legitimate means, unwarranted interferences by labor unions, with all their history of violence and coercion, with the orderly marketing of agricultural products. I call upon Congress and our State legislature to strengthen existing laws which will make labor unions responsible not only to their membership and the public, but amenable to courts of justice where they may be met upon equal terms.

One of the most important problems confronting the people of America today is that of bringing about a well-balanced and coordinated program for the best utilization of the country's total manpower and resources. It is quite evident that we cannot mobilize our total manpower into a balanced program and at the same time encourage and permit attractive employment in certain fields of industrial activity with limited hours of work and high pay, while in other equally important fields of service the hours of workers are unlimited and the financial returns much less attractive, and while many of our finest young men are being taken into the armed forces to risk their lives at meager pay. Justice requires that a more equitable program be developed.

Paul V. McNutt, War Manpower Chief, has estimated that 65,400,000 men and women of the country will be engaged in the war industry and in the armed forces by December 1943. He maintains that 59,000,000 persons are now working in essential industries, agriculture, nonessential industries, professional, or scientific spheres, or in the armed forces. This means that 6,400,000 more persons must go to work or become members of the armed forces within the next 12 months, or those now working will be obliged to work 48 hours per week instead of the present 43 hours.

LONGER HOURS FOR LABOR

The laboring class in Russia today is working 66 hours per week; in Germany 60 hours; in England 56, while American laborers are working only 43 hours. We cannot have the largest Army, the strongest Navy, and the greatest air force in the world, serve as the granary and arsenal of democracy, and continue on a 40-hour week. This program isn't possible. France tried the 40-hour week. Today her people are working 60 hours per week. This is because her labor leaders refused to give up their so-called social gains when she declared war against the Axis Nations.

I sincerely hope the people of America will profit by the experiences of others and set aside definitely, at least for the duration of the war, the 40-hour week and overtime rates of pay. I can see no justice in continuing a system that protects any group of people in limited hours and high wages when those who must feed the Nation and those who must fight for the Nation serve their country with unlimited hours of labor and for much less pay.

There should now be but one object of local, State, and national policy, namely, to bring World War No. 2 to a successful conclusion as quickly as possible. The accomplishment of this feat will mean not only the saving of millions of human lives and a high percentage of the wealth of this world, but it will also strengthen the possibility of our being able to preserve and enjoy the American way of life as you and I have known it in the past.

WIN WAR, PRESERVE CONSTITUTION

The United States, under its Constitution, which guarantees freedom of worship, freedom of speech, of the press and assembly, the right to trial by jury, the right to freedom from search and seizure, and recognizes individual initiative and enterprise, has become the greatest Nation in the world. Separately these freedoms guaranteed by our Constitution cannot stand; equally they support each other. If one is destroyed, the others will fall. It is the responsibility of every American citizen to prevent any individual or group from destroying these priceless privileges. We must insist on maintaining our constitutional rights here in America while our young men are fighting for them all over the world.

I am sure the farm people believe that it is desirable and necessary to eliminate all personnel and all expenses in government that are not essential for the necessary functions of government and successful prosecution of the war. I believe the increased revenue needed by our Government should be obtained largely through the recapture of

the increased earnings of people engaged in profitable war production. This includes the labor element in society. These procedures would serve as the most effective means of avoiding an inflationary price rise and lighten the debt burden upon the people of today, tomorrow, and future generations.

FARMERS WANT JUSTICE ONLY

Farmers are not fighting for special privileges. They have demonstrated their good faith by increasing their production to the utmost without first demanding a host of guaranties. Justice requires that the Government keep faith with them. I challenge any industry to show a record of longer hours, harder work, less delay or stoppage of production than will be found on our farms. All the farmers ask is the assurance of conditions which will enable them to plan for, to finance, and produce the crops expected of them.

The farmers of America have been made the victims of a bad press. They have been given credit for many things for which they are not responsible. This situation has developed largely through misunderstanding and lack of appreciation of the farmers' many problems by people engaged in other fields of activity. This situation can and must be corrected by close co-operation among the different elements of society.

Tremendous, difficult, and costly tasks in war and peace lie ahead of us, but I am inclined to agree with a statement made by Admiral Greenslade of the United States Navy. In addressing the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco a short time ago he said, "The United States has weathered the most critical year in all its history," and added, "Another year will bring us victoriously to the beginning of the end."

STRIVE FOR LASTING PEACE

In looking forward into the new year we must begin to apply the same genius and imagination to the problems of peace as we have applied to the problems of war. This time we are hoping and striving for a lasting peace, which can only be realized by a complete victory on land, on sea, and in the air, accompanied by a realization by those sitting at the peace table of the dynamic forces responsible for peace and war, and the formation of a cooperative organization, or world parliament, or world court composed of all nations to enforce the terms of international peace.

The President of these United States in his annual message to the Congress on January 8 last, spoke of the "four freedoms": freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. He did not mention economic freedom, which I think is of paramount importance. Educational and religious freedoms cannot endure without it. Let us not forget that it was the spirit of initiative and enterprise that built America and that typifies America today. The go-ahead spirit permeates the vast majority of our farmers, our laborers, and our businessmen, and they will steadfastly continue to refuse to accept the doctrine of defeatism. In the light of this spirit and of its fruits in the year 1942, we need have no fear as to the outcome of the present war. Political parties and partisans may come and go, but the American system of initiative and enterprise backed by the might of achievement and the right of service to mankind will push onward in spite of all obstacles. We in America have now, and we must maintain in the future, the freedoms provided in our Constitution. These will enable us to work together on a cooperative, self-help basis to improve general conditions and to plan for the time when our men in the armed forces will return home and our country will be safe from the dangers which now threaten. It is my sincere hope that the time is not far distant when the sun will again begin to cast its warm rays upon a peaceful, a happy, and a prosperous people.

The Peril at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Norwich (N.Y.) Sun of March 2, 1943:

THE PERIL AT HOME

While America musters the energies of the Nation to hurl its might against the most determined enemy it has ever faced, an enemy grows imperceptibly behind the lines—a towering, domineering superstructure of governmental machinery. This scaffolding threatens to become the master and to obscure the outlines of freedom's edifice. Free men must be on guard against this tendency lest its very complexity crush their liberties.

This development, which is not peculiar to the United States but the byproduct of today's intricate civilization in all industrial States, goes on almost by itself. Unless there is constant vigilance against the piling of committee on committee and the establishment of bureau after bureau, the machinery of government will get out of hand. No one branch of government is more to blame than another. Congress has shown an increasing tendency to delegate its authority to committees and subcommittees. The executive branch has gone on from the appointment of one agency to another.

Naturally in time of war the trend in this direction is strong. Were it only a war expedient, however, it could be dismissed—this building of a bureaucracy—without a second thought. But this "passing of the buck" from one group to another to escape responsibility was evident long before the exigencies of war imposed unusual strain on governmental machinery everywhere.

Even in those "dear, dead days beyond recall," when the League of Nations was confronted with Italian aggression in Ethiopia, the world had one of the worst demonstrations of this tendency. The coordination committee of the League was named to handle sanctions against Italy. It would not take on itself the onus of action, so, before it evaporated in a cloud of inertia, no less than 19 subcommittees had been appointed.

But this method of escaping government, as it were, was not peculiar to Geneva, as Carl J. Hambro points out in his book How to Win the Peace. It was a carry-over from the parliamentary systems of the home countries of the delegates—in short, a disease of modern government.

Few men are bettetr qualified than Dr. Hambro to point to these dangers, for he came face to face with them, not only as president of the League Assembly but as President of the Norwegian Parliament. His deductions carry a warning for Americans today. Says Hambro:

"Every new committee set up is evidence that democratic machinery is at fault. Every new functionary appointed under a public administration is an evidence of some kind of failure in the relationship between the individual and the state. Tyranny cannot be fought by appointing legions of petty tyrants in government offices of hypertrophic tendencies * * *.

"To preserve democracy we cannot imitate the totalitarian dictators and establish more and more governmental administration in every walk of life. * * * The cheap and shallow belief that human problems can be solved simply by setting up new machinery is part of the popular lack of a critical sense of proportions and dimensions.

"Here is the diagnosis. The cure is to be found in Hambro's opinion, not in new machinery but in a new spirit. Maybe the spirit does not need to be so new. A return to the simpler views of the past, a determination not to lose sight of the main issue: That the State was made for man and not man for the State, is the antidote.

"It would be history's most ironic twist if, after winning the war against the robot civilizations of the totalitarian states, the free people found that their failure to watch their own machinery of government had produced a Frankenstein from which they could not escape. The time to guard against this is now. We cannot repose in the thought that we must be on guard on only one front—that facing the enemy. We must watch ourselves at home, too. Otherwise the Frankenstein may be given its head and in the end become master in what was once the home of liberty."

Essential Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Constitution, of Atlanta, Ga., for February 20, 1943:

ONE MORE WORD

(By Ralph McGill)

A GREAT DEMOCRAT SPEAKS

It is perfectly apparent that the forces of reaction, the powers of special privilege who want to control the Nation again for their own profit, are planning the greatest expenditure in history to put over some well-harnessed candidate for the Presidency in 1944.

Mr. Josephus Daniels, one of the really great Americans, has spoken out in an editorial in his Raleigh News and Observer in a manner typically magnificent. As one who believes in the Democratic Party and the tradition of Andrew Jackson, I am happy to reproduce it to give strength to the faint of heart and to those of little faith.

ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES

"A little while ago an ex-Governor of a Southern State, voicing objections to some New Deal policies, predicted that in 1944 the Southern Democrats would secede from the National Democratic Party, nominate their own separate electors, and have no dealings with any national political party.

"The Associated Press carried a story from Washington that James A. Farley, returning from a visit to a few cities in the deep South, gave 'a gloomy report of Democratic prospects in the South.' If he is correctly reported, Jim has been 'seein' things' and 'the goblins will git you if you don't look out.'

"There has never been a time when all Democrats thought alike on all matters, but upon the fundamental creed of the party—equal rights to all and special privilege to none—it has based every successful campaign it has waged. Only three Democrats have occupied the White House in the memory of men now living—Cleveland, who was hated by the beneficiaries of 'the communism of pelf' as he called the high protectionists who

put privilege first; Wilson, hated by the privilege-seeking and corrupt politicians because he introduced the new freedom which ushered in a new day of equality; and Franklin D. Roosevelt, the crusader of the New Deal, who was honored by the hate of the selfish interests he unhorsed. And the Democratic Party has gone down to defeat when it sought to play up to the privileged classes as when it nominated Alton B. Parker. It elected two other Presidents—Tilden and reform in 1876, and the crusader commoner, William Jennings Bryan, but the forces of privilege and fraud swindled them out of the fruits of hard-earned victory. All these five great apostles of equality were 'loved for the enemies they made.'

"The Democratic Party cannot win with a tepid milk-and-water program, seeking the votes of those who advocate the New Deal and the new freedom along with those who believe in privilege, though some men with eyes in the back of their heads think victory can be achieved by playing both ends against the middle, saying 'Good Lord and good devil.' There are, unfortunately, some who bear the name of Democrats in the South who think victory and honor can come by copying Republican policies without avowing recreancy to the creed formulated by Jefferson. If the party should listen to such timeservers it would invite the same disaster that came to the Democratic Party when in 1860 it separated into two parts and thereby threw away the victory that was in its hands and were sent into the wilderness for a quarter of a century.

"If Mr. Farley thinks the reactionaries to whom he talked represent any considerable portion of the democracy of the South, he needs to make another visit and talk to the people. He will find an overwhelming majority resolved to stick to the old party and equally resolved to keep it true to 'Equal Rights to All and Special Privilege to None.'

"As to a split in the democracy of the South or secession from the National Democratic Party, it is the idle bubble of a dream of those who are in a hopeless minority.

"In 1944, if the people want to return to the flesh pots of privilege, they will return the Republican Party to power so as to have another era of frenzied finance and depression and destruction of sound peace.

"If they wish to prevent an era of stock jobbing and depression, and wish to retain the progressive policies which lifted the country out of the ditch, and wish to win the peace they will elect a Democrat who stands for the essential principles of the new freedom and the New Deal."

To all that I say a fervent "amen." And to all Democrats I say, "Keep the faith and hold the party line."

Civil Rights for Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana:

House Joint Memorial 7

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact suitable legislation to grant full and complete civil rights to all Indians who are members of, or who served in the United States in any war in which the United States is a part

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas on December 7, 1941, when Pearl Harbor was so treacherously attacked by the Japs, all hearts were stirred to their depths all over America, and our Heavenly Father knows that many Indian people were on their knees that day, the same as many sons' mothers bended the knee throughout our beloved land; and

Whereas the American Indians have proven undivided loyalty to the principles of democracy, justice, and equality to all men by enlisting in the armed forces of the United States of America in the First World War and in the present global conflict; and

Whereas the honored dead of the Montana Indians represent a proud record equal, and sometimes even surpassing the zeal of other races, and attestation of this is confirmed by the awards granted by many nations for distinguished service and valor; and

Whereas subsequent to the First World War the Congress of the United States recognizing these undeniable facts, enacted the Indian Citizenship Act of June 2, 1924, granting a limited right of franchise; and

Whereas the American people in many ways have manifested a desire that the American Congress recognize the Indian soldiers and others in the various services as an integral part of the American people by granting the many privileges enjoyed by all soldiers of other services; and

Whereas, notwithstanding the fact that the American Indian is the smallest minority of all the many races in the United States, less than one-half million, and specific peace treaties signed with the Government not to take up arms again and pledging undying devotion and loyalty "from where the sun now stands," the rate of enlistment is the highest throughout the Nation; and

Whereas such devotion and loyalty to a protecting Nation such as the Stars and Stripes have represented must be persuasive to the American people and the American Congress compelling them to bring them under the glorious folds of the Atlantic Charter proclaimed to the world as a milepost in the progress of humanity to a better world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House and Senate of the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of Montana, assembled at the State capitol at Helena, Mont., That it memorializes the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States of America, now assembled in session, that it enact into law H. R. 5212, Seventy-seventh Congress, or some such similar legislation for the purpose of granting full and complete civil rights to all Indians who are members of, or otherwise served in, the armed services of the United States in any war that the United States is a party thereto: *Provided further*, that in granting full rights enjoyed by other citizens of the United States, all acts, or parts of acts, found in conflict with this proposed legislation found to deny the said American Indian soldier the free exercise of control of all personal and real estate shall be considered inapplicable or repealed in such cases, and: *Provided further*, that copies of this memorial be furnished by the secretary of state to each of our Senators and Congressmen from Montana, with the request that legislation be immediately introduced and pressed for passage in order to adjust an error of long standing; and to give a legal right that justly belongs to the American Indian soldier, who in many cases have paid dearly for this American right.

Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

March 5, 1943

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. James M. Cross, county chairman of the A. A. A. of Dearborn County, Indiana; also suggestions in regard to the continuation of the triple A program and the signatures of petitioners attached thereto.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestions set out by these honest, sincere, hard-working farmers of Dearborn County should be very carefully considered by every Member of this august body. They come direct from the hearts of the farmers themselves, who have one and only one thing in mind at this time, and that is the winning of this war at the earliest possible date and with the least loss in lives that their boys, brothers, fathers, and loved ones may return home and soon. These farmers realize that food is weapon No. 1 in this war and their only desire is to produce that food.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, it is high time we paid some attention to the people who know how food is produced—the farmers themselves. The farmer, his wife and children will work to the point of exhaustion but it takes more than that. It takes good soil and it takes governmental assistance in order to compete with rising costs in industry.

Let us save the American farmer and he will save America.

We, the undersigned bona fide farmers and voters of Dearborn County, request that you use your influence and vote in favor of the following:

1. Continuance of the feed-wheat program whereby feeders may purchase this grain at present levels—(below parity) (enactment of this measure desperately needed at once).
2. Continuance of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in its present form—also the continuance of the administration of same by farmer committeemen.
3. Continuance of the soil conservation features of the present program.
4. Establishment of incentive payments on badly needed war crop to partially offset the risk involved and to insure adequate production of the crops so designated.
5. Provisions which will insure availability of labor and machines insofar as possible considering the acute manpower shortage.
6. Congressional action which will merit the confidence and continual support of the American farmer to the end that our great agricultural industry can be geared and guided toward peak production now in 1943.

We farmers and voters of our county do respectively submit the foregoing as our honest conviction, that, if carried out, you, as the one whom the people of this area have selected to voice our feelings and to cast our vote, will have honestly and courageously made a definite contribution to agriculture's total war effort.

Respectfully signed,

Joseph A. Horner, William Hubert Knue, R. L. Nowlin, George F. Connolly, Martin Horner, Albert Noel, John E. Briggs, Louis A. Gaynor, George T. Fox, John J. Fuchs, Albert J. Doyle, Paul Hiltz, William Barker, Charles Murtaugh, Joseph G. Schuman, Robert J. Frey, Eugene W. Wuestefeld, George Barth, Joseph Orschell, Raymond Zimmer, G. F. Knue, Aloysius B. Stock, Bernard Batta, Kleo Knecht, Adam Schantz, Frank L. Kramer, John Hornberger, Edward Hornberger, Albert G. Huber, Alfred Obermeyer, Melvin Hoff, Garvin L. Nickell, Henry M. Creech, John J. Hoffbauer, Jacob A. Hoffbauer, William Wilgenbusch, George Wesseler, D. Godfrey Greenhoe, D. G. Greenhoe, Stephen Gutzwiller, Edwin Zinser, Joseph G. Hoffbauer, Henry C. Asche, Emmert Tangman, Henry J. Anderson, Otto Schneeman, Jim Brown, Stoop Lowe, Carl Wissman, Ray Huddleston, Bernard Wendell, Joe Bittner, Charles Hoffman, Louis Fritsch, William Fuchs, Norbert Hartman, John F. Hornbach, Ronie Weber, Russell Weber, Henry Rodmaker, Carl Joerger, August Roell, Carl Marmet, Martin Droege, Theodore Otting, Minnie Otting, Agnes Droege, Wesley Licking, Albert Cutter, Velma Cutter, Robert Cutter, Wesley Nolte, Russell Craig, Henry Kamman, W. A. Stamper, Walter Benning, Everett Murray, Albert Goodpaster, Harry Cleeter, Jack Hodges, Katherine Hodges, Alfred O. Bentle, Joe Thurman, Edna M. Bentle, Raymond J. Haag, Charles Haag, Ralph W. Darling, Harry E. Davis, Eldon Andrews, Leonard C. Harper, Lloyd Dawson, Loren H. Huddleston, Joseph Alig, Albert L. Lutz, Joseph Bulach, Joe Miller, Alfred Brawand, Herbert Newmann, Harry R. Shuter, Charles A. Zeh, Smith W. Peasley, David T. Spencer, Sadie Mae Spencer, Gus Ickenroth, George Craig, Awanda Craig, James Waldon, Gerald Waldon, Herman Thies, Jessie Thies, James Willoughby, Lillian Willoughby, Andrew Eversman, Norman Cutter, Rolla Weaver, James Hughes, George Chase, John Tindle, Vena Huffman, Dale Ickenroth, Grace Pritchard, Alfred Pieper, Tillie Grace, Perry Canfield, Joe Grace, Joseph Block, Harry Bigney, Ira E. Porter, Milburn O'Connor, Harry Kaiser, Norbert Kaiser, Mary Rawlins, M. E. Callen, Clarence M. Shockley, E. V. Bigney, G. S. Brumback, Myrtle Houston, John Ickenroth, Harry L. Wagner, James M. Cross, Dolph McMullen, Chester Muntz, Geo. Schwipps, Henry Wolf, James A. Jaeger, Harvey C. Toler, Charley Collier, Frank Brandt, Albert Brandt, Elmer Platt, Cliff Gugel, Lewis Ruble, Hattie C. Rumsey, Walter J. Wilson, Lewis E. Wilson, Elmer Gifford, Leslie Pindell, T. J. Beggs, Morris W. McManaman, Henry Kaiser, George H. Kaiser, Albert F. Kaiser, Elmer Kaiser, John R. Peters, Henry Schweers, Viola Hoppmire, Howard L. Sutton, Walter Haubrock, Herman C. Jobst, C. W. McClanahan, Geo. Huffman, Emanuel Gillespie, Carrie Gillespie, John A. Meyer, Luella Meyer, R. W. Rader, Sallie Rader, Walter Hoppmire, Crystal Hoppmire, Lillie Hoppmire, Wm. Hoppmire, Virgil F. Shuter, Henry C. Hoppmire, Fannie A. Hoppmire, Ernest Hoppmire, Amy Hoppmire, William Shuter, Ivory Waldon, Mary Waldon, Edwin Waldon, Oliver E. Shuter, Henry Webster, Laura Dennerline, Sylvia Shuter Rand, Eldridge Shuter, Elmer Brandt, John H. Laker, Henry Schwanholt, Haskell McClellan, Willis S. Hoppmire, Helen McClellan, Kathryn Cutter, Frank Licking, Henry J. Fischer, Theo. M. Westmeier, Roy Lange, Elmer F. White, Frank C. Cutter, Henry E. Vornheder, Bessie Vornheder, Wm. F. Knollman, Charles Calender, Howard Barlow, Wm. B. Libbert, Anna M. Libbert, L. Heffelmire, D. Heffelmire, Fred Meyers, Mrs. Bessie Sharp, Oscar Sharp, W. E. Yelton, Louis Yelton, Louis H. Rahe, Claud York, Peter Andres, J. S. Kennedy, C. H. Scholle C. S. Sutton, Louis Meyer, Louis Sandbrink, Edward F. Smith, J. C. Ittner, Eugene H. Emery, Leonard E. Permar, James D. Gatch, Cecil Fryman, Albert Conaway, Alma B. Osborne, John S. Emery, Charles F. Emery, Charles H. Geisler, Agnes W. Geisler, John W. Stevens, Minnie M. Stevens, Anna C. Goodpaster, Robert E. Brady, F. Preston Bloom, Edwin Platt, Clayton Ashcraft, George Weis, Mrs. George Weis, Chester Weis, Clarence Feller, Herman Belew, J. W. Belew, Walter Lovelace, Raymond Lovelace, J. Arthur Feller, Desmond Schilling, Fred W. Klausing, Dilver Lewis, Lloyd Russell, Archie Stephens, Lawrence H. Barkley, Herman Waldon, George Hauntz, Clarence Rummel, Paul Rummel, Holley Bloom, Mrs. Holly Bloom, Mrs. Clyde Givan, Mrs. Ida M. Voshell, Clyde Givan, Wm. Lows, Robert Lows, Bluford Brady, Fred Meyers, Oscar Witte, Orris Witte, Lester Ampt, Clyde Turner, Harry Benning, Theophil Greive, Walter Smith, Harry Richards, Walter H. Scholle, Guy Dittmer, Raymond G. Kyle, Jacob W. Dils, Robert Aiken, Warren L. Slater, Louis W. Leffler, Harry M. Kyle, G. M. Carr, Della Carr, Clyde Siefferman, Leora Siefferman, Lillian Blasdel, Walter Blasdel, Floyd Grubbs, Lela Grubbs, Paul Cormican, Clayton C. Sears, Stanley B. Morris, Mabel C. Morris, Guy Grubbs, Jewell Grubbs, May Swales, John L. Swales, John D. Liddle, Ethel Liddle, Wm. Diefenbach, Bertha Diefenbach, C. C. Jackson, Harry H. Keyes, Esther Keyes, James H. O'Neal, Laura O'Neal, Chas. Heiskell, Clara Fondong, George Fondong, Melvin R. Hart, Clarence W. Rumsey, Emmett H. Platt, Wilmer Greenham, Charles Brown, Carl Rumsey, Rezin Brown, Lucus Brown, Guy Rumsey, Mary J. Todd, Lee Pastner, Walter Rumsey, Wilbur J. Molter, Fred Gompf, Edw. W. Meyer, Henry F. Meyer, Chas. Seamon, Fred Barndt, Raymond Snelling, Joe Snelling, Henry Folke, Charley M. Meyer, Ora H. Bockhorst, Woodson Ervin Warren, John J. Ott, Galen Pribble, Chas. Snelling, Fred H. Meyer, Jr., Alta Mae Hart, Frank Nowlin, Clair Rechenbach, Lewis H. Jackson, Otto Renck, Chas. Henderson, Emmett McMullen, Henry Bockhorst, Michael Molter, Howard Craig, Robert Conner, V. P. Serodino, E. W. Bentle, H. L. Klausing, Frank Molter, Lynn F. Mallory, A. Givan Heller, Earl Liddell, Charles W. McClanahan, Sr., Charles W. McClanahan, Jr., Harry L. Nolke, John W. Stacy, Elvin Manlief, John J. Vogelgesang, O. M. Keller, Henry A. Bobrink, William F. Meyer, Everett H. Knippenberg, George W. Meyer, Louis Bode, Ed Bode, Wm. Doughty, Albert Turner, R. H. Rose, Clarence Weiler, Scott Lovern, R. Hamilton Rees, C. Craig.

Some of the personal letters I received from other people in the Ninth District on the same subject were:

August F. Kiel, Seymour, Ind.; James H. Rimstidt, Dillsboro, Ind.; Charales H. Steuri, Osgood, Ind.; Otto F. Moeller, Osgood, Ind.; Walter Rust, Courtland, Ind.; Earl Bray, Vevay, Ind.; George T. Niese, Batesville, Ind.; Philip Weher, Batesville, Ind.; H. C. Peters, Brooksburg, Ind.; H. Frederick Mellencamp, Seymour, Ind.; Ivan T. Thies, Batesville, Ind.; Clarence B. Meyers, Spades, Ind.; Cyrus Bohlke, Batesville, Ind.; Henry C. Hoppmire, Aurora, Ind.; Joseph E. Meister, Batesville, Ind.; Raymond T. Rucker, Medora, Ind.; Bernard Mohr, Batesville, Ind.; R. E. Miles, Oxford, Ohio; Clifford Bischoff, Brookville, Ind.; George Morgenroth, French Lick, Ind.; Herman J. Merkel, Batesville, Ind.; Mrs. Laura Dennerline, Aurora, Ind.; Edward J. Merkel, Batesville, Ind.; Harry R. Shuter, Aurora, Ind.; Ralph C. Mainer, Austin, Ind.; Fred H. Merkel, Batesville, Ind.; Ralph Gookins, Versailles, Ind.

Casualty Lists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Daily Mirror, of February 10, 1943:

CASUALTY LISTS

Casualty lists are about as cold and unemotional as a lost love's smile when they finally appear in print, weeks after battle.

They are cold in time. They are cold in type. They look something like this:

"Doe, Pvt. John J.; wife, Mrs. Mary Doe, 1943 Main St., Our Town."

This isn't news to Mrs. Mary Doe. She has long since been notified by a telegram from the War Department.

It may be news to John Doe's acquaintances who hadn't kept close track of him for years. They may read his name in the list and say something like, "Why, that's the Johnny Doe who played second base on the Central High team. Gosh. I knew him well."

The point is that you've got to go a long way back of a casualty list before it gets "hot."

The point is that the casualty lists of many weeks hence are being piled up right now around some muddy little flea-bitten villages of Tunisia, the names of which are hard to pronounce and remember—Sbeitla, Gafsa, Sidi Bouzid.

The point is that American boys are falling and dying there, underneath the scream of the Stukas and before the blazing .88s of the huge Mark VI's, marshaled against them by that master of blitz warfare, the hated and hateful—but resourceful—Rommel.

Our boys are green. They are being salted in battle.

Their lines break, reform, break again.

Ground is gained, lost. The struggle spreads and sways.

CASUALTIES WILL BE HEAVY

And this minute, the future's casualty lists are being compiled from the metal tags, 2 inches by 1 inch, that soldiers wear—name, number, blood type, religion, date of typhoid inoculation, next of kin.

But now is no time for any American to doubt.

Now is the time for every American to weigh what President Roosevelt told the nation last Saturday night:

"I think we should be prepared for the fact that Tunisia will cost us heavily in casualties.

"Yes, we must face that fact now, with the same calm courage as our men are facing it on the battlefield."

Now is the time, in our opinion, for the entire home front to face the home front facts, as well.

And to resolve that not one name shall be added to battle front casualties because of failures on the home front.

How can we get more tanks, guns, planes, food and supplies to the African and other fighting fronts?

That is the paramount question, and not—

How can we get more wages, profits, higher prices, more time-and-a-half for overtime, bigger appropriations for the bureaus, more money for boondoggling, more funds for the National Youth Administration, greater allotments for the "planners," more time off from the job?

How can we send more weapons, indeed, when the curse of the war industries—absenteeism—has claimed 10,700,000 man-hours of labor in Pacific coast Navy shipyards alone?

And more food, with an agricultural program that is bogged down in bureaucratic maladministration to the extent that we are threatened with critical shortages? (A program, by the way, which has failed, because of politics, to call on the services of the nation's foremost authority in the field, ex-President Herbert Hoover.)

CONGRESS MUST GET THE ANSWER

And more manpower for production, with a Federal bureaucracy that approaches the 3,000,000 mark and still climbs?

And more money for guns and shells, when the nonessential and nonsensical National Youth Administration, which already has spent $700,000,000, continues boloney as usual?

These are some of the questions all Americans should ask against the black background of the casualty lists.

Fortunately, they are questions which our resurgent Congress, bent on the recapture of its just and rightful powers, is asking.

Congress must get the answers. Congress must put into effect the solutions those answers suggest.

This is a people's war, fought by a people's army.

The representatives of the people must see to it that nothing can be blamed to home-front casualties when the people's casualty lists start coming home.

Town Meeting Day in Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me I wish to extend my remarks to include a message which I addressed to my fellow townsmen of Northfield, Vt., which was read to them at town meeting on March 2, 1943, and was broadcast over the State.

The message follows:

Friends and neighbors, and fellow Vermonters, whenever I see the warning for town meeting, I am always reminded of the sacrifice I make annually in being deprived of the opportunity to join with all of you in the exercise of a right so fundamental and necessary to the maintenance of democratic ideals.

These are chaotic and hectic days down here. Washington is a madhouse. Congress is no less.

Speaking as one Vermonter to another, things are not what they are made to seem by a controlled radio and press, and are in an awful mess and muddle. Jealousy, friction, incompetency, lust for personal power, lack of planning, are each and all responsible for the situation which obtains. It is bad. We need a house cleaning. We are going to have one now. Not after the war.

TRAGIC DAYS

These days are not only chaotic and hectic. They are also tragic. They will become more and more so, due to confusion and mismanagement and muddling and we need not try to make ourselves believe otherwise. We better face facts. This war is far from won. One of the biggest battles is on the home front.

Our first great concern should be to win the war. One essential lack has been, and still is found in the fact that the will to win has not been as evident in some sections as the will to serve selfish and bureaucratic ends.

Perhaps we are too busy listening to those who are blowing post-war bubbles, to realize what a terrific price we will have to pay at home if we do not get onto our job and "holler" for help from everybody, to win this war. "This war" I say. The situation is not only tragic, it is dangerous! We are not winning, as yet. We need action, not talk.

VISIONARY PLANS

As I see it today, the post-war plans suggested are usually visionary, only partial solutions, not comprehensive, and those charged with winning the war and its successful conclusion, should not take their mind off that job long enough to give adequate and constructive thought to the endless details, contingencies, possibilities, pro and con, and unknown quantities involved in any post-war plan or plans. We can do a lot of harm by this generalizing, and any attempt to draw a blueprint of the peace terms now, may not be good judgment, for there is no peace in sight, nor is it "just around the corner."

It is true that the Germans are "on the run" in Russia—or out of Russia—but they may be on their way to Germany, to defend it against us, and our possible invasion of the Continent. It's a long, long road.

The Japanese accomplished what they originally set out to do. We must drive them back to Tokyo at an almost unbelievable cost in men, women, and materials, and against the necessity for a trip almost around the globe to get our men and materials there. Are we deaf, dumb, and blind?

Our early defeats in Tunisia do not make it any better for us. Our allies doubt our strength. They question our military leadership. The round 0 of their optimism is a zero. We have already lost thousands of brave men and a terrific amount of material, measured in dollars. There will be time enough to talk about the items of post-war peace after we regain our prestige and the war is won, and even after we are surely on our way to win it. We can be too premature.

WIN WAR FIRST

We should not let post-war planning interfere with present war winning. There are a lot of things to be done now, which should be done, and would be done, were it not for the almost mass bureaucratic set-up here in Washington, which obstructs our winning. Lack of inclination to assume responsibility for making decisions and lack of ability to make decisions has caused unbearable delay of the day of victory.

Nobody here dares to assume the right to make a final decision. Everything is left up to the President, poor man, who hesitates as he wonders how such or such a decision might or may affect his chances for a fourth term. That is not political partisanship. It is a fact. Who denies it?

If I had time and this were the place, I would like to talk to you about a lot of things. The alleged manpower shortage, how big our Army should be, has Congress thrown a monkey wrench into the wheel (running wild) of nonessential spending? Have we stopped strikes in war production plants? The answer to that last question is "no." The reason for it is found in the fact that the President has blocked the enactment of the necessary legislation by the Senate, which has passed the House, to help adjust the labor problem.

DEPLORES STRIKES

Do you realize that in 1942 there were 1,359 strikes in plants engaged in exclusively and entirely war production, and that 96 of these strikes occurred last December?

In these strikes there were 568,812 men, or over half a million men. We lost 2,095,294 man days from war production of essential and necessary tanks and planes and other material, by reason of these strikes. Sixteen million work hours were lost last December to vital war industries, due to absence from work, and only 3 percent of these absences were due to illness. It is not right to permit such a situation to continue. It is not fair to us, nor to the millions of loyal patriotic workers, men and women, who are working from 10 to 12 hours a day, seven days a week, in these war production plants in order to produce arms and equipment for our soldiers.

As Senator BYRD said the other day:

"We must hit at the heart of the matter, and Congress must declare that there shall be no strike in any defense industry." According to him there were 258,498 man-days lost through strikes in the four weeks ending January 23 last.

NOT CREDITABLE

It is true that, when the history of our part in this war is finally written the extent to which rapacious labor leaders were allowed to slow down war production and entrench themselves in power will be one of its most discreditable chapters. No man today can compute the cost of administration feebleness in this respect.

Not the least shameful thing about it are the greasy love letters which some of our highly placed officials have thought it necessary to write, praising labor's part and ignoring the fact that there has been such a thing as a strike anywhere or at any time. So says Frank Kent, who also adds that:

"It is a dreadful and tragic story, to which there seems no ending. That we should tolerate it is more than stupid—it is wicked. For the clear effects are, first, to prolong

the war at terrible cost in American lives abroad and, second, to increase the prospect of economic collapse at home."

NO PLACE OR TIME FOR DEMAGOGUES

The fact is inescapable that the administration has opposed antistrike legislation. The day has come when the people ought to realize that strikes in war industries should be outlawed. They will be when public sentiment is thoroughly and finally aroused to insist, that since the President will do nothing, Congress must and should pass, and he should sign, legislation which will put an end to such things. Until this is done, there is no alibi.

DECRIES POLITICS

Playing party and personal politics is not the kind of support to give our fighting men. We won the old war with a normal week of 60 hours. Working 40 hours we sabotage 440,000,000 hours per week; working 48 hours we sabotage 264,000,000 hours per week. This is not the way for us on the home front to treat the sons, husbands, wives, brothers, and fathers of the people of America.

Our economic system is not working, and the responsibility for that situation rests squarely on the shoulders of the administration and primarily on those of the voters who voted to keep the administration in power. There is no excuse, nor justification, nor alibi for the present tragic state of our internal economy.

I am not bragging, but I have the only 100-percent record as a Republican in support of the foreign policy of the Commander in Chief.

I am no swivel chair strategist. I think the military and the naval trained men should tell civilians what we need and how to do it, but I am and have been opposed to being a guinea pig for New Deal experiments, tried out unsuccessfully on the Pharaohs.

URGES THRIFT

You cannot spend yourself into independence or security as is evidenced by a debt of over three hundred billion dollars, which will be more instead of less, at least one hundred billion of which can be charged to New Deal mismanagement and profligacy. It is fine business for those who get the money taken from us, or so it seems, but when the day of reckoning comes, it will be another story, and a sad one; and that day is on the way. All we can hope to do is to soften the shock.

Let me assure you again that this Congress is definitely determined to regain its rights, and intends to restore to itself and the people and to the Government by legislative enactment the power of the purse, and incident prerogatives, rather than by bureaucratic directive, and the unauthorized usurpation of such power by unlimited authority and autocratic mandates, which the bureaucrats assume to issue unwarrantedly.

Not only will this be done, but it will have to be done, and it is being done, in order to win the war, despite attempts to make it appear that such action by Congress breeds disunity, and is unwise, which is not so. The people should not be fooled, by camouflaged propaganda.

As the representative of the people, I say the only way to represent the people is for Congress to represent them. That it proposes to do. That is what I am undertaking to do.

RECALLS COOLIDGE

Calvin Coolidge, who in a great day of "yes" men was a "no" man, said:

"The resources of our country are sufficient if we use them to help each other. * * * All that is needed is for each one of us to give what we think America is worth. * * *

"The America which Washington founded does not mean we shall have everything done for us, but we shall have every opportunity to do everything for ourselves."

This is the day of our trial and testing. Destiny is in us and our hands.

My friends, it is your responsibility to keep the spirit of constitutional government alive by evidencing your individual ideas with respect to the preservation, conservation, and perpetuation of the government you love, founded and dedicated to freedom and liberty for the individual and the benefit of all, by your forefathers and mine.

Release of Members of Armed Forces for Agricultural Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, believing that you will find enlightening the procedure now in vogue for determining whether a member of the armed forces, neded in agricultural production, is to be released for such work I am setting forth an outline of this procedure as given to me this morning in response to my inquiry as to the status of one of my constituents, who is immediately needed for farming operations, and who has filed formal application for release, with supporting evidence. The itinerary (comparable to an around the world cruise) of such an application is as follows:

First. The applicant files with his commanding officer formal application for discharge or furlough, supported by affidavits, showing his status in agriculture.

Second. The commanding officer makes a preliminary examination of the application and supporting papers.

Third. The commanding officer then transmits them, through military channels, so that they eventually reach the office of The Adjutant General in Washington.

Fourth. Thereupon The Adjutant General transmits them to the Director of National Selective Service headquarters in Washington.

Fifth. This latter official forwards the papers to the headquarters of the Selective Service System in the State from which the applicant came.

Sixth. This latter office forwards them to the local draft board in the county from which the applicant originated where the application is investigated.

This smooth-running and efficient machinery is now shifted to reverse, and the application and accompanying papers (if not by now worn out) begin the long trek back from the local draft board to the office of The Adjutant General in Washington by way of State Selective Service headquarters and National Selective Service headquarters. Upon their return to the old nesting ground the papers are processed and again started on the voyage back (through channels) to the commanding officer who originally launched them and where at long last the applicant finally and officially learns whether the application is granted or denied.

The above channeling, in both directions, is accomplished in the amazingly short period of from 3 to 4 months. In the meantime vital food stuffs go unplanted, uncultivated, or ungathered. Food shortages for both the armed forces and civilian population become more acute, but the crop of red tape flourishes with renewed and irrepressible vigor.

Many have predicted that this will be a long war and it will have to be if the applications above referred to are handled in their allotted time. Is this the speed which officialdom has promised the Congress in alleviating the increasing manpower shortage? If so, then may heaven help the farmer and those who must occasionally eat.

Relief of Hunger in Occupied Countries of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Helen Essary:

DEAR WASHINGTON

(By Helen Essary)

I who am often accused of being too nationalistic am wondering again how wise we of the United Nations are in our continued refusal to feed the children of the occupied countries.

Heaven knows I am anxious to guard the rights and privileges of the people of the United States against our enemies always, and sometimes against our allies

And yet I wonder if it is either smart or humanitarian of this powerful, fertile country to shut its mind and its food bins to the hungry children of Axis-conquered nations.

Hitler and Goering have just announced that in the food shortage that threatens the Axis it will not be the Germans who will starve. Already the natives of occupied countries have less than one-third of what they need to sustain health. Tuberculosis is almost a commonplace among the children there.

What will the young people of these harassed nations think of the Allies who, while enforcing the blockade, thus desert them? Idealism and the love of democracy are more appealing after a good meal than when your knees are wobbly from malnutrition. Well-fed people purr with contentment and gratitude. The starving, especially the starving young, are susceptible to enemy propaganda.

A national characteristic of the United States is the desire to help the whole world. Perhaps now is the moment to make another effort to feed the children in occupied territory. Your retort to this suggestion may be,

"Why, we haven't enough food for ourselves. Why should we, struggling with rationing and its unknown perils, risk the health of our own?"

Experts say we are not a hunger-threatened people. The shortage of food in the United States is only seeming.

The reason for the present rationing is the determination of the Government to build up stock piles of food. It does seem unbelievable that a country as vast and productive as this could ever be actually hungry. Certainly not if we are permitted to keep farmers at home as well as to send warriors abroad.

Besides, countries other than the United States are producing food. Argentina, for example, has great supplies waiting for shipments to Asia and Europe. Neutral Sweden has ships which may be used to transport food.

The International Red Cross, with the assistance of the Swiss and Swedish legations in Athens, has got food to starving Greece. Germany has permitted neutral observers to watch the distribution of supplies there. Perhaps an attempt at such an arrangement could be made in France, Holland, Norway, and Central Europe.

I hasten to say, however, that the people of the United States, suffering today from the pains of taxpaying, would respond more quickly to such a merciful effort if some of the leaders of occupied countries would themselves set an example of self-sacrifice.

Here is a chance for a spectacular demonstration. It has been suggested that the royal family of Holland sell its American holdings and give the profits to their own distracted countrymen. The Crown Princess Martha of Norway might easily economize on her living expenses. She dwells in an almost feudal manner on an estate in Maryland, bought especially for her.

Many of the famous refugees glow with jewels, baby sables and gold braid. Stalin manages a more simple and successful existence in his own country. His dictator's raiment alternates between two baggy old suits.

In the United States, the extravagant Harry Hopkins dinner has been an embarrassment to the New Deal. It behooves all of the leaders of all the democracies not only to demand sacrifice of the citizenry but to practice it themselves.

Investigation of Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered over the radio last night by the gentleman from Texas, Hon. MARTIN DIES:

My fellow Americans: In response to my radio appeal of February 24 urging you to write me your views, I have received thousands of letters and telegrams from people in every State of the Union endorsing my position. This has encouraged me to talk to you tonight so that you may be better acquainted with the facts concerning our investigation of un-American activities—its accomplishments and purposes. This is very important in view of the well-organized campaign of abuse, misrepresentation, and threats which has been conducted against our Committee on Un-American Activities from the very beginning of its work, and which now exceeds in bitterness, vindictiveness, and falsification anything that we have heretofore experienced. Full-page ads attacking our committee are being carried in the leading newspapers of the country by organizations that our committee and the Department of Justice have found to be subversive. Inspired editorials and news items, appearing in many of the foreign-language newspapers and periodicals, libel me and our committee in the most scurrilous manner. Clever and unscrupulous propagandists for un-American organizations have succeeded in persuading a large part of the Negro press to join in this concerted attack to discredit our committee, its motives, methods, and objectives. Millions of pamphlets and throwaways are being printed and circulated throughout the country as part of this conspiracy to undermine the faith of the people in the integrity, sincerity, and effectiveness of our investigation. This campaign follows the strategy of Hitler that if a lie is told often enough it will eventually take on the appearance of the truth. The purposes of this organized propaganda is to create hatred against me and the committee among people of foreign stock and certain racial minorities in the United States by making it appear that we are actuated by prejudice against these people.

Certain prominent radio commentators have joined in this campaign with the result that powerful forces of propaganda in this country are now arrayed against our committee. To ignore or minimize the danger of this campaign is to disregard the destructive and deadly effect which propaganda has produced in other countries in recent years. It was through this method that a madman was able to subvert the republic of Germany and build up a regime of brutal power and hate. Through propaganda the minds of millions of people have been bereft of reason and common sense and their hearts have been drained of the last drop of the milk of human kindness. By constant repetition of lies, the most hideous and sinister doctrines of paganism, barbarity, greed, and savagery have been implanted in the hearts of countless millions. Future generations will marvel that in an age of so-called civilization and enlightenment, millions of people could accept as true and authentic what every normal child would reject as ridiculous. The fruits of this propaganda may now be seen in the pinched and haggard faces of millions of people in Europe and in the slaughter of twenty millions of civilians and combatants.

What is the reason for this well financed and organized campaign of lies against our committee? The answer can be found in the effectiveness of our work during the 4½ years that we have been in existence. During that period we have investigated and exposed more than 100 Nazis, Fascist, and Japanese organizations, and as a result of that exposure every one of these organizations has been closed by Government order or public opinion, and many of their leaders have been convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary. During the period of our existence we have ferreted out and unmasked more than 100 Communist and Communist-front organizations, with the result that fully 60 percent of them have been forced by public opinion to go out of business, and some of their leaders have been convicted of crimes exposed by our committee. We have also turned the spotlight of publicity upon hundreds of people, some of whom hold important Government positions, who affiliated and associated with subversive organizations or expressed their opposition to the American form of government. If the committee had not done a thorough and fearless job, there would be no reason for the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars for propaganda designed to discredit the committee and its work. The public records of our hearings and the official reports of our committee which are available to any person prove beyond any doubt that the committee has investigated and exposed every Nazi, Fascist, and Japanese organization in this country. The very fact that the Government moved against these organizations is confirmation of our findings with respect to them.

Four years ago, when we exposed a number of organizations as Communist-controlled, our findings were bitterly assailed and disputed, but when the Attorney General and the Interdepartmental Committee which he established recently confirmed our findings in their written report, it was a complete vindication of the committee against the charge that we had falsely accused these organizations. Nor is it possible to prove against me any word or deed which evinces the slightest degree of prejudice against any racial or religious minority. On the contrary in hundreds of speeches I have denounced all forms of racial and religious prejudice as un-American. Black is the heart, warped the mind, and crooked the soul of any man who seeks to exploit either race prejudice or race consciousness for his political or selfish ends. Our committee has investigated and exposed every organization in this country where there was any evidence that the organization advocated that any racial or religious minority should be deprived of its rights under the Constitution. The central theme of all my utterances has been that God endowed every person with certain fundamental and inalienable rights, such as liberty of speech, thought, assembly, and worship, which neither government nor majorities have the right to abridge or destroy.

These un-American propagandists could not find anything in my record as Congressman to justify any charge that I was an appeaser. From my record they learned that I had supported ever effort to arm this Nation; that I supported the original lend-lease bill, under which valuable aid has been given our allies, and that when the change of one vote would have disbanded our Army I cast my vote with the administration.

Like everything human, we have made mistakes, but the very fact that there is no basis for any serious charge against the committee makes it necessary for the un-American propagandists to manufacture their false charges in bold defiance of the record itself. They believe that the insidious power of propaganda is such that, regardless of the facts and the record, they can deceive the people of the country into accepting as true what is absolutely false.

There are many different species of insect termites and many different species of human termites. In describing insect termites the Department of Agriculture in one of its bulletins said: "Due to their subterranean habits, insidious method of attack, and often countless numbers, termites are very difficult to destroy. Always coming up through underground galleries, they work under cover, avoiding exposure to the light, so that the damage is often hidden until beyond repair."

This language also accurately describes the human species of ideological termites that are undermining the foundation sills of this Republic. Different species of these human termites masquerade under different names and profess different brands of totalitarianism. Some of them specialize in attacking the foundation sills of religious liberty and individual rights upon which the whole structure of our Republic rests. Others seek to destroy the pillars of free enterprise and individual initiative which support the framework of our constitutional system. Others, under the guise of democracy, or liberalism, or trade unionism, infiltrate Government bureaus, the Democratic and Republican Parties, and the great trade unions of our Nation, so that they can carry on their destructive work

without danger of detection or molestation. Still others establish front organizations with high-sounding names and popular objectives to serve as baits to lure and deceive gullible people and professional joiners. It makes no difference what these species of termites call themselves or how hostile they appear to be to one another. The important thing is that all of them are engaged in the common enterprise of undermining this Republic.

To combat these insidious pests, our committee has followed the one method which they hate and fear the most because of its effectiveness. We have turnd the spotlight of pitiless publicity upon them and exposed their identities, methods, and true purposes.

While these human termites are striving to destroy our Republic millions of our sons, fathers, and brothers are fighting and suffering and many of them dying to preserve it and to establish a lasting peace.

Let us make no mistake about this: Our soldiers are not fighting for bureaucratic government or socialistic schemes or power-hungry politicians or an American brand of fascism. They are fighting and dying to preserve and strengthen the American Republic established by the Constitution of our country. It will be treasonable if their sacrifices should turn out to have been in vain. It is your duty and my duty to see that this does not happen and that this Nation under God shall not perish from the earth.

Removal of Wheat Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, broadcast Friday, February 26, 1943, in the Department of Agriculture period, National Farm and Home Hour, by Blue Network and associated radio stations:

Last Tuesday, acting under the emergency provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, I suspended wheat marketing quotas for the current year and for the year beginning next July. At the same time I removed this year's acreage limitations, by announcing that farmers who meet at least 90 percent of their war crop goals will be eligible for wheat loans and payments even if they plant more than their allotments.

I imagine that all of you already have heard of those two actions. I want to talk with you today about why they were needed and what I hope they will accomplish.

First of all, we have not run into any sudden wheat shortage. Last July at the beginning of this marketing year, our supply of wheat totaled 1,600,000,000 bushels. That is an all-time record. Our carry-over next July 1 also will set an all-time record—about 75,000,000 bushels more than the carry-over last year. To the north of us, Canada has a great deal more wheat this year than she ever had before.

As you can see, we are very comfortably fixed so far as supply is concerned. Also, we need to increase our output of soybeans and flax and other war crops of which we don't have large reserves. We still need increases in those crops more than we need increases in wheat.

Therefore you may ask why we are removing limitations on selling and planting wheat at this time.

Well, one part of the answer is this: We want more wheat only in cases where the increase will not interfere with increased production of war crops.

Another part of the answer is found in some figures which came to my desk early this month. Those figures show that we now are using more wheat in this country than in any past year.

In the current crop year we are using about 535,000,000 bushels of wheat for food. That is 40,000,000 bushels more than for any recent year. With some other foods scarcer, we can expect that the use of wheat as food in this country will continue to increase. Also, we are feeding more wheat to livestock than we have ever fed before and we are using quite a bit for making alcohol. Both of those demands are on the upgrade this year. Then we must be ready to send our wheat to hungry people across the ocean when they are liberated from the Axis. They'll need a lot of this kind of food.

Wheat is working three shifts in this war. It is going directly into food, and it is feeding animals that produce meat and milk, and it is going into industrial alcohol to make rubber and explosives.

We have a large wheat surplus. But with consumption going up, and giving signs of going up still more it is only common sense to maintain as large reserves as we can. Right now, the time is ripe to move in that direction for moisture conditions are good in nearly all of the wheat-growing country.

I want to make it plain that we do not expect the changes in the program to bring any large increase in total wheat output. In most wheat areas, other crops can be grown too, and as I have said, it is more important to grow the emergency war crops than more wheat. Farmers who meet their war crop goals won't have many acres for extra wheat. But there are some wheat areas where the other crops don't grow well. In these parts of the country it certainly is wise to produce all the wheat we can.

Of course the spring wheat crop will be the only one affected this year, but if moisture conditions still are good when the next winter wheat crop goes into the ground we can expect considerable increases in some parts of the plains country.

Now that the quota regulations are removed, farmers who have been holding wheat grown in excess of their quotas are free to sell it without penalty of any kind. With the demands for wheat increasing, it no longer is necessary to hold wheat off the market.

Now I know that some farmers will ask why the new steps in the wheat program weren't taken sooner. They may ask if the changes are exactly fair to farmers who planted within their allotments last year, or farmers who already have sold excess wheat under penalty. Those questions have occurred to me too. But I do not believe the changes would have been justified sooner. The situation has changed a lot in just the past few months, in particular, as the need for livestock feed has grown. By acting now, we are in a better position as far as reserves are concerned to meet the needs 6 months or a year or more hence. I believe most farmers will agree that it is wise to take such action just as soon as the need is clear. We have a war to win.

As I have said, one of the greatest needs for wheat is for use as feed. We have more meat animals and dairy cattle and poultry on farms now than we ever have had before. Adding them all up, they are enough to consume 11 percent more grain than the total number a year ago, and more than 20 percent above the average for the 10 years before that.

We need all the meat, milk, and eggs we can produce. One of the reasons we have been able to produce so much thus far is the fact that we have kept feed prices at a stable and reasonable level. We have done part of this job through sales of Government-owned wheat. This policy enables livestock, dairy, and poultry raisers to produce abundantly without advancing prices to a point that would invite a spiral of inflation.

Congress last year authorized the Department to sell 125,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed at feed prices rather than flour prices. Well, by now we have sold all of the 125,000,000 bushels. The Government still owns 200,000,000 bushels, and holds 400,000,000 bushels as collateral for loans to farmers.

Recently I asked Congress for authority to sell at least another 100,000,000 bushels of wheat at the feed price this year out of the stocks still owned by the Government. I very much hope that this can be done, for it is one of the best ways I know of getting full wartime use out of our great supply of wheat.

Absenteeism

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal today about absenteeism among the workers of this country, especially from such men as Secretary of the Navy Knox, Admiral Land, and quite a few Members of Congress.

I often wonder where they get their information, unless it is from the daily press, or the dollar-a-year men here in Washington, who are spreading propaganda against labor.

On February 18 the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], on page 1119 of the RECORD, stated that there were 12,700,000 man-hours lost in the month of December on account of absenteeism, which sounds very big to read. For my own information I got in touch with the Labor Department and asked them to give me a report on absenteeism. I was informed that the only information they could give me up to the present time is the absenteeism in 1941, due to accidents. They sent me a report listing seven of the principal industries of our country, and I want to assure you it was shocking to read that report.

During the year of 1941 there were 251,256,000 work hours lost because of injuries sustained by employees of the seven industries. Breaking it down for the 12 months, it would average 20,938,000 work hours for each month in 1941, which is almost twice the amount stated by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. The were unable to give me the number of hours lost due to sickness. However, my understanding is that

it is very large because of the unsanitary, unhealthy conditions in the factories, together with the unhealthy housing and transportation conditions which now exist throughout the country.

I was also informed that many of the large industries where men quit their positions in the early part of the month to go to work elsewhere, carry these men on their books until the end of the month when their names are removed, which is not fair as far as absenteeism is concerned.

It is hard for me to understand the attitude of the newspapers, many public officials, and men speaking over the radio, in relation to absenteeism. Could it be possible that they are trying to cover up the shocking, unsafe, unsanitary, and unhealthy conditions which now exist in many of the industries throughout the country?

I am going to insert in the RECORD a statement which I received from the Department of Labor in relation to this very serious question. I would ask those who are criticizing the workers of this country because of absenteeism to tell us where they get their information. Admiral Land stated the other day that they were short 100 ships because of absenteeism, which, of course, he put directly up to the workers. Do you realize, Members of the House, that probably 70 percent of the boys now fighting on the other side to save this great democratic form of government of ours, have fathers, mothers, brothers, and sisters working in those industries? I am sure that the parents, the brothers, and the sisters of those boys are not doing anything to retard our war efforts.

On Friday, March 5, I read in the New York Times, and in the Washington Post, a statement by Under Secretary of War Patterson, that for the month of February we produced 5,500 planes, the greatest output of planes of any nation in the world. I wonder who produced those planes. Was it the dollar-a-year men here in Washington who are spreading propaganda against the workers, or the newspapers, or the radio commentators who are finding fault? Or was it the fathers, the mothers, the brothers, and the sisters of those in our armed forces who are responsible for this great accomplishment.

I am not going to detain you with a lengthy speech. I will only ask you to read over the figures which I am putting in the RECORD. You will be convinced that the production of this country is retarded but very little by willful absenteeism. However, on the other hand, our great war program is going on, and on, and on, by the workers of this country.

I am a great believer in the freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, and all freedoms guaranteed by our Constitution. However, I think it is unfair of the newspapers to publish one side of the story in relation to absenteeism. They should publish both sides and give the public the benefit of what is the real cause of absenteeism. If they will do that the public will soon realize that the willful absenteeism is a very small part compared with the absenteeism through injuries and sickness, which is brought about by the unsafe, unsanitary, and unhealthy conditions in many of the plants throughout the country.

Instead of passing legislation to punish the workers for absenteeism why not make a thorough investigation and find out who is responsible for this situation? By so doing, I believe that Congress will be taking the right step toward correcting absenteeism.

The statement follows:

INDUSTRIAL INJURIES IN THE UNITED STATES DURING 1941 AS REPORTED BY THE LABOR DEPARTMENT

As a general rule, the number of disabling work injuries during 1941 increased much more sharply than did either total employment or the total number of employee-hours worked. Particularly was this true of manufacturing industries. For the 21,422 manufacturing establishments which reported to the Bureau of Labor Statistics for both 1940 and 1941, employment increased by 21 percent, employee-hours worked by 28 percent, and disabling injuries by 46 percent. As a result, the frequency rate, measuring the average number of injuries per million hours worked, was 14 percent higher in 1941 than in 1940. This increase in the frequency rate is attributable to the influx of large numbers of inexperienced workers into the rapidly expanding war industries, the crowding of workers in the wartime factories, and the failure of safety activities to keep fully abreast of the war program.

Industrial injuries are for the most part preventable, and yet their daily toll is one of the most significant causes of time lost from work in the United States. In 1941, according to estimates of the Bureau of Labor Statistics they resulted in 19,200 deaths, 100,600 permanent impairments, and 2,060,400 temporary disabilities. The workers injured in 1941 lost 42,083,000 days of work in that year. In addition, however, death and permanent disability will result in lost time or in lost effectiveness in future years. This amounts to 209,000,000 days. Similar injuries in earlier years resulted in lost time in 1941 of which there is no direct measure. The best single approximation of total time lost in 1941 because of injuries is therefore the sum of time lost in 1941 for disabilities incurred in that year plus the economic equivalent of permanent disabilities and deaths, a total of 251,000,000 days. This is equivalent to full-time employment for a year for more than 800,000 workers. These tremendous losses of manpower during a time requiring maximum production for war constitute a challenge to management to undertake more extensive and intensive safety efforts.

The weighted frequency rate for the entire manufacturing group was 18.1 injuries per million employee-hours worked. The 27,749 establishments reported an exposure of 6,122,000 employees with a total of 12,621,321,000 hours worked, and an injury total of 225,900. Of the reported injuries, deaths and permanent total disabilities accounted for about one-half of 1 percent, permanent partial impairments for about 5½ percent, and temporary total disabilities for the remainder, or 94 percent. As would be expected, most of the permanent partial injuries involved fingers or the hand. Injuries to these members accounted for 77 percent of the total of permanent impairments, impairments of the foot or toes for 7 percent, enucleation or impairment of vision for 5 percent, damage to arm or leg 3 percent each, and miscellaneous body impairments for the remainder. In the first rank, for having the highest percentage of lost or impaired fingers or hands, was the folding-box industry, with 94 percent, followed closely by the stamped and pressed metal products and the partitions, shelving, and store fixtures industries, each with 93 percent. The highest percentage of permanent injuries to legs occurred in the fertilizer industry, with 18 percent; and the logging industry came second, with 15 percent. Outstanding for high percentages of lost or impaired feet or toes were the fertilizer, petroleum-refining, soap, sugar-refining, logging, and special-industry-machinery industries. Eye impairments ranked relatively high in the ornamental metalwork, logging, pulp, and the brick, tile, and terra cotta manufacturing industries, and the streetcar and bus transportation.

Altogether, nearly 52,000 establishments with about 7,500,000 workers were covered in the Bureau's 1941 survey of both manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries. These employees worked during 1941 about 15,260,000,000 hours, and during that exposure suffered nearly 258,000 disabling injuries. Of these, 1,268 were deaths, 167 permanent total disabilities, 13,297 permanent partial impairments, and 242,958 temporary total disabilities.

Utilizing all available reports so as to have the largest possible exposure in each industry surveyed, the Bureau found that the logging industry in 1941 occupied its usual rank as the industry with the highest frequency rate, or 96.3 injuries per million hours worked. This means that there was approximately 1 injury for every 5 men employed throughout the year. Considerably lower, but still exceeding the rate of any other manufacturing industry were sawmills, with a rate of 54.5. Other manufacturing industries with frequency rates in excess of 30 were slaughtering and meat packing (30.9), fabricated structural steel (35.7), forgings (44.5), foundries (47.0), steam fittings and apparatus (32.5), planing mills (39.3), wooden containers (44.9), machinery-repair shops (35.8), corrugated boxes (32.7), fiber boxes (33.4), brick, tile, and terra cotta (38.2), concrete, gypsum, and plaster products (46.7), and cut stone and stone products (33.4).

Of particular interest is the experience of establishments manufacturing critical war materials. The explosives industry averaged only 5.7 disabling work injuries per million hours worked. In forgings and foundry establishments these averages were 44.5 and 47.0, respectively. Manufacture of ammunition averaged 32.1; of guns and related equipment, 29.8; shipbuilding, 26.4; manufacture of tanks, 18.3; and the aircraft industry, 10.4.

ESTIMATED FOR INDIVIDUAL INDUSTRIES

Continuing the practice started last year of providing general estimates of work injuries for individual manufacturing industries, the Bureau made similar estimates for 1941. The iron and steel group in itself was estimated to have had 74,300 disabilities, accounting for 7,000,000 lost man-days; the lumber-industries group followed, with 66,800 disabling work injuries, but with 7,250,000 lost man-days; the machinery group ranked third, with 56,600 injuries and 4,500,000 lost days; the food-products group came fourth, with 47,300 injuries and three and one-third million days lost; a close fifth in the number of injuries was the textile industry, with 45,200 disabilities and a time loss of not quite 3,000,000 days; the transportation-equipment group, sixth in rank, with 37,500 injuries, nevertheless ranked fourth in time lost, with nearly 4,500,000 days; the stone-, clay-, and glass-producing group, with 20,600 injuries, accounted for nearly 2,000,000 days of lost time. These seven groups of manufacturing industries are estimated to have had among them nearly 350,000 disabling injuries, involving 31,500,000 lost man-days.

Individual industries having lost time in excess of 1,000,000 man-days were iron and steel (2,259,000), foundries (1,483,000), general industrial machinery (1,229,000), motor vehicles and parts (1,313,000), shipbuilding, and aircraft manufacture. These six critical war industries alone are estimated to have

had 86,600 disabling work injuries (of which 520 were fatal) and a total of 8,820,000 days lost.

EXPOSURE, INJURY, AND FREQUENCY RATES

Comparison of the experiences of 21,422 manufacturing establishments indicates that the frequency of disabling industrial injuries per million hours worked was 14 percent greater in 1941 than in 1940. For the entire group of identical manufacturing establishments, disabling injuries went up 46 percent; employment, 21 percent; and employee-hours worked, 28 percent. In most individual industries the frequency rate changed upward, and in many the percentage of increase in injuries was two or more times as large as the increase in employment or employee-hours worked. Only 15 industries showed downward trends in frequency rates, whereas in 80 manufacturing industries the trend was upward. The greatest decrease in the frequency rate was that of 59 percent, in the explosives industry. The aircraft industry experienced a decrease of 20 percent; rayon and allied products, 16 percent; coke ovens, 12 percent; and women's clothing, 11 percent. All other decreases were less than 10 percent.

On the other hand, substantial increases in frequency rates were common. In the manufacture of forgings, the rate went up 40 percent; in foundries, 30 percent; tinware, 34 percent; confectionery, 45 percent; general industrial machinery, 29 percent; corrugated boxes, 62 percent; cement, 35 percent; and nonferrous smelting and refining, 35 percent.

In the iron and steel, forgings, and foundries industries, the increases in injuries far outstripped the increases in employment and exposure hours (i. e., employee-hours worked). In fact, this was true of practically all of the industries in the iron and steel products group.

In the important shipbuilding, metalworking machinery, and railroad equipment industries the increases in injuries were considerably in excess of the increases recorded in employment and employee-hours worked. Characteristic of this trend, the plants manufacturing rubber tires had an increase of 54 percent in injuries although employment and employee-hours worked increased only 17 percent and 26 percent, respectively. On the contrary, in the aircraft industry the proportionate increase in injuries was substantially less than the rise in either employment or in hours worked.

As a general rule, in both manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries, the addition of new employees and the working of longer hours resulted in disproportionately larger increases in industrial injuries.

For every million workers employed in manufacturing industries during 1941, 163 were killed, 25 were permanently and totally disabled from any gainful industrial pursuits, 2,060 suffered a partially crippling injury, and 34,646 were disabled for at least 1 day, and an average of 16 days.

Manufacturing industries experiencing more than 20,000 industrial injuries in 1941

Industry	Estimated number of injuries	Total man-days lost	Work hours, 8 hours per day
Iron and steel	74,300	7,048,000	56,384,000
Lumber	66,800	7,244,000	57,952,000
Machinery	56,600	4,441,000	35,528,000
Food products	47,300	3,372,000	26,976,000
Textiles	45,200	2,986,000	23,888,000
Transportation equipment	37,500	4,420,000	35,360,000
Stone, clay, and glass	20,600	1,896,000	15,168,000
Total work hours for year			[1] 251,256,000

[1] Divided by 12 it would make a total for each month of 20,938,000 work hours.

The Power-Trust Racket Goes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I pointed out that the Legislature of Arkansas had taken one of the most backward steps of this generation in voting down a bill to permit the municipalities of that State to own and operate their electric light and power systems.

We learn from the papers this morning that the Legislature of New York has now strained at a gnat and swallowed a camel. The mountain has labored and brought forth a mouse. Instead of going to the root of the troubles vexing the power consumers of New York, the legislature seems to have contented itself with a small bill tapping certain power companies on the wrist with reference to the volume of water used by them on the Niagara River.

This was done in the face of the fact that the people of the State of New York are overcharged $200,000,000 a year for their electricity, and the rates are so high that it cannot be used by the average householder for the purposes for which it was intended.

To be exact, in 1941 the people of the State of New York used 17,348,371,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $356,560,200. Under the Ontario rates, just across the Niagara River the cost would have been $157,171,157, or $199,389,043 less.

I know that the opposition will attempt to answer that statement by saying that the Ontario power system pays no taxes, which is true.

But let us see what difference that would make. In 1936, the last year for which we have the figures on this subject, all the private and public power concerns in the State of New York paid in taxes cash contributions and free services a total of $48,140,714, which taken from the overcharge in that State for 1941, would still leave a net overcharge of $151,248,329.

Just how the Legislature of New York could overlook this enormous burden to the power consumers of that great Commonwealth while dealing with this power question is one of the unsolved mysteries of the day.

Remember that these overcharges for the whole country in 1941, according to the Ontario rates, amounted to $1,301,409,970, and that all the taxes, cash contributions, and free services paid by the private and public power concerns throughout the entire Nation in the year 1936 amounted to only $303,734,203, which taken from the amount of these overcharges would still leave a net overcharge of approximately $1,000,000,000 a year.

These overcharges, as a rule, have gone to swell the coffers of those manipulators who own and control the vast, useless, holding companies that are now fastened upon the operating companies, and through them are fastened upon the electric power consumers in every State in the Union.

On August 22, 1942, the Securities and Exchange Commission belatedly issued an order requiring the dissolution of two of the subholding companies of the Electric Bond & Share Co. on the grounds that the continued existence of two such subholding companies violated section 11–B of the Holding Company Act of 1935. This order affected the existence of the American Power & Light Co. and the Electric Power & Light Corporation and is covered in S. E. C. file No. 59–12.

Previous to the issuance of this order the Securities and Exchange Commission held continuous hearings for over 2 years, during which time 18,000 pages of testimony were taken and over 1,500 exhibits were submitted. This voluminous record contains a mass of outstanding factual information. As a contribution to a better understanding of the Ebasco set-up I am giving a brief résumé of the facts as officially reported in these hearings.

The opinion of the S. E. C., based on sworn testimony, shows how the Electric Bond & Share Co., by the use of the so-called Mitchell plan acquired a heavy investment in operating companies without putting up any substantial funds. The Mitchell plan enabled Electric Bond & Share to acquire complete control of 237 operating companies, together with the right to participate in their earnings.

THE EVOLUTION OF A FINANCIAL PLAN

The evolution of the Mitchell plan shows how a few promoters, with a little actual cash investment on their part, gained control of a $3,250,000,000 concern and so manipulated paper subholding companies, without the use of officers, offices, and personnel, that the public was required to advance the money for the control over exorbitant profits. The record in this case presents an outstanding story of financial manipulation. The owners of this overall concern, with only a $25 investment were able to require the operating companies to return to them $13 in dividends, while as individuals, they sold these companies $308 worth of merchandise. After the sale of this merchandise, the promoters were then able to turn around and sell the completed property to the public for $117 while they still retained financial control and also retained the right to share in future profits, as though the business had never been sold.

In the case of Electric Bond & Share each dollar I have cited in this example represents $1,000,000 in the actual transactions, as is shown by the Securities and Exchange Commission's investigation of the Electric Bond & Share's books.

THE ELECTRIC BOND & SHARE SYSTEM

Under the Mitchell plan the Electric Bond & Share system can be compared to a 3-layer cake. The bottom layer consists of 237 operating utility companies doing business in 32 States.

These 237 operating companies serve one-tenth of the total population of the United States and manufacture approximately 13 percent of the energy generated and sold in this country.

The second layer of this hypothetical cake consists of five intermediate holding companies. These holding companies are the American Power & Light Co., the Electric Power & Light Corporation, the National Power & Light Co., the American & Foreign Power Co., and the American Gas & Electric Co. The top layer of this cake is the top holding company, the Electric Bond & Share, controlling an empire, with a consolidated balance sheet asset of nearly three and a half billion dollars. This is the largest single holding company registered with the S. E. C. The intermediate American company controls four operating companies in the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana. Representatives of Electric Bond & Share are now attempting to control the power division of W. P. B. which probably accounts for W. P. B.'s attitude toward the federally owned plants and R. E. A. projects. In addition, the American company controls 12 more companies operating in Arizona, Idaho, Florida, Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, Missouri, New Mexico, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and Texas. The intermediate American company serves or is served by a population of 2,700,000.

HISTORY OF ELECTRIC BOND & SHARE

The S. E. C. opinion brings out the fact that an exhaustive historical survey was made covering the organization and financing of the Electric Bond & Share system. At this point it would be well to quote the S. E. C. opinion:

> In particular, the historical survey clearly establishes that the sub-holding companies in their origin were artificial contrivances interposed by Bond & Share into the structure of the system to serve as pyramiding devices, that these companies have continued to perform this particular function down to the present time, and that they have not in the past served, nor do they now serve, any useful beneficial purpose.

As cited by S. E. C., the Bond & Share was organized under the laws of New York on February 27, 1905, by the General Electric Co., a leading manufacturer of electrical equipment. General Electric's purpose in financing Bond & Share seems to have been threefold: First, to realize as fully as possible upon the various securities which it had acquired in the process of selling its equipment; second, to obtain for itself a direct proprietary stake in a pomising young industry, with which it was already closely affiliated; third, to utilize the business it would acquire as a promotion factor in the utility industry, and to advance the sale of electrical equipment.

The General Electric Co. initially invested in Electric Bond & Share $1,300,000 in cash and $4,500,000 in securities. From time to time General Electric's investment was increased until it amounted to $25,000,000 in 1925.

The Senate in 1924 adopted a resolution directing the Federal Trade Commission to investigate this corporation's relationship, to determine whether these companies were attempting to monopolize and control the generation and transmission of electric power. As a result, in 1925, the General Electric Co. transferred its securities to another intermediate holding company called Electric Bond & Shares Security Corporation. The S. E. C. hearings indicate that between 1909 and 1925 General Electric received cash dividends from Electric Bond & Share amounting to $13,000,000 and sold equipment to the Bond & Share operating companies totaling $308,000,000. At the time of the transfer to Electric Bond & Shares Security Corporation, General Electric's investment in Electric Bond & Share represented a market value of $117,000,000.

MITCHELL PLAN

The first president and controlling spirit in the Bond & Share cake was Sidney Z. Mitchell who originated the so-called Mitchell plan. The S. E. C. in its opinion has the following to say regarding this plan:

> Indeed, the Mitchell plan seems to have contemplated at the outset, that through the effective use of the sub-holding company expedient, Bond & Share was to control its system with no investment except such as was represented by the time and talents of its executives; and it was only in recent years that the management of Bond & Share seems to have found it necessary or desirable to make some cash investments in the control securities of its system.

THE AMERICAN POWER & LIGHT CO.

The record in this case paints a clear picture of the operations of the Mitchell plan, by detailing its application to the organization of the "intermediate" holding company, American Power & Light.

In September 1909 the Electric Bond & Share Co. incorporated, under the laws of Maine, this intermediate holding company, known as the American Power & Light Co. A few months before the time of incorporation, Electric Bond & Share had acquired a controlling interest in five operating companies, four of which were located in Kansas and one in Oregon. This controlled interest in the five companies was purchased at a cost of $1,700,000. Shortly thereafter, Electric Bond & Share sold these five operating companies to a financial syndicate. At the time of this sale the American Co. turned over to the syndicate securities having a par value of about $8,000,000. The syndicate then immediately sold sufficient of these securities to raise two and a half million dollars in cash. The syndicate then gave Electric Bond & Share $1,800,000 in cash and returned to it the balance of the securities turned over to the syndicate. For these $8,000,000 worth of securities the American Power & Light received title to the control of the five companies which had initially cost Electric Bond & Share $1,700,000, of which only $500 was in cash. It might be well at this point to quote from the S. E. C. opinion describing the American transaction:

> It is thus apparent that Bond & Share had succeeded in realizing for itself complete working control of the new company and better than a 20 percent equity in it, after recovering every dollar of its investment in securities transferred to American, plus a cash profit of approximately $120,000. Otherwise stated, Bond & Share had sold out an 80 percent interest in the aforementioned security, recovering thereby its entire cost plus substantial profit without in any way parting with the control of such securities or of the property which they represented. * * *
>
> The obverse side of the coin must not be overlooked. American had issued $8,000,000 par value of its own securities to acquire $500,000 in cash and securities which had recently cost Bond & Share less than $1,700,000. The cash paid over to Bond & Share for the securities, and the profits realized by Bond & Share were furnished by the public which purchased "American" securities. Nevertheless, the control of the company rested firmly in Bond & Share's possession.

The same chain was followed in acquiring operating property, except that in this case the intermediate operating company became the seller, instead of the purchaser.

On page 24 of the S. E. C. opinion it is stated:

> The record established that the pattern used (Mitchell plan) in capitalizing the Kansas Co. became more or less the standard pattern of capitalization for operating companies throughout the Bond & Share system; namely, to write up the properties on the books, so that the holding companies would be reimbursed through sale to the public of bonds and preferred stock, leaving it the entire stock at no cost, or as close thereto as possible.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION'S FINDINGS

The Federal Power Commission also has investigated the write up of several of the Electric Bond & Share operating companies, which also bring out the effects of the Mitchell plan. Two of the operating companies investigated by the Federal Power Commission were the Northwestern Power Co., operating in Oregon, and the Pacific Power & Light Co., operating in the State of Washington. The Federal Power Commission's opinion in the Northwestern case, No. 53–A under date of April 14, 1942, gives the Commission's findings. In the case of the Northwestern Co., comparatively a small operating organization, the Commission found that $3,500,000 had been placed on this company's books as a bold deliberate write up and cannot be considered as valid entry under the legally prescribed uniform system of accounts. They thought that was "thievery within the law." The effect of the Federal Power Commission's order, in this case, reduces the book value of the Northwestern by $3,500,000. This order had been sustained by the courts, so it turned out to be thievery without the law.

A CHANGE IN THE PLAN

Prior to 1929 Electric Bond & Share acquired numerous small operating companies and combined them into large operating companies, while manipulating through the subholding companies. By 1929 there were no small companies left to purchase; therefore, if the Mitchell plan was to be continued, there must be a modification in the original plan. The late plan change is exemplified by Electric Bond & Share's 1929 acquisition of the Washington Water Power and the Montana Power & Light companies. In the acquisition of these

2 companies the subholding company, American Power & Light Co., issued to the public, preferred stock in the amount of $153,000,000, and then exchanged this preferred stock for the common stock of these 2 large operating companies. At the time of the acquisition the common stocks had a book value less than $84,000,000 and, as the S. E. C. points out, "In the case of the Montana Power Co., the record indicates that the common stock of $49,633,300 was substantially, if not entirely, balanced by inflation," which means watered stocks.

The effect of these Washington and Montana acquisitions upon the subholding companies' financial structures, and upon the security holders, is given on page 29 of the S. E. C. opinion, from which I quote:

It is evident that these two improvident purchases motivated apparently by an unreckoning determination on the part of the Bond & Share to increase the contours of its system, have contributed greatly to the present American financial difficulties. Dividend requirements on the preferred stocks issued by the holding companies in these transactions, equal $8,221,573 per year. This sum exceeded by $1,200,000 American's (American Power & Light) total net income after both interest and other charges in 1941, and was equal to more than 260 percent of the total income received by the intermediate holding company from the aforementioned two companies in 1941.

THE EFFECT ON CONSUMERS' RATES

On page 32 of the S. E. C. opinion the Commission sets out the effects of the Mitchell plan on consumers' rates. The Commission held, from the record, that obtaining control of such vast assets, with minor cash investments, resulted in a mechanical inflation of operating company book accounts. The mechanics of the Mitchell plan resulted in an intricate three-way transaction, which rendered rate regulation impossible by the various regulatory bodies, and this was in addition to robbing innocent investors. The problem of the regulatory agencies was further increased by the fact that the records of the subholding companies were so kept as to be outside the jurisdiction of the local regulatory bodies. Even Federal regulation was handicapped by the unavailability of essential records, as was brought out by the experience of the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission in attempting to proceed through orderly hearings and investigations. The record in the Electric Bond & Share case also shows that the holding companies knowingly employed tactics that obscured transactions affecting the operating company's rate base.

The hearings go further and set out ample proof that the write-ups were pushed into the rate base of the operating companies after the holding companies had received handsome, but manipulated, returns. The record of the hearings also illustrates, beyond question, how the burden of an inflated capital structure could be imposed on the rate payers.

The case of the Kansas Gas & Electric Co. also appears in the record. It was shown that for many years Ebasco and its intermediate holding companies received an annual return from the Kansas operating companies in excess of 30 percent on the actual investment and that during the entire 30-year period examined—namely, from 1910 to 1940—Electric Bond & Share returns averaged about 16 percent, even through the depression. In the case of the Portland Gas & Coke Co. the record shows annual returns, year after year, exceeding 43 percent. Also, in the case of the Nebraska Power & Light Co., Electric Bond & Share, with an established minus investment, received over $20,000,000 in dividends between 1917 and 1942.

FINANCING SALES

Throughout the record all the evidence shows that funds required to finance the transactions under the Mitchell plan were not furnished by Electric Bond & Share but were secured from sales to the public of bonds and preferred stocks issued against the operating companies to be acquired. These latter public sales were superimposed upon the operating companies' underlying securities, also held by the public.

In the 1929 modification of the Mitchell Plan, Electric Bond & Share ran into one obstacle, and that was that the preferred stocks of a number of operating companies carried voting rights. The Mitchell plan, however, provided for such eventuality through charter provisions. The charters of the intermediate Electric Bond & Share holding companies gave to Electric Bond & Share directors the right to issue additional common stock or divide existing stock issues. These charter grants thereby gave the directors of Electric Bond & Share Co. full latitude in the control of voting powers by the issuance of additional common stock and perpetual warrants, in any manner that the directors saw fit. As early as 1923, Electric Bond & Share adopted the practice of furthering stock control by issuing stock dividends.

Through all of these transactions and manipulations, Electric Bond & Share was able to exercise complete control over $3,500,000,000 with less than 2 percent actual ownership. What a racket.

CONCLUSION

This astounding S. E. C. record should be read by every Member of Congress in order that he may be advised as to the method used by the Power Trust to circumvent our National and State laws and to pass along these charges to an innocent public. Time after time the Power Trust, following congressional investigations, has promised to reform, but after having given such a promise, they reverted to their old practices or to more scientific modifications of them. This same Electric Bond & Share crowd seems to be running the Power Division of the W. P. B., and they place sizeable barriers against the progress of Federally owned power projects as a means of bringing all electric service to the home and farm and reducing electric rates.

In addition, every Member should read the Shelton articles in the St. Louis Post Dispatch and a résumé of the recent criminal trials in St. Louis, which resulted in North American officials being sent to the penitentiary for bribing public officials and for perjury. Nevertheless, this same bunch of North American manipulators have evidently induced certain local organizations in Washington, D. C., to publicly place a halo of righteousness around their heads when the executive department steps in to save a few dollars for the taxpayer.

The American people, in my opinion, will and should demand further action by Congress to stop such unlawful and unfair practices.

Stopping Waste in Agriculture

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this Nation in 1943 will produce food to the limit of their ability—hard work and long hours are accepted as part of the job. The acreages and numbers of animals cared for depend largely on the labor and machinery available. Mother Nature very probably will not be as kind as she was last year, and plant diseases, animal diseases, and insect pests will destroy part of the fruits of the farmer's labor.

While the American farmer is putting forth every effort to do his utmost on the food production front, it is hard for him to understand why his Government has made arrangements to spend millions of dollars in South America on a scheme to improve their crop and animal husbandry, and yet economizes and pinches pennies on projects that protect our own crops from preventable losses. Such a plan is now under way, and it is probable that crop specialists badly needed at home have already left this country on their way to remake South American agriculture.

England is plowing up many thousands of acres of grassland for food crops and we are providing much of the necessary farm machinery—tractors, plows, harrows, drills, and all kinds of harvesting equipment. All of this enables hundreds of shiploads of food to be produced within a few miles of where it is consumed. But the agriculturists of England are not sending their scientists to other countries, far from the home farms. They are not penny-wise and pound-foolish. They believe there is just as much value in protecting what they do raise and preventing losses to growing crops, as there is in increasing acreages. England has increased the number of their pathologists—plant and animal doctors — and entomologists — insect pest control men—400 percent since the war began.

It is time more attention was given to preventing waste in food products right here at home on the farms of the United

States. After that has been done, then there will still be plenty of time for thinking of new deals for South American agriculture.

Projects affecting the control of diseases and insect pests, both of plants and animals, are being neglected in this country; and yet millions of dollars are given to South American countries to improve their competition.

Pork production is a good example of how animals can be saved by proper care and prevention of disease. The average number of pigs saved per litter is slightly more than 6 for the United States. The average number born is between 8 and 10. Farmers that follow good hog sanitation procedure raise 8 and more per litter. The point is this—control disease with little extra trouble by following procedures long known to the Department of Agriculture and save an extra pig or two from every litter. Think what that means in pounds of pork in the United States. Much labor and feed would be saved because of not having to feed and care for as many sows to get the same production.

Many other examples could be mentioned as to how farmers and Government working together can save tons of food crops and thousands of animals by prevention of disease. Greater control of plant and animal diseases and insect pests deserves to be given immediate consideration by the Government. Today with every effort being made to increase the quantity and quality of most farm products, all the leaks—both large and small—must be stopped. No section of our Nation and no crop is safe from these saboteurs of the plant and insect kingdoms. Now is the time to demand that preventable diseases on the farm be given serious attention by those handling our food production strategy. Waiting until next summer will waste a year—action is needed now.

Government Subsidizing Rice Production in Cuba at Expense of United States Industry

REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, since we have opened the Seventy-eighth Congress, we have heard about the problems of many branches of agriculture, including farm labor, the need of agricultural implements, parity, ceilings, and today I am appearing in behalf of another important agricultural industry—the rice industry. I represent the largest rice-growing district in the United States, the center of which is Crowley, Acadia Parish, La., which is known as the "rice capital" of the United States.

In 1942 the State of Louisiana produced 7,687,777 barrels of rice, one of the finest and cheapest foods obtainable, and the major portion of this crop in normal times is shipped from Lake Charles, La. also in my district, one of the important ports of the United States also located in the midst of the rice-growing area where there are mills scattered throughout the area located such as to make it desirable to concentrate this rice for shipment to Puerto Rico and other parts of the United States and to all parts of the world, and due to the location of the Port of Lake Charles in this area, due to the fine system of concrete roads, excellent railway facilities, and the unusual facilities of the Port of Lake Charles, it costs less money, and much time is saved by the shipment of this important agricultural product through that port. Unlike many other agricultural crops, the expense of producing rice is tremendous. To grow rice, the farmer is obliged to make a large investment in land, deep wells for irrigation, and farm machinery for the harvesting of the crop, to say nothing of the millions invested in the rice mills to prepare the rice for market.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents have called to my attention an article which appeared in the January 17, 1943, issue of El Mundo, a newspaper published in Habana, Cuba, wherein it is stated that—

> Although this is being kept secret, it has become known that the United States Government has recommended to the Cuban Government the intensification of rice production in Cuba to a point where in 1943 and 1944 at least 90 percent of the consumption may be produced, following a plan previously made; and agricultural implements such as tractors, planters, and other essential equipment are in the United States ready for shipment to Cuba as needed.

I have taken this matter up with the various governmental agencies concerned by letter and have not yet received any reply, and now, Mr. Speaker, I am bringing this matter to your attention, as well as to the attention of the members of the various agricultural committees, fixed and special, and to the attention of the Members of Congress, as in addition to all of the confusion existing in directing the agricultural program from Washington, it is disheartening to learn that our Government is making secret arrangements with another country, subsidizing that country to the extent of $25,000,000, and furnishing them with all of the farm machinery which they need, when our farmers in all branches of agriculture are unable to obtain any agricultural implements and machinery in order to maintain an orderly production, to say nothing of increase the production of agricultural products so sorely needed at this time; to see the Government favoring the expansion of an industry in competition with one of the United States which exports $10,000,000 of this product to the country in point, and which district contributes so much in taxes to this Government. On behalf of the rice industry and my constituents in my district, I desire to register my protest and ask that the articles here be published in the RECORD.

[Translation of article which appeared in January 17, 1943, issue of El Mundo, Habana, Cuba]

THE UNITED STATES WILL COOPERATE IN RAISING TO 90 PERCENT OUR PRODUCTION OF RICE

Total importations of rice into Cuba during the last 40 years (from 1902 to 1941, both inclusive), reached the extraordinary amount of 13,653,313,751 pounds of rice, for which Cuba paid $437,882,272, which demonstrates the great importance of rice growing in our country, and the necessity of increasing cultivation thereof, in order to keep this large amount of money in Cuba, averaging $10,000,000 per year, thus strengthening even further our internal economy. In this connection the United States have offered their cooperation in order that in 1943 and 1944 local production of rice may be increased at least to 90 percent of our consumption.

Local production, constantly increasing, has permitted during the last few years a decrease in the number of pounds of rice imported, while the amount paid therefor has been increasing. Total importation in 1939 was 437,770,783 pounds, at a cost of $9,183,867. In 1940 importations reached the amount of 423,047,854 pounds at a value of $9,910,502; and although imports in 1941 of rice into Cuba reached only the amount of 397,503,137 pounds, we paid for this amount $14,269,565. Although 1942 figures are unknown, since their publication is prohibited because it constitutes a war secret, it has been determined that the price paid for the rice imported in 1942 is well above the price paid in previous years.

The advanced cost of our rice importations is due to the increased cost of production in the exporting countries, marine insurance, war-risk insurance, surcharge on freight, cost of insular invoices, bills of lading, brokers' commissions, consular fees, and import duties, all of which reflects on the retail price which in Cuba is already double what it was some months ago, and in other cases it is over 100 percent.

NEW ECONOMIC PHASE

Taking into consideration the increase in rice production in Cuba during the last few years, as we have explained in previous information, it may be considered that rice cultivation will mark a new era in the reconstruction of our agricultural economy, because total production may be absorbed by the country. In this manner as unemployment is relieved, our wealth is distributed among a large number of farmers whose farms can be used for this purpose.

CONSTRUCTION OF DAMS

The difficulties for extending the cultivation of rice consist primarily in the procurement of water to avoid the risk of losing the crops for lack thereof. Inasmuch as the irrigation system by pumps is extremely costly, the construction of small dams has been considered on several rivers to furnish irrigation by the law of gravity. This, of course, does not involve the construction of large dams, but the installation of dams in the most appropriate places in accordance with suitable lands available for the cultivation of rice.

In order to promote these plans, numerous projects have been made, and the following American engineers are in Cuba at present studying, on the spot, the above-mentioned projects: John D. Fitch, Wilfred L. Rowe, Arthur F. Johnson, together with the American Commercial Attaché, Paul G. Minneman, and Jose Garcia Montes, Cuban engineer. Their work has started in the Province of Pinar del Rio and will be continued in the other provinces. Surveys for the installation of a small dam are being carried out on the following

rivers: Cuyaguateje, Rio Hondo, and San Diego, in Pinar del Rio; Caonao, Arimao y Zaza, in Las Villas; Caonao y Maximo in Camaguey; y Buey, Yara, Bayamo y Cauto, in Oriente.

Should satisfactory conclusions be arrived at, the construction of small dams will not only increase the production of rice, but the benefits of irrigation may be extended to other crops which very often suffer heavy losses because of limited rainfall. In addition to that, hundreds of men would be employed on this project, earning good wages, contributing to relieve unemployment.

To finance the cost of this work, it is not necessary for the rice growers to contribute any capital, because the above-mentioned plan is included in the budget covering the development of public works and agricultural enterprises to be paid out of the $25,000,000 loan made with the Export-Import Bank.

PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

The cultivation of rice in Cuba lasts approximately 7 months. Planting starts in March or April, continuing as late as June or July, and would furnish employment to a good portion of our population in the event that we were able to produce almost the entire annual consumption, which amounts to 450,000,000 pounds.

INCREASED PRODUCTION

Although this is being kept strictly secret, it has become known that the United States Government has recommended to the Cuban Government the intensification of rice production in Cuba to a point where in 1943 and 1944 at least 90 percent of the consumption may be produced, following a plan previously made, of easy execution, so that in case the objective is attained the Allies may be in a position to supply enough food to the people of Europe and other continents after the war is over.

This enormous increase in production requires precisely large water supply, therefore studies are being made of the construction of small dams. But in addition, we need agricultural implements such as tractors, planters, and other essential equipment, which are in the United States ready for shipment to Cuba as needed.

Once rice production increase is accomplished, it will not diminish after the war is over. The difference between consumption and production will be covered by the quotas which will be imposed upon the countries from which rices are exported to Cuba, to guarantee definitely this agricultural industry to the nation.

Meat Shortage in California

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received by air mail, letters and clippings concerning the seriousness of the meat situation in my district and the entire State of California.

I hold in my hand a full-page ad advising of the action being taken by a packing house of my district to correct the situation.

I also have two articles from the Bakersfield Californian advising of the seriousness of the situation.

I personally have talked to the President, to Mr. Prentiss Brown and others whom I thought could be of assistance in correcting the conditions as now exist. Up to the present time I am sorry to say that the matter has not been corrected and I daily receive telephone calls, telegrams, and letters regarding the serious meat situation which still exists in the State of California and which is all due to the O. P. A. ceiling prices placed on meat.

I would like to read one paragraph of a letter sent by the Price Administrator, Mr. Brown, to the President.

There is no reason to deny that in many cases the price of livestock in California as well as in many other sections of the country is so high that a slaughterer cannot sell meat at the established ceilings without a loss. While many factors contribute to this situation, it is to a considerable extent due to the fact that black-market operators can afford to pay more for livestock than legitimate operators, and this factor has caused the live market to rise. Adequate enforcement of the meat restriction order and the price ceilings should have a corrective influence on these livestock prices.

The matters referred to follow:

[From the Bakersfield Californian of March 4, 1943]

THERE IS TOO MUCH CONFUSION ABOUT THE MEAT SITUATION

The story of this problem is a relatively simple one, and can be explained briefly as follows:

The stock raiser is paying higher prices for labor, feed, and other costs of raising and fattening his stock. He, therefore, must charge higher prices for his stock to the meat packer.

The meat packer is governed by price ceilings based on prices when costs were lower for livestock. The packer also is paying more for labor and other operating costs.

It is obvious that the packer cannot kill and dress meat at the same price as when costs were lower, without losing money. It has never been a policy of our democratic government to ask businessmen to lose money while supplying products vital to the winning of the war.

It is definite that we will not have as much meat as in peace times no matter what prices are paid, because large amounts are required for our armed forces and lend-lease purposes. However, the Government has agreed that 70 percent of our former meat supply should be available and Office of Price Administration quotas have been established on that basis. But due to the above-named conditions, Kern County markets have been getting only about 25 percent of their peacetime supplies.

It is the opinion of the organizations listed below that Congressman ELLIOTT's proposals to the President and the Office of Price Administration director, which call for a lifting of the price ceiling on the packer, should be supported. In order to more effectively support him, you are respectively requested to answer the questions listed below and return the coupon to the Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce, 1701 Chester Avenue, Bakersfield.

This statement endorsed by Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce; Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union, Local No. 193, and Kern County Retail Meat Dealers Association.

1. Do you want the meat markets of Kern County to close until meat rationing becomes effective? _____

2. Are you willing for the retail meat markets in Kern County to remain open and operate by paying prices to the packer allowing the packer a fair margin of profit? _____

3. Are you willing to pay a fair price for your meat consistent with today's livestock market prices and other production costs? _____

4. Are you in favor of meat prices at retail that will encourage the producer to produce more livestock so vitally needed? _____

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

(Please detach and give to your butcher or mail to the Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce, 1701 Chester Avenue, Bakersfield, Calif.)

[From the Bakersfield Californian of March 3, 1943]

KERN MEAT PACKER DEFIES OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION CEILING—TO BASE PRICES ON COST—KERN VALLEY PACKING CO. KICKS OVER FEDERAL STRUCTURES

Striking at Office of Price Administration price ceilings which they contend fail to take into consideration the high costs of livestock with the result that their firm and at least 85 percent of the butcher shops in Kern County are on the verge of being forced out of business, officials of the Kern Valley Packing Co. today were notifying customers that their prices from now on will be based solely on production costs.

"We want to continue carrying on our business in a legitimate, above-board manner and to continue distributing meat to the butcher shops in Kern County who are almost wholly dependent upon us for their supplies. For months we have been taking financial losses on every transaction while we wait for the Office of Price Administration to iron out the problems they have created. Now we've been forced to take the matter into our own hands," E. T. McAdams, manager of the packing firm, declared today.

In commenting on the stand taken by the Kern Valley Packing Co., H. L. Roy, president of the butchers' union, declared this morning:

"I believe I speak for practically all the butchers when I say that we are 100 percent in support of the packing firm's action. Anyone is absolutely justified in asking a fair price and that is exactly what Kern Valley is doing.

"While the major packers are working on a cost-plus basis and after the war will be reimbursed for their losses, the small independent packer who is endeavoring to keep care of the civilian trade is operating on a cost-minus basis.

"This step of Kern Valley's will do much to eliminate black-market dealings throughout the county and will make it possible for some people who have been without meat for weeks to get at least a meager supply. There won't be any surplus, but it will certainly help," the union official concluded.

"The prices we pay for livestock will be based solely on the daily quotations provided by the United States Department of Agriculture. We don't intend to pay any premiums, make any side collections, nor do any illegitimate trading, but we do want to be able to purchase meat through authorized channels, pass it on to our patrons, and still avoid financial ruin," Mr. McAdams said.

"On these livestock prices, which the Government approves as being fair, will be determined the price we ask our customers. We are notifying them of this policy and they may take what action they see fit," the packing company executive explained.

Packers throughout the Nation are being driven into bankruptcy because the Office of

Price Administration prices on dressed carcasses completely fail to take into consideration the high production costs they face, Mr. McAdams contended. Black-market operations which are flourishing throughout the Nation are the outgrowth of such regulations, according to testimony brought out at the State congressional hearings, he declared.

In speaking of future deliveries, Mr. McAdams stated that the Kern Valley Packing Co. would like to kill up to its quotas, but that it is almost impossible to get livestock because the cattlemen have no assurance that they can get prices for their products which will make it possible for them to operate.

[From the Bakersfield Californian of March 4, 1943]

STATE MEAT INDUSTRY WATCHES PACKER-OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION ROW IN KERN—MEAT WAR HANDED TO LEASK—NEXT MOVE UP TO STATE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION DIRECTOR AS CEILING FLOUTED

Action the Office of Price Administration may take on the precedent-shattering announcement yesterday by the Kern Valley Packing Co. that production costs and not the Office of Price Administration regulations will govern meat prices was watched closely throughout the State and by other parts of the Nation today by meat wholesalers and retailers. "The matter has been referred to the State Office of Price Administration director, Samuel Leask, Jr., since the packing company's stand is far more than a local issue," Henry DeLacy, Office of Price Administration field representative here, declared today.

Spokesman from the Office of Price Administration office announced that an investigator from the legal department of the Government agency was expected to arrive in Bakersfield from Los Angeles today but added that his visit had been planned before the Kern Valley announcement was made and the local office did not know whether he would make an investigation into the packing company's action today.

NO ACTION

"We have heard nothing from the Office of Price Administration in regard to the matter," E. T. McAdams, manager of the firm, announced this morning.

"We waited as long as we could for the Office of Price Administration to solve the problem but we can't continue to sit on the fence waiting while various experiments are carried on about the meat shortage," Mr. McAdams said.

"From now on, our prices will be based solely on production costs, the whole business will be carried on in an above-board manner and we don't intend to pay any side collections or carry on any illegal transactions to get our meat.

"We will, however, make every attempt to get enough livestock to fill our quota at published United States Department of Agriculture quotations. If we are allowed to do this we will have far more meat to supply our patrons and the whole situation will be greatly improved," the packing company executive declared.

Wholehearted backing of the "courageous stand" taken by the company was expressed by market managers, butchers, and consumers this morning while representatives of national meat distributors announced that they were "watching with great interest the outcome of the matter for it would undoubtedly affect packers throughout the Nation."

"I certainly hope Kern Valley's action works for it will have a far-reaching effect on solving the whole meat problem and changing the present price structures," a spokesman for one of the outside packers said.

TEST CASE

That the outcome of this "test case" is being eagerly awaited was evident in the statement of another packing company representative when he commented, "I'm watching this thing with keen interest. Frankly, I'm amazed at their announcement but I'm certainly in sympathy with it."

With an optimism that has not been seen since the structure of Kern County's meat industry began to collapse several months ago, butchers and dealers throughout Bakersfield discussed the outlook for the future.

The possibility that they, too, may be in difficulty if the Office of Price Administration cracks down on Kern Valley seemed to be of little worry to managers of butcher shops with whom the firm does business.

Between 85 and 90 percent of the county's meat markets are estimated to be almost totally dependent on the Bakersfield firm for their meat deliveries and as a result steps taken by the latter or any action that the Office of Price Administration may take on the case will immediately be reflected in the meat business throughout the county.

H. L. Roy, president of the Butchers Union, declared that he believed he spoke for practically all the butchers in saying that they were 100 percent in support of the packing firm's policy.

ENDORSE STAND

"We are endorsing Kern Valley's stand and I think nearly everybody is willing to take a chance on the outcome," he commented in discussing possible Office of Price Administration action.

When and how much markets may raise their retail meat prices as the result of paying the wholesaler more is still a matter of conjecture among dealers.

At present most markets would be happy if they could break even and they would gladly absorb some of the probable price increase if they could get meat and stay in business, one manager stated.

That the public is far more concerned with the supply of meat than with the price to be paid was shown in comments made by Bakersfield housewives.

NEED MEAT

One of them aptly expressed the opinion of many consumers when she said: "What we want is meat. We don't want to buy it through black markets where we have no assurance that it was properly handled but we do want to go to our butcher and find that he has something to offer. If he has to charge us more, that's all right as long as he has something to sell."

"The whole basis of the trouble will be corrected if Kern Valley is allowed to carry its plan," one butcher declared.

"There won't be any surplus meat but there will be far more available for people who haven't had any for weeks, the black market dealings will slump, and once more we'll be able to go to work, knowing we'll have something to sell our customers instead of wondering how much longer we'll be able to keep our jobs."

Indicative of the general feeling of market managers who see in the Kern Valley's announcement a straightforward plan to make it possible for the firm itself and their customers to continue in business are these comments:

DEALERS' COMMENT

Murray M. Bierman, Food City: "More power to them. This action should bring the whole matter to a head and alleviate a lot of trouble. After all the people make up the Government and this is the kind of thing they want done. They are willing to pay for the meat."

W. P. Gold, Consumers Meat Co.: "The only solution. If Kern Valley is able to slaughter up to its quota considerable relief from the shortage will result. Somebody has to take the lead and expedite matters. Operating your business at a loss is not the American way of doing business."

Manager at Security Market: "The only stand to take. It's the right thing to do and the only trouble is it should have been done sooner."

To prove that his contention that production costs have skyrocketed since the ceilings on dressed meat were set Mr. McAdams quoted the following figures based on records of the Kern Valley Packing Co.:

"At the time of the December 16 Office of Price Administration ceilings on beef carcasses and wholesale beef cuts, we were paying 13½ cents for steers, 13 cents for heifers, and 9½ cents for cows. On our last purchases, and supplies were very limited, 15 cents was paid for steers, 14 cents for heifers, and 11½ cents for cows.

"When the Office of Price Administration ceilings was placed on pork cuts on November 2, 15 cents was paid for live hogs as compared to 16 cents today.

"At the time of the mutton ceilings on December 23, live costs for lambs were 14½ cents, and 7 cents for mutton. Today we are still working on last year's lambs but we are confronted with prices of 14½ cents on lambs and 8 cents for mutton.

"Feed costs as of January 1942 were compared by Mr. McAdams with the same date this year to show the advance in this line.

"In the past 3 months these prices have continued to climb and hay and other feeds have grown increasingly scarce," he pointed out.

1941 PRICES

"In January 1941 10 cents was being paid for live feeder steers to be put in the feed yards; a year later the price was 12½ to 13 cents. Similar comparisons show $39 a ton for 43-percent cottonseed meal a year ago, $16.50 for hay, $35 for barley, and $4 a day for labor."

Mary Had a Little Lamb!

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, at 9:59 o'clock this morning, March 8, 1943, a special messenger delivered me a letter, dated March 6, 1943, from Mr. Frank L. Walton, director, Textile Clothing and Leather Division, W. P. B.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the letter in my remarks, and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the letter referred to follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1943.

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This morning's newspaper quotes your verse about an Idaho

sheep rancher who was advised to change his lambing season because no canvas could be made available to him for shelter at the present time.

I have checked carefully in my division, which would handle such an application for priorities for canvas, and can find no one who received such a request or could have written such a letter. If there is a rancher who needs canvas for this purpose, I believe that it can be made available, and I shall be glad to handle the request myself.

As a matter of fact, a similar story has been going around for months. In its earliest version, the story concerns wire which was needed for a fence for unborn lambs and the rancher was supposed to have been told that unborn lambs did not need a fence. Then the material was changed to lumber, and now it is canvas.

Your tale about the little lambs
Has moved our hearts with pity;
We liked your rhymes and like to see
A Congressman so witty.

But while it really seems a shame
To spoil so good a story,
We like to keep our head unbowed
Although at times it's gory.

We haven't undertaken yet
To change the ways of nature,
So please inform your colleagues
In the National Legislature.

That while we may appear sometimes
To lack both rhyme and reason
We really didn't tell the ewes
To change their lambing season.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANK L. WALTON,
Director, Textile, Clothing, and Leather Division.

Believing in fair play, I have asked that the letter be inserted in the RECORD in order that the reply may have the same publicity as my comments on the news item from the Associated Press. I had assumed that the Associated Press, which is usually pretty accurate, knew what it was printing when it gave the public the answer the western sheep raiser is supposed to have received suggesting that the lambing season be postponed. Then, too, having actual knowledge of some of the foolish and unheard-of things some of the "wonder boys" have been doing, the news item, I thought, kind of fitted into their scheme of things. I am indeed glad to know that Mr. Walton is unable to find such an answer, and unless some sheep raiser turns up with such an answer I will assume that no such answer was made.

In this connection I want to make another statement. I understand that Mr. Walton is an experienced and practical textile man and that he has rendered a real outstanding service in connection with our war effort. This being true, I am persuaded that if such an answer was made that it was made without his knowledge, and I want him to know that I do not class him among the "wonder boys."

And permit me to congratulate Mr. Walton upon his poetic replication. It is so good that I will not attempt a rejoinder. I confess that I am not in his class as a poet, and if I have any further dealings with him I will stick to plain, unadulterated prose. A fellow usually gets into trouble when he gets to grazing in the other fellow's pasture.

Mr. Speaker, my sole object in jumping on these wonder boys is to see if we cannot get a little common sense into some of our governmental set-ups. Everyone who has had any experience with some of our boards and bureaus knows that some of them are rotten and lousy and have caused a bogging down on the home front. I know that it is mighty hard to set up all the governmental activities that the war has forced upon us without making mistakes. I know by and large we have, in spite of the wonder boys, wrought miracles. Especially do I take my hat off to industry and labor. They have put over in a great way a real production job. But, Mr. Speaker, there can be no earthly excuse for putting in a directive position these impractical, visionary wonder boys, that do not know what it is all about. And there is no earthly excuse for letting these wonder boys interfere with our food for victory program. It is indeed encouraging to know that at long last the O. P. A. is going to be cleaned out. I think Senator Prentiss Brown and Senator Herring are capable of doing a real job. If they do they will hear nothing but praise from me. If they do not, then I expect to keep on hammering away until we get things clicking in the O. P. A. in the good old American way. And it is also encouraging to see that at long last the food for victory program is being tackled in a sensible way. It has taken some a long time to wake up to the seriousness of our farm program and to realize that farming is a war industry—just as much as a munitions factory, or a plane or tank factory—and will have to be given the right-of-way just like any other war industry.

Yes, Mr. President, it looks like we are beginning to get the ants out of Uncle Sam's breeches.

Jurisdictional Strikes

REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, last week I called the attention of the House to an article appearing in the Herald under the title "Union Halts Work at Rubber Plant," and obtained consent to put this article in the RECORD.

Through the good offices of the International News Service, I checked back on this proposition and found that the strike was caused because members of the American Federation of Labor International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers moved an electric pole which had been installed by members of an independent union called the Independent Union of Duquesne Light Company Employees. The independent union called the strike. The strike was settled when the independent union paid to move the light pole back to the original location and then move it again to the spot where the contractor wanted it. The strike started when the independent union pulled the power switches and lasted for an hour.

After this the leader of the independent union called the light company and told them flatly that if the switches were thrown back he would cut off the main power line.

The article I refer to follows:

UNION HALTS WORK AT RUBBER PLANT

PITTSBURGH, March 2.—Electric power was shut off at the vital Kobuta rubber plant of the Koppers Co. at near-by Monaca this afternoon because of a dispute between two unions.

George Miller, president of the Independent Union of Duquesne Light Co. employees, said he ordered the power shut off and warned that if any effort is made to restore the current, he will order his men to cut the supply lines leading into the vital war plant.

The power turn-off came, Miller said, because members of the American Federation of Labor International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers moved an electric pole which had been installed by members of the independent union.

He said he had warned against moving the pole, and when his warning was not heeded, he ordered the switches thrown at the plant and locked.

The electric power is needed to continue construction work at the plant, designed to turn out synthetic rubber for the war effort.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the production of rubber in this country is a vital part of our Nation's war effort—the workers building synthetic rubber plants and making machinery to equip them—yes, and those making rubber are engaged in the war effort.

Yes; they are as actively engaged in this effort as are men in uniform who might be throwing up a breastwork, or those who might man a lifeboat.

Mr. Speaker, if a soldier in uniform were to stop a group of his fellows from throwing up a breastwork, or if a marine or sailor would prevent the casting of a life line to his comrades, what would they be guilty of? The ugly word "treason" fits it best.

The man or men who were responsible for the situation depicted in this article of news are no less guilty.

A wounded American soldier, or a drowning marine, may be better able to arouse you than I, a fellow Member of this House. But we, the House of Representatives, are, too, a vital part of our country's war effort if we do our duty.

We must stop this sort of silly inconsiderate and unprincipled sabotage.

It is definitely our job. We are responsible for the power to stop this sort of racket being in other hands. We still have the power to do something about it. If we do not, and knowing by the record that those who should and could, will not, we will be doubly to blame and doubly guilty.

The boys over there, everywhere, will mourn many a buddy whose blood will be on our hands.

Post Office Employees Entitled to Consideration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads H. R. 1366 and a number of other bills having for their purpose the giving of long-deferred consideration to the need of increased pay to post office employees. It is well known that for 17 years Congress has neglected to provide any increases in the pay of these very deserving Federal workers. I trust that legislation will be brought up for consideration before us in the early future, covering this entire subject and giving relief to all of the employees in this branch of the Federal service and that such a measure will receive the full support of this body as well as the other branch of the Congress and the approval of the President.

As a part of my remarks, I include the following arguments showing the merits of this proposed legislation:

[From the Boston Sunday Post of August 10, 1941]

CLERK'S FAMILY NEEDS INCOME OF $2,898.10 ANNUALLY

BERKELEY, CALIF.—A clerk's family of five, living in San Francisco, Calif., and surrounding area, must spend $2,898.10 annually in order to live on a standard of health and decency. This was reported here by the Heller committee of the University of California for research in social economics under the direction of Dr. Emily Huntington, associate professor in social economics. Budget is based on prices of March 1, 1941.

SINCE MARCH 1, 1941, COST OF LIVING UP 20 PERCENT—COSTS $6 FOR EVERY $5 SPENT 2 YEARS AGO

WASHINGTON, January 3.—You need $6 today for every $5 you spent 2 years ago to meet the cost of living.

The Federal Reserve Board said tonight the cost of living was about 20 percent higher than in the period of virtual stability from 1939 to early 1941.

[From America of April 18, 1942]

NEGLECTED WORKERS

No public servants are more faithful, hardworking, and deserving than the employees of the Post Office Department. We are not speaking of the higher officials in the Department, nor of the postmasters who have been appointed for reasons that were purely political. The men we have in mind are the office workers, the clerks behind the windows who answer our foolish questions or patiently explain why it is unwise to send fragile articles in pasteboard boxes and the carriers who trudge early and late through heat and cold to deliver your letters.

There are nearly a quarter of a million of these public servants in post offices of the first- and second-class. Considering their work and the responsibilities attached to it, their wages are poor. Advancement in the service is slow and the maximum pay will make no man rich. These workers are too few in number and too widely scattered throughout the country to exert any political influence. They have an American Federation of Labor union, but it does not seem strong enough to stand up and battle effectively for them. They cannot strike and in common with other civil-service employees, their right to bargain collectively is nonexistent. They take what is granted them by Congress and live in the hope, not always fulfilled, that by economizing on every penny, they can buy food for their families, keep little Johnny and Mary properly clothed, and even, fondest hope of all, put aside a reserve for a rainy day.

It is to be regretted that the bill introduced in Congress for their relief has gone on the rocks. Possibly the bill introduced was so drawn that the presidential veto was inevitable. If so, another bill that will meet all technicalities should be introduced at once. A letter to your Congressman and Senator will help to do this.

We make that suggestion because with the rising costs of living the lot of these worthy public servants will become much harder. They see workers of all kinds demanding higher wages and getting them by pressure methods, which they as Federal employees cannot use and would not use if they could.

The nub of their case is that they are penalized for faithful service.

We have not been asked to make this appeal.

But we make it gladly since these workers have so few to speak for them.

THE PATIENT POSTMAN

Any general impression that the long-sought wage increase for post-office workers was accomplished by passage of the Mead-Ramspeck bill will be promptly dispelled when the public examines the terms of that feeble stopgap.

The Seventy-seventh Congress, in effect, evaded the issue with a meaningless gesture.

The Mead-Ramspeck bill merely provides extra pay for overtime work.

This will help a few clerks who put in long hours during the holiday rushes, but the majority of postal employees do not work overtime.

Fortunately, the makeshift bill expires on April 30.

There is opportunity for the new Congress to reopen the matter with honesty and sincerity and justice.

The postal personnel has not had a wage increase since 1925.

Instead they have had pay cuts—in 1932 and 1933.

Add to this direct cut the factor of rising prices during the 17 intervening years, and we have not only a financial crisis for the loyal, experienced, and patient postmen, but a gross injustice against them.

It is an obvious fact that in wartime the services of communication are vital to the Nation and that the post office is the core and soul of communications.

To ignore the needs and deserts of postal workers, to force them into other kinds of war work where they receive decent wages and fair treatment, is deliberately to injure this vitally essential service.

The last Congress, and several Congresses before, have hemmed and hawed, procrastinated, quibbled, and finally awarded a stone where bread was wanted.

Timid and time-serving legislators found it convenient and safe to ignore a body of invaluable public servants who could not strike nor lobby nor exert pressure in other ways.

But the same legislators found it necessary at the same time to give preferential treatment to other labor groups who could and did strike, lobby, and turn other necessary screws.

The Mead-Ramspeck bill should be allowed to expire without regret or help.

It should be replaced by a practical, generous, and equitable measure, giving the postal people what they deserve and what they need in order to live.

This is not only just, but sensible.

It is the only way the Seventy-eighth Congress can correct the economic and social myopia that notably, in this instance, marred the action of its predecessor.

An Arkansas Ex-Congressman Attacks Congressman Dirksen of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 5, 1943, there appeared on page 8 of the Peoria (Ill.) Star an account of the meeting held in the city of Peoria which was addressed by former Congressman Clyde T. Ellis, of Arkansas.

He took me to task for an alleged attack on the Rural Electrification Administration and by inference of being associated with a so-called Power Trust.

The remarks of ex-Congressman Ellis, as reported in the article which follows, are such a departure from truth and such a deliberate distortion of facts and such a violation of the executive nature of an appropriation subcommittee by some administrative official of the Rural Electrification Administration that the matter calls for a reply.

The entire article is as follows:

CHARGES VICIOUS ATTACK ON RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—DIRKSEN CRITICIZED BY CO-OP SPEAKER

Life of the Rural Electrification Administration is threatened and only this week was attacked viciously in the House Appropriations Committee, warned Clyde T. Ellis, of Washington, D. C., here Thursday at a meeting of the Illinois Association of Electric Cooperatives at Hotel Pere Marquette.

A former Congressman from Arkansas who is now executive manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Mr. Ellis told 200 or more Illinois farmers and rural power officials that a quarter of a million dollars was dropped from the Federal Power Commission appropriation and that the National Resources Planning Commission failed to get a dime.

"Only yesterday Congressman EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Pekin, made a vicious attack on the Rural Electrification Administration before the House Appropriations Committee," the national manager said in response to a question from the meeting on the attitude of Illinois Congressmen toward the rural light and power cooperatives.

Of Congressman DIRKSEN Mr. Ellis said: "I think he is one of the ablest men in Congress, but you never see anyone espouse the cause of the Power Trust unless he is an able man. DIRKSEN for the last 4 years has been leading the fight against the Rural

Electrification Administration, and he has indicated it should be destroyed."

The assembly went on record for continuation of the Rural Electrification Administration and expansion after the war, asserting it can make a greater contribution to the war effort with proper support in Washington. Officials were instructed to ascertain the attitude toward the Rural Electrification Administration.

Deemed too controversial for the meeting, a proposal by Ray Eiten, of Princeton, to push the clocks back an hour was defeated by the assembly.

Before he concluded his remarks the national manager mentioned numerous dams either built or to be built on the Illinois, Fox, Rock, Mississippi, and Ohio Rivers, and observed that Illinois has one of the highest average power rates in America with about the least excuse.

He said the dams have a potential capacity of 2,350,000 kilowatts to produce 8,900,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year, and cited records of the Federal Power Commission showing that present capacity is 48,370 kilowatts with a production of 207,900 kilowatt-hours a year.

Twenty Illinois cooperatives were represented at the meeting.

First let me say after canvassing the situation this morning that ex-Congressman Ellis, who is the executive manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association with present offices in the Continental Hotel in Washington, D. C., could only have learned that officials of the R. E. A. were testifying before the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations from some member of the R. E. A. administrative staff. A canvass of all those present in the course of the hearings indicates that only from the R. E. A. officials themselves could any observations have been obtained with reference to what transpired in the committee room and it is surpassing strange that while Members of Congress carefully refrain from revealing any actions taken by the subcommittee or of testimony taken by the subcommittee to avert the pressure which is so often exercised by agencies of Government if appropriations are diminished, yet the witnesses who are administrative officials of Government apparently feel free to sally forth and disclose things which transpire in the executive sessions of such a committee and aggravate the offense by resorting to falsehood.

On March 8 when the committee resumed its sessions at 10: 30 in the morning, I presented the clipping to the committee and requested that Mr. Ellis be summoned before the subcommittee to make a statement as to the source from which he obtained his information and to verify the deliberate distortion of fact contained in the statements which he made in Peoria.

First, let me affirm that I have supported the rural electrification program and shall continue to do so. At the same time let me state that I propose with all the vigor at my command to compel the officials of the Rural Electrification Administration to carry out that program in conformity with the intention of Congress as written in the statute under which the R. E. A. operates. I intend also with whatever talent and vitality I possess to make it an honest, efficient agency in its operations, and reveal to public view any wrongdoing or misfeasance by its officials.

The hostility of certain R. E. A. officials is not very difficult to understand. Two years ago when one of the deputy administrators furnished various information to the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations I first compelled R. E. A. to certify that information and then promptly caused an investigation to be made through the General Accounting Office, the Personnel Office of the Department of Agriculture, and through the investigation staff of the Secretary of Agriculture.

As a result of that investigation, the Secretary of Agriculture caused a thorough investigation to be made and that investigation sustained every allegation and every contention which I made at the time and resulted in the dismissal of Mr. Kendall Foss, Chief of the Information Division of R. E. A.; a reprimand and a 30-day suspension for Mr. W. Lyle Sturtevant, budget officer of the R. E. A.; and a reprimand for Mr. Robert B. Craig, the Assistant Administrator.

If this requires verification, it will be found on page 11 of the committee report which accompanied the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1943, which reads as follows:

INTEGRITY OF SOURCES OF INFORMATION OF COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS

Last year the committee in its report called attention to the failure of the Rural Electrification Administration to submit complete and accurate information on the matter of administrative promotions and stated that it was "of such grave importance that the committee believes it should be called to the attention of the House."

Since then there has been a further investigation by the Secretary of Agriculture, who made a report to the subcommittee on November 15, 1941, in which he stated:

"At the outset, let me say that the investigation fully supported Mr. DIRKSEN's contention that the promotion figures submitted by the Rural Electrification Administration to the Director of Personnel of this Department, which formed the basis of the Director's report to Mr. DIRKSEN, were inaccurate and incomplete. The investigation further revealed that equally inaccurate and incomplete promotion figures were submitted by the Rural Electrification Administration to the Bureau of the Budget."

Disciplinary action has been taken by the Department. In the case of Robert B. Craig, Assistant Administrator, the Secretary reports that "a severe letter of reprimand and warning has been addressed to Mr. Craig."

In the case of Mr. Kendall Foss, Chief of the Information Division of Rural Electrification Administration, the Secretary states that:

"At the very outset he 'invented' a scheme designed to thwart the submission of complete information that had been requested. * * * Charges looking to his removal from the service have been preferred against Mr. Foss."

In a subsequent report to the committee, dated February 9, 1942, the Secretary states:

"I have signed a decision finding that the charges are sustained and removing Mr. Foss from his position in this Department, effective at the termination of his last day of service, January 30, 1942."

In the case of Mr. W. Lyle Sturtevant, budget officer of the Rural Electrification Administration, the Secretary's report states:

"Mr. Sturtevant has been severely reprimanded and his suspension from duty without pay for a period of 30 days has been ordered."

The Secretary further advised the committee that:

"The foregoing information came as a distinct shock to me, and you may be sure that the Department will not tolerate the submission of false or misleading information to any committee of Congress or any Member thereof."

The Secretary is to be commended for this expeditious, forthright, and resolute disposition of this regrettable matter.

Note the severity of the Secretary's language when he speaks of "inaccuracies" and schemes and that these revelations were a distinct shock. I wonder what farmer-members of R. E. A. cooperatives think of such a situation existing among the high officials who administer R. E. A.

Here then is conclusive proof of misinformation submitted to a committee of Congress which involved the integrity of the committee proceeding and manifestly R. E. A. officials have felt hostile ever since. Notwithstanding such hostility I propose to do my duty for the taxpayers of the country by revealing malfeasance in Government whenever it comes to my attention and by prosecuting with determination any wrongdoers.

Turning now to the attack which was made upon me by an ex-Congressman from Arkansas, it might be interesting in the interest of truth to see how far he permitted his bias and prejudice to distort the facts. The fact that he referred to me as "one of the ablest men in Congress" does not mitigate the degree of his offense in departing from the truth.

When the printed record of the committee hearing is made public, in the near future, it will be obvious to anyone that the Honorable MALCOLM C. TARVER, of Georgia, was the first member of the subcommittee to express an interest in the operations of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the sources of its funds, the scope of its operations, and the question whether or not members of the rural cooperatives were aware of the use to which such funds were devoted.

In due time it was my privilege to cross-examine Mr. Slattery, the R. E. A. Administrator; Mr. Craig, the Deputy Administrator; and Mr. Nicholson, also a Deputy Administrator, along the same lines. Among other things, I requested to know whether Mr. Ellis, as executive manager of this association, was receiving $12,000 per year. I wanted to know whether Mr. Craig, Mr. Slattery, or Mr. Nicholson had anything to do with the creation of this cooperative association. I wanted to know whether or not the dues paid into the association were $10 for each cooperative and 10 cents for each cooperative member, which, on the basis of 1,008,000 members, would provide an annual revenue of $108,000 which the association might obtain from farmers and expend to maintain a Washington office. I wanted to know whether it was true

that the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association held a meeting at St. Louis on January 19 to which a number of celebrities, including Members of Congress, had been invited with expenses paid. I wanted to know whether the R. E. A. had inspired the association to venture into the insurance business and that insurance men in Arkansas and Illinois had filed protests against this venture. I wanted to know whether Mr. Slattery was identified in any way with the association and whether or not it was receiving his support and then read into the record a letter dated June 29, 1942, over the signature of Mr. Slattery, which speaks for itself and which follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE, RURAL
ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,
St. Louis, Mo., June 29, 1942.

Mr. STEVE T. TATE,
President, National Rural
Electric Cooperative Association,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TATE: It was a real pleasure to meet with you and your executive committee—Messrs. Stoneman, Edmunds, Jackman, and Walker—representing the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and to have the fine talk we had.

Your program as outlined to me during this conference and the presentation of the by-laws and objectives seemed to me to promise the fulfillment of the purpose of the Rural Electrification Administration, that is, as you well know, electric service to every farm home in this country. It is a great source of satisfaction to me personally that, as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, I have had a part in the partial fulfillment of this ideal, now with the assistance of those in your organization who have received power we can, through this great cooperative effort, fully electrify the rural areas of this country.

Of course, during the period of this present national crisis, our hopes for actively carrying on the extension of this program must be retarded in part. I am proud, however, to say that during the war your great objective is to have your members through the instrumentality of your association pledging your every endeavor to the winning of this conflict and the achieving of early victory. Working together with the members of your great organization and the friends of rural electrification everywhere, we will be on guard to see that this fine national program is not destroyed by selfish interests or political maneuvers.

The 1,000,000 farm members in your association wisely cooperating together can be a great force for victory and an ever defender of democratic morale and ideals. No matter how perfect the civilization or now politically organized it is to protect the freedoms of little men, history has shown that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." With this in mind and deeply appreciating the motives and ideals which have impelled the organization of this association, I want to pledge to you my every effort and assistance that together we can achieve the great purposes of our President and the Congress of the United States when they created the Rural Electrification Administration.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY SLATTERY,
Administrator.

These and other questions are pertinent to the hearings conducted by the subcommittee on Agriculture appropriations because Congress appropriates all the funds for salaries and expenses of R. E. A. and funds for loans and advances. This involves the use of funds by cooperatives and is a very proper matter of investigation by a committee which is charged with the responsibility of examining into the whole operation of the R. E. A. program.

These questions were regarded evidently by some R. E. A. administrative official as a "vicious attack on R. E. A." and that information was communicated by such official to ex-Congressman Ellis who without verification then undertakes to make it appear that I have made an attack on this agency.

I would be derelict in my duty as a public representative if I failed to explore into every operation of government that time will permit in order to safeguard public expenditure and procure wherever possible the utmost efficiency and economy in governmental operations. The whole story has not been written as yet and will not be until ex-Congressman Ellis appears before the subcommittee and explains the source of his information. At that time I shall have more to say about this matter and will put "the lie" where it belongs.

Introduction of the Science Mobilization Bill in the House of Representatives

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the science mobilization bill in the House of Representatives because in my opinion it is one of the most significant pieces of legislation to grow out of the current critical period in American history. It was introduced in the Senate by Senator KILGORE and is S. 702 in that body. My bill is H. R. 2100. The bill is aimed directly at conditions which are hampering our prosecution of the war. In addition, it has wholesome implications with relation to the reconstruction period which will follow the war.

A group of forward-looking Members of the House and Senate sponsored similar bills in the Seventy-seventh Congress. This new bill is a revised and improved version of those. It has been strengthened by following the advice and counsel of numerous scientists, technologists, and other Government and industrial leaders, many of whom testified before the Kilgore Senate committee during hearings on the bill in the Seventy-seventh Congress.

The bill is designed to eliminate the confusion which has arisen from conflict between multitudinous Government agencies having to do with scientific and technological matters. Through coordinating the work of these existing agencies it would prevent overlapping of functions and, even more important, fill in the wide gaps in our technological war work.

Of particular significance in the new bill are its bolstered provisions for assistance in the development of local and regional resources through use of small and medium sized production plants, and assistance to independent inventors and researchers who have no means for carrying their ideas to completion.

The new bill also looks to the post-war period in more certain terms. That is, it proposes to keep the Office of Scientific and Technical Mobilization in operation after the war so that the transition from a war economy to one of peace will be effected with minimum dislocation and confusion, insofar as technology is concerned.

Investigations of several congressional committees have disclosed that decentralization of industry not only is entirely practical but highly desirable if we are to make maximum use of American resources to win the war and to establish a better economy after the war. Take the steel industry, for example. Despite the fact that there are rich deposits of iron ore in many parts of the Nation, the steel industry has been concentrated in one small section and has depended almost entirely upon the Mesabi ores. Also the manufacturing processes in use now are those developed by the large companies and are not adaptable to use in smaller plants. We know that we can have more steel, wider employment, and consequent prosperity by decentralizing the steel industry to use the abundant ores of the South and the West. We know further that new processes must be used to produce steel with the smaller scale operations.

To give a specific case in point I would cite the establishment of a large blast furnace in my district in Texas. It was only after a great struggle that we were able to get that furnace, despite the fact that we have enough ore there to keep it in full operation for the next 75 years. Labor can be obtained there without recourse to recruiting from distant areas, and there is sufficient housing and an equitable standard and cost of living there for the worker.

Technological mobilization, as envisioned in the bill, will make possible maximum use of the American scientific and technical personnel and facilities in the national interest. It will eliminate present chaotic conditions whereby the scientist is not contributing to the fullest and much of our resources remain untapped.

Development of regional industry will mean regional independence and free enterprise in the true sense of the phrase. We know that currently less than 2,000 of the Nation's 150,000 manufacturing concerns have research facilities, and that of these a group of 13 gigantic corporations control one-third of all research personnel, and 140 control two-thirds.

It is clear then that this bill, through its provisions of assistance to small business and individual scientists, will enlist the aid of additional Americans in the war effort, at the same time making def-

inite and lasting strides forward in the technological development of the country.

The details of the story on steel are substantially the same in the cases of rubber, manganese, aluminum, and numerous other vital war products. It is well known, for instance, that aluminum can be made from a common type of clay found in many parts of the United States. All that is lacking is the technological wherewithal and the necessary Federal financial aid.

The principle of Federal scientific and technical assistance has been proved in the field of agriculture. Here the aid has been administered to small agricultural units with consequent great benefit to our agrarian economy. The Science Mobilization Act proposes an extension of this type of aid to all fields.

When science is mobilized the country will know a civilization it has never before envisioned. We think this bill will perform that task. We think it will give America an opportunity to add to her leadership in world affairs.

SYNOPSIS OF SCIENCE MOBILIZATION BILL

To effectuate the maximum development and application of scientific and technical resources requisite for successful prosecution of the war and for peacetime progress and prosperity the Science Mobilization Act establishes the Office of Scientific and Technical Mobilization.

The purposes of the act are:

First. Appraisal of the present utilization of scientific and technical knowledge, facilities, and personnel, and development of national programs for their maximum use.

Second. Mobilization of scientific and technical facilities for the prosecution of the war.

Third. Facilitation of the post-war transition from a war economy to peacetime enterprise.

Fourth. Collection, coordination, and development of scientific and technical information and facilities.

Fifth. Promotion, for national defense and the general welfare, of techniques for the benefit of agriculture and industry.

Sixth. Assistance, encouragement, and protection of research and enterprise of inventors, scientists, institutions, and Government establishments.

Seventh. Development of substitutes for strategic materials and promotion of the most beneficial use of natural resources.

Eighth. Promotion of scientific education and provision of scientific and technical training and employment.

Ninth. Guidance and assistance in scientific and technical matters wherever necessary.

Tenth. Maintenance and expansion of free enterprise by availing smaller businesses of the benefits of scientific advancement.

Eleventh. Standaridization, in the public interest, of scientific and technical designs and specifications.

Twelfth. Cooperation coordination, and integration of governmental and private facilities and personnel.

The Office of Scientific and Technical Mobilization would include a national scientific and technical board consisting of the administrator of the office (appointed by the President with advice and consent of the Senate) and six members representing industry, agriculture, labor, the consuming public, scientists and technologists, and a national scientific and technical committee consisting of the board, Federal departments, science, labor, and industry representatives.

The office would be authorized to:

First. Maintain a census of scientific and technical facilities, requirements and personnel in the United States and possessions.

Second. Promote, coordinate and develop scientific and technical projects, methods, training, and data.

Third. Foster domestic and international cooperation in scientific discovery and technology.

Fourth. Review specifications, standards, and designs of military and civilian products.

Fifth. Finance scientific and technical operations.

Sixth. Acquire patents and patent rights and authorize their use.

Seventh. Establish a system of merit awards for outstanding scientific and technical contributions.

Eighth. Conduct research and investigation on the use and development of scientific and technical facilities and personnel.

Ninth. Mobilize scientific and technical facilities for national defense.

Tenth. Coordinate and integrate in the national interest, information, activities and resources of governmental and private, scientific, and technical agencies.

TEXAS

Resources, the orderly development of which would be assisted under the Patman science mobilization bill:

Oil—estimated in 1939 at 9½ billion barrels, or 54.46 percent of the known petroleum reserves of the United States—and natural gas of which there is as much wasted as used. The bill would promote more economical exploitation of these resources and assist the small producer.

Sulfur: Texas produces approximately 75 percent of the total supply of the United States. The largest undeveloped deposit is in the Toyah basin in the trans-Pecos region. This bill would assist the economic and orderly exploitation of new deposits.

The bill would also promote the economic and orderly development of the following resources:

Lignite: Though undeveloped, lignite beds cover approximately 60,000 square miles, extending from Laredo to Texarkana, the reserve being estimated at 30,000,000,000 tons.

Coal, one of the State's largest mineral resources, is still largely undeveloped.

Iron deposits in northeast Texas cover an area of approximately 1,000 square miles—in parts of 19 counties—mostly undeveloped. Near Daingerfield, Tex., in the congressional district I represent a large blast furnace is under construction. It is expected to be completed within the next 60 or 90 days and will have a capacity of 1,200 tons of pig iron per day. There is sufficient ore within 6 miles of this blast furnace to keep it operating for 75 years. There are many other desirable sites for blast furnaces and steel mills in east Texas.

Quicksilver: Extensively but relatively undeveloped deposits are found near Terlingua in the Big Bend.

Copper is also found in the western and central mountains and in the Permian basin of the north central area; these deposits also are largely undeveloped.

Gold is found in small quantities in the western and central mountains.

Lead, manganese, zinc, tin, scattered in various areas through the State are still all undeveloped.

Graphite: Texas has large deposits, largely undeveloped.

Titanium, tungsten, uranium are found in southwestern Texas.

In addition to this there are the well-known and already commercially exploited deposits of Fuller's earth, clay, sand, gravel, silica and potash—largest deposit in the world—and extensive formations of limestone and granite. The further development of these deposits will be greatly aided by this bill, in such a way, moreover, as particularly to benefit small independent enterprises.

National Resources Planning Board Should Be Continued; a Postwar Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the recent action of the Seventy-eighth Congress in denying the National Resources Planning Board the necessary appropriation which would insure its continuance was in my opinion a serious mistake.

The National Resources Planning Board since its inception has functioned in an admirable way. It has contributed an invaluable service to long-range planning, both in regard to development of our natural resources and toward correlating the post-war employment programs of political subdivisions of Government and private employees.

Recognition of this service has been Nation-wide and from purely nonpartisan sources, as proof of which I wish to place in the RECORD a resolution memorializing Congress to restore this necessary appropriation to the Budget for the next fiscal year.

This resolution was forwarded to me by 5 supervisors of Los Angeles County, a county whose population is over 2,500,000 people. These supervisors have

utilized the services of the National Resources Planning Board since its inception and pray for its continuance:

Whereas President Roosevelt in a letter to Congress, dated January 14, 1942, stated: "The National Resources Planning Board, as the planning arm of my Executive Office, is charged with the preparation of long range plans for the development of our national resources and the stabilization of employment. At my direction, it is correlating plans and programs under consideration in many Federal, State, and private organizations for post-war full employment, security, and building America"; and

Whereas this board feels that said Planning Board in functioning as above outlined is doing a very necessary piece of work, and that the various reports issued by said Planning Board in recent months have been very helpful to the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to restore the budget for the National Resources Planning Board for the next fiscal year.

Where Is All Our Food Going?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following splendid and informative article by Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., United States Lend-Lease Administrator, on lend-lease shipments abroad of food, which article appeared in the magazine the American of April 1943:

WHERE IS ALL OUR FOOD GOING?

(By Edward R. Stettinius, United States Lend-Lease Administrator)

Food shortages have begun to be felt in the United States during the past year. The pinch will grow more severe in the year to come.

This seems strange in America, the land of plenty. Almost incredible. Did we not raise the biggest crop of foods in our history in 1942? Didn't our farmers break all records? What has happened to this vast supply of food?

It is hard to understand, and when people don't understand a situation, rumors flourish. You have heard such rumors at the office or the club or in the streetcar or at the corner grocery store.

The one I have heard most frequently is that Uncle Sam, acting under lend-lease, is taking our good American food and spreading it about the world with a foolish and lavish hand:

"No steak at the butcher's today. I hear they are sending most of the beef to Russia." * * * "Eggs are awfully high and scarce. They say we're sending just shiploads of them to England—and butter, probably to fry our nice eggs in, sunny side up." * * * "Junior hasn't been able to get a sundae for 3 days. What in the world are they doing with the ice cream? Giving it to the Hottentots and Eskimos, I suppose." * * * "Of course, we must help our allies, but why send them all the best things, the very things we want?" * * * "First thing you know, our own people won't have enough to eat. We want to be generous, but we don't want to be imposed upon."

It is hard to know just what to do about such rumors. They cannot be flatly denied, because they have an element of truth. It is foolish to denounce them as unpatriotic, since many a good citizen, honestly puzzled, repeats them. Mostly they are innocent, grumbling talk, but they have in them the elements of danger, cruelty, and death—danger to our success in the war, cruelty to millions of our allies who are now living close to starvation, and possible death to many thousands of our American boys through prolongation of the war. Therefore these rumors must be dealt with.

The best way to do this, in my opinion, is to give the facts. As Lend-Lease Administrator I will, so to speak, open up the books and tell you just how much of each kind of food we are sending abroad, to which countries it is going, and why. It is your food, and you are entitled to know.

One favor I ask: Do not draw your conclusions until you finish the story, because the food situation today is unprecedented, has some apparent contradictions, and takes a little study.

Let's look first at beef, because that has probably caused more talk than anything else. Also, it shows how deceptive appearances can be.

In 1942 we lend-leased and sent abroad, chiefly to England, 18,000,000 pounds of beef. That certainly seems to be a lot of beef, until we look at America's total 1942 supply of beef, which was over 9,000,000,000 pounds. In other words, out of every 500 pounds of beef at home, Lend-Lease sent 1 pound abroad.

Nor is that all the story. We have large American forces in Australia and New Zealand. These two countries, through reciprocal lend-lease, supplied our troops there with a total of 25,000,000 pounds of beef during 1942. This saved time and shipping. On balance we received 7,000,000 (25 minus 18) more pounds of beef than we furnished to all lend-lease countries during 1942.

Then where, if lend-lease didn't take it, has our beef gone? It has gone largely to our armed forces at home and abroad, and to those (chiefly war workers) who have more money to spend than in prewar days.

The armed forces in 1942 bought about 11 percent of our entire beef supply, some of it as reserve for future campaigns. Our hard-training, hard-fighting men in the services need beef, like beef, and eat a lot of it.

In 1939 the average American factory worker earned $23.02 a week. In November of 1942 our millions of factory workers, supplemented by other millions formerly unemployed, working longer hours and overtime, were making about $40 (to be exact, $39.78) per week. (Figures from Bureau of Labor Statistics.) Moreover, they could not spend this extra money in the usual way on such things as cars, radios, and refrigerators. So naturally they are spending more money for food, and for choicer food.

Farmers also had larger average net incomes in 1942, were able to buy more store food when they went to town. Americans, when they have more money, buy more beef, more meat generally, more milk, cream, butter, eggs, and poultry. Meanwhile, other Americans, with fixed incomes, or with smaller incomes than before, are feeling the pinch the most.

The effect of lend-lease on our beef supply, then, is nil. We have sent no veal whatsoever abroad. We have sent about 4,000,000 pounds of lamb and mutton (four-tenths of 1 percent of our supply), but our troops have received more than that from Australia and New Zealand.

Of certain other foods, however, lend-lease has sent large quantities of our allies, large enough to affect our shortages at home.

The great bulk of lend-lease foods which we shipped in 1942 was made up of pork, milk products, edible fats and oils, and eggs. In the first part of the year most of the food went to England, but by winter, for reasons which I will explain later, the emphasis began to shift toward Russia. In December more food was shipped to Russia than to England, and probably this policy will continue for some time to come.

In 1942 we shipped 1,112,000,000 pounds of pork to our allies. That was 10 percent of our American supply, and is a really big bite of pork. If we figured 135 pounds of pork to the hog, it would be over 8,000,000 hogs. It is enough pork to fill 55 big freight steamers carrying 10,000 tons each.

That pork helped to encourage and strengthen the Russian Army in its prodigious battles. We hear from Russia that their soldiers especially appreciate an occasional treat of American pork sausage; that, butter lacking, they often spread American lard on their black bread; and that their soldiers fighting in isolated posts in subzero weather frequently carry a chunk of American fatback as a battle ration to eat with their bread. Certainly this is no luxury. Fats are absolutely essential to men fighting in Russia's withering winters.

Incidentally, practically every bit of food we send to Russia is for the Russian Army.

In milk products, lend-lease shipped during 1942 the equivalent of 4,272,000,000 pounds, or approximately 2,000,000,000 quarts, or as much as 15 quarts for every person in the United States. That is about 3.4 percent of our American supply.

That would be enough milk, if shipped in liquid form, to load about 214 big freighters, at 10,000 tons to the ship. Of course, we did not ship it in natural liquid form. We shipped most of it as condensed milk, evaporated milk, dry skim milk, and cheese. In this way, with the water largely removed, it occupied far less space and weighed only about 815,000,000 pounds, or enough to load only 40 freighters instead of 214.

We are shipping these large amounts of milk products for two main reasons: First, because our allies are very short of them, and badly need milk nourishment to maintain health and fighting fitness. Second, cheese, and particularly dried milk, are among the most economical forms in which to move food value in terms of shipping space. Even so, remember, we sent only one-thirtieth of our total milk supply in 1942.

Dried milk and dried eggs have been lifesavers, and here, I think, lend-lease can properly claim much credit. When lend-lease began, in 1941, the production of egg-drying plants in America was only about 10,000,000 pounds a year. We helped finance the building of new plants, so that we now have a capacity of more than 350,000,000 pounds a year. This achievement has had just the same effect as if we had built a lot of ships. It has been of enormous benefit not only to our allies, but in supplying our own armed forces overseas.

We have sent no cream or ice cream abroad. But our heavy shipments of milk concentrates have been one factor contributing to the ice-cream shortage. Here, again, heavier buying of milk and milk products by war workers and the armed forces has had its effect.

We shipped 23 percent of our cheese and 7 percent of our condensed and evaporated milk. Production of both these items has been greatly increased.

How about butter? That has been quite short in many parts of the country, and has been the subject of a great deal of conversation, curiosity, and rumor. The facts are simple: In 1942 we shipped via lend-lease about 17,000,000 pounds of butter, or 8,500

tons, or one good-sized shipload. That was less than 1 pound in every 100 of our American supply.

All of this butter went to the Russian Army. None of it went to Britain or other allied countries.

Why such luxury for the Russian Army? Just think it over a moment. That 17,000,000 pounds, for, let us say, 8,000,000 Russian fighting men, would mean about 2 pounds a year for each soldier. Say, 3 ounces a month. This would permit the Russian soldier, fighting the bloodiest battles in history, to have American butter on his black bread once a week, instead of lard or linseed oil.

That is no luxury. It is a minimum necessity. Soldiers fighting in the Russian snow and ice and mud must have fats for warmth. Butter is the most palatable and wholesome of the fats. It is especially needed when bread is so large a part of the diet.

Most Americans, when they know these facts, feel that we should send a lot more of our butter to the army which so far has borne the brunt of the battle against Germany. I agree. This year we are going to try to send the Russian Army a considerably larger quantity. What do you think? Would you be willing to cut down your own butter supply by a fraction so that the Russian soldier could have butter on his bread almost every day?

The next large lend-lease item is fats and oils, such as lard, vegetable oils, cottonseed oil, peanut oil. These are especially valuable as a source of warmth, both in England and Russia, where they have far less heat in winter than we have, even with all our fuel oil troubles of the last winter. The Russians use these fats and oils not only on their bread, but in their soups. We shipped 723,000,000 pounds of such fats and oils in 1942, or 13.2 percent of our American supply. Our shipments account partly for American shortages in fats and oils, but another important factor is the use of these foods in making explosives for the armed forces.

Eggs are another controversial item. Why send this choice food abroad? It is true that we are shipping large quantities of eggs abroad. In 1942 we sent the equivalent of about 450,000,000 dozen natural eggs, chiefly to England and Russia. That was 10 percent of our American supply.

But the rumor picture of Britons and Russians reveling in fresh American eggs, poached on toast or fried sunny side up, is quite absurd. We don't ship eggs in the shell; it would take up too much shipping space. We send most of them in the form of dried egg powder. That is a wonderful product. It contains practically all the nourishment of the fresh eggs, but takes up only about one-seventh of the space. It keeps well, requires no refrigeration, and is easy to handle. But, it is not a luxury food. It cannot be boiled, fried, or poached. It can be scrambled or made into an omelet or used in a cake, but it does not have the same flavor or deliciousness that a fresh egg has.

Nevertheless, these dried eggs have been most welcome in England and Russia. The Englishman gets an average of 3 domestic eggs-in-shell each month. Our shipments of dried eggs supply him with the equivalent of an additional 4 eggs each month. In Russia, the shortage of eggs is also severe, and the American dried eggs are sent right to the army at the front.

Besides the pork, milk products, fats and oils, and eggs which I have mentioned we are sending smaller quantities of fish, canned vegetables, canned fruits and juices, corn products, and wheat products.

In 1942 we shipped 156,000,000 pounds of fish canned or frozen, or 7 percent of our American supply; 415,000,000 pounds of corn products, or about one-tenth of 1 percent of our supply; 398,000,000 pounds of wheat products, or three-tenths of 1 percent of our supply; 51,000,000 pounds of canned vegetables, or eight-tenths of 1 percent of our supply; and 89,000,000 pounds of canned fruits and juices, or 1.7 percent of our American supply.

That, then, is the true picture. In 1942 we sent our allies less than 6 percent by value of our total supply, but still it was a great amount and was of incalculable value to our hard-pressed allies in a critical year.

At present we are sending more than we were this time last year. No exact predictions can be made for this year, because we cannot be sure just what shipping will be available. Nor can we now say how soon or how deeply we will enter the countries of Europe which are starving under Hitler's heel. Wherever we go in, we must be prepared to move in rapidly with food in the wake of our armies. This is a military and political necessity of the highest order. Our troops cannot take the offensive successfully in the midst of famine and pestilence, riots and revolution.

Whatever happens, the lend-lease plans to take a much bigger share of our food supplies than it did in 1942. Russia's problem is acute and must be met. At the beginning of the war Russia did not need food. By last October, however, the Germans had overrun the Ukraine, the Crimea, and North Caucasus—lands producing two-thirds of Russia's normal food supply. That is as though an army, invading the United States, had occupied the entire Middle West. True, the Russian armies have recently recaptured part of the scorched and devastated territories, but it will be a long time before they can yield their former crops again. Meanwhile, the foods we can send may make all the difference between whether the Russians can advance or must retreat again.

No request for lend-lease food supplies has been received from China. The great distance that such supplies would have to be shipped, and the limited transportation facilities into China, make it unlikely that any such request will be made at any time in the near future. Should we be asked to provide food for China we will make every effort to do so, either directly or from Allied food sources nearer to China.

Although exact predictions cannot be made, Government food experts estimate that the armed forces and lend-lease may each take about twice as much food in 1943 as they did in 1942. This means more severe shortages, and stricter rationing in order to make sure that available food is fairly and equitably divided, so that no one need go hungry. Even so, although Americans will not have as much food or as much choice as before, they will still have the most nutritious diet of any people in the world.

The question remains, Why are we sending all this lend-lease food to our allies? If you have read this far you can probably give your own answer, but I will tell you how it looks to me.

All of us, in the United Nations, are joined in a vast war of survival, fighting for our lives and principles against the Axis nations. In this war each of us makes the utmost contribution in his power in the common effort.

These contributions cannot be measured in money. How can we weigh the food which we send against the British losses in the London blitz, or against the millions of Russian soldiers who have been killed or wounded in the battles against the Germans?

The food we send is neither a loan nor an act of charity. It is the plainest sort of decency, common sense, and self-interest.

Suppose we had not sent food to England. Maybe England would have held out. But could her undernourished workers have turned out the planes and weapons which have turned back the Luftwaffe and devastated Hitler's centers of war production? Would the British have had the extra reserve of strength which enabled them to stop Rommel in Egypt and chase him back across 1,300 miles of desert?

If not, where would the war be now?

Last August, Hitler's apparently irresistible armies were storming to the Volga River and into the streets of Stalingrad, with the Baku oil fields and the Caspian Sea not far away. The Russians stopped those armies. They have found the power to roll the Nazis back in the greatest defeat Hitler has ever suffered. But can they carry on without the food we have given them, plus the assurance of more to come?

No man knows the exact answer to those questions. But this, I think, it is fair to say: That food of ours, less than about three-quarters of a billion dollars' worth in 1942, and a relatively small part of our supply, was one of the most important weapons in this last critical year of war. It so tipped the balance as to bring victory years nearer than it might otherwise have been. In so doing, it has saved the lives of countless thousands of our American soldiers and sailors. And our food shipments will make a similar contribution as they are increased in the days ahead.

Letter From Citizens of Bogalusa, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a letter expressing approval of my activities, signed by some of my constituents in Bogalusa, La.:

BOGALUSA, LA.

DEAR JIMMY: We should be more formal now that you are our Congressman, but somehow we feel that you haven't changed a bit from the fellow that shook our hands as we went in on the graveyard shift, or patted us on the back as we came off at 6:00 a. m. And that's why we're writing you—you see lots of us working boys did what we could for you because we felt that you would do what you could for us. And we think you're doing just that.

Lots of us have had lots of fun in following your activities, and when you resigned from those "dead" committees some of us had nearly as much fun as we did running our poor boy campaign to send you to Washington. We want you to know that we're behind you one million percent. Maybe there's a lot we don't know, but we didn't think you were a freshman when we sent you up there and we don't like for some so-called big shots to keep you off committees where you could really do good work to help your people.

Maybe some of those who do the appointing don't realize that they don't wait for seniors to do the fighting on Guadalcanal and in Africa; it's all right to have youngsters to lead the line there. And just because you're not walking with a cane and are not bald headed or gray headed there's no reason to make you wait till you get that way to start to work for the people of your district. We know you're working for us, Jimmy, and we

know you're just the fellow we need to make the big boys sit up and notice the Sixth District of Louisiana—and by the way, if there's anything we can do for you, just say the word.

Sincerely yours,

Dan Rayburn, Tide Jones, "Sixty" Rayburn, D. W. Seal, N. W. Kinard, C. E. Rayburn, Mrs. William Dugan, Mrs. Daniel Rayburn, B. Z. Thomas, Jessie Harrell, G. W. Randy, N. Williams, J. L. Adams, John Wm. Vaughn, Daniel F. Thomas, Thomas Miller, J. B. Pollock, Hy. Carmichael, Edgar Rouillieu, Jr., C. A. Taylor, C. J. Thomas, Howard Warner, B. T. Boyd, Ernest Dulkersen, J. H. Dailey, Delmer Kennedy, N. E. Smith, Maurice M. Bennett, P. L. Crockett, Jewel Magee, L. E. Mizell, G. E. Adams, N. K. McDaniel, L. Smith, F. B. Sumrall, A. D. Seal, Horton Middleton, John R. Parker, W. A. Bond, J. B. Winstead, C. T. Brady, E. C. Tullos, Clyde Bennett, W. T. Brooks, Tom R. Averitte, Devon Varnado, Sidney Canall, Henry Mooney, Clyde Warner, J. E. Keen, Alfred Simon, Marvin Thomas, S. E. Schilling, F. P. Galloway, J. F. Galloway, Louis Lessell, Leroy Penton, Burt Mitchell, Ledet Walker, Porter Cothen, J. W. Criscoe, Bruce McLaughlin, Cecil Williams, B. V. Giordora, Willis O. Quinn, Walter Alford, Leslie Statham, Joe C. Miley, Densil Adams, Lonnie Thigpen, Fred Herrin, Frank Singletary, H. C. Schilling, M. Hendry, Luther Miller, John Lative, A. Schilling, J. W Odom, Troy N. Graves, O. P. Jones, S. W. Bateman, A. R. Pittman, W. W. Wilson, A. G. Strain, M E. Mixon, W. W. Walker, V. Edwards, R. M. Bender, Ab Robbins, James Roussell, Lawrence R. Roussell, Chalmers Wells, Bob Lavinghouze, D. Powell, A. Applewhite, V. Applewhite, Leo Creel, C. E. Thomas, H. W. Powell, D. W. Bond, Clifton Moran, J. H. Sharpe, Flemon Fortenberry, Robert C. Thomas, Geo. Johnson, F. N. Brown, Clyde Mattox, Ralph L. May, Steve Riley, Lucius Bateman, W. B. T. Sumrall, Ollie Buster, Chas. Burdeaux, Virgil Callender, Eli Pierce, Vernon Williams, Ellis Adams, Chas. S. Ashford, Earl Morton, C. Wascom, Cassie B. Heaning, J. A. Shows, Ned Haik, Elois Catha, C. D. Day, C. Powell, W. S. Boyd, Oneal Corkern, J. O. Brumfield, Carley Smith, Ottis Bates, L. A. Smith, J. H. Dunaway, Bill Dunaway, D. A. Walker, Geo. Cox, T. C. Dunaway, W. C. DeLaughter, R. C. Smith, Archie Grantham, Percy E. Moak, M. W. Galloway, H. K. Manning, Jr., P. M. Rawls, Tommy Penton, Nadim Davis, Johnny Penton, Denver Wascom, J. P. Smith, Willie Mizell, H. R. Boyd, Chas. H. Sullivan, Wilks Kerney, Millard Mizell, T. L. Laird, Baldy Brumfield, Roy Babington, Reace Parker, Bennett Parker, A. H. Penney, M. D. Bullock, R. F. Paul, B. B. Rayburn, Martin Miley, Artiss Nobles, C. W. Allison, Murphy Adams, Charles Holcomb, Emile Fergeson, J. D. Shows, Joe Williams, W. E. McDaniel, Eddie Bateman, Cecil Pullen, Dave Kirdy, Josh Campbell, Cecil Brunson, Melvin Scroggs, Ralph Grantham, M. Holloway, Mack Williams, G. C. Hunter, W. L. Teddlie, Burdette Paul, Jack Corley, A. V. Bianchard, John Blackwell, Carl McKay, G. H. Rawls, Willie J. Blackwell, Ernest Parritt, R. Rogers, J. Del Williams, E. R. Williams, J. N. Stallings, E. Seal, George Cooper, Q. A Boyles, T. E. Perretti, J. L. Smith, P. C. Law, L. H. Simmons, Van Roche, Ro Scroggs, N. V. Magee, Elmer A. Graves, C. E. Riley, Archie H. Thomas, Joe Varnado, Walter Lee, Melvin Hunt, Bill Kattman, David Scruggs, John Irvine, Mrs. George S. Mann, Fanny Campbell, James Harris, R. R. Pittman, Mrs. James Harris, N. S. Cerniglio, Willie Tullos, E. A. Haarala, C. T. Jones, G. W. Smith, Troy Breland, O. R. Cooper, Walter Bell, A. J. Foll, G. P. Keaton, Virgil Rester, J. V. Hyde, Virgil Byrd, Jim Hemphill, A. L. Whittington, Sidney Warren, Claud Parker, L. L. Welch, J. J. Tullos, Andrew Miller, I. Burnette, C. E. Bateman, Rex McDaniel, C. W. Brumfield, Carlton Broom, George Pierce, Walter Cothern, Jack Kirby, Joe Triona, Percy Quave, Frank Mixon, Loyd Paul, Lester McGehee, E. A. Bates L. J. Sharpe, Jeff Fournet, Ivy Cutrer, F. Burdeaux, J. D. Pittman, W. T. Knight, M. W. Anglin, M. Rowe, B. L. Burch, W. Stafford, J. B. Denham, B. J. Williams, Linda S. Williamson, L. E. Kirby, Charlie Hill, Johnnie Penton, W. I. Knight.

Marketing of Government Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MARCH 5, 1943.

WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

YOUR HONOR: As a last desperate attempt to help bring back Government wheat, will try and explain why it is vitally necessary in stepping up production to put wheat back on the market again.

We are only a dot on the globe, but have dished out 10 carloads of wheat this year. We provided 3 poultry farms, each feeding from 2,000 to 2,500 chickens, 2 large dairy farms who raise from 150 to 200 pigs apiece for market every 6 months, besides numerous other dairy and chicken farms that really produce.

It was their weekly habit to mix a 1,000-pound egg mash which formerly called for 200 pounds of oats, 200 pounds of bran, 400 pounds of old corn, and 200 pounds of a 32-percent concentrate, but the latter lacked in vital material now, and by adding 100 pounds of wheat and less bran, it brought the mash up to par.

The corn crop did not ripen this fall, new corn is soft, and old corn scarce and high priced. These people would feed wheat as whole grain once a day and dry corn with oats for the next feeding. Too much corn is fattening and tends to cut egg production. Imagine these people now cut off from all this wheat. They are desperate, Your Honor, and driving us mad. This is heartily discouraging at so critical a time. Later on their flocks would be out getting grass and other material a bird will gather, and it would not be quite so serious a matter.

The hog raisers, too, are finding it difficult with oil meal a scarcity, soft corn that heats, and light oats.

The depot agents report carloads of wheat are rolling every day, but where?—surely not where badly needed or we would still be able to get some here.

Do what you can for us and our producers, Mr. STEVENSON, and let the old wheat roll for a few months longer. We are in a position to really know how badly it's needed and that it cannot be doing anyone more good than it will these farmers.

Help us if you can. Thanking you kindly, I am,

Yours for more wheat,

JOE E. BARRETT.

Amendment of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri:

Whereas the Sixty-second General Assembly of Missouri is now convened in regular session; and

Whereas this body experiences much difficulty in the execution of the social-security laws of our State when drawn in conformity with the Federal Social Security Act; and

Whereas much confusion and dissatisfaction is evidenced on the part of recipients and charges of unfairness and discrimination are rumored, thus casting many reflections upon the officers in charge of the social-security operations in each county organized under said Social Security Act; and

Whereas we feel that the fundamental principle of any democracy is vested in the voice of the people; and

Whereas we believe the strongest counteracting force of political evil is public resentment when based upon the opinion of a well-informed constituency; and

Whereas we feel that exacting of burdensome taxes by any group of appointive officials only to be disbursed also by a like group of appointive officials with the taxpayer being deprived of the right to know who is the beneficiary, one bold step has been made in defiance of the principles of democracy and the American way of life which is the goal for which the greatest war in history is being waged, we therefore memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Social Security Act to the effect that any citizen in any county in any State thus organized under the Federal Social Security Act may be informed upon request made to his local Social Security Board of the names of any recipients in any branch of the Social Security Department and the respective amounts of money each is receiving, or has received during the past year, and to liberalize the Social Security Act so as to remove the many limitations and conditions placed upon the States before they may obtain Federal funds, also to allow the States and local boards to exercise greater authority in the administration and payment of assistance to the needy.

The "Haves" and the "Have-Nots"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the following, from the pen of William Berkey of the Cassopolis Vigilant of March 4, 1943, Cass County, Mich., is read, a better understanding of why I want what you have and someone else wants what I have may be had:

We sometimes wonder what percentage of the high wages now being paid to many thousands of workers in defense plants is being saved, and if not, why not. In talking with a gentleman from Michigan's defense plant area the other day he said he occupied a house which also housed another family, the head of which made $125 per week, but that when it came time to buy coal the man with the big wages had no money. To our question of what his neighbor did with so much money, he replied that he just spent it. These people who do not save when they can are the kind that will be on relief shortly after war work ceases, the kind that socially-minded people weep bitter tears over as the ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed third of our population. We can sympathize with the children who may have to suffer, but not with the adult wasters of big wages.

Since writing the above we came across the following editorial in Schuyler Marshall's St. Johns Republican News. It deals with some of the things we had in mind when we started to write the above, and says it better than we could:

"There has always been a struggle between the 'haves' and 'have-nots.' That is as it should be. Those who have, hope to keep what they have. Those who have not, hope to better their condition. This, we hold, is the thing that has kept the people of America on their toes ever since the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. It was, and is, a big country. There has been room to grow. People have grown. The rich men of today were the poor men of yesterday. The families of the rich generally go back to shirt sleeves in two or three generations.

"Few of us reach a state termed wealth. Many of us, more than in any other country reach a degree of comfort that is satisfying. Men reached this state through a system of competitive effort. The 'haves' do not keep what they have unless they exercise good judgment and fairness. The 'have-nots' rise to the 'have' class when they work, save, and invest wisely. Always a little capital backed with energy and brains has boosted people—if not to the top, toward the top.

"That's one of the things that a certain growing group of theorists in this country, many of them in government, would supplant. They have ridden to power on the misery of a depression. They are bolstering their theories by using a war emergency. They would destroy capital under the guise of subsidies. They make political capital by taking from the 'haves' and handing it to the 'have-nots.' They are undermining the system upon which the strength and wealth of this country is founded.

"We creep nearer socialism.

"Those who receive subsidies are apt to shrug their shoulders. 'Getting handouts while the getting is good' has destroyed the strength of character and the principles of too many. Because it is governmentally fostered, they accept it, forgetting that in the end it will wreck the very ones who now think they are benefiting.

"We shudder when we read that high governmental officials say very complacently, 'thousands of small business concerns will be wrecked.' The callousness with which it is said indicates a ruthlessness that is alarming. This country is made up of small home owners, small farmers, small businessmen.

"To use Government funds, in form of subsidies, to allay alarm is but the anesthetic to dull the pain of cutting the heart out of the American system of free enterprise. The rabble-rousing appeal to the 'have-nots' is an old, old technique."

Letter of Hon. Clare Boothe Luce to the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

The PRESIDENT,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your kind invitation to come to the White House on March 10 has just arrived. Like every one of the 120 new Members of Congress, I welcome this opportunity to meet our President and Commander in Chief. We realize how hard it would be for you to try to see us one by one. Indeed, in dangerous days like these, a generous attempt on your part to talk to us separately would be an almost unpatriotic waste of your time. Moreover, Mr. President, I feel that regardless of party, many of us freshmen Members have more or less the same story to tell. Maybe at your reception some will have a chance to tell their story, but many will not. And the newness of this meeting, the happy awe and honest respect which must strike every citizen who stands, perhaps for the first time, in his White House, face to face with his country's President, will conspire insensibly to confine the speech of most Members to formalities. Still, I know your precise purpose in asking us is to learn what we are thinking. So while accepting your cordial invitation, may I take the opportunity to tell you what is on my mind? I believe that the 425,000 people I represent in Fairfield County would be happy to have me do so.

It is this, Mr. President:

I believe that this Seventy-eighth Congress is utterly patriotic. In our love of our country, no aisle divides us, and no aisle separates us in our will to win this war. No matter what anyone's previous attitude, on the day of Pearl Harbor the phrase "unconditional surrender" was born in every heart.

Our confidence in our generals who have planned and are executing our campaigns in seven seas and on five continents is very great. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee I have had the privilege of listening to General Marshall. It seems to me (and I am sure to all Members of Congress) that every mother with a son in the armed services should give thanks in her prayers for this great soldier, who is also, she will be happy to know, a humble and compassionate man. Congress knows that in the choice of the heads of our armed services, America has been most fortunate. We know that the lives of our young men, and the honor of the country's arms are in strong and competent hands.

But sure of military victory though this Congress is, we are not complacent about the war effort. Indeed, we are very much perturbed. For while we feel that our cause is safe on the battlefronts, we are deeply alarmed by the many disquieting and even explosive circumstances that face us on the home front. Foremost among the fears that haunt us are there: That the conflict between the military program and the farm program may cause serious, if not disastrous, food shortages; that the aggravating muddling of the Manpower Commission, which does not seem to have yet done the elementary arithmetic of finding out how many men and women are needed by whom and for what, and where they can be got, may lead to a calamitous cramping of war industry; that the protracted wrangling and vacillating authority of the War Production Board may yet take its toll on the battlefield. And in all frankness let me say that to us in Congress has been transferred, as if by swift contagion, the people's long delayed fury against the swollen and wasteful Washington bureaucracies that have burgeoned through the years. Though I confess that many of us feel like untried Davids tackling unbeatable Goliaths, we know that the people's wish is that Congress should live up to its constitutional duty by dealing vigorously with them. The people have unmistakably renounced the credo sedulously nurtured among the bureaucrats themselves that the great issues before the country are not the concern of their Congress.

At the same time, each of us Congressmen has the urgent sectional problems and pressures of his constituents to deal with. Like little Dutch boys, each with one thumb stuck (under orders from "back home") into some local hole in the great legislative dike, we must reach to stem with our free hand the larger and more sinister leaks that yawn in our democratic structure on all sides. And we do know these must be repaired or the floods of socialism or fascism may yet sweep away our form of government. Our duty and our burden, to the Nation and to our constituents is a dual one.

We try. We try. We try, Mr. President.

Whenever you, with your many years of accumulated political experience have the chance (which may of necessity be rare) to turn your face from the fires that rage on the global war front to ur smoldering domestic problems, we shall be very grateful for your advice and leadership. And I hope that we will receive it in the same nonpartisan spirit in which we expect it will be given. How could we do otherwise, thinking of our young men, who daily fall on nameless battlefields?

Lastly, I think you should know that we Republicans, like all the patriotic Democrats who have crossed party lines to vote with us, are fully aware that power has a tendency to corrupt. We are alert to the danger that this tendency may yet infect the Congress and make it arrogant and reckless. Power in all but the truly virtuous—who tend to renounce it anyway—is at once a subtle opiate and a heady wine. But you, Mr. President, would be reassured if you could hear us Republicans talking in our offices and our cloak rooms. For you would know that we daily caution one another not to abuse in this awful crisis our newly delegated power from the people. For example, we are deeply aware that labor now, as always, is one of the great pillars of the Nation and the very backlog of the war effort. We do not, I believe, intend to use our power to penalize the workingman, or organized labor as a whole, for the abuses which small, selfish labor factions have perpetrated in wartime on our outraged and heavily burdened people.

Naturally, the Republicans hope that some day they will be the party really in power, not only because we do believe in the two party system, but also because we believe in the political validity and human worth of historic republicanism. But we know that he serves his party best who serves his country first. There are as many Jeffersonian Republicans, of whom I am proud to count myself one, as there are Lincolnian Democrats among us.

With faith in our institutions, and in loyalty to our President and Commander in Chief, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

Small Business Aided by Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has done much toward helping small businesses of different types. The following letter from the Honorable Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce and Federal Loan Administrator, and the report of the chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to him are self-explanatory:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 5, 1943.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WRIGHT: In accordance with your request, I have had prepared and enclose herewith a report covering the nature and scope of accomplishments of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its susidiaries with respect to the aid rendered small business concerns in connection with the war effort.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, March 1, 1943.

Hon. JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JONES: There is presented herein a report on the nature and scope of accomplishments of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its wartime agencies, with respect to small business concerns. The factual information includes loans and commitments authorized to and including January 15, 1943.

GENERAL RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PROGRAM

In considering that portion of the general war program with respect to loans and commitments to business enterprises by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the analysis is pointed toward the number of loans rather than the amount thereof. Examination on the basis of number of loans, which emphasizes the total of small business enterprises aided rather than the dollars involved, appears to be the more important consideration in evaluating the effectiveness of this phase of the Corporation's activities.

The statistics furnished in table I are a composite of three phases of Reconstruction Finance Corporation activity: (1) Straight business loans and commitments under section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act from June 25, 1940, through January 15, 1943; (2) loans and commitments for defense purposes made pursuant to section 5d (2) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act from June 25, 1940, through January 15, 1943; and (3) those loans and commitments authorized under section 5 (h) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act from May 11, 1942, through January 15, 1943.

TABLE I.—*Size of all loans and commitments under $1,000,000 authorized to business enterprises*

[From June 25, 1940, through Jan. 15, 1943]

Size	Number	Amount
$5,000 and under	2,225	$6,456,308.44
$5,001 to $10,000	1,333	10,167,451.02
$10,001 to $25,000	1,843	31,296,538.28
$25,001 to $50,000	1,100	40,604,266.53
$50,001 to $100,000	830	62,735,203.46
$100,001 to $200,000	352	51,161,437.32
$200,001 to $500,000	211	69,569,249.29
$500,001 to $1,000,000	79	58,144,885.58
Total	[1] 7,973	330,135,339.92

[1] Does not include 1 commitment for an undetermined amount and 139 automobile loans and purchase agreements for an undetermined amount.

On the assumption that loans of $100,000 or less are, for practical purposes, considered loans to small business, the foregoing table reveals that 7,331 business loans and commitments were made to small business enterprises.

Considering this number as a unit, the aid to small business enterprises is even more striking. When only loans of $100,000 or less are examined separately it is disclosed that over 2,225 were for $10,000 or less, and over four-fifths of the total for less than $50,000.

Of the afore-mentioned 7,331 units 6,352 loans and commitments were for defense and war purposes.

The loan and commitment program for defense (as distinguished from business enterprise loans shown in the foregoing table) has shown marked acceleration during the past few months. Of 6,352 loans for $100,000 or less covering defense purposes, 2,642 (including purchases) are on rationed commodities and were made between May 11, 1942, and January 15, 1943, as indicated in table II:

TABLE II.—*Size of loans and commitments of $100,000 or less, including purchases, authorized on rationed commodities*

[From May 11, 1942, through Jan. 15, 1943]

Size	Number	Amount
$5,000 and under	908	$2,271,154.97
$5,001 to $10,000	478	3,462,428.09
$10,001 to $25,000	646	10,411,141.30
$25,001 to $50,000	383	13,539,370.80
$50,001 to $100,000	227	15,682,763.25
Total	[1] 2,642	45,366,858.41

[1] Does not include 139 automobile loans and purchase agreements for an undetermined amount.

The remainder of the said defense purpose loans under $100,000 were made under section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act during the period from June 25, 1940, through January 15, 1943, as shown in table III:

TABLE III.—*Size of loans and commitments of $100,000 or less authorized to business enterprises for defense under section 5d*

[From June 25, 1940, through Jan. 15, 1943]

Size	Number	Amount
$5,000 and under	942	$3,136,702.71
$5,001 to $10,000	680	5,323,857.97
$10,001 to $25,000	974	17,014,837.21
$25,001 to $50,000	587	22,059,131.30
$50,001 to $100,000	527	41,084,286.07
Total	3,710	88,618,815.26

In short, the total loans and commitments of $100,000 or less made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation since the beginning of the national defense period furnishes an example of the flexibility and efficiency of the Corporation which enables it to adjust or accelerate its activities to meet any national emergency.

RATIONED ARTICLE AND COMMODITY PROGRAM

Authoritative sources indicate that business mortalities among automobile dealers brought about by restrictive measures incident to the war program will be substantially less for the year 1943 than 1942. A large part of the credit for this trend is due to the fundamentally sound principle behind the program of rationed article and commodity loans and purchases begun in June 1942 under section 5 (h) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act. This provision, commonly known as the Murray-Patman Act, authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase or make loans upon the security of any article or commodity the sale or distribution of which is rationed under authority of the United States. The act is specifically designed to prevent and relieve distress among dealers. Since the protection is designed for dealers rather than manufacturers, it necessarily is primarily concerned with the smaller business operators, as indicated by the following table through January 15, 1943:

Size of rationed commodity loans, commitments and purchases authorized to business enterprises

[Does not include cancelations]

	Number	Amount
$5,000 and under	908	$2,271,154.97
$5,001 to $10,000	478	3,462,428.09
$10,001 to $25,000	646	10,411,141.30
$25,001 to $50,000	383	13,539,370.80
$50,001 to $100,000	227	15,682,763.25
$100,001 to $200,000	73	9,654,213.12
$200,001 to $500,000	12	3,632,099.33
$500,001 to $1,000,000	3	2,235,486.97
Over $1,000,000		
Total	[1] 2,730	60,888,657.83

[1] Does not include 136 automobile loan and purchase agreements for an undetermined amount.

The foregoing clearly indicates the aid given to the small businessman. Almost three-fourths of the loans are $25,000 or less and only a small fraction of the remainder are for more than $100,000.

The program under the Murray-Patman Act is both direct and indirect. As of January 13, 1943, there were 2,095 loans to dealers covering some 50,500 automobiles and commercial vehicles of a value aggregating $53,103,000. As a result of this direct aid to dealers their assets are kept in a liquid state to be available for other uses, such as meeting added expenses of remaining in business,

conversion of premises or stocking additional or different commodities. Some measure of the success of this direct loan phase as a means of restoring confidence is indicated by the fact that there have been in the aforesaid period only 10 purchase applications. Of these 9 were approved aggregating $62,677 and covering only 64 vehicles of which 60 have already been sold.

Of perhaps even greater importance insofar as the number of small dealers affected is concerned is the indirect aid furnished pursuant to the Murray-Patman Act. Under this phase of the program the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has to date entered into automobile loan and purchase agreements with approximately 125 banks and finance companies including General Motors Acceptance Corporation, Commercial Credit Co., and Commercial Investment Trust, Inc., who are cooperative with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Some value of this phase of the program is indicated by the aggregate loans approximating $180,000,000 on more than 190,000 vehicles, but its greater value lies in the fact that these financial companies are thereby assisting their own innumerable thousands of customers throughout the Nation, in the carrying and orderly marketing of frozen inventories with a minimum of economic dislocation and incident hardship.

Loans have been made not only on automobiles but other new commodities as well, such as typewriters, oil burners, electric ranges, liquefied petroleum gas equipment, gas burning equipment, commercial and industrial refrigerating equipment and bakery equipment. Only the tires and tubes phase concerns used materials. Our agencies are authorized to make loans on rubber tires, casings, and tubes used less than 1,000 miles if owned by a dealer on December 11, 1941, and which had not been held in his inventory more than 6 months prior to that date.

A summation of the scope of the program under the Murray-Patman Act is indicated in the following statement covering loans and purchases authorized and uncancelled as of January 15, 1943:

Article	Loans to dealers			Purchases from dealers		
	Number of items	Number of loans	Aggregate amount	Number of items	Number of purchases	Aggregate amount
Automobiles	49,848	2,009	$52,618,354.87	64	9	$62,677.30
Oil burners	6,260	71	376,291.73	13,572	1401	634,329.91
Typewriters	1,809	26	103,016.37	153		5,139.63
Tires and tubes	27,205	35	244,638.70			
Liquefied petroleum gas equipment	256	6	32,448.80			
Electric ranges				127	4	10,797.98
Gas-burning equipment	1,811	17	71,020.48	983	18	58,989.60
Commercial and industrial refrigerating units	429	8	108,189.95	109	5	60,706.11
Baker equipment	37	1	4,106.58			
Total	87,655	2,263	53,558,067.48	15,008	177	832,640.53

DEFENSE PLANT CORPORATION

Defense Plant Corporation is engaged in financing the expansion of plants and other facilities vitally necessary for the prosecution of the war effort upon the recommendation and sponsorship of the armed services, War Production Board, Maritime Commission, Petroleum Administration for War, Civil Aeronautics Administration, and other departments and agencies of the Government having the responsibility of procuring essential war materials.

Defense Plant Corporation has to date made commitments covering such expansion in the amount of approximately $8,838,000,000. While many of the Corporation's commitments cover the establishment of completely new plants to produce military supplies in volume, a substantial number of smaller commitments have also been made for facilities or machinery for the manufacture of necessary parts, precision instruments, machine tools, and the like which have been undertaken for the most part by smaller business concerns.

The records of the Defense Plant Corporation show that approximately two-thirds, in number, of the plant expansions undertaken by Defense Plant Corporation are for less than $1,000,000.

The Defense Plant Corporation has aided hundreds of small concerns through employment to design and construct plant facilities, to do subcontracting work on plant construction, and to supply necessary construction materials.

As to one phase of the program, the burden of assuring the uninterrupted production and distribution of machine tools through the placement of pool orders recommended by the War Production Board and the services has fallen upon the Defense Plant Corporation.

To this end pool orders for machine tools and equipment amounting to $1,600,000,000 have been placed through this Corporation. These orders are guaranties to the machine-tool builder, many of whom are small, of prompt markets and prices for his product until firm orders are placed by private enterprise or Government agencies. When firm orders are placed commitments of Defense Plant Corporation are canceled to the extent of such orders.

As an additional aid to the industries of the country and of particular direct benefit to the smaller manufacturer engaged in war production, the Defense Plant Corporation has been both lenient and liberal in authorizing its lessees to lend machine tools to subcontractors. It is estimated that over 1,500 plants of subcontractors, the majority of which are small, have benefited through this loan arrangement.

In one instance, for example, the Corporation approved a commitment of approximately $20,000,000 for machinery and equipment to be entirely leased or loaned to small business concerns estimated to reach as many as 500 companies for the purpose of manufacturing many types of parts for a prime contractor of airplanes.

In addition, the Corporation, at the direction of the War Production Board and with the approval of the governmental agency sponsoring the project, undertakes to see that any idle or excess machinery and equipment which it owns is transferred to other manufacturers having immediate use or need for the same. In many instances this may involve only one machine costing a few hundred dollars and in other cases may involve many machines which are required in order to enable subcontractors to perform their work.

DEFENSE SUPPLIES CORPORATION

Defense Supplies Corporation was created pursuant to section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended. Certain of its activities have been of considerable assistance to small business, particularly those designed to afford relief to the holders of inventories frozen by order of an agency of the United States Government.

The Murray-Patman Act authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its wartime agencies to purchase and make loans upon the security of certain rationed articles or commodities and is specifically intended to prevent and relieve distress among dealers and distributors. Defense Supplies Corporation has several programs the purposes of which are to afford similar assistance to manufacturers whose inventories have been frozen. Manufacturers of automobiles, refrigerators, trucks and trailers, office machinery, oil burners, commercial laundry and dry-cleaning equipment, space heaters and gas furnaces have received aid in this manner.

Prior to the enactment of the Murray-Patman Act, Defense Supplies Corporation afforded substantial and much-needed relief to tire manufacturers, dealers and distributors by purchasing all the tires and tubes which manufacturers and mass distributors desired to sell. Under this program the corporation acquired more than 6,225,000 tires and over 7,044,000 tubes from practically all manufacturers and mass distributors in the country thus enabling them to take back frozen tires and tubes from dealers of which there are more than 200,000. The Corporation has also purchased from automobile owners over 10,000,000 new and used tires and tubes which will be redistributed to essential users through the normal trade channels. By this means the inventories of tire dealers will be replenished from time to time as needed with the result that many of the smaller tire dealers will have stocks with which to continue business.

In addition to the foregoing, the Corporation has in numerous instances purchased directly, pursuant to the provisions of the Murray-Patman Act, stocks of new tires and tubes in the hands of dealers.

One important phase of Defense Supplies Corporation's activities is the assistance which it lends to producers of articles and materials necessary to carry on the war effort. In many instances the production of certain articles and materials is not sufficient to meet war needs and in order to obtain additional supplies it is necessary to convert facilities normally used for the manufacture of civilian goods to the production of war materials. These producers, who are commonly referred to as submarginal producers, are unable to compete with the larger and more efficient operators. To enable them to undertake these activities Defense Supplies Corporation purchases their output at prices substantially higher than those generally prevailing. Among those benefiting are producers of aluminum rivets, aluminum rod and bar, and jewel bearings. After these articles and materials are acquired by Defense Supplies Corporation they are sold at going prices which results in substantial losses to the Government.

Through the foregoing programs and many others which have been of indirect assistance, the Defense Supplies Corporation has rendered material aid to the smaller businessmen. By purchasing, stock piling, controlling, and releasing commodities essential to many industries connected with the war effort, the Corporation has kept and is keeping in operation a great number of small business concerns.

METALS RESERVE COMPANY

Prior to June 1940 many minerals listed as essential in the industrial economy of the United States were obtained from foreign sources because the deposits of such minerals in this country were limited, were not readily accessible, or were of a character to make extraction commercially impractical. Under

war conditions, however, barriers of these kinds cannot be permitted to stand in the way of the military effort. Every domestic resource which can be operated without undue strain on manpower or equipment available must be brought into play. This has meant a tremendous expansion in the number of mining enterprises and the great majority of such new enterprises are small ones.

The function of Metals Reserve Company has been to increase the supply of essential minerals to the maximum extent practicable. Procedures which are effective in one mineral obviously may not be of assistance in connection with another, so that the program varies considerably with the different materials involved. Thus it is not necessary to provide marke' for the sale of copper, lead, or zinc ore, sin the smelters provide a ready market for all usable material.

On the other hand, the commercial demand for manganese and chrome ores in the far West is limited and the small miners are not in a position to finance shipment to eastern consuming centers, nor are prices there particularly attractive. With this in view, Metals Reserve Company has made provision for the purchase of manganese and chrome ores from small mines at 19 different locations in 10 States and one Territory (Alaska).

In addition to chrome and manganese, certain purchase depots have been authorized to purchase beryllium, antimony, tin ore, tungsten ore, tantalum, and columbium in small lots and at attractive prices. Total purchases by these depots during the year 1942 amounted to about $1,162,000, an average of about $60,000 per depot. Many of the depots, however, made purchases of only $10,000 or $20,000—yet in spite of this small volume of business it has been felt worth while to maintain them for the purpose of facilitating the marketing of ores produced by the small mines.

A summary of the program in some of the more important materials follows:

Manganese and chrome: Producers able to offer 1,000 tons or more of these minerals are given contracts. To date 135 manganese contracts have been made with as many sellers, of which 129 contracts are for less than 10,000 tons each—thus falling in the small-producer class; the tonnage covered is 1,817,965 long tons and deliveries amount to 190,007 tons. Of the 52 chrome contracts made, 44 are for less than 10,000 tons each; the tonnage covered is 602,951 and deliveries amount to 44,349. Producers too small to make a 1,000-ton contract may ship on a spot basis to any of the purchase depots referred to in quantities as small as 5 tons at a time (or, say, about $150 in value). Prices paid are in line with the current market at eastern consuming centers, the producers thus getting the equivalent of transportation free. To date deliveries on this spot basis plan amount to more than 15,000 tons of chrome ore and 50,000 tons of manganese ore.

Copper, lead, and zinc: All mines in the United States are eligible to participate in the premium plan under which a substantial bonus is paid for production in excess of a quota, which is based as a rule on 1941 output. Small mines (those that produced less than 200 tons of metal) and new enterprises are given "zero" quotas. Zero quotas have been assigned to 1,539 mines for zinc, 1,677 mines for lead, and 1,153 mines for copper. Premiums paid to date are in excess of $22,000,000 over and above the ceiling prices established by the Office of Price Administration.

Mica: An agent corporation, Colonial Mica, has been established to purchase mica of strategic grades and to assist mica enterprises in securing supplies, priorities, and labor. Mica is now being purchased from well over 300 mines; almost 200 mines have been provided with equipment; and technical assistance is being given through the operation of seven mica trimming shops. There are no large enterprises in this industry, which have a gross annual production valued at less than $2,000,000.

Tungsten: To encourage small mines, a bonus price of $30 a short-ton unit has been established to which only those properties that produced less than 100 short tons in 1942 are eligible. The previous price was $24 a unit. One hundred and twenty-four producing mines are currently in this classification. Production of these mines is expanding rapidly and the number is expected to increase substantially.

In addition, a plant has been built at Salt Lake City which is buying tungsten ores with a content as low as 3 percent tungstic trioxide for processing into a commercial product with a content of 60 percent or more. A fixed price schedule has been established and several thousand tons of low-grade ores have already been accumulated for which there was previously no market.

Mercury: The high price of mercury (three times the pre-war level) has greatly stimulated production and brought several hundred small mines into operation. To tide over periods of occasional slack demand, Metals Reserve Company is buying mercury through agents and through its purchase depots at a price slightly under the Office of Price Administration ceiling and the small producer is thus assured of a ready market.

Salvage program: Metals Reserve Company has formed a corporation to act as agent in the purchase of 200,000 tons of copper and copper-base alloys held by 100,000 owners, most of whom are small business firms.

Two other corporations have been set up in connection with steel. One will buy iron and steel scrap which has not moved to markets because of cost and inaccessibility. The other will acquire and distribute stainless steel, tool steel, other alloy steel, ferro-alloys, and carbon steel frozen in the hands of warehousemen and others.

Secondary brass and copper scrap is being purchased from dealers throughout the country. Scrap containing 62,000,000 pounds of copper had been bought up to August 1, and it is anticipated that this will continue at the rate of about 17,000,000 pounds per month.

An agent has been appointed to buy 10,000,000 pounds of manila cordage and fiber from some 7,000 wholesale and 46,000 retail owners through the country.

If there is any further information you wish, please let me know.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES B. HENDERSON,
Chairman.

What a Difference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the confusion, the inefficiency, the muddling, and the bungling of official, political Washington is enough to discourage any other than a courageous, determined American people. The contrast between the conduct of official Washington and our fighting men is as great as that which distinguishes white from black. The fighting courage, the determination, and the will to win which animates and which is exhibited by our fighting men strengthens our faith and brings the conviction that win this war they will.

With but two exceptions—that at Pearl Harbor and the sinking of three of our cruisers without the firing of a shot in the South Seas, neither of which was the fault of any enlisted man or minor officer—the men who do the fighting for the United States of America have never, in any respect, failed the folks at home.

On land, on and under the sea, and in the air they have never hesitated. The record which they have made will stand forever as an example of what free men, reared in a republican, representative form of government, can and will do for home and fireside, for the land they love.

What our fighting men can and will accomplish when given adequate equipment and properly led was demonstrated when the Japs' last armada met MacArthur's men; 10 warships, 12 transports, 55 planes, and 15,000 men were blasted out of the air and from the surface of the sea. Our losses were 1 bomber and 3 fighting planes destroyed; others damaged were able to return to their bases.

Guadalcanal gave to history another example of the willingness to sacrifice and to die.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE PICTURE

But here at home our politicians cannot, or they will not, keep their eyes on the vital purpose—the defeat of our enemies, the preservation of our national existence. Social planning is still their method of approach toward a regimented people and the dictatorship which seems to be their objective.

This week, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Ralph Bard charged that absenteeism cost the Navy 16,700,000 man hours of production in December and told us those hours were enough to construct 14 destroyers.

The War Labor Board reported that in 1942 we had 1,363 strikes which caused a loss of 2,095,294 man days in war industries alone, while in all industries—and who can say that every industry is not involved in the war effort—because of strikes we lost 4,565,000 man days of work.

Because of the President's refusal to adopt and put into effect a fair labor policy, more than once he has been forced, in order to get production and quell disorder, to order the taking over of production plants or shipyards.

Within the last few days, Admiral J. W. Greenslade, commandant of the western sea frontier, charged that a strike which was called by the union, because, for one reason, four union men had worked on the Christmas weekend, "seriously impaired" vital war production. Another Navy spokesman said that the stoppage of work "probably will delay trials of one minesweeper built at the yard. If it continues, it will delay construction and completion of other minesweepers."

ABSENTEEISM

War production is being seriously delayed because of absenteeism, some of which grows out of the fact that Government workers are on some occasions

paid whether they work or not; out of the fact that there is a great deal of Monday morning sickness—more accurately described as hangovers from Saturday and Sunday "pursuit of pleasure."

When, and only when, this administration, or a courageous Congress—one or the other—forgets political maneuvering and solves our production problems on a businesslike theory or places its solution in the hands of trained production men, the fighting men—the men who are sacrificing—the men who are carrying on the battle to preserve our liberty, insure the continued existence of our home—will have the support which they deserve.

Detroit Tank Automotive Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I delivered over station USOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., yesterday:

Army Ordnance is charged with the supply of all kinds of weapons for war. This means that the Ordnance Department is charged with the design, testing, and procurement of our small arms, our artillery, our machine guns, our tanks, our tank destroyers, and all other manner of weapons and equipment used in ground warfare.

During the last World War operations of our Ordnance Department did not meet with the approval of the American people, with the result—as you veterans who fought in France remember—our armies in that war fought pretty much with French equipment. Here in America, the greatest mechanized country in the world, famous for our productive genius, we never did get under way in producing and delivering to the front weapons of American manufacture. Our boys—our country had a right to be sore.

In this war, however, Army Ordnance is doing a most capable job.

During the interim of peace between the last war and this—to the limit of its ability to operate with relatively meager funds—Army Ordnance continued to design and experiment with various types of new weapons to increase the effective fire power of our troops for the next war. These were developed principally in the several Army Ordnance depots and arsenals such as Rock Island, Ill., and tested in Ordnance proving grounds, the most famous of which is undoubtedly that at Aberdeen, Md.

Meanwhile at the Quartermaster Depot at Camp Holabird, Md., the quartermaster Corps experimented constantly with various types and designs of automotive equipment designed to meet the demands of modern warfare, which requires armies to travel on wheels or on tractor treads. And at Holabird many new and improved designs were invented and developed.

From the outbreak of hostilities in Poland up to Pearl Harbor, Army Ordnance and the Quartermaster Corps—through maintaining observers on the various fronts—carefully studied the operation of mechanized equipment in this war and recommended many changes in our own equipment. Then it prepared specifications and designs for equipment for our own Army, designed to give to American manpower, if it should eventually get into this war, the very best of mechanical equipment that American mechanical genius could devise.

It was, of course, but natural that when the big job came Army Ordnance should and did recognize that the job of making America the arsenal for democracy would of necessity command the best brains and talent in the American civilian industrial empire. Our own city of Detroit, being the automotive center of the world, was at one and the same time the production-line center of the world. Therefore, Army Ordnance and, indeed, all America looked to Detroit to take the major roll in the establishment of America's production lines for war. Automotive plants together with their labor and equipment and their managerial brains and engineering talent were thrown into the full war effort immediately.

One of the outstanding geniuses of the American production line, Mr. William S. Knudsen, head of the great General Motors organization, was given the job of mobilizing that industry together with its allied source of supply. It is to our national regret that he was never permitted to function to the full extent of his abilities. But, nevertheless, much has been accomplished.

Let me recite for you one typical example of what he accomplished. Top administrative and engineering officials of the Chrysler organization, a peacetime competitor of Mr. Knudsen, were called before him and were asked to build tanks. Hundreds of pounds of detailed blueprints were laid on the desk. Chrysler executives and engineers poured over those blueprints and, in turn, came back with their answer as to how and when the job could be done. A new assembly plant, now known as the Chrysler Tank Arsenal, was born. Existing automotive facilities were inadequate or unsuitable. New land was acquired. A new plant built. New machinery was designed, purchased, and set up. Experienced automotive personnel was reeducated to produce tanks on automotive production-line methods. Thousands of new workers had to be schooled and trained to efficiency for war-production jobs.

Material had to be purchased, refinements, improvements in design had to be accomplished; bugs in the establishment of the production line and in its operation had to be ironed out. Detroit's automotive genius met the challenge. Seven months after Mr. Knudsen, now General Knudsen, dumped the job in its lap, and before the last walls or the last roof were on the new plant, the first new General Sherman tank rolled off the production line.

It recently has been my great privilege to inspect the Chrysler tank arsenal in Detroit and in my next weeks' broadcast I am going to tell you more about what I saw at this arsenal which is, after all, but one of many such arsenals that are doing such a commendable job as to have already won the battle of production for the arsenal of democracy. And when I say that we have won the battle of production, I mean that insofar as Army ordnance is concerned. Our problem today is one of distribution; our problem today is one of getting the output of the arsenal of democracy to the training camps and to the battle fronts. The supply from America's army of production today is far and above the demand of our generals on the various fighting fronts; is far and above the ability of our enemies to destroy American equipment at the front; our supply is far above the demands for and the ability of our Army to train the men in this country who will actually fight this equipment on our far-flung battle fronts in this global war. As a matter of fact, and in this I take encouragement and I give you encouragement to believe that the battle of production is so well on schedule at this moment that before long it may undoubtedly be necessary to slow down that line of production before our storage yards, docks, warehouses, etc., are overcrowded to capacity with fighting equipment which we are unable to get to the fighting fronts as fast as it can be produced. And it is of little use back here.

Now when the picture was perfectly clear that a relatively large percentage of our ordnance would be coming from the Detroit district, Army Ordnance recognized that it would be absurd to maintain our manufacturing facilities out there and keep the supervisory personnel back here in Washington. To do so would have made it necessary for a constant and prohibitive travel back and forth between Detroit and Washington of Army and automotive executives. Consequently, the Chief of Army Ordnance, Major General Campbell, very wisely last fall set up in Detroit a subsidiary organization. He took from the Army Ordnance Department here in Washington a complete cross section of his organization and moved it out to Detroit where he set up an organization known as the Detroit Tank Automotive Center, headed by Brig. Gen. A. R. Glancy as Deputy Chief of Ordnance. General Glancy was drafted from civilian ranks because, having formerly been president of one of the large automotive companies he knew the science of the production line from top to bottom. He knew where to look for help, he knew how to organize Detroit's famous production line for war purposes. In no small measure can it be truthfully said that the victory of the battle of production in the Detroit Tank Automotive Center can be attributed to the wise decision of Major General Campbell and the excellent ability of Gen. A R. Glancy.

The Detroit Tank Automotive Center is located in several large office buildings in Detroit and at the present time has a staff of approximately 500 officers and approximately 3,000 civilian personnel. It is their job to "keep 'em rolling" and they are doing a good job. Incidentally it should be mentioned in passing that at about the time the Detroit Tank Automotive Center was set up, due to a reorganization within the Army, Army Ordnance took under its wing the automotive end of the Quartermaster Corps so that all of the rolling stock of the Army, together with the rest of the munitions and matériel—procurement and supply—is now all concentrated under the ordnance branch. As of today almost 20 percent of our entire war effort, insofar as ordnance is concerned, is concentrated in the Detroit area and Detroit is meeting the challenge.

As I previously told you, next week I am going to tell you in detail about my trip through the Chrysler Tank Arsenal and about the thrill of having a ride in one of those new tanks. But before I close today I want to say a few words about the famous Ford Willow Run bomber plant, which I likewise inspected in Detroit recently. The Willow Run plant is, of course, producing B-24 bombers and therefore does not come under the supervision of the Tank Automotive Center; rather it is supervised by the Army Air Corps. I went through Willow Run early last summer when construction of the plant and its facilities was still under way, but at a time, however, when it was expected that Willow Run would be grinding out bombers off the production lines within a very few weeks and at a rate which would cause no end of headaches to Herr Schickelgruber and company.

America has always been justly proud of the genius of Mr. Henry Ford and his entire organization. It was perhaps Mr. Ford more than anyone else who brought into being and perfected the technique of the production line in America. We therefore had every

confidence that when Mr. Ford set out to produce bombers in hitherto unheard-of quantities that his production would keep pace with his past records. We can say, therefore, that the failure of Willow Run to date has been one of the greatest disappointments of our war effort. In saying that I want it clearly understood that I attach no particular blame to Mr. Ford or his organization, nor do I attach any particular blame to organized labor, upon both of whose shoulders some have sought to place the blame for the disappointment of Willow Run; rather is the difficulty attributed, as I see it, to a combination of most unfortunate circumstances.

In the first place, Willow Run is of such tremendous size as to be almost beyond comprehension and certainly beyond comparison with anything with which you and I are normally concerned. For instance, remember that at Willow Run there are more people normally employed under one roof than there are living in any two cities in our entire congressional district. Visualize if you can a single building over a mile long down through and between the walls of which run not one but several production lines side by side, turning our airplanes that are over 100 feet in width. Visualize this single building under the roof of which these production lines are over a mile in length, a building that is over a quarter of a mile in width. Visualize if you can a property on the grounds of which, along with the manufacturing facilities, warehouses, and power plant, and executive offices, are also school facilities in which are trained not only thousands upon thousands of skilled workers for duty inside the plant and on the production lines but, in addition, in which are being trained countless thousands of Army aircraft mechanics, who will be called upon to service these aircraft on the airports of the world. Then, lastly, visualize, if you can, extending from the doors at the very end of the production line an airport, with concreted runways, as large as any of the biggest airports in this Nation. The very establishment of such a tremendous outlay required that it be built far away from the metropolitan center of Detroit. Consequently, what with gas rationing, tire conservation, etc., the question of transporting the workers to and from the bomber plant has been a most difficult task—the new super highway for which have but recently been completed. The operations have been constantly hampered and harassed by a shortage of manpower and womanpower. For instance, over 15,000 mechanics have been trained in the Ford school in Willow Run and of these, 6,500 have so far quit and sought employment in other war production plants in the Detroit area located much closer to their own homes. Housing facilities, even reasonably adjacent to the Willow Run plant, have been most inadequate and shamefully unsanitary and new construction has been very slow. All of these factors have resulted in an abnormal amount of absenteeism and an abnormal labor turn-over. Without the settlement of all of these various contributing factors, Willow Run cannot hope to reach scheduled production.

Nevertheless, as one is privileged to go through Willow Run, he is bound to get the same reaction that I did. They are trying their best to do a good job; they are trying to iron out the difficulties and get this most mammoth of all plants on scheduled production as soon as humanly possible, and the production and the construction of the thousands, yes, literally hundreds of thousands, of component parts that all go into the final assembly of the bombers has progressed to a point where one can feel only that the Willow Run of today is a seething bomb ready to explode at any moment with a flood of finished bombers which will contribute its ultimate share in the complete and final overthrow of the dynasties of the despots—Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo.

Willow Run is about ready to run—when Willow Run does run—Hitler better run.

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on March 6, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress is turning out to be the most remarkable in history. You will remember, a year ago many folks were saying that Congress had sunk to the level of a rubber stamp in the strong hand of the Chief Executive. You will recall that the general impression seemed to be that Congress had laid down on the job and had ceased to be on an equal footing with the two other branches of Government, the executive and the judicial.

To quite an extent, that was one time the public was right. Congress found it difficult to handle all the agencies and bureaus it had created and appropriated money for. Congress found it hard to control the size and importance of the departments. It had not been made clear to many appointive officials that they were the servants, not the masters of the people.

But that is changing now to quite an extent. It will change more in the future. Congress is encouraged by the widespread public approval of its fight to maintain its place in the sun. The people are waking up to the fact that to save themselves, they must save Congress, the most direct means of expressing their will in government.

For this reason, heated debates on the course the war is taking and on how the war is being run seem to be the daily occurence in both House and Senate. Every angle on every subject relative to winning this mighty struggle for feedom we are all engaged in is discussed and scrutinized thoroughly. Voting by Members on great issues is more independent in Congress today than it has been in many years. Congress knows the people depend upon it to preserve the freedom at home for which our boys are fighting overseas. I do not believe that Congress will fail the people in this responsibility.

Last week I pledged my support to the anti-poll-tax bill which will come up in Congress some time this year. This measure is the same one that was defeated before in the Senate after it passed the House. It was a pleasure to cast my vote for it and I will do so again.

The anti-poll-tax bill abolishes for all time the obnoxious poll tax which has excluded thousands of poor white and colored citizens from free elections by making them pay a tax before they can vote. This takes away a fundamental American right, the right of every American to vote. The greatest responsibility as well as the greatest prerogative in America is the right to vote.

Therefore, I raise my voice with indignation against any barrier placed in the way of my fellow Americans to prevent them from voting whether they be white or black, Jew or Gentile, Catholic or Protestant. If you deprive even a part of our population of participation in the processes of freedom, you destroy the Constitution which guarantees all men the right to vote. I hope the anti-poll tax bill is adopted soon by both Houses of Congress and is made law.

March 15th will soon be here and still no pay-as-you-go income tax bill has been brought out on the floor to vote on. I received a short indefinite answer to the plea I made from the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. You will recall that I wrote him expressing my concern over how we are going to raise money this year to pay last year's income taxes. I reminded him that most of us hadn't been able to save enough out of our salaries and wages because of increased living expenses and the purchase of war bonds. His answer was that we should all have made arrangements to pay these taxes; how, he did not specify. Unfortunately, I'm afraid it isn't as easy as all that. The only sclution, as I see it, is the pay-as-you-go tax plan. Then we can all get even.

A few days ago I appeared before the Post Office Committee of the House to plead for justice to our Federal post-office employees. I pointed out the need which postal clerks, carriers, and custodians have for increases in pay comparable with all other Government employees. My statement, given befor the full committee and a packed auditorium, reads as follows:

"Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, at the outset I wish to thank the committee for the opportunity of appearing here today in behalf of the postal employees in my district.

"I have received many letters from organizations of postal employees and also from individuals employed in the post offices back home; I think I am safe saying that their condition and their interests in this matter is motivated by a feeling that the postal employees are the forgotten men in this whole gigantic war effort.

"I was glad to have the chance of voting for a 10-percent pay increase, as did other Members, for employees in the Federal service. I hope before this session of the Congress is over that I may have another opportunity to vote for an increase in pay for these loyal and patriotic Americans who work in the Postal Service.

"I was thinking just the other day of several experiences I have had back home. Postal employees have come to me and said it was absolutely impossible for them to consider maintaining a standard of living these turbulent times in view of the fact that the cost of living had increased so rapidly and they have not had any increased compensation. Moreover, they claimed that they were running behind before the war began, and along with the increased obligations they have been required to assume, including increased cost of living, they found they could not keep going.

"One of the previous speakers mentioned that one of the reasons many of the older employees of the Post Office Department are remaining in their positions is to take advantage of seniority rights. I know a number of younger postal employees who have stated to me personally that they just could not carry on much longer without relief, and they had been urged in many cases to take better-paying jobs.

"May I emphasize the necessity—and I know it is not necessary, because you gentlemen of the committee are dealing with postal matters all the time—of seeing to it that the mails go through. I always think of the expression, "The mail must go

through,' particularly in wartime, particularly in times when we have so many men at the fighting fronts, and so many loved ones left behind, who are constantly wondering about the welfare of those in the service. As we all know, there is nothing that can create and maintain morale better than communications from a loved one in the service saying that he is all right.

"I sincerely hope that the high standard of the Postal Service may be maintained; and I want to assure the members of this committee that I am in wholehearted accord with the provisions of the pay increase bills you are considering, because they will give them assistance in carrying their weight of the heavy burden of responsibility in this most crucial hour of the Nation's history.

"Once again I want to thank you for the privilege of appearing before you and to assure you that, as I have during my other two terms in Congress, I will back remedial legislation which I know you gentlemen will report from your committee to the Congress.

"I think the House of Representatives deserves commendation for the passage of beneficial legislation affecting postal employees of America. I think that we can discharge our responsibilities and throw any blame from our shoulders in the delaying of passage of important postal legislation. The blame for this delay lies on the Senate side or in the executive department.

"Repeating, it has been a pleasure to come before the committee, and I thank you again for this time and for your attention."

One of the greatest satisfactions I get is to help a dependent wife or mother of a soldier at the front. Not long ago, a lady wrote me saying she had four small children and that her husband had been snatched away from her by induction. She told me that the small fund her husband had given her before he left was exhausted. She had even been forced to borrow money to feed her family. She appealed to me to help her. Fortunately, I have splendid contacts with Colonel Gilbert of Dependency Benefits which is the agency handling such matters. I got in touch with him immediately and before very long that mother had her allotment together with all the back payments. This made it possible for her to repay her loan and to take care of those little children. It is sad but true that children must continue to eat and be sheltered even after their fathers are drafted.

I receive countless letters like that one and it does me good to be able to help splendid American wives and mothers in getting the money they should have from the Government to maintain themselves and their families while their husbands are in the armed forces. If your case is similar to the soldier's wife I have just mentioned, don't fail to write me in Washington. I will help you.

Of all the countries fighting totalitarianism and who are our allies, the one I most admire is China. No nation ever suffered from the ruthless invader more terribly than Mother China has suffered from the despotic sway of the Japanese. But in spite of a limited army, poorly equipped, in spite of far reaching misery due to her invader's brutality, China has rallied and fought back in the bravest manner possible. Today, the Chinese have succeeded in holding at bay over 1,000,000 Japs. They are engaging our enemies and preventing them from using this 1,000,000 against the United States.

The spirit of China is best personified, I feel sure, in the persons of her great leaders, Generalissimo and Mme. Chiang Kai-shek. A few days ago you will recall, Mme. Chiang addressed the House. This noble lady won the complete admiration and applause of a most critical audience which is never very enthusiatic over foreign visitors. I have witnessed the appearance of many dignitaries and representatives of our allies before Congress, but, I can honestly say, I have never seen more genuine approval of these guests than the House gave to this outstanding leader, Mme. Chiang not only demonstrated that a woman is capable of assuming high leadership but she also broke down all barriers of racial differences if any had existed by her ability to personally charm her audience. I can well understand why she is the wife of General Chiang. She has strengthened his high place in the world by her own rare qualities which are found in few individuals. I was well pleased over my meeting with her. China is certain to be victorious under such guiding genius.

General Marshall recently announced that by the end of this year, 2,500,000 Americans would be overseas. He went on to say that at the end of 1944, 5,000,000 will have been shipped out of the country. This means that countless mothers, wives, and dependents will wonder about where their loved ones are. Every mail delivery or batch of telegrams from home bring me requests of parents and loved ones asking me to obtain information regarding their boys. Many times I am able to find out what they want to know. Therefore, if you have any difficulty or doubts of the safety of your son, or your husband, or your sweetheart, please do not hesitate to call on me. I will investigate immediately. Bear in mind that nothing is too good for the men giving their lives for America. By the same token, nothing is too good for the folks they leave behind.

Thank you!

Rural Electrification Administration and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Robert B. Craig, Deputy Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, at St. Louis, before national convention, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of our Rural Electrification Administration family.

It is a particularly happy occasion for me for many reasons. It is the first time I have seen the family all together. Here, family, are brothers from all over the United States and this morning the men on the stage represent your future brothers from Latin America. All of us united, not by blood, but by a bond, that is as strong as the bond of blood, the bond of a common ideal.

Sometime in days to come, and peace is here, we will again plan the tomorrow in a larger measure than we can plan today.

But some of the plans that we make today we will begin to carry out tomorrow. One of those plans, I hope, will be a joint meeting in this city or some other city of this country, in which all folks of the Western Hemisphere, united by this bond of our common ideal of rural electrification meet together to talk about it.

We have had world power conferences in the past. One of the things for tomorrow is the Western Hemisphere Rural Power Conference.

The members of the family from Alaska couldn't make it to this meeting. They are busy getting power to the Kodiak Army Base. The members of the family from the Virgin Islands couldn't get here, either. They are busy serving a very important war zone. They will be here one of these days. Then we will see all of our brothers together.

So, then, one of the things for tomorrow is that one of these days from all the Western Hemisphere we will all meet to greet the coming age of power.

In this convention your association has talked about certain specific things that it wanted to do. And I would like to pause right here and pay a tribute to all of the men who have worked in the organizing and the development of your association.

They have worked hard. Your being here testifies to the great job they did. Every officer and director of your association has given untold hours of his time, has traveled in many cases great distances, and has borne a very large share of the expense out of his own pocket for a purpose. Not the purpose of personal ambition or aggrandizement, or purpose of political advance, but the purpose about which we are talking here at this meeting—the ushering in to the farm people of this country of the age of power.

Yes; they have done well. They are to be commended. After some months, as you know, in which the going was plenty tough, they selected an executive manager who, I think, meets every specification for the job which they had to fill. So for tomorrow let us hope that the promise of the executive manager, Mr. Ellis, is borne out by a stronger, greater association.

Electric power is known throughout the world. Cheap electric power is still almost a novelty in the United States. And yet the whole question of its use and its value is in the price that must be paid for its services.

As recently as 1935, as most of you know, the average price for farm power per kilowatt-hour was 9 cents. Today it is slightly under half that. When the price of power is right, farmers and everybody else will use power.

I have just a few figures in front of me. I want to read six of them—a comparison of the power used on your lines in 1939, and the price, with the comparison of those hours used in 1942.

Now, it is true a great many more people have been connected to the lines and a great many more miles of lines have been built, but we expect to connect more people tomorrow and build more lines. So I think the comparison is indicative of some growth.

In 1939 you purchased 152,397,929 kilowatt-hours at a price of 1.21 cents per kilowatt-hour, and you paid for that power $1,843,900.62. Three years later your program had increased tenfold. And you purchased last year 1,086,221,222 kilowatt-hours. Your price was ninety-four one-hundredths of a cent for that $10,192,747. In the tomorrows that are to come we must increase, not tenfold but we must increase about fortyfold, to do the job we are talking about—electrifying every farm home in this country.

Your officers have spoken of the passage of a bill which has been named for its sponsor, the Rankin bill. And it has been explained to you that its purpose is to reduce interest, remove the restriction on the size of the rural town you can serve, strike out the words "central station service."

For what purpose? Only one: that you may have cheaper electricity at retail. The day the Rankin bill passes, your rates can be reduced to the following schedule:

Three cents for the first twelve hundred kilowatt-hours, a cent and one-half for the next 4,000; and all over that one mill on the actual cost of service.

There is not a cooperative in the United States whose present wholesale rate will not stand that rate schedule. [Applause.]

Of course, by present-day standards such a schedule is unthinkable, for it does not contain any demand clauses, any number of

outlet clauses that you find in some contracts, nor the number of cows in the barn, which is in a retail contract in Connecticut, nor all the other dodges that have been used to kid you about what the cost of a kilowatt-hour ought to be.

This is a simple rate schedule that any child who can buy 2 pounds of sugar at the country store can understand, and when that schedule is adopted by you Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives, as it will be some day, a great many professors of rate economics at our universities are going to be out of jobs; a lot of public-service commissions are going to be asked why such a rate schedule cannot be used in our cities.

Almost 2 years ago, at a State-wide meeting in Missouri, I had the temerity to state that I thought farm power should cost 1 cent a kilowatt-hour. Not many agree with that statement today, except those of us who have been, as you have, in the farm-power business.

One cent a kilowatt-hour. That is almost what you pay now wholesale. What magic is going to wipe out amortization costs, maintenance, depreciation? The magic will be that in the tomorrow you will own and control your own generating plants and transmission systems. [Applause.]

In the Northwest we point with pride to two great dams, Bonneville and Grand Coulee. We call Grand Coulee one of the greatest engineering feats of man, and we point to the fact that its mighty generators equal 2,000,000 horses.

It sells power to the cooperatives in the Northwest—and ask your brothers from Washington and Oregon about it—at a rate of 2 mills a kilowatt-hour. We can show you from your own records, if you haven't kept them yourself, that many of you today are distributing this power between 8 mills and a cent at the present rates of usage.

Tomorrow can bring 1-cent kilowatt-hour power for you and your people back home, if following this meeting you go determined to see that all power potentialities in your millstream, in your neighboring river, are developed to your benefit. And, after you get that power at a price you ought to pay, well, let the engineers bring the gadgets of tomorrow to use it.

So I offer you a toast: Here's to the coming power age; may it be ushered in by this association. [Applause.]

Feed Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

MARCH 5, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Wisconsin Congressman,
Washington, D. C.:

Meeting today. Agreed that farmers will not accept and put into practice increased production methods recommended by college white-collar men. Past experience proves we will listen to methods given by dirt farmers. Discontinuing feed wheat hinders our production.

RICHLAND COUNTY FARMERS,
FOSTER PATCH.

Problem of Absenteeism in Relation to War Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Problem of Absenteeism in Relation to War Production," by Duane Evans, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in the January 1943 issue of the Monthly Labor Review:

PROBLEM OF ABSENTEEISM IN RELATION TO WAR PRODUCTION

(By Duane Evans, Bureau of Labor Statistics)

Absenteeism, the failure of a worker to appear at the job he is scheduled to do, is a matter of growing concern to those entrusted with the responsibility for war production. During peacetime, a certain amount of absenteeism was expected and accepted by employers, and it was kept within bounds by minor controls. Production schedules were usually flexible, and enough trained workers were ordinarily on hand to insure that no serious interruption in work resulted.

As the demands of war production bring us nearer and nearer to the exhaustion of labor reserves, the problem can no longer be viewed complacently. Thus far, war production generally has not been limited by absenteeism. In many cases, shortages of raw materials and semifabricated items, and of the facilities needed to produce them both, are more important than absenteeism in restricting production, and workers are still available in sufficient numbers in most areas so that "cushions" of a few extra workers can be arranged to guard against production delays. However, what may be said in general does not apply in particular cases. There are today a number of places where the amount of output that can be achieved depends heavily on the amount of trained labor which can be applied to the job, and in many cases these same points form critical constrictions in the entire war-production program. It is difficult to overemphasize the seriousness of a report that in a recent month 8½ percent of the available labor time in a large copper mine was lost forever through absenteeism. Moreover, as production schedules become more closely integrated, it is clearly evident that unnecessary absences of workers from their jobs will become a critical limiting factor throughout the war production effort.

For practical reasons, absenteeism is usually defined as the absence of a worker during a full shift that he is scheduled to work. Employers frequently are able to tabulate the number of workers scheduled to appear on a given shift, the number which actually reported, and, by difference, the number absent. It is much more difficult to tabulate part-day absences, and there is, for example, no obvious line of demarcation between part-day absenteeism and tardiness.

There is no statistical information available to indicate the general extent of absenteeism in war industries. Scattered reports from a number of factories reflect rates ranging from between 2 and 3 percent up to 15 percent and more. Reports from all shipyards in the United States, tabulated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, show that in the month of November the absenteeism rate in that industry averaged 8.7 percent. It is expected that reports indicating the extent of absenteeism in other war industries will be available in the near future.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ABSENTEEISM

Sufficient information is available, however, to indicate certain general characteristics of absences in industry. It is established, for example, that absenteeism rates are generally higher for women than for men, even on jobs of the same general character. Consequently, it is to be expected that, as more women are drawn into the labor force, absenteeism rates may tend to increase.

Greater sickness rates among women are probably a factor in their higher absence rates. The United States Public Health Service reports that in 1940 the frequency of sicknesses and nonindustrial injuries lasting 8 or more consecutive days was 153 per thousand for women as compared with 96 per thousand for men. The home responsibilities of many women in the labor force are without question an important factor. Many women industrially employed also carry the major part of the burden of running the home, and their actual working hours are thus not indicated by the time card in the factory. This extra strain probably leads to greater frequency of absences. It may also be observed that sickness among family members or children often means that the wife rather than the husband (where both are working), remains at home to provide care.

One large war plant reports current absence rates at 4.8 percent for men and 7.4 percent for women. Another gives the percentages as 5.2 for men and 8.5 for women. These figures are typical of a number of reports. Figures from another plant are especially interesting in that they show absenteeism rates for men and women separately during day and evening shifts. Whereas the rates for men and women on the day shift were 5.2 and 6.6 percent, respectively, corresponding figures for the evening shift were 5.4 and 5.7 percent. On each shift the rates for the women were higher than for the men, but on the evening shift the difference was only fractional. Moreover, the rate for women on the evening shift was lower than for women on the day shift whereas in the case of men the reverse was true. This suggests strongly that women who accept jobs on other than a day shift are likely to have fewer home responsibilities, or at any rate are more successful in carrying them along with an industrial job.

A study undertaken by one company indicates that absenteeism tends to be higher among older workers, increasing rapidly after 40 or 50 years of age. As younger men are drawn into the armed forces and the average age of those remaining in industry increases, this factor may also contribute to an increase in general absenteeism rates.

For obvious reasons, absenteeism tends to increase as the scheduled workweek becomes longer. The more time the worker spends on the job, the less free time he has to devote to personal affairs, and the more likely he is to take time off from his job. The physiological factor must also be considered. As hours are increased to the limit, the worker is under increasing nervous and physical strain. If the limit of his endurance is approached, time off the job in which to recuperate becomes a physiological necessity.

The accompanying table illustrates the effect on absenteeism of changing hours of work in a large war plant. This plant had been operating 6 days per week in most departments and 7 days per week in some. During the 5th day period shown in the table, the plant reduced hours so that most departments operated 5 days per week and a few 6. At almost the same time certain attendance regulations were put into force. As a result of the combined effect of these

two factors, absenteeism declined steadily in the following 3 months from around 7 percent to a low of 4.2 percent. At the end of the 3-month period hours were again increased, most departments going on a 6-day week. The attendance regulations were still in force, but within 2 months absenteeism had increased to a level of over 6 percent.

Absences on different days of the week show a marked pattern related to week ends and pay days. In general, absences are least frequent on pay days, and quite high on the day following pay day. Moreover, there is a tendency for absences to be numerous on days adjacent to a week end or holiday, independent of the pay-day effect. Since many plants pay on Fridays, these effects frequently combine to produce the lowest rate of the week on Friday, the highest on Saturday, and a relatively high rate on Monday. The data shown in the table are unusually interesting in that they permit separation of these effects, since this particular plant paid in biweekly periods. It will be observed that the Fridays which were pay days always showed rates substantially lower than the average for the biweekly period. As a matter of fact, the rates for pay days were remarkably stable and ranged in general between 3 and 4 percent In contrast, Fridays which were not pay days showed rates near the biweekly average. Absence rates on Mondays following pay days were substantially higher than the biweekly average and also higher than the rate on Mondays not following pay days. On the latter days, however, absences were usually higher than the general average.

A somewhat different situation was found in another large war plant. There the working schedule was arranged in such a way that one-seventh of the workers were supposed to be off every day. In such a situation it might be assumed that the week end as such would lose its significance, and only the pay-day effect would disturb an even pattern. The daily rates during a recent month were as follows:

Sunday	16.0
Monday	8.2
Tuesday	7.8
Wednesday (pay day)	6.4
Thursday	8.5
Friday	8.1
Saturday	9.0

Wednesday (pay day) was low for the week. The rate for Sunday, however, was about double the weekly average. This very high rate may have a religious significance, but it is probably also connected with the fact that Sunday is likely to be the day when friends and family are free from work.

There appears to be a tendency for evening and night shifts to have higher absenteeism rates than day shifts. The following rates on three shifts were observed in a large shipyard:

	First shift	Second shift	Third shift
Monday	7.5	8.3	9.8
Tuesday	6.4	7.1	7.9
Wednesday	5.6	6.6	8.1
Thursday	5.3	5.8	6.8
Friday (pay day)	4.2	4.9	6.1
Saturday	7.7	9.0	12.0
Weekly average	6.1	6.9	8.4

On every day, rates were successively higher on the second and third shifts. The pattern of absences, however, remained substantially the same, with Friday (pay day) lowest and Saturday highest during the week.

Efforts at control of absenteeism are effective in reducing the general level, but apparently do not alter this persistent weekly pattern. The following rates during a recent month were recorded in another large plant:

Monday	3.6
Tuesday	3.1
Wednesday	3.0
Thursday	3.1
Friday (pay day)	2.6
Saturday	4.5

This particular plant had an elaborate absence-control system, and had reduced its general rates to a level substantially lower than other plants of similar character in the same area.

Some plants keep separate records on absences by department. Where such data exist, there is usually considerable variation from department to department. The figures would appear to indicate that accounting departments, tool cribs, offices, and supervision show lower rates than factory work generally. There is, however, no information to indicate whether absences tend to be relatively more frequent on routine as compared with nonroutine work or on heavy versus light work.

CAUSES OF ABSENTEEISM

In discussing the causes of absenteeism, a distinction should be made at the outset between voluntary and involuntary absences. In general, no statistical distinction is possible. In a few cases efforts have been made to determine the extent and causes of voluntary absenteeism by interviewing workers. But the validity of the results was questioned by the investigators themselves because of the difficulty of obtaining an objective statement of the reason for a voluntary absence, or for that matter, simply a statement that an absence was voluntary. However, companies with absence-control programs and careful records of time lost have not generally been able to reduce absenteeism below 2 to 3 percent. Some such level may perhaps be taken as a practical minimum, and everything over this regarded as probably preventable and so in a sense voluntary. The real characteristic distinguishing voluntary absenteeism is, of course, that it is under the control of the individual worker.

There is no question but that the major cause of involuntary absence is sickness. Accordingly, the health programs sponsored by many companies for their workers are a direct attack on this source of lost time. Some employers require periodic physical examinations of their employees and so are able to employ preventive measures to reduce absences through illness. In some cases vitamin preparations and cold vaccines have been distributed free, or at cost, to reduce respiratory illnesses. The United States Public Health Service has made specific recommendations in certain industries to reduce special health hazards. For example, it has recommended that special "change houses" be established for workers in the iron and steel industry who are exposed to high temperatures, so that they may change from perspiration-soaked clothing to dry clothing before leaving the plant.

Community health and health services may influence absenteeism, especially as more women are brought into the labor force. For example, the health of young children is as important as that of their working mother, as far as her attendance at a job is concerned. Proper facilities for the care of children during the day, while parents are at work, will assist in reducing lost time from such causes.

Working conditions generally must be satisfactory if absences are to be held to a minimum. Reasonable hours of work and periodic days of rest contribute to reduction of absences from sickness. The recent statement of policy of a committee of Federal agencies headed by the Secretary of Labor, recommending that every worker be given at least 1 day off in every 7 and work not more than 48 hours in any one week except where absolutely necessary, was designed not only to maintain workers' efficiency in the war period but also to reduce absences caused by sickness and nervous strain.

Accident-prevention campaigns carried on by many companies help to reduce time lost from the job. Some employers have found that accidents off the job cause more absences than industrial accidents, and have inaugurated programs to make workers safety-conscious off as well as on the job.

There is a series of causes of absenteeism that lies on the border line between the voluntary and involuntary, in that a reduction in absences is possible through the voluntary effort of the employee, but the conditions which lead to absence are to some extent outside his control. For example, a worker who is required continuously to work long hours may take time off on his own initiative, to relax and relieve physical or nervous fatigue. Such voluntary absence may take the place of involuntary absence, later, because of sickness or nervous exhaustion. The most satisfactory remedy in such a case lies not in an appeal to the worker but rather in a reduction of working hours below the limit imposed by his endurance.

Housing shortages and transportation difficulties are in many cases related causes of absenteeism. Makeshift housing and overtaxed sanitary facilities in the vicinity of expanded war industries may lead to sickness, sometimes in epidemic proportions, and consequently to lost working time. The adequacy of housing accommodations in any area in which war factories are situated is thus a matter to be considered carefully in appraising general worker efficiency.

Crowded housing facilities in war production areas usually imply long journeys to and from the job for many workers. In several areas, according to reports, substantial numbers of workers are commuting distances up to and in excess of 60 miles. The effect of this is to add 2, 3, or more hours to the employees' workday. Both because of the added strain and because the worker has that much less time in which to attend to personal affairs, such conditions will lead to absences. Many of these workers traveling long distances depend on personally owned automobiles for transportation, and mechanical failures, poor tires, and the like are stated to be causes of absences, especially where public transportation is not available or is inadequate.

In particular cases, much has been done by employers themselves to ease transportation difficulties. Many companies have, of course, sponsored car-pooling arrangements. In many places, working shifts in the same plant and in neighboring plants have been staggered to ease peak demands on overloaded public transportation systems. Some firms have purchased and operate busses for workers where other transportation is inadequate. A more ambitious step in this direction has been taken by a shipbuilding company at Houston, Tex. It is renovating 42 railroad cars purchased from the defunct New York, Westchester & Boston Railroad. These cars will be used to carry workers the 15 miles from Houston to the isolated shipyards.

Some war plants in areas where housing facilities are inadequate have reported that week-end absences are frequent among men, who use this opportunity for visiting their families which cannot be housed in the neighborhood. Men are also reported to be absent frequently in efforts to find living quarters for their families.

Inadequacies in community facilities contribute to lost time in still other ways. As more women are brought into the labor force, there are more families in which all adult members are expected to work 6 days per

week. Where this is the case, it is important that shopping facilities be available for workers in the hours when they are off duty. In some cities the local merchants' associations have arranged to see that the stores stay open at least one night each week for the convenience of workers on day shifts. A different approach to this problem has been reported in England, where nonworking women have assumed the responsibility of shopping for neighbors who have accepted war jobs.

Mr. Roosevelt's Place in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Youngstown Vindicator of Friday, March 5, 1943, entitled "Mr. Roosevelt's Place in History":

MR. ROOSEVELT'S PLACE IN HISTORY

Much is being said as Franklin Roosevelt begins his eleventh year in the White House about all the precedents he has broken. He is the first man to have three terms, and consequently to be talked of for a fourth. He is the first President to cross the Atlantic in an airplane or to visit a foreign battle front. He is the first to bring about cooperation of the Americas, to institute fireside chats, social security, insurance of bank deposits, and so on. But all these firsts will pale into insignificance in comparison with history's answer to the two most important questions concerning him.

The first deals with the general trend of Mr. Roosevelt's policies. His main purpose up to the war was to better the position of the common man. He has succeeded in doing this, but has he done it permanently, has he done it in the right way, and in a way that will not injure but will improve the general economy and the social system of his country?

His friends assert that he has saved the country from domination by the capitalists and the great corporations, and certainly he has arrested if not reversed a trend in that direction. His critics reply that what he has done has been to accelerate the rise of the people that has been going on for more than a century. They say that he has hastened the trend toward equalitarianism—in which the worst is equal to the best—that can end in nothing but the break-down of standards and the lowering of the quality of American life.

The other question concerns the President's attitude toward the war. What could he have done to avert it, and what more should he have done to bring the country to a better state of preparedness? As President he must have known better than anyone else what was going on in the Axis countries. He proved in his famous speech in Chicago about the quarantining of aggressor nations that he was aware of the great danger. When he was attacked for that speech he let the subject drop. It is said that his mere suggestion that the United States might find itself involved had an effect that was the direct opposite of what he intended, that it strengthened the isolationists as nothing else could have done, that he gave them something concrete to oppose, a potential enemy to be on guard against and if necessary to crush. For great numbers of our people were ostrich-minded. They knew that a world war was going on, and that we could not help being drawn into the last one. They knew that this one was far more serious, and that freedom could not survive if the Axis won. Yet they had been taught that war is the worst of all evils and that they were safe behind the two oceans. They did not want to know the truth. Anyone who told it to them was a warmonger.

After the actual outbreak of war Mr. Roosevelt went ahead with promptness and decision. Even though he moved cautiously and felt his way, he took one necessary measure after another to protect his country and prepare it for war. But nothing he could do then could possibly be as helpful as these same steps would have been if taken years before. Can he be blamed for not having taken them? Stalin took them, but Stalin was a dictator and could and did put those to death who opposed him. If Mr. Roosevelt had been a zealot on the subject of preparedness, he might have been put out of office without accomplishing anything worth while. Instead of helping his country, he might have done it great harm, for it is quite likely that he would have deprived it of effective leadership and thrown everything into confusion just when a firm hand was needed at the helm. Once in the war, Mr. Roosevelt's leadership was masterly. He is not perfect, but he is farsighted, unafraid, with a comprehensive grasp of what needs to be done and how to do it.

The two questions remain for the world to ponder. We are too close to see them in proper perspective. Upon what historians find to say in answer to them will depend the President's place among the great men of the world.

Honor Thy Father and Thy Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press, of Pontiac, Mich., in reference to a decision rendered by the Honorable Arthur E. Moore, judge of probate for Oakland County, Mich., the second largest county in the State.

There is not a Member of the House who will not agree with the decision of the probate judge which was the only decision he could make in the case. The very thought that two able-bodied sons were unwilling to provide for their aged parents is repugnant to decency and we revolt at the mere suggestion that the ties of blood no longer mean anything in the human family.

Every Member of this House recalls the Scriptural admonition:

Honor thy father and thy mother which is the first commandment with promise; that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth.

As critical as we might be and can be toward these two young men who no longer are conscious of their responsibility to their aged parents, nevertheless the fault is not entirely their own. Their attitude has undoubtedly been influenced if not encouraged by a paternalistic Government which has, at least during the last decade promoted the theory and philosophy that everything was to be furnished by the Government. This philosophy has destroyed in the minds of many people their effort to provide for themselves and the moral obligation of children to their fathers and mothers.

The editorial follows:

WHAT OTHER DECISION COULD THERE BE?

Public approval undoubtedly will be forthcoming for the decision of Judge Arthur E. Moore in the recent case in probate court where two sons earning high wages in defense work were ordered to contribute to the support of their aged parents. Evidence in this hearing revealed a strange situation. One brother in service was contributing from his soldier's salary to pay on a contract to buy a home for his parents, while the two civilian brothers seemed willing to let the support fall upon welfare agencies rather than to give aid. Judge Moore ordered them to contribute monthly.

Shakespeare put it: "How sharper than a serpent's tooth it is to have a thankless child." The aged parents in this case may never have read the immortal bard but his thoughts on that subject expresses the thing that must have increased their misery. We can think of no situation so tragic as that of Charles and Lillian Brown. It was mitigated alone by the act of that son in service.

Few men ever have opportunity to repay their parents for the long years when they were supported, guided, clothed, and educated. With few exceptions the trials and duties that run from the cradle to the home stand in the credit column on the parental side of the family ledger. When it is needed to save parents from the ignominy of public support, refusal is not a personal matter but a subject of official and public interest and concern.

The defense in this hearing was that "the Government ought to take care of the aged." This is a philosophy of thought that has been growing in recent years to the confounding of humane family relations. We would do much better to turn to the Chinese philosophy of family life, and follow it.

Nor is this case only one here where children seemingly have forgotten the debt they owe their parents. Other cases of like character have been before the probate court but the details have not been made public. It might be much better if all these instances are brought into the limelight. Publicity might serve as an example to those who may have forgotten the debt they owe.

Mr. Willkie's Shoes Are in the Ring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of March 2, 1943:

MR. WILLKIE'S SHOES ARE IN THE RING

Wendell Willkie's mouthpiece, the New York Herald Tribune, says he is going to be a candidate for the Republican nomination in 1944. His shoes are unlaced. Almost any

day now they will be tossed into the ring along with his socks, and the transformation of the Wall Street lawyer into the barefoot boy from Indiana will again have been accomplished.

The announcement is interesting as disclosing that Mr. Willkie continues to take himself seriously. Travel has broadened him. Since his return from a round-the-world trip in an Army plane, Mr. Willkie can say, "Willkie is wonderful" in Russian, Chinese, Arabic, and Persian as well as in his native Hoosier accents. Nobody can accuse him of having wasted his time or the Government's equipment. He was a mighty busy man all the time he was gone.

Nevertheless, the loyal opposition has been having an uphill pull. The people just don't seem to be interested in him. They don't care much whether his shoes are on or off. The barefoot boy tried to push Mr. Dewey into limbo and now Mr. Dewey is Governor of New York and Mr. Willkie isn't. He tried to purge Congress of its most stalwart Republican Members only to see them returned triumphantly. He sought to make the Republican Party indistinguishable from the New Deal party only to see the Republicans make their greatest gains where the opposition to this nonsense was strongest. The election last November was as much a rejection of Willkie and his imitation New Deal as of Mr. Roosevelt and the original article.

With all of these evidences of his popularity to sustain him, Mr. Willkie is now undertaking to tell the Republicans of the country that they must support him for the Presidency because only he can win. Evidently it is true that when you've got it your best friends won't put you wise.

Assistance for Chinese Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Hon. E. R. Stettinius, Jr., Administrator of the lend-lease program:

MARCH 1, 1943.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am very glad to furnish you with the information requested in your letter of February 24, insofar as I can do so without divulging secret data that might be of assistance to the enemy. In accordance with your request, I am enclosing two copies of this letter and have no objection to your placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if you wish. Your questions are quoted below for your convenience.

"What is the C. N. A. C. (China National Aviation Corporation)?"

China National Aviation Corporation is a company which operates an air line between Calcutta, India, and Chungking, China, and also within China.

"Who (what government, what aviation interests, what persons) organized it?"

The company was organized by the Chinese Government and private American interests and a majority of its capital stock is now owned by the Chinese Government through its Ministry of Communications, and a minority by Pan American Airways Corporation or one of its subsidiaries.

"Who manages it?"

The board of directors of the company consists of Chinese Government officials, who constitute a majority of the board, and American civilians designated by Pan American Airways. The management consists of experienced American and Chinese air line operators. The president and executive vice president are Americans.

"What service does it perform (commercial or military or both)?"

The company provides regular passenger service between Calcutta and Chungking and branch line service from Chungking to the Provincial capitals of Lanchow in northwestern China and Kweilin in southeastern China. This passenger service is subject to Chinese Government priorities and passage is limited to Chinese and Allied Nations' civil and military personnel on urgent business.

The line provides cargo flight service for the Chinese Government over the same routes and carries no commercial cargo other than that certified by the Chinese Government as essential to the war effort.

Pursuant to contract with the United States Army, Services of Supply, China National Aviation Corporation also provides service for the movement of military supplies and equipment from Assam Province, India, to Yunnan Province, China. This supplements movements of identical character which are under the direction of the United States Army Air Transport Command, using United States Army owned planes. Return cargoes of both China National Aviation Corporation and United States Army planes consist of strategic materials.

"What is its (China National Aviation Corporation's) relation to the Chinese Government?"

"What is its (China National Aviation Corporation's) relation to the United States Army Air Forces in China (and in India)?"

"What war services has it rendered?"

I believe that the questions listed directly above have been fully answered by the replies to foregoing questions.

"What proportion of the military supplies that have been carried into China from India has it (China National Aviation Corporation) carried?"

Both China National Aviation Corporation and the Army Transport Command engaged in the identical three functions listed in the statement made to the committee. Before the United States Army Air Transport Command started operations, China National Aviation Corporation was carrying the major part of the load. As additional planes have been assigned to the Air Transport Command by the Munitions Assignment Board, the proportion of supplies carried directly by the United States Army, as compared with the China National Aviation Corporation, has increased. For the reasons given at the end of this letter, I regret that this question may not be answered more fully.

"What proportion of war materials that have been flown out of China and delivered in India, for shipment to war industries in United Nations countries, has it carried?"'

The answer to this question is approximately the same as the reply to the previous question.

"How many (planes) has it (China National Aviation Corporation) asked for?"

Prior to the operation of planes of the United States Army Air Transport Command over the route from Assam Province to Yunnan Province, the Chinese Government asked for 100 cargo planes to be operated by China National Aviation Corporation. This requirement was obviously modified when United States Army planes began to operate over the same route. At that time, part of the request for planes made by the Chinese Government had been met. I do not believe that this question can be answered more specifically without divulging secret military information, as is more fully explained below.

"What is the quality and the record of performance of its (China National Aviation Corporation) administration and of its pilots?"

The quality and the record of performance of the administration of China National Aviation Corporation and of its pilots have been excellent. The wartime experience of this organization gained in operations, first on flights to Hong Kong and later to Rangoon, proved of great value to the Air Transport Command in developing its operations in this area.

"Exactly how many Chinese student pilots have been brought to the United States for training under Lend-Lease?"

More than 400 student pilots have been brought here for training under Lend-Lease up to the present time.

"How many of these (planes) have been supplied by Lend-Lease? How many planes have been supplied by China National Aviation Corporation?"

"How many has Lend-Lease delivered to it?"

"How many does Lend-Lease expect to deliver to it within the next 6 months?"

"How many such planes have been supplied by Lend-Lease?"

"How many is it intended to send during the current 6 months?"

"What value and what tonnage were shipped from the United States in the last month for which complete reports are available?"

"What was the value and what the tonnage of air deliveries of lend-lease goods to China in 1942?"

The questions listed directly above relate either to the number of planes supplied or to be supplied to China National Aviation Corporation or to the amount of materials and equipment which have been shipped to China in the immediate past. As you will doubtless recognize, these matters involve military information which might prove valuable to the enemy and which has not been released by the Army. The air line bringing supplies into China from India is subject to attack from near-by situated enemy bases. Any information assisting the enemy to calculate the number of planes in this service and, hence, the frequency of flights, is likely to enhance the danger to which these operations are already subject. Furthermore, much of the military equipment and goods being supplied are now being used by Chinese troops facing the enemy in Yunnan Province. Obviously, information throwing light on the amount of these materials might adversely affect the operations of these troops. In addition, the answering of the next to last question listed above would not only aid the enemy in calculating the amount of goods being shipped to China from the United States, but might also endanger their transportation due to the fact that it sometimes takes 60 days or more for goods being shipped by water to reach India, en route to China.

I hope that this letter will give you a large part of the information which you desire. I deeply regret that we have not believed it possible to answer all of your questions as fully as we would have wished. We very much appreciate the interest you have shown in lend-lease operations regarding China.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
Administrator.

Involuntary Servitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of March 5, 1943:

INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE

It doesn't take an expert on the Constitution to see that the proposed draft of civilian manpower for assignment at the President's discretion to industry or agriculture can't live alongside the thirteenth amendment. That amendment very clearly states: "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

When somebody proposes flatly to tell any woman between 18 and 50 and any man between 18 and 64 what kind of job he shall take, where he must work, and what hours, pay, or other conditions he must accept, it is difficult to discover what other words than "involuntary servitude" will accurately describe the citizen's status. Yet this bill was drafted by a lawyer, Mr. Grenville Clark. It was introduced in the Senate by a lawyer, Mr. Warren Austin. It has been supported by the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, who is a lawyer as well as a close friend of Mr. Clark. And it evidently has the approval of the President, who holds a law degree.

It is impossible that these lawyers, or any lawyers, or, indeed, anyone at all familiar with the Constitution, should be ignorant of the fact that the proposed legislation contravenes the thirteenth amendment. There are only a few circumstances in which the Government can use compulsion to exact the citizen's services. It can coerce him to defend his country, and it can coerce him to enforce his country's laws. A citizen can be conscripted for military service in war, and in peace a sheriff can deputize any citizen. But nowhere in our law or custom is there any precedent for requiring the citizen in his capacity as wage earner to place himself at the disposal of the State.

When the Constitution granted Congress power to provide for organizing, arming, disciplining, governing, and calling forth the militia, it was taken for granted that the citizen owed it to his country to bear arms in its defense. The second amendment further clarified the citizen's military obligations when it gave him the right to keep and bear arms because "a well regulated militia" is "necessary to the security of a free state" and arms are necessary to the militia. Finally, by an act of 1903, the militia was specifically defined. It consists of every able-bodied male citizen and every able-bodied male of foreign birth who has declared his intention to become a citizen who is more than 18 and less than 45. The organized militia is to be known as the National Guard, and the remainder as the reserve militia. Thus, it was understood that all citizens of proper age, even if not on regular militia duty, were still subject at all times to call. Conscription acts are, therefore, merely a convenience in summoning inactive militia to military service.

Nobody can pretend, however, that because able-bodied males are required to give military service if necessary to their country, there is the slightest constitutional justification for assuming that all citizens, both men and women, can be required to place themselves at the disposal of the Government as civilians. Conscription is an extraordinary power of Government, to be invoked only in the event of invasion, threat of invasion, or rebellion. The service commanded is military and nothing else.

To attempt to torture this into sanction for the Government to levy upon the civil talents of the citizen, or to teach him new ones, is clearly to invade the freedom of person specifically guaranteed by the thirteenth amendment. Congress will be well advised to reject any arguments that the administration may advance that national security demands the passage of this bill. We cannot secure the safety of our country by stripping the citizens who compose it of their constitutional protections.

He Should Get the Medal for Dumbness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a newspaper clipping from the Chickasha Star, Chickasha, Okla. The suggestion to Mr. Martin could well have come from the same office who advised the gentleman from Virginia to have his constituents take the shoes off their horses at night, or who told the Idaho rancher to postpone his lambing season for more favorable weather.

The clipping follows:

HE SHOULD GET THE MEDAL FOR DUMBNESS

If they ever give medals for dumbness, there is one fellow in the War Production Board set-up at Washington who should be given an extra large one. His display of knowledge came about by reason of the fact that Bud Martin recently moved to Chickasha and set up housekeeping. Bud had to have a heater to keep himself and his family warm. There are dozens of gas heaters in Chickasha, but Bud couldn't buy one without permission of the War Production Board. So Bud picked one out at the Anderson Furniture Co. that he liked and wrote the War Production Board at Washington that he would like to buy it. The following letter came back:

FEBRUARY 13, 1943.

Mr. BUD MARTIN,
Chickasha, Okla.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: This is in reply to your letter of January 28, 1943, regarding the purchase of a gas heater.

Inasmuch as the use of gas and oil are restricted in your area, it is our suggestion that you consider the use of a heater requiring less critical fuel such as coal or wood.

If you wish to change your plan and reapply, your request will be given careful consideration and you will be notified of the final action taken as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH F. WILBER,
Director, Plumbing and Heating Division.
By J. T. KELLY, Jr.,
Chief, Inquiry Section.

Now, the fellow that wrote that letter is a typical bureaucrat. He didn't know that not 1 house in 10 of the newer houses in Chickasha has flues that could use coal or wood. He would have a resident of Chickasha install a wood or coal heater just because some bureaucrat up above him said that was the thing to do. He didn't know that natural gas is the cheapest and best fuel that can be bought in Chickasha. He said that gas and oil was rationed in this area, when if there are any two things that we have in abundance they are gas and oil.

When we read such letters as the above we wonder if we can ever really win the war with such dumbness in high places.

Milk Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM A. BARDEN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina:

House Joint Resolution 492

Joint resolution to petition the Office of Price Administration to adjust fairly the price of milk to be paid to the farmer

Whereas the Office of Price Administration has temporarily frozen milk prices on the farm level at the prices prevailing during the month of January 1943; and

Whereas the ratio between the price of milk and the cost of feed and labor was very unfavorable at that time to the producers and is now even more unfavorable; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration in fixing ceilings on feed manufacturers, warehousemen, handlers, and dealers, has provided for reasonable margins of profits; and

Whereas 56 herds of dairy cattle have already been sold in North Carolina and many other dairymen are seriously contemplating sale because milk prices are insufficient to cover mounting feed and labor costs; and

Whereas North Carolina is a milk deficient State and imports more than 2,000,000 pounds of milk per month; and

Whereas any decrease in milk production in North Carolina will necessitate increased shipment of milk into the State and further burden transportation facilities; and

Whereas this order will result in a decrease in milk production in North Carolina far below present demands and further aggravate the growing food shortage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. That the Office of Price Administration be requested to reconsider their action and either rescind the order or fix milk prices at the farm level high enough to cover all feed and labor costs and allow a reasonable margin of profit.

SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization, the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Prentiss Brown, Director of the Office of Price Administration, and to each Senator and Representative from North Carolina in the National Congress, with the request that our Senators and Congressmen

do everything possible to get the Office of Price Administration to reconsider this action and get this matter adjusted before it is too late.

Justice for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the postal employees of America are among our most loyal, efficient, and devoted public servants. The whole business operations of the country are dependent upon their faithful functioning. They are the medium through which romance is kept alive and carried on, expedited, and brought to fruition in the exchange of letters between men and women fond of each other. Through them, messages of cheer, affection, and good will are exchanged between the men in the armed services and their families at home. Too long has their welfare been neglected by the Congress. The basic rate of pay for the mail carriers and clerks has not been increased since 1925. They should not be penalized now by compelling them to continue working for the low compensation vouchsafed them for the past 18 years.

It is inevitable that, with this situation obtaining, a vast turnover in personnel afflicts the Department's operations. I plead with this Congress to effectuate a needed change at once, recognize these faithful men and women, encourage them, set the example for them. Let us practice what we preach when we enacted the wages-and-hours bill.

A conservative daily newspaper, the Post-Standard of Syracuse, N. Y., recently published an editorial which I believe to be most timely, and which I am hereinbelow quoting. It was republished in the 28 News, the official bulletin of Local 28 of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, of Seattle, Wash., for the membership and officials of which I entertain profound affection and deep regard. Though they are the employees of the Seattle Post Office, and hence, in most cases, are not residents of my congressional district, the membership of Local 28 are well known to me and I certify, without hesitation, that they are an exceptionally intelligent group of liberal-minded and soundly patriotic citizens, who are keen students of current affairs.

The editorial is as follows:

HOW GOVERNMENT CHISELS ON ITS OWN EMPLOYEES

Ours is a nation of strange paradoxes. Here is one of the strangest.

Our Government has established an elaborate set of regulations, agencies, and boards to safeguard the right of workers in private employment to obtain a living wage and to compel employers to increase wage scales to meet rising living costs and to pay time and one-half for all overtime beyond 40 hours a week.

But what does the Government do about its own employees? Let's consider the postal employees.

We need not eulogize post-office workers. Everyone who sends or receives mail appreciates the efficiency of that department, and there are certainly few jobs in private industry which are more exacting than that of mail carrier or clerk. True, they will become eligible for a pension, but when they reach that point, they will have earned it many times over.

The basic rate of pay for a mail carrier or clerk is $2,100 a year. This has not been increased since 1925. Postal workers did keep their jobs throughout the depression because theirs is a vital service—but they earned every cent they received.[1]

Up to the last few months they received nothing for time worked over 40 hours a week, but were given compensatory time off the next week. When the manpower shortage became acute, an order was put through authorizing them to be paid for overtime at the basic hourly wage rate of approximately 89 cents an hour.

Then came the Mead-Ramspeck bill in the dying hours of the Seventy-seventh Congress, putting all Federal employees on a 48-hour week, and providing that they be paid time and one-half for the extra 8 hours. Apparently Uncle Sam was at least meeting the standards he set for private employers—but no!

The postal workers discovered that although they worked 308 days a year,[2] deducting five holidays and 52 Sundays, their new overtime was to be computed on an annual basis of 360 days a year, and that instead of being paid about $1.30 an hour for the extra 8 hours, they would get only about $1.09. Since most carriers and clerks were already on a 48-hour week, their ballyhooed time and one-half rate amounted to only approximately 20 cents extra an hour, or only $1.60 more a week than they were already getting.

If a private employer attempted to chisel that way, the labor boards would crack down so quick they'd make his head swim. But the Government, which hasn't raised postal wages in 18 years, can get away with it. The only redeeming feature is that provisions of the new bill expire April 30, and that the sense of fairness of the American people may force an honest readjustment.

[1] Not mentioned is the fact that postal employes took a pay cut during this period.

[2] Although we were being paid for overtime on the basis of 308 working days per year, the actual number of working days in our year, based on the 40-hour week, was 253. It is on the 253-day basis that we want our overtime pay adjusted. (Editor.)

A Father

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, the letter I am having printed in the RECORD today so nearly parallels the feelings I recently experienced upon my boy leaving for the service at the age of 20 years, on February 11, 1943, and so well states the feelings of many other Members in this House whose sons have done likewise, that I believe we should give serious attention to the appeal voiced by this father and accept his admonition as the heartfelt anxiety millions of parents are feeling today about our conduct and action here at Washington.

Let us subscribe our efforts and mental capacity and dedicate our purpose to thinking about a wholehearted support and constructive application to the winning of this war as soon as possible. Let us give assurance by our actions to these unnumbered fathers and mothers of men in the armed forces that the trend of our thought and the purpose of our effort shall lend themselves to the plaintive petition inferred in the grief and anxiety of the writer of this letter:

A FATHER

March 2, 1943, my wife and I took our only son, age 19 years, 11 months, and 8 days, to catch a train for Fort Hayes in Columbus, Ohio, where he was to receive orders to report somewhere for training in the Army Air Corps. Like myself during World War No. 1, he enlisted of his own free will and accord.

I am an American through and through, but I will have to admit it was one of the hardest things I have ever had to do—all my 48 years of life—to send our only son away to war. Neither he nor myself know just what we are fighting for. The whole world seems to be in such a muddle. Our great leaders of the United Nations tell us we are fighting to stamp out tyranny and aggression. The way I feel right now that is not enough. We should also win the peace. If we millions of fathers knew definitely that our sons are fighting for something sound, something we could sink our teeth into, it would be a different story all over the world.

As my wife, my son, and I stood along the railroad track in front of the small depot in our home town awaiting the train to carry our son off to war, neither of us had much to say—we had a lump in our throats and something tugging at our heart strings. As the train rolled in, mother and I clung tightly to his arms, until he boarded the train, then we took a last glimpse of him as the train started to move away. Neither of us could hold back the tears any longer as we waved good-bye to him, then we got into our car, driving very slowly all the way home—neither had a word to say, but some serious thoughts were running through my mind. I thought, well am I buying enough War Bonds to protect our son and many other fathers' and mothers' sons who feel the same way we do? Then I thought of some of the things that were going on on the home front such as absenteeism, strikes, work stoppages in vital war industries, appeasement of Fascist Spain, of the isolationist, the friction between Army and Navy Chiefs and Congress, and lots of others I could mention. Then you begin to wonder when our great civilian Commander in Chief is going to crack down and put a stop to all this political bickering.

We've a tremendous job to do, let's get that done first. If Washington is the cause of this war being prolonged 2 minutes, and in that short space of time is the cause of our son not coming back, the end of the war, victory, and the peace of our Commander in Chief has promised will come, won't mean much to me any more. I think there are many millions of mothers and fathers who feel the same as I do. Can't the minority of Americans put aside greed and selfishness,

and work for a common cause and purpose? Let us do as the great Creator has told us, "love thy neighbor—do unto others as you would have them do unto you." This old world of ours is large enough for all of us with space to spare.

A large majority of us on the home front are willing to sacrifice, go hungry, ragged, or anything our Government asks of us if we can only have our sons back—they are still school kids.

D. W. ASHER.

CUYAHOGA FALLS, OHIO.

Lincoln on Limitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial taken from the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., Wednesday, March 3, 1943:

LINCOLN ON LIMITATION

Executive orders setting limits on what any American citizen will be allowed to earn in any one year have served to remind many people of what Abraham Lincoln said on the subject, entirely because it is so very different. Lincoln went on to say "Prosperity is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. * * *. Let not him who is homeless pull down the house of another, but let him labor diligently to build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence. * * * I take it that it is best for all to leave each man free to acquire property as fast as he can. Some will get wealthy. I don't believe in a law to prevent a man from getting rich; it would do more harm than good."

Newspaper Comment Favoring Pay Increase for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Los Angeles Herald Express speaks forcefully for itself, and it is encouraging to know the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has taken up the bill, H. R. 1366, which would provide the pay increase about which the editorial speaks:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS—POSTAL EMPLOYEES NEED THAT RAISE WITH COSTS OF LIVING STILL RISING

Post-office employees are still having their pay cut instead of being raised, as it should be. It is being done indirectly, of course, but none the less painfully.

It is through the medium of a steady advance in living costs. All know that is an effective way and that it hurts!

A real raise for post-office employees—which they did not get from the Congress which ended recently—is therefore unfinished business for the new Congress now in session.

A measure adopted by the previous Congress, which provided for overtime for a certain relatively small group of postal workers if, as and when they got it, did not solve the problem.

At first hailed as relief for the mass of postal workers, who have not had a raise for seventeen years, it proved not to be that at all when analyzed.

The situation stands as it was. The raise is still unprovided—but more sorely needed than before.

Very few post-office employees, relatively, work overtime. Only those who do can benefit from the action of the last Congress, and very slightly at that.

It was a makeshift measure that was passed and it expires April 30 next. Post-office employees are seeking higher basic pay. They deserve it. They ought to have it.

In time of war our postal system is one of the vitally important parts of our communications system, as it is, also, in times of peace.

The new Congress should not shirk its duty in this important matter but should raise the basic pay of the men to a figure on which they can live comfortably at present prices.

That's the fair, honest, and decent thing to do.

Facilities of Small Colleges Should Be Utilized by Government in Rehabilitation Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL. W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago this House passed a bill introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] providing for the hospitalizing of veterans of the present war on the same basis that we hospitalize veterans of the First World War.

Since its passage by the House a companion measure has been passed by the Senate. It is a source of satisfaction to those of us who supported and worked for the passage of this legislation that we have now removed an obstacle which was rapidly bringing about a disgraceful condition.

The Army was already beginning to discharge men for physical and mental disabilities arising from their service without any provision for their proper care. The Veterans' Bureau asserted that it could not, under existing law, provide for these men, and we all know the pitiful condition to which some of them were reduced, some even being cared for in jails or being thrown back on counties and States woefully unprepared to care for them.

The legal impediment to our assuming our proper responsibility for these men has now been removed by passage of the Rankin bill. Passage of that bill demonstrates that the Members of this Congress are alert to meet the needs of the men and boys who are suffering physical and mental ills because of their service to the United States.

But the passage of the Rankin bill does not meet in full our responsibility to these veterans of the present struggle. We have gone only part of the way by thus, through law, giving the Veterans' Bureau authority to deal with the problem.

It remains the obligation of this Congress to see to it that the Veterans' Bureau is given the tools with which to handle the job.

Most of us are familiar with the abhorrent conditions that prevailed for years after the World War when only inadequate or improper facilities were available for the care of the thousands upon thousands of veterans who were brought home with impaired minds and impaired bodies. Lack of foresight had caused the Congress to fail to provide for these shocked and wounded heroes.

When the pitiless facts were revealed the Congress moved with speed and energy to correct conditions. We rescued men whose minds were ill from insane asylums and worse institutions. We strove with might and main to provide cheerful and adequate and efficient hospital facilities for those who needed them.

Because of the pressure of time and conditions the then Congress was faced with doing an almost insurmountable job in an almost impossible hurry. No doubt money, effort, and efficiency were sacrificed to meet what had become an emergency condition.

We can avoid facing another such emergency when this war ends if we deal with the problem as it develops and as our passage of the bill the other day indicates we want to deal with it, humanely and decently and effectively.

We would be blind indeed if, much as we regret it, we did not realize that already ships are bringing back to our shores from many battle fronts men who are sorely wounded. We would be blind if we did not realize that we are already turning out of our training camps men who are equally entitled to the best medical and hospital care which can be provided.

It is not too early for the Congress to give time and thought to this situation. It is upon us. Let us deal with it now before it overwhelms us.

There has come to my attention recently one suggestion for immediately reaching this problem, at least in part. Action upon this suggestion would, in fact, go a long way toward solving two problems. It would give us at once a superb type of establishment in which we could give proper and helpful care to these men and boys.

It would also provide a means of saving from dissolution and destruction scores of small colleges and educational institutions. The very existence of these institutions is threatened by the complexities of the war. They are not, like the bigger colleges and universites, adaptable to the training needs of the armed services. These larger colleges and universities would be in the same

boat with the smaller ones if they could not be absorbed into that training program. Because we may as well face the fact that except for isolated instances of special training higher education is doomed for the duration of the war.

The training program has proven a lifesaver to these large universities. It will enable them to keep afloat until peace returns and they can return to their normal and essential sphere of action.

But the smaller educational institution does not have this lifesaver. Unless it is given some part in the war work it will sink. And if we permit it to be destroyed there will go out of American life an important, an essential factor. For the small college in peacetime meets a need which is not met by the bigger university. It gives a training to men and women which Americans should have.

The coupling of the solution of our problem of giving the best care to the shocked and wounded soldiers of the war with the solution of the problem of the small colleges in their struggle for existence affords a great opportunity to the Congress.

The proposal for union of these two needs is not my own. It has been suggested by Dr. Robert G. Ramsay, dean of students and registrar of Olivet College at Olivet, Mich.

Dr. Ramsay has already had considerable correspondence on the subject with Government officials and with officials of other colleges.

I believe it would be helpful to the Congress and to all those concerned with this problem to give a quotation from a recent statement of Dr. Ramsay on this matter. He said:

> In the whole field of rehabilitation, it seems to me that the small colleges can perform a distinctive service and one that is quite in line with the traditions of our institutions and within the limits of our capacities.
>
> It seems certain that as the war progresses this Nation will be faced by the appalling problem of reeducation, retraining, and rehabilitation of many of the wounded and of soldiers who suffer from shock. Certainly this creates an obligation on the part of this Nation to restore these men to useful life, and, equally certainly, it affords a real opportunity for service to colleges which, for reason of their size, are prevented from engaging in the more spectacular work which the larger institutions are now performing.
>
> Obviously, hospitalization will be required for many, but there will, in all probability, be thousands who, in a year in the quiet surroundings of our small colleges, and under the guidance of faculties that have developed skills in dealing wisely and sympathetically with students as individuals, can be restored to useful life and gainful occupations. * * *
>
> Such a program would, I think, be of inestimable value, not only to those who might have the opportunity of participating in it but to the colleges that must have some assurance of continued existence, and should not be denied the right to play a useful part in the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this program is grounded in the soundest of sense. At one stroke it would solve two problems.

Let us take advantage of it and save our wounded and shocked heroes from untold and indescribable suffering. We can keep them out of jails and asylums and rehabilitate them in the finest and most cheering of surroundings.

We should be warned and not put off this problem until it grows too big for ready solution. We should likewise be warned that if we permit the destruction of the small college we are letting something go out of American life which could not be replaced for generations.

The Food Supply

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, many States do not furnish sufficient food for the consumption of the people within their own borders. In addition during the past several years our agricultural imports have exceeded our agricultural exports. By 1940 our agricultural imports were twice our agricultural exports. In other words, we have not been feeding ourselves, but now we are called upon to feed the world. This is one reason the beef shortage is so acute at this time.

The following table shows the percentage of food and fiber sold by the farmers of each State and the population percentage of each State in relation to the national marketings and population:

Percentage each State is of total United States cash income from farm marketings for first 11 months of 1942 in comparison to percentage each State is of total population

State	Percentage [1] each State is of United States total cash income from farm marketings, January–November 1942 [2]	Percentage each State is of total population [3]
	Percent	*Percent*
Alabama	1.14	2.15
Arizona	.65	.38
Arkansas	1.95	1.48
California	7.46	5.25
Colorado	1.57	.85
Connecticut	.54	1.30
Delaware	.33	.20
District of Columbia		.50
Florida	1.26	1.44
Georgia	1.51	2.37
Idaho	1.14	.40
Illinois	6.17	6.00
Indiana	3.54	2.60
Iowa	7.90	1.93
Kansas	3.65	1.37
Kentucky	1.38	2.16
Louisiana	1.18	1.80
Maine	.54	.64
Maryland	.81	1.38
Massachusetts	.75	3.28
Michigan	2.59	3.99
Minnesota	4.54	2.12
Mississippi	1.88	1.66
Missouri	3.47	2.87
Montana	1.21	.42
Nebraska	2.94	1.00

[1] From statistics furnished by Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

[2] From statistics furnished by Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce.

[3] These percentages are practically the same as in 1941.

Percentage each State is of total United States cash income from farm marketings for first 11 months of 1942 in comparison to percentage each State is of total population—Continued

State	Percentage each State is of United States total cash income from farm marketings, January–November 1942	Percentage each State is of total population
	Percent	*Percent*
Nevada	.14	.08
New Hampshire	.22	.37
New Jersey	1.08	3.16
New Mexico	.60	.40
New York	3.40	10.24
North Carolina	2.87	2.71
North Dakota	1.87	0.49
Ohio	3.86	5.25
Oklahoma	2.40	1.77
Oregon	1.29	.83
Pennsylvania	2.63	7.52
Rhode Island	.10	.54
South Carolina	1.14	1.44
South Dakota	1.58	.49
Tennessee	1.52	2.21
Texas	6.26	4.87
Utah	.53	.42
Vermont	.42	.27
Virginia	1.31	2.03
Washington	1.92	1.32
West Virginia	.43	1.44
Wisconsin	3.73	2.38
Wyoming	.60	.19
Total	100.00	100.00

Mr. Speaker, this table is based on farm sales, and it should be borne in mind that an additional amount of food not reflected in this table and in the form of fish and other sea foods gleaned from the lakes and oceans is consumed by the people of each State.

You will note that many of the large food-producing States, such as California, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota are the same States in which powder plants, munition plants, shipbuilding activities, airplane factories, and other war industries are located. This results in the location of employees in regions of largest food production and near the food supply. However, it also results in an increasing manpower problem on the farms of that territory.

A study of this table will show the food responsibilities of these various States, especially when you realize that each State is responsible for feeding its own people as well as making its contribution toward the food commitments of the country.

A few of our large food-producing States like Iowa, Minnesota, Texas, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Kansas, and Missouri, representing only about one-sixth of the entire population of the United States, produce about one-third of the food of the country. It is apparent how important it is to keep the manpower on the farms in these States and how difficult it is to do so. The State of New York, which is one of the leading food-producing States, also has within its confines 10 percent of the population of the country. Gov. Thomas Dewey is to be congratulated upon the fact that he has not only fully realized the food situation in his State but has attempted to increase the food production in the American way.

What Hypocritical Gov. Sam Jones Left Out of His Article in the Saturday Evening Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, which include therein press accounts and a statement of the Louisiana League for Clean Government.

The following is part of what Gov. Sam Jones left unsaid in his Post article as written by James Aswell.

Note: James Aswell was removed by the legislature last July as Governor Jones' personal publicity agent at a salary of $10,000 which was paid by the State of Louisiana. Since then Mr. Aswell has been placed on another similar "deadhead" pay roll by Governor Jones.

There is an old adage that "people who live in glass houses should not throw stones." Evidently Louisiana's Bayou Governor had never thought of that or else he would have gotten his own house in order before he criticized other administrations.

The two most important departments in Louisiana are, first, the highway department, and second, the department of State police.

Gov. Sam Jones appointed W. Prescott Foster, a supposed wealthy sugar baron, who has worked labor at 75 cents per day for years, as chairman of his highway department. Mr. Foster, according to reports, donated large sums for the campaign of Governor Jones. Soon after his appointment Mr. Foster became involved in a scandal that rocked the State, as well as Governor Jones' administration.

Here is what the statement of the Louisiana League for Clean Government said:

WILL THE GRAND JURY ACT?—WHAT'S HOLDING BACK THE POSTAL INSPECTORS?—THE STATE LOST $224,000—WHY?

People are wondering why the now famous Kansas City bridge deal has never been investigated, when such a full investigation has been made of all other highway department deals. Who is shielding who, or trying to hide what? The public is entitled to the full and complete details.

The Louisiana Highway Commission had a written, binding, and valid contract with the Kansas City Bridge Co. for the construction of the Baton Rouge bridge. This contract provided that the Kansas City Bridge Co. would pay the State $1,000 per day for each and every day the job remained unfinished after a specified date. This provision was as legal and binding as any other clause in the contract. It was admitted that 307 days was the overdue time, so it was automatically admitted that the Kansas City Bridge Co. owed the State $307,000.

The bridge company never contended that the contract was invalid, so it owed this amount to the State just as much as the State owed it any money for the work performed by the bridge company.

Now, there was no question of the State having to collect its $307,000 from the Kansas City Bridge Co.—the State already had in its possession enough of the bridge company's money to cover the $307,000 owed to it under the contract. All the highway commission had to do was to tell the bridge company to run up the street. This is just what the Leche administration and the Long administration did. But when an "honest" administration came in, the bridge company got some attention.

The Sam Jones administration accepted $83,000 in full settlement of its legal and valid claim for $307,000. It only gave away $224,000 of the people's money. Think how much this $224,000 would have meant to the school teachers, the bus drivers, the old-age pensioners, the State employees, and the taxpayers. It would have paid for voting machines. It would have patched up a lot of highways. It would have run some departments of government for a whole year.

The highway commission did not have to collect this $83,000 from the Kansas City Bridge Co.; it had the whole $307,000 in its possession. Under the compromise, the highway commission handed over to the Kansas City Bridge Co. a cool $224,000, nearly a quarter of a million of the taxpayers' money. How come?

Little Dick Montgomery, the Sam Jones henchman, got a fat fee of $7,500 out of this deal. Who got what else, the public has not been informed.

The people demand to know:

1. Who Little Dick Montgomery represented. Did he represent the highway commission in parting with $224,000 of the taxpayers' money or did he represent the Kansas City Bridge Co. in crawling out of a valid $307,000 obligation for a puny $83,000?

2. Did Little Dick Montgomery resign as attorney for the highway commission just to handle this deal?

3. If Little Dick Montgomery represented the Kansas City Bridge Co., how could he ethically have done so when he had just been attorney for the highway commission and knew all about its affairs?

4. With the great attorney general, Eugene Stanley, at its disposal, as well as its own attorneys, why did the highway commission have to especially get Little Dick Montgomery to represent it in this deal?

5. With an able lawyer like Payne Brezeale representing it, why would the Kansas City Bridge Co. have to employ Little Dick Montgomery and pay him $7,500 to put this deal over?

6. With all the money in its own possession, why didn't the highway commission let the case be tried on its merits and let the supreme court determine the matter? Didn't the State have everything to gain (having possession of the $307,000) and nothing to lose by the court deciding the matter?

7. Did Sam Jones and the highway commission know that the constitution prohibits parting with the people's money this way?

8. Did Attorney General Eugene Stanley look the other way?

In case the East Baton Rouge grand jury, now in session, and the Postal Inspectors do not know what to do, we give them a few pointers:

1. Subpena the bridge contract and see what its provisions are.

2. Subpena Payne Brezeale and examine him under oath as to his knowledge of the affair.

3. Subpena Little Dick Montgomery and question him under oath as to his part in the deal, particularly as to whom he represented, just what he did to earn his fat fee, who paid the fee and who invited him in the case.

4. Subpena the members of the highway commission and question them under oath about the deal.

5. Subpena all the records of the highway commission and examine them, particularly the checks issued, and see if the mails were used in clearing them.

6. Subpena the officials of the Kansas City Bridge Co. and examine them under oath. Perhaps if they are promised immunity, some interesting facts will be developed.

7. Subpena the officials under the old "corrupt" administration and find out why they refused to compromise the claim.

. Examine all witnesses under oath as to whether any others, besides Little Dick Montgomery, got fees or made profits.

9. Make public the full results of the investigation, so that the public will be fully informed as to why $224,000 of the taxpayers' money was given away by State officials.

LOUISIANA LEAGUE FOR CLEAN GOVERNMENT.

Here is what was reported by one of the newspapers:

FOSTER TAKES $30,000 IN CROOKED BRIDGE BILL

The first hunk of big graft was uncovered last week when Prescott Foster, chairman of the State highway commission, received a $30,000 pay-off (on the side) to defraud the State of Louisiana out of $225,000.

It all happened this way: The Kansas City Bridge Co. which built the bridge across the Mississippi River at Baton Rouge owed the Louisiana State Highway Commission $307,000. The Kansas City Bridge Co. agreed to pay the State of Louisiana $1,000 per day for each day's delay in completing the bridge. The delay amounted to 307 days. Therefore, the bridge company owed the highway commission $307,000.

Presscott Foster, chairman of the highway commission under Jones, boasted about donating $30,000 to Sam Jones' campaign fund. When it came time to collect this $307,000 Mr. Foster collected only $82,000 of the $307,000 for the highway commission and collected $30,000 on the side for himself.

Officials in explaining the transaction stated that Louisiana was owed $307,000. When the pay-off came, the State of Louisiana was out $225,000, the bridge company paid $82,000, and Prescott Foster was in $30,000.

LIKE "BOSS" TWEED

As a result, Prescott Foster, for a bribe of $30,000, defrauded the State of Louisiana out of $225,000.

If history repeats itself this smells like the beginning of a period of graft and corruption comparable to that of "Boss" Tweed, of New York. It is recalled that Mayor Wood, of New York, was corrupt and consequently lost out to "Boss" Tweed, who was elected mayor of New York on a reform ticket (just like Sam Jones was) and a wave of graft and corruption immediately sprang up. It wasn't long before the corruption of the Tweed administration made the predecessors, the Wood administration, look like a bunch of small-town pikers.

From an unbiased viewpoint it looks like Sam Jones, the "reformer," is following in the footsteps of "Boss" Tweed, also a "reformer"; that is, if this steal of $30,000 by Prescott Foster is any criterion of the graft and corruption of Sam Jones and his gang.

Wonder if Pres had to split this $30,000; and if so, with whom and how much?

Highway Chairman Foster, in hot and deep water, smarting and withering under this exposure, resigned—apparently at the request of Governor Jones—as chairman of the highway department February 1, 1943.

Governor Jones at the beginning of his term as Governor appointed a superin-

tendent of State police, a man by the name of Steve Alford.

Immediately after his appointment, Mr. Alford's actions attracted suspicion of the entire State.

He organized a private patrol service and placed these men as guards in various defense plants, Army camps, and the like. Federal funds were paid to the worker, who, in turn, endorsed the check and turned same over to Mr. Alford.

Mr. Alford then deducted certain amounts and issued a check to the worker from the State police department. Mr. Alford sold all clothes and equipment. It is estimated that his profit was lucrative. It was shown that he had deducted $32,000 by July 22, 1942.

Here is a news article:

ALFORD INVESTIGATED FOR $32,000 SHORTAGE AT ARMY CAMP POLK

Somebody connected with the Louisiana State police at Camp Polk made off with $32,000—and it wasn't in Polk.

The $32,000 in Uncle Sam's cold, green cash mysteriously disappeared between the time checks issued by the Army Quartermaster were endorsed by Louisian State troopers working at Camp Polk at Leesville, La., turned over to Steve Alford, superintendent of Louisiana State police, and the troopers were repaid with checks issued by Alford.

In this transaction—all too, too mysterious to satisfy some people here—each State trooper found himself clipped of $10 on each check.

Federal investigators who went to Louisiana to investigate irregularities and excessive costs in the construction of Camp Polk, say that Superintendent Alford attempted to explain the $32,000 shortage, difference, or discrepancy. But, say the Government men, Alford just couldn't satisfy us with his explanation. The money wasn't there. It was gone.

Alford, reports here have it, contends that the $10 per check that the troopers were clipped—aggregating $32,000—was to pay the cost of the troopers' uniforms. The State bought each of the troopers a pair of pants at $4 per pair.

Here is another newspaper article which gives the background of Superintendent of State Police Alford:

SAM JONES KNEW THIS

Gov. Sam Jones has known for many years that Steve Alford was crooked and corrupt. Years before Sam Jones ever thought of running for Governor he had many dealings with Steve Alford.

As it is recalled, Sam Jones was assistant district attorney under John Robira. There had been several robberies of warehouses in and near Lake Charles several years ago. A man by the name of Mancuso was indicted for these robberies and Sam Jones, then assistant district attorney, was to prosecute Mancuso. The name of the case was *State* v. *Mancuso*. The district court in Lake Charles was the scene of the trial.

During the trial Steve Alford took the stand and, according to Sam Jones, Steve did some light and fancy lying known as perjuring. When Steve Alford got down off the witness stand Sam Jones said in a loud voice in open court, "Steve Alford, I am surprised at you, and if I could prove about you what I know is true, I would put you [Steve Alford] in the penitentiary."

So Jones knew Steve Alford perjured himself, and with that knowledge Sam appointed Steve to the very important position of superintendent of State police. Maybe that is the real reason why Steve Alford was appointed superintendent of State police, because Jones knew ahead of time that Alford was crooked and corrupt. There is no wonder that all forms of big and little graft evolve around Alford.

Here is still another item carried by a Louisiana newspaper:

ALFORD NABBED STEALING

Steve Alford was caught stealing oil by tapping the oil pipes of the Republic Oil Co. at Stark, La.

The Republic Oil Co. operated and owned several oil wells near Stark, La. Much of this oil was mixed with water and had to be separated by passing from one tank to another. During this operation there was a little seepage that the oil company did not bother with.

In fact the Republic Oil Co. allowed certain trusted fellows to gather this seepage each day for themselves. It amounted to two or three barrels a day and it meant about $2.50 for the day's work. When one of the fellows who was getting this waste oil went to Arkansas, Steve Alford asked to take his place, putting up a pitiful tale to the Republic Oil Co. that he was down and out. The company said O. K.

For the first few weeks Steve Alford gathered his 2 to 3 barrels a day. After that Steve began to get 20 to 30 barrels a day. The officials of the oil company became suspicious and upon investigation they found where Steve had tapped the main oil pipe and was stealing 18 or more barrels of oil a day.

That was the same Steve Alford that stole this oil who is today Governor Jones' State superintendent of police. No wonder there is so much graft in Louisiana today.

Governor Jones, without expressing his motive, declared that he was elevating Mr. Alford from superintendent of State police to head of the department of safety.

There are many who believe that Governor Jones should put his own house in order before he criticizes other administrations.

What Are We Doing to Control Industrial Accidents, Our Greatest Threat to War Production?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, suppose the newspapers had told us this morning that sabotage in our factories had injured over 2,000,000 workers—19,200 dead, 100,600 permanently disabled, war production lost and delayed beyond measure. Each one of us here today would be shocked into drastic action.

Our country actually suffered these losses in 1941 through industrial accidents. Accidents are sabotage, unintentional, it is true, but no less damaging to our war effort than enemy action. Workmen's compensation commission reports from 29 States for the first 6 months of 1942 show a rise of 18 percent in accidents as compared with the same period for 1941. On this basis, during 1942 over 2,500,000 of our workers sustained injuries ranging from minor lost-time cases to fatalities.

These losses on the production line are 40 times as great as the number of casualties to the United States armed forces in 1942—58,307, including those missing.

What is our Nation doing to control this sabotage? What has Congress done? Each one of you must be asking these questions. And in the same breath you must be answering: "The record shows that we have not done enough. What more can Congress do?"

A few years back we might have said that employers and the States could take care of this problem.

But a few years back we were not at war. Each year since 1940 industrial accidents and disease have increased, a rising tide that threatens today to swamp our war-production efforts. Can we stand and wait for the other fellow to build the dykes? At flood time all hands pitch in.

Uncle Sam rolled up his sleeves and got to work on this job back in 1940. That year the Secretary of Labor appointed 22 representatives of management, labor, State labor officials, and insurance interests as a National Committee for the Conservation of Manpower in War Industries to help in stemming the flood of accidents. Each of these groups and agencies does important industrial health and safety work. Through the national committee they have joined together in united effort—that is the American way.

This united effort has meant that the work of each separate group has become more effective, as a part of the committee's program.

Take the case of private industry, for example. Progressive management has shown what the individual plant can do in cutting down accidents through engineering methods. Such plants employ trained safety engineers. But there is a limited number of men with the skill, intelligence, and experience to do such work today in this country, and the great majority of firms cannot afford to employ such experts. So the national committee enlisted 554 of industry's best trained safety engineers to donate their services on a part-time basis to other war plants all over the country.

These agents visited, in 1942, 10,755 firms—prime Government contractors and companies manufacturing essential parts for them. Approximately 66 percent of these companies, with the help of these agents, markedly reduced their accident frequency rates. Rough estimate places the time saved in these plants because of accident reduction at 1,173,000 man-days.

These plants are sold on safety. They know that it pays in terms of greater production. They want to make safety a permanent part of their organizations. And so the national committee with the United States Office of Education is sponsoring safety engineering training

courses for the key supervisory employees in these plants.

These courses are conducted by local engineering colleges in war production centers. For example, in my own State, in 1942, the University of Alabama and the Alabama Polytechnic Institute have held 49 classes in industrial areas all over the State, with 1,460 plant supervisory workers enrolled. One firm in Peoria, Ill., with 10,000 employees, enrolled 64 of its supervisory staff in local courses and upon completion assigned them to safety responsibility in various departments of the plant, over the three-shift operation.

The War and Navy Departments have recognized the importance of these courses and have enrolled in them personnel from their ordnance and industrial shore establishments.

Because the national committee represents all the groups, agencies, and interests in the field of industrial safety, it does not duplicate their work. For example, it leaves to the State labor departments the job of law enforcement. National committee agents simply show employers how accidents can be reduced by applying time-tested and proven systems and standards—above and beyond the law. At the same time, the committee welcomes the advice and cooperation of the States. In my own State the Director of the Division of Safety Inspection of the Alabama Department of Industrial Relations is chairman of the State advisory committee for the national committee.

I want to emphasize that the Federal Government has been careful not to encroach on the work of the States in this field. Congress recognized in the Walsh-Healey Act that safe and healthful working conditions are important to production. At the same time it provided that compliance with State safety and health laws and regulations is evidence of compliance with the Federal law. The Secretary of Labor has issued as a guide to establishments subject to the law acceptable standards for safety and health, and requires these plants to keep a record of accident frequency rates. These rates are essential as a guide in determining the extent of the plant safety problem and in measuring the effectiveness of various prevention plans. But the rest of safety and health law enforcement is left to the States, and many State labor departments are making inspections for compliance with the safety provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act.

The national committee agents perform an entirely different function: they advise and instruct, as safety experts, on how to install an accident-prevention program. Let me tell you some stories to illustrate just what these committee agents have done.

A large lumber company in my State employs about 900 men. When the special agent first called, he found that the management had no idea of the importance of safety. Floors with broken boards and rickety stairways without handrails offered serious hazards. Dangerous machines had no guards, while the employees wore loose clothing that might easily be caught in machinery, worked without goggles where chips were flying, and used paint-spray guns without wearing masks. The plant had no safety program nor safety organization, and accidents were seriously delaying production. The safety agent analyzed the plant hazards and recommended corrective action. The company adopted his program and it got results—a significant increase in production.

Another special agent visited a textile mill in Alabama employing 1,250 persons. As a result of his recommendations, a safety organization was set up, reducing the accident-frequency rate from 12.29 in July 1941 to 2.63 in October 1942.

You can well imagine that the accident rate usually goes up when a plant takes on inexperienced workers, but this increase does not have to happen, as the committee has shown in some striking cases.

A safety engineer representing the national committee called at a plant in California that has grown from 400 employees in 1941 to some 10,000 today, and may eventually employ 35,000 or 40,000 workers. With his help this plant brought its accident frequency down from 35 accidents per million man-hours worked at the beginning of 1941 to 10 at the end of 1942, resulting in a saving of over 8,000 man-days.

One of the committee's special agents reports that a Cleveland firm manufacturing motors for the Navy has recently been awarded the Army-Navy E, and that the management attributes no small part of this accomplishment to the assistance of the committee in speeding up production through eliminating accidents. During 1942 the rate at which accidents were occurring in this plant had been reduced 21 percent and the man-hours lost reduced 99 percent, as compared with losses in 1940. This plant completed, in December 1942, 2,415,065 work-hours with only 22 days' loss of time. Had the 1940 accident rate continued, this number of hours of work would have resulted in 1,449 days lost—a saving of 1,427 man-days. This reduction is all the more impressive since there was an approximate increase of more than 200 percent in employment.

These stories show what can be done when proper attention is given to safety. I am sure you must agree that these agents of the national committee have done an outstanding job; that they have earned recognition for distinguished service. At the same time you must be asking, What about those 2,500,000 workers injured in 1942? If the committee has been operating since 1940, why have accidents increased every year since that date? The responsibility, I fear, lies at our doorstep. The annual appropriation for this work has been a drop in the bucket—$150,000 for the fiscal year 1942–43.

The national committee has made every penny of these funds count. Private industry has donated some $500,000 to the Government in salaries paid to safety engineers for the time they have spent giving safety service to other plants for the national committee. And there is no way of estimating the dollar and cents value of the lives saved, injuries prevented, and productive time added to the war effort through this program.

But the program has reached only a few of the plants that need it most. Approximately 18,000 plants were producing under direct contract with our Government all during 1942. No figures are available on the number of subcontractors, but assuming an average of five subcontractors for each prime contractor, we can roughly guess that some 90,000 plants were producing for the Government in 1942. Each day this number is increasing. Rapid expansion, employment of thousands, perhaps millions, of inexperienced workers, and constant pressure for production make the accident threat extremely serious for these plants.

If the national committee could reach every one—or even a substantial proportion of these plants, I am confident that we should see a significant reduction in the over-all accident figures for the coming year. As it is, however, the committee's volunteer agents find much of their time taken up with work that regular Government employees could perform—keeping records, making reports, and the many other supplementary but necessary duties that work of this kind entails. And when they give service to a plant, they cannot complete the job in one visit; often they must make two or three or even more calls before the accident rate has been pulled down satisfactorily. They need full-time assistance, and to provide such assistance the committee needs more funds.

Can we allow industrial accidents to increase each year, a growing handicap to war production? Each year since 1940 we have seen the accident figures rise higher and higher. We have turned our backs to this threat to our national security, while reading the front-page news on strikes and lockouts. We have appropriated millions of dollars to the various Federal agencies delegated to deal with industrial relations, and strikes today are an insignificant part of our war problems. Strikes in 1942 took only 569,801 workers out of production for less than an average of 4 days each. But many of the two and one-half million workers injured by industrial accidents that year lost weeks and months of work-time, while those killed will never return to their jobs. Industrial accidents and disease are a greater threat to our production schedules than any other single menace. I call on every Member of Congress here assembled to recognize our responsibility for meeting this threat with action and to give full support to the effective program of the National Committee for the Conservation of Manpower in War Industries.

Atlantic Intracoastal Canals Proved Dire Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newport County Sentinel, Tiverton, R. I., March 4, 1943.

ATLANTIC INTRA-COASTAL CANALS PROVED DIRE NECESSITY

We sometimes observe that democratic government has its weaknesses.

If any large corporation were run as carelessly as the United States Government it would go bankrupt in a few years!

SOMEBODY PAID TO FREEZE NEW ENGLAND

There is no coal coming into our Narragansett Bay by barge, simply on account of the fact that our network of Atlantic coastal canals is not completed across 70 miles of New Jersey!

We are being starved for food, oil, and gas, because Congress will not get down to business and complete our canals from Texas to Boston.

TWO MISSING LINKS

United States subsidies to the railroads and pipe-line cost—which will be abandoned when peace is declared—for a period of 6 months would pay the cost, entirely, of a ship canal across Florida and New Jersey.

SIMPLY RIDICULOUS

Back in 1940 the Sentinel backed Mr. George Webb's proposal to build intracoastal canals, at least 40 feet deep, from the Gulf of Mexico to Boston.

Today New England is starving and freezing for the lack of water transportation up and down our Atlantic coast.

Hundreds of millions of dollars in ship and cargo value have been sunk for the lack of these canals which could easily be complete by now!

Thousands of American lives are being lost, just because somebody prevents Congress from doing the obvious—work furiously to complete our Atlantic coastal canals.

NO WONDER

No wonder Germany and Japan chuckle at our submarine losses—a large portion of which are decidedly preventable!

FLORIDA CANAL ALREADY AUTHORIZED

The sad feature of the this whole business is that it is already months ago since Congress authorized a Florida barge canal to cost forty-four millions, but has never appropriated the money to dig it.

Recently the New York Daily News reported that General Summerall has practically demanded that Congress go ahead with the Florida project, in order to make practical the transportation of oil from Texas to New Jersey, in protected waterways.

In the accompanying map, it can be seen that the Florida Canal would save far more than a thousand miles of submarine-infested water transportation. It would make safe from attack our ships, tankers, and cargoes all the way from oil field to the Jersey refineries.

One more canal across New Jersey would give protected inland waterway transportation right to Boston!

Let Us Defend the American Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Let Us Defend the American Home," delivered by me over the blue network of the National Broadcasting Co., on March 5, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In a few days our country will have been at war for 15 months. Despite the fact that war raged in other continents, it broke with breath-taking suddenness upon this land. The 64 weeks that stretch back to Pearl Harbor are a monument to the internal fortitude, the spirit, the sheer amazing ability of this great democracy to pull itself by its bootstraps to effectiveness in waging modern, all-out war.

Since the days when the Congress approved of selective service, lend-lease, and the lifting of the embargo on shipping supplies to belligerent countries, I have not spoken to the people of this country through the radio. I knew the die was cast.

We have gone through trying times in those 15 months. We have experienced cataclysmic changes in our lives, in our daily habits, in our outlook for the future. For all of us—rich and poor—it has been a taste of what war means to the ordinary man and woman. But, for most of us, it has been only a taste.

The casualty lists are still small, as modern war is measured in blood and lives. The sadness, the loneliness, the emptiness that has struck the widow of Colin Kelly—the mother of the five Sullivan boys—the father of Meyer Levin—has touched only a relative few of our 130,000,000 people.

Bitter days are ahead of us. The blood and sweat and tears of which Mr. Churchill spoke so eloquently are not reserved for the English people, or the Russian people, or the Chinese people; they are to be our lot also before this war is over. It is foolish—yes, even dangerous—to count on a quick victory. Realistic thinking and a sober, practical analysis of the known facts can lead only to one conclusion—a long period of superhuman effort lies ahead before we can talk of unconditional surrender.

It is for this very reason that I speak to you tonight. We now know what we face, and we must plan for the days ahead intelligently to the end that we may muster our resources most effectively.

What I say is not intended as criticism of the war effort as a whole, and particularly not of the military phase of it. But the time has come for a more sober evaluation of where we are, what lies ahead, and what we, as a Nation, should do. This is a time for patient and calm thinking; the first flush of excitement, the anger and hysteria of December 7—the sanguine optimism of many of our people that we could lick the world in a few months, must be replaced by a cold, logical and scientific consideration of all the facts to the end that we may wage hard and effective war today—tomorrow—next year—the year after—and even 3 years hence, if the need be.

I am not one who ever has believed that the people must be kept ignorant of the facts. I do not regard the American people as children who are afraid of the dark. Nor have I ever forgotten that this is a democracy, that here the people rule. They cannot rule intelligently unless they know the facts.

As a Member of the national law-making body, it is my duty to report to you to the end that the people may make informed and intelligent decisions and through their elected representatives, do away with 1-man bureaucratic government.

This is our land—our Government—yours and mine. In war not every citizen can be a general; that would be dangerous. But every citizen has as great a stake in the war as any general or admiral. It is, therefore, the citizen's duty to counsel with his elected representatives in Congress so that a people's government may rule the land.

Up to now the war has been fought, on our part, as if it would end tomorrow. Plan has tumbled upon plan as fast as the bright young men in Washington could spew them out of their heads. Do this—do that—don't do this—that's wrong—that's right—have succeeded each other in glittering confusion. The result is chaos. The effect is worse than a major defeat on the battlefield. Our enemies must rejoice at the confusion worse confounded that besets us in this land.

I speak tonight of one problem that is of immediate concern to the men and women of America—and to the future of our country. It is a war problem—a defense problem—the defense of American homes. It concerns the operation of the selective-service law and the drafting of fathers of young children into the armed forces. This is not a question which can or should be dismissed with a wave of the hand as one to be settled by the military leaders.

Let us analyze the Selective Service Act. It is no secret that it was hastily-conceived legislation, full of loopholes and inconsistencies, which has resulted in great injustices to many of our citizens. After war came, the law was amended in one particular—the age limit was reduced down to 18 years—and later, the President, by Executive order, exempted all men 38 years of age, or over.

Drafting of men was put on a local and State basis, not on a national basis. It is as if we were raising 48 separate State armies, or 3,070 separate county armies, and not an army of the United States. What is the result? If, for example, New York has a larger number of married men than single men in proportion to its population than has New Jersey, New York will be drafting married men into the Army while single men are still undrafted in New Jersey. For the Nation as a whole, this system works an obviously rank injustice on married men, and fathers of families in hundreds of communities.

If the draft were on a truly national basis, every State in the Union would have to exhaust its supply of single men before a married man not engaged in war work could be drafted from any State.

If this had been done, we would not witness the inconsistency of some States already furnishing fathers to the Army, while in other States single men still remain undrafted. I am not advocating, of course, that essential war industry and agriculture occupational deferments be disregarded even though the law made no provision for occupational deferments. That is a separate question.

I believe, however, there are some points about occupational deferments that you may want to know about; they make clear how the spirit and intent of a law are evaded.

You know, of course, that there are large numbers of physically fit young men, most of them single, some of them married, but none of them engaged in essential war work, who are not yet in uniform. I refer to that

multitude of Government employees, who, like swarms of locusts, infest Washington and every city in the land where Government bureaus have been established.

In Washington every Government department and agency is full of them. A congressional committee is now studying the facts, and we may shortly expect a sudden burst of patriotism among the bureaucrats.

The State Department has its quota, carefully groomed young men who attend the diplomatic teas and suppers, deferred from the draft because they can speak a foreign language or two. One would think there are no older men in America who can speak foreign languages.

The Office of Price Administration—the place where they bring out in bewildering confusion these ration orders which are slowly but surely driving merchants to bankruptcy and housewives crazy—has its quota: Smart young men, fresh out of the law schools and the economic classroom.

The Federal Communications Commission, the agency that listens in to what our enemy propagandists are saying as its contribution to winning the war; it, too, has its quota of essential young men. So essential that in this one small agency, 432 have been deferred from the draft.

Washington alone could furnish a full army division of men who are less essential to winning the war than the housewife who saves her kitchen fats. But they are the men who are perfectly willing that other mother's sons, other women's husbands, other children's fathers fight for them.

The second loophole in selective service was created by Presidential Executive order, exempting men in the age group from 38 to 45. It is argued that men in this age group cannot withstand the rigors of Army life. That may be true. But there are large numbers of men in that age group who are doing a hard day's work every day. Of course, they will break down when thrown into a program of intensive training, of 20-mile marches under full pack, which are necessary to the building of combat units. But today's armies are highly mechanized; they require tremendous numbers of service personnel. By the end of this year, the Army will need about one and one-half million men for the service of supply and for ground and service crews for the Air Corps.

Is there any good reason why physically fit single men cannot be taken from the 38 to 45 age group and used for this noncombat work? Why should these men be subjected to arduous physical Army training in preparation for noncombat work? Here we have a situation where a large reservoir of physically fit manpower has been shut off through Executive order.

The third point to be considered is the size of the Army itself. Actually, the selective-service law has no connection with the size of the Army. But the size of the Army has a close connection with the manner in which the selective-service law may be made to operate.

I want to make it emphatically clear that I am not advocating a reduction in the size of the present Army; nor do I want to close off any manpower sources to the Army that are necessary to defend America.

On this question of how large an army we should have, I am perfectly content to let speak for me, men and publications who supported the administration's foreign policy long before Pearl Harbor. So stanch an administration advocate as the New York Times last week devoted one of the longest editorials that has ever appeared in that newspaper, questioning the wisdom of raising too large an army.

Let us examine, briefly, some of the facts. The Congress has been informed by military leaders that they desire to have approximately 11,000,000 men under arms by the end of this year. That means about one-third of our total adult male population. And as the selective-service law now works, such an army will take four-fifths—80 percent—of the physically fit American men between 18 and 38 years of age. Under such a program fathers—regardless of the age and number of children they have—will be taken along with the rest.

The New York Times does not agree that this decision for an 11,000,000-man army is irrevocable; or that those who question its wisdom want to fight a soft war; or that the Army decision is an expert one, and that any questioning of it is necessarily inexpert.

The Army's argument is that because our enemies have a certain number of divisions, we must have more than that number in order to win. The Army says that because Germany has 13½ percent of its total population in the Army, we must have the same, or more.

The main point here is that they imply that the total war effectiveness of a nation is measured by the men in armed service. Obviously, that is a dangerous fallacy. It is particularly so in modern war, in the kind of a war we are fighting in which we are the arsenal and the food supplier for all of our allies, for most of the world.

Modern war requires the nicest balance between the armed forces and the food and munitions of war for that armed force. It must be obvious to anyone that there is just so much raw materials and so much manpower. Whatever raw materials and manpower is used in one direction cannot be used in another. We are experiencing that problem on every hand. If you use steel and man-hours for building war vessels, you have just that much less of both for building merchant vessels. It's that simple—you have only one apple; you can cut it into two pieces or a thousand pieces, but you still have only one apple to cut up.

In our case the situation is even worse. Our internal effort must be balanced against the size of the combined fighting forces of the United Nations. For we are the supplier not only of our Army but the armies of the British Empire and Russia and China and Australia and the fighting French. Already we are supplying the armies—and large parts of the civilian population—of more than half the world.

Considered from this viewpoint, it is clearly dangerous and unwise to make a comparison between the size of the German Army and our Army, as the military leaders do. We have landed an army in Africa. We must keep it supplied. If we land troops on the European continent, we must keep them supplied. Obviously, our war effort in these type of operations is a different one than Germany has. We must use a far greater percentage of our strength in building and manning troop transports, merchant vessels, freighters and tankers—in keeping open the life line to our men on these far-away shores. Without that life line, the armies in Africa or Europe or the South Pacific are lost.

And to build this life line and keep it open, will require the services of millions of men, who otherwise might themselves be part of the armed services. It will require the raw materials which might otherwise go directly into guns, and tanks, and airplanes.

Isn't it clear now why military men alone are not qualified to be the sole judges of how large an army the Nation should have? Isn't it obvious that in reaching such a decision, the expert opinion of agriculture, mining, shipbuilding, machine tools, airplane, and labor specialists should be obtained, studied, analyzed? So far as we have been informed in Congress in closed committee sessions, no such expert knowledge was pooled in reaching the decision.

Already we are experiencing frightening labor shortages in agriculture, and in industrial plants producing for war. Our industrial economy—labor and management both—is doing a magnificent job—and don't let anybody tell you otherwise. Remember we are producing for armies and civilian populations so vast that it staggers the imagination.

Total war is not only a military problem; it is a problem of the total economy of a nation. We must have the considered opinion of the experts on that economy before we can risk decisions on which the whole future fate of the Nation hangs.

Will we ever learn that this is no time to take a chance—to leave it to guesswork, or to unplanned optimistic belief that it can be done. That way lies disaster for the people of this land.

I have discussed army size simply to illustrate that there has been no adequate consideration given to the proper utilization of our manpower, neither civilian nor military.

In my opinion, it is clear that under present conditions we are preparing to draft too many men into the armed services. It is clear that this program of giving no consideration to the marital status of men—of making every man a number in order to fill a quota—is the fault of the selective service law and should be corrected.

Today, throughout America, there is a growing realization that when fathers of families are drafted, we are breaking up the bulwark and foundation stone of American Government—the home. It would be a hollow victory, indeed, if in order to wage totalitarian war, we destroy that which these foreign ideologies have deliberately destroyed—the home and family life. Fascism and communism have as one of their basic tenets that the individual is nothing; the state supreme. Under those governments, the children are the wards of the state; do we want by indirection to bring that about in America?

It is unthinking that an administration which has talked more about building and making secure the home should unwittingly countenance policies which will destroy the very essence of American democracy. Today we have the Social Security Act, the home-owners' loan, Federal housing laws, and many others, all aimed at strengthening the family through a greater social security.

Draft American fathers and you jeopardize the existence of American homes. The wife and mother is left with bewildering and cruel alternatives—she must depend upon her parents for support, always supposing her parents are able to help her, or she must place her children in an institution while she looks for work in order to help support them. It is impossible for a mother to support herself and her children on the allotment she receives from the Government, and each day of rising prices for foodstuffs makes the task more impossible. But even if the allotment were doubled or tripled, the chief problem would not be met. That is the problem of making American children wards of the state and of breaking up the American home.

It is no answer to say that fathers must go forth to fight to protect their children. Those fathers can fight more successfully, more effectively, and more permanently for the welfare of the Nation by fighting on the home front. If they are needed on the farms, or in the mine or factory, by all means let us put them there to replace single men, or young married men who have no children. But it is imperative that so far as possible, the home itself not be broken up, else all that we are fighting for will be ashes in our mouth.

What kind of a soldier do you think a father of three or four children will be? Where will his thoughts be? They will be with his wife and children back home. Are they getting enough food? Has his wife found a job? How is she making a living? Who is watching over the children?—A thousand and one thoughts that only a father of

children can know. Every mother and father knows that children need the care and advice of their parents and no institution, however good, can take the place of a good mother and father.

This is your problem today. It is one which faces your Congress. Numerous Members of both branches of Congress have expressed grave concern over the effect on American home life. They feel, and I feel, that to draft married men who are the fathers of small children tends to break down the morals as well as the morale of the people of the country. In the House of Representatives, a Member from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], has introduced legislation dealing with this problem. Last week I introduced legislation to exempt married men with children—not for the purpose of saving the man but for the purpose of saving the children.

I repeat, I regard this legislation as a defense bill—defense of American homes and American institutions. I have sought to outline how closely involved this question is with the entire waging of the war. For the welfare of the land we all love and treasure, I hope and pray that you will take counsel, one with another, to the end that intelligent public opinion will advise your legislative bodies in arriving at sound, consistent, and safe policies.

Planting the Victory Garden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] at a banquet of the Catholic Charities of Rockford, Ill., in honor of Bishop John J. Boylan, on March 7, 1943. The title of the address is "Planting the Victory Garden."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate the opportunity which has been presented to me by the invitation of the Catholic Charities of Rockford to participate in this occasion marking the installation of His Excellency Bishop John J. Boylan. Not only does it afford me an opportunity to join in welcoming a distinguished prelate to this splendid community in my home State, but also to express my high regard for the noble character and excellent work of Bishop Boylan's predecessor, the Most Reverend Bishop Edward F. Hoban.

It is salutary in these days of un-Christian-like behavior on the part of, seemingly, half a world, for us who are engaged in a struggle, the like of which is not recorded in history, to take a few minutes now and then to consider our situation and that of our fellow men in the light of those teachings which should guide us, as against the actuality of the world in which we live.

In the lives of those who are gathered here there has been no sterner period. The demands, insatiable and bloody, made upon us by a war devised and perpetrated by the satanic megalomania of Hitler is causing us all—all who have the least spark of Christianity and civilization in us—to want to reassert and to effectuate a resolution that never again shall a holocaust such as the one we are trying to overcome be permitted to engulf the world.

However, before I discuss in some detail this important question, I want to take a moment here to emphasize my high regard for Bishop Hoban, now made Coadjutor Bishop of Cleveland. He is my good friend. His leadership was felt throughout our State and I am sure that in the new fields that he has entered he will again exert that fine influence whiich is his art. Bishop Hoban lent the support of his analytical mind to problems of our State involving broad social concepts. I know this, because when I was a member of the State government, under the leadership of the late and lamented Henry Horner, there were often times when the Governor counseled with Bishop Hoban. I am sure that Bishop Boylan, in following that tradition, will make himself available to the lay administrators, should his counsel be sought as I am sure it will be.

I say this with confidence for Bishop Boylan brings to his work here an experience and background in teaching and social work as well as administration which will be of tremendous value to this community. Twenty-eight years Bishop Boylan has given to the ennobling work upon which he is engaged. As priest, teacher, administrator, college president, and leader in the field of charity he has developed the teachings which he learned at the Catholic, Iowa State, and Harvard Universities, and at the great universities in Rome, to the advantage of his fellow men. This is what one expects from the priesthood; and it is what they give.

The advent of a new leader in any field is an important occasion and that is true of course in the religious world. It is true, therefore, in each segment, each constituent part. Thus, the coming of Bishop Boylan to this community is a noteworthy occasion and one upon which we look as a mark of hope in a period of darkness.

Fifteen months ago today we were catapulted into a cataclysmic struggle the issue of which is whether civilization shall survive. We were unjustly, treacherously, and wickedly attacked by Japan. This act of infamy challenged the basis of our very existence. The second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence says, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Insofar as America is concerned, the issue in this war lies in those fundamental truths.

Under the totalitarian regime, life is cheap, liberty is dead, and happiness lies only in a few self-annointed criminal leaders, as they force their tyrrannical will upon their own and subjugated peoples. We cannot at this crucial hour forget that this great Government of ours was instituted by men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed—the very antithesis of the manner through which Hitler, Hirohito, and Mussolini seized their power. They detest and despise what they term "decadent democracies." They do not believe in the God-given equality of man. The only unalienable right that the people of Japan, Italy, and Germany have is to follow rigidly, under the pains and penalties of concentration camps or the grave, the decrees laid down by their tyrannical and despotic rulers. Surely there is no reasonable or prudent mind that labors at this late hour under the impression that this is a local or academic conflict.

No, my friends, we battle for the preservation of the fundamental truths in the Constitution. We battle in this global conflict to achieve another birth of freedom. And yet while we join in this common purpose, we also know that we fight first for America, an America composed of all kinds of people, all colors, all creeds, and all classes. In that composite of mankind lies the essence of our greatness. There is room for all in a life whose laws are based on the Golden Rule. This crisis demands, however, that the leaders and the individuals composing those varying elements representing the different creeds, races, and classes, declare a moratorium on their political, economic, and social differences, especially if the advancement of any theory or philosophy will delay or impair the war effort. Obviously, our paramount objective is to win the war. This is a struggle of all for one and one for all. If we do not hang together, we could hang separately. Witness the plight of thousands of innocent peoples of today and yesterday in the countries conquered by Hitler and Hirohito.

Never before has humankind been confronted on so gigantic a scale with the problem of fighting to retain its fundamental rights. Of course, there have been periods in history when dictators have sought to press into slavery not only the physical man but the spiritual man. Of course, there have been moments in history when misguided, maddened men have sought to impose their will of idolatry upon their neighbors. But the present is an outstanding battle, a relentless war in which no quarter will be given by the enemy if he succeeds. Our enemies must not succeed; they will not succeed.

It is a source of great joy to us all in the realization that the military picture in the southwest Pacific is much brighter than it was 1 year ago. This is due to the bravery, the heroism, the intellectual capacity, and the tenacity of our military leaders and the men who are serving under them. What is true in the Southwest Pacific is also true of the European situation due in a great measure to the gallant Red army of Russia, whose victory against the Nazi hordes was proclaimed by General MacArthur to be the greatest military achievement in all military history. And then again our powerful military forces, together with the English and other Allied Nations, are demonstrating an amazing capacity for battle for that precious heritage of freedom, in the deserts and mountains of north Africa, as well as many other fronts.

We battle in the spirit expressed by Thomas Moore when he said, "'Tis sweeter to bleed for an age at thy shrine than to sleep but a moment in chains." The spirit of our men and our allies, and the spirit of the people behind them, points to the fact that Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito cannot succeed. However, no American should be deluded that this conflict may soon be over, or that victory is easy. Once that attitude of mind becomes an American fixture, the war will be prolonged and American boys will unnecessarily shed their blood in liberty's cause. If we are to preserve freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom of religion, if we are to end this catastrophe at the earliest possible moment, we must be ever vigilant, and ready to make any sacrifice on the home front. We must be ready to do or die on the military front. You need not accept my word for this. Take the words of Hitler himself, when he said, "There are now two worlds, one totalitarian and the other democratic, and one of them must break asunder." Hitler throws down the gauntlet. We either perish or we survive.

We in America are confident that Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito will fail for another reason, and that lies in the unnecessary and brutal shedding of blood, unheeding of the cost to their victims. The slavery which they are imposing, the destruction of community life, the despair and want and privation and hunger, both physical and spiritual, which Hitler has and is endeavoring to inflict upon the unprotected men, women, and children subject to his concentration camps and Gestapo will not go unavenged. The very soil which he is fertilizing with the butchered bodies of his victims will revolt

against him and his followers when the hour of invasion arrives.

From out of the very capital of nazi-ism have come warnings to him of the retribution and the fate which inevitably will strike him down with all of his evil works. Many of you no doubt have read the pastoral letter at last Christmastime by the Bishop of Berlin. It is so fine a document, particularly significant because of the circumstances under which it was issued and proclaimed, that it seems to me appropriate hereinafter to recite a paragraph or two from it.

Think. We are gathered here to pay honor to a leader of the church. We are met in complete freedom in one of the larger cities of this State, one of the great States of the United States. We are not concerned about the police. Their job is to help us and they do it. We are having no haunting fears of secret agents set upon us not merely to spy, but to distort our words so as to give them a meaning and connotation completely contrary to that intended and to make them serve as a basis for prosecution and persecution. We are met here with the complete good will of all of our neighbors, notwithstanding that some of them are not of our religious beliefs.

But the arena into which the Bishop of Berlin promulgated his serene and sincere pastoral letter, couched in the eloquently simple words of a man learned in the principles of justice and Christianity, is an arena of madness. It is a place where steel and bullets are constantly the scourge of men; where the whine and ping of the machine gun have replaced the church bell; where the spy and the provocateur are exalted; where the child is trained to tattle upon his father and mother and bring about their doom.

It requires no strength of will or particular bravery for us to gather here in this enlightened community, a segment of an enlightened land, but it required fortitude and stamina and honesty of purpose and loyalty to ideal of the highest order for the Bishop of Berlin, in the face of the murderous might of the present temporary masters of Germany, to say what he said in the pastoral letter in the last Christmas season.

If time permitted I would feel it worth while to read all of the relatively brief letter. Let me, however, read a sentence here and there from this classic. Said this heroic prelate: "Justice is essentially a quality based on eternal foundations. It does not depend upon the arbitrary actions of mankind. * * * One of its principles is 'do as you would be done by.' Another such principle is that the life of an innocent individual, be it an unborn child or an old person, is holy, and that the innocent may not be punished with or in place of the guilty."

How directly this throws the gauntlet into the face of Hitler. I need not recount to you the episodes, multiplied by the hundreds, in which the satellites of Hitler, following his direction under one pretext or another but without any least justification, have taken the lives of thousands upon thousands, yes millions of defenseless men, women, and children whose only crime was that Hitler did not like them. Particularly gruesome and horrible is the destruction in cold blood of an estimated more than 2,000,000 men, women, and children who professed the religion of Judaism, and the thousands whose crime was that nature, for reasons best known to it, built them with feeble bodies or minds.

Let us read further: "The right of mankind must be based upon the sovereign right of God; its striving for right must be built upon the foundations of justice with which God endows human nature. * * * If power creates and represents right there can be no peaceful communion between individuals or smaller communities or nations, and a fight of all against all will result. The most powerful will win until a still greater power arises and crushes him; the result is an existence devoid of all human dignity, a fight for existence on the level of creatures deprived of human intelligence."

The bishop here was warning the German rulers that instead of a peaceful future they were merely building for a greater and ever greater destructive force which would in the end destroy them.

Even more sharply the bishop continued: "Since the least principles of right are not of merely temporary duration and cannot be the quintessence of racial peculiarities, the rights and the application of such rights and the use thereof cannot be the privilege of a single nation. Every human being enjoys privileges of which no worldly power can deprive it. It is an honorable page in the history of mankind that the rights of aliens have been more and more developed and that the laws of nations define and establish these rights * * * only by acknowledging and respecting right can we hope for a better future for everyone and a just peace for all. * * * Let us cling to the faith that everyone is entitled to his rights, and let us also cling to the faith that these rights protect everyone who is innocent of personal wrongdoing. * * * We do not want to claim for ourselves things to which we are not entitled; neither do we wish to refuse anything to which others may be entitled. We wish to cultivate the spirit of justice and fairness. Let us always remember that by respecting alien rights we acknowledge and profess God's sovereign rule."

Upon this lofty note the Bishop of Berlin concluded his pastoral letter, a letter which, if read by Hitler and his henchmen, must have caused a cold fury to descend upon them because they have been revealed so completely by a fearless leader of the people. Upon this stone of tolerance will break the rotted, germ and disease ridden empire which Nazi idealogy and temporary might is seeking to establish.

But, my friends, it is not enough to speak of these things. We must do something about them and in the doing it is not sufficient that we win the battles and the wars. The battles and wars must be won, and the men of our Nation, amply supported by the men and women on the production line, are doing that. Momentary reverses or lack of success in a particular battle need not cause us grave concern. We are making steady progress toward our goal and under the inspired leadership of a God-fearing man, a man of bravery, who is our Commander in Chief, victory will be ours. But victory alone is not enough. Victory must be accompanied by a firmness of purpose and will, and a devotion to that purpose to see to it that the cancerous growths which have afflicted the world and the germs and diseases of malcontent, economic frustration and social decay must be eradicated so that there may arise out of the ashes of the lives of millions a chastened world of renewed integrity and democratic outlook.

There are those timid souls in America who proclaim that this cannot be done; that the history of the past proves conclusively that such an objective is impossible. But, my friends, I am confident that the hand of Almighty God has destined America to lead the way in the social and economic regeneration of the world. "It can be truthfully said that in normal times some nations are at peace with themselves and others. Some are at peace neither with themselves nor others. Some being themselves established in peace, struggle to establish it among their brethren." America has always been a peaceful Nation. We have striven to establish peace among nations of the world since the dawning of this Republic. No doubt it is interesting to many of you to learn that William Penn after forming his colony in America came forth with a detailed international plan to maintain the peace of the world. From the beginning this has been an American dream among many of the great leaders of the Nation. In following this course, let no one think that America will ever neglect herself. In so doing, America will be perpetuating the free institutions which are so near and dear to us all. After this war is over, Americans all, with courage, firmness, and faith, should leave no stone unturned in seeing that the tragedy of this generation, the greatest tragedy in all civilization, shall not again embrace the universe.

There is no sacrifice too great, irrespective of how annoying or how disturbing it may be to our material existence, which should keep us from doing whatever is necessary to exterminate forever global dissension. This accomplishment can be effected; it must be effected; it is no idle dream. The man who for any reason is unwilling to aid in the establishment of a just and lasting peace for mankind underestimates tomorrow's portending tragic conditions. That man underestimates the proximity of all nations brought about through the genius of man by the development of the telephone, the radio, aviation, and the lethal uses to which these various means of communication can be applied by ruthless dictators with no regard for the rights of God or man.

Wishful and smug illusions as to the protection of the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans provided America were shattered by the first Jap bomb dropped on the day of December 7, 1941. International cooperation along social and economic lines is absolutely indispensable if we are to preserve our freedom for generations unborn; a freedom, my friends, which has been sorely underestimated by all of us during the last two decades.

Many of you no doubt are thinking now of planting your victory gardens. In a larger sense the nations and the peoples of the world are presently engaged in planting a victory garden. The soil is being fertilized with the blood of men and women innocent of everything except the desire to live in peace and friendliness with their neighbors and fellowmen. Unless the plants which are now being developed are constantly sprayed with good will to overcome the demands of greed, social and religious intolerance, destructive economic forcces, our great victory garden will produce not the full flower of civilized living, but rather the rotten fruitless plants which inevitably spread new destruction.

It is not enough that we implant the great principles announced by the United Nations in the Atlantic Charter. We must cultivate them actively and affirmatively and even more diligently than we cultivate our own personal gardens. Intolerance must be eradicated and kept out from the gardens of the world. Men have a right to their individual beliefs. Men have a right to worship in the manner of their forefathers. Men have a right to read and speak in freedom, to listen without molestation, to earn a livelihood to permit them to care for their families. Men have a right to enjoy the fruits of their labor and if illness or uncontrollable adverses overcome them, they deserve the good will in terms of sympathy and care of their neighbors and the community. These are the things for which we are struggling at so tremendous a cost. These are the things for which we shall win against the lustful and licentious forces of nazi-ism and fascism and Japism.

Once won we must be aggressively alert to retain them and not permit a Munich to take them from us.

With the end of the war will come problems of tremendous difficulty and importance. There will be questions relating to demobilization of our armies and our war industries including agriculture. Technology will have made advances. Economic situations, heretofore of domestic significance, will assume world proportions. The reconstruction of Europe in all its various aspects will require our help.

Already, and properly, much thought is being given to these and related aspects of the problem in Congress and in the executive departments and by private and quasi-public agencies. In the solution of the problem there is bound to be friction, little sore spots which among sincere, thoughtful and just people can be ironed out readily and quickly. And we must not permit these irritations to grow so that they hurt and injure us. In the cultivating of our victory gardens we must not forget the reasons for which we fought and for which we gave so much.

The advent of a high representative of the church is such an occasion to justify a self-analysis to see whether we measure up to the demands of true Christianity, of true democracy. I am sure that all of you here and the many in the diocese who are not here, and those of other religious beliefs who join with you in welcoming your new bishop will be in the forefront of the movement to maintain the great freedoms for which we are fighting and to persevere in them so that tolerance and justice will forever prevail.

And after victory has come we must strive for a workable peace in the same spirit of tolerance, understanding, and cooperation. Each group can make its contribution to the mutual advantage of not only the world we know but unborn generations to come.

The Catholic Charities, which arranged this nonsectarian and typically American gathering tonight, could, by applying its own rules, write the fundamental principles for permanent peace for the world. It stands as the symbol of the eternal teachings of Christ—brotherly love, mercy, charity, protection of the helpless. Its activities carry out those teachings. Each religion in its own way fosters and promotes these simple but indispensable precepts without which civilization cannot survive.

That is why religion should and must aid in the formulation of the peace. The immortal maxims of religion are the cornerstones on which democracy has been built, on which the future world order must be built if we ever hope to attain permanent peace on earth, good will toward men.

With this great honor which comes to you, Bishop Boylan, there also comes a tremendous responsibility. That responsibility rests on the shoulders of every man of God to whom congregations of faithful God-fearing people look for spiritual leadership and oftentimes guidance in material matters as well. Your inspired and studied advice will set the rule on which your spiritual children will base their conduct with each other and with their neighbors of all denominations. So it will influence them, as Americans, in their thinking when this Nation suggests the rules by which the community of nations will endeavor to live side by side in harmony and mutual assistance.

Boundaries of Smaller Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown, a staff writer of the Washington Star, entitled "Early Talk of Boundaries of Smaller Nations Arises to Plague Studies of Post-War World," published in the Washington Star of March 1, 1943. The article is in line with statements made upon the floor of the Senate today in reference to post-war activities and planning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD—EARLY TALK OF BOUNDARIES OF SMALLER NATIONS ARISES TO PLAGUE STUDIES OF POST-WAR WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

President Roosevelt and his political advisers who are studying the shape of the post-war world have ample reason to show concern over the question of how fair a readjustment of frontiers can be made without ignoring the rights of the smaller nations and at the same time satisfy the claims of the large fighting nations.

The indication given Friday from Moscow, through the usual "writing spokesman," that those parts of Poland which had been conquered by the Soviet armies in 1939 when they were fighting on the side of the Nazis would remain Russian has created a sensation among representatives of the minor nations in Washington.

None of them is worried over the bugaboo which used to be known as the Bolshevik menace. What worries them now is Russian imperialism.

Poland and the three Baltic states, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, had pinned their faith on the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" which had been fully accepted by all the United Nations as their creed for a just post-war world. They realized that unless strongly backed by all the Allies, they could not exist as independent nations because a handful of people fewer than 50,000,000 could not resist the powerful and efficient Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, unless she was willing to permit them to exist as free and independent nations.

POLAND LATEST IN LIST

On February 8 Moscow intimated clearly that she is considering Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania as parts of the Soviet Republic.

Last Friday another "writing spokesman" indicated that as far as Poland was concerned the Soviet Government does not intend to return those portions of Poland which had been acquired by the Soviet Republic in 1939.

The so-called Von Ribbentrop-Molotov line which partitioned Poland for the fourth time between Russia and Germany apparently is the boundary which will separate a free but shrunken Poland from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics after the Nazis have been defeated.

Rumors of misunderstandings over the future Poland between the Polish Government-in-exile and Moscow have been reported for some time. But since nothing definite was known, these rumors were discounted as Nazi propaganda intended to divide the allies. No serious attention was paid to these reports because had they been Nazi intrigues any comment or public discussion would have come under the heading of "helping Hitler."

MIGHT GET OTHER LANDS

But now that one of Moscow's unofficial spokesmen has taken up the matter and the Soviet Embassy in Washington has circulated that sensational article, there is no reason to believe that previous reports had been manufactured in Goebbels' lie factory.

It is possible that Moscow has intended to compensate the Poles by giving them portions of the Reich, such as East Prussia. But it is doubtful whether the future Polish Government would want to be saddled after the war with another "minority question," since East Prussia is overwhelmingly German.

The latest Russian statement has created a sensation in Yugoslav quarters, too. For more than 8 months the Yugoslav Government-in-exile has been endeavoring to reach a definite agreement with the Russian Government. Conversations are continuing, but little progress has been reported since their start.

MAY WANT PARTISANS

The secrecy which naturally surrounds these talks makes it difficult to ascertain the exact trouble. But the repeated attacks against the guerrillas of Gen. Draja Mihailovich and the support which the Partisans, the other group of guerrillas in Yugoslavia who oppose the Axis and Gen. Mihailovich as well, lend color to rumors that Moscow would like to see the Partisans win and have Yugoslavia a federated Soviet republic.

Rumors that Russia would like to occupy Yugoslavia are, of course, fantastic. No such thought entered the mind of any responsible man in Moscow. But it is impossible that the Soviet government should want its influence extended toward the Slav country which has refused to recognize the government established in Moscow in 1918.

In the light of the gigantic military problems still confronting the Allies, these issues are of relative importance. But in view of the fact the United States has placed itself on record as champion of all nations which want to remain free, these are problems which President Roosevelt and his political advisers cannot ignore.

DIFFICULTIES AHEAD

The United Nations have endorsed certain fundamental principles contained in the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." The principal stock in trade of this country in its international relations is its scrupulous honesty of keeping its word and espousing the cause of the downtrodden peoples. We want the little and the big fellow to have the same right to independence and to be master in his own house.

Voluntary Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Keep Employment Voluntary," published in the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of March 6, 1943.

The editorial points to a practice in which the Manufacturers Association of Hartford County has been engaged. I believe it is a very worthwhile contribution to the pending manpower problem so far as industry is concerned.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO KEEP EMPLOYMENT VOLUNTARY

The Manufacturers Association of Hartford County has made a complete and effective answer to the suggestion of the United States Employment Service that an industrial area management labor committee be set up for the county to act in accordance with the policy formulated last August. The association has carefully examined that policy, and it finds that its own practices are in such close conformity with the declared objectives that there is not the slightest need of creating the proposed committee.

Already the association, the members of which are the employers of nearly 80 percent of the workers in Hartford County factories, has by tacit agreement succeeded in virtually stopping the pirating of labor. The employment bureaus of the respective factories studiously refrain from discussing employment possibilities with workers who do not have a certificate of release from their former employers. All advertising for help fully meets the requirements of the local branch of the Government's employment service. The problem of absenteeism is being attacked both by the association and its members individually, and its causes are being studied in the light of factual evidence. No committee such as that suggested could be more desirous of correcting absenteeism than the association itself, and it is receiving the cooperation of responsible labor leaders. Everything possible is being done to attract women to the war industries, and excellent success has attended the effort.

It is to deal with just such matters that the manufacturers of this county have been asked to set up an industrial area management labor committee, but to do so would merely duplicate the work now being done. Hence the manufacturers take the position that the status quo should be maintained and that the recruiting of labor should be carried on under the effective program worked out by the Community Manpower Mobilization Committee, an organization working through the Hartford Chamber of Commerce, to solve the manpower problem "in the voluntary New England way."

It is this voluntary feature that the Manufacturers Association of Hartford County especially emphasizes. The association frankly admits that the labor turn-over is large, as a consequence of "shopping around" for other jobs, but its members are reluctant "to become a party to any plan or agreement that might be interpreted as deterring people from the free exercise of choice and selection of employment." They hold, and with good reason, that "a worker retained against his will and judgment is of little value to the employer."

This old Constitution State has never taken kindly to anything savoring of compulsion. In the Fundamental Orders of 1638, which was the beginning of this State as a commonwealth, the Reverend Thomas Hooker promulgated the doctrine: "The foundation of authority is laid in the free consent of the people." From that day to the present Connecticut has recognized that the rights of liberties of the individual were of transcendent importance, not to be interfered with except under extreme provocation. The Manufacturers Association of Hartford County, therefore, does not believe in forced labor but pins its faith on the voluntary efforts of the community to solve the manpower shortage and get out the production that our military forces require.

The National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Howard D. Gregg, president of the State College for Colored Students, located at Dover, Del. The letter advocates the continuance of the National Youth Administration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE COLLEGE FOR COLORED STUDENTS,
Dover, Del., February 27, 1943.

Senator JAMES M. TUNNELL,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TUNNELL: I am writing you because I am interested in the continuance of the National Youth Administration.

The present program of this organization is very closely connected with the war effort and within recent months they have trained for war industries in this area alone approximately 1,795 Negroes, all of whom have been placed in nearby war plants. It is a fact also that at the present time many women are being trained by this organization to take the places of men who have gone to the armed forces.

It is also true that both colleges and high schools have enabled students to continue their work because of the aid given by the National Youth Administration. This applies especially to underprivileged groups who without some aid would not be able to secure training in the ratio they deserve.

We will appreciate any consideration you may give toward securing a continuance of this worthwhile organization.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD D. GREGG, *President.*

Washington Dinner Address by Ambrose O'Connell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Ambrose O'Connell, vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at the George Washington Dinner held on Saturday, March 6, 1943, at the Pfister Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American people are approaching a great test in the election of 1944. The mighty struggle in which we are now engaged may still be going on when the time comes to go to the polls. Or, if the guns have ceased firing, we may then be trying to make a treaty of permanent peace. Of one thing you may be certain.

When this tragic conflict does end, this Nation, as well as every other nation of the world, will be faced with a post-war situation filled with dangerous possibilities.

In this raging international storm, each of the two major political parties boldly proclaims its responsibility to guide the Ship of State through the perilous waters that lie ahead.

The Democratic Party, during the 10 years of the Roosevelt administration, has weathered this Nation through a sea of domestic chaos that threatened our economic life and the well-being of our people.

Its motives, its courageous leadership, and its record of magnificent achievement are known to all. It has won the faith and confidence of the American people.

The Republican Party offers a record of 16 years in exclusive control of the Government which brought this Nation to the verge of bankruptcy and plunged its citizens into widespread unemployment and despair.

Hoping and praying that the American people have forgotten all this, the Republican Party now presses forward, vaunting its demands for the control of the Government in this, the greatest crisis of our Nation's history.

They observed Lincoln's birthday this year, with unusual clamor and fireworks. They thought to conjure the support of the American people by the use of the name of this immortal American hero.

In his Lincoln Day speech at Pittsburgh, JOE MARTIN, former chairman of the Republican National Committee, and for years Republican leader of the House, hailed and hallowed Lincoln as the founder of the Republican Party, and declared that Lincoln will ever be its inspiration and ideal.

As a matter of fact, the old guard which is now trying to worm its way back into power to destroy the program of human progress that has been made by our people during the past 10 years, is the same old guard that moved heaven and earth to obstruct and disparage the work of Abraham Lincoln. And Mr. MARTIN is still the same old MARTIN of Martin, Barton, and Fish.

During the Civil War, Lincoln was violently opposed by his Republican Party enemies for a second term. When he came up for renomination, a half dozen Republican candidates were put in the field against him. He was charged with building a bureaucracy that endangered our free institutions, and of creating an appalling public debt that would bankrupt the Nation and plunge us into chaos. Despite all this, Lincoln, supported by the common sense and loyalty of the American people, was renominated and reelected in 1864.

In this same Lincoln Day speech, Mr. MARTIN declared:

"The American people demand, and we Republicans support the demand, that the war be fought efficiently and without regard to partisanship."

Now let us face the realities.

The day before Mr. MARTIN delivered his talk, the Washington Times-Herald carried this news item:

"Republican National Chairman Harrison Spangler today informed congressional Republican leaders that he plans to expand the committee staff for the preparation of the 1944 Presidential campaign.

"Spangler also disclosed an intention of working more closely with Republican Members of Congress than have some of his predecessors. The plan is to conduct a liaison with Congress through the Republican senatorial and congressional campaign committees.

"The new G. O. P. chairman discussed plans for the future with ex-Senator John Townsend, chairman of the senatorial campaign committee, and Representative WILLIAM DITTER, Pennsylvania, head of the congressional campaign committee, Republican Senate leader, CHARLES MCNARY, and Republican House leader, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, were consulted."

From this article it would seem that Mr. Spangler, while in Washington devising the utmost partisanship, must even have had a hand in writing Mr. MARTIN'S speech, demanding that the war be fought without regard to partisanship.

Their idea of a political armistice is that it was binding only on the Democrats.

In the last campaign, while our Congressmen and Senators remained on the job in

Washington doing their utmost to promote the success of the war, Republican spellbinders roamed up and down the country, viciously attacking practically every phase of the war effort. It was a foray of carping criticism.

Many able and patriotic Democratic candidates were defeated, while those who were elected on the Republican ticket have continued the same destructive tactics that characterized their campaign.

The President, deeply engrossed in the strategy and prosecution of the war, failed to make a single speech or to take an active part in the campaign. Wendell Willkie paraded up and down the land, and foreign lands as well, bellowing for a second front.

In the midst of all this, President Roosevelt was carefully designing the smashing blow that turned the course of the war.

Hitler and Mussolini and Willkie woke up one morning to find that the convoy of a great American Army had made a glorious and successful landing on the shores of north Africa.

Every citizen knows that had the President given any attention whatever to the political campaign of last fall, the election returns would have told a different story.

"We must try to evolve plans," the Republicans omnipotently declare, "to make sure that when the millions of men and women come back from the war, or leave factories no longer needed for war production, they will find good jobs at good wages available."

There is no doubt about the necessity for this program. We must not only provide jobs for our people when this war is over, but we must also see to it that after their sacrifices this world will be a better place in which to live. My friends, to accomplish this will be a monumental task. And who is going to do the job?

The American people have but one lamp by which their action is guided, and that is the lamp of experience. There is no way of judging the future but by the past. And judging the past, what has there been in the conduct of the Republican Party during the 16 years when they had control of the Government to justify the hope that they can meet and master the terrible problems that will follow this war?

Chairman Spangler, of the Republican National Committee, has declared time and again that the avowed purpose of his organization is to destroy the New Deal and all it stands for. "I have been after that animal since 1932," he cries, "and I hope that in 1944 I can be there at the kill."

Under Mr. Spangler's program, will our American soldier, returning from the war, find his parents destitute because the old-age pension has been repealed?

Will our returning soldier hear again the resounding ring of the auctioneer's hammer as the farm is foreclosed, as was done throughout the land under the Hoover administration?

Will he find his family deprived of the benefits of social security, that unemployment insurance is but a memory; that the Securities Exchange Act has been abolished by the Republicans, and swindling stock salesmen are selling the blue skies to his returning comrades and the widows and orphans of those who did not return?

Will he find long lines of people clamoring before the padlocked doors of a closed bank, hopelessly trying to regain their savings, because the Republicans have abolished the guaranty of bank deposits?

These are just a few of the questions upon which Mr. Spangler and Mr. MARTIN should further enlighten the American people. If the Republican Party is successful at the polls in the 1944 election, my friends, it can happen here.

At the close of this war, if the Republicans are in control, will not our factories and our offices be as idle and as bankrupt again as they were in 1930, in 1931 and 1932 when the Republicans entrenched in the Government were bewildered and without even a plan to meet the emergency?

Or will they then tell the people once more that "Prosperity is just around the corner," and compel the returning soldiers and the unemployed, as they did in 1930, to go back on the streets selling apples?

If our returning millions of soldiers should face economic disaster again, as veterans have done before under a Republican regime, will Mr. Spangler let us know, now if the Republican Party then in power in Washington will again call out the National Guard should these men come there seeking redress?

And, finally, will our returning troops, as well as our women returning from both industry and the war, find themselves explointed under the Spangler program by greedy employers working them day and night at starvation wages?

In a crisis like this, we must depend on the common sense of the American people to determine the fate of the Nation. While unbridled criticism stalks abroad, the truth is that one of the greatest accomplishments of all time has been the conversion of this Nation from a peace to a wartime basis. American labor has been working day and night turning out the greatest volume of armament and ammunition ever known to man. Ships, airplanes, tanks, bombers, and guns are rolling from the assembly line every minute of the day and night.

We have thoroughly trained an Army of 5,000,000 men who have already given a magnificent account of themselves in the field and on the sea and in the air. You can depend upon it that these achievements will be continued and increased so that the enemy shall never again provoke the might of this great Nation.

We will win this war, and when our troops return, rest assured that a program of security and employment will be put into effect as soon as the guns have ceased firing. Definite plans are being completed to provide work and security for our returning troops and for the conversion of the plants and factories into the pursuits of peace.

There is no hope for a program for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the Nation except under the leadership of a party that has been a true and faithful friend of the American people.

We are obliged to make sacrifices here at home in the meantime. But they are as nothing compared with those that our sons and brothers are making in the front lines.

There are many irritating experiences that each of us have had to endure. In an undertaking so extensively participated in by each citizen of our country, it is beyond reason to expect that things will always run smoothly.

Don't blame your local rationing board, your butcher, or your grocer for the shortages that they are obliged to regulate. The real cause of our trouble lies not with them but with the dictators who forced this war upon us.

The powerful and intelligent effort that is being directed against the enemy should, with the help of Divine Providence, bring this war to a successful conclusion in the not too distant future. So let us carry on as true Americans, true to the fighting men and women of this Nation and true to the Stars and Stripes.

To you who listen to complaints of restrictions, deprivations, and inconveniences—to the whispering voices of those who appear concerned more with their personal and political ambitions than with the winning of the war—I leave this thought.

We, too, at home are fighting for victory. We will share the fruits of victory.

We will live to enjoy those fruits in a happier world, but the grand young fellows, whose bones will lie under the sands of Sahara, in the jungles of New Guinea, in unmarked recesses of the ocean's floor—they will not live to share the victory.

They will not celebrate the winning of the war, because they died to win it. But, my friends, in fame's immortal chronicles they will live. In your hearts they will live. And, because you have made your own contribution, small indeed, when measured against their supreme sacrifice, you will feel that you have done your part.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act Must Be Renewed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a very forceful and well-considered editorial from the San Antonio Express under date of February 20, 1943:

First real test as to the permanency of this Nation's transition from a foreign policy hinged upon dangerously short-sighted isolationism to one accepting world responsibility and cooperation commensurate with its international interests, will come with the congressional vote on renewing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act before its expiration date (June 12, next).

That act affords machinery for wartime economic cooperation and for effecting the Atlantic Charter and post-war provisions of the lend-lease agreements. As Lindsay Crawford, National Foreign Trade Council secretary, points out, it substitutes bilateral tariff bargaining based on equality of treatment, for unilateral action that leads only to excessive trade barriers, throttled commerce and lower living standards within the competing nations.

Secretary of State Hull, who has fought tirelessly for the reciprocal trade principle, is no visionary but an experienced, discerning realist. His policies lately were backed by Winthrop W. Aldrich, the Chase National Bank board's chairman (New York), in these words:

"The trade agreements program has made a constructive contribution toward a liberalization of the world trade and toward a reduction in excessive and unreasonable trade barriers. Its renewal will demonstrate to the world that this country is ready and willing to collaborate with other nations in reshaping the post-war world * * * that we have renounced those unrealistic policies of economic and political isolationism which governed our foreign attitudes immediately following World War No. 1."

During the past decade the act has improved American trade with 25 foreign countries—among them leading customers. The good-neighbor policy has been furthered thereby. The act represents the kind of give and take which nations must practice in order to live together peacefully and prosperously. Failure to renew the act—without detrimental amendments—would erase a decade's constructive labors and drain America's reservoir of good will which Wendell L. Willkie asserts, already has sprung some dangerous leaks.

This issue is too fundamental to the United States future welfare to allow of partisan controversy. Judged on its merits solely, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act must be renewed.

As a developing industrial State—almost incredibly rich in natural resources and with surplus agricultural production—Texas' future largely depends on foreign trade expansion. The Reciprocal Trade Act's renewal thus should receive State-wide support. To that end, a resolution by the legislature at Austin and a popular appeal to the Texas delegation in Congress are in order.

Review of National Dairy Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review of the national dairy situation, issued by the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, under date of March 8, 1943.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIEW OF NATIONAL DAIRY SITUATION

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 8.—The following statement has been issued by Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation:

I am authorized by our Executive Committee to make public the views of the committee on the present state of dairying under war conditions.

A serious and increasing shortage of dairy products faces the Nation. This shortage will be most intense in the eastern, southern, and Pacific coast areas. In Corn Belt States, where dairying and hog producing are joint farm operations, many farmers will feel that their extra returns on skim milk fed to hogs will offset the relatively low returns on butterfat. Other farmers will abandon butterfat production and devote more attention to production of corn, hogs, and beef.

National production of milk, under best conditions, will be several billion pounds less than last year's production. Labor shortage is intensifying the situation and uncontrolled feed prices and uncertain feed deliveries are important factors in reducing this year's output of milk.

There is a very serious shortage of manpower on dairy farms. This manpower is very largely year round manpower and has been lost on a ratio of approximately 35 men being drafted to 65 deserting the farms for the higher paid and shorter hours of urban industry. A maze of regulations restricting the free operation of farming has also accentuated the trend of manpower toward the cities.

There is great need for more farm machinery. Farm machinery is the only possible substitute for some of the labor now lost to the farms. For efficient and increased production, more, and not less, farm machinery should be made available during this and the coming year.

A real and serious shortage of protein feeds now prevails. These feeds are particularly needed to maintain milk and egg production. The present price ratios of beef and pork to milk and eggs will divert large quantities of proteins to beef cattle and the hog growers which normally go to dairying.

During the past year, all costs of milk production, including labor costs, have risen more than has the price of milk; and these costs have risen more than the figures indicate due to intangible factors such as delay in obtaining repairs, greater inefficiency of labor, lack of surety of labor and supplies, and so forth. Manpower waste on the farms is increasing as a result of compliance with regulations covering truck certificates, gas rationing, delays in securing farm equipment, and rubber boot priorities.

Restrictions on obtaining repairs and parts include such important items as truck carburetor parts, tractor carburetor parts, milking machine motors, etc.

Despite the fact that Federal price policies for governing milk and its products necessarily hinge upon price policies with regard to hogs and beef, the Government has embarked upon three conflicting price programs. Prices of beef on the hoof have not been regulated. Minimum guaranteed prices for hogs have been assured. Butter prices have been frozen nationally on a Chicago basis of 46½ cents for 92 score, which is about 24 percent below a proper ratio with the guaranteed price of hogs. Milk prices to producers have been frozen throughout the Nation at January levels, which are from 65 cents to $1.10 per hundredweight less than they should be at this time in relation to a proper price for butter. Producers of milk for cheese have been forced to accept the humiliation of a subsidy in lieu of a necessary price, notwithstanding the fact that the Government is requisitioning for export and military use one-half of the cheese produced in this Nation this year.

By and large, the frozen price levels for dairy farmers will tend to increase shortages and will not even maintain last year's production levels.

Notwithstanding these handicaps America's dairy farmers will get along. Those who cannot afford to produce milk or its products will sell their cows and produce other farm crops, or leave their farms and take good jobs in urban industry. Those who can afford to stay on the farms will measure their capacity to produce in accordance with what they can get for their milk and do the best they can. Without an immediate rectification of the situation, the entire eastern area of the United States will shortly be on a deficit basis with regard to the milk supply. Similar conditions have already developed in California and in the South, where, due to shifts of population, milk supplies are already inadequate.

While a severe blow has been struck at the morale of dairy farmers and thousands of them feel hopeless and embittered, there will be few community disturbances and they will not strike. They will carry on by the process of curtailing their operations to meet the pattern of the new order.

What should be done is simple. It is so simple that great minds in the Government find it hard to understand. If milk and its products are an essential war industry, minimum guaranteed prices should be assured by the Government at points sufficiently high to maintain present production. If increased production is required, flexible price ceilings should be established at points sufficiently high to assure some measure of this increase. Between the minimum and maximum prices, there should be allowed free play of economic forces. Such a plan would be effective in controlling runaway prices and helpful in producing milk and its products in our present time of need. Such a plan is anti-inflationary, whereas the present administration's effort to freeze dairy prices at relatively low levels and make up for it by giving farmers some form of subsidy, which later must be paid for out of tax monies, contains the essence of inflation. It does not matter whether the low price is supplemented by an individual subsidy check, or whether the financial resources of the Government be used to purchase the product from the farmers at one price and resell it to the handlers at a lower price in imitation of the English system. Both are equally inflationary, undesirable, and unwanted by the farmers of America.

In presenting this statement to the public, the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation is not asking for a rational price policy to benefit dairy farmers. It is suggesting that if the Government really desires to have enough dairy products during and after the war, its present policy will frustrate that desire and the Federation is offering a plan to help attain needed production.

The Most Despicable Saboteur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Most Despicable Saboteur," published in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of March 6, 1943. The editorial was accompanied by a cartoon depicting a person labeled "Trojan horse candidate," placing dynamite under machinery labeled "Our two-party system of Government."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The New Deal's still-pending suit against the Associated Press, on monopoly charges—a suit which by general agreement constitutes one of the most serious threats ever raised against a free press in America—has drawn the vigorous condemnation of all but half a dozen or so American dailies in communities of any considerable size.

Naturally, this handful of newspapers which have either supported the administration's suit against the Associated Press or else kept an unprincipled silence, includes the two Marshall Field papers—New York's PM (commonly styled the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker) and the Chicago Sun, which latter Field paper's attempt to bludgeon its way into Associated Press membership provided the main occasion for the suit in the first place.

Perhaps just as naturally, the handful of American dailies that have uttered no whisper of protest against this New Deal threat to journalistic liberty includes, also, the local New Deal organ in this community.

If a man (or a paper) is to be fairly judged by the company that he (or it) keeps, then assuredly it may be set down that any publisher of any newspaper included in this tiny minority of American journals acquiescing in the anti-Associated Press action can claim no enviable distinction on account of whatever "kudos" may appear to reside in the mere fact of "exclusiveness."

For example, take the February 22 (Washington's Birthday) edition of the Field paper PM issued by out-and-out "pinkos" in a State which, just by the way, never adopted Jefferson's Declaration of Independence.

In that edition—a definitely typical issue, we assure you—PM viciously caricatured a

number of Members of Congress, depicting them as "hanged in effigy," although all of those Congressmen were freely chosen by their people only 4 months ago.

And in that same edition, the "pinko" PM also printed a cartoon of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, one of America's most highly and most justly admired heroes, ridiculing him as a Punch and Judy dancer—all, of course, in keeping with the despicable Russian-born Dave Levitt's recently reported reference to our ace of World War No. 1 as "the No. 1 rat of World War No. 2."

That's Mr. Field's New York paper.

Now, mindful of the old saying that a man may be judged by the company he keeps, let's turn to the New Deal's No. 1 Chicago mouthpiece—this same Mr. Field's morning paper, the 15-months-old Sun, which is spending a "barrel" of money plastering big blue-and-white signs all over Chicago, proclaiming that the Sun contains "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth."

Last Tuesday—as, indeed, steadily from week to week—the Sun made a cordial display of its warm affection and high esteem for Mr. Wendell Willkie.

Not even making the slightest attempt to conceal its first-choice fondness for Mr. Roosevelt (obviously for as many terms as Mr. Roosevelt may see fit to seek), the international playboy's Chicago newspaper presumes to "lecture" midwestern Republicans.

It presumes to enjoin Republicans that they have a sort of solemn obligation to nominate for the Presidency in 1944 no other man than Wall Streeter Willkie—with the possible exception of his political prima donna stooge and shadow, Mr. Harold Stassen, of Minnesota.

That such out-and-out tax-escaping New Deal playboy multimillionaires should squander their unearned, untaxed, inherited millions in such preposterous penny-lectures to Republicans is of no great moment. The primary essences of impudence, after all, are always more amusing than anything else.

But here is a matter provocative of considerable irritation:

That these out-and-out New Dealers (whose support for Willkie or some very similar Trojan horse is about the most logical thing that ever issues from their minds) should have a certain number of "Little Sir Echoes" permitted to run loose in Republican politics, wearing the livery of Republican leadership; and that these toadies should be fawningly attended, here and there, by dissident but deferential "small fry" more concerned with checkbooks than with charters of liberty.

There is a good deal of talk nowadays about "our way of life."

On the political side of things, however, if that phrase means anything, it means preserving the two-party system.

And preservation of the two-party system, in turn, necessitates the functioning of honest opposition. Friends of the two-party principle have the strong obligation to combat every attempt at Trojan horse fifth-column sabotaging of one party by the other.

A free people is entitled to a free choice on major issues.

The number one issue of the present hour is nationalism versus internationalism. Both sides are entitled to a hearing. Each side is entitled to offer the people a candidate championing its particular philosophy.

Let the internationalist New Dealers, therefore, nominate whomsoever they will.

And if there are any former Republicans who now wish to recant and abjure their party's traditional nationalist faith—let them go freely and support the New Deal's internationalist candidate and his philosophy.

But let them not labor, in the manner of boring bundists, to destroy from within, not only their party's ancient faith, but also the opportunity for free citizens, traditionally adherent to one party or the other, to find somewhere an opportunity to register however much nationalist conviction may be resident in the body politic.

The American people had enough tweedledum-tweedledee politics in 1940.

They will not forever submit to a "good fellow" tolerance of political chicaneries which favor—if they do not, indeed, guarantee—a gag in the mouths of millions eager to make themselves heard through the peaceful (and once familiar) agency of a free ballot.

They are insisting upon a recognition that honesty is the best policy—in political as well as personal affairs.

Secrecy in Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting address delivered by Dr. Hugh Grant, formerly Minister to Albania and later as our State Department representative in Thailand.

This address was delivered by Dr. Grant in Chattanooga, Tenn., and a report of it was published in the columns of the Chattanooga Times, issue of Wednesday, January 27, 1943.

Dr. Grant is considered by many to be one of our outstanding authorities on international affairs, and as a student of modern history his services are in great demand throughout the country as a lecturer and public speaker.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. GRANT HITS STATE SECRECY ON DIPLOMACY—FORMER UNITED STATES ENVOY DECLARES PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE MIGHT HAVE PREVENTED LOSSES

(By Charles Pennington)

"If the American public had been fully acquainted with the facts of Japanese intrigue in the Pacific before the war the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor probably would never have occurred," Dr. Hugh G. Grant told members of the Executives Club last night at the Read House.

Former United States Minister to Albania and later Minister to Thailand, Dr. Grant charged that under the existing "system" the American State Department is a secret organization and the American public is told nothing of the facts behind diplomatic policies

"One of the greatest defects in the State Department organization which has existed over a long period of time is the manner in which political reports from ambassadors and ministers abroad are received and treated in the Department," Dr. Grant asserted. "The vast majority of these reports are seen only by 'career' officers sitting at desks who initial them and pass them on to the pigeonholes, and oblivion. I am sure that it is a rare report which reaches the desk of the President."

PAYS TRIBUTE TO HULL

Prefacing his address with a tribute to "that great Tennessean and great American, Cordell Hull," Dr. Grant emphasized that he spoke only as a private citizen, and not as a representative of the State Department, nor of the War Department. (Dr. Grant recently made a tour of American Army camps and air bases delivering a series of orientation lectures.)

In his discussion of the "existing system" in the State Department, the former minister said that in a recently published State Department White Paper, it is revealed that Joseph C. Grew, Ambassador to Japan, had stated in January 1941 that war appeared certain with Japan, and predicted that Japan would attack Pearl Harbor.

"Did you ever hear of that dispatch, or of other dispatches telling of Japanese intrigue in the Far East?

"I can well understand how the late Senator Borah, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for many years, could be so deceived as to proclaim shortly before the outbreak of war that he knew from private information that there would be no war in Europe. Neither Senator Borah nor his colleagues of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who have a joint responsibility with the Executive in the conduct of our foreign affairs, had any direct access to the numerous reports and dispatches pouring into the State Department from American ambassadors and ministers abroad, describing the swift-moving events which indicated the probability of war. This system should be reformed so that the American people can be prepared for sneak attacks."

UNITED STATES POSITION ASKED

Dr. Grant said that soon after assuming his portfolio in Thailand he was approached by representatives of the Thailand Government who desired to know the position of the United States on claims the Thai Government proposed to make for territory in French Indochina.

"I immediately forwarded a cablegram to the State Department. I anticipated the character of the reply since I was thoroughly familiar with Secretary Hull's strong advocacy of the policy of the status quo and opposition to any form of territorial aggression.

"One week later I received from the State Department a reply in which I was instructed to inform the Thai Government that the American Government believed in the maintenance of the status quo. I was also instructed to use every opportunity possible to get this viewpoint across to the Thai Government.

"I followed my instructions, in which, incidentally, I heartily concurred. It appeared to me that the Thais in agitating for French territory in Indo-China were in danger of being drawn into a Japanese trap, becoming collaborators with Japan in the threat against the French possession."

BRITISH STAND CHANGED

The minister said he was pleased to learn that the British minister had received similar instructions from his Government on the Thai claims. After a few weeks, however, the British minister changed his attitude to favor a policy of appeasement, Dr. Grant said. He added that he believed the minister made the change on his own initiative, and not on instructions of the British Government.

"In upholding the policy of the status quo, I soon became the object of hostility on the part of the Thai propagandists who were clamoring for the French territory in Indochina working hand in hand with Japanese fifth columnists, who, it is now obvious, for some time had been intriguing behind the scenes to involve Thailand in their plot against Indo-china.

"The Thais went to war with the French in November, 1940, a few weeks before Japanese troops moved into northern Indochina. They walked right into the Jap trap.

"At the end of approximately 3 months of fighting on the frontier and a naval battle in the Gulf of Siam which was disastrous for the Thai Navy, the Japanese plotters in Tokyo, proclaiming to the world that Japan sought 'peace in Asia,' announced a 'mediation' conference in Tokyo to which Thai and French delegates were invited."

UNDERSTANDING BEFORE WAR

"Future history probably will reveal that a perfect understanding existed between the principal Thai and Japanese political leaders in regard to the Indo-china venture long before the Thai-Indo-china war. The so-called Tokyo 'mediation conference' was a phase of the Japanese plot for the seizure not only of Indo-china, but of Thailand, Burma, Malaya, and Singapore."

Dr. Grant said he continued to oppose the Thai claims in French Indo-china up to the last in an effort to keep them out of the Japanese trap. He said a Japanese-controlled radio station broadcast a report that the American minister to Thailand was being recalled to Washington by President Roosevelt and would be transferred to another post.

"As subsequent events proved, the alien intriguers who were plotting to get me out of their way in the pursuit of their plans to upset the American policy of the status quo were more charitable than certain career officers in the State Department. I was recalled to Washington by Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles during the absence of Secretary Hull, but not for transfer to another post. And Mr. Welles refused to grant me the customary consultation extended to ministers who are recalled from their posts."

Dr. Grant said that some time ago professional career officers in the State Department launched a move to place career men in all important positions abroad.

DECRIES COMPLACENCY

Dr. Grant described the spirit of complacency which he said he found in Hawaii, in the Philippines and in Singapore on his way to Thailand. He said Manuel Quezon, president of the Philippine Commonwealth, told him in 1940 that "I have never believed there will be war between Japan and the United States."

He said the British governor of Malaya told him in June 1941 that there would be war with the Japanese, and predicted that if war came the Japs would attack Singapore, not from the sea, but through the jungles, as they did do later.

Dr. Grant also told of his four years as minister to Albania, and of a conversation with King Zog, in which the Albanian King told him in 1935 that Germany was building the world's greatest military machine.

Dr. Grant predicted a "long, hard struggle ahead for the Allied Nations in the war." He said the United States is building the world's greatest army and air corps, but that victory must be bought with blood and tears.

He said the German people will not "crack," and predicted that the last battle in Europe will be fought on German soil. He predicted take it will take "years" to beat the Japanese in the Pacific, and said "our greatest danger now is overoptimism regarding the war."

After the war is won the United States must be "hard-boiled" in order to maintain the peace, and a League of Nations or some similar organization must be backed up with force, he said.

"We can't maintain peace by giving everyone a quart of milk. Paternalism won't work. The little nations of Europe will need our help, but ultimately they must pull themselves back up by their own bootstraps and work out their own destiny. We must not try to establish a world-wide Work Projects Administration. It is physically impossible for use to feed and clothe half the world."

Austrian Battalion

REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, recently I wrote to the Secretary of War by way of protest against forcing alien selectees who are Czechs, Poles, Yugoslavs, and Austrians to serve in the Austrian Battalion of the Army of the United States, which battalion, unfortunately, is tied up with Otto von Hapsburg, pretender to the throne of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. I am pleased to note as a result that the Secretary of War writes me, in part, as follows:

Those enlisted men who continue to object to service with this unit are now authorized to transfer to other ground-force units upon submission of written application to the commanding officer. Cadre personnel desiring transfers will be relieved from duty with the One Hundred and First Infantry when trained personnel is available within the unit. Moreover, current instructions confine the assignment of Austrian aliens to the One Hundred and First Infantry only to those who volunteer for such assignments.

I wish to thank the Secretary for his sound judgment, as thus expressed.

I herewith set forth a copy of the letter in full:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1943.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: This is in further reply to your letter of February 24 concerning the Austrian Battalion.

No doubt you are aware that the organization of this unit is American in every respect, and that it is part of the Army of the United States and carries the American colors only. Austrian aliens assigned to the One Hundred and First Infantry Battalion are entitled to and are receiving the same privileges as Americans in other units of the Army, including the right to apply for American citizenship.

Regarding instruction in the German language, only the officer and cadre personnel are receiving this training. This is being done solely to refresh these individuals in the German equivalents of English military terms, so that enlisted men assigned or to be assigned to this unit will be able to understand and be taught the English equivalents. Classes also have been organized to teach the English language to the enlisted men in this unit.

Without attempting to deprecate the remarks made in the correspondence enclosed with your letter, I cannot but deduce that they reflect groundless reports and rumors received by individuals prior to assignment to the One Hundred and First Infantry, and that their suspicions and fears will be materially relieved when they become acclimated to their assignments. However, those enlisted who continue to object to service with this unit are now authorized to transfer to other ground-force units upon submission of written application to the commanding officer. Cadre personnel desiring transfers will be relieved from duty with the One Hundred and First Infantry when trained personnel is available within the unit. Moreover, current instructions confine the assignment of Austrian aliens to the One Hundred and First Infantry only to those who volunteer for such assignments.

I trust this information adequately responds to your inquiry and appreciate your bringing your interest in this matter to my attention.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

No Time To Lift the Cotton Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, with the recent announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture, lifting the quotas on wheat, there has been a strong demand from certain sections and individuals that the Secretary issue an order lifting the quotas on cotton also, so that the farmers in our cotton producing sections could plant and raise cotton to their hearts' content.

The advocates of such a program fail to realize that the adoption of such a program at this time would not only disrupt our farm program, well under way in certain parts of the country, but would seriously upset the economic balance in many sections. The consequences of such a proposal are very clearly set forth in a recent editorial in the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., which I am including herein as part of my remarks and which I believe reflects the sentiment of most cotton growers of the country:

DIXIE IS NOT SO DUMB

"The Delta Council, representing a large majority of cotton producers in this area, vigorously protests any increase of cotton acreage under the present Agricultural Adjustment Administration allotment which has been approved by the vote of an overwhelming majority of producers in the recent election held for that purpose."

For purposes of emphasis we reprint the foregoing statement which the Delta Council sent to Washington this week. It is forthright. It is representative. It is an indication that the South is capable of understanding its problems now and in the future, and intends to fight for the right to handle its economy. It is not to be lured by glittering generalities.

To the uninitiated, all-out production of cotton would seem to be the logical course in wartimes. The cattle men in the West are demanding cotton oil and cake for protein. To get cotton oil we must raise cotton, but there is a danger of overproduction of cotton to get the seed.

Taking off restrictions now would endanger the balance. There are other oils which can be grown in the South—peanut and soybean, for instance—which would help the program of diversification. We must continue to grow food and feed as well as cotton.

All-out production of cotton would take us back to the one-crop system we have

struggled against so desperately in the past. Get us the machinery and the marketing set-up and we will get out the feed.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration does not want unrestricted cotton production. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration is making provision for supplying the seed, the market and the "know how" so our farmers can produce other proteins, such as peanuts and beans.

What we want is better cotton, not more cotton. And we want food crops, herds of dairy and beef cattle that thrive so well in our Southland. That is the safer way, that is the right way.

The demand is for more feed. That we can get from other products in the South. Meantime we can be improving our cotton and balancing our production.

If unrestricted cotton production were needed for the prosecution of the war, the South would not hesitate. But the Department of Agriculture says it is feed that is needed. The Department does not want unrestricted cotton production. It is striving to get oil-producing crops moving in the South, and we should cooperate.

Not only is it a profitable undertaking in wartime, but it is the sane way to proceed lest we be caught in a "cotton only" condition after the war. Diversification and improvement of farm products are important in the war program and vital after the war. Unrestricted cotton production is the wrong way, now or in the future.

We are glad Oscar Johnston, president of the National Cotton Council, has corrected the impression in Washington that the council or that he, personally, advocate unlimited cotton production. We applaud Walter Sillers and the Delta Council for a statesmanlike stand.

Walter Winchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HEADQUARTERS SQUADRON,
FLEET AIR WING EIGHT,
San Francisco, Calif., February 28, 1943.

DEAR SIR: In Walter Winchell's column reprinted in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin under the date of February 25, 1943, was a short note on your feelings about Lieutenant Commander Winchell.

Just because it may be a boost to your morale that Lieutenant Commander Winchell has been placed on the inactive list, it is hardly a boost in my morale but something of a reduction, because I have the utmost faith in what Mr. Winchell reports to the people of the United States.

As an officer of the Navy I know nothing, first hand, of what Mr. Winchell has done as an officer, but I had the very good fortune to help place in commission Patrol Squadron 83, which Mr. Winchell flew with on an enemy hunt at sea on which he manned a cannon in the plane in which he was flying. I have the utmost confidence in the commanding officer of patrol 83, and he would not report to the commander of the South Atlantic Forces if Mr. Winchell had not done what was reported.

It seems to me that people would learn sooner or later not to contest what Mr. Winchell says in his column or radio broadcasts because he has been threatened many times with lawsuits. For some strange reason they just don't seem to materialize in convictions or judgments. Could the reason for this be that Mr. Winchell has proof for what he says?

In the same column, Mr. Congressman, were excerpts from statements by other people, newspapers, and naval authorities of praise and criticism. When Mr. Winchell is attacked by a person or persons who try to lower his reputation in the eyes of the American people he prints both sides of the story so people can form their own opinion of his actions.

I am one of the fighting men you refer to in the Navy (a yeoman, second class), and I would like to take this opportunity to defend Mr. Winchell for the majority of the men in the Navy. The Navy is indeed fortunate to have had Mr. Winchell as an officer who has seen actual duty on the high seas and in the air.

In my way of thinking Mr. Winchell is something similar to a destroyer in that he attacks anything that his opponent may have without discrimination of size (or position).

When the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation (now the Bureau of Naval Personnel), and the Director of Public Relations approve of Mr. Winchell's broadcasts, I ask you, Mr. Congressman who is a layman to contest the judgment of the men that are running this war (and a good job, too) in which the Navy is playing such an important part.

When you speak of the fighting men of the Navy you may forget that Admiral Nimitz is in command of the Pacific forces that defeated the Japs at Midway and that he is the same Admiral Nimitz who said that Lieutenant Commander Winchell's broadcasts were of tremendous value to the Navy.

You have formed your opinion and have denounced Mr. Winchell in the press. I am a sailor, 21 years old, that believes in America with all his heart and soul and I, too, have formed my opinion of Mr. Winchell and I say that if the country had more men like him it would be too bad for Hitler and others who dislike Mr. Winchell and the right of the American people to criticize the people they elect to serve them in public office.

I leave this old saying with you: "It is the truth that hurts."

Very respectfully yours,
VANCE I. MORRIS, Jr.,
Yeoman, Second Class,
United States Navy.

Grade Labeling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

GRADE LABELING

The minority administration in Washington continues to disregard the mandate of the election last November which repudiated its policies. The latest attempt to inflict measures repugnant to the majority of the Nation's citizens is Price Administrator Brown's announcement that fruit and vegetable packers will be required to use grade labeling on every can that they put up this year.

This order is peculiarly offensive because it is an effort to use the war as a cloak for a phony reform which was investigated, exposed as fraudulent, and rejected in peacetime. Grade labeling is the darling of the Communists. Accerding to their theory, all that is necessary to identify goods is to require canners to label their products as meeting certain specified standards and the housewife can then purchase according to the limitation of her kitchen budget.

The process is given a false plausibility by the fact that grading of canned products obtains generally at the manufacturing and wholesale levels of that business. But, as canners have repeatedly pointed out, it is one thing to set standards on which canners and wholesalers can agree and quite another to write legally tight definitions such as would be essential to an enforceable system of grade labeling for consumers. When a canner and a wholesaler fall out on a question of grading, the normal procedure is not to take the matter to court but to submit it to arbitration. The arbitrator is, like the seller and the customer, an expert, and extreme precision is, for this reason, not required in the standards which he is called upon to interpret between the two disputants, who have agreed in advance to accept his judgment.

Mr. Brown and his Office of Price Administration enjoy no such favorable circumstances. If they undertake to enforce grade labeling they must be prepared to enforce it in court. That will call for grading definitions that are legally airtight and yet flexible enough to classify all of the variations in the natural products. It may be noted that peas, even what Mr. Brown would call substandard peas, are not a homogeneous subject that can be made to conform to specifications as ball bearings can. These airtight definitions would have to be written for literally thousands of products and would have to be accepted by the canning industry, or at least made intelligible to its members. If Mr. Brown should undertake such a herculean task he might get his standards ready by the end of the war—if it were a longer war than anyone likes to anticipate now.

Beyond the impracticability of drawing up understandable and legally enforceable standards, grade labeling would fall down because it makes no allowance whatever for taste. That, of course, is something which cannot be standardized. Yet it is, perhaps, the most important factor in the salability and, therefore, in the real value of any canned food. Not only is it impossible to say that this product has a fancy taste and that one a choice or extra-standard one, as the grade labelers propose, but tastes vary with consumers, a fact for which we should all be thankful. To grade labeling there is the additional objection that it encourages the buyer to believe that the higher the grade, the greater the nutritional value, though generally that is not the fact.

Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, has taken up the cudgels against Brown's proposal in Congress and there is good reason to hope that this silly venture will be stopped before it throws the canning industry into further chaos and further diminishes the Nation's food supply. As Mr. HALLECK noted, the people voting last November in effect told the administration to quit telling the American people that "papa knows best." If the news has not reached the ears of the bureaucrats, as apparently it has not, Congress is justified in taking the sharpest possible measures to bring them to heel.

The Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the letter of Vance I. Morris, Jr., a copy of which is inserted above by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], reply was made by me as follows:

MARCH 4, 1943.

VANCE I. MORRIS, Jr.,
Yeoman Second Class, United States Navy, Headquarters Squadron, Fleet Air Wing Eight, Care of Fleet Post Office, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. MORRIS: Many thanks for your letter of the 28th.

Now both you and Mr. Winchell are entitled to your opinion as I am to mine but when your friend Winchell refers to some 14,000,000 Americans as being "damned fools" and when he peddles so much dirty, nasty gossip, when he reflects upon the chastity of Joan of Arc and when, having been certified fit for active duty, he asked to be deferred and spends much of his time hanging around questionable resorts, millions of Americans have no use for him.

You are in the Navy but you are not the only one who is in the Navy and you will observe, if you have noted the facts, that Mr. Winchell does all his fighting with his mouth and so far as we are advised has made no substantial contribution, either of service or of property, to the war effort, while many of us have sacrificed practically everything we had in aid of the war.

You are still young and when you reach my age, 67, experience will have enabled you to form a more accurate opinion of people generally.

Good luck to you—a fine man.

Sincerely yours,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

Lend-Lease

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, there appears in the March-April issue of the Army Ordnance magazine, just off the press, a most timely and illuminating article on lend-lease by Maj. Gen. C. M. Wesson, U. S. A., until recently Chief of Army Ordnance, and now Senior Assistant Administrator, Office of Lend-Lease Administration.

The responsibility devolved upon General Wesson, until a few months ago, for the procurement and production of guns, tanks, bombs, and ammunition for the land forces of our own and allied governments, including the Marine Corps, and for a very considerable amount of naval ordnance matériel.

General Wesson's article comes as a great contribution to this debate:

LEND-LEASE—THE UNITED NATIONS POOL RESOURCES FOR VICTORY IN GLOBAL WAR

(Maj. Gen. C. M. Wesson)

It is with considerable hesitation that one discusses the subject of lend-lease. This hyphenated word is apt, I believe, to conjure in the mind of the busy man the thought that it is just another way for the United States to give away a lot of things which in the end may beget only international ill will. Moreover, the man absorbed in his work naturally has his paramount interest in those things which touch directly on his day-to-day life—such topics as the cost of living versus income, the local political battle, and what not. Or he may, perhaps, be diverted by events which are sensational in character or which have a romantic tinge. In his mind, lend-lease definitely fails to present an appeal from any viewpoint—it just does not register. I thoroughly disagree with both of these attitudes. Lend-lease has important practical advantages for the United States, and it should be of keen interest to every citizen.

In the first place, lend-lease hits the pocket of everyone very directly. Every man will have to pay his share in footing the bill which, I scarcely need to say, is no small one. And, secondly, as I shall attempt to point out below, it is contributing very definitely to his present and future security. Furthermore, there is knight-errantry and romance in the delivery—to our own troops and to our hard-pressed allies throughout the world—of guns, ammunition, food, and medicine over submarine-infested seas. This is coupled with the old spirit of accomplishment which, in spite of and perhaps frequently because of, difficulties and dangers, has been an American heritage since colonial times.

What could present a greater thrill to the imagination than the delivery of planes over sun-scorched deserts and frozen mountain ranges? Every day and every night, in this great effort, incidents are occurring which should stir men's souls. The Greeks at Thermopylae, Arnold von Winkelried at Sempach, and the charge of the Light Brigade at Balaklava are having their modern counterparts almost daily in Great Britain, in Russia, in Africa, in the South Seas—everywhere the Allied forces are meeting the hordes of the Axis.

When the present world conflict began in September 1939, most of us in America hoped, and many of us believed, that we could keep out of it. Even after the smashing defeat of Poland, we rested our hopes on the Maginot Line, and we could see no serious threat to our country. But when Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and finally France were overrun with bewildering speed and the Nazis were poised for action on the Atlantic seaboard of Europe, we could no longer feel secure. In fact, it seemed to many that we might be facing a victorious Germany unarmed and alone. The Battle of Britain happily proved that this view was wrong. The Royal Air Force, small but splendidly equipped and incredibly valiant, outfought and outgained the mighty Luftwaffe. Britain was saved. As Mr. Churchill so aptly said, "Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few."

And then it began to dawn on us that perhaps we were among the many who owed so much to those few. This realization had its first expression in the destroyers-for-bases deal and later in making available, under the exchange contract law, rifles, cannon, and ammunition to England after her Army had been denuded of equipment at Dunkerque. This realization grew in strength and came to full fruition in the act of March 11, 1941, known as the Lend-Lease Act. This act, in effect, was an announcement to the nations of the world that the United States recognized that the defeat of Germany, Italy, and Japan was essential to its own security. It expressed the calculated resolve of the United States to furnish all possible material aid and services to the nations fighting or threatened by the Axis, and to allow no obstacle to stand in its way. It was the only means for doing legally those things which had to be done in the interest of our future safety.

This act authorizes, not loans of money, but loans of goods and services. By goods is meant not only military items, but all other materials essential to the war effort such as metals, foodstuffs, and medicines. By services is meant chiefly repairs to damaged ships, dollar transportation costs incurred in getting weapons to the fronts, and improvements and additions to both base and transport facilities.

There is a limit to the capacity of our arsenal of democracy, vast as it is. Its output must be carefully allocated. Money loans, permitting each Ally to be its own purchasing agent, would result in unrestrained competition between the Allies for our products, and that would be intolerable. For this reason we have elected to furnish them with goods and services which our Government first procures itself. The goods and services, as procured, are divided among our Allies and ourselves by expert interallied boards. But whoever the ultimate consumer may be, there is always a single procurement agency—the United States Government.

We are not the only ones supplying goods and services. In their own countries our Allies are supplying weapons, food, and accommodations to our troops abroad which are vital to their training and operation. For example, in preparing for our recent movement into North Africa a very considerable part of our equipment was furnished in Great Britain from British stocks. I wish to emphasize that these issues were not made from surplus stocks, because there was no surplus, but from stocks actually held for issue to British troops.

The Lend-Lease Act was passed none too soon, for while aid began at once to flow in small quantities, it takes time to convert appropriations into concrete things, and it was not until considerably later that the first trickle began to take on the size of a respectable stream. We are only too prone to believe that when money has been provided for material things, these will at once appear. The time factor, so essential to preparation for war, has never been recognized by our people as a whole. Modern warfare is a complex business and requires long periods of preparation before the plans come to fruition. The situation in the Middle East and in Africa emphasizes the months of long preparation required to do a proper job and the benefits secured by waiting until preparation is reasonably complete before initiating "all out" action.

Of the total aid rendered before Pearl Harbor, less than one-third was in the form of military armament, the majority being foods, raw materials, machine tools, etc. And the armament percentage would have been even less but for the fact that the act authorized the diversion of our own armaments up to the value of $1,300,000,000 which had been provided for in military and naval appropriations made nearly a year before. You can't buy armament off the shelf.

In this effort to aid others, many, I dare say, little appreciate how much in reality we were helping ourselves. On the passage of the first lend-lease appropriation under the act, large sums were at once put to work to create additional production and distribution facilities. At that time, 9 months before

we were viciously attacked by Japan, we as a people could not, of course, visualize the tremendous increase in production demands which followed the events of December 7, 1941. But the facilities created to meet lend-lease demands have proved to be of inestimable value in our own war effort, particularly in the saving of priceless time—which means, in the end, the saving of priceless American lives.

Who will dare to say what would have happened if England, in December 1940, fighting alone, her factories under a hail of bombs and her dollar balances approaching the vanishing point, could no longer have looked to the United States for cannon, powder, machine guns, ships, food, medicine, and other assistance of a vital nature?

Lend-lease was launched with a fervent prayer that by throwing our material resources into the fray, we would ourselves be spared the horrors of war. Pearl Harbor dispelled that illusion. The tragic events of December 7 naturally produced many changes in the nature of the lend-lease program. No longer were we detached and aloof from physical combat in the tremendous world-wide struggle. We had to give greater heed to the needs of our own armed forces, whose requirements tripled overnight. We had to train and equip a huge army, air force, and navy, and do it with a minimum of delay. We had to build, in greatly increased numbers, the ships and planes necessary to transport these forces to the fighting fronts and to supply them when they reached their destinations. At the same time, however, we could not ignore the pressing demands of our allies who were doing the bulk of the actual fighting.

One fact stands out above all others—the war being waged all over the world should be considered as one war. It must be fought as one war, not as a series of separate wars—not one between the United States and Japan, another between England and Italy, another between Brazil and Germany, etc. This single war requires a single strategy in accord with which all the resources of all the United Nations should be put to the most effective use. This results in sending American tanks to Russia, British pilots flying American Kittyhawks over the Libyan Desert, American pilots flying British Spitfires over occupied France. It means feeding American troops in Australia with Australian-grown food and sending agricultural machinery to Australia to help grow this food. It means British antiaircraft devices guarding some of our defenses and American troops guarding the shores of the Fiji Islands.

From these very few examples can be seen the comprehensive development of the lend-lease idea. It can be seen that lend-lease is not a one-way proposition. On the contrary, it is a factor of tremendous weight in the fight which the United Nations will wage until victory is complete. It is designed so that each nation will bear its proportionate share of the task of supplying necessary goods and services and will make them available to those in position to use them to the best advantage.

The development of the pooling-of-resources idea has been reflected in recent appropriations made by Congress for lend-lease activities. The first appropriations were made directly to the President and were then apportioned to the War Department, Treasury Department, Navy Department, Agriculture Department, and Maritime Commission for programs for particular items for particular countries. Now the appropriations for lend-lease military, naval, and maritime items are lumped in the regular appropriations of the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission, respectively. This makes for greater simplicity in procurement and greater flexibility in the assignment of finished material. The Munitions Assignments Board is the agency which has been set up to assign all military and naval items.

We still have, however, separate appropriations for nonmilitary supplies, such as food, medicines, raw materials, industrial equipment, etc. Under these appropriations funds are allocated to various procurement agencies to buy items for specified countries. Except for items of a special nature which must be procured as needed, items which are in demand by more than one country, such as food, tanks, trucks, guns, etc., the needs for which can be clearly foreseen, are purchased in quantity and placed in depot stocks to be immediately available whenever and wherever needed to meet the exigencies of the strategical situation.

It seems pertinent to recount in dollars the extent of lend-lease aid. Dollars are necessarily used as the yardstick for the lack of any other common denominator applicable to so diverse a program. During the 9 lend-lease months of 1941, $910,000,000 worth of goods were transferred and $334,000,000 worth of services were rendered. For the first 9 months of 1942, four times as much aid in these forms was given. Moreover, the proportion of military to nonmilitary items has greatly increased. For 1941 it was less than one-third, but in September 1942 about 75 percent of the goods transferred were military items.

The President, on November 15, 1942, released some startling figures on lend-lease aid for October. More than $915,000,000 worth of goods and services had been furnished to our allies during the month. This topped the record of any previous month by more than a third. From July to November 1942, when we had the imposing task of arming, equipping, and transporting our strong expeditionary force now in north Africa, we were able to transfer $2,713,000,000 worth of goods and services to our allies. Two-thirds of the goods were military items, including large numbers of planes and tanks that helped to turn the tide in Egypt and to hold the lines in Russia.

In September and October 1942—when our preparations for the African campaign were at their height—more than $918,000,000 worth of military items were transfererd to our allies. This is to be contrasted with the $169,000,000 worth of military items transferred at the outset of the war in the months of December 1941 and January 1942.

The basis of lend-lease appropriations is requirements, as well as these can be forecast. And these in turn are governed by the over-all strategic plans in relation to the availability of raw materials and production facilities. Because of the relative accessibility to each other of the United States and the British Commonwealth of Nations, and because the United States and the United Kingdom have the production capacity which must supply the greater part of lend-lease aid throughout the world, these two nations have pooled their supplies and facilities with the objective of their best utilization for the effort of all concerned.

I shall not attempt to go into the ramifications of the complex organization designed to accomplish these ends. The problems involved are exceedingly intricate and difficult of solution. There is a constant necessity for give and take. The war is changing from day to day, and the machinery for furthering it must be flexible enough to respond promptly to its ever-changing demands. The Combined Production and Resources Board was set up by the United States and the United Kingdom for the purpose of coordinating the production facilities and the available raw materials of these nations for the most effective employment in the war effort. The Combined Raw Materials Board, under direction of the Combined Production and Resources Board, determines the available supply of critical raw materials and recommends their assignment. Raw materials allocated to the United States must in turn be reallocated through the machinery of the War Production Board to the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, lend-lease nonmilitary supply, and the home-front program.

Lend-lease provides for the nonmilitary items which are required by the 43 countries designated by the President for lend-lease aid. A Combined Shipping Adjustment Board is responsible for coordinating the assignment of shipping. The Combined Food Board determines, in collaboration with the War Production Board, the Food Requirements Committee, and the British Ministry of Food, problems which arise in connection with food distribution.

The foregoing account is a gross oversimplification of what is in reality an exceedingly complex series of procedures. I have only sought to give in a few words some idea of the machinery for solving the problems in the international field. To go into the items of actual purchase would take the discussion into detail which would obscure the general picture. The Lend-Lease Administration is an allocating and not a procuring agency. The War and Navy Departments and Maritime Commission do the actual work of procuring military, naval, and maritime supplies. The disposition of the appropriations for nonmilitary supplies made directly to the President is supervised by the Office of Lend-Lease Administration, which, on approval of requests from lend-lease countries for general nonmilitary supplies and services, forwards these requests to the proper procuring agency, such as the Treasury Department and Agriculture Department, which thereupon performs the actual purchasing.

The Lend-Lease Administrator is E. R. Stettinius, Jr., a great public servant whose distinguished career is well known. One of his prime responsibilities is to work with the foreign governments in the development of their requirement programs for nonmilitary supplies and services and to cooperate with them and with the other agencies of our Government in formulating broad programs for lend-lease aid. The administrator must approve or disapprove requests of lend-lease nations for articles or services, deciding whether a given article or service is properly lend-leasable and whether it could be obtained more advantageously in some other fashion. A prime requisite in establishing the lend-leasability of an article is that it must accelerate the war effort. The approval of requisitions by the administrator is in no sense final if in competition with our own requirements. In such cases, they have to be cleared through the War Production Board before they can be routed to the various procuring agencies to undertake purchase.

The office of Lend-Lease Administration has a dual responsibility: It is a friendly and sympathetic sponsor for the various lend-lease countries; yet it must assure itself of a real justification for the goods and services requested by them. In certain countries we have missions which do the preliminary screening of requests which are being initiated by these countries. These missions work under the supervision of the State Department representatives in these countries. They supply us with information most helpful in arriving at sound decisions. In other cases, the office must proceed without the help of such missions.

The Office of Lend-Lease Administration is a part of the Office for Emergency Management. It is the agency set up by the President to keep the records of lend-lease transactions and report to him the status of the

lend-lease program as a whole. This includes all projects under lend-lease, whether undertaken by the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, the Treasury, or Agriculture Departments. The lend-lease policy initiated by this Government will stand, in my judgment, as the greatest single step forward ever made in promoting international good will. What effect it will have on the postwar world no one can forecast. The basic philosophy of lend-lease may be, and let us hope it will prove to be, the foundation for great cooperation among the nations of the world and an everlasting factor in the maintenance of peace.

One thing is certain today. We are getting big dividends from the lend-lease program. On November 9 a release from the White House quoted the President to the effect that the magnificent British victory in Egypt was aided to an important extent by the Lend-Lease Act and is an outstanding example of the combined use of American and allied resources. The President further said: "While we must not overlook the fact that the larger part of the equipment used in Egypt is of British origin, we have a right to be proud that so much and such excellent equipment from American factories and shipyards contributed to the victory. In particular, we should be gratified by the performance of American-made tanks. In the Egyptian campaign we can see the vindication of the lend-lease idea. We propose to continue to expand our lend-lease aid to all of our allies until complete victory is achieved."

Message to the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Westbrook Pegler suggests a little more plain speaking, a little more consideration for America. The President and Mrs. Roosevelt might well read again his message of February 3:

NEW YORK, February 3.—Any further remarks about the need of a second front on the European Continent and of more weapons, explosives, and food in Russia and China should be addressed not to the American people, who have nothing to say in such matters, but to the White House, Washington.

Josef Stalin's speaking is tough, practical, and heartening because he is, in effect, always threatening to take Adolf Hitler into a locked room, in person, when he catches up with him, and pull him apart by hand, and when this war is done, if Hitler hasn't cut his own throat or hopped off his mountain, the little tough guy probably will arrange some personal and dramatic humiliation for him. His talks are good for us. He makes good his threats and he doesn't talk nonsense.

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek takes a pretty picture, also makes a good speech, is said to speak Americanism with a soft, magnolia drawl. She is welcome and very popular here and, in a manner of speaking, she can help herself to whatever we have that her people need to fight the Japanese.

But both of these rulers—I think it is correct to speak of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek as a ruler—certainly know that the American people have given President Roosevelt full power to allocate our equipment and food as he thinks best. Stalin knows, further, that the American citizen has no more power than one of his own subjects to interfere with the general staff. Our people don't know how much stuff we have sent to Russia or anywhere else, and therefore are in no position to judge whether it has been too little or could have been more, which is all right with us, too, for the time being, although there may be some complaints, one way or another, when the bill is added up.

FREE-HANDED HARRY

Last summer, when the Communists here and in London were hollering for a second front and Charlie Chaplin and Orson Welles, those night-club commandos of the Hollywood front, were demanding that American men walk up some continental beach through machine-gun fire, none of our people at home and few of our soldiers had the faintest suspicion that the expedition to north Africa was being organized. That seems to go for Wendell Willkie, too, who certainly gave a brilliant performance in the role of a dumb one.

If it is tools and/or food that Stalin and Mme. Chiang Kai-shek want, the person to see is Harry Hopkins, also residing at the White House. He has it all under his hand, having been deputized by President Roosevelt to handle all such matters. He has never been stingy with the American people's possessions and money, and if he has on hand enough of what the Russians and Chinese need, after our own fighters have been taken care of, he can be relied on to take it out of the arsenal of democracy and send it along.

Madame Chiang has been very nice about it all, but there have been times when Stalin has seemed a little impatient, not to say contemptuous, and that doesn't do anyone any good. It certainly gives the Nazis reason to hope that he might do something independent whenever he thinks he has had enough fighting or has won back enough country.

The same idea naturally flits through the thoughts of the Americans who are doing all they can and trying harder all the time. How would he like it if President Roosevelt should get up some Sunday night and point out to the American people that, after all, Stalin isn't doing, never has done, and hasn't promised to do anything at all for the United States, but has fought only for Russia and didn't fight a lick until Hitler attacked him?

He would burn up, and any such candor from the American President in response to suggestions that we have been dogging it might break up the United Nations. But none of our big men ever speaks that way. They and our people are always cheering for Russia and the people assume that we have been sending Russia all we can.

HOLDING UP PRODUCTION

President Roosevelt will never say it, but Mr. Stalin certainly knows that one important reason why we haven't been able to do more for him and a reason, therefore, why some incalculable number of Russian soldiers and civilians have been slaughtered is that his Communists in the United States did their worst to prevent the production of machine tools, weapons, and everything else that he has needed, during a period of almost 2 years. These Communists are his people and he knows it, and no denials by Earl Browder or any others will disprove the direct connection which has been recognized by President Roosevelt and Mrs. Roosevelt both.

If he wants to call them home and execute them for this that will be all right with the people of the United States because they are a traitorous, treacherous, evil lot and they belong to him. In the matter of war goods, all complaints as to quantity, quality, or tardy delivery should be addressed to the management, in writing, and not to the help by radio.

The Transfer of the Meat Inspection Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert here an editorial from the March issue of the Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association, protesting against the transfer of the Meat Inspection Division from the Bureau of Animal Industry, where it has functioned effectively for many years, to the newly organized Food Distribution Administration:

THE TRANSFER OF THE MEAT INSPECTION SERVICE

On February 9, 1943, Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard announced an order transferring the Meat Inspection Division from the Bureau of Animal Industry to the Livestock and Meats Branch, Food Distribution Administration. This transfer puts meat inspection into the agency now performing the marketing and distribution functions of the Department of Agriculture and is part of the scheme evolved as a result of the President's Executive order of December 5, 1942, which placed upon the Secretary of Agriculture full responsibility for and control over the Nation's food program.

Under the Executive order the Department of Agriculture's administrative set-up is regrouped into three major units: The Food Production Administration, the Food Distribution Administration, and the Agricultural Research Administration. The first two are new agencies. Herbert W. Parisius, former Associate Director of the Office for Agricultural War Relations, was designated by Secretary Wickard as Director of Food Production, but resigned 5 weeks later and was succeeded by M. Clifford Townsend, former Agricultural Adjustment Administration Administrator. Roy F. Hendrickson, Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Administration, was designated Director of Food Distribution. The Agricultural Research Administration remains under the direction of Eugene C. Auchter, who has held this post for some time.

In the announcement of the new administrative set-up made on December 10, 1942, Secretary Wickard also indicated the departmental agencies to be consolidated, as follows:

Into the Food Production Administration: Agricultural Conservation and Adjustment Administration (except the Sugar Agency); Farm Credit Administration; Farm Security Administration; that part of the Division of Farm Management and Costs of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics concerned primarily with planning of current agricultural production; that part of the Office of Agri-

cultural War Relations concerned primarily with food production.

Into the Food Distribution Administration: Agricultural Marketing Administration, the Sugar Agency of the Agricultural Conservation and Adjustment Administration, that part of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Agricultural Research Administration concerned primarily with regulatory activities, that part of the Office of Agricultural War Relations concerned primarily with food distribution.

From the beginning the rumored transfer of the Meat Inspection Division from the Bureau of Animal Industry, where it has served for many years as an essential cog in the machinery used to trace and help control outbreaks of infectious and contagious diseases of livestock, has caused grave concern and misgivings among cattlemen, livestock growers, and loss-prevention associations, sanitary officials and veterinary organizations, in fact, among all agencies which are vitally interested in the effective control of livestock plagues. The coordinated activities of the various divisions of the Bureau have been looked upon as indispensable to the all-around efficiency which that agency repeatedly has demonstrated in dealing not only with domestic disease problems but especially with foreign livestock plagues, such as foot-and-mouth disease, when introduced into this country. Such considerations are especially significant in wartime, when animal disease control in foreign countries is at a low ebb and when vessels pass between our shores and foreign ports at an accelerated rate and under wartime secrecy.

During the stress of the war emergency the shortage of trained veterinary personnel in every activity of the Bureau of Animal Industry has become more acute. Thus, the transfer of the Meat Inspection Division with its personnel of some 900 experienced veterinarians, selected for their known efficiency in the service to be performed, removes a great reservoir of trained men from the immediate direction of the Bureau and places them where their prompt mobilization in an emergency might be delayed, and so prove disastrous. Such a contingency is a dismaying thought—especially at a time when the livestock industry of the Nation is being asked by the Department of Agriculture to vastly increase production.

It is known that many organizations directly concerned with the welfare of the livestock industry and the protection of our animal resources have watched with growing concern the change in the Bureau herein discussed. The lack of official information about the move, while it was being considered and before it was officially announced on February 9, is not easy to comprehend. So far as known, no hearings on the advisability of the transfer were ever held. Aside from the statement by the Secretary of Agriculture that "the present administrative policies of the meat inspection service will be continued without any lowering of the high standards of inspection already established," there has been no official pronouncement or assurance, to our knowledge, that the services of the Meat Inspection Division essential to and previously coordinated with other livestock disease control work of the Bureau will be available under the new set-up. In short, the rationale of the move, other than being covered by the over-all authority conferred by the Executive order of December 5, has never been made clear.

Our readers will find further viewpoints expressed in Congressman GILLIE'S able and thoughtful speech before the House of Representatives on February 1, which is reprinted as the leading article in this issue, and in the letter of January 21 from the board of governors to Secretary Wickard which will be found in the news section.

An American Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport Times:

AN AMERICAN CHARTER

Every day of this war, every new and strong stone built into the physical foundation of freedom's definance of tyranny and evil, etches deeper and deeper into the records of time the inexorable fact that the United Nations have no binding accord or agreement among themselves as a whole as to what they will do or try to do with victory once they attain it.

Every new name etched by death upon history's hallowed rolls of American youths who die for home, for family, for country, and for freedom leaves unanswered the one great question of whether the future will reveal these men to have died in vain, as did their ancestors, their predecessors, in 1917 and 1918.

We fight for liberty, for freedom, for democracy, for the right to live our own lives so long as we live in decency—all that is true. But those noble causes will become mere words unless we also pledge ourselves to hold and protect our great objectives once we have reached their threshold—unless we win the peace as well as the war.

What guaranty is there today that when we stand bloody and worn at the line of military victory we will still be willing to go forward with the red blades of our swords still on high, determined to see that never again does the youth of civilization slash its way through horrible paths to victory only to find that peace is merely defeat?

The answer is: Absolutely none.

Regardless of milk and honey speeches, regardless of spiritual hopes of those who vision a brotherhood of man, regardless of conferences on the bobbing waves of the Atlantic or amid the olive groves of Africa, these facts today are self evident:

1. The United States of America, which must bear the greatest brunt physically and economically in both making and maintaining peace, is not committed in any binding way to any action of any kind to preserve the fruits of victory for which it is offering the lifeblood of its youth.

England and Russia are bound by a vague but formal treaty to remain united militarily against Germany (alone) for 20 years after the war, but neither has any legal and binding agreement with any other member of the United Nations as to post-war plans.

China, like the United States, is bound to nothing, so far as peace or peace years are concerned.

2. Russia is not even committed to continuing the war once she is able to drive the Nazis back into their own land. Stalin clearly has indicated that—as recently as this week. England is committed by Churchill's word—which all accept—to help the United States finish Japan if Germany falls first. But, Russia is Japan's friend by a binding treaty which both nations are rigidly observing—at the expense to the United States of bases from which our air forces quickly might destroy our Pacific enemy if our Russian ally were willing to let the way be open.

3. There is nothing in the way of binding agreement among any of the United Nations to prevent another peace table free-for-all such as came in 1919 and the years following when nations squabbled or remained aloof from each other even as their sons who died for world decency lay moulding in the ground.

None of this can be altered merely by conferences or by esthetic, and sometimes intentionally anesthetic, oratory by individuals.

No agreement by any President of the United States, now or in the future, with another nation is binding upon this nation until it has been approved by the United States Senate, with two-thirds of the Senators present voting approval.

No international agreement approved by the United States Senate is worth the paper it is written on, so far as posterity is concerned, unless its purposes and principles also are paralleled in the hearts of both the people of this Nation and the people of the nation or nations with which it is made.

The Atlantic Charter is simply a statement of individual aims—high and noble aims—of Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt as individuals, binding upon no one but them. It opens the way to many new nations in this world, each to be self-determined, free, and holding the power and right to go its own way. There is nothing to determine whether that way shall be good or evil. The "four freedoms" are simply expression of hopes—again, high and noble—by President Roosevelt in an annual report to Congress on the state of the Nation. The Casablanca Conference is presented as the "Unconditional Surrender Conference" but the words "unconditional surrender" do not appear in any official communiqué or document concerning it; they are simply one expression of one individual. The conference was participated in by only two nations and is binding on no nation so far as peace or the post-war period is concerned.

The whole question is not one of individuals. No one knows, whether President Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill, Chiang Kai-shek, Joseph Stalin or others of political leadership today will hold their political positions or be alive when peace is made. The point is that nothing that any individual political leader does is binding upon any nation or any people unless it carries the authorized approval of that nation and its official government. In the case of Russia, Stalin's decisions are final. In the case of the United States and England, no president and no prime minister may, alone, bindingly commit his nation to specific details of a future course. Woodrow Wilson forgot in 1917–18 that no one man can commit the whole United States. That must not be forgotten now.

What is needed—and what must be had—is binding action by nations themselves, separately and as a whole. This could be accomplished by such a simple process as:

1. Passage by Congress of a resolution, or similar document, definitely laying down principles which this Nation will follow internationally in the post-war years and definitely committing this Nation to follow those principles to their full culmination.

2. Acceptance of such document by each of the United Nations—especially by Russia, England, and China—and agreement by them to follow its course in making peace and in maintaining it.

Thus, an American Charter, growing into a world United Nations Charter, would be created, binding upon nations and not merely on individuals, ending all fear that when fighting is ended confusion and chaos may begin.

Such a congresisonal resolution should be so simple that there could be no misunderstanding its purpose, either by other nations, by the American people, or by Amer-

ican politicians. It should be amply definite to make clear that if we are fighting to end aggrandizement by Axis Nations, we also are going to block any aggrandizement desired by any of the United Nations.

Such a resolution should not be the child of any political party or faction. It should be drawn by congressional leadership of all political parties and factions, just as our own Declaration of Independence was drawn in its fundamentals by a committee representing all outstanding viewpoints of the Revolutionary days.

Passed by Congress, it should become part of the political platform of each major political party in coming national elections so that all threat of domestic political campaign disunity over post-war objectives might at one stroke be removed from our national life.

Such a document would be an international declaration of independence of freedom from tyranny, yet also an international declaration by civilized nations of voluntary interdependence on each other in preserving good over evil.

The lack of binding agreement as to post-war aims and binding principles under which to seek them is heading this Nation and other civilized nations of the world along the same rash path which proved so disastrous in 1917 and 1918 and the following years.

Then, as now, the Allies fought together with only noble but ethereal theses by individual political leaders as post-war aims.

Then, as now, the people themselves were ignored, and in our own Nation their elected Representatives in Congress were ignored.

It is now a matter of record that the path of 1917–18 led only to an abyss into which all hopes for lasting peace, for international decency, and safety, were dropped.

The path of today will reach the same end unless a new course is charted—and charted soon. Civilization must not in the 1940's receive the below-the-belt blow its own leaders dealt it in the 1920's.

This is a people's war—and the peace must be a people's peace. The responsibility for action now rests clearly with the Congress of the United States—and nowhere else. Let it act, now, fearlessly, courageously, as the Continental Congress of 1776 acted in proclaiming the course of liberty and democracy which has kept this Nation's lifeblood flowing red and strong for 167 years.

Do It Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 26, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Democrats and Republicans have many things in common. One is to clean the house of the New Deal; without delay get rid of the fuzzy-wuzzies who are hurling monkey wrenches into what would otherwise be the smooth running Government machinery.

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR., Democrat, from Virginia, expressed my views more forcefully, more interestingly, than I have been able to do when he spoke in the House on March 5, 1943.

With the permission of the gentleman from Virginia, I am reprinting and mailing copies of those remarks.

Andrew Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, on the 18th of this month in this city there will be a premiere showing of Tennessee Johnson, a picture depicting the life, character, and achievements of President Andrew Johnson.

On the showing of this picture in the city of Knoxville, Tenn., on February 17 of this year, former State senator, the Honorable E. E. Patton, of Knoxville, Tenn., delivered a memorable address on this illustrious Tennesseean and great American. I think it is good enough to give to the Nation and insert it in the RECORD as an extension of my remarks.

ANDREW JOHNSON, 1808–75

Mayor of Greeneville, Tenn., State senator, Congressman, Governor of Tennessee, United States Senator, Military Governor of Tennessee, Vice President, President. A great Tennesseean; a great American. "His faith in the people never wavered."

Lord Macauley has said that a people who do not remember the great deeds of worthy ancestors will never do anything worthy of celebration by posterity.

I congratulate the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer movie corporation and the Tennessee Theater for their gracious recognition of the sterling qualities of Andrew Johnson, one of America's greatest men. I want to express personally and in behalf of the people of Knoxville our gratitude for this expression of recognition of Knoxville in giving this premiere showing here.

A great American has said that a man should be judged, not by the heights that he reaches, but by the difficulties that he overcomes in reaching the heights. Judged by that standard, I regard Andrew Johnson as the greatest man that this Nation has produced.

Born in poverty, of honest and respectable parents, he fought his way through almost insuperable difficulties to the highest office in the world, and he never compromised with corruption or disloyalty.

Here let me correct one of the glaring mistakes of history: Johnson's wife, Eliza MacCardle, did not teach him to read; he could read when he brought his mother and stepfather to Greeneville in a one-horse wagon drawn by a blind pony, but she did teach him to write. If you will look at the signatures of the President, you will find that Johnson's ranks with the best.

He never attended school a day. He not only did not go to college or high school, but he was not even in grammar school. If ever this country produced a self-educated man, it was Andrew Johnson. Ingersoll said that a college is a place where bricks are polished and diamonds are dimmed; that a college education might have ruined Abraham Lincoln. We do not argue the question; we leave that to eternity.

But Johnson had all of the elements of greatness—intelligence, integrity, and courage. A man who joined in debate with Johnson knew that he had not been to a Sunday school picnic, but that he had engaged in intellectual combat with a giant.

Yes, he had integrity; he never sold out and he never compromised his convictions in order to attain political preferment. He was the only man in this country who did not change his opinion about the right of a State to secede. He said a State could not, legally or morally, leave the Union. When the war closed and both the North and South had changed their attitude toward secession, Johnson stood adamant, and said the Southern States had not been out of the Union and that their Representatives and Senators should be admitted to Congress.

Johnson was the only Senator from the 11 Southern seceding States to retain his seat in the Senate; and it is interesting to know that a Congressman from Louisiana kept his seat in the House until March 4, 1861. When Johnson took the oath of office as Vice President, his State had not been readmitted to the Union; so, strictly speaking, he was elevated to office although he was a foreigner to the country over which he was called to rule.

It is proper for me to say, at this juncture, that Johnson's speech in the Senate, in the inception of the Confederacy, put more than 200,000 Border States men in the Union Army and perhaps they were the men who turned the tide and saved the Union from dissolution and destruction. Johnson has not been given full credit for this.

At the age of 10 he was apprenticed to a tailor; moved to Greeneville, Tenn., when he was 18 years of age. There he set up a tailor shop and plied his trade while he informed himself on the issues of the day. He joined a debating society so he could learn to express himself while on his feet. At the age of 20 he was elected an alderman of Greeneville. There was on the ticket with him, when he made his first race for office, a man by the name of Mordecai Lincoln, a distant cousin of Abraham Lincoln; his last race for office—the Vice Presidency in 1864—was with Abraham Lincoln. He died on a farm that had been owned by Isaac Lincoln, the great uncle of President Lincoln; thus we see how the life of Lincoln and Johnson crossed and recrossed.

These two men had the least amount of formal education of any of our Presidents and yet they gave a good account of themselves and both belong in the category of greatness.

Johnson was alderman and mayor of Greeneville; he served in the Tennessee Senate; was a Member of Congress for 10 years. Was elected Governor of Tennessee in 1853; reelected in 1855. In this connection it is well to remember that he was the first Governor to occupy the present capitol; and that he is the father of our present system of public schools. He was denied the advantage of an education and this made him the more anxious to see that every child had an opportunity to attend school at the expense of the State.

In 1857, he was elected to represent Tennessee in the United States Senate, where he was a foeman worthy of the steel of the brightest and best that the Nation produced. He never sought a quarrel, but he never shirked a duty or evaded a responsibility. In 1862, President Lincoln asked him to resign his seat in the Senate in order to become Military Governor of the State; he was also a brigadier general, and this fact has often been overlooked by the historian.

He was again elected to the United States Senate in 1875 and attended a special session of the Senate, but died in July of that year. He is the only President ever to serve in the Senate after his term in the White House; the only President who never attended school a day; the only Southern Senator to retain his seat in the Senate when the South seceded; was the only President to be impeached—but not convicted. He met the charges like a man and refused to compromise in order to save himself the humiliation of being convicted and turned out of office.

He requested that his head be pillowed on the Constitution when he was laid to rest and that his body be wrapped in the American flag. Deep-cut in the shining marble of his monument are these words: "His faith in the people never wavered."

William Shakespeare, in Macbeth, says this about the murdered king:

"Duncan is in his grave;
After life's fitful fever he sleeps well;
Treason has done his worst, nor steel, nor poison,
Malic domestic, foreign yevy, nothing
Can touch him further."

So it is with Andrew Johnson: his life was a struggle and a conflict but he counted his struggles as an asset of character; and he bore himself with dignity and courage in every conflict.

On a beautiful hill in the edge of Greeneville, Tenn., "rest at last the ashes of this restless man." In the distance can be seen the blue mountains which he loved so well; there with his head pillowed on the Constitution, which he upheld so valiantly, and with his body wrapped in the sacred folds of the American flag, he awaits the day of the resurrection, careless alike of sunshine and of storm.

Lend-Lease Aid to Russia

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, at page A781 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I inserted an order of the day issued by Premier Stalin of Russia and called attention to the fact that in that order he did not mention either the United States or Great Britain, nor did he mention either President Roosevelt or Prime Minister Churchill.

But on the other hand he said that, "In view of the absence of a second front in Europe, the Red Army alone is bearing the weight of the whole war."

I called attention to that statement because there was a great furor going on throughout the press concerning it, and I wanted every Member of Congress to have that statement before him.

Whatever else may be said of Premier Stalin, he is for Russia first, and he does not hesitate to say so. Whatever may be said of Prime Minister Churchill, he is for Great Britain first, and has said frankly that he "was not chosen Prime Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." I admire them for their frankness, for I can truthfully say that my first interest is the welfare of the United States of America.

On yesterday Admiral William H. Standley, the United States Ambassador to Russia, made a statement which appeared in the New York Times this morning in two different articles—one by the United Press and one by the Associated Press.

I am inserting both of them in the RECORD in order that you may also have them before you for ready reference. They read as follows:

ENVOY WARNS AT MOSCOW OF LEND-LEASE EFFECT HERE

Moscow, March 8.—Admiral William H. Standley, United States Ambassador, said today that news of important American aid was being kept from the Russian people and he suggested that Russian authorities sought to give the impression that Russia was fighting the war entirely alone.

Admiral Standley said also by implication that Russia was reluctant to exchange information on conduct of the war and that unless Congress felt that it was helping Russia, it might be inclined to hesitate before it passed the pending lend-lease extension bill.

"It is not fair to mislead Americans into giving millions from their pockets, thinking that they are aiding the Russian people, without the Russian people knowing about it," Admiral Standley said at a press conference.

[Premier Joseph Stalin said in his order of the day to the Russian Army on February 23, the United Press recalled, that "in view of the absence of a second front in Europe the Red Army alone is bearing the whole weight of the war." Throughout his message Mr. Stalin emphasized that Russia was depending on her own resources.]

Admiral Standley, the blunt Navy man sent here on a key diplomatic assignment after a distinguished career of nearly 40 years that took him to the high post of Chief of Naval Operations, made his statement when he was asked about the fact that British and American, but not Russian newspapers had published an acknowledgment by the Russian Red Cross of American aid.

"Well, there is no question that people in America know the facts and that here the people don't," Admiral Standley said.

"Ever since I have been here, I have been carefully looking for recognition by the Russian press of the fact that they are getting material help through America, not only through lend-lease but through the Red Cross and the Russian-American Relief. And I have yet failed to find any acknowledgment of that.

"The American people are giving aid out of a friendly feeling for the Russians, but the Russian people do not know about it."

HE SEES LITTLE PROGRESS

Asked whether there had been any progress in the exchange of information between the Russian and United States Governments, Admiral Standley said there had been no obvious change in Russia's attitude concerning exchange of information dealing with the conduct of the war.

When asked why he thought the Russian authorities were not informing their people regarding the aid received, Admiral Standley said:

"They seem to be trying to create the impression at home as well as abroad that they are fighting the war alone.

"There appears to be a desire on the part of the Russians to create the impression that they are fighting the war with their own resources rather than acknowledge help from anyone."

In a discussion of extension of the Lend-Lease Act, Admiral Standley said that the bill to that effect had passed the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

"But as those familiar with legislative procedure know," he continued, "it is a long way from the Foreign Affairs Committee to enactment. The American Congress is rather sensitive. It is generous and big-hearted as long as it feels that it is helping someone. But give it the idea it is not helping, and it might be a different story."

FINDS "NO POLITICAL MOTIVE"

Moscow, March 8.—Admiral Standley in the course of his press conference statement today to the effect that he did not think the Russian people were being told the complete story of United States aid to Russia, said:

"I find no political motive to this. It is only an effort to create the impression with their own people that they are pulling themselves through by their own boot straps."

"The Russian people have no opportunity to know they are being helped by the American people," he added. "I mean the plain American people who are digging down in their own pockets."

The Ambassador said the Russians were getting numerous things from the United States.

"You can say planes by the thousands," he declared.

It was pointed out to Admiral Standley that recently several Russian generals told foreign correspondents they were getting no American help at the front except trucks.

"They are getting plenty of other kind of war material," said Admiral Standley. "If it's not at the front, I don't know what they are doing with it."

The Ambassador said he planned to see Premier Stalin soon.

Asked about the second front question, Admiral Standley said he was not sure what the Russians would consider a second front.

The President's Message on Election of the Governor by the Puerto Rican People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a press statement released by me on the message from the President read today about the election of the Governor of Puerto Rico:

I am happy that the President has recommended to Congress a favorable consideration of amendment to the organic act of Puerto Rico so as to grant to my people the right to elect this governor. As a Puerto Rican I feel greatly satisfied that the President has made a partial recognition of the rights of my country to its self-government and freedom. As a representative of my people in Congress, I am also especially satisfied, because since the Seventy-sixth Congress, in 1940, I requested that right for my people through a bill I introduced then in the House of Representatives. Lately I made the same request through a bill introduced in January 1943. I presented the request also, since about 6 months ago, directly to the President.

The people of Puerto Rico will unanimously welcome the message of President Roosevelt. I would have preferred that the President would have also recommended outright the proper amendments to be made to the effect of granting such right to my people as soon as possible. I do not see why any more delay should be given to this matter through advisory committees. The matter is very simple and the right of my people is so natural and elementary. The study and

final recommendations about the bill should have been left for the appropriate House and Senate committees of Congress, so that open and frank action on the matter may be taken at once. In this last manner the matter was already recommended, since about 20 years ago, by the Coolidge administration, although Coolidge's administration at that time was not championing world-wide self-determination and freedom for all peoples.

The President would have given better news to the Puerto Rican people if with his message he had announced the resignation or withdrawal at once of the present Governor of Puerto Rico, Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell, who is opposed by the overwhelming majority of the Puerto Rican people and by all its economic factors representing industry, agriculture, commerce, and labor in Puerto Rico. I hope that with this offer of granting the Puerto Rican people the right to elect their Governor, the President, as soon as possible, will heed the repeated and continued request of the Puerto Rican people against Governor Tugwell.

Trade Agreements in a New World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the March issue of the Atlantic monthly there appears a most interesting and informative article entitled "Trade Agreements in a New World," written by Hon. Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE AGREEMENTS IN A NEW WORLD
(By Sumner Welles)

When this war ends, Europe and much of Asia will be grim places to live in or to contemplate. Starvation, hatred, and disease—the terrible camp followers of war—will be more widespread than they have ever been before in modern times. The people who survive will face the job of making life tolerable again, or even possible.

The rest of the world—the United States, the other American republics, the British Dominions—will by comparison be very fortunate. Blood and treasure we shall have spent indeed, but we shall not, I feel sure, have seen our women and children slaughtered, our industries destroyed, our farms laid waste by hostile armies, our people starved, our brothers held as hostages. The plainest feelings of humanity will move us all to share our relative good fortune with those who stand in dire need of food, clothing, medicine, and shelter.

But relief of this sort cannot go on indefinitely. The peoples of the devastated countries will have to re-create their industries, bring their farms back into production, restore utilities and communications systems, and generally build up again the material foundations of civilized life. For the most part they will have to do these things themselves. But the basis on which they are able to go forward, and therefore the character of the new world which may emerge, will depend to an important extent on the attitude and policy, especially the commercial policy, of other nations, and in particular of the United States.

If we and the other undevastated countries intend to move consistently in the direction of reducing barriers to trade, then the European countries and the great Chinese Nation can move in that direction also and construct their new economies upon that basis. But if we do not have that intention, or if our intention is in doubt, they will have to plan and build for autarchy. It is therefore very important that the people of the United States determine and make clear in the near future their position and intentions in this matter.

The views of the present administration have been clear since 1934. They are based on the conviction that American international commercial policy, like every other policy and act of the Government of the United States, should seek to further, first and all the time, the genuine and long-time interests of the people of this country. Those overriding interests, in the field of foreign policy, are two: a secure and reliable peace, and a prosperous and fruitful world. The good neighbor policy; the gradual reduction of trade barriers; the attempt to prevent the present war, and then to limit its scope, and finally to win it, are all based on these ultimate objectives.

2. The first great purpose—secure peace—all Americans accept. The second is important because the first depends upon it, and because our own economic welfare is impossible without it. Naturally it is our own prosperity that interests us most, but modern history has made it clear that no producing and trading nation—not even the United States—can be prosperous in a starving world, any more than a great merchant can be prosperous when his customers and sources of supply are bankrupt.

Furthermore, the world will not be securely free from war until it is prosperous and fruitful. I should be the last to claim that economic causes are responsible, alone, for this or any other war. But surely it will not be doubted that what happened to the German people, and to German labor, and the German middle class, between 1918 and 1933 had a great deal to do with the creation of the warped mentality that made it possible for a civilized people to accept a warmongering maniac for their leader.

It was therefore not only a humane sentiment, but the soundest considerations of national interest, that caused the President and the British Prime Minister to formulate, and the other United Nations to endorse, the great objectives of the Atlantic Charter: freedom from want and fear. Their common action recognizes that, unil both of these freedoms exist throughout the world, neither will exist securely anywhere. It recognizes also that in these two fields the interests of all peoples are the same. We are in the long run men together, and as men we all need food, shelter, freedom, security, and peace. Together, if we are wise enough, we can have all of them; separated by hate and jealousy and war we can have none. The fate of humankind is, in the long run, one.

Once this is understood and acted on, the peoples of the world will have a chance by their own genius and labor to create for themselves and for their children a more fruitful and prosperous civilization than man has ever before known. For the thing that has happened in our time—and which is proved again by the miracle of American industrial production in this war—is that mankind now knows enough of the methods and techniques of production, of scientific agriculture, and of transport, to create from the world's resources the material basis of a secure and decent life for all of the world's people. It is because this is true—because of the advances of the last hundred years in all the sciences and techniques of production—that this century may indeed become the century of the welfare of the common man.

Third. How shall we go about it? Clearly, in cooperation—the cooperation of free people everywhere to the agreed and common beneficial ends of peace, liberty, security, and plenty.

Peace, liberty, and security require political collaboration, through effective common institutions of police, of political adjustment, and of justice. This is not the place to try to draw the blueprints. Assuming they are drawn, and that they operate well enough to enable a major part of the world's productive powers to be applied to the purposes of peace, what are the other requisites for the plenty which we seek?

Here some definite statements can be made. The world will have, to eat and wear, to live in and play with, only what the world produces. Efficient and continuous production of useful goods and services, wise use and development of resources, and effective distribution and exchange are the necessary bases of freedom from want anywhere.

Production must first of all be abundant. This means that people must be free to work at jobs for which their special skills suit them, according to processes which are themselves efficient, and with efficient tools. Much capital must be supplied, much knowledge spread, much training done, before this will be true.

Second, production, to be profitable and abundant, must be well situated. We shall not grow bananas well in the United States, nor cinchona, nor coffee; nor can steel be made too far from the natural deposits of coal and iron and limestone. The division of production in space, both within nations and between nations, is fundamental to the attainment of the standard of living of which the world is capable. We shall not attain freedom from want anywhere without it.

This seems to be a hard lesson for some Americans to learn. True, we have been more prosperous than many other countries; true, also, we have generally had a high tariff. But the people who connect the two as effect and cause forget the real causes of our comparative prosperity.

Those real causes are not far to seek. We have had first of all an industrious, intelligent, and ambitious people, enriched by all the strains and skills of the Old World, living and working under political institutions that encouraged free development, and with an enormously rich natural environment of continental scope. And we have had, within that great continental area, free trade between the States. The wisdom of the men who helped compose the early bitter trade disputes between the 13 States by writing the Constitution of the United States and by fighting through the great political battles that led to its adoption, and the wisdom of the judges who used the commerce clause of that Constitution to strike down State-created barriers to trade, have given us the largest and richest free-trade area anywhere in the world, and have made large-scale American industrial and agricultural development a possibility. That development is proof, not of the virtues of impediments to trade, but of the benefits of freedom.

Many men in the United States, and substantially all professional economists, have said this often. But internationally we have generally moved in the opposite direction. The total interests of all of our people—farmers, merchants, workmen, manufacturers, consumers—have been too often overlooked. We have built our walls too high, others have retaHated, and the result has been a lower living standard all around, even in our country, than it otherwise would have been.

The economic conduct of mankind is very puzzling. With one hand we expend enormous energies, intelligence, and capital improving transportation, to make it easy and inexpensive to move goods, and with the other we build tariff barriers to slow the movement. Why did we build the ships and dredge the harbors and lay out the railroads and the highways and the airports in the first place? If we really think it mutually beneficial for New York and California to exchange the products of their labor, why do we doubt it as to California and England?

4. No responsible statesman has proposed complete free trade for the United States, either tomorrow or in the measurable future. What is proposed, and what a growing number of the United Nations have agreed to seek with us, is "agreed action * * * open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers; and in general, to the attainment of all the economic objectives set forth in" the Atlantic Charter.

Many things are included in these objectives. The heart of them is increased trade. Production, employment, living standards, the stabilization of exchange, the development of resources, international investment, all depend in the long run on the facilities for moving goods. Unless we can make exchanges of goods freer, other economic measures will fall far short of their objectives.

How do we propose to move from hope to accomplishment? Clearly by a process of negotiation, either between two countries at a time, or many. Neither we nor they expect to act alone, nor could any of us do very much alone. We must first talk together, fix our path in detail, and then go forward according to our various constitutional arrangements to put our detailed agreements in effect.

In the United States, so far as the tariff is concerned, the machinery for negotiation and for action is already in existence. It consists of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, renewed in 1937 and 1940, under which the President is authorized, by the procedure and within the limits stated in the act, to enter into agreements about tariff rates, quotas, and the like with foreign governments, and to proclaim the changes in American rates necessary to carry out our part of the agreements. We have been operating under the act and its renewals since 1934, have made thirty agreements under it, and have accumulated an important body of experience, both as to procedures and as to the tangible and intangible benefits of such a program.

Tariff making is of course within the control of Congress, under that body's stated constitutional powers to tax and to regulate foreign commerce. But Congress cannot negotiate with foreign governments and cannot therefore obtain reductions of their barriers by the process of negotiation and agreement. Nor can Congress, with its many other duties, engage in the continuous and detailed studies which are necessary to understand the actual operation of our complicated tariff structure and that of other countries. Accordingly, by the act of 1934, Congress marries part of its tariff-making power to the President's executive authority, and authorizes him, within the limits stated in the act, to make agreements and to proclaim the rates resulting from them.

5. The practical operation of the trade-agreements program is well illustrated by the most recent major agreement made under the act—the one with Mexico, signed December 23, 1942, and effective January 30, 1943. That agreement reduces, or binds at present levels, United States tariff rates on a number of important products supplied to us in quantity by Mexico, and reduces Mexican duties on many agricultural and manufactured products which we furnish to that country.

Each country grants the other unconditional most-favored-nation treatment, so that in the future we shall receive the benefit, at once, of any tariff reductions made by Mexico in agreements with other countries, and vice versa. The most-favored-nation principle is spelled out in detail in its application to quotas, to exchange control, to purchases by government monopolies, and to other forms of regulation affecting foreign commerce. The specific duty reductions agreed to will, under the Act, be generalized to like articles imported from third countries, in accordance with our long-standing most-favored-nation policy. We have, in short, agreed with Mexico to enable trade to move more freely, as natural economies call forth the movement, both between the two countries concerned and between them and other areas.

One great advantage of this sort of negotiation is that it can be conducted now, before the war is over. No one can tell in detail what the foreign trade of any country will be like after this war, but natural resources, climate, and many skills are permanent and condition the main patterns. Agreements based on them cannot therefore be far wrong; and if they err in detail they may be modified under the emergency clause, which is fully developed in the Mexican agreement, or by renewed negotiation.

That emergency clause, plus the general right of either country to terminate the contract at the end of the first 3 years or thereafter, affords adequate protection against unforeseen developments, and enables the main work to go ahead. It is important that it should go forward now, so that when the fighting stops, the recuperative forces of production and exchange may be able to operate as freely and as rapidly as possible. It is equally important that our intentions for the future should be settled and made clear, so that the rest of the world, and especially those countries which must recreate their business life from ruins, may know what they can count on.

The authority to enter into trade agreements under the 1934 act is due to expire next June unless action is taken again by the Congress to extend it. The action of the Congress with regard to this matter will furnish a real test of our intentions toward the future. If Congress provides adequate trade-agreement authority, this country will be able to move in the right direction, in concert with other "countries of like mind," reducing selectively and with regard to all the interests concerned, and by a well-organized and proved process of negotiation and agreement, the multitudinous restrictions that hamper our commerce with the world.

The renewed grant of such authority, by as large and as bipartisan a vote as possible, will settle the main question. It will demonstrate that the people of the United States approve and intend to have their Government act in accordance with the promises and hopes expressed in their behalf in the Atlantic Charter, the declaration by United Nations and the Lend-Lease agreements. Once that has been made clear the rest of the world and the executive branch of the Government of the United States will know where they stand and the general policy that they can count on. They and we can then go forward, with whatever speed and by whatever detailed methods other developments make possible, to carry out that policy.

The decision about the trade-agreements authority is not the only choice, or the most difficult, that the people of the United States will have to make about the foundations of the peace. But it is fundamental, and it happens to come first in time. Our action on it will be an acid test of our intentions.

Russia and the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport Times:

RUSSIA AND THE PEACE

In Congress, in private conversation, on the radio, in the press and in the unspoken thoughts of individuals the question of what Russia's position will be at the peace table is being raised—especially if Russia then can claim she was the dynamo in defeating the Nazis in Europe.

Will a victorious Russia dominate the European phases of the peace and the post-war plans, setting up a communistic Europe and turning communistic eyes in other directions also?

Will talk of freedom, justice, and independence for nations victimized by aggression become mere vapor, with Russia taking its full will of such little countries as Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Besserabia, Estonia, or Poland?

Will the present spoken American ideals of a peace and a world of decency and nonaggression apply as equally to those countries which Russia already has raped, or sought to rape, as to those where the rape was committed by Hitler?

Such questions are too prevalent, the causes of them too obvious, to be cast aside lightly. To ignore them is simply to play into the hands of the Nazi sowers of discontent and disunity. They should be faced boldly, openly, not with a hush-hush policy. We have no patience with those who would lull the world to sleep with honeyed phrases that if we will just believe their siren songs and leave the peace to them the world will be happy. We have no patience, either, with the pessimists—a very small group—who honestly or for selfish reasons grumble that nothing can be done about the great post-war problems—that the United States must in the war and also be a sucker for doing it.

We have even less patience with those who pretend that anyone opposing the honey-phrasers are great ogres, seeking to destroy the world— or with those who foolishly think that because American democracy and Russian communism are joined in a practical and working alliance in war against a common enemy they must also join their purely domestic social and political theories after the war.

None of this is "red" baiting or discrediting our ally any more than it is China baiting, England baiting, or baiting of the South Sea Islands. The record on Russia and on communism is clear. It is history now that Russia bombed women and children of Finland without warning as the opening move in an effort to rape a small and helpless nation. The record is clear that Russia, as an aggressor of the weak, swept into Poland as also

the ally of Hitler at the start of this war we now are fighting. Russia itself, through its Washington Embassy, made it equally clear a few days ago that she intended to claim what she calls her share after the war—and she named specifically some of the states we mentioned above. It is equally a matter of record that Poland is so suspicious that Russia's post-war intentions are evil that the scheduled conference between her representatives and the Moscow Government a few days ago was called off indefinitely.

It is a matter of record also that Stalin, personally, twice has made it clear—once during the past week—that Russia actually is not even committed to further fighting in this war once she is able to drive the Germans back to the German borders.

Let those who talk of "red" baiting turn their eyes to what the situation would be at the peace table right now if victory miraculously should suddenly come at this very moment to the United Nations:

Russia and England have a formal treaty of alliance and both are at war with Finland. The United States is at peace with Finland and constantly offers her protection. If Stalin (at a peace table now) insisted on completing his attempted rape of that nation, where would we stand? Where would England stand? Where would its treaties with Russia, beside its pledges of honor to us, stand? The same questions apply to Baltic states also.

England went into this war in 1939 to protect and save Poland. At the same time Russia went in—unofficially—to help Hitler destroy Poland, and later switched sides. If Stalin, at the peace table, seeks that part of Poland he originally grabbed—or more—where would England, protector of Poland, be? And the United States, which has always been Poland's strong friend?

The United States, England, and China are pledged to destroy Japan. But Russia is bound by formal treaty to remain Japan's friend, to aid her economically and otherwise. How would a peace table today face that mess, if the war should suddenly end now?

China wants power to control what she considers barbaric Communist Mongolian tribes to her north, but they are Russia's friends and allies. How far would a peace conference get on this right now?

Such things are not "red baiting." They are hard fact—dangerous fact; far too dangerous to be ignored. If we sleep through them now we will simply encourage the same dangers that engulfed us as we slept through the peace years before Pearl Harbor—dangers which became possible and which became fact because we also had slept through the peace and the peace years following World War I.

Adoption of the proposal we made in these columns yesterday for an American Charter, embodying the principles the United States will follow and insist upon at the peace table and after it, would go far toward avoiding much of the dissension that may come—that seems certain to come—if these problems are ignored. Such a charter, created by resolution of Congress and thus given the formal backing of the United States as a nation instead of being merely the individual and foundationless views of individual political leaders, could then be adopted by the United Nations as a United Nations Charter. It would be, as we said, an International Declaration of Independence and of willing interdependence of decent nations upon each other in the post-war years.

Right now there is not one single binding agreement among the United Nations as a whole or among any group of them as to post-war aims or how to achieve them.

So far as communism and its dangers are concerned, those who think that we should try it, or that stating plain, bald, unwholesome facts about it is spreading disunity, should remember that no reputable individual and no decent publication has placed it any lower in the human scale than have President Roosevelt himself, Prime Minister Churchill, Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles, Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson when he was United States Attorney General—and many others who could never be classed as in any way inimical to Russia. We present herewith a few quotations from statements of their views:

President Roosevelt, in his fireside chat of June 24, 1938, said in discussing democracy:

"Be it clearly understood, however, that when I use the word 'liberal' I mean the believer in progressive principles of democratic, representative government and not the wild man who, in effect, leans toward communism, for that is just as dangerous as fascism."

Prime Minister Churchill, in pledging England's military support to Russia when Germany invaded the Soviet Union on June 21, 1942, said:

"The Nazi regime is indistinguishable from the worst features of communism. It is devoid of all principle except appetite and racial domination. No one has been a more consistent opponent of communism than I have for the past 25 years. I will unsay no words that I have spoken against it.'

On December 1, 1939, when Russia launched its sneak bombing of Finland, President Roosevelt denounced Russia as a wanton aggressor in that act and called for the American public to establish in their minds a "moral embargo" against Russia. On the physical side, he asked all American firms to shut off all shipments of supplies of any kind for Russia.

On June 1, 1941, just a few days before Hitler invaded Russia, President Roosevelt had to call out Federal troops to keep open the North American Aviation Co. plant in California which was rushing production for our defense—with war obviously approaching. At that time, the then United States Attorney General Robert Jackson said:

"The situation more nearly resembles insurrection than a labor strike. The distinction between loyal labor and those following the Communist party line is easy to observe. Loyal labor leaders fight for a settlement of grievances. Disloyal men who have wormed their way into the labor movement don't want settlements. They want strikes. That is the Communist party line."

In his comment on Hitler's invasion of Russia—at the same time Churchill made the statement quoted above—Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles said:

"This Government has often stated and, in many of his public statements President Roosevelt has declared that freedom to worship as their own conscience dictates is the great and fundamental right of all peoples. This right has been denied to their people by both the Nazi and Soviet (Russian) governments. To the people of the United States, this and other doctrines of the Communistic dictatorship are as intolerable and as alien to their own beliefs as are the principles of the Nazi dictatorship."

Last spring, Francis Biddle, then and now the United States Attorney General, rendered a formal legal opinion in the case of Harry Bridges holding that communism was anti-American and that, since Harry Bridges was a Communist Party member, he was per se an enemy of American form of government.

Are Roosevelt, Churchill, Biddle, Jackson, and Welles "red" baiters? Is this remarkable unity of viewpoint among them on communism to be ignored, along with the acts which caused these expressed viewpoints—lest someone upset some private and personal applecart of someone else?

The United States and Russia stand as unbreakable military allies against a common enemy—Germany and Italy; but not against Japan. They should and will conduct this alliance on strong, business-like, aggressive lines. Their relations after victory should and must be of the same friendly type. But we do not ask Russia to accept our theories of government nor must we permit Russians—or Americans—to force her political theories on us any more than we would bow to a British king or conduct our religious worship in the manner of the Chinese.

Friendship between all of the United Nations should be strong and unending, but to fail to recognize that friendship between nations must be bound by acts of the nations themselves and of their peoples could be fatal. We need an American Charter of principles—a United Nations charter—lest in crushing our enemy we also defeat ourselves.

Economic Union Versus Political Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by one of my constituents:

ECONOMIC UNION VERSUS POLITICAL UNION

(By Robert Wesley Castleberry)

The solution to the problem of world peace is an economic problem and is not primarily a political question. Therefore, we should be concerned with economic union rather than a world political union.

There is much frenzied activity on the part of certain people, who are not identified usually, in a military sense, with America's armed forces, and who desire to establish some grandiose plan of world federation, before World War No. 2 has ended. Indeed, their rush to put their plans into effect, before the war ends is strangely reminiscent of the manner in which the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States was put over in the absence of the soldiers who fought in World War No. 1. Certainly the men who are fighting in this war should have the right to express their views on the subject of America's entrance into any kind or character of political union with any nation, for that is a far more important matter than was prohibition.

Thomas Jefferson devoted his life to two great convictions and staked his reputation upon them. One was his belief that nations can live in peace and harmony; the other was democracy. It is significant that Jefferson's approach toward the former ideal was economic and not political. He knew Europe and wished America to be unlike it. Hence, he, as Washington, advocated the avoidance of foreign, entangling alliances. All of our experiences in world politics teach the wisdom of such admonitions. Yet, there are those, who would disregard all that history teaches; would subject our priceless sovereignty to the caprice of the suspicious, jealous, subdued nations enmeshed in the spiderweb of world federation, perpetrated upon them by their conquerors; and, then, have us foot the bill for a notoriously hated world police force. Yes, the men now in arms would like to have a voice in such matters.

The cause of war is economic—an enforced and restricted form of trade and commerce, "enjoyed" by such powerful nations as are able to promote such relations

to the exclusion of weaker bidders. To end war, merely remove its cause, by placing trade and commerce on a strictly voluntary basis and making it a matter of accommodation rather than intrigue. When nations exchange commodities among themselves, as a matter of accommodating one another, only mutual friendship can follow. We should eliminate the erroneous notion that we must have foreign markets, in the present sense, which is based upon the false assumption of the necessity of the so-called favorable balance of trade, which in truth only impoverishes our own Nation, and substitute therefor the realistic principle of accommodation as the prime incentive for foreign trade.

In order to accomplish this aim, it becomes necessary to alter the world's monetary system, so that the primary function of money becomes, in fact, that of facilitating the exchange of economic goods and services, whether in local or foreign trade. This step contemplates free trade amongst all nations. Any nation or group of nations can launch upon such plan at any time and without any economic or political sacrifices to any people; but, rather, gains of a social nature instead. Of course a world-wide economic union putting such a plan into effect would spread the scope of and hasten the benefits of such a plan. However, if any one of the larger nations should adopt such plan, the other nations of the world would quickly follow.

The advantages to be gained by humanity from such an economic union are far too numerous to recite. They would include the bringing about of the only real world peace; a general rise in the standard of living, limited only by our ability to produce and our desire to consume; an intense and narrow nationalism would give way to a friendly, wholesome pride in nationality; and the elimination of the cry of certain densely populated nations for a so-called breathing space.

The only valid objectors to such a plan would be the large banking groups, certainly the international bankers.

A. A. A. Threats and Coercion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert at this point an exchange of correspondence between myself and Mr. Fred S. Wallace, Chief of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Department of Agriculture, with regard to reports that A. A. A. agents are using threats and coercion in their efforts to force 100-percent compliance with the A. A. A. program:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington D. C., February 23, 1943.

Mr. FRED S. WALLACE,
Chief, Agricultural Adjustment Agency,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WALLACE: During recent days I have received several letters from farmers in my district who are not conforming to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency program, alleging that Agricultural Adjustment Agency agents have threatened to close them out if they refuse to sign up for the 1943 program.

Your attention is especially called to a news story in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of February 12, 1943, which reads as follows:

"WABASH, IND., February 12.—Wabash County farmers today found that there is a joker in this year's Agricultural Adjustment Agency program.

"Those calling on the township sign-up committees are told that they do not have to sign nor agree to take part in the Government program, but, the committee then explains that any farmer seeking a priority permit during the coming year for building material, needed farm-machinery repairs, or new farm machinery will be required to show that they are cooperating 100 percent with the Agricultural Adjustment Agency program."

I would like to know if the Department of Agriculture condones this type of coercion, and would appreciate receiving your comment on these reports at an early date.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. GILLIE.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1943.

Hon. GEORGE W. GILLIE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. GILLIE: This is in reply to your letter of February 23, 1943, concerning statements of farmers in your district to the effect that Agricultural Adjustment Agency agents have threatened to "close them out" if they refused to agree to comply with the 1943 Agricultural Adjustment Agency program. In connection with this, the news item from the February 12 issue of the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel indicated that farmers would be able to obtain building material, new farm machinery, and repairs for farm machinery only if they were cooperating fully with the Agricultural Adjustment Agency program.

The Agricultural Adjustment Agency program for 1943 contains no provisions for action such as that indicated in your letter. As a matter of fact, the manner in which the rationing programs for building material and new farm machinery are carried out would make it impossible for the Agricultural Adjustment Agency to control the sales of building material and new farm machinery. As for repairs for farm machinery there are no restrictions on the sales thereof, and any farmer, whether he be cooperating in the Agricultural Adjustment Agency program or not, may buy any repair part from any dealer.

The statements made to you by farmers in your district and the statement contained in the news item may possibly result from an erroneous or biased interpretation of certain phases of the rationing programs for building material and new farm machinery. These programs contain provisions which are designed to bring about the most efficient and effective use of scarce building material and new farm machinery. For example, before a request for the purchase of building material is approved, it must be established that the material will be used in such a manner as to materially further the war program. Before a request for the purchase of new farm machinery is approved, it must be established that the machinery will be used to capacity in the production or harvesting of those crops most vitally needed in connection with the war program.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration program for 1943 has gone all-out for the production of the farm crops and commodities which will contribute most to the war program. To meet the goals for these crops and commodities will require the proper and most efficient use of all farm labor and machinery. Those farmers who are adjusting their farming operations in 1943 to conform with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program will make more effective and efficient use of new farm machinery, insofar as contribution to the war program is concerned, than would those farmers who are not complying with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program and who would use the new farm machinery for the production of less-needed crops and commodities. It logically follows, therefore, that applications for the purchase of new farm machinery submitted by persons who are complying with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program are apt to receive more favorable action than applications submitted by persons who were not complying with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program—not because of their compliance with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program, but because of the use to be made of the machinery. I believe you will agree that this is as it should be.

Applications for the purchase of building material are passed upon locally by the United States Department of Agriculture county war board. This board is composed of representatives of all field agencies of the Department in the county. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration has only one representative on this board. Applications for the purchase of new farm machinery are passed upon locally by a county farm machinery rationing committee. The chairman of this committee is the chairman of the United States Department of Agriculture county war board and of the county Agricultural Adjustment Administration committee. The two other members of this committee are farmers who are not Agricultural Adjustment Administration committeemen. Accordingly, on either type of application the Agricultural Adjustment Administration would have only one vote, and I am sure that in practically every case the Agricultural Adjustment Administration representative votes, not as an Agricultural Adjustment Administration representative, but as a farmer who is interested in dealing fairly with his neighbors and in acting in a manner that will result in the greatest contribution to the war program.

I appreciate your calling this matter to my attention and giving me this opportunity to explain to you in this general way how the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program and the rationing programs for building material and new farm machinery work on a local basis.

Sincerely yours,

FRED S. WALLACE,
Chief, Agricultural Adjustment Agency.

Planning for Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, there is today no more important question before the people of this Nation than the determination of what the future policy of the country will be, once peace has been restored to the world. The necessary surrender of personal liberties, rights, and privileges must make us pause, one and all, to consider whether we may not be surrendering for all time

the very thing which has made this Nation what it is today, namely, the right of free enterprise.

Were we in any way to surrender our past heritage of free enterprise, as a consequence of the demands of the present war effort, then the war itself would become a mockery, defeating, as the price to be paid for victory, the very objective for the preservation of which we fought. To preserve this Nation from the pitfalls of destruction that have beset other nations in the past, it is now time that we carefully considered the steps which we should take, rather than trust to chance that in the aftermath of war, we will serenely return to the same conditions of living which we heretofore enjoyed.

Because of the clearness with which this question of free enterprise is discussed in an editorial published by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, I am taking the liberty of calling it to the attention of the Members of Congress, so that having read this article, we may take the time to turn our thoughts to consideration of this subject and thus not neglect to keep clearly before us the present need for planning for free enterprise.

The article is as follows:

PLANNING FOR FREE ENTERPRISE

The first objective of you and the thousands of others who comprise the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce is to win this war. Everything else is secondary.

But the fact that winning the war is our primary aim is no justification for leaving untouched and undefended the principles for which we are fighting.

One of those principles is freedom. One phase of freedom is free enterprise, the phase to which these comments will be directed.

Enterprise is doing an amazingly good job in war production—making the greatest record of any productive system, anywhere, any time.

Had it not been for conditions in the past favorable to free enterprise, we would today be without the vast productive resources capable of performing this much-needed war job.

Great performances, also, are going to be required for the period following the war. But conditions at the moment and as they appear for the future are not favorable to a continued high performance by enterprise. The situation is serious—so serious that it deserves our attention even in the thick of battle.

LIBERALS BY CONVICTION

Roughly, there are two economic banners under which most of us parade, the banner of the collectivists and the banner of the free enterprisers.

It is a safe bet that there isn't one of us who will admit to being a communist, fascist, socialist, or any other variety of statists or collectivists.

Some of us aren't Communists or Fascists, or think we aren't, because we were born on the opposite side of the political fence. Some of us are partners in our idealogies simply because we happen to associate with and like each other. Something like family devotion.

There are others of us, the vast majority it is hoped, who would support socialism if we but considered it the best way to organize society for the achievement of our aims in life. It is only because of our sincere convictions that the superstate is an inferior method of social organization that we oppose it and instead support free government, free institutions, and free enterprise.

UNWORTHY GOALS

Of course, if our objective were military conquest and the exploitation of other nations, then we would support a military dictatorship as the ideal form of government.

If our sole purpose is full employment, regardless of the usefulness of the products made, then we should set up a slave state like that of ancient Egypt which built the pyramids, the greatest make-work projects of all history—up to our times.

If we want merely a $300,000,000,000 national income we can accomplish this by extending present policies. Ask our Government to keep on coining debt. We can, for instance, build 6,000 fifty-million-dollar battleships annually. Ere long, by this process, we shall have more money than we know what to do with simply because there won't be anything it will buy.

If economic equality is all we want and we are willing to penalize success, dragging everyone to the level of the lowest, then all we need to do, again, is to further the trend of present policies of confiscatory taxation on enterprise and leadership.

Or, if security were life's supreme aim, we might complete our own Chinese Wall—constructing it of trade barriers, agreements to restrict production, price arrangements, parities, quotas, coercive wage and working policies, a prison wall high enough to exclude new ideas, new methods, new men and unusual labor. We would keep on with these processes until we had organized ourselves into rigidity—seeking security and stability because we had lost the will to advance. Thus we could imitate the oyster, which can neither walk, swim, nor fly, and has only meager ambitions, but does seem to enjoy a reasonably secure and stable existence.

THE AMERICAN GOAL

What, then, is our goal? Certainly the American people have more in mind than these unworthy objectives of conquest, fruitless employment, economic equality and mollusk security. Peoples, tribes, and nations contenting themselves with these aims are soon reduced to poverty, meanness, disease, and forms of savagery. Such ambitions pave the road to economic, moral, and cultural perdition.

The goal we want for ourselves and our children is opportunity for achievement. We want freedom to expand our latent and undeveloped qualities. Let every boy have the chance to be President though born the son of a bootblack. Let the wage-earner enter the business arena if he wishes. We want to be explorers, not in geography, necessarily, but in science, in art, and in moral development. Leave free the frontiers, new fields for individual initiative, in health, in sanitation, in education, in social relationships. Yes, we want employment, but in jobs that are useful, in jobs that are honest exchanges for what we receive in performing them—not devices for taking wealth from others. We want a good standard of living but we want it for health, strength, usefulness, not for idleness and self-indulgence.

All through this goal there runs the theme of freedom. None of it can be accomplished without freedom. If we wish to pursue the freedom course we will avoid that form of social organization in which the state is supreme, the master of the people—a situation in which freedom does not and cannot exist. We will adopt that form of social organization in which the state is servant of the people—a situation in which maximum freedom abounds. Broadly speaking, these are the only systems between which we can choose.

Any careful observer knows that in recent years we have been moving rapidly away from the freedom system and as rapidly approaching its opposite.

Free institutions, free government, and free enterprise become less and less possible as this trend continues—this trend toward totalitarianism.

THE GOOSE-STEP

But totalitarianism, the ultimate in the statist trend, is not the invention of a few would-be dictators crazed for power. It is a disease which a nation brings upon itself by unwise policies.

When a nation is bankrupt, with a large part of its population idle and hungry, when enterprise is paralyzed by high taxes, price and wage rigidities, and by bureaucratic red tape, and when government has undertaken economic functions too complicated for democratic methods of management—dictatorship is the only way out.

Totalitarianism, or dictatorship, is not new. Time and time again historians and philosophers have watched it develop, described the conditions favorable to its growth, and analyzed the course it is likely to run. "Tyrant," "caesar," "emperor"—these were titles taken by popular "fuehrers" of other days. They were glorious titles, used with reverence and affection by subject peoples, who gladly put their necks beneath the yoke of despotic government in order to escape the evils brought on by their own follies and weakness. Only after the follies of these totalitarian rulers in turn brought their own downfall did these titles become synonyms for oppression and suffering.

In simplest terms, totalitarianism, or dictatorship, is the goose-step applied to every aspect of life—to education, religion, art, business, and even childbearing—everything from the cradle to the grave. It means that the traffic policeman moves into the schools, the churches, the factories, and the homes to tell people what to do in the minute details of learning, loving, praying, and working.

Sometimes a nation may fall subject to such regimentation through military defeat and conquest by a stronger foe, as in the case of Belgium and the Netherlands during the present war. But the home-grown product, such as nazi-ism in Germany or fascism in Italy, arises because of some internal breakdown, or disorganization.

THE BLUE EAGLE WAS A GOOSE

The United States had a taste in early 1933 of the conditions out of which fascism may arise. Whatever the causes of the crisis of that year, there is no doubt a majority of the people wanted a strong Executive to take charge and to use whatever measures might seem necessary to restore confidence and put people to work. Furthermore, there was widespread loss of confidence in the processes of voluntary enterprise, which was necessarily highly competitive. Out of this fear of competitive private enterprise and free exchanges came the National Recovery Administration, which was set in motion with the same patriotic fervor which Hitler and Mussolini used to establish nazi-ism and fascism.

The National Recovery Administration closely resembled the economic set-up which we find in the totalitarian states. Group control and dictation under compulsion of government were substituted for individual enterprise and initiative throughout all trade and industry. It was fascism, or national socialism, pure and simple.

And when the Agricultural Adjustment Act and other similar legislation were added the United States had for the time being accepted in principle the same economic system which prevails in the totalitarian countries.

Proponents of such measures in this country tell us that this is the road to security, to ordered progress, and to economic justice. And they tell us that we may have "all these and democracy too."

Does history bear out these claims? Are societies in which the economic life of the

citizens is closely controlled by government more secure or progressive? And can a representative government efficiently discharge the many complicated duties thrust upon it by such a system? If a representative government cannot discharge these complicated duties it follows then that we have to adopt the other style of government—the totalitarian style.

GOOSE SECURITY

Let's consider the matter of economic security. A regimented society is insecure because it must rely on the artificial stimulus of inflationary government spending to maintain an appearance of prosperity. The reason for this is that government meddling keeps raising new barriers to private industry and private employment. The result is disrupted markets and rising unemployment, which can be remedied only by removing the barriers set up by government or by resorting to the nostrum of artificial spending. Power-loving bureaucrats, of course, prefer the latter—inflationary spending. This enables them to continue their collectivistic experiments and keep their jobs while temporarily giving an artificial appearance of prosperity to the national economy. It keeps the patient feeling good while the medicine men intone their incantations and hack away at the nation's political and economic vitals.

But to retain its stimulating effects, inflation must be administered in ever larger and larger doses. Can any sane person maintain that this is the road to security and prosperity? Sooner or later such policies must bring a day of reckoning which reveals the security of the so-called "managed" economy to be nothing but a mirage created by false promises and inflationary marihuana.

When that day comes the nation is fortunate if its people retain sufficient clarity of mind and self-reliance to cast off the bonds of bureaucracy and break down the barriers to enterprise. Too often such a nation, driven to financial bankruptcy and economic chaos, chooses the road of dictatorship because the people, through disuse, have lost confidence in their powers of self-direction and self-government.

Parenthetically, and before it is too late, we should recognize one very important point: Representative government can have no part in a collectivist society. Recent events have made this fact dramatically clear. We who fight for the cause of freedom have no better ally than the Congress of the United States, a freedom institution.

The achievement of free enterprise is not easy, but free enterprise is the economic foundation of the freedom structure. Once that foundation is destroyed the whole structure topples.

LIP SERVERS

If we consider words alone, there seems to be almost universal recognition of this fact by the American people. Nearly everyone, except the self-admitted socialists, loudly proclaims his belief in free enterprise. The President and Vice President of the United States have publicly said they are on our side. The National Resources Planning Board, while suggesting governmentally controlled financed and operated projects, put free enterprise at the top of objectives for national policy. Labor unions say they are for it.

Yet all the while that we hear and read these fair words on its behalf, free enterprise has been sabotaged by policies pursued by the very groups which profess to be its ardent supporters.

Not the least offenders are business people themselves, too many of whom give lip service to free enterprise, more because they regard it as the opposite of dreaded socialism than because of any specific understanding of its real benefits or of the virtues which have to be lived to make it work.

Too many of us think free enterprise is freedom of privilege—freedom to devise our own little brand of monopoly, freedom to set prices or fix production, freedom to get Government to protect us from competition. This is not the self-government that is freedom, but the lawless self-seeking which is license.

CAN FREE ENTERPRISE BE DEFINED?

Free enterprise does not lend itself easily to precise definition. It is easier to say what it is not than what it is. But this much can be said:

Free enterprise means freedom for every in dividual to exert his utmost capacity in producing those commodities and services which a people needs.

It means equal opportunity and freedom for every worker to choose where he will work and what he will do without asking the consent of any bureaucrat or paying tribute to any vested interest.

It means a system of rewards, profits, and losses, arrived at through voluntary agreement in competitive markets.

It means protection by law and public opinion against predation, fraud, and violence.

It means good sportsmanship on the part of participants, who will try to win by superior efficiency and service, not by racketeering, political favoritism, or monopolistic combinations.

It is men and women working out their common destiny, not under the lash of coercive authority, but under the discipline of enlightened self-interest and moral responsibility.

Free competitive enterprise will put everyone capable of honest effort to work. It will put all of us to work because increased production will reflect itself in lower and lower prices bringing products and services within ever lower ranges of purchasing power, thereby requiring still more production. It will put an end to increased production reflecting itself in sterilized surpluses decaying in storage. Price rigidities, extravagance theories and restrictive rules which cause this condition have no part in this system. Free enterprise is also the one way to get the new products, new services and new industries which create new jobs and open new opportunities for the creative genius for all the people.

Free competitive enterprise is the only means of ending the paradox of impoverishment amid plenty.

Free competitive enterprise is the only hope we have of extricating ourselves honorably from the astronomical debt we shall have when this war is over. It is the only hope because all wealth has to come from production and this is the way, the only way, to get full production.

LABOR GAINS WITH BUSINESS

While the enterprise system will make plentiful business it is also the only sound method labor has of increasing real wages, that is, affording more goods and services for a day's work, and to those labor leaders who say that management is a matter of no difficulty, that labor can run the industrial works, we say free competitive enterprise offers the answer. Not cynically, but sincerely, we say let those in labor start new enterprises and show the country better ways to do things. This is the way at least of those who ask no special privilege but only equality of opportunity.

Business, under free competitive enterprise, is no particular frozen group of people or corporations. Instead, it is a condition, or an aspect, of enterprising life into which people from all classes come and go, fail and succeed, according to their abilities, their self-disciplines, their ambitions, their initiative.

To those who say free enterprise has failed, I reply, it cannot have failed—it has never been tried. It has only been approximated—for short periods and in certain aspects of our economic life—but those were the periods of most rapid progress in abolishing want and in raising standards of human welfare. Economic failure has come to nations not because of competition but because of the lack or perversion of it.

PLANNING THAT EXPANDS, NOT DIMINISHES, FREEDOM

All right, is there a plan of action to suggest?

Yes, there is a plan; one too big for the chamber or for Los Angeles to effect, but one which we could detonate, one that ought to interest other people in other communities, one that the Congress must nurture, for it requires a vast amount of political unraveling, one that is extremely radical in that it calls for the uprooting of present policies and trends, one that requires understanding, courage and an unshakable staunchness in our convictions.

This plan is premised on the belief that a post-war era, built on the foundation of debt and socialism, is futile and hopeless. This plan calls for the revamping of the foundation itself—it calls for the attainment of free competitive enterprise.

I present it only partially and in broad outline:

1. Plan how, in the conduct of the war, to assure ourselves that war controls will be temporary in nature and that none of them will remain as permanent features of our peacetime economy.

2. Plan the transition from war to peace and from the superstate to a free economy. Obviously, Government, by reason of the militaristic role it has had to play and by reason of the paternalistic role it has aimed to play, will have a responsibility to see that the job is conducted in such a manner as to insure the strongest incentives for private as distinguished from governmental employments.

3. Plan how to manage the huge post-war debt so as to minimize its potentially disastrous inflationary effects—even going so far as to discontinue at once the issuance of securities redeemable on demand at the end of the war.

4. Plan reduction in the expenses and personnel of governments—Federal, State, and local—to supportable proportions.

5. Plan a revision of existing statutes to insure against price-fixing, production restrictions, agricultural parities, labor monopolies, feather-bed practices, and trade barriers. In short, plan the basis for increased production and technological advances reflecting themselves in lower prices and therefore in benefits to society generally.

6. Plan how to abrogate those international commitments which would require our Federal Government to control domestic production and distribution, thus making freedom in enterprise impossible.

7. Plan how to teach the American public that mere employment, regardless of its productiveness, and that national income, irrespective of what composes it, are meaningless and without significance to general economic welfare.

8. Plan public works which by reason of their utility will yield a net gain to the productive and distributive processes and therefore a tangible value to the people as consumers—works which are not possible by private endeavor.

9. Plan how to expose the fallacies of public works of the nice-if-we-could-afford-them type, the type which provides useless employment.

10. Plan to expose the fraud of squandering on current expenses the money obtained by so-called social security taxes on workers.

Let us not get the idea that we are establishing security when we have nothing but Government I O U's as an insurance fund. These I O U's are worthless except as we are taxed a second time to raise money to pay ourselves off.

11. Plan how to put every local resource, human and physical, to its greatest productive usefulness. This embraces a multitude of tasks on which we in Los Angeles can and will effectively work and about which you will be hearing much.

12. Plan to attract to and support in public office men who have an understanding of the broad benefits of free competitive enterprise, who know the conditions under which it will thrive and who can be depended on for a sincere pursuit of their elected purposes—men who care more for adherence to good principles than they care for election to office.

13. Plan how to stabilize international exchanges so they will not stand as obstacles between citizens of the several nations who want to do business with each other.

14. Plan a broad public appreciation of the fact that international morality and economic integrity are fundamental to any advancement in world trade or in world peace, and that it matters little how we try to organize the post-war world if these virtues are absent.

15. Plan a revision of our Government so that it will assume the role of referee; that it will keep the enterprise arena ordered for fair play; that it will suppress violence and fraud; that it will enforce contracts; that it will look to the public as distinguished from pressure group interests; that it will not concern itself with which ones of its citizens win in the competitive race; that it will not enter the competitive race itself, the Government being the citizens' servant; and that it will confine itself to those activities for the success of which an element of compulsion is necessary and which are therefore unsuited to private endeavor.

Prepare yourselves for some such program or forget the attainment of free enterprise—of freedom itself.

OUR DESTINY CAN BE SHAPED

I am well aware of its difficulties. The sacrifice, tolerance, understanding, and faith required challenge the imagination. Yet it can be done. Sound policy will be achieved if the American people once realize the utter chaos to be visited upon us should we continue on the drunken road of debt and socialism.

The present course, that of debt and socialism, is easy and intoxicating now, but inevitably disastrous.

The other course, that of free enterprise, free government, and free institutions is difficult now, but inevitably will lead to widespread opportunity from which, among a virtuous people, prosperity and national well-being flow as a natural consequence.

We are worthy of what we hope is our great destiny only if we are courageous, intelligent, and numerous enough to tackle this big and complex job.

John B. Hawley, Jr., of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post on February 20, under the title "Minnesota's Blitz Producer," referring to John B. Hawley, Jr., of Minnesota. I have often felt that directives and orders from bureaucrats in Washington and unnecessary red tape were putting many unnecessary obstacles in the way of patriotic and capable manufacturers upon whom we are depending for war-production materials. This article is informative and interesting.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA'S BLITZ PRODUCER

(By Robert M. Yoder)

The speed in production of war goods shown by the Northern Pump Co., of Fridley, Minn., has been variously spoken of by the prose laureates along the unquiet Potomac as incredible, an industrial miracle, and a marvelous job by a wonderful plant. These encomiums are not of themselves impressive. Incredible, in the courtly language used about war production, may mean anything from not bad to all right. Wonderful may connote anything up to good, and marvelous may mean simply better than we feared.

But gun mounts speak louder than words—at least, in the hearing of enemy ships and planes—and these are the principal output these days of John B. Hawley, Jr.'s, Northern Pump Co. on the outskirts of Minneapolis, which, in conjunction with the Navy, also manufactures all manner of intricate hydraulic machinery. Moreover, not only did War Production Board last spring bestow further praise on Northern Pump as an example of a plant that is really rolling but the Navy, too, has fired salvos of praise.

When Commander B. K. Culver, the Navy's man-on-the-scene inspector, left for sea duty his farewell version of what goes on in the largest private naval ordnance plant the Nation has ever had was: "We have surpassed predictions that were called fantastic. Today we are 2 months ahead of the unbelievable."

Called the finest machine shop in the world, Northern Pump is a row of buildings housing 2 or 3 miles of sleek machine tools. One big machine shop owned by Hawley, three or four big machine shops owned by the Navy—they are all operated by Hawley—operated with such smooth speed that the fall found that place approximately 2 years ahead of minimum contract schedule.

To build naval guns at all takes a sanguine disposition; Navy men say cheerfully that this is an excellent way to go broke. A gun mount is everything that goes into one of these big dual-purpose cannon but the barrel. Guns like this must swing bolt upright to get in a lick at high-flying bombers, and down again for work on the horizontal, in which direction they will throw a shell fifteen miles. The mount is wrist, arm, brain, legs, and back. It consists of 15 to 30 tons of high-precision machinery, standing in relation to the barrel as the works of a watch compare to the hands.

Hawley is an unimpressed, 43-year-old inventor whose company, until the war, was relatively small. He has become the Nation's foremost gunsmith for big sea-going antiaircraft guns, making them on a moving assembly line that is a marvel to see. * * * "We don't fool around," says Hawley. * * *

How not to fool around was exemplified when the Minnesota pump builder first offered his services as a manufacturer of naval antiaircraft-gun mounts.

Hawley's company was already well known to the Navy, for, as one engineer remarks, "the principal function of a battleship is to carry pumps." It made, among other things, a submersible pump of Hawley's invention, useful in pumping out flooded holds. * * *

He saved many hours of polite discussion by summing up his qualifications in one memorable sentence. "I'm the only man who can defend America," said he. He meant that only in Minneapolis and St. Paul were there enough highly skilled workmen not already engaged in, or at least earmarked for war orders. * * *

Demanding an order for a hundred or so, instead of the customary 15 or 20, Hawley turned out his first gun mounts with neatness and dispatch, and has been doing the same ever since. They think it was the first time big guns had been made with interchangeable parts, using automotive-type jigs and fixtures; the jigs alone being as much work as 200 gun mounts, requiring 50,000 square yards of drawings.

The big shop stands in what was a cornfield in October 1940, and represents another application of the Hawley running start. It would take 90 days, he was told, to get plans.

"Ninety?" said the kinetic Mr. Hawley. "Hell, I'll have it built and running in 60." He did, and was making gun mounts 9 months later.

Northern Pump men drew the plans, selected standard building sections from American Bridge, and put them together at racing speed in the dead of one of those Minnesota winters when farmers freeze to death trying to get from the house to the barn.

* * * * *

INDUSTRY'S CORPS D'ELITE

From 200 employees in the summer of 1938, Northern Pump grew to 6,800. One noon the major employers of the Twin Cities assembled at lunch to discuss the disappearance of key men, who were vanishing like hens to a marauding fox. One after another, the gentlemen expressed the pious hope that there would be little or no labor pirating in that area, no "scamping," as it is called in the Northwest.

All present were strongly opposed to this deplorable practice and would sooner cut off an arm than hire a single precious machinist away from another's bench. Amid all this solidarity, they called for a few words from Hawley.

"I assume you invited me here because I am stealing your men," the guest of honor said amiably. "You fellows haven't taken defense orders—I have. I am paying a $10 bonus to any man in my plant for each good man he can persuade to come to work for me. About overtime: My men work till they drop. They come out of the plant all bent over; they can hardly stagger to the gate. But one peek at that pay check and they feel swell. Sure, I'm stealing men. I got to have them. This is Navy work. But I'll tell you what. You fellows appoint a committee, tell me what I ought to do, and I'll abide by any plan you think up."

* * * * *

There is free coffee, night and day. Good looking girls, called "servettes," move through the shop selling cigarettes and soft drinks. Meals are sold from a fleet of stainless-steel trucks, each with a butane-gas tank aboard to keep things hot. Hawley considers good food a must. The trucks at The Pump sell a quarter of fried chicken, for example, for 25 cents, and the 10-cent ham sandwiches have a quarter inch of hot ham in them.

This is an industrial corps d'elite, and is treated accordingly. While a man works at his machine, attendants at the oversize parking lot check his tires, repair them, if needed, at no charge. The personnel department gets driving licenses and license plates, goes to court for the driver who gets a ticket.

* * * * *

When Hawley attacked his first order of 5-inch antiaircraft mounts, the big shop bloomed with red, white, and blue like a grandstand. All over the plant appeared signs reading: "Blitz 100." They meant:

"Turn out a hundred gun mounts by Christmas."

* * * * *

The hundredth mount was painted red, white, and blue, the plant stopped long enough to cheer, and Hawley raised pay all around in celebration. Later, new signs appeared: "The Navy wants twins." It meant the plant had taken on the manufacture of mounts for twin, or double-barreled, guns at the same time as they made the singles.

To get a big machine shop going fast is something like racing an elephant across a tight rope. A single part may need two dozen different shaping, drilling, and milling operations—that for an item no bigger than your hat.

* * * * *

The financial risks involved in this kind of work would unnerve a five-horse-parlay player.

* * * * *

MULTIMILLION-DOLLAR FAITH

On one multimillion-dollar job, Hawley went right into production on 2,000 mounts without waiting for the Navy to approve his million-dollar sample. Approval might involve long testing, and that could take weeks. A lot of gun mounts could be made in that time. If the Navy turned thumbs down, Northern Pump would be stuck with a plant full of fine-precision work worth nothing but its price as scrap. "An awful gamble," says the chief of engineers. But as Hawley sees it, "This is not primarily a low-cost operation. The idea is to make deliveries, regardless of cost, hell, or high water."

At every stage of his career as a gunsmith, Hawley has taken chances that would turn a banker's hair white overnight. Early in the game, long before his shop was getting called "the finest plant under naval jurisdiction," he took an order for $500,000 worth of equipment, and spent $3,500,000 for jigs, tools, and fixtures. He knew he could get contracts for $100,000,000 if he demonstrated ability to deliver. He says that in December of 1940 he had spent $15,000,000 on gun mounts with no contract to protect him and was in far deeper than the bonding companies cared to follow him. Others may think twice before they risk their firm's solvency. Hawley is financially uninhibited, willing to bet everything on his talent as an engineer, and he is a free agent, having no stockholders to appease and no directors to consult, owning the place—lock, stock, and barrel.

Hawley bumped into one sample of heat-treated steel he couldn't chip. Those were the case-hardened and indurated purse strings of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Up to his ears in Navy work, Hawley asked for a loan. This was long before his shop was getting called the finest plant under naval jurisdiction. Still, along with an admiral's letter terming him vital to the Nation's defense, the visitor had $33,000,000 in war orders. He wanted a grubstake of three or four million dollars—hardly more, as he saw it, than a petty-cash fund. But he had to get the money at home in Minneapolis, and from friends and customers. The best the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would offer was a paltry million. A ranking member of that friendly credit institution asked Hawley to leave, saying he was disrespectful. He had just told them they were a passel of penny pinchers without any financial guts.

"They wanted me to take a cost-plus contract," he recalls. "I said only creepy mice would take a contract like that—nobody with a real desire to produce."

War contracts required a performance bond. Hawley was refused a bond on the ground that he was taking on more work than was financially prudent. The bonding companies, he says, constituted a serious production bottleneck—producers were at their mercy.

Hawley was up to his ears in an even bigger fight over ordnance patents. To enter the ordnance business was extremely dangerous. At any moment a man might infringe fire-control patents which, because of their nature, were secret. "No man," said the battling Minnesotan, "should hold patents on the defense of his country." Hawley worked up a patent clause by which anyone can do Navy work without fear of patent suits, and by which the producer throws in his patents when he takes a contract.

* * * * *

THE RENEGOTIATION PLAN

"If I don't get this contract," he said, "I won't have anything better to do than to fight you fellows from hell to breakfast. And there's nothing I'd rather do." Finally, the Navy accepted a token bond, and this, Hawley says, paved the way for the present system, in which bonds are not required.

Hawley is a talented "aginner." On almost every broad question of production policy, his position is a neat 90° from that prevailing in Washington. Eight Government departments joined in a statement calling 48 hours the proper workweek. Hawley circulated copies of the statement marked, "This is not the opinion of the Northern Pump Co." He cut his plant down to two 10-hour shifts, 6 days a week, but it went against the grain. The way to win the war, as he sees it, is to run wide open.

The unreconstructed pump maker in wires to Congressmen declared the renegotiation plan would torpedo production, and was, furthermore, a dirty deal. In wires and telephone calls to 14,000 businessmen, he urged them to make a stand against it. He won many pats on the back, he says, but no recruits. He has been in a slow boil about renegotiation ever since the subject was first mentioned. It puts a swarm of auditors into his plant, where, in trying to find out what things cost, they tie up the most valuable men—foremen and supervisors. And "you have to mix your own hemlock," meaning that the contractor must pay the auditors. He can be renegotiated on contracts taken 2 years before Pearl Harbor, long before renegotiation ever was mentioned, and that strikes him as more than a little unfair. "The Government plays for keeps if the contractor loses, but can renege if he wins."

War contractors are given every encouragement, it seems to Hawley, to keep their costs high. Paying a man cost plus a percentage of cost means his profits depend on cost, while cost plus a fixed fee induces him to keep costs high enough so that the fee won't look all out of proportion. The whole system, to this critic, appears to be tailored to the big and musclebound. He thinks it penalizes the efficient man and rewards the one who takes least responsibility. Suppose Northern Pump, through high efficiency and low overhead, can make a certain huge roller bearing for $1,500. As his profit, Hawley would be allowed a percentage of his cost. Say, for example, 10 percent, making a profit of $150. But if he bought the part, which he says might cost $4,000, he would be allowed a percentage of that. "I could make more for lifting it out of the packing crate than if I take the responsibility of making it."

Allowing a man a percentage of his costs, as profit, may look perfectly fair, but says Hawley, it does not stimulate production. Hawley could make as much money turning out one gun mount for $120,000 as for turning out two at $60,000. One way, the Navy gets one gun. The other way it gets two. The ideal, as Hawley sees it, is to discourage profiteering while encouraging production. The way to do that, in his opinion, is to allow the contractor a small percentage of his contract price, say 2 percent, after Federal and State income taxes, so that the amount he makes depends on the amount he produces.

Skeptics might suspect these views are colored by Hawley's own profits, which, no matter how he is renegotiated, undoubtedly are in the millions. "This profiteering stuff," he scoffs, "is just a lot of numbers. Today I've got an inventory of ten or fifteen million dollars. What happens if the war ends tomorrow? Then the inventory stuff is worth exactly what some inexperienced bookkeeper wants to say it's worth, with a million miles of red tape to back him up and the United States Court of Claims as umpire. Am I a millionaire or a pauper? If the Government reneges now, what will it do after the war?"

* * * * *

Hawley puts most of the profits into improvements, taking only 2 percent of the sales as his own salary—as little as $6,000 in the bleak years of '31 and '32. Two percent of his present sales would make the snow-capped pay envelope of Mr. Thomas J. Watson, or even Mr. Louis B. Mayer, look modest, but this year Hawley gave himself a $423,000 cut. The day after President Roosevelt called on a flattered populace to adjure salaries over $25,000, Hawley wired the White House that he would do so retroactive to Pearl Harbor.

"When I was 28," he says, "I had money. Today, figuring what I owe for materials, I must owe fifteen to twenty million dollars. That's my life—a sort of cumulative bankruptcy. I've made $40,000,000—before taxes and renegotiation. Have I got anything to show for it? Yes, sir—I own my own home."

Farm Security, National Security, and Post War Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address on the subject of Farm Security, National Security, and Post-War Planning, delivered by the Vice President of the United States before a meeting of farmers and representatives of civic organizations at the Deshler-Wallick Hotel, Columbus, Ohio, March 8, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to meet with farmers once again, as in happier and more carefree days. But these are trying times. You are beset with labor and machinery problems, with shortage of gas, and rationing. Since these difficulties first began to appear, I have followed them through my closest friends and relatives in the Corn Belt, and I know exactly how you feel.

On this particular occasion, the tenth anniversary of the national farm program, I do not want to talk about your immediate problems but about the long-time outlook.

First let me remind you of the origin of this farm program. It was just 10 years ago this evening that, as Secretary of Agriculture, I conferred with President Roosevelt and we decided to call the farm leaders of the Nation to Washington. Great as was our faith in the farmers, we did not foresee at that time that the farm leaders of America when called together would formulate a program which

would serve as one of the essential foundations for preserving the democratic way of life for the United States and the whole world.

In 1933 the program whose birthday we are celebrating today took farmers out of the slough of despond. It is equally useful today in providing food to win the war. After the war, this program will be needed again to protect both farmers and consumers in the changing market conditions that are certain to arise.

It is interesting to compare the situation of today with that of 10 years ago.

In March of 1933, wheat on American farms was selling for 35 cents a bushel. Now it is around $1.20—nearly four times as much.

Corn in March of 1933 was 21 cents a bushel. Today it is four times as high.

Cotton in March of 1933 was 6 cents a pound. Today it is three times as high.

Hogs in March of 1933 were selling for $3.21 a hundredweight. They are worth nearly five times as much now.

In March of 1933, milk on farms brought $1.08 a hundredweight. Today it brings nearly three times as much.

Butterfat in March of 1933 was 15 cents a pound. Today it is three times as high.

Tobacco in March of 1933 sold for 6 cents a pound. Today it is five times as high.

Soybeans in March of 1933 were worth 41 cents a bushel. They are worth four times as much now.

In March of 1933, beef cattle sold at Chicago for $5.25 a hundredweight. Now the price is three times as high.

Everybody knows that the Triple A and the rest of the recovery program played a prominent part in the price advance during the four or five years following 1933. Everybody also knows that the present high prices are not due to the efforts of the Government but are due to the war.

On May 13, 1933—1 day after the original Agricultural Adjustment Act became law, I made a radio address in which I said: "The immediate job, as I see it now, is to organize American agriculture to reduce its output to domestic need, plus that amount which we can export at a profit. If * * * it happens that the world tide turns, and world trade revives, we still can utilize to excellent advantage our crop adjustment and controlled distribution set-up. * * * We can take off the brakes and step on the gas.

Then, on August 19, 1934, in an article in the New York Times, I said further:

"It is a poor piece of social machinery which is built to operate always in reverse. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration was not thus planned or built. We have in it something new, and still crude, but it is a typically American invention equipped to meet crises, go around or through them.

"Our agricultural adjustment machinery could readily be turned to spur rather than to check farm production, should need arise. If this country should ever attain to an enlightened tariff policy, reopening world trade; or if there should be war beyond the ocean and other nations clamor for our foods again, it is conceivable that we might offer adjustment payments for more, rather than for less, acreage in certain crops.

"That is the very last use I should want to see our adjustment machinery put to, but it could ameliorate the waste and suffering of such an emergency, just as it can meet and to some extent ameliorate the suffering caused by this drought. With controls locally organized and democratically administered, we could provision a war in an orderly, organized manner, with far less of that plunging, uninformed, and altogether unorganized overplanting which got us into so much trouble during and after the last great war.

"I am convinced that the people of this country do not want to see another war or to get into one. If we have learned anything at all, we have learned that war is a bad business, a murderous business, and that all you can collect on it afterward is increasing grief. Another world war would conceivably destroy us and destroy civilization.

"I do find some feeling here and there that a good-sized war abroad which we could keep out of, yet provision and supply, would be better than toilsome, peaceful planning, and a more generous internal sharing of existing wealth, as a measure of national recovery. But I do not think this feeling is widespread in business circles or elsewhere in our country. I feel that even those who did not suffer in the field the last time the world went crazy have now suffered enough post-war consequences so that they do not want new foreign customers, temporarily, for our farm and other products at such a price.

"Like drought, earthquakes, flood, fire, and famine, war remains, however, a recurring reality. Drought is upon us now. Beyond the seas nations hurt by the terrible grind of ungoverned economic forces are in warlike mood. Their men are arming. We want none of that, but the world is small.

"It is the duty of wise statesmanship to lay a far course and to lead people toward security; toward an alleviation of needless misery, dissension, and waste; toward peace between neighbors, classes, and nations. Yet the machinery set up to that end must be adaptable to use in times of tragic natural disasters, such as this drought, and in times of terrific outbursts of blind competition, carried, as has long been customary, to the nth degree, with gunfire. That is why I have mentioned the adaptability of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency to a wartime state, should such madness again possess the nations of Europe and Asia, or our own."

That is the end of the 1934 quotation.

Today, with the national and world demand for food greater than ever before, we can rejoice at the wonderful organization that the 6,000,000 farmers of the United States have built up over the years. We can be thankful for the leadership of more than 100,000 farmer committeemen, elected by their neighbors to handle the local administration of the farm production program.

We can be thankful also for the extra fertility stored up in our soil through the conservation program and for the ever-normal granary. We can be glad that in the years of surplus we piled up 700,000,000 bushels of corn and 600,000,000 bushels of wheat over and above the amount needed for current consumption. Much of this stock pile was sealed in cribs and bins on the farms of the United States. It is this reserve stock of wheat which today gives assurance that we shall have plenty of bread. These reserve stocks of wheat and corn assure us of hundreds of millions of pounds more of meat, milk, and eggs than would otherwise be possible. As a result of our large feed stocks, we shall be able in 1943 to produce nearly 50 percent more than the normal number of hogs.

In spite of the unavoidable wartime shortage of farm labor and farm machinery, we can, with the aid of our farmer organization and these reserves of fertility and grain piled up in the past, provide the food that is indispensable to the winning of the war. We can feed our soldiers and sailors, with their big appetites; we can provide at least the necessary minimum of food for our hardworking civilians; and, barring serious drought, we can send to our allies overseas the food that is essential to keep them in the fight. We can be proud that food from American farms helped the Russians win the battles of Stalingrad and Kharkov, and helped the British drive Rommel across north Africa.

I have been talking to you first about farm affairs because they are your most immediate concern. But you are also vitally interested in the goal we are fighting for—national security.

Farm folk and city folk alike want to make sure that our victory, when it comes, will give us security in the future. We want to be secure not only against war, but against the suffering caused by business depression and unemployment.

Actually, the two kinds of security are closely related. Economic prosperity in the United States is important not only for our own welfare but for the welfare of the world. In ordinary times, the United States is the second largest importer of goods exported by the rest of the world. When we are prosperous, our buying power for foreign goods and raw materials is high, and we help the other countries of the world to be prosperous. This in turn helps to protect the entire world, ourselves included, against economic breakdown and war. As we discovered in 1930, when we go into a slump and we quit buying from abroad, the rest of the world goes into a tailspin too. The depression abroad is reflected back in still worse depression here—with export markets for our farm products gone, with farm prices collapsing, with millions of workers thrown out of jobs in the cities. And men without jobs are fruitful soil for demagogues like Mussolini and Hitler to cultivate.

We know from experience that the laboring man is not secure in his job if the farmer does not have a market for his products. We want security for the laboring man in his job not only in this country but elsewhere in the world, because we know from our experience after the first World War that those parts of our agriculture dependent on the export market are in serious trouble when the people overseas are unable to buy, and the trouble that comes to cotton, corn, and wheat communicates itself to other farmers and the whole domestic economy.

After this war is over it is quite possible that we shall have the same experience as after the first World War, when for nearly 2 years there was an advance rather than a decline. This time, after we have met the problems of the immediate transition from war to peace, we may enjoy a period of good business which may last anywhere from 1 to 5 years. There will be at least $10,000,000,000 in the hands of businessmen, which they can use to replace worn-out equipment and depleted inventories. There will be another $10,000,000,000 of consumer credit which can be tapped, since the old installment debts will have been paid off and the field will be clear for people to buy on credit again. There will be at least $10,000,000,000 of purchasing power in individual war savings. Automobiles, tires, furnishings, clothing, homes all will be worn out or run down and needing replacement or repair. The combination of this pent-up demand for goods and the $30,000,000,000 or more of unusual purchasing power may produce full activity, or even a runaway boom if preventive measures are not taken. But, while such a period of good business and full employment might possibly last for several years, it still might prove to be temporary, because it would be based on a combination of war-caused factors that are only short-lived.

Unless we take definite steps to insure that sufficient buying power will be kept up, there will be a decline in both foreign and domestic demand for farm products within a few years after the war ends. If that should happen, farmers will desperately need the kind of help that only the Triple A machinery can give. That is one reason why it is so important for the farmers to be on guard now, so as not to let their fair-weather friends destroy the Triple A machinery or public sympathy for the farmer's cause.

If such a period of business decline should set in, not only will farmers desperately need a farm program, but businessmen and laboring men will desperately need a program to restore industrial employment and production.

Thus, on the economic side, the post-war planning that all of us are hearing so much about will probably have to cover three successive phases here in the United States. First will be the shock of transition from war to peace when some form of separation pay may be needed for soldiers and war industry workers until they find jobs. Second will be the period of post-war prosperity, when restraining measures will be needed to prevent uncontrolled inflation and a runaway boom in stocks and land. Third will be the period of threatened decline, when strong action, in advance, both by private business and by public agencies may be needed to prevent a repetition of 1932 in this country and the rise of another Hitler abroad.

It happens that the Board of Economic Warfare, with which I am connected, is not engaged in post-war planning. That is the function of Congress, the National Resources Planning Board, and the State Department. I as an individual, however, have my own ideas, and I believe that national security is our No. 1 business when we talk about post-war planning.

I am convinced that we cannot have national security if we follow an isolationist or excessively nationalist policy. With our country fighting for her life against aggressor powers on the other side of both oceans, hardly anyone in this country is now willing to admit openly that he is an isolationist. Nevertheless, the country is being flooded with propaganda for new, subtle, and, therefore, dangerous forms of isolationism, which, if adopted, would lead straight to World War No. 3.

Here are some of the ways in which the old doctrine is taking new forms:

First. People are being told that a world war in every generation is inevitable and that we can have national security only by maintaining the biggest Army, the biggest Navy, and the biggest Air Force in the world. Even if we could indefinitely stand the expense and the privation of such a program, it would not necessarily protect us. For though we might have the best and biggest Army, Navy, and Air Force, other countries might and probably would combine against us. If they formed a combination stronger than our own, they would defeat us.

My view—and I am convinced that it is the majority view of the American people—is that, rather than remain an armed camp, waiting for the inevitable World War No. 3, it is more practical for us as a Nation to throw the weight of our influence behind world-wide efforts to prevent such a war.

Second. People are being told that anything which is done after this war to improve the standard of living of other countries will lower the standard of living at home.

Of course, while the war is on, the people of this country are making sacrifices, and making them cheerfully, to help our allies—Britain and Russia—keep on fighting. Doubtless, our people will gladly continue these sacrifices for a short period, after Germany is defeated, in order to prevent widespread famine in Europe.

But, for the long pull, the most effective assistance we can give is the kind which helps other countries to develop their agriculture and industry and which, at the same time, increases our own prosperity. Those who really want to improve the standard of living of the American people know that the United States is now so much a part of the whole world that we can best help Americans by helping the peoples of all the world to help themselves.

The favorite device of the distortionists is to repeat over and over the canard that this Government wants to give a quart of milk a day to everyone in the world—evidently on the theory that by frequent repetition this myth will come to be accepted as fact. Among those who spread this myth the most enthusiastically are some isolationist leaders of yesteryear, who for a time were silenced by events, but who now hope to drive the United States back into her old isolationist cave.

I am not urging Ohio farmers or any other farmers to give a bottle of milk a day to Hottentots. This weird and manifestly impossible idea has been peddled up and down the land—why, I will leave it to you to guess.

People of other countries can enjoy higher standards of living when they learn to use their soils and their resources more effectively to produce the things they need. We in the United States can help them learn how to do those things, and also can help build the factories they need to get started. Our technical experts and industrial equipment can aid them to raise their own standards of production and of consumption—and so, along with other good things, have plenty of milk for themselves, producing it from their own pastures through their own efforts.

Third. Another step in what appears to be a campaign of fear is the assertion that our Government is preparing to take control of education everywhere in the world. This is nonsense. But all sensible people know that the United Nations in some way must prevent Germany from teaching the Nazi philosophy in the future as a preliminary to launching another German war for world conquest.

Fourth. A movement is already under way to abandon the same tariff policy represented by our reciprocal trade agreement program, and go back to the Smoot-Hawley days of building a high tariff wall around the United States. Economic warfare of the Smoot-Hawley type is the initial step toward military warfare. It leads first to totalitarian control of trade, then to shooting. To win the peace, we must follow through to establish the right kind of international trade relations. We cannot hope to maintain peace by force unless the peace we are maintaining is a just peace.

Fifth. It is urged that, after the war, American aviators ought to be permitted to fly everywhere in the world, but that not a single foreign plane should ever fly over any part of the United States. This astonishing idea seems to be first cousin to the fallacy that we can sell our goods everywhere in the world at the same time that we keep foreigners from selling to us. Many problems are bound up in the question of our post war relationships with other countries in the field of aviation. We shall never solve them in a constructive way—and in a way that will promote peace instead of war—if we base our approach on such absurd and fuzzy thinking.

Recently I expressed the view that neither political party would want to be opposed to freedom of the seas or freedom of the air after the war. But I find that on January 5, 1943, an opposition leader set the tempo for orthodox opposition thinking with regard to American post-war imperialism when he said: "America must rule the air, and to do this it is necessary for the Congress to plan intelligently for this air supremacy following the war."

This envisions an imperialistic fight for air supremacy between at least three great nations in the world—a fight which can end finally only in World War No. 3, or American domination of a type which will eventually make the United States worse hated in the world than the Nazis ever have been. Americans want peace, not war. Americans want sensible world cooperation, not isolationism or imperialism. By common-sense world cooperation the people of the United States will have infinitely more prosperity than in a senseless race for air power.

It is possible now to get votes, build prestige, and even make money by shouting American supremacy of the air and seas. But when we yield to American imperialism of this type we are working for the death of our children and grandchildren in World War No. 3. What we want is not imperialistic American supremacy in the air and on the sea. By cooperating with other nations we can get security and peace, but by striving for imperialistic American supremacy of the aid and sea we shall get insecurity and war at a tremendous outlay of taxpayers' money and our children's blood.

On this tenth anniversary of the founding of the Triple A, farmers may well wonder what the next 10 years will hold. Will farmers and city workers both be taken for a joy ride on the roller coaster of boomtime prosperity, only to end up in the ditch of a worse depression than before? As soon as the war is won, will short-sighted policy makers again shut us off from the rest of the world? Will our country fail to grasp this second opportunity to help build a world of peace and cooperation? Will our leaders engage instead in a mad nationalistic race for supremacy on land and water and in the air? Will our country be surrounded with another sky-high tariff wall, as if the world outside did not exist? Will our leaders foolishly and selfishly deny that hunger and want and suffering in the rest of the world are of any concern to us? Will a spineless policy of drift once more lead us straight for the falls?

Even in the midst of war and the nerve-wracking job of producing the necessary food and munitions to win it, these are questions which must be faced. The choices we make, both now and later, will go far to determine what the next 10 years, and perhaps the next 100 years, will bring.

Tasks of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, together with a group of other Senators and Members of the House, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] had been called upon by the editors of the weekly magazine New Masses to answer the following two questions:

What in your opinion are the chief tasks facing Congress?

What can the people do to assure the carrying through of these tasks?

The Senator from Montana wrote an article which answers those two questions in so enlightening a manner, his arguments are so vital at this period of our history, that I hope every Member of Congress will take the time to read what he has contributed.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the dissertation of the distinguished Senator from Montana, appearing in the New Masses of March 2, 1943, printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS' TASKS—AND OURS

LET US NOT REPEAT PAST MISTAKES, SENATOR MURRAY URGES

(Recently we addressed two questions to a group of Senators and Representatives of the new Congress—questions uppermost in the minds of the American people. They are: 1. What in your opinion are the chief tasks facing Congress? 2. What can the people do to assure the carrying through of these tasks? Last week we published the first five of the replies received. Others appear below.)

(By JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator from Montana)

There is one and only one supreme task facing the Seventy-eighth Congress—the winning of the war. All other problems pale into significance before this stupendous task.

America did not pick a quarrel with the aggressor nations. The war was forced upon us by nations bent on imposing their tyrannical rule upon the world. The designs of these would-be enslavers of freedom-loving peoples were well known. Hitler had supplied us with a blueprint of the sort of world he was going to create, in his book Mein Kampf. And yet, despite these warnings, and even after he had laid waste one harmless country after another, the American isolationists and the paid agents of Hitler, Hirohito & Co. continue to denounce President Roosevelt and the Members of Congress who had seen the onrush of this world catastrophe long before it came.

Thus, America's real preparations for war did not begin until after the treacherous attack upon Pearl Harbor. Leaders and Members in the Seventy-seventh Congress worked feverishly to provide men and means to put this Nation in a position to defend itself. For their efforts, the isolationists and their fellow travelers called it a "rubber-stamp Congress." But undaunted, Congress proceeded with the work of converting this Nation into the arsenal of democracy. Realizing that the victory of Hitler and his barbarian legions would spell the doom of liberty and human dignity for centuries to come, Congress carried forward its plan of helping the nations arrayed against the aggressors.

Who would dare to say now that the lend-lease plan has not helped the cause for which we are fighting? Not only have our tanks and bombers and guns and food helped decimate the enemies on steppes of the Soviet Union, in the African desert, and the wilds of China, but the hope it has given to the nations united with us in this cause has helped them in their trying hour of this war.

What do I mean when I say that the supreme task before us today is the winning of the war? We are fighting the war to win the peace. That is our real goal. The winning of the war is a means to an end, but the real end is the bringing about of a state of affairs in the international arena when catastrophes such as we are now experiencing will no longer be possible. If we fail in bringing about an enduring peace, we shall have lost the war just as definitely as we lost the First World War. Who would dare to say now that the Allies had won the First World War? It might be correct to say that we had defeated Germany and her allies, but complacency and gullibility on the part of the American people had lost the peace for them. A few selfish and vain men inside and outside the Congress of the United States had nullified the sacrifices of the Nation during the years of 1917–18. A handful of people in the Congress of that time, out of sheer personal animosity for President Woodrow Wilson, used their high position to camouflage their real reasons for opposing America's participation in world affairs. They wanted to destroy Wilson and they succeeded, and in the process they also destroyed the fruits of our sacrifices during the First World War. This has helped bring on the present world catastrophe, drenching the human race in blood, devastating whole countries, and setting the clock of progress back for countless decades.

Some people don't like to hear this subject mentioned. It is my contention, however, that we should forever keep before us the lessons of the last World War and the interplay of forces which contributed to the world's woes of today. The mistakes of today might come to plague the generations yet unborn. We owe it to the brave men of our own military forces and the gallant Russian and British, and those of the other United Nations, who have already laid their lives down in order that we, the living, may continue to enjoy the blessings of freedom and liberty under our respective free institutions.

To win the peace there must prevail the same esprit de corps in the ranks of the United Nations as exists now while our armies are fighting shoulder to shoulder against the common enemy. That was not the case after the last World War. The deplorable blunders of the Allied Nations in first abandoning the Russians and then aiding and abetting the counter-revolutionary campaigns against their new government must be accorded generous credit for helping bring on the present world conflagration.

Space does not permit a fuller discussion of this subject. It might also not make pleasant reading for some people. But this is the time to search our conscience and to study the mistakes of the past, especially for men in responsible government positions. An American ambassador of ability and understanding in the Russia of 1917–19, with the capacity to grasp the implications of the Russian revolution and the aims of her leaders, might have guided the Allied Nations to take a wiser course, one which would have averted the onrush of the counter-revolutionary impulses which later on found expression in the Fascist and Nazi movements in Europe.

The wise founders of our Constitution had made ample provision for the safeguarding of the interests of our Nation. Not infrequently a President might nominate an Ambassador for reasons unrelated to outstanding ability. That is why it is provided that the Senate shall approve or reject the candidate. This is a prerogative which the Senate must guard most jealously. Two heads are better than one, and a wise President is not likely to take it as a personal affront when the Senate rejects a nominee.

In times of peace Congress might be content with the function of merely enacting legislation. But in times of war, especially a war as unprecedented as this one is, a war which is destined to decide the fate of mankind for countless centuries to come, it would be a luxury which the Nation could ill-afford. Congress, therefore, must keep a vigilant eye upon the proper interpretation and enforcement of the legislation it passes. I confess that there are today in the administration branch of our Government entirely too many newcomers to Government service who still think in terms of their private enterprises. They forget that they are now servants of the people and not their masters. This erroneous attitude has caused much annoyance to the citizens of our country; it has hurt morale; it has engendered doubt in the efficacy of democratic government and its ability to defend itself against the aggressor nations.

An unprecedented war calls for unprecedented alertness and action on the part of the representatives of the people—the Congress of the United States. It must stand watch over the interests of the people by holding back the tide of the onrushing monopolistic groups. The destruction of small American business enterprises has been going on for some decades. The wholesale slaughter of America's small business would help bring here totalitarianism of one sort or another. To reduce the many millions of our citizens now engaged in what is commonly called small business to the status of mere wage slaves would spell the doom of our liberties and our way of life. The so-called small business is in reality the biggest segment of our economy—about 95 percent of the total American enterprises. That is why the Seventy-seventh Congress was unanimous in its resolve to preserve this institution for the day when the cannon will cease thundering. I am sure that the Seventy-eighth Congress will do likewise, that new means and ways will be found to perpetuate the institution which has helped make of this country the citadel of democracy.

What can the people do to insure carrying out these tasks? The chosen representatives in Congress claim no monopoly of brains or ingenuity. They are part and parcel of the people inhabiting this country. They have been called to the highest legislative body of the land from farms and factories, from executive offices, and artists' studios. Their constituents must support them, they must guide them and periodically advise them of the people's wishes and needs. The people at home can help Congress by familiarizing themselves with the laws enacted and by observing them to the very letter and spirit intended by Congress. In these days of rationing of goods, in these days when so many millions have entered the war industries, it is for the people to do their utmost for their sons and brothers who have gone to the distant battlefields to fight against the implacable foes.

Too much is at stake in this war. The task is too gigantic for any one group to act on its own. There must be greater cooperation and coordination in all matters affecting the welfare of the Nation. And this sense of cooperation must be extended far beyond the horizon and the deep oceans—to our British allies, to our Russian allies, to our Chinese and French allies, and all the other nations united with us in this titanic struggle against evil.

Once our enemies have been defeated decisively, once an enduring peace has been won, it will be the duty of the Seventy-eighth and succeeding Congresses to usher in a brighter world—a world of economic and cultural and spiritual opportunity, which will afford every American citizen an equal chance to rise in his respective field of endeavor regardless of origin, creed, or color. We have the means, we have the skills and the technical genius to bring it about. Economic insecurity must vanish from this land and the rest of the world. Educational opportunities must become the birthright of every free-born American; the benefits of scientific progress must be made accessible to everyone who is willing to pay his quid pro quo in work and achievement.

This, in brief, is the task of the Seventy-eighth Congress. A big task, to be sure, but by no means an unfulfillable task.

Lyle Watts' Appointment as Chief Forester Well Deserved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call attention to the well-deserved promotion in the ap-

pointment of Lyle Watts as the new Chief Forester. At the age of 52 Mr. Watts assumes this important position.

While Mr. Watts was born in Iowa, at an early age his family took up residence in the State of Washington and he has throughout the years of his adult life been closely associated with the West. At the age of 23 he entered the Forest Service as a laborer, and his promotion to the top position in this great industry is a well deserved recognition of faithful, continuous, and effective service in the forestry industry.

Under leave heretofore granted, I include as a part of my remarks a factual study of Mr. Watts and his work, written by Richard L. Neuberger, and appearing in the Portland Oregonian in its February 21 issue, as follows:

HE GUARDS A FOREST LEGACY—LYLE WATTS, NEW CHIEF FORESTER, VIEWS NATION'S WOODED REGIONS AS A HERITAGE OF ALL THE PEOPLE—TEDDY ROOSEVELT CALLED IT A JOB OF SACRED TRUST, TODAY IT IS IN THE HANDS OF A PORTLAND MAN

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

The first wilderness trip I ever made with Lyle Watts was on the steep watershed of the Mount Hood National Forest. We were sitting on a lava crag which faced off toward eastern Oregon. In the shadows of late afternoon, the firs of the Pacific slope blended evenly with the distant pine woods of the dry region. We seemed to be riding the bowsprit of a ship cleaving a measureless green sea.

Watts pointed eastward, out over the vast solitudes. "This scene represents the heritage of America," he said. "Forests like this one belong to all the American people, to men and women in every State. It is up to us to achieve the twin goal of both using these forests and saving them. We must use them today for lumber, for recreation, for grazing, for drainage and water supply. And we must save them for the next generation, so that they, in turn, can claim similar benefits."

In the gathering dusk his blue eyes—the eyes of a forester—were bright with enthusiasm.

This is the philosophy which Lyle Ford Watts now brings to the most important forestry post on earth, the position of Chief of the United States Forest Service. At 52 he has just become America's first chief Forester in 4 years. Since Ferdinand A. Silcox died in 1939, the Forest Service has had no permanent head. The assignment had been filled by temporary appointments until last month, when President Roosevelt and Secretary of Agriculture Wickard suddenly decided upon Watts.

AMERICA FOREMOST AMONG LUMBER PRODUCERS

The United States produces more lumber than any other nation. In America grow the world's greatest stands of timber. The management and protection of this invaluable resource are now the responsibility of a lean, rangy Portlander who in 1938 became head of the Forest Service in the Pacific Northwest. Watts occupies a post long held in esteem by the American people. Gifford Pinchot first filled it. John Muir and Teddy Roosevelt called it a job of sacred trust.

The Chief Forester of the United States is directly in charge of the national forests of the land. These forests embrace the country's most magnificent wilderness—the hardwood forests of Michigan, the Lake Superior meadows, the dense "rain forests" of the Oregon sea coast, Idaho's lordly Ponderosa pines, the gentle woodlands of the southern States. America's national forests aggregate 151,897,000 acres. This is nearly three times the area of the British Isles.

To a post so crowded with responsibility Lyle F. Watts, of Portland, Oreg., brings a rich background of forestry experience. He was born in Cerro Gordo County of Iowa on November 18, 1890. He attended the public schools of Clear Lake, Iowa, and later his family moved to Bellingham, Wash. He returned to his native State to study forestry and won both bachelor's and master's degrees in that subject at Iowa State College. His graduation was cum laude.

In the United States Forest Service Lyle Watts came up the hard way. He is, so to speak, the former switchman who became president of the railroad, the paper boy who became editor. In 1913, when he was 23 years old, he started with the Forest Service as a laborer. He cleared trails, felled trees, saddled horses, cleaned stables. Most of this toil took place in Utah. In 1915 he met Nell Bowman in Ogden and married her. They have two children—Gordon L. Watts, a lieutenant of engineers at Camp Claibourne, La., and June A. Watts, who is an employee of the Willamette Hyster Co. in Portland.

In 1928 Lyle Watts took graduate courses in forestry at Utah Agricultural College, and the next year was appointed a silviculturist for the Forest Service. He studied trees from roots to crown. From 1931 until 1936 he was director of the Northern Rocky Mountain Forest Experiment Station, and in 1936 he was appointed regional forester for the North Central region, which centered on the States of the Great Lakes. There he did an outstanding job in aiding in the resuscitation of a once great lumber area.

Five years ago, Mr. Silcox, then chief of the Forest Service, placed Watts in charge of the organization's most important region. This region is the Pacific Northwest, which supplies more than a third of the lumber of the Nation. Watts moved to Portland, where he made his home until last month, when he was called to Washington to head the Forest Service in all 48 States and Alaska. He and his family lived at 809 Northeast Thirty-ninth Avenue.

The Forest Service's new chief is a friendly, mild-mannered man. On the trail he says little, but sees much. At the end of the wilderness day he can tell his companions around the camp fire the condition of the range, the flow of the streams, the quality of the timber, the survival opportunities of the wildlife. Like Thoreau, the wilderness to him is a page to be read. Watts has the long, easy lope of a woodsman and covers ground tirelessly. Tramping is no effort for him, although in recent years some trouble with his back has restricted his activity.

In a world at war, with America the principal arsenal of the democratic nations, the position of chief forester of the United States is more important than ever before. Lumber is a critical material, one of the most critical of all. It requires hundreds of board feet to house each soldier. Shipyards use vast quantities of lumber for piles and decking. Spruce for airplanes is needed in America and England. Military cantonments are literally huge lumber accumulations. And when the war is finally won, enormous amounts of American timber will be required to reconstruct the shattered continent of Europe.

FORESTER HAS TO MAKE SURE LUMBER ADEQUATE

Lyle F. Watts must see to it that sufficient lumber is available for victory. And he also must see to it that the forests and woodlands are spared for the next generation. As he said on the slopes of Mount Hood that bright afternoon, he must try both to use the forests and save them. No chief forester ever faced a sterner task, for never was lumber in such urgent demand. In fact, the War Production Board has listed wood along with steel and aluminum as one of the vital sinews of war. Without an adequate supply of lumber, the war machine would jolt to a creaking halt.

Lyle Watts is an advocate of sustained yield. This means that the forest should be maintained as a going institution, the amount of lumber cut being kept in balance with the new growth. "Yet," he recently added, "sustained yield for the Nation or region or State is not enough. We must get right down to sustained yield for communities or working circles. Just so long as we are satisfied with a type of sustained yield that balances an overcut on Puget Sound territory by an undercut in southwestern Oregon—that long we will miss the answer to the real problem.

"It's a human problem. Frankly, it is the woods workers and their families which come first in my mind as I view our forest problem. It is the communities that are built up and broken down. It is the unemployment and relief loads and distressed local governments that follow in the wake of closed mills that make a national problem. If you have worked in the Lake States or the Ozarks, you get the point. Shifting populations and ups and downs in community well-being can never be overcome by high wages, short hours, or the more recent paid vacations."

As basic precautionary measures, Watts has urged five requirements for better forestry:

1. Insure the leaving of needed seed trees of desirable species and prevent the unnecessary destruction of reproduction and immature young growth.

2. Insure safeguarded use and control of fire, including exercise of preventive measures.

3. Prevent clear cutting and deforestation unless positive assurance is forthcoming of natural restocking or, if need be, of replanting.

4. Prevent the use of destructive logging methods and equipment.

5. Prevent excessive grazing in critical run-off, erosion, and forest reproduction areas.

Some of these proposals are already in effect. A number of lumber companies have adopted them. The 1941 session of the Oregon State Legislature, at the urging of Gov. Charles A. Sprague, enacted laws requiring a certain proportion of trees to be spared in the cutting of timber. These trees will serve to seed the land for a new growth. Many lumbermen have voluntarily abandoned the old "cut out and get out" philosophy and have undertaken strenuous conservation programs.

Watts regards the Pacific Northwest as the one region in the land where a substantial growth of timber can be perpetuated. In other regions entirely new starts must be made. "The Pacific Northwest," he said not long ago, "still has vast areas of virgin forests, in spite of the fact that we already have cut out the better half of the timber of Washington and are beginning to concentrate in Oregon. The Douglas Fir Belt in western Oregon and Washington has one-third of the remaining old growth timber of continental United States."

Watts has frequently declared that adequate reforestation is dependent upon effective fire control. Otherwise, in his opinion, the new trees will simply constitute a fire trap. Small trees scattered among underbrush, are mostly tinder. "In many places," he once told a meeting of lumber workers, "a tree-planting program would be providing fuel for fires which will occur unless a Nation-wide program for protecting all forest lands from fire gives insurance against the destruction of reforested areas as well as commecial timber stands."

For many years divergent groups have wrangled over the use of America's national

forests. Fishermen want power and irrigation dams kept out. Lumber companies believe that careless fishermen start wanton fires. Campers dislike indiscriminate grazing. Stockmen resent the influence of recreationists. Some conservation groups believe the national forests should be entirely closed to commercial development. They claim that commercial use is ruining the solitudes.

What is the attitude of the new chief forester in this respect? "Obviously," he contends, "our national forests, our timbered mountains, are essential to a lot of uses. It is my philosophy that all these uses can be enjoyed on any sizable area at the same time. Surely there are areas like camp grounds and roadsides where neither timber cutting nor grazing can be allowed, or if it is allowed, then restricted to the off-season. There are winter ranges which must be held for game, and there are areas where the system of timber cutting must be varied to meet public demands.

COOPERATION INSURES ALL GROUPS OF FOREST EQUIPMENT

"But, by and large, we can do all of these things on the same area if there is a fine degree of cooperation between the different classes of users; if we have tolerance of the other fellow's views and he of ours. Probably no single use can be enjoyed 100 percent under this multiple-use administration. But the stockman can enjoy 75 percent of the things he wants. The wildlifer can have perhaps 75 percent as much big game as he would have with complete elimination of livestock.

"The recreationist can get an equal part of the pleasure he wants from the hills even though some areas look bad immediately after logging or a band of sheep has trailed a road he travels and destroyed the wild flowers. That's multiple use. It's tolerance with the other man's viewpoint, so that our vast wilderness can do the most to improve our conditions."

This statement epitomizes the kind of chief forester Lyle F. Watts will probably be. An ardent conservationist, he nevertheless believes that the vast national forests of the United States can be adjusted to all the demands of a complex society, in war as well as in peace. Once he told me that an old pioneer in eastern Oregon said to him, "Remember the other fellow may be right." And Watts commented, "You have to approach issues with that kind of open mind. Otherwise you will be arbitrary and dogmatic and stubborn. No one is infallible."

Safeguarding the wilderness is practically a creed with this slender man who has made forestry his career. Trees to him are no mere inanimate growths.

WOODS HOLD DEEP MEANING FOR CHIEF FORESTER

As Watts strolls through a wood in Oregon or a grove in Montana, each sight has meaning for him—the acorns on the ground, the scars on the tree trunks, the patches of snow on the distant hills, the color of the water in the creeks, the chirping of the squirrels, the tracks of deer and elk. These things tell him about the health of the wilderness, just as veins and skin and eyes denote to a physician the condition of his patient. After a journey in eastern Oregon, Watts observed to Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court that he had seen some uplands grazed bare and that grazing would have to be watched.

Lyle Watts will not be the desk-pounding, noisy type of executive. He is essentially quiet. Around the logs of a leaping fire in the woods, I have seen him say less than anyone else in the group, although he, best of all, was qualified to comment on the topics of conversation. But when he did talk, every one listened and what he said was generally right to the core of the subject. "Mr. Watts knows an awful lot about the woods, doesn't he?" young Jimmy Rosenman, son of Judge Samuel I. Rosenman, asked me on a drive up the Hood River Valley one sunny afternoon 3 years ago.

Watts' friends in the Pacific Northwest are legion. They include fellow foresters like Jack Horton, John Kuhns, and Arnold Standing, lumber industry men like E. T. Clark and Colonel Greeley, wildlife authorities like William L. Finley, forestry experts like Dr. George W. Peavey, planners like Lt. Col. Roy Bessey. Not for many years has anyone from the far West been elevated to the principal forestry position in the land. Men who have been associated with Lyle F. Watts feel certain he wil establish a distinguished precedent. And they also point to the advantage of having America's forest resources supervised by a man thoroughly familiar with the dominant forest region of the continent, the Pacific Northwest.

Socialistic Experiments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to pay tribute to those fighting forces of ours who are daily achieving brilliant victories on the fighting fronts of the world. They deserve the heartfelt thanks of all of the American people. This because of organization, coordination, and team work which is responsible for these outstanding victories.

I also want to call your attention to the home front where, instead of having teamwork and organization, we have confusion and social reforms to such an extent that we are scattering our hits in so many different directions we are winning no ball games on the home front.

Social reform must go on in spite of the fact that we are in this all-out war with our backs up against the wall like we never had our backs against the wall before.

The bureaucrats are insistent on putting across their grade-labeling program, simplification and standardization program, and many other programs that would revolutionize and regiment our economic life, and bring disorder to many industries that are now working along smoothly, causing confusion in making these change-overs when time is so important an element in this war effort.

I also want to call to your attention an editorial appearing in the Times-Herald of Saturday, March 6, entitled "What For?" which indicates an aroused public are indignant at these attempts to sabotage our system of free enterprise.

The editorial follows:

WHAT FOR?

Your attention is called to a cartoon by Mr. Burris Jenkins in the upper right-hand side of this page for a quick eye-summary of a matter which has been the subject of much undercover contention here for some time.

WOULD WIPE OUT ALL BRAND NAMES

As Mr. JENKINS indicates, there is a strong campaign down at the War Production Board to wipe out trade-marks and branded titles for various kinds of soap, soup, and similar consumer items, substituting therefor "standard uniform grades" to sell at fixed prices everywhere.

Such projects have a strong appeal for people who like to think about planning a "total economy" for this Nation and the world.

In the minds of the planners, radio plugs, newspaper advertisements, and the efforts of salesmen and saleswomen peddling soap, all represent what the planners call economic waste. Instead, they would like to see a system in which manufacturing plants turn out Government authorized quotas of soap at Government authorized cost, and said soap then distributed to users through Government authorized sales stations at Government authorized prices.

THREE EXPERIMENTS—THREE FAILURES

The only trouble with all this lovely imagining is that nobody knows how to make it work out in real life.

Three times in the modern era this socialistic experiment has been tried, and three times it has failed.

In Russia, 25 years ago—that's a quarter of a century—a project was started. Certain difficulties arose, in view of the fact that while some people wanted to try one way of working out the great over-all plan for pie in the sky, others wanted another way. One immovable plan collided with another irresistible one, while Russians went without things to eat and wear.

Big-scale shooting followed and never stopped up to the time Russia got in a foreign war. What has happened since we don't know.

When Italy attempted to imitate Russian socialism with Mussolini's pet version, which he labeled not "communism" but "fascism," plans were made out Italian style. Shortages followed. And so minorities in disagreement were physically exterminated.

Then the third great planner, one A. Schickelgruber, attempted to produce a super-duper improvement on the two earlier projects. He, too, found it impossible to run his country on production-for-use lines without shooting and shortages.

These troubles were already almost unbearable for the Russian, Italian, and German people in peace. What must they be like in war?

YOU'RE ON YOUR OWN UNDER OUR SYSTEM

The American system, on the other hand, has been to let each soap maker scratch for himself and go bust or get rich, according to his ability to gage his business. With what result?

The American production of things people need and want is the greatest in the world. The American system of distributing to the people what they want when they want it is the best in the world.

It just happens that the outward workings of the American system show in the form of advertising and salesmanship. The important fact is that the said system produces and delivers the goods. The other system—no matter how you label it—doesn't.

Now that we are in this war, shortages are bound to overstrain some parts of our machine for making and distributing what people want when they want it.

But that's no reason to junk the machine. Our military men are fighting to protect it.

How do you think they would react to the discovery that somebody at home is trying to destroy what they are fighting to preserve?

Faith in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by E. O. Osborn:

FAITH IN CONGRESS

In memory you may recall
The days that used to be
When Congress was the people's voice
In Washington, D. C.

Dictators and commissioners
And czars of doubtful hue
Are now performing all the tasks
Our Congress used to do.

Emergencies, contingencies,
And wars provide a plan
To put our Congress on the shelf
And try the superman.

Our Government "of, by, and for"
We knew so long before,
Like Nellie who went far away,
Don't live here any more.

Joe Congress has our confidence;
He is the man we know,
And we don't want to meet the guy
Who came to talk for Joe.
—*E. O. Osborn.*

Pay-As-You-Go Delay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. D. McWILLIAMS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Norwich Morning Bulletin of Saturday, February 27, 1943.

Mr. Speaker, the good citizens of eastern Connecticut are becoming impatient at the delay of Congress in not acting on a pay-as-you-go tax plan. I realize this matter is in committee and will come to the floor of the House very soon. But the impatience of our citizens is crystallized and aptly expressed in the following editorial:

PAY-AS-YOU-GO DELAY

Although it has long since been recognized that there is no chance of a pay-as-you-go bill being adopted by Congress ahead of the first payment on the income tax March 15, there has been no demonstration of an early effort to present such a measure for action in the House, where it must of necessity originate.

There is a delay which is disturbing, and to such an extent that it is not surprising that warning has been given that if the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee doesn't stir itself and produce something along the line of the Ruml idea, there will be action taken to relieve the committee of its task and the Ruml plan will be called on the floor for consideration.

It is apparent that the Treasury Department is opposed to Mr. Ruml's suggestion. It seems to object to anything that doesn't originate within administration circles. But the suggestions which have been advanced by the Treasury Department have not received a good reception, while there has been a widespread demand from all over the country for the adoption of the Ruml plan and the advantages it would give to the taxpayers.

Smoke screens have been set up in order to create a prejudice against the Ruml plan. The aim has been to confuse the public, and yet, where public sentiment has been sounded, it has been found to be favorable to such a plan. In the face of this, and the facts brought out at the hearing, the sub-committee hasn't done anything, although it is time when the taxpayers ought to be given some idea of what they can expect.

It is evident that they must pay a portion of their tax by the 15th of March, and it has been intimated that the second quarterly payment will have to be made on the same basis June 15. But it is time it was settled. It is time it was determined whether the old plan is to be retained, or whether the advantage of the pay-as-you-go plan is to be furnished.

Address by Under Secretary of State at Convocation of University of Toronto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, at the convocation of the University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, on February 26, 1943. This is a very illuminating and inspiring address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am desply conscious of the privilege you have afforded me of addressing this convocation of the University of Toronto.

During the century of its magnificently vigorous life this great institution of learning has become, in the field of education, one of the recognized glories of our New World. In its notable contributions to the welfare of humanity and to the inspiration of the human spirit, all of us who are citizens of the Western Hemisphere can justly feel satisfaction and pride.

It is for that reason that I am so greatly honored by the degree which the University of Toronto is today conferring upon me.

I know, of course, of the long line of graduates from these halls who have distinguished themselves in so many varied branches of public endeavor, and I am therefore also peculiarly gratified that from now on I may lay claim—at least an honorary claim—to a connection with the university from which graduated the present Prime Minister of Canada.

You will, I feel, permit me to say that while I know how highly and how justly his outstanding abilities and achievements are recognized in other parts of the world, there is no place outside of his own country where he has won more affectionate regard, or a higher measure of sincere admiration, than in the United States. The peoples of our two countries are singularly blessed, in these the most critical moments of their history, that the guidance of the destinies of our two nations should have been entrusted at this time to two men, Mackenzie King and Franklin Roosevelt, who have ever believed in the need for complete confidence and understanding between the peoples of Canada and of the United States, and who have done more than any other two men similarly placed in the course of our national lives to strengthen in real and practical fashion that friendship which is so vital to the well-being and to the security of us both.

Today our peoples are fighting side by side to defend their liberties and to bring to utter defeat the band of dictators who have dared to think they could extinguish the light of democracy in the modern world. And we recognize fully how long and bitter the road may still be before the final victory is won.

Canada and the United States have had very similar problems in this war.

We have met them in similar ways, and in collaboration, in the spirit of the Ogdensburg and the Hyde Park agreements.

Our naval and military forces are cooperating closely in both oceans, and on our land frontiers. In production we have both faced shortages of raw materials, labor, and manufacturing facilities, and our Governments have imposed effective, and often parallel, controls to overcome these shortages. We have both put our civilian economy on rations, increased taxation, and regulated prices. We have sought to supply each other with the things of which one of us was short, and to coordinate our production facilities and resources in the most effective ways.

Both of us are arsenals of the United Nations, and in that, too, we have followed a like policy. That policy is first that food and munitions are dispatched to the places where they can be most useful in the conduct of the common war, and second that deliveries to countries that are not in position to make payment now are on terms that do not create impossible financial obligations later. Both of us are seeking to avoid the creation of uncollectible and trouble-breeding war debts.

The present high degree of economic cooperation between our two countries for the purpose of making as great a contribution as possible to the pooled war effort of the United Nations is extremely gratifying to us and must be so to our allies. Fortunately, the groundwork for this close collaboration was laid years before the outbreak of war. I refer primarily to the two reciprocal trade agreements between us, the first of which entered into force on January 1, 1936, and the second of which, replacing the first, became effective on January 1, 1939, the first day of the year in which Hitler forced upon Europe the war that was destined to spread over the globe.

The trade agreements we entered into in the days of precarious peace went a long way to heal the economic wounds, and attendant ill feeling, each of us had dealt the other in earlier years after the First World War.

On my side of the line, there had been the so-called Emergency Tariff Act of 1921, followed immediately by a general upward revision of the tariff in the act of 1922; then, on the brink of the worst economic depression the world has suffered, came the monumental barrier created by the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930. In our Revenue Act of 1932, two of the four products subjected to new excise taxes by means of a rider to that legislation—lumber and copper—were and are of great interest to Canada. These measures in their collective effect struck hard

at the trade of other countries. Canada felt the effects as much as any other country—perhaps more than any other.

Action on your side of the line was not slow in coming. You may recall that Canadian duties on a considerable number of products normally imported from the United States were raised automatically to the levels provided for on the same products in our Tariff Act of 1930. Everyone remembers the Ottawa agreements of 1932, when the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations turned their backs upon the United States and all countries and made a desperate effort to make up for lost and depressed markets elsewhere by tariff preferences intended to encourage an expansion of trade within the British Empire. Every country felt the effects of the Ottawa agreements; none, I believe, more than did the United States.

I mention these historical facts because they serve to remind us of past mistakes, still by no means completely remedied, that must be avoided after this most costly of all wars, in men and wealth, has been brought to an end by our common victory. They also serve to emphasize the fundamental necessity of carrying forward constructively the task of economic cooperation between us begun with the first trade agreement and continued ever since.

The governments of your country and mine see eye to eye on this. They have formally declared their intention to seek common goals in peace as well as in war.

On November 30 last, in an exchange of notes, our two Governments took another important step along the road to a better world after victory. We agreed not only to try to promote mutually advantageous economic relations between ourselves, but to seek the cooperation of other nations of like mind in promoting the betterment of world-wide economic relations. These aims involve appropriate national and international measures to expand production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods; elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce; reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers; and, generally, attainment of the economic objectives of the Atlantic Charter, through the collaboration of the United Nations which are willing to join with us in the realization of these objectives.

Many of the United Nations, through article VII of their mutual-aid agreements with the United States, have already joined in this same declaration of post-war economic objectives.

Our two countries, in the same exchange of notes, have expressed our intention to do something concrete about our declaration of aims by discussing soon with other United Nations how we two and other like-minded nations can agree upon a program to carry out these aims. They seek to furnish to the world practical evidence of the ways in which two neighboring countries that have a long experience of friendly relations and a high degree of economic interdependence, and that share the conviction that such reciprocally beneficial relations must form part of a general system, may promote by agreed action their mutual interests to the benefit of themselves and other countries.

I am not so bold as to venture a prediction here as to the details of such a program. However, I am confident that we can march together, with other forward-looking nations, along the road to a fruitful and secure post-war world, provided the people on both sides of the line support their governments with understanding and determination in their efforts to do everything within their power to achieve these great objectives.

When the war ends similar problems will face us both. We shall both confront the task of demobilization, and we shall both endeavor to make sure that the young men—and young women—who are discharged from military service have a real chance to find useful and productive employment. Both of us prefer a system of free enterprise, and we shall both desire to lighten government controls as rapidly as the phenomenon of scarcity vanishes and conditions permit free enterprise to play its proper role. Both of us will find our industries still working largely on war orders, and the problems of conversion will be urgent. Both of us will want to make our contribution to the relief and reconstruction of the devastated countries, and we shall want to make that contribution in the way which will help the peoples of those regions get back to health and strength and to self-reliance as rapidly as possible. We shall both be interested in possible international arrangements about gold, and currencies, and international investment. And we shall both desire to increase the economic interchange between us and with others on the most fruitful basis possible.

On all these questions we can talk usefully together as we have agreed to do. Our discussions will become even more useful as we undertake to conduct them in an even larger framework, the framework of the whole United Nations. There is no disagreement anywhere as to what the United Nations want. They want full employment for their people at good wages and under good working conditions, and the other physical and institutional arrangements that add up to freedom from want. But differences of opinion doubtless exist within and between the several countries as to the means to be adopted—divergencies may arise as to the desirability or efficacy of particular policies or measures.

An examination of the causes of any disagreement will usually reveal that it exists mainly because people are considering the question from different viewpoints, that the parties are basing their judgments on different or incomplete facts and different considerations. If both parties had the same facts and considerations in mind, and if each knew fully the reasons behind the position taken by the other, there would much more quickly be a meeting of minds.

This is true not only of individuals, but also of nations, and it suggests the need for joint as well as separate study of the facts and considerations relating to proposals aimed at attaining the desired ends. I believe that if the United Nations were to set up machinery for the purpose of assembling and studying all international aspects of problems under the general heading of freedom from want, and for assembling all the pertinent facts and considerations relating thereto, and for jointly analyzing all facts and considerations relating to measures or policies proposed for furthering the end in view, the controversies and conflicts of policy which have so long embittered relations in the international economic field, and therefore generally, might largely disappear. If the analysis were thorough enough, and the problems of each country were fully understood by the others, solutions could be found that would serve the interests of all concerned. Nothing is more clear to my mind than this: If all aspects of an economic problem were explored, it would become apparent that the basic interests of all countries are largely common interests, that each country's economic problems are related to and inseparable from, those of the others.

A United Nations study such as I have in mind would explore in a careful, thorough, and systematic way world problems in the economic field, toward the solution of which much progress must be made if we are to have anything approaching the goal of freedom from want in our own countries or elsewhere. People and governments here and everywhere are studying these problems; are searching for solutions. The plans of one government or group of governments may seem sound enough in the light of their own interests, but may contain flaws which are visible only from the viewpoint of other governments or countries. If the study to which I have referred did no more than detect and focus attention on such flaws, if it did no more than prevent the crystallization in one country or group of countries of ideas which are objectionable from the viewpoint of others, it would serve a highly useful purpose. It is, however, my hope and belief that a United Nations undertaking such as I have suggested would be able to formulate plans and recommendations of a constructive sort—to find, so to speak, common denominators which, in the net, would be advantageous to all. Failing to begin such organized study and discussion now, there is danger that divergent views and policies may become crystallized, to the detriment of the common war effort, and to the detriment of efforts to bring about a peace that will be more than a brief and uneasy interlude before another even more horrible and more destructive war devastates and depopulates the world.

My Government believes that the initiation of such studies is already overdue. If we do not make a start now, there is danger that we shall be brought together to make the peace with as many plans as there are governments. The day of complete victory cannot come too soon; we all give thanks to God for every advance we make toward that goal at every sign of weakness in our enemies. Between now and that day we must endeavor to prepare ourselves to meet the responsibilities and to make the most of the opportunities that peace will bring.

I am glad to say that my Government intends at once to undertake discussions with other members of the United Nations as to the most practical and effective methods through which these vitally necessary conferences and consultations between us all can be held. It is my conviction that from these meetings a large measure of agreement will already be found to exist, that solutions will be available for such divergencies as may be apparent, and that in the last analysis it will be found that what may even appear to be fundamental obstacles can be resolved in the interest of the welfare of us all.

What the people of the United States are striving for, I am persuaded, is exactly what the people of Canada are striving for. They seek the attainment of the noble objectives set forth in the Atlantic Charter. They seek to achieve these ends, not because of any altruistic motives, not through the dictates of any theoretical idealism, but rather because they believe that the attainment of these objectives will be in their own self-interest—and I believe that in my own country we have learned through the bitter experience of the past quarter of a century that the most practical form of self-interest is enlightened self-interest.

We have seen beyond the shadow of any doubt that a policy of international cooperation which far too many told us 24 years ago was a policy of suicidal sentimentality, was in fact a policy of advantageous hard-headed realism.

Most of us have learned a great truth that is beginning to dawn upon the consciousness of many peoples in all parts of the globe, and that is that the real self-interest of one nation coincides with the permanent, with the ultimate, self-interests of other nations.

For there is no people which will not benefit more by peace than by war. The preservation of peace and the practice of human tolerance must come to be recognized by every nation and by every government as the indispensable requisites of all peoples. Never again can humanity permit dictator demagogues once more to proclaim the alleged

virile glories of war or the cruel falsehood that there exists a master race.

No rational man or woman today can question the fact that had the nations of the world been able to create some effective form of international organization in the years that followed the close of the last great World War, and had been able to bulwark that organization with judicial and police powers, the devastating tragedy which humanity today is undergoing would have been avoided. From the standpoint of material self-interest alone, leaving aside every moral consideration, the lot of every one of our fellow citizens would have been far better. No one can appraise the cost of the present war in terms of life and human suffering. But we can appraise its cost in material terms, and we know that as a result of this material cost, the standard of living of every individual in every region of the world will be impaired.

If at the conclusion of this war the governments of the United Nations are not afforded by their peoples the opportunity of collaborating together in effective policies of recovery, or of assuming a joint responsibility for making completely sure that the peace of the world is not again violated, there can be no result other than utter disaster. The structure of our civilization is not so tough as to make it conceivable that it would resist a repetition of the present holocaust.

We have evolved here in the New World a system of international relationships which constitutes perhaps the highest achievement in the sphere of practical international living which civilized man has so far created. From the historical standpoint it is very recent indeed, but it has grown, gradually perhaps but nevertheless steadily, throughout the period of the individual life of the democracies of the Americas. It is a system in which the smallest state is just as free to determine its own destiny as the largest state. It is a system where the smallest state feels just as secure as the largest state, because of its knowledge that its independence and integrity are a matter of vital concern to its more powerful neighbors, and because of its assurance that should its liberties be jeopardized by aggression coming from without the Western Hemisphere, its more powerful neighbors will take the action necessary to repel that danger.

Every region of the world possesses its own peculiar problems, its own special advantages, and its own inherent difficulties. We hear much of the age-old rivalries which have persisted in Europe and in other quarters of the globe. But I think that we of the Americas can say that if 22 independent democracies such as those which occupy North, Central, and South America—of different races, of different languages, and of different origins—can achieve the measure of progress which we now have achieved, toward a peaceful and humane relationship, and toward profitable economic cooperation, that same form of relationship can be achieved in all regions of the world.

The creation of that same kind of decent international relationship by all peoples is the objective today of the United Nations. I am confident that after the unconditional surrender of our common enemies that objective will be attained.

Through our continued cooperation the peace of the world can be maintained, for with the defeat and total disarmament of the Axis Powers there can be no further conflict—if the United Nations stand together.

We cannot permit this time that the supreme sacrifice which our sons and our brothers are making in the defense of our liberties shall be made in vain. Only through our combined efforts can we make certain that the victory which we will win in battle can become in fact the victory of peace.

War Guilt and Punishment for War Crimes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article prepared by me and appearing in the February issue of the American Magazine dealing with the subject of war guilt and the problem of punishment, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WE MUST DO WITH THE WAR CRIMINALS

(By ELBERT D. THOMAS, United States Senator)

(Senator THOMAS is one of Congress' leading authorities on international affairs. He has lived widely in Europe and the Far East. For 5 years he served as a missionary in Japan and later traveled extensively in the Orient, studying its people, customs, and languages. He is chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and a member of several other important committees, including Foreign Relations and Military Affairs.)

Deep in the secret archives of the United Nations there is being built up, name by name, one of the most infamous rosters in the history of the modern world. It is a list of individuals responsible for atrocities in this war, with detailed recitals of their crimes.

At the close of hostilities that list is to be handed to commanders of our armies of occupation with instructions to arrest the suspects and imprison them pending trial.

Thus will begin the final and perhaps most dramatic act of the war.

If we play our roles well in the war-guilt trials, if we handle our responsibilities intelligently, seeing to it that guilt is properly allocated and the guilty appropriately punished, we shall be able to lay the foundation for enduring world peace. If we bungle the job, we may bring war upon the world again within a generation. It would be easy to bungle.

That is why we must begin now to formulate hard-and-fast plans and policies looking toward the perpetuation of peace, and no problem that confronts us is more vital than our treatment of those responsible for the world's misery. I am fully aware that we have a long way to go before the war is won, a long way and a hard way, but I know also that we must be forward-looking if we are to make world peace easier, better, and longer-lasting when it comes. * * *

War criminals fall into three groups.

First and least important are small fry whose brutalities over and beyond the practices of warfare brought humiliation, physical suffering, or death to helpless victims. This group would include the officers who ordered or sanctioned the unspeakable indignities inflicted upon Chinese civilians at Nanking and a dozen other scenes of rape and massacre. It would include the commanding officers of concentration camps and prisons where torture was practiced. It would, in short, include all persons who used their power to wreak unnecessary cruelties upon human beings who could not protect themselves.

This list is already long, and it grows day by day. Not one of these men shall escape; you may be assured of that. But I say they are least important in the broad picture of war guilt, because their trial and punishment involve no problems of policies or politics. They are common criminals, and must be handed over to military courts-martial set up by the Armies of Occupation for the swift justice they deserve.

The second group of war criminals is composed of the Quislings, the traitors. It is not a large group, nor is it entitled to any special consideration. These individuals stand charged with a specific crime, the crime of treason against their own countrymen. Therefore, when the nations are reconstructed, it is just and fair that men such as these should be turned over to their betrayed countrymen for trial and punishment. I feel sure the Norwegians, for instance, will know how to handle their Quisling.

The third group of war criminals is composed of the leaders—Hitler and his satellites, Mussolini and his aides, Tojo and his associates. Each of these groups presents a particular problem and must have individual treatment.

What shall we do with these men who plunged the world into war?

We must deal with them wisely, for upon our treatment of them hangs much of the future peace of the world. We must deal with them sanely, without passion, being careful not to violate a single tenet of international law, for if we are going to set up an association of nations that will maintain peace by mutual observance of law and order, we must set an example at the outset.

Yet we cannot permit them to go free. The world can't take a chance on men such as these.

It is a strange fact that in all the world at present there does not exist a single court of law with sufficient jurisdiction to try criminals of this category. The World Court couldn't do it; it is essentially dedicated to adjudicating disputes between nations, not judging criminal cases. So, looking forward and making plans, we can see that certain steps must be taken.

First, a war-guilt clause must be embodied in the peace treaty.

Second, provision must be made for the establishment of an international criminal court to try the heads of the offending nations.

Third, authority must be designated for the execution of the sentences imposed.

Let me make one thing clear: By the word "execution" I do not mean to imply that I consider the death sentence fitting or desirable for men of this character. On the contrary, I should be unalterably opposed to it, not because it would be an unjust penalty, but because it would be inadequate.

The firing squad or the hangman's noose would only elevate these men to the stature of martyrdom in the eyes of their unregenerate followers. To see them hanging by ropes would not effect a cure for the little ills they brought upon mankind, nor act as a deterrent for others who might seek to follow them in aspiring to world domination. Dead, they would be forgotten too soon.

No, I believe their penalty should be to live in solitary exile, like beasts in cages, as constant reminders that society will tolerate no more such transgressions against common decency.

I should favor the living death of an exile which would debar them from all contact with other human beings, and I confess frankly that I have taken the notion from the story of Cain and Abel. You remember that the Lord, discovering the murder of Abel, told Cain He would send him away to be "a fugitive and a vagabond . . . in the earth."

Cain pleaded for mercy. "My punishment is greater than I can bear," he cried. "Everyone that findeth me shall slay me."

But the Lord made sure that Cain should not be assassinated, first by putting a mark upon him so that he could be recognized, and second by giving warning to the world that "whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold."

The murder of Abel, as a single act of violence against an individual, was not the crime for which Cain was punished. He was punished because murder constitutes a crime against society.

We have an exact parallel in the case of the war criminals. They should be forced to live as pariahs, marked, shunned, detested, shorn of all right to respect, fellowship, or consideration. The Lord thought this was the most severe punishment He could inflict, and it has been my observation that the Lord does a pretty good job of meting out justice.

Our problem will be finding a place to send them. By precedent, we should permit them asylum in neutral nations. But that would not cut them off from human contacts, which would be potentially dangerous to world safety. Too, neutral nations will be hard to find when this war is over.

I believe the victorious United Nations should select isolated islands and set them up as No Man's Lands under control of the Inter-Allied Peace Council. Some of these islands might be utilized as international police bases, but three of them should be set aside specifically for the residences-in-exile of Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo.

We should build no villas for these men; we should give them habitations compatible with the simple, Spartan ideals to which they pretended. After all, the sort of profound mediation which makes for spiritual purification and enlightenment flourishes in such stark monastic environment. No ship should ever be permitted to touch the shores of these islands, and the only contacts of the exiles with the world should be the international sentries forever patrolling their shores.

But perhaps we are getting the cart before the horse. Perhaps we are discussing methods of punishment before we have established the guilt of these men. After all, what crime have they committed? Let us examine the legal aspects of the charges which can be brought against them.

First, Hitler * * *

Twenty-five years ago, our soldiers marched away to "Hang the Kaiser." Do you remember? We were going to do all sorts of unpleasant things to him. In England, an election was won on a promise to "Hang the Kaiser," and in that spirit a war-guilt clause was written into the Versailles Treaty.

We did not hang the Kaiser; everyone knows that. He lived to a rich old age in sumptuous mock majesty, attended by his courtiers and protected by his guards. Technically, he was in exile. Practically, he was free. He even managed to accumulate a good hausfrau to care for him in his dotage.

In all fairness, perhaps the Kaiser deserved no greater punishment. Legally, he was guilty of no crime against society. His was a crime only against the nations his armies actually attacked (and in another sense, against his own people), for at that time war was a commonly accepted instrument of national endeavor, and had been so recognized for centuries. So, when the Kaiser went to war, he was exercising a normal and legal means of attaining a goal for his country.

The Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928 changed all that. When the great powers signed that agreement renouncing war as an instrument of national policy, war in that instant became an act of outlawry, a crime against society, against the whole human family.

Thus, when Hitler marched into Poland in 1939, he was committing a crime not against Poland alone, but against all nations. With that act, in that moment, Hitler became a world criminal.

His perfidy was made more flagrant by the fact that he had violated the solemn pledge of his people, since Germany, too, had signed the non-war pact.

His status can by no stretch of the imagination be compared with that of the Kaiser in the last war, for Hitler lacks any pretense of the royal precepts and prerogatives that gave the Kaiser at least a hereditary right to order his people to war. Hitler has no royal properties. He rules only by arbitrary assumption of power. His personal lineage is tainted. He is not even a German.

We cannot accept him at the peace table; he has forfeited all right to enter into any sort of negotiations with other nations, for he cannot enter with clean hands. He cannot be considered an honorable adversary. He has fallen to the state of a common criminal.

If we are able to apprehend him before he takes his own life, banishment and ostracism must be his penance, so that he may feel every day the contempt of all mankind and experience the hunger that results from denial of all human companionship. Let's not forget that the peace of the world lasted a long time after Napoleon was exiled; that can be our precedent and guide.

When Hitler stands before the bar of justice I imagine he will fall back upon the plea that he is being martyred. I should like to see him try to prove that contention to the mothers, wives, and sweethearts of the German soldiers he sent to their deaths. * * *

With Mussolini, our greatest danger will be to guard against our sense of humor. Poor, baffled Benito presents a lugubrious picture as the war rolls on. Shouldered around by his stronger partner, bedeviled by swarms of ubiquitous Gestapo agents and recurring rumors of revolution, while Allied airmen rain bombs upon his cities and Allied troops threaten momentarily to invade his coasts, Mussolini is in a sad way.

Our American impulse is to feel sorry for him. This is a laudable emotion so long as we keep it under control. We must not permit our emotions to cloud the cold facts. When Mussolini stabbed France in the back, he, too, became an outlaw in the eyes of world society. It is a step he can never retract.

True, he is more of a properly constituted spokesman for Italy than Hitler is for Germany, for the king still reigns in Italy, even if he doesn't rule, and parliament is still there, even if it doesn't enact any laws.

Mussolini has been a fool. When he personally assumed responsibility for Italy's partnership in the Axis, he took upon his own person the liability for his country's war guilt. And so it is Mussolini, the man, who must pay the penalty.

Yet I am not at all sure that we shall find it possible to bring Mussolini to trial. I predict that the Italian people will attend to him in their own fashion, once the growing wave of dissatisfaction reaches its crest.

If he is spared for trial, what defense can Mussolini offer? I can imagine only one—the defense that weak, spineless individuals have relied upon since Eve: "He made me do it!"

I can imagine also, how Italy's widows and orphans will relish that. * * *

There can be no doubt that Japan committed an act of utter madness when she threw herself into the war against the United States and England. Knowing Japan, I am convinced it was an act of renegade Japanese, and the extent of their guilt can be determined only when we know the full extent of their renegadism. The picture is still far from clear. Even when all the details are known, it will be difficult to fasten guilt upon individuals.

It has become fashionable to speak of hanging Hirohito. It is a serious mistake even to joke about such an act. The Japanese emperor, the Son of Heaven, is never responsible under Japanese laws for the acts of the Japanese government. The emperor is an institution aside and apart from the government, and around that institution and stemming from it are the national religion, the national constitution, all the courts and governmental processes—the entire Japanese social system.

There is much that is good in the institution of the Son of Heaven, much that is stabilizing. The man himself can never be considered as a political person. He is not commander in chief of his armed forces, as are Hitler and Mussolini. He is a diety, and as such is a stabilizer. We must be extremely careful not to tear down any stabilizing influence that remains anywhere in the world when the war is over; we shall need every one we can find.

Touching the person of Emperor Hirohito, or the institution he symbolizes, would be deemed a sacrilege by millions of Japanese. It would solidify sentiment against us and could only lead to vengeance, probably in the form of a new war, as well as blighting every ideal that might be advanced in support of justice. If the institution of the Son of Heaven is to be altered, the Japanese people themselves must alter it, and this possibility is remote.

What about Tojo? Well, we caricature Tojo and speak of the dreadful things we are going to do to him, yet the charge that Tojo is a dictator is no more justified than charging that President Roosevelt is a dictator. Tojo, like Roosevelt, has operated to date in rigid accordance with the established laws of his country, but his methods make it advisable to remove him from circulation.

It is true that Japan committed a crime against human society when she struck at Pearl Harbor, and she must be punished. Many of her leaders besides Tojo must be brought to trial. Matsuoka, for example, who taught Japan how to break treaties; his followers, who aped the worst qualities of Hitler and Mussolini; Kurusu, who was babbling of peace as Pearl Harbor was attacked; the military men who ordered or sanctioned atrocities against innocent civilians and helpless prisoners of war—all these and others guilty of crimes against decency must be held to answer.

We must smash the military and naval establishments of Japan, disband her army, destroy her navy, take away Korea, Manchuria, Malaya, Malaysia, and all other territory she has accumulated in her aggressive madness, and reduce her to comparative impotence in world affairs. Japan was lifted to one of the world's great powers after the last war. She has shown that the honor went to her head. She has lost the right to a second opportunity for some time.

When the bells ring and the whistles blow heralding the winning of the war, we shall be just beginning the task of winning the peace.

We must, above all things, renounce all spirit of hatred or vengeance. We must create universal faith in the integrity of the people who are to enforce the peace. We must be certain that these individuals have the confidence not only of their own people but of the people upon whom they must pass judgment.

This is the American way, and I deny that it is the soft way. It is the way of decency and fairness, and upon such sentiments we must build all our deeds if peace is to endure.

A Heartening Telegram

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the present shortage of farm labor and farm machinery the leaders of Boone

County, Ill., one of the counties in my district, have girded up their loins, surveyed the possibilities for increased farm production to supply urgent war needs, and have determined to do their part to produce increased crops. As a result of their efforts, they report to the Nation, by telegram, substantial increases in vital farm crops in that county as goals for 1943 over 1942. The following telegram tells the story:

BELVIDERE, ILL., *March 8, 1943.*

Hon. N. M. MASON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Boone County reports to the Nation an intention to produce: War crops, 4.0 percent increase; corn, 8.7 percent increase; truck crops, 7.1 percent increase; sows to farrow, spring, 7.9 percent increase; sows to farrow, fall, 6.8 percent increase; milk cows, 9.0 percent increase; hens and pullets, 9.4 percent increase.

VERNE BARNES,
Secretary, Chamber of Commerce.
HAROLD LAMBERT,
Bonus Grange.
FRED GALLANO,
Pomona Grange.
Rev. ALLEN DARLING.

Mr. Speaker, the encouraging increases in farm production goals listed in this telegram are very heartening in this era of shortages, and establishes a standard for other counties to strive to attain. We need more leaders of this type all over America.

Getting Ready for A. D. 2039

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann entitled "Getting Ready for A. D. 2039," which appeared in the Washington Post of Tuesday, March 9, 1943:

GETTING READY FOR A. D. 2039

(By Walter Lippmann)

Although there seems to be no doubt that Congress will vote to extend lend-lease, much remains to be done to clarify the national policy of which the act is the instrument. Senator TYDINGS, for example, has written an article for the United Press, which makes the following argument:

1. The United States is giving our allies munitions of war and "the only return for these gifts is the comparatively small amount of goods and services that our foreign allies are giving to our armed forces on foreign soil. Otherwise lend-lease is a one-way street from the United States to our allies."

2. But Senator TYDINGS will vote to continue lend-lease "because the stronger we make our allies the more quickly our enemies will be defeated and the less life all concerned shall lose if the war is shortened."

3. Nevertheless, since all we get out of lend-lease is the "comparatively small" return of defeating our enemies more quickly and losing less lives, Senator TYDINGS feels that we ought to ask for a still bigger return. And Mr. TYDINGS' idea of a bigger return is that the land leased to us on British West Indian Islands for 99 years should be owned outright.

Mr. TYDINGS feels that as a far-sighted statesman he must make sure that in the year A. D. 2039 there is no argument with Britain about renewing the leases to the land we are using in these British islands. He would rather have an argument now in which the British Parliament and the American Congress and the legislative assemblies of these British colonies have to debate and vote on the momentous question of what is to become of these bases in the middle of the next century.

There is such a thing as being so far-sighted that you do not see what is right in front of you. And the reason that Senator TYDINGS is so far-sighted about the year A. D. 2039 is that he is not seeing the years A. D. 1943 and A. D. 1944. If he did see what is right in front of us, he would not be saying in one breath that lend-lease is a one-way street and in the next that it will shorten the war by defeating our enemies more quickly. For if lend-lease will shorten the war, it is not a one-way street. And if it brings us the quicker defeat of our enemies and the saving of many lives, the return on lend-lease is not "comparatively small" but infinitely great.

As a matter of fact, it is high time that a Senator of the United States stopped talking about our "generosity" in sending supplies to Britain, Russia, China, and our other allies. It was very handsome of Mr. Churchill to say that lend-lease was "the most generous act by any government in the world's history." But let us not deceive ourselves. If Great Britain had not won the Battle of Britain, Rommel and not General Eisenhower would be in Dakar and Casablanca today and Montgomery would not be at the Mareth line in Tunisia, and Hitler would be in Iceland and Greenland and the Azores, and there would almost certainly have been no Australia for General MacArthur to fall back upon when we lost the Philippines and we would not be in India preparing to reopen China for an attack on Japan, and in all directions we should certainly be in a frightful mess.

How then can a Senator talk about these great matters with such trifling condescension, as if an act of the most enlightened American national self-interest were like a rich man giving pennies to a beggar? The next thing you know somebody will get up and say that Eisenhower's and MacArthur's and Halsey's men ought to come back and thank the taxpayers for their generosity in giving them planes, tanks, guns, ships, and food to fight the enemy with. Does that sound absurd? What is the difference between an American plane flown by a British pilot from Tripoli, an American pilot from Tunisia, a Russian pilot from Stalingrad, or a Dutch pilot from Australia? Do the British, the Russian, and the Dutch pilots owe us anything for the use of the plane, or do we owe them something for their services?

Yet the notion persists in the minds of men like Senator TYDINGS that lend-lease is charity and not an American military policy. They had better get rid of the notion. They had better stop counting the pennies to see how the money value of what we have contributed compares with the money value of what we are receiving. There are many indications that the European war is going to be brought to an end by campaigns in which the British and the Russian contributions in blood and treasure will have been enormously greater than our own. Let us not be in a position of expecting to be repaid by our allies for our smaller contribution to the victory.

And let us remember that when the war ends in Europe, there will still be the war in the Pacific, and that we are counting on the British and Chinese. We shall also not wish to reject the help of Russia. We have a right to believe that our allies will in their own interest do all in their power to bring the Pacific war to a decisive and prompt conclusion. But if we teach them to think that our contribution in Europe was generosity that should be bargained about and repaid, we shall invite them to remind us that now it is their turn to be philanthropic, condescending, and picayune.

So I say that Senator TYDINGS and those whose views he reflects should not be so far-sighted about A. D. 2039, and should devote themselves to the American things that really matter right here and right now. The twentieth century has been a tough century, tough enough to occupy the attention of any Senator. The twenty-first century may for the time being be left to take care of itself.

Farm Production Will Lag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, planting time is here. Farmers must complete their preparations for the year's crops. The seasons will not wait on Government pronouncements or Government regulations. The average farmer, accustomed to years of Government supervision of his farm program, finds himself badly at a loss. The Department of Agriculture's 1943 program is incomplete and muddled. There is a terrible shortage of labor, a serious lack of machinery, equipment, and fertilizer. Time grows ominously short, and each passing day of uncertainty means greater reductions in next fall's crops. It is interesting to read Mark Sullivan's comments on this situation, and I include his noteworthy article herein:

FARMERS DISCOURAGED

(By Mark Sullivan)

The date can be fixed when official Washington woke up to the crisis about food production the coming summer. On March 6, Manpower Commissioner McNutt issued a hurried and belated order—that farmers be deferred in the draft. This will be a help, but only a slight and partial one. And it comes late.

Up to the first week of March, the attitude of Washington officials about food production had been confident. They reproached persons who cried warning. They had set a goal for this year's production—8 percent above last year's crops—and they thought the goal would be met.

Last week, however, Washington began to receive reports from some 3,000 county agents of the Agriculture Department. These predicted alarming reductions of spring planting. Upon receipt of these reports, Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, questioned by a Senate committee, said, with obvious concern and reluctance, that the prospect of getting production even equal to last year's "doesn't look very good now."

Actually, the prospect is more serious than the statistics show—this is a field in which the statistics lag materially behind the facts.

The survey by county agents of the Agriculture Department was made in February, when there was still time for farmers to plan their spring planting, and farmers still hoped that steps would be taken at Washington to relieve their handicaps—which are mainly shortage of labor and shortage of farm machinery. Today the time for planting is close at hand. In the interval, no helpful step was accomplished at Washington, until Mr. McNutt's order of March 6 deferring farmers in the draft.

Throughout February proposals to cure the farm situation encountered opposition and delay. Proposals that farmers be deferred, and that farmers already in the Army be released, had opposition from Army heads. The administration proposal of a subsidy to farmers had opposition from farm leaders, suspicious of the increased Government control which would accompany a subsidy. The proposals about organizing volunteer town persons to work on farms encounter skepticism from the farmers, who doubt their practicality. All the proposals, except the one about deferring farmers, are still in suspension. The truth is the farmers' chief handicap—lack of workers because of high wages paid in industry—is deeply rooted in the administration policy about labor, going back several years. Any present practical and sufficient remedy is difficult to envisage.

It is probable the reduction of food supplies will be even more serious than is now belatedly realized. A large contributing factor is the farmers' psychology, a thing not subject to statistics. These March days, as the sun warms the soil, the instinct of every farmer is to plow and plant, to the limit. But this year the farmer is discouraged, indignant. The mood is reflected in letters to this writer from practically every part of the country.

From Ottumwa, Iowa, a farmer-owner writes in a spirit of patient resignation to a somber and ominous condition: "Farmers are quitting farming in this locality. That does not mean that these farms will stand idle, but it does mean that production on these farms will be down. I employ two men, with myself part time. Last year we milked 13 cows, raised 100 hogs and 13 calves.

"Now one man will work our farm this coming season and he will do just what he can and that is all there will be to it. Our neighbors up and down the road for miles are experiencing the same thing. * * * Something that we never have experienced before is happening in the Corn Belt."

The spirit of a letter from Cedarville, Ohio, is indignation. In nearby cities, industrial plants doing Government work are paying wages to $10 and $12 a day. Because farmers cannot pay such wages, farms are drained of help. As a result, in a single county 2,000 acres of last year's crop of soybeans are still unharvested, and 20,000 acres of corn. "And farmers are now asked to plant more. * * * I have a herd of milking shorthorns. We have dropped out of milk production and are letting the calves have the whole milk. In 10 months they will bring $150 each. Think how much milk it takes to bring that amount at the local farm price of $2.70 a hundred pounds."

This last point may not be clear to city folks. It means that the price received for beef is so high and that received for milk so low that dairymen feed their milk to calves in order to make beef of them. The effect on milk supply for cities is bound to be grave. The time is late for remedy. To a farmer who in mid-March has not yet been able to arrange for help for the season, or has not yet surmounted the red tape and delay involved in getting more farm machinery, the die is cast.

The Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following supplemental list of names of farmers who have written me regarding the farm situation:

William Suttmann, Oldenburg, Ind.; Charles Comer & Sons, Osgood, Ind.; August Pepper, Peppertown, Ind.; Frank H. Reifel, Metamora, Ind.; Joe Myers, Sunman, Ind.; Charles W. Miller, Sunman, Ind.; Charles Hayes, Bedford, Ind.; William H. Baudendistel, Brookville, Ind.; Ben Fleckletman, Batesville, Ind.; Logan Thompson, Laurel, Ind.; Frank C. Curry, Okeana, Ohio; Harry M. Brier, College Corner, Ohio; William A. Stirn, Metamora, Ind.; Leo J. Werner, Batesville, Ind.; Wayne Sheeks, Bedford, Ind.; Joe Billman, Sunman, Ind.; Myrle Bunger, Rising Sun, Ind.; Henry C. Asche, Sunman, Ind.; Edw. F. Meddel, Brookville, Ind.; Leonard Gartenman, Brookville, Ind.; Fred B. Greene, Madison, Ind.; Monroe Crowell, College Corner, Ohio; Rolla Baudendistel, Brookville, Ohio; Clifford Evans, Brookville, Ohio; Richard O. Moley, Brookville, Ohio; Almont Reifel, Metamora, Ohio; Arthur J. Stone, Harrison, Ohio; Arthur Siekman, Rising Sun, Ind.; William Lagle, Pekin, Ind.

William McKinley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of President William McKinley, the event was celebrated by this House under the auspices of the Ohio delegation. I insert as an extension of my remarks a tribute to this great and good man by the Honorable E. E. Patton, of Knoxville, Tenn. This article is of historical worth and is one filled with human interest.

MCKINLEY, WAR PRESIDENT OF 1898, BORN 100 YEARS AGO TODAY—WAS A MASTER OF TACT

(By E. E. Patton)

Today is the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of William McKinley, our twenty-fourth President, who was in office during the Spanish-American War of 1898. Greater lawyers and statesmen have sat in the White House, but never a man with a higher regard for integrity, honesty, and truth, or a greater sympathy for unfortunate humanity. It is said that he could deny an office seeker and make the disappointed one think more of him than when he first approached the President.

Bob Taylor used to tell how, in the war of 1898, Tennessee had three regiments and was thus entitled to a brigadier general. The Governor appointed all of the officers from colonel down. Now Governor Taylor had long wanted to go to the Senate, and he thought if he had a military record it would put him there. So he got an appointment with the President, with whom he had served in Congress.

"He did not tell me," said Governor Taylor, "as he could have, that I did not know how to lay out a sanitary camp; that I could not protect the lives of my soldiers in camp or on the field of battle. He just slapped me on the shoulder and said: 'Governor, I'm afraid you might get killed.' Right then all my military ambition oozed out, and I left the White House thinking more of William McKinley than when I went in."

CHOSE SOUTHERN GENERALS

McKinley could oppose without rancor; he could fight without bitterness. When the Spanish-American war came on, he appointed as major generals Joe Wheeler of Alabama and Fitzhugh Lee of Virginia, and the nephew of Gen. Robert E. Lee—both of whom had worn the Confederate gray and had followed the Stars and Bars to Appomattox. This act did more to heal the wounds between the North and South than anything before or since. He held no resentment; he bore no grudges against former opponents and enemies. He regarded them as great Americans, and he felt they were capable.

During most of the time McKinley was in Congress, in the governor's mansion and in the White House, Mrs. McKinley was an almost helpless invalid. Yet his official duties were never too pressing for him to neglect the gracious lady who helped him to achieve fame and high office.

When Governor McKinley was on his way to Washington to take the oath as President, he traveled on a special train in which his aged mother was a passenger. Reporters aboard asked Mother McKinley what her reaction was to the high honor that had been bestowed on her boy.

She informed the reporters that she was praying a special prayer for her boy. And when pressed to know the burden and theme of this prayer, she said: "I am asking God to keep my boy humble and to make him an instrument in the hands of God to help humanity."

UNBOSSED BY HANNA

McKinley's name is generally linked with that of Mark Hanna, and, by many people, in a slighting manner. It was charged that Hanna owned and controlled McKinley, but there is not one word of truth in the statement. Hanna had been trying for years to promote the fortunes of some Ohio man and make him President.

In the pre-Convention days of 1896 McKinley, Myron T. Herrick, William R. Day, and other leading Republican figures in Ohio were invited to Hanna's home in Cleveland for Sunday dinner.

After the meal, the men went into the library to smoke and talk a little war strategy. Hanna informed the ex-Governor that, with the delegates they already had pledged from the Southern and border States, his nomination was assured and his election certain if they could get the support of the delegations from New York and Pennsylvania; that they could get both of them if Mr. McKinley would make one promise. He asked what that was, and Hanna told him that Matthew S. Quay, of Pennsylvania, and Thomas C. Platt, of New York, wanted Platt to be Secretary of the Treasury.

McKinley was immersed in thought as the smoke curled from his cigar. He replied: "Mark, some things in politics come too high." Senator Platt was never Secretary of the Treasury.

OHIOAN, UNION VETERAN

McKinley was born in Niles, Ohio, of Scotch-Irish parents. He went to Alleghany College in Pennsylvania and served 4 years in the Union Army, Ohio Volunteers. He enlisted as a private and came out brevet major.

After the war he took up law practice at Canton, Ohio, served as prosecuting attorney and then was elected to Congress, serving from 1877 to 1883. Then he was defeated but was elected again in 1884 and served until his second defeat in 1890.

The very thing that caused his defeat in 1890 made him Governor of Ohio from 1891 to 1895 and eventually made him President. As chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, he had charge of what was known as the McKinley tariff bill. But beginning in 1893 we had a serious depression, or as it was called then, a panic.

The country swung rapidly to a high tariff and this contributed to McKinley's advancement politically.

McKinley's parents were devout Methodists and it is said that his mother wanted him to enter the ministry and become a bishop of that church. But he had a mind for law and politics. He had wise parents. They let their son follow his own star of destiny.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from one of my constituents on the current tax situation:

I feel that I would be remiss in my duty if I did not call your attention to the sentiment of a large number of your constituents, with whom I come in contact, with respect to the collection of income taxes. I have yet to find one person who is in favor of the Treasury's plan to collect more than a single year's taxes in any one year, or to find anyone who is not completely in accord with a pay as you go system and in favor of the Ruml plan for accomplishing that end.

I believe, however, that there is at least one other very important point which is a serious objection to any proposal to double up on tax collections—the effect that double payments will have on War bonds. Not merely from the standpoint of decreased future sales, but from the liquidation of bonds already sold in order to obtain the cash with which to pay the second tax.

Many people have not accumulated the funds to pay their taxes, but a large number of these same people have bought War bonds.

Many people have accumulated the necessary funds, not in cash, but in War bonds.

Both groups must cash in their War bonds if they are called on to pay more than 1 year's taxes in a year. Certainly such a situation would be much more serious than the cancellation of a year's tax obligation. The claim that the latter is a cancellation of Treasury assets is purely academic, but the cancellation of an equal amount of bonds for which the Government has already received the money would be a calamity. It would force the Treasury Department to furnish cash it has not figured on furnishing and when it did get the cash back as taxes it would not have any more cash than it had in the first place.

How such a procedure possibly helps anyone—either the individual or the Government—is beyond understanding.

All of which has prompted the telegram I sent you today which said:

"Don't force us to sell our War bonds in order to pay 2 year's taxes in one. Adopt the Ruml plan."

Address by Hon. Thurman W. Arnold at Banquet Given in His Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, last evening at the Statler Hotel there was held a most unusual and delightful banquet as a tribute to Hon. Thurman W. Arnold, whose nomination to be an associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia was confirmed yesterday. I had the honor, Mr. President, to participate in the program. Aside from any remarks which I may have made on the occasion, I am very sorry that those made by the other speakers are not available.

I ask, however, that the program be printed in the RECORD, and that the remarks which Justice Arnold made, and which were broadcast over the Nation-wide hook-up of the Mutual Broadcasting System, be printed in the RECORD in connection with my statement.

There being no objection, the dinner program and the address by Justice Arnold were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THE HONORABLE THURMAN W. ARNOLD: A TRIBUTE FROM HIS FRIENDS AND ASSOCIATES OF THE ANTITRUST DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, PRESIDENTIAL ROOM, HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 9, 1943

PROGRAM

Toastmaster: The Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

America: Led by Capt. Edward P. Hodges, United States Army; Mrs. Lawrence S. Apsey at the piano.

The Honorable Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

The Honorable William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

Harmony accordionists: Mary Poppe and Kay Poppell.

Mr. Arthur D. Whiteside, president, Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

The Honorable ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., United States Senate.

A group of songs: Jane Hamill; Max Cushing at the piano.

The Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY, the majority leader of the Senate.

Mr. Henry J. Kaiser, president, Kaiser Co., Inc.

Tom C. Clark, on behalf of the Antitrust Division.

The Honorable Thurman W. Arnold, Nation-wide radio hook-up (Mutual Broadcasting System) at 10:45 p.m.

The National Anthem.

ADDRESS BY JUSTICE THURMAN W. ARNOLD

I would scarcely know what to say this evening—and if I did know I wouldn't say it—if I thought of this occasion only as a personal testimonial. But I do not think of it in that way. There are gathered here members of the Antitrust Division who during the past few years have attempted to give economic meaning to the Sherman Act on a Nation-wide scale during our great depression, during our period of preparation for war, and during the war. With them are met distinguished representatives of Congress and the Government, of both political parties, for the Sherman Act is the exclusive property of neither political party. And there are here also men whose interests are in industry and in agriculture. In meeting here I think they give evidence of their support to that tradition which made America a great industrial nation and a great democracy at the same time—the tradition of unrestricted freedom of opportunity of which the Sherman Act is the symbol.

I appreciate, more than I can say, that these men have come to a dinner at which I am the guest of honor. Yet the thing that binds us together is not so much personalities as it is a common faith in the American philosophy of industrial freedom, of which the Sherman Act is a part.

We do not know today how long the war will last, but we know that final victory will be ours. And so we think about the economic policy of a post-war world. There are those who wish that world to be managed by an industrial bureaucracy with power to control production at home and abroad, to establish quotas, to determine the business policies of all the independent units of industry, to make unrestricted opportunity secondary to a managed order, under State control. They have a wavering faith in American traditions and a Utopian faith in Government power in partnership with industrial cartels. On the other hand, there are those who see the vast new industrial energy and production released by the war as a great liberating force which will shake off the domination of the private groups which restricted our production in the past 10 years in the interest of a policy of high cost and low turn-over. Instead of a partnership between cartels and the Government they want a new age of commercial freedom. They know that the ideal of a managed economic order is alien to every American tradition, and they have faith in the traditions of America.

It is the men of both parties who hold this faith who are here tonight because it is this tradition for which the antitrust law stands. I call it the economics of opportunity.

The economics of opportunity means that every man in America must be free to take a chance, to gamble on his abilities or on the efficiency of his organization and to win or to lose. And out of that race to produce and distribute in an open market will come the only real material wealth a nation can have—an expanding productive plant. The economics of opportunity means that invested capital values must not be allowed to protect themselves against new enterprise or new techniques, under the cloak of corporate franchises, or associations, or patent pools or any other organized device. Established enterprise must constantly meet the challenge of new enterprise. It means that the

opportunity to make a fortune is the impulse that makes the profit system work, not the stabilization of fortunes already made.

During the years of our depression we were obsessed with a static philosophy that I call the economics of security. On both sides of the political fence and the economic fence there was the same dominating note—security, security, security. That same note was sounded by persons who bitterly disagreed on how to become secure. Prices must be stabilized to make investments secure. Production must be stabilized to prevent surpluses to make prices secure. New inventions must be held off the market to make the world safe for obsolete machinery. The savings and new processes in necessities of life, like housing, must not be passed on to consumers in order to make labor secure in old jobs. A fool must be prevented from parting with his money. Old age must be protected. The loss of jobs must be protected. There were myriad schemes to make us safe from future depressions by abandoning industrial freedom.

Out of this emphasis on security there came the belief that our old traditions of industrial democracy were relics of a disorderly past, that men must not be free to produce and distribute when they disturbed the stability of someone else who was producing—the belief that mass production in a machine age made it necessary that production and distribution by independent men be managed by a dominating group which had acquired the powers of a state.

Out of the obsession for security for established groups came the fear of producing or of letting others produce. Big business restricted production because it was afraid of the effect of falling prices on its bookkeeping values. Labor stopped efficient methods in housing to make its jobs safe. And finally, farmers, because they could not exchange their full production for the restricted production of industry, in desperation entered the race for the kind of security that comes from high prices and controlled output.

Of course, it is the duty of a government to provide social security, and unemployment relief, and safeguards for investment. It is equally its duty to take temporary measures of stabilization in time of crisis, just as it is necessary to give drugs to a sick man. But when the idea of security rather than opportunity becomes the dominating note; when economic thinking is aimed at taking the chance and the struggle out of business life; when those already established in industry can protect their profits against the initiative of those trying to break in, something happens to the industrial muscle and morale of that nation.

No commander of an army is opposed to fortifications. Yet when France put all her faith in the security of the Maginot line, the finest army in the world became rigid and hidebound and unable to meet an emergency.

In the same way something happens to the industrial army of a nation whose economic thought is dominated by the idea of removing opportunity for success or for failure in order to stabilize and plan for a mature and static economy.

The Sherman Act represents our faith in the economics of opportunity. It is dedicated to the principle that the energy and initiative which made America great in the past will make it even greater in the future; that the control of this energy and initiative must not be delegated to any group of experts, however chosen, because the power to control initiative is the power to destroy it. The Sherman Act puts no featherbeds under any industrial group. It compels them to race for a competitive place in a free economic world.

Opposed to this philosophy of opportunity is the cartel ideal of security for established groups.

Let me give a single example of the consequences of this philosophy: By an agreement between the American Railway Express Co. and the principal air lines, air freight rates could not be fixed at less than twice the rates on railroads; actually they were held at five to seven times railroad rates despite the fact that air rates if permitted to seek their proper level would today be less than rail rates. In 1938 Western Airlines tried to make a connection at Los Angeles. Its application was refused, because it was held that there were enough planes in Los Angeles; that is, there were enough planes to carry freight at those noncompetitive rates. And so, at the beginning of the war we had less than 400 commercial planes. Canada, with only 11,000,000 population, was carrying 6 times the amount of air freight of the United States with 130,000,000. And the country which had invented the airplane was refusing to take advantage of it in order to stabilize existing forms of transportation.

Today in the midst of a great war we are compelled to throw off every restriction on production and to forget our fear of surpluses.

At the beginning of the war our industrial morale was disturbed by the memory of the undistributed surpluses of the depression, the idle capital and idle labor, the want in the midst of plenty. We have been afraid that the expanding production of the war will create new surpluses and plunge us into a new depression. This vast new production endangers established price structures upon which the future dividends of our business bureaucracy depend. New light metals, new forms of transportation, new techniques, may make vast investments obsolete. New Henry Fords like Henry Kaiser are over the horizon threatening the domination of the industrial groups who are responsible for the philosophy of our economics of security. And so the cartel leaders are gathering from all parts of the world to protect their system of high prices and low turn-over, restricted production and controlled markets—domestic and foreign—against the new enterprise that is coming after the war.

The great struggle between economic forces which is going on behind our armies in the field is not a struggle for profits—it is a struggle for domination of industry after the war. That struggle comes from fear of the tremendous productive energy of the new world. We are on the verge of a new industrial age—the age of light metals and chemicals—which may bring a higher standard of living than the world has ever known before, better housing, better transportation, more abundant food. Against this opportunity stand the forces which seek to establish an industrial bureaucracy in control of the production of that new age—the domestic and international cartels. If the principles of the Sherman Act are kept alive, if we are vigilant in attacking that power to control production, case by case, whenever it shows its head, the consumer dollar will be bigger than it ever was before. Products of the farms producing to the utmost can be exchanged for the full production of industry.

Some wars are utterly barren of beneficial results. They are measured only in terms of men and property destroyed and progress retarded. This war has another and brighter side. The full production which it creates may destroy monopoly control and set up undreamed of opportunities for independent initiative. It may sweep aside the restrictions which have been stifling our energy and initiative for the past 20 years, ending with an unused industrial plant and an irreducible minimum of 9,000,000 unemployed—provided that we do not permit the industrial bureaucracy of domestic and international cartels to gain a position of control during the war.

I have served with the men of the Antitrust Division who will carry on the work. I know them. I have faith in them. I know that under the strong leadership of Francis Biddle they will play their part in the coming battle for economic liberation. I have faith that leaders of Congress who are here tonight will support them in the fight to save for the plain people of America the fruits of the new industrial age that is to come. If, with courage and determination we preserve the fifth freedom—the right to produce—against the private seizure of industrial domination—the paths to all the other freedoms will be kept clear and America will again become the land of undreamed of opportunity.

Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Trade Agreements," published in the Washington Star of January 14, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE AGREEMENTS

The Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, the sole contribution of the Roosevelt administration to tariff legislation, must be reenacted by next June or else it will perish. There have been rumblings about the fight which will be made. Inquiry rather indicates that the Republicans, who voted against the bill by which the life of the act was once before extended, will inquire carefully into the whole question before undertaking to make this a party issue in Congress.

The Trade Agreement Act was put through in an effort to get away from the impossibly high tariff walls set up under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. It had the hearty support of Secretary of State Cordell Hull, who is firmly convinced that steps must be taken to keep open as far as possible the doors to international trade. It was designed to improve relations between the United States and other nations—some of which had reacted harshly against the tariff laws of this country. And it did.

As of today, this country has entered into 30 reciprocal trade agreements with 25 countries, among them Britain and a number of the integral parts of the British Empire. No such trade agreements were ever entered into between this country and Nazi Germany, Italy, and Japan, the present Axis Powers. Under present war conditions there are no public records of the amount of international trade done under the reciprocal trade agreements. The percentage of trade which comes under these agreements, however, must be very large. In 1937 it was 66 percent of the total foreign trade of the United States, and in 1939, it had increased to 68 percent. To indicate still further the importance of this trade with the other "agreement" countries it is estimated that 60 percent of the total world trade came within the framework of these trade agreements.

Under the authority granted him by the reciprocal trade agreement law, the President is authorized to enter into these pacts

with foreign nations, and to lower or increase tariff duties by not more than 50 percent of the duties set in the tariff act. These agreements do not require ratification by Congress in any way. Prior to the enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, there existed the so-called flexible tariff act, which also authorized the President to lower or raise tariff duties by 50 percent after thorough investigation by the United States Tariff Commission. In theory, this was all right. In practice, it did not get far. There was no provision for international agreements, and it dealt with tariff rates on individual items.

To kill this Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act would be a sad commentary on the probable attitude of this country toward other nations after the war. The immediate effect would be to prevent the negotiation, renewal, or amendment of such agreements. Existing agreements would continue in effect for the full period for which they were negotiated—usually a 3-year period, though some are for less, and if not denounced by either party, they would continue indefinitely.

In the opinion of many, failure to renew the act would be disastrous, a poor start, indeed, on the improvement of international relations after the war is over.

Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bureaucratic Rule Brings Food Shortage," published in the San Francisco Examiner of March 4, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCANDAL—BUREAUCRATIC RULE BRINGS FOOD SHORTAGE

The food shortage in the United States, resulting from bureaucratic mishandling of the farm manpower problem, is rapidly assuming the proportions of a national disaster.

Mr. Louis Bromfield, famous author and New Deal Democrat, emphasized the extent and imminence of this disaster in a recent Town Hall address in New York City.

"The American people," said Mr. Bromfield, "will one way or another be fighting for butter, pork, beef, dairy products, eggs, and many other commodities.

"There are already many metropolitan and industrial areas where, for days and even weeks, few of these things are even available today. The situation will grow worse rather than better. * * *

"I think it fair to say that nothing practical whatever has been done to help the farmer to produce more. * * * This scandal, and by next autumn it will be one of the greatest scandals in American history, effects the whole future history of ourselves and of the world.

"Its repercussions will destroy the future of the Democratic Party for years, the future of liberalism, even the future possibility of a decent peace.

"And throughout the world, millions of people will sicken and die and generations of children will grow up stunted and sickly because a frivolous and incompetent bureaucracy, in the richest country in the world, did not do its job."

Mr. Bromfield does not speak with excessive alarm about this ominous situation, as many other informed authorities attest.

The war food goal for America has been set 8 percent above 1942 production, and 30 percent above normal production.

But the Senate Appropriations Committee has just received the stunning report from 85 percent of the nearly 3,000 county farm agents of the country that farm food production this year will be from 10 to 31 percent less than last year.

Mr. Guy Kinsley, regional food rationing representative of the Office of Price Administration, told the Hatfield committee of the California Legislature:

"There is no such thing as a civilian meat quota. The armed forces and lend-lease are going to get whatever meat they need, and what is left will be the civilian quota.

"Regardless of what the population basis is, civilians will be lucky to get 1 pound of meat a week in the future. Whoever figures there will be 2½ pounds available for each civilian is crazy."

Why does the United States, which has abundant and virtually inexhaustible food resources, confront such a disaster?

Why is the American Nation producing less food when it should be producing more?

Farmers know the answers to these questions.

Hundreds of thousands of skilled farmers have been inducted into the armed forces, or have been attracted by higher wages to war industries, in utter disregard of the fact that agriculture itself is the most vital and essential of all industries.

Farm machinery is virtually unobtainable.

Acreage is reduced. Planting is curtailed. Care and cultivation are neglected. Harvesting is impossible in many cases.

And in the livestock and dairying industries, lack of skilled farm help has caused the wasteful decimation of herds and thus a shortage of dairy products and an exhaustion of meat.

Somebody is crazy all right, but it is not the civilian who is supposed to feel lucky to get 1 pound of meat a week in the future.

It is the bureaucratic czars of America who are crazy.

Civilian economy will collapse with insufficient food, and war production will collapse, and the armed forces will suffer and even the idealistic lend-lease commitments will ultimately be unfilled.

Bureaucracy has had many failures. It has in fact had few if any successes. But of all its failures, its reduction of both civilian and armed Americans toward starvation levels is the most unnecessary and stupid, the most unpatriotic and criminal.

The Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I was surprised and pleased to read that Jay Franklin, who in his various articles and speeches has spent a part of his time attacking the system of free enterprise, has now reversed himself and has announced that hereafter he will be listed as its defender. I ask that an announcement by him to this effect be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOUGHTS ON AN UNSENT TELEGRAM

(By Jay Franklin)

It may surprise some readers of my columns and shock others to read that I am at last convinced that free enterprise for private profit is essential to human liberty. During the past 10 years I have been so articulate in denouncing the abuses of property rights in derogation of human freedom that I have been accused of communism, fascism, and inborn hostility to business.

My revelation on the road to Damascus came on February 4, when I called Western Union, as usual, to send a birthday telegram to my youngest daughter who is away at school. This seemed to me to be a harmless, natural, human thing to do. However, Western Union politely informed me that they were not permitted to accept private anniversary telegrams on account of the congestion of wires due to the burden of war business.

With this ruling of the Federal Communications Commission, I have no quarrel. I am entirely willing to forego my right to send birthday telegrams for the duration and I hope that it will help defeat the Axis. The Government can't make me sore that way.

But the more I thought about the Government's ruling in this matter, the more I realized that the only real protection of my right to send family telegrams and other things which express my personal freedom was the fact that Western Union and other privately owned business groups stood to make a profit out of my individual desires.

In other words, so long as other individuals, groups, or corporations find it worth their while to let me operate over the wires or in any other way, then I shall be free to operate. The moment it is no longer to the direct profit and advantage of other individuals, groups, or corporations to let me operate freely then I am at the mercy of bureaucrats with other motives and other incentives than my unregenerate self.

Suppose, for example, after the war we were to adopt a Fascist or Communist or totalitarian system of government, with government ownership of communications and basic industries. Suppose that such a government decided that every man, dollar, and ounce of material that could be spared must go into a great national rehousing program and that, therefore, the inmates—I will not call them citizens—of the United States must be allowed to send certain kinds of telegrams, make certain kinds of telephone calls, or go on certain kinds of journeys (pleasure driving is a foretaste). Such a government could not be in the least bit interested in the profit account of the telegraph or railway companies and could highhandedly and perhaps mistakenly refuse to let me do the things which seem to me to be normal, natural, and harmless expressions of my rights as a human being. And I would have no redress under these circumstances, except to agitate or to vote—both of which might simply get me into a bad personal jam.

For when the Government steps in, it is a monopoly. With the Government writing the rules—which means some little guy in a bureau, whom nobody knows, nobody elected, and nobody can remove—it does me no good to go from Western Union to Postal Telegraph

or Radio Corporation of America. They are all bound to refuse to accept a telegram sending many happy returns of the day to a 14-year-old schoolgirl. If there is a ban on travel, except as authorized by some bureaucrat, it does me no good to try the B. & O. when the Pennsylvania declines to sell me a ticket, and I cannot use my automobile, since the Government is engaged in keeping me out of gas. The power of the Government to regiment me is absolute under such a system, and I don't like it; it is just too bad.

That is why the Manufacturers' Association and the United States Chamber of Commerce—my old targets in the days of yore—can be assured that when the shooting stops they will find me fighting the battle for private enterprise and private profit without reference to my past performances in criticism of unregenerate capitalism and the purblind exaltation of property rights over human rights. I know now, what I never fully realized before, that while Government regulation is necessary to control traffic—whether on the highways, the stock exchange, or the labor market—Government ownership, when divorced from considerations of private profit, is death to human freedom and the right of the individual to develop his own life without reference to the views of the bureaucrats.

Intercoastal Canal

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I have been encouraged recently by the support given to my request for an appropriation of $44,000,000 to complete the intercoastal waterway from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Trenton, N. J. I think the opposition is fighting a rear guard and a defensive action.

We are paying now more than $250,000,000 in subsidies to the railroads to transport fuel oil and it is ironic indeed. Out of the $250,000,000, New York State alone is paying $50,000,000, the New England States $75,000,000, and New Jersey and Pennsylvania also large amounts, and these are the States that are suffering most from lack of oil.

Recently the opposition has said that they are opposed to this project, because it will take too long to build the canal. General Reybold has stated it will not take as long as he first thought. Hearings are to be held on this appropriation bill shortly, and I believe we will be able to prove to anyone who wants the proof, that it will take less than a year to complete this canal and provide the Atlantic seaboard with the fuels that are necessary. I desire to incorporate in my remarks an editorial from the Boston Globe of March 2, 1943, entitled "Why the Barge Canal?"

The matter referred to follows:

WHY THE BARGE CANAL?

Among the many reasons why residents of the eastern seaboard—and New Englanders in particular—should interest themselves through their Members in Congress in getting the appropriation needed to put through the Florida barge canal project, there is one of commanding concern.

The experience which the people throughout the whole Northeastern section of this country have lately undergone, because of the defective distribution facilities for fuel oil in winter; the uneconomic costs represented by Federal subsidies to the tune of more than $250,000,000, which have been forced upon the Nation because of lack of an adequate pipe line and waterway system, taking advantage of the great inland waterway now existing; the fact that the State of New York is compelled to pay annually more than $50,000,000 as its share for fetching oil by tank car to its own population, while the six New England States themselves have chipped in approximately one-third of the total amount that would be needed to implement the authorization already given by Congress—these are powerful arguments.

It will not do, moreover, to dismiss this highly useful project on the contention that the pipe lines now under construction or contemplated will settle the matter. The barge canal, which is already completed between Corpus Christi, Tex., and the neck of the Florida Peninsula, will connect with the great inland waterway once the 93-mile cut is made through the last remaining barrier. It will provide an inland water route all the way to Trenton, N. J., entirely beyond reach of submarine attack. At the same time, once it begins to function, it will lift the burden on the already overloaded railroads of the Nation, permitting the new pipe-line system to coordinate with tank-car delivery for the region beyond the Alleghenies.

It is from the viewpoint of national defense, however, that this project should receive especial attention, both from the people resident in the eastern areas from Florida to Maine, and from their Representatives in Congress.

The former director of supply for General Pershing's American Expeditionary Force, General Summerall, and the present chief of war supply procurement, Lieutenant General Somervell, are in emphatic agreement that this waterway supply route is essential as a military undertaking. In the present war, if it were pushed through speedily, it would clip approximately 4 days from the shipping time required to send men and supplies to Europe and north Africa and the Middle East.

More important in the view of these military authorities, who are supported by the Army Engineering Corps, the canal is needed to secure the defense of the whole northeastern area of this Nation. In these days of highly mechanized war, when vast quantities of fuel oil and gasoline are required to stoke the engines of tanks, planes, trucks, and other motorized vehicles of combat, it is little less than madness to permit the most congested and exposed industrial areas of the Nation—those along the Atlantic coast—to continue dependent upon so haphazard a system of essential supply.

This is no casual consideration. Given the experience through which we have lately been passing, can any citizen envision the consequences to the Eastern Seaboard States, were the repelling of invasion attack and the requirements in fuel that would entail added to the problem we have already experienced of getting bunker oil to industries here, heating and cooking oil to homes, and gasoline to fill our existing road traffic needs?

The barge canal has been approved by Congress already. It merely awaits an appropriation. It has waited 6 months. Delay will assure only a continued waste of Federal tax revenues, new burdens for our railroads which they should not be required to meet, a persistence of faulty distribution with consequent human suffering, and an uncorrected defect in our national defense system.

Cooperation Pledged to Price Administrator, the Honorable Prentiss Brown, and His Senior Assistant, the Honorable Clyde Herring

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

PRICE-CONTROL LAW PREVENTED RUINOUS INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the price-control law was absolutely necessary. No one would seek its repeal. Had it not been for this law, our country would have already experienced run-away and ruinous inflation. If Congress is not pleased with the way the law is administered, Congress can either change the law or any part of it, or can amend the law in any way that it desires. In addition, Congress has the purse strings and no agency of our Government can operate without money being provided by Congress for that purpose. In that way, Congress can exercise some control and supervision over the manner of administering the act.

The administration of this law is not an easy matter. It involves 1,800,000 different commodities, including grades, brands, classes, styles, and fashions, so it is not an easy matter to enforce a law involving so much. In addition, it involves rent control, which has many complex problems.

I am inserting herewith a copy of a letter I have written to the Honorable Prentiss Brown, Price Administrator. It is self-explanatory:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1943.

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN, *Administrator,*
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: I want to express my approval and commendation to you for the excellent start you are making to reorganize Office of Price Administration and put its administration upon a common-sense basis.

It is realized that you cannot make these changes quickly and you cannot hastily correct many of the errors that are now known that are very harmful to the general welfare, but when you reorganize the group, as you evidently contemplate, then it will be an easy matter for known errors and mistakes to be corrected quickly.

Under the present set-up of the Office of Price Administration it is organized under district and regional divisions; and your desire to change this on State lines, I believe, will be most helpful. This will enable you to select the best personnel from the abolished offices and use them in the State offices.

Attached hereto is a statement, which, I understand, is an excerpt of your press conference held at 2 p. m., March 3, 1943, concerning Senator Clyde Herring's work with the Office of Price Administration. This statement indicates a very fair attitude and a desire on your part to correct any wrongs. Specifically, may I suggest about this statement that there is a great deal of congressional criticism, and I know that after a

thorough investigation a substantial part of it is justified.

Your desire to improve the Office of Price Administration set-up outside of Washington is a step in the right direction, but I hope you do not overlook the Washington office. The fact is that too much power is lodged in the Washington office. More power should be given to the State offices when they are set up.

Furthermore, your desire to make a survey of the business advisory organization will be helpful. Although the original price-control law contemplated that trade associations would be consulted relative to rules and regulations adopted by the Office of Price Administration affecting them, I doubt that they have been given sufficient consideration.

I have read with interest Senator Clyde Herring's statement in the Washington Post, March 5, 1943. First, he stated that it was his desire to eliminate all possible red tape in the price and rationing program by letting the public carry the ball voluntarily, with the Office of Price Administration assuming the role of bookkeeper rather than policeman. His statement that "horse sense like we use in the country" will be the Office of Price Administration policy from now on instead of the practice symbolized by carloads of questionnaires, which will never be read or used anyway is heartening to the people, who have been so greatly burdened by these useless questionnaires.

Possibly you will need two or three regional offices, but it occurs to me that the State office set-up entirely would be more desirable, in order to expedite the handling of any matters coming before the district office. However, your experience and knowledge will, doubtless, guide you in the right direction on this point.

It is my understanding that you contemplate abolishing at least 6 of the 9 regional offices and all of the 102 district offices, which include a field force of 33,000 persons, and substitute therefor 48 State offices and, doubtless, one in the District of Columbia. Senator Herring's statement that "local rationing boards will not be touched, but will instead get more authority to deal directly with the people instead of looking higher up whenever a special problem arises" is, according to my view, exactly in the right direction. Local rationing boards are composed of good, sensible people and I think in the past they have been given too little authority. Senator Herring touched upon this point again in his statement, in which he said: "I hope to make it possible for State offices to take care of almost all save unusually special problems, when Washington will step in."

Senator Herring also suggested that up to now the intent of the legislation (Office of Price Administration) has been entirely mishandled. I can refer you to some instances that I believe his statement applies to especially:

1. Slaughterers and packers are being forced out of business because the plain congressional intent written into the law is not being complied with.

2. Known errors, about which there is no dispute, have not been corrected when discovered. On the other hand, they have allowed them to continue, which has crushed hundreds of thousands of businessmen out of our economic picture and has been very harmful to our country. My opinion is that it is absolutely dishonest for known errors to continue which destroy the property rights or the liberties of the people.

3. The home owners have, in many cases, been dealt with niggardly on the rent-control question. This is a place where much improvement can be made.

Both you and Senator Herring have indicated that you have knowledge of the major problems affecting the Office of Price Administration. It will be a pleasure to me to work with you gentlemen. You will have my hearty cooperation in carrying out the law according to the intent expressed by Congress.

You have demonstrated confidence in the people and have already removed picayunish, arbitrary regulations, which were annoying and needling the patriotic citizens of our country, which indicate that you will continue that course, which is very encouraging to the people, I am sure. I know it is to me.

In the final report of the Committee on Small Business of the House, which was prepared in January of this year and submitted February 15, 1943, I stated:

"The people expect mistakes to be made in any huge program during wartime, but they expect them to be just as quickly corrected when discovered. War is waste, and in our haste to prepare ourselves, waste is created. This is expected, but when obvious gross errors are pointed out to administrative officers, they should be corrected without delay. This has not been done in all cases."

Again pledging you my hearty cooperation in your expressed desires, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

EXCERPT OF PRESS CONFERENCE OF MR. PRENTISS BROWN HELD MARCH 3, 1943

Question. Could you tell us something about Senator Herring's work with the Office of Price Administration?

Answer. Yes. One of the things that I can't do myself is survey this organization; its general set-up, and so on and so forth is subject to a great deal of congressional criticism. I don't know whether it is right or wrong. And I feel that there should be a careful survey made of our organization to determine whether or not we can improve it. At the present time, in my own mind—naturally, I have some opinions, having been here for 6 weeks, but I have none that are strong enough for me to make a determination as to whether or not our organizational set-up is the most efficient that we could build in a short-time emergency agency. Senator Herring is an experienced and able businessman. I have no hesitancy in saying that his experience in the distribution as a State distributor of Ford automobiles in Iowa, for a great many years, tractors and so on—a large business operation—qualifies him to look into the Office of Price Administration, particularly outside of Washington, and determine whether or not we could improve our set-up. I hope to have that done with some assistance possibly from—I had a few names in mind, but I presume I ought not to mention them—I mean, of agencies; but I would like to see a survey made by a business advisory organization, to tell me whether or not we could improve our set-up; and Senator Herring is going to represent me in that respect.

Question. What will be his title in the Office of Price Administration?

Answer. I think he is known as senior assistant.

Mr. PLUMMER. Senior assistant to the Administrator.

FIRST PRICE CONTROL ACT

I desire to invite attention to certain sections of the first Price Control Act, which became a law January 30, 1942. It is Public Law No. 421 of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

The policy of the act, embodied in section 1 (a), is as follows:

SECTION. 1. (a) It is hereby declared to be in the interest of the national defense and security and necessary to the effective prosecution of the present war, and the purposes of this act are, to stabilize prices and to prevent speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases in prices and rents; to eliminate and prevent profiteering, hoarding, manipulation, speculation, and other disruptive practices resulting from abnormal market conditions or scarcities caused by or contributing to the national emergency; to assure that defense appropriations are not dissipated by excessive prices; to protect persons with relatively fixed and limited incomes, consumers, wage earners, investors, and persons dependent on life insurance, annuities, and pensions, from undue impairment of their standard of living; to prevent hardships to persons engaged in business, to schools, universities, and other institutions, and to the Federal, State, and local governments, which would result from abnormal increases in prices; to assist in securing adequate production of commodities and facilities; to prevent a postemergency collapse of values; to stabilize agricultural prices in the manner provided in section 3; and to permit voluntary cooperation between the Government and producers, processors, and others to accomplish the aforesaid purposes. It shall be the policy of those departments and agencies of the Government dealing with wages (including the Department of Labor and its various bureaus, the War Department, the Navy Department, the War Production Board, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the National War Labor Board, and others heretofore or hereafter created), within the limits of their authority and jurisdiction, to work toward a stabilization of prices, fair and equitable wages, and cost of production.

Section 1 (b) provides that the act shall terminate on June 30, 1943, or upon the date of a proclamation by the President, or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by this act is not necessary in the interest of the national defense and security, whichever date is the earlier.

The act covered prices, rents, markets, and lending practices.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES REQUIRED IN LAW

On the question of prices there is this provision:

Before issuing any regulation or order under the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Administrator shall, so far as practicable, advise and consult with representative members of the industry which will be affected by such regulation or order.

And also this provision:

Appoint an industry advisory committee, or committees, either national or regional, or both, consisting of such number of representives of the industry as may be necessary in order to constitute a committee truly representative of the industry, or of the industry in such region, as the case may be.

It was hoped that these provisions of the act, which incidentally I had something to do with writing, would be sympathetically administered and existing trade associations used in selecting the advisory committees.

ENCOURAGING FARM PRODUCTION

On the question of encouraging farm production, the act provides two ways in section 2 (e). One is:

Whenever the Administrator determines that the maximum necessary production of any commodity is not being obtained or may not be obtained during the ensuing year, he may, on behalf of the United States, without regard to the provisions of law requiring competitive bidding, buy or sell at

public or private sale, or store or use, such commodity in such quantities and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof or otherwise to supply the demand therefor.

The other, which immediately follows the above language is:

Or make subsidy payments to domestic producers of such commodity in such amounts and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof.

PURPOSES FOR WHICH ACT SHALL NOT BE USED

It will also be noticed that the original act specifically provided that certain powers granted should not be used for certain purposes and one specific provision is contained in section 2 (h), and is as follows:

The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.

NO LICENSE TO BE REQUIRED OF FARMERS

The act, in section 205 (f), has this provision relative to licensing farmers:

That no license may be required of any farmer as a condition of selling any agricultural commodity produced by him, and no license may be required of any fisherman as a condition of selling any fishery commodity caught or taken by him.

SECOND PRICE CONTROL OR STABILIZATION ACT

The Second Price Control Act, approved October 2, 1942, known as Public Law No. 729, Seventy-seventh Congress, contained the following declarations of policy:

That in order to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, the President is authorized and directed, on or before November 1, 1942, to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries affecting the cost of living, and, except as otherwise provided in this act, such stabilization shall so far as practicable be on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942. The President may, except as otherwise provided in this act, thereafter provide for making adjustments with respect to prices, wages, and salaries, to the extent that he finds necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities: *Provided*, That no common carrier or other public utility shall make any general increase in its rates or charges which were in effect on September 15, 1942, unless it first gives 30 days' notice to the President, or such agency as he may designate, and consents to the timely intervention by such agency before the Federal, State, or municipal authority having jurisdiction to consider such increase.

This act contained the following language relative to the power of the President:

SEC. 2. The President may, from time to time, promulgate such regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this act; and may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him by this act through such department, agency, or officer as he shall direct. The President may suspend the provisions of sections 3 (a) and 3 (c), and clause (1) of section 302 (c), of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to the extent that such sections are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, but he may not under the authority of this act suspend any other law or part thereof.

PRICES INCREASED TO ENCOURAGE PRODUCTION

This act, in section 3, contained the following language relative to maximum prices on agricultural commodities and for commodities processed or manufactured from agricultural commodities:

That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs.

FAIR RETURN TO MEAT PROCESSORS

The same act, immediately following the above language, contains the following language relative to fair margins to packers:

Provided further, That in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing.

COST OF FARM LABOR TO BE CONSIDERED

In connection with farm labor, the following provision follows immediately the preceding one:

Provided further, That in fixing price maximums for agricultural commodities and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, as provided for by this act, adequate weighting shall be given to farm labor.

Section 6 of this act states that it shall terminate on June 30, 1944, or on such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President by proclamation, may prescribe.

Section 7 of this act extends the Emergency Price Control Act to June 30, 1944.

Construction of Merchant Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1943, I extended my remarks in the RECORD on the work of the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration. These remarks appear on pages A619–A621 of the Appendix.

It is my purpose to supply from time to time these records for the benefit of Members of Congress so that the excellent work that is being done by the shipbuilding plants and by the workers in the shipbuilding plants may be known. There is a danger that in our criticism of matters such as absenteeism and other retarding factors, we shall overlook the great work that is being done in these plants and by these workers.

First, I desire to correct an error which appears in my previous remarks, based upon a report which had been issued by the Maritime Commission. I stated at that time that January 1943 was the second month in which more than a million tons were added in 1 month to the fleet. That was correct, but I stated that the figures for January 1943 were 106 vessels totaling 1,008,400 deadweight tons and that the temporary decline in January from December's high of 121 ships aggregating 1,199,300 deadweight tons was attributed to shortage of steel and the higher type propulsion equipment as well as severe weather conditions which affected production, particularly in northern yards. The statement was correct in all particulars except that the number of ships constructed should have been shown as 103 with the same total tonnage, however, of 1,008,400 deadweight tons. The error arose from the fact that in the release by the Maritime Commission, there had been included erroneously three tugs which are not shown in these monthly statements, but are included among the vessels of smaller size and miscellaneous types. There is no change in the total tonnage.

It will be remembered that the production in 1942, exclusive of about 800 ships of smaller size and miscellaneous types, was 746 ships aggregating 8,090,800 deadweight tons. The three tugs referred to are such as were included in the 800 ships of miscellaneous types.

FEBRUARY RECORD

The record for the month of February surpasses all previous ship-construction records. In that month, there were delivered into service 130 new ships, totaling approximately 1,239,200 deadweight tons, and there will be shown below a complete list of yards, number of vessels delivered, and type of vessel for the month of February. This delivery of 130 new ships brings the total number of vessels delivered thus far in 1943 to 233 ships of the type listed below, exclusive of tugs and small miscellaneous craft. These 233 ships total 2,247,600 deadweight tons.

RECORDS BROKEN

In my extension of remarks on February 17, I pointed out that in the last war we did not reach our peak until 10 months after the Armistice, when in September 1919, 814,886 deadweight tons of ships of all types—steel, wood, concrete, and composite—were delivered. Very few, if any, ships were completed in time for war service.

In January 1943 we were 400,000 tons per month ahead of our highest record established in 1919 notwithstanding the fact that our ships are 30 to 40 percent larger than the ships that were built during the previous World War. During the last war, average deliveries took about 7 months per ship.

In 1941 only 95 ships of 1,088,000 tons were completed, or less than in the month of December 1942, the result being that

in the space of 1 year construction of ships was increased more than 700 percent. The record for the months of January and February 1943 shows that the total number of vessels delivered during those 2 months already exceeds the number delivered during the first 6 months of 1942. In my remarks for January I said that January 1943 was the second month in which more than a million tons was added in 1 month to the fleet. February constitutes the third month.

The work goes on, and in the race of competition between yards and workers in yards seeing which yard can do the most to win this war and which worker in each yard can do the most, absenteeism will diminish. Again I say we have just begun to fight.

Of the 130 ships delivered in February 1943, 81 were Liberty ships, 15 were C-type cargo, 9 tankers, 23 special types, 1 concrete barge, and 1 coastal cargo ship. West coast yards still maintain the lead in the production of deadweight tonnage, delivering 52 percent of the country's February production.

The complete list of yards, their deliveries and types, is as follows:

Shipyard	Number of vessels	Type of vessel
Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., Baltimore, Md.	8 11	Liberty, special type.
Bethlehem-Sparrows Point Shipyard, Inc., Sparrows Point, Md.	2	Tankers.
California Shipbuilding Corporation, Wilmington, Calif.	14	Liberty.
Concrete Ship Constructors, National City, Calif.	1	Concrete barge.
Consolidated Steel Corporation, Ltd., Wilmington, Calif.	6	C-1, cargo.
Delta Shipbuilding Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.	5	Liberty.
Federal Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Kearny, N. J.	2	C-2, cargo.
Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, Mobile, Ala.	1	Do.
Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, Houston, Tex.	5	Liberty.
Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation, Pascagoula, Miss.	2	C-3, cargo.
Kaiser Co., Inc., Swan Island, Portland, Oreg.	1	Tanker.
Kaiser Co., Inc., Vancouver, Wash.	11	Special type.
Kaiser Co., Inc. (outfitted at Oregon), Vancouver, Wash.	4	Liberty.
Kaiser Co., Inc. (Richmond Shipyard No. 3A), Richmond, Calif.	1	Special type.
Marinship Corporation, Sausalito, Calif.	4	Liberty.
Moore Dry Dock Co., Oakland, Calif.	2	C-2, cargo.
North Carolina Shipbuilding Co., Wilmington, N. C.	9	Liberty.
Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, Portland, Oreg.	11	Do.
Permanente Metals Corporation (Richmond Shipyard No. 1), Richmond, Calif.	4	Do.
Permanente Metals Corporation (Richmond Shipyard No. 2), Richmond, Calif.	9	Do.
Rheem Manufacturing Co., Providence, R. I.	1	Do.
Leathem D. Smith Shipbuilding Co., Sturgeon Bay, Wis.	1	Coastal, cargo.
Southeastern Shipbuilding Corporation, Savannah, Ga.	1	Liberty.
South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation, South Portland, Maine.	6	Do.
Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa.	6	Tankers.
Western Pipe & Steel Co., San Francisco, Calif.	2	C-3, cargo.
Total	130	

Absenteeism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Tribune:

CHICAGO LEADS NATION IN LOW ABSENTEE RATE—ARMY MAN PRAISES WAR PLANT RECORD

A GIRL'S SLOGAN

WICHITA, KANS., March 6.—The Cessna Aircraft Co. is trying a new approach to the absentee-worker problem. It wants to slogan the thing away. Of several hundred entries, one by Carol Cragg, 17 years old, in the electrical department, won. Hers: "You can't spell victory with an absent T."

(By Philip Hampson)

Workers in Chicago area war plants appear to be leading the Nation with their low rate of absenteeism, or willful absence from jobs, a survey of representative plants showed yesterday.

Several Chicago companies doing important war work reported absentee rates close to 3 percent, which an Army ordnance district officer said was ideal. None of the companies queried had a rate higher than 5 percent.

These reports were contrasted with figures from other parts of the country which indicated that the waste of manpower from absenteeism is a grave problem. The Department of Labor stated recently that the rate in commercial shipyards since last April has averaged approximately 7½ percent, and since last January 6.4 percent. In Atlantic coast yards the rate was 8.2 percent; Pacific coast, 9; Gulf, 8.1; and Great Lakes, 4.6. Other reports showed even more serious cases of manpower seepage.

CREDIT RECORD TO COOPERATION

Credit for the good record of plants in the Chicago area was given to the cooperation between workers and management. Instead of denouncing the shirkers and resorting to appeals to patriotism, plant managers have gone to the workers and asked them to suggest remedies. In many cases this has brought quick improvement.

Following are reports on willful absentee rates in Chicago companies forming a good cross-section of the area's industrial war activity:

Buick aviation engine division of General Motors—Rate has varied from 2.8 to 3.5 percent.

Electro-Motive Corporation, division of General Motors—Approximately 4.5 percent.

JOINT COMMITTEE LOWERS RATE

Goss Printing Press Co.—Current rate about 2.7 percent, while a year ago it was 6 percent. Improvement credited to work of war production committee composed of 5 representatives of workers and 5 of management. The committee adopted a system of posting names of absentees.

Hurley Machine Co.—Rate 4 to 5 percent, a sharp improvement over several months ago. Further progress expected with establishment of WOW, a volunteer national organization of women ordnance workers.

Inland Steel Co.—Rate is 4.85 percent, with most absentees among younger employees. Older skilled men who form the backbone of the company's operations are rarely absent.

International Harvester Co.—Absenteeism not yet a serious factor in Chicago area, but has been on the increase. Company receiving hearty cooperation of employees.

Minneapolis-Honeywell Co.—Rate 4.68 percent.

Pullman-Standard Car Manufacturing Co.—Rate 4.21 percent, called especially good because the company does much outdoor work. Reasons given by absentees included illness, 2.12 percent; transportation difficulties, 0.30 of 1 percent; personal, 0.77 of 1 percent; injuries, 0.06 of 1 percent; and other causes, 1.95 percent.

Stewart-Warner Corporation—rate was 15 percent 8 months ago, but now is 4 to 4½ percent as result of worker-management cooperation. The company, which has many women employees, tries to place them in jobs for which they are best suited, reducing complaints.

BETTER THAN IN MOST AREAS

A high ranking Army officer in the Chicago area said this district's absentee problem is much less serious than in most other areas, but he explained that it is difficult to get accurate figures.

Plants taking on large numbers of new employees are bound to have considerable absenteeism, he said. Other causes which he listed are poor transportation, bad housing, and epidemics of illness.

The officer remarked sometimes the women of a community get steamed up about going into war work. After a few weeks the novelty wears off and they start taking days off for trivial reasons, he said.

A bill pending in Congress intended to reduce absenteeism would require employers in plants producing for the Navy to submit records of willful absentees to local draft boards. The boards then could refuse to renew deferments on the ground that a worker is doing an essential job.

How Much Help?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the Shanghai Evening Post and Mercury, New York edition, of Friday, March 5, 1943, there appears an editorial as follows:

HOW MUCH HELP?

Secretary Stimson tells a press conference that "We are gradually building up our air strength in China and are adding to the number of transport planes that are flying their important cargoes from India and China." That is good news. Every patriotic American will be glad to hear it not only because of our traditional friendship for China, but because it means greater strength to our side in the war. There will also be general agreement with Colonel Stimson's further remark that "the courage and perseverance of the Chinese deserve and will get all of the aid we can possibly supply."

The big catch is that Washington has been giving us reassuring generalities for a long while now, and performance seems to have been substantially behind what the public believed had been delivered. Dr. T. V. Soong, now in Washington, says that the Chinese could begin a real offensive with considerably less than 1,000 planes. Sometime, somehow,

it would be nice if somebody could give us a really concrete figure on our aid to China. We suspect that when that aid is big enough to count, it will be discovered that military secrecy doesn't require a complete black-out on publicity.

The Farm Manpower Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD P. GALE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in spite of the administration, in spite of Congress, the farm manpower situation is just where it has been—in a jam, a bad jam. Everybody heaves and groans over the poor farmer. Some because they hysterically forecast a food shortage; some because they actually know farm conditions; others because they want the farm vote.

Microphones have bent under the burden of impassioned bellowing; the Halls of Congress have echoed, reechoed, reverberated, and rung with wild oratory—speeches destined for the frank and the rural mail.

The Department of Agriculture, the home of the bureaucrats, has given birth to a futile series of bright ideas, born not to blush unseen but to die in the withering light of publicity. The Manpower Commission has done a beautiful job in gumming up the works. A farsighted job, so farsighted that no one seems to have thought of first figuring out the national war needs. Then the available total manpower and fitting the two together.

There are only two noncontroversial, two outstanding manpower facts today: First, a complete and utter muddle; second, nothing is being done about it.

The farmer is being wept over and in the meantime the spring season opens up. Fields are drying off and crops have to go in, not next year or next summer, or next June, but next month. Unfortunately farming is still a natural process of growth. In spite of the starry-eyed planning of the planners, in spite of the Department of Agriculture, the farmer has to go to work when the weather is right, not when the Manpower Commission provides labor, not when Congress passes a law, not when the farm bloc gets going. The farmer has to go to work now. That is the way farming is.

What does the farmer need most? What is really pestering, worrying, and badgering the whole broad, broad area? Not prices, but the hired man who is not there. Not higher ways of computing parity, but the drill with the broken gear and the mower with half a sickle bar—lack of machinery, lack of repairs.

Parts can be supplied and are being supplied, but not the hired man. Joe is in Africa and Pete is working in the ordnance plant. Small chance to get either back.

All agreed. What to do about it? Here is one idea which needs no bureaucrat directive, no congressional act. Here is a simple plan—decentralized. A plan which needs no bureaucracy, no Washington papers to be filled out and lost in the files. Here is a plan which is not a panacea guaranteed to cure a backache or broken leg, but which will help cure the problem of the idle cultivator, the barn full of cows, and the empty place at the table.

High-school boys! In Mound, where I live in Minnesota, the consolidated high school has 900 pupils—at least 400 high-school boys—and are they needed on the farms!

Not to take advantage of this labor supply is more than stupid. Not to use these willing boys on the farms is to sabotage the war effort—a stab in the back for their brothers in uniform.

Close down the high schools—now. Let those 15-year-old boys in agricultural areas go out on the farms for a summer, starting now instead of in June. Of course, they will lose a little education, but what they might learn would be of little satisfaction if we should lose the war.

These are not normal times, and we cannot do everything we want to do or have been accustomed to doing. I think we are all finding that out; all of us.

A 15-year-old boy is not as good as a skilled farm hand. But he is a lot better than nothing. A lot of help with a milk pail; a lot of help on the cultivator; a lot of help on the hay load.

The community does it. The mayor, the school board, the town board—these people know their local needs even better than Washington. Know whether Farmer Jones really needs help; whether Bill Brown's boy is any good.

If Washington cannot help the farmer, why not the good old American custom, the sturdy farm community in desperation taking the bull by the horns and helping itself?

Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Lake County, Ohio, are feeling the crippling effect of the exodus of labor from the farms, much damage has already been done and they are deeply troubled lest relief come too late.

True to their fine American traditions they have set down their problems and their constructive suggestion in the form of resolutions.

Thinking these resolutions may prove helpful to the Members of this body I am inserting them herewith in the RECORD:

Whereas—

1. The farmers of Lake County and other counties in vital defense areas have been stripped of nearly all of their farm labor by the war industries and selective service.

2. A reduction of farm production in 1943 is indicated unless relief is given in the next 30 to 60 days.

3. Relief cannot be brought about by the shifting of labor, which is talked about so freely.

4. The farmer cannot compete with the war industries in wages or working hours.

5. Farm boys and men are as patriotic as any people and they refuse to ask for or seek deferment.

6. The action seems to lie in a drastic move which only the Government or Congress can make: Therefore in view of these conditions, as above set forth, be it

Resolved—

1. That the Selective Service System be informed of the dire necessity of ceasing to draft bona fide farm labor.

2. Further resolved that the Selective Service System seriously consider drafting men for farm service the same as is being done for the Army, Navy, and other armed forces.

3. Further resolved that the men so drafted be furnished with regular military uniforms, caps, or insignia to be worn at all times when not in actual farm duty.

4. Further resolved, that our leaders be urged to act quickly so that we may prevent a serious situation in our all-important food-supply line.

Arthur Logan, chairman; F. G. Haskins, secretary; Walter Green; J. R. Fuller; Maynard Freshley; H. L. Mantle; Edward George; Lynn Plaisted; David P. Blackmore, Committee Appointed for Mobilization of Lake County Resources.

The Ax for Small-Town Bankers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that the small banks of this country are rendering great service to the war effort, to say nothing about their continuing the historical good work which they have always carried out in the various communities where they have operated in the past and where they now function. In the days to come when the dance of the billions of dollars ceases to flow from the Federal Treasury we shall find that local community banks will be required to assist in handling the banking and credit needs of our people when we return to peacetime operations and get down to the very practical business of providing jobs in private enterprises for the soldiers who may return to our homes. The need we shall then have for small-town banks cannot well now be understood because of the influence of war and the deficit financing which has placed most everyone's mind in a whirl. The attached editorial is timely. The banks should be preserved. Their successful operations and financial structures must be protected.

The editorial follows:

THE AX FOR THE SMALL-TOWN BANKER?

Assurances come out of Washington from time to time that the Government is glad to let private business do any job that it is willing and able to handle. Small-town

bankers wonder why this policy doesn't apply to them. Through one of its agencies, the Government is actively competing with them and trying to take away their customers.

This Government-fostered competitor is the Production Credit System, a division of the Farm Credit Administration. Its origin goes back to the early thirties, when agricultural areas were in difficulty from depression and drought. Many farmers were unable to provide the security required by State and Federal banking regulations for the short-term loans by which much of the annual crop production and feeding of livestock are financed. Such loans commonly comprise one of the country bank's main sources of business. In setting up the Production Credit System, the intention of Congress was plainly to supplement the existing banking resources and to finance farmers unable to get credit or obtain it at a reasonable cost.

But Production Credit did not long confine itself to this purpose. Rather guardedly at first, then openly, it became a competitor of the country banks for the general type of farm accounts. Now it seeks the cream of these short-term loans, as demonstrated by the growing size of individual loans made by it.

In this competition it has some formidable advantages. Operations are carried on through so-called cooperative associations, composed of farmer borrowers. Each member is required to take stock equal to $5 for each $100 or part of that amount he borrows. They are not, however, true cooperatives—of which much that is favorable can be said—since they are Government nurtured and supervised. An association obtains its loan funds from a Federal intermediate-credit bank—another division of the Farm Credit Administration—on the security of its members' notes and its capital and reserves. The bank rediscounts the paper and sells debentures to investors. These have back of them the original security, plus the capital and reserves of the intermediate-credit bank and the sanction of the Government. As a result, they command a low rate of interest. At last report Production Credit was paying 1½ percent for money and charging its farmer borrowers 4½ percent. The difference is used to pay operating charges and to establish reserves.

Unlike the country banks, Production Credit pays no taxes. In fact, it enjoys use of taxpayers' money through retaining a considerable amount of the original capital invested by the Treasury. It also has another signal advantage which the country bank cannot afford. This consists of liberal and persuasive advertising, promotion, and publicity, prepared by skilled writing men in Farm Credit Administration employ. Moreover, in proportion to the volume of loans, it is staffed beyond the capacity of a private institution to maintain.

Production Credit now has 530 active local associations and, according to its own claims, is prepared to serve every agricultural county. In Iowa—certainly not a State in any farm distress at present—it has 46 offices. In addition to the personnel in full- and part-time offices, Production Credit carries a large number of local representatives, application takers, and inspectors, at a time when manpower is at a premium. Many of these, bankers charge, are actively soliciting business from farmers whether they are being adequately served by local banks or not. Almost any country banker can recite instances of long-standing customers being weaned away from him by this means.

Any doubt that Production Credit is out of the substandard farm-loan field and is strictly competitive with country banks was removed by a recent announcement. This told of a new $200,000,000 Government loan fund being set up by the Department of Agriculture to help farmers lacking credit resources to increase production. This also, it was stated, is not intended to compete with other lenders, but "to supplement such other sources of credit where needed," Production Credit being named among these other sources.

Country banks generally are able and willing to take care of all the short-term farm-loan business that comes up to banking requirements. Many of them now have deposits of record volume. They are taking generous amounts of Treasury issues to finance the war and are devoting their facilities to the sale of War bonds to the public. Some of the local uses of their funds have dwindled because of the war restrictions on small-town business. This makes more serious any inroads on their short-term farm loans at this time. Their unimpaired facilities will be required when the post-war recovery begins, for they are an essential part of the machinery of any going community, serving a variety of local needs that no Government agency can fill.

The independent banks fought off a series of attempts to fasten a branch banking system on the Nation. Now the small-town independent banks find themselves in a struggle with a bigger branch banking system under Government auspices. No one outside of the inner circles knows whether the incurable urge of a Government agency to expand or some other motive is back of the development. An official reason has never been given to the public. One is certainly due.

Contribution of Volunteer Women Workers to Travel Comfort of Members of Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, throughout the land the noble women of America are working energetically and conscientiously to make the travel life of service men and women as comfortable as possible. Transportation problems in time of war are of great importance, and the increase in travel tests the capacities of our railway systems. Certainly there would be great inconvenience were it not for the thoughtful women who help to give comfort to the boys in the service.

Yesterday in Washington at the President's lounge in the Union Station, which is a typical unit of the Nation, there was presented to Mrs. Mason Gulick a silver cup in tribute to her faithful work in this commendable activity.

The solicitude of these good women for the lonesome service man's travel is greatly to be commended. Their work is rendered not only with the highest patriotic motive, but is most practical and comforting to those whom they aid.

I ask that the speech which Mrs. Lionel Atwill, chairman of the committee of 500 women engaged in this war work, made in presenting the cup to Mrs. Gulick be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Isabel Gulick, it is a happy privilege for me as chairman of our wonderful committee of 500 hard-working, earnest, and distinguished women to pay tribute to you this afternoon for your splendid work on behalf of the men in uniform in the President's Lounge at the Union Station. Both in this war and in the last war—you worked faithfully and well.

We want to present to you with our spoken tribute, this silver cup, a token of our esteem that will last when our words are silent and forgotten.

We are not going to thank you because we have all become "expendable," taking on important war work which is now a necessary part of our daily life besides our domestic duties, and women don't go around thanking one another, but they do appreciate work well done and examples of self-sacrifice help us to carry on our own war work.

We feel that in honoring you we also honor ourselves. The thanks you receive will be from the boys in uniform. I say "boys" advisedly, as all men are boys to women, especially to mothers and wives.

I wonder if you ever have the same thoughts as I about the boys arriving on crowded troop trains in our big station? I mean what the thoughts are in their minds and hearts—hidden by a brave, boyish smile—what they left behind and what they face? Most of them came from pleasant American homes; most of them have their own room or share one with an older or younger brother. In that room are their treasures; pennants on the walls of schools and colleges; pictures of teams and groups at gay parties or fraternities. There is usually a girl friend's pretty face in a frame, a radio, a desk by a window, mother's and dad's photographs on a bureau, perhaps an old bird's nest and some unusual stones brought home from last summer's camp. What a different camp they are heading for today. I am sure they pause, bag in hand, at the door, for a last look at that room—a silent good-bye, for they know full well it may indeed be that. Then the crowded troop train and their destination, the cantonment, the training center or combat duty; a several hours' wait between trains and the thoughts of what they have just left behind and what they must face in the near future. They file into the President's Lounge and the U. S. O. lounges in the many big stations throughout the country, and there they are greeted by charming women, "kinda like Mom," with a cheery smile, a pleasant word, a welcome; a little advice; a little praise. What is their reaction? A sense of pride in their new uniform, a desire to fight bravely and win the war; to get it over with and get back home again? This is what General Marshall meant in his speech the opening day of the President's Lounge, May 12, when he said, "High morale on the home front means high morale on the fighting front. In fact, an army cannot fight well without morale."

There are many women here today who go to the station regularly and who have helped organize the President's Lounge for the comfort and welfare of these many boys, and they all feel it is an honor to work there and a pleasure beyond anything they have ever known before.

So, as a tribute to them, two famous young American musicians, probably the two most famous of their generation in America today,

have come here to express the thanks of those many unknown boys to you all, and they will say it with music. One is Corp. Virgil Fox, of the Army Air Forces Band, the former director of organ music of the Peabody Conservatory of Music in Baltimore, and Yeoman Earl Wild, of the Navy Band, who Toscanini called the greatest pianist of his generation. Corporal Fox is considered the greatest of many great organists. These boys are most anxious and happy to play in your honor here this afternoon.

Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of Small Business, delivered by Mr. Nat Bass at the American Business Congress, held at the Hotel Pennsylvania, in New York City, on February 18.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concern for the future of small business grows acute with the expansion of our defense program. Priorities have left many dependent upon what small stock they acquired before priorities were invoked. The end of these stocks will mean the end of business activity for many. We believe small business, fighting to live under wartime hardships is our most serious domestic problem. Unless we do something concrete about it now, the small businessman will be the new vanishing American, and something we can never replace will vanish along with that small businessman—"Freedom of opportunity" (it may become a pre-war memory). Agriculture was helped out of its difficulties. Labor has been accorded its fundamental rights, but small business remains America's orphaned child, and is now facing a prospect of complete elimination. Surely no one likes to look forward to the day when the great American economy would be left in the comparatively few hands of large firms able to survive, because of war work. It isn't a matter of asking small business to escape its share of sacrifice, even though they have to make a disproportionate contribution, but we believe it is fundamental to our entire democratic concept of living that we come out of this (when war will some day come to an abrupt end) preserving some things which are inevitably a part of our country, our people, and our way of life. It was America's faith in the small businessman, and its determination to protect him because he was small, which helped us grow into the great people we are. How can small business survive this crisis, or is antidemocracy inevitable? The American Business Congress now offers a bold, concrete proposal for Nation-wide consideration and discussion. Before offering our proposal, let us just for a brief moment look how another important industry to our economic system was rescued when unexpected conditions arose. In 1933 our Government was forced—yes, only after several years of pleading from small banks—to take a drastic step to save our banking institutions. Through no fault of depositors, or the innocent investing bank stockholder, investment portfolios of banks suddenly were regarded frozen, and a typical American tragedy started with runs on banks. With eventual forced liquidations, values crashed, and time-honored institutions, which had served their community faithfully for years, were forced to close. What did our Government do to save depositors, the bank's stockholders, and the banking industry? It formed the much opposed and harshly abused Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. A move (even though several years late) was considered highly antidemocratic by our "economic royalists," with many strong banks openly opposed to a theory of making a contribution through an assessment system, which might primarily help stabilize many weak-sister and smaller banks. In 10 years this proven successful noble experiment of insuring the deposits of the masses, not the classes, for it only covered up to $5,000, proved to be the stabilizer of the banking industry. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, while it is Government-controlled, costs the Government nothing, and a huge guarantee fund is accumulated by assessing all banks a mere one-twelfth of 1 percent of its deposits. It proved to the banking industry the theory that "United they can stand, and divided they can fall." Now, who pays for this deposit insurance? It is either a charge against income, so it decapitates something from the possible earning dividend of a bank stockholder, or it may be defrayed through a reduction in bank-deposit interest rates, which affects primarily the large depositor, who, regardless of the size of his deposit, gets the same $5,000 insurance limit, so ultimately some individuals or firms make the contribution to cover the assessment for the insurance fund.

Now in line with this experience and considering "small business" as the most dignified and oldest industry in our democracy, and believing that poverty for small business is not inevitable any more, and refusing to return to the "apple-vending era" which prevailed after World War No. 1. The American Business Congress recommends the formation of the Federal Small Business Insurance Corporation as a vehicle for tiding over small business, who of necessity will be hard hit under our total war economy, when they are cut off with their supplies of goods, and their manpower. How can these mounting business casualties be saved from total destruction? Our answer is the Federal Small Business Insurance Corporation. Insurance has taught people that the great use of money (when you have it) is to spend it for something that outlasts it—even life insurance is a "live to win proposition." We propose that the Federal Small Business Insurance Corporation, like the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, function as a Government agency, and at no cost to the Government. Nor will the cost be saddled on corporations or salaries to cut into Government taxes, but we propose to raise most of the funds by a simple assessment of 10 percent from those who receive stock dividends during the war period from corporations able to survive, payable at the source, into a steadily accumulating fund for the proposed Federal Small Business Insurance Corporation which may, we believe, finance the cost of such a program.

From Department of Commerce statistics given to us, dividends from listed corporations alone totaled about $4,000,000,000 in 1942. Other sources may be found if additional funds are required. Regardless of the cost, we believe it would still be worth the price to preserve small business.

The principal purpose of this Federal Small Business Insurance Corporation is to enable firms to keep alive—not to function mind you—but to keep alive without being forced to go bankrupt or be forced to liquidate as a result of financial difficulties caused by the war. The Government recently organized the Federal War Damage Insurance Corporation to insure cold inanimate buildings against war damage, and mortgage holders, particularly banks, are now forcing property owners to insure the banks mortgage investment by a compulsory insurance policy—another form of assessment—but what good will properties be without the survival of small business?

What else will our proposed Federal Small Business Insurance Corporation do? It would promptly enable any qualified small business to at least have an agency to apply to for advice and assistance to enable the preservation—again, not to function, mind you—but the preservation of a business, or to recover it when circumstances permit. Like the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation who works out plans for banks, in time of distress, and like the Federal War Damage Insurance corporation, who provides the funds to rehabilitate property damaged by a bomb, so our new proposed Federal Small Business Insurance Corporation will arrange for readjustments of principal installments on equipment, rents, extensions on the life of existing patents covering frozen items, and other contractual liabilities, and we propose that a maximum outlay of $5,000 a year shall prevail on any one business location. Provided, of course, that the small business in question is essentially sound, has been functioning for at least 5 years and shall have employed at least five people, and above all, have a real reason to hope for continuation after the war. This insurance corporation, in our opinion, will be a suitable life preserver for thousands of deserving small firms, who are destined to be the unfortunate victims.

Now, isn't it fair to assume that those who should have the greatest optimism for such a program, would be the millions of corporation stockholders, now getting unheard of dividends (and in many instances, dividends from stocks which never paid a cent during pre-war days) to be assessed with a mere 10 percent of their dividend? This temporary assessment will in the end be a mere insurance premium (yes, mighty cheap insurance) to preserve the very precious capital stock of any individual or group. For, after all, let's be practical. What good will even Westinghouse or General Motors stock be as an investment for the future, if their mass consuming customers (small business, of course) are strangled out of existence? Can't these stockholders realize, before it is to late and costly, that bigness in industry brings regimentation? That the market must be basically kept free, and that only with the existence of a healthy small business situation, can the drawing up of blueprints be possible for the orderly revival of business, and the restoration of thousands of jobs, when the war is over? Wake up you "war-baby economic royalists," and give a thought to the rugged individualists who have created industries out of their ideas and hard-earned capital, who are directly responsible for over 80 percent of our approved patents, and who unfortunately cannot convert their business to war work—they are most certainly deserving of being retained by their brethren, now financially strong by the war, as a living issue with a chance for a new lease on their old business life. Don't you think these small businessmen have sons in our Army, and the hope of survival for the business of their parents is a strong morale builder? The Federal Small Business Insurance Corporation will also greatly help the present depressed manpower situation, for it will promptly release thousands of small businessmen and their staffs for war work. To many of us small businessmen, good will, fixtures, neighborhood patronage, and other intangibles are potent assets well worth preserving. So many are holding on to the bitter end. But an orderly, protective closing down, with an insured chance to open up with their

business premises kept full intact, is our goal.

Finally, instead of telling small businessmen, as the new control material plan of the War Production Board infers, because of the war necessity, that they must die for lack of goods, the manpower problem, and the new 48-hour edict, we must find a way at whatever cost, at least to preserve their future existence for our own future good. In closing, we repeat, the Federal Small Business Insurance Corporation can help the small businessmen to make a great contribution to our war effort, and prevent them from becoming the new vanishing Americans.

Russia: Big Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the big question here in Washington seems to concern Russia's plans for the future. Vice President WALLACE, in his most recent speech, brought the question to a head by inferring that there is a strong possibility that Russia and Germany might make a separate peace.

There is no question but what the Russian situation is a delicate one and must be handled with shrewd finesse. The United Nations, under the leadership of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, are trying to lay plans for a post-war world. Yet it has been almost impossible to lay any plans because of Russia's reluctance to take part and her refusal to make any kind of statement as to what her aims are.

Members of Congress are very seriously worried about this condition. They do not want to say or do anything to kindle the fire. In considering the lend-lease bill this week, many of the Members deep in their hearts wanted to provide that no more lend-lease materials go to Russia until they sit down and tell us what her post-war intentions are. But so delicate and tense is the Russian problem, that Members of Congress just kept thinking about it. But no Member of Congress thought out loud. They were afraid that talking out loud might add further fuel to the fire and increase the tension already existing.

The Russian intentions are of grave concern here. Molotov keeps quiet and says nothing. We here in Washington know that all is not well but are worried about what to do. Should we face a show-down with Russia now or should we sit tight and help them finish annihilating Hitler and pray that we can get together when the fighting stops?

I am inclined to do the latter. Let us give them aid, all the aid they need to finish Hitler hoping that Russia will keep her word that she will make no separate peace with Hitler. Russia did give that word. Let us hope that our kindness to her will help Russia keep that word. I think that any disruption between our country and Russia now would prolong the war and it also would tempt Russia to make a separate peace with Germany. This would be very disastrous.

We must keep Russia as our ally at any cost. Disagreeable as it is to some here, that seems the only sensible thing to do. There is no question but what we might have to go more than half way to do this. There is no question but what we have cause to wonder why Russia refuses to tell us of her post-war plans. But I feel that we can best talk about those things when Hitler has been finished. It certainly would not help matters at all to try to force a show-down now.

America Should Be On Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the floor of the House the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] made this statement:

Whatever else may be said of Premier Stalin, he is for Russia first, and he does not hesitate to say so. Whatever may be said of Prime Minister Churchill, he is for Great Britain first, and he said frankly that he "was not chosen Prime Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." I admire them for their frankness, for I can truthfully say that my first interest is the welfare of the United States of America.

To show that some Americans—North as well as South—regardless of their political views, are fully aware that America should be on guard I print the following editorial from the March 8 issue of the Chicago Tribune:

Col. Oliver Stanley, Colonial Secretary in the British Government, says the British colonies are going to remain British and colonies. He spoke at Oxford in reply to "the great volume of friendly criticism and disinterested advice" from America. To all of it his answer is "No." There isn't going to be any international administration of Britain's colonies. They are going to remain under the British flag whether they want to or not. If the native peoples show aptitude for self-government they may, perhaps, some day be allowed to advance toward the status of dominions, but Colonel Stanley gave no promises such as we gave the Filipinos. He did say, however, that it would be a mistake for the home government to spend too much money in providing social services for the native peoples. Presumably he was talking about such things as secondary schools, hospitals, and sanitation. The natives, he said, must not become accustomed to more luxury than they can afford to maintain at their own expense if ever they become self-governing. He did not say so, but it seems likely that the lack of schools and sanitation will be cited as evidence of unfitness for self-government.

Colonel Stanley seems to have missed the point of much of the criticism he professed to answer. The American people have read the third item in the Atlantic Charter with its reference to the "right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live." Americans have wondered, some of them hopefully, some of them skeptically, what these words may mean. What were Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill trying to say when they declared that "they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them"? And what did Mr. Stalin mean when he accepted these principles as his own?

The answer is, as we suggested at the time, that the phrases are so much wind. They don't mean anything. The colonial peoples are being forcibly deprived of freedom, but nothing in the Atlantic Charter is going to help them get it. The noble phrases of the Charter don't apply even to the peoples and territories seized by our enemies. Stalin has said that if the Germans are ever driven from Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and the eastern half of Poland, these territories, together with Bessarabia and parts of Finland, are to be incorporated in the Soviet Union for keeps. He is fighting to reconstitute the Russia of the Czars and no Atlantic Charter is going to keep him from attaining his goal.

The same people in this country who took the Atlantic Charter at face value have been whooping it up for American participation in one or another of the various schemes to enforce peace everywhere on earth. We now know from Colonel Stanley and from Mr. Stalin that it is likely to be an uneasy peace in which captive nations will seek to break the bonds that hold them. America is being asked to pledge its men and its money to the perpetuation of national enslavements and to do so in the name of liberty.

New York Bay-Delaware River Section Intracoastal Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, March 9, 1941:

Mr. Chairman, I appear before you today in behalf of the New York Bay-Delaware River section of the Intracoastal Waterway. The need for this missing link in the Atlantic Coast Intracoastal Waterway is so great that the people are demanding early initiation and prosecution of the project.

The canal section to which I refer extends across the State of New Jersey from the head of Raritan Bay, an arm of New York Bay, to the Delaware River near Bordentown, a distance of about 30 miles. The plans provide for a canal with a depth of 27 feet and a bottom width of 250 feet. The water level in the canal would be maintained at an elevation of 10 feet above mean low tide by dams and locks in the Raritan River at Sayreville, and in the Delaware River at Bordentown. Its course is through an agricultural region of central New Jersey, but the lands that will be required for the improvement are 60 percent waste and woodland. There are no large cities directly on the selected route for the land section.

The construction of this ship canal as planned and recommended by the Chief of Engineers will provide the missing link needed to complete a continuous inside deep waterway from Norfolk, Va., to New York City.

from which there is a protected channel to New London, Conn., and on through the Cape Cod Canal to Boston, Mass. A barge canal along the same route across New Jersey has been considered and discarded in favor of a 27-foot waterway providing in general for ships of 25-foot draft. Obviously, the 27-foot Chesapeake and Delaware Canal and the harbor of Philadelphia should be connected with New York Harbor by a ship channel rather than by a barge channel. Prior to 1935 the canal connecting the Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay was a barge canal and the traffic through it was limited to shallow-draft vessels. Since the enlargement and deepening of this canal, the traffic has increased by leaps and bounds. This increase happened before the present emergency. Of course, the emergency has caused a further increase in the ship traffic through the canal both with respect to commercial vessels and warships.

An uninformed person might wonder why an inland canal is needed from New York to Philadelphia when vessels can make the trip outside in the Atlantic Ocean. However, the distance outside and around is much greater and the difficulties and expenses caused by rough seas and inclement weather are large. Ships will always seek an inside route to avoid storm-lashed outside seas. The results of the enlargement of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal tell us what may be expected when we have completed a deep-draft canal from the New York area to the Philadelphia area.

One or more large oil companies now own and operate, in the Chesapeake Bay region between Baltimore, Washington, and Norfolk, self-propelled oil barges which, according to newspaper accounts, have on more than one occasion reached Washington just in time to keep the city's oil supply from being completely exhausted. These large barges draw more water than the shallow-draft inland barges and towboats used on the 9-foot canals and rivers of the country, but they are not suited for long outside runs in rough seas. If the Chesapeake Bay and Philadelphia regions are connected with New York and Boston by a deep-draft quiet waterway from the Delaware River to New York Bay, the same or similar self-propelled barges could operate from Norfolk, Baltimore, and Philadelphia to New York and to New England localities. Such traffic is only one example of the deep-draft traffic that would be additional to the normal shallow-draft inland traffic that could use a continuous protected channel from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Boston, Mass.

It is axiomatic that water transportation is the cheapest mode of transportation. Large tonnages can be accommodated by a waterway when all other methods prove inadequate for bulk transportation. Deep draft ships are the most economical transportation vehicles for large tonnages and barges of less draft are the next best for heavy traffic. The necessities of the New England States can never be supplied by railroads and motor trucks alone. These methods of hauling freight are too limited in the amount of tonnage they can carry. The only practical way to solve the problem is to provide for a complete barge channel into the New England States.

I have discussed briefly the peacetime advantages of a canal across New Jersey, and now let me add a few words about its value in wartime. In the past and until recently the people of this country, including our military and naval experts had never even imagined how great is the need for protected deep-water routes between the great industrial centers on our seacoasts. Recent enemy submarine activity along our Atlantic coast has taught us something we could never have learned except by experience. Insofar as national military planning has governed, it is only by lucky chance that we have the protected deep channel between Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Norfolk. Think how much better off we would be if we had a similar channel between the New York area and the Philadelphia area. Who knows when we will have dire need for this channel, both for commercial vessels and for our warships?

During the past winter the hardships experienced by the New England States because of lack of fuel have been almost unbearable. My people are hardy and can stand a lot. They have never shrunk from privations in order to contribute to the welfare of their country in peace or in war, but they should not be subjected to conditions that can be remedied by a properly efficient Government. This country has an abundance of fuel, even a surplus, but its transportation system has fallen down and the failure in the distribution of fuel has left New England cold.

There is now an intracoastal canal from Texas to New York, except for two short stretches, one across Florida and the other across New Jersey from the Delaware River to New York Bay. The canal across Florida has already been authorized by Congress. The missing link from the Delaware River to New York Bay should be authorized by Congress as soon as possible. Now, right here, let me say something important. There will be all sorts of relatively inconsequential details brought up to support opposition by those who spend their lives advocating doing nothing and saying things cannot be done. I admit that the Delaware-New York Bay canal can never be built if it is never started. I do not base my advocacy of this canal solely on the predicted time of completion. No man can predict what is going to happen in the future. We need the canal now. We will need it after the war. It is an uncompleted link in a great, useful, and needed public improvement already planned and almost completed by the National Government. It is quite likely that after the war there will be urgent demands for public works for employment.

The President has said we should have blueprints ready for such public works. The Delaware River-New York Bay canal was proposed over 30 years ago. The planning for it has been thorough and practical. The blueprints are ready now, but the time-consuming legislation, necessary before a start can be made, has not been enacted. I do not understand how any administrative agency with full knowledge of the President's views on over-all advanced planning can, with reason and logic, report on this project in any but a favorable way, if it heeds what he has said about having blueprints ready. It does no good to have the blueprints ready without an authorization. What we need right now is a legislative authorization for this canal. First things should come first. Let's not worry about the second things until we have accomplished the first things.

Now, I have told you about this project for peacetime use and for wartime use. I have shown you how it connects up deep channels between Norfolk and Philadelphia with similar channels between New York and Boston. I have described its connection with the intracoastal canal for shallow-barge traffic. The reports show that the planning has been going on for some 30 years, that it is skillful, thorough, and complete, and that it has contemplated the national economic and military aspects of the project with foresight and vision. There is little, if any, more that can be said. We have the blueprints; let's have the legislative action necessary for accomplishment in peace or in war, either for wartime emergency construction or for postwar employment.

More About "Surplus" Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the March 5, 1943, Bucyrus (Ohio) Telegraph-Forum is another bit of evidence of waste and frustration of the national resources of our Nation by the Washington bureaucracy:

MORE ABOUT "SURPLUS" BUTTER

The "free" distribution of "surplus" butter by the Surplus Commodities Corporation becomes more disgusting with every official report received concerning the shortage of this particular dairy product. Latest official report is that recent imports from South America included 22,000,000 pounds of butter, which is not expected to come close to helping relieve the country's immediate butter shortage. Yet the Surplus Commodities Corporation continues to hand out butter by the hundreds of pounds to rural schools in this and other counties. Within the last 2 weeks one school in this county was offered an additional 150 pounds. It was turned down because the school now has enough "surplus" butter to last the remainder of this month.

In a recent bulletin issued to the schools, the agency in charge of these wholly unnecessary and silly hand-outs attempted to justify the "gifts" by pointing out that rural school children need to be adequately fed. Of course they need to be adequately fed and no one knows better how to feed them than their own parents. The mothers of this and every other county in the country know more about feeding their children than all of the crackpots of Washington put together. The inference that unless the children get Washington's hand-outs in classrooms they will be underfed is an insult to American parenthood.

The big fuss that is being made today about school lunches is nothing more than a glaring effort to keep alive a New Deal agency that is needed no more than our troops in the South Pacific need snowshoes.

Operating as it is at a time when the Government needs every available dollar to hasten the end of the war into which its people have been drawn, the distribution of "surplus" wartime luxuries such as butter and nutmeats is an inside attack upon the whole war effort. With agriculture, factories, stores, offices, and all forms of businesses short of help as they are today, there is no need for poverty of the kind that requires our Government to spend millions each year to buy "surplus" luxuries and hand them out free to the children of people who can well afford and want to pay their own keep.

It can be stamped out if butter dealers refuse as a local dealer, C. W. Warnock, has refused to deal with the agencies that buy butter for the hand-outs. Answering a recent letter from a Chicago agency which he knows buys for the Surplus Commodities Corporation, Mr. Warnock told the agency that in this county you are being laughed at because you are giving away dairy products to rural schools and to your local relief agency at a time of scarcity and while people who work in factories are only able to buy about a half or third as much butter as they bought a year ago."

Continuing, he pointed out that he would be glad to deal with the Army or the Navy, and that if they "catch us cheating they don't need a great big long contract of several pages filled with crazy lingo to start prosecution."

Concluding, Mr. Warnock wrote: "What you are doing is the reverse of patriotism. It is unfair, unreasonable, and un-American, and while the writer is manager of this company we will not be a party to any such pettifoggery."

Hats off to the courage displayed in this letter. Only when the people themselves take matters in their own hands as Mr. Warnock did in this letter will we shake ourselves free from the yoke of centralized control that is growing more and more into a dictatorship, not ruthless like that of Europe, but just as binding upon all of our lives.

Appointments Under Lease-Lend Administration in North Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters and statement from the Office of War Information:

MARCH 6, 1943.

Mr. ELMER DAVIS,
Director, Office of War Information,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: On February 22, 1943, the Capital Times at Madison, Wis., published a news release, copy of which I am enclosing herewith.

Will you kindly advise me of the facts with reference to this release and send me full information with respect to these jobs? If there are any announcements in connection with this offer of jobs, I would like to have copies of the same for use in connection with my work as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

I will want this information by Tuesday next, and trust that you will see that it is sent to me by messenger so that I will receive it at that time.

Very respectfully yours,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION,
Washington, March 8, 1943.

Hon. FRANK B. KEEFE,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEEFE: The news story published on February 22, 1943, in the Capital Times at Milwaukee, Wis., to which you refer in your letter of March 6, was evidently based upon a press announcement released for Sunday papers of February 21 by the Milwaukee field office of the Office of War Information. I attach a copy of this press release.

Upon inquiry I am informed that the recruiting of the personnel referred to was undertaken by the Personnel Division of the Office for Emergency Management after discussions with the Civil Service Commission, on behalf of the Lend-Lease Administration. I am informed that the Lend-Lease Administration was in need of very rapid recruitment of a number of specialists and that accordingly the Office for Emergency Management sent instructions to all of its branch personnel officers, of whom there is one in Milwaukee, asking them to assist in any possible way in securing the names of persons who might be qualified for the positions which Lend-Lease desired to fill in north Africa. So far as I am aware, nowhere else in the country was this request for assistance interpreted by the recruiting officers as indicating the need for widespread recruitment through the newspapers, but apparently in the Milwaukee office it was so interpreted. Accordingly, the Office for Emergency Management personnel officer there, the Miss Devota Mullen referred to in the press release, made an official request upon the local branch of the Office of War Information in Milwaukee for assistance in the form of a press release.

The press release referred to was specifically approved as to content by the personnel recruiting officers of the Office for Emergency Management in Milwaukee, being based on information furnished by that office. Unfortunately, however, it appears on checking the accuracy of the facts in Washington today that the press release was erroneous in one major particular, that having to do with the total remuneration paid. The reference in the release to: "Basic pay plus at least 25 percent additional" seems to be the basis of the erroneous calculations. We are told by the Office for Emergency Management here that the jobs pay the basic salary of the grade plus $7 a day subsistence, and an additional $7 a day in the case of travel outside of official headquarters. The total payments listed, therefore, appear to be inflated by the amount of 25 percent of the basic pay in each instance.

As a means of getting you the accurate information you requested, we have today checked with both the Office for Emergency Management and the Lend-Lease Administration, and I understand that the office of Mr. Stettinius at Lend-Lease will communicate immediately with you regarding the matter.

Cordially,
ELMER DAVIS,
Director.

Men with records of proven experience and responsibility in any of 19 fields of employment are being recruited by the United States Government to fill important civilian positions with the Lend-Lease Administration in north Africa, the Wisconsin area office of the Office of War Information announced Saturday. Pay ranges from $5,020 to $12,520 a year—the highest rates listed in any general recruiting announcement of the war.

Appointees will be stationed in the wake of Allied armed forces in such north African countries as Morocco, Algeria, or Tunisia to expedite the movement and distribution of lend-lease food and materials destined for these and other areas.

Recruiting for Wisconsin is handled by Miss Devota Mullen, field personnel officer of the Office for Emergency Management, 7196 Plankinton Arcade, Milwaukee, cooperating with the Civil Service Commission.

Salary schedules include basic pay plus at least 25 percent additional for out-of-country employment, and $7 a day subsistence. Should the applicant be required to travel, $7 a day additional pay will be provided for expenses.

Those who qualify are not required to sign a work contract, and neither is Civil Service approval needed, due to urgent need for their services, Miss Mullen said. Appointees will be flown from America to north Africa.

Jobs are open to men experienced in clerical, industrial, food, transportation, engineering, accounting, and other fields.

No family man under 35 will be considered and no single man under 38. Applicants must be in excellent health, cannot have any near relatives living in an occupied country, and must have a clean personal record. The list of positions to be filled, and their salaries:

Classification CAF–15, $12,500 a year: Requirement chief to develop sources and expedite flow of raw materials; food expert, experienced in distribution, production, and handling food in large quantities; materials expert with engineering and practical experience, familiar with materials from production and repair angles.

Classification CAF–14, $10,645 a year: Truck service men qualified to repair all types of antiquated trucks; truck parts man qualified to run large parts warehouse; industrial machine tools man with designing and drafting experience; medical supplies man, familiar with pharmaceutical warehouses and drugs of all kinds; railroad equipment man; reports and clearance man, familiar with loading and unloading procedure, stock, and space.

Classification CAF–13, $9,520 a year: Assistant in charge of lend-lease organization at Algiers, Algeria; six food experts, with experience in all foods, distribution, storage, loading, and shipping; six industrial engineers of rough-and-tumble type, qualified to take over industrial plants that have been bombed, or where help has walked out; three pricing and distribution experts, of merchandising manager type to handle pricing and distribution of all types of commodities, including gadgets for the natives; three transportation experts familiar with the trucking field.

Classification CAF–12, $8,270 a year: Ten accountants and record keepers, preferably men who know Government-travel voucher procedure; nine field distribution investigators whose duties will be following up merchandise, keeping it moving, and providing protection so that goods are not stolen.

Classification CAF–9, $6,520 a year: Nineteen male stenographers.

Classification CAF–7, $5,770 a year; Three male file clerks.

Classification CAF–5, $5,020 a year: Six male typists.

The north African land in which qualified applicants will carry out their duties has a mild climate, with the year divided into the 3 seasons of winter lasting from November through February, spring from March through June, and summer July through October.

Archeological authorities who have accompanied expeditions to Tunisia, Morocco, and Algeria, describe the northern and northwestern coastline of Africa as a "garden spot, where flowers and vegetables of every kind grow."

The north African climate is about the same as that in North Carolina and Virginia, they report, and along the seacoast, daytime temperatures rarely rise above 90 degrees. Nights are cool.

Modern cities, nurtured by expert and tourist trade, dot the fertile northern country, and with an eye to the tourist business all have developed fine hotel facilities, these travelers add.

Justice for Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a telegram sent to

me by Edward C. Carter, president, Russian War Relief.

NEW YORK, N. Y., MARCH 9, 1943.

Representative EMANUEL CELLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It would help to minimize potential damage to work of Russian war relief from Ambassador Standley's statement if you would speak in House tomorrow, for the sake of gaining widest public dissemination of facts, on the effect that aid given to the Soviet people by Americans through Russian War Relief has had and still can have.

We know that the message which the contribution of millions of American citizens to Russian War Relief is intended to send to our Soviet allies has been getting through and it is essential, if we are to continue this work at maximum effectiveness, that the confidence of the public be not destroyed. For your information I have today issued the following statement to the press in New York:

"Evidence that the Russian people are being at least fairly widely apprised by the Soviet Government of the aid being given them by Americans through Russian War Relief was presented today by Edward C. Carter, president of the relief agency. United States Ambassador William H. Standley said Monday in Moscow that Soviet authorities have not informed their people of American aid being given the Soviet Union.

" 'I certainly am not qualified to question the general content of the Ambassador's remarks in Moscow.' Carter said, 'but in respect to supplies shipped to Russia by Russian War Relief we have direct evidence that the Soviet Government has taken some pains to inform Soviet citizens of the arrival of our shipments and of the fact that they come from the hearts of the American people.'

"As one example of the kind of evidence of which he spoke, Carter cited cables sent to Russian War Relief in the last year from Moscow and Kuibyshev by Red Army authorities, Russian journalists, leaders of religious groups and labor organizations, and civil authorities, all expressing gratitude for supplies received. 'We have a radiogram,' Carter said, 'describing in detail the distribution of one consignment of clothing and other supplies to soldiers on the central front in Russia. The Red Army authorities ordered special meetings of the troops to receive these gifts and at each meeting, our correspondent radioed, the personnel heard with deep interest about the activities of Russian War Relief committees.'

" 'We have received direct substantiation of this radioed information in the form of personal letters from many individual soldiers on all of the Red Army fronts, including a batch of notes written by Red Army men in Stalingrad during its siege.

" 'Other individual letters from Russian citizens have come from college students, farmers, the directors of orphanages, housewives, and factory workers.

" 'It is interesting to note in this connection, that the Soviet Embassy in Washington, has consistently, since organization of Russian War Relief in 1941 not only facilitated exchanges of greetings between American contributors to Russian War Relief and recipients in the Soviet Union, but has encouraged them.' Carter said that Russian War Relief plans next month to launch a campaign urging Americans throughout the country to write letters to individual Russians in connection with a planned national observance of the historic significance of June 22, second anniversary of the invasion of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by the Nazis. 'We have received the assurance of the Soviet Embassy they will cooperate to get these letters delivered to individual Russians,' Carter said."

EDWARD C. CARTER,
President, Russian War Relief.

Judaism and a Just and Enduring Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1943

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a few days ago I obtained the unanimous consent of the Senate to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement from the American Institute, held under the auspices of the Commission on Justice and Peace of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, on the subject of Judaism and a Just and Enduring Peace. It transpired that the matter was found to require slightly more space in the RECORD than I anticipated, and I had not procured an estimate of cost for the printing. I have now procured an estimate of $135; and I renew my request that the matter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDAISM AND A JUST AND ENDURING PEACE

INTRODUCTION

The American Institute on Judaism and a Just and Enduring Peace was held at the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio, from December 21 to December 24, 1942, under the auspices of the Commission on Justice and Peace of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. At the 1942 meeting of the conference held in Cincinnati, Ohio, the Commission on Justice and Peace was given the mandate to "invite our brethren of the household of Israel to aid us in planning a peace based on the principles of the Hebrew prophets." In response to this mandate, subsequently endorsed by the executive board of the central conference, the Commission on Justice and Peace invited rabbis and Jewish laymen representing all interpretations of Judaism to share in the task of preparing a statement on Judaism and a just and enduring peace. In making plans for the institute, careful consideration was given to the procedure of the Malvern conference under the leadership of the Archbishop of Canterbury, of the Delaware conference, under the auspices of the Federal Council of Churches, and of the Inter-American Seminar under the auspices of the National Catholic Welfare Council. The Reverend Bradford Abernathy, of the Federal Council of Churches, was very helpful and offered invaluable suggestions about techniques.

The Hebrew Union College extended to the American Institute the hospitality of its dormitories and the facilities of its administrative buildings. The opening session of the Institute and three other plenary sessions were held in the chapel of the Hebrew Union College. At the opening session, Rabbi Samuel Thurman, of St. Louis, offered the invocation and Rabbi Charles B. Latz, of Canton, Ohio, the benediction. The introductory statement was made by Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, of St. Louis, Mo., chairman of the commission on justice and peace and of the institute. Words of greeting were brought by President Julian Morgenstern of the Hebrew Union College and Mr. Adolph Rosenberg, chairman of the board of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. Messages of greeting were read from the Archbishop of Canterbury, chairman of the Malvern conference; from John Foster Dulles, chairman of the Delaware conference; from Msgr. John A. Ryan, director of the National Catholic Welfare Council, which sponsored the Inter-American Seminar; from Vice President Henry Wallace; Secretary of State Cordell Hull; Secretary of the Treasury Henry S. Morgenthau, Jr.; and from Gov. Herbert H. Lehman. Word also came from Dr. Israel Goldstein, president of the Synagogue Council of America, and Rabbi Harry M. Levitsky, president of the Rabbinical Assembly. Rabbi James G. Heller, president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, delivered the opening message. Rabbis Harry Kaplan, Columbus, Ohio; Arthur J. Lelyveld, of Omaha, Nebr.; and Joseph Gumbiner, of Phoenix, Ariz., presided at institute services.

Immediately after the opening session, the institute was divided into six round tables, each one of which was charged with the task of preparing for consideration of the entire institute a statement on one of the following six topics: The religious, interfaith, political, economic, and racial bases of a just and enduring peace, and Jewish post-war reconstruction. Within each round table, the prepared study was read and served as the basis of discussion. As soon as any round table was ready with a final report, a plenary session was called and the report was considered. After all reports had been discussed and adopted, the editorial committee was requested to put the statement into final shape.

During the institute, Dr. Mordecai Ezekiel, of Washington, D. C., economic adviser of the Secretary of Agriculture, spoke on the teachings of the prophets and the economic order of tomorrow. Dr. Jacob Robinson, of New York City, director of the institute of Jewish studies of the American Jewish Congress, addressed one of the sessions on Jewish post-war reconstruction. Prof. Sheldon H. Blank, of the Hebrew Union College, served as secretary of the institute. Prof. Abraham Cronbach, of the Hebrew Union College, delivered the closing benediction.

Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, of Temple Israel, St. Louis, presided at all the sessions. Within every round table, there was a leader who had prepared the preliminary study, a chairman who presided and a secretary who kept the records. The round table organization was as follows:

1. The religious basis of a just and enduring peace

Leader: Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, of Cleveland, Ohio.

Chairman: Rabbi James G. Heller, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

Secretary: Rabbi Richard Hertz, of Winnetka, Ill.

2. The interfaith basis of a just and enduring peace

Leader: Rabbi Morris Lazaron, of Baltimore, Md.

Chairman: Rabbi Louis L. Mann, of Chicago, Ill.

Secretary: President Julian Morgenstern, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

3. The political basis of a just and enduring peace

Leader: Prof. Paul Freund of the Harvard Law School and Special Assistant to the United States Attorney General.

Chairman: Rabbi Barnett R. Brickner, of Cleveland, Ohio.

Secretary: Prof. Jacob R. Marcus, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

4. The economic basis of a just and enduring peace

Leader: Rabbi Sidney Goldstein, of New York City.

Chairman: Rabbi Leon Fram, of Detroit, Mich.

Secretary: Rabbi Albert G. Minda, of Minneapolis, Minn.

5. The racial basis of a just and enduring peace

Leader: Rabbi Maurice Zigmond, of Storrs, Conn.

Chairman: Rabbi Abram V. Goodman, of Davenport, Iowa.

Secretary: Prof. Abraham Cronbach, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

6. Jewish post-war reconstruction

Leader: Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein, of Chicago, Ill.

Chairman: Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath of Toronto, Canada.

Secretary: Rabbi Ely Pilchik, of Tulsa, Okla.

The statement adopted by the institute is printed in full in the following pages. The delegates of the American Institute in preparing this statement and in making it public, want it understood that they speak only for themselves and that they assume full responsibility for it. They came to the institute as individuals representing no organization. The American Institute on Judaism and a Just and Enduring Peace is pleased to give this statement of its findings to the public for discussion, deliberation, and guidance, and adds the hope that its words may help mankind to achieve a just and enduring peace.

THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE,
FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN, *Chairman*.
MAURICE N. EISENDRATH.
LEON FRAM.
JAMES G. HELLER.
ABRAHAM V. GOODMAN.
JACOB R. MARCUS.

1. THE RELIGIOUS BASIS OF A JUST AND ENDURING PEACE

The failure of men to recognize the implications of the sovereignty of God and the sanctity of human life has resulted in moral disruption and world-wide devastation. Misreading the findings of the sciences, both physical and social, men have given their allegiance to false philosophies. Spiritual and moral values have been divorced from human life, and materialism has been made supreme in the affairs of men. In order to rebuild our broken civilization, the spiritual teachings of religion must become the foundations of the new world order and the dynamic force in a just and enduring peace.

We hold that any attempt to extricate humanity from its present tragic condition must take cognizance of the following basic principles which derive from Israel's historic teachings:

1. International peace is of the very essence of the ethical doctrine of Judaism, and the propagation of it has been part of the historic mission of Israel. The ideal of universal peace springs directly from Judaism's concept of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Racial, national, and cultural divisions among men have historical and moral value and serve the purposes of the Almighty. The emphasis of Judaism, however, has been upon their harmonious coexistence and their collaboration in establishing God's Kingdom on earth.

2. Judaism recognizes no inherent national or racial superiorities and has consistently condemned the employment of all such fictions for the purpose of dominating and exploiting other peoples.

3. Judaism teaches that national sovereignty must be subordinate to the higher moral law of God. No nation is above this law. No nation can be a law unto itself. Every nation is morally responsible and accountable to God, who is the source and sanction of all life, individual and collective.

4. Judaism has always urged the necessity of organizing for peace, by creating a permanent international society, the members of which will covenant to observe the moral law of God. Nations can find just and enduring peace only insofar as they merge their separate national interests with the corporate life of humanity.

5. Judaism was first among the great religions of the world to proclaim the ideal of universal disarmament. This will come as a natural consequence of the establishment of a righteous and effective international order. Nations will beat their swords into plowshares only when there will be an international agency strong enough to protect every nation against aggression.

6. Judaism maintains that no just and enduring peace is possible unless it is founded upon full political, economic, and social rights for men everywhere. Only the work of righteousness can yield peace, and only upon justice and truth can peace rest securely.

7. Judaism believes that a lasting peace can come only with reconciliation. It seeks the destruction of evil rather than of the evildoer. Governments and their leaders who are responsible for bringing war, suffering, and destruction upon the world must be brought to justice. Retribution is neither revenge nor retaliation but a requisite condition of international morality. An enduring peace must be based upon the voluntary association of nations as equals within a world community, regardless of past offenses, of which no nation is entirely blameless.

8. Despite the complexities and difficulties of building world peace Judaism does not despair. Judaism believes confidently in the perfectibility of man and in the moral progress of mankind. It affirms unfaltering faith in the future and in man's capacity to achieve a just and enduring peace, once he becomes possessed of the power and the might of the spirit of God. Judaism proclaims that it is man's present duty and ultimate destiny "l'taken 'olam b'malkut Shaddai," "to perfect the world under the loving sovereignty of the Almighty."

II. THE INTERFAITH BASIS OF A JUST AND ENDURING PEACE

1. Judaism and Christianity spring from a common source, worship the God of the universe, uphold an ethical way of life, and labor for a common end—the unification and salvation of mankind. The present war has made clear their historic kinship. Today they face a common enemy bent upon the annihilation of both. Their mutual heritage of ideals and beliefs and their present mortal peril must draw Christianity and Judaism closer to each other and induce them to work together in trust and fellowship until their common goal shall be attained.

2. The democracy of the Western World has been inspired by Judeo-Christian religious traditions. The preservation of democracy and the fashioning of a just and enduring peace offer Christianity and Judaism a unique opportunity for cooperative action. Indeed, this time in which we live may prove the acid test of religious sincerity. Unless all religions eschew sectarianism and learn to unite upon their essentials, unless they make a valiant and wholehearted effort to interpret their beliefs in terms of social action, they may well forfeit their right to the allegiance of men. They will not otherwise play their due role in the writing of the peace, or in the making of the world to be built after this war.

3. In the light of our common origin, tradition, and present peril, we propose that there be convened as promptly as possible a world council of Christianity and Judaism. While preserving the integrity of both faiths, this council should mobilize their spiritual resources and speak in one mighty voice for the application of the universal ideals of righteousness and brotherhood in the post-war world.

4. Beyond this there is a comradeship of all believers. God has revealed Himself in various ways and through the genius of different communions. We seek fellowship with all the children of God, our brothers, in the glorious adventure of rebuilding the world. In this spirit we look beyond the world council of Christianity and Judaism to the formation in due time of a world council of religion which, with full regard for the integrity and dignity of each, shall embrace in its membership all the religions of the world. Such a council might well be the conscience of mankind, speaking in the name of the living God.

III. THE POLITICAL BASIS OF A JUST AND ENDURING PEACE

Judaism recognizes no ultimate distinction between secular and sacred or between the fields of politics and religion. In advocating the following principles and policies for the post-war world, we wish to state our conviction that each and every one is deeply integrated with moral and religious issues and ideals:

1. Total victory for the United Nations shall not lead to a new tyranny of nation over nation.

2. Every nation shall recognize the inalienable right of every individual within it to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; to freedom of expression, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

3. There shall be established a federation of nations in the interests of which the sovereignty of individual states shall be limited.

4. To enable this federation of states to establish the reign of right among nations, there shall be created a court of international justice.

5. To make such a federation secure, there shall be established an effective international police force.

6. The United Nations shall set up a tribunal to pass judgment on those responsible for the perpetration of crimes against humanity.

7. Victory shall be followed by the immediate disarmament of the Axis Nations as a prelude to eventual world disarmament.

8. It shall be one of the first duties of the victorious nations to emancipate, reconstruct, and rehabilitate all oppressed groups and peoples.

9. Economic and territorial imperialism shall be terminated and the federation of nations shall assume the obligation of assisting all subject peoples, colonies, and mandated territories to attain their independence.

10. All nations shall have free and equal access to the raw materials, economic resources, and markets of the world.

IV. THE ECONOMIC BASIS OF A JUST AND ENDURING PEACE

In the world that has grown up in the last two centuries—a world of international trade, of large scale industrialism and mass production, no proposals for peace that do not rest firmly upon economic grounds, that do not grapple with the problems of labor and capital and their relation to the freedom and happiness of myriads, can be either realistic or successful. As in the case of political programs and principles, we affirm our conviction that the very context of justice and of brotherhood in the modern world is to be found in the conflicts and issue of economic life. Like our spiritual forebears, the great Hebrew prophets, we know that until there is fair dealing between man and man, until nations learn to bring equality of opportunity to all, there can be no complete worship or service of God. Therefore, with due consideration of their importance for the time to come, we enunciate the following principles:

1. By virtue of our scientific knowledge and technical equipment, we of the modern world already possess the economic resources for a wide and equitable distribution of income. All we need is the courage and the wisdom to create and maintain it. Essential to the achievement of the abundant life for all are the right to work, and the right to equality of economic opportunity without regard to race, religion, or nationality. There must be no room in the post-war world for exploitation or serfdom.

2. In consonance with the dignity of human personality, the standard of living in every country and on every continent should provide not only proper shelter, sufficient food, and adequate clothing, but all other services now recognized as a part of civilized life, such as medical care, opportunities for culture and education and facilities for recreation. Such a wide distribution of income will involve heavy taxation and will impose sacrifices upon certain individuals and groups. They should be as selfless in behalf of a peaceful world based on righteousness as in the cause of military victory.

3. "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." Man is but the steward over the natural resources which God created. In order that all men may be assured of economic justice, our natural resources should be treated as the endowment of society alone, to be controlled democratically for social use.

4. Widespread unemployment was one of the causes of that general social despair which drove men to the desperate recourse of totalitarianism. The problem of unemployment must not be allowed to develop in the post-war world, as it did after the last war. Employment can be provided in our time for every person willing and able to work. A program toward this end should include: (a) limitation of the hours of labor in accordance with the welfare of the worker and economic needs, (b) rationalization of production, (c) the elimination of child labor, (d) the expansion of social services such as health, education, and recreation, (e) a program of reconstruction of the areas devastated by war, (f) a housing program to eliminate slums and such other construction projects as are socially desirable but which may not enlist private enterprise.

5. In a democratic society the workers in agriculture, industry, commerce, and the professions, must possess the right to organize in order to advance their own welfare. This implies their right to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing and to negotiate with employers the terms of contracts covering wages and salaries, hours and conditions of work, vacations, and severance compensation, and the machinery through which grievances are to be adjusted. These rights of labor should be incorporated in the social legislation of every country.

6. The rights of workers imply responsibilities for the welfare of the industry in which they are engaged. The relationship of workers and employers should not be one of conflict but of cooperation. Economic democracy requires that workers participate with employers in the management of industry.

7. A general sense of insecurity was another of the causes which drove men to surrender their freedom to dictators who falsely promised to give them security in exchange for liberty. We believe that social security is a function of democracy and freedom. Our social-security program should include the following: unemployment insurance, accident insurance, training of the handicapped, health insurance, old-age annuities, maternity aid, and child care.

8. International cooperation must be economical as well as political. Even as individuals cannot live by themselves alone and be unconcerned about other men, so no nation can plan only in terms of its own prosperity. Economic isolationism, expressing itself through tariff barriers, and other obstacles which impede the flow and exchange of food, materials, and products, at best brings only temporary gains and creates the bitterness, the friction, and the poverty which eventually lead to war. Nations like individuals have common responsibilities to establish economic justice for all.

V. THE RACIAL BASIS OF A JUST AND ENDURING PEACE

A corollary to the cardinal doctrine of Judaism, the belief in one God, is the belief in the oneness of mankind. This belief is echoed and reechoed in biblical and rabbinic literature. The first chapter of Genesis proclaims man's common ancestry, and the rabbinical interpreters hailed this as evidence of the equality of all races.

1. The doctrine that there are superior and inferior races is a modern superstition. The physical differences between groups are not profound and the degree of distinctiveness which might justify the use of the term "race" is indefinable within precise limits. The most painstaking investigations have failed to reveal any correlation between physical form on the one hand and mental or social habits on the other. Neither race nor color indicates cultural progress or capacity. Every human group possesses worth. Difference does not mean superiority or inferiority. Difference signifies variety, and variety promotes cultural enrichment. Ethnological arguments used to justify the oppression of one group by another are fallacious. Nothing could be more baneful than the doctrine of the Herrenvolk, the master race. As long as such a concept is rife, the peace of nations is grievously imperiled.

2. There is a deep connection between amicable and constructive relationships across the boundaries of nations and parallel relationships within these nations. By reason of our troubled history and the centuries of persecution we have endured, we Jews should feel ourselves especially obligated to understand the plight of the Negro in all sections of our country and to espouse his cause. We ask for the Negro the recognition of his right to earn a living unhindered by the disabilities which at present bar his way. He must enjoy the same advantages that other Americans enjoy in education, medical care, and housing. The day must come when lynching will be abhorrent to every American. Finally, we urge the removal of all barriers which impede the progress of Negroes as children of God.

3. We declare the basic equality of all races.

We assert that no race has the right to dominate another.

We reaffirm Judaism's teaching of the brotherhood of all peoples.

We deny that God has selected some races for special favors and others for debasing servitude.

We urge the education and full emancipation of all peoples.

We do not regard conflict between races as inevitable. On the contrary, they must cooperate as equals, if there is to be a just and enduring peace.

We look with especial concern upon the exploitation of many millions in Asia and Africa, and urge their admission as equals into the councils of nations.

All sanctions for racial discrimination and segregation must be eliminated from the laws of states and nations, and from the minds and hearts of men.

VI. JEWISH POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

Among all the peoples who have been victims of Axis tyranny and aggression that has been directed at the destruction of the life and liberty of men, none has suffered more than Israel. An overwhelming majority of European Jews have already been uprooted and dispossessed. Large masses of Jews have been and are being massacred in pursuance of the publicly proclaimed Nazi policy to exterminate all Jews. This unparalleled tragedy summons all freedom-loving men to forthright action.

Any adequate program of post-war reconstruction must do complete justice to the urgent needs of Jews as individuals and as a group.

The assistance of the United Nations is imperative in order to achieve this reconstruction, since the task is on a scale beyond the capacity of the surviving Jewish communities.

1. Homes must be made available for the millions of homeless Jews. They must be granted the opportunity either to resettle in their former homes, remain wherever they are, or find new homes where they may be free.

2. Together with all other men, Jews must be guaranteed political equality, full economic opportunity, and a chance for complete spiritual self-realization.

Because of the global nature and complexity of Jewish life, there can be no single solution for the problems of the Jews as a group.

1. Meeting these needs requires the recognition of the right of Jewish groups everywhere to the fullest enjoyment and fostering of their religious and cultural heritage in accordance with their specific needs and conditions in their respective countries.

2. All Jews are bound by spiritual and historic ties to the Holy Land. Since the issuance of the Balfour Declaration, a tremendous impetus has been given to successful Jewish settlement in Palestine. Since the advent of the Nazi regime, there have been some years in which immigration increased to such a degree as to prove the extraordinary absorptive capacity of Palestine. After the war conditions must be created to permit as large a Jewish immigration to Palestine as possible, in accordance with obligations assumed under the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine Mandate. Now more than ever the nations of the world must give fullest recognition to the right of Jews to a homeland in Palestine, and they must help facilitate in every way the work of rebuilding that land.

From Maine to Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a statement made yesterday before the Rivers and Harbors Committee by Mr. Roy Miller, of Corpus Christi, Tex., active vice president of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas and legislative representative of the port of Corpus Christi. The statement gives strong support to H. R. 1880, introduced and sponsored by my distinguished leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and now being considered by the committee. If Mr. MCCORMACK's bill is enacted into law, it will assure the ultimate completion of a through protected inland waterway from Maine to Mexico. Naturally, the people of my district and of the entire Southwest are much interested in this great enterprise. Mr. Miller's statement gives some of the reasons. It follows:

My name is Roy Miller, of Corpus Christi, Tex. I am active vice president of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and

Texas and legislative representative of the port of Corpus Christi. I also represent other waterway interests in Texas. I appear here to advocate and urge the approval of H. R. 1880.

The Intracoastal Canal Association is one of the oldest waterway organizations in the country. It was organized 37 years ago by public-spirited citizens and business interests of Louisiana and Texas for the purpose of bringing about the construction of an inland waterway from the Mississippi River to the Rio Grande. Largely as a result of its activities, there is now in existence an inland waterway with a depth of 9 feet and a bottom width of 100 feet from the Mississippi River to Corpus Christi, Tex. The waterway is handling a large and rapidly increasing traffic.

As members of the committee are aware, the dimensions of the Intracoastal Waterway of Louisiana and Texas were enlarged to a depth of 12 feet and a bottom width of 125 feet by the Mansfield bill, H. R. 6999, approved July 23, 1942, now known as Public Law 675, Seventy-seventh Congress. The Mansfield bill also, as members of the committee know, authorized the extension of the Intracoastal Waterway and its completion on the basis of these enlarged dimensions from Corpus Christi to the Mexican border, a distance of approximately 120 miles. It further authorized similar enlargement of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from the Mississippi River to the vicinity of Apalachee Bay on the west coast of Florida and also authorized the construction of a barge canal 12 feet deep and 150 feet wide across Florida to connect with the existing 12-foot inland waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Trenton, N. J.

The authorization proposed in H. R. 1880, if enacted into law, will therefore provide for the completion of a protected inland waterway from the Mexican border in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas to Boston, Mass. Since it is an integral and essential part of such a through protected waterway, the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas believes that the project, which this measure seeks to authorize, is obviously in the public interest and therefore earnestly urges its adoption.

The territory traversed by the Intracoastal Waterway of Louisiana and Texas constitutes the Nation's most productive region in respect to petroleum and its products and many other natural resources essential not only to the war effort but necessary in the Nation's peacetime economy. Between the Mississippi and the Rio Grande and in close proximity to the Intracoastal Waterway there is produced probably two-thirds of the Nation's supply of fuel oil and gasoline. In the same area, there is produced practically all of the Nation's sulfur, all of the mines being located immediately on or in close proximity to the waterway.

Texas alone produces more than half of our supply of petroleum and its products including gasoline and 52 percent of all of the Nation's petroleum reserves are located within the boundaries of Texas. The total petroleum reserves in the United States as of December 31, 1942, amount to 20,082,793,000 barrels. Notwithstanding the production of 1,385,479,000 barrels last year, total reserves for the country as a whole were increased during the year by a net gain of 493,497,000 barrels.

Of course, all of us realize the vital importance of an adequate supply of oil and gasoline in the winning of the war. Ample fuel for ships, for planes, for trucks, for tanks, and other motorized equipment can truthfully be said to constitute the surest road to victory and when the final chapter in the story is written it will record that the ability of the United States of America to supply the fuel needs of the United Nations was the greatest single contribution to victory.

The total oil production of the world is approximately 2,250,000,000 barrels annually, based upon available figures for 1941. Of that vast total, countries producing approximately 2,000,000,000 barrels are on the side of the United Nations. Of that total amount the United States produced 1,403,784,000 barrels, or 70 percent of the total. When it is considered that two-thirds of the United States production exists in the territory in reasonable proximity to the Intracoastal Waterway of Louisiana and Texas, the importance of that project in its relation to the Florida barge canal and the waterway across New Jersey can be readily appreciated. If to the production of Louisiana and Texas is added the production of the States of Mississippi, Arkansas, and Oklahoma, we have in the territory which this waterway will serve 75 percent of the entire oil production of the Nation. Before the normal transportation situation was reversed by war necessity, the oil production of all of these States drained southward by pipe line to the coasts of Louisiana and Texas, which are served directly by the Intracoastal Waterway.

There are many other vital natural resources in the territory traversed by the Intracoastal Waterway, such as salt, timber, hardwood, etc., but petroleum and its products and sulfur constitute the major portion of the available traffic.

Prior to the war, and before the disastrous submarine sinkings and the shortage of ocean transportation facilities due also to other causes, practically all of the requirements of the Atlantic seaboard and the eastern and northeastern parts of our country in respect to fuel oil, gasoline, and sulfur were supplied by coastwise ships which provided not only the completely adequate but the very cheap kind of transportation which is necessary in the movement of such bulky and comparatively low valued commodities. As members of the committee know from reliable testimony presented to the committee during its consideration of the Mansfield bill, the normal requirements of Atlantic seaboard territory for petroleum and its products was said to be 1,600,000 barrels per day. The consumption of sulfur in the same area in normal times amounted to several hundred thousand tons annually. It is now very much greater.

In the normal movement of these essential commodities, the cost for transportation by ocean ships was very low, so low, in fact, as to have comparatively small relationship to the cost of the commodities to the consumers. The major portion of the movement today is by rail; and, while I do not have the exact figures, I am quite sure that, taken as a whole, the cost of transporting them from Louisiana and Texas fields to the Atlantic seaboard area is from two to three times greater than was the case when the movement was accomplished by ocean vessel.

In an address delivered at Corpus Christi, Tex., on April 18, 1942, on the occasion of the completion of the Intracoastal Waterway to that point, Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, gave the following figures as representing the cost of transportation of oil by various methods:

"Eight mills per ton-mile by rail, 3 mills per ton-mile by pipe line, 2 to 2½ mills per ton-mile by shallow-draft barge, and 1¼ mills per ton-mile by deep-draft tanker."

From my own experience in observing inland waterway transportation in Louisiana and Texas, I think it is safe to say that this ratio of cost, generally speaking, applies to all products and commodities which lend themselves to water transportation.

At this point it should be observed that not all commodities are suited to water transportation, neither are all commodities suited for rail transportation. Bulky commodities of low value and raw materials particularly are natural water-transportation commodities. The whole industrial structure of our country has been built upon the foundation of water transportation for low-valued raw materials. It is, therefore, perfectly patent that it is uneconomical to move such bulky and low-valued commodities as petroleum and its products by rail for any great distance if it is practicable and possible to transport them by water.

Everyone knows that the present method of supplying the eastern seaboard of our country with its fuel oil and gasoline by railroad tank car is not only uneconomical but extravagant in the extreme. It is being done only because it is absolutely necessary. The tremendous penalty which American taxpayers are paying to meet this present necessity has been frequently pointed out. The figure of $700,000 a day, estimated in a recent speech by the distinguished chairman of this committee, has not been denied. It requires the genius of no mathematician to figure to what extent the waterways of the Nation could be improved to meet this situation and to largely remove this penalty if calculated upon the basis of this expenditure for 6 months or a year. It would easily take care of all of the authorizations contained in the Mansfield bill, estimated at $93,000,000, in less than half a year.

The authorization contained in the Mansfield bill for the enlargement of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from Corpus Christi to the west coast of Florida is well under way. Many dredges are now at work on the enlargement of the canal to a depth of 12 feet and a bottom width of 125 feet between New Orleans and the Houston-Galveston port district and it is my understanding that dredges will start the enlargement work in the waterway east of the Mississippi within the next few days.

When Congress authorized a survey with a view to providing a completed canal from New Orleans to Corpus Christi by resolution adopted March 3, 1923, our Intracoastal Canal Association obtained the services of the late Gen. George W. Goethals as its consulting engineer. General Goethals made an exhaustive study of the project and presented a report strongly endorsing its economic justification. In summarizing his conclusions, General Goethals said:

"Considering the shipments of sulfur and the materials needed for its production, as well as of steel shipments for other purposes that will go by the canal, the present tonnage possibilities of such a waterway are between 5,000,000 to 7,000,000 tons annually, and this statement is conservative."

He then added:

"With the maintenance of a 9-foot channel in the Mississippi River, with the completion of the Ohio River improvement, and with the enlargement of the Chicago-Mississippi Canal, the tonnage possibilities of the canal (the Intracoastal) will exceed 12,000,000 tons annually * * * and the Intracoastal Canal will become a vital part of the great inland waterway system of the country."

It will interest the committee to know that even the last prediction of General Goethals has already been surpassed. For instance, last year, the section of the canal from the Mississippi River to the Texas line, a distance of 272.4 miles, handled over 12,000,000 tons, while the section from the Texas line to Galveston, a distance of 90.5 miles, handled over 10,000,000 tons.

I am not prepared, nor would it be within my province, to deal with the tonnage possibilities of the proposed waterway across New Jersey which, as I have already stated, is

an essential and integral part of a great protected inland waterway system from Maine to Mexico. This phase of the matter has already been and will be further presented by those more familiar with the facts. However, I submit it is self-evident that if we had a completed inland waterway from that great treasure house of natural resources down in the Southwest, with the barge canal across Florida completed and in operation, a tremendous tonnage of the essential commodities to which I have referred would use the waterway across New Jersey to supply the great industrial and commercial centers which lie beyond. If such a waterway were in existence today, with the necessary floating equipment of towboats and barges, the shortage of fuel oil and gasoline from which the Atlantic seaboard and eastern part of our country have suffered so severely for the past several months, and will no doubt continue to suffer until the remedy is provided, would not exist. Besides, the drain upon the Public Treasury which amounts probably, all commodities considered, to more than $200,000,000 a year would be largely eliminated.

This, as we all know, is an authorization bill. It carries no appropriation. Both the Board of Engineers and the Chief of Engineers urge the adoption and authorization of the project now. In its report the Board says:

"It is the opinion of the board that the canal should be authorized at this time as a military measure and steps taken toward the preparation of construction plans with a view to initiating construction as soon as can be done without interfering with other construction directly connected with the war effort."

In his report, the Chief of Engineers says:

"It is my judgment that the genuine military value of a ship canal along this route has been amply established by the situation prevailing since this country entered the war; * * * it is believed that a ship canal should be authorized now and steps taken toward the preparation of construction plans with a view to initiating construction as soon as can be done without interfering with other construction considered to be more directly connected with the war effort."

I trust that in its consideration of this bill, the committee will think in terms of an authorization and not of an appropriation. The question of the appropriation will receive due consideration at the proper time from the Appropriations Committee. The Chief of Engineers says it will take 5 years to construct the waterway but urges the authorization now so that there may be no delay in the preparation of necessary plans which will take time and which, in any event, must precede the letting of a contract and the commencement of actual construction work.

It will no doubt be urged, as it has been and is now being urged in connection with an appropriation for the barge canal across Florida, that this great project cannot be constructed or completed in time to be of any value in the prosecution of the present war. To me that argument makes no appeal for two reasons. First, because no one can say when the war will be over, and second, because even after the war is over, it will be years before the economy of our country can or will return to normal. The only argument, for example, which has been urged with any degree of reason against the construction of the barge canal across Florida has been that it could not be completed in time to be of service in the war effort. There have been, and are, of course, differences of opinion as to how long it will take to construct the Florida barge canal. The estimates, as everyone knows, vary from 1 to 3 years. But regardless of the time that will be required, it is perfectly obvious that if construction had been started immediately following the passage of the Mansfield bill, now nearly 8 months ago, the time of construction would now be a half a year less than it was at that time.

But entirely apart from the relation of any part of this great protected inland waterway from Maine to Mexico to the winning of the war, no one, I am sure, would seriously contend that its final completion should not be assured as soon as it may be possible in the public interest because it will provide a facility of transportation, the national benefits of which can scarcely be estimated. Therefore, this bill, H. R. 1880, should be approved and enacted into law now so that when the time comes that its construction can be undertaken, there will be no unnecessary delay. As I have already suggested, the question of the funds to do the work will be determined when the matter comes before the Appropriations Committee.

I trust I may be pardoned for making a suggestion with respect to what I conceive to be a matter of sound public policy. Last year this committee reported a large and comprehensive general rivers and harbors authorization act. As it was reported to the House in November 1941, it contained 236 projects, all of which had been carefully studied by the United States Army engineers and painstakingly considered by this committee. Since that time, many other projects have been referred to the committee with the approval and recommendation of the engineers. The list of projects covers every section and part of our great country. Taken together, they present a comprehensive plan for the further development of the natural resources of the Nation and the increase and improvement of our transportation facilities.

Because of conditions growing out of the war and the feeling which, of course, all right-minded and patriotic Americans share that no expenditures should be made for any purpose which will not contribute directly and definitely to the winning of the war, the bill died on the calendar of the last Congress.

At the moment, America and her gallant allies are winning the war. While no one is so bold as to venture a prediction as to when full and complete victory may come, even the most cautious among those qualified to hazard a guess feel that the end will come with complete victory for our country and her allies before the end of 1944.

You gentlemen, Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress, will occupy your present positions of duty and responsibility until January 1945. You will, we all hope, enjoy the proud privilege of being Members of the great Victory Congress.

All of you, I am sure, feel great concern as to what the conditions may be in our country when victory comes, when war activities cease, and when the millions of our population now in the armed forces and in war industries are released from their present duties and the Nation again seeks to assume the ways of peace. Everyone is agreed that some sort of sound and comprehensive program of public works must be provided to help fill in and bridge the gap. Of what shall that program consist? Will we again embrace some futile, haphazard scheme of merely providing employment without reference to what the employment is, produces, or creates? Will we again resort to some spurious device that differs from the dole only in name and not in fact? Or will we profit by the lessons we should have learned following the other World War and again in the unhappy depression of 10 years ago, and with statesmanship, foresight, and vision plan and provide for public works which will not only pay their own way but assure dividends to the American people in the service they will render in making this a greater, richer, and more productive Nation?

All of us look with fear and foreboding upon the mounting national debt which has already attained astronomical proportions and the greatest total burden of taxation any nation in the world's history has ever assumed. How to meet it, pay current bills, and eventually liquidate the total obligation, or at least a portion of it, calls for the highest statesmanship and patriotism. Personally, I feel there is only one sure method by which that can be accomplished, and that is through the fullest possible development of our great national natural resources and the fullest possible increase in our wealth production, which go hand in hand.

In my judgment, nothing of which it is possible to conceive will contribute more to that result than the development of the water resources of our country and their fullest utilization for every possible beneficial use—navigation, flood control, irrigation, reclamation, soil conservation, and power development where it can be economically achieved. In my opinion, there is no program of public works which can approach this program of water development in its possibilities for the future growth of our country and the well-being and prosperity of our people.

I trust, therefore, that this committee will very soon give careful consideration to such phases of this program as may come within its jurisdiction. I speak for no particular project. I plead for a Nation-wide program. I personally feel that it is the solemn duty of this committee to do its part in seeing to it, insofar as its jurisdiction extends, that a sound program of public works is formulated and authorized so that when the war is over and peace comes, America may be enabled to safeguard and maintain her recognized position as the greatest nation and the most prosperous people on the face of the earth. I may be pardoned for saying that, in my opinion, this constitutes not only a serious and solemn obligation you owe to the Nation but an opportunity to do your part in assuring not only the future but the very existence of our great democracy. The processes of authorization are slow. We should not wait for the war to be over before these processes are put in motion. Why not do it now—have the program and the plans in readiness so there shall be no gap of unemployment to bridge between war and peace?

Letter From J. C. Rush, of Hot Springs, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOT SPRINGS, ARK.

Hon. W. F. NORRELL,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NORRELL: Have thought of writing you a number of times, but due to the fact that you have been a very busy man was reluctant about troubling you. Furthermore, have kept thinking conditions in Washington would aright themselves without my interfering.

However, as I see it, there is an inclination to make things worse instead of better, and while I am not a politician feel it my duty to submit you the following suggestions:

1. The Allies should have all the men, material, and money needed to win this war, but the waste that has been going on for several years by alphabet agencies too numerous to mention, should be eliminated.

2. Do away with unjust labor strikes which have and are retarding efforts toward winning the war, and which possibly caused a great many of our boys not to come back, on account of not having equipment to defend themselves.

3. Abolish the 5-day (40-hour) per week, and work 10 hours per day, 60 hours per week, like you and I have worked.

4. Am a strong believer in good salaries, but think it absurd, when a mechanic is getting from $75 to $200 per week, and strikes on account of frivolous arguments which causes the war to be prolonged and lives lost for the lack of implements to defend themselves with.

5. It seems that people are being taught to get something for nothing, instead of working for it, and several billions of dollars could have been saved if work had been let to contract bidding.

6. In place of employing fifty to one hundred thousand additional employees per month, begin cutting out the dead timber, fifty to one hundred thousand per month until all of the superfluous timber has been removed. Said timber can be utilized to a good advantage on the farm or in the service.

7. As I see it, we are in great danger of a food shortage and which is partly caused by bad administrative management, with red tape, unpractical theory, telling the farmer what he has to do, without any protection as to cost of labor, or prices he gets for his produce.

8. Due to so many restrictions, thousands of farmers and business places have been forced to fold up, at a great loss to themselves and the Government.

9. Cotton should be used where possible instead of rayon, as we have a surplus of cotton, and the millions of cords of pulpwood that is being cut in this and other States could be left growing without a loss to anyone.

10. Buying bonds is very necessary, but at the same time the money should be spent judiciously without so much experimenting on things that never materialize to where they are a benefit to the war effort or to the taxpayer.

11. Make an effort to get some of the disastrous leaks which are causing so much waste stopped, and get America placed back into the hands of the taxpayers instead of the politicians.

12. No doubt you have thought before now it is presumptuous on my part to encroach on your valuable time (which I will agree), but if I have given you a thought where you could only save from one million to a billion dollars I feel that it has been worth while for us both.

13. In conclusion, will say that I am an original Democrat but cannot subscribe to all the New Deal variety. Am firmly against bureaucrats and dictatorship. Have never held or sought political office, nor seeking one now, but am very much interested in the winning of the war and getting a just peace which will be permanent for all time to come, and the ones that follow you and me will have a better place to live throughout the world.

Wishing you much success in the exalted position you now hold, I am,

Sincerely,

J. C. RUSH.

O. P. A. Regulation of the Meat Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. G. ROHRBOUGH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the Honorable Haymond Maxwell, Sr., former member of the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, relative to the attitude of O. P. A. toward small wholesalers engaged in the meat industry:

CLARKSBURG, W. VA., *March 8, 1943.*

HON. E. G. ROHRBOUGH,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

(Re: Young & Stout, Inc.)

MY DEAR MR. ROHRBOUGH: The Honorable Prentiss M. Brown, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, has instituted in the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia a civil action against the above named corporation and Laco L. Young and Abner Stout, operators of said corporation, a proceeding primarily for the purpose of enjoining them from selling meat at prices in excess of the schedule fixed by the Office of Price Administration. Under the writ which was served on these gentlemen late Saturday night, they are allowed 20 days in which to make answer to the complaint.

Inasmuch as matters pertaining to the Office of Price Administration are very much in the public eye at this time, both in Washington and throughout the country at large, I am prompted to write you this letter.

Yesterday's papers carried an Associated Press report that Members of the Senate are giving to the Office of Price Administration special attention at this time in an effort to reach an adjustment of some of the obvious injustices now prevailing.

As we visualize the situation, the embarrassment in the meat industry, particularly respecting small wholesalers, arises from the fact that though Government regulation has undertaken to place ceiling prices on the wholesale of dressed beef and other meats, the prices of livestock remain unaffected. The consumers are protected—they are legion and their votes are many. The producers (farmers and graziers) are uncurbed—they, too, have many votes. The wholesalers are not so numerous—they get the squeeze.

Young & Stout, Inc., of Clarksburg, W. Va., is engaged in slaughtering livestock and wholesaling meat, principally cattle and lambs, in which business they have been engaged since about 1931 or 1932. Under their plan of operation, Mr. Abner Stout, a stockholder and officer of the company, buys livestock and supervises the slaughtering of the same. The meat is then sent to their place of business on Traders Avenue, in the city of Clarksburg, where it is marketed under the supervision of Mr. Laco L. Young, a stockholder and officer of the company.

The writer is informed by the above named gentlemen, on behalf of the Young & Stout Co., that the prices which have been paid for livestock have been paid on the market, that is to say, most of their stock has been bought at local livestock sales, and some purchases have been made from farmers; that the prices the Young & Stout Co. has paid have been in harmony and in keeping with the prices which have prevailed on the Baltimore and Pittsburgh livestock markets; that at some of the local livestock market sales at which Young & Stout Co. has bought livestock representatives of the large packing companies have been present and bought similar stock at comparable prices to those paid by Young & Stout.

It is the information of the writer of this letter that the wholesale prices which the Young & Stout Co. has charged for dressed meat have been so based as to cover the cost of livestock and overhead expenses, allowing the company a close profit.

The Young & Stout Co. has grown into its present modest proportions through the unceasing efforts of the two gentlemen above named, who have been devoting their time, long hours daily, to the developing of this small enterprise in which they are engaged.

As citizens and taxpayers, the officers of the Young & Stout Co. protest against Government action which threatens to squeeze them out of business, from which result neither the local retail dealers nor the public nor the Government will benefit.

Our viewpoint is that if the United States Government would regulate the prices of livestock on such basis as would permit a small margin to wholesalers, there would be no difficulty along the lines involved in this investigation.

This letter is written to you in order that you may be informed as to what is taking place in this locality in connection with Office of Price Administration activities.

Surely this great Nation of curs can wage war successfully without the basic rights of the people being destroyed. Is there any possible excuse for crushing Young & Stout, Inc., and hundreds of other like enterprises under the untenable excuse of war necessity?

Trusting that you may be able to use this information in furtherance of efforts to correct the grave injustices which are being brought about in the meat industry by the Office of Price Administration, I remain,

With great respect,

Very sincerely yours,

HAYMOND MAXWELL.

Where Is All Our Food Going?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the April 1943 issue of the American magazine by Hon. Edward R. Stettinius, United States Lend-Lease Administrator:

WHERE IS ALL OUR FOOD GOING?

(By Hon. Edward R. Stettinius)

Food shortages have begun to be felt in the United States during the past year. The pinch will grow more severe in the year to come.

This seems strange in America, the land of plenty. Almost incredible. Did we not raise the biggest crop of foods in our history in 1942? Didn't our farmers break all records? What has happened to this vast supply of food?

It is hard to understand, and when people don't understand a situation, rumors flourish. You have heard such rumors, at the office, or the club, or in the streetcar, or at the corner grocery store.

The one I have heard most frequently is that Uncle Sam, acting under lend-lease, is taking our good American food and spreading it about the world with a foolish and lavish hand:

"No steak at the butcher's today. I hear they are sending most of the beef to Russia." * * * "Eggs are awfully high and scarce. They say we're sending just shiploads of them to England—and butter, probably to fry our nice eggs in, sunny side up." * * * "Junior hasn't been able to get a sundae for 3 days. What in the world are they doing with the ice cream? Giving it to the Hottentots and Eskimos, I suppose." * * * "Of course, we must help our allies, but why send them all the best things, the very things we

want?" * * * "First thing you know, our own people won't have enough to eat. We want to be generous, but we don't want to be imposed upon."

It is hard to know just what to do about such rumors. They cannot be flatly denied, because they have an element of truth. It is foolish to denounce them as unpatriotic, since many a good citizen, honestly puzzled, repeats them. Mostly they are innocent, grumbling talk, but they have in them the elements of danger, cruelty, and death—danger to our success in the war; cruelty to millions of our allies who are now living close to starvation, and possible death to many thousands of our American boys through prolongation of the war. Therefore, these rumors must be dealt with.

The best way to do this, in my opinion, is to give the facts. As Lend-Lease Administrator I will, so to speak, open up the books and tell you just how much of each kind of food we are sending abroad, to which countries it is going, and why. It is your food, and you are entitled to know.

One favor I ask: Do not draw your conclusions until you finish the story, because the food situation today is unprecedented, has some apparent contradictions, and takes a little study.

Let's look first at beef, because that has probably caused more talk than anything else. Also, it shows how deceptive appearances can be.

In 1942 we lend-leased and sent abroad, chiefly to England, 18,000,000 pounds of beef. That certainly seems to be a lot of beef, until we look at America's total 1942 supply of beef, which was over 9,000,000,000 pounds. In other words, out of every 500 pounds of beef at home, lend-lease sent 1 pound abroad.

Nor is that all the story. We have large American forces in Australia and New Zealand. These two countries, through reciprocal lend-lease, supplied our troops there with a total of 25,000,000 pounds of beef during 1942. This saved time and shipping. On balance we received 7,000,000 (25 minus 18) more pounds of beef than we furnished to all lend-lease countries during 1942.

Then where, if lend-lease didn't take it, has our beef gone? It has gone largely to our armed forces at home and abroad, and to those (chiefly war workers) who have more money to spend than in pre-war days.

The armed forces in 1942 bought about 11 percent of our entire beef supply, some of it as reserve for future campaigns. Our hard-training, hard-fighting men in the services need beef, like beef, and eat a lot of it.

In 1939 the average American factory worker earned $23.02 a week. In November of 1942 our million of factory workers, supplemented by other millions formerly unemployed, working longer hours and overtime, were making about $40 (to be exact, $39.78) per week. (Figures from Bureau of Labor Statistics.) Moreover, they could not spend this extra money in the usual way on such things as cars, radios, and refrigerators. So naturally they are spending more money for food, and for choicer food. Farmers also had larger average net incomes in 1942, were able to buy more store food when they went to town. Americans, when they have more money, buy more beef, more meat generally, more milk, cream, butter, eggs, and poultry. Meanwhile, other Americans, with fixed incomes, or with smaller incomes than before, are feeling the pinch the most.

The effect of lend-lease on our beef supply, then, is nil. We have sent no veal whatsoever abroad. We have sent about 4,000,000 pounds of lamb and mutton (four-tenths of 1 percent of our supply), but our troops have received more than that from Australia and New Zealand.

Of certain other foods, however, lend-lease has sent large quantities to our allies, large enough to affect our shortages at home.

The great bulk of lend-lease foods which we shipped in 1942 was made up of pork, milk products, edible fats, and oils and eggs. In the first part of the year most of the food went to England, but by winter, for reasons which I will explain later, the emphasis began to shift toward Russia. In December more food was shipped to Russia than to England, and probably this policy will continue for some time to come.

In 1942 we shipped 1,112,000,000 pounds of pork to our allies. That was 10 percent of our American supply, and is a really big bite of pork. If we figured 135 pounds of pork to the hog, it would be over 8,000,000 hogs. It is enough pork to fill 55 big freight steamers carrying 10,000 tons each.

That pork helped to encourage and strengthen the Russian Army in its prodigious battles. We hear from Russia that their soldiers especially appreciate an occasional treat of American pork sausage; that, butter lacking, they often spread American lard on their black bread; and that their soldiers fighting in isolated posts in subzero weather frequently carry a chunk of American fatback as a battle ration to eat with their bread. Certainly this is no luxury. Fats are absolutely essential to men fighting in Russia's withering winters.

Incidentally, practically every bit of food we send to Russia is for the Russian Army.

In milk products, Lend-Lease shipped during 1942 the equivalent of 4,272,000,000 pounds, or approximately 2,000,000,000 quarts, or as much as 15 quarts for every person in the United States. That is about 3.4 percent of our American supply.

That would be enough milk, if shipped in liquid form, to load about 214 big freighters, at 10,000 tons to the ship. Of course, we did not ship it in natural liquid form. We shipped most of it as condensed milk, evaporated milk, dry skim milk, and cheese. In this way, with the water largely removed, it occupied far less space and weighed only about 815,000,000 pounds, or enough to load only 40 freighters instead of 214.

We are shipping these large amounts of milk products for two main reasons: First, because our allies are very short of them and badly need milk nourishment to maintain health and fighting fitness. Second, cheese, and particularly dried milk, are among the most economical forms in which to move food value in terms of shipping space. Even so, remember, we sent only one-thirtieth of our total milk supply in 1942.

Dried milk and dried eggs have been life savers, and here, I think, lend-lease can properly claim much credit. When lend-lease began, in 1941, the production of egg-drying plants in America was only about 10,000,000 pounds a year. We helped finance the building of new plants, so that we now have capacity of more than 350,000,000 pounds a year. This achievement has had just the same effect as if we had built a lot of ships. It has been of enormous benefit, not only to our allies but in supplying our own armed forces overseas.

We have sent no cream or ice cream abroad. But our heavy shipments of milk concentrates have been one factor contributing to the ice-cream shortage. Here again heavier buying of milk and milk products by war workers and the armed forces has had its effect.

We shipped 23 percent of our cheese and 7 percent of our condensed and evaporated milk. Production of both these items has been greatly increased.

How about butter? That has been quite short in many parts of the country, and has been the subject of a great deal of conversation, curiosity, and rumor. The facts are simple: In 1942 we shipped via lend-lease about 17,000,000 pounds of butter, or 8,500 tons, or one good-sized shipload. That was less than 1 pound in every 100 of our American supply.

All of this butter went to the Russian Army. None of it went to Britain or other Allied countries.

Why such a luxury for the Russian Army? Just think it over a moment. That 17,000,000 pounds, for, let us say, 8,000,000 Russian fighting men, would mean about 2 pounds a year for each soldier. Say, 3 ounces a month. This would permit the Russian soldier, fighting the bloodiest battles in history, to have American butter on his black bread once a week, instead of lard or linseed oil.

That is no luxury. It is a minimum necessity. Soldiers fighting in the Russian snow and ice and mud must have fats for warmth. Butter is the most palatable and wholesome of the fats. It is especially needed when bread is so large a part of the diet.

Most Americans, when they know these facts, feel that we should send a lot more of our butter to the army which so far has borne the brunt of the battle against Germany. I agree. This year we are going to try to send the Russian Army a considerable larger quantity. What do you think? Would you be willing to cut down your own butter supply by a fraction so that the Russian soldier could have butter on his bread almost every day?

The next large lend-lease item is fats and oils, such as lard, vegetable oils, cottonseed oil, peanut oil. These are especially valuable as a source of warmth, both in England and Russia, where they have far less heat in winter than we have, even with all our fuel oil troubles of the last winter. The Russians use these fats and oils not only on their bread, but in their soups. We shipped 723,000,000 pounds of such fats and oils in 1942, or 13.2 percent of our American supply. Our shipments account partly for American shortages in fats and oils, but another important factor is the use of these foods in making explosives for the armed forces.

Eggs are another controversial item. Why send this choice food abroad? It is true that we are shipping large quantities of eggs abroad. In 1942 we sent the equivalent of about 450,000,000 dozen natural eggs, chiefly to England and Russia. That was 10 percent of our American supply.

But the rumor-picture of Britons and Russians reveling in fresh American eggs, poached on toast or fried sunny side up, is quite absurd. We don't ship eggs in the shell; it would take up too much shipping space. We send most of them in the form of dried egg powder. That is a wonderful product. It contains practically all the nourishment of the fresh eggs, but takes up only about one-seventh of the space. It keeps well, requires no refrigeration, and is easy to handle. But, it is not a luxury food. It cannot be boiled, fried, or poached. It can be scrambled or made into an omelet or used in a cake, but it does not have the same flavor or deliciousness that a fresh egg has.

Nevertheless, these dried eggs have been most welcome in England and Russia. The Englishman gets an average of 3 domestic eggs-in-shell each month. Our shipments of dried eggs supply him with the equivalent of an additional four eggs each month. In Russia, the shortage of eggs is also severe, and the American dried eggs are sent right to the Army at the front.

Besides the pork, milk products, fats and oils, and eggs which I have mentioned, we are sending smaller quantities of fish, canned vegetables, canned fruits, and juices, corn products, and wheat products.

In 1942 we shipped 156,000,000 pounds of fish, canned or frozen, or 7 percent of our American supply; 415,000,000 pounds of corn products, or about one-tenth of 1 percent of our supply; 393,000,000 pounds of wheat products, or three-tenths of 1 percent of our supply; 51,000,000 pounds of canned vegetables, or eight-tenths of 1 percent of our supply; and 89,000,000 pounds of canned fruits and juices, or 1.7 percent of our American supply.

That, then, is the true picture. In 1942 we sent to our allies less than 6 percent by value of our total supply, but still it was a great amount, and was of incalculable value to our hard-pressed allies in a critical year.

At present we are sending more than we were this time last year. No exact predictions can be made for this year, because we cannot be sure just what shipping will be available. Nor can we now say how soon or how deeply we will enter the countries of Europe which are starving under Hitler's heel. Wherever we go in, we must be prepared to move in rapidly with food in the wake of our armies. This is a military and political necessity of the highest order. Our troops cannot take the offensive successfully in the midst of famine and pestilence, riots, and revolution.

Whatever happens, the lend-lease plans to take a much bigger share of our food supplies than it did in 1942. Russia's problem is acute and must be met. At the beginning of the war Russia did not need food. By last October, however, the Germans had overrun the Ukraine, the Crimea, and North Caucasus—lands producing two-third of Russia's normal food supply. That is as though an army, invading the United States, had occupied the entire Middle West. True, the Russian Armies have recently recaptured part of these scorched and devastated territories, but it will be a long time before they can yield their former crops again. Meanwhile, the foods we can send may make all the difference between whether the Russians can advance or must retreat again.

No request for lend-lease food supplies has been received from China. The great distance that such supplies would have to be shipped, and the limited transportation facilities into China, make it unlikely that any such request will be made at any time in the near future. Should we be asked to provide food for China we will make every effort to do so, either directly or from Allied food sources nearer to China.

Although exact predictions cannot be made, Government food experts estimate that the armed forces and lend-lease may each take about twice as much food in 1943 as they did in 1942. This means more severe shortages and stricter rationing in order to make sure that available food is fairly and equitably divided, so that no one need go hungry. Even so, although Americans will not have as much food or as much choice as before, they will still have the most nutritious diet of any people in the world.

The question remains: Why are we sending all this lend-lease food to our allies? If you have read this far you can probably give your own answer, but I will tell you how it looks to me.

All of us, in the United Nations, are joined in a vast war of survival, fighting for our lives and principles against the Axis nations. In this war each of us makes the utmost contribution in his power in the common effort.

These contributions cannot be measured in money. How can we weigh the food which we send against the British losses in the London blitz, or against the millions of Russian soldiers who have been killed or wounded in the battles against the Germans?

The food we send is neither a loan nor an act of charity. It is the plainest sort of decency, common sense, and self-interest.

Suppose we had not sent food to England. Maybe England would have held out. But could her undernourished workers have turned out the planes and weapons which turned back the Luftwaffe and devastated Hitler's centers of war production? Would the British have had the extra reserve of strength which enabled them to stop Rommel in Egypt and chase him back across 1,300 miles of desert?

If not, where would the war be now?

Last August, Hitler's apparently irresistible armies were storming to the Volga River and into the streets of Stalingrad, with the Baku oil fields and the Caspian Sea not far away. The Russians stopped those armies. They have found the power to roll the Nazis back in the greatest defeat Hitler has ever suffered. But can they carry on without the food we have given them, plus the assurance of more to come?

No man knows the exact answer to those questions. But this, I think, it is fair to say: That food of ours, less than about three-quarters of a billion dollars' worth in 1942, and a relatively small part of our supply, was one of the most important weapons in this last critical year of war. It so tipped the balance as to bring victory years nearer than it might otherwise have been. In so doing, it has saved the lives of countless thousands of our American soldiers and sailors. And our food shipments will make a similar contribution as they are increased in the days ahead.

Lend-Lease

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I expect to vote against the continuation of the lease-lend bill because the allotments and allocations by countries are in inverse proportion to the victories of the United Nations on the sixty-odd battle fronts of the world.

To emphasize my point, I call your attention to the speech of the illustrious Prime Minister of England, Mr. Churchill, who said, on December 26, 1941, in speaking to a joint session of the House and Senate:

If the United States has been found at a disadvantage at various points in the Pacific Ocean, we know well that it is to no small extent because of the aid which you have been giving to us in munitions for the defense of the British Isles and for the Libyan campaign, and, above all, because of your help in the Battle of the Atlantic, upon which all depends, and which has in consequence been successfully and prosperously maintained.

The predictions of the renowned Prime Minister have not been falsified by events in the Pacific.

On January 2 the Japanese took Manila while American and Philippine troops retired toward Bataan.

January 11: Japanese invade the islands of the Netherlands East Indies.

January 19: Japanese invade Burma from Thailand.

January 23: Japanese land on New Britain, northeast of New Guinea.

January 31: Japanese complete conquest of Malay Peninsula; siege of Singapore begins.

February 14: Japanese invade the oil fields of Sumatra.

February 15: Singapore falls to the Japanese.

February 27: United Nations sea forces overwhelmed in the Battle of the Java Sea. Defeat opens way for enemy invasion of Java.

March 8: Japanese occupy Rangoon in Burma. Japanese cut Burma Road. Other Nipponese troops land at Lae and Salamaua.

May I stop for a moment and emphasize this loss and its significance. You remember that lease-lend had been in operation for nearly a year on March 9, 1942. This broad highway led from the sea to the courageous and indomitable people of the Chinese Republic. The Lease-Lend Administration could not see the value of shipping supplies over the Chinese lifeline to stay the bloody dagger of the Japs. The Burma Road fell and now we are apparently helpless to keep open this avenue to our allies. The Lease-Lend Administration has disposed of materials and services in such a way as to disregard the probability that Japan is consolidating her gains in the Pacific. What answer has lease-lend offered to this Japanese Empire that is self-sufficient with rubber plantations, mines, and oil production? What contribution has it made that justifies its existence in the Battle of the Pacific?

March 8: Japanese overrun Java, richest of the Netherland East Indies and last major bastion of the United Nations in the archipelago.

March 13: Japanese land in the Solomons, thrusting a spearhead toward the vital supply route to Australia.

April 9: Bataan peninsula falls to the Japanese—more than 30,000 Americans and Filipinos are captured.

April 29: Lashio, terminus of the Burma Road, China's supply life line, seized by the Japanese.

May 6: Corregidor fortress surrenders to the Japanese.

June 12: Washington announces that Japanese invaders had occupied Attu and other islands in the western Aleutians.

Some may say, "Well, we won the following battles." May I suggest to you that lease-lend did not contribute to these reported victories:

May 8: Battle of Coral Sea.

June 5–7: Battle of Midway.

November 12: Three-day naval battle, greatest since the First World War, starts in the Solomons. It ends in an American victory and is described by Secretary of the Navy Knox as round 2 of the campaign.

March 6, 1943: MacArthur's victory in Australia.

Now let us examine the victories predicted by the Prime Minister on Decem-

ber 26, 1941, in the Libyan campaign. I refer to the following headlines that appeared in the New York Times:

British Retire in Libya. (New York Times, June 19, 1942.)

British Retire to Egyptian Border. (New York Times, June 20, 1942.)

Axis Troops Reported in Bardia. (New York Times, June 21, 1942.)

Tobruk Falls, Axis Claims 25,000 Prisoners. (New York Times, June 22, 1942.)

Let us refer to the lease-lend report of Mr. Stettinius, December 31, 1942, pages 36 and 37, as follows:

Lease-lend aid

[Thousands of dollars]

Type of aid	United Kingdom	Australia, New Zealand, India, other British Territories, Egypt	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	China	Other	Total
Goods transferred	3,179,907	1,860,932	1,261,024	126,260	119,556	6,547,679
Services rendered	780,943	532,261	271,206	30,478	91,066	1,705,054
Total lease-lend aid	3,959,950	2,393,193	1,532,230	156,738	210,622	8,252,733

Mr. Speaker, you will note that Australia is grouped with New Zealand, India, other British territories, and Egypt, so that the sum total of $2,393,193,000 is spread pretty thin if proponents of the lease-lend hope to get any consolation from the recent victories of General MacArthur and General Eisenhower in Australia and north Africa.

The promises of Mr. Hopkins to the Russians in July 1941, is not unlike the glowing testimony for lease-lend in this debate. Mr. Hopkins said:

I have found out that there are certain things which you need in order to fight this war for the democracies. I am confident America can supply them. We in America are determined to give all possible aid to China and Russia—and immediately.

Fifteen months later Stalin said:

As compared with the aid which the Soviet Union is giving to the Allies by drawing upon itself the main force of the German Fascists, the aid of the Allies to the Soviet Union has so far been little effective.

On February 23, 1943, he left no doubt that he thought that Russia was bearing the brunt of the Russian front alone.

Certainly the $1,532,230,000 gift to Russia cannot claim the crushing victories of Stalin's armies over the Nazis. Three billion nine hundred and fifty-nine million nine hundred and fifty thousand dollars of gifts to England, nearly two and one-half times the amount given to Russia, and over 25 times the amount given to China, should set the Nazi dominated Continent of Europe on fire. The statement of Lease-Lend itself indicates that it ships the most material the quickest to the wrong places. If I interpret Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker's statements correctly, our boys at Guadalcanal lived in ditches, had little airplane assistance, and were lucky to get rice to eat at times. Lease-Lend proudly boasts $1,040,000,000 worth of food of which $880,891,000 is resold by Britain at a devalued price and the money is used to maintain the value of British pound sterling on the markets of the world.

I repeat that the allocations are made to countries and to the spots in the global strategy in inverse proportions to the victories of the United Nations and I, therefore, register my protest to the war inefficiency of the Lend-Lease Administration.

Lend-Lease Policy—A Tribute to the Statesmanship of Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 days I have listened to the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee discuss the pending H. R. 1501 for the extension of the so-called Lend-Lease Act of 1941. I have studied at length the voluminous report of the extensive and impartial hearings. I believe that all the Members of the House should compliment this committee on its unanimous action in recommending the passage of this vital act.

It augurs well for the patriotism and determination of Congress that partisanship, personal ambition, and mistaken actions of the past by Members of Congress shall not stand in the way of successful prosecution of this war. It is true that the first Lend-Lease Act was opposed by a great majority of my Republican colleagues and that it was passed by the votes of an overwhelming majority of Democrats. This action, at the request of the President, has been justified by the onrushing tide of events.

The funds and equipment provided the democracies of Europe and China may well have been the vital difference between survival and defeat in their struggle against the Axis Powers. The tribute of future generations will be paid to the vision and statesmanship of those who led and those who supported this phase of our foreign policy. Its approval today in this House, and I predict an overwhelming approval, will be a source of satisfaction in future years to every Member who supports it.

There has been some talk of driving a bargain with our allies, of requiring a dollar compensation now or in the future. God grant that it were possible for us in the United States to sacrifice only our goods and gold. I would that it were possible that the materials of lend-lease were all that should be required of us in the preservation of civilization, but I know this is not the case, although lend-lease has been the substitute for uncounted American lives.

This global war depends upon our supplying the Allied Nations with materials of war. To this date, the sacrifice of human lives has been made to a great extent by our allies, chiefly Russia and China, fighting the Axis Nations. Before civilization is saved, we, too, will be called on to shed the blood of our patriots in this cause.

As Thomas Jefferson said:

The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time by the blood of patriots and tyrants.

Each generation must make its payment for the precious privileges of freedom. This war is not of our seeking, but with the help of God we shall wage it with confidence that victory shall be ours, and with hopeful eyes we look forward to establishing a just and enduring peace where the destiny of freemen can be established and the brotherhood of man be realized.

Jobs, Junkets, and $280 Christmas Card Bill Go With Tugwell "Economy" Edict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, on March 9 President Roosevelt sent to the Congress a message recommending that the organic law of Puerto Rico be amended so as to permit the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own governor. It appears that, first, a recommendation was received by Secretary Ickes of the Department of the Interior from Governor Tugwell of Puerto Rico calling for this amendment to the organic law. The President points out that in accordance with the general policy of this Government, that it would be well for the Congress to consider as soon as possible an amendment of the organic law of Puerto Rico to permit the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own governor and to redefine the functions and powers of the Federal Government and the government of Puerto Rico, respectively.

Along with the President's message he submitted to the Congress a copy of a letter which the President addressed to the Secretary of the Interior and which letter included the names of a committee composed of an equal number of

Puerto Rico and of continental residents—the committee to advise with the President on changes in the organic law. We can assume, therefore, that in due course this committee will submit to the Congress for its consideration such changes as the committee may recommend. It appears that Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes is to act as chairman of the committee.

It is well known that for months the administration of the Governor of Puerto Rico, Mr. Tugwell, has been under fire both in Puerto Rico and in the United States. Recently a committee of Senators visited Puerto Rico and made a preliminary investigation and many people await with interest such findings as this senatorial committee may make public. There are considerable developments which lead some to believe that the President, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Governor of Puerto Rico have deemed it advisable to take an important step which would tend to consolidate the thought of conflicting economic, social, and political forces in Puerto Rico and away from the cross firing which has brought the Governor of Puerto Rico within the range of these disagreeing forces.

Unquestionably, most of these conflicting forces will be friendly to the suggestion which the President has made to the effect that the organic law be amended so that Puerto Rican people may elect their own governor. If all of this is true, thought and effort can now be centered on the activities of the committee above referred to, its recommendations, discussions, which will probably in due course be held before the congressional committees and eventually to such changes in the organic law as may be legislated. When all of these changes will clear through and become the law, and the Puerto Rican people will be given an opportunity to actually vote for and elect a Governor, is an entirely different proposition. Under the stress of war it may be many months and even years before the Puerto Rican people are so permitted to vote. But, in the meantime, perhaps, this proposal on the part of the Puerto Rican Governor, the Secretary of the Interior, and the President may alleviate the embarrassing situation in which the Governor has recently found himself, and as a matter of fact, this may all tend to cause the Congress to be less active in its investigation of Puerto Rican affairs. For the RECORD, I submit an article from the Puerto Rican World Journal:

TUGWELL APPROVED 1,404 JOBS SINCE ECONOMY BULLETIN—16,000 ON INSULAR GOVERNMENT PAY ROLLS; LIST STILL GROWING

(By Oliver Headland)

While it is impossible to measure how much injustice has been done in Puerto Rico by those who "frameth mischief by a law," this much is certain: An economy edict issued by Gov. Rexford G. Tugwell last July, and known as Administrative Bulletin No. 804, isn't worth the paper it is printed on.

This order was issued to effect economy in government circles by prohibiting new appointments except in cases of extreme emergency, and then only by special dispensation of the Governor. By mid-January, when the World Journal first challenged the good faith in which appointments are being made, 1,404 positions involving more than $1,282,000 in salaries had been authorized.

THOUSANDS OF JOBS

The insular government was swarming with highly paid personnel of dubious value to the community at large. There were over 16,000 people on the government pay rolls, not counting ordinary laborers, thousands more than under the previous Governor. Over 600,000 individuals were partially or entirely dependent upon Federal aid for food, more than 312,000 were unemployed. Economy had turned into an expensive joke, and the insular government resembled a gigantic political employment agency.

At last survey on February 6 the Government, bent on discouraging private enterprise with one hand, was handing out thousands of dollars with the other to hundreds of officials holding synthetic jobs. Appointments authorized under the restrictive bulletin had increased to 1,624, salaries exceeded $1,550,000, and both totals were rising by leaps and bounds. One official declared it was almost impossible to keep up with them.

Just a casual glance at approved appointments reveals many positions, as previously asserted, are superfluous, costly, and unnecessary to the general welfare of Puerto Rico. This questionable list of appointments had to be torn from the Coordinator of Information offices after La Fortaleza interests made every possible effort to prevent its release.

OBJECT TO STATEMENTS

Here in part is what the list revealed: $29,000 in appointments to an insular fire service so devoid of fire equipment the Army and Navy are regularly called on to put out fires; appointments for nine new district fire chiefs, a $4,000 assistant fire chief, a $4,000 inspector, a custodian of property. (The Insular Fire Service chief receives $6,000, the Insular Chief of Police, with a vastly larger force, $5,600.)

It would be hard to reconcile the $3,000 information-specialist and the $2,400 translator-reporter in the Office of Publicity and Promotion of Tourism with grim necessities.

Or all the $43,000 worth of appointments to Civilian Defense (an organization more heavily appropriated for than 18 States leading in civilian defense expenditures). During January Governor Tugwell objected to statements in the World Journal on Civilian Defense personnel. "At this moment," said the Governor, "there are only 35 paid workers among more than 65,000 nonpaid volunteers."

As a matter of accuracy, Civilian Defense officials reported there were 58 persons on Civilian Defense pay rolls instead of 35. It is understood the number has since increased.

In the light of "extreme emergency," it's hard to see why the island needs a $720 clerk in the Institute of Puerto Rican Literature.

MORE PLANNING JOBS

Puerto Rico should be able to plan from here to Kingdom Come with the $55,000 in appointments authorized for the Planning, Urbanizing, and Zoning Board. Included in this total are a $4,000 engineer for the mapping division, a $5,000 senior planner for the land division, two $3,000 associate planners, a $3,000 assistant engineer, a $3,000 economist, a $3,000 secretary and legal advisor, $20- and $25-a-day consultants, and so on ad nauseum.

(Three other chief planners not included in the above total, and previously authorized, receive about $17,000 in salaries.)

From an economical standpoint, figures lose their meaning in the jammed lists of planners and associate planners, inspectors, and subinspectors, engineers and associate engineers, secretaries, clerks, statisticians, analysts, and other anonymities by the score.

There is a $7,000 visiting plant physiologist and a $4,000 economist geographer for the Institute of Tropical Agriculture; a $3,000 assistant director for the Insular Park Service, $30,000 in appointments to the office of the Governor, more personnel for the Bureau of the Budget.

"If economy were disregarded, as it has been," suggested one official, "what about the 'extreme emergency' of such appointments?"

Governor Tugwell recently declared the World Journal has never printed a word of praise for his administration. Outside of a few minor items like milk stations for hungry children, there hasn't been anything good to report. For over a year Puerto Rico has been experiencing one of the sorriest misapplications of government ever to occur in an American possession.

MALCOLM REMOVED

The World Journal couldn't honorably praise an administration that threatens free speech, freedom of the press, to abolish private enterprise. Or a Governor who kicked out his best legal adviser—former Attorney General George A. Malcolm—and turned loose a bunch of questionable laws and radical agencies to experiment with the island's uncertain destiny.

Praise a legislature that appropriates $50,000 of a hungry people's money for a political junket to Washington to settle the "political status" * * * at the same time the Chavez committee, with only a $15,000 appropriation, was here tackling life and death problems of social and economic welfare? Not while printing presses still turn.

COSTLY TRIPS

In connection with junkets between here and the continent, the Insular Government has been conducting a regular shuttle service. Many of these journeys, amounting up toward $50,000 in the last 20 months, might better have been left untraveled.

Four individuals spent $1,996 attending the same Pan-American Child Conference. Three individuals spent nearly $2,000 on trips to the States to purchase "fire-fighting apparatus." (Not yet here at last reports.)

Some $2,400 went to pay traveling expenses for Luis Muñoz Marín, President of the Senate, and politicians who accompanied him to Washington on a strictly political matter. Opposing politicians, also interested in the same issue, paid their own expenses.

Right now the $6,000 coordinator of information (whose coordinating has consisted largely of attempts to control news circulation in Puerto Rico, and in passing out propaganda for the Governor), is trotting around the United States with a $700 expense account. His travel voucher states the trip is to "coordinate information between Puerto Rico and the mainland."

UNNECESSARY SPENDING

One can't praise economy where there is only extravagance, and unnecessary expenditures are less easily excused in Puerto Rico than in most other places of the world.

La Fortaleza, with more cars than ever before for official use, recently purchased another.

Luis Muñoz Marín, who once said he received only $420 a year for his official services, presented the government with a bill of $280 for Christmas cards, sent as president of the senate.

Economy avowals mean nothing. The government is being run like an extravagant farce in a Gilbert and Sullivan operetta, but with tragic consequences for the spectators. The treasury is being drained to pay for "expendable" salaries, rattle-brained authorities and agencies, and pork-barrel projects.

Slums may stink to high heavens forever, but last week $10,000 of war relief funds were

earmarked for landscaping at the University of Puerto Rico.

Because of maladministration Old Glory's stars and stripes are fading in Puerto Rico. The island finds only sorrow in frustration and humiliation in failure, instead of satisfaction for disquietude and pride in accomplishment. Rigidly applied economy would not be a cure-all for Puerto Rico's problems. But a thorough insular housecleaning would certainly be a step in the right direction.

That much is certain.

No Atheists in Fox Holes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Star carried an article by James D. White entitled "No Atheists in Fox Holes." This article is of interest to so many people that, under unanimous consent, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I commend it to the careful reading of those who are skeptical on spiritual matters:

NO ATHEISTS IN FOX HOLES—MEN ON FIGHTING FRONTS TURN TO RELIGION

(By James D. White)

"When men are living cheek by jowl with death, they rapidly get down to essentials."

Navy Chaplain Merritt F. Williams, who was aboard the aircraft carrier *Wasp* when she went down in the Solomons, might have been speaking for all American fighting men when he said this.

From every part of the world where Americans face the realities of war, reports come in to show that they turn to reassurance in religious faith.

Shipwrecked sailors, aviators afloat on rubber rafts, soldiers in slit-trenches and in jungle bivouacs later recount how they prayed for deliverance, and sometimes for other things.

A Navy chaplain with the marines on Guadalcanal reported that a young man who had been arguing for atheism on the way over remarked to him under fire:

"If this keeps up much longer, I'll be thinking your way."

Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker provides the best-known instance of how fighting men think in the shadow of death. He tells it in his vivid account of his experience afloat on a rubber raft in the Pacific after his plane had been forced down.

RICKENBACKER'S EXPERIENCE

Captain Rickenbacker spoke first of the disregard men facing death show toward material things. He tells how they tossed overboard everything in sight to lighten the craft and possibly delay its sinking. Then there was the feeling of personal insignificance and helplessness as he and his crew drifted for days at the mercy of a tropic sun.

They held daily religious service, reading this quotation (Matthew, vi:31-34) from the New Testament:

"Therefore take no thought, saying, what shall we eat? Or what shall we drink? Or, wherewithal shall we be clothed? * * * For your Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things, but seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you. Take therefore no thought for the morrow; for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof * * *."

It was after one of these services that a gull landed on Captain Rickenbacker's head. He recalls how he caught it and how he and the men regarded its fishy, stringy meat as a miracle in answer to their prayers.

Pvt. John Bartek (now sergeant), who also was on the raft, said later: "After what happened to us out there, I've decided to become a minister after the war. I feel I'm a true believer." He doesn't know yet what denomination he'll go into. It was from his G. I. Testament that Rickenbacker had read passages of Scripture.

A soldier writes from somewhere in the southern Pacific: "The sustaining influence of the church and the communion with God never meant more to me than now. It seems that when we get far away from home and those we love we think more about God and divine things."

Maj. Gen. George S. Patton, commander of the United States forces in French Morocco, included in an official Army communique: "It is my firm conviction that the great success attending the hazardous operation carried out on sea and on land by the western task force could only have been possible through the intervention of Divine Providence manifested in many ways."

Yank Army sergeants have frequently attracted notice for qualities other than religious feeling, yet one recently wrote:

"The captain brings the Christian message with an added meaning, because God knows who will come back again, and even the most hard-boiled soldier knows there is comfort and strength in his message."

A Navy dive bomber pilot from the Wasp was reading from his G. I. Testament after she went down. A Jewish boy near him spoke up:

"What does it say of times like these? Read it to us."

More than one fighting man attributes his deeds to divine guidance. A pilot who got his crew out of his cracked-up bomber under hazardous circumstances later said:

"I know that some power greater than mine guided my every action. I am glad that I was able to do the job but do not want any false glory to be sent my way over it."

An aviation cadet, Clifford Anderson, reported that after he made a blind emergency landing at night, a farmer came running up to him and told him he had missed a house and a windmill by only a few feet.

"I would never have attempted a landing there in daylight—it wasn't humanly possible. I've been asked how I did it, and there's only one answer—the Lord did it for me."

Army and Navy chaplains agree that the closer the boys move up toward the front the more they think about these things.

"Professions of faith increase the closer we get to the front," says Brig. Gen. William R. Arnold, Chief of Army Chaplains.

"We noticed an upswing after Pearl Harbor and more or less expected this to taper off later, but it hasn't."

Navy chaplains say that attendance at services aboard naval units approaching north Africa grew perceptibly just before battle—were even larger after active engagements.

Soldiers at isolated posts are reported walking miles to attend services. Chaplains baptize fighting men on the spot in the nearest creek, river, or ocean if it's that kind of baptism that's required.

Navy Chaplain W. Wyeth Willard baptized Marine Corp. Arthur S. Tripp in the Lunga River on Guadalcanal along with 17 other leathernecks last December. Tripp's mother, when informed of this, recalled that he never wanted to go to Sunday school or to church.

An Army chaplain tells how he has ridden with American flyers on jeeps, racing at break-neck speed, to hear their confessions as they rushed to their planes with the alert howling over the post.

Both Army and Navy provide religious ministration wherever possible for every creed. All denominations are found in the service. The Army, for instance, has chaplains from 40 denominations in the field.

The basis of distribution is one chaplain to about every 1,200 men, but Chaplain Arnold says that smaller isolated units are provided for.

"But as of December 31, 1942, we needed twice as many chaplains for the present and for future expansion of our work."

Chaplains are selected clergymen who receive specialized military instructions before going into active service.

What do they find at the front? Well, there's the official version of the sergeant on Bataan.

Lt. Col. Warren J. Clear reports how he slipped into a fox hole during a Jap bombardment. There was a sergeant in the fox hole and "he prayed almost as loud as I did," says Clear, who spoke to him about it.

"Sir," replied the sergeant, "there are no atheists in fox holes."

Bureau of Animal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a concurrent resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, memorializing Congress to reinstate immediately the Federal Meat Inspection Service as a division of the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture:

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress relative to the transfer of certain duties of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture to the Division of Food Distribution Administration

Whereas with the Nation facing the greatest need for meat and meat products to feed the armed forces, the industrial workers and the other civilian population, the health of livestock becomes of major interest in America; and

Whereas the health of meat animals has been guarded carefully through Federal restrictions on importations and domestic regulations, the results of which now serve the Nation in an hour of emergency through work carried on efficiently and effectively in the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas recent rulings have transferred this valued and technical work from the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture to the Division of Food Distribution Administration whose primary purpose is to provide food supplies rather than the protection of animal health, a situation that could easily expose American

meat animals to such diseases as hoof-and-mouth disease, anthrax, and other equally contagious diseases: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the senate concurring)—

SECTION 1. That the Eighty-third General Assembly of the State of Indiana memorializes Congress to immediately reinstate this duty to the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States of America where complete and effective surveillance will provide protection against the possibility of animal disease through the importation of meat and meat products not properly certified.

SEC. 2. The principal clerk of the house is hereby instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and a copy to each of Indiana's United States Senators and Members of the National House of Representatives.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, day before yesterday I obtained consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. George W. Norris, a former Member of the Senate, at the meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in St. Louis, Mo., on January 9, last. I find that the printing of the address runs a little over the number of pages allowed under the rule without an estimate. I have obtained an estimate, which indicates that it will cost $135 to print the address. I renew the request that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am both proud and honored to be invited to address this national convention. With what has been said by the president of the association, in the resolutions that have been presented by Mr. Sorenson and adopted by you, I am overcome with emotion to the extent that I fear it will be impossible for me to say to you what would express the feelings of my heart.

Honest work done in behalf of our fellow men, as we struggle along in this imperfect world, is the best and only pay for a lifetime of work. It goes further and deeper into the human soul and the human heart than any other kind of compensation could go. I hope I may, during the few remaining days of my life, do nothing that will cause regret from you for what you have done for me tonight.

I assure you this beautiful plaque will be kept by me and cherished very deeply in my heart until the time shall come that I must pass over the river that we must all cross sooner or later.

The Rural Electrification Administration is but one of the many things, one of the greatest I think, that has come out of the development of electricity in our lifetime. And electricity is not understood by man, not even by scientists. We cannot see it. We do not know from whence it comes or where it derives its power. But we do know that in all the universe there is nothing that can compare with this unseen and but little understood element of nature that we call electricity.

It is hard to bring happiness and comfort and joy to the human race, as the art has only in comparatively recent years been at all understood. And every day of every year that passes some bright mind, dreaming of better things for humanity, invents something new that electricity does. We know it is created by falling water. There never should be a drop of water come from the heavens and fall upon the earth beneath unless it does some good to man.

When properly harnessed it can create power that will almost turn the world on its axis; and, for all we know, that is the way the world is turned on its axis. And with equal delicacy and with equal firmness it can regulate the smallest wheel of industry ever known to man. Its uses are unlimited, and men dream of new things that shall come to bless humanity by further discoveries in the electric world.

One of the uses of electricity has made it possible to create the Rural Electrification Administration. And I would like to remind you, my friends, we never would have had a Rural Electrification Administration if we hadn't first had a Tennessee Valley Authority, and we never would have had either one of them if it had not been for our President Roosevelt. [Applause.]

I was wondering this afternoon when I had a few moments to myself whether it would not be well for me tonight to tell you people the story of how the Rural Electrification Administration was born. It is not an ugly story, perhaps not a very interesting one, but it has never been told that I know of.

First, we had the Rural Electrification Administration established by an order of President Roosevelt. But later on Congress passed the fundamental act creating the Rural Electrification Administration, which the President signed.

I wonder how many of you, how many of my fellow countrymen, know just how that came about? First, let me tell you that the same powers—and they are almost unlimited—the same condemnations, the same monopolies opposed Rural Electrification Administration that for years opposed and still oppose the Tennessee Valley Authority. But that act was passed first by the Senate and then by the House, in a modified form.

And I think it illustrates another point in history that has been in the record that has nothing to do with Rural Electrification Administration or Tennessee Valley Authority either one, but it demonstrates what is often possible, that special interests sometimes in bicameral legislatures defeat the best of laws by getting them into conference and putting them in a forgotten pigeon hole.

There were several amendments made in the House. And, the conferees to whom it was referred had dozens of meetings.

Now, a conference committee is always necessary in a bicameral legislature to iron out the differences between the houses. Some people have an idea that conferees take a vote and every vote in the conference committee counts one, and the majority settles it. But, of course, that isn't true.

If there are, for instance, 10 conferees, as there were in this case, there might be more and there might be less—there is just 1 vote from the Senate and 1 vote from the House. And, the House conferees decide the House vote, and the Senate conferees decide the Senate vote. And, unless those votes agree, there is no agreement of conference, and there can be no report.

It happened in this case, that the Senate conferees were busily engaged, honestly working on some other proposition of legislation and were unable to attend these conferences that lasted quite awhile. And, it happened that each one of them, with one exception, each one delegated to me, and I was the conferee from the Senate, their votes in that conference committee.

So, when the conference committee met, with very few exceptions I sat down on one side representing the Senate, and five Members of the House sat on the other side representing the House. But, I had in my pocket the votes of all these other Senate Members, so, as far as numbers were concerned, we were equal.

We quarreled a long time. No one lost his temper. There were no bitter words spoken, and when the conference was over, each time, it adjourned, they were all friendly with each other. But, they were determined, set men, and since I spoke for five, I had it my own way, and had no difficulty in agreeing on the vote as to what the Senate meant. [Laughter.]

Now, I want to tell you what the final difficulty was. There were three things upon which we disagreed. One was a copy of the law—a copy taken from the Tennessee Valley Authority law—which in effect said that no one in the Rural Electrification Administration should be appointed to office or promoted or demoted or discharged on account of partisan political recommendations, but all action should be taken on the basis of merit and efficiency.

If that is not exactly quoted, at least, I have given you the substance. The House struck that out, and when we got into conference, of course, that was one of the difficulties we had disagreeing.

Another was, as the bill passed the Senate, it provided that the loans made to organizations—rural organizations that were setting up cooperatives—loans made by the Government of the United States should be at a rate not exceeding 3 percent. The House struck that out, just changed a few words, but when they struck it out and inserted, this is the way it read:

"No loans shall be made for less than 3 percent."

That was a great difference. The sky was the limit in one House and 3 percent was the limit in the other. Now, we jangled over that for days. We reached a point where it seemed to me that agreement was an impossibility, and it was taking up an immense amount of time, which, for me, was valuable because I represented five men. [Laughter.]

And after this I reached the conclusion that we weren't going to get any report and the bill would die. I said to them one day, "Gentlemen, this is our last meeting. It is quite evident we are never going to agree, and, representatives in assembled conference, I notify you I will never agree to sign it on either one of those measures, and you don't show any inclination that you are going to agree to them. So when we adjourn today it will be without day."

And I left the room. One of the conferees followed me out. I said before I left, "Don't be mistaken, now. Don't forget that this question of Rural Electrification Administration is going to the voters of the country of the United States." [Applause.] "It is going to be an issue in the next campaign. I think I can make it an issue, and I am going to have a lot of help to do that. And, it is going into every district where a man here has got a record one way or the other; not necessarily to beat somebody, but that the people may know who it is that has killed Rural Electrification Administration."

And then when I left, the chairman of the House conferees followed me out and said,

"Now, Senator, don't be discouraged." [Laughter.] "I think we are going to reach an agreement. After that little speech of yours, I believe we will come together because we have made up our minds you are not going to give in."

He said, "Just let it rest awhile; you have said enough. They will think about it and let them think, and I think within a few days we will notify you we are ready to have another meeting."

And, I said, "All right," and I called another meeting, and we met, and we quarreled a little while in a friendly way, but finally they surrendered on this partisan proposition that we had in the Senate bill, to keep it out of politics; and, on the other, a man on the other side of the table, who was opposed to the whole thing, made a proposition that is in the law now. I thought it was one of the best things.

He said, "I propose now instead of this 3 percent interest being up or down, above or below, that we provide in the law that the rate of interest these farmers will have to pay will be the same rate of interest the Government pays."

And I snapped my fingers and said, "It is done." [Applause.]

I thought that was a better thing than what we had in, because I was satisfied that rate of interest was going to go below 3 percent, and it has been below ever since, and there has never been one organized under your cooperatives since that didn't pay less than 3 percent on their money. It is the cheapest rate than anybody ever got.

My own opinion, my own private opinion, is that the Government on this great undertaking could afford to loan the money for nothing. [Applause.] It ought to loan it without any interest. We have subsidized everybody in creation where it didn't do anybody but a few people any good, and here was an opportunity to subsidize the fundamental industry not only of our country, but of all the world. And it ought to have been done. Of course, I knew it couldn't be done, it wouldn't be done, and nobody tried it.

Now, the Rural Electrification Administration has demonstrated how when a free people, untrammeled, are allowed to handle a thing of this magnitude, under a law which, I think, is perfectly fair, what great changes come about. I wouldn't be surprised to see the name of the next great invention in the electric world come from some rural farm, way out in Missouri, 10 miles away from a town.

They are studying it, those boys are. They are improving it. They have got lots of them in operation now. For instance, how many in this audience would be able to read a meter? I learned once or twice, probably three times, by studying it several hours each time, but I have forgotten every one of them now and—oh yes, there is more than that, because there are some electric experts here.

Why should we have a meter that we had to get an expert to read in order to tell how many kilowatt-hours you had consumed? Well, now, as I understand it, the Rural Electrification Administration has got a new meter, at about a third of the price they used to have to pay for the old one, and it is just as plain as reading the meter on your automobile. Now, since you won't have a chance to read your meter in your automobile, it will be some relief to read your power meter. [Laughter and applause.]

And, why shouldn't you? Did you ever ask yourself that question? "Why are these three wheels and these figures and these dots and these dashes and everything put up here when you might just put it in English and let you know what it is?" The experts, the monopolies that owned and controlled it didn't want you to do that. It took the Rural Electrification Administration to do it.

And, they had quite a time to do that one thing—just thing of that. You would think everybody would rejoice at it, but I got the story either from Harry, here, or Dr. Craig under him, both of them maybe, as to just what happened.

They saw the economy in getting a report from your meter without sending all over the country an expert to go around and read the meters every month. That was one of the fights they made against this bill. Why, it was going to cost too much. It never would pay. You will be bankrupt.

Now, one of the things that would keep you bankrupt would be to have to send to town for an expert to come out and read your meter, when you want to find out how much you owed for electricity you had used. Why shouldn't you read it, a meter that any school child can read? Today he telephones it in to the office.

Well, now, under the old regime, they wouldn't have trusted you to do that. They would think you would cheat them. The Rural Electrification Administration went on the theory that most men are honest, and that while there were some dishonest fellows, they probably wouldn't cheat themselves because in the cooperative you would not lie about the amount you had consumed: you would be cheating yourself. You are one of the cooperators.

Then, too, those fellows that are getting that word at the main office know about how much you are consuming. They know how many electric fixtures you have in your home. They know about how much electricity they will consume. And, they can tell pretty well without knowing anything about a meter, how much electricity you use. But, there are other reasons why they send around to your homes experts to do this, or to do that, and when they go they will read the meter, and even though they haven't been there for 6 months, they can read the meter back for 6 months and see how it compares.

So, there are two reasons why it shouldn't be dangerous. First, most of the people are honest and would tell the truth when they telephoned it in, and save the necessity of sending around a man every month, and, second, because if there were some of them dishonest, they would know they would get caught at the job.

That is one of the little things being done. I could go on all night and tell you of thousands and thousands of little things that are being done that are saving expense.

You are not paying a third as much now for the various different things you have to have that you used to pay. Rural Electrification Administration brought prices down. They put the strong level upon the big industries, and said, "We will make them ourselves, or we will get somebody and give them the exclusive right of making all of the things the farmers will use in this connection."

That has occurred a lot of times. It has been a continual improvement, continual economy from the time the Rural Electrification Administration was born down to this hour; improvement and more economy. And, we haven't reached the end of the road yet, my friends.

It will go on. Some of these will come from the little children, now in your homes, going to the country school. They will learn electricity by its practical application, that they see before their eyes. I think it is the most wonderful thing that has taken place in a century.

But, friends, don't forget. Your enemies are the same fellows that are enemies of the Tennesee Valley Authority, and are enemies of Bonneville out West, are enemies of Grand Coulee, the greatest dam of all, up near the Canadian line, that, itself, will make, when the units are all in, more electricity than all of Tennessee Valley Authority put together.

The same interests are fighting you. But, fortunately for our cause, they have a greater army to fight when they fight you, than when they fight the Tennessee Valley Authority, for instance. Although it is a mammoth concern, almost beyond imagination to properly conceive, yet as compared with the Rural Electrification Administration it is very small, covering a very small territory, and the Rural Electrification Administration covers the United States. That act says it must be kept out of politics. We must keep it out of politics; as sure as it gets into politics it is ruined. You have the same law in the Rural Electrification Administration Act that you had in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. It must be kept out of politics.

But, that doesn't mean you, as a voter, should not know the record of your Member of Congress or your Senator. [Applause.] That doesn't mean that you should not make up your mind that a man who is against Tennessee Valley Authority and against Rural Electrification Administration and against all electric improvements of that kind ought not be in Congress, and that it is your duty to vote against him. There is no law against that. [Laughter.]

And, I want you to remember, all of you, that when you find a Member of the House or the Senate continually fighting Tennessee Valley Authority, he is an enemy of Rural Electrification Administration, if he were not afraid to be a pretended friend when it comes time to vote. At heart he is your enemy. You can mark that down and you won't be mistaken in a million times.

And, I think we ought to remember that. I don't mean, now, that I am advocating that a man ought to vote against a Member of Congress simply because he is against Rural Electrification Administration. But, I do mean to say that Rural Electrification Administration is one of the important things that comes before him in his official capacity, and I think, whether you do or not, I don't know, but I think that when we come to vote for a Member of Congress, we ought not let our decision rest upon some silly little thing, some personal matter, or some one matter, and forget everything else. We are supreme here in free America, in every democracy. That is so when we go to the ballot box. Nobody but God knows what you do if you want to keep it to yourself. And that is a privilege you ought to have. That is one of the God-given privileges of every citizen of every democracy, and we ought not to destroy it.

So it is for you to determine. Maybe he is a good man on everything else, and wrong on something. To weigh that importance is up to you and you alone. I only want to call your attention to the fact that the man who is opposed to the electric development, improvement of our natural resources, I think, has something wrong about him somewhere, even though he goes to church every Sunday and pays the preacher well, and leads in prayer meeting every Thursday night. [Laughter and applause.]

How much weight, when I come to vote against you, shall I give to the Sabbath and how much to that. I will balance it all up. I reach a conclusion that is satisfactory to me in here. [Senator Norris indicates his heart.] It doesn't make any difference whether it seems to suit you or not. You do the same and everybody else does the same. Every citizen in a democracy does that—ought to do that, at least.

In the aggregate we get the expression, the honest conscious expression of a whole people. There is no reason why we should not find out our friends even though they are Members of the Senate or Members of the House, and we ought to take our own way of doing it, and do it just as we please, to satisfy perhaps nobody but ourselves, but that is a good way to solve it.

Now, the Rural Electrification Administration was fought by men who are now leaders in the political world in the House and Sen-

ate. They might have been honest in their opposition. Perhaps if they just did it once, I might think that, but when the same special interests want something else, and they are with them there, I think that is a suspicious circumstance.

They said—and if you will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you will find this to be true—they stood up on the floor of the Senate—some of the great leaders there that Senators now that are not leaders probably are following—they said: "Why, these Rural Electrification Administration concerns will all be bankrupt. They aren't going to pay. They are founded upon a financial basis that is erroneous. They cannot live. They will all perish."

That is the substance of the argument. The records show that the Rural Electrification Administration has been one of the most successful financial operations ever undertaken. And they are paying this interest that they owe to the Government. Several millions of dollars, at this hour, has been paid before it is due.

No; you cannot take away this electricity from the farmers' wives, anyway. [Applause.] The farmers may forget about it, but the farmers' wives won't.

I saw Mr. Carmody one day. He came to see me about something, came right from the train up to my office. I went over before breakfast to meet him. He wired me he was coming. He had been on a trip up in Minnesota or Wisconsin, somewhere, in regard to Rural Electrification Administration, and after we got through with our conference I said to Mr. Carmody, "I want to ask you, did you ever put in a rural cooperative electric system; did you ever get a man in and then lose him after you got him in? Did he go back on it?"

And he said, "Yes; that happened once. It was up in Minnesota, where they put in a rural cooperative. It ran for 2 or 3 months, and the man who had been one of the original subscribers, a farmer out in the country, came into the office in town and said, 'I wish you would send a man out to disconnect me. I want to quit this Rural Electrification Administration business and bring in the meter.'"

They talked with him and tried to get him to stay. They did everything they could. But they couldn't do anything with him. So, they thought it was all over and they said, "All right, we will send a man out in a few days."

And in a few days they sent one out. He went to the house and the man wasn't at home. His wife let him in and he told the wife what he was there for. He said, "Your husband was in and ordered that you be disconnected from the Rural Electrification Administration, and that I should come out and get the meter."

And the wife looked around surprised, and she said, "Why, no, no; I don't want it disconnected. I don't want you to take the meter."

Well, he said, "I don't want to take it either, but your husband is the boss; of course, if he says so, why we will have to take it out."

"No," she said, "No, I don't think that he is the boss about that matter." [Laughter.] "I don't want you to disconnect it." And she got a little more determined than ever, and she backed up to the wall where the rolling pin was hanging and he made up his mind that he didn't want any further argument with her and he left.

So he told his experience when he got back to the office, and they said, "Oh, well, he didn't tell her about it. She will explain it to him now and it will be all right."

But it wasn't. He came in, in a few days, and brought in the meter himself, and threw it onto the table. He said, "There is your old meter; I disconnected it myself. I have got enough."

They said, "What is the matter?"

He said he couldn't afford to pay for it. They had got along without electricity for so long, and they were going to get along without it the rest of the time.

They didn't talk to him very much, because they had tried it before, so he went home. And when he got home his wife wasn't there. And she has never come back to this hour. [Laughter and applause.]

The powers that are fighting the Rural Electrification Administration know they have a different enemy from the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is spread out all over and the women of the country will tear them to pieces if they ever get a chance at it.

But, the Rural Electrification Administration ought to know its friends. You ought to know that your enemies, if they could destroy you, would do it. They may destroy you indirectly. They will always be against the Tennessee Valley Authority, if they can destroy that, and that has been a great help to Rural Electrification Administration. That is where you are getting some of the best demonstration of what can be done by the Rural Electrification Administration, is right in the Tennessee Valley, where to begin with you get electricity at a wholesale cost that is fair, and it is honest, and yet enables the Tennessee Valley Authority to make money.

Incidentally, in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942—that is the last fiscal year—the Tennessee Valley Authority paid back to the Government of the United States, in round numbers, $35,000,000 for what the Government had advanced Tennessee Valley Authority. About half of that, somewhere in the neighborhood of half, was in cash, the balance was just the same as cash; it was credit to an amortization fund to build up this system if some accident should happen to it.

In the 5 months of the present fiscal year, they have increased that about $7,500,000. So, in round numbers, the Tennessee Valley Authority, in the few years that it has been operating—it hasn't gotten into full operation yet—has paid back in the neighborhood of $40,000,000 to the Government in money that it received through appropriations of Congress. It is going to be able to pay the Government back as we said it would, over and over again.

We were called foolish, and silly, and crazy, and a lot worse names than that when we did it. But, we told them that would happen. We told them that would happen in the Rural Electrification Administration, that it was one of the best risks that the Government of the United States had ever undertaken, and it has proved to be so. And, it will get better and better as more members join and take electricity in your various cooperative organizations. [Applause.]

As I see it, we are in an electric age. We have gone great distances in the last 10 years. The Tennessee Valley Authority and the development out in Washington and Oregon and the Rural Electrification Administration all over the United States, constitute the shining star in what would otherwise be a rather blackened, dark atmosphere. It is the bright hope. It will bring happiness and comfort to every farm home. It takes the drudgery of life, that all our mothers knew, away. It takes it away.

Oh, how we feel, who are as old as I am, if you've lived the same kind of life I had to live and see my poor old mother when I was just a little baby toddling up the hill carrying a pail of water, going to the pump and pumping the water, sometimes for the cattle and the horses, always for the house, and carrying it in—I can see her yet taking out of the garden a lot of lettuce, taking it over there near the pump and pumping the water to wash it and get it ready for the next meal.

We didn't know any better then. We didn't know what improvement was coming. But it has come. And this electricity that gets into the farm home means a new hired girl in that home, and she is a remarkable girl, too—the harder she works the better she likes it; and the longer hours she works and the more she works the less she charges for it. [Laughter.] And she never takes off any Thursday afternoon or forenoon, either. She works 24 hours a day and enjoys every minute of it.

That is the kind of hired girl the Rural Electrification Administration has brought into the home.

It has brought a man to the farm, too. He gives the same thing. He is grinding the feed; he is going to do all kinds of work on the farm. And the more work he does the better he gets, the cheaper he gets, and the more efficient he becomes.

That is the Rural Electrification Administration. That is what the Rural Electrification Administration is doing. And, after all, these helpers that came through the Rural Electrification Administration came to a class of our people who needed it badly. To a great extent, the farmer of America had become the forgotten man, and the children of the farmer were going away to town. Even if we had not had the war crisis there would have been somewhat of a crisis if we had not had the Rural Electrification Administration. The children were going to the cities, going to the towns.

The Rural Electrification Administration changed that. It has not only relieved the drudgery of your wife, your mother, and your daughter, but it has brought happiness to you; it has brought the radio, and new inventions are going to come, I think.

I would like to live long enough to see some of them coming true. They are coming. It would be an out-of-the-ordinary thing of this life if they didn't come. Everything points to it, and every time you spread Rural Electrification Administration you put more scientific men to work—don't you forget it.

The fellow on the farm, the schoolboy is that expert in your case, and he is a dandy, too. He is going to improve. He has improved. He does improve. They use electricity now to keep pigs from starving to death, to raise little chicks, to brood them after they are hatched. They now put an electric wire around a pasture and very little voltage, 8 volts is enough. You can keep any kind of a cow or any other animal inside of that fence, and without any trouble. You put one low down, near the ground and you keep in the pigs, too. They never run up against it but once. [Laughter.] And in a few years, after they have done that once or twice, at least, you can take the electricity off. The cow cannot tell by looking at the wire whether it has electricity in it or not. [Laughter.] And, the wire without electricity will accomplish the same result as one which has electricity in it, so it is comparatively cheap, as you see.

My friends, I wish I could tell you just how I feel about this Rural Electrification Administration. I cannot help but think it is one of the great advancements of our age. I think a great deal of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It has done a wonderful work. It has been the realization of dreams for many years, and it seems to me that the Rural Electrification Administration has greater possibilities.

I think that it has greater possibilities because it is going into homes of men and women who have been neglected. It is bringing the comfort and the pleasures of the city life onto the farm. It has made farm operation in many cases financially profitable, where they otherwise would not be so. It has been one of the greatest instrumentalities in carrying on this war; all put together, one of the greatest dreams that was ever dreamed since Adam was driven out of the Garden.

I think—well, I know—that to the Tennessee Valley Authority and Rural Electrification Administration, engineers are coming now from all over the world to see the operation, to see how we do it, to find out something that might benefit their people, that it is something that we can tell them and explain to them and rejoice when they go home to their own people and give them some of the blessings that we share.

One of the great improvements that must come to us is the cheapening of the wholesale price that you must pay for electricity. And, every time Tennessee Valley Authority is advanced, or anything like Bonneville is advanced, it helps out that price. It cuts it down.

You cannot separate these things. They belong together. God put them together. And, every stream that rolls down the mountain side through the meadows into the sea ought to be made to bring its blessings, its comforts, its joys, to the farm home as well as to the city home. [Applause.]

The New Deal Farm Program

REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, during the last several days, Members of Congress from Indiana and other States have been deluged with letters and telegrams from triple A committeemen, urging the preservation of the entire New Deal farm program and, incidentally, their jobs. The letters and telegrams are all identical. They urge, first, that the A. A. A. program be continued indefinitely; second, that excess wheat be released for feed purposes at cheap, subparity prices; and third, that the New Deal program of incentive payments and subsidies to farmers be adopted.

It is obvious that this is an organized lobby, sponsored and directed by the triple A, in a desperate, last-ditch effort to stem the tide of resentment against the New Deal farm program. As evidence of this fact, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point two very interesting communications from Mr. Hassil E. Schenck, president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., with reference to statements recently made by Mr. Harry Schooler, triple A director for the Indiana region, before a triple A meeting at Indianapolis:

INDIANA FARM BUREAU, INC.,
Indianapolis, Ind., March 5, 1943.

GEORGE W. GILLIE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GILLIE: You are likely getting a deluge of mail from Indiana relative to our agricultural program.

This is all coming as a result of a special meeting held in the Claypool Hotel, Indianapolis, on Friday, February 26, which was addressed by Harry Schooler, regional director of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

Enclosed is copy of a letter which has gone to our district directors, district S. and E. leaders, County Farm Bureau presidents, S. and E. leaders, secretaries, Purdue University officials, county agricultural agents, State triple A committeemen, Secretary Wickard, Governor Townsend, and to Harry Schooler.

Very truly yours,
HASSIL E. SCHENCK,
President, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

INDIANA FARM BUREAU, INC.,
Indianapolis, Ind., March 5, 1943.

To County Farm Bureau Presidents:

DEAR FRIEND: I have just returned from Washington, where I have had an opportunity to check up on the statements made by Harry Schooler, regional triple A director, before the county triple A women in a meeting in the Claypool Hotel, Friday, February 26.

I was in an extended conference with Secretary Wickard and the Secretary evidenced as great disappointment and alarm at the statements made by Mr. Schooler as did I. I refer to the statement made by Schooler, in which he said "the fight is on between the Farm Bureau and the triple A. Strike below the belt, above the belt, or anywhere you can. Tell the farmers to join the Farmers' Union, read the Spade, and write their Congressmen."

This was an alarming statement to me, particularly as I had just returned from four county-wide meetings in which I had spoken strongly in favor of a continuation of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. It was only because of a planned program that the farmers of America were able, not only to meet but to exceed all production quotas last year. Without a planned program, this would have been impossible.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act is what its name implies, an adjustment act. When surpluses were piled so high as to depress prices, it was then that production was adjusted downward in order to assimilate these surpluses and elevate the price. When the time came, because of greatly increased domestic consumption and an unprecedented foreign outlet, that we needed to adjust production upward, this same plan was utilized in establishing quotas, not only by States, but by counties, townships, and individual farms, making possible the unprecedented production of last year. This can be repeated in 1943 if sufficient farm labor and equipment is available to do the job.

Following my public statements along this line you can imagine my great surprise to find a representative of the Department of Agriculture making such assertions as Schooler made Friday, February 26.

There are some slight differences of opinion as to proposed amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which are insignificant as compared with the basic principles involved in the act. It was because of these slight differences of opinion that Schooler made the unwarranted and unethical and misrepresentative statements which he made. President O'Neal is as greatly disturbed as I, to think any man should be as unethical and as untruthful as was Mr. Schooler.

I want to have it clearly understood that my statements in this letter are neither an indictment of anyone in Washington nor of our State triple A committee. However, I do mean it as a severe indictment of Harry Schooler's statements.

I found Secretary Wickard as gentlemanly and as fair in his thinking as could be expected of any man on any occasion. I regretted very much that Triple A Administrator Townsend was out of Washington and I didn't get to talk with him, but I want to assure you and the farmers of your county that the American Farm Bureau Federation, with all its leadership, and the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., are wholeheartedly behind a retention of the basic fundamentals of our constructive agricultural program. Any amendments which may be made will be only for the purpose of strengthening the program and adjusting it to meet changed conditions.

I sincerely hope it will be possible to rid ourselves of a man as unethical in his statements as is Harry Schooler.

Again I want to express my greatest confidence in our State committee and in our good friends in the Department of Agriculture at Washington. Any questions which you may have to ask I shall be glad to have you direct them to me or to call in person at this office, that we may discuss matters openly and frankly.

Very sincerely yours,
HASSIL E. SCHENCK,
President, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

Absence From Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago (Ill.) Daily Calumet of March 6, 1943:

ABSENCE FROM WORK

Absenteeism in southeast Chicago may be as prevalent in our local industrial plants as in other sections of the country though we have been unable to check the rate here. From general observations, however, this department is inclined to believe there is less in this district than the average throughout the Nation.

Reports have it that loss of time and production had been increasing during the last year rather than decreasing. The House Naval Affairs Committee has under consideration a bill to curb absenteeism by requiring war contractors to report absences from work to draft boards with the view of inducting into military service men who willfully stay away from their war-production jobs.

Appearing before the House Naval Affairs Committee, Secretary of the Navy Knox testified the other day that from reports he had received, time lost in war plants due to absenteeism was "many times greater than the time lost due to strikes or shutdowns." He said further "that whatever final form this legislation may take, I am heartily behind anything that can be done to reduce absenteeism."

There seem to be no reasons advanced so far by those studying the problem as to the specific causes for absenteeism. It is this corner's contention that such fundamentals would establish the basis for correcting the condition. The bill apparently has for its sole object reports of absenteeism to draft boards which obviously would involve those in the draft exclusively. It appears to us that such an approach would result only in a partial solution since it is logical to assume that if absenteeism is so acute those absenting themselves include many who are not subject to conscription.

It is reasonable to assume that in the northern sectors this winter season—which has been long and severe—that illness of workers is a big factor and one that most likely has been taken into consideration. We wonder, however, whether the illness of the wife of the man of the family has not required the attention of the latter in these days when medical attention is hard to get

or vice versa where the wife is a war worker and her sick husband requires her attention.

Further, are those absenting themselves periodically spending their off time at theaters or other forms of diversion or in resting at home or in household work or pursuits in these days of both husband and wife on armament jobs? Perhaps a "note to the teacher" as prevailed in our school days would divulge many reasons, some warranted and others unwarranted. At least the problem would be closer to solution if the specific reasons were analyzed.

Naturally there are some who, due to physical handicaps and those who have grown older since their last engagement in steady work who cannot stand the pace of full-time vocations. And there are the individuals who are constitutionally indolent who want their lazy days to themselves periodically. On the other hand there are not many with higher costs of living and tax obligations, who, assuming they are hale and hearty, are not mindful of the prevailing high wages and reflect over the foregoing of the day's pay.

As this department knows local wage earners in this predominantly manufacturing district we are inclined to the belief that the normally strong and healthy individual is not shirking his or her duty in the local plants. They are with few exceptions in peace or wartimes an industrious class. Family folks and home owners comprise a big percentage of them. They have demonstrated in many ways that the home front is stanchly behind the armed front.

War and Politics

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, four developments within the past few weeks may well give the people cause for serious thought.

The first was the statement in a bulletin issued by the Russian Embassy at Washington indicating that Stalin did not intend to stand by the articles of the Atlantic Charter, except in the way that he might desire to construe them.

The second development came after public reaction in the United States had indicated a good deal of shock on the part of the people that even before the war is ended the Atlantic Charter is being tossed overboard. It was a quasi-denial by spokesmen of the Embassy that Russia would not observe the terms of the Atlantic Charter.

The third development came when the United States Ambassador to Soviet Russia, the blunt and forthright Admiral William H. Standley—and I may add that any naval officer who acquires the rank of admiral in the United States Navy is a gentleman who speaks the truth on all occasions—said that news of the help being given to Russia by the United States was being suppressed from the Russian people. Admiral Standley cited Premier Joseph Stalin's assertion that "the Red army alone is bearing the whole weight of the war," and then he proceeded to point out that thousands of airplanes, and many, many thousands of machine guns, and huge quantities of supplies have actually been sent by the United States to Russia.

The fourth development is the now generally recognized campaign being carried on with the tacit approval of the President for his nomination for a fourth term. This puts the war in politics and puts politics in the war.

These developments taken together with recent statements of the Vice President, HENRY A. WALLACE, that Russia and the United States must reach an accord, otherwise we will have a third world war, comprise a disquieting sequence. The American people do not know what post-war plans may be in the making, and unless Congress moves definitely to determine what is being done there is no way for the people to find out.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Roosevelt's closest political advisers and managers, including the Postmaster General, Frank Walker, who is chairman of the Democratic National Committee, are openly maneuvering for a fourth-term nomination for the President, because it is not possible, with Mr. Roosevelt a candidate for a fourth term, to separate the war effort from politics, and to prevent political considerations from having a serious impact upon the war efforts.

The President's most recent action in naming a board to be a sort of super-supreme board of survey composed of Trouble Shooter Jimmie Byrnes, Bernard Baruch, the close Presidential adviser, Samuel Rosenman, Harry Hopkins, the former welfare worker, and Admiral William T. Leahy, seems to be another indication that the President intends to continue trying to win the war with only the people he likes.

The most regrettable aspect of this whole sequence of developments is that the confidence of the American people in the conduct of the war is bound to be weakened if they feel that partisan politics is being crossed with the war effort.

As is being pointed out by several Washington columnists and students of affairs, Mr. Roosevelt could well devote his entire attention to the war effort and our domestic problems and allow the American people to direct by public opinion the action of the next Democratic National Convention. It is, of course, obvious that with the power he possesses Mr. Roosevelt can compel his subordinates to do as he likes in the matter of a fourth-term nomination, and he can unquestionably impose his will upon the next Democratic National Convention. Since this is generally recognized as being true, it can serve no good purpose for the President and his political advisers to pretend that the President does not know anything about these maneuverings to compel the Democratic Party to nominate Mr. Roosevelt for the fourth time as its Presidential candidate. Such tactics are bound to impair the confidence of the people, because they are an insult to the public intelligence. Consequently, it becomes incumbent upon the Congress to move to determine what post-war plans are being contrived, because if Mr. Roosevelt is elected for a fourth term he would become so powerful that he could make binding almost any sort of post-war commitments he might make in the name of the American people. Certainly the heroism of our men and women on the fighting fronts deserves that our whole energy and attention at home be given to war production and supply.

Negro Youth Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PENNSYLVANIA STATE TEMPORARY COMMISSION ON THE CONDITIONS OF THE URBAN COLORED POPULATION,
Philadephia, Pa., February 25, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MYERS: The commission has examined the program of the National Youth Administration in Pennsylvania, with particular reference to its impact upon the training and placement of Negro youth. Region III of the National Youth Administration operation includes the States of Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey, but the greater portion of its program is in the State of Pennsylvania. Due to the fact that the Negro population of Pennsylvania is larger than that of New Jersey and Delaware, the majority of Negro youth trained on this program are residents of this State. The average enrollment of Negro youth trainees in this tri-State area has been approximately 1,200, with about 900 of this number residents of the State of Pennsylvania. The total assignment of Negro trainees represents approximately 18 percent of the total number enrolled in this area.

A review of placement records of the National Youth Administration shows that 1,795 Negro youth have been placed in war industries for the period July 1, 1942, to January 31, 1943. Examples of the industries in which these youth have been placed are as follows:

Philadelphia Navy Yard	86
Middletown Air Depot	20
Sun Shipbuilding Co	183
Dravo Corporation	13
Mathis Shipyards	10
New York Shipbuilding Co	21

Of particular note is the record of 719 Negro girls employed in the textile trades as power-machine operators. This report of placements is significant when it is realized that without this training the great majority of these youth would not now be employed in their present capacities. The fact that this group has benefited by this preemployment training is an outstanding reason for the continuance of this agency.

The flexibility of National Youth Administration training is demonstrated in its resident center program which permits the transfer of trainees from communities without training facilities to well-equipped centers located near acute labor shortage areas.

National Youth Administration training is practical because of its production training program, fabricating useful items for

the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and other civilian Government agencies. In this region, National Youth Administration trainees have produced during the past year for the Army and Navy ordnance a total of 918,324 articles, 86,673 of which were produced in metal shops and 791,744 garments fabricated in the industrial sewing shops—39,907 articles were produced in National Youth Administration woodwork shops. In addition to these, there were 636,180 articles made for civilian Government agencies. Reports indicate that the articles produced met all specifications.

Added to the services to youth by the National Youth Administration is the student work program which aids needy students, through part-time employment in the schools, to continue or complete their education. Our survey discloses that in secondary schools, approximately 3,300 students, of which 10 percent are Negro, are aided. In colleges and graduate schools, approximately 2,600 students, of which 3 percent are Negro, benefit by this program.

Estimates of the War Manpower Commission indicate that there is still a great need for skilled and semiskilled workers in war industries. The age limitation for trainees imposed upon the National Youth Administration by your honorable body limits the effectiveness of this agency in realizing its maximum contribution to the training of workers for war industries. The Commission knows that hundreds of persons, particularly women, have applied for this training and have been turned away because of age limitations. This restriction, if lifted for the duration of the war, would insure maximum use of facilities and increase the contribution of this agency to the war effort.

Having examined the work of this agency, its efficiency and flexibility in the training of war workers, the Commission urges that this agency not only be continued but expanded to include trainees of all ages.

Respectfully submitted.

LAURENCE FOSTER,
Exeeutive Director.

O. W. I.'s Roosevelt Pamphlet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit News of March 8, 1943:

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION'S ROOSEVELT PAMPHLET

A silly incident in Congress had to do with the biography of President Roosevelt which, its critics charged, is a piece of Roosevelt fourth-term propaganda that was put out by the Office of War Information. In pamphlet form, the biography tells the President's story from his younger days, through his political career, to the present. There are illustrations of a direct kind, having the appearance of a cartoonist's or comic strip artist's work.

Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, has made prompt and sufficient explanation. The pamphlet was issued in 11 languages besides English. The copies in English are for circulation in England or English-speaking countries other than the United States. Simple texts and illustrations were chosen, that the document might have broad popular appeal among foreign peoples.

No work the Office of War Information does compares in importance with its efforts, if they are at all successful, to reach foreign peoples and move them to sympathize with our cause in the war. Its work in that field has rapidly expanded in volume and variety. There may be a question of the worth of this particular pamphlet, but, in attempting to favorably dispose other peoples in a personal way toward President Roosevelt, our war leader, the Office of War Information made a good move. Foreign populations hear the name Roosevelt often, but they don't know much about him. Telling them is among the things our foreign propaganda may profitably do.

Representative JOHN TABER, of New York, is a senior House Republican who ought to know better than to stamp this Office of War Information product as "purely political propaganda, designed entirely to promote a fourth term and a dictator." He made the House laugh, but he also made himself ridiculous.

Hobbs Antiracketeering Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 10, 1943:

A NEGLECTED OPPORTUNITY

In their minority report on the Hobbs antiracketeering amendment, on which the House soon will vote under a special rule, Representatives CELLER, of New York, and LANE, of Massachusetts, state that the basic objection to this measure is "its wholly unwarranted reflection on the organized millions of men and women in this country." That statement deserves some examination.

The amendment is aimed chiefly at one specific practice of certain union locals. The practice is to stop trucks entering a city and to collect a fee, said to be equivalent of a day's pay for a union driver, from the owner or driver. The collection of the fee is made under threat and those who in the past have refused to pay it have been beaten. The Government lost its attempt to prosecute union locals under the antiracketeering law when the Supreme Court held that the practice was a union practice, which Congress had exempted. The Hobbs amendment wipes out such exemption.

Now the opponents of this amendment make no attempt to condone the practice. "On the contrary," say Mr. CELLER and Mr. LANE in their minority report, "it is our own belief that these activities are in the long run disadvantageous to those comparatively few locals who engage in them and to the organized labor movement in general." President Daniel Tobin, of the teamsters' union, according to the report, has disavowed the practice and prohibited in the future "such outrageous conduct on the part of unions under his jurisdiction."

But it is evident that such disavowals and such orders have not been sufficient to end a practice which is condemned by the critics as well as the friends and members of organized labor. Why, then, should a law designed to stop this practice be interpreted as an unwarranted reflection or, for that matter, as any reflection, on members of organized labor? Do the laws against murder, arson, and bank robbery reflect on the millions of citizens who do not participate in such crimes?

Opposition to the amendment reflects an apparent weakness in labor leadership which is not conducive to the progress of organized labor, and which does the labor movement more harm than good. There are other practices which are not condoned by responsible labor leaders and which violate fundamental precepts of individual freedom in this country. Unable or unwilling to remove them, those responsible for labor policy leave their removal to outraged public opinion. But instead of gaining the advantage which lies in really effective condemnation of obnoxious practices, labor leadership is placed, as in this case, in the position of defending them.

The Hobbs amendment undoubtedly will pass the House and it should be approved by the Senate. Wise labor statesmanship would be to work for its enactment, not to oppose it by making it appear that the vast majority of decent, law-abiding citizens who belong to labor unions feel any differently toward the elimination of labor rackets than their fellow citizens who are not members. Certainly such labor statesmanship would work, in the end, for the advancement, not the detriment, of organized labor.

O. W. I. Overstepping Its Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Syracuse (N. Y.) Herald-Journal of March 6, 1943:

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION OVERSTEPPING ITS AUTHORITY

Where does the Office of War Information get the idea that it was created for a general censorship over the news of the Federal Government?

That it does have that view, or is acquiring it, is indicated by the fact that it is investigating a published statement that a ceiling will be placed on soft-wheat prices and that ceiling prices will be raised on flour milled from that type of wheat.

Because the announcement was made before the Office of War Information authorized it that organization is exceeding wroth. It claims the exclusive right to release Government information regarding the wartime food program.

The press of the country recognizes that military secrets about movements of armed forces or other facts which would aid the enemy should not be published. Because the line is sometimes hard to draw, the news gatherers have welcomed having an official body to pass on disputed points and make the decision as to whether a given news item should be published.

But there is no analogy between such information and that which relates to purely domestic affairs such as rationing and prices of food. And there is no benefit to be obtained by giving the Office of War Information such sweeping authority over the country's news.

Freedom of the press is too precious a safeguard to the liberties of our people and it is too deeply interwoven into the warp and woof of our American way of life to be sacrificed for some purely imaginary gain. The American people are not children—that vital news must be ladled out to them like soup.

The greatest protection to the general welfare, the best assurance of efficient and honest government rests in the vigilance of the Argus-eyed press which has many of its most able members on duty in Washington.

When the day comes that Washington newswriters must confine themselves to accepting official handouts all coming from one source, something serious will have happened to popular government in the United States of America.

It seems to be a human weakness that power breeds love of power. That is why bureaucracy grows by what it feeds upon. The Office of War Information is headed by a veteran journalist with a reputation for hard common sense. Elmer Davis should vindicate that reputation by recognizing the legitimate bounds of the authority of his Office instead of trying to stretch them into a general censorship which public sentiment has not called for and will not sanction.

Letter to Our President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 4, 1943.

Hon. FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last year, on this day, I wrote to congratulate you upon your splendid example to the people of America, your attendance at church services to mark the beginning of another year in your term of office as Commander in Chief.

Again, this March 4, to commemorate the anniversary of your assumption of the Presidency of the United States of America, you have set a shining example for the American people by recognizing the vital need of Divine guidance for intelligent, sympathetic, and inspired leadership.

I am sure that the eyes and the hearts of your people turned to the White House this morning and joined with you in profound meditation and prayer, as you listened to the words of the Reverend John Gillespie Magee.

Surely, as Dr. Magee invoked the vision and strength of the Heavenly Father, his own paternal heart must have thrilled with the glory of the words written by his young aviator-son, John Gillespie Magee, Jr., who offered his life so gallantly on the altar of freedom:

"Oh, I have slipped the surly bonds of earth
And danced the skies on laughter-silvered wings;
Sunward I've climbed, and joined the tumbling mirth
Of sun-split clouds—and done a hundred things
You have not dreamed of—wheeled and soared and swung
High in the sun-lit silence. Hov'ring there,
I've chased the shouting wind along, and flung
My eager craft through footless halls of air. * * *
Up, up the long delirious, burning blue
I've topped the wind-swept heights with easy grace
Where never lark, or even eagle, flew;
And, while with silent, lifting mind I've trod
The high untrespassed sanctity of space,
Put out my hand, and touched the face of God."

I take renewed courage from the confident assurance that you, too, in these dark hours, "put out your hand, and touched the face of God."

I have the honor to remain, my dear Mr. President,

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN J. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 9, 1943.

Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MARTIN: Your keen appreciation of the spiritual side of our March 4 anniversary flows through that splendid letter of yours. Such generous and heart-warming expressions touch me deeply.

Ever so many thanks.

Always sincerely,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Acute Shortage of Feed Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the last 10 days I have received more than 100 letters concerning the shortage of feed wheat. With a threatened shortage of food, this condition is really serious. In my district it looks like a long winter. It means the cattle must be fed longer inside. This means there must be more feed wheat. More than a hundred farmers certainly would not write me if the condition were not serious.

There is plenty of wheat in this country. What is more, there is plenty of wheat in Canada. But, very foolishly, there is an embargo on Canadian wheat. I cannot see why enough feed wheat is not released to take care of this acute shortage. It appears that the speculators are holding it for profit purposes.

I have done all I can to get this wheat released. It must be released at a fair price. Farmers cannot pay $50 a ton for this kind of feed. With the cooperation of other Congressmen we have protested individually and collectively to the Department of Agriculture and to the President of the United States. This situation could be remedied in 1 minute. All the Secretary of Agriculture has to do is issue an order that this wheat be released.

Here is the letter I have written to the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the House Committee on Agriculture:

Immediate action must be taken by you to release feed wheat to avoid a feed famine among Wisconsin farmers. Wisconsin farmers must immediately have available feed wheat at a fair price. To avoid grave consequences, I urge you and beg you to take action today to release wheat for that purpose. I cannot urge or beg this too strongly.

ALVIN E. O'KONSKI.

Absenteeism and Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communications received by me with reference to H. R. 2082:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *March 6, 1943.*

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The writer is neither a wet nor a dry, but you have laid your finger on one of the vital causes of absenteeism in naming liquor. On each corner across from this post office are two such places which are doing this emergency no good. The same crowd of columnists and commentators now clamoring about absenteeism are the same ones who heaped odium upon prohibition. But they have not learned that such a place as the Coconut Night Club ever existed.

Yours,

H. P. FAGAN.

DUMONT, IOWA, *March 5, 1943.*

Congressman BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.:

We congratulate you on your courage and urge you to push your bill to outlaw liquor manufacture and sale for the duration.

Respectfully,

MRS. W. S. AUSTIN.

MISSIONS COUNCIL OF THE
CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN CHURCHES,
New York, N. Y., March 7, 1943.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I want to commend your stand on the need of prohibiting the liquor traffic for the duration. This is certainly one point at which we might well save needed materials and also help to overcome absenteeism.

Your courage is most commendable, and I want to assure you of my wholehearted support.

Very sincerely yours,

A. D. STAUFFACHER,
Executive Secretary, Missions Council.

THE OAKS HOTEL,
Springfield, Mass., March 6, 1943.

The Honorable Mr. BRYSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The account in the morning papers with respect to a move to limit the sale of liquor for the duration at least, heartened many of us who are appalled at the unrestricted sale of alcoholic beverages at a time when essential foods are undergoing the stiffest kind of rationing and when the country is in such desperate need of able-bodied manpower.

I am sure that the experiences here at our hotel can be repeated many times over throughout the country at large. We have a constantly shifting personnel—1 week is the average duration—for just one reason: alcoholism. Butter, sugar, coffee, meats are rationed from our hotel table, but members of the kitchen staff have their choice of five package stores and no less than five bars within 3 minutes' walk where they can purchase or consume as much intoxicating liquor as their week's pay envelope permits—which means, in most cases, the whole of it.

Students at our local college, where I head one of the departments, are forbidden to introduce liquor into the dormitories, of course, but opposite the armory where they are employed outside of school hours there are no less than 10 spots within easy reach where both boys and girls can indulge to the extreme limit in alcoholic beverages until their earnings, needed for books and tuition, to say nothing of War stamps and bonds, gradually melt away into the pockets of the bartender and the liquor dealer who continue to ply their luxury trade unhampered by the restrictions under which the rest of the world is operating at the present time.

Absenteeism is only one of the evils resulting from our method of handling the liquor problem, or rather of not handling it. Unmodified prohibition, as well as unrestricted license, are in the opinion of this writer equally inadequate methods. However, prohibition with capital letters will receive the support of all of us interested not only in the present but the future welfare of our country, if the present situation continues. It is becoming utterly intolerable.

Can we not at least take a leaf from our English and Canadian allies, or from the system which has proved effective in Sweden, before we find ourselves further along the road which led in no small measure to the fall of France? Most certainly our Government owes a social responsibility to the unfortunate victims of alcoholism, if it continues to provide no protection to its citizens from one of the curses of our time—unrestricted sale of dangerous beverages at every street corner.

We thank you, Mr. BRYSON, for your efforts in connection with this problem and wish you Godspeed in your undertaking.

Very truly yours,

HENRIETTA LITTLEFIELD.

CORAL GABLES, FLA., *March 6, 1943.*

Hon. JOSEPH BRYSON.

DEAR SIR: I notice in the morning paper you have introduced a bill for prohibition of the liquor traffic. I for one heartily approve this move.

It seems to me that this is the only practical method of dealing with the absenteeism question. There are many other reasons why the liquor traffic should be curbed at this time, including the waste of the servicemen.

Very truly yours,

CASSIUS A. PHILLIPS.

DERIDDER, LA., *March 6, 1943.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,

United States Congress:

Louisiana Moral and Civic Foundation is following your prohibition bill with interest.

Rev. O. E. SANDEN,
State Director.

ALLENTOWN, PA., *March 6, 1943.*

Hon. Mr. BRYSON.

DEAR SIR: I read in our paper this morning that you have the courage to introduce a prohibition bill into the House. I am writing to thank you for this. When our President in a speech of acceptance said "From this day the eighteenth amendment is doomed" I said to myself, that means that our country is doomed, for this was the first time that our country took a backward step on a moral issue. I often feel that we have gotten into our present situation as a punishment, and that we will win the war if we are honest enough to admit our mistake and to repeal repeal. The damage that alcohol is causing is appalling. I dread to read from time to time that Pearl Harbor was a perfect timing for absenteeism because of a normal Sunday morning hangover, with hundreds of saloons run by Japanese in the background of this sordid story. Who then was really responsible for Pearl Harbor? Think of Coccanut Grove in Boston. Think of highway accidents every day due to alcohol. Think of our roadhouses, cocktail parties and general roughhouse into the early hours of the morning, ruining our young people. Then we ration food and gasoline, but the beer trucks are running all the time. It would seem to me that a sign of intelligence in Washington would be to do nothing else until the whole liquor business were annihilated. Then we could do something against the enemy countries who have outlawed it largely. Thanks again. No Christian country should continue the business a minute.

Sincerely,

ROBT. R. FRITSCH.

Evening paper reports a nasty outbreak again in California because of liquor. So practically every day.

POINT LOOKOUT SCENIC STAND,
Old Fort, N. C., March 6, 1943.

Hon. Congressman BRYSON,

United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: I see in our morning papers that you are sponsoring a move to impose national prohibition for the duration of the war, by an act of Congress rather than by a constitutional amendment.

Mr. BRYSON, you are sponsoring one of the greatest moves, and if adopted, will do the greatest good of any legislation put before the Congress of the United States since the war began.

If our Nation or our manpower, and our women as well would leave off, or be deprived of liquor and other alcoholic effects, they would be sober-minded, and sincere in their efforts to carry this war to a successful conclusion; sober men and women will work better, stay on the job better, and last but not least, they will fight better.

My place of business is up on the Blue Ridge Mountain. When beer was first legalized in the State with 3.5 alcoholic content, I applied for license, and have been selling beer up to August last year, when money began to be plentiful, more people began to drink, and I saw the effect that the industry was having on the Nation at large, I stopped selling beer for the duration at least, maybe forever.

If you can get this move through, we will find favor with God and man, and will be given a greater prestige for good all over the world. I am not a religious fanatic, but I do prize good above money.

I have been here on the side of the road in business for 18 years, and one busy year we handled 134,000 customers, and I watch the coming and going of the people, spiritually, politically, and financially. Not boasting, but a very good barometer, in a very good place, I am enclosing a post card of my place, which was made a long time ago, and does not give true representation of it, as we have made several changes since the postcard was made. This mountain place has not been closed day or night since 1928.

I am mailing copies of this document to a few of our North Carolina Senators and Congressmen.

Yours very truly,

H. A. RAGLE.

SOUTH CAROLINA FEDERATED
FORCES FOR TEMPERANCE
AND LAW ENFORCEMENT,
Orangeburg, S. C., March 6, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR BROTHER BRYSON: The news this morning of your wartime prohibition bill introduced in Congress stirs our hearts with joy. I earnestly hope that you can get it to a vote, for it stands a good chance of passing, considering the present temper of public opinion. You will have strong backing here in South Carolina. And we are justly proud that it is one of our own Congressmen who takes the lead in this timely effort.

I trust that you can continue to have an informal committee in Congress, like you formed last May. Some of our leaders feel that dry sentiment is much stronger in Congress this time than in the last Congress, for the Middle West is normally dryer than the East.

We will give all the publicity to your efforts that we can, and I would like to have a copy of your bill when convenient.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours cordially,

ALBERT D. BETTS.

RICHMOND, VA., *March 6, 1943.*

Congressman BRYSON,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It was gratifying to read of your bill offered yesterday, the 5th, in the House of Congress, to prohibit hard liquors for the duration of this terrible war.

Way back in the Czar days in Russia, the whole world well remembered what very poor fighters Russian soldiers seemed to be. Even Chinese were not afraid to face them at any time. It was well known that in those days they were allowed to fill up on vodka—that is parallel to our whisky; heads of armies there then, claiming it would "stimulate" them and "cause them to be more willing and desperate and brave, etc." But in fact it was their well known ruin in any battle, for they were a bunch of drunks, stupid fools, just exactly like it makes our poor boys who are (seemingly) now actually encouraged to pour down the stuff to "make them brave, etc." Well, may I tell you what has actually caused the whole world to buck their eyes with the greatest of admiration for the 1941, 1942, and 1943 Russian soldier? The fact is, my dear Mr. BRYSON, that if a man or woman either is caught even attempting to give or sell any Russian soldier a drop of vodka they are sentenced to 6 months in a Russian jail. If proved that they actually gave it to one or sold one drop of it to a soldier, they are taken out and shot. That's why the difference in the present Russian soldier and years ago. And by the way, it is of record that rarely indeed we ever hear of an airplane accident in Russia. While I am not saying liquor did it, but in America it is very seldom a week goes by but what some American Army or Navy plane has crashed causing valuable officers' deaths.

Very sincerely,

CHAS. H. TREAKLE, JR.

P. S.—And how well do I know that liquor of all "calibers" is being allowed almost freely as water to flow all around every air depot, every Navy training camp, and every Army camp in America. In fact how well it is known that many are allowed to clean up in profits from our soldier boys.

SPRING VALLEY, OHIO, *March 7, 1943.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Methodist Sunday School of Spring Valley with a membership of 150 passed a formal resolution at its session this morning, extending to you its hearty ap-

proval and best wishes for speedy passage of your recent bill introduced in the House to impose national prohibition for the duration of the war.

The resolution passed without a dissenting vote and I was instructed to forward you this expression of our splendid body of citizenry for the courage you have shown in daring to tackle this dangerous enemy to our war effort.

One of the teachers,

J. W. WHITESIDE,
A retired superintendent of schools.

P. S.—I am a reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so I shall follow with patriotic interest every progress of your bill.

J. W. W.

PEOPLES SPECIAL SERVICE,
Chicago, Ill., March 6, 1943.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRYSON: At this time are more than pleased to convey to you our deep appreciation in common with all clear-thinking Americans for your matchless courage and fearless American caliber you are dealing with the powerfully entrenched liquor interests.

Your bill to curb the liquor traffic for the duration of the war period has met the approval of all loyal Americans irrespective of political or sectional divisions, and please be assured that your proposal to outlaw the corrupt liquor interests has given voice to the thoughts of the millions of American manhood and womanhood in this most crucial period of our country's existence.

Here we are, our Nation in the midst of a gigantic conflict unparalleled in all past history that is taxing our national vitality to the utmost and the overwhelming consensus of opinion prevails that it would be our gross folly if we continued to tolerate the liquor traffic to undermine the morale of our fighting forces as well as those in the home front.

Above all let us follow the example of the men who so ably fought and brought the World War of 1917–18 to such successful conclusion who then realized that to win that war it was necessary to eliminate the ravaging effects of the liquor traffic. They in their day did not hesitate to act against the liquor interests then when our Nation was faced with the test and there remains no good nor sensible reason for us to hesitate to take such steps to eradicate this greatest menace when we of our generation are confronted with a war of survival.

All indications point unmistakably that the Democratic Party is losing prestige and on the verge of defeat everywhere primarily because of the indecision and timid souls holding sway in our National Capital. The universal consensus of opinion is for courageous and drastic action on the part of those entrusted with America's all-paramount war program and we can accept nothing less than that.

Most sincerely yours,

RICHARD D. SULLIVAN.

MARCH 5, 1943.

Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON (Democrat, South Carolina).

DEAR SIR: I noticed in the paper this morning what you said about prohibiting the sale of beverages stronger than one-half of 1 percent of alcohol. You are one of the first that has dared to face the problem of what liquor is doing to the worker. I have been trying to help people quit drink for the past 10 years, and very few are able to quit with all the prayer and help you can give. I just finished a 3-day fast to help a neighbor man who is struggling so hard to quit and can't. He says he is as weak as a baby. He wishes all the liquor could be destroyed but until it is he is its slave. He is a meat boner and of the 40 or 50 that work with him, they all drink. He even has it at lunch and they hide a bottle under their aprons and pass it around while they work. The boss is now in the hospital dying with an eaten-up stomach. His wife has been struggling for 14 years to pull him out of it but to no avail. Now, at Christmastime, 5 places I know—some 70 workers, some 200—all small factories, or places—but drinking was so universal that in 3 places the folks came home the day before Christmas. There was too much drinking to work. One place where Army guards (special police) searched them for drink for 1 week, the boss, who is quite a drinker, took the liquor in and passed it around from the office. One guard who has a boy in the service quit because he couldn't stand such goings on. Another wanted to report it but said no one would do anything. Everybody likes their drink too much. What's the use? I see $28,000,000 was spent for advertising liquor this last year, and the shipping space, the man-hours of work, the trucks, the bottles, the whole thing, takes an unbelievable amount of labor and time to keep it going. I heard a radio program last week that sure made me think. Then when we see the drunks everywhere, it makes one wonder how we have let it go on. When I fasted 3 days the Lord showed me that millions would die from the effects of liquor. It eats up the stomach, enlarges the liver, and affects the kidneys. People everywhere tell you that someone they know has died from the effects of liquor or are so in its clutches that they are on the way out. It is a slow death, but sure. A spiritual person, when he gets around liquor, is hit so hard that he is tied up in a knot, like a heavy weight was on him. The demon power around it is so terrific you want to run. I could gladly spend 8 hours a day breaking liquor bottles and pouring the stuff down the gutter, to try and save the lives that it will claim. You hardly realize what has happened until you find out you are its slave forevermore. You will spend all your money. No one means anything to you but your drink, but of course that is in its final stages just before you pass out of this picture. The first thing a doctor tells you when you go to him is to quit drinking. I wonder why, when we spend $28,000,000 a year to entice you to your death. Liquor will kill more men than bullets if what I saw in the spirit is true, after a 3-day fast.

Now it is encouraging to hear of one man in Washington who will face the truth. This will be faced by all at the judgment seat of God. Just how much we have contributed to the death of these millions of liquor slaves will be checked against us. I am trying to be sure that it is not checked up against me. The liquor demons tremble when I come around. The man that drinks so much says when he looks my way, he shivers. Ten years of prayer against liquor is not in vain. I will continue to fight it from now on. God is going to do something when he can find anyone to help Him. I hope sincerely you are on God's side.

Very sincerely yours,

RUTH E. MOXLEY.

HUNTINGTON PARK, CALIF.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *March 6, 1943.*

Representative BRYSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to commend you for your stand on wartime prohibition. The Christian people of our Nation have been feeling for some time that some steps should be taken to curb the drastic waste of men, food, materials, and the cause of so much absenteeism and other wartime draw-backs.

I am sending you a few clippings from here and there that say more than I know how to say. I feel though that, while we are doing without sugar, rubber, fuel, canned goods, and many other things that we once thought necessities, people should be willing to do without their liquor for the dufation.

I have two sons in the service, one son-in-law, another soon to go, and a son making jigs and dies in an aircraft factory. Liquor so far hasn't touched my family, but I feel I have a right to say it might even cause us to lose this war. That would touch all mothers and all homes, regardless of what we have been able to train into our own families.

God bless you and here's wishing you much success.

Sincerely yours,

BESSIE M. BURKETT.
(Mrs. H. D. Burkett).

Conditions for a Free Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement entitled "Conditions for a Free Europe" by Dr. Antonín Obrdlík, attaché of the Czechoslovak Embassy:

It became almost proverbial to speak in this country about the so-called Balkanization of Europe, namely, about the small and medium-sized states of central and southeastern Europe, living in a state of constant feud, quarreling with each other and intriguing against each other all the time—thus "Balkanizing," i. e., disintegrating, Europe instead of trying to unite that unhappy continent.

On the surface it appears as if the critics of the European scene hit the nail right on its head. Their explanation as well as the ensuing isolationistic attitude seem to be plausible and justified. However, there is a significant shortcoming: They hit the head of the nail all right—but that head belongs to the wrong nail. Let me explain. True enough, Europe was, is, and for some time to come will continue to live in quarrels and disunity, even after this war is over. But it would be utterly wrong and unjust to blame the European peoples. Not the peoples themselves, but various cliques, within and outside the national or state boundaries, are to be held responsible for the European malaise; it is those who represent vested interests of selfish short-sighted individuals, groups of individuals or whole nations which are guilty. The peoples of Europe wanted to unite their efforts for the common good. They were willing and ready to cooperate long before the war started; at least economically.

They were not interested in having watertight barriers of the so-called economic autarchy—self-sufficiency—which created unnatural and disastrous economic conditions with all what it meant also in the sphere of politics and ideology. Unfortunately, there were also others, who were equally ready and by far more determined to fish in the muddy waters of a chaotic Europe for their own advantages. Millions of common European people merely fell a helpless victim to

shrewd machinations behind the scenes of public life; machinations which were abusing the noble feeling of love for one's own country, by changing it into the hybrid form of an overheated, chauvinistic nationalism; abusing man's quest for higher spiritual values and his fervor to serve them devotedly, by purposely deluding the common peoples' mind with ideologies of racial hatred; even the truth about the meaning and aim of the historical development of the individual European nations has often been distorted for the purposes of selfish interests.

Now, from time to time, we hear or read in this country utterances of people who draw a tempting picture of a united, peaceful, happy and cooperating Europe in the post-war era. These people, whether they are longing for a royal crown, or their followers who are waiting for royal rewards, or, finally, the well-intentioned but naive armchair politicians, with splendid visions for the organization of the whole world yet without an adequate knowledge, all these would-be saviors of Europe have one thing in common—they simplify the picture of the European situation, by especially not mentioning, or by knowingly avoiding to mention, various difficulties and obstacles involved in it. Most certainly, their vision of that future happy Europe is tempting and sympathetic, a Europe that in spite of all centuries-old antagonisms, whether economic, political, social, or religious, ethnic, cultural, and, as we clearly witness today, even spiritual and moral, would appear as a United States of Europe overnight. Very tempting, indeed, and I for one am all for it. But, much to my regret, I must frankly confess that I do not believe in miracles that happen overnight; at least not as far as whole nations are concerned. You may change in a short time the course of life of an individual, but you cannot do it with a state or nation.

However, I realize that the majority of us prefers to be lulled by visions rather than to face an unwelcome reality. Therefore, I am not surprised that quite a few of my American friends seem to be more favorably impressed by the grandiose scheme of a United Europe right after the war, than by a more modest, but by far more workable plan of a gradual process of European unification which takes into account certain basic traits of human nature such as traditionalism, prejudices, geographical, historical, social, and cultural determining factors in human behavior, as well as the concrete and quite specific conditions existing in European countries, so different in various aspects from what you find here in America. It is, of course, quite natural and understandable that if somebody says, "Let's try it also in Europe; whatever was possible here in America should also be possible over there," he almost invariably wins a sympathetic echo from the Americans. Let me assure you that I am the last one to contradict the desirability of a United States of Europe. The only thing I do question is the practicability of such a grandiose scheme right after the war for I am afraid that, perhaps, by wanting to accomplish too much in too short a time, we might easily fail in accomplishing what little could be done immediately at the end of this war and what must be properly prepared before that end comes.

I had to make these rather discouraging statements although I knew that should I talk to you enthusiastically about the realization of the United States of Europe right after the war I would have your equally enthusiastic response of approval. I made those statements because I wanted to be quite frank with you. Intellectual honesty—that's what is needed here more than a wishful, but not sufficiently informed and not enough experienced idealism. I simply cannot help seeing that behind the argumentation of the let's-do-it-also-over-there type, you find either a naive mind, or—if the person was properly informed—somebody who for some undisclosed reasons was interested in presenting an intentionally and willfully distorted picture of the European reality as, e. g., it might easily be the case of a pretender to the throne looking for the restoration and aggrandizement of his monarchy.

You may then well ask me, ladies and gentlemen, "Is it not a dark outlook for the future of Europe?" My answer is "No." Because in spite of what I have just told you, I strongly believe in the desirability and possibility of a United States of Europe. My criticism and caution are directed only against the believers of miracles overnight. We all know from the history of the development of mankind, that, in the long run, miracles did happen. In the realization of this kind of miracles, which are the outcome of an interplay of forces operating in every human group, and which are the result of a very complex social causation, I do believe most passionately. Therefore, allow me now, in the latter part of my remarks, to elaborate somewhat on what I consider to be the prerequisites of a free and united Europe.

II

To begin with, I want to stress two things in particular. Firstly, that it would be wrong to suppose—as it has often been done—that nothing can be accomplished by war. True, war in itself is a destructive process. Yet, by destroying, partially or completely, what existed before, it clears the ground for the edification of something new. History is full of examples to the effect that wars brought about permanent changes. The question, then, is not whether we can accomplish through this war what we would like to have, but rather what are the ways and means of attaining our aims. And that leads us to my second point.

It seems to me that plans for post-war Europe are usually characterized by a lack of due emphasisis that should be given to the variety of differences between individual European countries. They differ widely in their social structure, the word "social" being understood in this connection in its broadest sense: They differ in the level of their technological and cultural development as well as in the general set-up and functioning of their political, economic, religious, and other social institutions; they speak in different languages; belong to different ethnic groups which perpetuate their typical customs and folkways, cherishing—rightly or wrongly—the ideals of their national history. In a word, Europe is a mosaic the component parts of which have not yet been successfully arranged into a harmonious and smoothly functioning whole. Far from it.

Now, there are some who advocate that the differences in Europe could and should be quickly eliminated by using coercion if need be; and that it should be done immediately after the war, the argument being: "If they do not want to agree among themselves and cooperate, pressure will be used to assure the desired results." I personally have no doubt that it could be done, although even such forceful measures would take some time. But don't you think, ladies and gentlemen, that, basically, this would be the same thing that Hitler tries to do? Do we really want to do this? Is it our intention to organize the colorful European mosaic in such a "unity" where the individual component parts would lose their characteristic color, and the whole of the European Continent would appear as a gray mass in which everything would be like everything else? I trust you will agree that this, in fact, would be the worst kind of regimentation and totalitarianism. Does, then, the issue seem confused, without meaning or hopeless? I don't think so.

If there ever was a moment when Europe had to learn from American experience, this is the moment. Yes, I wholeheartedly agree with those who urge that Europe follow the example of the United States, although I would reject such claim should "unification of Europe" mean—by a misrepresentation of American conditions—the nivellization and a kind of deindividualization of the countries of the Old World. America learned her lesson from her own experience. Remember, there was first the melting-pot theory based on the assumption that unity of the American Nation could speedily be obtained by a process where "Americanization" was an equivalent of that colorless nivellization of which I spoke above. When put into practice, this theory did not work, although much money was spent for that purpose and the United States was in a far better position than Europe, have the same language, the same currency, no artificial dividing frontiers between the different regions, and an advantage of a united economic system based on vast natural resources and a miraculous development of its technology.

In spite of all this, and several other helpful factors, it did not work. American social scientists soon realized that even had it worked, it would have deprived this country of many a valuable asset which various ethnic or national groups could have given by keeping and further developing the very best from the cultural heritage of their forefathers. The melting-pot theory has thus been fortunately and in time replaced by the theory of cultural pluralism. The term itself suggests the meaning: A unity achieved not by suppressing or eliminating desirable differences, but by letting those distinguishing traits influence and enrich all the rest, creating thus gradually a common denominator of a united national soul of America—l'âme Américaine. It is the same healthy idea that is found in the Latin inscription on American coins: E pluribus unum, i. e., a unity out of many, or, as so ably expressed by one of my compatriots, United States is the greatest Nation because it is a nation made of many nations.

Mutatis mutandis, cultural pluralism is, as far as I can see, the best method for the attainment of European unity if properly put into practice. But what does it mean, this "putting it into practice," and how, concretely, it could be achieved? That constitutes the closing part of my brief remarks.

The quest for an ever-growing European unity and, through it, toward a more and more complete freedom on the European continent should get a good start as soon as the armistice is concluded. Then, it should gradually progress, supported by a determined good will of all nations and states concerned; based on workable plans; on continuous hard work coupled with enthusiasm and devotion in service to the idea of a general welfare; and on an undying patience which is willing to wait for permanent results not only during months and years, but for decades and even centuries.

Common sense and experience advise us further to proceed gradually, uniting, first, smaller regions with similar or identical interests, before larger geographic areas will be ready to confederate. And again, the process of unification should not start with the more subtle phases of national life where people are much more easily hurt than in other respects, just because they are more "touchy" and particular about them and, therefore, less willing to accept changes. They should not be antagonized in their feelings, attitudes, or prejudices, at least not before the necessary channels of communication had previously been established to facilitate the intercourse and assimilation of various groups.

All this clearly indicates that the initial, we might call it the "preparatory," phase of the integrating process leading toward a European federation should primarily be concentrated on external factors, i. e., technicalities, such as: (a) customs union, abolishing once for all that futile idea of economic self-sufficiency; (b) planned economy, based on an effective cooperation of wider geo-

graphic units than the ones previously represented by individual European states; (c) abolition of passport and visa formalities, so that, at long last, the European peoples could begin to feel at least the geographical unity of their continent; (d) if to this, in due course of time, could be added also common currency, together with improved facilities of transportation, then vital external factors would be at work in the upbuilding of a United States of Europe at a more distant future. At the same time, a unifying educational system should be set to work in accordance with the spirit of a European and even a world unity. Obviously the adoption of a common language would be of greatest help. Those of you who came from Europe or who are familiar with the European conditions in this respect know how much time and energy had been spent—or shall I say wasted?—on learning different foreign languages. I gave much thought to this and for several reasons, which for lack of time cannot be discussed here. I came to the conclusion that English should be adopted as the common medium for the whole of Europe. Not as a substitute for the mother languages of different European nations, but as a means of facilitating their mutual understanding. A discussion of whether or not such common language ultimately could become the only language spoken in Europe of the future, and the desirability of it, would at the present moment be premature.

Creating a united and free Europe is, in the last resort, an educational problem—a problem of how to get rid of the shortcomings of ethnocentrism by replacing it with a set of truly European and world standards. That, by itself, represents a tremendous job. But it can be done, and it gives me a great satisfaction to realize that while in Germany the members of the would-be master race drank from the source of a pseudoscientific racial mythology, the Czechoslovak youths were taught that to be a good Czech means to be a good man. National and racial exclusivism can have no place in the future world, nation being merely an intermediate step leading from individualism toward the collectivity of mankind.

Then, and only then, with the help of the above-mentioned external unifying factors an internal European unity could gradually be also achieved, in the same way, though by overcoming much greater difficulties, as it is being done within the frontiers of that subcontinent known as the United States of America. Attitudes, opinions, customs, and even prejudices could then become European attitudes and opinions, European customs and prejudices, as some of them, as a matter of fact, have already reached that level. In other words, and if we try to put it into a more general statement, it boils down to this: Let's first create and adopt suitable external conditions, a favorable external situation, in which and through which the process of an internal unification could be completed. A unity? Yes; but, to repeat once again my main point, a unity of a mosaic in which all component parts are purposefully arranged without losing their characteristic shapes or colors.

In closing, let me quote the words of President Dr. Benes regarding Czechoslovakia's role in post-war Europe: "Czechoslovakia will simply continue in her former tradition, adapting herself to new conditions and changes in Europe and the world. Post-war reconstruction will perhaps be more swiftly carried out in Czechoslovakia than in any other country, for much of what will be done elsewhere, after the present war, had already been carried through or prepared before the war in our homeland."

I therefore sincerely hope, ladies and gentlemen, that I shall not be misunderstood when I say with a feeling of a modest but justified pride that one of the positive factors in the upbuilding of a free and united Europe will be my beloved country, the democratic Republic of Czechoslovakia.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 27, 1943.*

Development of Public Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago there appeared before your Committee on Roads representatives from 24 of our 48 States. They were high officials in the American Association of State Highway Officials. At that time the president of the association and other officers presented to your committee a very constructive program which, in the opinion of this association, should immediately be carried out. This organization is composed entirely of officials chosen by the various States and, therefore, is in no sense partisan and in no sense can it be regarded as a group organized for selfish purposes, but, on the other hand, it represents the people. These officials are chosen because of the work they are doing and the positions they hold in the various States.

The speeches were so informative and so important to all of us who are interested in the future development of our roads, and, of course, this includes every Member of this House, that the committee instructed me as its chairman to have these speeches inserted in the RECORD. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following speeches:

REMARKS MADE BY H. G. SOURS, DIRECTOR OF HIGHWAYS OF OHIO

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I shall not take the time to discuss in further detail the presentation just made by Mr. White and Mr. Gentry. There are some things, however, which we recommend to your committee in connection with your consideration of the matters which have been presented to you. I would like to briefly outline them:

First. We recommend a continuance of the policy of Federal aid to the States for highways. Federal aid as we have known it has produced excellent results over a period of many years. It is not something new, it is a tried, proven, and satisfactory plan of financing highways. We recommend its continuance now and during the post-war period with the necessary modifications to fit the needs.

Second. We recommend that Federal aid be allocated to the States by formula. We recognize that a formula method may have some inequalities and result in some inequities. On the other hand the formula has been proven to be much more equitable than the so-called need basis. The latter plan always results in pressure and favoritism regardless of the actual needs. You gentlemen who are Members of Congress are relieved from pressure groups under the formula plan. It is probable in an enlarged program that it may be necessary to modify certain factors in the formula, but be that as it may we definitely recommend that some formula method be followed.

Third. We recommend that construction work be done under the contract system. We are not here to plead the case of the contracting fraternity, but time and experience have proven to us that best results and the most value per dollar expended are obtained through the contract system. We do not believe that the States or the Federal Government should be in the construction business. We feel that construction belongs in the field of private enterprise. One of the reasons for our post-war program will be to provide employment of people on useful public works. The morale of the people so employed is higher where they are carried on a private pay roll on public works than where they are carried on the public pay roll, whether it be Federal, State, or local subdivision. This is particularly true when such a program is at least partially designed for the relief of unemployment. We feel that this is a factor which should not be overlooked.

Fourth. We strongly urge that the program be set up, planned and carried out under the direction of the Public Roads Administration and the State highway departments of the several States. These organizations are well established and their personnel is trained and experienced in the specialized job of planning, design, and construction of highways. The basic structures for this work are in existence and have been for many years. An enlarged program of work can be handled by expanding these organizations to meet the problems. This can readily be done because after the war there will be a large number of engineers and technical men returning from the armed service and the war industries. It should not be necessary to create and build up new agencies when trained ones are already in existence.

Fifth, we are not here to tell you that highways represent the only form of useful public works. We do say, however, that highways represent a form of public works used by everyone every day, either directly or indirectly. Highways are needed in all of the various communities and the war program resulting in the destruction of many existing roads will create an even greater need after the war is over. We feel that highways properly located and constructed represent a real investment rather than merely an expenditure of public funds.

Sixth, we wish to point out that the program submitted to your committee is not one which emanates from Washington. It is being submitted to you by the State highway departments of the 48 States, and we represent the same people that you represent. If we did not believe in this program; if we did not think it was sound; and if we did not believe that our people would support it, we would not submit it for your consideration. We know that the public needs and demands the necessary roads to handle the Nation's motor transportation requirements.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee.

STATEMENT OF FRED R. WHITE, CHIEF ENGINEER, STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT OF IOWA, MEMBER, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS

Thank you, Mr. Chairman; the group appearing before you and your committee today represents the American Association of State Highway Officials. We have two matters which we wish to present to you. One of these matters pertains to the approximate $175,000,000 of regular Federal-aid road funds, secondary Federal-aid road funds and railroad crossing funds heretofore authorized by Congress and allotted to the several States, but which funds the States have been unable to expend because of restrictions growing out of the war effort.

Under the existing Federal law these funds remaining unexpended on June 30 next will revert to the Federal Government and will be reallotted among the several States. It would appear that since the States have been unable to expend these funds through no fault of their own, but through a war condition which we were all unable to avoid, the reversion and reallocation of these funds should be suspended during this war emergency.

The other matter which we wish to present to your committee at this time is a forward-looking suggestion for the post-war period. Before discussing either one of these matters in any detail, I think it advisable to tell your committee something of the American Association of State Highway Officials, and since your chairman has so graciously introduced the members of your committee to us, we should like to reciprocate by introducing to you the representatives of the American Association of State Highway Officials, who are appearing before you today.

The American Association of State Highway Officials was organized in 1914. The association includes the State highway departments of all the 48 States of the Union, the State highway departments of the Territories of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and the United States Public Roads Administration.

We have here today representatives from the State highway departments of 24 of the States. That is exactly one-half of the member States of the Union. As I introduce the representatives from each State, I should like to have them stand up so that you can see them and we can thus become better acquainted.

Alabama: W. G. Pruett, commissioner.

California: F. J. Grumm, assistant State highway engineer.

Connecticut: W. J. Cox, State highway commissioner.

Delaware: W. W. Mack, State highway engineer.

Indiana: S. C. Hadden, chairman, State highway commission.

Iowa: F. R. White, chief engineer.

Kentucky: T. H. Cutler, chief engineer.

Massachusetts: H. A. MacDonald, commissioner of public works.

Maryland: Ezra B. Whitman, chairman, State roads department.

Michigan: G. Donald Kennedy, representing L. B. Reid, commissioner; Carl McMonagle, director, planning and traffic; Scott Baker, construction engineer.

Mississippi: H. J. Patterson, chairman, State highway commission; E. D. Kenna, State highway director; T. J. Lowry, commissioner.

Missouri: C. W. Brown, chief engineer.

Nebraska: W. G. Scott, State engineer.

New Hampshire: F. E. Everett, commissioner.

New York: H. O. Schermerhorn, commissioner of highways.

North Carolina: John J. Clark, commissioner; W. Vance Baise, State highway engineer; Charles Ross, general counsel.

Ohio: H. G. Sours, director of highways.

Oregon: R. H. Baldock, State highway engineer.

Rhode Island: G. H. Henderson, chief, division of roads and bridges.

South Carolina: J. S. Williamson, chief highway commissioner.

Tennessee: C. W. Phillips, commissioner of highways.

Texas: Brady Gentry, chairman, State highway commission, president, American Association of State Highway Officials.

Virginia: J. A. Anderson, State highway commissioner.

West Virginia: W. H. Schimmel, district engineer; Julian Lynch, Charles Moore.

These men come from 24 of the States. Had time and the exigencies of wartime travel permitted, we could have had here to present to you representatives from every State in the Union because every State highway department in the Union is an active and paid-up member of the American Association of State Highway Officials.

Having thus been introduced to the State highways officials who are appearing before you today, you will doubtless be impressed by the fact that State highway officials look much the same as Members of Congress—and we are in fact very much the same—both you and we are public officials. We are interested in exactly the same purposes. We, both of us, your committee and our group, are actuated solely by service—a desire to do a good job for the people whom we represent. I think perhaps I can explain the purposes of the American Association of State Highway Officials more quickly and concisely by reading to you the first paragraph of article II of the association's constitution, which is as follows:

"ARTICLE II. PURPOSE

"The purpose for which the association is organized and for which it shall be perpetuated is to study the various materials, methods of construction and maintenance, all problems connected with highway transport, and other highway problems of the United States; to exchange ideas; to promote a closer relationship between State and territorial highway departments with a view of establishing a uniform system of administration, construction, and maintenance; to promote legislation for the purpose of conserving the capital invested in highway construction and maintenance by producing the highest possible efficiency; and to cooperate in every way possible with the United States Bureau of Public Roads (now the Public Roads Administration) or similar Federal organizations in the consideration of road problems."

The association maintains a headquarters office at 1220 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., and has maintained such headquarters for the past more than 20 years. The association derives its funds from annual dues paid by the various State highway departments. These dues are paid by the State highway departments out of the public treasuries of the respective States. Thus the American Association of State Highway Officials is financed through public funds furnished through the respective States. We are not affiliated with any other organization. We have no entangling alliances. We are masters of our own house. We are governed only by our judgment and our consciences as to what is the right and proper thing to do for the benefit and welfare of our respective States and the United States. We are not interested in securing any contracts; we are not interested in any equipment; we are not promoting any material; we have nothing to sell. We are the responsible representatives of the State highway departments of the several States which collectively have under their jurisdiction and control approximately 500,000 miles of the most important highways of the States and the Nation. It is our duty and responsibility to construct and maintain those highways in a manner satisfactory to our people. Many of us have spent our lives in the service of our States. Since Congressman CUNNINGHAM, of Iowa, in whose district I have the honor to reside, has already stated to your committee that I am the dean of the State highway officials in that I have rendered longer continuous service to my State than has any other State highway official, it may perhaps be not inappropriate for me to say that I have served the Iowa State Highway Commission for 35 years, during the past 24 of which years I have been its chief engineer. Much of that same statement can be made with respect to many other men who have been introduced to you here today.

The American Association of State Highway Officials sponsored and worked for the adoption of the original Federal Aid Road Act in 1916. The association sponsored and worked for the revised Federal Aid Road Act of 1921, which act up to the present time constitutes the basic Federal aid road law of this country, and under which Federal Aid Road Act the State highway departments, in cooperation with the United States Bureau of Public Roads or, more recently, the Public Roads Administration, have constructed in this Nation the greatest and finest highway system this world has ever known.

We tender to you our technical skill, our experience, and our knowledge of highway construction and maintenance matters, gained through the past quarter century. We come before your committee today to submit our recommendations to you, who are the responsible representative of the Congress, and through you to the Congress, which is made up of the responsible representatives of the people themselves.

With that somewhat brief explanation as to who and what the American Association of State Highway Officials is, I should like to submit to you a proposed bill of a more or less routine nature, designed to prevent the reversion and reallocation of heretofore authorized but unexpended regular Federal-aid road funds, secondary Federal-aid road funds, and Federal-aid railroad-crossing funds, which have been allocated to the several States but not yet expended because of restrictions due to the war emergency.

In addition to preventing the reversion and reallocation of these funds this bill would make such existing funds available for use by the Public Roads Administration in cooperation with the State highway departments for the purchase of rights-of-way and for the making of surveys and plans for highway projects to be constructed in the post-war period when unemployment problems will be pressing for solution. (Mr. White read and explained the proposed bill, copy of which is attached hereto. Also, he submitted a tabulation showing the amount of the above-mentioned Federal road funds available to each State as of January 31, 1943, copy of which tabulation is attached.)

With that brief explanation, Mr. Chairman, we should like to submit this bill for your consideration; and I now desire to introduce to you Mr. Brady Gentry, chairman of the Texas State Highway Commission and president of the American Association of State Highway Officials, who will present to you the association's proposal for the authorizing of funds at this time to be used in the post-war period to accomplish the twofold purpose of improving the Nation's highway system and at the same time aid in the relief of unemployment, which will be a problem at that time no less serious than some of the war problems which haunt your thoughts at the present time.

STATEMENT OF BRADY GENTRY, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS

PROPOSAL BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS TO THE NATIONAL CONGRESS FOR THE SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION NOW OF FUNDS FOR ROAD CONSTRUCTION IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE CLOSE OF THE WAR

The highway departments of the 48 States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia present the request that the Congress authorize at this time the sum of not less than $1,000,000,000 yearly for a period of at least 3 years, effective immediately on the conclusion of actual hostilities of the present war, for the purpose of rehabilitating, improving, and expanding the Nation's highway transportation system.

We are today engaged in the greatest war effort of our history. It is a complete, total, and all-out war. Neither man nor money is being spared. The President has announced

that 11,200,000 men will be in the armed services of our country by December of this year. Mr. McNutt has stated that 10,500,000 men will be in the munitions factories alone by that time. It is generally said that there will be 35,000,000 engaged solely in the war effort when this year closes and an additional 15,000,000 to 25,000,000 who are partially so engaged. Our degree of participation is emphasized when we recall that in the recent First World War we had only 4,500,000 men in the armed services and bought practically all our munitions of war from others, whereas in the present war we are the arsenal, if not the granary, for most of the nations of the world. We are now operating on a $100,000,000,000-a-year expenditure basis for war alone—something entirely new in our history, if not in the history of the world. It seems fairly evident that the war will cost us in the neighborhood of $300,000,000,000. Conceivably it may cost us considerably more. The Nation accepts without question the verdict of Congress that the result will be worth the cost in men and treasure.

Some day the present conflict will end. The people of our country will have undergone a period of emotional strain and self-denial. Hundreds of thousands, if not millions, will have made great sacrifices. We do not believe their temper and mood will be such that they will lightly accept any verdict that they must also then suffer serious economic depression. It is not good for our country and its institutions that they have to do so, yet the historic fact is that this country has experienced an economic depression of at least 3 years' duration after each of its major wars, usually beginning immediately at the war's close. Practically all countries of the world have had similar experiences—sometimes with drastic and pitiable consequences. It might easily be feared that our country's stupendous effort in the present instance might make for the same result, possibly in an aggravated and extended form.

Unquestionably the transformation of our country from a total-war economy to a civilian peacetime economy, including the complete disruption of the employment of approximately 50,000,000 people, is sufficient to cause the Congress great concern, as well as to warrant serious consideration of the problem involved. It is a problem no less than the war itself—one in which the consequences can be almost as fateful as the result of the present world conflict.

Is there something this Congress can do now—March 1943—to prevent such a condition, or, if not prevent it, to at least lessen its severity and shorten its duration? We believe that there is. With your further indulgence, may we briefly discuss the Nation's highway transportation system.

In our consideration of this indispensable utility to the people's welfare we must keep in mind that it is a responsibility of the Congress, primarily because of its use but also, in our opinion, because of federally imposed motor-vehicle-user taxes, which reached the total sum of $680,000,000 in the calendar year 1942.

There are today 500,000 miles of designated State highways, 300,000 miles of city streets, and 2,400,000 miles of undesignated rural roads. All the undesignated rural-road mileage and practically all of the city-street mileage is subject to designation and inclusion in the designated State highway system. Of these 3,200,000 miles of roadway, constituting the Nation's highway transportation system, 2,550,000 miles have not now, and never have had, pavement of either oil, concrete, or brick. The remainder of the mileage has at some time been paved and is today in various states of repair. A considerable part of it needs replacement or improvement. It is definitely known that approximately $12,000,000,000 has been spent on the designated highway system. It is estimated that approximately $25,000,000,000 has been expended since 1910 on designated highways, city streets, and rural roads exclusive of relief expenditures. Including relief, the total estimated expenditure is $29,500,000,000.

We consider it a conservative estimate to say that $10,000,000,000 could be economically invested—not merely expended—on the rehabilitation, improvement, and expansion of the Nation's highway transportation system and that such an investment would render a return to the people of our country in actual dollars and cents.

This is an automotive age and we live in the world's greatest automotive country. There were 30,000,000 cars on our highways when we entered the present war. Does anyone think that we can maintain our standards and discharge our obligations after this war is over unless there is sufficient business development to increase the cars, trucks, and busses on the Nation's roads beyond the prewar figure and upward, finally to 35 or 40 millions?

It is our observation that highway construction has not in the past kept pace with highway demand and that our highway system was neither good enough nor large enough when the present war commenced. If we are correct in that belief, what about the post-war period with its greatly increased demands? It is tragically true that our inability at the present time to do any substantial betterment, because of war's restrictions, will make the problem a great one. Unquestionably, we are now losing ground from a highway standpoint. It is equally certain that our highway system must be made better and that it should be considerably expanded.

The obvious danger in connection with consideration of this problem, is in failure to envision the tremendous scope of highway transportation and its full meaning to our country. Highway transportation is everywhere—it is as big as the country itself. Go wherever you will, you cannot escape its obvious import. There is hardly a house in all our vast country that cannot be reached by it. It is truly a life blood of our country and its people. There are many modern conveniences that are considered essential, but if we were to be denied some of them and could have our choice, there would be few, with any knowledge of our civilian economy, who would ever part with highway transport as we know it. Such a step would take us backward for generations.

We stated in the beginning that Congress, in our opinion, should take action now that would guarantee that the 48 States, 2 Territories, and the District of Columbia highway departments, under the supervision of the Public Roads Administration, would expend not less than $1,000,000,000 yearly of Federal-aid funds in at least each of the 3 years immediately following the war's conclusion, and that the authorization should be made now. We repeat that statement and yet we think we err in not urging you to authorize us to invest a greater amount. Why do we say so?

Employment in useful work which raises the Nation's income, results in what we choose to call prosperity. Highway construction is useful work. It is more than useful—to a country such as ours it is indispensable. Highway construction is ideal as a kind of work to stimulate production and employment, yet it is not a competitor of private industry, neither does it run counter to the principles of private enterprise. It is a distinct help to private industry in that it starts a chain or cycle of business movements which stimulates business in many ways as well as in far removed places. Our great aim must be to avoid unemployment. Large numbers of idle men always mean a business recession. If continued, it becomes a depression, the duration of which determines its severity.

An expenditure of $1,000,000,000 yearly in highway construction will give approximately 750,000 men work for 1 year. An expenditure of $2,000,000,000 a year in highway construction would give 1,500,000 men employment at gainful labor. The success, however, of such a proposed program in the 3-year period immediately following the war must wholly depend on having sufficient and entirely complete plans ready when hostilities end and this would, in turn, depend upon action by the Congress now, making consummation of the program an absolute certainty.

It must be remembered that before contracts can be let for highway construction aggregating $1,000,000,000, the State highway departments must make surveys, secure rights-of-way, and draft detailed plans, at a total cost of approximately $200,000,000. It will take time to complete these various steps. This vitally demonstrates why the program must be assured by congressional action before the States undertake such an effort. It is the only method which will result in real economy and a careful selection of the work to be done.

There is now much planning—or, at least, talk of planning—for the post-war period. The country seems to be full of planning agencies and societies. All plans envision a noble purpose—putting idle men to work, stabilizing employment, maintaining the national income, and finally assuring a measure of prosperity for our people. They seek to avoid the mountaintops of booms and the deep valleys of depression, and aim instead at economic evenness and stability.

Highway construction is given the same classification and standing in all well-considered planning treatments as private construction because it is the one utility that is an obligation and responsibility, not of private agency but of government itself.

It is our belief, therefore, that the Federal Government's first and major concern in the field of public-works construction should be highway, road, and street construction, and that this construction should receive full and complete treatment by Government before consideration is given to other kinds of public-works construction. Certainly the need for further stabilization of employment should first develop before the Government enters construction fields which compete with private enterprise.

This subject has been presented up to this point as if we were asking for an authorization of funds that otherwise would not be expended. So far it has been urged only on its merits as an investment in the future economic welfare of our country and because it would serve the additional purpose of relieving unemployment in a period that may be a critical one in the history of our country.

There is, however, another great and impelling reason as to why the Congress should authorize the Public Roads Administration and the State highway departments to invest every dollar that is economically possible on the Nation's highway transportation system in the 3 years immediately following the war.

These 3 years will constitute the period in which the war effort will be liquidated. How much money will the Congress appropriate during this period? Certainly $75,000,000,000—probably more. The liquidation of a war effort that must include at least 11,000,000 men in the armed forces and 30,000,000 or more in war and allied industries is a tremendous and costly undertaking.

Regardless of the fact that there will be no need for the further service of at least 90 percent of the men in the war industries and in the armed service located in continental United States, does anyone think that all that can be spared will be immediately discharged when hostilities cease? Regardless of the administration in power at that time, isn't it logical to conclude that—after the struggle which our country has just undergone—tens of millions of industry workers and armed forces will not summarily be severed from their service until employment

is definitely known to be available. They have been assured of that by no less an authority than the President of the United States, as well as by the Vice President and many others in high positions. Maybe it should not have been done, but it has been done. We rather think that the promises will have to be made good and that Congress itself will be interested in seeing that such is done.

If such a situation means anything, it means that there must be assurance of employment for these tens of millions before their discharge from the armed forces and the war industries and if you do not make possible the employment for a portion of them you will nevertheless expend the same funds by the resultant extension of their wartime employment and service.

For every billion dollars you let us invest in the Nation's highway system, 750,000 men of the Nation's armed forces and war workers can be immediately taken off the Government pay roll and given employment by State highway departments and allied industries in gainful work. It will be an investment in the future of our country. It will relieve unemployment at a time when it is vital that we have none. It will, we think, be a saving of money that otherwise will be expended without beneficial result.

You have shown great and commendable courage in spending unprecedented hundreds of billions of dollars because you thought it was necessary. Need we emphasize that—because of the stress and strain of the many emergencies the country will have experienced—it is vitally important that our ship of state be secure and steady in the immediate post-war period and that an investment of a few billions in useful—yes, indispensable—highway construction will be justified in order to make sure that it is that way.

We present this program in the belief that its consummation will represent a substantial contribution by the Congress and the State highway departments to the solution of the problems of the immediate post-war period. It is novel in that it does not plan for the whole world but is designed only to make life a little easier for our own people and our own country. It was conceived, not in Washington, but in all the countries and all the States of our great Nation. If your foresight and wisdom so permit, it will be carried out by old, efficient, and regularly established agencies of Government and the money will be expended uniformly throughout the country under a formula that assures fairness to each State. We believe it highly meritorious. We feel that serious consideration by the Congress will result in its adoption. We ask that consideration fully convinced that its obvious merits justify it.

STATEMENT OF T. H. CUTLER, STATE HIGHWAY ENGINEER OF KENTUCKY

It is my desire in the short time allotted to emphasize and stress certain phases of this proposed post-war highway program.

First, that this program which we bring to you to implement is one originating from the needs of your people back home and not from some newly set up Washington bureau.

Second, there is no program which Congress can foster to assist in the change from wartime economy to that of peacetime, that would give more widespread, and at the same time more needed work, than a carefully planned post-war program of highway work. Every county in our State (Kentucky), and I am sure that our State is typical of the other States, has needed road work that has been postponed due to lack of funds or the exigencies of the war. In 1937, through our planning survey, a check was made of the needs of the State and county road systems. We have these needed road projects listed and tabulated for every county both on the State-maintained systems and on our system of rural highways.

Third, distribution of labor. Every county and town has furnished men to the armed forces. When these men come back after hostilities have ceased, road work would give them employment right at home. Road work ranks high as a means of furnishing employment. Labor is required both on the job and indirectly in quarries, refineries, cement plants, equipment factories and distributors, contractors organizations, transportation agencies, etc.

Nearly 90 cents of every road dollar reaches and employs labor.

This opportunity of having work available in every county of our country will aid the effort to adjust the dislocation of labor caused by the war effort better than anything I can think of. At the same time the money provided is invested, rather than just spent, in work that will show increasing returns.

Fourth, by utilizing the State highway organizations, we do not need to have the waste and inefficiency that follows where funds are turned over to newly organized agencies.

State highway departments have been functioning for more than 20 years. They have been close to the people and we believe they have earned their respect and confidence. What we now need is the authorization by Congress for the use of Federal-aid funds already allotted to the States. We can then proceed with the surveying, preparation of detail plans and securing of rights-of-way for these projects and be ready to act when the war is over.

Letter to Mme. Chiang Kai-shek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEBRUARY 17, 1943.

Mme. CHIANG KAI-SHEK,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MME. CHIANG: To the First Lady of China, and by universal acclaim, one of the greatest women in the world, our proud and wholehearted welcome.

We welcome you also, as a daughter is welcomed by her foster mother, to the land where you received an American education, where you spent years far more carefree than those of late, and where by your charm, your modesty, and your intellectual attainments you won the hearts of so many. And now, both for yourself and as a flaming symbol, your unflinching courage and patience and faith, through 5 years of relentless aggression and horror, arouse the admiration of liberty-loving people the world over.

The bomber, while it has destroyed boundaries, has shortened distances. Today we can, like Samuel Johnson, "survey mankind from China to Peru" with the twist of a radio dial, and with agony and resolution in our hearts.

You Chinese are a nation of 450,000,000 souls. Your land is about one-third larger than ours. Several millions of you, including the President himself, are Christians. You have a cultural background of more than 4,000 years. Today you have compulsory education at the age of 6, and your hundreds of universities, colleges, and technical schools exchange brilliant students with our own.

You are brave and stoical, industrious, honest, and honorable. Save for one minor interruption, we have always been at peace with you. During the difficult period of the settlement of our West, the importation of "cheap Chinese labor" brought with it a wave of alarmed misunderstanding and prejudice on the part of some of our people. There was no justification for this fear. Even under the 1930 census there were only 46,129 Chinese people in our country. We have more than that number of European refugees in a few months.

Since February 12, 1912, China has been a member of the family of republics. I take this auspicious occasion in your gracious presence, as an indication of my unbounded admiration of a nation's courage which has amazed the world, to introduce, this day, a bill to grant to the Chinese rights of entry to the United States and rights of citizenship. A people which have shared with us the common danger, and will share with us the eventual victory, a people which have earned our friendship, our gratitude, and our respect, have by the same token surely earned our franchise.

Long live the Chinese Republic!

I have the honor to remain, dear Madame,
Respectfully yours,

MARTIN J. KENNEDY.

CARE OF CHINESE EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., Feb. 25, 1943.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: Your letter dated February 17 enclosing a bill which you propose to introduce to Congress has just been received.

I am indeed gratified that as each day passes, better understanding between our two peoples is brought about by farsighted leaders on both sides to further solidify the traditional friendship between our two great countries. It is my sincere hope that this unexcelled friendship should shine as a torch to guide mankind for generations to come toward peace and good will.

I am happy to say that Americans are always warmly welcome in my country where they will find my people ever ready to receive them as friends from afar. I am pleased, therefore, to take this opportunity to convey to you my hearty congratulations for your far-sightedness.

Cordially yours,

MAYLING SOONG CHIANG.

Compulsory Versus Voluntary Manpower Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the subject Manpower: Compulsory Versus Voluntary Controls, which I gave to the press on March 1.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public concern over the problem of manpower and its allocation has assumed tremendous proportions in recent weeks. The American people are gravely concerned with the disposition of this problem, for they realize that their fate as free individuals, the fate of the system of free enterprise, which built America, and the fate of our Nation and its Government hang in the balance. The manner in which this problem is handled and the philosophy which lies behind its administration, i. e., compulsion or voluntary cooperation, will leave an indelible mark upon American history for better or for worse.

The most recent effort of these forces of compulsion has been the "work or fight" edict, which has emanated from high places. While, in the spirit of patriotic fervor and determined resolve upon complete military victory, this proposal has gained some public support, the vast majority of people look upon it as the most serious threat to the American system of democratic government and to the American system of free economic enterprise, that has ever emerged in our history.

The production records which have been achieved in America over the years; and, especially, during this first year of war, stand as an irrevocable proof that no system of compulsion can begin to attain the effective results of a free economic system. This system of compulsion; that is, freezing, or forcing, men into a given job, was carried out in both Italy and Germany. After the working man was frozen into his job, industry was then taken over and administered by the Government. We all know what the results in these countries have been—loss of freedom, loss of right, stifling of progress, and constant social and economic deterioration.

In this total war, America has committed herself to the destruction of slave systems everywhere in the world. It would be a most tragic and destructive thing if America, itself, became enslaved while striving to destroy slavery in other lands.

Hitler, himself, has proclaimed that any nation, which would seek to defeat him, must itself become a regimented dictatorship. I, for one, have no faith in the validity of this prophecy on the part of the German overlord.

But there is yet another danger in this system of compulsion. We have all seen the duplication, confusion, waste, and lack of accomplishment that has typified the efforts of those various administrative agencies that have been created to administer the various war programs. We have all beheld their meager accomplishments, their lack of foresight, and their continued encroachments upon the people. The failure on the part of the War Manpower Commission to produce a sound and workable policy leaves serious doubt as to the practicability of entrusting the all-important problem of manpower to the dictates of this agency. We must never permit the allocation of manpower to become bogged down in that endless chain of red tape, confusion, and uncertainty, that has become so marked in the efforts of other wartime bureaucracies.

At the present time, in America, these bureaucracies are telling our citizens what to wear, how much to eat, what they can do with their time and money, and controlling their lives in a number of intimate ways. The American people have borne up remarkably well under this treatment; but I seriously question that they will accept, for a moment, the dictates of any bureau, which will seek to tell them where they can work, when they can work, and for what rates of pay they can work.

The American worker has always enjoyed freedom of choice and freedom of mobility. There is no reason now to expect him to submit to any bureaucratic edict, which will break up his home by forcing him to take a job which may be many hundreds of miles away—a job which he may not be fit, and a job which he may not want, to do. I not only question the effective operation of a system of compulsion, but I seriously question the need for such a system at this time. It is my opinion that this is another grand scheme of social experimentation, which is being carried out in the guise of a war measure—an experiment in which the American people are being used as social guinea pigs, to determine the effectiveness of another unnecessary New Deal enterprise.

The manpower question is not a question to be resolved by America alone. When we consider this issue we must take into account the total manpower of all the Allied Nations, combined; and we must so use and distribute that manpower that the most effective use is made of every able-bodied man available to the United Nations' cause.

America, itself, has assumed the role of the arsenal and granary of the civilized world. This should be our fundamental concern and our prime function in this war against the Axis Powers. I believe, therefore, that in view of the large number of our men already under arms, we should now see to it that our production and agricultural programs are supplied with manpower sufficient to insure their continued and complete success.

Our pleas from China and Russia have not been for men. They have been for guns, planes, tanks, food, and all the other materials which are necessary to carry on a modern war.

China and Russia simply do not have the industrial capacity necessary to absorb or occupy their vast manpower reserves in any concerted production effort. They are increasingly dependent upon the advanced technology and productive ability of the United States to supply their material needs.

With respect to the allocation of our own manpower, I believe that two fundamental principles should be our guideposts and our directives: First, I believe that we should make every effort to safeguard the system of free enterprise which has built America, and to see to it that the driving force of incentive is not diminished or blotted out. The American farmer, the American workman, the American manager have always been inspired by the system of incentives and rewards, which has marked America's economic development. This incentive has done more than any other one thing to build up and sustain the great productive powers of our people.

After we have secured this system of incentive against encroachment, we should then see to it that a balance is struck between our civilian and military economies, to the end that we do not undertake such gigantic military commitments that they will break the back of our production machinery, and impair its effectiveness for years to come.

The production problem now confronting America is not merely that of supplying our own Army, for not only is America committed to feed, clothe, and equip its own Army, it is also committed to the feeding, clothing, and equipping the vast armies of our allies, which number into the many millions of men.

We must, therefore, compute the manpower needs of our productive economy on the basis of supplying the military machines of all the United Nations, and not merely upon the basis of supplying our own armed forces, the needs of which, in fact, represent only a small portion of the total volume of war production which must come from the United States.

Sound policy must look to war and food production programs based on an American system which respects our fundamental institutions, and which respects the voluntary capacities of the American people. The continued drafting of family men can only bring with it dire dislocations and serious repercussions.

Food production is another example of New Deal muddling and lack of coordinated planning. Faced with the tremendous need for increased food production, the New Deal bureaucrats still labor under the delusion of scarcity. The farmer has been given neither the manpower nor the machinery nor the prices necessary to attain the goals of increased food production.

No less a critic than former President Herbert Hoover, whose broad experience and extensive background permit him to speak out upon these issues with no little authority, has said that we must be very careful in the allocation of our manpower, to see to it that we do not commit ourselves to military policies so gigantic that they destroy our productive powers—for it is well known that a collapse on the production front would lead to inevitable defeat on the field of battle.

As was pointed out by Mr. Hoover, our production economy and our system of economic life can be sustained only if we retain adequate incentives and adequate reserves of manpower in those vital areas.

Mr. Hoover also pointed out that this great and productive Nation stands in imminent danger of going hungry. This is an incontrovertible and shameful fact.

Immediate provision must be made to release the restrictions which have been placed upon agriculture over the last decade, so that the farmer may proceed with production without fear of penalty or reprisal. Farm labor must be secured to the farmer. That is a step fundamental to every other aspect of the war effort.

Moreover, gasoline and farm machinery must be provided in sufficient quantity, if the food production program is not to collapse. There is no group in the American economy, other than the farmer, which has been dealt such heavy blows by these ill-conceived and ill-administered plans of the New Deal bureaucracy. If adjustments are not immediately forthcoming, America and her allies will be in for a serious time.

The recent directives of the War Manpower Commission—indefinite, obscure, and uncertain as they are—clearly indicate that no well-planned and well-coordinated policy has been created by this Commission. The attitude which this executive department has shown has caused great misgivings among a vast portion of the people.

The continued insistence of the War Manpower Commission, and the Selective Service System, on drafting all men within the age group of 18 to 38, without respect to dependency, without respect to the home and without respect to the family, has only served to shake the public confidence.

It is to be strongly hoped that the allocation of manpower does not remain long in the power of this executive bureau, there to meet with the same inconsistency and maladministrations that have marked its efforts thus far.

On the contrary, I am very firmly convinced that the American people will respond to every legitimate demand that is placed upon them, and will fulfill every need occasioned by the war; and that they will fully execute all America's commitments in this great struggle; and that they will do it on a voluntary and cooperative basis, without the dubious help of any dictatorial, or bureaucratic, compulsion.

Services of Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a statement made by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, commanding general, Services of Supply, at the War Department Building yesterday, March 10, at the end of the first year of the Services of Supply. The statement was made to the personnel of this branch of the War Department, and was in the nature of a message to those making up that branch, and to the country in general.

In my opinion, this was a wonderful talk, and very much worth while. The statement was made by one of the conspicuous men of the Army, not so much because of his high rank, but because of the extremely good job he and his department are doing. I ask that the statement may appear in the RECORD in full.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Services of Supply is 1 year old.

It has been a momentous year. In 12 short months we have created within the War Department one of the largest organizations for service ever conceived by man; we have staffed it competently; we have set objectives that most men insisted could not be reached in twice 12 months. We have attained these objectives.

The first phase of our job has been accomplished with great credit to you and to the organization as a whole. We are well into the second phase. It, too, will be accomplished. There is no obstacle so great that, working together, we cannot overcome it.

Let us look briefly at what we have done so far.

We have procured $17,000,000,000 worth of supplies and equipment for the Army.

In that huge task we have never permitted the urge for increased production to retard the development of new and improved weapons or to interfere with making the finest quality of articles for our fighting men. During the year, we have brought many important weapons into production. This includes the new medium tank, several calibers of self-propelled artillery, radio for previously unknown uses, and many other important items.

We have accepted delivery on a large portion of this immense program. We are speeding delivery on the remainder.

We have inducted, classified, and assigned more than 4,000,000 men.

We have fed these men adequately, clothed them, housed them, and have kept them well.

We have constructed $6,000,000,000 worth of military facilities.

We have moved over 1,000,000 men and 14,000,000 tons of supplies and handled millions of domestic movements.

We have set up an administrative organization for the largest American Army in history, and have made that organization function.

To the military and civilian personnel in the Services of Supply, I here and now say: "Well done."

To our associates in the other branches of the armed services, to our fellow workers in industry and commercial life and in the other governmental agencies, I offer my deepest gratitude.

Your achievements are of such magnitude that no single pair of eyes can see them all at once, no single mind encompass all of them. Therefore, let us study them part by part, so that knowing the parts we can better judge the whole.

Let us first look at your procurement efforts. You were harried and harassed by the necessity of getting immediate results and by many changes of plans.

These changes were inevitable. The fluidity of war, the stress of shortages first in one raw material and then in another, the unpredictable shifts of enemy strategy, our experience on the field of battle—all these required revision from time to time of the Army supply program. There will be many revisions in the future. War is never static; our plans never can be permanently fixed.

But in spite of these obstacles we pressed forward steadily. We are still moving forward. We will continue to move forward at increasing speed.

With the cooperation of the War Production Board we will carry out our responsibilities under the controlled-materials plan. We are making good progress in the renegotiation of contracts and in so doing we contribute our share to the general effort to prevent inflation and dislocation. Also, with the aid of the War Production Board, we materially increased the use of small plants geared to the war effort. We will further increase the use of these small facilities.

In our first year we systematized our relations with the other United Nations on all questions of supply procurement and munitions assignment. Our relations with our allies are on a sound basis of mutual understanding. This is an achievement of which we all may be proud.

Having obtained the supplies, it was our duty to make sure that they quickly reached the hands of troops. This we did, without maintaining excessive inventories.

The part you played in logistics overseas, and especially with regard to the African campaign, was superb. You were given a job to do; you did it. At the same time you kept that other long pipe line full—to the southwest Pacific. Only a well-geared, well-oiled, smooth-running machine could have accomplished so much, so well, so quickly. When you are called upon to perform similar feats in the future, I know you will succeed as well.

Without skill, loyalty, and immense efforts in the administrative services, we could not have succeeded. Without the benefit of hard-working, self-denying staff divisions our plans would have bogged down. Without the complete cooperation of every one of the supply services we would have failed.

There is time to mention each service and division only briefly. Our personnel activities have become increasingly important. Manpower in all its phases—in the armed forces, in agriculture, and in industry—is rapidly becoming a most vexing national problem. We have solved many manpower difficulties and many others are in process of solution.

We have laid a good foundation for the better use of both civilian and military personnel. The officer shortage with which we began the year has been greatly relieved; civilian personnel is more efficient and more properly used. We have placed increasing emphasis on training, on the greater utilization of women, on the curtailment of paper work. We have aided in the settlement of many labor disputes.

We have prepared the greatest single long-range educational program ever set up in a single generation and have done it in a few short months. I refer to our training program in American colleges and our preinduction courses in our high schools. The latter, already functioning, will save millions of man-hours of instruction of new soldiers; the former will provide the technicians and specialists we need in mechanized war. Our plans to keep high the morale of troops are being realized. We are supplying men where they are needed. We have expanded our facilities for training officers and men and are improving our methods of instruction.

In the administrative services I want to mention the organization of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, their fine accomplishments, and the difficulties still to be overcome in the expansion of that corps.

We have amalgamated the National Guard and the Reserve and Reserve Officers' Training Corps into the Army of the United States on time and with little waste motion.

In this day of enemy-inspired hatreds our chaplains have led the way in the cooperation of all faiths. They have done their job well.

The high standards of justice maintained in the Army are a credit to the Judge Advocate General. Prompt payment of nearly $4,000,000,000 a month, with almost a complete absence of peculation, is a tribute to the efficiency of the office of the Chief of Finance. The fact that only last week investigators announced that there had been almost no sabotage in our industrial plants proves that the office of the Provost Marshal General is on its toes. We are proud of the spirit instilled in our Corps of Military Police.

Our Army Exchange Service has taken half a billion dollars' worth of every-day needs to soldiers stationed far from retail trading centers.

We all know about the splendid job of standardization, simplification, and decentralization carried out by The Adjutant General. In this department I want particularly to mention the advances the Army Postal Service has made, and especially the establishment of V-mail.

Let us look briefly at the accomplishments of the Supply Services. Army Ordnance in this 1 year has expanded production seven times. Establishment of the Ordnance Automotive Center at Detroit has speeded production and simplified procedures. We have developed new weapons—some so revolutionary that they quickly modified the science of tactics. Other new weapons are in process now. We have redesigned old weapons to procure greater efficiency. We have established production-control methods which give us maximum flexibility in meeting the changing demands of war.

Every American should be proud of the M4 tank. In spite of fireside strategists, the men who actually know insist that this is the finest tank on the battlefield. We are producing ordnance in imemnse quantity. In the First World War our allies furnished most of our artillery; all our tanks. Today the situation is reversed. We must not only supply all our own weapons but vast quantities for the other United Nations. This we are doing. The quantity and the quality of the arms flowing from our arsenals to all the world's battle fronts surely must be ominous to our enemies.

New types of clothing to fit new types of war, new rations to meet new conditions and world-wide shortages and still maintain a balanced, adequate diet, plus the ability to keep up with procurement schedules, are the outstanding accomplishments of our Office of Quartermaster General in the first year of Services of Supply.

Completion on time of the greatest construction program in history, the training of large numbers of combat troops, and the con-

tribution to a new phase of aerial warfare through the development of steel landing mats are high lights in the work of our engineers.

The fact that only about 1 percent of our troops are disabled through illness, less than 3 percent from all causes, and that those wounded in battle are given prompt and adequate treatment, is proof that our Medical Corps lives up to its finest traditions. The development of new uses for sulfa drugs by Army doctors, new antimalaria measures, the extensive application of blood plasma, and new, quick evacuation methods for the wounded are examples of the forward-looking plans of our Medical Corps.

Working in secrecy, our Signal Corps has revolutionized communications and detection devices that will affect not only the winning of the war but the daily lives of all people in the peaceful years to come.

The movement of men and supplies by our Transportation Corps in our first year has been one of our outstanding accomplishments. Working in conjunction with the Navy and the Maritime Commission, we have shipped overseas six times the volume of supplies we did in the first year of the First World War, two and a half times as many men; this in spite of the much longer distances now involved. We are prepared to do nearly three times as much this year. Next year we will increase the volume even more.

We have produced a million incendiary bombs in our first year of Services of Supply. At the same time we trained all our troops to defend themselves against gas.

In all our efforts we have never lost sight of the necessity for conservation. Evidences of this are found in our manufacturing processes and in the reduction of waste in garrison and in the field.

Let us not forget our service commands. Our plan to decentralize authority and responsibility has worked out even better than we had hoped. These commands are giving daily evidence of their effectiveness.

All of the accomplishments would have been impossible without the active support of the Secretary, the Chief of Staff, the Under Secretary, and the Assistant Secretaries. All have given us the inspiration of their leadership and their unstinted support. We should never forget this. We are similarly indebted to our associates, the air and ground forces and the General Staff for their sympathetic handling of our common problems and their cooperation in their solution.

At this point I want to leave behind us what we have accomplished and examine briefly what lies ahead. Of course, we have not solved all last year's problems. In addition, we shall soon meet other major problems that fall into four categories.

First is procurement. Here on the whole we are in good shape. With few exceptions, we have met the needs for supplies and equipment. We have met them on time. In spite of the fact that required production this year is two times as great as for 1942, I feel that, in general, we have taken the necessary steps to insure the accomplishment of the 1943 program. The major areas in which we must concentrate our procurement effort are briefly these:

We must continue our drive to get deliveries at a tempo greater than last December. Our record in January was not too good. We dare not fall so far behind in the first 6 months that we need to make up a deficit later. The time to get production is early in the year and not at the end. Only our determination to help the Air Forces and the Navy is holding us back now and even with the deference we are paying to the needs of sister services, materials are becoming available which will make the required speed-up possible.

I am told that our preparations for carrying out the Corps of Military Police and our execution under this plan to date are superior to that of any other agency in Washington. I believe that this is true. I also know that we cannot yet check off Corps of Military Police as something we have accomplished and reduced to routine. Bills of materials are not all they should be; our estimates need greater accuracy; our schedules are not yet perfect. We have not perfected our organization or our procedures in all echelons for administering the Corps of Military Police. However, I am still confident that the Corps of Military Police will work and must be made to work. Recent changes in the War Production Board have not affected this picture, and I am convinced we can count on its cooperation. Certain Supply Services have made a tremendous drive in the past few months in our scheduling of production. We must keep up this pressure until scheduling is one of the things behind us.

With increasing operations overseas we must pay particular attention to learning the needs and to revising models to meet the flaws disclosed in combat. We must provide promptly all new items of equipment and improve existing types as dictated by combat experience.

The next major category of present and future problems is the supply of our armies in the field. This encompasses storage, distribution, transportation, maintenance, rehabilitation, and salvage. Our supply operations must be geared to and ahead of our forces in active theaters of operations. The major items in this field are these:

Maintenance, repair, and spare parts. I believe none of you is satisfied with this particular activity in the continental United States. Special attention must be extended to our forces overseas.

Warehousing needs improved organization and more streamlined methods. Use of personnel in our depots can be greatly improved.

Stock or inventory control requires immediate attention. We must have a simple, uniform mechanism to distribute and redistribute supplies and equipment in the right quantities at the right time. I fear that here we are going through too much paper work without getting corresponding results. The new stock control should help on all fronts on this problem.

The whole field of transportation will continue to require our best efforts. Making the best use of limited shipping, we must gear our activities to know and meet the needs of theaters of operations. Our relations with the War Shipping Administration are excellent, and our working relationships are improving. This is a war of transportation, and no effort must be spared to reach 100 percent efficiency.

Finally, we must insure a systematic and efficient flow of supply through our manufacturers, through our depots and ports to the debarkation ports. We must intensify our efforts to make sure that troops going overseas leave with full equipment.

Thirdly, there is a category of problems which I term "management." This past year we have built an organization. We have been producing and getting to the users the supplies, equipment, and services that are our mission. Some of the latter have been done by brute strength and awkwardness, much of it hand-to-mouth. We have been pushed by immediate problems, have solved day by day the many major crises that arose. For most of you it has required long hours and strenuous efforts. On the whole, we now are providing a steady flow of the things we must provide. We have reached a considerable degree of stability in organization and in results. We now should devote more attention to internal management, to techniques to secure our end results with the least waste of effort. We must critically examine methods and procedures. We must develop simplified, coordinated systems. We should establish such routines that we are not plagued day after day by minor crises.

We must again and again simplify our work, eliminate nonessential procedures, activities, reports, records, and other paper work. We must eradicate duplications, overlapping, and conflict. We need to install the best practices of specific elements of the organization throughout all elements. We need to decentralize further the functions and authority to field installations. In other words, to use a hackneyed phrase, we need to streamline our management techniques and methods.

Finally, as a fourth major category of the problems we face I would like to speak of the program which General Styer recently inaugurated for the more effective use of personnel. This is serious. Any unnecessary drain on manpower is becoming increasingly inexcusable. In the urge to get results we have not been too careful in limiting personnel. We got the results—we did the right thing, but the time arrived toward the end of the year to consolidate our position. This program is an attempt—and a good one—to get this problem out of the talking stage and on the road to tangible results. You have already received some, and you will receive more instructions on specific measures which must be carried out. The whole personnel problem can only be solved by commander through command channels. I want you to give these matters your personal attention. Don't be driven into this—take the bit in your teeth—forge ahead on your own initiative.

I have said many times that this is a world of people and not of tanks and guns. Although sound organization structure and a simple and coordinated framework of systems and procedures are essential in any complex undertaking, they are useless without good leaders. We, you and I, are the leaders. Success or failure depends on us. We must not lose our sense of urgency. We must have the same intense drive that is required of troops in the front lines. We must see situations as they actually are instead of as we hope them to be. We must have such an overwhelming indignation upon the discovery of delays, ineffectiveness, or unsatisfactory conditions that we move ruthlessly to remedy them and remedy them at once. We must not fall into pitfalls of empire building and jurisdictional jealousies.

Much of our work throws us in contact with other agencies, our allies, the Navy, civilian bureaus and departments, other branches of the War Department. Our relations with these are of the best.

We must get results. We may become impatient with delays that cooperation with other agencies inevitably entails. Let us not under any circumstances be irked by these contacts—let us not become intolerant of their views and problems and let us not under any provocation, no matter how great, be drawn into useless bickering which turns our blood into bile and taunts us into anger against those with whom we should work in harmony. Remember it is the Japs and Germans we hate and it is the Army's job to put them to the sword and not those who work with us to that end.

Our motives, our capacity, and even our integrity will be questioned. One would be less than human not to be disturbed by such attacks. Our duty to our country, our jobs, and ourselves, however, demands that we ignore them. No matter how difficult it may be, our faith in our cause and in ourselves must rid our systems of this poison and keep us from retaliation.

As I said on my return from my recent overseas trip, I was impressed by the unity

of purpose and action everywhere. We cannot afford to engage in any intra-Services of Supply battles or in the battle of Washington. There is only one real battle going on in the whole world right now. Each of you is contributing to it. Each can be responsible for your share of ultimate victory.

Although we have done well, we must not rest on our accomplishments. The future will place even greater requirements on us. We have worked hard. We shall have to work harder.

There is not much glamour or glory in our work. All of us would prefer a combat assignment. All of us cannot be there. Our satisfaction must come from a personal sense of work well done each day—from the realization that our work must be done if the fight is to be won. To this satisfaction I wish to add my deep appreciation of your accomplishments, my thanks for your outstanding loyalty to me and devotion to the work of the organization.

A Pay-As-You-Go Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, in 1942 heavy increases were made in personal income taxes because of heavy expenditures for war purposes. The increase, for instance, on a net taxable income of $5,000 resulted in a 1942 liability substantially equal to the combined liability of the previous 5 years. Prior to 1942 the largest tax collected from this source was $3,262,000,000. The personal income-tax liability for 1942 is now estimated at approximately $10,000,000,000, and for 1943 at approximately $13,000,000,000. The number of taxpayers who will be liable for the payment of income taxes on 1943 income is now estimated at 44,000,000.

In view of the tremendous increase in the number of income-tax payers and the amount they are required to pay, the Ways and Means Committee started hearings some weeks ago on various proposals, including that of Mr. Beardsley Ruml, to establish what was called a pay-as-you-go plan with respect to personal income taxes which included two major objectives: First, to make as many taxpayers as possible current; and second, by withholding at the source to facilitate both the payment and the collection of income taxes. In the course of those hearings, I proposed a plan, since referred to sometimes in the press as the Robertson plan. I introduced no bill, stating at the time that I offered a plan for analysis, discussion, and consideration, and with the further understanding if someone offered what appeared to me to be a better plan I wished to be free to support it.

After weeks of hearings and of executive sessions, no one offered what to me appeared to be a better solution for what is, frankly, a difficult problem and one for which there is no perfect solution. Therefore, throughout all of the deliberations of our committee I consistently supported the proposal I had first made. In view of the fact that the proposal has never been put in bill form, or adequately explained except in the executive sessions of the Ways and Means Committee, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the benefit of those who may wish a clear understanding of what I proposed, the following explanation of that plan:

A. OBJECTIVE OF PLAN

The plan described below is designed to initiate collection at source at the highest practicable rate and thus to get the great majority of taxpayers on a current basis while completely avoiding any doubling up of tax payments, that is, payment of more than 1 year's tax at current rates in 1 year.

B. DESCRIPTION OF PLAN

1. Collect March 15 and June 15, 1943, installments of 1942 tax liabilities, as provided under present law. Treat the part of these payments corresponding to the basic liability (6 percent normal tax plus 13 percent of surtax net income) as advance payments of 1943 basic liabilities. Treat the payments in excess of the basic payment as payments of 1942 taxes.

2. Require September 15 and December 15 installments on 1942 tax only with respect to liabilities in excess of the basic liability.

3. Forgive the basic liability on 1942 income.

4. Begin collection at source from wages and salaries, and, possibly dividends July 1, 1943, at a rate sufficient to cover basic liability of 6 percent normal tax and 13 percent surtax.

5. For income not subject to collection at source begin current payments of basic liabilities with the third quarter of 1943 on the basis of simple quarterly statements of income, permitting the use of 1942 income as a presumptive basis where desired.

6. Collect the balance of liability above the basic liabilities in the year following receipt of income as under existing law.

TABLE I.—*Amount of tax that would be collected at source for selected levels of net income if collection at source were at a rate sufficient to collect normal tax and surtax at the first bracket rate; married person, no dependents*

Net income before personal exemptions [1]	Income-tax liability, present law [2]	Amount that would be collected at source [3]	Balance to be paid	Amount collected at source as a percent of total liability
				Percent
$1,200				
$1,500	$48	$48		100.0
$1,800	103	103		100.0
$2,000	140	140		100.0
$2,500	232	232		100.0
$3,000	324	324		100.0
$4,000	532	508	$24	95.5
$5,000	746	692	54	92.8
$6,000	992	876	116	88.3
$8,000	1,532	1,244	288	81.2
$10,000	2,152	1,612	540	74.9
$15,000	4,052	2,538	1,514	62.6
$20,000	6,452	3,488	2,964	54.1
$25,000	9,220	4,438	4,782	48.1
$50,000	25,328	9,188	16,140	36.3
$100,000	64,060	18,688	45,372	29.2
$500,000	414,000	94,688	319,312	22.9
$1,000,000	854,000	189,688	664,312	22.2
$5,000,000	4,374,000	949,688	3,424,312	21.7

[1] Maximum earned net income assumed.
[2] Excluding Victory tax.
[3] Normal tax and 13 percent of surtax net income.

TABLE II.—*Approximate distribution of income recipients taxable in calendar year 1943 by percentage of total liabilities discharged currently under Robertson plan*

Percentage of total liability discharged currently	Number of taxable income recipients (millions)	Percentage of all taxable income recipients	Cumulative percentage of all taxable income recipients	Maximum amount of tax not discharged currently
100	38.7	88.8	88.8	0
90–100	4.2	9.6	98.4	$90
75–90	.3	.7	99.1	550
50–75	.3	.7	99.8	4,200
25–50	.1	.2	100.0	115,000
Less than 25	.002	.005	100.0	
Total	43.6	100.0		

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS REGARDING THE PLAN

1. What was the objective of the plan?

The plan proposed arose out of the problem of collecting at source the largest practicable rate, placing the mass of taxpayers current under a convenient collection system, with the minimum difficulty in transition. A plan presented by the Treasury to the Ways and Means Committee in 1942 was subject to the objection that more than 1 year's tax was collected in 1 year. The plan of starting collection at source at the basic liability of 6 percent normal tax and 13 percent surtax while canceling the same amount of prior years' liability makes possible the maximum practicable collection at source while avoiding paying 2 years' taxes in 1.

The objective of the Ruml plan stressed by Mr. Ruml was getting taxpayers out of debt to the Government. The only way of doing that at once without complete doubling up is by the forgiveness of a year's tax.

Plans involving no forgiveness but spreading the doubling up payments over several years would not get taxpayers current and would not collect the deferred amount at source but would increase the revenue during the period of postponed payment.

2. How does the plan avoid doubling up tax collections?

Under the plan the basic liability of 6 percent normal tax and 13 percent surtax would be collected currently during the year in which the income is received. The balance would be collected in the following year as under the present law. Since the basic liability for 1 year is canceled the current collection of the basic liability replaces the present collection in the following year without any doubling up.

3. What percentage of taxpayers are made current under the plan?

Taxpayers whose incomes do not exceed the first surtax bracket are made current under the plan. Ninety percent of all taxpayers are in this group and are made fully current. For most of the rest of the taxpayers the amount collected currently would be the greater part of their total liability. For example, for a net income of $10,000 before exemptions the basic liability collected currently would amount to approximately 75 percent of the total liability. There would be only 1 taxpayer in 100 for whom the amount collected currently was less than 75 percent of his total liability. The accompanying tables indicate the proportions of tax paid currently at various levels and the numbers of taxpayers involved.

4. How much cancelation of liabilities would be involved?

The plan involves the cancelation of approximately $7,600,000,000 out of a total of $10,000,000,000 liability for 1942.

5. How is the cancelation of the liabilities distributed as compared to a plan under

which a percentage of 1 year's tax would be forgiven?

Under the plan the lower incomes would receive relatively more cancelation and the higher incomes relatively less than under a plan providing for the forgiveness of all or a percentage of the liability.

6. Is not the best plan the one that forgives the least?

Not necessarily. The distribution of the forgiveness is very important. The forgiveness at the bottom can readily be offset by a higher rate of tax on the same general income group in later years, but forgiveness at the top cannot be offset by tax increases on the same income group in later years, because the rates of tax on that group are already very high. Forgiveness of large amounts for persons in the higher income brackets thus inevitably means a redistribution of tax burden from higher to lower incomes.

Cancelation of one-half the liabilities would amount to $6,000,000,000 for 1943 and $5,000,000,000 for 1942 whereas the cancelation of 1942 basic liabilities amounts to $7,600,000,000; this is $1,600,000,000 and $2,600,000,000, respectively, more than cancelation of one-half of 1943 or one-half of 1942 liabilities. However, the cancelation of a uniform percentage up and down the income scale would give a less equal distribution than cancelation of only the basic liabilities.

7. How would current collection be made on incomes not subject to collection at source?

One of several methods might be used, including the presumptive method suggested by Mr. Ruml. However, the simplest method would probably be to have the taxpayer declare his approximate income each quarter and pay the basic tax on that income, making final adjustments in his annual return. The quarterly statement would be extremely brief. Gross under-reporting of income during the year would be penalized by adding a percentage to the amount of the tax.

8. Would the plan involve revenue loss to the Government?

As long as incomes continue to rise, the speeding up of collection would increase the current receipts to the Government.

9. Cannot forgiveness under any plan be offset by simply raising rates?

The revenue can be made up by raising rates. The burden cannot be placed on the same persons since some people will have more income in 1942 than in other years and others will have less. Moreover, the burden cannot be placed on the same income groups generally if large amounts of forgiveness are allowed in the higher brackets since the rates at such brackets are already at a very high level.

10. Is the fact that the plan does not make the higher income groups entirely current a defect?

The answer depends on the point of view and the way in which people are to be made current. From the higher income taxpayer's point of view, if the alternative to the plan is that of being made fully current through complete forgiveness, the failure to give that complete forgiveness will no doubt be considered by him a defect. If, however, the taxpayer is to be made completely current not through forgiveness but through spreading the doubled-up tax over a period of years, he may prefer not to be any more current than the plan provides, since under it he can, as at present, borrow tax money, interest-free, from the Government for a period of about a year.

It should also be noted that any plan involving doubling up does not make the taxpayer completely current until he has paid his deferred installments.

Under the Ruml plan, or any plan rigidly adhering to the presumptive basis for computing a tentative tax, there will be in many if not all years more taxpayers who are not fully current than under the plan. This is due to the fact that a very large proportion of the incomes fluctuate from year to year and this fluctuation is reflected in necessary adjustments, sometimes very substantial, in the form of additional tax assessments or credits and refunds in the following year.

11. How does the plan compare with plans involving full forgiveness of a year's tax or half of a year's tax for everyone, as regards treating all taxpayers alike?

To begin with, it may not be particularly important to treat all taxpayers alike under any specific formula. In effect, what is being done by any plan involving forgiveness is to write a new lower-rate schedule for 1 year. Within limits set by the other objectives which are to be achieved the problem is to make the new rate schedule a fair one in the minds of the committee.

Moreover, what constitutes "treating taxpayers alike" depends on the standard accepted as equitable. A few comparisons may be of assistance.

The plan treats all taxpayers alike in the same sense that changes in personal exemptions treat them alike and in the same manner in which the reduction in income taxes for the year 1929 treated them alike. Under the plan the same reduction in rate per dollar of income is applied to all dollars of income of all taxpayers. In effect it is a flat rate income tax in reverse.

The Ruml plan and plans involving canceling 50 percent of the tax treat all taxpayers alike in the sense that all or a uniform percentage of tax is forgiven for everyone. The burden distribution resulting under this method of treating all alike may be considered very undesirable.

Another comparison is how much the wealth of the taxpayer is increased as compared to his income after taxes, which is his source of new saving. The Ruml plan, one-half of the Ruml plan, and the plan herein proposed increase the wealth of the taxpayer with various-sized incomes as follows:

Income	Income after 1942 tax	Amount forgiven		
		Rum plan	One-half Ruml plan	Robertson plan
$1,000,000	$146,000	$854,000	$427,000	$189,688
$100,000	35,940	64,060	32,030	18,688
$10,000	7,848	2,152	1,076	1,612
$3,000	2,676	324	162	324

Another comparison concerns how much of the increased tax burden imposed since January 1, 1940, to pay for the defense and war programs would be eliminated by the forgiveness. The effects or burden under the Ruml plan, one-half the Ruml plan, and the proposed plan are as follows:

Income	Amount forgiven			Total increases in tax Jan. 1, 1940–Dec. 31, 1942, over prior law
	Ruml plan	One-half Ruml plan	Robertson plan	
$1,000,000	$854,000	$427,000	$189,688	$267,000
$100,000	64,060	32,030	18,688	62,833
$10,000	2,152	1,076	1,612	2,740
$3,000	324	162	324	469

TABLE III.—*Comparison of amount of tax that would be forgiven under alternative proposals; married person, no dependents*

Net income before personal exemptions [1]	Income tax, present law [2]	Amount forgiven	
		One-half of income tax under present law [2]	Basic liability [3]
$1,200			
$1,500	$48	$24	$48
$1,800	103	52	103
$2,000	140	70	140
$2,500	232	116	232
$3,000	324	162	324
$4,000	532	266	508
$5,000	746	373	692
$6,000	992	496	876
$8,000	1,532	766	1,244
$10,000	2,152	1,076	1,612
$15,000	4,052	2,026	2,538
$20,000	6,452	3,226	3,488
$25,000	9,220	4,610	4,438
$50,000	25,328	12,664	9,188
$100,000	64,060	32,030	18,688
$500,000	414,000	207,000	94,688
$1,000,000	854,000	427,000	189,688
$5,000,000	4,374,000	2,187,000	949,688

[1] Maximum earned income assumed.
[2] Excludes Victory tax.
[3] Basic liability is 6 percent of normal tax net income plus 13 percent of surtax net income.

TABLE IV.—*Effective income-tax rates under present law, under the 1941 act, and under various plans canceling part of 1942 liabilities;* [1] *married persons, no dependents*

Net income before personal exemption	Tax under 1942 act	Tax under 1941 act	One half of tax under 1942 act	Tax after canceling normal tax and surtax at first bracket rate	Tax after canceling the difference between 1941 and 1942 rates both computed at 1942 exemptions
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$1,200					
$1,500	3.2		1.6		1.6
$1,800	5.7	1.3	2.9		2.9
$2,000	7.0	2.1	3.5		3.6
$2,500	9.3	3.6	4.6		4.8
$3,000	10.8	4.6	5.4		5.6
$4,000	13.3	6.2	6.7	0.6	7.2
$5,000	14.9	7.5	7.5	1.1	8.3
$6,000	16.5	8.7	8.3	1.9	9.5
$8,000	19.2	10.9	9.6	3.6	11.7
$10,000	21.5	13.1	10.8	5.4	13.8
$15,000	27.0	18.3	13.5	10.1	18.9
$20,000	32.3	23.1	16.1	14.8	23.7
$25,000	36.9	27.5	18.4	19.1	28.0
$50,000	50.7	40.9	25.3	32.3	41.2
$100,000	64.1	52.7	32.0	45.4	52.9
$500,000	82.8	69.0	41.4	63.9	69.1
$1,000,000	85.4	73.3	42.7	66.4	73.3
$5,000,000	87.5	78.5	43.7	68.5	78.5

[1] All figures exclude the Victory tax.

Advertising War Savings Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, a merited tribute to the advertising men and businessmen of the country for their

splendid part in the sale of War Savings bonds is contained in a letter I have received from William H. Rankin, head of the New York firm of William H. Rankin Co., one of the best-known advertising men in the United States. Mr. Rankin says:

DEAR LOUIS LUDLOW: Attached is a page from this week's Printers Ink, reading as follows:

"Honor to whom honor, etc., Chairman LOUIS LUDLOW of the House Appropriations Subcommittee says it is interesting to note that of the 275,000 persons now engaged in selling War bonds only 1,250 receive any compensation, whatever, for their services. The Congressman might find it interesting also to note how much money business has spent on selling these bonds—spent in the way of advertising space, spent for salesmen's salaries, spent for bookkeepers' time on the voluntary pay-roll allotment plan, and so on. That would make a story of absorbing interest. How about a pat on the back for businessmen (including even advertising men) too, Mr. LUDLOW?"

The other attached story, a Washington dispatch to the New York Herald Tribune dated March 2, shows that the Treasury Department is now going to use the recommendations I made to the Department in 1941 by selling United States Defense or Victory bonds through the 12 Federal Reserve districts.

Six months ago I gave the plan to the advertising council and told them to let each Federal Reserve bank use their own discretion about using paid advertising as an expense to lower the cost of selling and delivering a $100 or a $1,000 bond. We did that in Chicago and the record is attached—phenomenal.

The Treasury Department will find they will and can market $13,000,000,000 of new bonds, keep the millions of workers sold on holding their bonds for 5 to 15 years, and continue to invest 10 percent of their weekly earnings in Victory bonds.

Decentralize: As the plan that influences the Chicago Federal Reserve district must be different in its appeal to that of Boston and New York, and thus the Treasury Department will not have to ask the Appropriations Committee for $10,000,000 to $15,000,000, but can let each Federal Reserve bank use its own judgment, as they do in being men and paying for posters and a lot of supposedly good sales material that is far more expensive than newspaper (and outdoor and radio) advertising, which costs one-half cent for a full page, one-fourth cent for a half page, and one-eighth cent for a quarter page advertisement; whereas just the cost of printing or typing a letter and address on an envelope is 1 cent to 2 cents per home reached. And radio and outdoor and magazine advertising is just as economical and productive as newspapers.

I had a nice letter from BOB SIKES, saying you and he would get together, and I do hope you may say that "If advertising can lower the cost of selling Victory bonds—advertising of all kinds should be used to insure success, and thus support our armed forces and help shorten this war 3 months, or a month, or a week, or a day."

General Pershing told me that he knew our advertising that persuaded 13,400,000 young men to register to fight September 12, 1918—helped shorten World War No. 1 at least 8 months—as the Kaiser threw up his hands and said "What's the use—we can't win from a country that has 13,400,000 men ready to lick us!"

Do let me hear from you. I'm doing my part by asking all advertising men to work and place Treasury advertising without profit, as their contribution to show that they, too, believe in advertising.

We did that in 1917-18, and that did more to convince the bankers that we were right and unselfish, than anything else. In 25 years I have never made 1 cent profit on Government advertising, and I have delivered millions of dollars worth at no cost to the United States of America.

Cordially,

WM. H. RANKIN.

P. S.—Fifteen top leaders in advertising spent a larger part of our time, at General MacArthur's request, conducting research, tests, and making plans, and our conclusions are as stated above.

WASHINGTON DISPATCH TO NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

WASHINGTON, March 2.—Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, announced today at a special press conference the creation of a new war finance committee to integrate the work of all of the organizations participating in the bimonthly $13,000,000,000 "new money" financing program for war expenditures.

William M. Robbins, former vice-president of General Foods Corporation, a specialist in mass sales and distribution methods, will head the new group to be known as the United States Treasury War Finance Committee.

Assisting Mr. Robbins in the largest financing program ever undertaken by any government are Harold N. Graves, assistant to Mr. Morgenthau, and George Buffington, assistant to the secretary in charge of the victory fund committee. Additional members of the committee will be announced by Mr. Morgenthau later.

The Secretary revealed that presidents of the 12 Federal Reserve Banks have been asked to serve as chairmen of district committees to be organized on lines similar to the War Finance Committee. These district committees will include representatives of the War Savings Staff in each State and of the victory fund committee.

Mr. Morgenthau's press conference was called as Washington was having an air-raid test. As the conference ended, Allen Sproul, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, arrived to attend a meeting with Daniel W. Bell, Under Secretary of the Treasury, to discuss plans for the $13,000,000,000 "new-money" financing program which will be launched on April 12.

Asked whether the Treasury would adopt the Canadian plan of advertising in domestic and foreign language newspapers to sell War bonds, Mr. Morgenthau replied that no publicity outlet will be overlooked in the coming campaign.

Mr. Robbins, it was disclosed, has obtained a leave of absence from General Foods Corporation for the rest of 1943. The War Finance Committee will operate for the duration, Mr. Morgenthau said.

The committee in Washington will act in an advisory capacity to the national director in the formulation and execution of plans for sale of Government securities, and the committee's set-up in the Federal Reserve districts will likewise act in an advisory capacity to the presidents of the Federal Reserve banks, who will act as chairmen of such committees, with full authority and responsibility in their respective districts to direct the drive.

The national director of sales is authorized to deal directly with the Federal Reserve banks as fiscal agents of the United States in all matters relating to the promotion and sale of Government securities, and in this connection he has authority to utilize all the facilities of the War Savings Staff and the victory fund committee, coordinating their respective activities as he may direct.

Tribute to Ben Robertson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the News and Courier, of Charleston, S. C., which pays high tribute to Ben Robertson, a distinguished citizen of South Carolina, who was devoted to the principles of good government throughout the world. He was the author of many books, and was in foreign service as a war correspondent since the beginning of hostilities. For many months before the United States entered the war he served in England, and since we became involved he has been in almost continuous service in Russia and India.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEN ROBERTSON

Like the kinsmen he wrote about in Red Hills and Cotton, Ben Robertson, who has been reported missing in a plane crash, was always ready to go some place, and in his crowded lifetime he has been to most parts of the world. He went as a newspaper reporter, bursting with curiosity about places and people. People were his particular hobby, he collected friends as others collect postage stamps or antique furniture. He had an endless flow of small talk that served to strike up an acquaintance with anybody from an elevator boy to a grand duchess; and with it went a memory for names and details.

"How is your cousin Susie, and did she ever marry the tall boy she had a date with when you introduced me to her that cold day 6 years ago?" he was apt to inquire of a friend on one of his return visits to South Carolina, after a voyage to the Orient or Europe, or the Dutch West Indies.

Ben always liked everybody and everybody liked Ben. He hadn't a mean streak nor an unkind word. His ambition was to return to his native Piedmont and run for Congress, but he had too many other places to go first. His first newspaper job was as a reporter for The News and Courier 20 years ago; he stayed about a year, then struck out on a trip that carried him around the world, via the University of Missouri, Honolulu, Australia, Java, and New York, with stops of 6 months' to several years' duration. When he crashed in Lisbon Harbor, with a distinguished career behind him and an even more promising future, Ben was still on his way, covering an assignment.

Ben had made clipper crossings many times before by way of Lisbon. In the opening of his second book I Saw England, he tells about the nervousness of his first ocean flight. As he undressed for bed the thought struck him that it would be embarrassing to crash without his pants on. Next day he landed safely in Portugal, on his way to cover the blitz in London.

Fellow newspapermen can sympathize with Ben, because he apparently won't be there to cover the ending of this war that was his biggest story. He had grown with the story of the war. In England, Ben Robertson was more than a reporter; he was an unofficial

ambassador of America, a symbol of the courage, the good will, and the gallantry of the United States both before and after Pearl Harbor. He was on first-name terms with the mighty and the humble, and the people who knew him in foreign lands will love Americans the better for having met him.

When Mussolini invaded Ethiopia, Ben was sent to cover the war, but he was held up by complications in London, and the campaign was over before he reached the front. And so now, a new and tragic complication has kept Ben away from his return to London. Though he never may write again one of those moving and often beautiful stories of the things he saw and heard, wherever things are happening, there will be the spirit of Ben Robertson. Whatever new land he may now be visting, he will be making friends.

T. R. W.

Post-War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able and timely editorial published in the Age Herald of Birmingham, Ala., of the issue of March 3, 1943. The editorial comments on the recent address delivered by Hon. Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, before the University of Toronto in which he discussed a post-war program.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. WELLES AGAIN

In his recent University of Toronto address Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, made another of his efforts in behalf of achieving agreement now among the United Nations as to a general post-war program.

It was, moreover, definite assurance that our Government is doing more than talking about this purpose. Mr. Welles declared that the United States "intends at once to undertake discussions as to the most practical and effective methods" through which the more formal conferences and consultations essential to final agreements can be held. He repeated this announcement Monday in Washington.

This was a disclosure of the first importance. While no one yet can know just when the war will end, it is apparent that, even though victory requires many months yet, there will be little enough time in which to work out plans and solutions for the immediate and gigantic problems that then will be faced.

There is, of course, a broad measure of agreement as to the general objectives. But if this agreement is to be made effective, there must also be a concord as to methods. That fact is so obvious it scarcely calls for argument.

There are those who think that attention and effort cannot be wisely diverted from the prosecution of the war now, that there still will be time for implementing victory after it is won, but even this viewpoint does not challenge the importance of agreement on methods. There is only a difference here as to the timing of necessary efforts to that end. Mr. Welles believes that now is the time. Further, he says that "my Government believes that the initiation of such studies is already overdue."

Consider the calm, reasoned, far-sighted presentation of this viewpoint which he made at Toronto. His was the voice of sanity, of high intelligence, of reliance on reason. That voice still is urgently needed in this world of violence. For it is only through its counsel that the victory for which we now fight can be completed.

Disagreement, Mr. Welles said, usually results because people are looking at problems from different viewpoints, because those who differ are moved by different considerations and do not have a complete knowledge of the facts involved.

Yet, basically, the interest of all people concerned by the problem is the same. That is to say, the great problems of the world are common to all peoples and any real solution must be a common solution.

The Under Secretary of State did not hesitate to espouse a doctrine which is ethical, but it is also intelligent and realistic. Indeed, in the last analysis, the ethical is the intelligent. There is no conflict between them.

Some might say that Mr. Welles only preached a sermon. But he also talked common sense. If a sermon is not good sense, it is not a good sermon. And all good sense, when forcefully and unequivocally expressed, carries at least an implication that it should be followed.

Mr. Welles said he believes that in the last quarter of a century the people of this country have learned that the most practical form of self-interest is enlightened self-interest. As individuals we are all so closely bound together now by conditions of interdependency that the fallacy and eventual failure of one-sided, strictly selfish efforts to get ahead in the world are easier than ever to comprehend. The same general truth applies to individual nations. There is only one way to go forward, and that is together. There is only one lasting solution for the modern problems of the world, and that is a general solution.

"Most of us have learned a great truth that is beginning to dawn upon the consciousness of many people in all parts of the globe," Mr. Welles said, "and that is that the real self-interest of one nation coincides with the permanent, with the ultimate, self-interests of other nations."

Theoretically, that great truth has been recognized, more or less, for many centuries. The trouble has been that there has been too little application.

There is, undoubtedly, a wider and deeper recognition of this law of life now, but whether it is wide enough, deep enough, resolute enough to bring a broad measure of true world cooperation is still a question.

Mr. Welles seems hopeful. So are we. It seems to him, as to us, that it should now be so apparent that there is no way to get away from war except by cooperative action that after this conflict there will be a good chance for constructive action in this direction.

There will certainly be a widespread will to such action. But one of the great dangers to high achievement is that, even though this realization and this will exist, the time of test will find the nations unprepared.

When the war ends there are going to be many tremendous issues pressing for immediate solution. Unless there are adequate preparations for that time, the rush and complexity of those problems may be overwhelming. Mr. Welles clearly sees that fact. The unity now prevailing among the United Nations may be disrupted. Discouragement, disillusionment, and desperate expediency may make it impossible to give effect to the general realization of the need for comparative action.

Mr. Welles maintains that consultations and conferences now can do much to bring about the specific agreements which will be so urgently necessary after the fighting ends. He is, of course, right. And it is heartening and hopeful news that our Government now is actively moving to bring about such conferences.

It should be much easier to arrive at agreement, in the unity that now prevails and with the time that still remains, than when the fighting front no longer is necessary and urgency demands swift solutions.

Moreover, there can be high hope that agreements now reached for a better world—agreements which will apply to all nations—will hasten the break-down of internal support of the Axis militarist regimes.

American Business and Radio's War Contributions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article headed "American business leads in radio's war contributions, says Mark Woods," published in Broadcasting of the issue of March 8, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BUSINESS LEADS IN RADIO'S WAR CONTRIBUTIONS, SAYS MARK WOODS

American business is credited with a large share of radio's war contributions in a statement issued last week by Mark Woods, president of the Blue Network, in connection with the announcement that during the period of January 1 through February 15 of this year the Blue broadcast more than 160 network hours of programs devoted exclusively to the war effort. Of this total, 39 hours was commercially sponsored time directly paid for by national advertisers.

The remainder, 124 hours of sustaining time, is the contribution of the network itself, but Mr. Woods pointed out that under the American system of broadcasting, in which there is no license fee on receiving sets nor a tax on listening, American business organizations through the medium of advertising, make this vast contribution possible.

MORALE PROGRAMS NOT INCLUDED

"American radio has been given recognition and great credit for the part it has played and is playing in aiding in the prosecution of the war," he continued. "It is only too easy to forget the men and women and the organizations they represent who are in reality 'the men behind the man behind the gun.'"

The figures cited do not include any programs which might be helpful to the war effort as affording relaxation or building morale among the armed forces or war workers, but cover only those broadcasts devoted solely to war messages. Time given individually by Blue affiliated stations, such as the more than 18 hours of war-effort programs on WJZ, New York, during the period studied, also is excluded from the total.

Mr. Woods stressed two points: Much of the fine talent on the air is sponsored by

companies whose plants are converted to war production and who have no products to sell to the public. Also, it is the revenue derived from this commercially sponsored time (approximately 22 percent of the Blue's total broadcast time) which enables the network to present war effort programs on its sustaining time.

PRIVATE BUSINESS GETS CREDIT

"The Fred Allens, Jack Bennys and Ed 'Archie' Gardners," he pointed out, "are the result of thinking, programming, and expenditures by commercial clients. The network and the station are the media through which these morale builders are presented to a war-working public. Never before, in any war, has private industry been given such an opportunity to do its share.

"No broadcaster and no group of broadcasters, on their own initiative, could afford to take over this highly important phase of war activity. When programs such as the Victory Parade of Spotlight Bands travels hundreds of thousands of miles to entertain soldiers, sailors, marines, and war workers, it is the result of planning and expenditures by private business. American broadcasting can be proud of the fact that it can cooperate in this great campaign carried on at its own expense and on its own initiative by American business."

OTHER WAR AIDS

Mr. Woods' tribute to the war contributions of American advertisers points up the fact that while more than 100 American companies have been awarded the Army-Navy E for manufacturing contributions to the Nation's war effort, little recognition has been given to the equally important psychological and educational contributions to the Government war program which American business and industry has made through its advertising.

Subject was discussed at a recent meeting of network executives with Chester J. LaRoche, chairman of the Advertising Council, and Frederic R. Gamble, managing director, American Association of Advertising Agencies. National Broadcasting Co. was represented by its vice president and general manager, Frank E. Mullen; Columbia Broadcasting System by Paul Hollister, vice president in charge of advertising and promotion; Mutual Broadcasting System by President Miller McClintock, and the Blue by Earl Mullin, publicity director.

Group agreed on the importance of the commercially sponsored programs, with their established audiences, in presenting Government war messages to the public and that the success of the Office of War Information radio allocation plan is really based on the donations of time and talent by the sponsors of these programs. They also agreed on the necessity for telling both business and the public that radio's advertisers, as well as the stations and networks, have gone to war. A number of methods for putting across this message were discussed and the meeting decided that each network would do the job in its own way.

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and well written editorial appearing in the Age Herald of Birmingham, Ala., relating to Mme. Chiang Kai-shek.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"FORGIVE THEM"

That was a remarkable, almost a unique, plea which Mme. Chiang Kai-shek made in her Madison Square broadcast Tuesday night. She was the spokesman of a people who have suffered incalculable agonies and losses through 6 years of barbaric, unprovoked aggression. Yet here she was talking about forgiving enemies after the war is won.

What people have greater provocation for bitterness, for disillusionment, for cynicism, for taking the attitude that, after all, some peoples simply must be regarded as incapable of cooperation, than have the Chinese? Yet hear Mme. Chiang:

"All nations, great and small, must have equal opportunity of development. * * *

"Then, too, there must be no bitterness in the reconstructed world. No matter what we have undergone and suffered, we must try to forgive those who injured us and remember only the lesson gained thereby."

And, finally, she said, "there must be cooperation, in the 'true and highest sense of the word.' There must be a world based on 'justice, coexistence, cooperation, and mutual respect.'"

The words of this woman presented a profound contrast in spirit, tone and method to the admonitions of those who have been saying or implying that hatred is necessary to the winning of this war and that when it is won, force must be the major factor in preserving the peace.

Exceptional as was the doctrine of Mme. Chiang, however, it was by no means a new doctrine. It was the doctrine of the Christ to whom this woman of China gives her spiritual allegiance. It was a doctrine that, in varying words but with the same general meaning, has been advocated by many men, in many lands, for many centuries. It was a doctrine known to China before the time even of Christ.

There is nothing really new in advocating such a doctrine, though it is not often advanced and emphasized in wartime. It would be new and revolutionary if broad and literal application were given to the doctrine.

A MATTER OF FAITH

The fact that there has been, comparatively, so little of this spirit in the settlement of wars is not explained simply by saying that peoples generally are cruel, revengeful, altogether selfish. There are many such persons, of course. But there are also vast numbers who are merciful and desirous of justice and peace and yet who cannot believe that such a doctrine as Mme. Chiang advocates can work at the present stage of the development of mankind.

No one can say with absolute authority, of course, just how it would work. It never has been persistently and comprehensively tried. It does seem obvious that some advantage would be taken of such a spirit, that there would be certain dangers, certain costs. But just what would be the net, long-term results no man can certainly foresee.

There can only be faith, like that of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, a willingness to take the risks of such a course. Or lack of faith and an unwillingness to do so.

WHAT IS FORGIVENESS?

There are so many, of course, who probably do not fully grasp the doctrine the Chinese woman advocates. They think of it, more or less subconsciously, as involving some sort of a compromise with evil itself, as condoning frightful things, such as those China has suffered.

That is not at all Mme. Chiang's meaning. None could more intensely and uncompromisingly hate evil in itself than those who love justice and mercy and gentleness as does this woman. He who prayed that those who were crucifying Him be forgiven never implied or felt any condonation of evil. But He said that they who were doing evil did not know what they were doing.

That is true of many of the evildoers of the world, though not at all. If they knew better, they might do better. To forgive an evil is not to say that it never existed, that it ceases to be evil. It is, in effect, to say that the evildoer, under certain conditions, may have another chance and do better; that he is not condemned as forever incapable of turning from his evil.

It is this kind of forgiveness which must prevail among the peoples of the world if there ever is to be true peace.

It is a forgiveness that, in its very forgiving, gives a new emphasis to the eternal horror of evil, for mercy and humility can often express a far greater judgment than mere condemnation.

It is this kind of forgiveness of which Mme. Chiang must be thinking. All the ancient wisdom of her people speaks to her of the universal need of all men, of all peoples, for forgiveness—not all in the same measure, of course, but all in some degree. None among us is above that need. All, at one time or another, need forgiveness that we may start again.

HER REALISM

Many will say that this is mere sentimentality. But it is not sentimentality to Mme. Chiang.

A tremendous chorus will assert it is not realism. But it is realism to this woman. It is the realism of the deepest wisdom of the human race, a wisdom that is in inevitable accord with the highest religious and ethical ideals.

It is the wisdom that entire nations cannot be brought to peace primarily by force, as a relatively few criminals are kept from evil through imprisonment, as the leaders of Axis crime will be punished.

It is the wisdom that genuine peace is something of the spirit, something that cannot be compelled.

It is the realism that it is only through cooperation in the true and highest sense that an enduring order of peace, security, and freedom can be established in the world.

This was the voice of a woman of the modern China which has so immeasurably suffered, so indomitably fought. But it was also a voice of the ages, uttering what the loftiest and wisest spirits of all time have known, what the least of us, save only the hopelessly depraved, must ever realize in our best moments.

Slants on Various Post-War Stages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article from the Detroiter, published by the Detroit Board of Commerce, for March 8, 1943:

SLANTS ON VARIOUS POST-WAR STAGES

In any discussion of post-war problems, whether such discussion concerns nations, cities, industries, or individuals, it is evident at the outset that the imponderables of the future are such as to prevent unchangeable forecasts. Yet I believe that we may narrow

the field of reasonable possibilities, and thus be able to plan tentative paths of action.

The first postulate I seek is one which estimates the probable duration of the war. In talking with people I hear armistice guesses which range from "this spring or summer" to "10 years." Obviously if we allow ourselves to be balked by the fact that no one can tell us the month or even the year of the cessation of fighting, we will get nowhere. My proposal is that we begin to put some orderliness into our estimates, first by accepting the following possibilities as reasonable:

1. The war in the European theater may end within the next 12 months.

2. The war in the European theater may last more than another 12 months, but is not likely to endure for 24 months.

3. War in the European theater may resolve itself into a stalemate requiring maintenance of large armed forces abroad for 3, 4, or 5 years.

You will note that I have not attempted to estimate the length of the Pacific war. I believe that our war with Japan may continue for a long time. I am quite ready to assume, for my own part, that the "post-war conversion" we look ahead to will take place while the Pacific war is still a bitter and indeterminate engagement.

If this forecast is accurate, and it certainly is the most reasonable one I can find, we are blind indeed to spend any considerable amount of time in talking about a future wherein one day would see us all at war and the next would see the war clouds all cleared away. It is far more likely that half of our war aims will be realized first, and the other half not for some time thereafter. And in that case we would face two conversion periods, not one.

To me this is the national blind spot in our present discussions of post-war problems. When we entered the war—or wars—the declarations of full-scale belligerence were made within a few days of each other. We were so-called neutrals in a world of peaceful pursuits one week, and engaged in war with Japan, Germany, and Italy the next. Many of us have the idea that we will get out of it all at once, too, although we know most certainly that the plainly announced strategy calls for fighting one war to a conclusion while delaying the ultimate effort in another theater.

The average businessman in the industry I represent, or in any other, I believe, should not spend much time planning his activities of the future on the basis of the third possibility of European war duration—that which would indicate a stalemate and years of war in that theater. It is gambling a bit, but I would suggest adoption of a belief that we can force capitulation of the Axis in Europe within the next 12 months. If that should happen, we would have to continue the flow of many supplies for quite a long time, of course, and I should think that the guns and shells would continue to flow but that they would go westward instead of to the East. All in all, even if we adopt the optimistic view that the fighting in Europe will cease this year, there is little likelihood of any change in our manufacturing obligations for many months thereafter.

Putting all of this together, the conclusion I reach is that we can, with good luck, reach what I call the first conversion period in the spring or summer of 1944. That is roughly a year and a half ahead of us.

What can the average manufacturer do about it?

First, if he thinks the above diagram is based on good thinking, he can plan to be ready in the summer of 1944 to convert, but he will be uncertain as to the opportunity to convert. I think most of our manufacturers can be classified roughly as follows:

1. The manufacturer who makes a product for war use which is not greatly different from the article he makes in peacetime. Let us say truck gears, with no side line.

2. The manufacturer who makes both peacetime and wartime goods. For an example we might choose truck springs and shell casings.

3. The manufacturer who has been forced out of his peacetime line entirely, and is making wartime articles now. Let us say, for example, the one who used to make passenger-car bodies and now makes airplane wings.

Now I submit that the first conversion period is going to witness a more or less gradual, regulated return to peacetime effort of those who are not indispensable in the war effort, and that those whose war production cannot be dropped will be required to maintain their production of arms.

For the manufacturer who is fortunate enough to have stayed within his own field, even in wartime, the problem is not intense. The ones who are partly, or entirely, in war production must study their relative position in that field to determine whether they can convert to peacetime goods. If they are sole sources, or very important sources, they should realize that the war with Japan may keep them busy even though others are freed for development of peacetime markets.

I believe that the individual businessman must quit wondering and begin assuming. The first assumption I think he is justified in making is that full employment—or nearly so—is to his interest and to the national interest as well. If this be so, he must next assume that no matter what kind of armistice occurs, it will be impossible for everyone to get out of war pursuits and into peacetime efforts at the same time.

Sometimes we are all inclined to get tangled up in thoughts and discussions which are so all-embracing in their scope as to drown out the serious, down-to-earth consideration of individual businesses. Bound and restricted by rules and regulatitons which take initiative and freedom from him in many ways, the businessman sometimes even gets the feeling that he isn't free to think. I believe that there never was a time when it was more necessary for him to take stock of his own and his company's future from a competitive standpoint.

It also is true that there are obligations upon us all to deal with broad problems in a broad way. This country's national conversion path should be marked out. But leaving that subject for the moment, I would like to describe what I mean by the opportunity for progressive, self-reliant planning by individuals.

The individual has a chance to do some independent thinking, and should exercise that right. He should not be overwhelmed either by mass enthusiasms or mass pessimisms. He should examine critically the plausible forecasts which come to his attention, but should use liberal amounts of horsesense in making up his mind.

Let me give a few examples of what I mean by mass optimism which I think is unjustified to some extent;

On every hand we hear and read of a glowing sales market of the future, when everything will be needed in such vast quantities that anything will sell. I don't believe that is easy of attainment.

We hear that in the post-war period there will be a tremendous boom in the airplane business, and I know quite a number of men who believe that the air will be full of flivver planes, millions of people will buy small aircraft for pleasure and business and tremendous markets for cargo and transport planes will be ready for the sales departments. I don't believe that.

Some people believe that the public will rush forward in 1945 to buy 1942 model automobiles, radios, and other articles. I don't believe that. I believe that the purchaser will receive, very quickly, the benefit of the new things we have learned about materials and methods during the war.

At least I don't believe that full-blown mass markets will open soon, and by soon I mean within 4 or 5 years. My feeling is that the first conversion period will be gradual and held to the manufacture of essential articles which are badly needed, while a great many of us are still engaged in war pursuits. When the automobile comes back in quantity I expect it to be a lighter and much more efficient machine, but I do not expect to see the automobile factories shut down war production all at once and begin to tool up all at once. I feel that some sort of peacetime rationing will accompany the early conversion period.

As for airplanes, it seems to be that at war's end we will have a great supply of them on hand and a great overcapacity to build. In years to come we no doubt will develop what we think of as an air-minded public, but it won't happen overnight just because fascinating advertising has been issued in four colors. Right now there are so many people anxious to get rich in this aircraft industry of the future that I expect a lot of them to get hurt in the rush.

For the individual manufacturer, I think that a prime problem lies in a study of the product he hopes to make in peacetime. If he is in a fair way to be held back a little during the conversion, I believe that he should be ready with another product or two, perhaps for another field than the one he cultivated so long.

Let me give you an example. An automobile parts maker, successful and well-established in the manufacture of certain parts for passenger cars, becomes a successful and reliable source of important war materials. Military demands may hold him behind the eight ball, unable to move, when the first automobiles hit the highways of conversion. In that event, I don't think that his former customer will wait for him, and I don't blame the customer. If I were that parts maker I would have some ideas of other products to make, and new places to sell them.

Now, what of government and its part in the planning for the future? I am not one of those who shudders at the very word "government." I feel pretty badly at the prospect of absolute regimentation but I also feel badly at the thought of a wide swing of the pendulum back to wide-open, laissez-faire competition and the devil take the hindmost. I am too much afraid that the devil would catch millions of us.

It seems to me that there are certain things which the National Government has to do, and that it is the obligation of us all to insist upon them. I'll list them as I see them. But before the list let me say that the crying need is a sort of 10-year plan, brought forward by intelligent, reasoning citizens who not only have a social conscience but who also understand production, distribution, and the true meaning of wealth.

Here, then, are the things which need to be done, with our help:

1. An accurate, understandable accounting of raw materials and national resources should be ready for use as we move into a conversion period. What is the state of our oil resources, for example? Will we have used them up so fast as to necessitate husbanding of fuel for factory, home, automobile?

2. A clear national policy should be stated so that this country may know whether its citizens and industries can take up foreign concessions, both to develop new fields and to protect our investments.

3. The rate of return to civilian life of some 30,000,000 persons from armed service and war production should be accurately scheduled to fit the needs of reviving peacetime trades. In this case industry will have

to tell Government what it needs, first, and Government will have to oversee the orderly release.

4. Government controls over materials and prices should be relaxed as far as possible. Complete relaxation or destruction of such controls may not be wise, but certainly unnecessary controls should be abandoned. Just where the line should be drawn is a question for all our intelligence and foresight.

5. Contract cancelation and clearance must be taken up by industry early—well ahead of the war's end, of course—as a major problem. I believe that there are far too many men these days who put off the problem as too dense to see through, and I believe that these men are making a grave mistake.

6. The problem of new plant versus old plant should be clarified by Government and industry. Obviously, if the Government-owned or controlled fabricating capacity is maintained under such control, a danger of large proportions is raised against private industry.

Beyond these problems is one which I do not list as an essential, because I believe that we can worry along under our present condition. I refer to the labor laws, which more and more are becoming what the railroad men call "feather-bed" regulations. In our efforts to protect men against injustice we have gone too far in orders which paralyze self-reliance, courage, and hope. I believe that our future can be one of the greatest periods of productive, progressive advancement this country has ever seen, but the degree of our advancement will depend upon the degree of our unselfish devotion to high principles.

Cradle-to-Grave Program of the National Resources Planning Board

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in order to allay the fears of some Members of Congress and a great many people who are not in Congress, let me say that all the recommendations of the so-called National Resources Planning Board will never be written into law.

Some of those recommendations, of course, are good; they could not say as much as they did without saying something good; but on the whole the program they propose constitutes the most fantastic conglomeration of bureaucratic nonsense that was ever sent to the Congress of the United States.

They remind me of the story in Gulliver's Travels, where he visited a country with a planning board that had been working for 8 years attempting to develop a process for extracting sunbeams from cucumbers.

If this program, proposed by our so-called National Resources Planning Board, were put into effect, it would wreck this Republic, wipe out the Constitution, destroy our form of government, set up a totalitarian regime, eliminate private enterprise, regiment our people indefinitely, and pile upon their backs a burden of expenditures that no nation on earth could bear.

Freedom From Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, among the four great freedoms we find one called freedom from fear. In the last issue of the Saturday Evening Post, under the title "Freedom From Fear," there appears an editorial written by Stephen Vincent Benét. It is a fine piece of journalism, but, more than that, it contains a great many helpful and dynamic ideas. Among other things, it presents this thought:

So what do we mean by "freedom from fear"?

We do not mean freedom from responsibility—freedom from struggle and toil, from hardship and danger. We do not intend to breed a race wrapped in cotton wool, too delicate to stand rough weather. In any world of man that we can imagine fear and the conquest of fear must play a part.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM FROM FEAR

(By Stephen Vincent Benét)

What do we mean when we say "freedom from fear"? It isn't just a formula or a set of words. It's a look in the eyes and a feeling in the heart and a thing to be won against odds. It goes to the roots of life—to a man and a woman and their children and the home they can make and keep.

Fear has walked at man's heels through many ages—fear of wild beasts and wilder nature, fear of the inexplicable gods of thunder and lightning, fear of his neighbor man.

He saw his rooftree burned with fire from heaven—and did not know why. He saw his children die of plague—and did not know why. He saw them starve, he saw them made slaves. It happened—he did not know why. Those things had always happened.

Then he set himself to find out—first one thing, then another. Slowly, through centuries, he fought his battle with fear. And wise men and teachers arose to help him in the battle.

His children and he did not have to die of plague. His children and he did not have to make human sacrifices to appease the wrath of inexplicable gods. His children and he did not have to kill the stranger just because he was a stranger. His children and he did not have to be slaves. And the shape of Fear grew less.

No one man did this by himself. It took many men and women, over many years. It took saints and martyrs and prophets—and the common people. It started with the first fire in the first cave—the fire that scared away the beasts of the night. It will not end with the conquest of far planets.

Since our Nation began, men and women have come here for just that freedom—freedom from the fear that lies at the heart of every unjust law, of every tyrannical exercise of power by one man over another man. They came from every stock—the men who had seen the face of tyranny, the men who wanted room to breathe and a chance to be men. And the cranks and the starry-eyed came, too, to build Zion and New Harmony and Americanopolis and the States and cities that perished before they lived—the valuable cranks who push the world ahead an inch. And a lot of it never happened, but we did make a free nation.

"How are you ever going to live out there, stranger?"

"We'll live on weevily wheat and the free air." If they had the free air, they'd put up with the weevily wheat.

So, in our corner of the world, and for most of our people, we got rid of certain fears. We got rid of them, we got used to being rid of them. It took struggle and fighting and a lot of working things out. But 130,000,000 people lived at peace with one another and ran their own government. And because they were free from fear, they were able to live better, by and large and on the whole, than any 130,000,000 people had lived before. Because fear may drive a burdened man for a mile, but it is only freedom that makes his load light for the long carry.

And meanwhile around us the world grew smaller and smaller. If you looked at it on the school maps, yes, it looked like the same big world with a big, safe corner for us. But all the time invention and mechanical skill were making it smaller and smaller. When the Wright brothers made their first flights at Kittyhawk the world shrank. With those first flights the world began to come together and distant nations to jostle their neighbor nations.

Now, again in our time, we know fear—armed fear, droning through the sky. It's a different sound from the war whoop and the shot in the lonesome clearing, and yet it is much the same for all of us. It is quiet in the house tonight and the children are asleep. But innocence, good will, distance, peaceable intent, will not keep those children safe from the fear in the sky. No one man can keep his house safe in a shrunken world. No one man can make his own clearing and say, "This is mine. Keep out." And yet, if the world is to go on, if man is to survive and prosper, the house of man must be kept safe.

So, what do we mean by "freedom from fear"?

We do not mean freedom from responsibility—freedom from struggle and toil, from hardship and danger. We do not intend to breed a race wrapped in cotton wool, too delicate to stand rough weather. In any world of man that we can imagine, fear and the conquest of fear must play a part.

But we have the chance, if we have the brains and the courage, to destroy the worst fears that harry man today—the fear of starving to death, the fear of being a slave, the fear of being stamped into the dust because he is one kind of man and not another, the fear of unprovoked attack and ghastly death for himself and for his children because of the greed and power of willful and evil men and deluded nations.

It will not be easy to destroy those fears. No one man can do it alone. No one nation can do it alone. It must be all men.

It is not enough to say, "Here, in our country, we are strong. Let the rest of the world sink or swim. We can take care of ourselves." That may have been true at one time, but it is no longer true. We are not an island in space, but a continent in the world. While the air is the air, a bomb can kill your children and mine. Fear and ignorance a thousand miles away may spread pestilence in our own town. A war between nations on the other side of the globe may endanger all we love and cherish.

War, famine, disease are no longer local problems or even national problems. They are problems that concern the whole world and every man. That is a hard lesson to learn, and yet, for our own survival, we must learn it.

A hundred-and-sixty-odd years ago we, as a nation, asserted that all men were created

equal, that all men were entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Those were large assertions, but we have tried to live up to them. We have not always succeeded, we have often failed. But our will and desire as a nation have been to live up to them.

Now, in concert with other free nations, we say that those children you see and other children like them all over the world shall grow to manhood and womanhood free from fear. We say that neither their minds nor their bodies shall be cramped or distorted or broken by tyranny and oppression. We say they shall have a chance, and an equal chance, to grow and develop and lead the lives they choose to lead, not lives mapped out for them by a master. And we say that freedom for ourselves involves freedom for others—that it is a universal right, neither lightly given by providence nor to be maintained by words alone, but by acts and deeds and living.

We who are alive today did not make our free institutions. We got them from the men of the past and we hold them in trust for the future. Should we put ease and selfishness above them, that trust will fail and we shall lose all, not a portion or a degree of liberty, but all that has been built for us and all that we hope to build. Real peace will not be won with one victory. It can be won only by long determination, firm resolve, and a wish to share and work with other men, no matter what their race or creed or condition. And yet, we do have the choice. We can have freedom from fear.

Here is a house, a woman, a man, their children. They are not free from life and the obligations of life. But they can be free from fear. All over the world, they can be free from fear. And we know they are not yet free.

The Tax Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the tax mess referred to in the editorial which I am inserting in the RECORD under leave to extend, comes about as a result of the New Deal bureaucratic totalitarian philosophy that the state is everything and the individual citizen nothing. It is a case of public opinion be d——d.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 11, 1943]

THE TAX MESS

It used to be said that nothing was sure except death and taxes. We have now reached a point in United States Government tax policies where taxes are so unsure that few taxpayers know where they stand, or why—especially income-tax payers.

On our best information and belief, here is the present status of the attempt to put the country on a pay-as-you-go income tax collection basis:

The House Ways and Means Committee's Democratic majority has decided to drop all genuine pay-as-you-go proposals. The committee majority wants to keep the present pay-as-you-went system, and add to that a 20-percent tax check-off against pay envelopes. Some leeway would be allowed taxpayers, so that sooner or later they could hoist themselves onto a pay-as-you-go basis, but only by sooner or later paying their back taxes while also paying taxes on current income.

To illustrate: Suppose you made $3,000 in 1942, and are running along at that rate in 1943. Under present law, you owe roughly $470 (minus exemptions and deductions in your individual case) on your 1942 earnings of $3,000, and will owe another $470 if you make $3,000 in 1943.

The Ways and Means Committee majority proposes that you start paying your 1942 $470 on March 15 next; and that beginning next July 1 your employer clip 20 percent of the taxable part of your weekly wage off your pay check and give it to the Government. You could call this 20 percent check-off payment on current income or on last year's income as you choose; you could take your time about catching up; but sooner or later you would have to pay $940 for 1942 and 1943.

If 1943 is the first year in which you have made enough money to become a payer of income taxes, the 20 percent check-off would put you on a pay-as-you-go basis. But this scheme would leave the older income-tax payers where they are now, with the added necessity of paying double taxes sooner or later in order to become pay-as-you-go taxpayers.

MORGENTHAU IN THE FOG

That is what has happened to Beardsley Ruml's original, simple, and scientific suggestion that we go on paying income taxes at current rates but call them taxes on this year's income instead of on last year's. Because of jealousy, obscurantism, and inability to grasp simple mathematical problems, various Treasury Department and congressional master minds have concocted this substitute scheme, which in essence is a scheme to squeeze most income-tax payers for twice as much as the present tax law says they may be squeezed.

Henry Morgenthau cannot get over the mistaken notion that the Ruml plan would cost the Treasury some $10,000,000,000 in "assets." Henry still thinks that an uncollectible debt is an asset—even though the income-tax law itself permits taxpayers to deduct for bad debts.

JUST ADOPT RUML'S PLAN

How about the practical effect of all this on tax collections?

There are three danger spots. One of these is already showing up, in the recent cashing of about $90,000,000 worth of War bonds by persons who couldn't get up their income taxes from any other source.

The second danger spot has to do with the possibility that the master minds may yet wish double or one and one-half taxation on us. It will also hit our civilian front a body blow, and will arouse furious resentment all along that front, at a time when we ought to be united for war.

The third and worst danger spot looms up when the war ends. We shall be hard enough hit then in any case, with war plants closing, millions of people losing war-plant jobs, and soldiers coming home. If, in addition to that, millions of people are saddled with bills for taxes on money they did earn but have ceased to earn, the post-war slump will be several times worse. It is situations like that that breed revolutions.

Fortunately, the Republican minority on the House Ways and Means Committee seems determined to force the Ruml plan onto the floor of the House for a showdown fight. It is to be hoped that it will; and that the House has a majority who can understand simple mathematics and therefore can see that we've got to have something very like the Ruml plan if we are to sidestep post-war catastrophe.

We hope, with most Americans, that the original Ruml plan will eventually be adopted. It is the sound solution, and the others are phonies. Dangerous phonies.

Ban on Searching Homes for Canned Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news item appearing in the Washington Star, headed "Brown bans searching of homes for canned goods." I desire to have the article printed for the reason that it shows that Government departments and agencies are realizing that the people of the United States are interested in the war, and that prosecution of citizens is not needed in order to prosecute the war.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROWN BANS SEARCHING OF HOMES FOR CANNED GOODS

Price Administrator Brown said today he would not tolerate the searching of private homes for violation of Office of Price Administration regulations, "except in the most flagrant cases."

Mr. Brown reported that racketeers posing as Office of Price Administration officials had attempted in some cities "to seize stocks of canned foods by intimidating householders," and that "in one city there was a story that an Office of Price Administration man had entered a home without permission to check up on a supposed failure to declare stocks of processed foods."

"I believe, of course, that all citizens have the right to be inviolate in their homes, and I will not tolerate the searching of private homes except in the most flagrant cases, such as where a house is being used to conceal black market operations, and where the full legal procedure of obtaining a search warrant is followed," Mr. Brown said.

Packers, Slaughterers, and Meat Processors Caught in Price Squeeze Should Have Immediate Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following statement and resolution are self-explanatory:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 10.—Decisive measures calling for swift action were adopted by the Senate and House Committees on Small Business today to end the break-down in the production and distribution of meat and meat products for civilian consumption and for use of the armed forces.

The two committees in joint session adopted a resolution calling upon the Office of Price Administration and the Department

of Agriculture without further ado to establish in the industry such equitable margins between prices of livestock and price ceilings on sales and to create such quotas and allocations as are necessary to correct a condition which has already brought independent processors, packers, wholesalers, and retailers of meat and meat products to the brink of ruin.

After 4 days of hearings and consideration, the Senators and Representatives comprising the two committees minced no words either in their findings or in their expressed determination that action shall no longer be delayed. In this resolution they asserted that the break-down in the civilian supply of meat and meat products has resulted from the failure of the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture to conform with the express mandate of the Congress in the Second Emergency Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, that "in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing," and "the break-down in the civilian supply of meat and meat products has further resulted from the failure of the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture properly to guide the flow of meat and meat products through the orderly channels of distribution."

The Price Administrator, says the resolution, has not exercised his discretionary powers to set up an advisory committee, as suggested by the act. Nor has he consulted regularly with all the segments of the meat industry, including the large and small slaughterer and nonslaughterer in the packing industry, the large and small processor, the wholesaler, retailer, and consumer. All of this, according to the resolution, has contributed to the break-down of normal distribution and the destruction of small business throughout the country.

In this circumstance Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, at the joint meeting today proposed that the Office of Price Administration proceed to discharge its discretionary powers under the act by immediately establishing a meat industry advisory committee to include in its membership equal representation for all the segments of the industry. This committee, it is provided, shall be "regularly consulted by the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture with respect to all new regulations, directives, orders, or any promulgations with respect to the form" of these requirements.

The committees on small business of the Senate and the House have been giving serious consideration to this resolution for the past week. Three executive sessions have been held. At today's meeting it was recommended by Senator MEAD, of New York, presiding, that the framing of the resolution in its final form be left to a subcommittee consisting of Senator STEWART of Tennessee, Senator WHERRY of Nebraska, Representative PATMAN of Texas, and Representative HALLECK of Indiana. This was done, and the subcommittee made the result of their efforts public later in the day.

Members of the committee disclosed that the evidence showed that independent meat packers were being forced to close their doors, due to the losses suffered in the slaughter of hogs and cattle. These losses have ranged from $2 to $4 on each hog and from 57 cents to $3.76 per hundredweight on cattle, according to grades.

Definite action culminated Wednesday morning at the executive session of the two committees on small business when this resolution was adopted calling for specific action to correct a serious condition which threatened the supply of meat for the armed forces and for civilian needs, as also to overcome the shortage of meat existing in various parts of the United States.

Resolution adopted at a joint session of the Senate Committee on Small Business and the House Committee on Small Business, March 10, 1943, as reported by a subcommittee composed of Senators STEWART and WHERRY and Representatives PATMAN and HALLECK

Whereas the small meat industry, including small packers, processors, wholesalers, and retailers, has complained for several months to the Small Business Committees of the House and Senate against various practices imposed upon them by the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture, which threaten to drive them out of business and disrupt the distribution of meat and meat products for essential civilian needs; and

Whereas the Small Business Committees of the House and Senate have held both joint and individual hearings and have otherwise investigated conditions in the meat industry and said committees as a result of said investigations and hearings are persuaded that the small meat industry, including the small packers, processors, wholesalers, and retailers, is in danger of being destroyed; and

Whereas the break-down in the civilian supply of meat and meat products has resulted from the failure of the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture to conform with the express mandate of the Congress in the Second Emergency Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, that "in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing"; and

Whereas the break-down in the civilian supply of meat and meat products has further resulted from the failure of the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture properly to guide the flow of meat and meat products through the orderly channels of distribution, and

Whereas Public Law 421, Seventy-seventh Congress, known as the Price Control Act, title I, section 2 (a) provides that the Administrator shall "appoint an industry advisory committee, or committees, either national or regional or both, consisting of such number of representatives of the industry as may be necessary in order to constitute a committee truly representative of the industry, or of the industry in such region, as the case may be," and the said section further provides that "the Administrator shall from time to time, at the request of the committee, advise and consult with the committee with respect to the regulation or order, and with respect to the form thereof, and classification, differentiations, and adjustments therein," and

Whereas the Price Administrator has not exercised said discretionary powers and has not set up such an advisory committee, as suggested in the act, and has not regularly consulted all segments of the meat industry, namely, the large and small slaughterer and nonslaughterer in the packing industry, the large and small processor; the wholesaler, retailer, and consumer; all of which has contributed to the break-down of normal distribution and the destruction of small businesses throughout the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House Committees on Small Business, That—

1. The Office of Price Administration immediately establish fair and equitable margins between the price of livestock and the price ceilings set on sales of meat and meat products for all processors, packers, wholesalers, and retailers;

2. The Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration immediately establish quotas for nonslaughtering packers as well as slaughtering packers and allocate adequate supplies to the small wholesalers and retailers in all areas of the country, so that when meat rationing is put into effect adequate initial inventories will be held by such packers, processors, wholesalers, and retailers; and

3. The Administrator of the Office of Price Administration immediately proceed to discharge his discretionary powers under the act (Public Law 421, 77th Cong., 2d sess., ch. 26) by immediately establishing a meat industry advisory committee that will include in its membership equal representation for the large and small slaughterers and nonslaughterers in the packing industry, the large and small processors, the wholesaler, the retailer, and the consumer, which advisory committee shall be regularly consulted by the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture with regard to all new regulations, amendments to existing regulations, directives, orders, or any promulgations with respect to the form thereof and the classifications, and adjustments therein as the same affect the meat industry; and

4. Copies of this resolution be immediately forwarded to the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture and that this committee be advised promptly by the Price Administrator and Secretary of Agriculture of action taken.

The Part Is Many Times Greater Than the Whole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a most interesting article written by Mr. Fred M. Rolens, the publisher of the South Pasadena Review of South Pasadena, Calif.

It is a story of how a gift by the State of California of a block of gold quartz to be set in the Washington Monument was paid for by a due note for $975 in 1850. In 1851 the note was replaced by a bond issue. But the fearful and wonderful operation of compound interest has brought about a situation where the State has already paid interest in the amount of $136,000 on this tiny original debt and still owes $2,227,500.

Mr. Rolen's story, however, will speak for itself and tell the tale better than I can. The moral, I think, is obvious.

WHO GETS THE MONEY?

(By Fred M. Rolens)

This seems incredible. Bill Kay, writing in the January number of Westways, the official publication of the Automobile Club of Southern California, tells this story under the title "Monumental Finance":

"While the Washington Monument cost all of $1,300,000 when finally completed, one single stone in that structure is valued at over $2,225,000 and it isn't paid for yet. It all started way back in 1850, when the then newly organized State of California decided to contribute a block of gold quartz to the Monument, then under construction.

"Having no funds in its treasury, the State issued a due note for $975, to pay for the stone and for its transportation to Washing-

ton. The note was to bear the healthy but then customary interest of 38 percent. In 1851 the note was replaced by a small bond issue, bearing a lower interest rate.

"Time went on; with typical Argonaut laissez faire, neither note nor bonds were paid; but the interest continued to pile up. So, in 1857, the legislature refinanced the bonds; this process was repeated in 1873. Finally, in the black panic year of 1893, the bonds matured; and again, the State was without funds to retire them. In the previous year, the sovereign voters had specifically rejected a proposal to lift the incubus.

"But as evidence of good faith, or maybe just because their predecessors had established the precedent the 1893 legislature passed an act, providing for payment of the interest only, by the time the debt had reached the respectable figure of $2,277,500.

"Time—and compound interest—did the rest; nearly 50 years California has paid $136,000 in interest alone on what started out in life as a debt of less than a thousand dollars. And the principal is still unpaid.

"However, State Assemblyman Lee T. Bashore, of Glendora, has introduced a bill in California's Legislature, providing for the retirement of the $2,227,500 bond issue, 'when, and if' the State shows a budgetary surplus. This happy consummation seems imminent, as a surplus of over $25,000,000 has accrued in the State Treasury, due principally to abolition of the State relief administration, and concurrent piling up of sales-tax receipts.

"Meanwhile, from its niche in the 120-foot level of the Monument to our Country's Father, the block of gold quartz, California's grand gesture so generously given, glows in gold-streaked magnificence.

"The part, this time, is greater than the whole; in cost, at any rate."

Let's Not Forget Those Who Have Borne the Brunt of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Robert T. Merrill, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, to all Members of Congress:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1943.

To all Members of Congress:

Let us not forget—"those who have borne the brunt of war."

Inflation spells disaster to persons of fixed income. No one can deny that we are caught in the vicious spiral of ever increasing costs of the essentials of life—shelter, food, and clothing.

Aged and disabled war veterans, and the helpless dependents of deceased war veterans receiving compensation or pension from the Government, are striving desperately to exist under fixed and meager incomes, but are rapidly becoming the leaders in the ranks of the ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clad. Wartime wages mean nothing to them—they don't get them. Rapidly soaring wartime prices mean everything—moving to poorer quarters, less and inferior food, cast-off clothing, cold, misery, loss of faith in their fellow citizens and in their Government.

In past months, private business led the way in seeing the necessity for increasing wages and salaries in order to give industrial workers a decent living standard. More recently, the Federal Government recognized the fact that its employees could no longer exist on the wages it was paying. Increases of from 10 to 20 percent were granted by the Congress, with more consideration under way. There can be no quarrel with industry and Government for taking that action, it should be commended on all sides, but the time is now at hand for the Congress of the United States to consider the plight of our Government wards endeavoring to live on existing compensation or pension, a comparatively small group, but one whose cause is just and must have immediate attention.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States suggests as a remedy the Rankin bill (H. R. 1121) to increase by 15 percent the rates of compensation or pension to veterans and dependents of deceased veterans under laws and regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration. Other veterans' organizations see eye to eye with the Veterans of Foreign Wars in this urgent task of obtaining a reasonable increase in income for the patient and loyal men, women, and children, whose lives have been touched heavily by war, and who are struggling along on monthly pittances from the richest and greatest Nation on earth, but one that at times appears to look with greater favor on peoples in distant lands than on its own.

The 1942 average annual value of monetary benefits (exclusive of insurance and adjusted compensation) paid to veterans and dependents of veterans of all wars (War of 1812, War with Mexico, Indian wars, Civil War, Spanish-American War, Regular Establishment, World War No. 1, World War No. 2) was $504, or a monthly average of $42. The modest increase of 15 percent, which we are requesting, would raise the average to $579.60 per year, or $48.30 per month. This increase of only $6.30 per month, or 21 cents per day would not cover the increase in the price of food alone during the past year.

Surely no one would question this small increase for disabled war veterans, their wives, widows, and children. The only thing wrong about it is that it is far too little, but the group for whom we are pleading is patiently, loyally, and patriotically awaiting the time when the strain on the Federal Government's finances is less, and a world at peace can survey the wreckage of this global war. The American people can then build a program under which those who served and bled, and the dependents of those who sacrificed their all for the sake of humanity, may always have freedom from want.

May we count on you to give sympathetic and active support to H. R. 1121, or some other satisfactory plan to bring increased sustenance and renewed hope to these helpless wards of our country?

Respectfully,

ROBERT T. MERRILL,
Commander in Chief.

Increase of Pay for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer, of March 10, 1943:

POSTAL WORKERS NEED THIS AID

In approving bills providing a $300 bonus for postal workers, to be effective until 6 months after the war, Senate and House committees recognize that they have been virtually forgotten men among the vast number of Federal employees.

Except for some temporary and inadequate benefits, which expire April 30, these faithful, hard-working servants of the public have received no increase in salaries since 1925. The recent and continuing rise in costs of living has accentuated their plight.

At the same time they have witnessed extensive pay increases granted to workers in war industries to enable them to cope with higher prices for the necessaries of life. These war jobs beckon to the kind of men whom the Government needs for the Postal Service, but the Nation requires their knowledge and experience for the indispensable work they are now performing.

The House bill for this emergency pay allowance will soon come up for consideration on the floor. Its prompt passage, with similar action by the Senate, would be widely approved.

Stassen Challenges the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD P. GALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the American Mercury for March 1943:

STASSEN CHALLENGES THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

(By William Bradford Huie)

Fate appears to be tapping the shoulder of the Republican Party. In the elections of 1942, the people elevated what had been a minority party to a full partnership in the war Government. Seventy-five million Americans now have Republican Governors in their State capitals. Two-thirds of the war production is now carried on in States with Republican administrations. At the recent meeting of the Council of State Governments in Baltimore, it was easy to see that Governors like Stassen of Minnesota, Bricker of Ohio, Saltonstall of Massachusetts, and Griswold of Nebraska have taken the ball away from their Democratic colleagues. In Washington, the smart whisper in the embassies says: "Cultivate the Republican leaders, for the Republicans may make the peace."

It is possible to believe that the trend toward the Republican Party will continue; that the voter's impulse to "sweep the bureaucrats out of Washington" will grow stronger; and that the Republican Party, indeed, may find itself charged with the responsibility of leadership at the peace table and during the post-war reorganization of this country.

Because of this possibility, every American must be concerned with the mind of the Republican Party, with the thinking of the Republican leadership, and with the Republican plan for the peace and for post-war America. The jockeying for leadership and the internal policy debates within the Republican fold are not the concern of Republicans only, because they may well prove

fateful for the whole country and the whole world. The Republicans should be encouraged to draw a new blueprint, to agree among themselves as to its specifications, and to present their blueprint to the people for approval. Unless this is done, the country must run the risk of conferring leadership upon a negative Republican Party which either has no program at all or has the wrong kind of program.

One Republican who is determined to make his party keep its date with destiny is 35-year-old Harold E. Stassen, second-term Governor of Minnesota. Expecting to enter the Navy in April, Stassen is wasting no time in his efforts to promote discussion of Republican aims and ideals. He thinks that if Republicans will talk enough and debate enough during the next 15 months they can evolve a plan which the people will approve and which may save the world from another dose of cynicism and disillusionment of the 1919 brand.

I sat with Stassen on a Saturday afternoon high up in the St. Paul Hotel. Outside it was 22 below zero and we looked out the window across snow-packed houses and streets as we talked. He has none of the caginess of the usual professional politician, but talks easily and earnestly with no asides or off-the-record remarks. His ancestry is Norwegian and German and he is built like a Minnesota halfback.

"As I see this war," he said, "there is only one thing really important about it. And that is that something good come out of it. And I mean a positive good, not just the negative good of our having saved ourselves from defeat. If we can get something good out of the war, if we can give hope to our own people and the people of the world, then I think we'll see the greatest upsurge of human enterprise the world has ever known. There'll be no limit to what can be done. But if we muff the peace, we'll have only disillusionment and great arms races and misery and war. So it's the responsibility of everyone of us to try to figure out some way that will help us to get that good out of the war.

"That's what I am trying to do. Just as one man and as a Governor of one State and as a member of the Republican Party, I'm trying to figure out how we can get that good out of the war. While we are fighting, I think we ought to keep talking about the peace from every pulpit and rostrum in the country. No man ought to be dogmatic, because none of us ca nbe certain about these things. But if we believe in democracy, we believe that by talking enough and giving the people the facts, we can come to a sound conclusion."

I asked him: "Do you think the people will want the Republican Party to make the peace and rebuild the country?"

"Yes, I do," he answered. "And I think the Republican Party has the greatest opportunity in its history. Next year is the election year. It looks as if the war will still be going on, but it should be nearing an end. That means that just before the end of the war—just before the peace negotiations begin—the American people will have a chance to say what kind of peace they want and what this country's commitments shall be in the post-war world. I think this circumstance is important. We can prevent failure and disillusionment and cynicism if we, as Republican leaders, will tell the people exactly what we propose to do after the war, and then proceed to do it.

"This time the people can send instructed delegates to the peace conference."

Stassen's belief in presenting specific proposals to the people derives from his own political experience. In his first race for Governor, he avoided oratory and simply went out and told the voters what he wanted to do if elected. He offered a detailed plan, and when he was elected, he used his plan as a blueprint. He converted overdrafts into surpluses, cleaned house, gave Minnesota a model labor-relations law, and improved public services. His reelection last November was a foregone conclusion.

The same plan, he thinks, can be used now with relation to post-war America and the post-war world. The blueprint, with specific proposed actions, must be evolved and presented to the people. Then, when the majority has approved it, the administration can proceed. With plenty of public discussion, a resulting agreement, and honest leadership, there need be no doubts as to where America stands at the peace conference.

II

I asked Governor Stassen what he considers proper Republican activities during 1943 and 1944, while the war is being prosecuted. He replied:

"Our first responsibility, of course, is to make the greatest possible contribution to the total strength of America in the drive for complete victory. We Republicans should remind ourselves every day that victory for the United Nations is tremendously more important than that our party win in 1944. We must expose mistakes of the national administration only on a basis that will contribute to the correction of those mistakes for the country's sake.

"As to specific, constructive steps we can take, I think that we should seek to have the people receive a franker and fuller report of the facts of the war. Facts breed confidence and facts lead to the correction of mistakes. In the field of military news, I think we ought to see that censorship is not used to keep mistakes and failures from the people. In the field of domestic news, I think we ought to see that all necessary sacrifices and inconveniences are explained to the people. The people don't mind necessary sacrifice. What makes them mad is any theory which holds that unnecessary sacrifice is justified in order to train the people for necessary sacrifice. When new restrictions are decreed, I think the Republican Party should call for detailed explanations from the appointed executives who are demanding the sacrifice.

"We Republicans should fight for better management of the Government. We should try to prevent buck-passing in Washington by asking for more specific responsibilities for the various executives. The people are tired of the creation and recreation of seemingly powerless commissions.

"Then I think that the Republican Party should make certain that the American machinery of government suffers no permanent injury during the war. We must recognize that great powers must be delegated; that to fight a total war, we must adopt some of the methods of totalitarianism. But we should make sure that all delegations of power are temporary, and that the totalitarian structures which may be necessary now are built so that they can be demolished quickly after the war."

Governor Stassen feels that Republican Governors can make a vital contribution during the war. He outlined to me four specific objectives for a State government in wartime. They are:

1. A reduction of the number of State employees so that State expenses can be reduced and so that manpower can be made available to war industry and agriculture.

2. The maintenance of State public services in the best feasible condition, and at worst, to save them from permanent dislocation.

3. An effort to improve the State's fiscal position so that it will be prepared to meet the shock of peacetime readjustments. The Minnesota State Government is setting aside funds for State public works to be begun the moment the war is over. The State has halted all public works at present so as to channel manpower into the war effort and to build up a backlog of public works to provide employment during the transition period.

4. Intelligent planning for the problem of the returning soldier. Minnesota, alone among the States, has already set up a fund of $5,000,000 to be used in helping Minnesota soldiers to find peacetime places. A part of this fund is to go to helping boys resume educations which are being interrupted by the war.

III

I asked Governor Stassen what he thought should be included in the Republican plan for domestic reorganization after the war. He replied:

"I think our first effort should be directed toward retaining all the good that has come from the New Deal experiments. We should dispel any notions that a Republican administration is going to be reactionary, and that it is going to take the country back to any particular year in our history. The year 1928 is ancient history. We must consolidate the good and move forward.

"Labor legislation is an example. I think the New Deal laws affecting labor have been good, and if I could change the Wagner Act today, I would change only one provision—the one which prohibits the employer from talking to his employees. With all of its new powers, labor must expect to assume more responsibility in the post-war world and the better unions already are preparing to do this. A Republican administration should concern itself with efforts to help the rank and file put their unions on a more business-like and democratic basis. Union leaders should not be allowed to dispose of funds without a ballot vote of the membership. Democracy should begin at home with the unions.

"But I don't believe that the labor problem in post-war America will be difficult of solution. The war, with its totalitarian menaces, has reminded our wage earners that they have as large a stake in our system of private enterprise as has capital."

"What about this term 'private enterprise?' Will it need a new definition?" I asked.

"Not a new definition" the Governor said, "but the Republican Party should dispel certain misunderstandings. We should set forth again that the individual urge to strive and to acquire, far from being immoral, is the basic and proper motivation of democracy. Perhaps it can no longer be said that every American cradle holds a potential millionaire, but it should be explained again that the primary concern of this Nation is to safeguard the right of every American boy to acquire an estate of his own. Moreover, we should announce that if this Nation is to continue to grow and prosper, it will have to encourage the individual to carve his own niche, pay for his own farm, or build his own business."

"Do you foresee a Beveridge plan for America?" I asked.

"No," he answered. "Not in the sense that it is being considered for England. Perhaps England needs the Beveridge plan, and certainly the extension of social security should be a post-war objective in any Republican blueprint. But we need to remind ourselves that the attainment of a Beveridge plan is no fit primary objective of a democratic society. A Beveridge plan may become necessary through failures of the democratic society, but it is no worthy end in itself. I imagine that the American boys returning from our armies will be far more interested in the scope of individual opportunity we can provide them than they will in whether we have attained state medicine or state burial.

"Government works and Government development of national resources should be continued in the post-war world. Our security floor should be buttressed and extend-

ed. But these two lesser responsibilities of free government must not be emphasized to the point where they obscure the primary objective, of encouraging free enterprise and individual initiative."

Because the charge was made in the last election that Wendell Willkie, whom Governor Stassen supported, was no different from Roosevelt, I asked the Governor this pointed question:

"What do you consider to be the main difference between your ideas and Roosevelts?"

He hesitated and considered the question carefully.

"I think the difference is a matter of emphasis. Individual opportunity and social security are the two great considerations of a people's government. The New Deal has sought security above all else. I think that a new balance must be worked out between security and opportunity. Opportunity and the individual drive to acquire are the motive power of a democracy. Security is the safety device. I think that a Republican administration should seek to maintain the safety devices, but should make certain that the motive power is encouraged. A Republican tax program, for instance, should call for a readjustment of any tax which is repressive to business. The idea that taxation is a proper weapon to be used against business is a harmful fallacy. American business shall need to thrive and expand in the post-war world in order to provide employment for our people and to provide tax moneys for paying our debts and financing the reconstruction program. Taxes must be contrived to encourage business to expand rather than to threaten its very existence."

IV

I questioned Governor Stassen at length about his ideas as to the international aspects of the post-war world. What kind of organization should this country advocate and, particularly, what sort of plans should the Republican Party present? There is nothing dogmatic about his answers. He believes it his duty as a Republican leader to initiate ideas in speeches and in correspondence. He invites argument and suggestion and his mail is filled with both. He reiterates that his proposals are tentative and are made so that by 1944, when the Republican Party faces the electorate, the party can have a specific blueprint to offer.

The tentative Stassen plan for world reorganization embraces the following considerations:

The creation of the United Nations of the World, with China, Russia, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the United States and all the smaller United Nations as charter members. Each nation would retain its own national identity, and would make only such concessions to the international organization as seem to be indicated by present and future developments.

The key governmental device to handle international functions, as he sees it, would be a single-house parliament. Representation and voting power would be based upon a formula which would consider the numbers of the literate population of the respective nations, as well as their resources and contribution to the joint government. The United Nations parliament would then select a chairman of the United Nations council and the chairman would select seven members for his council and submit them to parliament for approval. The council would thereupon become the executive side of the United Nations Government, and the parliament, of course, the legislative branch. The United Nations government could then function in seven major categories, each under one of the United Nations councilmen:

1. To establish temporary governments over the Axis Nations, preferably using citizens of the United Nations whose ancestry goes back to the particular Axis nation. Under these temporary governments, the Axis Nations would be entirely disarmed, their criminal leaders punished. But there would be no wholesale reprisals against civilian populations.

2. To administer the great international airports and airways of the future. Air transport of the future will have to be regulated by an international agency just as American railroads must be regulated by national rather than by many State agencies. There will be thousands of finely trained pilots who will know the airports of the world as they know their own back yards. The United Nations government will establish rights of flight, enforce rules of the air, coordinate weather data, control radio beams and communications, and maintain safe international airports throughout the world.

3. To administer the gateways of the seven seas. In the post-war world, there must be complete freedom of the seas. The development in the air will not lessen the importance of shipping, and the control of the gateways to the seas—the Panama and Suez Canals and Gibraltar—should be an international function. This step will require concessions from the United States, the British Commonwealth, perhaps China, and perhaps Turkey, which controls the Bosporus and the Dardanelles. Objection to this move will be slight, since the great development in the air will reduce the military significance of the ocean gateways.

4. To increase trade between the peoples of the world. Only in this way can the general standards of living throughout the world be gradually improved. Only in this way can countries with high standards of living maintain high standards without war. This does not contemplate a sudden change to universal free trade, but it does contemplate embarking upon a definite trend toward increased world trade. It will involve assurances by our Government to agriculture that the total percentage of agricultural export and import will be maintained at an equal level. Important factors in the world balance of trade will be increased tourist trade and increased capital investments in undeveloped countries.

5. To increase the literacy of the people of the world. This should be approached, not as any Utopian idea, but with the realization that the ability to read and write is the key to much of the progress of man.

6. To establish a world code of justice and a United Nations Court to administer that code. The code of justice should include provisions protecting minorities, preventing religious persecution and abolishing slavery. Members of the Court should be named by the highest courts of the member nations.

7. To establish a United Nations Legion, consisting of units of air strength, efficient modern naval forces and highly mechanized land divisions. The United Nations Legion would enforce the code of justice, support the administration of international areas, and insure the continued disarmament of probationary areas. The basis for this International Legion is being formed as the war is fought. The various foreign units within the British Army can furnish many volunteers for the Legion when the war is over. There will be no necessity for the troops of any one nation to take over the job of "policing the world."

The seat of the United Nations Government should be some point like Panama, which would be readily accessible by sea and air to all continents, world-wide in its very atmosphere, and yet easily defended from attack.

As Governor Stassen talked of his "international plan," seven big B–24 bombers maneuvered over St. Paul and we could see them from my window. When he had finished, he turned to me and said: "How can any American watch our development in the air without realizing that we must come to some sort of international organization? We don't have to give away America or sacrifice any of our standards of living. We only have to recognize what is happening around us.

"The Midwest was once called isolationist. Minnesota was in another world from Europe and Asia. But now those big bombers fly over us every day. We are a way station for planes flying both to Europe and Asia. In this hotel, there are probably a score of boys who, until 2 years ago, had never been outside of Minnesota or Kansas or Georgia. But now they hop off for Alaska, or Australia, or India, or England as nonchalantly as though they were going to the corner drugstore. And after the war, they'll continue hopping off in planes that will carry American-made goods to the people who will want them. Perhaps isolationism died not because it was bad in its day, but because it became impractical."

These are the current, tentative thoughts of a man who believes that leaders should tell the people what they are thinking, what they plan to do, and how they plan to do it.

Stassen is Republican-born, Republican-trained, and has remained a good party man. He believes that Republicans should start working out their plans so that they can have a blueprint to offer in next year's elections. And he believes that the Republican Party can best supervise the rebuilding of this country and the world.

There are many cross-currents of opinion both inside the Republican Party and outside. There is no certainty that the party will be called upon to make the peace and to superintend the domestic reconstruction. There probably are sound objections to some of Governor Stassen's ideas. But there can be little argument with his method and no question of his sincerity. His proposed plans stand as an invitation to thought and debate by all Americans, and particularly, as a challenge to those within his party who would steer the elephant in other directions.

Pay-As-You-Go Is Still a Good Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post:

PAY-AS-YOU-GO IS STILL A GOOD IDEA

By this time most good citizens have figured out their income taxes for 1942, and next Monday the check for at least the first installment goes to the internal-revenue collector. Unfortunately, however, income tax still lags behind income.

Perhaps this situation will be changed to some extent in the next few months. It takes a long time to act, because neither the Treasury nor the House Ways and Means Committee, which initiates revenue legislation, has been quick to understand the importance of bringing income tax up to income as it is being earned. When Mr. Beardsley Ruml, originator of the so-called Ruml plan, appeared before the committee last month, it might have been supposed that he headed a movement to evade income tax instead of expressing the growing concern of the American people over means for paying it. Mr. Ruml was polished off as ranking with "the great 'gimme' exponents of the past decade," and

Representative CRAWFORD, who is not a member of the committee, but appeared as a witness, declared that "even Dr. Townsend has never advocated remitting taxes." Another member wanted to know what the soldiers in the field would say when they came home to discover that Mr. Ruml had arranged to have them pay for all the tanks and cannon with which they had been fighting. In the Senate, a few days later, Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, described the Ruml plan as "the beginning of a strike by income-taxpayers against our Government."

Despite this extraordinary display of indifference to what Mr. Ruml's plan is and lack of curiosity to find out, the campaign for pay-as-you-go has accomplished something. It has hammered home the truth that taxes for 1943 cannot be paid as they are earned unless some disposition is made of the tax debt for 1942. Mr. Randolph Paul, of the Treasury, who had explained that, although the Treasury would not lose receipts under the Ruml plan, it would lose assets, was all for pay-as-you-go in principle, but the nearest he came to an answer to the question "How?" was a veiled suggestion of double taxation. Mr. Paul would have none of the Ruml plan because, in his view, 60 men with million-dollar incomes would each receive a benefit of at least $854,000. * * * Those who had no income in 1942 would receive no benefit whatever. In other words, the Ruml plan was bad, not only because it forgives taxes but because it doesn't forgive taxes that were never paid.

Of course, as was inevitable, the members followed up their denunciations of Mr. Ruml's forgiveness, which was not forgiveness, with a series of compromise plans most of which did involve forgiveness. One was a scheme to cancel the normal tax and the first bracket of surtax on the 1942 incomes. Another would apply the 1941 rates to 1942 incomes and collect currently on 1943 incomes.

Another would collect as much as possible from those who were able to pay on their 1942 incomes plus the tax on 1943 incomes and, while not putting the overwhelming majority of small taxpayers in jail, would leave them with the same old income-tax debt still hanging over their heads. Still another would cancel half the tax on 1942 incomes and collect in 1943 the tax on 1943 incomes.

In other words the problem of our legislators has been to give us Ruml, or a part of Ruml, with Ruml left out. That intrepid reformer has earned the reward of all who succeed in putting politicians on the hot seat. He has also earned the gratitude of millions of people, who are not trying to evade taxes but only to pay them, and who have made a pretty shrewd guess that as soon as faces can be saved all round, the essentials of the reform which Mr. Ruml has so convincingly and urbanely urged will be a part of our income-tax procedure.

Let's Forget Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, most Americans, regardless of their political affiliations, are proud of our boys in the armed forces of our country. Politics was forgotten at Pearl Harbor, Bataan, and Corregidor. There is no politics in Guadalcanal, in Tunisia, nor in any of the other battle fronts of the world. Our boys, Republicans and Democrats, march and fight together as Americans so that we can continue to live as freemen and women.

Most Americans, regardless of their political affiliations, resent the recent unwarranted attack made on Col. Elliott Roosevelt by the gentleman from Kansas, Congressman LAMBERTSON, Republican, a bitter Roosevelt hater. His own colleagues denounced this kind of politics on the floor of the House as highly unpatriotic.

I have received a number of letters from constituents of mine denouncing the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] and pleading with him to forget politics. I am happy to include as part of my remarks a masterful letter sent to me and addressed to the gentleman from Kansas, Congressman LAMBERTSON, from Mrs. Mary Deshong, of North Braddock, Pa., a Republican committeewoman by political affiliation but a true and genuine American:

BRADDOCK, PA., *March 6, 1943.*

To the Congress of United States:

DEAR SIR, OR MR. LAMBERTSON: No doubt I should say Mr. Congressman, but I don't feel you are worthy of the title as Congressman after the attack you have just made on the President's son, Elliott Roosevelt. You may think you are a clever politician, but I must say you are a dumb one.

I am a Republican, also a committeewoman in my district, and I would never attempt to make a remark like you have made to hurt one boy in Uncle Sam's Army, regardless of who it may be. I believe in justice and I believe the President's sons are backing this war 100 percent. And with all the talk of the President becoming a dictator, thank God his sons still believe in free speech. They would have not answered you so quickly Mr. LAMBERTSON if they hadn't. Yes, this is still America, where everybody speaks, even the people. Forget the political side and try winning the war for us. If some of you Congressmen think Elliott Roosevelt is not in the fighting, why don't you go and enlist yourself and get in the same unit. Let the women fill your jobs. Maybe we would make our boys feel America was worth fighting for.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. MARY DESHONG.

O. P. A. Livestock Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter from the Honorable Prentiss M. Brown, Administrator of the O. P. A., with reference to the attitude of his agency toward price ceilings on livestock:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D. C. March 9, 1943.

The Honorable GEORGE GILLIE,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. GILLIE: This will acknowledge your memorandum of February 27, 1943, with which you enclosed a letter from Mr. Herman J. Eckrich, of Fort Wayne, Ind., in which he suggests that ceilings be placed on livestock.

We have felt that it would be possible to regulate prices in the meat industry without imposing livestock ceilings. It was our opinion that by establishing appropriate wholesale meat ceilings and retail meat ceilings, we could provide consumers with sufficient quantities of meat at reasonable prices and also give producers, processors, and meat distributors a reasonable margin of profit on their operations. However, we have found that there has been such active competition for live animals that many packers have found it exceedingly difficult to purchase live animals at prices which would permit them to conduct their operations on a profitable basis. Since the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, provides that all persons are to be given an opportunity to conduct their operations on a profitable basis, we have considered it advisable to explore the possibility of establishing livestock ceilings. Accordingly, we have formulated a maximum price regulation providing for ceilings on live hogs. We intend to submit this regulation to the Secretary of Agriculture for approval.

There are numerous problems relating to live cattle ceilings. We are devoting a great deal of our time to the solution of these pressing problems and it is very possible that a maximum price regulation, covering live cattle ceilings, will be forwarded to the Secretary of Agriculture for approval in the near future. In the meantime, we are doing everything possible to provide for an orderly distribution of our available meat supply to all sections of the country so as to insure everyone their fair share of the meat which is available for domestic civilian consumption.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN,

Administrator.

Resolution of the Women's League for Political Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas persistent demands from high administration sources and bills now pending in Congress call for the drafting of women for the war effort; and

Whereas such demands presuppose the existence of a great available pool of womanpower, witness Maj. Gen. James T. McSherry's recent reference to the 33,600,000 idle women; and

Whereas contrary to this presumption the homes of the Nation today are being drained of womanpower to such an extent that the clamor for Government nurseries to care for children of working mothers grows well-nigh hysterical as mounting juvenile delinquency, youthful crime, shocking cases of child neglect and absenteeism stir the Nation; and

Whereas the exclusion of mothers with young children from compulsory draft is but an empty gesture when economic pressure due to soaring living costs, drafting of fathers, and other more or less worthy motives impel mothers in ever-increasing numbers to seek gainful employment, which fact is attested by the experience of the War Manpower Commission in various enrollment campaigns which resulted in applicants being

35 to 50 percent mothers with young children; and

Whereas scandalous waste of manpower today exists in Government bureaus whose endless and often meaningless questionnaires cause further waste of countless hours in farms and factories, and likewise industry itself is guilty of hoarding manpower; and

Whereas the same shortsighted, disastrous policies that stripped manpower from the farms of the Nation now threatens to strip from American homes the one truly stabilizing factor in our social order, the mother and homemaker, whose willing hands have ever rendered service freely: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, members of the Women's League for Political Education, hereby condemn the proposals to conscript the women of the Nation as utterly unwarranted by the facts, and a bold attempt to bring the yet unregimented women under absolute control of an overpowerful administration; and be it further

Resolved, That we challenge the proponents of such legislation to point out where the so-called idle women exist. Are they among the farm families whose women today are carrying double burdens? Are they among the urban dwellers whose daughters are working day and night in defense plants? Or perchance the women approaching 50 who today are refused employment? Will you find them among the millions of young mothers (hundreds of thousands of whose husbands are in service), whose first-born even now send the Nation's birth rate soaring, and whose numbers it is estimated will reach 12,000,000 by the end of 1944? We point out that it is not more compulsion that is needed in this crisis, but more common sense and a sober realization of just where this Nation is headed; and be it further

Resolved, That we decry the spurious remedy of providing public nurseries for children of working mothers as degrading to motherhood and abhorrent to American ideals, to say nothing of the expense sustained by the Government for high-salaried personnel, etc., which would certainly equal, if not exceed, the cost of enabling mothers to care for their own children instead of turning them over to the bureaucrats; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon Congress to decide now just what this Nation can undertake to furnish in the way of manpower and materials to conduct this global war, without destroying the very thing for which we are fighting. We repeat with Justice Davis: "It could well be said that a country preserved at the sacrifice of the cardinal principles of liberty is not worth the cost of preservation"; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to Hon. ROBERT T. REYNOLDS, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, Members of Congress from Illinois, and such other public officials as may be deemed advisable.

Railroad Transportation in Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ROCKWELL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial from the Legislature of the State of Colorado:

House Joint Memorial 4

Whereas the railroads furnish transportation which is vital to the war effort and the national defense; and

Whereas the narrow-gage railroad between Antonito, Colo., and Santa Fe, N. Mex., has been abandoned; and

Whereas at various times there have been discussions and requests for the abandonment of railroads connecting Antonito and Durango, Colo., and Alamosa and Salida, Colo.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the senate concurring herein), That protest is made hereby to any future and further abandonment of railroads in the State of Colorado, whether narrow-gage or otherwise and that there be no further replacement of such railroad transportation service by the use of trucks on the public highways for the reason that such abandonments must have an adverse effect upon the transportation facilities of the State with a resultant unfavorable deterrent upon the State's war effort; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado so as to urge their vigorous support in accomplishing the purposes of this memorial.

Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it will be difficult to fix a permanent peace with so many things in the air.

Tomorrow in the House we will raise the debt limit eighty-five billion, making it two hundred and ten. We worried about the national credit when it was forty-five.

We learned first-hand at the lend-lease luncheon at the new de luxe Statler Hotel Thursday that dehydration is going to win the war.

The pincer movement from far-flung fronts by Elliott, Winchell, and Woodring on this poor farmer boy is forcing him to get out his slingshot.

T. Roosevelt fought every form of special privilege. It was the essence of his progressiveness. His sons and his grandsons are living by it.

Our hats are off in devout appreciation, especially for the 2,200 of our boys missing in recent fighting in Africa—they gave ground and then came back gloriously.

The next few days will determine whether it will be farm security, extension, or a new food administration set-up to bring help to farmers in the form of labor.

"The social problem created by economic insecurity is many-sided and requires for its solution a series of diversified programs." You could pick this out in the dark.

The unbelievable is Senator HARRY TRUMAN coming to Washington as the creation of a party machine that emitted some odor, and then becoming a great independent public servant. He smells like a rose. Gen. George C. Marshall has settled the question about having a field marshal. He said it sounded too much like the dictator nations. He is content to hold only the military title of Washington, Grant, and Pershing.

The Educator and His Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able and interesting article entitled "The Educator and His Government," written by Hon. Joseph Rosier, a former colleague of ours in this body from the State of West Virginia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In times past the professional educator has not occupied the position and exerted the influence that he ought to in relation to government. The philosopher has been a positive influence throughout history, and his ideas have made a great contribution to social progress. In the history of our country the man of education has been rather set apart and has not been recognized as a participant in the world of actual affairs. It has come to pass that academic activity is interpreted as something which does not have anything to do with the actual affairs of life; in fact, the teacher is pictured in tradition and in literature as a freakish person, visionary, and lacking in a knowledge of the common everyday affairs of life. This has probably been a logical development, because the scholar spent most of his time in the scientific laboratory and in research. He was a discoverer of facts and a person who assembled knowledge and made it available to other people. This brought about a wide separation between the men who, as scholars, knew a great deal and the practical men who possessed little knowledge but were experienced in doing things. In the realm of modern educational discussion this contrast appears in the difference between theory and practicability. It is unfortunate that the man who devotes his time to the study and development of theories should find himself in a situation where he is not able to put his theories into practice. Some of our recent educational philosophers have sought to harness or bring together these two factors so essential to any scientific and educational advancement.

It is a happy development to observe that in recent years there has been more disposition on the part of the leaders in public affairs to call upon the men who have spent their years in libraries and laboratories in the accumulation of knowledge and scientific facts. In the field of government, for a good many years now, executives have called into their services the so-called "brain trusters." As I understand it, a

"brain truster" is an educator or a scholar who has theoretically mastered certain phases of political science and economics. He furnishes his knowledge to those entrusted with executive responsibility in the Government and in this way the Government has profited by the services of the scholar and educator. There still remains the disposition among a great many leaders of public affairs to ridicule or criticize the contributions of the "brain trusters." The utilization of educators and men trained in certain fields has not been the resort of any particular party. While the so-called New Deal of recent years has called more educators and scholars into its service than any previous administration, it is a fact that President Hoover called into his services a considerable group of scholars who made a notable contribution to the study of the various phases of our social and economic life. The volume which that group compiled is a very important contribution to the study of modern government in its relation to social welfare. As a result of this development nearly all State legislatures and the Congress of the United States have groups of men drawn from the colleges and the universities to act as advisers in the drafting of legislation and in suggestions for the improvement of existing laws and enactment of new laws that will improve governmental service. In spite of all the criticism heaped upon the scholar in politics, the fact remains that some of the most beneficial legislation in recent years has been the result of the studies and investigations of such men.

There is no doubt in my mind that we have here a field in which the services of the educator will become increasingly beneficial in years to come. Those of us who attempt to evaluate education are encouraged by the tendency of leaders in politics and government to give more weight to the theories and the studies of men who come from the so-called academic cloisters. The recognized extension of education for this type of service should be an inspiration to all men and women in the educational field. Great opportunities for rendering public service are offered to those who are able to develop ideas and theories that can be applied to the operation of modern government.

There is an increasing number of men who have been called from the academic shades into legislative and executive positions. Some of the outstanding men in the Halls of Congress were, before entering upon their governmental careers, members of university and college facilities. I think a study of our political history will show that the standards of educational preparation for men in public life have been raised. While it too often happens that men of meager education and little general knowledge are elevated to positions of power and significance, generally speaking, the great majority of men in public leadership have had the training provided by our colleges and universities. In this connection, the educator has a rare opportunity to instruct young men and women who are to become the leaders in civic affairs, some of whom will inevitably occupy important legislative and executive positions in the Government. It may be that the teacher in his instruction of the young people who are to become leaders has a greater opportunity for public service than if he should step out of his academic circle into active political leadership himself. While I do not think the professional educator should aspire to leadership in the political field, I do not think he should evade responsibilities that may be placed upon him if duty calls. The educator is primarily a man who provides training and knowledge for those who are to become leaders. In this direction he can probably render his greatest service. It has often happened that men who stood high in the academic world failed when thrust into the maelstrom of public life. While such failures have been conspicuous, they have been no more numerous than those made by men coming from other fields.

In my opinion, we are coming into that period of social development when the educator, as a result of his wide knowledge and study, should be an authority in matters of human progress and government. I do not mean by this that the educator alone can solve all the problems that confront us, he should as a result of his study and investigations, be able to contribute ideas that are of value. We have come into that period of civilization and progress when a knowledge of past history and investigation in the field of modern politics should be recognized; in fact, I do not think it is possible to solve present-day problems without the knowledge and keenness of mind which the educator and the educated man can bring to bear. I have no words of ridicule for the so-called professional politician, if he is a thinker and a student and applies the principles gained from practical experience, to the solution of governmental problems. However, we should have little patience with the type of politician who caters to the whims and prejudices of people and bases his public activities upon such foundations. The problems that confront us in this modern age are too serious to be solved by those who cannot bring facts and tested knowledge to their solution.

I think a special obligation rests upon the educator in the present day to be a thorough student of history and of government. I know of no better source of inspiration than a study of the essays and declarations of those who founded our own Government. Probably no greater studies have been made concerning the problems of government than were made by men like Hamilton, Madison, and Jay in the so-called Federalist papers. Thomas Jefferson, whose anniversary we celebrate this year and for whom a great memorial is to be dedicated in our Nation's Capital, was a profound student of government.

It would be a very appropriate time for educators to make a study of the principles of human freedom and liberty as enunciated by the author of the Declaration of Independence. The struggle for human liberty has been going on for centuries and in the different periods of history there have always been men of training and vision who have kept alive the seed of freedom. Surely, the educator, as the instructor of potential political leaders, should have a thorough knowledge of government in its development through the ages. I would particularly emphasize the study of American history and the development of the American theory of government. This is especially important at this time because the soundness of our form of government is being challenged by dictators in other parts of the world. There never was a time when it was more needful for all of us to study the principles on which the American Government has been built. The value of American freedom is based upon the immortal Declaration of Independence, which was a cry for freedom. Our form of government is built upon the American Constitution, framed by the greatest group of students of government that ever appeared at one time. Time has tested the theories embodied in the Constitution of the United States, and it could never have been made to work without leadership to put it into effect. Educators ought to be able to speak with knowledge concerning the development of our type of government from the time the Constitution was adopted down to the present moment when great new problems face us to be solved under that Constitution and in accordance with its spirit and principles.

Important as it is for every American educator to know his own government, in the next period of history it will be equally important for him to know something about the various types of government that have been developed in the different nations of the world. We are engaged today in a great war in which we need to preserve in the world the finest type of government, and while we seek to preserve our own particular way of life, we must recognize the fact that other nations and peoples will desire to retain their own particular type of government. We feel that our form of government is more conducive to the development of our type of life, but we must realize that other forms of government may be more desirable for peoples who are differently situated from us. While we like to think that the United States of America has developed the most advanced form of free government, we must at the same time recognize that many other nations have made contributions to human freedom. The educator should go back to ancient history for a full study of the kind of government developed in nations like China, Greece and Rome, and in recent history the whole theory of the British form of government. No teacher who aspires to instruct or train young men and women for service in modern life should be ignorant of the contributions which have been made to human freedom by these and other nations. Their history is replete with contributions to liberty and the use of knowledge in all the principles of human progress.

In his studies of history, the educator should strive to analyze the causes of war which is the greatest scourge that has been heaped on humanity throughout all the ages. Indeed it is time for the student in his library to survey all of the struggles that have gone on among nations in times past to analyze those facts of human nature which lead men and nations to make war upon each other. The educator should have a vision of a time, not now in sight, when men will no longer engage in such futile struggles. Surely it is possible to establish a durable peace among the peoples of the world. It is a vision which some men in all ages have entertained. I do not suggest that the present-day educator should in any current sense be a pacifist, but I do think he should, through his studies and investigations, develop opinions and beliefs concerning all of the factors involved in war and peace.

One of the most pressing problems in the present-day world is that of political and economic power among the nations of the world. If we are to have a world in which men may live in peace, nations with power must learn to exercise such power for the welfare, not only of their own people, but of all of the people of the world. I do not believe there is any other question in the whole field of government more important than this. Out of the world struggle in which we are engaged will evolve a few nations of great power. Such nations will have within their grasp the opportunity to organize a world on a basis of cooperation and mutual helpfulness rather than on a foundation of selfish exercise of authority. Educators, I believe, recognize the fact that our own Nation can no longer live in isolation. It was the ideal of the founders of our Government that we might be free from foreign entanglements, but modern developments in transportation and communication have made it impossible for any one nation to live in separation from the other nations of the world. For this reason leaders in world government must exercise power with fairness and justice to all. This will probably be one of the greatest problems confronting the leading nations of the world when this war has reached its conclusion. If those in power, sitting around the peace table, seek to gratify their selfish desires, they will only plant the seeds of future wars. The educator ought to be heard in the consideration of these problems, for he seeks to conserve the human values. He believes in the theory of human freedom, the free spirit. The sort of world that he envisions cannot exist where power and au-

thority are exerted for the tyrannical control of others. Those nations which evolve from this world war with great power must be constrained to exert such power for the welfare of humanity and not for selfish purposes.

In all movements for the improvement of humanity there has always been a wide separation between the knowledge which men possess and the application of that knowledge in their relations to each other. If men would put into practice the knowledge which they have concerning human relationships they could live in peace. Someone has said that Christianity has failed in the world because it has never been put into practice. If the Christian philosophy were applied in all of the relationships among men, this would be an entirely different world from what it is. The educator finds himself in possession of theories and knowledge, of which unfortunately the great majority of the people in the world are ignorant of or unwilling to accept.

There ought to be a growing number of people who will accept and put into practice the principles of freedom which have been handed down to men through the ages. We are at war today, not because there is not a philosophy and a knowledge that disprove the futility of war but because there are so many people as leaders of nations who refuse to follow the knowledge which is available to them. It is most depressing to realize how coolly large groups of people regard the Christion philosophy and all of the knowledge which has been accumulated regarding human freedom. There is no doubt we have a body of facts and knowledge which if followed would make a better world. It is the function of the educator to strive constantly to keep this accumulated knowledge before his people and to hand the torch of freedom into the hands of those who are to be the new leaders of our own country and maybe of the world. There can be no better goal for us as educators to set than that of teaching men to put into practice what they can learn and what they know.

I think it is not too much to expect that the educator of the future shall be not only a student in the library and an investigator in the laboratory but a statesman in the world of affairs. There should be a closer relationship between what is known as the academic sphere and the field of practical affairs. The theorist and the investigator can contribute a great deal to government. Modern civilization rests largely upon the discoveries of science. A closer union between science and theory and practicability will be beneficial to the whole movement of human progress. There is no reason why the college professor and the educational administrator should not excel in his knowledge of world affairs. Government should be a matter for the study of people in all professions and surely it is a matter which should receive special study by those whose duty it is to teach the men and women who are to be our future leaders.

More than ever, the educator must be a student of psychology and not in any narrow sense. The most serious problem confronting us in the world today is the problem of the various races of humanity. Even in our own country the racial problem is a serious one. In many countries it has been a disastrous one. The psychologist ought to be able to make a helpful contribution to the whole problem of racial relationship. Much of the confusion in the world today arose through the fact that people and races are different and because they are different they do not understand each other and consequently drift into the futility of war. I should like to see a wider development in the field of psychology and a greater study of the whole problem of the different philosophies of the peoples of the world and the races of the world. Not only do we have these contrasts and differences, but we have a different psychology in the various nationalities of the world even when the nation may be of the same race. The educator can make a valuable contribution to human progress and the advancement of civilization by a study of such psychological questions. Governments are instituted for the welfare of those who are governed. They have no other excuse for existence. Through the activities of government, human civilization has been advanced. The educator ought to be a contributor to every type of human progress. His contributions should be made through his study and through his investigations. The goal of all our intellectual striving is a better world. That better world will be marked by social progress, by economic security, and spiritual and intellectual enlightenment. Surely the educator should play a greater part in this modern world than he has in any time past. In order to meet his opportunity and make his contribution, he needs to come out of his academic sphere and step out into a broader world. He can make a contribution to the advancement of civilization in this great world and he ought not to hesitate on account of his own fears. We are coming into that period when the educator can really be a leader for human freedom and welfare.

Russia and the Western Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Ernest Lindley entitled "Russia and the Western Allies," which is reprinted in today's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA AND THE WESTERN ALLIES

(By Ernest Lindley)

Others, including Wendell Willkie, had said previously what Vice President WALLACE said Monday about future relations between the Soviet Union and the western democracies. They must collaborate or another world war will become only too probable. Until now, the tendency in some official quarters has been to discourage open and frank discussion of this central problem, lest the result be to inspire greater mistrust and fear, and so weaken the grand alliance. The Axis radio exploits to the utmost every sign or admission that Russia and the western allies do not entirely trust each other. It probably will twist the Vice President's speech into a prediction of war between the United States and Russia within 10 years. For internal political reasons, also, some officials have hesitated to talk candidly about our relations with Russia, now and in the future.

The Vice President has taken off the lid. He was not quite as blunt as Stalin sometimes is, but he did not pretend that our present understandings and relationships with Russia form a solid base for confidence as to fruitful collaboration in the future.

We are fighting the war with Britain on a basis of mutual confidence. Our affairs have become interlocked at many points with those of Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and other parts of the British Empire. With Britain and the Empire we not only have a solid structure of common understanding but it already contains a great deal of machinery for day-by-day collaboration. The machinery could be dismantled and the structure weakened after the war by short-sighted policies in London, Washington, and the Dominions. But both the structure and the machinery inside it will already exist, and with sound management on all sides it should be possible to keep them in repair and expand them as conditions warrant.

Our relations with Russia are still those between fortuitous Allies, of dissimilar languages, institutions, and traditions. Russia's relations with all her allies are handicapped further by the suspicions and fears which grew out of the Communist revolution, and the reaction of most of the rest of the world to it, and by the possibility of a revival of Russian imperialism of the traditional sort.

Mr. WALLACE has underlined the first essentials of enduring collaboration between Russia and the principal western allies. Russia must not revert to its efforts to foment world revolution. The western powers must not foment or encourage anti-Russian activities in Germany and other nations. This means, of course, that Russia must not arouse the fears of her neighbors and of more distant powers by imperialistic practices.

As the Vice President also rightly emphasizes, the principal western democracies need have no fear of old-line communism or any other revolutionary doctrine, including fascism, if they provide full employment and a rising standard of living.

If these first principles of policy are accepted by Britain, Russia, and the United States, there is no reason why a foundation of mutual trust cannot be laid and the machinery for enduring collaboration contrived. Many problems will have to be worked out. Some may be difficult but no more so than some of the collisions of interest between Britain and the United States which will be amicably adjusted unless, after the war, men completely lacking in common sense come into power in London or Washington. But there are no fundamental conflicts in interest between Russia as a nation and the United States, unless one or the other embarks on a policy of world-wide imperialism or domination menacing to the security of the other. As things stand now, the Russians have no territory or spheres of influence which we want, and we have none which, so far as we know, they want. The geographical claims made by the Russians raise difficult questions—and incidentally have created more mistrust of them than Nazi propaganda has been able to arouse since the war began—but so far they are limited and specific claims, which are not without historical and other justification.

Insofar as these justifications are military, their weight will depend upon the other military and political arrangements made by the victorious allies, especially the Big Three who will have most of the military power in the years immediately following the defeat of Germany and Japan.

The Vice President has posed the alternatives and given his own answer—the only answer which holds the hope of achieving an enduring peace.

After Victory, What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on the subject After Victory, What? at Rollins College, on the Animated Magazine program, on February 1, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You are right when you say that our first task is victory. That victory lies through travail. It is yet to be won, with blood, sweat, and tears. None of us here will be spared privation. Many must bear the heavy yoke of sorrow and loneliness and a lifetime of sad memories.

But what, after the victory? Are we concerned with that? Is that as real to us as the war? Is that really a part of the war? Do we fight for that, too? And will we fight for the right kind of post-war world as we are fighting, and shall fight, for the right kind of a victory?

What shall we do with Hitler, Tojo, Himmler, and Hirohito? It is worth mentioning, what shall we do with Mussolini? What shall we do with the Germans and Japanese? What shall we do with Germany and Japan? Who is going to decide what we shall do about anything? What shall we do with the disbanded armies of all lands, who when victory comes at last may number one hundred millions or more? What shall we do with the war workers who will number more than one-half of all our working population? What shall we do with our war factories and our war machinery? What shall we do about taxes and the national debt, international trade, the use of the world's free air, a stable world currency? What shall we do about feeding the hundreds of millions of hungry peoples; restoring the bloated bodies and shrunken cheeks of starved children? What shall we do to heal the gaping wounds and to straighten the twisted bodies of the world's wounded? What shall we do about peace of mind and spirit for the shell-shocked and all the ruined and broken bones and flesh and minds and spirits who are the casualties of war? What shall we do to purge the minds of those who have been reared upon the perfidy of the Nazis, the military clique of Japan, the paganism of the Fascists, these demons who have turned a generation of boys and girls into devils inhuman? Who shall keep the world's peace and how shall it be kept? Who shall hear the plaintive cry of the wronged and give them redress? In what forum may an oppressed people or person cry for freedom and where shall be the council of those who would build grand and noble edifices of a new world?

Whose mighty voice shall sound the note of certain leadership which we can all follow? Whose song shall we sing as we march? What shall hold us together in unity with a single purpose? Who will keep down the disrupting cries of the selfish and the cynical? Who will hold up the banners of confident hope? Who will be sure that we can, despite those who would dare to say it cannot be done?

My fellow Americans, all you who have heard the scorn hurled at those who speak of a people's world, common men of the earth, remember, remember, remember! Remember it is your sons and daughters whom the war swallowed up. It is your substance which it takes away. It is your homes which break apart. It is your altars it desecrates. It is your women it violates. It is your aspirations and dreams it shatters. It is your war. It is your world. It is you to whom the future calls. It is you who must, whether you will it or not, even whether you know it or not, answer the question, "After the victory, what?"

Mr. Browder's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently in the Bay City (Mich.) Times there appeared a splendid editorial entitled "Mr. Browder's Message." In the light of late events, this editorial is a distinct contribution to a better understanding of a number of things in connection therewith.

I offer it for the RECORD in the hope the Members of the House will read it carefully:

MR. BROWDER'S MESSAGE

During the past week Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party in this country, delivered a message to the American people through full-page advertisements in many daily newspapers. The message is of importance only to the extent that it reveals the "line" the Communists will follow in attempting to use the war and the military successes of the Red Army to bolster their own position in the United States.

Mr. Browder, whose speech which formed the basis of the published message was made on Lincoln's birthday, began by linking the Civil War President with Vladimir Lenin, founder of the present Soviet regime, as fellow marchers in the advance of democracy. Then he progressed to his main thesis, which was that the United States can be allied with the democratic forces in Europe "only on condition" that we are allied with the Soviet Union.

To accomplish this union with the Soviets, to the satisfaction of the Communists, several things must be done, according to Mr. Browder. First, the 302 Members of the House who voted to continue the Dies committee must be repudiated, with the country rallying behind the 92 Members who voted against the committee.

Second, we must stamp out the "powerful elements" in the State Department who have been working with the Vichy French and other European groups which are on the Communist blacklist. Mr. Browder unhesitatingly pictures the State Department as acting contrary to the wishes of the President in this respect, although he undoubtedly knows that this is not the case.

Third, something will have to be done about Attorney General Biddle, concerning whom Mr. Browder had some very disparaging things to say. The absurdity of his claims is best illustrated, however, by the contention in the message that Mr. Biddle "shares the basic theories of MARTIN DIES, but is jealous of the Texan's prominence."

Finally, again according to Mr. Browder, the United States is going to find it impossible to have a realistic relationship of alliance with the Communists of Europe, without which we cannot have an alliance with the democratic forces of the world, unless we open the doors at home to our domestic Communists and stop suspecting them of being anything but loyal and patriotic citizens of the United States.

This, in substance, is the sales talk which Mr. Browder circulated throughout the United States last week, at what must have been a considerable financial outlay. It is evident on the face of the message, however, that Mr. Browder has little if any understanding of the temper and psychology of the American people. It is not likely that he will be able to sell the Communist Party in this country on any basis, but in this resort to the or-else technique he is simply wasting his time and somebody's money.

Small Business Being Helped by War Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, while the administration of Public Law No. 603, the Murray-Patman Act, has been extremely slow in getting under way, it is hoped that the appointment of Col. Robert W. Johnson as Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation Board will hasten greater accomplishment by that agency.

Meanwhile, however, I have been carefully following the efforts of the Federal Government's procuring agencies to carry out the intent of that act; namely, to spread their purchasing into the thousands of capable small concerns throughout our Nation in order to further strengthen the war production program.

Today I have received a report covering purchasing done by the War Department during the month of February from Maj. Alvin E. Hewitt, Chief, Smaller War Plants Branch, Purchases Division, which is under the Services of Supply, commanded by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell. This report indicates further substantial aid to small manufacturing concerns. The activities of the War Department through its Smaller War Plants Branch, which was first organized by Col. Fred C. Foy, reveal to me not only a sympathetic attitude on the part of that agency toward the intent of the Murray-Patman Act but, above all in importance, a most effective job in actually getting prime contracts placed in volume with small concerns.

I am inserting herewith the report from Major Hewitt, together with a chart showing the distribution of business to small concerns:

WAR DEPARTMENT,

HEADQUARTERS, SERVICES OF SUPPLY,

Washington, D. C., March 11, 1943.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, *Chairman,*

House Committee on Small Business,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE: During the month of February the War Department substantially increased the amount of business awarded to small con-

cerns employing less than 500 persons. The detailed analysis of the figures is attached.

During February such small concerns were awarded a total of $349,487,000 worth of prime contracts compared with $327,139,000 to such concerns in January, in spite of the fact that the over-all dollar volume of contracts awarded in February was approximately 45 percent lower than the total dollar volume in January.

The percentage of total dollar volume awarded in February to smal' concerns employing 500 persons or less by the seven Supply Services increased to 29.8 percent, or 6.2 percent higher than the 23.6 percent reported for January.

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN E. HEWITT,
Major, A. C., Chief, Small War Plants, Branch Purchases Division.

Number and dollar value of prime contracts awarded in February 1943—7 supply services of the War Department and Army Air Forces, Matériel Command

	Break-down of contracts by size of plants (number of wage earners)					
	Under 100		100–500		Over 500	
	Number of contracts	Dollar value	Number of contracts	Dollar value	Number of contracts	Dollar value
Chemical Warfare Service	139	$1,976,000	155	$2,308,000	196	$8,713,000
Corps of Engineers	781	18,450,000	560	38,296,000	773	120,173,000
Medical Corps	6	1,879,000	7	1,272,000	25	5,918,000
Ordnance Department	473	29,565,000	471	115,543,000	849	442,220,000
Quartermaster Corps	5,958	34,563,000	3,505	63,189,000	5,691	100,229,000
Signal Corps	1,072	2,728,000	1,133	11,957,000	2,146	86,453,000
Transportation Corps	25	1,752,000	50	5,762,000	70	11,092.000
Subtotal	8,454	90,913,000	5,881	238,327,000	9,750	774,798,000
Army Air Force	230	7,964,000	184	12,283,000	550	518,920,000
Total	8,684	98,877,000	6,065	250,610,000	10,300	1,293,718,000

Above figures represent supply contracts only.

Percentages of total dollar volume of War Department supply contracts placed with various-size plants in February 1943

	February, number of wage earners		
	Under 100	100 to 500	Over 500
	Per cent	*Per cent*	*Per cent*
Chemical Warfare	15.2	17.8	67.0
Corps of Engineers	10.4	21.6	68.0
Medical Corps	20.7	14.0	65.3
Ordnance Department	5.0	19.7	75.3
Quartermaster Corps	17.5	31.9	50.6
Signal Corps	2.7	11.8	85.5
Transportation Corps	9.4	31.0	59.6
7 supply services	8.2	21.6	70.2
Army Air Forces	1.5	2.3	96.2
Total	6.0	15.3	78.7

Mr. Speaker, figures for the Army Air Forces have not been included in previous reports. Therefore, in order to make comparison possible, I will at this time use only figures for the seven supply services indicating some of the progress that has been made.

As of September 1, 1942, 6 months ago, the Services of Supply had but 20.8 percent of the dollar volume of their prime contracts with small concerns employing under 500. The report shows that today 29.8 percent of the dollar volume is going to small concerns on prime contracts alone. This increase of 9 percent represents a worthy accomplishment by the supply services.

Now the Army Air Forces, since it places a tremendous dollar volume of business, must necessarily be included in the over-all War Department purchasing figures. The volume of prime contracts placed by this service with small business is meager compared to the billions it spends. While recognizing that airplanes, airplane engines, propellers, and gasoline—the items for which the large proportion of Air Forces money is spent—may not be manufactured by small plants generally, I believe that the volume of prime contracts placed by the Army Air Forces with small concerns can be enlarged. The 3.8 percent of the total dollar volume placed by the Air Forces with small concerns in February on prime contracts does represent an increase from 2.6 percent in January. However, it can be agreed that the larger benefits of Air Force contracting for small concerns must accrue from subcontracting. It is reported that a major campaign to increase subcontracting under Army Air Forces contracts is now in progress and already several million dollars' worth of subcontracts have been offered to the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which has been requested to recommend suitable small companies.

PERCENTAGE TO SMALL CONCERNS PRACTICALLY DOUBLED IN MONTH

To indicate the substantial increase in the volume of all War Department business, including that of the Army Air Forces placed with small concerns, the February report shows the total dollar volume of prime contracts as $1,643,205,000 of which nearly $350,000,000 went to small concerns. In January, the next preceding month, War Department prime contracts totaled $2,976,540,000 of which $327,000,000 was placed with small concerns. Thus, it is shown that, in spite of a greatly reduced total volume in February compared with January, the volume to small concerns rose $23,000,000. Percentage-wise, the proportion of business awarded to small concerns practically doubled in February.

MORE SUBCONTRACTING BEING DONE

In addition, the War Department has recognized that to carry out the full intent of the Murray-Patman Act subcontracting must be developed to the maximum extent. The increasing number of newspaper stories reporting the subcontracting volume of large concerns is, I believe, a direct reflection of the War Department's effective efforts in this direction. For instance, the Chrysler Corporation stated on March 5 that, "of the more than $2,000,000,000 in war contracts now being handled by Chrysler Corporation, more than $1,300,000,000 or 58.2 percent of the total is being subcontracted to smaller companies. At the present time, 8,079 individual companies located in 856 cities and 39 States share Chrysler Corporation's war work through subcontracting." The Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co. reveals that it has increased its subcontracting almost 6 times and now uses 1,534 firms in 31 States. The Oldsmobile Division of General Motors has reported an effective distribution of subcontracts in connection with its important Ordnance Department contract. Of 769 component parts in the end products, 757 or 98.4 percent are built by subcontractors. The 137 individual subcontractors are located in 58 cities in 10 States and 103 employ less than 500 people.

ORDNANCE AND QUARTERMASTER ESPECIALLY COMMENDED

During the period since I have been receiving reports from the War Department on the distribution of contracts to small concerns I have been particularly interested in following the progress of the individual branches of the Services of Supply. Two of these seem to merit particular commendation for their efforts in behalf of small business as shown by the records. First, the Ordnance Department which buys all tanks, motor vehicles, artillery, and such heavy industry items, has found it possible to show a continuous month-by-month increase in the volume of business awarded to small concerns. Second, the Quartermaster Corps, which buys largely standard and semistandard items including all food, clothing, and housing equipment has increased its contracts with small business to the point where it placed 62 percent of its contracts and approximately half its total dollar volume with small concerns in February.

MUCH ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT

I do not believe that the War Department should consider its record at the maximum effective peak because there is still much room for further accomplishment. Other agencies and civilian business must also add their maximum purchasing power so that a much greater number of small concerns will be able to participate effectively in both war and civilian supply production. To this end I am asking each Government procurement agency to estimate its volume of business for 1943 in two large industrial fields where there is great productive capacity in small plants—the woodworking and the apparel trades. Upon receipt of this information it will be possible to determine how much available capacity will be filled by Government procurements and how much will be

available for civilian purposes. Then consideration can be given to the requirements necessary to insure adequate civilian use of these and other industries.

FEWER BUSINESS FAILURES SINCE MURRAY-PATMAN ACT

As a further indication of the effect of concentrating attention on the value of small manufacturing companies in the war production effort, business failures among industrial concerns are now at the lowest point in 22 years. Dun & Bradstreet's reports clearly show the decline in industrial failures since the passage of the Murray-Patman Act. In 1941 Dun & Bradstreet reported 12,067 industrial failures as against 9,405 in 1942. The decline of failures is particularly marked since May 1942 when the act was approved by the Congress. During that month 955 failures were reported. The figures here show the decline since that time:

1942:	
May	955
June	804
July	764
August	698
September	556
October	673
November	585
December	506
1943:	
January	458
February	422

Explains Vote on the Debt-Limitation Bill, H. R. 1780

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CALVIN D. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in casting my vote on this measure, I find myself in a rather unusual position. I am opposed to section 21 of the bill which increases the debt limit from $125,000,000,000 to $210,000,000,000. My convictions are that one-half the amount of this increase could be voted at this time without in any way impeding the war effort, then, if the need arose, this Congress will be in session for 2 years, and would readily vote the necessary increase.

I favor section 4 of the bill which removes the $25,000 limitations from salaries, as I do not want my three soldier sons or the soldier sons of any other man to return when this war is over to America and find a nation in which opportunity has been limited and incentive destroyed. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I vote "no" as an expression of my opposition against this excessive extension of the debt limit, but in so doing I am voting contrary to my convictions concerning limitations of salaries. I feel I have chosen to strike at the greater of two evils, for when we place a ceiling upon income and remove the ceiling from debt, we adopt a system the direct opposite to that under which all nations have progressed throughout history.

Shipment of Oil and Gas to Great Britain

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, you have just heard read the report from the State Department I asked for regarding the amount of oil that has been shipped to Spain. I quote from an article by Roy Gibbons published in this morning's Times-Herald:

In Canada you can get all the oil you need to heat your home, providing it is not a multiple-flat building.

We are shipping a great deal of high-octane gas, oil, and so forth, to our allies. We have no lend-lease with Canada. It is known that we have been shipping oil to Canada. I cannot see why we in New England and the rest of the east coast should be cold and the Canadians warm while we ship our oil and gas to Great Britain. We should not sell oil to Canada when we need it ourselves. I do not see why Canada does not ship oil and gas to Great Britain. She is a part of the British Empire and should take care of Great Britain. We should not be forced to be cold while Canada has plenty of oil. This shows the necessity for the extremely careful check-up that should be made on all lend-lease goods and all other goods going out of this country. I have asked for a detailed report on this matter.

The complete article by Mr. Gibbons is as follows:

FOOD, LUXURIES FOUND PLENTIFUL IN CANADA CITIES

(By Roy Gibbons)

NEW YORK, March 10.—Canada is a land of milk and honey, overflowing with bacon, canned goods, new bicycle tires, five-course dinners, mountains of shoes, and most of the luxuries denied to Americans under the rationing system, a tour in that country from Montreal to Toronto discloses.

In Canada you can get all the oil you need to heat your home, providing it is not a multiple flat building and houses no commercial enterprise such as a barber shop or store. You don't need coupons for the oil. All you require is a permit.

MAY BUY NEW AUTO

You can even buy a brand new automobile, providing it is not in what is known as the government pool.

Canadian stores are loaded with the finest cuts of meat. Opened refrigerator doors in such stores reveal long rows of juicy carcasses. You can buy all the meat you want—steaks, pork chops, lamb or beef. You also can buy mechanical ice boxes, typewriters, sewing machines, rifles, shotguns, gas and electric stoves, and all the ammunition you need.

One Montreal store (Eaton's) does such a big bacon business that it uses a slicing machine equipped with a four-foot conveyor belt to take care of the rushing business.

CURB ON SOME BUYING

This same store displays signs in both French and English, asking customers to buy a minimum of fresh pork products.

One sign urges customers to forego fresh pork, bacon, and ham purchases "during the next six weeks" to enable Canada to fulfill her commitments of sending 600,000,000 pounds of bacon to Britain.

A customer almost knocked the sign down while reaching for her purchase consisting of 3 pounds of pork sausage, a package of bacon, and a small pork butt.

I told a floor walker in the food department of this same store that it was a heartening thing to see such plenty in contrast with the lean days that had come upon my fellow countrymen who were finding it increasingly difficult to obtain a Sunday roast just across the line.

"Yes," he said, "We're not so badly off. But of course we don't get the best cuts any more. We don't get any blue or red brands (red is the best grade and blue the second best under the Canadian meat grading system). Come and I'll show you."

BLUE BRAND DISPLAYED

He took me over to the meat counter and there staring both of us in the face was a generous display of beef marked with the blue brand stamp.

The floor walker was obviously confused. "Now how did that ever get there?" he said.

"Them gremlins?" I asked. "Oh, no, not gremlins," he laughed. "This must be an unusual marketing day." And saying that he hurried away.

The only rationing Canada has today is on butter, tea, sugar, coffee, and gasoline. You can get ½ pound of butter a week, 1 ounce of tea, or 4 ounces of coffee, and ½ pound of sugar per week, per person. Children under 12 years of age can't get the tea or coffee.

The Canadian sugar ration is the same as that in the United States. The Canadian coffee allotment is greater than that here, where the ration now is a pound every 6 weeks, with no coffee for a child under 15. Butter and tea are not rationed in the United States although the Office of Price Administration has announced that butter rationing will begin when that for meat is started, probably about April 1.

Farm Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the January 30, 1943, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, appeared an article entitled "I Speak for the Middle Class Farmer," written by Mr. Ed Will of Odessa, N. Y., which brought Nation-wide attention in its portrayal of conditions on the average farm and the thoughts of the average farmer. I have heard very favorable references to this

article by several of our colleagues in the House. Just recently, I have received from the author, Mr. Will a résumé of the response which he has received from various parts of the country regarding the article and, with the permission of the House, am inserting them as a part of my remarks.

A summary of letters received by Ed Will in reaction to the recent article, I Speak for the Middle Class Farmer, appearing in the Saturday Evening Post, issue of January 30, 1943, and exclusive of letters received by the editors of the Post, is given.

A total of 53 letters was received, plus some repeat letters from some of the same parties. The letters sum up as follows:

	From farmers, farm organizations, etc.	From nonfarmers
Letters received	30	23
Number in 100-percent agreement	28	17
Number from Northeast	15	9
Number from South	4	4
Number from Middle West	4	10
Number from West	5	----------
Number from Washington, D. C.	1	----------
Number from Canada	1	----------

A strong indication of national understanding of poor conditions on farms is the lack of a single letter denying that conditions on farms are as pictured in the article. A summary of the seven letters disagreeing in part with the article is as follows:

Two letters, one farm, one nonfarm, blame middleman for low farm prices.

Two letters, one farm, one nonfarm, dispute certain views on farm organization, particularly view that farm organizations can be bad.

One letter, nonfarm, hints a lack of patriotism for writing such an article in wartime.

Two letters, nonfarm, deny interests of farmers and labor are opposed.

SOME INTERESTING EXCERPTS FROM THESE LETTERS

You have stated exactly what I think.

This phrase in various forms used in many letters, both farm and nonfarm.

In September 1941 we had a sale and sold our herd of 65 purebred Holsteins. All our hired men were either drafted or went into munitions plants. (Huntington, Quebec.)

Although from Canada, this is of interest, as the Canadian manpower system is often held up as a model for the United States.

If only some of these rocking-chair farmers will take heed or even read your article * * *. I have been forced to beef 26 head of milk cows. (Newton, N. J.)

It may interest you to know that * * * and other neighbors still have soybeans and other crops under the snow. (Muncie (Ind.) Chamber of Commerce.)

Wish we knew our Congressmen were reading it carefully. (Trumansburg, N. Y.)

At the request of our Government * * * grew hemp seed in 1942 * * * price was fixed. The same acre of land which produced $50 worth of hemp seed would have produced $700 worth of burley tobacco. (Cynthia, Ky.)

It describes conditions here exactly. (Lagoda, Ind.)

I imagine I'm one of thousands who hail from the farm and have had to sit helplessly and see our once proud farmers being steadily exploited by our own Government. (Detroit, Mich.)

I have never farmed * * * taught school * * * boarded in a farm home, and realize the farmer's problems and hardships. I want to see everything possible done to make farm life more attractive. (Talladega, Ala.; secretary of the Alabama Prohibition Committee.)

We should have a modification of the socialistic state after the war. (New York City.)

The idea of a subsidy to farmers is repugnant to everybody * * * only delays the day of reckoning. (Cleveland, Ohio.)

The small farmer is the backbone of the American way of life. (Columbus, Ohio.)

I was surprised to find that producing 10 war units is sufficient to freeze me to my farm * * * the producing of 30 war units is not sufficient to justify deferment of a 19-year-old boy who has been working for me. (Leon, Kans.)

The farm situation in Mississippi is exactly as Mr. Will pictured it in the Northeast. The disparsity of rural income with urban income has resulted in a positive schedule of training for young people intended to take them off farms and give them access to opportunities for decent existence rather than hold them in economic slavery. (From a letter from a banker of North Carrollton, Miss.)

How About an "Open Door" Policy at Home?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 7, there appeared in the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal a most enlightening editorial by John S. Knight, publisher of this newspaper. I commend the editorial to every Member of the House:

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

(By John S. Knight)

At the beginning of President Roosevelt's eleventh year in office, Drew Pearson wrote a column outlining the chief reason why the conduct of the war on the domestic front is going so badly.

Reduced to a few paragraphs, it placed the blame on the President's preoccupation with the military phase of the war to the neglect of the vital problems at home which require prompt decision and guidance from the Chief Executive. In drawing a comparison between Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the similarity of their difficulties, Pearson said:

"Lincoln, faced with a tragic war and a difficult home front, divided his time between them. He listened patiently to almost every disgruntled politician with an ax to grind, struggled to keep his political support.

"Roosevelt, faced with the same problem, has spent his time almost exclusively on the war. Much of this is necessary. But the President carries it to extremes.

"His political empire is disintegrating around him, with a foreign policy necessarily so difficult that its intricacies may sour a naturally isolationist American people.

"The manner in which the administration is being shoved all over Capitol Hill, the increasing glee with which Congress is running the Executive by the simple expedient of curtailing funds, all indicate that Abe Lincoln was right, and that Roosevelt has got to give more time to disagreeable Senators than to Harry Hopkins, if he is to save the peace after the war—the only thing we are really fighting for."

With Pearson's analysis, we thoroughly agree. But the tragedy of the current confusion and bungling on the home front is that it need never have developed if we had enjoyed the forceful, decisive type of leadership at the top that gets things done by demanding results from subordinates, or else.

A little of this quality, mixed with the willingness to concede that occasionally there may be something to an opposing point of view, would have gone a long way toward eliminating the unfortunate bitterness that has developed between Congress and the Chief Executive. It would also have brought to the President's side the support of many able men in both Houses of Congress who don't relish taking their orders from Harry Hopkins' circle of influence.

PASSING THE BUCK

The trouble with our war effort and a contributing reason for the disunity now developing at an alarming rate is that nearly every one of us, from the President on down, tries to lay the blame for the mess we are in on someone else's doorstep.

In the President's mind, newspaper editors who fail to go into raptures over HENRY WALLACE's fantastic promises to the rest of the world are set down as pettifoggers. The plain fact that many of Henry's schemes are impossible of fulfillment and may serve thereby to incur the post-war hatred of our allies, does not seem to enter into his calculations.

In turn, the newspapers blame Congress for wasting time when there is serious work to be done. Congress deserves that censure, but at the same time we should be fair enough to admit that the executive branch of the Government has made but little effort to reach a harmonious working arrangement with Congress, or to accord the Members even a measure of courtesy or respect. As an institution, Congress has functioned effectively for more than 150 years. It is elected by the people to serve them. In the past, it fought zealously to preserve the legislative branch of our Government against inroads by ambitious bureaucrats who represented no one except the urgings of their own greed and ambition.

Within the past year, we have seen Congress by-passed time and time again by the use of White House "directives." These Executive orders actually nullified legislation enacted by the elected representatives of the people. The 1942 elections clearly indicated the changing temper of the people and while Congress has since persisted in much inexcusable bickering and obstruction, its Members feel they are carrying out the will of the people as expressed in the most recent congressional mandate.

There are many good men in both Houses of Congress, men capable of real leadership and patriotic service. But let a Congressman or Senator rise to his feet and question the wisdom of any particular piece of New Deal legislation and he is a dead pigeon so far

as the White House is concerned. The able Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, can give personal testimony to that fact and bring Senators HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, and MILLARD TYDINGS, of Maryland, to the witness stand with him.

This is no time for the President and Congress to be at loggerheads. Unity of purpose is essential to the winning of the war and, if we don't win the war, all the fine talk about "preserving our social gains" and creating a dream world for the Hottentots with your tax money and mine will be utterly meaningless.

SHOULD CRITICISM BE STIFLED?

While our war aims have never been clearly outlined to the satisfaction of any one except Winston Churchill, we are safe in assuming that we strive for a more ideal democracy at home even while we are in the process of extolling our virtues abroad.

In that case, should we not encourage a greater degree of tolerance and understanding among our own people? Is it not possible to point out the soft spots in our war effort and to bring them to public scrutiny without being denounced as "Ratzis" and traitors by shrill voices and intemperate words? Is a newspaper or a man in public life to be stigmatized or commended for informing the public that the War Labor Board finally granted a raise of 4.5 cents an hour to striking Boeing aircraft workers after piddling around with the case since last July? The War Labor Board is supposed to compose disputes, not to invite them by stalling and procrastination. Yet this Board is a fair sample of the administration's tendency to make last-minute opportunistic compromises which avoid fundamentals and settle nothing.

We are in another mess on the tax problem. None of the workable pay-as-you-go plans is acceptable to Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau because of administration stubbornness and prejudice against any man who has made a success of his own affairs. So we stumble along, offering an open invitation to millions of new taxpayers not to take the whole thing too seriously. The day of reckoning will come when the income tax payments fall due and it is discovered that we have failed to devise an adequate plan of financing the war.

But meanwhile we swirl merrily along on an inflationary trend which now looks as if it may never be halted unless strong action is taken—and soon. It will be too late if the Morgenthaus and the Eleanors continue to dabble with curious economic theories and experiments which neither of them understand.

It was hoped that the appointment of Economic Director Byrnes would help restore a better relationship between Congress and the White House. Byrnes served in Congress with most of the present leaders and is well liked by them. But it is now becoming more and more evident that only the President has the personality and the prestige to end the legislative revolt.

The people voted for an independent Congress but owing to the widening gap between the White House and the legislative body there is the very real danger that Congress will go to regrettable extremes in its resistance to the President. Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, a true and sincere conservative, has sensed this danger and recently warned his fellow Members of Congress against blind opposition to all Roosevelt policies. Mr. Roosevelt should be as charitable.

We hope the President reads Drew Pearson's column in the Washington Post and takes it to heart. Without questioning his abilities as a military and naval strategist, we think he can now safely leave some of the campaign planning to the fighting men and give at least 50 percent of his time to the unsolved domestic problems that are piling up on his doorstep.

He was elected to that job, too.

New Deal Politics in the Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Deal Politics in the Courts," published in the Chicago Herald-American on March 9, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DEAL POLITICS IN THE COURTS

Another shocking instance of New Deal subordination of the national welfare to ruthless machine politics is the President's nomination of James V. Allred as a judge of the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. Allred, a former Governor of Texas, was appointed a Federal district judge by Mr. Roosevelt upon his retirement from that office 4 years ago.

Federal judges are appointed for life, on the theory that they will be independent of politics and above the opportunistic and sometimes sordid demands of politics.

But Judge Allred, although he assumed the judicial robes, remained only briefly out of active politics. Last year, at the instance of the New Deal, he resigned from the bench to run for office.

He became the New Deal's candidate against Senator LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas, whom the New Deal proposed to purge because of his refusal to obey the dictates of Washington politicians.

Mr. Allred's swift return to politics, so shortly after his elevation to a post presumably above politics, caused the people of Texas to feel, very properly, that he had never actually been out of politics. They felt, with sound reason, that the Federal courts, to which they had always looked for pure and even justice, had been drawn into politics and were being used for political purposes.

This impression was heightened by the fact that no judicial successor to Mr. Allred was appointed for months and also by the knowledge, general throughout Texas, that Mr. Allred had been assured he would be reappointed to the Federal court in case he failed to be elected.

Thus the great and august power of the Federal court was actually employed for campaign purposes. A Federal judge's power over the destinies of citizens and business interests can be tremendous. A Federal judge taking a virtual vacation from his bench to run for office carries with him into the campaign a menacing implication of possible reprisal on his opponents in the event of his defeat and return to his court.

However, the people of Texas were more resentful than intimidated. They defeated Mr. Allred soundly, in spite of the earnest support given him by President Roosevelt and the New Deal machine. Like the other New Deal purges, the purge of Senator O'DANIEL failed.

Now, confirming the impression that Mr. Allred had been promised a return to the Federal bench in case he failed of election, he has been nominated to a higher Federal court, a court of appeals, by President Roosevelt.

The alarming suspicion that the Federal courts were being used by the New Deal as mere implements of sordid politics is thus transformed into a proved and shameful fact.

The high and austere office of Federal judge has been debased into a reward for slavish obedience to the devious dictates of party expediency.

In the nomination of Mr. Allred to a Federal court of appeals, the New Deal has laid the degrading hands of cheap politics on the Nation's judicial system, just as it did to the Nation's diplomatic corps with the appointment of Political Boss Ed Flynn as Ambassador to Australia.

The Nation was shocked by the attempt to subordinate the country's vital international relations to party expediency in wartime, and the Nation's resentment, reflected in the Senate, put an end to the attempt.

The effort to subordinate the courts to party expediency is equally dangerous and equally shocking. The Senate should frustrate and rebuke that attempt also, by refusing to confirm Mr. Allred's nomination.

Remember Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Remember Us," as printed in the February issue of Reader's Digest.

The article was written by that great American novelist and playwright Ben Hecht, and is a most capable and brilliant presentation of the horror which has befallen the Jews of Europe.

REMEMBER US

(Condensed from the American Mercury)

(By Ben Hecht)

When the time comes to make peace, the men of many countries will sit around the table of judgment. The eyes of the German delegates will look into the eyes of Englishmen, Americans, Russians, Czechs, Poles, Greeks, Norwegians, Belgians, Frenchmen, and Dutchmen. All the victims of the German adventure will be there to pass sentence—all but one: the Jew.

There are two reasons for this.

First is the fact that the Jews have only one unity—that of the target. They have lived in the world as a scattered and diverse folk who paid homage to many cultures and called many flags their own. Under attack they have achieved falsely the air of a race, a people, and even a nation.

The Germans have animated the myth of Jewish menace beyond any of their predecessors and have tried to prove their case by presenting the world with a larger pile of Jewish corpses than has ever before been introduced into the ancient argument.

Despite this unity which death has given them, the peace will reveal that the Jews were a diversified and harmless political nobody who had in common little more than the rage of the Germans. They have no country to represent them at the judgment table.

The second reason why they will not be represented is even more practical. Outside the borders of Russia, there will not be enough Jews left in Europe to profit by representation were it given them. They will have been reduced from a minority to a phantom.

There will be no representatives of the 3,000,000 Jews who once lived in Poland, or

of the 900,000 who once lived in Rumania, or of the 900,000 who once lived in Germany, or of the 750,000 who once lived in Hungary, or of the 150,000 who once lived in Czechoslovakia, or of the 400,000 who once lived in France, Holland, and Belgium.

Of these 6,000,000 Jews almost a third have already been massacred by Germans, Rumanians, and Hungarians, and the most conservative of the scorekeepers estimate that before the war ends at least another third will have been done to death.

These totals will not include Jews who died in the brief battles of the German blitzes; nor those who figure in the casualty lists of the Russians. Of the 3,000,000 Jews in Russia, more than 700,000 have entered the Soviet Armies and fought and bled on all the valorous battlefields of the Muscovites. These are the lucky Jews of Europe and are not to be counted in the tale of their nightmare.

The millions who were hanged, burned, or shot did not die dreaming, like the valorous Greeks, Dutchmen, Frenchmen, and Czechs, of abasements to be avenged and homelands to be restored. These great sustaining powers in the human soul are unknown to the Jews. When they die in massacre they look toward no tomorrow to bring their children happiness and their enemies disaster. For no homeland is ever theirs, no matter how long they live in it, how well they serve it, or how many of its songs they learn to sing.

When plans for the new world are being threshed out at the peace conference, when guilts are being fixed and plums distributed, there will be nothing for the Jews of Europe to say to the delegates but the faint, sad phrase, "Remember us."

The dead of many lands will speak for justice, but the Jew alone will have no one to speak for him. His voice will remain outside the hall of judgment, to be heard only when the window is opened and the sad plaint drifts in:

"Remember us. In the town of Freiburg in the Black Forest 200 of us were hanged and left dangling out of our kitchen windows to watch our synagogue burn and our rabbi being flogged to death.

"In Szczucin in Poland on the morning of September 23, which is the day set aside for our Atonement, we were in our synagogue praying God to forgive us. All our village was there. Above our prayers we heard the sound of motor lorries. They stopped in front of our synagogue. The Germans tumbled out of them, torches in hand, and set fire to us. When we ran out of the flames they turned machine guns on us. They seized our women and undressed them and made them run naked through the market place before their whips. All of us were killed before our Atonement was done. Remember us.

"In Wloclawek also the Germans came when we were at worship. They tore the prayer shawls from our heads. Under whips and bayonets they made us use our prayer shawls as mops to clean out German latrines. We were all dead when the sun set. Remember us.

"In Mogielnica, in Brzeziny, in Wengrow, and in many such places where we lived obeying the law, working for our bread and offering harm to no one, there also the Germans came with their bayonets and torches, debasing us first and then killing us slowly so they might longer enjoy the massacres.

"In Warsaw in the year 1941 we kept count and at the end of 12 months 72,279 of us had died. Most of us were shot, but there were thousands of us who were whipped and bayoneted to death on the more serious charge of having been caught praying to God for deliverance. Remember us.

"In the 7 months after June 1941 there were 60,000 of us massacred in Bessarabia and Bukovina. There were more than that killed in Minsk. We hung from windows and burned in basements and were beaten to death in the market place, and it was a time of great celebration for the Germans.

"Remember us who were put in the freight trains that left France, Holland, and Belgium for the east. We died standing up, for there was no food or air or water. Those who survived were sent to Transnistria and there died of hunger slowly and under the watchful eyes of the Germans and Rumanians.

"We fill the waters of the Dnieper today with our bodies, thousands of us. And for a long time to come no one will be able to drink from that river or swim in it. For we are still there. And this, too, is held against us, that we have poisoned the waters with our dead bodies.

"Remember us who were in the Ukraine. Here the Germans grew angry because we were costing them too much time and ammunition to kill. They devised a less expensive method. They took our women into the roads and tied them together with our children. Then they drove their heavy motor lorries into us. Thousands of us died with German military cars running back and forth over our broken bodies.

"Remember us in Ismail when the Rumanians came. For 2 days they were busy leading all the Jews to the synagogue. We were finally locked inside it. Then the Rumanian Iron Guards blew us up with dynamite.

"In Ungheni, Rumania, the Germans accused us of crimes against the police. Three thousand of us were tried. The Germans followed us to our homes. They had been forbidden to waste bullets on us. We were old and unarmed but it took them 2 days to club us all to death with their rifle butts and rip us into silence with their bayonets.

"Remember, too, those of us who were not killed by the Germans but who killed themselves. Some say there were 100,000 of us, some say 200,000. No count was kept. Our deaths accomplished little, but it made us happy to die quickly and to know that we were robbing the Germans of their sport."

These are only a few of the voices. There are many more and there will be yet more millions.

When the German delegates sit at the peace table, no sons or survivors or representatives of these myriad dead will be there to speak for them. And by that time it will be seen that the Jews are Jews only when they fall under German rifle butts, before German motor lorries, and hang from German belts out of their kitchen windows. Once dead, it will be seen that the Jews are left without a government to speak for their avenging and that there is no banner to fly in their tomorrow.

Only this that I write—and all the narratives like it that will be written—will be their voice that may drift in through the opened window of the judgment hall.

Regret Ambassador Standley's Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my own remarks, I desire to express my own concurrence with the feelings of the Hartford Committee for Russian War Relief as expressed in the following telegram:

HARTFORD, CONN., *March 11, 1943.*

Congressman WILLIAM J. MILLER,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

As thoughtful American citizens with hopes of a quick victory and lasting peace with our allies of the United Nations, we regret Ambassador Standley's ill-timed statement, and trust you will voice our regrets before your fellow Congressmen.

HARTFORD COMMITTEE FOR RUSSIAN WAR RELIEF.

Pay of Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMORY H. PRICE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I have heard many capable speakers, in an eloquent manner, entreat the Members of the House to remember the sacrifices being made by our boys on our battle fronts, asking that we consider them as we deliberate upon the questions coming before us in this body and, may I add, that these speeches have been timely and appropriate. If we, as Members of Congress, were as willing to risk our political lives as our boys are to risk their lives, we would soon take up the slack in the lines of our home front.

Today, I have introduced a bill that will allow us to remember these boys in a definite way. In the passage of this bill we can show our appreciation to a much greater extent than by anything that any of us may say.

As a new Member of this House, it would probably be better for you to consider this as merely an announcement rather than a speech made in an effort to influence your actions in this matter. Many times I feel that we give more weight to who is speaking than to what is being said. This is not only true in Congress but in public as well. Therefore, I will appreciate it if you will not think of the speaker but consider the statements I make.

Briefly I will explain the provisions of the bill and will say here that I hope every Member of the House will read the bill carefully.

It provides for the payment of $50 per month to every member of ur armed forces for each month served between the time the first Selective Service Act was passed and until 6 months after the war ends.

I believe the passage of this bill now would have a wholesome effect upon the morale of our boys in the service. It would show them in no uncertain way that we are conscious of the great sacrifice they are making and that we are taking definite action to show our appreciation in a material way. Naturally, we all know that we cannot hope to fully compensate them for the services they are rendering, but at least we can show them that we have made arrangements and actually have done something for

them rather than simply make ready to shout and wave flags as a greeting when they return.

You and I know that many of these young men will return to find a "For rent" sign on the door of their former employer, and many will not have a place with the companies that are still in business. Many of these men will also be unable physically to enter upon their former duties immediately even though the opportunity exists. Therefore the satisfaction of knowing they will continue to receive $50 a month until they can adjust themselves will indeed be most gratifying.

Then we all realize that there is a danger of business being none too good for a period immediately following the end of this war, and I am sure the money paid to all those returning to civilian life would be put into circulation each month and would certainly create a more healthy condition in the business world.

Let me ask that every Member of the House give this bill serious consideration.

The Late Thomas J. Walsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, last week, on the tenth anniversary of the passing of Montana's greatest of the great, the late T. J. "Tom" Walsh, a little country newspaper took occasion to pay him tribute.

Tom Walsh was the most distinguished citizen Montana has developed, one of the most able men ever to gain a seat in the United States Senate and was one of the greatest advocates of modern times.

I think a minute or two spent in reading the history of this great and unselfish man, as set out in the Yellowstone, can be a source of comfort and pride to all of us—comfort in the reassuring thought that there are such men and pride in the fact that he was one of us:

[From the Yellowstone, Billings, Mont.]

T. J. WALSH

Ten years ago this week, Montana lost her most brilliant and distinguished citizen, for on March 2, 1933, just 2 days before he was to become Attorney General of the United States, Thomas J. Walsh died suddenly on a train speeding him to Washington to attend the inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt as President. By this unfortunate act of Providence, Montana was deprived of the honor of having its first member of the Cabinet and our country of a faithful and able public servant.

Born in Two Rivers, Wis., on June 12, 1859, T. J. Walsh was approaching his seventy-third birthday, rather old for the strenuous duties of a Cabinet officer, but so unimpeachable was he in character, so broad, liberal, and humane in his views, and so brilliant in legal attainments, that the incoming President could see no one as eminently qualified as he to guide the all-important Department of Justice. His death was an irreparable blow to the President and his vast program of liberal and humane legislation.

T. J. Walsh, after 6 years of practice in South Dakota, came to Helena in 1890, and attained the rank of Montana's ablest lawyer. He might have become the attorney for the great corporate interests and made millions of dollars, but he preferred to represent the common people and protect their interests. He was, throughout life, a sincere Democrat, not altogether in the partisan sense but in its wider application—a friend of the people. The firm of Walsh, Nolan & Scallon was the acme of professional ethics and brilliant legal attainments.

He was a delegate to every Democratic National Convention from 1908 to 1932, and presided as permanent chairman over the conventions of 1924 and 1932. He could have been nominated for Vice President on more than one occasion. Though endorsed by the Democrats in 1910 for the United States Senate, he was defeated in the legislature, which then elected the Senators, by the corporate interests, which could not control him. At the first election, by direct vote in 1912, he was elected to the United States Senate and re-elected in 1918, 1924, and 1930.

His record in the Senate was equaled by few and surpassed by none. He was recognized as the leading authority on constitutional law in the Senate. He was liberal and progressive, but not radical, in his views. He was what few of our Members of Congress are, politically honest. He never trimmed his sails to catch popular sentiment. He was politically what he was personally, candid, honest, and intellectual.

His handling of the Teapot Dome oil scandal was masterful. The result was that a faithless Cabinet officer was sent to the penitentiary. Involved in the investigation was not only Sinclair, but one of his closest old friends, Doheny, but in T. J. Walsh's conception personal friendship had to give place to stern public duty.

Montana has never produced the equal of T. J. Walsh. In perilous times like the present, we sorely need men of his caliber. In the Hall of Fame in our National Capitol his statue should be erected.

Two Hundred and Twenty Thousand Forgotten Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record, dated March 11, 1943:

TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY THOUSAND FORGOTTEN MEN

For his own good, let alone theirs, it's Uncle Sam's duty to increase the pay of postal employees.

Unless Congress enacts and the President signs pending legislation granting these workers a $300-a-year wartime bonus, something is bound to happen to the Postal Service—and it won't be good.

The 220,000 underpaid postal workers make no threats. That is not their style. They have shown heroic patience in all the years they have been forced to meet increased living costs on a basic wage scale that hasn't advanced since 1925.

If these men can look forward to no relief in their effort to make ends meet, there's only one thing they can do—leave the Postal Service and find work elsewhere. And it won't take much of a labor loss to impair the workings of a department already carrying a heavier load as a result of the war.

The most a long experienced, highly skilled postal worker can earn today is under $40 a week.

The Bureau of the Budget opposes the pending increase, claiming "a bonus to postal workers would be preferential."

To the contrary, the Government's failure to increase salaries in this "forgotten" branch of the service is a plain discrimination against them.

The New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star-Journal of March 4, 1943:

THE NEW DEAL

Today is the tenth anniversary of the New Deal—which is to say, of the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Time was when the new dealers envisioned their political movement as something bigger than any individual, which would continue under other leadership when the Roosevelt period of service had ended; but that time is probably past. For Mr. Roosevelt remains, as much as—perhaps more than—ever, the political embodiment of the New Deal, and already it becomes fairly evident that the hopes for its continuance after 1944 rest on him.

The name, "the New Deal," signified a new approach to domestic problems—an era of domestic recovery and reform. Yet it is Mr. Roosevelt's historical fate, and that of his administration, to be judged (as Woodrow Wilson's movement toward the New Freedom was 25 years ago) by the yardstick of world events—of the conduct and outcome of the war—of issues of foreign policy.

And in truth the domestic issues, from the beginning of the New Deal and earlier, were relatively less important than we believed them to be, while foreign policy was relatively more important than we recognized.

Or, to say it in another, perhaps better way: What the New Deal did to meet the depression, or what Mr. Hoover would have done if he had been reelected in 1932, was bound to be conditioned chiefly by what was going on in the world around us.

The depression was not primarily a domestic problem, as almost all Americans (new and old dealers alike) believed it to be; and history is bound to say of the New Deal that its solutions, both good and bad, were largely ineffective because they could, at best, succeed only in a limited degree; they were undertaken in a too-limited framework.

The fact is that the world slid gradually toward anarchy and chaos from the World War onward, because, at the end of that war, the British system which had maintained order and security and expanding prosperity in the world for a century was not effectively restored nor was anything put in its place.

We entered on a new Dark Age of rulelessness—an age in which we still live, and

in which we will continue to live until the world is organized again for peace as it has been organized, all through the Christian Era, whenever it has known peace.

In Christ's time it was Rome which organized the known world for peace; in Columbus' time, after the thousand years of the Dark Ages, it was Spain which organized the world; and after 1588, when Drake defeated the Spanish Armada, Britain became the organizer of the world, maintaining over-all order and security by (a) control of the seas and (b) adroit manipulation of the balance of power.

At the end of the World War Britain was among the victors, but it was unable by itself to restore pre-1914 controls in a world in which the United States and Japan had become major powers and achievement of a balance of power was not simply a European job, but a world job.

We enjoyed a false and fleeting prosperity after World War No. 1 and mistook it for the fruit of peace, instead of using those boom years of recovery from war to help lay the foundations for a stable and lasting peace.

But because there were no rules in the world, no laws, no enforcement, no organization, inevitably chaos came—in commerce first, creating world-wide stagnation and depression; and then in world politics, giving the Hitlers and the Japanese militarists a chance to try to apply their rules in a ruleless world in which men everywhere unconsciously were groping for some adequate standard by which to live and work and trade.

It was onto such a scene that the New Deal came 10 years ago today—bravely, boldly, but misjudging the problem utterly, as most Americans and almost all peoples of the world misjudged it—tackling it on too small a scale, fancying that we could do here something that could succeed regardless of what happened in the larger world of which we were and are a part.

We ought to recognize and remember, in appraising the decade of the New Deal (as many commentators and editorial writers will be doing today), that the New Deal's strengths and weaknesses in domestic endeavors for recovery and reform were, after all, puny sweepings by the seashore.

The real issues 10 years ago and today were and are world issues. Only as we meet those world issues wisely and successfully can we establish a framework in which we can cope with our problems at home.

Increase of Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the problem of an adequate increase in compensation for our deserving postal employees should be given early consideration and action by the Seventy-eighth Congress, as it has been properly designated as the unfinished business of this body. The measure adopted by the last Congress was an emergency and temporary arrangement established until this, the Seventy-eighth Congress, could, with necessary deliberation, enact a fair and adequate bill to provide the necessary increase in revenue to these postal workers. That they are deserving of such is not, cannot, and will not be doubted. The great mass of American people, irrespective of party lines, have wholeheartedly endorsed the plea of the postal worker. In time of war, as well as in time of peace, the Postal System comprises one of the vitally important parts of our vast communication system. Let us not fail these deserving people, who, in light of the steadily advancing cost of living, are being denied the right to live as comfortably as their neighbors. Let us put an end to this unnecessary suffering, and let us do it now.

New York Bay-Delaware River Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement of Mr. John H. Ross, president, Inland Water Petroleum Carriers Association, before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, March 11, 1943:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is John H. Ross. I am president of and represent the Inland Water Petroleum Carriers Association, a non-profit-making membership organization consisting of owners and operators of tank vessels operating on those inland waterways tributary to the Atlantic Ocean between Eastport, Maine, and Key West, Fla., extending westward to and including the Great Lakes but exclusive of the Mississippi Valley waterways system.

There are at present some 600 inland water tank vessels engaged in the transportation of bulk petroleum products representing approximately 668,000 gross tons with a cargo capacity of 4,753,377 barrels. The members of this association own or operate approximately 85 percent of this tonnage.

I would like to quote you from a statement emanating from the United States Coast Guard last month:

"The present shortage of petroleum products is a geographical shortage, that is, the shortage is actually in facilities for transporting petroleum and its products and not in the oil itself. Nearly the full production of the petroleum industry at the present time is devoted to the war effort or to essential civil requirements. About the only nonessential consumption of oils at the present time is that used by the holders of A cards and this consumption has been so drastically reduced recently that it, too, may be considered as necessary consumption. In any event, A card consumption of petroleum products is an insignificant part of the whole consumption required by the war effort. The importance of petroleum products to the armed forces and to industry, and the critical shortage of tankers and barges to move these products has produced a major problem of the war. Every hour that can be saved by these vessels consistent with reasonable safety of operation is a direct contribution to oil transportation, to oil supply, and to the war effort."

I want to also quote you from an address by Jack Garett Scott, general counsel, Office of Defense Transportation, before the Foreign Policy Association at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, Saturday, October 8, 1942:

"The final decision in this war, in my judgment, will rest very largely, if not primarily, upon production and transportation. Manpower, of course, is, and will continue to be, an absolute essential, but in this war sad experiences have disclosed too many times, that manpower is helpless without an adequate supply of the modern implements of war, at the place they want them, and at the time they need them. In this great and bitter struggle, transportation takes its place beside production as a vital and indispensable element to ultimate victory. And the importance of transportation is not confined to the shipment of men and supplies overseas to all of our far-flung battle fronts, but applies as well to our domestic transportation which makes these shipments possible. Without the latter, raw materials could not reach the processor or manufacturer, the finished products and supplies and troops could not reach the ports of embarkation, the workers in war industries could not reach their place of work, the ships for overseas service could not be built."

Petroleum is vital to victory on the three fronts of America—first, the military front; second, the production front; and, third, the home front. Petroleum products serves essential needs of the soldier, the worker in war production, the trucker, the farmer, and others engaged in essential civilian pursuits. Petroleum products, which in peacetime aided the American people to attain the highest standards of living ever achieved by any nation, now has become one of the most essential materials in the war effort. On every front—in the wheatfields of the Middle West, in the armament factories from coast to coast, in the airplanes over Wake Island, in the ships that sail the seven seas, in the buses, cars, and trucks that transport war workers and war materials, in the depth bombs that destroy Axis submarines, and the aerial bombs that drop on Tokyo, in all of these petroleum plays an important part. Therefore, transportation to distribute it wherever it is required is most essential.

Practically all of the further detailed information which I have to present to your honorable committee is contained in a letter which I addressed to your distinguished chairman on February 18, 1943, and which appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A890. If it is your pleasure to have me do so, I will now proceed with the subject matter contained therein.

It will be interesting for you to know, that the 17 Eastern States normally use about 1,600,000 barrels of petroleum products daily, and that under normal conditions about 95 percent of this quantity is brought from the Gulf in ocean tankers. The remaining 5 percent is delivered by pipe lines, tank cars and barges. About June 1941, the Coordinator of Petroleum inaugurated tank-car shipments from suppliers to the Eastern States and by September of this year these shipments had reached a high of 856,710 barrels daily.

The differential in freight rates between tank car shipments and tank vessel shipments is about 2½ cents per gallon and involved an extra transportation cost of $400,000,000 per year. Price adjustments involving an increase of approximately 2½ cents per gallon were arranged by the Coordinator of Petroleum with the Office of Price Administration and these were put into effect and continued until Federal Loan Administrator Jesse Jones agreed to assume this extra cost as a proper war charge against the public Treasury. So that at the present moment the necessity of using railway transportation in lieu of water transportation involves a minimum cost to the taxpayers of the United States of approximately $400,000,000 per year.

At the present time there is being delivered into the eastern area of the United States approximately 1,250,000 barrels of oil a day. Of this figure, approximately 800,000 barrels are being moved into the area by tank cars at an average freight rate of approximately $1.40 a barrel, 75,000 barrels a day via the Great Lakes and the New York State waterways at an average freight rate of 84 cents a barrel, 64,000 barrels via pipe lines at an average rate of 65 cents a barrel, and about 35,000 barrels via the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers in conjunction with either pipe lines or tank cars from the Pittsburgh area to the eastern seaboard at a cost of $1.40 a barrel. Roughly, this total is about 974,000 barrels, and the average weighted freight rate is $1.30 a barrel. By multiplying 974,000 barrels by the average rate of $1.30, we have $1,266,200 the cost per day, and, multiplying this amount by 365 days, we have the total cost per year of $462,163,000.

There is still being received on the Atlantic seaboard by tankers approximately 250,000 barrels per day, with a fixed martime freight rate of 40 cents on gasoline to 48 cents on heavy bunker oil. The excess cost, which is being absorbed by the Public Treasury in the form of a subsidy, amounts to the difference in delivery cost between the present means of transportation and that formerly delivered by tank vessels at a cost below 40 cents per barrel, whereas present average transportation cost is $1.30 per barrel. The present total cost of getting petroleum products to the east coast amounts to $462,163,000, as compared to the cost of shipments by approved tanker rates, if tank vessels are available, amounts to $197,173,000, which indicates that approximately $264,990,000 is the excess cost being paid as a subsidy by the taxpayers of this country.

In Jul; 1942 the Coordinator of Petroleum anncunced that a shortage of fuel and heating oils in the States on the Atlantic seaboard actually existed. He stated:

"Fuel and heating oils in storage in the East are only about half of what they were at this time a year ago. And, although summer is the period during which inventories are normally built up for winter, we have not been able to build them up this year. All of you know the reason; the fleet of some 300 tank ships which used to bring about 95 percent of the oil to the East has been reduced to a fraction of its former size by transfers to military service and through destruction by enemy submarines. It has been impossible to replace those ships with tank cars, pipe lines, barges, lake tankers, and trucks, in spite of the fact that your Government, the petroleum industry, and the transportation companies have done, and will continue to do, all in their power to move more and more oil east. And so, although no man can make any valid predictions in wartime, there is no assurance, as of today, that you will have enough fuel and heating oil to supply your next winter's supply. On the contrary, the prospect as of today is that your supplies will be substantially restricted. It is possible that there may be some days when both distributors and consumers will be without fuel and heating oil."

It is generally conceded by military experts and others with a recognized knowledge of the subject that we have a long, hard war ahead of us and there is no prospect that American tank ships can be, for some time to come, diverted from their present military activities to any great extent for coastal service. According to the best information available from unofficial sources, approximately 496 ships have been sunk in the Atlantic by Axis submarines through torpedoes or gunfire; a number of these vessels are tankers, and as a result of these losses it is generally conceded that the shipping shortage constitutes the greatest bottleneck of our national war effort and of the shipment of economic supplies to the East Coast States. A conservative estimate of the cost of the 496 ships lost amounts to approximately $600,250,000. The amount of cargo lost through these sinkings may be estimated at 2,500,000 tons, and while it is difficult to estimate the value of this cargo, it may be safely stated as $250,000,000—making a total financial loss on this account to $850,250,000.

Our coast line from Eastport, Maine, to Key West, Fla., was inadequately defended, except for several ports where seacoast fortifications existed, and some 35 years ago the founders of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association recognizing this condition proposed the construction of an inland protected waterway along the Atlantic Coast from Boston to Miami. At the present time, this waterway is partly completed and is in operation. It permits vessels loaded to a 10-foot draft to move through its channel from Jacksonville, Fla., to Norfolk, Va. Between Jacksonville and Miami, the draft is limited to 6½ feet. From the Virginia Capes to Trenton via the Chesapeake Bay, the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal and the Delaware River, there is a 27-foot channel. Between New York Harbor and Boston, there is a deep-water channel through New York Harbor, Long Island Sound, the Cape Cod Canal, and Massachusetts Bay to Boston. The continuity between the Virginia Capes and Massachusetts Bay is stymied by the lack of a connecting link between the Delaware River and New York Harbor. There is now before your committee House Resolution 1880, a bill to provide for the immediate authorization and construction of the New York Bay-Delaware River section of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway between Bordentown, N. J., on the Delaware River, to the vicinity of Sayreville, N. J., on the Raritan River, which if completed, would provide a continuous inland waterway between Miami, Fla., and Boston, Mass. It would also provide an inland waterway route to every port of the Hudson River, every port on the New York State Canal System and every port on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River for economic purposes, as well as military, and the Washington Navy Yard, by using the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers would also be accessible to vessels of 23-foot draft.

For military purposes, it will afford a protected inland water route connecting the Norfolk, Washington, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston Navy Yards, shortening the distance between the New York and Philadelphia Navy Yards by 150 miles and that of the Norfolk and Washington Navy Yards with the New York Yard by 100 miles.

Surveys have been made and reports submitted by the Army engineers in connection with the construction of this canal. However, its construction at the time was disapproved on the grounds that it was too costly, not urgently necessary, or economically justified at the time these reports were reviewed. The estimated cost of construction varied from $20,000,000 for a 12-foot lock channel to approximately $200,000,000 for a 27-foot-depth channel. However, all reports conceded that this canal was essential for the completion of a continuous interior waterway, the Intracoastal Canal, between Boston and Miami.

With the attack on Pearl Harbor, conditions changed instantly. National defense plans became war plans—a paramount issue, and transportation, both commercial and military, became a serious and difficult problem in the new light of events, and still is. The Atlantic Ocean became, and still is, infested with enemy submarines that have taken an appalling toll in ships, their cargoes of essential materials, and of human lives.

If the so-called missing link is constructed between Bordentown and Sayreville, there will be then available a connecting and protected waterway immune from submarine attacks and the hazards of the sea encountered on the outside route. It would permit vessels to enter it at the Virginia Capes and proceed to Boston. The capacity of vessels using this route will be determined entirely upon the depth of the channel and, inasmuch as the controlling factor is the depth of the channel in the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, namely, 27 feet, there is no apparent good reason why the missing link should not be the same depth. If you will take the cost of the vessels lost on the Atlantic Coast between the Virginia Capes and Cape Cod that might have used such a channel, also the value of the cargoes which were lost through the sinkings of these vessels; consider the number of lives lost, the delay to our war efforts and the hardships and suffering resulting therefrom, together with the $400,000,000 minimum annual differential in transportation costs that Federal Loan Administrator Jesse Jones agreed to assume as a proper charge against the Public Treasury, I am constrained to the opinion that you will agree with me that the amount involved in the construction of this canal is not too costly either as an economic measure, a war measure, or on humanitarian grounds. I also believe that you will agree with me that it is now urgently necessary and that in the post-war period when low freight rates will be essential for our economic stability, it will prove economically justified.

If this connecting link had been constructed in accordance with the original recommendations and had been completed before December 7, 1941, it would have proved of inestimable value to the Nation from both a military and an economic viewpoint.

It would have eliminated the necessity of coastwise vessels using open waters of the Atlantic for the entire distance between the Virginia capes and Massachusetts Bay. It would have released naval and Coast Guard vessels and air forces from patrol duty along this stretch of the Atlantic and would have permitted of them being diverted to other waters for duty where enemy submarines were active to augment the small patrol forces in such waters apparently unable to wholly eliminate the submarine menace. It would have saved many ships and lives and now it would serve to practically eliminate all danger of the fuel shortage on the Atlantic coast.

I have attended several hearings before governmental agencies in connection with this project and on each occasion I particularly noticed that practically the only objections to it were raised by the railroads or their affiliates and associates. In the event of further hearings on this project during the duration, I seriously doubt whether under the conditions, even the railroads will offer serious objection. It is my personal conviction that in view of what this proposed canal means to the Nation, both from a military standpoint and an economic one, any effort to defeat it would be very, very close to an unpatriotic act.

Lend-Lease Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of March 2, 1943:

LEND-LEASE EXTENSION

Two years ago this month, the lend-lease bill was approved by the House and Senate and signed by the President. The act expires June 30, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has recommended unanimously its extension for another year. Approval of the extension by Congress is virtually certain.

The lend-lease bill delegates broad powers—powers which, at the time the bill was first presented and under the circumstances then existing, were considered by many as beyond the immediate necessity of providing aid for Britain, which was the primary purpose of the measure. In accepting the bill 2 years ago, Congress merely added a terminal date, and asked for quarterly reports, which were duly made.

The circumstances have changed greatly since March of 1941. In June of that year Germany launched its attack on Russia; in December Japan struck at Pearl Harbor. The United Nations were joined early in 1942. Lend-lease, at first designed primarily for Britain, has become a reciprocal arrangement between the United States and its allies in the world-wide war. Powers which might have seemed too great for the President when the country was at peace, are not too great for the Commander in Chief of a nation at war.

And there is no doubt that the plan has been greatly beneficial in carrying on the war. The House committee reports that lend-lease has operated brilliantly and has been "a powerful force in halting the Axis advance, and in supporting the United Nations' offensive." Less satisfaction is expressed regarding aid to China, but the committee states that it has been assured such aid will be forthcoming as soon as it is physically possible. The figures cited, of dollar value of lend-lease shipments—$3,959,950,000 to Britain, $1,532,230,000 to Russia, $2,393,193,000 to the Middle and Far East, up to the first of this year, and $156,738,000 to China to date—tell their own story. And the flow is steadily increasing.

Shipments of Butter to Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

CLAIMS TONS OF BUTTER AND SUGAR RUINED IN ALASKAN PORTS

SEATTLE, March 6.—The Seattle Post-Intelligencer said today that enough coffee and butter to give the 400 residents of Nome, Alaska, thousands of pounds each was landed there last October by the civilian reserve food supply office.

The coffee and butter, the paper said, were part of an unexpected and unneeded shipload of foodstuffs for which there was no storage place in the community. Much of the shipment, the article said, has spoiled on the beach.

"Alaskans charged the stuff was purchased and ordered sent by Washington, D. C., and Chicago Government officials to whom Nome was only a place on the map, and who do not realize that its present civilian population numbers only about 400 persons," the paper said.

Included in the alleged shipment, the paper said, were 350 tons of butter, 173 tons of coffee, 78 tons of salad oil, 59 tons of soap, 503 tons of canned milk, 70 tons of canned pears, 78 tons of toilet tissue, and 78 tons of dried eggs.

The paper said lack of a warm storage space caused the brine in which the butter was packed to freeze, bursting the barrels and wasting much of the shipment. Canned pears also burst their containers, the article said, and the rest of the shipment is expected to deteriorate with the arrival of spring thaws.

The paper said Alaskans had expressed first disbelief and then amazement.

"This thing has become a joke the length and breadth of Alaska," one Alaskan businessman was quoted, "it is incredible, so unbelievable it's funny."

Another Alaskan, the paper said, charged that similar occurrences had happened before.

"This is only one instance," he quoted. "Do you know the Government sent 150 cases of canned salmon to Nulato on the Yukon river? If there is one thing Nulato doesn't need its salmon. Catching salmon is Nulato's sole industry."

Triple A Still in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 10, I called attention to the pernicious activities of the Wisconsin State triple-A committeemen and their field men. This is a matter that should have the attention of this House immediately, and I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Roscoe Smith, president of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation, and a copy of a mimeographed letter which has been broadcast throughout the State of Wisconsin and which undoubtedly has the backing of the United States Department of Agriculture:

WISCONSIN FARM BUREAU
FEDERATION CORPORATION,
Madison, Wis., March 9, 1943.

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: You will note from the enclosure that the mimeograph machines belonging to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration are mighty busy. You will also note that at the request of the State agricultural adjustment administration committee and their field men, county committees are becoming quite active in an aggressive campaign to flood Senators and Congressmen with letters and telegrams carrying out the requests of the bureaucrats in the Department of Agriculture.

The Wisconsin State triple-A committee and their field men have practically completed their series of district and county agricultural adjustment administration meetings. Those invited to attend district meetings were the county agricultural adjustment administration committees, and their field women. Those invited to attend county meetings were county and township agricultural adjustment administration committeemen and their wives. No one was asked to attend these meetings except the paid employees of the agricultural adjustment administration.

Wisconsin farmers resent Washington bureaucrats invading their peaceful State with vicious charges leveled against the Big Four Farm Organizations, the Extension Service, and the Farm Bloc.

There are two issues involved, and they are:

1. Centralized Washington bureaucratic control over agricultural policies versus agricultural policies developed by farmers and authorized by Congress.

We recognize the necessity of bureaucrats in the administration; however, they must not replace Congress and the people in forming governmental policies.

2. Farming—"only a way of life" versus farming—"a business."

One group contends that farming should be nothing more than a way of life, and should be closely supervised and heavily subsidized by the Government for the sake of cheap food. They would grant the producer of food only the bare comforts of life, but would not permit farmers to produce food on a sound business basis.

Wisconsin farmers believe that farming is a business and should be treated as such.

Farmers want only parity prices in the open market place. We have held over 100 meetings with farm groups this winter, and not in any case have they supported the philosophy of incentive payments. Particularly when our national income is the highest on record, shouldn't there ever come a time when farmers may maintain a position of dignity when they may receive from the consumer a fair price without Government subsidy?

We recognize that there are periods when it may be in the public interest to provide Government aid to farmers, but if we are to subscribe to the philosophy that Government payments be paid at this time, then we are declaring to the world that agriculture must always be a subsidized industry. One of the greatest issues in agricultural history is at stake, and the decision made will largely determine the status of the American farmer in our human society.

Respectfully,

ROSCOE SMITH,
President.

TRIPLE A ATTACKED

Farmer-committeemen administration and the triple A farm program in general has been challenged. Farm-bloc Senators acting for the powerful Farm Bureau—extension leaders are up to their necks in a bloody campaign to wreck the national farm program and any move that gives the farmer a right to speak for himself.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED

1. Additional feed wheat has been refused farmers when we still have 275,000,000 bushels in Government storage of the 1,150,000,000-bushel supply on hand.

a. We need feed wheat at 85 percent of parity prices to hold down the cost of producing milk, eggs, and meat.

b. We have kept more brood sows and cows. We have anticipated obtaining more chicks with the thought in mind of using feed wheat to increase production.

c. There is no reason why feed wheat should be held back when our present supply is enough to run the country 2 years.

2. The appropriation for incentive payments to get increased production of war crops has been turned down by the House subcommittee.

a. The whole move is an organized attempt to discredit the administration's farm policy. If the farm policy can be upset and the lid

taken off food prices, speculative interests, and incidentally large corporation farms that are backing Farm Bureau and supporting Extension Service, stand to make millions of dollars and the small farmer won't be a bit better off than he was before.

b. Incentive payments will make it possible to get further increases in production without increases in food costs to consumers.

c. Incentive payments to farmers are the same as 3- to 5-year contracts, guaranteeing 8 percent profit to war-production plants, such as the powder-plant contract at Merrimac. The incentive payment, like the contracts, is for extra effort and extra risks. Payments for high costs of beyond-normal safe production.

3. Drastic changes have been recommended to Congress to abolish triple A and farmer-committeemen administration.

a. The question is, Are farmers going to run their own business? Some think it ought to be run by nonfarm, so-called technical experts who never had a blister on their hands. It will be, if undercurrents now working in Washington and elsewhere succeed.

b. Eliminating farmer-committeemen will run the food-production program on the rocks. People don't realize how much the Nation and the war is dependent upon the work of triple A committeemen.

c. How do you think farmers will fare after the war, without their triple A farm organization?

HOW TO FIGHT BACK TO SAVE OUR PROGRAM

1. Write or telegraph our Congressman WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, Washington, D. C., also our Senator ROBERT LA FOLLETTE and Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Washington, D. C.

(a) State that you believe war food production will suffer without farmer-committeemen organization.

(b) That the fertilizer and lime program will practically discontinue without triple A committeeman's support.

(c) That improved farming practice recommendations of extension and other technical groups will, as previous to triple A, fall on deaf ears if not backed and sold by triple A committeemen.

(d) That farmers will not, as a whole, accept and put into practice increased-production methods recommended by college white-collar men. The past 10 years' experience has proved they will listen to suggestions from fellow dirt farmers.

(e) State how triple A has increased production and soil fertility on your farm and in your community.

(f) Explain the need for the ever-normal granary and price-support programs.

(g) State that Farm Bureau controlled extension will not receive cooperation of farmers in rival farm organization localities, such as farmers' union locals.

2. Contact your farm organizations, such as farmers' union, farmers' cooperatives, etc. Request their support of triple A.

3. Contact businessmen, professional men, and their organizations. Request their support of triple A.

4. Hold meetings in your community for the purpose of getting farmers to write their Congressman and Senators.

5. Contact educators, such as vocational agricultural teachers, superintendents of schools, country school teachers, your minister, and others. Request them to write and support the triple A farm program.

THINK—ACT—NOW

If we are to hold the vital freedom we have gained, to elect men to think and act for our local farm welfare, then we must think and act now to enlighten the men in Washington whom we have elected to think and act for our national welfare.

Russia and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial recently published in the Wheeling Intelligencer, which I believe expresses the proper attitude respecting the aid given to Russia under our lend-lease program:

RUSSIA AND THE WAR

Despite official Washington's evident consternation, we believe Ambassador Standley performed a public service by his assertion that Stalin is withholding from the Russian people the truth about America's war aid to them.

His statement should help clear the atmosphere of a lot of fog which the administration has been busy producing ever since Hitler invaded Russia.

Washington seems to be deeply concerned over what effect the Standley statement will have on official American-Russian relations. We doubt if there is much ground for that fear if, indeed, the fear exists. Mr. Stalin takes no offense at blunt language. He uses it himself and has directed not a little of it toward his allies in this war. So long as the stream of war supplies keeps coming in—as we believe it has and should—Mr. Stalin will be content. And his attitude now and hereafter will be changed in no way by what Mr. Standley says. Nowhere should this be better appreciated than in Washington, where the real fear, we suspect, is that the American people will lose faith in the fiction—and we use the word advisedly—that Russia and the United States are engaged in a great joint enterprise to free the world.

Undoubtedly, Admiral Standley spoke without having consulted with his Government, which was, we would think, a serious breach of diplomatic discipline. For this he probably merits a rebuke. But when it comes to the essence of what he said, it would seem to us that he is in a much better position than is Washington to know what the Russian Government is permitting its people to learn about American war aid.

We have no doubt at all that Stalin is doing just what Standley says he is doing. Moreover, we think this is a matter of no importance whatever, so far as the official relationship between Washington and the Kremlin is concerned, or so far as prosecution of the war is concerned. Its importance lies in helping reveal to the American people the real purpose of Russia in this war. We think Senator WHEELER hit the nail on the head when he said:

"The reason Stalin isn't telling his people about our aid is because Stalin is a realist. He's for Russia first and last. He isn't for the four freedoms and never will be, because he couldn't be for them and still be a Communist."

From the very beginning, Stalin has complained publicly about the lack of assistance given Russia. He spoke pointedly on several occasions about the failure of his allies to open up a second front against Germany. And within the past several weeks he proclaimed publicly that Russia is carrying on alone against Germany. Indeed, so far as any of the record we have seen shows to the contrary, Stalin has, from the first, emphasized to the Russian people that they had only themselves to depend upon.

We see no particular objection to this. If Stalin can get more out of the Russian people in this way, and if he can at the same time condition their minds for a Russian peace when the war is over, that is a Russian affair.

What we do object to is the fairyland attitude of the American Government toward Russia and the war. Why can't we be as realistic as Stalin is?

Russia is fighting Germany because Germany attacked Russia and threatened the very existence of Russia. Russia isn't fighting Japan because Japan has done nothing to Russia. Russia, in other words, is interested in Russia and in no other country. And Russia will be primarily for Russia when the time comes to make a peace.

We are interested in helping Russia only because she is fighting a country with whom we are at war. Russia is doing a better job against Germany than is anybody else in the United Nations line-up. So it is only the part of enlightened self-interest for this country to keep on sending war supplies to Russia, whether or not the Russian people are told about it. As a matter of fact, our war supplies in their hands probably are more effective against Germany than in the hands of any others, including our own. And that, if we're sensible, is all we are interested in.

Let's face these facts as they are. Let's be content with the job Russia is doing in beating up, for her own sake, an enemy of ours. But let's quit this silly pretense that we and the Russians are part of a great crusade, not only to make democracy safe in the world, but to spread it throughout the world.

Unless we do clear our minds of this fiction, and unless we see to it that the Government is in the hands of men who know the score when the war is over, we are in for some distressing times at the peace table.

F. S. A. Menu for Mexican Agricultural Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, I addressed you regarding a menu for feeding Mexican nationals sent out by the Farm Security Administration. This menu was sent to me by Mr. Ivan McDaniel, an attorney of Los Angeles. He is of high caliber and his word is his bond. I quote from his letter:

I enclose herewith a copy of a menu which the Farm Security Administration has required agricultural employers in California to use in feeding the Mexican nationals brought in as agricultural workers.

My purpose was to point out the injustice of this menu that was sent to Mr. McDaniel, as it would place additional burdens upon our farmers who secure Mexican workers to assist in harvesting our agricultural crops.

On February 20 I received a letter from Mr. C. B. Baldwin, Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, stating

that he was astonished to hear of the reported requirements—that he had no knowledge of such regulations. He further stated that the Farm Security Administration had made no such requirements or even recommended such feeding regulations as reported to me, but in the same letter he admitted that the Farm Security Administration had sent a menu to the Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation. Apparently Mr. Baldwin started a check to find out who in my District had been given the menu by the Farm Security Administration, for the Di Giorgio Corporation has large holdings in my District. He took it for granted it came from my district, not knowing that it had been sent from Los Angeles. It would be interesting to know how many menus were distributed by his organization in the Western States.

While the Farm Security Administration maintains they had nothing to do with it, last week into my office walked Mr. L. I. Hewes, who has charge of the San Francisco office of the Farm Security Administration, and that gentleman sat in my office and told me that he would take full responsibility for the menus and said he would like to see a copy to see whether or not it was the same as that sent out from the San Francisco office, admitting that they knew of the menu.

After bringing the menu to the attention of the Congress I heard that a radio commentator had commented on my remarks and indicated that I did not have all the facts. I again contacted Mr. McDaniel and quote from his letter of February 19, 1943:

On February 3, 1943, Mr. R. V. Moore, a representative of the Farm Security Administration, came to my office and had a conference with Mr. George Lyon, who is associated with me in the practice of law. I was returning from Washington at the time. During this conference, which had to do with certain contracts, Mr. Moore stated that the Farm Security Administration had menus for use in feeding the Mexican nationals and that if we would write to the Farm Security Administration office in San Francisco they would forward these menus to us. Accordingly, on February 9 Mr. Lyon wrote to the Farm Security Administration in San Francisco on other matters and mentioned the menus as follows:

"At our conference you stated that if I requested it you would send me sample menus for use in feeding the Mexican nationals. I would appreciate receiving these."

Thereafter, and on or about February 12, a copy of the menus which I sent you was received from the Farm Security Administration office in San Francisco.

Whether the Farm Security Administration did or did not prepare the menus I do not know, but I do know that they had distributed them. Mr. Baldwin admits to one case, Mr. Hewes states that he is responsible for the mailing from the San Francisco office and Mr. Moore discussed the menu and suggested that the F. S. A. office be contacted for copies.

Why does the F. S. A. send out these menus if they are not advocating the program? It cannot just be a suggested diet for we of the Western States have had Mexican laborers since long before the F. S. A. was ever dreamed of.

After a few years of dealing with some of the bureaus in our Government I know that tactics and suggestions of this kind are often the forerunners of demands.

Lease-Lend Without Strings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tribune (Scranton, Pa.) for February 27, 1943:

LEND-LEASE WITHOUT STRINGS

If one program of our Government has paid off dividends in checking the Axis march of aggression it is the lend-lease program. Not only did the weapons and supplies from lend-lease enable European belligerents fighting the Axis to stand up against the mechanized force Hitler and his associates were able to employ, but the program proved a timely vehicle for conversion of American civilian industry to military production.

America has truly become the arsenal of democracy. The aid we have been able to give our allies has counted heavily in turning the tide against the Axis. Now, when we are really hitting on all cylinders on the production front, it would be a serious mistake to limit the lend-lease program or hamstring it with restrictions. Let lend-lease be continued in its present form.

The Real Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article in the Washington Post of today, March 12, entitled "The Real Ruml Plan," by Mr. Mark Sullivan:

THE REAL RUML PLAN

(By Mark Sullivan)

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Whether the country is to get the Ruml pay-as-you-earn tax plan depends now on Congress as a whole. The preliminary bill, written by the House Ways and Means Committee, is not that plan. When the bill gets on the floor of the House, attempt will be made to change it into the Ruml pay-as-you-earn plan. The attempt has many backers and will be earnest.

Right now, with some 27,000,000 citizens making out tax returns, is a good time to make the pay-as-you-earn plan understood. For that purpose consider an average taxpayer. Say his name is Doe. In assuming Doe's averageness, we can only be approximate and typical, as to figures and other conditions.

Say Doe's yearly income is $4,000. Say, for the sake of simplicity, he is a man who receives the same income every year—last year, this year, future years. Say his income tax is $400 a year.

Consider Doe under the existing system. On March 15 he pays the quarterly installment of his tax, $100.

After paying, Doe is, under the existing system, right where he was before. He still owes three-fourths of his tax on last year's income, $300. And he also owes the tax on this year's income up to March 15, about another $100. Doe's debt to the Government remains $400.

Under the existing system, Doe will go through life always owing the Government some $400. Next June, after paying another $100, he will still owe half the tax on last year's income—and the tax on nearly half this year's income. And so in September and December. Doe is always a year behind. He will die a year behind.

Now consider Doe under the proposed Ruml pay-as-you-earn plan. Under this, Doe on March 15 would pay $100, the same as under the existing system. But under the Ruml plan, Doe would now be up to date, in the clear. In the next 3 months, he would become subject to another $100 tax. This he would pay on June 15, and again be up to date. And so on throughout his life.

Instantly arises the question which critics of the Ruml plan ask. Wouldn't the Government lose? Well, the Government certainly would not lose this year. For Doe this year would pay under Ruml plan the same amount he pays under the existing system. The Government would get the same amount, $400. And the same next year and every year, so long as Doe lives—in every year, the Government would get from Doe the same amount under the Ruml plan as under the existing system. So far as Doe is an average and symbol of all taxpayers, the total the Government would get would be about the same.

Theoretically, there is a point at which, on paper, the Government might seem to lose. That is when Doe dies. Under the existing system, Doe will die owing the Government $400—his wife and children or other heirs will be called on to pay it. But under the pay-as-you-earn plan, Doe would die in the clear—or at least not owing more than the tax on his earnings for a few weeks, never more than 3 months, in money never more than $100.

This question—whether the Government would lose—is tangled with contentious argument and counterargument (as this writer knows from many letters received). It seems fair to say this, that over a period of years the Government would lose something, theoretically. In Doe's case, if he lives 30 years, the Government will fail to get $400 over the period as a whole—fail to get one $400 payment out of 30 such payments. As to all taxpayers as a group, the Government would, over a period of years, lose 1 year's taxes. The period would depend on the life expectancy of the present generation of taxpayers, perhaps about 20 years.

But to this there are answers. One is, if the Government really wants that final $400 from Doe's heirs 30 years from now, treat it separately and call it what it is—an inheritance tax. Actually, in practice, as respects all taxpayers as a group, the Government, over the period of life expectancy, would adjust itself—whether by a slight increase in annual tax rates or what not.

Doe is a presumed average man who gets the same income every year. There are classes of taxpayers outside the average,

which the proposed plan would affect in special ways. Persons whose income last year was greater than this would get an advantage—they would pay less taxes. Many of these are persons who last year had considerable earnings in civilian life, but this year are in the Army and get only Army pay. For some, it would be embarrassing to have to pay taxes on last year's income out of this year's small earnings. As respects the Government's total revenue the present year, this will be balanced by persons whose insome this year is increased, and by new taxpayers.

War Is the Army's Business—Let the United States Army Run It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record of March 11, 1943:

WAR IS THE ARMY'S BUSINESS; LET THE UNITED STATES ARMY RUN IT

Who are the best judges of the means America must use to win the war?

A Congressman concerned for the comfort of his constituents in a single district of a single State?

An editor five to ten thousand miles from the fighting fronts, with no inkling of the grand strategy of the high command?

Plain John Citizen, dropping in for a beer on his way home from work, arguing that conscription must stop at this point or that?

Or the national leaders—military and civilian—who have intimate knowledge of every phase of the problem and who bear the terrible responsibility of victory or defeat?

There is only one answer for Americans with the courage of realism. It cannot be evaded on the ground that the Army program to have 8,200,000 men in service by the end of the year means heartbreak and sacrifice in thousands of homes which have until now been touched lightly by the war.

This is not to say that the President or Cabinet members or generals should be free from criticism. The people under whom they hold their authority retain the right to challenge it. Some critics of the Army expansion program are deeply in earnest in their contention that the national economy will not support fighting forces of the size contemplated.

Our enlarged Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard will bring more than 11,000,000 men under arms. For months opponents have protested that the increase would strip American factories of manpower to a point where we could no longer equip our services.

The debate has been calm and carefully reasoned on the whole. But sooner or later a conclusive response had to be given. We believe it was furnished on Tuesday night in the speech of Secretary of War Stimson.

Mr. Stimson dealt first with the military problem of having sufficient American fighting men to carry on an aggressive war, to strike hard and swiftly, to take advantage of what he terms "the priceless opportunities which are already opening up for us." Curtailment of the Army, he said, would be a graver blow than any losses likely to be suffered in battle.

But—more important, perhaps—he made it clear that military plans have been balanced against the factors of manpower, production, shipping, and equipment. Civilian authorities were consulted and the accumulated research of the Government taken into consideration.

The decision was that America can build and equip the forces she needs. It has been approved by the joint chiefs of staff and by President Roosevelt.

We do not believe that any of the opposition is competent to disregard it, for no one is as close to the core of the problem as the men who have drawn the blueprint for our military future.

It is going to be a road far more difficult than the one we have followed this far. It may mean a draft of labor—a general service act similar to England's. It may mean longer hours and it will certainly mean harder work.

But we've picked our leaders. The chips are down. They're playing our hand.

We must never forget, as the game grows more tense, that there's no short cut to victory, no easy chair route to Berlin and Tokyo.

Lynn Hero Awarded the Navy and Marine Corps Medal by President Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Lynn, Mass., is proud of her fighting men, and right now she is bulging with pride for Commander John J. Twomey. The Navy and Marine Corps medal has been awarded to Lynn's first major hero of World War No. 2 for heroic and courageous conduct as commanding officer of a United States vessel during operations in August 1942.

Commander Twomey's courage commands attention even in these days when men rise to the stature of heroes, even in these days which witness thousands of heroic acts—not to mention the hundreds of thousands of courageous acts which are never known or told. Let me read the official citation:

For heroic and courageous conduct as commanding officer of a United States vessel in August 1942. In spite of damage to his vessel and subsequent fires, and although severely injured himself, Commander Twomey brought his crippled vessel into position and towed a disabled vessel until relieved by a salvage tug. This operation, conducted under most adverse conditions, was undoubtedly an important factor in the successful salvaging of the vessel in tow. His splendid seamanship and initiative in an emergency reflect great credit upon Commander Twomey, his command, and the United States Naval Service.

Lynn, Mass., is proud of her hero, not only because of this extraordinary performance, but because he is a symbol of Lynn's many boys who are fighting for their country. The heart of Lynn beats with pride because Commander Twomey now represents the courage and devotion of all the boys of Lynn. We in America have known many men who were great, not only as individuals, but because they were representative of hundreds of unknown men who shared similar characteristics. Daniel Boone became the symbol of the bold vision and ready courage of America's pioneers; Paul Revere became the symbol of America's alertness and readiness for action; the Minute Men—Davy Crockett, Robert Fulton, and these and many others are dear to the hearts of America, because of what they accomplished, and because in that accomplishment they represented the spirit of the age and the men of that age.

It is by no means an exaggeration to point to Commander Twomey as the symbol of Lynn's fighting men. Surely his courage was manifest, his devotion plain, his conduct exemplary. And we all know that similar acts of courage and heroism are occuring every day throughout the world, possibly not as outstanding or as significant as Commander Twomey's action, but certainly performed by men who are made in the same mold.

The city of Lynn knows that it has heroes and many of them. Commander Twomey has done more even than his citation states, for he has become a symbol, a living and proclaimed example for every citizen of Lynn to take pride in. For every citizen in Lynn knows another hero, and it is for that hero that Commander Twomey stands.

Deserving a Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of March 11, 1943:

DESERVING A RAISE

Next Monday the House in Washington is to consider a bill that would grant a $300 annual cost-of-living bonus to postal workers, to be effective until 6 months after the end of the war. A Senate committee has favorably reported a similar measure.

Temporary legislation, adopted in the final days of the last Congress, expires April 30. If a new measure is not adopted by that time, pay rates for postal workers will revert to figures that have not been changed—except for this temporary bill—since 1925.

The increase of $300 being proposed comes close to the 15 percent raise allowable in industry under the Little Steel formula.

Under the handicaps of reduced personnel due to service in the armed forces, and a much greater volume of mail, the postal workers have been carrying on. The increase that the pending bills would provide is deserved.

Kosse, Tex., Proves Its Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN recently placed in the RECORD tables and statistics showing that Texas leads all other States in having the highest percentage of its population in the armed forces during this war.

There is in my district a town, Kosse, Tex., having a population of 881, according to the Census Bureau, and from this town and community there are now in the service of their country the large number of 250. This record probably exceeds that, on a percentage basis, of any other town or city in the United States.

Rev. William H. Sealy, pastor of the First Baptist Church, of Kosse, Tex., has furnished me an alphabetical list of these 250 names, and he advises me that all of them, at the time of their enlistment, either lived at Kosse or in that community, and while a few of them had moved away at the time of their enlistment, they still considered Kosse as their home.

A large burnt-wood plaque has been made with the names of each of these burnt into it, and there is to be an unveiling of this plaque in their honor, at Kosse, Tex., on Sunday afternoon, March 21.

The spirit actuating this patriotic celebration by the citizens of Kosse is an evidence of the same spirit of patriotism which prompted these young men to enlist in the Army and Navy in the defense of their country, and is symbolic of the patriotic fervor of these loyal Americans.

The record made in this small community is so outstanding that I feel it is worthy of being called to the attention of the Congress of the United States.

Florida Barge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston Post of March 8, 1943, entitled "For Florida Barge Canal":

FOR FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

If the Government had proceeded promptly with construction of the barge canal across Florida, provided for in the Mansfield bill, it could have been completed by now.

And if the work now were begun immediately, it could be dug in time to avert a repetition of this winter's acute fuel shortage on the eastern seaboard.

Congress appropriated $6,425,000 of the amount authorized in the Mansfield bill, for deepening and widening the intracoastal canal. Now the canal advocates are asking for $44,000,000 more to cut the barge canal through Florida. Authorities have said it could be constructed in 10 months. In fact, responsible firms have proposed to do it in that time.

The House appropriations committee will consider the appropriation at a meeting next Friday. It is to the interest of the entire Nation, and of the Gulf coast and the east coast particularly, that it be granted and the barge canal dug. Thus the eastern oil shortage can be relieved, and at less cost than the shipment of petroleum and its products by other means entails.

The all-over program authorized by the Mansfield Act of last year contemplates the widening and deepening of the intracoastal canal all the way from the Rio Grande up to Newark, N. J., the upper terminus of the Atlantic inland waterway. The Florida Canal will link up the two inland arteries. Representative MCCORMACK has introduced a bill providing for extension of the Atlantic inland waterway from Trenton to New York. Texans will advocate it at a committee hearing Tuesday.

This program not only will solve the problem of oil transportation, but will give the Gulf coast its greatest commercial asset since the development of the cotton industry. It will be a great bloodstream of commerce, enriching this entire section with trade and industry. And not the least of its benefits will be the relief it will afford of the discriminatory transcontinental rates which shippers now must pay.

If all friends of the canal will write or wire their Congressmen urging their support of the canal project, it will help.

Freedom and Security in a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE STARNES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me to the graduating class of the University of Alabama March 6, 1943:

Dr. Paty, members of the first graduating class of 1943: We face a world at war. Scenes of carnage are found on a thousand battle fields. The skies are filled with fighting men and planes. On the seven seas fierce and bloody naval battles are being waged. Submarines are on the prowl. Their deadly charges are tearing the vitals of transports and freighters carrying men and equipment to the firing lines, and destroying the commerce of the world. All this is a part of a world tragedy, bringing to a climax the death struggle between the forces of hate, intolerance, and lust for power on the one hand and the forces of justice, tolerance, and freedom on the other.

More significant than the struggle for economic supremacy between "have-not" and "have" nations is the clash of the dictatorships with the democracies of the earth. The philosophy of an all powerful state which dictates every act of the citizen is being tested in the crucible of battle with the philosophy of private enterprise, constitutional liberty, and unfettered political and religious freedom.

Against this somber background you face the future. Everything we hold dear is at stake. The spreading fires of war threaten to engulf and destroy our freedom and economic security.

For countless ages the desire for freedom has burned fiercely in the human heart. No other country in all history has hitherto guaranteed a fuller measure of freedom to its citizenship than ours. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights have been translated from an expression of political, religious, and personal idealism to a living reality. Under the benign protection of our Constitution a Government by law was instituted which has enabled us to guarantee free expression, political activities, and social justice. These rights which we proclaim as inalienable are denied or unduly circumscribed in every country where state socialism is in effect. The stifling of free enterprise; the denial of the right to own property and use it for a profit; the denial of free speech and the censorship of press are natural consequences in a socialistic state.

Freedom and security are the two most natural desires of the human race. How to attain both without the loss or impairment of the other has always been a problem which challenged the genius of economists and statesmen. The economic system under which we have grown to be the richest and most powerful Nation on earth is one of private ownership and free competitive enterprise based upon the profit motive. It has produced the largest national income and the highest standard of living in history. Our wage scales are the highest; our working hours the shortest; our public-school system the best; our postal service the most efficient; our public-health program the most progressive, and our way of life measured in terms of freedom and prosperity, infinitely superior to that of any nation in the long and varied career of mankind. Whenever competition has been stifled or monopolies created by the unscrupulous we have set up a system of checks and balances by governmental action which gave us umpired competition to protect the weak from the strong and introduced a decent spirit of fair play which has enabled free enterprise to flourish and provide comfort and security for the thrifty and the ambitious.

The immediate and first order of business confronting us is war. Our objective is the complete annihilation of the military power of the Axis. There must be no compromise with the forces of evil. There will be no armistice, nor a negotiated peace. Our terms are "unconditional surrender." Just and tolerant peace terms must be imposed upon the vanquished. After the sacrifices this generation must make to win this war they have a right to expect and enforce a lasting peace. The following must be amongst the actions taken when peace has been established in order to accomplish our aims: (1) The trial and punishment of those guilty of bringing on this war and for the atrocities they have inflicted upon innocent and helpless people; (2) Restoration of lands and goods of despoiled nations and just recompense for their illegal use or destruction; (3) The destruction of the heavy industries of Japan; (4) The supervision and control of the industrial life of Germany and Italy to prevent the rearming of these nations; (5) Actual occupation and supervision of the Axis nations until peace terms have been complied with, stable political governments of the free choice

of the people have been established; and, (6) The guaranty of the territorial integrity of smaller nations.

Every intelligent American knows we cannot withdraw from our responsibility and position of leadership in the post-war future. We must follow through and win the battle of peace. Modern inventions in the fields of transportation and communication have annihilated time and space. We must discharge our obligations to ourselves and to our neighbors to lead the world into a new era of cooperation, peace, and understanding. The peace must be kept through some form of collective security in which we must participate without loss of sovereignty or freedom of action. All this talk of a world-wide organization of United Nations in which all the nations would be incorporated in a world superstate is idealistic nonsense and would be suicide for the political sovereignty of the United States.

It is highly important that we assist in a world-wide revival of trade. Artificial barriers stifle free trade, invite retaliation, increase hostile reactions in other nations, and incubate wars. Without lowering our standards of living we can and we must be a good neighbor to all nations by the promotion of world trade. Upon the ability to produce and exchange goods, wares, and merchandise depends the stability and economic security of a nation. There is a sufficient amount of natural wealth in the fields, forests, mines, and seas of the earth to provide a degree of economic security and happiness for all nations and all peoples without waging wars to obtain it. Distribution by trade in good will is to be preferred to economic rape and world wars.

At home our first order of business with the advent of peace is to restore democratic government and democratic processes. It has been necessary to delegate unusual powers over the lives and property of our citizens to the Chief Executive to assist him as Commander in Chief of our armed forces to wage a total war. These rights and powers the Congress delegated are yours and must be recaptured and restored to you if we are to remain a democracy.

Every true American will do well to consider what American democracy has to offer in contrast to dictatorship. Our democracy is a method of conducting government. Dictatorship is a state of being governed.

Americanism means a state which is wholly subordinate to the will of the people. Dictatorship means a people wholly subordinate to the will of the state.

Americanism means decentralization of authority in government. Dictatorship means absolute centralization of authority in government.

Americanism is a rotation of officeholders as a result of free elections. Dictatorship is entrenched power in the hands of officeholders whose tenure rests upon the abolition of free elections.

Americanism is government authority curtailed by a system of checks and balances. Dictatorship represents uncurbed power over the lives of its subjects.

Americanism rejects the idea that the majority may exercise a tyranny over the minority. Dictatorship is the ruthless suppression of all minorities.

American democracy develops leaders. Dictatorship developes followers.

In Americanism the discipline of the individual is self-imposed. In dictatorship, the discipline of the individual is state imposed.

Americanism means complete religious freedom. Dictatorship means the right to worship under sufferance of the state.

Americanism means freedom of press—freedom to print in opposition to government policies. Dictatorship means press censorship and imprisonment for printing in opposition to the state.

Americanism guarantees freedom of assemblage. Dictatorship means state-controlled assemblage.

Americanism means freedom of individual expression in art, science, and enterprise. Dictatorship means the complete regimentation of thought and feeling in all fields of life.

Americanism represents freedom of private enterprise, the function of the state being limited to the preservation of competition. Dictatorship represent a business and industrial economy under the "planning" of state bureaucrats.

Americanism recognizes that property rights must be respected by the state as well as so-called human rights. Americanism rejects the fallacy that there is any sharp distinction or conflict between property rights and human rights. Dictatorship abolishes both the property rights and the so-called human rights of the individual.

Americanism permits the free choices of consumers to determine the character, quality, and abundance of production. Dictatorship bends all production to the will and necessities of the state, denying the free choice of consumers.

Americanism says that individual security is not to be preserved at the price of liberty. Dictatorship promises individual security in return for the surrender of liberty but invariably reneges on its promise.

Americanism is based upon tolerance—racial and religious. Dictatorship is based upon hate—racial, religious, and economic.

The threats to Americanism do not arise from foreign armies alone. They rest even more upon the presence and activity within our borders of those who owe allegiance to Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini. The experiences of this generation have shown beyond any doubt that the enemies within a country may be and often are more dangerous to its welfare than are the enemies without. National defense does not consist alone in bringing our armed forces to a state of complete efficiency. It consists even more in preparing the morale of the American people to resist the inroads of totalitarianism upon public thought. Our intellectual and spiritual defenses are even more important than our bombers and destroyers. Unless we are convinced in the depths of our spiritual beings that Americanism is worth living and dying for, it will avail us little to spend billions upon our armed forces.

The national unity which is essential in this time of crisis must rest upon the overwhelming conviction that Americanism will outlive all the dictatorships for the simple reason that it satisfies the ageless demands of men for freedom on the one hand and security on the other.

Our first obligation in the post-war era is to the soldiers, sailors, and marines who will bring victory to our banners. There must be no unemployment and bread lines for our gallant fighting men when they come home. I suggest a policy of the Selective Service System inversely in dealing with the rehabilitation, vocational training, and employment of our returning warriors. They fought to preserve democracy and economic security. They must find both at home at the end of the war. They were in a select preferential class to fight on the battlefields of the world for their country. In simple justice they must be given preference in employment on the battlefields of peace in the country they saved.

The conversion of our industrial life from war to a peacetime status will be a challenging problem and will provide employment and opportunities for new types of industry in a new world. Undoubtedly, many of the huge war establishments in the South have a peacetime value which should be utilized to the fullest in order that the industral development of the South may continue to grow apace. This will mean increased income and additional opportunities for economic development in this region. We have exploded for all time the theory that southern labor lacks skill and technique. There have been more records established in efficiency and economy of production in the southern area than any other. And the loyalty of our labor is proven by the fact there has not been a single major labor disturbance with its attendant disruption of vital production. This is a tribute to the working men and women of the South.

It is fallacious to assume that only the Federal Government should engage in post-war planning. Private business must remain the greatest employer of labor. Private enterprise has furnished us genius in business organization and management. It has encouraged skill and daring. It has opened the doors of opportunity and provided us with wealth and comfort. What a multiplicity of avenues we have at our disposal to provide employment and economic security in the post-war period. After years of war and waste, rationing, and restraint, and the circumscribing of civilian consumer goods, we shall be face to face with the necessity of providing food and raiment to fill our elemental needs—millions of homes to build and renovate, thousands of business establishments to build and repair; the development of new uses of plastics, chemicals, and power.

Responding to these needs will call for the best in our system of free competitive business enterprise. It provides agriculture, business, and labor with the opportunity to work out post-war problems in a helpful atmosphere. Productive capacity, management genius, and labor technique must cooperate to meet the needs of the human family made so acute by the world's greatest tragedy.

The tremendous expansion of our airplane industry since 1940 has been one of the marvels of the ages. In the fires of war and research plants and laboratories of our aviation companies we are forging for the future in the air. The discoveries made in motor power and equipment and the lessons learned in arena of sky combat will be used to our advantage in establishing the greatest air transportation system in the world. In this field our Army air transport has pioneered and developed methods of operation and management, overcome the elements, obtained invaluable meterological data, and established bases throughout the world. Based upon these experiences, improving upon the equipment at hand, we can and will become the unquestioned leader of the peacetimes skies of the universe.

From the fires of adversity and the demands of necessity will come substitutes of various types to meet our needs. Chief amongst these will be alloys and plastics. Never again will the race be so dependent upon steel and heavy metals to meet its civilian needs as in the past. Many of the new things brought about will be vast improvements upon the old. In our search for substitutes and security the chemists and scientists with their test tubes and retorts, and their laboratory experiments and discoveries will bring to us many new uses for age-old resources. From the vegetable kingdom, the forests, and the earth will come new discoveries and magic byproducts to aid us in providing ample security for all our wants.

To supplement and integrate planning and employment policies of private enterprise the Federal, State, and local governments should devote their energies and facilities for providing needed public works. Today more than a hundred executive agencies of the Federal Government are spending in excess of $150,000,000 and much time in post-war planning. The Congress should create an agency by law to correlate the planning of

private enterprise and the Federal Government. This agency should be equipped with the ablest men available in the fields of education, public health, highway and airport construction, public buildings, and other public works. Furthermore, it should be implemented by law with the power to correlate its program with those of State and local governments.

I note with pride our own beloved State of Alabama has embarked upon a program of post-war planning for needed public facilities which enhance the functions of the State and enrich our lives. The State is wisely making provisions for cooperation with local governments and the Federal Government. After all, one of the most important phases of post-war planning by governmental agencies is the planning to be done at the "grass roots" of democracy by local governments. The clearest expression and deepest understanding of the welfare of a free people stems from the art of local self-government. Local planning will provide the most direct expression of the real needs of our people.

Education has suffered and will continue to suffer throughout the war. Our youth is being called to the colors; our educational plants are being converted, in part, to war uses. While this has been necessary, the tragedy of it all lies in the fact that after the war we will need as never before trained minds to help direct the plans and the activities of our Nation. With the coming of peace we must redouble our efforts to provide proper training for our youth. Those whose school careers have been interrupted should be assisted by a grateful Federal Government, through the Veterans' Administration, in order to complete their careers. We must have longer school terms, more vocational training, better trained and paid teachers, better buildings and equipment. Here all agencies of Government can assist.

Our public health system in Alabama has been a model for other States and nations. On a recent visit to Central and South America it was with pride that I heard a noted public health authority speak in highest terms of our public health system here in Alabama. In the construction of additional hospitals, the increase in the number of public health clinics, and the provision for improved sanitation facilities we can continue to increase our economic security by conquering or controlling diseases that prey upon the human family. This generation has been healthier, stronger, and sturdier than the last. It is our hope that public health facilities plus a physical development program in our schools will produce stronger and better men and women in the future.

The Federal Government must construct a strategic net of transcontinental superhighways which will become arteries of trade and commerce in peace, and vital communication and supply routes in war. To implement this system the States must continue to improve and extend State highway nets of strategic and commercial value. State highways can and will be implemented by a system of feeder roads in the form of farm-to-market and community roads to be constructed by State and local governments.

The improvement of rivers and harbors, and the construction of multiple purpose dams on navigable waterways are highly desirable. Such projects stimulate commerce, open the way for the development of natural resources, provide protection against the ravages of uncontrolled floods, and afford a method for the fullest utilization of our power resources.

New uses for power are being created each day. Nothing will contribute more to the stimulation of industry and enhance the social and economic welfare of our people than a freer use of electric power. The South with its myriad streams, each of which is a potential power reservoir, and its untapped natural resources will profit more from the improvement of transportation facilities and power potentialities than any other region. To a large extent our economic development depends upon our winning the fight for an equitable adjustment of interterritorial freight rates, the improvement of our navigable waterways, and the full development of our power possibilities for factory and farm.

All these possibilities are open to us. Their realization is incentive for intelligent planning, cooperative action. Their complete fulfilment affords opportunity for wealth and happiness, and economic security such as no other people have ever enjoyed.

A few days ago I received a letter from a member of this graduating class. It read in part: "Exams start Friday. Graduation will be on March 6. Doesn't seem I should be graduating from college now. I know so little. The future looks dark but I have a chance to change it and that is all I want or could expect." That letter was from my son.

May I speak to this wonderful class of young American citizens as a representative father? Our hearts are torn between conflicting emotions. Our joy and pride at your accomplishments are tempered with the sober realization of the sky-darkened future. We are heartened by such an expression of your courage and faith. It is the spirit of this great institution whose traditions and training have so nobly enriched your lives. It is the spirit of Alabama. It is the spirit of America.

So long as you retain a spirit of intellectual modesty you will honestly and fearlessly seek after knowledge—and the truth. An open mind is the gateway to the road of enlightenment.

You will have your chance to meet and destroy the forces of hate, intolerance, and dictatorship at a thousand disputed barricades. This class, this generation, has a rendezvous with destiny—a world in which peace reigns with freedom and security. You will meet that rendezvous with courage undaunted, faith undimmed, and hopes high. Nothing is beyond your grasp if you keep faith in yourself, your country, and God.

New Jersey Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Mr. William H. Webb, executive vice president, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, March 11, 1943:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the projects committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, composed of an outstanding waterway expert from each of the 11 engineering divisions of the United States, made a careful examination and study of the proposed New Jersey canal, and unanimously endorsed the project as being sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status, and one that should be promptly constructed in the public interest. The recommendation of the committee was subsequently approved by the congress in convention assembled, which thereby went on record in favor of the project, known on our docket as project No. 36–R of the North Atlantic Division.

Certain canals occupy such strategic locations that their importance to national defense is vital. The fact that the Navy can pass quickly from ocean to ocean through the Panama Canal greatly increases its mobility and its ability to defend either coast. To a lesser degree but still of great importance, the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, the Cape Cod Canal, and the projected New Jersey canal will permit the ships of the Navy to pass between our sheltered bases without moving through the open ocean.

The intracoastal waterways now well developed along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts are performing essential service as feeders to the principal ports. They afford a ready means of transfer between ports without exposure to the hazards of the ocean voyage and harassment by the enemy. Depths are not sufficient to permit passage of major naval vessels, except in the strategic canals, such as the Chesapeake & Delaware, but do provide for the movement of smaller auxiliary vessels.

The Intracoastal Waterway is of vital importance also to certain sections where it is the principal means of communication, as, for example, in the low coastal area of the South Atlantic, the Mississippi Delta, and the oil fields of the Texas coast.

In all of the leading European countries the rivers have been systematically improved for navigation, and wherever practical, connected into one continuous network by a strategic system of cross canals. Pressure from competing agencies has not been permitted to block these vital cross-connections. When the missing links are completed we shall have such a transportation chain in this country.

We now have about 6,000 miles of river channels practical for navigation. On the Atlantic coast we have a continuous channel from Trenton, N. J., to Jacksonville, Fla. On the Gulf coast we have a continuous channel from the west coast of Florida to Corpus Christi, Tex., and the recent act authorized extension of this channel to Brownsville on the Mexican border.

With two other missing links supplied, namely, the proposed channels across New Jersey and Florida, the Atlantic-Gulf Intracoastal Waterway would then be continuous from Boston to Brownsville, and, through the Hudson River and Erie Canal, would connect with the Great Lakes at Oswego and at Buffalo. It would also be continuous with the great inland Ohio-Mississippi system and connect with Lake Michigan at Chicago. A channel from New York to Philadelphia, and one from Jacksonville to the west coast of Florida, to connect the Atlantic and Gulf intracoastal waterways, would supply the missing links in the chain and round out the greatest inland waterway system in all the world.

The importance of water transportation for national defense cannot be disputed. This was first thoroughly demonstrated by the Germans. After their annexation of Schleswig and Holstein, they constructed the Kiel Canal, which affords safe and quick passage of their fleets between the Baltic and the North Seas, avoiding the difficulties of the Skagerrak. The improved rivers of Germany, with their connecting channels, are models of strategy and have contributed enormously to the success of Nazi military operations.

Our river and harbor projects have generally been designed and improved for commercial rather than for military use. Yet practically all of them are performing an important part in our war program. Products of the forest, soil, and mine are being

reliably and efficiently moved en masse to blast furnaces, smelters, mills, and factories, and thence the finished goods to ports, arsenals, shipbuilding plants, navy yards, refineries, warehouses, cantonments, coast-defense forts, and railway gun-mount spurs. Any failure in this would mean that our defenders on sea and land and in the air would not be given the wherewithal to fight. Similarly, men in huge numbers are being assembled in their home regions, quickly transported with reasonable convenience over long distances to training camps, and therefrom to ports of embarkation and theaters of operation overseas. Railroads and highways are, of course, the chief means of troop transport, but for the movement of the bulky materials necessary for the supply of the fighting forces as well as the civil population, the enormous capacity of our waterways is required to supplement that of the railroads and to release rail facilities for those services in which they are most urgently needed.

Everyone who has supported the development of our country's harbors and waterway channels must be gratified to know that their past efforts have been fully worth while from the knowledge that such developments are today, individually and as a system, serving the cause of the Nation. The large number of improved harbors along the Atlantic coast suitable for oceangoing vessels form a springboard for the drive against the European end of the Axis, while the network of feeder and connecting waterways aids tremendously in solving our critical transportation problem.

Water transportation is an essential element of our peacetime transportation system and is carrying its portion of the increased burden of national mobilization. The man who has most reason to know the need of every available means to success, because he commanded them successfully in 1917 and 1918, Gen. John J. Pershing, has said:

"The fullest development of waterways wholly within our own boundaries would have a very direct bearing upon the problems of defense. * * * None of us, especially those who have had the experience, ever wants to see another war, but it should be pointed out that adequate facilities for the movement of armies and supplies are vital to the successful outcome of military operations. Any extension of water routes for peaceful purposes would also be advantageous in the conduct of national defense."

The People Speak on the Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH MRUK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that if I were to sum up in a few words what the people of my State and of the Nation are saying to me almost unanimously in their communications to me on the Ruml plan I could reflect their thinking very accurately in these few, simple, understandable words: "We want the Ruml plan—and we want action, now." But, as to what else they say on the subject, I wish to concentrate attention, if I may, upon important and pungent passages from the great mass of endorsements of the Ruml plan which have come to my desk. I quote:

By the Buffalo Evening News of Buffalo, N. Y.:

While Congress and the Treasury Department still bicker over half a dozen different pay-as-you-go income-tax collection plans—all of which would involve some measure of unfair double taxation—Canada has quietly adopted a substantial version of the Ruml plan which would make all Dominion taxpayers even with the Government in their tax payments. * * * Dominion officials cannot understand the fears which afflict United States Treasury specialists and some congressional leaders over the "forgiving" feature of the Ruml plan. Obviously the plan would not have been adopted by Canada if officials there saw any prospect that it would diminish greatly needed wartime revenues. * * * It is difficult to understand why the United States Treasury has thrown so many specious arguments in the way of the Ruml plan here. The Treasury itself has suffered by the resultant confusion in the public's mind. Many taxpayers have mistakenly assumed that their obligations might be forgiven in fact, while others have been greatly concerned by the prospect of double taxation which they cannot possibly meet. Adoption of the Ruml plan to set the tax clock ahead 1 year would resolve all these doubts at one stroke. The Treasury should reconsider its attitude in the light of the Canadian experience and choice.

From Mr. Charles H. Hyde, Buffalo, N. Y.:

Uncle Sam needs all the money he can get from taxes. There is only one way that he can collect from several million taxpayers who are making more money today than they have ever made before, and spending every cent as fast as they get it. If he does not collect at the source he will get several million IOU's not worth the paper they are written on. I get tired of hearing Mr. Paul speak of forgiving 1942 taxes. The Treasury is not forgiving anything if they simply bring the collection up to date. If you will check back to the first year we had a Federal income tax I think you will find the law was passed late in the fall and made retroactive to the first of the year. Since Congress saw fit to inaugurate the income tax on that basis, why should they now refuse to correct the mistake they made at that time, putting us all 1 year behind in our taxes?

From Mr. Philip H. Brown, Harlomoor Co., Inc., New York City, N. Y.:

I see by the papers that the committee has reported against the Ruml plan; but I hope that when the matter comes to the floor of the House, you can see your way clear to support the Ruml plan. Although it seems that the committee, and possibly Congress, are becoming more and more confused in trying to make a selection between various plans, the "man in the street" understands and is strongly in favor of the Ruml plan.

From Mr. and Mrs. William Tanner, Lancaster, N. Y.:

The Ruml tax plan may make a few war millionaires, but on the other side of the tracks it will save millions of families from want, and save their little homes.

From Mr. R. E. Dillon, president, Lake Erie Engineering Corporation, Buffalo, N. Y.:

I did not address a letter to you until having acquainted myself in detail with the workings of the Ruml plan, as I do not believe in just jumping at any panacea offered for every possible problem. I am writing as a taxpayer and as an employer who appreciates the hardship which will be placed upon taxpayers, large and small, during the coming year unless some relief is given to them on a pay-as-you-go basis, and I can think of no better plan than the Ruml plan.

From Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Draycott, Derby, N. Y.:

We believe you do not wish to befuddle and doubly tax the people, but have confidence that you will approve in full the Ruml plan.

From Mr. Ralph F. Peo, Buffalo, N. Y.:

I have talked to a great many of the factory and office people who work under my direction, and find as a very rare exception the person who has laid away sufficient savings for the purpose of paying the 1942 taxes. It is very apparent to me that if such a program as the Ruml plan is not established right now, we will see the year following the cessation of hostilities with literally millions of unpaid income taxes, and our jails not large enough to hold the violators. Everyone that I have talked to, without exception, emphasizes the hope that some workable pay-as-you-go tax plan will be quickly established by Congress, and that an equitable way of eliminating a fictitious year's income will be worked out.

From Mr. Marvin A. Davis, assistant secretary, real estate and mortgage department, the Marine Trust Co. of Buffalo:

I believe the Ruml plan will accomplish the solution to our tax problem. I am not in favor of any plan that burdens the taxpayer with 2 years' taxation in 1 year, even though 1 year is placed on a deferred-payment plan. I am sure it is the Government's desire to levy a tax that can be collected and not one that creates such a hardship to the taxpayer that he is unable to pay and consequently the Government suffers.

From Mr. Perry R. Cant, president, Lancaster Machine Knife Works, Inc., Lancaster, N. Y.:

The officers and employees of this company are definitely in favor of the Ruml plan. To us who are in constant touch with the habits and problems of daily life it is astonishing to find how few taxpayers are in any sense prepared to meet their tax obligations. It is our opinion that the Ruml plan is eminently fair and just, not only to the taxpayer but to the Treasury Department, and that it is the only process by which the Treasury Department can avoid a staggering tax delinquency.

From Mr. R. A. DuQuette, assistant to the vice president, North Tonawanda division, the Rudolph Wurlitzer Co., North Tonawanda, N. Y.:

We would like to go on record as being in favor of the Ruml plan; that is, foregiveness of the 1942 personal income tax and the pay-as-you-go method, starting immediately.

Sniping at Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of March 3, 1943:

SNIPING AT CONGRESS

Thoughtless commentators and those who deliberately aim to destroy faith in Congress are making a great fuss over the discovery that the Office of Price Administration has set up a special office to provide Representatives and Senators with their ration books, etc. These critics take the position that Members of Congress should take their chance with the general public. We disagree.

A Member of the Senate or the House is not only a high official of the Government but he also is a very busy person. Congress has been in session almost continuously for 2 years and more. The average age of its membership is above the 50-year mark. Senators and Representatives are laboring under a constant strain. Day after day they confront issues of major import to the future of this Nation and, not infrequently, questions which directly concern every American.

We do not recall that these critics complained very loudly when President Roosevelt went fishing aboard a giant warship. Nor did we. We do not recall that they hollered when Mr. Willkie, as the President's personal representative, flew around the world in an Army bomber. Nor did we. We do not recall that they protested when Mrs. Roosevelt flew to England and, whether she went in a Government ship or a private plane doesn't matter since all available planes are needed for ferrying war personnel. Nor did we criticize at the time.

The House of Representatives has its own restaurant, and deserves it. It has its own barber shop, which is all right with us.

A Member of the House or Senate has credentials transcending those of any other person in Washington excepting only the President and the Vice President, because he has been elected by the people of this country to represent them. He is the guardian of the people's rights, the public's funds, and the Nation's future. He deserves whatever special consideration he receives in Washington and elsewhere.

A Country Doctor Gives His Slant on Absenteeism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently many criticisms have been directed at what is commonly called absenteeism among war workers in our industries at home. Rather indiscriminately the charge has been directed against these employees that they are lacking in patriotism because now and then one of them is absent from his place of employment. Too little study has been given, however, to the real causes of absenteeism.

Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker has been making speeches throughout the country, implying that practically all absenteeism is due to laziness, overindulgence, desire to spend high wages in pursuit of a good time, or to some other frivolous motivation. This has resulted in an unfortunate feeling, entertained on the part of many, that our workers in war factories have been unpatriotic and impeding our war program willfully, or at least carelessly.

Congress should have a thorough investigation made of conditions prevailing in war industries, and a factual study made of the whole situation, before attempting to enact legislation which would have the effect of demoralizing war workers by making them feel that there had been imputed to them charges of lack of patriotism.

A general practitioner of medicine in my district, Dr. J. W. Yowell, resident in a small but lovely community, Duvall, in northern King County, Wash., has written me his own views on the subject, which I believe to be well worthy of study on the part of my colleagues and all American citizens generally. I am appending it hereinbelow:

DUVALL, WASH., *March 6, 1943.*

The Honorable JOHN COFFEE,
Representative in Congress,
Sixth Congressional District,
State of Washington.

DEAR JOHN: You being our Representative in Washington makes you the man to whom we may turn with our difficulties.

There is much nowadays over the radio and in the papers concerning what is commonly known as absentee workmen in our defense plants over the country. I can only speak for our district and the relatively few of these men that I see in my small country practice.

It seems to be the consensus that much of this is due—or at least it is implied—to a week-end hang-over, and it is a hang-over, but not the kind implied from too much to drink and like parties, but a hang-over from their working in ill and poorly ventilated ship holes, where welding and galvanizing is done. The men inhale these fumes during working hours, but when they come home and breathe good air for a couple of days they feel better, and have lost a part of that lazy, dull, lack of ambition feeling; they feel that the acute stuffed up breathing passages are good enough to enable them to go back and work again. They feel that the cold they had last week is now over; only to have the same thing happen next week and every week end until they are thoroughly fed up with shipyards and are willing to quit and are going to quit if some remedy is not shortly discovered for this condition.

I do not blame them for this attitude, and as a matter of fact, just today I gave two of these men a note to the management, to the effect that it would be detrimental to the health of these men to continue in this sort of work. One of these men had acute lead poisoning, and he is not a welder, but a shipfitter's helper. He is the third man that I have seen this past 24 hours.

These men that lose time from defense plants are unjustly criticized for absenting themselves from their work—that is, the ones that I see are. These men are ill. One boy's mother asked me today why it was that her son never felt well any more. He is only 23 years of age, but feels like and acts like an old man.

You will do these men a great favor if you will bring this condition to the attention of the proper authorities, to say nothing of the increase in production.

Tell them that these men are sick, and not home on a binge, and they are sick from, or as a result of, poorly ventilated shipholes.

I do not know whose fault this is, but the men that I see are suffering from this lack of ventilation. If this is not handled in the near future, there will be more and more absentees.

Sincerely,

J. W. YOWELL, M. D.

Tax Stew Simmers On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of March 11, 1943:

TAX STEW SIMMERS ON

A stew is something that happens, as distinguished from a dish that is constructed by design. You add or reject material at will, and the result is often pleasing though surprising. It is not so successful a method when applied to a revenue bill.

The House Ways and Means Committee went through the pantry. It rejected the Ruml plan and a half dozen feeble substitutes. But it picked a pay-withholding scheme off the shelf and tossed that in. It added part of the Victory tax and its special exemption, and it also stirred in the normal and first surtax with their special exemptions. The result is a curious combination bearing no resemblance to anything that could or would be created by design.

One of the virtues of the Ruml plan was that after the Nation was placed on a current basis, a pay-withholding system could be established. The latter feature was an integral part of pay-as-you-go. It didn't make sense by itself, with payments this year on last year's income. But the committee did the impossible, and it now proposes that the Treasury collect 20 percent, after exemptions, from all salary and pay checks after July 1 to be applied to the obligation remaining from 1942 incomes.

If an individual's wages are the same this year as last, this 20 percent will just about erase what he owes to the Government, including the Victory tax. Instead of paying the last two quarterly instalments this year, together with the 5-percent Victory tax, he will cover both weekly.

But if he got $40 a week last year and is getting $80 this year, that 20 percent will more than pay his obligation on 1942 incomes. In this case, the committee proposes to apply the excess to the 1943 income, continuing the 20-percent deduction in 1944 to be applied to what is left of 1943 and then to 1944. By this completely unclear process, he attains an approximation of a partial pay-as-you-go system.

On the other hand, the individual who was getting $80 last year and $40 this year will not liquidate his tax obligation by the withholding levy. He will have to make up the difference by cash, adding to the general confusion.

Under the Ruml plan, the pay deduction would bear a direct relation to the current salary, and at the end of the year the taxpayer would find himself very close to even with the board. Despite its opposition to this arrangement, the committee, by adopting the withholding scheme, has made the Ruml plan more than ever necessary.

The Congress Has Been Labeled as a Congress of Special Privilege

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the vote today repealing the limits on profits at this time is the saddest thing that could happen in this Congress. When this Congress convened the people of the Nation looked up to it with hope in their hearts. Here they thought was a group of people who would protect them from the special few who want to make all they can out of this war. These boys who have made $500,000 before Pearl Harbor can again make that much. Today Congress took the lid off and said to the boys whose only interest in this war is the making of money, "Come and get it, boys, it is yours for the asking and there is no limit from now on."

The arguments used by the leaders to steamroll this bill through were the silliest I have ever heard. The Congress clearly gave the President the power to limit wages and farm prices. But when the President used the same power to limit profits in manufacturing the tools of war these leaders in Congress brought up the silly and childish point of constitutionality. By what right do we decide the constitutionality of the acts of the President? That is for the courts to decide and not the Congress.

If the President acted without authority those who had their wings clipped could have gone in the courts and had the order repealed. But not one of these war racketeers and profiteers had the fortitude to test the legality of the President's act. These war profiteers knew that the people would hold them in contempt even if they tried to curtail the act of the President. Yet the dirty work that these war profiteers did not have the nerve to do they succeeded in getting the leading Members of this Congress to do for them. This was done today.

What a sad day for our country. Today this Congress, in taking off the limit on profits, told the millions of boys who are dying for this country what they are fighting for. We told them that while they are getting $50 per month and dying for us they are protecting the war profiteer and the war racketeer who can make as much as he can steal as long as he is on the side of the law. We have told the boys who are fighting for us that there should be a limit on farm prices. We told the boys who are fighting for us that there should be a limit on the wages of labor. But at the same time today we told the boys who are fighting for us that the war racketeer and the war profiteer are little tin gods and we must not touch them and we must not limit them. What a sad tragedy took place today.

Yes; today this Congress threw discretion to the winds and admitted the special privileged. As of this date the class of the special privileged has taken over the Seventy-eighth Congress. This is the Congress which the people had so much confidence in. I predict that those Members who voted to take off the present limits on profits will regret the day they did so. And when the millions of boys get back after the war, these same Members of Congress will have a lot of explaining to do. They will come back and say the same thing they said after the last war. When they come back they will say, "Is this what we risked our lives for? Is this what we have to show for the lives we lost? Are these many, many new millionaires all that we got out of this war? Lord forbid that it should ever happen again."

Prohibition of Alcoholic Liquor Traffic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communications received by me with reference to H. R. 2082:

DEWEY, OKLA.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: Thankful to see you are interested in our country enough to try to get the flow of liquor stopped. Most of us know how much is stored up, enough for 4 or 5 years. And that we, the Government, are making it in the Virgin Islands—first time in our history—and if anyone should go on a strike it should be the mothers of the boys in these camps where beer and liquors are in their reach. England, Canada, and even Germany and Russia are doing something. We all know this is a pet measure of the President's. France lost; also Pearl Harbor due somewhat to this. What are we fighting for? So some can have their liquor, vice, and abundant life and take our freedom from us.

MRS. L. H. PITTMAN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 7, 1943.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Noticed by the paper some one there suggests cutting out liquor for the duration to cure absenteeism. Now you are on the right track. As you see I live in a western city halfway between two big shipyards. I opened my home to room shipyard men to help on the cause. They spent more on liquor than they paid for their food and kept us awake carousing as late as 4 a. m. Naturally they had a hang-over and slept too late to work. Fortunately it is for the good of the other workers that they are absent after a drunk because men suffering from yesterday's hang-over are dangerous around a shipyard. And those big fires in the defense homes are due to whisky and cigarettes. Seven lives lost in Vancouver, Wash., recently. A second fire there only yesterday; and last week a fire at Swan Island in Portland, a dormitory near Kaiser's big yard. Damages were $9,000. All of these were caused by smoking in bed—mattress fires. While firemen tried to put out the fire tenants of the burning building hooted and swung empty whisky bottles, saying, "Let her burn." Of course they were lit.

And have you heard back there one of the Office of Price Administration's problems here? It's tire sabotage, caused by glass on Portland's city streets. The glass bears the label of John Barleycorn.

And then those terrible tragedies we had from time to time—murder. You should know about lower berth 13—a young woman sleeping there in her berth was raped and her throat cut by the Negro porter. He was lit. Dozens of tragedies as bad—they were drunk.

It is a mystery to me how thinking men, learned men, calling themselves good Americans could fail to apply a remedy. You can't fool with liquor any more than you can with any other type of dope. Go to the dance halls and see the young girls there lit. Go to the poverty-stricken homes, see the half-starved children—rickets. Chances are the dad is sitting in a beer parlor.

Whisky makes a liar, a thief, and a wife beater out of good men. Read up on nazi-ism and communism. Where were they born? The first in the beer halls of Munich—the latter same place in Russia.

For God's sake give us a sober Nation, with minds intelligent enough to do our duty in this serious hour. Imagine if we were raided the grief a drunken ape might give the household.

MOTHERS OF PORTLAND, OREG.

FARMERS & TRADERS NATIONAL BANK,
Hillsboro, Ohio, March 8, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I understand that you are working on a bill to be presented to your committee which will prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war and as long as men are in arms thereafter.

I wish to commend you for that. It is a step in the right direction. Of course, it would be much better if such traffic could be abolished entirely.

There is no question that liquor hinders our war effort, both in the Army and in defense work and at home, and it would be a great saving to the national economy to be able to close the many offices that handle that thing and at the same time make it possible for the drinking citizen to have more of his earnings for taxes and food.

If your measure gets onto the floor of the Senate, I would appreciate knowing and I would then write our Ohio Senators urging their support.

Respectfully yours,

G. H. BROOMHALL.

HIGH POINT, MO., *March 8, 1943.*

Mr. BRYSON.

DEAR SIR: I'm in favor of abolishing the liquor from our Nation during the war since it seems necessary to ration foods and vitamins that are necessary for building strong bodies.

It seems to me it's reasonable and should be done to take away the liquor that tears down the body—that makes for inefficiency in our armies and defense plants. We are back of you 100 percent.

Respectfully,

G. A. SIMPSON,
Sunday School Superintendent.

WICHITA, KANS., *March 8, 1943.*

Representative BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BRYSON: I want to commend you for presenting your bill in Congress to impose national prohibition for the duration of the war.

I hope and pray that it will become a law, as liquor is certainly the greatest saboteur in our Nation; not only is it causing destruction among the armed services but it is the greatest cause of absenteeism in our defense factories. Every hour lost there prolongs the war.

Why can't we use as much good common sense now as they did in World War No. 1?

Yours for a dry nation,

BESS H. LANDER.

DAYTONA BEACH, FLA., *March 7, 1943.*

Mr. BRYSON, *Representative,*
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I regret I do not know your initials but that is not going to keep me from writing to thank you for introducing the bill to stop the manufacture, sale, and transportation of liquor.

Your courage in trying to do something about this appalling situation is most admirable and will give mothers as well as all right thinking people in this Nation a wonderful lift in morale.

The magnitude of the problem, with the unscrupulous liquor interests using their unlimited financial resources in the most insidious advertising campaign ever foisted upon a people and resorting to every sort of diabolical means to sell more and more beer to our young people, makes us realize that only drastic action will stop this powerful and growing menace to our Nation at war.

I do hope you have read Fletcher Dobyn's book, The Amazing Story of Repeal, and if not that you will. It can be an enormous help in fighting the propaganda of the liquor machine.

Should there be anything that individuals like myself can do to help in this matter your suggestions would be most gratefully received.

Please accept my sincere good wishes for a successful fight on this issue.

Very truly yours,

S. ELIZABETH GARDINER.
(Mrs. W. J.)

PHOENIX MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
Hartford, Conn., March 8, 1943.

Congressman BRYSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRYSON: I am thoroughly in accord with your bill on prohibition of liquor for the duration of the war, and I know there are millions like me who will not write to you who feel the same way.

It is amazing to me that we have gone as far as we have burning up fuel and tires and putting up with the liquor business. I have seen many men in uniform staggering on the streets of my city and have seen many civilians who are using up their energy the same way.

Sincerely yours,

T. T. PHILLIPS.

SUNRISE DAHLIA GARDENS,
Connersville, Ind., March 7, 1943.

Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I read in the March 6 Indianapolis Star the article Urges Wartime Ban on Liquor. I think all of the best class of American citizens will be truly grateful to you if you can bring about Nation-wide prohibition.

Although you may not hear from all of the grateful citizens, there are millions of people who would be grateful to you to the end of their lives if you can bring about Nation-wide prohibition.

There have been many accidents in our part of Indiana—great destruction of lives and autos and property from drunken driving—it is becoming a great menace to our country.

Prohibition would bring about still better efficiency in war production factories with fewer mistakes made by sober workmen than with liquor-laden workmen. It would also release the ones who are on liquor boards, etc., to more important war work.

After the war is over it would truly be a millennium measure, if there could be world-wide prohibition.

Please pray that such a measure may be brought about; that all nations may be free from John Barleycorn's curse on humanity.

God has blessed America. He will continue to bless America as a torch bearer to world-wide prohibition.

Let's make America the torch bearer to world-wide prohibition, even as the Statue of Liberty is the torch bearer of liberty to all approaching foreign immigrants.

Yours very truly,

ELSIE A. WILLIAMS.

P. S.—May God speed the day when we have national prohibition again. This is my prayer.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *March 8, 1943.*

Congressman BRYSON,
Of South Carolina,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BRYSON: I am glad to note that you are sponsoring a bill to outlaw the manufacture, sale, and transportation of liquor in the United States and possessions until the conclusion of the war and thereafter until the termination of mobilization, as determined by the President. The aim given is to curb absenteeism among workers. Drinking is beyond a doubt the chief cause of absenteeism in our defense plants. I am very much concerned in winning this war in as short a time as possible, and your bill will help much, if in liquor you include 3.2 beer and wine and all alcoholic beverages. Just a few days ago in driving past a very large tavern just across from Timpkin's plant, I saw three big beer trucks parked unloading their product. We remarked, "look at the big tires, six on each and two extras." How inconsistent to talk about and urge conservation of rubber so essential and permit them to a business that is only a curse to humanity. Many of our milk wagons are horse drawn now. I hope there will be favorable action on your bill, and that mighty quick. I will write and get others to write our Congressman and Senators.

Very sincerely,

MRS. O. H. DYER.

LOUISVILLE, KY., *March 7, 1943.*

Hon. J. R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Just a note to let you know I am in favor of your bill for national wartime prohibition to curb absenteeism, due to hangovers caused by drinking liquor. To prove liquor is largely responsible, there are many more employees absent on Monday morning and the day after pay day.

I have read that Hitler has curbed the use of even beer until after the war. Dare we do as much? Essentials are being rationed, yet liquor is not, and we continue to waste rubber, gasoline, and manpower hours, both in the manufacture and distribution of liquor and the indirect loss in manpower due to absenteeism.

Hoping you success with your bill, I am,

Sincerely yours,

A. T. SHUCK.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *March 6, 1943.*

Congressman BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your prohibition bill offers more for the war effort than any bill ever introduced in Congress and the following is the proof.

I have spent 2 years in the defense plant work in this war and also in the years of 1917 and 1918.

I worked from September 1942 to January 1943 in one construction camp where I figured the wasted money amounted to more than 50 percent of the total cost.

Cost-plus contracts and liquor, mostly liquor, were responsible for the loss in moneys and time in completing the job.

A liquor store in a small town opened for business at 5:30 a. m. so that defense workers might take a bottle along to the job and that was what they did.

A large number of men, under the influence of liquor, stayed on the job but worked but little although they were paid from $15 to $20 per day. Some of them went out and slept the drink off in their parked cars or hidden in stacks of supplies.

I have seen as many as 5 men in a crew of 10, shoot dice and drink liquor all day Sunday and not pick up a tool for work. They were paid $22.50 for the day. The heavy drinkers often worked their way into a foreman's job and took care of any drunks in their gang. Men left the job for a day, more or less, and drew the same pay checks as others.

On the job in question the slow-down started in a small way but after liquor became master the work all but stopped.

I am a member of organized labor and I may be putting out my head to have it chopped off at the age of 61, yet I am an American citizen and fully conscious of the fact that our country is at war and a food shortage is in sight and feel that I have the right to report such matters to our lawmakers who are trying to solve our problems. Men under the influence of liquor are not conscious of what the war effort means and soon become disinterested in anything but drinking.

I fully realize that pointing out evils and offering no remedies is of little value and that is why I am not telling more.

As you know our Government agencies have made mistakes and corrections, which interfered with the war effort and in my opinion these mistakes were, and are due, to the fact that the heads of these agencies do not have an opportunity to see and learn what a man in the field learns. My position has often caused me to see these mistakes before they matured and I have some remedies in mind which I feel would be highly beneficial yet I know of no way to be heard.

Owing to my advanced age I would prefer that my name be not made public or passed on to any organization that could indirectly stop me from defense plant work, yet if it became necessary I would come before a legislative committee and bring the proof.

Sincerely,

CLARE, MICH., *March 8, 1943.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you because of this clipping in yesterday's Detroit Free Press, which I enclose.

My son recently returned from Australia and New Guinea. In telling about the differences between Australia and the United States of America, here is what he said, as nearly as I can remember: "Australia has it all over the United States of America on the liquor regulations. The grog shops are only open from 11 a. m. to 1 p. m. Nothing can be carried out so there are very few drunks. Only the old drinkers care to get it then. No drink whatever around the dance halls."

I don't know whether this was a country-wide regulation or just a local. At any rate it is a great improvement on the arrangement here, you will agree.

Sincerely,

MRS. JESSIE E. GIBES.

WASHINGTON, March 5.—A move to impose national prohibition for the duration of the war, by act of Congress rather than by a constitutional amendment, was launched today by Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON, South Carolina Democrat, who said that his aim was to curb absenteeism.

Shipment of Butter to Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my hand the following United Press dispatch from Seattle which carries the heading:

Three hundred and fifty tons of butter sent to 400 residents of Nome.

I am not in a position to know whether there is a word of truth in this dispatch but it is of such a character that in justice to a people who are being asked to go without butter and cheese and other necessities of life to help win this war, the truth should be made known by our officials who are in a position to either admit or deny the truth or falsity of the statement. If this, by any chance, is foreign propaganda, calculated to enrage or discourage our people, it should be nipped in the bud. This dispatch says, among other things, that "a high-ranking Federal official in Seattle, who declined to be quoted by name, said the large-scale shipment was made to provide reserves for several years as a war-shortage safeguard." I mention this because, evidently, if this report be true, the facts are within the knowledge of a Federal official. I respectfully urge that the administration give us the facts on this United Press dispatch of March 6.

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY TONS OF BUTTER SENT TO FOUR HUNDRED RESIDENTS OF NOME

SEATTLE, March 6.—The Seattle Post-Intelligencer said today that enough coffee and butter to give each of the 400 residents of Nome, Alaska, thousands of pounds each was landed there last October by the civilian reserve food supply office.

The coffee and butter, the paper said, were part of an unexpected and unneeded shipload of foodstuffs for which there was no storage place in the community. Much of the shipment, the article said, has spoiled on the beach.

"Alaskans charged the stuff was purchased and ordered sent by Washington and Chicago Government officials who do not realize that Nome's civilian population numbers only about 400," the paper said.

Included in the alleged shipment, the paper said, were 350 tons of butter, 173 tons of coffee, 78 tons of salad oil, 59 tons of soap, 503 tons of canned milk, 70 tons of canned pears, 78 tons of toilet tissue, and 78 tons of dried eggs.

The paper said lack of warm storage space caused the brine in which the butter was packed to freeze, bursting the barrels and wasting much of the shipment. Canned pears also burst their containers, the article said, and the rest of the shipment is expected to deteriorate with the spring thaws.

"This thing has become a joke the length and breadth of Alaska," one Alaskan businessman was quoted.

A high-ranking Federal official in Seattle, who declined to be quoted by name, said the large-scale shipment was made to provide reserves for several years as a war-shortage safeguard.

Field Offices of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

EAST BOSTON, MASS., *March 8, 1943.*
Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: We understand that the Government is contemplating closing the field offices of the Department of Commerce known as Bureaus of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

We would appreciate your giving this some consideration before such a step as closing this office is taken. We find the presence of the office always a help on problems that come up regarding foreign business. At the present time we certainly feel that the office is essential.

We rather feel, also, that there are other economies that might be taken on the part of the Government that would be more effective from an economical viewpoint, without at the same time hurting our struggle to render business to our foreign customers.

Very truly yours,
K. J. QUINN & CO., INC.

Our Armed Forces and Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 5, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me last night in the city of New York at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, under the auspices of the New York Board of Trade, on the occasion of the annual banquet of the board, at which there were present 2,200 banqueters. The title of the address was "Our Armed Forces and Victory."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In choosing to explore the problem of our country's manpower and its efficient distribution in a war economy I fully realize that I am approaching what has lately become the most controversial issue in our national life. I do not shrink from this task. I accept it as a duty of high priority to discuss the size of our armed forces in relation to our total manpower, aloof from the emotion and special interests which are clouding its just appreciation in the public mind.

I am confident that the American people, once in possession of the facts, will appraise them fairly. For many weeks in Washington, in company with my colleagues, I have subjected the estimates of our military leaders to the most searching scrutiny. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, it has been my privilege to examine the figures upon which these estimates of our projected Army are based.

During the course of committee deliberations, I have also learned of the appalling size of the enemy forces which we must conquer before peace will return to this land of ours. Gentlemen, the time has come to speak out boldly. I solemnly warn you that we stand on the threshold of great danger. In these next few weeks, when the snows and mists and mud of winter are succeeded by battle weather, we must expect the beginning of hard and exhausting fighting. We must expect casualties, and we must anticipate the necessity of fresh troops ready to carry on the assault. After the campaigns already underway are completed, it is evident that the men who are brought into the Army this year for intensive training will be the decisive elements in the battles of 1944.

This is the hour of our country's greatest need. Our young men are already in contact with this enemy whom we may expect now to lash out with his fiercest blows. In this time of crisis, we cannot permit our national unity to be divided by the bitter ax of controversy. I ask you, as Americans, to perceive our necessity, as I have perceived it. I ask you to stand firmly with me in support of this magnificent Army upon which we depend not only for victory but for the very continuance of our free way of life.

There is no need to accept blindly and without proper examination the establishment which our military leaders consider necessary for the success of our arms. The American people have a right to know the disposition of these 8,200,000 officers and men which the Army expects to have in the service by the end of this current year. The War Department has freely recognized this right. To congressional hearings the military leaders who planned this Army and its strategy have brought their figures for scrutiny. They have spread on the record the distribution of these men and women in the efficient pattern they have cut to the needs of victory.

Do not be deceived by statements that an army of the contemplated proportions cannot be assembled without crushing dislocation of our civilian economy. Do not be deceived by assertions that such an army cannot be transported to the theaters of operations where it will make contact with the enemy. Do not be deceived by statements that, once such an army is overseas, it cannot be adequately supplied.

These vital problems have had the most searching consideration in drawing plans for the size of the Army. I have had proof that each one was solved before these estimates were written down and approved by the Chief of Staff, by the Secretary of War, and, finally, by the President himself, who is Commander in Chief of our armed forces.

There is a logic to military operations which I am not sure we civilians always appreciate. The generals and their subordinates who plan the organization and training of our Army and its strategical employment in the field leave nothing to chance. When you examine these gentlemen on any question, they are able to produce an array of facts—and I would stress that they are facts and not opinions—to support their answers.

I suppose this habit has been gained because the human factor is the ultimate consideration in every military operation. Generals deal in human lives—the lives of fathers, and of husbands, and of sons. In war, some lives must always be lost on the road to victory. It is the generals' task to make certain that they achieve success with the smallest

sacrifice of life. Dead soldiers win no more battles.

So the military mind begins its thinking with a clear statement of the mission which faces it, and the mission now is to force the unconditional surrender of Germany, Italy, and Japan. A logical approach to the defeat of these principal enemies and their satellites requires first an estimate of the situation—a consideration of the size of the opposing armies, since this is the first gage of the force which this country must build. Into this situation enters another factor—the strategical disposition of our forces in combat areas throughout the world where our chance of success against the enemy is greatest.

These two factors may be gathered together under a single head—strategy. Our strategy is the first consideration in fixing the size of the Army.

Let me lay before you now some of the information about the size of the Axis armies upon which our military leaders based their decision to oppose them with an Army of 8,200,000 officers and men. Testimony before the Senate committee of which I have the honor to be chairman estimated that the Axis nations in the entire European area, which would include Russia and North Africa, as well as the European Continent, have approximately 483 divisions in the field. In the Pacific area, the Japanese have 85 divisions under arms.

To oppose this total of 568 divisions, the armies of the United Nations, without adding our own strength, can muster 321 divisions. Out of our Army of 8,200,000 we plan to create 100 divisions, which would bring the total of the United Nations' forces to 421 divisions. Let me emphasize this figure again. The United Nations will have, with our own forces fully mustered—and this cannot take place until sometime late in 1944—147 fewer divisions than our enemies. Against their 568, we shall have 421.

When you consider that fact coldly, you begin to appreciate that our military men have stopped far short of optimum objectives in fixing the size of our Army. It is a military axiom that when two forces, equally matched in training and equipment, are pitted against each other, the advantage is always with the force that is stronger in men.

I give you this to remember, then: The United States is building no juggernaut to crush the Axis forces by sheer weight of numbers. The real estimate of whether an army is large or small comes only when it is set against the size of the enemy it must oppose. By those standards, our Army is small.

Our military leaders have been by no means blind to this deficiency of manpower in the United Nations. They plan to adjust the inevitable over-all shortage by the priority which has been given to air power.

Our enemies—Germany, Italy, and Japan—now muster 900 combat squadrons of aircraft. The United Nations, without the aid of the United States, are able to put an equal number of squadrons into the air—900. Before a Senate committee in Washington not long ago, Major General Edwards, head of the Organization and Training Division of the General Staff, had this to say: "The War Department and, I believe, the country, agrees we cannot employ our ground troops without first gaining air supremacy. That is the principle we are working on and the Air Forces get the first break in everything. The first principle is, 'Don't ship ground troops if there are air forces ready to go.' The air forces are No. 1 priority."

Now I submit that this is a very encouraging aspect of our military strategy and one which will readily capture the imagination of the American people. Our mighty industrial effort to produce fighting planes has already aroused the Nation's enthusiasm. I can now reveal that our strategical program contemplates 900 squadrons bearing the great white star of the Army Air Forces. In other words, by the end of 1943 this Nation will have equalled under its own insignia, the strength of our enemies. We shall have an air superiority over our enemies of two combat planes for every one of theirs. When all these get into action, some time in the year of 1944, we shall indeed have a force to drive the once powerful Luftwaffe from the skies.

We come now to the second consideration which has fixed the size of our Army and the rapidity of its growth: Available shipping tonnage. I have heard many fretful criticisms that we could not possibly transport and supply such an army. I do not believe these criticisms have been based upon much of any evidence. But I will readily admit that there is not now—nor has there ever been—any intention, of pouring 8,000,000 soldiers on shipboard between now and the end of the year and dropping them haphazardly on a hundred fighting fronts.

Let me show you how the Army approached this shipping problem in terms of the men which it could reasonably expect to use.

A committee was set up some time ago whose sole responsibility is to consider the facts about shipping. This includes not only American bottoms, but ships flying the flags of all the United Nations which are available to transport American soldiers and equipment to the fighting fronts. Sitting in Washington, this committee is constantly studying the rate of loss by submarine attack, the number of ships under repair in ports or loading, the ship-building programs, the tonnages of individual vessels and the turn-around rate of every ship on their lists.

From the array of statistics thus made available, the War Department is able to make a realistic estimate of the number of ships which it can allocate to the transport of men and supplies. You may be sure that our general staff removed every factor of uncertainty from the equation before the strategy and the deployment of our troops would be decided. This was a gigantic task. The initial requirement of supplies and equipment to be sent abroad with each man is eight ship-tons. To keep him supplied with food, equipment, and ammunition requires an average of 1.2 shipping tons per man every month.

But it is not so difficult a task when all the facts and figures are constantly at the fingertips of the War Department agency which arranges these movements. I would remind you of the admiration which greeted the convoy of that mighty armada which poured troops into north Africa on the morning of November 8, 1942. American planning brought those ships to their objectives with split-second timing.

By the end of 1943 the War Department plans to have 2,700,000 out of its Army of 8,200,000 in combat areas abroad. I cannot prove to you by figures that there is shipping available to transport the portion of these men not yet overseas and maintain their pipe line of supply. The figures are available, but you must take my word for them, since to reveal the figures would be to provide our enemies with the most valuable information. But I can assure you that the task can be done. I can go further and assure you that the task will be done.

But—you say—as we are to have an Army of 8,200,000 men by the end of the present year and only 2,700,000 will then be overseas. Why must we have 5,500,000 more men under arms unless they can be immediately transported to battle areas?

That is a fair question. I am glad to provide you with the answer, which brings me to the third of the primary considerations which have fixed the size of our Army—the time necessary to train units for battle.

Month by month during this year of 1943 new men will be inducted into the Army of the United States. New divisions of ground forces troops, new squadrons of combat aircraft, new units for the Services of Supply will be activated for training. Something like a year is required for the training of a unit. It can be readily seen that these troops will be fully occupied in the necessary maneuvers required to prepare them for battle.

These men, inducted now, will not go overseas until the spring of 1944. Those inducted toward the end of this year will not see foreign shores until the close of 1944 or the beginning of 1945. Even if shipping were available to send all these men immediately to combat zones—and I emphasize this important particular—they would still remain in the United States until their training was finished. For there is one point upon which the War Department is adamant—no unit shall go overseas until it is adequately prepared by training and maneuver to meet the skilled troops of our adversaries.

I do not need to stress the importance of this training. Less than a month ago the Nation was anxiously watching the advance of Rommel's armored troops against our outpost line in central Tunisia. "Green troops," one correspondent called our men when they were forced to retreat, and I submit to you that the magnificent recovery of these fine young Americans against the surprise attack of a superior enemy flung back the epithet. If it was "green troops" who sent the pick of Rommel's tankers reeling back through the Kasserine Pass a few days later, then I say good-bye Rommel when our men have had the seasoning of a few more such battles.

No episode could have brought home so sharply to the American people the importance of the rigid maneuvers through which our men are put before they go into battle. A superior force can always drive back a line which was never meant to withstand a heavy attack. But the test of men comes in how they stand under fire, how they accept the fierce, sledgehammer blows under which they must fall back.

I am proud of those boys. Proud of their courage and their spirit and their battle skill. And I am proud of those other Americans, training now in this country and impatient of the day when they, too, will come to grips with the Nazis and the Japs on distant fields. From their thorough drill and training now grows the skill of battle-wise veterans who can take their baptism of fire and drive forward from it to victory.

Not all of our men, of course, will see combat. Some of those who are under arms now or will be inducted before the end of this year will never go to foreign shores. Some will remain here to protect our shores against the sudden assault of some frantic strategy of our enemies. Some are, and will continue to be, part of the establishment which must be maintained to carry on the business of war—supply, administration, the hundreds of tasks which are necessary in the homeland to keep an army overseas.

Next year, as we near the goal of our training objectives, this force will begin to diminish. It is under scrutiny now, as the War Department studies the status of every man in a noncombatant job, replacing some with men on limited service, replacing others with members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, that great, new efficient army of women which has taken its place beside the men in uniform. Later on, many of the men vitally needed to train recruits now will be relieved for combat duty. As the camps and posts are depopulated by the transfer of

units overseas, the size of their overhead may be reduced. Half a million men will be added to our combat strength in this contraction of training forces.

I mention these facts to show that our Army is no great sprawling horde of men, but an efficient, highly trained organization, working on a schedule which is laid out according to the most careful plan. Let me put it this way: When the Army decided that it would require 8,200,000 officers and men to defeat the Axis, this was no figure dreamed out of the air, as some of the critics of the Army's program would have you believe. For every one of these men the Army has an appointed place. It has a job for him to fill, whether it is to drive a tank which came off the assembly line last week, or to pilot a bomber which will be finished and flown from the plant to the airfield only when he is ready to begin his bombardment training. There are no orphans in the Army of 1943.

I have kept this discussion so far strictly to an analysis of the military situation responsible for the size of the Army, since I am confident that a great deal of the confusion which has obscured a fair consideration of the size of our Army has risen from the lack of this knowledge. I think you must agree with me that an examination of these military factors leaves no doubt that the Army needs the 8,200,000 men and women for whom it asks.

Through these past few weeks while the controversy about the Army has been developing, I have listened with amazement to the statements of its critics. We are in a war, I would remind you. We are in a war on which depends the survival of this great Nation, and I hear men talk as though the conflict spurting death and destruction on a dozen fronts at once is a side show at which we are disinterested spectators.

Can these critics realize that it is American men who are fighting and dying in the mud of Tunisia? Do they realize that those men who drove the Japs off Guadalcanal were Americans—from your home town and mine? Do they think those young airmen who cross the narrow sleeve of water from Britain to the Continent every day are on errands of pleasure?

Before ever the size of the Army was fixed by the War Department, its chiefs had delved deep into the figures of the Nation's available manpower. They had determined, from every source which offered statistics, that the needs, not only of the Army but of the Navy and the Marine Corps and Coast Guard could be met without dislocating the civilian economy.

Civilian manpower requirements, including industry and agriculture, approximate 53,500,000. Out of a total employable male and female population of 65,000,000 this number can be set aside and still leave the less than 11,000,000 men and women which all the armed services of the Nation together will require.

Sometimes I wonder if most of this criticism of the Army does not spring from the fact that the Army has been straightforward enough to give us its complete estimates, to spread on the record what it wants and the reason it wants it. The Army's figures are the only ones available which are incontrovertible, so let us fire away at those, say the Army's critics.

I can think of no other reason why the members of the agricultural bloc are demanding that the Army return its farmers, since a far greater number of the farmers who have left agriculture were lured by the greater wages of industry than have ever been inducted into the Army. Last November the Department of Agriculture issued a pamphlet entitled "Agricultural Manpower Situation." This pamphlet is my authority for the statement that during the period from September 1941 to September 1942, 921,000 workers left the farms to enter industry, and during the same period only 694,000 were drafted or volunteered for military service.

No one is more conscious than I that this Nation has a pressing agricultural problem to solve. But we will not solve it by furloughing men wholesale from the Army to work the farms. We shall solve it only when proper authority is given to hold these men on the farms after the draft boards have deferred them for this purpose, adding others to them, drawn from nonessential occupations, to carry on this necessary work of providing our food.

Nor do I deny the problem of manpower in industry, but I submit that no proper effort has yet been made to solve its difficulties. The evils of absenteeism and of the turnover occasioned by workers seeking more profitable or agreeable employment in other fields, the need of training more women to replace men in jobs which women can perform as well as men—these are some of the facets of the manpower problem in industry which still require solution. Some can be solved by the employers themselves through greater emphasis upon the productivity of the individual workman, through increasing the efficiency of his supervisors, and through the natural growth in skill of the workmen.

We have been through a period of the most rapid and exhaustive expansion. Industry, in its change-over from peace to the trade of war, has created many new occupations requiring fresh skills. The extensive training program for those jobs has held back our approach to efficiency, but I believe that great strides could be made toward greater productivity by a more strict scrutiny in every industrial plant.

I suggest these things, not in criticism, but as a constructive offering toward the goals of production which we must reach. I suggest them because with the most serious war in our Nation's history to fight, whenever a deficiency in manpower or supply threatens, the first cure prescribed is the release of men from the Army to fill these gaps.

I yield to no man in my respect and admiration for the American farmer, the American industrialist, the American workman. But I would ask this question, Can the problems of fitting manpower to production in this Nation be solved in the midst of war without a more efficient allocation of our manpower to the essential needs of the Nation?

We have now come to a period, I believe, where the same order and thoroughness which have characterized the preparation of the Army for its physical contact with the enemy must be applied in some degree to the other members of our body politic.

This is not a time to permit segments of our civilian economy to jeopardize the whole victory of the nation. I repeat my warning: We stand on the threshold of danger. The great battle is still to be joined. And in the awful ferocity of that all-out attack upon our enemies there will be no time to extemporize fighting divisions or to revise our plans.

Should we make now the fatal mistake of reducing the size of our Army it would prolong this struggle to agonizing lengths. It would leave us with too few men where we should have had many. It would leave its imprint on thousands more of our American homes—in casualties which might have been avoided if the plans of our military men had not been hampered by the short-sightedness of these men who claim our Army is too large.

Never doubt that Hitler and Tojo and Mussolini hope the Army will be reduced, for then they will have a breathing spell to prepare themselves more fully for our attack. Then—it can happen still—they may gather their strength for an attack which will send our weakened forces reeling back before their superior numbers. It will be too late then for action. You cannot improvise an Army.

The Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall, had something to say on this score last December, when the first rumblings of the present controversy were heard. "It is a comparatively simple thing to cut a program," said General Marshall, and I am quoting, "If the happy day comes when that is found permissible, but I assure you that it is utterly impossible to improvise military organizations, and it requires more than a year to build them. Therefore, it is our opinion that no more tragic mistake could be made than to ignore the great mass of enemy divisions and expect us to win this war on a shoestring or by some specialized process. If there is a demand at some later date for us to correct such an error of public judgment when the necessity for these troops finally becomes apparent to the layman, it would be demanding the impossible. The most disheartening influence we can impose upon our enemies is the vision of a rapidly growing storm of legions of virile young Americans organizing to destroy their military power."

This struggle that is coming will be the great test of our democracy. Will we meet it boldly, shoulder to shoulder, labor, industry, and agriculture driving behind their brother-soldier upon whom they depend for victory?

The time to answer that question in words has long since passed. We can answer it now in deeds alone. We must answer it in the unity of the Nation, in the solidarity of its men and women behind the armed forces, in the stepped-up production of food and supplies which roll from field and factory.

Only by hard work and unstinting, unselfish effort and sacrifice on the part of every man, woman, and child in this country can we reach our goal of complete victory in 1943 or early in 1944.

We are willing to go hungry and cold and ragged, if necessary, and to ask nothing for ourselves except that the Government be organized to win the war quickly and bring our boys home safely.

Only unity, hard work, and sacrifice will bring victory and permit the generations that follow us to say, We did avenge Pearl Harbor.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following editorial from a recent issue of the Page News and Courier, published at Luray, Va.:

ROBERTSON DISCUSSES TRADE AGREEMENTS

One of the most enlightening statements concerning the current debate in the Congress over the extension of reciprocal trade agreements comes from Representative A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, who recently wrote a constituent as follows:

I am glad you agree with me that we should continue reciprocal trade agreements and I agree with you that the labor policy of this administration is not in harmony with its international trade policy. In fact that conflict disturbs me very much because aside from our inability to get other nations to buy manufactured goods produced under a 40-hour workweek at an average weekly wage of $40, our own people, especially those dependent upon agriculture for a living, will be unable to buy in quantity goods produced on that basis. As you say, if we attempt

to pay wages far above the world level, our manufacturers would demand and probably get tariffs sufficiently high to keep out foreign imports. That policy does not limit the American market to the American producers of manufactured goods only—it likewise limits the farmers' market to the domestic market.

In normal times we produce for the export market 40 percent of our cotton, 20 percent of our wheat, 20 percent of our Virginia apples, and 20 percent to 30 percent of our flue-cured tobacco and 40 percent or more of our dark-fired tobacco. We now have about 80 percent of the above-ground supply of world gold and all we know to do with it is to buy it. Foreign nations do not have gold with which to buy our goods and we could not use their gold if they did.

If we follow a high tariff policy with a view to becoming self-contained and refuse to buy from other nations, they, from the standpoint of policy as well as necessity, will refuse to buy from us. Then to keep our farmers from glutting the domestic market through overproduction we must strictly regiment them. While control is better than bankruptcy, it is a poor substitute for freedom of action and an economy of abundance.

In 1929 our foreign trade, composed of exports and imports, amounted to approximately $10,000,000,000. After the passage of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act all major nations retaliated and by 1932 our foreign trade had fallen to less than $2,000,000,000, with farm exports down to a mere trickle. That situation added up to the worst depression in history, with ruinous prices for all farm products and a drop in the national income from nearly $80,000,000,000 to nearly $40,000,000,000. While the Hawley-Smoot tariff was not the sole cause of that depression, it was a major contributing factor, as our foreign trade fell off more sharply than that of any other major nation, we went deeper in the hole of the depression than any other major nation, and our recovery was slower. Under the impetus of trade agreements negotiated with about 25 countries, in which tariff rates on approximately 1,000 items were reduced, our imports immediately increased and so did our exports, the chief increase in exports being farm products.

In return for our agreement to extend to all nations the same benefits given to any contracting nation in a trade agreement, the contracting nation agreed to extend to us any future benefit it might give to any other nation, beyond what was already given to us in the trade agreement. That is known as the most-favored nation treatment which was one of Woodrow Wilson's 14 points for enduring peace. You cannot break down international trade barriers by a horse trade between just two nations even though the trade be mutually beneficial for the simple reason that there are some 109 trading nations in the world and when two nations enter into a trade arrangement that excludes the other 107, it is just an invitation to the other 107 to make some arrangement among themselves that excludes the first 2. In other words, bilateral trade agreements are just invitations to an international trade war. And experience has proven that when a trade war lasts long enough it ultimately flames into a fighting war. The only international policy under which nations in a modern world can live in peace and harmony is for all of them to agree upon a live-and-let-live policy. Otherwise when some nation feels it is not getting its fair share of the natural resources of the world, it will set out to take them by force when it feels strong enough to do so.

Under the provisions of the reciprocal trade agreements program we obtained valuable concessions from 18 nations for Virginia apples and from 13 nations for Virginia tobacco and these concessions would have meant much to us if a war had not intervened and broken up normal trade. As you know, the farm dollar reached parity with the industrial dollar in the period between 1909 and 1914. Never, since the passage of the Hawley-Smoot tariff in 1930 did the farm dollar exchange on a par with the industrial dollar until last year when farm parity was achieved, partly through Government benefit payments and partly through the export of farm products under our lend-lease program. For the 10-year period after the adoption of the Hawley-Smoot tariff, farm machinery and every manufactured item the farmer bought was held at an artificial figure by tariff restrictions enacted for the benefit of the few and at the expense of the many. Fifty-cent wheat in the summer of 1932 would not have been so disastrous for our farmers had it been accompanied by 50-cent binders, but when a farmer attempts to exchange 50-cent wheat for dollar-and-a-half binders he can make just one trade and throw in the sponge.

Under the provisions of reciprocal trade agreements 600 dutiable items in the general classification of manufactured articles were reduced and the average reduction on those articles was 25 percent. The effect of that reduction from the standpoint of parity was to hold down future increases in manufactured articles through foreign competition if they attempted to go too high, while the Government subsidy program was bringing up the purchasing power of the farm dollar. Then when price-fixing was resorted to as a necessary war measure, manufactured articles were frozen at their then existing level and as indicated for the first time in many years the farmers got to parity in 1942 from the standpoint of the over-all average.

In attempting to discuss these problems over the radio on the evening of the 21st I realized, of course, the impossibility under the limitation of a 4-minute opening statement and rebuttal statements limited to a minute or two, of adequately presenting any phase of so big and so complex a problem and it cannot be done in a letter either, but I trust what I said over the radio and what I have written above will be sufficient to indicate the importance of the subject being discussed and the necessity for everyone to do some organized thinking on it for himself.

There is considerable opposition in the Congress to the extension of these agreements which have proven so successful. It is entirely possible that with the press of war legislation opponents of the agreements can marshall, by divers means, enough strength to defeat the extension. As Representative ROBERTSON points out, all citizens and especially farmers, should do some organized thinking on the subject and bring the matter to the forefront for discussion.

With Representative ROBERTSON, a leader advocating the extension of these agreements, it is important that the people of his district give him hearty support if they are in favor of these agreements. It is to be hoped that all readers will thoughtfully consider the points he has brought up in the foregoing letter.

An Article on Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arthur R. Baxter, an outstanding citizen and businessman of Indianapolis, Ind., has written an article on bureaucracy which is attracting much attention, and, by unanimous consent of the House, I present the salient points of his article for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

AN INCREDIBLE STORY OF BUREAUCRACY

There arrived in a little city of Florida (population only 5,000) last Saturday an Office of Price Administration inspector (snooper) from headquarters at Jacksonville (150 miles away).

He waited until 11 p. m., then went about town in search of cars "on pleasure bent." As a result, he certified to the ration board 10 cases of unlawful use of gasoline for pleasure driving.

The evidence was license numbers taken from 10 cars which were located at various places about midnight. He did not interview a single driver.

As required by the regulations, the ration board summoned these offenders against the law before them, under threat of canceling their ration cards. The culprits appeared, one by one, in fear and trembling. This is what developed:

Law violator No. 1 was a deputy sheriff of the county, whose car was parked near a roadhouse on Saturday night to preserve order.

Law violator No. 2 was a constable especially hired by another roadhouse to be present "just in case."

Law violator No. 3 was a grocer whose car was standing in front of his own store, while he counted his cash after closing his store.

Law violator No. 4 was a variety store owner, whose car was in front of his own store, while the owner was cleaning up after a Saturday evening rush.

Law violator No. 5 was the owner of Hills Hotel, whose car was standing at his front entrance, as usual, all night.

Law violator No. 6 was a waitress in Hills Hotel, about ready to go home after an evening of serving.

Law violator No. 7 whose car was found outside the bank building. The owner was on the look-out on top of the bank building, serving as a volunteer air warden.

Law violator No. 8 was a private in the United States Army on a 4-day furlough to visit his folks. He had borrowed his father's auto to see some people before returning to camp.

Law violator No. 9 owned a tavern, and his car was in front of his own place of business.

Law violator No. 10 was a woman who was in a restaurant eating a midnight lunch, unaware that she was being "spotted."

Think of the time and gasoline wasted in attending this hearing.

The Government was wasting time and gasoline in paying this snooper to disturb these people.

Some of these folks felt a humiliation because they were hailed into court. All were incensed at this interference.

Did this action help the war chest drive now on? Or the Red Cross drive to start in March?

Will that soldier fight better because his Government presumes him to be a law violator on his short furlough?

How about that volunteer air warden on his lonely vigil watching for airplanes? Will he work for nothing for a Government which meets him with a subpena for breaking the law?

And these businessmen, worrying right now about paying their income tax to the Government, and meeting all requirements as to priorities and rationing, will this enhance their enthusiasm for war measures?

This is a small incident in a small town, but the whole population is talking about it—and other similar ones.

The snooper evidently went to many other places, and other snoopers from Washington

are prying into our affairs all over the country, and from many departments of the Government.

All of these investigations by Washington start with the assumption of crookedness on the part of the people. We are all dishonest, therefore we must be checked and double-checked, prosecuted, and presumed to be guilty until we can clearly prove we are honest. Technicalities are added to a multiplicity of rules and regulations and directives, which even the officials cannot understand.

Can unity be achieved and maintained by such methods?

Can efficiency be reached by people who are under constant surveillance and suspicion?

Can cooperation and even patriotism be sustained by Government injustice and constant condemnation?

Or is there a more sinister purpose in all this? Are we surrendering one liberty after another, under the guise of necessity of war, and submitting to regulation, and supervision, and regimentation, to accustom us to Government control permanently, after the war? A la Tugwell.

That is what happened in France during the 1930's by a venal bureaucracy. See the results.

That is what happened in Germany, a step at a time, and we observed what resulted.

That is what happened in America before the war, and has been accentuated since.

America had better wake up, and defend her liberty at home, while fighting an enemy without.

We shall win this war against Hitler. There is no doubt about that. But are we strong enough to win the war at home?

The enemy within is more powerful than Hitler!

Only a few in numbers, but they have seized, and they hold the reins of government.

They have the power of government at this moment. They are using that power insidiously, persistently, adroitly.

They are making alliances and connections that tend to fasten upon us authority and coercion and regimentation that destroys our liberty.

Think it over, America. Each citizen should be vocal. An aroused public opinion must correct these abuses.

Address of Hon. J. W. Fulbright Before Commission to Study the Organization of Peace

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Congressman J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, before the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Commodore Hotel, New York City, Saturday, February 27, 1943:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I was naturally quite pleased to receive the invitation to appear on this program. I hesitated to accept, however, simply because I fully realize that there is little that I can contribute to the thinking of such a learned group as this. Upon reflection I accepted with the thought that perhaps the thinking of a freshman Congressman might, in itself, be of interest to you. It is with that thought that I venture to address such a distinguished audience.

Within recent weeks, as the Russian Bear has chewed and clawed the Nazi monster more viciously than ever before, many of our people have awakened to the fact that we may win this war before we know what we are fighting for. For example, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the leading metropolitan newspaper in my section of the country, began last Sunday a series of 14 articles by prominent citizens on the subject What Are We Fighting For? In the light of the attitude of the people of St. Louis toward our participation in the war, that is a significant undertaking by that great paper. In the back of everyone's mind is the discouraging futile feeling that again we may expend our most precious resources, our finest young men, and our treasure for nothing. Although I think we have a long and bitter struggle before us, nevertheless I believe the time is short for the difficult task of clarifying our purposes in this war.

For more than a year we have been told that we are fighting to defend our country; that we are fighting to preserve and defend our American way of life; or that we are fighting for freedom. The emphasis has been on the idea of defense such as Defense bonds, defense plants, and appropriations for defense. Americans, because they have been a peace-loving people, have always considered their military ventures as primarily defensive. This idea has tended to limit the scope of our objectives in this war to negative and purely defensive goals. We have a national characteristic of setting for ourselves certain goals and then, upon achieving these goals, going no further.

I would like to suggest today that we should discard this defensive attitude of mind, these various defensive goals. Even the phrase "fight for freedom" is too vague to mean anything. Freedom by itself is meaningless, for no man wants to be entirely free from the associations of his fellow men or free from the obligations of society. I believe that it would clarify our minds if we should regard this struggle as a positive, creative war; a war to promote, rather than to defend, our way of life. This positive, creative purpose goes much further than the defensive goal. It involves permanent obligations on our part, the most important of which is the abolition of war as the means by which nations adjust their differences. I cannot reconcile myself to the too prevalent idea that nothing can be done about war. On the contrary, I feel certain that something will be done about it. It is a question of whether we or Hitler or some people of the future shall do it.

I believe that we should help other countries develop their own version of democratic government in order to lay the foundations for a warless world. By this I do not mean that we should attempt to dictate their internal affairs. Primarily I mean that, by removing the constant threat of war that has hitherto existed, we can create a condition which will, over a period of time, be conducive to the development of republican or democratic governments throughout the world. The rate of development will, of course, depend upon many other factors such as the economic, religious, and educational advantages of the various peoples.

This creative, positive goal does not mean (either by inference or implication) that we, out of the goodness of our hearts, are assuming all the burdens of the world. It does not mean that we are assuming the role of the good Samaritan and are going to give to the poor and ignorant peoples of the world all the wealth of this land. It does not even require that we give a bottle of milk to every Hottentot. On the contrary, as a purely selfish business proposition, it means that by the expenditure of a small fraction of the lives and billions which we are now expending on war, together with a modicum of intelligence and foresight, which we have rarely employed with regard to war or peace, we can create a condition in this world in which the principles of our civilization will have an opportunity to flourish. In other words, I believe that with an expenditure of vital resources much smaller than that required by modern war the peoples of this world can create a system of collective security which will make war, if not impossible, at least much less frequent.

In saying that our selfish interests require us to undertake this great task I do not mean to exclude the moral or spiritual elements involved. The latter are more evident than the former, and, furthermore, the opposition to this country's participation in a world organization is usually based upon a professed concern for our own material welfare, or, as it is more often called, our standard of living. This opposition usually is expressed by the shallow and superficial statement that those who advocate the abolition of war are Utopian idealists with no regard for the hard realities of life. In short, they are full of "globaloney." The truth of the matter is exactly the contrary. The dreamers are those who think that our Christian, democratic civilization can continue to exist in a world torn by wars of ever-increasing savagery and destruction. The realists are those who see that our own selfish interests demand a system of collective security. It is extremely significant that many of the self-styled realists who oppose any such system are those same wise and very farsighted gentlemen who said only a short time ago that no one would ever dare attack us; that we could do business with Hitler; and that, in any case, England would collapse in a few weeks and no one could hope to defeat the Axis. Those same great and wise patriots who harbored Axis agents in some cases, and who urged us to collaborate with the evil Nazi, are the nucleus of the so-called realistic opposition to collective security. On the other hand, the same people who foresaw this war, who urged preparedness, who, in short, were able to evaluate accurately world forces, are the strongest proponents of collective security. I leave it to you: who are the dreamers and visionaries?

Further, it is appropriate to recall that the profound and truly great men who founded our own constitutional government were dubbed visionaries and Utopians by the Tory reactionaries of that day. Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, and Jay were the long-haired radicals with Utopian dreams of cooperation and peace through a supergovernment for the collective security of 13 States. I repeat. Who were the realists and who the dreamers?

Today the airplane has made the world smaller than these 13 States were 156 years ago. The problem that confronts us is the same: Shall we have war and chaos, or shall we have government and peace? As Thomas Hobbes said so many years ago, without government man always relapses into war and anarchy, and then the life of man is solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.

As a result of this war this Nation will achieve a position of relative predominance among the nations of this earth, which it may never again possess. We know that under the impact of this war we are extracting and expending our vital and, in many instances, irreplaceable natural resources at a rate far in excess of that of any other nation. Although it is true that synthetic materials are coming to the fore in some instances, yet the exhaustion of our iron, lead, zinc, mercury, petroleum, bauxite, and other mineral

deposits will definitely put us in a less powerful position relative to those countries which still have vast undeveloped deposits of these elements. On January 10, 1943, Richard L. Stokes wrote an article entitled "War Using Up America's Natural Resources at Rate That Threatens Early Exhaustion." Subject to new discoveries, he says, for example, that our high-grade iron ore will be exhausted in 5 years and our petroleum in 14 years. On the other hand, we know that China, Russia, India, and South America have huge undeveloped mineral reserves; that the first three at least have greater manpower than we have; and that the development of incalculable physical force by these nations awaits only their education in modern technology. We ourselves are contributing mightily to the industrialization of these countries. We have sent oil refineries and rubber plants to Russia; iron furnaces to Brazil; and machine tools to China. By our own efforts we are starting developments in those rich countries which certainly proceed at an accelerated rate with the return of peace. This inevitable industrialization, together with the inexhaustible manpower of some of these countries, during the next 25 or 30 years should enable them to equal or even surpass us in many of the activities essential to war.

I realize that this country will not stand still, but I think the advantages we have enjoyed during the past 100 years must inevitably decrease relative to the rest of the world during the coming decades. For example, let us suppose—what I am not predicting—that China with 459,000,000 becomes as highly industrialized as Japan and likewise should, under new leaders, become imbued with a mission to remodel the world. With such manpower and her enormous natural resources I believe all will admit she would make a formidable opponent. By the hard and bitter route we have learned that even little Japan is not a nation to be knocked out in 6 weeks with our left hand. Surely we must not again so stupidly underestimate the potential power of the other nations of this earth. I believe that similar conclusions may be arrived at in the case of Russia and even of India.

If this analysis of future development is even approximately correct, then the only realistic and practical policy is to create an organization by which these great potential forces may be controlled and be made the permanent allies of peace. I sincerely believe that the great mass of people in this country have already sensed the fact that something positive, something creative, must be done about war. If only we can induce the same discrimination as to our true welfare, among those who are so concerned about our standards of living, among our erstwhile isolationists and defeatists, then we can make progress toward a better America and a better world.

To wage a creative war we must first rid ourselves of our isolationist's dream, however beautiful it may be. The good old days simply will not return. We must stop regretting that all this happened to us and realize that we can turn this barren, ghastly tragedy into a tremendous opportunity; an opportunity which, with imagination, intelligence, and determination, will enable us, together with our allies, to create the world of the future.

Furthermore, I believe that this Nation must decide to take the lead now in the formation of a system of collective security. This decision must be made while the minds and hearts of men are concerned with universal problems, while danger and sacrifice give us humility and understanding. With the return of peace and safety our personal and domestic problems will overshadow our will to sacrifice for the common good. If we wait until we return to normalcy as we did in 1920, futility and sadness will be the only reward for our efforts in this war.

In the face of our experience of 25 years ago, is it not foolish not to attempt some positive solution of this problem? Have Americans no faith in their ability to solve great problems? While we were a young Nation, seeking to establish our civilization in this wild and fertile land, it was proper that we give our attention primarily to our internal affairs. But now we have come of age. We have wealth, power, and brains. All we need is the assurance, the confidence, the boldness to apply our talents to problems worthy of a great people. I cannot believe that a great Nation like America is destined always to stay on the defensive, to be stabbed in the back more than once.

As I have indicated before, the abolition of physical warfare as the accepted method of solving international disputes should be the first objective. The direct approach seems to me the simplest and most effective. In other words, I think an international organization with the power to control the productive capacity and disposition of the heavy armored weapons, necessary for modern warfare, is the essential minimum. If we get less than this we get nothing. If we ask for more than this, we multiply the difficulties to be solved and run the risk of complete failure. Further, I believe that if the ever-present fear of armed aggression is removed from the world, many of the economic and social problems of the various peoples will be much easier to solve. I think it is obvious to all that an organization of strictly limited powers will be much easier to sell to the great nations of the world than one with broad powers. Nationalism is still a very strong force and, in fact, if its martial proclivities can be controlled, it is not an altogether bad force. I think, therefore, without going further into the details of the organization, that in general it should seek to change the international political divisions as little as possible, that it should restrict its immediate objective to the abolition of aggressive war by the control of armed force and should leave for future solution economic and social problems.

I recognize that there are great difficulties involved in any plan for a world organization. On the other hand, I have no doubt but that there are men in this world who are wise enough to devise a workable system if the peoples of the United Nations, and more especially of these United States, demand that it be done. As a matter of fact, the mechanical details of the organization are not as important as the determination and the spirit of the peoples concerned. No system will work without the support of the people. It is for this reason that I feel so strongly that our people should be made to understand that the real goal of this war, that the only worth-while compensation they can expect for their sacrifices and their sufferings, is an organization to prevent war. With this objective in their minds they will be more inclined to give the organization their loyal support and to see that it works.

I believe that if the American people can ever visualize such an organization and believe that it is possible, that it will have an electrifying effect upon our national spirit. Today we know that there are many among us who have no enthusiasm for this war. Many of our people did not want to enter this fight at all. Their concept of victory is merely all the sugar, coffee, and gasoline that they had before. The reason for their attitude is that we have no creative goal, no definite positive goal which we can even hope to accomplish. We merely hope to avoid a defeat. We are on the defensive. If we can believe in a real positive creative goal, a goal that challenges our utmost powers, then I am confident our people would rally to the task with zest and enthusiasm such as we have never before experienced in our history. We need such a goal not only to win the war and the peace, but we need it for the sake of our own national soul. In recent years much has been said of a spiritual awakening in America, yet it has never come. I think it has never come because we have never had a purpose or goal worth awakening for. There can be no spiritual or moral awakening merely to amass greater wealth, more automobiles, more radios.

America has been the most fortunate of nations in the history of the world. We, as a nation, have received the blessings of countless years of struggle by other peoples for liberty. There is, I believe, a law of compencation in these matters. I think the time has now arrived for us to make our contribution to civilization. That contribution can be made by our people setting as our goal the formation of an organization which will give to all the nations of the world the same opportunity for political and economic liberty that we have so long enjoyed. If we deny this obligation, I am fearful that we ourselves may lose that liberty and integrity which we are now sacrificing our boys and our wealth to preserve. We are denying to Hitler the organization of the world according to his ideas. The Nazis are fighting to get the kind of world they want—a slave world over which they shall be masters. They are fighting, not just for victory but because they have a burning hunger for what they believe victory will bring them. Unless our faith burns as fiercely as the Nazis' faith, we not only may lose the war but we will certainly lose the peace. If we deny the Nazis their kind of world, isn't it our obligation to the world to create a better one? Isn't it possible for us to want to create our world with the same fanaticism as the Germans want theirs? Certain it is that if we deny Hitler his world and fail to create a better one, it is only a question of a short time until some other power will again attempt the same task. Our choice is clear—either we accept Hitler's "new order" to create a new one of our own. We will unite with other nations voluntarily or involuntarily. We will either do it now, after this war, or it will be done after the next and much more frightful war.

In conclusion, may I observe that, from my brief experience in the House of Representatives, I believe that a majority of the Members elected for the first time last November are already eager to create a world organization to prevent war. On the other hand, there are many on both sides of the aisle who still long for the good old days. They yearn for the days of the Coolidge era, an era in which a carefree and thoughtless people disregarded all social and economic principles in an orgy of speculation and prosperity. They sigh for those days before the closed banks, the soup kitchens, and the unemployed.

They spend hours cursing the Office of Price Administration, the Work Projects Administration, or the War Production Board. Never once do they seem to realize that both the counterfeit prosperity and the irritating regimentation are largely attributable to war. They see no causal relation between war and the afflictions of our people. They are the self-styled practical men, the realists who somehow must be awakened to the facts of life, who must be persuaded that we cannot go back to those idyllic days of their youth. Only the overwhelming voice of an aroused people can destroy the dreams of those men and compel them to join in the effort to save our tottering civilization. As the very wise Mme. Chiang Kai-shek recently said before Congress, "Man's mettle is tested both in adversity and in success. Twice this is true of the soul of a nation."

The Farmer Is Not a War Profiteer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, which will release 100,000,000 bushels of feed wheat for the purpose of increasing farm production. I think this measure necessary to win the war. I do not see how farmers can be expected to meet production goals unless they have sufficient feed. There has already been too much indifference by Government toward the problems of American agriculture in this crisis.

I was interested in the remarks made here earlier in the day by the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the powerful Rules Committee [Mr. SABATH]. The gentleman represents a great district in the city of Chicago. He is the dean of the House of Representatives in point of years of service. I am, on the other hand, the junior Member. However, I think that I can, with all due respect, teach my city friend something about agriculture.

The gentleman inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of his remarks an article from the Washington Post. The gentleman from Illinois used this article to suggest that under the present administration the farmer was better off than he has ever been in American history and that he is selling out and leaving the farm because he can get such high prices for his land and machinery. The article in question is doubtless accurate in suggesting that prices received at these auctions are generally good. But the gentleman from Illinois is in error when he goes further and suggests that this is due to the wisdom of the farm program and the treatment which the farmer has received from Washington, D. C., bureaucrats. Further, I resent, and I know every farmer in the land resents, any implication that he is selling out to make a profit. What are the facts?

Forced sale of farms this year is 15 percent higher than at any previous time in history. As one who has first-hand knowledge of the situation, I can say that these sales are held against the wishes of many of those selling at a loss. Approximately 3,000,000 men have left the farm in the past 12 months. Experts estimate that 40 percent of those leaving the farm have done so because drafted by Selective Service. Sixty percent have gone voluntarily because the average monthly earnings of war-factory workers is $209.40 and the average of farm workers, without board, is $62.43, with no time and a half for overtime. Agriculture is a war industry, but it has not been treated as such. When labor is not available on the farm, the only thing one can do is to sell out or cut down his farm production. That, Mr. Speaker, explains the food shortage and farm sales in the richest nation on earth.

I would not say that the farmer should in every case be exempted from the draft. But I do say that unless he gets adequate prices for his products he is not going to be able to hire adequate labor and will have to continue to fold up whether he is drafted or not. The lure of big wages in a war factory is an available and welcome opportunity to save himself from bankruptcy and serve his country. It is no more proper to single out the farmer and call him a profiteer for taking such wages when he cannot make a living on the farm than it is to single out any other person who takes those wages and accuse him of taking blood money. This little incident here today explains a lot about the mental attitude which has resulted in the present food crisis under this administration. It shows that the big city farmers and university agriculturalists from the densely populated centers had better get behind a movement to put some rural gumption into farm-manpower policy. There are two schools of thought on the subject. The school of thought, now riding high, is that of the Harvard bureaucrats who are trying to teach the farmer, through tons of free literature and lots of personal instruction, how to milk ducks, extract sunbeams from cucumbers, manufacture gunpowder from ice, graft a dead bough to a living trunk and make it blossom as the rose, make boon companions of the spider and fly, change the shoes of a work horse each night, preserve our social gains, and grow a quart of milk on every sprout for everyone who believes in the more abundant life. The school to which I belong believes a good farm program is one which will bring adequate production by giving the farmer a guaranty of the cost of production, some machinery to produce with, some of his sons who understand farm work to help him, and then just leaving him alone and not calling him names like "war profiteer" or a member of a "greedy pressure group." In more detail this philosophy is set out in 15 points by Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. This program is now before the House Appropriations Committee. If adopted it would result in classifying farming as a war industry with all the preferments given to such industry. High in the list of "musts" is a demand that farm labor be deferred in the draft in proper cases and the adding of increased labor costs to parity. Other requisites are—

Adjustments in accordance with existing acts of Congress of price ceilings and price supports to such levels as will encourage and enable farmers to achieve maximum production.

Eliminating all subsidies used to keep prices from rising in the market place to parity or a price necessary to get needed production.

Additional legislation to require that administrative officials fix price ceilings in accordance with the plain intent of existing acts of Congress.

Continuation of commodity loans and price supports at 90 percent of parity or at higher levels if necessary to get needed production.

Providing a more simplified, decentralized, economical administration, greater farmer control, and with activities of employees and committeemen confined strictly to administration.

Lengthening industrial work week and eliminating premium pay in order to spread workers and increase labor supply for factories and farms.

Transferring needed functions of Farm Security Administration to appropriate existing State and Federal agencies.

Centering farm-labor responsibility in Extension Service, with authority to contract with United States Employment Service to recruit and transport workers, and eliminating labor-union standards as conditions of supplying farm labor.

Providing adequate farm machinery, fertilizer, protein feeds, and other essential supplies.

Release of surplus grains for feeding, but not below a price that would reduce the price of a competing feed grain below parity.

Adequate farm and market transportation for farmers.

Simplifying and minimizing Government regulations and eliminating red tape and unnecessary questionnaires that confuse farmers and consume their time.

Common sense in rationing.

This program could be carried out with substantial reductions in present appropriations to farmers by the Federal Government.

A Report From the Farm Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including a letter and a table submitted to me by the Very Reverend F. G. Mock, chairman of the Nebraska State Farm Mobilization Committee.

I particularly call attention of the Congress to the statement contained in this letter that the great need is for experienced year-around help on the farm. The various plans that have been discussed here in Congress, as well as elsewhere, deal with additional help for seasonal work. There is a tendency on the part of our city friends and official Washington to assume that by soliciting extra seasonal help from our schools, townspeople, and elsewhere we have solved the problem. That alone will not put a farm back in production that has been completely closed because of the manpower situation.

The letter and table are as follows:

MARCH 9, 1943.

Hon. CARL CURTIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: On Monday of this week members of the Nebraska State Farm Mobili-

zation Committee, an organization composed of representatives of various civic, professional, religious, and trade groups throughout the State, met with the State United States Department of Agriculture War Board for a review of farm-production progress and the agricultural situation in general. I served as chairman of the meeting with Director W. H. Brokaw of the Agricultural Extension Service.

Of particular interest in connection with this meeting was a report on the production intentions recorded by farmers on the first 25,000 completed Agricultural Adjustment Administration farm war plants.

I am enclosing a copy of this report for your information, and am forwarding additional copies to other members of the Nebraska delegation in Congress with similar letters.

You will note that only decreases in production, on the basis of intentions expressed in the 25,000 farm plans, are in sugar beets and barley. Our discussion brought out the fact that the chinch-bug threat and increased acreages of corn and war crops are largely responsible for the probable decrease in barley seedings. The indicated cut in sugar-beet acreage is probably due to the uncertain labor outlook.

We feel this preliminary production picture is a fine tribute to the spirit of Nebraska farm people.

In our discussion it seemed the farm labor situation stands out as the greatest production barrier. We feel it would be helpful to farmers in their planning if the farm manpower policy were clarified immediately. It is difficult for farmers to determine just exactly where they stand, particularly in regard to experienced, year-around help. The seasonal labor outlook does not appear so serious except in the irrigated areas of intensive special crop farming.

Sincerely yours,

(Rev.) F. G. MOCK,
Diocesan Rural Life Bureau,
St. Joseph's Church, Beatrice, Nebr.

Survey of farmers' 1943 food-production plans—Nebraska

	Number	Percent coverage
Completed 1943 farm plans included in this report	25,614	16
Cropland in farms covered by this report.....acres..	3,528,456	18

Comparisons of 1942 production with 1943 intentions

	1942	1943	Percent 1943 is of 1942
Soybeans for beans Acres..	8,980	18,161	202
Dry beans.....do....	5,321	12,328	232
Potatoes.....do....	8,894	9,881	111
Sugar beets.....do....	5,700	3,754	66
Grain sorghums.do....	28,840	54,724	190
Corn .....do....	1,019,749	1,228,541	120
Barley.....do....	340,945	292,275	86
Wheat.....do....	635,077	640,082	101
Sows to farrow: Spring..	80,659	133,293	165
Chickens raised.....	4,853,155	5,938,907	122
Turkeys raised.....	107,136	150,775	141
Total milk cows in State (Bureau of Agricultural Economics).....	672,000	707,000	105

CATTLE AND CALVES

Cattle and calves on feed for market, Jan. 1, 1943.....	.....	.....	96,506

Food for Thought

REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the President has filed with the Congress reports of the National Resources Planning Board with a recommendation that these reports be considered carefully and acted upon by the Congress at the present session. These reports, embracing as they do a comprehensive program for "Cradle-to-grave security," should be given very careful consideration because the program involves an annual expenditure of from six to seven billion dollars. The cost of this program piled on top of the heavy taxes that are being heaped upon the American people as a result of necessary war expenditures—and unnecessary expenditures in support of a tremendously expanded Federal bureaucracy—should cause the Members of Congress to pause and ask themselves the question that Congressman Rich asked so often, "Where are we going to get the money?" How are we to finance this blissful security that has been envisioned by this visionary planning board, and has been submitted to the Congress with the blessing and recommendation of the Chief Executive, better known today as the Commander in Chief?

There is plenty of "food for thought" in the reports. Please listen to this, and then pause, consider, and act in the light of this paragraph taken from the reports:

> Where a State refuses to comply with the Federal requirements in accordance with the Federal law or refrains from participation in the program, the Federal Government should have the power to operate the program within the State with Federal personnel until the State demonstrates its ability and willingness to reassume its responsibilities.

As I see it the above paragraph sums up the real intent of the cradle-to-grave security scheme. It is a scheme to give the Federal Government control of every activity of the Nation, with the States pushed back into a position of impotence, if not entirely obliterated. The paragraph indicates that any State that does not cooperate with the program is to be policed from Washington until it sees the light. It means war controls fastened permanently upon the Nation, including rationing and price control. It means Government control and supervision over American business and industry. In fact, it means just exactly the situation Italy has today, that Germany has today, that Russia has today, and no matter by what name you call it, the word "to-tal-i-tar-ian-ism" covers it.

The following editorial taken from the Washington Evening Star of Friday, March 12, 1943 points out so well the problems that confront the Congress in connection with the reports of the National Resources Planning Board and the President's recommendation of the program contained therein, that I include the same for the benefit of my colleagues as a part of my remarks on this subject:

CRADLE TO GRAVE

The two reports of the National Resources Planning Board which the President has sent to Congress set out proposals that are certain to occupy a prominent place in our national thinking for years to come. When this war is over it is not going to be possible for the United States or any other nation to cast off its military habiliments and step easily back into a peactime economy. On the contrary, the transition from war to peace and the reorganization of our future national life is going to be an extremely difficult process. And it will have to be worked out under the pincers-like pressure of a fantastic national debt and a surging demand from all classes of people for a better living and a greater measure of individual security.

Obviously, no solution of these tremendous post-war problems can be hoped for unless there is adequate advance planning, and it is in recognition of this fact that the Congress—and the people—should undertake consideration of the tentative programs worked out by the Planning Board. There will be extensive disagreement, of course, as to details, and there is no doubt that many of the Board's specific suggestions will fall on unsympathetic ears in Congress. But it is to be hoped that opposition to such sections of the reports as may be deemed inadequate or unwise will not tend to blot out the larger fact that these documents are a significant challenge to the vision and the common sense of the Congress and the people.

The specific recommendations contained in the reports have been published elsewhere in the Star, and space considerations preclude their restatement here. But it may not be amiss to suggest some of the fundamental factors which must be taken into account in arriving at any conclusion as to the usefulness or otherwise of the Board's recommendations.

First, there is the important question of cost. Apparently the Planning Board did not attempt to reconcile its proposals with the Nation's ability to pay for them, and, in any event, this is a matter which must be determined by Congress. It is evident, however, that the program in its entirety would be costly. Undoubtedly Congress will endeavor to bring it within the range of probable revenues, always having in mind the thought that a failure to do anything to meet the post-war problems would be the most expensive of all procedures.

Second, there is the question of the ability of the National Government, influenced as it is and always will be by political considerations, to handle such a gigantic undertaking in an efficient manner. As outlined by the Planning Board, the post-war program would project the Federal Government into the affairs and the lives of the people to a far greater extent than at any time in the past. Is it capable of undertaking this responsibility? To what extent should the Government's ability to discharge such functions in the future be judged by the manner in which it is presently handling the burdens imposed upon it by the war?

Finally, it will be necessary to determine whether, on balance, the social gains contemplated by the Planning Board would more than offset the losses, for certainly there will be losses if the plan, as proposed, is adopted. The Board's proposals tend to encourage the individual to look to society for support; to discourage reliance upon one's self. Under the increasing complexity of our

economy, we have already gone far in this direction, and it is reasonable to suppose that we shall go further. But there ought to be a keen awareness of the disadvantages which accompany any dulling of individual initiative or incentive, a clear realization that the goal of democracy should be a minimum rather than a maximum of dependence upon government.

Congress, reflecting the will of the people, must decide how these matters, with others that will suggest themselves, are to be worked out. The most that can be asked is that the problem be approached constructively and with a firm determination to do the best we can with the resources at our disposal.

Our Priceless Privilege

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, many years ago, when I was a small boy, I lived on the same street with another youngster of my age. He and I started our school careers at the same time, and many days we trudged to and from the little ward school hand in hand. The friendship between us which blossomed at that time has continued to grow all the years since. We lived in a small town where opportunities in life, as we now know them, seemed far beyond the reach of any of our people. Early in life our paths diverged and our late contacts were not numerous but were sufficiently so to enable our friendship to ripen with the years.

The gentleman I speak of is William H. Griffin, who for many years has lived in Canada. He is associated with the Southam Press, Toronto. Notwithstanding the fact he has lived all these years in Canada and has met unusual success while there, he still retains his American citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman to whom I refer is a well-known writer. He has written two articles recently which seem particularly appropriate at this time. Therein he speaks a sentiment and a language which should be near to the heart of every American citizen.

OUR PRICELESS PRIVILEGE

(By W. H. Griffin)

Are we properly humble and grateful to God for the privilege of merely living in North America—North America, where we sleep undisturbed by the roar and din of battle, where our women are not ravished by foreign fiends, or where our homes are not ruined by the destructive forces of war? North America! May you always be as great as you have been. We like to think of you, North America, as a glorious picture in the gallery of the universe—as the great geographical masterpiece, drafted with precision by the Almighty; then, that we might have our way of life, colored by man with pigments of wisdom ground in the mills of time—protected, so far, by the priceless frame of the waters of the seas.

True, the picture has been smeared by ruthless, greedy, careless, or misguided hands with the mud and mire of foreign ideologies and domestic mistakes. But that is only on the surface. Underneath is the picture itself. We are fighting, sweating, sacrificing that it shall not perish.

So, are we sufficiently grateful for each hour of honest labor by the soldiers fighting on the production front? This is war; may we pause to salute the army in overalls. Theirs is a uniform of high rank when worn in the cause of human freedom. It is worn with honor by those who do their best.

Are we sufficiently grateful for the wealth, creative ability, and productive capacity of this continent that is being so nobly devoted to the great cause of all history—and because of which all men of all lands should some day profit? If there are greedy or indifferent ones in any strata of life, from the humblest to the most powerful, may they be brought to see wherein they are wrong and dedicate their efforts to the heroic cause which now confronts us. What shall it profit a man if he gains a few cents or a million today and lose his all tomorrow?

May each of us understand that any sacrifice of ours here at home is as naught when compared with the sacrifice of others—especially those millions who have pledged their all. May our tongues be governed by caution and our hearts be hopeful as we look toward the days when things to make life better shall replace bombs and shells. The best we can do will never be too much.

Are we grateful beyond words to all who are away fighting, suffering, bleeding, dying for men of the ages to come? Man can never repay those who will not return. That is beyond his power. May time in its mercy heal the wounds of their loved ones, as the lesser wound of the battle is reduced to a scar. When the last shot shall have been fired may all those destined to return to their native lands be confronted with hope and opportunity. May they face a future wherein the unfortunate will be cared for and the dignity of man be respected. May it be a future in which success is not a sin—a future wherein man may receive a net reward in accordance with his ability, his energy, and his honest efforts. That is what is hoped for in every land on earth. That is what is expected in North America.

SIX-AND-TWENTY LEADEN SOLDIERS

(By W. H. Griffin)

From the moment that marked the beginning of the war in which we are engaged there has been an unconquerable army in the field—an army consisting of exactly 26 lead soldiers—the same powerful army that has been one of the great factors, almost from time immemorial, in every war and in every great peace project—those 26 letters of the English alphabet cast into printer's type.

It was this little army of lead soldiers that brought together the boys to shoulder the rifles, fly the planes, and man the ships in behalf of the world at large.

It was this little army of lead soldiers that raised every dollar of the fabulous amount necessary to equip the boys at the front with what they needed to carry on.

It was this little army of lead soldiers that has kept and is keeping us in fighting trim here at home. What would we do without them?

They are still capable of undreamed-of conquests—this little army of 26 lead soldiers. The peak of their power has never been approached. They stand at attention; awaiting more potent words of command that they may snap into new and more effective fighting formations. They are ready, willing, and waiting to perform newer, better, greater tasks toward the proper ending of this regrettable war; and in the negotiating of a proper peace—and in the restoration of a war-torn world of prosperity and happiness in the better days to come.

So long as these six-and-twenty leaden soldiers are left in there, fighting with and for the boys at the front, mankind may look toward the future with confidence. They will feed the hungry, clothe the naked, care for the sick and the maimed—and inject a measure of sunshine and hope into the dark corners of despair.

Meanwhile place at the disposal of this lead-soldier army enough words, each with enough power, and the hordes of Hitler, Hirohito, or hell cannot prevail against them.

A Tribute to Joe Timmons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay homage to one of the outstanding newspaper writers of the Pacific coast, Joe Timmons, political editor of the Los Angeles Examiner.

Joe passed to the Great Beyond a few days ago and left behind him a host of friends. He had a very full life, interviewing many notable personages, including Mme. Chiang Kai-shek and her sisters in China before their marriage.

He covered the activities of the Legislature of California for many years, and was considered by all one of the fairest reporters of his time. He was a credit to the fourth estate.

The Death of Joe Timmons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who live in California, and particularly in southern California, have all been saddened by news which only came to us Friday, too late to bring to the floor before this. It came in a news item in the Los Angeles and San Francisco papers, particularly the Los Angeles Examiner, which we read in the cloakroom of this House. This news item told of the tragic death of Joe Timmons, who was one of the best known and best loved men in the newspaper fraternity. I called it a tragic death,

for it was by his own hand, yet as I think of it, I think it was also a courageous death, for he preferred that end to dependence, to admitting that his heart would no longer allow him to carry on the activities of the working press.

I have known Joe Timmons for more than 8 years; many here knew him longer than that. I first met him in connection with the agricultural problems of the Imperial Valley. I met him again at meetings of veterans, particularly those where the welfare of the veterans was the issue. He reported for the papers many meetings on State issues. His interest was as keen as his ability was great. He was a veteran of the newspaper business. He had the confidence of those who knew him. He was ever young. When he realized that he was no longer able to carry that interest into active daily work, he took a courageous way out.

I have lost a personal friend. He can never be fully replaced. He was Joe Timmons, and Joe Timmons is gone.

Death of Joseph Timmons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the other day I received word of the death of one of my most valued friends, Joseph Timmons, the political writer for the Los Angeles Examiner.

During the decade from 1932 to 1942, as a member of the California Assembly, I came to know Joe Timmons as one of the shrewdest political commentators of the west coast. But above that, I came to know him as a man instinctively fair, no matter how hot became the argument, no matter what public cause he might be espousing.

Men like Joe Timmons are not created by ordinary circumstances in dull and routine lives. Their careers must be unusual and distinctive to instill in them the depths of understanding, to give them the marvelous background that Joe Timmons possessed.

I understood better his brilliance of mind, his remarkably clear and accurate interpretation of current events, when I learned some of his experiences as a correspondent in the Far East as correspondent and soldier in the first great war of our generation and of all the places he had been and the events he had observed.

For all of the great events of our generation, Joe Timmons saw, and part of them he was.

There is not a man in public life in California who does not feel a personal loss, who does not feel that the State has been deprived of a splendid citizen.

Things Not Always What They Seem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to call attention to an editorial which recently appeared in the Pensacola (Fla.) Journal in support of a highly meritorious cause. I refer to pending legislation for needed increases in compensation for postal employees. It is my earnest hope that this legislation will have early approval:

THINGS NOT ALWAYS WHAT THEY SEEM

In endorsing pending legislation to grant postal employees a flat $25-a-month pay increase last Sunday, we pointed out that this would take the place of a raise granted last December, expiring this April, which provided for a 10-percent increase and time and a half for overtime.

Postal workers in Pensacola have expressed appreciation of our endorsement of the legislation, but were quick to point out that the 10-percent raise and overtime pay did not materialize when the Comptroller General finished interpreting the bill. As a matter of fact, the raise was so little that it was insignificant and in no way enabled the postal workers, who are on the same basic pay they received in 1925, to meet increased cost of living in this day of soaring prices.

At our request, O. L. Lowery, executive secretary of the Pensacola Branch, No. 321, National Association of Letter Carriers, has written us a letter explaining how the December raise failed to materialize and what the workers think they should receive. The letter follows:

"Reference is made to your editorial appearing in the News-Journal of February 28, 1943, relative to a raise in pay for postal workers.

"On behalf of the letter carriers of this office I wish to extend our sincere thanks for the policy your paper has adopted in regard to publicizing our effort to have Congress grant us a fair standard of American living.

"In connection with your editorial on that subject I would like to point out that it was the general impression of postal employees that Congress had voted us a 10-percent increase in pay and time and one-half for all overtime, but it has turned out that we were overoptimistic when the bill became operative and the Department promulgated their regulations on the interpretation of the law, we discovered that only the substitute carriers would receive a 10-percent increase in their hourly pay of 65 cents, and that the regular carriers would receive time and one-half for overtime pay based on a 360-day year. In substance this raised their pay for overtime work from 86 cents to $1.09 per hour.

"So, in reality, you can readily see, the regular employee is receiving pay for overtime work amounting to about 23 cents per hour. In other words, we are told to work premium hours and are not given a just premium pay.

"Fortunately for us the law we're now working under will expire on April 30, 1943. We are now making an effort to have what is known as the Mead-O'Brien bill enacted into law. This bill was introduced in the Senate by the Honorable JAMES M. MEAD as S. 360 and in the House by Congressman GEORGE D. O'BRIEN as H. R. 1366.

"This legislation is designed to grant a flat wartime bonus of $300 per annum to all employees in the service of the Post Office Department. Our national organization has endorsed the bill, and we in the Postal Service are making a concerted effort to have this bill enacted into law as early as we possibly can.

"It is our sincere belief that if the American public were fully aware of the fact that our basic salary had not been increased since 1925 that they would assist us in every way possible to secure a much needed salary increase, and it is our hope that you, through your paper, will continue to convey our plea for a just and equitable standard of living to that American public.

* * * * *

"We are glad to call to public attention the fact that postal workers are carrying on in 1942 on a salary based upon 1925 living costs, that these employees cannot, do not want to, and will not strike for higher wages, that they are loyal workers for Uncle Sam and that they deserve consideration in meeting the problems of this war period.

"We hope our Florida Senators and Representatives will support this legislation."

Address of Archbishop Francis J. Spellman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Archbishop Francis J. Spellman to the American armed forces in north Africa as printed in the New York Times of March 15, 1943:

Soldiers and sailors of the United States in north Africa, gladly do I accept your invitation to speak to you. For more than a week I have been in north Africa, visiting many places, traveling more than 2,000 miles, seeing and meeting many of you under the varied conditions of military life. To me you have been an inspiration and I consider these days that I have already spent with you and the days to come that I am still to be with you to be among the most sacred of my life.

In these solemn circumstances when, as modern crusaders, you are working and fighting, living and dying, to preserve our Nation, our ideals, and our liberties, I have been thrilled beyond expression to observe the spirit of high resolve with which you are animated and the unity of purpose that is everywhere manifest among you. Your destiny is not alone to live protected in the folds of the Star-Spangled Banner and to sing in chorus its soul-stirring verses. Your vocation is something infinitely more noble and responsible, for you are writing again in imperishable glory its immortal stanzas.

"Then conquer we must for our cause it is just. And this be our motto—in God is our trust."

You are the sacred instruments of the triumph of our cause. You are the example to Americans in the homeland, not alone in the firm belief in the justice of our struggle against a treacherous attack by a combination of aggressor nations, but you are also an

example to your fellow Americans in your supreme faith in victory.

FIGHTERS HAVE NO ILLUSIONS

Your fellow American may have some illusions in regard to what that victory will cost. But it is no illusion to you who know full well and full seriously the cost. For part of the price of this precious victory has already been paid. It is true that all Americans both directly and indirectly must bear this cost. But yours is the greater and harder portion, though those you love and those who love you bear with you something of the pain, the honor, and the glory.

With you first things come first. And therefore you know how that victory must come before the fruits of victory; and those who attempt to force the ripening of the fruits or snatch them prematurely may imperil or retard victory itself. Likewise do you soldiers give us incentive in all things that are essential to the unity of our country.

We Americans are diverse in many ways and divided in many matters—and probably in too many ways and in too many matters, and frequently all too acrimonious—but I belive that never before in our history have we Americans been more fervently united not only in love of our country but also in appreciation of it, in our faith in its destiny and the determination to do our utmost in her service. Your unity of purpose should be a good example to all your fellow Americans, that at home they may strive to live together with increasing mutual respect for one another and with a desire to be cooperative one with the other for the common good.

OUR WAR AIMS ARE JUST

Men of every racial and national origin compose the armed forces of the United States, and all are secure in their faith in victory and united in the hope that the end of that victory will be the achievement of a just and lasting peace. Our war aims and our peace aims are no secret. They have been stated again and again with utmost clarity and sincerity.

On Lincoln's birthday our President reaffirmed them and said, "In our uncompromising policy we mean no harm to the common people of Axis nations." The President's words on that occasion were but a reaffirmation of America's undeviating attitudes and actions for the past half-century. In 1918, for example, when America had invitations to assume mandates and protectorates, America did not appropriate even a square inch of territory, and long before the outbreak of the present war the independence of the sovereign Commonwealth of the Philippines was well on its way to realization.

Likewise have we engaged to respect the territorial integrity of Spain and Portugal, and also have agreed not to remain longer in French North Africa than military exigencies require. The fact that imperialism is not an American war aim or peace aim is known to our allies, to our enemies, and to the world. We Americans ardently desire to retain our freedom, our own form of government, our right to live, to worship, to work, to assemble, to trade, to express ourselves, to defend ourselves, to live at peace with God and with our neighbors. This is our strongest defense against totalitarian war aims. America's war aims and peace aims will be the expressions and hopes of all freedom-living people.

NATURAL RIGHTS RESPECTED

The President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain have defined them and subscribed to them, and leaders of several other peoples have also subscribed to them. These objectives are the natural rights of man and express the desire of his conscience. They agree clearly with the traditional teaching of the church and are in accord with the Christian life and the elocutions of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII.

One year ago this month, President Roosevelt wrote to you soldiers and sailors of the United States, members of the American Expeditionary Forces, telling you that you bore with you the hope and confidence, the gratitude and prayers of your families, your fellow citizens and your Commander in Chief. In that letter the President described America as a God-fearing, courageous people which throughout its history had put freedom under God before all purposes. And it is true that your service draws its deepest significance and its greatest strength from God, for we believe that in serving your country in a just cause, you are also serving God.

This, too, was also stated by President Roosevelt in a celebrated message on our freedom: "Storms from abroad," the President said, "directly challenge three institutions indispensable to Americans now as always. The first is religion, itself the source of the other two, democracy and international good faith."

Religion, by teaching man his relationship to God, gives the individual a sense of his own dignity and teaches him to respect himself by respecting his neighbor. And the abandonment of the teachings of religion in domestic life, in social life, in civic life, and in national and international life, has brought the world to the brink of chaos. The way back to peace with justice after victory is therefore in the same order. Personal righteousness, domestic integrity, social justice, civic virtue, and national and international law and order.

BELIEF IN GOD NOT ENOUGH

To believe in God is not enough. We must live our lives as if we believed in Him, and not a few minutes of our lives, but all our lives. There are some who say they do not believe in God. The Old Testament and the New Testament call all men fools who do not know of God's existence. And to all soldiers who look upward into the dark, star-studded skies of Africa, the same skies into which St. Augustine gazed and in the same places in which he lived, I pray that Almighty God will give the same blessing and the same answer that He gave Augustine when the stars to his silent questioning answered: "We are not the God whom thou seekest—He made us."

Yes; the stars proclaim in luminous, uneraseable language the existence of God, for they navigate the firmament in a certain, definite way, and the order in their movement presupposes an intelligence that cannot come from matter or from chance. And the first great cause to regulate celestial orders, who designated our bodies resulting from the union of a hundred other perfectly coordinated masterpieces we know by the name of God. Every fiber of our bodies, every power of our souls, proclaims the existence of God, and to that God and Creator, our ultimate end, we wish to be faithful and loyal.

Our Commander in Chief has told us that our soldiers in Tunisia are well trained and well equipped. We can be absolutely certain that they are conducting themselves bravely and effectively. Thus we are assured of victory, not only of our mighty might over our enemies, but also over the souls of all righteous people because we shall keep our national soul inviolate through our scrupulous adherence to national honor. We shall also keep our own individual souls in close union with God through our belief in Him, our sincere and complete love for Him, through repentance for our past sins because we have offended Him—who is goodness itself—through simple prayers and acts of faith, hope, love, imploring God's mercy on our souls.

Thus in time and element shall we be forever and ever united to Him.

Aid to Schools

REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I introduced a bill (H. R. 2160) which would grant Federal aid to the schools of this country during the war. This bill provides that the Federal Government shall make funds available to the States on the basis of the relative need for such funds, to enable the States to maintain our educational system during the war. Thousands of American teachers, particularly from the rural areas, are leaving the classrooms; not because they wish to give up teaching; not because they do not see the tremendous importance of the teacher at the present time, but simply because they cannot live on the small salaries which the States and the local communities are able to pay to them. The income of the States and the local communities has, in many instances, been greatly reduced during the war because the taxable resources of the States and their political subdivisions have been curtailed, and because of the very great drain of Federal taxation.

In this bill it is provided that during the war emergency the Federal Government will help the several States toward bringing the teachers' salaries up to a basic salary of $1,500. Surely no one can object to paying a professionally trained person who serves his community, as does a teacher, a minimum of $1,500.

The bill also contains provisions to enable the local communities to feed their children where undernourishment exists; to provide school lunches for all children within any State who shall need them. Let me say emphatically that I do not believe that this is the time for any American to say that he would refuse to feed a hungry child because the child goes to one type of school or another. This is the time when the health of every American child is the concern of every loyal American citizen.

Under the provisions of this bill it will also be possible for the advisory boards, which the bill sets up, to address themselves to the question of school transportation. The break-down of transportation facilities has caused a very acute hardship in some rural areas in this country and this problem deserves our immediate constructive aid.

The bill safeguards the right of every child, regardless of race or creed, to share in its benefits. This, too, I believe is an American principle which cannot be ignored.

The provisions of this bill have the indorsement of the American Federation of Labor, whose thousands of members throughout the country are concerned, not only with the immediate maintenance of our schools but with a program of saving the future for the American

child by preserving some of his fundamental rights today.

Nothing in the bill can be construed to extend any degree of control over our schools by the Federal Government. It only provides funds to enable the States and localities to carry on the most fundamental work of any democracy—the education of its rising generation.

The Army Postal Service Is Meeting the Vital Problems of Handling the Mails for Our Soldiers All Over the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the problem of handling mail for our armed forces is recognized on every hand as one of the most vital tasks involved in this global war.

The Army Postal Service, operating as a branch of the Adjutant General's Department, is meeting this tremendous job with an ever-increasing efficiency as our military forces become larger and larger on the different battle fronts throughout the world.

Just recently the Army has opened a new postal school at West Chester, Pa., for the purpose of training men in the art of handling the Army mail. On the occasion of the opening of this school an address was delivered by Col. W. A. Kenyon, Deputy Director of the Army Postal Service.

The address of Colonel Kenyon is so timely and is so full of interesting information relative to the all-important problem of Army mail, that I am asking unanimous consent to have this address printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, not long ago Capt. Burris C. Jackson of the Army postal service arranged a luncheon for a number of the members of this House at which time Lt. Col. Harold F. Ambrose, chief public relations officer of the Army postal service, gave an explanation of some of the problems and complications that are constantly arising to keep the mail flowing to our soldiers everywhere. The remarks of Colonel Ambrose cleared up many points for the benefit of those present, and the meeting was very constructive.

Captain Jackson, formerly president of the Texas Postmasters Association and a vice president of the national association, has also been very helpful to Members of Congress from my State in explaining the huge workings of the Army postal service, which has been appreciated.

Colonel Kenyon's address should be read by every Member of the Congress as it will aid them in answering the many letters that come from constituents relating to mail moving to and from our armed forces.

The address of Colonel Kenyon follows:

To have this opportunity of taking part with the student body and faculty of the State Teachers College and the citizens of West Chester in these ceremonies in connection with the opening of the Army's new postal school is a distinct honor and privilege.

This is, indeed, an auspicious occasion for the Army postal service.

With the opening here today of enlisted branch No. 9 of the Army administration schools on the campus of the West Chester State Teachers College, the Army has reached a new and significant milestone in the matter of Army postal service.

Utilizing the buildings and facilities of this well-known teachers college, the War Department, starting today, will train American soldiers for the very specialized task of handling Army mail throughout the world.

To this splendid campus every 2 weeks will be assigned 125 enlisted men with a postal background gained in civil life. Here they will round out their basic military training with special studies of the various and complex functions of the Army's own postal service, which is today in operation at every point in the world where American troops are serving.

This postal branch of the Army administration schools is the first such school for enlisted men ever to be established. Only enlisted men who receive a postal classification upon entrance into the Army will be selected for the 6-weeks course which will be provided. They will come here to enlisted branch No. 9 of the Army administration schools only after they have completed the major portion of their basic military training at the various Army camps throughout the country.

The importance of this latest development in the matter of supplying the best possible mail service to American soldiers in time of war cannot be over emphasized.

From the earliest days of the Republic down to the current fighting in Tunisia and the southwest Pacific, the United States Government has exerted every effort to provide good postal service to American troops in time of war. Gen. George Washington made special provision for mail service to the Continental Armies which he commanded. During the Civil War special arrangements for keeping the mails moving to and from the men at the front were made. Still later, in World War No. 1, an Army postal organization went into France with the American Expeditionary Forces and delivered the mails to our troops in western Europe until long after the Armistice had been signed.

In World War No. 2, elaborate plans for the providing of an Army postal service were laid long before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. As far back as the spring of 1940 when the Army was expanding on such a scale as to permit large maneuvers in various parts of the country, the ground work for the present Army postal service was laid.

It was at that time, March of that year to be exact, that the Secretary of War and the Postmaster General drew up a joint agreement providing for the establishment of an Army postal service and defining the functions of the two Departments in the matter of providing mail service to soldiers in time of war.

With that agreement providing the basic pattern of the present Army postal service and benefiting by the experience gained from handling the Army mails in the last war, the Army postal service is today according the finest mail service that has ever been provided by any nation to its soldiers under conditions of war.

Never before in all history has any postal organization, either civilian or military, been confronted with the tremendous and complex tasks with which the Army postal service has had to cope.

In the previous conflicts in which the United States has been engaged, the actual theaters of operation had been very much localized compared to the present scope of global warfare.

In World War No. 1 it was necessary to provide mail service to and from a theater of operations which for the most part comprised only western Europe. Today, on the other hand, mails are being moved to and from American forces from Iceland and Alaska in the north around the world's equatorial reaches and to far-away Australia and India. Scattered in between these far-flung areas are whole continents and hundreds of islands on which American soldiers are stationed. Nevertheless, regardless of how remote the area or how inaccessible a tiny island outpost may be, the Army postal service is dispatching and receiving mail to and from our troops at these distant points. Whereas in World War No. 1 the American Expeditionary Forces were less than 4,000 miles from the United States mainland, several hundreds of thousands of troops overseas today are serving thousands of miles farther from home.

Owing to the vast distances involved and to intensity of submarine warfare on the high seas, the problem of getting surface mails over these hazardous sea lanes has been a difficult one. The necessity of boats carrying mail sailing in convoys, and the circuitous routes followed by the latter in an effort to avoid enemy action have increased considerably the time consumed in transporting thousands of tons of surface mails overseas.

With cargo space on airplanes at a premium, it has not been possible to dispatch as much mail by air as we would like to have done. As a means of meeting this latter problem, however, we have adopted the new V-mail system of transporting letters overseas on rolls of film following which they are reproduced and delivered individually to the soldier.

This latter method alone has resulted in a saving of 98 percent in cargo space and has the added feature of being the safest method of overseas postal service yet devised. The reason for this is that the original letters are held at the ports of embarkation until the film has safely arrived overseas. Should the plane carrying V-mail film be brought down by enemy action or should it meet with accident, it is possible to replace the first films by reprocessing the original letters and redispatching them overseas.

A striking example of this safety factor in V-mail was had less than 2 weeks ago with the crash of the *Atlantic Clipper* at Lisbon, Portugal, when 176,000 V-mail letters on rolls of film were lost. Within 48 hours the originals in New York were reprocessed and sent on their way across the Atlantic by another plane. Had this been any other type mail than V-mail these letters could not have been replaced.

We can have some idea of the magnitude of Army postal operations today when we pause to consider that between fifteen and twenty million individual letters are being dispatched overseas every week to American soldiers throughout the world. It is hardly necessary for me to point out the many problems which this involves under adverse trying circumstances of total war.

Army post offices located at key points in all overseas sectors where American troops are serving are today providing the same postal facilities to the American soldier which

are available here at your own West Chester post office.

It is with a view to providing outstanding personnel with a background of postal experience gained in civilian life and rounded out with a course in the Army's own postal school that this new postal branch of the Army administration schools has been set up here at West Chester State Teachers College.

The enlisted men who complete this 6-week course will then be assigned to Army post offices and Army postal units throughout the world, and by the very nature of their past experience and completion of the prescribed subjects at this school they will be in a position to meet every postal contingency that can and does arise from day to day in time of war.

These men will be an integral and vital part of the Army postal system which operates from the United States to every theater of the war. The Army postal service, in keeping abreast with modern mobile warfare which makes advances of 50 to 100 miles a matter of but a few hours, is providing mail service right up to the front lines in all combat areas.

When the great American Expeditionary Force landed on the shores of north Africa on the morning of last November 8, complete Army postal-service units went ashore with the first troops. From that day forward they were providing mail service to the front lines. On the other side of the world in the jungles of New Guinea and on the islands of the Solomons other Army postal units were providing mail service to American troops in those combat areas.

Ever recognizing the receipt of a letter from home as one of the most important of all factors in a soldier's morale, the War Department is today exerting every effort and energy at its command to provide the most expeditious mail service possible to our troops. Every convoy leaving American ports has thousands of pounds of mail stowed away and Army planes winging their way from the United States across the world's new, war-created air lanes have their cargo of soldier mail aboard, mostly in the form of V mail.

If this new postal school here at the Pennsylvania State Teachers College in West Chester can accomplish or bring about in some degree the providing of outstanding personnel for the handling of soldiers' mail throughout the world, it will have in some small manner fulfilled its primary purpose.

That this school will do much to improving the Army postal-service operations in the future I have no doubt. That it will become an increasingly important phase of the basic Army postal-service operation, I likewise have no doubt.

To this first group I extend a hearty welcome and wish to convey to you on behalf of the Army postal service my best wishes for success in the specialized task of handling the mail which has been assigned to you by the Army and for which you will receive your postal training here on this campus.

A Reply to Martin Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System at 10:30 p. m., on March 11, 1943, by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, professor of applied Christianity at the Union Theological Seminary, national chairman of the Union for Democratic Action:

In an address over the radio a week ago Representative MARTIN DIES sought to justify the work of the so-called Dies committee, which presumably investigates un-American activities, against the rising tide of criticism against it. He speaks of powerful forces of propaganda and certain radio commentators who seek to discredit his work, and attributes opposition to him to subversive forces in America.

The real fact is that opposition to MARTIN DIES springs from a wholesome respect for the validity of an ancient and hallowed commandment of the moral law. The law reads: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." It is unfortunately a human tendency to tell lies about opponents in the heat of political and other controversies. One purpose of government is to set up juridical institutions which carefully sift truth from falsehood by ordered procedures and impartial inquiries. When these institutions become themselves perverted and are made into instruments of untruthful propaganda the sanctity of government itself is undermined. The lies which are told under the authority of governmental quasi-judicial institutions are more potent lies than those told by individuals. This is what makes the Dies committee so dangerous to the integrity of government itself. It has consistently and perversely defied the commandment "Thou shalt not bear false witness" and sought to give this defiance the aura of governmental authority.

The Dies committee has never seriously investigated anything. The committee's chief brain and research director is a self-confessed former fellow traveler who was a tool of various Communist organizations. He even wrote a book with the title "Confessions of a Fellow Traveller." The primary interest of Mr. DIES and the majority of his committee is to embarrass the Roosevelt administration. In his perverse ignorance he regards all the necessary measures of Government for the control of economic life in wartime as bureaucracy; and in his simple mind bureaucracy is identical with fascism. As Secretary Ickes has observed, he has uncovered no Nazis or Fascists. When the criticism of his lack of interest in the really subversive elements in this country became embarrassing he finally produced a report which contained nothing but well-known facts about Nazi and Japanese activities.

All the recent reports of the Dies committee have been issued without public hearings and even without a meeting of the committee. "The methods employed by the committee," said a Member of Congress, Mr. SADOWSKI, of Michigan, "have been such that they have given rise to doubts as to the stability of justice and of the great American principle of fair play." In the recent debate on the continuance of the committee the great majority of Members of Congress who spoke at all, spoke against its continuance. The committee was continued nevertheless because as one Member, Mr. GALE, of Minnesota, confessed, "we are afraid to vote our honest convictions, because of the misconceptions and the false impression which that committee through abundant publicity has built up in the American public."

The reports were not only issued without public hearings and without meetings of the committee, but efforts of persons who were traduced in the reports of the committee to secure a fair hearing in an effort to refute the charges brought against them, fell on deaf ears. Mr. DIES could not afford to have his false charges publicly challenged. Representative VOORHIS of California, himself a member of the committee, opposed its continuance in the recent debate and declared: "I have seen the committee become more and more a political instrument of definite conservative ideas and less and less a dignified, impartial, and effective congressional committee. For when a committee includes people loyal to their country but whose opinions simply disagree with those of a majority of the members of the committee, on a list of those to be proscribed and accused, then such action becomes dangerous to democracy itself instead of an exposure of un-American activities."

The fruits of the completely unjuridical procedure of the Dies committee, its perverse disregard of all rules of judicial honesty and impartiality, are now quite apparent. The fruits are the mockery of justice, a fantastic perversion of the sanctity of government, particularly the judicial function of government.

Thus in the most recent Dies report a list of 39 alleged Communists and Communist sympathizers was given. Ironically the list contained some of the best known anti-Communists in the labor and liberal movement. A man was listed who consistently fought the Communists for years in the period of organization for the unemployed during the depression. Two well-known Negro anti-Communists were mentioned. A high official of the War Production Board, whose probity is vouched for by Donald Nelson and Henry Kaiser, was traduced. Representative WILL ROGERS, Jr., called attention in Congress to the name of a soldier who is now serving his country as a paratrooper. A gentleman in Pittsburgh was included in the list for some unknown reason. His political activity had consisted in support of the Committee for Non-Participation in Japanese Aggression, a committee of which Secretary Stimson was honorary president. A representative from Pennsylvania declared "My people resent such unfair innuendoes and misstatements of fact."

Last summer the Dies committee presented a special report on an organization of which I am the national chairman, the Union for Democratic Action. We were presented as a Communist-front organization, though the real and avowed purpose of our organization was to fight all forms of totalitarianism, Communist and Fascist, and we demanded a pledge of opposition to both forms of totalitarianism of our members. In the days when the Nazi-Soviet pact had suddenly persuaded the Communists that this was an imperialist war and prompted them to make common cause with the isolationists, a position from which they suddenly shifted again when Hitler invaded Russia, we were particularly active in challenging the Communists in labor and liberal circles. We were interventionist in foreign politics and liberal in domestic politics, broadly speaking, in support of the Roosevelt administration in both foreign and domestic affairs. This was our avowed position. The Daily Worker declared that we "were linked to the Government, tied to the war machine, faithful to capital and a menace to the labor movement." We were the "fifth column of the Wall Street empire."

But the Dies committee insisted we were Communists. The reason was simple. We had actually had the nerve to publish the voting records of all incumbent Congressmen, and even suggested that some of those Congressmen, including several members of the Dies committee itself, should be voted down by the electorate. This democratic activity was considered subversive by the Dies committee, which means that if any of you who are listening to my remarks criticize your Congressmen, you are engaging in an activity subversive of parliamentary government. In an effort to prove that we were Communists, the committee went to the most fantastic lengths in perverting the truth. They published a chart purporting to show our connections with Communist organizations. In my own case, I was credited with member-

ship in four organizations. To three of these I had never belonged. From the fourth, the American Student Union, I resigned when the Communists gained control of it.

I might mention a particularly flagrant case of bearing false witness in that report. Dr. George Counts, president at that time of the American Federation of Teachers and on the executive board of our Union for Democratic Action, had become known throughout the whole liberal world because he had been the leader of the movement to free the teachers' union of Communist control. This did not deter the Dies committee from branding him as a Communist sympathizer. So one could go on and on in exposing the falseness and the baseness of the Dies investigation of un-American activities. I say it is base as well as false because the mistakes it makes are so glaring, the accusations so preposterous that even its slipshod method of alleged investigation could not account for the errors it commits. Some of them must be intentional. In the case of Mr. DIES and his committee the purpose is usually to embarrass the administration. I could not help but smile ironically when I found that I had been listed as a member of an organization of which Mr. DIES' research director, Mr. J. B. Matthews, was once president and which I refused to join, despite his entreaties, not because it was Communist but because I thought Communist influence too dominant in it. The organization was in fact liquidated in the process of following the tortuous "party-line."

Whatever we may say about these ludicrous antics of the Communists in the past, it is a fact that at the moment they are loyal to the war effort and that there are many quasi-Fascist and anti-Semitic organizations which are not. And Mr. DIES has done nothing to expose these subversive influences.

But this glaring inconsistency, however important, pales into insignificance in comparison with the general dishonesty of the whole Dies procedure. Bearing false witness is an infraction of the moral law. Bearing false witness under the cover of institutions designed to guard the truth is a perversion of government. It is so dangerous a corruption of the sanctity of government that honest democrats of whatever political persuasion must do all in their power to eliminate such a corruption from our body politic. Mr. DIES himself is unimportant, but his committee incarnates for the moment a peril to democracy. The people of America must understand this peril and the Congress must summon up the courage to destroy it.

Absenteeism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Evening Star of March 13, 1943:

MOVE TO FOG ABSENTEEISM ISSUE SEEN—CONGRESS ROLL CALL, 10 PERCENT MISSING, USED AS SMOKE SCREEN

(By David Lawrence)

In a transparent attempt to becloud the issue, new dealers now are saying that absenteeism in industry isn't so bad because, after all, 10 percent of Congress is customarily reported as "absent."

But the New Deal spokesmen have overlooked the fact that absence from a roll call in Congress does not constitute absence from legislative work. Anybody who is at all familiar with the duties of a Senator or Representative knows that a Congressman spends as much time as he can off the floors of Congress because he has more pressing duties elsewhere in connection with his public office.

Thus, every Senator and Representative must answer thousands of letters from constituents. And if he doesn't dictate personal letters or seem to be giving personal attention to the requests that people back home make, they—who are his true bosses and employers—feel that he isn't earning his salary.

The Senator and Representative today must often go to the executive agencies for the information with which to answer the requests of his constituents. He must spend time in his office giving interviews to the constituents who come to Washington to discuss pending legislation.

COMMITTEE WORK

Many committees are in session in the morning hours, and sometimes these extend into the afternoon. Committee work usually takes from 10 o'clock in the morning to 1 o'clock. Then the Congressman or Senator must decide whether he will let all his office mail go and take his seat on the floor to listen to debate or whether he will go to his desk, in either the House or the Senate Office Building, and see callers or answer mail or look up data in preparation for next day's committee work.

In order to keep Members informed, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is published. This contains every syllable spoken on the floor of the Senate and House every day plus the extension of remarks, whereby exhibits and miscellaneous supporting data are often printed to supplement oral speeches. The RECORD likewise prints excerpts from committee reports, which, for the most part, are separately printed and give the Congress Members an opportunity to study the work of committees other than those of which he may be a member.

Why should the Representative or Senator spend his valuable time listening to spoken words on subjects not of direct interest to him when he can read the same in a verbatim record the next day? Why should he who has interests in an agricultural State, for example, spend his time listening to a technical discussion on oil drilling or mining when there may be no oil wells or mines in his district? He can read all he needs to know about it in the RECORD.

ROLL CALL OR VOTE?

But, it will be asked, should the Senator or Representative not be present at a roll call or vote? Not necessarily. Many a measure is slated for passage by voice vote or by overwhelming majority. Many a measure occasions little dissent, and it is immaterial whether it passes by a 50-vote majority in the House, for instance, or by 150 votes.

The Senator and Representative can sit in his office and if a roll call is demanded he is notified by bells that ring loudly in the corridors of all the congressional office buildings. Generally speaking, he knows beforehand what bill is scheduled to be voted upon each day. If it is not a measure of concern to his district and there is little opposition to it and he favors it anyway, there is no point in attending a roll call. To call the roll—to go from office to the floor and then back again—sometimes consumes at least a half hour's time.

Nor is a Member of Congress guilty of absenteeism if he goes back periodically to his district to consult his constituents.

It is a safe assumption that if the hours worked on his tasks and duties as a Member of the National Legislature were the criterion, there would be a 110-percent record for Congress. Certainly the Members do not get time-and-a-half payment for hours over 40 per week, and they don't get paid at all for the many expenses they must incur in line of duty in buying lunches or dinners for visiting constituents.

To compare the statistical record of roll-call absences with absenteeism in industry is to smear Congress and draw a smoke screen over the New Deal's encouragement of an attitude of irresponsibility on the part of workers in industry, which is the real cause of absenteeism.

Pay-As-You-Go Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CLARINDA PUBLISHING CO.,
Clarinda, Iowa, March 12, 1943.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: In a telegram to you I stated in effect that it is my opinion as a taxpayer that Congress may be losing sight of the objective a majority of taxpayers would want in the proposed pay-as-you-go legislation. It stated that while we are fully aware we must pay the taxes, we cannot and do not so much look for relief from the income tax as we do look for and hope for relief from the income task.

News of proceedings in Washington led me to fear that the outcome may be more complication instead of relief from that very thing. It is this hope for the simplification of tax payments for the average citizen, unaccustomed to the intricate details of expert accountancy, that gave the Ruml plan immediate favor among all my associates—I have found none objecting to that plan so far as it was explained to the public in the press. Now, Mr. JENSEN, you are on the scene there and I believe your judgment as to the specific merits of the bill at hand will be more competent than ours out here, but again let me suggest that no change is desired that would increase the task of making annual or periodic reports by the general public (individuals). I have talked with lawyers, and even they agree with me, for they are overwhelmed with day and night work trying to keep up with the demand from clients for assistance. The average person—literate as Americans may be—simply is not capable of correctly filling out the intricate blanks, or is too busy trying to make the money to meet our strenuous living costs and these taxes.

We in Iowa have been well satisfied with our sales-tax system; I do not recall ever hearing complaints about it since the first few weeks of becoming accustomed to it. It is the least troublesome of methods, and our experience with it may be one of the influences that made us favor the Ruml plan or some similar plan if it would do away with the end-of-year annoyance of dizzy blanks for the common people.

Isn't it possible that solving this problem for us may also reduce somewhat the terrific overburden of personnel necessary to record and check and enforce the present income tax plan?

In respect for your good judgment,

C. C. CASWELL,
Business Manager, Clarinda Publishing Co.

The Roosevelt Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a distinguished Republican from the First District of Kansas. I respectfully call this letter to the attention of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]:

To the Roosevelt Boys and the Congress of the United States:

GENTLEMEN: Many of the folks in the First District of Kansas weren't surprised when their Congressman, W. P. LAMBERTSON, unleashed his blast at the Roosevelt boys. Mr. LAMBERTSON was only running "true to form."

The writer of this letter is a First District Republican—one that has never voted for anyone except a Republican for either Governor or President—but has never voted for LAMBERTSON.

During the primary campaign last summer the writer asked Mr. LAMBERTSON why he had given the Axis more support and comfort than any other Kansan. His reply was, "I don't like the English or Russians."

No; Mr. LAMBERTSON hasn't any use for the Roosevelt boys, the Russian boys, the English boys, or anyone else that's fighting the Axis.

By the way, someone might ask Mr. LAMBERTSON why his own boy had time to take $125 a week working at Fort Riley last year but is now sticking close to the farm, safe from the draft.

Perhaps you'll ask why LAMBERTSON's perennial return to office. First, because he always gets out a third man in the primary to split the protest vote against him; second, because the overwhelming Republican press wants to bet on a sure winner and be in on the "gravy jobs" when a Republican becomes President again.

Sincerely yours,

N. T. LARSON,
Wamego, Kans.

Patriotic Americans Will Plant Victory Gardens This Year To Help in the Food Production Program To Help Win the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the American public this year as never before is called upon to cooperate in the production of food. Almost every one of us, regardless of age, will be able to assist somehow in the planning of a victory garden and then doing the job.

A goal of 18,000,000 victory gardens has been set for 1943, the Department of Agriculture has announced. The help of every able person in every town, city and suburban area is needed to meet this goal.

A victory garden is everyone's direct contribution to the war effort. Our farmers are working long hours with the biggest food production in history, even though they are greatly handicapped because of shortage of labor, farm machinery, parts, and equipment.

The Department of Agriculture reports universal interest in victory gardens this year. These gardeners are expected to make an important contribution to the Nation's food supply. The Department, therefore, is urging that gardens be well planned and cared for. Those who have a sunny plot 30 by 50, or even smaller, at home are asked to do their gardening there if the soil is reasonably good. It is suggested that others make every effort to get a plot in a community garden.

Food production is war work this year—

H. W. Hochbaum, chairman of the Federal Government Victory Garden Committee, said.

Food needs of our armed forces and our allies are greater than last year and it is very doubtful that commercial growers can supply the great varieties of vegetables that we have had in the past—

He added.

The Department of Agriculture is receiving tens of thousands of letters daily from people who want information on victory gardens.

Members of Congress, both on the House and Senate side, are cooperating with the Government and with the public in this great victory-garden campaign. They, too, are receiving thousands of requests from their districts back home.

Many very interesting and helpful publications are available without charge, and these may be secured by writing to either one of the two United States Senators from your home State, or to the Congressman representing your district.

The following publications are available free for the asking: Victory Gardens, The City Home Garden, The Farm Garden, Diseases and Insects of Garden Vegetables, Disease-Resistant Varieties of Vegetables for the Home Garden, Hotbeds and Cold-Frames. Get to know the name of your district's United States Representative in Congress and just write a letter or card, requesting any or all of the bulletins mentioned.

Here is some good advice from the Department of Agriculture:

Victory-garden vegetables can be only as good as the plot they have to grow in, United States Department of Agriculture garden authorities say. Selection of space for the growing of vegetables—whether it be part of the family lot, a neighboring vacant lot, or in a community garden—deserves careful consideration.

The victory gardener wants beautiful crops, crops that are full of flavor and health-protecting vitamins and minerals. Vegetables grown under unfavorable conditions are apt to be poorly developed, lacking in flavor, and of little nutritive value. The garden plot should be fertile, sunny, free from competing tree roots, and well drained. Heavy clays are harder to work, and root crops seldom develop satisfactorily in them. A site, convenient to the family dwelling, where spare time can be turned to the care of the garden, is much to be preferred over one at a distance, even though it may be larger.

The demand for vegetable seeds on the part of prospective victory gardeners has taken on unprecedented proportions. The rush to buy vegetable seeds—a rush aggravated by the desire of housewives to plant vegetables for home canning with which to supplement the family food supply—has been going on a month to 6 weeks earlier than usual.

To be of further assistance to those who are planning victory gardens, I am pleased to reproduce an excellent article entitled "War in Your Back Yard," by David Burpee, an authority on seeds and gardening. This excellent article was published in This Week magazine, which each Sunday is distributed with many of the larger daily newspapers in the country. The article, which follows, was published in the issue of January 31, 1943:

Our first year of all-out war has brought some drastic changes in gardening. Americans are gardening as never before, partly because rationed travel means more time to dig in the backyard, partly because we know we have a serious food-producing task on our hands. The war is jerking us back to the soil. It is likewise revolutionizing our gardening habits. Here is what is happening:

Vegetables versus flowers: In wartime there is an inevitable swing to vegetables. Since 1919, nearly all home gardeners have ordered their flower seeds first, then appended the vegetable seed selections somewhat as an afterthought. Last year, the reverse was true. The quantity of vegetable seed ordered by home gardeners nearly doubled.

Heretofore, orders for flower seed have tapered off in war years. But in this war, orders for flower seed are up slightly, too. This puzzled me until I saw hundreds of war gardens last summer in back yards that were untilled the year before. In most of them flowers were growing usually in borders around the vegetable plot.

"Our sons are at war, so we grow flowers along with our vegetable to cheer us up," one mother told me. Tens of thousands of families are doing that.

Fashions in flowers: In the flower department, the swing is back to the old-fashioned, bright-colored stand-bys, such as zinnias, marigolds, petunias, particularly in the dwarf varieties that take little space and yield many blossoms. There is a boom in the flowers that blossom in patriotic colors, notably sweet peas, larkspur, asters.

Already the war has brought about more natural habits in gardening. For the past 2 decades many Americans gardened for show, with emphasis on exotic plants, rock gardens, and other frills. Now most of this "parlor" gardening has disappeared—along with the hired gardener. We are doing our own digging, and we are getting more from the soil in blossoms as well as food.

Accent on vitamins: Today's home vegetable gardens reflect significant changes in American eating habits. During World War No. 1 there was a demonstration food garden in Union Square in the heart of New York. The thousands who came to ask questions were interested mainly in growing potatoes,

corn, beans, squash—the quantity vegetables. In this war, the same gardeners are planting the green-leaf vegetables, such as chard, spinach, turnips, and beets (grown for the tops as much as for the roots), green celery and the green-leaf types of lettuce. All these are vitamin vegetables. This is woman's touch in today's war gardens.

Cooperative gardening: Last year there were over 1,200 garden projects sponsored by large industrial concerns, and even more group gardens inspired by schools or other community effort. This year there will be still more. We can't have too many. Witness what an intelligently worked community garden program can yield: Early in 1942 the Firestone Co., at Akron, Ohio, offered free seed and a plowed 50-by-80-foot plot to employees. Sixteen hundred workers accepted the offer. Seed worth $475 yielded $63,700 worth of vegetables. That is gardening to beat Hitler.

School children, too, are tilling the soil. Many schools had their own truck gardens last year, grew all the vegetables used for pupils' lunches, canned the surplus for use this winter. Hundreds of additional schools will start such gardens this spring, adding their share to America's food drive.

Seed for the world: Americans must divide not only their food but their seed supply with their allies. The largest buyer of seeds in history is the Lend-Lease Authority. So urgent was the need last spring, military authorities diverted cargo planes to fly essential seeds to Russia. The seed farms of this country are now food arsenals of the democracies. The seed industry, like others, is faced with an acute labor shortage at the very time it is called upon to double production. Women and girls have replaced men on the seed farms. We will have seed, but none to waste.

Before the war there were certain stand-bys of the vegetable garden whose seed we could not grow in competition with Europe. They were the varieties calling for much hand labor, notably cabbage, cauliflower, broccoli, and spinach. Now, with new techniques, American seed growers can produce these seeds, too.

Bread-and-butter gardens: Seedsmen have been swamped with letters from home gardeners. Veterans want to know why they can't always get the varieties of seed they selected; beginners want to know what to plant.

To the former, my advice is, give your seedsman some leeway. There may be a shortage of a certain variety. You can get carrot seed, or beets, or turnips, but you may not always get the kind you want.

To beginners: Start with the bread-and-butter vegetables—beets, carrots, cabbage, turnips, beans, onions, chard, lettuce—all vegetables you can plant as soon as frost danger is past. Replant frequently for new crops maturing well into the fall. And don't overlook the vegetables that will winter in the ground—such as oyster plant (salsify), parsnips, Scotch kale.

There is a war boom in seed for double-duty vegetables: Turnips, whose tops are rich in vitamins and even more edible than their roots; red-stalked chard, which is both decorative and a vitamin green comparable to spinach in taste; celtuce, a new plant from China in the lettuce family, with leaves that make crisp salad when the plants are young and whose stalks cook up like celery when the plant matures; tomatoes, which the hybridizers have remodeled to compare with citrus products in essential vitamins. Then there are the edible soybeans, the most nutritious of all vegetables, yielding up to 40 percent in protein and 20 percent in fat.

Exit lawns: In World War No. 1 Americans dug up lawns, tennis courts, parks, and planted vegetables so enthusiastically and indiscriminately that they wasted tons of precious seed. This time, when war overwhelmed us, we had no seed to waste. The United States Department of Agriculture put the brakes on war gardens except in rural and suburban areas, where people already had experience in preparing the soil. Lawns were not spaded up.

But this spring, with our food shortage more critical than we dreamed it could be, more and more of our lawns are expected to be turned into vegetable plots. Fortunately, there is no better soil for most vegetables than a spaded-under sod, rich in humus. And when the war is over, the vegetable garden, replanted to grass, will make a lawn more luxuriant than the original. That is one of Nature's unexpected compensations.

Smaller War Plants Division of the War Production Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I have criticized some of our governmental agencies for their ineffectiveness, I think it is only fair that I should also insert in the RECORD an instance where they have accomplished good results: I am, therefore, quoting a letter from Vasco Electrical Manufacturing Co., as follows:

VASCO ELECTRICAL MANUFACTURING CO.,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 17, 1943.

Congressman NORRIS POULSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: In view of the invaluable service rendered to ourselves and other smaller manufacturers engaged in the production of war materials for the United States Government, we suggest that recognition be given the Smaller War Plants Division of the War Production Board, under the leadership of Lou Holland, by introducing into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD evidence of their accomplishments.

We were certified to the War Production Board as a small distressed war plant by Mr. J. A. Handin, of the Production Service and Smaller War Plants Division, War Production Board, Los Angeles office. We were given invaluable assistance in Washington by Mr. L. E. Rush, Chief of the Production Service and Smaller War Plants Division, and excellent cooperation from Mr. John Mikesell, also of the War Production Board.

Through the efforts of the Smaller War Plants Division we secured a prime contract with the United States Navy Department, which otherwise would have gone to a manufacturer on the east coast who was well supplied with contracts and had a large backlog of orders. This action on the part of the Smaller War Plants Division enabled us to continue the operation of our plant and facilitate deliveries to the west coast destinations, as required by the Navy Department. Our prime contract, No. NXSS23506, amounted to approximately $45,000, which is at least 60 days' work.

In view of the foregoing and other instances where small war plants have been kept busy, we sincerely hope that a permanent record is made of the achievements of the Smaller War Plants Division of the War Production Board.

Respectfully yours,

R. C. PERSONS,
Vice President.

Letter to the Seventy-eighth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the Seventy-eighth Congress from one of my constituents:

To the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States of America, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESS: I don't know, but I'll bet a horse and buggy that one gay and gallant warrior did know what he was about when he wrote on his shield of arms in the language of his time, "Ne quid nimis."

He well knew before he forked his frisky steed and rode out to duel and lance for the glory of his country and the heart of his queen that the thrust of his lance would be increased by the power of his creed.

Ne quid nimis—nothing too much; not anything too much.

He must have measured his charge by the stamina of his horse. He must have tempered his anger with his want to love.

Surely his lance wasn't too long nor his sword too heavy.

Ne quid nimis—nothing too much.

Now, dear Congress, my horse is string-halted, my sword is dull, and my lance is old and bent, but I'll borrow, beg, or steal this ancient warrior's creed and I'll fight a fighter's fight till the fighters come.

Ne quid nimis—nothing too much.

Don't make your journey too long. Don't weight your saddle pockets too heavy. Don't bring me anything too much, too much Army or too many bureaucrats, too many social reforms or too many taxes, too much politics, too much quibbling, too much fault finding, not even too much of too little.

Don't tell me that all of labor's demands are just. Tell me they are half right, or even 51 percent.

Don't tell me that the Great Emancipator ever had any idea that the time would come when our race would want to make it legal for a white man to woo and wed a Negro's daughter.

Tell me the colored folks are entitled to share in our "four freedoms."

Ne quid nimis—nothing too much.

Don't tell me that all corporations are big bad black buzzards that ram their beaks in the bowels of our social economy while they claw at the backbone of our democracy. Tell me, rather, some corporations are this and even more.

And please don't tell me that all little businessmen are earthly saints with halos around their curly heads and that their hearts spew sweet charities and human kindness like water from an old rusty well bucket.

Tell me some small business tactics stink.

Don't tell me we have to soak all the rich to save the poor.

Tell me that some of the rich got their security too quickly and that some of the poor are too poorly.

Don't tell me that we must be Communists just because our friend Mr. Stalin is on our side.

Tell me that you think Mr. Stalin fights well and that we're mighty glad to have his help.

Don't tell me to fight because I hate the Hun and the Wop.

Tell me to fight for the love of my country and my way of living.

Don't tell me that we must exterminate the Japs.

Tell me that we are going to whip the stuffins out of that whole Axis bunch.

Don't tell me that the Democrats have to defend the President. Don't tell me the Republicans have to crucify him. Don't tell me that codfish should be rationed in New England. Don't tell me that the radio should be the voice of the Government. Don't tell me that we have to have inflation. Don't even tell me that agriculture blocs are absolutely necessary.

Ne quid nimis—nothing too much.

Please tell me that all these things are only half truths. Tell me that somewhere between the extremes lies the truth.

Tell me that you, Dear Congress, will not legislate any law on the assumption that any extreme change from our past philosophy of life is all truth.

Ne quid nimis—nothing too much.

Don't even bother me too much, Dear Congress, while I pray for the suffering, and work, work for my God, my country, my own folks, and me.

GEORGE AUTRY.

AMARILLO, TEX., *February 17, 1943.*

Rayburn Rides Out Minor Storm, Keeps Same Mild Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of March 14, 1943:

RAYBURN RIDES OUT MINOR STORM, KEEPS SAME MILD PHILOSOPHY

(By Robert De Vore)

SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, could see in the House last week signs of spring after a long, hard winter, signs of unity after weeks of intraparty strife, signs like crocus buds in melting snow.

Only six votes against extension of the Lend-Lease Act.

A nearly solid bloc of Democrats and more than a score of Republicans standing fast against a proposal to attach to the bill a rider giving Congress veto powers over final settlement of lend-lease benefits—a proposal to lay the legislative foundation for reform of New Deal foreign policy that lost by 60 votes.

Just 1 week earlier the House had turned down by 114 votes a resolution to create a separate standing committee on aviation, although this proposition had the support of Republican Leader JOE MARTIN and was sponsored by well-liked JACK NICHOLS, of Oklahoma.

For the Speaker there was confirmation of his judgment that he could count on his beloved House of Representatives when the chips were down on an issue involving conduct of the war or basic legislative mechanics.

SAM RAYBURN could now look past the late snows of March and the rains of April and take comfort in contemplating the flowers of May.

THEY GET TIME TO "BLOW OFF STEAM"

A few weeks ago a group of worried Democrats called on RAYBURN in his office at the Capitol. The party had suffered a series of floor defeats and the lickings were being administered almost as much by recalcitrant Democrats as they were by Republicans.

The group wanted RAYBURN to call a party meeting, lay out the law to the mavericks, cure those indifferent southern Democrats of absenteeism at roll-call time. RAYBURN said "No."

"There won't be any serious trouble," he said in effect, "if we just give these fellows time enough to let off steam."

Members of the House, he reasoned, had just come off the hustings and through the fire of another congressional election, and they were full of ideas. All that was needed was time and patience—plus a little quiet persuasion—and the Democratic majority, with only 13 more votes than Republicans, would be working in harmony at least as far as war issues are concerned.

THERE'S ALWAYS DIVISION ON DOMESTIC ISSUES

"The Democrats in this House are closer together than they ever were," said RAYBURN last week. "There will be division on domestic issues, of course. There always is division on domestic issues.

"One thing our fellows have got to do is to unlearn some of the habits they acquired in the days when we had big majorities. It didn't make much difference then whether a man stayed in his office and answered his mail or picked up his hat and walked over to the floor. It makes a lot of difference now."

Last March 4, SAM RAYBURN rounded out 30 years of unbroken House membership—30 years in which he had climbed with characteristic caution and sure-footedness to the pinnacle of his career; and yet, behind the easy confidence born of those years of experience, it was possible to see that the Speaker was fully aware that after the freshness of spring comes the terrible wilting heat of summer.

To a less experienced observer it seems that more time is needed to tell whether that noise in the House in the first 2 months of the new Congress was merely the sound of escaping steam.

The belief is current at the Capitol that on many issues RAYBURN'S sympathy has been more with the anti-new dealers than it has been with the New Dealers. Certainly he stands far from the left, but neither can he abide politically those who would roll this country back to the days of Calvin Coolidge.

RAYBURN, a moderate man, seeks instinctively the middle of the road, and now to the normal difficulties of this practice must be added turmoils of a man as unswervingly loyal as he is to President Roosevelt and his beloved House.

It was to lighten this burden, and, of course, to promote good will for the benefit of Mr. Roosevelt and Senate leaders as well, that freshmen Members of Congress went to a party at the White House last week. RAYBURN carefully shepherded his yearling flock, saw that each had his chance to meet and talk with the President, and took care that the party should break up while everyone was happy and before the President grew tired. For his ministrations, Mr. Roosevelt gave him a new name, "Father Sam."

"Father Sam," said the President when the Speaker sounded the go-home signal, "you want to send the boys to bed too early."

IT'S A "FUR PIECE" FROM FLAG SPRINGS

During his climb to a position of power and official standing outranked only by the President and the Chief Justice of the United States—and, more importantly, during the trying successes of his speakership—RAYBURN has never taken his eyes from his main guideposts to living.

He has never forgotten, for example, the tiny house on 40 acres of black north Texas land at a place known as Flag Springs where his father eked out a bare living for a family of 14, including an uncle. So conscious is he of his lowly beginnings, of the chunky boy who labored from dawn to dusk in the cotton, that there are times of reminiscence when he can no longer resist a gaze of wonderment upon the Capitol and this remark to a close friend:

"This sure is a 'fur piece' from Flag Springs."

RAYBURN was 12 when he decided he was going to be a Congressman. The decision was made in the rain. It was raining when he climbed upon the broad bareback of a farm horse and rode off to Bonham, Tex., 12 miles away. It was raining when he reached the tabernacle where late Representative Joe Bailey was orating. In the rain the boy stood, too shy to come into the shelter, drinking up every word of one of the better southern-style orators of his day.

"I am going to take that man's place in Congress," he thought.

A few years later Sam and his father were working side by side in the cotton. Sam spoke to his father about going to college. His father remarked upon the difficulties of sending a boy to school without money.

"I didn't ask you to send me, paw," said the boy. "I asked for you to let me go."

The following fall Sam left home with the family treasury of $25 in his pocket and entered the East Texas Normal College at Commerce. By sweeping out the schoolhouse and attending to the ringing of the college bell he earned a cash income of $8 a month. He later taught school to repay the balance of his tuition money.

At the age of 24, RAYBURN ran for the State legislature and was elected largely by dint of his willingness to canvass most of the voters in his district. He spent his legislative fee of $5 a day to attend law school between sessions. He was reelected to the legislature, and 4 days after his twenty-ninth birthday he became its speaker.

A short time later he was elected to Congress and when he left for Washington it was with full confidence, compounded only by the most fierce of determinations, that one day he would be Speaker of the House.

NINE WORDS OF THE BEST ADVICE

A few days ago, some of RAYBURN'S friends gave him a surprise dinner, a testimonial to his 30 years in Congress. It was a small, intimate gathering and there were informal speeches. One of his friends recalled how his father walked with him to the railroad station the day Sam first went to the State capital and gave him nine words of advice:

"Son, don't do anything you'll ever be ashamed of."

"That's the best advice I could have received," RAYBURN commented.

"If I never get anything more in this world I've got more than I deserve anyway," he said.

SAM RAYBURN, 61 and unmarried, is a simple man, devoid of pretension. His remarks on this evening were typical of the simple, straight, short-sentence style of a man who still keeps his eye on the weather-beaten guideposts of his youth. He speaks in his office as he does in the House, appealing to reason and decency. Again and again he has said, and he repeated it last week:

"Strive to be fair. Legislation, like people, should be fair. It has always been my conviction that legislation should not be passed to punish anybody, only to bring justice. * * *

"You think you hate a man only because you don't know him. * * *

"If you can't lead by persuasion, you can't lead at all."

Let's Win the War First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Beacon Journal of March 12, 1943:

LET'S WIN THE WAR FIRST!

Memo to the White House:

Mr. President, this Nation is fighting a war!

No one should be more cognizant of that fact than you, the Executive head of our Government, the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. You should know, better than anyone else, the gigantic tasks confronting us, both at home and abroad, if we are to win this global war.

Why, then, do you add to the confusion and the burden by introducing a program for post-war social revolution?

Is it to divert congressional attention from immediate and more pressing legislation? Is it a smoke screen to becloud vital issues and hide mistakes made in Washington? Or is it a beautiful pipe dream of an everlasting Christmas to dangle before the voters to keep the New Deal in power, and perhaps assure your fourth term?

We can lose this war.

Our victories have been insignificant compared to those of our enemies. Our production is under way, but far below capacity. There is still a vast amount of work to be done, decisions to be made, difficulties to be solved, before we can have any assurance of ultimate victory.

Let's get those settled first. Let's be sure we can't lose the war. Then we will have time and opportunity to discuss fully and with calm deliberation the reforms your planning board recommends.

If we lose the war, Germany and Japan will decide our future social program.

This is no time, Mr. President, to add to the work of an already overburdened Congress the consideration and debate of idealistic schemes, many of which, at first glance, seem contrary to the American way of life. We do not condemn your program. We haven't time.

If such reforms are necessary to the future welfare of the Nation, the people and Congress can consider them later, when the war pressure is off. But right now, the people are too much concerned with the production of guns and planes, tanks and ships, with the training of men and the conservation of materials, to call time out to listen to utopian schemes.

Congress has its hands full. And it is your obligation to aid, not hinder, speedy decisions on legislation of paramount importance to every American.

The full strength of American manpower is not yet mobilized. Factories and farms vie with the armed services in the demand for more and more men. Is industry utilizing to fullest extent the manpower now available?

Agriculture faces a desperate future. Unless action is taken soon, as concerns labor and machinery, the Nation will see a drastically reduced harvest. Some of last year's crops, ripened and rotted, are still in the fields today—food that might have been en route to our boys, our allies, or our own tables if there had been men to gather it. Will farmers plant more than they can hope to harvest this year?

For months now, Congress has labored over an income tax bill and not even the birth cries of a mouse are audible. The people are willing to pay and pay and pay still more—all it costs to win the final battle. But the people must have some hope of ultimate relief from taxation, not increased tax loads.

The picture you paint of tomorrow is rosy and beautiful, Mr. President, but the fact remains that the present is pretty dark. Before we start on castles in the air, let's clean up the mess we are in, both at home and abroad.

Settle the quarrels in your own official household; calm the bickerings of administrators; keep labor and capital working together in harmony; clear out the deadwood and trash of bureaucracy; create new efficiency and action. Turn off the loudspeakers who only add to the din.

Work with the Congress, not against it. This is your war, too, Mr. President.

We are all in this to win, and we are going to win. After we are sure that Hitler and all he represents will be driven from power in Germany, after we are certain that Japanese war lords will never again disturb the peace of the Pacific—then, and not until then, we'll be glad to listen to your ideas on post-war social reforms.

THE BEACON JOURNAL.

Absenteeism and Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communications received by me with reference to H. R. 2082:

FRIENDSVILLE, TENN., *March 8, 1943.*

The Honorable Mr. BRYSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We wish to commend and thank you for the move you have launched regarding imposing national prohibition for the duration of the war, an act of Congress.

Such a step is imperative, and will be welcomed by many of the Nation's best citizens. Our public morals committee is sponsoring a publicity campaign to create intelligent public sentiment along this line in our community, and are urging our Congressmen from Tennessee to use their influence along with the rest of you who are going ahead with the campaign.

May you be given wisdom and inner courage as you carry on this fight against the distressing waste which is so obnoxious to thinking people.

In and on behalf of the public morals committee of the Society of Friends, Friendsville, Tenn.

RUTH M. BORING,
Chairman.
B. E. DRAKE,
ERNA NIXON.
D. H. BORING.

HYDE PARK, CINCINNATI, OHIO,
March 8, 1943.

Hon. Representative BRYSON.

DEAR SIR: We are in hearty support of the prohibition bill which you recently introduced. The people of Cincinnati are very much aroused over conditions as they exist today. Not only are we losing manpower in our defense plants but no nation can win a war half sober and half drunk. May God give you support in this undertaking is our prayer.

Sincerely,

MRS. ANGIE COOPER BOWERS,
(or) Mrs. W. C. Bowers,
Hyde Park Corresponding Secretary, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Cincinnati, Ohio.

HEATON, N. C., *March 8, 1943.*

Hon. J. R. BRYSON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We see in the papers and hear over the radio that you are advocating national prohibition, and really it seems to be the consensus of a great majority that such a measure should be introduced in our Congress and a unanimous vote taken by its Members. Though I have been absent from the Palmetto State for a very few years, my interest still stands out innermost for our people and State. You know as well as do I that the liquor traffic in our fair land, and especially at a time like the present, is a weapon in the enemy's hand. It is the prayer of the parents in these parts that your bill will go over with flying colors. You and I, having participated in World War No. 1, know beyond a shadow of doubt what the alcohol curse is and what it does to our young men in the service of our country. We need many more fine gentlemen of your caliber in our Congress to help put measures over which are worth while to the welfare of our America and its great people. If your bill is brought to a vote, you may rest assured that I will lend you every physical effort I have.

Hoping that you and yours are enjoying the best of health and that the present session of Congress will prove most successful to you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. WHALEY.

MARCH 9, 1943.

Congressman BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: I do want to thank you for the step you took against the liquor, and I hope and trust that some day soon it will all be put out of our country for good. And I just want you to know you have a lot of folks behind you and will help in every way we can.

Yours respectfully,

MRS. O. E. BELLER,
Huntington, W. Va.

BAKER, OREG., *March 7, 1943.*

Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Please accept my congratulations on your sane, timely, and American stand in regard to prohibition for the duration. In my humble estimation, you have voiced the most helpful and beneficial solution to our great problem—winning the war. Your plan will and can cure the great and evil liquor problem at its source. We owe this liquor freeze to our fighting men. So please continue this wonderful program you have had the courage and conviction to launch.

You have voiced the greatest and most needed message of 1943.

Hoping these lines meet with your approval, I remain,

Yours truly,

GERTRUDE LEVY,
(An Oregon Pioneer.)

GOODMAN, MISS., *March 10, 1943.*

Hon. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Am glad to note from recent press reports that you are sponsoring a measure to restore national prohibition. The

measure should have the hearty cooperation and support of all thoughtful Representatives. The liquor traffic and its allied evils is doing more than anything else to retard the war effort, and is also a serious barrier to the moral, spiritual, and economic welfare of the Nation. Drinking among the officers of our Army camps is a disgrace. Hope you will keep up the fight till victory comes.

Am sending under separate cover copy of my magazine; read the editorials.

Best wishes,

G. T. SLEDGE.

TIONESTA, PA., *March 10, 1943.*

Representative BRYSON:

Please accept my thanks for your effort to establish national prohibition for the duration. I feel this is a much-needed legislation. I hope this bill may not be killed in committee as has so many of our temperance bills. Believe me the people are wanting something done in this matter and are wishing you success.

Respectfully yours,

MRS. H. B. DOTTERRER.

MARCH 11, 1943.

Representative BRYSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I recently read in the local paper that you have had the foresight and courage to urge national prohibition for the duration of the war as the surest remedy for absenteeism.

You have put your finger on the pulse of this whole matter and I wish you success.

If I can help in any way I would like to do so.

Sincerely yours,

ALLAN C. EMERY,
EMERY & CONANT CO., INC.,
BOSTON, MASS.

OIL CITY, PA., *March 12, 1943.*

Representative BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you on your move to impose national prohibition for the duration. I certainly hope you will be successful in bringing it about, and I pray that God will bless you in your efforts, for we know He is on your side in that work.

I have two boys overseas now and a third about to enter the service. When the two left, neither of them had ever tasted liquor nor smoked a cigarette and I am praying that they will come back as clean and good as they left. I feel that those who favor this liquor traffic will have a great deal to answer for. Because they are putting a stumbling block in another's way.

So when I find one who takes a stand against it I cannot help but admire and praise him so again I say, "God bless you."

Sincerely,

Mrs. J. C. BROOKS.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA., *March 10, 1943.*

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH R. BRYSON: Just a few lines to say "Thank you" for introducing a national wartime prohibition bill in the House.

You can be sure that you will have the support of most all mothers—in fact, all sane thinking American people.

More luck to you.

Yours sincerely,

MRS. ARLIE W. GREER.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *March 11, 1943.*

Representative BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I read the enclosed article in the Globe-Democrat and wish to express my sincere appreciation to you for introducing such a measure. It would seem that such action should have been taken before this, but I am so glad that you have introduced this bill. With everything rationed, it would seem that liquor which is not needed at any time, should be rationed or done away with altogether.

Trusting that this bill goes through in a big way and wishing you success in all your undertakings, I am,

Sincerely yours,

AMY ROLL.

MOSCOW, IDAHO, *March 11, 1943.*

Representative BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: We believe the bill you introduced to prohibit the manufacture or sale of liquor for the duration is one of the most promising things we have read from Washington.

Please know you have a large following, who are wishing you success in this undertaking.

Respectfully,

MR. AND MRS. ED HAGEDORN.

Status Quo Ante—Ante Status Quo Ante

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorial:

STATUS QUO ANTE—ANTE STATUS QUO ANTE

BACK TO 1939 OR 1914?

For the purposes of this editorial, the first Latin phrase used above—status quo ante—means the state of the map of Europe on September 1, 1939, when World War No. 2 began; and the second phrase—ante status quo ante—means the state of the map of Europe on July 28, 1914, when World War No. 1 began.

As World War No. 2 draws toward an Allied victory, which now seems a certainty, though it may be some time coming, debate increases as to what the map of Europe is to look like after the war.

Do we go back to the status quo ante of 1939, when Russia was quarantined off from western Europe and the outer Baltic by Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and a Rumania swollen by the addition of Russia's former territory of Bessarabia?

Or do we go back to the 1914 status quo ante, when most of Poland and all of Finland belonged to Russia, Germany stretched all the way to Memel on the Baltic, there was a big Austria-Hungary in central Europe, and the little Baltic buffer states did not exist?

There are several complications, contradictions, and nationalist ambitions which go to make this debate interesting, to say the least.

RESURRECTING SMALL NATIONS

Naturally, the small nations artificially created by the series of treaties begun at Versailles want to be recreated after Hitler has been put down. At least, their political leaders want them recreated.

They can be recreated only in part if a world state is set up after this war. To that world state, some of these nations' sovereignty will have to be surrendered. So will some of the larger nations' sovereignty, for that matter, including some of our own.

In addition to this knotty question, there is the attitude of Russia to be considered, where Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Finland, and Rumania are concerned.

Russia's current attitude is that this is not only a horizontal war across land but also a vertical war of economic classes, with Russia championing the poor peasants and workers. These people in the former Baltic states, Poland and Finland, according to the Communists, would be happier under the Red government at Moscow than under their old landlords and industrialists.

This is the present Russian alibi for saying ever more loudly that it intends to get back after this war all the territories which Czarist Russia had before the previous war, except for a sliver of Poland. A small Polish state after this war appears to be agreeable to Stalin, for reasons best known to himself; and he is now telling the Poles that they can be compensated for their sacrifices of territory in the east by being given East Prussia and additional parts of Germany.

If that would not sow the seeds of another war, we don't know what would.

Russia, too, along with its mouthpieces in the Communist Party organizations in other countries, is still trying to pump life and permanence into the legend that it was gigantic, aggressive, and cruel Finland which attacked poor little peaceful Russia in December 1939.

This is an evident attempt to lay a foundation for reabsorption of all Finland into Soviet Russia after this war, and too bad about the Atlantic Charter's insistence on self-determination for small nations and the world-known fact that Finland does not want to return to Russia.

There is one factor in the situation which many of the debaters overlook.

IF STALIN IS VICTOR

It may be right, desirable, just, ethical, and all that, to go back after this war to the status quo ante of 1939, or to the ante status quo ante of 1914; or it may be right, etc., to go to some world state governed by a parliament of man and passing out a quart of milk a day to every man, woman, and child on the planet.

But in one now eminently possible event the question will not be what is right or what is wrong, what just or unjust.

That eminently possible event is the defeat of Germany on land chiefly by the efforts, sacrifices, and military skill of Russia.

At this writing Russia is the only one of the Allied Nations that is actively and officially fighting Germany in Europe. And Russia was the first nation to stop the Hitler march of triumph. It is quite conceivable that Russia will be far and away the biggest single factor in the final defeat of Germany.

In such case Russia will draw the boundaries where it wants in eastern Europe.

The Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following list of additional names of farmers of the Ninth District of Indiana who have written

personal letters asking that the A. A. A. be continued as it is at present:

Orville Ault, Columbus, Ind.; John A. Back, Brookville, Ind.; Henry Rauch, Brookville, Ind.; George Braunagel, Sunman, Ind.; Harvey Dieckmann, Batesville, Ind.; Wm. Enneking, Batesville, Ind.; Mary J. Todd, Aurora, Ind.; John Franzman, Brookville, Ind.; Virgil Hannebaum, Metamora, Ind.; Henry Werner, Metamora, Ind.; Frank Flaspohler, Batesville, Ind.; Henry Flaspohler, Batesville, Ind.; Mathias A. Werner, Metamora, Ind.; Clarence Rumsey, Aurora, Ind.; Gus Heppner, Batesville, Ind.; Joseph Enneking, Batesville, Ind.; Richard Rahe, Batesville, Ind.; Harry A. Niese, Batesville, Ind.; Frank Meer, Batesville, Ind.; Albert H. Bornemeier, Batesville, Ind.; Willard S. Mull, Salem, Ind.; Earney Stegemiller, Rising Sun, Ind.; Louis Rahe, Aurora, Ind.; Mrs. Harry Fletcher, Milan, Ind.; D. B. Adamson, Bedford, Ind.; D. Freudenberg, Milan, Ind.; Ray A. Daugherty, Orleans, Ind.; Charles Noah, Laurel, Ind.; Wallace Noah, Laurel, Ind.; Alver Critchfield, West Baden Springs, Ind; Clifford Jones, Laurel, Ind.; Charles P. Clements, Orleans, Ind.; Henry A. Colegate, Harrison, Ohio; E. H. Vehslage, Seymour, Ind.; Mrs. May Crowell, College Corner, Ohio; Peter A. Renyer, College Corner, Ohio; Le Roy Barber, Laurel, Ind.; Joseph Fledderman, Brookville, Ind.; Leona Kennedy, Laurel, Ind.; Albert Neukam, Brookville, Ind.; Ben Schwegonan, Batesville, Ind.; Chris Schrank, Franklin County, Ind.; John J. Moormann; John H. Sanders, Orleans, Ind.; William H. Wilcox, Bedford, Ind.

Let Us Consider Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorial:

LET US CONSIDER FOOD

The National Resources Board announces worthy objectives for post-war America, in a program through which Government benefits sound like a refrain, and any purpose that private enterprise shall be permitted unharassed, to do—the work of the country and provide jobs and wages for its people—is all but inaudible. It is only human that the Board should seek to divert public attention from the spectacle, presented here and now by the results of New Deal planning, and turn attention to a future not blue-penciled by realities.

Let us consider food alone, in which these facts are within the memory and observation of all readers: The Government conducted a campaign to destroy millions of pigs and needs their progeny now. It paid farmers heavy subsidies for not raising crops and penalized those who produced more than the quota which it fixed. Only a year ago, it actively discouraged home gardens on the ground that the gardeners probably didn't know how and might waste seed by sowing it on barren soil; now it gives every home gardener the green light. It drafted farm lads into the Army and now talks of releasing soldiers for farm help. It has permitted food prices to rise twice as fast and as far here as in Britain, which imports most of what it eats. As a crowning touch of fantasy, it forbade grocers to sell sliced bread and then rescinded the edict.

For climax comes the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture that "we are approaching a level of nutrition such as they have in Great Britain." If this be true—we doubt it—of the greatest food-producing country in the world, it is such a confession of incompetency as no government has ever made before. Accepting for war reasons, as it should, the vagaries of a quasi-totalitarian regime, the country will not forget the object lesson provided when peace comes. Nor is it likely to ask the present batch of planners to keep at it.

Post-War Plan 1001

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD P. GALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. L. J. Feser:

Genghis Khan, Napoleon Bonaparte, and Adolph Hitler were at one time or another little pink babies, subject to tender mother love and dreams. Their mothers could not dream of the rivers of human blood or the starving minds and bodies of countless millions of other babies that they would be held responsible for. What tiny baby in mother's arms today may be the killer and ogre of tomorrow? Is there anything that man can do with the equipment and knowledge at his disposal to prevent forever the curse of war?

What are the causes of war? Who has the formula for peace? Is it enough to place the blame for war without taking measures to prevent its cause? Will apprehension and punishment of war mongers prevent another Napoleon from going forth to seek virtue and find power? These questions are honestly and fearfully asked by many of us, and the answers are sincerely and fearlessly attempted by a few. The answers are meant to be specific and effective, but when they are compared, we find them confusing. We read and study them, but we are unable to correlate their applications. The many of us are confused.

We are the laymen. We work on farms, in factories, in offices. We fight in tanks, in planes, in ships. We read current literature and listen to radio round-table discussions. We believe in law and order. Some of us have been educated in the academic and technical colleges, but most of us have received our education in the very real college of hard knocks. We respect authority, but we reserve the right to question authority. In our confusion we struggle to get a handhold on the complex problems involved in the causes of war, and when we do get that hold the handle comes away with but a tiny fraction of the knowledge sought. We find that the 1,000 plans offered or ideas presented to prevent war are but 1,000 individual opinions, each colored by the individual training, experience, and interests of their respective authors.

We read the answers given by the military man. He believes in cleaning up the present mess with force, and preserving the peace that is to follow with a continuation of force. We respect this opinion, and agree that the criminal fears the strong arm of the law-enforcing agencies. Then we listen to our minister or priest expound the Christian "Peace on Earth" version. We are men of faith, so we believe in the Ten Commandments and the Beatitudes. The Golden Rule is embedded in our characters, but we do feel more at ease when we know that the corner policeman is on the job.

Can the economist clarify the issues for us? He tells us quite simply that trade and distribution of wealth are large factors in the determination of peace and war. We have often wondered why some people have so much more than we have, and we never were able to understand why we had so much poverty in the midst of plenty a few short years ago. Just why the current war cleaned up an unemployment problem that had us down in the formerly so-called have countries is still confusing in the light of the "wealth is production" theory. Our economist explains fully, using such terms as resources, investments, raw materials, supply and demand, transportation, imports, exports, debts, gold standards, securities, balance of trade and other terms that he fully understands. We nod in overwhelming agreement and look forward to tomorrow when we can watch the soil slip away from the moldboard of our plow, for that we can understand.

The scientist can help us. He who taught us how to take nitrogen from the air to fertilize the soil, he who designed a machine that will transport us and our goods in hours rather in days, he who heals our wounds with marvelous drugs that prevent infection and allay pain, surely he can design a cable that will pull us out of the war mire and onto the highland of peace. But so far in modern history science has little to show for the effort. The nitrogen is used for explosives, the machines transport guns and bombs and the drugs are used to get men back into fighting condition. Science alone cannot answer our questions.

Men and women in political life have been promising in their various answers. The reflection of their prepolitical training throws strong individual light on their answers. Democracy is essential to any post-war peace, even though democracy in many parts of the world has had to yield to unpleasant isms. Of course, democracy is what we are fighting for again, and we will win again. Democracy, however, must live in the same world as communism. We are thankful that communism is not the bad old wolf that it was 2 short years ago. Then, too, the age of kings and queens is by no means a mere memory. These political angles are quite beyond our comprehension. Still, we are average intelligent citizens of a great democracy, and we ought to be able to grasp the importance of political considerations of a world peace.

Answers to our questions. A few of the 1,000. The militarist, the economist, the clergyman, the scientist, the politician, the thinking individual. The individual whose very strength lies in the specific narrowness of his specialized training and work. The individual who couldn't hold our plow in the furrow or drill our steel or enter the figures in our books. The individual who would faint in the heat of a fighting tank, become senseless in the rare atmosphere encountered by the bomber, or become seasick in a storm at sea. The individual who at birth had an equal chance of becoming a Pasteur or a Himmler. The individual who is essential to any and all progress, but the individual with but one brain which is too small to contain all the answers.

When we are able to concentrate the thinking power of many specialized minds on the peace problem, a formula for peace will be in the making. We have many patterns to follow in setting up the machinery to enable our thinkers to function as a unit, but the pattern used by American industry in the development of research and new ideas has been successful in practice, and could be applied to our greater problem. The idea of an engineering department in modern industry is inductive of far greater results than the

efforts of many individual inventors working independently of each other. The world needs an engineering department. An engineering department composed of men and women chosen from the specialists of all countries.

The specialists in the exact sciences, the engineers, mathematicians, and others who are familiar with precise and accurate thinking. The specialists in the inexact sciences, the doctors, authors, educators, and artists. The spiritual men, the specialists in religion and matters of faith. These specialists in the proposed world engineering department would make the blueprints. The rest of us would carry out the plans. We would cooperate with our engineering department as we were called upon to do so. People of all countries would cooperate with the department, because they would be represented in that department.

The big job of the department would be the formation and maintenance of the design for peace and prosperity. It would act in investigational, educational, advisory, and arbitrational capacities. The department should not act in the capacity of policeman or guard, but could recommend the employment of policemen and guards if necessary. The department should not be an international parliament, but could bring about the establishment of such parliament if such action becomes possible and desirable. While acting in an arbitrational capacity the department could bring about the establishment of permanent world courts if such establishment would promise better results than could otherwise be obtained.

Periodic reports issued by the department would be available to all people in all languages. Where complete agreement could not be established in the reports minority opinions could accompany the reports. Insofar as the department did not rely on the strength of any national government for its continuance, the opinions rendered in reports would not be subject to open or secret international diplomacy. The peoples of the world would be refreshed by authoritative, honest policy, unmarred by political considerations. The individual findings of the specialists would not be tossed at us to add to our confusion, but would be presented as conclusions of an international congress composed of men and women of high ideals and practical experience. Such conclusions would serve as a basic guide for all national legislative and administrative action.

The founding of such world engineering department need not be contingent on the ending of the present war. Our Congress could appropriate a fractional part of the war outlay to provide the work fund for the formation of such body immediately. A committee of representatives chosen by American scientific and religious societies could form the nucleus of the organization, and issue invitations to all nations to send like representation. An early date could be set for the first meeting of such body, at which time all arrangements for the permanent organization could be completed. It may not be too much to hope that such organization could draw up a plan which would be used by the peacemakers who attempt to settle the issues of this war, and that the babies of today will not be killing each other 20 years hence.

Is it reasonable to assume that the dark opinions of a Hitler could stand for a moment in the light of a report from the proposed department? Is it reasonable to believe that under the guidance of able minds working in cooperation, some permanent type of international law and order is impossible? Is it reasonable to doubt that the proposed international congress would soon bring forth some practical method of dealing with nations or men who undertook military, religious, or commercial conquest? Is it reasonable to take immediate action to save our babies from a future of starvation, blood, and horror? If these questions of the laymen go unanswered, may God have mercy on the mankind He blessed with individual power of reason, for their failure to use that power collectively.

Structural Defects in the Construction of Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, there has naturally been a great deal of public interest in the newspaper report as to the sinking on the west coast of the *Schenectady*. This matter, as well as other instances of defects, will be investigated by a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Soon after the accident occurred, I wrote a letter to the president of the American Bureau of Shipping, and I submit below a copy of my letter to Mr. Luckenbach and his reply:

FEBRUARY 1, 1943.

Mr. J. LEWIS LUCKENBACH,
President, American Bureau of Shipping, New York City.

DEAR MR. LUCKENBACH: I have noticed in the New York Journal of Commerce that you have advanced the theory that the break-up of the tanker *Schenectady* is inherent in welded ships, and that this theory was given credence by Rear Admiral Vickery, who said cracks had appeared in numerous welded hulls that would not have occurred in riveted ships.

I shall be glad to have all the information I can get on this subject.

Yours very sincerely,

SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND,
Chairman.

AMERICAN BUREAU OF SHIPPING,
New York, N. Y., February 15, 1943.

Hon. S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE BLAND: Beg to reply to your letter of February 1, which was acknowledged by my secretary during my absence on the Pacific coast, relative to the failure of the steamship *Schenectady*.

A very thorough and exhaustive examination has been made; the testing of the steel itself and the testing of integral parts of the structure adjacent to the fracture have been made by a special committee of experts comprised of men from the industry best fitted for such an investigation. Professor Graf, of Oregon State College, is making some special tests and, while a final report may not be forthcoming for a few weeks, a meeting of the committee will be held on Wednesday to establish such facts as can be brought out at this time.

I think we all feel that the prime difficulties have been discovered and already eliminated, not only in this yard but in other yards of the country, as the matter has been followed up throughout in order that all yards might enjoy the benefits of better practices where not already in use.

The urge for shipbuilding and the rapidity of construction has caused neglect of certain best practices which while seemingly minor in themselves when pyramided are collectively sufficient to bring about a happening such as occurred. The rapidity of ship construction, which is so important to the winning of the war, can only be accomplished by the extensive use of welding and speed sometimes brings in neglect of fundamentals. However, I do feel that a procedure is at hand which must be adhered to and difficulties such as this will be decreased and eliminated.

This very happening, owing to its magnitude, presents a full-scale-model test which permits a very thorough study which heretofore has not been permissible and the special committee of this bureau on welding, together with the committees of the American Welding Society, shall put even further effort into this exhaustive study in order that reoccurrences will not be forthcoming.

The report of the committee should be at hand shortly, and I will see that a copy is sent to you as soon as it is available.

Very truly yours,

J. LEWIS LUCKENBACH,
President.

Mr. Speaker, a special subcommittee, of which Representative HENRY JACKSON, of Washington, is chairman, will investigate fully the matter of the *Schenectady* and similar matters.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from an article by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Evening Star on March 11, 1943, and which stresses the popularity of the Ruml plan.

The Republicans in the House of Representatives answered their critics rather emphatically by the almost solid vote given in support of an extension of the Lend-Lease Act and thus removed any doubt that the big minority strength would be in any way used to impair the war effort.

On the same day the Republican minority in the Ways and Means Committee of the House showed their independence of the "rubber stamp" tactics which has bowed down the Democratic majority so much in the last 10 years on domestic issues. The Republicans served notice that they would carry to the floor of the House the fight to get approval of the pay-as-you-go Ruml plan on income taxes.

In this move the Republicans are really outmaneuvering their Democratic brethren, for the latter are impressed by the allegations that the Treasury would be deprived of a year's taxes—which need not be so if the proper amendments are adopted.

The pay-as-you-go Ruml plan is popular with the country, and if put to a vote doubtless would pass by an overwhelming majority in both Houses.

An astonishingly large number of the millions of residents of New York State whom I have the honor to serve as one of their Representatives at Large have addressed to me letters in support of the Ruml plan. The first of these letters,

signed by 19 employees of the Buffalo, N. Y., branch of the Travelers Insurance Co., was received on December 9, 1942, and stated:

We speak for many when we urge you to pass legislation harmonious with the Ruml tax plan.

Since that date many letters and telegrams have been received. Today, on March 15, they are still arriving. In going through the voluminous file on this subject I have been impressed by the spirit of patriotism expressed in so many of the letters, and the clear realization of the direct connection between this problem of taxation and the accomplishment of that objective which is first in the heart of every American, the winning of the war.

For example, Mr. J. D. Black, of Rome, N. Y., writes:

I am an ordinary citizen with an ordinary citizen's responsibilities, a mortgage on my home and obligations to meet in the way of family expenses. I am also patriotic and will go to any necessary extreme to help my country in its present emergency. I do not see, however, how the canceling of 1942 taxes, provided the new tax bill is such as to raise the maximum amount that the country can pay, will affect the Treasury income adversely. It seems to me that the use of the word "forgiving" in connection with the 1942 tax payment is an unfortunate expression.

The same spirit is expressed in the following statements:

I feel very strongly that the Nation will be better off in the long run if the Ruml plan is adopted, and I hope that after study you will come to the same conviction. (Alex Osborn Barton—Barton, Durstine & Osborn, Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.)

May I take the liberty of urging upon you favorable consideration of the Ruml plan or its equivalent? It would be heartening to us ordinary citizens who are being called upon for heavy contributions to the prosecution of the war if we could feel that income taxes, however heavy, will be equitably adjusted to rise and fall of income. (Preston S. Millar, New York, N. Y.)

The burden of taxation now put upon the public is the heaviest and severest it has ever been. I believe every citizen in these times is willing to go to the utmost extent of his ability to furnish funds for the successful prosecution of the war, but he certainly should have the opportunity to express the hope that his Senators and Representatives in Congress will see to it that the payment of whatever tax may be imposed may be made in a way by which he can the more surely and easily pay it and without being in the position of having hanging over him from year to year an unpaid tax bill of an amount which, in most instances, by reason of changes in tax legislation, he may not himself be able easily to estimate beforehand.

The very simplicity of the Ruml plan would seem to commend itself to all, and I sincerely trust that you can see your way clear to have that original Ruml plan enacted into law. (Robert L. Greene, Bronxville, N. Y.)

To my thinking, the Ruml plan is not only fair and just, but it is anti-inflationary, and because it will make it possible to collect the taxes needed for the prosecution of the war, it is in the national interest. (Leonard J. Lewinson, New York, N. Y.)

On behalf of myself and other members of my family I am writing to solicit your active support of the Ruml plan. It is difficult indeed for the mass of citizenry to understand why such a simple solution of the pay-as-you-go tax problem is not used. Further, the suggestion of additional sums to be paid in any tax year or even the distribution of all or any part of any tax claim over a period of years adds an insuperable burden to all Americans who are willing and eager to do everything they can to support this Government in war or peace. (Ralph Dawson, Kew Gardens, N. Y.)

Please give every consideration to the Ruml plan. It seems vital to put the country on a pay-as-you-go basis and to pay 1942 and 1943 taxes in the same year would cause many of us to cut out all benefactions and contributions, and would greatly reduce purchases of War bonds. (Mabel S. Oppenheim, Buffalo, N. Y.)

I have been following with interest the progress of the Ruml plan and when I noted that the first item of the eight ways to speed victory as suggested by Eric C. Johnston in the February issue of the Nation's Business was the prompt adoption of this plan, I considered it my duty to urge your favorable consideration and support. (Eugene E. Johnston, Lockport, N. Y.)

I am amazed at the objections raised by the Treasury Department in regard to the Ruml plan and feel that if some restraint is not placed on Treasury officials they will put through a plan which will create great hardships on the people of the United States by compelling them to pay 2 years' taxes in 1 year. Furthermore, if we are to continue buying War bonds I am wondering where the money is to come from to purchase these bonds if the Treasury plan goes through. I also believe a large number of the bonds already sold will be cashed since people will have no other way of paying 2 years' taxes in 1 year. (Glen C. Parsons, Kenmore, N. Y.)

Don't force us to sell our War bonds in order to pay 2 years' taxes in one. Adopt the Ruml plan. (E. F. Entwisle, Wanakah, N. Y.)

Besides the note of patriotism expressed in letters supporting the Ruml plan, there is also a strong indication of growing impatience with the delay in adopting a pay-as-you-go tax plan. L. G. Finlay, of Bronxville, N. Y., writes:

It is not as if the Treasury Department is a creditor and the taxpayer is the debtor. The situation is that we are all in the same boat and it is the country as a whole that has to pay itself for all expenses.

Kenneth C. Bell, of Scarsdale, N. Y., has this to say:

The Ruml plan, being simple, direct, and up-to-date, appeals to the entire American people—save possibly some officials of the Treasury Department who either misunderstand or oppose it for some other invalid reason—and is the one and only relief from a constant year-to-year unpaid tax liability hanging over their heads. It should be adopted promptly, and I believe even the Treasury Department officials will reluctantly be convinced of the wisdom of the plan after it has actually been put into operation.

One of the best statements as to the advantages of adopting the principle of the Ruml plan is expressed in a letter from the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce which was inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A625. Mr. Karr Parker, president of the chamber of commerce, has sent the following telegram to the House Ways and Means Committee:

The failure of the Ways and Means Subcommittee to face the issue of a pay-as-you-go tax plan is discouraging and disappointing. The Buffalo Chamber of Commerce hopes there will be courageous rejection of the specious arguments of the Treasury's experts, and a prompt reversal of the action of the subcommittee. There should be no retreat from the goal of a pay-as-you-go tax plan, equitably applied to all individual taxpayers, involving no doubling up of taxes. Prompt repudiation of the action of the subcommittee will go far toward a restoration of the public's confidence in the Nation's tax and fiscal policies.

Editorial writers in the New York Times—January 11, 1943, and February 4, 1943—have summed up the situation as follows:

The sole question now seriously at issue is how to get on a pay-as-you-go basis. And by far the simplest, fairest, quickest, and most effective method is that suggested by Beardsley Ruml—to solve the problem as we solve the daylight-saving problem—to turn the tax clock ahead 1 year and to begin paying now, immediately, on 1943 income.

This does not mean skipping a year's taxes. It merely means changing the basis of assessment for the taxes of this and subsequent years compared with what that basis would otherwise have been.

To say that generally public opinion is inclined to be right, is trite but true. Public opinion today, March 15, 1943, is in favor of the Ruml plan.

Salaries of Fourth-Class Postmasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of passage of the pending bill, H. R. 324, placing all postmasters at fourth-class offices on an annual salary basis with semimonthly payments. Under the provisions of the bill their salaries for each year will be based on the gross postal receipts of the preceding calendar year. At the present time fourth-class postmasters are paid upon a cancellation basis, in other words, they compute the total value of all postage cancelations at their offices and 85 percent of the total cancelations must be used or counted for the purpose of determining their compensation. Then on a basis of 85 percent gross cancelations the postmasters figure their commissions at the rate of 160 percent of the first $75, 85 percent of the next $100, and 75 percent of the remainder, with a maximum of compensation of $275 for a 3-month period or $1,100 for a year. This system is confusing, antiquated and outmoded, and is subject to abuses. It is highly unsatisfactory and objectionable to the fourth-class postmasters and to the Post Office Department. Under the present plan the postmasters must act as accountants; they must make their own calculations or computations with reference to the total amount of their cancelations and must figure out their own compensation. They act as their own paymasters, as they can withdraw the amount due them on the cancelation basis just outlined, at any time during the quarter and at the end of each

quarter they must submit their report in regard to total cancelations and the amount of their compensation to the Post Office Department. Of course, there is a possibility that unintentional errors will occur either in counting the total value of stamps canceled or in calculating the proper commissions under this complicated and cumbersome system, since some postmasters may not fully understand the percentage plan of cancelations upon which their pay is based.

Fourth-class postmasters must be pretty good accountants in order to follow the proper method of keeping their accounts. A representative of the Post Office Department has stated that—

> It is very difficult for a postmaster of the fouth class to accurately render a quarterly account, that under the present cumbersome method more than 50 percent of the quarterly accounts of the postmasters of the fourth class, which are reports sent to the General Accounting Office, need correction on account of the method in vogue.

Under the present bill fourth-class postmasters will turn in all of their postal receipts except fees for issuance of money orders, and will receive regular salary payments semimonthly for the year based upon the receipts of their offices for the preceding calendar year. He will then know definitely what his salary will be for each year. At the present time the first-, second-, and third-class postmasters are paid fixed annual salaries based upon the postal receipts of their offices for the preceding year and this bill simply provides that the same plan or system shall be adopted for the payment of salaries to fourth-class postmasters.

Under the terms of the bill a small increase in compensation will be given to the great majority of fourth-class postmasters, however, the greater increases, although small they may be, will go to those postmasters whose adjusted postal receipts are less than $1,000 per year. Postmasters with annual receipts of only a few hundred dollars per year are entitled to a greater increase in their compensation because they have to keep their offices open and work just as long hours as in the case of the offices with much larger receipts. The postmasters in the small offices are being woefully underpaid when you consider the amount of services they are rendering their patrons and the long hours they keep their offices open each day. They must stay on the job regardless of how much postal business they may do each day. Their time, as well as the receipts, should be taken into consideration in fixing their pay.

The Post Office Department is of the opinion that the passage of this bill will cause an increase in payments to fourth-class postmasters of about $1,000,000 for the first year; however, a departmental representative has stated that in 2 or 3 years this additional cost will be entirely eliminated. I believe that the Department's estimate of the additional cost for the first year is speculative and excessive. When you consider the saving that will be made in the time of post-office inspectors in making their examinations of fourth-class offices and in the time of the General Accounting Office in reviewing the simplified reports, I am of the opinion that the total cost will be greatly reduced. However, granting that it will add about $1,000,000 to the cost for the first year, the change in the method of payment is still warranted.

For years efforts have been made to change the system of paying our fourth-class postmasters and bills of similar import to this one have passed the House twice.

Our fourth-class postmasters are loyal, conscientious, patriotic citizens who are ever faithful and true to their duties and responsibilities, and they are justly entitled to have this bill passed. We owe this obligation to them. So let us get rid of this outmoded method of paying them on a cancelation basis and put them on a fixed annual salary, which is certainly little enough for them under the provisions of this bill. It is high time that we came to their relief and put their compensation on a sound, businesslike basis.

Absenteeism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Daily Globe of March 12, 1943:

ABSENTEEISM NO BIG PROBLEM HERE—LOCAL INDUSTRIES SAY TRANSPORTATION GREATER OBSTACLE TO STEADY EMPLOYMENT, BUT NOT A REAL WORRY NOW

Absenteeism is not a subject that excites much interest or concern among the men directing local war plants. In fact so little are they interested that few of them have compiled data on the subject. In a word, the problem has not, hereabouts, become a problem.

At the Boston Navy Yard the matter of absenteeism is considered negligible. At the General Electric plant in Lynn there is said to be a slight increase but so small that it neither alarms nor bothers the management, and does not hamper the operation of the plant. At one of the largest shipyards in the vicinity the problem was said to affect, almost entirely, the youngest and newest group of workers and is not felt to be of any great consequence. Several other large industrial plants supported these statements.

At the navy yard, at the shipyards, at the General Electric and elsewhere, the management is more worried about finding a sufficient supply of qualified labor than with the difficulty of absenteeism. However, a few conclusions have been reached as to the numbers of absent workers in local plants.

There are two sets of factors, one affecting men employees and the other affecting women.

As to the men in the large shipyard previously mentioned, the absentees are chiefly among youths who can earn $30 to $35 in 3 or 4 days and then feel free to spend the rest of the week spending easy money. Such men are making money for probably the first time in their lives, have few if any family responsibilities, feel that they are going to be drafted very soon anyway, so they take their jobs as an opportunity to have a final fling before entering the armed services.

At the General Electric plant the matter of absenteeism has always been present and it may be a little more prevalent now than in peacetime. But if it is, it is so little greater that it is not materially noticeable. The present rate is not thought to be abnormal or too high.

Most of the plants attribute absenteeism among the men to several causes. There is the difficulty of transportation. Oftentimes employees are trying to handle two jobs. Most important, the plants have less chance to select their workers than formerly. They hire almost anybody they can get. Under these circumstances, they necessarily find a certain proportion of unreliable and uncertain employees among the newcomers; men who are simply not steady workers, or who are physically not up to the grind.

Overindulgence in alcoholic beverages, especially in habitual benders, is not a factor of any importance. As a spokesman for one of the big companies phrased it:

"The fellows who go on drunks now and then are pretty well tabbed by the foremen. Of course we have a few chronic drinkers; everybody has. But we know who they are and there are so few of them that they do not count in estimating the effect of absenteeism.

"On the other side of the picture: Boston and its vicinity has been less disturbed by the great war production effort than many other industrial centers, especially those in which great new plants have been erected. As an old and well-established industrial community Greater Boston has had the facilities to handle the expansion of industry more smoothly than some other parts of the country. Our supply of skilled labor was large. Our plants already existed and have been expanded rather than created on new ground. Our public services have proved equal to the occasion. The vast influx of itinerant workers that has provided headaches in many parts of the country has not been sufficient here to disturb the community seriously."

For women workers, a different set of factors applies. Absenteeism among women workers is higher here than it is among the men, although it has not reached serious proportions. An official of a large employment agency gave three reasons for the inability of women to work as steadily as men.

A. There is the matter of fatigue among women. They are physically not built to work as long hours over as long periods as men. Hence the accumulation of fatigue after several weeks' work necessitates a day or two of rest.

B. In the case of married women, particularly, the demands of taking a day or so off now and then merely to clean up the house and put things in order is imperative. There also may be children who ail and require a day or two of nursing. As there are no nurses available, mothers sometimes must stay home a day or two to take care of sick children. The demands of running a house require a woman's attention occasionally during the week.

C. Frequently, owing to the various shifts in a plant, a woman is unable to do the household shopping in her hours off. On Sunday the stores are closed. So, in many instances, a woman has to take half a day or more merely to buy food and other essentials for her household.

The consensus of opinion among the men in our industries is surprising uniform. None of those talked to admit that absenteeism is a burdensome difficulty in the operation of their plants.

As one of them remarked:

"There is a lot of talk about absenteeism, but I have not heard any men in our local industries taking part in it. Absenteeism may be as bad as they say it is in other parts of the country. Around here it just is not one of the things we worry about."

Time To Quit Squawking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, from day to day we witness the anomalous situation of Members of this body rising in their seats and announcing to the world their loyalty to our Commander in Chief, the President, and voicing the importance of each one making every necessary sacrifice and doing everything possible to win this war, and in the next breath, or on other occasions, hearing them denounce the President and the men—generally referred to as bureaucrats—he has selected to carry on this all-out war program and holding him and them responsible for every personal inconvenience and sacrifice we are called upon to endure, while our boys are dying on every battle front.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when many of us must face about and make good our vocal professions or be condemned by a thinking public which will not be fooled.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting as part of my remarks a very timely editorial which appeared in the Missouri Cash-Book, one of the leading weekly newspapers in the Tenth Congressional District of Missouri, and edited by my friend Mr. R. K. Wilson, of Jackson, Mo., as follows:

"Ain't it hell"—a land flowing with milk and honey but a year or so ago now being compelled to ration food. Why, it hasn't been long since stockmen were ordered to kill little pigs, and farmers were burning their wheat and corn for fuel. Restrictions were placed upon the acreage to be planted to crops, and now the Government is urging increased plantings.

How come?

The rationing of coffee is all bunk. There is more sugar in the country than ever before. Why send butter and eggs and meat overseas while we who produce these products are not permitted to gorge our stomachs to satisfy every desire? Why limit the production of farm machinery while urging farmers to produce more? Why limit tire purchases when there is enough rubber in the country to last for 2 years, and when ample production of synthetic rubber is just around the corner?

We Americans have been living in what closely resembled a fairyland. We have grown selfish and spoiled with no conception of self-denial. Most of us appear to think that this is Britain's, Russia's, and China's war and consequently we are not obligated to make any sacrifices to maintain our freedom.

Right now we are in a war against the most cruel and overbearing peoples of the earth. If we lose the war our country will be quickly converted from a fairyland to a slave state. We will be denied even the right of protest. Regimentation of crops will be in the hands of hard masters who will exact tolls which will leave us barely enough to eke out an existence.

We have not appreciated our blessings and freedoms because within the past 80 years we never conceived that anyone ever had the right or strength to deny us the privileges we had grown to believe were our heritages and which were undeniable.

We are now face to face with actualities. Our rights to do this or that are hanging in the balance. Within a period of a few short years, those of us who survive may not be able to speak our minds in public or raise a finger of opposition.

What a transition it would be to suddenly convert a carefree people living in the greatest country on earth into a slave state almost overnight? Brother, such a possible condition is confronting you. We cannot afford to remain complacent and unwilling to make personal sacrifices to hold what we have. Victory is far from near. We will undoubtedly lose a million men and be required to ration food as severely as is now being done in Germany and Britain before we are victorious. If you desire, you have the privilege of cussing and retarding every move designated to hasten and assure victory, but if you lose, you are certain, if you survive, to have hell on earth—and in the world to come, because you will be adjudged a slacker when you should have been a patriot.

Appeal to Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over the radio on March 13, 1943:

Within recent months the civilized world has been stunned by the report of the atrocities against the inhabitants of the unfortunate countries conquered by the Nazis. To top the unorganized activities of his troops who had been using the method of plunder, rape, and murder to convert the subjugated people of Europe to the Nazi philosophy of life, Hitler ordered an object lesson—he issued an edict calling for the systematic extermination of all the Jews in occupied territory. This edict which could only have been concocted by the diseased brain of a madman and executed by his cohorts who no longer can be called human beings, resulted in the most cruel destruction of millions of innocent men, women, and children.

Now the whole of Europe has been turned into a concentration camp. Women are being raped. little children are being stabbed right in the arms of their frantic mothers. The whole European continent is being drowned in the blood of an innocent people.

The whole world seems to have gone mad in an orgy of blood and steel, of plunder and destruction. Nazi henchmen have murdered about 3,400,000 human beings during their reign of terror. More than 2,000,000 of those slaughtered were Jews. They have sent about 5,500,000 people from the occupied countries into forced labor in Germany. The conditions under which these helpless victims are being shipped to Germany and the way they are forced to exist there defies all human decency. Remember, there is no other way out for these poor creatures. If we of the Allied Nations do not succeed in rescuing them, it means slavery or complete extermination for them. In their hour of deepest anguish and despair the victims of such unprecedented barbaric wrath have no hope except that the United Nations will win this struggle and destroy this monster. They are praying for a speedy victory of our arms and are calling to us, their last hope on earth, to do all in our power to rescue them.

Time and again I have taken the floor of the House to call the attention of my colleagues and my country to the inhuman slaughter of a defenseless people. Time and again I have appealed to the conscience of America to answer the call for help uttered by a people in deepest pain and agony. Only last week, on March 3, I called upon Congress to voice its protest against the ruthless murder of an innocent people. I begged the Allied Nations to warn the German people that they will be held to strict accountability for their crimes. As I stated in the House of Representatives, if an appeal to their conscience and fear of God does not stop their murderous activities, maybe fear of threatened retributions will. I suggested that an inter-Allied committee be appointed to take immediate steps to save as many human lives as can be saved. I suggested that arrangements be made with neutral countries to secure permission for these unfortunate victims of Nazi barbarism to enter their territory and to remain there until final arrangements for their settlement were made.

Let me say at this point, ladies and gentlemen, that some of the neutral countries—especially Switzerland—have been very generous and humane in their treatment of refugees. As a matter of fact, little Switzerland can justly be proud of its record. It has done more to save human lives than many a larger and richer country. It has lived up to its traditional pattern of lending a helping hand to the weak and the downtrodden. It has gained the undying gratitude of the people who have found a haven of refuge there and it has gained the respect and admiration of the whole civilized world.

The last 2 weeks marked a turning point in America's official attitude. I am gratified, indeed, to see that my faith in Congress and the American people was justified. The silence which had puzzled and dismayed many of us was finally broken. The State Department sent a note to the British Government stating our Government's desire to cooperate in saving the Jews from the extermination threatened by Hitler. The memorial held in Madison Square Garden last Monday showed the world that the American people were aware of their responsibility. Over 400,000 people gathered to voice their indignation over the wholesale slaughter inaugurated by the Nazis. Their cry for action will be heard around the world and will rally all decent people to the cause of saving the poor defenseless victims of Nazi wrath.

On Tuesday, March 9, the Senate unanimously passed a resolution introduced by Senator BARKLEY condemning the Nazi brutalities and warning the German people that those guilty, directly or indirectly, of these criminal acts will be punished for their crimes. I feel confident that the House of Representatives will concur in the Senate resolution this coming week.

America has spoken. Officials and private citizens have raised their voices so that the world may know where we stand. We are a mighty nation and our expression of sympathy will be a great encouragement to the oppressed people of the world. But in this darkest hour of civilization sympathy alone is not sufficient. We must translate our words into deeds. We must be realistic in our approach. We must take some practical steps before it is too late to save the people slated for complete extermination. Before it is too late, that means now, immediately.

We cannot do anything for the thousands who have been and are being murdered, even while we are making plans for their rescue. But we must live up to the faith and trust put in us by these innocent victims of a madman.

Fortunately, Hitler's satellites, although willing to imitate their master in every respect, have neither the power nor the ability to exterminate all the Jews in their countries. As a result, a number of Balkan countries have now decided to let their Jews depart. These countries would be willing to enter into some kind of an arrangement with us or our allies to permit the removal of their Jews by emigration. I do not know how genuine the wish of those countries really is. I do not know, at the present time, as to how many could be saved if proper action were to be taken at once in an endeavor to do so. We dare not break faith with millions of suffering fellow beings who are going through the tortures of hell, who are being sacrificed upon the altar of greed and racial superiority. They are dying for the principles for which we are fighting. They are being annihilated by a madman who wants to destroy anything and everything that challenges his right to proclaim himself God. These people turn to us in their hour of need, begging us with the last breath on their lips to save their children, to save the few who can still be snatched from certain doom.

The Allied Nations must do something to keep faith with all these unfortunate victims of our common enemy. They must do everything in their power to save as many lives as possible.

This is not the usual war fought for territorial gains or political supremacy. It is a fight for the right of the average person to live as a decent human being. It is a struggle to keep the world from being enslaved by a fanatic imbued with the idea of German race superiority.

The rescue of the victims of Hitler's fury, therefore, is not an act of charity on our part. It is definitely an absolute necessity if we want to live up to the principles involved in this great struggle. It is our front line defense. What good would it be to win a technical physical victory, if we were to be defeated in the moral principles involved?

As human beings, as a democratic people, we cannot and will not let the cry for help go unheeded. We have pledged that we will liberate all the Nazi enslaved people. We have promised that we will bring back decency and human dignity to the liberated countries. Here is our chance to show the world that we intend to live up to our promises. Here is our chance to follow the policy traditionally established by our country in protesting, at all times, against injustice and inhumanity. Here is our chance to save human lives whenever they suffer from tyranny and persecution.

Let us open up our hearts to the call of humanity. By doing so we will be accomplishing God's work and performing God's will.

Weekly Reports to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on March 13, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, most of my past week has been devoted to filling orders for victory gardens booklets and other pamphlets which are valuable to you folks for aid with planting. The past 2 years have witnessed the revival of the back-yard and back-lot gardens in American cities, villages, and towns. This has already stimulated interest in all sorts of home-grown varieties of vegetables and has substantially increased food production.

With the sudden realization of a serious food shortage for the first time in a century in the United States, the number of victory gardens planted this spring will probably double or treble all past records. Practically everyone will be engaged in planting from little plots in a corner by the back fence to a half acre down on the river flats. Fortunately, as yet there is no rationing of elbow grease in this country and there is no reason why most folks cannot have a goodly supply of green vegetables if they start planning now.

Although many of the policies adopted by the Department of Agriculture here in Washington seem ridiculous, nevertheless their scientific methods of production are the best in the world. I am not talking about bureaucrats now. I am referring to the real experts in the Department who have spent a lifetime at their work of experimentation and study. These men stay in the background. They possess the wisdom and ability which the policy makers in the Department sadly lack. They are the scientists who prepare all the valuable pamphlets on soils, planting, livestock raising, and general farm procedure. They have nothing whatever to do with bureaucratic agents who have so idiotically planned American agriculture that most of our farmers are giving up farming in disgust.

No; the Victory Gardens booklet and the thousand other valuable papers upon which the American farm public has learned to depend have been prepared by the most expert agricultural minds in the world, are complete in every detail, and are available to every person back home for the asking. In case my office is not able to reach all you people this year by direct communication with a bulletin list, do not hesitate to write to me here in Washington and I will supply you with what you need. Remember, there is going to be a food shortage next winter or before. Even now we are beginning to feel the pinch of it. We have not only our own mouths to feed, but the men in our armed forces as well and many millions beyond the seas.

What are we going to do about it? There is nothing else to do but to roll up our sleeves and plant and produce, plant and produce, and utilize every acre, every plot of ground that we possibly can. We have all got to take it on the chin for the bungling, the mistaken idea of the past 10 years in government, that the only sensible approach for the farmer was to create a scarcity by plowing under a part of his crops.

I have never been an advocate of that philosophy. If Joseph had done as the bureaucrats did, Pharaoh's people would have starved in the 7 lean years. But the Bible tells us Joseph filled Pharaoh's storehouses to overflowing, displaying a wisdom and a foresight which saved the Egyptians from starvation.

Joseph believed in the law of supply and demand. He advocated saving for a rainy day. Egypt was prepared for the 7 lean years because nothing had been wasted.

I wish we could say that our Nation is in as enviable a position today. I wish we could be assured of meeting all the obligations of food giving to which we are committed. There is little point in my saying "I told you so," although I feel like it. I pleaded with the Secretary of Agriculture 6 months ago to keep as many farmers on the farms as possible. My words were unheeded. Nothing was done about it. Let me read to you what I told the House last week. Snipping with my scissors and pasting with paste from my paste pot, I patched a few remarks together of my own. I quote:

"Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-eighth Congress has been in session now for a little over 2 months. On several occasions since it convened I have referred to two vital problems which I think the country is facing today and I have attempted to introduce measures for their correction. I refer particularly to a bill which I introduced to unharness the farmer in order to enable him to produce and to give him full sway, which he is not able to do at this time. I also introduced, at the request of a number of people back home, a bill which would make illegal any of the penalties which the Office of Price Administration has placed upon the population at large.

"As I have said, we have been in session over 2 months now and I have received a lot of complaints from home which from time to time I have tried to give to the House. I am sure a great many other Members have also had complaints from home and I know they reflected the wishes and desires of their people. It all boils down to one proposition, Mr. Speaker. If the Congress is going to survive, if we are going to remain a body which decides the great questions of the day and takes priority over the various agencies and departments which Congress has itself created, we are going to have to get busy before very long because time is slipping and so are our prerogatives.

"Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to place before the House the various questions which have come to my attention and which I have been asked as a Representative to ask the Congress to take action upon. I refer today to the agricultural situation, and if I seem to be pessimistic I hope that the membership will bear with me, because after a number of trials and errors I have come to the conclusion that many of us have been ineffective in trying to cure these evils as the agricultural situation is presented.

"I am going to make a rather bold statement at this time, a prognostication, if you would like to call it that. In 5 years, if the United States keeps on the same course we are now pursuing in agriculture, we are going to be under a system of collective farming whether we like it or not. Last year the President called upon the Congress to formulate a program for agriculture, and he called upon the farmers throughout the country to produce food for victory. Unfortunately that has been impeded by in-

numerable regulations from the department which have hampered the farmer and have kept down the full production we should have.

"We have also had to face the problem of regulations from the Office of Price Administration that have not been pleasant to the folks back home, and although I myself along with every other Member have approved the system of rationing, nevertheless, I regret that action of an enforcement nature has been taken. This is illegal and contrary to the interpretation of the laws which the Congress intended. So it is today that I face the House in a rather pessimistic mood.

"I have done everything that I can to correct the situation. Yesterday I listened intently to the testimony of agricultural officials before the Committee on Agriculture of which I am a member. I heard Secretary Wickard say 6 months ago that he felt it would be a deplorable situation if farm owners and farm managers were ever drafted from the farm. I felt then that he was going to take a definite stand to see that this was prevented. Unfortunately, the farm owner has been drafted—along with farm labor. In cases where he has not been drafted off his farm he has abandoned it because he has found it impossible to produce and to continue to participate"—

As your Representative, I have been aroused by the considerable delay on the part of the War Department of paying allotments to soldiers, wives, and dependents. Many women have written me saying that no attention is being paid to their continued pleas for this money. Most of these people are entirely dependent upon these allotments. If there is delay, they are bound to suffer. Their little children are apt to be hungry. Their husbands have left to go into the Army and their means of livelihood is often cut off.

I realize this delay is some times unavoidable by the War Department. They have over a million applications for allotments and they have their hands full. I think they are trying to do an efficient job of getting money to the dependents of our fighting men just as soon as possible.

But there is still too long a delay. Wives are even having to go and borrow the money to keep going. I will read to you in part a typical letter similar to those which I receive from home every day. It is from the wife of a serviceman, and I quote:

"MY DEAR MR. HALL: Will you please ask the War Department why I haven't received the money which my husband arranged for the Government to pay me. He was drafted last September and wrote me he was making application in January. To date, I haven't received a cent and I'm in terrible straits because what little my husband had saved from his job before he left has now been used. Won't you help me get this money? I'm up against an awful proposition trying to feed my two children."

To this good lady, I telegraphed immediately that I would investigate and find out why she had not received her allotment. Within a few days I heard from the Department that everything had been adjusted and this soldier's wife not only had been mailed the amount of her monthly check, but also the total amount of back allotments due her. A day or so later I heard from her again, and I quote:

"MY DEAR MR. HALL: Words cannot express my gratitude to you for going to the War Department in my behalf. Everything is now adjusted and all the money has been received.

"I know there are many other wives and mothers in the same predicament as I was who just don't know how to go about getting a response from the War Department for their much-needed funds.

"I am going to refer them to you, and you can bet I'll sing your praises to the skies whenever I talk to my friends and neighbors."

Needless to say this gives me a lot of personal satisfaction. I am proud to be able to help the loved ones of our boys in service. There are numberless people in circumstances similar to this woman's. I hope you will write me if you have any trouble whatsoever with your allotments or getting your money. Nothing is too good for the valiant soldiers, sailors, and marines giving their all to America. Nothing is too good, therefore, for their wives, their children, and their parents.

Farm Security Administration Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, there is taking place considerable criticism of the organization and work of the Farm Security Administration. When such criticism is constructive, and based upon the desire to improve the program of this agency it should be welcomed by all. However, cheap, political criticism, blind ignorant criticism, or narrow, sectional criticism gain us nothing; rather are they harmful to the all-out war effort.

The program of the Farm Security Administration in my State and district has made four distinct contributions which, in all fairness, should be cited, and should be considered by this Congress. I mention briefly each of these constructive contributions:

First. The Farm Security Administration has made loans to small farmers who could not otherwise have secured funds and, consequently, in all probability would have lost their farms. To date, 9,464 loans have been made in the State of California, involving approximately $13,000,000. The American way has always been based upon the work of the small businessman and the small farmer. Here is a concrete illustration of the way in which the Farm Security Administration has helped to preserve that American way of life.

Second. The Farm Security Administration has been instrumental in increasing production, a goal for which we are all working especially hard at present. A sample survey shows that the 3,798 active borrowers under this program in California in 1942 increased their output as follows: Chickens, 58 percent; milk, 23 percent; pork, 8 percent; beef, 81 percent. This increase was due in large part to the educational program of this agency, and can certainly be listed as a benefit both to the war effort, and to the standard of living of the individual families concerned.

Third. The Farm Security Administration has operated 13 regular migratory labor camps in the State of California. At the present time 489 families occupy homes in these centers and 1,072 more occupy metal shelters and tents and tent houses. In addition, this agency operates 4 mobile migratory camps, now housing 319 families. In a State like California, where a large supply of mobile labor is necessary for the harvesting of fruit and vegetable crops, it is essential that adequate housing be provided. The Farm Security Administration has made a much-needed start in the right direction.

Fourth. The Farm Security Administration has brought into California to date approximately 5,200 Mexican laborers in an attempt to meet a most acute labor shortage in this area. Operating in the face of considerable difficulty, this international program is continuing to be carried out, and indications are that many thousand additional Mexican nationals will be brought into this country to help fill the crucial need for agricultural labor. This particular project is an extremely complex one, involving international negotiation, plans for care while in this country, eventual transportation back to Mexico, and many other details that have to be worked out with utmost care.

I am of the opinion that these four contributions of the Farm Security Administration constitute a genuine boost to the war effort, and I believe that in all fairness we should give credit where credit is due.

American Athletics Help Develop American Fighting Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, occasionally these days we read or hear of someone who seems to believe that all forms of competitive athletics—both amateur and professional—should be abolished for the duration of the war. Before any such drastic action is taken, however, it seems to me that we should make a careful investigation to acquaint ourselves with the vitally important part which the great American athletic program has played in developing the physical fitness, the team work, the coordination between mind and muscle, and the will to win which are making our American fighters such superior combatants in every theater of this war.

In this connection, I would like to call attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Athletic Journal and which was written by my good friend, Maj. John L. Griffith, of Chicago, commissioner of athletics for the Big Ten. Both in the last war and in this one Major Griffith has had abundant opportunity to observe the definite carry-over of virtues acquired in athletic contests and projected onto fields of battle.

The editorial follows:

It has frequently been suggested that the American soldier is the best soldier in the world. When we make that statement we, of course, are thinking in terms of soldiers, sailors, marines, Coast Guard men, and all the men in our armed forces. Perhaps we are a bit prejudiced in favor of our own fighting men but at least it is justifiable pride that we have in them.

For the ultraconservative we might put it this way: The American soldiers, sailors, and marines are not excelled by fighting men in any other country in the world.

Certain things might be pointed out by way of supporting either one of the contentions. The most striking thing, it seems to us, is that the Jap troops that went against the American troops in the Solomons had had several years' fighting experience in China and elsewhere while the great majority of our men saw action for the first time when they met the Japs.

The same situation developed in North Africa. Our men who met the German troops were new at this business of fighting and the first few minutes of the first quarter consequently were pushed back. They, however, soon rallied and drove the enemy back into their own territory. Now these German troops that met our men in North Africa were picked troops, so it was reported, who had been conditioned in the kind of fighting that in football we would call practice games, yet our less-experienced boys showed that they were at least a match for the German first team.

We might go on and call attention to the way our Navy fought at Midway and in the other engagements, and, in fact, how our troops scattered around the world have certainly demonstrated in a short time that the American fighting man is not surpassed by any other nation's fighting men.

Why is this? Some may say because we had better officers. With this argument we will take no exception. We personally believe that our officers are the best in the world.

Some will say that it is because we have more to fight for than do the people of totalitarian countries who, in a sense, are slaves to other totalitarian masters. This, also, we are glad to agree is probably true. However, there have been innumerable incidents in this war that show that the men from Russia, Germany, Japan, and other countries that are involved in the war were courageous to the *n*th degree.

The point that we wanted to try to make, however, is this, namely, that one reason why our boys in a few short months are able to shift from peacetime pursuits to military endeavors and to meet the best that the other nations of the world have to offer is partly, at least, because of the athletic training that our young men almost from childhood have received here in the United States of America.

We are not thinking solely of the boys who got into school and college competition or the men who played in the professional leagues. We believe that their training was superior, on the whole, to the training that the others may have had, but the great majority did not make the teams and yet they have done a fine job of fighting. Can it be that it is partly, at least, because these boys also had a certain amount of athletic training? Maybe their athletics were of the loosely organized sort. Perhaps it started with games with other children of kindergarten age in the courts of the big cities or in the pastures in the farm districts.

Recently different news commentators have raised this same conjecture. We are disposed to agree with their contentions.

If these things are true then why do we waste more time in arguing whether or not our sports should be continued during the war? Someone the other day very aptly remarked that when our lads were fighting in Guadalcanal they did not depend upon the lessons that they had learned from books when they were in school but they had to depend on the things, at least to a certain degree, that they had learned in their combat games.

Mr. Speaker, Major Griffith is by no means the only prominent American who recognizes the important contributions which athletics have made in the development of the fighting fitness which is so characteristic of every branch of American military endeavor. I am calling attention at this time to the following statements by Gen. George C. Marshall; Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox; Col. Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune; and the Honorable John W. Bricker, Governor of the State of Ohio. Let us proceed slowly, Mr. Speaker, in any movement which would deprive future Americans of the tremendous training value and character development which are so inherently a vital part of the athletic program of American schools and colleges as well as of many professional athletic activities of this country.

Physical training and athletics are of great importance to the welfare of any nation. The War Department places great emphasis on the physical development of officers and soldiers of the Army, and physical-training programs have long been established as an important factor in Army training schedules. The athletically trained young men of this country, developed in muscular strength, general health, coordination, endurance, and leadership, have acquired the will to win in the face of opposition. These are qualities basically essential to the soldier. Athletic activities on playgrounds and in our high schools and colleges constitute an important contribution to the national defense. (G. C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, U. S. Army.)

From the experiences the Navy has had in examining men for service, it is clear that our educational institutions have tended to neglect the physical education of American youth for their intellectual development. The two are really interdependent, and it must be emphasized that the time to build up the health of these young people is in school. Only in that way will they be completely fitted to serve their country—only in that way will we bring about the national stamina and the national teamwork which is the foundation of effective national defense. (Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy.)

Athletes are better trained as soldiers, except in the use of weapons, than the average soldier, because they have had so many years practicing movements and taking advantage of situations. (Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune.)

One cannot read about the large number of young men rejected from the military draft without wondering if, somewhere along the way, there has not been neglect in looking after the physical condition of the Nation's youth.

In these days of world crisis, it is particularly important that serious thought be given to meeting this problem, and to improving the physical condition of our citizens, especially the Nation's young people, so they will be physically and mentally prepared for effective service to their country.

I think much could be accomplished toward this end by an expansion of physical education and athletic training in our educational institutions. Such an expanded program would do much to build the foundation for a nation of strong and sturdy citizens, capable of meeting any problems the future may bring.

I have just returned from a visit to Camp Shelby, Miss. I was much impressed by the bronzed and healthy looking men at the camp. They stand as an excellent example of the value of regular training and outdoor life. (John W. Bricker, Governor of the State of Ohio.)

America's Narrow Escape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Parade magazine of the Washington Post, of March 14, 1943:

AMERICA'S NARROW ESCAPE—THE NAZIS IN THIS COUNTRY CAREFULLY PLOTTED TO OVERTHROW THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

A burly man with a fat, blotched face and a brown uniform strode to the swastika-bedecked platform and thrust out an arm in the Nazi salute. A guttural voice shouted, "Heil Hitler!" Below him a forest of arms and a roar of voices returned the salute. It was not Berlin. It was the United States of America.

If you are an American, there should be a chill running down your spine as you look at the pictures on these and the following pages (not printed). They show the preparations Hitler made for your enslavement and, perhaps, murder. They show the German-American Bund in action.

If it had its way, and its timetable had worked, you would by now be an unprotesting subject of Berlin, or you would be either in a concentration camp or dead. You would have been clubbed for your religion, for your race, for your tolerance, for your love of democracy—or because you dared to listen to anti-Nazi songs over your radio.

Born secretly, over 10 years ago, it was aimed directly at you. When Hitler made his plans to conquer the world he had two guiding principles. One was to crush weak nations. The other was to nazify the strong into helplessness. The bund was the weapon against America.

With blueprints carefully laid out in Berlin, it came here in the brief cases of Hitler's high-powered organizers, with every step plotted in advance. Cynically exploiting the tolerance and freedom it intended to destroy, it attacked us at our most vulnerable point—the old, established German-American societies. In 1936 it was strong enough to come out in the open, with propaganda shrewdly calculated to win loyalty away from us. Hitler's bogus Aryan superman theories won over thousands of our Germans. Carefully injected Nazi poison and hatred did the rest.

ACT AMERICAN

The bundists played a careful game. They thumped their chests and waved American flags even after they began to wear their swastika-decorated uniforms. They spent their summers in "health camps." They carried no weapons but harmless-looking flashlights. The orders were, "Act American." We saw nothing but harmless crackpots. The guttural men from Berlin kept carefully in the background.

They fooled us. The flag-waving was ironic. The flashlights were, as many a loyal

German-American discovered, efficient clubs that could brain a man. The camps were schools of nazi-ism.

Berlin's tentacles spread wide. The guttural men had money and influential friends. Sleek black limousines rolled from New York to carefully guarded estates in the countryside. Secret radios kept in touch with the fatherland. Secret caches of guns, ammunition, and explosives were being built up all over the country. They were in careful preparation for "Der Tag"—the day when the Nazis in the United States would overthrow the American Government.

WELL-LAID PLAN

The tentacles reached deep into the underworld in Chicago and St. Louis and on the Pacific coast. There were unexplained, and unexplainable, tie-ups to important men in public life. The slimy trail of nazi-ism touched even Washington.

The bund was only the surface, the window-dressing, the come-on. Its plans were well worked out, but its leaders were "boneheads."

After Pearl Harbor, the Federal Bureau of Investigation raids on German spies sent a quiver of fear through the interlocking network of Hitler's grasp on America, and the bund fell like a house of cards.

What it was like, and how it attempted to make America a replica of Germany, is told over the page.

THE NAZIS RAN SUMMER CAMPS IN 10 STATES, WHERE THE MEMBERS HAD TO WORSHIP ADOLF HITLER

Hitler's great objective was control of American public opinion.

Before double-talking and slugging his way to power in Germany, he said:

"We shall have friends in all enemy countries. We shall know how to obtain such friends."

The master plan for the United States of America paralleled a blueprint for a shooting war in every detail except the army was not to be in uniform and the ammunition was not bullets and bombs, but propaganda and lies.

Long before the word "Quisling" meant "rat," America had its share of these vermin, carefully recruited from German residents and Americans, sympathetic to Hitler.

There has been a Nazi Party cell in the United States since 1922. It spawned a group called Teutonia, which later became the Friends of Hitler movement. By the time Hitler reached power in 1933, his American stooges were known as the Friends of New Germany. The Bund was just a change of name which was accomplished in 1936.

ORDERS FROM STUTTGART

Although master-minded in Berlin, orders for the bund and similar groups were transmitted from Stuttgart, headquarters of the Nazi Party foreign organization.

Its motto is—or was: "A German always and everywhere remains a German and nothing but a German—and thereby, a National Socialist."

National Bund Fuehrer—and Nazi-Jap spy—G. Wilhelm Kunze explained it this way:

"I am racially a German, but politically an American."

Asked how long it would require to become just an American, Kunze added: "1,000 years."

Of the 71 bund units, those in New York, Detroit, Chicago, and St. Louis operated schools where American children studied primers edited by the best Nazi minds in Germany.

The Nazi Party regularly recalled picked bundsmen to attend propaganda schools in Germany. Upon their return to this country they carried the Nazi torch to bund pupils.

PROPAGANDA BY THE TON

The bund distributed tons of propaganda, which arrived on German ships. They schemed with German consuls and with native Americans who dreamed of an American Hitler.

Bund gorillas, politely called Ordnungsdienst or ushers, muscled into old German societies, took over membership and treasury, expelled anti-Nazis and started nazi-ism seeping into the country through another outlet.

Public bund activity revolved around 20 or more summer camps in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Texas, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Oregon, Washington, and California. The influence of the bundsmen doubtless had its effect in many neighboring States.

In these camps bundsmen built bungalows with swastikas designed into the roof shingles. They practiced military drills, held rifle practice, and indoctrinated youth groups with Nazi ideology.

Following the approved Hitler method of trimming Nazi propaganda with red, white, and blue bunting, the bund newspaper was named Free American and Weckruf und Beobachter. It was a screaming little Nazi sheet featuring reprints from Nazi newspapers and selected excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE BUND WAVED THE STARS AND STRIPES BUT THEY DREAMED OF "DER FUEHRER" IN WASHINGTON

The bund wore a thick mask, but the strings that controlled it led directly to Berlin. The hand that pulled them was close to Hitler.

Rudolf Hess, Hitler's deputy fuehrer, now a war prisoner in England, was leader of all Germans abroad.

It was Hess who went through the motions of "officially" dissolving the Nazi Party in America in 1933. Nazi Party members thereupon simply transferred membership to the bund.

The bund had little contact directly with Hitler except in the summer of 1936 when bund leader Fritz Kuhn led 200 "Olympic Games tourists" to the fatherland for a personal salute from Hitler.

Hitler kept his American helpers waiting, but finally appeared to give a salute. Kuhn then led a delegation of leaders into the Reichschancellery to meet Hitler personally.

Kuhn gave Hitler a $3,000 cash gift from the bund for the annual Nazi shake-down, Winterhilfe (winter relief). The fuehrer also was given a gold buch (gold book) with the names of bund contributors inscribed under a statement of their loyalty and devotion to Hitler.

Said Fuehrer Hitler to Fuehrer Kuhn: "I know of the great struggle you are having. Never falter!"

THE FALL OF FRITZ KUHN

Four years later Kuhn did falter—for a blonde who talked to the district attorney and Kuhn was convicted of stealing bund funds. He is now in prison.

Carrying out Hess' orders was Ernst Wilhelm Bohle, under secretary of the Foreign Office and head of the party's foreign division. Bohle lost no time in proceeding to snap the whip on the bundsmen and they jumped in unison.

First bund leader was Heinz Spanknoebel, a young German photoengraver who lied his way into the United States by swearing he was a clergyman. Spanknoebel was a paid Nazi agent sent here to take over all German organizations.

With his lieutenant, Fritz Gissibl, he ran the bund with an iron hand, appointing and deposing leaders at will.

THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION CRACKS DOWN

When a Federal grand jury indicted Spanknoebel for acting as a German agent without being an accredited diplomatic agent, he disappeared. Gissibl then took over.

Today, Spanknoebel and Gissibl are Gestapo generals in Germany.

When Kuhn went to jail, G. Wilhelm Kunze, American-born professional Nazi, succeeded to the throne. He lasted until the Federal Bureau of Investigation broke up an espionage ring, unmasking Kunze and Anastase Vonsiatsky, Russian Fascist, as the principal spies.

Today the rat's nest is crumbling for keeps. Twenty-three of its leaders have gone to jail for evading the draft. Men who assumed American citizenship to betray us will soon lose it as the Department of Justice goes to work. They will spend the duration in enemy alien internment camps.

America has come through a dangerous period. Most of our German-Americans have remained loyal. The bund bungled.

Food for Victory Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include a statement concerning resolutions adopted by a group of farmers in Poweshiek County, Iowa, on the subject of the farm program for 1943 production of food for victory.

Poweshiek County is in the heart of the Corn Belt. There is no land in the world more productive than the soil of this county and nowhere in this great country are the citizens more patriotic. The whole desire and purpose of this group is to help win a complete victory for our armed forces at the earliest possible moment.

The resolutions are as follows:

BROOKLYN, IOWA, *March 8, 1943.*

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY POWESHIEK COUNTY FARM LEADERS IN JOINT MEETING

Resolved by a joint meeting of 75 Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Farm Bureau, Grange, and other farm representatives of Poweshiek County, Iowa, That the State and national leaders of the Farm Bureau and the Department of Agriculture settle their differences on controversial details of the 1943 food for victory program and show a united front to the rank and file of the farmers of this Nation in order that they may plan their 1943 farm programs uninhibited by the mental stresses of confusion and uncertainty. This cannot help but resolve some of the uncertainty and differences now existing in the Congress.

Specific resolutions are as follows:

1. Continuance of Agricultural Adjustment Administration with the soil-conservation features and commodity loans kept intact.
2. Want release of feed wheat.
3. Against the Pace amendment.
4. Immediate action.

Aspects of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the West Virginian, Fairmont, W. Va., which is the first of a series of articles to be run each Friday in Lent in the editorial column of the West Virginian, prepared by Rev. Bradford H. Tite, rector of Christ Episcopal Church:

Freedom is necessary for the development of human personality. We say that we are in danger of losing our freedom—but we cannot confine ourselves and our efforts to the preservation of the freedom which we already have. It was the inadequacy, the defects of that freedom which created the danger and furnished a plausible excuse for attacks upon it. Obviously, therefore, freedom can be preserved and safeguarded from future danger only by improving its quality and making its blessings both apparent and available to all the peoples of the world.

Freedom can only be won by men who are free at heart. It is this freedom of heart that Christ came to bring us. There are three bondages from which He taught us that it is vital that mankind should be delivered; the bondage of self, things, and fear.

The denial of self is His first condition of discipleship. In the most splendid of His paradoxes He declared that a man could not be himself till he had lost himself. It is true in the individual life: The selfish man is the man of stunted personality. It is still more plainly true in social life—a nation of selfish men cannot reach any fellowship or freedom.

When a man is under bondage to things, he is possessed by them. He is not his own master; he is not free. He cannot follow or develop his higher nature; he must do the things that pay. A society, which cares more for things than for people, is on utterly wrong lines.

When a man lives for himself and believes that a man's life consists in the things that he possesses, he lives in a world of enemies. The two first bondages produce a third—he is afraid. Every man is his foe, and he seeks to protect himself against his fellowmen by accumulating money. Behind the rampart of his possessions he lives imprisoned, and is more and more withdrawn from the full stream of human brotherhood. He fears mankind when he ought to think of them as a great family of his brothers. So arises mutual distrust and suspicion. Where these reign, the very idea of the association of free men in a voluntary discipline, to secure the freedom of all, is impossible.

Obedience to some discipline there must be; without it freedom is impossible. You will never get freedom by letting everyone do just what he likes.

That is the way in which these bondages have grown up. Freedom is a social thing. It has got to be everyone's freedom, not my freedom at everyone else's expense. Everyone must have equal opportunity. Men are, of course, not equally gifted; there are wide differences in capacity, but such differences do not warrant any loss of liberty or any failure to give all the children of God the opportunity of a full human life.

Freedom will never come by mere license and absence of restraint. It can only come by obedience to the law of our being. The man who is "free" of the piano is not the untaught man, without skill or knowledge, who sits down and strikes notes at random, but the man who by patient practice and discipline has learned to obey the laws of music and of the instrument he plays. We must learn to obey the law of our being, and then we will be able to do what we like with life.

"Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." The essence of New Testament teaching is that freedom means power to do God's will. The man who cries "The evil that I would not, that I do" is not a free man. He is not free till he can say: "I thank my God through Jesus Christ, our Lord," and until he can say: "Thy will be done." Jesus was the free Man: because His power was entirely in line with and united with God's will.

God's will for us is: Our unity with Him (the fatherhood and sonship). Our unity with one another (brotherhood).

This therefore must be the way of freedom. Freedom is not independence of, but conscious dependence upon God; it is not independence of, but conscious unity with our brother. The individualist is seeking God apart from man; the secular socialist is seeking man apart from God; and both are seeking what does not exist. The truth is that we cannot get on apart from God, nor apart from man. We cannot be free from the community, but only through the community.

The struggle toward freedom is the struggle toward obedience to the will of God.

A nation cannot be free unless its citizens are capable of freedom. No community can have a free life so long as its members are slaves to selfishness and worldliness and fear of one another. Men who desire to be free out of envy of those who command, or impatience of discipline, will never win freedom.

Every man therefore who desires to help in the fight for freedom must discipline himself to live life God's way. This lent gives us a special opportunity to develop a greater trust in God—and endeavor in every way to live by His power.

The Importance of Our Retail Distribution System in the Civilian Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks, I include herein a statement by the Illinois Federation of Retail Associations which appeared in the press on Wednesday, March 3, 1943:

RETAILERS URGE CONGRESSMEN TO RECOGNIZE WORK

The Illinois Federation of Retail Associations today urged Members of Congress to recognize the importance of the work being done by the tens of thousands of retail employees in Illinois. At the same time the federation expressed the hope that every means available would be used not only to help the retail employee appreciate his full importance in the war effort but also to call to the attention of the consumer-public the vitally necessary function which the stores and their employees perform on the home front.

The statement which was sent to virtually every trading area in Illinois reads as follows:

"The two keystones to civilian economy are agriculture and distribution. We are a part of one of these, distribution. It must work. Without it the economy will break down. Without reasonably efficient retailing, food, clothing and basic household and personal necessities required by both war production workers and the civilians will not be available—almost as damaging a situation as a failure to provide machines or raw materials for our production facilities.

"Our jobs are important to the community and to the Nation. Our Government looks to retailers as leaders in home front logistics to supply war workers with necessities—to make the best possible distribution of available goods to all civilians, including rationed merchandise, such as shoes—to keep the prices of goods within bounds, to help the people of Illinois and the Nation become familiar with substitutes as they come into the market.

MAKING TRANSITION

"We are making a transition to wartime economy, and distribution must lead the field in supplying the civilian population with essentials.

"Hundreds of thousands of people—including soldiers, sailors, marines, war workers, and their families—come into our stores each week. We have the important home front, the morale-building job of giving them the service they have come to expect.

"Most of you have had letters from friends overseas and in the camps. They eagerly ask how things are going here, making it plain that they consider it important that we keep things going on the home front. That's what they are really fighting for. We can't all be production workers any more than we can all serve in the armed forces. We have our own jobs to do—important civilian jobs.

"Employees contribute most to the war effort by staying on their regular retail jobs that they know how to do, paying taxes, performing the very essential service of distributing civilian goods to those on the home front who have learned to depend upon them over many years of peace and war. Many workroom employees are engaged in repairing and keeping in service thousands of articles and goods, thereby releasing the materials and labor which would be required to make replacements for the armed forces. We know that as a result of combined efforts retailing pays many millions of dollars to our Government in taxes to pay for the waging of the war. We are proud of our part in keeping up the home front. We feel that winning the war is the most important thing in our lives. We are willing to go anywhere to do anything we can to aid the war effort when, as, and if our Government points the way—but we want to be sure that whatever we do will count the most in the net results.

TAKING PLACE IN WAR EFFORT

"Retailing has enthusiastically and proudly attempted to take its place in the war effort. Practically as one man, the citizens in the industry have placed themselves behind the bond plans of the Treasury, the price control, inventory control, rationing, and similar restrictions of the Office of Price Administration, civilian defense, the staggered-hours needs of the Office of Defense Transportation, the recruiting needs of the armed services, etc., and cooperated to the fullest extent of their abilities.

"These are the reasons our jobs are important, and these are the reasons on which the

Government bases its decisions designating which occupations are essential and which are not.

"Our work is essential to the national economy; we have so much to contribute to the war effort that we take our place beside the man or woman in the armed services and the man or woman in war production. We are the foundation for the wartime structure with which our country is operating—without us the armed services and the war production would not be able to function.

"To continue our work and to do it the best way we know how is what our Government asks of us. We may feel sure that we, as the people best equipped to do this important work—who are well trained and have had experience in this vital field—will continue to be needed in our present jobs and we should expect to remain in them."

The Pattern of Reaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Il Progresso of March 7, 1943:

THE PATTERN OF REACTION

Indications are in evidence that a sinister coalition has been formed of labor-baiting tories and reactionary isolationists to generate bitterness, conflict, and distrust in our midst. This Bourbon bloc has launched a high-powered national drive to wipe out all New Deal social legislation and to destroy the hard-won gains of labor. This combination seeks to aggravate the prejudices against Americans of foreign birth and to perpetuate racial intolerance. It aims to promote suspicions and antagonism between our soldiers of production on the home front and our soldiers at the battle front.

These short-sighted individuals would wipe out the Wages and Hours Act and cripple the Wagner Act. Wrapping themselves in the flag, they resist every effort to enable the common man to get wages somewhat commensurate with the rising cost of living. Posing as superpatriots they propose to rob labor of every freedom and right, to outlaw strikes and picketing as criminal, and to put at the disposal of open-shoppers all union records. So blind are these reactionaries in their hatred of the President, that they would even go so far as to repeal many Roosevelt-inspired social-security laws which have done much to stabilize our present economic system.

What of the laboring man's role in the war effort? The working men and women of America—foreign-born as well as native—have been doing their share and doing it with increasing effectiveness. More than 1,800,000 union members are already in the armed services of our country. And many more are daily changing overalls for uniforms, denim for khaki. Besides, very many of our heroes fighting at Guadalcanal, north Africa, and on other fronts are the sons and brothers of the men who are working in our war plants turning out the tools of victory. More than 25,000,000 American workers have been buying War bonds. The common laboring men have been crowding the Red Cross blood banks. Ordinary seamen in our merchant marine have displayed the most inspiring heroism in braving the submarine- and shark-infested waters, the deadliest torpedo planes while delivering the goods to our forces overseas and to our hard-pressed allies. Furthermore, labor has done a magnificent job on the assembly line, performing miracles of production. Last, but not least, the year 1942, according to the National Safety Council, saw 47,500 workers killed by accident—nearly half of them on the job. In the same period, there were more than 4,000,000 injured, almost half of them through occupational accidents.

The insignificant number of strikes has been grossly exaggerated. Last year the number of days lost in war industries because of strikes was only 6 days for each 10,000 days worked. The time lost through industrial accidents was about 15 times as great as that lost through strikes. Then, there is some time lost through absence from work. Of course, every hour of absence from war production is deplorable. But the problem of absenteeism is also being deliberately misrepresented. Last year only 1 man in every 2,000 was away from his job on any given day. Competent authorities have found that poor transportation, bad housing, illness due to hard work, and the heavy influx of inexperienced help are the main causes of absenteeism.

That is why Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau has said, "The most consistent and most helpful backing I get from the country comes from organized labor." That is why the shipbuilding wizard, Henry J. Kaiser, traces his achievements primarily to "the devoted effort of labor and its wholehearted cooperation. That is the prime force under the entire output."

We are gravely disturbed by the heavy clouds of black reaction. They sap our country's all-out effort for all-out victory. Tory policy at home is bound to bring on a reactionary imperialist course abroad. That would impair America's standing and influence among the oppressed common people of Europe, Asia, and Africa. That would undermine the faith the people of Italy, the Balkans, France, and elsewhere have placed in America as the hope and guarantor for a just and lasting world peace.

All progressive forces must, therefore, set aside their small differences and close their ranks against the reactionary onslaught. For the pattern of reaction we must substitute a pattern of progress. A speedy and victorious end of the war demands it. The welfare of our country and the peace of the world make such unity most urgent.

Resolution of State Association of Supervisors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL. W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a resolution dealing with a question which should be considered without delay by this Congress. The resolution adopted by the Michigan State Association of Supervisors in session at Lansing, January 27, 1943, follows:

"Whereas the United States Government has, through purchase or condemnation, acquired many parcels of lands in the cities, towns, and counties of the State of Michigan; and

"Whereas these parcels of land become tax exempt; and

"Whereas upon most of the lands thus acquired the Government has seen fit to erect huge munition factories and to install valuable machinery therein which are also tax exempt; and

"Whereas these factories are run and managed by private corporations on a contract fee basis for a profit; and

"Whereas the location of these factories in most cases have imposed upon the local government tremendous problems in road construction and maintenance, traffic control, schooling, health, sanitation, drainage, and policing, the cost of which is borne mostly by taxes imposed upon the other real estate of the communities; and

"Whereas, due to the exemption of soldiers, the shrinkage of merchants' stocks, and curtailment of civilian commodities due to rationing and other war causes, the closing of nondefense factories due to lack of raw materials, and other similar causes, the assessed valuation of these communities will show a decline this year; and

"Whereas the expense of these local governments will increase, due to high costs of materials and the necessity of higher wages for their employees in competition with Federal wage scales and other similar causes: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Michigan Association of Supervisors*, That we go on record as favoring the payment by the Federal Government of a service charge equivalent to the amount of tax that should be paid to respective units of government in whose jurisdiction the plant is located as if the said plant and machinery were the property of a private enterprise and subject to taxation."

The Association of Supervisors of the State of Michigan would recommend and would appreciate whatever you can do in your position to promote the passage of such an act through Congress.

MICHIGAN STATE ASSOCIATION OF SUPERVISORS,
J. SCHEPERS, *Secretary*.

Point Rationing System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Legislature of the State of Montana I present a joint memorial to Congress requesting that rationing authorities provide sufficient food supplies essential to maintain ranch, mining, and logging operations in our State. The continued working of these industries is essential to our war effort. However, due to great distances and poor transportation facilities over certain periods of the year, it is necessary that they depend on canned goods for their supplies of fruits and vegetables. In addition, there is a lack of storage and refrigeration facilities which must be considered. It is imperative that something be done to alleviate this critical situation so that these producers of vital materials can remain in business.

It has been announced that 40.3 pounds of fruits and vegetables is to be established as the annual per capita allowance for the Nation. Montana's actual consumption is at least four times greater than this.

To overcome this discrepancy and to iron out an unfair situation I urge that point rationing be based on the per capita consumption in each State for the previous year and that the State Office of Price Administration through its local rationing boards be granted the necessary authority to provide sufficient food supplies essential to maintain mining, logging, and ranch production.

The joint memorial follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 15

Whereas the production of meat and fiber is essential to the war effort; and

Whereas many Montana mine and logging operators, ranchers, and farmers live great distances from the sources of their food supplies; and

Whereas these essential industries are entirely dependent on canned goods for their supply of fruits and vegetables; and

Whereas the extreme lack of transportation, storage and refrigeration facilities makes the use of fresh vegetables and fruits impossible; and

Whereas a lack of these necessary products would force many producers out of business; and

Whereas it has been publicly announced that forty and three-tenths (40.3) pounds of these products is to be established as the annual per capita allowance for the Nation; and

Whereas Montana's actual consumption is reliably estimated to be at least four hundred percent (400%) more than this allowance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Twenty-eighth Legislative Session of the State of Montana (senate and house of representatives concurring), That the point rationing system be based on the per capita consumption in each State for the previous year, and that the State Office of Price Administration through its local rationing boards be granted the necessary authority to provide sufficient food supplies essential to maintain mining, logging, and ranch production; and be it further

Resolved, That the following be memorialized: the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Economic Stabilization Director; Prentiss M. Brown, National Director of Office of Price Administration; Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture; Roy F. Hendrickson, Food Distribution Administrator; Senators BURTON K. WHEELER and JAMES E. MURRAY and Congressmen JAMES F. O'CONNOR and MIKE MANSFIELD, to take into consideration conditions peculiar to all mining, lumbering and range States in the point rationing program.

Our Goal Is Maximum Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, today many Americans are challenging the post-war program presented by the National Resources Planning Board. Their program is to be built upon a foundation of debt. According to history, a system of this kind has always led to dictatorship. We must not borrow our way to dictatorship. It is the goose step to every aspect of American life. We must maintain our American way of life and preserve it for those who subscribe to it and participate in it. No elected official or appointed bureaucrat has the right to abolish that for which millions of American boys are fighting. The greatest defense any nation can have is a strong internal economy. We must have less internal hatred, less internal strife between capital and labor, and between race and creed. Perhaps our greatest internal weakness is the tremendous power which the bureaucrats wield over the American people. I speak plainly for I do not want you to be deceived about the difficulties of the future. It is our job to continue the American system—a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The capitalistic system is the only system which has stood the test of time and which has properly rewarded individual initiative, ability, and ambition. It has given us the highest standard of living in the world. The American system of free competition and private enterprise is better than anything that has been offered as a substitute. It is not perfect, but it is responsive to the demands of progress and to the requirements of the common welfare. It has made mistakes, but it has not failed to correct its methods when the right remedy was found.

We can build a better America whenever all of our groups accept the solemn responsibility of trying to build the economic phases of our Republic. A nation, like a family, cannot exist unless there is mutual respect, confidence, and understanding. In our struggle for justice, we should temper our desires with a sense of fairness for other groups. We must stand united for the future, and all can benefit if all will serve. We must seek to correct our problems in the American way of adjustment, arbitration, and with a live-and-help-live policy.

Today there is a growing resentment of the American people toward union labor. Union labor should seek to counteract and try to win back that portion of public confidence which it has lost. Unless this is done now, labor may lose some of those hard-won basic principles which took so many years to establish. Labor should cooperate more with industry and not depend too much upon the Government for protection. Industry, labor, and agriculture must unite to prevent regimentation and seizure of business and labor unions by the bureaucrats in Washington.

Over 95 percent of the American workers are doing a real job in our war effort. The great mass of labor is made up of mothers, fathers, wives, sweethearts, and relatives of our boys, who are fighting in the front lines to win this war Our workers in airplane plants produced 5,500 planes in the month of February and the shipbuilding program is far ahead of schedule. In many other plants they are doing a great job in turning out tanks, guns, and war materials. These workers are also playing a great part in buying millions of dollars worth of War bonds and stamps.

The American workers want to be led, not driven. The successful employer must win the confidence of his employees. More than 90 percent of our labor disputes are the result of misunderstanding. To secure the best results, a business should adopt and practice such policies which would bring about a condition of mutual confidence and create a spirit of sympathy and of real cooperation between the members of its working organization, its customers, its stockholders, and the citizens of the communities in which its plants are located. It is therefore the responsibility of our industrial leaders to devise plans whereby the rank and file can secure from those in whom they have confidence and who from knowledge and experience are qualified to talk, a clear and simple explanation of the problem of business as they relate to financing, producing and marketing. Any business can win the confidence of its employees if it proves that the management realizes its responsibilities and will see to it that the workers do receive a square deal. I believe that free management and free labor, each doing its part and cooperating with the Government can outproduce any economy in which labor is enslaved and management shackled.

I realize that we have some racketeer labor leaders and some shirkers among the rank and file of labor, but we also have them in other fields. Many have criticized labor for receiving big wages, but the facts are, millions of workers, due to increase in prices, are going to have a hard time to make both ends meet. Millions are receiving less than 75 cents per hour. Some defense workers in my district make less than 50 cents per hour.

I believe these racketeer labor leaders and shirkers should be investigated. This small group has caused the loss of ships, planes, and other war materials. The real labor leaders and the rank and file are disgusted with these racketeers. The House Committee on Labor should be authorized by Congress to investigate absenteeism, strikes, and slow-downs in war plants. I am certain that organized labor would welcome such an investigation. This committee would dig out the facts promptly and impartially.

In order to get additional data on these racketeer labor leaders, who are charging war-plant workers large initiation fees and dues and who are hiring men and discharging them after they have paid up their initiation fees, I have introduced H. R. 1483. This bill is directed to get information about this small group of un-Americans who are causing the damage, by their very acts, which will in time wreck the labor unions. My bill provides that all labor unions who wish to participate under the National Labor Relations Act shall furnish certain information to the Secretary of Labor, such as the name of the organization, office address, name of officers, total number of members, fee charged for membership, dues, total cash receipts, total expendi-

tures, salary of each officer, all assets and liabilities, and the number of affiliated organizations.

I believe that all labor organizations should report to the Secretary of Labor twice a year. Every union member should be entitled to a report from his national and local union. However, some unions do report to their membership periodically.

The second part of my bill makes it unlawful for any labor organization to make a political contribution in connection with any election of Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or Senators or Representatives, or Delegates or Resident Commissioners to Congress. Further, the bill makes it unlawful for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

It is certainly unfair for union headquarters to take part of the union funds that have been made up from some members that are Democrats and contribute to the Republican Party or vice versa. When this law is enacted every union member, regardless of political faith, will be on an equal basis. This law will prohibit contributions to any political party.

We must have this information and investigation in order to increase production of war materials. We must reach our goal, which is to get the maximum production with the least amount of delay. Let us give credit to that great portion of loyal American workers, who are doing a real job and investigate that small group who have been delaying production. Time is the essence of victory. Every day we move closer to victory—every hour we save shortens the war, which in turn will save thousands of American boys' lives. What further inspiration do we need?

Lest we forget the words of Abraham Lincoln, when he said:

> If we do not make common cause to save the good old ship of the Union on this voyage, nobody will have a chance to pilot her on another voyage.

This Government of ours is your ship, my ship, and our ship. Let us run it the American way. America is still the hope of the free people of the world. The hope of the world lies in freemen, for only freemen can establish peace and security.

Address of the Governor of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message of the Honorable Ingram M. Stainback, Governor of Hawaii, delivered February 17, 1943, at the joint session of the two houses of the Twenty-second Hawaii Legislature, assembled in the Territorial house of representatives:

Fellow citizens of the senate and house of representatives, you meet today in a war-torn world, a world torn by the bitter struggle for the survival of free nations and the democratic form of government, a war in which our very national existence is at stake.

As the legislative body of this bastion of the Pacific your responsibility is great, the responsibility to so adjust the laws and life of this community to meet best the shock of war, to make most effective the total resources of this Territory in this struggle.

I have no doubt that you will measure up to this responsibility and work patriotically, carefully and patiently with your executive to this end.

I shall not attempt to present in this message all the recommendations I deem necessary to meet our common problems. Additional requests will be referred to you from time to time during this session.

In this connection I want to assure you that I shall at all times welcome your officers, your committees, and the members individually for consultation on our mutual problems, and I myself shall feel free to consult you frequently and avail myself of your counsel and advice.

EFFECT OF WAR ON TERRITORIAL DEPARTMENTS

Every Territorial department and agency has felt the impact of war. Many employees resigned their positions to enter the armed forces of the United States or to do special defense work, many to take up more lucrative positions in private business and others have evacuated to the mainland.

Scarcity of materials, supplies, and equipment have handicapped many departments. Priorities on certain essential items of materials and supplies have slowed down departmental operations.

I shall not attempt to review here in detail the actual effect upon each department, but summarize by saying that all have had to revise and adapt their programs and policies to the war emergency.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Act 24, special session laws of 1941, the Hawaii Defense Act, gives the Governor extraordinary powers to aid in protecting the Territory against enemy attack and to deal with the public emergency.

Events have proved the wisdom and foresight of the legislature in enacting this law. A request will be made later that certain amendments be made to this act for the purpose of clarifying and strengthening its provisions.

Under this act the office of civilian defense was set up and also the Territorial guard was organized, equipped, and called into active service.

To carry out this action an appropriation of $1,500,000 was made available and an additional $50,000 for the organization and equipment of the Territorial guard.

These sums were clearly inadequate for these purposes. Fortunately, $15,000,000 was allocated to Hawaii by the President of the United States through the Department of the Interior for the protection and safeguarding of the people of Hawaii.

The accomplishment of the civilian defense during the past year is a matter of public record and scarcely needs repetition here. Construction of bomb-splinter-proof shelters, hospital auxiliaries, evacuation units, first-aid stations, and gas decontamination stations have been largely completed. Blood-plasma banks, air-raid wardens, fire-fighting units, and police reserves have been created, and many other activities have been organized into a highly efficient machine which day and night is on the alert to perform its tasks swiftly and efficiently in any emergency.

Volunteer armed units have been organized and are being trained under Army supervision and instruction. These activities have involved a monthly expenditure of about $500,000.

It would be beyond the ability of the Territory to wholly finance these projects; Federal aid is absolutely necessary.

The remaining balance in the $15,000,000 appropriation by the President is approximately $7,500,000, but of this amount approximately $5,000,000 will lapse on June 30, 1943.

I shall exert every effort to have the appropriation extended and, if need be, increased. Notwithstanding the grant of Federal funds, I believe that some appropriation should be made by the Territory for financing the activities of the Territorial Government in connection with civilian defense.

I recommend that the legislature consider the appropriation of at least $2,000,000 for this purpose.

HEALTH

The Territory has been fortunate that the war, with its attendant increases in population through large increases of military and defense personnel and disruption of the established routine of living, has not given rise to epidemics or health problems of a most serious nature.

What the future holds it is impossible to foretell, but every effort is being made to institute safeguards and to apply public-health measures to prevent the development and spread of diseases.

Closer supervision of water and sewage systems, of the collection and disposal of garbage, more rigid inspection and control over food manufacturing and dispensing establishments, of the housing facilities and sanitation in general, closer supervision of measures for the prevention and control of communicable diseases, immunization of the entire population against typhoid and paratyphoid fevers and smallpox, the expansion of the treatment of venereal diseases, and many other safeguards have become necessary over the past year to protect the public health in Hawaii.

BUDGET AND FINANCE

I am submitting to you in a separate document the budget for the next biennium. The present financial condition of the Territory is excellent.

It is estimated that the Territory will have a surplus of approximately $6,000,000 on June 30, 1943, the end of the present fiscal year. However, we must not be misled by this surplus into thinking the Territory will continue to receive in the future revenues on the basis of this biennial period.

When the huge construction programs of Army and Navy end and the large expenditures for both labor and materials in the Territory cease, there necessarily will be a certain and marked decrease in Territorial revenues.

We must provide for this contingency by accumulating during these fat years a sizable surplus to be available for the lean years sure to come.

I therefore recommend that appropriate legislation be considered setting up a portion of our surplus funds into a reserve account to be available for future emergencies.

Such a fund would be utilized not only to take care of the loss of Territorial revenues when the large emergency works cease but would be available to cushion the economic fall by taking up the slack in unemployment and utilizing such funds for construction of needed public works throughout the Territory.

It is obvious that any estimate of revenues for 1943–45 biennium can be little more than a guess—too many contingencies exist to make any reasonably certain estimate.

Also we must bear in mind that living costs have risen sharply during the last few years

and allowance must be made to take care of such increased wages and cost of materials and supplies.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS

The war has interrupted the normal program of public improvements which, when the emergency ends, will be more pressing than ever.

These improvements include reconstruction of roads and new roads, Territorial airports, extension of low-cost housing facilities, Territorial harbor, wharf, and warehouse facilities.

The shortage of both materials and labor caused by the present war emergency makes it impossible to undertake these at this time, but there is need for early extensive study of these problems and adequate appropriations so that when the emergency ends the improvements can be promptly undertaken.

In this connection you should give consideration to making an appropriation for the Territorial planning board so as to enable it to properly function.

The health department has been fortunate in receiving the assistance and cooperation in this regard not only from the United States Public Health Service and other Federal agencies, but also from the department surgeon, headquarters, Hawaiian Department. This has included the assignment of personnel to the board of health. We are fortunate in receiving such active cooperation from the military authorities, particularly in view of the shortage throughout the Territory of doctors, nurses, inspectors, and trained personnel of every kind and description.

The military authorities fully realize that the health problem of the Territory is a joint one in which they are as vitally interested as the civilians for epidemics and diseases are no respecters of persons or occupations. There must be no let down in this respect.

I therefore ask you to give your special attention to the financial requirements to thoroughly safeguard the health of the Territory.

EDUCATION

Our school department, including the University of Hawaii, as our other departments, has had to adjust itself to the shock of war and to rendering every aid in defense of the country.

About 800 units—classrooms, cafeterias, laboratories, storerooms, etc.—were given up by the schools for the use of the armed forces or other agencies connected with the war effort. To meet this shortage new facilities had to be acquired in private homes, churches, social halls, and foreign-language schools.

The public-school system has geared itself to the problems arising out of the war and while our educational system must be streamlined and many sacrifices must be made to fit our young people to fight the war, yet we must not lose sight of the fact that the continuation of our civilization depends upon the training and education of our youth. They must be fitted to take up the responsibilities; they must be instilled with the firm foundation of Americanism, with a knowledge of our history and of our institutions.

In this connection I recommend that foreign-language schools be regulated and controlled. We should permit no foreign country to send in its priests and teachers and through the medium of language schools teach disloyalty to Americans of alien parentage and inculcate in young Americans beliefs opposed to the fundamental principles of Americanism.

It is of utmost importance that American children in their early and formative years learn the culture and language of America, unfettered by the conflicts of an alien culture or loyalty. I believe legislation in this field can be constitutionally accomplished.

Foreign languages can and should be taught in our public schools and in private schools where the medium of instruction is English.

I also recommend that the educational program be extended to include the establishment both of public kindergartens and day care centers. Such establishment will aid in the complete Americanization of our children of alien parents and will help meet the problems of the care of young children where mothers have been drawn into industry.

Careful consideration should be given to the matter of removing, or at least relaxing, residence requirements for appointment of teachers in public schools. There are many advantages to be gained from such outside personnel; there are many disadvantages to an inbred school system, particularly in an isolated community where so many of the pupils are children of alien parents. I ask that you give this matter your careful attention.

INSTITUTIONS

War conditions have added to the problems of the department of institutions. Every institution is short-handed. However, the department, with its limited facilities, has operated with efficiency and has also rendered valuable aid to the military and defense agencies. At the Territorial hospital casualties were received and treated and in January 1942 an extensive construction and alteration program was instituted to provide facilities for the Army. Improvements should be made forthwith at the Territorial hospital for the insane.

The inmate population of Oahu Prison has greatly increased as a result of provost court commitments. This large increase has resulted in an acute shortage of guards, which should be corrected immediately.

PUBLIC WELFARE

This department, like other departments, has felt the strain of war conditions and has had new duties thrust upon it.

Recommendations will be made for legislation giving the department broader and more flexible powers that will enable it to perform its functions more effectively.

LABOR

I need hardly tell you that the labor problem is a serious one all over the United States, but we in Hawaii have problems of manpower far more acute than exist on the mainland of the United States, that controls must be exercised which will make the most advantageous use of all labor and prevent, so far as possible, recurrent separations from employment, yet at the same time assure to labor fair and equitable treatment in accordance with democratic processes.

I propose to utilize existing legislation in connection with Federal agencies to accomplish this end. Possibly additional legislation will be required. If we so find, it will be recommended by me in the amendments to the Hawaii Defense Act.

To meet the labor problems that are bound to arise we must have the full cooperation of the Army and Navy, who have drawn so heavily on our existing manpower supply. I have no doubt that this cooperation will be readily obtained.

CIVIL SERVICE AND CLASSIFICATION

As I have pointed out, the war has seriously lessened the available material for Territorial employment, due both to employees leaving for defense projects or for private enterprise where the pay is much higher than that offered by the Territory.

I regret to report that our civil service commission seemed unable to appreciate and properly meet the changed conditions. After several meetings and consultations with this commission, it appeared to me that the members were hopelessly at odds and unable to function. I therefore pointed out to them that while I did not question the good faith of any one of them, and would not attempt to lay the blame for the existing conditions upon any one of them, it seemed to me that a condition existed which could be cured only by the resignation of all the members and the appointment of an entirely new commission, which would start afresh without any trace of clashing personalities.

Two of the members have submitted their resignations, but the third refused to resign. A cure will have to be found for the existing situation.

In respect to replacement, it is apparent that under the existing conditions civil-service qualifications and eligibility requirements have tended to impede the operation of governmental agencies. I am not opposed to civil service, but believe in it wholeheartedly under proper circumstances if properly administered. The government does not exist for civil service; rather civil service should exist as an aid to good government, and where it threatens to impede governmental processes it should give way for the time being.

I therefore recommend that you should seriously consider the suspension for the duration of the present emergency of qualifications, examinations, and eligibility requirements of civil service, so that the department heads may make immediate appointments and replacements in their respective departments. Such action would not disturb the civil-service status and rights of present employees nor prevent such emergency employees from later qualifying under the Civil Service Act.

In connection with classification and rates of pay, I call to the attention of the legislature the rule made by me authorizing the payment of additional compensation to employees earning $210 per month or less. Such action on my part was an emergency matter to permit the continued efficient operation of the government. This did not purport to be an adjustment of all salaries to meet the increased costs of living throughout the Territory. This bonus is to continue only until the legislature has had opportunity to act upon the matter.

AGRICULTURE

Hawaii is essentially an agricultural community, agriculture being the basis of our economic life. Its scientific development throughout the Territory cannot be overemphasized.

Tremendous strides have been made in the production of our principal crops, and scientific advances in the cultivation of sugar and pineapples have attained world renown. An understandable but short-sighted policy has led us to lean upon two crops that have proved profitable to the exclusion of others that would have made us self-sufficient.

We have neglected the basic problem of the production of food necessary for our daily existence and have leaned heavily on importation from the mainland. At this particular time it is highly important that we put our best brains into the production of food, which is so vital to the well-being of the Territory. The increase in population, the problems of transportation and importation of foodstuffs from continental United States have served to accentuate and aggravate our food problem.

I regret to say that during this very critical period since December 7, 1941, we have failed to meet the problem presented. This problem must be met in a satisfactory manner, not only for the present emergency, but as a long-range policy in our economic life after the war.

This problem is now acute. It is essential that we take steps at once to stimulate the production of food for our daily use. Small farmers must be encouraged; there is ample

land throughout this Territory available for this purpose, and, if necessary, some of the marginal lands presently used for the production of our major crops could be diverted for this essential purpose.

At the present time we are using Federal funds for this purpose. These may not be available after July 1 of this year, hence adequate provision should be made by the Territory for the purpose of financing food production and distribution.

TAXATION

The great influx of war workers and others into the Territory and the unprecedented amount of buying resulting from the great flow of wealth into the Territory on account of the defense construction has resulted in the tax office enjoying the biggest year in its history. The office consequently needs expansion in personnel and facilities so that taxes may be collected with maximum efficiency.

A study should be made of exemptions of real property. The amount of real property that escapes taxation due to the ever expanding list of exemptions has become a serious problem. A casual examination of the exemptions as set forth in chapter 61, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1935, shows the extent of real property escaping taxation.

Not only do I consider such exemptions undesirable from an economic standpoint, but of doubtful validity under section 55 of the organic act. As the law now stands, even business property leased to the United States is tax-exempt.

There can be no legitimate reason for this to exist or continue. To correct this evil, I recommend that all laws exempting real property from taxation be repealed excepting only real property owned by the United States, the Territory, and the counties.

POLICE COMMISSIONS

The city-county of Honolulu and the county of Maui have by legislative enactments been operating under police commissions. This practice has proven itself far superior to the system of the elective sheriff and I strongly urge that you enact legislation providing for police commissions for the county of Hawaii and the county of Kauai. At this time it is imperative that our police machinery operate with maximum efficiency and effectiveness.

COUNTY ACTIVITIES AND FINANCES

The several counties of the Territory have had serious difficulty in balancing their budgets from year to year. Various proposals have been made to turn over to the county certain Territorial taxes.

I suggest that the legislature investigate and consider the feasibility of the Territory taking over certain of the burdens now imposed upon the counties which are primarily Territorial activities, for example, such as the support and maintenance of the courts and also take over certain of the functions and activities of the counties, the latter in the interest of both economy and efficiency as well as relieving the county of considerable financial burden.

CIRCUIT COURTS OF HAWAII

The island of Hawaii has two circuit courts, the fourth circuit with its sessions at Hilo and the third circuit at Kailua. This was necessary 40 years ago when it took 2 or 3 days to make the journey between these points. It is no longer necessary today and the business of the island is not too much for one efficient judge.

I recommend that the two circuits be combined under the title of third judicial circuit but with sessions to be held both in Hilo and Kailua.

I may add that this proposed consolidation has the approval of the Attorney General of the United States. As there is an existing vacancy in the fourth circuit judgeship, the proposed consolidation will meet no legal objections.

EQUAL RIGHTS COMMISSION

The Territorial Equal Rights Commission has proved its usefulness during the war period in serving as an official medium of information and helping directly to counteract false and injurious rumors reflecting on the conduct of Hawaii's people during the emergency. The Commission is now studying a plan of representation at Washington and full cooperation with Hawaii's Delegate to Congress and other officials of the Territory who may be on missions there.

I recommend continued support of the Commission as experience proves its work and scope will probably increase.

MARTIAL LAW AND MILITARY GOVERNMENT

On December 7, 1941, the Governor of Hawaii issued a proclamation suspending the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, declaring martial law and requesting the commanding general to exercise all the powers normally exercised by the Governor, the powers normally exercised by judicial officers and employees of the Territory, and of the counties and cities thereof. Under this unprecedented proclamation a military government was set up, exercising executive, judicial, and legislative functions.

Under my proclamation issued February 8 of this year the management of civil affairs was restored to civil authority as of March 10 except for certain specified subjects which are primarily of military concern. However, martial law was and will be continued so long as military conditions demand, as will also the suspension of the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus.

This modification was made with the approval of the President, the Secretary of War, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of the Interior, who agreed that military control of civilian matters should be thus modified so as to restore to a large extent civilian control over civil matters.

The history of Hawaii for the last 165 years has been one of progress toward the essentials of self-government by a free and freedom-loving people. This progress, though occasionally retarded by temporary causes, has continued throughout the days of the monarchy, the revolution, the provisional government, the republic, of annexation, and of the organized Territorial government. Its legislative, executive, and judicial history is no mean record.

On December 7, 1941, the people of Hawaii responded loyally and efficiently to the demands of the sudden war emergency and in the 15 months since have shown their capacity to meet these stern tests. For these months we have had a military government. Soon, on March 10, most of the civilian functions will be restored to the civil authorities. This adds to our responsibilities as Americans and citizens of the Territory. We must demonstrate our capacities for self-government equal to the confidence which our national officers have shown in us.

It is not too much to say that on the record of this legislature and this administration depends largely the future of government in Hawaii.

I have profound faith in the ability of Hawaii's people. I have profound reliance in the integrity, courage, and will to achieve of our citizens and their elected representatives. I have confidence we will meet the challenge of these difficult days, that we will fully demonstrate our capacity for self-government.

We shall not, we must not, we will not, fail!

INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
Governor of Hawaii.

Farm Labor a Three-Way Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I place in the RECORD my remarks on the subject of farm labor, made before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Deficiencies, during their consideration of House Joint Resolution 96, March 11, 1943. The remarks follow:

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman the general problem was well discussed by others in the full committee this morning. I will confine myself pretty much to specific suggestions of what might be done.

The problem of farm labor it seems to me falls under three headings.

First, the stoppage of losses of farm labor.

Second, the recruitment of new farm labor.

Third, the recapture, possibly, of some of the farm labor that has been lost.

Now, under the first, the stoppage of losses, I recognize the limitations on the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee to meet that problem and some of these other things. Yet in the proposed legislation before the full committee this morning there was a suggestion of trying to make an approach that was wider than a sheer appropriation of money; hence I venture to suggest recommendations in that field.

The first thing would be to recommend that the local selective-service boards be instructed to take the initiative in deferring the keymen on farms whose taking will mean the destruction of the farm as an operating unit.

Now, the draft boards may hesitate to do that. In that case the county defense boards should be requested to take that initiative. The farm boys themselves hesitate to ask to be deferred. I would if I were a boy on the farm; I would not want to make the decision that I was more important there than carrying a gun. The boys hesitate to do it. In every county, however, there is a United States Department of Agriculture defense board. That board is charged with the war program as it affects farms and could very properly be asked to take the initiative in requesting a deferment for key farmers, those whose going means destruction of a farm unit.

The second thing, in the stoppage of losses, would be to ask the War Manpower Commission to direct the United States Employment Service managers in the local offices not to refer to industry men who ought to be on the farm. The War Manpower Commission has assumed equal authority in the field of industry itself by a recent directive. They announced that the employment should not be offered by employers unless individuals were referred to them by the United States Employment Service.

A simple directive to the managers from the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission that they should not refer farm boys to industrial jobs unless they knew that they could be replaced upon the farm should stop further loss to industry.

If 60 percent of losses in farm manpower are to industry rather than to the armed forces, Congress should be as much concerned about that as about deferring calls into the armed forces.

I come, then, to the recruitment of labor, or the finding of a new labor supply. The thing that I would place first in importance is the assurance that the farmers will get adequate machinery and repairs. Machinery is manpower.

I have here a telegram from the chairman of the South Dakota United States War Board whom I had asked for a report on farm labor conditions in the State. He reports in his telegram that he has contacted through his organization approximately 70 percent of the farmers in South Dakota on their production problems. This is his conclusion:

"The chief obstacles which must be overcome are labor and machinery. There will be an urgent need for harvesting equipment. If repairs are available, farmers can get by this year without too much other new farm equipment."

That summary is in keeping with letters that I have had from a great many individual farmers.

Here is a pencil-written letter by a dirt farmer whom I know personally, a man well qualified to speak. He says:

"We old loyal men and women will produce the foodstuff if they give us the improved equipment and we will beat the world. I need a plow this year and need to keep my truck going and a little fuel, and I will produce more than in 1942."

So it seems to me that the over-all approach to the problem places the securing of the assurance of adequate repairs and machinery as probably the most important thing in increasing the productivity of manpower on the farm.

Mr. LUDLOW. On page 175 is discussed very diligently by the Secretary of Agriculture the subject with reference to mechanizing farming and the needs of repairs and the need of replacing mechanisms on the farm. I asked him if there was any way of getting an arrangement made whereby he could get new tractors and new combines for the farmers when the old ones would wear out. He answered, "Yes, sir, we are in negotiation with the War Production Board, not only for more steel for the manufacture of farm machinery, but for a definite schedule of delivery. In other words, it is not the amount of steel you get, it is when you get it, to see that it is delivered in time for planting the crop and for cultivating the crop and for harvesting the crop.

"To be quite frank with you we have failed to get the amount of steel that we ought to have to make the machinery for this spring's planting."

I think that is interesting.

Mr. CASE. That does fit in, and I think that the Secretary is right in his emphasis on the necessity for a definite schedule of delivery.

It happens that we have a place that we call a ranch; you would call it a farm here. I got a ration certificate from my county board in January for a certain piece of equipment that was allocated to the county. I attempted to get that in three different makes. One manufacturer's stock was exhausted; another had no allocation for my county. The third said that his pieces of that equipment had been frozen but that I should watch the papers for an announcement when the machinery would be released because probably at some time during the year it would be released and probably at some time during the year I would be able to get it. Of course, that did not help much.

Obviously, a farmer cannot plan his operations unless he can be assured definitely as to whether or not he is going to get equipment at the time he will need it in the harvesting process.

As the second thing, in the recruitment of new labor, I would place what was suggested this morning, that is, the utilization of the Extension Service and county agents throughout the country for the organization and mobilization of the latent manpower in every farming community. That would include the people in offices and shops and stores and schools to do part-time work. It would include a concerted effort to have the schools close early in May so that the maximum utilization of high-school boys could be accomplished. Or, in some places, it may be found better to have 2 days off in a week, instead of Saturday alone.

The truth is, I think, that in practically every community there is some latent part-time farm manpower, people who are familiar with the farming that goes on in that territory. Organization of these people in work corps, or listing of them for definite work assignments would be superior to bringing in people who are unfamiliar with the farming operations of any given community.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is there anything in your State laws pertaining to children attending school working?

Mr. CASE. Yes; there are, but, of course, that would not interfere if the schools were scheduled to close early. I know one high school in my district that has set up its graduation to April 23. Normally they run until the 1st of June but they are getting out that much earlier so that the boys can go to work. I think that they are holding sessions on Saturday now in order to get their courses out of the way.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And you have no State law that controls that?

Mr. CASE. The boards of education have considerable leeway. There is a State law as to the ages at which children can be hired. Then, the third thing, under new recruitment is the importation of labor. One of the gentlemen this morning suggested that there was a much more simple way of getting Mexican laborers than that which has been employed. He made a suggestion that could be followed. Recruitment of farm labor to handle war-needed crops is hardly an occasion for pressing a social welfare program. I was amazed this morning to hear the gentleman from Georgia say $1,500,000 had been expended last year and only about 13,000 or 14,000 workers obtained.

Mr. TARVER. Allocated. I understand that only $198,000 has actually been expended, and it has been a 7-month program, not all last year.

Mr. CASE. In this connection, there is one thing that has occurred to me, and in mentioning it I recognize a man can show a great deal of ignorance—fools rush in where angels fear to tread—and that is the consideration of Puerto Rico as a possible labor supply. We have heard a great deal about the Puerto Rican problem and we are going to be asked to appropriate money because of it. If the Mexicans offer a reasonably satisfactory source of labor, it seems to me some investigation ought to be made of the possibility of utilizing some of the Puerto Rican labor which I understand is idle. We are told that the island is heavily overpopulated.

At least, in the case of Puerto Rico, we would not have the problem of meeting treaty requirements and immigration laws that are found in importing Mexicans, and we might save ourselves appropriating to alleviate over-population in Puerto Rico.

Those are the three fields that occur to me under the subject of recruitment: Better assurance of machinery and repairs; organization of local labor, part-time or otherwise; and investigation of Puerto Rico as a source of imported workers.

Now, as to the recapture of farm labor gone from the farms. I would not for one instant want to be put in the position of depriving the armed forces of one man they need. Personally, I am not in favor of a mandatory deferment of all farm boys. I think such a proposal fails to consider the needs of the individuals that ought to be considered. I think it is unfair to the farm boys. There are some farm boys who can be spared and who ought to be in the armed forces when we are at war. Many of them would resent being told they could not go. It would be unfair to them if they were deferred by law, regardless of the labor supply on their farms.

The recapture of farmers already in the armed services is among suggestions heard. That offers a very special problem and I doubt that this committee can do much about it. Specific legislation would be required, I fear, and there are so many questions involved in the return of any man, that I doubt if much can be done in time to help this spring. Where a man is, how much military training he has had, whether he can be replaced at his post of duty—these are some of the problems.

It so happens that I recently asked the War Department for a specific statement on the procedure to be followed for the release of men over 38 years of age who are already in the Army. Under date of March 9, just 2 days ago, I received a reply from the War Department, and with your permission I will leave that to be inserted in the record. I think it will convince you that little help is to be expected from this source. I might state that in the answer the War Department sets forth the entire procedure for the release of men who are over 38 years of age and also those who are under 38 years of age, but the statement by Colonel Pearson concludes with this sentence:

"I am forced to state that a discharge under the method mentioned is a cumbersome procedure and must not only be approved by the local military authorities but by the headquarters of Selective Service in Washington, D. C. Discharges such as indicated are provided for in the Selective Service Act of 1940, Section 5 (a)."

Obviously with a procedure which the liaison officer says is cumbersome, and a procedure that requires the approval not only of the local military authorities, but of the headquarters of Selective Service in Washington, there is very little to be expected under existing regulations.

Mr. LUDLOW. On that very point on page 174, Secretary Wickard was testifying and I would like to read what he has said:

"We have been told by the Army people—we have had discussions on this topic—but they say that they might have 375,000 farm boys in the Army who are still in the country. They cite the fact that they have had difficulty getting men over 38 who can be released to go back to the farms. A lot of them do not like to leave the service. A lot of them say that the pay is going to be less on the farms when they go back. A lot of them, since they have had some training, perhaps have gotten some advancement; I do not know how much we could do. That is, if we were to do this sort of thing, how many we can get out of 375,000 that they say is in the Army, that might be allowed to go back."

Mr. CASE. If you gentlemen will read this procedure you can see how it can be accomplished whether he is over 38 or under 38, but it is not encouraging.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to leave this letter to be inserted in the record at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, March 9, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: Reference your inquiry of this afternoon, there follows a statement as to the policy of the War Department relative the discharge of men 38 years of age and over in order that they may engage in essential industry, including agriculture.

There also is furnished herewith a statement as to the matter of discharge of men under 38 years of age in order that they may

engage in essential industry, including agriculture.

1. Enlisted men stationed within the continental United States: a. Within the continental United States, an enlisted man 38 years of age and over who is on active duty may be discharged for the convenience of the Government, if he—

(1) Reached his thirty-eighth birthday on or before February 28, 1943.

(2) Enlisted or was inducted into the Army on or before February 28, 1943.

(3) (a) Prior to May 1, 1943, voluntarily submitted to his immediate commanding officer written request for discharge. Failure by the enlisted man to submit written request prior to May 1, 1943, will forfeit any right to discharge under the provisions of this memorandum. Note that the limiting date pertains to the submission of the application. Actual discharge may be effected at any convenient time subsequent to submission of application, or may be indefinitely postponed when the interests of the service so dictate.

(b) Commanders having discharge authority are authorized to extend the time for submission of application in individual cases when the soldier did not have reasonable opoprtunity to file his application. (For example, because of absence on furlough.)

(4) Has presented evidence in the form of a letter or statement from a prospective employer, the United States Employment Service, farm agent, or other responsible person to the effect that the individual concerned will be employed in an essential industry, including agriculture, if he is discharged from the Army.

b. If the enlisted man meets the requirements of a above, he will be discharged unless such action will seriously affect the efficiency of the organization to which he is assigned.

c. All enlisted men upon submission of application for discharge under the provisions of this memorandum will be informed that acceptance of an application for discharge will not be considered as a promise to release an individual. Acceptance of an application means that the enlisted man's request will receive prompt consideration. If early discharge seems probable, commanders will so inform the applicants, giving an estimate as to the effective date thereof, in order that each soldier may make plans and inform his prospective employer.

d. Commanding officers having discharge authority will effect discharge of men under the provisions of this memorandum in such a manner as to cause the minimum interference with administration, training, and transportation facilities; however, action on each application will be expedited.

2. Enlisted men stationed outside the continental United States: The instructions in paragraph 1 apply to enlisted men stationed outside the continental United States except that—

a. Application for discharge mentioned in paragraph 1a (3) may be submitted at any date prior to June 1, 1943.

b. The enlisted man will not be released from duty overseas unless a suitable trained replacement is present and available.

c. Commanders are authorized to waive the provisions of paragraph 1a (4) pertaining to evidence of future employment.

3. Members of Enlisted Reserve Corps on inactive status: Members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps on inactive status who have attained their thirty-eighth birthday on or before February 28, 1943, will be discharged unless they request orders to active duty. If ordered to active duty at their own request, these men forfeit any right to discharge under the provisions of this memorandum.

4. Discharge of enlisted men from active service who are under 38 years of age: If the soldier is under 38 years of age, a different problem is presented. He must apply for discharge from the service for the maintenance of national health, safety, or interest. He should forward with his application a statement setting forth the position offered him in civil life in essential war industry, with all the supporting and duly attested data he is able to obtain to prove his case.

I am forced to state that a discharge under the method mentioned is a cumbersome procedure and must not only be approved by the local military authorities but by the headquarters of Selective Service in Washington, D. C. Discharges such as indicated are provided for in the Selective Service Act of 1940, section 5–E.

I trust that the above is the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

WM. F. PEARSON,
Colonel, A. G. D., Liaison.

Mr. CASE. There is more likelihood of success if consideration be given to the recapture of men who have been lost to industry. If two-thirds of the farm boys lost have gone into industries rather than into the armed forces, some attention should be given to making it possible for them to take their places on the farms again. Now, much could be accomplished, it seems to me, in two ways:

First of all, when a man leaves a construction job that is completed, he ought not to be referred to another industrial job if he is a man with a farm training. He should be referred to a farm. Here, again, a policy could be established by the War Manpower Board by a directive to the United States Employment Service that would insure the man's going back to the farm rather than going to another job in industry.

If that step resulted in a shortage of manpower in industry, as it might, my second suggestion would be that members of the Appropriations Committee throw their influence behind a movement to establish a 54-hour week in industry for the duration. Personally I regard the establishment of a 54-hour week in industry in wartime as the greatest possible source of increasing the manpower of the country, coupled, of course, with steps to eliminate and avoid absenteeism.

The CHAIRMAN. We do not have jurisdiction over that.

Mr. TARVER. When the gentleman refers to a 54-hour week, does he mean a week without time and a half for overtime over 40 hours?

Mr. CASE. Yes; straight time for the 54 hours, time and a half over that. I would point out that the President's directive increasing the workweek to 48 hours contemplates time and a half for the hours above 40. Now, obviously that is highly inflationary because it contemplates an increase in pay rolls and purchasing power out of proportion to goods produced. A 54-hour week as the base week for the duration would mean 2 hours more of pay than 52 hours' pay for 48 hours so that the worker's pay check would be larger and you would be getting 6 hours more of work, an increase of one-eighth, the equivalent of millions of new workers. If we are in an all-out war, a 54-hour workweek for the duration is the most promising answer to the manpower problem.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for its attention.

Production of Electric Power in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release from the railroad commission of the State of California:

RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
February 6, 1943.

Ample electric power will be produced in California during 1943 to adequately care for the State's war-busy industries and needs of the civilian population, President Franck Havenner, of the California Railroad Commission, announced today on the basis of a Statewide summary on electric power and light requirements, completed by commission engineers.

The commission's staff reported that the total peak demands of customers in the California market area totaled 2,716,000 kilowatts in December of 1942, as compared with 2,709,000 kilowatts in the same month during 1941, an increase of one-quarter of 1 percent from the preceding year.

The investigation shows that the increased loads and operations of war industries, broadening out in many cases during the year from one-shift operations to two and three shifts per day, has substantially increased the consumption of electrical energy. The demands have also increased for such loads, but the daylight-saving time, coupled with the dimouts now in effect throughout most of California, have largely offset the increased demands of war industries. Since the need for new electric-steam and hydro-generating equipment under present conditions in California is measured by the peak demand of kilowatts rather than the consumption as measured in kilowatt-hours, the latter developments have confirmed conclusions reached earlier in the year by a joint board representing the War Production Board, Bureau of Reclamation, and California Railroad Commission. The commission survey indicates that present capacity, coupled with the new hydroelectric power projects as well as additional hydroelectric generating units in Boulder Canyon and steam-electric plants at San Diego, Los Angeles, and Burbank, now in process of installation and scheduled for completion in 1943, will satisfactorily meet the prospective war demands in addition to civilian demands for electrical energy.

The commission has kept in constant touch with the power situation because of the vital part that it plays in the war effort, for the industrial and agricultural productivity of the State, Havenner said.

The cycle of wet years which California has enjoyed has had a most favorable effect on the electric-power situation. This favorable position cannot always be hoped for, and all studies are based on the assumption of low winter rainfall and consequent lessened hydroelectric capacity, according to the report by Commission engineers.

Shortages of Farm Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I have received from Mary H. Hartsock, legislative member of East Wayne Advisory Council, Warren County, Ohio, which vividly describes existing shortages of farm equipment and repair parts in the agricultural sections of the Nation, and

suggests certain actions that may be taken to remedy the situation.

I commend this letter to the attention of all Members of Congress, but especially to the attention and consideration of the War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Food Administrator.

The letter is as follows:

WAYNESVILLE, OHIO, *March 8, 1943.*

Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The East Wayne Advisory Council, a discussion group consisting of 15 families, met last week for discussion of the problems of shortage of labor and shortage of machinery and repairs. One of the members is on the county committee which is supposed to untangle the mess in which the farmer finds himself.

The farmer does not complain about a 16-hour day, 7 days per week, but he does know that, if the crops are to be planted, tended, and harvested, he must have his machinery in running order at the right time. Each year certain repairs on machinery are absolutely necessary. Local stores have very little, if any, at the present time. Some of the men went to the International Harvester Co. in Cincinnati to get parts so that their machinery would be ready when it is needed. Some parts were not available at all. They got the last of others. Many of the bins which hold parts were completely empty. The men in charge of the store had no idea when more parts would be available. As you know, this store supplies southern Ohio, southern Indiana, and northern Kentucky.

For 2 years it has been very difficult to get parts for Allis-Chalmers machinery. Last summer a belt for the combine broke. The owner stopped combining and started out in the car. Before he found one, he had gone to four different places, traveling a distance of 70 miles. This took over 4 gallons of gas and all of one morning. If this delay had not been necessary, he could have combined about 7 more acres of wheat that day. This is a negligible amount, if only one person is considered, but the same sort of thing happened to farmers everywhere last year.

Now the situation is worse. With parts not available here we will have to send to the factory and wait about 2 months for them to arrive. Wheat which is ready to combine in June will not be worth bothering with in August or September. Corn which should be planted in May will not make feed if planted in July. If corn pickers are not repaired immediately there will be more than 17 percent of the corn crop still in the field at this time next year. With the present shortage of food, we cannot afford to use our corn crop for feeding the rats and the field mice. The farmer must have repairs on the spot when he needs them.

Our group has two suggestions to make, which we hope will help to remedy the present situation. Most of the work concerned would need to be done locally, but it would be necessary to have different localities coordinated for best results.

First, we think that the location of each piece of machinery should be listed in a central place. This listing should include (1) kind of machine (2) make of machine (3) size (4) age. Also, long enough in advance of the time when the machine will be needed, a competent person should make a thorough check-up of each piece of machinery to determine what repairs are needed and what repairs are likely to be needed during the season. A report of this check-up should be given to the place where the machinery is listed and in turn their report should be sent on to the companies which make the parts. Thus parts would be sent to the places where they are needed instead of having a surplus one place and a total lack somewhere else.

Our second suggestion is that stores which carry parts should keep a running inventory and make weekly reports of what they have on hand for machinery being used in that particular season. This report should be sent to the same central place where machinery is listed, and the information should be sent to all dealers in the surrounding territory in order that each dealer may know where to locate parts if his need is greater than his supply.

We hope that you will give our problems and our suggestions your very careful consideration.

Very sincerely yours,

MARY H. HARTSOCK
(Mrs. Luther H.),
Legislative Member of East Wayne Advisory Council, Warren County, Ohio.

On the Florida Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HENDRICKS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Evening Bulletin, Providence, R. I., March 5, 1943:

ON THE FLORIDA CANAL

EDITOR: Your fine and timely editorial, Our Best Bet, in your February 21 issue, has come to our notice. What is the unseen force blocking the Jersey and Florida connecting links in a sheltered intracoastal waterway so vital to the North Atlantic seaboard and its hinterland?

Failure to improve the Atlantic and Gulf coast inland waterway routes in time to avert fuel-oil and gasoline shortages in New York and New England is water over the dam so far as this winter goes. But another and a more critical winter will soon be upon us. We have no time to lose.

The Florida barge canal could be completed within a year. The necessary oil barges and towboats could be available, we are told, before snow flies next fall. Now is the time to start digging.

Who can say how long the present emergency will last? What informed authority can deny that, with a completed Florida and Jersey Canal, our country will have an incomparable Intracoastal Waterway, safe and sheltered, stretching from the Mexican border to Massachusetts Bay; a peacetime asset of incalculable value. Surely, if earnest effort is made, there is some way in which forces can be set in motion to complete this great waterway.

Every day of delay intensifies the fuel situation, now already grave, along the North Atlantic coast and its hinterland. This is the most densely populated and industrialized area of the Nation. Our railroads are doing a grand job, but if they bog down owing to the tremendous war transportation load superimposed on civil transportation, we can blame ourselves for the wide distress that follows. Why must we continue to put all our transportation eggs only in the railroad basket? The bottom may fall out any day.

In view of their indisputable all-time value and the certain current urgent need for them, what is really holding up the completion of our Gulf and Atlantic Intracoastal Waterways?

JOHN L. BOGERT,
Associate Editor, Marine Journal.
NEW YORK.

Dwarfs Cost of the Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of March 8, 1943:

DWARFS COST OF THE CANAL

Persons to whom the cost of the proposed through canal from Lake Erie to the Ohio River has seemed prohibitive will revise their opinion after reading figures given out by Congressman JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Congressman MANSFIELD'S statement, published in yesterday's Vindicator, showed that while the through canal would cost about $200,000,000, the Government is now spending at the rate of $400,000,000 a year to reimburse oil shippers for the difference between what they are paying to ship oil by rail and what they formerly paid when they shipped by water.

Besides, Mr. MANSFIELD pointed out, the Government is now building a pipe line from Texas to the Atlantic seaboard at a cost of $95,000,000. If the normal demands of the East are to be met, four more such pipe lines will be needed. Each line will require 355,000 tons of critical steel.

To accomplish what it could have achieved by spending $200,000,000 on the canal, the Government will now have to spend between half a billion and a billion or more, depending on the length of the war.

The pipe lines can be used for a single purpose—the delivery of oil from the West to the East. The Lake Erie-Ohio River canal, on the other hand, would have innumerable uses. If it had been built before the war, it would have prevented the fuel famine which has deprived so many Eastern States of heat in this coldest of winters, and it would have done much to prevent the railroad congestion which has thrown most of the eastern roads off schedule these many months. Traffic on the canal would be in two directions: Canada and the Eastern States would use it to ship their products west; Pennsylvania and Ohio use it to ship their steel and other products down the Ohio and Mississippi.

Congressman MANSFIELD has proved that the advocates of the canal are not visionary. They have urged it for its many patent economic advantages in peacetime. Now the whole country can see that it would have been one of the best and cheapest measures of national defense, as well.

Post-War Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the report of the National Resources Planning Board, presenting the cradle-to-the-grave post-war planning

proposals, is very interesting and should cause American citizens to give very serious thought to the subject. While it is realized that this is only a report and not a legislative proposal, yet I think we may undoubtedly expect, in the near future, requests for legislation to carry into effect most, if not all, of these proposals.

In general, the report recommends:

SOCIAL SERVICES

Benefit payments to workers under social security who become ill or disabled.

Federal aid to qualified youths who desire college training.

Extension of social security to some classes now exempt.

Aid to local communities to build hospitals as part of a broad health program including Government cooperation with the medical profession in a plan for patients to pay medical expenses on a budget plan.

Greater assistance to the aged, blind, and other groups receiving public assistance.

Free lunches for all school children.

WAR-TO-PEACE ECONOMY

Guarantee every man released from armed forces or war plants a job with "fair pay and working conditions."

Continue rationing and other wartime restrictions so long as necessary.

Give labor "responsibility in organization and sharing in management."

Consolidation of railroads into a limited number of regional systems.

Government-private partnership in some plants and facilities with Government deciding what concerns should be left operating in such fields as aircraft, shipbuilding, aluminum, and magnesium.

I recognize the urgent necessity for those charged with the responsibility of government to think ahead and to see to it, as far as we can, that we are prepared to meet problems that will undoubtedly occur at the end of the war. I cannot, however, subscribe to the philosophy embodied in the cradle-to-the-grave report. In my judgment, the whole thing is based upon an entirely false premise.

In the first place, the report seems to assume that immediately upon the cessation of hostilities there will be vast unemployment due to demobilization of troops and war industry.

In the second place, the report apparently assumes that the post-war period will be one of great economic distress and depression, calling for a record-breaking Federal support of its citizens; and

Finally, the report seems to assume that American citizens have neither the inclination nor the ability to do anything for themselves.

The old homely admonition to thrift and self-reliance are ignored, and instead the citizen is given assurance that he has nothing to worry about, dear old Uncle Sam will be there to succor, comfort, and support.

Not only is the scheme based upon a false premise but the planners apparently took no account whatsoever of the cost of the undertaking. Such planners rarely are concerned with the practical problem of financing or paying for their utopian dreams. The "cradle-to-the-grave" school of thought is apparently concerned only with the idea of having dear old Uncle Sam take each of his children by the hand at the cradle and lead them down the highway of life, under his support, guidance, and protection until he reaches the grave. At the grave the planners apparently leave him to shift for himself, though something may be done about that later.

DEMOBILIZATION

I do not think we have the right to assume that with the cessation of hostilities our armed forces are going to be immediately demobilized or that war industry will at once stop. It would seem to me that following cessation of hostilities, there will be perhaps an extended period during which peace negotiations would be under consideration and during which time it would be not only expedient but necessary that we maintain certainly a large portion of our armed forces in this country and abroad. Certainly it should be true that we should proceed with the building of our two-ocean Navy and with our merchant ship program and the rounding out of our air force. Therefore, it should not be a very difficult problem to go through such a period of transition in which there will be a gradual slacking off of the manpower required in the armed forces and in the war industry, which would enable these workers to assume their places in the economic life of the Nation, on the farm and in other trades and callings that can and will be resumed after the war.

POST-WAR DEPRESSION

Likewise, and for these reasons, I do not think we can assume that the post-war period will be one of great economic distress and depression. Certainly, it is true that it will call for alert and intelligent leadership. We will have, at the end of the war, a mobilized industry, running at an all-time high. The devastated world will be our customers for everything that we can furnish to them in the way of manufactured goods, commodities, machinery, equipment, and every product of our industry. Not only that, but vast agricultural areas, being then able to secure necessary labor, will find a world market for their produce. Also, American citizens, having long been denied the opportunity to purchase, not only necessities, but some of the luxuries of life, will be in the market as purchasers and with money to pay.

BUILDING BOOM

Again, one of our largest and most profitable industries in normal times is the building-trades industry. This industry furnishes large opportunities for the employment of skilled and unskilled labor, as well as manufacturing business. Today, many States, cities, localities, and firms and individuals are laying plans for large building and construction programs, just as soon as the war effort releases materials and labor. There is much work to be done and there will be ready money to pay for it.

So it would seem to me that when we picture a post-war America with millions of our citizens unable to care for themselves, incapable of finding work and forced to rely upon the Federal Government, that we are making an assumption that is not only unjustified but that might be considered an admission of our inability to furnish the leadership that will take advantage of these conditions.

SELF-RELIANCE

To me, one of the most objectionable features of the cradle-to-the-grave scheme is that it seeks to give the impression that Americans are not able to care for themselves and that they must be supported by the Federal Government. If this plan were put into effect, vastly enlarging Social Security, furnishing aid to students of all categories, furnishing medical assistance under Federal supervision, and then, with our vast pension systems of all the war, there would indeed be very few of us that would not be on the Federal pay roll in some form or other. To me, it is fantastic. I have always subscribed to the philosophy of government that it is the prime duty of the citizen to support the state, and not the state support the citizen. I have always believed that the greatest assistance that the Federal Government can render to its citizens is to keep its own house in order, to pursue sound National fiscal policy, and to see to it that every man, woman, and child has a fair, square, and equal opportunity in the scheme of things: That by fostering and supporting individual initiative and a system of free enterprise, we can give our citizens the most ultimate protection and lasting security.

There is no security so sweet and consoling as a little home and a competence for declining years that one has provided for himself by his own brain and brawn. The objective of a good government should always be to help the citizen to help himself.

To my way of thinking, among the greatest virtues of American citizenship are independence, self-reliance, and individual responsibility. Not only is it the privilege, but it is the duty of every citizen to stand upon his own feet, and to move out on his own motive power, to support himself and his dependents as far as it is within his power to do so.

If, because of physical infirmities or economic conditions over which he has no control, he is unable to do this, then the problem arises for him to have assistance from his own locality, from his State or from the Federal Government, if need be. These are old-fashioned and home-spun characteristics but it was by their practice that Americans built here in the Western Hemisphere a great nation of great people. It seems to be that in a post-war period, all economic factors will be favorable to America but everything will, of course, depend upon where we sit at the peace table, who represents us at this conference and whether or not, as a nation, we have the courage and the ability to coordinate and utilize these favorable factors.

The New Draft Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of March 8, 1943:

THE NEW DRAFT REGULATIONS

The administration has tackled the most urgent phase of the manpower problem by ordering blanket deferment of farm workers, if they are real farmers, and by making the continued deferment of men 38 to 45 depend on their getting farm jobs. Some such action was plainly necessary to assure the production of food on which all else depends. The moves are only preliminary and partial approaches toward the whole manpower problem, but they may be expected to hasten broader action.

Draft boards no longer have discretion, once they have determined that a man actually is engaged in productive farming. They must defer him. Moreover, the county farm boards are given authority to request deferment. If this policy makes it impossible for the draft boards to fill their quotas, then the military call is to be left unfilled. In addition, the Army is to release 546,000 men for industry and agriculture.

This policy, standing alone, would leave the armed forces short of their needs. Yet the informal 5-man committee on manpower (Byrnes, Baruch, Hopkins, Leahy, and Rosenman) has determined to support the military demand for 11,000,000 men by the end of this year. As the new agricultural policy squeezes the Army, the Army will have to squeeze some other part of the population, and this will require broader action in the manpower field.

As this chain of necessities becomes evident the country will see the need of more drastic and sweeping over-all measures. If possible these should not go to the extreme of the bill to draft labor introduced recently by two Republicans, Senator AUSTIN and Representative WADSWORTH. A similar bill, now being prepared by Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, may be presented soon. Both are open to serious objection and would be vigorously opposed by labor.

There is opposition to an out-and-out drafting of labor because of the wide difference between drafting a man for his country's Army and forcing him to work in private employ. Some way to avoid the undesirable features of a labor draft should be worked out, if possible, while still attaining the essential result.

The administration's delays and tentative approaches may yet justify themselves. If the President had acted broadly and firmly before the country fully realized the situation, there would have been an outcry that the action was not yet necessary, and that it was a dictatorial exercise of power. As the country comes to understand the urgency and extent of the manpower problem, it will support broad and drastic measures.

If adequate action can come from Congress, so much the better, for the charge of dictatorial policy would then be avoided. In any event, it is evident that the new farm regulations are only the beginning, and that the country must come to grips with the general manpower problem before the year is much further advanced.

Salary Increase for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. CURLEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is pleasing to find that after a lapse of 18 years, the Congress of the United States is prepared to render a tardy and long-delayed measure of justice to the men in the Postal Service.

My personal opinion is that it should not be regarded as an emergency war measure to continue in force until 6 months after the war but should be made a permanent measure of legislation and this, I assume and trust, will be done before the period designated for expiration has arrived.

There is no branch of the Government service where the requirements are more exacting than in the postal branch, where, in addition to physical fitness of high order, educational qualifications above the average are necessary to pass the required examinations to enter the Postal Service.

The most welcome visitor to any home in America, with the exception of the first day of each month when the bills arrive, is the letter carrier, who, due to the large number of men from the large families of America who have entered the Service, is today required to carry a load similar to that which a pack horse is required to stagger under.

The increase in the cost of living renders it difficult for the men in the Postal Service to replace uniforms as speedily as they might desire if conditions were otherwise, with the result that we see them on bleak, cold days moving along like fading grey shadows, due to the exactions of their employment.

The committee that studied the conduct of the Postal Department are unanimous in the opinion that a revision in the rates of second-, third-, and fourth-class matter would return sufficient income to the Postal Department to meet the $300 annual increase in salaries for more than 300,000 employees of the Postal Department. It has been stated, in the course of debate, that the Comptroller has declared that there will be a veto in the event the increase is granted and I believe I expressed the views of the membership generally when I stated upon the floor of the House that regardless of veto whether by the Comptroller or otherwise, I would vote to grant the long delayed increase in the salaries of men and women in the Postal Service.

Great strides were made in the 9-year period prior to the present war in providing healthful and adequate accommodations for employees of the Postal Department but the fact remains, however, that quarters in many places are insanitary, unhealthful, and cramped and are not conducive to the health of the employees.

As a rule, war takes its toll of progression and in all probability, the improvement of postal facilities, insofar as housing is concerned, will be required to wait until after we have won the war.

There is no justification, however, for delay in the matter of granting relief upon which a majority of the men in the Postal Service, the Members of Congress, and the public generally are in agreement—namely, the $300 increase in pay.

Supplies for the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I have received from one of my constituents which might be multiplied by many thousands of times.

The letter reads as follows:

DETROIT, MICH.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: I know you are very busy with Government problems these days so I will make this as brief as possible.

About a week ago we heard from our son. He writes to his wife and she passes the letters on to us because they are short of writing materials. He has been on Guadalcanal since the first part of January. He said they had seen a great deal of action and had some very narrow escapes. He also said they were very short on fighting equipment and were told they would have to capture it from the Japs. What I would like to know is, Why haven't they the fighting materials they need down there? According to the papers and radio reports, our factories are producing ahead of schedule. Where are all these supplies going? Could it be that Mr. Churchill, our President's adviser, is getting the lion's share of it for his battle fronts? They are so badly in need of planes in the southwest Pacific, but according to reports they are not getting them. Most all of the marines who are now home on furlough from Guadalcanal tell about the lack of equipment there. If our son is killed in battle, I'll not say he gave his life for his country, I'll say his country let him down.

In yesterday's Detroit Times I read that 270 wounded boys had been taken to Battle Creek hospital. Most of them were from Guadalcanal. Some were carried on stretchers, others hobbled painfully and still others were led. The paper stated that some of the parents of these boys had not yet been notified as to their whereabouts or the extent of their injuries. Again I say perhaps some of these injuries could have been avoided if they had had the proper fighting equipment. It's no wonder some of us lose faith in our Government.

There seems to be so much mismanagement everywhere; for example, the shipload of tons of food that was sent to Nome, Alaska, and left there in the harbor to spoil.

A good many of our boys are complaining about the food they are getting in the various camps throughout the country. If the boys in our camps here are not getting the proper food, what about our boys who are overseas?

If I have been too bitter in my denunciations, please forgive me. It's so hard to take it all without a word in self defense.

Sincerely.

Vermont Wins First Place in Nation-Wide Scrap Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, tonight at the State capitol at Montpelier impressive ceremonies will mark the presentation of the first place award to Vermont for the national salvage contest last October. Highlight of the event will be the presentation of an elaborate black onyx plaque, suitably inscribed, which Gov. William H. Wills will receive on behalf of the State of Vermont from the War Production Board.

Awarding of prizes to towns and counties for their part in the scrap campaign will take place in the hall of representatives at the statehouse at 7:30 o'clock this evening.

Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., New England regional director of the War Production Board, will present the plaque to Vermont and Governor Wills will make the presentation to the towns and counties.

Awards will also be made to the winners in the four population groups. These will go to Barre City for communities in excess of 5,000 population; Barretown, winner in the 800 to 5,000 population group; Dummerston for communities with less than 800 people; and Somerset, which was first among unorganized towns, grants, and gores and, incidentally, had the highest per capita rating of any community in the State.

In this connection I sent the following telegram to Governor Wills:

> Vermonters everywhere are proud of the outstanding championship record made by Vermonters at home in the scrap drive and also of the record made by Vermonters at home and abroad in the scrap with the Axis which we propose to win even more decisively.

Our Scrap Situation—Then and Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, during the past year Special Committee No. 3 of the House Military Affairs Committee has held hearings on certain issues and programs that we felt were vital to the success of our military undertakings throughout the world. As never before, this is a war that requires materials, guns, ships, tanks, planes, and all of the other complicated machines essential to the prosecution of modern warfare. These weapons of war are made from the raw materials that we extract from the mines of the country.

Of all of these materials, steel is by far the most important. It enters into and is by weight a large proportion of practically every item that is used by our fighting forces. Steel production, therefore, had to be maintained at the highest possible rate and that rate had to be expanded. Steel is primarily made of two raw materials—pig iron, on the one hand, and scrap iron and steel, on the other. It is roughly made of about one-half of each. We examined the pig-iron facilities and found that the blast furnaces of the country which make pig iron were operating at capacity; that there was a program to expand the number of blast furnaces with the necessary contingent expansions in the mining of iron ore, the shipping of iron ore, and the other facilities that go with the expanding production of pig iron. But we also found that it necessarily would take many months before these new expanded pig-iron facilities could possibly be made available. We also carefully examined the scrap-iron situation.

We found that the responsibility of the procurement of scrap iron and steel was in what is now called the Salvage Division of the War Production Board, under the direction of Paul C. Cabot. A year ago a very serious situation faced the country and the responsibilities of and the load upon the Salvage Division were very great. As I have stated, at that time, in February 1942, the country was faced with the necessity of producing more iron and steel and, as a consequence, with collecting and making available more iron and steel scrap than we or any other country in the world has ever had to furnish. At the very time of this record-breaking demand sources of supply had been or were reduced, restricted, and retarded by many factors. The principal ones were:

(a) Shipments of in excess of 10,000,000 tons to the Japanese in years prior to Pearl Harbor markedly reduced the accumulated reservoir against which we could draw.

(b) A considerable shipment of steel ingot and semifabricated steel to our allies. (The fabrication of these ingots and semifabricated products into finished war material has resulted in the incidence of scrap in foreign countries and the loss of that scrap to this country.)

(c) Conversion of our economy from peacetime to wartime production with the very serious temporary curtailment of production scrap resulting therefrom. The incidental scrap generated through conversion was considerably less than the production scrap which would have been available during a period of active operation.

(d) The shipment of large quantities of guns, tanks, ships, and other materials outside the territorial U. S. A. with practically no recovery of scrap from these sources.

(e) Very drastic curtailment in the production of scrap which is best typified by figures from one of our leading railroads which, before Pearl Harbor, was producing some 20,000 tons monthly but since that time only 4,000 or 5,000 tons per month because of the necessity of the railroads and other normal producers of scrap to keep everything rolling and to patch up and repair all possible equipment.

These and other factors had led to a decline in inventory best indicated by the following figures:

Inventories of scrap iron and steel held by all consumers

[Gross tons]

	End of month inventory
1940:	
March	4,289,000
June	4,452,000
September	4,857,000
December	5,046,000
1941:	
March	4,661,000
June	4,510,000
September	4,032,000
December	3,395,000
1942:	
January	3,127,000
February [1]	3,085,000

[1] Low point of war period.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines.

This serious decline in inventory resulted in the closing of approximately 45 steel-making furnaces as of a year ago.

In brief, this was the situation and the problem that confronted us a year ago, and is the situation which your committee brought to light and developed. At a series of hearings before your committee, the Salvage Division of the War Production Board through its very able Director, Mr. Cabot, explained at length to us exactly the organization that he was engaged in setting up and how he proposed to meet the very difficult problem confronting the country. Suffice it to say, he had examined, as had your committee, the methods and procedures of salvage collections in many foreign countries, including that of Germany. Suffice it to say that the German system is based on laws, coercions, and stern penalties and punishment. The American plan was, and is, and I am assured will continue to be, a democratic plan based primarily upon the use of all the men, women, and children in America volunteering their efforts in their own communities in their own way, under their own initiative, and responsibility, to help solve the problem put before them.

At that time, the Salvage Division had nearly completed the basic volunteer organization comprised primarily of State, county, and local salvage committees. I am informed that, as of today, there are in existence in excess of 14,000 volunteer committees that engage the volunteer services of over a million of our people on a regular organized basis.

Their plans contemplated the physical handling of the material through the normal, customary, and well-constituted channels of trade. We, also, approved of this procedure, recognizing the fact that there are 75 different varieties of iron and steel scrap alone, that this material must be prepared, sorted, graded, and in many instances baled, and then

shipped in large amounts, generally carload lots, to the consuming mills that are making steel to the closest military specifications and that, therefore, must buy not any old type of scrap, but one or more of the specific 75 grades required.

We believe that your committee's commendation of the programs and procedures as outlined by the Salvage Division of the War Production Board has been eminently justified when we examine the results achieved in the preceding year. Of course, no one can say exactly how much of these results are due to the activities of the Salvage Division and the enormous volunteer army that they have enrolled, or the work and cooperation that your committee and others have given, but nonetheless the over-all results are gratifying.

Number of steel-making furnaces shut down because of lack of scrap, 1942

February 1942 (unofficial)	45
Mar. 2	20
Apr. 6	10
May 4	6
June 1	0
July 27	1
August-December	0

Source: American Iron & Steel Institute.

Also, inventory figures are presented below of available supplies of iron and steel scrap since the low point was reached in February 1942:

Visible inventories of scrap iron and steel in hands of consumers and suppliers

[Thousands of gross tons]

1942	Total visible stocks	Consumers' stocks	Suppliers' stocks
Jan. 31	4,100	3,127	973
Feb. 28 [1]	4,072	3,085	987
Mar. 31	4,101	3,090	1,011
Apr. 30	4,324	3,288	1,036
May 31	4,602	3,547	1,055
June 30	4,859	3,837	1,022
July 31	5,086	4,088	998
Aug. 31	5,276	4,268	1,010
Sept. 30	5,545	4,458	1,067
Oct. 31	6,260	4,938	1,322
Nov. 30	6,742	5,427	1,315
Dec. 31	6,917	5,590	1,327

[1] Low point for year.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines.

The foregoing figures will indicate that in spite of the enormous demands and limited supplies referred to, there have been no furnaces shut down for lack of iron and steel scrap since the end of July of a year ago and, of equal or possibly more importance, the inventories of iron and steel scrap in the hands of consumers are today equal to or greater than any this country has ever seen before.

I submit, therefore, that the results obtained are highly satisfactory and certainly must go a long way in endorsing the methods and procedures used to obtain this necessary and gratifying result.

Although all that I have said is concerned solely with iron and steel scrap, I believe that it is important for you to recognize that the results that have been obtained by the Salvage Division of the War Production Board in the last year are by no manner of means solely in terms of iron and steel scrap.

The many volunteer salvage workers, aided by the paid personnel of the Salvage Division, have very greatly increased the collection of other secondary or waste materials that are highly important as an additional source of raw materials to our wartime economy. For example, during the past year, the collection of secondary copper has increased 45 percent over 1941. In July those volunteer committees, aided by the paid personnel of the Salvage Division and under orders from Mr. Nelson, supervised and aided the petroleum industry in the collection of a year and a third's supply of scrap rubber. Since this time, the salvage organization has been responsible for, or at least of great importance in, the continued collection of an amount of scrap rubber approximately equal to current consumption of this material.

These local salvage committees, a year ago turned a shortage of waste paper into a glut of waste paper and thereby made possible a resumption of full activity by the paperboard manufacturers whose activities had been previously reduced because of a lack of this material.

A few of the other articles whose collection this organization has been largely responsible for include 21,400,000 pounds of fats and greases since July 1942, vital to the production of glycerine for explosives and other war materials; 400,000 pounds of silk and nylon stockings, used for powder bags and parachutes; and a collection of used tin cans, currently running at a rate of 25,000 tons per month, which are used primarily as a source of tin and steel scrap after they have been detinned.

There are various other items that could be mentioned but the point I wish to make is that all of these secondary or waste materials generally do not occur in isolated forms. In your attic and in your cellar you undoubtedly have or did have waste paper, waste rubber, waste ferrous and waste nonferrous materials and many others. We have always maintained that this country must have general collections of all types of scrap, rather than collections of a specified commodity. For example, the stimulation in the collection of all types of junk materials resulted in the enormous collection of iron and steel and nonferrous scrap, rubber, and so forth, mentioned above.

From the foregoing, we do not wish to imply that these various materials do not have to be physically handled separately but we do wish to point out to you that in many instances they occur in the same spot—the household, the farm, the auto graveyard or industrial plant, and so forth, and that the stimulation of all collections should be under one rather than numerous functioning organizations.

We are gratified with the work and accomplishments of the Salvage Division of the War Production Board, and have been impressed with the ability and initiative of its Director, Paul C. Cabot. We urge, as do they, that the American public and their State, county, and local salvage committees in no way relax their efforts because the satisfactory supplies that are now available can only be maintained if all of these volunteers continue to work as hard or harder in the future as they did in this last year.

Further, no mention can be made of this subject without emphasizing the splendid newspaper, radio, and industrial support that has been given to the program throughout.

In 1943, and as long as the war lasts, we must have increasing quantities of these important waste materials with which to augment our limited supply of materials necessary for the prosecution of the war. The American people have in the past year demonstrated that they can do this on a voluntary basis far better than the job could be accomplished by laws or restrictions. It is vitally necessary that they continue to do this as long as the war lasts. There must be no let-down.

Absenteeism and Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communications received by me with reference to H. R. 2082:

MARCH 8.

HON. SIR: I am heartily in favor of your bill for prohibition or rationing of liquor for the duration of the war. Would prefer prohibition, but I am afraid that is too much to hope for. Think rationing would be a big help. It wouldn't hurt those who drink in moderation and would save those who drink to excess. If something isn't done, liquor will be the cause of us losing this war. My prayers are with you in this fight to have this bill pass.

(Mrs.) MARY SLINKARD,
Los Angeles, Calif.

PLAINWELL, MICH.,
March 7, 1943.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BRYSON: Your efforts for national prohibition are appreciated. May they bear fruit. At this time of all times, we need fighting men who are not weakened by the use of intoxicating or any alcoholic liquors.

Yours truly,

R. W. FENNER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you for your action in introducing your prohibition bill at this time.

Suffice to say, it is timely, and urgently needed to cure absenteeism among war workers. I have been told by some, that many of these workers, both men and women, squander their pay over the bars of cocktail lounges and dives of all kinds here—being broke, because of it.

The result—they have no money to pay the Government income tax now. Sincerely, I hope your bill becomes a law.

M. O. FITZGERALD.

WHITE PLAINS, N. Y., *March 7, 1943.*
Congressman BRYSON, of South Carolina,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN: Your plea for a kind of prohibition for the duration is the thing we need most at this time.

Please let me tell you how very grateful I am for your courage in expressing yourself so earnestly and truthfully.

Do all in your power to bring this thing to pass.

Very gratefully,
ANNA D. STAUFFACHER.

CALIFORNIA, MO., *March 8, 1943.*
Mr. BRYSON.

DEAR SIR: Hearing of your bill against the liquor problems of our country, we as Christians highly approve of the bill to do away of this terrible evil. We urge that every step be taken to abolish this evil of drink from our boys in camp and on battlefields.

As our country needs sober men at a time like this.

Respectfully,
LOLA R. SIMPSON.

KANSAS CITY, KANS., *March 7, 1943.*
Congressman BRYSON,
Representative from South Carolina.

DEAR SIR: The Saturday morning edition of the Kansas City Star of March 6 had a short notice of your move to impose national prohibition for the duration of the war, by act of Congress rather than by constitutional amendment, as a means to curb absenteeism.

This note is written to show our appreciation for your courage and wisdom in speaking out against this evil. Twenty-five women of the Vernetta Sharp Bible Class of the Western Highlands Presbyterian Church in Kansas City, Kans., are behind you in best wishes and prayers—to say nothing of many thousands throughout the country, and even across the sea, who feel as you do.

Even if the going is tough, may you continue to put up a good fight.

Sincerely yours,
AMELIA WARE BAIRD,
(Mrs. Justus U. Baird).

P. S.—You will pardon the mode of address at the beginning of this letter. The Star did not give your name or initials.

OWENSBORO, KY.,
March 9, 1943.
Representative BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please allow me to congratulate you on your bill "to outlaw the manufacture, sale, and transportation of liquor in the United States of America." Please include beer. Am sure everyone knows that alcohol is the cause of 99 percent of absenteeism, and am glad one man has the courage to admit the truth and offer a remedy, not only for absenteeism, but for the destruction of the souls and bodies of our boys. Am writing to the men there from this district.

Thanking you for your effort,
Sincerely,
ANNA T. MISCHEL.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
March 13, 1943.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BRYSON: I am the mother of four married sons, two of them enter the United States Army next month, then a little later on the other two go.

I want to thank you and Mr. CLARK for your whole-hearted interest in trying to enforce national prohibition or, better still, I believe the rationing system of liquor like Canada is now using or like the United States is using for coffee, sugar, and almost all necessary commodities.

The Christian and better class of people all over America wish you success in your valiant endeavor to protect us against this evil monster, liquor. We are standing behind you a hundred percent.

Sincerely,
MAUDE B. (MRS. E. W.) LOCKARD,
Memphis, Tenn.

KANSAS CITY, KANS.,
March 6, 1943.
The Honorable Mr. BRYSON,
Representative of South Carolina,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Relative to the enclosed paragraph from the Kansas City Times of March 5, 1943:

While not all that we desire in the matter of prohibitory measures, it is a long step forward, and I personally want to endorse your move. Also, may I urge that it be carried through our legislative bodies with speed and zeal?

Two current statements are enclosed: One appeared this morning in the Kansas City Kansan, the other is an article in the March issue of the New Century Leader. It is conditions such as these portray, that are rousing civilians to loud and active protest against the liquor traffic.

Wishing you success for your measure or a better one, I am,

Most sincerely yours,
LILLIAN M. HAMILTON,
Teacher of Vernetta Sharp Bible Class,
Western Highlands Presbyterian Church,
Kansas City, Kans.

PINCKNEYVILLE, ILL., *March 9, 1943.*
Representative BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am glad to see in the St. Louis Globe, that you have introduced a bill to curb absenteeism.

I am glad that you have the courage to put your finger on what every intelligent person knows is the right spot. I am convinced that those who pray for the speedy close of this war, will support the bill.

May the dear Lord give to you and your supporters the strength of 10. I know this takes courage. We pray for you.

ETTA ROOT EDWARDS,
President of Perry County Woman's
Christian Temperance Union.

MILDER, LA., *March 7, 1943.*
Representative BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Seeing in the paper where a move was made by you to impose national prohibition, we the members of Pine Ridge Baptist Church wish you success in this move.

We have written the President of the United States, asking that prohibition be enacted around all Army camps.

We sincerely pray that this move made by you will be approved and enforced at an early date.

Done in regular conference this 7th day of March 1943.

J. R. WELCH,
Superintendent of Sunday School.
O. HAMMOND, *Pastor.*
MRS. J. R. WELCH,
Church Clerk.

DENVER, COLO., *March 10, 1943.*
Representative BRYSON.

DEAR SIR: I wish to voice my most heartfelt approval of your measure imposing prohibition during the war.

There is no doubt that drinking is delaying the war effort and contributing to juvenile delinquency.

Yours truly,
M. H. GEE.

Dry Milk Should Have Name That Can Be Advertised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House is now considering a bill to permit the use of a true name for skim milk and one that is not obnoxious to consumers. In explanation of this important proposal the following statements are inserted:

[Press release regarding H. R. 149, hearing before House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee March 16, 1943, from Robert E. Jones, Hotel Washington]

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The Cinderella of lend-lease foods, dry milk solids, now largely shipped overseas, is pleading with Congress to rid it of the term "dry skim milk," which has set back the industry. Users have refused to advertise it under that name.

Dairy leaders making this fight before Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce favoring H. R. 149 by PATMAN, were supported by eminent scientists including Dr. E. V. McCollum of John Hopkins University and Dr. Ralph M. Wilder of Mayo Clinic, now Chief, Food Requirements Branch, United States Food Distribution Administration, and by Prof. C. L. Roadhouse of the University of California. Many dairy, and consumer organizations and bakery manufacturers also supported the bill.

The industry asks that the name "Dry Milk Solids" or "Defatted Milk Solids" be legalized.

Regarding the bill, Congressman PATMAN said:

"Ninety percent of the spray process dry milk solids has been taken by the Government for shipment to England, Russia, and our Army. As Dr. McCollum says, if this industry hadn't been handicapped in its development by a bad name, we would have a lot more for our allies now.

"Bakers have been known to quit using dry milk solids in their bread and cancel advertising campaigns on learning that the word 'skim' had to be used. It is an amazing fact that there is enough separated milk left on farms, largely fed to hogs, to make 10 times as much dry milk solids as now produced. It is the finest of human food."

H. R. 149 is sponsored by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, Washington, and by the American Dry Milk Institute, Chicago, together representing approximately 80 percent of the producers and manufacturers in the dry milk industry. Supporting organizations included the American Dietetic Association and American Farm Bureau Federation and dairy groups in all the important producing States.

[Statement in support of H. R. 149 (by Congressman PATMAN), relating to nonfat dry milk solids, made by E. V. McCollum, Ph. D., Sc. D., professor of biochemistry, the Johns Hopkins University, school of hygiene and public health, Baltimore, Md. (NOTE.—Dr. McCollum is noted as a leading scientist in the original work that discovered vitamins; is one of the world's foremost nutritionists)]

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA, *Chairman*,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: It is my hope that your committee will approve and Congress will pass H. R. 149 in order to do justice to an excellent food product.

The term "dry skim milk," which is now the legal name for dry milk solids, is unfair and untrue; it means inferiority, and I'll tell how that came about.

But first let me say that this product, which we want legally to call dry milk solids, is now recognized by all nutritionists as the most valuable part of milk. It is also our greatest undeveloped food resource. If its development had been encouraged instead of being held back by a bad name, and we now had twice or three times as much milk powder for overseas shipment, our present emergency food problem would be greatly simplified.

It is another case of short-sightedness—too little, too late.

The historical reason why "skim" is a bad name is this: People were taught years ago that only the cream, or fat, of milk was valuable. Besides, the skimming method was primitive; milk stood for hours without refrigeration to let the cream rise; it deteriorated; and often the skim milk was only fit for hog feed. Skim milk came to mean hog feed and still does in the minds of most people.

Dry milk solids or defatted milk solids today are made from sweet separated milk. This milk is cooled immediately after milking and taken to modern manufacturing plants by quick transport. There it is put through a mechanical cream separator, shot under pressure to the drier, and becomes powder within a few seconds. There has been no deterioration as in the old-fashioned skimming process. In a food so delicate as milk this is of first importance.

In my research work in nutrition I have had much contact with food processors, particularly the baking industry. These bakers, before the Government took over, used 70 percent of the dry milk solids. In 1923 I spoke before a national convention of bakers and urged them to use dry milk solids in their bread. Since that time the use of the product in bakery goods greatly increased, because dry milk solids improves the loaf, enriches the bread. Yet bakers have learned not to tell their customers that they use what is legally called skim milk—they can't advertise that they enrich their bread.

Today the United States Government in its Food Distribution Administration bakery order requires "all white bread shall be enriched, shall contain not less than 3 parts nor more than 4 parts of solids of milk or skim milk to 100 parts of flour."

How ridiculous to say "enriched with skim milk"; it is like saying black is white to the average consumer.

But when the order says, "enriched with solids of milk," that is different. The consumer knows that "solids of milk" is good food.

How can the Government justify requiring this industry to live under the handicap of the word "skim" and at the same time, in its own bakery order, use the terms "solids of milk" and "skim milk" as meaning the same thing.

Some people contend that "dry milk solids" is not the whole truth, since most of the fat is taken out. However, the industry for years has used the term "powdered whole milk" to designate "whole milk powder." I'm sure that "dry milk solids" is much closer to the truth than is the term "dry skim milk." If desired, "dry milk solids" might be modified by adding the words "not over 1½ percent fat." Or the words, "defatted milk solids" could be used. Nobody can claim that this is overstatement, for some fat does remain in the product. To those word purists who contend that defatted is not true because some fat does remain, let me say: Nobody questions the words "dehydrated" or "dry" yet in all products put through a dehydrating or drying process some water does remain.

I hope that I have made myself clear that I believe this fine, nutritious product, one of our greatest food resources, deserves a good name such as "Dry Milk Solids" or "Defatted Milk Solids." I sincerely request your honorable committee, in the interest of building up our supply of human food, to approve this bill and recommend its passage by Congress.

Sincerely yours,
E. V. MCCOLLUM, Ph. D., Sc. D.,
Professor of Biochemistry.

MARCH 12, 1943.

[Statement in support of H. R. 149 (by Congressman PATMAN) relating to nonfat dry milk solids, made by Russell M. Wilder, M. D., Chief, Civilian Food Requirements Branch, Food Distribution Administration, Washington, D. C. (NOTE.—Dr. Wilder is a noted scientist on leave from the Mayo Clinic, is a member of the Council on Foods and Nutrition of the American Medical Association, also a member of the National Research Council's Committee on Food and Nutrition)]

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA, *Chairman*,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I am in receipt of a notification by you of a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on March 16 to consider H. R. 149 relating to nonfat dry milk solids.

I regret that I am unable to appear at this meeting because I should have liked to present my views to the committee.

It has long been my opinion that use of the common name "skim" or "skimmed" milk for the residue of milk remaining after removal of most of the fat by centrifugation is misleading and for this reason objectionable. Actually the practice of skimming milk has been almost wholly replaced by use of seperators.

The connotation of the word "skim" is to remove the major part of the value of a product, whereas in the case of milk the part that remains after separation of the fat greatly exceeds in nutritive value the part that is removed.

The evidence is clear that the proteins of milk which remain after removal of the fat are among the most valuable proteins known, possessing as they do certain amino acids essential to life but found in comparable amounts in very few other protein foods.

The evidence is also clear that the nonfat solids of milk represent the best food source of the vitamin riboflavin and the mineral calcium. These two nutrients are found in comparable amounts in few other foods.

Inasmuch as many American diets are deficient in respect to the nutrients provided by the nonfat solids of milk and whereas consumer acceptance of these milk solids is impeded by reference to them as skim milk solids, it is clearly in the interest of the public health to permit the use of an alternate name which will more accurately and more truthfully describe them.

Yours very truly,
RUSSELL M. WILDER, M. D.,
Chief, Civilian Food Requirements Branch.

MARCH 13, 1943.

[From the Pacific Dairy Review of September 1942]

ALONG THE MILKY WAY

Powdered milk (dry milk solids) is one of the most promising agricultural products of Pacific Slope States and, more than any other food, is helping to feed Britain. California alone produced 68,000,000 pounds of dried milk products in 1941, two-thirds of which was for human food. Other States of the Pacific area which are extensive producers of powdered milk are Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Utah.

The reason powdered milk is so important is because of the shipping situation. Dr. Tom G. Stitts, Chief of the Dairy and Poultry Bureau, Agricultural Marketing Administration, Washington, D. C., explains:

"To carry 22,000,000 cases of evaporated milk, which the British wanted, would require 121 boatloads of 5,000 tons each. To transport the same amount of food as dried (powdered) milk would take only 30 boatloads of the same size."

Immense plants, running night and day, are making powdered milk in the California counties of Humboldt, Glenn, Sonoma, Stanislaus, Merced, Fresno, Tulare, and Imperial. Others are planned. This speed-up beyond the normal growth of the industry is the result of the war.

Nutritionists and food economists recognize this product as the greatest and most economical quality human food in America, as yet only partially utilized. Billions of pounds in fluid form is still going into animal feed for hogs and a great deal is wasted.

Furthermore, dairymen view with foreboding the fate of this product after the war is over. How will they hold and expand a market for powdered milk?

Why is this?

It is because of the word "skim." "Skim milk" is a term for inferiority. It is a holdover from a practice long since obsolete, dating back to the days when cream was taken off milk by hand, and when knowledge of the rare value of solids in defatted milk was meager. Pure food regulations require that what we have called powdered milk or dry milk solids be termed "dry skim milk."

Certain bakers in California have been told that they must change the reading on their loaf wrappers from "fat-free milk solids" to "dry skim milk." They have replied that rather than put the word "skim" on the package, they will quit using "dry milk solids."

These bakers know that every housewife is repelled by the word "skim" when applied to food. No advertising man would dare use it regarding a product he wanted to popularize.

To rid powdered milk of this derogatory term, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN introduced H. R. 7002, now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which Representative CLARENCE LEA, of Santa Rosa, Calif., is chairman. The bill is a simple one and provides:

"That for the purposes of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of June 26, 1938 * * * dry milk solids or defatted milk solids is the product resulting from the removal of fat and water from milk, and contains lactose, milk proteins, and milk minerals in the same relative proportions as in the fresh milk from which made."

The normal composition of dry milk solids is:

	Percent
Lactose	51.5
Protein:	
Casein	30.0
Albumen	6.6
Ash	8.0
Fat	.9
Moisture	3.0
Total	100.0

The bill is sponsored by the American Dry Milk Institute, Chicago, Roud McCann, di-

rector, and with many members in Pacific Slope States. It is supported by the dairy industry generally and by a large number of dairy department heads and nutritionists of American universities. All agree that the word "skim" as applied to dry milk solids carries only the false meaning of inferiority.

Even the League of Nations has taken notice of the fact that the word "skim" has retarded the use of this important food product. One of its reports says: "It is unfortunate that the prejudice against skim milk has, in certain cases, resulted in a reduction in the total consumption of milk."

Philippine Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOAQUIN M. ELIZALDE

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. ELIZALDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech by Vice President Sergio Osmeña of the Philippines, to the Bendix aviation plant employees in New York City on March 14, 1943:

Mr. Chairman, friends, I wish to thank you for the kind invitation to attend this first annual communion breakfast of Bendix aviation plant employees. As a Catholic coming from a Catholic country, I am doubly happy to be with you.

Today, when man's basest hate is being unleashed against his fellow men, communion with God is a greater human need than ever. It is a way to peace of mind and soul, and, consequently, to universal peace. It is as necessary for the soldiers on the front line as it is for the workers on the home front—in the factory and the home. Let me, therefore, congratulate all the people whose initiative and zeal are making today's spiritual gathering here so successful.

We of the Philippines, in the far Pacific, have been the victims of unprovoked aggression. Japan, as you know, struck at our country with ever-increasing fury from the very first day. With our planes destroyed on the ground, Japan ruled the Philippines skies virtually unchallenged. Mitsubishi bombers and Zero fighters bombed and strafed our naval installations in Cavite, our dockyards in Manila and Olongapo, forcing the United States Asiatic fleet to withdraw from Philippine waters. Their bombs hit not only military objectives but also defenseless cities and towns, destroying our schools and churches and homes. It was an uneven fight from the beginning, and it continued to be uneven to the end.

Because of the initial advantages gained by the enemy's surprise attacks, the Filipino-American forces were reduced to ground operations. With this handicap, and with the additional difficulty created by the country's long coastline, it was obvious that we could not ward off all enemy thrusts. His first landing attempts in the north were repulsed, but his subsequent determined attacks, launched simultaneously at many different places, were successful. Once having gained footholds, the Japanese rapidly consolidated them, bringing in reinforcements which their control of the sea permitted. Supported by tanks and planes, enemy infantry began a relentless advance toward Manila, the capital. The net of steel closed in fast from three directions. Manila's fall was inevitable. We were in danger of being trapped. But General MacArthur, our commander in chief, declared Manila an open city, gathered together his little army, and then, by a series of brilliant maneuvers, withdrew to Bataan Peninsula for a defensive stand. And there, in that strip of land, 20 miles wide and 30 miles long, our entrenched little army and the onrushing robots of Nippon staged the Battle of Bataan.

The full story of Bataan still remains to be told. But, even now, we know that Bataan was no ignominious defeat. With unflinching courage and heroism, our fighting men, four-fifths of them untrained citizen-soldiers, battled for 4 long months against an army three times their size—an army of seasoned and well-equipped soldiers. We inflicted heavy losses on the enemy. We forced him to divert large contingents from other war fronts, largely delaying the fall of Burma and the East Indies and preventing the invasion of Australia and New Zealand. But it was not only a fight against an enemy army. We had to fight, too, the cruel ravages of want and hunger, of disease and fatigue. Americans and Filipinos suffered the ordeal side by side, sealing their comradeship in fire and blood. They gave in only when it was no longer possible to endure. Bataan was an epic struggle against vastly superior odds and under the most adverse conditions, a fight desperately uneven but glorious in its unwavering faith in ultimate victory.

But the Battle of the Philippines was not simply a wild clash of physical forces. It also involved a conflict of ideologies: Christian and democratic ideology, as upheld by the Filipino-American forces, against the pagan ideology of brute force, as represented by Japan's invading armies.

As the only Christian nation in the Far East, the Philippines has ever been zealous of her role, standing for the teachings of Christ—for the dignity of women, for love and charity, justice and order, peace and brotherhood.

Japan, on the other hand, as a militaristic nation, has stood for emperor-worship, for regimentation and subservience, conquest and exploitation. While she has proudly proclaimed herself the guardian of all Asiatic peoples, she has unscrupulously stripped them of their rights and liberties, of their wealth and power.

After treacherously assaulting the Philippines, Japan now offers independence. But everybody knows how empty is this promise. Korea was an independent country; a solemn pledge was given by Japan to respect her independence; and history records that Japan dishonored this pledge and Korea lost her freedom. Japan is seeking to do in the Philippines what she has done in Korea, Formosa, Manchuria, and occupied China—to exercise power and dominion, to exploit our natural resources, to regiment the minds of our youth, and to substitute emperor-worship for the worship of God.

All nations the world over who believe in a well-ordered society cannot view with indifference the tragic fate of the Philippines, the outpost of Christianity in the Orient. On them rest the high responsibility of undertaking a crusade—not only to liberate the Philippines from the clutches of tyranny but to save the world from godlessness and anarchy, poverty, and slavery.

In the task of redeeming the Philippines, so solemnly promised by the President of the United States, you American workers, no less than the sailors and soldiers, share a great responsibility. The Battle of the Philippines was lost because we did not have enough ships, or planes, or guns, or tanks. Therefore, it rests upon you, workers of America, to make these weapons. Yours is the responsibility to produce the arms that will prevent a recurrence of Bataan and Corregidor—that will insure our victory in battles of today and tomorrow.

With diligent workers in the Nation's war plants, with our brave soldiers at the front, with a people united and trusting in the justice of the Almighty, the crusade to redeem the Philippines and the whole enslaved world cannot fail. And when the Philippines is free again, let us then insure its liberty and happiness under God and keep it as an enduring monument of human progress, as the stanch vanguard of democracy and the precious jewel of Christ in the Far East.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, for about 2 months the Ways and Means Committee has labored on a proposed tax bill and its labors have brought forth nothing definite to date.

It has been announced in the newspapers that the President has expressed disapproval of the Ruml plan, but has offered no substitute.

The Treasury has declared itself in favor of a pay-as-you-go tax plan. It has failed to suggest any substitute for the Ruml plan that will bear scrutiny. It has utterly failed to recommend a simple, clear-cut withholding tax plan, but instead it has put forward various alternatives without telling plainly what plan is preferred. Aside from following the Ruml plan nothing has been worked out except what has been characterized by the newspapers of the Nation as hodge-podge systems.

Under the circumstances, it seems quite clear what should be done—we should adopt and vote for the Ruml plan.

In order that taxpayers might know where they stood before March 15, the whole country expected the committee to act with speed. It is now March 16. There is no tax bill after all this time. Why? Some of the "smart boys" in the administration have said that the people like to pay taxes and the conduct of the administration is proof of its belief. With the war on, this Congress cannot expect to cut down taxes. It can, and has cut down some useless spending, and I believe it will cut down more. Since Congress cannot cut down taxes, the very least thing it can do is to adopt the most logical and practical plan available for the payment of these heavy taxes to come. I deem it the most fortunate circumstance for this Congress that a plan has been suggested that has met with the approval, I dare say, of 90 percent of the taxpayers. I say further, that the very least this Congress can do, is to permit the taxpayers to pay in the manner they desire to pay. They are willing to pay as they go. What more could any taxing body ask for?

I believe the Members of this House are not going to allow themselves to be frightened and confused by appeals to class prejudice and by innumerable demagogic arguments that have nothing whatever to do with the point at issue.

The taxpayers, who are also the voters, are well aware of what the Ruml plan is. I come from the district where legend relates Rip Van Winkle slept 20 years, but if the fine people in my district have been asleep concerning the amount of taxes they will pay, or the manner in which they shall or can be paid, the number of letters I have received disprove it. They are now wide awake—they want the Ruml plan. They do not want some half-baked, ill-considered and ill-conceived, withholding and make-shift half-way pay-as-you-go tax law. They do not want a tax law that will carry their income-tax debt "from the cradle to the grave."

As indicated from the letters I receive, the people in my district are worried and concerned about this tax bill. They desire to pay their taxes and they desire to pay them when they are due. To be in debt for your taxes, to not be able to pay them when due, to their minds, is almost certain and positive proof of insolvency. The people in my district are not unlike the people in your respective districts. They are proud. They do not want the perpetual stigma of being behind with payment for the support of their Government, which, up to recent years, they thought to be the best in the world, and still think it is the best but needs improvement, and for which they are sorrowfully sacrificing the lives of their sons to maintain.

The people in my district just know that they cannot pay 2 years' taxes in 1 year, and I also know that it is impossible for them to pay 2 years' taxes in 1 year. It just cannot be done.

Since I have been a Member of this honorable House, I have heard it said that at the last election a mandate was given by all the voters of the country to this Congress. I do not wish to affirm or deny that broad statement, but I do wish to state that I am sure of one thing and that is that the people of my district gave me a mandate and they know that I will carry out their order to the very best of my ability.

The mandate that I did receive was that I should come here and attend all the sessions, that I should listen carefully and familiarize myself with all the facts relative to the measures and legislation to be voted on, and that I apply those facts to the question and then in voting use the common, ordinary horse sense that I would apply in my own business.

In carrying out that mandate I would like to have the opportunity to vote for the Ruml tax plan, or something very similar. It is simple and understandable; it is the best plan suggested in my opinion. The people in my district understand it. They want it. I believe 90 percent of the taxpayers in the country understand it and I believe that 90 percent of the taxpayers of the country want it. I favor the adoption of the Ruml plan.

Roads to Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a carefully prepared and challenging article by the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] entitled "Roads to Lasting Peace." This article appears in the current number of the Republican magazine, published in Chicago.

This interesting thesis recounts the age-old struggle to construct some instrumentality that will promote permanent peace. It should grip the heart of every lover of peace and good will on earth.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE ROADS TO LASTING PEACE

(By Senator HAROLD H. BURTON, of Ohio)

"Nations can blunder into war. They cannot blunder into peace. * * * We went to the peace conference in 1919 animated by the loftiest and most disinterested ideals, but we were totally unprepared for the specific problems that had to be met at the peace table. We secured neither peace, freedom, nor prosperity. * * *

"We are in a gigantic war. Our first task is to win it. Having set our hand to the task, we cannot stop until lasting peace has been made. Only from a lasting peace can we hope to save our civilization."

These words were written in 1942 by Hugh Gibson (Minister to Poland 1919–24; Switzerland, 1924–27; Ambassador to Belgium, 1927–33; Brazil, 1934–37; Belgium, 1937–38), and by Herbert Hoover (chairman, American Relief Commission, London, England, 1914–15; chairman, Commission for Relief in Belgium, 1915–19; United States Food Administrator, 1917–19; United States Secretary of Commerce, 1921–28; President of the United States, 1929–33), in their constructive book on The Problems of Lasting Peace.

They call America to the important task of locating and building, now, all that we can of the roads to lasting peace.

Lest, through post-war unpreparedness, we lose that for which we fight, thoughtful, orderly, vigorous work is needed now on the roads to victory, to internal stability, to regional stability, to immediate post-war emergencies, to world-wide military stability, and toward world-wide economic, social, and governmental stability.

1. THE ROAD TO VICTORY

First we must win the war. Dependable authorities estimate 2 to 4 years more of hard fighting. There can be no lasting peace without complete victory for the United Nations in both hemispheres. We must let nothing weaken our determined overwhelming drive toward military victory. We must plan each effort toward lasting peace so that it will strengthen our attack and weaken the resistance of our enemies. We should unite the people of the United States with one another, the people of the Americas with one another and the people of the world with one another in an orderly but flexible program to secure and maintain a just and lasting peace.

We should support vigorously and generously the establishment of combined staffs covering the world-wide warfare of the United Nations and the establishment of unified competent commands in each theater of the war. Victories by land, by sea, and by air, adequate supplies, transportation, equipment, and food, together with the maintenance of civilian strength and spirit on all home fronts are essential.

Discussions must not divide us from our allies. If we weaken in any way our unity of military action we become our own worst enemy. Our cause is too sacred, the fortunes of war too uncertain and the lives of our soldiers too precious for that. The first step to lasting peace is to cross the one-way bridge to victory. We must also plan our advance beyond the bridge.

2. THE ROAD TO INTERNAL STABILITY WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

Beyond the bridge we need to build three roads. These are the highways to internal, regional and world-wide stability. Each has its hazards. Some hazards we can see clearly and we can decide how to overcome them. Of others we need to know more before we can choose our final course.

Within the United States we can learn most of the facts upon which our post-war course will depend. We owe it to ourselves and our soldiers to plan a clear course of internal post-war policy. In fact, we owe it to the world to do so, because, for better or for worse, the United States will stand as the great example of how well or how ill self-government can meet the major issues of peace as well as of war.

We must establish a sound internal post-war economy. We must pass from the governmentally controlled and financed economy of war to the far freer economy of individual enterprise. We must not yield our hard-won freedom of individual opportunity for small, as well as large, private business in favor of the dictation of a totalitarian state by whatever name it may seek to be called. While recognizing the need for governmental guidance, help and even regulation we must set our course unalterably by the fixed star of faith in individual enterprise and initiative. To do so we need not yield our standards of living, our recognition of the equal value of capital, management, and labor, or our faith in privately owned and operated agriculture.

We are looking into the dawn of a bright new day. America has at hand boundless new tangible wealth based upon electric power, Diesel engines, automotive power, light metals, plastics, chemurgy, welding, aviation, radio, moving pictures, soybeans, improved housing, improved agricultural equipment, vitamins, sulfa drugs and countless other products of her people's inventive genius, scientific research, skilled workmanship and productive power. If we add to these resources the opportunity for peaceful production based upon fair dealing and a deep appreciation that the highest destiny of man depends upon the practice of the Golden Rule, the world of tomorrow can be far richer, healthier and happier than that of yesterday. To make it so we must chart the course for the post-war restoration of private industry, prevention of economic dictatorship, encouragement of individual initiative, increase of productive capacity, improvement of living standards, stabilization of personal economic security, checking of waves of inflation and deflation and the practice of honesty, efficiency, and economy by a Government dedicated to the interests of all the people.

To do this there now should be in progress governmental and private studies leading to thoroughly nonpartisan constructive treatment of these issues. In the absence of leadership in this field from the Federal departments as now constituted, consultation

on a national scale should be begun between representatives of our legislative and executive branches of Government working with representatives of capital, management, labor, agriculture and consumers.

3. THE ROAD TO REGIONAL STABILITY IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Within the Americas, already drawn together into the Pan American Union as a development of the policies of President Monroe and Secretary of States James G. Blaine, we should proceed on the basis of what we know will be the probable post-war facts.

The Americas should show how to maintain mutually helpful regional relationships without interfering with appropriate spheres of national sovereignty. Our cordial, natural, regional relationships in the Western Hemisphere, strengthened by continually improving communication and personal contacts, should enable us to meet purely regional issues without disturbing the balance of the world.

To do this we need emphasis on the development of post-war policies within the Pan American Union. We should bring into conference the executive, legislative, commercial, industrial, labor, agricultural, and cultural interests of all concerned.

4. THE ROADS TO MEET IMMEDIATE POST-WAR EMERGENCIES

The following semimilitary emergencies are so sure to arise immediately after the fighting that we must prepare for them as we would for steps during the war itself. Reasonable, humane, constructive programs to meet them should be agreed upon in advance among ourselves and with our allies. Knowledge of such programs will weaken the final resistance of war-weary enemies. Such programs are important weapons in war as well as constructive aids to peace.

A. Demobilization: We should plan total disarmament of enemy nations and partial demobilization of our own and allied forces. Our demobilization should be adjusted to the scope of our victory, the attitude of our enemies, and the need for armed forces, especially air forces, to maintain the military stability of the world. Demobilization should keep step with the absorption of returning soldiers into productive civilian life.

B. Feeding the hungry: We should prepare now to help feed promptly and efficiently the hungry men, women and children in the needy allied and conquered territories. Not only will natural sympathy dictate this but such a program gives us our greatest opportunity to establish lasting faith in us on the part of millions of anxious people. Our proper handling of this will go far to demonstrate the economic soundness, as well as the understanding friendship, of a truly free people.

C. Temporary boundaries and governments: To preserve law and order, temporary boundaries must be set and temporary governments established in recovered and conquered territory. This will allow time for the later establishment of representative local governments with which the United Nations may deal as to the future.

D. Reestablishment of homes, farms, and factories: The survival of civilization demands that all people resume, as soon as possible, the production of their own food and materials and that the family become again the foundation of society.

E. Preliminary planning: Conferences should be held now among those of us who are to be responsible for our share in meeting these emergencies. People should be trained to carry out these plans. Both because of the need for financial appropriations and the need for wide understanding of our major policies, there should be brought into these conferences not only executives but also representatives from each party in each House of Congress. Such conferences should lead to similar consultations and agreements with our allies.

5. THE ROAD TO WORLD-WIDE MILITARY STABILITY

Here we step directly into the field of world relationships. Here post-war factors are less certain than in our national and regional areas. Yet in the field of military stability some factors are clear enough to permit of positive planning.

Total war must not come again. We must contribute whatever military effort is necessary to prevent it.

When the United Nations win this war they will dominate the air. With this comes a new opportunity and responsibility for maintaining the peace. In this the United States should have an important share. A clear understanding of it should be developed during the war.

The program should include agreement upon the availability to the United Nations, at least for joint military purposes, of all necessary planes, personnel, equipment, air routes, landing fields, and supporting forces throughout the world.

This is a major military problem. It emphasizes the need for a world-wide combined strategic staff. It points to the natural need for international understandings beyond the purely military issues. The United States, by virtue not only of its military position, but of its scientific, commercial and financial contribution to the development of civilian aviation throughout the world should take a constructive and fair part in making its contribution to post-war aviation. Our executive and legislative agencies, together with representatives of our military and civilian air personnel, should be preparing for this and considering it with our allies. It is related to the lend-lease program.

6. THE ROAD TOWARD WORLD-WIDE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND GOVERNMENTAL STABILITY

In these fields we reach far beyond predictable factors. We must, therefore, guard carefully against taking premature action.

While it is important that we study these factors it is imperative that we refrain now from pressing our suggestions if they involve unnecessary friction between our interests and those of any of our allies. These issues will be decided finally in the light of what may be substantially changed conditions.

The most important element in post-war relations is the dependability of all nations and their faith in one another. The sinews of international cooperation should grow steadily stronger as we help one another in the life-and-death battles to come.

We must earn the confidence of the world. Faith will be the cornerstone of the post-war structure. It is the foundation rather than the superstructure of the temple of lasting peace that today should command attention. With an increase of mutual faith in one another many questions will become soluble. With a decrease of such faith many solutions will become impossible.

Air commerce is an highly important post-war problem. We, as well as others, should share in the opportunity to develop it so that the world shall make the greatest possible use of it. Its maximum development is vital to world-wide recovery.

There should be development of international trade without destroying our standards of living. Nations should not yield their sovereignty to an economic dictatorship any more than to a governmental dictatorship. There will be room for international monetary, labor and agricultural agreements.

We should be giving consideration to these subjects now through competent representatives of the executive and legislative branches of our Government and of the financial, industrial, labor and agricultural interests of our Nation. Yet, we should not attempt to dictate our solutions to our equally independent allies in advance of their opportunity to share in the consideration of them.

World-wide social stability is the paradise of idealists. Its scope extends from the conditions of today to those when the will of God shall be done on earth as it is in Heaven. Progress will come best through good example.

Our enemies are attacking the foundations of our social stability. They strike at our faith in the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. We fight for the right of each man to be his own master. We fight for the recognition of every human soul. It is a world war for independence in much the sense declared by our forefathers when they pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to defend the propositions that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

To this faith we rededicate ourselves. We will do well to proclaim it again and again and to think its implications through to their full conclusions as to the equality of all men, women and children before God.

That we may make the best progress along these lines it will be well if those considering our economic problems shall associate with themselves in the consideration of the social stability of the world, men and women filled with the idealism of our Declaration of Independence as above defined.

The elements upon which will depend world-wide governmental stability, likewise, cannot be anticipated fully much before the end of the war. It is difficult to foresee now the final needs and wishes of all our allies to say nothing of the people in territory held by the enemy.

At the same time we should note that on July 18, 1941, a Russian-Czechoslovak agreement was signed in London pledging those governments to mutual support. On July 30, 1941, a Russian-Polish agreement, followed by a Russian-Polish Declaration of Friendship and Assistance on December 4, provided not only for mutual military assistance but looked toward "a new organization of international relations on the basis of unification of the democratic countries in a durable alliance." On January 7, 1942, the governments of Czechoslovakia, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Poland created a Central and Eastern European Planning Board. On January 15 the Greek-Yugoslav agreement was signed looking toward the constitution of a post-war Balkan union and on January 25, 1942, the Polish-Czechoslovak Agreement provided for a post-war Polish-Czechoslovak confederation.

Of still more significance is the Anglo-Russian Treaty of May 6, 1942, looking 20 years ahead and expressing the intention of Great Britain and the Soviet Union "to collaborate closely with one another as well as with the other United Nations at the peace settlement and during the ensuing period of reconstruction on a basis of the principles enunciated in the declaration made August 14, 1941." That declaration was the Atlantic Charter.

There should be developed post-war machinery for arbitration, international litigation and continuing cooperation of an economic, social and governmental character that will improve upon the world's past experiments. We must not repeat the mistakes of the past 25 years. The proposals must fit the conditions of the time when they are accepted. They should provide for their peaceable modification.

We will do well to study all plans for governmental cooperation. We will do well also to agree, even now, upon the procedure through which the United Nations will deal with these questions promptly in an orderly way after the war. An understanding might well be reached now that there will be no attempt to solve everything on a permanent basis at a single peace conference, but that consideration shall be given promptly to the several issues by special international boards designated for these purposes. These must be required to render early constructive reports, timed so that the pressure of war shall not force any program into a hastily designed defective mold and yet so that the inspirational force of our wartime alliance shall not be lost before the solutions are reached.

Studies should be made now by qualified representatives drawn from the executive and legislative branches of our Government and from appropriate fields of civic, financial, industrial, labor and agricultural interests.

CONCLUSION

We should do more than we have been doing to prepare for post-war internal and regional stability, immediate post-war emergencies and world-wide military stability. We should study the problems of world-wide economic, social and governmental stability but should refrain from unnecessary pressing for final agreements in these fields. We should seek an understanding now upon an orderly program of prompt consideration and solution of these problems to the extent that the demands of war permit. The force of the war should thus be harnessed now to the production of military stability and of well-planned progress toward a lasting peace.

To win the war but gain no lasting peace would be a tragic and empty victory. To lose the war would be worse.

The issues of lasting peace rise far above partisanship. Republicans and Democrats alike must meet them constructively, without seeking partisan advantage. I address this statement to Republicans with confidence that they will meet this opportunity vigorously and with unshakable loyalty to the principles of our Declaration of Independence for which we fight.

New Generator at Grand Coulee Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it should be of interest to the Congress to know that another generator has just been put to work at Grand Coulee Dam in the State of Washington. This generator is not as large as the one specified for the dam. Priorities made it necessary to use a generator originally constructed for Shasta Dam and this has been adapted to the facilities at Grand Coulee. This addition brings the present capacity of the Grand Coulee power plant to more than 400,000 kilowatts, and this project is beginning to pay for itself. The mighty Columbia, second largest river in the United States and the greatest in potential hydro energy, is the dominating factor in providing the steady flow of electric current to all points of the Pacific Northwest, over a growing system of transmission lines, and is making the State of Washington daily more important in the winning of the war and as one of the potential resources that will help us to win the peace.

Winning the War and Planning for the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Harold E. Stassen, Governor of Minnesota, at Philadelphia, on March 11, 1943, before the United Nations Forum. The forum was presided over by Hon. Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Justice Roberts, fellow citizens, we meet in an historic city. Here a century and a half ago was drafted the document which became the living Constitution of these United States. It was a document under which "We, the people" established a new form and a new level of government. "We, the people" emphasized to a greater degree than ever before the fundamental dignity of man, the eternal source of human rights, and the best concepts of the role of government.

We meet at a time when the developments of modern science, of aviation, of trade, and of radio, require that once again "We, the people" establish a new and higher level of government.

The pages of history tell us over and over again that when men are living close together they need a government to prevent anarchy and conflict and tragedy. This has been true from the earliest tribes and clans on through states and nations. The developments of science in travel, trade, and communication clearly indicate that government, limited to a national scale, is not enough. We need a new and higher level of government to serve mankind.

Two world wars and a world-wide depression in a single generation speak loudly and tragically of this need.

I realize there are those who recognize the desirability of world cooperation but who urge that the means and methods should not be discussed now, and who feel that after the war is over we can suddenly pick out of thin air a full-blown plan of international action.

This view is not justified. The shape of the peace is molded even as the war is fought. Our own form of government of these United States developed after an unusual period of frank, public discussion carried on throughout the desperate war for independence with many different proposals and counterproposals for government.

Four years before the Declaration of Independence, in November 1772, the Committee of Correspondence was formed in Boston to conduct a campaign of education of the people and to send representatives to other communities. Out of this grew other committees of correspondence, seeking means of joint action of the colonies. In 1774 Samuel Adams proposed in the Massachusetts Colonial Legislature a resolution to call a congress of delegates from the various colonies to meet in Philadelphia. Other colonies responded. They selected their delegates through many different methods, some of them very irregular and unofficial. This first Congress recommended the call of the second Congress which met on May 10, 1775, in Philadelphia and seized and exercised many powers in the crisis that arose after Ethan Allen's troops took Fort Ticonderoga and the Battle of Bunker Hill was fought. As early as July, 21, 1775, shortly after Bunker Hill and Lexington, the Congress received from Dr. Benjamin Franklin a draft of a plan for confederation, while acting as a committee of the whole. On July 11, 1776, the committee was appointed to prepare articles of confederation. The work of this committee and its report were the subject of many direct, forthright debates.

This search for methods of joint action continued during the War for Independence. The Articles of Confederation proved to be weak and defective and a serious situation developed. Finally Alexander Hamilton secured the arrangement for a convention at Philadelphia in 1787. This convention met from May to September. It was a long, earnest session, considering various proposals, and compromising different views as to the form of government to adopt. Finally the draft of the Constitution was completed. It provided that nine of the States must ratify to bring it into effect. Five States ratified quite rapidly: Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut. Massachusetts, on February 6, 1787, ratified by the close vote of 187 to 168. Then Maryland and South Carolina by a good vote, followed by New Hampshire on June 21, by a vote of 57 to 46. In Virginia on June 26, the vote was 89 to 79, and in New York only the remarkable eloquence and leadership of Alexander Hamilton were able to turn an adverse majority into the slender approval by a vote of 30 to 27. North Carolina ratified on the following November and Rhode Island finally on May 29, 1790, by the very close vote of 34 to 32.

I review these precise facts of our own early history to emphasize that our form of government was not suddenly brought forth in complete plans, but grew out of many discussions and trials and proposals. Furthermore, the course of its adoption was not an easy one, and frequently rested on very close votes in tense conventions.

So, it is today. There are many obstacles and difficulties confronting us in endeavoring to work out a government affecting the nations of the world.

It is a problem that is neither impossible nor easy of solution. We should neither be discouraged nor should we delay our process of thinking through to the best answers.

I highly commend the sponsors and committees who have arranged this United Nations forum. It is a significant contribution to the world-wide discussion out of which will arise the best hope of an enduring peace.

It is in this spirit that I frankly present my views.

Alliances, treaties, pacts between nations, will not be enough. Just as men living together in a community must not only agree that they wish to live together in peace, but must also establish a mechanism of government to serve them, so the nations of the world must not merely agree that they wish to live together in the world in peace, but they must also definitely establish a mechanism of government to serve the people.

This does not mean that the new level of government will take the place of the national level of government. It will not fundamentally disturb domestic sovereignty. Nations will continue to have their own flags,

their own constitutions, their own heritage, their own citizens. The new level should be added to carry out those relations to other nations, which have been unsuccessfully conducted by devious diplomacy, international intrigue, balance of power, extraterritoriality, spirals of rising tariffs, devaluated currencies, making and breaking of treaties and recurring wars.

How shall such a government be formed? It appears to me that the most practical way is to develop it gradually out of our associations together in this war. When the day of victory comes, China, Russia, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the United States of America, and our other allies will together have actual jurisdiction over the world. It is therefore my proposal that we begin now to plan and to establish a definite continuing organization of the United Nations of the World.

This new level of government must emphasize human rights rather than nations' rights. The cornerstone of the United Nations government must be a deep respect for the fundamental dignity of man, of every race and color and creed.

One of the most eloquent pleas that has been made for an enlightened peace came from the lips of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek in her message to the United States Congress a few days ago. She said:

"We of this generation, who are privileged to make a better world for ourselves and for posterity, should remember that, while we must not be visionary, we must have vision, so that peace should not be punitive in spirit and should not be provincial or nationalistic or even continental in concept, but universal in scope, and humanitarian in action, for modern science has so annihilated distance that what affects one people must, of necessity, affect all other people."

Such a new level of government must gradually develop over a period of years. To move in this direction, here are some of the steps we should take.

We should strengthen the unity between the United Nations in the conduct of the war.

We should develop definite United Nations commissions to handle joint problems, such as the allocation of food supplies between nations, the reconstruction tasks in liberated territories, and the maintenance of temporary civil governments in such areas.

We must not sacrifice principles in an attempt to secure an easy victory in the war. To build for lasting peace, we must win a victory both for our arms and for our principles. Washington and Lincoln never sacrificed principles in search of an easy victory. It can well be said that if we walk over very many wartime bridges with the devil at our side, we will find him at our side when we sit down to work out the peace, and his presence then will be disastrous.

We must renew the lease-lend program and extend the reciprocal trade treaties.

We must prepare to change our pre-war domestic policies so as to promote a healthy domestic economy, encouraging enterprise, prduction, capital, and initiative. A strong America can contribute in large measure to progress in the world.

We must not permit suspicion or dissension to develop between us and the other United Nations. We must respect Russia, China, the British Commonwealth of Nations, and the United Nations of South and Central America and of Europe, and extend the same courtesy to their internal problems that we expect them to extend to us.

We might well begin now to think through the governmental structure by which our common purposes with the other United Nations will be preserved and through which nations now neutral and those now our enemies may ultimately be added.

A legislative or parliamentary body as the key unit for such a United Nations government might best safeguard human rights. The executives might well spring from the parliamentary body in a manner similar to the Canadian and British systems.

Obviously, such a United Nations government, as it gradually develops over a period of time, should have very limited powers, with the member nations maintaining their own domestic sovereignty.

Such a United Nations government should enact a very elementary code of justice worldwide in scope, based upon, not nations' rights but human rights. It should include provisions for abolishing slavery, for the protection of minorities wherever they may be, and for preventing religious persecution.

A United Nations court would be needed to administer the code of justice.

Realistically recognizing man's weaknesses, should we not contemplate establishing a United Nations legion or police force to keep the Axis Nations and other outlaw territories disarmed, to enforce the basic code of justice and to support the administrative functions?

No orderly government on any level in all of history has ever been successful without a police force. This was one of the three fatal weaknesses of the League of Nations.

This does not mean that our country and the other United Nations should completely disarm. Just as the law-abiding residents of the West continued to pack their own guns long after the first sheriff was installed to bring about orderly government, so we must maintain armed strength of our own in addition to the United Nations' Legions.

In other words, I do not suggest that we place all of our eggs in the international basket, but we should definitely place some of our eggs in continuing United Nations government. They might at least hatch something better than recurring wars, each of increasing tragedy and horror.

To those who scoff that efforts to work out some such program are idealistic, impractical, impossible—it can well be said that when the founding fathers of our own United States of America were struggling to devise a new method of government, the same cries of the defeatists—"idealistic, impractical, impossible"—were heard.

Permit me to quote from a statement of the Dean of Gloucester, Josiah Tucker, in 1786, just one year before the Constitution of these United States, which we have taken for granted for a century and a half, was drafted: "As to the future grandeur of America, and its being a rising empire under one head, whether republican or monarchial in its form, it is one of the idlest and most visionary notions that ever was conceived even by writers of romance. The mutual antipathies and clashing interests of the Americans, their differences of governments, habitudes and manners, indicate that they will have no center of union and no common interest. They never can be united into one compact empire under any species of government, whatever; a disunited people till the end of time, suspicious and distrustful of each other, they will be divided and subdivided into little commonwealths or principalities, according to natural boundaries, by great bays of the sea, and by vast rivers, lakes, and ridges of mountains."

So stated the Dean of Gloucester 1 year before the Constitution of this country was drafted.

We now have a world-wide vision to win the war. We must keep our sights high and maintain a world-wide vision to win an enduring peoples' peace.

The vote of the people of Massachusetts on November 3, 1942, on the broad proposal looking toward world government, and the similar resolutions adopted by the North Carolina and New Jersey Legislatures are encouraging developments.

We must say over and over again that men can die upon the battlefields in vain because of what happens after a war as well as because of what happens during a war. During the battle for independence, we planned to win that peace.

During the War between the States, Lincoln began to plan the winning of that peace. We reverted from those plans to that shameful period of carpetbagging and almost lost the peace. Then we worked out the means of again accepting the Southern States, in keeping with human dignity, as a part of our Union, and the Nation progressed.

Our men upon the field of battle in '17 and '18 acquitted themselves well. They won a heroic, decisive victory, but—we all know—we lost that peace.

The winning of this war must come first. It must be uppermost in our minds and thoughts and deeds. Each of us must add to the total strength of America until victory comes to the United Nations.

But we must not forget that with peace, as with war, there is no easy road to victory. With persistence and with vision we must use the lessons of yesterday and the realities of today to build tomorrow's world. May it be a world in which we find the pattern whereby the tragic clash of nations gradually becomes a harmonious mosaic of nationalities. May it be a world in which to an increased degree men and women and little children of all continents can walk in dignity, in honor, in freedom, and in peace.

Why Farmers Do Not Like Subsidies Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter written by Mrs. Pearl Buntzen of Edna, Kans., requires no comment on my part. It sets out very clearly why farmers are not happy over present governmental policies relative to agriculture and labor:

EDNA, KANS., *March 1, 1943.*

Honorable Mr. HOPE,
Washington, D. C.

KIND SIR: I like the little booklet that you sent. But a couple of things wrong with it. On Page 15 somebody's supposition as to the farmer and wife, John and Mary's conversation. I'm afraid if they really stepped in they would not find such an amicable reaction at all.

Two years ago, 4 years ago, and backwards, while the farmers were not satisfied, still they were not mad nor did they blame Washington. They felt that there just was no market and that the Government was trying to help, and that subsidies were a necessary evil.

But now they know there is more demand than supply and plenty market. They know that people are plenty able to pay decent prices and would if it were not for the low ceilings. They see their former hired hands (often plenty dumb at that) now making $100 a week and short hours while they slave for a fraction of that. It is making their blood boil. The farmers know that farm prices causing inflation is all bunk.

Since getting your letter I have made it a point to talk with farmers, urging them to write to Washington and explain things. With one exception, they all said, "No use." They say the Government has it in for the farmers and is trying to punish them. Part of

them say nothing to do but quit, but too many say, "Nothing but a gun will change Washington; we will clean up Hitler and the Japs; then we will clean up Washington." I tell you it scares me. It is nothing like John and Mary's conversation in that booklet. As I ride (horseback) through my pretty woods, with all at peace here, I think with a shudder how terrible if Washington does not wake up and lets us in for civil war, our homes torn up and afraid to be out alone.

I tell you, farmers are bitter and getting more so. They say the city folks are hogs and think the farmers are dupes. Wages were highest in history and food cost the lowest according to wages, yet at Christmas they increased wages 10 percent. That made the farmers pretty mad, but they thought, "Well, we will soon be getting our raise accordingly." Then more added to wages by giving overtime for the 48-hour week. Farmers feel there should be no overtime till the war is ended. Now all they want to give the farmers is dole (subsidies), so that everyone will call them parasites when they are hardest workers of all. Farmers don't howl like city folks, but the biting dog is not the barking one. Farmers are getting too bitter to please me. I am a city woman (been on the farm 6 years). I can understand the city folks' viewpoint much better than farmers who always lived in the country. As a child I heard them say, "Farmers are lucky. When they need money all they have to do is haul some stuff to town and sell it." They do not understand, is why they kick on higher prices. They do not realize the expense and hard work to get that stuff. The selling is all they think there is to it.

All that farmers want is the same share of national income as others are getting, or true parity. In 1910–14 a farmer could pay as high wages as any industry, therefore, could get good help. And he had plenty left for wages for himself and family that worked. The booklet says they should give the farmer as much wages as his hired hand. That is the other thing I felt wrong in it. No one would expect the president of any other industry to take the same wage as his lowest unskilled laborer. Yet they are not willing that the farmer should have any wage counted in his parity. It takes plenty of skill and responsibility and often up nights for the farmer. He should be allowed as much as a skilled laborer for his time.

And the farmers do not want subsidies when there is plenty market for their stuff. If they must have subsidies, why don't they call it by its right name, subsidizing consumers. If they feel some are not able to pay the price to give the farmer their share of the national income and a decent wage, why do they not give the consumers tickets something like they did the Work Projects Administration (to cripples or old people or such), but let the farmers feel self-respecting since he works and earns it.

Farmers realize that wages are the biggest inflation danger, and that no danger of inflation so long as prices are controlled. They believe in ceilings, so long as ceilings are such that they give everybody equal chance to a wage according to his skill and effort.

I have talked with some ex-farmers now making big money in defense and asked them how they liked big wages and cheap food and they said they did not like it. They said if they would let the farmers make same as other industries, that they could be back on the farm where they long to be. Farmers love the soil—but they like money, too.

Now with the food rationing it seems city folk would be more open to listen if someone would only explain to them that no one can eat his cake and still have it. They wanted short hours—which has taken too many men to do what fewer men could have done, therefore, no one to make the less essential things. They have wanted cheap food and biggest wages in history, which has put many farmers out of business and caused a food shortage—and will cause more. What good will their money do when there is nothing left to buy? By being too hoggish they will become like King Midas who wanted what he touched to turn to gold. One can't eat gold, and unless they wake up many will be in the same fix as King Midas.

I am writing to give you what I have learned in talking with farmers as one of them, and you may pass it on to others in Congress, and thank you for your time. My husband was raised in Paterson, N. J. My mother-in-law lives there now. My brother is pastor of a large church in Omaha, so I can see both sides, I believe, better than average farmers. I know that lack of understanding is the reason they are so hard on the farmers, but the farmers think it is hoggishness (not willing to live and let live) of the consumers, and that Washington has it in for them.

Yours truly,

MRS. PEARL BUNTZEN.

Planning in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Planning in Reverse," from the Boston Post of March 15.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLANNING IN REVERSE

There has been a great deal of scornful talk by planners of world peace and post-war aims directed at those who urge that we wind up the war before planning the peace.

It has become almost an integral part of the strategy of the United Nations to plan the solution of peace problems before any prospect of peace is in view, and this planning is not confined to those indulging in wishful thinking. Right now President Roosevelt and Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden are engaged in such discussions at the White House.

From the standpoint of the American who has been taught from childhood that it is folly to cook a rabbit stew before you catch your rabbit, the post-war planning is irksome while we are engaged in a struggle which demands more and more sacrifices each day.

The resolution to be offered in the Senate for the calling of a conference of the United Nations to work out wartime and post-war problems serves to indicate how deeply ingrained this project is in the consciousness of the Nation's lawmakers.

Yet, despite the manifested desire of these lawmakers and executives to avoid the mistakes of the last peace conference, the plain truth is that in the rush of wartime domestic problems the Nation's leaders have demonstrated no great genius for arriving at a cohesive plan.

There are urgent wartime domestic problems to be faced and solved before the post-war plans are made. The people must be fed. Tax programs must be devised. Manpower problems must be solved. The whole war effort must be financed. The looming danger of inflation must be curbed. Production must be increased and raw-material supplies assured. Armies must be raised and trained.

Over all of these immediate needs the threat of debate on post-war problems in the Congress looms as a real danger. One has only to turn back to the events in the Congress following the last war to discern that it is entirely possible to lose the war while planning a peace.

The public would like to see the immediate domestic problems solved by sensible legislation before the Congress turns its heavy hand to the post-war world. War problems are quite sufficient to keep one government—even such a numerous body as we possess—busy for the duration.

Always there is the possibility that in setting the United Nations to the quarrelsome business of planning a post-war world, the Axis has accomplished a master stroke of political warfare. In short, let us start to squabble about how we are going to manage something that we do not now possess—a peaceful world—and the war effort will inevitably suffer by being short-changed out of the best effort of the men who are charged with the duty of obtaining victory. Let's get on with the war and stop planning in reverse.

Proposed Consolidation of War and Post-War Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Taking in Too Much Territory With One Arm," by Arthur Krock, which appears in the New York Times today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—TAKING IN TOO MUCH TERRITORY WITH ONE ARM

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 15.—The newest Senate move to consolidate the war and post-war programs of the United Nations in advance of victory ran into trouble at once for several reasons. It takes in too much territory. It was publicly sponsored—by Senators HILL and HATCH, Democrats, and BALL and BURTON, Republicans—without that preliminary spade-work which must be done in all such projects. It lacks the endorsement of at least one former isolationist, and therefore was instantly suspect by them all.

The majority leader of the Senate, Mr. BARKLEY, knew nothing of the plan, it is said, until a day of two before the public was apprised, and only then because the minority leader, Mr. MCNARY, insisted it should be laid before Mr. BARKLEY also. This was very bad tactics in a matter of such gravity and import. And Senator BALL's co-authorship instantly spread the belief that the resolution has for its specific objective the world government plan outlined by his fellow Minnesotan, Governor Stassen. That plan is noble and progressive. But it is a

large order to ask of the Senate while uncertainty exists that all the anti-Axis nations subscribe even to the general principles of the Atlantic Charter.

THE BASIC QUESTION

In all these respects the resolution differs from one which was laid before Senator CLARK of Missouri some days ago and which for a time he sympathetically considered. That resolution merely sought to put Congress on record in favor of maintaining collective security after the war by such effective economic, social, and military means as could be agreed on by the United Nations.

It made the House a partner in the pledge. It confined itself solely to resolving the preponderant question in the minds of our Allies. This question is, will Congress demolish collective security after the war, as in 1919? And finally the source of this resolution was to be the former isolationists, because any which they oppose might evoke a debate so bitter and vote so divided as to produce a worse effect than to leave the burning question unanswered.

Mr. CLARK, after much consultation, decided not to sponsor the resolution, even with certain changes in the text. But that a day or two passed before he came to this decision lent hope that an agreement might be reached between his group and the other on a broad, general statement that Congress would stand by some form of post-war collective security. That would have been sufficient, and, if the statement could have come while Mr. Eden was in the United States and the Russian armies at Kharkov were taking new blows from the Germans, the beneficial effects on anti-Axis unity would have been immeasurable.

THE DEPLORABLE POSSIBILITY

The probability now is that, aroused by the breadth and particularity of the four-Senator resolution, the former isolationists, joined by some of those who opposed them but who cannot go the full length with Governor Stassen, will counter the proposal with one of their own. This might be the deplorable document, discussed in the cloakrooms, in which the United Nations are notified that the Senate is a constitutional part of treaty-making powers and not to forget it. Those who have suggested this chilling proclamation have urged its necessity on the grounds that otherwise the President may try to commit Congress on international matters within its jurisdiction.

If floor or even committee consideration of the four-Senator resolution should bring on a debate and a vote on such an alternative, it would be better for the Allied cause if it were never introduced. But it is to be introduced. Therefore, if leaving it moulder in a pigeonhole can avert that debate and vote at this time, the pigeonhole would be the best possible place for it.

A DETAILED PLAN

The detailed nature of the resolution served quickly to fuse two groups: The former isolationists and those who first want to know what Russia plans to do about Poland, part of Finland and the Baltic States, and Great Britain about looming items of post-war competition with this country. It advocates the formation of a world government with specific, though limited, authority. It promises world-wide food during a growing domestic food shortage. It definitely indorses a United Nations military force to suppress any future attempt at aggression by any nation. This gives Senator WHEELER his cue to ask, in effect, "Would Russian seizure of territory be present or future, and would Russia agree that this is military aggression?"

Almost any Senator will concede that, remembering 1919, the executive heads of the United Nations should undertake no commitments with the President which they are not certain the Senate, and actually Congress, will approve. They concede that some way should be found to state in very general terms the limiting principles of commitments that are acceptable to Congress. To say the Atlantic Charter is such a statement would cover that position. But the fourth-term talk obstructs this solution, and the four-Senator effort is obstructed by its details and its sources, real and suspected.

Report of Fuel Oil Rationing Investigating Committee Appointed by Sixty-third Illinois General Assembly

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the publication in the RECORD of the report of the fuel oil rationing investigating committee appointed by the Sixty-third Illinois General Assembly under authority of Senate Joint Resolution 2. The report includes an exhaustive study of a question that is affecting all our people. Witnesses representing all types of organizations and citizens were heard. I believe, therefore, that this report is of such importance and significance that it should be published in full in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I have had an estimate made of the cost of printing the report. The cost will be $157.50.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE FUEL OIL RATIONING INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *March 3, 1943.*

To the Members of the Sixty-third General Assembly:

The joint fuel oil rationing investigating committee, authorized by, and operating under the provisions of, Senate Joint Resolution No. 2, introduced in the senate on January 12, 1943, and subsequently adopted by the senate and the house of representatives, herewith presents a report upon work and activities to date consummated.

Pursuant to appointment by Lt. Gov. Hugh W. Cross and the Speaker, Elmer J. Schnackenberg, the committee membership is as follows:

Senators Walker Butler, R. G. Crisenberry, Nicholas L. Hubbard, Stanley J. Mondala, and Earle Benjamin Searcy; Representatives George Garry Noonan, Lottie Holman O'Neill, Lyle M. Prescott, William G. Thon, and J. L. Wellinghoff.

On February 9, 1943, the committee met and organized by electing the following officers: Chairman, Senator Earle Benjamin Searcy; secretary, Representative Lottie Holman O'Neill.

Immediately Senate Joint Resolution No. 2 was introduced in January, many citizens of Illinois, living in numerous sections of the State, began transmitting complaints, statements, and personal experiences in relation to fuel oil rationing, both verbally and in writing. Thus fore-armed with a representative picture of the situation from the more scattered and separated communities of Illinois, the committee at its organization meeting, voted to hold its first formal hearings in the city of Chicago on Friday and Saturday, February 19 and 20, 1943.

This decision was reached with three ideas in mind:

1. Expressions from down-State Illinois consumers of fuel oil indicated marked similarity throughout all sections as related to rationing problems.

2. Inasmuch as Chicago is the domicile of many leading concerns intimately informed upon fuel-oil problems, as well as a large center of typical fuel-oil consumers having experiences akin to, and perhaps identical with, those of users from down-State Illinois, the committee deemed it possible to procure an exhaustive and comprehensive grasp of both consumers' and officials' problems through hearings there.

3. The committee desired to proceed as rapidly as possible, at nominal expense to the people, having in mind both the accessibility of relevant witnesses and the advance status of the current winter season, in order to report to the general assembly at the earliest possible date.

WITNESSES

At the Chicago hearings February 19-20 witnesses with knowledge of substantially every phase of the fuel-oil rationing problem were heard. All of them appeared voluntarily before the committee. The list of witnesses, 32 in number, was as follows:

Michael F. Mulcahy, Metropolitan Chicago area representative, Office of Price Administration.

E. W. Miles, manager, fuel-oil department, Standard Oil Co. of Indiana.

Charles S. Rosenthal, Apex Motor Fuel Co., Chicago.

Bernard L. Majewski, Deep Rock Oil Co., chairman, marketing district 2.

A. C. Sailstad, executive secretary, Supply & Distributing Co., district 2, Petroleum Administration for War.

Medville Keim, Apex Motor Fuel Co., Chicago, author "ABC" plan.

Miss Charlotte Miller, president, Sterling Fuel Oil Co., Chicago.

W. A. Erley, private consumer, 1346 Madison Park, Chicago.

Carlton C. Hilliard, private consumer, 5426 Ferdinand Street, Chicago.

C. W. Adams, Bell Oil Co., Chicago.

Rev. David J. Reid, consumer, St. Francis Episcopal Church, Chicago.

C. R. Jonswold, Triangle Oil Co., Chicago.

Harry Hough, A. & A. Blue Flame Oil Co., Chicago.

Frank E. Spencer, president, Distributors' Association, 616 South Michigan Avenue.

Joel Dean, National Director, Fuel Rationing Division, Office of Price Administration.

Robert Gray, care of Heating Publishers, Inc., New York.

Edward F. Stegen, assistant director, regional office of Office of Price Administration, Chicago.

Charles Genge, Braun Bros., Chicago.

Harvey L. Cavender, consumer, 711 Williams Street, River Forest.

C. W. Johnson, Director of Marketing, Petroleum Administration for War, district 2.

Ernest L. Hughes, Chief, Fuel Oil Section, Petroleum Administration for War, district 2.

Wirt Franklin, Director, Petroleum Administration for War, district 2.

Dale Larish, regional fuel-oil representative for Office of Price Administration.

Carter Jenkins, down-State Illinois director for Office of Price Administration.

Julius Loeffler, Commerce Petroleum Co., Chicago.

Oscar L. Peterson, care of George Peterson Oil Co., Chicago.

P. J. Healy, Arrow Petroleum Co., Chicago.

H. C. Lewis, Administrative Head, Fuel Oil Section, Petroleum Administration for War.

Wilfred R. Collier, consumer, Braun Manufacturing Co., 100-percent war materials.

I. W. Lee, Pure Oil Co., Chicago.

F. B. Caldwell secretary, Distributors' Association, 616 South Michigan Avenue.

J. J. Hyde, attorney for regional office of Office of Price Administration.

District No. 2, the committee wishes to point out, is a jurisdictional section used by both Office of Price Administration (O. P. A.) and Petroleum Administration for War (P. A. W.), comprising 15 Middle West States, of which Illinois is one.

The regional office has jurisdiction over 8 of the aforesaid 15 States of District 2, including Illinois.

Smaller units of jurisdiction range down from the above to the metropolitan Chicago area, embracing Cook, Lake, DuPage Counties in Illinois, and Lake County, Ind.; down-State Illinois, the local rationing boards, etc.

COMMITTEE OBJECTIVES

On convening the hearings the committee chairman made the following statement:

"Rationing presupposes a shortage of the article rationed. If there is a shortage, the question properly arises, Why? Is the Federal Government doing its utmost to increase production of the article which has suffered shortage? Is the State government following a like policy? If not, why?

"Americans can well get along with less of some items and commodities, especially in war, without impairing the national health. In the case of fuel oil, too little heat in winter, if long imposed, tempts ill health. A healthy, vigorous citizenship is vital, in war as in peace.

"Complaints have come to members of the sixty-third general assembly alleging (a) shortage of necessary fuel oil for heating; and (b) confusion in rationing such supplies of fuel oil as have been allocated.

"In the conviction that the welfare of the State's citizens transcends either personal or partisan preferment, the general assembly has directed this inquiry, as provided under Senate Joint Resolution No. 2, and we enter it in a spirit of duty toward the people whom we represent.

"Moreover, we are actuated by the tenth amendment to our Federal Constitution, a section of the Bill of Rights, which provides:

" 'The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.' "

The committee, in general agreement with the foregoing, thereafter endeavored to direct its further scope of inquiry to the following questions:

1. Is fuel oil rationing necessary in Illinois? If so, is there a need for a modified plan to guarantee a sensible, practical, and simple means to the end of equitable rationing, at a minimum of health-impairing risk and inconvenience to consumers?

2. If fuel oil rationing is to continue, ought not the counsel and advice of experienced oil consumers and sales agencies in the Middle West be invited, listened to and, within reason, followed?

TESTIMONY

The committee, from transcriptions during the hearings, possesses a rather detailed and comprehensive report of the testimony submitted by each witness. For your convenience, however, only a brief summary of the aggregate thereof is here presented. The committee has a complete file of detailed testimony, together with the identity of the witness giving same; and this file is open to all members of the general assembly.

The committee was presented with the following summarized testimony:

Including all classes of users—private homes, industrial plants, institutions, churches, schools, etc.—there are 949,090 fuel oil consuming units in Illinois. Of this number, 697,561 are in downstate Illinois; 251,529 in the Metropolitan Chicago area.

Under present fuel-oil rationing, average reduction in oil quota for this winter to private dwellings in Chicago area is 26 percent less than last winter's consumption.

The current winter period of 1942–43 has been 23 percent colder, northern Illinois average, than the winter period of a year ago, 1941–42.

Oil company officials testified there is no shortage of fuel oil in Illinois at this time, nor has there been. Distributors who testified corroborated this assertion.

Fuel-oil stocks on hand at this time (February 1943) are larger than at any time during mid-winter of 1942, despite increased demand for fuel oil this year, because of colder weather. Statement by oil company officials and corroborated by distributors.

Oil company officials stated there are no transportational difficulties, against which any fuel-oil shortage, real or theoretical, can be charged; distributors corroborating.

Witnesses familiar with fuel-oil problem, not only in Illinois but nationally as well, expressed doubt, in view of present fuel oil stock inventories and available transportation facilities, whether fuel-oil rationing was necessary in Illinois this winter. No forecasts were attempted as to future fuel-oil rationing conditions and needs.

Insufficient grants of fuel oil under present rationing system have caused many cases of illness, due to inadequate heat. War workers reported days lost from work through present rationing system.

Homes with babies and small children have been subjected to serious disarrangement under present rationing system. Little, if any, of the rationing machinery was ready and prepared when rationing became effective. Many local rationing boards, through confusion and errors in computation, reduced consumers' fuel-oil quotas 4 percent below reductions contemplated and directed through Office of Price Administration regulations.

Private (residential) consumers were practically unanimous in testifying that under present fuel-oil quotas they will exhaust their complete present winter's quotas not later than March 31, 1943. Some already have used up their total quotas and are being subjected to costly inconveniences in trying to procure small auxiliary quantities of fuel oil from time to time. Private consumers generally wanted to know how they will fare after March 31, with April and May, both heating months, ahead.

One of the phases of present rationing system which consumers and distributors uniformly condemned is what is known as the coupon system devised by the Office of Price Administration in Washington. One witness declared, with all other corroborating—except Office of Price Administration officials—that fuel-oil distributors especially are burdened "with additional and unnecessary manpower and womanpower needed to collect, clip, paste, count, exchange, and ultimately account for millions of coupons," whereas a simpler system was urged.

One witness, who is both an oil company executive and a government aide during the war emergency, testified, with no one refuting, that with a proper price adjustment on fuel oil—increase of one-half cent per gallon—together with a change in processing whereby the fuel oil residue from crude were stepped up approximately 3 percent higher than is now processed, fuel oil rationing, in his opinion, could be abolished in Illinois and the Middle West, without impairing the supply of fuel oil either to Illinois, to shipping points for war use, or to the East for civilian use.

In connection with the coupon system one witness, from statistics he had procured, testified the present fuel oil rationing system, with the coupon requirements contributing largely, requires the full time of 10,000 persons and, in addition, costs heavily in manpower, rubber, transportation equipment, extra office costs, postage, stationery, light, heat, etc. Supporting this contention, another witness, a distributor, testified that his net additional operating costs this winter, because of rationing, will be not less than $10,000. Others corroborated this claim, but with varying individual figures as to individual added cost.

Witnesses generally, who discussed the subject, condemned the action of local rationing boards in ordering conversion from fuel oil to other heating fuels immediately—in midwinter. This Office of Price Administration policy was criticized by one spokesman from the P. A. W., who expressed his view that all conversions should be delayed until summer, when heating plants are idle.

Most of the fuel-oil distributors advocated, to take the place of the existing measurement formula and coupon system, a plan authorizing "horizontal cuts" in quotas, if there is to be future rationing, administered in a manner that would insure equal percentage reductions to all, together with provision for hauling fuel oil to consumers during the summer, in tank-capacity quantities, thus doing away with the present system of numerous short hauls, entailing unnecessary impairment of rubber and transporting equipment. Supporting this testimony, a private consumer, who operated a manufacturing plant turning out war materials 100 percent, testified that only with the aid and influence of the United States Army has he been able to "piece along" with supplies from time to time, and, further, that his problems from now until the end of the heating season are not yet solved. He heats his war-manufacturing plant with fuel oil.

Fuel-oil distributors testified, and their testimony was not refuted, that when original fuel-oil rationing plans were under preparation, no one from Illinois, grounded and informed on the mechanics and problems of fuel-oil consumption and handling, was consulted in formulating the Office of Price Administration rules and regulations now in effect in Illinois. Regardless of the oversight, however, distributors declared they have tried earnestly to conform to the multiple rules, as issued; that their attempted cooperation has come from patriotic motives.

In his testimony, Director Joel Dean, Office of Price Administration, described in detail the national Office of Price Administration's panel, an advisory group of oil and allied representatives which, Director Dean maintained, assisted in writing the regulations governing fuel-oil rationing. Illinois distributors did not dispute the existence of the panel, but maintained their position that experienced Middle West interests were not represented thereon.

Mr. Dean defined, and confirmed present operation of, the Office of Price Administration policy pertaining to the rationing of fuel oil to occupants of private dwellings, as follows: That occupants of residence property which has suffered greater obsolescence, and has installed fewer modern safeguards against weather, are cut more severely in fuel oil quotas than occupants of property which has suffered lesser deterioration and obsolescence, and is of more modern construction. Questioned as to why the Office of Price Administration had adopted such an hypothesis as this, Mr. Dean advised that the policy was designed to help rid the Nation of fuel oil "wasters." This explanation was taken as explaining why witnesses had complained of seemingly disproportionate grants of fuel oil in cases where private homes were similar, if not identical, in floor and room measurements, room space, size, etc.

Regional and area Office of Price Administration offices testified that a total of 369 formal appeals from local rationing board

decisions, on fuel-oil quotas, had been filed, at date of the committee's hearings, with Office of Price Administration appeal officials in Illinois. Oil company officials and fuel-oil distributors, in rebuttal testimony, conceded that though the total number of formal appeals was probably no greater than reported herein, they had daily encountered masses of "consumer resentment" which, they insisted, reflected the true temper of consumers rather than the number of formal appeals. One distributor, speaking from records of the company represented, testified that 85 percent of all consumers served by the company had complained against present fuel-oil rationing provisions. The factor of unappealed, yet openly expressed "consumer resentment" was stated by a majority of the witnesses to be general.

Original fuel oil rationing order No. II of the Office of Price Administration, under which fuel oil rationing operates in Illinois, was reported to have been amended 36 times up to the date of the committee hearings; and within the week following the hearings, 2 more amendments were added. Witnesses averred much confusion has ensued both from the original order and from amendments thereto.

Officials of the Office of Petroleum Administration for War (PAW) disclaimed to the committee any responsibility for administration of the present fuel-oil rationing system; though much of PAW's work parallels, and is allied with, the general fuel-oil rationing plan.

Officials of oil companies and representatives of both OPA and PAW were repeatedly questioned by committee members as to whether there is any present comprehensive program, or unified effort, to encourage the drilling of a greater number of new oil wells, thus increasing the production of crude oil, in Illinois or any other portion of the oil-producing Middle West, particularly in view of the fact that the United States is engaged in war. No evidence was given the committee to indicate that any such program has been either inaugurated or is contemplated. One witness, an oil company official and a Government aide during the war emergency, testified that, several months ago, Leon Henderson had been asked to approve a requested increase in the price of crude oil at the wells, in the hope of encouraging increased production, but that the request, to date, has not been acted upon.

In response to questions asked by committee members as to the extent to which local rationing boards have the power to exercise authority over matters pertaining to fuel-oil rationing—original quotas for consumers, auxiliary quotas, conversions to other fuel forms, etc.—explanation and replies lacked clarity until National Fuel Rationing Director Dean of the OPA stated:

"Local rationing boards have complete authority within the framework of, and subject to, the parent regulations as formulated in Washington, D. C."

Legal counsel for the regional office of OPA stated it as his opinion that rules and regulations, as created and published by the parent office of OPA in Washington, D. C., possess and carry the same full force of mandatory law and statute, as if enacted directly by the Congress of the United States.

APPENDIX

In order that members of the general assembly may familiarize themselves more thoroughly with the type of testimony presented to the committee, there are appended herewith three authenticated exhibits:

A. A letter from a local rationing board to a fuel-oil consumer;

B. A letter, supporting oral testimony given, from a fuel-oil distributor to the committee;

C. A letter from a consumer to a distributor (fuel-oil dealer).

A

This letter was written January 23, 1943, to Dr. Peter Karedis, 3136 Douglas Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and was signed by Winifred Bergmann, Fuel Oil Department, Local Board 40-24, Office of Price Administration, 3827 West Roosevelt Road, Chicago, Ill., and reads as follows:

"In view of the increasingly serious fuel-oil supply situation, it is imperative that buildings other than dwellings be compelled to convert or lose their fuel-oil rations. Only the most conclusive proof that the property is not convertible will be acceptable.

"Boards will terminate heating rations for such buildings unless written proof is presented that arrangements have been made for conversion by a definite date within the current heating season, or that the conversion of the plant is impossible. This is regardless of the size of the heated area.

"This policy will be applied even if it means heatless buildings. You must convert."

B

This letter was written February 22, 1943, to the Fuel Oil Rationing Investigating Committee, Senate Joint Resolution No. 2, Springfield, Ill., and was signed by Julius Leoffler, president, Commerce Petroleum Co., 2923 Lock Street, Chicago, Ill., and reads as follows:

"Supplementing the writer's appearance before your committee, it has been the writer's opinion from the very beginning that the question of rationing made its appearance that a horizontal reduction would be the simplest and most economical way. In my opinion, the so-called 'waster' would have eliminated himself this winter, whereas the consumer who was thrifty would have gotten by.

"We have just finished a comparison of operations under the ration plan between October 1, 1942, and January 31, 1943, as compared to operating under normal conditions between October 1, 1941, and January 31, 1942. The following figures are interesting, taking into consideration that the volume handled during the ration period was only 92 percent of the volume handled during the normal period:

		Percent
Number of stops	increase	24
Average per stop	decrease	25
Mileage	increase	19
Cost per gallon	do	26

"The mileage increase is in spite of the fact that we relinquished a certain amount of business in outlying districts, such as South Chicago, Blue Island, Oak Lawn, Oak Park, River Forest, Berwyn, Riverside, and Evanston. This business was relinquished because we felt that it was necessary for us to conserve rubber.

"In spite of being unable to get shipments of fuel oil in tank cars to our plants since May 1, and relying entirely on transport-truck shipments, our own supply position has been the best in the past 5 years. This is enlightening because we were faced with the following situation:

"A. Twenty-three percent colder winter.

"B. Operating with 20 percent less drivers and equipment.

"C. Rush orders because of period rationing and also emergency rations.

"D. Bad operating conditions because of heavy snows and icy streets and highways.

"We are concerned with the attitude of OPA with regard to conversions, especially as far as home owners and owners of small flat buildings. These consumers in a good many cases followed the suggestions of OPA and OPC, spending considerable money for insulation, storm windows, weather stripping, etc. Neither OPA nor OPC should attempt by threat or otherwise to force these types of consumers to convert. These consumers spent their money on the theory that the conservation would permit them to continue to burn oil.

"We offer the following suggestions in connection with any revised plan for fuel-oil rationing:

"1. All cuts should be horizontal;

"2. Elimination of periods;

"3. Replacement of coupon system with 'check system';

"4. Permit consumers to purchase to the extent of their storage capacity, as in the past, thereby permitting the consumer to get the benefit of the quantity price and also permit the oil company to make the best possible use of manpower, equipment, and rubber;

"5. Permit consumers to fill their available storage this summer. This would help the refiners, oil distributors, railroads, and transport operators to level off operations on a more even scale. This would also permit the small oil company to have work for their drivers during the 'off period,' otherwise these drivers may be lost to other war industries and may not be available next winter to the oil company.

"6. Simplify to a great extent the application for emergency ration.

"7. Ration should be of 'fixed value.' Adjustments for weather conditions can be made after the peak, preferably late spring.

"Any revised policy by the OPA should be accompanied by a complete revision in the minds of its executive personnel, both in Washington and elsewhere. The OPA should get out of its mind that the consuming public or the oil industry are 'chiselers' or unpatriotic Americans. Our 25 years of dealing with the consuming public, in our opinion, is a better yardstick to judge the quality and honesty of the consuming public than the judgment of inexperienced officials of OPA, some of whom have had absolutely no experience either in dealing with the consuming public or in business life.

"Greater cooperation, especially locally, between the OPA and the oil industry is necessary to facilitate smoother and more economical operation of a revised fuel oil rationing program."

C

This letter was written February 21, 1943, to Frank E. Spencer, president of the Burning Oil Distributors Association, 616 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and was signed by W. B. Mueller, 3512 Osceola Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and reads as follows:

"Let me first offer my sincere thanks for the fine fight you are making against the inhuman rationing of fuel oil. I, too, would help if I could.

"The following is the situation in my case as a user of fuel oil for heating my home, which is an average 5-room brick bungalow. I used 1,450 gallons last year, was allowed 680 gallons plus the 50 gallons in change stamps to heat my home this year; an utter impossibility. I purchased 200 gallons on a note against my coupons, before I received them by mail after a number of trips to the ration board, and being almost out of oil. I am a tool and die maker on 100 percent war work, both Army and Navy orders. I have lost about 6 days so far this winter running to the ration board. For each day my work is delayed, 15 or more workers are also delayed, making more than 16 man-days lost for each day I lost. Yesterday (Saturday) I had to lay off again as I was about out of oil. At the ration board they very kindly exchanged 7 of my remaining No. 5 coupons for No. 4 coupons so I could get oil now. They would not exchange them all, in this way making it necessary to purchase 150 gallons of oil in two deliveries.

"So far this winter I have purchased 820 gallons of oil, the first 400 gallons in two deliveries, the other 420 gallons, due to rationing, required three trips, requiring seven trips to deliver less than 1,000 gallons of oil, when normally I would have bought

this amount in four trips. Where is the saving of rubber, gasoline, and manpower in this case, not to mention the days and nights of worry over getting oil at the right time to keep my home heated? Under these conditions, neither I nor my wife can put 100 percent efficiency into our work. We are both employed on defense work, my daughter attends high school, so you can see I must have automatic heat, as there is no one to take care of a hand-fired boiler. Now I must again take a day off from work so I can have a competent oil engineer check the burner, heating plant, and building, so I can file an appeal."

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee, after reviewing all testimony in hand, submits the following conclusions and recommendations:

1. Illinois citizens are not alone in their criticism of the confusing and misunderstood rules and regulations affecting fuel-oil rationing. Complaints similar to those from this State are being voiced from citizens of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Missouri. Of these, the committee has specific record.

2. From evidence submitted, and which was not refuted, on the basis of fuel-oil stocks in hand by dealers, together with facilities for transporting which seemingly have carried the winter load admirably, Illinois probably could have gone through the current winter period safely without the imposition of fuel-oil rationing, without in any way impairing the war effort. As to the future, the committee ventures no predictions, particularly in the light of equally unrefuted testimony that the war demands for fuel oil, in the future, will be greater than they have been in the past.

3. The committee feels that fuel-oil rationing ought to be only a war-dedicated necessity; that whatever policies enter into the operation of such rationing be designed for one purpose, namely, of augmenting the domestic and foreign strength of the United States for a speedy winning of the war.

4. The committee urges drastic simplification of the fuel-oil rationing system, effective immediately.

5. The committee urges immediate elimination of the coupon system.

6. In fixing fuel-oil quotas for consumers the committee urges that the OPA abandon the present complicated and theoretical formulas, which have resulted in admitted discriminations and inequities among consumers. The committee proposes the adoption of a method by which consumers will be treated on a uniform basis.

7. The committee urges that officials in charge do not enforce, or attempt to enforce, conversion of fuel-oil plants from oil to other fuel during any heating season.

8. The committee urges immediate and summary abandonment of the expressed OPA policy now in effect, whereby occupants of property suffering greater obsolescence and having fewer modern weatherproof devices, are cut more severely in fuel-oil rations than occupants of property that enjoys lesser deterioration and is of more modern construction. Americans can be counted on to make their homes as comfortable as circumstances will permit without coercion.

9. The committee urges adoption of a governmental policy designed to encourage the drilling of more new oil wells and production of more crude oil. The committee believes that a reasonable increase in the price of crude oil would foster greater production.

10. The committee urges abolition of the multiple control of fuel-oil rationing and the concentering of such rationing in one responsible authority, with duties and methods clearly defined.

11. The committee urges that any necessary fuel oil rationing, commence on June 1 of each year; that provision be made for summer delivery of fuel oil in consumer tank-capacity lots; except, of course, in cases where tank capacity may exceed total seasonal quota.

12. The committee urges that OPA coordinate its practices with other governmental agencies, notably ODT, which require conservation of transportational facilities. The Committee urges eradication of the prevailing system of small quantity deliveries and short hauls, because it necessitates waste of manpower, rubber and transportational facilities.

13. The committee urges abandonment of the false premise of OPA that simplicity of system is not compatible with equity in distribution.

14. The committee appeals, through proper channels of authority, for the abandonment of OPA Fuel Oil Rationing Order No. 11, with its 38 confusing amendments, and that there be substituted therefor a new, simple system of uniform rationing, if such is to continue, wholly war-dedicated in purpose, under which discrimination will be abolished, health will be safeguarded and actual need will become the determining factor.

Delay in Transportation of Mail to Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let's Have Action on This," from the Shreveport Times in respect to the delay in the transportation of mail between the United States and our armed forces.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S HAVE ACTION ON THIS

In almost every letter we have seen from our overseas fighters and in virtually every conversation we have had with men returning from the front—and the total would run into the hundreds—there is one universal complaint: That it takes too long for mail to travel from home to the distant outposts of our armed forces, that it arrives too seldom and that there isn't enough of it.

Quantity of the mail to our armed forces is a matter that can be settled only by the relatives and friends of those in uniform.

But, the question of time of transportation of overseas soldier mail and of frequency of delivery rests in its fundamentals with our own Government and with the administrative branches of the War and the Navy Departments.

There will be times when forces cannot be reached with any regularity by mail and the number of men so affected is bound to increase as the volume of our fighting effort increases. But, there is every indication of laxness and lack of maximum efficiency in the mail service from this country to our main overseas bases. Typical of the complaints we have received is the following excerpt from a letter written recently by an American overseas general to his wife in this country—a complaint worthy of especial consideration because it does not come merely from a homesick boy but from a high-ranking officer at the front, who is a veteran of overseas service in World War No. 1 also:

"Now we all realize that there are difficulties to overcome, but troops need original letters from home just as much as—perhaps more than—any other supplies for effective fighting.

"No photographed V-mail can take its place—it's as flat and impersonal as last year's newspaper.

"I have yet to find a soldier who likes that kind of mail, although he'll admit it's better than nothing for emergency news.

"But, it is not and never will be a 'letter from home.' And that's what counts.

"It's apparent that the War Department doesn't appreciate the tremendous morale factor involved.

"We realize that mail takes up some cargo space—but if our air-mail letters to you can make it in a week, why in the Lord's name can't the same airplanes use part of their cargo space for air-mail coming this way? (And leave off the visiting firemen.)

"Six weeks is too darn long from you to me, and no one hereabouts has had any more recent.

"The fact is our supply ships take only half that time to get here.

"There's something very wrong somewhere."

Obviously, and very emphatically, there certainly is something wrong in the overseas mail service and obviously, also, a photographed V-letter can never take the place of the real thing or have the same heartwarming "feel" that a real letter brings.

We fully appreciate the lack of shipping space, the need for sending fighting weapons, food, and clothing, and all those things. But, we also know that American ingenuity is capable of overcoming those things to some extent at least in getting home mail to men at the front just as it was capable of exceeding all time expectations in getting auto plants into construction of planes, in cutting training periods for soldiers without cutting the efficiency of training, and in bucking the tremendous odds the enemy held at the start of this war. The time element in transportation of home mail overseas is just as much an enemy as the Jap Zero plane or the German Mark VI tank—it is a breaker of morale and a destroyer of efficiency if it is permitted to lag too much.

Mail transportation overseas often must be slow. There will be outposts—such as small island outposts—with which there is no physical communication for weeks at a time. But, we do not believe that either the War or Navy Departments are so slow moving that mail to such major bases as England, Australia, Egypt, north Africa and the Aleutians need take the time—month in and month out—that is being taken now. The man who goes into action with the thought that he hasn't heard from home in 6 weeks—and in the belief that the delay probably has been unnecessary—won't be at his fighting best.

Let's have some action on this—in the Army and the Navy and, if necessary, from our Congressmen. Probably every one of them has the same type of complaint that comes constantly to us. The purpose of V-mail is obvious. It is a space and time saver, with thousands of letters transported via tiny film in the space hundreds of normal letters would take. But there are other ways of saving space, too, such as lightweight paper. Perhaps V-mail cannot and should not be abandoned, but there should be ample supplementing of it with regular mail.

Farm Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "Farm Crisis," from the New Orleans States of February 3, 1943, and the other under the title "The Farmer's Side," from the Times-Picayune of New Orleans under date of February 3, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Orleans States of February 3, 1943]

FARM CRISIS

In an article discussing food as a war weapon, a recent issue of Victory, official weekly bulletin of the Office of War Information, said:

"Food is a weapon of war and American food is being used to shorten the war. Hitler uses starvation as a weapon of conquest. American food is being used as a weapon against Hitler."

This makes so much sense that nobody can take issue with it. Food is an American weapon of surer efficacy than bombs and bullets. Our wheat and meat gave the Red army the power for those knockout wallops landed on the Nazis around Stalingrad. With candy and chocolate the American soldiers won over the populace of Dakar and intrenched themselves there without spilling a drop of blood. Our food has won the friendship of tribes and people in other parts of Africa. It has held Spain's assistance to the Axis down to a minimum. It has kept the people of Britain on their feet and going strong. It has lessened the ravages of famine in France and Greece and Poland—famine caused by Hitler's looting.

We have had, up to recently, an abundance of food in America. The harvests during the three consecutive years from 1940 to 1942 were record-breaking. We piled up enormous surpluses of many food items. Yet in spite of successive copious crops all surpluses have vanished except as to corn and wheat and these are going fast. If this year 1943 is not another record-breaker in food crops, the American people will be tightening belts before another midwinter.

Food is not a product of miracle and magic, any more than planes and guns and ships. Food is produced only by arducus labor in the fields, for long hours every day. The farmer's day is from "kin to kaint." No timekeeper lists his extra hours for overtime pay. Neither farm owner, nor tenant, nor hired hand knows the meaning of the 40-hour week or double pay for Sundays and holidays. Nor do they give a minute's thought to "social gains" of this sort.

The farmer is the only producer of the nation's No. 1 war weapon. And he cannot keep it up unless he has labor and tools and gets enough out of the proceeds for his very modest living. This Nation does not expect the captains of industry to manufacture planes or guns without tools, without labor, and at prices that do not leave a profit. Should it expect more than that from the agricultural classes?

We know of only one way the country's urgent demand for more and more food can be met:

1. The labor essential to efficient farming must be kept on the farms. It must not be drawn into the armed services, nor pirated into the war plants with the bait of fancy wages.

2. The farmer must have tools, such as tractors, ploughs, cultivators, seeders, and harvesters, and if these do not head the priority list, then it is silly to assume that food is the No. 1 weapon.

3. The farmer must receive a little bit more than the cost of his crops; not a big profit; merely enough for a living half as comfortable and luxurious as that of the $1-$2-an-hour-war-plant worker. Either the ceiling price on his grain and livestock must be raised, or an equivalent bonus paid him, to pay higher wages and other increased costs.

If the battle for more food is to be won this year, the farmer must get help quickly. In the lower South the season for planting is at hand, and in the upper South it is approaching. In the North it isn't far behind. It is absurd to set goals for the farmer and then take his labor and his tools from him. Farmers cannot very well share among themselves their meager stocks of tools because all need the same implements at virtually the same time.

Unless the farmers get tools and labor and fertilizers and transportation in ample quantities soon enough, nothing but a miracle will save the people of this country, or our allies, from acute food shortages. That miracle will be a fourth generous harvest in a row. Four successive years of copious farm production happens very rarely.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of February 3, 1943]

THE FARMER'S SIDE

The small farmer's side of the current controversy over his present and future condition was clearly presented in last week's Saturday Evening Post by Ed Will. Writing as "a middle-class farmer whose sole support is the income from his farm," he submitted these averments:

Though his is a skilled occupation, the average farmer of this group has a lower income, including return on investment, than that of unskilled labor in industry * * * The living standard supported by his farm is far below par for the United States * * * Many farmers who cannot afford a bathroom still must seek supplemental income to support even their lower standard of living or maintain the condition of even farm buildings and equipment * * * Their average workweek exceeds 60 hours. Compare this farm family's lot, he challenged, "with that of the skilled industrial worker's family, who, with practically no investment, supports a much higher standard of living working a 44-hour week."

The present farm outlook as he sees it is bleak. Farm labor still is being drawn away by the shorter hours, easier work, and much higher pay offered in the industries. The acute labor shortage thus created is aggravated by scarcity of farm machinery. In consequence, he foresees less ground will be farmed this year and many farmers will put in only such crops as require the least labor.

As one major cause of this situation he cites "the failure to permit farm prices to rise enough to pay wages that would compete with industrial wages." There is, he affirms, "a growing feeling among farmers, amounting in some areas to sincere conviction, that the administration is exploiting farmers for labor's benefit. * * * The administration seems to want low food costs for high-priced labor."

Whatever its past policy, purpose, and theory, the administration must face the stubborn fact of increasingly serious farm labor scarcity resultant in part from its own conscious or unconscious favoring of organized and aggressive industrial labor at the expense of the farmer and white collar city dweller. Farm labor shortage steadily grows more acute. Here in Louisiana agents of industrial concerns even now are touring rural districts and offering farm laborers and tenants shorter hours, easier work, and much higher pay—a combination usually proving irresistible. Not long ago a Carolina farm owner was reported to be offering, for Government use in food production, a thousand-acre plantation for whose cultivation he could not secure adequate labor.

It won't be long now before great-scale farm preparations must be started. The sooner Washington quits theorizing and playing politics and favoritism, and faces squarely the threatening farm situation which politics, favoritism, and theory can cause but cannot cure, the sooner commonsense remedies may be found to remake or relieve the all-but-prohibitive handicaps now operating to prevent the great scale food production the United Nations expect and must have from American farms this year.

Increase of Commerce on the Mississippi and Its Tributaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and informative article written by Mr. Paul Wooton, correspondent in Washington of the Times-Picayune of New Orleans, with reference to the increase of water-borne commerce on the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Use of inland waterways to relieve the strain on the railroads is being urged by the Department of Commerce. Thomas T. Lyons, the Department's transportation specialist, in a statement issued here, points out that the country's rivers could carry vastly more traffic than at present. He thinks it is particularly important to make greater use of the rivers of the Mississippi Basin where most industries have been converted to war production.

While pointing out the urgent need for more towboats and barges, he calls attention to the fact that more than $50,000,000 have been invested during the past 20 years in floating equipment and terminal facilities on the Mississippi River system. This means that the country entered this war with a great deal more inland waterway equipment than was the case in 1917, when extensive barge operations were confined to the Monongahela River. With the beginning of this war there were more than 3,000 towboats and barges in operation on the Mississippi and its tributaries. A single 2,500-horsepower towboat, Mr. Lyons points out, can handle the

equivalent of 300 freight cars loaded to maximum capacity.

In showing how much better the Mississippi River system is equipped to help handle the transportation burden, Mr. Lyons calls attention to the fact that more than $500,000,000 have been expended for flood control and navigation improvement. The river distance from St. Louis to New Orleans has been shortened by 156 miles. This saves a day's time on the downstream trip. Improvement of the dams in the Ohio River has made that stream a year-around waterway that can handle vastly larger tonnage than was the case during World War No. 1. River terminals with modern equipment make for a quick turn-round for barges.

The handling of traffic has been expedited by allowing barge lines to interchange barges and cooperate in filling up tows.

During the first 9 months of 1942 the amount of coal handled on the Mississippi River increased by 28 percent over the volume handled in the same period of 1941. Scrap iron has become an important item in river traffic. Until this year it was a negligible item. Sulfur is moving in large volume on the inland waterways. The greatest promise for increase in traffic comes from the need for petroleum products in the North and East. A very much larger amount of steel will be handled on the Mississippi River in 1943 than was the case in 1942, it is believed.

As it is apparent that the demands on the railroads will be greater this year than last year, the Mississippi Valley, which produces 82 percent of the country's petroleum, 95 percent of its bituminous coal and contains 70 percent of the farm population, will have to be used to a much greater extent.

Bartlett, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Selden Menefee from the Christian Science Monitor:

THE COUNTRY SPEAKS: TEXAS—THE STORY OF A TOWN

(By Selden Menefee)

The story of the country town of Bartlett, Tex., is a story of what public ownership of utilities has done for a community.

Bartlett is a town of about 2,000 persons in the black-soil belt of central Texas, north of Austin. Twenty years ago a young man named Randall W. Miller came there from the neighboring town of Hearne to open a Ford agency. Hearne had its own power plant, and Mr. Miller soon began to agitate for a municipal plant in Bartlett which would compete with the privately owned one already established. In 1930 he was elected mayor, an office the wiry, dynamic man has held ever since.

Mr. Miller's first attempt to get a public power plant resulted in the private power company obtaining an injunction against the project. An election was then held, and the people voted 4 to 1 for public power. The plant cost $90,000, but in the first year of its operation it showed a net profit of $11,000. In June 1934, when it began production, it generated 18,700 kilowatt-hours; 4 years later it was turning out 51,000 kilowatts, and had 94 percent of all customers.

By the end of 1942, the debt on the city light plant had been cut from $90,000 to $42,000. Street lighting for which the town had formerly paid $2,500 a year was being supplied by the new plant for $24 a year. When the light plant is all paid for it is expected that local taxes will be unnecessary.

In 1935 Mayor Miller decided to let the light plant help to finance the building of a city hall, instead of renting rooms in private buildings. With the equivalent of the rentals formerly paid, plus a part of the profits from the light plant, the handsome little brick building is rapidly being paid for.

Armed with his experience, Bartlett put in an early bid for Federal aid for rural electrification. In 1936 it got the first Rural Electrification project in the Nation. Today the Rural Electrification Administration project has more than 500 miles of power lines in the area around Bartlett, and is so prosperous that it has already paid off two notes totaling $22,800 which were not due until 1956 and 1957.

In 1938 Mayor Miller proposed that the town buy the sewer system, for the use of which the residents had long been paying $1 a month apiece in sewer rent. The people voted for this by 107 to 2. Mr. Miller closed up his business a year ago, and now divides his time between the mayor's office and the Rural Electrification Administration project, which he heads. He attributes the success of public ownership in Bartlett to the hundred percent cooperation of the citizens. But a major part of the credit should go to him for his solid, progressive leadership.

Partly because of its sound finances, Bartlett has weathered the war better than most small southern towns. Some stores have closed; but the migration of local labor to nearby Camp Hood and the larger war centers has been partly compensated for by some two dozen Army families from Camp Hood, who have filled all of the town's vacant houses.

The most grievous problems facing Bartlett now, according to its citizens, are the shortage of farm labor, intensified by the migration of Negroes north and west; and the growing independence of those colored workers who remain.

When the war is over, the Army families will leave and many war workers will return. The farmers once more will have the help they need to raise bountiful crops from the black, waxy soil of Bell and Williamson Counties.

Daylight Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

CONSOLIDATED BADGER COOPERATIVE,
Shawano, Wis., March 6, 1943.

The Honorable REID F. MURRAY,
Congressional Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: At the annual stockholders' meeting of our organization (held in the city of Shawano on the 2d day of March 1943 and attended by more than 1,900 farm people) the major subject of discussion necessarily was the part that these farm people will have in the production of foodstuffs for our Nation.

One of the things that has apparently caused considerable dissatisfaction is the daylight saving program as it affects farms and farm labor. Farm labor has been taught that 6 o'clock in the evening is quitting time, and with the delays necessary in the morning, much of the farm work cannot be completed by that time.

The attached resolution was unanimously adopted at this meeting; and we would appreciate your giving the sentiment of this group of farmers consideration in formulating any legislative changes.

Respectfully,

CONSOLIDATED BADGER COOPERATIVE,
GEORGE W. RUPPLE, *Manager.*

Whereas the present daylight savings plan is definitely detrimental to agriculture and dairying; and

Whereas the winning of the war is dependent upon an efficient food-production program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the annual meeting of the Consolidated Badger Cooperative, held on this 2d day of March 1943, go on record as favoring an immediate return to standard time; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Gov. Walter Goodland, the proper assemblymen and State senators, the Honorable ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, and the proper Representatives in the lower House of Congress.

Increase of Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction that I note so many gentlemen rising in their seats in favor of passage of the so-called post-office employees bill, H. R. 1366. While the additional cost will run from $60,000,000 to $80,000,000, I believe these men are entitled to this increase as I feel we have no more loyal and sincere men in the Government service than those in the Post Office Department. It is indeed gratifying that of all the gentlemen that have arisen none have had a single word to say against the Postmaster General's administration of the Post Office Department except one gentleman who stated that if we could increase the second-class postage rate this appropriation would not be necessary. However, I doubt whether we would have more than a very few gentlemen voting to increase the second-class rate.

As I understand, the postal workers have received no increase in pay since 1925. Certainly they should be paid adequately for their splendid service, especially in the light of the increased cost of living, and I trust this pending bill (H. R. 1366) will be enacted into law as speedily as possible.

Pay-As-You-Go Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John H. Crider on taxation from the New York Times of last Sunday:

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAXES LEFT TO FULL HOUSE—WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE FIRM ON DEDUCTION-FROM-SOURCE PLAN

(By John H. Crider)

WASHINGTON, March 13.—The objective of pay-as-you-go taxation died this week as far as a majority of the House Ways and Means Committee was concerned, but for the public and for many Members of the House and Senate it was still very much alive.

President Roosevelt joined the opposition on Friday when at his press conference he attacked the original pay-as-you-go plan of Beardsley Ruml, chairman of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, as partial to the rich. The President repeated the thesis of Randolph Paul, Treasury General Counsel, who some weeks ago advanced before the Ways and Means Committee the theory that cancelation of the liability on 1942 income automatically lost to the Treasury an "asset" of close to $10,000,000,000, which is the estimated yield on the 1942 income of individuals.

RUML PLAN VIEW

Ruml supporters in the meantime have pointed out that so far as current income is concerned the Treasury would gain probably $3,000,000,000, the estimated excess of the tax yield on 1943 income over the yield on 1942 income and that the only loss to the Treasury would be upon the death of individuals who would then have 1 less year's taxes to pay. The latter situation could be remedied in several ways, Ruml supporters emphasized, but the committee preferred not to act on the cancelation proposal, which is concededly the only immediate way of getting taxpayers on a current basis.

The thing that was new in the tax situation this week was the novel plan "approved in principle" by the Ways and Means Committee on Friday to grant incentive discounts of from 1 to 4 percent to taxpayers who paid taxes during the year preceding their due date.

Not only was this something brand new to American tax methods, but many a Ruml supporter shook his head and remarked in effect, "So this is the scheme of a committee that does not want to aid the rich?" Who, these questioners ask, would receive most benefit from the discount plan but the individuals who are financially fortunate enough to be able to qualify for the discounts?

THE PROSPECT

With the President in his Budget message calling for simplified taxation, and in view of the strong support in the House for the Carlson bill embodying a modified version of the Ruml plan, it appeared likely that the Ways and Means Committee might ultimately find matters taken out of its hands.

The 9 out of the 25 members of the Ways and Means Committee who voted against the committee's plan immediately issued a statement in support of the Carlson bill in which they declared of the committee's action: "The mountain labored and brought forth a mouse." JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., leader of the House Republicans, promptly stated that he would meet with his supporters on Monday to organize backing for the Carlson bill.

"They'll know they've been in a fight," he remarked of the opposition.

CARLSON'S PLAN

As matters stand at week end the pay-as-you-go controversy has simmered down to these alternatives:

The bill of Representative CARLSON, Kansas Republican, original sponsor of the Ruml plan in the House, provides that rather than cancel the 1942 tax liability for everyone, as Mr. Ruml proposed, persons making more than $20,000 a year would pay in 1943 on the income of either 1942 or 1943, whichever was higher. All others would pay on 1943 income, being relieved of the 1942 obligation. The return filed on Monday (the first 1943 quarterly date) would be regarded as a tentative or presumptive return on 1943 income, with provision made for corrections. Income tax collections would be by a 20-percent withholding tax commencing July 1, and only those whose income was derived from sources other than salaries or wages would continue to pay quarterly installments. Exemptions based on those in the 1942 Revenue Act would be applied at the source, plus 10 percent for allowable deductions (charity, etc.), so that the amount withheld would be only from income above the allowed exemptions and deductions.

WAYS AND MEANS PROPOSALS

The plan thus far announced as approved, "tentatively" or otherwise, by a majority of the Ways and Means Committee, would include a 20-percent withholding tax effective July 1, but would cancel no part of the tax liability on income of either 1942 or 1943.

The withholding tax differs from that of the Carlson bill mainly in that two exemption rates are applied—the $624 exemption of the Victory tax to 3 percent of the taxable income, and the 1942 Revenue Act exemptions (including the 10 percent for deductions) to 17 percent. Taxpayers would pay all four of their instalments on 1942 income during 1943 if their income is from nonsalary or wage sources or if their liability greatly exceeds that collected by the withholding taxes.

Salary and wage earners would have their withholding tax applied to the remaining half of their 1942 liability beginning July 1. Under the incentive scheme taxpayers would be encouraged by discounts of from 1 to 4 percent to pay taxes ahead of time so as to make themselves current. On any part of the tax due in 1944 that the taxpayer paid before June 15, 1943, he would get a 3-percent reduction, on any part of it paid before September 15 he would get 2 percent, and on any part of it paid before December 15 he would get 1 percent.

Next year he could get a 4-percent reduction on any part of the tax due in 1945 that he paid before March 15, 1944. The only taxpayers who would immediately get on a current collection basis under the committee plan are about 4,000,000 persons estimated to have had no taxable income in 1942, but who will be earning such income during the current year.

Beginning in 1944, persons with nonwage or salary income would have their choice of paying the entire tax due in the current year in a single payment on the date of filing their return or of paying it in monthly instalments throughout the year. Consideration is being given to moving the date for filing returns up to February or January.

The Chrysler Tank Arsenal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a transcribed broadcast delivered by me over radio stations WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and WMAM, Marinette, Wis., March 14, on the subject of the Chrysler tank arsenal:

Last week I told you briefly about the operations of the Detroit tank automotive center and promised to take you this week for a mental trip through the great Chrysler tank arsenal. Possibly this name is misleading because the arsenal itself and all its equipment is owned by Uncle Sam rather than the Chrysler organization, but it is that great peacetime automotive organization that has been charged with the responsibility of operating this huge arsenal.

As one approaches this arsenal—some 10 miles north of the heart of Detroit—he sees scores of these huge 32-ton tanks galloping around a huge muddy field, in and out of holes, up and down hills, stopping, starting, turning, and darting hither and yon. On inquiry he is told that they are on their shake-down runs. Later after you have had the experience of riding in one, you agree that shake-down is not a misnomer. I know that from personal experience, although I confess that at the end of my trip I thought it was your Congressman rather than the tank that had been taken for a shake-down trip.

You recall that last week I told you how the Chrysler tank arsenal came into being. Lt. Gen. William S. Knudsen, who was then in complete charge of our war-production program summoned to a conference the heads of the Chrysler organization and laid before them hundreds of pounds of blueprints which he told them represented the design details of a tank. They were asked to study them, determine whether or not they could build them and in what quantities they could be built and what facilities were needed for the construction of a given number. Within a few days, Chrysler came back with its answer. The Chrysler tank arsenal was laid out, land purchased and construction started and just 7 months later—even before the initial building construction had been completed—the first tank rolled off the production line.

Now, if you will let your imagination follow me, I will take you for a quick trip through this mammoth war plant. After you have gone down the line of a retinue of armed guards at the gate and given your pedigree and satisfied them that you are not a subversive element in our Nation, you are whisked by car clear down to the end of the huge buildings and then you alight from the car and start your long walk down the production lines.

Your first stop is in the spare-parts department, and you are told that for every tank that is sent overseas almost a duplicate tank, in all of its intricate knocked-down parts, goes along as being necessary for maintenance of this tank in combat at the front. Thousands upon thousands of individual parts and assembled parts are being coated

with oil or grease to protect their highly polished surfaces against the ravages of salt-water spray, desert sands, and hot suns. They are then individually packed and hermetically sealed in coated paper containers and then in heavy paper cartons, and finally literally sealed by tar in heavy wooden shipping containers. You learn why all this meticulous care is taken in the packaging of these spare parts as you continue your inspection trip and realize the almost watch-making precision with which these huge, lumbering tanks are constructed, and you remember there are neither time nor facilities at the front to make spare parts—they must be on hand and ready for immediate replacement.

Then as you go on down the subassembly production lines, you see the various parts of various sections of the tank being assembled into larger component units. You are amazed to see the exacting precision with which the transmission gears are assembled, for instance, assembled to very much finer tolerances than is the transmission gear in the highest-priced automobile you can find. Perhaps you appreciate the difficulty and the cost attendant to the manufacture of a tank when you witness the machining of the huge ball-bearing container rings and the race rings upon which will revolve the fighting turret of the tank. Here you see a huge, extremely hard and tough steel ring, 72 inches in diameter, being machined, ground, and polished to receive the hundreds and hundreds of ball bearings upon which the huge turret is mounted.

Bear in mind, this turret weighs several tons and yet when it is all assembled it moves with the precision of clockwork. For one who has been used to occasional travels through the ordinary machine shops, you are immediately impressed with the tremendously heavy equipment needed to machine this very tough steel going into the tank parts. You have but to look to the cutting tools and the tremendous heavy jigs, with which all of the tank parts are held, to appreciate what a difficult machine tooling job the entire tank mechanism calls for; and yet, perhaps, you are further amazed to see that in the final operation of machining this heavy 72-inch ring, one man is putting the final mirror-like polish on the ball-bearing race with a piece of the finest emery paper held in his bare hands. And then, as you go on down the assembly line you notice that as each part is assembled and tested the various parts go into movement by the slightest pressure of one finger, illustrating the mechanical perfection demanded in the construction of these huge lumbering tanks.

Then as you go on down the line, you notice the exceptionally accurate gear-cutting operations and the heat treating of the gears and other parts by the most ingenious methods and in long batteries of huge electric furnaces. And then you turn the corner and start down the final assembly line. Here you see the huge tank bodies in the form of fairly rough castings and forgings being put into the largest and heaviest machine tools that I think I have ever had the pleasure of seeing. Words fail me to describe to you their over-all size or the tremendously heavy cutting tools used in these delicate machine operations. You are even more amazed when you realize that all of this tremendously heavy work, operating with armor-hardened steels, is still carried out to a perfection and to much closer tolerances than the automotive industry has heretofore used in the manufacture of our highly efficient automobiles. Automotive perfection in the post-war world will be the fruit of this wartime precision and technique.

And now the tank begins to take form as the chassis are started down one of the five final assembly production lines which are over one-half mile in length; and it is a beautiful sight to witness these five production lines from an overhead point of view as you go from station to station watching the various parts of the subassemblies being put in their final resting place; and eventually you come to the end of the line where in one of the final maneuvers you see the huge cranes pick up a roll of steel caterpillar tread and permit it to unroll in a fashion which reminds you of an elephant unrolling his trunk after he has just eaten a snoutful of peanuts. And, incidentally, this same huge overhead crane, by a very ingenious maneuver, holds the caterpillar tread over the driving gears and roller trunnions, and holds it in place until the mechanics can clip the ends of the tread together. Then if you are still as foolish as I was, you will accept the invitation to ride in one of these tanks. Of course, your trip would not be complete unless you actually did find out in some small measure what our boys are up against when they are actually traveling in one of these tanks for keeps.

Naturally, every tank as it comes off the line goes through this shake-down run, over scores of miles, while being driven by Chrysler tank test drivers and mechanics, before it is finally driven again and reinspected by the Government's own test drivers before it is accepted and brought in for final painting and shipment.

And so your host dresses you in a suit of white coveralls, pulls a helmet over your head and clamps a big pair of goggles over your eyes, and then you realize you are not as young as you used to be when you start to climb into this mammoth elephant. But you finally get in through the top of the turret and then you stand up on the tank captain's sponge rubber cushioned seat and rest yourself on another little cushion about 8 inches in diameter so your head and shoulders stick out of the turret and then if you are smart you take the advice of the driver and hang on. All around you the turret ring is heavily padded by sponge rubber but you soon learn, when the tank starts galloping across the rough field, that the driver knew whereof he spoke when he suggested you hang on. True, the ring is padded but so are Joe Louis' fists when he is in the ring. It is my considered opinion that the tank and Joe Louis both swing about the same blow at the kidneys when you are riding where I was.

After I got through my shake-down trip of about 30 minutes and we came back to the test floor, I crawled down inside this turret. The white enamel paint job is wonderful inside that turret, but I wondered just how a man of my size could maneuver himself to get even reasonably comfortable in that confined space. Imagine my chagrin when I was reminded that three men fight in that same little dungeon and in addition there are scores of good-sized shells and machine-gun ammunition and radio equipment and other appurtenances of battle that likewise have to get into that same cramped space. Frankly, I did not try to climb into the driver's seat, because I could not get through that hatch, although I am told it is reasonably comfortable after you get in.

Your reaction would be the same as mine after having made one of these trips. The Tank Corps needs young men, hardened young athletes; nobody else could begin to take the physical beating that goes with service in the Tank Corps, even on the proving ground and I can imagine what it must be in the heat and on the sands of the African desert. I take my hat off to the boys of the Tank Corps. They have a real job on their hands, but in saying that it is also my firm conviction that we are giving them out of the Chrysler tank arsenal and out of the many other plants building the same or similar tanks, the finest piece of heavy equipment and the finest product of American mechanical genius that we can provide. These tanks will surpass anything that Hitler can provide any day.

In conclusion let me remind you of two things. First, you will be amazed to learn that these tanks are not actually being built at the Chrysler tank arsenal. True, much work was being done in the construction of those tanks, but primarily the job there was one of assembly. The big job in the manufacture of those tanks at the Chrysler arsenal was being done by 4,571 separate subcontractors all over the Nation, which are pouring into that assembly line the parts needed to give me my ride. I repeat that 4,571 subcontractors are represented and that one fact alone illustrates why it was necessary for General Knudsen to dump the problem of building tanks into the laps of organizations such as Chrysler, because they knew where to turn to find the subcontractors who could build those component parts and so when I hear complaints from back home that this man and that man is not permitted to put his small plant into war production and cannot obtain a contract, then my answer must of necessity be that it is possibly due to the fact that he himself has not exercised sufficient sales ability to secure a subcontract from one of the multitude of larger contractors in this Nation to whom we turned in our time of peril to organize for and complete the final assembly of our fighting equipment. No Member of Congress can find those subcontracts for him. He must—as ever in the past—sell his own product and his own facilities.

And lastly, I was very much concerned by the fact which I mentioned last week that there was most conclusive evidence not only at the Chrysler plant but elsewhere that our big difficulty today is getting this equipment to the fighting fronts. We can produce—we are producing—it faster than the enemy can destroy it. Our big job is one of getting our matériel of war to the fighting fronts.

Rock of Ages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Talladega Daily Home:

ROCK OF AGES

Several score Negro children, totally blind, stand massed before a building, huddled close against the bite of a frigid wind.

The bus pulls into the school yard, stops, and there are the first quick movements toward the front as the doors swing open. Then the men on the bus catch a sound that rises above the wind. They stop and listen.

"Rock of Ages * * *."

The words come clearly. The music holds the ancient rhythm * * * the shading of notes that belongs exclusively to the Negro * * * the shadows of old sorrows.

But it holds, too, an ancient faith, a faith of childlike simplicity in a personal God over yonder somewhere who understands, and who will bring the light to darkened eyes after a while.

"* * * cleft for me * * *."

The buzz of conversation has stopped completely, and men step gently, quiet as they move out of the bus for better hearing.

"* * * let me hide myself in Thee."

Without being conscious of what they are doing, several of the men begin singing the hymn, softly, almost under their breath.

The song moves along, with one clear soprano voice rising magnificently.

"* * * In my hand no price I bring. Simply to Thy cross I cling."

There was no thought of the deliberately dramatic in the minds of those who arranged that welcome for the members of the legislative committee who visited the School for Negro Deaf and Blind.

But several eyes were wet as the legislators moved on to inspect the buildings.

In the rush of state affairs, in the tumult of a world gone mad with war, it had remained for blind Negro children to bring the solemn reassurances of a God who is greater than war and more enduring than the everlasting hills.

Food for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Secretary of the Interior:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, March 15, 1943.

MY DEAR MR. DIMOND: In response to your letter and telephone call of March 12, I give you the facts in regard to the emergency food supplies for northern and western Alaska referred to in an article which appeared in the Seattle Post Intelligencer of March 6 and which has been quoted in dispatches by the United Press and the Associated Press. The facts from our records as compared with the allegations are as follows:

The quantities landed at Nome were:

	Actual quantities	*Newspaper figures*
Butter ---------- tons	162	350
Toilet tissue ---------- do	13	78
Coffee ---------- do	62	173
Milk ---------- do	420	503
Soap ---------- do	41	89
Dried eggs ---------- do	25	78
Rolled oats ---------- do	62	108
Vinegar ---------- gallons	None	5,160
Salad oil ---------- tons	None	78
Pears ---------- do	None	70
Salmon (Nulato) ---------- cases	None	150

No pears, salad oil, or vinegar were discharged at Nome. No salmon was sent to Nulato or any other point along the lower Yukon River.

There were 162 tons of butter landed at Nome, the greater part of which was immediately put into storage at Lomen Commercial Co.'s warehouse. A small portion was temporarily stacked on the platform outside of the warehouse pending such time as the commodities could be shifted to make room for it in the warehouse.

The article states that Alaskans say the quantity of food shipped was not needed. It was needed in the same sense that emergency food in a plane is needed. It is there to provide against an emergency and to prevent the possibility of hardship and starvation should the normal means of transportation or supply be cut off by enemy action or by disaster of any kind. The supply of food at Nome was not for the 400 people of Nome alone but for the civilian population of 7 large districts of western and northern Alaska which are normally cut off from the source of supply for 9 months of the year because of natural weather conditions. The food was ordered by the Washington office of the Civilian Food Reserve by Mr. Paul Gordon, who is thoroughly familiar with Alaska, and the storing of the food was supervised by Mr. Harold W. Snell, of the Alaska Railroad, whose experience in Alaska extends over the past 10 years, and who spent over 3 months in Alaska in immediate charge of the operations. All of the supplies requiring warm storage were placed in that type of storage, and those requiring only dry storage were placed in buildings meeting that requirement.

The food reserve is a joke probably only to those who are unfamiliar with all of the details and who have believed the canards which have been circulated by people ignorant of the true situation and purpose. To all those understanding people in Alaska who of necessity must remain in remote and threatened places throughout the long winter the emergency food supplies are looked upon as a foresighted project.

In Galena, also mentioned in the story, all food requiring warm storage was placed in heated quarters. Because of lack of storage space the food requiring dry storage was stored under tarpaulin, a practice that is not unusual at this time with the Army and other organizations.

It is unfortunate that such misinformation as that appearing in the Post-Intelligencer should have received such wide circulation and should have caused you and other Members of Congress so much unnecessary work answering inquiries brought about by newspaper readers believing all that is reported by the press.

I would appreciate it if you would see to it that the true facts in regard to this matter are brought out.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Hon. ANTHONY J. DIMOND,
House of Representatives.

Creation of a Pharmacy Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the Congress the following memorial, introduced by Senator John Campbell, of Missoula County, from the Montana State Senate. I have felt for some time that the graduate pharmacists in both the Army and Navy have not been treated fairly and I urge that their just status be accorded them through the establishment of a pharmacy corps. Graduate pharmacists receive sound training in our higher educational institutions and have the technical qualifications which entitle them to commissioned rank in our armed forces. We, in Montana, have sent an exceptionally large number of pharmacists into the service and we are extremely proud of their records and ability. I should like to urge that their training be recognized and that they be given the positions to which, as a matter of right, they are entitled.

Senate Memorial 2

Senate memorial to the Congress of the United States, requesting the enactment of Senate bill 216 and House bill 977, now pending before Congress, creating a Pharmacy Corps in the armed service

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

Whereas there is now pending in Congress Senate bill 216 and House bill 977, known as the Pharmacy Corps Act, providing for a coordination of the activities of thousands of registered pharmacists now engaged in the armed service of the Nation; and

Whereas the sponsors of this legislation maintain that the formation of the pharmacy corps will accelerate and coordinate the prompt and efficient dispensing of emergency medicines on the battlefields, as well as coordinating research activities; and

Whereas Montana has an exceptionally large number of pharmacists in the armed service who favor the creation of this corps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana, That Congress be requested to take appropriate action for the passage of the pending acts creating a pharmacy corps; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of the Senate of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, the Senate Military Affairs Committee, the House Military Affairs Committee, and to the Honorable B. K. WHEELER and the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, United States Senators from Montana, and to the Honorable JAMES E. O'CONNOR and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Congressmen from Montana.

ERNEST T. EATON,
President of the Senate.
CLAUDE J. MCALLISTER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Ten Senators Picked To Cook Up World Utopia a la New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Rothwell Brown:

TEN SENATORS PICKED TO COOK UP WORLD UTOPIA A LA NEW DEAL

(By George Rothwell Brown)

The Senate has met the challenge of the Utopian dreamers who are thinking up a world-wide New Deal for the post-war years, by setting up a committee of its own through the medium of which, it is hoped, the Congress of the United States will have the last word as to what is to be the destiny of the United States.

A group of Senators resolved upon this step some weeks ago when HENRY WALLACE began scattering blueprints of an international

dreamland which obviously could be financed only by the American people.

SENATOR GEORGE'S IDEA

Their idea took shape a few days ago when, under the inspiration of Senator WALTER F. GEORGE (D.), of Georgia, the Senate created a special committee of 10 to consider, and to report from time to time to the Senate thereon, the various problems that will come from the ending of the war.

Vice President WALLACE may be an idealist when it comes to supplying a quart of milk a day to the Hottentot, or instructing the bushmen of the Congo Basin in the intricacies of the differential calculus, but he is no idealist when it comes to appointing a Senate committee that might conceivably awaken him from one of his socialistic nightmares.

The Vice President was obliged under senatorial courtesy to make Senator GEORGE the chairman of this special committee and he did so. But he also did the best job of committee packing that he could in selecting the other nine members.

WALLACE PICKS NEW DEALERS

These include the rubber-stamp Democratic Senate leader, "Dear ALBEN" BARKLEY, of Kentucky; the No. 1 New Deal "yes man," CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida; the eminent new dealer from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN; along with Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming; and SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois—these on the Democratic side.

The Republicans are: Senators MCNARY, of Oregon, who will be very busy most of the time as Republican leader of the Senate; VANDENBERG, of Michigan; AUSTIN, of Vermont; and TAFT, of Ohio.

The make-up of this committee means that in most instances it will require the strength of character of Senator GEORGE and his courage and intellectual ability to carry the thing through. He will probably be able to do it, although it is regrettable that under the rules of the Senate the Vice President had the power to name a committee, one of the chief functions of which will be to examine and pass upon his own fantastic schemes in that land of make-believe in which he loves to dwell.

GOOD MEN OVERLOOKED

Senator GEORGE will have a difficult but not impossible task in commanding a majority of his committee. It is a pity that on it there could not be BYRD, of Virginia; TYDINGS, of Maryland, CLARK, of Missouri, and a few other Senators of established reputation for ability to keep their feet on the ground and their minds out of the clouds.

O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, may again do the country a great service commensurate with that which he did in 1937. It will be recalled that he was the authority of the devastating report from the Senate Judiciary Committee which damned the court-packing plan beyond all hope of redemption.

This committee is created in the very nick of time. The theorists, the dreamers, and the planners are about to move in on us on all fronts, international and domestic. In fact, they started moving in last week when the President sent to the Capitol the National Resources Planning Board's voluminous treatise on a permanent new deal for America.

BLUEPRINT OF UTOPIA

Soon the planners will be assembling from the four corners of the earth to draw a blueprint of the world to be which is not yet saved from the enemy.

With the material he has, Senator GEORGE will probably be able to do a fine job, even if it takes minority reports from his committee to get the unbiased, unvarnished, and uncontaminated facts before the Senate and the American people.

Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter on farm problems as presented by one of my constituents, Mr. J. H. Keilman, of Barnesville, Pa., and my reply thereto.

It is not my practice to take this action on many occasions, but Mr. Keilman's communication on our current farm problems is written by a practical farmer, whose age and wisdom is reflected in his suggestions with the sincerity of purpose that is symbolic of the patriotism that pervades the homes of our American farmers. I respectfully submit Mr. Keilman's letter for your thoughtful and serious consideration:

BARNESVILLE, PA., *March 1943.*

Hon. IVOR D. FENTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FENTON: I feel it my duty to write to you so you may know how we farmers feel about things as they are going on in Washington at this time. Really I cannot see how we farmers can do the impossible things they expect from us; we know by experience that we cannot grow the large crops asked for under these conditions of shortage of experienced farm hands. It is entirely out of the question to do the work with inexperienced help. We have tried it out, and while they think they are helping, they are really in the way of a real active farmer. A few years ago two men (coal miners) in return for a favor wanted to help us to haul in hay, so they grabbed our hay forks and started to load the wagon, so one of us had to go to the barn and get and use the manure forks which have too short handles and square shoulders unsuitable for pitching hay. Naturally my boys and I had to wait on these men poking around in front of us. These men really were working hard from lack of experience, and, being miners, not used to the heat of the sun. Naturally they were sweating and thought they were helping us a lot, yet they were hindering us, but courtesy kept us from telling them, so after 1 hour of patience with them we decided our load was large enough and took it to the barn, which was a great relief to our would-be helpers. Then we thanked them for their kindness and to our great satisfaction they were off. (Thank goodness.) Then my two boys and I went out for another load almost again as big as the one they helped us load and loaded it in half an hour besides going to two fields for it.

That is an illustration of how these soft and inexperienced men can and will hinder farm work. And the idea of city women and children as farm workers is still more silly. We farmers simply cannot afford to let such people (not helpers) to try to operate our expensive and now very precious farm machinery. Rather we will be compelled to put all these valuable machines into the machine sheds, lock the doors, and let them there for the duration so that our real help, when and if they come back, will have them in at least as good condition as they left them. Price ceilings are useless. During the last war I had an example of how they work when food becomes scarce. I had a customer who insisted on having 1 dozen of fresh eggs a week. The price then was 60 cents a dozen, and I could only spare one-half dozen to each customer, as I wanted to be fair and share up. But he said never mind about the other fellow, here is $1, give me the dozen, and that same spirit is beginning to show up again. With people earning big money for short hours, and farmers working long and hard hours for starvation ceiling prices, can you blame the farmer for taking the money when the taking is good? That will be the beginning of inflation and it will not be started by the farmer, either, as they would have us believe. Neither will incentive payments to farmers help, as these payments will only be made to a few favorites and the average real farmer will get nothing. The only thing that will really do the trick is to leave all the real farmers and their help on the farms. Give them the necessary fertilizer and machinery, and let them make their own plans, as they know every inch of their soil and know how to manage it. They usually are good weather prophets and know what to expect, and plan accordingly. The right thing to do will be to let the law of supply and demand operate. The farmer will soon enough stop growing the crops that do not pay because they are not in demand. And with every industrial worker having plenty of money now they can afford to pay a fair price for food now, rather than to pay a public debt of $100,000,000 incentive payment money during the worst depression the world has ever known that is sure to follow this war.

Victory gardens? Yes. They sound good over the radio, and look good in the newspapers. But there is a big difference between theory and practice, and should only be attempted by people who know how. Mr. R. P. Kester, in Pennsylvania Farmer of February 27, 1943, says: "I was assigned the duty of inspecting some of these gardens during the other war. A few showed signs of care and skill and were creditable to the gardeners.

"But in every such case I found that the worker had originally been raised in the country or had farm experience. Most of them were attempted on poor soil, lacked proper cultivation, or showed the inexperience of the would-be gardener. Some had been planted with care and energy. But the interest died out when the hot weather came, and allowed to become patches of weeds. Seeds were wasted and fertilizer lost in thousands of cases."

What a shame to ration the real experienced farmer on seed, fertilizer, and machinery and have it wasted by those lacking experience, even though they have the best of intentions. They had better buy Victory bonds with that money.

Revelations, sixth chapter, eighth verse, says: "And power was given unto them over the fourth part of the earth to kill with the sword and with hunger." Imagine, if you can, a more pitiful and heart-rending picture than an innocent child asking its mother for bread and the mother has none to give. And how can a kind and merciful God answer our "Give us this day our daily bread" petitions when the farmers are not allowed to keep on working in His vineyard. It is high time that this foolish political bungling in Washington is stopped, and that the would-be advisers to farmers get down to basic facts. Farmers are the most patriotic of all classes. They work longest hours for the least pay. They never go on strike, and they do not want subsidies. The late President Calvin Coolidge said: "Let the farmers alone; they know their own business better than anyone else." And he was right. We do know our business, and know how to do our work, and would be at the same disadvantage

in the factories and coal mines as are those men on farms. Being a farmer and now past 72 years of age, naturally I am writing from the standpoint of an experienced farmer, and while this may seem to you as a plea for the young farmers, I have no apology to offer. As everybody knows, or should know, that the farmer is the only man on earth that can supply the food without which all life would soon be extinct, and unless these young farmers are left on the farms to plant and cultivate the crops there will be no earthly use in sending any kind of help to harvest the crops—there will be none to harvest.

Please think these things over carefully and earnestly, and talk it over with other Representatives and Senators, or give them this letter to read, as I cannot write to them all as I do not have a typewriter. It takes quite some time to make a number of copies of a letter like this. Honestly, this is not a letter of selfish interest for farmers. As a rule, the real farmer has the interest of all humanity at heart. He is naturally so, as his work is in God's beautiful nature, where hope and faith in God for His blessings on our work is our earnest prayer.

Respectfully yours,

J. H. KEILMAN.

MARCH 13, 1943.

Mr. J. H. KEILMAN,
Barnesville, Pa.

DEAR MR. KEILMAN: I received your letter of recent date with reference to the problems that are faced by the farmer.

I carefully noted the contents of your communication and want you to know that I am wholeheartedly in accord with your views.

The farmer understands his problems and should be left to work them out to the best advantage. In this respect, as you stated, the farmer must have experienced help, and I agree with you that experienced farm workers should be left at their duties so that an adequate supply of foodstuffs will be guaranteed to our armed forces and civilian populace.

As you know, a number of bills on the subject about which you have written are pending action in Congress and some are expected to be called up in the near future.

You have my assurance that when any legislation on agriculture is called up in the House for action it will have my most serious attention and consideration. I repeat that I am pleased to have your views, and most certainly will present same to many of my colleagues.

Thanking you for your patriotic interest, and with all best personal wishes to you and yours, I am,

Sincerely yours,

IVOR D. FENTON.

Food Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Boston Herald of February 28, 1943, and written by a very outstanding writer and American, Bill Cunningham. The article is of importance and interest to all citizens.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD RATION BASED ON FALSE PREMISE—MILLIONS USE NO CAN GOODS, WHOLE ARMY NEEDED TO DO PAPER WORK.

(By Bill Cunningham)

Our three major shortages, in order, have been rubber, petroleum products, and now food. The Japs are to blame for the first, the Nazi pig boats for the second, but we are squarely to blame for the new one. Dimwitted do-goodery beginning back with the days when Brother WALLACE plowed under the pigs, and extending right down to, and including, the new directive on rationing is the prize boobocratic donkeyshine of them all.

This is no protest against rationing.

WARNING THAT IT JUST WON'T WORK

As matters stand, it's necessary. Whether the necessity could have been avoided by more intelligent and more practical handling is beside the point now. The ox is in the ditch. The thing to do is get him out.

This is no protest against rationing, but it's a definite protest against the organizational machinery of rationing and the type of reasoning that created the machinery. It's not alone a protest, but a warning that it won't work. It won't work because (1) it's stupid, and (2) because there aren't enough available people in the United States just to handle the necessary paper work.

This thesis has nothing to do with the housewife and her new problems in points. Hers is the easiest part of the entire tangle, and, as confusing as this trading in what amounts to a new type of money may be to her for a while, her part will work if this background can be straightened out.

I said "stupid." I'm not trying to insult anybody, but how otherwise would you classify this:

Everybody knows we've had, and have right now, a meat shortage in New England. It's been especially biting in the vicinity of Boston. There've been stories and rumors, some of them bitterly, unjustly and no doubt deliberately antiracial. There've been sinister whispers of mysterious black markets.

PRICE SITUATION CALLED REAL TROUBLE

These are byproducts, and mostly the bunk.

The cold truth of the matter is that ceiling prices on meat were set at the meat prices of March of last year. All of March last year was in Lent, and this, and especially the city of Boston, is one of the largest and most devout Catholic communities in the United States. Meat supplies and meat prices in the metropolitan area are lower then than at any other time of the year.

Yet no regional allowances whatsoever were made by the "master minds." Probably they are entirely unfamiliar with the local situation. But, at any rate, at the low, not the mean, were the prices thus frozen.

The packing plants are still in business trying to make themselves a dollar. The temptation to them is to ship to regions where the frozen prices are higher. Big ones, such as Swift and Armour, try to take care of old customers, but one of them recently shipped 12 carloads of beef to Boston—and lost $800 per carload on the consignment.

There'd be no black market here, and certainly a lot more meat, if ceiling prices in Boston were increased to the level of those in Los Angeles or Chicago, or better, if it could be done without bankrupting the packing plants, the prices of Los Angeles and Chicago could be lowered to the Boston level.

That particular item epitomizes the trouble with this entire rationing program, and shows where it's certain to break down.

Those who've drawn up the plan have moved upon the theory that every man, woman, and child in this great and regionally contradictory Nation eat the same things, the same amounts of the same things, and can do without the same things. That isn't even true in the same community, but it's definitely, basically, and fundamentally impossible in terms of the Nation as a whole.

Specifically, the plan, which housewives, grocers, restaurateurs, wholesalers, and manufacturers start wrestling with tomorrow, takes 57 percent of all processed foods and sets that aside for the armed forces and lend-lease. The other 43 percent is to be given the civilian population on the point-rationed basis.

MILLIONS NEVER USE CANNED GOODS

The directive is so big, so contradictory and so new that there are no authorities upon it as yet, but, figuring that armed forces mean armed forces, even if they are stationed in this country, and therefore will have to cut the civilian's 43 percent, it means that every man, woman, and child in this country will have approximately 40 pounds of processed food a year, regardless of location, habit or circumstance, and not a pound more nor less.

It's completely generalized and standardized.

What it forgets is that there are multiplied millions in the Southern States, Florida, California, the Rio Grande Valley and wherenot, living where fresh fruits and vegetables are available the year round. There are statistics to show that 90 percent of these people never have and never will use canned goods.

This is an agricultural Nation. Almost all farm families grow much of their own food. They "put down" much of it for the winter, and will undoubtedly put down more now.

Most of these two classes don't want and won't use even a small percentage of any processed allotment.

There are, however, other multiplied millions who live upon processed foods almost entirely, and who can't exist without them. These are the inhabitants of the crowded industrial areas, the big towns and cities, the workers in steel mills, shipyards, and defense plants.

They have neither the time, the space nor the climate to grow their own. Yet there is no differentiation whatsoever between these different sorts of peoples and no allowance made for their differing needs nor desires. They all get the same, 40 pounds, the truck farmer in Florida, the shipyard worker in Portland, a babe newly born, and a husky man at hard labor.

The plan is basically so wrong that it actually takes food away from people who need it and gives it to those who don't want it.

RETURN OF BOOTLEGGING CONFUSION SEEN

Unless it is changed, it will break down completely into a maze of confusion and bewilderment such as this Nation has never seen—the nearest approach to it being the bootlegging era of prohibition days. Ration points will be bootlegged. All sorts of evasions will ensue. There are more loopholes possible in the plan than any loyal citizen would care to call attention to publicly, but the entire conception is unfair, unworkable, and doomed to the chaos of general evasion.

The bootlegging of liquor was bad enough. This will be worse because everybody needs food, whereas not everybody felt impelled to get drunk.

That's the stupidity of the plan as it applies to the individual, but you haven't heard

a thing. If you're any good at deciphering the Rube Goldberg mechanical cartoons, maybe you can comprehend the following sketch of the machinery set up for the simple job of dispensing such food as is available.

Beginning tomorrow, the housewife starts purchasing with points as well as with money. Nobody knows who figured out the points, nor upon what basis, but it looks as if the allowance will be about three average-sized cans per person per month.

The retailer must duly take the points from her ration book as she buys, and he's supposed to deposit them then in some bank with which he has opened a rationing checking account. If he's a big dealer, he'll probably have one. If he isn't, he may not have. Opinion seems to conflict, as to whether banks can refuse this type of account, but the best information currently available is that there'll probably be many little fellows who won't be able to get accepted.

But when the retailer buys his next supplies from the wholesaler, along with the money he must send a rationing check for the points involved. These are the points, of course, he's collected from the housewives.

JUST SO MUCH MORE BOGGLE-DE-BOTCHERY

Here again is an illustration of how a pretty plan drawn by some beautiful dreamer in Washington without due allowance for regional or practical problems is just so much more boggle-de-botchery. There'll still be shortages, undoubtedly, and at the source. Suppose the retailer orders five or six different items, duly forwarding his rationing check. And suppose the wholesaler, with the best of intentions, is shy a few cases of any or all items and therefore can't deliver.

In that case he owes the retailer some points, and, according to the new law, he must immediately send the retailer his own rationing check for the points. If the retailer has a rationing checking account with some bank, he can turn the check in there, and the bank will have to do the extra paper work. If he hasn't such an account, however, the retailer has to go to his local rationing board and stand around until he can turn in his returned points for a new certificate.

This will tend to overburden the already overburdened rationing boards. You've undoubtedly called upon a rationing board. How long did you have to wait? This man is supposed to be selling groceries, and he's probably short-handed at his store, with problems of delivery, gas, tires, and the rest. There's no profit in spending the day at the city hall, or the rationing office, trying to get his points back. And that doesn't mention the wear and tear upon him nervously and physically.

But that's not all for the retailer.

At the end of the month he must take inventory of all his rationed goods and points on hand, report these, and likewise report in itemized detail all his purchases from wholesalers or other sources, the number of points involved in each transaction, and the date upon which each occurred.

These are short-handed times, with many grocers and butchers working far into the night. I know one who died a short while ago, just as surely from overwork in a loyal effort to take care of his old customers as if the coroner had officially so certified. Who's going to do all this extra paper work and form filling? How many millions of Office of Price Administration help is it going to require to check all this? And to what end?

That's just the retailer.

There are others.

RATIONED GOODS MAKE UNRATIONED ITEMS

There is, for instance, the class of food handlers known in the trade as "industrials." They are the bakers, the ice-cream manufacturers, and others, often little fellows, who use rationed foods to make unrationed products. That sounds complicated, but, for instance, canned apples are rationed, but apple pie isn't. Therefore, the baker, using rationed sugar and apples, turns out a product in the unrationed category.

He now is ordered to go to his local board and obtain Office of Price Administration Form R138, a formidable and complicated looking affair. On this he must itemize his purchases of last year in 4-month periods. Many of these are small operators, Italians, Swedes, or other honest and hard-working people in their little businesses for years. But they've never kept any such records and wouldn't know what to do with them now if they had.

In a similar category come the restaurants and institutions, even the jails. These get Office of Price Administration Form R137. This is about 3 feet long and must be made out in triplicate. On it must be reported in detail their December business, pounds served, persons served, and dollars received. It must likewise include a complete inventory of supplies on hand as of midnight tonight, February 28.

Hotels, restaurants, roadside stands, lunch carts, college fraternity houses, and all such come within this classification. No consideration is given in any of this to transient trade, which many of them depend upon. No provision is made for the floating population. Whether December was a good month or a bad month isn't taken into account. It certainly isn't a typical month with many institutions because it included the Christmas holidays, and with many schools and colleges, especially in this section, an extra long Christmas vacation, due to the fuel shortage.

All this must be filed, however, within the next 10 days, or the places can purchase no processed foods whatsoever. This applies to Joe Greaseball's two-man diner as well as to the Ritz-Carlton Hotel. Many of the little fellows haven't any such records, and again, couldn't fill out this complicated form on a bet even if they had.

From these Forms R138 and R137 the Office of Price Administration will then figure out what supplies these businesses are henceforth entitled to. I have been over the process a dozen times. I have figured it with a lawyer, a food man, and a college professor of mathematics. None can understand it, nor decode it, and I don't believe the Office of Price Administration can.

It appears that they plan either to multiply or to divide the dollars of business done by the meals served, or some such, throw in a mysterious factor, which is secret, and then multiply this with something else and from this they hope to figure whether the man's inventory is justified.

Curtailed supplies will drive many of these people out of business. Inability to cope with this paper work will swamp many of the rest. There probably aren't enough people in the armed forces to handle it all. One wholesaler tells me his firm figures it may be able to ride herd upon the various forms with the addition of 50 new clerks, but it isn't sure it won't need 100. This isn't rated as defense work. Where's the help to be found?

FOOD INDUSTRY SHOULD HANDLE IT ALL

I believe in constructive criticism, and here's the constructive suggestion:

So far as the individual goes, the gasoline rationing pattern should be followed. Instead of assuming that every person in the Nation uses the same amount and kind of food, let individuals state and prove their needs. At least give 'em a chance to tell the truth. Who wants food he can't or won't eat? I wouldn't eat a can of beans if somebody gave me a thousand.

As for all this elaborate bookkeeping and mathematical acrobatics, you'll have to ask Einstein. If I were running it, I'd call in the food people, say, "You are loyal Americans. You know food, and food distribution. You know regional needs and how they are handled. Here's what we have. Please see that it reaches the right places and goes as far as it can. If you don't, or can't, we'll have to try something else, but this, until further notice, gentlemen, is your patriotic service."

This present abracadabra is impossible.

The Truth About MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Truth About MacArthur," from the New Republic of December 28, last, written by Irving Brant, and another article from the New Republic of March 1 containing a letter from Joseph C. Harch, and the reply thereto by Mr. Brant.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the New Republic of December 28, 1942]

THE TRUTH ABOUT MAC ARTHUR

Anybody who discusses the question of a unified Pacific or far Pacific command with Army and Navy spokesmen in Washington will discover that they agree completely on one proposition: The Pacific area is an oceanic hemisphere in which the over-all strategy of the war is naval and the fighting is amphibious; therefore, if the command is centered in one man it must be given to a master of naval-air strategy. The Army, as its own high officers are the first to declare, plays a supporting role in a long war of island-hopping and naval attrition and maneuver.

The actual call for unification comes chiefly from admirers of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, hero of Bataan, who is visualized for any post that comes to the fore, regardless of whether it fits his special talents. Many believe that he has been deprived of a more extensive command in the southwest Pacific because of the discussion of him as a possible Republican nominee for President.

The political aspect came to a head late in October when Joseph C. Harsch of the Christian Science Monitor wrote that "political Washington" caused two commands to be set up in the far Pacific "partly because of the conservative opposition which launched a MacArthur-for-President campaign." General MacArthur thereupon issued a statement in Australia denying that he had any thought of running for President. The charge repeated by Mr. Harsch is incompatible with the facts. The Presidential boom originated while MacArthur was still in the Philippines. The original form of the political canard was that supplies and reinforcements were withheld from Bataan to prevent MacArthur from reaping the political rewards of a military victory there. This Goebbels-like slander was sufficiently answered when the President, instead of leaving MacArthur to become a prisoner of Japan along with "Slim" Wainwright, ordered him to make his way to Australia and

prepare to take supreme command there. He arrived March 17.

The second form of the political canard took shape from a dispute (discussed later in this article) over the extent of MacArthur's command. The charge went that some time after March 18, when President Roosevelt announced that MacArthur was to command all land, sea, and air forces in the Southwest Pacific, the Australia-New Zealand area was split for political reasons into the Southwest and South Pacific commands, one going to MacArthur, the other to Vice Admiral Ghormley.

The falsity of this accusation is evident from the fact that as early as March 9 the newspapers announced that Ghormley, home from London had been assigned to a post at sea. The wording of the March 9 order, not then disclosed, was that he take command of the South Pacific area and the South Pacific force. In other words, Ghormley received notice of his South Pacific command (the New Zealand area) before MacArthur even reached Australia. It was quite impossible, therefore, for President Roosevelt to have subtracted the South Pacific from the Southwest Pacific command, some weeks later, for political reasons.

The slander continued to flourish, even among people who bore no malice to the President, because the status of New Zealand was suppressed at first for operational reasons, and also because of the cumulative growth of a false impression about General MacArthur's attitude. This was due to something for which American correspondents are responsible—the illegitimate use of the date line "General MacArthur's Headquarters" over stories written in all parts of Australia (often rehashed from Australian newspapers), on subjects ranging from strategic pipe dreams to invasion-jittery criticism of the conduct of the war in the Pacific. Consider, for example, two Associated Press and United Press dispatches dated, "General MacArthur's Headquarters, Australia, August 7," one quoting "an authoritative source" and the other "an informed source" on the meagerness of American supplies and paucity of American troops in Australia. This authoritative, informed source at General MacArthur's Headquarters (any reader would assume it was MacArthur himself) declared that "American equipment which has been sent to Australia is a trickle which could be replaced by 3 days of United States war production." This story did not come from General MacArthur's Headquarters at all. The Associated Press and United Press correspondents had rewritten a "think piece" published in the Melbourne Argus. The "authoritative source" was an Argus reporter, George H. Johnston, who was agitated over the recent Japanese landings at Buna and Gona, and the unopposed development of the Japanese air base at Guadalcanal. (The marines took it 2 days later.)

This story gave the political Washington canard a new lease of life. The Australian tabloid magazine, Smith's Weekly, took up Johnston's statements and editorialized: "Is MacArthur to be let down? Is he sold short as he was in the Philippines?" The United Press cabled the attack across the Pacific, saying that "the tabloid weekly Smith implies in the Australian war theater to win important successes." With political rumors dential timber * * * are deliberately letting him down by not giving him enough supplies in the Australian war theatre to win important successes." With political rumors bouncing back and forth across the Pacific, and with newspaper critics in Australia giving the impression, by false date lines, that they were writing with their feet on General MacArthur's table, it is by no means strange that what began as a slander about the defense of Bataan should flourish with protean change and gargantuan growth.

These political rumors and complaints about supplies, given verisimilitude by the false date line General MacArthur's Headquarters, have tangled the thinking of thousands of Americans. They caused almost universal misinterpretation of the remark which a spokesman for General MacArthur made at the outset of the Solomon Islands campaign: "This is a navy show." The effect may be found in the writings of so fair-minded a person as Walter Lippmann, who recently described the Solomons campaign as a navy show only loosely and inadequately connected with MacArthur's campaign in Australia, and went on to say: "But, if the object of the campaign was to defend Australia, what are we to make of the fact that General MacArthur, who is generalissimo for the defense of Australia, is not in command?"

Take a globe and a piece of string, and you will find that from Melbourne, General MacArthur's original headquarters (he afterward moved to Canberra and other places, and lately to New Guinea), the distance to Guadalcanal is about the same as from England to Persia, or from San Francisco to the Hawaiian Islands. Port Moresby, New Guinea, MacArthur's nearest air base, is as far from the scene of the Solomons aircraft-carrier battle as England is from Bulgaria. The Solomons, in truth, bear the same relation to the defense of Australia that Pearl Harbor and Midway do to our Pacific coast. One could paraphrase Mr. Lippmann by saying about the Battle of Midway:

"But, if the object was to defend our west coast, what are we to make of the fact that General DeWitt, who is charged with the defense of the west coast, is not in command?"

When MacArthur's spokesman said "This is a Navy show," he was not complaining about the fact that the Navy was commanding a naval action. He was explaining to newspapermen why General MacArthur was not going to issue any communiqués about the sea fighting. He found it necessary to make this explanation because in the Battle of the Coral Sea, which was also a Navy show (Vice Admiral Fletcher and Rear Admiral Brown in command under Admiral Nimitz), practically all of the communiqués about it were issued by General MacArthur, within whose territorial waters it was fought, his bombers aiding. Nearly everybody, indeed, supposed that MacArthur was in command. Considering th reticence of Navy Commander in Chief King on the news of sea battles while they are in progress, it is quite possible that he requested the change in General MacArthur's press policy. The point is that a casual remark which related to publicity was mistakenly construed in the United States as a criticism of the strategic direction of the war.

Tactical command in the Pacific has to be divided and coordinated in the field, but in over-all strategy distance means nothing. The bombing of Pearl Harbor was known in Washington, D. C., in less than a minute after it began. The time required to send orders from Washington to Australia, or from New Zealand to Guadalcanal, is measured by split seconds for the rate of transmission, and, if the most secret code is used, perhaps 3 hours for coding and decoding. For the direction of strategy, the whole world is in a schoolroom. It is just as easy to establish a unified strategic command in Washington as in the Pacific, and that is what we have in the joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Solomons campaign was planned and ordered jointly by Admiral King, the naval-air man who commands the Navy; General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army; General Arnold, head of the Army Air Force, and Admiral Leahy, personal Chief of Staff to the President. General MacArthur was invited to make suggestions before he received orders regarding the cooperation of his bombers. On the Navy side, the orders went from King to Nimitz to Ghormley, and from Ghormley to Major General Harmon, whose Army bombers operated from Espiritu Santo. Ghormley, at MacArthur's invitation, sent a naval officer to Australia to help coordinate the two commands.

The alternative proposed to this system is to unite the territorial jurisdictions of General MacArthur and Admiral Halsey (Ghormley's successor) and give MacArthur full control of land, sea, and air forces in the entire South Pacific, with authority to plan his own campaign and forces sufficient to carry it out. Regardless of whether MacArthur is a better naval-air-land strategist than King, Marshall, Arnold, and Leahy combined, such a move would force the splitting of the Pacific Fleet into two immobile units, each too weak to face the united Japanese. To have both a Pacific and a South Pacific policy, one must be inside the other

United Nations authority was divided last January between General Wavell, commanding India, Burma, Malaya, Hong Kong, the Philippines, and the East Indies, and Admiral Nimitz, who was given the entire Pacific. Australia and New Zealand were left out of both jurisdictions, but it was planned early in February to put that naval area under Admiral Hart, then under Wavell. On March 2, after Singapore fell, Wavell's command was split between him and the Dutch admiral, Helfrich. General MacArthur's command was built up from:

1. The Helfrich territory, mostly in Japanese hands, and the Philippines, entirely so.
2. Australia.
3. That part of Admiral Nimitz' command lying west of the 158th meridian and south of the Equator (a line governed by the effective range of Army bombers). With this went a naval command consisting chiefly of the Australian cruisers, the *Australia* and the *Canberra*, and the surviving units of the American Asiatic Fleet, under Vice Admiral Leary.

The jurisdiction given to MacArthur undoubtedly was a disappointment to him, as to territory, naval strength, and strategic autonomy. Melbourne dispatches of April 9 quoted one of his aides as saying that revenge for Bataan "has been uppermost in MacArthur's mind in planning his grand strategy for war in the Pacific." MacArthur's directive was sent, following its approval by the Pacific War Council on April 7, 4 days after its formal acceptance by Australia and the Netherlands. MacArthur informed the War Department that he understood it and was satisfied. Then, for a week, news stories came out of Australia saying that General MacArthur was unable to complete his command for lack of a directive regarding New Zealand. The President, Secretary Stimson, and Foreign Minister Evatt, of Australia (in Washington) all said everything was understood, but the President said he would let the Japanese guess about New Zealand and other island groups.[1] Unlike the later stories improperly dated "General MacArthur's Headquarters," these came specifically from his spokesmen. A United Press dispatch from Melbourne April 15, said: "A three-way controversy developed out of an Army spokesman's assertion that MacArthur still did not have the necessary orders from Washington."

[1] On April 17, I wrote a background note to the editor of the Chicago Sun saying that our Government "does not want Japan to know whether New Zealand, the Fiji Islands, American Samoa, and the New Zealand Mandate are in the operational area governed from Australia or Hawaii, because that knowledge would tell them whether the main American counterthrust is likely to come through * * * or * * * New Zealand has troops in the Fiji Islands and others in the New Zealand Mandate and cannot well be separated from their defense."

The story quoted the "Army spokesman" repeatedly. The President and everybody else in Washington were on a spot, because if they admitted that MacArthur was dissatisfied it would be the same as announcing that New Zealand was under Ghormley. The controversy was sidetracked by blaming it on faulty communications.

The most particular reason for this concealment was fear that if Japan knew that a New Zealand-Samoa-New Caledonia naval-air triangle was in the making, she might strike instantly at the Fiji Islands, which at that time had no fighting airplanes and almost no antiaircraft guns, or at New Caledonia. The pounding taken in silence by President Roosevelt, in the barrage from Australia and criticism from the American press, had the same purpose as his silence concerning the invasion of north Africa. It has given life and endurance to the myth about political Washington holding down General MacArthur because of the 1944 election.

Army and Navy men agree that General MacArthur has done an excellent job in Australia under difficult conditions, building the Australian Army, uniting and retraining the numerous refugee armies that filtered in ahead of the Japanese march. He has been a skilled diplomat, a successful military leader in New Guinea, and has cooperated to the utmost with the Navy and Marine Corps. The fundamental difficulty is that he is too ambitious a general for the subordinate work that lies ahead of the army he has trained, while the nature of the war in the Pacific makes it impossible to give him the naval command and strategic independence needed to match his desire for leadership in the offensive against Japan.

Piled on top of this, the political charges and journalistic misunderstandings make it difficult either to unify the Pacific command in accordance with the established strategy of the war—that is, under Nimitz under the joint chiefs of staff—or to transfer General MacArthur to a post actually more important than the one he now holds but less important than the prevailing conception of it. The first necessity, before any of these steps can be taken, is to clear up the misconceptions of the past 12 months.

IRVING BRANT.

[From the New Republic of March 1, 1943]

MAC ARTHUR AND POLITICS

SIR: The article by Irving Brant in your issue of December 28, The Truth About General MacArthur, did a serious injustice to a group of American correspondents, including two who have lost their lives while serving with American troops, which deserves and requires correction.

The article terms the charge that politics entered into the division of command in the southern Pacific between General MacArthur and Admiral Ghormley (now Admiral Halsey) a "slander."

It then proceeds to blame this slander on "the cumulative growth of a false impression about General MacArthur's attitude," which, it goes on to say, "was due to something for which American correspondents are responsible—the illegitimate use of the dateline 'General MacArthur's Headquarters' over stories written in all parts of Australia (often rehashed from Australian newspapers), on subjects ranging from strategic pipe-dreams to invasion-jittery criticism of the conduct of the war in the Pacific."

This is completely and entirely false in every respect and in every implication.

The date line "General MacArthur's Headquarters" was used by correspondents attached to that headquarters on orders from the American censor. It was often used under protest by the correspondents. Frequently it was written on their copy by the censor. It was never used by any correspondent writing from any point except headquarters.

The idea that what the group of American correspondents in Australia was writing was not a true reflection of General MacArthur's Headquarters is nonsense. Seldom has a more strict military censorship ever been maintained. Control was maintained over subject matter and treatment of subjects. General MacArthur's Headquarters did not necessarily agree with all the strategic views expressed by correspondents, but you may be sure that no criticism of the conduct of the war emanated from any American correspondent in Australia which was not approved at headquarters. And in 9 cases out of 10, any such criticism, or dissatisfaction, which emanated from Australia emanated directly from headquarters, where the most complete dissatisfaction did exist over:

1. The fact that General MacArthur was given reasons for leaving the Philippines which proved on his arrival in Australia to have been false.

2. The fact that for 7 weeks after his arrival in Australia he was a supreme commander so far as the newspaper headlines were concerned, but a commander of nothing so far as his credentials were concerned.

3. The fact that even after he was given command of the southwest Pacific area he was given a bare minimum of tools to work with, a minimum so far short of what was needed even to defend that area that the idea of conducting a campaign to retake the Philippines became a mockery. He had been induced to leave the Philippines on the promise that he would be given the means to return. He had left under protest on the assumption that he would be leading a relief expedition back at once.

When the dispatches of American correspondents in Australia reflected some of this dissatisfaction they were not writing out of their own heads. They were writing straight from headquarters. The idea of blaming them with illegitimate journalistic devices is a malicious injustice to them and also one which falls down entirely as a means of wiping out the fact of General MacArthur's extreme dissatisfaction with the treatment accorded him at that period of the war.

The author of your article, Irving Brant, can confirm this by conferring with the correspondents of his own newspaper, the Chicago Sun, who were among those also present in Australia at the time.

JOSEPH C. HARSCH,
Washington News Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I accept and welcome Mr. Harsch's statement that American correspondents were ordered to use the date line "General MacArthur's Headquarters," virtually by the general himself (Edward Angly says the order came from his press representative, not the censor.) That was my original supposition. Having no proof of it, I redrafted my article when an official defending General MacArthur placed the responsibility on the correspondents. The effect of Mr. Harsch's disclosure is to reverse conclusions I had stated that were favorable to General MacArthur, and to lay him open to criticisms that I did not make.

Mr. Harsch is incorrect in saying that I blamed the political slander on misuse of the date line, for I said the slander arose in the Philippines, 6 months before the date line appeared. I said that stories appearing under the MacArthur date line helped to perpetuate the canard, and my error was in stating that General MacArthur bore no responsibility for those stories. Here, in brief, is the needed modification of my article of December 28:

1. Since the shift in date line was from Allied headquarters, the motive in ordering it was not military secrecy but personal publicity.

2. The same motive may be assumed to govern the issuance by General MacArthur of communiques during the Battle of the Coral Sea, giving information which Admiral Nimitz, commander of the American forces in that battle, desired withheld from the Japanese.

3. General MacArthur conducted a propaganda campaign, directed against the decisions of his superior officers, which, had it been successful, would have prevented the landing of an American army in north Africa and would have rendered impossible the strategic decisions reached at Casablanca.

4. The marines at Guadalcanal, and the Army forces under General Harmon, suffered even more severely for lack of supplies and reinforcements, and for the same reason—lack of ships. Therefore, the shortage was not due to discrimination.

Mr. Harsch was told in Australia that General MacArthur went 7 weeks with nothing but newspaper headlines to show that he was supreme commander. I was told here that President Roosevelt's request for recognition of General MacArthur as supreme commander was transmitted to Prime Minister Curtin, in a letter from General Brett, on March 17, the day MacArthur landed. The full text of the letter was published in the Melbourne Argus of March 19. On March 25 the Australian Associated Press reported an address of Mr. Curtin to the House, saying that the Australian Government had given authority of the highest order to the American general, Douglas MacArthur. You can take your choice.

IRVING BRANT.

Small Business Will Be Helped by a Change in Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 99 to amend our antitrust laws to help the smaller concerns. It is as follows:

House Joint Resolution No. 99

Joint resolution to permit retailers to combine in negotiating purchases from suppliers

Whereas chain retail sales organizations have a competitive advantage over owners of independent retail establishments because of discounts and other advantages gained through quantity purchases; and

Whereas the antitrust laws are interpreted so as to prohibit independent retail dealers from joining together in negotiating purchases; and

Whereas such interpretation of the antitrust laws works to the disadvantage of small businesses and aids and encourages monopoly; and

Whereas owners of independent retail establishments should be able to compete with chain retail sales establishments on an equal basis: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 15, secs. 12

to 27, inclusive) is amended by inserting after section 3 the following new section:

"SEC. 3A. No provision of the antitrust laws shall be held or considered to forbid any person who is regularly engaged in selling goods, wares, or merchandise at retail from negotiating jointly with one or more other such persons in the purchase of such goods, wares, or merchandise from the manufacturer or suppliers thereof for resale at retail."

Plans for International Restoration Must Rest on a Sound, Workable, Adequate Monetary System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, today our leaders are turning their attention to the restoration of world governments and the reestablishment of international relations after the war. To be successful, any enduring plan must rest on a sound financial basis of a stable, workable, adequate monetary system.

The need for the establishment of such a monetary system, apparently, is recognized by the energetic and farseeing young westerner, Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, when he says:

We stand at a solemn parting of the ways. Our business leaders and our labor leaders want freedom. No American wants slavery. But what is the price of freedom? I say it is the capital with which to operate capitalism.

What that capital must be is ably presented in his article, Money in the Post-War World, by the eminent economist René Léon, which is inserted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues:

MONEY IN THE POST-WAR WORLD

East is east and west is west and soon the twain will meet, Mr. Kipling to the contrary notwithstanding. And from this meeting there must emerge a stable and durable international monetary system in order that the world may enjoy lasting peace.

If the victory of the United Nations over the oppressors is the condition of future freedom everywhere, it follows that India and China will some day soon manage their own economies, their own fiscal, financial, and monetary affairs in complete independence and, of necessity, adopt those systems best suited to their own needs. They will choose their own internal media of exchange—China her yuan, India her rupee—and these will be linked to foreign units of currency only by the free will of those concerned. Their banking systems will not continue the monopoly of foreign institutions. These latter will function under Chinese and Indian laws and regulations, without benefit of extraterritoriality, even as foreign banks function in London, in New York, or in Buenos Aires. The Indian and Chinese rates of exchange will be fixed and regulated at home by Indian and Chinese officials in responsible control of the commercial and financial affairs of their respective countries.

India and China will not adopt the gold standard because they could not function under it. The humble status of countless individuals devoid of banking facilities, or without need of them, many averse to credit on religious grounds, who use the rupee, the yuan, or the tael as their medium of exchange and as their store of wealth, makes of silver their only practical currency. Unlike gold, silver can be minted into coins of small denominations adequate to the modest requirements of myriads of farmers and tradesmen who, from one year-end to the other seldom earn through hard labor enough to set aside more than the few bangles with which they adorn their womenfolk. Nor will they willingly accept paper currency which they distrust for many reasons, not the least, if the latest, of which is the "occupation" currency forced upon them by the invaders of their country.

Those who sweat to produce and to serve demand sound money which they visualize as coin composed of a commodity also produced by labor. They will accept a coin freely only if its face value closely corresponds to the value of the labor involved in producing the substance of which it is composed. Sound money, which the French once defined as "Monnaie sonnante et trébuchante," must ring true and possess just the right resiliency. The oriental wants his coin to ring true; he wants it of high fineness for resiliency. He associates alloys with fraud and properly regards seigniorage charges exceeding the cost of mintage as an unjust tax levied upon him. The average Chinese has no contact with treasury officials, but he knows the "shroff" in the neighboring countinghouse and the "kungku" in the local melting shop, and he trusts them to tell him accurately what his coin or bangle is worth. The same applies to the Indian when he goes to the bazaar to buy ornaments when the crops are good, or to dispose of them after a bad monsoon. Neither aspires to the possession of gold which is beyond his reach. Silver is what they want, because silver is the gold of the masses.

Be it remembered that from the China Sea to the Mediterranean there live and have their being 1,000,000,000 human beings who cannot afford the gold standard; who look upon the gold exchange standard as a system devised for their exploitation; who classify credit, as distinct from money, as the province of the wealthy few. Of these, some two-fifths use the rupee as their monetary unit. Current from Burma through India and Arabia to the east African littoral the rupee is monnaie courante to more people than is any other unit of currency on earth. And the edges of this vast region are inhabited by peoples of similar monetary habits. The Straits dollar, the kran of Persia, and the Maria Theresa thaler of Abyssinia, all silver coins, are evidences of this intimate relationship.

Because complete monetary independence cannot be achieved in any other way, one of India's first actions will be to divorce the rupee from the pound sterling. Once again she will coin silver rupees and restore to her people the only kind of money they want. This coinage will be limited by the small volume of silver available, for since 1926 India's treasury has been selling its stocks of white metal, replacing coin with paper. India will then turn to America for help because America has silver in superabundance.

When her soil is purged of the invader, China will have to bring order out of chaos. Japan's forced occupation paper money will long since have lost all value, and such of China's stocks of silver as the looters will have overlooked will be hopelessly inadequate to her requirements. Yet China will need to rebuild her torn economy and she, too, will turn to America for aid.

How will we respond? By making one deal with China, another with India? By fixing a price on our silver, as we did on our gold, without regard to its economic justification and in defiance of monetary reason? Will we attempt to enforce Western standards on the East and thus, having denounced colonialism, will we then practice monetary imperialism?

The East is on the march. We can, as we choose, retard or accelerate its progress, but we cannot arrest it. Either we help the Asiatics to climb to our economic level or we shall certainly descend to theirs. We will trade with the East on a cooperative basis or, with a disorganized economy bereft of monetary facilities, the East will challenge us to cutthroat trade competition. Which shall it be? It were better to recognize the significance of the development of vast new markets to those who help create them, and orient our Good Neighbor Policy toward the East as well as the South. Thus, once again to quote Mr. Kipling, shall we successfully shift "the white man's burden"; that of preserving peace, of instituting just government, of introducing modern education, and so discharging the duties of that burden as to prepare the oriental peoples for the independence to which they now aspire and of which they must assume the responsibilities, not as peoples apart, but as members of the community of free men.

Possessed of the silver that India and China need, we should make it available to them, not merely as a loan, but as part and parcel of an international arrangement designed to facilitate world trade. For the acid test of post-war statesmanship will be the development of normal human activities and the improvement of living standards. And if we are not to revert to barter on an individual or national scale, if private enterprise is to be nurtured and the price system preserved, then we must come together and agree upon a common denominator which will serve as the anchor to which the monetary systems of the East and the West can be moored. Managed currency, nationalistic in its essence, unable to function without quotas and controls, must forever be got rid of. Post-war humanity will not allow trade once again to be adjusted to the needs of money management. It will be the other way around—money must facilitate, not hamper, trade.

In the absence of a better system, despite the contention of some that metallic money is antiquated, we perforce shall be constrained once again to turn to gold and to silver as international media of exchange—gold for those to whom it is best suited, silver for those who cannot afford the more precious of the two metals. Nor need we fear the wholly fallacious argument of those who prate about the unworkability of a double standard, for a fixed ratio will make it work.

India's problem is nearing solution. A way to solve it will be found because the will to find it exists. In the meantime, the renunciation of extraterritorial rights in China by Britain and the United States is added proof, if proof were needed, that this will does exist, and that, in the treatment of Asiatic questions, close cooperation on the part of the English-speaking nations is already at work, because it is an essential corollary of the Atlantic Charter.

When India wins her freedom we must help her that she may conserve it. If she successfully restores her time-honored monetary system, she will enable China to follow suit when the time is ripe, so that together they will constitute a solid Asiatic bloc upon which, and in association with which, we can erect an enduring post-war economy.

In conclusion, and for the benefit of those who would fight the "sound money" battle of 1896 all over again, suffice to say that William McKinley then stood on the Republican Party platform which declared for bimetallism with the ratio of silver to gold fixed by international agreement, whereas

William Jennings Bryan, the isolationist of the time, wanted it established by the United States at a ratio of 16 to 1 without agreement with other nations.

And President McKinley was right. He merely followed the monetary policy of the United States which, by act of Congress, was established on November 1, 1893, and never altered to this day. Section 311 of the United States Code Annotated (ch. 8, 28 Stat. 4) lays down our policy as follows:

"SEC. 311. Policy of United States as to bimetallism: It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts."

This monetary policy is sound today, not only for us but for the British Commonwealth of Nations. If similar legislation were now enacted in London, success of the policy would become certain. This, in turn, might save India's membership within the British Commonwealth of Nations. And no one is in a better position to appreciate this than Prime Minister Churchill himself.

RENÉ LÉON.

Social Security for Post-War America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a very thoughtful address delivered by Mr. Arthur J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board at the National Conference of Social Work in New York City, March 12, 1943. As the address when printed in the Record will exceed the two printed pages allowed under the rule. I have obtained an estimate of cost, which is $165.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEEDED CHANGES AND EXPANSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY

I have been asked to discuss the subject of needed changes and expansion of social security. The very title of the subject assigned to me indicates the great change that has occurred in the short space of one decade. Hardly a decade ago the term "social security" had not come into existence. In those days, that now seem so remote, the discussions ranged around the question of whether we should embark on a social-security program for this country. Now, social security is an accepted goal of the democracies, I might say the chief goal of the democracies, and discussion now centers upon precise ways and means of improving our social-security program.

Ernest Bevin, the Minister of Labor of Great Britain, has termed social security "the main motive of national life, both in wartime and in the peace to follow." So has Jan Smuts in far off Africa. The Atlantic Charter, endorsed by the 32 United Nations, proclaims that "they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security."

Possibly there are some who still believe that there is a basic conflict between the idea of individual liberty and social security. You will recall that some people used to say that we must choose between liberty and security but that we cannot have both. They used to point out that a convict has security but not liberty and felt that such an illustration proved their point. Such a concept of what is meant by social security is, of course, the exact opposite of its true significance. It is, of course, true that we can furnish an individual security in the sense of providing for his animal wants and deprive him of his personal liberty, but socal security, if it means anything, means that we make it possible for the individual to provide for his own wants in his own way. Thus, the concept of social security not only is not in conflict with the concept of liberty but it is synonymous with the concept of liberty because it makes liberty a positive and not a negative thing. Liberty means far more than freedom to starve. It means real opportunity to make the fullest use of one's capacities.

Far from destroying individual initiative and thrift, providing a minimum degree of protection to families against the major vicissitudes that beset them in this modern, complicated, and hazardous world in which we live, releases energies because it substitutes hope for fear as the mainspring of human endeavor.

There is some danger now that the term social security has come to have such an inclusive meaning that its usefulness as a term to describe a specific program of action may be impaired. In its larger sense I think we would all agree that social security must mean above all full employment and full production. I think we would all agree that it must also include decent housing, education, and health, as well as the elimination of destitution.

I do not propose to discuss with you social security in this larger sense of the term. I shall discuss social security only as a specific program designed to eliminate want by preventing the loss of current income. Regardless of how completely and quickly we achieve the goal of social security in the larger sense, it is not only feasible but vitally necessary that we establish a specific program for the elimination of want in this country of ours. I say that it is feasible to eliminate want in this country because the actual production of goods and services before we entered the war, if properly distributed, was sufficient to eliminate want. I say that it is necessary to provide a system designed to eliminate want even though we achieve the goal of full employment and full production because the working people of this country will still be confronted with the great economic hazards of sickness, physical disability, old age, and death, as well as intermittent unemployment. All of these great hazards mean interruption of earnings, and loss of earnings will still spell want even in a land of plenty. I mention intermittent unemployment as a continuing major cause of loss of earnings because under a system of free enterprise, which we cherish and are fighting to preserve, we must encourage invention, improvement, elimination of waste, variety, and continual adaptation to changing ideas and circumstances. This must mean that as the processes of production and distribution change individuals will be forced out of one employment and be obliged to seek another. This is the price, if it can be called a price, that we pay for maximum production, free enterprise, and free labor.

Of course, to the extent that we fail to achieve full employment and full production, a system of social security designed to eliminate want is all the more necessary. Nor should we overlook the fact that a system designed to eliminate want also does actually make a great contribution to the maintenance of full production and full employment by assuring the maintenance of mass purchasing power, upon which mass production must depend.

I do not propose to present a statistical case to establish the need for a system of social security in this country. I need only remind you that at one time, not so long ago, there were 28,000,000 people who were dependent upon their Government for the necessities of life. Not so very long ago, there were 12,000,000 workers unemployed through no fault of their own. Even today there are over 5,000,000 people who are still dependent upon their Government to supply them with the necessities of life an there are still approximately one and one-half million workers unemployed through no fault of their own. On this very day, we know that there are 7,000,000 people who are unable to work because of sickness or physical disability of some sort and that three and one-half million of these are permanently totally disabled. We know that 45 percent of the persons examined under the Selective Training and Service Act have physical defects which caused their rejection for general military service and which must affect their earning capacity in private life. Whether or not we establish a social security system, as a civilized and progressive Nation, we shall still have these problems and their economic consequences to solve and we will undertake to solve them. A social security system merely undertakes to solve these problems in a systematic, effective, and economical manner.

When we undertake to establish a social-security system designed to eliminate want we are not striving for strange and new ideals, nor is it even necessary for us to depend upon strange and new methods. We have a world history and world experience upon which to base our planning and our action. Indeed, we already have in our own Social Security Act the fundamental elements of a program of social security designed to eliminate want. It is only necessary for us to extend, expand, and improve upon our present Social Security Act in the light of the experience and thinking that has developed since that act was passed in 1935.

Since the security of the large majority of people is dependent upon thier earnings, the focal point of our efforts should be to provide reasonable protection against interruption of income due to sickness, accidents, old age, death, and unemployment. This can be accomplished to a large extent by a system of social insurance under which benefits are paid to compensate for a reasonable proportion of the wage loss sustained, the cost of such benefits being financed out of contributions made by the workers of this country and by their employers, and ultimately with some contribution by the Government, representing the entire community. However, even a comprehensive contributory social insurance system cannot provide complete protection under all conceivable circumstances. Certainly an insurance system cannot insure against hazards that have occurred prior to the establishment of the system. Therefore, there is also need for a basic and comprehensive system of public assistance to meet the needs of individuals and their families which cannot be met out of their own resources.

I believe that the respective responsibilities of the Federal and State Governments are

markedly different in the case of social insurance and in the case of public assistance. The cost of social insurance is borne by contributions based on pay roll and the benefits are paid on the basis of wage loss without a needs or means test. The cost of public assistance is borne out of general revenues and assistance is granted only on the basis of an investigation as to the individual's need.

Since the cost of social insurance is related to pay rolls, it is important that employers not be subjected to unfair interstate competion because of varying rates of contributions in the various States. In the case of public assistance there cannot be this unfair interstate competition because the cost is borne out of general revenues

Since the benefits under social insurance are related to wage loss, there is an automatic adjustment to the presumptive need of the beneficiaries and an automatic adjustment to varying wage levels throughout the Nation. Therefore, there is no necessity for investigation and determination of individual need in the light of local circumstances as is true in the case of public assistance. However, while social insurance should be set up as a Federal program, the actual administration of social insurance should be and can be highly decentralized through delegation of authority and the establishment of representative advisory councils and appeals boards in the several States.

At present, as you know, we have a Federal old-age and survivors insurance system administered wholly by the Federal Government and an unemployment compensation system administered by the States but largely induced and sustained because of Federal legislation. I believe that there should be added to the benefits presently provided by the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, insurance covering a reasonable proportion of the wage loss and other costs of permanent total disability, sickness, and nonindustrial accidents sustained by the insured workers and their families. I further believe that the present Federal-State program of unemployment compensation should be combined into a single comprehensive Federal system of contributory social insurance. We would then be covering all of the major economic hazards to which the workers of this country are subjected.

Under such a unified comprehensive system of social insurance there would be no gaps, no overlaps, and no discrepancies in the protection afforded. Such a system could operate with a maximum degree of simplicity and efficiency, since there would be only one contribution, one report, one record, and one local office to which employers and employees could go to ascertain their rights and duties. I believe that it is sound public policy, as well as in the interest of the insured workers, that workers share with employers the combined cost of all of the benefits proposed instead of the employer bearing the entire cost of certain benefits and the workers bearing the entire cost of other benefits.

During the next 10 years it is probable that the current costs of all of the benefits suggested would be more than covered by a total combined rate of contribution on pay rolls of 10 or 12 percent, depending on the exact benefits provided. This would include both employers' and employees' contributions. The total combined rate at the present time is 5 percent. However, even under the present Social Security Act, the combined rate automatically becomes 7 percent on January 1, 1944, and 9 percent by January 1, 1949.

Since general taxes are insufficient to meet the costs of the war and other necessary Government expenses, they should not be relied upon at this time to pay any part of the cost of a contributory social insurance system. On the contrary, a sound contributory social insurance system should levy payroll contributions sufficient to yield a large surplus in a period of full employment, such as we are experiencing now, in order that the system may be prepared for a period of declining employment when income from pay-roll contributions will decline and benefit payments will increase.

In 1939 Congress amended the Federal old-age insurance system so as to provide for dependents' allowances. I believe that all of the various types of social insurance recommended should also provide for dependents' allowances. By providing for dependents' allowances a social insurance system can be made more adequate in meeting the actual needs of beneficiaries without increasing the total cost of the benefits. While insured workers with dependents would receive more than persons without dependents, every insured person would receive his money's worth in insurance protection. This is possible because a larger proportion of employers' contributions would be used to pay benefits to those with dependents than to those without dependents.

I fully appreciate that my suggestion that the present Federal-State unemployment insurance system should be made a part of a single unified comprehensive social insurance system would represent a very important change that should of course be given most careful consideration. However, I believe that it is of vital importance not only to the success of a social-insurance program but also to success in coping with post-war problems that the Federal Government assume direct operating and financial responsibility for the payment of unemployment benefits.

The causes and cure for mass unemployment are beyond the control of individual States. The Federal Government in the past has been obliged to assume prime responsibility for coping with the problem of mass unemployment and undoubtedly will have to do so in the future. It is vital that there be no division of that responsibility, in order that the related approaches toward a solution may be completely integrated. Government stimulation of private enterprise, public works, and unemployment compensation are all necessary to cope with the problem of unemployment. What is done or not done in one respect has a profound effect on what can or must be done in the others. During the post-war period the policies followed in the demobilization of the armed forces and in the termination of war contracts will vitally affect the volume of unemployment compensation payments. On the other hand, the adequacy or inadequacy of unemployment compensation benefits must be taken into account in determining the policies to be followed in the demobilization of the armed forces and in the termination of war activities. Under such circumstances division of responsibility may well lead to failure to act consistently and effectively.

There is no question in my mind that combining the present State-by-State unemployment insurance system, into a unified, comprehensive, contributory social insurance system would result in far simpler, more effective, and more economical administration. At present there are 51 jurisdictions collecting contributions and requiring reports from employers and 51 systems of records. An employer operating in all of the jurisdictions must submit 209 separate reports in the course of a single year. If unemployment compensation were made a part of a comprehensive Federal social insurance system, such an employer would be required to submit, at most, 4 reports in the course of a year and perhaps only 1. And the same record could be used not only for unemployment compensation but also for all other types of insurance as well.

But of still greater importance than these administrative advantages is the fact that a truly national system of unemployment insurance would be much safer and sounder because of the wider spreading of the unemployment risk and the more effective utilization of reserves. Therefore, such a system would be far better able to cope with any severe depression resulting from the termination of our war production program.

A Federal unemployment compensation system could also provide much more adequate benefits for workers generally because of the wider spreading of the risks and the more effective utilization of reserves. It is most important that unemployment compensation benefits be made more adequate than they are at the present time. The weekly benefit rates in many States are insufficient to cover a reasonable proportion of the weekly wage loss that an unemployed worker suffers. Most serious of all is the fact that in most States the duration for which benefits are payable is so limited that a very high proportion of workers in receipt of unemployment compensation benefits exhaust their benefit rights before finding another job. For the country as a whole, even in a period of good employment, such as 1940 and 1941, 50 percent of the workers exhausted their benefit rights before they found another job. In some States the proportion ran as high as 65 and 75 percent. In a period of considerable unemployment these percentages would of course be still higher.

A national system of unemployment insurance as a part of a comprehensive social-insurance system would not only be safer and sounder and more adequate; it would at the same time possess the necessary flexibility to meet varied situations in different parts of the country. Since benefits would be based on the individual's past earnings, they would automatically reflect differences in wage rates in the various parts of the country. The administration would be decentralized and representative advisory councils and appeals boards would be established in the several States to make certain that administration is kept close to the persons affected.

If a single social-insurance system is adopted covering all of the hazards that have been mentioned, it of course becomes increasingly desirable and necessary that the coverage of such a system be extended as widely as possible, since all of the population of this country is subject in varying degrees to these hazards.

The main groups of employees now excluded from protection are agricultural laborers, domestic servants, and employees in nonprofit organizations. In addition, self-employed persons such as small-business men, professional men, and farmers are also excluded. From an administrative standpoint there is no longer any reason why any of these groups should be excluded, and from the standpoint of providing protection there is every reason why they should be included. In the case of workers for small employers it is administratively feasible to extend coverage through the use of a stamp-book system. Under such a system the employee would be furnished with a stamp book in which stamps would be placed by his employer evidencing contributions made by the employer and employee. In rural areas the employer could purchase these stamps from the mail carrier and in urban areas they could be purchased at post offices.

It would, of course, not be feasible to insure self-employed persons against unemployment or temporary disability because there would be no employer-employee relationship or specific wage loss to serve as a test of entitlement to benefits. However, it would be perfectly feasible to insure self-employed persons against the other economic hazards mentioned.

It is most essential, of course, that the social insurance rights of workers entering military service be fully protected. Under the present law workers entering military

service suffer the same reduction and eventual extinction of any social insurance rights they may have developed as do other employees who leave insured employment to enter uninsured employment. In the case of unemployment insurance most of the States have frozen any rights which persons entering military service may have possessed prior to entering such service. However, a great proportion of persons entering military service either had developed no rights whatsoever or very meager rights. Therefore, the best solution would be to count the period of military service as a period of insured employment so that when these men return to civil life they not only will have suffered no loss of benefit rights but will have also built up greater benefit rights to assist them in making the difficult transition. This would be an act of simple justice to men who have been asked to sacrifice so much.

Even with the comprehensive social insurance system which I have suggested it would be too much to expect that all destitution would be eliminated. As I have previously pointed out, no system of insurance can insure against hazards that have already occurred or can provide adequate protection under all conceivable circumstances. Therefore, I believe that we should not only maintain but greatly strengthen our present system of public assistance.

When we discuss social security as a specific program of action we usually make a distinction between social insurance and public assistance. It is true that social insurance is usually financed through contributions made by or on behalf of the beneficiary covered by the system of social insurance. In contrast, public assistance is usually financed out of general public revenues. Likewise, under a contributory social insurance system, benefits are paid on some predetermined basis not related to the individual need of the individual, whereas, under public assistance, benefits are paid having regard to both the actual resources and the requirements of the individual. However, the usual statement—that social insurance provides payments as a matter of right irrespective of need, whereas public assistance provides payments only on the basis of need and not as a matter of right—is quite wrong and betrays a lack of understanding of the basic philosophy underlying social security. It is true that the payments under the social insurance system are made on a predetermined basis. However, that predetermined basis usually involves a benefit formula which is related to the presumptive need of the recipient; that is to say, the formula is usually worked out in such a way that low-paid workers usually receive a larger proportion of their wage loss than high-paid workers and workers with families receive larger benefits than single workers. In the case of public assistance, while it is true that benefit payments are made on the basis of individual need, nevertheless those payments are made as a matter of right which the recipient possesses as a citizen and he has a legal remedy if that right is ignored. The inextricable relationship of social insurance and public assistance is inevitable because the objective of both is to provide people with a minimum income necessary for decent living.

The Social Security Act as it now stands provides Federal grants-in-aid to the States to cover 50 percent of the cost of cash assistance to three groups of the needy—the aged, the blind, and dependent children. At the present time there are 2,250,000 needy old persons, 860,000 children, and 55,000 needy blind persons receiving monthly cash assistance. As I have already indicated, I believe that public assistance should continue to be administered by the States and not by the Federal Government. However, I believe that the Federal Government should make grants to the States for assistance rendered to any needy persons, not only to the needy aged, the needy blind, and dependent children, as is the case at the present time. There is great need for a system of Federal grants-in-aid to relieve distress among persons who are not eligible for assistance under the existing Federal-State categories of the aged, the blind, and dependent children. This arises out of the fact that many States and localities have inadequate resources with which to meet the total relief problem and the further fact that the resources they do have are used disproportionately to help needy persons who are eligible under the three categories for which the Federal Government now grants aid, as against other needy persons who are not eligible under these limited categories. The termination of the food stamp plan and of the distribution of surplus commodities by the Federal Government has further reduced the adequacy of the assistance being rendered these needy persons. Most of the families now dependent upon public assistance do not include any person who could be employed even under very favorable employment conditions. Moreover, studies show that there are many needy families receiving no assistance whatsoever. Therefore, even with the general increase in employment, the States and localities will continue to have a large burden to meet.

A plan of Federal grants-in-aid to the States for aid to all needy persons should not be looked upon as a substitute for Federal work programs in periods of widespread unemployment. On the contrary, the adoption of such a plan would make work programs more effective, since they would be relieved of pressure to meet the needs of persons who may be cared for better in another way. Moreover, such a plan, adequately financed and properly administered, could assist in restoring to the labor market a substantial number of needy persons, thus rendering them self-supporting.

I believe that it is also essential to supplement the present system of uniform 50 percent Federal grants-in-aid with additional Federal aid that would not have to be matched by States whose per capita income is low in relation to that of other States. I believe that it would be possible to establish such a system of additional Federal aid on an objective basis which would utilize existing Governmental data measuring the per capita income of the various States. In addition to the two major changes that I have suggested, namely. Federal grants-in-aid for assistance rendered needy persons not falling within the present categories and special Federal aid for States with low per capita income, I believe that there are several other ways in which the present Federal grants should be liberalized. For example, I believe that the definition of dependent child should be broadened. Under the present definition a child, in order to be eligible, must have been deprived of parental support or care by reason of "the death, continued absence from home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent." Moreover, a child must be living with prescribed relatives. I believe that the definition of a dependent child should be broadened to include all children who are needy for any reason whatsoever and who are living in a private home with any relative or legal guardian. I also believe that the maximum amount of aid to dependent children for which the Federal Government will provide matching should at least be raised if not eliminated.

I think it is also highly desirable that the Social Security Act be amended so that payments for medical care of recipients could be matched by the Federal Government even though the payments are made directly by the public-assistance agency instead of being included in the individual recipient's budget.

I believe that the expanded social-security system which I have outlined can play a vitally important role in the economic readjustment and reconstruction that will be necessary when the war ends. On the one hand, it can provide protection to individuals and their families against the loss of income which they may suffer for one reason or another after the war, when a decline from the high levels of wartime production will increase the burden of the various hazards. On the other hand, from the standpoint of the economic system as a whole, social security can aid in maintaining consumer purchasing power when the national income exhibits a tendency to shrink and thus can assist in maintaining employment at a higher level.

The obvious question which will occur to many who may agree with the inherent desirability of having a comprehensive social-security system available at the end of the war is whether the present is a practical and appropriate time for action. The enormous outlays and the vast administrative undertakings now necessary for the prosecution of the war may appear to suggest that action be deferred until after the war is won. The answer is that unless action is taken now there is grave danger that the post-war period will arrive before a well-rounded social-security system can be put into successful operation. A successful social-security system cannot be improvised overnight.

As a matter of fact, the extension of social security now would not only not interfere with but would greatly aid in the successful prosecution of the war. The greater sense of security which would result would make the people of this great Nation more effective defenders of democracy. This has been amply demonstrated in Great Britain, where social security was extended even while the bombers roared overhead and where it is now proposed that there be far greater extension.

Entirely apart from the increased human happiness and well-being that would result, the fact is that immediate expansion of the social-security system is highly desirable from the standpoint of the Nation's economic and fiscal circumstances. Two of the major economic problems of the war effort are to control inflation and to obtain revenues through taxation or borrowing or both. The enlarged excess of contributions over disbursements which would occur during the war period would curtail current purchasing power and serve as a potent force in the fight against inflation. Investment of the excess in Government obligations would make corresponding sums available to the Treasury. These investments would aid in financing the war just as do the War Savings bonds purchased by individuals. Moreover, the establishment of an expanded social-security system now would make the people of this country better able to pay war taxes and buy War bonds because they would have some protection against loss of current income due to the hazards insured under the contributory social-insurance system.

As President Roosevelt has said, "This is one case in which social and fiscal objectives, war and post-war aims are in full accord. Expanded social security, together with other fiscal measures, would set up a bulwark of economic security for the people now and after the war and at the same time would provide anti-inflationary sources for financing the war."

I should like to emphasize that the program suggested would provide only a minimum basic security for the people of this country. It would provide a safety net protecting the people of this country against major economic hazards, not a featherbed releasing them from the necessity of helping themselves. It would be an effective system because the benefits would be related to proven wage loss or proven need. It would be a system which would provide a maximum amount of security at a minimum cost.

In fact, in a very real sense the costs of insecurity are now being borne by the individual citizens of this country. A sound social-security program makes these costs more bearable by distributing them more systematically and equitably. This is true of

both the public assistance and the social-insurance phases of the social-security program, although it is more apparent in the case of social insurance.

There are some who fear that social security will destroy individual initiative and thrift and enterprise. There are some who believe that providing a minimum basic security for the people of this country will merely encourage them to rely upon the Government instead of upon themselves. I submit that such fears arise out of a basic lack of confidence in democracy and the common man. I believe that assuring people a minimum of subsistence will encourage them to strive for something still better for themselves and their families. I do not believe that we can expect the helpless and the hopeless to practice the prized virtues of independence.

Let us also not forget that under a contributory social insurance system the workers of this country and their employers would pay for the benefits that are received. It is not a plan for giving everybody something for nothing. In the case of public assistance, I am merely proposing that we do better what this Nation from its inception has always accepted as a public responsibility, namely, the care of the poor who would otherwise lack the necessities of life.

I do not pretend that the program I have outlined will usher in Utopia; I do not even contend that it will eliminate poverty in this country; but I do believe and contend that it will abolish want. Is this too ambitious a goal for a great and powerful Nation? I do not believe that it is, and I trust that you will agree.

This Nation should emerge from this war a richer Nation not only materially but spiritually. We have learned how to provide full employment. We have learned how to increase our production tremendously. We have learned lessons of cooperation the hard way. Our future problem is not a problem of resources but of unity of purpose. I am confident that with unity of purpose we have demonstrated that we have the ability to accomplish our purpose. Certainly there can be no higher purpose than to promote the welfare of human beings, and that is the paramount responsibility of social workers.

National Resources Planning Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Despite Great Achievements the N. R. P. B. Faces Extinction," by Joseph P. McMurray, which appeared in the March 13 issue of America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESPITE GREAT ACHIEVEMENTS, THE NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD FACES EXTINCTION

(By Joseph P. McMurray)

(Early in February the House Appropriations Committee refused the Budget Bureau's request for $1,400,000 to finance the National Resources Planning Board, an executive agency, for the fiscal year 1943. Unless the Senate Appropriations Committee restores this item, the Board will pass out of existence on June 30. Realizing that the readers of America would be interested at this critical time in the fate of the National Resources Planning Board, the editor invited Joseph McMurray, who last year contributed thoughtful articles to this review on the Farm Security Administration and the Tolan committee, to write an objective story of the Board's history, functions, and accomplishments. That story follows.—EDITOR.)

Operating under several names in past years, the National Resources Planning Board was organized in 1933 as the National Planning Board. Since its establishment, the President has depended to a considerable extent on the facilities and trained judgment of the Board in advising and preparing plans for meeting the almost overwhelming social problems with which his administration was faced. Many of the measures he adopted for the physical and economic development of our resources grew directly out of the investigations and studies conducted by the Board. The rural electrification program, for instance, grew out of the Mississippi Valley committee report, and the soil-conservation program originated in land committee reports of the early thirties.

Planning was a textbook term in those early days, but principally through the tireless work of the Board it became pretty much what might be called a resource itself. The war has brought this home in a most unpleasant sort of way. One has only to refer to the problems of strategic materials, housing, industrial facilities, plant location, manpower, price control, and fiscal policy to show what the lack of planning produced. As far back as 1934, the Board's mineral policy report advocated the setting up of stock piles of strategic materials. Several years ago the Board called attention, in another report, to the need for increased railroad-car capacity to handle defense-production shipments. In 1940 the Board urged that our steel capacity be increased. "Wild-eyed and crackpot stuff" was the usual comment on these reports. We know differently now.

Unfortunately for those who would like to have people believe otherwise, the Board since its inception has been committed to the policy that planning must be done at the "grass roots" if it is to be at all successful. In line with this policy, nine regional offices were located strategically throughout the country. It is the function of each of these offices to develop an intimate familiarity with the problems of each area, advise the Board concerning these, and serve as a source of counsel, guidance, and inspiration to the local, State, and private groups concerned with the various problems. By encouragement and example from the Board, 45 States and Territories now have planning boards as compared with 2 in 1934, and 45 drainage-basin committees are now actively functioning. The Board, through its regional offices, cooperates very closely with these State and local boards, and by it a constant means of communication is maintained between the various strata of Government and among the several agencies of each.

With the impact of the defense program, hundreds of localities found themselves ill prepared to deal with the complex problems which beset them, and the regional offices were besieged with requests for all kinds of technical assistance and advice, and for direction to proper Federal officials. In like manner, the various Federal agencies and officials sought information from the Board when they desired impartial and expert advice concerning local conditions and problems. War Production Board, for instance, frequently consulted the Board concerning local community facilities, labor, supply, transportation, etc.

This intimate acquaintance with the effects of the war effort on local communities has enabled the Board, in its advisory capacity to the war administrators, to stress the incipient problems to which certain decisions would give rise. The Industrial Location Advisory Section, for instance, has been doing outstanding work in this connection.

No one familiar with the achievements of the Board would accuse it of armchair or centralized planning. The nature of its organization has prevented that. The three members of the Board are chosen from widely separated sections of the country and from widely varying fields of enterprise. Frederic Delano, Chairman of the Board, served for many years as a leading railway executive; George Yantis was formerly speaker of the house of representatives for the State of Washington, and Charles Merriam was professor of political science at the University of Chicago. The two advisors of the Board are Beardsley Ruml, chairman of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, and H. S. Dennison, the famous Boston industrialist. The director, Charles Eliot, is a well-known landscape architect.

The technical committees which are set up by the Board are composed of representatives of interested governmental agencies, technical and professional groups. A skeleton staff assisted by experts hired on a per diem basis prepare the basic material from which the Board through its committees makes its recommendations. This ingenious organization has prevented the Board from becoming a static and inflexible organization.

The breadth and intensity of the work carried on by the Board can be appreciated if one examines a few of its numerous publications and reports. The so-called "bible" of basic information and policy recommendations for land, water, and mineral resources is the National Resources Board report of 1934. Its Population Report of 1937 pointed to the fact that our declining birth rate was making us a Nation of oldsters, and highlighted the many economic and social problems which would follow from this. The Structure of the American Economy is the first living picture of what makes up the American economy and how it operates. Widely quoted, and still the only comprehensive work in the field, is the Board's study determining how income was distributed in this country in 1936 and for what classes of goods expenditures were made. More recently the Board's Transportation Report pointed out that the ultimate solution of that complex national problem is through the establishment of a transportation agency which will consider the needs and possibilities of all forms of transportation. Shortly the President will present Congress and the Nation with the Board's report on social security, which presents a comprehensive analysis of the problem of social security and an approach to the problem of freedom from want.

In line with its policy of stimulating planning at the "grass roots," the Board has not been content to publish reports which only experts would find intelligible and valuable. All the reports, while comprehensive and often lengthy, are extremely readable. For those with less patience or time, the Board publishes in pamphlet form condensed but interesting summaries. In addition to them, the Board from time to time puts out popular pamphlets designed to stimulate interest and study in the various fields of planning. After the War—Full Employment, and Our Cities are examples of the recent pamphlets which have created widespread interest in planning for the post-war period.

Under the Employment Stabilization Act of 1933, the Board is responsible for keeping the President informed about the probable trends in employment, and devising methods for maintaining a high level of employment. The Employment Stabilization Section is carrying on rather exhaustive studies in connection with the probable national income, employment, productivity, savings, and investment in the post-war period. At the

same time it is making a study of the demobilization and conversion problem which we face, and will soon issue a pamphlet on the problem after World War No. 1.

Originating in the Stabilization Act, a 6 years' program of Federal public works has been developed to a point where there is a shelf of projects ready for construction if they are needed to maintain full employment after the war. The Board cosponsored the now defunct Public Works Reserve, the purpose of which was to sell the idea of establishing a shelf of public works to State and local governments and to render technical assistance to them. The Federal Government, by pyramiding such construction in a short period in cooperation with the State and local governments, could carry on an intelligent public-works program if the need for such should arise. Actually, a synchronized public-works program carried on by local and State governments, with their own funds, would have such a multiplying effect on the economy that the need for Federal aid would be considerably decreased. More important, it would place the responsibility for the economic fate of the Nation where it belongs—in the local communities.

Strange that an organization that has been the principal planner of them all should now be charged with duplicating the efforts of other groups for which it planted the seeds. The problems we face are so tremendous and complex that, even if another group were concerned with the identical problems, the results would not overlap. Rather would it provide the necessary verification or clarification all such studies require. In fact, the Board in its role as a clearing house and synthesizer prevents duplication. If the President is to be ready with a practical program of reconstruction, he must depend on some one group to familiarize itself with the work of the 157 and more public and private groups currently intent on post-war plans, and tie together the results of their work in a logical, orderly, and integrated program. The Planning Board is attempting to do just that. The Board no more duplicates the work of the various planning groups in the Federal Government than do the Budget Bureau and Civil Service Commission duplicate the budget and personnel work in the different agencies, or the work of the Appropriation and Civil Service Committees of the House and Senate.

Considering the chaos which would be likely to result if the President and Congress were unprepared to act immediately on a post-war program when the war ends, it appears that Congress would be taking too big a risk in attempting to save one one-thousandth of 1 percent of the President's budget by abolishing the one agency which has already proved itself and has the most experience and background in solving the problems which confront us. If Congress had a committee to study these problems, as the Board does for the President, we could expect that the Board would work in close harmony with it, and the Nation would not have to fear extravagant delay while the executive and legislative branches of the Government reach an agreement on how to bring the Nation back to a peacetime basis.

Operation of Local Draft Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in the city of St. Louis and St. Louis County, constituting the St. Louis metropolitan area, there has been organized and been in operation during the last year and a half an organization known as the Associated Draft Boards of St. Louis and St. Louis County. This is an unofficial organization for the comparison of experiences and suggestions between draft boards in that great metropolitan area. It has rendered very conspicuous service. It is an unofficial body; but, in my opinion, such organizations should be official throughout the country. The head of that organization is Col. John J. Griffin, of St. Louis, Mo., one of the most outstanding citizens of that community. The other day Colonel Griffin was interviewed by the St. Louis Globe Democrat and gave out a very comprehensive statement of the operation of the draft boards in that metropolitan area. His criticisms are in no sense captious. They are in no sense intended to reflect on the draft administration of the National Selective Service System, but he makes constructive criticisms which might be of benefit for the improvement of the whole System. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Colonel Griffin may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DRAFT OFFICIALS OUGHT TO THINK TWICE BEFORE OPENING THEIR MOUTHS, SELECTIVE SERVICE CHAIRMAN HERE DECLARES—"CONSTANTLY CHANGING ORDERS CLUTTER UP LOCAL BOARDS," SAYS JOHN J. GRIFFIN—COMPLETE LIST OF CLASSIFICATIONS AND THEIR DESIGNATIONS OUTLINED

Heavily burdened local draft boards are performing a great and a conscientious service in supplying men for the armed services but "unwarranted statements" from Washington officials that add to the wartime confusion and uneasiness of the civilian population do not help the war effort or do they make the task of the boards any easier, in the opinion of John J. Griffin, chairman of the Associated Draft Boards of St. Louis and St. Louis County.

"The recent statement about fathers was most unfortunate," he said in an interview in which he outlined current draft regulations. "The next day I had a long line of anxious wives and fathers that ran from my desk to the sidewalk, all asking if it were true.

"Every time someone in Washington opens his mouth and makes some unwarranted statement, the same scene is repeated before virtually every draft board in the country. You'd think that officials in the public service of the government would have sense enough to think twice before opening their mouths."

ASSAILS PRACTICE

The practice of Washington officials in announcing changes in draft regulations to the press before notifying local boards also drew the fire of Griffin, who said:

"Until we get an official directive from selective service headquarters, we must continue to operate under previous orders. Yet the morning after a change is announced in Washington, we get a flock of telephone calls and visitors asking if it's true. All we can tell them is that we have not yet received our orders, leaving many people considerably irked over our lack of information. Then too, it adds to the local board's work. Everytime we think we are caught up, some cockeyed statement comes out of Washington and we're right back where we started."

NEWS MOVES SLOWLY

Several days after selective service headquarters announced in Washington that men 38 to 45 years old no longer were to be placed in class IV–H but were to be placed in the regular classes such as I–A, III–A, and others, with an (H) appended to the classification, local boards here still were without official notification of the change.

"We just got through classifying men in that group into class IV–H," Griffin said. "Now we have to go through the list and do the whole thing all over again.

"I hope someone in Washington makes up his mind eventually so we will know where we stand and can stop this confusion. These constantly changing orders do nothing but clutter the draft boards and mean more work for the offices and more worry for the men involved."

LATEST CHANGE

The March 7 announcement from Washington that there no longer would be a class IV–H adds just another series of letters and numbers to an already heavily burdened classification system. Here is the present list of classifications and their designations:

I–A. Available for military service.

I–A–O. Conscientious objector who because of training and belief is not available for combatant duty but who is available for noncombatant duty.

I–C. Member of land or naval forces of the United States.

II–A. A man necessary in a civilian activity that is necessary to national health, safety, or interest, such as public health, garbage dispostal, etc.

IN WAR WORK

II–B. Man necessary to war-production program.

II–C. Single man deferred by reason of his agricultural occupation or endeavor.

III–A. Man deferred by reason of dependency and not engaged in a civilian activity necessary to war production.

III–B. Man deferred both by reason of dependency and activity necessary to war production or which is supporting the war effort.

III–C. Man deferred both by reason of dependency and agricultural occupation or endeavor.

PUBLIC OFFICIALS

IV–A. Man deferred by reason of age, i. e., over 45 years.

IV–B. Public official deferred by law, such as the Governor of a State, a State official chosen by the voters of the entire State, a Member of Congress, etc.

IV–C. Neutral aliens requesting relief from training, and aliens not acceptable to the armed forces.

IV–D. Minister of religion or a divinity student.

IV–E. A conscientious objector, who, because of training and belief, is available for neither combatant nor noncombatant duty; usually assigned to conscientious objectors' camp.

IV–F. Physically, mentally, or morally unfit for military service.

OTHER CATEGORIES

In addition to the 15 classifications into which draft registrants are placed, draft boards have established 4 categories for pooling men in the order in which they will be called:

1. Men subject to immediate call.
2. Single men with collateral dependents.
3. Married men without children.
4. Married men with children.

Thus, a single man supporting an aged mother and not engaged in a civilian activity necessary to war production would be classified III–A, category 2.

TO NTH DEGREE

A married man with children, who is engaged in an activity necessary to war production, or which is supporting the war effort, would be classified III–B, category 4.

Or to carry classification to the *n*th degree under the latest national Selective Service announcement, a married man between 38

and 45 years, with children, who is engaged in an activity necessary to war production, or which is supporting the war effort, would be classified III–B (H), category 4.

For some months draft boards have operated under a State-wide pooling system, Griffin said. Each board sends a monthly report to State headquarters listing the number of registrants in each classification and each category. From these figures, quotas are established for each board.

Under the pooling system, category 1 men are taken first, category 2 men are not taken until all category 1 men are exhausted, and so on. For some time, draft boards have been taking from category 3, but so far category 4 has been untouched.

STATUS OF FATHERS

"Until we receive further orders, there will be no drafting of fathers," Griffin said. "Under selective service regulations, of course, children born after September 15, 1942, do not count toward such exemption."

Not the least of the local draft board's problems is keeping up with the directives and forms that come out of national headquarters in Washington. Current regulations in a large, leather-bound loose-leaf notebook on Griffin's desk total at least 500 pages. Board members must keep up as best they can with what has been rescinded and what has been retained.

For example, there is Transmittal Memorandum No. 1, under date of February 1, 1943. Consisting of 14 printed pages, it is released under the heading "Subject: Amending local board memorandum No. 1, rescinding certain local board releases and transmitting list of local board memoranda."

TEXT OF ORDER

It continues:

"1. It has become necessary to amend local board memorandum No. 1 to change the title of this medium to local boards from 'local board release' to 'local board memorandum.' Accordingly, previous local board release No. 1 is amended in its entirety and the title has been changed to local board memorandum No. 1. The attached amended local board memorandum No. 1 will be substituted for previous local board release No. 1.

"2. The following local board releases are hereby rescinded for the reasons set forth:

"(a) Local board release No. 6, subject: Identifying local board of origin on 'Order for transferred man to report for induction' (form 156), dated July 15, 1941, for the reason that reference to the local board of origin is now included in revised form 156."

EXHAUSTS ALPHABET

And so it continues from (a) to (z) and after exhausting the alphabet, from (aa) through (nn).

The attached local board memorandum No. 1, as amended by LBM 139, 7–27–42, and TM 1, 2–1–43, continues in this vein:

"Change of Title: To avoid confusion with news or press releases, the title of local board release is changed to local board memorandum. The memorandum number will be the same as the previous release number. All local board releases will hereafter be referred to as local board memoranda.

"Transmittal Memo: Confusion has previously resulted from the practice of amending local board releases by other local board releases. It has been decided that hereafter local board memoranda will be amended or rescinded by transmittal memos. Also, a table of local board memoranda will be transmitted by transmittal memos. Transmittal memos should be filed in their numerical order following local board memoranda. With this amended local board memorandum No. 1 is being transmitted transmittal memo No. 1 which rescinds certain local board memoranda for the reasons stated. It is the purpose of the transmittal memos to perform all functions necessary in the mechanics of keeping current the series of local board memoranda and fully explain and transmit all changes."

HISTORICAL NOTE

Under the signature of Director Lewis B. Hershey is the following "Historical Note."

"This local board memorandum was previously designated as memorandum to all State directors (I–154), Local Board Release No. 1, amended by Local Board Release No. 139, 7–27–42."

Local draft boards also have some 73 separate forms, which they use at various times as the exigencies of the war situation demand. The number of these forms ebbs and flows as new ones are added and old ones are abolished. At one time or another, 351 separate forms have been produced by draft officials since the Selective Service Act went into effect, although the current list totals 73.

In addition, boards receive occupational bulletins in which the status of thousands of occupations as doper and dope maker are defined for the board's guidance.

SEEK REVISION

"Some effort has been made," Griffin said, "to get national headquarters to bring out a completely revised set of regulations in brief form to simplify the work of local draft boards but so far nothing has been done."

Under present methods of operation, new regulations are set forth in directives that indicate what portions of previous regulations have been rescinded or retained, making it necessary to constantly refer back to what has gone before and causing many boards to place conflicting interpretations upon regulations.

It was with the idea of establishing uniform interpretations of draft rules that the Associated Draft Boards of St. Louis and St. Louis County was organized last April. Griffin, who is chairman of local board No. 5, was elected head of the organization, but he said it is "an office without portfolio," since the Selective Service Act makes no provision for such groups.

MEETS MONTHLY

The 39 city and county boards organized voluntarily, however, following complaints of varying interpretations of cases involving parallel facts. The group—probably the first of its kind in the country—meets monthly to discuss new regulations, so that it can act as a unit instead of as individual organizations in each ward.

Griffin long has been an outspoken critic of firms that continued to employ men of draft age after the Selective Service Act went into effect. He is particularly critical of war plants which inaccurately classify men as irreplaceable in their pleas for draft deferments.

"Too many war plants contend that young men without dependents and of draft age, cannot be replaced if they are taken into the Army," he said. "What they really mean is that they cannot be replaced at the $16 or $18 a week the men are being paid."

RIGHT TO DEFERMENT

Pointing out that skilled workers requiring long years of training have every right to be deferred, Griffin declared that many firms, even after selective service went into effect, refused to hire men over 45 simply because of their age.

Under present regulations no deferment is granted for longer than 6 months to men working in essential industries, insuring a periodical check to make sure that such workers' status has not changed. In asking for a deferment, employers must fill out Form 42A in the case of necessary and essential workers, stating the worker's duties, pay, how long he has been employed at the task he is performing, how long it will take to train a worker to replace him, what effort has been made to replace him and where the employer has gone to find a replacement. Such workers are classified as II–B or III–B, depending upon whether they are married and have children.

Boards also have been instructed to classify as III–B married men with children who are engaged in an essential industry, regardless of their duties to encourage a trend to essential industries, thereby releasing to the armed services single men and married men without children.

DUTY OF EMPLOYERS

Employers are expected to initiate the classification into III–B of married men with children who may not be necessary and essential workers but who work in an essential industry, by filling out Form 42B, although in some instances draft boards have made such reclassification when the necessary information was available from other sources.

In cases where an essential worker or a married man with children leaves his job in an essential industry, both the employer and the worker must inform his draft board, since the action calls for reclassification. Essential workers who move from one job to another without justification are termed "grasshoppers" and are considered ripe material for filling quotas for military service, Griffin said.

Another term not found in selective-service regulations is the "weatherstrip marriage"; that is, one contracted to avoid the draft. Post-Pearl Harbor marriages are not recognized by selective service, although each case is handled individually on its merits.

BACK TO FARM

It was Griffin who first pointed out that adequate manpower to supply the shortage of agricultural labor could be obtained by the simple expedient of taking out of war plants men who have migrated to the cities and putting them back on the farms from which they came.

Mayor Becker has estimated that some 45,000 more persons than are needed in the St. Louis war area, many of them farmers, could easily be rationed to the farms to solve the agricultural shortage. Their places here could easily be filled from the untapped labor reservoir of women, married men with children, and men beyond military age, he declared.

An agricultural worker who moves from the farm to a war plant, forfeits his II-C or III-C draft classification and becomes potential I-A material, but the difficulty of catching up with such migrants is that local boards have jurisdiction only over the men in their district, and State selective-service headquarters have jurisdiction only over the men in their State.

"If a war plant in St. Louis sends a letter to a draft board in 'Sleepy Gap,' Ark., saying that John Jones is a keyman necessary to the war effort, chances are that the board will grant him a deferment," Griffin said.

"The board might recall that John Jones wasn't much good while he was around 'Sleepy Gap,' but when they get a letter from a big firm in St. Louis telling how important he is, they're ready to put a tablet on the courthouse wall in his honor."

Tribute to Frank L. Yates

REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon the President of the United States sent to the Senate the

name of Hon. Frank L. Yates, of West Virginia, to become Assistant Comptroller General of the United States. This selection is pleasing to me. Mr. Yates is a citizen of Jefferson County, in the district I represent. I have enjoyed his friendship for many years. The reason I rise at this time is because I know there are scores of other Members in this House who have known Mr. Yates through his duties at the Comptroller's office, over a long period of years, and they have known of his work favorably. He began his duties there when the agency was created in 1921, and has worked his way up and up and up, under Mr. McCarl, under Mr. Brown, and now under our former colleague, Mr. Warren. I think those employees in Government service can point to this recognition of long service and ability. We rightly see a career commended.

It is gratifying that he is faithfully rewarded for his endeavor. This action can serve as an incentive to others.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. COX. Just to add my endorsement to what the gentleman from West Virginia has said, Mr. Yates is a valuable public servant.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate that expression from the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LUDLOW. I join in this tribute to a man who has performed splendid service.

[From the Washington Star]

FRANK L. YATES NAMED CHIEF ASSISTANT TO COMPTROLLER GENERAL—NOMINEE ROSE IN UNITED STATES SERVICE FROM CLERK—SUCCEEDS ELLIOTT

Frank L. Yates, attorney-conferee in the office of the Comptroller General, today was nominated to be Assistant Comptroller General, succeeding Richard N. Elliott, who retires April 30.

Mr. Yates, 49, entered the Government service as a claims-settling clerk in the office of the auditor for the War Department, October 1, 1919, and went to the General Accounting Office when that agency was established July 1, 1921. He served as attorney, special assistant, and attorney-conferee under John R. McCarl, the first Comptroller General, and later as attorney-conferee under Mr. McCarl's successors, Fred H. Brown and Lindsay C. Warren, the incumbent.

The new post is of 15 years' tenure and pays $9,000.

Mr. Yates, who is widely known in the Federal service, is a native of Kabletown, W. Va. He was born January 23, 1894, and received his early education in the grade schools and Shepherd College, the State preparatory school. He studied for a bachelor of arts degree at West Virginia University, and took his law course at George Washington University, being graduated in 1922. During the World War he was a commissioned officer in the Forty-fifth Infantry, and also was adjutant of the Ninth Division.

Mr. Yates is married and resides at 4628 Reservoir Road NW. His wife is the former Alice Hume Cooke, daughter of the late Reverend Thomas Worthington Cooke, rector of the Episcopal Church of the Ascension, and Mrs. Cooke. He is a member and former national president of Sigma Nu Fraternity and also is a member of Phi Alpha Delta Legal Fraternity. He formerly served on the board of the Congressional Club.

Mr. Yates, a Democrat, succeeds a Republican. Mr. Elliott, a former Member of Congress from Indiana, is retiring on reaching the statutory age of 70.

Comptroller General Warren, who is confined to his home by illness, expressed warm approval when advised of Mr. Yates' nomination, describing him as a "splendid coworker."

Alleged Waste of Emergency Food Supplies at Nome, Alaska

REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, several days ago a newspaper article, first carried in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer and later in other newspapers in the United States, alleged that a considerable waste of emergency food supplies had occurred in the city of Nome, Alaska. The article, on its face, seemed to me to be almost entirely fiction, but, nevertheless, I made several inquiries, among them at the office of the Secretary of the Interior, and I now ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the letter, dated March 15, addressed to me by the Secretary of the Interior on the subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND]?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, March 15, 1943.

Hon. ANTHONY J. DIMOND,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DIMOND: In response to your letter and telephone call of March 12, I give you the facts in regard to the emergency food supplies for northern and western Alaska referred to in an article which appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of March 6 and which has been quoted in dispatches by the United Press and the Associated Press. The facts from our records as compared with the allegations are as follows:

The quantities landed at Nome were—

	Actual quantities	Newspaper figures
Butter.....Tons..	162	350
Toilet Tissue.....do....	13	78
Coffee.....do....	62	173
Milk.....do....	420	503
Soap.....do....	41	59
Dried Eggs.....do....	25	78
Rolled Oats.....do....	62	108
Vinegar.....gallons..	None	5,169
Salad Oil.....tons..	None	78
Pears.....do....	None	70
Salmon (Nulato).....cases..	None	150

No pears, salad oil, or vinegar were discharged at Nome. No salmon was sent to Nulato or any other point along the lower Yukon River.

There were 162 tons of butter landed at Nome, the greater part of which was immediately put into storage at Lomen Commercial Co.'s warehouse. A small portion was temporarily stacked on the platform outside of the warehouse pending such time as the commodities could be shifted to make room for it in the warehouse.

The article states that Alaskans say the quantity of food shipped was not needed. It was needed in the same sense that emergency food in a plane is needed. It is there to provide against an emergency and to prevent the possibility of hardship and starvation should the normal means of transportation or supply be cut off by enemy action or by disaster of any kind. The supply of food at Nome was not for the 400 people of Nome alone but for the civilian population of 7 large districts of western and northern Alaska which are normally cut off from the source of supply for 9 months of the year because of natural weather conditions. The food was ordered by the Washington office of the Civilian Food Reserve by Mr. Paul W. Gordon who is thoroughly familiar with Alaska, and the storing of the food was supervised by Mr. Harold W. Snell, of the Alaska Railroad, whose experience in Alaska extends over the past 10 years, and who spent over 3 months in Alaska in immediate charge of the operations. All of the supplies requiring warm storage were placed in that type of storage, and those requiring only dry storage were placed in buildings meeting that requirement.

The food reserve is a joke probably only to those who are unfamiliar with all of the details and who have believed the canards which have been circulated by people ignorant of the true situation and purpose. To all those understanding people in Alaska who of necessity must remain in remote and threatened places throughout the long winter the emergency food supplies are looked upon as a foresighted project.

In Galena, also mentioned in the story, all food requiring warm storage was placed in heated quarters. Because of lack of storage space the food requiring dry storage was stored under tarpaulin, a practice that is not unusual at this time with the Army and other organizations.

It is unfortunate that such misinformation as that appearing in the Post-Intelligencer should have received such wide circulation and should have caused you and other Members of Congress so much unnecessary work answering inquiries brought about by newspaper readers believing all that is reported by the press.

I would appreciate it if you would see to it that the true facts in regard to this matter are brought out.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, when the further information that I have asked for is received, I expect to ask permission to again address the House on this subject, because from all of the facts that have come to me up to date and from my own knowledge of conditions at Nome, Alaska, I am certain in my own mind at least that the article is substantially, if not entirely, without foundation in fact.

I invite the attention of the Members to the discrepancies between the figures given in the newspaper article as to the quantities of food sent to Nome and the actual quantities landed at Nome according to the records of the Secretary of the Interior. Not only did the writer of the article grossly exaggerate the quantities and the types of supplies actually discharged at Nome but he listed as having been discharged there 5,160 gallons of vinegar, 78 tons of salad oil, and 70 tons of pears, whereas no amount whatever of these particular products was landed at Nome. He also recited the sending of 150 cases of salmon to Nulato when the fact is that no shipment of salmon in any quantity was sent to that place. It is a reasonable assumption

that such errors are a result of gross carelessness or, as seems more likely, deliberate resort to fiction.

The writer specifically tells of the loss of butter at Nome through the bursting of the barrels in which the butter was packed. Even if every barrel containing butter had actually burst, as described by the writer, the butter itself in the winter climate of Nome would be just as fresh and good now as it was when it came there. Nome is only about 100 miles south of the Arctic Circle, and the ordinary winter temperature, although not severe, is well below the freezing point. There are enough civilians and troops in that area to use up any butter that may be subject to deterioration without the loss of a single pound.

The plan of sending supplies to Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands was the result of the wise and sound judgment of Congress and the administration. The acts authorizing the supplying of the Territories and possessions, and making the appropriation therefor, were passed shortly after Pearl Harbor. No one can yet be certain that traffic between the States and Alaska will not be interrupted for considerable periods of time. Our experience in the early days of the war should be sufficient warning against overconfidence. I know, positively, that the people of Alaska welcomed the action of the Government in sending stocks of emergency supplies to Alaska and storing them there. Not a single resident of Alaska, to my knowledge, has expressed anything but commendation and gratitude for what has thus been done. If there has been any waste of such supplies, which I do not for a moment believe, no one has taken the trouble to suggest any such thing to me. Under the impulse of the maxim, "False in one, false in all," I am at this moment persuaded that there was no waste.

Workers' Ideas Help Lick the Axis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a most interesting and encouraging article written by Don Wharton and reprinted in the Reader's Digest from Factory Management and Maintenance. Men on the job have more to contribute to improvement of methods of production than any other group.

WORKERS' IDEAS HELP LICK THE AXIS

(By Don Wharton)

Our war-production effort is now calling upon the brains, as well as the hands, of those who work at the bench and the lathe. In every branch of American industry, ideas slipped by workers into suggestion boxes are cutting corners and speeding production.

When joint labor-management committees were set up last spring, Donald Nelson asked companies with war contracts to coax more ideas from the rank and file. The result is something to make your eyes pop.

At the Consolidated airplane factory on the west coast, employees' ideas have saved 300,000 man-hours in 6 months—the equivalent of several four-motored Consolidated B-24 bombers. Boeing workers' suggestions are saving 60 man-hours on every Flying Fortress. At General Motors war plants 31,777 ideas were submitted from April to September, so many of them good that one new idea was put to work every 45 minutes. Akron rubber workers contributed 7,000 suggestions, one out of every three of which earned some employee a cash reward.

Prior to last January, D. E. Holmes was selling cars, and when his job was knocked out from under him he became an engine inspector in the Packard factory. He turned in one suggestion which is responsible for the production of an extra Rolls-Royce engine every month.

A Boeing workman, B. E. Reynolds, contributed an idea so valuable that authorities permit nothing to be told about it except that it will result in a change of design in the Flying Fortress.

In 2 months the suggestions turned in at the Republic airplane plant saved 200 hours' work on every plane.

An employee of one of the automobile plants which makes aircraft engines got to worrying about the inner surfaces of drilled oil lines. Dirt or pieces of metal left in them might stop the oil flow and wreck the engine in the midst of combat. He had read of the bronchoscope, with which surgeons explore children's lungs for obstructions. He tried one out on the oil lines, and it worked.

Charles Mayer, of the B. F. Goodrich Co., in Akron, was timid about submitting ideas. "I was afraid they'd think I was trying to run the company," he said But when he found out how eager for suggestions the management really was he began to spark, and his 15 usable ideas have brought him from $5 to $450 each. Once when Mayer needed money for a minor operation he deliberately thought up an idea which he guessed would be worth $25. The company gave him $250 for it.

Two years ago Thomas Grady, mechanic, got a job at Pratt & Whitney, in Hartford, screwing nuts at an angle onto the cylinders of airplane engines. His wrench often slipped, ruining material into which hours of work had gone. This made Grady so mad that he became one of America's most important authors. What he wrote on the back of a scrap of paper was a suggestion for a new type of wrench which would not slip. Grady's new wrench works so well that it saves 3.4 hours on every engine of that type. Grady was given a War bond and a better job. Before the war is over his wrench may be found in aircraft plants and air bases everywhere.

The N tion's largest maker of shells is the Budd Wheel Co. Every shell it turns out has to be covered with paint except for three little spots the size of a postage stamp. Small pieces of paper were being pasted on and removed after the paint dried. Elmer De View kept thinking of the time spent in pasting on and taking off thousands of pieces of paper every day. Why not stick three magnets to the shell, spray on the paint, and later strip the magnets off with a sweep of the hand? It worked.

In plant after plant one hears of workers who become so interested in developing new ideas that they work on them at home, sometimes in their own little machine shops.

Many women employees are as ingenious as the men. One of the New Jersey Westinghouse plants makes sealed-beam headlamps for war planes. When these headlamps came out of the annealing furnace they were so hot that workers, in spite of asbestos gloves, occasionally got burned. The company nurse, Elizabeth Meister, with the help of the foreman, rigged up a rubber tube which pours cold air into the worker's asbestos gloves. Thanks to her, there are no more burns, production has speeded up, breakage has been reduced. A better product is obtained, too, for the cold airstream permits the use of temperatures 100 degrees higher than before.

Another young Westinghouse worker, Julia Hrebenak, operated a spectroscope machine which used pointed carbon rods. They had to be kept sharp, and that required laborious filing. Miss Hrebenak said: "Why couldn't we sharpen them with a pencil sharpener?" She was right.

This suggestion system is a safety valve for grousing and friction; it makes workers realize that they are important and that the company wants to hear from them. Men who get the idea habit think more constructively about their jobs, understand their machines better, and become more skillful workmen. One company reports that 70 percent of those promoted to foremen last year were workers who had turned in suggestions.

It is hard to estimate in dollars and cents what an idea is worth. Most companies feel that the wells of workers' imagination won't gush unless properly primed. (Top gusher, by the way, is probably 29-year-old Ed Brannagan of Westinghouse, with $2,580 for 330 accepted ideas.) If payments are too large, there is danger that employees will neglect their work and spend their time thinking up prize-winning ideas.

When the Packard Motor Co. set up its suggestion system last spring, labor and management talked it over and decided not to give cash prizes. Management agreed to let workers retain patent rights (if any), and labor asked for nothing more. Both knew that the main thing was increased production. The response of Packard workers was beyond all expectation—5,475 suggestions in 6 months. To those who have submitted a usable idea the plant gives a coveted emblem—a little pair of wings costing about 20 cents—and 646 Packard workers now wear wings. Of the first 84 certificates for individual production merit given by the War Production Board—that's the first 84 for the whole country—20 went to Packard employees.

Post-War Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Moses wrote a splendid article, What To Do About Post-War Immigration, which appeared in the March issue of the Reader's Digest. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article by Mr. Moses. I am also including an editorial appearing in the March 12 issue of the Jewish Examiner, which takes Mr. Moses to task for being guilty of unholy patriotism. Mr. Moses, like 90 percent of the native-born American citizens, feels that we should tighten our immigration laws and further restrict the influx of people into this country. If history repeats, we will have a temporary economic recession for 6 months to

a year after the cessation of the present hostilities, followed by a year or two of prosperity, and then a serious business depression will follow. We will have millions of our own citizens out of work who should be insured full employment at all times before we let another person enter our country to work. I commend both articles to your attention and let you decide whether or not it is unholy to be patriotic.

The articles follow:

[From the Reader's Digest of March 1943]

WHAT TO DO ABOUT POST-WAR IMMIGRATION

(By Robert Moses)

In discussion of post-war plans, immigration receives its share of attention. It is one of our most ticklish problems. There is still an enormous amount of misinformation and sensitiveness on this subject. Even people who can think logically about other matters become emotional about this one. Powerful organizations, especially religious groups whose honesty and unselfishness cannot be questioned, have already gone on record with resolutions endorsing a program of more or less unrestricted immigration after the war.

For example, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America adopted this plank in March of last year:

"All men should be free to move over the surface of the earth under international agreement, in search of the fullest opportunity for personal development."

The Commonweal, a Catholic journal, recently said:

"Our position is that the whole theory of exclusion is indefensible and that men and women should have the right to go anywhere in the world where they can find work."

On the question of Asiatic immigration Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt said in the New Republic (May 11, 1942):

"I doubt very much if after this war is over we can differentiate among the peoples of Europe, the Near East, and the Far East."

Survey Graphic, which represents social workers, said (May 1942):

"The whole war enterprise rests upon the hypothesis—which has now become a demonstrated fact—that the nations of the world are bound together by such ties of common interest and common humanity that national isolation is impossible."

Although a respectable body of church people and liberals want wholesale postwar immigration, sentiment in Congress and throughout the country is opposed to liberalizing the quotas. Among bills now ready for introduction to further limit immigration are: One to cut the existing quotas to one-third, another to end immigration entirely for 5 or 10 years or until our own domestic employment problem is settled, and a third to change the system so that quotas are based on race rather than nationality. If I have gaged correctly the temper of the country, and particularly of conservatives who are becoming more articulate everywhere, the measures which propose to cut quotas have a better chance on a showdown than those which would liberalize them.

The simple truth is that we are fully as liberal in our immigration laws as any other great nation. Consider, for example, Great Britain and her colonies. No alien can enter the United Kingdom to ply a trade or practice a profession without a special permit from the Ministry of Labor. The number of persons entering Canada yearly from other than the United States, the United Kingdom and the British dominions is negligible. Candidates from continental Europe are not wanted and get in only in small numbers as independent farmers. Ninety percent of the population of Australia is British, Scottish, Irish, and Welsh. There is not the remotest reason to believe that there has been any change in sentiment throughout the British Commonwealth on this subject.

A great deal of nonsense has been talked about the effect of the restrictions on immigrants both before and since the beginning of the Second World War. Between 1931 and 1940, 528,431 immigrants were admitted, roughly one-eighth of the number who entered in the previous decade. In 1941 approximately 50,000 entered and in 1942 approximately 29,000 Catholics, Protestants, and Jews were admitted because they were from Great Britain, Germany, Italy, or elsewhere, without reference to religion. The story that there was discrimination against Jews has nothing to support it. As a matter of fact, between 1933 and 1942, 33 percent of all immigrants were Jews, and in 1939 and 1940, with the rise of Hitler terrorism, 52 percent of all immigrants landing here were of this stock.

Since 1929 immigration has been limited to 150,000 a year—each nation having a fixed quota. Yet the legal quotas have never been filled. Thus Germany and Austria might have sent us 273,000 between 1931 and 1940, but actually sent us only 120,000. Ireland might have sent us 178,000, but contributed only 31,000. Italy, with a quota of 58,000, shipped us only 30,000, and Poland, which was entitled to send 65,700, sent in fact only 28,000. In 1938 Germany and Austria sent in 10,000 less than their quota, though in 1939 and 1940 together they exceeded the quota. In some years former immigrants returning to their native countries actually exceeded those arriving.

Why, under the circumstances, force a show-down on this issue? Why precipitate antagonisms which cannot aid us in the war and surely will not make for a better peace?

Those who insist that men should be free to move over the surface of the earth in search of work and opportunity can't win this argument in the United States with the people who inhabit it now. As an ultimate objective far off on the horizon it is properly the concern of all idealists if they will only concede that progress in this direction is slow and that our people will not be whipped or driven beyond their convictions and their strength.

The American people are prepared to make great sacrifices to feed and clothe the stricken peoples of Europe and the East, and to get them back on their feet. They will not, however, invite them to come over here by the millions to swamp a domestic economy which will be under the most terrific strain anyway, with perhaps 15,000,000 men and women looking for post-war jobs.

We must assume severe dislocations and unemployment after the war, at best mitigated by public works and other temporary expedients to pave the way for the resumption of private enterprise. Can any sane person advocate that we further complicate our problems by bringing in large numbers of immigrants to compete for comparatively few jobs? Our first duty is to provide our own population, including the returning members of the armed forces, with work, food, shelter, and a decent chance to enjoy the victory which they have earned.

The best thing to do about immigration for the present is nothing. Leave the law substantially as it is for the duration, with a limit of 150,000 a year and with the same national quotas. We don't need another new commission with a balanced membership and another set of clerks, statistical sharks, and publicity directors. Congress has had committees on immigration for years. Let them study necessary amendments to be effective a year or 2 years after the war. It might be desirable, for example, to permit under proper conditions an additional 50,000, representing cases of extraordinary hardship or exceptional qualifications, and it might be well also to transfer the Immigration Service to the Department of State, whose diplomatic and consular agents abroad are best equipped to decide initially who shall come over.

There is plenty of time to establish simpler and more understandable rules governing immigration and naturalization which make no wild promises, raise no false hopes, and leave no room for recriminations. Such honesty may give cold comfort to cosmic idealists and global planners, but it will reflect the considered opinion of intelligent and, in the main, generous Americans who are proud of the fact that they are all immigrants or the descendants of immigrants

THE SAGA OF AMERICAN IMMIGRATION

The story of American immigration from Columbus, and later English, Italian, Spanish, and French explorers, to Einstein, is the most extraordinary saga of all time. The conquests of Caesar and Alexander, the barbarian invasions of Europe and the Crusades are tame stories by comparison. The Pilgrims, the Dutch, the Swedes, the Germans, the Irish, south and southeastern Europeans, the Russians, and all the other groups which followed each other in rapid succession to escape famine and oppression and to find opportunity were welcomed with open arms by a new country whose generosity to immigrants has no parallel in modern times. Between 1820 and 1942 we admitted over 38,000,000 immigrants who have created at least one-half the population of the United States, and have brought to it the strength, the skill, and the talent of every race on the globe.

Self-interest no doubt played a considerable part in this welcome. Our earlier laws and practices were no doubt actuated in part by the policy of getting our dirty work done by new immigrants as the older stocks moved up in the social scale. There were, however, other and finer motives which, up to the end of the nineteenth century at least, made the average American feel that there was room here for everyone who was healthy and came with the right spirit. Certainly it was not a demand for manual labor which brought to these shores such vital contributors to American progress as Alexander Hamilton, Casimir Pulaski, Baron von Steuben, Albert Gallatin, John Mitchel, Carl Schurz, Joseph Pulitzer, Jacob Riis, Michael Pupin, Walter Damrosch, Charles Steinmetz, Josef Hofmann, and David Sarnoff. The cavalcade of American immigration belongs to all of us from the gothic Daughters of the American Revolution to Toscanini. Only a full-blooded Indian can afford to be disdainful of it.

The attitude of the average native toward the immigrant suffered a great change toward the end of the nineteenth century. The country was simply fed up. If you eat too much, even of good things, your system will revolt. You will have all the symptoms of poisoning and invite a dozen other troubles, not the least of which is a pervasive irritability. In the first 14 years of this century the country was gorged with immigrants. In those 14 years about 13,000,000 came in, or about 68 percent of the number which arrived in the whole 80 years preceding. In 7 of those 14 years they came at the rate of over 1,000,000 a year. The debate over restriction flared up again after the first World War, and ended in drastic action by Congress.

In May 1921 the first Quota Act provided that thereafter the number of immigrants of each nationality admitted would be only 3 percent of the number of that nationality resident in the United States according to the census of 1910. In May 1924 the Johnson Act reduced the number to 2 percent by the census of 1890, but the minimum quota for any nationality would be 100. In March 1929 the total number of immigrants in each year was fixed at 150,000. The percentage of each nationality in the whole population of 1920 determined the quota.

The enormous floods of immigrants who entered in the first quarter of the twentieth century clogged our economic, administrative, social, and cultural systems in scores of ways. The effect was intolerable on our language, on the schools, on housing, on crime, disease, and dependency, on congestion of urban centers, and on labor and employment. There were sporadic outbursts of racial and religious animosity which did no one any good but were almost impossible to prevent.

It was futile to argue, that most of these immigrants were useful, that they were building up the country, that they were loyal, and that they constituted as fine material as any that had come in before. The answer was that there was no thought of shutting off immigration, that a reasonable number could still come in, but that the tremendous unselective mass migrations without let or hindrance had to stop.

No doubt the quota acts were crude. The debates, as distinguished from the laws, were lighted by fireworks of chauvinism, bigotry, and intolerance. The basis of restriction was necessarily arbitrary and unscientific, but the results show that it was not unfair. There is one thing about it which is not open to the slightest doubt. The principle of drastic restriction had and continues to have the support of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

[From the Jewish Examiner of March 12, 1943]

RIVALS TO THE "FOUR FREEDOMS"

By what authority Robert Moses, the zealous guardian of American shores and mores, presumes to speak for the everyday American he alone knows, although we suspect it is a divine right bestowed on himself by himself at a beautiful and mystic ceremony. However sacrosanct his pronunciamentos on the subject of immigration restrictions may be to De Witt Wallace, publisher of the Reader's Digest, which has been running Moses' articles, or to Senator REYNOLDS, and others of that breed, our reaction to them is a feeling of undisguised contempt.

"How many of our voters," Mr. Moses inquires, "would open the gates to unlimited immigration of all races?" The number, the suddenly omniscient Mr. Moses decides, "would surely be small." In these narrow, cruelly restricted dimensions he constructs his kind of a post-war world, where we "shall jealously guard the American institutions which gave us victory" and in which we must shy clear of the peoples of other nations, since "closer association may increase animosities as it often does within families and wherever people live in close quarters."

Mr. Moses' magnanimous solution for a problem which refuses to be dismissed no matter how authoritatively he may shrug it away is a truly impressive one. "The best thing to do about immigration for the present is nothing." To this he adds the suggestion that the Immigration Service be transferred to the Department of State—that notoriously flint-hearted abattoir.

Laden with crude sneers at the Atlantic Charter and the visions of post-war planners, his decision, taken unilaterally but in the name of the average American to restrict entry to this country "in order to prevent the rushing in of vast hordes" is a wretchedly heartless, greedy, and callous document. "Narrowness, selfishness, meanness, and stupidity, all defects of human character and education, have made the mess we are in," Mr. Moses observes. But that mess and those low qualities are the very things he is arguing to preserve with his churlish ukase to close the gates of America. It is chauvinism at its worst and ugliest, laying unholy stress on patriotism to one nation and outlawing concern and devotion to mankind as a whole.

How painfully sardonic that a man whose name evokes stirring memories of deliverance and freedom should be the spokesman for "narrowness, selfishness, meanness, and stupidity"—reaction's rivals to the "four freedoms."

Louis B. Mayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Oklahoma delegation had as its guest Mr. Louis B. Mayer, and the inspirational remarks of Mr. Mayer in his visit with the Oklahoma delegation leads me to comment on yesterday's meeting at this time.

Mr. Mayer, as you know, has for 35 years had a close and unbroken relationship to the advancement of motion pictures as a great American industry and as a social asset to American life.

The part that motion pictures play in the war effort is great indeed. A general recently told me that the first question that a soldier asked him when he landed by airplane in North Africa was "Did you bring any motion-picture films?" The motion picture is probably the greatest source of relaxation from the strain of war, and this relaxation is provided to the men in the very areas of battle. I saw a British soldier last evening arise from a table in a restaurant and seek out Mr. Mayer to say a word of gratitude for what the American picture industry has done to benefit the British Army. The pictures of this period have been inspirational assets to our vital cause, and the motion-picture industry has willingly and generously contributed to the war effort not only in the direction of their aims in scenarios but in a financial way and all other phases the industry has thrown itself into the war effort.

When Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt were in conference here together, they suggested to Mr. Mayer that the showing of the picture "Mrs. Miniver" would be helpful to a public understanding of the united objectives and united interest of Britain and America in this crucial time, and they asked that this picture be promptly shown to as many people as possible. It was done. At a financial sacrifice—it probably totaled $18,000,000—the motion-picture industry presented that picture to a total number of people that created a new world's record in the number of people seeing a single film.

Mr. Speaker, I have been an interested student of this particular industry, because its problems, so far as legislation is concerned, are in the jurisdiction of the committee of which I am a member. In times past I have had words both of criticism and of praise for certain phases of the motion picture industry, but I want today to say that I believe that there is probably no industry in America that is more devotedly bending all of its efforts to the purpose of best serving this Nation's war effort. And further, it is my opinion that this splendid record of service is in the main due to the genius and wisdom, and the faith in democracy and devotion to Americanism, that directs the thought and heart of the great American, Mr. Louis B. Mayer.

It might interest you to know that Mr. Mayer has risen to his high position and vast influence through the genius of his own efforts, starting in his days of childhood in Boston, Mass., when he was earning his livelihood as a teen-age boy in selling from door to door. The path of his life and rise to power and influence has been the path of American opportunity. His achievements have been a complete example of the American way.

I am too conscious of my limitations as a biographer to attempt here any interpretation of his life experience. I wanted to say chiefly that what Mr. Mayer had to say to the Oklahoma delegation was a word of inspiration. It was a great expression of the greatness of democracy, and the certain right of the American way of life and the American philosophy of government. Our distinguished majority leader was present, as was the gentleman from Virginia who represents the district where lived Thomas Jefferson and who here so ably exemplifies the continuation of Jeffersonian statesmanship. Our Speaker honored us also with his presence. I am sure that all who heard the inspiring heartfelt words from the lips of this man who gave us out of his vast experience an earnest transcript of his mind and thought—yes, I am certain that all agree with me that that hour was an important hour and that yesterday was a red-letter day in our experience. There was no buncombe, no deceit, no sham, nothing but great and eloquent truth from a heart filled with affection for America and a great understanding of America's destiny.

I want to pay tribute to the motion-picture industry for meeting the current great challenge to public service. I want to pay tribute to the energetic spirited life of endeavor that Mr. Mayer has given America, and to his particular part in the war effort.

It is good to have the picture of American opportunity and initiative translated into the reality of Americanism in the life of a man such as Mr. Mayer. He has the kind of knowledge which has been hammered out in the forge of experience, and tested out in the furnace of time. He has both a broad and detailed understanding of industrial possibilities and industrial service to a nation.

American brains and American energy have wrought amazing things. The motion-picture industry is one of the examples of marvels in achievements. Both the industry and Mr. Mayer have proven to be assets in our struggle for the perpetuation of the American way of life. I mean here to express what I know his modesty would not permit him

to believe—the greatness of his lasting worth. This one man has so injected his personality throughout a vast corporate organization as to vitalize it as an integral part of America and America's struggle and achievements.

I would be the last to attribute mystical powers to any man or perceive a magic wand in any hand, but this I know: That under his guidance the vast possibilities inherent in motion pictures only dreamed of have become realities, and I conceive that to his hand and brain and heart the credit is due.

I am convinced that I have inadequately voiced the sentiments entertained by those who had the privilege of yesterday's luncheon, but it has been my purpose in these remarks figuratively to shake the hand again of the man who has thus achieved, and to congratulate him and the great industry of which he is a part for what he has done and is doing.

Profits in Money Manipulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 12, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in the record of the profits that have been made by money manipulation in north Africa as a result of the American forces taking over a part of that country, we have a foretaste of the gains to be made by international financiers with the manipulation of the inconvertible paper money systems of the several nations after the war. The report of these money manipulations as disclosed in a recent issue of Business Week is inserted herewith for the consideration of the Members of the House:

FRANC FINAGLE

There are stories about French banks making big money, but probably the inside dope is a flight of French capital.

A few weeks ago a Washington columnist reported that French bankers had pocketed $175,000,000 on an international deal involving 25,000,000,000 francs manipulated in the north African money market.

OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL

Before the African campaign the franc was officially worth 2¼ cents, but in such towns as Lisbon and Tangier had been black-marketed for as little as ¾ cent. In Morocco and Algiers, however, the black-market value was 1⅓ cents, and representatives of our Treasury Department and the British Exchequer chose this rate as the exchange value for occupation dollars and pounds (BW—Dec. 26, 1942, p. 31) after the invasion.

The Arab shopkeeper may not have liked the shenanigans of the German armistice commission which were reflected in his ragged robe and unstocked shelves, but at least it hadn't meddled with his money. American soldiers began to cash in with strange money that was decreed to be worth more than the shopkeeper believed it was. He raised his prices. His till—or money bag—was stuffed with paper.

ANOTHER SWITCH

After the Casablanca meeting, it was announced that on February 2 American dollars would be worth only 50 francs; the franc, 2 cents. Thus, on every dollar bill he held, the Arab lost 33⅓ percent when he went to the bank to change it into francs.

Somewhere in marbled offices were French bankers—traditionally experienced in the art of making money the smart way—watching, and perhaps anticipating, this financial juggling.

PROFITING ON DOLLARS

And kicking around the banks of Europe—particularly in neutral countries—are sizable dollar balances or credits which are beyond the wartime controls of our Treasury Department (even though they can't buy anything in the United States without a license). It is conceivable that manipulation of these credits might have enabled the purchase of francs in North Africa when the rate was 1⅓ cents (75 to a dollar)—after allied occupation. The bankers would gain a tidy sum when and if they could cash their francs for dollars.

Another possible dodge may have been the transfer of franc credits from France to African branch banks or the smuggling of currency into the colonies. Here the banker would have accepted a theoretical loss in the value of his franc but would have gambled on the chance that he would be able to use this money in north Africa long before it would be freed by allied invasion of France.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that the sacrifices that the American people are making to free the world is susceptible to such profiteering.

Lay-Offs in Alabama Plants Traced 60 Percent to Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of March 13, 1943:

LAY-OFFS IN ALABAMA PLANTS TRACED 60 PERCENT TO LIQUOR

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—A big percentage of the absenteeism in war plants, especially on Mondays and after pay days, is due to liquor, according to Noel R. Beddow, of Birmingham, regional director of the Congress of Industrial Organizations and president of the Alabama Industrial Union Council. He said an investigation by his organization showed that 60 percent of the after-pay-day and Monday morning lay-offs "are due to the fact that whisky flows so easily and freely in Alabama."

"Certainly we in labor know that these unnecessary lay-offs should be eliminated," said Mr. Beddow. "To a certain extent we have been successful, but we must have more cooperation if we are to make the progress we should.

"Why not look this issue squarely in the face, call an ace an ace, a spade a spade, and put the responsibility at least where responsibility lies, and, knowing this, proceed honestly and fearlessly to correct it.

"We in labor are using our good offices in every legal and legitimate way to control or at least lessen these after-pay-day and Monday morning lay-offs. We have on one occasion appealed to several ministers in Birmingham to use their influence in connection with the leaders of labor that these whisky houses of the State of Alabama would be closed on Labor Day and other holidays.

"Undoubtedly labor has its shortcomings. We know these weaknesses, and are surely, if slowly, correcting them. Improvement in some instances is gradual, slow, to say the least, but so long as the State of Alabama boasts, as they have recently, of the $8,000,000 they have taken in through taxes in a diabolical business, let's not lay all the blame at labor's feet."

The Farm-Labor Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, as one step in the direction of independent thought by the Congress concerning the farm problem, and as one step toward the alleviation of the terribly difficult task with which our farmers are confronted, I favor the enactment of the farm labor legislation which is before us. However, let us not deceive ourselves. It is no cure-all. It proposes to assist in relieving the farm labor shortage and it sets up machinery which utilizes the services of the county agricultural agents for that purpose. Frankly, I do not believe that any program can adequately solve the farm labor problem at this late date, but I think the Congress is right in attempting to do what it can.

It has been sorely disappointing to me to see the lack of initiative, or of understanding, which has characterized the actions of the Department of Agriculture in its attack on present-day farm problems. Obviously our farmers are confronted with their greatest task in our history as a Nation. It is not too much to say they are called upon to feed and clothe almost the entire Allied war effort. Yet, facing that great responsibility, the farms have been stripped of labor, machinery is scarce and in some instances unobtainable, and even seed and fertilizer are lacking in normal quantities. Prices of many farm crops have been set at figures below cost of production. In no case has farm crop price kept pace with prices paid to industry. Consequently this legislation is but one of several grievously needed steps.

The inability of the Department of Agriculture to develop and carry through a comprehensive and adequate food-production program will be sorely felt when harvest time reveals the shortage of food and fiber. It is now time for planting, and uncertainty is the order of the day. Surely this is an unnecessary and unjustifiable situation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is time for Congress to take matters in its own hands and to provide the American farmer with tools for the job ahead. His courage and patriotism will do the rest.

The Soldier's Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following poem written by one of my constituents. I am certain it will speak for itself:

I TELL MY TROUBLES TO A SOLDIER

(By Capt. A. A. Roe.)

I'm a good loyal citizen of the U. S. A.
I buy bonds and stamps on each pay day,
I pay my taxes as they become due;
I think after all that, I should be through.

I don't like the way this war is run,
I'm denied all my pleasure and all my fun,
I'm sick of rationing and regimentation,
I'm denied my right to an explanation.

I don't know what we're all coming to,
I don't think those in charge know what to do,
I want to hold on to my "Bill of Rights",
I tell you Jim, I'm sick of this fight.

Thus I wrote to a soldier friend of mine.
He was somewhere, away out on a firing line.
The other day he wrote me in reply,
Ever since then I've been wanting to cry.

THE SOLDIER ANSWERED

So you're sick of the way the country's run,
And you're sick of the way the rationing is done,
And you're sick of standing around in line,
You're sick you say—well, that's just fine.

So am I sick of the sun and the heat,
And I'm sick of the feel of my aching feet,
I'm sick of the mud and the jungle flies,
I'm sick of the stench when the night mists rise.

And I'm sick of the siren's wailing shriek,
I'm sick of the groans of the wounded and weak.
I'm sick of the sound of the bomber's dive
And I'm sick of seeing the dead alive.

I'm sick of the roar, the noise and the din
And I'm sick of the taste of food from a tin;
I'm sick of the slaughter, I'm sick to my soul,
And I'm sick of playing a killer's role.

I'm sick of all this blood, death, and hell,
And I'm even sick of myself as well;
But I'm even sicker of the tyrant's rule
In conquered lands where the wild beasts drool.

And I'm cured damn quick as I think of the day
When all this hell will be out of the way;
Then none of this mess will have been in vain
And the lights of the world will go on again.

Then freedom will ring from shore to shore
And the kids will laugh in the streets once more;
And the Axis' flags will be dipped and furled
And God will look down on a peaceful world.

(The original thought, The Soldier Answered, was taken from "The Soldier Speaks," by Maude Harget. It is here changed to fit in with Captain Roe's story.)

Food-Production Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ROLAND KINZER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the March 15 issue of the Daily New Era, published in Lancaster, Pa., on the subject of food-production problems confronting the farmers of Lancaster County:

Lancaster County, one of the greatest farming communities in the United States, will produce 10 percent less farm crops this year than last year unless some of the present problems confronting the farmer are remedied.

That is the opinion of responsible farm leaders expressed at a recent farm meeting. And representative farmers in most sections of the county bear out the statement.

In sharp contrast, the Federal Government has asked that farm production be increased 30 percent this year to meet the food requirements of our armed forces, our civilian population, and lend-lease.

If farmers cannot produce, particularly in a county like Lancaster where abounds fertile soil and the will to make the most of it, food supplies obviously will be short, and that creates a problem of concern to everyone.

In short, what generally is described as the farm problem actually is a food problem, a community problem—a grave public problem.

LABOR IS KEY PROBLEM

A thorough survey of representative Lancaster County farms and farmers by the New Era indicates the reason the outlook for increased farm production this year is bleak is because, farmers and farm leaders agree, the farmer's "hands are tied."

There are a number of contributing factors which tend to hold up production, but the main reason is the lack of farm labor.

If they can get the labor, farmers throughout the county feel that they can in some way overcome most of the other obstacles.

But from where this labor is to come and whether it will be available at all is the big question the farmers are asking.

Whether this labor might be obtained through the return of conscientious objectors to the farms, return of former farmers from industry or from the Army, enrollment of city white-collar workers for the harvest season, or from the ranks of school children, is widely discussed throughout the county as well as throughout the Nation.

92 PERCENT PRODUCTIVE LAND

Lancaster County is one of the most highly publicized and renowned agricultural centers in the Nation. Although the county lies within the most populous part of the United States, 92 percent of the total county area is in productive land, with 8,863 farms, averaging 58.6 acres each representing a grand total of 591,371.8 acres for cultivation purposes.

The land in the county is extraordinarily fertile; the farmers produce almost incomparable yields under normal conditions on comparatively small farms; the people are born farmers and they are prideful of their farm production and patriotic in their will to produce all they possibly can.

Traditionally Lancaster County farmers have come to the rescue with food during wartimes. During the Revolution this section was known as the granary of Washington's Army and provided food for the Continental soldiers; during the War between the States, the county helped feed the Union Army; in World War No. 1, the county again produced exceptional amounts of food for the allies as well as for civilians at home.

In this war, local farmers again are called upon to produce—and amounts asked this time top any previous demands.

WE COULD PRODUCE

That the county can produce exceedingly large amounts of food is proved by the fact that its productivity tops the State, with a value of $25,000,000 placed on our farm crops during the past season.

The Nation needs the food. There seems to be no doubt of that in the minds of anyone—Government officials, Congressmen, agricultural leaders, individual farmers, or the public.

Food is on a par with ammunition, planes, and tanks as the No. 1 factor in winning the war. As in former wars the question of who has and who has not sufficient food becomes one of the major deciding points in victory and the terms on which peace is made and kept.

The United States is now facing its second summer of the war. Foods are already rationed because of unprecedented demands and because there is not sufficient food to allow unbridled buying. The Nation is now confronted with the triple task of supplying steadily increasing amounts of food to our armed forces, tremendous quantities of food for our allies, and adequate foods to keep civilian national health at the high peak necessary for intensive war production work.

"WILL TO DO" NOT ENOUGH

In view of these demands a county like Lancaster should produce the needed quotas, even though those quotas are almost a third larger this year than the productive level of last year.

Obviously the land and the mere will to produce are not enough to turn out quotas such as are needed.

To produce, farmers first need manpower. Then they need equipment and materials. Prices that allow sufficient margin to carry on, provisions for processing, marketing and distribution are other angles to be considered.

But the wartime emergency and its related problems are reflected in farm circles as well as in city life.

They point out that the county had a farm problem last year. Tales of incidents where crops were never harvested, where vegetables and fruits didn't get to the canneries in time, where crops rotted in the ground—all because there wasn't enough labor, are still being told in rural sections.

Indications are that the problems will be far greater this year. Last year Selective Service demands on manpower were comparatively small as contrasted with those this year. Demands on manpower by industry also had not reached the peak to which they are now soaring. Farm equipment was available, repair parts were in stock and on the market, ceiling prices had not been established. Fertilizer of most kinds was available. The farmer could still find some seasonal labor to hire, and though in most cases he had to pay higher than ordinary farm wages, there was some itinerant labor in these parts.

LABOR IS SCATTERED

This year the picture is different in many aspects.

A tremendous amount of labor has left the farm—to go into industry, to go into service. Farm equipment is rationed; repair part stocks are meager. Ceiling prices are established or imminent on many products. Fertilizer of some types is scarce or frozen. Protein feeds are scarce. Itinerant or seasonal labor is unavailable.

And it should be understood that while transient labor—voluntary or otherwise—can be of great help there are certain types

of farm work which require skilled labor of a high degree.

Now the farmers are asking why they should bother to plant large crops if they have little assurance of machinery to cultivate, if they can't get enough money out of some crops to warrant work and expense, if they have little assurance they can get help for the harvest.

Controversy over all these problems has been growing steadily in National, State, and local circles during the past few months. Selective Service, Office of Price Administration, Congress, State governments, Cabinet members, agricultural agencies, the War Manpower Commission—all have taken a hand in the farm problem.

Farmers and the public alike are vitally concerned with the outcome—the great question of "Shall we have enough to eat?"

The local planting season will begin in a few weeks—the start of the struggle to produce the needed increased quotas.

As an aid in helping the public understand the situation of the farmer and food in the war year of 1943 the New Era will publish a series of articles dealing with these problems as they exist in Lancaster County.

Berks County, Pa., Farmers Opposed to Farm Bloc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition signed by farmers of Berks County, Pa.:

We pledge to our boys in the armed services, to the rest of the Nation, and to our freedom-loving friends in all of the United Nations that we, as patriotic farmers, will do everything in our power to provide the greatest possible output of farm production in 1943.

We desire to disavow the disruptive activities of the self-styled farm bloc which would have the public believe that the farmers are opposed to a $25,000 limitation on salaries or income, that we object to effective price stabilization, and that we are in favor of tax plans which soak the poor but spare the profiteers, the latest of which is the Ruml plan. Despite its hypocritical claim to be a spokesman for the farmers, this bloc has fought against the incentive payment plan which would help the farmers to meet the cost of increased food production; it has opposed proposals for the release of government-held grains to farmers for use as a feed; and it has resisted all efforts to aid smaller farms in expanding their production.

We point out that the farm bloc has sought to blame others for the unsolved problems of the farmers, but the farm bloc has itself done nothing to alleviate the basic production problems now facing the farmers. While the farm bloc follows the program of the National Association of Manufacturers, it should not go around pretending to speak for the farmers.

We urge that Congress give its attention to the serious problems now interfering with full farm production and that, instead of allowing agriculture to be used as a political football, it concentrate upon an over-all, positive plan for assisting the farmers to increase output, to shift from less essential to more essential crops, and to bring the smaller farms into full production. Instead of listening to the fake farm bloc, we urge that Congress take steps to put agriculture on a wartime basis and to assist the farmers in meeting their production problems.

Amendment to Hobbs Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over Mutual network Tuesday evening, March 16, 1943:

I should like to speak to the men and women of the radio audience tonight on a subject which strikes very close to the heart of our preparation and production for our ultimate victory in the present war.

We all know that this is a war in which every one of us has a stake. More important, we all know that this is a war in which our entire Nation, every man and woman, has a part to play. It is a war in which production is as vital as fighting at the front—production of tanks, guns, ships, and ammunition. It is a war, therefore, in which we have called upon our mines, our mills, and our factories, on the men who manage them, and upon the more than 60,000,000 workers of the Nation, to perform superhuman tasks, to produce as they have never produced before.

Into that job all of the groups in our Nation have thrown their full energies. When I say "all," I mean all—management, labor, everyone.

This is a basic fact which no one with integrity would dare to deny. We could not have turned out the production records which this country is now achieving if any one of the groups necessary to our productive effort were lying down on the job.

Of course there are individual exceptions. It would be a miracle if in a nation of more than 130,000,000 souls, there were not such exceptions. Indeed, the small number of exceptions is itself a miracle, as ships and tanks and guns and planes are being turned out in record numbers.

Assuredly, we could not have won air supremacy in Tunisia and in Guadalcanal if labor had not been giving and is not giving its full measure of devotion to the war effort. Labor hasn't the trumpet by which it can blast and send forth its message and its story, as has the employer and the labor baiter. I incline to the belief that the press of the Nation, if neutral in its news dispatches, is benevolently neutral to the bosses, if not partisan. I do not wish to sanction for one moment by this statement any featherbedding, any racketeering, any attempting to hold continued unfinished business conferences or sessions until the War Labor Board can render a decision. Those guilty of such practices are the enemies not the friends of labor. Labor would do well to weed them out. They are the mischief makers. But the sins of the few should not be visited on the many. Honest labor leaders are doing their level best to check the marauding and excesses of these few labor buccaneers.

It would do well to look at some concrete facts. The loss of man-hours during October, November, and December was less than three one-hundredths of 1 percent as a result of labor's no-strike pledge. There were produced 8,000,000 tons of shipping last year and we shall produce 16,000,000 tons this year. How possible would that be if labor were laying down on the job? We are making 5,000 planes a month. Of these, 3,500 are combat planes. Would that be possible were labor not with whole heart giving its share to the war effort? There was produced 1,000,000 bombs this past year. Is labor shirking?

General Somervell stated to members of his staff on the occasion of the first anniversary of the Services of Supply, "With few exceptions, we have met the needs for supplies and equipment." Could that have been possible without labor doing its share? Under Secretary of War Robert T. Patterson on March 9 cited a 300 percent increase in arms output. A new record was established for small arms ammunition in February. It consisted of 1,244,000,000 cartridges of .30, .45 and .50 caliber or more than 500 every second during the month. In January and February 150,000 machine guns and 134,000 submachine guns were turned out, while 5,000 tanks were rolling off assembly lines. This compared with production of 132,000 machine guns of all calibers in the first World War. Other production figures for the January-February period included 28,000 Army trucks, 2,000 antitank guns, 5,000,000 pairs of marching shoes and—this in February alone—7,800 weapon-bearing vehicles. Can it be said that labor is not on the job?

In this gigantic job of team work to produce, any problem of production that arises, any creaking in the machinery, any grinding of the gears in our entire productive organization, must be met with a constructive effort to find out the causes for the creaking or the grinding, find out what needs adjustment, and to make the adjustment. It is a rank disservice in this present world conflict to start shouting accusations at one another, to become divided among ourselves. This is just what the Axis wants. It is certainly a disservice to reach for the club and insist on beating one group or another, instead of reaching for the screw driver, the blue print, and the slide rule, to fix the machinery and devise methods of conciliation and team work to bring about maximum effort through mutual understanding.

Unfortunately, ever since this Congress opened there has been a group both in Congress and out, a group which now, as in the past, has demonstrated that it has a pronounced antipathy to labor and its organizations. This same group during recent months has been all too anxious to carry its antagonism forward into this crucial war period and to attack or blame labor for every weakness, every difficulty that appears in our war-production efforts.

Someone complains that production is being retarded by the fact that a certain number of workers are absent from their jobs each day. Immediately a vast hue and cry is raised. American working men and women are denounced, accused of being derelict in their duty to the Nation, accused of staying away from productive jobs to drink or carouse. One would imagine that all hewers of stone and carriers of water, all men who toil, are shirkers or good-for-nothings. Absenteeism, legitimate or illegitimate, is bunched together and is grossly misrepresented. Absenteeism is propagandized as a sort of catch-all phrase with which to beat and strafe labor. Immediately bills are introduced in Congress to reach for the club, to threaten absentee workers with being drafted into the Army.

I hold no brief for the deliberate slacker or drone. Ostracize—blacklist them.

Have we so little faith in our American people—for 64,000,000 workers on farms and in factories constitute the substantial backbone of our American people—that when we

find a certain degree of absenteeism we must immediately leap to the conclusion that it is voluntary and willful rather than to seek the causes of the absence to see what we can do to remedy them?

As a matter of fact, the hearings now before the House Naval Affairs Committee have demonstrated that for all this furore over the much-publicized absenteeism problem, actually the percentage of workers away from their jobs on any given day in this war, in the shipyards for example, is far less than the same figure for the last war. It is interesting to note that in January–September of 1918, an absenteeism of 17.8 percent in shipyards is recorded, while in the April–October period of 1942 the highest percentage reached for absenteeism is 8.7. The comparison is certainly worthy of note.

More important, the testimony before that committee has given some indication of the reasons for the absence of workers from work on any given day. Testimony given by the Secretary of the Navy, the Assistant Secretary of War, the Secretary of Labor, and many others, indicates a host of such reasons, which completely exonerate the rank and file.

Consider the fact that thousands upon thousands of war workers have been brought into war-production areas. Many live in trailer or tent colonies with no sewage disposal. They find no housing near the plant, and are required in many instances to travel 25 or 30 miles a day with transportation so bad that the missing of a single bus in a morning means a complete day of absence from work.

Working mothers find no provision for the care of their children while at work. Indeed more women are absent than men. This is due to biological reasons. Workers coming from lighter jobs into heavy manual tasks are faced with workweeks not merely of 40 or even 48 hours, but 50, 55, and sometimes 60 hours. This means fatigue, increased illness problems, increased industrial accident and death rates. The United States Public Health Service estimates that 2,600,000,000 man-hours a year are lost through illness. The professions and business serving these defense areas in a good many instances have not changed their hours to meet the needs of the workers. Thus arises the problem of finding time for family shopping, for visits to doctors and dentists. The surprising fact is not the existence of absenteeism, but that there is not more of it.

You can't abolish these problems by the police club or by a draft threat. It is ridiculous to attempt to punish a slacker by placing him into the armed forces. What kind of soldier would he make? This would make the Army a penal institution. Indeed, it is a privilege and an honor to serve in our armed forces. If you are going to follow that line of punishment, what about women and those over 38 years of age who do not serve. That type of remedy is just balderdash. It is the result of loose thinking and certainly a slur upon the honor of the Army.

To solve the problem of what limited absenteeism does exist, requires constructive thinking. It requires improvement of transportation facilities in war centers, attention to housing problems, establishment of child care facilities for working mothers, attention to nutrition standards and adequate food for workers to enable them to withstand the rigors of increased work, adjustments in the hours of stores and shops in war centers to permit shopping by all shifts without interference with work schedules. It is this kind of approach and not the use of the club and bayonet on the American people that will win this war against absenteeism. The Stromberg-Carlson Telephone Manufacturing Co. of Rochester, N. Y., solved the absentee problem on just such an approach. A survey of the causes there revealed that 60 percent were absent because of sickness (43 percent colds); 16 percent sickness in the family; 16 percent personal business; and 8 percent, lack of transportation. The company then proceeded to promote car clubs, city transportation facilities were readapted to war workers' needs, banks stayed open one night a week, educational information against spreading of colds was plastered on bulletin boards, a medical program was instituted to feed workers cold-resistant vitamins at cost or less, and so forth. Absenteeism now runs under 3 percent a week. It wasn't rancor and browbeating that solved the problem, it was understanding of the causes.

This use of the question of absenteeism as a springboard of attack by certain groups on labor, is merely one instance of this unfortunate tactic. Another is the much-debated Hobbs bill. This bill has been placed before the Congress and publicized as an antiracketeering bill. As a result, an effort has been made to make it appear that in opposing the bill, labor is protecting racketeering. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Every right-thinking Representative is against racketeering, but the so-called Hobbs bill goes beyond ostracizing unwarranted and unlawful practices. The bill could unfortunately be interpreted as a means to interfere with collective bargaining, minimum wage and maximum hour laws and other safeguards that have been won by labor as a result of 50 years of struggle. Surely no man of equity and justice would want any bill to be passed that might tend to wipe out at one fell swoop all these beneficent provisions for labor, which have profited not only the workingman but the employer and the Unites States Government as well.

The simple fact is that we now have on the Federal statute books an antiracketeering law against business and labor. Racketeering, in general, as we all know, is not a new phenomenon. As a matter of fact, it had its real hey-day in years gone by and it was as the result of that that we passed the antiracketeering law in 1934. The law now on the books applies to and covers racketeers of all kinds, whether they are racketeers who describe themselves as businessmen, or racketeers who describe themselves as labor leaders. Labor has no more use for the racketeers who describe themselves as labor leaders than has business for racketeers who describe themselves as businessmen.

The difficulty is that in describing what we mean by racketeering we often run the risk of affecting by law the legitimate activities of labor organizations seeking to secure for their members a raise in wages. Thus, if we say that racketeering means getting money by coercion or by force you and I would agree that we do not mean to include a peaceful strike for higher wages. Unfortunately, there are judges unfriendly to labor who have in years gone by held that even a peaceful strike or a peaceful picket line would be an attempt to get money by force—that is, to get higher wages. You and I would agree that no antiracketeering law should have that effect.

That was why in 1934 certain protections were written into the antiracketeering law to prevent the law from being misapplied to legitimate labor activities.

Actually, the proposed Hobbs bill adds nothing to the existing law, but, on the other hand, may be faultily interpreted to eliminate those basic labor protections.

Surely this of all periods is not the time to push for legislation which might interfere with the legitimate aspirations and activities of organizations of our more than 60,000,000 American workers who are so vital a part of our war effort.

I am convinced that the best interests of our war effort, and of this Nation, require that a bill like the Hobbs bill as drafted and unamended be defeated. To make the real issue involved perfectly clear, I have prepared and will offer in the House, when the bill reaches the floor, an amendment which would specifically declare that the bill is not to affect labor activities now lawful under the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the National Labor Relations Act. Surely, none could quarrel with that. Anyone refusing to support such an amendment is saying, in effect, that he wants the Hobbs bill to interfere with labor activities that have been held lawful in the courts of the land, including the United States Supreme Court. If the amendment is rejected, I hope and trust that, with the true effect of the Hobbs bill thus exposed, a majority of the Members of Congress will rally in opposition to the bill and in support of the unity of management and labor and of all groups which has resulted in the production records which this country is now achieving.

Dishonest Parliamentary Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that the House indulges in dishonest parliamentary practice. Last week, in the passage of the debt-limit bill, we had a glaring example of this kind of legislation.

The issue before us should have been whether we would or would not increase the debt limit from $115,000,000,000 to $210,000,000,000. That issue would have been straight cut and, of course, would have passed with only a few dissenting votes. We are at war and whatever debt limit it takes will be arranged.

When this bill came in, however, it had an extraneous matter attached to it that had no relation whatever to the issue on the debt limit. This rider—in substance—repealed the Executive order limiting salaries to $67,200.

The chicanery practiced by those who handled this bill was to compel everyone who wanted to raise the debt limit—which every patriot wanted to do—to vote to rescind the President's order fixing a limit on salaries. Of course, it did not work out that way. I, for one, voted no, not because I refused to raise the debt limit, but for two other reasons.

First, I do not believe in this kind of "foxy" legislation. Every person with just a common understanding of parliamentary law will see that the matter of the President's order should have come before the House as a direct issue rather than be sneaked in under cover of legislation that everyone favored anyway.

Second, I voted no because I was of the firm opinion that this Congress had given the President power to issue such an order, and that when he fixed the top

salary at $67,200, or $25,000 clear of all taxes, that he did the best thing that could be done for the country.

I have gone over this act—to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942—as a lawyer and after careful consideration I am of the opinion that the President usurped no function or power which had not been given him by the Congress. Every person who does not agree with my conclusions ought to read Public Law 729 pertaining to the matter of the right of the President to fix salaries. Here is what Public Law 729 says:

> The President may, except as otherwise provided in this act, thereafter provide for making adjustments with respect to prices, wages, and salaries, to the extent that he finds necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The President may, from time to time, promulgate such regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this act.
>
> * * * * *
>
> No action shall be taken under authority of this act with respect to wages or salaries (1) which is inconsistent with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or the National Labor Relations Act, or (2) for the purpose of reducing the wages or salaries for any particular work below the highest wages or salaries paid therefor between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942: *Provided*, That the President may, without regard to the limitation contained in clause (2), adjust wages or salaries to the extent that he finds necessary in any case to correct gross inequities and also aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

It will be obvious that the President was given absolute power over the matter of fixing salaries—with two reservations. The first reservation was that he could take no action inconsistent with the two labor acts already on the statute books, namely, the Fair Labor Standards Act and the National Labor Relations Act. The second reservation was that he could not reduce wages or salaries below those paid in a certain period. But there immediately follows a clause under a provision that gives the President full power to reduce salaries "to correct gross inequities and also aid in the effective prosecution of the war." This provision suspends, in certain cases, the reservation contained in provision second of section 4 of Public Law 729. In other words, Congress made two reservations of power. The first was absolute. The second was not absolute and to be disregarded entirely if to "correct gross inequities and also aid in the effective prosecution of the war." Does anyone contend that a salary of $400,000 paid to the head of a concern making instruments of war is not a "gross inequity" in comparison to the pay of labor, the pay of soldiers, or the pay received by 90 percent of the American people? Does anyone contend that lowering this $400,000 salary to a net of $25,000 does not contribute to the "effective prosecution of the war"?

The President exercised the authority granted in this act and by proper proclamation announced that no salary would be permitted which netted the individual more than $25,000 annually. To put it in other words, no salary above $67,200 would be permitted. These figures seem inconsistent, but after the Federal tax is deducted from a $67,200 salary, only $25,000 remains.

About 130,000,000 people in the United States will applaud the President in reducing these salaries which, in some instances, reached over $400,000 annually. Those few millions of people that are left in our population—after deducting 130,000,000—will, of course, find fault with the Presidential order.

The proponents of this bill—containing a repeal of the President's order—strove diligently to make the issue one of the President's having assumed a power which he did not have in law. The President was made to appear as a usurper of this power. Many of the Members who made such statements also voted this extraordinary power to the President.

I could not follow my brother Republicans in their almost solid vote for the repeal of the President's Executive order, for two reasons: First, I try to be consistent. Nearly all Republicans who voted this power to the President voted to rescind it, not because the President had not done the right thing, but because they wanted to get back the power which they themselves had handed over. This did not apply to the new Republican Members because they had no part in the matter, but the old Republicans who made all the noise in the debate were the very ones who voted the power to the President.

Secondly, the President wisely exercised his power. He found salaries ranging all the way from $85,000 to $400,000 being paid in industries holding Government contracts. He could see that—even with tax deductions—some few were enriching themselves off the misery of the people who were supporting this gigantic war effort. Where can be found a sane man or woman who would appear on a witness stand and say the President was wrong? Deep in their hearts, those who voted against the President on this legislation, know the President was right.

Nothing can be gained—politically—by any party in taking a stand against a measure which is right and which will be supported by 90 percent of the American people.

I am not here in this Congress to contribute to the success of the Republican Party—or any party. I am here to contribute to the success of our common country, and no party consideration will have the least effect upon my determination to see this war through as quickly as possible to a complete victory. The President is the Commander in Chief of all our forces. He is not only entitled to my support, but has it. As long as he never does anything worse than reduce a salary from $400,000 to $67,200 annually, neither he nor those who support him will be condemned by the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States.

Mr. Brown of O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Columbia (S. C.) State of March 16, 1943, relative to the splendid common-sense attitude shown by the new Price Administration Director, Mr. Prentiss M. Brown:

MR. BROWN, OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Prentiss Brown believes in rational rationing.

This is very evident, though he has only been Office of Price Administration Administrator a few weeks.

Mr. Brown apparently knows that, after all, he is dealing with human beings and it is easier to lead than to drive.

By lessening rigidity here and there, where obviously it was the sensible action to take, Mr. Brown has paved the way for an understanding reception of such more stringent rules as he may deem necessary.

Mr. Brown is looking at rationing from several angles.

He knows the grocer must live, too.

For instance, in the matter of raisins and prunes. They are very nice as extras, but the points were so high that people would not buy them. And this is the type of stock that would fare ill from a summer on the shelves, whereas certain other articles could keep forever. So Mr. Brown stepped in and helped the merchants and the consumers by lowering the point values of these products. Perhaps he may have to cut them again to move them, but the point is that he was responsive to the situation, just as he was about sliced bread.

Another example, Mr. Brown saw no reason why maraschino cherries should be saved for equal distribution. If a person never got a maraschino cherry he would not suffer. And he saw no reason why mushrooms—very delightful dish when creamed and certainly a choice addition to a good steak—purely a luxury item, should be rationed. So Mr. Brown took maraschino cherries and mushrooms off the coupon list.

Now comes news that more points may be allowed each person for canned and dried fruits and vegetables.

Mr. Brown has already adopted the honor system for pleasure driving. Inspection was irritating not only to the public but to the inspector, to whom it was a most disagreeable job. Now one's conscience is his guide, and we believe there is less pleasure driving than there was when numbers were being taken in front of theaters, social gatherings, etc. This, of course, pleases us because we suggested the honor system as soon as the inspection plan was revealed.

We believe Mr. Brown is going to go a step further soon and adopt the most practical way we know of for the handling of "A" gasoline—that is, to give a man as many gallons as he can be spared (maybe less, if necessary, than the present 3 gallons), and let him use whatever amount it is, if, when, and where he sees fit.

In fairness to Mr. Henderson it must be said, however, that it is a good deal tougher to put a revolutionary plan, such as ration-

ing, into effect than it is to "let up" on the rules. But not everyone would see the human side, and that's what Mr. Brown has done. More power to him.

Which Path, America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times of Sunday, March 14, 1943, the lead editorial entitled "Which Path, America?" presented to the American people a question which in the not distant future must be decided. Nothing has come to my attention which more clearly or more logically discusses this most important subject, and for this reason I present the same for the RECORD.

I commend it to the thoughtful consideration of every person who believes constitutional government, with its guarantees of freedom of opportunity and individual liberty, should be preserved.

The editorial follows:

WHICH PATH, AMERICA?

The United Nations are engaged in a global war to stop the aggression of the totalitarian states, which have embarked on a career of conquest to impose their system on the world and organize it in their own image. The totalitarian states will be defeated; but it has often happened in the past that the ideas of the vanquished have conquered the conquerors. And something like an ideological totalitarian conquest is even now under way right within the democracies which are pledged to the destruction of totalitarianism.

The fundamental basis of totalitarianism is an exaltation of the state, which takes command of the individual from the cradle to the grave. It starts out as a welfare state, which takes care of all essential needs of the individual; it schools him, provides him with work, supports him in sickness and distress, takes care of him in old age. Very soon, the individual becomes completely dependent on the state, which, as a result, acquires complete power over the individual. Philosophers and ideologists arise to extol the excellence and beauty of such a state. And as a final step, there arise some tough-fisted ruffians and fanatics who, seeing the vast power acquired by the state over an acquiescent because dependent populace, start out to seize the state for themselves and to command the state in the name of a single party consisting of themselves.

That, at least, has been the development in the most totalitarian state of all of them, Nazi Germany. In some measure, ff sometimes only in the matter of promises, it has been paralleled elsewhere, in Italy, in Japan, even in Soviet Russia. And this development must be kept in mind in studying the implications of the post-war plans worked out by the National Resources Planning Board and presented to Congress by President Roosevelt.

The reports of the National Resources Planning Board are presented to the American public as the "American Beveridge plan." But quite aside from the fact that the Beveridge plan itself is an imitation of Bismarck's State insurance system, which laid the foundation for the German welfare state that ended in nazi-ism, the National Resources Planning Board plans go far beyond it. They provide not only for compulsory insurance under state control but also for a larger Government participation in private industry and for a share in business management by labor. The first envisages that mixed economy which long flourished in Germany, in which the state enters more and more into the domain of private enterprise and in time begins to swallow it, with the result that both management and labor become more and more dependent on the state. The second provision obviously derives from the former shop councils of Bolshevist industry. But the drafters of this particular plan may not have been told that these councils, insofar as management is concerned, have been abolished, and that the authority and disciplinary power of management are more absolute in Russia today than in any other country.

It is an axiom of political economy that liberty depends on ability to choose one's work and one's employer. When all jobs are controlled by one agency, that agency will dominate all workers. Control over every job and the livelihood of every individual is the basis of the power of the Nazis in Germany, the Fascists in Italy, the "New Bureaucrats" in Japan, and the Bolshevists in Russia.

In the United States, the one agency run entirely by the Government, namely the Post Office Department, has long been a living demonstration of how Government control over jobs impinges on the political freedom of the individuals dependent on such jobs, and how a party in power can utilize such an agency to enhance and prolong its power over the State.

Ironically enough, all these schemes are advanced in the name of "liberalism," which at one time was supposed to fight against usurpation of power by the State over the individual. Now liberalism has executed a complete turnabout and fights for the extension of State activities to every phase of life. Perhaps many present-day liberals do not realize that every extension of State activity also entails extension of State power. Perhaps some of them do but, taking Bolshevist ideology as the touchstone of their liberalism, welcome it. In any case, if the schemes of the National Resources Planning Board should ever become law, they are bound to produce a profound change in the psychology of the American people and the American way of life for which we are supposed to be fighting. For they mark the beginning of the Europeanization of America. Perhaps their framers have understood the Zeitgeist better than others, but it might be well to know in advance which way they are leading us. Otherwise we may wake up some day and find that we are the dependent and powerless subjects of a totalitarian state, run by our own brand of "New Bureaucrats."

Anti-Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to enact the anti-poll-tax bill, so-called

Whereas many colored people are fighting in the armed forces of the United States to protect and preserve the principles of democracy for which the United Nations stand: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States to enact, and the President of the United States to sign, the so-called anti-poll-tax bill to the end that millions of citizens of the United States residing in several of our Southern States shall have restored to them their democratic right to vote; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted March 2, 1943.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 8, 1943.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*.

Farm Security Administration Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report on the Farm Security Administration program as of November 30, 1942, for the Third District of Nebraska:

Farm Security Administration borrowers in the Third District of Nebraska have made considerable increases in the production of essential agricultural commodities. A sample survey shows that the 3,409 active Farm Security Administration borrowers in the district made the following increases in production in 1942:

Product	Increase in 1942 over 1941	Percent increase
Chickens..pounds live weight..	1,065,769	56
Milk.....gallons..	1,097,293	11
Eggs.....dozen..	761,280	31
Pork.....pounds live weight..	3,306,064	31
Beef.....do....	1,000,399	12
Soybeans.....bushels..	285	7
Peanuts.....do....		

Under the rural rehabilitation loan program as of November 30, 1942, in the third district $6,055,907 had been advanced to 6,681 farm families for loans for operating goods since the inception of the program in 1935. The total collections on these loans amounted to $2,843,276, of which $2,390,376 represents repayments of principal. As of the same date these collections amounted to 98 percent

of matured principal and accrued interest.

Under the farm ownership program as of November 30, 1942, $1,424,812 had been lent to 140 tenants, hired men, and small operators to enable them to purchase and improve family-type farms under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. Collections amounted to $103,776 of which $63,834 represents repayment of principal. The total collections of principal and interest amounted to 99 percent of maturities of principal and interest.

In addition to making, servicing, and supervising these loans, the Farm Security Administration has brought about the establishment of 226 community and cooperative services which make available the use of purebred sires, machinery, and other facilities to some 1,429 farm families who otherwise would lack them.

The total number of all farms listed in the 1940 census for the district is 40,083, of which 27 percent had a gross farm income under $600 in 1939.

Exempting Merchant Seamen Serving in War Zones From Certain Taxes

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, this morning I introduced a bill for the purpose of exempting merchant seamen serving in war zones from the Victory tax and from collection of the tax at source on wages.

It is my firm opinion that this so-called Victory tax should not be paid by the men of the armed forces and by men of the merchant marine serving in war zones. The work being done by the armed forces and by the men of the merchant marine is a sufficient contribution to the victory of our country and of the Allied Nations. There is no necessity for saddling upon these individuals this additional tax in order that they may contribute to victory. What they have contributed and are now contributing to our victory exceeds any contribution to the war effort made by the civilians.

I have not included the men of the armed forces in this bill because my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] has already introduced H. R. 1549 to exempt members of the military and naval forces from the payment of this tax. In addition to this, the Ways and Means Committee has recommended a plan providing a minimum exemption of $3,500 a year for servicemen on their Government earnings, thereby proposing to free noncommissioned officers and the lower ranks of commissioned officers. This plan is intended to be retroactive for 1942 taxes. The proposal of the Ways and Means Committee affecting the servicemen, is eminently fair, and I hope that it will be enacted into law. The men of the armed forces are entitled to this consideration.

How about extending some consideration to the men of the merchant marine? Surely no one needs to be told of the fine work they are doing. Our enemies do not have to be told, as they are convinced that these men are doing too good a job for our country. That is the reason why the enemy has filled the seas with submarines.

Our people realize that it is most essential to maintain the line of supply from our factories to the fighting fronts. It is important to produce war material, but equally important that it be placed in the hands of those who have been trained to use it. The merchant marine is doing just that.

It is common knowledge that a heavy toll has been taken of our merchant vessels by submarines and air attacks. These men have faced the gravest perils which a deadly and hateful enemy has been able to contrive. Many of them have lost their lives. In fact, it has been figured by the War Shipping Administration that, during the first year of the war, about 4 percent of the number of merchant sailors were reported dead and missing. This figure gives an idea of the dangers which these men are facing. However, this knowledge does not deter these brave men from continuing to face the perils of the sea in an effort to deliver the material of war where it will do the most good.

So, despite the dangers, our supply lines are being maintained, not only to our own troops, but also to our allies. We find the merchant marine sailing all over the world, to Russia, Australia, north Africa, and other distant points, with just one thought in mind, viz, that the supplies get through in order that our action against the enemy continue unabated.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I consider it fair that the men of the merchant marine, who sail in war zones, should be exempt from the Victory tax, in accordance with the terms of my bill, and I hope that the bill will be enacted into law.

West Roxbury Veterans' Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to increase the bed capacity of the West Roxbury Veterans' Hospital

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges upon the Congress of the United States the necessity for increasing without delay the capacity of the West Roxbury Veterans' Hospital to 2,000 beds, so as to meet the mounting hospital needs of the veterans in this area; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted March 2, 1943.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 8, 1943.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*.

Doles or Trade?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech recently made by Hon. John Haynes, ex-Under Secretary of the Treasury, before the Pennsylvania Economy League on the subject of reciprocal trade agreements:

Is this country going to have to bear the burden of world-wide relief after this war? And if so, how are we going to pay for it?

One thing is sure, conditions in Europe and much of Asia are going to be perfectly horrible when the fighting stops. There has already been enormous destruction of life and property, and there will be much more before Hitler and the Japs are cleaned out. There will be thousands of wounded, millions of refugees, and whole continents of half-starved people. Crops will be bad, farm animals dead, seed eaten, and fertilizers used to make munitions; transport of all kinds will be worn out or wrecked; water and gas mains broken; sewer systems blocked; factories blown up; housing and all kinds of business buildings smashed. Diseases of all kinds will be epidemic. People will hate other people in a way which we—whose relatives have not been shot as hostages—can hardly comprehend. There will be vengeance, riots, perhaps civil wars. Something to eat will be the most important thing in life.

Obviously we cannot walk away and turn our backs on these conditions. We—and the other undevastated countries—will have to take some action to improve the situation, not only because humanity requires it, but because we cannot sleep safely in our beds with kegs of dynamite like that next door. Two wars in one generation are enough to show that serious trouble anywhere puts us in danger. Unless the peace can be made secure—and that means among other things unless conditions can be created in which people can earn a decent living—we shall have to stay armed to the teeth indefinitely. I think we are beginning to realize what that would mean both in tax burdens and in regimentation. We shall have to find some sort of an insurance policy that gives better protection than the one we bought last time.

For some of the conditions that will exist immediately after the war ends the only answer is relief. Governor Lehman's office is being set up to take care of our share of that. He has a terrific job, and he deserves our full support. But both he and the rest of us hope that the time during which straight relief is the principal thing will be as short

as possible. In some places it may be shorter than we think. Our shipments of civilian supplies to north Africa were described originally as relief, connected of course with the military operation. But I notice this in Ed Stettinius' release of February 5, which describes the shipments of food and coal and so on which we and the British are making to that area:

"The United States and United Kingdom are being reimbursed for most of the civilian supplies which they are furnishing. * * * Money received * * * is used to pay for raw materials and other commodities and services furnished by north Africa * * * north Africa is the world's second largest producer of phosphate rock. It also produces important quantities of high grade iron ore and cork, and, among other strategic materials, zinc, lead, cobalt, and manganese. All of these are valuable for United Nations war production." (From Office of War Information release 1214, February 5, 1942. The order of the sentences has been changed.)

The two-way trade which Stettinius describes is going on in wartime, in a theater of operations, I suppose most of it for the present is conducted by the Government. But some day there will be a peace-time trade, and that will be conducted on our side, if we have sense enough, on a basis of free enterprise. Trade like that, which helps both parties, is the cheapest, the simplest, and altogether the most satisfactory way we have of being helpful to the reoccupied countries. We could not afford to support them indefinitely, and they won't want us to. But they will all have things to export, and the best thing we can do for them is to admit those exports to our markets. That means food and jobs and self-respect for them, which is our best insurance against war and revolution, and it means that relief stops that much sooner and that we begin to get paid for the things we send abroad. There is no other way we will get paid, and if the trade is conducted on business principles it ought to benefit both sides. Private trade needs no bureaucracy to boss it, and to the extent that it finds markets for our surplus it removes the need for either relief or bureaucracy at home.

Some of these countries will want to buy a great deal from us when the war is over. Russian industry, to take only one example, has been very badly damaged in the areas the Nazis overran in 1941 and 1942. There will be Russian buyers in the market for machinery of every kind, and the orders will be big ones. Many of our plants would like those orders very much when war production stops. They can have a lot of them, for the Russians like our stuff, provided we can figure out a way to make it possible for them to pay the bill. Financing schemes will be proposed, of course, but you and I know very well that in the long run, and aside from the limited possibilities of shipping gold, payment can be made only by the sale of Russian goods in the United States, or in some other country which has dollar balances which it can turn over to the Russians in payment for their goods.

We know also that no other country will have dollar balances available for transfer unless it in turn sells us more goods than we sell it. Unless we can make settlement possible in goods, either direct or on a triangular arrangement, we will not get the Russian business, and we will not help the Russians either.

Russia is perhaps the solidest of the countries on the continent of Europe, and it won't need much relief. But the fundamental story is the same from every devastated area. We can have our choice of making long-time handouts, or of taking pay. If we want pay, and the friendship of the other peoples, we had better not exclude the goods they have to sell.

This is just one application of what Secretary Hull has been telling us, and trying to carry out on our behalf, ever since 1934. His trade agreements program is nothing in the world except an effort, patiently and carefully conducted, to reduce trade barriers in both directions by negotiation and agreement, and so let private traders operate, let more goods move, more people make a living, and prosperity and peace develop. It is simple, it makes sense, it works; and it doesn't take any big bureaucracy to run it, nor any big appropriation. His program will be up again this spring in Congress, and there may be a fight. I am convinced that he and the trade agreements program deserve the best support that we can give them.

Increase of Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the problem of increasing food production, impeded as it is with a labor and machinery shortage, was given full consideration at the Corn Belt conference of Governors and official representatives of Midwestern States, held at Des Moines, Iowa, this week, called by Governor Hickenlooper, of Iowa. Present also was former President Herbert Hoover.

After a full day's discussion, the Governors of eight States and the official representatives of four others proposed certain remedies for the critical agricultural situation.

Significant recommendations were adopted by the conference that I desire to call to the attention of the House, and in extending my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the six-point plan adopted by the conference for farm relief.

Following are the recommendations adopted by the conference:

First. That agriculture be recognized as an assential war industry and be rated as such with respect to manpower, materials and equipment.

Second. That, while we are not proposing blanket deferment for agricultural workers, we recommend that all experienced labor essential to farm production be deferred, and that all such farm workers be given proper recognition by Federal authorities with suitable insignia or other mark of distinction for giving their best services to the country by remaining on the farm front.

Third. That there be provided immediately a supply of steel and other material adequate to complete the manufacture of all partly completed machinery; that all present stocks of machinery be now released for sale; that the needs of material which should be this year provided for farm machinery to be used in 1944 be ascertained by May 1, 1943; and that the present unsatisfactory system of allocation of such machinery which sends machinery where it is not adapted, be supplanted by one which recognizes the actual needs of respective areas.

Fourth. That material be immediately supplied manufacturers of farm machinery repairs and parts and all restrictions on the manufacture and distribution of the same be removed at once; that full authority be placed in the hands of the local war boards to supply welding rod, bar steel, and other materials used in the local repair of farm machinery.

Fifth. That migrant seasonal agricultural laborers be furnished the necessary transportation to and from their work.

Sixth. That available supplies of fertilizer be released immediately for the 1943 crop season.

"In this 1 day's conference, our conclusions have been limited to manpower, machinery, and supply of fertilizer. We do not at this time pass on other farm problems," the recommendations explained.

Post-War Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks to the House Roads Committee by Samuel C. Hadden, chairman of the State Highway Commission of Indiana, in support of a post-war highway program, Washington, D. C., March 4, 1943:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have been introduced to you as chairman of the State Highway Commission of Indiana, but with your permission, I wish to amplify my introduction and identify myself also as the vice president for the third district of the American Association of State Highway Officials. This district, gentlemen, embraces 12 States in that fabulous area known as the Middle West, where the Garden of Eden was, and is, located.

You have heard the recommendation by our association of a post-war highway development program, to be carried on jointly by the Federal and State Governments, as presented by our president, the distinguished chairman of the Texas State Highway Commission. I wish to assure you that the 48 State highway departments unanimously approve this program. Not only was agreement in support of it reached without difficulty by those of us who are here in attendance, but we have heard also from the absentees. State departments not directly represented at our present meeting in Washington have communicated their views to us with respect to the present need for highway legislation and, although they have had but little, if any, knowledge of the trend of our discussions here, they have each, acting independently, reached the identical conclusions we are today presenting for your consideration.

We trust that you will recognize the fact that these views come from men who have spent their best years in creating and maintaining the Nation's highways. They are

the practical highway administrators and engineers, men of established position and demonstrated soundness.

Our program is not only moderate but modest. It proposes no experiments or departures from precedent. It does not contemplate anything either sensational or fantastic. It is the very essence of conservatism. It contemplates merely the resumption of highway activities where we left off and the giving of proper attention at the earliest possible date to highway work now deferred during the period of emergency.

Our program is in no sense a made-work program. The work will not only be here to be done after the war but actually it is here right now. It is work everybody wants done. There is no opposition to rational highway construction and maintenance. The people are intensely proud of their highway systems.

If this program is approved and the requisite legislation is enacted, contracts can be awarded within 2 weeks after the end of the war and we can begin actual construction and the employment of men and the use of materials within an additional 2 weeks.

This program is not visionary but is intensely practical. It will integrate and give direction to the joint highway efforts of the National and State Governments. It will enable the States to proceed with assurance and will establish those terminal facilities which are a part of the mind and spirit of those designers upon whose talents we are all dependent.

To give some idea of the work to be done may I draw upon my home State for an illustration? Of the 10,000 miles in the Indiana State Highway system we have 4,000 miles of cement concrete pavements. On January 1 of this year the average age of these pavements was 12½ years. We have retired more than 500 miles of similar pavements by reconstruction with the same or some other type. The age of these pavements on retirement has ranged from 13 to 18 years. From this it is quite evident that we are on the eve of a tremendous resurfacing and reconstruction program in our State. We have been in touch with our neighbors and find that exactly similar siutations exist in all the States in our area. In addition to this reconstruction work there is need at this time, also, for the modernization and improvement of our present highway systems. The need for a large mileage of new highways is not indicated but the demand is urgent for the preservation and improvement of what we now have.

In presenting this program to you we are completely confident that if translated into legislation it will prove to be not only timely but very popular. May I give you one more Indiana illustration in support of this contention? The Indiana State highway law as amended in 1941 directed the State Highway Commission to present to the 1943 legislature a report on the condition and needs of our State Highway system with a rough estimate of the cost of doing the work now known to be desirable. While this law was enacted before we entered the war the fact that we are now at war did not excuse the Indiana commission from the statutory requirement to present this report to our legislature, now in the closing days of its session.

It was with considerable trepidation, and with some apologies, that we presented our report showing that we could now expend judiciously the sum of $160,000,000 on our present State highway system if money, materials, machinery, and men were available. The size of this figure will be appreciated when it is recognized that we have expended only $400,000,000 on our State highway system from its inception in 1919 to date. As indicated we were very careful to point out to the public and to the legislature that we were submitting such a program at this time only because the law required us to do so. To our great relief, and our very considerable surprise, this report proved to be extremely popular. It is the sort of practical planning the public understands and approves. It lies well within the range of their knowledge and experience. Excerpts from the report were printed in almost all the newspapers of the State and almost every newspaper printed the map we prepared to show the location of the proposed improvements. Even our most widely circulated newspaper, which is not always considerate in its editorial discussion of State highway officials and affairs, commended this program editorially not only once but on several occasions. We believe that the action we are now recommending that you take will prove equally popular throughout the entire country.

We are very hopeful that, in your wisdom, you will see fit to carry out the program we are today recommending to you.

Muddling With Food and Bronze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication received by me from Mr. Carl A. Stewart, of Des Moines, Iowa:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *March 15, 1943.*
Representative PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAUL: I have before me one of the bulletins which I get from various surety companies, which bulletins give notice of bids to be opened by the Government in various places, and this one certainly takes the cake.

The bulletin advises that the Department of Interior, National Park Service at Washington, D. C., will open bids on March 22, this year, for casting in bronze and placing or erecting a statue of Thomas Jefferson in the memorial room of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial at the Tidal Basin.

Thomas Jefferson was, of course, a fine President, a fine man, and is deserving of all the honor which this country can give him but, with so much stress being placed on the necessity for conservation of bronze, brass, and copper, I believe that Mr. Jefferson himself would probably much prefer to have that bronze used in the conduct of the war than in a statue to be erected for him at this time. Undoubtedly, he would much prefer to postpone that token of respect on our part.

Not that it makes any difference, of course, in the long run but it certainly is a silly piece of business to my mind.

By the way and while I am in a critical mood, I want to call your attention to something else of which I was informed at a party last night. I talked with a gentleman who lives in Marshalltown and who operates a canning factory there. He has a contract with the United States Government for canning chicken for the Army. The Government, however, does not want the soup which is an incidental but necessary byproduct of the canning operation. However, under his present contract and under present Government regulations, he is not allowed to can or otherwise dispose of this chicken broth except by destroying it and he tells me that every day his canning factory operates he must pour into the sewer anywhere from 125 to 150 gallons of top grade A chicken broth.

I am quite sure that the school children of Marshalltown would enjoy and would be greatly benefited if the school cafeterias could be allowed to serve that chicken broth to the students gratis. Once more, of course, this is a small matter when we compare it to the total food wastage which goes on every day in this country, but it is a little hard for an ordinary citizen like myself to get very enthusiastic in food conservation and saving when we see things of that nature going on because of a Government regulation which requires it.

This matter is being reported from another source to Mr. Russell, formerly farm editor of the Register and Tribune and now I believe connected with the food conservation movement and located at Washington, D. C. I think something ought to be done about it.

Very truly yours,

CARL A. STEWART.

Absenteeism and Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communications received by me with reference to H. R. 2082:

NORFOLK, VA., *March 8, 1943.*
Representative BRYSON.

DEAR SIR: If you can impose national prohibition for the duration of the war in your bill, then you will have the gratitude of the women of America. I know so many splendid young men going to the dogs from liquor.

With all good luck and every good wish,

E. V. CALLENDER.

MARCH 6, 1943.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BRYSON: I am so glad to hear of your sponsoring a bill to impose national prohibition for the duration of the war. The only improvement I would suggest would be to have such a law in force forever.

My prayers are with you regarding its success.

FRANCES BOUWMAN.

RUFFS DALE, PA., *March 8, 1943.*
Representative BRYSON.

DEAR SIR: You are to be commended on the move you have taken to curb absenteeism by national prohibition for the duration. More power to you in this action.

Yours truly,

(MRS.) HAZEL D. BUSTEL.

FALMOUTH, KY., *March 11, 1943.*
Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: It is with keen interest that members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union have noticed in the daily press that you have sponsored a bill the object of which is to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquor for the duration.

We want you to know that we heartily endorse your most worthy efforts in this vital

matter and assure you of our sincere and prayerful interest.

Hoping for a successful culmination of your endeavors, we beg to remain

Yours very truly,

FALMOUTH, KY., WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION,
Per Mrs. T. E. NICHOLS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 9, 1943.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Bully for you. You are on the right track. The country is alcohol mad. Of course the higher-ups can't do anything for fear of losing votes:

I saw our boys in the last war go away sober and steady (Oregon was dry then) and it did not take them long to finish the job either. Now they go away in a baptism of liquor. In Portland our saloons are crowded with women and soldiers mostly. Oh, yes; I am old-fashioned.

By the way, if we have as many soldiers in North Africa as are in Portland on Saturday nights, the job should soon be finished if our No. 1 saboteur were not present.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT GREGG.

TAMAQUA, PA., *March 13, 1943.*

Representative JOSEPH BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In behalf of the officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Schuylkill County, Pa., I congratulate you on the stand you have taken to outlaw the manufacture, sale, and transportation of liquor in the United States and possessions.

It does cause absenteeism and brings misery and neglect to many homes.

It is hard to believe that the necessities of life must be rationed, but wine, beer, and whisky are not rationed. Kindly advise why the worst enemies of mankind are not rationed.

Too bad we had the repeal of the eighteenth amendment.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. ANNIE L. WALTERS.

ORANGE, TEX., *March 9, 1943.*

Representative BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I can no longer refrain from writing you after having read the article in the Beaumont Enterprise newspaper of Beaumont, Tex., of your proposed bill to impose national prohibition for the duration of the war by an act of Congress, rather than a constitutional amendment.

I can give you references as to my reliability. I was reared and educated in this town, taught school in the public schools prior to my marriage.

I am writing you from personal experience about absenteeism from defense work. My husband is 40 years old. He has been working at shipyard work for almost 7 years. He is a first-class shipfitter, and his foreman says he can hang as much steel as two men when on the job, but that is the problem. He used to be absent a day or so from his job but now since wages are good and whisky plentiful he is off for 1, 2, and sometimes 3 weeks. It may be too late to help this individual man and home but I am confident I speak for thousands of mothers and wives. This man is a law-abiding citizen, a loyal American, a good father and husband until he gets drunk.

As to juvenile delinquency; we have five children, a boy 12 years old, a girl 14, a boy 15, one 17, and a girl, 19. All are intelligent and normal girls and boys. The 15-year-old boy ran away from school one day. When I got him home, I asked him, "Why did you run away?"

He said, "Anywhere would be better than Daddy being drunk all the time." This father, as thousands of other fathers, is needed to guide these children, especially the boys, through this adolescent age.

School authorities as well as civic organizations are very much disturbed over the juvenile delinquency problem in this defense town. The saddest part is that so many women, young girls, and boys are drinking heavily.

You are at liberty to use this letter if it will have any weight upon the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of alcohol during this time of emergency when every hour wasted is helping our enemies.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. MYRTLE TALLEY BEAN.

MOUNT DESERT LARGER PARISH,
Northeast Harbor, Maine, March 8, 1943.

The Honorable Representative BRYSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Those of us who have long been concerned over absenteeism directly traceable to the effects of alcohol; those of us who have thought highly of the present administration except for its gross indifference to the undermining effects of alcohol upon the war effort; and those who have been indignant over the coddling and special exemptions given the vested interests of liquor by this administration, are exceedingly glad that you and some of your colleagues have finally seen fit to make sacrificial efforts against one of our greatest home evils in the name of a common democracy, which has a war to complete and a peace to win.

From my contacts as a minister, I know that there are scores of people in my community who heartily support your move toward national prohibition for the duration. Petitions supporting your proposal would, at this time, be far more easily secured than the average petition; however, realizing that a personal letter carries more weight, I write commending your endeavors toward achieving congressional action which would apply national prohibition in the name of the common good during this crisis period.

Wishing you success in effecting national prohibition, not for its own sake but for the sake and interest of average Americans who have no axe to grind, I wish to express my whole-hearted support and Godspeed.

Respectfully,

MERTON B. MCKENDRY,

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *March 6, 1943.*

The Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BRYSON: I have just read, in the San Francisco Chronicle, an account of your bill for wartime prohibition to check absenteeism. Splendid!

May God speed you!

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR K. WHITE.

OWENSBORO, KY., *March 8, 1943.*

Representative BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After having read your article in regard to the whisky and its effect on our Nation in my home paper, the Owensboro Messenger, I could not resist writing to you and urge you in the name of our dear Saviour to use all your power to stop the sale of this evil, at least for the duration.

My only child, a son, 26 years of age, has been in the service for 1½ years, and I plead with you and all the rest of the Representatives and the President of this United States to give my boy and other mothers' boys who do not drink a fair chance in this war. If boys who drink are allowed to get drunk at this critical time, then that works a hardship on my son and all other boys who no not drink. Is a guardhouse full of drunks any good in the war effort? Then, if they are not, is it not high time we were doing something about it? I visited my son at Fort Benning, Ga., last April, and my heart was made to ache seeing so many drunken soldiers in the nearby town. My son and I were eating in a place and three soldiers were at a table across from us. They drank three beers apiece and were begging for another bottle. They were so drunk they had to be helped out and put on the bus. Then why do the lawmakers of our great commonwealth allow the sale of anything that will make our soldiers worthless to their duty. They even had a bar in the officers building at Fort Benning, and there sure was a lot of this whisky sold on Saturday. I feel certain this week-end drinking is hurting the war effort. I see this excess drinking here in my home town.

I don't think this is any time to have whisky and beer put before our fine soldiers. Authorities have stated that alcohol is the most dangerous poison widely used in human diet; that it affects nearly every tissue in the body, but is particularly deadly in its toxic action upon tissues of the central nervous system. Then why do we allow them this poison? Hitler took drink from his soldiers, who in our country is not as wise as Hitler?

God's Word says: No drunkard can inherit the Kingdom of God. We hate to see our boys killed by the enemy's bullets, but do we hate to see them killed by the drink that our Government allows them for that paltry little tax derived from same?

In the name of our dear Saviour, work hard, Representative BRYSON, to get this liquor put out at least for the duration. I would like to ask you to talk to the Representatives from old Kentucky there, especially BARKLEY, CHANDLER, and others, and ask them to stand with you and give my dear son in the service a fair chance and, too, will you hand this letter to our President, that he, too, may know that I hope and pray that you great men there in Washington will put this evil out. And do you think it is right for any government to license the greed of one class of citizens to prey upon the weakness and appetite of other citizens for monetary gain?

Mr. William E. Gladstone said that the liquor traffic causes more poverty, more human misery, and more deaths than all the wars of all time.

In God I trust.

Mrs. OLA LUTTRELL WALTERS.

If this letter could help in any way, it may be read or used in any way you may see fit.

Mrs. WALTERS.

Antilynch Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to adopt an adequate antilynch law

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States to adopt, and the President of the United States to

sign, an adequate antilynching law which would enlist the powers of the Federal Government in learning the identity of, and prosecuting, those participating in lynch mobs; those responsible for inciting such mobs; and those local law enforcement officers who remain lax or passive while a lynching is committed; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted March 2, 1943.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 8, 1943.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*.

Statement of Hon. Elmer M. Ellsworth, Member of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Hon. Elmer M. Ellsworth, member of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico, made before the Chavez committee in Washington, D. C., on December 8, 1942:

What interests most the people of Puerto Rico about the subcommittee sent to Puerto Rico by the Senate of the United States is the mental attitude which the five members bring to their investigating activities.

Up to the present time, the predominating factor in the thinking of the Congress of the United States in regard to Puerto Rico has been simply the military value of the island due to its peculiar geographic position. All other factors including the human one have been, frankly speaking, secondary.

When the United States Government in 1898 took over the island of Puerto Rico from Spain, it was the military factor more than any other which prompted the action. Surely it was not more land (a mere 3,000 square miles) nor raw materials, nor mineral resources which the United States was seeking to gain through this acquisition. No, it was the strategic position of the island for the defense of the continent of North America (recognized by naval authorities almost a hundred years before) which was in the minds of the Executive and the Congress at that time.

Now, 45 years later, Puerto Rico has become one of the most heavily fortified of the advance outposts of the United States in the Atlantic. It is being called the Gibraltar of the Caribbean. In addition to its importance as a naval base it has acquired now a new and additional importance as a great air base, a sort of huge airplane carrier anchored at just the right spot in relation to North and South America and the Panama Canal. Millions of dollars have poured into the construction of naval and Army air bases in the past several years and plans are drawn for pouring in millions more. For these reasons it would not be surprising if the military factor is probably still the dominating one in the thinking of the Congress in regard to Puerto Rico.

However, the island of Puerto Rico is not merely a rock in the ocean like Gibraltar, nor a strip of wild jungle land like the Canal Zone, nor a protected harbor in the crossroads of the Pacific like Singapore. Puerto Rico is a Latin-American country of 2,000,000 people. It is small, yes, but there are a number of Latin-American countries with less people: Panama, Costa Rica, Paraguay, Honduras, Nicaragua, Salvador and the Dominican Republic, Uruguay, Ecuador, Haiti, Bolivia, Guatemala, and Venezuela have scarcely larger populations. As Puerto Rico is not an independent nation like these others, it sounds smaller and less significant. But the fact that Puerto Rico as a country is small and apparently insignificant does not mean that its people are not entitled to consideration. Precisely one of the reasons that the United States is fighting a war today is to secure and guarantee the right of small nations to exist. It would seem to be recognized then by the people of the United States (including, we presume, the five Senators of your committee) that no country, however small or however weak, should be denied its rights to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

That brings us again to the question in the minds of the Puerto Rican people today: Is the military or the human problem the factor which dominates the thinking of this latest congressional committee to investigate the island? If, as several of you have repeatedly expressed, it is the latter then it is opportune that the major and fundamental problem which concerns the Puerto Rican people as a people be presented to you here and now. That problem, as you must guess, is the political status of the island. The people of Puerto Rico in one great united voice ask "Where are we going? Statehood, independence, autonomy—let us decide! Until we know we cannot even begin to really solve our problems." On the solution of the political status of this country all other problems depend. From whatever angle you look, economic, social, educational, you come back to the same impasse. Whatever way you turn, you come back to the same great interrogation, "Where are we going?"

Let us look first at the economic problem. "Ah, yes," we can hear you exclaim, "that perennial headache." Quite, and so it will continue to be with no possible cure until first the political status is faced and decided on a basis, of course, where the human factor is always predominant. For a densely populated country with only one main crop, one main industry, which it is not allowed to expand beyond the limits that industry had when the population was less than a million and a half instead of the present 2,000,000, what are the prospects? The answer is relief projects and more relief projects ad infinitum. You must face this fact, gentlemen, that you will have no relief from relief projects for Puerto Rico until the fundamental problem of the status is once and finally resolved.

There are visionaries, to be sure, still heroically planning, still willing to break a quixotic lance in the futile attempt to begin solving the economic problems without first cutting the Gordian knot of the status problem. There is Luis Muñoz Marín with his Popular Party program: a visionary, yes, undoubtedly. There is Rexford Tugwell, Governor of Puerto Rico. Muñoz Marín and the Popular and Liberal parties with the collaboration of Governor Tugwell dare to make some experimental attempts to relieve the economic headache, when the fact is that the Congress of the United States has a legal right to destroy these experiments at any time it may take a violent enough dislike to them. The Congress can even threaten to destroy the experimenters themselves through starvation. Visionaries, truly, to try experimental cures in the face of such facts! There are other visionaries, too, who have never been so accused; the Gonzáles brothers of San Juan, who have built a splendid chemical fertilizer plant; the Ferrer brothers in Ponce, who in the face of tremendous difficulties have just completed a new cement plant; the Valdes brothers in Mayaguez, who have built an excellent modern brewery; the Serrallés family in Ponce and the Roig family in Yabucoa, who have built modern plants for refining sugar. Visionaries, all these, too, who dare to create new industries when they have neither votes in the Congress of the United States nor a sovereign government of their own to protect their creation.

Only the visionaries continue to dream and plan and create. The hard-boiled businessmen, the realists, know the score. Long before the Popular Party experiments began to scare them, these realists were investing no new capital in new plant in Puerto Rico. Certain new expendable equipment, yes, such as tractors, trucks, cars, etc., but new plant, no. "Patch up the old mill, paint up the old locomotive and keep it going a few years more, until we see what happens." Those were the orders. In the meantime, some of these realists are quite willing to unload their land at a decent price to the "experimenters" rather than be bothered any more by an old law (limiting land holdings to 500 acres) once thought dead, but now revived. New American capital or foreign capital has not come into the island for years. "Too uncertain." "The island might get independence or statehood." "Show us how we can make 20 percent or more the first year, and then maybe."

So, only the visionaries, in the government and outside, mostly Puerto Ricans with a very few continental Americans, try to start anything new, try to begin to relieve the terrible tragedy of chronic unemployment. As the visionaries willing to invest capital are still so few, and the hard-boiled realists not willing to invest capital are still so many, the economic headache naturally becomes constantly worse, until all the rest of the body politic becomes weakened and infected in turn. How can you have education (either in English or Spanish) when so many of the fathers of families are too poor to send their children to school? How can you have public health when 90 percent of the homes have no running water nor even the most primitive sanitary facilities? Without education and without sanitation, how can you prevent an excessive birth rate and an excessive death rate? During the course of your investigation, you have seen how intimately the human problem is related to the economic problem in Puerto Rico.

If it is your purpose, gentlemen, to help the Puerto Rican people, to begin to resolve their economic problems, then you must first allow them to choose the permanent foundation on which they can build their economic structure. You must let them choose their own solution of their political status.

However, if there is no choice involved—that is, if you do not intend to offer any choice to the Puerto Rican people in the solution of their status—then the least you can do is to state this fact plainly and clearly so the people of Puerto Rico can know what to expect. There is a saying in Spanish which means that clear speaking preserves good friendship. With the Puerto Rican people united at last behind the resolution passed recently by the island legislature with the unanimous votes of all political parties presenting the need and necessity of the immediate solution of the status question, it is quite evident that now, more than ever before, clear speaking based on clear thinking is necessary in the relations of these two friendly peoples, the people of the United States and the people of Puerto Rico.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation substantially in accordance with the Ruml plan for the deferred collection of the income tax

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation substantially in accordance with the Ruml plan, so called; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the State secretary to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Members of the Congress from Massachusetts.

In senate, adopted, March 2, 1943.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, March 4, 1943.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

Women Doctors Should Be Commissioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements by Dr. Emily Dunning Barringer, of New York; Minnie L. Maffett, M. D.; and Judge Dorothy Kenyon, of New York, presented to the subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee at a public hearing on March 10, 1943:

STATEMENT BY DR. EMILY DUNNING BARRINGER, OF NEW YORK

The women physicians of America come before you today to ask you to give them proper wartime rating.

The American Medical Women's Association is the national association of women physicians. It has appointed a special committee to secure commissions for women physicians in the Army and Navy. Cooperating with this committee are other groups of women physicians as the Women's Medical Society of New York State; New Jersey Medical Women's Association; Women's Medical Association of New York City; New York Infirmary for Women and Children; Woman's Medical College, of Pennsylvania; and a coordinating committee of women physicians, many from the South and East, who have done me the honor to be their chairman, and with us, our confrere, Judge Dorothy Kenyon, who has had charge of the legal side of our struggle and will address you in regard to it.

On this occasion all of these various groups of women physicians are coordinating, and I lay before you our earnest joint appeal.

We have a large and growing support from our brother colleagues in the profession. The Medical Society of the State of New York blazed the trail, and has unanimously gone on record that women physicians shall be admitted to the Medical Reserve Corps of the United States Army and Navy with the full rights and privileges enjoyed by men physicians. The Medical Society of New Jersey has unanimously passed a similar but not identical resolution. Copies of these will be presented to you with our other endorsements. Undoubtedly other medical societies in due time will follow suit, but we cannot in this crisis wait for these societies to act. However, from every quarter individual men of the profession are giving us vigorous support. Time is a great factor now. We are in the midst of a total devastating war. Manpower and womanpower are the supreme issues of the day.

Our situation deals with a class of highly trained professional specialists, who should be released at once for the vital services they are capable of rendering our armed forces.

Mighty support has come to us from other quarters not medical.

The press of the Nation has stated our case fairly and squarely making it a common sense appeal, but back of this has been a rare and amazing understanding of a small group of professional women, who are earnestly trying to give their best to the country in a time of dire distress. Many of the editors are personally vigorously championing our cause, but prefer instead of appearing in person before your committee to speak through the columns of their newspapers.

And another most important group that is standing by to help us are the citizens of America, the men and women who know the woman physician intimately in her daily rounds of professional work in times of peace. Many of the babies whom the women physicians have brought into the world, now to manhood grown are speaking from the conviction that goes back to their earliest childhood, that the woman physician is a good and skillful one. Thoughtful men recall with gratitude perilous times when the woman physician has seen his beloved wife or child through some desperate illness or critical operation.

One of the most impressive endorsements we have had is from the American Legion. Those men know war at first hand, and they have gone on record as approving that a woman physician may go wherever a woman nurse does.

Among our endorsements are those from students, business and professional women's clubs, associations and societies with an aggregate memberhip of upward of 10,000,000.

In order to understand the many sides of our case, it will be necessary to briefly sketch the history of the American woman physician. When the State granted that first license to Elizabeth Blackwell nearly 100 years ago it settled the question that the woman physician should exist. In this hundred years that followed the woman physician has had to find her way through the long hard entanglements of ignorance and prejudice. One by one she has had to prove that medical schools should be opened to her.

About the turn of the century she faced the ordeal of opening the general hospitals where she might get equal experience with men physicians in general medicine and surgery. And steadily over the years she has had increasing privileges in medical societies, associations, and the development of organized medicine here in America. Just prior to the present war the woman physician's position was very satisfactory with only a small residue of old-time prejudice withholding from her complete equality with her brother physician.

But with the onset of this total war—the whole situation has gone in reverse for the woman physician. Representing only about 5 percent of the medical power of the country she has been swept back 25 years by a War Department that does not realize that she even exists, and who have made no adequate provisions for utilizing her services. At a moment when there is an urgent call for as many and as skilled physicians as possible for care of our armed forces—the potentialities of the women physicians are overlooked.

This is a moment of greatest responsibility for me. As chairman of this special committee to secure commissions much important information as to the true state of affairs has come to me. I want to keep faith with the women who are relying on me to help them and I trust that ability to properly present their problem will be given me.

I have picked four cases to represent the various phases of our problem. Commissions in the Medical Reserve Corps would solve each one of them.

The first is Dr. Margaret Janeway, of New York City, a young woman physician with a splendid practice. She had registered for war service, and when the call came she was offered a position as contract surgeon in the WAAC's, with the hope of a commission to follow.

She asked me, as chairman, what she should do. Should she give up her excellent practice to take a contract surgeon's job? I told her that personally I believed she should do so—for the following reasons—our country is at war, and the War Department asks her to do a definite job for which she is especially fitted, namely, general medical supervision of a large group of women. Out of patriotic loyalty to her country and fitness for the job, she accepted the position of contract surgeon, but filed a protest with the War Department, stating that she hoped it would lead to a commission.

Today she is in North Africa—serving with the WAAC's, commissioned a second officer, which is equivalent to the rank of first lieutenant in the Army, the rank given to male physicians upon entering the Army.

If Dr. Janeway were commissioned in the Medical Reserve Corps of the United States Army she would surely rate the rank of major in her own professional right, with the superior salary and privileges thereof, and in case she were called upon to make the supreme sacrifice her loved ones would get commensurate protection.

I notice in the paper delivered before the Annual Congress on Medical Education and Licensure by Col. George F. Lull that he states: "There is a demand for a certain number of women physicians for duty with the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. Such physicians are hired as contract surgeons and sent to the WAAC training center at Fort Des Moines. After a period of training they are given commissions in the WAAC's. Apparently few women desire this type of work, as less than a dozen qualified physicians have applied, although publicity has been widely distributed." May I ask Colonel Lull why he thinks women physicians would especially desire these positions which are definitely lower than the Army offers young male internes on graduation from the hospital?

The second case I have in mind is Dr. Alice McNeal, of Chicago, director of anesthesia in the Presbyterian Hospital, which hospital has become Base No. 13, and has been ordered into active service. Dr. McNeal's papers were forwarded to the Surgeon General's office in Washington along with those of the rest of the medical staff. Some two hundred female nurses, technicians, and other personnel. All were accepted except Dr. McNeal, who was told there was no authorization to allow a woman in the Medical Corps. She then offered to go as a contract surgeon, so anxious

was she to remain part of the operating team that she had worked with for years. But word came back that she could not go as a contract surgeon. The colonel in charge of the hospital wrote most urgent recommendations, explaining that she was especially trained and skilled in wartime surgery type of anesthesia, and that she was the best person he had for the position and in addition could teach anesthesia and also relieve a man physician for active duty. But an emphatic "no" was the answer.

Shortly thereafter she was offered a position in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps and came to me to ask what she should do. Again my personal advice was equally strong but the opposite to what I had given Dr. Janeway. I advised her not to accept as there was no urgent need for highly skilled specially trained anaesthetists in a group of noncombatant women, far above the average in physical endowment. Again if Dr. Alice McNeal, with her superb education and special training in anaesthesia were a member of the Medical Reserve Corps of the Army, she too would rate as major in her own right.

The next case must remain anonymous for various reasons. But the physician involved is a woman of similar splendid education and special training that Dr. McNeal enjoys, and has done anesthesia for 15 years.

In one of the military camps there was a shortage of anesthetists and this physician was asked to give anesthesia. She was employed on a non-civil-service basis, and was not even offered a contract-surgeon appointment, but classified as "a special technician."

The further details of her job are as follows: A 48-hour week with a salary of $150 a month, out of this she must pay her own living expenses. She was allowed to buy her own gasoline at Army prices and pay for her own lunches in the officers' mess hall at 22 cents a day.

In addition to giving anesthesia to the military patients, she was instructor to groups of corps men, who take a 3-month course in anesthesia.

As to insurance, she received only compensation insurance while on the grounds; and wears no uniform and has no rank. Again, if this woman physician were a member of the Medical Corps, she would undoubtedly be a major.

And right here I would like to ask one question. Supposing your son or mine today were out in some emergency hospital with some terrible war injury, where his chance for life might be only one in a thousand, would you not prefer having the skill and experience and cool nerves of either of these trained women giving him anesthesia rather than a well-intentioned, clumsy, inexperienced recent graduate who might otherwise do it? No one who has faced the possibilities of life and death in major surgery can possibly realize what a difference a trained and experienced anesthetist makes to the operating surgeon.

My last case deals with a repercussion of the other three cases and has to do with the oncoming medical students.

Because women physicians are not eligible to the Medical Reserve Corps of the United States Army, certain of the medical schools are cutting down or refusing their usual quota of positions to women physicians. The University of Arkansas attempted this last fall and the dean frankly admitted this was the reason. Such a mighty protest from the alumnae followed that this order was rescinded and women are now taken again.

But my case No. 4 assures me that she is having greatest difficulty in getting into any medical school in her vicinity, which is Midwest, and that she has been informed that three well-known coeducational universities in that section have been asked to bar women students for the duration.

This young woman and a number of others writing me stress the fact that the Government is allowing a subsidy to its male medical students to complete their medical education while this is not allowed its women students.

It is not necessary for me to draw your attention to the fact that if this state of affairs continues, it will not be long before the women medical students will begin to deteriorate and the position of the woman physician will slip backward from the high plane of accomplishment which she enjoys today after a 100-year struggle for her right to exist.

In concluding I wish to stress two facts: the women physicians of America know their womanpower and what ability and talents they have ready to give their beloved country in this time of terrible urgency. They have a coast to coast registration of all women physicians available.

When Mr. McNutt called for 5,000 doctors for July 1 of last year, the women physicians were ready to furnish their quota and would immediately have volunteered if they had been allowed to do so.

In the hard struggle ahead every physician, man or woman, will be needed. We ask you to remove all sex discrimination and let us go forward as free women, able to respond to any duty that calls us, and have our individual qualifications for our work our only criterion. In order to be able to do this we must have equal opportunities, privileges, and protection that the State accords its men physicians.

We therefore earnestly request full membership in the Medical Corps of the United States Army.

STATEMENT OF MINNIE L. MAFFETT, M. D., PRESIDENT, THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., which I represent, is made up of 76,000 women in 450 different occupations and professions. We are interested in legislation giving women doctors the right to serve with the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy with the same rank and status as men for two principal reasons. In the first place, we advocate equality of opportunity for all women everywhere. In addition, in this wartime period, we believe that artificial barriers raised against women in any profession or service lead to an inefficient use of our human power. We are convinced that we can only win a total war by using all our trained brains and skilled hands, no matter whether they are feminine or masculine.

Whenever we exclude women from any business or profession we set off a chain of unexpected and unforeseen results. For example, already the exclusion of women doctors from the Army and Navy Medical Corps has threatened the training of future women physicians. In one State medical school (Arkansas) the dean ruled that no more women medical students would be accepted. When his action was protested by our State federation and others, he explained that his reason was purely patriotic. As the Army and Navy need doctors desperately, he felt that the medical school should concentrate on producing future Army and Navy physicians. As the Army and Navy did not accept women, it followed logically, that time and effort should not be wasted in their training.

Similarly, there is a plan now under way, we understand, for the Army and Navy to take over all medical schools, putting the boys into uniform, but allowing them to finish their courses, and then commissioning them upon graduation. In making these plans no one has thought of the women medical students, who now constitute about 10 percent of the entire student body. What is to happen to the women students, if they are not eligible for military service? Are students half through their courses to be discouraged from finishing? Are girls to be barred again from the portals of medical schools as they were 50 years ago? If so, the country will be tragically the loser.

Fifty years ago we did not know that some of our greatest doctors and surgeons could be women. Now we do. We now know what some eight or ten thousand women doctors can do. We know some of them are surgeons and specialists in work particularly needed at the battle front. Some of the best plastic surgeons in the country happen to be women.

Recently, I made a survey of women physicians practicing in Dallas, Tex. It is usually argued that almost all women physicians have specialized in obstetrics, and, therefore, they are not useful in the military forces. The facts disprove this theory—which would seem to be based more on supposition than on scientific analysis. For out of the 26 women physicians in Dallas, only 4 handle obstetrical cases. Of the 22 remaining, 6 are general practitioners. The others were specialists in the following fields: 2 endocrinologists, 1 pathologist, 1 dermatologist, 3 otolaryngologists, 2 pediatricians, 2 radiologists, 2 orthopedists, 2 gynecologists, 2 abdominal surgeons, 1 ophthalmologist.

A study made by our organization in 1934 entitled "Women and Their Careers," revealed that women who entered the medical profession are among the most capable and successful of all women. It was found that median earnings of women in medicine was $6,000 a year, and a not inconsiderable percentage went up to the $30,000 annual income level. This coldly economic criteria is only one measure of their ability.

I need not labor the point, however, of the capabilities of women doctors. After an uphill fight for recognition, women doctors have now proved their worth. It seems almost shocking that they are granted greater recognition in other countries than in our own, where equality of opportunity is one of our cherished ideals.

But the granting of military status to women doctors is not only a theoretical right, it is also a practical necessity. The shortage of doctors in our wartime economy is a matter of general knowledge. In allocating medical power we must consider our total supply in relation to our total need, just as in allocating our industrial manpower we must add up all available brains and hands without regard to sex, age, or color or creed.

It is quite possible that there are many women doctors, out of the 8,000 now practicing, who might be classified as I-A, insofar as their dependency status, age, and general health are concerned. Why should these women not be taken before men classed in III-A, who may be older physicians, married, and with young children to support? The more arbitrary barriers we put up, the less efficient will be our use of our human power, which is our major national asset.

As far as specific legislative proposals are concerned, we are in favor of any bill which will grant full military status to women doctors. They should not be confined to service with the WAAC's, as surgeons and bone specialists may be more needed by men on the fighting lines, than by the men or women who serve behind desks. Women should be granted the same rank as men of equivalent age and experience. They should be permitted to serve wherever they are needed.

Of the bills now before this committee, we believe the Celler bill is the best, as it clarifies the wording of existing law. There never should have been any question that "persons" referred to in the joint resolution of September 22, 1941, now Public Law 252 covered women as well as men. However, since old time modes of thinking have led to such an interpretation, the only remedy is to clarify the legislation. The Sparkman bill is an acceptable compromise. We are willing to leave the exact wording of the bill to the honorable gentlemen on this committee.

All we ask is that women doctors be permitted to serve with the medical corps of the Army and Navy, wherever there is need. We doubt that a wounded soldier will question whether his attending physician is a man or a woman.

STATEMENT BY JUDGE DOROTHY KENYON, OF NEW YORK

ARE WOMEN PERSONS?

When war broke out and doctors, men and women alike, began offering their services for their country, few of us anticipated that there would be any obstacle to the service of women or that legislation would be necessary to give them a chance to serve their country as their men colleagues were doing. The Army law uses the word "person" throughout except when it talks about the combatant branches of the service. The regulations relating to the Medical Reserve also use the same word "person." We all naively supposed that women were "persons" and therefore qualified. We all know better now, however, and that is why we are taking your time today.

In Dr. Mary Walker's time, during the Civil War, male doctors were practically the only kind of doctors there were and so there was nothing strange in the fact that the Army Regulations of that period provided for male doctors only. Consequently Dr. Mary Walker, brilliant surgeon that she was, could not get a commission and Congress had to pass a special act specially commissioning her as a lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the United States Army.

But times change and after a while there were plenty of women surgeons who had made distinguished names for themselves. Women nurses did the same thing. Their services were recognized during the last World War when the Army Nurse Corps was made an integral part of the Regular Army proper, with equivalent rank, pay, and benefits. But not so the woman doctor. She was given no recognition or chance for service commensurate with her ability. Her only opportunity to serve was as contract surgeon, that is to say as an ordinary civilian doctor without rank, authority, security of tenure, or any of the other safeguards which the Army throws around those who risk their lives in its service, whether combatant or noncombatant.

Our most brilliant woman surgeon had to find an outlet for her patriotism during the last World War by serving with the French Army, the American Army being closed to her. The French Army granted her a major's commission and was highly appreciative of her services.

It is disheartening to see how little the world has changed since then and how history repeats itself. For now in this World War No. 2, once more one of our most brilliant women surgeons is forced to find an outlet for her patriotism in the British Army, which also has commissioned her as a major. Barbara Stimson joined the British Army as the earlier woman doctor joined the French Army for the reason that our women doctors still find that they are not yet "persons."

The absurdity of it is that that word "male" in our Civil War Army Law and Regulations was changed many years ago to read "persons." The Army Regulations relating to the Medical Corps, it is true, still use the word "male" in describing the qualifications for appointment to that body, but this requirement is not called for by statute. The Regulation, therefore, could be amended to eliminate the word "male" without amending the law at all.

But women doctors are not interested in joining the Medical Corps of the Regular Army. They have no desire to become a part of the permanent Military Establishment of the country maintained both in peace and war (U. S. Code, title 10, Army, sec. 3), thereby making it their life career. All they want to do is to be allowed to join the Medical Reserve Corps and to be ordered into active service in the war emergency as all other reservists are. The only legal requirements for appointment to the Medical Reserve Corps of the Army are that the applicant must be a citizen of the United States between the ages of 21 and 60 and must have had the requisite medical training. Public Law 252, Seventy-seventh Congress—which the Celler bill amends—and which was passed to permit the temporary commissioning of officers for the war period, uses the same word "persons."

So all this would have seemed authority enough for the appointment of women, that is to say provided the word "person" meant what we thought it meant. For there is really just one common-sense definition of the word "person" and that is that it covers both men and women. In common parlance women are persons, and it would take a brave "person" nowadays to deny it. The dictionary bears out this interpretation. "Person" is defined as "an individual human being; a man, woman, or child; a human being indefinitely;" etc. (Webster's Encyclopedic Dictionary 1941.)

It is true that you gentlemen in Congress, when you passed this law in 1941 for the temporary commissioning of officers in the Army, were dealing with a body in which women are not customarily thought to be included. Fighting is a man's job (or used to be thought so), but not all Army work is fighting. There are large noncombatant sections, of which perhaps the biggest and best known is the medical. Ever since 1918 the Army Nurse Corps has been an integral part of the United States Regular Army (title 10, Army, U. S. C., sec. 81). The Army Nurse Corps consists exclusively of women. There have also been women contract surgeons. Recently a whole new section—the WAAC's—have come into existence, officered and manned exclusively by women. It is clear, therefore, that there is no inherent absurdity in the notion of women in the Army or even in the notion of giving commissions to them for work for which they are specially adapted. There is, therefore, no reason whatever for distorting the word "person" to mean anything other than its plain and obvious meaning.

It is worth noting that the Secretary of War, who proposed that bill to Congress in the first instance (and presumably had some idea of what it was intended to cover), was also the person who availed himself of its provisions to promote Major Flikke, of the Army Nurse Corps, to a colonelcy. If he had felt any doubt as to whether Colonel Flikke was a person within the intendment of that law, he certainly would not have done so. It is not to be presumed that he would do anything inherently absurd. On the contrary, it is to be presumed that he actually thought the word "person" meant person.

It is hardly necessary to point out how well adapted to the commissioning of our brilliant women surgeons was the particular statute in question. As the Secretary of War said in his statement to Congress explaining why he wanted this particular law passed, "specialists' * * * services are highly desired in connection with particular projects during the present emergency * * * whose military knowledge and general qualifications would not justify their retention * * * after the emergency has terminated." If the Army wanted to commission women doctors it could hardly have asked more eloquently for them.

But all of us reckoned without the Comptroller General. For when the War Department decided last spring to promote the head of the Army Nurse Corps, Major Flikke, to be colonel and she came to cash her first colonel's pay check, the Comptroller General said no. He had several good reasons for saying no. First, Public Law 252 dealt not with promotions but with appointments from outside the ranks. Second, the Army Nurse Corps law provided that its head should be a major, not a colonel and how could Major Flikke be colonel and major at one and the same time? If the Comptroller General had stopped there no one would have quarreled with him. But unfortunately he did not do so. He went on to say the word "person" in the law meant "male" not "female" and that no woman could be commissioned in the Army thereunder, whether nurse, doctor, or anything else. A ruling perfectly unnecessary to his decision, irrelevant and sheer dictum; yet the War Department has felt bound by it and it is to get around that decision that the present bill has been introduced.

The Comptroller General's decision, incidentally, is based upon a line of cases which represents a minority viewpoint, concurred in by only two States in the Union, whereas the courts of at least eight other States have come to precisely the opposite conclusion. The principal case cited by the Comptroller General (*Commonwealth* v. *Welosky*, Mass. 177 N. E. 656) poses the question whether the words "person qualified to vote" as used in a jury statute was to be interpreted as including women as well as men after women got the vote. The court answers this question in the negative. An Illinois case (*People ex rel. Fyfe* v. *Barnett*, 319 Ill. 403) is the only authority to the same effect. Against these States, Massachusetts and Illinois, is an array of eight States which have come to diametrically opposing decisions. These States are Washington, Nevada, Michigan, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Indiana, and Ohio. Not all of them, it is true, involve the use of the word "person" any more than the Illinois case (*People ex rel. Fyfe* v. *Barnett*, supra) did. The word used there was "elector." But five of them involve the use of an equally neutral word, devoid of sex significance, such as "elector," "voter," etc. Three of them actually involve the use of the word "man." And in every one of them the courts interpreted the various words involved, "electors," "voters," and even "man," as including "woman" after women got the vote. It is submitted that there is much more reason for refusing to expand the term "men," or even "electors," to include women in these jury cases than there is for refusing to expand the term "person" to include women in the case of women doctors. Women have not always been "electors," whereas they have presumably been "persons" for a considerable period of time.

A recent English case is also interesting in this connection. The Canadian Constitution (British North America Act, 1867) provided that Senators of the Canadian Parliament, who are appointed by the Governor General for life, must be qualified persons. After women obtained the vote the question was raised whether a woman could be appointed senator. An advisory opinion was asked of the court. The Canadian court held that a woman could not be appointed to that office since when the law was passed women could not hold office and therefore the word "person" in the statute must be deemed to mean "male person." The case was appealed, however, to the Privy Council in England, which reversed the Canadian court (matter of reference as to meaning of word "person" in section 24 of the British North America Act, *Henrietta Edwards et al.* v. *Attorney General of Canada*, from Supreme Court of Canada. Judgment of the lords of the judicial committee of the Privy Council, October 18, 1929). The court in reviewing the entire legal history of women from early tribal days (when women did not bear arms) down to the present day, comments thus:

"Customs are apt to develop into traditions which are stronger than law and remain unchallenged long after the reason for them has disappeared."

It finally concluded:

"The word 'person' as above mentioned may include members of both sexes, and to those who ask why the word should include females, the obvious answer is why should it not? The burden is upon those who deny that the word includes women to make out their case."

As a result of this decision a woman Senator now sits in the Canadian Parliament.

So women are "persons" in Canada. But here in these United States the Comptroller General says we are not. And he it is who controls the pursestrings. The only thing we can do is to make the meaning of the statute clear even to him, by changing the word "persons" to read "men and women." That is all that the proposed Celler bill does. It would permit the immediate commissioning in the Army of those women surgeons whose skills are so desperately needed in the war effort. It would eliminate sex as a job qualification and would make merit, skill, and ability the sole criterion. That is all that any professional person can ask. It is also what our country needs. Pass this measure, gentlemen, and then we will be sure of having the best surgeons we possess, whether men or women, taking care of our boys.

Pay-As-You-Go Income-Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an address entitled "Pay-As-You-Go Taxation" which I made over the Columbia network, from the studios of WJSV in Washington, on Tuesday, March 16, 1943:

I appreciate the courtesy of the Columbia Broadcasting System in making it possible for me to talk with you for a few minutes about pay-as-you-go taxation. The objective of pay-as-you-go taxation is to remove the income-tax debt that hangs over all taxpayers. This is what is meant when it is said the purpose of the Ruml plan is to put personal income-tax collections on a current basis. The way in which it is proposed to do this is to move the tax clock ahead 1 year. It is now 1 year behind all the time. This effect is to be brought about by substituting the income of the current year as the basis of assessment for the Federal personal income tax. Few people realized how much money they owed the Government for taxes on last year's income until they made out their income-tax returns. There seems to be a prevailing impression that when you pay your quarterly income-tax payments everything is paid until the taxes for the next quarter are due, or at least they assume they are not in debt to the Federal Government. This is an erroneous impression. The facts are that every citizen is indebted to the Federal Government for last year's taxes until they are fully paid, and more than that, he is indebted to the Federal Government for the accrued taxes due in the year in which he is paying income taxes. This tax indebtedness is a threat to the solvency of our Federal Treasury and a millstone around the neck of the taxpayer.

The income-tax debt hits most when sickness strikes, when a shift of employment reduces your salary or when you have lost your regular income.

Under the present plan of taxation a man this year pays out of this year's income the taxes assessed against last year's income. In 1944 he is required to pay a tax out of his 1944 income, but based upon his income for 1943. Under the present system it can truthfully be said that a dead man pays income taxes—because his estate is liable for income taxes accrued for the year previous to his death. Such a situation—to put it mildly—is not one in which we as a nation can take pride.

The greatly increased rates and lower exemptions of the Revenue Act of 1942 make it imperative that Congress approve legislation making our tax collections current.

Shortly after the opening of the Seventy-eighth Congress the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee unanimously urged prompt and favorable action on pay-as-you-go tax legislation. The Ways and Means Committee began public hearings on various pay-as-you-go tax proposals on February 2. After weeks of hearings and executive sessions the committee has finally reported a bill. I would be unfair to the committee and the country if I did not state that this has been a most complex and difficult task.

You might be interested in knowing that the President of the United States, in his Budget message to Congress last January, urged the adoption of pay-as-you-go tax legislation. The Treasury Department has advocated it. Every witness—notice I said every witness—that appeared before the Ways and Means Committee urged pay-as-you-go tax legislation. In fact the Ways and Means Committee notified you that they were going to write that type of a bill. I regret to say they have not done so. You no doubt read in your newspapers—you may have heard over the radio—that the President was opposed to the Ruml plan. At a recent press conference the President stated that he was advised by the Treasury that the approval of the Ruml plan would bring in less revenue to the Treasury than existing law. The President had a right to depend on the information submitted by the Treasury Department. I state here and now that the President was misinformed by the Treasury Department. The facts are that the Ruml plan or the Carlson plan will bring in more tax revenue in 1943 than existing law.

Before beginning a discussion of the various bills presented to the Ways and Means Committee for consideration I want to make it perfectly clear that there are only two methods of getting the taxpayer on a current basis.

First. Congress can base this year's tax on this year's income. In other words, move the tax clock ahead.

Second. Congress can try to collect 2 years' taxes in 1 year. These are the only two alternatives.

Personally I do not believe that our taxpayers can pay 2 years' taxes in 1 year. I wonder how many people who are listening to me this evening could pay twice the amount of taxes you are being required to pay this year. Under the bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee, no present taxpayer can become current except by paying 2 years' taxes in 1. In fact, the bill reported to the House by the majority of the committee does not make any present taxpayer current. It is my contention that this bill fails to carry out the promise to the people that taxes would be made current.

Since January 1 I have introduced two bills in the House of Representatives for the purpose of modernizing our income-tax system in order to meet your needs under war conditions. The first bill I introduced presented the original Ruml plan in legislative form. The second bill, which was introduced on March 3, 1943, served to make adjustments in the Ruml plan in order to eliminate any possibility of windfalls, and also provided for collection at the source. H. R. 2042, the second bill I introduced, is a complete pay-as-you-go bill and is written so as to fully protect the Treasury and allow no one to escape their fair share of the tax burden. It eliminates any basis for some of the criticisms that have been made to defeat and delay a reform that is so important to more than 40,000,000 taxpayers. This bill, if enacted into law, would place taxpayers, as nearly as possible, on a current basis by assessing the Federal income tax for 1943 and every year thereafter on the taxable income of the year to which the tax applies.

The specific provisions of my bill are as follows:

1. The return you filed on March 15 of this year, based on last year's income, is treated as a tentative return for 1943, subject to final adjustment March 15, 1944.

2. All tax payments in 1943 are deemed to be a discharge of the 1943 liability.

3. Assessments on 1942 incomes, payable in 1943, are canceled in order to avoid double taxation.

4. Beginning on July 1, 1943, start deducting tax at the source on wages and salaries and credit the same against the 1943 liability. The withholding will be at the rate of 20 percent on excess over present exemptions. Please understand this does not mean that 20 percent of your salary will be withheld for taxes. It does mean that 20 percent of your salary—less present exemptions—will be withheld. This is the amount of taxes you are now paying. The withholding tax is simply a collection device and does not add one penny to the present tax liability. The only difference is that your tax money will be collected currently and largely, if not wholly, out of the pay envelope.

5. My bill provides that where the 1943 income is expected to be greater or less than the 1942 income, on which the March 15 return was filed, the taxpayer is permitted the filing of one or more supplemental returns during the year to provide the utmost flexibility in adjusting the tax up or down in conformance with current income.

6. It assures against any possible windfall to wealthy persons by providing that where income exceeds $20,000 in 1942 the tax shall be based on the 1942 or 1943 income, whichever is the greater. This provision eliminates any possibility of a war profiteer making millions of dollars in 1942 and having less income in 1943 and escaping his just tax on these war profits.

7. All taxpayers with 1942 incomes of less than $20,000 pay currently on their 1943 income. This provides relief for millions of our boys who have entered the military service at greatly reduced pay and are at present liable to the Government for their 1942 income tax, as well as to those whose income has declined or ceased entirely in 1943.

Without going further into explanation I should like to point out that by enacting my plan into law in the legislative form now proposed we should be able to avoid the crisis which might otherwise confront persons who have entered the military service—thousands of small businessmen who were put out of business in 1942 because of the war program—and also avoid much anxiety and suffering on the part of mothers and wives whose husbands died last year and left them with a 1942 tax liability.

Under my bill the Treasury will collect more revenue in 1943 than it would if tax collections were not placed on a current basis. No responsible authority can question this because we know that the 1943 assessment will be at least $3,000,000,000 greater than the 1942 assessment.

Present indications are that this important legislation will be considered by the House of Representatives next week. My Republican colleagues on the committee and I expect to carry the fight for the adoption of the modified Ruml plan as proposed in my bill to the floor of the House. If you favor this plan, if you favor pay-as-you-go taxation, I would suggest that you write your Member of Congress your views on it.

Every effort will be made by opponents of this plan to advance arguments that might mislead some of our citizens.

You will be told:

1. That the adoption of my bill, which is the perfected Ruml plan, will pile up a big debt for soldiers to pay. I will answer this accusation by saying the soldiers and their families are the chief beneficiaries, since they now have to pay a high tax on civilian income out of soldiers' pay, which will not be collected from them under my bill. When they come back from war they will be out of debt for taxes. There is no loss to the Treasury under my bill, so no debt will be piled up which they might have to pay. Surely no one would contend that the American Legion would favor any bill or any legislation that would not be for the best interests of our soldiers and war veterans. I am glad to inform you that Mr. Roane Waring, National Commander of the American Legion, has endorsed the principles of the Ruml plan.

2. You will be told that it will cost the Treasury $10,000,000,000. That is not true, as even the Treasury admits. The fact is the Federal Treasury will get $3,000,000,000 more revenue under my proposal than under existing law.

3. You will be told it would give wealthy persons more benefit than small taxpayers. The answer is that if our graduated income-tax system is fair in the imposition of taxes, then the plan is fair in reverse. The small taxpayer gets the same proportionate benefits from this tax plan as the large taxpayer.

4. You will be told that it will create new war millionaires. That is not true. I ask you in all sincerity how new millionaires can be created when our present Federal tax rates take 90 percent of all incomes over $200,000 for taxes. Those with large incomes have been paying heavy taxes, even before the war, and don't forget that the man with the large 1942 income had to pay his 1941 tax out of it. If he has a current income he will continue to pay 90 percent of it in taxes.

My friends, you cannot go on carrying this burden overhanging income-tax debt to your Government, nor can the Government afford to have you always a year behind with the possibility that some cannot meet last year's tax debt out of current year's income. Congress cannot afford to delay the settlement of this question much longer.

We must get on a pay-as-you-go basis of personal income taxes.

The bill I have introduced is the only one under consideration which will accomplish this with fair and equitable treatment for all income-tax payers.

I hope you are interested in this—I hope you are enough interested to write your Congressman your views on the matter.

If you continue to give us the fine support you have given this worthy cause during recent months I believe there is a good chance that our efforts to safeguard your interests will ultimately be crowned with success.

Now that March 15 is over and tomorrow is St. Patrick's Day—let's drive the snakes out of the tax problem.

Income-Tax Exemption for Members of Our Armed Forces Is Not Without Precedent

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, income tax is a subject that is proving a problem to the vast majority of American citizens. Practically every wage earner has been called upon this year to pay an income tax, and millions of new taxpayers have been added to the rolls through the reduction in the amount of personal exemptions.

Since the proposal to place the collection of income taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis, the whole subject of income taxation has been widely discussed. Frequent assertions have been made that debt-ridden farmers and migratory workers were specific classes that are finding it difficult to pay last year's taxes this year, and the prospect of collecting 2 years' taxes during the present calendar year is not only impractical but very likely an utter impossibility.

Many of the migratory workers have families at home to support while they follow the call for labor in defense industries in some distant city. As a result, despite attractive wages these workers are reported as saving very little money. This is especially true with regard to their ability to pay their income taxes. Hence a pay-as-you-go plan will not alone aid the farmer by enabling him to discharge his tax obligation with a marked degree of certainty from current farm income, but such a method of tax collection will aid the Government by guaranteeing collection from the great army of industrial workers who are roving the country from one industry to the other and, in many instances, accepting employment under different names so that it is difficult for the taxing authorities to keep an accurate check on their earnings. But the farmer and the migratory worker are not the only classes who will benefit from the pay-as-you-go plan for income tax collection.

This year it is estimated that three times as many people will pay income taxes as did in 1941, and it has been frequently estimated that only 10 percent of the millions of taxpayers were prepared financially to pay their first quarterly installment of 1942 incomes taxes on March 15.

With these facts in mind the subject of income tax presents a pressing problem for every American wage earner. By the same token, it presents a distressing picture for the millions of servicemen and women who have been obliged to interrupt their civilian vocations and enter the armed forces. A vast majority found it necessary to make the readjustment at considerable expense. Their daily lives were changed and overnight hurried plans had to be carried out to put their financial affairs in order. Lifetime savings were spent in arranging for the transition from civilian to military life. In countless instances good jobs at adequate wages were abandoned for the base pay of their rating in the service.

If, as it has been said in discussing the income-tax problem of civilians, that it is proving a difficult problem, how much more distressing is the subject to our service men and women. It has been stated that civilian workers were worried over the marked increase in 1942 income taxes as compared to 1941 and that the question of where to get the money was interfering seriously with the morale of these workers. Loan sharks and pawnbrokers were looked upon as saviors to the civilian employee who had spent sleepless nights trying to wrestle with the age-old question, Where will I get the money?

If civilian morale in the industrial centers of the Nation have felt such an impact, let us consider the effect among the members of our armed forces who are plagued with the same distracting problem.

It is true that Congress has granted an additional income-tax exemption of $250 for a single person and $300 for a married member of the armed forces and that they may elect to postpone payment of their income tax until 6 months after the termination of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that we have not gone far enough in recognizing the sacrifices of our service men and women. In addition to requiring that they pay income tax on the compensation earned as members of the armed forces, these valiant men and women are subject to the 5-percent Victory tax which the Federal Government proposes to collect from them in 1944.

It is my measured judgment that we should at once consider the untold sacrifices these young men and women are making, and for that reason I introduced H. R. 1210 in Congress on January 14, 1943. This legislation provides for the exemption of persons in the military and naval forces of the United States from Federal income taxes.

Income-tax exemption for members of our armed forces is not without precedent. After the close of the Civil War a special exemption of honorably discharged soldiers from income tax was provided by joint resolution of July 28, 1866, 14 Statutes 371, as follows:

> Whereas by the Joint Resolution No. 77 of Congress, approved July 4, 1864, a special income tax of 5 percent on all incomes exceeding $600 was directed to be assessed and collected and was enforced generally upon all citizens accessible to the revenue officers, but was not enforced against all our soldiers then in the field in the active service of the country; and
>
> Whereas since the surrender of the insurrectionary armies and the disbanding and return of the Federal soldiers to their homes, said tax is being with manifest hardship assessed and collected of them in many parts of the country: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved, etc.*, That said special tax so imposed shall not be further enforced against officers or soldiers lately in the service of the United States and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, and that the Secretary of the Treasury direct the proper observance of this resolution by all revenue officers.
>
> Approved July 28, 1866.

Following the First World War provision was made for adjusted compensation to honorably discharged veterans—see 43 Statutes 121. Payments of such adjusted compensation were protected from attachment or levy and also from National or State taxation—see 43 Statutes 123, section 308, amended by 44 Statutes 827, section 3—thus constituting at least a partial exemption from income tax.

Since the introduction of H. R. 1210 I have received many letters from members of our armed forces expressing the hope that Congress will consider such legislation. Many of these letters disclosed the great adjustment that has been found necessary in many lives in transferring from a civilian to a military status. There is no doubt that there have been huge sacrifices made by servicemen and women and the least we can do is to preserve their morale and give them freedom from the fear of the income tax collector as they prepare to sail the seven seas or patrol the five continents in defense of the American way of life.

We are preaching freedom from fear to the whole world, so let us begin at home by freeing our servicemen and women from the gaunt specter of income taxation which we acknowledge has brought frenzy and despair to well-paid civilian workers.

H. R. 1210 has been referred to the House Ways and Means Committee where I hope it will receive early and favorable consideration. The passage of this legislation will be a godsend to the members of our armed forces and will demonstrate with sincerity that ours is a grateful Government and that our appreciation of the untold sacrifices of American manhood and womanhood is capable of concrete expression and not mere lip service for their patriotic zeal and love of country.

Exploration of Dam Sites in New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my bill, H. R. 323, it has been my unpleasant lot to learn that the purposes of this bill have been distorted, but worse than that attempts have been made to relate incidents as having happened which have no actual basis in fact and never have taken place.

For instance, it was asserted that drilling was started in the plaza of the pueblo of San Felipe and that drilling was to be done at the steps of the sacred kiva. This is absolutely and completely false. I have from the Bureau of Reclamation under date of March 12 a report from the associate engineer, J. R. Yates, covering the Middle Rio Grande project investigations of dam sites. In it he says, concerning the dam site at the pueblo of San Felipe:

> No attempt was made whatsoever to drill at this dam site and no equipment was moved to the site.

Again, I am informed that a rumor was circulated to the effect that there was to be drilling within the San Ildefonso Pueblo. The Bureau of Reclamation has officially denied that. It did receive permission to drill at the Otowi dam site several miles from the pueblo, but when some controversy developed the drilling equipment at the location was moved to another location, and no further attempt has been made to drill at Otowi.

I insert this in the RECORD in order that those sincere friends of the Indians may not be misled into a premature conclusion on a bill which is only for the benefit of all the people living up and down the Rio Grande Valley. It will help both whites and Indians. There is a serious danger of flood in the valley, and widespread floods are not respecters of persons, nor do they stop their destruction at the borders of Indian pueblos or the sacred burying grounds of Indian dead.

It is because of that that I feel it would be far wiser to protect all the inhabitants of the valley, both Indians and whites, rather than to allow a mistaken sentimentality to interfere with a worth-while project, which was started by the Bureau of Reclamation and is necessary to the welfare of people served by the river.

Fugitives From the Tax Gatherer—An Income Tax on the Wages of Servicemen? Never!

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, since this great Nation of ours entered the present world-wide conflict, the flower of American manhood and womanhood has been called upon to preserve for us our ideals, our rights, our freedom, and our American way of life. Many of those in our armed forces will make the supreme sacrifice. Many will be maimed and wounded. Many will be otherwise permanently disabled.

Mr. Speaker, I came to this Congress cognizant of the great sacrifices being made by these millions of our young men and women. We do not question their patriotism. We know they love our country. We know that they will do their part to protect it from the domination of any foreign power whether it be German, Italian, or Japanese. We know what to expect of them.

What are they to expect of us?

Income taxes are intended to be levied upon the incomes of those receiving monetary returns from a business venture of individual selection—a venture wherein the individual expects to further himself financially, with no expectation necessarily of physical sacrifice or the possible sacrifice of individual being—a venture calculated to further his personal interests and not necessarily to preserve the liberties of his fellowman.

Why levy an income tax upon a man's wages serving in the armed forces of this nation? No sound theory or reason may be assigned in its support. The service man is not in business. He is not fighting for wages. His wage is merely incidental to his service. Many of them, besides risking their lives in the defense of this Nation, made a heavy financial sacrifice when they volunteered or were inducted. Yet, under our present revenue laws their wages are regarded as a return from a business venture, thus becoming an object for the recovery of income taxes.

The revenue laws of this Nation do not relieve these valiant sons and daughters from the payment of income taxes on service wages—nay, not even those bearing their breasts to the fire of enemy cannon on the hot sands of north Africa or other battle fronts of this colossal conflict. Under present revenue laws, even many of those in foreign service are required, within a very short time following their return from field of battle to the land which they will have made free from totalitarian domination, to file income tax returns, covering service wages, if you please. Should one be fatally stricken down on the field of battle, even his executor or administrator is required to file a return on the service wages of the deceased within the 15th day of the third month following his appointment.

Why, Mr. Speaker, should he be seriously wounded, returned home, and discharged as physically unfit for further duty, he is required to do likewise within the 15th day of the third month of his discharge. From the lowest private or seaman to the highest general or admiral, I believe that our servicemen and women should be exempt from all taxation on their service wages during the time of war.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 1943, I introduced a bill in this House, which was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, amendatory of the general revenue statutes, exempting all men and women in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard from the payment of income taxes on their service wages, including all such income since December 31, 1941. A companion measure was introduced in the Senate by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi. In addition, this amendment goes back to include taxation on estates of enlisted men, women, and officers who have been killed, or who have died in the service since induction under the present Selective Service Act, including taxes on estates accumulated outside of Government earnings since December 31, 1939. Taxes on these estates, where the estate is $10,000 or less, are forgiven by the amendment.

The total thus exempted by the Government under these amendments will far more than repay itself in added morale in the armed forces. This is just common sense. The total loss to the Treasury by this complete exemption from income tax is a trifling sum as compared with total Government income and expenditures.

On day before yesterday, March 16, only 11 days following the introduction of the Eastland-Abernethy amendment, the distinguished gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee approved a revenue measure. I am informed that this

measure adopts the principles of our amendment. In embodying these principles into the measure with such rapidity and dispatch the members of the Ways and Means Committee are entitled to the commendation of this House.

This is worthy legislation—so worthy that it should, and undoubtedly will, meet with the unanimous approval of the Congress. Surely, no one will oppose it. I earnestly urge that you do not.

Since the introduction of my bill, which was widely acclaimed by the national press, I have received many letters of wholehearted approval from all sections of the country. They urged immediate passage. Not one dissented or disapproved. I am most grateful for this response.

Exemplary of the many communications received, may I read to the Members of this body the following letter:

UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION,
Jacksonville, Fla.

Representative THOMAS G. ABERNETHY,
Washington, D C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Congratulations on your stand against tax on servicemen's wages. There should certainly not be any Victory or other kind of tax on the servicemen's wages but on others who are gaining by the war effort.

The servicemen will notice who are acting for or against their interests. If more tax money is needed, then increase it on those who are making more than ever before and who have plenty of time to squander it foolishly, as they are doing, but not 1 cent against the small salaries of servicemen.

Very truly yours,
SOME SERVICEMEN.

God bless those servicemen, Mr. Speaker. To them and their thousands of comrades I am grateful for their service. Let the Congress send this message to its servicemen throughout the world: "When you return you will not be a fugitive from the tax gatherer."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to commend my colleague from Mississippi, who is a member of the World War Veterans' Committee, of which I am chairman, on bringing this matter to the attention of Congress. In doing so he has rendered a valuable service to the men in our armed forces, and I certainly hope the measure will become a law at once.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank the gentleman.

Resolution of the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted by the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, at a meeting held March 16, 1943. This is in reference to the resolution which I introduced on March 8:

Resolution adopted by the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, at a meeting held March 16, 1943, at the Federal Courthouse, New York City, endorsing a joint resolution introduced into Congress by Congressman PLOESER, providing for investigation and study by the Federal Trade Commission of plans and problems with respect to effective post-war operation of the American economic system

Whereas the members of the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut are in daily, active, and direct contact with Federal laws and the work of all of our Federal Government's administrative agencies; and

Whereas the members of said association are deeply concerned that our Nation shall not only be successful in the present struggle for existence, but that after its victorious conclusion our business system shall be on a sound, just, economic and equitable basis to promote the general welfare of all its citizens; and

Whereas the members of the association have for many years watched with deep interest and gratitude the work of the Federal Trade Commission, and especially its Economic Division, in the studies made on many intricate problems affecting our national economic efforts during the past 25 years; and

Whereas the staff of trained expert business economists employed by the Federal Trade Commission are unequaled for their practical business understanding and their ability to study and solve the intricate national and world-wide business problems, as witnessed by the great beneficial studies they have made for Congress and our Presidents which have resulted in the passage of salutary and corrective legislation for the greater good of the American people; and

Whereas there is at present a great need for a comprehensive study by trained experts of all the factors directly related to our economic structure with respect to our war and peace efforts, so that when peace comes, Congress will have before it an up-to-the-minute survey to guide it in making laws to prevent the collapse of American business and to effectuate an orderly transition from an American wartime economy to a peacetime economy; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives on March 8, 1943, a joint resolution by Congressman PLOESER to provide an investigation and study by the Federal Trade Commission of plans and problems with respect to the effective post-war operation of our economic system, and requiring a report from said Commission to the Congress; and

Whereas the said joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas it is the sense of this meeting that said resolution is entitled to the immediate, favorable attention of Congress so that it may be passed at the earliest possible moment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association commends House Joint Resolution 90, introduced by Representative PLOESER to provide for an investigation and study by the Federal Trade Commission of plans and problems with respect to the effective post-war operation of our economic system, and urges its early consideration, report, and passage with such changes, if any, as consideration and debate in the committee and on the floor of the House and Senate as may hereafter disclose to be necessary or advisable; and be it further

Resolved, That the committee on interstate commerce of this association, headed by former Congressman William S. Bennet, be, and the same hereby is, authorized and requested to secure the introduction of the said joint resolution in the United States Senate by a Senator from New York, New Jersey, or Connecticut, and the said committee is further requested to take such steps as in its judgment are necessary to secure the prompt consideration and passage of the said resolution inasmuch as the urgent demands of our critical situation requires that immediate action thereon by Congress be taken; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this association be directed to send copies of this resolution to Congressman PLOESER, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and to such other persons as may be interested.

HENRY WARD BEER,
President, Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

Attest:

ANNA FARINS,
Secretary.

Thoughts of a Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader of March 15, 1943:

THOUGHTS OF A MARINE

What does a soldier, situated at the scene of some of the nastiest fighting of this war, think about?

The answer to that question in respect to one soldier came in a letter which we have just read. It was written by Sgt. J. C. Ryan, whose mother is Mrs. C. G. Ryan, of Sioux Falls.

The letter recorded the sergeant's reflection as a member of a marine battalion in the Pacific southwest.

Here are excerpts from it:

"I am sorry that there has been such a lapse of time between letters. But, as you know, it couldn't be helped. As you can see, there are apt to be more times like that. All I can say is not to worry about me when you don't hear from me. I'm not going to try to mislead you about my safety in times like these, but I want you to believe that I am not at all unhappy about it. So far I am much the better for the war. I can say truthfully that in most operations the percentage of men who don't get a scratch is much higher than of the ones who do. There is no strain to dying in action. * * * I don't know what there is beyond this or if there is anything, but it is all right. I acquired more religion in the past few months than I have ever had, and I haven't been to church, either.

"The job of assuring a permanent peace is as important as winning the war because there is no victory unless it is assured that it is a lasting one. I don't figure that I am fighting the individual man just because he happens to be born in a different country. I like to think that we are combating an idea. I would feel no higher than the animal we must become in combat if I were fighting individuals.

"I think one of the main things that must be done is to make sure our natural resentment is not allowed to control us when a peace is made. The feeling of revenge is directly against everything we are fighting for. By allowing it to dominate our thoughts we would lower ourselves to the level of the people we are fighting. Rather we should bring them up to our level.

"In the case of the Japanese, that is going to be difficult. From what I have seen of them, they don't seem to be exactly human. Of course, when I observed them I looked and acted like an animal myself. They might be different under different conditions.

"I do know for sure that all Japs don't want to fight and that all of them aren't fanatical about dying for their Emperor. I know of some who were afraid to die and of one who surrendered and blamed the Jap Government for the war. I have yet to hear an American blame our Government for being out here * * *. Maybe I'm just not much of a man, but I feel no personal grudge against the Japs. I have buried friends of mine, too.

"As for deceit and treachery of the Japs as professional soldiers, I can't blame them. In order to make war efficiently, treachery and deceit are necessary. It is not a nice business. I don't believe in observing any rules when engaged in war. It is hypocritical to do otherwise. I don't condone the Japanese two-faced way of doing things in peacetime. That is why I am here to put a stop to it. * * * I hope there never is another war, but if there is, I don't think that I or any of my children will engage in it. If we muff again, I am through. If the human race allows this to happen once more after the example they have before them, they aren't worth my efforts."

Sergeant Ryan has written an editorial—a profound one. He expresses a philosophy of civilization. And, even in the midst of the worst of the war, he displays a remarkable ability to maintain the fundamental virtues of tolerance and understanding.

It is easy for a nation at war to lose its poise, to become inflamed, angry, and intemperate. Sergeant Ryan, however, sets an example for those of us who are at home. If he can think dispassionately where he is, certainly we at home should be able to do so.

Ceilings on Livestock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert herewith a copy of a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota. This resolution requests the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the Office of Price Administration to refrain from establishing ceiling prices on live animals and thereby encourage rather than discourage increased production.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that before any ceilings on livestock are established this question should be thoroughly investigated as to the deteriorating effect of such action upon production and upon the possible stimulating effect on black markets.

The resolution follows:

House Resolution 7

Resolution requesting the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the Office of Price Administration to refrain from establishing ceiling prices on live animals and thereby encourage rather than discourage increased production

Whereas the farmers of the Nation, recognizing their patriotic duty in this time of a food crisis to supply the needs of the civilian population and to furnish food for our armed forces and our allies in this war, have greatly increased meat production during the past 2 years; and

Whereas meat and animal fats are vital food products and their increased production is necessary to win the present war; and

Whereas ceiling prices applied to live animals will seriously hamper the war effort through decreased production of livestock; and

Whereas we concur in the ceiling price on the finished product to protect the consumer, as is done at the present time; and

Whereas no ceiling prices applied to live animals will be satisfactory to producers of livestock, and encourage and stimulate increased production if the retail prices to consumers and the wages of labor are allowed to continue to rise; and

Whereas a program providing for ceiling prices on live animals is impractical and unworkable due to the fact that livestock must be graded before a ceiling can be applied, and livestock is assembled and sold at numerous points throughout the country, such as public markets, direct-buying centers, packing-plant auction markets, and direct from innumerable farms and ranches. This would necessitate the employment of thousands of graders of questionable ability; and

Whereas under a program providing for ceiling prices on live animals all packers would be paying ceiling prices during the period of scarcity, which would necessitate allocation to markets to assure supplies at slaughter centers. It is un-American to prevent farmers from patronizing their choice of markets; and

Whereas ceiling prices on live animals would assure packers and retailers margins at the expense of producers; and

Whereas lower prices on livestock would stimulate the development of black markets: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, That the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Claude R. Wickard, and the Chief of the Office of Price Administration, Hon. Prentiss Brown, be requested to refrain from applying ceiling prices to live animals; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota is hereby instructed to submit a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Office of Price Administration, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

Board of Legal Examiners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the National Legislative Committee of the American Legion:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1943.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: On Monday, March 15, there came up for consideration in the House the bill (H. R. 1025) which had been reported by the House Civil Service Committee. It was passed over without prejudice.

The intent of the bill is to provide statutory authority for a board of legal examiners which had been created by Executive Order No. 8743 of April 23, 1941.

We of the American Legion are convinced this proposal not only destroys the merit system but also veterans' preference. It is our understanding the board of legal examiners conducts an examination of attorney-applicants and establishes a list of eligibles. However, the appointing officer may select No. 1 or No. 1000 from that list of eligibles. Therefore, we are opposed to any move which will destroy veterans' preference. Further, this proposal would tend to perpetuate in office a number of attorneys while other attorneys are now serving with the armed forces.

Following the theory of H. R. 1025 to its logical conclusion, there would be no necessity to continue the United States Civil Service Commission. If it is logical to have a board of legal examiners, then why not a board of engineer examiners, a board of dental examiners, a board of stenographic examiners? In fact, it might not be long before each separate occupation within the Federal service would desire a separate board to conduct examinations for applicants for each occupation.

Because H. R. 1025 would destroy veterans' preference insofar as attorneys in the Government service are concerned, we would appreciate anything you might do to bring our objections to the attention of the House.

Very sincerely yours,

F. M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director,
National Legislative Committee.

Fear Unjustified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Drug Topics:

FEAR UNJUSTIFIED

Proceeding upon the wise principle that it is well to be ready for anything which might happen, Director Byrnes, Office of Economic Stabilization, had the War Production Board prepare and submit estimates showing "just how heavy and extensive the slashes in civilian goods might be in the last extremes of a total war." The purpose of the study was to make all necessary preparations just in case.

In spite of this fact, however, some confusion has shown up in retail drug circles, and elsewhere, with respect to the immediate portents of this "bedrock" program. Some have jumped to the conclusion that the bottom is about to fall out of the civilian economy. They seem to fear that supplies of drugs,

medicines, and other medical needs will begin to dry up, and that drug-store volume will sharply drop within the next few months.

There is, of course, no possible basis for such fears, as a careful reading of the War Production Board statement would have shown. All the War Production Board did was to look ahead and try to estimate or guess how much civilian goods there would be "in the last extremes of a total war." It was merely an adventure in conjecture.

And, while there is no possible justification for getting jittery over the immediate implications of this War Production Board statement, this is not to say that it has no immediate value. As we see it, it should serve to steady the Nation's nerve rather than upset it. It shows that, even in the "last extremes of a total war," there will be more consumer goods available than were purchased and consumed during the darker days of the depression years. We came through then, a little shaken, it is true, but we came through just the same.

But, the total volume predicted for drug and medical supplies would be a sizable figure, even under the dire conditions which are visualized. In fact, some drug classifications are stepped up over usual demands, a fact which makes this dismal prophecy not so dismal after all.

It is this optimistic view of the situation which retail pharmacists should see, and which they should emphasize to their store patrons who are unduly disturbed over the alleged inadequacy of point rationing, and who profess to see "hunger riots" around the corner.

The War Production Board study makes it clear that, under no conceivable circumstances will the supply of consumer goods drop to the danger point. There will be no blow-up of the civilian economy, and there will be no food riots.

Let's get on with the war!

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a businessman of York, Pa.:

W. M. HART CO.,
York, Pa., March 16, 1943.

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHESTER: Since events made possible this screaming headline: "F. D. R. asks jobs for all, lifetime security, and Government partnership in industry," in a large newspaper, my heart has been heavy, indeed, for I wonder if anyone considered its possible effect on our people. Remember, they are already suffering from an advanced case of nerves, due to news of their loved ones, no news at all, which often leads to visions of things far worse than the actual reports, and the exhaustion which follows in the wake of superhuman effort to contribute to the winning of the war. In addition, there are the sacrifices being made to buy Government securities in the amounts needed for financing the effort, and at a time when everyone should have their faith fanned and their work encouraged they are submitted to a shock such as this.

My faith and belief in our people are endless, for it is characteristic of them to take what comes with courage and resolution. I have an abiding faith in the Nation itself, but why make our people endure things that are not necessary?

Without the complete report before me, it is impossible for me to speak with thoroughness. A study of it would doubtless consume weeks. That is something I am not called upon to do. But I can speak authoritatively on views formed from experiences with many people and on principles which I know are sound. In this spirit I am writing you.

I believe I could write a book on the insecurity of social security. It would contain the dangers of building on assumption that all (and I mean the workers) believe that it is the answer, and of results which have already made themselves manifest, which are most harmful. For example: I have found two types, among others. The first is greedy—never is given enough. The second doesn't know what to do with what he has been given. Many in the first group "moan" when it comes to deductions from their pay. They want to do their own saving—never stopping to realize that even what is left is more than they thought they would have. Many in the second group spend with an abandon that is shocking. I know of cases where men have been paid in the neighborhood of $100 for the week ending Saturday night, and seen "bumming" cigarettes by Wednesday noon. Or consider those having their checks cashed at a food store, which does it as a good-will gesture, who don't even stop to buy food but rush to the bar across the street. And listen to their spiritless plaints: "Drink gets my mind off my work," or "I like to be free," or the very sad admission of him who "can't hang on to my money. It's a good thing that I signed up for bonds; otherwise I wouldn't have anything." And take the very many who say: "What's the use of working or worrying? The Government's going to take care of me, anyway." Can any thinking person believe that there is any "security" in this sort of social security? Can we hope to build men by this method?

What of the times when men had to work to eat? When by industry and thrift they acquired self-reliance, character, and independence that spelled security for them—and social security for our people, as a whole?

If the Government is to make work and money secure for every man, what's going to happen to the good unions?

Are the great masses of our fine workers to look to those appointed by Government for both jobs and wages?

Remember, we are one people; consequently, what one man does affects his comrades, and what they do affects him. And what the Government does affects us all.

Now if the Government is going to make life a bed of roses for everyone, and the money for it is taken out of the pockets of industry, the workers, and other consumers, not directly affected by such costs, in the form of higher prices of goods, why should the money be collected twice—maintaining the Government agencies necessary to such a gigantic system, and the labor unions, too?

What possible incentive will there be for the worker? What excuse is there for the rewards which, in the past, have gone to those with initiative? Nevertheless, these two—incentive and initiative—have been responsible to an incalculable extent for the growth of this great country of ours.

Government and industry, partners in business, is to be the new shingle.

Think for a moment what this might mean.

I cannot conceive of any of the great industrial leaders (and don't forget that many of them came up from the very lowest rungs on the ladder), or men who have made smaller successes, ever being content to head up the national business of the United States. So what happens? The fine men and fine talents which the Senate and the House represent instead of devoting both to the passing of far-visioned and wise laws, must detract from both long enough to set up more bureaus for the purpose of administering the detailed business of the manufacturing plants, and other business houses of the country. And who will be in charge? If the men who made these concerns successful won't head and man these bureaus, themselves, Who is to be placed in those positions? Men, no doubt, who are incapable, as a rule, of making a success of any business venture. Men whom the business leaders wouldn't hire for any opposition involving great responsibility. Not because the men, themselves, are not good and capable of other things, but they would not serve business—and business must make a profit, or there is no business worthy of the name. Are we to forget the lesson which we should have learned from the National Recovery Act?

Now then let's assume that all of these able men would agree to run their businesses from out-of-town. Ask any one of them how well he believes he could do it.

If you want to prove some of these things for yourself, consider some business you know about—a family-owned affair, largely, from which the builder was suddenly taken by death. Some relative steps in over the capable, carefully trained executive whom the builder placed in charge, next to himself. The novice, or "know-it-all" shows his good judgment and ability by taking hold of things and, usually, by placing every conceivable obstacle that his small brain can conjure up in the way of the capable man. Or what happens when the man is kept on but subject to every whim and passing fancy any one, or all members, of the family see fit to visit on him? The latter does one of two things—steadfastly tries and stays on or resigns in disgust. Either way the business suffers, sells out, or goes broke!

Now consider the administration of an all-out Social Security and Government partnership in industry in terms of power. And power in incapable hands. Think of the opportunities for its misuse. Not, let us say, because the men or women are not up to high moral standards, but because they, never having made a success, don't know what to do with it. How easy for the miscreant to work his will, if he has influence, with those lacking in ability or who are timid. Think too of the crop of parasites it is possible for us to harvest within a short time. What control would anyone exercise, even the legislative bodies, over such a set-up. It staggers the imagination.

The only kind of power that is useful is the kind that is earned and deserved. The kind of power that is based on character—the quality of the bloodstream in people; and their Christian beliefs and principles; their intellects; their education over the broadest possible fronts; their powers to persuade; their honesty; their dedication of self to God, to country, to humanity, to people, to business (whatever they are doing), and to serve.

One, we are wisely told, cannot serve God and Mammon. Why run any more risk than we have?

It has been publicly reported that workers in war plants are worried about not having jobs at the war's end. I, of course, haven't met and talked with every one of the millions now so engaged. But of the great number with whom I have talked, I have yet to find one who is giving any thought to it. The fact that the pot of gold, or the chair of ease, is to be given to him anyway, regardless of what he does, will certainly rob many of them of any incentive whatever. Not to recognize this as a possibility is to admit of not knowing human nature. I can

imagine nothing that will spread the disease which has the Nation worried at the moment, absenteeism, more rapidly or with greater sureness than a blanket and binding promise that so long as you do not steal, set fire to something, or otherwise misbehave in a manner that demands your confinement, you haven't got a worry in the world, insofar as money is concerned. Which all goes to prove that it is possible to commit sins against people far greater than ordinary wrongs, and which never can be rectified, and still be left at large. For when one robs man of his birthright, or an opportunity to develop his soul, he is answerable to the only Power in the universe, and the One to which all men, in the end, must bow.

Right now one of the greatest organizations in the country is considering the problem of providing jobs, and opportunity, for all working people. It is composed of some of the ablest and finest characters to be found. These men are successful themselves, and are now engaged in one of the greatest social-security movements the world has yet seen.

Why not give them their chance? Not one is in a position to reap the harvest of political rewards. They are able men, noble men; men with a love of country that transcends all else—personal health, family life, anything at all save being their "brother's keeper," and helping to assure opportunity for all, and making this world a little happier, better, and finer place in which to live.

This war must be won. And the peace, God grant, must be based on something else than the greed, unfairness, and stupidity of Versailles or future generations will have the same job that we're trying to do now to do all over again.

So I implore you to direct all of your energies and many talents to the great cause ahead, the winning of the war. Consider, as you go along, such factors as must necessarily serve your purpose in arriving at decisions in the matter of the peace, when it is to come. And urge all of your colleagues to do likewise. This is a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

May God grant that it "shall not perish from the earth."

Sincerely,

W. M. HART.

Report of the Secretary of the Interior on H. R. 323

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to say that on the opening day of this Seventy-eighth Congress I introduced a bill (H. R. 323) to authorize the exploration of proposed dam sites located on Indian lands within the State of New Mexico. The bill is not long, and I include it at this point:

H. R. 323

A bill to authorize the exploration of proposed dam sites located on Indian lands within the State of New Mexico.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to permit the exploration by the Bureau of Reclamation, through surveying, drilling, and other appropriate procedures, of proposed sites for reclamation or conservancy works located on trust or restricted Indian lands, whether tribal or allotted, including pueblo lands, or on lands purchased or reserved by the United States for the use and occupancy of Indians, within the State of New Mexico, whenever he deems the exploration of such sites will be of assistance in carrying on an investigation which the Bureau of Reclamation may legally undertake. Funds made available for the prosecution of any such investigation shall be available for the payment of compensation to Indian tribes or pueblos, and to individual Indians, for damages sustained by them through surveying, drilling, or other operations incident to the explorations provided for by this act, in the amount determined to be just by the Secretary of the Interior or a representative designated by him. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize the construction of any reclamation or conservancy works not otherwise authorized pursuant to law, nor to limit or curtail any powers now vested in any officer or agency of the Government pursuant to law.

Mr. Speaker, after the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation unanimously reported out this bill with a recommendation that it pass, there arose quite a little comment as to its true purposes and my own interest in the matter. In order that I may answer many of the questions that have been raised about this bill, I desire to set forth the report of the Secretary of the Interior dated March 16, 1943, which fairly appraises the situation in the Middle Rio Grande Valley.

The report follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, March 16, 1943.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Chairman, Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. WHITE: Further reference is made to your communication requesting a report on H. R. 323, a bill to authorize the exploration of proposed dam sites within the State of New Mexico

The measure would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the Bureau of Reclamation to make surveys, subsurface explorations, and other investigations of proposed sites for reclamation or conservancy work on any Indian land or land purchased or reserved by the United States for the use and occupancy of Indians within the State of New Mexico.

The 37,500 Indians within the State of New Mexico are members of three distinct tribes residing in four geographical localities. They comprise the Navajos located in the extreme northwestern part of the State on an extension of the larger Arizona Navajo Reservation; the Apaches, some 1,500 in number, who are about equally divided between the Jicarilla Reservation, which is also in the northern portion of the State, and the Mescalero Reservation, which is in the south central section; and some 13,000 Pueblo Indians, who are located on 19 different small pueblos, all of which, with the single exception of the Zuni Reservation, are located on the Rio Grande River or its tributaries.

A number of early investigations and surveys in the Rio Grande Basin have been made by both private and Federal agencies. As a result of numerous solicitations on the part of various interests in this basin, this Department, through the Bureau of Reclamation, undertook a comprehensive study and survey of the area beginning early in 1942. The only investigations of reclamation or conservancy projects involving the exploration of sites on Indian lands in New Mexico that are currently under way are those being made in connection with flood control, conservation, and rehabilitation in the Rio Grande Basin. These investigations will provide data for the preparation of a plan of development which may be utilized to alleviate the serious physical and economic situations now existing, particularly in the Middle Rio Grande Valley. A preliminary examination for flood control, soil erosion prevention, and related problems in the drainage basin has also been initiated jointly by the War Department and the Department of Agriculture, as authorized by the act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 649).

The Pueblo Indians were irrigating considerable areas of land in the Rio Grande Valley and in this general region at the time of Coronado's visit in 1540. In the subsequent Spanish and Mexican colonization, the lands of the Pueblo Indians were set apart by Spanish grants and this ownership was later confirmed by the United States after the territory was acquired by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848. Irrigation development was accelerated between 1880 and 1890. As early as 1920 it became evident that much irrigated land was being seeped and a serious decline in the agricultural development of the region was in prospect. This adverse condition can be attributed to decreased water supply, extensive erosion and consequent aggradation of the river bed, together with an accompanying elevation of the ground water level.

The collective effort to improve the irrigation systems to remedy these physical conditions resulted in the organization of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District in 1925. This district comprises a gross area of approximately 278,000 acres, of which about 97,140 acres are subject to irrigation benefits. Interspersed with the district lands are 20,700 acres of Indian lands located within the six Indian pueblos of Cochiti, Santo Domingo, San Felipe, Santa Ana, Sandia, and Isleta. Construction development by the district got under way in 1930 and was practically completed by 1935, but this work was confined largely to purely reclamation development and had little effect toward remedying the aggradation, flood damage, and land seepage. Largely because of these adverse conditions and because the conservancy district was not in a position to exercise control over the entire watershed, it has encountered financial difficulties, and its economic stability is being jeopardized.

I am advised by the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation that in order properly and fully to conduct the investigations in the Rio Grande Basin, it will be necessary to explore certain possible dam and reservoir sites on, or which may affect, lands of the Pueblo Indians. Access to these sites has been denied by the Indians, and numerous protests against construction of possible reservoirs at these sites have been made. The Indians have contended that these reservoirs, if built, would destroy irreplaceable agricultural lands, their ancestral homes and villages, their clay pits upon which their large pottery industry depends, and their sacred shrines.

Unquestionably, the situation in the Middle Rio Grande Valley is critical and must be viewed in terms of economic survival and future habitation of existing cities, towns, and pueblos, as well as the utilization of agricultural areas. The continual building up of the river bed, causing both damage from floods and ground water, is becoming increasingly dangerous. The investigation of the Reclamation Service will exhaust every possible plan or alternative method of solving this critical situation. In the drilling or other investigations on Indian land

particular care will be exercised to the end that Indian shrines or other sacred places will not be disturbed.

The final study of plans for improvements in the Rio Grande Basin will be done cooperatively with the Corps of Army Engineers for the purpose of exchanging data and reconciling conclusions and no recommendation to Congress will be made by me for the construction of any improvements until full consideration has been given to all interests and to values of every nature, including the real and intangible ones of the Pueblo Indians.

The Indians, and especially those of San Felipe Pueblo, have expressed a fear that exploratory operations might do violence to their kivas or other sacred areas. If authority for the explorations be enacted by the Congress, extreme effort will be made to avoid any operation hurtful to the religious sentiments of any tribe.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs on H. R. 323

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

In connection with my bill, H. R. 323, I have been asked frequently about the attitude of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Honorable John Collier, upon the bill which I introduced. I desire at this time to set forth in the RECORD the letter of Mr. Collier to the governors of the New Mexico Pueblos dated March 6, 1943:

As the author of the bill, I am very appreciative of the extremely fair and sensible attitude which the Commissioner of Indian Affairs takes in this letter. This is particularly true of his assertion:

> It is my belief that Congress cannot be expected, or reasonably asked, to defeat the Anderson bill. Congress has directed that the whole watershed be examined. It is not reasonable that Congress now should say, in effect, examine the whole watershed, but do not examine a certain part of it.

He has put his finger on the very crux of this whole matter. We cannot do flood control piecemeal on this river. We must consider the river as a whole and the Bureau of Reclamation is in position to do that. Furthermore, it is doing it under the mandate of Congress and it would be absurd for it to refrain from studying the entire watershed because of fears which in my opinion are completely unfounded. However, for the purpose of this extension of remarks, I am glad to submit the statement of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and let those interested parties judge for themselves how fairly the Commissioner has appraised the issue.

His letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
WASHINGTON, *March 6, 1943.*

To the Governors of the New Mexico Pueblos:

DEAR FRIENDS: Indians of the Pueblos, and many of their white friends, have written me about the Anderson bill, H. R. 323. This bill would permit investigations by the engineers, to be carried out on certain Pueblo lands. I give you my best information and thought on the whole subject and I urge you to read carefully what I shall say, and think about it

You are all familiar with the general problem of the Middle Rio Grande watershed. You know that soil erosion on the watershed has caused the river bed to rise higher each year. This has increased the flood troubles and has caused the waterlogging of much land.

There is now going on an investigation, authorized by Congress, into all the possibilities for correcting the bad situation. This investigation starts out as an engineering study, but before it is completed it must take into account everything that ought to be taken into account—the economic and human situation in its entirety.

It was the intent of Congress that all the whole watershed be examined, and that all the possibilities should be explored.

Now, a portion of the watershed is pueblo lands, and among the numerous possibilities, from an engineering standpoint, are dam sites which might be built if adequate foundations were discovered to exist. If adequate foundations were not discovered, then these dam sites would become unfeasible regardless of any other consideration.

The Anderson bill has the exclusive purpose of authorizing the engineering explorations which are necessary in order to complete the studies of the whole watershed. These uncompleted studies involve some of your lands.

It is my belief that Congress cannot be expected, or reasonably asked, to defeat the Anderson bill. Congress has directed that the whole watershed be examined. It is not reasonable that Congress now should say, in effect: Examine the whole watershed, but do not examine a certain part of it.

I now give you my own best information as to what would be the situation if the Anderson bill passed, and if the engineering examination discovered that there were adequate foundations for dam sites.

The subject would then pass out of its strictly engineering phase into the broader human, economic, and social phases—the policy phases.

What is needed is the saving of the river and the river lands through saving the whole watershed.

What should be done is the thing that would accomplish that result with the smallest cost to the Government and the least damage to existing interests and values.

A dam built, for example, at San Felipe, would, in my judgment, be unduly expensive; it would destroy important tangible and intangible values, not only Indian but Spanish-American, and it would give no more than a temporary relief. Silt would continue to pour down in a volume always increasing from the eroded watershed.

It is my belief that other methods just as feasible, from the engineering standpoint, and less expensive and more efficient will be proved to exist when the total study is finished; that there exist upstream reservoir possibilities which could regulate the floods and contain the silt; and that it is perfectly practicable to stop the erosion on the watershed if only people can be brought to see that this watershed erosion is the ultimate source of all the trouble.

You can be very sure that before any dam was authorized, and before Congress appropriated the money for such a dam, flooding your lands and villages, all of these considerations would be taken into account by Congress. You can be very sure that your voice would be heard and that your friends all over the United States would make their influence felt.

Some of the letters which are reaching me point out that the Pueblos have good reason, from old times, to fear that their interests will not be taken into account by New Mexico or by the Government. That is true, speaking of old times. But I ask you to remember that through the last 20 years, ever since 1922, your interests have in fact been protected. You have acted to protect them, and your white friends have acted, and the Government has acted. Repeatedly, across these 20 years, your interests have been in jeopardy, and in every single case, sometimes after a struggle and sometimes without a struggle, your lands and waters, your ancient governments and sacred places and religions and all of your interests have been protected. I believe that your interests are going to be protected in the future.

This letter does not suggest that you adopt any particular course about the Anderson bill. It is written to give you my own thought and belief about the whole situation. This thought and belief are not being expressed for the first time. Secretary Ickes, repeatedly, has insisted that before anything is finally done, every human consideration, and specifically yours—the Pueblos' situation—will be taken into account. As you know, Dr. Aberle, Mr. Walter Woehlke, and I have made numerous statements to this same effect, and this letter contains nothing we have not said before. But lest I be misunderstood, I repeat that there is no reason to expect Congress to defeat the Anderson bill because that bill does nothing except carry forward the intent of Congress that flood- and silt-control and erosion-control studies of the entire watershed shall be made.

Sincerely your friend,

JOHN COLLIER,
Commissioner.

Restrictions on Use of Chemical Fertilizers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Senate of South Carolina:

Senate Resolution 250

Resolution requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to rescind or amend order No. 9280, dated December 5, 1942, so as to allow farmers to buy and use necessary chemical fertilizers for use on melon and cucumber crops

Whereas the Food Production Administration and authority vested in the Secretary of Agriculture by Executive Order No. 9280, dated December 5, 1942, to assure an adequate

production of food to meet war and civilian needs has prohibited certain restrictions on the use of chemical fertilizers, which restrictive order is dated January 18, 1943; and

Whereas the said restrictive order as dated January 18, 1943, and which is as follows:

"(1) No fertilizer manufacturer, dealer, or agent shall deliver any chemical fertilizer containing chemical nitrogen for use on melon or cucumber crops except where grown specifically for seed production, or in the case of cucumbers where grown for processing, and no person, including fertilizer manufacturers, dealers, or agents, shall use any chemical fertilizer containing chemical nitrogen for any purpose restricted by this paragraph (f) (1);" is in our opinion unfair and unreasonable as regards the planting of melon and cucumber crops in our State and will practically wreck the production of same; and

Whereas it has come to our attention that Hon. GERALD W. LANDIS, Congressman from Indiana, has brought this matter to the Congress and its serious effect upon the growing of watermelons and cantaloups and the facts in respect to such has been carried in the editorial column in the Columbia State as of February 26, 1943, which also calls attention to the serious plight farmers would be in if the production of such foods are curtailed; and

Whereas South Carolina has so many farmers using this necessary fertilizer and who are engaged in the planting of such produce and such restrictive order above referred to will do such great damage to so many farmers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Carolina, That a committee of at least two from the senate and a representative of the department of agriculture be appointed by the president of the senate to immediately get in touch with the proper officials in Washington as well as the Members of Congress from South Carolina to urge them to study the aforesaid restrictive order as passed, and to urgently request that the said order be rescinded or amended so that the farmers of South Carolina may be able to secure the necessary chemical fertilizer containing chemical nitrogen for use on melon or cucumber crops as unless such is done the farmers will suffer greatly; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be immediately forwarded to the Members of Congress from South Carolina, to the Food Production Administration and to the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture.

Absenteeism and Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communications received by me with reference to H. R. 2082:

BOULDER, COLO., *March 8, 1943.*

Congressman BRYSON,
Of South Carolina.

DEAR SIR: My sympathies are with you in your efforts toward eliminating the manufacture, sale, and transportation of liquor in these United States during the war and for all time thereafter.

A speech by the president of Colgate College made recently to a Baptist gathering is an eye opener on the liquor subject, and I deplore the assistance given this traffic by our President.

Very truly yours,

ISAAC T. EARL.

OWENSBORO, KY., *March 10, 1943.*

Representative BRYSON.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend you for the bill prohibiting the sale and manufacturing of liquor for the duration of the war. I hope that it will be successful.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. J. H. MONTGOMERY.

HOLLY HILL, FLA., *March 15, 1943.*

Representative BRYSON.

DEAR SIR: Am writing to say we as Christian women and mothers with sons in service, are behind you to the last, and we are very proud to know we have a man not afraid to present a bill to outlaw the manufacture, sale, and transportation of liquor in the United States of America and possessions until the conclusion of the present war.

We must put out the one thing that is tearing down so many of our noble young men and young women in the service. A shame to our Nation. We would so like to see it back as in 1917, when the penalty was so great no one dared to sell to a man in uniform.

We are praying for just such a law.

We are very proud of you for what you have started.

I remain, a mother with two sons in service,

Mrs. U. M. BAGWELL.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 7, 1943.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
State House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Here is one reason I am for your bill. Last night employee No. ——— of the Kaiser Companies' Swan Island Shipyard, Portland, Oreg., went to a show, drinks followed. She reached home at 5:45 a. m., Sunday morning and reported for work at 7 a. m. still under the influence. Naturally she was sent home as unfit for work. I personally know of two other cases in which a drink resulted in weeks of time lost.

It seems to me ridiculous, if not criminal, that we should be asked to do without sugar and other necessities so the likes of her can have her choice of luxury.

I also have a pet "peeve" over glass-littered streets where my precious rubbers and overshoes have been ruined to say nothing of the auto tires thus wasted.

May your bill meet with speedy success.

Yours for victory,

FLORENCE TYLER.

II Cor. 2:14.

UNITED TEXAS DRYS,
Dallas, Tex., March 16, 1943.

The Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: As a son of the Old South, and a strong believer in fair play, I am writing to give my unqualified endorsement to your bill outlawing liquor for the duration. The many thousands of fathers and mothers whose sons are in the armed forces of our country will rise up and call you blessed.

If there was ever a time when we needed sober men to guide the destiny of our Nation that time is now. All honor to you.

Sincerely yours,

JEFF DAVIS.

COLBY JUNIOR COLLEGE,
New London, N. H., March 16, 1943.

Congressman JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRYSON: I have noted that you are sponsoring a bill to forbid the manufacture, sale, and transportation of liquor in the United States and possessions until the end of the war and thereafter until the termination of mobilization as determined by the President. Let me say that I am heartily in favor of this action and that I sincerely hope you can persuade Congress to do something about it.

Conditions in many parts of the country are a disgrace. The presence of drunken men on the trains and in railroad stations, many of them in uniform, is not only bad for public morale but positively injurious to the good name of our Army, Navy, and other services.

With best wishes to you in this matter, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

J. DUANE SQUIRES.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY,
Togus, Maine, March 15, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: A few days ago I was delighted to see by the headlines that you were making an effort to get prohibition during the present emergency.

Not long ago I made a trip home to be with my father in his last illness, and I found all the trains loaded with soldiers, sailors, and marines. The sad feature about it was that in most instances there was heavy drinking. Many of the men were drunk, drunk to the point where they had lost all sense of decency, and their behavior in the presence of women was bad, and they were not all privates either. Many of them were officers.

How can America hope to win a war with an army of drunken soldiers. How can a nation hope to build an efficient fighting force with men whose bodies, mind, and spirits have been wrecked by strong drink?

It is strange that the Government will spend millions upon millions of dollars to train men and then break these men down with strong drink while they are training them.

Surely the mothers and fathers of our country, who entrust their boys to the care of the United States are entitled to consideration along that line, for it is a fearful thing to think about that our boys might be returned to us after the conflict wrecked in body, mind, and spirit because of alcohol, and the evil associations that is connected with it. I think your bill is a long step in the right direction, and I wish it all the success I feel it deserves at the hands of the United States Government.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHAS. P. BENSON.

P. S.—I would like to have a copy of the speeches made on the subject.

GARRETTSVILLE, OHIO, *March 8, 1943.*

Representative BRYSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: I note your efforts in the press to endorse prohibition for the balance of the war. God be with you for we need workers with clear brains on Monday morning and not a hang-over of alcohol (CH_3OH).

Then after the war I think the Swedish system of liquor selling is best and should be in effect here. No man who breaks the law all the time is given a book and those who get a book and break the law have it taken away, and so forth.

Then I am also strong for a national divorce law. We need a law to clear up the muddle in all the States and our near neighbors. So do what you can.

As a high-school teacher I hope you will have success and good health.

Sincerely,

W. D. PARSONS.

NORFOLK, VA., *March 16, 1943.*

Hon. J. R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to add my note of approval to your move to impose national prohibition for the duration of the war, by act of Congress rather than by a constitutional amendment. I believe that it will help curb absenteeism as well as help many of the ills that follow drinking liquor. We should do all we can to try to protect people who are weak and have more money than they know what to do with. I have lived in this war-boom town through two wars and I know whereof I speak.

The alcoholic liquor traffic is a curse and is much worse during a war.

I will do what I can to help the movement and pray for your success.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. ELLEN MILLER SMITHWICK.

ASSOCIATE REFORMED
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Winston-Salem, N. C., March 9, 1943.

The Honorable J. R. BRYSON,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to express my appreciation of the introduction of the bill to prohibit the traffic in beverage alcohol. Every sensible man who has had anything to do with war knows that the whisky traffic is the most dangerous ally that a foe can possibly have. My observation is that, to-day, those who have the moral strength and courage that it takes to win this war are in favor of the complete and absolute prohibition of the liquor traffic everywhere our flag flies. It is just as destructive to civilians as it is to soldiers. If we are in earnest about winning this war we'll kill this traffic. It is folly to ask a man to be brave enough to face death before an enemy's guns and then surrender like puny cowards before the enemy that is at our own doors. The fact of the matter is that we are sending boys out to face death because Almighty God is chastening this land for the sins of the fathers who surrendered the land into the hands of this godless and nation-destroying traffic.

The people well knew that the thing behind these strikes and behind this absenteeism was drunkenness long before it was aired in Congress.

Strength to your arm! If Congress wants to continue to be cowards it will continue its surrender to the liquor traffic. If it wants to exhibit some manhood it will rise in the strength of Almighty God and assert its independence of the enemy that has the Nation by the throat. I have no confidence in the professed loyalty of any man who is willing to harbor this enemy that is a greater foe of our Nation than Hitler and all his satanic companions that array themselves against us.

It is time for patriots to be willing to be summoned to true and noble manhood.

Yours for Christ and country,

GILBREATH L. KERR.

P. S.—Let me acknowledge receipt of your speech made some time ago on this important matter.

G. L. K.

NEW YORK, *March 6, 1943.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: I heartily congratulate you on your effort to impose national prohibition for the duration of the war by an act of Congress, and sincerely hope you will succeed, for I am convinced it will very greatly add to production and the health and prosperity of the Nation. Hard liquor has possibly more to do with absenteeism from work, cruelty to members of the family, and various crimes that are committed than anything else.

Very truly yours,

W. F. HARTRANFT.

Limitation of the Size of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

QUITAQUE, TEX., *February 8, 1943.*

Mr. EUGENE WORLEY,
Eighteenth District, Texas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WORLEY: I appreciate your letter of January 22, and your statement that the important thing at the present time is first to win this war. In that connection, may I tell you what my friends and fellow soldiers are saying?

We all agree that the ghost of those lost on Guam should haunt the Congressmen who voted against fortifying Guam years ago. Some of the same Congressmen and others are now talking of limiting the size of the Army, regardless of the wishes of our Commander in Chief and military experts. Some of the same Congressmen, perhaps, who voted against the draft, extension of the draft, and against preparedness, are again trying to play military experts. They should be ashamed to raise their heads, much less their voices.

If we who fight should find ourselves outnumbered on some battlefield, what do you presume we would think of the Congressmen who voted to have us outnumbered?

Do not let anyone tell us we need the men for production until you have drafted all men with dependents out of unnecessary positions into production jobs or defense positions.

Sincerely yours,

Cadet R. L. EARTHMAN.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address entitled "What Is the Ruml Plan?" reprinted from the National Republican for March 1943:

WHAT IS THE RUML PLAN?

Mr. BRYSON. This is Lyman Bryson, chairman of the People's Platform. My guest tonight is Beardsley Ruml, and we are going to talk about plans for paying Federal income taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis. Mr. Ruml is treasurer of Macy's and chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Mr. Ruml, you have suggested a basic reform in our income-tax procedure. What is wrong with our present system?

Mr. RUML. When the Federal income-tax bill was passed in this country in 1913, it had an important defect which was that a citizen was required to pay in the year 1914 a tax on his 1913 income. In this way we got started on a vicious practice of paying out of one year's income a tax on the year that had already gone. As a result and in consequence of increasing rates, the debt which people owe to the Federal Government for income tax has become a national danger. The present system is a bad system for all of us and should and can be corrected. It is clear that the Government cannot continue for long to be the creditor of some 27,000,000 taxpayers and their families, in debt for income tax as they are today, particularly when there is no substantial question of revenue involved in changing the basis of assessment and getting the whole country on a current pay-as-you-go basis.

Mr. BRYSON. Could you make the situation any better by making a change?

Mr. RUML. There are two broad purposes for reforming our historic income-tax practice in order to place our income taxes on a current basis and to eliminate the accumulated income-tax debt. The first purpose relates to the financing of the war, to the reduction of potential inflationary purchasing power, and to the preservation of the integrity of our income-tax system through obtaining the highest possible level of collections and the lowest possible level of defaults. The second purpose springs from the personal and humane desirability of removing from millions of citizens the constant threat of unpaid tax debt, a debt imposed under a faulty tax system, unwittingly unprovided for by our citizens, a debt now grown so large under present tax rates that loss of current income for any reason by the individual taxpayer brings acute financial and personal distress.

Mr. BRYSON All right, now, concretely, what do you suggest that we do?

Mr. RUML. In order to accomplish the desirable objective of getting our income taxes on a current basis, I suggested to the Treasury in March of last year and to the Senate Finance Committee in July a plan which I called the pay-as-you-go income-tax plan. This plan is to be applied to individuals, not to corporations. The first problem is how to get our personal income taxes on a current basis without paying 2 years' taxes in 1 year.

Mr. BRYSON. Can that really be done?

Mr. RUML. The answer is as simple as daylight saving. Let us turn our tax clocks ahead 1 year. The taxes we have paid last year out of our 1942 income are taxes on our incomes received in 1941. We can best solve the problem now by recognizing these 1942 payments to be taxes on 1941 as they really are; and by beginning 1943 by paying on 1943, thereby dropping out the year 1942 from the tax calendar forever.

Mr. BRYSON. But that sounds like forgiving everybody 1 year's taxes. Is that what you mean?

Mr. RUML. Not exactly. The tax year of 1942 is gone but not forgiven. I want to stress particularly that the essence of the plan is to make a change in the method of assessing personal income taxes. That change is to assess this year's tax against this year's income. By this change in the method of assessment, the taxpayers go on a current basis and accordingly at the same time they are income tax debt free. Much confusion

has been caused by referring to this change as the "forgiving" of 1 year's taxes. "Forgiving" is a term which I have never used in describing the plan. It suggests, and wrongly, that this year the taxpayers will have a year in which they pay no taxes and that the Treasury will have a year in which it gets no revenue. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Our thinking will be clearer if we think of the plan as a change in the method of assessing income taxes. When we turn the tax clock ahead, we do not stop the clock.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Ruml, last week at his press conference President Roosevelt said that he thought "we are all in favor of getting on to a pay-as-you-go basis," and that a "lot of people think the only way to do it is to forgive the individual either all or a portion of 1 year's taxes * * * but it means the poor old Treasury is out of pocket just that much money." I think we would all like to have your explanation of how we can turn the tax clock ahead as you suggest without hurting the Treasury.

Mr. RUML. First of all, Mr. BRYSON, I feel sure that when the President referred to the Treasury he was not speaking about the old gray building that sits on Pennsylvania Avenue just east of the White House. Nor do I think that he meant the people who work in the building, all the officials and civil servants, who from one point of view are also the Treasury. No; I think he referred to the Treasury as the financial agency of the Government. The Treasury is to the people as a pocketbook is to an individual, an instrument of utility but not an end in itself. And so it is the financial soundness of the Government and, in a special sense, the economic well-being of the country that we must be certain to protect.

Mr. BRYSON. That's right. How do we provide for that?

Mr. RUML. The answer to the question is that we shall all go along paying our income taxes, only they will be on a current basis. The Treasury will also go along getting its revenues. The only difference is that when a taxpayer dies or ceases to receive income he will not owe a tax as he does under the present system. Reduction of tax payment by the taxpayer as a result of setting the tax clock ahead occurs only at some future date, when and as the taxpayer's income ceases or declines. The reduction is therefore spread over the whole lifetime of the present income-tax-paying generations, and occurs beneficially for each taxpayer at the time when his income fails. As for the Treasury, the Treasury has never considered taxes receivable as an asset, and accordingly they can be written off the balance sheet of the Government without the change of a single penny.

Mr. BRYSON. Then there really would be a reduction in the long run. What would it amount to, say, for a generation of taxpayers?

Mr. RUML. If we study the consequences of the plan over the generation we find that since the loss would be spread over a period of some 35 to 50 years, the gross amount of $8,000,000,000 estimated as tax liabilities on 1942 income would amount to an average of only $180,000,000 to $220,000,000 a year. The first big loss would come, if at all, in the year of a post-war depression, and it would occur as a timely adjustment both for the economic welfare of the Nation and for the help of each individual taxpayer whose income has suffered reduction. Another way of looking at it is that the loss over a generation would be about the same as 1 month's current expenditure. It seems a small cost to achieve a basic income-tax reform, preserving the integrity of the income-tax system, making possible other badly needed wartime tax measures, and affecting beneficially 27,000,000 citizens.

Mr. BRYSON. Would there be any way of cutting down the unavoidable loss—the gross loss?

Mr. RUML. The gross loss of revenue in any case would be partially offset by better tax collection and collection methods and also by recoveries through the estate tax of part of what would otherwise have been payable as income tax. Many people feel that these offsets to the gross loss would be very substantial indeed, particularly if a high withholding tax is promptly adopted.

Mr. BRYSON. I take it then, Mr. Ruml, that you do not believe that the adoption of your suggestion for a pay-as-you-go income-tax plan would hurt the financial soundness of the Government or the economic well-being of the country.

Mr. RUML. That is correct, Mr. BRYSON, for the reasons which I have given.

Mr. BRYSON. Of course, there are other suggestions for pay-as-you-go plans. Some people seem to feel that it would be better to defer the tax on 1942 income rather than cancel it. We might pay it gradually, say, in 5 years.

Mr. RUML. This criticism of the plan that has been made by some, but not to my knowledge by the Treasury, stems from a feeling that somehow it is wrong to cancel a debt. These critics would like to get on a pay-as-you-go basis in 1943, but retain the tax liability for 1942 as well, although they recognize that it must be deferred or spread over many years. The effect of all such proposals is to complicate the problem, to leave a disagreeable debt overhanging millions of taxpayers—a debt that would be a perpetual football of politics—and to increase beyond the will of Congress, as expressed in legislated income-tax rates, the burden of payments to the Federal Government assessed on the individual taxpayer.

Mr. BRYSON. Are you suggesting that it may not always be wise for a creditor to insist on the payment of a debt?

Mr. RUML. The feeling that it is somehow wrong to cancel a debt runs very deep and it is respected in quarters where the feeling itself is not shared. It is not easy to find the reason. Certainly it is a common practice, as evidenced by the experience of banks and other commercial institutions, to reorganize debtor-creditor relations without prejudice, upon the initiative of either party, whenever it becomes necessary in furthering the best continuing interests of both. Removal of debt liabilities in this way is considered a means of preserving the integrity of the relationship and a recognition of joint interest in a future welfare. It avoids the deceit and bitterness characteristic of evasion and default.

Certainly the canceling of debt in order to further the welfare of all concerned has had the high approval of age-old moral authorities.

Mr. BRYSON. That's certainly true.

Mr. RUML. There is also a special reason why the liabilities which have arisen under our income-tax procedure may properly be set aside as I have suggested. These liabilities are not debts, such as those which arise in the exchange of money, property, or services between private individuals. They cannot be removed by bankruptcy proceedings. On the contrary, they are the result of a unilaterally imposed levy by a legislative body under a traditional practice of assessment recognized by all to be defective. There would therefore appear to be neither practical nor ethical grounds of a general character for not changing the basis of assessment of income tax and removing the old income-tax liability if that seems the best way of solving our problem. Moreover, in view of the defect and delay in our income-tax law, there is sound and just reason why the correction should now be made.

Mr. BRYSON. Don't you feel that it would be desirable to have a withholding tax or payment at the source as part of our tax program? Why not ask our employers to take the taxes out of our wages?

Mr. RUML. Most people feel that a withholding tax at a high rate is important in keeping taxpayers current. I have from the beginning favored withholding or collection at the source, and have said so. I think collection at the source improves the pay-as-you-go plan because it makes it easier for people to keep on a pay-as-you-go basis, and if we want a withholding tax at a high rate the pay-as-you-go plan does solve the problem of having a withholding tax without having some amount of double taxation; that is, of paying 2 years' taxes in one. However, if a withholding-tax provision at a high rate turns out to be either undesirable or impractical, the pay-as-you-go plan stands on its own feet as a sound method of getting the country free of income-tax debt.

Mr. BRYSON. What about inflation, Mr. Ruml? That's still a danger in the minds of a great many people. Would your plan affect that problem?

Mr. RUML. I do not believe that pay-as-you-go plan would lead to inflation. The only persons who would have more cash on hand under the plan are the few who have saved up for their income taxes, and who hold them in ready cash. These are few indeed, and they are not spendthrifts. On the contrary, it is a matter of common observation that the American people will not spend their savings or their War bond purchases when they have once been acquired except under conditions of real economic pressure. Striking evidence of this is found in the familiar Christmas savings clubs, where money is purposely saved to buy Christmas presents; and yet when the time for expenditure comes, under all the pressure of the holiday season and in spite of the identification of the savings with the season, only 30 percent of the Christmas club resources are actually spent for consumer purchases. As a matter of fact, since the pay-as-you-go plan will make withholding taxes possible at a high level, and since we will be collecting for 1943 in 1943, the total effect will be anti-inflationary rather than otherwise.

Mr. BRYSON. All right, suppose we do decide to turn the tax clock ahead, and assess this year's tax on this year's income instead of on last year's, there are still difficulties. How can we pay our income taxes on a current basis when we do not know at the beginning of a year what our income is going to be in that year? How do we figure what we owe the Government?

Mr. RUML. The way of solving this problem is not too difficult. We will go ahead as we do today, filing an income-tax schedule about the 15th of March declaring our previous year's income. But this will be a tentative return for the year then beginning and we will pay our current taxes on the basis of this tentative return. After the year had ended there would have to be an adjustment up or down depending on whether our actual income for the year was greater or less than that on our tentative return. But this adjustment would be made on the same blank and at the same time as our return for the following year. This return would be, at one time, the final return for the old year and the tentative return for the new. There would be no doubling of returns involved and only a few extra lines for the adjustment computations.

Mr. BRYSON. It doesn't sound as if it would be much more difficult than what we have to do now.

Mr. RUML. It won't be.

Mr. BRYSON. But some taxpayers will have sharp reductions or increases in their regular income after the year has already started. What will you do about them?

Mr. RUML. One feature of the plan is the provision for relief in case a taxpayer knows his income in the current year is going to be less or greater than that of the year of his tentative declarations. The plan provides that he may declare his true knowledge of lower or higher income, as a result of salary

changes, and so forth, which have actually occurred, and make his current payments accordingly. This provision eliminates the awkwardness of avoidable year-end adjustments and keeps the plan closer to a true pay-as-you-go basis than it would otherwise.

Mr. BRYSON. What about windfall cases; I mean cases where a taxpayer's income for some reason was very much greater in 1942 than in either the year that preceded or that followed. What would you do about such a case?

Mr. RUML. The plan includes special provisions for minimizing objectionable windfall cases. These provisions were not included in the original plan and have been added to meet a widespread feeling that, even though the number of cases be few, it is desirable to guard against them. To meet this feeling, I have made three suggestions for handling these windfall cases.

Mr. BRYSON. But suppose these three special rules do catch all of the most objectionable windfall cases. There may still be a few remaining cases of too much good luck for somebody. What then?

Mr. RUML. Much as I dislike "windfalls," even if they can be entirely eliminated, I am still for the plan. In all fairness, we should not refuse to do good for millions simply because we will be doing too much good for a few that don't deserve it.

Mr. BRYSON. Does the plan apply to everybody, to all taxpayers?

Mr. RUML. The pay-as-you-go income-tax plan proposes to give equal treatment to all taxpayers under the plan. This means to skip a tax year for all alike in every bracket and start the whole country income-tax debt free.

Mr. BRYSON. For the lower brackets?

Mr. RUML. For those in the lower brackets, the plan will obviously have far-reaching beneficial results, since unfortunate circumstances of loss of income will not be doubly unfortunate because of last year's debt.

Mr. BRYSON. And the middle brackets?

Mr. RUML. For those in the middle brackets, the plan will eliminate countless personal and family tragedies, free many able citizens for public service, and step up the efficiency of American industry by making possible the retirement and pensioning of executives who are holding on, largely to pay their income tax * * * and never catching up.

Mr. BRYSON. What about those who pay really heavy taxes?

Mr. RUML. For those in the upper brackets, it will make much less practical difference than might appear. First, because, like anybody else, as long as they have their income, they continue to pay their taxes, and, when they die, what otherwise would have been payable as income tax on the taxpayer's previous year's income is subject to estate taxes in its highest brackets. The reason I favor over-all application of the principle is because it gives equal treatment to all taxpayers under the plan. In adopting pay-as-you-go by skipping a year, I believe we should treat all citizens alike. As we turn the tax clock ahead for some, we should turn it ahead for all, and get the whole Nation out of income-tax debt as of the beginning of 1943. Insofar as we want more equality of income and of wealth, we can have these through the progressive income tax and the progressive estate tax, but we should not use this general income-tax reform, pay-as-you-go, unequally to accelerate indirectly the impact of progressive taxation. Let us achieve such leveling, or lack of it, as we desire, directly through legislative action on measures explicitly drawn to serve that purpose.

Mr. BRYSON. Let us take a concrete case. Here is a married man with one dependent that made $2,400 in 1942 and who makes the same amount in 1943. What would he pay under the present plan and what would he pay under pay-as-you-go?

Mr. RUML. This taxpayer would pay $129 under pay-as-you-go, exactly the same amount as under the present system, only it would be a tax on his 1943 income instead of 1942. At the end of the year he would be free of income-tax debt instead of owing a year's taxes as the present system requires.

Mr. BRYSON. Suppose this man's income dropped because of lay-off so that in 1943 he only had $1,900 instead of $2,400. What would his tax be?

Mr. RUML. His tax would be $42 in 1943 instead of $129 as under the present system, and still at the end of the year he would be free of income-tax debt instead of owing a year's taxes as he does under the present system.

Mr. BRYSON. Do I understand that if the pay-as-you-go plan goes through, we will all have to make an income-tax return and a quarterly on March 15 just as under the present system?

Mr. RUML. You certainly will. The pay-as-you-go plan provides for identically the same declaration on March 15 as the present system. The only difference is that it is a tentative return for 1943 instead of a final return for 1942. But this means you will owe nothing for last year and what you are paying on March 15 is a payment for tax on your 1943 current income.

Mr. BRYSON. There are many citizens whose income is irregular. What about farmers, contractors, and professional men? How do they calculate what they owe?

Mr. RUML. Farmers, contractors, and professional men would be on a current basis just like everybody else. But the method of collection should be adapted to the kinds of income. For example, deduction at the source would be a good plan for salaries, wages, and dividends. Professional men and contractors could be on a quarterly basis as at present, using their last year's income as a basis for a tentative declaration and making a year-end adjustment. Farmers should be aided by having their payments come due when their receipts come in. But in every case we should all of us pay our income tax in any year on the income of that year and not be a year in debt.

Mr. BRYSON. Broadly speaking, what will the plan accomplish?

Mr. RUML. The pay-as-you-go income-tax plan is a three-way plan; as I have said, it applies only to individuals and not to corporations. First of all, it is a plan that will relieve thousands of citizens from hardship and distress arising from income-tax debt, and that will bring peace of mind to millions more who are in income-tax-debt danger.

Mr. BRYSON. And there are also advantages to the Government?

Mr. RUML. Yes, for the Government, too. It is a method for clearing the decks for an all-out war-financing program. If we can all be free of income-tax debt on the first of next year, w can start on a pay-as-you-go basis and stay there. If we need high withholding taxes we can have them; if we need to supplement voluntary savings with compulsory savings, we can do that, too. But, whatever is called for, it would be paid out of the current year's income, as an assessment on the same year's income. We would not be paying for dead horses while we are fighting a war.

Mr. BRYSON. What about the post-war period?

Mr. RUML. The pay-as-you-go income-tax plan is the best kind of financial planning for the post-war period. Our policies can then be forward looking, not backward looking. We will not be trying to collect income taxes from people who are unemployed. We will not have a spending spree in the first little boomlet, financed on unpaid taxes, and then a tax debt headache if income should drop off for a year or so.

Mr. BRYSON. But, Mr. Ruml, why did such a plan as this have to wait so long for someone to propose it?

Mr. RUML. As I said earlier, when the income-tax law was passed in 1913 it had this defect of paying income tax assessed on last year's income. At the time the defect was of no practical consequence because income-tax rates were low and affected comparatively few people. In 1913 the rates began at 1 percent and the top (normal and surtax) was 7 percent. Exemption for a single person was $3,000. It is only with the recent high tax rates and the lowered exemption that the problem of income tax debt has become so acute and so general that we must eliminate it.

Mr. BRYSON. What are the chances of pay-as-you-go in 1943?

Mr. RUML. The chances of getting the new year 1943 on a pay-as-you-go basis seem to me distinctly good. I feel that a pay-as-you-go plan in a form acceptable to Congress will certainly be adopted, because income taxpayers want to pay their taxes on a current basis, they want to be free of income-tax debt, and they know it can be done without hurting the Treasury and without paying 2 years' taxes in 1. The taxpayers know that pay-as-you-go solves the problem simply and fairly by skipping an income-tax year. They know the whole trouble was caused by a basic defect in our income-tax law which has existed from the beginning, that of paying a tax on last year's income out of this year's receipts.

This defect was not their fault and they know it. They want it corrected and they want to be on a pay-as-you-go basis in 1943.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General, at the diamond jubilee dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, Cincinnati, Ohio, March 17, 1943:

In past years, events have always conspired to keep me and the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Cincinnati from getting together. However, the happy coincidence of your diamond jubilee and my visit, banishes all regret about the past. It pleases me to realize that for so long a period the Irish of Cincinnati have been making their collective contribution to the growth of this wonderful State of Ohio. The attraction of so many millions of people to the relatively small area of Ohio testifies to the wealth and variety of resources here. Ohio is really a little world, and much more a cohesive, economic, and governmental unit than most of the small independent nations in other parts of the world. The number and high quality of your colleges and universities prove how well you have done with what you have. And, may I add, that your colleges and universities have done well with what was given to them. Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Harrison, McKinley, Taft, and Harding, all Presidents of this great Nation, were products of Ohio. Seven Presidents compose a great number for one State, and I am given to believe you have not a few around here who are clamoring to be your eighth.

This is March the 17th. Those words roll easily off the tongue of every Irishman. Visions of shamrock and green field grip his imagination, and his mind fastens upon the good deed and the kind word, which in his experience have characterized the Irish. From banquet tables in every part of the world tonight, words of fulsome praise and commendation for the Irish fill the air. Tonight they are saying, "The Irish are a great people; there's nobody like the Irish; an Irishman will never let you down; come, drink a toast to the grandest people God ever placed upon the earth."

These are the sentiments expressed so often tonight. True enough for the most part, they are being expressed by the Irish themselves.

But no one of different stock resents the 17th of March, and no one resents the mutual admiration that goes on among the Irish on this day. Everyone knows that the spirit of these affairs is not the spirit of narrow race consciousness nor of blood superiority. Dwelling at every place in this dining hall and inspiring the sentiments that flow from the lips of every diner is the spirit not of a thundering military god urging the conquest of your fellow man. The spirit is the spirit of St. Patrick, the spirit of a saint urging love and good fellowship for Irish and non-Irish alike. That is why no one resents the high talk that fills the air. They know that if the Irish are claiming to be anything superior, they are claiming to be saints, and the humor of it is apparent. The simple truth is that the way the Irish describe themselves on St. Patrick's Day is the way they would like themselves to be. This is to their credit, for you cannot achieve an ideal unless you have one.

The limited goal of material comfort may be enough to satisfy the soul hunger of one people. Another nation more ambitiously embraces the ideal of military conquest. The Irish are content with a saint. A saint is their ideal because a saint is one who loves his fellow man and wants to be happy and to laugh with him. That's the Irish sense of humor; it is a sense of values. It is something the Irish should cherish and have a right to be proud of. It operates day in and day out to the common good. To my mind it is their outstanding contribution.

It is what makes an Irishman feel so strongly the personal relationships he develops. An Irishman's loyalty preserves the tie that binds him to another soul even in the face of the most damaging revelations. It is a beautiful poetic instinct. The Irishman has often carried it to extremes to the detriment of himself and society.

Many times in my career have I seen Irishmen in public life accused of corruption and pilloried in the press, whose basic fault was loyalty. It is something the average Irishman should be very careful about, especially in these times when the support he lends or denies may be the added weight in the balance of a decision that is not merely policy-making or superficial but fundamental in its purpose and effect. The duty to be steadfast and thoughtful should be a matter of constant reflection on the part of the businessman, as well as the politician and the humble citizen. It is in times like these that the good things of the past are in jeopardy, and traditions are washed away. And the Irish have a great tradition.

In the Christian era, it extends back to the fifth century when the barbarians from the north and the east conquered the Roman Empire, and spread disorder and havoc throughout civilized Europe. Law and order were gone, and governmental authority no longer existed. The Dark Ages had begun. Force was the first and last rule of authority. The weak man pledged his support to the strong man in return for physical protection. The strong man pledged his support to a stronger man in return for his protection. And so was forged a long line of law and order by private contracts. It came to be known as feudalism. It took centuries for it to gain stability. Meanwhile, the best-willed of men in Europe had little or no time to concern themselves with anything more than bread and safety. But over in the Emerald Isle, the Irish monks in their monasteries, dedicated to the ideal of a saint, were working tirelessly, preserving the wisdom and learning of previous centuries. Scholars all over the world recognize this debt of mankind to the Irish followers of Saint Patrick. And yet, in my humble opinion, the natural friendliness, the sense of humor, the ideal of a saint, that every good Irishman aspires to, count for a greater sum total in the common good.

The cultural leanings of the Irish continue to yield fruit, of course. Just a few weeks ago I read the statement in the book section of the New York Times that the foremost poet, the foremost novelist and the foremost playwright of modern English literature have been Irishmen. The name of our own illustrious Eugene O'Neill was not needed to make that statement true. It may still be a surprise to some but the Irish prove that the ideal of a saint is the greatest incentive to the pursuit of truth and culture.

From this same ideal springs the deep feelings of patriotism that have long characterized the Irish. In the recent motion picture, Yankee Doodle Dandy, the President makes the statement: "I have always admired the patriotism of you Irish-Americans. You wear it on your sleeve for all to witness." Yes, and the Irish have proved the genuineness of their patriotism on every battlefield in American history. Of no true Irishman can the cynical observation be made that "friendship is a myth and gratitude a lost art."

In the Revolutionary, Civil, and World Wars the Irish have not been laggard in their sacrifice or puny in their exploits. Daring disregard of personal interest was thrillingly demonstrated during the Revolution in the bold and effective exploits of a true Irish general, Mad Anthony Wayne, to mention but one. During the Civil War the march of the Confederate forces up the Shenandoah Valley threatened the security of the Capital at Washington for three years until the Irish general, Phil Sheridan, was called to the scene and turned a Union defeat into a remarkable victory at Cedar Creek and secured the safety of Washington from that moment. His accomplishments came at a time when Abraham Lincoln was despairing of reelection and the future of the Union was in doubt. The little, courageous Irish general became the symbol of ultimate Union victory and Lincoln was reelected. From Cedar Creek, Sheridan led his army over to aid Grant on the Richmond front where Grant was suffering tremendous losses. Sheridan routed Lee's forces and Grant took Richmond and made the long overdue peace at Appomattox.

The military contribution of the Irish in the present struggle is too fresh in the minds of all of us to be recounted. And yet in this first St. Patrick's night after the event we are compelled to express our thrilled respect to the Sullivans of Iowa. Probably at this very moment Mr. Sullivan is joined with other Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in a toast to the great saint whose spiritual example can be a consolation for the loss of five sons. And while he drinks his toast in manly fashion, Mrs. Sullivan, wherever she may be, repeats a prayer, over and over in her heart, for her boys. Their loss is so overwhelming as to make any attempt to console her seem sacrilegious. Yet I'm sure she will permit us to call to her attention the splendid words of a great soul to another mother.

From Abraham Lincoln to Mrs. Bixley, who had lost five sons in the Civil War, came that immortal letter on November 21, 1864:

"DEAR MADAM: I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming, but I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage that anguish of your bereavement and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

"Yours very sincerely
"and respectfully,
"ABRAHAM LINCOLN."

As it is the soul of a Sullivan that provides the price for victory, it is that same soul that will make a peace worth while. All America should join with the Sullivans in their prayer that the war's end will be hastened and other mothers spared the sacrifice that Mrs. Sullivan so gallantly sustains.

You and I are more interested in that than we are in answering the question constantly put: When do you think the war will end? It is futile to try to predict when the war will end. Every American must do his utmost to help win the war in the shortest possible time at the lowest possible cost of life, for the harder we work the sooner will our victory come. While everything considered, we have done reasonably well to date, we could and should have done much better.

A good word of advice for America at this moment, I take appropriately from the words of a man who was a great wartime Governor of your own Ohio. Incidentally, he is the man who, in my opinion, should have been the eighth President from Ohio, the Honorable James M. Cox.

In a recent editorial he made this pertinent observation: "The bull's-eye of our every endeavor must be to win this war and to win it in ways and methods clearly above the suspicion of politics. This question can well await at least a year. The American people will cross that bridge when they see the water."

I sincerely believe that most Americans are willing to pay in labor, wealth, and with their lives if necessary, whatever the frightful cost is to preserve our freedom by defeating the enemy. There are still a few, however, who are more insistent on personal gains than national victory. No one, whether he is a manufacturer or a laborer, should make an unfair profit out of this war. This is a time for sacrifice, not avarice, and for equality of sacrifice for all Americans.

I am proud to stand here tonight and be able to say, supported by the record, that the Irish as a group are ready and willing to equal any sacrifice necessary to the fulfillment of our national purpose. We say this not in boast but in the truest sense of noblesse oblige. If we speak of sacrifice, we must make sacrifice, and it is a rare Irishman who falls into contradiction in this respect.

But, as I have said and as I want to emphasize, it is not the literary talents or cultural accomplishments of the Irish race, or their exploits and sacrifices on the battlefield, that justify a celebration on March 17. These are just the bright excesses of a spirit that dwells in the heart of the true Irishman day by day. It is the spirit that makes the Irish nature alien to any conspiracy against their fellowmen. Conspiracy to conquer by arms and conspiracy to conquer by seduction and pollution are equally repulsive to Irish sensibilities. Every true Irish design for living is sure to pro-

vide for all men on equal terms in a brotherhood of man forged with mutual love and inspired by a faith in God. It is the spirit of St. Patrick and the faith of our fathers, and it is the greatest contribution of the Irish because even as they preserved and disseminated it centuries ago, they are today imposed with the duty to hold fast.

Paganism and cynicism spread within our midst. The most learned scientists profess to learn that faith alone can be the final solvent of ultimate problems, but the less wise abound and look upon it as an outmoded escape of the ignorant.

This has been the era of realism and the Irish are incurably romantic. But realism leads to defeatism. Defeatism breeds cynicism and a lack of faith, not only in God, but in one's fellowman. The despair that follows is the source of those reckless plans to control by conquest and to conquer by seduction. The Irish, for all their romanticism, will prove a stabilizing force in the center of the Ship of State, because the Irish have an immovable faith in God without which there can be no faith in man.

This truth was very eloquently subscribed to recently by the head of the Church of England. A series of advertisements were placed in the press by an industrial organization, each quoting a leading figure on the goals he would set before mankind. The last was a message from the Archbishop of Canterbury. After expressing all the ambitions and Christian objectives which are so frequently these days held forth by groups which renounce religious faith, this wise churchman appended a footnote in which he stated that he would be more than misleading if he did not make clear his belief that there can be no hope of achieving these Christlike objectives through persons or groups who do not accept Christian principles.

No one has shown a greater appreciation of that truth than the Irish. Through all the vicissitudes of this hard and difficult life, under the heavy pressure of providing home and shelter for his family, the Irishman has clung tenaciously to his fundamentals. He has wavered many times in his actions as is the weakness of human nature, but always has he rebounded to the faith. Rare is the Irishman who is made incurably hard by the difficulties of life. And the term "sophisticated Irishman" carries an air of contradiction. The Irish personality is rarely guilty of that vice which Pope Pius in his Christmas message pointedly described as "icy egoism."

Nations have been made great by technical skill, industry, cultural accomplishments, and valor on the battlefield, but a man is made great by none of these things. It is simplicity, honesty, loyalty, and a sense of values that make a man great.

And while the Irish have added their quota of the ingredients that have made America great as a nation, it is not for that reason that I salute them tonight.

Germany and Japan have technical skill, industry, and military valor in high degrees. And, in the fashion of speaking, they are great nations. From their examples it is clear that great nations are not the need of the day. If they were, there would need be no war. We are fighting, in a sense, against the greatness of nations. We are fighting for the greatness of men, that great men may be free to grow and to enrich their fellows' lives.

The qualities that make great men are to be found in abundance in the Irish race. It is for these that I salute them, and am happy to be here tonight. Here tonight to honor and respect the greatest of them all—the ideal of all Irishmen, and our pattern of the kind of man we are fighting for—the humble, simple, faithful, loyal, and friendly St. Patrick.

Canadian Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following comments from the Brockton (Mass.) Enterprise, of February 25, 1943, in reference to the Canadian system of price control:

The details of how Canada is handling prices and wages to prevent inflation were again described by Donald Gordon, the Dominion price director, in a public address in Chicago recently, and it seems worth while to describe the Canadian method in this column again.

The chief characteristic of the Canadian system is its extraordinary simplicity. They have not gone in for complicated regulations, questionnaires, reports, mathematical formulas, and the other totally unnecessary trappings of the American system.

They simply declared that no prices could rise above the maximum of the basic period, September 15–October 11, 1941; that no wages could rise above the levels of mid-November 1941, except by government approval, on a simple formula related to the cost of living, and stuck to those two elementary rules that anybody can understand.

The wage formula is for an increase or decrease of 25 cents a week for each point of rise or fall in the index of the cost of living. Nothing else counts. There are no exceptions, no talking about inequities, maladjustments, and the like in the style of our War Labor Board.

They turned the administration of this very simple and direct system over to businessmen, and they are policing the price regulations through the citizenry.

Any dealer in any commodity who tries to gouge his customers, or any black marketeer, is reported by customers to the local enforcement board, which is operated by a reputable local businessman, and the board chairman does the rest. The dealer gets in line or his shop is closed by the Government.

When the price regulations mean manufacturers, middlemen or retailers, must operate at a loss the Government steps in with subsidies but this operates only with regard to essential goods. Thus luxury goods are slowly disappearing.

As a result the cost of living in Canada has remained almost stationary since the first of December of 1941, and there has been only one large arbitrary and embarrassing labor demand for higher wages and that was settled by Government intervention.

Rationing now applies in Canada to tea, coffee, butter and gasoline, but the Government is prepared to ration other commodities if necessity arises.

The essence of the simplicity and the success of the Canadian plan for preventing inflation is that the Government knows businessmen and industrialists are experienced and well trained, believes they are honest and trusts them to work patriotically for the nation.

Thus they are spared the necessity of the Americain way of hiring college professors, modernistic economists, ideologists, politicians and their friends to do the job.

Increased Flaxseed Greatly Needed for Construction of Ships and Planes, To Fire Guns and for Farm Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article and recent radio talk by Mr. M. W. Thatcher, vice chairman of the national executive council of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America. His address is 1923 University Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.

Flax is vital to the actual conduct of the war, and unless the country awakens to the seriousness of the problem, the results will constitute another American tragedy.

I think the American public should know more of this critical need for flax and suggested means of increasing its production. Mr. Thatcher's excellent talk will give the interesting picture of this important and greatly needed crop.

His contributions follow:

AN AMERICAN TRAGEDY

The Congress is confronted on all sides with tragic situations. It is our duty to call one of these situations to your immediate attention while there is yet time to satisfactorily meet it. This matter is in the hands of the Congress, and it must bear the responsibility.

Planes and ships cannot be built or guns fired without linseed oil. We can have no linseed oil without the production of flaxseed, and we will have no flaxseed unless the farmers produce it. Farmers who intended to put in flaxseed this spring are so confused with backing and filling in Washington, and the lack of proper support from Congress, that thousands of farmers who had intended to produce flaxseed this year are disgusted and will put their land to other use.

Figures which show that many farmers are now abandoning production of flaxseed this year are supported by reports which we have received from the triple-A offices and the county agents in the four central Northwest States. We are informed that all of this information has been filed with the United States Department of Agriculture and, therefore, is available to you.

THE CRITICAL NEED FOR FLAXSEED

A careful survey shows that we need a minimum of 50,000,000 bushels of flaxseed. We need the linseed oil as a drying oil, essential to the construction of ships and planes. We need it to fire guns. There is a tremendous shortage of oil meal—from flaxseed—as a protein requirement in the feeding of meat animals and milk cows. Farmers are begging for oil meal and linseed cake, a by-product of flaxseed. A lack of it is a lack of meat and dairy products.

A minimum of 50,000,000 bushels of flaxseed is required in production this year if we are to have the required amount of linseed oil and the million tons of oil meal, as a byproduct of 50,000,000 bushels of flaxseed crushed for oil.

Ships, planes, gun firing, meat products, dairy products—in maximum production—

depend upon a supply of 50,000,000 bushels of flaxseed.

PRODUCTION

Nearly three-fourths of the flaxseed produced in the United States comes from the Dakotas, Minnesota, and Montana. Seeding will be over within the next 6 weeks. The responsibility of Congress must be met within the next 2 weeks, in order to induce the farmer to make his plans for seeding this crop, if we are to have it.

Flaxseed is the most hazardous crop the farmer can undertake, as official production records show. Before the war, the average production in the United States for the period 1937–41 was 19,500,000 bushels and for the same period the annual average importation from Argentina was 16,500,000 bushels and the annual crushing of flaxseed for oil and oil meal was 33,870,000 bushels.

Prior to that period, 1937–41, the annual production of flaxseed in the United States, from 1926 through 1936, was as follows:

	Bushels
1926	18,531,000
1927	25,174,000
1928	19,118,000
1929	15,924,000
1930	21,673,000
1931	11,755,000
1932	11,511,000
1933	6,904,000
1934	5,661,000
1935	14,520,000
1936	5,273,000

To give you the bad years, they are as follows:

	Bushels
1933	6,904,000
1934	5,661,000
1936	5,273,000
1937	7,089,000
1938	8,152,000

Yet, in this war year of 1943, we need 50,000,000 bushels. If that won't scare Congress, nothing will.

IMPORTATION OF FLAXSEED

Historically, we have imported close to one-half of our requirements from Argentina. That country now has 116,000,000 bushels on hand, but that does not help us any more than the surplus of coffee that now exists in Brazil. We have no way of getting the supplies in the amount we need from South America because of lack of ships.

Canada has only 7,000,000 bushels on hand, half of which is in elevators in shipping position and the other half in the hands of farmers. That's a small supply, compared to our needs, and Canada is holding on to that small supply for seed, awaiting the outcome of 1943 production. England is calling upon Canada for some of that small supply.

EXPORTS

We are shipping large quantities of oils out of this country to our allies. England is clamoring for edible oils, such as soybean oil and cottonseed oil. It does not want any linseed oil for edible purposes. Strangely enough, however, Russia is buying tremendous quantities of oil from us, including linseed oil, which it accepts gladly for edible purposes.

FATS AND OILS

It will be seen that linseed oil is not only essential for our armed forces, in the construction of planes and ships and firing guns, but it also enters the total field of fats and oils because Russia will take linseed oil as an edible product and thus require less from us in soybean and cottonseed oil, which our country and Britain so urgently need for the food supply.

INDUCEMENTS

The farmers in the Central Northwest States (the Dakotas, Montana, and Minnesota) were ready to put in an all-time record seeding on 5,000,000 acres, against a normal national acreage of about 2,500,000 and a 1941 acreage of 3,000,000 and 1942 acreage of 4,500,000. They had planned to put in this 5,000,000 acres because of the following inducements:

1. Patriotism to meet the war-goal acreage.
2. Minimum prices guaranteed by the Commodity Credit Corporation.
3. Incentive payments of $10 per acre in excess of 90 percent of their war-goal allotment.
4. A type of loan which carried partial crop insurance, to be made available by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.

RESTRAINTS

But what's happened? After the Secretary of Agriculture, in good faith, announced the programs to the farmer which called for this great acreage in flaxseed, the newspapers report that the Congress is running out on the incentive payments. To illustrate: A farmer has a war goal for flaxseed of 100 acres; 90 percent of the goal would be 90 acres. If that farmer put in 110 acres, he would have 20 acres in excess of the 90-percent goal. The Secretary of Agriculture promised an incentive payment of $10 per acre on the 20 acres in excess of his goal, or $200. So far the Congress says "No."

The Rural Agricultural Credit Corporation has offered a loan program that, in substance, states to the flaxseed farmer, "You put up your land, your personal labor, and your machinery, and we'll make loans to you for hired labor, gasoline, oil, repair parts, and if the crop does not come through, upon proper proof of loss, we'll cancel the loan."

The banking fraternity, learning of this, moved in on Washington. In substance they said, "Our banks are bulging with money which we'll loan," and implied that if the Government was going to put out a type of credit which would interfere with the banks loaning money and making some profit, that the banks would be less inclined to participate in the buying of Government wartime bonds.

This worried the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, who condemned this type of crop-insurance credit just referred to, and stated that the banks ought to have the first crack at this job. We know of no banks willing to make a loan to a farmer for putting in a risk crop, such as flaxseed, in support of the war effort, and assume any risk in connection with the crop—and they shouldn't.

Some Members of both the Senate and House have condemned as loose credit this type of loan, designed to help the production of this war crop. People who condemn it have failed to understand that this was offered as incentive credit, with partial crop insurance, as a means of trying to assure this Nation and the war effort the needed supply of this most critical farm war crop.

There is a natural area where flaxseed is regularly seeded, as a part of the farm rotation plan of production, and this covers about two to two and a half million acres, if prices are reasonably in line with other farm commodities. We are concerning ourselves with that extra 3,000,000 acres that we want seeded to flaxseed, the bulk of which will not come through or be put into production except with special incentive programs.

We repeat, there were three incentives to bring in this extra production: Patriotism; the $10-per-acre bonus for excess acreage seeded to flaxseed; and war-risk credit offered by Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, which has been so roundly condemned by people who do not thoroughly understand what's involved. This includes farm organizations, as well as some Members of the Senate and the House, who have looked upon this loan program as a banking transaction, or who believed in the philosophy that if there was a horizontal increase in all agricultural prices, everything would just be lovely.

A 12-percent increase in all agricultural farm prices will not solve the critical situation of how we may be sure that 5,500,000 acres of farm lands will be put into flaxseed production. It is a sick spot and must be treated as a sick spot. The failure of the Congress to appropriate the incentive payments, the bonus to the farmers for exceeding 90 percent of their acreage goal, and the modification of the original war-risk loan program, put out by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, has thoroughly confused thousands of farmers who had intended to put in flaxseed this spring. One of the modifications, as a palliative to the bankers, is found in the instructions recently sent to the county war boards, that the county banks shall appoint one of their members as a consultant to the county war board. The farmer is required to state that he can't get credit elsewhere.

Of course, that has only one effect, to drive the farmers away from the county war board, which will find these farmers putting in a less risky crop than flaxseed, and thus we'll have less acres planted in flaxseed. In this case the bankers and certain Members of the Congress scared the bureaucrats into doing something that they should have had the courage not to do. They should have given the bankers and certain Members of the Congress the facts and also got that information to the people of the United States, so that the people could know something about the "fiddling while Rome burns."

FAITH IN GOVERNMENT

What faith can the farmer have in the United States Department of Agriculture when, after having carefully analyzed farm-production requirements and possibilities for the following year, and after having pledged the faith of the United States Government to the farmers that the Government would do certain things, under certain conditions, the farmer finds that a few Members of Congress and some bankers could cause a right-about-face in policy, with the Government failing to go through with its pledged word, and the Congress of the United States contributes its efforts to that failure? What faith can the farmers of the United States have, from here on out, in that branch of our Government?

Maybe the bureaucrats should have cleared this first with Congress. The point we want to make is that the utter bad faith, if permitted to continue, will disorganize American agriculture more than we have the ability to state and will be most destructive to agricultural production in fields where it is most needed from here on out.

In business a board of directors supports any commitment of the management. If the board of directors doesn't like the actions, it always goes through with the commitment, even though it may then fire the manager. In this case it seems that the Congress ought to go through with the incentive payment to the flaxseed producers and carry out the originally announced war-risk credit to the farmers for the year 1943, and then, if they deem it important enough, fire the Secretary of Agriculture and the bureaucrats.

We have lived with this flaxseed-production problem and the need of flaxseed since a few days immediately following the attack on Pearl Harbor. We fully support the Secretary of Agriculture and the bureaucrats in every way, including incentive payments and the war-risk credit, with partial crop insurance, so far as it relates to flaxseed. From what we have studied we believe that the Secretary of Agriculture and the bureaucrats were also

right as regards the other war-risk crops, such as potatoes, soybeans, dry beans, etc. The failure to carry out these programs appears, so far, to rest upon some Members of Congress, the other farm organizations, the representatives of the bankers, and the unfortunate statement of the Secretary of the Treasury.

DISPARITY

In many cases where private industry was required to convert from peacetime to wartime production the Government purchased land, constructed buildings, and entered into cost-plus contracts to fully protect the interests of the stockholders and the management of those institutions. In addition thereto, most of the labor was paid on a basis of 40 hours a week, with time and a half for overtime on weekdays and double time on Sundays. We support that procedure and that guaranty as urgent and proper, in support of the war effort.

In other cases, the Government pays subsidies to less efficient institutions as an incentive for production. For illustration, in the crushing of soybeans, less efficient plants are paid a subsidy of 25 cents a bushel. Would the same Members of Congress, bankers, and farm organizations condemn paying 25 cents a bushel to farmers as partial crop insurance? War-risk credit, with partial crop insurance to induce farmers to raise flaxseed on so-called marginal land, is the same thing in effect.

Actually, comparable treatment for agriculture, with a war crop such as flaxseed, would be: We must have the flaxseed. We'll buy a farm, furnish machinery, all supplies, and hired help on the same basis as we carried on our program with Mr. Ford, if you'll just agree, and sign a contract, to raise flaxseed, potatoes, dry beans, etc.

Not many Members of Congress protested such a procedure when it applied to private industry. We know of no complaint from the Bankers' Association or the other farm organizations. But just a little incentive and a little protection to the farmers, to induce them to divert some of their production into this essential war crop of flaxseed, brings on all of the hullabaloo, holler, and complaint.

We want to state that it is perhaps unfortunate that the bankers, the other farm organizations, and the Congress were not given the vital information first. We state this because we believe we all are on a parity in our patriotism and our determination to win the war. It isn't too late to correct the disparity. We still have 2 or 3 weeks' time before the farmers seed the land.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

It's pretty well understood that the Office of Price Administration is about to place a ceiling on flaxseed at $3 per bushel. A week ago, the futures price on flaxseed reached $2.93, with premiums for the best grade of flaxseed, that is, high in oil content, up to 25 cents a bushel, making a price of $3.18, Minneapolis. For the last week, both the futures price and the premiums have been dropping, and we suggest that in this regard Office of Price Administration has done a great disservice to the flaxseed producers, both as regards to the price and its effect upon seeding of flaxseed for next year's crop.

CONCLUSIONS

It would appear that everything is being done to discourage production of vital war crops, especially flaxseed. The effects of the proposed program of the Office of Price Administration to cut down the price of flaxseed, the modification of the Rural Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program, which practically destroyed partial crop insurance on this most risky crop, flaxseed, and the determination of the Congress, as carried in newspaper stories, not to support the Secretary of Agriculture on incentive payments, just about combine to do the job of assuring a tremendous drop in acreage which will be planted to flaxseed this year.

Such a loss in acres planted to flaxseed means, of course, a loss in production of this critical war crop. As production becomes less, then we will have less linseed oil to provide the critical drying oils for the construction of ships and planes; less critical oil for firing guns; less oil for fats and oils for domestic requirements, and less oil for the requirements of our allies, together with a smaller supply of oil meal or linseed cake, so essential for the production of meat and dairy products.

There isn't any group of people in the United States that can do anything about solving this problem except the Congress of the United States. A smaller supply than we need could extend the time of war. Extension of the war means more soldiers killed.

There is still about 2 weeks left for the Congress to make its final decision and still provide enough time to give the farmers the information and urge them to plant at least five and a half million acres in flaxseed, which must be completed within just a few weeks if we are to have a minimum production for war needs. To support our statement we are attaching hereto part of the annual report given on December 5, 1942, by the Honorable H. L. Walster as president of the Flax Institute of the United States. Dr. Walster is dean of the State agricultural college at Fargo, N. Dak., and is recognized as the outstanding authority on flaxseed in the United States.

Respectfully submitted.

M. W. THATCHER,
Vice Chairman, National Farmers Union Executive Council; President, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

THE FLAX SITUATION

(By H. L. Walster, president, Flax Institute of the United States)

Flax producers of the United States responded to the call to arms by producing for harvest 4,440,000 acres of flax in 1942, an acreage nearly four and one-half times that harvested in the 10-year period, 1930–39. The average yield per acre, even though severely cut by the leaf rust epidemic, was 9.6 bushels per acre, an average yield just one and one-half times as great as in the 10-year period, 1930–39. But the most gratifying fact was the tremendous increase in production. Bulging bins testify to a national flax production of 42,682,000 bushels, a production more than three and three-fourths times as great as in the 10-year period, 1930–39, and a production more than 35 percent greater than in 1941. Large numbers of flax producers who had experienced the rust epidemic of 1941, or knew about it, and who did not have available to them a seed supply of the more rust-resistant varieties, nevertheless took a chance. The patriotic motive helped tremendously and it will help again in achieving the increased flax goal asked for in 1943.

WHO GREW THE FLAX IN 1942?

Twenty-one and six-tenths percent of the bushels of flax was produced in North Dakota.

Forty and four-tenths percent of the bushels of flax was produced in Minnesota.

Six and three-tenths percent of the bushels of flax was produced in Montana.

Eight and six-tenths percent of the bushels of flax was produced in South Dakota.

Seventy-six and nine-tenths percent of the bushels of flax was produced in those four northwestern States of the North Central region of the United States.

Twenty-three and one-tenth percent of the bushels of flax was produced in the rest of the United States.

North Dakota increased its 1942 harvested flax acres by over 73 percent as compared to 1941, and by nearly 100 percent as compared to the 10-year period of 1930–39. Other States must have done as well or better. My only purpose in furnishing the foregoing figures is to emphasize the fact that, although flax production has spread to other States, notably Texas and California, the Dakotas, Montana, and Minnesota are still the mainstay of the crop, having experienced flax growers ready and willing to expand their acreage whenever a reasonable incentive is provided.

The period 1930–39 was a period of low-average yields of flax in the United States—only 6.4 bushels to the acre as compared to the 40-year period 1890–1939 of 9.9 bushels per acre. In that same 10-year period North Dakota flaxseed yields fell even lower, to only 4.3 bushels to the acre as compared to the 40-year average of 9.1 bushels to the acre.

In the first 20 years of the 40-year period, North Dakota flax yields were 1 or more bushels below the 40-year average 13 times. In the second 20-year period, North Dakota flax yields were 1 or more bushels below the 40-year average 17 times. The period of hazardous production was in the second score of years, during which time North Dakota harvested 13 out of 20 flax yields below 6 bushels to the acre; whereas the national fields fell below 6 bushels per acre only 7 times in that same period.

Those who contend that there is a serious hazard in the production of this vital war crop are absolutely right. If we are to have 6,000,000 acres of this vital war crop in 1943, we shall have to work for it. We ought to have it to get production, for the long-time record of flax yields indicate wide spreads in yields in the last 20 years. A reduction of one-half bushel to the acre on a 6,000,000-acre production is equal to 3,000,000 bushels; if the 1943 national production fell to the national average of the 20-year period 1920–39, we would harvest only 7 bushels to the acre, or only 42,000,000 bushels, which would be 682,000 less bushels than we harvested in 1942. It was the increase of over 1,000,000 acres that gave the United States the increased flax production in 1942 over 1941; the average yield was slightly less. If, then, we are to maintain production at or 15 percent above the 1942 level, we must have more acres in 1943. We must not forget that in the 20-year period 1920–39 flax yields in the United States fell below 7 bushels per acre 10 times. If in 1943 we rely on only 4,440,000 acres of flax, our 1942 harvested acreage, and get only 7 bushels per acre, we shall harvest only 31,080,000 bushels of flax, a figure 11,602,000 below our 1942 production, and over 400,000 bushels below our 1941 production. The Nation cannot afford to take such chances. The farmers who are asked to increase or even maintain flax production are, however, taking broad chances as shown by the historic variations in yields. I, therefore, find myself solidly behind those who champion the idea that all the people must share these chances for this is truly a people's war. The linseed-oil casks of the Nation must be kept filled; if you have ever been near a ship, you realize that the paint brush is in constant use. To keep the oil casks filled all those instrumentalities of government designed to take the chances out of the production of the flax crop must be used—these include the saving and making available of seed of the most disease-resisting varieties, parity price, and crop insurance for flax.

Flaxseed

[In thousands of bushels]

State	Production					
	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1937–41 average
Wisconsin	42	44	121	182	144	107
Minnesota	4,077	4,756	12,230	16,695	14,858	10,523
Iowa	92	146	1,000	2,587	3,438	1,453
North Dakota	1,548	1,370	1,930	3,672	4,576	2,619
South Dakota	228	382	1,296	1,960	2,210	1,215
Kansas	331	377	735	1,314	1,144	780
Montana	43	160	400	770	888	452
California	660	684	1,728	2,814	3,267	1,831
All other	68	233	712	892	960	573
United States	7,089	8,152	20,152	30,886	31,485	19,553
United States net imports	17,861	18,744	13,212	11,198	21,122	16,427
United States crushing	25,870	25,569	30,078	36,645	51,190	33,870
Average farm price	$1.87	$1.59	$1.46	$1.42	$1.72	$1.61
Parity price	$2.26	$2.15	$2.11	$2.13	$2.26	$2.18
Farm price is of parity, percent	83	74	69	67	76	74

UNITED STATES PRODUCTION

	Bushels		Bushels
1926	18,531,000	1932	11,511,000
1927	25,174,000	1933	6,904,000
1928	19,118,000	1934	5,661,000
1929	15,924,000	1935	14,520,000
1930	21,673,000	1936	5,273,000
1931	11,755,000		

Sources: A. M. S. Crop Reports and Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Prepared in Economic Research Section, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Sept. 15, 1942.

Meat-Packing Industry Imperiled Through Failure of Government Departments To Obey Mandates of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture had deliberately conspired to wreck the meat-packing industry of this Nation, they could not have done a better job than is now being accomplished under their policies and regulations. Time and again the gravity of the situation has been pointed out, but the only answer has been more delays and excuses, and additional rules, orders, and regulations.

I doubt that we have ever witnessed a more striking example of bureaucratic inefficiency. It may be comparable in a measure to the program set up for the canning industry. Certainly it is more serious than the recent bread-slicing fiasco. We are faced with a dangerous shortage of meat, although the Nation possesses perhaps the greatest supply of cattle in its history and more than enough hogs to satisfy all needs. Ever since the Office of Price Administration placed ceilings upon retail meat prices but refused to place a ceiling upon livestock, meat processors have been compelled to operate at a loss. In a report filed recently by the Committee on Small Business of the House the startling statement is made that at the present time packers are losing on hogs from $2 to $4 per head slaughtered and on beef from 57 cents to $3.75 per head, depending upon quality. In the March 6 issue of the National Provisioner, which has been the leading publication of the meat-packing and allied industries since 1891, it is reported that for the preceding week the average loss of all packers, large and small, was as follows: $2.44 on hogs weighing 180 to 220 pounds; $2.57 on those weighing 220 to 240 pounds, and $3 on those weighing 240 to 270 pounds. This represented an increased loss of almost 10 percent in 1 week. The loss on beef has also considerably increased since the Committee on Small Business announced the losses quoted in its report. Under a policy which has created these conditions, black-market operations were inevitable, just as inevitable as the closing of packing plants if relief is not forthcoming without further delay.

That you might have some idea of the extent of the damage already done I would call your attention to the fact that a representative of labor testified before the Committee on Small Business that because of the bad price situation packers in the Cincinnati area have reduced employment to only 28 to 30 hours per week although packers have by contract guaranteed 35 hours per week. At least 4,000 persons in the Cincinnati area alone are employed in the packing industry.

The normal volume of business in some instances has been cut as much as 75 percent—and this at a time when there is an increased demand because of the huge requirements of our armed forces and lend-lease. In this connection I desire to point out that the ceiling prices which have been fixed by the Office of Price Administration for processed meats apply not only to purchases by the civilian population but to purchases by the Government itself. On this phase of the subject the Committee on Small Business was particularly critical. Based upon testimony presented to it by representatives of both the Government and industry, that committee reached the conclusion that "the maintenance by Government edict of below cost prices on products which the packer must supply on compulsory Government orders is un-American and cannot be too severely condemned." A distressed packer from Cincinnati sums up the whole situation in these words:

> What a paradoxical situation—production vitally needed by the Government being destroyed by an agency of the Government.

As a further indication of how serious the matter is becoming, I would call your attention to the fact that during recent weeks all federally inspected packers have received set-aside orders requiring them to allocate and give priority to the Army, Navy, and lease-lend of a certain part of their output. These orders, which are already running as high as 40 percent, will necessarily increase as production decreases and packing plants go out of business. But that apparently makes no difference to the Food Administrator, who refuses to place a ceiling upon livestock even after the Price Administrator has recommended it.

If you think, Mr. Speaker, that the dismal outlook for this great industry is confined to those whose business is being jeopardized by bureaucratic decree, I would suggest that you examine the testimony presented to this committee by representatives of the Office of Price Administration itself. The price executive in the Food Division of the Office of Price Administration, when interrogated about the number of meat packers who may be forced out of business under existing regulations, said that he could not give an accurate estimate. He guessed, however, that the number would be somewhere between 20 and 40 percent. Think of it. On the one hand the Food Administrator, who is also the Secretary of Agriculture, is telling the farmers they must increase production 30 percent over last year, while another bureau head is guessing that the policies of his department and those of the Department of Agriculture may force as many as 40 percent of the meat-packing houses of the country out of business. Shades of the little pigs destroyed and every third row of ground plowed under. Apparently the bureaucrats are unmoved in their idealistic planning and devotion to socialistic experiments even by the war itself.

If the bureaus responsible for these deplorable conditions were merely guilty of negligence, incompetence, or bungling, it would be bad enough. But they have gone further than that. They have defied, or at least ignored, the expressed intent of Congress. The Price Control Act of 1942 was amended on October 2, 1942, to provide "that in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a general fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing." In enacting this provision Congress, in more explicit language than is usually employed in general legislation, made it mandatory that processors of agricultural commodities, including livestock, be allowed

an equitable margin of profit. Yet the Office of Price Administration has ignored this provision of the law and is continuing to ignore it. Had this law been obeyed we would not be faced today with a loss of possibly 40 percent of our meat-packing plants, we would not be faced with black-market operations, and we would not be faced with a serious shortage of meat.

But that is not the only respect in which the plain mandate of Congress has been ignored. You will recall that Congress passed an act known as the Small War Plants Corporation Act, which act established a legislative policy designed to protect the small business concerns of the Nation. The Small War Plants Act has been recognized by the Army and Navy. It has been recognized by the Maritime Commission and by various other procurement agencies of the Government, but not by the crystal gazers of the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture. These latter departments cannot help but know that the smaller plants will necessarily be the first victims of their bungling policies, yet they stubbornly refuse to do anything about it. This, I submit, is contrary to the expressed wishes of Congress and a clear violation of the Small War Plants Act.

In enacting the Price Control Act Congress endeavored to place every safeguard against unreasonable price regulations. Among other things we provided for the creation of an emergency court of appeals and for a review of rulings and decisions of the Price Administrator. Although provision is made in that act for the filing of appeals in this court within 30 days after a decision of the Administrator, testimony presented to the Special Committee on Small Business was to the effect that such appeals have been denied, or at least seriously delayed, by the Office of Price Administration by constantly asking petitioners to furnish additional information. In one case information dating back 5 years was demanded. Compliance with such order would necessarily involve considerable delay and expense. To date only 22 cases have reached that court although the court was set up immediately after the passage of the first Price Control Act, which was approved in January 1942.

Let me direct your attention to still another violation of the expressed mandate of Congress. When the Price Control Act was passed it contained a provision in title I, section 2, providing that the Administrator shall—

> Appoint an industry advisory committee, or committees, either national or regional or both, consisting of such number of representatives of the industry as made be necessary in order to constitute a committee truly representative of the industry, or of the industry in such region, as the case may be.

And the said section further provides that—

> The Administrator shall from time to time, at the request of the committee, advise and consult with the committee with respect to the regulation or order, and with respect to the form thereof, and classification, differentiations, and adjustments therein.

This particular violation of the law is referred to in the joint statement and resolution of the Senate House Committees on Small Business, dated March 10, 1943. These committees declared the failure of the Price Administrator to discharge the powers vested in him by Congress to be one of the factors which is threatening to put the meat packers out of business and disrupt the distribution of meat and meat products for essential civilian needs. In the House committee report of February 23, 1943, contained in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A943, it is pointed out that the Office of Price Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture have adequate legislative authority to correct the maladjustment and injustice now in the meat industry, but that they have not worked in close cooperation and have differed on important questions of policy. In the language of the committee:

> There is as between the Office of Price Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture a regrettable lack of joint effort.

The Small Business Committee of the House is to be commended for its efforts to fix responsibility for the shortage of meat in the country and for the chaotic conditions existing in the meat-packing industry. Before arriving at any conclusions this committee conducted extensive hearings at which all interested persons, including representatives of the Office of Price Administration, were given an opportunity to be heard. The report of the committee, as well as the resolution of the joint Senate and House committees, constitute an indictment of the Office of Price Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture for their failure to correct a condition "which has already brought independent processors, packers, wholesalers of meat and meat products to the brink of ruin." Failure to conform to the expressed mandate of Congress is particularly condemned.

Price Administrator Prentiss Brown, I am convinced, is making every effort to bring order out of chaos. The personnel of the Office of Price Administration was not of his choosing, and his authority over the meat situation is still subject to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Brown has indicated a willingness to fix ceiling prices on hogs as a step toward a solution of the problem, but so far the Secretary of Agriculture has refused to concur. Thus the packer of meats and the wholesaler and retail dealer find themselves enmeshed in governmental red tape and confusion without parallel in bureaucratic government and getting nowhere. The present Price Administrator has stated that he wants more men in the merchandising field who will be able to run the Office of Price Administration as a large and successful business undertaking. Mr. Brown says the Office of Price Administration has relied too much on crackdown psychology instead of the public willingness to cooperate. These are hopeful signs and certainly steps in the right direction. But still there is no single authority, which I submit, is essential before lasting results can be hoped for.

Quite obviously the whole problem will not be solved by placing a ceiling on livestock alone, for this may result in a loss to the livestock dealer or to the farmer. An adjustment all along the line from producer to retailer may be necessary. If so, it should be made without delay. A fair margin of profit to packers and producers will not only eliminate black-market operations, but should assure a reasonably adequate supply of meat to the armed forces, our allies, and the civilian population. Congress has provided the legislation and ample time has elapsed for results. The Price Control Act was approved on January 30, 1942, and was amended on October 2, 1942, but the Office of Price Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture have permitted the most serious problem the meat-packing industry has ever faced to remain unsolved. The law does not require further amendment. It needs only to be obeyed by those who have been entrusted with its enforcement, however much this course may clash with Utopian dreams, or be foreign to bureaucratic imagination.

Post-War Commercial Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. FREDERICK PRACHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, dispatches from England indicate a growing demand for pressure upon the American Government to negotiate a treaty with Great Britain allocating "spheres of influence" within which commercial air lines of the respective countries may operate in post-war aviation. It appears that American air supremacy in South America, in the Pacific, and other parts of the world has seriously concerned British industrial and commercial magnates respecting their ability successfully to compete with our commercial air lines.

Such a compact or treaty is unthinkable to the American spirit of individual freedom. If American planes are welcome to the British when flying in all parts of the world in military endeavor, there can be no ethical or logical objection to their flying in times of peace. Throughout its 167 years of independent existence the United States of America has steadfastly held to the doctrine of the freedom of the seas; it should now as firmly adhere to the corollary principle of freedom of the air insofar as it is consistent with American sovereignty. What American sailors and soldiers died to maintain should not casually be relinquished and relegated to the "limbo" of lost causes by the idealistic philosophy of outsmarted diplomats who may be anxious to be generous before they are just. The pen is mightier than the sword

only when it is wielded to defend, protect, and maintain the American constitutional theory of individual freedom.

Furthermore, such an allocation of "spheres of influence" reminiscent of gangsters' agreements not to "muscle in," would be a gross unfairness to all the peoples of the world in that they would be precluded, by treaty to which they are not a party, from the freedom of contracting and doing business with whom they will. Let our spirit of American resolution be an international anti-trust law, permitting all people of all nations to do business with him who offers the best terms and the most value.

Since the world's first commandos crossed the Delaware under General Washington in 1776 the flame of American liberty has been kept aglow by the firm conviction that "all men * * * are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness." To partition the world into "spheres of influence" would be a denial of such rights to others. That competition, which is the life of trade is the privilege of all to enjoy.

Never before has such a sweeping proposal been made. There was no such treaty made when but a few years ago American industry expressed serious concern over its lack of control of available rubber and tin, largely controlled by British interests. Let it, then, not seriously be considered now or in the future. May it never be said that an American airplane, product of American inventive genius, shall not be permitted to fly to a destination willing to receive it.

In peace, as in war, let the victory go to him who "gets there firstest with the mostest." American aviation is unafraid in war and it is unafraid in peace.

Anniversary of the Evacuation of Boston and St. Patrick's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech I made at the ceremonies held at Dorchester Heights, South Boston, Mass., on March 17, 1943, in celebration of the one hundred and sixty-seventh anniversary of the evacuation of the British from Boston, commemorated annually on St. Patrick's Day:

Fellow Americans, it is a great honor and privilege for me to be invited to speak on this hallowed ground from which George Washington and his patriotic army of volunteers forced the British to evacuate the city of Boston 167 years ago. This was the first great British defeat. It was the beginning of the establishment of America as a free and independent Nation.

We are now engaged in another war to guarantee the liberties and freedom we won in the Revolutionary War. Events that occurred at Concord, Lexington, Bunker Hill, and Dorchester Heights were the foundation-stones of American liberty. The very memories of such men as Otis, Quincy and Hancock, Samuel and John Adams, Paul Revere, Prescott and Warren, and all the glorious company of Massachusetts patriots will live forever and animate oncoming generations of Americans to preserve those liberties handed down by them to a free people.

Our country will survive just so long as we stand steadfast for those principles of freedom and constitutional government as a monument to the patriotism of our forefathers.

My direct ancestors on my father's side of the Fish family landed in Massachusetts over 300 years ago, and in 1637 founded Sandwich, the first town on Cape Cod. My mother was a direct descendant of Rev. Thomas Hooker who founded Hartford, and my wife is a direct descendant of Deacon Samuel Chapin who founded Springfield, Mass. I spent 10 years of my early life in schools and colleges in Massachusetts, and am, therefore, not an entire stranger to its traditions and historical background.

I am glad to concede everything that has been written by the eminent historians about the glorious contributions of Boston and Massachusetts in the Revolutionary War, provided that it is likewise admitted that New York also participated in and did her share toward winning that war. There is no use debating whether Faneuil Hall at Boston, Independence Hall at Philadelphia, or Washington's headquarters at Newburgh had the best claim to being the cradle of the Republic. All three played important parts in the history of our country.

Massachusetts has a right to be proud of the heroism of her sons and the wisdom of her revolutionary ancestors. We need hundreds of Paul Reveres today to go forth throughout the Nation and arouse the American people against the activities of radical groups who seek to destroy our free institutions and erect a government based on foreign ideologies and dictatorship. There can be no compromise between Americanism and communism, or its twin sisters of the right—nazi-ism and fascism. There is more to fear, now that we have surrounded the Nazis and Japs, from our enemies from within.

False foreign ideologies have sprung up in our country that seriously threaten the very existence of our American form of government, religion, and way of life. St. Patrick drove the snakes out of Ireland; I wish we could produce another St. Patrick to run the snakes, or modern termites, who are gnawing at the foundations of the Republic, out of America. I am in favor of the deportation, now, and after the war, of all alien Nazi, Fascist, or Communist agitators, and giving their jobs to loyal American citizens.

Americans of Irish blood played an important part in winning the Revolutionary War: Commodore John Barry, father of our infant Navy which served with such gallantry against the might of the British Fleet; General Montgomery, who was killed leading his men at Quebec; General Sullivan, who conquered the Iroquois and freed western New York; and General Knox, a member of the Boston Irish Charitable Society, who brought the guns in midwinter from Fort Ticonderoga in New York to place on Dorchester Heights. The troops of Mad Anthony Wayne were largely of Irish stock and won victory after victory wherever the fighting was hardest.

In peace or war Americans of Irish origin have been loyal, patriotic citizens. They are industrious, hard-working Americans in time of peace and courageous hard-fighting soldiers in time of war. In every walk of life men of Irish blood are prominent in America, not only as soldiers but as statesmen, lawyers, and in business.

We are now engaged in a great war which calls for all-out effort, service, and sacrifice in order to win the war at the earliest possible moment and with the least casualties. The Congress, representing the will of the American people, is in favor of all necessary war measures regardless of party affiliations. No President has ever had such complete support from the opposition party as has been given by the minority Members of Congress since war was declared.

That does not mean that all American people should not express their views openly on both domestic and international issues, the conduct of the war, and the peace terms afterward.

Whispered criticism of the administration is not desirable. We still live in a free country and have a constitutional right to free speech and free inquiry. We have a fundamental right to openly criticize the usurpation of legislative functions by the bureaucratic agencies honeycombed with "bureauquacks," "lame ducks," and "fellow travelers," and by personal edicts issued in defiance of the Congress and the Constitution. We have a right and a duty to prevent by every means in our power the march to collectivism, socialism, communism, and totalitarianism.

We also have a right to ask, What are our own war and peace aims, and those of our allies, the British Empire and Soviet Russia?

I admire the British and Soviet Governments because they always put their own interests first. The British Prime Minister puts the British Empire first, and Stalin places the Soviet Socialist Republics uppermost. However, in America we have Anglophiles and Communists who insist on putting the interests of foreign nations ahead of our own. The time has come for us to place the interests of America first, last, and all the time. That is the only yardstick I know—what is best for America and the American people.

I do not believe in secret diplomacy or sneaking in the back door at the peace conference and being called Uncle Shylock. I am in favor of openly asking the British Government, as part of reciprocal lend-lease, for outright possession of all the islands from Bermuda to South America for use as strategic air and naval bases for our own national defense. These islands are of no real value or of military or naval importance to Great Britain, but they are essential to our security and protection. We do not expect to get back any money under the lend-lease after the war, but we should expect to obtain these bases permanently. We are not a 99-year country, but are only in the morning of our glorious destiny, if we would look after our own interests as well as Great Britain and Soviet Russia protect theirs.

We have already learned one lesson from this war as the result of the victories at Midway and the Bismarck Sea—that land-based airplanes can destroy enemy fleets before they can land troops. It must be apparent to all fair-minded people that these foreign-owned islands off our eastern coast are necessary for our own safety and protection.

I offer the following three-point program to expedite winning the war:

1. The creation of a supreme war council composed of the United States, Great Britain, Soviet Russia, and China, with equal rights for all.

2. The immediate extension of more aid to China, particularly airplanes.

I believe thousands of airplanes could be flown by Chinese pilots from Alaska to Siberia and thence to China. We have given more than a billion and a quarter dollars' worth of war supplies to Soviet Russia under lend-lease aid. I think we have a right to ask permission to fly these planes across Siberia to China.

If the Chinese had 2,000 planes, or one-third of our production for one month, they could change from the defensive to the offensive and bomb Japan.

3. General MacArthur should be placed in supreme command of all of our armed forces in the far Pacific, and given full au-

thority and power to concentrate on a major offensive to carry the war to Japan.

Up to now we have been fighting on jungle islands on the fringe of the Japanese Empire, 3,000 miles from Tokyo. At the present rate of island-hopping, the war may go on for years.

I am opposed to the mobilization and conscription of American women, except in the extreme case of actual danger of invasion, of which there is none at the present time. I see no reason or need of following the pattern of the Nazis or Communists in regimenting the daily lives of American women.

I do not know the war or peace aims of the British or Russians, but I am opposed to a fifth partition of Poland. The origin of World War No. 2 was to stop Nazi aggression on Poland, and to guarantee her territorial integrity; what a tragedy it would be if a part of Poland is surrendered to Communist aggression after the war.

I have always believed in international cooperation for the preservation of world peace. Our common objective is to win the war and to win a just and lasting peace afterwards. This war will have been fought in vain and the lives of our sons sacrificed in vain if we do not lay the foundations for a just peace that will endure for at least a hundred years.

If I have incurred the enmity of the Communists or those who maintain foreign ideologies in this country, I could ask for no better testimonial of my love for American institutions. If they were to speak well of me, I should be compelled to exclaim like one of old: "What bad thing have I done, that such men praise me?" If I had my way, I would provide free transportation for all alien Nazis, Fascists, and Communists to return to their native lands, and remain there and not plague us with their attacks upon our free institutions and our representative and constitutional form of government.

Address by Senator Walsh at Banquet of Friendly Sons of St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], whose long and honorable public career has reflected great honor upon Americans of Irish descent, delivered a notable address on Wednesday evening last at the annual banquet of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick here in Washington. The address should be made a matter of public record, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To many of us, who have seen other days, there is a tinge of regret in connection with present-day celebrations of "The day we celebrate." One who has witnessed, as I have, these celebrations during the years when the participants were the first and second generations of Irish-Americans, notes the absence of the deep emotions that were inherent in those earlier anniversaries. The celebrations to which I refer were characterized by outbursts of real Irish enthusiasm and were the annual occasion for publicly recalling not only one's pride in the race and its accomplishments, but the personal link of attachment to and personal memories of the old land that passing time has considerably weakened.

I can readily recall the days of my youth when practically every city or town in New England as well as elsewhere had its religious services, its parade and its musical and oratorical exercises on St. Patrick's Day. I witnessed, year after year, halls crowded to the doors with men and women of the first generation of Irish immigrants and their children, deeply moved as they listened in rapture to the music of their fatherland and as they heard retold the struggle of the race through the long, dreary winters while watching and praying for the springtime that never came. I have seen vast audiences moved to tears as they recalled the sufferings, hardships, trials, and tribulations of the race. St. Patrick's Day awakened not only their racial pride, but also aroused a real sense of loneliness. There is no grief so poignant, that crushes the human heart like lonesomeness. It is one of the most grim and harrowing pains to bear—the long, lonely vigils of mothers, wives, and loved ones for those who are absent fighting for their country. It is being borne in silence and with patriotic resignation in every home in America today.

I will not attempt tonight to unfold the long historic story that has made this day so dear to the Irish people. It has been said that the history of Ireland is a drama of 7 acts; every act a century and every scene a tragedy. We would like to forget it—the story of woe, want, poverty, and enslavement. If the world would understand the progress of the race, the qualities that have made the men and women of Irish blood what they are and what their contribution to human welfare has been, the past could not be obliterated. It is the qualities that have been molded and fashioned through tears, sweat and blood, famine and privation that have largely contributed to the sturdy character of the race. That the race survived is one of the miracles of the ages. The fact that in spite of suppressions, her exiled children have reached commanding positions throughout the world today, is indicative of the courage and indomitable perseverance of the race and its capacity to suffer and sacrifice for spiritual and democratic ideals.

Therefore, on this, the day we celebrate, we pay tribute to the men and women who have won for us the qualities of heart and mind and soul, that have made our existence and our position of influence in the world possible—the Saints, the scholars, the impoverished men and women, who, while enduring forced illiteracy, were denied the opportunity to worship God, to possess a home and to breathe the inalienable rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Tonight, in particular, I want to recall and pay tribute to the Irish exiles who came to America in such large numbers during the famine days of the middle of the last century. Between 1848 and 1852, 250,000 Irish families were evicted, and between these years 750,000 were killed with famine, and 1,250,000 Irish souls were sent, exiles, from their native land.

How shall I describe those exiles?

"He was born in a land which no longer was his,
He toiled for a landlord whose face he never saw,
In the midst of plenty, his children ate the bread of poverty."

Hearing of a land across the sea where they and their children might find an opportunity to live in freedom, thither they came bearing within their breasts "the deep, unutterable woe" which none save exiles feel.

Irish-Americans have many reasons to love America. We should love her not merely because she has been a beacor light of hope and opportunity to mankind everywhere, but especially because she gave welcome and innumerable opportunities to our emigrant ancestors when there was nothing for them to live for in the land of their birth except starvation and death. What did they bring with them to America—John Boyle O'Reilly has given the answer:

"No treason we bring from Erin—nor bring we shame nor guilt!
The sword we hold may be broken, but we have not dropped the hilt!
But the hearts we bring for freedom are washed in the surge of tears,
And we claim our right by a people's fight outliving a thousand years.

"Oh, willing hands to toil;
Strong natures tuned to the harvest song and bound to the kindly soil;
Bold pioneers for the wilderness, defenders in the field—
The sons of a race of soldiers who never learned to yield."

Into the lowliest and humblest walks of life they entered. Their heartstrings throbbing with the grief of a sensitive race, they toiled unceasingly, established homes, built churches, and made tremendous sacrifices to give their children the education—civic and religious—denied themselves. Well they knew that no race could exert an influence in contributing to the progress and welfare of the human family unless they produced, trained, educated, courageous men and women to fight for the preservation of those rights and privileges that America generously gave them and which were denied mankind in nearly every other part of the world. In one generation these exiled emigrants sent into the professions, into the schoolrooms, into the commercial, public, and religious life of America their sons and daughters, who from that day to this have made, and are continuing to make, a strong, powerful, and patriotic contribution to American life. The bones of the children of these exiles are on every battlefield of the Republic; their names are written into its history with their sweat and their blood; their loyalty and their honor are incontestable.

What shall I say of the Irish exiled women? The contribution by the women of the Irish race is one of the most glorious pages in Irish history. I have seen in my own day thousands of Irish-American youth whose higher education has been made possible only by the toil of their Irish mothers and sisters over the machines of the cotton mills of New England. The bent backs and gnarled fingers that I have witnessed at the mill gates of New England are silent testimonials of the undying devotion of the Irish women to their homes and their loved ones. Yes; it was largely the contribution made by the Irish exiled mothers throughout every section of America that opened the way, made the opportunity, and gave the inspiration by which their sons and daughters have since risen from poverty and misery to a position so commanding that it would seem almost inconceivable. Fitting it is that on this, the day we celebrate, we pay a loving tribute to those who were the pioneers in opening up the trails that have led to our present position in American life.

There are two priceless heritages that our ancestors brought to America in their empty hands which we must cherish and preserve at any cost. We shall be unworthy of the inheritance of our forbears unless we expand and improve what has been bequeathed to us. The first is the gift of religion. This was their first consolation; their strength and their discipline. In every avenue of their life, their labors, their hopes, their duties, and their enjoyments, their religion encouraged and consoled them. When all else was lost, the Irish clung to and preserved

their reverence for and their worship of the Supreme Being. Their gifts to us and to the New World were spiritual rather than material. The Irish people are a deeply religious people, not only the Irish Catholic, but the Irish Presbyterian and the Irish Episcopalian.

Next to their love of and explicit trust in the Supreme Being was their unyielding devotion to freedom, their unshaken confidence in democratic institutions and their hatred of the class, caste, and often tyrannical aristocratic governments of the Old World. They developed a hatred for tyranny that permeated every fiber of their being.

There never has been a blow struck in the cause of liberty or in behalf of human rights throughout the world that was not strengthened by Irish valor and sacrifice. A people who have furnished so many defenders of faith, justice, and liberty can never countenance intolerance or persecution.

To anyone who knows the history of Ireland, it is not difficult to understand the caution with which the people of Irish blood approach the consideration of any world-wide proposals that would maintain the status quo or the territorial domination of subject peoples by the use of force.

The inalienable rights that our American founders proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence have no more devoted or loyal supporters than the men and women of the Irish race Their deep sense of national justice has led them to cherish the institutions of this Republic not one iota less than their religious sanctuaries.

Let us preserve in this land of material plenty these two precious heritages, these two most consoling and beneficient influences in the progress of mankind—religion and freedom. To the preservation and defense of these, we pledge "our fortunes and our lives and our sacred honor" on this, the day we celebrate.

A Free Austria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at the Diplomat Hotel in New York City on March 10, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My dear Austrian friends, with pleasure and gratitude I accept the invitation to speak to you on this day of mourning remembrance which is at the same time a day of brightest hope for victory and liberation. I am speaking to you not only as a Member of the United States Senate, but as an American of Austrian descent. I am glad to tell you that you have many friends in the American Congress who have deep sympathy for this brave little country.

First, let me tell you how we Americans felt and feel about that dark and cruel event 5 years ago, whose fifth anniversary we are commemorating today. On that unhappy March 11, 1938, vast columns of the German panzerwaffe began to rumble into Austria. It was that very day that the second World War started.

Four years of bravest resistance—no other European country has stood that pressure for such a long time—had come to an end. The 4 years of terror inspired by Hitler's fifth column still could not conquer Austria's 6,000,000 people. So Hitler's 60,000,000 Reich marched into Austria, after the appeasers had given them the green light.

What a dark moment for Europe's history! What a terrible price the world had to pay for it!

This was not merely a military conquest. Like a hungry spider the Third Reich began to sap the blood and wealth of that small, rich country. Goebbels' propaganda agency tried to tell the world that Austria had no economic resources, but the rich booty they carried away is proof of what the Nazis found there.

You may well ask what remained of old Austria after a few weeks. Very little, indeed. In a few days there were no shoes or linen, clothes or silk, furs or soap any more. The gigantic, systematic plundering of the country was under way. With tears in their eyes and helpless rage in their hearts the Austrians watched the millions in gold from the Austrian State Bank and historic and invaluable art treasures of the Viennese museums carried away to Berlin.

Within a few hours after the military occupation, the wild terror started. With the German panzerwaffe came Himmler's storm-troopers to do their bloody work.

It was in the month of March 1938 that the so-called Austrian action began. Within 5 months, more than 24,000 men were sent to the concentration camps. Penitentiaries and police jails became crowded with 80,000 men and 17,000 women prisoners.

Discontent grew apace. By the month of May a diversion of hatreds was imperative and 6,000 Viennese Jews were sent to concentration camps.

In November 1938 the secret police issued orders to start the spontaneous persecution of the Jews. In Vienna alone 300 Jews were killed and 60,000 jailed. Some 18,000 of the latter were sent to the camps of Buchenwalde, Dachau, and Oranienburg. In the next few days, 1,500 Jews died as a result of maltreatments. Jewish stores were awarded to the disgruntled Nazis. The worst thief was the secret police who systematically plundered homes under the guise of searching.

In the first year of Hitler's rule some 13,000 Austrians were killed, some 4,000 of these perished in camps during the first week following the Nazi invasion. More than 2,000 were shot.

Hitler knew what the real feeling of the Austrians was toward him. Hitler especially hated Austria because she had sized him up and refused to submit to this paperhanger.

Even the name of Austria was extinguished, but he succeeded in this only in official documents. More than ever Austrians took pride in calling themselves by that name and not by the official designation "Ostmark," which means Eastern Marches.

Hitler feared even the power of historic names. The names of Upper and Lower Austria have been changed to Upper and Lower Danube. Only Vienna's name has not been altered, for lack of Nazi courage.

It took the Nazis only a few weeks to drive terror into Austrian hearts. But the people were so aroused that even the secret police felt their hatred. Prussian nazi-ism lost no time in coping with this problem. Organization has always been the strongest side. It promptly ordered the exchange of population.

Tens of thousands of Viennese officials were transferred to Prussia in the spring of 1938, to be replaced by Prussians. The police were the first to go, followed by the postal service, railway employees, the ministries, and finally the Army. No fewer than 2,000,000 Austrians were thus to be cleared away according to Hitler's plans. Only the war prevented the execution of this scheme.

The general discontent had now risen to such a pitch that Hitler set out to exterminate political opposition in Austria.

After Austria's fall, Europe crumbled fast. Czechoslovakia was outflanked and doomed to be conquered. Germany got a perfect base for the march into Poland. Italy became the neighbor of Hitler's military machine and in southern Austria the German panzerwaffe threatened the Balkans. Hungary's vast plains stood open to Hitler's army and within a few weeks Hitler's might extended from western Europe to the Black Sea.

The war started, Hitler conquered Europe and while the United Nations fought for their very lives, Japan decided this was the right time to attack. So we have Pearl Harbor.

America has taken up the cause of Austria. The American people have always appreciated the Austrian culture and know that not only Austrian art and science have influenced our way of life, but that many thousands of Austrians as pioneers in south and west of this continent have helped build our great Nation.

Not only as a United States Senator, but also as a former Governor of North Dakota, I have seen what our Austrian settlers have done for this country. As a man of Austrian descent, it has been my privilege to serve my State as Governor at the same time that Governor Koehler, of Wisconsin, also of Austrian descent, was serving there. In all places where the Austrians have settled in our country they have become real Americans, real American patriots, without forgetting their homeland.

So convinced were the American people of the faithfulness of the Austrians that a few weeks after Pearl Harbor all mistrust was swept when the United States Government declared Austrian noncitizens as friendly aliens.

On July 27, 1942, our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, declared that our Government has never recognized the military occupation of Austria by the Third Reich. In this policy our entire Nation has concurred.

Meanwhile the unhappy Austrians under Hitler's yoke are fighting a hard and deadly fight against the oppressors just as the Netherlanders, the Norwegians, and the Poles are resisting. Obviously the German propaganda machine tries to suppress all such news, yet the Austrian underground movement grew so rapidly that although the German press and radio published warning after warning and there was execution after execution, the news of the Austrian resistance continued to occupy more and more space in the international press.

Today, as never before, the whole Austrian nation is united against Hitler. Farmers and laborers, and even the middle classes are united in this fight.

I am firmly convinced that there are no party differences anywhere in the country between Switzerland and Hungary. The farmer in Tyrol and the workman in Vienna have only one goal—to rid the country of the brown plague. When the Nazi control of Austria breaks down there will begin one of the bloodiest revolutions in all of history.

The fact that during 5 years of the cruelest terror, Hitler has not been able to break the Austrian resistance is causing the Nazis very grave concern right now. The war in the east and the expected invasion of Europe will make Austria a focal point in the European theater of war.

The Third Reich took over the rich raw-material resources of Austria, her big industries, and the excellent railway transportation system. Today all troop trains to the south Russian front and to the Balkans, all the foodstuff from eastern Europe, and the oil from Rumania must pass through Austria.

Austria's industry is vital to the German military machine because the production in

western Germany is greatly reduced by the bombing of the American and British air forces.

We Americans know how much the Austrian resistance and the Austrian sabotage program contributes to our own war effort. We also understand what the stiff Austrian resistance means in the saving of American lives. We Americans feel that we must help the Austrians in their fight by letting them know that we are fighting for their unconditional liberation.

In November last year the United States Government took the first step in that direction Our War Department created an Austrian Battalion within the United States Army. This news has been accepted jubilantly by all good Austrians and Americans in this country.

Austrians fortunate enough to escape Hitler's henchmen are glad to have the opportunity to volunteer to fight side by side with our American soldiers. The Austrian battalion is a fighting symbol of Austria's will to fight to the bitter end to smash Hitler. News of this Austrian fighting force is spreading over Europe and has seeped into Austria, causing Hitler increasing concern.

We know that from the day the creation of the Austrian Battalion became known in Austria, a new hope arose there and the fighting spirit of the Austrians rose to the highest pitch. From that very day the news of sabotage and executions has continually increased.

Not only shall the souls of the slaughtered people of Austria haunt Hitler but the spirit of the outraged living shall unite to annihilate the oppressor.

With the help of God we shall soon see a liberated Austria. Strengthened as she is through the political and spiritual alliance with the United States, there shall be a greater, a stronger, and a happier Austria. Austria, the eternal heart of Europe.

Why We Must Bomb Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Why We Must Bomb Japan," prepared by me over a year ago and published in the American Magazine for April 1942.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WE MUST BOMB JAPAN

Our war in the Pacific demands a hypodermic. We can't win it by defensive methods. We can't win it by conferences, letter-writing, or speech-making. We've got to strike, and strike hard.

When I say "Let's bomb Japan," I say it with conviction backed by a 35-year acquaintance with the country and its people.

Japan must be beaten on her home grounds. She must be hit, and hit hard.

If we could drop a thousand bombs tomorrow on the munition factories of Tokyo and Osaka, we would save the lives of 50,000 American soldiers and sailors. A few such bombings would paralyze the heart of industrial Japan, and the heart of Japan is the place we must attack.

I was a 24-year-old college graduate when I went to Japan as a missionary in 1907. My first job was to learn the language well enough to preach and teach. My course of study was through colloquial contact with real people.

In those days Japan was as free to the traveler as any part of the United States. There were no prohibited areas. As I became somewhat proficient in the conversational vocabulary, I ventured out entirely on my own, among the common people—factory workers, farmers, artisans, and the professional classes.

They were all friendly and helpful, glad to listen to my missionary message, although not all of them were sympathetic with its teachings.

My period of residence in Japan was at a time when the country was laying the foundations for what has happened in the last decade. The motivating force behind this movement was an intensive nationalistic sentiment and a fanciful determination to make Japan the greatest country in the world.

There were universal education and universal military service. These two objectives have a lot to do with Japan's present preparedness. They have been carried forward without hesitation for 40 years, until today Japan has no illiterates and no able-bodied men who are not trained soldiers.

I am greatly disturbed by the American tendency to underestimate the Japanese, to think of them as an inferior race—ignorant, superstitious, and semicivilized. How many of my readers know that Japan has more electric-light bulbs per capita than the United States? That its newspapers surpass ours in circulation, coverage, and intensity of readership? That its book stores are much bigger, busier, and more numerous than ours? That its average citizen has more schooling than ours, at least in many of our States? That its people are tougher and more prolific than ours? That it has no racial problems, because its racial unity is complete and absolute?

On the military side, I don't like to hear their soldiers rated as inferior troops or inferior fighters. Japanese soldiers are tough and capable, and their leadership is excellent. One of the Japanese generals, often ridiculed by our news broadcasters because of his ample girth, is regarded by one eminent West Pointer as the ablest military strategist in the world today.

Japanese Armies have had an intensive military training for 2 generations under the best teachers that could be found by combing the world. They are well equipped, by factories that have been producing tested materials for decades. Moreover, Japan has given its Army a real war approximately every 10 years since 1894. The major part of its personnel are veterans of real battlefields, not textbook soldiers.

If anybody wants to know how clever their staff work is, let him take a look at what they did on the opening day of the war. Nowhere in history has any nation opened a war instantaneously and simultaneously on such a vast stage, extending the full width of the Pacific, from Pearl Harbor and Wake Island to the peaks and headlands of the Philippines, striking at the same moment in every direction with impressive force. In all the history of traitorous behavior, this is the most magnificent effort. And, from the over-all military standpoint, it must be marked down as highly successful.

Japan is filled with high confidence about this war. The only thing Japan dreads is this, that war may somehow be brought to her own threshold and hearthstone. She knows she must fight at great distances in order to keep her own precious little islands from becoming a shambles.

Her navy, like England's, is her first line of defense, and if it comes to a long war, it is her very lifeline, for only through ships can Japan hold her empire together. If we can wipe out the Japanese Navy, we shall have won the war. But that's a big job, and some people think an impossible one.

So, in any discussion of this situation, I always come back to my overwhelming belief that the quickest and most economical way for us to deal with Japan is to start bombing her industrial centers—factories and shipyards, arsenals and storehouses. Japan's greatest weakness is that these are concentrated in a comparatively small area, easily identified from the air.

On my desk in the Senate Office Building is a map of Japan, drawn for me some years ago by a deft Chinese mapmaker. On it I have marked all the 63 cities and towns that I know personally, and I have surrounded the munitions centers of the island with a red heart—the heart which I hope we shall soon begin to pound with unrelenting explosives.

Japan's industrial cities are built along two great roads. These are named Hokkaido and Tokaido, and they make the shape of a reversed letter L along the backbone of the empire's crooked main island. The Hokkaido runs north and south, from Aomori on the northern tip to Tokyo at the bend of the big L. The Tokaido runs east and west, from Tokyo through Osaka and Kyoto to Moji, the highly fortified jumping-off place for Manchukuo and Korea.

The bend of the L is the nerve, railway, and industrial center of Japan. All things meet at this junction of the two great roads. Blast that center, and end the war. Blast that center, and the reign of the present noveau riche and military clique of rulers will end.

It is not my province to tell how the bombing of Japan should be done. There are plenty of alternatives. There are our bases at Dutch Harbor, in the Aleutians north of Japan. There are the bases which we hope to get from Russia on the Kamchatkan Peninsula. There are the Russian bases at Vladivostok. There are Chinese bases that can be used if we can get planes there. There are possible activities of naval carriers from the ocean around Japan.

It would be magnificent if we could blast a path to Vladivostok through the Amori Straits, whose 50-mile width is not too narrow for naval action. This tactic would divide the main island of Japan from its northern neighbor, and cut off valuable supplies of timber and foodstuffs.

It would still be more magnificent if we could actually land on the northern island and establish airplane bases for continuous bombing of the Tokyo-Osaka area of munition plants. That would be paying them back in their own coin.

Study of the map emphasizes the importance of Russia in our future plans. We need Russia as an ally against Japan, and I hope we can get her. The war will be much faster and more effective if we do.

But we needn't wait for that to blast Japan's war-industrial heart. Let's strike with all our might, as soon as we can, in the confident knowledge that quick and decisive blows here will shorten the war and be an economy in men and money.

Peace After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address on the subject of peace after the war, delivered by Hon. L. W. Hardy, at Bradenton, Fla., to the members of the Optimist Club of that city.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President and members of the Optimist Club of Bradenton, I have been asked to speak on some phase of the war and have chosen the subject of peace after the war. I heard Gabby Knowles speak yesterday and he stated that, in his opinion, all of the discussion of peace terms now was out of order and was detracting from what should mainly be the first order of business; that is, winning the war. Up to a point, I agree with him, for, if it is to detract from the war effort, it should not be done.

The war through which we are going has been planned by minds that are devilishly clever and it is hellishly brutal and cruel. I saw this morning a widow, who had lost her only son in this war, and her head was bowed in grief, her feet were dragging the ground. I have rarely, in my lifetime, seen a sight so sad as that. We can expect a lot more of this bloody business before the war is over, for we have only begun to fight. For that reason, we should not for a moment forget sight of the main order of the day, which is winning the war. My talk today is purely an exploratory talk to see if we can arrive at some intelligent public opinion which would be beneficial when the war is over, and this, it seems to me, is beneficial so long as we do not start a cat-and-dog fight among ourselves.

I am not a good guesser and do not know what the peace will be like when it comes. Hon. HENRY WALLACE says that we should have one thing and CLARE BOOTHE LUCE says it should be entirely something else. Not knowing what the final outcome will be, I will tell you what I would do, if I had it in my personal power to conduct the affairs of the Nation after peace comes.

I would divide the program which I have in mind into three parts. The first part of the program would be to keep the United States strong and well armed for an indefinite period of time. As soon as the main fighting ends, we will be faced with disease, pestilence, starvation, hate, and confusion such as the world has never known. There are certain to follow the main fighting outbreaks in various parts of the world and the United States should, by all means, be sufficiently strong to exercise her full potential power. You consider, for a moment, the hates which have been developed against the Germans by the conquered Poles, with their homes and crops and fields confiscated and their young women captured and carried away into brothels behind the German lines for the German soldiers and thousands and tens of thousands shot as hostages because some of the community resisted. Such ruthlessness and wanton cruelty are bound to generate hates that will last a thousand years. Add to this a hundredfold plus what persecution has been meted out to the Jews, and you can see readily that the cessation of fighting will not end the conflict.

It seems likely to me that some form of conscription should be a permanent policy of the United States and that we should have a standing Army of at least a million men; that they should be well armed and kept efficient at all times from now on. I would call this part of the program keeping your powder dry.

In the second part of the program, I would expand the State Department a hundredfold, and where they have been spending $1, I would spend at least $100. I would begin at once a system of searching for the brightest young men from our colleges to go into consular and diplomatic work, and I would maintain a consul in every important place in all the world.

The Germans, before the present World War, maintained a system by which they gained a great deal of information about all of the various countries plus a file on all of the prominent men. I would expand on this system 10 times over so that we would have the essential facts about all of the nations, the essential facts about all of the leaders in the various nations, and so that we would know the background about every important problem in all the world with some one or more men with background and brains enough to know what it was all about.

I could show you dozens of incidences where we and other nations have been dumb because we did not understand the purposes and plans of other nations. For years we furnished Japan with scrap iron and high-test gasoline to use against China, which she is now using against us. Premier Baldwin, of Great Britain, was told that Hitler was rearming, and he brushed it aside. Chamberlain, who followed him, was given the same information, and he brushed it aside, and Chamberlain apparently completely misread the character of Hitler and his Nazi Germans. So far as I am able to judge, Mr. Roosevelt and Joseph Stalin neither were ever fooled by Hitler. It is my idea that, after the war is over, the international problems will be vastly more complicated and serious than they have been in the past and that we will have to have a good deal more information about them and have men with brains and background to handle them from the heads of the Government down to the last consul.

We have a shining example of good diplomatic work in the case of Mexico. During the last war Mexico was in a critical condition and filled with spies and saboteurs. In recent years, however, we had Dwight Morrow and Josephus Daniels down there as Ambassadors, both highly intelligent men, and they have put an entirely new complexion on our relations with Mexico.

I would make globe trotters out of the State Department and require that every member spend at least 3 months of each year in traveling to gain an intelligent background of world affairs. I would take only the young men of great promise into the Department and I would stop the practice completely of dumb-cluck ambassadors for the simple reason that they had contributed a hundred thousand dollars to the party political pot. This part of the program I would call the spade work.

As a matter of fact, I would add a little more to this spade work if I had the power. I would establish a department of research, in which the United States would vastly expand its research work, and all of the information and patents that were obtained from this, with the exception of information vital to national defense, I would exchange with the other nations of the world who maintained experimental departments and would reciprocate by giving to the United States their information and patents. This, to my mind, seems to be important because it would vastly accelerate our own economic advance and would be a great benefit to other nations, especially those which have not become industrialized.

It seems to me certain that if China, for instance, was prosperous and industrialized then we could sell her vastly more goods than we do under the present set-up. Therefore a prosperous China is an advantage to the United States. It also seems to me that if malaria could be wiped out in South America, thereby making the South American countries more healthy and prosperous than they now are, it would be of great benefit to us here. By such a reciprocity, it seems to me, we could more quickly establish one of the "four freedoms;" that is, the freedom from want.

Now after you have kept your powder dry and have your spade work done, you have to have some over-all structure for international affairs. You may call it the United States of the World, the League of Nations, a World Court, or name the baby anything you may choose, but it will be necessary to have it. The four great powers which will emerge from this war will be the United States, Russia, the British Empire, and China. Our cooperation with these nations should be wholehearted and steadfast, with the primary purpose of keeping the peace of the world and seeing that the mad dogs of the world keep it. If we are split apart by propaganda or by selfish motives or for any other reason in the years to come from these other three great powers the peace of the world will be in grave danger.

These three steps—that is, keeping your powder dry, doing your spade work, and maintaining an international government of some description—are all necessary to the national welfare of our country. This rough outline, it seems to me, could well be a beginning in our thinking and planning for peace after the war. We are living in an age when an unscrupulous nation can move so quickly that a peaceful nation could be absolutely exterminated before it was ready to fight. For this reason, since we are the richest nation in the world, we would be the prize goose in all history if we, in the future, fail to keep our guard up or if we fail to do everything in our power to promote peaceful relationships, or if we fail to help maintain international law and order by some international association of the nations.

What Kind of People Are We?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What Kind of People Are We?" prepared by me and published in the True Story magazine for May 1942.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT KIND OF PEOPLE ARE WE?

Winston Churchill, in a speech which was heard by half the population of America, said, "What kind of people do they think we are?"

It is a splendid phrase of scorn and defiance. But it is also a challenge, and in this sense it needs our deepest thought and our most prayerful consideration.

What kind of people are we? And what kind of people are our enemies, the Japanese?

Are we really better people, man for man, than they?

This war is more than a contest in military skill and ability—it is a contest between two kinds of human beings, and two different ways of life. We must be sure that we neither overestimate ourselves nor underestimate our enemy.

We are stronger in resources than Japan, and we have greater manpower. But our superiority is not overwhelming enough to assure victory. We shall have to exert ourselves to the utmost to win.

Actually, Japan has the strength of the weak, and America has the weakness of strength. Our weakness is very dangerous and very difficult to overcome.

If we have had any one predominant fault in the past, it has been to underestimate the Japanese. If Japan has had any one predominant fault, it has been to overestimate us—and this has driven her to supreme efforts in her preparations to fight us.

Racially, Japan has a big advantage over us—an advantage which gives her a complete and unquestioning national unity in this war. To achieve this national unity, Japan closed Ler doors to all immigration back in the days when the Pilgrims were landing on the shores of New England. They kept the doors closed for nearly two centuries, and during that period they made themselves a single racial unit.

America, on the other hand, is racially complex, and while the melting-pot process is working the fusion has not yet taken place, and probably never will. Our unity in this war cannot be racial, like Japan's, but will have to be a unity of ideals and endeavor.

Physically, the average American is larger than the average Japanese, but the Japanese is hardier—at least, at the moment, he can endure more on less.

Educationally, there is an interesting comparison between the two countries. Japan has had universal education for 50 years and universal military training. There is no illiteracy in Japan. I wish we could say as much for America. But education with us has been a function of the individual States, counties, and school districts, which have different standards. Right now the training of a good number of selectees is hindered by the fact that time has to be given to teaching them the three "R's," so that they can understand written orders.

America has had unlimited freedom of speech, thought, and religion. Japan has had these same freedoms, but always limited by every citizen's overwhelming loyalty to his Emperor. There can't be any conscientious objectors in Japan because what the Emperor commands is heaven's will

The worshiping of the Emperor is a universal duty for all Japanese. He is the Son of Heaven, a direct descendant of the gods. And the devotion which he demands of his people is reinforced by ancestor worship. Every Japanese soldier is surrounded by the spirits of all his forefathers guiding and aiding him. For him, they have the same potency as the voices which guided and aided Joan of Arc.

These are the factors of morale which make Japan's military strength so formidable. Its Army has a social strength greater than the western mind can comprehend.

But that is not all. Japan's history books tell every school child that the nation has never suffered defeat. Never has a foe touched the Japanese homeland. Only once was it threatened—back in the thirteenth century when Kublai Khan led an armada of mighty ships carrying 100,000 warriors. And then what happened? Ah, the gods intervened! They sent a tidal wave which destroyed all the ships and men in the greatest naval disaster of history.

Every Japanese is convinced that the present war, like all Japan's previous wars, is being fought for the nation's security and independence.

So, when you try to estimate the foe that America faces today across our western ocean, you must add together the following factors: Loyalty, plus devotion to a cause, plus the profound conviction of fulfilling a national destiny, plus a fight for security, plus threatened independence. This constitutes Japan's religion. It completely possesses the mind of the Japanese soldier. He knows what he is dying for.

What about us? What about us Americans? What kind of people are we? Have we achieved—or can we achieve—any similar consecration to the cause for which we are fighting?

I have stated that our unity cannot be racial, like Japan's, but will have to be a unity of ideals and endeavor.

Our unity of ideals already exists. It is rooted in our concept of God, of the state, and the individual citizen.

The God whom we worship is no mere personalization of the state. Our ties with Him are far more ancient than the comparatively recent Mikado cult of Japan. Our Constitution is honored by many as being divine, because to be divine is to be in harmony with divine purpose; and as a people we believe this is so of our form of government. And we believe it, because both our religion and the Constitution emphasize the worth and majesty of the individual. Our Constitution speaks of persons. In setting up a government where persons can live good lives, we are assisting a divine purpose. In Japan the son of heaven in theory grants all rights and privileges. In America we have right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness because that is inherent in man.

Our ideals are patently so superior, so much more civilized, so much wider in their promise of happiness and fulfillment for every individual citizen that we are shocked to find them seriously challenged. But we now know that if the Axis wins, these ideals will disappear as the dominant force shaping American life. And out of this knowledge will come—is coming—the unity of endeavor essential to victory.

For, united to defend our common ideals, our ideals will give us in increasing richness those very superiorities we need for victory. By our belief and faith in the individual throughout our whole history, we have made individuality bloom in the United States as it blooms nowhere else in the world. This means that, individual for individual in any given situation, we are a truly superior people and, in the end, a war effort like any other effort comes down to the individual—the individual soldier, sailor, worker, and farmer. Upon their individual energies, shrewdness, adaptability, inventiveness, courage, and loyalty depends the decision.

As a Nation of united individualists, I am convinced the future is ours. But don't forget that word "United."

Our Part in Maintaining Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Kansas City Times of March 15. One of my reasons for asking that the editorial be inserted is that one of the Senators who has been very strongly supporting the adoption of the resolution which several of us submitted a few days ago is the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. I am very glad to offer this editorial from his home town paper for printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PART IN MAINTAINING PEACE

The proposed Senate resolution for immediate organization of the United Nations for wartime collaboration and peacetime security represents a statesmanlike approach to problems vital to the United States and to the world. It is refreshing that the resolution should be proposed by Senators of both parties in an effort, as the proponents say, to prevent "the basic foreign policy of the United States from becoming an issue in partisan politics."

As to the fundamentals of the program outlined, the Star believes the Senators are right in the opinion "that the overwhelming majority of the American people favor United States participation in such a United Nations organization."

The preliminary paragraphs of the resolution deal with immediate problems—with the need of a coordinated war effort, with the setting up of temporary administrations as Axis-controlled countries are reclaimed and with relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories where such aid is required. These proposals embody measures adopted in the First World War. No one can dispute their necessity now.

The paragraph calling for procedure and machinery for peaceful settlement of international disputes is in accordance with traditional American policy. Its fundamental weakness has always lain in the fact that only nations animated by good will and the spirit of international decency would accept the peaceful settlement of disputes that involved national ambitions. This weakness would be cured by the all-important fifth paragraph in the resolution:

"To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation."

This proposal is based on the bitter experience of the post-war years. The American policy adopted in connection with the peace treaty proved ineffective in preventing war. Yet in the light of then existing conditions the policy was certainly natural and to the great majority of Americans seemed perfectly reasonable. For a century there had been no world conflict. Most of us believed that the war of 1914–18 was an entirely exceptional and unforeseeable event brought on by an arrogant and irresponsible German government against the will of the peace-loving German people. This was President Wilson's firm belief and it was shared by most Americans.

It followed then that if the autocratic government of the Kaiser should be supplanted by a republican government expressing the will of the German people, Germany could be depended on to become a good neighbor in the family of nations. In the transition period a defeated and prostrate Germany was to be disarmed. Britain and France had overwhelming military power. We Americans naturally felt that we could leave our allies to keep the peace of Europe while we withdrew and went about our business at home, meanwhile contributing largely from our resources to feed and restore a war-torn world.

Events proved both our fundamental assumptions were wrong. Reviewing history we found that the German people had been so indoctrinated with the Prussian ideals of military conquest that they regarded war as a justified and proper method for carrying out a policy of world domination. The character of the people had been expressed in the Kaiser's government and it did not change with the Kaiser's flight to Holland. Under

the pressure of public opinion the republic began systematically to sabotage the treaty and to rebuild Germany's military might. Hitler merely inherited a war machine that already was in process of construction by the republic.

Our second assumption that Britain and France could keep the peace was equally mistaken. Peace-loving Britain gave up its armaments and retired to its island home. It had the same illusions about the peaceful Germans that were cherished by the American people. Internal conflicts in France, in later years skillfully fomented by Hitler, destroyed national unity and broke its power. The Fuehrer's professions of love for peace fooled the world and Germany was able to prepare thoroughly for another war of conquest without interference by nations that could have stopped it if they had not been blind.

What has happened in the last 30 years has demonstrated that the German Nation cannot be trusted. The mass of the people, individually pleasant, are obsessed with ideals of racial superiority and world domination, and of the righteousness of ruthless and inhuman war to carry out national policies. It has been demonstrated that the United States is so inextricably involved in world affairs that it has a vital interest in the peace of Europe and further that it must join with the peace-loving nations in keeping the peace.

There is no proposal at this time for any sort of world organization. That would be a complicated and controversial matter, to be considered later. All that is contemplated in the Senate resolution is an international police force to prevent any aggressor nation—especially Germany—from once more involving the world in war. No large army of occupation is proposed. The police force presumably would be chiefly made up of air squadrons supplied by the United Nations.

It is urgent that the obligation of sharing in this force to maintain order be formally accepted by the United States through the Senate at this time. Other nations, especially Russia, are now planning their post-war policies. There is reason to believe that the Soviet Union is waiting to learn what the attitude of the United States will be. If it was convinced that this country could be depended on to do its share in maintaining European peace it could fix its future boundaries in the light of that fact. But if it believed America would withdraw from Europe, the Moscow government would be under compulsion to take additional territory to safeguard Russia against future German aggression.

Action by the Senate would be of immense importance in clarifying the world situation. It is to be hoped that neither blindness to the significance of history, nor partisan politics will prevent a general declaration of policy at this time.

The Food Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLISON D. SMITH

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Food Problem," by Mr. Frank Gannett, reprinted from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times Union of March 11 last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FOOD PROBLEM—AMERICA FACES THE MOST CRITICAL PERIOD IN HISTORY; DARK DAYS CERTAIN, WITH STARVATION AND RIOTING THREATENING; PROMPT, VIGOROUS ACTION VITAL IF SUFFERING IS TO BE ALLEVIATED

(By Frank Gannett)

America's outstanding problem at this moment is food. Everyone is beginning to find it difficult to get various kinds of food. Food is the main topic of conversation everywhere.

The distressing feature of the situation is that there is no relief in sight. Instead, conditions will grow worse. The public does not yet understand how critical the situation already has become, or how bad it is going to be.

One economist who knows much about the situation recently said that if we should have bad weather this coming summer we might have food riots by this time next year.

The tragedy of the situation is that there are no real shortages of food at this time. Our shortages are artificial. They have been created by stupid mismanagement of the food problem by our Government agencies.

Food is absolutely essential for our Army, for our war workers, for producers in all lines. Our people must be fed. Furthermore, there is a great demand for food for our allies, so that they may better help to win the war.

We cannot win this war without food. It is as necessary as guns, ships, tanks, or planes. All of us would gladly deprive ourselves of all food that we do not absolutely need for our existence if that would hasten victory in the war. As bothersome as regulations are today and as frequent as is our inability to buy the foods we want, the food situation has not improved. Inefficient, short-sighted bureaucrats are making it worse and worse.

The present distressing conditions are due primarily to Office of Price Administration restrictions and bad administration. In the confusion over the term "parity," too low ceilings were set on our food supplies and many other foolish things done to discourage production.

In the year 1942 a crop production record was established. We had had several good growing seasons. This meant an accumulation of many varieties of food and also a great supply of livestock. It takes 2 or 3 years to develop for market cattle, sheep, hogs, and other food-supplying animals. To fatten these animals, we must have an abundant supply of grains and proteins. For instance, it takes 7 pounds of corn to give us 1 pound of pork.

The time is not far off when we shall not have enough food to supply both animals and human beings. This means our meat supply must dwindle rapidly, whatever may be the production of grains this year.

As a result of last year's favorable weather the Nation's larder, elevators, and warehouses and the farmers' storehouses and barns were well stocked and filled.

Statistics show that today there is somewhere in the country an abundance of the food supply, created last year. When the Government fixes too low prices, those who have these food supplies do not release them to the market. In many cases if they did release this food, they would do so at a financial loss. Instead of releasing the food, they hold it for higher prices. That is human nature and applies to the farmer, the wholesaler, the retailer, and to everyone, regardless of his occupation.

So it is that we have artificial shortages in a growing list of our food supplies.

But there are other factors creating these artificial shortages. The American Institute of Food Distribution, described as a nonprofit research organization, has arrived at the conclusion that the wild buying of food by the Army quartermasters and other Government officials has cornered a quantity of food completely out of line with the actual requirements for this year.

Our Lend-Lease Administrator says that the dollar value of food shipments abroad made through his agency last year was only 6 percent of the American farm production, but 6 percent is a considerable quantity. The Institute of Food Distribution reports that canners are holding for the Government between 40 and 75 percent of the entire pack of canned fruits and vegetables. The Government itself, it is reported, had estimated that only from 12 to 15 percent of the pack was needed to supply the Army and Navy until next fall, when most of another year's pack would be in.

Thus it is evident that the Government has been a potent factor in creating our food shortages. It is our biggest food hoarder.

The restrictions on canned goods recently put into effect are practically a prohibition of that form of food. An allowance of two or three cans a month for each individual practically eliminates canned goods from the average table. This means that the greatest burden will fall on the poor, the class which uses most canned goods.

It is difficult to visualize what will happen to the millions of people in our large cities when the supply of canned goods is exhausted. It has been said that New York City, for instance, has on hand at any time only enough food for a week. When the people living in apartments can no longer get canned goods, when meats are out of reach and the supply of fresh vegetables dwindles because of the increased demand for them, it is likely that millions of people in the metropolis will go hungry before many months pass.

Yes; as I said before, food riots may be possible within the year.

This is a great country and we boast of our enormous production, but even in normal years we do not, as a matter of fact, produce all the food our people and our animals need. It has been necessary to import a small percentage. The lack of shipping now makes the importation of food practically impossible. No one can predict what we will produce in 1943. The weather is a great unknown factor in the situation, but even if we produce this year a normal crop of all our foods, we shall not have enough for our needs.

We have a large army overseas and are creating a larger army here at home. Men in the Army and in training consume a third more food than they did as civilians. Much of the food that we ship to our forces abroad has been and will be sunk by submarines. On top of all this, food will be needed under lend-lease for our allies and for the peoples in the countries that may be recovered from the enemy.

There is nothing, then, more important than increasing to the utmost our production of food this year. Our Government should have foreseen this situation long ago and should have taken steps to meet it. The planting season is already close upon us. Spring plowing is under way already in many sections.

For more than a year, the various farm organizations have been pleading and pleading with the Government for action to meet the crisis that now is fast approaching. They complained because farm labor was being drafted into the Army and being attracted to the cities by high factory wages and shorter hours. Our farm leaders again and again predicted a great national disaster

if something was not done to correct these conditions.

The Selective Service Act at the very beginning should have exempted farm labor from the draft. Workers on the farms should have been automatically deferred. At this late day, bills are pending in Congress to stop the further drain of labor from the farms but that doesn't solve the problem. Irreparable harm already has been done.

Farm labor in these times is skilled labor. Any one not fully experienced in the handling of modern farm equipment, not trained in scientific food production, is not of much value to the farmer-owner. It is absurd to think that we can get maximum food production by taking men from the city, inexperienced in agriculture, and put them on our farms. Our children may help in harvesting certain crops but they cannot possibly qualify as real farm labor, or solve the farmers' labor problem.

In my opinion, to meet this situation, from half a million to a million experienced farmers now in uniform should be released from the Army and sent back to the farms until the crops are harvested next fall. These farmers could be kept in the Army and on the Army payroll and could be given additional pay by the farm operator, to speed up food production.

Appeals to the public to go into gardening extensively this year must be heeded. If everyone would develop a garden of his own, the total production would run into enormous quantities. In England, amazing results have been obtained by tilling unused land and vacant lots. Every available foot of land is being utilized. If we are going to escape a famine next year, we must carry out a similar program here in America.

Another thing we must do is to begin to practice drastic saving of food. Americans have been notorious for wasting food. It has been said that the average family in Europe could subsist on what an American family throws away. We must learn to practice rigid economy and get accustomed to eating less. The British people have only a scant supply of food, but they have found it adequate and have had better health because they have been eating less.

We must learn also basic facts about nutrition. Our research laboratories are developing new facts about vitamins, calories, and body chemistry that should be very helpful in meeting food famine. The new school of nutrition at Cornell University, especially, should have exceedingly valuable information for all of us. The time it not far off when we must entirely change our eating habits.

Still another basic cause of our frightening food prospect are the Office of Price Administration ceilings put on all that the farmer produces. Under many of these ceilings, the farmer cannot produce food except at a loss. The farmer is as patriotic as anyone. He, too, has sons in uniform. He is as eager as anyone to win the war. He is going to do his best for his country. He knows that we must have food, but he simply cannot produce more crops if held down to unprofitable returns, especially with the added difficulties confronting him this year—less help, less machinery, more expensive repairs, higher prices for everything that he buys.

Those latter difficulties, however, will not stop the farmer. No industry in this country enlists more devoted, more skillful, or more resourceful men. Pile all these handicaps on the farmer and he still will produce. He has done it before under conditions appalling to city men who know nothing of the study and skill represented in every successful farm operation.

But our farmers can't do the impossible. They must get enough for their products to be able to hire labor on a wage scale that will be closer to par with industrial wages than at present. No farmer can be expected to spend money in plowing and planting seed unless he can be reasonably sure that he will be able to harvest the crops.

Another destructive factor in the situation is the restriction put on the makers of farm machinery by our War Production Board. Entirely blind to the consequences, the War Production Board has denied to the farm machinery manufacturers, steel enough to develop new farm equipment and to repair and replace the old. It is too late now to correct this situation. Our manufacturers now can't give the farmer the machinery that he will badly need for this year's production.

The price regulation bill was passed under a threat by the President that if Congress didn't do it, he would. Anyway, we today have price regulations and rationing in an increasing degree. The purpose of this legislation was, in the words of its advocates, to prevent inflation.

Inflation is a term very much misused and again has misled many people.

Moderate inflation is wholesome—a good thing. Inflation is the opposite of deflation and deflation, we all know, is the disease that causes depressions, hard times, bankruptcy. A moderate degree of inflation is a stimulus to production on field and in factory. It promotes new enterprises and normally brings good times and prosperity.

Wild inflation, however, is another matter. That is something that must be avoided if we want to escape what happened in Germany and in other countries in Europe after the First World War. Wild inflation results in printing press money and worthless dollars.

Raising prices that the farmer will get for his crops should not produce any alarming inflation. There can be and should be a certain amount of control of prices but that control must not go so far as to discourage production as has been the case under the Office of Price Administration.

Any of us would be willing to give almost any price for food when it is not available. When it comes to necessary food, we simply will not be stopped by any price.

Before we had Office of Price Administration price regulation, restrictions, and rationing, prices automatically rationed everything. When prices rose, consumption decreased. The law of supply and demand always operates. When demand declines, and supply increases prices fall and vice versa.

When the supply of anything is limited and there is a scramble for some of that definite supply, rationing becomes necessary, so that each may get his fair share. But when you put ceilings on foods or goods that are to be produced, you invariably decrease production and cut down the supply. So far as food is concerned, the Office of Price Administration restrictions and regulations are having exactly that effect.

Black markets are hard to suppress. In Spain they just shot black market operators. Killing thousands didn't end the evil. Then the government imprisoned violators. That too failed. Now they recognize the situation and tax the violators.

Neither in Spain, Germany, Russia, Italy or anywhere else has it been possible to wipe out black markets even by death penalties.

To police the country tightly enough to keep prices at fixed levels would require millions of police and snoopers and would cost billions of dollars and millions of hours of manpower. That would be bureaucracy at its greatest. Such cost would be extravagant in peacetime, prohibitive in wartime.

When we begin to see the importance of our food supply, one of the most necessary things in our lives and in the prosecution of the war, we should insist that Congress and the administration at Washington reverse the disastrous steps that have brought about our serious plight and do something to give us relief.

With this critical situation facing us, even at this late hour the Government is doing little to correct conditions and lessen the misery that is ahead of us.

Secretary of Agriculture Wickard has absolutely failed in his job. His resignation should be forthcoming and someone should be put in his place who could produce results where he has so utterly failed.

The public as it begins to see the awful consequences of the waste, the blundering and the stupidity in the handling of this most important subject, will become furious. Louis Bromfield, author, Democrat, and former supporter of the administration, who owns a farm of 1,100 acres and who knows the food situation, recently said that: "This (the handling of the food situation) by next autumn will become one of the greatest scandals in American history It affects the whole future history of ourselves and of the world—even the future possibility of a decent peace. And throughout the world, millions of people will sicken and die and generations of children will grow up stunted and sickly because a frivolous and incompetent bureaucracy in the richest country in the world, did not do its job."

Anyone who studies the situation and knows the facts today will agree that Bromfield is not exaggerating. There is nothing more tragic in our history than the mishandling of all phases of the problem of an adequate supply of food for ourselves, our Army, our allies, and the starving people of Europe.

Absenteeism in War Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix two timely discussions in the press of absenteeism in war industry. One is an article published in the Washington Daily News of Monday, March 15, entitled "Plant Cuts Absences by Attention to Colds, Transportation, Banking." The other is an article by Edward Robinson, entitled "Britain, Too, Has Absenteeism But Relies on Internal Remedies," published in the Washington Post of March 14, 1943.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of March 15, 1943]

IT PAYS TO COOPERATE WITH EMPLOYEES—PLANT CUTS ABSENCES BY ATTENTION TO COLDS, TRANSPORTATION, BANKING

While Washington absenteeism in Government offices awaits somebody to motivate remedies, the Stromberg-Carlson Telephone Manufacturing Co., at Rochester, N. Y., is solving the absentee problem on a commonsense basis of cooperation.

The firm's labor-management production drive committee, credited by Government officials as one of the best in the country, began tackling the problem 5 months ago.

SURVEY OF CAUSES

The first step was a survey of the causes of absenteeism. The check showed 60 percent absent because of sickness (43 percent colds); 16 percent, sickness in the family; 16 percent, personal business; and 8 percent, lack of transportation.

Approaching the job as a community responsibility as well as a factory problem, the committee set to work in cooperation with other plants and community agencies to get rid of the causes.

Car clubs were intensively promoted. City transportation facilities were adapted and readapted to war-worker needs.

BANKS STAY OPEN

Investigation showed that overtime workers were taking time off to do their banking. A sympathetic banker took the matter up with the Rochester Clearing House Association. Banks now stay open one night a week until 9 o'clock.

Anticipating a leap in absences from income-tax headaches, the committee took preventive steps to save time for the workers. Arrangements were made to have workers fill out a simple questionnaire, pay a money order, and say goodby to March 15 blues.

Health problems were attacked on several fronts. Educational information against spreading of colds was plastered on bulletin and war production boards.

MEDICAL PROGRAM

The committee recommended an expert medical program of feeding to workers cold-resistant vitamins at cost or less. Workers were urged to use city recreational facilities.

Experts were brought in to reorganize the cafeteria, and workers were sold on doing their share to keep the place clean.

An intensive general educational campaign, with posters and loud speaker, through the factory, hammers home daily such themes as "An A. W. O. L. worker is a deserter." A poster contest among workers produced a batch of attractive posters that appealed to workers.

As a result of Stromberg-Carlson's campaign to eliminate unnecessary causes of lost man-hours, absenteeism now runs under 3 percent a week.

[From the Washington Post of March 14, 1943]

BRITAIN, TOO, HAS ABSENTEEISM, BUT RELIES ON "INTERNAL REMEDIES"—BEVIN EXPECTS INDUSTRIES TO LOOK FOR OWN CURES, NOT DEPEND ON ANY OUTSIDE DISCIPLINE

(England has been at war for 3½ years. For more than 2½ years, since the fall of France in the spring of 1940, her production has been on an all-out war basis. She has had her problem of absenteeism in war plants, and has developed her own methods of approach to it. Edward Robinson of the Associated Press London staff interviewed British leaders and visited factories for the following summary of the English counterpart of the problem that is receiving so much public attention in this country.)

(By Edward Robinson)

LONDON, March 13.—Absenteeism, a mounting problem to the war industries of the United States, is also a problem in Britain; but the government here believes it can be remedied by internal rather than external measures.

Labor Minister Bevin puts the view this way:

The cure "is more likely to be found by those establishments who look for the solution within themselves than by those which tend to rely more on external powers of discipline or punishment."

At the end of 1942 there were about 8,000,000 persons in Britain engaged on "essential work," and of these about 10 percent (800,000) were absent from their work each day from one cause or another.

MOVEMENTS RESTRICTED

In industries under the "essential work order," labor movements are definitely restricted; an employer cannot discharge a man from his job, nor can an employee quit, without Government permission.

The Office of War Information, in a report issued February 15, said job absences in the United States now "may be twice" the rate of 3 percent "common in industry" before war industries got under way, and that the rate may be even higher in some plants which experience difficult working and transportation problems.

Richard Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, reported that normal prewar absence in industry was 2.2 percent and has now increased among men to 4.5 percent and among women to 6.5 percent.

According to the Congress of Industrial Organizations, more than half of the absences are caused by illness, inadequate health, transportation and housing difficulties, labor hoarding, and inadequate planning of allocation of materials, to draft-board examinations, appearances in court, blizzards, and flood.

SHOPPING IS FACTOR

In the official view, malicious absence accounted for about 2 percent of the British absentees; the workers who, nursing some sort of grudge, stayed out for days on end or were persistently late. Some, in the careless class, excused themselves with "missed the bus," "away for the weekend," "alarm clock didn't work," and the like.

Short-period absences reached their peak on Fridays—traditional British pay day—were high on Saturdays and Mondays. "Married women tend to take Saturday mornings for shopping," says a labor-ministry official.

About two-thirds of the daily absences were accounted for by illness. Absence through this cause has increased since the replacement of younger men by older workers and those of lower medical grades.

In seven factories checked by the British Medical Journal, colds and flu were found to be the greatest causes of time lost. Fifty percent of all the male workers and 45 percent of the women lost some working time during the 6 months of 1942 under review.

LONGER WEEK THERE

Numerous differences make comparisons between the American and British situations difficult, but one factor tending to make absenteeism an even more acute problem in Britain is a longer workweek, taxing health and endurance. The British war industry week is 56 hours. Latest Office of War Information figure for United States is 47.9 hours as the average for all metal-working industry.

The British Medical Association warned the Government at the end of 1942 that "industrial fatigue due to excessive working hours was filling the consulting rooms with thousands of war workers suffering from minor ailments" and pressed for an immediate inquiry.

Government investigators used no rose-colored spectacles when seeking causes and cures. One reported: "What must be accepted is the psychological factor that thousands of workers see in their job the complete disruption of their home life. Married women with the full-time job of looking after husband, children, and the home are working long hours in factories and shops. Men's homes are disorganized by the fact that wives, daughters, other relations, parents in some instances, are all going to work, or because they have been sent right away from their families to work."

PEP TALKS HELP

Another noted that the lack of real interest in the job and lack of conviction about its importance and urgency are mainly due to ignorance:

"It is too readily assumed that workers generally are only concerned with the money incentive whereas experience shows that workers in general respond in an increasing degree to the incentive of interest when they are made aware of the part their job plays in the final product."

The supply ministry in a recent circular emphasized "it is part of the business of good management to keep the workpeople informed of the use of their products in battle."

The ministry itself helps with a thousand day and night cinema shows, mostly of news films, demonstrating to the workers the results of their efforts. Ten-minute pep talks are another feature.

"Many workers," commented another report, "particularly women, cannot be expected to work 5½ days weekly and long hours, week in week out, if they have to spend an additional 2 or 3 hours daily or even more in traveling, possibly by crowded bus or train, in all weathers. It must be remembered that a high percentage of today's war workers are not used to factory life."

AWAY ABOUT 12 HOURS

Most workers, it was added, were away from their homes or billets about 12 hours, calculating the average traveling time plus work shift.

Another contributory cause noted was idle time when workers are forced to stand about for hours, even days, held up by some cause usually completely beyond their control.

A significant point noted by investigators was the gulf in the factories between those who know and those who don't, blamed by many for loss of output through slacking and absenteeism.

Labor Minister Bevin summarized: "The majority of the absentees stay away occasionally because of exhaustion, and the best way to reduce that is to limit the call upon human energy. There must be every possible aid to labor, every device to avoid unnecessary fatigue."

CURES OUTLINED

In a recent memorandum to all war industries, Bevin indicated broad and general outlines for cures, asked employers, managements, works production committees, and trade unions to seek the best remedial action "to mitigate difficult conditions and to bring public opinion to bear on those who are careless in attendance or punctuality."

Included in the remedial schemes are:

1. Factory records of absence and all relevant data, to be discussed regularly before works production committees and managements. (In previous investigations one stumbling block was the lack of or unsuitability of factory records.)

2. A very high rate of sickness absence is to be checked by medical examination; high accident rates to be immediately investigated.

3. Absence backed by what appears to be a reasonable excuse to be watched by welfare officers, in whose hands should be such "cures" as transport improvement, additional nurseries, better hostel arrangements, tastier and more regular meals, suitable leave for shopping.

4. Rotated schedules to give workers another day off weekly besides Sunday; workers to be encouraged to use hostels and billets near the factories where traveling is a hindrance to attendance.

"Works production committees, personnel departments and such other bodies," said Bevin, "can and should settle absenteeism locally and without any governmental interference."

Time to Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have a request to make which has a little personal tinge. In the Christian Science Monitor of March 17 appears a fine editorial entitled "Time to Act," dealing with the subject of the resolution submitted in the Senate by several of us a few days ago. I think the editorial was written by Mr. Donovan Richardson, an editorial writer of the Christian Science Monitor, whom I have known ever since he was very young. He comes from New Mexico, and possesses one of the best minds in the country. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO ACT

Some sincere advocates of American participation in a system of world security are questioning the wisdom of raising the issue in the Senate at this time—as it is raised by the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution. They are concerned lest Senators who, nudged by events, had begun to emerge from the shell of isolationism, take fright and climb back in. They fear that opposition which had been melting under the pressure of war's necessities may harden again in the acerbities of debate.

Now there is good reason to cherish the tender growth of United Nations cooperation. But common danger nourished cooperation; every approach toward victory lessens the impulse to cooperate. The long-range need for collective security will be no less when war ends, but it will be less urgent and visible. After the rain stops we tend to forget the leaky roof.

Moreover, as a practical matter it must be asked how much farther United Nations cooperation could grow when continually threatened by the blight of Senate disapproval. Military and economic collaboration for winning the war has been fairly good, although haphazard and incomplete. But beyond the Churchill-Roosevelt conferences and lend-lease there is no machinery for united action by the United Nations. Both these methods will decline in peace. There is no United Nations organization which by work in the war is gaining strength for the task of maintaining peace.

One alternative to a Senate declaration would be a device by which the President could obtain the constant advice and consent of the Senate. This was envisaged by the framers of the Constitution who were thinking of a Senate not much bigger than its present Foreign Relations Committee. But today there is no clearly feasible method, except a vote, for obtaining either advice or a dependable sign of consent from the Senate.

President Roosevelt is noncommittal on the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution. Two possible reasons are apparent. One is that he does not want to press the Senate on a point where it is jealous of Executive authority. The other, indicated by Senator CONNALLY'S statement, is that he may feel a United Nations council would interfere with the conduct of the war. However, a stage has been reached today where United Nations plans—even for conduct of the war—are hampered by lack of assurance about the Senate's sanction for American participation in the policing of the peace.

This newspaper welcomes the resolution of the four Senators as a means of obtaining this essential assurance. We believe the American people are ready to take their full share in policing the peace and preventing another war. We believe that if they will make their purpose known, the Senate will find no difficulty in giving its consent and a basic step toward winning the peace will have been taken.

Organization of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mark Sullivan entitled "Post-War Planning," published in the Washington, D. C., Post of March 17, 1943, and an editorial entitled "Applying the Touchstone," published in the Philadelphia, Pa., Bulletin of March 16.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 17, 1943]

POST-WAR PLANNING—STEP IN TIME

(By Mark Sullivan)

The action of four Senators—BALL, HATCH, HILL, BURTON—is a landmark. By the step they have taken, all the diffused talk about post-war has been brought to a focus. From the sprawling mass of plans, suggestions, and ideas emerging everywhere the four Senators distilled a concrete proposal. They wrote it out in the form of a Senate resolution. They took their resolution to President Roosevelt, who in a general way, approved informally the "broad objective." Then they took it to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. TOM CONNALLY, of Texas. He took much the same position as the President—approval of the broad objective, with preference for alternative details. Finally the four Senators, acting through Senator BALL, of Minnesota, formally introduced their resolution in the Senate.

There is now something definite which Senators and everybody else can get their teeth into. People were longing for some such thing. This is shown by the quick publicity and discussion which the action excited, the instant importance it attained. Its chief distinction is its concreteness, its comprehensiveness. Also its nonpartisan quality—2 of the Senators are Democratic, 2 Republican. This resolution has no greater standing than others that have been proposed or will be. The four authors, while esteemed, are not important leaders; they are not members of the Foreign Relations Committee. The post-war plan that will emerge ultimately may differ greatly from this resolution. The very important and timely service these four Senators have done is to give the country something tangible upon which all the talk about post-war can concentrate for endorsement or modification, for addition, or for subtraction.

The provisions of this Senate resolution, here condensed, are:

That the United States bring about an organization of the United Nations, for six limited and specific functions. First, to cooperate in the war; second, to set up temporary governments in countries that will be occupied by the United Nations' forces; third, to administer relief and restore economic life in occupied and other countries; fourth, to set up machinery for peaceful settlement of future disputes between nations; fifth, to provide a joint military force to keep the peace; sixth, to provide for the future admission of other nations to the organization now set up.

Introduction of this Senate resolution, and others proposed, has several motives and intended effects. One is outstanding. It represents an attempt by the Senate to facilitate and participate in the making of peace, and the post-war arrangements to follow. The Senate is going to do this and—this is the point—do it in time. What this step, taken at this time means, can be understood by recalling the peace negotiations at the end of the Great War—and what happened later. The Senate is about to do that which fatally was not done in the Great War.

During the Great War, President Wilson evolved a post-war plan, including a League of Nations. He evolved it himself, with mainly one intimate personal adviser, Colonel House, who was not the Secretary of State. With this plan evolved, Wilson went to the peace conference. He did not take with him any Senator. As the peace conference progressed, the idea of the League of Nations became understood in the United States. Some details of it were disturbing to some areas of American thought.

Thereupon 39 Senators signed a round-robin reminding the world, the peace conference, and Wilson, that any treaty of peace must be ratified by two-thirds of the Senate.

Wilson went on with the League. When completed, he laid it before the Senate for ratification. There ensued more than a year of debate. In the end, the League was rejected. Yet essentially the difference between rejection and acceptance was not great. At times during the debate, had Wilson been willing to agree to certain modifications, the League might have been ratified.

It is a fair judgment that had Wilson laid the League of Nations before the Senate preceding the end of the war, had the Senate and Wilson cooperated in formulating the League, it would have been adopted and much subsequent history would have been different.

What is now taking place is a forehanded effort to avoid what happened after the Great War. It is an attempt to have, before the war ends, the debate which, 23 years ago, did not come until the war was over. It is an effort to assure, for the United Nations, a better fate than befell the League of Nations.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin of March 16, 1943]

APPLYING THE TOUCHSTONE

The Senators who are trying to get the United States to give a lead in organizing permanent cooperation of the United Nations for peace have the right idea. There is little open opposition to the idea in principle; it has been endorsed by the Republican National Committee and the party delegation in the last House.

But the way to test the strength of the conviction of professed adherents is to come forward with a concrete plan. Such a plan may have defects, but it will start discussion, and above all serve to get on record those who will have to deal with the post-war problems.

If the proposal of a plan is met not by constructive criticism of its features, but by

a general plea that it is too early to attack the problem, we are justified in seeing a play for postponement leading to final defeat.

Senator WHEELER makes objections that are a good argument for the proposal of his colleagues. He complains that we do not know what the Russians or the British really mean to do. The obvious way to find out is to invite them to join in a definite plan of cooperation. If they do, we have made a considerable advance. If they make objection, we have a chance to negotiate and learn their terms.

The plan of the Senators who called on the President is reasonable. It is for some form of international organization by which the United Nations will act together in war and peace. Something in the nature of permanent military force will help give effect to its decisions. It is not to be another League of Nations, for only the members of the anti-Axis alliance are eligible to belong. It will be a sort of permanent executive committee of the United Nations.

We have already a pretty good idea of the obstacles to the cooperation sought; but it is important to get them in the clear. The project of a permanent alliance of peace-loving nations for the curbing of aggression isn't something that we can take or leave alone at our pleasure. If it is not realized, men and women in the future, perhaps the very next generation, will pay the price in more blood, sweat, and tears.

Discounting Advance Payments of Tax

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, there are many Members of this House who are as friendly to the institution of private enterprise as I am, but there is no Member who is any friendlier to it than I, or who desires its preservation any more than I.

The principle of a discount for prompt payment in advance of the due date of a bill is as old an institution as the institution of private enterprise itself. It is a principle which is participated in by every successful small merchant in the United States. It has been the custom for decades. At the present time the small merchants of this country are liquidating their inventories, they are building up cash reserves, and there is no group on earth that will participate in a discount privilege on tax payments any more than will the small enterprisers of the United States.

It is a fact that the business interests of this country thoroughly understand the principle of "discount for cash." This principle is as sound as is our economy and the practices upon which it has been built. It is indeed surprising that a Republican Member of this House would fail to understand that all this is true. Furthermore, if our people could be induced to pay their taxes in advance before the due date it would do two very important things: First, it would prevent the necessity of the Federal Treasurer going into the market and borrowing that much of funds and thereby make unnecessary the payment of such huge interest charges; and, second, the cost of administration or what is called the collection costs could be materially reduced. How can anyone overlook such fundamental and evident truths? Does not the gentleman understand the discount which is allowed by States and other subdivisions of government with regard to this very problem? Of course, discounts are allowed for advance payment and penalties are imposed for delayed payments. To advocate that such a discount principle appearing in a Federal tax proposal is a "rich man's game" is an advocacy the people of this country will not accept. They are too wise for that kind of talk.

Organization of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sound Foreign Policy," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 15, 1943, and an article by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, entitled "Senators' Plan Called Guaranty of Unity," published in the Washington Star of March 15, 1943, dealing with the Senate resolution to establish a central United Nations organization.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 15, 1943]

SOUND FOREIGN POLICY

With a foresight that holds great promise for the future, four Senators, two Democrats and two Republicans, one of them being Senator BURTON, of Ohio, will present a resolution to their colleagues tomorrow to establish a foreign policy that will insure American participation in world affairs after the war.

This step is even more important than the arrival in Washington of British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden to lay the basis for United Nations war and post-war policy. Whatever American statesmen might agree to with Eden and other representatives of our allies would be tentative and possibly futile without the sanction of the Senate.

The Senate resolution is a fortunate coincidence. It supplies the necessary ground on which Secretary of State Hull, Under Secretary Welles, Eden, and other representatives of the United Nations can build. Their labors in the weeks ahead, if the resolution is adopted, can be directed toward the solution of specific problems which confront the United Nations in the war and those which will face them at the termination of hostilities. There will be less shooting in the dark than would otherwise have been the case.

This resolution removes a great fear that for almost a quarter century has hung over all international relations: The fear that whatever steps were taken toward collective action would be scuttled by a hostile Senate. This fear stemmed from the action of that body in the days immediately after the World War when the program that President Woodrow Wilson had proposed for a world order was thrown overboard in one of the bitterest partisan battles the Senate had ever witnessed.

The bipartisan character of the 4-man group introducing the resolutions and the fact that Senate leaders of both parties have given their advice and approval rules out a repetition of the unhappy quarrel which hastened President Wilson's death. It did more than that. By arbitrarily returning to a policy of isolation in a world where isolation was no longer possible; by refusing to permit the United States to act as responsible world power, that quarrel helped create conditions which contributed in no small measure to the war that now engulfs the globe.

Geography, transportation, communications, and all the sciences that mankind has employed to shrink his world, not party feeling, predetermine the position of the United States. The value of this resolution is that it frankly recognizes these facts and proposes specific means of meeting them.

The framework of the world organization which the sponsors of the Senate resolution desire already exists in the United Nations. That framework can be strengthened for the future conduct of the war and made permanent for the future prevention of wars of aggression. The resolution is an insurance policy. The people of the United States, enlightened by hard experience, are ready to pay the premium.

[From the Washington Evening Star, of March 15, 1943]

SENATORS' PLAN CALLED GUARANTY OF UNITY—MAJOR ELIOT URGES PASSAGE OF RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CENTRAL ALLIED ORGANIZATION

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

The four Senators who have prepared the resolution advising the creation of a central United Nations organization have performed a great public service. The names of Senators BALL, BURTON, HATCH, and HILL deserve to be long remembered with gratitude by their fellow countrymen, and those countrymen will do well to begin without delay making their sentiments known to the remaining Members of the Senate. The future of our country, the welfare of our children may well hang on the success or failure of this momentous resolution.

This historic document touches upon two main themes:

(1) The need for a central agency of the United Nations, a supreme war council, if you like that name, for the better coordination of allied effort and policy in the direction of this war.

(2) The even more urgent need for such an agency to begin planning now the steps to be taken when the war is won.

The first is an essential instrument of victory.

The second is an essential insurance against the loss of the fruits of victory.

The proposal of the four Senators is no high-flung attempt to make a blueprint of some visionary Utopia. It is a severely practical document. It deals with the United Nations as the victors in this war and as the inevitable inheritors of the responsibility for conserving the benefits of peace, that just, charitable, and enduring peace which alone will justify the sacrifices which the winning of victory has demanded and will continue to demand.

It comes at a peculiarly propitious moment. The Foreign Minister of Great Britain is in Washington for the precise purpose of discussing means of securing better cooperation among the United Nations and "questions arising out of the war." Our relations with

the Soviet Union have just become the subject of open and frank discussion, and seem to have benefited from the process. Meanwhile it has become clear—as it should always have been clear—that Russia is not going to defeat Germany single-handed, that the task of winning this war must be a coalition effort, both directed and fought in the true spirit of coalition for which the absolutely indispensable foundation must be a rock-ribbed mutual confidence amongst the members of the coalition. That confidence must go down to the people; it cannot be merely the personal confidence existing between individual heads of state.

Toward the establishment of such confidence, the four Senators have taken a long step; a still longer one will be taken when the Senate has adopted their resolution, as it is to be earnestly hoped that it will.

The peoples of the world have not forgotten the lessons of the last peace. They have not forgotten that the United States Senate then refused its endorsement of the plans and commitments of the President, and withdrew the United States from active participation in the League of Nations. They have not forgotten, either, that American foreign policy has ever since that time, down to the outbreak of the current war, been weakened and restrained by this same inability of the Executive to make definite commitments in the sphere in which the advice and consent of the Senate are constitutionally necessary.

Now it is proposed that the Senate put itself on record in advance. Nothing could be better designed to produce an upsurge of confidence amongst our allies in our future good intentions. Nothing could be a better guaranty, in London and Moscow and Chungking, that the people of the United States now recognize that they live in a world too small to enable them to escape responsibility for their share in the keeping of the common peace

Out of that reborn confidence may flow immense results. We may at last have a real United Nations council. The United Nations may become a living fact rather than a distant hope, a name, a promise without guaranty. Better organization may shorten the war, save thousands of lives, bring us the sooner to the better world for which that organization must then lay the cornerstone.

The four Senators have done their share. Now it is up to their colleagues to indorse their vision and their wisdom; more than that, it is up to every citizen of every State in the Union to let his Senators know, and at once, that he expects them to tell the world that this time America means not only to be victorious in war, but to accept the responsibilities of peace and reconstruction. This we must do if we are to hope that our children may in their time escape the trials and the sacrifices which in our time our own folly and blindness have brought upon our Nation and the world.

The Problems of Agriculture

REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the mounting shortage of farm labor and essential agricultural machinery constitutes a major problem which the national administration has completely failed to solve. How critical the issue has become is apparent from the conclusions presented at the Midwest Governors' Conference attended by the representatives of 12 Midwestern States constituting the Nation's "bread basket." Without guaranties of adequate labor and farm equipment to meet the Agricultural Department's demand for new record production in 1943, the Governors and spokesman of the most important grain-growing regions in America declared there is no assurance of adequate provisions for home consumption and the huge allotments of food earmarked for our Allies abroad.

It is significant that no representatives of the Federal Government were present at this important meeting in spite of the fact that Secretary of Agriculture Claude Wickard, War Manpower Director Paul V. McNutt, and Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, had been invited. Their failure to be present in person or to have officials of their departments on hand to participate in the discussions and present the administration viewpoint demonstrates anew the fact that the present Government has not succeeded in evolving an adequate farm program to meet our wartime needs.

To produce the food necessary to feed our civilian population and to take care of foreign orders, the 12 States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, South Dakota, Kansas, Minnesota, North Dakota, Wisconsin, and Ohio have been called upon to raise 15 percent more food than was grown in the bumper year of 1942. But to do this task, our farmers will have 20 percent less labor, and less farm machinery, and small prospect of obtaining effective replacements for either.

The responsibility for these critical shortages cannot be avoided by our Government. For the past year farmers and their spokesmen have been bitterly denouncing the induction of their skilled help. They have pointed out the obstacles thrown in the way of replacing their outworn machinery or purchasing new farming implements. Allocation of steel to manufacturers of farm equipment has been kept at such low levels that the shortage of available farm machinery which is already regarded as serious in some areas may become critical throughout the entire Nation by the end of 1944.

But nothing better illustrates the utter inadequacy of our national farm policy than the confusion which prevails everywhere on the induction of farm workers into the military services. If our responsible Government officials had worked out an intelligent, far-sighted program at the outset, there would be no necessity for the frantic efforts now being displayed to recruit armies of children, city deskworkers, and even furloughed soldiers to bring in our crops. And even these makeshift, admittedly inefficient proposals offer no prospect of meeting the demand for planting and cultivation which must go on continuously to assure adequate farm production. Those officials in our Government who would have us believe that modern farming can be carried on by handfuls of farmers throughout the growing season, with an army of harvesters when the crop has matured cannot be seriously regarded. If they know their business, they know full well that this is not the way in which American farming has produced the tremendous crops upon which our Nation has thrived. If they know their business, they understand that we must have an assured supply of farm labor from the beginning of the planting season right through the harvest. They know that inexperienced farm hands may be worse than none at all.

All of these difficulties stem directly from the failure of the administration to accord farming its rightful place in our war economy. The widely publicized observations of our Secretary of Agriculture to the effect that "Food will win the war and write the peace" must have been forgotten somewhere in the drafting of our military plans. When it becomes necessary for the representatives of 12 great food-producing States to remind our Government of the needs of agriculture, there is something definitely wrong with our Department of Agriculture.

The entire Nation must be deeply concerned over the recommendations and conclusions reached by the Midwest Governors' Conference. They urged, and the people of our country must urge with them:

First. That agriculture be recognized as an essential war industry and be rated as such with respect to manpower, materials, and equipment.

Second. That while there is no proposal of blanket deferment for agricultural workers all experienced labor, essential to farm production, should be preferred and farm workers like industrial workers should be given proper recognition by Federal authorities with suitable insignia or other marks of distinction for giving their best services to their country by remaining on the farm front.

Third. That adequate supplies of steel and other materials be provided to complete the manufacture of partly finished agricultural machinery, that all present stocks of farm machinery now frozen be released for sale, that planning of farm machine needs for 1944 be undertaken immediately and ascertained by May 1, 1943, and that the present system of allocating farm machinery be corrected to meet the actual needs of farmers in every area of the Nation.

Fourth. That local War Production Boards be given authority to supply the welding rod, bar steel, and other materials used in the local repair of farm machinery; that restrictions on manufacturing farm machines, replacement parts, repairs, and distributing these products be removed at once.

Fifth. That transportation facilities be provided for migrant seasonal workers.

Sixth. And that supplies of fertilizer now available be released immediately for the 1943 crop season.

Our farming population is waiting to hear the answer of the Government to these critical needs. Joined with them must be the population of the entire Nation, for on our food-production front there stands the greatest challenge to American victory.

Duke's Chambermaid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL. W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, this Congress owes a debt of gratitude to Mr. Frank C. Waldrop, able reporter for the Washington Times-Herald, for his recent article entitled "Who Let This Pretty Fair In?" The facts revealed by Mr. Waldrop further justify the action by this House in denying further funds to the National Resources Planning Board. Under permission to extend my remarks I include this splendid job of reporting:

WHO LET THIS PRETTY PAIR IN?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Whether it was Alexandre Dumas or Victor Hugo we can't remember, but one of these two got off a neat line as follows:

"If you would be splendid, be a duke. If you would be powerful, be a duke's chambermaid."

French novelists are bound by tradition to say things like that, and wink. But nevertheless the truth is self-evident. Carried over into politics, the central thought of the above crack has been proved true thousands of times.

Behind every front man there is, in politics, almost invariably a fast thinking string puller who does not seek publicity.

The front man takes the bows and the blows. The obscure manipulator behind the scenes enjoys a satisfaction that has no equal for the power lover, and that is—authority without responsibility.

Two fine specimens of the front-man type in politics are the esteemed Uncle Fred Delano, Chairman of the soon-to-be-defunct National Resources Planning Board, and Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board.

Frederic Delano signs his name to the reports of the National Resources Planning Board, such as the massive proposition recently sent to Congress by the President, providing a formula by means of which to destroy private property and the independence of United States citizens, and enforce state socialism.

Donald Nelson takes the responsibility for the War Production Board's labor policies, which have been mushy to a degree that it would take an extended chapter to diagnose in detail.

You can grasp the essential facts by a look at the headlines almost any day or by listening for 5 minutes to any returned soldier discussing battle-front sentiment toward the Administration's labor policy.

Students of political operations have wondered sometimes about some of the manipulators of these two front men, Messrs. Delano and Nelson. Herewith a little report on a brace of these:

Exhibit A: Mrs. Dr. Eveline M. Burns, Ph. D., director of research for the National Resources Planning Board.

Exhibit B: Mr. Dr. Arthur R. Burns, Ph. D., chief labor adviser to the War Production Board.

The Drs. Burns are man and wife, as you may have suspected. What you may not have known is that the Drs. Burns are both natives of England and were British subjects until a recent phase of the New Deal era, at which point they became United States citizens and soon took office of the United States Government.

We are indebted to the underground railroad operated jointly by the Honorable Felix Frankfurter of the United States Supreme Court and by the Honorable Harold Laski of the London School of Economics for their presence in our midst.

The Drs. Burns are both ex-high functionaries of the London School of Economics, which has turned out in its day many a pretty mess of confused master statisticians and enthusiastic Communist and Socialist joiners.

The Drs. Burns are both, naturally, prolific word wranglers, and have much to say about how the world should be made over in an image best described by Karl Marx, the venerable inventor of excuses for governments which wish to destroy the independence of citizens.

Some people have been wondering where Mr. Delano got all that Socialist abracadabra for his National Resources Planning Board report. It was much too expertly done for an amateur. The answer, of course, is that Dr. Eveline Burns did the job. It is not her first.

In 1932 the Socialist Party of the United States issued a tract entitled "Socialist Planning and a Socialist Program," in which Mr. Delano's thinker, Dr. Eveline Burns, now on the United States Government's pay roll, wrote that the good society "will have to devise methods of preventing the indiscriminate use of resources by every optimistic producer * * * and of replacing the guesses of individual producers by a more orderly method of estimation (of need)

"Such a method would imply the imposition of controls that would refuse individuals the right to make what use they wish of their own labor and property."

Note well that labor as well as property is to be controlled. Further along in her tract Dr. Burns says that when socialism comes "the Socialist state will have to devise some means of coercing labor where necessary" to make labor do what the Socialist state wants.

And, reviewing the collapse of Socialist government in England, Dr. Burns makes special note of the fact that in the absence of censorship it is difficult to make people swallow the Socialist state's doctrine. "Something," she says, "must be done about that."

There, for whoever wants to defend it, is the bared mentality of the thinker behind the Honorable Frederic A. Delano, who signed a report which, if executed into law, would impose socialism on the United States. What goes for the wife over at National Resources Planning Board, by the way, goes for the husband over at War Labor Board.

The Doctors Burns are a happy pair, congenial in every respect. And why not? They're on the pay roll of the United States Government busily doing their bit.

Every advocate of state socialism should be pleased—but not so the American who believes in liberty and who opposes regimentation of the press, of labor, and of property.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, John L. Lewis has given his ultimatum to us, fixing the deadline April 1. What would Grover Cleveland do?

Yes; this was the land of opportunity, but with all these taxes, what chance has one to make a million dollars now?

The ides of March
And income tax,
Took all his starch,
He'll now relax.

He spent his dough,
Now cash he lacks;
He'll cash a bond
To pay his tax.

—*M. L. R.*

Representative FRANK CARLSON and his Ruml plan will furnish much conversation in the next several weeks. Who said the G. O. P. couldn't furnish something new and constructive?

What the country needs most in America for the war effort this summer is a little less saluting and a little more snap put in pitchforks, shovels, hoes.

The daily observation of their National Capitol by thousands of young Americans in service uniforms is a constant source of greatest interest to Members of Congress.

We saw our recent Kansas colleague, Houston, raise his hand and heard him repeat the words with the final "I do." Luck to you, Jack, in your labors with labor on the N. L. R. B.

Kansas has not only given General Eisenhower to our country at this important time, but it has set an example to the other 47 States by passing a Rickenbacker labor bill. HOWARD SMITH, are we coming?

If the House has its way, the old Extension Department will come to the front for supplying farm labor. With all his other duties the county agent will be busier than the proverbial cranberry merchant.

Just as we had resolved to spend our A gas card on showing servicemen about on Saturdays and Sundays, on the expected lifting of the pleasure ban, here comes a 50-percent cut in gallons, making it only six per month.

Col. Frank Roberts and Lt. Col. Howard Reed told us at luncheon today, of India and Africa. When our men talk the story is more interesting, yet there is so much for military reasons that they cannot tell.

So Dr. Merton Rice, of Detroit, is dead. He was one of Bishop William A. Quayle's boys at Baker University. While in the academy at Ottawa, Kans., in the late nineties, I walked 2 miles each way on Sunday to hear him preach to his first congregation of a hundred.

Government in Peace and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD an article entitled "Government in Peace and War," written by Milton W. Harrison, editor of the Savings Bank Journal, and published in the Savings Bank Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT IN PEACE AND WAR

(By Milton W. Harrison, editor, Savings Bank Journal)

As the war in Europe and Asia roars toward a climax and on the home front post-war plans multiply and expenditures mount, it behooves all of us to survey objectively our present predicament. I am concerned mainly with the financial aspects of this crisis.

Up to December 31, 1942, the authorized war program amounted to $238,000,000,000, of which $184,000,000,000, or 77 percent, was already committed, and $75,000,000,000 or 32 percent was already spent.

Had these war costs been thrust upon a nation not in debt, our task would be much less difficult. Unfortunately they came as an aftermath of years of deficits. The following table, based on data obtained from official sources, shows that the Federal Government had gone $29,228,000,000 in the red for its peacetime budget operations for the 9 fiscal years immediately preceding Pearl Harbor:

Year	Net receipts	Expenditures [1]	Net Budget deficit
1933	$2,080,000,000	$3,864,000,000	$1,784,000,000
1934	3,116,000,000	6,011,000,000	2,896,000,000
1935	3,800,000,000	7,010,000,000	3,209,000,000
1936	4,116,000,000	8,666,000,000	4,550,000,000
1937	5,029,000,000	8,177,000,000	3,149,000,000
1938	5,855,000,000	7,239,000,000	1,384,000,000
1939	5,165,000,000	8,707,000,000	3,542,000,000
1940	5,387,000,000	8,998,000,000	3,611,000,000
1941	7,607,000,000	12,711,000,000	5,103,000,000
Total	42,155,000,000	71,383,000,000	29,228,000,000

[1] Excludes amounts for public-debt retirement which are chargeable to the sinking fund, etc., under special provisions of law

And now, because of the world strife in which we find ourselves embroiled, we must superimpose $148,096,000,000 of deficits for 3 years only upon this already unsound base, as follows:

Year	Net receipts	Expenditures [1]	Net Budget deficit
1942	$12,799,000,000	$32,397,000,000	$19,598,000,000
1943 [2]	22,976,000,000	80,432,000,000	57,456,000,000
1944 [2]	33,081,000,000	104,123,000,000	71,042,000,000
Total	68,856,000,000	216,952,000,000	148,096,000,000

[1] Excludes amounts for public-debt retirement which are chargeable to the sinking fund, etc., under special provisions of law.
[2] Estimated.

Prior to fiscal 1942, the last year in which Federal expenditures approached the $20,000,000,000 mark was in 1918 of World War No. 1. At that time we spent $18,515,000,000 and incurred a deficit of $13,363,000,000. Our total net deficit for the 3 years 1917-19 was $23,249,000,000, or less than one-sixth of our contemplated deficit for the 3 years 1942-44.

Equally significant is the fact that regular Federal services in those 3 years of World War No. 1 cost only $6,456,000,000, or slightly more than $2,000,000,000 a year. But now, following on the heels of 10 years of deficits, we find our regular Federal Government activities costing more in 1 year than they did in the entire 3 years 1917-19. This, I believe, is a fact of consequence, and one for serious concern.

To be sure the machine war of today is a more expensive proposition than war of 25 years ago. But we cannot reason the same way about regular governmental, or nonwar, activities. Yet the 1944 Budget contemplates spending $7,334,000,000 for nonwar purposes, including $3,000,000,000 of interest on our accumulated national debt.

The proposed expenditures of $104,123,924,923, exclusive of statutory public debt retirement, for regular war and nonwar activities is twice the amount of all such expenditures in the 131-year period 1789 to 1920. Interest payments of $3,000,000,000 in 1944 alone will exceed the total of such payments for the 131 years. But in addition Government corporations and agencies will spend a net of $4,774,123,000, making total expenditures of nearly $109,000,000,000 for the 1 year—an unprecedented amount in the history of government.

According to the 1944 Budget, $75,719,007,888 of debt will be added during that fiscal year.

Startling though these figures may be, they are not without some compensations. From now on, more individuals will be paying income taxes to the Federal Government than voted in the last election. This fact in itself will become a moderating influence. Another compensatory factor is the suddenly awakened interest of Congress in regaining control of its duties. Bureaucracy is, in short, in for hard times. What once was accepted, albeit reluctantly, has now become a favorite topic of harangue.

INCREASE IN EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Recently data were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which to my mind indicate to a startling degree the extent to which Congress allowed its functions to be usurped during the past decade. The total number of Executive orders almost equaled the total of all public laws enacted by Congress:

Year	Executive orders issued	Public laws enacted by Congress
1933	658	93
1934	472	448
1935	390	482
1936	275	505
1937	257	494
1938	249	425
1939	287	454
1940	309	551
1941	382	397
1942	286	453
Total	3,565	4,300

Representative LUDLOW expressed the danger inherent in government by Executive order when he said:

"Executive orders usually have their genesis in the bureaus and are expressions of bureaucratic minds. When promulgated they have the force and effect of law. Those who originate them are not elected by the people. They do not represent anybody. They stand for their own peculiar ideas and hobbies and do not speak for any well-established philosophy or any political party. They are intent, as a rule, on promoting their own notions and enhancing their bureaucratic power and authority. Many of them are theorists who think they know how to remake the world but who overlook the laws of nature and the immutable principle of sound economics."

The nature of bureaucracy will be more than an interesting topic to the average person from now on. It will be a vital topic. Laymen can as intelligently follow the course of bureaucracy as experts. It is human nature in action. The dry rot of bureaucracy is an everpresent menace everywhere. Parasites are found not only in government and bureaucracy; they are a threat to every farmer's crop and garden and to every form of economic organization. The bigger the organization the more menacing the danger. Only alertness in detecting and timely action in eliminating parasitical growth can save the body on which it feeds. The fact that it finally kills its provider and thereby eliminates itself is of comfort only to history. Congress now recognizes this natural law.

PUBLIC RESENTMENT STEADILY RISING

To eliminate parasites may require the destruction of some good with the bad. Any farmer knows it; so does business management. The longer one waits the more good must be sacrificed. The job facing this country is one of prompt, courageous action with the pruning knife by both those with legislative and executive responsibility. Otherwise the destruction will be greater in the future than is necessary.

A recent statement from the National Federation of Federal Employees showed an understanding of that fact when it said, "Public resentment is rising steadily against administrative ineptitude in certain branches of the Federal establishment. Unless it is checked by prompt and effective remedial action, this resentment will become a tidal wave. A tidal wave is not discriminating, and if permitted to reach full flood, the results will be disastrous."

Necessary bureaucracy should welcome the official legislative or executive knife. It protects them as well as others. Of course some worthy objective, something which some of us think important, will go with the pruning operation; but it saves much more. We must grimly support these operations now going on in Congress. All of the latest anesthetics, germicides, and operating equipment may not always be available, but operate they must. It is time that taxpayers and believers in the American way declared an emergency to reduce bureaucracy. Bureaucracy has had emergencies for several years. It should not object to the emergency techniques now necessary to trim the barnicles from government.

Remedy due to the integration of peace and war functions is made difficult. It will take vigorous demands from a wide segment of public opinion to compel drastic retrenchment. However, the Seventy-eighth Congress has already shown striking independence of the executive branch and a start toward legislative control of bureaucracy has been made. Typical is House Resolution No. 70 introduced by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, and passed by an overwhelming majority. This resolution sets up a committee of five members authorized to investigate any action, rule, procedure, or order of the executive agencies which is beyond the authority granted to them by Congress; which invades Constitutional rights of citizens; which imposes penalties without opportunity of fair trial; which duplicates the work of other agencies; or which attempts by interpretation, to write into an act of Congress or Executive order, purposes not justified by the language.

A second resolution passed by the House authorized the Appropriations Committee to police the spending of taxpayer funds by the executive agencies and bureaus. This action should enable the House to get an independent check-up on the financial needs and activities of bureaucracy. It should release the Appropriations Committee from dependence on testimony by bureau officials directly interested in obtaining additional funds and personnel.

Pending before the Senate at present and possibly adopted by that body by the time of the issuance of this publication, is the so-called McKellar bill, requiring Senate confirmation of all Federal employees receiving salaries of $4,500 per annum or more. The

bill excludes Army and Navy personnel, and those persons appointed by the Executive prior to 1936. This bill is designed to achieve one purpose and one purpose only—the return to Congress of its constitutional power to legislate. It will effectively stop the usurpation of this power by bureaucrats. It will tend to stop the issuance of Executive orders without foundation in law.

UNDERLYING FACTORS OF REVOLT

To understand what lies behind the revolt on Capitol Hill again bureaucracy we must add up the following factors: A certain resentment against infringement on legislative functions by bureau heads; the mandate for economy and retrenchment reflected in the last election; a huge volume of protests from constituents back home against bureaucratic red tape; national publicity given to reports of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures, headed by Senator BYRD; the campaign of public education conducted by such agencies as the Citizens Emergency Committee on Nondefense Expenditures, of which I am happy to be the treasurer; a new public interest in Federal extravagance, reflected in the Nation's press, due largely to taxpayer bewilderment at the huge extra burden for the cost of the war; a growing fear among all income groups of the rapid expansion of Federal power and influence to every county; a realization that Federal money and bureaucratic controls under the pre-war economy had penetrated deeply into nearly every field of private citizen endeavor, including housing, insurance, shipping, agriculture, banking, railroads, public utilities, securities markets, public education, State governments, household credit, child and social welfare, home and farm mortgages, and real estate. In this whole network of controls, stretching from Maine to Texas, from Oregon to Florida, Congress has played little part. If the American people, through their elected representatives and after due consideration, had surrendered their economic freedom in favor of centralized government by executive decree, then the people themselves would have abandoned democracy and freedom; but no such thing has happened. Bit by bit, the executive agencies have taken over authority, under the guise, first of peacetime, then of wartime emergency, until today Federal money and authority are woven into the whole fabric of our private economy.

If we are to return, after peace, to anything like the traditional American private enterprise system which has created our high standard of living, there will have to be a basic change in Federal policy and in relations between the public and private economy.

Whatever happens must be decided by public opinion. We are face to face with a historic decision between a progressive, relatively free, private economy where initiative and competition can survive, and a controlled or Government-managed economy in which the national income is a political football and the bureaucrats tell us where to work, what to manufacture, how to spend our money and manage our affairs.

A WELL-INFORMED PUBLIC

Can public opinion make an American decision in the historic American way? Does it grasp the meaning of Federal power centralized in the Executive? Does it know how completely war and bureaucracy have socialized our private economy? Does it want this kind of a system to hand on to our children and grandchildren?

The answers to these fateful questions depend on the knowledge and common sense of our millions of common citizens. To answer at all, they must be better informed on the challenge to freedom at home than they are or have been. They must catch up with the rushing tide of events before peace or the next national election brings a showdown on Federal post-war policy.

Increased Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Columbus, Ohio, March 13, 1943.

Hon. GEORGE H. BENDER,
Ohio Congressman-at-Large,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENDER: Since food production has become one of the critical war problems of our Nation to which Congress is giving much attention, I should like to submit for your information some pertinent data relative to the contribution of the farm families cooperating with the Farm Security Administration.

I judge that you are familiar with the large scale task in which Farm Security Administration has been engaged for some time—that of restoring disadvantaged farm families to a function useful to themselves and the Nation. Our program was quickly adjusted 2 years ago from building for a solid peacetime life to giving assistance in credit and guidance to small farmers to enable them to increase the production of needed foods.

In the spring of 1941 these families pledged important increases in their farm and home plans. By doubling and tripling their efforts to produce and by increasing their efficiency they overshot their pledges in three of the six food commodities for which pledges were tabulated in the Nation as a whole. In the three others, they made significant increases. The following table shows increases made by Farm Security Administration borrowers the past year and compares the increases made by these "small" farmers with all farmers:

Commodity	Farm Security Administration borrowers		All farmers	
	Amount increase, 1942 over 1941	Percent increase, 1942 over 1941	Amount increase, 1942 over 1941	Percent increase, 1942 over 1941
Milk (pounds)	1,419,000,000	20	3,914,000,000	3
Beef (do)	124,300,000	38	1,767,000,000	11
Peanuts (do)	101,700,000	88	1,028,000,000	70
Pork (do)	192,400,000	36	2,252,000,000	13
Eggs (dozen)	49,800,000	31	516,000,000	15
Soybeans (bushels)	3,360,000	106	104,000,000	98
Chickens (pounds)	37,100,000	36	366,365,000	14
Dry beans (do)	30,100,000	34	110,500,000	6
Sugar beets (tons)	113,000	24	1,616,000	16

These figures represent a cross-section of the production of 463,941 families, who constitute 7.6 percent of the 6,097,000 farmers listed in the 1940 census. Although it is generally recognized that these families could make sizable increases in terms of their own past production, the question has been raised as to whether the total volume of these increases from small operators really amounted to very much in terms of the total volume of increased production for the Nation.

The significance of the volume of increased production from these farms to the total increased food supplies of the Nation is shown by the following percentages based on the comparative increases in the preceding table:

Milk: Farm Security Administration families accounted for 36 percent of the total increase for the entire country in 1942.

Dry beans: Farm Security Administration families accounted for 27 percent of the total increase for the entire country in 1942.

Chickens: Farm Security Administration families accounted for 10 percent of the total increase for the entire country in 1942.

Eggs: Farm Security Administration families accounted for 10 percent of the total increase for the entire country in 1942.

Peanuts: Farm Security Administration families accounted for 10 percent of the total increase for the entire country in 1942.

Pork: Farm Security Administration families accounted for 9 percent of the total increase for the entire country in 1942.

Beef: Farm Security Administration families accounted for 7 percent of the total increase for the entire country in 1942.

Sugar beets: Farm Security Administration families accounted for 7 percent of the total increase for the entire country in 1942.

Soybeans: Farm Security Administration families accounted for 3 percent of the total increase for the entire country in 1942.

Thus, Farm Security Administration borrowers, using mainly labor available in the family and given help they needed to do it, have contributed in a significant way to the total food supply. The need for manpower on the farm became critical in the fall of 1942 and Farm Security Administration was given the job of transporting and housing workers when the local labor supply was inadequate. About 12,000 workers, more than 5,000 of them Mexicans, were moved from surplus to shortage areas to save sugar beets, long-staple cotton, vegetables, and fruit crops last fall. A shortage of year-round farm workers has since developed and the Farm Security Administration, working with the United States Employment Service and Vocational Agriculture, has recruited, trained, and placed many hundreds of workers—moving them from poor land areas to more productive farms where their full energies can be used to increase production of needed foods.

Now, some information on what our Ohio farmers have been doing for the war effort. Approximately 70 percent of all Ohio farmers had a gross income (include value of home-use products) of less than $2,500 in 1939. This group contributed 40 percent of fall farm products and depends almost entirely on family labor—often not fully employed when considering total production.

In 1942, approximately 5 percent of all Ohio farmers were operating under a program of directed credit through this Administration. The majority of this number were from the lower one-third income bracket and operated farms that were definitely below the average commercial farm as to size, quality of land, adequacy of buildings and equipment. In spite of these handicaps, the response of this group to an appeal, coupled with credit and guidance, for increased food production over 1941 resulted in the following: An increase of 12.3 percent in the production of milk; an increase of 19.7 percent in the production of pork; an increase of 18.5 percent in the production of eggs; an increase of 42 percent in the production of beef; an increase of 28 percent in the production of

chickens; an increase of 117.8 percent in the production of soybeans.

In comparison to the total increase of these products by all Ohio farmers in 1942 this same group of people, comprising 5 percent of all Ohio farmers, contributed 13.4 percent of the total increase of milk; 12.5 percent of the total increase of pork; 7.3 percent of the total increase of eggs; 27.1 percent of the total increase of beef; 14.5 percent of the total increase of chickens; 3.7 percent of the total increase of soybeans.

This certainly, to me, is an indication of what many more thousands of families in our State in similar circumstances could do this year if afforded an opportunity through credit and guidance to participate fully in food production.

With reference to the shortage of farm laborers, may I say that within the past 3 months, more than 400 year-round farm workers have been placed on as many Ohio farms, having been recruited from the less productive areas of Kentucky and southern Ohio. This was made possible through a program of recruitment, training, and placement with the Ohio Department of Education, United States Employment Service and Farm Security Administration cooperating. Training centers have been established at Ohio State University and Rio Grande College, which offer not only a short training course for the workers but afford an opportunity of orientation. All orders for workers to date have been filled.

I trust that this information will be useful to you in your consideration of national agricultural programs at this critical time. It is my personal hope that every farm family that can produce food will be given full opportunity to do so at this time when food is so much needed to win this war. I should be happy to have an opportunity to discuss with you at your convenience, sometime either in Cleveland or Columbus, other factors relative to the full utilization of resources in the production of food.

Sincerely yours,

IRENE H. WOLGAMOT,
Associate State Director
in Charge of Home Management.

Eddie Rickenbacker and William Jennings Bryan

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I listened this morning to Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, who, with the help of God, has just passed through one of the greatest ordeals in history, pleading to America to return to the incentive plan and not make the mistake that Russia made in adopting communism. He pointed out that Russia has now returned to the incentive system, that communism is leaving Russia and coming to this country, that Russia has long since eliminated the commissars from her army and is rapidly returning to our economic system.

Russia has taken down the sign "Religion is the Opium of the People," and has reopened the Christian churches throughout her vast empire.

As I listened to Captain Rickenbacker, I was reminded that this is the birthday of the greatest Christian lay leader of modern times, William Jennings Bryan.

Mr. Bryan's outstanding expression, in my opinion, one that should be written on his tombstone, will be found in his Prince of Peace, in which he said:

If the Master deigns to touch with divine power the cold and pulseless heart of the buried acorn, causing it to burst forth into a new life, will He leave neglected in the earth the soul of man, made in the image of his Creator? If He stoops to give to the rose bush, whose withered blossoms float upon the autumn breeze, the sweet assurance of another springtime, will he refuse words of hope to the sons of men when the frosts of winter come? If matter, mute and inanimate, though changed by the forces of Nature into a multitude of forms, can never die, will the imperial spirit of man alone suffer annihilation, after it has made a brief visit, like a royal guest, to this tenement of clay? No; I am as sure that there is another life as I am that I live today.

Some time ago while in Cairo—

He said—

I was shown a few grains of wheat that had slumbered for more than 3,000 years in an Egyptian tomb. As I gazed upon those grains of wheat, this thought came into my mind, that if one of them had been planted upon the banks of the Nile the next year after it was grown, and all its lineal descendants had been harvested and planted from that day to this, its progeny would be sufficiently numerous to feed the teeming millions of this world.

There is an unbroken chain of life that connects the earliest grain with the one which we now sow and reap. If there is an invisible something in a grain of wheat which enables it, when warmed by the sunshine and nurtured by the rain, to discard its old body, and build out of earth and air a new one so much like the old that you cannot tell the one from the other, and transmit its own likeness through 3,000 generations, I need not fear that my soul will have the power to clothe itself with a new body, suited to another existence, when this earthly frame has crumbled into dust.

Karl Marx need not tell us that "religion is the opium of the people."

Status of Japanese in the United States

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Pacific coast citizens are becoming increasingly concerned over the status of the Japanese in this country. This is a subject which requires immediate and thoughtful attention by the American Government. Unless steps are taken now to clarify the status of Japanese, citizens as well as aliens, I am afraid we will have some very difficult racial troubles when the war is terminated. My colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has introduced a resolution providing for the creation of a special committee to study this entire question. I rise at this time to urge speedy action on the resolution. In order to point out one of the reasons for so doing, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks the following resolution recently adopted by the Pajaro Valley and Watsonville Defense Council:

Whereas it has been announced through the press—

1. That the Secretary of War contemplates that some 28,000 native-born Japanese shall be incorporated into the United States Army in separate combat units; and

2. That the Federal authorities contemplate the release of from 25,000 to 40,000 Japanese from relocation camps where they are now restrained, with no announced provision for adequate surveillance or control; and

Whereas the Pajaro Valley and Watsonville Defense Council, the membership of which is made up of representatives of all civic organizations in the community, at a meeting held for the purpose of considering these matters, has officially expressed its opinion that such contemplated action would be inimical to the best interests and to the welfare and effective defense of our country; be it

Resolved, That we most vigorously and earnestly protest against the above proposed actions and each of them; that we convey this protest to the Secretary of War, to the War Relocation Board, to our Congressmen and Senators, and to the President of the United States.

That we urge upon these authorities the following reasons, based upon an extensive experience with the Japanese, for more than 40 years, an intimate knowledge of their character, and our observation of what occurred on December 7, 1941, and immediately thereafter:

(1) Following Pearl Harbor and for the defense of the west coast against attack and sabotage the Army wisely moved the Japanese from the Pacific coast. Now, to permit them to return to their former habitat would subject us again to the danger of serious sabotage and difficulty in defending our shore line in the event of attack.

(2) Due to the temper of the American public since the dastardly attack at Pearl Harbor we feel that it would be detrimental to the best interests of the Japanese themselves to allow them to return for residence on the west coast, and that difficult additional policing problems would be presented thereby in effecting their safety.

(3) It is impossible to distinguish between loyal and disloyal Japanese. We are in no position to judge the emotions of the Japanese inasmuch as they have maintained their own schools and religion, and in many cases, dual citizenship with their main allegiance to the Emperor of Japan.

(4) If Japanese were allowed to return to this area we could not expect the cooperation of present agricultural or industrial laborers already engaged in the war effort if they were called upon to work with Japanese evacuees.

(5) To allow young Japanese to leave relocation camps for educational purposes in our colleges would be unjust and inequitable as it affects our own American boys who have been taken out of college and are so loyally serving their country in the armed forces to the detriment of their education and employment.

(6) It is the opinion of this council that these Japanese should be contributing substantially to the war effort but we feel that it should be in areas removed from the Pacific coast and by group movement under full and proper control and supervision by the Army.

In no event should they be disbursed throughout the country without proper provision for absolute surveillance and control; be it further

Resolved, That the Japanese, both alien and American born, should be retained in relocation centers for the duration unless they are placed under direct and absolute supervision and full control of Army authority and engaged in the furtherance of our war effort.

Deserved Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee of the House has embraced in its report and recommendations in the new pay-as-you-go tax bill, a basic exemption of $3,500 on the pay of all officers and enlisted personnel of the armed forces, regardless of whether they are married or single.

It is inconceivable that any considerable opposition could develop to this measure. I would have voted enthusiastically for complete exemption of their pay, because it seems a travesty to talk about "equality of sacrifice" and then expect the armed forces to fight the war and at the same time help pay for it, too. The compromise, however, represents the wisdom of the committee, and it must be agreed that the figure arrived at will prove to be exceedingly helpful to all those whose pay comes within the tax-paying bracket. It is a safe bet it will pass both Houses of the Congress with no substantial opposition. I cannot conceive that any reasonable person will object to this basic exemption which, if it becomes the law, will give all officers and enlisted personnel an exemption of $3,500 instead of $1,200, as in the case of civilian married people and $600 in the case of civilian single persons. All other normal allowable deductions would also obtain for the officers and enlisted personnel in addition to this increased basic exemption.

It will be recalled that the same sort of measure was enacted for the officers and men of the First World War; therefore, there is a precedent for the action.

We must not forget—and the fathers and mothers of officers and enlisted members of the armed forces undoubtedly do not forget—that those men and women who are in the danger zones and on the battle lines get no time and a half for overtime, or double time for Sundays and holidays. They are on 24-hour duty. They are in danger 24 hours a day. They are ready to make the supreme sacrifice of yielding up their lives on the altar of their country 24 hours a day. They must undergo all of the rigors and sacrifices and hardships of the readjustment to a peacetime basis after the war is ended the same as everybody else.

It is very probable many of these officers and enlisted personnel will be required to remain abroad a considerable time after the war has ended. In any event, their way of life has been disrupted; for many of them their businesses have been sacrificed and are gone; for many of them the practice of their chosen professions has been abandoned and must be rebuilt upon their return from the war; in other cases men who owned dairy herds or farms have had to abandon them, to sacrifice them, and will have to reestablish themselves when they return from military or naval service.

Under these circumstances, it would seem that no fair-minded person could possibly object to allowing all of the officers and enlisted personnel of the armed services the basic exemption of $3,500. In view of all the proposed beneficiaries have had to sacrifice, in view of all they have had to give, and in view of all they have had to go through and must continue to go through, this recognition is small indeed.

It is a notorious fact that people with practically no training—except perhaps 6 weeks or 2 months—are going into the munition plants and the war production industries and are able to earn with their overtime, double time, and bonuses, in many cases more than the base pay of a colonel who has spent years going through West Point and other hard years in the Army in order to rise to his grade.

I can conceive of nothing that would do more to strengthen the morale of the armed forces than a unanimous action on the part of the Congress to grant this exemption while they are in the service of their country. It would be a tribute to the brave men and women who are ready to sacrifice their all for the Nation, which the Congress ought to offer and which undoubtedly the Nation will applaud.

The going is tough in this war. And the toughest of the tough-going falls to the lot of the officers and enlisted personnel of the armed services. We civilians have made no sacrifices in any way comparable to those we have required of our officers and enlisted members of the armed services.

I think it is a perfectly safe guess that there will be practically no opposition whatever in either House of the Congress to the enactment of this provision in favor of our fighting forces.

Organization of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 9), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Raymond Clapper entitled "New Senate Attitude," from the Washington News of March 15, and an editorial entitled "Moving Forward" from the Washington Post of March 15. Both these comments refer to the resolution recently submitted by several Senators regarding the organization of the United Nations.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of March 15, 1943]

NEW SENATE ATTITUDE

(By Raymond Clapper)

The change in the times is clearly marked by the initiative that the Senate is taking with regard to the United Nations.

The Senate is getting ready to give the President some advice. But unlike the advice the Senate gave Woodrow Wilson a quarter of a century ago, the Senate this time is going to tell President Roosevelt to take the lead in organizing the United Nations.

Probably a majority of the Senate is ready now to vote for the resolution that has been prepared. But if the Senators are wise, they will wait until they are sure of two-thirds for the resolution. There should be no misunderstanding this time about the attitude of the Senate—and there must be two-thirds if the Senate's advice is to be conclusive.

This resolution has been prepared in consultation with the Senate leaders of both parties. The significant thing about it is that it comes up out of the Senate indigenously. It is non-political, non-Administration, non-White House, and non-State Department. President Roosevelt heard about the resolution only recently. Senators had talked over several points with Sumner Welles at the State Department. He mentioned it to the President, who then sent for the sponsors. But this is a Senate show and the Senators intend to keep it such. The men behind this move for international collaboration are middle-of-the-road men, mainly younger men, in both parties. It is not a crackpot brain child. Nor is it the child of any of the propaganda groups working for world peace.

This resolution has evolved and grown gradually in the minds of plain American Senators who think that world wars are too frequent and too costly in lives and treasure and that the United States ought to try to do something to prevent any more of them. The whole move springs out of that simple, grass roots common sense. The point of a Senate expression now is that since everybody here and abroad remembers that the Senate once scuttled the League of Nations, the Senate ought to make it clear now just where it stands.

One young Republican Senator, JOSEPH H. BALL, of Minnesota, campaigned for reelection and won, in a supposedly isolationist State, on a platform which was quite similar to the goal of this resolution. Senator CARL A. HATCH, of New Mexico, the Democratic author of the clean-politics law, is working with Senator BALL on this. In introducing the resolution they are joined by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, one of the Democratic leaders, and Senator HAROLD H. BURTON, of Ohio, a Republican. Senator BARKLEY, the Democratic leader, and Senator MCNARY, the Republican leader, have been consulted and their advice has caused some changes in plans.

For instance, it would have been possible to obtain probably a majority of the Senate as cointroducers of the resolution. But the Senate leaders of both parties advised against trying to dress up the move with any stunt ballyhoo of that kind.

This is not a bloc move of any kind. It is a Senate move. It is contemplated as an impressive act in which the full dignity and power of the Senate is thrown into the de-

velopment of our foreign policy, to make clear to the world which fork of the road the United States intends to travel.

Other Senators supporting this resolution include AUSTIN, of Vermont, the assistant Republican leader; Chairman CONNALLY of the Foreign Relations Committee, WAGNER, of New York; TRUMAN, of Missouri; PEPPER, of Florida; and MAYBANK, of South Carolina. Others have advised sponsors that they intend to announce their support later on after the resolution is before the Foreign Relations Committee.

Above all, the spirit in which this is being done is what counts. Not a single Senator attempted to obstruct the continuation of lend-lease last week, not even to capitalize through any gallery grandstand play by delaying the vote, as any single Senator could have done. Now the Senate is making a straightforward move to make its attitude on the United Nations clear to the world. In these ways the Senate is bound to inspire public confidence and help to provide the national leadership that the United States is entitled to exercise in world affairs from here on out.

[From the Washington Post of March 15, 1943]

MOVING FORWARD

The Hatch-Hill-Burton-Ball resolution to be introduced in the Senate this week is one of the most constructive and far-reaching movements originating on Capitol Hill in recent years. We believe that the four Senators have succeeded in expressing the wishes of an overwhelming majority of the American people. And freemen everywhere will elicit fresh hope and courage from the fact that members of both parties represented in the Senate are joining hands in an effort to solidify the strength of the United Nations in war and to hold them together in the maintenance of the subsequent peace.

If the four Senators had attempted to work out among themselves the terms of a peace treaty, their efforts would have been highly presumptuous. But they have not done that. On the contrary, they ask the Senate to request the President to take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations with the object of forming a lasting international system. Acceptance of the resolution would, of course, leave the President entirely free to handle the problem in his own way. But it would put the treaty-ratifying branch of our Government on record in favor of international cooperation on a comprehensive scale. And it would exert widespread influence in favor of precisely such an organization as the four Senators propose.

Yesterday's conference between the President and sponsors of the resolution resulted in agreement on its broad objectives. Unquestionably the administration is as eager as Senators HATCH, HILL, BURTON, and BALL to strengthen the sinews which bind the United Nations together. We may be sure that the President and the Secretary of State are also more cognizant than the sponsors of this resolution of the difficulties that stand in the way of negotiating the proposed agreements. But the time has come to make our influence felt in behalf of the sound principles outlined in the Atlantic Charter and again embodied in the proposed resolution.

First on the list of objectives which the suggested United Nations organization would seek is full coordination of military and economic resources to hasten the defeat of the Axis. That objective alone would be sufficient to justify the United States in using all of its influence to bring about a formal council of statesmen representing all members of the grand alliance. Full cooperation in the military sphere would automatically make negotiation of the peace easier.

While the proposed resolution also contains simple guidelines for the Government of territory captured from the common enemy, for the relief of rescued peoples, and for maintenance of peace once the firing ceases, these would reflect only the wishes and hopes of the Senate and the American people. Those principles would have to be matched against the ideas and objectives of our allies. The really great advantage would be the existence of a council which could wrestle with specific problems as they arise.

We believe that the four sponsors of this resolution have caught the real spirit and temperament of the American people at a timely moment. Regardless of what the obstacles may be, our influence must be cast on the side of effective cooperation for the attainment of a more orderly world than we have had in the past. By pointing the most hopeful way for us to follow toward that objective the forthcoming resolution is an act of forward-looking statesmanship that should command an enthusiastic response from the people.

From Cradle to Grave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from The Oil City (Pa.) Derrick:

FROM CRADLE TO GRAVE

At the President's suggestion the National Resources Planning Board has submitted a report which would make the United States the most socialistic nation on earth. It is the American Beveridge plan, but it goes far beyond the British concept. It is referred to as President Roosevelt's cradle-to-the-grave security program, to become effective when the war is over. Unlike the Beveridge plan no estimate of its cost is submitted, but the best guess is $25,000,000,000 a year.

Congress is raising the national debt limit from one hundred and seventy-five to two hundred and ten billions. It was less than twenty billions when Mr. Roosevelt became President in 1933. If this war lasts 2 years longer it will exceed three hundred billions, as much as the United States is worth.

This plan guarantees to the individual adequate diet and shelter during childhood, a government financed college education if it be desired, a guaranteed job at good wages, insurance against temporary unemployment, against sickness and disability, with assured medical attention and a retirement annuity on reaching old age.

For the businessman the plan contemplates a government voice in the management of his property, a union voice also in the management of his property, taxes high enough to underwrite security for all, with Government pump priming on a large scale and a promise that the Government will promote prosperity for all.

For the banker the plan contemplates a chance to share in Government financing. For the taxpayer a use of taxes to redistribute income, to reduce savings, to promote consumption. A tax plan that could level individual incomes at the top and force incomes up at the bottom to stimulate consumption is part of the plan.

It is the outline for managed economy, for a post-war New Deal far more ambitious than the pre-war one.

It would continue to operate, probably on a production-for-use base, some of the Government-financed war plants. The others would be passed around among several operators. Federal development corporations would be formed to rebuild cities, public power projects, low-cost housing, and to improve transportation.

The railroads would be consolidated and terminals would be modernized. North-south, east-west highways would be built for high-speed cross-country travel, with built-off-street parking places for cities. It would improve pipe-line facilities, promote a series of Tennessee Valley Authoritys and expand rural electrification. It would revive the Work Projects Administration and the Public Works Administration, with a new and broader system of old-age and unemployment insurance.

All of this, of course, is predicated on a fourth term for President Roosevelt or a first term for Vice President WALLACE. It is a plan that takes as many pages to describe as there are in Gone With the Wind.

It is a state socialism developed to the *n*th degree. It is a dream, a phantasy. It is the doctrine of Karl Marx as expounded by the social economists who now have the run of the White House. Under it no man or woman would know what would become of his or her property, capital, savings, or life insurance. No business, no industry, no investment would be secure. It would take a bureaucracy running into the tens of millions of people to administer it, with nobody knowing where the money would come from to make it work, or maybe money would cease to exist.

In all probability this would be the pattern set for the post-war world. How long it would take Europe, Asia, and Africa to adjust themselves to this plan nobody knows. It would involve the turning of all we have over to the Government and then having the Government dole it out on a grandiose plan. For all of which we have only one phrase that seems to fit: "It's as crazy as hell."

Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, if America is to continue her part in the war effort and on the home front, it will be necessary to do something in a hurry in order to take the red tape and restrictions away from farming. The American farmer today is in a most precarious situation, and, above all, he does not know where he stands. Through slipping and blundering which involves red-tape, the various bureaus have muddled the situation as far as agriculture is concerned until the farmer has found himself bewildered. Unless something is done to simplify, aid, and encourage the farmer, the American people and the armed forces are bound to suffer for lack of food in the future. It is going to take action, and immediate action, and I, as one of the Congressmen, believe that the many problems can be solved.

During the past week, I conferred with Messrs. Wallace C. Kemper and Clarence J. Bourg, officials of the American Sugar

Cane League, who explained that the several problems of the sugar industry at this time are: First, fertilizer; second, labor; third, farm machinery; fourth, price.

Arrangements have already been made by W. P. B. to increase the amount of cyanamid which can be used on sugarcane acreage during March as well as to increase the deliveries of nitrate of soda in March and for early delivery in April. The present outlook is that by the end of March the sugar producing parishes should have received about 11,000 tons of cyanamid; about 3,000 tons of sulphate of ammonia and about 8,000 tons of nitrate of soda. This makes a total of 22,000 tons. If the W. P. B. is generous in its allotment of nitrates for early delivery in April, I understand that the needs of the sugarcane growers will be pretty well satisfied, considering the difficulties of transportation and the scarcity of fertilizers due to war conditions.

The problem of farm labor is one of the most vexing problems that our country has and it probably will require some legislation by Congress before full relief is obtained. I am pleased to report that the War Manpower Commission has already arranged for the deferment of farm labor from selective service and there is now pending in Congress a bill to require the deferment of farm labor while they are needed on the farm. In addition, the President has nominated a committee under Justice Byrnes to make a complete study of the farm labor shortage in connection with other labor needs of the country, and it is hoped that this committee will report in time to take care of the cultivation season as well as the harvesting season next fall. The farm labor problem is too big from the standpoint of food production in the United States to be allowed to remain unsolved much longer. Congress certainly will take action if the executive department does not.

The production of farm machinery, I am told, would help greatly to solve the labor shortage in sugarcane fields, if manufacturers were allowed to produce more mechanical equipment and if W. P. B. would allow them to distribute this equipment to cane growers. For instance, there were approximately 150 cane harvesters in use in Louisiana for the 1942 crop, and if we can prevail upon the W. P. B. to allow the manufacture of another 150 harvesters, these machines will replace a large percentage of the absent labor due to the draft and to the attraction of jobs in war industries. In this way, the two problems of labor shortage and farm machinery could be handled by the direct action of our Government in permitting the manufacture and distribution of needed mechanical equipment to farmers.

The question of farmers getting a fair price for farm products is involved in the desire of our Government to prevent inflation and to keep the costs of living down. Recently the Price Administrator admitted in a letter that the can growers were only getting 94 percent of parity, but since the beet growers were getting 105 percent of parity, all sugar growers were averaging parity. I do not subscribe to this way of deciding whether a sugar cane grower is receiving parity simply because sugar beet growers are getting more than parity. Besides, the parity index has been rising since that letter was written; in fact, the parity index was 154 and is now up to 160. Figured at 160, the cane grower is getting less than 91 percent of parity. There are bills under consideration in Congress to instruct the Secretary of Agriculture to include the costs of farm labor in computing parity, and another not to include Government payments in determining whether the farmer is receiving parity price. If these two bills are passed, the effect will be immediate to help the sugar cane growers to get a better price for their cane.

Office of War Information Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent, from the Washington Evening Star of March 19, 1943:

SENATOR TAFT SEEN SERVING USEFUL PURPOSE IN PRODDING DAVIS ON OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

(By Frank R. Kent)

One has to be very meticulous in the choice of words when referring to the activities of Elmer Davis. Even the most careful criticism evokes from the slightly sanctimonious head of the Office of War Information pained expressions of surprise that anyone should suggest that his methods fall short of perfection.

The latest person to discover this is Senator TAFT of Ohio. Senator TAFT, referring to Mr. Davis' personal weekly broadcasts, asserted that he had "commandeered" radio time and intimated, though not in those words, that unless Mr. Davis had some subtle propaganda to spread or intended to forestall the regular radio commentator and press correspondents, the only purpose served was to gratify his desire to enjoy the sound of the human voice when uttered by himself.

The claim is that "commandeered" was the wrong word. Mr. Davis replied that he had not "commandeered" any time and said he would be glad to have Mr. TAFT point out any propaganda.

So far as that is concerned, one may acquit Mr. Davis of any personal propaganda purpose, except such as the inevitable presentation in a favorable light of the administration by one of its highly placed members. Certainly, too, the presence in the organization, as director of domestic affairs, of the highly competent and conscientious Gardner Cowles, Jr., is adequate insurance against partisanship.

TAFT'S LANGUAGE DEFENDED

Nevertheless, whether Mr. Davis likes it or not, Mr. TAFT was justified in using the word "commandeered" and the former's objection is disingenuous.

For Mr. Davis must know as well as any one else that a suggestion, a request, or even a hint, from anyone in his position in the administration has the full effect of a command to the radio stations and the broadcasting companies.

For 9 years they have lived at the mercy of the Federal Communications Commission. Anything the administration wants at any time they bend over backward to give. They would be foolish not to.

No consistent critic of the administration ever survives on the radio. There are at least four strong pro-New Deal columnists and administration supporters now regularly on the air as political and news commentators.

There is only one who has ever been really critical and a year or so ago he was called up after a rather innocuous broadcast and roundly cursed by a member of the White House circle now holding a job in the Office of War Information—which slowed him down a good deal.

Adding to these things the pleasant little habit of the President of telling the correspondents at his press conference what he thinks they should make their "lead" or "play up," plus the fact that the administration is saturated with earnest fourth termers who, war or no war, are determined not to sink back into the obscurity from which they came and which surely will envelope them again when the Roosevelt regime is over—it is not surprising that those who dissent from the administration policies should feel at a disadvantage in reaching the public eye and ear.

SILENT ENCOURAGEMENT

The truth, of course, is that the Republicans and the anti New Deal Democrats are particularly sensitive at this time because of the approach of the 1944 campaign and the openness with which the fourth-term movement is being promoted with the same sort of silent White House encouragement that was given the third-term movement.

So, while Mr. Davis may be as innocent as the well-known new-born babe, there undoubtedly is some foundation for Republican apprehension that taxpayers' money may be spent on furthering certain political purposes.

Mr. Davis will not consciously do this himself, but there are people in his organization who would do it like a shot if they got the chance, and think they were being very noble and patriotic in doing so, too.

Therefore, it serves a sound purpose to prod Mr. Davis once in a while so that he will keep his eyes a little wider open for that sort of thing. He has conceded that in one instance—the Victory magazine—some "indefensible" stuff got by him. And "commandeered" was the right word.

Calling Mr. TAFT's remark bunk does not make it so. It is bunk to deny it.

What Is Back of the Ball Resolution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John T. Flynn:

WHAT IS BACK OF THE BALL RESOLUTION?

(By John T. Flynn)

The Ball resolution for an agreement now on post-war plans of the United Nations is the culmination of a long and persistent campaign carried on in this country.

An extraordinary number of books, magazine articles and radio addresses have been

released insisting on agreements now. The general theme of these books, articles, and addresses is stated by Dr. Egon Ranshofen-Wertheimer in his recent book Victory is Not Enough. He says:

"There must be a cooling-off period between the end of the war and the actual establishment of the peace terms. This does not mean, however, that major decisions governing the peace settlement should be postponed until some years after the war. On the contrary, some of the more constructive and daring decisions must be made while the psychological emergency state engendered by the war prevails. Preferably they should be made during the war." (P 97.)

The theory is quite obvious. During the war our people are being worked up to a state of high emotional voltage While they are thus excited is the time to capture their minds for decisions that can be produced only by emotional appeals. When the war ends, when the war propaganda ends, when the war emotionalism ends, and people once more begin to think, the job of drawing this country into complex commitments for long and costly and dangerous activities all over the globe will be very difficult Then the appeals will have to be made to the minds, not the passions. The subject will have to be thought out, argued, reasoned The people must be hurried into commitments, therefore, before reason gets back on her throne.

At the moment, however, we can see with clearness some serious facts. We have in this country now representatives of all the nations involved in the war. They are welcome here and they are being given every opportunity to express themselves and to argue their several cases. They have written a number of books, they appear constantly on the radio and find their way into the magazines and newspapers with their views. They are highly organized, provided with ample funds, and are highly favored by the administration. They feel free to express their views, their interests, their claims, while Americans refrain from debate in order to focus national attention on winning the war. Whatever one may think of all this, certainly this much is certain: These men and women are thinking in terms of their own countries, not ours. They are all eage to get the United States into commitments for the post-war world—commitments involving vast billions, military obligations, enterprises for the policing of their enemies, alterations in our own laws, our fiscal and other policies that will aid them in their plans for their countries. This is quite natural and human. We should listen to them, but we should remember that they are talking for the interests of their nations and not for ours.

It is these foreign groups that have been engineering with incredible industry the plan to precipitate decisions now. Now Americans are angry. The administration is on the side of the internationalists. They imagine that in a discussion now the voices of those who oppose their international schemes will be drowned out. And so they say, in the words of one of them quoted above, let us force the decision now "while the psychological state engendered by the war prevails." Let us not wait until the American people begin to think again.

From the point of view of Americans, however, we know that if this debate is opened, it will split the Nation wide open. Let no one suppose that the debate can be hushed or soft pedaled. Those opposed to the grandiose world programs of the administration have remained quiet lest they contribute by debate to the distraction of the Nation's preoccupation with winning the war. But the unity which the administration is striving for and begging for will be utterly shattered if this proposal is forced to decision now. It does not originate in the interest of America, but in the interest of the many groups here which pull and haul and scheme and propagandize to involve us in their, rather than our own interests. The best treatment of the Ball resolution is to let it die in committee.

What Should Our Schools Teach in Time of War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Town Hall Meeting of the Air, March 18, 1943:

How can our schools help win the war? That question overshadows every educational interest right now. The war changes everything. The tremendous demands for trained men, both for military and civilian service, are unlike anything in history An immediate and complete conversion of the schools to war service is imperative.

If here and there students and teachers are still living in ivory towers, let them come out and have a part in this challenging task. It cannot be "business as usual"; it is not business as usual for agriculture, for the automobile industry, or for any industry, and our schools will hardly ask to be made an exception. Still the change need not be disruptive It can be accomplished without the loss of anything that is really vital in public education, and is even likely to bring permanent gains.

Many great educational advancements have come in war times. The Morrell Act, establishing our Nation-wide system of land-grant colleges, was adopted in 1863 while our country was still engaged in war, and the Smith-Hughes Act, creating our marvelous vocational-training program, originated as a part of our war preparations in 1917.

In the present emergency, the Nation calls upon its schools to supply in unprecedented numbers trained mechanics, pilots, radio operators, doctors, dentists, and engineers. Particularly in the colleges is it essential that scientific instruction have first call, but in addition to the vocational and scientific instruction, we want instruction in American ideals and institutions. Both high schools and colleges in furnishing preinduction training must endeavor to give to every student an understanding of the issues of the war, what caused the first World War, why the second World War came about, and why it is necessary that some sort of organization be set up so that one nation can live in peace with other nations. We must show how this is more important now than it has ever been in the past because of the frightful instruments of death, and also because modern machines, such as the airplane, have brought the nations very close together. We should teach that in terms of time for getting places the world is only one-half as big as it was in 1938. By plane, the farthest point is now only 60 hours away. The globe which Columbus talked about was 500 times as big as ours.

As I see it, therefore, the new educational aims require boldness, imagination, and human devotion. And the teachers of America have these qualities.

For the elementary schools we shall require continued participation in all the war activities. Scrap drives and bond sales are vitally important, not only because they produce huge piles of scrap and increased bond sales, but because patriotic attitudes are developed. There must be a new emphasis on health instruction and disease prevention. We must teach more about the world we live in, about our allies, and even about our enemies. Certainly not to teach hatred of our enemies, but to impart a knowledge of their aggressions and how to stop them permanently.

The Army and Navy are asking our colleges to carry a heavy share in training not only the specialists but the men in every branch of the service who must supply their leadership. That means instruction in history, government, geography, and literature. History and government that is taught with an appreciation of America's great part in the world drama, but not disguising our failures; government that develops conviction as to the principles that underlie our system; geography that teaches how people are affected by important physical forces, and literature taught so well that men learn the power of clear expression The curriculum would include simple instruction in public speaking, and psychology so that officers standing before their men with orders involving life or death may give those orders with precision and with such an understanding of men that calm minds and unshaken nerves carry the battle at their best.

Considerable attention must be given to political science, which has too often been taught in a debatable way. The war is emphasizing the need for definite convictions and understanding relative to the principles on which our Government is based and the reason for these principles. Too much has passed under the name of the social sciences which was little more than talk and theorizing, often raising questions as to the soundness of the doctrines on which our traditions and concepts of government rest. Too often have we debunked our heroes and scoffed at the idea of democracy as a growing, living form of government. We must be more definite in our teaching relative to the ways of democracy.

Information is of little value unless it is definite and can be used. Definite information gives discipline and self-confidence. It gives notions of what is right and what is wrong. All teaching, in wartime as well as in peacetime, should have more definiteness in its character.

One final word about the selection of inductees for college training. While the war is on, who should be free to go to college to prepare for officer training and who should go into the ranks? That question must be answered in the light of our traditions of equality and democracy. The boy who comes from a part of the country not favored by educational advantages should have just as fair a chance to take the college training as one who holds a diploma from the finest high school in the land; the poor boys should have the same chance as the wealthy. That is democracy.

In this way we can maintain the flow of military and post-war civilian leadership, or, as we would say in my part of the country, we can save our seed corn. We are concerned not only with the quantity of seed corn, but also with the character of soil which produces it. In America we prefer the varied types. A democratic society must get its leadership from every class and every section.

The college trainee should be taught by both civilian and military instructors, subject to military discipline, but mingling with student life in as nearly a normal way as possible.

If these general principles are followed, we will emerge from this war with our schools unimpaired by the emergency service and possessing possibilities for even a grander contribution to the America of the future.

A Message to Soldiers on Entering the Service

REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, an address by Col. Stanley Washburn to the Ocean County contingent of men leaving for Fort Dix last November 30 so deeply impressed me that I am asking leave to insert it in the RECORD.

From the standpoint of practical usefulness to the individual soldier, this is the outstanding composition of its kind to date relative to World War No. 2 which has come to my notice.

It is conspicuous for its healing of fear in the individual mentality. We are all fearful of this holocaust of war. Colonel Washburn's address takes up the matter of hardships and dangers, and frees the reader from that fear by a graphic description of the scientific and medical means of combating disease and wounds.

Then this soldier takes the individual to the very heights of spirituality. He tells them that for years he has carried a copy of the ninety-first Psalm, which he quotes in full. In times of danger it was with him for his spiritual enlightenment.

So much healing of fear is contained in Colonel Washburn's speech that I am having several thousand copies printed to be sent to soldiers and their parents. I beg of you to read it:

It is my pleasure and my privilege to address you men and boys who are about to go forth and enter the greatest adventure of your life which will bring pride and joy to all those members of your family and your community. You are going forward to fight for the greatest cause in the history of civilization. It is not just for our town, or even our State, but you are fighting for the cause of civilization itself, and civilization is based on some form of spiritual life.

It does not matter whether you are Catholic or Protestant, Jew or Gentile. The only test of any creed is your sincerity in that faith in which you profess to believe. There is nothing in life so important as faith; first faith in God, faith in your country and its traditions, faith in yourself, and faith in each other. If you have this in the depths of your soul, you cannot lose. We are fighting enemies both in the East and the West who, if victorious, would destroy all the cardinal principles on which our country has been founded.

Many mothers have written me since I started a year ago to try and get the Selective Service Act amended to reduce the age to 18, asking if I approved of sending the youth of the home front to be slaughtered. You men an ' boys should realize that we are not mobilizing a great army for the purpose of having it slaughtered, but we are mobilizing you men for the purpose of sending you where you may inject a foreign substance, either in the form of cold steel, bullets, or bombs, into the anatomy of our enemies, and this I doubt not you will do, but, of course, in a nice way. You must always remember that for every enemy you have disposed of you have brought us one step nearer our victory and the peace and freedom for us all in perpetuity.

First, I want to tell you that the so-called hardships of Army life are greatly exaggerated. In the service in which you are entering you are embarking on the greatest adventure of your life and one that you will never regret. I have seen a great deal of war, and in my opinion 85 percent of you will return. In the last war so many people believed that a casualty meant a death, when the fact of the case was that only one out of every four casualties was fatal. In this war it should be even less. Most of those who died from wounds in the last war did so because of infection. In this war, however, we have the serums for gas gangrene bacilli, which was, in the last war, the cause of so many amputations and even deaths. Sulphanilamide, which is used for all sorts of flesh and abdominal wounds, has enormously reduced fatalities, and each of you will carry this wonderful drug in your first-aid kit, so, if by chance you are wounded, you can treat yourself even before medical aid reaches you.

When I was in Russia from 1914 to 1916, tens of thousands died from tetanus, or what you perhaps know as lockjaw, but in this war we have antitetanus serum which, when administered promptly, reduces the losses to only 1 in 500. A letter from one of the greatest surgeons in the last war, which I had the opportunity of reading last week, tells of the important use of the blood plasma in this war, and stated that 1 pint will save a soldier's life. Perhaps the most outstanding brain surgeon of America writes me that the improvement in the technique in head cases should greatly reduce the fatalities from head wounds.

In the nature of war, tragic as it may be, some must die. I made up my mind nearly 40 years ago, when it became obvious to me that I spend a large portion of my life in facing death, that it was better to die in one's twenties in line of duty than to live to be 80 by the evasion of one's responsibilities to God, country, and one's self. After you have been in a few actions, I think you will come to realize, as most soldiers do, that if worse comes to worse, it is easier to die outright than to be scared to death half of the time.

Death itself has always seemed to me to be an illusion, for I believe that when we pass from this vale of tears it is nothing more than a transition to a higher and better plane. No matter what your feelings about immortality may have been in times past, you will find when you are confronted with the day-by-day uncertainty that your minds will turn more and more to some form of spiritual life. As someone has said, "None of the boys in the fox holes of Bataan were atheists after the first shot was fired." I myself have gotten up at least a thousand mornings in my life and not definitely seen the end of the day, and on these occasions I derived great comfort from the ninety-first Psalm which says in part: "Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night; nor for the arrow that flieth by day; nor for the pestilence that walketh in darkness; nor for the destruction that wasteth at noonday. A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee. Only with thine eyes shalt thou behold and see the reward of the wicked. Because thou hast made the Lord which is my refuge, even the Most High, thy habitation; there shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling. For He shall give His angels charge over thee to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone. Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder; the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet. Because He hath set His love upon me, therefore will I deliver Him; I will set Him on high because He hath known my name." Translated into modern language, this means Hitler the Hun, Mussolini the adder, and Tojo the ugly dragon of Japan, and I do urge you to go forth and trample in a big way.

For many years I carried a copy of this in the tunic of my uniform and never heard an approaching shell that these lines did not flash through my mind in a fraction of a second. I recall so many occasions where the danger was most disconcerting. Once in Russia a colonel of an artillery regiment asked me to visit his camouflaged battery. To reach it I had to walk 200 yards over a tow path. There were three enemy observation balloons up and their artillery was so near that I could see the flashes of their guns. I thought of this beautiful Psalm of King David's, and while I traversed this distance three consecutive shells fell within 10 feet of me and not one exploded. Another time when I was in the Argonne with the French in 1916 a shell fell within 6 feet of me, exploded in the mud, blew in the side of the trench, and covered me with dirt, but I was not scratched. Again at Verdun in that same year I was within 30 feet of a German trench, and in fact so near that they could hear me whispering to my one companion. Their outpost began throwing hand grenades, and though many exploded not far away, not even a fragment touched me. Maybe it is true that "a thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee because thou hast made the Lord, which is my refuge, even the Most High, thy habitation." In any event, if one must die, and for the cause to which one is committed even unto death, always remember that it is better to leave this world with a spiritual thought in one's heart.

As you leave your homes to join the armed services of our country, I hope you may all realize that no greater opportunity was ever presented to men entering the Army than in this present day. Napoleon used to tell his recruits that every private carried a marshal's baton in his knapsack, and, indeed, many of his generals rose from the ranks, and it can fairly be said to you today that every one of you has in his pack a potential officer's commission if you can prove yourself worthy of it. As the Army is today, everything begins at the bottom. After your 3 months of basic training, on recommendation of your unit commander, and he only knows what your noncommissioned officers tell him, you may be sent to an officers' training school, and if you satisfactorily complete your course after 4 months, you will receive a commission as second lieutenant. If you do, you will draw a salary of $1,800 a year, plus commutations and quarters, which in the layman's language means board and lodgings.

After having been with troops for so many years, I always thought and I am now sure of the fact, in this man's Army courtesy and a smile will get you further than political influence. Remember that the corporal and the sergeant who deal with you most intimately have been privates themselves, and they now deserve the respect which they have earned and which someday should be yours. You are not required by regulations to salute your noncoms, neither are you required to smile and say "Good morning" to everyone with whom you come in contact, but it is a safe rule to follow both in civilian and army life. Many newly inducted soldiers feel that saluting is a sign of subserviency, but it is nothing of the sort; it is merely a courtesy between gentlemen.

When this terrible war is over, and if you receive an honorable discharge with a character and service rating of excellent, it will be of more value to you in securing employment than a college degree. Some of you whose education has been curtailed, and if you are ambitious, will have the opportunity, when you return, to go to college if you so desire, for as the President himself has said,

every opportunity will be given returning soldiers to take up their studies which have been temporarily postponed. It is far better to graduate from college 3 or 4 years later, say at the age of 25, as free American citizens in perpetuity than to graduate at 21 and be economic slaves for the rest of your life which is what would happend were we to lose this war.

You all know Patrick Henry's famous lines, "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death." I have always felt this from the bottom of my soul from the time I was 18 and I hope to heaven that everyone in this room feels the same.

Good-bye, good luck, and God bless you.

More About Gov. Sam Jones and Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a speech which I made over the radio, as follows:

Good evening ladies and gentlemen of the State of Louisiana, this is JIMMY MORRISON, your Congressman, speaking to you from radio station WRC here in the nerve center of the world and cross-roads of the universe, Washington, D. C.

I took my oath of office as Congressman on the 6th day of January. It was my firm resolution that I would report back to the people of my district and of my State as often as circumstances would permit as to my activities here in Congress.

When I landed here in Washington an unusual situation presented itself, which I believe was handled in accordance with the wishes of those people who elected me to my office. I was appointed on five very minor congressional committees, when I had sought and made every effort to be appointed on such committees as would permit me to serve my people to the best of my ability. The five minor committees were of no interest to the people of my district or State, and any service which I would render thereon would not be helping my constituents. I therefore promptly resigned from the said five minor committees, and by so doing upset over 100 years of congressional precedent. The reason for this extraordinary action on my part was the extreme desire to serve my people in the best way I know how—I could not do this on the five minor committees, and by resigning therefrom I am now able to devote much more time to the specific problems presented to me by my constituents.

The greatest portion of my time thus far in Washington has been spent fighting for the people against the bureaucratic system which is in effect here, trying to help the small merchant and the small businessman get the necessary commodities in order that they may continue in business, fighting this bureaucracy and fighting unnecessary red tape and all the many other agencies that make it so hard for the small businessmen to keep on going. The small man has always been my friend. He was my friend in Louisiana and I fought for him and he is still my friend in Washington and I am still fighting for him here.

I have voted against unnecessary and needless nondefense appropriations on the theory that the war is paramount and all possible funds should be diverted in that direction in order for a successful prosecution of the conflict.

I voted to reject and to oust notorious Communists now on United States pay rolls at large annual salaries, who comprise many of the so-called bureaucratic departments now in existence here in Washington.

In my first major speech in Congress I questioned the propriety on the part of the State Department of the Martinique Island situation. I demanded to know why our country was sending approximately $1,000,000 worth of food to this island which is being controlled by notoriously rabid pro-Vichy representatives. As a resut of this speech, which was quoted on the front pages of a the London newspapers, the shipments of food have been stopped and pressure is being brought to bear on Admiral Robert to change his allegiance from Laval to the United Nations.

I intend to vigorously support the Abernethy-Eastland bill, which exempts from income-tax payments all men in the armed forces.

I intend to introduce a bill which will give to each man in the armed force a right to transportation by bus or train in the amount of one-third of the present fare, so that when that soldier, sailor, or marine gets an opportunity for a furlough, he will not have to spend all of his money, and then borrow a little bit for transportation back home.

I intend to support and back any legislation which will in any way aid the American boys in the armed forces.

As far as the food situation is concerned, it is my belief that a lot of the shortages thus far revealed were unnecessary and that there has been considerable bungling in the Agricultural Department and other departments. As a matter of fact, there is a great deal of talk here in Washington that Claude Wickard will resign as Secretary of Agriculture as a result of bureaucratic bungling.

The prevailing opinion in the cloakroom amongst Congressmen from various parts of the United States shows a bitter hatred and contempt for the way the American people are being treated at this time, and their belief, which I also share, is that a lot of unfair treatment toward the American public is totally unnecessary.

There is no argument as far as the patriotism of the American people is concerned, and I speak freely for the people of Louisiana when I say, they will go ragged, hungry, and without shelter if necessary to win this war. However, as far as America is concerned, that will not be necessary for at least several years unless the muddling and bungling increases to a greater extent than it now exists.

We, as members of the Louisiana delegation, recently secured for New Orleans a permit from the Federal Housing Administration to build over 1,000 new homes to aid in the housing shortage. I had secured the cooperation of the other members of the delegation and asked that Baton Rouge be allotted 625 new houses to relieve a very critical housing situation. However, when I took this matter up with the Federal Housing Administration I was confronted with a letter written by Dewitt Pyburn to an official in Washington, stating that there was no housing shortage at the present time in Baton Rouge. Mr. Pyburn is Director of the Department of Public Works in Louisiana and he was appointed by the Jones-Strenske-Herget forces. What his reason was in stopping Baton Rouge from getting the badly needed 625 new homes I do not know. However, I have not lost hope even though my task is increased many fold, as the Federal Housing Administration, or any other Govvernment agency, is looking for an excuse to stop any new construction. I have demanded that there be another survey of the Baton Rouge situation, which will take an additional 30 days. In event that the people of Baton Rouge do not get the 625 new houses, they can thank Mr. Dewitt Pyburn, Mr. Sam Jones, Mr. Strenske, Mr. J. Y. Sanders, and their clique.

I have spent considerable effort and time toward aiding agriculture in the State of Louisiana. I have asked and demanded and worked for an increase in the price of sugar cane, especially from the viewpoint of the small grower. I have also put forth much effort in connection with the rice industry of Louisiana, which is not in the shape that we wish it were at this time.

Needless it is for me to say that I have worked night and day in an effort to see that the strawberry farmers get a higher price for their strawberries this season.

Last, but by no means least, the most neglected crop in the South today is cotton. I have worked diligently to the end that the minimum price of cotton will be 25 cents per pound. I have done everything I could toward getting unreasonable restrictions removed.

It was through my efforts that the minimum loading of potatoes was changed from 45,000 pounds to 30,000 pounds in Louisiana. Naturally I am very proud of this accomplishment.

I want to say at this time that I appreciate the thousands of letters that are coming to me from all over the State, and especially from farmers who have outlined their troubles and their needs, which they know is very near and dear to my heart.

I wish to bring to your attention at this time a serious problem which demands your utmost consideration. On February 20, 1943, there appeared in practically every newspaper in the State of Louisiana a huge advertisement captioned "Sam Jones says." This advertisement had a picture of sanctimonious Sam Jones, the present accidental Governor of the State of Louisiana, and in addition to the picture, Mr. Jones proceeds to make much of the fact that this date was the third anniversary of his election as Governor, and he goes on to enumerate 17 so-called pledges of his political platform in 1940 and accomplishments thereunder. This advertisement reads beautifully. It has a lot of nice, high-sounding words and figures.

But let's look into this advertisement. To begin with, who paid for all these tremendous ads? Sam Jones himself? The Sam Jones political party? Or were these ads paid out of that sales-tax money which Governor Jones promised would never be? It is my understanding that a full-page ad in a New Orleans newspaper runs about $900 or more.

You will recall that after Jones assumed the Governor's office I was the first man in Louisiana to stump the State and warn you that his so-called constitutional amendments were unconstitutional. The district courts and the Supreme Court sustained me in my opinion.

I appreciate the faith that the anti-Jones people had in my efforts then, and I appreciate their faith even more today.

JIMMY MORRISON denounced Sam Jones and his political allies from the very beginning as being a sanctimonious and hypocritical would-be reformer who attempted to hide his true motives and his true actions behind a camouflage of so-called aristocratic virtue. This speaker called the turn on him from the beginning, and his every action, while desecrating the high office which he now holds, has proven beyond any reasonable doubt that he is a would-be aristocratic, blue-blooded arch enemy of the poor and the underprivileged people of the State of Louisiana. He has accomplished much for the very few rich at the expense of the poor, and his name must

go ringing down through the halls of political history as being what he really is, and that is an accident who became Governor of the State of Louisiana.

Highhat Jones begins by speaking about taxes. Among other things he said he raised the homestead exemption from $1,000 to $2,000. That is an absolute and positive untruth because the record undeniably shows that when sanctimonious Sam took office the homestead exemption at that time was fixed at $2,000.

But with further reference to this tax situation which he speaks of to his everlasting discredit and disgrace, and the one great political sin which he committed, which can never be forgotten or forgiven, is the sales tax which Sam Jones fostered and placed on the backs of the people of the State of Louisiana. He was practically elected on the single issue that "there would never be a sales tax in Louisiana as long as he was Governor." He ridiculed and denounced previous administrations for their enactment of sales taxes and he cried to the high heavens that this horrible sales tax would always be most conspicuous by its absence when he became Governor. But in 1942 hypocritical Sam sang a different tune. The obnoxious, that so-called nefarious sales tax, for which he had crucified previous administrations, now was extremely necessary for the proper administration of his government.

JIMMY MORRISON, in the 1942 session of the Louisiana Legislature, fought with every ounce of energy at his command in an effort to stop said sales tax from being enacted. I appeared on the floor of the House before the Ways and Means Committee, and talked for over 45 minutes. I also appeared in the Senate before a committee to plead for the poor people, and my efforts at that time were not in vain and the sales tax was ignominiously defeated at the regular session of the 1942 legislature.

But a few months later Sam Jones called a special session of the Louisiana Legislature and by the use of a great deal of subtle propaganda, by the use of much political pressure, by the use of the vast patronage and other powers at the command of the Governor, the sales tax was jammed unwillingly down the throats of the people of our State by Governor Jones.

The great war is costing us billions of dollars, and, rightfully, we the people must pay for it and we are only too glad to do so to the best of our ability. But why, when many States throughout the Union are economizing, are cutting their expenditures to the bare bone, are decreasing their taxes and trying to help the people bear their Federal tax burden, why must Louisiana and Sam Jones increase the taxes? There has never been shown any real necessity for the so-called sales tax. Is this sales-tax money being used for political purposes? Is the sales-tax money being used for campaign purposes?

Governor Jones, when he was running for Governor of the State of Louisiana, in the last gubernatorial campaign, in which I was also a candidate for Governor, shouted to the housetops that if he were elected Governor that he would not have a political machine. He further said that Louisiana had for too many years been terribly burdened with an obnoxious political machine and that it was his idea to let it be a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Yet, my friends, we find Sam Jones at this very moment using rationed gasoline to go all over the State of Louisiana talking to this group and that group and attempting to build a political machine the like of which has never been known in the State of Louisiana.

Governor Jones says he has performed all his promises to end dictatorship. What was the crime commission bill? What was the reorganization bill? What were many other sundry actions on the part of Sam Jones, which a brave and courageous Supreme Court threw out as being unconstitutional? Sanctimonious Sam sought to institute a private Gestapo of his own through the crime commission bill, to hunt down and persecute all of those who might be politically opposed to him. Mind you well, the crime commission did not look for crime. They looked only for political differences. The purpose of the crime commission bill was to do away with everybody who would not accept Jonesism as their political creed and to try to make all people politically subservient to the one and only Samuel Houston Jones. Who, in their right sense, in their right mind, could fail to call this other than a sheer, brazen attempt at dictatorship?

The reorganization bill as passed by Sam Jones was another of the many attempts on the part of this power-craving, mediocre country lawyer to establish in Louisiana an autocratic type of government with him at its head. The first reorganization bill, which was declared unconstitutional by the courts of the State of Louisiana, provided in essence that all of the departments and all of the functions of Louisiana government should be centralized and it would not be going too far afield to say that under this reorganization bill a citizen had to ask Sam's permission before he could go into court. This was a cunning device aimed to vest unheard-of powers in the hands of the Governor so that virtually he alone would rule the destiny of our people. In its most liberal view, the reorganization bill can only be comparable and be synonymous with dictatorship in its most European definition thereof.

JIMMY MORRISON fought these two attempts on the part of Sam Jones to disrupt American democracy in Louisiana. I led the fight practically single-handed against the crime-commission bill and had it declared unconstitutional. And my actions in the reorganization bill are a matter of public record. When the Sam Jones reform government came into existence, JIMMY MORRISON was in the vanguard of those who first tore the mask of hypocrisy and deceit from their faces. My fight will continue until all the vestiges of Jonesism have been committed to the proper political grave in which they so rightfully belong and the people—I mean the average people of Louisiana—will receive the proper vindication that they are justly entitled to.

With reference to home rule, Sam Jones has interfered in over 65 local elections throughout the State of Louisiana since he took office. He has attempted to influence the voters in every one of these elections. He has used every possible resource to influence these local elections and to put a Jones man in office. He has resorted to the State police, the gestapo headed by the indicted Steve Alford; no efforts have been overlooked on his part to utterly disappoint and debase home rule. And yet Governor Jones-supported candidates lost in practically all of these 65 local elections.

Sam Jones, the pay roll of the State of Louisiana and of its many departments have never been so ingloriously packed with the high-powered and so-called high-class deadheads that you have put on there. Yes, you eliminated a lot of deadheads. You took out the $100-a-month deadheads and in their place put $5,000-a-year and upward men. You brought them from out of the State of Louisiana from every direction. The pay rolls of the State of Louisiana prove this assertion on my part beyond any question. The record in this matter speaks very loudly and very clearly for itself. Why don't you stop trying to fool the people? The people have repudiated you and your candidates in these local elections because of statements like this on your part. Only one person is being fooled, and that is Sam Jones who is being fooled into believing that he is fooling the people.

Governor Jones says that he made public records public; and abolished the system of closed books. Why don't you make mention of the fact that during the regular session of 1942 of the Louisiana Legislature your political advisor and head of the highway commission, Prescott Foster, was arrested in the city of Baton Rouge. Prescott Foster was arrested because he failed to file records of his department in compliance with existing State law. I am advised that this charge is still pending against the said Prescott Foster. You, Sam Jones, passed the law, making it mandatory that the heads of departments file their department records at stated periods with the State auditor. Why has not Prescott Foster performed? What were he and you trying to hide? Why did you not want to make these records open to the public?

Time does not permit me at this time to go into this terrible record of the Jones administration piece by piece. This will come from time to time.

Sam Jones' forces have several months ago begun the 1944 gubernatorial political campaign. Under various guises and under camouflaged circumstances, sanctimonious Sam and his so-called aristocrats, who are his political crown princes, are visiting many of the parishes of the State. They are talking to people and attempting to put the pressure on one way or the other. But when you look into the matter and see how many obstacles they have to overcome, you are going to agree with me that he should have started his campaign in 1940. Not over 15 percent of the voting populace of the State of Louisiana are Jones-minded today; they include the aristocrats, the Boston clubbers, and his relatives. The other 85 percent include the people—you and me and your friends—to whom the very idea of a continuation of the Jones administration in Louisiana is, to say the least, extremely nauseating.

Unheard-of sums of money, actions of indescribable character, pressure never before dreamed of in the State of Louisiana have all been brought to bear in an attempt to convince the people that Jones and Jones' candidates were the right candidates for public office, and, strange as it may seem, the people of Louisiana will never again be misled.

This Jones crowd can distort, they can misinterpret, but the people remain steadfast in their rock-bound relief that this reform government tried to reform everybody except themselves.

From now on the people of Louisiana are going to be subjected to much more of the Jones propaganda. Every effort is going to be made to influence you, to persuade you, to intimidate you to keep the Sam Jones administration in office. I don't believe there is much need on my part to forewarn you or to explain the situation from a political viewpoint. In most instances you are as well acquainted as I. There aren't many more months left during which the Boston Club will rule the State of Louisiana. You average citizens will have your opportunity to express your sentiments in the not-too-far distant offing. Just sit tight. The political noose is drawing closer and closer around the necks of the so-called reform government of Jones, who betrayed the people and their pledges to them.

It is well remembered by the people of Louisiana that this sanctimonious Sam promised the people that he would take the 7 cents per gallon gasoline tax off of the farmers, trappers, and the fishermen. Did he do that? He promised to give the trainmen a full-crew bill. Did he do that? He promised to repeal the sales tax. What did he do about that? He promised to stop the deadheads. Did he do that? He promised to stop waste in government. Did he do that? He promised that there would be no new taxes. How about that one? He promised to give every old man and woman $30 a month pension. Did he do that?

He promised the people of the city of New Orleans a free ferry service. Did he do that? He promised the school teachers of Louisiana to raise their salaries and to pay them for 12 full months. Did he do that? He promised to raise the pay of the school bus drivers. What about that one?

You, the good Christian people of Louisiana, know the answers to these questions. You know he stands indicted in the minds and hearts of all these people he has misled. Can it not now be said that he obtained that office under false pretenses by promising things he never really intended to do, and has not to this time done?

From my Sunday school days until the present time it never heretofore occurred to me that there was anything in the life and character of Judas Iscariot that I could ever defend, but there is one point in his conduct that differs from that of Governor Jones, and that is this, that, finally, when Judas came to realize what a terrible thing he had done in betraying his master and his people, old Judas, after all finally had enough manhood to go and hang himself.

All of you people know what Jones' record is in Louisiana. You know how he stands in Louisiana with the people. Let me now tell you how he stands here in Washington. There is not a department head, there is not a department secretary, there is not a department assisting secretary or an assistant secretary that will let Jones in the outer office. Authorities here in high places have long ago, as have the people of Louisiana, found him out. May we not now be reminded that we are told in the Bible, "Make sure your sins will find you out." My friends, as you have found him out in Louisiana, they also have found him out here in Washington

Memorial of New York State—Expansion of Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH MRUK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include New York State Senate Resolution No. 19, by Mr. Wicks, adopted by the senate March 8, 1943 and concurred in by the assembly March 10, 1943, petitioning the Congress of the United States to amend the social-security law to include certain employees now excluded from the benefits of the social-security law:

Senate Resolution 19

Whereas the national administration has enacted legislation to provide old-age security benefits for many of our citizens and is contemplating the expansion of the social-security program to include other groups not now eligible for such benefits; and

Whereas under the social-security law only the employees of covered employers may participate in social-security benefits, and only the covered employers are required to pay social-security tax, the covered employer and the covered employee each paying one-half thereof; and

Whereas there are in the State of New York a great many employees who were formerly covered by the law and were formerly eligible for benefits thereunder, but who, through no action or choice on their part, became ineligible under the law when they, through no action or choice on their part, became employees of uncovered employers; and

Whereas a great many of such employees who so became ineligible under the social-security law are desirous of being eligible thereunder and being covered thereby, and to participate in social-security benefits, and are willing to pay not only the amount of employee contributions but also the amount of employer contributions which their present employer would have been required to pay if such employer were covered under the law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to provide that all employees who were formerly covered by the Social Security Law and who heretofore made contributions thereto in the form of employee tax, and who became ineligible through no action or choice on their part, may again become elegible under the Social Security Law for social security benefits upon signifying their willingness to pay, not only the amount of employee contributions, but also the amount of employer contributions which their present employer would have been required to pay if such employer were covered by the law; and be it further

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the secretary of the United States Senate, the clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the Congress elected from the State of New York.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial by Mr. A. M. Piper, editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil, of Council Bluffs, Iowa.

His editorial deals with reciprocal trade treaties pointing out two provisions which should be incorporated in future treaty and tariff legislation.

After reading these proposed amendments by Mr. Piper, who I know has given a great deal of serious thought to this important subject, as they will affect our whole post-war economy, I felt his editorial merits wide publicity and serious consideration by the administration and every Congressman, especially the Members of the Senate who will sooner or later have this very vital question to pass on and to solve in the best possible way.

The editorial follows:

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Republican Members of the House of Representatives probably have it in their power to say whether the reciprocal trade agreement program shall be continued. The law authorizing the negotiation of such agreements expires June 12. If it is not extended, no more trade agreements can be negotiated and put into effect by the State Department. Presumably those now in effect would eventually lapse.

There are enough Republicans and dissatisfied Democrats in the House to defeat extension of the law.

The majority of Republicans opposed the Reciprocal Trade Act for several reasons. They maintained that tariff making was the function of Congress and should not be transferred to the Executive. They feared that numerous American industries would be put out of business by the tariff cuts negotiated by the State Department. And of course the protective tariff has always been one of the cardinal doctrines of the Republican Party.

The law was passed by an overwhelmingly Democratic Congress and the State Department has negotiated some 25 agreements. Whether these agreements have hurt or helped the United States is a question. The world has been in such a turmoil since the pacts were entered into that no one can be sure just what their effect has been, or would have been if trade conditions had been normal. At the present time we have very little international trade except on lend-lease. No one foresees what the situation will be after the war.

In the light of the record and the outlook, what should the Republicans do when the trade-agreement program comes up in the House?

We have never approved the present law but we do not believe the Republicans should be responsible for allowing it to lapse completely. Neither do we think it should be extended in its present form. In our opinion the House Republicans ought to insist on at least two important changes.

First, the most-favored-nation clause should be barred in all future agreements and eliminated from those now in effect. Under this clause tariff concessions made to one nation are automatically extended to all other nations whose tariffs do not discriminate against us. The plain fact is the trade-agreement program has amounted to a general reduction of United States tariffs. Every nation granted a tariff concession by the United States should be required to make some concession in return. This would be real reciprocity.

Second, no trade agreement should become effective until Congress has had an opportunity to reject it by a majority vote of both Houses. We would not require affirmative approval by Congress. We would merely give Congress a chance to disapprove. If the two Houses did not reject it within a reasonable time, say 90 days, the agreement would become effective.

We believe that with these two amendments the Republicans would be justified in voting for extension of the reciprocal trade agreement program.

Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of recommendations concerning the matter of price ceilings on vegetables as unanimously adopted at a State-wide confer-

ence of vegetable growers of New York State:

We, as representative vegetable growers of New York State, in conference at Albany March 11 and 12, recognize as our country's whole population must, that a nation produces and its army fights on its stomach and that therefore food is as assential in our total war effort as planes, ships, tanks, and guns.

We vegetable growers pledge to our country our utmost effort in meeting the needs not only of our sons in the armed forces and our civilian population but of our allies and the populations of the deprived and persecuted nations.

We therefore maintain that our first and most important job as growers is to utilize to the fullest possible extent our tremendous potential of production in meeting these stated needs for food. But to the end that these needs may be met we must be unhampered and unrestricted in going about the unprecedented task before us. Our farms and our hands must be freed for the job.

At the present time, March 12, with many seedling plants already growing and when seeds and fertilizers should be on the farm, we stand at the very beginning of another growing season. The way production goes, up or down, is in delicate balance today. Governmental interference in the form of price ceilings exerts an increasing daily pull downward.

This conference, after a detailed study of price ceilings and the many factors involved with respect to vegetable growing in New York State, places itself on record as being unanimously opposed to any and all price ceilings on perishable produce in general, or on tomatoes, peas, beans, cabbage, spinach, lettuce, and carrots specifically, for the following reasons.

1 COST OF PRODUCTION

The cost of producing vegetables in New York State varies with each producing section and with each farm within these sections and with each season. Labor costs can neither be accurately determined in advance of marketing, nor without knowledge of yield per acre. Yield per acre is subject to growing conditions over which neither the grower nor the Office of Price Administration has any control.

2. CONTAINERS

We maintain it is impracticable to establish ceiling prices on any commodity which is sold in various sizes and kinds of containers. For example, tomatoes in the Rochester area normally sold in 12 quart climax baskets or half bushels. Capital district growers market theirs in 24 quart baskets. In the Hudson Valley both 16 quart baskets and tomato lugs are used.

The first requisite, therefore, to fair ceiling prices dictates stabilization of containers over the State. Under war conditions, this is not feasible. Supplies of new containers are so restricted that second-hand containers must be largely utilized. Many of these have been bought for the season. Standardization of containers would enforce undue hardship upon such growers. It might well result in crop losses due to scarcity of any one fixed type of container.

3. GRADES AND GRADING

We maintain that it is impracticable to establish ceiling prices without considering grades and quality of any product. Vegetables are grown under a wide variety of conditions in the State. Many different varieties of each vegetable likewise are grown, each subject to variations in price. Grading practices vary both as to sections, as to individual growers, and as to the time of harvest. We do not believe it feasible to establish standard grades at this time. Such standards, if adopted, could not be enforced because of shortages of manpower in the enforcement agencies.

4. SEASON OF PRODUCTION

Seasons of production vary in different parts of the State. Tomatoes, for example, ripen progressively over the State starting with the Hudson Valley. By the time the Capital District is in production, a basket of tomatoes worth $5 at Albany brings $3 at Newburgh. By the time later production areas come in, the Hudson Valley tomato sells for $1, the Capital District tomato for $3, and the northern tomato $5. How then are price ceilings to be established, or how enforced? This applies to all of the other vegetables mentioned.

5. FARMERS CANNOT EXIST IF PRICES ARE HELD BELOW PRODUCTION COSTS

The theory of price ceilings is based upon the assumption by the Office of Price Administration, by other Federal agencies, and by the consumer, that, regardless of price ceilings, regulations, or orders affecting growers, we farmers will continue to plant, produce, and harvest as usual. It is time this was recognized as wishful thinking. In spite of subsidies, incentive payments or "what have you," farmers still stay in business by making a profit. When ceiling prices are put upon fresh vegetables, restricting a high price, with no consideration to a floor price, the result is to encourage low prices and to take away the incentive for production.

A case in point. Thousands of early tomato and cabbage plants which supply our local markets with early produce before the main crop comes in are now started in our greenhouses. Bear in mind that the cost of producing these early crops is much higher than that of later plantings. Bear in mind also that early crops are produced only because they command very high prices. These early crops are more than justified because they supply our local markets when there is no other source of supply except by resorting to and placing an added burden on our now overtaxed transportation system. Bear in mind, likewise, that canned vegetables are rationed. One grower present stated that if ceiling prices of $2 to $3, to use an arbitrary figure, are set, he will pull out his 15,000 tomato seedlings and throw them away. This man knows that he cannot produce at this figure. Nor can he risk producing this early crop with any Government bureau holding the arbitrary power of fixing prices at any figure designed solely to protect the consumer.

It is not too difficult, then, to envision price ceilings as boomeranging to force growers to shift their production from these essential crops to others not bound by ceilings. We wonder whether this has been considered. We wonder whether we, as a nation, can afford to continue to close our eyes to practical considerations of this sort.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

We cannot admit the wisdom of price ceilings on perishable produce. We believe it a false economy. If, however, we must submit to them, we recommend that:

A. Price ceilings be based upon the highest market prices of last year for each crop and for each production area, as duly recorded by our State Department of Agriculture and Markets.

B. To this base price for each area must be added coverage for the increased costs of production that must be met this year.

C. These prices are a matter of record from day to day. The adoption of this method will compensate our growers for the increased costs of his early crops. They will fluctuate in each area in accordance with the season and, by and large, furnish the only approach to this problem.

D. If this method, as recommended, be adopted, or any other method, we insist that the control of these prices be lodged, not in Washington, but in the district office closest to each production area. Unfavorable weather, disease, insect pests, all play their role, war or no war. It is vitally important to our producers that provision be made for appeals to cover unforeseen and unpredictable happenings and that adjustments be made with the minimum of delay.

E. If price ceilings are to be placed upon fresh vegetables, New York growers must know what these ceilings are to be, not later than March 20, 1943, because planting time has arrived.

F. If price ceilings are to be resorted to, we recommend that they be placed on the terminal market or on the retailer, or on both, but not f. o. b. shipping point.

G. Whenever price ceilings are placed on a given farm product the producer who sells direct to wholesale houses, or retail stores, commercial, industrial, institutional, or government users, the same ceiling price shall apply for the producer at any given point of sale as applies to any other seller.

Under many of the present price-ceiling orders where sales are made direct to both retailers, restaurants, commercial, industrial, etc., users, and direct to consumers, both at farmers' public markets and at the buyer's place of business or home, the producers' ceiling prices are set at a lower level than other handlers For example, the farmer's ceiling on onions and potatoes on a regional market or delivered to a retail store is less than a merchant trucker or class 3 wholesaler.

This is a clear case of unfair discrimination against the producer.

7. It is the opinion of this conference that the establishment of ceiling prices on perishable produce is an open invitation to the expansion of black market operations. Black market operations must, in turn, lead to the by-passing of all our organized marketing channels. These marketing channels and our distribution systems have been developed over a long period of time and at great cost to farmers, dealers, and to the consumer. Grower, distributor, and consumer have benefited from these organized marketing facilities. They must not be disrupted if we are to do our job today. The cost to the Nation of permitting a policy that will extend our black markets, must be far greater than the cost of permitting our farmers a fair return for his products.

8. IN CONCLUSION

We stand at the threshold of our production season. The scales determining which way production is to go—up or down—are in delicate balance today. Price regulation without price floors and governmental interference with agriculture today exert a daily pull downward.

The price at stake is too great to risk much more downward pressure on the scales. The farmer is the forgotten man of today.

Let us alone and we will produce. Work with us, not against us. We want to do our job in our way as we know best. Whose stake is any greater than ours? Our sons and daughters are scattered over the face of the globe. They are gone from our farms. We who are left, recognize our trust.

Let it be truly said that in America, all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed. We cannot give our consent to any scheme of regulation that jeopardizes the very things we fight for.

Taking the Milk From the Babies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the A. F. of L. teamsters of Port Huron, Mich., in order to collect initiation fees, dues, and force the drivers of vehicles delivering milk into their union, are willing to deprive the babies of Port Huron of their milk.

The union insists that the employers force their employees into the union or else quit delivering milk. That would be a violation of the N. L. R. A. How the drivers feel about it is shown by the following from the Port Huron paper:

"NOTHING ELSE WE COULD DO," SPOKESMAN STATES

Drivers for dairy firms in Port Huron said today they regret they were forced to suspend delivery of milk.

In their temporary headquarters at 508 Huron Avenue, they told why they took the action they did. "We didn't figure there was another thing we could do," said Clarence Smith, their spokesman.

"It hurts me to deprive the people of their milk," William Duncanson, who has delivered for Babcock's Dairy Co. 16 years, declared.

Why, then, did they refuse to make deliveries today?

Smith answered the question.

He charged that representatives of the American Federation of Labor teamsters' union had attempted to organize the drivers by bringing pressure on their employers, the dairymen. He said the drivers were perfectly satisfied with present conditions and that they would not benefit by joining the union.

On the other hand, he said, the public would suffer if they did join the union.

Smith said drivers of the dairy firms decided a month ago that they would continue to work, hoping the union would recognize that they were satisfied with existing conditions and drop its organization efforts.

He pointed out that the drivers work on a commission basis and that their incomes are comparable to those of men working in war plants. He said that to cover their routes some of the drivers often work well into the night.

"We're satisfied with our wages," he said. "As for working hours—if we were limited to a certain working schedule the people would not be served."

"During the snowstorms we had recently, some of us worked until 10 or 11 p. m. to deliver milk," Clarence Ogden, who has delivered for the Wurzel Dairy Co. 12 years said. "If we'd been in the union, we couldn't have done it."

Thomas Odom, who has driven a milk truck for Bailey's Jersey farm dairy 7 years said relations between dairymen and their employees have always been cordial. "When anything happens we think should be adjusted, we can go to our bosses and say, 'Here John,' or 'here, Mike,' and get satisfaction. We've never had any trouble we couldn't settle among ourselves."

Smith said he and his fellow drivers intend to stay off the job until the union quits its effort to unionize them.

"We're sorry we won't be able to deliver milk to the people," Odom added. "But consider our position too. We're out of jobs. If it becomes necessary we'll have to get other work."

What the courageous editor of that paper thinks is shown by the following editorial:

DRIVE OUT THESE OUTLAWS

The people of Port Huron today are being made the victims of as fine a bunch of pirates as ever scuttled a ship.

Babies are being deprived of milk and sick persons are suffering because a lot of racketeers have this city's milk supply shut off.

It is an intolerable situation and one which demands prompt and decisive action from State and Federal authorities.

Milk drivers of Port Huron, refusing to be forced into a union against their will, have asserted their Americanism and rebelled against as rotten an attempt to invade their sacred rights as has ever been witnessed in this or any other American community.

This is not a question of whether a union is a good thing or whether it isn't.

It is not a question of employers standing in the way of their employees to organize a union.

It is not a question of wages, hours, or anything else of that kind.

This is simply and solely a question of whether a crowd of highbinders, led by a few outlaws, are going to be able to cram down the throats of good decent Americans a union contract upon which the racketeers can take a rake-off for themselves.

It is an unthinkable thing, the sort of thing that Adolf Hitler has tried to force upon free men and women all over the world.

It is something which should never for a minute have been allowed to go as far as it has already gone without someone being placed behind prison bars.

Employers, protesting that they have no control over whether their men may consent to join a union, have been laughed at and told to get busy, or they would be put out of business.

Their customers have been taken away from them, or picketed by as frowsy and lousy individuals as could possibly be obtained.

They have been plainly and brazenly told to go ahead and organize their men and that the so-called labor leaders were only out for "the dough."

Come across "or else" they have said in just those words.

Decent labor leaders in this community have been shocked by the tactics employed and have so informed this newspaper.

If this sort of thing can go on in this country without any interference from State or Federal authorities there is little use trying to fight a war for freedom.

Why should our sons be spilling their blood all over the world, while a lot of bandits are being permitted to ply their dirty trade at home?

The Times Herald believes the milk drivers are doing exactly the right thing and that they have only done what every decent American would do under the circumstances.

They are not antiunion, or anything of the kind.

The are simply demanding the right, which they are entitled to under the law, to vote themselves on whether they should unionize and, if so, what union they should join.

Their employers would be in direct violation of the Federal law if they attempted to force an organization on them.

The time has come for a showdown.

Drive out these outlaws.

What I would like to know is this: How much longer will Franklin Delano Roosevelt stand back of and encourage those who insist upon collecting tribute from American citizens?

What is the difference, in principle, between the highway robber who forces you to stand and deliver at the point of a pistol and the union racketeer who takes the money out of your pocket by a threat to beat you up if you do not join his union and pay the fees he demands?

Rice Production in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication signed by Members of Congress, addressed to the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations of the Department of Agriculture:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1943.

Mr. L. A. WHEELER,
Director, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WHEELER: The signers of this letter are Members of Congress from the rice-growing districts of Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, and California. We desire to protest the plans of the Federal Government to subsidize the production of rice in Cuba at the expense of the rice industry in the United States.

We understand that a plan is under consideration whereby the Export-Import Bank is to loan $25,000,000 to Cuba to be used in promoting the production of rice and that the United States plans to ship agricultural implements to that country as needed to carry out this proposal.

It is obvious that this money is to be used for farm equipment such as planters, tractors, and other essential implements and for the construction of irrigation canals and dams to supply water for the island's production of rice.

Since rice producers in the southern rice belt are now in need of irrigation pumps, tractors, and other equipment necessary in the production of rice, and in view of the barriers in getting this equipment due to priorities and the shortage of critical materials, it is difficult to understand the Government's plan to export implements so badly needed at home. This is a good-neighbor policy which may be good for the "neighbor" but is manifestly unjust and unfair to the "home folks."

Information from Cuba reveals that there is not sufficient water for the production of rice. The cultivation of rice depends largely upon the procurement of water and this would prove a costly undertaking in Cuba. But the people of the island have been assured, according to newspapers published in Habana, that to finance the cost of this work it is not necessary for the rice growers to contribute any capital because the irrigation plan is included in the budget covering the development of public works and agricultural enterprises to be paid out of the $25,000,000 loan made with the Export-Import Bank.

Domestic rice producers have to resort in many cases to the costly irrigation system by pumps to avoid the risk of losing their crops, but the Government proposes to help Cubans

cultivate rice by the construction of small dams. This work will be paid for with American funds, if the plan is adopted, and American engineers are down there now studying ways and means of bringing this project to a successful conclusion.

Unquestionably, Cuba's soil is not adaptable to rice, as sugar is the island's principal economic crop. It is very doubtful that Cuba could produce a supply of rice which would make the island self-sufficient. These funds would, therefore, be spent without obtaining the hoped-for results.

Since the beginning of the war Cuba has received practically all of its rice from the United States, with the exception of some small imports from Mexico, Chile, Ecuador, and Brazil. All of these countries, including our own, have surpluses in which Cuba can participate. During the present crop season Cuba has received reasonable supplies from the United States and from the other countries mentioned, and there seems to be no logical reason for undertaking an experiment of this kind in Cuba now.

The rice producers of the United States have made a concerted effort to achieve an economic balance—naturally, their foremost objectives now are to produce more and better rice for victory. In inviting Cuba to compete with them the United States Government is bringing disaster to an old and established industry and to thousands of people that depend directly or indirectly on the production, milling, and distribution of this product.

We take this means to object very strenuously to any movement to advance funds to Cuba or any other country for the purpose of experiments in rice production. We also object to the export of farming equipment to Cuba or elsewhere to be used for such an experiment. If this proposal is not abandoned we are prepared to take legislative action to protect the interests of the rice industry of the United States.

Hattie W. Caraway, United States Senator, Arkansas; John L. McClellan, United States Senator, Arkansas; E. C. Gathings, Member of Congress, Arkansas; Wilbur D. Mills, Member of Congress, Arkansas; W. F. Norrell, Member of Congress, Arkansas; Hiram W. Johnson, United States Senator, California; Sheridan Downey, United States Senator, California; J. Leroy Johnson, Member of Congress, California; John H. Overton, United States Senator, Louisiana; Allen J. Ellender, United States Senator, Louisiana; Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Member of Congress, Louisiana; James H. Morrison, Member of Congress, Louisiana; James Domengeaux, Member of Congress, Louisiana; Tom Connally, United States Senator, Texas; W. Lee O'Daniel, United States Senator, Texas; Martin Dies, Member of Congress, Texas; Joseph J. Mansfield, Member of Congress, Texas.

Federal Planning Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an editorial from the Plaquemines Gazette, of Pointe-a-la-Hache, La. I desire to call the attention of the House to the editorial which reached my desk today:

FEDERAL PLANNING BOARD PROGRAM UN-AMERICAN

The New Deal party in Washington through its Resources Planning Board filed a new proposed American Bill of Rights for consideration by Congress. Their proposals are as far as the opposite poles from the American way of life provided by our Federal Constitution and the principles laid down by our founding fathers and followed for over 160 years in the growth and development of our country.

The program, or "pogrom" requires repeated close reading and study with an understanding of the European systems far and beyond that possessed by American citizens to fully appreciate the aims, objects, and purposes of such a revealing document.

It is understood to have been drafted by professional social workers and beneficiaries who have lived so long on the fat of this grand and glorious land that they visualize a false Utopia.

But a close reading and casual understanding reveal also the serious pitfalls and traps such as were laid down and used by the early proponents of national socialism and communism in well known parts of Europe.

The New Deal pronouncement of its ideals of governmental paternalism plagiarizes both the Nazi national socialism and the Russian communistic system. The authors are practical enough, however, to provide for themselves when they require that the personnel administering public-aid programs and social security should be fully qualified by training and experience and should be in the hands of fulltime personnel selected on the basis of merit, such as presently employed professional social-security workers.

In recognized Nazi style they propose an all-out control program for America's youth, regimenting their education, work, and habits, their curricula in school, their apprenticeship for occupational adjustments, their registering at public employment offices with special stress upon the inculcation of habits and disciplines of youth, even providing facilities of counse'ing and the guidance to all young people and their parents.

Then comes the old familiar style of coating the bitter pill with sugar words, or just plain "bribe" offered to put over a nefarious scheme on the supposed beneficiaries who comprise the masses of the people.

The program provides for free school lunches for all school children; for the physical health of youth, including medical care for millions among the mothers and children of this great country; child-welfare services, and the distribution of commodities to the entire low-income population, and not merely to public-aid recipients, and for all forms of social security, insurance benefits, and a carefree life from cradle to grave, all at taxpayers' expense.

LABOR TO BE LIQUIDATED

They lay down the most remarkable proposition that, "The merit system should be extended upward, downward, and outward" for all personnel in the field of public aid.

But in another part of their program they also lay down the rule that, "Experience rating should be abandoned."

Then they let the cat out of bag. They say: "The federalization of employment service should be continued as a permanent policy." The work of the labor market, mechanism for interstate exchange of labor, vocational guidance, etc., should be further developed.

We are now witnessing with horror, interstate exchange of labor between Herr Hitler and Pierre Laval.

And they go on: "The activities of the public employment service along these lines in the defense period should be incorporated into the permanent program of the agency."

Then again they propose to hand out a little social security or bribe to labor and they say, "The Employment Service should be empowered to make advances to workers for the purchase of tools and the payment of fares to give financial assistance to those incurring heavy cost due to geographical transfers, and to pay training allowances to workers undergoing approved training courses."

We have no doubt but that Herr Hitler would pay the transportation and furnish the tools, too, for the 400,000 forced slave labor which he is now demanding from France, in his proposed interstate exchange of labor.

The program offers a hodge podge of European national socialism and communism seasoned with national bankruptcy.

Aside from the more academic questions of what would or can be done by such a program to the Nation's economy and general business structure and our American way of life, including freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of contract, freedom to work and to follow one's ambitions in life and to further develop the natural creative ability in our American people, it is beyond comprehension how an American Congress, each Member of which has taken the oath of fidelity to the Federal Constitution, can entertain for a moment of their precious time in this gravest of all war emergencies such infidelity to our Constitution and American way of life as has been handed to them by a little band of professional would-be European regimenters.

The Roosevelt Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under the permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following resolution, dealing with the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas regarding the fighting Roosevelt boys:

Be it resolved by the S. M. N. & R. Post, No. 163, American Legion, Marysville, Kans., That we, as voters of the First Congressional District of Kansas, apologize to the four Roosevelt boys and to the Nation for our part in placing a man of the character and mentality of W. P. LAMBERTSON in office.

It has been with the mixed emotions of shame, disgust, and nausea that we have witnessed the attacks by Mr. LAMBERTSON on these fine American soldiers. If Mr. LAMBERTSON feels that he must heckle the President, we feel that to be his American privilege, one which a million American boys, including the President's four sons, are now fighting to maintain, but we regret this attack upon these soldiers who are too far away to defend themselves, as un-American, unsportsmanlike, and indecent.

As former soldiers we know of a time-tested method for a soldier to defend his honor and we suggest to the Roosevelt boys that the first one to return to Washington, settle personally with Mr. LAMBERTSON, if he can be caught away from the sanctuary of the House of Representatives.

And to you, Mr. LAMBERTSON, we recommend that in view of your own war record you cease your scurrilous sniping from the rear. There is something in warfare you would not understand, and that is—that

nothing is as disturbing to troops in action as to be fired upon from the rear.

The only thing you have accomplished by your attack is to focus attention upon your own lack of qualifications for the high office you hold, and to distract the attention of our troops from the enemy toward what should be a friendly rear territory.

Keep up the attacks upon the President if you feel it is the only way you can attract attention but in the name of decent Americanism, lay off the boys; let them do without hindrance what you were not willing to do—fight for this country; be it further

Resolved, That the State officials of the Kansas Department of the American Legion be requested to investigate Mr. LAMBERTSON'S right to membership in the American Legion. Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Mr. LAMBERTSON; to Mr. Roosevelt for transmission to his sons, to Representative LANHAM of Texas, and to Mr. Walter Winchell, whom we thank for his efforts in attempting to silence these unjustified attacks.

Food Production in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the 2½ months that I have been a Member of this House, not a single day has passed that one or a dozen Members did not cry about the impending food shortage. Time and again I have heard the statement that the farmers of this Nation are going to let the people down. Time and again I have heard the statement that because of a shortage of machinery and farm help there is going to be a decline in the coming food crop.

I have heard at least a hundred speeches in this respect. Therefore, it is, indeed, illuminating and most unusual when we get the other side of the picture. I do have the other side of the picture, ladies and gentlemen of the House. To show you how the farmers of northern Wisconsin are responding to our Nation's need I would like to quote you a letter that I received from one of the counties in my district, a letter from a member of the U. S. D. A. War Board. Luther M. Hamrick points out that the production of milk in that one county alone for January and February of this year is more than 20 percent above January and February of last year. The Medford Cooperative Creamery reports an increase of 22 percent per head over 1942. This cooperative has approximately 1,400 patrons. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I am going to insert this letter in the RECORD because in spite of all the blues that have been sung in this Congress regarding our food crop, I want to bring out the fact that no matter what the handicaps are or what the handicaps might be in the future, the farmers of northern Wisconsin will respond to the fullest extent. The figures stated in this letter are ample proof of the patriotism that spurs the farmers on in Taylor County regardless of all the red tape and the handicaps which emanate from Washington:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Medford, Wis., March 15, 1943.

Congressman A. O'KONSKI,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We have been hearing a lot of talk about 1943 food production being considerably less than 1942 production. A survey of dairy plants in Taylor County during the week of March 8 shows the following volume figures of 11 of the 16 plants in Taylor County. These figures should give a fairly accurate picture of 1943 milk production in general in Taylor County as well as a comparison of 1942 and 1943 production.

January 1942	5,492,921
January 1943	6,567,106
February 1942	5,390,275
February 1943	6,593,795

A good share of this increase is due to a considerable increase in the number of cows. The Medford Cooperative Creamery reports an average increase of 22 percent per head over 1942. It looks like Wisconsin dairymen are really going to town in 1943 in spite of less help, less machinery, etc.

Very truly yours,
LUTHER M. HAMRICK,
Chairman, Taylor County United States Department of Agriculture War Board.

Ickes' Latest Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick:

ICKES' LATEST ORDER

Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator for War, last night issued an order removing the ban from pleasure driving. But Mr. Ickes, who relishes a joke as keenly as Mr. Roosevelt (when it is on the other fellow), coupled this with another order reducing the allowance of gasoline to holders of A cards from 3 gallons a week to 1½ gallons. This is a grim joke.

In justice to Mr. Ickes we must say that the gasoline situation on the east coast is bad and growing worse. Besides, we have no means of knowing how heavily our Army in north Africa is drawing on our supplies. But it is well known to the public, and it should be well known to Mr. Ickes, that the use of gasoline is being flagrantly abused—not by the A card holders but by those who are permitted to use it in unlimited quantities.

There was little complaint from the A card holders when the 4-gallon allotment went into effect. Many of them were entitled to more, but they limited themselves as a patriotic measure. There was not much grumbling when their ration was reduced to 3 gallons, but cutting this allowance in two is akin to insult. This is giving them about 20 miles of driving a week.

During the recent cold spell cars and trucks standing idle ran their motors for as much as half an hour to keep their batteries charged. At night the streets are filled with cars, their occupants on pleasure bent. It is not easy to blame drivers who still think that as long as they have the gas it is their privilege to use as much as they want, but it arouses the indignation of the A card holders.

This latest order is characteristic of the whole war administration on the home front. Apparently there is no fixity to anything. Generally there is some group with sufficient force to have orders trimmed.

We admit the difficulty of establishing orders which can be enforced without breaking down the national economy, but if there is a famine in the East, and if our boys in north Africa need gasoline to operate their trucks, tanks, and planes, to burn it up wantonly at home is not good Americanism.

Recommendations of National Resources Planning Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Foote:

UNDER THE WASHINGTON DOME WITH MARK FOOTE

WASHINGTON.—Anyone who fondly imagined that President Roosevelt was not fighting two wars—one against the foreign enemy and one for revolutionary social and economic reform in this country—was disillusioned by the two reports of the National Resources Planning Board which the President transmitted to Congress last week.

These reports and their recommendations go far beyond social security, and even beyond Great Britain's Beveridge plan. Here are some of the disturbing, socialistic phases of the recommendations:

1. The "cradle-to-the-grave" social-security program would set up a post-war America in which labor would share in industrial management and in which Government would be in partnership with many businesses.

2. Equal educational opportunities for all would be established through high school and college and summer youth camps, and a medical program just short of socialized medicine would be set up. A new 9-point "bill of rights" for America would, among other things, guarantee the right to rest, recreation, and adventure, the opportunity to enjoy life and take part in an advancing civilization.

COOL RECEPTION IN CONGRESS

But reaction on Capitol Hill indicates that the war will have to be dragged out many more years to ram these proposals down the throats of Members of Congress who know the thinking of the people back home.

The proposals for labor sharing in industrial management and Government partnership in business would wreck the foundations of the system for private initiative on which this country was founded and grew to be more prosperous, with the highest standard of living in the world.

Take the single suggestion of revision of the school curricula under Federal supervision. If that isn't adoption of the Hitlerized method of education, what is it? Once the Federal Government gets its hands on education it will mean political education, depending on which party is in power. It will mean standardization and regimentation and

the loss of freedom of thought which is the pride of our educational system of today.

VOTERS TURN AGAINST FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY

Men who attack these proposals will be branded as lacking in vision, believers in a static world, tools of the interests and "economic royalists." But it was similar suggestions of socialization of industry, Federal control of education, limitations of salaries to $25,000, bureaucracy in everything, swarms of Federal snoopers, and Government gestapos which caused the voters last November to stage a peaceful revolution at the ballot box. They want nothing now that does not contribute to the winning of the war.

The wings of the National Resources Planning Board already have been partly clipped, as the House of Representatives recently refused to appropriate funds for it after July 1. Head of the Board is the President's 79-year-old uncle, Frederick A. Delano.

The personnel of the 7-man board and the 10-member committee on long-range work and relief policies which did the research and drew the reports includes the following:

Two social workers, two businessmen, and one each of the following: Retired, university professor, planner, social worker, economist, sociologist, priest, and Government service. Insofar as disclosed not one of the long-range committee ever met a pay roll, was elected to public office, or made a living at manual labor.

Most distinguished members are Dr. William Haber, chairman of the department of economics of the University of Michigan, and Prof. Charles E. Merriam, of the University of Chicago.

GRAND RAPIDS NATIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER

Another member, Corrington Hill, Grand Rapids-born, lists himself as an economist. His jobs on the Government pay roll for the last 12 years are illustrative of others. He was statistician of the Federal Employment Stabilization Board 1931-33; assistant administrator of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, assistant administrator of the Federal Civil Works Administration, assistant director of the Works Progress Administration, 1935-39, assistant commissioner of Works Progress Administration, 1939-41, and deputy director in charge of the Operations Office of Civilian Defense since September, 1941.

Another member, Charles W. Eliot, is a grandson of the late president of Harvard University and graduated from that school as a "landscape architect." He has been a member of various Government bodies, including National Planning Board, Works Progress Administration, and National Capital Parks and Planning Board.

The two businessmen on the committee, Beardsley Ruml, author of the "Ruml pay-as-you-go tax plan" now being kicked around in Congress and opposed by the administration, and Henry S. Dennison, a Massachusetts manufacturer.

Governors Should Follow Through

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 19, 1943

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission granted to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to a very fine editorial in the Marshalltown Times-Republican, of Marshalltown, Iowa, in regard to the recent Des Moines food conference. This meeting, which was called by Gov. Bourke Hickenlocper, of Iowa, was attended by men whose knowledge of the subject of food production cannot be questioned.

The resolutions adopted by the conference state very clearly views that many of us have been trying for some time to impress on certain people in the executive branch of the Government. I agree with the editorial that all of us should follow through and insist that action be taken in accordance with the program set forth in the resolutions.

The editorial is as follows:

GOVERNORS SHOULD FOLLOW THROUGH

Governor Sharpe of South Dakota proposed at the Des Moines food conference that the Governors go at once to Roosevelt and announce the results of their conference and demand action.

Why not? Resolutions are fine, but it's the follow-through that counts. Governor Bricker of Ohio deplores the tendency of Washington's failure to utilize State governments to the extent of the authority and ability of such governments.

There is little difference of opinion among the Governors who met at Des Moines and their guest speaker, Herbert Hoover, as to what is needed to solve the food problem.

Surely the recommendation that farm machinery held in storage be released is a good one.

Who will question the demand that food production be recognized as essential war effort?

If food will win the war and, as Mr. Hoover says, save the world from anarchy, it is high time to recognize it and allot men enough to do the job.

The recommendation that deferred farm workers be given an insignia to show that their Government has assigned them to farm work is a good one.

Material for farm machinery must be made available if farmers are to get enough machinery, and this is a matter which the Governors should thresh out at once with Donald Nelson.

If as stated there is available fertilizer it should be released or a good reason given for failure to do so.

There appears to be nothing unreasonable in what the Governors ask; in fact, not very much that is new. The way to make the conference in Des Moines worth while is to follow through and see that Washington acts.

No Governor of a sovereign State ought to be afraid to take the needs of his State in these wartimes direct to Roosevelt, Nelson, Brown, Wickard, or McNutt.

The Governors have a comprehensive vision of the needs of their States in this battle for food and their resolutions are clear and their demands reasonable. If the Governors are in dead earnest they ought to do something more than mail a copy of their resolutions to Washington.

They ought to ring the doorbell at the White House and they ought to visit Wickard, Nelson, Brown, and McNutt in person and camp on Washington doorsteps until they get action.

Having taken a stand the Governors ought to pound on mahogany desks until they get attention. If the czars at Washington can't find time to visit the biggest food-producing area in the world the Governors from these 12 States should carry their demands to Washington.

Plight of Jewish People in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of New Jersey:

Senate Joint Resolution 3

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to find ways and means of mitigating the lot of the conquered peoples in Nazi-occupied lands, and protesting the barbarism of Nazi Germany in its announced plan of annihilating the Jews in occupied countries

Whereas the wanton barbarism of Nazi dominion has caused untold suffering and anguish to peoples of all nationalities and all faiths which have refused to yield, and has united the entire civilized world in armed and moral protest against it; and

Whereas the Jewish people in particular, scattered, defenseless, and unrepresented by any civil or political authority, has been singled out for especial attack ever since the accession of the Nazis to power; and

Whereas the corrosive doctrine of anti-semitism has been and is being utilized by the Nazi regime, as an avowed instrument for undermining the morale and confidence of the peoples of those nations which are their prospective victims, as a prelude to armed attack; and

Whereas it has been confirmed by our State Department that the announced purpose of the Nazi regime is to liquidate the Jewish population of Nazi-occupied Europe, an execrable deed of horror and barbarism of unparallelel magnitude in human history, which has profoundly shocked the conscience of the civilized world; and

Whereas the said program of mass murder, upon which the Nazi State has officially embarked, has already claimed 2,000,000 innocent victims and thousands more perish daily; and

Whereas the traditional American policy of humanity, justice, and fair play renders it imperative that the powerful voice of the American people ring out in defense of all the conquered peoples of Nazi-occupied Europe, and particularly, in defense of a people which has no government of its own to plead its cause: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey protests the brutalities practiced against all the conquered peoples of Nazi-occupied Europe and the barbaric, cruel, and premeditated plan of the German leaders to liquidate the Jewish population now enmeshed in Nazi toils, as being against the laws of God and man.

2. The legislature petition the President of the United States, Congress, and Secretary of State, to use the weight and prestige of their respective offices in making effectively felt to the Nazi overlords the protest of the conscience of the civilized world against their inhuman and barbaric practice against the peoples of the conquered countries, and particularly with respect to the Jewish population now situate in Nazi-occupied territory, and to hold the said Nazi warlords to strict accountability for their manifold crimes before the bar of justice.

3. The legislature petition the President of the United States, Congress, and the Secre-

tary of State, to use the weight and prestige of their respective offices to prevail upon the leaders of the United Nations to establish havens of refuge for those few unfortunates who manage to escape the Nazi oppressor and to facilitate the passage and travel of said refugees to the aforesaid havens of refuge.

4. The Secretary of State of New Jesey be, and he is hereby directed, to transmit copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Jersey in the Congress of the United States.

5. This resolution shall take effect immediately.

Approved March 17, 1943.

Painting Others Black Never Makes One White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a very interesting and timely editorial by my good friend Hon. William M. Franklin, a former member of the State Senate of Oklahoma and now an official of the Oklahoma State Union of the Farmers' Education and Cooperative Union of America. The editorial, which appeared in the Oklahoma Union Farmer of March 1, 1943, is as follows:

Since we have no national election this year, and the winning of the war is now our first and major task, partisan politics should take a back seat. Patriotism should prevail over petty grievances and selfish desires.

Our President is our Commander in Chief. It is generally acknowledged that he he has been right on our foreign policy and that more has been accomplished by this country during the past year to meet the threat to the liberties of our people than has ever been accomplished by any nation in the same time in the past.

The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are Republicans. Pat Hurley, Secretary of War under Hoover; Bill Donovan (once Republican nominee for Governor of the State New York); and other prominent Republicans have been given important assignments by the President.

We should encourage unity of efforts to meet the forces of evil and appreciate the fact that we have as our leader a man who will go down in history as a great humanitarian and statesman, ranking with Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. Each of them reached the highest peak in the mountain ranges of human greatness, but they did not escape being made the objects of the most venomous attacks.

Human nature, to some extent, has been the same in all ages. The people protest any change which affects their mode of life. Every advance in civilization has been over stubborn opposition. Our most sacred rights, such as freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, trial by a jury, and the right of the ballot, are fruits of much sacrifice in blood and money. Every age has had its tories. Every good cause has had the opposition of appeasers, reactionaries, and Benedict Arnolds and Judas Iscariots.

WASHINGTON

In celebrating Washington's birthday, our President, referring to his trials, said:

"Large numbers of the people of the Colonies were either against independence or at least unwilling to make great sacrifice toward its attainment." He stated that some sneered at the Declaration of Independence and claimed it was impractical and idealistic. There were many skeptics, cynics, and traitors. Henry Cabot Lodge in his Life of Washington refers to bitter attacks made upon him after he became President. It was asserted that his conduct in making a treaty with Great Britain had been "improper and monarchial and that he ought to be impeached." Briefly some of the attacks and charges made against him were as follows:

That he had "violated the Constitution"; "had been overdrawing his salary in defiance of law and had actually stolen in this way $4,700"; that "the mask of political hypocrisy" had been worn by him. In February 1796, 13 months before his retirement, the House of Representatives refused to adjourn on his birthday for half an hour, in order to go and pay him their respects, as had been the pleasant custom up to that time. The Aurora, a New York newspaper, 2 days after his retirement, printed a vicious editorial about him and, among other things, said that every heart ought to beat in unison "with exultation that the name of Washington ceases from this day to give currency to political insults and to legalized corruption." Lodge, in his history, says:

"This was not the outburst of a single malevolent spirit."

The article was copied and imitated in other cities. Washington was accused time and time again of "violating the Constitution," "debauching the country," "seeking a crown," and "trying to pass himself off as an honest man." One prominent writer charged that he was "treacherous in private friendship"; "* * * a hypocrite in public life, the world will be puzzled to decide whether you are an apostate or an imposter; whether you have abandoned good principles or whether you ever had any."

On the floor of Congres he was again and again assailed as a "tyrant," a "usurper," and "a despot as absolute as the Czar of Russia." It was charged that his government was a "perfect military despotism." (See chapter on Slanders of Washington in McMaster's History.)

LINCOLN

On September 23, 1864, the New York World printed an editorial under the heading "Is Mr. Lincoln honest?" It was a serious assault. It charged that a court martial against McKinstry was "dissolved immediately after the evidence had traced $90,000 into the hands of a female relative of Mr. Lincoln's sister. Did our 'honest' President fear lest the public might push the inquiries nearer home?" Another editorial attack the 1st of October the same year was under the caption The Ambitious Buffoon. He was derided and frequently called a buffoon by some of his own party. The Tribune, Greeley's paper, which supported General McClellan for President, published a series of editorials headed Mr. Lincoln—Has He or Has He Not an Interest in the Profits of Public Contracts? The question was answered affirmatively. He was accused of being responsible for high prices then ruling in the following:

"If Mr. Lincoln's 3 years misrule has run up the price of coal to $15, flour $16, butter 60 cents, coffee 60 cents, clothing to five times its former price—everything that the people eat, drink, and wear in a similar proportion—what will be their prices if Mr. Lincoln is reelected?"

S. S. Cox, later named "Sunset," in an address said, "We will damn him to eternal infamy." John Fuller, a Michigan Congressman, referred to him as a "perjured wretch." Congressman Stambaugh, of Ohio, declared, "You may search hell over and find none worse than Abraham Lincoln."

Henry Clay Deam, of Iowa, charged that the people were "ruled by felons" and that "Lincoln has failed, failed, failed." He continued:

"And still the monster usurper wants more victims for his slaughter pens; I blush that such a felon should occupy the highest gift of the people. Perjury and larceny are written all over him."

He referred to him as a "usurper, traitor, and tyrant."

On August 5, 1864, Benjamin F. Wade, of Ohio, Republican leader of the Senate, and Henry Winter Davis, one of the Republican leaders of the House, issued the following manifesto to the people:

"The supporters of the administration are responsible to the country for its conduct and it is their right and duty to check the encroachment of the Executive on the authority of Congress and to require it to confine itself to its proper sphere."

It was charged that he overrode the Constitution and usurped powers that belonged to Congress. The same charges were made against President Wilson and are now being made against our President and Commander in Chief today.

JEFFERSON

Vicious attacks were made upon Jefferson. He had many detrators. The Louisiana Purchase was questioned as being contrary to the Constitution.

Those who render the greatest service to mankind are the ones who are subject to the most venemous attacks. Jesus was classed as a "disturber." The Holy Bible has been fought more than any other book.

Time has a mellowing effect. Woodrow Wilson, a casualty of the first World War, is now being commended by some who want to discredit our present leadership. It is now generally conceded by students of government that if Wilson's policies could have been carried out we would not likely now be witnessing the Sampsons of militaryism pulling down some of the pillars of civilization. Fifty years from now Roosevelt, as are Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln will be praised without regard to party affiliations.

ENEMY WANTS MORE COMPLAINERS

Much of the criticism of our Commander in Chief gives aid and comfort to the bloody beast of Berlin, his puppet Mussolini, and his savage ally of the Orient. They would like to see more appeasers and complainers in our country.

Most of our people, without regard to party affiliations are loyal, patriotic and are willingly contributing to the common good.

Recently Secretary of the Navy Knox, at Lincoln's tomb, emphasized he is a Republican, recalled that Lincoln had been subjected to criticism, said:

"We see history repeating itself. Our President, our leaders have been subjected to all the same familiar charges of 80 years ago. We have seen again in these hours of another supreme struggle the same temptations of partisan advantage obstruct our larger purposes."

Roosevelt when he became President began to have our Navy and Air Force strengthened. He wanted to fortify some islands between us and Japan. He was called a war monger in this country and Hitler parroted the charge.

William Allen White, editor of the Emporia Gazette is a progressive Republican who puts

the interest of our country above cheap partisan politics. He has repeatedly commended the President's foreign policy. This great, patriotic citizen recently published in his paper the following:

"WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

"Hugh Powell, of the Coffeyville Journal is a straight-laced Republican. He has fought, bled, and died against the domestic end of the New Deal for the last 10 years and more. But the other day, summing the results of the war, Mr. Powell wrote in his Coffeyville Journal this significant paragraph:

" 'We shudder at the thought of what might have eventuated in the months immediately following our precipitation into a foreign war with a well-prepared enemy had it not been that lease-lend paved the way for mass manufacture of planes, ships, guns, tanks, and munitions. Credit Franklin D. Roosevelt for that. Credit him also with wise and sagacious conduct of war in its first 12 months. Errors have been made? Sure. But they were mistakes of action, not inaction.

" 'The sad part of this story, so far as our own Republican Party is concerned, is this: They got to hating Roosevelt so heavily that they emoted their votes against every measure, however wise it was, which he presented to Congress. Think of it—Republicans in Congress voting in the face of the enemy in 1941, to send the National Guard back home after they had been training 4 or 5 months! And that with an enemy who was slowly advancing on this Nation from two sides. Later, the same group voted against the lend-lease bill which has been the salvation of this world. They knew it was wise but they wanted to slap Roosevelt and they wanted to save their own hides politically and thought it would be popular to vote to save money.'

It is partisans like Hugh Powell who are Americans before they are Republicans, whose wisdom will save this country.

THEY ARE THAT KIND

Some Republican papers have admitted that we are fortunate to have at the head of our Government a man who held a high position during the First World War. He was Assistant Secretary of the Navy and he was in France during some of the peace negotiations. He had been in submarines and then and since encountered dangers. A great humanitarian, three times elected President by the people and our leader in the greatest world conflict, his place in history is fixed. His sons are in the service and one has been decorated for bravery. (The Roosevelts are that kind. Theodore Roosevelt was a brave man and one of his sons was killed in the first World War).

In referring to the President, I am referring to your President and my President, your Commander in Chief and my Commander in Chief. He is the elected leader of all of our people and as such we should all give him our loyal support as he helps guide us to victory against the aggressors. Some have charged that we were not helping keep the Japs from Australia. A few days later we landed troops and supplies in that area. Then it was charged we were losing on all fronts. The next week we were victorious in the Soloon Islands and a big force was successfully landed in North Africa. Most of the news since has been good. Recently William Allen White published the following editorial in his paper:

A G. O. P. SALUTE TO F. D. R.

"Well, it is now 60 hours since the Old Smiler returned to the White House from his great adventure. He saw more of an amazing world than Marco Polo. He saw in North Africa alone as much conquered land as Alexander saw when he wept for new worlds to conquer. He performed a feat so strange even in modern war, so amazing and unbelievable, that if it had been prophesied 50 years ago men would have stoned the prophets for impiety!

"Biting nails—good hard, bitter, Republican nails—we are compelled to admit that Franklin Roosevelt is the most unaccountable and on the whole the most enemy-baffling President that this United States has ever seen. He has added a certain vast impudent courage to a vivid but constructive imagination and he has displayed his capacity for statesmanship in the large and simple bill-board language that the common people can understand; moreover, that the people admire even when it is their deadly poison. We have got to hand it to him.

"Well, darn your smiling old picture, here it is! Here, reluctantly, amid seething and snorting, it is. We, who hate your gaudy guts, salute you."

We need more such patriots. Discontent and lack of proper support for our Commander in Chief aids our enemies. Much of the complaints and criticisms we hear and read are not based upon proper information and can only serve to prolong the war and cause it to cost us more in blood and money.

No other soldiers are as well provided for as ours. Never before was there as much done as is now being done in this country to preserve those things that are most worth while.

In these times of stress, we should be cool and be mindful of the following words of Lincoln to a delegation of complaining ministers:

"Gentlemen: Suppose all the property you possess were in gold and you had placed it in the hands of Blondin to carry across the Niagara River on a rope. With slow, cautious, steady step he walks the rope bearing your all. Would you shake the cable and keep shouting to him, 'Blondin, stand up a little straighter'; 'Blondin, stoop a little more; go a little faster; lean more to the south, now lean a little more to the north?' Would that be your behavior in such an emergency? No. You would hold your breath, every one of you, as well as your tongues. You would keep your hands off until he was safe on the other side. This Government, gentlemen, is carrying an immense weight, untold treasures are in its hands. The persons managing the ship of state in this storm are doing the best they can. Don't worry them with needless warnings and complaints. Keep silence, be patient, and we will get you safely across."

We should not be deceived by the selfish and sinister interests or be a party to hindering our war efforts for the national interest and our common good.

War Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Committee of the House has made a favorable report on H. R. 2087, and it is now upon the calendar.

The Department of Justice feels that this is a very important and necessary measure, and there appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 16, 1943, an editorial which clearly and forcefully presents the necessity of the legislation, and under leave granted, I submit same herewith:

WAR SECURITY ACT

In the light of our experience since Pearl Harbor, which has shown that the United States Government lacks adequate laws to deal effectively with sabotage, legislation to close serious gaps and correct defects in our present wartime security laws is plainly needed. Last fall the Department of Justice prepared a bill designed to remedy defects in existing statutes and a measure embodying its recommendations was introduced in Congress. A new bill, having the same objectives as the earlier measure, with some modifications aimed to make it even more effective in protecting our wartime security, has been reported by the House Judiciary Committee, and a measure closely similar is now before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

As Attorney General Biddle told Speaker Rayburn in a letter last October, the inadequacy of existing criminal statutes in wartime is evidenced by the absence of any provision under which persons preparing to commit acts of sabotage or espionage may be properly prosecuted. "If an enemy agent, for instance, plans a campaign of sabotage and collects for that purpose large quantities of explosives and incendiary materials, he is not guilty of any serious crime unless he comes close enough to the actual dynamiting or burning of a factory so that he can be charged with an 'attempt'," he pointed out. Equally inadequate for wartime purposes, he added, are the existing statutes concerning conspiracy. For example, a far-reaching and carefully planned conspiracy to destroy a vital shipyard—if no act or "attempt" at sabotage has occurred—is punishable now only by a fine of $10,000 or by imprisonment for 2 years.

To correct inadequacies in existing law, the bill reported by the House committee provides that a person found guilty, in wartime, of a hostile act against the United States may be punished by death or by life imprisonment, or in the court's discretion, by a shorter term. The bill lists a wide variety of acts which would aid the enemy, or which are steps toward extending him such aid. The bill would make an offense, punishable by imprisonment of not more than 10 years or a fine of not more than $10,000, the failure to report to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or other law enforcement agencies, information concerning violations of the act. The measure contains other provisions designed to expedite the handling by the courts of cases involving acts of secret warfare.

Despite the stern justice meted out to the eight Nazi saboteurs who landed on the shores of the United States last summer, the Axis may be expected to make other attempts to interfere with the American war effort. Congress, therefore, should lose no time in completing legislative action on the War Security Act, thus putting the Government in a stronger position, during the present emergency, in dealing with actions endangering internal security.

Cut Out the Red Tape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a letter which I have just received from Mr. Thomas O. Logsdon, of Shawneetown, Ill. Mr. Logsdon is one of the successful farmers of southern Illinois, is a good businessman,

a man of sound judgment, and is a real American.

The letter reads as follows:

SHAWNEETOWN, ILL., *March 15, 1943.*
Congressman HEIDINGER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Being a livestock farmer I'm very interested in keeping all unnecessary regulations off some. I feed around 500 cattle, breed and market 1,000 hogs each year. It is my sincere belief that a fixed price will only add to confusion and greatly decrease the next pig crop.

Give the people who wade the mud and carry the lantern a fair chance "without red tape" and they will never let their country down.

Yours respectfully,
THOS. O. LOGSDON.

Patriotic Service of School Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. JASPER BELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, some time ago, when rationing first started, I made a speech on the floor of the House commending the teachers of America for the loyal, splendid, and patriotic work which they did in the service of their country.

I know something of the strenuous lives that teachers live. All day long they are teaching the young of America. Their services in connection with local rationing boards have been performed in addition to their other tasks. Never once have I heard a complaint from anyone of them about the sacrifice they were making without financial compensation. They have done it cheerfully.

In looking over the Washington Star of Saturday, February 27, 1943, I saw an editorial which I think deserves to be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I am, therefore, including it in my remarks at this time.

The editorial is as follows:

AGAIN—THE TEACHERS

Monday they go back to teaching the little boys and the little girls various ramifications of the A B C's. But for 4 days past they have been teaching the rest of us some of the elementals of cheerful, efficient service in helping the war program along. The teachers should be proud of the fine compliments they are receiving for their handling of the latest complicated job of issuing ration books—Book of Doom No. 2. People often call the Star about their troubles, but the calls received by the Star this time, for the most part, have been in cheerful confirmation of the smooth dispatch with which lines of rather nervous citizens were passed through the schools, shorn of their honestly declared can coupons and sent with a smile into a dreary world of fresh vegetables and raw potatoes.

Who first thought of having the teachers handle these things? Whoever it was deserves a V. For of all our groups of workers, none comes so close to the people in their daily lives, knows more about the neighborhood families, their roots and branches, or has a better disciplined sympathy for the laborious mental processes of mankind. One would have to look far, indeed, to find a group of public servants more keenly aware of the obligations of citizenship or more ready to discharge them.

In those early, hysterical days of the war, when harassed authorities kept school buildings open 24 hours a day, it was the teachers who stood the lonely vigil. When ancient males of 45 to 65 were registered, the teachers guided their faltering hands through the intricacies of the questionnaires. When gasoline-ration books first were issued it was the kindly teacher—bless her heart—who was broadminded and understanding about X and C cards. Now they have taken us through ration books Nos. 1 and 2. If all of us are promoted, eventually, to book No. 3, it will be the teachers who hand them out. And when Distinguished Service Crosses are issued, for gallantry on the home front, the first to wear them should be our teachers.

Nobody Is Going To Get a Patent on the Post-War World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is about time that everybody in this country recognizes that nobody is going to get a patent on the post-war world. No individual, no organization, no political party, and no political leader is going to be able to withdraw from a purple bag a prettily phrased Utopia for giving everybody what everyone wants after the war and sell it to the United Nations or to the United States. Consequently, it seems to me that we Americans should now begin to hold open and candid and non-partisan hearings wherein a realistic and dispassionate examination can be made of the various proposals, both from the standpoint of domestic policies and of foreign affairs, which are now cropping out in almost daily announcements from one source or another. In no other way, in my opinion, can we be assured that we shall be prepared for the peace which will follow our victory in this war.

Mr. Speaker, this war may last for many years or it may end with a suddenness which will surprise and gratify us all. If it ends soon as we all hope it will, this country will again approach the peace table with a vague uncertainty and no bipartisan agreement as to our post-war policies unless we take early action to establish a post-war planning commission along strictly nonpolitical lines. With the war now in its sixteenth month for this country, neither the President nor the Congress has as yet exercised the statesmanship or leadership necessary to establish a squarely nonpartisan group to give official consideration to what is wanted and what is needed for this country and for the welfare of the world after peace comes in this costly conflict.

It is generally agreed that the United States must play an increasingly important part in world affairs and in the maintenance of a permanent peace. But there is no general agreement as to how this is to be done and there is no balanced board or commission to consider the outlines of such policy. It is generally agreed that the United States must safeguard its own solvency and sovereignty after the war in order to make its influence most effective in post-war cooperation and peace protecting activities. But there is no general agreement either as to how this is to be done and there is no nonpolitical and representative board or commission or agency or bureau or committee or group of any kind which has been set up by either the President or the Congress to devote its study and thought to these important problems. Thus we worry along from day to day in the sorry position of marshalling our all for a peace which we are failing to equip ourselves to secure and a victory which we are failing to prepare ourselves to interpret.

We continue to act as though the President, or the Secretary of State, or the Senate, or the House, or some outside individual or organization, or some department or bureau of the Government, were each and all trying in darkest secret to pull out of some global hat a ready-made post-war plan to submit to the patent office of the universe so that due credit could accrue to its originator. Thus while little men mull over their puny plans for global peace, prosperity and progress, time marches on. We steadily approach the day of peace, and the essential group thinking which is a prerequisite to any successful post-war program continues to be delayed entirely or to be divided among a hundred and one programs, proposals, plans, patterns, and panaceas. The vital factor of providing a sound and sensible laboratory to analyze and consider all suggestions on a completely nonpartisan and nonpolitical basis has not yet been provided and thus no area of agreement is developing around any focal point of view in this country while the environment of disagreement grows apace with every edition of the daily press reporting additional suggestions and proposals for the final answer.

In an effort to correct this deficiency and to provide a proving ground for post-war ideas, I introduced House Joint Resolution 28 on the opening day of this Congress. Whatever demerits and faults this resolution may have, it is, so far as I have been able to discover, the only proposal before either House of Congress candidly providing for a completely nonpolitical and a strictly nonpartisan group to study post-war policies. It is also the only suggestion that I know anything about which brings together around the same table and in the same conference room the executive and legislative branches of Government along with representatives of the general public for the sole and only purpose of investigating, studying, analyzing, criticizing, and commending the

twin factors of domestic and foreign policy which must be geared to each other if this country is to do its part to build a better world after this war.

It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I again urge the Congress and the country to support some such proposal as I have made to the end that without further costly delay we may have an official body of this Government which can take the leadership in developing as wide an area of agreement as possible on post-war policies and attitudes so that our leaders at the peace table may this time speak with some assurance that what they say reflects the heartbeat and the prayers of the people who, praise God, are still the rulers of America.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a letter appearing in the Des Moines Register Tribune and written by Clarence K. Streit, author of one of the post-war programs now being discussed in this country. This letter supports my position that we should not delay consideration of post-war policies while waiting for somebody to devise a secret Utopia to patent for the universe but that we should here at home among ourselves begin without delay an effort to amalgamate our diverse suggestions into some type of satisfactory synthesis and orderly understanding of what we want in the post-war world and how we propose to further our objectives.

The letter follows:

WHY THE MACHINERY FOR PEACE MUST BE READY—BORDERS, TARIFFS, ETC., BETTER SETTLED LATER

To the EDITOR:

It seems to me that it would greatly clarify discussion and hasten sound conclusion if we divided all peace plans and planners into two broad categories: (1) constitutional and (2) legislative.

Those in the first group recognize that the nations now lack effective machinery for securing in good time peaceful agreement on any important question, for enforcing it when reached, and for interpreting it with justice in disputed cases. They concentrate on the task of providing this machinery, of constituting world government, as problem No. 1.

Those in the second group concentrate on all and sundry specific questions on which international agreement is needed, such as boundaries, trade barriers, raw materials, disarmament, rehabilitation, etc. This vast pile of hard rocks tends to monopolize and confuse the post-war discussion. Worse still, it distracts attention from the fact that these rocks have piled up because we lack effective rock-crushing machinery and still depend on chain-gang methods.

HORSE BEFORE CART

To make the distinction I suggest is surely to agree on the wisdom of tackling No. 1 first and tackling No. 2 then with the machinery that No. 1 provides.

President Wilson began by putting the legislative cart before the constitutional horse. In his 14 points he gave foremost position to 13 points that were legislative in the above sense, and relegated the constitutional one to last place.

He thus put such items as the evacuation of Montenegro on the same plane as the establishment of the world's first government.

Result: Attention was centered more than ever on the specific problems, the commission that framed the Covenant was so neglected that it had to meet after office hours, and the League was buried before it began—buried under the Versailles rock pile.

Meanwhile, President Wilson had learned his mistake—and everyone else's. He warned his colleagues to this effect: We cannot make permanent decisions here, but we can set up permanent processes for making decisions. But he learned this too late. World interest was already centered on the decisions, instead of on the need of providing effective processes of law, just as it is now.

EXAMPLE OF UNITED STATES FATHERS

Contrast this with the example set by the founders of the United States of America. There were 11 territorial disputes to vex them when they gathered in Philadelphia; there were any number of tariff and financial questions. They did not waste their time on any of these problems. They concentrated on setting up more effective machinery for tackling such problems than the old Confederation provided. Result: They turned out a brief, effective document, the Federal Constitution—and all those trade wars and territorial disputes were soon settled by its machinery or forgotten.

We, of Federal Union, Inc., believe in following the example that worked.

If this is done, it should help end in a happy compromise the increasingly partisan debate over whether to make an immediate or a delayed peace. Obviously, it is dangerous to try to settle immediately and in the heat of passion all the specific problems facing us. It is no less obviously dangerous to leave all these problems as open, running sores, and settle nothing by war.

The way through this dilemma is to remember that the basic issue in this war is whether international issues shall be determined by human law or by jungle law, and to settle that issue immediately by establishing an effective, democratic, and just process for settling all other issues by human law—and to leave the other issues to be settled subsequently by this process.

TAKING FIRST STEPS NOW

The more we concentrate on the tremendous task of establishing international governmental machinery that is effective, democratic, and just, the more chance we have of succeeding in giving it these attributes, and the more safely we can leave all other problems to be handled by it in due time.

CLARENCE K. STREIT,
President, Federal Union, Inc.,
New York City.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would also like to call attention to some editorial comment from widely scattered points which is typical of many items which have come to me from throughout America in support of the proposal I made in House Joint Resolution 28 for the establishment of an official and strictly bipartisan and nonpolitical post-war planning commission. The first of these comes from the Beresford (S. Dak.) Republic, which paper incidentally is published in the home town of the esteemed former Senator from South Dakota, William J. Bulow:

URGES PEACE GROUP

Representative KARL MUNDT is sponsoring a 32-member, bipartisan, post-war planning commission, which he believes will produce results in this field. While we know little about the details of MUNDT's plan, we are glad to know that a South Dakota Congressman realizes the need for it and is working to bring it about.

There is altogether too much talk among our governmental leaders and the people as a whole to the effect that we have no time for anything but the war, itself; that any consideration of the peace to come must be postponed until after the war is won.

We will grant, of course, that winning the war is of the first and utmost importance. But let's not fool ourselves that post-war planning is not mighty important too. After this war we want as little as possible of the bungling and chicanery which characterized the peacemaking following World War No. 1.

The general argument usually heard against any post-war planning now is that we have no time for it. This argument is manifestly absurd. There are many able leaders in this country who are making few direct contributions to the war effort. Indeed, there are a number of Congressmen and governmental workers who might much better be spending their time at planning the peace rather than in squabbling over many of the inconsequential things and measures as they are now doing. If we cannot spare 32 persons or, for that matter, 10 times that number, to plan such an important thing as the world we will live in following this struggle, then we are certainly faced with a dearth of intelligent and able men and women. If this is true—and we know it is not—then we had better give up even hoping to win the war.

Getting back to MUNDT's proposal, he has said in a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "I believe that Americans generally will applaud any action this House will take to set up the machinery now for bringing representatives of the executive and legislative departments of government together with able representatives of the general public to consider realistically and dispassionately, without political bias or partisanism, the outlines for post-war policies."

Well, Mr. MUNDT, here is one American who will certainly applaud such action. We trust you will do everything in your power to bring it about.

Next comes a word of encouragement from the Union Sun and Journal, published in Lockport, N. Y.:

Something new in the way of a commission is proposed by Representative MUNDT, South Dakota, who suggests a 32-man group to make recommendations regarding the peace aims of this country and outline policies after the war. Interesting is the suggestion that Secretary Hull appoint 8 members, former President Hoover 8, and the remaining 16 be appointed by the Speaker and minority leader of the House.

From up in the great Northwest, I now call your attention to a highly favorable editorial appearing in the Hibbing Tribune, of Hibbing, Minn.:

A BODY TO PONDER POST-WAR PLANS

Very interesting is Congressman MUNDT's (Republican, South Dakota) House Joint Resolution 28 for a post-war planning commission of 32 members to probe the whole matter and to make suggestions from time to time. The proposal has attracted considerable attention throughout the Nation. The suggestion is a valuable contribution to the entire discussion, and what Congressman MUNDT said to the House when he introduced his resolution is extremely pertinent:

"We have seen and heard many glittering generalities about post-war programs, but most of them have contained a disappointing blind spot in their thinking, in view of the fact that proposals on domestic economy, and proposed patterns for our post-war domestic economy usually fail to consider the impact of world affairs upon our national problems. Consequently, I have deliberately suggested this commission be charged with both our foreign and domestic policies in the post-war era and especially the interrelationships existing between the two.

"Neither our foreign policy nor our domestic economy can operate in a vacuum after the war; each must be developed and

directed with due consideration to its effect upon the other. A commission to bring together these two realms of planning and thinking should help to clarify our peace aims, and aid in the prevention of our becoming myopic in our mission after the war."

The discussion of post-war plans, we think, is bringing somewhat into relief the inherent difficulties of the situation. The blue prints that have been offered may none of them be finally adopted, but they have been exceedingly valuable just the same.

While it is probable that a stage peace can only be achieved experimentally over a long period of time, the suggestions thus far made show the hope that is in the minds of men. They show also that man is more determined this time to win a lasting peace. We are aware and we are determined. We should be able to work out a way. But it is a job to be done.

The awareness of the people and their determination is more important than any concrete plan that can be proposed—particularly the awareness and the determination of the people of this country. America's strength will be the greatest of any single nation following the war; if its people have a clear determined purpose, they will make that purpose count in the post-war councils of the world.

Mr. Speaker, to illustrate the widespread demand for such a Post-War Planning Commission as I have proposed let me quote an editorial in the Mitchell Daily Republic, a strongly pro-Roosevelt newspaper of my State, which has never supported me in an election. I think this demonstrates the fact which we all should recognize that there is no politics in a just and lasting peace and there should be no partisanship in preparing to secure it:

MUNDT'S PROPOSAL WIDELY WELCOMED

KARL MUNDT'S resolution urging creation of a bipartisan commission for post-war planning is drawing favorable comment from many corners.

The South Dakota Republican introduced his resolution in the House. It provides that a commission including appointees of ex-President Hoover, Secretary of State Cordell Hull, and Congress be set up immediately to prepare America for its economic part in the next peace.

In other columns on this page today we are carrying comments from Time Magazine, once one of MUNDT'S severest critics. Frank Kent, nationally known newspaper columnists, also has discussed the Mundt resolution, saying:

"A South Dakota Congressman—Mr. KARL MUNDT—has already introduced a resolution creating a commission for the development of post-war economic plans. Mr. MUNDT is a Republican and his resolution is not free from flaws.

"However, it basically has the right view. This planning business should not be left exclusively to the executive branch.

"It is a matter in which not only the legislative branch should cooperate but the aid of the ablest private citizens available should be had.

"If an official commission of this sort could be created by Congress and started to work now, there is no reason the answer could not be found and the goal which all desire, at least, measurably approached."

As this newspaper pointed out in an earlier discussion of the Mundt proposal, it is only through planning from every angle that a basis for permanent peace can be achieved. We cannot leave post-war development to chance. To do so will only invite a recurrence of today's bloodshed.

Similar expressions of approval and support have reached my desk from Denver, Colo.; Boston, Mass.; New York City, St. Paul, Minn., and many other points. I shall not belabor the RECORD by calling attention to additional editorials.

AMERICAN BAR PRESIDENT APPROVES

However, Mr. Speaker, I do want to quote a paragraph from a letter received under date of February 3, 1943, from Mr. George Maurice Morris, of Washington, D. C., national president of the American Bar Association. Mr. Morris has kindly given me permission to quote this paragraph in full.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 3, 1943.*

MY DEAR MR. MUNDT: Thank you very much for that interesting resolution, House Joint Resolution 28, respecting the Post-War Planning Commission. This is a new approach to a field in which 20 Government agencies and 125 volunteer private agencies have already been identified. It has the practical virtue of bringing the Congress into the picture formally. I have an idea that no plan is going to get very much headway which does not have the official approval of Congress. I like the nonpartisan idea very much also. It not only appeals to any one thinking of the problem in its broad terms but has a practical value in view of possible changes in political majorities in the years to come.

GEORGE M. MORRIS.

Let us tarry no longer in this important business of beginning to prepare for peace; Mr. Speaker, in this field, at least, we can all agree, time is running against us. Whether by my resolution or by some other device, let us set up a strictly bipartisan, nonprejudiced, realistic Post-War Planning Commission to begin, now, the development of tangible and acceptable proposals for meeting the domestic and foreign problems which will inevitably follow the conclusion of this war.

"Keep 'Em Rolling"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by Mr. Frank S. Columbus, chairman of the legislative board, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, on March 11, 1943, before the Central Railway Club, of Buffalo, at the Statler Hotel.

I think that Mr. Columbus has done a splendid job in bringing out so many important details of the railroad industry. The loyalty and skill of the men who make this vital transportation run so smoothly is unquestioned and they are doing one of the greatest jobs of this war.

The speech follows:

It is a great privilege to participate in an affair that demonstrates to our fellow citizens our anxiety and ambition to "keep 'em rolling." There has been no time in our country's history when gatherings of this kind have been more important. In this mechanized age we take much for granted. We snap on the electric light and flood the room with artificial sunlight, without considering the investment and equipment and personnel which makes possible the distribution of electricity.

We turn on the radio and bring the world's best entertainment to our homes without thinking of the ingenuity that made it possible. We are in the midst of the greatest war that civilization has ever seen, we are in an era of mass production and the greatest demand upon transportation ever known. We came into this increased demand for transportation not thoroughly equipped. For years our industry has been living from hand to mouth, fighting for its life against subsidized competitors.

Bankruptcies among a large number of railroads had taken place, yet, the railroad management anticipating events, struggled to improve and expand their equipment and to fortify themselves against the emergency that soon developed.

The vitality of the railway system lies in the locomotive. The pulsations of its heart carries to and fro the commerce and travel of the country, just as action of the human heart sends the blood coursing back and forth through the body.

The discovery of the locomotive is, as a whole, the greatest achievement of man, in the art of carriage. Discoveries of this kind do not spring full-fledged into existence, but are created little by little and thus mature and grow. With the needs of the commercial world come the perfected locomotive.

Time will not permit me to carry you through the evolution of the locomotive from the wooden wheel, tired with iron, the upright boiler to the horizontal one: the cogged wheel and notched cast iron rack rail to the smooth steel wheel and rail. Even today, we find that the growth of the locomotive is not yet ended. As a matter of fact, probably a locomotive has never been manufactured that was not intended to be in some respects an improvement over those preceding it.

One cannot help but be impressed with the beauty of the locomotive considered purely as a work of art. Who, moreover, has ever stood beside a modern locomotive without emotion: without admiration for its beautiful lines: its mammoth proportions and magnificent possibilities? Who has ever seen a locomotive under headway, or as it is stopped from its flight, who has not felt that it was a living thing that gloried in its magnificent performance?

It seems at such a time to stand upon the track under admiring eyes with the great consciousness which a gladiator might possess when his skill and strength were admired and commented upon.

Nothing in the world is more inspiring than the flight of a railroad train. Stand near it and get its full inspiration, more than half made up of terror, as it rushes onward. Repetition will not dull the impression nor lessen the admiration. The coldest man at such a time has difficulty in restraining his enthusiasm.

One of the greatest jobs of this war is being done by the railroads, especially when you consider the handicaps under which the railroads are laboring. The acquisition of engines is limited. The building of cars is practically stopped. Facilities generally have been slowed down by priorities. Nevertheless, we are functioning with astounding efficiencies, without us the Nation would be sunk.

We are moving vast quantities of freight cars and troops and doing it without undue confusion. Due entirely to the fact that experienced men are at the helm. The locomotive engineer has inevitably had many years of experience, as has the conductor. They guide the destiny of the crew and train. They have an investment at stake in the welfare of the railroad. They have invested their lives, which is much greater value than any monetary fortune that they can hope to win.

With new firemen and trainmen in these perplexing times come many headaches. Some enter the service with the thought in mind of making it their life's work. While to others, it's just merely a job. So, it develops upon those in charge to inspire confidence and loyalty into new employees to produce expedience and safety that is so essential in these critical times.

The machinery of the locomotive is so vast and involved that its working and details cannot be clearly explained and an attempt to do so would tire you.

The wear and tear of a locomotive depends upon the nature of the work required of it, roadbed, and speed. Exposure and hard usage soon necessitate repairs which multiply and if not properly taken care of by men of talent and experience, finally collapses. The force engaged about roundhouses of railroads constitutes a vast and intelligent army. They are the boys who are using their ingenuity to "keep 'em rolling."

The machinery department of railroads has never been so highly esteemed as at this moment, and with the growth of business it can be clearly seen that the highest class of talent is required to "keep 'em rolling." While locomotives may be made to perform efficient service for a long time, by carefully attending to petty repairs from day to day, sooner or later they wear out. The rebuilding requires faithful and skilled workmen and a supervisory force of the highest degree. These things are essential.

Any service institution like ours requires a large number of employees, and the problem of an adequate supply of manpower is becoming more and more important and has become acute in this locality. I believe that local draft boards have recognized that rail transportation is essential to the war effort and that men employed on railroads are doing their part. Women may have to be used to replace men who have entered military service, and those who make it a practice to be absent without leave.

The dynamic times in which we are living, and the swift currents of present-day life have made it imperative for every worker, and particularly the railroad worker, to take account of himself, his job, his relationship to his Government, and the world at large.

The streamlining and world-wide pace of the present time applies as much to human labor as it does to machinery. So, I suggest wherever possible that labor-management committees be set up. Many benefits can be achieved from such a group, provided both sides gather in the conference rooms, with a thought in mind of improving transportation to keep 'em rolling. They could play a prominent part in absenteeism. This is really a serious problem. There could be established an absent-without-leave system designed to curb this practice and at the same time take care of those who desire time off for legitimate reasons.

The fullest contribution of every craft, service, and citizen is the least that can win this war quickly enough to compensate for the unparalleled suffering and destruction it is causing—and effectively enough to insure a peace that will repay the sacrifices made.

The railroad men exercise a vital function in this effort for victory, as they play an important part in the Nation's progress in peace. Transportation workers carry the production line to all the far points where the implements of war become effective as, in normal life, they link the producer with the consumer.

The high caliber of personnel and standard of skill for which our group of workers is noted, inspires public confidence, else why has America become outstanding in the quantity, speed, and safety of railroad travel?

The coming year is going to be the hardest, toughest year our generation has had to endure, but we can make it, if we will, one of the most glorious years in our history.

Our tomorrow depends on what we do today. We should face the future with undaunted courage and high faith, knowing that if we remain true to our duties as railroad men all will be well.

Because of our intriguing set-up we are not in a position to be given the Navy "E," so we have designed a button, one of which I display, that has across the top "A. R. S.," which stands for American Railroad Service—in the center we have the slogan "Keep 'Em Rolling" With this button we have the railroad man sign a pledge which is kept for posterity. The pledge is captioned, "Keep 'Em Rolling," then—

"I am in the service too—American railroad service. I am a soldier in the American army of railroad transportation—a million and a quarter strong.

"As a member of that army, my job is to keep the cars rolling, that the arsenal of democracy may not lack raw materials and the armed forces of democracy may not lack the weapons of war.

"The victory of democracy depends upon my unhesitating performance of my job—until the last gun is fired.

"Therefore, in recognition of my grave responsibility to my country and the cause of liberty,

"I hereby pledge my strength, my loyalty, and my honor to doing my job to the limit of my ability, in the hope of speedy victory and the return of peace."

We are all aware that this world convulsion has dislocated the lives and activities of millions of people. What our fate may be in the world of tomorrow no man can tell, but the emergency is such that demands the best of each individual no matter what his rollin' life may be.

I plead with those in labor and management, as well as every other individual or group who seek in this critical hour to take advantage of this situation, to lay aside these childish things and give their all-out effort and whole-hearted cooperation in order that we may have an uninterrupted and continued flow of the maximum production of defense materials for this Nation.

Absenteeism and Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communications received by me with reference to H R. 2082:

PLAINVILLE, MICH., *March 15, 1943.*

Mr. BRYSON.

DEAR SIR: Concerning bill H. R. 2082. I am very heartily in favor of not importing, exporting, or allowing the transportation of liquor in the United States while this war is on. I agree with you that liquor affects our war effort and also our transportation problem.

If Japanese and German soldiers consumed as much liquor as our boys we would probably lick them sooner. But since they don't I think it is high time we called a halt to this business.

Very sincerely.

IRENE MEREDITH.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y., *March 16, 1943.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for introducing a bill to curb liquor which is the cause of so many evils. I feel very strongly that victory will come sooner if we abolish liquor. I speak for many when I pray that your bill may be considered soon, and enacted to law.

Yours truly.

HELEN G. H. ESTELLE.

NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION,
Pittsburgh, Pa., March 17, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRYSON: I was glad to have the pleasure of meeting you when I was in Washington last week and am today mailing you as I promised copy of the March issue of the Christian Statesman, our association's organ. You will be interested in several articles in it on the liquor issue, particularly one which is on the front page.

I wish to congratulate you on your wisdom and courage in introducing H. R. 2082 to stop the manufacture, distribution, and sale of alcoholic beverages as a war measure. There can be no doubt at all that the liquor industry is seriously interfering with our all-out efforts to win the war. There is a rising tide of resentment against the industry because of its all-out efforts to increase the sale and consumption of intoxicating liquors since our entrance into the war, and an increasing dissatisfaction with the Government because while laying a restraining hand on many other lines of business essential to the welfare of the people, it has done nothing to restrict the sale and consumption of this nonessential luxury business. In 1942 the distillers and brewers spent at least a quarter of a billion dollars in advertising to step up the sale of their products without any restraint from the Government at Washington in striking contrast with the Government of Canada which recently prohibited all advertising of both liquor and beer for the duration of the war.

The result has been that there has been a decided increase in the sale and consumption of beverage alcohol since we entered the war over what it was before. For example, in the State of Pennsylvania in 1942 the drinkers spent for hard liquors, wine, and beer $447,550,000 ($45.21 per capita), as against $383,822,765 ($38.77 per capita) in 1941. The increase in 1942 over 1941 in the sale of distilled liquors was 29¼ percent, of beer 5½ percent. While I do not have the figures for the country as a whole, the increase was probably as great.

The time has come to face this liquor issue squarely. The manufacture, distribution, and sale of alcoholic beverages is using manpower greatly needed in our war effort. Their distribution is using trucks, railroad cars, and space in ships needed for transporting the sinews of war to our fightitng forces. Their consumption is slowing down production in our war plant industries and in many other ways impeding our war effort. The rationing of many of the necessities of life, with no rationing of alcoholic beverages, is breaking down the morale of many millions of our citizens.

The Federal Government has the power and the responsibility to meet this liquor situation. For the Congress your proposal to meet it by the passage of H. R. 2082 appeals to me as the sensible and courageous way.

The rising tide of Christian and patriotic sentiment of the country will support you in your efforts to secure its passage.

Sincerely yours,

R. H. MARTIN, *President.*

INTERNATIONAL REFORM FEDERATION

I want to introduce you to our constituency and the religious press of the Nation in our April issue of Progress, featuring your bill for prohibition for the duration for the Nation. We are much gratified to have you introduce such a bill as it seems to us that the civil population ought to make the same sacrifice at home which they ask the men to

make in the service. It is fitting and proper that we should play no favorites in legislation whether in war or in peace.

Since our people are more than willing to sacrifice the necessities of life in food and clothing, they ought certainly be willing to apply that sacrifice to unessential, if not harmful, drinking. We regard your bill as a patriotic measure which appeals to all of our people and not a prohibition measure which would be offensive to some who indulge their privilege to drink and are just as patriotic as other citizens who prefer to obstain. It is our intention to give to your bill every possible support because we believe its passage would contribute to the winning of the war, which all Americans, whether moist, wet, or dry, desire. Our federation wishes to thank you for the patriotic service you have rendered.

CLINTON N. HOWARD,
General Superintendent and Editor.

HIGHLAND COUNTY WOMAN'S
CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION,
Hillsboro, Ohio.

Jos. R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am highly in favor of H. R. 2082 bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials for the winning of the war.

MRS. STELLA SAUNER.

L. B. CLARDY CO., INC.,
GREENVILLE, S. C., *March 11, 1943.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You have many friends down here in old South Carolina who are keenly interested in the fight you are making toward total national prohibition. Please keep up your good work, because it takes men like you to arouse the people to a realization of the terrible hold and curse that liquor, wines, and even beer has upon our people and nation today.

Continue to use your voice and influence whenever and wherever you can, and we will sure do what we can and shall pray for the not too far distant day when prohibition will be Natior wide.

With every good wish for you, I am,
Sincerely yours,

W. C. MOSELEY, SR.

COLUMBIA COUNTY, GA., *March 16, 1943.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Member Congress From South Carolina.

DEAR SIR: This is to commend, praise, and thank you for your move to impose national prohibition for the duration of the war by act of Congress rather than by constitutional amendment as proposed by H. R. 2082.

It is a shame, a disgrace, an outrage for the liquor dealers to be legally permitted to locate just outside, and even inside our Army camps.

There is one man who could prevent this without any additional law—the President of the United States by virtue of the fact that he is Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy.

Yours truly,

J. L. WEEKS.

P. S.—Enclosed you will find clippings which I hope you will have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

J. L. W.

ENON, MO., *March 8, 1943.*

Representative BRYSON.

DEAR SIR: I have read in the paper where you are trying to put a bill through to forbid intoxicating drinks in the United States of America. May God help you to do that. We do not need whisky in any form and it is hard enough for Christian mothers to give their boys to Uncle Sam to fight this war and perhaps to never see them again but it's worse to think of the awful influence that whisky might have on them. After all of a mother's teachings and prayers we are not complaining at any hardships caused by the war. We only ask God and our lawmakers to protect our boys and they tell me that people go to camps to visit their boys and find them so drunk that they do not recognize their parents. I think we that are strong enough to overcome evil influence should protect them that are weak. The work that is being done down there is being watched closely and I think it will all be remembered at election time. May God bless you in this work.

MR. and MRS. L. BATTY.

NEW ROCHELLE, N. Y., *March 17, 1943.*

Hon. J. R. BRYSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I hope you will endeavor to bring H. R. 2082 to the floor as quickly as possible.

I would doubt its passage if only strict nondrinkers were to favor it, but I believe many occasional drinkers like myself favor prohibition.

Essential foods are rationed—why not liquor? People on the east coast cannot secure enough oil to keep themselves and young children warm, because of lack of transportation. Yet trucks loaded with liquor roll over hundreds of miles of roads wasting gas and rubber just to deliver goods that will result in absenteeism and lack of war material for our fighters abroad.

Yours for a sober America,

W. J. WILLEY, Jr.

UNION, S. C., *March 6, 1943.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BRYSON: On behalf of myself and hundreds of other persons in this county, I thank you for introducing the bill in Congress with regard to banning the sale of all alcoholic liquors for the duration, and hope that you will influence others to support it so that it will be passed and put into effect immediately.

I consider it very unjust to make people everywhere do without coffee, sugar, and many of the important foods, while drinking people and drunkards, immoral people, and criminals have no restrictions put on their consumption of alcoholic liquors, which represent large quantities of sugar and other things people are having to do without.

With personal regards and thanking you for what you are doing for helping make Americans more truly patriotic and sober.

Your friend,

ALLAN NICHOLSON.

The Farm Labor Problem in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS ROLPH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the Senate of the State of California wired Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard setting forth the dire need for farm hands in agricultural districts of our State.

The resolution and telegram are quoted herewith in full:

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the attached telegram be forthwith sent to the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, at Washington, D. C., and that copies hereby be sent to the California delegation in Congress.

Hon. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

Lack of Federal cooperation in providing agricultural labor replacement and farm implement priorities is jeopardizing food production in California, discouraging crop planting and creating a state of general confusion among farming interests.

The uncertainty resulting from constant changing in Federal labor personnel and Federal farm policies in this State is such that the farmer fears to venture forward without some assurance of relief.

The Senate of the State of California respectfully requests information as to what is being done to meet the requirements of agriculture in California and what the farmer may expect in the way of labor and priorities.

It is imperative that we be forthwith advised how and when relief may be expected and how and what encouragement you can give the farmer that will enable him to solve his labor and priority problems and encourage him to proceed with food production with assurance that his efforts will not be futile and that farm labor and implements will be available when and as needed.

The situation is acute. Relief must be certain and immediate.

SENATE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
FREDERICK F. HOUSER,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.

It Jarred Their Back Teeth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Anthony Eden's visit to Washington last week delivered a blow which jarred the back teeth of Vice President WALLACE, the internationalists, the advocates of union now, and those who are planning, when war ends, to haul down the Stars and Stripes, create a super united states of the world, and make Franklin Delano Roosevelt president thereof.

We would all like to have the Christmas thought, "Peace on earth; good will toward men," put into effect not only throughout the year but for all time and to make it universal. Unfortunately, we live in a wicked world, and some of us believe that, until the world is converted, envy, greed, ambition will still have their place, and men will fight.

Prior to Eden's visit, not only history and experience but facts indicated that it was not only futile but silly for the new dealers, the warmongers, and the internationalists to insist that after the war was over they would reallocate the earth's surface, divide it among the nations, police the world, and force our economic system, our idea of social reform and the New Deal upon every people.

Stalin told us, in no uncertain terms, that Russia and her people were his first concern, and he has shown that he intends to retake and hold a large portion

of the territory lost to Russia in the first World War.

Churchill not long ago stated, in substance, that he did not become Premier to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire, and just a few days ago England announced that she would control and guide the destiny of her colonies. A world Utopia is out.

The United States is fighting two wars—against the Germans and the Japs. Britain is fighting, principally, the Germans. Russia is fighting no one but the Germans, and while insisting that we form a second front, and this while we, with Britain's help, fight the deadly submarines, and at a tremendous loss keep open the lanes across the Atlantic and supply her with food and munitions, denies to us bases from which we could attack Japan on a second front.

So it is evident from recent events, from the statements of Stalin, from the mouth of Churchill, that after the war is over, Russia and Britain will see to it that they gain, not lose, by any peace that may be made. They—not we—will make the peace, determine its terms. That is the substance of what Anthony Eden, according to the press, told official Washington.

Let us hope and pray that those who would haul down the Stars and Stripes, who would surrender our independence, who would drag us into a super united states of the world, at last realize the futility, the un-Americanism of their planning and join the rest of us in a united, supreme effort, the single purpose of which is to defeat our enemies, win the war, preserve our national existence and have here, when the boys come home, a constitutional government, under which there will be opportunity, equality, and justice for all.

William Jennings Bryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF FENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 1860, 83 years ago today, in Salem, Ill., a son was born to Silas and Mariah Bryan. They named him William Jennings. Thirty years later William Jennings Bryan was nominated as the candidate of the Democratic Party for Representative from the Second Congressional District of Nebraska. He personally wrote for the platform of the convention which nominated him a plank demanding the coinage of silver on equal terms with gold. His opponent, the Republican incumbent, had voted with the Democrats in Congress in favor of free coinage of silver and since the candidates agreed upon the silver question, the campaign turned upon the McKinley tariff bill.

Mr. Bryan was elected to a seat in this House in 1890 and reelected in 1892. He did not leave his district in either campaign and took no active part in the discussion of the silver issue until it came before the House in the closing days of the second session of the Fifty-second Congress. In February 1893 he made his first speech against the unconditional repeal of the silver-purchasing clause of the Sherman Act. From that time he was recognized as a leading advocate of bimetallism, and when, in 1896, as a member of the committee on platform of the Democratic national convention at Chicago, he took the leadership of the struggle to commit his party to a declaration in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, it was not surprising that after triumphing in that fight following his masterful Crown of Thorns speech, he was selected as the standard bearer of his party. At the age of 36 William Jennings Bryan was the nominee of the Democratic Party for President of the United States. The confidence of the rank and file of his party in the personal integrity and devotion to the common welfare of William Jennings Bryan became so strong that in 1900, and again in 1908, he was chosen as the nominee of his party for the Presidency. Without patronage to proffer and without promise of place or position, he was from 1896 to 1912 the dominant force in the Democratic Party.

After his resignation from the Cabinet of President Wilson, the influence of Mr. Bryan in the party organization was not so marked and gradually his activities became less distinctly partisan and dedicated to broader political and moral considerations. In the campaigns for woman suffrage and for prohibition, he took an active part. After the World War, while participating freely in party affairs and at all times expressing well-defined convictions on political issues, Mr. Bryan did not loom large in the public eye until his participation in the trial involving the statute of Tennessee against teaching the theory of evolution in the public schools of that State. Mr. Bryan's entrance into this noted lawsuit was not so much the result of his objections to the teaching of theories concerning the evolution of the physical body of man as it was due to his challenge of the rank materialism which seized upon those expressions of scientific thought as a basis for the assertion that science had discarded God and that there was no longer any ground for the hypothesis of God. Bryan sensed in the background of the trial of that case the inevitable conflict between the materialistic version of the survival of the fittest with its Nietzsche-inspired interpretation that might makes right and the philosophy of the Galilean that we are all brethren and that the strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak.

Soon after his second Presidential campaign, Mr. Bryan with members of his family made a tour of the world. From Japan he wrote comparing the religions of the Occident and the Orient. Said Bryan:

> Japan needs the Christian religion. A nation must have some religion and she has outgrown Buddhism. The ideals presented by these two systems are diametrically opposed. One offers faith as the inspiration to noble deeds, the other a plan for the perfecting of self with no sense of responsibility to God.

On that same trip, standing in Palestine on the mountain known as Horns of Hattin and overlooking the environment of the Sermon on the Mount, Bryan said of that utterance,

> No other philosophy has ever touched so high a point or presented so noble a concept of human life. In it mercy is enjoined, forgiveness commanded, and love made the law of action. Christ here offered a balm for the healing of the nations.

Realizing the menace of a godless science and the hopelessness of mankind in a godless world, Bryan enlisted early in the battle for the triumph of right over might. He lives today in the hopes and longings of millions of souls for a life ruled by the law of love rather than the law of the jungle. We who fondly believe that his faith will be realized, pay tribute on this anniversary of his birth to William Jennings Bryan as among "the dead but sceptered Sovereigns, who will rule our spirits from their urns."

Spirit of St. Patrick Lives in Present Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech which I made to the Commodore John Barry Division and Auxiliary, Ancient Order of Hibernians, on March 17, 1943, St. Patrick's Day, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

Mr. Toastmaster, reverend fathers, national officers, officers and members of the Commodore John Barry Division, Ancient Order of Hibernians, members of the ladies' auxiliary, visiting Hibernians, and friends, it is a great honor to speak to you tonight; it is also a great pleasure. It is a pleasure at any time to share the good fellowship and hearty good cheer of fellow Hibernians, but when the spirit of St. Patrick is in our midst, then all that is Irish within us stirs mightily and our enjoyment is at its highest. Even as St. Patrick found Ireland a fine land when the vision called him to her shores, but left it the finest land when God called him, so is it true that any meeting of men of Irish blood is blessed with conviviality, but when we meet in our beloved saint's honor, then his presence makes our meeting supreme. It is not mentioned by any authority or tradition that I know, but St. Patrick must have also obtained from God in his great petition the guarantee that any meeting of Irishmen would be marked by a good humor and fine fellowship unknown to all other men. You are my witness to that.

I said that it is an honor to speak to you, and that needs no explanation. Whether it is the Blarney stone, or the open country which gives a man room to raise a strong voice, or even the long, long protests against persecution which have strengthened it, at any rate the Irish tongue is strong, sweet, and persuasive. There is no need for me

to mention the orators of the past whose names are proverbial, Emmett, Curran, Grattan, O'Connell, Parnell, and the many more whose eloquence and fervent language not only thrilled those who heard them, but have continued, like the great Greek orators, to thrill men to this very day. Nor need I mention the orators of America whose fiery eloquence flowed from their Irish blood. From the seven Irishmen who signed the Declaration of Independence down to the very present, the halls of Congress have been mellowed by the sincere and fervent voices of the descendants of O'Connell, Grattan, and the others.

But I am even more conscious of the honor of being invited to speak to you, when I remember that in every Irish heart there glows the fire of eloquence. It may only find expression in so many of us when we are in our shirt sleeves and slippers and our only audience is a pair of not too-attentive ears, but it burns there just the same. It is indeed very much like bringing coals to Newcastle to invite someone from outside your group to speak to you—although it may be a very wise thing, too. Even Newcastle must be short of coal these days.

At any rate, speaking here to you reminds me of the experience of a friend of mine who went out late one afternoon for a round of golf. He could find no boy to carry his bag but a little spalpeen who said that he had never caddied before. The lad was all right, until an iron shot from the fairway on the first hole landed on the green and rolled into the cup. The youngster hurried over, pulled out the flag, looked into the cup, and then with eyes wide open, said, "Mister, you sure are in a tough spot now."

One of the greatest contributions of St. Patrick to Ireland and Irishmen was himself. For it is amazingly true, as Oliver St. John Gogarty has pointed out, that "every person in our island shares something of the personality of that steadfast and enduring man." He fixed his personality on the people of Ireland so that every Irishman and every descendant of an Irishman, shares that personality to some extent. St. Patrick remains always present in Ireland today; his presence is a bond, a common heritage, an obligation of good will. Whatever the history of the fifth century may have been, St. Patrick's presence today is beyond dispute. He has become Ireland; he lives in the people that he has made. I should say here, if it need be said, that whenever I use the word "Irishman" I refer not only to the dweller on that Emerald Isle today, but to her sons and daughters all over the world who still show the mark of St. Patrick upon them.

And that is what I shall try to show tonight; how the character of St. Patrick is still working its influence on the men of today; the great pattern of St. Patrick's powerful personality is being constantly revived by his miraculous presence through 1,500 years to the present day.

First of all he was a man of highest courage in an age when physical courage was necessary for existence. Before I show how similar that is to the present day, I would like to ask your permission to recollect several illustrations of this extraordinary courage. You recall that St. Patrick came to Ireland with his small group after Palladius, who had preceded him by a year in an attempt to bring Christianity to Ireland, had been driven out by the hostility of the people. But witness the courage of our beloved saint; he had not been in Ireland a year, before he determined to seek an audience with the High King himself, the ruler of all Ireland. For St. Patrick was determined to embrace the whole island, and he must face the High King at Tara if he was to achieve his purpose. Now to King Leary, Patrick's coming could be nothing but an attempt to disrupt his kingdom by preaching the freedom of slaves and the rule of a Divine King, supreme over all, who dwelt in heaven. And at the King's side at Tara were the Druids, the priests of paganism, who hated and dreaded the coming of Patrick.

But the great moment and the dramatic moment that I would like to call to your attention is on Holy Saturday. In those days the Easter light was lit in the evening on Holy Saturday. St. Patrick, on this day, came as far as the Hill of Slane. Nine miles away the High King was preparing for the great festival of the year when all the kings of Ireland came to do him homage. All was darkness as night came on, for by solemn ordinance it was forbidden to kindle light before the sacred lamps of paganism were lit in Tara's royal house. But St. Patrick was not deterred from his sacred observance; he blessed the new flame born of flint and lit the paschal fire. He knew well of the law of the pagan land and the possible consequences, but his duty was above the pagan law. This simple act of the greatest courage was at once a symbol that a new power was born in Ireland and the symbol of the Light of Lights that he brought to Ireland.

What followed I will describe briefly since it was so dramatic. Nine chariots bearing the royal followers, including King Leary, drove out of Tara toward that light, for the magicians had said in prophetic warning to the King, "Unless that fire which you see there in the northeast and which was kindled before the royal fire was lighted here, be quenched tonight, it will never be quenched in Ireland." Before the hill was reached the King halted, the company took their places, and the saint was brought before the King. Once again there was a prophetic warning from the Druids: "No one must rise when he comes in, for whoever rises now will worship him forever."

At the King's command, the saint came out of the place which was lit up. Robed in but one color, in ghastly white, crowned with the gold of his mitre, the golden circle of the bishop on which the light shone, he came far in advance of his followers, in majesty and power. All was silent. And then the spell was broken and another victory achieved when the young poet of the King, Erc, his mind flooded with prophetic light, stood up to do homage to him and followed him for the rest of his days. I would like to describe further the scenes that followed as two strong men faced one another. But this has been enough to prove the great courage of St. Patrick who stood up in a strange land and did his own bidding which was the bidding of his God.

But there is another amazing manifestation of St. Patrick's physical courage which shines in our memories and works its influence upon us. In the rigorous and bitter days of March he climbed to the high and rocky summit of that great hill which is now called Croagh Patrick or the Reek. Pilgrimages are made today in July by sturdy men to climb the Reek, and the climb is bitterly hard, with black clouds swirling around and torrential rain thundering down its sides. But the great saint, then in his early fifties, climbed to its stormy height and made his Lenten retreat in solitude, staying 40 days and nights on the windswept, rain-lashed, bare, cruel summit. With the mightiness of the fervor of Moses, he demonstrated his physical courage and set a pattern for all Irishmen who followed him. When we observe the courage and physical endurance of Irish heroes today, we should not wonder but should know that the spirit of St. Patrick dwells in them. For St. Patrick communicated his spirit to Ireland, and it is truly said, that "A spirit communicated is a perpetual possession."

And every day now we see sons of St. Patrick demonstrating the moral and physical courage which is their heritage from him. We remember with pride the first hero of this war, Colin Kelly, who with St. Patrick's pattern marked on him, plunged his plane down and down almost to the very deck of an enemy warship and destroyed it. This was not hasty heroism, but the heroism of deliberate purpose and the physical courage to persist until the deed was done. There comes to memory the lad at Midway, Lieutenant Cannon, of Irish ancestry, whose citation reads, "This officer was directing fire from a command post when it was hit by a Japanese shell. He received wounds that fractured both legs and pelvis. He refused to be evacuated before his men who had been wounded by the same shell, and as a consequence he died from loss of blood." Does not this ring in the same stirring tones as St. Patrick's sustained courage before the High King? And those five Sullivan boys who went down together on the U. S. S. *Juneau* show us how universal is that stamp of courage which our saint marks on us. I know it would not weary you to hear of other boys, bred in the same mold, showing the same courage, who have risen in this time of our struggle, but there is no need for me to list more. We have always known that courage marked the Irish heart, and in time of war men wear their hearts on their sleeves.

And St. Patrick had not only courage, but he had initiative and daring; he had a sure boldness and this too he has perpetuated in his people. There is one illustration of this that to my mind stands above them all and gladdens our Irish hearts. It was at Croagh Patrick, at the Reek, where he had been fasting for 40 days. As he was tormented, an angel came to console the weary saint and to announce God's granting of his prayers. We know that Patrick was promised that his people should hold the faith, even to the end of time; that a great sea would overwhelm Ireland 7 years before the judgment day; that the Saxons never should hold Ireland by consent or force while he was in heaven; and that everyone of us doing penance even in his last hour will not be doomed to hell on that day. And with this the angel stopped. And here was the moment of his boldness, his initiative. He made another petition: "That on the day of doom, I myself shall be judge over the men of Erin."

The angel, probably somewhat shaken, replied, "This surely cannot be had from God."

Patrick refused to leave the mountain unless it was granted, and he went to say mass while the angel returned to heaven with the strange demand. Before the mass was over the angel returned. "All heaven's powers have interceded for thee and the petition is granted. You are the most excellent man that has appeared since the apostles, except for your stubbornness."

This is the bold legend of St. Patrick's wrestling with the angel, presuming upon authority with the assurance of sincerity and right.

Is not this the pattern, the example for the young Irish aviator named Cullen who so recently flew his scout plane beyond his authorized limit and who contrary to instructions dipped his plane down below the low-hanging clouds to discover the mighty Japanese armada in the battle of Bismarck Sea. The daring initiative of this young Irish lad, modeled after St. Patrick, discovered the enemy fleet and enabled our forces to win that smashing aerial victory over the naval might of Japan. We remember General MacArthur's words that "Divine Providence guided us this day." The saintly daring of St. Patrick, living once again in an Irish breast, was no small part of that Divine Providence.

You remember, too, the daring of Admiral Callahan, who won for us another great naval victory in the Pacific, although it cost him his noble life. Mike Moran tells the story of how the Americans, greatly outnumbered, plunged their ships between the long lines of enemy vessels and, firing from both sides, took advantage of their own accuracy and the

enemies' inaccuracy to win a stalwart victory. Does not this daring bold stroke prove once again that St. Patrick's spirit still prompts the Irish personality to imitation of him?

Ladies and gentlemen, there is one other significant parallel between the life of St. Patrick and that of the young men of Irish blood who are fighting our country's cause today. St. Patrick sentenced himself to a long and bitter exile. He traveled without cease throughout the country, faced its manifold dangers, and founded an organization which is as enduring as himself. He met savages and made them Christians who to this day owe to him largely that which makes them kindly Irish. He got nothing for himself for his service and self-sacrifice, except the satisfaction of the deed and purpose accomplished.

And our young men who are in Tunisia and Guadalcanal, in the Aleutians and Casablanca, in Iceland and India, in all parts of the world are traveling on the same mission and they are traveling in the same voluntary exile from home, in the same self-sacrifice. They are fighting the barbarism which denies man liberty and freedom.

For Germany has apparently forgotten and Japan has never known what the Irish have known since the days of St. Patrick, what our fathers had to know for many centuries of tribulation: That man is free, that all men stand equal before God.

St. Patrick brought to the slaves of Ireland a soul, and to their kings he brought a conscience. The slaves of Germany and Japan do not know that man has a soul and that therefore he is free. The kings, or rulers, of Germany and Japan have no guiding conscience and therefore do not know of the dignity and worth of the individual.

It is our mission to imitate St. Patrick, to travel through the alien world teaching it the meaning of liberty, and in that our young Irishmen once again follow St. Patrick. And they know above their friends and fellow soldiers the meaning of and the value of liberty, for they know what it means to be deprived of it. And they know, too, that man has a mind by which he knows truth and a will by which he does good and this is what makes him free. That was the lesson of the liberator of Ireland.

And it is a lesson that will last forever, for the very words of St. Patrick in that great and moving story of his life, his confession, tells us that the Divine answer assured him that "He that touches you is as he that touches the apple of my eye."

If you men and women who are not always free, as you must realize now, have listened so kindly till now, you will surely permit me a few words more. I have shown how St. Patrick's personality and character have lived in Irishmen since his day. There is one place where it has failed, though I still have hopes. Holinshed's Chronicle, that old history from which Shakespeare took so many of his stories, has this story:

"After it happened on a time that a man of that country stole a sheep which belonged to his neighbor, whereupon St. Patrick admonished the people that whomsoever had taken it should deliver it again in 7 days. When all the people were assembled within the church and the man who had stolen it made no move to deliver this sheep, then St. Patrick commanded, by the virtue of God, that the sheep should bleat in the belly of him who had eaten it, and so it happened that in the presence of all the people the sheep cried out and bleated in the belly of him that had stolen it. And the man that was guilty repented him of his trespass, and the others from then on kept them from stealing sheep from any other man."

Now, much as I admire my former colleague in Congress, Senator Prentiss Brown, I venture to say that if there were an Irish saint, or to maintain my theory, any Irishman, as Administrator of the Office of Price Administration today, we would have no bother from a black market.

In closing, ladies and gentlemen, may I express once again my appreciation to you for giving me the opportunity to be with you tonight. In these days when we are all working diligently and without ceasing in order that the peace may be soon and secure, it is fitting and necessary that we gather together occasionally to strengthen our spirits, revive our courage, and face the difficult future with greater hope. For it is apt to be a lonely world today and we need an occasional reminder that we are all working together for the same cause. And in no place could our spirits be strengthened, our courage be revived more surely than in such a friendly gathering as this, where the reminder of the troubles of the past is met by the assurance that the great saint who has always been with us will always remain with us. That is the assurance that enables every Irish heart to carry on with courage in spite of the greatest tribulation, that is the assurance that makes the "Fighting Irish" the bulwark and strength of America's courage today. And may the spirit of St. Patrick always guide us.

Work of the Committee on Insular Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, for one of the series of station broadcasts by radio station WHN in New York City to familiarize the people of the country with the work done by committees of the House and Senate, I was called upon to tell something of the history of the Committee on Insular Affairs, of which I am chairman, and the work now pending before the committee.

Many requests have been made to the radio station for copies of my talk by school children, college students, and others interested in governmental affairs, indicating an intense desire of the American people to know just what we are doing here and what is being considered behind the greater stage of the work on the floor of the House and Senate. It is my sincere hope that other committee chairmen in the House and Senate will avail themselves of any opportunities offered to carry to those people the information about their own committees and their work.

I wish to insert into the RECORD at this point the talk I made on WHN's regular Friday night program, "Congressional Record on the Air." My talk follows:

In the early days of the United States, Congress was able to function almost as a committee of a whole in both the House and Senate, but with the increasing of population, bringing with it many new and perplexing problems, it was necessary to divide the work of the Congress among a greater number of committees, new ones being added from time to time to cope with the new problems.

After the War with Spain in 1898 the Philippine Islands and Cuba came within the sphere of United States control. It was necessary that some committee be established in the House of Representatives to weigh and consider the problems arising from the internal affairs of those island possessions and the Committee on Insular Affairs was established in 1899.

The rule establishing the committee stated that all matters, except those affecting the revenue and appropriations, pertaining to the islands which came to the United States through the Treaty of 1899 with Spain shall be referred to the committee.

As now constituted the committee has jurisdiction over matters relating to Puerto Rico, the Philippine Islands, Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. It is expected that if the United States should be entrusted with the supervision of government in any of the insular possessions of Japan after this war, jurisdiction over them will be conferred upon the committee.

For the sake of clarity it should be pointed out here that jurisdiction over legislative matters affecting Hawaii and Alaska are the responsibility of the Committee on Territories of the House.

The Senate's Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs has complete jurisdiction over legislative matters which are considered by both the House Committee on Insular Affairs and Committee on Territories.

The membership of the committee, of which I am chairman, at this time is divided politically with 12 Democrats, 10 Republicans, 1 Progressive, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, and the Delegate from Hawaii. The narrowing down of the margin of membership between the Democrats and Republicans followed the increased Republican membership in the House in the present Congress.

All members of the Committee are entitled to vote on bills and other matters before the committee except the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico and the Delegate from Hawaii. While they have no vote they may propose legislation and may enter into the discussions before the committee.

One of the greatest works done in the history of the committee was the action taken which resulted in enactment of the Philippine Independence Act, approved March 24, 1934. That act guarantees complete political independence to those islands by July 4, 1946, upon proving in a 10-year period after inauguration of its government in 1935 that the Filipinos are capable of self-government. During that 10-year period our country was to be represented by a High Commissioner appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

In 1935 I had the pleasure to be present in Manila with other members of my committee, the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Senate, the leaders in Congress, and high Government officials at the time President Quezon was inaugurated as head of the provisional government. President Quezon had previously distinguished himself as a leader of Philippine thought and action and had served her in Washington as Resident Commissioner for the Philippines.

Even at that time President Quezon and other leaders were showing a capacity for efficient and sound self-government. I am certain that they would have continued to carry out their country's part of the bargain with the United States if it had not been for the dastardly invasion of the islands by the Japanese.

At this time the Government of the Philippines is in exile from its own country, with President Quezon, who risked his life to escape with General MacArthur, and others carrying on from its offices here in Washington.

It might be added here that the Philippine Independence Act, sponsored by Senator TYDINGS and Congressman McDuffie, chairman of the Senate's Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs and the House's Committee on

Insular Affairs, respectively, was a revolutionary action on the part of governments in dealing with territorial possessions. Never before in the history of the world has a great nation shown such enlightened treatment of the people of one of its possessions. I am proud that America has given to the world this demonstration of its genuine belief in democracy.

Hon. Harry B. Hawes, former Senator from Missouri, should not be forgotten in discussions of the Philippine Independence Act. It was largely the product of his advocacy that these steps were taken, and I do not believe there is a man in the United States better informed on Philippine affairs than Senator Hawes.

Before turning to other matters of contemporary importance to the committee's work I would like to say that never have I heard any suggestion that our Government should renounce the principles outlined by the Philippine Independence Act. I am convinced that the policies of our Government as outlined under it will be carried forward when the war is won so that the Philippine people will be free and self-governed.

At the present time legislation affecting the affairs of Puerto Rico occupy the spotlight of attention by the committee. Because of the reference to the committee of several bills affecting the form of the government of Puerto Rico, its social and economic conditions, and because of the recommendation of President Roosevelt the other day that Puerto Rico should be permitted to elect their own president, the committee at its last meeting directed me to file a resolution for consideration by the House to provide for a full and complete investigation of the social, economic, and political problems of the island so that any necessary corrective legislation could be forwarded.

That resolution, House Resolution 159, was filed in the House on Wednesday of this week and was referred to the Committee on Rules which must approve it before it can be voted upon in the House.

Prior to the action of the committee in directing me to file the resolution, the committee had considered House Resolution 784, filed by Resident Commissioner PAGÁN, of Puerto Rico, to provide for the ending of the term of office of the present Governor, Rexford G. Tugwell, and establishment of the term of office to be for 2 years instead of the present provision that the Governor shall be named by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President, who could dismiss him.

After several hearings on that bill, the committee became convinced that the problems of Puerto Rico involved much more than purely political situations and voted to end the hearings on the bill until a full and complete investigation could be made to determine the proper solutions for all problems.

As many of you have perhaps noted from the great many articles that have appeared in magazines and newspapers and the comments made over the radio, the problems of Puerto Rico are many. First, the island is one of the most congested and thickly populated sections in the entire world. With very limited resources available for the support of the dense population, often hunger and privation of very serious proportions exist. Since the wartime curtailment of shipping to Puerto Rico, the problems have become more complex and baffling than before.

It is the purpose and intent of the committee to get to the very bottom of these problems and work out solutions for them, if possible, along sound principles of government which would alleviate the present suffering.

Puerto Rico, located as it is at almost the far eastern end of the Lesser Antilles in the West Indies, is of strategic importance to the United States for national defense. As a nation we must do everything possible to protect and defend that outpost for our own national security.

The other day one of the officials of the Bureau of Territories of the Department of the Interior, which has charge of the administration of laws affecting the welfare of Puerto Rico, commented that he sincerely hoped that the committee would be active and working toward the solution of the many problems that beset the island and others of our possessions. I wish to publicly assure him and all of my listeners that this will be done for the members of the committee are deeply interested in doing this.

Before concluding I wish to say that in its deliberations this committee should not confine its thinking along provincial or continental lines. Consideration must be taken at all time of the great importance that these possessions, such as the Philippines and Puerto Rico, play in international affairs. Some of the problems involved are of very profound importance to the welfare of our Nation and to the world as a whole.

The Committee on Insular Affairs has a job to do. I am sure it will put forth every effort to do it as well as possible for you and for the best interests of the people living on the islands.

Thank you for listening.

Why There's a Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a write-up in the New England press of a statement made by Mr. Ed J. Saunders, Exeter, N. H., who is a farmer, which should prove of great interest to the Members of Congress.

This statement is one of the best that I have read, outlining in plain English—the kind that is used by farmers—the real position of the farmers of this country now operating under our war program. In the first place, it clearly indicates just what farmers are up against because of lost motion, confusion, and red tape, brought about by many rules and regulations, and especially because of the shortage of farm labor.

Mr. Saunders states:

Last October my two hired men left to take jobs in the Pacific Mills at Lawrence. One tells me he gets $85 a week and the other slightly less. They are good, industrious men and I hated to lose them. But when they came to me I said, "Hell, boys, I don't blame you," and I didn't. I couldn't pay that kind of money.

I hope this will stick with the Members of Congress at least until we have an opportunty of considering the Pace bill, H. R. 1408, reported by my committee some days ago, and which will, as I understand, be considered by the House during the coming week, which has for its purpose including in the price of the farm products of Mr. Saunders and all other farmers of this country the cost of labor in connection with the operation of their farms.

I am sure that the passage of this bill will not within itself settle the farm problem, in that in the first place it may be vetoed by the President. If not, in the second place, as usual, it may not be given proper consideration by those administering it in line with the intention of the Congress in the passage of the bill. But the passage of this measure will tend to call to the attention of those in authority the fairness of adding the cost of farm labor in the so-called parity price, as well as it should clearly indicate to the farmers of the country that the Congress of the United States is interested in doing for them that which every other group has been doing all along, that is securing full consideration of the cost of labor in connection with their various lines of business.

The matter above referred to follows:

WHY THERE'S A FOOD SHORTAGE

(By Austen Lake)

Let's be candid. The average Boston city dweller knows little about the New England farmer. We have regarded him as a picturesque person, seen at little distances during prewar motor vacations, a man in toil-stained dungarees who follows his plow or drives his kine or moves methodically among his haycocks.

Perhaps, with urban wistfulness, we have envied his wide-flung freedom, his sylvan setting and the independence of being his own master. We city folk may even yearn to own a patch of country earth and sky in what we think of as the remote solitudes where one can keep some brindle cows, a yard full of settin' and eatin' hens, a dirt garden and maybe a brood sow with a suckling litter.

But that isn't farming. Not in this anno domini of war. Step up, Mr. Ed Saunders of Exeter, N. H., and tell the nice people what farming really is. Your unsolicited definition has just come in the mail.

"FARM PROBLEM

"SIR: My wife and I have been reading, when we have time to read, about what Washington's lawyers call the farm problem. The problem seems to be how to keep the farmer down on the farm. The lawyers seem to think they can do it by (1) kidding him, (2) passing laws, and (3) subsidy. The farmer doesn't want indifference or theory. He wants a fair, livable price for his produce that will at least let him break even at the end of a hard year—not a deficit.

"I think you could call me a representative, practical New England farmer. I've always lived on the land, except for my schooling period, and so did my father before me, and his father. Most of our neighboring farm families date back many generations on New Hampshire land. There aren't many floaters. We live on our soil and we'll be buried in it.

"I own a little short of 450 acres, of which 125 is woodland and pasturage and the rest under cultivation—feed grain, silo corn, table vegetables, chickens, a few hogs, and until recently 43 cows. We got along comfortably, hard work of course, but we had no quarrels with life. We put our two boys through college and a daughter through normal school. We kept up our farm machinery, had a Ford car and a couple of trucks, and hired from two to three hands.

MODERATELY PROSPEROUS

"I guess you'd have said we were moderately prosperous. Our credit was good and we didn't owe the banks. But I'm telling you now that we're mighty near the breaking point in strength and patience and we don't give up easily.

"First off, last October, my two hired men left to take jobs in the Pacific Mills at Lawrence. One tells me he gets $85 a week and the other slightly less. They are good, industrious men, and I hated to lose them. But when they came to me I said, 'Hell, boys,

I don't blame you,' and I didn't. I couldn't pay that kind of money.

"Then my oldest boy, Dick, was called by the draft and the other, Tom, joined the Navy. As a patriotic American I didn't discourage them. They were good, red-blooded lads and while, as every parent does, we felt bad, particularly as both lads were right where they would have been pretty useful, we gave them our blessings.

"I'm past 50 myself and I haven't got the muscle I used to have. I have a 60-year-old man helping out but he can't do much heavy work. My wife, God bless her, does what she can with the small chores and milking, but it's telling on her. My daughter is married, has a small child and lives in Belmont. So this spring we'll plant 100 less acres than last year and milk about half as many cows and butcher off all the pigs.

"What I'm trying to say is that what is happening to us and to my farm is what is happening to hundreds of thousands of other New England farmers. That's why the city people are going to grow shorter and shorter on food and you might as well know why.

SOLD 14 COWS

"I've sold 14 good, high-test milk cows because I can't raise the crops to feed them, can't milk them, and can't take care of them. I'm ashamed of the condition inside my cow barns. The fences need mending and the drainage needs fixing and from the fine, clean property it was, it's going rapidly to pot.

"Still, somehow, we'll limp along even if we're reduced to raising only enough stuff to feed ourselves and keep even with the taxes. But you can see that we're not able to contribute much to the war-food program and, if you multiply that by thousands, you have what Washington calls the 'farm problem.' Food needs are greater than ever but we're going to raise lots less and the people are going to be rationed lots more.

"Now Washington is fixing up a flock of farm regulations, some big, some little. But one thing that is the farmer's hereditary right is to handle and dispose of his property as he sees fit. He'll fight anybody over that. We're a pretty uppity lot when it comes to outside interference and yet we'll stack our brand of patriotism against any group in the land.

GET OUT THE GUN

"But when Washington's lawyers threaten to tell me that I can't slaughter my own cattle on my own farm and have to sell through certain markets, I'm ready to get out my old duck gun and give any agent or inspector a 12-gage charge where he sits down. Nobody is going to tell me where, or when, or how I'm going to kill my hogs or calves, or to whom I'm going to sell my surplus cows, or at what price. Nor is anybody going to ration me on my own meat.

"We farmers haven't got what you'd call a union in the sense of a militant organization like that of the industrial workers. We don't call any strikes for higher prices or overtime wages. We average between 72 and 84 hours a week, don't 'dog' on the job, or declare unofficial holidays. There's not a striker or 'absentee' among us. We don't need any swing bands or artificial pep talks to inspire us to greater production. And we wind up broke anyway.

"Just give us a fighting chance and only a middling break from price control, a chance to replace our worn-farm machinery, a guaranty of hired help and honest market outlets, and we'll give the Nation back 200 percent in effort. But whatever Washington does it had better do it quick. Because you can't milk cows that are butchered or harvest acres that lie fallow or raise pullets from nonexistent eggs. You can't eat theory and you can't mow political opinion. That's all, I guess.

"ED. J. SAUNDERS,
"Exeter, N. H."

The editor of this column has no comment. Ed. Saunders' case is plain.

Keep Your Shirt On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, keep your shirt on is an old and a familiar expression. It may mean go slow and it may mean watch your step or someone will trim you so you will have nothing but a shirt left. Expressing the first meaning is the March 13 editorial from the News-Palladium, of Benton Harbor, Mich. It contains much good advice so here it is:

Official Washington recently broke out in a rash of post-war planning, with Vice President WALLACE conspicuous as a mason building castles in the air. President Roosevelt also chose this week to unveil his version of the post-war period, envisioning a Utopia in which government and business will go hand-in-hand down the lane of mutual good will and there will be security for all, from the cradle to the grave.

We hope this all comes true. Of social and economic changes there will, of course, be many. Neither society nor economics is static, and it is necessary to batten down the hatches of the ship of state and make everything secure against the day when the tempest of war suddenly turns into the typhoon of peace readjustments. But it's one thing to prepare for the future, and quite another to become to engrossed in the future that the present is overlooked. That certainly must not happen. Unless all signs fail, or the true condition of the enemy is being withheld from public knowledge, the war is far from won. It, therefore, behooves America and the rest of the United Nations to concentrate on the job in hand, namely cleaning up the Germans and the Japs.

Perhaps the resurgence of Nazi power in Russia, while not yet proving that Hitler can fight anything more than a delaying action, will have a sobering influence on wishful thinkers, from Washington down to Main Street. We hope so. The business of winning the war before settling the post-war problems should have 1A priority.

Frankly, getting back to Mr. WALLACE, we are puzzled and a little apprehensive over his vagaries. Why did he set up the straw-man bogey of American-Russian relations? Why did he exhume the scarecrow of Russian intrigue for world revolution and hint of a possible double-cross of Russia by the United States?

We don't know the answers.

Since everybody's putting in their nickel's worth on the world-to-be after the war ends, we'll do just what we started out not to do when this was written: We humbly suggest that we lick the enemy, render him forever impotent, and at the peace table keep enough nationalistic spirit to safeguard our country and our way of life. International cooperation, yes; but we didn't turn Europe into a land of paupers and we aren't under any obligation to channel into Europe, Asia, and Africa our wealth, our resources, and our food in the name of charity.

The soundness of the above advice was demonstrated this past week when circumstances and the utterances of Anthony Eden forced upon official Washington the realization, if official Washington can be brought to that state, that when this war is over the United States, having done its share to win it, will be brought face to face with the fact that neither Great Britain nor Russia intends to let anything stand in the way of the preservation of their respective empires.

It is long past time when we should remember that the preservation of our national existence rests upon us; that it is our first duty that only from a sound foundation here at home can we hope to help anyone elsewhere.

Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS ROLPH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce is on record for early completion of the irrigation features of Central Valley. A letter to me dated San Francisco, March 12, 1943, reads as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
San Francisco, Calif., March 12, 1943.
Hon. THOMAS ROLPH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROLPH: To make available thousands of additional acres in the San Joaquin Valley for the production of food, fiber, and guayule rubber, essential to the Nation's war program, the board of directors of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce have placed the chamber on record as favoring early completion of the irrigation features of the Central Valley project to the extent consistent with the Nation's war program.

This action was taken on the recommendation of the agricultural committee of the chamber.

Your support of this important project is earnestly solicited.

Sincerely,
ERNEST INGOLD, *President.*

Lt. Jack Mathis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay humble tribute to a 22-year-old

youth from my home town of San Angelo, Tex. The story of the death of that young man, which occurred on last Thursday, is a story of heroism and sacrifice unsurpassed by anything that has come out of this war.

Lieutenant Mathis was on board the *Duchess*, a Flying Fortress, that led a force of American bombers on one of the heaviest and most successful American raids of the war in Europe. It was Jack's fourteenth flight across the Channel. The raid was a daring one and the target was the Vegesack submarine yards near Bremen. Mathis was the bombardier and his post of duty was in the vulnerable transparent nose of the plane. A burst of shellfire tore into the nose of the *Duchess* and filled Jack's side, chest, and back with shrapnel fragments and almost tore his right arm from his body. The impact threw him 9 feet from his bomb sight.

While thus mortally wounded, Lieutenant Mathis nevertheless pulled himself back to his position, spotted his target with deadly precision and released the cargo of bombs. Lt. Paul M. Thomas, bombardier in an accompanying plane watched those bombs drop and said they "split the target."

With his mission finished, that dying boy from Texas, who was accustomed to say "Bombs away" at that point, was able only to say "Bombs" and his voice faltered and he crumpled over dead.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Jack Mathis is dead. But the memory of that young American will continue to live. That heroic deed and unexcelled devotion to duty will stand as a pattern for posterity.

By the supreme sacrifice of that Texas boy, may we be inspired to greater unity, and may we become ever more conscious of how little we at home are doing even when we are doing our most.

Mr. Speaker, it is such a pattern of devotion and sacrifice, determination to accomplish the mission, even in death, such as is exemplified by the heroism of Jack Mathis, that will win this war.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two news articles relating to Lt. Jack Mathis:

[From the New York Times]

BOMBARDIER WHO DIED AT HIS WORK IN RAID ON GERMANY IDENTIFIED AS BOY FROM TEXAS

LONDON, March 20.—The 20-year-old bombardier who completed his assignment, though mortally wounded, in Thursday's Flying Fortress raid on Vegesack, Germany, was Lt. Jack Mathis, of San Angelo, Tex., the United States Eighth Air Force revealed tonight.

Lieutenant Mathis, a typical country boy, died as his bombs sped to the target. He could utter only the first word of the traditional "Bombs away!"—the signal for the big bombers to head homeward.

He was a member of the crew of a fortress called the *Duchess*. Capt. Harold Stouse, of Spokane, Wash., the pilot, said that just as the fortress got into position to bomb the heavily defended U-boat installations a burst of flak just below the nose tore through the fuselage and fragments hit the bombardier in the back, side, and chest.

With his right arm useless, Lieutenant Mathis managed to complete the final touches as he crouched over his Norden bombsight. Not until he was sure did he let his bombs go—with the left hand.

Second Lt. Paul M. Thomas, bombardier in an accompanying plane, *Eight Ball*, said that he saw the *Duchess'* deadly load fall and split the target.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 21, 1943]

EYEWITNESS TELLS HOW HERO BOMBARDIER DIED FOR LIBERTY

(By Walter Cronkite)

A FLYING FORTRESS BASE, SOMEWHERE IN ENGLAND, March 20.—The lads in his squadron, even the chum who saw him die, still can't speak of Jack Mathis in the past tense.

They regard him as the epitome of the day-to-day heroism that goes on in the American bombing raids over Germany—and to them, he's still there, struggling to perform successfully his job and getting away a bomb load for a square hit as the last act of his life.

FAMILY INFORMED

Jack Mathis, only 22, a first lieutenant, was bombardier in a plane of the force that bombed Vegesack, Germany, Thursday night. His name was withheld until his family in San Angelo, Tex., was informed of his heroic death.

Today the story of that death was told by the only man who saw it, his chum, First Lt. Jesse H. Elliott, of Tallahassee, Fla., navigator on their plane, the *Duchess*, who shared with Mathis the tiny exposed cubicle where the bombardier and navigator must carry out their duties.

RECOUNTS MISSION

"Jack Mathis and I flew 14 missions over enemy territory sharing the nose cubicle of our Fortress," Elliott said.

"Jack's brother, Mark—he's also a bombardier—had just come over to visit him. They stood out by the plane talking. Mark called up to us as Jack was climbing in, 'See you boys later,' and Jack yelled back, 'Sweat us out on this one boy.'

"We had a pretty routine trip to the target until we ran into enemy fighters. Jack was really beating it out there, pouring on the coal. He ran out of ammunition at least twice.

FLAK WAS HEAVY

"We were just turning into our bomb run and then flak started coming. Jack was quiet and easygoing and flak didn't bother him, although it was raining on the nose like hail on a tin roof and knocking the plane all around. He wasn't saying a word—just sticking there above his bomb sight.

"We were just seconds short of the bomb release point when a whole barrage of flak hit right in the middle of our squadron, which we were leading. One shell burst out to the right and a little below the nose, and a hunk came tearing up through the ship. It shattered the glass on the right side of the nose. I saw Jack fall back.

"I didn't have any idea he was injured. Without any help from me he pulled himself back to his bomb sight, where his seat had been knocked out, and he sort of knelt over it.

BOMBED NAZIS

"I looked at my watch to start timing the fall of the bombs, and I heard Jack call over the intercommunication phone, 'Bombs—.' He usually called it out sort of sing-song. He never finished the phrase. The words just sort of trickled off. * * * I looked up and saw Jack reaching over to grab the bomb bay door handle to close the bomb doors, and just as he pushed the handle he slumped over backward.

"When we finally got him in, the doctor said he must have died instantly—but we know he lived long enough to get those bombs away on Germany."

H. R. 1408

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want the RECORD to show that, if given the opportunity, I would have voted "no" on the passage of the Pace bill, H. R. 1408, a bill amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act so as to nclude the cost of all farm labor in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities.

Last Friday I sat for 5 hours listening to the debate on this bill—a debate which at times was exceedingly dull. I do not pose as an expert on agricultural legislation, but for the past 4½ years I have heard Representatives of the farm States say on numerous occasions that if they could but bring the price of farm commodities up to parity the farmer would be perfectly satisfied. In fact, I have heard the farm bloc plead for 75 percent or 85 percent of parity at different times. Now it seems, when most of the basic farm crops are selling at above parity, an effort is being made to change the parity formula.

On the surface it would appear reasonable to contend that the cost of farm labor should be a factor in determining parity prices. However, I am assured that labor costs are considered under the present method of determining parity, labor being but one of more than 200 factors taken into consideration. If this were not so, it is quite apparent that those who first formulated the doctrine of parity would have insisted that the cost of labor be considered.

Last Friday we saw an example of the farm bloc being on the job, while other Members were absent from the Chamber. Late in the afternoon the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture asked unanimous consent that all debate on the bill end in 20 minutes—this despite the fact that more than 30 Members of the House were seeking recognition to speak for or against the proposal. Unanimous consent was denied, but the chairman then moved that all debate end in 20 minutes, and this motion was adopted with a bare quorum of the House present.

The statement of the proponents of this bill that its only purpose was to increase the price of farm commodities should be sufficient to warn any of us that it is an inflationary measure. I am hopeful that the Senate will defeat this legislation, but, if it should be enacted into law, I hope that the President in

his effort to prevent inflation will veto it. If vetoed, we are bound to have a roll call on the question of overriding Presidential veto.

South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

Monday, March 22, 1943

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said on the floor of this House and elsewhere by way of criticism of the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation that I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that in the 60 days ending March 20 it completed 14 ships. This means a ship practically every 4 days and is a record to compare favorably with any yard in the country having comparable facilities. The stipulated quota of 36,000 tons of steel to be fabricated has also been exceeded materially. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news release of the Maritime Commission.

This yard got under way under conditions of exceptional difficulty and I want the House to share my satisfaction at its recent accomplishment which I believe promises well for the future.

The news release follows:

Production requirements for the 60-day period starting January 20, for the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation, as set by the Maritime Commission, have been met and the contract with that yard will be continued the Maritime Commission announced today.

With the delivery by the Maine yard scheduled for this afternoon of the *Hannibal Hamlin*, the quota of 12 ships to be delivered within the trial period has been exceeded by 2, the stipulated quota of 36,000 tons of steel to be fabricated also has been exceeded materially.

This performance, the Commission states, is adequate evidence of the yard's ability to carry out its contract. Both labor and management have cooperated in expediting production.

Following investigation by the Maritime Commission, the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Truman committee of the Senate, new management was installed at the yard on January 4. Shortly thereafter the Commission announced it would be in the interest of the war effort and would avoid any interruption in essential ship production if the yard were permitted to continue operation for 60 days subject to a stipulated production minimum.

The present yard, with 13 ways, is the result of consolidation of the adjoining yards of the Todd-Bath Iron Shipbuilding Corporation and the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation. The former corporation originally constructed 30 Liberty-type ships for the British Government. At the conclusion of that contract, keels were immediately laid for the construction of Liberty ships for the United States Maritime Commission.

The recent operations at the shipyard, the Commission said, showed indications of a decided decrease in the number of man-hours required per ship and in costs and construction time. For the first time since the inception of the ship-construction program the South Portland yard is now averaging less than 105 days from keel laying to completion for the construction of a Liberty ship. In one instance the yard delivered a new ship into service in 95 days and it is expected this performance will be improved upon during coming months.

Latest reports definitely indicate to the Commission that the personnel in the combined yards are fully appreciative of the vital importance of the work they are doing so that production will be continuously increased.

The Tax Bill

REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am in accord with the remarks just made by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

I do hope that when the bill is brought up next week the debate can be conducted on a high plane. I think it is only fair to say that the committee has been working for 2 months on this very, very difficult measure.

I fear the chairman of the committee, the able gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], misunderstood the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. The gentleman from Illinois simply referred to an open rule, as I understood. Of course, the gentleman himself has very consistently opposed closed rules, as I have, but I want to say to the Members on the minority side there is the greatest harmony existing between the gentleman from North Carolina and myself. We are both working for what we feel will be the best interests of the country.

Shackles Are Forged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following splendid editorial from the March 15, 1943, issue of the Indiana Farmers Guide, of Huntington, Ind.:

SHACKLES ARE FORGED

Recently, in their search for a scapegoat on which to place the blame for our present inability to win military victories and our economic chaos at home members of the New Deal autocracy have been recalling for the *n*th time that some Republican and Democratic Members of Congress were, before Pearl Harbor, isolationists.

These isolationists, they would now have us believe, prevented our great President from preparing the country for war and are wholly responsible for the lack of sufficient food in this country to meet civilian needs.

Let's get the record straight.

The Guide never advocated isolation. It never opposed preparedness. On the contrary, when the New Deal crackpots were killing the little pigs and limiting the amount of corn and wheat that the farmer might raise, the Guide was pointing out the folly of destroying the food that the Almighty was giving us for our future.

Its sympathy at that time was with those mothers who had the solemn promises of Franklin D. Roosevelt that their sons would never be required to fight on foreign soil. It was with the taxpayers who had Roosevelt's solemn promise of a balanced National Budget and a reduction in the excessive costs of government. It believed then and it believes now that the best interests of the people of the United States then lay in keeping out of the quarrels of Europe, as Washington had admonished.

Pearl Harbor settled the issue of isolation for all time. It plunged the isolationists and the interventionists alike into an unwanted war. It unveiled the demagoguery of the isolationists and the interventionists alike and it afforded to Roosevelt the only defense he has for planning an African expedition after solemnly assuring the Nation that he never would send our soldiers to fight on foreign soil.

Did Mr. Roosevelt foresee Pearl Harbor when the New Deal was attempting to purge the Congress of isolationists in both parties? If so, why was he, Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, asleep when bombs rained down on the naval base?

Did Mr. Roosevelt foresee a shortage of food in the United States such as is now offered as the excuse for drastic rationing? If so, why did his Agricultural Adjustment Administration pay the farmers to raise less food?

Did Mr. Roosevelt foresee the stupendous national expenditures of the present year? If so, why was the Work Projects Administration allowed to spend millions in no more valuable public work than raking the leaves off highway berms?

Unfortunately for its future, the New Deal will never be able to convince the people of the United States that those conscientious Congressmen who truly represented their constituents in their opposition to entrance in the war are responsible for the unholy mess into which New Deal crackpots have led this country. As was evidenced by the last election, the sound thinkers of this country have been awakened to the eternal truth that no man, New Dealer or otherwise, has found a way to set aside the law of supply and demand, nor to mitigate the innate cussedness of would-be dictators, abroad or at home.

On January 3, 1936, Mr. Roosevelt said to Congress:

"We have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government, this power is wholesome and proper. But in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people."

No amount of howling about isolationists today is going to destroy the people's knowledge that "shackles for the liberties of the

people" have been provided since the new instruments of public power have been created, fostered, and developed by the "hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy."

These shackles are the Presidential edicts which have supplanted the constitutional laws of the land. They are the edicts that "political puppets" are now attempting to use, under the guise of winning the war, to throttle free speech and the free press, to abridge the right of the people to assemble and petition their Government for redress, to prevent the farmer from the enjoyment of the fruits of his field, to confiscate or destroy the businesses of those who will not yield to bureaucratic domination.

And successful as have been the new dealers in their chicanery and outright deceit, we do not believe that the American people can be forced to hold out their hands for the application of these shackles under the smoke screen of internationalism.

Memorial of the State of New Hampshire on Ruml or Other Similar Pay-as-You-Go Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a joint resolution approved by the State Legislature of New Hampshire on March 16, 1943. This resolution is relative to a Federal pay-as-you-go plan of taxation:

Whereas the burden of taxation placed upon the people of this country is very heavy under the present Federal statutes; and

Whereas some plan should be adopted to distribute this tax in an equitable manner: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened, That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, urged to proceed at once to enact the so-called Ruml or other similar pay-as-you-go plan for paying taxes on present income; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the New Hampshire Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the President of the United States Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives in Washington.

Jackson Hole National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a wire from J. R. Riggan, chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Teton County, Wyo., relative to the creation of the Jackson Hole National Monument by Presidential proclamation.

On March 19, I discussed this matter on the floor of the House, advising that the President, by proclamation, had created the Jackson Hole National Monument, and, in effect, had enlarged the Grand Teton National Park by approximately three times its original size.

I have received a large number of protests and the following wire from the Teton County commissioner is indicative of the attitude of the people of Wyoming on this important matter:

JACKSON, WYO., *March 20, 1943.*

Congressman FRANK BARRETT,

Washington, D. C.:

At a meeting of representative citizens of Jackson Hole called by the county commissioners today, expressions were unanimous that the dictatorial and un-American action of the Federal Government in creating Jackson Hole National Monument contrary to the expressed wishes of the people, the United States Senate, the Congress and the Governor of the State of Wyoming will result in the destruction of our county and bring untold miseries to the people involved.

We fully appreciate the action taken by our Governor and our congressional delegation in the efforts to correct this gross injustice.

The people of Jackson Hole look to you and all our Representatives to use all means in your power to have this vicious proclamation set aside and to restore to its rightful status these lands belonging to the State of Wyoming and our citizens.

This act is particularly vicious in view of the fact that our young men are fighting to preserve those principles of democracy our Government has now renounced by this secret un-American stab in the back.

How can the Federal Government reconcile taking away the homes of men who are now fighting to preserve their homeland? We can now more deeply sympathize with people of foreign nations whose homes have been taken away like ours. We are solidly behind you with any honorable means at our command to the end that this proclamation be abrogated.

J. R. RIGGAN,

Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners for the People of Teton County, Wyo.

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me over station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on March 20, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, spring comes to Washington several weeks before it arrives in the Triple Cities; perhaps it is a good thing this year because it has reminded me to get ready my thousands of agricultural bulletins and helpful pamphlets on gardening so I can send them to you on time.

All of us are in this food-production program because we all have to be. It wasn't our fault that short-sighted, incompetent Government planners made the farmer plow under his surplus crops during 7 years of plenty. It wasn't our fault that there didn't appear a Joseph to store up our warehouses and elevators with golden harvests as Joseph of Bible fame did in Egypt. If someone in authority had looked ahead to see the 7 lean years which will certainly follow now, we would not be in the deplorable situation in which we find ourselves.

So we have a big job to do. We must raise our own food this summer. Remember that on top of all our own people at home, we have to feed our men in service and millions of starving peoples throughout the world. Yes, we have a big job to do to produce food. We can do it if every plot of ground in America is made productive.

Most of you have heard me talk about the Victory Garden Handbook during the past few weeks. This is a most helpful volume if you are planning a victory garden. I have had several school superintendents write me to order a number of these for their faculty and schools. This week I am supplying every teacher in Binghamton with the handbook. I will gladly fill all individual orders for Victory Garden books as long as my supply lasts.

You victory gardeners really have need for this valuable information. As I said last week, the Victory Garden Book contains scientific direction by the greatest agricultural experts in the world. They are not the dreamers and crackpots who are responsible for the disastrous policy of waste and destruction. The authors of these pamphlets really know what farming is all about. I know you will find a lot of help from this source, and if you will write me, I'll be pleased to send you one. I want to urge you young folks, the boys and girls especially, to get out doors this year and plant as big a victory garden as you can. Remember the best way for us to lick Hitler and the Japs is to produce all the food we can. We must keep our own people in shape if we are going to win.

Scarcely a day goes by that we do not read of extensive plans being made for a post-war world. These proposals are many and varied. They embrace every idea under the sun. Some are far-reaching and carry with them commitments which will bind the American Nation to some pretty rigid measurements.

Frankly, I have been so busily engaged in trying to help folks back home find their missing soldier and sailor boys, or negotiating with the War Department to find out why wives and mothers haven't received their allotments from husbands and sons in the service, I just haven't had any time to formulate a post-war plan of my own. And since every Tom, Dick, and Harry has brought forth his plans and submitted them to the public about a post-war society of nations, I guess I have the right to also, don't you think?

A few years ago, you will recall, a lot of us got some big laughs out of the book entitled "The Specialist." The hero of this story spent the whole course of the book in specializing. He was a specialist. In like manner, we have to listen to a lot of present-day specialists solve the post-war period. One cannot listen to them without getting some ideas. So I am studying the situation and in due time the mountain will labor and bring forth—oh, well, my attempt at specializing will doubtless be as effective as some other talent I have read about.

But whatever form my post-war plan happens to take, it will surely contain one premise. The United States will take her rightful place in the family of nations. The United States will sit at the head of the table. She will not take a back seat for any

other nation in the world. She will not be shoved aside by any one nation or group of nations.

Our country is contributing too much in men, machines, and material to this great war to be thrust aside at the peace session after victory has been won. We are grateful to our allies for the way they are holding our enemies at bay on every battlefield. We recognize that were it not for the Russians and their magnificent fight, we would even now be feeling the brunt of the struggle. But it is safe to say, at least from the admissions of all the United Nations in their insistence that we continue lend-lease arrangements, that neither Britain nor Russia nor China could have continued the war without American aid. On the strength of this argument from testimonial statements by our allied officials, I cast my vote in favor of continuing lend-lease for another year. I was glad to do this, for I firmly believe this action will lead to complete victory.

But let me make this point very clear: Americans have as much right to look forward to a just peace as anybody else. After the count is taken of blood, sweat, and sacrifice, you will find that America has been carrying a big share. Therefore, the American people have the right to expect fair and equitable consideration around the victorious peace table.

So much for this. The subject I want to emphasize tonight is our post-war attitude toward our returning victorious Army and Navy. What plans are we going to make for them? What plan has been formulated thus far? None. We have all dealt in a lot with high-sounding platitudinous statements and proposals for America's part in post-war affairs. What about America's part in rehabilitating her own fighting men? What is Washington going to do for the boys who live to come back home to take their places once more in the normal, peaceful life which Americans hold so dear? These are the questions I am raising tonight and they must be answered before the problems of a post-war world can be solved.

No doubt I will be chastised by some for saying that the welcome of our own boys should come ahead of considerations abroad after the war is over. I don't care anything about that. Ever since I've been in Congress, I have looked upon my biggest job there as watching out for our soldiers' welfare. I'm not going back on them at this late date. I'm not going back on them after they've won the victory either. No, you folks at home can count on my sticking with your boys, and with them when they come back to you, those that God Almighty allows to come back.

You can count on my continued interest in your sons and husbands and sweethearts when they come back to you imbued with the long-felt desire to settle down, build their own homes, raise their own families, and make their respectable rightful livings in the American communities they've fought so hard to maintain. You can count on me to fight for their interests; when they come back to find their jobs filled by somebody else, their money gone, their futures a big question mark. Are we to repeat mistakes made after the first World War when the boys we sent away with flags waving and drums beating came home to find only a very few who cared about them? It is a matter of record that the veterans of the World War No. 1 walked the streets in vain to find employment which didn't exist.

I say to you that we cannot allow anything like that to ever happen again. I maintain that this country owes it to the boys at the front to guarantee them jobs and decent treatment when they get out of service. I pledge to all my friends at home that I will dedicate my entire energy to this end. The men in our armed forces must be given a square deal after the war is over.

During the last Congress you will recall that, as your Representative, I was the first to call upon Congress to double the base pay of our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps from $21 to $42 a month. With great satisfaction I saw this goal reached. I was grateful for the chance to vote to raise that base pay to $50 a month. During this session of Congress I am working on another tough nut, trying to get enough votes in the House to pass the Hall free-furlough transportation bill. This will give every man fighting for Uncle Sam the privilege of free rides during furlough from any point in the United States when a furlough is granted him by his commanding officer. Your son, your husband, your loved ones in the service deserve such a concession by your Government. There is nothing too good for the members of our armed forces. They should certainly be allowed to reach their homes when given furloughs. The Hall free-furlough bill will give them this opportunity.

After the war, what then, for those brave boys who have given up everything to give us victory? Let the post-war planners give attention to this most important of all post-war issues. Are you going to face stark realities like the country witnessed after 1918 when our armies were mustered out and unemployment was rife for several years thereafter? Heaven forbid that we ever allow a parallel in America to the German situation after World War No. 1. It is said that soldiers returned to Berlin, Munich, and all the other centers of population in Germany, and became gangsters and outlaws because nothing was done to stimulate peacetime pursuits and employment.

Such things must not happen in America and I am sure they will not happen in America if we formulate a definite plan for action on the home front at the same time we are emphasizing the necessity for world-wide programs. Guarantee the returning soldier, sailor and marine a place in the sun and you will solve the problem. This problem will have to be solved because upon its solution hangs the fate of the Nation.

The American Legion was responsible for our positive remedy of internal postwar conditions after the last war. Today, I believe the Legion and all the other service groups are in like position. They are capable of anticipating the needs of the future ex-service man and I hope they will lend their valued support to outlining and recommending the steps which must be taken. At this time, I wish to salute our great National Legion organization, along with the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Marine Corps and all their auxiliaries. I appeal to them, particularly to the local chapters and groups of these bodies for moral support, suggestions and helpful advice in my efforts to better the lot of our present day fighting men.

The boys fighting the battles for freedom today are in great need of the indispensable backing of the service organizations of the last war. I am sure the latter are aware of this fact because they are doing everything they can for the men at the front. They have already contributed largely to the comforts and well-being of our fighting men.

After the war, in order to avoid great economic dislocation, hardships to our servicemen and their loved ones, strife and unrest within our entire population, I propose the following steps be taken:

1. Make sure every man and woman mustered out of the armed services either be placed in a job with a living wage or that he or she is to pursue a gainful occupation.

2. Provide every serviceman with cash payments from his national service life insurance policy in sufficient amount for him to start out in peacetime pursuits with a clean slate.

3. Exercise the same preference procedure which was accorded servicemen in the last war in regard to reemployment and guarantee his replacement in his former job or one similar to it.

4. Make it possible and attractive for servicemen to operate independent family-size farms and afford them with opportunity to own these farms.

5. Foster and encourage the serviceman's return after the war to the normal family life which is even now being dislocated and abandoned due to inevitable wartime conditions.

In the next few broadcasts I will elaborate upon these points and develop several articles of legislation which I wish to see passed in time to benefit the millions of boys who will be coming back from the greatest victory the world has ever seen.

Equal Rights for Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the annual agitation for congressional consideration of the so-called equal-rights amendment to the Constitution is now at its height. The National Woman's Party, the chief advocate of this amendment, has, during the last 20 years, presented every possible advantage which might accrue to women if this amendment were made a part of the Constitution. Most other women's organizations of national scope have, during this period, tentatively opposed the amendment. However, to my knowledge, there has never been any concerted, extensive, Nation-wide opposition propaganda in any way comparable to the affirmative propaganda sponsored by the National Woman's Party.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, to which constitutional amendments are referred, my position in reference to this proposal is well known to the National Woman's Party, as well as to others who have concerned themselves in connection with the submission of this amendment during the last 20 years.

In the light of the law of the land, as it now stands, possibly it would be more appropriate to say that the purpose of this proposed amendment is to give equal rights to men. The enactment of this amendment would take away from women many of the legal rights which they now enjoy and which are not reserved to the men.

Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Mrs. James A. Starr, president of the Michigan League of Women Voters, which, of course, is affiliated with the National League of Women Voters. In behalf of the League of Women Voters, the president encloses a circular issued by the National League of Women Voters, asking some pertinent questions, and pursuant to the permission granted to

me, I include the circular, which is as follows:

LOOK TWICE AT THE EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Everyone wants equal rights for women—especially now when the work of women is essential to winning the war. But the proposed so-called equal-rights amendment to the Federal Constitution raises a lot of questions:

In some States the legal age for marriage is lower for girls than for boys. Is this equal rights or would the age have to be raised for girls or lowered for boys?

Who knows? Nobody. Who must decide? The courts.

In some States the husband's failure to support his wife is cause for divorce. Under equal rights may her husband divorce her if she does not support him?

Who knows? Nobody. Who must decide? The courts.

In some States a woman reaches the age of majority at 18 years; a man at 21. Does the age for a man become 18 or that of a woman 21 under equal rights?

Who knows? Nobody. Who must decide? The courts.

The property rights of married men and women are different in all the States. Would these rights be affected?

Who knows? Nobody. Who must decide? The courts.

In California and some other States husband and wife own together property acquired during marriage. Would this be true in every State?

Who knows? Nobody. Who must decide? The courts.

In some States jury service for women is compulsory, in some optional, in some prohibited; some require women to serve, but excuse those who have the care of young children. Which laws would be valid under equal rights?

Who knows? Nobody. Who must decide? The courts.

Do you want the courts—State and Federal—burdened with litigation as to the validity of existing State legislation pertaining to girls and women?

Do you want the Congress to take on the task of legislating in fields now reserved to the States?

The proposed equal-rights amendment reads:

"SEC. 1. Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

The amendment would cause great confusion and further burden already overburdened courts.

The mischievous vagueness of the amendment means that every law treating men and women differently would be subject to challenge in the courts.

What does equal mean? Identical? That would be the simplest answer. Any law treating men and women differently would certainly be open to challenge in the courts if this amendment were adopted. If equal means identical, the amendment fails to consider the differences between men and women.

What does equal rights throughout the United States mean? Does it mean uniform treatment of men and women throughout the United States? Would it mean only equal treatment of men and women within each State?

The amendment isn't needed.

Legal discrimination against women in State laws or State constitutions will be changed as fast as enough women in those States want them changed. The vote gives them that power.

The amendment would be the greatest single step toward centralization of government control ever taken.

It authorizes the Congress to pass legislation in the whole field of social and property legislation—property rights, marriage and divorce, dependency, legitimacy, age of consent, inheritance, etc.

The real discriminations against women result from custom and prejudice—not from laws. A constitutional amendment won't change these attitudes. It could aggravate them.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 1, the so-called equal-rights amendment, reads:

Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.

Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

I am this day in receipt of a letter from Mrs. Elizabeth H. Schnabel, executive secretary of another group of women calling themselves American Council for Equal Legal Status, which letter reads, in part, as follows:

We object to the wording of House Joint Resolution 1, the proposed equal-rights amendment, now before Congress. It is ambiguous, and for that reason 99 people in a hundred are afraid of it.

It might mean Federal control. It might mean geographical uniformity. Then again, it might mean nothing more than a declaratory statement, until implemented by Congress. There is nothing to give it vitality or understanding.

Because of these objections, we decided to consult the highest authority on the subject, Thomas Raeburn White, noted Philadelphia constitutional lawyer, and laid the matter before him. After some weeks of time and thought, he submitted a draft, a copy of which is enclosed.

We believe you will agree with us that this draft is the finest, the clearest, the simplest that it is possible to make. And the folks back home will have no trouble in understanding it. It will not interfere with States' rights, except insofar as they discriminate between men and women.

The amendment as drafted by Mr. White is as follows:

Men and women shall have equal rights in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States and in the District of Columbia.

No law shall be made or enforced which fails to recognize equal rights for men and women throughout the territory over which the law is operative.

Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

It seems to me that as between the two proposals the White draft is preferable because it has teeth, spectacularizes the repeal of existing laws, is clear, concise, and accentuates the doubts raised by the letter from the League of Women Voters to which I have just called the attention of the House.

In short, this amendment provides that no law shall be made in the future, and no law now on the statute books shall be enforced, which fails to recognize equal rights for men and women. Surely, placing such an addition to the Constitution at this time would create much confusion and require the repealing of legislation affecting the rights of men and women in practically every State of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good place to make haste slowly.

Food Scarcity

REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the people of Greater Boston and surrounding communities are confronted by a food scarcity due in large measure to the inefficiency and bungling of the Office of Price Administration.

Businessmen distributing food are threatened with bankruptcy because food which would otherwise be furnished the Boston area is being shipped to other points where price ceilings are higher.

This discrimination comes on top of the bitter experience of many in respect to fuel-oil distribution during the excessively cold recent months.

It is publicly charged in the Boston press that the shortages referred to are the result of improper price ceilings, making it possible to obtain higher prices in other nearby communities even where freight rates are lower.

The statements speak for themselves. They furnish further evidence of bungling in the field of food distribution. They furnish further evidence of how the O. P. A. is handicapping the war effort. They furnish further justification for a thorough investigation of O. P. A. and for the elimination from its pay rolls of those persons whose incompetence is responsible for the conditions referred to. The O. P. A. should be called on the mat immediately.

I quote very briefly, Mr. Speaker, from a recent article in the Boston Globe, as follows:

Food scarcity grows acute. Prospect of meatless Sunday looms here; vegetables are low. Continued shortages of meat and vegetables in Boston markets yesterday made it highly probable that many Boston homes will not enjoy hearty Sunday dinners tomorrow.

Meat wholesalers agreed yesterday that tomorrow will be the closest to a meatless Sunday Bostonians have had to undergo since the start of the war. Sausage, frankforts, and bologna may be the main course in many homes.

The shortage of meat was so acute in the Faneuil Hall market district yesterday that several stores were cleaned out of their stocks before noon. One of the largest retail pork houses drew its blinds early yesterday afternoon when everything except bologna had been sold from its showcases.

Vegetables, too, are among the missing. Dealers have received only half of their previous meager allotments.

I quote briefly, also, from a recent article in the Boston Traveler, as follows:

A near riot took place at the Boston market terminal today as hundreds of dealers fought to buy part of the single carload of spinach that arrived, and for the second successive day no peas or green beans arrived at the terminal through which flows 95 percent of the New England vegetable supply. Only a small supply of green cabbage was available.

This was the critical situation that faced the dealers, threatened with loss of their

business because of the refusal of producers to send food here, when they can get higher prices in other communities, and the situation facing the housewife who does her shopping for the week end on Thursday or Friday.

Veteran terminal men placed the blame squarely on the shoulders of the Office of Price Administration. "They are doing the best they know how," one veteran dealer said, "but they don't know a damn thing about the produce business."

Sheer Folly To Attempt To Determine the Peace Before Winning the War Other Than Deciding on General Aims and Broad Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the discussion of our domestic and international post-war problems is indeed a fine thing, so long as it does not detract our untiring efforts and concentration toward winning of the war. To be sure we are looking forward with fervent hope and earnest prayer to the day when the world will again be at peace. However, we must not become so enthused with the favorable progress of the war that it will lead us again to complacency and an attitude that this terrible war can be won by wishful thinking. Recent activities and commitments indicate that there are those who take the position that the war will soon be over.

To be sure, we have made encouraging progress. Our fighting forces and those of our Allied Nations within the past few months have been taking a tremendous toll of the enemy, and we have seized upon the initiative and have taken the offensive in the great conflict. In my opinion, we have a long, grim, and bloody fight ahead of us and we cannot detract a single moment of our efforts at home and abroad from our continuous and victorious progress. We are confident of victory, but only by continuous, deliberate, thoughtful, sane, and determined acts that have always made this Nation strong and great.

Indeed since the beginning of this conflict, we have had a definite concept of what we are fighting for. First, to stop the insane, mad dictators, with their great military machine and its world-wide aggression. We must blot it from the face of the globe. It must be utterly destroyed. The world will not live in slavery and under the dictator of the Axis Powers. No one will deny but what this is our broad aim and our first and all-important policy.

Second, we are fighting that with the end of this war we may be insured that there shall be no repetition of such a conflict inevitably leading to the destruction of civilization. That our economic and political security will not again be so threatened. That the nations of the world will never again permit the assembling of such a powerful force that will lead us into devastating activities, causing the death of men and the destruction of property.

To be sure, we should look forward to a broad national foreign policy that will lead us without a doubt toward the realization of these objectives, but we cannot do more than to discuss these international problems in a broad and general conclusion. "We cannot cross the bridge before we get to it." It is well to reach an agreement and understanding on broad policies and general objectives, but we cannot bind ourselves on details that no one can foresee and which may not be reached for many years to come.

The Atlantic Charter and the declaration of the United Nations gives a broad vision of post-war aims and securities. Specific formulas and definite methods of procedure in carrying out the administration of post-war activities should not be agreed on at this time. To attempt to work out the stupendous details at this time would not only detract our efforts from the winning of the war but would be most impractical and sheer folly.

Belatedly we adopted a policy of price control in an attempt to defeat inflation and to keep our economy from being destroyed. There is not one who would deny that the general policy, the aims, and objectives of such a program is needed. In the practical application of these objectives we have found it to be most difficult. Many of the details necessarily had to be changed. Specific formulas have had to be altered. Many other practical analogies could be drawn that should convince us of the tragedy of binding ourselves or any nation to something specifically that we cannot determine or foresee.

Yes, we have decided on the broad and general principles, the aims, and objectives of the post-war period. Let us not go back into a state of complacency and isolation. Let us look forward to international security and cooperation, but let us first of all go shoulder to shoulder in unity and effort toward producing food, materials, and implements of war at home and providing for our boys on the many far-flung theaters of activity in their continuous victories and crushing the enemy to an ignominious death.

Again I want to issue a warning to this Congress, to this Nation, and to the world that we must be at our noble task with all of our might and energy and there will come a glorious day that the stains of war will be removed. The peoples of the world must see that greed and selfishness will not be permitted at the peace table, as was experienced in the last World War, but the broad objectives and purposes for which we fight will have the practical application—justice and fairness that will give the world a lasting and enduring peace.

Plight of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. G. F. Wilder, executive secretary of the Independent Business Men's Association of Iowa:

MARCH 11, 1943.

IOWA DELEGATION IN CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I have been sending you copies of information from time to time to keep you informed as to the plight of the small businessmen of this country, and I shall continue to do so when I find items of interest and value.

You will recall that there was a prediction that 300,000 small businessmen would be put out of the picture this year; and according to the words of Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, it was not necessary for this to happen, meaning that if certain things were worked out by Congress and the powers that be that things could be adjusted so that we could remain in business.

For your information, the danger point is approaching, and very rapidly. If you were to visit many of our stores and learn of the condition of our stocks, you would then believe that we could not long remain in business. Gentlemen, something must be done, and it must be done quickly.

I wish to give you a picture of a store in a neighboring town that I visited. I found one of the most dejected men I have ever seen. His meat counter was completely empty, he had no cookies, and he had sent an order to a wholesale house for coffee and sent the stamps which must accompany the order. The wholesale house evidently was out of coffee and was holding up the order. They had his stamps and he could not order from any other source, and his shelves were only half filled with other merchandise. This is only one case, and there are many other similar cases.

I will be very frank in the things I wish to say. Such men as Mr. Donald Nelson must be removed from office, along with many others, and men placed in those positions who have no connections whatsoever with big business. There are plenty of men in this country who are sincere and conscientious who can fill such positions and men who have no connections with mail-order houses or big corporations of any kind.

Congress has the power to make such changes and if the men in question refuse to resign, Congress holds the weapon that can perform the trick, that of removing the appropriations so that those departments cannot operate.

We small businessmen are aware of the fact that we are at war, and many of us served with the armed forces during World War No. 1. We know the meaning of sacrifice and are willing to do our part in the winning of this war. But if we can remain in business so that we may do our part, such as the purchase of bonds, paying of heavy taxes, and many other things, small business must be preserved. It is not the American way of life to force us out of business and allow the big operators to continue unmolested. We have taken many blows on the

chin, but this one thing we are not going to take lying down. We are here to fight for our rights, and we must have the assistance of Congress.

We also know that the Iowa delegation in Congress are well informed as to our difficulties and are with us in a big way and we do know that you gentlemen, like all good soldiers, will come through with flying colors.

The one thing we need mostly right now is merchandise. Also not so many regulations. We cannot continue in business if we have no merchandise to sell, and we cannot pay the taxes and purchase bonds if the commodities from which we make our livelihood are taken from us.

Never before in the history of this country has big business been played up to like they have been during this war, and, gentlemen, something must be done about it at once.

We know well that many factories have had to change from the manufacture of merchandise to the making of weapons of war. But the big operators are receiving things that we small merchants cannot obtain.

We must have merchandise and we must have it at once if we are to remain in business.

We have worked long hours trying to build up a business that we might have a little security in old age and also be a credit not only to our respective communities but to our Nation.

You have noted from the articles I have mailed to you that many of the things the Office of Price Administration is doing are fantastic and do not make sense. The same thing is true with other departments. Congress must take cognizance of the pleas of small business and act quickly.

I firmly believe that if Congress will bring pressure to bear on the powers that be that more merchandise can be released for the small merchants so that we can continue in business and continue to do our part in the winning of this war. Big business must be controlled and we are also firm in our belief that the reason such men as Mr. Nelson are in the responsible positions is that they may look after the interests of big business.

In behalf of our association, I wish to thank you in advance for your consideration of our difficulties, and I am certain that you will do everything within your power to protect small businessmen.

I plead with you, gentlemen, in the name of everything that is good and wholesome, do something about this at once.

Yours sincerely,

G. F. WILDER,
Executive Secretary, Independent Business Men's Association of Iowa.

Inclusion of Labor Costs of Farmers in Parity Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED NORMAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 19, 1943

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the consideration of the Pace bill—H. R. 1408—I want to say that I intend to vote for this bill for the following reasons:

I have been a member of the Farmers Grange of the State of Washington for 24 years. Since coming to Washington, D. C., I have been in consultation with Mr. Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, on all farm legislation. While the pending bill does not completely cover all farm legislation that is desirable for the benefit of our farmers, it is a long and decided step in that direction, and as the National Grange is strongly for it, I am voting for it and hope it will pass and become law.

In every other field of production, such as manufacture, transportation, distribution, and services of all kinds, the cost of labor is figured in all costs and selling prices, and properly so, because in most cases labor is the largest single factor in the final cost.

Since this is the situation, why should not the farmers' labor costs be included in calculation of parity prices? Certainly this factor should not be left out on the theory that a farmer does not labor, because I was raised on a farm and I know by experience that every farmer does plenty of hard work throughout the year.

I do not believe operation of this bill will increase the cost of living to the extent that its opponents claim. Since the price the farmer receives for his products is only a small percentage of the usual price to the consumer, the increase in costs to consumers would only be the increase on that part of the price that the farmer receives. All added costs, such as processing, transportation, distribution, and retailing costs, already include labor costs and would not be affected by the Pace bill.

As a matter of fact, the Pace bill does not add all farm labor costs to parity prices. It only adds the difference in the increased costs of labor, as compared with the cost of labor during the parity base period; that is, the years 1909–14. I believe this could well be extended later to include all labor costs. Since all other labor costs have increased since that time and have already been included in rising prices, it is just simple justice to pass this bill for the farmer, and I feel that it has been too long delayed already.

We are now threatened with a serious food shortage by the end of this year. One reason for this is that farming has become so unattractive that many leave their farms. We cannot win this war, or even survive as a nation, unless the farmer is given a square deal.

I am glad to go along with the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farm Cooperatives, and the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation in supporting this bill.

It has been suggested that the President might veto this bill when passed. I can hardly believe so, because the President said in his message to Congress of September 7, 1942, "Calculations of parity must include all costs of production, including the cost of labor."

I am voting for this bill, and if it is vetoed, I will vote to pass it over the President's veto.

Federal Use Tax on Motor Vehicles Should Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the House will begin consideration of a method to collect income taxes. While we are on the subject of taxation, I feel it is appropriate that I call attention to H. R. 2010, introduced by me on February 26 and designed to repeal section 3540 of chapter 33a of Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, commonly known as the Automobile Use Tax.

That there is widespread sentiment for repeal of this $5 levy is evidenced by the great many letters I have received from persons throughout the United States protesting the imposition of this tax and characterizing it as an unnecessary burden on transportation.

With the great percentage of our citizens being forced to curtail the operation of their automobiles, the so-called use tax becomes a glorified form of extortion and should be repealed from the standpoint of simple justice to the millions of American car owners. When it is realized that the motorists of the Nation are driving only for essential purposes, the charge that the use tax is a burden on modern transportation is fully substantiated.

As a nation that takes great pride in a network of modern highways it is recognized that the revenue from motor vehicles has made possible these great lanes of transportation. It follows that if there is a decrease in the number of motor vehicles in operation in a State that there is a corresponding reduction in the amount of revenue received by the State for highway maintenance and repairs. Thus the use tax on motor vehicles is a means of discouraging ownership of motor vehicles and directly retards the expansion and maintenance of our modern highway system.

The Treasury Department reports that State registrations of motor cars for 1941 represented approximately 32,500,000 motor vehicles and adds that, due to rationing of motor vehicles, tires, and gasoline, plus the normal junking of vehicles, the number now in use is considerably less than 30,000,000. From June 1, 1942, through January 31, 1943, the sale of Federal use stamps discloses that tax was paid on approximately 29,590,000 motor vehicles. It is interesting to note at this point that appropriations granted to the Bureau of Internal Revenue for administering the use-tax law resulted in $1,300,000 being transferred to the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1942 and $525,000 for the fiscal year 1943. It is explained that these sums were necessary to cover the expenses of the Post

Office Department since the sale of motor-vehicle stamps is conducted jointly by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Post Office Department. The difference in the amounts transferred for 1942 and 1943 is accounted for because of the fact that during 1942 two tax payments were made, one beginning in January and the other in June.

That the Federal use tax is unsound in principle is beyond contradiction. According to statistics compiled by the American Automobile Association, over 41 percent of the motor vehicles registered in the United States are on farms and in villages under 2,500 in population. In addition, 55 percent of all cars are owned by people making less than $30 weekly. In the smaller villages where over 41 percent of the cars are located, a survey discloses that 65 percent of the mileage on these vehicles is for business purposes. Farmers as a rule have the oldest and cheapest motor vehicles. Many States allow a lower registration fee for farm cars; yet the Federal use tax is levied at the same rate as that of a high-priced custom-built motor car. The result is that the cost to the farmer is increased beyond all sense of proportion.

With 55 percent of the Nation's motor vehicles being owned by persons making less than $30 weekly, this levy of a $5 use tax by the Federal Government is exacted without any regard for the ability to pay. In addition, the motor car is indispensable in rural and urban territory as a modern method of transportation. Therefore, this use tax is a tax on transportation and is discriminatory, because it applies to one field of transportation.

To discourage the ownership of motor vehicles is a threat to the functioning of our economic system. Public means of transportation are already overburdened, and appeals are being made by Director Joseph B. Eastman, of the Office of Defense Transportation, to restrict the use of such travel, or it may be necessary to place travel on a rationing and priority basis. A decrease in the use and ownership of motor vehicles will contribute greatly to the serious transportation problem and, therefore, should not be encouraged.

When the $5 use tax was proposed and debated in Congress, attention was called to the fact that many regarded such a tax as an invasion of State rights and that the Federal Government should not enter that field. It was recalled that a use tax on carriages was levied in 1815 to aid in paying the cost of the War of 1812 but that it was promptly repealed.

The rationing of gasoline and the fact that the automobile is a modern means of transportation and, therefore, essential to our economic life is evidence that the Federal use tax on motor vehicles is discriminatory, unjustified, and wholly unsound.

It is dangerous legislation because it has established a precedent which may well lead to the taxation of other items of personal property. In addition, now that the tax has been collected at the rate of $5 on every vehicle regardless of size or age, we have the ridiculous situation of a small passenger motor vehicle or farm pick-up truck being placed in the same category with higher-priced models in the passenger-car field or with huge cargo trucks that dot our highways with the load capacity of an average railroad boxcar. And there is nothing to stop the increasing of the present $5 tax from double or triple the present rate. It is a vicious tax levy that has merited the storm of protest that has risen from over 30,000,000 motorists in America.

Mr. Speaker, the taxes paid by motor-vehicle owners before the imposition of the Federal use tax were numerous and oppressive. In many States additional municipal and county taxes are levied against automobile owners. As a result, there are 18 direct taxes on automobiles or automobile operation exclusive of the Federal use tax and they comprise the following levies: State registration fees, State gasoline taxes, State personal-property taxes, State drivers' license fees, State certificate of title fees, State sales taxes, county gasoline taxes, county personal-property taxes, city gasoline taxes, city personal-property taxes, city wheel taxes, city drivers' license fees, city registration fees, and Federal excise taxes on automobiles, trucks, parts and accessories, rubber tires and tubes, gasoline and lubricating oil.

While every State does not exact all these taxes, the majority of them are levied in all States and represent the heavy burden of taxation placed on automobile owners.

I feel certain that if serious consideration is given to the subject of a Federal use tax on motor vehicles that it will be the consensus of opinion that such a form of taxation is unsound in principle, lacks the essential elements of fairness and justice and, therefore, should be repealed.

I ask your favorable consideration of H. R. 2010 in order that we may lift the added burden of the Federal use tax from the backs of the already overtaxed car owners of America.

The Norman "Home Rule" Public Power Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting one of the numerous comments on my "home rule" public power bill, H. R. 1899, which, when passed, will provide for the acquisition of Grand Coulee and Bonneville hydroelectric power facilities for the benefit of the people of the State of Washington. The article is from the magazine Electrical World, published in New York, issue of February 27, 1943:

BILL ASKS SALE OF COULEE, BONNEVILLE TO STATES—HOME RULE OF FEDERAL POWER PROJECTS IS AIM OF LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVE FRED NORMAN, WASHINGTON REPUBLICAN—ISSUE MAY LOOM LARGE IN 1944 PRESIDENTIAL RACE

Home rule of Federal power developments on the Columbia River is the aim of recently proposed legislation empowering the States of Washington and Oregon to purchase the Grand Coulee and Bonneville projects.

SECOND STEP IN CAMPAIGN

The bill, introduced by Representative FRED NORMAN, Washington Republican, requires the Federal Government to sell both projects, Grand Coulee to Washington and Bonneville to Washington and Oregon jointly, whenever the States complete satisfactory financing arrangements. It constitutes the second step of a double-envelopment campaign to make public power—operated under home rule—supreme in Washington State.

Under the act the Federal Government would be paid net cost of the projects at the time of acquisition, less depreciation reserves. Financing would be by revenue bonds backed by project income, in cash or by a combination of both. Estimated cost of each project now is $160,000,000.

Last previous step in establishing supremacy of public power in Washington was the recent passage of initiative 12 by the Washington Legislature. Under the initiative two or more public-utility districts may combine to purchase private systems covering the areas they serve. This opens the way for abolishment of all remaining private electric-power companies.

NORMAN, who regards his measure as the capstone of the home-rule program, described it as the final step toward complete home rule by the people of my State over their hydroelectric resources. If it becomes law, NORMAN predicted, it will probably result in a combination of public-utility districts or a State public-power authority to take over and operate both projects.

"There is little doubt in the minds of well-informed persons that the Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects will pay out," NORMAN declared. He pointed out that Bonneville Administrator Paul Raver estimates that annual revenues of both projects will reach $18,000,000 by July. At that time both projects will be producing approximately 8,000-000 kilowatt-hours of energy yearly, most of it sold to direct war industries. Post-war industrial expansion which will be enabled by this power supply and by the area's natural resources will allow the projects to pay for themselves, NORMAN believes.

ICKES OPPOSITION FORESEEN

Possibility that a New Deal Congress would pass the bill, or that President Roosevelt would sign it, is remote. Its introduction, however, puts the Republicans on record as favoring home rule, an issue which may be important in 1944 elections. NORMAN and his "freshman" colleagues, each of whom beat a Democratic Representative last fall, are already on record as favoring public over private power as a result of their indorsement of Initiative 12. Thus, it may be that NORMAN is working toward the possibility that a popular record at home may help elect a Republican President in 1944. Since a Republican administration then would probably introduce a trend toward Federal decentralization, possibilities of such legislation becoming law would be improved.

Interior Department's Reclamation Bureau is almost certain to oppose the Norman bill. Ickes-sponsored legislation to create a Columbia River Authority, controlled by the Interior Department, will be introduced at a future date. At present Senator HOMER T. BONE, Washington Democrat, who was co-

sponsor of similar legislation last session, is in Puerto Rico serving with a congressional committee investigating economic conditions of that island.

Retail Coal Distribution

REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a situation that threatens the ability of retail coal dealers to supply sufficient fuel next winter to assure home heating adequate to the protection of civilian health.

I would like to extend in the RECORD a statement issued by a committee representing the retail coal dealers in Richmond, Ind.

This statement was submitted for my consideration by Mayor John R. Britten, of Richmond, Ind., and prepared by Mr. Dudley Cartwright, chairman, and Mr. William J. Anderson and Mr. Phillip Starr, members of the committee representing the local retail coal dealers. I believe that it gives a very clear picture of a situation that should be given careful consideration in the interest of public health and the war effort on the civilian front:

Manpower problem: Increasing shortage. If it continues, distribution of coal will be very limited. Every day brings further facts to light which indicate that the condition is growing worse rapidly.

Alibis from officials seek to make coal man the goat: Naturally, officials of various Federal bureaus would like to create the impression that the plight of the retail coal industry is the coal man's fault—that he doesn't pay enough for labor; that he isn't a good businessman, etc. It makes a good smokescreen and sounds plausible to the public. Actually, the facts are that the manpower mess is directly chargeable to lack of a unified Federal policy on manpower problems. First of all, the coal man cannot raise wage rates if he wants to—pay rate in Richmond, drivers, 60 and 55 cents per hour; yard labor, 50 cents per hour; majority of labor is colored—not with all the War Labor Board edicts prohibiting pay increases. Secondly, if the coal man could raise hourly or weekly wage scales, these increased operating costs cannot be passed on to the consumer with retail coal prices frozen at present maximums.

Delivery and yard labor is being pirated away from the coal dealer by war industries and high wages on the one hand and being drained by Selective Service calls on the other.

The coal man is powerless: The War Manpower Commission takes a fence-straddling position, refusing either: (1) to declare retail coal distribution essential, or (2) to say point blank that it is nonessential.

Federal bureaus and officials stab at relief: The only relief in any way has been directives issued to the United States Employment Service (which has acquired a virtual monopoly of funneling available manpower into jobs). This indicates impractical if not actually evasive solutions.

The latest of these, issued March 9, 1943, instructs United States Employment Service offices not to transfer truck drivers and maintenance mechanics employed by fuel distributors to other jobs, even in plants producing war goods. Encouraging as this sounds, it will not prevent anyone from shifting to a higher-pay job or quitting for other cause. The usual excuses—"work too hard for me," "my health won't stand it" and other stock pretexts so familiar to coal men—are still effective. The vicious circle of Federal temporizing with a critical situation continues day in and day out. There will be a rude awakening when the public begins to realize where such policies lead.

To protect coal consumers of Richmond, the following must be done as soon as possible:

(1) Coal dealers' present maximum price which is frozen by O. P. A. must be increased to offset increased wage scales and increased operating expenses.

(2) War Manpower Commission must declare retail coal distributors essential industry, so that labor will be protected against pirating.

Poultry Production in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution recently adopted by the California State Senate.

In this regard I should like to say that I have been in constant touch with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration on the subject of poultry production in California. So far our efforts to obtain proper recognition have been unsuccessful. Unless immediate steps are taken to correct the existing situation I fear that the production of meat chickens in our State will be seriously curtailed. The resolution follows:

Senate Resolution 81

Whereas in normal times the poultry industry in this State is of paramount importance to the people of California; and

Whereas this importance has been tremendously magnified by reason of the existing shortages of meat and other forms of protein; and

Whereas there annually exists at this time of year a normal surplus of cockerels which in the past have been destroyed because of a lack of available market; and

Whereas this surplus of cockerels could be raised and marketed as broilers within a relatively short time if the ceiling price for broilers would permit the raising and marketing of broilers by poultrymen without incurring a substantial loss; and

Whereas it would appear that the Office of Price Administration and other Federal agencies should do all in their power to encourage and stimulate the raising of broilers for use in California in order to relieve the present meat and protein shortage; and

Whereas despite the efforts of the poultrymen of the State of California to persuade the Office of Price Administration to realize the uniqueness of the California situation, the Office of Price Administration insists on fixing ceiling prices for California on production costs of other States where labor and feeding costs are much lower; and

Whereas the persistence of the Office of Price Administration in its present conduct will result in the loss of many million pounds of poultry meat for use in California; and

Whereas local Office of Price Administration officials have refused to take appropriate steps to alleviate present conditions even when they have had power so to do: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Honorable Prentiss Brown, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and the Honorable Claude Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, be and they are hereby memorialized to direct their regional representatives for California to establish ceiling prices for poultry in California that will permit making available to the citizens of the State this essential supplement to the meat and protein supply.

The Committee's Counterfeit Pay-As-You-Go Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is the abject surrender of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee to bureaucratic domination and dictation that calls forth the rebuke contained in the editorial from the Waterloo Daily Courier of March 19, 1943, which I am including as a part of my remarks under leave to extend:

THE COMMITTEE'S COUNTERFEIT PAY-AS-YOU-GO PLAN

After squatting for 2 months on various pay-as-you-go tax eggs, the House Ways and Means Committee, with much falsetto cackling, has hatched out a dodo bird.

The committee plan provides a 20-percent withholding tax but fails to present a practical formula for putting the taxpayer on a current payment basis. The proposal is that any taxpayer who has paid his 1942 taxes in full may deduct 6 percent on all taxes paid on 1943 income before June 15 of this year. Four percent may be deducted on taxes paid by September 15 and 2 percent by December 15.

What does this plan accomplish? It enables the wealthy man who has large savings to take advantage of the deductions and obtain a considerable reduction in his taxes. The small taxpayer, who must use his income for living expenses and has small savings, cannot pay both his 1942 and 1943 taxes in the same year.

The opponents of the Ruml plan have made the ridiculous assertion, wholly without any proof, that the Ruml proposal aids the rich. They now are confronted with the House committee's spurious pay-as-you-go proposal which actually does aid the rich. The net result of all this debate has been to generate even more powerful support among the public and independent Congressmen for the Ruml plan.

For fairness and simplicity, the Ruml plan is so much superior to all the other alternatives that a Congress ruled by logic and statesmanship would introduce it immediately as has been done in Canada. The arguments have been adequately presented, for the most part, but one advantage deserves more emphasis:

The Ruml plan, by putting all taxpayers on a current basis, would be a great boon to the widows of deceased taxpayers. When an individual with a reasonably good income dies without having saved to pay his income tax, the liability falls on the widow and often causes great hardship. The Ruml plan would, of course, erase this unfortunate situation.

We doubt if the members of the Ways and Means Committee who voted for the committee plan have any serious conviction that it is a good proposal. Unable to agree on any sensible scheme, the members merely compromised on a hybrid monstrosity in order to get the issue off their hands.

Reflections on Program, From the Cradle to the Grave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press, an outstanding newspaper in my congressional district, the Seventeenth Michigan, on the proposed from-the-cradle-to-the-grave-by-Government proposal:

SOME PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

President Roosevelt's post-war objectives contemplate a state of society more perfect than any yet built by the hands of man. It is not difficult to outline conditions in which every man, woman, and child lives amid comfort, happiness, and prosperity. Who would not desire a country from which all fear and uncertainty had been banished? There will be no disagreement with the notion that jobs at good pay, educational advantages of the best, health assurance, ample supplies of wholesome food, and satisfactory housing conditions are desirable objectives. Mankind has been wishing for such an idealistic state since the dawn of creation.

Experience has shown that the world is made up of the good and the bad, the wise and the foolish, the strong and the weak, the capable and the shiftless, and no transcendental aspirations will alter this condition.

Men and women do not grow in strength, mentally, physically, nor spiritually, by being pampered and indulged. Self-reliance is not the child of coddling and indulgence. America was made great and strong and powerful by men who carved out their own destiny and built a great empire because they learned how to to overcome difficulties as a result of their own initiative. They went without and they suffered from lean years, but they built into their characters by these disciplinary methods the qualities that ultimately commanded success for themselves and for the country they loved.

If American life is to be regulated, directed, and managed from the cradle to the grave by government, we may as well kiss good-bye to democracy and all it represents.

Our Food Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, because of the timely importance of the subject and the imperative necessity of insuring an adequate food supply throughout the war emergency, I am sure that the membership will find much of interest in the article reprinted from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of March 11, 1943, which its author, Mr. Frank Gannett, chairman of the executive committee of the board of trustees of Cornell University and editor in chief of the Gannett newspapers, has entitled "Our Food Problem."

In order that it may be called to their attention, I ask that it be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks. The article follows:

OUR FOOD PROBLEM—AMERICA FACES THE MOST CRITICAL PERIOD IN HISTORY, DARK DAYS CERTAIN WITH STARVATION AND RIOTING THREATENING; PROMPT, VIGOROUS ACTION VITAL IF SUFFERING IS TO BE ALLEVIATED

(By Frank Gannett)

America's outstanding problem at this moment is food. Everyone is beginning to find it difficult to get various kinds of food. Food is the main topic of conversation everywhere.

The distressing feature of the situation is that there is no relief in sight. Instead, conditions will grow worse. The public does not yet understand how critical the situation already has become, or how bad it is going to be.

One economist who knows much about the situation recently said that if we should have bad weather this coming summer, we might have food riots by this time next year.

The tragedy of the situation is that there are no real shortages of food at this time. Our shortages are artificial. They have been created by stupid mismanagement of the food problem by our Government agencies.

Food is absolutely essential for our Army, for our war workers, for producers in all lines. Our people must be fed. Furthermore, there is a great demand for food for our allies, so that they may better help to win the war.

We cannot win this war without food. It is as necessary as guns, ships, tanks, or planes. All of us would gladly deprive ourselves of all food that we do not absolutely need for our existence, if that would hasten victory in the war. As bothersome as regulations are today, and as frequent as is our inability to buy the foods we want, the food situation has not improved. Inefficient, short-sighted bureaucrats are making it worse and worse.

The present distressing conditions are due primarily to Office of Price Administration restrictions and bad administration. In the confusion over the term "parity," too low ceilings were set on our food supplies and many other foolish things done to discourage production.

In the year 1942 a crop production record was established. We had had several good growing seasons. This meant an accumulation of many varieties of food and also a great supply of livestock. It takes 2 or 3 years to develop for market cattle, sheep, hogs, and other food-supplying animals. To fatten these animals, we must have an abundant supply of grains and proteins. For instance, it takes 7 pounds of corn to give us 1 pound of pork.

The time is not far off when we shall not have enough food to supply both animals and human beings. This means our meat supply must dwindle rapidly, whatever may be the production of grains this year.

As a result of last year's favorable weather the Nation's larder, elevators, and warehouses and the farmer's storehouses and barns were well stocked and filled.

Statistics show that today there is somewhere in the country an abundance of the food supply, created last year. When the Government fixes too low prices, those who have these food supplies do not release them to the market. In many cases if they did release this food, they would do so at a financial loss. Instead of releasing the food, they hold it for higher prices. That is human nature and applies to the farmer, the wholesaler, the retailer, and to everyone, regardless of his occupation.

So it is that we have artificial shortages in a growing list of our food supplies.

But there are other factors creating these artificial shortages. The American Institute of Food Distribution, described as a nonprofit research organization, has arrived at the conclusion that the wild buying of food by the Army quartermasters and other Government officials has cornered a quantity of food completely out of line with the actual requirements for this year.

Our lend-lease administrator says that the dollar v-lue of food shipments abroad made through his agency last year was only 6 percent of the American farm production, but 6 percent is a considerable quantity. The Institute of Food Distribution reports that canners are holding for the Government between 40 and 75 percent of the entire pack of canned fruits and vegetables. The Government itself, it is reported, had estimated that only from 12 to 15 percent of the pack was needed to supply the Army and Navy until next fall, when most of another year's pack would be in.

Thus it is evident that the Government has been a potent factor in creating our food shortages. It is our biggest food hoarder.

The restrictions on canned goods recently put into effect are practically a prohibition of that form of food. An allowance of two or three cans a month for each individual practically eliminates canned goods from the average table. This means that the greatest burden will fall on the poor, the class which uses most canned goods.

It is difficult to visualize what will happen to the millions of people in our large cities when the supply of canned goods is exhausted. It has been said that New York City, for instance, has on hand at any time only enough food for a week. When the people living in apartments can no longer get canned goods, when meats are out of reach and the supply of fresh vegetables dwindles because of the increased demand for them, it is likely that millions of people in the metropolis will go hungry before many months pass.

Yes, as I said before, food riots may be possible within the year.

This is a great country and we boast of our enormous production, but even in normal years we do not, as a matter of fact, produce all the food our people and our animals need. It has been necessary to import a small percentage. The lack of shipping now makes the importation of food practically impossible. No one can predict what we will produce in 1943. The weather is a great unknown factor in the situation, but even if we produce this year a normal crop of all our foods, we shall not have enough for our needs.

We have a large army overseas and are creating a larger army here at home. Men in the Army and in training consume a third more food than they did as civilians. Much

of the food that we ship to our forces abroad has been and will be sunk by submarines. On top of all this, food will be needed under lend-lease for our allies and for the peoples in the countries that may be recovered from the enemy.

There is nothing, then, more important than increasing to the utmost our production of food this year. Our Government should have foreseen this situation long ago and should have taken steps to meet it. The planting season is already close upon us. Spring plowing is under way already in many sections.

For more than a year the various farm organizations have been pleading and pleading with the Government for action to meet the crisis that now is fast approaching. They complained because farm labor was being drafted into the Army and being attracted to the cities by high factory wages and shorter hours. Our farm leaders again and again predicted a great national disaster if something was not done to correct these conditions.

The Selective Service Act at the very beginning should have exempted farm labor from the draft. Workers on the farms should have been automatically deferred. At this late day, bills are pending in Congress to stop the further drain of labor from the farms, but that doesn't solve the problem. Irreparable harm already has been done.

Farm labor in these times is skilled labor. Anyone not fully experienced in the handling of modern farm equipment, not trained in scientific food production, is not of much value to the farmer-owner. It is absurd to think that we can get maximum food production by taking men from the city, inexperienced in agriculture, and put them on our farms. Our children may help in harvesting certain crops, but they cannot possibly qualify as real farm labor or solve the farmers' labor problem.

In my opinion, to meet this situation, from half a million to a million experienced farmers now in uniform should be released from the Army and sent back to the farms until the crops are harvested next fall. These farmers could be kept in the Army and on the Army pay roll and could be given additional pay by the farm operator to aid in food production.

Appeals to the public to go into gardening extensively this year must be heeded. If everyone would develop a garden of his own, the total production would run into enormous quantities. In England, amazing results have been obtained by tilling unused land and vacant lots. Every available foot of land is being utilized. If we are going to escape a famine next year, we must carry out a similar program here in America.

Another thing we must do is to begin to practice drastic saving of food. Americans have been notorious for wasting food. It has been said that the average family in Europe could subsist on what an American family throws away. We must learn to practice rigid economy and get accustomed to eating less. The British people have only a scant supply of food, but they have found it adequate and have had better health because they have been eating less.

We must learn also basic facts about nutrition. Our research laboratories are developing new facts about vitamins, calories, and body chemistry that should be very helpful in meeting food famine. The new school of nutrition at Cornell University, especially, should have exceedingly valuable information for all of us. The time is not far off when we must entirely change our eating habits.

Still another basic cause of our frightening food prospect are the Office of Price Administration ceilings put on all that the farmer produces. Under many of these ceilings, the farmer cannot produce food except at a loss. The farmer is as patriotic as anyone. He, too, has sons in uniform. He is as eager as anyone to win the war. He is going to do his best for his country. He knows that we must have food, but he simply cannot produce more crops if held down to unprofitable returns, especially with the added difficulties confronting him this year—less help, less machinery, more expensive repairs, high prices for everything that he buys.

Those latter difficulties, however, will not stop the farmer. No industry in this country enlists more devoted, more skillful or more resourceful men. Pile all these handicaps on the farmer and he still will produce. He has done it before under conditions appalling to city men who know nothing of the study and skill represented in every successful farm operation.

But our farmers can't do the impossible. They must get enough for their products to be able t hire labor on a wage scale that will be closer to par with industrial wages than at present. No farmer can be expected to spend money in plowing and planting seed unless he can be reasonably sure that he will be able to harvest the crops.

Another destructive factor in the situation is the restriction put on the makers of farm machinery by our War Production Board. Entirely blind to the consequences, the War Production Board has denied to the farm machinery manufacturers steel enough to develop new farm equipment and to repair and replace the old. It is too late now to correct this situation. Our manufacturers now can't give the farmer the machinery that he will badly need for this year's production.

The price regulation bill was passed under a threat by the President that if Congress didn't do it, he would. Anyway, we today have price regulations and rationing in an increasing degree. The purpose of this legislation was in the words of its advocates, to prevent inflation.

Inflation is a term very much misused and again has misled many people.

Moderate inflation is wholesome—a good thing. Inflation is the opposite of deflation, and deflation, we all know, is the disease that causes depressions, hard times, bankruptcy. A moderate degree of inflation is a stimulus to production on field and in factory. It promotes new enterprises and normally brings good times and prosperity.

Wild inflation, however, is another matter. That is something that must be avoided if we want to escape what happened in Germany and in other countries in Europe after the First World War. Wild inflation results in printing-press money and worthless dollars.

Raising prices that the farmer will get for his crops should not produce any alarming inflation. There can be and should be a certain amount of control of prices, but that control must not go so far as to discourage production, as has been the case under the Office of Price Administration.

Any of us would be willing to give almost any price for food when it is not available. When it comes to necessary food, we simply will not be stopped by any price.

Before we had Office of Price Administration price regulation, restrictions, and rationing, prices automatically rationed everything. When prices rose, consumption decreased. The law of supply and demand always operates. When demand declines and supply increases, prices fall and vice versa.

When the supply of anything is limited and there is a scramble for some of that definite supply, rationing becomes necessary, so that each may get his fair share. But when you put ceilings on foods or goods that are to be produced, you invariably decrease production and cut down the supply. So far as food is concerned, the Office of Price Administration restrictions and regulations are having exactly that effect.

Black markets are hard to suppress. In Spain they just shot black-market operators. Killing thousands didn't end the evil. Then the Government imprisoned violators. That, too, failed. Now they recognize the situation and tax the violators.

Neither in Spain, Germany, Russia, Italy, or anywhere else, has it been possible to wipe out black markets even by death penalties.

To police the country tightly enough to keep prices at fixed levels would require millions of police and snoopers and would cost billions of dollars and millions of hours of manpower. That would be bureaucracy at its greatest. Such cost would be extravagant in peacetime, prohibitive in wartime.

When we begin to see the importance of our food supply one of the most necessary things in our lives and in the prosecution of the war, we should insist that Congress and the administration at Washington reverse the disastrous steps that have brought about our serious plight and do something to give us relief.

With this critical situation facing us, even at this late hour the Government is doing little to correct conditions and lessen the misery that is ahead of us.

Secretary of Agriculture Wickard so far has failed to get results. This may be due to the fact that other executive branches, the action of which he cannot control, are either failing to cooperate or are putting into effect policies that are draining and handicapping agriculture.

The public, as it begins to see the awful consequences of the waste, the blundering, and the stupidity in the handling of this most important subject, will become furious. Louis Bromfield, author, Democrat, and former supporter of the administration, who owns a farm of 1,100 acres and who knows the food situation, recently said that "This (the handling of the food situation) by next autumn will become one of the greatest scandals in American history. It affects the whole future history of ourselves and of the world—even the future possibility of a decent peace. And throughout the world, millions of people will sicken and die and generations of children will grow up stunted and sickly because a frivolous and incompetent bureaucracy in the richest country in the world did not do its job."

Anyone who studies the situation and knows the facts today will agree that Bromfield is not exaggerating. There is nothing more tragic in our history than the mishandling of all phases of the problem of an adequate supply of food for ourselves, our Army, our allies, and the starving people of Europe.

Absenteeism and Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communications received by me with reference to H. R. 2082:

ALABAMA PROHIBITION COMMITTEE,
Talladega, March 17, 1943.

Hon. J. W. BRYSON,
Member of Congress, South Carolina,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I notice that you have introduced a bill forbidding the manufacture and sale of liquor in the United States until after the war and thereafter until the troops are demobilized.

Let me express to you my commendation of your action in this matter. I hope that the bill will become a law. It might be advisable to let Congress decide when demobilization is done instead of leaving it with the executive department.

Yours very truly,

J. B. LOCKHART.

TEXARKANA, ARK., *March 9, 1943.*

Representative BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Our Sunday-school class of Pine Street Presbyterian Church representing some 65 adults read aloud and discussed legislation you are proposing to Congress prohibiting sale of liquor for duration. Want you to know we favor such a movement and wish you success.

WORTH WHILE BIBLE CLASS,
Mrs. J. T. ROBERTSON, *Teacher.*

THE TOWNSEND NATIONAL RECOVERY PLAN,
Independence, Mo., March 16, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you on your stand in regard to prohibiting the sale of liquor for the duration.

When passing places where they have rows and rows of bottles of liquor on display, I never fail to think and wonder how many tragedies such as murders, broken homes, ill-fed children half clothed and uneducated, and quarrels that could have been avoided.

I have thought about it so much and hoped and prayed that such a bill would come up before Congress, and may the day be near when your bill will be passed.

If it is possible will you kindly send me a copy of H. R. 2082, and I assure you it will be greatly appreciated.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. W. L. ADAMS,
Secretary, Club No. 3.

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Greer, S. C., March 8, 1943.

Hon. JOS. R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BRYSON: My session of the little country church, the Fulton Presbyterian Church, has asked me to write you and express to you the appreciation of our people there for the action that you have taken in presenting a bill in the House of Representives to stop the sale of alcoholic beverages in our country for the duration of the war. Of course, we feel that the liquor traffic should be outlawed for all time. But certainly this great evil that is causing so much ruin and lowering the production of war materials should at least be stopped until the war is won. We are praying for you that God would give you wisdom and power to get this legislation passed during the present session of Congress.

I am,

Yours very sincerely,

F. T. MCGILL,
Pastor.

DENVER, COLO., *March 15, 1943.*

Congressman BRYSON, of South Carolina.

DEAR HONORABLE MR. BRYSON: The great and urgent need for this Congress to impose national prohibition for the duration of this war is self-evident and I, as a citizen of the United States, am writing this to you, requesting that you as a congressional Representative, urge that this be done.

I have read of your bill which has been presented to the Judiciary Committee, of which you are a member.

I am in favor of national prohibition of the liquor traffic at all times and for all time but as a means of helping to win this war, in which I have two sons fighting, as quickly as possible, I urge that this step be taken immediately, believing that American citizens will be able to see such a benefit derived from it that we will, after the war, have national prohibition restored to us by a constitutional amendment.

It is well known that the report of the Office of War Information as to the drinking of our armed forces was a great fallacy. Nothing is more disgusting than to see a soldier in uniform drunk on our streets and we see it every day here in Denver.

Recently a letter from a nephew, a North Carolina boy, stationed at Camp Claiborne, La., told of the demoralizing effect it had upon him when he saw his officer staggering drunk one night, knowing that he had to take orders from him next morning.

Not only do we see the soldiers drunk but the citizens as well.

Only recently a mother of eight children came to the job in a laundry one morning with her face beaten black and blue by her drunken husband, the night before.

This liquor curse, as you know, has been condemned by many of our best and foremost people, Presidents and other notable characters of our Nation, down through the years and to think that the eighteenth amendment was repealed and the curse brought back upon us by a man so drunken with greed for power that he would link himself with the cursed liquor element in order to be elected—it is too much to endure without protest.

Thanking you and assuring you my commendation for your work against the drink evil, I am,

Yours truly,

Mrs. MARTHA CRAFT,
Denver, Colo.

GREENVILLE S. C., *March 7, 1943.*

Hon. JOS. R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: I wish to express my appreciation to you for your efforts to bring about national prohibition for the duration.

You have many friends in this section that are grateful for your stand and especially those of us that are Christians are concerned about this, and remember that we will be praying for you in your efforts to stop a traffic that is such a detriment to our Nation.

Sincerely yours,

J. CLYDE JONES.

AUGUSTA ROAD BAPTIST CHURCH,
Greenville, S. C., March 17, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, your fellow citizens of your home town, and voters in the district which you are so ably representing, wish to convey to you by this communication our appreciation of your advocacy of laws limiting the sales of intoxicating liquors in and around Army camps, and your very able addresses in different parts of the country for the cause of temperance.

We see in this stand that you are really mindful of the strong dry sentiment in your district and in supporting dry legislation you are not only true to your own personal convictions but faithfully standing for the convictions of a substantial majority of citizens of the Fourth District.

We wish to assure you that we are supporting you with our prayers and influence.

We wish for you the largest measure of success in your official duties and divine blessing on your family.

Action of the Berean Class of Men of the Augusta Road Baptist Church.

V. D. GIFFORD, *President,*
W. C. MOSELY, *Secretary,*
J. CLYDE JONES, *Teacher,*
S. D. GIBSON,
Committee.

THE CHERRINGTON HOSPITAL, INC.,
Logan, Ohio, March 17, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your stand against the liquor traffic has the endorsement of all soldiers, mothers, fathers, and citizens I have contacted in this community.

This hellish institution is a thousand times more dangerous than war. It destroys mind, body, and soul.

God will add His blessings to this kind of a fight.

We are with you.

J. S. CHERRINGTON, M. D.,
Logan, Ohio.

LITTLETON, N. C., *March 6, 1943.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: Please accept my sincere thanks and appreciation for introducing your war-time prohibition bill in the House of Representatives. As a fellow Baptist it gives me an added pleasure to have one of our faith take this definite step which is in entire harmony with our Southern Baptist Convention.

I wish it were possible for me to do more to help the passage of your bill. I can and shall pray for its passage.

It is nothing less than a national disgrace for the allied liquor interests to be able to continue their destructive and debauching traffic unmolested during this war and through a period of restricting and rationing all the necessities of life.

It is treasonable to allow these deadly enemies to work their havoc against our every war effort by and with the support and defense of the national administration.

As an expression of my attitude on this matter so vitally affecting our Nation, I enclose one of my letters to the News and Observer published in Raleigh by Hon. Josephus Daniels, a former Secretary of the Navy under President Wilson. As I have no other copy of this letter, I will appreciate its return.

With assurance of my appreciation, and with hearty best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours.

W. F. WILLIAMS,
Superintendent, Littleton Baptist Sunday School.

THE METHODIST CHURCH,
INMAN-GRAMLING CHARGE,
Inman, S. C., March 10, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: You doubtless are already aware of the thinking of the Christian people of your district on the subject of whisky control and prohibition during these critical days of our national history. So I do not write to inform you, but rather to congratulate you and encourage you in the stand you are now taking in Congress on the subject.

I have heard many comments here in this splendid section of your district, and without a single exception they have been favorable. The people admire a man who places righteousness before political expediency, and who is a statesman before he is a politician. And I believe that since God is on the side

of right, the man who lives and advocates the right cannot ultimately be defeated.

We are proud of you as our Congressman, and I am glad to count you as my personal friend.

Yours faithfully,

FRANCIS T. CUNNINGHAM.

Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolutions:

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Madison, March 19, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEVENSON: The Wisconsin representatives at the Midwest Governors' conference held March 15 at Des Moines have reported to me that the resolutions adopted by the conference check closely with the present needs of agriculture in this State. A copy of these resolutions is enclosed, and I hope you will give all possible support to the recommendations regarding actions that should be taken by the Federal agencies concerned.

We in Wisconsin subscribe to the emphasis which the resolutions have given to the provision of farm machinery repairs and needed new farm and dairy equipment, and to expansion in the manufacture and use of commercial fertilizer to increase crop yields.

We also face a serious shortage of manpower on Wisconsin farms, particularly skilled men to care for our livestock and especially our dairy cattle. These skilled men are needed on a year-around basis, not just during the summer season as is the case with cash-crop farms in some States. We hope that our need for year-around livestock men can be given careful consideration in all future policies adopted by the Manpower Commission, selective service, and other Federal agencies concerned.

A special labor problem in rural Wisconsin is the acute shortage of trained cheese makers, butter makers, dairy-plant workers, skilled canning-factory employees, and other types of skilled workers employed in the local food-processing plants. We believe these key workers in the local food-processing plants are as urgently needed where they are, as are the workers on farms, and that they should be given the same occupational deferment by Selective Service.

Most of all we urge that the Congress and the President take immediate steps to remedy the present confusion and inefficient duplication and competition between the many Federal agencies concerned with agricultural manpower, food production and distribution. Centralization of responsibility and authority for all Federal matters that concern farmers in their efforts to increase production will enormously increase farmers' confidence and effectiveness.

We believe, also, that the Nation's welfare will be greatly advanced if less time is spent exhorting farmers to food-production goals, and instead give all possible aid to farmers in order that they can meet the practical difficulties that must be overcome if food production is to be maintained at 1942 levels, let alone increased as is so urgently needed.

Finally, I am convinced that State agencies and organizations could render much more assistance in these food matters than they have been given the opportunity to do by Federal agencies. By both law and practice the States have large authority in these matters. It is unfortunate that so many Federal employees adopt a go-it-alone policy at the expense of the public welfare and the whole war program.

Wisconsin is a leader in the production of most of the foods given highest priority from the standpoint of nutrition and war needs—the high vitamin, high protein foods such as fluid milk, cheese, evaporated milk, butter, dried milk, meat, eggs, and canned vegetables. Our farmers are giving all-out effort to maintain and, if possible, increase the output of these health-giving foods. All they ask is that their Government permit them to obtain the absolutely essential factors for this food production.

Sincerely,

WALTER S. GOODLAND,
Acting Governor.

We, the members of the Governors' Conference at Des Moines, Iowa, March 15, 1943, and composed of the States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin, that annually produce approximately two-thirds of the food produced in this Nation, do hereby adopt the following conclusion:

The agricultural situation is in crisis; unless we have more manpower and more machinery, the food production cannot be maintained. Already serious losses in crop and animal products are imminent; there can be no delay.

We therefore recommend:

1. That agriculture be recognized as an essential war industry and be rated as such with respect to manpower, materials, and equipment.

2. That while we are not proposing blanket deferment for agricultural workers, we recommend that all experienced labor essential to farm production be deferred, and that all such farm workers be given proper recognition by Federal authorities with suitable insignia or other mark of distinction for giving their best services to the country by remaining on the farm front.

3. That there be provided immediately a supply of steel and other material adequate to complete the manufacture of all partially completed machinery; that all present stocks of machinery be now released for sale; that the needs of material which should be this year provided for farm machinery to be used in 1944 be ascertained by May 1, 1943; and that the present unsatisfactory system of allocation of such machinery which sends machinery where it is not adapted, be supplanted by one which recognizes the actual needs of respective areas.

4. That material be immediately supplied manufacturers of farm machinery repairs and parts, and all restrictions on the manufacture and distribution of the same be removed at once; that full authority be placed in the hands of the local war boards to supply welding rod, bar steel, and other materials used in the local repair of farm machinery.

5. That migrant seasonal agricultural laborers be furnished the necessary transportation to and from work.

6. That available supplies of fertilizer be released immediately for the 1943 crop season.

7. That Congress pass the legislation appropriating $26,000,000 to the Agricultural Extension Service for the purpose of recruiting, transporting, housing, and placing agricultural labor.

In this 1 day's conference, our conclusions have been limited to manpower, machinery, and supply of fertilizer. We do not at this time pass on other farm problems.

Statement of California Joint Labor Legislative Headquarters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under date of March 16 the California Joint Labor Legislative Headquarters, embracing the following organizations: California State Federation of Labor, Edward D. Vandeleur, secretary and legislative representative, San Francisco; State Council of Carpenters, David Ryan, secretary, San Francisco; Joseph Cambiano, San Mateo; Don Cameron, legislative representative, San Francisco; California State Theatrical Association, Anthony J. Noriega, secretary-treasurer, San Francisco; California State Association of Electrical Workers, legislative representatives: Al Speede, secretary, Hollywood, Amos Feely, San Francisco; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, George F. Irvine, chairman, California State legislative board, San Francisco; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Harry See, State representative, California legislative board, San Francisco; Order of Railway Conductors, W. G. Welt, legislative representative, California legislative committee, San Francisco; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Fred E. Reynolds, legislative representative, California State legislative board, San Francisco; San Francisco Labor Council, John A. O'Connell, secretary, San Francisco; Los Angeles Building Trades Council, C. J. Haggerty, secretary, Los Angeles; Order of Railroad Telegraphers, J. E. Hanlon, general secretary-treasurer, San Francisco, issued a statement, which, pursuant to permission granted, I wish to include in my remarks in the RECORD. Same follows:

California railroads are moving more freight and passengers than at any time in their history, according to a statement issued jointly today by representatives of six railroad brotherhoods. Furthermore, it was stated that lack of foresight by executives and numerous instances of stupid management are the factors that prevent the breaking of present enviable transportation records and not restrictive union rules or absenteeism by workers.

The joint statement was issued by Fred E. Reynolds, of the locomotive engineers; G. F. Irvine, firemen; Harry See, trainmen; W. C. Welt, conductors; Lyle Du Frane, clerks; and J. E. Hanlon, telegraphers. It was an answer to recent allegations in the press and by railroad officials before a legislative committee in Sacramento that railways were operating far below peak capacity because of

"featherbedding" and other reprehensible union practices.

The complete statement follows:

"As representatives of a substantial majority of the operating employees of California's railroads we consider it regrettable that the rank and file members of our unions who are today moving more freight and passengers than ever before in history should be subjected to the present campaign of criticism and vilification by individuals intent on destroying labor organizations and by company officials who selfishly seek to expand already swollen profits at the expense of their workers.

"In the recent past it has been untruly and unjustly charged that absenteeism among railroad employees and restrictive union rules are thwarting the war effort by unnecessarily delaying movement of critically needed materials for civilian and military use. These and all similar allegations are utterly and completely false. Dissemination and reiteration of the charges cannot possibly serve any useful purpose, but will inevitably tend to break the spirit and morale of thousands of patriotic men who now toil almost to the limit of human endurance for a wage that in many cases is not commensurate with the experience and responsibility demanded by the companies.

"In essence, the charges are that over a period of years powerful railroad unions have demanded and received shortened hours of labor and conditions of employment which today's manpower shortage puts in the category of 'featherbedding.'

"Cited as one horrible example in this connection is a contractual arrangement dating back to World War No. 1, which provided that 3,800 miles shall constitute a month's work for a freight engineer. As every railroad worker and every railroad executive knows, this is the equivalent—under average operating conditions—of 38 eight-hour days in a month, an assignment which we believe that few of our detractors would care to equal.

"The regulation complained of was adopted, with full approval of the companies, as a work-sharing arrangement which would prevent a few men with 'fat' runs from making large earnings while other men on the extra board were without any employment whatsoever. It is still in effect. What our critics fail to state, however, is that any train or engine service employee may be called any time, irrespective of his accumulated mileage for any run for which no extra man is available. The fact that few, if any, engineers have ever been called by the company for extra runs appears to be conclusive evidence that no serious manpower shortage exists insofar as engineers are concerned and that this rule is not hampering train operation.

"Neither is there a serious manpower shortage in any other category of train service employees. One company with potent political connections, however, is sponsoring a bill in the California legislature to repeal the present full crew law which requires sufficient brakemen on heavy freight trains to protect the lives of the crew, insure the safety of passengers on other trains and to safeguard the property and equipment of the company itself.

"As a plausible excuse for this action, the company now contends that it is impossible to hire sufficient brakemen to operate all of its trains under the present law. This claim is being pressed despite the fact that in many terminals the records show that brakemen have actually been laid off during the past year and that there are now sufficient brakemen on every extra board in the State to handle not only the present heavy traffic, but any contemplated emergency.

"This is true despite the fact that applicants for positions as brakemen have been and still are compelled to serve an initial apprenticeship as students for 30 days, during which time they receive no compensation whatsoever—not even expense money to cover costs of meals and lodging while they are on the road.

"A survey of 'help wanted' advertisements reveals that from July 1, 1942, to the middle of February 1943 the company in question did not at any time advertise for brakemen, although other classifications of employees were sought. We trust that the public will not condemn all railroad workers as unregenerate cynics who suspect the current advertisements for brakemen may possibly have some connection with the efforts of the company to create the impression of a nonexistent manpower shortage in this classification to justify a repeal of the safety provisions of the full-crew law.

"It is not denied that shortages of skilled workers in certain categories outside of train service handicap railroad operation. Even in these cases, however, present difficulties are primarily due to lack of foresight on the part of company executives and not to union regulations. Several years ago the Brotherhood of Railroad Telegraphers foresaw the present shortage of men in their craft and made several proposals to the company for the training of men in this line of work. The company scorned all overtures and if honest would now blame themselves rather than our brotherhoods for the predicament in which they find themselves.

"We concede that little surplus office help is available. As evidence that this shortage is not critical, however, we wish to point out that all overtime is held to an irreducible minimum, and even on Washington's Birthday practically all office help was dispensed with because, under our contract, all work performed on that day would have to be at overtime rates.

"We need only say that the current rate of pay for freight handlers is 62 cents an hour to explain the difficulty of the company to obtain that type of workers.

"Charges of absenteeism among railroad train- and engine-service men are ridiculous when coming from antilabor propagandists. The same charges are libelous when enunciated by company officials, because they know that no men in any branch of train service can lay off without permission of the company. For many months that permission has not been granted without a statement from a doctor that the man making the request was ill.

"A recent allegation that train crews delay trains for as much as 2 hours for meals is incorrect. We make that statement without hesitation or apology. The records will show that day after day our members do the hardest kind of work in all kinds of weather for hours on end without respite or food. One train record picked at random reveals the case of a crew that was on the road for 10 hours and 56 minutes between terminals with no opportunity to eat. Similar cases occur daily where workers fight doggedly and persistently for many consecutive hours without thought of personal comfort to keep freight moving expeditiously to its destination. They have been doing their full duty, even while their employers were condemning them as 'feather bedders' in an attempt to discredit their unions and repeal laws designed for their safety.

"We can prove to any fair-minded man by train records that stupid operation has been responsible for 100 times as much delay in traffic as has been caused by union regulations. We can cite numerous instances of such stupidity, that not only delayed critically needed military supplies, but which were financially costly to brotherhood members as well.

"A classic example of managerial ineptitude—to use a polite word—occurred on December 22, 1942. A crew was called on duty to man extra No. 3156 at Corona at 8 a. m. In this train was a second engine and caboose, both with full crews, deadheading to San Bernardino. Eleven train-service men—on and off duty—were therefore on this train. It was held in the yards, with all its men and equipment, waiting for train orders until 11:15 a. m. After this inauspicious start it proceeded 17 miles to Highgrove, where it arrived at 12:05 p. m.

"At this station it picked up 2 more engines and 2 more cabooses, both with full crews totaling 10 men. Its complement of men and equipment was now 4 engines and 8 enginemen, plus 13 trainmen. Again, however, it was detained to await orders. It finally left Highgrove at 3:20 p. m. At Colton there was further delay and the conductor in charge called the chief dispatcher in San Bernardino from a public telephone, at his own expense, to advise him that he was being held up with 4 engines and 21 skilled and experienced train-service men. He was given immediate orders to proceed and finally arrived at San Bernardino at 6:40, where he found the yard practically blocked with trains unable to leave due to lack of engines. This crew was on duty for 10 hours and 50 minutes, covering a distance of 24 miles. Total unnecessary delay en route was 8 hours and 58 minutes.

"We feel that we would be derelict in our duty as representatives of railway employees if we did not issue this forthright denial of scurrilous and infamous charges that have been made against our members. Day and night, rain or shine, fog or sleet, burning hot or frigid cold, California's train-service men are setting new transportation records.

"They do their full duty under all operating conditions, switching cars under difficult and dangerous circumstances, riding on top of slippery boxcars to bring heavy freights down treacherous grades in safety. We commend to the people of California a recent statement of a representative of the Santa Fe who told a legislative committee that his company had no complaint against its train-service men and that in most cases he felt they were overworked.

"To those company representatives who are now in the State Capitol lobbying under the false guise of wartime necessity to break down standards that protect the lives of the public as well as our own we advise: Go home and rectify your managerial deficiencies. Give your men on the trains a pat on the back instead of a stab in the dark. Give them the opportunity and they will set amazing new transportation records of which they will be as proud as yourselves. If the time ever comes when it is reasonably necessary, you can rest assured that the railroad brotherhoods will make whatever revisions in their contracts are needed to expedite traffic and win the war. The men who run your trains are not looking for 'feather beds.' They deserve your cooperation. They resent as ingratitude your attacks on their patriotism and your efforts to selfishly endanger their lives through the repeal of a reasonable and necessary safety measure."

Our Duty Is To Serve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD an editorial written by Mr. H. A. Lawson, publisher

and editor of the Eagle Rock Sentinel, which not only conveys the sentiments of the people of my district but also represents that of the entire United States. I wholeheartedly concur in what Mr. Lawson has written:

OUR DUTY IS TO SERVE

Like a cry in the wilderness is that of the small businessman of the present day, to his Government, to give him a chance—a break. No one is more patriotic than he, no one more anxious to serve in the present emergency. But he cannot serve to the extent of his ability when he is under the fear that Government restrictions and the scarcity of labor is going to grind him down and force him out of business completely. Many of these businessmen are qualified for one thing and that is to operate their business. They are not under the selective service. They are not qualified to go into war industries. Forced out of business it is obvious they cannot help in financing the war. So what?

Everyone now realizes, we take it, the war must be won regardless of the sacrifices that must be made. We appreciate the value of manpower in our war industries. Our young men know it to be their duty to respond for military service for the duration. All realize that heavy taxes must be paid, that War Savings bonds must be invested in and that there will be other financial sacrifices. But the small businessman wants to know how he is going to do all these things when high wages in war industries are taking his help from him and competitors who are willing to pay skyrocketing wages are doing the same thing. He is forced to run his business—if he can run it at all—with incompetent and irresponsible help at unreasonable wages.

The businessmen in Eagle Rock are no exception to the general deplorable situation that faces them. Nor are the businessmen in Los Angeles, or all over the State of California. Four-fifths of all retail establishments all over the United States are small businesses. Today more than 40 percent of them are in lines of trade expected to decline as the war program expands. These are Government figures. The Department of Commerce has made an analysis of the situation. A special committee of the Senate has been studying it. In the meantime the small businessman is being ground—or plowed—under. Because we are at war is it necessary to destroy competitive private enterprise? Is that serving the purpose of winning the war? Better far to heed this anguished cry coming from the retail wilderness of our country by 100-percent Americans who wish ardently to serve.

This Bill Will Aid Small Burley Tobacco Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the House had an opportunity to pass today, and did pass by unanimous action, H. R. 2020 by adding to section 313 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the following language:

And provided further, That the burley tobacco acreage allotment which would otherwise be established for any farm having a burley acreage allotment in 1942 shall not be less than one-half acre, and the acreage required for apportionment under this proviso shall be in addition to the National and State acreage allotments.

This bill came to the House, as we are advised, with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Agriculture of the House. The record shows that most allotments of burley acreage for 1942 ranged from one-tenth acre up to 2 acres, the average being about 1.6 acres. This amendment, it is estimated, will add about 6,000 acres of burley tobacco, which is only 1⅓ percent of the present national allotment.

Growing of burley tobacco is one of the main sources of cash income of farmers. This small increase in acreage will give to the small farmers in the burley regions a larger income, and at the same time, we are informed, this increase of burley is necessary to meet the market requirements.

It is pointed out by the committee that this small increase in burley acreage will encourage the farmers in the production of more food and feed greatly needed for our war effort. In view of the great need of food, feed, and fibers for our war effort, a greater acreage of tobacco is not justified.

While this bill does not meet the wishes of many growers of burley tobacco, yet at the same time, the Committee on Agriculture and those engaged in the production of burley tobacco feel it is the fairest and best measure that can go through Congress at this time.

It is a great relief for the small growers who now have an allotment of one-tenth, two-tenths, or one-fourth acre, and I know it will help hundreds and hundreds of small burley growers in my congressional district and will not be unfair to other growers of burley tobacco in my State or in the Nation, and, therefore, it is a pleasure to give this measure my support.

The Tax Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, it is quite apparent from the many conversations we hear on taxes that there is not only a dissatisfaction with both the committee and Carlson bills, but there is a desire to find a solution to this pay-as-you-go idea. With that in mind, I am submitting this plan. I ask the membership to carefully study it, as it is fundamentally sound and is not a new, revolutionary idea.

To begin with, the President, in his message to Congress, has stated the need of more revenue. Everyone seems to agree on that point. Since the committee has apparently utilized every source of taxation, a rate increase seems to be the only avenue open. We are, therefore, expecting a new tax bill to be written with an increase in rates. If either the committee or the Carlson bill passes, it will be necessary to amend it later by increasing the rate of collection at the source.

Now, realizing this apparent necessity of increasing our rates, and the urgent request for more revenue, I suggest that we increase this withholding rate 5 percent, and, instead of designating it as a current increase, we term it our amortization payment. This additional amount will amortize our back taxes so that by January 1, 1947, or within a period of 3½ years, we will be on a current basis. This amount of increase will raise three and one-half billion dollars per year, revenue which is needed at this time, and it can also be considered by the taxpayer as a prepayment. This, in effect, is the equivalent of a hidden reserve.

The same problems or adjustments applicable to this plan, because of fluctuating incomes, are likewise applicable to the Carlson and committee withholding plan. They are definitely problems which can be handled by regulation.

Under no circumstances can this be called a doubling-up process unless the Ways and Means Committee definitely does not increase our rates and does not present a new revenue bill.

Oregon Proud of Its Own Farm Labor Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the State of Oregon, a portion of which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, has great agricultural resources. The Cascade Mountains running north and south through the State naturally divide its terrain into two great areas totally different in characteristics and in the adaptability to agricultural production. The western portion lying between the Cascades and the Pacific Ocean is favored with much heavier rainfall and much of it is peculiarly adapted to the dairying industry. It is of an equable temperature, with open winters, and the lowlands, valleys, and coastal areas are carpeted with nutritive grasses suitable for grazing of dairy herds. The eastern portion of the State, much of it higher tablelands, with small rainfall except in the winter months, is particularly adapted to the growing of grains such as wheat, barley, and oats. Much livestock is raised in this portion of the State by reason of large grazing areas, together with suitable lands for the production of forage for winter feeding.

My State has been hard hit by the enforcement of the various rationing orders which have severely affected agricultural industries. Many of the experienced

farm hands have left the farms, lured by high wages and more attractive surroundings in war industries, or called directly by the draft into the armed services. We have also suffered by reason of the sharp restrictions in agricultural machinery and in the inability to secure protein feeds such as cottonseed meal and other like products necessary for maintenance of dairy herds and the poultry industry. Many operators of dairy farms have had to send their dairy herds to the butcher's block, being unable to secure farm labor and to dispose of their dairy products at a price to meet the cost of production. Our people, however, in Oregon are taking in their stride these severe restrictions on their freedom of action and are willing to suffer in common with all of our people in the United States and to make every sacrifice necessary to bring success to our armed forces. Mr. Speaker, I do most urgently plead with the Congress and the agency heads in charge of these farm problems that immediate action be taken to solve these problems and avoid a complete break-down in our food supplies. We must see to it that sufficient farm labor and machinery are provided and prices fixed for farm produce which will return to the farmers cost of production and a fair return for their labors.

We have in the State, I am glad to say, adopted a program of our own which is helping to solve the farm problem. We cannot go alone without Government cooperation. A very interesting discussion of this program appeared in the Washington Post of the Sunday issue, March 21, written by Agnes E. Meyer, which under authority heretofore given I include as a part of these remarks. The article to which I refer is as follows:

OREGON PROUD OF ITS OWN FARM LABOR PLAN—STATE GETS BEHIND DRIVE TO TEND, HARVEST CROPS; VOLUNTEERS ARE EFFECTIVE

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

SALEM, OREG.—Will anything make the Washington war lords realize what their quarrels, their indecision, and their arbitrary behavior are doing to this country? The people are loyal to the President, but they are confused and unhappy about the kind of leadership they are getting. A feeling of uncertainty and insecurity exists in every walk of life, especially among the young people. Where are we going?—is the unanswered question that haunts their minds.

Let us consider the dilemma in which the farmers of Oregon find themselves.

For the past 3 years the State leaders, from the Governor to the local county committees, have been working on a well-organized Statewide plan, coordinated under the local United States Employment Service, for the recruitment and allocation of workers to produce and harvest the crops of the entire State.

The plan was so successful that the farmers of this State harvested every single crop without loss in spite of the labor shortage.

Since last December, all local Government agencies, the Department of Education and hundreds of voluntary agencies have been hard at work, under the leadership of the State Agricultural Advisory Committee, to perfect this plan. They are all set to go.

ALMOST DESPERATE

Imagine the state of mind into which these farmers are thrown when they read a different preliminary release in their papers every day, in which Senator Snooks, or Secretary Wickard, or some other potentate says that this or that or another bureaucratic set-up will be formed to take charge of the agricultural manpower situation in their State.

The latest report says that the extension service of the State college is to have the responsibility for farm-labor placement. The Salem paper, the Oregon Statesman, says the whole chaos is the result of "the disorder and rivalries in Washington."

The farmers are alarmed to the point of desperation, but the officials who have worked out the Oregon plan with the help of thousands of subsidiary organizations are keeping calm. Mr. L. C. Stoll, State manpower commissioner, Mr. Emory Worth, head of the United States Employment Service, and Mr. J. J. Fisher, chairman of the Governor's agricultural committee, which includes representatives of the principal agricultural interests from every section of Oregon, are quietly determined that nothing shall interfere with the agricultural interests of the State.

DON'T WANT NEW PLAN

They are judicial in temper, very sure of themselves, very confident that whatever Washington decides they can cooperate by making an adaptation of these orders and channeling them through the United States Employment Service. But they have their hands full calming the farmers from one end of the State to the other as to the outcome of the situation. "If we have a new plan forced upon our State now," said one member of the committee, "it would be disastrous, for it would sabotage a program that has been successful and substitute nothing but confusion and chaos."

Oregon does not want any new elaborate offices set up, either under the Federal Security Administration or the Agricultural Extension Service.

Oregon is asking the Senate to withdraw any funds that it wishes to allocate to a new agency and earmark those funds for the United States Employment Service, under whose direction the recruitment and placement of workers in the producing and harvesting of crops in Oregon was so successful last year.

STATES ITS POSITION

The State agricultural advisory committee has just issued Resolution No. 2 to the United States Employment Service for Oregon, which reads more like a declaration of independence:

"Whereas directives have been issued from Washington, D. C., to several agencies giving them responsibility for recruitment, placement, and training of farm labor which are contrary to the whole successful fulfillment of farm labor needs, as carried out in 1942; and

"Whereas the farmers of Oregon are in a state of confusion and the entire plan is in the process of distintegrating to the point that it will be impossible to produce and harvest crops in an orderly fashion in 1943 after every assurance was given that the Oregon plan would not be disturbed; and

"Whereas complete detailed plans for recruitment and placement of farm labor in 1943 have been outlined by the United States Employment Service in cooperation with other agencies and civic organizations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Federal Food Administrator, and the Secretary of Agriculture be requested to immediately inform all agencies concerned that the Oregon plan for recruitment of farm labor throughout the United States Employment Service will be carried out in 1943 the same as in 1942, and that no further directives will be issued from Washington interfering with the Oregon plan of recruitment and placement of farm workers; and be it further

"Resolved, That the complete responsibility for recruitment and placement of farm labor continue to be the responsibility of the United States Employment Service in cooperation with other agencies in order to avoid confusion, waste of public moneys by duplication of effort, and expansion of unnecessary personnel."

HOW PLAN OPERATES

What is this plan that worked so successfully that Oregon is up in arms at the thought of being upset by Washington?

It depends primarily on the most minute research supplying the necessary data concerning acreage of crops, estimated production, and starting dates, and livestock numbers for each county, prospective yields, and production, seasonal development for crops and harvesting dates. This information is the basis for a well-ordered program of farm labor recruitment and placement.

In other words, if a farmer comes in to the Employment Service and says that he needs 1,000 workers, the Employment Service can look at the map, estimate his needs exactly, and say to him, "You get 50" or whatever else the records show to be necessary.

They also have the exact data on labor requirements by operations. This information was used last year by the Employment Service throughout the State to determine in advance the approximate number of persons that would be needed for the various agricultural crops from planting time through harvest.

LABOR COMMITTEES USED

Farm labor subcommittees were established during the spring of 1942 in all counties having major farm labor problems. The Extension Service and the Oregon State College collaborated with the Employment Service in the planning and setting up of the committees to tie in the farm labor problems in every county with the activities of the Federal Employment Service, the County War Board, the Land Use Planning Committee, and the Agricultural Planning Committee.

All State agencies also cooperated on such details as suggestions on sanitary conditions, wages, and hours of work in agriculture.

The State department of education cooperated in many instances by postponing the opening of secondary schools, by lending aid through its superintendents and teachers, and by advising students of the urgent need for the assistance of youth in harvesting crops.

Church groups, civic bodies, chambers of commerce offered their services or assisted in recruiting their own members at peak periods of labor demand.

Newspapers and radio stations throughout the State gave wholehearted support to the program and contributed much space and time in advising the public of agricultural labor needs. The whole State was organized into neighborhood groups headed by wardens—an organization similar to what is called the block plan—to bring out every last available volunteer.

WOMEN ALSO AID

A State-wide mobilization of womanpower was also organized. County-wide committees appointed subcommittees in every city and community. All the women were registered with the understanding that they might be called to enter the labor market at any time to prevent crop losses. This mobilization of women was followed almost immediately by the registration of school children throughout the State.

There were many variations in the program from county to county. In Ontario County, for example, in the beet area, every shop was closed until 1 o'clock so that all the clerks could help with the beet thinning. The beauty shops had signs in the windows:

"Will be back at 1. Thinning beets. Why aren't you?"

The courthouse, the barbers, the schools, and the county judge all had teams competing against each other. Books could be writ-

ten about the different ideas that were brought up to comb the towns for more and more workers. When they were good, the employment service encouraged them all. There were unworkable ideas, too—so many of them that it was hard to keep the fires put out.

COURSE OF STUDY

In cooperation with the agricultural labor subcommittees, a group of teachers at Salem prepared a course of study of Oregon's agricultural economics for presentation to the school children.

This study course emphasized the value of the crops produced in the various counties, and the proper methods employed in harvesting.

More than 10,000 young people from the fifth grade through high school took the course, and 11,000 young people in one county, under 18 years of age, were actually referred to seasonal agricultural jobs. School platoons were recruited in the schools by the teachers, who acted as leaders. The record kept of their earnings proved that their contribution to the harvest effort was an important one.

The leadership of the school children was a problem last year. Many parents, especially in Portland, which is the largest recruiting area in the State, refused to let their children go as they feared that the children might not be adequately protected.

More complete enrollment of school children is the big advance planned this year. The State committees on welfare and child care have become important in the scheme to acquaint the mothers of safety measures provided for the platoons.

Sometimes not only the children but the mothers or even the entire families go to pick hops, berries, and beans.

GETS $10,000-A-YEAR MAN

When the canneries were hard pressed, white-collar workers, after they had finished their regular jobs, went on the night shift to save the pear crop. Office women and professional workers who had never before sought employment in processing establishments worked during their vacation periods throughout the canning season.

A manager of a very prominent business spent his vacation drying prunes for a harassed farmer. That farmer, not knowing the story of his worker, naturally swears by the Employment Service that was able to find him such a fine workman. He never knew that his hired man draws $10,000 a year. Bookkeepers, stenographers, and mill hands picked beans and hops and peaches.

So thorough was the publicity program that farmers did not necessarily have to appeal to the Employment Service for workers. The whole State was stirred up and workers turned up everywhere right out in the country, looking for work to do.

EXPECT MORE WORKERS

This year the agriculture committee says that it can do the job again. In fact, the members feel that they learned a great deal last year and are in a better position to make a success of the plan than last year.

The warden system has been thoroughly organized and they expect to find more workers than ever. Moreover, they are well pleased with the last war directive that anyone with an agricultural background will be deferred if he goes back to agricultural work.

Oregon is in a good position to take advantage of this directive because it has occupational questionnaires in every local employment service office, which gives every man's history. Furthermore, they say that they will call the shipyards for 2,000 or 3,000 agricultural workers if necessary, with the cooperation of the Manpower Commission.

GO BACK TO FARMS

The shipyards last month lost 1,000 employees, who are voluntarily returning to their farms. Many were granted a leave of absence by the Kaiser Co. The intricate Statewide organization is all set to go, and the leaders are determined that no decisions in Washington shall be permitted to throw their State into confusion at a moment when the spring planting has to begin. They claim that it would be a disaster to the whole Nation.

This claim is no idle boast. In the Pendleton-Walla Walla-Athena area, for example, there are 60,000 acres of peas which supply one-sixth of all the canned peas in the United States.

In addition, Oregon is one of the largest growers of berries and other small fruits and the largest hop-growing State in the country.

The sugar-beet industry has increased since 1941 to a point where labor has become a problem.

READY FOR SHIFTING

The acreage of potatoes in 1942 reached a high of 21,000 acres. The State also had a big pear area and 2,200 acres of snap beans, for which the labor demand is heavy during 6 weeks.

The United States Employment Service has its plans made to shift groups of workers from one part of the State to the other if necessary, and it has also obtained permission to obtain Japanese workers from the concentration camps for "stooped" labor, such as thinning beets.

"The United States Employment Service has our complete confidence and cooperation," said Mr. J. J. Fisher, speaking for 28 of the State's leading dairy, livestock and other agricultural associations.

WANT SAME PLAN

Mr. L. C. Still said to me, "Oregon's plan for agricultural placements and recruitment was so successful last year in harvesting every last crop without loss that no other plan should be substituted for it. It should be strengthened and used again. Any other substitute at this late date would only be confusing and might prove disastrous. If any changes are made now the responsibility for loss of crops will rest upon other shoulders and not upon the agricultural leaders of Oregon."

The State Agricultural Advisory Committee has had the cooperation of Senator MCNARY in all of its endeavors. Mr. Harold Barnett, president of the Athena Pea Growers Association, whose headquarters are at Pendleton, was especially emphatic in his comments about the State's popular Senator:

"All the home folks, without exception, think that Senator MCNARY has made an invaluable contribution to the development not only of our great agricultural interests, but in securing for the State its many new war industries and shipbuilding yards. He has been especially helpful in making our very difficult adjustments to the war situation go along in an orderly way."

The Oregonians stick together and work together as a State, with splendid unity, and a fine spirit of cooperation. The threat to their agricultural plan has only drawn them closer together.

The farmers resent bitterly the uncertainty that Washington has thrown into the situation and though even these Oregon farmers, being farmers, sometimes have individual points of view, now they are one and all getting together as a matter of self protection. The officials are all objective and reassuring in their point of view. One of them said: "If it didn't threaten production, I'd say to Washington, 'Go ahead—you do it,' but we have to think about our families, our counties, our State and our country and, therefore, we are all hoping that Washington will trust the practical people on the ground and let us do what we think is best."

Association of Free Germans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the very interesting and important program of the Association of Free Germans, Inc.:

DEMOCRATIC GERMANS SPEAK

The Association of Free Germans is a group of responsible Germans—composed of all democratic political parties—incorporated under the laws of New York State on November 29, 1941. Its certificate of incorporation, together with the names and addresses of the incorporators, has been registered with the Department of State of the United States as required by law.

It is the purpose of the members of the association to cooperate with all of the agencies of the United States Government in the prosecution of the war and in the solution of problems rising out of the war situation. It is their desire to serve the democratic cause especially by crystallizing democratic thought among Germans wherever they may be. As democratic citizens speaking the German language and thus being in a position to appeal to the German people, they feel they can play an effective part both during the war and in the period immediately following it.

They feel that the time has come for them to make their appearance before the American people and to present their ideas with regard to the reorganization of Germany during the post-war period. As collaborators in the activities of the Weimar Republic, they have devised a sketch of a second German republic which, in their opinion, will eliminate the weaknesses which permitted the rise of Hitler, and which will be appropriate to solve the social evolution which is expected. This sketch is herewith presented to the statesmen of the United Nations and to the people of the Allied countries.

NEW YORK CITY, *October 1942.*

FOR THE FREE GERMANY OF TOMORROW

The Association of Free Germans, Inc., confident that complete victory will reward the efforts and sacrifices of the United Nations, trusting that this victory will bring freedom to the German people, which is now oppressed by Hitler and his henchmen, as well as to the rest of the world, deeply convinced that the collaboration of the free German people is indispensable for the peaceful development of Europe and the world in the spirit of the Atlantic Charter, determined not to spare any sacrifice in the struggle for freedom, will strive for the realization of the following aims in Germany:

I. True democracy

The German people will build a free republic.

The second German republic shall establish democracy in Germany firmly and permanently, and make sure that Germany never again shall be subjected to a dictatorship of any description. The state shall serve the interests of the people. It shall maintain peace through the authority of law and provide for the people of the second German republic the "four freedoms"—freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from fear, and freedom from want.

II. On the morrow after the removal of Nazi tyranny

The National Socialist rule shall be completely uprooted. All laws, decrees, and measures of the Nazi government and its functionaries, which were aimed at the furtherance of the Hitler regime, shall be declared null and void. All the Hitler annexations, including those masked as Anschluss, will be repealed. If any foreign territories are still occupied, they will be promptly returned to their status quo.

Newspapers, radio, and motion pictures will be purged from the enemies of democracy. The policies applied to these institutions will be governed by democratic principles.

All Germans, regardless of race, color, creed, or political opinion, are entitled to the exercise of all the rights of citizenship, except people who have actively participated in the Nazi system of oppression. They shall be deprived of such rights, for they have forfeited their claim to live under a democratic form of government by promulgating and furthering a totalitarian form of government. Attempts to overthrow the democratic form of government in the future will be checked by adequate agencies to be established by the Government, and all such attempts shall be repressed with utmost energy.

The crimes committed by the Nazis and their henchmen in Germany or in the victimized countries will be punished as criminal acts against the German people and the peace of the world. A speedy trial of the criminals shall clear the situation and establish a warning example for the future.

Damage inflicted by the Nazis upon individuals or minority groups shall be repaired within the limits of possibility.

III. Influence on youth

The Second German Republic shall educate the young people to be loyal citizens of the democratic state. With this end in view, care for and education of the younger generation shall be completely reformed. Youth shall be taught the appreciation of cultural values, shall learn to believe in right rather than might, in tolerance rather than persecution, in respect for the sanctity of human life, in the binding force of a pledged word, in the conscientious observation of agreements and treaties. The Fuehrer legend shall be destroyed by bringing to light the appalling facts of the Hitler terror.

IV. Economic democracy

The groups and classes which provided the strongholds for pan-German militarism and imperialism will be permanently reduced to impotence. To break their power, they will be deprived of their economic basis (heavy industry, other industrial monopolies—for instance, I. G. Farbenindustrie—and large agricultural estates).

The national socialist policy of autarchy, which served the purpose of war and brought starvation upon the German people, will be abolished. Within the future economic organization of the world, the German republic will work for a restoration of unrestricted international exchange of goods. The German republic will participate with all its resources in international economic planning in order to secure economic and financial stability and protect the nations from misery and from the catastrophic effects of depression. In her domestic economic policy, Germany will try to realize the same aims on the national level.

V. Return into the community of nations

The German Republic will collaborate without any reservation with her neighbors and all other nations in the reorganization of Europe. German economic and technical ability shall create works of peace, among which the reconstruction of territories destroyed by war or plundered by the Nazis shall have priority. The German republic will consider it a proper and natural task to participate in this effort of reconstruction with all available resources. The supply of goods and services for this purpose must be so organized as to make all profiteering by individuals or groups impossible.

In order to safeguard the common interests of Europe, the German republic will fit the solution of her own economic and transportation problems into a plan for the whole continent. The republic will make sure that Germany's production and transportation system will never again serve purposes of aggression.

The German republic will carry out the complete disarmament and demilitarization of the German people, as the primary condition for the establishment and protection of peace which all nations desire.

The new German republic shall take its place in the family of nations as a state based on law and shall participate in the measures to safeguard the peace, for the good of the German people and all mankind.

Government Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. C. F. Byrns, which appeared in the Fort Smith Times-Record, of Fort Smith, Ark., on March 18, 1943, as follows:

OFF THE RECORD

(By C. F. Byrns)

Americans are learning in this war that Washington direction of the intimate details of their lives bogs down.

Most of us have always believed with Jefferson that "that government is best which governs least." But we never were quite so sure of it as we are now, after watching the performance of a central government fumbling with multitudinous controls which affect the lives of people in every hamlet, far remote from the National Capital.

All of us are accepting Government controls in the war period because all of us recognize that stricter controls are essential in time of war. The experience we are having with them will be infinitely valuable to us when the war is over. We will be thoroughly convinced that this system won't work and we shall take the first opportunity to move back in the direction of a government which governs as little as possible.

Every absurd regulation which a Government bureau attempts to put in force is a blessing in disguise, since it adds to the public conviction that we cannot operate permanently under such a system.

The latest example of impractical regulation is the announcement that farmers who consume their own foods raised on their own farms are supposed to tear coupons out of their ration books for all the rationed foods they use. If anybody expects any considerable number of farmers to do that, he is kidding himself. Another regulation says that farmers who sell foods on the ration list to individual consumers are supposed to take up ration-book coupons from their customers. Technically and logically, that may make sense. As a practical matter it doesn't. It is merely another regulation which will be widely ignored.

The most efficient controls which have developed are those which are exercised by local authority. The most inefficient are those which are exercised entirely in Washington. Many instances might be cited.

Gasoline rationing is an outstanding example. The rationing of gasoline for passenger cars is in the hands of local rationing boards, which operate under general principles, but with considerable discretion to deal with local situations with common sense. Gasoline rationing for commercial and farm trucks has been handled by the Office of Defense Transportation. The policies have been made up in Detroit. Little authority has been given to State agencies of the Office of Defense Transportation. The staff of the State agencies of Office of Defense Transportation is small. The result was unreasonable and apparently arbitrary allowances of gasoline for commercial and farm trucks which took weeks to straighten out.

The War Production Board is steadily increasing the authority of its local representatives to deal with the multitude of details which affect business enterprise in the country. Its program has improved in efficiency as authority has been decentralized.

The latest change in the War Production Board's workings affects applications for priorities for scarce materials. Originally all priority applications had to clear through Washington. Since March 15 applications are filed first with the local War Production Board office, like the district office in Fort Smith, where they will be checked to see that they are in proper form. Then they go to the Kansas City regional office, which now has authority to pass on them up to $100. Only those involving larger amounts will go on to Washington. After April 15 the Kansas City office will handle applications up to $500. Already local offices have emergency authority up to $100, and it is probable authority will be extended local offices to handle all applications of $100 or less, which constitute about 60 percent of applications.

So long as we must have Federal Government controls over details of our lives, authority should be delegated to local officials so far as possible. When the necessity for controls ends we shall swing back sharply toward the free economy which has made America great.

The Father of a Williams County Soldier Speaks His Piece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MONTGOMERY, MICH., *March 16, 1943.*

Hon. CLIFF CLEVENGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is to inform you that we are against appropriating any money for the triple A. We farmers don't have to be paid a check from Washington to be patriotic. Just see that we farmers get a fair price for what we produce and we will produce what is wanted.

Our 19-year old son is in the armed forces and don't think for a minute that we will let

him and our neighbors' sons down. My wife and I and our two sons, 12 and 16, are going to produce more pork, beef, dairy, and poultry this year. We farm 205 acres and we will have to work this spring and summer from 14 to 16 hours a day, and we can do it. We don't have to be paid a check from Washington every time we turn around.

If Congress wants to do a good deed, give that $100,000,000 to the boys that are fighting in the sands of Africa and the jungles of the Pacific.

Do away with the triple A and send the army of Agriculture Adjustment Administration fellows that are in every county seat back to the farms to work where they belong They have farmed in swivel chairs long enough.

Very truly yours,

WALTER M. TOWERS.

War and Peace—And Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of March 21, 1943:

WAR AND PEACE—AND FOOD

Ex-President Herbert Hoover's latest speech on the deepening food crisis had a note of increased urgency in it. It is easy to see why Mr. Hoover grows more worried about our wartime food supply He is worried because it is getting late in the day, 1943 cropwise, and our rulers seem unaware of how late it is.

This particular speech was made a few nights ago at Des Moines, Iowa, in the middle of the country's breadbasket. The occasion was the Midwest Governors' Conference, called by Governor Hickenlooper, Iowa, and attended by Governors Green, Illinois; Schricker, Indiana; Kelly, Michigan; Donnell, Missouri; Bricker, Ohio; and Sharpe, South Dakota, and by Representatives of Governors Schoeppel, Kansas; Stassen, Minnesota; Moses, North Dakota; and Goodland, Wisconsin. All these are Republicans except Schricker and Moses.

War Production Board Chairman Donald M. Nelson, War Manpower Commission Chairman Paul V. McNutt, and Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard were invited, but all sent their regrets. Mr. Hoover nevertheless managed, as usual, to get down to bedrock, and to unroll some most ominous facts and figures.

THREE-WAY FOOD DRAIN

"Food," said Mr Hoover, "serves on both the home and the foreign fronts. We have not only the job of feeding ourselves, but also our allies And if we would have peace after the war instead of the anarchy of starving Europe, we must be prepared to meet that also."

How is this preparation coming along? Mr. Hoover's answer is: Not well; not well at all.

Before this war, he points out, we had ceased to be a big food-surplus country: "With the exception of the extraordinary harvest of 1942, we were on balance of all foods an importing country." Crops equal to the 1942 record breakers are not expected in 1943.

Yet the drain on our food supplies will be bigger than in 1942. We are blockaded by the Japs from vegetable-oil supplies equivalent to the fats produced by eight to ten million hogs per year. War alcohol manufacture is eating into our grain reserves. We are shipping more and more food to our lend-lease clients all around the world. There are other drains on our food supply, but these are the main ones.

CUTTING OUR OWN THROATS

In the other war, Mr. Hoover recalled, we licked a similar problem, though a much smaller one, and licked it decisively.

We voluntarily reduced our own food consumption, and increased food production by keeping an adequate number of men on the farms. By these measures, we were able to push up our food exports from ten to thirty billion pounds a year—"to carry Britain, Italy, France, and Belgium on our food back." We were also able to save Europe from famine and chaos after World War No. 1.

This time the picture up to now is nowhere near as bright. We are draining men off the farms and into the armed forces and the war plants. Farmers are unable to get enough farm machinery, because farm-implement makers rank too low on priorities lists. Complicated price-ceiling systems are keeping many farmers from being able to make any money on what they produce, so that many of them are curtailing production or stopping it altogether.

If we go on much farther in this direction, we can bring crippling food shortages on ourselves, fail to meet our lease-lend commitments, and fall down completely on the job of feeding large parts of the world as a stopgap measure against famine, pestilence, and anarchy after the war.

SUGGESTIONS BY HOOVER

Mr. Hoover's proposed remedies are simple, if we would only adopt them.

He wants food supervision consolidated under the Secretary of Agriculture instead of being split up among a dozen or so jealously competing agencies. He wants all farmers given a chance to make fair profits. He recommends rounding up and training emergency farm labor on a systematic basis, as against hit-or-miss use of enthusiastic but untrained children and women. And he wants a reasonable number of farm boys with experience deferred from the draft, plus furloughs at harvest time for farm-trained soldiers to go back to the farms and help bring in the crops.

It is a pity that the wisdom of Herbert Hoover is not utilized by the Government in the winning of this war.

Assistance to the Aged People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, during my service in the House of Representatives, it has been my privilege to sponsor the Townsend plan for old-age pensions and to serve as chairman of the Townsend Steering Committee in the Congress. I subscribed to the principles of the Townsend program before the war and still believe they are sound and applicable to our wartime economy and social order.

Our first obligation as citizens is to do only those things that will win the war at the earliest possible moment. One important factor that enters into the successful prosecution of the war is morale. Anything that will inspire our armed forces and civilians to greater effort must be recognized as an important war measure. I believe the Townsend plan bill, H. R. 1649, now before Congress would contribute to the morale of the fighting forces if enacted into law.

It would provide a monthly income for those qualifying over 60 years, sufficient to keep them in decency. Certainly the soldier boy fighting on one of the many battle fronts throughout the world would fight with greater determination if he knew that his parents, his grandparents were provided with the necessities of life. He would feel that a country that recognizes the welfare of its senior citizens was a country worth fighting for.

If the Townsend plan bill, H. R. 1649, were in operation today, thousands of boys in the war service would be relieved of the worry and mental harassment caused by the plight of their folks back home. It would serve a definite purpose in stimulating morale, so necessary and important in our war effort.

Star Gazing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Colorado Springs Gazette on the present international situation, as follows:

STAR GAZING

Senator BALL, of Minnesota, told the Senate on Tuesday that uncertainty as to the postwar policies of Russia, China, and Great Britain "stems directly from the fact that no one knows yet what the attitudes of the United States Senate, whose consent is essential under the Constitution, will be." Accordingly he proposed that the Senate should go on record as favoring "an organization of peace-loving nations of the world with authority and power to stop any future attempts at military aggression."

That is the world police force resolution, and while it may serve the purpose Senator BALL has in mind, it hardly fits his argument.

If there is any uncertainty as to the postwar policies of Russia, China, and Great Britain, it must exist in the minds of Washington's starry-eyed internationalists, and even that may be doubted. New Deal feeling, it appears, is less one of uncertainty than of misgiving, which is not admitted. Indeed, there is reason to believe that Britain's Foreign Minister, Anthony Eden, is in this country precisely for the purpose of bringing Russia into line if possible.

Stalin has indulged in no star gazing at any point in this war. He manifestly does

not look upon the four freedoms as an objective and he has carefully refrained from mentioning any post-war international order. To the contrary, he has called for a Russian victory, and his press has indicated what is considered Russian interest by warning that allied preoccupation with the future of such territories as the Baltic states and Bessarabia is premature. For that matter, Stalin himself has gone a step further to insist that this war is against nazi-ism and not the German people, which becomes doubly significant in view of the fact that it was Communist infiltration in Germany that produced nazi-ism.

On this basis Russia's post-war policies seem reasonably clear, as respects Europe at least. The Russians are the most numerous people on that continent, with the Germans next, and it is improbable that outside domination will be accepted even in the name of international order.

Mr. Churchill has been even more explicit with regard to Britain's post-war policy, and if he is not fully understood in Washington it is because Washington doesn't want to listen. Mr. Churchill has said that he is fighting for Britain and Britain's empire and that it is his purpose to safeguard the one and hold together the other. Mr. Eden will be glad to corroborate this if corroboration is needed.

Nor has Chiang Kai-shek at any time been reticent in speaking China's purpose or remiss in serving it. He was engaged in driving the foreign devils out before the Japanese marched in. The foreign devils were in the treaty ports while another was appearing over the horizon in the form of the Chinese Communist army. That army of the north, fighting Japan, is still opposed to Chiang Kai-shek. The nationalist army, thus confronted on one side, must be concerned that what it retrieves on the other be not handed back to those who formerly controlled it or otherwise be allowed to slip out of Chinese hands.

What the United States Senate may think of these things is a matter of little practical importance and what the present Senate may do, lacking specific proposal, is a matter of no consequence. To endeavor to commit the country in advance to a generalized course of action is futile, and to turn from the realities of war to argue the abstractions of peace is an inanity that the country will not long tolerate.

Some Dangers of Universal Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following letter:

LIBERTY NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
Birmingham, Ala., March 19, 1943.

Hon. CARTER MANASCO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANASCO: I have just had an opportunity to read the Austin-Wadsworth bill, known as Senate bill No. 666. I do not know whether or not you have as yet read this bill but, after you have read it, I believe you will agree with me that it should only be passed if its passage is absolutely necessary to win the war. I say this for the reason that to my mind it will take away the last vestige of individual liberty.

It does not seem to me from what little I know of production in this country that there is any necessity for such a bill. I know that when we hear of strikes, hear of absenteeism, hear of people refusing to work, that we are inclined to say, "Let's pass a law and make them work." This, however, I think, is a loose statement and does not represent the thinking of the American people.

It has been my understanding and belief that American industry with free capital and free labor has been doing an outstanding job. The President, on many occasions, has said that we are measuring up to expectations. Quotas are being reached and exceeded, the Army and Navy E is being awarded to hundreds of plants throughout the country, and we seem to be measuring up in a surprising manner to the job of becoming the arsenal of democracy.

If we admit that the Austin-Wadsworth bill is necessary, then we admit that free enterprise and labor are not as good as Government-controlled industry and slave labor. Certainly, I do not believe, and I am sure you do not believe, that the time has come when we must admit this and resort to such measures as these.

I pray that that time will never come, for, in my judgment, if Senate bill No. 666 becomes the law, it would take away from the American people their freedom and would force them to work wherever they were ordered to work, for the pay that was prescribed and under the conditions that existed.

Theoretically, of course, it would contemplate that men and women would be placed where they could do the most good and given employment similar to that which they had previously had. Although I know the bill contemplates that labor would be drafted through local draft boards and that the rights of citizens would be protected under this plan, this might not happen, and there would be unquestionably a great many maladjustments. Even though the draft boards are local, they would have absolute control over the lives of all of us, and it seems to me that this is too much power to give to anyone or any committee.

The passage of the bill would be an admission that free enterprise and free labor cannot defeat a totalitarian government where people are slaves and the state operates the industry. It is inconceivable to me that government could long draft labor and order labor to work for an individual where the individual was making a profit. This would be similar to our old convict lease system in Alabama which was abolished, as you know, because of abuses. It was felt that it was unfair even to criminals to lease them out to a private operator.

It follows as night follows day that if the bill should pass, the Government would be forced to take over the operation of all businesses where people were being forced to work, and we would then have lost our American system in its entirety in that there would be no free labor and no free enterprise.

I know that the argument will be made that if we can draft men into the Army there is no reason why we should not draft men and women for work behind the lines. Personally, I do not think it is the same thing but if we are to do it, then it seems to me that men and women should be drafted just as they are drafted in the Army, paid the same thing that soldiers are paid, furnished with uniforms and treated as soldiers. Personally, I do not feel that there is any basis to an argument that men in the services will be better satisfied if people at home are also drafted and forced to work. The soldier would still feel that he was working harder and taking greater risks for $50 per month while the man at home was being paid many times that amount.

I apologize for writing you at this length. I do not know who is supporting the bill. I cannot imagine that labor would be in favor of it nor can I imagine that business and industry would favor it. Since it was introduced by a Republican I cannot think that it is an administration measure, but it seems to me to be so far reaching that every man should express himself on it. I have always felt that you were glad to have reactions from those of us at home who care to express ourselves on pending legislation.

I sincerely hope that if this bill ever comes before you for consideration that you will oppose its passage.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK P. SAMFORD,
President.

Our Food Supply and Its Relation to the Outcome of the War and the Peace After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Harold H. Stewart, Seattle, before the Toast Masters Club, of Seattle, March 8, 1943:

Since the dawn of history the greatest problem of mankind has been food.

First we must eat.

Living as citizens of the greatest producing Nation on earth, we of the present generation of Americans, take an ample food supply for granted.

As a matter of fact, for several years, the supermen of our New Deal, have carried on a procedure of actually destroying food and curtailing its production.

Strangely enough, this procedure has even been continued in the last 3 years, with most of the world at war, and with the recording of all history as proof, that the "beating of plows into swords" has always been followed by scarcity of foods.

Furthermore, other policies have been followed that have caused even a greater loss to our farm production than direct curtailment orders.

For instance, in a recent address, A. S. Goss, National Grange master, stated that the loss of labor by the farm to industry, due to the unbalanced wage situation between farm and industrial labor, was twice that caused by the draft.

Mr. Goss went on to say that the recent Presidential 48-hour industrial workweek order, with the provision for overtime after the first 40 hours, actually constituted a blanket per-hour wage increase of about 8 percent to all industrial labor not already receiving overtime. This fact, he said, further unbalanced the situation, and he added that early reports had already indicated an additional loss of labor from the farm to industry, because of the order.

Now the point has been reached in this country where the question of a possible food scarcity is no longer a subject for academic debate. It is already officially admitted that a scarcity exists and that a greater one is threatened.

A few days ago Secretary Wickard stated that even our much-heralded wheat supply can no longer be considered a surplus.

What does this situation mean with reference to the outcome of the war or to the peace after the war?

Napoleon said that "armies march on their bellies." In other words, wars are won with food. Think of our Civil War—the starving South and the well-fed North.

But let us not explore the possibility of losing the war; let us assume that we will win. Then, in that case, let us consider our already outstanding promise to feed the starving millions of Europe and Asia. With what?

Is there any doubt that the lives of millions of people in the world—and quite possibly even the survival of our Nation—depend on a greater production of food in this country in the immediate future than now appears likely of attainment?

Can there be any question but that it is imperative that immediate steps be taken to obtain, at all hazards, the maximum food production possible to this Nation—a production not limited by any consideration of protecting so-called labor gains, or of elections 2 years hence, or even a belated worry of inflation?

What can be worse than a lack of food? In fact, referring to inflation, doesn't scarcity cause inflation?

If additional food production is imperative, how are we to get it?

To my mind there is only one solution: Place the food producer on the same incentive level as that already given the producers of ships, airplanes, and other war materials.

Food production is admittedly suffering from lack of machines and fertilizers, and from a loss of labor by the draft, and to industry.

All right then, give the farmer equal priorities, equal draft deferment, and equal per hour wage earnings with those engaged in production of war materials; then, and then only, can the farmer be expected to be able to accomplish the task asked of him.

The Greatest Steal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because there is no legislative subject of more timely importance than the issue with which the editor of the Borger (Tex.) Daily Herald deals, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able editorial expression which appeared in the columns of that newspaper of Wednesday, March 17, 1943, an editorial which I can commend to the very careful consideration of the membership.

The editorial referred to follows:

THE GREATEST STEAL!

Here comes Banker Ruml, from New York, trying to tell the rest of the country what is good for it.

All he wants is to see that those who made millions during 1942, the year of the greatest war profits in history, get to keep every cent that they have added to their already fat pocketbooks—and he is going to get away with it, human nature being what it is, if we don't watch Congress.

There is nothing strange about the whole thing.

Government by direction or indirection from Wall Street is nothing new. Not satisfied with having a corner on the Nation's money, now Wall Street bankers want to get by without having to pay their 1942 income taxes.

Of course, all of this must be sugar-coated. It must be to help those poor, unfortunate workingmen who made decent wages for the first time during 1942, and who, being unused to receiving decent wages (the reasoning goes) simply didn't, or couldn't, lay aside part of their 1942 income to meet the taxes thereon.

Those same people don't tell you that those who made millions during 1942 could pay their 1942 income taxes without any trouble, regardless of whether they make another million or nothing during 1943.

These same people don't tell you that, any way it goes, the small taxpayer will pay just as much whether it is called 1942 income taxes or 1942–43 taxes or just plain current taxes.

What will happen to the swollen wartime profits made by both legitimate business and by those greedy, unpatriotic profiteers during 1942 is one of the things that the backers of the Ruml plan soft-pedal. In fact, they don't peddle the thought around where it might cause anyone to think about it.

And the big-time editors who were so quick to find fault with the laboring man during recent years, are not so quick to find fault with those Wall Street money grubbers who want to have Congress to forgive all 1942 income taxes.

The Republican Party is letting itself in for a big post-war headache, just in case their efforts succeed in putting over this, the greatest steal of all time, upon the United States Treasury.

When the boys come home, and millions of them will, they will, first of all, want to know how many war millionaires were made at their expense, while their buddies were being slaughtered in the name of something greater than the Wall Street dollar mark.

Veterans of this war will ask other questions—they will want to know who these millionaires are, and who helped them to avoid paying their 1942 income taxes that would have cut back most of their excess profits due to the war.

Yes—the Ruml plan may get so hot that those New York politicians who have raised it in their golden hothouse will gladly drop it—and if the Grand Old Party succeeds in dumping this baby into the lap of the American taxpayer, it could easily spell the doom of that party.

That the national commander of the American Legion came out openly in support of the Ruml plan without first consulting the membership of his organization, could just as easily bring upon the leadership of that great organization the charge of being procapital, a charge the Republican leadership has attracted to itself.

If there must be tax "forgiveness," in the name of common sense, don't forgive taxes on those millionaires well able to pay. Let Congress be reasonable in dealing with the small taxpayer—but don't ask your Congress to go into the business of making any more war-millionaires than necessary.

In the Wake of the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Evening Chronicle of March 5, 1943:

IN THE WAKE OF THE NEWS

The revolutionary report of the National Resources Planning Board, which has just been submitted to Congress by President Roosevelt, makes the issue crystal clear.

The American people are going to have to fight this war on two fronts: They are going to have to fight those who would destroy the American way from without—the Germans, the Japs, the Italians. And they are going to have to fight those who now blandly and openly propose to revolutionize the American way from within.

Here is the most vicious document of our times, a proposal sugar-coated with sweetness of expanded social security, which most everyone approves, buttressed by a proposed bill of rights containing, under the guise of a new liberalism, most of the things America always has stood for, the things most Americans have always enjoyed in ever-increasing degree.

The entire proposal verges on the absurd for the outstanding reason that it has been laid down by the very master minds who have been unable to bring orderliness and logic to the simplest issues of the moment—the very same family of brains which has made gasoline rationing the laughing stock of a Nation, has messed up the manpower problem so hopelessly, has fiddled and fumed until the farm and food situation has assumed the proportions of a crisis, has brought the country to the brink of a taxpayer's revolution.

Consider for a moment some of the items proposed:

One would have the Government virtually take over all railroads and transportation systems—in the face of the fact that American transportation has done an outstanding job under the greatest difficulties, in the face of all manner of handicaps, despite the record of Government operation during the last war and the horrible example of what Government operation can be as evidenced when Uncle Sam took over the business of carrying the mails by air a few years ago.

Another would have Washington run all the public utilities, although it has been amply demonstrated that the privately operated utilities have been the ones which have risen to the demands of war industry, have actually been called upon to help out the so-called power giants created in recent years at Government expense for just such emergencies as we now face.

Still another, of all things, proposes that the Federal Government take over rubber, blithely ignoring the now-accepted fact that had the Washington planners been so smart, we would not now be behind a rubber "eight ball" and that if private enterprise had been given its way, there would have long since been ample synthetic rubber for everyone who really needs tires and the like.

These self-same dreamers suggest, without cracking a smile, that the Government continue controls over production after the war, selecting plants that will continue in production, closing down others, apparently forgetting that their ill-considered plans have already produced dislocations of serious and major proportions and overproduction of certain implements of war.

Why, there appear to be no lengths to which these planners will not go. They even propose that in time to come every American man and woman who so chooses will be a college graduate at public expense.

Perhaps worst of all is the time chosen for the presentation of the plan to a Congress already harried by important and vexing matters. The result cannot help but add confusion to the chaos in Washington. It is

difficult to escape the suspicion that this was planned that way, too.

Here is something of such grave import that it should be considered seriously and at length by all Americans at a time when their minds are not cluttered with other matters. Instead, it is thrown into the hopper when such consideration is an utter impossibility; presented in such a way that no one can separate the good from the bad among its many phases.

It has been said that the report out-Beveridges the now-famous Beveridge plan for social security in Britain. From what can be seen at this writing, it out-New-Deals the New Deal, too.

The late Huey Long, who knew a lot about these things, was once asked, "Will we ever have fascism in the United States?" To which he replied, "Yes; but we will call it Americanism." Well, here it is.

If this plan of the National Resources Planning Board is accepted as presented, no American living today will be able to live his life as he or she has planned; the living standard of every person earning from $25 a week on up will be drastically lowered, perhaps for a lifetime. Everyone is going to have to pay through the nose if these dreams come true. Everyone will have to be regimented, regulated, controlled from birth to death.

The whole proposal, because of its timing, its content, and its sponsors, should be regarded with suspicion and distrust. It should be shelved until the people of America and the boys on the fighting fronts have a chance to sit down and plan their own future.

What are we fighting for, anyhow?

Arbitrary Grades

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Norfolk (Nebr.) Daily News:

ARBITRARY GRADES

Nebraska is getting a taste of what will happen if Washington takes it upon itself to substitute grades for private brands on processed foods. What Washington has done to Nebraska is to put a B-grade on our butter which has always carried the top 90 score standard.

The excuse for doing this is because it is made from sour cream, which, butter makers say, does not affect its quality. The arbitrary grading of our butter in the B or second class will cost the farmers of the State from $400,000 to $800,000 a year, it is estimated.

The legislature has protested, but as a regrading of all processed foods is proposed, its protest may have little effect.

Several years ago, when the West was interested in turning its cheap corn into sugar, the pioneers were handicapped by the fact that Washington insisted that sugar isn't sugar unless it is made from cane or beets. Corn sugar would have to be designated in such a way as to lead the consumer to believe he was getting a substitute and not real sugar. It will take a long time by public education to offset that ruling.

Now our butter suffers from the arbitrary standard set up by someone in the Agriculture Department. Next the housewife will be deprived of the privilege of buying by brand names she has found reliable, and will have to choose by grade markings fixed by arbitrary standards set up in Washington.

It is easy to see the damage that will be done by this proposed system, and it is a little difficult to understand what good will be accomplished.

Support for the Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Gallup poll on the Ruml plan:

RUML PLAN HAS STRONG SUPPORT WITH ALL GROUPS, POLL SHOWS

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., March 20.—If the American public has its way—and it usually does—Congress will sooner or later pass a pay-as-you-go income tax plan.

As a way of putting into effect a pay-as-you-go plan, the proposal of Beardsley Ruml has gained the overwhelming support of both Democratic and Republican income taxpayers.

EIGHTY-THREE AND EIGHTY-SEVEN PERCENT "YES"

In its most recent study, completed this week, the institute found Democratic income taxpayers throughout the Nation favoring the Ruml plan by virtually the same proportion as the Republican income taxpayers.

Based upon those persons who have formulated definite opinions regarding the Ruml plan, the results by parties are as follows:

"Do you favor or oppose the Ruml plan?"

	Percent
Favor:	
Democratic taxpayers	83
Republican taxpayers	87
Oppose:	
Democratic taxpayers	17
Republican taxpayers	13

Few proposals have gained such wide currency in recent weeks as the Ruml plan. Not only have most of the taxpayers of the country heard of the plan, but of those who have heard of it, the overwhelming majority have formed definite opinions for or against it.

While some have opposed the Ruml plan, claiming that big income taxpayers would get a better break than the small income taxpayers, there is actually little difference of opinion between those who pay income tax on larger incomes and those who pay income taxes on smaller incomes, on the plan itself, as the following table shows:

BY INCOME GROUPS

	Percent
Favor Ruml plan:	
Taxpayers in upper half	83
Taxpayers in lower half	86
Oppose Ruml plan:	
Taxpayers in upper half	17
Taxpayers in lower half	14

Analysis of the reasons given by taxpayers in support of the Ruml plan indicate that they view it as a simple and practical solution to the problem of putting income taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis. It is not a case of tax evasion.

HAVE NO COMPLAINT

Although more than 40,000,000 people were expected to file tax returns by March 15 and those liable for taxes had to pay higher rates than at any time in the history of the country, the great majority of income-tax payers have no complaint. A recent study found that a sizable majority of income-tax payers regard the current rates as fair.

Not only do the majority of American taxpayers favor the Ruml plan, but they also favor, overwhelmingly, its complement, the withholding taxes at the source.

LITTLE VARIATION

There are likewise no marked centers of opposition to the Ruml plan in any section of the country. The plan meets the same approval along the east coast as it does in the South, Central or Western States, as the following vote by sections shows:

Section	Favor Ruml plan	Oppose Ruml plan
	Percent	*Percent*
New England and Middle Atlantic: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, and Maryland	87	13
East Central: Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio	85	15
West Central: Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and North Dakota	81	19
South: Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, Georgia, and Texas	85	15
Mountain and far West: Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Idaho, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, and California	86	14

Slaughtering of Horses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of March 21 written by Mrs. Rhoda Christmas on the timely subject of horse meat in war:

RHODA CHRISTMAS SAYS

Horsemeat in time of war is nothing new now, nor was it as far back as 100 years ago. We also know that in case of necessity people have to resort to food which, in ordinary times, would be totally unacceptable. Europeans during severe days of devastation are being forced to eat even cats, rats, and dogs.

Horses, like dogs, through their constant association with humans, have an appeal which is founded upon true sincerity and loyalty, dependency, and protection. Hence, when we destroy that which has touched upon our very economic and spiritual value, there is bound to be a sense of great revulsion, even though pressing circumstances enforces the fact that self-preservation is the first law of Nature.

Because of this, horses are being slaughtered today for human consumption. The larger plants used for this purpose will be found mostly in the North and Central West, while some few are scattered scantily in the eastern areas. It is food and we have even

now felt the meat shortage. But here we might be looking at just one side of the picture. Conservation of food and the production of it are two fundamentals which, of course, insure frugality.

HORSES, MULES DIMINISH

Facts and figures bring to our attention that horses and mules are diminishing in the United States very rapidly. During a span of 22 years, from 1915 to 1937, there was a drop of 11,000,000 of these animals from existence. This can be attributed mainly to motorization, and revolutionizing of labor. Five years ago we had 11,342,000 horses and 4,460,000 mules. The preliminary census for 1942 shows there are now just 9,856,000 horses and 3,811,000 mules on our farms.

Farm mechanics are practically out for the duration of this war. And everybody knows either horse or motor power are essential in crop production. With the tractor and truck already gone for the time being, horses and mules are steadily on the decrease. While farms are at present stripped of labor, Americans will soon have to realize that food does not just grow. When manpower does finally relieve the paralyzed conditions of our farms, will there be enough animal power left?

It is a misconceived idea that only our worst animals are finding their way to these slaughterhouses. Yet it is natural to wonder how horses and mules can be produced to go upon the killing market? Cattle are so much cheaper in both the raising and upkeep, yet horse meat sells for far less. Certainly the breeders of the horse and mule are taking losses. And it can be readily assumed that these breeders are not only cutting down their rate of production, but are gradually terminating their efforts for production. No man can raise a horse or mule for what he can a cow or steer. Only a surplus of horses could warrant such an economic difference. And the figures certainly indicate that there is no surplus. The horses of quality which go to slaughter have been forced from the farms, and elsewhere, because of the high cost of food for maintenance, and the utter incapability of the farmer to produce such needs because of labor shortage.

SECRETIVE BUSINESS

It would seem then that we are using for food a more expensive animal to substitute for an inferior grade of meat, at a time when that animal would, and will, be of more material value in growing crops. Since the origin of the horse in its domesticity, before the time of Christ, it was not bred, nor developed as a source of meat supply. Through sheer necessity it has, from time to time, been used for food. Because of the horse's intrinsic value to man through the ages of his development, it might be well to consider this fellow in the most humane way when that day arrives for him to go to the slaughterhouse to further sustain the existence of mankind.

Reports of slaughtering horses disclose that the business is most secretive in the larger packing houses. Investigations reveal that not only some superior animals are winding their way up "the golden stairs" (which is the term used in speaking of the ramp which they traverse to be killed) but are most inhumanely treated before they are killed. The actual killing is quick, and as humane as possible. But it is the way these horses are treated before they are killed which is most nauseating and revolting to the spirit of any animal-loving American.

Horses, because of their domestic and even spiritual relationship with man, are not habitually treated as cattle. They have a much higher grade of intelligence and, if closely associated with man, have the same sense of loyalty and devotion as the dog. Consequently when truck and carload lots are brought in to be slaughtered, they are herded much in the same manner as cattle, and are, in many instances, jammed into pens to await destruction without food and water. They are handled entirely through the sense of fear. One place was so crowded for room, a sick horse had to stand in the killer's box overnight.

TAIL-GATE DROPPED

This box is devised like a standing stall, which permits the horse to walk straight in. A tail-gate is dropped behind him so he can't back out, and a barrier is in front to keep the animal perfectly still to be shot and his throat cut. The only way this horse could move was to pick up his feet and replace them in the same spot. On his head was a rope head halter which had worked across the horse's eyeball. The horse was already running a temperature, and, to add to his miserable state, was the agonizing rope searing a blinding irritation across the eye.

Like some people, some horses have keener senses. Those which portray some understanding of what is about to happen, are most pathetic.

The Tax Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star:

THE TAX REPORT

The arguments advanced by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee in its tax report lend strong support to the conclusion that only through adoption of the principle embodied in the Ruml plan can the income taxpayers be brought to a current basis.

The committee majority was in a difficult position. Its stated purpose was to "provide a method for the payment currently of individual income taxes." But it did not want to collect 2 years' taxes in 1 year, nor did it want to shift the tax base from 1942 to 1943 income. Thus was created the dilemma from which the committee majority, despite all the verbiage of the report, was unable to extricate itself.

From the nature of the arguments advanced, it appears that the majority was influenced by three main considerations—the fear that approval of the Ruml plan, or the modification known as the Carlson plan, might in some way benefit the wealthy at the expense of the poor; the apprehension that the revenue position of the Treasury might suffer at a time when we are faced with "the most frightful war" in history, and the belief that the "vast majority of the American people will not want to have their taxes forgiven."

In support of the first fear, the majority dwelt at length on the argument that abandonment of the 1942 tax base would mean a "benefit" of $854,000 to each of 60 persons with million-dollar incomes. This is a most unrealistic argument because of the simple fact—which the majority neglected to mention—that these individuals would pay as much or more in taxes if 1943 income were substituted for 1942 as the tax base. Much the same thing may be said of the concern for the Treasury's wartime revenue position. The facts are that, with the income tax based on 1942 income, the Treasury will get about $10,000,000,000. But with the base shifted to 1943 income, tax receipts would rise to approximately $13,000,000,000. This is not denied by the majority.

The third point, concerning what the people want, cannot be resolved by any resort to mathematics, but it seems clear enough that the committee majority has sadly misgaged public opinion. The latest Gallup poll shows, for instance, that 83 percent of the Democratic taxpayers and 87 percent of the Republicans want the Ruml Plan. And it is especially interesting to note that the plan was favored by a higher percentage of taxpayers in the lower range of incomes.

To these people the proposal of the committee majority will be disappointing. Under this plan—despite the majority's concern lest it do something for the rich while not helping the poor—only the well-to-do will be able to get on a pay-as-you-go basis. They would do it by paying 2 years' taxes in 1, with a discount on the levy on 1943 income. But all of those who cannot afford to pay 2 years' taxes in 1 year—certainly the great majority of the people—will be left to struggle along, forever in debt to the Government. This is a fact which should give strong support to the position of the Republicans who are supporting the Carlson bill, the only feasible pay-as-you-go plan now before Congress.

Windfalls Under Pay-As-You-Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, as it contains many well-considered comments upon much-discussed phases of the so-called Ruml skip-a-year's income-tax plan, I offer for inclusion in the RECORD of this day's proceedings as a part of my instant remarks, a letter which Mr. Frank H. Fayant, of Miami Beach, Fla., wrote to the editor of the Wall Street Journal, a communication which was printed in the columns of that paper on February 19 last.

The letter referred to follows:

WINDFALLS UNDER PAY-AS-YOU-GO

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

The two chief defects in the Ruml plan for income-tax collection are these:

1. It deprives the United States Treasury of some eight to ten billions of revenue from taxes on 1942 incomes.

2. It grossly discriminates between citizens in the canceling of these tax obligations, giving rich windfalls to taxpayers with abnormally large 1942 incomes, while unjustly penalizing those whose 1943 incomes exceed their 1942 incomes.

Mr. Ruml does not admit the first defect in toto. He says that while taxes would not be collected on 1942 incomes, much of the loss to the Treasury might be made up in the years to come by inheritance taxes on the estates of citizens who had had their 1942 taxes canceled. That is, for example, if you had a tax, say, of $1,000 on your 1942 income forgiven under the Ruml plan, you would carry this $1,000 in your bank account or investments throughout your life and hand it

down to your heirs, who would pay an inheritance tax on it.

In this way, says Mr. Ruml, a good part of the $10,000,000,000 of taxes forgiven for 1942 might come back to the Treasury. This diaphanous argument, mind you, is seriously made by no less an authority than the chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and the treasurer of one of the world's largest businesses. It fades into thin air when analyzed. It is not very good arithmetic, and plainly poor psychology.

The second defect, however, Mr. Ruml does admit. "We concede the fact," he says. "In answer we point out that no tax program will cut with the precision of a surgical knife. This is an imperfection of a minor order as compared with the great good that will be achieved." That is what Mr. Ruml told members of the House Ways and Means Committee when it was pointed out that a lot of war profiteers, Washington lobbyists, and fortunate big-money earners of 1942 would, under his plan, receive rich windfalls from the Treasury in the canceling of their taxes for the year.

Take, for example, one of those Washington go-getters, the contract chasers we have been reading about in the congressional investigations. If one of them cleaned up $500,000 last year by good footwork up and down Pennsylvania Avenue, he now owes the Government something like $415,000 for taxes. He may have this cached away in banks or gilt-edged securities, but, with the coming of the Ides of March, he will be handing it back to the Treasury at the rate of more than $100,000 a quarter. That is, if the Congress doesn't swallow the Ruml plan lock, stock, and barrel. But, if it does, then this particular war profiteer will have a gift of $415,000 from the Government in canceled taxes. He will be able to keep all this swag. And the prospect of any recovery by the Treasury in the distant future of some part of this rich haul in the form of inheritance taxes is very thin indeed. Easy money of this kind isn't hoarded for expectant heirs.

These windfalls, Mr. Ruml admits, are objectionable and he thinks something ought to be done about it. But he insists that his plan be adopted even though it produces many millions of windfalls for war profiteers and other fortunate taxpayers. "We should not refuse," he says, "to do good for millions simply because we will be doing too much good for a few who don't deserve it."

The "good for millions" that Mr. Ruml is pleading for is abolishing the year of credit that the Treasury for some 30 years has been giving taxpayers in the collection of their income taxes, and substituting for it a sort of spot-cash system. His chief concern is for three main classes of citizens:

1. Men who have been drafted into the armed forces who had incomes in civilian life much larger than their Army pay and who are now faced with tax bills on their 1942 incomes that they can't meet out of their Government pay.

2. Those "who every year suffer reduced income because of accident, sickness, old age," and haven't saved anything for their taxes.

3. High-salaried executives who spend their large incomes year after year, always counting on paying their income taxes out of next year's salary checks. When these men want to quit, says Mr. Ruml, they can't afford to.

It seems hardly possible that the Congress is going to shed many tears for the $50,000- and $100,000-a-year men who can't afford to quit because they have been so improvident "keeping up with the Joneses" that they can't pay their income taxes until they have worked another year, and then can't quit because they have another year's taxes to pay. In his statement before the Ways and Means Committee Mr. Ruml argued that his plan would "make possible the retirement and pensioning of executives who are holding on, largely to pay income tax and never catching up."

So this is what all the shooting is about, and surely a potent reason for the almost unanimous support of the plan among leading industrialists, bankers, professional men, and other big-money earners. Surely our whole fiscal system is not going to be turned upside down, and billions lost to the Treasury at a time when the Government needs every dollar it can lay its hands on to carry on the war, in order that a few over-age high-salaried executives can quit work and live on their capital.

As for those improvident Americans who do not lay aside something for a rainy day (and most of us do have rainy days), and who do not set aside from current income what they know full well will soon have to be paid to the tax collector, maybe we have come to a time when for traditional American thrift and foresight and fortitude we must substitute the helping hand of the Government. The Government Printing Office might be directed by Mr. Morgenthau to send copies of Ben Franklin's Almanac to all taxpayers along with Form 1040.

But for the millions of our young men who have gone and will be going to war—the majority of whom have never before had to pay income taxes—the Congress should provide a generous measure of assistance. Special provisions can easily be made to make sure that no man fighting for his country shall be worried unfairly by tax bills from the Treasury. Under the existing law, a married man with two dependents, who goes to war has an exemption of $1,200 as the head of a family, $700 for his two dependents, and, if he is not a commissioned officer, an extra war exemption of $300 a total of $2,200. The $300 special exemption could well be increased. Make it $500 or $1,000, if need be. Or make the amount of this exemption increase with the length of military service—say $50 or $100 a month.

Tax relief for men who are called to the colors—many of whom will never come back—could be made very large without entailing any such loss to the Treasury, or any such scandalous favoritism to taxpayers in the top brackets, as is inherent in the Ruml plan. The best method of giving such relief to men in the armed forces is something for Congress to contrive. It can and should be done without resorting to any such financial legerdemain, thinly disguised as a pay-as-you-go plan, as has been advocated by the chairman of the New York Federal Reserve Bank.

FRANK H. FAYANT.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of today:

AMERICA WANTS THE RUML PLAN

American taxpayers are not as dumb as the tax experts of the Treasury and some of the Congressmen of the Ways and Means Committee seem to think.

Despite all the lies that have been told about the Ruml pay-as-you-go tax plan, despite all the hypocrisy and class-angled demagoguery, the people who pay taxes are still in favor of this simple formula for getting on a cash basis with the tax collector.

The Gallup poll, published yesterday, shows that the sentiment is overwhelming. To the question, "Do you favor or oppose the Ruml plan?" the answers were divided as follows:

Democratic taxpayers—83 percent in favor, 17 percent opposed; Republican taxpayers—87 percent in favor, 13 percent opposed; upper-income-level taxayers—83 percent in favor, 17 percent opposed; lower-income-level taxpayers—86 percent in favor, 14 percent opposed.

The people who pay the taxes—and there are about 40,000,000 Federal income taxpayers this year—know what they want. And they are not trying to avoid or evade taxes. The Gallup Pollers found that a sizable majority of income taxpayers think the present stiff rates of taxation are fair. But they don't like the present collection system.

Taxpayers will think they have been fairly treated if Congress adopts the Carlson bill, which embodies the Ruml plan. But they will not think they have been fairly treated if Congress adopts the substitute proposed by the Ways and Means Committee majority, which would establish a pay-as-you-go basis—and with a 6-percent discount—only for those taxpayers who have enough ready cash to pay 2 years' taxes in 1 year.

Political Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Rothwell Brown, from the Washington Times-Herald of March 21, 1943:

POLITICAL PARADE

PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS IN GRIP OF FIGHT OVER BLANK CHECK GRANTS OF POWER OF EXECUTIVE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

The evils in the American Government from which Congress is seeking to be free, spring largely from the veritable showering of blank checks upon President Roosevelt.

These were blank checks of both money and power.

Once in his possession, the President was able not merely to cash them at his pleasure but to devote the proceeds to purposes not originally intended by Congress when it flung them into his ample lap.

Congress today is trying to get some of these blank checks back. To do this it is obliged virtually to defy the President, for no human being enjoys relinquishing something he has long possessed, and has come to look upon as his own, and Mr. Roosevelt is intensely human.

Thus Congress is endeavoring to regain the $25,000-salary-limit blank check, the farm-parity blank check, and has gone to the mat with the Executive on both counts of the indictment.

Actuated by the same instinct, the Senate, unless I greatly mistake the present temper of that body, has no intention at this time of giving President Roosevelt a blank check in the matter of American participation in the politics of the after-war world.

For this reason the premature resolution offered by four of the least conspicuous of Senators, for a sort of pre-peace league of na-

tions, with an international police force—including Americans—guaranteed and underwritten in advance by the Treasury of the United States, has failed to create the sensation that was confidently expected.

Its present shape, as to flatness, is that of the well-known pancake.

In addition to the constitutional obstacles in the way of the present Congress committing a subsequent Congress to a post-war program, there are two vital psychological factors which the Senate is not for a moment overlooking.

One of these is the psychological reaction to the war of the American people, say a year or two hence, when the casualties which they have been warned to expect have become a grievous reality in many thousands of homes.

The other is the psychology of the American soldiers, sailors, and marines, some 10,000,000 of them, when they return—those who do—from the great adventure on 40 fighting fronts.

In the last analysis, these men—and women—will determine the post-war policy of the United States. It would be futile for politicians in Washington to believe they could determine it now. Few are making that mistake.

Only 2,000,000 men of the American Expeditionary Force returned from France after the First World War. They were fed to the eyebrows. They had opinions of their own.

They had seen Europe from the cockpit of a flying coffin, from the peepholes of a prehistoric tank, and from the mud that covered the bottom of a lousy trench.

They would have none of the League of Nations, and it was this mighty force that stood behind Hiram Johnson, and Borah, and Lodge, and Knox, and Brandegee, and which in the end turned thumbs down on the Treaty of Versailles, with its League covenant.

In the uncertain tomorrow which lies over the unknown horizon of time, the surviving veterans of the global war will be coming back to their homeland.

They will know more about the world than the statesmen in Washington, for they will have learned it first hand.

They will decide whether they want to keep an American police force from Greenland's icy mountains to India's coral strand.

It is this thought which is causing the Senate to decide to rush into no commitments on this point.

As for a debate in the Senate today on post-war problems, the very thought causes apprehensions in every sober mind on Capitol Hill.

No more blank checks!

An Iowa Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in a newspaper published in the South Pacific area on February 13, 1943, and was reprinted in Public Opinion, published in Decorah, Iowa, under date of March 17, 1943.

This is a narrative which grips the attention of the general reader and there attaches to it the special interest of a host of persons because the young hero is the nephew of the able and energetic veteran Congressman from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON. Having sprung from good racial stock, Norman Bredesen is well equipped to sail the seven seas. His acts of courage and daring call to mind the Viking spirit of old:

For an act of heroism performed in the Pacific between Australia and the Solomon Islands, Norman Bredesen, 26, quartermaster in the merchant marine and son of Rev. and Mrs. Alfred Bredesen, of Glenwood Township, has received much publicity in recent days.

After an 11-hour chase in the southern Pacific waters off the east coast of Australia, the merchant ship on which Bredesen was serving was sunk by an enemy sub which had been sighted at sundown but which did not attack until the next morning.

Members of the crew, who had been keeping watch all night, saw the submarine appear the next morning off the starboard bow. Almost immediately they saw the wake of torpedoes near the ship.

Kent Atteridge, who was in the crow's nest when the attack was made, said, "I saw the first torpedo making for the ship and shouted like hell to the bridge.

"The torpedo was leaping out of the water every few yards. I saw my warning was too late, and hung on to the mast.

"The explosion nearly jarred my back teeth out. Pieces of hatch cover, beams, and twisted metal flew past me.

"I was one of the first men into the boats. We were standing close in to the ship, wondering whether to go back or not when the second torpedo hit on the opposite side.

"We pulled back and took off some more men, and went back again later to pick up the gun crew, who stayed on to the last, hoping to get a shot at the sub."

When the first torpedo hit the ship, fire broke out. Those torpedoes fractured fuel tanks, sent geysers of oil spurting high into the air. But the crew manned hose and within 30 minutes had the blaze under control.

JAPS STRUCK AGAIN

The Japs were not satisfied. "Not long afterward the Jap had another go at us," said Russell Goodborough, the ship's carpenter. "He moved around, and once again the boys saw torpedoes coming at us. We were hit again.

"There was a scatter on deck, I can tell you. We ran like hell to get away from the spot. After that, we abandoned ship.

"Some clambered down the side to the boats, others dived overboard wearing their lifebelts.

"Last to go off were the gunners, who stuck to their platform, hoping to get a shot at the sub. They had no luck."

When the second torpedoes were fired, one of the gunners is reported to have opened up with a quick-firing antiaircraft gun in the forlorn hope of exploding it before it reached the ship. Only seconds after the rat-tat-tat of the gun had ceased, the explosion occurred.

Seamen report a heavy sea was running and some of the men became seasick. Waves were too rough to permit rowing. The boats pulled off some distance from the vessel and the men could see the stern was almost awash.

DRIFT AIMLESSLY

While the men were drifting rather aimlessly around in these boats, the captain realized that if one of the bulkhead doors leading to the engineroom could be closed the ship might be saved.

Winneshiek County's young seaman, Norman Bredesen, volunteered to make the attempt. He dived from the lifeboat and swam to the sinking vessel, cutting his way through the thick scum of fuel and oil.

Bredesen not only succeeded in closing the door but he was pulled safely into the boat again, nearly blinded from the fuel oil through which he had swum.

When a rescue ship arrived later, the captain again called for volunteers to go aboard with a towline. Again Able Seaman Bredesen ventured to the vessel, accompanied by Able Seaman K. Atteridge and G. Paisley.

ENEMY REAPPEARS

The rescue vessel attempted after that to tow the damaged ship back to port, but 15 minutes later the enemy submarine was reported nearby again, so the three seamen were ordered to leave the ship.

The towline fouled one of the propellers of the rescue ship and had to be cut. Sometime later the merchantman sank.

Norman Bredesen reports the incident in this manner: "I was asleep in my bunk when there was an explosion and I was on my back on the deck when I really woke up.

"I gave a hand to some chaps who were struggling with a fire hose, and we soon had the fire killed.

"My most anxious moment was when the chief engineer and I went down to the hold to test the bulkhead. We had to stay there 20 minutes before we could be sure the head was holding well.

RACED TO QUARTERS

"I raced back to my quarters to get some warm clothes and heard our antiaircraft guns firing. They were shooting at the second torpedo, which was then approaching the ship.

"In a few seconds there was another terrific explosion. By the time I got on deck we were only 15 feet above the water, and the ship seemed to be settling by the stern.

"I got into a lifeboat mighty quick and we pulled away as fast as we could. The sea was very rough and a lot of the men were seasick."

Gordon Paisley, able seaman, said, "Norman Bredesen was the hero of the day. In going down to the hold and going back to the ship twice after we had abandoned her he did enough to win a mighty high decoration."

"We are proud of him, of course," Reverend Bredesen told the Public Opinion simply when interviewed relative to his son's heroic exploits.

Norman's father, pastor of the Glenwood Lutheran Church, was in Decorah Saturday attempting to obtain birth records for Norman, who strangely must prove now that he has been born. In the dramatic encounter with the Jap sub, Norman lost all his belongings, including his birth certificate and his diploma from Luther College.

Norman Bredesen will be remembered by readers of the Public Opinion as the boy who, when only 16 years old, hitchhiked his way to New York on $2 and worked his way to South America. Two years later, many readers will recall, young Bredesen again hitchhiked to New York, and this time worked his way to India.

O. P. A. Ceilings Handicap Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, while steps are being taken to assist small war

industries, the American people have every reason to be gravely concerned with the orders of the Office of Price Administration which are forcing out of business many thousands of factories which, in peacetime, furnish a most important contribution to the employment of our citizens. I am struck by the wholly unsympathetic attitude of the bureaucrats in the O. P. A. at the havoc which which they are causing. These businesses cover the entire production front except for essentially war items. No effort seems to be made to cause distribution of production among all of the plants in an industry in order that all may survive. The bureaucrats seem to prefer to concentrate such production in the hands of a few of the largest concerns. This is the course that they pursued in the war industries and has made necessary affirmative steps in the protection of small war plants. No protection, however, is being afforded directly for concerns engaged in business other than war items.

Similarly, we find that the Office of Price Administration is placing ceiling prices on scores of our most important food products. In February they placed a price on kerosene in the Massachusetts area which would require certain classes of dealers to sell the oil at less than cost. This oil, together with the O. P. A. order which permitted anybody with an oil coupon to secure oil at any time from any dealer who had oil on hand, caused much of the trouble and suffering which prevailed in New England during recent months. Obviously, such regulations would not be issued if the bureaucrats in charge would cooperate with the men engaged in the particular businesses involved and familiar with price conditions.

I have just received a letter from a large dealer in eggs in the Springfield area. He has been vitally interested in securing proper ceiling prices in the egg business. He has attended meetings with representatives of the Office of Price Administration in various eastern cities. The letter which I have just received from him shows more clearly than any words that I might use the troubles which the O. P. A. is now bringing upon the American public by ceilings which inevitably must lead to a loss in production of one of the most important food articles of the country. It contains an appeal for common sense in bureaucracy which I hope will be heeded. I also wish that those of you who are faced with similar difficulties will join in protesting to the Office of Price Administration at the ceiling prices placed upon eggs.

The letter is from John B. Randall, manager of the Springfield Cooperative Auction Market Association at Springfield, Mass., and is as follows:

SPRINGFIELD COOPERATIVE
AUCTION MARKET ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Springfield, Mass., March 17, 1943.

Hon. CHARLES CLASON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLES: Perhaps I should have written sooner to forward my opinion on the egg price ceiling as it affects me personally, and the industry as a whole—however, I deemed it best to afford the new schedules a fair trial before condemning them.

It is to be regretted that Office of Price Administration did not see fit to profit from previous mistakes in other agricultural ceiling schedules and thus avoid the same pitfalls in the new egg order. Although trade representatives conferred constantly with the Office of Price Administration in preparing the regulations, all constructive recommendations and suggestions were turned down and fellows who have spent all their life in producing and marketing eggs were pointedly told that when egg price ceilings were prepared the Office of Price Administration preferred to insert their own ideas and use their own terminology. As a result we have just one more bungled job to add to the long list already discredited to the present administration.

It is our impression, and the common belief of the people of this Nation, that price regulation is a necessary wartime practice to hold living costs down, and provide us all with an equitable share in the necessary articles of life The chief need, the chief want, and the main requirement of man, all through the ages has been food. As this war drags on we find luxuries disappearing, nonmilitary commodities going completely off the markets, and we are left with our all-important item of food. Food will win the war—how many times have we heard that statement—furthermore, how many of us realize how utterly true it is? But believe you me, sir, unless we take an about-face attitude on this food situation from Washington's bureaucrats down, we are going to lose out on the food end of this conflict.

The jumbled mess each succeeding Office of Price Administration regulation plunges the food industries into is doing just that much more to break down morale among our food-producing elements—the farmers—and I don't mean the farmers of the West and South alone—no—we have just as great a portion of dirt-farmers right here in the East, the Northeast, New England, and in particular, Massachusetts.

The situation is all the more confusing because, as I and other folks see it, the legal end of the Office of Price Administration is actually looking forward to the day when private enterprise can be squeezed entirely out of the picture. Everywhere you turn you encounter the phrase "black market"—certainly we have black markets, some have been so profitable that one wonders whether conniving somewhere along the line has helped to sponsor rather than suppress their presence.

Plain, simple language and plenty of common sense inserted in the proper places would have made ceiling regulations acceptable to everyone. It has been rumored frequently that Office of Price Administration was to become a greater organization than Work Projects Administration ever thought of being. It certainly looks as though that were no understatement. Any proposed investigation of Office of Price Administration should not be allowed to pass by—nor should any opportunity to put things in order within this Office of Price Administration slip by. Business is not in sympathy with the tactics used, and certainly the people are disgusted with the results thus far obtained.

Our own particular complaint concerns eggs and egg marketing. Perhaps if this was the first mistake committed by Office of Price Administration we would not be entitled to so bitterly oppose it; however, we believe in view of all past errors and unwillingness to even attempt to rectify conditions that it is time someone got up on their high horse and shouted loud and long.

Ceiling prices have been laid out for 1 year in advance; quite a courageous feat for even an experienced egg man to attempt to do, let alone a novice at the business of predicting egg values. On paper they look pretty good if one forgets that production costs are unchecked, that other food shortages are continually increasing demands for eggs, and that despite the Government request for a 28 percent production increase from the industry for 1943 that we have only enough feed supplies to care for volume equal to that of 1942. These factors should have been checked first.

The farmer is adversely affected by the ceilings because he has no guaranty that his production costs for the year ahead will remain where they are now—and according to the ceiling he already knows just what he can legally expect from the egg market. Give this fellow definite assurance that he is going to make a fair and just profit in the year ahead, and that he will be as well off on the farm as at one of the lucrative shop jobs and I will show you a satisfied man, one upon whom you can depend to give his all toward winning this war, and who will do his utmost to keep the men in the field, and the folks at home supplied with good nutritive food. Right now these fellows are a disgusted, disappointed, and discouraged lot of men, who would as soon sell their place and flock, lock, stock, and barrel, and take a factory job somewhere. This is the wrong attitude entirely, and much as I personally depend upon them for a living I still cannot blame them for thinking as they do. Appeals to their patriotism will not bring results unless they can see for themselves that Washington is no longer frittering away golden opportunities to bring this war to as quick a finish as possible. We need those fellows on the farm. The fact is, enough have been taken into the service and into the shops so that we cannot afford to let any more go. We can't expect them to stay and slave the way the majority are accustomed to doing now, and it is up to our Congress to repair damaged morale, and rectify mistakes of administrative agents, in order to hold a farmer on the farm and keep America and her allies fed.

I do not intend to delve into the technicalities surrounding our operations here at the cooperative and the disastrous effects we expect unless remedial measures are instituted by the Office of Price Administration to help keep folks in business and raising food. To do so would be to offer a repetition of the trend in the beef, butter, poultry, etc., lines. I do intend to forward to you in the near future the constructive suggestions that will be set forth by the egg industry as a whole and particularly those advocated by the producers associations. We feel that your help will be very essential in injecting a cooperative spirit, rather than a dictatorial attitude into the present make-up of our more inefficient bureaus.

For the present you can best help your constituents here in Massachusetts by impressing on your colleagues in Washington that the criticism set forth in this letter represents not only my attitude personally, but is indicative of the feeling of everyone connected with the poultry industry throughout the Nation. I have held meetings here in Springfield, have attended gatherings in Boston, New York, and Providence, in connection with protests on the announced ceilings. At these meetings we have "tied the Office of Price Administration in knots" with a million honest and nontricky questions—we have little hope that our recommendations will be recognized until we bring pressure to bear through Congress on the highest post in Office of Price Administration. The ceiling prices as scheduled are absolutely contrary to the best interests of the majority until organized on a practical basis. You as our friend and Congressman are representative of a majority. With the majority as a common denominator, Congress needs no other excuse to place Office of Price Administration on a practical basis.

Mr. Piene has worked hard on the Poultry and Egg Division of Office of Price Administra-

tion but from all appearances we gather his hands are tied somewhere. Frankly, any contacts with him on your part will produce nothing more than a sympathetic viewpoint for the position of the poultryman. This thing has become so tangled up that only a congressional house-cleaning of Office of Price Administration divisions, and in no uncertain terms, will ease the situation and restore the confidence of our producers in their ability and right to produce food for a living, and also in the restoration of public confidence in the belief that the Washington administration is doing it is best to efficiently bring this war to a successful finish. The home front is not quite so serene and complacent as Washington has often accused it of being. How much longer are we going to afford mockery of the phrase "America, the home of the free and the land of plenty?"

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely,

JACK RANDALL,
Manager.

The Citadel: American Epic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Citadel: American Epic," by Herbert Ravenel Sass, which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post for March 20, 1943. Mr. Sass is one of our foremost historians and a writer known throughout the Americas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CITADEL: AMERICAN EPIC

(By Herbert Ravenel Sass)

The youngest and largest of the distinctively military colleges of this country, except the national academy at West Point, is celebrating its hundredth anniversary this week. Its name is The Citadel and the great majority of Americans know little or nothing about it. It ought to be, and it will be, better known because of what it now is. Behind it the story of its hundred years rises at one point to heights of genuine drama in what was certainly one of history's most fateful moments.

But on its centennial date The Citadel isn't thinking of that or any other moment of its historic past. Its thoughts are focused with an absorbed intensity upon its vigorous present. The fact which it regards as of highest significance is this: With the inevitable exception of West Point, The Citadel leads all American colleges in the percentage of graduates now serving in the United States Army. That, in this time of total war, is a very handsome distinction. When one learns, in addition, that something like 99 percent of these Citadel men are officers—thanks to the excellent training The Citadel gave them—the evidence is strong that here is an institution which the people of this country may appropriately salute on this its hundredth birthday.

Yet the fine spectacle of militant Americanism in full and effective action which The Citadel now presents is not the whole reason why its centennial is an occasion of national interest. A broader reason is the fact that in the length and breadth of the land it would be hard to find a more inspiring demonstration of the basic strength and soundness of the Republic than this military college at Charleston, S. C., most loyal of all southern cities to the memory and ideals of the Confederacy.

For this same Citadel which is now out in front on the road to Tokyo and Berlin was the actual instrument that began the war between the sister States, which still stands as the most crucial of this country's conflicts. It was the superintendent of The Citadel whose lips gave the decisive command, "Commence firing!" It was a Citadel cadet who fired the first shot. That this southern school, foremost in action for the Stars and Bars, now leads all the rest—except, of course, West Point—in the service of the Stars and Stripes is one of the most dramatic illustrations it is possible to find of the process by which, through tears and blood, the United States has become a nation.

Hence this is an anniversary which has something more than a local significance. Its significance, in fact, reaches as far as Germany and Japan. Hitler has been said to cherish a belief that the United States has never been really united since the North and South had their quarrel; Hirohito, if he is allowed any thoughts, may have somewhat the same notion. If they could come to Charleston, where that war started, and see The Citadel cadets, whose predecessors started it, marching proudly with their eight Confederate battle streamers commemorating eight operations of The Citadel in the Confederate Army; if they could see that handsome sight, the foreign dictators might for a moment be confirmed in their fuzzy idea.

But their pleasure wouldn't last. They would discover quite promptly that a Confederate stronghold can be a hornets' nest of aggressive and hard-hitting Americanism; that, through a process which Pearl Harbor completed, the Stars and Bars now live in the Stars and Stripes.

They would learn that men from this "rebel" hotbed have been in the thick of virtually everything that has happened on the land and air fronts of this war where the American flag has flown. The Citadel rode with Doolittle on his famous air ride to Tokyo. It was with Rickenbacker through his long ordeal in the Pacific. There were Citadel men on Bataan and Corregidor, in the Iceland occupation, in the bloody Commando exploit at Dieppe. There are Citadel men on New Guinea and Guadalcanal—in fact, there are so many of them in those far regions, ranging from generals to lieutenants, that, at a certain base down under, one street of tents is known as Citadel Row. In North Africa, Citadel men are so numerous that whenever a lull comes in the fighting there is talk of forming a Citadel North African Club.

And to these already in service many more will soon be added. Immediately after the commencement in May, the entire first and second classes, about 500 men, will go into the Army as officers, after a brief interval in training camps—an interval which will be very brief because The Citadel, rated "excellent" by the War Department and pushing West Point hard in thoroughness of military instruction, has already taught them nearly all that they need to know.

That is why the centennial exercises on the parade ground of the fine new plant on historic Ashley River and in the cadet chapel, one of the most beautiful in the South, will be simple and short. At first it was intended to give a week to the exercises, but when war came it seemed best to give only a day—March 20. More grimly than ever before The Citadel is at work, and now time is precious. For again, as has happened more than once in its eventful hundred years, it is called upon to play its part in the kind of national crisis with which, if its theory of education be sound, it is peculiarly fitted to deal.

The soundness of that theory will hardly be questioned at this juncture. Established by the State—its full title is The Citadel, the Military College of South Carolina—primarily to prepare young men for civil life by giving them a thorough education reinforced with thorough military training, the careful blending of these two elements has again and again brought the institution brilliantly to the fore in time of stress. These occasions—and they include the most dramatic episode in the life of any American school—we shall come to later. First, a glance at the place as its hundredth birthday finds it.

OUT OF THE ASHES

It is a hundred years young, not old. In the past few years it has grown faster than ever before. Younger than Norwich University in Vermont, Pennsylvania Military College, and the Virginia Military Institute, The Citadel is now by far the largest of this group often designated as the distinguished and distinctly military group of colleges. It has won to this eminence through periods of varying fortune and, at times, of seemingly irretrievable disaster. Its darkest days came after the War between the States, when its buildings were occupied by Federal troops until, in 1882, it resumed its sessions with Col. John P. Thomas as superintendent. In the late eighties and nineties, when Ben Tillman led his agrarian jihad and the State was turned upside down, the rabble-rousing pitchfork wielder roared at The Citadel as a "dude factory," and again its days seemed numbered.

But Tillman, able himself and sobered by responsibility, discovered that the "dudes" made able and useful citizens, and under the superintendencies—the title was later changed to president—of Gen. G. D. Johnston, Col. Asbury Coward, and Col. O. J. Bond, The Citadel continued to grow. A score of years ago it outgrew its old quarters in the center of Charleston and moved to a fine new plant at the city's edge, with plenty of room for the further expansion which the future seemed to promise, and in 1931 an even more remarkable development began when Gen. Charles Pelot Summerall, retiring after a distinguished career in the Army, of which he was Chief of Staff, assumed the presidency of The Citadel.

Under General Summerall's vigorous leadership the institution has much more than doubled in size; its enrollment at the beginning of the present term was 1,957. If it was once a local or sectional institution, it is that no longer. Its faculty represents every section of the country; its cadets come from 44 States, and more than 500 of the 1,957 come from outside the South. This year, for instance, the first cadet captain is W. A. Pashley, of Kansas; the second cadet captain is H. L. Beckington, of Illinois. D. M. Fort, of Illinois, commands the second battalion, G. K. Webb, of Ohio, heads the third battalion, while George Daniels, a native of Michigan, is regimental adjutant.

For an equally good geographical cross section, take this year's color guard. The 8 men forming it hail from Minnesota, New England, South Carolina, Georgia, Maryland and Washington, D. C. With this growth and broadening of its personnel, both its scholastic and its military structures have been broadened and strengthened and its facilities enormously increased. Scholastically, it is today a fully accreditied senior college on the approved list of the Association of American Universities and of the Engineer's Council for Professional Development. Militarily, it has won for 11 years hand-running the highest rating which the War Department gives. Physically, its plant is so extensive and so well adapted to its purpose

that it is beyond all question the finest and most complete strictly military college property in the United States, except the national academy at West Point.

These, perhaps, are prosaic facts, but important. Never before have the American people realized so clearly the value of the military code and military training as part of a citizen's educational equipment, and it is well for the public to know where these things may be had. They may be had at The Citadel at a yearly cost of $500 for State cadets and $650 for out-of-State men. But these facts, though they have their place, aren't The Citadel.

THE STAR OF THE WEST

The Citadel isn't figures and statistics. It isn't the spacious square of imposing gray buildings on the bank of the Ashley River. It isn't even the regiment of smartly uniformed young men drilling on the palm-bordered parade ground or buckling down to their studies in the laboratories and lecture rooms.

Rather, The Citadel is a story—a story which might even be called an American epic. That sounds extravagant, but this story is part of the central thread of America's own story in the most crucial hour of the Nation's life. No shot had yet been fired by North or South and the question of peace or war hung in the balance when one day a steamship was sighted off Charleston, heading for the harbor. It was the United States ship *Star of the West,* bringing reinforcements and munitions for the Federal garrison holding Fort Sumter. In anticipation of such an attempt, a battery had been erected at the harbor entrance and had been occupied by a detachment of Citadel cadets. The task of these boys, called from their classrooms to man the South's cannon, was to stop at any cost any vessel trying to reach Fort Sumter from the sea.

Certainly no other American school and no other group of American schoolboys—for they were hardly more than that—have been cast for so fateful a role. To fire upon the *Star of the West* meant war. These boys met their responsibility unflinchingly.

The *Star of the West* came on. When there was no doubt about her purpose to reinforce Fort Sumter, the superintendent of The Citadel, Maj. P. F. Stevens—after the war he became a bishop—gave the command, "Commence firing!" The cadet captain passed the order, "No. 1, fire!"

Cadet G. E. Haynsworth, of South Carolina, pulled the lanyard and the first shot of the War Between the States went hurtling across the water.

There was another shot immediately afterward, then another, and for some minutes the firing was general. The *Star of the West,* hit just abaft the fore rigging and narrowly escaping disablement by a shot which almost carried away her rudder, slowed, turned, and headed out to sea. The Citadel had given the South its first victory—bloodless and small in itself, but ushering in the mightiest drama this continent has seen.

That was in 1861. The capture of Fort Sumter followed. Then came Manassas, Chancellorsville, Gettysburg, and Appomattox. Seventy-two years after the cadet artillerymen had turned back the *Star of the West,* a significant event took place on the parade ground of The Citadel.

In the spring of that year, 1933, a cadet named A. B. Sundin won the Star of the West Medal. This is a medal awarded each year since 1893 to the best-drilled Citadel cadet—a medal deriving its name from the fact that it contains a piece of oak wood from the *Star of the West's* hull. Cadet Sundin—now Lieutenant Colonel Sundin, of the United States Field Artillery—had come to The Citadel from Massachusetts and was the first Yankee to win this emphatically Confederate trophy. The second Yank to win it is the present holder of it—Cadet C. J. West, of Hudson, N. Y.—and in showing it to the writer the other day, he remarked that the moment when he won it was the proudest of his life.

That is certainly something for Hitler and Hirohito to put in their pipes and smoke. And, in passing, here is another. In 1863 the Confederate General Beauregard presented to The Citadel a 15-inch cannon ball fired by the Federal fleet at the defenses of Charleston. At the close of the war this souvenir came into possession of the Federals and was taken to the United States Military Academy at West Point, where it remained for many years. Nevertheless, you can see it on display at The Citadel today because in 1913 Secretary of War Stimson personally ordered its return—a gracious and graceful gesture which did its bit to make the Republic whole and strong again for the great test that Pearl Harbor began.

SONS OF BATTLE

Indeed, looking back from Pearl Harbor and Bataan and Guadalcanal, one sees the *Star of the West* and Fort Sumter and Gettysburg as earlier chapters of the same great story. The Citadel, in the forefront of events in that first decisive hour, emerged 4 years later with a record probably unsurpassed by any school in any country. It shares with the Virginia Military Institute the distinction of wearing on its regimental colors a battle streamer authorized by the United States Government for having gone into action as a unit of the Confederate Army. Actually, The Citadel participated as a military unit in eight operations of the War between the States, in recognition of which fact it flies, besides the Government streamer, eight other streamers awarded by the State.

Of these eight occasions, the most notable in its consequences was that already described—the episode of the *Star of the West,* when it fell to The Citadel to fire the first gun of the war. Most strangely it was also the lot of this school to fire the last shot east of the Mississippi River when, on May 1, 1865, a detachment of cadets beat off an attack by Federal cavalry. Between these two actions, marking the beginning and the end of the great struggle, the most important service of The Citadel was performed when the heavily outnumbered Confederate forces were trying to check the relentless advance of Sherman's great army.

That was a pretty grim undertaking for a battalion of boys in their teens—some were as young as 15—but, ordered to attack near the Tulifinny River, they went forward with complete steadiness against the seasoned and victory-flushed troops in their front. The engagement lasted about 3 hours and at the end of it the enemy had been driven back. Thereupon a bearded veteran of the Virginia campaigns paid the beardless cadets a compliment. "Them fellers fight like Hood's Texicans," he observed casually to a comrade, and the remark has become a Citadel tradition.

Something more than a year ago newspaper readers may have noticed the following dispatch:

MONTREAL, January 27.—Corp. Dick Doherty, 20, and Pvt. Joe O'Malley, 19, fellow cadets at The Citadel, military college in South Carolina, today enlisted with the Black Watch (Royal Highland Regiment) of Canada after thumbing their way 1,200 miles from Charleston, S. C. They arrived in Montreal wearing the uniforms and colorful red shoulder capes of The Citadel. Now they are clad in the khaki battle dress of the Canadian Army. O'Malley is a native of St. Louis, while Doherty hails from Chicago.

Corporal Doherty and Private O'Malley had excellent Citadel precedent for what they were doing. They were quitting their classrooms and going to war on their own. Eighty years before them, other cadets did the same thing. The school as a unit—between tours of field duty it was carrying on its classes—wasn't seeing enough action to suit these exuberant youngsters. Thirty-six of them decided to play hooky for the duration and go where the going was hot.

They did that. They walked out of school one day in 1862, formed a cavalry troop of their own, known as the Cadet Company, joined the hard-fighting Sixth Regiment and—careless of the zeros presumably being marked up against them in the classrooms—proceeded to spill their young blood on the battlefields of Virginia and Carolina.

Their story, including Trevilian Station—one of the biggest cavalry battles ever fought on this continent—is also a part of Citadel tradition. If The Citadel were awarded a battle streamer for every battle in which the Cadet Company took part, it would fly so many streamers that the regimental flag might not be visible at all.

THE BLUE AND THE GRAY

So it was good Citadel practice that Doherty and O'Malley were following. Now, to show what time hath wrought, take note that Doherty came to The Citadel from Chicago, while O'Malley hailed from Missouri. That is the way now with this Confederate stronghold, to quote a recent reference. It is full of Yankee blood from all over, its Yanks hold their full share of its honors and its rebel medals, and together its Yanks and Rebs are giving one of the finest exhibitions of Americanism conceivable—they have put The Citadel in the van of this war for American freedom just as truly as it was in the van of that other war. To see the picture, and see it whole and get its full fine meaning, your eye must take in the whole broad sweep from the *Star of the West* to Guadalcanal.

Meanwhile, life at The Citadel—never an easy life because military training there is thorough and discipline real—goes on. The war has caused changes and adjustments, but the old customs persist. There is no hazing, but neither is there relaxation of the rigid rat regulations by means of which rats are kept always and painfully aware that they are rats. About the only change which has come about in their status is found in the fact that once, long ago, they were called plebes. Similarly, third classmen were then called upstarts and this designation survives, whereas the goodly titles given second and first classmen, demigods and sublimes, have regrettably lapsed with the years.

The Citadel code, too long to quote here, is an admirable statement of ideals; an unwritten code concerns itself with lesser matters. No fist fight is permitted to mar the dignity of the campus. No cadet smokes or eats in the street—a rule founded upon a sound theory of manners. Many and various are the ways of tucking shirts into trousers, but Citadel custom approves of only one way. It is said that today in the fox holes of the Solomon Islands one can spot The Citadel men by the way their shirts—if any—are tucked in. But none of this leads to a slavish uniformity or a stifling of initiative. In the entire universe there are no firmer believers in military training, its codes and customs, than these young men, who certainly should know whereof they speak.

Finally, there is another important fact about The Citadel—to many readers the most interesting of all. Not merely passively, as in most nonmilitary colleges, but actively and, under General Summerall, even militantly, religion is the controlling principle of the institution and its work. To some this will be surprising, for most people do not associate the military and the religious ideals.

They forget that in the South these two have been conspicuously associated. They forget what kind of soldier Lee was and Stonewall Jackson—a kind of soldier that walked very humbly before God.

That is the kind of soldier and the kind of man The Citadel tries earnestly to produce, and that is another reason for saluting it with respect as it celebrates its centenary March 20.

Address by Hon. Herbert Hoover to Mid-West Governors' Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD the address delivered by the Honorable Herbert Hoover to the Mid-West Governors' Conference in Des Moines, Iowa, March 15, 1943.

While I have the floor, Mr. President, I desire to urge strongly that Mr. Hoover is entirely correct, in my judgment, in the importance he places on the production of food in the war effort. Agriculture should have been recognized as a war industry from the start.

Hr. Hoover recommended considerably more than a year ago, if my memory serves me aright, that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, be named food administrator, and given authority as well as title and responsibility. Belatedly Secretary Wickard was given the title and the responsibility, but the authority was scattered around among so many other officials and agencies that actually there was no authority exerted in the direction of food production.

Military and war industries continue to take necessary men from the farm. The War Production Board makes practically no allowances for manufacture of farm machinery necessary to replace manpower on the farms.

We face deficits in meats, vegetables, fats, oils—everything except cereals. And the wheat surplus is going to disappear rapidly as our population eats more bread in place of meats and fats and oils and as more and more millions of bushels of wheat are fed to animals, and used for making industrial alcohol.

In the face of a program which calls ultimately for the farmers of the United States to feed 300,000,000 persons instead of supplying bare surpluses, except in the case of wheat, for 130,000,000 persons, our policy to date has been that farmers can produce more regardless of how inadequate is the supply of labor, machinery, fertilizer, protein feeds, and without taking account of production cost in the fixing of prices.

I urge every Senator to read Mr. Hoover's address. He has not overstated the gravity of the food situation in the slightest degree. His words of warning, if not heeded, and acted upon promptly, will leave ourselves and our allies in a very precarious position before the end of 1944, perhaps even before the end of 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FOOD FRONT

I consider it an honor to participate in this most important conference of Midwest Governors. You represent the great major food supply of the Nation. And you have much to contribute to its solution. And that is our sole purpose here.

I have been deeply impressed by the single-minded attitude of every man at this conference. You have sought solutions to this inevitable problem of total war. You have brought a wealth of knowledge and experience.

Every man at this conference wants to help the Government in its gigantic task of winning this war and the peace. The problem considered here is a problem of the home front.

We have a most difficult war to win. We must win. And to assure winning beyond any doubt we must organize our economic resources for a long war. Any other course would be national folly.

The strategy in total war is not solely a military question. The home front is as important as the military front.

The home front of the greatest physical staying power, of the greatest resources, of the greatest will to endure and work will give the greatest strength to the military front. A weakened home front will weaken the military front. Wars can be won or lost on the home front in this war as in any war.

Our country is going strong on the military front. The magnificent ability, courage, and devotion of our Army and Navy lift the spirit of every American. We have weaknesses on the home front. We at home must show the ability, courage, and devotion to correct these weaknesses.

THE FOOD FRONT

One of these weaknesses is in the food sector. And indeed, of the different sectors of the home front, food is the greatest. It stands next to the military effort in importance.

Food serves on both the home and the foreign fronts. We have not only the job of feeding ourselves, but also our allies. And if we would have peace after the war instead of the anarchy of starving Europe we must be prepared to meet that also. Therefore our food production must be strengthened for a huge and a long-sustained effort.

Moreover while our civil population can be deeply deprived of most other consumers' goods there is a sharp limit to what it can endure in food and still be physically effective for its part in the war. Failure on the food sector has lost wars before now.

We can well explore the experience of nations in the First World War in this particular.

RUSSIA

Prior to that war Russia was a surplus food country. She exported large quantities of food. Her war leaders devoted themselves solely to the military front. They neglected the food production front. Two years later the Russian cities were pinched for food. Mobs roamed the streets howling, "Give us bread!" "Down with the Czar!" The Czar went down, as he deserved. The Kerensky government came to power. It lasted 9 months. It could not recover the food production and thus restore the home front of a great nation in the midst of war. The Communist slogan was: "The rich have hoarded the food; you will find it in their cellars." The cellars were empty. And Russia collapsed in the war.

GERMANY

Germany in 1914 produced about 85 percent of her food supplies despite the blockade. Her war leaders were sure they could ration the population down 15 percent and therefore had no anxiety about food. They neglected the food front. In 3 years Germany was dangerously short of food. In 4 years mobs were demanding bread and the Emperor's head. And Germany failed on the military front.

FRANCE

France was a self-sustaining food country before 1914. She had to concentrate her manpower wholly on the military effort to defend herself. Her food production decreased and she imported more and more from overseas. In 1917 she had exhausted her resources with which to pay for imports. We came into the war and saved her from collapse on the food front.

I do not contend that these collapses were wholly due to food, but it was the largest sector.

THE CAUSES OF DEGENERATION ON THE FOOD FRONT

And we can usefully explore the causes of this food degeneration in these European countries during the last total war. You will find some sinister parallels in America today.

Too much manpower was drained from the farms in all these nations. Their leaders said the women, children, and inexperienced city people could serve the farms. They could not. The manufacture of farm machinery was turned to munitions and inadequate replacements were made. Fertilizers were diverted to explosives. The fisheries were restricted because of the dangers of the sea and the draft of seamen. The planting was less effective and harvesting less complete. More fields had to be turned to human food and thus feed supplies for the animals decreased. The import of feed from overseas was reduced or cut off. The loss of skilled manpower particularly affected the care of animals. The herds decreased and the animal products went down at an accelerated rate every year. As they decreased, more and more of the breeding herd had to be eaten for meat. The degeneration everywhere was first in meats and fats, which include dairy products, and then in breadstuffs.

Never has there been a greater demonstration of man's dependence on his food animals.

THE FOOD FRONT IN AMERICA IN THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Before the last war we in America were a great food-surplus producing country. We exported about 10,000,000,000 pounds of human food a year.

In that year our leaders fully accepted the fact that the food front was the next important thing to the military front. Early in the war President Wilson announced:

"The importance of an adequate food supply * * * is superlative. Upon the farmers * * * rests the fate of the war and the fate of nations. * * * The Government will do everything possible to assist the farmers in securing adequate seed * * * an adequate force of laborers * * * and farm machinery." And again he said, "The men and women who devote themselves to these things will be serving the country and conducting the fight for peace and freedom as truly as the men on the battlefield."

In that war we held enough of the boys on the farm. We increased our food production. We voluntarily reduced our consumption. From these two sources we were able to increase our exports from a rate of 10,000,000,000 to a rate of 30,000,000,000 pounds per year. We increased our total number of food animals over the war period. We were able to carry Britain, Italy, France, and Belgium on our food back and we were able to save Europe from the after-war famine as well.

THE SITUATION TODAY IN OTHER NATIONS AT WAR

Now what is today's food situation abroad?

Britain, always a food-deficient country, is dependent upon overseas imports. Now cut off from their normal sources of supplies from overseas, a large part of the burden must be carried by the United States.

Russia was self-sufficient in food before this war. But due to the drain of her manpower to the war effort and due to the German invasion she has become partly dependent upon the United States for food.

Germany sought to hold her food front by storing large stocks of food in advance. She has robbed her victims until they are starving. But implacably from the same causes as in the last war her food production is degenerating. In meats and fats particularly, she is steadily approaching a disastrous crisis. Italy is traveling the same road.

THE CONDITION OF OUR OWN NATIONAL LARDER

Now what is the state of our larder today? What will it be tomorrow?

For some months I have devoted myself to this problem in which I can claim some experience. I have traveled into 20 States in inquiry from the farmers, from the processors, from merchants, from housewives, and from public officials. I have not depended solely upon statistics.

We have today five certain drains from our normal larder.

The first deficit—we are part blockaded

Surprising as it may be to some people, the United States had before this European war ceased to be a great food-surplus country. With the exception of the extraordinary harvest of 1942 we were on balance of all foods an importing country. The Japs and the submarine have cut off a large part of these imports. This shrinkage in our supplies of imported vegetable oils alone would be equivalent to the fat produced by eight or ten million hogs each year. And we imported large amounts of protein feed for animals. We imported vegetables and sugar.

We had a surplus of one major food line alone—that is cereals. But as the war goes on we can quickly expend that surplus in manufacture of industrial alcohol and necessary animal feeds. With this exception, the day after Pearl Harbor our national cupboard was potentially partly short of its normal food.

The second deficit—our obligations to our allies

We are compelled to open our larder, already depleted by blockade of our imports to help Britain, Russia, and others through lend-lease.

The third deficit—extra food for our fighting men

Our armed men eat more than as civilians. They eat twice as much meats and fats. And they must have a priority on our larder.

The fourth deficit—extra food for workers

Our increased numbers engaged in hard physical labor need more food.

I have no doubt we can tighten our belts and ration down our consumption to meet these four deficits in our normal larder. That is the deficiency in imports, the drain from lend-lease, from extra supplies for our military forces, and for our workers.

The fifth deficit—decrease in production

The most disturbing thing about our Nation-wide larder is the prospective decrease in our food production. Secretary Wickard has repeatedly warned we will produce less in 1943 than in the last year. We lost crops, many dairy cows and sheep last year for lack of labor. Yet we had more manpower and machines on the farm last year than we can hope for again during the war.

And we lived under two illusions last year. One was the spell of a record ground crop harvest far above normal.

The other was the abnormal killing of animals and thus a fictitious appearance of meat supply. A study of the increase in noninspected slaughter of cattle based on the country hides which came into the market, the abnormal number of dairy cattle slaughtered, the abnormal number of sheep slaughtered, all show that we had an abnormal meat supply. Yet we had a shortage in animal products during the latter part of the year despite this abnormal killing. And it is already much worse this year.

SIGNS OF DEGENERATION IN AGRICULTURE

But all that is not the greatest worry. There are symptoms of a dangerously degenerating agriculture that must be stopped.

Unlike our case in the war 25 years ago, we have today at work in America these uncanny parallels with the same degenerative forces that have been so disastrous in Europe. Like them we have drawn undue manpower from the farms. In the recent survey by the county agricultural service 70 percent of them report that due to decreased manpower there would be decreased acreage planted this year. Fifty-eight percent of them reported prospective decreases from 11 percent to 20 percent in planting. And harvesting requires much more manpower than planting. The livestock situation is also acute.

Work as they will, it is impossible that women, children and city folks can wholly supply the lack in this skilled craft. That farming requires great skill needs no further indication than that we have replaced 16,000,000 horses with tractors. We have increased production by intense development of plant and animal technology. Like Europe in the last war our farm machinery is wearing out faster than the replacement. Our imports of food are curtailed. Our fisheries are seriously restricted. Our protein feed for animals is very short. We are compelled to divert our nitrate fertilizers to explosives. All these are characteristic of European failures in the last war.

And we now have another degenerating force peculiar to ourselves. We have a price system in force that often strangles production and distribution. And prices are below the farmer's cost and just wage in many commodities.

All this sort of degeneration is progressive. Unless it is stopped in 1943, it will be worse in 1944 and still worse in 1945. And a prudent nation would plan for a long war. We must come in strong at the finish if we are to make the peace.

Unlike Britain and Russia, we have no great food country standing behind us filling our larder from overseas in this emergency.

If we wanted any further evidence of this degeneration we can find it in the despair that leads to auction sales, and in the abandonment of farms. We can find it in the undue killing of dairy cattle. We can find it in the shops without supplies for the housewife for days at a time. We can find it in local famines of meat or butter or potatoes or something else. We can find it in the epidemic of black markets all over the country.

REMEDIES

There is no cause for alarm, provided we set about to remedy the situation—and quickly.

Some of us, anxious over this problem, have had the temerity for the last 5 months to make suggestions to our authorities as to this strategy on our food front. We have supported the Secretary of Agriculture in his efforts.

We have from time to time made many constructive recommendations. They are familiar to you. I only mention them again because this vaccination has not sufficiently taken even yet. And time runs short—very short. No man can affect the timing of crops. That is inexorable.

We have recommended that agriculture must rank with munitions.

We have insisted that there must be more manpower and more machinery on the farms.

We recommended that the divided and competitive authorities over food in Washington should be consolidated under the Secretary of Agriculture.

We recommended that farm and food problems should be more largely decentralized to the States. That method contributed greatly to win the food battle in the last war.

We recommended that this ancient and inefficient method of price control now in use should be replaced by a simpler and more effective protection to both farmer and housewife.

We asked that prices to the farmer be increased to cover his costs and his labor.

We recommended definite organization for recruiting and distribution of agricultural labor, including training of women.

We asked that the former large seasonal immigration of Mexican farmers be organized and restored.

We recommended that the Army should consider deferring the draft of farm boys during 1943 and the furloughing of farm boys especially for the harvest and for some livestock purposes.

I have in mind a letter from President Wilson to Senator CAPPER in 1918 in which he assured the Senator that "men essential to the continued and undiminished operation of our farms shall be deferred" and that the Secretary of War had asked from Congress the authority to "furlough selected men during planting and harvest time."

We said an assurance of this cooperation in this war from the Army would help restore the confidence of the farmers that they can harvest this year and thus encourage them to plant.

We said: "There is a bottleneck in shipping which for the present limits your sending immediately all your men and equipment overseas." We suggested that this bottleneck should be examined in the light of the desperate agricultural need, to see if some relief could be given in manpower and machinery in 1943 without weakening our military effort abroad. We have offered no opinion as to the ultimate number of the armed men required to win the war.

But we have a right to speak on what it will require to win it on the home front.

I would not repeat all these recommendations here if they had been heeded. However, an aroused public opinion is getting some results. I have no doubt the Governors of our States will be able to advance public understanding, and to offer further constructive recommendations.

BETTER COORDINATION

In traveling about I find there are from 5 to 10 different Federal agencies operating in each State, which in some degree affects the farmer. Many of them conflict with each other and with the efforts of the State and local organizations. It would seem to me that the time has come to recognize that the Governors of the States should be allowed to make a great contribution in coordination of these agencies. Especially there should be set up in each State somewhere a single place that the farmer can go to and get attention to his particular problems.

BETTER DISTRIBUTION

There are questions of the control of food distribution and of the situation of housewives that I could comment on at great length. A price and distribution method which stifles production, produces great areas of scarcity, allows the constant spread of black markets, that in consequence deprives the poorest consumers of their just share of food, is amply subject to criticism. I am disposed, as I said 3 months ago, to give our authorities a chance to correct these things. But the patience of the country is running short.

FOOD AND PEACE

In all this I have discussed the question from our immediate point of view of win-

ning the war. But food must also win the peace.

When firing ceases we will be faced with three or four hundred million starving people in Europe and China.

To save these millions of people after the war is not alone a transcendent act of compassion. It is the only road to peace. Unless we stop the degenerative forces on our own food front we will have no supplies for this purpose.

And unless we stop these degenerative forces we will weaken our military front.

OUR FARMERS

And I want again to say a word as to the people on the farms. There can be no doubt that the men and women remaining on the job are putting forth the absolutely maximum effort to produce everything they can. They are working a 72-hour week at wages less than any other group. They are showing the highest courage and fortitude. But there are things that cannot be remedied by them alone.

We must find solutions to these problems—we must not fail.

Shortage of Meat and Other Staples

REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are perfectly willing to make any sacrifices necessary to the national war effort. They are willing to deprive themselves not only of luxuries but also of necessities that we may be victorious. However, their morale has been forced down to a very low point as a result of the confusion that has been created by governmental agencies and governmental officials.

Reassurances have been given by these officials and agencies that while there will not be a profusion of various foods, that with proper rationing everyone should have the necessities of life.

Such is not the case. In almost every large city of this country today, it is impossible for the citizen to purchase meat and other staples. In the city of New York, it is impossible to procure meat of any kind or cut. Housewives are walking blocks and blocks without result. The same situation exists in the vegetable market. Asparagus sold for 97 cents a bunch on last Saturday. The same day, string beans were 35 cents a pound.

If there is a scarcity of meat, our people are willing to be rationed. If there is a complete absence of meat, our people are willing to do without it, but our people do demand of their Government that the mental chaos for which the Government is responsible shall be wiped out. They are insistent that the true facts be told them and that seemingly responsible parties shall not give them half-truths, or absolute misinformation.

On January 12, 1943, I caused to be introduced into this body House Resolution 48, calling for an investigation of the meat industry and the black market. This resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules of the House. Although I have written to the chairman of the committee asking for a hearing, and although I have approached him verbally and reiterated my request, and although he has given me assurances that such a hearing would be granted by his committee, no action has been taken to date.

The problem of food, especially meat, is the paramount question before the American people today. It has superseded in their minds the war itself. If we are to win this war, the mental stability of our people must be restored. They must receive assurances backed by facts from the Government that every effort is being made to assure every household that it shall receive all necessary foods in the necessary amounts for subsistence. In a land of plenty, it is impossible for a population to fathom the chaos that now exists.

This Congress should investigate the situation, and unless I receive a hearing on House Resolution 48 within the next 48 hours, it is my intention to place a discharge petition upon the desk and to invite the Members from both sides of the aisle to sign it so that we, the people's representatives, can assure the American public that every effort is being made to get at the crux of this situation.

Forced Sales of Dairy Herds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members of Congress may realize that the difficulties of the dairy farmers under present O. P. A. regulations are Nation-wide and not confined to the particularly famous dairy districts, I am bringing to your attention a letter which I have sent today to the Price Administrator, Hon. Prentiss M. Brown, and a newspaper article describing the reasons for the dispersal of one of the finest dairy herds in the Connecticut Valley.

The letter and article are as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 23, 1943.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BROWN: I am enclosing copy of article appearing in the Springfield (Mass.) Union of March 17, 1942. It describes the sale of one of the finest dairy herds in the area supplying Springfield. It also sets forth the reason for the sale.

I am told by another leading farmer that milk is leaving the Springfield area for the Connecticut and other markets. The farmers are feeling discouraged with both prices and the help situation, and this leading farmer predicts that there will be a serious shortage of milk in Springfield if the price is not raised soon.

According to my information, the Massachusetts Milk Control Board claim that they would like to raise the price of milk but are unable to do so because of Office of Price Administration regulations. My constituent urges that the price of milk be raised in the Springfield market 1 cent a quart or 0.465 a hundred pounds.

I wish you would advise me why the Office of Price Administration puts into effect regulations which prevent the established milk-control boards of a State like Massachusetts from using the judgment which they should be in a position to exercise after years of direct connection with the problems which arise within the State.

I would like to know whether or not it is true that prices cannot be raised for milk in Massachusetts at the present time, due to restrictions or regulations of the Office of Price Administration. If so, I will appreciate it if you will cause a survey to be made of the Springfield, Mass., area at this time and advise me whether or not changes should be made in order to secure to the dairy farmers a better return for their products.

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. CLASON.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union of March 17, 1943]

SOUTH HADLEY MAN MUST SELL HIS FINE HERD—DONNELLAN FORCED TO ACT BY LOW MILK PRICE AND HIGH COSTS

Although Federal, State, and local officials continue to deplore the breaking up of fine dairy herds when the Nation is threatened with a rapidly worsening food shortage the practice continues here as elsewhere and is sharply pointed up by the sale set to open in South Hadley at 10 this morning when one of the largest and best herds in the Connecticut Valley, 83 head on the farm of Arthur L. Donnellan, goes on the auction block.

A graduate of Massachusetts State College in 1922, Donnellan managed large dairy farms in Whately, New York State, and in Virginia before assembling his own herd, but he flatly announced last night that he is out of the dairy business until such time as present intolerable conditions which burden the industry, such as surpluses, inequitable prices for milk, and doubled labor costs are something in the past. Emphasizing that the complete herd and all dairy equipment which will be auctioned today are his own, free and clear, and that the sale is in no sense a forced disposal, Donnellan added that under current conditions he can make only a living by hard work from 4 a. m. to 9 p. m. and that he simply decided that he wouldn't do it any longer.

His plans for the future are indefinite but one certainty of his withdrawal from the dairy production field is that the supply of Grade A baby milk coming into the Springfield market will be considerably decreased. Shipping in 500 to 600 pounds daily in winter and 700 to 800 in summer, he noted by reference to his books that from December 1 up to yesterday, 96,171 pounds of milk have gone from his farm to Springfield.

FROM BAD TO WORSE

The milk business has been in a turmoil throughout his 21 years in the game, Donnellan said, its only change being from bad to worse and the dairy farmers having faced so many broken promises of improvements which were to come that they no longer have any faith even in the organizations, which are supposedly gotten together for their benefit. Although he places the principal blame on the big distributors the daily farmers sell to, with what he termed their constant juggling to the farmers' disadvantage and the distributors' gain, neither has Donnellan any commendation for the State milk-control board, which he vigorously asserts seems to

accomplish practically nothing for the dairy farmers.

Specifically he pointed to the decision by this official board last December 1 that distributors must pay $4.02 per hundredweight for 3.7 percent butterfat milk, an increase of one-half cent for the farmers but which they have not yet collected, at least not from the three big Springfield distributors. Donnellan said that it might be presumed that this official pronouncement should be effective and at once but it hasn't been, although the Holyoke distributors are paying $4.02. Even if it were effective, he declared that it would be insufficient and he asserted that the milk control board is always 6 months at least behind the situation. In his opinion, present costs to the farmer would necessitate at least $4.75 per hundredweight of 3.7 milk and probably nearer to $5 if the farmer is to make a profit since it is costing him 10 cents a quart today to produce Grade A milk. But, he pointed out, the control board hasn't thus far even gotten around to enforcing its decision of last December for $4.02, against which court action was brought by some of the distributors.

Donnellan supposes that the case is lost somewhere in the court dockets and he has been unable to obtain any information on it either from the control board or the distributors, but meanwhile the latter are withholding the one-half cent on each hundredweight. How much the distributors allocate to surplus the farmer has no way of knowing until the checking statement comes from the company, Donnellan said, and he added that it would take a genius to understand the company's statements. Sometimes the surplus amounts to 10 percent, he declared, and another practice he pointed out as unfair is that although he has his own trucks the distributor insists upon doing the trucking but charges him, the farmer, for it.

How the agricultural experts can talk about milk scarcity at the same time surpluses are being charged up against the dairy farmers is something which Mr. Donnellan can find no sense in. Other headaches of the dairy farmer he noted are labor costs doubled, and grain prices reaching for the skies; also the cost of good dairy cows doubled with those which sold for $100 to $150 now $200 to $300. Not, he pointed out, for purebreds but just good dairy stock which he said are hard to find now in any instance short of $200 a head. The selling of milk at a cent a glass in schools and child-care centers he characterized as a racket and expressed the opinion that those whose children are drinking this milk are in these times well able to pay the real value for it.

Free To Go, But Tied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Hartford Courant on Friday, March 19. The editor discusses the recent O. P. A. regulation reducing the value of gasoline rationing A coupons from three to one and one-half gallons each.

My constituents may be interested to know that the O. P. A. tells me that there has actually been no reduction under the recent regulation. O. P. A. points out that previously only 90 miles per month were allowed for pleasure driving to holders of A, B, or C books. Under the new regulation, holders of A books are presumed to be using their car for pleasure only. In other words, if those who have had A books in the past use their cars in connection with their occupation or business or to travel back and forth between their home and shopping centers, under new regulations, they should apply for a supplemental rationing. The Washington office of O. P. A. assures me that these orders have gone out to all local boards.

The editorial follows:

FREE TO GO, BUT TIED

"Mother, may I go out to swim?
Yes, my darling daughter;
Hang your clothes on a hickory limb,
But don't go near the water."

Those familiar lines seem to apply to the announcement lifting the ban on "pleasure driving," but cutting in half the gasoline ration. Yes, you may now use your car in any way you see fit, but we'll see to it that your gasoline supply doesn't permit you to get any particular use out of it. We've made a great concession in telling the local police and the O. P. A. gestapo not to interfere with your movements, but to counterbalance it we've taken the precaution to keep you tied down. Go "pleasure driving," dearies, to your heart's content. We wouldn't stop you for the world, but that gallon-and-a-half will, and don't we know it!

Prentiss Brown of the Office of Price Administration and Harold Ickes, the Petroleum Administrator for War, thought it all up between them, and they seem to flatter themselves that they did a pretty good job. They have removed a great source of public irritation by wiping out all restrictions on three-gallon "pleasure driving," thus leaving the individual in the full possession of all his rights and liberties in this respect. At the same time they have seen to it that there "just aint" a scintilla of what they call "pleasure" to be found in a gallon-and-a-half—meaning gasoline, of course. There is hardly a trace of utility or necessary driving in the halved quota.

Now, if the gasoline supply, the transportation situation, and military needs do not permit of enough gasoline to give the eastern seaboard more than half of what it has been getting, then that is that, and we must make the best of it. Nobody wants to deprive our armed forces of essential motor fuel; the first duty and responsibility is to them. But as the Baruch rubber report emphasized, a duty and a responsibility are also owed to the home front if the war is to be successfully prosecuted, and the question arises whether everything possible is being done to bring needed gasoline to the Eastern States. Mr. Ickes says that only 330,000 barrels a day can be made available for this area, but that is 15,000 more than the daily average for this month. Why, then, cut the A coupon to 1½ gallons? Because there must be a reserve for spring plowing and planting, says Mr. Ickes, who seems to feel that as Petroleum Administrator he cannot squeeze out another drop of gasoline for the east coast civilian and industrial use.

However, neither Mr. Ickes nor Mr. Brown has any idea that the new rationing restrictions will prove sufficient for actual needs. So a scheme is being figured out that will enable those who use their cars in driving to work to get supplemental gasoline. That may result in virtually putting nearly everyone back on the 3-gallon basis, which in many cases has been proved too little. What the Washington officials ought to understand is that there never has been any such thing as pleasure driving on the 3-gallon ration, and that in these days when the family car has to keep traveling about to supply such household necessities as food, market deliveries being practically "out," the 1½-gallon coupon will be found little better than nothing at all.

How absolutely essential the automobile is under present conditions is recognized by the Office of War Information, for on the very day the announcement appeared that the gasoline ration would be halved beginning next Monday, it urged all car owners to have their tires recapped, since the Government was vitally interested in keeping passenger cars rolling as a means of relieving the public transportation system. "Drive into any local tire dealer's and he will do the work himself, or have it done for you," said the Office of War Information. But why bother about tires if there is no gas in the tank? It looks as if the Office of War Information and the Office of Price Administration, and the petroleum fellows ought to sit down together with a view to deciding what's what, and how.

Experience seems to have proved that after the bureaucratic mind has thought long and deeply enough about any given subject, it may begin to undo some of the things previously done. It comes as a bit of especially welcome news that the Office of Price Administration has about decided that there was altogether too much red tape wound about its fuel oil rationing scheme. It is only necessary, it now seems to feel, to give the householder a certificate entitling him to a given number of gallons and leaving it to the suppliers to make deliveries against the certificate as occasion requires. It is just as simple as that, and very much less expensive. Evidently somebody at the Office of Price Administration has read the report on the gasoline and fuel oil situation turned out by Senator MALONEY's committee and shows a commendable desire to profit from its conclusions. We may now hope that this Connecticut Senator will undertake to tell all and sundry officials who have fussed themselves up over this matter of "pleasure driving" that they are again off on the wrong foot and had better make another try at it. It is very hard to believe that supplies are running so short and that transportation has so far broken down that it is imperative to cut the A ration to as little as six gallons a month. Unless a greater leeway is afforded, there'll be a lot of stalled cars on the streets and the towing companies will waste a lot of gasoline getting them back home.

Soldiers Ask No Cancelation of Their Date With Death; Why Should We Ask Cancelation of Civilian Taxes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Ruml tax plan is probably the most colossal hoax of all of the reforms foisted upon the American people in the past decade. I refer to the plan as it was submitted by Mr. Ruml.

It is well to observe that the internationally known and recognized economist, Mr. Neil Carothers, of Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa., has pointed out

that the plan is indefensible. Mr. Carothers points out that it might be observed that Mr. Ruml has done his country a disservice, and that by promoting an unsound scheme he has thrown the country into a turmoil in time of war, led the people to follow an economic will-o'-the-wisp and inspired such a political terror in Congress that it may adopt some grievously unfair measure.

Mrs. Paul Cheek, secretary of the Organized Families of the American Expeditionary Forces, has also observed that any form of forgiveness of any taxes would destroy American morale and would stab in the back our overseas men. And Mrs. Cheek submits the question: How can anyone worthy of living in America ask that their just taxes be forgiven when our men are dying?

The cancelation phase of the Ruml plan outdoes all of the wild leaf-raking stories of the heydey of the W. P. A. The Ruml plan not only rakes the leaves from the Nation's financial trees from one side of the road to the other, but it does not even bother to pick them up.

The moot point in this plan is not at all the question of "pay-as-you-go," but the spotlight of the whole proposal has been focused on that particular phase. The people have been led to believe that "pay-as-you-go" constitutes the Ruml plan. They have been detoured around the cancelation mudhole.

The important thing behind Ruml's plan is the wiping out of the taxes for 1 year on $114,000,000,000 of national income which someone received.

It is inconceivable, in this great national crisis, when strong-hearted young men fight America's war for a pittance of $50 a month, that leaders in the homeland should inaugurate a delirious hallucination to detour our financial approach in the way of raising more taxes for the specific purpose of avoiding some of the pains of regimentation and to cut down the excess inflationary dollars already floating around.

The O. P. A.'s rapidly growing regimentation is not to aid the war effort but an attempt to avoid destructive inflation, caused by our own failure to channel excess dollars back to the Treasury.

On the military fronts, in the air, under the sea, and on the oceans, men in the armed services are not asking cancelation of their date with death. No, they are not having their taxes canceled, but they are having their lives canceled out through moving forward into the jaws of the enemy.

Will someone offer just one sane reason why some leaders insist that present excess dollars be not taxed? Even worse, these leaders advocate and support the issuance of more inflation dollars.

With war profits after taxes running freely and with pay envelopes fatter than ever before and still expanding and at a time when citizens at home should be giving consideration to the post-war period when the soldiers will be coming home, the inventive mind of man gives birth to this incredible tax dodge.

Taxation as a means of avoiding post-war collapse is one of the points advocated by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in its new bulletin signed by Dr. Emerson P. Schmidt. The bulletin contends there must be full public support of a program for financing a larger part of the war costs by taxation and the purchase of War bond by individuals and savings institutions rather than by commercial banks.

"Pay-as-you-go is still a good idea" says the Saturday Evening Post in an editorial. There are few who will argue against that claim. Certainly I think "pay-as-you-go" is a fine idea.

But the Saturday Evening Post steps down off the curb and joins the parade in a noisy demonstration for freak tax legislation that would put to shame the ballyhoo for the monstrosities of P. T. Barnum.

Its befogged editorial follows:

PAY-AS-YOU-GO IS STILL A GOOD IDEA

By this time most good citizens have figured out their income taxes for 1942, and next Monday the check for at least the first installment goes to the Internal Revenue Collector. Unfortunately, however, income tax still lags behind income.

Perhaps this situation will be changed to some extent in the next few months. It takes a long time to act, because neither the Treasury nor the House Ways and Means Committee, which initiates revenue legislation, has been quick to understand the importance of bringing income tax up to income as it is being earned. When Mr. Beardsley Ruml, originator of the so-called Ruml plan, appeared before the committee last month it might have been supposed that he headed a movement to evade income tax instead of expressing the growing concern of the American people over means for paying it. Mr. Ruml was polished off as ranking with "the great 'gimme' exponents of the past decade," and Representative CRAWFORD, who is not a member of the committee, but appeared as a witness, declared that "even Dr. Townsend has never advocated remitting taxes." Another Member wanted to know what the soldiers in the field would say when they came home to discover that Mr. Ruml had arranged to have them pay for all the tanks and cannon with which they had been fighting. In the Senate a few days later Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, described the Ruml plan as "the beginning of a strike by income taxpayers against our Government."

Despite this extraordinary display of indifference to what Mr. Ruml's plan is and lack of curiosity to find out, the campaign for pay-as-you-go has accomplished something. It has hammered home the truth that taxes for 1943 cannot be paid as they are earned unless some disposition is made of the tax debt for 1942. Mr. Randolph Paul, of the Treasury, who had explained that, although the Treasury would not lose receipts under the Ruml plan, it would lose assets, was all for pay-as-you-go in principle, but the nearest he came to an answer to the question "How?" was a veiled suggestion of double taxation. Mr. Paul would have none of the Ruml plan because, in his view, 60 men with million-dollar incomes would "each receive a benefit of at least $854,000. * * * Those who had no income in 1942 would receive no benefit whatever." In other words, the Ruml plan was bad, not only because it "forgives" taxes but because it doesn't forgive taxes that were never paid.

Of course, as was inevitable, the Members followed up their denunciations of Mr. Ruml's "forgiveness," which was not forgiveness, with a series of compromise plans most of which did involve forgiveness. One was a scheme to cancel the normal tax and the first bracket of surtax on the 1942 incomes. Another would apply the 1941 rates to 1942 incomes and collect currently on 1943 incomes. Another would collect as much as possible from those who were able to pay on their 1942 incomes plus the tax on 1943 incomes and, while not putting the overwhelming majority of small taxpayers in jail, would leave them with the same old income-tax debt still hanging over their heads. Still another would cancel half the tax on 1942 incomes and collect in 1943 the tax on 1943 incomes.

In other words the problem of our legislators has been to give us Ruml, or a part of Ruml, with Ruml left out. That intrepid reformer has earned the reward of all who succeed in putting politicians on the hot seat. He has also earned the gratitude of millions of people, who are not trying to evade taxes but only to pay them, and who have made a pretty shrewd guess that as soon as faces can be saved all round, the essentials of the reform which Mr. Ruml has so convincingly and urbanely urged will be a part of our income-tax procedure.

Certainly the Saturday Evening Post has not—nor has the press generally—done anything to tell the public what the Ruml plan is. It identifies the plan with pay as you go, though Mr. Ruml has himself admitted that pay-roll deductions are no necessary part of his plan. The Post further denies the plan involves forgiveness, although this is the only point at issue. Such demagoguery can only be regarded as sabotaging discussion of an issue which requires careful thought. Though 60 percent of individual taxpayers paid their year's taxes in full on or before March 15, 1942, they are now encouraged to postpone payment of essential war taxes by propaganda which says they never should be paid at all.

The Post charges that—

Neither the Treasury nor the House Ways and Means Committee * * * has been quick to understand the importance of bringing income tax up to income as it is being earned.

The Treasury proposed income-tax deductions from pay envelopes as early as March 3, 1942, and the House Ways and Means Committee wrote a collection-at-source provision into the Revenue bill of 1942 which it sent to the Senate. Mr. Beardsley Ruml's proposals added nothing to these plans except the notion that it would be nice to skip a year's taxes, plus a scheme for substituting pay as you went for pay as you go by omitting the collection-at-source feature and proposing that 1942 taxes be paid on the basis of 1941 income. He has since abandoned this latter idea, and differs with the Treasury and the House Ways and Means Committee only in insisting that a year's taxes be forgiven.

Despite the Post's statement that the Ruml plan involves no forgiveness, the question of forgiving 1942 taxes is the only issue at stake between Mr. Ruml and the majority of the House Ways and Means Committee. Though the Treasury might not lose receipts in 1942 if the rates of tax are not changed in the Revenue Act of 1943, the point at issue is whether, in increasing taxes to meet the greater war costs of 1943, we are to ignore

1942 incomes, on which taxes have already become payable, and concentrate solely on 1943 incomes as a basis of ability to pay. The issue is, in approximate figures, 20 percent first-bracket rates for both 1942 and 1943 incomes versus a 40-percent rate on 1943 incomes.

The fact that million-dollar incomes are already paying 85 percent rates means that little, if any, increase in rates can be applied to 1943 incomes at this level to compensate for the loss of 1942 taxes forgiven. Therefore, taxes on the very large incomes would be forgiven completely under the Ruml plan, though small incomes might be forced to make up the loss by doubling of the first-bracket rates. This inevitable shifting of the war burden from one class to another is certainly a good reason for opposing the Ruml cancelation plan.

Moreover, the fact that 40 percent might be considered by the Congress as too high a first-bracket rate indicates the likelihood of a loss to the Treasury under the Ruml plan.

Further contribution in befogging the pending tax legislation is the claim of the Post that there has been an "extraordinary display of indifference as to what Mr. Ruml's plan is and the lack of curiosity to find out."

The Treasury has certainly not shown any indifference to the Ruml plan, but has given it a very thorough study, and given it an exposition in clearer terms than Mr. Ruml has succeeded in doing. The Ways and Means Committee spent many days in listening to Mr. Ruml and going over the plan with him and with the Treasury from every point of view, and as Mr. Ruml told the committee himself, he had gone over the plan with the Treasury long before he presented it to the public, so that there was never any need for the Treasury to "save face"—if it could ever be accused of so childish an attitude—by thinking of an alternative to a plan which had "earned the gratitude of millions of people."

Mr. Speaker, we cannot permit the efforts of our soldiers, sailors, WAAC's, WAVES, and other personnel located on the global battle fronts and occupying the military posts to be undermined and sabotaged by strikes, lock-outs, or other disruptions which prevent the physical production and transportation of military equipment and supplies. For the civilians to be unmindful of the fact that it will be impossible for our economy to function and for our industrial and other workers to be content in maintaining production if chaos is created through the operation of inflation, can, too, prove fatal. For civilians to fail in the second instance is as deadly as to fail in the first.

We have established the great agency of the O. P. A.—not to aid the war effort but to prevent inflation. Yet at the same time there are those who lead our people into unconsciously supporting a fiscal policy that will not stand.

If the civilian ever wanted to make his contribution to the war effort, he should make it now and pay his Federal taxes. Never before have I so greatly felt the necessity for such a contribution. Needs of the hour give the citizen an opportunity to justify his immortality in the economic life of this Nation.

We should thank God for the privilege of making this tax contribution.

Presentation of Scroll at National Rural Electric Cooperative Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include the address delivered by S. R. Finley, general superintendent of the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga, Tenn., on January 19, 1943, upon the presentation to the Honorable George W. Norris of a scroll from the distributors of the T. V. A. wholesale power. The address was made part of the program at the national convention of the Rural Electric Cooperative Association, which was held in St. Louis on January 19, 1943:

Mr. Chairman, Senator Norris, Mrs. Norris, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentleman, it is written of old that "our young men shall dream dreams and our old men shall see visions." The distinguished American whom we honor tonight dreamed of developing the water resources of this country so as to bring the greatest benefit to the people. He had a vision of a chain of dams, financed and constructed by the Government, along our great water courses and their tributaries, which would control floods, prevent soil erosion, improve navigation, and generate cheap electric current sufficient to send it into every farmhouse in this country, and furnish cheap fuel for the operation of the industrial plants of the Nation.

When the President of the United States sent his message to Congress in 1933 advocating the passage of what is known as the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, and the same was read in the Senate, Senator Norris called it "the greatest humanitarian document ever to come from the White House." And added, "The message is an official approval of a 12-year dream I have had." And, today, he can see 27 dams in the Tennessee Valley area, either completed or under construction, as a fulfillment of his dreams and visions.

During the 12 years preceding the enactment of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, this distinguished statesman introduced eight similar bills, none of which was enacted into law. Two of them, after passing through Congress, were vetoed by the President—one by President Coolidge and one by President Hoover.

However, while failing of passage into law, all of these eight so-called Muscle Shoals bills served the noble purpose of keeping private power and fertilizer interests from getting control of the river and its resources—for exploitation and private gain.

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act was not merely a plan to bring electricity to the poorer people of the South, it was a coordinated plan to develop and conserve, for the benefit of the Nation, all of the natural resources of the great river's watershed. It was a program to bring a new opportunity to millions of men and women in this area, and called for reclamation of the soil, reforestation of the de-wooded lands, and control of floods. In establishing the Authority there was created for the first time a governmental authority which was armed with powers of government, but yet had the flexibility of private business. George Norris and President Roosevelt believed "it was destined to be probably the wildest experiment ever conducted by a government." Its scope was to be as wide as the problems of the region. And if anyone doesn't think we have problems in Tennessee, they should visit us.

It is not often that we can, in the short space of 10 years, realize the full fruits of completion of a program as wide in purpose as that of the Tennessee Valley Authority development. And yet, in that length of time we have seen the power of falling water in the great river's watershed controlled and harnessed, a new transportation artery has been established, marginal lands are being restored to fertility, reforestation of barren acres is a fact accomplished, agricultural and industrial development have been stimulated—and, most important of all, a Nation—now sorely at war—finds for its use a valuable resource for its fight to preserve our democratic freedom. All of this, fashioned to the fullness of value, through our democratic process by a governmental authority, clothed with and exercising, besides its governmental powers, the flexibility and efficiency of private business.

I could dwell at length upon the actual results in our region, and the inestimable value, to the Nation and to our region, of the benefits now being realized. Only a few short weeks ago our city of Chattanooga was saved from a disastrous flood by the water-control methods of Tennessee Valley Authority. Over 500,000 users of electricity now purchase, through either publicly or cooperatively owned power systems, the electricity byproduct from the multipurpose river dams. Annual savings to these electricity users, over costs previously incurred for their electric service, are estimated to be $10,000,000. The sale and utilization of household electrical appliances has increased over 1000 percent since 1933—when George Norris' dream became a reality. Tennessee Valley Authority region residential electricity costs are the lowest in the South and only one-half the national average.

Tennessee Valley Authority's farm demonstration program, rural household electrification, farm machinery development, malaria control, soil conservation, and many other related benefits from the regional development program, have helped to remake our area. Truly, here is real American democratc Government at work, and for the coming fiscal year no appropriation from the Congress has been asked to keep it functioning.

It was my privilege as a small boy to be present at my father's desk in Congress in 1910 and to witness George Norris' successful fight to unhorse Speaker Joe Cannon's despotic rule and restore democratic rule to the Congress. It has been my good fortune to be present in the Tennessee Valley Authority area for a number of years and to witness the successful culmination of George Norris' dream to restore and develop for the people the wasted resources of that region. It is now my high privilege to represent here tonight the over one hundred city, town, and farm cooperative electric systems in the Tennessee Valley Authority region, and to present to you, for them, Hon. George W. Norris, this expression of grateful esteem from the people of the Tennessee Valley—a region where is being realized your dream of the conservation and use of natural resources for the good of all. May God bless and keep you—you have earned His richest blessing.

Wartime Salaries

REMARKS
OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, last week when we had under consideration the amendment to strike down the Executive order of the President limiting large salaries during war, I did not have time then to give a list of the salaries of many large industrial executives. I have secured a list from the Securities and Exchange Commission which is entirely official, but I do not undertake to say that it is a complete list by any means. In fact, I think it is only a very partial list. This list covers several large corporations and gives the salary received by the president, and, in some cases, by some vice presidents and directors, for the years 1940, 1941, and 1942, in some instances, and for the years 1939, 1940, and 1941 in other cases. I desire to call your attention to the fact that in a great many of these cases there was a very pronounced increase in salaries due to the war conditions. I call your further attention to the fact that in some cases salaries were increased from a very few thousand dollars to fifty or sixty thousand dollars in the short space of 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, many of us in this House could not justify the payment of such exorbitant salaries during war and we, therefore, voted against the Disney amendment, which struck down the President's Executive order. We took the position that during this war, when American men are fighting and dying all over the world on very small salaries it was wrong to permit these large salaries to be paid the great industrial moguls in the country.

I think that this list of executive salaries which I have will make most interesting reading. I believe that the American people will be interested in receiving these figures. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may revise and extend my remarks, and that I may include in my remarks this list of salaries of industrial executives.

The list of salaries follows:

Registrant	Name and capacity	Fiscal year ending—	Remuneration		
			1940	1941	1942
Continental Motors Corporation [1]	Clarence Reese, president, general manager, and director	Oct. 31	$16,604.04	$40,903.25	$58,026.91
	Edward F. Thomas, assistant to president		18,264.55	36,189.79	
	W. R. Angell, technical adviser		13,000.00		
	Lewis P. Kalb, vice president in charge of operations and director			29,384.65	44,554.48
Hayes Manufacturing Corporation [1]	John W. Young, president and general manager	Sept. 30	15,000.00		
	Roy J. Charters, vice president		5,499.96		
	William B. Robertson, vice president		5,395.83		
	R. W. Clark, president and director			18,129.66	[2] 28,372.43
	T. F. Junker, salesman			17,604.72	
	J. H. Thompson, salesman			10,504.67	
	Alfred J. Miranda, Jr.				
	I. J. Miranda				[3] 55,591.67
	F. William Zelcer				
Swift & Co. (Illinois)	G. F. Swift, vice chairman of board	Oct. 2	50,000.00	50,961.55	60,000.00
	William B. Traynor, vice president and treasurer	Nov. 1	55,000.00	60,288.47	60,000.00
	John Holmes, president	Oct. 31	65,000.00	76,442.31	85,000.00
The Celotex Corporation [1]	Bror Dahlberg, president and director	do	[4] 82,081.14	[5] 193,771.98	[6] 71,200.00
	Carl G. Muench, vice president and director		[7] 28,216.23	[8] 50,474.40	[6] 37,100.00
	O. S. Mansell, vice president and director		[9] 20,347.88		
	L. R. Boulware, vice president and director			[10] 62,474.40	
Beech Aircraft Corporation	Walter H. Beech, president and director	Sept. 30	12,449.63	19,355.55	65,299.29
	T. A. Wells, vice president and chief engineer		6,601.55	9,615.49	41,015.91
	J. P. Gaty, vice president and general manager		5,746.65	9,615.12	41,015.91
West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co. [11]	Thomas Luke, president	Oct. 31	29,730.00	90,525.00	32,100.00
	Adam K. Luke, vice president and treasurer		29,730.00	90,525.00	32,100.00
	John R. Miller, vice president		28,736.70	103,505.03	42,325.00
	David L. Luke, Jr., vice president			94,355.03	34,125.00
General Shoe Corporation	W. M. Jarman, president and director	Oct. 31	23,291.67	29,836.25	30,830.00
	W. H. Wemyss, executive vice president and director		20,621.08	26,139.34	27,025.00
	J. H. Lawson, general manager and director		19,451.25		
	H. W. Boyd, Jr., vice president, treasurer, and director			24,880.28	28,080.40
Minneapolis-Moline Power Implement Co. [1]	W. C. MacFarlane, president, general manager, and director	Oct. 31	48,100.00	48,100.00	48,210.00
	G. L. Gillette, vice president and director		20,100.04	22,060.04	22,210.04
	S. L. Angle, treasurer and director		10,286.63	12,850.00	15,710.00
Bendix Aviation Corporation [12]	Vincent Bendix, president and director	Sept. 30	51,492.77	83,034.98	
	Charles Marcus, vice president and director		40,892.83	71,110.00	[13] 77,043.33
	D. O. Thomas, vice president and director		34,662.85	56,160.00	60,050.00
	E. R. Breech, president and director				[14] 92,600.01
Nash-Kelvinator Corporation	G. W. Mason, president, general manager, and director	Sept. 30	126,092.30	[15] 225,731.07	125,482.22
	W. F. Armstrong, vice president		75,090.00	[16] 125,074.99	100,059.96
	Frank Pierce, vice president		49,999.96	107,144.97	72,500.00
The Cessna Aircraft Co.	Duane L. Wallace, president, general manager, and director	Sept. 30	5,400.00	16,619.77	[17] 89,851.67
	Dwight S. Wallace, executive vice president, treasurer, and director		2,325.00	16,032.16	[18] 89,851.67
	Tom Salter, vice president, director, and chief engineer		3,030.00	9,704.44	32,531.45
Joy Manufacturing Co.	J. D. A. Morrow, president and director [19]	Sept. 30	7,332.80	49,089.32	55,577.26
	W. E. Barrow, president and director [20]		16,141.23		
	C. A. Barrow, assistant secretary and treasurer		6,843.41		
	A. S. Knoizen, vice president in charge of sales			21,529.30	25,975.75
	H. W. Hawkins, secretary			8,880.16	
	Charles F. Ball, director of engineering				14,430.97
Cleveland Tractor Co.	W. King White, president	Sept. 30	15,300.00	26,604.47	51,166.66
	H. P. Mee, executive vice president		15,300.00		
	Harry Chaffee, regional vice president		25,707.34		
	J. G. Heaslet, vice president			15,620.00	23,200.00
	E. M. Bell, Jr., vice president and treasurer			13,365.00	
	L. H. Grutsch, works manager				15,000.00
Wilson & Co., Inc.	Thomas E. Wilson, chairman of board	Oct. 26	77,619.27	76,992.43	[21]
	Edward Foss Wilson, president	Nov. 1	31,511.65	36,753.99	
	A. R. McCartan, employee		30,000.00		
	J. D. Cooney, vice president			31,057.56	

[1] Figures covering 1942 remuneration taken from proxy soliciting material filed by the management of the company.
[2] Includes bonus of $8,702.42.
[3] Accrued and became payable to Alfred J. Miranda, Jr., I. J. Miranda, and F. William Zelcer, collectively, as remote assignees of Hayes Aircraft Accessories Corporation, to apply on present unpaid balance of approximately $173,500 of commissions under sales agency contract.
[4] Includes bonus of $46,081.14.
[5] Includes bonus of $157,871.98.
[6] Includes a bonus approximately two-thirds of which or $23,333 and $12,000 was placed in trust under the profit-sharing plan for the respective benefit of each.
[7] Includes bonus of $9,216.23.
[8] Includes bonus of $31,574.40.
[9] Includes bonus of $4,347.88.
[10] Includes bonus of $31,574.40.
[11] The 1941 figures include profit-sharing bonus provided during fiscal years 1940 and 1941.
[12] The 1940 figures include salary for 9 months and bonus paid in 1940 based on 1939 earnings. The 1941 figures do not include bonus paid in December 1941 based on 1940 earnings.
[13] Includes bonus of $32,000.
[14] Includes bonus of $50,000.
[15] Includes bonus of $100,000.
[16] Includes bonus of $50,000.
[17] Includes bonus of $37,000.
[18] Includes bonus of $37,000.
[19] President from Aug. 7, 1940.
[20] President to Aug. 7, 1940.
[21] Figures covering 1942 remuneration paid by the company not yet available.

Registrant	Name and capacity	Fiscal year ending—	Remuneration 1940	1941	1942
George A. Hormel & Co	Jay C. Hormel, president and director	Oct. 26	$52,670.27	$53,376.84	$61,733.96
	H. H. Corey, vice president and director	Oct. 25	36,844.99	25,113.02	36,392.53
	M. F. Dugan, treasurer and director	Oct. 31	22,754.39		
	Park Dougherty, vice president and director			16,690.02	18,900.89
	W. F. Calladay, branch manager				42,435.25
John Morrell & Co	T. Henry Foster, president and director	Nov. 2	36,000.00	36,000.00	[21]
	G. M. Foster, vice president and director	Nov. 1	30,000.00	30,000.00	
	J. C. Sturtz, vice president and director		30,000.00	30,000.00	
Nunn-Bush Shoe Co	H. L. Nunn, president	Oct. 31	20,000.00	13,000.00	[21]
	A. W. Bush, vice president		20,000.00	20,000.00	
	J. C. Johnson, secretary		10,333.83	13,597.30	
	J. B. Buchanan, treasurer		10,333.83	13,597.30	
The United States Leather Co.[1]	Henry M. McAdoo, president and director	Oct. 31	40,850.00	40,850.00	[22] 55,000.00
	Eugene H. Amory, vice president and director		22,800.00	22,800.00	[23] 30,000.00
	Roland H. Zinn, vice president, secretary and director		18,050.00	18,050.00	[23] 26,000.00
The Waco Aircraft Co	Lee N. Brutus, vice president and treasurer	Sept. 30	4,750.00	8,470.00	
	A. F. Arcier, chief engineer	Oct. 31	6,500.00	7,579.55	13,033.68
	H. R. Perry, vice president and director		5,435.00	6,729.80	9,736.80
	C. J. Brukner, president and director				10,875.00
Williams Oil-O-Matic Heating Corporation	W. W. Williams, president	Oct. 21	21,210.00	21,600.00	[21]
	A. T. Simmons, vice president and treasurer		4,800.00	6,595.00	
	R. V. Hopkins, secretary		3,792.00		
	W. A. Matheson, vice president			10,000.00	
Seiberling Rubber Co.[1]	F. A. Seiberling, chairman of board and director	Oct. 31	36,000.00	36,000.00	36,000.00
	J. P. Seiberling, president and director		18,333.28	19,999.92	20,000.00
	W. A. M. Vaughan, vice president, treasurer, and director		14,100.00		
	H. P. Schrank, vice president and director			15,000.00	15,571.47
Illinois Zinc Co	James A. Hill, president and treasurer	Sept. 30	14,750.00	21,666.72	50,283.03
	W. B. Porter, vice president and general manager		11,833.32	12,000.00	
	Leroy E. Nelson, vice president		7,280.00	5,700.00	
	L. R. Berkey, secretary and assistant treasurer				10,365.38
	Howard Mellor, vice president and assistant secretary				10,430.77
Food Machinery Corporation	P. L. Davies, president and director	Sept. 30	30,911.10	33,797.02	33,729.26
	J. D. Crummey, president and director		25,391.10		
	F. L. Burrell, vice president and director		25,391.10	27,797.02	27,729.26
	A. R. Thompson, vice president and director		25,391.10	27,797.02	27,729.26
	Ogden S. Sells, vice president and director			27,797.02	27,729.26
Willys-Overland Motors, Inc	Joseph W. Frazer, president and director	Sept. 30	60,000.00	[24] 103,092.53	[25] 123,183.80
	George W. Ritter, general counsel		19,875.25	28,197.50	
	Delmar G. Roos, vice president in charge of engineering and director		18,000.00		24,250.06
	Ward M. Canaday, chairman of board			51,425.00	50,000.00
The Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co	W. S. Symington, president, chairman, and general manager	Sept. 30	24,000.00	24,000.00	24,000.00
	O. C. Schmitt, vice president		12,247.20	12,247.20	15,932.80
	J. A. Driy, vice president		10,206.00		12,413.02

[1] Figures covering 1942 remuneration taken from proxy soliciting material filed by the management of the company.
[21] Figures covering 1942 remuneration paid by the company not yet available.
[22] Includes bonus of $10,000.
[23] Includes bonus of $6,000.
[24] Includes bonus of $42,592.53.
[25] Includes bonus of $63,183.80.

Registrant	Name and capacity	Remuneration 1939	1940	1941
Allied Chemical & Dye Corporation	H. F. Atherton, president and chairman of board	$125,000.00	$125,000.00	$125,000.00
	C. G. Tufts, vice president	60,000.00	60,000.00	60,000.00
	F. H. McAdoo, vice president	55,000.00	55,000.00	
	B. A. Ludwig, vice president			60,000.00
	E. W. Clark, vice president			60,000.00
The American Tobacco Co	George W. Hill, president	[1] 420,299.58	[2] 456,415.36	[3] 288,144.75
	Paul M. Hahn, vice president	[4] 230,179.75	[5] 251,849.22	[6] 150,886.86
	Vincent Riggio, vice president	[7] 230,179.75	[8] 251,849.22	[9] 150,886.86
Atlas Imperial Diesel Engine Co	F. H. Kilberry, president	18,000.00	18,000.00	24,000.00
	S. P. Eastman, chairman of the board	9,000.00	9,000.00	
	F. H. Dickson, branch manager, Chicago	5,000.00		
	J. W. Camp, first vice president of Atlas Diesel Engine Corporation, New York, a subsidiary.		9,683.13	11,000.00
	J. B. Wright, manager, Chicago branch			10,000.00
Atlas Powder Co	Leland Lyon, president and director	48,033.38	63,604.00	64,639.86
	Isaac Fogg, vice president, director, and treasurer	34,200.03	48,604.00	49,639.86
	W. T. Penniman, vice president and director	33,150.04	47,354.00	48,389.86
The Aviation Corporation	W. H. Beal, director and president	37,640.00		
	A. I. Lodwick, director	20,040.00		
	L. B. Manning, director and vice president	24,395.00		
	Victor Emanuel, president and director		25,000.01	[10] 79,150.00
	R. S. Pruitt, director and general counsel		55,658.09	
	William F Wise, vice president		43,910.00	[11] 73,718.05
	Ira J. Snader, vice president of a subsidiary and general manager of a division			35,124.96
Bethlehem Steel Corporation	*Eugene G. Grace, president and director	[12] 271,224.00	[13] 478,144.00	[14] 537,724.00
	Charles M. Schwab, director and chairman of board	135,000.00		
	*Quincy Bent, director	117,364.00	[15] 179,443.00	[16] 197,317.00
	*Paul Mackall, director	117,364.00	[17] 179,443.00	[18] 197,317.00
	*Robert E. McMath, secretary, vice president, and director			[19] 155,393.00
	*Frederick A. Shick, comptroller and director			[20] 155,393.00
Blaw-Knox Co	W P. Witherow, president and director	38,000.00	44,000.00	50,000.00
	Frank Cordes, director and chairman of board	35,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00
	Chester H. Lehman, director, vice chairman of board, and executive vice president.	30,000.00	36,000.00	42,000.00
Boeing Airplane Co	Claire L. Egtvedt, chairman of Boeing Aircraft Co	19,999.92	20,000.00	20,000.00
	R. J. Minshall, vice president of Boeing Aircraft Co	11,250.10	12,000.00	
	Fred P. Laudan, vice president of Boeing Aircraft Co	10,625.05		
	P. C. Johnson, president and general manager of Boeing Aircraft Co		20,000.00	20,000.00
	H. O. West, executive vice president of Boeing Aircraft Co			16,000.00

*Also an officer and/or a director of one or more subsidiaries.
[1] Includes bonus of $300,299.58.
[2] Includes bonus of $336,415.36.
[3] Includes bonus of $168,144.75.
[4] Includes bonus of $180,179.75.
[5] Includes bonus of $201,849.22.
[6] Includes bonus of $100,886.86.
[7] Includes bonus of $180,179.75.
[8] Includes bonus of $201,849.22.
[9] Includes bonus of $100,886.86.
[10] Includes bonus of $35,000.
[11] Includes bonus of $43,529.05.
[12] Includes bonus of $91,224.
[13] Includes bonus of $298,144.
[14] Includes bonus of $357,724.
[15] Includes bonus of $89,443.
[16] Includes bonus of $107,317.
[17] Includes bonus of $89,443.
[18] Includes bonus of $107,317.
[19] Includes bonus of $95,393.
[20] Includes bonus of $95,393.

Registrant	Name and capacity	Remuneration		
		1939	1940	1941
Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co.	H. A. Jackson, president	$67,020.00	$79,020.00	$120,020.00
	W. L. Lewis, executive vice president, secretary, and treasurer	67,000.00	79,000.00	120,000.00
	A. E. Goodhue, vice president	15,200.00		
	E. G. Russ, sales representative		28,214.00	
	G. J. Coffey, sales representative			64,897.00
Cooper-Bessemer Corporation	B. B. Williams, president and chairman of board	12,625.00	23,333.33	25,000.00
	C. M. Reagle, vice president	15,269.90	23,702.60	29,044.93
	C. B. Jahnke, vice president and general manager	14,255.00	23,000.00	
	J. W. Reed, salesman and assistant branch manager			23,986.62
The Dayton Rubber Manufacturing	J. A. MacMillan, chairman of board	15,000.00		
	A. L. Freedlander, president and general manager	19,166.66	22,666.66	35,333.30
	F. C. Murray, manager of original equipment division	17,432.33	18,456.36	26,110.46
	K. H. Glanton, vice president		15,899.97	
	J. O. Cole, manager of textile products division			21,547.16
Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.	Donald W. Douglas, president	64,683.30	75,080.00	101,769.09
	V. E. Bertrandias, vice president and sales representative	81,180.67	54,898.34	
	Carl A. Cover, senior vice president and general manager			50,794.10
	A. E. Raymond, vice president and engineer			31,769.09
General Electric Co.	Owen D. Young, chairman of board	[21] 164,987.00		
	Gerard Swope, president and director	[22] 164,987.00		
	Charles E. Wilson, president and director	[23] 97,487.00	[24] 135,000.00	[25] 175,000.00
	Philip D. Reed, chairman of board		[26] 90,000.00	[27] 120,000.00
	Clark H. Minor, director, also director International General Electric Co. Inc.		[28] 74,000.00	[29] 86,000.00
The B. F. Goodrich Co.	David M. Goodrich, officer	49,625.04	49,625.04	
	S. B. Robertson, officer	47,718.78		
	J. H. Connors, officer	31,927.10		
	John L. Collyer, officer		84,999.96	[30] 130,835.28
	T. G. Graham, officer		39,999.96	[31] 81,085.58
	J. J. Newman, officer			[32] 76,511.58
International Harvester Co.	Sydney G. McAllister, president until May 15, 1941; since then chairman of executive committee.	83,368.72	99,399.96	121,710.00
	Maurice F. Holahan, first vice president	54,256.22	56,349.96	70,250.00
	William S. Elliott, vice president and general counsel	53,556.22	55,849.96	
	Fowler McCormick, second vice president until May 15, 1941; since then president.			93,258.00
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation	H. E. Lewis, president and chairman of board	118,125.00	135,000.00	135,000.00
	W. J. Creighton, vice president	43,750.00	50,000.00	54,167.00
	L. M. Parsons, vice president	50,000.00	[33] 80,385.00	[34] 110,375.00
	S. S. Marshall, Jr., vice president			54,167.00
P. Lorillard Tobacco Co.	David H. Ball, president	30,000.00		
	George H. Hummel, president	30,000.00	38,037.64	40,000.00
	Earl J. Bush, vice president and comptroller	30,000.00		
	George D. Whitefield, vice president		24,215.05	25,000.00
	Edgar S. Bowling, vice president		25,000.00	25,000.00
Mesta Machine Co.	L. Iversen, president and director	37,159.99	40,240.00	45,459.93
	L. W. Mesta, vice president and director	27,970.00	30,240.00	34,285.00
	F. A. Mesta, vice president, treasurer, and director	27,950.00	30,260.00	34,365.00
The Monarch Machine Tool Co.	W. E. Whipp, president and treasurer	12,000.00	18,000.00	
	Martin J. Luther, salesman	12,219.09	39,256.35	47,221.81
	F. C. Dull, vice president and secretary	10,800.00		
	S. A. Brandenburg, salesman		16,999.16	35,068.08
	H. T. Kuck, salesman			29,790.43
Monsento Chemical Co.	Charles Belknap, executive vice president	[35] 67,943.60	[36] 70,477.53	[37] 66,543.77
	Gaston DuBois, vice president	[38] 61,248,27	[39] 56,394.23	
	Wm. M. Rand, vice president	[40] 61,243.27	[41] 57,646.63	[42] 56,375.66
	Edgar M. Queeny, president		62,320.18	63,113.34
Phillips Petroleum Co.	Frank Phillips, chairman and director	100,000.00	100,000.00	73,333.34
	K. S. Adams, president and director	49,166.67	50,833.33	61,000.00
	Don Emery, vice president, general counsel, and director	29,666.67	30,500.00	36,000.00
R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.	S. Clay Williams, chairman of board	100,000.00	100,000.00	100,024.97
	Jas. A. Gray, president	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,024.97
	J. W. Glenn, vice president	35,000.00	35,000.00	35,024.97
Shell Union Oil Corporation	R. G. A. van der Woude, president	106,786.16	106,525.60	117,000.00
	D. Pyzel, vice president	69,832.01	69,682.52	70,000.00
	S. W. Duhig, vice president and treasurer			35,000.00
Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Co.	Hugh Morrow, president and director	40,318.46	40,288.62	44,000.65
	Ben Davis, vice president	15,500.00	18,833.30	21,874.98
	Russell Hunt, vice president—sales	11,199.96	11,200.00	12,099.96
Union Carbide & Carbon Corporation	Jesse J. Ricks, chairman of board and general counsel	150,700.00	150,700.00	[43] 150,700.00
	William F. Barrett, vice president and director	140,183.00	150,500.00	[43] 150,500.00
	Benjamin O'Shea, president and director	139,883.00	150,500.00	[43] 150,599.34
United States Steel Corporation	Benjamin F. Fairless, president and director	138,410.00	139,610.04	[44] 156,010.04
	Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., director and chairman of board	105,620.00		
	Enders M. Voorhees, director and chairman finance committee	105,610.00	106,720.08	[44] 107,410.08
	Irving S. Olds, director and chairman of board		[45] 61,243.73	[44 46] 107,320.08
Worthington Pump and Machinery Corporation	Harry C. Beaver, president	49,291.62	59,025.00	60,000.00
	Clarence E. Searle, vice president	27,000.00	29,250.00	39,500.00
	Hobart C. Ramsey, vice president	19,900.00	24,500.00	39,500.00
Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co.	A. W. Robertson, chairman of board	[47] 154,768.30	[48] 183,134.97	[49] 190,452.56
	George H. Bucher, president and director	[50] 115,852.93	[51] 137,862.36	[52] 143,531.88
	F. A. Merrick, vice chairman of board and director	51,415.70		
	Ralph Kelly, vice president		60,299.97	
	Roscoe Seybold, vice president, comptroller, and director			61,070.83
Zenith Radio Corporation	E. F. McDonald, Jr., president and general manager	57,646.35	62,616.71	71,851.72
	Hugh Robertson, vice president and treasurer	42,646.35	47,616.71	55,351.72
	E. A. Tracey, vice president in charge of domestic sales	32,646.27	25,583.31	
	L. W. Sturdevant, district sales manager			54,510.32

[21] Includes bonus of $60,000.
[22] Includes bonus of $60,000.
[23] Includes bonus of $40,000.
[24] Includes bonus of $60,000.
[25] Includes bonus of $90,000.
[26] Includes bonus of $40,000.
[27] Includes bonus of $60,000.
[28] Includes bonus of $24,000.
[29] Includes bonus of $36,000.
[30] Includes bonus of $45,000.
[31] Includes bonus of $40,000.
[32] Includes bonus of $37,426.
[33] Includes bonus of $30,385.
[34] Includes bonus of $60,375.
[35] Includes bonus of $37,943.60.
[36] Includes bonus of $37,946.80.
[37] Includes bonus of $27,058.33.
[38] Includes bonus of $36,238.27.
[39] Includes bonus of $29,322.52.
[40] Includes bonus of $36,238.27.
[41] Includes bonus of $31,047.39.
[42] Includes bonus of $22,999.57.
[43] Does not include amounts paid by the corporation and its subsidiaries to insurance companies under retirement plan for employees with respect to retirement annuities for the individuals as follows: J. J. Ricks, $45,524.09; W. F. Barrett, $18,619.13; and B. O'Shea, $21,097.48.
[44] Not including amounts paid by the corporation and its subsidiaries to the trustee under the contributory pension plan of the corporation with respect to the individuals as follows: Benjamin F. Fairless $7,056; Enders M. Voorhees, $4,656; and Irving S. Olds, $4,656.
[45] Not including $7,553.75, his part of legal fees paid to law firm of which he is member.
[46] Not including $374.06, his part of legal fees paid to law firm of which he is member.
[47] Includes bonus of $51,825.
[48] Includes bonus of $70,335.
[49] Includes bonus of $80,143.
[50] Includes bonus of $38,868.
[51] Includes bonus of $52,750.
[52] Includes bonus of $60,107.

Organization and Collaboration of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Advice and Consent of the Senate," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of March 16, 1943, together with an editorial on the same general subject from the Cleveland News of March 15, 1943.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 16, 1943]

ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE SENATE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The fundamental question, which has been raised by Senators HATCH, BURTON, BALL, and HILL, is how the Senate can be enabled to play its part in the conduct of American foreign relations. This is a very old question. It has always been a difficult one. But it is not unanswerable.

As we look for the answer to it, two conclusions are, I think, at once self-evident. The first is that the Senate cannot now commit itself to approve treaties which have not yet been negotiated. To expect the Senate to do this is to ask it to vote on abstractions and generalities rather than on practical commitments. The second is that the Executive cannot negotiate with our allies unless at each critical step in the negotiations he knows and they know that he is acting with the advice and consent of the Senate. For unless the Senate is somehow participating in the negotiations, our whole diplomacy becomes a blind gamble as to what the Senate might some day do about them.

The test, therefore, of the move made by the four Senators is not whether the Senate will bind itself now to ratify agreements drawn according to the five general propositions of their resolution. The test is whether the Senate will agree that a way must be found to associate the Senate continually with the President before and during the momentous negotiations that have to be undertaken. Merely to pass a general resolution would no doubt be reassuring to most of mankind. But it would not really resolve the ancient constitutional difficulty. For if the resolution were passed, the whole dangerous uncertainty would still remain for unpredictable debate, because the question would still be whether the actual treaties negotiated conformed to the meaning of the general propositions.

Therefore we must fix our attention upon the ways and means of enabling the Senate to participate in the negotiations. If we can do that, we shall be restoring the Senate to the place intended for it by the authors of the Constitution, and we shall have removed the practical difficulty which not only threatens to paralyze the making of peace but also to make it infinitely more difficult to win the war.

For if the United States Government cannot now confidently make binding engagements with our allies, how can we make sure now that we shall have all the allies we shall need in order to finish the war in Asia as well as in Europe? The situation is such that the Senators simply cannot afford to delude themselves with the idea that the question is whether they will at their leisure at some distant time consider whether they will ratify agreements with our allies.

The situation, in fact, is that the United States must be able now to persuade our allies to make agreements with us. They need us, to be sure. But we need them not one bit less.

In foreign affairs the Senate was intended to be a council that the President would consult continually. The Senate, we must remember, had originally only 26 Members, and it was a small enough body to be consulted confidentially. Thus, for example, when the question was raised whether the House should also be consulted, the proposal was rejected on the ground that 65 Representatives were too many for what John Jay described as the requisite of negotiations—namely, "perfect secrecy and immediate dispatch." And David Ramsey, a member of the Convention, said to the people of South Carolina who wanted the House to be entrusted with the treaty-making power: "When 65 men can keep a secret, they may." Yet the House was then only two-thirds as big as the Senate is today.

There is no doubt that the authors of the Constitution meant to have the Senate do exactly the kind of thing which the four Senators are now trying to arrange to have it do. Six months after he was inaugurated, Washington went to the Senate with the project of a treaty he was negotiating with the southern Indians. He took with him General Knox, his Secretary of War, and after they had been introduced, Washington rose and told the Senate that he had come to them for their advice and consent on certain propositions in the treaty.

Unfortunately, it appears, President Washington neglected to invite Senator Maclay to dinner before he went to the Senate, and for lack of this kind of personal preparation, the Senate stood on its dignity, Washington lost his temper, the Senate never became a council, and Washington declared that "he would be damned if he ever went there again."

Nevertheless, as Mr. Denna Fleming tells us in his book on The Treaty Veto of the American Senate, Washington "still adhered to the practice of asking the advice of the Senate before negotiations were opened and during their course." Thus he suspended his negotiations with England over the northeastern boundary until he had consulted the Senate, and the Senate agreed in advance to approve a proposed treaty with Algiers. Other Presidents have gone to the Senate for approval in advance—for example, President Polk in 1846 on the suggested terms of peace with Mexico.

But as we all know, the relations between the Senate and the President have rarely been satisfactory where the treaty-making power was involved. The treaty of peace with Spain in 1898 was almost defeated; it was ratified by just one vote more than the necessary two-thirds. Wilson's treaty was, of course, defeated. This is the third war in which we have been engaged in less than 50 years; once we almost failed to get a treaty of peace, once we did fail, and now for a third time we find ourselves wondering whether the Senate will permit us to make a treaty. Surely, the four Senators cannot be wrong when they say that something has to be done about it, and done about it now before it is too late.

The remedy must lie in assuming that considerably more than two-thirds of the Senators will support the necessary arrangements with our allies if in the course of the negotiations they are consulted about these arrangements and are enabled to understand them. But since it is impossible to consult 66 men daily on all sorts of questions, the practical problem is how to find a working committee which at least 66 Senators will trust.

Theoretically the committee ought to be the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. That is what it is for. But, in fact, owing to the antiquated rules of the Senate on the subject of seniority, the present committee is unrepresentative and has an appallingly bad record. It is such a bad record that some of the committeemen are determined, it would appear, to make it worse by trying to prove that when they were wrong they were really right. The committee as now constituted is a bad one because such a large number of the Republican members have a vested interest in their own historic mistakes, and are, therefore, not to be depended upon altogether to deal confidentially with delicate matters that must in the early stages of negotiation remain confidential.

The problem, therefore, is either to reconstitute the present committee, perhaps by enlarging it, or to establish a new committee which is representative and efficient.

[From the Cleveland News of March 15, 1943]

END OF ISOLATIONISM?

Nearly everybody has said at some time or other that it will be futile to win the war unless we also win the peace. Four United States Senators tomorrow will take the first long step toward this winning of the peace when they introduce a resolution which declares America's intention to share in the responsibility of preventing future wars.

The special values of this resolution are:

It is bipartisan, having the approval of both party leaders.

It arises in the Senate, which eventually must pass on peace agreements.

Its authors have been at pains to determine probable acceptance before exposing it to debate.

It comes in time, probably, to head off another movement of irresponsible isolationism, built on slogans and petty prejudices.

Although the document has been carefully trimmed to fit a variety of opinions in the Senate, and may have to be trimmed still more, it is so built on the fundamentals of peace management that such doctoring can be sustained.

We are to stay in the war until it is won; we are to help set up temporary governments; we are to provide the means of peaceful settlements; we are to administer relief and help with economic stabilization in the crushed countries; we are to take our place in maintaining an international police force.

Those are the foundation stones of a new world, and roughly they mark the extent of participation required of the United States. If the resolution is adopted, it will do more to bring an understanding among the United Nations than any amount of pre-victory negotiations among diplomats.

This is not to disparage the conferences just now being undertaken in Washington by Anthony Eden. They also are necessary, but the proposed Senate action supplies the essential base of operations.

It should be especially pleasing to Ohio citizens that Senator BURTON is one of the sponsors of this action, sharing the leadership with Senators BALL (Republican), HILL (Democrat), and HATCH (Democrat).

The Irish-American in World War No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Irish-American in World War No. 2," which I delivered in Syracuse on March 17, last, at the St. Patrick's Day dinner of the Ancient Order of Hibernians.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The poet tells us that all the world loves a lover. We know that at least once a year all the world loves the Irish. Every son and daughter of Ireland, on St. Patrick's Day, renews his vow of affection for the land of his ancestors. Today, the native son goes back in memory to the beauties and to the joys and the sorrows of Ireland, known to the rest of us only through song and story—the refreshing waters of the Shannon; the joyous music of the pipers in the hush of a twilight on a delightful summer evening; the charm of Killarney's lakes and fells; the warmth of a crackling turf fire on a long winter evening; the bickering of the hucksters on fair day in the town. Yes, and they think of the loved ones who were left behind, loved ones whose hands reach across the seven seas in a token of friendship. With them our minds go back to the centuries of Ireland's struggle to be free; the patience and fortitude of her sons and daughters; the famines and the hard times; and of her martyrs and heroes, of Robert Emmet and Wolfe Tone; of her famous statesmen and political leaders, Charles Stewart Parnell and Daniel O'Connell. We dwell upon the folklore and the fairy tales and we listen once again to the story of the minstrel boy and to the melody of the harp that still sings through Tara's halls. These are but some of the reasons why today, in all corners of the globe, there's a tear mingled with the smile of the Irishman. The hat is cocked at a jaunty angle today, the shoulders are squared, and the chest displays with great pride the green shamrock. There's music in the voice and laughter in the heart. This is St. Patrick's Day.

As the lamp of learning was kept glowing by Irish priests and scholars during the darkness which enveloped the rest of Europe during the Middle Ages, so Ireland has sent her sons and daughters into strange lands with the light of freedom. The Irish immigrants were among the early settlers in colonial America. They have come to this land to the west in a steady stream ever since.

The contributions which the Irish people have made to our culture and civilization, to the ideal society which we call the American way of life, can never be measured. But when we turn back the pages of history and read the accounts of the leadership, the bravery and daring, the devotion to duty and the patriotism of men such as Jack Barry, the "father of the American Navy"; O'Brien, who won the first naval battle of the American Revolution; the roster of Kellys, Murphys, Ryans, McCarthys, Sullivans, O'Briens, Reillys, Burkes, and Connollys, in the Revolutionary Army, and when we realize that 38 percent of the men in the Revolution were Irish, we can truly say that the cause would have been lost had it not been for the Irish.

That immortal document by which we declared our independence was executed by four men who were born in Ireland and by five others who descended from Irishmen, while John Carroll was of invaluable assistance to General Washington and his associates.

It is no surprise to anyone familiar with the inherent qualities of an Irishman that those heroes and statesmen rendered such valiant service to the Revolutionary cause. It was only natural that they should be among the first to volunteer and persevere till victory. They have always served in the cause of democracy and freedom, not only in Ireland, but in any land to which they journeyed. The civilization of every land to which he journeyed has felt the impact of the Irishman.

Where he found oppression, he was in the forefront of the movement for freedom. Where he found freedom, he became the most loyal citizen. The land of his adoption then had first call on his undivided allegiance. The love for his native land has never interfered with his loyalty and patriotism in the land where he found liberty. That is why the Irishman has earned the respect and admiration of our neighbors in Canada and in the Central and South American countries, as well as in far off Australia and New Zealand.

That is the story of the men and women of Ireland who came to America at the time of the Revolution. Here they found oppression and joined in the movement for freedom.

The example set by those early patriots was followed by the Irishman of every generation which found our country in danger. Irish names dot the rosters of the ranks of all wars. Commodore John Cassin and Lt. Patrick MacDonough in the War of 1812; Gen. James Shields, Gen. Thomas W. Sweeny, Major O'Brien, and Chaplain O'Reilly in the War of 1846–48; General Corcoran, General Kearny, General McMahon, General Sheridan, Adm. Edward Barrett, and Father Ryan in the Civil War; and Gen. Robert M. O'Reilly and Maj. John A. Ryan, in the Spanish-American War, are included among the sons of Erin who have furnished inspired leadership to our military and naval forces in every struggle.

The names of the Irish-American heroes of the first World War, and the exploits of the immortal fighting Sixty-ninth are fresh in our memories.

The hallowed soil of Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, and Yorktown has been blessed by the loyal blood of the Celt. The markers of the honored dead at Gettysburg, the crosses row on row in Flanders Fields, and the sacred shrine for our Nation's heroes at Arlington, all bear mute testimony to the full measure of devotior to freedom's cause, that men of Irish lineage have always given.

The present war has added new names to the list of immortals, men whose devotion to duty and love of freedom overshadow all else. They were willing to risk everything for the cause of democracy, for the safety and future of America, the land which gave freedom and opportunity to their ancestors. Thus it was that Colin Kelly sank the first Jap ship of this war, and laid down his life in the task. It explains why Edward O'Hare shot down the first Jap plane; why Dick Fleming made himself the first human torpedo; why Daniel Callaghan became the first admiral to go down fighting; why Mike Moran became the first naval officer to sink six Japs ships in single combat. This explains why Mrs. Nichols A. Foran, of Hartford, Conn., writes an average of 15 letters a week to her 5 sons in the service and why Mr. and Mrs. Sullivan could tour the country selling war bonds instead of grieving over the unprecedented loss of their 5 sailor sons missing with the sinking of the *Juneau*. Do we need inspiration in order to fulfill our obligations in the country's need?

The men and women of Irish names who have earned undying fame in this present struggle for meritorious service are legion and their ranks are swelling every day. The Irish names on the roster sound like the roster of the Revolution.

The peacetime contributions of the Irish in the pioneer days, when our country pushed westward from the sea, likewise cannot be measured, but we know that the daring, ingenuity, genius for leadership, and the brawn and brain of the Irish immigrant played a great part in clearing the trackless forests, opening up new means of transportation, establishing outposts, cultivating the lands, discovering new wealth, and in visualizing the future of America. Throughout this important area of our development, the material advances of the Nation were solidified by the moral and spiritual contributions and Christian principles of the God-fearing Irish people.

His love of home, devotion to family, obedience to the laws of God, and loyalty to his country, made the Irishman a good American, and helped to make America a better place in which to live. At all times he interested himself in the welfare of the community and of the Nation, with the result that the Irish of every generation furnished some of the outstanding political leaders of the day.

The American of Irish ancestry has always been a good citizen. He has set a splendid example for us to follow. In keeping with this example of the past we must now adopt the role for which we are best fitted in our country's cause, patriotically and unselfishly. In keeping with our heritage we must set a good example for our neighbors by shouldering every responsibility, cheerfully accepting every call for sacrifice in true Irish style, without squawk or complaint.

The man in the office and the laborer in the shop must strive valiantly to avert anything that interferes with production, whether it be shut-down, slow-down, sit-down, walk-out, lock-out, or strike. The war comes first. The worker must be ever vigilant to prevent sabotage; he must put an end to all loose talk and injurious rumor. He must be another soldier at all times. And the soldier, be he officer or private, must give orders and take orders like a true patriot. If he is in the newspaper field, the American of Irish ancestry likewise has his grave responsibilities to exercise the freedom of the press in the light of his greater responsibility of preserving our country, by avoiding that which gives invaluable information or comfort to the enemy, or which unnecessarily weakens the morale of our folks at home.

It is the duty of everyone to shun the role of a curbstone general or a parlor admiral. We have a well-trained staff of military and naval leaders and we must let them map and plan the military strategy.

Our American of Irish ancestry must be willing to eat round steak so that the tenderloin can go to the boys in the armed forces. He must accept the rationing system of the Office of Price Administration without complaint and consider it a privilege to go without sugar in the tea, coffee for breakfast, or butter on his toast. He must participate in the blood banks of the Red Cross, help out in the scrap drives, volunteer for fire patrol, and air-raid defense activities. He must pay his taxes cheerfully and buy War bonds till it hurts. In short, his obligation is to comply willingly and without a murmur or complaint, with every call for service and thereby set a good example for his fellow citizens to follow.

It is because of the great contributions of the Irish in the past that we now enjoy the fruits of democracy. There is no choice for the American of Irish lineage, his duty is clear—he must do all in his power to preserve our Government, to continue our democracy, with the same unselfish service which has characterized the service of Irishmen in every generation in America. As a citizen of the democracy he will render his full support to the President of the United States, our Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces. The next generation will be as proud of the Irish of today as we are of the Irish of the past.

Perhaps there are some who say we should forego these gatherings in this critical period. But we can turn to historical precedent in

paying homage to the patron saint of Ireland. Our first Commander-in-Chief, Gen. George Washington, during the darkest days of the Revolution, realizing the mighty contribution of the sons of Erin in that desperate struggle, set aside the 17th of March as a day of celebration for the Irish.

Tonight we can dedicate this gathering to the principles for which our forebears gave their all. We can dedicate ourselves to the cause of liberty and freedom, true to the noble and lofty example written in letters of gold by the Irish who have helped to make this country great. We can resolve to do all within our power, on the military front or on the home front, to bring this war to an early and victorious conclusion so that this great country may continue to be a land of freedom and opportunity, a place where once a year on St. Patrick's Day, down through the ages, the sons and daughters of Erin may gather round the festive board and live again the glories of old Ireland.

Rationing of Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Hartford Courant of March 19, 1943, entitled "Free To Go, but Tied," and an editorial from the Hartford Times of the same date entitled "What 'Pleasure Driving'?"

Both these editorials refer to the recent announcement of unrestricted pleasure driving and a further curtailment of the gasoline allowance in District No. 1.

On behalf of the Oil Shortage Committee of the Senate I have asked the Petroleum Administration for War and the Office of Price Administration if we may be furnished such information as is proper concerning the need for this further cut in gasoline rationing.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford Courant of March 19, 1943]

FREE TO GO, BUT TIED

"Mother, may I go out to swim?
Yes, my darling daughter;
Hang your clothes on a hickory limb,
But don't go near the water."

Those familiar lines seem to apply to the announcement lifting the ban on "pleasure driving," but cutting in half the gasoline ration. Yes, you may now use your car in any way you see fit, but we'll see to it that your gasoline supply doesn't permit you to get any particular use out of it. We've made a great concession in telling the local police and the Office of Price Administration gestapo not to interfere with your movements, but to counterbalance it we've taken the precaution to keep you tied down. Go "pleasure driving," dearies, to your heart's content. We wouldn't stop you for the world, but that gallon and a half will, and don't we know it!

Prentiss Brown of the Office of Price Administration and Harold Ickes, the Petroleum Administrator for War, thought it all up between them, and they seem to flatter themselves that they did a pretty good job. They have removed a great source of public irritation by wiping out all restrictions on 3-gallon "pleasure driving," thus leaving the individual in the full possession of all his rights and liberties in this respect. At the same time they have seen to it that there "just ain't" a scintilla of what they call "pleasure" to be found in a gallon and a half—meaning gasoline, of course. There is hardly a trace of utility or necessary driving in the halved quota.

Now if the gasoline supply, the transportation situation and military needs do not permit of enough gasoline to give the eastern seaboard more than half of what it has been getting, then that is that, and we must make the best of it. Nobody wants to deprive our armed forces of essential motor fuel; the first duty and responsibility is to them. But as the Baruch rubber report emphasized, a duty and a responsibility are also owed to the home front if the war is to be successfully prosecuted, and the question arises whether everything possible is being done to bring needed gasoline to the Eastern States. Mr. Ickes says that only 330,000 barrels a day can be made available for this area, but that is 15,000 more than the daily average for this month. Why, then, cut the A coupon to one-and-a-half gallons? Because there must be a reserve for spring plowing and planting, says Mr. Ickes, who seems to feel that as Petroleum Administrator he cannot squeeze out another drop of gasoline for the east coast civilian and industrial use.

However, neither Mr. Ickes nor Mr. Brown has any idea that the new rationing restrictions will prove sufficient for actual needs. So a scheme is being figured out that will enable those who use their cars in driving to work to get supplemental gasoline. That may result in virtually putting nearly everyone back on the 3-gallon basis, which in many cases has been proved too little. What the Washington officials ought to understand is that there never has been any such thing as "pleasure driving" on the 3-gallon ration, and that in these days when the family car has to keep traveling about to supply such household necessities as food, market deliveries being practically out, the 1½ gallon coupon will be found little better than nothing at all.

How absolutely essential the automobile is under present conditions is recognized by the Office of War Information, for on the very day the announcement appeared that the gasoline ration would be halved beginning next Monday, it urged all car owners to have their tires recapped, since the Government was vitally interested in keeping passenger cars rolling as a means of relieving public transportation systems. "Drive into any local tire dealer's place and he will do the work himself or have it done for you," said the Office of War Information. But why bother about tires if there is no gas in the tank? It looks as if the Office of War Information and the Office of Price Administration and the petroleum fellows ought to sit down together with a view to deciding what's what, and how.

Experience seems to have proved that after the bureaucratic mind has thought long and deeply enough about any given subject, it may begin to undo some of the things previously done. It comes as a bit of especially welcome news that the Office of Price Administration has about decided that there was altogether too much red tape wound about its fuel oil rationing scheme. It is only necessary, it now seems to feel, to give the householder a certificate entitling him to a given number of gallons and leaving it to the suppliers to make deliveries against the certificate as occasion requires. It is just as simple as that, and very much less expensive. Evidently somebody at the Office of Price Administration has read the report on the gasoline and fuel oil situation turned out by Senator MALONEY'S committee and shows a commendable desire to profit from its conclusions. We may now hope that this Connecticut Senator will undertake to tell all and sundry officials who have fussed themselves up over this matter of pleasure driving that they are again off on the wrong foot and had better make another try at it. It is very hard to believe that supplies are running so short and that transportation has so far broken down that it is imperative to cut the A ration to as little as 6 gallons a month. Unless a greater leeway is afforded, there'll be a lot of stalled cars on the streets and the towing companies will waste a lot of gasoline getting them back home.

[From the Hartford Times of March 19, 1943]

WHAT PLEASURE DRIVING?

The irony in lifting the ban on pleasure driving and at the same time cutting in half the amount of gasoline which owners of private automobiles may buy in the next 4 months, is not lost upon the public.

One and a half gallons of gasoline per week will give no car owner any pleasure.

This pittance of fuel will, instead, increase the inconvenience the public now endures in public service vehicles, because it will force all who cannot obtain supplemental supplies of gasoline to use transportation facilities that already are crowded far beyond their capacity.

It would have been better, psychologically, for the Office of Price Administration to have hinted that further restrictions would be placed on the use of private automobiles rather than for it to lead the people to believe that with the end of winter would come lifting of the ban on pleasure driving.

The Office of Price Administration and such other Government agencies as have a hand in regulating the lives of the people should be more forthright. In this instance they should have warned that less gasoline is available now than was on hand in the middle of the winter. They should have said, plainly, that the military needs of the country are so great that gasoline which it had been hoped might be released for public use cannot be so released. If propagandists, politicians, regulators of life, whatever they call themselves, only would deal frankly with the people they would save themselves and the Government a lot of criticism and grief. Secretary Ickes has been the one exception—he has been pessimistic about the gasoline supply all along.

A transportation crisis looms. The public has it from Director Eastman, of the Office of Defense Transportation, who says it may be necessary to ration travel. Already railroads and bus lines show deterioration from overuse. Now they are called to carry still heavier loads, unless families are to be kept separated and intercommunity travel in general is to be stalled. Surely the American people have ingenuity enough to meet this problem and to avoid the stagnation that seems sure to follow slashing in half of the value of A coupons and the driving of the people to the use of overburdened public facilities.

Deferment of Farm Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Class Deferment of Labor Inadvisable," published in the Sioux Falls

(S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader of March 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLASS DEFERMENT OF LABOR INADVISABLE

The United States Senate acted unwisely in approving a measure compelling the class deferment of farm workers.

Such a regulation places the farm workers apart. It is a type of special attention neither warranted nor do we believe fully desired by the persons who are directly affected.

It is true that food production is essential. It is likewise true that selective service boards should defer farm workers when it appears that their services are required to obtain efficient production on a farm.

But there are many essential industries. Our armies need food but they also need countless other things. If we were to establish broad class deferments few men would be available for the Army.

It seems to us that the better policy is to allow the determination of essentiality to be made by the selective service boards. They can pass judgment upon individual cases.

As a resident of an agricultural State, we must admit that we do not relish the position in which this area would be placed through the acceptance by Congress of the bill as approved by the Senate. And there are many farm boys who might have occasion to feel disturbed about it.

The average farm boy is as patriotic as those who reside in the towns or the cities. But he is affected by parental pressure as are many others. Even though he might wish to enlist voluntarily, he might be dissuaded by appeals from his father and mother who might say that he was forsaking them in a time of need when the regulations specifically exempted him from military service.

It is difficult to develop an exact formula to apply to all cases. Parents as a rule do not look forward with satisfaction to the departure of their sons for military camps. They generally realize what the requirements are, of course, and accept them as an inevitable accompaniment of war. Yet the imposition of a blanket deferment rule, such as that outlined in the Senate bill, will soften their consciences in this respect. They will have an official reason for attempting to prevent their sons from enlisting voluntarily. They can say to them: "Your Government has said that it is more important for you to remain on the farm than to enter the military service."

In later years the farm boys of today will not thank the Members of Congress if the class deferment plan is approved. They are more likely to be resentful.

The Argus-Leader hopes that the House refrains from approving the measure as passed in the Senate.

This does not mean that we are unmindful of the importance of full farm production. It is essential. And certainly the selective service boards should give proper consideration to this factor in the drafting of men. But let's not have a blanket deferment.

Recommendations of 89 Economists for Adequate War Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a document entitled "Recommendations of 89 Economists for Adequate War Taxation." This document was sent to me by Albert Gailord Hart, professor of economics at Iowa State College. The signers of this memorandum represent a group of distinguished economists, specialists in public finance, money, and business cycles. Professor Hart informs me that it is the intention of his group to present their views before the appropriate committees of the Senate and House, and that he has a further document setting forth in detail the grounds for these recommendations. He will be glad to furnish such document to interested Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF 89 ECONOMISTS FOR ADEQUATE WAR TAXATION

Efficient conduct of the war demands quick action to round out the anti-inflation program on the side of public finance. The sides of inflation control which have so far been the focus of popular attention -price control in particular—are means for dealing with the results of inflation. We shall obviously have far less difficulty with the results of inflation if we control its cause, which lies in the huge excess of Federal expenditures over Federal revenues. In fact, an attack on the financial roots of inflation is essential to keep our other inflation controls from collapsing.

The undersigned economists are gravely perturbed by the lack of adequate action in this field during the critical first year of war. We are much encouraged by recent Treasury pronouncements looking toward the enactment early in 1943 of substantial additional taxes. But meanwhile it must be emphasized that the taxes payable to the Government in 1942–43 under the Revenue Act of 1942 do not exceed what the Treasury proposed as a minimum in March 1942—at a time when expenditure estimates for the fiscal year 1942–43 were twenty or twenty-five billion dollars below present estimates.

Under present legislation, an increase of some $60,000,000,000 in the public debt is scheduled for the current fiscal year 1942–43, and for 1943–44 the increase would be much larger. Even if this increase in the public debt did not involve any threat of wartime inflation, it would add seriously to the adjustment difficulties of the post-war period. But over and above this post-war danger, there is clearly a wartime danger. A good half of the debt increase must be financed by borrowing at banks, despite increasing sales of War Savings bonds and successful drives to sell bonds to the nonbanking public, like that of December 1942. It is well known that all the great inflations of modern times have issued from such use of bank financing.

The great shortcoming of the anti-inflation campaign so far lies in the inadequacy of the tax program and the failure to tap the possibilities of compulsory lending. This fact has been somewhat pushed into the background in recent discussions, in which the important question how to tax has overshadowed the still more important questions how much to tax and when. Our recommendations deal with all three questions. Since the inflationary pressure arises from Government spending, it is essential to keep that pressure down by maximum economy consistent with the war effort. Subsidies in agriculture and elsewhere should be withdrawn unless it is clearly shown that they contribute to increasing production or that they are essential to hold down living costs; other nonwar expenditures of State and local governments as well as the Federal Government should be carefully reviewed; and war expenditures themselves should be held down by vigilance in letting and renegotiating war contracts. But the largest economies compatible with an all-out war effort and with the maintenance of decent standards in education and public services can make only a minor contribution to the fight against inflation.

It is feared in some quarters that heavier taxation of the sort we recommend will involve the country in needless hardships. This fear is groundless. It would be nearer the truth to say that failure to levy much heavier taxes will have this effect. Irrespective of taxes, the war itself necessitates a reduction of living standards for the duration by reducing civilian supplies of tires, sugar, gasoline, fuel, fats, meat, clothing, etc. Failure to levy adequate taxes cannot conjure goods out of empty air to relieve these shortages. But such failure will add needless additional wartime hardships to those which are unavoidable. Without adequate taxes, the pressure of excess spending power will "insure the disregard of law" (as the Office of Price Administration has officially stated), and break down our other inflation controls. Far from enabling Americans to be better fed, housed, warmed and clothed, leaving excess spending power free to break down our defenses against inflation will reduce civilian supplies by encouraging hoarding of commodities, stimulating wasteful consumption, and bringing about a running battle over wage rates and farm prices which is bound to hinder production. Besides reducing supplies, furthermore, such a development will increase "black market" activity, making it much harder to share our scarce supplies fairly among consumers. And all this says nothing about the social disruption that always goes with inflation.

The choice is not between avoiding sacrifices or making sacrifices through taxation. It is between sharing sacrifices among the citizens on an agreed rule, through taxation supplemented by rationing of key items, or sharing them in a totally planless fashion through inflation. Needless to say, wartime privations cannot be made painless for the citizens by sharing them out through the tax mechanism. But they will be still more painful if we lack the courage to adopt an adequate system of war taxation.

PROGRAM FOR ADEQUATE WAR TAXATION TO ROUND OUT ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

1. Minimum revenue goals

The Federal revenue system should be adjusted immediately to yield revenue at an annual rate of at least $45,000,000,000, effective not later than April 1, 1943.

2. Revenue flexibility

To allow for possible underestimation of the inflationary pressure existing in early 1943, and for the nearly certain increase of inflationary pressure during 1943, provision should be made for increasing tax revenue on short notice by as much as $10,000,000,000 above the $45,000,000,000 goal mentioned above.

3. Sources of revenue

The great bulk of the additional revenue should be raised by increased taxation of net incomes of individuals and families; and most of the increase must of necessity come from incomes between $1,500 and $10,000, since this is where most of the national income lies.

4. Methods of expanding income taxation

To make increased levies on personal incomes effective in 1943, we recommend:

A. Withholding at the source of income enough to settle the bulk of tax liabilities on salaries, wages, dividends, and any other types of income for which taxation at the source proves practicable.

B. Adjusting withholding schedules and income tax rates so that the great majority of taxpayers will have paid their 1943 income taxes by the end of the calendar year.

C. Reducing exemptions enough to make the tax base in excess of exemptions (i. e., the

aggregate of "surtax net income") embrace at least half the national income.

D. Reducing tax avoidance by applying wartime increases in rates to interest which is now tax free, by eliminating the inequities associated with separate returns by husband and wife, and by closing other loopholes.

E. Reducing tax evasion by a campaign to get fuller reporting of income, particularly from farmers and other self-employed persons.

5. Use of compulsory loans

We recommend substantial use of refundable levies (compulsory loans) as a means of taking excess spending power off the market during the war with a minimum adverse effect on incentives to work, and as a means of providing a backlog of post-war spending power without the danger that it will simply burn itself up in a burst of ill-timed spending at the return of peace. But not more than $2,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 of refundable levies should be counted as part of the minimum goal of $45,000,000,000.

Signers:

Karl M. Arndt, associate professor, University of Nebraska.

Roy A. Ballinger, associate professor, Louisiana State University.

William T. Beadles, professor, chairman of division of social studies, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Ill.

P. W. Bishop instructor, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

J. Keith Butters, instructor, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Raymond T Bye, professor, University of Pennsylvania.

Valdemar Carlson, professor, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

William A. Carter, professor of economics, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

Lester V. Chandler, professor, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.

Denzel C. Cline, associate professor, Michigan State College, Lansing, Mich.

Ralph E. Conwell, professor, head of department, University of Wyoming.

Gilbert W. Cooke, associate professor, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.

Garfield V. Cox, professor, University of Chicago.

Maurice Criz, assistant superintendent, Illinois Department of Finance, Research and Statistics, Springfield, Ill.

Kenneth J. Curran, assistant professor, Princeton University.

B. W. Dempsey, S. J., assistant professor, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

J. C. Dolley, professor, University of Texas.

Kenneth Duncan, professor, Pomona College, Claremont, Calif.

Earl V. Dye, associate professor, Pennsylvania State College.

J. A. Estey, professor and head of department, Purdue University.

Frank W. Fetter, professor and chairman of department, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.

Clyde Olin Fisher, professor of economics, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

Carroll W. Ford, assistant professor, University of Akron, Ohio.

Albert Gailord Hart, professor, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

H. W. Hudson, professor and head of department, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.

D. B. Jeremiah, associate professor, University of Pennsylvania.

M. Slade Kendrick, professor, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Richard S. Landry, instructor, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.

Clarence D. Long, member, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J.

L. J. Long, professor, Alleghany College, Meadville, Pa.

Fritz Machlup, professor, University of Buffalo.

F. K. Mann, professor, American University, Washington, D. C.

Arthur W. Marget, professor, University of Minnesota.

Donald B. Marsh, instructor, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

W. E. Mason, graduate student, Princeton University.

M. K. McKay, professor, University of Pittsburgh.

Royal Meeker, administrative assistant, Connecticut Department of Labor.

Frederick C. Mills, professor, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Carl L. Nelson, assistant professor, University of Nebraska.

S. H. Nerlove, associate professor, University of Chicago.

Mabel Newcomer, professor, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Rudolph Peterson, professor, Bucknell University, Lewistown, Pa.

William J. Phillips, Jr., assistant professor, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette, La.

J. Donald Pymm, assistant professor, Fresno State College, Fresno, Calif.

Lawrence H. Seltzer, professor, Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.

Lewis Severson, professor and head of department, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.

William J. Schultz, assistant professor, College of the City of New York.

Henry C. Simons, associate professor, University of Chicago.

Lynn A. Stiles, security analyst, Illinois State Tax Commission.

William G. Sutcliffe, dean, college of business administration, Boston University, Boston, Mass.

George A. Tesoro, research fellow, American University, Washington, D. C.

V. P. Timoshenko, food research institute, Stanford University, Calif.

Alvin S. Tostlebe, professor and head of department, College of Wooster, Ohio.

Royal S. Van de Woestyne, visiting associate professor, University of Buffalo.

Rutledge Vining, assistant professor, University of Arkansas.

S. V. Ciriacy-Wantrup, associate professor, University of California.

Leonard L. Watkins, professor, University of Michigan.

W. A. Weisskopf, assistant professor, University of Omaha, Nebr.

Philip Wernette, associate professor, Harvard University.

K. M. Williamson, professor, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

G. Walter Woodworth, professor, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

E. E. Agger, professor and head of department, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.; New Jersey commissioner of banking and insurance.

Edward D. Allen, assistant professor, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

John R. Commons, emeritus professor, University of Wisconsin.

Alzada Comstock, professor, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.

Howard S. Ellis, professor, University of California.

William J. Fellner, assistant professor, University of California.

Lewis A. Froman, University of Buffalo.

Edwin F. Gay, emeritus professor, Harvard University.

Arthur D. Gayer, associate professor, Queens College, New York, N. Y.

Harry D. Gideonse, president, Brooklyn College, New York, N. Y.

Frank D. Graham, professor, Princeton University.

Harold M. Groves, professor, University of Wisconsin.

Ernest H. Hahne, professor, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Robert M. Haig, professor, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Clarence Heer, professor, University of North Carolina.

Richard A. Lester, assistant professor, Duke University, Durham, N. C.

James W. Martin, professor, University of Kentucky.

Lloyd W. Mints, associate professor, University of Chicago.

Wesley C. Mitchell, professor, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Walter A. Morton, professor, University of Wisconsin.

E. G. Nourse, vice president, Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C.

B. U. Ratchford, associate professor, Duke University, Durham, N. C.

Carl S. Shoup, associate professor, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

O. M. W. Sprague, professor, Harvard University.

Eugene Staley, professor, Fletcher School of International Law and Diplomacy, Medford, Mass.

J. Wilner Sundelson, assistant professor, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., tax consultant New York State division of budget.

Ray B. Westerfield, professor, Yale University.

C. R. Whittlesey, professor, University of Pennsylvania.

Discipline in the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I addressed the House on the subject of merchant marine awards of Distinguished Service Medals, covering awards up to and including March 15, 1943. I shall supplement that list from time to time. That record, however, splendid as it is, does not tell the complete story of the heroism, the fidelity, the patience, the devotion, the patriotism, and the continued daring of the men of the merchant marine. There arise from time to time rumors and reports of difficulties among the crews of the Nation's war cargo carriers.

The Office of War Information called on Admiral Land, War Shipping Administrator, for a report. That report has been made public and refutes those rumors and reports. I desire that the report shall be made a part of the RECORD. I should say also that a special investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been appointed under the chairmanship of Mr. HERBERT BONNER, of North Carolina, "to investigate, first, discipline on merchant vessels; second, allegations derogatory to services on said vessels; third, character of services rendered on said vessels by personnel thereon, licensed or unlicensed; fourth, efficiency of operations in port or at sea; fifth, sources of reports inimical to morale on said vessels; and sixth, all other matters deemed by the special subcommittee to be pertinent or relevant to the matters above mentioned or which, in the opinion of the special subcommittee, should be

brought to the attention of the full committee."

If the rumors and reports have any foundation in fact, the committee wishes to know what the facts are, and if the rumors and reports have no foundation in fact, the committee wishes to know the subversive and hostile influences behind them.

It will be noted that in his report Admiral Land said:

The examination of 302 log books, covering voyages from January to November 1942, disclosed only 56 cases of infraction of discipline, of which only 32 were deemed serious enough to warrant disciplinary action. For the period covered this shows that only one-half of 1 percent of the merchant marine personnel at sea in 1942 were guilty of misconduct serious enough to report on log books.

The complete report of Admiral Land, War Shipping Administrator, follows:

Patriotism, courage, and devotion to duty are among the outstanding attributes of the seamen who man our merchant marine. The War Shipping Administration daily receives a stream of authenticated reports and information which attests to the loyalty and efficiency of seamen who voluntarily serve their country in their civilian capacity as members of the American merchant marine.

During the first part of the war a lack of sufficient armament on board merchant ships, inadequate escort vessels, slow convoys, and insufficient safety devices, all made the seaman's life one of almost constant peril. Nevertheless, experienced seamen have continued to go back to sea while courageous red-blooded young Americans have flocked to fill our training stations, determined that our ships shall be kept sailing. High wages and war bonuses are not the essential inducements which lead these men voluntarily to go to sea. The real answer is patriotism.

The attitude of prospective seamen toward enemy torpedoes and bombs is shown by the response to a recent call for experienced seamen by War Shipping Administration. In a period of only 10 days 100,000 persons from every walk of life applied. As only 16,000 proved to be experienced, the rest had to be turned down for immediate sea duty. Many of them were eligible for training courses for later sea duty.

Seamen who have been through hell and high water voluntarily sign on for another voyage and keep delivering the goods. The honor ribbon, designed by the War Shipping Administration for men who have been through enemy action, can now be worn by well over 3,000 merchant seamen, some of whom have been torpedoed 6 and 7 times, while hundreds have had their ships blown from under them 3 and 4 times.

Since President Roosevelt awarded the first Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal in October, the Awards Committee of War Shipping Administration has reviewed 280 cases of seamen who have so far distinguished themselves for heroism "above and beyond the call of duty" as to be considered for this honor, and hundreds more are coming to light every month.

There have been scores of instances where ships, valuable war cargoes, and lives have been saved through the resourcefulness and perseverance of American crews. Ships have been raked by shell fire, damaged by torpedo explosions, turned into blazing infernos by bombs, and yet repaired, salvaged and brought limping into port by their merchant crews. There are numerous cases where seamen have stuck to their posts with only a slim chance of survival, have manned guns when the armed guards and half the ship's company have been wiped out, and in the end won out over the enemy.

At the end of 1 year of war the merchant marine has suffered casualties far heavier in proportion than any of the armed services. This amounts to about 3.8 percent for the first year of war as compared with about three-fourths of 1 percent for all the services. In numbers alone the merchant marine has lost, in dead and missing, well over 3,200 seamen. As there is little chance of missing seamen turning up, this number can be said to equal the total dead, killed in action, of the Army, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard combined. Three quarters of the personnel of the merchant marine is always in the "front lines."

There is a general impression that merchant seamen are lavishly paid for the risks they run at sea today. On practically all off-shore voyages the crew is paid a 100-percent war bonus. In addition, they receive extra bonuses for danger zones such as the Red Sea, British Isles, the White Sea-Murmansk, and other areas. The average total monthly earnings of an able seaman or a fireman is a little under $300 per month. He works an average of 10 months a year, and figuring in his free board and room, his job is worth about $57 per week. This is substantially the same amount a second class rigger earns in a shipyard. Furthermore, the shore worker is exposed to comparatively little risk and enjoys the advantages of family life. The seaman gets $5,000 life insurance free, but he receives no monetary benefits for injury similar to workmen's compensation benefits, nor social security other than an old-age pension.

Recently there has been considerable comment on the conduct of merchant marine crews. The Division of Maritime Labor Relations of the War Shipping Administration, which keeps a close check on this subject, attributes the fundamental cause of misconduct to war nerves brought about by the continued strain under which seamen work. Practically all infractions of discipline investigated by the Administration have happened in port.

It is worth pointing out that infractions of discipline are invariably brought to light and thus a few isolated cases are apt to discolor the whole picture, whereas the usual voyage where everything has been "smooth sailing" is seldom reported.

The examination of 302 log books, covering voyages from January to November 1942, disclosed only 56 cases of infraction of discipline, of which only 32 were deemed serious enough to warrant disciplinary action. For the period covered, this shows that only one-half of 1 percent of the entire merchant marine personnel at sea in 1942 were guilty of misconduct serious enough to report on log books.

In order to maintain this excellent record, the War Shipping Administration has appointed a new committee to deal expressly with crew disciplinary matters and to see that uniform, nondiscriminating action is promptly taken. This committee will further guarantee the maintenance of officer authority on board United States vessels and of their crews in foreign ports. It will also gather information on meritorious and commendable conduct on the part of crews to the end that they may be suitably recognized.

Through repatriation centers in England, Scotland, Iceland, Trinidad, and elsewhere, the War Shipping Administration in the last 6 months of 1942 brought back to this country by ship and plane more than 1,900 American seamen stranded abroad. Most of these men have returned to sea.

Despite expected increase in enemy attacks on our merchant shipping in 1943, a greater percent of survivals is anticipated because of (1) more escort vessels, (2) better armed ships, (3) more and improved safety devices, (4) more experienced crews. It is also to be noted that new ships, because of compartmentation, are harder to sink.

Rubber lifesaving suits, required for every person on board, have considerably prolonged the length of time a man can hold out in northern waters or exposed to cold weather in a lifeboat. In warm waters these suits have reduced the danger from sharks and barracuda. The red water lights, with which all suits and life jackets are equipped, are effective in locating men in the water at night The regulation requiring these rubber suits has been complied with approximately 99 percent.

New regulations (May 1942) require each vessel to carry a portable radio transmitting set in at least one of their lifeboats capable of sending out an automatic S O S signal. This regulation has been complied with (as of December 1) 62 percent, and the percentage will improve as equipment is available.

New regulations (as of January 1, 1943) require approximately a 50-percent increase in the capacity of lifeboats—15 cubic feet per person. New Liberty ships now carry six boats instead of four and two of these are motor boats. This means lifeboat capacity for double the number of the crew or boats for the full crew on each side of the vessel. In addition quick releasing rafts of sufficient capacity for the entire crew and also additional life floats are carried.

Improved lowering and releasing gear for lifeboats now makes it possible to launch a boat in half a minute or less.

Contrary to some publicized but erroneous statements, lifeboats are the principal means of saving life at sea. A 1942 survey of a group of vessels whose crews numbered 1,756 persons, showed that 81 percent, or 1,432 persons were rescued. Of these 79 percent were saved by lifeboats, 14 percent by rafts, 1 percent by life jackets, and the remaining 6 percent by remaining on board.

A record of the first 46 of this group sunk reveals 700 men were saved by boats and 84 by rafts. This same approximate ratio holds true today. These 46 vessels carried 115 rafts, of which 36, or 30 percent, were launched. At the same time 46 percent of the lifeboats were launched.

The speed with which lifeboats are launched is shown by the case, in the early part of the war, of a vessel with 391 persons on board which sank in 4 minutes and 20 seconds with a loss of only 6 crew members and 3 passengers.

A recent survey of the time in which a torpedoed ship sinks shows times as widely varied as 2 minutes, in an unusual, case, to 9 hours, with approximately half sinking in less than 10 minutes. The average sinking time of ships included in this survey was 1 hour and 52 minutes. This is very much the same as it was last spring or earlier in the war, and therefore would not indicate any increased efficiency in enemy attacks. Newer ships of the long-range type are, however, more capable of resisting attack, as they are faster, better armed, and, in case of torpedoing, sink slower because of stronger construction and more bulkheads.

No United States flag vessels were armed before Pearl Harbor, and it was not until October that practically all ships were armed in some fashion. Even then, they were not considered adequately armed, as many of the guns dated back to World War No. 1 and the .50-caliber machine guns proved ineffective against armored bombers.

The present plan calls for greatly increasing the armament once thought adequate. Merchant vessels on the more dangerous

routes are being equipped with barrage balloons and kites, while several secret protective devices have been installed and are being tried out.

Degaussing and other protective devices against various types of mines are being installed as rapidly as possible on vessels that go into areas where these mines are laid, as well as on other vessels as protection in the event of a possible spreading of these mined areas by the enemy.

Electric Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Electric Cooperatives," which appeared in the Burlington Suburban List of March 18, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

One matter that received considerable attention from the legislature is electric cooperative concerns. There are three of them in the State and under the present law they are not under as direct rigid control of the public service commission as privately owned electric companies. The new law before the legislature would divorce the cooperative electric companies from any control by the public service commission and make it much simpler for them to organize and carry on their business. The Randolph Herald and News takes the position that electric cooperatives should have the same regulation as proprietary utilities and says:

"Why should electric cooperatives be exempt from the same regulation by our State public service commission that is exercised over proprietary utilities? That's the favor they are seeking in a bill now before the legislature and without real reason that we can see. They claim that commission oversight hampers them. So it does other utilities, but in most ways for the public good. The cooperatives can stand it and they should. No 'fish or fowl' legislation."

It may not be generally understood that electric cooperatives organize and carry on their business in quite a different way than the proprietary concerns. In a way the cooperatives are about the same as privately owned concerns. They do not set up their organization to serve the public in the way that the utilities do.

The proprietary concerns are bound by law to serve all people along their lines with electric current and to serve them all at the same rate for the same kind of service. They are strictly utilities and are given jurisdiction to serve certain areas and are given a monopoly for the areas in which they operate. Utilities are organized for the one purpose of making a profit for the stockholders. They are in business simply to make money.

The profit element does not enter into the organization and operation of electric cooperatives. Their object is to serve their own members with electric current and they do not operate at all as a utility in the same way as proprietary concerns. The cooperative electric companies are owned by the members. They have no stock or bonds to sell to the general public.

It does not matter at all whether they pay for the construction of their lines or whether they borrow the money. The Government loans money to electric cooperatives and the Government loans money to farmers and for many other purposes. The records show that the electric cooperatives have been operating so that they can meet all their obligations including payment of interest and principal for borrowed money.

But what is a cooperative in its simplest form? Here are two farmers located several miles from an electric line of a proprietary utility. There would be an extra line charge if those two farmers were to be connected up for electric service. But the two farmers pool their issues and build the line themselves and pay for it. A meter is installed at the point of connection of the utility line and current is bought at the wholesale rate. Then the two farmers agree among themselves as to how much each shall pay. That may be looked upon as a privately owned line but in reality it is a cooperative and also built and operated in just about the same way as the electric cooperatives.

Such a privately owned line is now operated in the Cedar Beach territory. Originally four summer residents built the line and operated it. They owned it, lock, stock, and barrel and buy current at the wholesale rate. Then another summer resident located along that line and wanted electric current. He was required to buy an interest in that privately owned line. It operates in about the same way as an electric cooperative.

Now who in the world would say that the Public Service Commission should have any control or jurisdiction over that Cedar Beach privately owned line or the several miles of line that the two farmers built. Neither set themselves up to serve the public. They are not at all utilities and by the same line of reasoning the electric cooperatives are not utilities as they are not bound to serve the public.

In order for a person to get service from an electric cooperative he must be a member of that cooperative. There is not only a distinction but a clear difference between private utilities and electric cooperatives. The utilities are bound by law to serve the public wherever their lines run, but the cooperatives confine their operation to their own members.

The argument may be made that the Cedar Beach line and the case of the two farmers far removed from electric service may be private concerns and not cooperatives, but when does a privately owned line cease to be such and become a cooperative. Is it in numbers? Four or five people can organize and become a strictly electric cooperative just as well as four or five hundred. The matter of numbers does not enter into it. It is the type of organization and type of service rendered that determines the proprietary utility or electric cooperative.

If these cooperatives served the public in general in the same way that proprietary utilities do then there would be some reason for their control by the Public Service Commission, but their operation is confined to their own members and in a way they are privately owned and privately operated concerns.

The further argument might be used that corporations and private business are controlled, to a large extent, by the Government but such corporations and private business are carried on for profit. Corporations have stocks and bonds to sell to the public.

The profit element does not at all enter into electric cooperatives. They have no stocks or bonds to sell to the public. The property is all owned by the members and the operation is for their benefit. In comparing these two different types of concerns the public generally does not understand that one is carried on for profit and the other for service to its members.

Address of Hon. Winston Churchill

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, every American ought to read Prime Minister Churchill's speech of last Sunday, especially that part of it where he upholds our economic system, our form of government, and our way of life.

Here is one paragraph that is worthy of Thomas Jefferson or any other great American or great Englishman. He says:

We must beware of trying to build a society in which nobody counts for anything except the politician or an official, a society where enterprise gains no reward and thrift no privileges. I say "trying to build" because of all the races in the world our people would be the last to consent to be governed by a bureaucracy. Freedom is their lifeblood. These two great wars, scourging and harrowing men's souls, have made the British Nation the master of its own house.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FISH. Is it not a fact that the Prime Minister puts the interests of Great Britain first?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. FISH. And should we not copy that?

Mr. RANKIN. Every patriotic man on earth should put his own country first, but that does not mean that he would be against the allies of his country in this war.

But the point I am making is that Mr. Churchill lays down the great fundamental principles upon which English-speaking institutions are founded, and to that statement all patriotic Americans who understand the situation can say "amen."

Mr. Churchill's address follows:

Let me first of all thank the very great numbers of people who have made kind inquiries about me during my recent illness. Although for a week I had a fairly stiff dose of fever which, but for modern science, might have had awkward consequences, I wish to make it clear that I never for a moment had to relinquish the responsible direction of affairs. I followed attentively all the time what was happening in Parliament and the lively discussions on our home affairs when peace comes.

It was very clear to me that a good many people were so much impressed by the favorable turn in our fortunes which has marked the last 6 months that they have jumped to the conclusion that the war will soon be over and that we shall soon all be able to get back to the politics and party fights of peacetime.

I am not able to share these sanguine hopes, and my earnest advice to you is to concentrate even more zealously upon the war effort and, if possible, not to take your eye off the ball even for a moment. If tonight, contrary to this advice, I turn aside from the course of the war and deal with some postwar and domestic issues it is only because I hope that by so doing I may be able to simplify and mollify political divergencies and enable all our political forces to march for-

ward to the main objectives in unity and, so far as possible, in step.

WARNS AGAINST PREMATURE PLEDGES

First of all, we must beware of attempts to overpersuade or even to coerce His Majesty's Government to bind themselves or their unknown successors in conditions which no one can foresee, and which may be years ahead, to impose great new expenditures on the state without any relation to the circumstances which might prevail at that time, and to make them pledge themselves to particular schemes without relation to other extremely important aspects of our postwar needs

The business of proposing expenditure rests ultimately with the responsible government of the day, and it is their duty and their duty alone to propose to Parliament any new charges upon the public and also to propose in the annual budgets the means of raising the necessary funds.

The world is coming increasingly to admire our British parliamentary system and ideas. It is contrary to those ideas that ministers or members should become pledge-bound delegates. They are a band of men who undertake certain honorable duties and they would be dishonored if they allowed their right and duty to serve the public as well as possible on any given occasion to be prejudiced by the enforced premature contraction of obligations.

Nothing would be easier for me than to make any number of promises to get the immediate response of cheap cheers and glowing leading articles. I am not in any need to go about making promises in order to win political support or to be allowed to continue in office. It was on a grim and bleak basis that I undertook my present task, and on that basis I have been given loyalty and support such as no Prime Minister has ever received.

REFUSES TO "TELL FAIRY TALES"

I cannot express my feeling of gratitude to the nation for their kindness to me and for the trust and confidence they have placed in me during the long, dark, and disappointing periods.

I am absolutely determined not to falsify or mock that confidence by making promises without regard to whether they can be performed or not. At my time of life I have no personal ambitions, no future to provide for. And I feel I can truthfully say that I only wish to do my duty by the whole mass of the nation and of the British Empire as long as I am thought to be of any use for that.

Therefore I tell you round your firesides tonight that I am resolved not to give or make all kinds of promises and tell all kinds of fairy tales to you who have trusted me and gone with me so far and marched through the valley of the shadow till we have reached the upland regions on which we now stand with firmly planted feet.

However, it is our duty to peer through the mists of the future to the end of the war and to try our utmost to be prepared by ceaseless effort and forethought for the kind of situations which are likely to occur. Speaking under every reserve and not attempting to prophesy, I can imagine that some time next year—but it may well be the year after—we might beat Hitler. By which I mean beat him and his powers of evil into death, dust, and ashes.

Then we shall immediately proceed to transport all the necessary additional forces and apparatus to the other side of the world to punish the greedy, cruel empire of Japan, to rescue China from her long torment, to free our own territory and that of our Dutch allies and to drive the Japanese menace forever from Australian, New Zealand, and Indian shores. That will be our first and supreme task and nothing must lure us from it.

THE GRAND CLIMAX OF THE WAR

Nevertheless, in my opinion, the moment when Hitler is beaten and Germany and Italy are prostrate will mark the grand climax of war and that will be the time to make a new declaration upon the task before us. We and our allies will have accomplished one great task. And Nazi tyranny and Prussian militarism, which threatened to engulf the whole world and against which we stood alone for a fateful year—these curses will have been swept from the face of the earth.

If I should be spared to see that day and should be needed at the helm at that time I shall then, with the assent of the cabinet, propose a new task to the British nation. The war against Japan will demand a very different arrangement of our forces from what it is at present. There will certainly be large numbers of British and also no doubt United States soldiers whom it will not be physically possible to employ across the vast distances and poor communications of the Japanese war.

There will certainly be large numbers of men not only abroad but at home who will have to be brought back to their families and to their jobs or to other equally good jobs. For all these, after full provision has been made for the garrisoning of guilty countries, return to something like home and freedom will be their heart's desire. However vigorously the war against Japan is prosecuted, there will certainly be a partial demobilization following on the defeat of Hitler and this will raise most difficult and intricate problems, and we are taking care in our arrangements to avoid the mistakes which were so freely committed last time.

Of course, these ideas may be completely falsified by events. It may be that Japan will collapse before Hitler, in which case quite another layout will be necessary. As, however, many people wish ardently to discuss the future, I adopt for this purpose tonight what seems to me the most likely situation.

On this assumption, it would be our hope that the United Nations, headed by the three great victorious powers, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the United States, and Soviet Russia, should immediately begin to confer upon the future world organization, which is to be our safeguard against further wars, by effectually disarming and keeping disarmed the guilty states by bringing to justice the grand criminals and their accomplices and by securing the return to devastated and subjugated countries of the mechanical resources and artistic treasures of which they have been pillaged.

LOOKS TO COUNCIL OF EUROPE

We shall also have a heavy task in trying to avert widespread famine in at least some of the ruined regions. We must hope and pray that the unity of the three leading victorious powers will be worthy of their supreme responsibility and that they will think not only of their own welfare but of the welfare and future of all. One can imagine that under a world institution embodying or representing the United Nations, and some day all nations, there should come into being a council of Europe and a council of Asia.

As, according to the forecast I am outlining, the war against Japan will still be raging, it is upon the creation of the council of Europe and the settlement of Europe that the first practical task will be centered. Now this is a stupendous business. In Europe lie most of the causes which have led to these two world wars. In Europe dwell the historic parent races from whom our western civilization has been so largely derived. I believe myself to be what is called a good European besides should deem it a noble task to take part in reviving the fertile genius and in restoring the true greatness of Europe.

I hope we shall not lightly cast aside all the immense work which was accomplished by the creation of the League of Nations. Certainly we must take as our foundation of the lofty conception of freedom, law, and morality which was the spirit of the League. We must try—I am speaking, of course, only for ourselves—we must try to make the council of Europe, or whatever it may be called, into a really effective league with all the strongest forces concerned woven into its texture with a high court to adjust disputes and with forces, armed forces, national or international, or both, held ready to enforce these decisions and prevent renewed aggression and the preparation of future wars.

SUGGESTS CONFEDERATIONS

Anyone can see that this council, when created, must eventually embrace the whole of Europe and that all the main branches of the European family must some day be partners in it. What is to happen to the large number of small nations whose rights and interests must be safeguarded? Here let me ask what would be thought of an army that consisted only of battalions and brigades and which never formed any of the larger and high organizations like army corps. It would soon get mopped up. It would, therefore, seem to me, at any rate, worthy of patient study that side by side with the great powers there should be a number of groupings of states or confederations which would express themselves through their own chosen representatives, the whole making a council of great states and groups of states.

It is my earnest hope, though I can hardly expect to see it fulfilled in my lifetime, that we shall achieve the largest common measure of the integrated life of Europe that is possible without destroying the individual characteristics and traditions of its many ancient and historic races. All this will, I believe, be found to harmonize with the high permanent interests of Britain, the United States, and Russia. It certainly cannot be accomplished without their cordial and concerted agreement and direct participation. Thus, and thus only, will the glory of Europe rise again.

I only mention these matters to you to show you the magnitude of the task that will lie before us in Europe alone. Nothing could be more foolish at this stage than to plunge into details and try to prescribe the exact groupings of States or lay down precise machinery for their cooperation or still more to argue about frontiers, now while the war even in the west has not yet reached its full height, while the struggle with U-boats is raging, and when the war in the Far East is only in its first phase.

This does not mean that many tentative discussions are not taking place between the great nations concerned or that the whole vast problem of European destiny—for that is what I am speaking of now—is not the subject of ceaseless heart searchings.

We must remember, however, that we in Britain and the British Commonwealth of Nations, although almost a world in ourselves, would have to reach agreements with great and friendly equals and also to respect and have a care to the rights of weaker and smaller states, and that it will not be given to any one nation to achieve the full satisfaction of its individual wishes.

ADVOCATES BRITISH 4-YEAR PLAN

I have said enough, however, I am sure, to show you at least in outline the mystery, the peril and, I will add, the splendor of this vast sphere of practical action into which we shall have to leap once the hideous spell of Nazi tyranny has been broken.

Coming nearer home, we shall have to consider at the same time how the inhabitants of this island are going to get their living at this stage in the world story and how they are going to maintain and progressively improve their previous standards of life and labor.

I am very much attracted to the idea that we should make and proclaim what might be called the 4-year plan. Four years seems to me to be the right length for the period of transition and reconstruction which will follow the downfall of Hitler.

We have 5-year Parliaments, and a 4-year plan would give time for the preparation of a second plan. This 4-year plan would cover five or six large measures of a practical character which must all have been the subject of prolonged careful, energetic preparations beforehand and which fit together into a general scheme.

When this plan has been shaped it will have to be presented to the country, either by a national government, formally representative as this one is of the three parties in the state, or by a national government comprising the best men in all parties who are willing to serve. I cannot tell how these matters will settle themselves. But by 1944 our present Parliament will have lived 9 years, and by 1945 10 years, and as soon as the defeat of Germany has removed the danger now at our throats and a register can be compiled and other necessary arrangements made, a new House of Commons must be freely chosen by the whole electorate, including, of course, the armed forces, wherever they may be.

STRESSES DIFFICULTIES AHEAD

Thus, whoever is burdened with the responsibility of conducting affairs will have a clear policy and will be able to speak and act at least in the name of an effective and resolute majority.

From what I have already said you will realize how very difficult and anxious this period will be and how much depends not only on our own action but on the action of other very powerful countries. This applies not only to the carrying to the conclusion the war against Japan but also to the disarming of the guilty and to the settlement of Europe. Not only to the arrangements for the prevention of further wars but also to the whole economic process and relationship of nations in order that the ruin of our wealth may be rapidly repaired, in order that employment and production shall be at a high level, and that goods and services shall be interchanged between man and man and between one nation and another under the best conditions and on the largest scale.

The difficulties which will confront us will take all our highest qualities to overcome. Let me, however, say straightaway that my faith in the vigor, ingenuity, and resilience of the British race is invincible.

Difficulties mastered are opportunities won. The day of Hitler's downfall will be a bright one for our country and for all mankind. Bells will clash the peal of victory and hope and we will march forward together, encouraged and invigorated and still, I trust, generally united upon our further journey.

WOULD EXTEND INSURANCE

I, personally, am very keen that the scheme for amalgamation and extension of our incomparable insurance system should have a leading place in our 4-year plan.

I have been prominently connected with all these schemes of national compulsory organized thrift from the time when I brought my friend, Sir William Beveridge, into the public service 35 years ago, when I was creating the labor exchanges, on which he was a great authority, and when with Sir Hubert Llewellyn-Smith I framed the first unemployment-insurance scheme. The prime parent of all national insurance schemes is, of course, Mr. Lloyd George. I was his lieutenant in those distant days and afterwards it fell to me as Chancelor of the Exchequer 18 years ago to lower the pension age to 65 and bring in the widows and orphans.

The time is now ripe for another great advance, and anyone can see what large savings there will be in administration, once the whole process of insurance becomes unified, compulsory, and national. Here is a real opportunity for what I once called "bringing the magic of averages to the rescue of the millions"; therefore you must rank me and my colleagues as strong partisans of national compulsory insurance for all classes, for all purposes, from the cradle to the grave.

Every preparation, including, if necessary, preliminary legislative preparation, will be made with the utmost energy, and the necessary negotiations to deal with existing worthy interests are being actively pursued so that when the moment comes everything will be ready.

WE CANNOT HAVE DRONES

Here let me remark that the best way to insure against unemployment is to have no unemployment.

There is another point: Unemployables, rich or poor, will have to be toned up. We cannot afford to have idle people. Idlers at the top make idlers at the bottom. No one must stand aside in his working prime to pursue a life of selfish pleasure.

There are wasters in all classes. Happily, they are only a small minority in every class, but anyhow we cannot have a band of drones in our midst, whether they come from the ancient aristocracy or the modern plutocracy or the ordinary type of pub crawler.

There are other large matters which also have to be dealt with in our 4-year plan and upon which thought, study, and discussion are advancing rapidly.

Let me take first of all the question of British agriculture.

We have, of course, to purchase a large proportion of our food and vital raw materials overseas. Our foreign investments have been expended in the common cause. The British Nation that has now once again saved the freedom of the world has grown great on cheap and abundant food. Had it not been for the free-trade policy of Victorian days our population would never have risen to the level of a great power and we might have gone down the drain with many other minor states, to the disaster of the whole world.

Abundant food has brought our 47,000,000 Britons into the world. Here they are and they must find their living.

It is absolutely certain that we shall have to grow a larger proportion of our food at home.

During the war immense advances have been made by the agricultural industry. The position of the farmers has been improved, the position of laborers immeasurably improved. The efficient agricultural landlord has an important part to play. I hope to see a vigorous revival of healthy village life on the basis of these higher wages and of improved housing and, what with the modern methods of locomotion and the modern amusements of the cinema and wireless, to which will soon be added television, life in the country and on the land ought to compete in attractiveness with life in the great cities.

But all this would cost money. When the various handicaps of war conditions are at an end I expect that better national housekeeping will be possible and that as a result of technical improvements in British agriculture the strain upon the state will be relieved. At the same time the fact remains that if expansion and improvement of British agriculture is to be maintained, as it must be maintained, and a reasonable level of prices is to be maintained, as it must be maintained, there are likely to be substantial charges which the state must be prepared to shoulder.

Next, there is the spacious domain of public health. I was brought up on the maxim of Lord Beaconsfield, which my father was always repeating: "Health and the laws of health." We must establish on broad and solid foundations a national health service.

Here let me say that there is no finer investment for any community than putting milk into babies. Healthy citizens are the greatest asset any country can have. One of the most somber anxieties which beset those who look 30 or 40 or 50 years ahead—and in the field one can see ahead only too clearly—is a dwindling birth rate. In 30 years, unless the present trends alter, a smaller working and fighting population will have to support and protect nearly twice as many old people; in 50 years the position will be worse still. If this country is to keep its high place in the leadership of the world and to survive as a great power that can hold its own against external pressure, our people must be encouraged by every means to have larger families.

For this reason, well thought out plans for helping parents to contribute this lifespring to the community are of prime importance. The care of the young and establishment of sound hygienic conditions of motherhood have a bearing upon the whole future of the race which is absolutely vital. Side by side with that is the war upon disease, which, let me remind you, so far as it is successful will directly aid the national insurance scheme. Upon all this, planning is vigorously proceeding.

THE QUESTION OF EDUCATION

Following upon health and welfare is the question of education. The future of the world is left to highly educated races who alone can handle the scientific apparatus necessary for preeminence in peace or survival in war. I hope our education will become broader and more liberal. All wisdom is not new wisdom and the past should be studied if the future is to be successfully encountered. To quote Disraeli again in one of his most pregnant sayings: "Nations are governed by force or by tradition." In moving steadily and steadfastly from a class to a national foundation in the politics and economics of our society and civilization, we must not forget the glories of the past nor how many battles we have fought for the rights of the individual and for human freedom.

We must beware of trying to build a society in which nobody counts for anything except the politician or an official, a society where enterprise gains no reward and thrift no privileges. I say "trying to build" because of all the races in the world our people would be the last to consent to be governed by a bureaucracy. Freedom is their lifeblood. These two great wars, scourging and harrowing men's souls, have made the British nation the master in its own house. The people have been rendered conscious that they are coming into their inheritance.

The treasures of the past, the toil of the centuries, the long built-up conceptions of decent government and fair play and tolerance which comes from the free working of the parliamentary and electoral institutions and the great colonial possessions for which we are trustees in every part of the globe. All these constitute parts of this inheritance and the Nation must be fitted for its responsibilities and the high human beings are endowed with, infinitely varying qualities and dispositions, and each one different from the other. We cannot make them all the same. It would be a pretty dull world if we did.

It is in our power, however, to secure equal opportunities for all. Facilities for advanced education must be evened out and multiplied. No one who can take advantage of higher education should be denied this chance. You cannot conduct a modern community except with an adequate supply of persons upon whose education, whether humanitarian, technical, or scientific, much time and money has been spent.

There is another element which should never be banished from our system of edu-

cation. Here we have freedom of thought as well as freedom of conscience. Here we have been pioneers of religious toleration.

But side by side with all this has been the fact that religion has been the rock in the life and character of the British people, upon which they have built their hopes and cast their cares. This fundamental element must never be taken from our schools and I rejoice to learn of enormous progress that is being made among all religious bodies in freeing themselves from sectarian jealousies and feuds while preserving fervently the tenets of their own faith.

The secular schooling of the great mass of our scholars must be progressively prolonged and for this we must both improve our schools and train our teachers.

After schooltime ends we must not throw our youths uncared for and unsupervised on to the labor market, with its blind-alley occupations which start so fair and often end so foul.

We must make plans for part-time release from industry so that our young people may have the chance to carry on their general education and also to obtain specialized education which will fit them better for their work.

FORWARD IN A GREAT FAMILY

Under our ancient monarchy, that bulwark of British liberties, that barrier against dictatorships of all kinds, we intend to move forward in a great family, preserving the comradeships of the war, free forever from the class prejudice and other forms of snobbery from which in modern times we have suffered less than most other nations, and from which we are now shaking ourselves entirely free. Britain is a fertile mother and natural genius springs from the whole people.

We have made great progress but we must make far greater progress. We must make sure that the path to higher functions throughout our society and empire is really open to children of every family. Whether they can tread that path will depend upon their qualities, tested by fair competition.

All cannot reach the same level, but all must have their chance.

I look forward to a Britain so big that she will need to draw her leaders from every type of school and wearing every kind of tie. Tradition may play its part but broader systems must now rule.

We have one large immediate task in the replanning and rebuilding of our cities and towns. This will make a very great call on all our resources in material and labor, but it is also an immense opportunity not only for improvement of our housing but for employment of our people in the years immediately after the war.

In the far-reaching scheme for reorganizing the building industry, prepared by the Minister of Labor and the Minister of Works, will be found another means of protecting our insurance fund from the drain of unemployment relief.

Mr. Bevin is attacked from time to time, now from one side, now from another. When I think of the tremendous changes which have been effected under the strain of war in the lives of the whole people of both sexes and of every class with so little friction, and when I consider the practical absence of strikes in this war compared to what happened in the last, I think he will be able to take it all right.

You will see from what I have said that there is no lack of material for the 4 years' plan for the transition period from war to peace and for another plan after that.

"NO PROMISES, EVERY PREPARATION"

For the present during the war our rule should be no promises but every preparation, including, where required, preliminary legislative preparation. Before I conclude I have to strike two notes, one of sober caution and the other of confidence that all our improvements and expansion must be related to a sound and modernized finance. A friend of mine said the other day in the House of Commons that "pounds, shillings, and pence were meaningless symbols." This made me open my eyes and prick up my ears. What, then, are we to say about the savings of the people? We have just begun a "wings for victory" war savings campaign to which all classes have subscribed. Vast numbers of people have been encouraged to purchase war savings certificates. Income tax is collected from the wage earners of a certain level and carried to the nest egg for them at the end of the war, the Government having the use of the money meanwhile. A nest egg similar in character will be given to the armed forces.

For those whose houses have been destroyed by air-raid damage and who have in many cases paid insurance are entitled to that compensation. All those obligations were contracted in pounds, shillings, and pence.

At the end of this war there will be seven or eight million people in the country with two or three hundred pounds apiece, a thing unknown in our history.

These savings of the nation arising from the thrift, skill or devotion of individuals are sacred. The state is built around them and it is the duty of the state to redeem its faith in an equal degree of value.

I am not one of those who are wedded to undue rigidity in the management of the currency system, but this I say: That over a period of 10 or 15 years there ought to be a fair, steady continuity of values if there is to be any faith between man and man or between the individual and the state. We have successfully stabilized prices during the war. We intend to continue this policy after the war to the utmost of our ability.

QUESTION OF TAXATION

This brings me to the subject of the burden and incidence of taxation. Direct taxation on all classes stands at unprecedented and sterilizing levels. Besides this there is indirect taxation raised to a remarkable height.

In wartime our people are willing and even proud to pay all those taxes. But such conditions could not continue in peace. We must expect taxation after the war to be heavier than it was before the war, but we do not intend to shape our plans or levy taxation in a way which by removing personal incentive would destroy initiative and enterprise.

If you'll take a single year of peace and take a slice through the industry and enterprise of the nation you will find work which is being done at the moment, work that is being planned for the next year and projects for the third, fourth and even fifth year ahead which are all maturing.

War cuts down all this forward planning, and everything is subordinated to the struggle for national existence. Thus, when peace came along suddenly as it did last time there were no long carefully prepared plans for future. That was one of the main reasons why at the end of the last war after a momentary recovery we fell into a dreadful trough of unemployment. We must not be caught again that way.

It is therefore necessary to make sure that we have projects for the future employment of the people and the forward movement of our industries carefully foreseen, and, secondly, that private enterprise and State enterprise are both able to play their parts to the utmost.

FIELD FOR ENTERPRISE

A number of measures are being and will be prepared which will enable the Government to exercise a balancing influence upon development which can be turned on or off as circumstances may require. There is a broadening field for State ownership and enterprise, especially in relation to monopolies of all kind. The modern State will increasingly concern itself with the economic well being of the Nation, but it is all the more vital to revive at the earliest moment a widespread healthy and vigorous private enterprise without which we shall never be able to provide in the years when it will be needed the employment for our soldiers, sailors, and airmen to which they are entitled after their duty has been done.

In this brief survey I have tried to set before you both hopes and fears; I have given both caution and encouragement. But if I have to strike a balance, as I must do before the end, let me proclaim myself a faithful follower of a larger hope. I will proceed to back this hope with some solid facts. Anyone can see the difficulties of placing our exports profitably in a world so filled with ruined countries. Foreign trade to be of value must be fertile. There is no use in doing business at a loss.

Nevertheless, I am advised that in view of the general state of the world after the defeat of Hitler there will be considerable opportunities for re-establishing our exports. Immediately after the war there will be an intense demand both for home and export for what are called consumable goods, such as clothes, furniture and textiles. I have spoken of an immense building program and we all know the stimulus which that is to a large number of trades, including the electrical and metal industries. We have learned much about production under the stress of war. Our methods have vastly improved. The layout of our factories presents an entirely new and novel picture to the eye. Mass production has been forced upon us.

Electrification of our industry has been increased 50 percent. There are some significant new industries offering scope for the inventiveness and vigor which made this country great. When the fetters of wartime are struck off and we turn free hands to the industrial tasks of peace we may be astonished at the progress in efficiency we shall suddenly find displayed. I can only mention a few instances. The field for activity, the ceaseless improvements in wireless and the wonders of radio-location applied to the arts of peace will employ the radio industry. Striking advances are open for both gas and electricity as the servants of industry, agriculture and the cottage home. There is civil aviation. There is forestry. There is transportation in all its forms. We were the earliest in the world with railways; we must bring them up to date in every respect. Here in these few examples are gigantic opportunities which if used will in turn increase our power to serve other countries with the goods they want.

Our own effort must be supported by international arrangements and agreements more neighborlike and more sensible than before. We must strive to secure our fair share of an augmented world trade. Our fortunes will be greatly influenced by the policies of the United States and of the British Dominions, and we are doing our utmost to keep in ever closer contact with them. We have lately put before them and our other friends and Allies some tentative suggestions for the future management of the exchanges and of international currency, which will shortly be published. Let this be the first installment only.

VICTORY YET TO BE WON

I have heard a great deal on both sides of these questions during the 40 years I have served in the House of Commons and the 20 years or more I have sat in Cabinets. I have tried to learn from events and also from my own mistakes. And I tell you my solemn belief, which is that if we act with comradeship and loyalty to our country and to one another, and if we can make state enterprise and free enterprise both serve national interests and pull the national wagon side by side, then

there is no need for us to run into that horrible devastating slump or into that squalid epoch of bickering and confusion which mocked and squandered the hard-won victory we gained a quarter of a century ago.

I end where I began. Let us get back to our job. I must warn everyone who hears me of a certain, shall I say, unseemliness, and also of a danger of it appearing to the world that we here in Britain are diverting our attention to peace which is still remote and to the fruits of a victory which have yet to be won while all the time our Russian allies are fighting for dear life and dearer honor in a dire, deadly, daily struggle against all the might of the German military machine and while our thoughts should be with our armies and with our American and French comrades now engaged in decisive battle in Tunisia.

I have just received a mesage from General Montgomery that the Eighth Army is on the move and that he is satisfied with their progress.

Let us wish them Godspeed in their struggle, and let us bend all our efforts to the war and to the ever more vigorous prosecution of our supreme task.

Production of Food for Armed Forces and Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, the production of food for our armed forces, as well as for our allies, is of equal importance with the production of munitions, guns, planes, and other war equipment. We cannot win the war unless we have both. Yet the condition facing the country today with reference to agriculture is most alarming. The unwise policies of restricting production, and of stripping the farms of men skilled in agriculture, will result in a food famine unless immediate steps are taken to remedy the situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. J. A. Stewart, of Blackfoot, Idaho, with reference to this matter. Mr. Stewart is not a theorist. He is a practical farmer of many years experience, and he sets forth in detail the reasons why it will be impossible for the farmer, under present conditions, to meet the demands of the Government for increased production.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLACKFOOT, IDAHO, *March 17, 1943.*

HON. JOHN THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: The serious conditions with respect to the shortage of food, farm machinery, and farm help now confronting us impels me to call to your attention certain conditions existing in this county, and which I am advised exist in other counties of this State and perhaps in other States of the Union.

The doctrine of scarcity has put the food and farm machinery supply at low ebb, and the persistent efforts of the selective service in removing from this farming community the farm and range help so necessary to the production of food has created a farming and stock raising crisis.

I am not a politician, as you know. I am fundamentally a farmer. I am operating 653 acres of irrigated land myself and I supervise the operation of 10,685 acres through tenants for nonresident owners, all of which is irrigated land. I have made a complete survey of this county, have consulted with the various bureaus, agencies, and boards and interviewed the farmers in all parts of this county and in some other counties of the State, and I find a very serious condition in the shortage of farm machinery and farm help. The only thing that we seem to have plenty of is radio speeches, press propaganda, bureaus, and boards and the only ones who can live on such a supply are those who are actually connected with those bureaus.

The conditions of the country with respect to farm machinery was so low at the beginning of this war that far-sighted policy should have dictated the continuance and speeding up of the production of farm machinery as other countries in war have done, because after all it is food that wins the war, and if the men are to be drafted, machinery to do their work must be manufactured and put to use.

The present indications are, and I think I am safe in saying, that unless some unforeseen miracle happens not to exceed 50 percent of the beet acreage of last year will be signed up or planted. Farmers endeavoring to farm tracts of land with hired help are making arrangements to curtail their efforts because they cannot, with such machinery as they have and the help they can obtain, farm their entire acreage now under cultivation. Livestock and even dairy cattle are being sold every day in this community because of the impossibility of securing help to handle and operate the same. Sheep men are disposing of their flocks and herds because they cannot get herders and camp tenders to care for them, and must cut down to the point where they can personally do the work.

Our two greatest shortages in this community are labor and farm machinery, and the allotments made to this community are ridiculously small, and if it were not so serious could be considered a great joke. My survey shows that the machinery which we should have at this time to properly operate the land in this county is as follows:

Machinery needed	Number	When needed
Tractors	50	Immediately.
Beet and potato cultivators	50	By May 1.
Plows	50	Immediately.
Discs, tandem	35	Do.
Mowers	60	By June 1.
Manure spreaders	45	Immediately.
Grain drills	25	Do.
Potato planters	35	By May 15.
Potato diggers	50	By July 15.
Grain binders	25	Do.
Corn planters	5	By May 1.
Corn binders	5	By Sept. 1.
Hay rakes, side delivery	45	By June 1.
Dump hay rakes	80	Do.
Harrows, spring tooth	25	Immediately.
Fence wire	(1)	Do.
22 x 38 threshers	2	Aug. 1.
Feed mills	25	Immediately.
Hay loaders	10	By June 1.
Hay stackers	15	Do.
Buck rakes	100	Do.
Hay balers	2	Do.
Combines	30	By Aug. 1.

[1] 3 carloads, 60,000 capacity each.

With respect to the combines, they should be 4 and 6 foot. This is imperative on account of the serious shortage of labor. These combines will save at least two-thirds of the men otherwise necessary to cut and thresh the crop. On account of the impossibility of securing binder twine, it will be necessary to save the grain crops of this community by combining it. The total amount of twine allotted is not half enough to bind the grain that is planted or in prospect of being planted.

There have been in this county 53 applications for tractors. Only 9 tractors are allotted to us. At one sale recently 24 bidders for 1 tractor were present, and, of course, it was necessary to determine who should receive the 1 tractor for sale. Consequently, lots were drawn and 23 persons needing tractors had to return home disappointed. The following is the meager allotment for this county: 21 mowers, 10 plows, 10 discs, 7 potato cultivators, 23 beet cultivators, 13 of which have already been disposed of and the farmers are sparring for the other 10. There are on file 40 applications for cultivators, of which 3 are for beets and the balance potatoes.

It would seem to me now that the useless bureaus, Agricultural Adjustment Administration offices, and other political appendages should be eliminated for the duration. We can ill afford them at this time, and the men who are sitting around trying to preserve their organizations and keep their jobs could render a better service to the United States and the war effort by taking up their shovels and pitchforks and going to work in the fields.

My own opinion is that instead of trying to run this thing from Washington through a bunch of subsidized clerks and employees it should be thrown in reverse and the structure built from the farm up. Cease dictating to the farmer and let him run his show. He knows better than anybody else what is needed to produce crops, and if he is not hampered and is given any semblance of machinery and help, the Nation can depend upon him to make good. These folks in Washington who never saw west of the Allegheny Mountains have no idea what it means to farm with irrigation. They have no idea of what a farm here will produce, how much effort, labor, or machinery is required to do it. They have no way of knowing the pressing needs of these farmers, and it would seem to me that it is about time that Washington commenced sitting up and taking notice of what these farmers say instead of trying to further paternalize and regiment them in this time of great emergency.

Yours very truly,

J. A. STEWART.

Speech of Col. Arthur Evans, Member of Parliament, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SPEECH BY COL. ARTHUR EVANS, MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT, TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

On behalf of the late Speaker of the House of Commons, Captain the Right Honorable Edward Fitzroy, I am charged to deliver this letter to you, sir.

You will be aware that since the letter was written Captain Fitzroy has died, but his successor, Colonel the Right Honorable Clifton Brown, has written to you in similar

terms, but his letter has not yet had time to arrive.

Permit me, sir, to express through you our appreciation of the sad circumstances which have prevented the presentation of this communication to Mr. Speaker RAYBURN personally.

Sir, I am privileged to speak in the name of four parliamentary committees—the British Group of the Interparliamentary Union, the Welsh Parliamentary Party, of both of which I am chairman, also the British-American Parliamentary Committee and the Empire Parliamentary Association, as a member of their executive.

These committees, in the aggregate, represent most of the members of both houses, all of whom are most anxious to have the closest possible practical contact with their colleagues in the Congress of the United States of America.

Never in the whole course of their histories have greater responsibilities fallen upon the legislatures of the English-speaking peoples, for upon their capacity to think clearly and to act quickly may depend the future happiness and welfare, not only of their own peoples but of the world at large. It is, therefore, not unnatural that these bodies should wish to consult together as to how they can discharge these onerous and pressing duties. The exchange of views between free peoples is the foundation on which all our democratic traditions are built and the representatives of the people, who have to interpret to constituents the activities of governments, and to governments the wishes of the people, must, I think, take counsel with one another from time to time as to how they can most wisely discharge their responsibilities.

Such consultation has long been the recognized principle upon which the Inter-Parliamentary Union has been built up. Discarding utopian conception and all dogmatism, it summons to its councils political men of good will, whatever their native country or their opinions. Our two Houses have become, in some sense, the trustees for the future of the free institutions of those peoples who have fallen under the Nazi-Fascist yoke. We are providing in the day to day work of our assemblies that, carrying with us the confidence of our people, we can build up a more efficient machine to wage total war than the vaunted modern and practical methods of the enemy. Our immediate preoccupation is great and the difficulties of inter-communication under the stress of total war are many. In spite of these, we hope that you will share our view that if we fail to give some time now and in the immediate future to taking counsel with one another we may forfeit, when the day of victory comes, those things for which the peoples of the United Nations are sacrificing so much.

Today, parliamentary form of government is on trial as never before. It has proved itself in the past to be by far the finest form of government which has yet been devised but it still has to prove itself under conditions of total war. For, on its success or failure may well depend the future happiness and prosperity of the whole world.

REPLY OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE M'CORMACK

Colonel Evans, it is very kind of you to express your appreciation of the sad circumstances which have prevented the presentation of your communication to Speaker RAYBURN personally. Your expression of sympathy to the Speaker on the death of his late brother will be presented by me to the Speaker. I appreciate your expression of sympathy, and the Speaker will also.

I am very glad to meet you and to welcome you to the Capital and to assure you of our desire to extend every courtesy possible to you in your present trip.

We regret very much the death of the late Speaker of the House of Commons, the Honorable Capt. Edward Fitzroy, and we hope that you will transmit to the members of the House of Commons and the four Parliamentary committees our keen regrets and our deep sympathy.

I am pleased, representing Speaker RAYBURN, and personally, to accept the invitation which you bring with you, and I will deliver it to the Speaker immediately upon his return to Washington.

It has long been my personal view that various legislative bodies of the world, and there are not so many free democracies left in the world today, to come closer to one another in the understanding of each other's problems and of the world's problems by contacts such as are proposed in the invitation which you leave with me today for Speaker RAYBURN. I have long felt that better understanding and greater tolerance and more good will be established if legislative bodies of the free democracies brought themselves closer to one another. There are many ways in which that can be done and one of the most effective means is through the strengthening and broadening of the activities of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. Representative government is another way of characterizing democratic processes of government. Democratic processes of government cannot exist without a legislative branch which represents the free will of the people. It is the duty of that legislative branch, particularly in these trying days, to make its contribution, no matter in what country it exists that is engaged in war, to the winning of the war and thereafter the establishment of a just and lasting peace. This requires leadership in the legislative branch of government as well as in the Executive. It means if we are to prevent, for example, the next generation of youngsters from being used as cannon fodder, that legislative branch of government as wel las in the from a broad and not from a provincial angle.

One of the means of accomplishing this would be the bringing of legislative bodies of the free countries of the world closer together, as you have well stated in your remarks made today.

The inventive genius of man has brought the peoples of the world closer to one another. It has, in a sense, eliminated time and space. We cannot ignore the fact that this condition exists. It therefore follows that it is for the best interests of the free governments of the world that the legislative branches of such governments be brought closer to one another through consultations and exchange of views. It is my opinion there should be such a development, and I am confident there will be such a development in the future.

We are very glad, Colonel Evans, to meet and to greet you and to welcome you to the Capital and to wish you, when you return to England, a safe journey. We also ask you to extend to the members of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the four parliamentary committees in whose name you speak, and to present to the present Speaker of the House of Commons and to the members of the House of Commons, our greetings and best wishes.

Radio Address of Hon. Richard M. Kleberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON H. WEST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address recently delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]:

These are indeed troubled and tragic days. All about us is chaos and change. Yes, even as I address you on the state of our Nation and before I conclude, portentous events occur and others portend and are forming.

We are in the most desperate war recorded in all history. We shoulder the greatest burden of responsibility one people and one country ever bore.

For over a century and a half since our birth as a Nation we have prized and defended our national life and liberty and the life and liberty of each of our citizens. We have done this by making the Declaration of Independence effective and by sacred compact agreeing to be governed by our national charter, the Constitution of the United States.

Though at times we have wavered in the stanchness of our respect and support of this immortal instrument, we have never even momentarily abandoned it as a people. God forbid that we ever do. Because of our faith in Him and His immeasurable blessings we with God-given reason to our ancestors first secured it.

Young Americans on far-flung fields of battle are giving their lives and healthy bodies to keep it secure to us.

By reason of our form of government, the United States of America reached its present place in the eyes of the world.

Because, we the people of the United States in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do we now find ourselves the hope of all thoughtful Christian civilized people in the world.

In sacred even though tragic truth, the state of the Union and the added hopes of these millions depend on us. This is our greatest test as guardians of the most sacred trust in this world.

One of those great Americans who took part in the drafting of these early instruments with the God-given reason which blessed the founders of our Government was Thomas Jefferson.

With a foresight seldom if ever equaled he expressed this thought. I quote: "A single good government is a blessing to the whole earth."

Cyrus the Conqueror, according to Xenophon, warned his officers at the end of his wars in 400 B. C. in these words. I quote: "It is a great work methinks to found an empire, but a far greater to keep it safe.

"To seize it may be the fruit of daring and daring only, but to hold it is impossible without self-restraint and self-command and endless care."

We who are charged with preserving the Nation at home must heed this age-old admonition.

The flower of our Nation's manhood; yes, and womanhood, the veritable glory of our Nation in our armed services, in the trenches, in the hospitals or wounded on the battlefield; yes, mayhap, in their lonely graves at sea or in foreign lands, are looking to us. Looking to us at home for the safekeeping of America's home when those of them who are left come home.

As a Member of Congress—their and your, yes, of our Congress—this responsibility to a major degree is ours.

The Congress writes the laws and should see to it that they are administered in accordance with the intent of Congress.

You, the people, elect and keep the Congress informed as to your individual opinions in this matter.

Clear thinking on sound constructive lines should be the first order of today and tomorrow.

Politics must be given its walking papers. Prejudice must be cast off and aside and all

selfish or self-serving stress inimical to our national self-preservation must be ignored or uprooted when discovered.

Only the exercise of truly American patriotic jealousy as to the safety of American rights can safeguard this land until the survivors of its true defenders return.

The right to work is more than ever a vital American right today. It is assailed here at home on many fronts and in many ways.

By propaganda, by regulation, and by overt act the unwitting if there be such and the deliberate enemies of the American way of life would abridge and hamper its exercise.

All these challenge the responsibility of government and would prevent the discharge of our trust to those who are giving and risking their lives to defend the American way of life.

Members of Congress are charged with knowledge of the habits, the practices, the feelings, and the way of thinking of the American people, as Americans and as members of a highly responsible branch of government.

No one who is a stranger to these components can possibly propose or constructively apply regulations which fit them.

The ideology of racketeering labor leaders is foreign to American ideas—they must be put out of practice here at home.

Production of munitions and matériel of war must not be impeded or restricted.

Likewise, production of food must not be hampered or harassed by ill-advised and theoretical regulation.

The state of the Nation and the fate of the Christian world may well depend on how truly we heed these facts.

Remember this—only true Americans can, must and will defend the American way and the representative democracy that we love, the United States of America.

World War I produced a new use for barbed wire—entanglements to retard the enemy advance. At times there were shortages in the production of barbed wire.

The administrative branch of our Government in many of its bureaus and agencies is now producing red tape at a rate far, far in excess of our national production in weapons and food. Red tape entanglements here at home are serving the enemy better than barbed wire can serve him elsewhere.

I am hopeful that when our Commander in Chief sees this he will get out and use the big shears. He can do more with the big shears now than was done even by one who advised us to "speak softly and carry a big stick."

In cowboy parlance these red tape makers are a part of his outfit—and spring time is round-up time when the cutting out begins.

Representative democracy is a product of the United States.

Its objectives and purposes together with its ways and means are set out in our organic law and the constitutions of the 48 States. By its practice we have the products of free enterprise and freemen.

Representative democracy stands for the land of the free and the home of the brave—its sons and its daughters must not be restricted in their efforts to defend and preserve it from those within who would destroy it.

The executive, legislative, and judicial branches and you, my fellow citizens, are actually or impliedly sworn to uphold and defend its Constitution.

Surely we must let it defend itself and work its own salvation.

We can't, we must not, and we won't let them down.

To American citizens and our allies, and to our friends and the suffering people in Europe, Asia, Africa, and elsewhere in this war torn world, we at home say to you, I pray we'll do our part the American way.

Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. JONES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of March 22, 1943:

WHERE LEND-LEASE AID SHOULD BE SENT

During the recent debate preceding renewal of the Lend-Lease Act Representative ROBERT F. JONES, of Ohio, asserted with much justice that the great flaw in the operation of the act is that allocations of lend-lease material to the various fighting fronts have been in inverse proportion to the victories won on those fronts. Seventy-five percent of all shipments, for example, have gone to Britain, but British forces have turned these materials into victory nowhere except in Libya. Meanwhile the big Allied victories were being won by the Russians, by General MacArthur's forces in Papua and the Bismarck Sea, and by the American fleet and airmen in the Coral Sea, at Midway Island, and in the Solomons.

Paraphrasing the famous remark of Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest, Representative JONES said that the apparent strategy of such gentlemen as Edward R. Stettinius, Lend-Lease Administrator, and Harry Hopkins, Chairman of the munitions assignment board, is to "ship the most material the quickest to the wrong places."

When the lend-lease system was first devised 2 years ago the United States was a nonbelligerent, and the theory was that lend-lease material would be shipped wherever most urgently needed to prevent a collapse on the part of the nations resisting the Axis. In practical operation this meant that almost everything would be sent to the British, with an occasional shipment to the Chinese.

When Russia was drawn into the war she became eligible for assistance, and there was some change in scheduling shipments, but in general the bulk of material still was allocated to Britain, although the British fronts became increasingly dormant as Hitler threw his main force against the Russians. When the Japanese attacked at Pearl Harbor, and Germany and Italy followed that up by declaring war against the United States, radical revisions in the entire lend-lease policy might have been expected to ensue, but shipments remained largely in the same old groove.

In response to repeated complaints of the Russians, an effort was made to increase the flow of materials to them, but these shipments never exceeded 19 percent of the total and Stalin himself said that all the aid of the Allies had "so far been little effective." Meanwhile, the British lost Malaya and Burma and all shipments to China over the Burma Road ceased. Material that could be flown into China amounted only to 1.6 percent of total lend-lease.

Despite Stalin's complaint of inadequate assistance, the Russians after 21 months of war had largely neutralized the German war machine. If unable to achieve a decisive success itself, the Red Army at least was capable of preventing the Germans from doing so. Meanwhile, the war was withdrawing ever farther from the British Isles. But, although the situation was completely different from what it had been in March 1941, lend-lease shipments continued to pour in unabated to Britain.

Completely ignored was the fact that the pressing menace now existed in east Asia and the southwest Pacific, where Japan had been permitted almost unhindered to conquer a great empire and build a new wall closing China off from the outside world. General MacArthur, with his meager resources, occasionally was able to deal a body blow to Nippon, and in various air and sea actions, as well as on Guadalcanal, America threw the Japs into reverse. But none of these victories was more than a stopgap which halted the Japanese temporarily in their onward march, but did not deter them from planning to return again.

The strategical picture dictates the need of a complete overhauling in lend-lease allocations, unless we intend to let the Pacific front go by default. If assignments under lend-lease are to be proportionate to the urgencies of the threats to the safety of this country, the claim of the Pacific front is far and away the most pressing.

Treasury's Experts on Taxes Remain in Background

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a very informative article written by Rodney Crowther, staff correspondent for the Baltimore Evening Sun, on March 19, 1943. This article gives an interesting background of the men who represent the Treasury Department on Capitol Hill. They are Randolph Paul, Stanley Surrey, Roy Blough, Louis Shere, and Al F. O'Donnell.

Those of us who are privileged to serve on the Ways and Means Committee have an opportunity to know personally and work with this excellent group of men. We have utmost confidence in their ability and integrity. As tax legislation will be the important item for consideration by the House for the next 2 weeks, I thought the Members of the House might enjoy reading the background of the Treasury representatives.

The article follows:

TREASURY'S EXPERTS ON TAXES REMAIN IN BACKGROUND

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, March 19.—Those alert young men you see hurrying in and out of the House Ways and Means Committee room these days, lugging overstuffed brief cases and trying to look unostentatious, are the Treasury's tax experts.

They are the boys who think up many of the Treasury's tax proposals to Congress, and amass the statistics and other data used in demonstrating the effect on the taxpayers—not to forget the Treasury purse—of this or that revenue scheme.

FAVOR ANONYMITY

Any stranger could tell at a glance that these young men are not Congressmen—there is too much bounce in their stride and too little bulge around their midriffs.

Nor do they have the usual harried look of committee members, and for the most part they exhibit a passion for anonymity seldom found in a Member of Congress.

Several of them are still in their early thirties. Others are in their early forties. Only one of the group—small, graying but still youthful Randolph Evernghim Paul, dean of the delegation and the Treasury's chief tax spokesman on Capitol Hill—is beyond 50.

FEW ATTEND MEETINGS

As a rule, only four or five of the experts actually attend the committee meetings. The remainder stay behind in the cluttered and somewhat cavernous interior of the Treasury, where they amass the tax facts the other experts lug up to Congress.

The delegation that may be found "on the Hill" almost any day a tax committee is in session includes, besides Paul, Stanley S. Surrey, tax legislative counsel of the Treasury; Roy Blough, director of tax research; Louis Shere, assistant director of tax research, and Al F. O'Donnell, assistant director of research and statistics.

In past years the group included red-headed Assistant Secretary of the Treasury John L. Sullivan, who, before Paul came to the Treasury, guided Treasury tax programs through the political wilds of Congress. Now Paul takes the rap on the Hill and Sullivan worries about collecting the money other people levy.

SULLIVAN'S LONE APPEARANCE

Sullivan's sole appearance before the committee this year occurred when the Treasury became frightened that talk about tax forgiveness would induce many people to refrain from filing returns. He made a plea for a resolution by the committee advising the taxpayers that regardless of what it did about "pay as you go," they would have to file their March 15 returns.

The thought of a "tax expert" conjures up for the average citizen a mental image of something far removed from the youthful group that actually speaks for the Treasury.

Actually they are personable and, for the most part, very pleasant men, with no stuffiness, no stiffness about them. Most of them pretend to be nothing but what they are—tax technicians.

PAUL ALSO AN AUTHOR

Paul, who came to the Treasury as personal tax adviser to the Secretary of the Treasury and moved up to Treasury general counsel, is the one nationally known expert in the lot. He had established a reputation as a tax adviser to big corporations and author of books on taxation before he came to Washington.

Probably the chief tribute to Paul as a tax expert is the fact that no matter how many good or bad Treasury tax schemes he has had to ride herd on before the tax committees—and sometimes the riding has been very rough and very unpleasant—he has remained personally popular with the Members of Congress.

UNFAILING GOOD HUMOR

Time and again the committees have kicked his tax programs to pieces, and at least once they even laughed in his face—or at least that was the report—but always Paul has come up smiling.

A cool and imperturbable person, with a modesty seldom found among experts, Paul has won the respect of both Democrats and Republicans by his unfailing good humor, his courteous and deferential attitude toward committee members.

The members admit his expertness among the obscure technical wilds of the income-tax laws, and Paul returns the compliment by never trying to lord it over the members of the committees. That makes for good personal relations, even when on matters of principle the expert and the committee members are at loggerheads and as far apart in their concepts as the poles.

DRAWS MODEST SALARY

Paul came to the Treasury in December 1940 from a very lucrative practice as a tax attorney, and now draws only a relatively modest salary as Treasury counsel. The story is told that Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., was impressed by the fact that while in matters of corporate income taxes Paul was usually on the side of the conservatives, he freqently had voiced ideas for tax reforms, particularly in the field of individual levies, which found responsive chords in the Treasury mind.

Nobody knows for certain just which of the schemes Paul backs are of his own devising and which were thought up either by the staff experts, or maybe funneled up to the Treasury from some of the obscure New Deal reform circles which flit persistently around the White House.

OPPOSED RUML PLAN

Into all of them he has thrown tremendous energy and in none of the fights has he exhibited more courage than in his battle against the skip-a-year tax plan proposed by his personal friend, Beardsley Ruml. Paul and Ruml served together on the board of the New York Federal Reserve Bank and in at least two respects have much in common—each is a glutton for hard work and neither takes any important recreation.

There was a time, however, when Paul was something of an athlete—class B, at least—and in those days he took part in the University Club of New York's squash tournaments, and swung an average or better racquet.

NATIVE OF NEW JERSEY

But that was long ago. Once the counsel's bench and the professor's rostrum had claimed him, he gave up active recreation.

Born at Hackensack, N. J., in 1890, Paul took his bachelor's degree at Amherst in 1911, his law degree at New York Law School in 1913. After practicing privately for a time, he was admitted to the New York law firm of Lord, Day & Lord. He soon took to taxation as a specialty, wrote and lectured widely on the subject. He served as Sterling lecturer on taxation at Yale University Law School, and performed the feat of lecturing in the same scholastic year at the Harvard Law School.

MARRIED TO ATTORNEY

He has two children, a son, Richard H., and a daughter, Mrs. Hans Schickle, who is librarian at the University of California at Berkeley. The children are of an earlier marriage. The present Mrs. Paul, the former Muriel Shaver, is an attorney in the office of the trustees for the Associated Gas & Electric Co. They were married in 1931.

Paul is author of three series of Studies in Federal Taxation, published in 1937, 1938, and 1940; of Federal Estate and Gift Taxation, published in 1942, and is coauthor of Law of Federal Income Taxation, published in 1934.

ROY BLOUGH IS NO. 2

No. 2 expert among those who speak the Treasury mind in tax matters before Congress is soft-spoken, bespectacled Roy Blough, a native of Pittsburgh, who has been Treasury director of tax research since June 1938.

A historian and economist, Blough received his bachelor's degree in 1921 from Manchester College, North Manchester, Ind.; his M. A. and Ph. D. from the University of Wisconsin. He majored in finance and taxation.

After serving 3 years as assistant and associate professor of history and economics at Manchester College from 1922 to 1925, Blough served 2 years as assistant in economics at the University of Wisconsin, then moved over to the Wisconsin Tax Commission as statistician, and chief statistician in charge of tax research and statistics.

TAUGHT IN CINCINNATI

From 1932 to 1938 he was associate professor of economics in the graduate school of public administration, University of Cincinnati, in charge of courses in taxation and public finance.

During a leave of absence from his professorship from July 1933 to February 1934 he served the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. In the summer of 1936 he taught at Columbia University. In 1937 and 1938 he served as a part-time consultant to the Social Security Board, as he did in 1938 for the Treasury Department.

A member of the American Economic Association, an associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research and chairman of the committee on social security legislation and administration of the National Tax Association, Blough has written widely on tax problems. He was associate director of research and joint author of Facing the Tax Problem published by the Twentieth Century Fund in 1937. He is married and has three children.

STANLEY S. SURREY

Tax legislative counsel of the Treasury is 32-year-old Stanley S. Surrey, a tall, dark-haired young man of mild manner and deferential demeanor who has been specializing in taxation almost ever since he became of age.

Born in New York City in 1910, he took his bachelor of science degree magna cum laude from the College of the City of New York in 1929; his law degree from Columbia in 1932; was managing editor of the Columbia Law Review, and in 1933 research assistant of Prof. Roswell Magill in the preparation of the latter's book, Taxable Income.

FORMER NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD ATTORNEY

From 1933 to 1935 Surrey was assistant to the director of litigation of the National Recovery Administration, and assistant to the counsel of the compliance division, National Recovery Administration. From 1935 to 1937 he was senior attorney with the National Labor Relations Board.

In the latter year he also served as secretary of the joint committee of the Board of Tax Appeals and the Treasury which reviewed the rules of procedure of the Board. He was also associated with Roger J. Traynor, then tax consultant to the Treasury, in research on special problems in the field of tax administration. In 1938 he became assistant tax legislative counsel to the Treasury; last year legislative counsel.

He has written widely on tax matters for the leading law reviews and has lectured at the University of California school of jurisprudence on Federal taxation and at the practicing law institute of New York on Federal income taxation.

ENGINEER TURNED ECONOMIST

Al O'Donnell, an engineer turned economist, is probably the least communicative of all the Treasury experts, and the most press shy. As assistant director of Treasury research and statistics, he supervises the making of revenue estimates both for the Budget Bureau of the United States and for the use of Treasury officials and congressional committees considering revenue tax legislation. He regards his estimates as closely guarded secrets and never passes them around lightly.

Born in Massachusetts in 1897, O'Donnell took a bachelor of science degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1918, engaged briefly in engineering, then

turned to economics. He spent a year at Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, got his master's degree at the University of California at Berkeley, and his doctor of philosophy in economics at the University of Chicago.

TAUGHT AT CHICAGO

He taught at Chicago and was professor of economics at Iowa State College, then returned east to New York where he engaged in economic research, was chief economist of a New York Stock Exchange firm, and served on company directorates until 1934.

But 1934 was the year of the great migration of economists, lawyers, sociologists, and statisticians to Washington and Al O'Donnell came along as an economic adviser to the National Recovery Administration. In 1936 he joined the Treasury as senior economist in the Division of Research and Statistics, and since 1937 has been Assistant Director.

Louis Shere, a native of Oxbow, Saskatchewan, was one of a group of seven economists called in by the Treasury in 1934 to survey the Federal tax system with the aim of recommending comprehensive revisions of the tax laws.

ACCEPTED PERMANENT POST

He joined the Treasury in a permanent post the same year and has been with it ever since. This cannot be held against him, or any of the experts who counseled the Treasury in 1934—but the tax laws of the Federal Government are as complicated as ever and seem to some observers at least to be getting more complicated by the minute.

Shere is a graduate of the University of Manitoba, a doctor of philosophy of Columbia University, an associate of the late Dr. H. Parker Willis in the banking seminar which produced The Banking Situation, by Willis and Chapman in 1934. Shere contributed the section of Public Finance and Banking.

A RESEARCH EXPERT

Shere's particular job as Assistant Director of the Division of Tax Research, a post he has held since April 1, 1940, is to supervise the technical aspects of the Division's research work, schedule the work incidental to the legislative tax program, present documentary and statistical evidence in connection with the Treasury's revenue programs, and to assist Roy Blough in offering tax data to the congressional committees.

Before coming to Washington he was a member of the research staff of the New York State Commission for Revision of the Tax Laws in 1931 and 1932. Prior to that he was with a New York bank, a brokerage house, and an investment trust.

Now 42 years old, he is married but has no children.

Among the experts who work on income-tax matters at the Treasury end of the Avenue are L. L. Ecker-Rácz and C. Lowell Harriss, both economists.

EXTENSIVE EXPERIENCE

Ecker-Ráez, like most of the other experts, had extensive tax experience before joining the Treasury staff. He served as fiscal consultant to the Michigan tax study commission appointed by Governor Murphy to recommend revisions of the Michigan tax system, was a lecturer on taxation at the American University and a teacher of economics at George Washington University and Radcliffe College.

He holds degrees from Columbia, Harvard, and Budapest universities. His wife, Cornelia Bruere Rose, Jr., is also an economist. Ecker-Ráez is director of staff work on ways and means of financing the war.

Youngest of the experts at work on problems now engaging congressional tax committees is Harriss, a 30-year-old native of Fairbury, Nebr., who came to the Treasury by way of Harvard, Columbia, the University of Chicago, and the Twentieth Century Fund.

After taking his bachelor of science degree summa cum laude at Harvard in 1934, he spent the following year as a Sheldon Traveling Fellow in Europe, North Africa, and the Near East, spent a year with the Twentieth Century Fund, was secretary of the Conference on Research in Income and Wealth of the National Bureau of Economic Research; and is now on leave from Columbia University, where he was an instructor in economics from 1938 to 1941.

At the Treasury he is engaged in research in individual income, estate, and gift taxation. He has written widely for tax journals, economic, and law reviews.

Ceiling Price on Livestock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ROCKWELL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HCUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, the livestock producers of the West are greatly worried over the effort of O. P. A. to place a ceiling price upon live meat animals. If such a ceiling price is established, it will result in the dumping of thousands of half-fat hogs, sheep, and cattle upon the open narkets and will mean the ultimate loss of hundreds of thousands of pounds of meat to the Army, the Navy, and the consumer.

What does it matter if we have ration cards if there is no meat to sell across the counter?

I hope that the sane plan offered by Fulton Lewis, Jr., whereby there will be a fair and equitable rationing of meat across the counter with no ceilings whatever placed upon the producer or distributor of live animals will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following editorial of March 19 from the Denver Post:

THAT'S THAT

"It is a sad commentary on our republican form of government that you, the Nation's (livestock) producers, are forced to leave your work and travel all the way to your National Capital to defend yourselves against damnfool regulations." (Congressman HILL, of Colorado.)

Western stockmen have strong bipartisan support in their fight against bureaucratic plans to impose price ceilings on the livestock industry. Both Republicans and Democrats have rallied to their defense. Congressman HILL (Republican), of Colorado, has assured them that the House Agriculture Committee, of which he is a member, "will do everything possible to block this ceiling." Senator O'MAHONEY (Democrat), of Wyoming, has warned Office of Price Administration officials that price ceilings on livestock will "glut the market prematurely with marketable cattle, create endless confusion, and thoroughly disorganize the industry."

Stockmen insist that imposition of price ceilings on the livestock industry will reduce production, increase black markets, and require an enforcement staff of one-fourth million. It's a cinch that this country cannot promote increased beef production, for example, by putting a price ceiling on cattle. For a price-fixing production costs are ignored. Farmers certainly cannot be expected to raise and feed more cattle when they know they are going to lose money on every animal they market.

The Canned-Food Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

MARCH 22, 1943.

Mr. A. E. CODDINGTON,
President,
Indiana Canners' Association, Inc.,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MR. CODDINGTON: This acknowledges your letter of March 19 regarding the critical situation facing the canners and producers throughout the country.

Your concern is readily understandable. In fact, it is fully shared by everyone here who has been urging the officials responsible for the paralyzing confusion for prompt and effective relief.

Needless to say, I agree fully with the action you are urging, and assure you that I shall continue to do everything I can in the matter.

With very best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FOREST A. HARNESS.

INDIANA CANNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Indianapolis, Ind., March 19, 1943.

Hon. FOREST A. HARNESS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARNESS: Canners of this State are terribly upset over the bickering and bungling of this canned-food problem and the way it has been handled in the last few months. Since last November we have been told that the answers would be given to us the next week and the next week and 3 weeks later, until even now answers are not forthcoming.

The top men in various Washington agencies, departments, and bureaus issue statements almost daily to the press and over the radio about how serious the food problem is and about how much cooperation should be given to farmers and processors, and yet nothing is done about it. We list herewith the important matters confronting the canners today:

1. Subsidies: The United States Department of Agriculture has set the canners' prices they must pay for various war crops and now detail the method by which canners will bill the C. C. C. for the difference between what they paid this year and what they claim the average price was paid last year, but there is a great discrepancy in these figures.

2. Office of Price Administration indicates regional ceilings at which canners will be forced to sell their goods, and these ceilings are in many cases below 1942 prices, and apparently do not take into consideration the many advances in cost to produce this year over last year.

3. Wage freezing: The War Labor Board has frozen labor prices so that canners cannot meet competitive conditions in order to retain what little labor they have or compete with

the farmer on one hand and defense industries on the other for the labor they will need to put up this year's packs.

Grade labeling: The Office of Price Administration, in one fell swoop, has fastened on grade labeling without regard to the fact that Congress has turned it down time and again, and industry is decidedly not prepared for it, and that it is extremely expensive, and that it will seriously hamper the normal movement of canned food from canners to consumers, and that the tremendous waste caused by the sampling and cutting of hundreds of millions of cases of canned food will cause a serious loss of badly needed foodstuffs.

5 Emergency court of appeals: Section 204 of the original Price Control Act of 1942 sets up an emergency court procedure through district Federal courts to anyone against any rule or regulation of the Office of Price Administration, at the same time retaining for themselves the right to enforce their regulations through the United States District courts.

We, therefore, urge Congress immediately to pass an amendment to the Emergency Price Control Act to the effect that:

1. Price ceilings on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, shall not be lower than the cost plus a reasonable profit.

2. Section 204 of the original act is hereby repealed.

We also respectfully urge our representatives in Congress to give us every possible assistance to secure from the War Labor Board an exemption from the wage freeze order which will permit us to compete for our labor along with the farmers and defense industries; that the Office of Price Administration withdraw their grade-labeling edict, and that the Food Distribution Administration immediately recognize the various discrepancies in their subsidy plan and give proper consideration to the sound advice offered by the canners who have spent weeks in Washington on this subject.

Very truly yours,

INDIANA CANNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
A. E. CODDINGTON, *President*.

Those Louisiana Yams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the following editorial from the State Times of Baton Roug., La., of March 18, 1943, entitled "Those Louisiana Yams":

THOSE LOUISIANA YAMS

Louisiana sweetpotatoes are gaining prestige every day.

They have come into a leading role in the war effort, and are given new recognition as a basic food on the home front.

Whether dehydrated—as Uncle Sam wants them—or whole from the vine, they are now regarded as an important essential.

It is now being impressed that the sweetpotato is not only a palatable and popular food, but that it has exceptional food value. It is high in vitamin A content, and in other vitamins and minerals, and our Louisiana State University experts say that more carbohydrates can be produced per acre with the sweetpotato than with any other crop, excepting only sugarcane.

Furthermore, they cite the excellence of Louisiana soil for growing sweetpotatoes, enabling Louisiana to lead the entire Nation in sweetpotato production.

Naturally, Uncle Sam is looking to Louisiana for a large share of the sweetpotatoes he needs for military purposes. They are especially suitable, because they lend themselves easily to the dehydration process. Plants for this purpose are already operating at St. Francisville, in the neighboring parish of West Felicana, and at Lafayette, and it was recently announced a third would be established at Opelousas. The Government has already requested some 52,000,000 pounds of dehydrated sweetpotatoes.

All this adds up to the fact that sweetpotatoes will be more and more in demand. They have been a little less plentiful here this season. They are apt to be scarcer in another season, and a little harder to get for the family table.

Happily, hundreds of families in the Baton Rouge area can raise their own sweetpotatoes. A larger plot is required than for the average city garden. But those living in the roomier additions, or in the suburbs, or all who have a large enough back or side yard can look forward to having a sweetpotato patch. They may be able to use a vacant lot for this purpose.

Both sweet and Irish potatoes are basic food crops, and can be successfully raised by many victory gardeners. Louisiana State University horticulturists, and extension workers, and others are offering detailed information about "how to do it." They are eager to help you, and you can get free instruction for the asking. Or you can follow the victory gardeners' column appearing weekly in the State-Times.

If you have a sizeable plot, by all means include sweet potatoes or Irish potatoes or both in your home gardening program.

New York's Farm Manpower Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered on February 25 by the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, containing a practical approach to the solution of the Empire State's wartime food production problem, and the editorial comment thereon which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune:

TEXT OF DEWEY'S SPEECH ON STATE'S FARM MANPOWER PROBLEM

Tonight I want to talk about a problem of first importance to all the people of the State of New York.

How are we going to provide food for our armed forces, for the people of our State, and also for the starving millions whom our fighting men will surely rescue from their oppressors?

The answer is clear and definite. We are going to help raise and harvest that food, each of us, according to his capacity. We are going to turn out and do the job, or we will all go hungry. Worse than that, our armies and our allies will go hungry. No hungry nation, no hungry armies can win a war.

Tonight, therefore, I call upon the people of New York State to join in the program of the State of New York to raise food. There is a part which can be played by almost every boy and girl over 14, by almost every man and woman, whether farmer, war worker, housewife, garment worker, waiter, or shopkeeper. If each will do his part, there will be enough plain food for all. Moreover, we shall be taking a mighty step forward together toward victory.

For many years we have heard about the farm problem. People in the cities did not think it concerned them. Food was plentiful and cheap. Wasn't there always an agricultural surplus?

The truth is, there never was a surplus. A surplus of cotton and tobacco, yes. But you can't eat cotton and tobacco. A surplus of wheat, yes. But bread is a small part of a balanced diet. This country has never had a real surplus of meats, eggs, vegetables, butter, and milk. During the dismal 1930's the problem was not surplus production; it was just that our people did not have the money to buy all the food they needed.

With frozen stocks of canned goods and point rationing beginning next week the illusion about the surplus has been pretty well dissipated.

We are finding that the ration of canned goods to begin next week is down 50 percent. Furthermore, as our people recently found with fuel oil, ration cards do not create food. They are a permission to buy, if the food is there to be bought. A ceiling price means nothing on an empty shelf in a grocery store. Food production of the United States is less, per capita, than it was when America defeated Germany the first time.

In my judgment, the food shortage threatens to get progressively worse. For many months, in and out of public office, I have been calling for a recognition of the grave food situation facing the United States. Last year was the sixth straight year of bumper crop weather and still there was a basic shortage. Now that shortage has become plain to everyone.

MANY PLANS OFFERED

The result has been a rash of newspaper stories out of Washington, each about some new, magic plan to solve the suddenly discovered food shortage. One day we hear that German prisoners will man the farms—but not within 200 miles of a border or the seacoast—which leaves New York out. The next day we hear Japanese prisoners will do the work. Then a land force numbering 3,500,000 is announced—as if there were one-tenth that many to be found for love or money. The latest scheme comes from the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. He announces that the President has approved his suggestion to release some of our soldiers, for a day at a time, to work on farms. As if an occasional day's work, or even a few days work near an Army camp, is what we need.

The blunt truth is that these magic schemes are little better than useless. They mislead our people into believing that there is no problem after all.

Long ago Thomas Jefferson gave us the answer. He said: "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread."

Those words, uttered nearly a century and a half ago, are equally true today. Here in New York State this year the people themselves are going to have to plant, cultivate, harvest, and process their own crop. For permanent help on the farms we shall have to keep what we have and get more men and women not now engaged in war work. For seasonal help, we must rely on boys and girls from the schools and, in many communities, on businessmen and women who will shut up shop and help harvest the crops.

In New York State I believe we can and will do the job. Your State government is organized to lead the way. We have a plan, a program, and a working organization. I am sure the people of our State will respond to the chance to serve.

FOUR AGENCIES CONCERNED

The plan is the fruit of the labors of many men and women, of many agencies of Federal, State, and local government and of the organizations of the farmers themselves. Our people in New York have been functioning, not as Republicans or Democrats; not as State employees or as Federal employees. Without jealousies or competition, they are working together to get a job done.

Four agencies are primarily concerned:

First, the State farm manpower service, headed by T. N. Hurd, whom I have appointed to direct our State program.

Second, the United States Employment Service, which was a State agency until taken over by the Federal Government a year ago. Under the able direction of Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, the employment service has the general responsibility for recruiting and placing farm help.

Third, the extension service of the New York State College of Agriculture. It consists of the county agricultural agents, the 4-H Club agents, and the home-demonstration agents.

Fourth, the State department of education which will have charge of the high-school farm-labor program and training for farm work in the State schools of agriculture. Legislation is now being enacted to release boys and girls from school for work on farms. Local school boards have the power to rearrange the school year in accordance with the needs of each community. Today, boys of 18 are fighting in our armed forces. Boys of 16 and 17—even 14 and 15—will be called out to produce food. For every 40 boys and girls in any kind of farm work there will be a teacher from their own school who will supervise their working and living conditions.

TO COORDINATE ALL AGENCIES

The State plans for coordination of all agencies in a harmonious, joint effort, are all prepared. Most of the necessary legislation has been enacted. The leadership in your State is ready to carry the plans into action. Tonight, I present the plans and the opportunity to serve their country to the men and women, the boys and girls of the State. There are different jobs to be done. There is a place for everyone who will do his part for victory.

First, of course, comes the regular year-round help on farms—primarily dairy farms. For this work, both men and women of all ages are now being trained. We need thousands more from all walks of life.

Second, are the summer help, for which thousands, including high-school boys, are needed.

Third, are the seasonal workers, principally for vegetable growers and fruit growers. For this work, mostly in September, thousands of high-school boys and girls will be needed. Also, whole communities may have to shut up shop for a few days and help on nearby farms.

Fourth, is the contribution which can be made by growing victory gardens. However much is done on our farms they simply will not be able to produce as much food as we need. Every family which has, or can get a patch of good ground, fit for cultivation, should plan to produce part of their own food.

WORK WILL BE NO HOLIDAY

To everyone who will volunteer for work on the farm I want to make one thing clear. Working on a farm is no holiday. A St. Lawrence County farmer was asked the other day when he thought that farmers would achieve the 7-hour day. He replied: "We have it now, 7 hours before noon and 7 hours after noon, every day in the year."

Your work on a farm will be perhaps harder than anything else you have ever done. Moreover, the pay will not be great. The crops just do not yield enough to pay either the farmer or his help the kind of wages that can be earned in factories. But the sense of service to your country will be great, indeed. Of all the heroes in this war, the American farmer and those who help him will in the end be recognized with those in the front ranks who worked hardest and gave up most for victory.

Now, what is to be done?

If full-time year-round new workers are to be found for farms, we must ask every man and woman of the State able to do farm work to volunteer for it. Those who find themselves in the recently listed nonessential occupations should immediately register for farm work, especially if they know something about it. Everyone in a nonessential job should consider himself a candidate for farm work.

LETTER FROM A NEW YORKER

I recently received a letter from the lower East Side in New York City. It reads:

"DEAR GOVERNOR DEWEY: I am writing for my husband because he cannot write English. He is 46 and in good health, but has lost his job because of priorities. He has always worked hard and was brought up on a farm in Italy but has been an American citizen for 14 years. Can you help him find a job on a farm?"

The answer, of course, is "yes."

The same is true for the thousands of others in similar situations.

Young women, too, can do a full-time farm job, just as 60,000 of them have done in Great Britain.

For everyone who can do full-time farm work the procedure is simple. Go to your nearest United States Employment Service office and register for farm work in New York State. The State of New York will provide free training.

The State maintains six agricultural institutions in addition to the State College of Agriculture at Ithaca. All of these have now been turned into short-course training centers for new full-time farm workers.

At the State school at Farmingdale, Long Island, the first class of women students has been graduated. Three of them came to see me over in the capitol last Tuesday. They are eager, strong, patriotic young women, each able and willing to do a job in the fields and in the barns of the farms of New York.

At the State school at Delhi we have a class of 17-year-old boys who were graduated this month from high school, and another class started the day before yesterday at Canton.

At the Alfred and Morrisville schools 60 farm recruits are arriving every 2 weeks from Kentucky for training and placement.

FREE TRAINING OFFERED

The program is already under way. But we need several thousand more recruits to accept free training with free transportation, board and room at our agricultural schools who will then go on and do the job on the farms of our State.

For summer work by high-school boys there is an equally great need and opportunity. If you are in high school now and over the age of 14 you can join the Farm Cadet Victory Corps of the State of New York. I urge you to enroll with your teacher tomorrow—subject to your parents' consent. Within a short time your teacher will give you a formal enrollment card. The need is for boys who will work 4, 5, and even 6 months on the farms this summer.

For boys and girls in high schools there is still another job if they cannot do full summer work. Seasonal help for the harvesting of crops is important. This will be directed by local organizations, county by county, under the direction of the extension service and the county agents.

The local school boards will make arrangements so that high-school boys and girls can take part. The local service clubs, women's clubs and all other groups will have an opportunity to do their share in organizing to harvest the crops.

There is a job to be done in this State by every New Yorker—man, woman, and child over 14. Everyone can have his place ranging from full-time farm labor to seasonal work during a 2-week vacation. If you do not know where to register for farm work, write the State farm manpower director at Albany and he will advise you. Of course, you will not be called upon immediately. But if you are prepared, you will be available when the call comes.

URGES FARMERS TO STAY ON JOB

To the farmers of the State and their families, just a word. You may have the urge to take factory jobs or refuse the deferment the selective service provides. You are needed desperately where you are. That is why farm workers are or should be classified in 2-C or 3-C. Your services are worth more to your country on the farm than anywhere else. That is the meaning of selective service. I hope no New Yorker now working on a farm will leave it for any reason whatsoever.

I know very well that the briefly trained help of boys and young women cannot fully take the place of the experienced farm hand you lost to the armed services or to the munitions factory. I know it is asking a great deal of you to equal last year's production with no farm machinery replacements and green help. But I also know that this is all the help there is and our country is at war. I know that the farmers of our State, knowing we are scraping the bottom of the barrel on manpower, will do the best they can to train those who come to work with them and that those who go into farm work will do it out of a sense of patriotism and a great desire to be of service.

Much depends on the point of view of both the new farm help and the farmer whether we will produce our food in this State and in this country this year or whether we will all be hungry. Let me give you one example:

In Monroe County, a farmer I know needed a man last summer and needed him badly. A boy in the nearest town had volunteered for farm work the summer before but he had not made out very well. The farmer who had hired him did not want him again and the boy didn't want to try it again. But the farmer was desperate and he persuaded the boy to take the job. Now this farmer used his head. He gave the lad several jobs to do and watched him. Within a couple of days he discovered the boy had a knack for working with machinery and fell in love with the tractor. The farmer encouraged him and within 3 weeks that boy was a competent helper. Soon that farmer had a waiting list of boys who wanted to work for him. The word went around that he was a good man to work for and he gave a fellow a break.

NO COMPULSION TO BE USED

To all of the people of the State I want you to know that in our farm program we contemplate no directives, no orders, and no compulsions. There will be no effort to compel anyone in our State to do what he does not want to do. I know we can rely on the patriotism of an informed and aroused people. There will be no effort from Albany to fit a Jefferson County dairy farmer into the pattern of a Wayne County fruit grower or a Suffolk County potato grower.

There will be in every community of the State a well organized program with local

leadership to meet the needs of every differing type of community and every differing type of agricultural work. Every department of the State government is at the service of the farm manpower program and I assure you every department of the State will cooperate just as I am sure the Federal services will cooperate.

All of us can help in this battle of food. There is an opportunity for everyone. The need is great. The life of our country is at stake. Nothing else counts.

We, all of us, the whole 13,500,000 people of New York State will, I am sure, do the best we can with the tools we have to do a job. We will do it in the best and oldest American tradition of helping each other to help our country win a war. In so doing we will grow closer together. City and county will learn again how truly interdependent we are. We are all one people, each doing his part in a free and independent Nation—a free Nation which can never be conquered by any power on earth.

"GOD HELPS THOSE WHO"—

The approach to New York's wartime food production problem offered by Governor Dewey last night—that the people of the State plant, cultivate, harvest, and process their own crops—is essentially the approach which has allowed Great Britain to double her food production and more since the start of the war. The elemental idea—that people in a tight spot help themselves—has, astonishingly, yet to be promoted on a national scale, it is not included in the "magic schemes" which stirred the Governor's scorn last night. Yet, were that idea applied with vigor and gumption in the 48 States of the Union, we venture to predict that it would act as a catalyst, making the national farm problem fall into its component parts so that our administrators and legislators, now stymied by doubts and fears and jealousies, might see each part in its relation to the whole and proceed with the solutions.

The Governor's proposed solution for the State was presented in one of the most forthright and dynamic speeches of his career. He first stated the gravity of the situation: Food production now less per capita than when Germany was defeated in the first war; food shortages due to get progressively worse.

Then he outlined the State "plan, program, and working organization," which includes four steps to enlist the people to anticipate this grave prospect: First, free training (including free transportation and board and room while at school) in the six State agricultural institutions for workers who will take year-around jobs, especially on dairy farms; second, enlistment of high school boys, 14 or more, in the Farm Cadet Victory Corps for summer work—4, 5, even 6 months of it; third, similar enlistment of high school boys and girls, of city workers for their vacations, of unemployed women and of all those who can take time off from a nonessential job, for seasonal harvesting, and, fourth, the mighty flourishing of the victory-garden campaign. "There is a job to be done in this State by every * * * man, woman, and child over 14," said the Governor, adding, "We must ask every man and woman of the State able to do farm work to volunteer for it."

To the farmer he addressed a special plea—to stay on the farm as a patriotic duty and to accept and make the most of green help and briefly trained volunteers because "it is all the help there is and our country is at war." Now, there is the real, the dignified, the only appropriate appeal to make to farmers—"It is all the help there is and our country is at war!" No more patriotic fellow ever lived than the American farmer. And it is only fair that his work be recognized on the basis that it is as essential to victory as that of the soldier and the factory worker. Of all the heroes in this war, the farmers and his aids will be "in the front ranks who worked hardest and gave up most for victory," the Governor said. He asks thousands of the people of the State, all the thousands who can, to join those ranks.

The Farmer's Complaint on Bureaucratic Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks, I would like to call the attention of the House to the typical high-grade Missouri farmer's complaint on the numerous and, in many cases, inconsistent regulations by the bureaucrats in the various agencies of the Government, as follows:

STURGEON, MO., *March 6, 1943.*

Hon. MAX SCHWABE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: We farmers along with the war news, are reading carefully every bit we see in the press that is going on in Washington affecting us farmers. As you well know I live in the midst of that section of Missouri referred to as Little Dixie where we usually vote Democratic about four to one. This letter to you is not intended to be a criticism but is intended instead to convey to you what you no doubt already know.

I believe the biggest single worry every one of us farmers who produce surplus grains and livestock have is the problem of price. Farm sales have for months been the most numerous that I have ever seen. The city press admits this fact, but gives as the main reason the shortage of labor and materials. I have talked to hundreds of farmers and I am firmly convinced that this is not true. The farmers around me who are selling out, invariably are tired of operating at a loss and have decided to get a better job in town.

There is no question about the shortage of labor and materials and machinery, but I do not know any important farmers who have been forced to quit and sell out because of these reasons. Many though, will have to curtail their operations.

The big question that burns us farmers up is the unfair attitude the administration has taken in continuing to hold us down with unfair price ceilings administered as we believe in plain defiance of the laws of Congress and meanwhile, still even now, pushing union labor further and further upward.

Personally, I hire 10 men on my farms throughout the year and my bill for hired labor in 1942 was over two and one-half times what it has been any year since 1929. I am now having to pay $25 per week, straight time, rain or shine, plus the furnishing of a house, electricity, a cow to milk, meat, and garden spot with time to work it, or my help just won't be on the farm; they will go to the two brick plants in my county or to the defense industries, where they can get $8 to $10 to start with and work 8 hours per day. They work in excess of 12 hours per day for me for the year round, as near as I can figure, about 75 hours per week average.

The farmers who are not paying these prices have already lost their help and there is no chance to hire any help that can do the job because the Army has taken our number one help, or the defense industries have taken them at $10 to $20 per day.

Wickard's subsidies and incentive payments only make us angry. If this Nation cannot afford to pay a fair price for agricultural products, us farmers might as well all quit and get jobs with short hours and let our country import its food from those countries with whom we have reciprocal trade treaties which have much cheaper labor. Our administration seems to love them more than it loves the American farmer anyway.

Although my margin of profit was very small each year, 1942 was the first year since the drouth years of 1934 and 1936 that I operated at a financial loss for the year. Somebody is not doing a good enough job telling the city man that we farmers are not rolling in wealth as the editors of the city newspapers and our administration leaders have led them to believe. I hear farmers say every day, "If our city friends are not willing to pay us the cost of productior and a little profit we might as well let them get good and hungry until they change their mind about it."

If the Nation cannot pay as parity at present when our national income and when wages paid to labor are at the highest level in American history, can you blame any farmer for losing heart and selling out.

I wrote some of my friends in Congress about a year and a half ago, and among other things, told them that unless they began listening more to the wishes of their people here at home, that one of these days, and probably sooner than they thought, they were liable to wake up and find that the voters have a stinger both longer and sharper than that of the President.

In conclusion I am only trying to say that if we farmers are to get production, which every one admits is urgently needed, there will have to be enough price paid for that production to enable us to get it. The way the Government gets vastly increased production of other war materials than food, is by giving contracts (which run into the hundreds of billions of dollars) for cost plus a fair profit. The farmer has a huge investment, plus his labor, and due to the 20 years of depression we have been going through we have not yet emerged from the losses and misfortunes financially incurred during that time so that we can roll up our sleeves and do the job requested of us.

I recommend these things for your consideration.

1. Either removal outright of the price ceilings on all the farmer produces, such as beef, pork, mutton, butter, corn, beans, etc., or revising of the definition of parity so as to include our greatly increased costs of labor, taxes, and other items that have never been figured heretofore on the present grossly unfair method of calculating farm parity prices.

2. I recommend the untying of the hands of our bankers by governmental rules and red tape so that they can furnish us the credit needed for our greatly increased costs.

3. Stop drafting any more farm labor.

4. We must have the necessary machinery and supplies, such as fertilizer, gasoline, diesel fuel, motor oils, etc., and with a minimum of red tape, questionnaires, and trips to the rationing boards.

I had to make 50 trips (50 miles each) to Mexico, Mo., last year for the purpose of seeing the county draft board, the county Agricultural Adjustment Administration, or the

county rationing boards and 12 trips (60 miles each) to Columbia to see the State Agricultural Adjustment Agency or the Boone County draft boards, making a total of over 3,200 miles and about 1 month of my time for the year.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN D. SCHINDLER.

Our Aims and Our Diversions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Our Aims and Our Diversions," written by the Honorable A. B. Shafer, attorney at law, Marion, Ark.:

OUR AIMS AND OUR DIVERSIONS

The American people are desirous of winning the war and the following peace. They are unwilling to even contemplate leaving things as they are at the end of the war. They demand a lasting peace, or at least one that will make future aggressive wars practically impossible. This is a firm, underlying intention on the part of all of us. So firm is this intention that it may be said that if we win the war and lose the peace we have, in effect, lost the war. Our ultimate aim is, therefore, to win the peace. The winning of the war is a mere incident to this end—indispensable, it is true, but an incident, nevertheless.

Our primary peace aim is to prevent a recurrence of aggressive wars. All other aims are subordinate to this. For the present, at least, we need have no other aims. In the future and in the security of a lasting peace, and freed from the destruction of war, we may regard other matters as worthy of being adopted as national aims. But this is for the future. The immediate aim is a lasting peace. Whatever is necessary to secure this, we must insist upon. It is indispensable.

In the herculean effort we are now called upon to put forth we cannot afford to be distracted by side issues. It is said this is a war to make the world safe for democracy. But this is not true. It is no more a war for democracy than it is a war for communism, monarchy, or dictators. Every nation has a right to choose its own form of government. We have no right to impose our own form upon others for which, perhaps, they are not fitted. Again it is said that this is a revolutionary war in the sense that the people demand certain reforms from their governments. It is said that they demand freedom from want, economic security, sanitary housing, health clinics, etc. This is not true. None of these things, or the lack of them, brought on the present war. All these are merely red herrings drawn across our path to win the war. Social reformers have become opportunists and have attempted to incorporate their schemes as a necessary part of our war effort by the simple device of claiming that they are necessary. They are not. They simply confuse and detract from our war effort.

We are fighting this war to maintain our freedom. We are fighting this war to prevent subjugation by the Axis Powers and for nothing else. At its conclusion, if victorious, we propose to enter into whatever arrangements we may think necessary to prevent future aggressions. It may be that we will have to extend the Monroe Doctrine, which makes an act of aggression against any of our American republics an act of aggression against us, so that an act of aggression against any of the Allied Nations shall be an act of aggression against all the Allied Nations. But whatever device is adopted, it need be one only designed to prevent aggressive wars, to secure our lasting peace. A complicated world power or world government or superstate scheme for the solution of all our differences is unnecessary and would probably prove unworkable.

Absenteeism and Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communications received by me with reference to H. R 2082:

WAMIC, CREG., *March 15, 1943.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Good Americans who want to fight this war with clean hands and top efficiency, getting the job done as quickly as possible and with the least loss of life and wealth are backing the Bryson bill for wartime prohibition that enabled us to bring a quick decision in the First World War. Yes; we are grateful to you and are working for its quick passage.

Respectfully yours,

D. M. STANCLIFF.

P. S.—Damn the liquor revenue—it's blood money.

AUSTIN, TEX., *March 7, 1943.*

DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you on your bill to outlaw the manufacture, sale, and transportation of liquor. In my opinion, this is the greatest enemy we have in the United States and possessions.

Yours truly,

Mrs. LATEN STANBERRY.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *March 16, 1943.*

Representative BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: I, as one mother of many, appreciate what you are doing concerning the liquor problem.

My husband and I are wholeheartedly behind you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GEO. W. BROWN.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *March 7, 1943.*

Mr. BRYSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BRYSON: I am writing to say that I am glad to hear that you are author of a bill to impose national prohibition for the duration of the war.

May that thought grow and grow, because it would not only put a stop to most absenteeism, but many lives would be saved through decrease of drinking and, perhaps, in time the populace would learn that prohibition was not a failure.

Yours truly,

Miss JOSEPHINE HINKSON.

PELZER, S. C., *March 13, 1943.*

Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On last Sunday our Sunday-school class voted to send you a letter commending you for the step which you have taken in introducing a bill to abolish alcoholic beverages for the duration. You have our prayers, best wishes, and heartiest approval.

We are a class of young girls of Washington Church, near Ware Place in Greenville County, Rev. H. M. Fallow, pastor. We have 20 on roll and last Sunday we had 22 present (3 visitors). Everyone present voted to let you know that we appreciate your attitude toward liquors and offer our assistance if there is ever anything that we can do. May God help you to carry through.

Sincerely yours,

FRIENDSHIP CLASS,
Mrs. R. A. COKER,
Teacher.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *March 19, 1943.*

Hon. BRYSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRYSON: Having two sons and a son-in-law in the Army, I am interested in a sober and sane war effort. I am heartily in favor of your bill to bring about wartime prohibition, and all the time, as far as I am concerned.

Your approach, through the war production angle, is timely and should be effective, since our executive and military leaders have been so callous and blind to the destructive influence of liquor drinking among servicemen, defense workers, and other civilians.

I have just written a letter to our Congressman, CLIFFORD DAVIS, asking him to support you in your effort.

Wishing you complete success and assuring you of my heartfelt interest and prayers, I am,

Most sincerely,

Mrs. Y. ROZELLE HOLMAN.

BETHEL METHODIST CHURCH,
Union, S. C., March 10, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On last Sunday morning 30 men in our Bible class voted to send you words of congratulations and heartiest approval of the bill you introduced in Congress to outlaw the sale and manufacture of alcoholic beverages for the duration.

Our prayer is that the bill will pass and our country will be rid of public enemy No. 1, alcohol.

With kindest regards and praying God's blessings upon you, I am,

Cordially yours,

H. E. BULLINGTON.

CITY VIEW BAPTIST CHURCH,
Greenville, S. C., March 7, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: The City View Baptist Church this morning, in conference, with the pastor, Rev. D. A. Martin, presiding, voted unanimously for me, as clerk, to express to you their deep appreciation and gratitude for the splendid work that you are doing in Congress as our Representative, and especially for the bill that you presented this past week to Congress in prohibiting the sale of liquor, beer, and wine throughout our Nation for the duration.

Our church has a membership of more than 800. We are 100 percent with you in your endeavor, and if at any time you need our help, please do not hesitate to call on us.

We are praying earnestly that God will continue to make you useful and helpful in this period of world crisis that we are passing through.

Second Chronicles 7 : 14, expresses our deep feeling in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

BATES AIKEN,
Church Clerk.

THE CHERRINGTON HOSPITAL,
Logan, Ohio, March 17, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: Congratulations and thanks to you for having the courage of your convictions in introducing your prohibition bill to stop the sale of the greatest curse of the world and just now, along with the New Deal, the chief hindrance to our winning the war.

Those who will align themselves against this bill will be the blind who having eyes yet see not and those having ears yet hear not, the un-Christian, un-American who is a hearer of the word but not a doer of the word.

The Congressman who will not support this measure is insincere in his protestations of love for free America and for her success in the great struggle in which we are now engaged.

Sincerely yours,

M. H. CHERRINGTON, M. D.

PERULACK, PA., *March 15, 1943.*

The Honorable Mr. BRYSON.

MY DEAR SIR: I read an account of your proposal to abolish the liquor traffic for the duration. I cannot refrain from congratulating you on this move. Not only from the point of absenteeism, but from the moral standpoint.

Think of the 18- and 19-year-old boys who have never been away from parental care, and place them in camps surrounded by such vices. What are the dollars in revenue received compared to the ruining of the youth of our land, not only physically, but morally and spiritually. I have a son 19 years old, which makes this doubly interesting to me. Again I congratulate you and I trust and pray you may have sufficient support to carry it through. Keep fighting.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) A. K. FERGUSON,
Perulack, Pa.

DENVER, COLO., *March 16, 1943.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: I am a regular reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD through the courtesy of our Congressman HILL, and I note the fact that you introduced a bill to prohibit the sale and manufacture of intoxicating liquors for the duration of this war. This should be passed at once by both Houses and signed by the President, and set to work at once.

As it stands now, the Government is quite inconsistent. Most all we eat is being rationed, but booze flows freely. Why should this business be so favored in such times when it really contributes no good effects to the welfare of the country, but really lowers efficiency among laborers and the armed forces?

But remember you are going to fight the powerful liquor forces, and they put booze before country and freedom. But here is hoping you may be able to voice the sentiments of the thinking people of the land and make some dent on the lawmakers to act for the good interests of the country.

Yours very truly,

Dr. C. L. ORGAN.

Adding Insult to Tax Injury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of yesterday:

ADDING INSULT TO TAX INJURY

The House Ways and Means Committee majority has added insult to injury by implying, in its formal report upholding the committee's thoroughly unacceptable income tax bill, that the American people don't want the sound, equitable Ruml pay-as-you-go plan.

The committee majority, under the outmoded chairmanship of Representative DOUGHTON, has never been able to get out of its mind that the Ruml plan does not involve forgiveness of taxes but simply moves the tax clock ahead 1 year. Tax payments would go on without a break; but they would be payments on 1943 income, not that of 1942, and all of us would then be on a genuinely pay-as-you-go basis.

But here is the committee majority, even at this late date, pronouncing unctuously that "your committee members who have approved this report do not want their taxes forgiven. They are ready to pay their 1942 taxes, which have already accrued with respect to their income for 1942. It is believed that the vast majority of the American people also will not want any of their taxes forgiven."

In view of the majority's well-known but mistaken fondness for that word "forgiven," it is apparent that what Chairman DOUGHTON and his associates are trying to prove is that the Ruml plan has no popular following. If that isn't adding insult to injury, what is it? The fact is that the people want the Ruml plan.

As one indication of public opinion, the latest Gallup poll on the question, "Do you favor or oppose the Ruml plan?" reveals that of those queried 87 percent of the Republican taxpayers and 83 percent of the Democratic taxpayers approved the Ruml program.

Furthermore, the Ways and Means majority harps on the old familiar tune that under the Ruml system the large taxpayers would be "forgiven" millions in taxes for 1942 and that the small taxpayers would be saddled with the extra burden of making this "loss" up to the Treasury.

But judging from the Gallup inquiry the small taxpayers aren't a bit alarmed over that. Of taxpayers who were questioned, 83 percent of those in the upper half of income brackets and 86 percent of those in the lower half favored the Ruml plan.

In addition, the committee majority weakly insists that "this is no time to experiment" in tax collection systems. Yet the committee, by reporting a bewildering bill that invites taxpayers to pay double to get on a pay-as-you-go basis, and puts forward a confused system of bonuses to taxpayers able to pay more than a year's obligation in 1 year, is itself trying to inveigle the country into a dizzy tax experiment.

Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., minority leader in the House, has labeled the Ways and Means Committee's tax bill a "monstrosity," and he is right. The committee minority calls it stupid, misguided, and unenlightened, and a repudiation of the whole pay-as-you-go idea. It is all of that.

The Carlson bill, embodying the Ruml plan's principles, is the only tax measure now before the House that would put the Nation's income taxpayers on a forthright pay-as-you-go basis with a minimum of hardship and confusion. It should be adopted by Congress after the Doughton committee's proposals have been kicked out of the window.

National Income Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star:

NATIONAL INCOME RISE

That the United States in 1942 progressed far toward the complete mobilization of its resources for war is evidenced by the Commerce Department announcement that national income and gross national product last year achieved record levels of $119,800,000,000 and $151,000,000,000, respectively. The income gain for the year was more than $24,000,000,000, and the increase in gross output upward of $32,000,000,000. War expenditures and the shift of our economy to meet the demands of total war were mainly responsible for both gains.

Important changes in its composition accompanied last year's increase in national income. Farm proprietors, whose 1942 income is estimated at $9,700,000,000, had the largest percentage increase, a gain of 55.5 percent over their 1941 income, and more than thrice that of 1939. This is the first year since the post-war inflation of 1919, according to the Commerce Department, that the net income of farm operators has exceeded $9,000,000,000.

The salary and wage component of national income, which include pay of the armed forces, amounted to $80,300,000,000 in 1942, an increase of 32 percent over the 1941 total and 80 percent more than in 1939. Wage and salary payments made by privately owned enterprises advanced 27 percent during the year.

Other components contributed little to last year's expansion in national income. Interest payments were estimated at $5,400,000,000, an increase of $200,000,000 over 1941, and net rents and royalties at $3,100,000,000, a gain of $500,000,000. After payment of taxes, 1942 corporate profits amounted to $7,600,000,000, slightly less than in 1941, and nearly $2,000,000,000 below the 1940 total.

This year, according to Commerce Department estimates, national income is expected to reach $140,000,000,000 with all kinds of income payments to individuals totaling $135,000,000,000. Since all taxes paid out of individual income will take only $14,000,000,000 to $15,000,000,000, American consumers will have an unprecedented volume of income at their disposal for spending or saving. With the supply of civilian goods already limited, and with further reductions

likely, as war production continues to expand, Secretary Jones seems fully justified in his warning that the country faces this year "a severe intensification of the inflationary threat."

New Jersey Ship Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Newark Evening News on the subject of the proposed New Jersey ship canal which certain outsiders are trying to put over, contrary to the wishes of an overwhelming majority of the people of New Jersey:

THE CANAL AGAIN

Under the guise of wartime necessity old blueprints for the New Jersey ship canal are emerging from the obscurity of the file room. Its new-found friend is Representative MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, who offers the project as the answer to New England's appeal for more fuel oil. A responsive Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House approves a bill authorizing $199,000,000 for construction, and directs the War Department to get to work—and then adds that chilling and often fatal proviso reading "if and when" the Congress appropriates the money.

Twenty years ago earnest advocates of the transstate canal were billing it as insurance against attacks on coastal shipping by enemy fleets. The country appeared to be pretty remote from a return engagement at that time, and nothing was done. Now in the midst of war the project is revived. Immediate obstacles are cited by opponents, including representatives of the North Jersey District Water Supply Commission, whose duty it is to conserve limited water supplies on which ever-increasing demand is being made in this center of war production

Objections advanced are solid. First, there is the question of manpower. How could 4,200 men be spared for building the canal? This number would increase, as work progressed, to 7,200. The question of materials follows. Where would they, and the necessary consents, come from? Neither of these items has been satisfactorily explained. Enters also the question of cost, for even in wartime $200,000,000 is an item. Finally, and fatally, comes the time element. Four years, it is estimated, would be required to complete the canal.

Thus the project collides head-on with considerations of men, material, money, and time, all vital war commodities. Apart from consideration of men and resources, what would happen to the Raritan River, the Delaware River and other sources of potable water supply if they were drained to fill the canal? This may be a matter of incidental concern, or no concern, to Mr. MCCORMACK. It is to New Jersey, it is to New York, and to Pennsylvania, with a joint stake in the Delaware River, from whose limited supply something like 2,000,000 gallons a day would be diverted. As for north and central Jersey, their supplies would be even more perilously curtailed by the necessity of supplying more than 4,500,000 gallons daily to fill the canal.

Americans Neglect Their Own Swiss Alps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article on northern Idaho and western Montana, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of Friday, March 19, 1943.

The article reads as follows:

AMERICANS NEGLECT THEIR OWN SWISS ALPS

(By M. Le Tour)

Western Montana, exclusive of Glacier National Park, and the Idaho panhandle are scenic regions which have been generally overlooked by American travelers. Tourists, having visited the grandeur of Glacier National, have hurried on over to the coast to visit Mount Rainier, and missed this natural vacation area.

There are American travelers who know the Swiss Alps by heart and who have scarcely heard of Lake Pend Oreille and Lake Coeur d'Alene, the two Cinderella lakes of northern Idaho. But the prince has found them at last and for over a year now has been arriving by the thousand with the "U. S. Navy" on his hat to practice seamanship at Camp Farragut on the waters of Lake Pend Oreille.

Young men from every State in the Union are enjoying the beauty of this lake where pine trees accented by tall tamaracks climb up the sheer banks It is no toy lake either, being 57 miles long and with water that gets extremely choppy at times, rough enough for any inland boy to remember.

The two lakes are named for nearby Indian tribes, names which, in turn, reveal the French influence of the early voyageurs of the Hudson's Bay Co. They are pronounced all through the Pacific Northwest, "Coor-dee-lane," accent on the lane, and "Pond-ee-ray," accent on ray.

A BEAUTY OF THEIR OWN

The forest beauty of this area which men of the Navy live with, ski in, and photograph, is entirely different from the lush beauty of fir, hemlock, and spruce west of the Cascades. There is no heavy undergrowth under the yellow pines of this sector and pine forests have a groomed, park-like beauty of their own.

In Idaho the climb is well on toward the Rocky Mountains and Camp Farragut is sometimes described as a naval training camp in the mountains. The climb continues into Montana and culminates in the incomparable beauty of Glacier Park up over the Great Divide by way of Logan Pass over Going-to-the-Sun Highway.

The beauty of mountains and pine forests and lakes prevails throughout western Montana, not so awesome as in Glacier but leading up to it. Each city is a center of beauty. Libby is cupped in pine-covered mountains with glaciers and snow peaks and, if you can pick them out, four sky-high lookouts from which rangers keep sentinel.

AREA OF DUDE RANCHES

Kalispell is where Glacier Park begins; Flathead Lake is another large mountain lake excellent for boating in a superb setting; trout fishing in the streams about busy Missoula is famous; and even Butte and Anaconda, mining cities, are not far from the beauty of national forests.

The very names fit this western Montana beauty; lower Flathead Valley, the Mission Range of the Rockies, the Bitter Root Range and Bitter Root Valley, Kootenai National Forest, Kootenai River, and Kootenai Indians.

This is an area famous for its dude ranches which are served by the Milwaukee and the Northern Pacific Railroads. It is the Great Northern to the north that services Glacier National

Pre-war invitations to this western Montana describe side roads and byways that in many instances lead to areas of exceptional beauty and charm. They also describe lakes—large and small—almost without number and speaks further of cool, green forests, and dashing, foaming streams, fed by melting snow and glaciers.

It is a region so near to the primitive that wildlife still is plentiful. Black bears, brown ones, and big grizzlies are not uncommon; tawny deer are a common sight bounding through the timber; there are bighorn sheep in the mountains, and the funny marmot is plentiful Chinese pheasants have been "planted" and have grown in number until "chinks," as they are called, in their gay iridescent coloring, are most abundant

"When the lights go on again all over the world" and gasoline and rubber are no longer restricted then western Montana publicists will again send out their call: "The people of western Montana invite you to visit this land of charm and enchantment and the true western hospitality awaits you when you get here." A vacation-hungry world will accept the invitation, and wherever they are, men of the Navy, who have trained here, will carry with them memories of the beauty of Lake Pend Oreille in Idaho.

William Jennings Bryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent the district in Illinois where the late Honorable William Jennings Bryan was born 83 years ago at Salem, the city also of my birth.

I want to pay my humble tribute to his memory here in this House today where he served as a member of the Congress from his later home at Lincoln, Nebr., being elected to this body to the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses.

William Jennings Bryan, who for some 20 years of his active political life was regarded as the most persuasive and powerful individual leader in the Nation, stood out as a distinct symbol of the power in our Government that has so often come from the humble men of the small town in our Nation who have played such an important part in shaping and guiding the destiny of our beloved country.

Most of us know the great accomplishments of this dynamic crusader of his day. Few of us know the interesting

little things surrounding his boyhood days. Some of these were repeated by three of his early boyhood friends at Salem, Ill., Saturday, March 20, when Salem citizens met in a memorial meeting in honor of his birthday. On that occasion the three of his closest boyhood friends yet living who spoke briefly of their former school chum were William Slack, 86, retired merchant; former Mayor Joseph Schwartz, 83, retired merchant; and Harper Sweney, 80, one of the leading druggists of that city. They told how Billie Bryan in 1876 cut his initials in his new desk at school, which caused his teacher to remark that he would never amount to anything, how they hunted together, skated on the old mill pond, and painted up as American Indians rode their ponies together at Fourth of July celebrations.

When he had finished high school at Salem, William Jennings Bryan attended college at Jacksonville, Ill.; was graduated in law from Union College in Chicago, practiced law at Jacksonville, Ill. for a time, moving to Lincoln, Nebr., in 1887, where he continued the practice of law.

Taking an interest in politics, in addition to serving two terms in Congress, he was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1896, 1904, 1912, 1920, and 1924. His power with the people was so great that he was the first man in our history whose party permitted him to be a standard bearer for three successive national defeats—in 1896, 1900, and 1908.

During the Spanish-American War he raised the Third Regiment of the Nebraska Volunteer Infantry in May 1898, and was commissioned colonel.

His father, Judge Silas L. Bryan, a very devout man, was at one time a State senator and for three terms was circuit judge for the district. The bodies of his parents lie in the cemetery at Salem, Ill., and in all the years when he returned to visit or speak at the town of his birth, he never failed to visit their graves and place thereon, with loving care and tender memories, flowers in token of his love and affection for them.

National fame suddenly came to him when, as a delegate to the Chicago convention in 1896, he made his famous speech, The Cross of Gold and Crown of Thorns, before that body in a debate on the monetary plank of the platform. His oratory was so persuasive and powerful that the delegates of the convention stampeded to him on the free silver issue and he was nominated for the presidency by his party. Prior to this speech he was not considered for the nomination, but at its close the nomination was made by unanimous vote. The great free-silver campaign followed and he was defeated by William B. McKinley, of Ohio, on the gold standard and high protective tariff policies.

His spiritual influence over the people was one of his greatest attributes. He held steadfastly to the philosophy of the old-time religion and was recognized as the foremost lay Christian leader of his generation. He was consistent and courageous. Having decided in the justice of his course, no influence was great enough to turn him from it. Having largely directed the course of his party for almost a quarter of a century, culminating in the nomination and election of Woodrow Wilson to the Presidency, after opposing on principles his lifelong friend, Congressman Champ Clark, his yearning for peace was so abiding and his hate for war was so great that he resigned his high position as Secretary of State under President Wilson as his Nation entered World War No. 1.

Through his lifetime he championed the democracy of Jefferson and was always interested in the lot of common men. He feared the influence of financial leaders to the point of refusing to counsel with them, which doubtless cost him the Presidency.

He was against "isms" of all kinds, yet he was the foremost liberal leader of his time but never campaigned as a liberal or a progressive. He believed in the two-party system. He believed in the philosophy of common sense applied to government and strict honesty in the discharge of public service. He looked far ahead into the future.

He was the foremost national leader for a Federal income tax, one of the early leaders in support of woman suffrage, the first great leader to advocate the election of Senators by direct vote of the people, and was a foremost crusader in support of antitrust legislation.

Unlike many of our present leaders, he honored and revered our Constitution. He believed in the sanctity of the courts. He sought to broaden and strengthen our national laws within the framework of the Constitution. He never dreamed of the remaking of America with such sweeping schemes and plans as are advocated by many of the dreamers of our present day. He was against graft and corruption in politics, and for years he fought against New York Tammany Hall in his own party. He feared the evil influences of the great political patronage of machines of the large cities of America which, within the past few years, have not only controlled the State but National elections, proving the clearness of his vision.

While time seems to have proved that he was wrong on some of his economic policies, yet there are few thoughtful citizens of today who will fail to endorse and applaud his honesty of purpose, his statesmanship and foresight, his courage and his policy of reform in government within the framework of the Constitution.

The great moral force of William Jennings Bryan, during his lifetime, to keep government and politics on a higher plane, not only endeared him to the people of America but to the world as evidenced that even though he never attained the Presidency, at his death flags were flown at half mast around the civilized world in tribute to his worth and in memory of a life that was devoted to the interests of all mankind.

Door-Key Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over the Mutual Broadcasting System on March 22, 1943, on the Door-Key Children Program, convention of the air of the American Association of School Administrators:

Mrs. BOLTON. Thank you Miss Pinkston for this opportunity of taking part with Mr. Taft in this convention of the air sponsored by the important department of elementary school principals, who are so vividly aware of the tragedies that lie behind the very words that have been used, "Door-key children."

Think of it! Little children with the keys of their homes hung around their necks, hideously symbolic of the burden of responsibility we have permitted the war to lay upon their frail shoulders. Little children having to fend for themselves in an adult world; helpless victims of our failure to protect for them the security of their homes.

It is true that we shall need to use the energy of every able-bodied man and woman to win the war. But the use we make of this great pool of energy is all important. We must be very certain we are putting first things first; that we are not forgetting essentials.

The great vital throbbing heart of America is the home—the center of the home is mother, and the future of America is America's children.

Something over 18,500,000 children are enrolled in our elementary schools. Nearly 5,000,000 of these are in kindergarten and first grade, with about 12,500,000 ranging from there through the fifth grade, which means 10 years old and under. What has happened to the homes of America that makes it possible for J. Edgar Hoover, head of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, to say as he did on February 18: "The increase in crimes among juveniles indicates a deplorable lack of parental guidance and discipline in many homes. Boom conditions in many communities and easy money in youthful hands, accompanied by a sense of wartime abandon are contributing to the general let down in moral standards among juveniles." What crimes, you ask? I will tell you: Drunkenness, assault, sex offenses, gambling, carrying and possessing weapons.

"Lack of parental guidance and discipline," says the man whose business it is know. Parents are necessary to the normal life of childhood—parents, home, adequate housing, decent environment—but parents first, and mother most of all. For some time dad has been away with the forces or working long hours. Now mother, too, is gone in the early morning and back late at night. Left to their own devices, with the key hanging around their necks, is it small wonder that these bewildered youngsters find their way into every kind of difficulty? It is not their fault; it is definitely ours.

Overcrowding, inadequate housing, hideous environment are unfortunately not new phenomena, but they have grown to truly terrible proportions. To these deplorable conditions we add the absence of those whose

presence has a little discipline at least and certainly has spelled security to the younger ones who must now fend for themselves, unwatched, unprotected, and often overwhelmed by sheer terror of the unknown.

Valiantly do our brave teachers try to meet the situation. But alone they cannot provide the 12- to 14-hour schedule needed by children of school age. And certainly they cannot be responsible for the all-day care babies and little tots under 5 require. Woefully underpaid as a group, magnificently patriotic in their living, we cannot ask them to carry the full load.

The emergencies of crowded living and shifting population came upon us overnight, it is true. But we cannot permit them to continue. We must assume our full responsibilities and attack the problem on all fronts.

Schools can play a splendid part by organizing larger programs, nurseries can and must be set up to take care of the littlest ones, and ways can be found whereby mothers can be at home at the hours when their children most need them.

All these things are possible if we men and women of America recognize and assume our responsibilities.

The war must be won, or all light goes from the world. But in giving ourselves to that end we must remember that we are fighting for a better world, for a finer, stronger, happier humanity.

Our family is as big as our great Nation. Our strength as a people in the world of tomorrow will be measured by the physical, mental, and spiritual stature these children of today can attain.

Let us assume the responsibility that is ours. Let us take the door keys from about the necks of our little ones and open to them the doors of a decently protected childhood that they may be ready to take a constructive part in the rebuilding of a world.

An American Firster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the March 23 Washington Times-Herald is a rather accurate estimate of Winston Churchill, who speaks for Britain.

Here in Washington those who with equal determination speak for America have been charged by certain Department of Justice officials with being pro-Nazi.

No one doubts Churchill's determination to do what he can toward the winning of the war. No one doubts his determination that when the war is over first in his mind will be the British Empire and her interests.

The editorial is as follows:

A BRITISH FIRSTER

The Washington grapevine has it that Winston Churchill sold President Roosevelt the idea of the August 1941 Atlantic Conference, which produced the so-called Atlantic Charter, on the plea that "after all, I (Churchill) am half American, and we ought to be able to understand each other," or words to that effect.

100 PERCENT BRITON

In calling himself half American, Mr. Churchill exaggerated. His mother, Jennie Jerome, was an American woman, but when she married Lord Randolph Churchill in 1874 she became a Britisher like her husband—and properly so.

As for Prime Minister Churchill, he has never given the slightest sign of being anything other than a 100 percent Briton. His thoughts and deeds first and last are shaped to advance the power, prestige, and happiness of the British Empire. He suffers from no divided allegiance. He is the world's outstanding British Firster at this time; and we admire him for it.

EXCELLENT SPEECH BY MR. CHURCHILL

Mr. Churchill made another of his major speeches day before yesterday, to a world-wide radio audience.

It was not the most eloquent speech he has yet made, because it was not so immediate as some have been. But it was an excellent speech; and it was keyed throughout to the statement: "I only wish to do my duty by the whole mass of the nation of the British Empire as long as I am thought to be of any use for that."

Mr. Churchill concerned himself chiefly with post-war probabilities, after expressing the hope that Hitler may be beaten "into death, dust, and ashes" sometime in 1944 or 1945. He gave considerable attention to the Beveridge plan, British forerunner of Uncle Delano's plan for a post-war Fascist paradise in America. But more dramatic were his views on post-war international politics and world-peace preservatives.

As we understand it, Mr. Churchill hopes to see the pre-war small nations resurrected, but banded together in regional alliances, each of these alliances to be sworn to help the big nations keep the peace. The big nations in turn are not to go gobbling up any little nations.

If the Allies win the war, these big nations, of course, will be Great Britain and its empire, Russia, the United States, and China.

It so happens, though, that the rub in this matter is already noticeable. How about Russia after the war, and its attitude toward Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Finland, and Poland? Russia is already saying it wants those countries or parts of same back, as of July 1914. If Russia is the big factor it promises to be in beating Germany, then Russia will take that territory back, and nobody can prevent it, and Europe will have returned to the status quo ante of 1914.

THE GREATNESS OF CHURCHILL

Among all these post-war uncertainties, one thing stands out as absolutely certain: That Winston Churchill will be in there punching as long as he lives for Britain, and for nothing else.

We don't think Mr. Churchill is a great strategist or a great statesman. In World War No. 1, he underestimated tragically the Allied strength needed to (1) hold Antwerp, (2) take the Dardanelles in the Gallipoli push. In World War No. 2 he overestimated tragically the strength of the French Army. Dunkirk was the consequence; and Britain was saved from invasion and conquest by an eyelash, by fortitude, and by a few fighter pilots.

But when it comes to dreaming, planning, speaking, and acting for Britain's advancement all over the world, Churchill stands without a superior in today's world. And by virtue of him and like-minded Britain Firsters, England often wins the last battle. England, for instance, came out of World War No. 1 with another 1,000,000 square miles of Africa in the bag. It would not surprise us to see England come out of this war with the 1,750,000 square miles of what now appears on the maps as French and Italian north Africa. It wouldn't grieve us, either; heaven knows the United States would be foolish to want that territory.

Mr. Churchill, in short, is a great orator, and he embodies the very soul of Great Britain. He is a Great Britain Firster. He is a great man.

Mr. Speaker, recently Churchill said:

Let me, however, make this clear in case there should be any mistake about it, in any quarter, we mean to hold our own. I have not become the King's first minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire.

Let Congress and the administration show equal concern for the preservation of our constitutional government—of our Nation. What America needs is more American firsters.

Governors Talk "Farm Crisis"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article on the recent conference of 12 midwestern Governors on the farm crisis.

The article is by Mr. Lou Gardner, of Des Moines, Iowa:

FOREMOST ON SUPPLY FRONT

The Midwest agricultural conference called by Gov. Bourke B. Hickenlooper of Iowa, marked a clear step in vitalizing food production as a war industry second to none other on the supply front. Eight governors, accompanied by advisory staffs, together with representatives and officials from four other States, discussed farm production to aid the war. It was significant that price, profit, and other selfish interests were absent. The discussions revolved wholly around the problems of food production.

The governors and others made reports of conditions in their various States. They listened to informative presentations from those of extensive experience and broad knowledge. They spent hours in a panel discussion, and listened to an address from a world authority on food production and distribution.

FARM PRODUCTION ESSENTIAL

As a conclusion the thought was predominate that agriculture must be recognized as a war essential. In furtherance of that idea six-point resolutions were adopted. These endorsed deferment of agricultural workers, and called for a better job of allocating farm machinery. They suggested removal of restrictions retarding the manufacture of farm machinery and parts, proposed transportation for migrant farm labor, and demanded that available supplies of fertilizer be immediately released.

The 12 States represented are engaged in the production and processing of 65 to 70 percent of the food of the Nation. They include approximately a third of our population—a third that has been rapidly depleted in both man and woman power drawn into Army service and into factory production of war materials. It was made clear in this conference that a serious shortage of farm

manpower and machinery exists in these States.

IGNORED BY WASHINGTON

The reports indicated that there has been earnest study of the situation in the various States represented. The reports were intelligent. They were clarifying. They struck at the very vital questions and problems that are interwoven in the job of meeting a food crisis. The work which had been done in this direction emphasized that in Washington there has not been enough of cooperation with, or dependence on, State governments in solving food and manpower problems. This was emphasized by the fact that Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard, Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt, and War Production Board Chairman Donald P. Nelson declined invitations to attend. They did not recognize in the conference enough of importance to send representatives.

DID NOT BUILD CONFIDENCE

By this action Washington officials did not build in these 12 great agricultural States any confidence in their own methods of handling farm problems. Their action only brought to the front failures of administration which are causing a crisis. The purpose of Washington officials is to build a huge Federal machine, made up of boards and officials bound about by red tape and running wild with the extravagances of salaried Federal employees. This is in striking contrast to the way war agencies were handled during the First World War through State governments—by thousands of volunteers—at a minimum of expense and a maximum of efficiency.

There were other evidences that Washington did not look with favor on the Iowa conference. Releases sent out from the Capital had the appearance of being an effort to apply a wet blanket. Releases were made in Iowa which served to soften any threat to production.

HAD BETTER TAKE NOTE

Washington had best take note of the conference and its conclusions. These were important to the people of the great Midwest. They are important to our soldiers, our sailors, our allies, and the people of all of our States. Our troops could lose this war even though our food production be ample. They cannot win it unless that production is at its highest limits. This is a distinction clearly brought forth by the Des Moines conference. Washington had better not spar for position. Washington had best take full account.

BACK TO NATIVE STATE

Herbert C. Hoover, only living ex-President of the United States, came back to his native State of Iowa to spend a busy day in discussion and consideration of farm and war problems. He appeared before the Governors' conference to give information on food production and distribution. He addressed the Iowa Legislature with a plea for a new approach toward peace. He listened to a discussion of food problems by the Governors' panel. He finished the day with a masterful address on the food problem and its relation to the winning of the war.

Age is touching Mr. Hoover kindly. It is drawing light lines on his features and putting a touch of frost to his hair and eyebrows. He is the same energetic, alert Herbert Hoover, sincere in purpose, broad in outlook, and exuding confidence by reason of his rich experiences. Clipping his phrases, using the Hoover style of incisive language and conversational tone, he spoke with that effectiveness which has made his broadcasts fine examples of radio diction and oratory.

TWO HARD, SOLID FACTS

Mr. Hoover's appearance in Iowa drove home two hard, solid facts: Food is necessary to win the war; food will be necessary to establish peace. This is the same Hoover who saved thousands of Belgians from starvation, who kept millions from starving in Europe following the First World War, who successfully administered food production in this country during that war and who served 4 years as President of the United States, at a time when the whole world was in a state of collapse and struggling to recover from a post-war depression. His broad experience, his unselfish humanitarianism, his extended study of world conditions, his knowledge of statesmanship and statecraft give Mr. Hoover a breadth of vision and a foundation of understanding unsurpassed by any living man.

Relations Between Congress and Parliament

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs have just had a rare and historic experience. We were in the office of our Speaker when Capt. Arthur Evans, representing the Speaker of the British House of Commons, and accompanied by the British Ambassador delivered a letter from their Speaker to our own Speaker. Captain Evans is a distinguished Member of Parliament, serving on important committees of the House of Commons, and an officer of the Interparliamentary Union. As we talked together we all realized anew the possibilities of collaboration between members of the Mother of Parliaments and the Congress of the United States. We envisioned the great potential power for good of having the elected legislative representatives of the people from the great democracies of the world discuss their common wartime problems and seek out together their common goals for peace.

Captain Evans mentioned to us that he was the Member of Parliament who had asked that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be sent to England so that the members of Parliament could read it. I suggested to him as a form of reciprocal lease-lend which I felt would be of great value, that the debates of the House of Commons and the House of Lords be made available to us. He told me that he had already arranged this.

It is my hope that we can arrange to have these debates available in the Speaker's lobby where we can look them over, just as our brethren across the sea may have our debates to read. It will help us to see things as the people's representatives in Britain see them. It will help them to see problems as we see them. This will not only help to keep us all well informed but may cause us to weigh our words more carefully, as we bear in mind that our remarks made here are to go across the seas to those who serve the people by election in other lands, as a record of what we think of them and of ourselves.

I am one of those who have felt that the Interparliamentary Union, in which our country has played a leading part for over half a century and in which that great Member from Ohio, Theodore Burton, took such a leading part, should not be a casualty of the war but should function with full vitality in war to help shape the pattern of the future.

I hope this meeting this morning is prophetic, as it seemed to us this morning to be symbolic and full of meaning, and that it means that the people's elected representatives in the lands where we have government of the people, by the people, and for the people, will be getting together to discuss their common problems, to understand the problems which are peculiar to each, and to work out a peace that will represent the hopes and the needs of the people who are doing the paying and the fighting.

Restraining Order Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article from the American Glass Review of February 6, 1943.

RESTRAINING ORDER NECESSARY

"Scare advertising is a cheap device used to swindle the public," Leon Henderson wrote to Kenneth Barnard, chairman of the war activities committee of the National Association of Better Business Bureaus.

No matter who else the former head of the Office of Price Administration had in mind, he was referring to the copy writer, who, playing loosely with the truth, tries to get over the idea that if you don't use his product you have no one but yourself to accuse for the calamities that will follow and you might as well prepare for the worst.

Scaring people into buying something by blasting away in print with claims that have no basis in fact is the practice of those meant by the former Office of Price Administration head, who, in the same letter to Mr. Barnard, said, "People who resort to this dishonest means of promoting their petty self-interests serve neither their country nor themselves."

Fortunately, for the sake of the Nation's well-being and the long-suffering public, this group of fear flingers is not large. The advertising profession is an honorable one. Most of its members strive to uphold the dignity it deserves and most of them make an honest effort to adhere to the fair practice code demanded by the ethics of the profession.

It is almost inconceivable then, to encounter in this field one who not only shows a complete disregard for facts, but at the

same time loosens a smear barrage at a competitor with an attack as unfounded as that employed to exploint his own product.

* * * * *

Not content to advertise paper containers legitimately and permit the choice of their use to be determined on their merits, the Cup and Container Institute in recent months has embarked on an insidious campaign designed to scare the pants off of such persons as proprietors of eating places, soda fountains, and drug stores by predicting dire consequences to those who fail to shift from glass to paper cups in service to customers.

MILITARY POLICE AT YOUR FRONT DOOR

Through national newspaper and magazine advertising and by direct-mail broadsides, dispensers of food and drink to the public, and health officials wherever they could be reached, have had pictured to them the glass tumbler as the spreader of disease, particularly influenza, with the unqualified statement that only by the use of paper cups can an epidemic, such as the one of 1918, help to be prevented. In one circular, mailed Nation-wide to drug-store and fountain owners, a member of the military police of the United States Army is shown stationed outside a pharmacy. He is waiting there for soldiers who might enter the establishment seeking a sundae or soda, and his mission is to tell them, "Not in here fellows; better try that drug store on the next corner." This is purported to show what the druggist will find himself up against unless he uses paper cups. Bosh. It is only an attempt to scare him into abolishing his glass service that the paper-cup industry can sell more of its product that by no means has found universal approval in the soda-fountain trade of the country.

The circular states, "That restriction, not unusual during the last war and already threatening in the present crisis, is fraught with significance for soda-fountain proprietors everywhere." If "that restriction" refers to the presence of a military policeman outside the drug store, it was quite unusual in the first war. To the knowledge of many servicemen who were engaged in that war memory fails to recall one instance of a military police officer guarding the health of soldiers in that manner.

There were unsanitary places thrown up quickly in the vicinities of Army camps which were made to clean up or close up by authorities, but established stores were not bothered by the military police. These places deserved to be cleaned out. But not because they were not using paper cups, that had nothing to do with it—most of them were using them.

They were using them then as some still are being used today—tossed in broken packages under counters or on the floor and left to collect dust, germs even, until called into use.

Uncle Sam says "thumbs down on dirty soda fountains," and that is as it should be. But he hasn't said, "thumbs up on paper cups," as the paper forces would have you believe. He hasn't said anything about it. He, and all of us will not patronize a dirty-looking store for things to eat or drink. And we have faith enough in our druggists and soda-fountain proprietors to believe that their pride in their establishments will not permit them to operate except in the observance of health regulations laid down by authorities in the communities in which they are located. They don't have to be whiplashed with the fear of a boycott simply because they do not convert their glass-service methods, as old and as popular as the first sundae, to a new order just for the sake of advancing the sales of another product.

In the same circular the statement is made that "soda-fountain proprietors who adopt single-service paper cups and utensils can be assured of the approval of the public and of health officers."

Who said so? No one but the high-pressure sales spouters of the paper-cup interests. No Government agency has said so. No health officer has said so. * * *

PAPER CUPS STOP NOSE RUNNING

A widely circulated illustration portrays a waitress with one hand holding a cup and saucer under the spout of a coffee urn and the other holding a handkerchief, wiping her nose. The caption reads, "Personal habits of employees count for much in the customer's opinion. Wiping the nose is only one of the man, things to avoid that customers find objectionable."

The object lesson there isn't clear. The paper people can't mean that if the waitress were filling a paper container with coffee she would disregard her running nose. It seems that would be just as objectionable to the customers. The import must be that paper cups have hidden powers not apparent in the advertising. Underlines for the picture might read: "Use paper cups and slow your nose down to a walk."

Of course, it's silly. But it isn't any sillier than the attempted propaganda. If a waitress has a cold and it is necessary for her to wipe her nose while drawing coffee she'll wipe it whether the container she is using is paper or solid gold.

Advertisements such as these have been spread by the Cup and Container Institute through magazines and newspapers in many parts of the country. Many of them have appeared under the name of the public health committee of the institute.

PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE ONE MAN

This was interesting because the findings of a committee, whether they appear in an advertisement or are submitted in a report, ordinarily contain the opinion of a majority of the committee and bear some weight because it is the consensus of a number rather than the undesirable methods obtained when left to the dictates of one individual prejudiced or in the control of the agency seeking a favorable decision. A desire to know the makeup of this public health committee of the Cup and Container Institute led a reporter to the institute's headquarters in a New York office building where he was told he would find the committee on the floor above.

He visited the indicated office but discovered no committee. He learned there was no committee, that the high-sounding phrase bore no relation to fact and that the misleading and untruthful propaganda against glass containers spread in ads throughout the country over the name of the public health committee of the Cup and Container Institute was the work of one man, Homer N. Calver, a publicist in the employ of the paper cup interests. His printed card contained "The public health committee of the Cup and Container Institute" at the top; the word "for" below these lines, and "from Homer N. Calver" at the bottom. No other committee members names appeared. Mr. Calver was and is the committee.

* * * * *

It is difficult to understand why an industry like the paper cup and container would sink to such mud-slinging levels, and it is equally hard to believe that an advertising firm like that of Young and Rubicam would consent to lend its efforts in laying out copy of such unethical nature.

* * * * *

About 10 years ago the paper-cup interests boldly came out with ads in a leading magazine picturing a death head above the rim of a glass tumbler. The American Glass Review, representing the glass industry, protested, with the result that the ads were discontinued. In recent printed matter, scare copy has not reached quite such fiendish proportions, but the campaign initiated some time ago using present war conditions as a refuge are almost as malignant.

It would have us believe, for instance, that only by the use of paper cups and containers can the spread of influenza be prevented. "Let's not have another October 1918," screams bold type in an ad that appeared in numerous magazines. It is stated, "in the last war October 1918 was a black month for the United States. Black not because of military defeats, but because thousands of people lay sick and dying from a flu epidemic. * * * And one of the causes for the rapid spread of the disease was reported by authorities as 'transmission through eating and drinking utensils.' "

In another ad which had wide distribution the copywriter for paper cups states, "Paper cups can help prevent another scourge in this war like the flu epidemic of 1918." Again, who says so? The one-man committee of public health who is paid to say so? No one else has said so because nobody knows, definitely.

REFUTING THE INFLUENZA PROPAGANDA

A few facts have been discovered about the influenza germ but not enough to warrant any honest man to say conclusively how influenza is contracted. What has been learned tends to indicate that the germ is not communicable through hand to mouth transmission, to any extent. The claim of the paper container interests that influenza can be prevented by paper cups which can be used once and thrown away is not substantiated by either Navy or Army authorities.

Commander Albert Paul Krueger, in command of Naval Laboratory Research Unit No. 1 at the University of California, has made the discovery that influenza viruses type A and type B die in a few minutes if put on human skin. Commander Krueger, who formerly was professor of bacteriology at the university, stated that "virus solutions so strong that a teaspoonful would kill half a billion mice, lost all disease-producing capacity within 10 minutes."

"These results," he said, "emphasize again the importance of tiny virus containing droplets sprayed into the air when one sneezes, coughs, or talks vigorously, as a means of spreading influenza. Hand to hand distribution of the virus and eventual hand to mouth transfer would appear to be an unimportant hazard."

* * * * *

The paper cup ad writer's phrase, "transmission through eating and drinking utensils," has appeared time after time in magazine and newspaper ads. He cites "authorities" for the statement but lets it go at that. In one instance it is written, "transmission through eating and drinking utensils was reported by Army medical authorities as one of the causes for the spread of the disease." What are the facts?

Lt. Col. William S. Stone, Medical Corps, United States Army, writes from the office of the surgeon general in Washington, "this office has issued no recent statement or publication on the role of eating and drinking utensils in the spread of infectious diseases. It is well recognized that there are a number of factors involved in the spread of the respiratory diseases, and the exact role that each plays cannot be clearly defined. Various methods have been used to evaluate experimentally the role of air-borne infections versus other means of human contact in the incidence of respiratory diseases. It is our opinion that the exact importance of the individual factors involved in the spread of these diseases has not been determined. * * *"

INFLUENZA VIRUS BREATHED IN

* * * * *

It is recognized clearly that the virus of the disease is in the air. It it were taken into the system by way of the mouth after depositing itself on the rim of a container of any sort, the person first using that con-

tainer would be the victim and the use of a brand new paper cup would be of no preventive benefit.

How did those who ministered to influenza sufferers in Army camps in the first World War protect themselves? They wore gauze bandages over their mouths to prevent them from inhaling the germs. The hand to mouth and mouth to mouth danger so terribly prevalent according to the paper container forces seems rather remote.

EPIDEMICS CONTROLLED

"The scourge of 1918," so fearfully recalled by the Cup and Container Institute's panic pitcher will not occur again. No epidemics of any magnitude have visited this country since that time. Not only has the medical profession learned how to prevent epidemics but the individual has become health conscious.

* * * * *

No, "the scourge of 1918" is history. It will not recur. But when the Cup and Container Institute tells the public in effect that if it does not buy and use its paper products the "scourge" is being invited to return, it is time that measures of restraint be taken.

* * * * *

WHAT THE SURVEY FOUND

A survey conducted on the value of the alternative for glass stated:

"Many municipalities have attempted to overcome the problem of the dirty glass at the soda fountain by requiring the use of the paper cup. No work has been carried out that has been reported to show to what degree this overcomes the danger. Rice (J. W. Rice, in the sixth annual report of the Pennsylvania Association of Dairy and Milk Inspectors) has amply demonstrated that paraffined paper caps for milk bottles, supposedly packed in sterile containers, were contaminated with a variety of bacilli and molds. A similar condition was found by Fellers (C. R. Fellers, in American Journal of Public Health, vol. 18, No. 6, p. 763) with the paraffined paper-lined caps and closures for food containers.

"He particularly stressed the presence of the organisms causing botulinus. Recently our laboratories completed an extensive study of the paper containers for milk that lately have made their appearance. This investigation showed conclusively that the ordinary paraffining process through which the paper was put failed to destroy all the organisms on the paper, although the paraffin, when forming a perfect lining, did tend to prevent access of the organisms into the milk. Examinations of empty and supposedly sterile containers both of the preformed types and those finished at the dairy showed the majority to be heavily affected.

"There is little reason to suppose that any better condition would hold in the case of the individual paper cup. From practical observation, the treatment accorded these cups, after being removed from the packages, frequently offers greater opportunities for contamination than would occur with glass. Instances have been noted by members of our staff when several of the cups have fallen to the floor and after rolling around were replaced for use. In other cases opened and unprotected cartons of cups were left under the counter. * * *"

Particularly craven is the widespread use of fabrications employed by those who push the alleged advantages of the paper cup container over glass. Publicity releases contain cleverly worded bits injected at intervals into copy without any attempted play-up but which are so pointed and forceful that the mind is unconsciously impressed by them. * * *

One such instance is that in which it is stated: "These products (paper cups) are particularly essential in war workers' lunches now that glass and other containers are prohibited from many plants due to the risks of accidents and sabotage."

Glass prohibited in plants because it will lead to accidents or sabotage? Where has it been prohibited? A survey was made among different factories and no one knew of an order prohibiting it. The head of the internal security section of one of the country's largest steel plants stated there has been no such order, and added that on the contrary, thousands of bottles and other glass containers pass through the plant every day.

Yet, because it is the un-American practice of the Cup and Container Institute to grasp at any means to increase sales of the paper product, it brashly publishes such statements and hopes for the best.

This is not an attack on the paper cup and container industry. It has the same right to survive and enjoy as great a sale of its products as possible as any other industry. But it is a protest and a vigorous protest against the unethical and sordid methods practiced by the publicists vested with authority to promote the product's sale. When it is necessary for a competitor to drag in the mud the American glass industry and otherwise smear it with unfounded allegations, it certainly is time steps were taken to stop it.

GLASS INDUSTRY CONTRIBUTING TO WAR EFFORT

The glass industry in this country is contributing in an amazing way to the successful prosecution of the war. Its products are being used in a manner never before dreamed of in replacements and substitutions for vital materials necessary to the war effort. From its research laboratories have come startling new applications for glass and products made of nonessential materials which have made it possible for the people of this country to continue to enjoy some of the conveniences that otherwise would be denied them.

An instance of this is the jar closure for vacuum-packed coffee that has just been announced by the Owens-Illinois Glass Co., manufacturers of Duraglas. It is made entirely of materials not needed for the war and has met the enthusiastic approval of roasters. It was developed after months of research. One of the important features of the cap is its ability to reseal a jar and keep in tact the freshness of the coffee remaining.

The Libbey Glass Co., one of the largest producers of glass tumblers, has converted part of its facilities to war and is making radio tubes and X-ray tubes for the armed forces. The Corning Glass Works, Hazel-Atlas, Anchor Hocking, and Federal Glass Cos., all large glass-container manufacturers in peacetimes, are devoting a large part of their capacities to essential needs of service men here and abroad. Were it not for the glass industry, many foods needed to insure the health of both the military and production soldier could not be packed or shipped.

It is in the defense of such an industry as this that the protective hand of government is sought to restrain unscrupulous agencies from dragging it in the mud with insinuations, implications, and barefaced lies.

The Federal Trade Commission has been appealed to in an effort to end the smear campaign of the Cup and Container Institute. In reply to a letter of protest written by the managing editor of the American Glass Review, Chairman W. A. Ayres, of the Federal Trade Commission, stated, "If the advertising of the Cup and Container Institute should, after investigation, prove to be factually false or misleading, further consideration can and will be given the matter." In another communication from the Commission, Director P. B. Morehouse wrote that "there is no law administered by the Commission which would prohibit scare copy as such. The test is simply whether the factual claims made for the product are false or misleading in a material respect."

The American Glass Review, in all honesty, believes the claims are false and misleading to the extent that a stop order should be applied. The statements of the paper-cup industry's high-pressure propagandists certainly are misleading. Assuredly they are false. If permitted to continue without restriction, the welfare of thousands of patriotic and loyal men and women connected with the glass industry might conceivably be placed in jeopardy.

Harry H. Cook, international president of the Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America, an organization of 30,000 American men and women, is in full accord with the stand this publication has taken, as is James Maloney, president of the Glass Bottle Blowers Association of the United States and Canada, with its added thousands of members.

LABOR UNIONS SUPPORT PROTEST

In a recent letter Mr. Cook said in part: "Please be advised that the American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America, embracing a membership of approximately 30,000 workers, depending upon the American glass industry for employment, is unanimously and wholeheartedly in support of the American Glass Review in protesting against the unethical advertising campaign of the Paper Cup and Container Institute being promoted by the firm of Young & Rubicam, advertising counselors. Your communication addressed to Mr. William A. Ayres, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, was indeed timely and highly justifiable.

* * * * *

"If the paper cup and container manufacturers persist in carrying on their campaign by misrepresentation and reflection on glass for drinking and container purposes, we feel certain that a vigorous campaign by labor and management in the glass industry will be necessary in order that the general public will understand the real facts. * * * The public may be told that materials in the making of articles of glass are clean and that glass transmits light, thereby permitting one to see what the vessel contains before eating or drinking. Regardless of what may be said to the contrary, there are no more sanitary containers or drinking vessels or dishes than those made of glass. Certainly the Federal Trade Commission should not permit the use of same to be discredited by any campaign to advertise the use of paper cups and containers * * *."

The glass industry has yet to utter one word in condemnation of the paper cup and container. It has made no effort to strike back at the violent attacks made on it in recent years. It is content to let its products rest on their merits alone. But it condemns and deprecates the unjust methods of an adversary, who, spurning the decencies of ethical competitive practices, stoops to the observance of wile and delusion in spreading the claims of the product he is paid to advertise.

The glass industry believes in justice and fair trade methods and is strong in the faith that the agency whose obligation it is to see that others maintain the same belief, will not be derelict in its duty.

A Real Move Against Labor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the

Boston Evening Globe of March 22, 1943:

A REAL MOVE AGAINST LABOR SHORTAGE

Discussion of absenteeism in war plants has moved from a period of emotional accusations to a more temperate phase in which some concern for facts seems to be in evidence. This is all to the good. The problem will scarcely be solved by wild claims, or ill-founded action.

Meantime, a situation responsible for a far greater lag in war production has not been receiving proper attention. This past dozen months the industrial accident rate, including injured and killed, approximates 1,000,000 persons. About 1 in 10 of these workers was killed. A majority of these accidents could have been avoided by proper use of safety devices and policies in the pla ts.

The Army and the Navy have been honoring plants with excellent records on production by bestowing upon them the well-known "E" flags. Would it not be practical and beneficial if these same agencies would begin bestowing, let us say, a silver "A" on all industries which reduce their industrial accident records by 10 percent for a period of 3 successive months, and a gold "A" on all which cut accident records by 20 percent or more for the same period?

An absentee may return to work with a reasonable explanation. A dead worker can't.

A Bureaucrat Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. SABATH Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Times of March 18, 1943.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that with the reading of this editorial we will se less of the sniping and carping criticism that is heard on this floor from day to day.

A BUREAUCRAT TALKS

Mark A. Brown, vice president of the Harris Trust & Savings Bank, was introduced to the Irish Fellowship Club yesterday to report on the progress of the war as he saw it while he was in Washington as financial adviser to the director of industry operations of the War Production Board.

The first thing Mr. Brown said was that he was "one of those bureaucrats." A lot of people in the audience stretched their necks a little more to get a look at a bureaucrat. They saw a stalwart man of 54, with ruddy cheeks and a fighting jaw. He spoke with a Hoosier wit, and he didn't mince any words.

After hearing him talk, we looked him up in Who's Who in Chicago (edition of 1941) and this is what we found:

Brown, Mark A., vice president, Harris Trust & Savings Bank; born, Fairmont, Ind., March 11, 1889; son Will F. and Lillian (Dean) B.; educated Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind., 1911; married Hannah Coxon, March 11, 1914. Reorganized and financed the J. M. Leach Manufacturing Co., Kokomo, Ind., now president and treasurer; organized the Kokomo Automotive Co. in 1919; handled the financing of the Shell Am. Petroleum Co., Kokomo, in 1922, now vice president; reorganized the Globe Stove & Range Co., of Kokomo, 1922, now the Globe Am. Corporation, of which he is director; from 1924–26, vice president and general manager Cole Manufacturing Co., Chicago; vice president Harris Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, since 1928; director J. M. Leach Manufacturing Co., Abso-Pure Ice & Coal Co., Globe Am. Corporation, Shell Am. Petroleum Co., Cloverleaf Ice & Coal Co., the Kelvie Press, Medallic Manufacturing Association, Chicago Association of Commerce. Mason, Elk Clubs: Chicago, Mid-Day, Attic. Chicago Yacht, University, Bob o'Link, Glenview. Home: 32 East Linden Avenue, Wilmette, Ill. Office: 115 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

Getting back to Mr. Brown's speech before the Irish Fellowship Club, here's a part of what he said:

"I found Washington wasn't a madhouse run by the inmates as it's represented to be, but a place where the best business brains of the country are working long hours to win this war as quickly as possible on an unconditional-surrender basis. There are workers in Washington, and of course there are some drones, as there are every place. In the main places, our affairs in Washington are in very good hands.

"There are lots of busy people there and some of the delays that we complain about back home are due to the fact that the leaders in our war effort are working with each other on a democratic basis, each having his say and all trying to solve the problems of their country in the best way possible. That's the way it should be—not one man giving all the orders.

"Those leaders of ours have the figures and facts. No one of them has all the figures and facts about everything, just as no one of us here has all the figures and facts.

"Yet there are many among us who make statements that are a lot of bunk. Wars are not won by armchair strategists or by those who spend all their time cussing the Commander in Chief. On December 7 we became a nation with just one purpose. On that day ended divergent opinion. This is no time for destructive criticism."

The next time you hear somebody saying that those pesky bureaucrats in Washington are a bunch of theorists who never met a pay roll, never had a nickel in the bank, and would be on the relief rolls if they weren't in public jobs, remember that a lot of men down there are of the caliber of neighbor Mark A. Brown, banker, who thinks it's a duty to warn his countrymen against the scolding, amateur strategists who spend all their time cussing the Commander in Chief.

About the Ruml Plan and the Rich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Des Moines Register of March 15, 1943:

ABOUT THE RUML PLAN AND THE RICH

President Roosevelt has finally declared himself against the Ruml plan for shifting to a pay-as-you-go basis of individual income tax payments. The President puts his opposition on the familiar ground that if the Ruml plan were adopted it would benefit the "big boys"—the ones that pay heavy income taxes personally.

Previously the President himself had declared in favor of getting on the pay-as-you-go basis. So had the Treasury. So had practically everybody.

Therefore the whole point of the hostility to the Ruml plan is based not on what the plan aims to achieve but entirely on the way in which Ruml has proposed to achieve it.

Ruml has said, "Let's just forget all about last year's income taxes. Let's have everybody pay his income taxes at the usual time, starting with March 15. But let's simply treat these payments as payments on 1943 income."

Ruml argues that this way of doing it "wouldn't mean a thing," as far as revenues that come into the Federal Treasury are concerned, and also that it "wouldn't mean a thing" as far as any actual benefit to any considerable number of income taxpayers is concerned.

He points out that every year until they die our income taxpayers will keep on paying. Until they die, or unless some of them lose their income before that, they wouldn't gain anything by the proposed "skipping" of the 1942 income-tax year.

But the Treasury says, No. It says that somehow it is an "asset" to the Treasury to have last year's taxes due on the books. The Treasury apparently wouldn't object if taxpayers were willing approximately to double their income-tax payments this year, paying both the income taxes due on 1942 income and the somewhat larger taxes for 1943.

The President also says, No. He uses what he calls "simple mathematics" to prove that a person with an income of a million dollars, for instance, would "escape" on 1942 tax liability of $854,000. And so on, with respect to persons having smaller incomes.

But all this seems to be largely a play on words. The significant word used by the President is the word "liability."

What an income taxpayer would actually escape is a "tax liability" for 1942. He'd still have to pay taxes on March 15 and each of the succeeding quarterly dates. If he were paying under the 1943 tax law he would have to pay somewhat more, not less. He would continue to have to pay in 1944, 1945, and all the succeeding years unless he died or lost his income.

The Treasury, similarly, wouldn't actually lose anything unless and until the taxpayer died or lost his income.

Tax rates could be increased just as much, at any time, as the Treasury could persuade Congress to increase them. That the income taxes are going to be increased as the war progresses, everybody knows.

Maybe we're just dumb about this, but the only case in which we can see that an income-tax payer, big or little, would actually make a cash gain would be a case in which the particular taxpayer had already put himself as an individual on the pay-as-you-go basis.

In other words, if a particular taxpayer, big or little, had accumulated in 1942 all the tax money that he would need to pay his 1942 income taxes due in 1943, that chap would be benefited. It would be temporary. But for this one time he could use that saved-up money to pay part, in some cases, most, of his taxes on 1943 income.

But how many income-tax payers have actually done that? How many have saved up, in some sort of separate tax fund, enough money during the last year to pay on March 15, 1943, all, or nearly all, the income taxes that they would normally have to pay throughout the year—in March, in June, in September, and in December?

Perhaps there are a few. We suspect that they are darned few.

And we wonder why anybody should get so excited about the temporary benefit to persons of this sort, unless it is actually true, and can be proven to be true, that they represent a relatively large number.

The admitted gain to all concerned, including the Treasury, of getting on a pay-as-you-go basis surely ought not to be tossed away unless it can be shown that some con-

siderable element of unfair advantage would be created.

And, frankly, all we've had so far is broad, and, as we see it, rather loose assertions to the effect that this would be so. We have not yet seen a single figure, in terms of "simple mathematics," that even pretends to tell how many individual income taxpayers have really saved up already the whole of their 1942 tax liability.

Unless such cases are actually numerous, which we very much doubt, it seems to us that Beardsley Ruml has much the better of the argument—that all this talk about rich guys escaping tax liability doesn't have any serious practical meaning.

Address of Andrew Jackson Higgins, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Robert Neal and the address of Andrew Jackson Higgins, Sr., at the celebration of the sixty-seventh anniversary of the founding of Creighton University, Omaha, Nebr.:

OMAHA, NEBR., *March 12, 1943.*

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIMMY: I have secured a copy of the address of Andrew Jackson Higgins, Sr., given at the celebration of the sixty-seventh anniversary of Creighton University.

I do not know how well you know Mr. Higgins, but I am sure the people in Louisiana feel about him as they do elsewhere; that he is a boat-building genius. Jimmy, I think it would be wise and smart for you to have his talk inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I know you well enough to ask this favor of you. If you are ever out this way please contact me.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT NEAL.

ADDRESS OF ANDREW JACKSON HIGGINS, SR., AT THE CELEBRATION OF THE SIXTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY

I am happy and proud to come back to my home town, by invitation, to join in giving honor to the founders of Creighton University.

Every native Nebraskan can be proud of his State, and of the men and women who built its great institutions.

The settlers and the builders of Nebraska—the pioneers—were, in fact of accomplishment, engineers, with imagination and courage to overcome all obstacles. Truly the people who won the West were crusaders, and amongst the foremost were the Creighton brothers, Edward and John. It is seldom recalled, and not properly appreciated, that the completion of the Western Union antedated by years the building of the Union Pacific.

It was due to the Creighton brothers' vision, their engineering genius and their indomitable courage, that telegraphic communication was established from the Atlantic to the Pacific; and who can deny that this arm of communication made possible the winning and holding of the West, when unity of this Nation swung in the balance in the War between the States?

Edward Creighton planned well—his widow accomplished his wish. His brother John extended and embellished their dream of a great university. Crusaders that they were, they entrusted the institution of their creation to the crusading Jesuit Fathers.

And so we are here today, and I am privileged to give acknowledgment and honor to Edward and John Creighton and their wives, the founders of this university. And, from an appreciative heart, to give honor to the glorious religious order of teachers, the Society of Jesus, who have preserved this monument to the founders.

As a boy I enrolled at Creighton. I found what I had not found elsewhere—from the Jesuit professors and priests I received friendship and fatherly guidance and advice. There were no barriers raised, no prohibitions, no inhibitions, no proselytizing, but full freedom of thought and appreciation of one's honest concept of religious belief—truly Catholic in the broadest interpretation. At Creighton one also got strict discipline, developing strength and confidence, reliance and faith.

The arrows of advice all pointed in the right direction. From my associations there I acquired a nucleus of a human understanding that I have tried to hold and guide me.

Unquestionably I was one of the poorest students that Creighton may have had, that is, scholastically. But Creighton boys were mentally intrigued, made inquisitive. Father Kuhlman, Father Sherman, Father Dineen, and other dear men associated with them; yes, the, now Father Reilly, today just as handsome as yesterday when a professor; Father Rigge, a great man, great scientist and astronomer; all "fathers" in every sense of the word, opened before us great vistas for exploration, new worlds to conquer, with work in the arts and sciences, and impressed upon us the need for engineering skill.

The Creighton brothers were engineers and, though the Jesuits as a whole might deny it, the members of that great order are also engineers. The Creighton brothers in their work dealt with and engineered in material things, the Jesuit fathers engineer in the minds and souls of youth and men.

The world today needs engineers—and these engineers must have imagination. They must plan and they must deal in fundamentals, with physics. There is no place in engineering for metaphysics. Engineers are positive; they know there are no cure-alls, no panaceas. We have both negative and positive forces. The Creighton brothers were builders—they were positive type men. Positive men are needed today to salvage this world from its chaotic state.

There is now the job of the war—the job of creating implements—the training of the men for the obliteration of the negatives, negatives dealing in metaphysics, religious metaphysics and political metaphysics, for domination, and for damnation.

To win the war alone should not be our sole objective. We must also win and hold the peace, maintain and extend the "four freedoms." There is an awakened social consciousness in the countries of the United Nations. It is the democracies that are declaring the principles for which they fight. They are the ones who see the new horizons; who must draft the charts that make certain a practical design for living the "four freedoms"—living them in all the countries of the earth. This giant job can only be done, and success achieved, through the continued cooperation of the allied nations. But America must see to it now that our allies' cooperation will continue when their needs are for peace and not for war.

We are only now becoming globe-conscious. Science had wiped out global space and time, but we did not grasp the real social significance of the miracle. The globe is our battleground now. We are forced to become globe-conscious through the blood and tears and agony of a global war.

The United Nations, fighting under the slogan "Liberty, equality, and justice for all," must, in common decency, must, yes—if for no other reason than their self-preservation—banc together for a practical salvaging of civilization. For this they must hold together in a sacred pact, until there is built a global constitution—a global Magna Carta, a global Bill of Rights, under which a new world of free nations can live, can develop, can communicate and trade under law and order; where enterprise, commerce, science, social planning and all the arts are built for living and not for killing. This should be the treasure for which millions are fighting and dying.

What blind fools we are. We only see the truth when it is almost too late. Jesus gave us the framework for a chart of life: "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all they heart and all thy soul, and the second is like unto it, thou shalt love they neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang the whole law and the prophets." This is not a weak creed—it is a real truth. It embraces all the strong and just methods of law by which man should govern himself.

We must look forward to the day when our boys will be returning. Shall they return to conditions that their fathers faced on their return from the previous war? Would they be satisfied? Will they submit to being shunted and shoved around to sell apples on the street corner? No, indeed; they will not.

Now is the time for the Edward Creightons and the John Creightons amongst us—and for all of us—to crusade, to plan, to engineer and to demand that those representing us in government be constructive, and lay aside party strife, personal or political ambitions and greed; to see to it that this country for which our boys are fighting and dying will be a better place in which to live than it has ever been before.

There must be a greater distribution of the wealth; there must be universal opportunity for all to acquire education and works-training to the extent of each one's ability to absorb and utilize same. There must be work with an assured income for everyone.

It is sad that it takes a national peril and war to reveal the capacities of a people and the ability of a nation to achieve.

We have learned that when there is the need, the money to meet that need can be found. In the past there has been too much prattling about balanced budgets, concern for the gold-reserve; alarm about the national debt. Such negative bugaboos used to maintain the status quo. The debt will be increased; the Budget will continue to be unbalanced; but the debt is our own—it is owing to the American people—and thank God, very well distributed.

In time of war we are forced to enlarge the debt—and for expendable things, even the most precious of all, "human life." The specie spent and the credit engaged for materials: Ships, tanks, planes, guns, powder; for everything that can be obtained, produced or fabricated by the hands of American men and women—all to be expended, to be scattered over the seven seas and over all the continents on which we and our allies are fighting—this is the American way.

We hope, we pray that most of our men will return. Nearly all of the materials will be lost in the war. Should we "view with alarm" or refuse to act courageously, to continue to increase the debt of the Nation, if need be—a debt owed by and to ourselves, and offset by the good accomplished; for this is wealth created for acts of peace; wealth to be conserved and not to be dissipated? Should we

fear to attempt tasks as great as, or even greater than our accomplishments for the war? Why should not the vast plants and other enterprises created to produce expendables be even increased for greater employment, to create usable things, to advance our civilization and to insure the betterment of our way of life?

Why should we hesitate to undertake vast enterprises, such as the creation of superrailroads, superhighways, the establishment of great craft-training schools, the elimination of slums, and provide decent habitations for all of our people? Why, for example, should it be necessary for this great Central West to still have before it the danger of droughts and crop failures, with the consequent destruction of wealth and the people's health by dust storms. Shall this condition continue, when, by sensible engineering and with extensive labor provided for in our postwar planning, this land could be made a paradise, with an assured productiveness and wealth totaling in fixed and productive values, far more than its cost; yes, with the total national debt added on?

I will ignore argument about limitation of working hours for labor during the war period; but I do not view with alarm forced limitation of the hours of employment in time of peace. Wage scales should be as high, or higher, than wartime wage scales—wages to increase as work hours decrease.

The abundance in the land, the technology, the productivity, the need of the rest of the world, and our own need and consumption of our production, would balance and determine the labor hours and the wage scales.

We shall have none of our people raking leaves if we maintain living standards and control the economy by limitation on the hours of employment. If, by the ingenuity of our people, we can produce more with less labor, then the Government must stipulate that labor time gained from employment be paid for in training or in education.

I am reminded of our adage: "Think big but make it simple"; and another, "Only fools say it can't be done."

The same spirit that guided the Creighton brothers will stir the people of America to gain the victory and triumph over the evil forces loose in the world. Hitler and his gang set the stage on which they opened the diabolic pageant of hell—war. The theme of his dream was "Death to freedom and slavery to mankind." We and our allies did not set the stage; we did not write the script; but by the eternal, and with God's help and our own determination and sacrifice, we shall write the last act and raise the curtain for victory with the stage set for "liberty, justice, and equality for all mankind."

I thank you.

Salary Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following analyses and tabulations explaining the statement with reference to salary increases inserted in the RECORD yesterday by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN]:

War production companies

Corporation	Employee	Salary		Tax		Net after taxes	
		1940	1941	1940	1941	1940	1941
Allied Chemical	H. F. Atherton, president	$125,000	$125,000	$69,946	$85,298	$55,054	$39,702
American Tobacco Co.	G. W. Hill, president	456,415	288,144	326,341	219,200	130,074	68,944
Atlas Imp.-Diesel Engine.	F. H. Kilberry president	18,000	24,000	3,864	8,712	14,136	15,288
Atlas Powder	L. Lyon, president	63,604	64,639	28,165	35,994	35,439	28,645
Aviation Corp	V. Emanuel, president	25,000	79,150	6,864	47,700	18,136	31,450
	W. F Wise, vice president	43,910	73,718	16,554	43,150	27,356	30,568
Bethlehem Steel	E. Grace	478,144	537,724	329,990	416,860	148,154	120,864
Blau-Knox Co	W. P. Witherow	44,000	50,000	17,116	25,328	26,884	24,672
Boeing	C. L. Egtvedt, chairman	20,000	20,000	4,614	6,452	15,386	13,548
Chicago Pneumatic Tool.	H. A. Jackson, president	79,020	120,020	39,100	81,050	39,920	38,970
Cooper Bessemer	B. B. Williams, president	23,333	25,000	5,864	9,220	17,469	15,780
Dayton Rubber	A. L. Freedlander, president	22,666	35,333	5,739	16,405	16,927	18,928
Douglas Aircraft	Donald Douglas, president	75,080	101,769	36,064	64,880	39,016	36,889
General Electric	Charles E. Wilson, president	135,000	175,000	76,803	141,522	58,197	33,478
	Philip Reed, chairman of board	90,000	120,000	45,976	81,050	44,024	38,950
International Harvester.	S. G. McAllister, president	99,396	121,710	52,704	81,050	46,692	40,660
Jones & Laughlin	H. E. Lewis, president	135,000	135,000	76,803	94,193	58,197	40,807
Mesta Machine Co	L. Iversen, president	40,240	45,459	14,880	22,047	25,360	23,412
Monsanto Chemical	C. Belknap, executive vice president.	70,477	66,543	32,879	37,060	37,598	29,483
Phillips Petroleum	Frank Phillips, chairman	100,000	73,333	52,704	42,390	47,296	30,943
Union Carbide	J. J. Ricks, chairman of the board	150,700	150,700	87,189	106,536	63,511	44,164
U S Steel	B. Fairless, president	139,610	156,010	80,292	107,060	59,318	48,950
	I. Olds, chairman	61,243	107,320	27,000	64,697	34,243	42,623
Worthington Pump	H. Beaver, president	59,025	60,000	26,509	32,492	32,516	27,508
Westinghouse	A. W. Robertson, chairman	183,134	190,452	110,444	141,521	72,690	48,931
Zenith Radio	E. F. McDonald, president	62,616	71,851	27,910	40,106	34,706	31,745

NOTE.—In every instance I have assumed that the salaries paid during 1940 and 1941 were actually paid during 1941 and 1942. I have consequently figured the tax on these salaries (for the purpose of illustration of the point with respect to the increase of salaries during 1941) on the rates which would have been applicable during 1941 and 1942. In other words, the tax on the salaries listed as 1940 taxes is actually the tax computed under 1941 rates and the tax listed as 1941 tax is the tax on the income received during 1941, computed on 1942 rates.

Mr. Speaker, the following corporations show actual salaries and tax payments for the years 1941 and 1942. This entire table, therefore, in the effect of increases shows the effect of increases for the preceding portion as if those increases were made during 1941 and for the remaining portion as they were actually made and taxed:

Corporation	Employee	Salary		Tax		Net after taxes	
		1941	1942	1941	1942	1941	1942
Continental Motors	Clarence Reese, president	$40,903	$58,026	$15,000	$31,059	$25,903	$26,967
	L. Kalb, operating vice-president	29,384	44,554	9,215	21,390	20,169	23,164
Hays Manufacturing	R. Clark, president	18,129	28,372	3,864	11,020	14,265	17,352
Swift & Co	G. W. Swift, chairman	50,961	60,000	20,500	32,492	30,461	27,508
	J. Holmes, president	76,442	85,000	36,701	59,970	39,741	25,030
Celotex Corporation	B. Dahlberg, president	193,771	71,200	117,491	40,867	76,280	30,333
Beech Aircraft	W. Beech, president	19,355	65,299	4,600	36,299	14,755	29,000
	T. Wells, chief engineer	9,615	41,015	1,214	19,422	8,401	21,593
	J. Gaty, general manager	9,615	41,015	1,214	19,422	8,401	21,593
West Virginia Pulp	T Luke, president	90,525	32,100	45,976	13,516	44,549	18,584
	A. Luke, treasurer	90,525	32,100	45,976	13,516	44,549	18,584
Minneapolis Moline Instrument Co.	W. MacFarlane, president	48,100	48,210	19,329	24,012	28,771	24,198
Bendix Aviation	V. Bendix, E. R. Bendix, presidents.	83,034	92,600	41,267	58,014	41,767	34,586
Cessna Aircraft Co	D. L. Wallace, president	16,619	89,851	3,339	55,890	13,280	33,961
	D. S. Wallace, executive vice president.	16,032	89,851	3,300	55,890	12,732	33,961
Nash	G. W. Mason	225,731	125,482	140,041	85,722	85,690	39,760
Joy Manufacturing Co.	J. D. Morrow, president	48,089	55,577	20,095	29,268	27,994	26,309
Cleveland Tractor	W. K. White, president	26,604	51,166	7,656	26,116	18,948	25,050
G. A. Hornel Co	Jay Hornel, president	53,376	61,733	22,502	35,080	30,874	26,653
Waco Aircraft Co	L. Brutus, vice president	8,470	13,033	969	3,292	7,501	9,741
Seiberling Rubber	F. A. Seiberling, president	36,000	36,000	9,672	16,141	26,328	19,859
Illinois Zinc Co	J. A. Hill, president	21,666	50,283	5,334	25,000	16,332	25,283
Food Machinery Corporation.	P. L. Davies, president	33,797	33,729	11,004	14,172	22,793	19,557
Willys Overland	J. W. Frazer, president	103,092	123,183	54,773	83,598	48,319	39,585
Emerson Electric Manufacturing.	W. S. Symington, president	24,000	24,000	6,414	8,663	17,586	15,337

It is interesting to note that there are 52 different salaries listed on these charts. Of the 52, 36 received less money in the last year's listing while there were 16 increases. Nine of the 16 increases, amounting to a total increase of $52,912, were for salaries which even after increases amounted to less than $25,000 after taxes. There was $81,777 more compensation paid to the 7 employees who received more than $25,000 after taxes in the last year listed.

Of these 16 increases on the list, 2 of these employees received more than $25,000 after taxes for the first year listed so that the Executive order would apply to only 5 of the named increases on the list. In many instances, even these 5 would not be forced to surrender any income because of the fact that the

amounts remaining after taxes are within the range which is permitted to be paid above taxes even under the Executive order to take care of life insurance payments, debt retirement payments, and the similar additions which are now permitted.

Farm Labor Should Be Included in the Parity Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I have unqualifiedly supported H. R. 1408, commonly known as the Pace bill, which amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. This bill is designed to include the cost of all farm labor in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities. It has the unanimous approval of the House Committee on Agriculture, the Mississippi and Federal Farm Bureau Federations, and the farmers of my district.

The inhabitants of my district are predominantly agricultural. They, and the other American farmers, have been called upon to produce the largest food crop in the annals of American history. In their efforts to accomplish this colossal task they are confronted with a shortage of labor, a shortage of implements, a shortage and slow delivery of fertilizers. Though confronted with these seemingly insurmountable obstacles, the farmer is patiently and with determination preparing to do his job. He has accepted the challenge of Hitler and his satellites. He begins his day of labor long before the sun rises and remains at work long after the evening shadows are reflected from the west. He listens not for a whistle to end his day of toil. On the contrary, over sweating brow and thoughts of those sons in North Africa, the South Pacific, Australia, and other battle fronts, he toils laboriously on into the quiet of early evening darkness. Simply because we know that he has accepted the challenge and will do the job we must not overlook the fact that he is entitled to fair play and an even break. He seeks only a reasonable return for his commodities. This he must have.

FAIR MARKET VALUES INCLUDE LABOR COSTS

Mr. Speaker, there is no product of industry which does not charge labor cost into the cost of the manufactured article. Do you think, even for a moment, that my farmer friends could purchase a plow point at the cost of material only? Why, certainly not. Labor was required to manufacture that plow point. The cost of that labor enters into the retail price thereof, and the farmer pays it, which is as it certainly should be. The same is true of a hoe, a rake, a harrow, a singletree, a planter, a cultivator, and every piece of farm machinery necessary to make the crop. It is likewise true of shoes, of overalls, of clothing, of every article purchased today throughout the world, with the exception of products of the farm. Why not include labor costs in determining the fair market value of the products of the farmer? Is that unreasonable? The farmer asks only a fair return. For this he has waited and waited and he must have it now. He should be placed on a par with those who sell to him the implements, clothing, and other necessities.

INFLATION

The only argument against this bill is that it might cause inflation. Why, Mr. Speaker, should these people be so fearful of inflation just at the time the farmer is about to get a break? Have not industrial benefits and wages skyrocketed during the past 12 months while the products of the farmer have been stymied with price ceilings? Industrial labor is today receiving several hundred percent of parity. Why should the farmer not be placed on equal terms? Inflation? Listen to this—a few nights ago I ate an ordinary sized piece of ham in a nearby restaurant. They charged me, believe it or not, $1 for that ham. How much of that dollar would you say the farmer received? Just about 4 cents. With labor costs added into the parity formula he would receive only a fraction of a cent more—insufficient even in the slightest to affect the consumer's price. Those who fear this bill will bring inflation might say that the foregoing is an exaggerated illustration. The fact remains, I assure you, that the figures are positively correct. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, inflation will never come from the final adoption of this bill. Labor cost included in the parity formula would have the following effect upon parity prices of farm products:

Parity prices

	Under present formula	Under Pace bill, H. R. 1408
Wheat, bushel	$1.37	$1.591
Corn, bushel	.995	1.156
Oats, bushel	.618	.718
Rice, bushel	1.26	1.463
Cotton, pound	.1922	.2232
Hay, ton	18.40	21.37
Peanuts, all pounds	.0744	.0864
Peanuts, for oil, pound	.0364	.0423
Apples, bushel	1.49	1.73
Hogs, per hundredweight	11.27	13.09
Beef cattle, per hundredweight	8.40	9.76
Veal calves, per hundredweight	10.46	12.15
Lambs, per hundredweight	9.11	10.58
Butterfat, pound	.447	.518
Milk, wholesale, 100 pounds	2.71	3.15
Chickens, pound	.177	.205
Eggs, dozen	.410	.476
Wool, pound	.284	.329

THE SO-CALLED FARM BLOC

It has been said that this is a farm bloc bill. Personally, I think it is everybody's bill. If the organization of a farm bloc becomes necessary to bring about a fair deal for the farmer, then I am happy to be identified with the members of the so-called farm bloc. The farmer is the friend of every man in this Congress, in this Nation, and in this hungry world. Why should there not be a farm bloc? Do we not have a utility bloc, a silver bloc, a labor bloc, an educational bloc, a pension bloc, even a loafers' bloc? There is a bloc of some description with which each and every person in this country is more or less identified. May I repeat that I am not ashamed but, on the contrary, am proud of my affiliation with the so-called farm bloc.

FARM LABOR COMPELLED TO SEEK PAY ROLLS OF INDUSTRY

Let me remind you who fear inflation that labor for the present year or more has been leaving the farms by the thousands. It has been forced to seek the fat, high-wage pay rolls of industry. The fearer of inflation should look back for a moment. Did he fear inflation when labor insisted upon and secured advancement to its present status of several hundred percent of parity? Does he fear inflation when men like John L. Lewis, labor's bottleneck and America's No. 1 public enemy, demand, under threat of strike, which would paralyze industry, an additional $2 per day for coal miners? Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that Lewis makes his demands at a time when the people of the East are freezing for lack of fuel. He would close down industry upon which the sons of this Nation, who stop bullets at $50 a month, are so dependent for weapons of defense.

Would you put an unfair ceiling over the commodity of the farm simply because the farmer does not, with the threat of a walk-out or a sit-down strike, demand certain prices or else? There may be hunger in this country before this war is over. Let those who snap with the crack of the whip of John L. Lewis remember that. Hunger can be averted. It can be averted by giving the farmer a fair return for his commodities. The inclusion of the cost of farm labor in the parity formula will be a step in that direction. You will then see those who till the soil, who love the farm, return once again, return to grow the food and fiber crops, to feed the hungry mouths of a war-torn world.

Parental Sacrifices to the War Effort

REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, all credit to him who risks his life for his country. When a child leaves home for service in the military or naval services of his country he is a changed person ever after. His parents are from that time forward so completely interested in the war that they are never free from the thought of their son and his activities in the Army or the Navy. Sacrifice which such parents are called upon to undergo brings to them more anguish than any person who has not had that experience can possibly know. I dare

say that every individual parent would be glad if he or she could take the place of their son or daughter.

Some parents are only called upon to give up one child while others give up two and some three and some four and others five and in a few instances some have given up six sons.

I wish to call special attention to some families in the district I have the honor to represent which have laid on their country's altar the destinies and lives of their sons. Three families have had the distinct honor of sending six stalwart sons into the service of our country and several have sent as many as five.

I have adopted a rule that I will give a beautiful service flag to any family that sends five or more boys into the armed service. I have sent a flag with five stars to each of the following families:

To the family of Mr. and Mrs. John Y. Evans, of Gallia, Ohio. The following are the names of their sons in the armed service: Pvt. Leslie L. Evans, Pvt. Floyd Evans, Pvt. Lewis Lowell Evans, Pvt. Lawrence Evans, and Pvt. Orin Evans.

To the family of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest J. Skinner, of Glouster, Ohio. The following are the names of their sons in the armed service: Jesse James Skinner, Daine Wendel Skinner, Dallas Webster Skinner, Willard Alonzo Skinner, and Ellis Gordon Skinner.

To the family of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Banik, of Murray City, Ohio. The following are the names of their sons in the armed services: Chief Motor Machinist Mate Thomas P. Banik, Pvt. Edward J. Banik, Seaman Philip E. Banik, Seaman Albert M. Banik, and Pvt. Justin E. Banik of the Army Air Corps.

To the family of Mr. and Mrs. Newton Irwin, of rural free delivery, Murray City, Ohio. The following are the names of their sons in the armed service: Seaman Alan Homer Irwin, Seaman Thomas Irwin, Seaman Robert Irwin, Corp. Edward Christian Irwin, and Pvt. Raymond Arthur Irwin.

I have sent a flag with six stars to each of the following families:

Mr. and Mrs. Sigmund Kozma, Sr., of Millfield, Ohio. Their sons in the armed services are Sgt. Sigmund Kozma, Jr., Pvt. Julius Kozma, Pvt. Carl Kozma, Pvt. Bert Kozma, Pvt. Calmon Kozma, and Seaman Alex Kozma.

Mr. and Mrs. C. P. McAfee, of Ironton, Ohio. Their sons in the armed services are John N. McAfee, Jack A. McAfee, Wesley T. McAfee, Clelland B. McAfee, George A. McAfee, and Paul McAfee. These parents also have one grandson and a son-in-law in the service. George McAfee made for himself a national reputation at Duke University and with the Chicago Bears as being one of America's greatest all-time football players. He left his place with the Chicago Bears and enlisted in the service last year.

Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Null, of Platform, Ohio. Their sons in the armed services are: Corp. William Null, Sgt. Wilson Null, Corp. Clyde Null, Pvt. Warren Null, Pvt. Donivan Null, and Seaman George Null.

I am moved to make these few remarks because I know that patriotism is not a special incident of any locality or of any group and it is likely that all over the Nation the same story can be told that I have told in these few sentences. It all adds up to the fact that our people are as patriotic as they have ever been and that our young men are as loyal and devoted to the interests of our country as the young men of any generation in the life of our great Nation.

The parents to whom I have given these service flags have appreciated them tremendously. I am making this statement in the further hope that some of the other Members might be moved to follow my custom in this matter and I am sure it will be a source of great satisfaction to them if they decide to do so.

The Ginsburg Case

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 11 I made certain statements on the floor of the House with reference to one Mr. David Ginsburg. That reference has brought about a good deal of conversation, as well as newspaper comment. I have no animosity in my heart against the Jews or any other race. I do, however, entertain strong and positive views with reference to those who are attempting, in my opinion, to dodge serving their country in this its greatest hour of need.

Mr. Speaker, it is not to my liking to enter further into the Ginsburg case. For the small part I played in bringing the matter out in the open I apologize to no man. Had not the searchlight been thrown upon the whole ugly affair, in all probability, Mr. Ginsburg would be in London today wearing the uniform of an American officer. And, Mr. Speaker, had not some, whose American concept of government I question, attempted to cover the whole thing up by charging that the exposure was brought about by the enemies of the New Deal in furtherance of their smear campaign, I would hold my peace today.

I have not been an enemy of the New Deal. I have been a part of it. Ofttimes, I have been the lone Representative from Virginia to support Mr. Rooveselt in his effort to bring the blessings of Government to all the people. And for the small part I have played in humanizing our Government and extending to the humblest in this land every privilege and concession enjoyed by the most exalted, I apologize to no man. My record is an open book. I have not dodged any votes. I have always fought out in the open. Everyone knows where I have stood.

And, Mr. Speaker, I have followed the President in his war effort. I am no isolationist. I have voted for every defense measure, every war measure, from the fortification of Guam to the present, with the single exception that on the 12th of this month I voted against extending the debt-limit bill; and I voted against this bill not because I was against extending debt limit, but because the bill carried the Disney amendment which, in my opinion, was a gratuitous and uncalled for slap at Mr. Roosevelt.

The fact is, instead of joining in an attempt to smear Mr. Roosevelt, I have been doing everything in my power to uphold his hand. Yes; I am behind our Commander in Chief. He is a great war leader and should command the admiration, respect, and love of every loyal American. My attitude toward him is clearly stated in the speech I made accepting my last nomination for Congress. I said:

> And right here may I pause to say that I am one of those who believe that God still moves in the affairs of men, and that to me it was no accident but Divine Providence that directed the shattering of a long-established precedent and brought about the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt for a third term. America—yea, the whole world—needs Mr. Roosevelt's leadership, and, as for me, today in common with countless millions scattered over a confused and fright-stricken world, I thank God daily for supplying that leadership.

I still stand by that statement.

So, Mr. Speaker, the charge that I am part and parcel of the campaign to smear Mr. Roosevelt falls flat.

Now, before I go into the war record of Mr. Ginsburg, let me first make a general statement relative to the O. P. A. and Mr. Ginsburg who, as everyone knows, was one of its chief policy makers.

That I have blasted the wonder boys that have been bogging things down here on the home front, especially the Henderson-Ginsburg O. P. A., I freely admit; and for this I apologize to no man. If I can assist in banishing Henderson and Ginsburg and all others of their type from governmental service, I will not think I have lived in vain. On the contrary I will think I have not only assisted in preserving the American system of government and the American way of life but that I have assisted in preserving unity and solidarity here on the home front. Moreover, I will think I have assisted in promoting our war effort in removing from directive and policy-making positions those totally unfit to hold such positions. I feel deeply on this subject.

While I have been considered a New Deal Democrat, be it ever understood that I am first of all an American. I like our system of government, I am satisfied with it; yes, my colleagues, I am in love with it. And while my boy and your boy and the other American boys are fighting to destroy Hitlerism and preserve our system of government and our way of life, I am not going to sit idly by and see a Henderson, a Ginsburg, or anyone else bog down our war effort, or Hitlerize America, or, under the cloak of the emergency, by edict, order, or decree change in any way our form of government. If there are any changes to be made in our system of government, we will wait until our boys come back and find out what they have to say about it. As for me, I am going to fight to see that

there is no bogging down of our war effort here on the home front, and to see that our boys return to the same America they left, the land of liberty, the dwelling place of freemen, and the home of free labor and free enterprise. I have so purposed in my heart, and nothing is going to deter me from carrying that purpose into action.

The time has come for plain talking. The American people are not so gullible as not to know what was going on in the O. P. A. under Henderson and Ginsburg. It was, and I make the statement advisedly, far from an American institution. Tactics were resorted to that were foreign to every American concept of government. And these tactics, instead of furthering our war effort, hampered it in that they brought about, and rightly brought about, ill will and resentment, when we needed, as never before, unity and solidarity. Thank God the American people can still resist the usurpers. Let me catalog some of these grievances. The American people were treated, more or less, with contempt and contumely. Treat them rough was the order of the day. Complaints were ofttimes viewed with suspicion or treated with indifference. Petitions for redress ofttimes considered but the instruments of a pressure group to obtain leave to profit unjustly from the war. Consultations and meetings that in no way affected our war effort were ofttimes held behind closed doors, after the newspapermen had been removed, and those in attendance admonished that everything that went on was to be treated in the strictest confidence. Meetings were often called, ostensibly for the purpose of considering with those affected the policies under which they would operate, only to find that the policies had already been determined by O. P. A. and the meeting in reality was only a means of informing the affected parties what those policies would be. Spies were sent out to shadow free Americans as if they were alien enemies.

Yes; the O. P. A. had its "gestapo." Inspectors when sent out to investigate infractions of ceiling prices were ofttimes told to treat those against whom complaints had been made as being guilty until their innocence was established. Reports were required of business establishments compelling them to divulge business secrets and information that could serve no useful purpose, but could be used by their competitors to cripple or destroy their businesses. Forms and reports, many useless and senseless—interminable forms and reports—that required the business concerns of America, right when we have a labor shortage, to hire additional untold thousands of men and women, were required, only to be filed away as so much blank paper. Drunk with power, they reached out and practically took charge of, and I am afraid seriously crippled, our food-for-victory program, unnecessarily closed the doors of thousands of small business establishments, and created a resentment never before witnessed during my connection with government. It is useless for me to further recite these abuses, because under the Henderson-Ginsburg regime the withering, leprous hand of O. P. A. entered every city, town, and hamlet in America. Oh, be not deceived, the American people knew what was happening, but, at first, stood stunned, not realizing that such things were possible in free America. Never before in the history of our country, my colleagues, were the people so sorely harassed and oppressed.

When I found out these things, I started out fighting. Why? Because they were un-American, because they were bringing about disunity, and because they were destroying the morale of our people. And for the fight I have made I apologize to no man. Lack of confidence in government will destroy the morale of the governed quicker than anything else. And, too, Mr. Speaker, knowing that Mr. Roosevelt was busy directing the war effort and naturally could not keep an eye on all endeavors here on the home front, I thought that it was my duty to assist, in every way possible, to keep the home front not only clean but a united, fighting American front. And, thank God, the fight has not been in vain. Mr. Roosevelt at last got around to Henderson and got rid of him, and from the Drew Pearson column of the 8th of March, got rid of him for good. I pray that he has, and to this prayer I know that all Americans say amen. I quote from the Pearson column:

> He (the President) cut the ground partly from under his belligerent visitors by saying that he knew appointments under Leon Henderson and the Office of Price Administration had been reprehensible. In fact, he castigated Henderson in such a way as to indicate that Henderson would never come back.

Pretty strong language, coming from the President of the United States, but not too strong.

In this connection, let me commend the President upon the appointment of Mr. Brown. We who served in the House with him know that he is not only a man of outstanding ability, but a man of the highest integrity and honor, and that he firmly believes in the American concept of government and the American way of life. While I realize he has a tough job, probably the toughest job an American in civilian life ever tackled, I know that he will succeed because he will have the American people behind him. Government is based upon confidence and faith, and Mr. Brown is entitled to both our confidence and our faith. The American people are not so soft that they cannot take it on the chin with a smile when they know that what they are taking on the chin is necessary to the successful prosecution of our war effort. The American people are not asking for the easy way, but they are demanding the American way. If the successful prosecution of this war calls for blood, sweat, and tears right here on the home front, we can take it, and take it with a smile in the good old American way, knowing that sooner or later in God's own way, in God's own time, that justice and right and freedom will prevail over oppression and wrong and tyranny, and that in the end victory will be our portion. And I know that Mr. Brown will not ask us to take it on the chin unless it is necessary, and when it becomes necessary I know he will administer the dose in the good old American way.

The great mistake, of course, was made in placing these impractical theorists, these wonder boys de luxe, who know nothing about the practical side of life, many of whose concept of government, as I see it, is far from the American concept, in charge of the economic life of 130,000,000 free-born Americans. Naturally they surrounded themselves with subservient helpers of their own type. Naturally they made a mess, a grand and glorious mess, of the whole thing. And while I know that much damage has been done to our morale, that many unnecessary hardships have been suffered by our people, let us remember that we are at war, and that we have got to pull together, work together, and fight together in order to win. And with this one thought in mind, profiting by the mistakes of the past, let us here and now resolve to get behind Prentiss Brown and put this thing over. Because, as someone has wisely said, the preacher has run off with the deacon's wife is no reason why the church should be destroyed. The church is still fundamentally sound, and it would be foolish to destroy it simply because the preacher and the deacon's wife turned out to be sinners. Under such circumstances, the sensible thing to do is to get rid of the preacher and the deacon's wife and others, if in the church, of their stripe. The same is true of the O. P. A. We need it in order to keep down inflation. And we cannot afford to destroy it simply because the Hendersons and Ginsburgs got in charge. Reason and common sense dictate that the thing to do is to get rid of the Hendersons and Ginsburgs and all others of their stripe and keep the O. P. A.

Now, having made these general remarks for the purpose of showing that my criticisms have been made not for the purpose of smearing but for the purpose of improving conditions on the home front, and for the further purpose of giving you a better insight into the Ginsburg case, let me get back to the charges against Mr. Ginsburg. In presenting the record I am animated by but one motive, and that motive a desire to see equality of treatment meted out to our young men upon whom falls the defense of America. On August 30, 1940, in a radio address on conscription, I said:

> Then, too, those who are against conscription overlook another fundamental democratic principle, the principle of equality. Democracy, it is true, means freedom and liberty, but it also means equality—equality of opportunity and equality of treatment.
>
> My friends, in standing for conscription I am only applying in a common-sense and realistic way the great American principle of equality to present-day conditions. I am only asking that my Government in her effort to protect our freedom and our liberties place all citizens upon the same footing. Treat us all alike. When you call my boy, call the rich man's boy. When you call the laboring man's boy, call the industrialist's boy. When you call the Irish boy, call the Jewish boy. When you call the Presbyterian boy, call the Baptist boy. That's democracy; pure and undefiled democracy. It is the kind of democracy my forefathers died to establish, and it is the kind of democracy I am willing, if

needs be, to follow in their footsteps and pay the same price to maintain and preserve.

Yes, my friends, protecting America is above and beyond race or creed, station or rank. It is a common duty that brings us all down to a common level. And in the discharge of this duty the burdens imposed should be, as far as possible, distributed equally among the citizenry of our country.

When we get away from the American doctrine of equality of treatment, we are treading upon dangerous ground. We are undermining, in the hour of stress, one of the foundation stones upon which the framework of our Republic rests. It is not right, because it is not distributing the burdens of government, as far as possible, equally; it is not right because it is permitting some, while sharing the benefits of government, to shirk its responsibilities and burdens, to expect my boy or your boy to protect the freedom of the boy who, while anxious to enjoy the blessings afforded by this Republic in times of peace, in time of danger wants to hide behind his deluded conception of freedom. The citizen who honestly shares such an opinion needs to get his democracy straightened out. He needs to be taught that those who accept the benefits of government must assume the responsibilities of government.

And then, my friends, we have an element in this country—I grant you it is a small element—but nevertheless it is here, who are simply unwilling to assume their just duties and responsibilities when danger threatens and the security of our Republic is in jeopardy. These among our citizenry should be forced—I use the word advisedly—to assume their equal part of the burdens of government. A democracy that is not flexible enough to use force, when force is needed, will soon perish. We should never hesitate to use force when the security or well-being of our Republic demands force. Ofttimes we have to use force, even in times of peace, to compel men to share their equal portion of the burdens of Government. Why, for instance, sometimes we have to force men to pay their equal and just part of taxes, to observe the laws of sanitation, and to assume other burdensome and distasteful obligations.

In my speech accepting my last nomination for Congress, I told my people frankly that I could make them but one promise. I said:

> The sacrificial hour has arrived. We have all got to make sacrifices, probably sacrifices that today we do not dream of, in order to bring about our heart's desire, an all-out victory, and in my effort to bring about that all-out victory the only thing I promise is to work to the end that the sacrifices, so far as possible, are equitably and fairly distributed.

I still stand by those statements. And in trying to uncover those who are attempting to dodge Army service, I am only trying to carry into effect the principles of government I stand for. While I realize that it is unfortunate that Mr. Ginsburg is a Jew, because I know that the fact that he is a member of the Jewish race, will lend color to the anti-Semitic cry that some are attempting to raise, this fact shall not deter me from presenting the true facts. It was quite by accident that Mr. Ginsburg was singled out. The facts are these: For a considerable length of time there has been a general rumor that Mr. Ginsburg was a draft dodger that has been protected in his high position by Mr. Henderson. It was also rumored around that Mr. Brown would, sooner or later, dispense with the services of Mr. Ginsburg because there was such a wide difference in their philosophies of government.

On Thursday morning, March 11, when I went over to attend the meeting of the House, I purchased a copy of the Washington Daily News on the ground floor and glanced through same as I walked up the steps to the House Chamber. I was not only shocked, I was astounded, when I saw in big headlines on one of the inside pages, "Ginsburg gets colonelcy in London assignment." From a reading of the text of the news item it looked like a fast one was being pulled and that if something was not done, and quickly done, Mr. Ginsburg would receive a high Army assignment. I immediately decided to bring the matter out in the open, and for this I apologize to no man. The record that I shall soon present will, I believe, convince all fair-minded Americans that I was justified in the course I pursued. Before presenting the record I do, however, want to state that the fact that Mr. Ginsburg happened to be a Jew had nothing to do with the exposure. I was not striking at the Jews. I was striking at Ginsburg, David Ginsburg, and no one else. If he had been a member of some other race, be that race the Irish, English, Australian, Russian, French, or one of Parson Jasper's four great races, "The Hottentots, Huguenots, Abyssinians, and Virginians," I would have pursued the same course. And what I said stands good for all of his type, be their names Ginsburgs or Flannagans. And right here I want to say to those who ignorantly charge that my Catholicism motivated me in bringing the matter to the attention of the House, that the Catholics need no defense at my hands, or the hands of anyone else. When it comes to our war effort, they have come clean in this war, like they have in every American war, and the heroic deeds of their sons have written many of the glorious pages of American history. Let me here and now disabuse the minds of these narrow bigots by telling them that they cannot charge this exposure to the Catholics, because I am a Presbyterian.

Mr. Speaker, I now present the selective-service record of one David Ginsburg:

First. Mr. Ginsburg was born in New York on April 20, 1912. His father and mother came to America a short while before his birth, settled in New York, and a short time after his birth moved to Huntington, W. Va., where they became naturalized American citizens on May 19, 1939. He attended the University of West Virginia, and received an A. B. degree from that institution in 1932. Later he attended the Harvard Law School, receiving his LL. B. degree in the year 1935. Upon graduating in law from Harvard he immediately became connected with the Securities and Exchange Commission and later acted as legal clerk to Mr. Justice Douglas, of the United States Supreme Court. During 1940–41 he acted as general counsel to Price Stabilization Division, Advisory Commission in Council of National Defense. Upon the setting up of the Office of Price Administration on April 11, 1941, he became general counsel and remained in this position until Mr. Prentiss Brown succeeded Mr. Leon Henderson as Price Administrator. On November 20, 1940, he married a young lady who held a position in the Personnel Office of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture.

Second. Now, at this point I desire to call attention to the fact that the Selective Service Act was introduced in the summer of 1940 and was signed by the President September 16, 1940. Possibly this date has something to do with this case, possibly it has not. Just keep the date in mind in considering the record.

Third. Under the Selective Service Act the young men of America were required to register on October 20, 1940. Just keep this date in mind also. Mr. Ginsburg on October 20, 1940, registered with local draft board No. 10, Washington, D. C.

Fourth. On July 24, 1941, local draft board No. 10 sent Mr. Ginsburg a selective service questionnaire, which was duly filled out and returned August 4, 1941. In this questionnaire he sets forth his educational attainments, his activities since leaving school, the fact that he is general counsel for O. P. A., and under "dependency" he states that he was married November 20, 1940, but has no children. He also states that his wife gave up her position with the Department of Agriculture in January following their marriage. Now, evidently Mr. Ginsburg was afraid to rely solely upon the claim of dependency, as he was married after the Draft Act, even after he had registered, and some of the boys had been inducted into the service thereunder, because we find on the same day he filed his questionnaire, namely, August 4, 1941, his protector, Mr. Leon Henderson, filed an affidavit before the draft board claiming occupational deferment for Mr. Ginsburg. On August 16, 1941, the local board turned Mr. Ginsburg's claim for deferment on account of his wife's dependency down, but gave favorable consideration to Mr. Henderson's affidavit and gave Mr. Ginsburg occupational deferment for a period of 5 months.

Fifth. The occupational deferment expired January 16, 1942. Now, let us see what happened. On January 15, 1942, Mr. Ginsburg wrote draft board No. 10, calling attention to the fact that his occupational deferment classification would expire on January 16, 1942, and in the letter stated:

> I would like to bring these facts to your attention. My wife is wholly dependent upon me for a livelihood. Neither she nor I has any income other than my salary. * * * I am not yet aware whether Mr. Henderson, as Price Administrator, will ask for my deferment; I assume that he will. Nevertheless, I should prefer as a primary matter this issue of dependence.

Mr. Ginsburg was correct in his assumption that his friend Henderson would come to his rescue, because on the same day the letter was written, namely, January 15, 1942, Mr. Henderson filed another affidavit with the board claiming occupational deferment for Mr.

Ginsburg. In this affidavit Mr. Henderson is a little stronger in his statements relative to Mr. Ginsburg being an irreplaceable man. He says, among other things, in his affidavit:

He (Mr. Ginsburg) cannot successfully be replaced. I request his deferment for the duration. * * * His position in the organization is such that I cannot risk the loss of his services.

Well, what happened this time? Here is what happened: local draft board No. 10, in spite of Mr. Ginsburg's claim for deferment on account of dependency and in spite of Mr. Henderson's strong affidavit for occupational deferment, placed Mr. Ginsburg on January 19, 1942, in class 1, which means that he was available for military service subject, of course, to his physical examination. This makes the second time the local draft board turned down Mr. Ginsburg's deferment on account of dependency.

Sixth. On January 30, 1942, Mr. Ginsburg wrote the draft board:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 21, stating that on January 19 my case was reviewed by the board, that the request for occupational deferment filed by Office of Price Administration was denied, and that I was therefore in class 1 subject to physical examination. Although there is no express mention of the fact in your letter, I assume that my request for deferment based upon my support of a dependent was likewise denied.

In the same letter Mr. Ginsburg attempts to explain his marriage in order to reconcile same with selective-service regulations covering marriages entered into after the registration date of October 19, 1940, and filed a long affidavit relating thereto. On February 3, 1942, the draft board gave Mr. Ginsburg a 60-day deferment.

Seventh. What happened next? Let us see: On February 18, 1942, Capt. John R. Brown, occupational adviser, executive for Selective Service for the District of Columbia, wrote draft board No. 10, as follows:

I am in receipt of a carbon copy of a letter sent the local board by the above-named registrant (Mr. Ginsburg). From the information therein contained, it may be that this is a dependency. I would suggest that the board look into the matter to determine whether the registrant is qualified for class 2 deferment before the matter of occupational deferment is investigated. Colonel Welsh says it probably is a dependency case.

The draft board on March 3, 1942, again turned down the dependency claim but gave Mr. Ginsburg a 6 months' occupational deferment, placing him in class II-A. This makes the third time the local draft board turned down Mr. Ginsburg's deferment on account of dependency.

Eighth. Now, before the 6 months' occupational deferment expired Mr. Ginsburg and his friends really got busy.

Pursuant to a phone request the local draft board on September 2, 1942, sent the Ginsburg file to Mr. William E. Leahy, Director of Selective Service, Washington, D. C.

On September 4, 1942, the ever-faithful affidavit-filing Mr. Henderson filed another affidavit with the local draft board asking for Mr. Ginsburg's deferment. In this affidavit I do not think he left anything unsaid. Said Mr. Henderson, "A serious blow to O. P. A." would be struck if Mr. Ginsburg should be inducted into the service. "He"—Mr. Ginsburg—"is not replaceable." Many more extravagant expressions were used in the affidavit.

On September 16, 1942, Lieutenant Colonel Welsh, member executive staff, District of Columbia headquarters, Selective Service System, wrote draft board No. 10:

The file of the above-named registrant (Mr. Ginsburg) of your board, which was forwarded to this office for review, is returned herewith for appropriate attention.

It will be noted that the registrant was married November 20, 1940, at a time when his selection was not imminent and that he is now maintaining a bona fide home with his wife. Under our present regulations he would apparently be entitled to consideration for III-B classification until such time as the question of dependency with respect to all married men under similar circumstances is being considered.

I take it that this letter was a polite way of telling the draft board to place Mr. Ginsburg in class III-B, which is the dependency and occupational classification. The statement in the letter that "registrant was married on November 20, 1940, at a time when his selection was not imminent" is indeed a strange statement. Why was not his induction imminent? The draft law had been passed, he had been called to register, and stood subject to his country's call. As a matter of fact, the first boys were inducted into the service under the Selective Service Act on November 18, 1940.

This letter, whether a polite request or a command, brought results. On September 18, 1942, the local draft board placed Mr. Ginsburg in class III-B, "man deferred both by reason of dependency and activity." At long last Mr. Ginsburg had won his fight. Or had he?

Things now take a strange turn. Mr. Ginsburg, who, since September 18, 1942, had been enjoying the favorable status of 3-B—man deferred both by reason of dependency and activity—which would give him as near a bombproof status as a man can obtain, as it would exempt him from Army service even when married men without children are called, suddenly, it seems, became alarmed and was moved by a patriotic impulse that sent him to the War Department to talk matters over. Just when he went to the War Department first is not clear, but it was a short time before either March 6 or March 8. As there seems to be some confusion as to just what went on between the War Department and Mr. Ginsburg, I will present both sides. The evidence I present is found in the report of the proceedings of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs to Investigate Draft Deferments of the afternoon of March 11, 1943 which is the afternoon of the day I brought the matter out into the open by my remarks on the floor of the House.

The War Department's report of just what took place as detailed before the committee by Colonel Browning is to the effect that sometime prior to March 6 or 8, 1943, Mr. Ginsburg came to see him with reference to getting into the service, and—

talked about it in general. He said he didn't know what he was going to do, with this changed administration, as to whether he would want to stay on, or whether they would want him to stay on, that he would like to go into the service. I told him one way to do was to be inducted, spend 3 months in the ground course, then put in an application for officers' candidate school, and if his application was accepted he could go to the officers' candidate school, and on completion of that course, if he was successful, he would be commissioned as a second lieutenant.

I take it that this was the only advice Colonel Browning could give Mr. Ginsburg in view of the fact that an Army order had been issued prohibiting the commissioning of civilians under the age of 35, except in certain highly technical branches, in none of which branches, of course, Mr. Ginsburg would fall.

Evidently this was not the information that Mr. Ginsburg desired. At any rate if he expressed any desire to get in the Army in the regular way the record is silent.

According to Colonel Browning's testimony Mr. Ginsburg did not come back to the War Department until the request came from London for two majors and a captain to serve in the noncombat service of the Army, namely, in the Purchasing Agent's Office in London. Said Colonel Browning:

Then, when he came over the other day, I had just received a cable from London asking us to send over to them three officers—two majors and a captain.

The date of this visit is fixed by Colonel Browning as being either Saturday, March 6, or Monday, March 8.

Congressman AREND, a member of the investigation committee, evidently thought it a little strange that Mr. Ginsburg happened to turn up just at the time the request came from London, because he asked—

Mr. AREND. It just seems a sort of coincidence that the thing happened on Saturday, and on Monday Mr. Ginsburg made application for it.

Colonel BROWNING. There is no connection between the two at all.

Well, Colonel Browning said that there is no connection between the call from London and Mr. Ginsburg's trip to the War Department on the same day or the next day, and we will just take his word for it, knowing that coincidents, while strange things, sometimes do happen.

Well, anyway, in spite of the fact that such assignments are made by the War Department from lists of officers in the Military Personnel Office, and the two majors had been located from such lists, and there were seven or eight on the lists who were being considered for the assignment calling for a captain, and in spite of the fact that the Army order prohibited the granting of commissions to civilians under 35 years of age, Colonel

Browning testified that he told Ginsburg that we "would consider him for that"—meaning the assignment as captain—"and sent a cable to London to ask if they wanted to consider David Ginsburg for that job."

Colonel Browning, further in his testimony, stated that he told Mr. Ginsburg the difficult road that he would have to travel in securing the assignment. Said Colonel Browning:

So I told him we would consider it. That means, first he has got to pass a physical. If he doesn't pass the physical that is out.

Second, he has got to get through the Office of Procurement Service; they might not clear him through there.

Third, they have got to want him in London. We have got to put an order through our office for appointment. Finally, it has to go up through the Secretary of War's board, and our experience in getting men through under 35 is zero. We haven't been able to get anybody through.

In view of this statement, it does look a little strange that Mr. Ginsburg was advised that he would be considered. Colonel Browning explained, however, that while the order prohibiting the commissioning of civilians under 35 years of age applied to domestic and foreign service alike, he thought, perhaps, as the assignment was for foreign service that the board might take a different attitude. As to why Colonel Browning entertained such a thought, in view of the order which makes no distinction between foreign and domestic service, I do not know.

Mr. Ginsburg, to say the least, must be a man of parts. As general counsel for O. P. A. he impressed Mr. Henderson so deeply with his legal learning that he swore that he was indispensable. Then, it seems, he made such a deep impression upon Colonel Browning that he evidently thought Army orders, and a little of everything else, would be set aside in order to secure his services in the purchasing office in London. Probably Mr. Ginsburg possesses some strange hypnotic power. However, in fairness to Colonel Browning, let me say that Mr. Ginsburg did not quite put the matter over, because Colonel Browning made the positive statement that he had not been recommended for a commission. Said Colonel Browning:

But I might say, in addition, he has not been recommended for a commission.

Now, if Mr. Ginsburg thinks that he is a man of many parts and possesses hypnotic powers and wants to put his magical powers to the real test, I suggest that he go back to his own congressional district and run for Congress, and find out if he can hypnotize the war mothers and fathers into voting for him.

The above view of the matter, as detailed by Colonel Browning, does not exactly jibe with the impression Mr. Ginsburg got from his contacts with the War Department. As to whether Mr. Ginsburg contacted Army officials, other than Colonel Browning, I know not. I do know that Mr. Ginsburg represented to Mr. Prentiss Brown and local draft board No. 10, that he had been offered a commission in the Army, and that the only things that stood in his way were releases from Mr. Brown and the draft board. Naturally the Army wanted a release in writing from the O. P. A. that the services of this indispensable man, whom Price Administrator Henderson had thrice sworn to be indispensable, could now be dispensed with without crippling our war effort.

On March 8, 1943, Mr. Brown wrote to Mr. Ginsburg, as follows:

MARCH 8, 1943.

DEAR DAVE: You have asked me for a release to the armed forces for service overseas. From our conversation I understand that you are extremely anxious to accept the opportunity which has been offered you. I hereby grant a release for the purpose only.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS BROWN,
Administrator.

On March 8, 1943, Mr. Ginsburg wrote local draft board No. 10, as follows:

SELECTIVE SERVICE LOCAL BOARD NO. 10,
1622 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: An opportunity has arisen which will enable me to be of immediate service to the Army as a commissioned officer in overseas duty. A condition precedent, however, is a release by my employer and my draft board. I am enclosing for your information a copy of a release which Mr. Brown has given to me today.

I hesitate to press the matter, but time appears to be short. If releases can be obtained, I shall be sent abroad by plane within a matter of a very few days. In this connection, the War Department also requires that certain forms be executed. I have been asked to report this Wednesday at 10 a. m. If I may, I shall call the board office late Tuesday afternoon. I should be deeply grateful if I could obtain at that time a written release, as well as the executed forms which are herewith enclosed.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID GINSBURG,
General Counsel.

In the questionnaire submitted by Mr. Ginsburg March 6, 1942, in which he stated "I participate in the formulation of over-all policy" of O. P. A., this question was asked:

Question. Duties of job for which you are best fitted.

Answer. Legal adviser or interpretation of statutes, contracts, particular Office of Price Administration programs, administrative and judicial procedures, negotiation, organization, and presentation of economic data.

In the questionnaire the next question was:

Question. Title or job for which you are next best fitted.

Answer. None.

In view of this statement it does seem strange that overnight, so to speak, Mr. Ginsburg became qualified for a captaincy in the United States Army to be assigned to the purchasing agent's office in London.

The reaction of the subcommittee to the evidence presented at the hearing, I think, may be fairly summed up by a question asked Colonel Browning by Congressman ELSTON of Ohio and a statement made by Chairman COSTELLO, both of which I quote.

Congressman ELSTON'S reaction:

Mr. ELSTON. You don't know what it was that moved him (Ginsburg) to this sudden spirit of patriotism?

Colonel BROWNING. I haven't the slightest idea. We have had a slight change of administration over there (O. P. A.) and I think he probably got upset.

The pity is he did not get an upset sooner that would have aroused his patriotism. However, there is consolation in the thought that it is better late than never.

Congressman COSTELLO'S reaction:

Mr. COSTELLO. Here we have these three vacancies occurring rather unexpectedly. Wouldn't it be possible to find men in the Army with military background, to fill them, rather than even considering civilians to fill such vacancies?

Colonel BROWNING. As soon as we get a cable like that we go to military personnel and ask them to give us a list of available men.

Then we take our own organization and go down through the list and see if we have men who would be able to fill these jobs, and could we spare them.

As I say, the two majors we were able to locate in that way, and we are going through the list now for the captain.

Mr. COSTELLO. Frankly, just looking at this particular case offhand, the public is naturally going to feel that here is an attorney who has done nothing but practice law, purely as an employee of the Government, since the time he graduated from law school. Along comes some legislation creating the Selective Service program. Because of his legal background and because of his employment with the Government he is put in a special category. He is deferred from having to serve under the draft, and proceeds to enjoy that immunity from military service over a period of a year or more, during which the country is at war, and then suddenly, for no particular reason at all, a vacancy suddenly appears over in London, and this essential individual, who cou'dn't be considered for draft purposes, is denied any opportunity to go into the Army if he desired to go because his superior officer said that he could not be replaced, that the Office of Price Administration could not operate without him, suddenly, out of a clear sky—and this only came to our attention in the last 2 or 3 days—suddenly we learn that he is being considered for a commission in the Army, and the local draft board is being asked to remove any obstacles that they may have so that this essential man can be put into service and sent overseas.

I don't know what the public generally may think about it. I think it is very embarrassing to the draft board itself to be put in the position of deferring this man, considering him essential, and when he gets an opportunity to receive a commission and not be drafted as a soldier the board then would change his classification and let him get the commission. I don't think the reflection in such a case would be back on the War Department but on the draft board, and the draft board comes in contact with the civilian population—other people who are subject to the draft—and if we are going to allow the Federal Government to permit any of its employees to enjoy an essential position, so-called, and thereby get deferment until such time as they can secure some other position, regardless of the hazards of it, but a position that gives certain emoluments in rank and possibly better pay, I think we are doing a grave injustice in refusing the selective service.

Frankly, I don't think that anyone in civilian life would have been in that category unless he has peculiar background, and I think it is evident that this man does not have any specific background that would qualify him for this particular job, that it does not require legal background but that that is merely an incidental.

My own reaction: It stinks.

Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1943, there was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—see page 1949—one of the most remarkable letters I ever read. The letter is dated January 19, 1943, and was written by Mr. David Ginsburg, general counsel of O. P. A., to Mr. Prentiss Brown, new O. P. A. Administrator. I am going to read this letter in full, because I want to make a few observations on it.

PRENTISS BROWN, Esq.,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRENTISS: This is my resignation, to be accepted at your convenience.

From what has gone before, I realize that your first inclination will probably be to hand the letter back to me with instructions to forget the matter and go back to work. But before your decision is made I want you to read carefully what I have to say, and to think about it.

Your job is tougher even than you believe. Time will reveal this. When we spoke by telephone I tried to give you some intimation of what lay ahead, but words alone don't cut deep enough. Directly or indirectly, sooner or later, every organized special interest and pressure group in the country will bring its power to bear on you—first by what will appear to be appeals to reason, then by threats, and if need be by force. Every decision which affects them adversely will come to be challenged before you or the Congress or the public as a threat to the war effort or the public interest perpetrated by a college professor or an inexperienced young lawyer. The adjectives and the epithets may change as the character of the staff changes, but so long as the ruling remains adverse the challenge will also remain. They will try to divide you from your staff, and then try to undermine you and your staff separately. As a symbol of Office of Price Administration, and in order to preserve the loyalty and support of your people, it will be your obligation to defend them as you defend yourself. It will be harder because you will have inherited the organization.

You must therefore decide now or soon what and whom you will defend. Office of Price Administration, I recognize, may have some defects in organization and personnel—defects in the sense that a better job perhaps could be done in another way or by another person. For this reason you are not called upon privately to underwrite everything and everyone in Office of Price Administration, whatever public position you may take. But Office of Price Administration is also vulnerable, if not defective, in another quarter. My own position illustrates this second kind of problem, and that's what I want to bring to your attention.

I combine in myself almost every handicap that can be brought to an important public office in a war agency in January 1943. I am a New Deal Democrat; I am a Jew; and I am young—31 in April. As a result of my youth, incidentally, I shall almost certainly be attacked as a draft dodger. This would hurt me fearfully, and hurt many others who are unknown to me. Only the President can forestall this, but it is doubtful whether he would choose to do so.

Shifts in policy may be expedient, yet I feel so deeply that success in our work depends on our hanging on, that instinctively I should tend to oppose or qualify such shifts or compromises.

Lastly, I am physically tired and a little dispirited. I'm almost ashamed to say this, because we are at war, but it is important that you should see the picture whole. I've been on the job more than 2½ years, and most of my weeks have had 7 long working days in them. I don't begrudge that. Indeed, I'm proud of my share of what we've accomplished. But there's a limit to what people can take and still do their job efficiently. Maybe the work needs fresh minds and the public new faces.

These are all reasons, moreover, why the prospect of a place in the Army is appealing. I do recognize, of course, the dangers to the Office of Price Administration of a shift now in the top staff, but all of us, I know, would do our very best to minimize those dangers. What I want to get across, however, is that my case presents you with special considerations which you must consider separately from others, and that I am offering you my resignation without reservation of qualification of any kind.

Yours sincerely,

DAVID GINSBURG,
General Counsel.

If I were attempting to defend Mr. Ginsburg I would never have exhibited the letter to public gaze, because it is the most conclusive evidence that could be presented that he is wholly unfit for either Government service or official service in the Army here in free America. It is also conclusive proof that my charges against the Henderson-Ginsburg O. P. A. are true.

Let us first take a look at the letter from the standpoint of governmental service.

Of course the letter was written after Mr. Ginsburg began to realize that he no longer would be considered among the policy makers of the O. P. A.

It starts out by gently hinting (by innuendo at least) that the writer is indispensable and, for this reason, of course, Mr. Brown will become so alarmed over the loss of this indispensable man that in desperation he will "hand the letter back—with instructions to forget the matter and go back to work." And then as if to impress Mr. Brown with the hopelessness of the task that he has assumed, unless he retains the wonder boys, he paints the rottenest, the most despicable picture of the American people I ever read. Hitler's propaganda machine never painted the American people as being quite so rotten. Why, he tells Mr. Brown in no uncertain language that in dealing with the American people he is dealing with a bunch of greedy, ravenous thugs that place self-interest above their love of country. Continuing, the letter admonishes Mr. Brown, that these thugs will not only—

try to divide you from your staff, and then try to undermine you and your staff separately—

but if you do not bow to their bidding they will, if necessary, resort to force. Think of it, my colleagues—resort to force. Listen carefully to the language of the letter describing to Mr. Brown the method of procedure these thugs will use in bringing him to terms:

First by what will appear to be appeals to reason, then by threats, and, if need be, by force.

Yes, Mr. Brown, watch your step, or you will be taken for a ride by these American highjackers. Continuing, the letter holds out a ray of hope if Mr. Brown will only stick to them and become their symbol, like, I suppose, Hitler is the symbol of Nazi Germany. Yes, Mr. Brown, if you will only stick to us—the wonder boys—we will remain loyal, and, united, we will give these American thugs unshirted hell.

Listen to this quotation from the letter:

As a symbol of Office of Price Administration, and in order to preserve the loyalty and support of your people (the wonder boys), it will be your obligation to defend them as you defend yourself.

And, continuing in a choose-ye-this-day attitude, Mr. Brown is admonished:

You must therefore decide now or soon what and whom you will defend.

For brazen effrontery, for contempt for and distrust of the American people, the letter, in my opinion, has no counterpart in the long and glorious history of this Republic.

And so, my colleagues, I say unto you that the man who penned that letter is wholly unfit for official service in the Government.

Now, my colleagues, let me bring to your attention why the letter shows that Mr. Ginsburg is wholly unfit for official service in the Army.

Love of country is supposed to be the controlling motive in time of war why Army service is appealing. Now, read the letter from beginning to end and, while bitterness and resentment and hate ooze out of practically every line, you will be unable to find even an intimation of love of country.

"These are the reasons," states Mr. Ginsburg, why he is unsuited for governmental service and "why the prospect of a place in the Army is appealing." Let me enumerate them:

First. "I am a New Deal Democrat."
Second. "I am a Jew."
Third. "I am young—31 in April."
Fourth. "Lastly, I am physically tired and a little dispirited."

In my opinion, these reasons are not the true reasons why he submitted the letter of resignation. The true reasons were that he realized that under Mr. Brown he would no longer be one of the policy makers of O. P. A. And, then, too, he realized that he had lost the protecting care of Mr. Leon Henderson.

Now, a few words relative to the reasons assigned:

First. "I am a New Deal Democrat."

As a New Deal Democrat myself I resent reason No. 1. Being a New Deal Democrat I hope does not keep me from being a patriotic, loyal American worthy of serving my Government in her greatest hour of need. If it did, then I would quit the New Deal overnight. I do agree, however, that war service should appeal to a New Deal Democrat. And this being true, I wonder why it took the appeal so long to register with Mr. Ginsburg. Oh, be not disturbed my fellow New Deal Democrats, because this man Ginsburg is not a New Deal Democrat, but one of these wonder boys who labor under the hallucination that they have been commissioned by Divine Providence to remake America.

Second. "I am a Jew."

I did not know that race, color, or creed was a bar to governmental service.

If being a Jew, however, is a bar, then we have made a thundering of a mistake because governmental Washington is full of them today. Certainly no one can accuse this administration of discriminating against the Jews. I agree, however, that Army service should appeal to the Jews, because the successful prosecution of this war means, perhaps, more to the Jews than any other race. Surely the way they have been so outrageously treated by Hitler should fire them to such a patriotic zeal that they would run over one another enlisting in the Army that is out to crush Hitler and all that he stands for. Why, may I ask, did it take so long for the appeal to reach Mr. Ginsburg?

Third. "I am young—31 in April."

Well, I frankly admit, except in extraordinary cases—and I do not know of any such cases—that youth should be a bar to a swivel-chair assignment in a governmental agency during these days of stress, especially when we are being sorely pressed for war manpower. I admit, however, that youth is a mighty good reason why an American should be in the armed service. The real reason, though, it seems from the letter, why his age is now disturbing him is the fear that he will "be attacked as a draft dodger" if he remains longer in civilian life. Well, it has been rumored around for over a year that he was a draft dodger, and it seems a little strange that these rumors did not disturb him until the advent of Mr. Brown. Was this sudden fear engendered because he was no longer under the protecting care of Leon Henderson? Then, Mr. Ginsburg makes this remarkable statement:

Only the President can forestall this—

This draft-dodging business—

but I doubt whether he would choose to do so.

My heavens, Mr. Ginsburg, do you think Mr. Roosevelt, who has spared not his own sons, would step in and shield you from Army service? My colleagues, to me it is apparent that Mr. Ginsburg at long last decided to enter the Army service, not through love of country, but because he had lost the protecting care of Mr. Henderson, and he did not think the President of the United States would "choose" to throw his great office across his path of duty. Oh, it may be said that Mr. Brown would have asked for a deferment. Well, let me state that Mr. Ginsburg is a man of high intelligence, and he knew that there was nothing in common between his and Mr. Brown's philosophies of government, and that sooner or later Mr. Brown would force his resignation. This knowledge, my colleagues, in my opinion, accounts for his sudden patriotic impulse to obtain a commission in the noncombat service of the Army.

Fourth. "Lastly, I am physically tired and a little dispirited."

The last reason assigned is, "I am physically tired and a little dispirited." Well, I understand that Mr. Ginsburg is a hard worker, and no doubt, at times, like the rest of us, gets a little tired. This war is no pink tea. It is hard on all of us. But, Mr. Ginsburg, let me remind you that what we have to go through here on the home front is but child's play compared with what the boys on the battle front have to go through, and it comes with poor grace for a man on the home front to complain because his task today is an arduous one. As to being dispirited: Well, I presume that Mr. Ginsburg did feel like the bottom had dropped out of the world when he lost his protector, Mr. Henderson.

I submit that this letter alone clearly shows that Mr. Ginsburg is wholly unfit for official service in the Army.

After the war mothers and fathers have read the record, I believe they will join in with me in the hope that neither Ginsburg nor anyone of his type will be placed in charge of their boys.

In closing, let me again reiterate that the fact that Mr. Ginsburg is a Jew had nothing to do with my protest on the House floor. Had not Mr. Ginsburg attempted to pull what I considered a fast one, I would never have mentioned his name. I thought quick action was necessary to stop what, in my opinion, was an outrage. I have been trying for some time to clean out the young men who found shelter from the war in the departments here in Washington. The Costello committee, recently appointed for this very purpose, I have every reason to believe, will do this very thing. And I think their report, when made, will open the eyes of some.

Treat all of our boys alike is all that I ask. No patriot will ask more; no patriot will stand for less.

Gestapo Practices of the Department of Justice

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the Department of Justice, as now constituted, is destined to degenerate into a Gestapo for the persecution of the white people throughout the South and for the persecution of white gentiles throughout the country generally and for the stirring up of race hatred and promoting race strife, I must say it is well on its way.

A short time ago the Department of Justice went down into Mississippi and dragged some white people a hundred miles from their homes and indicted them in the Federal court for the violation of a State law. That is an insult that has not been offered to a sovereign State of this Union since the darkest days of reconstruction, of which all right-thinking Americans are now ashamed.

In commenting on this proposition, one of the leading newspapers in Mississippi had this to say a few days ago:

Twisted and distorted meanings read into existing statutes, no matter how cleverly it is done, is an offense no less reprehensible than mob violence.

If they are going to continue that kind of Gestapo practices against a free people, free speech, and a free press, I submit it is time for the American Congress to wake up and take matters into its hands and hedge them about with limitations that will prevent them from perpetrating such outrages.

Food Supplies for Alaska

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I placed in the RECORD some comment upon an article which appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer alleging mishandling and waste of the emergency food reserve in Alaska. The Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] subsequently placed in the RECORD some information on this subject received from the Secretary of the Interior. I advised the House at that time that I was seeking to get additional accurate information in order to answer this devastating article that was republished in newspapers throughout the country that did more, in my opinion, to break down morale than anything that has occurred in some considerable time.

I now have a letter from the Secretary of the Interior in which he gives me the information I requested and which breaks down the amount of material that was shipped to Nome, as to pounds per person. It indicates very clearly that the total of the food supplies that were shipped to Nome were intended to cover a large territory and not merely the residents of Nome. It further indicates that these reserve supplies that were provided, and I believe very providently provided, were just the bare provisions that would be necessary to protect our population in Alaska in the event the ordinary supply routes were cut off by enemy action.

I challenge your attention to this statement, because in a spirit of fair dealing I believe the Secretary of the Interior has given to the American people the facts. When it is understood that this food was received at Nome on the last cargo vessel arriving at that port before it froze up, and that the temperatures at that time ranged from zero to 32° below zero, I think they did a pretty good job in getting this food under cover and getting it in a protected place, where it will serve useful purposes for the citizens of Nome and the citizens of Alaska. I am pleased to include the letter from the Secretary, which clearly recites the facts, as part of these remarks.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, March 19, 1943.

Hon. FRANK B. KEEFE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. KEEFE: I have read your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 12 in regard to the article which appeared

recently in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer alleging mishandling and waste of the emergency food reserve in Alaska. I appreciate your desire to learn the facts, and to correct the misstatements contained in the article. In response to this and to your telephone inquiry, I wish to supplement the information already given to Delegate DIMOND, which he has inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Emergency food supply depots were established in Alaska solely for the purpose of preventing hardship and starvation should the normal means of transportation or supply be cut off by enemy action or by disaster of any kind. They are not intended to follow the ordinary channels of trade, but to be held strictly for emergency reserves.

Not only was the quantity of all of the commodities listed except evaporated milk grossly exaggerated, but no canned pears, salad oil, vinegar, or salmon were landed at all. Contrary to the article, all of the food is in proper storage at Nome, some warm, some only dry as the commodity demanded. No salmon was shipped to the lower Yukon River points. Foods in depots established at other points were also stored under proper conditions.

In considering the quantity of food stored at Nome it should be borne in mind that the districts for which this food was intended as an emergency supply are cut off from normal means of transportation because of natural weather conditions for approximately 9 months of each year. It is evident that should the normal means of transportation have been cut off by enemy action or any other disaster during the short open season it might have become necessary for this emergency supply to have provided for a period of 18 months rather than 9 months.

It should also be borne in mind that at the time the purchases of the supplies in question were made the only food rationed in the United States was sugar, and that did not apply to the Territory of Alaska.

The items under discussion in the newspaper reports were only a few of the foods that were shipped to and unloaded at Nome. These supplies were intended not for the population of the city of Nome alone, but for the inhabitants of 7 districts of western and northern Alaska having a total population of 11,337, according to the census of 1939.

The following is a list of the food stored at Nome for the seven districts, broken down to show the amount of food per person per week, based on 40 weeks or approximately 9 months closed season:

Commodity:	*Pounds per person per week*
Sirup	0.1665
Rice	.2727
Hard white flour	2.0065
Graham flour	.6687
Sugar	.6137
Butter	.7165
Soap	.1625
Canned sausage	.1587
Lima beans	.1450
Canned tongue	.1362
Canned chicken	.0135
Lard	.1042
Salt	.0682
Peanut butter	.0520
Coffee	.2762
Baking soda	.0060
Dried eggs, whole	.1102
Rolled oats	.2727
Cheese	.1100
Macaroni	.1685
Canned milk	1.8557
Toilet tissue	.0587

This is a total of less than 8 pounds per week per person, certainly not an excessive ration in a climate like Alaska.

This food was received at Nome on the last cargo vessel arriving at that port before it froze. The temperature ranged during the time of unloading from 0° to 32°. At the time the vessel arrived it was said that there was no storage space available. Notwithstanding that, all of the food was placed under proper storage in well-roofed buildings with a minimum of delay, dry storage where commodities did not require heat and warm storage for commodities requiring that protection. We have no reports of any substantial loss or wastage.

Both the Washington and Chicago officials mentioned were thoroughly familiar with conditions in Alaska, and the depots were established under the personal supervision of competent men. The food reserve is not a joke to those who face long, isolated winters in remote and threatened places.

It is unfortunate that responsible news services are willing to lend themselves to the distribution of misinformation without making any attempt to check the facts at informed and responsible sources.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Amendment of Securities and Exchange Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FADJO CRAVENS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 30, adopted by the Arkansas Legislature at its recent session, in support of H. R. 1502, introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN]. From this resolution you will note the very definite attitude of the legislature toward the necessity of definitely establishing the fact that the Federal Securities and Exchange Commission has no regulatory power whatsoever with respect to the issuance of bonds or other securities by the respective States, their instrumentalities, or political subdivisions. This is the purpose and objective of the bill sponsored by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

The resolution referred to is as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 30

Whereas Congressman LYLE H. BOREN, of Oklahoma, has introduced a bill in the Congress of the United States (H. R. 1502) amending the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934; and

Whereas the purpose of said bill is to remove the ambiguity in that act touching the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission to regulate securities issued by States or political subdivision or instrumentalities of States; and

Whereas public financing by States or subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof should not be restricted by bureaus of the Federal Government but are matters of purely local concern: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact the bill aforesaid (H. R. 1502) at an early date to the end that public financing by States and subdivisions thereof may be freed from the hampering influences of the ambiguity of the present law; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Arkansas is hereby directed to immediately send a duly certified copy of this resolution to each of the Representatives and the United States Senators in Congress.

The Hunger for Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the desperate efforts on the part of people now to obtain a little butter we find here in Washington that practically none can be obtained. We who represent farm districts where the milk is produced are cheered by the admissions by even some of those who in years past have been fighting the battle of the substitute monopolies that butter is most valuable. We are glad that demands are coming to us from all over the world for good butter. We are also glad that high officials admit that butter is an essential part of the diet of the fighting man. Only when it is so difficult to obtain butter do we hear statements from all corners of the great benefits and the health contributions of this valuable food. There is no difficulty in these hours of our butter shortage to convince people that butter is better than a substitute.

Only a year ago a high official told of how it was possible to inject by electrical processes into substitutes some sort of vitamin which would perhaps make that substitute look and taste and perhaps make it equal to butter. We then witnessed the commercialization by the substitute monopolies of that official statement. Only on yesterday we had before us legislation which would nullify a law which made it mandatory that butter, instead of substitutes, be served to the patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital. Hundreds of veterans of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are undergoing hospitalization in this great institution. It had been the intent of Congress that these veterans of our Army and Navy be given the best possible food, including good butter instead of substitutes. We were told that the officials of that hospital were no longer able to obtain butter and wanted permission to serve these veterans a substitute. That request was made possible by the passage of this bill. But those of us knowing the value of good butter amended that bill so that the change from butter to substitutes should be made only for the duration of this emergency. That is because we feel that our own soldiers and sailors are entitled to something better than substitutes when the real product is obtainable.

In a recent statement the top-flight official of lend-lease told of the value of butter to the fighting men of Russia. He stated in that announcement that at this time the Russian soldiers were not getting enough butter. That they were perhaps getting only enough of our butter for use once or twice a week. I had the impression that he hoped to get enough butter to them so that the Russian soldiers would have butter for every day of the week. I had the feeling from what he said that butter was of the greatest value to these men who are fighting the Axis.

I have been told that we have now shipped about 17,000,000 pounds of our butter to Russia. Also, I am told that we have allocated through lease-lend about 127,000,000 pounds of our butter to be shipped to Russia when possible. I have investigated carefully the various statements regarding demands for our butter and I believe I am safe in saying that every country in the world would like to have all of the butter we can send them. Especially are the armed forces of all of our allies anxious to get our butter. They all want good American butter and good American dairy products of all kinds. It is refreshing to hear so much said about the value of good American butter. So it was with reluctance that I did not object to the bill allowing only temporarily the replacement of butter by substitutes to be fed to our own veterans in our veterans hospitals. I feel that our own soldiers are entitled to the same treatment that we are according to soldiers of foreign governments. I also believe that our own civilians are entitled to the benefits that we are giving to civilians in foreign lands. We must not bring the standard of living here in America to the low standards of people in some of the foreign countries.

Butter has always been somewhat of a luxury to some of our own needy people. There are many people of humble means in our own country who have not been able to afford butter. I personally know that there are thousands of Russian soldiers who in their lifetime have not had the means to eat butter. Many foreigners know little about butter. They just could not afford it. So I am glad to learn now that in spite of the millions of dollars the substitute monopolies have expended to educate the people to eat substitutes instead of butter that men in high places admit that there really is no real substitute for good American butter. These monopolies must not be allowed to commercialize on this war to the extent that butter will take a secondary place.

We must be ever on guard that these forces do not get the opportunity to label their substitute products in such a way as to mislead the public that they are being given butter instead of substitutes. Especially now that our own Nation and the whole world is crying for good butter we must be on our guard that when the crisis is over the farmer who milks the cow and provides the dairy products for our consumption is not relegated to the low standard of living of the native of oriental and other foreign countries from which come much of the oils which make up the substitutes for American butter.

I warn Members of the House also to guard against the passage of legislation and the putting into force bureaucratic rulings which in any way would classify butter or standardize our good butter with the standards of substitutes.

Even here in Washington the hue and cry for more butter goes on daily. We should be glad to do without this great food temporarily if, as we are told, it is so essential for the fighting men of our own Army and Navy and for the fighting men of our allies. We from farm districts feel sure that with proper assistance and encouragement our farmers will produce the products they are asked to produce. The farmers in my district are not counting time or minimum wages. All they want is the blessing of the Almighty for moisture and good growing weather; a little machinery, parts, and repairs; a little additional labor and less interference. They are among the most patriotic of all Americans. They will do the job.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks I include an editorial appearing in last night's Washington Evening Star on the subject of butter and its great value as food:

Persons who ordinarily would not pause to give it a second thought now suddenly find that, like his majesty the king in A. A. Milne's delightful poem, they appreciate a little butter on their bread. One of the psychological results of rationing is that of creating a new interest in common foodstuffs, and what technically is described as "a solid emulsion containing fat, water, curd, milk, sugar, and inorganic salts" is no exception to the rule.

Who first invented the application of the rich and nourishing golden yellow mixture to slices of the wheaten loaf may never be known, but the human race is indebted to him for a most notably delectable combination. He was a dietary genius of the rarest order. How long ago he flourished has been suggested by the words of Leigh Hunt, who, in 1840, declared: "Bread, milk, and butter are of venerable antiquity. They taste of the morning of the world." Long, long before the dawn of formal history, the peoples of the mystic East were familiar with the art of beating cream until it coagulated. A Sanskrit proverb says, "Butter is life," and one of the 10 references to it in the Bible indicates that it was held in the highest honor by the Hebrews—Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite, in the song of Deborah and Barak, Judges, verse 25, carries butter to Sisera "in a lordly dish," and he pays for it with his head.

Some scholars believe that the cost of the nutritious spread in classic times was so great that only very wealthy families could afford it. Frank Frost Abbott in his study of The Common People of Ancient Rome explains: "The ancient and modern prices of butter and eggs stand at the ratio of 1 to 3 and 1 to 6 respectively." But all such communities as participated in the gradual expansion of agriculture and dairying must have had fairly easy access to both eggs and butter under the empire, later in the so-called Dark Ages and during the period of the development of industrial crafts in medieval Europe. Shakespeare mentions butter directly on 13 different occasions, and it should be remembered in that connection that he wrote for a universal audience—the spectators at his theaters included groundlings as well as princes.

Yet a hint of the relative scarcity and desirability of butter remains in such affirmations as John Heywood's "I know on which side my bread is buttered," 1546, and Jonathan Swift's "I won't quarrel with my bread and butter," 1738. The American tradition, it would seem, traces back to the Vikings from whom, by way of England, the Colonial settlers of the Atlantic seaboard borrowed the habit, discussed by Dr. Mary Wilhelmine Williams in her Social Scandinavia, of using butter as a sauce "in the preparation of various dishes." For prodigious butter eating prior to Pearl Harbor, the modern Northmen of Minnesota and Kansas were famous. When the war has been won, a practicable measure of the prosperity of the enfranchised world might be the democratization of what his majesty the king very ardently desired a little of.

Lease-Lend Shipment of Butter and Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin:

Senate Joint Resolution 8

Joint resolution memorializing Congress and the United States Department of Agriculture to supply butter to our armed forces and those of our allies and to properly allocate butter for lend-lease shipment in order to safeguard the dairy industry

Whereas the people of Wisconsin recognize that a successful army must be properly fed, clothed and equipped and that our fighting forces at home and abroad must have plenty of butter and that lend-lease needs for our fighting allies must also be met; and

Whereas the United States department of Agriculture in charge of purchases of food for lend-lease is reported to have approved the shipment of 130,000,000 pounds of butter in 1943 to Russia, at a time when the supplies of butter are critically and seriously short and the consumption of oleomargarine is on the increase at home; and

Whereas new food and drug standards and specifications permit the fortification of oleomargarine with vitamins and flavoring extracts so that detection from butter is difficult and thereby dupe and deceive thousands of people of the United States into the purchase of an inferior substitute; and

Whereas the Government freezing regulations will take 30 percent of our national butter output after February 1, 1943, or approximately 503,000,000 pounds; and

Whereas our Government should use every precaution against any limitation of butter supplies available for our armed forces and our civilians because for years the United States has been on a domestic basis in the production and consumption of butter, our consumers did not need to depend on imports, and our producers did not need to depend on exports; and

Whereas in 1943 there is expected to be a decrease in butter production of 100,000,000 pounds due to diversion of milk to the manufacture of cheese, the increased consumption of butter by the armed forces, and other territorial emergencies; and

Whereas it is fully recognized that our fighting allies have miraculously, coura-

geously, and tenaciously withstood the onslaughts of the Axis forces, and that our country is gratefully appreciative of the valor, bloodshed and heroism of the fighting forces of our allies, but that in all fairness to both our allies and the United States, a plan be formulated and adopted so that both butter and oleomargarine may be so transported; and

Whereas such compromise on allocation of lend-lease supplies not only will not upset and disturb the delicate balance of home consumption and manufacture of butter but will also prevent oleomargarine manufacturers to explosively utilize the present butter shortage to expand their local markets for a long period of time; and

Whereas it is the sense of this legislature that the dairy industry of the United States should continue to be protected by a wise and cautious administrative discretion so as to maintain the practical and legislative safeguards for dairy commodities in competition with and marketing of inferior products: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States that our fighting forces and those of our allies must be supplied with good food, including butter, and that a fair share of this nutritive product must be supplied to our people on the home front so that they will not be compelled to resort to inferior substitute products; and that the lend-lease authorities be directed to stabilize, control, and properly allocate the distribution of butter for lend-lease shipment during the present emergency in order to safeguard the health of the workers and toilers on the home front and their families, to protect the great dairy industry of the country, and to prevent further entrenchment and encroachment of the oleomargarine market; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the lend-lease authorities, and to each House of Congress of the United States, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

Strikes in War Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, according to a news item in the Mason City Globe-Gazette of March 20 a 3-day strike at the Ottumwa Iron Works caused the loss of 30 tanks to the United States armed forces. The John Deere Tractor Co. and its affiliated firm, the Iowa Transmission Co., of Waterloo, Iowa, are manufacturers of transmissions for tanks, for which they receive some materials from the Ottumwa Iron Works. The work stoppage in Ottumwa killed the flow of these materials for 3 days and thus the loss for 3 days of transmissions and finished tanks.

The day may come when our Army will be badly in need of these tanks. Surely there must be intelligence and authority enough somewhere to devise a plan to settle these disputes between employers and employees without delaying the manufacture of equipment so badly needed to win the war.

What are we waiting for?

The Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. D. McWILLIAMS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from one of the leading papers in my district relative to the meat and gasoline shortage.

Mr. Speaker, I noted in the Sunday issue of the Norwich Record the following item. This situation is not peculiar to Norwich alone, however, but to New London, Middletown, Willimantic, and all the other towns in my Second Congressional District. I quote as follows:

In many a household here today the family will look back to and appreciate the good old pre-war days when they sit down for their Sunday dinner and have to be satisfied with a patched-up, frugal meal. These same people who used to heap plenty of butter on a nice, juicy steak and reach for a second helping of peas and perhaps a second canned vegetable will be fortunate today if they have hamburger for the meat course, any butter at all for their bread, and a single vegetable for a side dish. (They may have their potatoes, but they hadn't better waste them because the day may soon come when these, too, will be missing from the table.)

The local meat shortage during the past few days reached record proportions, and there were some people who couldn't even find hamburger when they scanned the bare and barren meat counters around town Saturday.

Hundreds of persons flocked to the stores early Saturday morning hoping to be the "early bird," but in most cases they were sadly disappointed. Meat counters at the few stores that did display a piece of meat were actually mobbed.

The meat and poultry shortage was only part of the story. Potatoes were increasingly hard to get. Butter, when it could be obtained at all, was being doled out in quarter-pound packages

The shortage here and throughout the East is being accompanied by a virtual customers' boycott of rationed canned goods carrying high points. Canned fruit juices, especially, were at a standstill. "We're just dusting them off on the shelves," said one marketman.

Besides meat, poultry, potatoes, and butter, other especially acute shortage goods were reported to be beans, peppers, shortening, and canned meats.

The food shortage here Saturday wasn't the only thing that bothered the populace, at least the auto-driving class. The latter found it difficult to get gasoline and some just had to do plenty of shopping before they got enough gas to tide them over the week end. Many gas pumps were absolutely dry and the few places that did have gasoline doled it out in limited portions.

In the same issue there was an article on scrap to be raised in my district, and the quota for Norwich is 1,304 tons of scrap iron and metals for the next period. Norwich, as always, will not only meet their quota, but will exceed it.

I am not mentioning these clippings to give Congress the impression that the good citizens of Norwich are complaining. Quite the contrary. The citizens of Norwich are of the old-fashioned type. They can take it on the chin. They can deny themselves. They are always in there pitching.

The citizens of Norwich will deny themselves everything and anything if they are assured their boys who are fighting our battles are getting all the foodstuffs and matériel of war to bring this conflict to a successful and early conclusion.

And the citizens of Norwich will raise more than the quota of 1,304 tons of scrap if they have to raise it with empty bellies. They have met crises before. They will meet them and will continue to do so with the same indomitable courage and will that has so distinctly characterized them in the past.

Collection of Fee for Inspection of Cattle Brands in Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma:

Enrolled House Resolution 36

Resolution requesting the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States not to authorize and direct the charging and collection of a per head fee for the inspection of brands, marks, or other identifying characteristics of cattle originating within the State of Oklahoma and marketed at posted stockyards located in Oklahoma City, Tulsa, Enid, Muskogee, Beaver, Woodward, and West Fort Smith; and declaring an emergency

Whereas application has been made to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, pursuant to the provisions of an amendment to the Packers and Stockyards Act (Pub. 1, No. 615, 77th Cong., 2d sess., June 19, 1942, also found as sec. 217a of title 7, U. S. C., annotated) for an authorization to charge and collect a fee of 5 cents a head for the inspection of brands, marks, or other identifying characteristics of cattle originating within the State of Oklahoma and marketed at the posted stockyards located in Oklahoma City, Tulsa, Enid, Muskogee, Beaver, Woodward, and West Fort Smith; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States is authorized to direct and permit such a charge only in the event he finds that branding or marking, or both

branding and marking livestock as a means of establishing ownership, prevails in Oklahoma by custom or statute, and only in the event he finds that such a charge is necessary; and

Whereas the State of Oklahoma does not have a compulsory branding or marking law, and it is the sense of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma that branding or marking cattle or other livestock as a means of establishing ownership does not prevail in Oklahoma, either by statute or custom, to such an extent as to make it advisable that such a charge be made for the inspection of brands; and

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma that a public hearing was had on the application to make such a charge by the Secretary of Agriculture in Oklahoma City on January 15, 1943, at the conclusion of which the matter was taken under advisement for study and decision by the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma:

SECTION 1. That the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States be hereby memorialized and requested not to authorize the collection at such yards in Oklahoma of a fee of 5 cents, or any other amount, per head of cattle coming into such yards for the reasons given above, and particularly for the reason that such a charge is unnecessary in the State of Oklahoma, where the great majority of the raisers of cattle are small, rather than large, producers and do not brand or otherwise mark their cattle and would, therefore, receive no benefit whatsoever from such a tax or charge, and for the further reason that such a charge would, in the opinion of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, constitute just another tax or burden upon the producers of livestock at a time when such taxes or burdens should not be increased.

SEC. 2. That the secretary of state of the State of Oklahoma is hereby instructed to immediately send a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States and to each member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation for their consideration.

SEC. 3. It being immediately necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health, and safety, an emergency is hereby declared to exist, by reason whereof this resolution shall take effect and be in full force from and after its passage and approval.

Suspension of the Liquor Traffic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Christian Science Monitor:

NATIONAL WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION FOR ALL-OUT SUSPENSION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC

WASHINGTON, March 11.—Nothing less than complete suspension of the liquor industry for the duration of the war will be effective to halt its daily direct and indirect sabotage of America's war effort, the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union declared here today.

Commenting on the bill providing for wartime prohibition introduced in the House by Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON (Democrat), of South Carolina; the Woman's Christian Temperance Union declared that since before Pearl Harbor the liquor trade had been putting its interests ahead of national interests and depriving the Nation of sober manpower as well as transport, rubber, tin, and other vital products.

The statement released by the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union follows:

"The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union feels that the Bryson bill to suspend the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of alcoholic beverages for the duration is a logical outgrowth of the situation in which we find ourselves today, plus the attitude of the alcoholic beverage industry. Serious conflict between the interests of the alcoholic beverage industry and those of the public has been developing ever since the first selective-service draft, and in almost every instance the interests of the alcoholic beverage industry have been put first.

"The Sheppard bill to create a small zone around camp areas at the discretion of the War and Navy Departments was labeled 'prohibition.' It is evident that the same will be true of any other similar mild restrictive measures.

"When the matter of priorities has been under consideration, it has been with the utmost reluctance that any restrictions were placed on the alcoholic beverage industry, and these have only taken effect after the industry has been permitted to well stock itself with rubber, tin plate, salvaged tin cans, and everything else which it might require, not only to maintain its status quo but actually to expand itself.

"Canada has announced a policy of sales curtailment, and banned alcoholic beverage advertising. Bills to accomplish this in the United States have lain in committee through the Seventy-seventh Congress. In the meantime, the problems of manpower shortage are becoming acute, while the Army and Navy camp community relations are not being improved by the conditions which have been allowed to continue in those areas.

"Stories have come to us from the press, and in letters from men in the services, of vessels loaded with beer instead of food or airplane parts. It becomes evident that nothing less than complete suspension of the industry for the duration will cure these evils and insure the restrictive cargo space in outgoing vessels for the food and munitions necessary to conserve the lives of our men overseas."

Post-War Settlements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD substitute for House Joint Memorial 3, being a joint memorial passed by the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of Montana relative to the winning of the war and to post-war settlements affecting the peace and stability of our country and of the world:

Substitute for House Joint Memorial 3

Joint memorial to the President and the Senate of the United States of America, setting forth the wishes of the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of Montana, relative to the winning of the war by the total defeat of the Axis Powers, and relative to post-war settlements affecting the peace and stability of our country and of the world, and asking the President and the Senate, as the treaty-making power in our country, to fully recognize and accept our national duty and responsibility in the reestablishment and future maintenance of world peace and order

To the President and the Senate of the United States:

Whereas young men from Montana are for a second time in a generation fighting and dying on foreign soil for the freedom and security of our Nation; and

Whereas the people of our State, mindful of the fact that a nation as large and as powerful as the United States of America will find it impossible to maintain a policy of complete isolation in a world in which distances are being cut down every day by continually improving means of transportation and communication, and hopeful that in the peace to follow our certain victory that our country will, together with the other nations, accept its full share of responsibility in the reorganizing and rebuilding of the post-war world and the safeguarding of world peace; and

Whereas realizing that the new problems our Nation will face in its task of helping to establish and maintain a just and durable peace, may require certain sacrifices, a high devotion to the cause of world peace, a united effort on the part of all citizens of the Nation, and a determination to insist on the maintenance of a free and stable order in the world regardless of race or religion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, in regular session assembled, the senate and house concurring, do respectfully and earnestly urge upon the President and the Senate of the United States our firm conviction that our war effort should not stop short of the total military defeat of all the Axis Powers, our belief in the vital need of our country's full cooperation and responsibility with the other United Nations, in reestablishing order after the present war; in the maintenance of peace in the many countries where civil law has been wiped out during this war, and in the necessary use of international policing or such other means as may be required to keep such peace: In the readjustment of treaties with other nations so the world trade and commercial needs and possibilities may be encouraged and developed to the mutual benefit of all nations and peoples; and in the necessity that our country accept this inevitable change in our world relations, and enter upon such new policy with the courage and determination characteristic of the United States of America, and with a full confidence in the eventual solution of the principal problems ahead, to the end that American principles may benefit the rest of the world, and strengthen and fortify here at home, those same principles of economic and political democracy which we so deeply cherish; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state of Montana, to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, to the Honorable Senate of the United States, to the Members of Congress from the State of Montana, and to each of the legislative assemblies of the several States of the United States of America.

The Ruml-Carlson Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, under date of March 24, 1943, an editorial entitled "The Ruml-Carlson Plan" which I ask leave to extend in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE RUML-CARLSON PLAN

Representative FRANK CARLSON (Republican, Kansas), chief backer of the Ruml plan in the House, has introduced a bill containing some new modifications of the original plan. These modifications are aimed at preventing any large income-tax payer from profiting abnormally by some war-caused windfall.

As Mr. CARLSON explains his amended bill:

"In general, taxpayers are made current by skipping 1942 and taxing the 1943 income in 1943.

"Where the 1942 income exceeds $20,000 and is higher than the 1943 income, the taxpayer, in effect, pays on the higher of the 2 years, and the assessment on the lower year is abated. This $20,000 limit avoids hardships on taxpayers entering the armed services.

"Where both the 1942 and 1943 incomes exceed the 1941 income by more than $50,000 and may, therefore, be said to represent abnormal wartime income, a special anti-windfall tax is imposed on the abnormal portion of the income of the year otherwise abated. The rate is 25 percent (the capital-gains rate) on the first $500,000 of the excess and 50 percent on the balance."

These amendments meet scientifically the main objection which the President and Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau have raised to the original Ruml plan. It is these gentlemen's fear that, though some 44,000,000 income-tax payers would benefit enormously from the Ruml plan, the richest persons in the country would also be helped. In the New Deal philosophy, that would never do.

The Carlson amended bill would prevent any such outrage (which probably wouldn't happen even under the original Ruml plan); and now that the Carlson bill has been thus amended, we can see no reason why Congress should not speedily pass it.

Beardsley Ruml's plan, to repeat, is a scheme to shift the Nation's Federal income-tax payers to an efficient, businesslike pay-as-you-go system. The present inefficient, clumsy, and dangerous pay-as-you-went system would be scrapped, and at one simple bookkeeping swoop. We would all go on paying our income taxes at current rates, but we would call them taxes on their year's incomes, paid as the money was earned, instead of taxes on last year's incomes.

Carlson's amendments would cancel the possibility that a handful of overnight war millionaires by this change could hold onto unfair percentages of their war profits. Inheritance taxes would remain as stiff as they are now, at least, and thus would recoup at each large taxpayer's death the income taxes saved him by the skipping of a year.

That the Nation is in urgent need of the Ruml plan is as plain as that 2 plus 2 equals 4. That the people and the Government alike would profit by it is equally plain. We would all be able to pay our taxes as we earn our money. After the end of the war and the 99.44 percent certain epidemic of unemployment because of war-plant shutdowns, the Government would not be caught with a lot of uncollectible tax bills. During the war, we could all plan our War bond purchases far more confidently and accurately than we now can.

We think the administration would be wise, and we know it would make a hit with most Americans, if it would now withdraw its opposition to the Ruml-Carlson plan.

The War Against Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, billions, yes, billions, have been put into lend-lease. Harry Hopkins, the social worker who never produced a dollar by manual labor or by the management of any industry, is the chairman of the committee which allocates lend-lease funds and materials.

Waiving the question of how much of lend-lease money is wasted, used in Washington and other cities for the entertainment of foreign guests and representatives, is it not about time that the United States place the spending of the taxpayers' dollars under the direction of those who are trained to production and those who have scientific military training and then allocate at least enough of the lend-lease materials to protect the men we have sent to fight Japan?

Whether or not he intended to do so, David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of March 24 has clearly pointed out that the United States is to be left holding the bag when Hitler is defeated.

Had I, or any other man in Congress, who endeavored to keep us out of war, made the statements David Lawrence makes he would have been charged by the new dealers with being disloyal; by those who are now fourth-term advocates. Lawrence but states the facts. Read his statements:

Prime Minister Churchill may not have so intended it, but his Sunday speech has produced the impression in some quarters that Britain is weakening somewhat on her pledge to mobilize all of the British Empire's might to assist America in defeating Japan once Hitler is beaten.

There is no use concealing the disappointment which is felt here that the British Government has not concurred in the American view about the necessity of an all-out war against Japan. Efforts to see more of our war production allocated to the Pacific have met with the response that there isn't enough to wage total war against Japan and against Hitler at the same time.

To satisfy American opinion, however, the Prime Minister on February 11 revealed that he had given President Roosevelt a pledge at Casablanca to put all Britain's resources into the fray against Japan when Hitler is beaten. He said, "In that event, all forces of the British Empire, land, sea, and air, will be moved to the Far Eastern area with the greatest possible speed and Britain will continue the war by the side of the United States with the utmost vigor until unconditional surrender is enforced upon Japan."

Last Sunday Mr. Churchill said:

"The war against Japan will demand a very different arrangement of our forces from what it is at present. There will certainly be large numbers of British and also, no doubt, United States soldiers whom it will not be physically possible to employ across the vast distances and poor communications of the Japanese war * * *.

"JAPAN SEEN NOTIFIED

"However vigorously the war against Japan is prosecuted, there certainly will be a partial demobilization following the defeat of Hitler. * * * Of course, these ideas may be completely falsified by events. It may be that Japan will collapse before Hitler, in which case quite another lay-out will be necessary. As, however, many people wish ardently to discuss the future, I adopt for this purpose tonight what seems to me the most likely situation."

Here is the Prime Minister of Great Britain notifying Japan that he doesn't expect the United Nations to force the surrender of Japan before Hitler is beaten and that, even when the latter event occurs, the entire force of the United Nations will not be made available. The Japanese may be counting on such a contingency—their ability to obtain a stalemate by consolidating their positions at present so strongly that it might take the United States, fighting with the partial assistance of Britain, many years to recapture the vast areas now held by Japan.

The British attitude is most important, because the United States would never have been caught unprepared in the Pacific if it had not been necessary to send aid to the British and to deploy a substantial part of the American naval and air forces in the Atlantic to help Britain in 1940 and 1941. If the British people are going to be promised even partial demobilization, it can only mean that the Prime Minister is harboring the notion that the Japanese war is America's war after all.

UNITED STATES DEMANDS MAY CHANGE

If such a view is permitted to grow in America, it cannot but lead to the belief that the recapture of the Malaya Peninsula and other areas previously held by Britain may lead in the end to an American mandate for that area rather than a return to Britain of the territories she has lost. The American people are not likely to enjoy the continuation of a fight for British possessions if the British Government, which is now so instrumental in preventing the proper amount of aid from going to the Pacific loses interest in the continuation of the war against Japan.

Mr. Churchill is sincere in his promises and pledges, but the moment he promises even a partial demobilization after Hitler is beaten he encourages a psychology in Britain that will make it difficult for him or any other Prime Minister to send huge armies overseas to help conquer Japan.

Much the better way would be to allocate more production now to the American naval air and land forces so that Japan's collapse will come contemporaneously with that of Hitler. The American people are being told that our war plants are producing 5,500 planes a month. Can't a substantial percentage of this big production be given to General MacArthur and General Kenney, so that they can carry on an offensive against Japan now? The issue has been beclouded by the emergency needs of the north African front, but it is an issue that ought to be brought out into the open, for it concerns the United States Navy and marine and land forces which are not being adequately supported in the Pacific.

Read the above again, and read it carefully. From it you get the following conclusions, which are fully supported by the record:

First. We lost Pearl Harbor. We suffered staggering reverses in the Pacific because so much of lend-lease materials were allocated to Great Britain. Churchill himself made that statement to Congress on the 26th day of December 1942.

Second. Britain insists that come what may in the war against Japan, Hitler must first be defeated. That is Churchill's statement. It means that our men who have been sent to the Pacific to fight Japan must take whatever is left after we supply Britain and Russia with the materials and the men to defeat Hitler.

Third. When Hitler has been defeated, at least a partial demobilization has been promised the people of Great Britain by Churchill. England will now not put forth an all-out effort to defeat Japan. She will give us, in our war against Japan, such aid as she can after Hitler has been defeated and after she has brought about a partial demobilization of her own armed forces.

Fourth. Russia has not, up to the present time, and she gives no indication that she will in the near future, permit us to use bases on her eastern border from which we could attack Japan.

The foregoing all tend to show that when Hitler has been defeated the burden of the war against Japan will fall upon the United States.

In view of the foregoing do you wonder why it is that I believe that lend-lease money should be spent—the allocation of lend-lease munitions of war be made—under the direction of the trained officers of our armed fighting force; that I have no faith whatever in the expenditure, by Harry Hopkins, of a single dollar for war purposes?

Only yesterday a committee of the House was told by its counsel that privately owned ships, carrying war materials to the Red Sea in 1941, received from lend-lease funds—yes, from lend-lease funds—profits for single trips ranging as high as seven times the book value of the ships. It was disclosed to the committee that $26,874,176 in war profits were received by certain shipowners.

Look at this one case: Lyke Bros. Steamship Co., Inc., with four vessels valued at $187,208, received charter hire on four voyages of $1,370,440 and profits of $1,318,493, a return of 700 percent.

When lend-lease funds are used to create millionaires, it is time to call a halt, to place the spending of the money, the allocation of munitions of war under someone other than the present disbursers of those funds.

Is it not time that we send aid to MacArthur, to the men we have sent to the Pacific; that we give them the things which they must have if they are to defeat Japan?

They have made a glorious record and we have let them struggle along without the aid which should have been given them.

Restrictions on Planting of Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution from the Oklahoma State Senate:

OKLAHOMA STATE SENATE,
Oklahoma City, Okla., March 20, 1943.

The Honorable ROSS RIZLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RIZLEY: Pursuant to direction of the Oklahoma State Senate I am enclosing herewith a copy of House Concurrent Resolution No. 14 with the request that you exert every influence at your command to accomplish the purposes as outlined in the resolution.

In the event the authorities named therein do not deem it advisable to comply with the request contained in the resolution the senate has directed me to urge that you attempt to get approved a program whereby any individual farmer can produce his own cotton and cottonseed for home consumption.

I am authorized to advise you that the senate feels that this matter is one of great importance and urges complete cooperation on your part in relieving the critical condition existing among those engaged in stock and cattle raising in the State of Oklahoma.

Yours very truly,

J. WM. CORDELL,
Secretary of the Senate.

House Concurrent Resolution 14

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture to release the restrictions on planting cotton in Oklahoma for the crop year 1943

Whereas Oklahoma is one of the largest livestock-producing States in the entire United States. During the past 40 years Oklahoma has produced the majority of the feed with which to fatten and finish its own livestock, and has been able to buy such additional supplies as might be necessary from nearby States; and

Whereas under the restrictions of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration the feed we have been producing has been so reduced that we have been called on to buy more of our necessary livestock feed from other States, such as Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi; and

Whereas those States have also been reduced in the amount of feed they can produce. Texas is now only able to produce protein feeds to the extent of one-half its requirements and is now competing with Oklahoma for feed in other States. At the same time the States that have been furnishing part of the feed for our livestock have increased their own livestock and are using a greater proportion of their own production. It is now practically impossible to buy this protein feed from other States; and

Whereas the program of crop restrictions has now resulted in a large percentage of our livestock going without the necessary protein feeds to produce the greatest amount of meat and dairy products and has caused a large percentage of the livestock being marketed in a light and unfinished condition, and a considerable amount being held off the market on account of not being fattened. This is one of the largest contributing factors in the shortage of meat; and

Whereas the Agricultural Marketing Administration has recently removed the restrictions on planting wheat and peanuts for 1943 crop and in the case of peanuts are offering to pay subsidies equivalent to $50 per ton for the production of peanuts in addition to other payments as an incentive to plant peanuts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Nineteenth Oklahoma Legislature (the Senate concurring therein), That we earnestly request the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to remove the restrictions on the planting of cotton acreage in Oklahoma for the purpose of permitting a larger production of protein feeds, cottonseed oil, and cotton linters. All of which is important in reaching production goals for meat and dairy products; be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully submit to the Agricultural Marketing Administration that more than three-fourths of the Cotton Belt in Oklahoma will produce more pounds of essential food, feed, and materials necessary for the national defense than any other crop, and that in those sections where the annual rainfall is insufficient and on those types of soil where the clean harvesting of peanuts is not possible, that every effort be made to plant and raise all of the cotton possible, not only for the fiber but for the feed and food that cotton will produce.

We also call to their attention that with the present consumption of cotton in the United States, and with the prospects of a large demand from other countries as soon as the war is over, that the present stocks of cotton will be insufficient to meet the demand.

We further call to the attention of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the people of Oklahoma that unless restrictions on the planting of cotton are relaxed to allow the planting of a larger acreage, Oklahoma will not be able to produce the livestock that it has been producing, and in all probability Oklahoma livestock will be reduced in the same percentage as our protein feeds have been reduced. The State of Oklahoma will not only have lost the income from cotton but from livestock as well.

Therefore, we urge that each farmer in Oklahoma be allowed to produce without penalty those crops which, in his judgment, can be produced, taking into consideration the type of soil on his farm, the farming equipment now owned by him, the size of his family, and the needs for producing the greatest volume of necessary products; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly authenticated by the respective signatures of the presiding officer of each house of the legislature, be forthwith sent to Claude Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., to I. W. Dugan, Director of the Southern Division of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, New Orleans, La., and to H. P. Moffitt, State administrator, Stillwater, Okla.

The Capitol Pages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Horace G. Carlisle, of Washington, D. C., has taken much interest in the boys who

act as pages in both the House and Senate. Mr. Carlisle was formerly a schoolman, and the earlier contacts he had with the boys who were students under him no doubt causes him to become greatly interested in the pages' school, which is conducted in the Nation's Capitol.

Mr. Carlisle has written a poem, entitled "The Capitol Pages," which is entirely worthy of publication. The page boys are a fine lot of our youth in this Nation, and upon them rests the grave responsibility of perpetuating our form of government, our liberty and freedom, and our American way of life. They will not fail us, I am certain.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein the poem, written by Mr. Horace G. Carlisle, of Washington, D. C., on the subject The Capitol Pages.

THE CAPITOL PAGES

T-he pages, peculiarly, Congress's pride,
H-ave, in the Page School, an incentive sublime,
E-quipped, as it is, with desks where—side by side—
C-ongressional statesmen sat, in Lincoln's time.
A- silent reminder to these youths that are
P-reparing themselves for the future's demands,
I-n this troubled world, torn and tortured by war,
T-he Capitol Page School for discipline stands.
O-n youth, youth alone, a great future depends—
L-ong live the Page School, to accomplish its ends.
P-reeminence comes through the sweat of the brain—
A-nd he who'd attain it must learn self-control—
G-reat men, to attain it, have labored in vain,
E-njoined, till they made self-control their first goal.
S-o, while these page youngsters here labor, and wait,
C-oncerned with their studies and daily tasks, they
H-ave contacts with statesmen, whom they emulate,
O-utgrowing themselves, in this marvelous way.
O-n youth, youth alone, a great future depends—
L-ong live the Page School, to accomplish its ends.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Collier's Has Enough of the Smear Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, even though Collier's has frequently taken a crack at Congress and we think sometimes very unjustly, probably because of a lack of knowledge of the facts, it now thinks the smear campaign has gone far enough. The following is an editorial from this week's Collier's:

Capt. Eddie "Indestructible" Rickenbacker came back from his latest bout with death and at once began to talk loudly and often about the evil of absenteeism in war plants, the outrage of strikes in same, and the likelihood that returning soldiers will not relish the idea of the Government's making them join unions in order to get jobs.

The reaction in radical and left-wing newdealer circles was typical. Instead of attempting straight answers to Rickenbacker, a smearing campaign got promptly into high gear. Rick is called a hidebound, antilabor reactionary and other fighting names.

We think most Americans are weary of these tactics. Americans like fair play and hate unfairness. Some, at least, of the heavy anti-New Deal gains in the elections of last November 3 happened because so many people were tired of hearing various candidates blackguarded and defamed.

As for Rickenbacker, he is saying nothing that a lot of other people are not also saying. War plant absenteeism without cause is the dirty outrage against our fighting men that Rickenbacker says it is. War plants should not go on strike, and that is that.

We think it is time to call off these smear campaigns against persons who don't invariably sing in tune with the new dealers; and it is time to begin making frank, honest answers to the contentions of those persons when there are such answers, and to try to remedy the conditions complained of when there are not.

One-half Million Families Borrow Income-Tax Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Syd J. Hughes, vice president of the Morris Plan Industrial Bank of New York, the largest consumer credit bank in the Nation, has just issued a statement which reads that a minimum of 50,000 New York families borrowed from banks and lending agencies a conservatively estimated $10,000,000 to pay their first quarterly income taxes, and over the Nation at least a half million families borrowed a minimum of a hundred million dollars for the same purpose. Mr. Hughes estimates that the actual figures will be much larger in the three remaining installments of this year's taxes. It is his estimate that the number of taxpaying borrowers might rise to as many as 5,000,000, involving a billion dollars directly or indirectly, due to the present tax base.

This statement, which I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is in answer to those who contend that we do not need to get our taxpayers on a current basis. It is perfect evidence that Congress should immediately pass the bill I introduced. Only Congress, by legislative action, can remove this personal-income-tax debt. The American people are insisting on early action.

The statement follows:

A minimum of 50,000 New York families borrowed from banks and lending agencies a conservatively estimated $10,000,000 to pay their first quarter income taxes and over the Nation at least half a million families borrowed a minimum of $100,000,000 for the same purpose.

The actual figures, when available, will no doubt be much larger, and under the acceleration of higher cost of living, the three remaining tax instalments and the proposed 20-percent withholding tax, the number of taxpaying borrowers might very likely rise to as many as five million involving a billion dollars directly or indirectly due to the present tax base.

The Ruml plan or some similar pay-as-you-go plan would largely eliminate such loans.

If taxpayers are not to be granted this relief, present estimated figures will be wildly pyramided before the end of the year with hundreds of thousands of families facing an insoluble dilemma.

These are the estimates and opinions of Syd J. Hughes, vice president of the Morris Plan Industrial Bank of New York, the largest consumer credit bank in the Nation. Mr. Hughes, also a director of the Consumer Banking Institute, a nonprofit research organization at Washington, D. C., said that his estimates were made and projected nationally on the basis of the unprecedented rush of tax borrowing which descended on banks and other lenders during the first 2 weeks of March—and loans are still being made in large volume with the first tax payment period already past.

Mr. Hughes said that while this volume of business would be lost to banks under the Ruml plan because taxpayers would be on a current income basis and not saddled with last year's tax debt, that nevertheless it was to the broader interests of the Nation's economy for banks to do everything possible to avoid a calamitous financial pile-up for the sake of a purely seasonal volume of business.

"The danger signal in this entire situation is not in the fact that people borrow to pay their income taxes. Many have always done so purely for the sake of the convenience of paying all their taxes in a lump sum and amortizing the loan in convenient monthly budget payments.

"This year such borrowing is more one of grim necessity, and the taxes were not paid in full and three more payments are yet to come plus a minimum 20-percent withholding tax from salaries and income.

"The estimate of $100,000,000 in such tax loans for the first quarter is very conservative, in my opinion. It is predicated on certain reported volume of 'personal loans' as made by banks with personal-loan departments, industrial banks of the Morris Plan type, personal-loan companies and credit unions, the latter lending agencies set up within a given business or industry by the employees themselves, such as the Municipal Credit Union of New York with a volume of millions of dollars of loans among city employees.

"The estimate does not include the thousands of banks where a personal-loan department is not maintained as such, yet where a large volume of this type of business is handled in the regular course of the bank's business. It does not include tax loans secured by collateral, such as stocks and bonds made by banks in their commercial-loan departments. It does not include short-term loans made by banks by the thousands for 30, 60, or 90 days. It does not include the large volume of loans made by

insurance companies, nor in number of loans does the estimate include those loans where two or more taxpayers may make a joint loan sharing the proceeds among them. The latter is a common practice.

"The Federal Reserve Board has the machinery available to collect fairly accurate figures from the banks and other lending agencies previously mentioned, but such a survey would not encompass all the other types of borrowing just outlined nor would it be accurate in the sense that loan applications may show the proceeds to be used for some other purpose and where that other purpose was made necessary by the diverting of current funds into tax payments.

"Borrowing continues for this reason. People who depleted their current working funds to pay their first-quarter taxes are now borrowing to pay other neglected bills and to improve their individual cash positions.

"Loans of this type will be tremendous as the year progresses with its three remaining quarterly payments plus the contemplated withholding tax. It will be impossible to determine the amount of such borrowing and impossible to even estimate it.

"Some people did not borrow all that their present financial position would warrant. Such credit is based on character and earning power, meaning a good credit reputation and a salary or income big enough to retire the loan after paying living expenses.

"But other people did borrow their total eligibility to meet this one period. What is to become of them?

"People borrow to pay their taxes because it is their way of winning the war and the honorable thing to do, despite the generous provisions made by the Government for those who find it difficult or impossible to pay. Americans don't want it that way. They want to pay their way.

"It seems to be as simple as A B C, and as plain as the nose on your face that the Ruml plan would largely correct an already pressing problem for millions of taxpayers and certainly would head off the hopeless predicament that millions more face in the months and years ahead with still larger tax accumulations likely long before relief will come in the form of lower taxes.

"Further, when we observe that loans are made for taxes, we are, as a rule, talking about entire families rather than individuals. It is a different thing to say that a half million or a million loans were made for this purpose than to say a half million or a million families were so involved. Because the family unit would double or treble the actual number of people involved. If the family head is under financial pressure the whole family is under a corresponding pressure with drastically reduced family budgets, meaning the sacrifice of many things necessary to the basic health and comfort of the home itself.

"Few men without families are involved in these figures because most men, up to 38 at least, are in the military services. Further, single people have always been far in the minority among tax borrowers. It is the family head, beset with all the normal financial problems of running a home, who now finds himself approaching a point that can completely break down the home economy if some relief is not forthcoming—and promptly.

"A half million or a million taxpaying families may seem a small minority compared with the total number of people now subject to taxation, but it must be remembered that millions of the new taxpayers are in the lowest income groups whose taxes are comparatively small and their aggregate total of taxes paid is small percentagewise to the total taxes collected.

"It is the middle and upper income groups who pay the bulk of the taxes, the groups who have been in income-tax brackets for years and now fall into the tax-borrowing class. They are the stable year-in-and-year-out tax producers on whom the Government must depend rather than the new emergency wartime taxpayers whose contribution is relatively small."

Aviation in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to me from Gill Robb Wilson, director of aviation of the State of New Jersey:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION,
Trenton, March 17, 1943.

The Honorable FRANK L. SUNDSTROM,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SUNDSTROM: I testified before the Interstate Commerce Committee on H. R. 1012. Where the bill would promote aviation, it is excellent, but where it would abrogate to the Federal Government complete and absolute control of aviation to the exclusion of every other phase of government, it is bad and dangerous.

Aviation in the United States is not the product of Federal promotion. It is the product of the initiative of States, counties, municipalities, and individuals, a great deal more than of the Government. By its definitions and declarations of promises, this bill is an invasion of States' rights, for there could be no intrastate commerce of the air if this bill became a law. I would like to see the bill amended retaining all of its promotional features and wiping out or modifying the others.

Aviation in the United States is not the air lines. When the war started there were but 300 transport aircraft used on all the domestic systems. In contrast to that, there were some 22,000 private planes. There were approximately 1,200 air-line pilots flying the 300 planes, but there were more than eleven hundred thousand pilots flying the other ships. Air transport is no more all of aviation than the busses are all of the automotive industry. The bill appears to me to lay emphasis almost wholly on aviation as corporate transportation. Now, of course, I am for the air lines and for the regulation of air commerce, but I am much more for the people of the United States and their rights and privileges to use the skyways above the United States as a medium of private transportation, recreation, and the pursuit of the happiness which is supposed to be constitutionally theirs.

It is my impression that the gentlemen of the committee are attempting to do a sincere and honest job, and I only hope that they will think of aviation in its broad implications, not merely of commerce but of the privileges of the people. In the post-war era hundreds of thousands of our people will utilize aircraft in very much the same way as they utilize their automobiles. The airplane will find its first great sales market among the farmers. New developments in aviation will make it possible for the physically handicapped to fly safely and with profit and pleasure. I do not believe it wise in our national destiny to ape the view of aviation held in Europe. This thing is not merely an agency of Government. It is a privilege which belongs to the people. By all means we must have uniform regulations in order to preserve the public safety, but the idea that the people's participation in aviation should be curbed on the theory that such participation would interfere with corporate commerce is just as far from the American way of doing things as it would be if we drove all the private automobiles off the highways so the busses could roll on them. The so-called interference with interstate commerce is just another one of those sacred cows which manage to clutter up the stalls of democracy. The question is very simple: Are our laws made for the people, or were people made for the laws?

If the bill is amended, I think it would be a very wise and constructive provision. We don't need more aviation regulation today, but we do need more promotion. We have always had plenty of regulation. If regulation would have produced air power, we would have been the No. 1 nation in the skies of the world. It was overregulation which was our greatest handicap. Let us not shut off post-war aviation by any more of it. The Air Transport Command, the Ferry Command, the liaison flying, the bombing, and even a lot of the fighting is being done today by men who learned their flying in civil aviation. If civil aviation was the backbone of national defense when called to meet the military necessity, so civil aviation will again be the backbone of national defense in the post-war world. Let's keep aviation as typically American as is the Congress itself.

Sincerely,

GILL ROBB WILSON,
State Director of Aviation.

Crop Plantings For 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the comments of Secretary of Agriculture Wickard on the subject of prospective plantings for 1943:

Today's crop report contains some of the most gratifying news the country has had in a long time.

This report shows what the farmers of this country plan to do in the face of labor shortages, machinery shortages, fertilizer shortages and, in some instances, uncertain returns for what they are going to produce.

From personal experience I know some of the situations facing American farmers today. Life on a farm has never been easy and today it is harder than ever. The prospective increases over last year's record highs are a tribute to the determination of our farmers to see that they make the greatest possible contribution to victory. It reflects the will of farm men, women, and children to work in the fields and to overcome handicaps by even longer hours than the long hours they work customarily.

The report today shows that the farmers plan to exceed or approximate their crop production goals in the majority of instances,

but it would be too much to expect them to reach the goal in every case. A reduction in beet acreage as compared with last year, for example, reflects a persistent handicap—the lack of farm labor. Sugar beets require a large amount of hand labor and undoubtedly many producers figured that this labor might not be available in 1943.

We intend to do all that we can to obtain this labor and to help obtain also the labor needed for other vital crops. The intentions to plant, while gratifying, must be carried out through hard work, careful planting, and the spirit that American farmers have always evidenced in time of national emergency.

The farmers will do their part. Their record production for the last 3 years and their plans to break production for the fourth straight year is evidence of this. It is up to the rest of us to do our part on this vital food front. Today's intentions to plant report covering major field crops gives us a preview of the entire food production front for 1943. Through previous Government reports we have tangible evidence of what the farmers are doing and plan to do with regard to livestock, poultry, and eggs in 1943.

Hogs: The December pig report, released December 23, indicated that the number of sows to farrow this spring would be 24 percent more than the record number which farrowed in the spring of 1942, as compared with a goal calling for a 15-percent increase in spring farrowing. The report of livestock on farms January 1, released February 18, indicated that there were 22 percent more hogs and pigs on farms the first of the year than a year earlier.

Eggs: The March crop report indicated that egg production in January and February of 1943 was up nearly 16 percent over production in the same months of 1942. Goals call for a 1943 production 8 percent more than 1942.

Chickens: The number of chicks hatched commercially in January and February of this year was 20 percent more than were hatched in the same months of last year. The number of eggs set in January and February of 1943 was 19 percent over a year ago. The number of chicks on order March 1 for latter delivery was 77 percent larger than on the same date a year ago. Goals for 1943 call for a 10-percent increase in the number of chickens raised on farms and a 10-percent increase in slaughter from general farms, dressed weight. The number of chickens on farms January 1, 1943, was 14 percent larger than a year earlier.

Turkeys: On March 12 growers indicated their intention to raise 37,098,000 turkeys in 1943—a new record and a 19 percent increase over the number raised in 1942. Goals call for a 15 percent increase in turkey production. The number of turkey poults on order March 1 was 54 percent greater than on the same date a year earlier—an indication that growers were placing their orders early for turkey poults as well as for chicks. Turkeys on farms January 1 totaled 6,549,000—14 percent fewer than a year earlier.

Milk: The March crop report indicated that milk production on farms January and February of this year was 1 percent larger than the January and February production of 1942. February production was a record for the month. The goals call for a production of 122,000,000,000 pounds of milk in 1943, 2 percent more than was produced in 1942. Milk cow numbers on hand January 1 were 26,946,000 head, 2 percent more than a year earlier and slightly above any previous record

Cattle: There were 51,224,000 head of cattle and calves on hand January 1, excluding milk cows 2 years old and over—a 5 percent increase over numbers on farms a year earlier.

Other livestock: On January 1 livestock numbers include 9,678,000 horses, a decrease of 2 percent from a year earlier; 3,712,000 mules, a decrease of 3 percent; and 55,089,000 head of sheep, a decrease of 3 percent.

The Position of China in the Post-War World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the gentleman from Massachusetts:

The brave people of China have been fighting against Japanese aggression for 6 years.

While it is necessary to defeat Hitler and nazi-ism, the importance of the Far East cannot be overlooked. A cold, cruel, calculating enemy confronts us and our courageous ally, China, in that theater of the world conflict. While the defeat of Hitler is a primary matter of consideration, we cannot permit the impression to exist that the defeat of Japan is a secondary matter of our consideration.

There is nothing that I know of that would tend to dishearten the people of Asia under the tyrannic yoke of Japan, and particularly of China, more than to permit this impression to exist. The war must be waged vigorously and constantly, with growing momentum in the Far East.

The freedom and independence of China is dear to the people of the United States. Its future independence is important to our future best interests as a nation, and to a future decent world.

The position of China after victory in post-war days cannot be underestimated. It will occupy its place at the peace table and in the councils of the nations of the world, not as a "rescued child," but in its rightful position in cooperation with the United States, Great Britain, and Russia. It would be a serious mistake for any other condition to exist. The future peace of the world depends in the main upon the United States, Great Britain, China, and Russia. The success of any future peace depends just as much upon full participation by China as it does any other one of the United Nations.

Any idea in the minds of any persons that China will occupy the position of a "rescued child" had better be dissipated.

The councils of any peace conference will never be complete without the voice of China's representatives under Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek be on equal terms with the representatives of the other United Nations.

While Prime Minister Churchill has made a contribution for discussion by suggesting a council of Europe and a council of Asia—a post-war regional set-up—there are many who feel that regionalism is contrary to the concept of the global character of the present struggle.

He reminds his listeners that "We shall not likely cast aside the immense work by the creation of a league of nations." There are many who do not forget that the League and all it stands for were really undermined by its failure to check aggression in Manchuria. Peace to me seems to be indivisible, and the doctrine of regionalism may lead to future world disorder instead of bringing the world closer to the concept of universal order and decency.

As China is one of the four major nations engaged on our side in this war—so in victory must it be one of the four major nations that will determine at the peace talks the future of this world for decades to come.

Relief of European Jews in Nazi-Occupied Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, president of the American Jewish Congress:

MARCH 15, 1943.

Rabbi STEPHEN S. WISE,
President, American Jewish Congress,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR RABBI WISE: I read with sympathetic interest your letter of March 9, as well as the resolution adopted at the meeting sponsored by the American Jewish Congress in Madison Square Garden on March 1

My reaction is that the tragic plight of the European Jews in Nazi-occupied countries requires more than expressions of sympathy from the United Nations. Words of protest and condemnation are not enough. Over 2,000,000 Jews have already been exterminated, and in time, if the war lasts long enough, there will be no Jews left in Continental Europe to enjoy the freedom promised by an Allied victory. Time is of the essence, and immediate action is required if we are sincerely interested in saving the lives of these doomed people.

It is my conviction that President Roosevelt—and I am sending him a copy of this letter—should call immediately a meeting of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of determining what percentage of European Jews who might be rescued or released from their Nazi captors should be given a haven of refuge in the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the Latin-American countries, and Palestine. It should not be difficult to work out a formula that would be fair to all countries concerned. The available territory in the aforementioned areas is so vast that many times over the number of Jews still alive in Europe could be housed if each country assumed its fair share of responsibility without affecting to any noticeable extent the internal economy of any individual country. In fact, most of the warring countries could well use these newcomers to relieve labor shortages on farms and elsewhere.

When the United Nations' representatives have decided on the percentage of refugees that each country should absorb as and when they are released, the President should request the heads of the neutral Irish and Swiss Nations to negotiate with Germany for their possible release from the Nazi-occupied countries. With the speed of modern methods of communication and air transportation this meeting could be called, held, and its business concluded within a matter of days, or at the most, of weeks.

If the Nazis refuse to cooperate, the captive Jews are no worse off. However, our conscience will be clear and the persecuted Jews throughout the world will be given tangible evidence of the good faith of the United Nations' promise of a better world when the war ends, and it will strengthen their courage to fight against our common foe.

If the Nazis should accept our proposal, then we may be successful in saving the lives of millions of innocent people.

To not make a sincere effort to save these doomed prisoners would be not only repugnant to all instincts of human decency, but would be an indictment of Christian civilization.

Sincerely yours,

WM. B. BARRY,
Member of Congress.

Training of War Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ralph W. Page from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of March 17, 1943:

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION SCHOOLS WIN COMMENDATION FOR TRAINING WAR WORKERS

(By Ralph W. Page)

WASHINGTON, March 17.—A correspondent writes: "Is there some sort of irresistible impulse that makes you Washington scribes write about denunciations and bungles and controversies? Aren't there any first-class performances going on to provide a little exhilaration and enthusiasm to the scene?"

The answer is plenty of them. In fact most of the agencies are doing a really superb job.

A good example is the National Youth Administration. As the war clouds gathered, this headquarters stopped every other activity and concentrated on the sole purpose of training boys and girls to take their places in the war production factories. Today it is the greatest industrial training school in the country.

It operates 700 distinct schools, equipped with 40,000 machines, or work stations for training welders, machinists, sheet metal workers, aircraft mechanics, radio operators, foundry workers, draftsmen. Every month they graduate seventeen to eighteen thousand boys and girls who go directly into the great war plants.

There is nothing amateur about this. The students work under factory conditions, guided by practical industrial foremen. Employers give the students their own test. After an average course of 8 weeks a high-school boy or girl is ready for a skilled or semiskilled job where the manpower pinch is sharpest, and ready means ready.

For instance, the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation reports: "We have hired and are continuing to hire a large number of young women who have been trained by the National Youth Administration, and feel that this is one of our best sources of supply. During the next 18 months we hope to employ approximately 8,000 individuals who have been trained on your projects in aircraft riveting, sheet metal assembly, electrical assembly, and machine tool operation."

John G. Pew, president of the Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., is more emphatic. He wrote his Congressman, JAMES WOLFENDEN, protesting any design to close the Chester school, saying: "The school has been of great benefit to the shipyard. They (this one school) have furnished to us 459 welders, 92 machinist's helpers and machine operators, and 63 sheet metal workers. * * * Anything you can do to assist in keeping the school open will be appreciated."

Aubrey Williams, the Administrator, says that he challenges any critic to go to the great industrial war plants and ask about the proficiency and value of the National Youth Administration graduates, and the National Youth Administration as an indispensable source of labor. If they do not endorse the program he will himself voluntarily go before Congress and recommend that the schools be abolished.

Incidentally, a prodigious amount of parts and materials for the Army and Navy are produced in the process of training. And the benefit to the students cannot be overestimated. Any Philadelphian can get his own thrill and inspiration out of this by a visit to the center at 900 North Broad Street. It is full of children—literally children, mostly from 17 to 20, a large proportion girls, and a considerable proportion Negroes.

The place runs at top pitch all day and all night in 8-hour shifts. There is no set time for graduation. The employers give periodic tests and take those they want. The beginning pay runs from 60 cents to 95 cents an hour. One smart, attractive girl got her welding job at 95 cents after a week and a half. And not only are these kids trained with certainty of getting a vitally needed position in the war. On an average they are paid $16 a month wages while learning, given one splendid hot meal, put through a thorough physical examination—and corrective treatment—and carefully trained in the knowledge of diets and food values and the principles of personal health.

Moreover, as anyone can see, they have the greatest enthusiasm and team spirit and almost frantic ambition to get on with the work.

Isaac C. Sutton, administrator for Pennsylvania, and John W. O'Boyle, personnel director, at 900 Broad, asked particularly that all the families and boys and girls in Philadelphia be notified that opportunity exists to train for immediate jobs under these conditions, and said that the difficulty now is to keep the ranks full. This is the primary recruiting agency for the training of skilled workers in America.

A Soldier's Shoe Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Lt Thomas B. Spencer, of the United States Army:

HATTIESBURG, MISS., *February 24, 1943.*
The Right Honorable JOHN E. SHERIDAN,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: A cocky little guy once said, "An army marches on its stomach." This miserable assumption was equaled only by another of his, namely, that "Joe's folks were push-overs." In the latter case, he was so far wrong he wasn't even in the right ball park—much less ever getting to first base. For his gross error, he had his tail feathers clipped outside Moscow, just as did his 1943 edition. Sauterne was not served in the Kremlin in 1812, nor did they stock up on schnapps for the 1943 tourist trade.

That Frenchman's first assumption is equally as preposterous. If it were true, it would mean that one-half the army would be flat on their backs while the other half frolicked over their solar plexus with their hobnailed tootsies. They speak of the "mail fist," the "iron heart," and "steel nerves," but this would be the original example of "cast-iron guts," or its reasonable facsimile. The only other possibility is that the individual soldier slithered over the steppes like a reptile—obviously, this is too ridiculous to dwell on. Yes, we have human snakes even today, but, without exception, they walk erect. No, I do not believe that either of these is what the Little Corporal had in mind. Granting that his cerebration was many times proven askew, and, this time, giving him every benefit of the doubt, he must have thought "an army's marching capacity is in direct proportion to its gastronomic intake." True, a hungry man may not be able to march as far or fast as one who is well fed, but may I ask what difference it would make to either if neither had shoes. They would both tiptoe gingerly to the nearest soft spot, lie on their respective backs, and in unison, yell, "No shoes—no march—and to hell with the Marseillaise!"

Now, give either of the footsore gladiators shoes, even bedroom slippers, and, whether he was gastronomically content or not, he would be on his feet and a usable belligerent boy. In fact, the only person in all history who was eulogized because he lacked the proper footwear was Whittier's Barefoot Boy. Other than this adolescent resurgent—all God's chillun got shoes.

Army Quartermaster's Supply says it's some feat shoeing soldiers—it must be. One million eight hundred thousand pairs o' shoes a month ain't hay! Furthermore, they insist that every pair fit the soldier properly—as it should be. But they say nothing about officers, and more particularly and personally, those heavily endowed on the ground floor. It is not my fault that my understanding is so all-encompassing, for I was born that way. Most people say that is a physiological impossibility—that I must have used fertilizer, frequent watering, and much tender care to have produced such a harvest. Be that as it may, the turned-up ends of my legs are a very vital part of me.

All my life I have been called "Tootsie," "Boots," "Footsie," "Suitcase," "Admiral Spencer, Commander of Two Gunboats"; have always had to listen to the inevitable, "Why don't you get a job stamping out forest fires?" "Where are the oar locks?" "If you didn't have so much turned up on the ground, you would really be tall," ad infinitum.

All my life civilian shoe stores told me they couldn't be that big, they will have to be shipped in separate boxes, or Why, you don't have a large foot, only 3½—three cowhides and a half keg of nails. However, as a civilian I never went barefoot—always managing to get shoes somehow.

Now, however, things are different. I am in the Army. Mind you, I volunteered for this scrap; I was not inducted or drafted. From the start I have been quite willing to spill my corpuscles in any designated hell hole they choose for the last rites—but I have never before been asked to walk barefoot to my own funeral. If I do I'll get my feet wet wading the River Styx.

The Army issues 30 different kinds of footwear in 238 different sizes but can I get 1 pair of shoes or can anyone who should know tell me how I could arrange to get just 1 pair of teeny, weeny 14½ B's?—no. Quartermasters laugh in my face and glibly say: You are out of luck, aren't you? Some joke.

The new shoe rationing wil' not affect me—rationing an idea is difficult. If only my feet were rationed 30 years ago the problem today would never have existed. I have to date exhausted every source, but I cannot raise any interest 'n my plight. If they insist on proper dress, from now on I'll have to tan my foot tops.

Someone said, Why don't you write your Congressman? So, pardon my baring my soul to you, but I have been forced to bare both my soles to everyone in the Army.

A perpetual supporter.

HIRAM Q. MACPENNYFEATHER,
(Alias: Lt. Thomas B. Spencer, M. C., 01689103.)

Capitol Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the article on David K. Niles to which I made reference on the floor today and which appeared in John O'Donnell's column, Capitol Stuff, in the Washington Times-Herald of March 22, 1943:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

The jittery White House job of running a fourth-term campaign for F. D. R. without creating any vulgar suspicion that a fourth-term campaign is actually under way is now in the plump, competent hands of one of the most interesting and little-known figures that the New Deal has tossed up in the last decade.

The gentleman who is quietly and unobtrusively making a place for himself in American history behind the best political camouflage thrown up in recent years is Mr. David K. Niles, of Roxbury, Mass., and the Carlton Hotel, administrative assistant to the President at $10,000 a year.

Most importantly, Brother Niles is one Roosevelt assistant whose past, as well as his present, gives proof to his life-long devotion to the specific requirements for his present White House post—"a passion for anonymity."

Postmaster General Frank C. Walker, as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, functions of course, in his titular position as head of the political arm of the party of which the President is the titular head.

But Niles, known on intimate terms only by the White House clique, a mysterious figure to the Democrats here except those from Massachusetts, is directing from behind the White House scenes the fourth-term movements of political forces that go beyond the bounds of Democratic Party regularity.

Niles for 20 years has been the intimate of Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter. For more than a decade he has been the trusted confidant of Harry Hopkins. The self-effacing, mild-mannered, mouse-like bachelor from Boston, scurrying from his quarters in the Carlton to his private office in the State, War, and Navy Buildings has successfully avoided all publicity and the searing burns of political limelight.

The Democrats who are waking up to the power of Niles in the White House third term have begun to demand more about his background and the source of his power. Democrats from west of the Alleghenies have been repeating the couplet:

"Where did you come from, Davy dear,
Out of the nowhere, into the here?
Where did you get your White House drag?
From Felix? From Harry? From holding the bag?"

Up in good old Boston the citizens from Niles' native city are as much bewildered as the newcomers to Washington when they try to account for Niles' rise to White House power.

From South Boston's L Street to Beacon Hill's Louisburg Square the politicians, some in rage, some in bewilderment, have pondered over the rise to New Deal power of the soft-spoken, bland, and benign little man from Boston who peered gently at them through his horn-rimmed spectacles and then swiftly yanked the rug of patronage from beneath their feet and left them sprawling before the eyes of their faithful supporters.

White House Administrative Assistant Niles is one of the New Deal appointees that the Senate had in mind when they considered the bill now pending before Congress, which will empower them to summon and interrogate all Presidential appointees making more than $4,600 a year. They are curious about the Niles mystery.

Niles is little known to political Washington and completely unknown to New Deal social Washington. Hence such recent descriptions of him as the "the mystery man," the "White House Rasputin," and the "thinking machine of the fourth term general staff."

The boys from New England, if they've been in the rough and tumble of recent elections, know his power better. They give Niles credit for being the intermediary by which John L. Lewis was persuaded to use his influence so that a half million dollars of labor funds was made available to the Roosevelt campaign treasury in the Landon campaign of '36.

They will also tell you that it was Dave Niles who back in those same years of New Deal popularity, launched the boom to make the President's eldest son James the Democratic nominee for Governor of Massachusetts—one of the few Niles-directed political moves that fell flat.

It was Niles, up in his native Massachusetts, who took over control of all Massachusetts appointments to Work Projects Administration jobs under delegated authority from Harry Hopkins, thereby arousing the fury of Democratic faithful. * * *

From Boston comes the assurance that Brother Niles, soon after World War No. 1, quietly—but always unobtrusively—identified himself with Boston's ancient, ever-active radical-liberal movement.

He became a director and one of the moving figures in Boston's famed Ford Hall Forum, which had its Civil War boots in the defiant Abolitionist free speech of William Lloyd Garrison.

Closely associated with Niles in those early days was English-born Harold Laski, then of Harvard's faculty, now spokesman for the radical wing of Britain's Labor Party. Others included leaders of textile strikers, in whose behalf Niles had been himself arrested, and the spokesmen for Boston's striking policemen—the civic explosion which won Calvin Coolidge the Vice Presidential nomination and, by Harding's death, the Presidency.

Even then, Niles was a shadowy figure against a background where more colorful actors stole the scene. His instinct for self-effacement is still a dominant characteristic. As one forthright new dealer explained it:

"When Niles is on a White House political errand I get the feeling that he's wearing sneakers and has a dictaphone in both pockets."

Most potent of the present connections of Niles is the friendship formed in the early twenties with Justice Felix Frankfurter, then Harvard Law School's most publicized liberal.

Frankfurter and Niles battled side by side in the losing fight to overturn the Sacco-Vanzetti death verdict.

In 1924, Niles was a Bay State worker for the Progressive Third Party ticket of La Follette and WHEELER. In 1928 he directed the organization of Republican Progressives and former Bull Moosers to back Al Smith against Hoover. Never in these years did Niles appear in the publicity forefront on a speaker's platform. Then, as now, he was a potent, invisible organizer behind the scenes.

When the New Deal came into power in 1933, Niles tiptoed into the national picture—his passion for anonymity then well established.

Under the Blue Eagle of the National Recovery Administration, Niles received from the late Gen. Hugh Johnson, a post empowering him to mediate in Blue Eagle labor disputes. He was ever in the background of any violent clashes.

Then came the start of the now powerful Hopkins-Niles combination.

After the death of the Blue Eagle, Niles became Hopkins' spokesman in Massachusetts for the old Federal Emergency Relief Administration and later for the Works Progress Administration. In 1938, quietly and without fanfare, he arrived in the Capital as Hopkins' Assistant Administrator of the Works Progress Administration.

In 1940, when Hopkins became Secretary of Commerce, Niles moved his office to the Commerce Building and became assistant to Secretary Hopkins.

After the fall of France, when Hopkins resigned his Commerce post to move into the White House, and F. D. R.'s defense program got under way, Niles followed him, and functioned as a special assistant under the now defunct production set-up headed by now Lt. Gen. William S. Knudsen and Labor Advisor Sidney Hillman.

Last August the mild-mannered, conservatively dressed bachelor from Roxbury became one of F. D. R.'s administrative assistants—"another eye, another ear, another arm, all directed by the President's brain, all imbued with a passion for anonymity."

Now Niles is directing the all-important opening thrusts of the fourth-term drive for F. D. R.'s 1944 election.

And the political writers from Massachusetts still report to us here:

"Most Bostonians still ask who Niles is when they hear his name and learn the great power he wields. Up here they admit Niles is more powerful than Boston's native son—majority leader of the House JOHN MCCORMACK.

"But they don't understand yet where Niles gets the pull."

Seven Sons in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. Erick J. Hultgren,

346 West Bluff Street, Marquette, Mich., have seven sons in the armed forces of our country. Six are in the Army and one in the Navy. In the order in which they entered the service they are: Arthur, 23, Army antiaircraft, stationed in Iceland; Herbert, 35, a corporal in the infantry at Fort Lewis, Wash.; Otto, 25, United States Army armored division, North Africa; Ernest, 40, mobilized infantry, Fort Riley, Kans.; Elmer, 29, signal corps school, Kansas City; Russell, 27, United States Army engineers, amphibian base, Fort Pierce, Fla.; Warren, 21, who left Marquette last month and is now at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noteworthy illustration of American patriotism. It is a fine example of what the American mothers and fathers of this country are willing to do in its defense and, in my judgment, Mr. and Mrs. Hultgren deserve the admiration and respect not only of the Members of this Congress but of the people of the Nation as a whole. I know that I personally am very happy and proud to say that these people come from the Twelfth District of Michigan.

Good Faith the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 8, 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of January 30, entitled "Good Faith the Issue."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD FAITH THE ISSUE—JOHN O'DONNELL WINS $50,000 VERDICT AGAINST PHILADELPHIA RECORD—WASHINGTON NEWSMAN'S LIBEL SUIT BASED ON ATTACK IN EDITORIAL

PHILADELPHIA, PA., January 29.—Damages totaling $50,000 he asked were awarded today to John O'Donnell, chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Daily News, in his suit for libel against the Philadelphia Record, because of an editorial it published April 18, 1941, attacking O'Donnell, whose Capitol Stuff column is also published in the Washington Times-Herald.

The issue in the case, as defined by Common Pleas Judge Joseph Sloan in a 40-minute charge to the jury, was the good faith of J. David Stern, publisher of the Record.

CALLED HIM BIASED

The Record did not attempt to plead or prove the truth of its editorial attack upon O'Donnell. The editorial called him a Nazi-phile and said he "broadcast to his friends and barflies his sympathies with Hitler's aims, such as destruction of the British Empire, suppression of labor unions, and liquidation of the Jews." O'Donnell is "not an unbiased reporter," the attack continued.

Stern testified that he wrote the editorial in the Washington bureau of the Record—the office of Robert S. Allen, who was then his correspondent there.

LISTS HIS INFORMANTS

Stern also testified he obtained information adverse to O'Donnell from George Backer, former coowner of the New York Evening Post, in which Stern is a stockholder and director; from Drew Pearson, with whom Robert Allen was formerly associated in writing the column Washington Merry-Go-Round; and from Charles Michelson, former publicity director for the Democratic National Committee.

O'Donnell's counsel later pointed out in argument that all of the defendant's witnesses were either associated with the defendant in business or were members of the Fight for Freedom organization who were later employed by the Government.

NEW TRIAL SOUGHT

The jury of eight women and four men reached its verdict against the Record late last night, and handed it to the court in a sealed envelope, to be opened at 10 o'clock this morning.

The trial took a sensational turn when, after the verdict was announced, Defense Counsel Scofield charged the jury had deliberated only a few minutes and hadn't given the evidence sufficient consideration. He said he made these allegations "in the light of information given by court attaches who overheard the deliberations."

The jurors, upon being questioned this morning, all stated they devoted 25 to 45 minutes to deliberations before taking their first vote, which admittedly was unanimous in favor of O'Donnell. Further deliberation was held on the amount of damages.

IMMEDIATE ARGUMENT REFUSED

The court refused Scofield's motion for immediate argument and ruling on his new trial petition.

This motion will be argued next Thursday before a panel of three judges, including the trial judge in the case.

This just closed trial, which lasted 9 days, was O'Donnell's second attempt to get the evidence of libel before a jury. His first, in November 1941, in another branch of the Philadelphia common pleas court, ended in a mistrial of a sort that has since attracted widest attention among lawyers all over the United States.

It developed as follows:

On the first day of the proceeding, O'Donnell's counsel entered most of their evidence in chief of libel by the Record and put on several of their principal witnesses.

The Philadelphia Record for the next day published a news story with an eight-column banner line disclosing the fact that O'Donnell had asked damages for $50,000. Under Pennsylvania law, the amount of damages claimed in any lawsuit is supposed to be kept secret from the jury, and to publish such information is contrary to the law of court procedure.

O'Donnell, therefore, was entitled to ask a mistrial, but his counsel informed the court they felt it more important to go on with the trial than to claim their rights under law.

FIRST TRIAL ENDED

Thereupon, Lemuel B. Scofield, counsel for the Record, went into the corridor of the courtroom building for consultation with Stern and, on his return, announced that the Record itself would ask for a mistrial on the basis of the story it had published.

To everyone's amazement, the judge promptly granted the motion, and the trial was ended with O'Donnell's principal evidence disclosed and the defense's still unrevealed, thus allowing the Record to profit from its own misconduct.

O'Donnell's counsel asked for the earliest possible resumption of the case, and this just-concluded trial was set for January 18. Among the witnesses for the Record, in its attempt to prove its good faith in writing the libelous editorial, was Stephen Early, secretary to President Roosevelt.

Other witnesses for Stern included Kennedy Crawford, of PM, one-time correspondent for Stern's New York Evening Post, and Gardiner Jackson, whose $5,600-a-year Agriculture Department job has just been abolished.

Ulric Bell, now with the Office of War Information, former executive secretary of Fight For Freedom, came from Los Angeles to testify for Stern.

Jackson has been cited several times by the Dies committee. Before going to the Department of Agriculture as special assistant to Under Secretary Paul Appleby, he was for several years an official of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union.

Testimony favorable to Stern was read into the court record in the form of a deposition by Robert S. Allen.

O'DONNELL'S WITNESSES

Among the witnesses for O'Donnel was Sir Willmott Lewis, Washington correspondent of the London Times. Others who testified for O'Donnell were: Morris Ervin, of Cincinnati Times; Warren Francis, Los Angeles Times; Theodore Goldsmith, financial writer; Charles Gridley, Chicago Sun; Lt. James Preston O'Donnell, United States Army. Also testifying by deposition was Arthur Hachten, International News Service.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY Republican of New Hampshire, confirmed O'Donnell's statement that before writing the story that brought on the Record editorial he (TOBEY) had conferred with O'Donnell and that he was one of the Senators who gave O'Donnell the information on which the story was based.

DEPOSITIONS GIVEN

Depositions favorable to O'Donnell were given by Washington correspondents Edwin W. Gableman (Cincinnati Enquirer), Richard L. Harkness (formerly of the Philadelphia Inquirer, now National Broadcasting Co. newscaster), Paul Ward (Baltimore Sun), and Clifford A. Prevost (Detroit Free Press and other Knight papers), but these were not allowed by the court.

Counsel who obtained the $50,000 judgment in O'Donnell's favor included John D. M. Hamilton, of the Philadelphia firm of Pepper, Bodine, Stokes, and Schock, and Louis G. Caldwell, Washington partner of the Chicago firm of Kirkland, Fleming, Green, Martin, and Ellis. Thomas E. Comber, Jr., assisted Mr. Hamilton.

Born and educated in Massachusetts, John O'Donnell began his newspaper career as a police reporter for the Boston Record in 1913, at the age of 17.

His first job in New York was writing descriptions for McCall's Fashion Plates, after which he got a job picking serials for a syndicate, and joined the staff of the New York Daily News in the middle 1920's.

He came to Washington to cover President Roosevelt's first inauguration in 1932 and has remained here since.

The possessor of a keen analytical mind, O'Donnell says he became a political writer by accident after years of police, crime and sports reporting in Boston and New York.

Self-Reliance the Only Hope for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, recently the President of the United States

laid before Congress his cradle-to-the-grave program for the future of America.

Such a program, if adopted in this country, means that the Republic of the United States will cease to exist. It is a program of state socialism. Therefore, it is refreshing indeed to hear the voice of one calling upon America to reassert its faith and confidence in individual initiative, economic competency, private enterprise, and the right of the citizen to improve his opportunities under a government established by freemen.

I offer for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a passage from an address delivered by H. W. Prentis, Jr., of Lancaster, Pa., before 700 members of the graduating class and 4,000 of their relatives and friends who attended the midwinter commencement of the University of Pennsylvania. The 700 members of the class responded enthusiastically to the sound principles and the common sense enunciated by the commencement speaker referred to, when he made the statement which I include as a part of my extension of remarks. The observations included in this commencement address ought to appeal to the intelligent, self-respecting middle class of America and to the two-thirds or more of our population who are competent to take care of themselves:

THE CULT OF COMPETENCY

Economic competency plays a very vital part in a republic of freemen. In fact, James Madison said, "The economic foundation of the American political system is the protection of the differing and unequal capacity of men to acquire and use property." Yet, in recent years, in the name of social reform, many serious obstacles have been placed by government in the path of the competent citizen. Under the added impact of war, these handicaps have now reached such proportions that, unless young people like yourselves see to it that they are ameliorated as soon as peace comes, the American Republic will be in serious jeopardy. When I was growing up as the son of a school principal, any man who could put aside say $20,000 in savings and life insurance for his family was considered to have accumulated a tidy fortune. Invested at 6 percent it yielded an annual income of $1,200, which purchased probably as much as $2,000 will buy today. Assume that, starting from scratch, a young man can save $20,000 today—a real task in the face of mounting taxes. Invested at 3 percent—about the maximum safe rate—this sum would yield $600 a year. Taxes would take a bit out of that, but after the war, with the creeping inflation now in progress, even $600 will probably not have the purchasing power of more than half that sum a few years earlier.

One of the finest instincts of a normal man is his desire to provide for the financial future of himself and his family. Hence, the situation I have just described, which strikes at the roots of personal incentive, is rightly a matter of deep concern to every thoughtful American. The preservation of our freedom and national well-being—including economic security for the unfortunate—depends directly on the continuation of reasonable financial opportunity and reward for the competent. Consider the plight of the one-third of our population who are alleged to be ill-nourished, ill-housed, and ill-clad. In the last analysis, who but the competent among us can help that situation? Of course, government can tax away the savings of the competent of this and past generations and distribute them; but eventually, when this accumulated fat is gone, where is new productive wealth to come from in a free society, if not from the ingenuity, initiative, and thrift of the competent?

It is, therefore, high time, it seems to me, for believers in American liberty to raise their voices in behalf of the two-thirds of our citizens who have proven competent to take care of themselves, and thus show some concern for the original "forgotten man" of William Graham Sumner—the quiet citizen who paddles his own canoe day in and day out, marries and raises a family, meets his bills promptly, pays his taxes, supports his church, contributes to the community chest, fights for his country when need arises, asks nobody to protect him from the cradle to the grave, and thereby does his quiet bit to maintain the American Republic for his children and his children's children. If this be social treason, make the most of it. As Somerset Maugham said: "If a nation values anything more than freedom, it will lose its freedom; and the irony of it is that if it is comfort or money that it values more, it will lose that, too."

Exempt From Income Tax the Pay of the Persons Serving in Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I submit for the consideration of the Congress the following resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois on the 18th day of March 1943. I hope the Congress will give careful consideration to this resolution:

House Resolution 28

Whereas our present Federal revenue laws require certain of our men serving in the military forces of our country to return a portion of their service pay to the Federal Government by way of income taxes; and

Whereas it is manifestly unjust that such men while bearing the fighting burdens of our country throughout the world should be additionally burdened by financial problems; and

Whereas from the meager service pay received by such men deductions are already being made for War bonds, insurance, and in many cases for dependents; and

Whereas when our military men are mustered out of service it is unfair that they should be forced to resume their civilian activities hampered by a debt already owing to the Federal Government: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact measures without delay to exempt all persons serving in the military forces of the United States from the payment of income taxes on all pay received by them from the United States Government for such services, and that a copy of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the clerk of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois to each Illinois Member of the Congress of the United States.

The Merchant Marine Are Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a speech made before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries on March 18, 1943, in favor of two bills filed by me, H. R. 1361 and H. R. 1858, which seek to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the United States merchant marine as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, there is no need for me to dwell on the great contribution the merchant marine is making in this present grave emergency. A few brief words should serve to focus attention on the invaluable work of these men, work which I am sure the committee fully realizes.

We recently completed passage of the extension of the Lend-Lease Act. The tremendous extent of the mutual assistance provided by the act, an assistance which must be even greater this year than last, will place an unprecedented and vital demand on the members of the merchant marine this coming year. The submarine warfare of Germany, which continues to wreak havoc and which will increase with the coming of spring, is another factor which must be considered. Again there is the very important consideration of the increasing drainage on manpower, which is causing a strain on all services throughout the Nation.

On the successful fulfillment of the lend-lease program depends not only the continued success of the United Nations in waging this war, but also the winning of peace and agreement thereafter. We all realize what tremendous upheavals, possible defeats, and international suspicion would result if the lend-lease program were to falter or slow down. And the continued success of the lend-lease program depends to a great extent on the merchant marine.

Submarine warfare continues to be our gravest enemy and our greatest problem. Even the secrecy covering the effectiveness of this warfare cannot conceal the fact that submarine warfare continues to be far too successful. And it is the merchant marine that bears the brunt of the attacks of the wolf packs.

These are important considerations, because they lead to this fact, namely, that while our available manpower is being rapidly depleted, our shipping demands are increasing. Once again the burden falls on the merchant marine. And the farmers speak true when they say that a farmer cannot be made in a moment. The same applies to the maritime service. Yet the drain on the skilled personnel of the merchant marine is tremendous. Records for the present war up to January 31, 1943, only slightly more than a year, show 3,617 members dead or missing.

This, then, is the situation. The risk grows greater; the toll of experienced men increases; the number of available men is rapidly reduced. There are no selective-service provisions to provide men for the maritime service. The result is that there is a virtual freeze on available manpower. The ranks are being rapidly depleted, and this in

a service that is as essential as any other service in time of war.

Even from this very brief outline, it is obviously a matter of immediate expediency that we take steps now to prevent the situation from becoming critical, if not hopeless. We all recognize the invaluable service of the merchant marine; but it is not so much our desire to acknowledge that service as our desire to prevent a dangerous crisis from occurring that prompts these proposals.

Present laws protecting these men are makeshift, uncertain, and changing. H. R. 133, a bill designed to clarify merchant-marine laws, is now waiting the President's signature to become law. What protection does this offer? Although most of the merchant mariners are civilian employees of the Government under War Shipping Administration, they would not be eligible for compensation from the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, nor would they be protected by the Civil Service Retirement Acts. And, of course, at present they are not eligible for any benefits by the Veterans' Administration.

What provisions then are made for these men? They receive a war-risk-insurance policy for $5,000. Their danger is as great, if not greater than the risk of men in our armed forces (the percentage of casualties is much greater); yet they receive a protection which is 100 percent less than that which is granted our men in the armed forces under the national service life insurance policies. The counter argument is made that these men receive this free; they pay no premiums. That seems irrelevant. The purpose of life insurance is to provide protection for the survivors, the dependents. They would not be affected in any way by the payment of a small premium; but what a tremendous difference there is between the five and ten thousand dollars. If we are to protect the dependents of these men who daily put their lives in peril, then we must accord them the same benefits which we give dependents of men in the service. Are they any less needy? Surely not. And that must be the basis for our decision. And, furthermore, no insurance company is going to offer these men and their dependents protection. Once again these men are squeezed by lack of full understanding. Five thousand dollars is not an adequate recompense and protection to a family when the source of all income and safety is gone.

H. R. 133 guarantees that the men in the merchant marine shall have all the benefits, etc., of seamen employed on privately owned and operated American vessels, with reference to their rights to redress for death, injury, or illness, with the exceptions I stated above. The committee must surely be aware of the endless chain of lawsuits, the great expense, the long delay, the disheartening litigation, which accompanies any attempt to secure such benefits. The ship or company must be sued for injuries, losses, etc.; and the burden of proof is great and rarely fully successful. This point could be expanded and more specifically demonstrated, but I think that the committee will recognize the apparent injustice.

We must remember that the provisions made for seamen on privately owned and operated vessels, which would be made applicable to these men, were provisions made in peacetime. There is no comparison between the conditions which prevailed then and the conditions which now occur. The inadequacy of these conditions is obvious.

Furthermore these men have no guaranty of reemployment after the war, as do our men in the armed forces; but their opportunities will be drastically limited. Nor are they granted any preference when applying for Government employment. We have the inappropriate situation of the Government controlling and employing these men in their extremely hazardous work and yet washing its hands of direct obligation to them and denying them the assistance which it accords to all other branches, civilian and military, of its workers.

One of the first arguments proposed against this measure arises from the fact that these men receive much greater return for their services than men in the armed forces. This argument recognizes first the similarity in the service which the merchant marine performs to the service of the armed forces. That is significant. The difference in pay becomes less significant in view of certain factors. First, these men are all specialists and the discrepancy between their recompense and the pay of specialists in the armed forces is not so great as we might imagine. The comparative uncertainty of this pay is another factor; this is less significant at the moment; but our problem, while prompted by the crisis, is a long-reaching problem. That, too, is a consideration we must keep in mind.

Another argument presented by the Navy and War Departments is that these bills confer in a sense a military status upon a group of civil employees not in the active military or naval service. It should be noted that veterans' status should be accorded to these men after the war is over, after honorable separation from the merchant marine service. This would involve no problems of military discipline, jurisdiction, or authority. It would not invade the line of demarcation which is zealously preserved between civilians and military personnel. The purpose is to accord to these men a status similar to that of veterans upon completion of their service. It is a question of properly and justly providing for these men at a time when their need will be great; it is a question of just and equitable provisions rather than a question of terminology or honor.

Protest is made that the phrase "member of the United States merchant marine" is not clear, and that not all seamen are engaged in the perilous work which exposes men to submarine warfare. The proper extension of this term, I think, is for the committee to decide, depending on its attitude toward the recommendation of the proposed measures. Such a determination would demand definition and clarification by the War Shipping Administration and the United States Maritime Commission. But this slight difficulty on the extent of the bill should not be used as an argument against its just demands.

The claim is also made that if additional rights, privileges, or benefits are to be extended to members of the merchant marine, the plan should be embodied in separate legislation, applying to the merchant marine alone. That has been the difficulty in the past, that is why present legislation is so shifting, bewildering, and, above all, so inadequate to provide proper protection to these indispensable men. Makeshift attempts at correcting errors and injustices have succeeded only to a small extent; the greater problems remain. That is the reason for these proposals, namely, that they would remedy immediately all injustices, eliminate all uncertainties, and provide definite and adequate protection at once.

In conclusion may I remind the gentlemen of the committee that after 60 days from the time a seaman leave his vocation, he is entitled to no medical care nor other service which the Federal Government accords to active seamen, and regardless of his service rendered to his Nation in time of war, he is not entitled to any consideration of any kind from the Government.

Gentlemen, questions of terminology, definition, or the sacredness of a separate status should not be permitted to blind our eyes to the essential fact that the men in the maritime service deserve the same consideration as the men in the armed services whose work and risk is similar, but whose consideration by the Government is so different.

The Challenge of Wartime Traffic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, we are constantly being reminded of the vital importance of highway transportation. We hear much of the rubber shortage, mileage rationing, and the shortage of motor fuel in the East. This is so because our automobiles are absolutely essential for transportation needed in war production and for maintenance of civilian life. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs I have had an excellent opportunity to observe the importance of automotive transportation under war conditions. There has come to my attention a highly important message, The Challenge of Wartime Traffic, delivered at the Southern Safety Conference by Pyke Johnson, president of the Automotive Safety Foundation. It pays a deserved tribute to my distinguished colleague the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; and others of our colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that this informative and timely address be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This conference has more than ordinary significance. It clearly indicates that the safety leaders of the South are alert to the problem of wartime traffic. It is timely because it brings into focus the fact that even in the midst of an all-out war we realize that conservation of life and property on the home front is of prime importance in support of our forces.

Not, if you please, solely from the humanitarian point of view which we have always considered a sufficient justification in itself, but because every life lost at home—and to date there have been more lives lost from accidents than in battle—has a direct impact upon our ability to achieve victory. Every casualty has a bearing on manpower and war production, whether it occurs in the home, in the factory, on the highway, or elsewhere. Carelessness today is deadly sabotage. Normally we have 1 doctor to every 750 civilians. Now we have 1 to every 1,500. Obviously, we must do more to avoid accidents.

Somehow we have not yet come to a full realization of one inescapable fact—that the civilian economy closely affects and is affected by the war. We equip our boys for battle with everything we can devise to protect them, but we still permit excesses on the home front which may strike them in the back. Even in peace times we never fully measured the total costs of hospitalization, wrecked homes and lives, growing out of preventable accidents.

HAS ROOTS IN COMMUNITY

The problem is one which calls for a great continuing educational effort such as is involved in prevention and care of tubercu-

losis and the use of antitoxins as safeguards against disease. It is a problem which begins with leaders of industry and technicians such as you who are assembled here, if it is to be intelligently met. But in the final analysis, it is a problem which has its roots in community life.

So its solution rests with every individual in the country. It requires also full and continuing support of those officials, Federal, State, and local, who are charged with the authority and the responsibility for safety wherever it is demanded.

Again I say, this conference has great significance. It should leave an imprint on thoughtful men and women everywhere.

As a layman, I could not for a long time fully understand the value of these safety meetings. Since, as an individual, I never had been particularly interested in safety, it was hard for me to understand the concern of others. Recently it has come home to me. Perhaps an analysis of my own approach may clear up for some of you the apathy which others have shown from time to time.

SAFETY NOT END IN ITSELF

Very few people, I believe, are interested in safety for themselves. Always it is for someone else. If we visualize the possibility of an accident on the highway, it is the other fellow who is going to get hurt. Our concern at home goes to our desire that our children shall get safely to school and back again. The housewife doesn't stop canning because she may get burnt. The farmer doesn't fail to plant and harvest the crop because he may get tangled in the machinery. The workman at the bench thinks first of making a living, then of accidents, if he thinks of them at all. In other words, safety is not our first interest in life. Always there are values which transcend it.

If that concept is real, then our approach to the problem will be sharpened if we will recognize the simple fact that the true path to safety is that of design. We must design safety into our machines. We must design safety into our roads, into our homes, into our lives, either through constant improvement in our physical techniques or into our educational processes. We must stress the responsibility of the individual in successful prosecution of the war.

If, then, in what I have said, the premise has been established that what you are concerned with is safety as a factor in winning the war, that it can be accomplished by a great forward educational and technological undertaking, perhaps I may be permitted to devote the remainder of my time to an analysis of these concepts and their solutions expressed in terms of a subject about which I know something—if not too much—namely, highway transportation. Keep in mind that while I may not be using the word "safety," I still shall be thinking of it, but as a means to an end rather than as an objective within itself.

WAR CONSERVATION NEEDS

Go back with me for a moment to December 7, 1941.

On that date the Japanese brought an end to automobile manufacturing in the United States. This crafty enemy made it necessary to turn facilities for automobile production to making implements of war—a job which has been done beyond all of the standards of planners at home or abroad.

A few months later, the same enemy forces conquered territory containing 90 percent of the natural rubber areas of the world and thus brought us face to face with an acute need for rubber conservation.

In another area German submarines began a campaign of destruction against oil tankers moving up the East Coast and this brought on an acute petroleum shortage to all of the people living in the Eastern States. People who had been taught in classrooms that A's on their report cards meant they were going places, had to revise all of their thinking and ways of living.

Now it is a curious paradox of the war, that it wasn't until Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public began to feel the effects of these Axis actions that they began to awaken to the fact that through their purchase of an automobile, they had over a period of years completely changed their whole way of living.

SIX STATES WITHOUT STREETCARS

We hadn't realized that six States no longer have any streetcars, we hadn't realized that 90 percent of our passenger mileage is by automobile; that 18,000,000 people living in suburbs were dependent mainly upon passenger cars to get to and from their places of work; that 48,000 communities have no other form of transportation; that we have only 140,000 busses all told, of which 90,000 are school busses. Nor had authorities realized that the loss of rubber supplies was possible or the effect of such a loss on our whole national economy.

Otherwise they would not have done what they did—build virtually all of the new war-production plants of the country on the peripheries of our cities so far removed from other forms of transportation that today 86 out of every 100 factory war workers in the country can only reach their places of work on rubber-tired vehicles.

At this point let me dispel the fallacy that because we have rationing we no longer have a traffic problem or individual transportation and so do not longer need the services of enforcement officials.

MASS AGENCIES EFFECTIVE

Actually, an amazingly efficient job is being done in moving people and goods by the great mass transportation agencies of the country, but they are reaching their peaks, and only the vast reservoirs of millions upon millions of passenger cars and trucks remains as the bulwark which will stand up against the growing pressures until manufacturing genius, working night and day, can bring in new processes and new materials.

Just 2 weeks ago William M. Jeffers, the Rubber Director, said: "Perhaps the greatest lesson of this war is that which is being taught the average citizen, namely, that the domestic economy of this country depends upon transportation, not only the transportation that is afforded by the railroads, airplanes, busses, and trucks, but also the individual transportation which each family has in its automobile."

Leon Henderson, just before his retirement from the Office of Price Administration, admitted to a Senate committee that "the reliance on automobiles and rubber-borne transportation is considerably more than even the loftiest statements made by the industries connected with the making of automobiles and tires."

If these statements regarding the essential character of highway transportation are true—and each of you can answer that question for yourselves in terms of your daily life—then they lead to certain indisputable conclusions.

THRIFT IMPERATIVE

Transportation shortages linked up with the shortage of manpower and materials for all purposes which are an inevitable corollary of all-out war mean that both the acquisition and maintenance of supplies and equipment of all kinds for our armed forces will impose increasingly serious burdens upon civilians. It must be made fashionable to be thrifty, thrifty in life saving as well as in material saving.

In all of our activities we must conserve what we have to the utmost. All of our transportation facilities are no more than adequate to the job at hand. If we don't conserve the vehicles we have and use them with the utmost efficiency, which means careful maintenance of vehicles, parts, and tires, and careful use of fuel, as well as sharing vehicle use with others; if we don't protect life and limb on the highways; if we don't care for our huge investments in highways and streets by careful, if lean, maintenance, then neither will we be able to get raw materials and workers into our far factories nor finished goods out; we won't be able to feed our urban populations, and so, logically, we won't win the war.

I put in that word "logically" by way of limiting the prophecy because, of course, we will conserve, and our men will win. We must not and will not fail them.

Recognizing that conservation of highway transportation is absolutely essential to winning the war, how are we going to bring it about?

First, let's know where the problem is and what it is. Then we can tackle it intelligently.

FACTS BASIS FOR PROGRAM

Fortunately, a vast fund of information exists for that purpose in the highway planning surveys of the 48 States in cooperation with the Public Roads Administration. These surveys have been carried on for a long period of years. They show where the traffic is, what it is, even why—in most cases. Then there are the illuminating studies of accidents made by the national safety council, and other findings of fact respecting manpower, material, stock piles, and all the other relevant information necessary to complete analysis.

Out of these data one of the most striking things we have learned is the essentially local character of the traffic with which we are dealing. It isn't for long distances. It isn't away from centers of population, it's to and from these centers.

And equally as important, its safe movement isn't dependent upon any single factor, but a multiplicity of factors which call for the services of the engineer, the educator, the law enforcement agencies, groups like this and, finally, the public at large.

Link these several factors together and what do you get as a program?

Recognition of the fact that only the armed forces can estimate their material requirements of war and that only Federal authorities can gage the total needs of the civilian population.

(Those estimates have been made, and out of them is seen immediately the need for conservation of life, limb, and property on the highway.)

PROBLEM LOCAL IN CHARACTER

But since the problem is essentially local in character, it calls, in the first instance, for administration by the State and local authorities and only as these authorities accept their responsibilities as outlined to them by the national administration, can we hope to move forward quickly and expeditiously.

That means, of course, that both at State and local levels, it is necessary to have focal points of authority behind which public opinion can be rallied by groups like this; and that the efforts of national agencies must be coordinated at the State and local levels, else we will have the confusion of many voices and failure to secure what otherwise would be a more than willing public response.

Fortunately, these administrative needs have been recognized in the creation of the State highway traffic advisory committees to the War Department made up of State highway engineers, motor-vehicle administrators, police, and, in some instances of public utility, commissioners and educators. These agencies and the men who guide them have the legal responsibility for safe and efficient use of our highways.

The Director of Defense Transportation has recognized the need for decentralization

in his call upon mayors to create local war transportation committees to work with and through the State advisory groups. Today there are more than 2,000 such groups in the country.

In the confusion attendant upon the dislocation which followed material shortages, the efforts of the several national agencies have not always resulted in complete coordination at the local level, but the problem is fully recognized at Washington now and progress is being made.

But again I say that full results can only be secured as State and local agencies accept their responsibilities. Here voluntary civic groups, such as this one, and industrial leaders can do a great public service if they will place their technical skill and public-relations appeal at the service of those hard-pressed men and women in Government who are struggling valiantly with challenging problems.

WARTIME PROGRAM AVAILABLE

Now as to the substance of the job to be done, much has already been accomplished in analyzing the problems involved.

As one illustration of what can be done to coordinate and unify the effort, more than 33 national organizations have already joined in endorsement of a wartime highway-traffic program, drawn from the platforms and principles enunciated by the American Association of State Highway Officials, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators as the principal legally responsible agencies in this field.

Further, this program is in accord with established national policies carrying the approval of the President and the administrators of all of the Federal agencies concerned with highway transportation.

In language it is a revision and expansion to meet war conditions of the standard highway safety program with which all of you are familiar. It calls for accident prevention, conservation of equipment and facilitation of essential war traffic.

Much already is being done to mobilize public support for its objectives. Its content is already before many legislatures. A great deal more should be done in the months ahead, and this is one of the many important functions of your conference.

MILEAGE CURTAILMENT

Bulking large among these problems is the need for curtailment of unnecessary mileage of travel to prolong the life of usable equipment.

At the moment tires appear as a central issue, if we are to maintain the rolling stock required to move millions of workers daily and to serve the transportation needs of farmers and other groups dependent upon the highways for their very existence.

Especially important to the users is the careful, periodical inspection of their tires to make sure that carcasses will not be worn to a point beyond recapping.

Not so obvious, but most important for the long pull is the condition of the vehicle. While synthetic rubber will be coming in on the basis of present Government programs by midyear 1944, so far no provision has been made for replacement of existing vehicles and again it must be emphasized that none exists. Further, none may exist until well after the war is over because conversion as we have learned by bitter experience, is not an overnight job, but one which requires months even to begin where we left off. The same applies to busses and mass transit facilities.

On last Thursday, Director of Defense Transportation Eastman said:

"It is important that car owners should understand that the public transportation systems have a terrific load to carry and that they need all the help the private automobiles can give them."

He urged that the use of cars for necessary purposes be conserved in every possible way and particularly "by the device of group riding," adding that the situation with respect to rubber-tired vehicles is more likely to become worse than better during the year.

Car sharing, staggered hours, changed transportation routes, provision of facilities for factory workers—these are problems at the community or metropolitan or State level and only as they are accepted as a war obligation by State and local officials, by industry, business, and by the public generally, can they be carried forward.

ENFORCEMENT PROBLEMS PRESSING

Involved, too, as problems of immediate concern are those having to do with enforcement. There is a constant pressure upon enforcement officials, already harried by loss of manpower, for a break-down in enforcement. There is an unwillingness on the part of the public to have men who are part of a war effort themselves disciplined when they break the laws of the road, and so endanger themselves, others, and the war effort. There has been a tendency to break down driver-examination procedures because of the same pressures.

There is the difficulty of maintaining enforcement forces at efficient levels due to lack of manpower and funds.

These are but a few of the problems which are arising every day now which will require unceasing vigilance to avert sabotage, death, and accident on the highways. The job, I repeat, remains one for public officials in the last analysis, and they are giving everything they have to its fulfillment. Still, it is one they cannot hope to accomplish without the full understanding and sympathetic support of experts like yourselves and of the citizenry generally.

OTHER IMPORTANT PROGRAMS

Comparable in importance to the wartime highway program is the manpower conservation program of the National Safety Council. If I limit myself to simply mentioning it, this is not because of failure to recognize its importance, but because it will be discussed later by an authority, Dr. Ned Dearborn.

In still another area, the War Department, working directly with prime contractors, is developing a national program of car-sharing in the field of transport of workers to factories.

These are specific action programs which are of immediate concern to each of you, and are of vast importance to the South at large, as well as to the Nation's war effort.

PROGRESS BEING MADE

Out of all this stress and strain and despite the confusion necessarily attendant upon it, great progress is being made.

With the peace, we shall have new techniques which will afford almost unlimited opportunities for highway transportation to contribute further to the welfare of our country and the world.

Peace will bring with it demands for the immediate useful employment of millions now engaged in the war.

As the war began, we had reached the end of a highway era in this country and were entering upon a new one.

The rural areas had been gridded with roads, never all that was desired, but still the greatest system of rural highways in the world, giving every center of population in the mainland highway contact with every other.

Over these roads moves a vast traffic which now finds its bottlenecks within our cities where vast projects must be carried forward in the future if we are to avoid the stagnation which was settling down upon us.

Here, again, Tennessee registers leadership in the person of Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, chairman of the important Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, who, with Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, and other distinguished Members of Congress, have been important figures in highway progress and will have an equally important part in defining Federal highway policies of the future.

PLACE FOR TECHNICIAN

In the development of future roads there is a place for the safety technician. His field, as we envision it, is broader than the word implies. It requires an understanding of the very pattern of life itself because only as we know where people go and why can we get at the ways and means of designing safety into the ways over which they move.

Winning the war is, of course, our first objective. All emphasis today must be placed upon the war requirements. But if we are to win the peace, then we must be ready when the war is over to apply immediately the lessons war has taught us.

We must be ready to meet the demand for freedom from restraint and for freedom of movement with facilities for enjoying that freedom safely if we are to reap the full fruits of our victory. On far-flung fronts our fighting men are ready to give their lives for all that America represents. America can do no less than pledge to them attainment of the objectives for which they are fighting.

Organization of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able speech delivered over the radio by the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] on the evening of Tuesday, March 23, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, it is a privilege for me to have the opportunity to express my support of Senate Resolution 114.

This win-the-peace resolution, introduced by Senators BALL, HILL, HATCH, and BURTON, has the support of Republicans and Democrats. The thoughts and ideas of the resolution were those of the Senators, and its introduction into the Senate was determined after careful deliberation by the authors and other Senators who had been invited to discuss the resolution.

It is a resolution to pledge our wholehearted effort to the war program and to assure our allies that the Senate is prepared to act positively as far as the Constitution of the United States permits by advising with those who are responsible for our foreign policy.

The resolution assigns three specific undertakings to the United Nations organization—namely:

First, the full utilization of the military and economic resources of all nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis Powers.

Second, the cooperation in the establishing of temporary administrations in the world areas taken over from the Axis until permanent governments can be assigned.

Third, the administration of relief and assistance in the territories of the member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by the United Nations.

These three problems are now being worked out, and it is our desire to have the Senate, by positive action, confirm what is being done by our military and political leaders.

The fourth and fifth sections of the resolution call for the establishment of procedure and machinery for peaceful settlements of disagreements and disputes that may arise between nations.

This would be supported by a military force to carry out the provisions that may be determined upon.

All of us know from experience that the fatal defect in the League of Nations was that it could render decisions but had no power whatsoever to enforce these decisions. There must be a military force of sufficient size assigned by member nations to the United Nations to suppress any future attempts of military aggression.

The authors of the resolution and those supporting it would not at this time suggest any of the details that would be necessary under such a plan but the principles of such a plan could be discussed freely in the light of what has happened during the past 25 years.

We all remember that the men of our armed forces fighting side by side with our allies 25 years ago helped to win the victory in the First World War. We also know that although we won the victory on the battlefield we lost the peace by quarreling and bickering which was caused primarily by the jealousies and hatred that followed the Armistice.

With these facts fresh in the mind of every citizen it appears to us that at least the Senate by positive action through such a resolution can cooperate fully with the President on the Nation's foreign policy. Everyone is well aware that our Constitution makes it difficult for our representatives to have sufficient power in conferring with the representatives of other nations. However, the assurance of the United States Senate in its desire for cooperation will certainly strengthen the hand of the officials of our State Department and all others who are now and who will be engaged in the discussions that are necessary first to win the war and next to win the peace.

In conclusion let me state that the foreign policy of the United States should be kept as free from party politics as is possible. There is no place for party politics in either the conduct of the war or in the agreements to be reached after the war.

The combined general staffs must run the war and the combined representatives of the United Nations must determine the post-war program. However, we do believe that they should have cooperation from the political end of our Government without factional, party, or personal politics.

It is for this reason that I favor the resolution, to the end that we can freely discuss the future foreign policy of this Nation when we are not engaged in a national political election.

The consideration of the resolution at this time would insure a full and free discussion both in the Senate and among the people. This is as it should be. This is a people's war. Let us help make it a people's peace.

This resolution's origin in the Senate was bipartisan and its support is bipartisan. Senator RALPH O. BREWSTER, of Maine, my Republican colleague, who speaks next, has had a distinguished public career. After serving in the last war he was Governor of Maine for 4 years and served three terms in the House before his election to the Senate in 1940. He is a member of the Commerce and Naval Affairs Committees and also is the ranking Republican member of the famous Truman investigating committee. His son is now in north Africa.

Organization and Collaboration of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by William Henry Chamberlin, published in the interesting paper, the Progressive, of Madison, Wis., of the issue of March 22, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA IS NOT GOD

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

It was in Hong Kong at the time of the crisis over Czechoslovakia in the autumn of 1938. War clouds were thickening both in the west and in the east. The Japanese had thrown a ring of conquered outposts around Hong Kong itself. An Englishwoman beside whom I was seated at dinner turned to me impulsively and said:

"If your great country would only say the word, there would be no war anywhere in the world."

It was a little difficult and embarrassing to repudiate such a flattering suggestion. With a realism that was perhaps ill-timed under the circumstances, I suggested to my companion that events had moved too far for words to offer much hope of stopping the drift toward war. And the overwhelming majority of the American people at that time were indisposed to underwrite the expenditure in blood, tears, and sweat that would be necessary to crush Hitler in Europe and to reconquer East Asia from Japan.

It is not only foreigners, always appreciative of our aid in men and supplies, not always so appreciative of our advice, who sometimes attribute to the United States the omniscience and omnipotence that are attributes reserved for the Deity. A good many Americans cherish the same delusion that it is only necessary for America to wish for something in international affairs to make that something happen. One result of this twist in our thinking is that our foreign policy has been more guided by cloudy abstractions, as opposed to concrete realities, than that of any other great power. We have permitted ourselves some great luxuries in this connection.

THE OLD LEAGUE ARGUMENT

This naive belief that America possesses divine powers has been responsible for some very inaccurate interpretations of past events. And, unless it is curbed by a wholesome infusion of bedrock facts, it will let us in for some sorry disillusioned headaches after the present conflict is over. For, unless all previous historical experience is misleading, a war of coalition, such as we are now engaged in, always ends in compromises between the viewpoints of the partners, not in the unconditional triumph of the aspirations of one of the allies.

It is often taken for granted that all would have been well with the world if we had only joined the League of Nations after the First World War. Apart from the fact that the terms of the peace settlements were glaringly at variance with the Wilsonian Fourteen Points which had been our theoretical contribution to a new world order, the actual record does not bear out this theory that American membership in the League would have averted war.

Canada was a member of the League. The Canadian Government, responding to the pressure of majority opinion at home, invariably tried to reduce Canada's commitments to fight under the terms of the League covenants to an innocuous minimum. There can be little doubt that the American Government would have acted similarly.

And, after all, American troops were not needed to stop Hitler when he tore up the disarmament clauses of the Versailles Treaty in 1935 and broke the Locarno Treaty by sending troops into the demilitarized Rhineland in 1936. It was not lack of physical power, but lack of will and unity on the part of France and England, that prevented the adoption of measures that would have stopped the Nazi menace at negligible cost.

WHAT INFLUENCE HAVE WE WIELDED?

These inaccurate assumptions about the past are often made the basis for improbable assumptions about the future. Many publicists and speakers seem to take it for granted that if America can be won for the idea of a world state or an international army or universal free trade the rest of the countries will immediately fall in line.

Now certain practical experiences in the present conflict should serve to dampen down these optimistic assumptions. As we are now the primary source of munitions and supplies for all the United Nations it would seem that our views about the organization of world order after the end of hostilities would command a certain amount of influence. At least we should wield more leverage than will be the case when the war is over and our allies do not need our manpower and supplies any longer.

But if we have done anything to modify the stiff unyielding British attitude on the Indian question which became very marked as soon as Japan was checked and the danger of a Japanese invasion was diminished the fact is a well-kept secret. Theoretically we are fighting to establish the "four freedoms everywhere in the world." And it would take a very agile stretch of imagination to reconcile British rule in India, or imperialist rule anywhere, for that matter, with freedom of speech and freedom from want and fear. Yet it seems to be psychologically and diplomatically impossible for us to do anything in the matter of breaking the Indian deadlock.

We also seem to have come off second best in our diplomatic dealings with Stalin. Our State Department has made a point of not recognizing the Soviet annexation of the three little Baltic republics, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Stalin, in his latest message to the Red Army, treats this annexation as an accomplished fact, something that is not to be disputed or discussed or referred to a plebiscite.

STORING OF DISAPPOINTMENT

And it is safe to predict that the fate of the Baltic states will depend on the ability of the Red Army to occupy them, and not on any idealistic generalities, such as the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." A good

many other post-war settlements will be carried out in the same rough-and-ready manner, if past experience is any guide to future events.

Walter Duranty, a publicist who has been generally regarded as quite friendly to the Soviet regime, recently predicted that Stalin's far eastern war aims included the establishment of a Soviet Republic of Manchuria. This, of course, is mere speculation. But Stalin's record in foreign policy (and I am not at all inclined to criticize him for this aspect of his dictatorship) is that of a man who does nothing for nothing.

We are merely storing up disappointment for ourselves if we imagine that Stalin, assuming, as seems increasingly probable, that Japan will not attack the Soviet Union, will help us out in the war against Japan, even after Germany has been defeated, except at a price. And that price may very well include Manchuria, which projects like an inconvenient wedge into Siberia and which would round out the Soviet frontier in the Far East very nicely.

WHOLE IDEA IS FANTASTIC

It will be interesting to watch the reaction in America if the hammer and sickle should replace the rising-sun flag of Japan in this big area of Manchuria, which legally belongs to China, where most of the people are of Chinese stock, but which China has never possessed the military strength to defend. Should we be obligated to oust Russia by force? Or should we decide that a Russian occupation of Manchuria was somehow more compatible with the moral law and with our own security than the Japanese had been?

Before we commit ourselves to any adventurous anti-Soviet policies it would be wise to remember that the mere fact of total defeat and disarmament of Germany in Europe and of Japan in the Far East will leave the Soviet Union, by process of elimination, far and away the strongest land power on the two continents of Europe and Asia. In fact, it will be extremely difficult to implement any settlement in eastern Europe, in the Far East, and in other Asiatic regions adjacent to the Soviet Union that does not meet with the approval of Moscow.

The whole idea of America laying down the law to the world is fantastic. Every scheme of world domination by a single power has ended in a fiasco; and we should face a similar experience if we should ever be ill-advised enough to try to force our will, or our philosophy of government, or our standards of morality on other countries. The immense shrinkage in our civilian production, the decline in our standard of living that has been the result of the comparatively modest overseas operations which we have already undertaken, is a significant indication that the effectiveness of our power is in pretty direct inverse ratio to the distance over which it has to be exercised.

POSITION OF SOVIET UNION

It is a strange illusion among some Americans to regard this country as the primary, if not the sole obstacle to the realization of idealistic, but often impractical schemes of world salvation. I sometimes find my breath taken away by the glib orators and publicists who assume that a world government might come into existence tomorrow, if the idea could only be sold to the American electorate, or that we alone are blocking the way to universal freedom of trade and immigration.

In this matter of world government, of international police force, and of other measures requiring considerable abrogation of national sovereignty it is interesting to consider the position of the Soviet Union. Here is a country that has almost sealed itself hermetically against foreign contacts. The average Soviet citizen has no right to receive a foreign newspaper.

Foreigners are admitted with great difficulty and are closely watched by the political police. A whole younger generation has grown up with a minimum of contact with the outside world, schooled in the most uncompromising nationalist patriotism.

There have been frequent complaints that American military representatives have been given very limited opportunities for observation, despite the extensive aid in munitions and supplies which we have been sending to Russia. Now even if one assumes that some of the distrust of the outside world which has been so characteristic of the Soviet Union may be attributed to a sense of military insecurity and will abate after the war, it seems highly improbable that such a regime could be fitted into any scheme of world reorganization which would require extensive abrogations of national sovereignty and much give-and-take in information about armaments.

SLOGAN OF HEALTHY HUMILITY

Or take the question of free trade. We were stupidly and shortsightedly selfish in our economic policy during the twenties. It was absurd to maintain a high tariff wall and at the same time to try to hawk our goods and capital in all the markets of Europe and Asia and South America. One hopes that the lesson taught by the widespread repudiation of our loans and the world economic crisis has been learned, and that after this war we will not lend money abroad unless we are prepared to let our debtors pay us in the only practicable way, in goods and services.

But we are by no means the only great power that will impose restrictions on the free flow of trade after the war. Foreign trade, like industrial production, is a matter of state planning in the Soviet Union. And planned trade is not free trade. It also seems highly probable that England, the old stronghold of free trade, will find itself forced to retain war restrictions on the movement of goods and currency after the end of hostilities and will probably try to use as an asset the accumulation of blocked pounds in Canada, South America, and other countries. The whole set-up is not encouraging for freedom of commerce, no matter what may be our own tariff policies.

We will avoid a great many disappointments if we examine the attitude and psychology of other countries realistically before we raise high hopes of international federation, if we recognize the limitations which geography imposes on our international influence, and if we engrave on our minds the slogan of healthy humility: America is not God.

Resolution of Shreveport, La., Chamber of Commerce Seeking Reduction in Number of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed on March 11, 1943, by the Shreveport, La., Chamber of Commerce seeking a reduction in the number of Federal employees.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Manpower Commission, through its various spokesmen, has repeatedly emphasized the manpower shortage in the essential industries in the United States, especially agriculture, war-material producing industries, and the armed forces; and

Whereas it is being debated continuously in the halls of Congress as to whether or not America, because of the manpower shortage, will be able to produce the necessary food and materials to maintain an army of desired strength, both for ourselves and our allies; and

Whereas to do so it is recognized by all that the most effective and complete utilization of existing manpower within the Nation must be maintained at all times and accordingly unnecessary activities in the field of government, as well as in business, must be minimized or dispensed with; and

Whereas in the various Federal bureaus in Washington and elsewhere throughout the United States the personnel has been expanded needlessly in the pursuit of efforts, some of which are nonessential, and even in the essential wartime activities of the Government the civilian personnel has been increased to the point of creating conflicting agencies and committees, conflicting efforts on the part of the staff employees, and the resultant decrease in efficiency and waste of energy through the duplication of effort; and

Whereas our ratio of civilian to military personnel exceeds by far that of comparative nations who are our allies in this conflict, thus demonstrating the nonessentiality of many of these employees with respect to the war effort; and,

Whereas careful estimates made by authorities indicate that at least 1,000,000 men could be removed from the Federal pay roll of our Nation without in any way affecting adversely the needed services of our Government during this period of national emergency, and it is further believed that the eliminating of conflicting activities through this reduction in personnel would increase the efficiency of those remaining to more than offset any work now being done by those removed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce, through the unanimous action of its Board of Directors, go on record as recommending to the National Congress that they take the initiative in reducing the Federal pay roll by at least 1,000,000 men so as to aid in relieving the manpower shortage in the United States; be it further

Resolved, That in expressing our wishes to the Members of Congress we, through this resolution, urge upon them the necessity for government, as well as private enterprise, eliminating business as usual and making the sacrifices necessary to the winning of the war.

This resolution passed on the 11th day of March 1943, by the Board of Directors of the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce, Shreveport, La.

L. M. MOFFITT,
President.
ED C. BURRIS,
Secretary.

Reorganization and Collaboration of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an article and poll by George Gallup relative to the resolution recently offered to the Senate by the Senator from Minnesota and three other Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONVINCED UNITED STATES SHOULD BEGIN ACTION NOW

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., March 3.—Senator BALL'S resolution, which would have the United States take the initiative in organizing the United Nations for war and post-war action, is in accord with the majority opinion of American people at this time.

What may be of equal significance is the fact that the majority of voters in both the Republican and Democratic Parties are equally convinced that action should be taken now by the United States to see that the country participates to the fullest extent in world post-war planning. This agreement among the rank and file of both parties may mean that this issue may not be the bitter party issue that it was after the last war.

The institute has probed the public's view on three aspects of war and post-war problems, all of which are embraced in the Ball resolution. Substantial majorities of both Republican and Democratic voters favor all three proposals.

The American people believe that we should take steps now, before the end of the war, to set up with our allies a world organization to maintain the future peace of the world. And majorities in both parties favor formation of a joint Allied war council which would plan all war operations against the Axis Powers.

On the general question of whether this country should take a more active part in world affairs after the war, the public votes in favor of such a proposal by an overwhelming majority.

The resolution offered in the Senate last week by two Democratic and two Republican Senators thus reflects the same political unity on the issue as exists among the voters.

Field representatives put the following question to a cross-section of the country's voters:

"Should the Government take steps now, before the end of the war, to set up with our allies, a world organization to maintain the future peace of the world?"

The national vote and the vote of Democratic and Republican voters follow:

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
National	64	24	12
Democratic voters	65	23	12
Republican voters	63	28	9

The question on the joint allied war council asked of another Nation-wide cross section follows:

"Do you think the United States, Britain, Russia, China, and their allies should form a joint war council which would plan all war operations against the Axis Powers?"

The results show again the vote of Democratic and Republican voters.

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
National	74	9	17
Democratic voters	74	8	18
Republican voters	75	10	15

Following is the question dealing with the general issue of whether this country should take a more active part in world affairs after this war:

"After this war, do you think the United States should stay out of world affairs, or take an active part in world affairs?"

	Take active part	Stay out	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
National	76	14	10
Democratic voters	78	12	10
Republican voters	76	15	9

What the Farmers Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the farmers in my district need, most of all right now, some new farm machinery, parts and repairs for old machinery, and the manpower that will enable them to produce the amount of food they are expected to produce.

I have listened to the debate on this bill, and I am surprised by the measure of interest displayed by Members from the big cities. It is encouraging to hear them finally admit that food is essential to the winning of the war and to hear them give the farmer credit for the important part that he is playing in this emergency. It is only recently that I have begun to hear these city people admit that food is as important as ammunition. That is what we have been trying to put across to them ever since we got into this global war and from the beginning of selective service.

I fear that what we are doing here today may be a little late. The farmers of America are already plowing and producing in some parts of our country. The sun is shining, and time and weather wait for no man. If our farmers can have the machinery and manpower that they need, they will do the job that they are being asked to do.

If the Almighty gives them the moisture and the right kind of weather, the farmers can be depended upon to produce. But I cannot now tell you that they are going to produce as much as they did in 1942—a great crop year. The evidence in my district indicates that production will be less than it was last year. Some of the reasons are that we may not get enough moisture at the right time. Most of our farm boys have already gone into the service. Their occupational value was underrated. Another reason is that the Department of Agriculture was not given the needed amount of help when it started long ago to plead for machinery and repairs for the farmer. We are now informed that we can expect very little new farm machinery this year. So we must depend on what the implement dealers and jobbers have in their stocks. For the present we must concentrate on parts and repairs and what old machinery is available. The extraordinary prices at which farm machinery is selling at farm sales reveal the seriousness of the situation. Another reason is that the price-fixing program has hit our producers. Many of them, seeking to avoid losses, sold live animals before they were finished for market. Much farm land may lay idle this year. The demands upon producers to supply our ever-increasing armed forces with food and to meet the increasing food requirements of our allies tax our food resources to the limit. It takes time to produce meats and other foodstuffs which our farmers are told they must furnish. They just cannot do the job unless they are aided in the procurement of necessary machinery and experienced farm help.

Notwithstanding the handicaps our farmers faced last year, they did an astonishing job. It is almost a miracle that they completed the great harvest last year in the face of their difficulties. They can be depended upon to duplicate that job only if they get more helpful encouragement and less interference.

The names of two farm agencies have been brought into the controversy over this proposed legislation—the Farm Security Administration and the Agricultural Extension Service. So far as I can learn, the farmers in my State consider them part of the Department of Agriculture. Each has its own functions to perform. The Extension Service has been doing a great job in my district with 4–H Club boys and girls, and Dr. W. H. Brokaw, who is the Nebraska director, has the respect and confidence of the people in my district. The Farm Security Administration has its separate functions to perform, and so far as I can learn, there has been no duplication of work between these two agencies.

To indicate to you the harmony which exists between the two in my State, I quote the following statement made by Mr. Cal A. Ward, Regional Director of the Farm Security Administration at Lincoln, Nebr.:

> The relationships between the Farm Security Administration and the Extension people in Nebraska are fine and have been ever since the beginning of the Farm Security Administration. Dr. W. H. Brokaw and myself have been personal friends for the last 15 years. There is no duplication of work between these agencies. The county agent has his specific work to do, and the county supervisor has his specific work with Farm Security borrowers. I've insisted from the beginning that this whole job was of such proportion that full and wholehearted cooperation was essential to success.

Mr. Speaker, the real reason why I speak today is that I wish to tell the House that I have assembled opinion from many farmers throughout all of the counties of my district, and opinion, also, from merchants and professional men. I knew that there would be considerable discussion on these farm bills that are now coming to us. I wanted to know directly from the people in my own district what was going on. I wanted to know what they thought of conditions and what, in their opinion, could be done. I especially wanted to know what was really needed out there where the food is produced. So I have taken the following excerpts from many of these

letters, and I include them in my remarks so that all members of Congress may read them and get a true view of some of the things that are now in the minds of the real farmers:

ANTELOPE COUNTY

First—

It is hard to get help on the farm now, and it will be a problem when spring work starts. You know the boys from town or the city—those of 14 to 15 years of age—are no good on the farm. I think boys raised on the farm should be left. We have had boys from town who just can't learn to milk, and you have to be with them all the time to tell them what to do.

Second—

I want the farm program continued. We don't want a repetition of the effects of the last war. We are getting very short of farm help. I have two sons in the service and one boy 18 years of age at home. I can't run this farm alone and make it produce to full capacity. I don't complain about the two boys going, but we are asked to produce food and should have the help to produce it.

Third—

I am paying 75 cents for corn and getting $14 for hogs. That is fine for me, but it certainly is not just for the man growing corn for the market. If one has to hire help at the present prices, grains are pretty cheap. I wonder if the folks there know the risk of raising hogs, as they are subject to so many diseases causing so many losses. It is hard to say just what hogs should be worth—$1 corn and $14 hogs is a fair enough ratio, but 50 percent of the average people are not making money on hogs at these prices, for they don't understand the hog game. Feeding cattle, too, is a great risk.

Farm machinery is not as serious a problem as we are being told. If the blacksmiths and machinists are allowed the proper materials to work with, we will be able to get by for a good while.

BURT COUNTY

First—

The farmers in this community are willing to go to the limit in food production, but we can't do it unless we have more competent labor at a price that the farmer can afford to pay. We simply can't compete with wages paid in the war industries. Farm labor here has been cut 15 percent.

I believe there will be plenty of machinery on the farms and available in warehouses, and repairs enough on hand for old machinery to farm every available acre of land in our entire county.

The most complaint is made about lack of competent labor and, also, the farmer wants less interference. There are thousands of acres of land along the Missouri River that could be made very productive. We ought to reclaim some of this land that is now wasted by floods.

Second—

Of course, the first important contributions for those of us producing the food Washington is asking us to produce, are rain and good weather, and I know they can't do anything about that. Nearly all of our farmers and farm workers between the ages of 18 and 40 are gone. The situation is far more acute than a year ago. Farm sales due to lack of help still continue. I believe that all men with farm experience and over 35 years of age should be released from service. Of course, there are not so many of them, but one experienced man is worth six or more inexperienced men, especially those raised in the city.

We need farm machinery and repairs.

Another great question out here is the matter of time. Daylight saving time does not fit into the farmer's program. Let us have God's time and not man-made time. The latter is most confusing and of no value that I can see.

CEDAR COUNTY

First—

We have had fine weather out here, almost comparable to the South or California, and we had a good rain, but we will need more of it. Cattle, as a whole, look good because there is plenty of feed. Hogs are in good shape. Warm weather has brought up egg production. Everybody seems to be getting along all right but this is our slack time. When spring planting comes and the harvest time arrives, we will have a shortage of labor.

Second—

We are increasing our hog production. I had 140 hogs and this spring I figure on having 200, and if I raise fall pigs, I expect to double the amount. I usually have about 9 or 10 cattle in the feed lot but expect to have 30 or 40 head. I figure everyone will do their part and do the best they can. Of course, we are going to be short of help because the boys are gone. We will get along in our community.

Of course, we need parts and repairs. The lumber is our biggest problem around here. The Government wants us to produce more stuff and one cannot get lumber to build shelters. Wire is another article that one cannot get. We need barbed and woven wire very badly for our fences.

COLFAX COUNTY

The farm-labor situation would not be serious if we could make a better distribution on every farm. If the farmers could get repairs for old machinery, I do not think we would suffer from the lack of machinery. If they do not get repairs and parts, there will be serious delay in getting the crops under cover. Of course, if we have good weather so that the farmers will have enough time to clean the harvest up, it will not be so bad, but if we should have rainy weather during the harvest and the farmers do not have repairs for their binders and will be forced to wait until their neighbors get through so they can borrow a binder, there will be considerable loss.

CUMING COUNTY

First—

I feel that a higher price for corn would encourage people to increase production. It would aid in counteracting the increased wage scale. At the same time, I cannot see that it would harm the production of hogs and cattle. As long as farmers can raise what they like and as much of it as they like, they will be willing to raise all that is humanly possible.

Some men are now being deferred because they are essential to farm production, but, even so, we are suffering from a labor shortage. Many are either in the service or in the defense plants. Yet, there are some individuals who are idle and who are capable of helping if they would be willing to do so. These people must somehow be made to cooperate with the farmer to increase his production.

If we could get sufficient repairs, I believe the farmers can get along this season with but little new machinery; however, more new machinery will be needed next year.

Second—

I cannot see how the farmers are going to produce much more than they have. The serious thing here seems to be farm machinery, parts and repairs. So far as labor is concerned, I believe the farmers will get along with the work, but if they take very many more farm boys into the service, it will be serious.

Third—

I am farming 300 acres of land. I have 300 head of livestock, but I am short of help. There seems to be plenty of help in the East on a 48-hour-week basis. We work from before sunup until way after sundown. We will need some repairs for our machinery.

DAKOTA COUNTY

Labor to carry on our normal, or better than normal, crop production will be about as it was last year when we had some labor shortage. We have some farm labor which went into the service, but we also have some labor coming back out of the service due to the 38-years-of-age limitation. We will have more women working on the farms than ever before, and the situation will not be much worse than last year unless we are unfortunate enough to hit out-of-the-season weather for the various crop plantings and harvesting. I believe, if we get the right kind of weather and nature is kind to us, and the farmer is not thrown behind in his work, he will be able to handle the situation.

We read a lot about strikes in the industrial centers, and we in the Middle West don't like it when they stage a let-down of production in the face of what is needed in the war effort.

DIXON COUNTY

First—

We had so many bad years we could not buy new machinery. Ours is all worn out. At farm sales old machinery brings more than new machinery. Hay rakes bought in 1932 for $50 sold at one sale for $98. An endgate feeder bought for $32 sold for $64. We hear a lo+ about new machinery, but we never see any. If we could buy tractors and tractor-drawn machinery, then there would be no labor shortage. One man with a corn-picking machine can do the work of 10 men picking by hand. It seems that every farmer around here needs some new machinery.

Second—

The greatest complaint of farmers at this time is lack of help on the farms. The great majority of young men have been drafted. Farm help cannot be hired, and where it can be had it is not the best, owing to the lack of knowledge possessed by the city worker. Lack of sufficient tractors and tractor-drawn machinery is quite a handicap to the farmers who are actually living on the farms and doing the farm work.

DODGE COUNTY

There have been more than a thousand people from this county who have been inducted or who enlisted in the armed forces during the past 18 months. Many of these have been farm boys and men taken out of vital industries. Many of these boys are from farms, and since leaving their fathers, many of them because of age, have had to sell out because they are not physically able to carrry on the farm work. I checked with one of the leading livestock companies, which handles farm sales, and one of the owners told me that since November 1, 1942, their firm had conducted a sale every day and two sales on some days, with but two exceptions—Christmas and New Years. Unless something is done to help the farmers in this area, as well as throughout the rest of the State, the food necessary to feed the Army will never be produced this year.

HAMILTON COUNTY

First—

All the farmers here will do their part in the production of food which will be increased considerably. I am very glad to see, especially in my community, that every farmer is doing his bit. Right here the farm labor problem will not be so serious except in the harvest time, when we will be short, but with good weather I think we can handle the crop pretty well.

At the present writing we have plenty of repairs, but should we be denied the necessary repairs, and we have break-downs, the result would be serious. Get us as many repairs and parts as possible right now.

The most talked of thing here is the daylight savings time. The average farmer's day starts before daylight and lasts until pretty well after sundown, and what does livestock care about time? When we have business in town, we must go during the best working hours of the day, so I would say, do away with the daylight savings time and go by sun time.

Second—

Dairy milk prices should go up. Feed costs have gone up from 20 to 25 percent. Labor has actually doubled in price since last March, but the producers of milk must keep their prices down to 1942 levels regardless of the increased prosperity in industrial sections. Defense workers get from seven to twenty dollars a day, and dairy products are forced to be sold at prices that are almost ruinous.

The labor situation on the farm is serious. I am sure that we cannot operate 100 percent out here as we employ so much help producing milk.

MADISON COUNTY

First—

The trouble is, in my opinion, that the Federal agencies seem to have enough men to build the guns, the ships, and airplanes which, in my way of thinking, is well organized, but they seem to have too many cooks who get into the soup. Everybody tells you how to cook up the soup on the farm and how to win the war. Nobody seems to know about our food production. The farm system does not seem to be united on how much food we can raise. We are having too many farm sales in our community. Too many are forced out and others want to quit because they know what happened in the other war.

Second—

Farmers around here are in pretty fair shape. Many are starting to buy farms. All of the farms are rented so far, and if we get rain we will have a larger crop than last year. There will be no idle acres and a very great amount of cattle, hogs, and chickens will be raised. The farm prices are very good and we certainly do not want crazy prices like we had in the last war. We may need a little extra help during harvest time. If the manpower is really needed, there are a good many men clerking in stores, beer parlors, and filling stations that could be forced to work. We are much worse off here as to machinery due to all of ours being old, and with conditions as they were for so long it was impossible to buy new machinery, but people are repairing and getting along. Just give the farmer some repairs and parts and he will do the job with what he has. We are having a number of farm sales because things sell so well, but there are no idle farms. A great number of women will be used, and the women are glad to go into the field with their men folk.

Third—

The boys are all gone. My wife and I are left alone on the farm. We will do our best to produce what we are asked to produce, but farm labor is scarce and we will need some repairs and parts.

PIERCE COUNTY

First—

There will be a decline in milk and dairy products in this neighborhood as I can name at least six farmers who have cut down on milk cows or are going to do so as soon as the spring work starts. We know we put in 70 or 80 hours of work on the farm as compared with the 48-hour week you people are talking about back there. There has been a sale every day—and sometimes two a day—throughout the winter, and a lot of the farmers are going to the city to work on account of more pay and less work. What farmers are on the farm and those who are going to stay on the farms tell me they will let the crops rot in the fields before they will hire white-collared workers from the city and pay them exorbitant wages when their own boys who were experienced farm workers are gone to the front. I believe the farmers can get along on their old machinery if they can get the repairs and parts. The farmers' wives and the women folk will help the farmers produce as much as they can.

Second—

Under war limitations it is impossible to increase our food crops. We are short of some machinery, and skilled farm labor is a serious problem. We can't get any help to carry on this extra production. One farmer who was shelling corn needed some help. He went to town to get a man to help shovel the corn, and this man charged the farmer $3 for 3 hours work. In this community there have been many farm sales. So many of the older farmers are retiring. Their boys are gone and they are renting their farms.

PLATTE COUNTY

The farm-labor problem in my community is not serious as yet. There are still a few men in the small towns that should be forced to work on the farms. I think we can get along without new machinery if we can only get repairs and parts for our old machinery.

POLK COUNTY

The labor problem is bad here and will be worse. One farmer who is farming 320 acres had 140 acres of corn. He couldn't hire any help with the result that he still has some corn in the field. There is a big demand for machinery here but it cannot be obtained.

SEWARD COUNTY

First—

Food crops could be increased by letting the farmers grow crops that are adapted to certain conditions, namely, more moisture or less moisture. At this time we have been asked to raise war crops in Nebraska that do not fit into this particular part.

If drafting of farm men isn't completely stopped, you will find the result will be that next fall there will be less food. In talking to other farmers, I do not think there is a desperate need for new machinery, but repairs and parts should be made available. We have more machines than we have men capable of operating them around here.

People complain most about the complexity of forms and questionnaires that have to be filled out to get fuel for tractors, etc.

Daylight-saving time does not fit agriculture in our part of the State.

We want less commissions and less bureaucrats.

Second—

On the farm question, I will give you a few generalities. Example No. 1: A farmer and his two sons were farming 370 acres of good farm land. Both boys were single and living at home. The boys were called into the service just before husking time. This left the father with 175 acres of corn to husk and no help to get. After a time he got a one-row corn picker by paying the owner $50 more than it cost new. I was out to his place this fall and he was pushing wagons around by hand to hook them up to the picker. I have not seem him since but was told by neighbors that he had covered his fields and got the corn that was standing up, but it was an impossibility for him to go over the fields and pick up the loose corn. This man says he will farm as much as he is able to handle and has time for and that the rest will have to grow up in weeds.

Example No. 2: A farmer, about 70 years of age, and his son were farming 140 acres. The boy did not ask for deferment because he did not want public opinion to be pointed at him. A neighbor living close by and farming 160 acres of his own is going to farm the place for him in addition to his own.

I have asked many farmers about machinery. Some of them stated they needed new implements, but because they couldn't get them, they would have to do the best they could. The main trouble is to get the old machinery in working condition and that means we have to have parts and repairs. We will not produce as much this year as last year because of the shortage of manpower and because we will scarcely have the ideal crop conditions in this locality as we had last year.

Third—

The average farmer around here seems fairly well satisfied with the prices today. He is opposed to too much interference. Let the farmer raise what he wants. If some product is needed more than some others, just raise the price of it. The farmer will raise more of it.

Labor is a serious problem here. Where the extra labor will come from I don't know. We will do our very best, but we can only do so much. In my opinion, the labor situation is more serious than the machinery problem.

I think crop production around here will be retarded 5 to 10 percent.

THURSTON COUNTY

First—

The farm labor problem is serious. There just aren't enough farm hands around here. People complain mostly because of lack of machinery, lack of repairs and parts to put old machinery into working order.

Also, the scrap-iron heaps in the towns; people are wondering if the Government really needs it. It is hard to collect any more scrap, and it will be until this other is moved. The farmers are not complaining about rationing.

Second—

So many boys have left the farm to work in defense plants in this State and Iowa and South Dakota because of high wages. Many have gone to the west coast also; and, of course, many have left for the service. I am sure we cannot raise as much as we did in the past because of the lack of labor and lack of machinery. In my opinion, the trouble is that there has not been enough foresight on the question of agriculture as it fits into the war picture.

YORK COUNTY

Farmers do no like too much interference and too much regimentation. All they want is a fair price for their products with reasonable profits. They would like some of the privileges that are enjoyed by labor groups. There is a great shortage of help, that is, experienced help. There will be a shortage of machinery, and we need repairs and parts. I do not think production will be retarded very much, but it will be some. Most farmers I have talked to want to be left alone. They are willing to produce everything that will aid in the winning of the war.

Deferment of Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an article taken from the March 19 issue of Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., which discusses the question of deferring farmers. Coming as it does from this stanch opposition newspaper, I am very glad to have it put in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFERRING FARMERS

In the form approved by the Senate the Bankhead bill providing for the deferment of farm workers from the draft is much less objectionable than the original version. That is at least part of the explanation for the 50 to 24 vote by which the Senate passed the measure in the face of the strenuous opposition of the armed forces and selective-service authorities.

Some of the looseness tending to make the bill a refuge for draft dodgers has been eliminated by the provision requiring that deferred workers must be engaged "substantially full time" in the production or harvesting of crops deemed essential to the war effort. Moreover, deferment is to be granted only to workers who stay on the farm.

To meet the argument that the measure is undemocratic because it binds farm laborers to the soil, the Senate provided that a farm worker who wants to leave the land can ask his local draft board to decide whether it would be better for him to take another job or enter the armed services. These decisions are subject to appeal. Also, since the boards must give the deferred worker a certificate stating that its action has been found to be in the best interests of the war effort, it appears that they will retain some freedom of judgment.

Nevertheless, passage of this measure by Congress would seem to set up a favored class and would therefore be disruptive of the Selective Service System. It would at the same time impose a certain compulsion on one group and not on others. The real explanation for the Senate's action lies in the seriousness of the food situation and the inadequacy of the administration's manpower program.

For that reason a Presidential veto alone will not be enough to dissuade the Congress. There will have to be better solution. The administration cannot beat something with nothing.

Rehabilitation of Disabled Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, with the help of the veterans of the World War, we have won a great victory for the disabled veterans of the present war.

In addition to signing of H. R. 1749, so as to provide hospitalization for the disabled veterans of this war, and the signing of H. R. 2023, an act extending the 5-year term insurance to the men in the armed forces, I am advised by the White House that the President has also signed Senate bill 786, which is virtually the same as House bill 801, for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans of this war on the same basis we provided for rehabilitation of disabled veterans of the last war.

I say this is a great victory because we take these veterans out from under social security and prevent them from being used as a common carrier for appropriations by the billions to rehabilitate people who never worked or fought either. I make this statement in order that the veterans throughout the country may know that we have won this fight and that we are going to rehabilitate the veterans of this war who come home disabled in order that they may be able to carry on and earn a living in the years to come.

The bill referred to follows:

A bill to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1, title I, Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 20, 1933, be amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection known as subsection (f) and to read as follows:

"(f) Any person who served in the active military or naval forces on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of hostilities in the present war shall be entitled to vocational rehabilitation, subject to the provisions and limitations of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, part VII."

SEC. 2. Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new part to be known as part VII and to provide as follows:

"PART VII

"1. Any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war, who is honorably discharged therefrom, and who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, or would be but for receipt of retirement pay, and is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement: *Provided*, That no course of training in excess of a period of 4 years shall be approved nor shall any training under this part be afforded beyond 6 years after the termination of the present war.

"2. The Administrator shall have the power and duty to prescribe and provide suitable training to persons included in paragraph I, and for such purposes may employ such additional personnel and experts as are deemed necessary, and may utilize and extend existing Veterans' Administration facilities and utilize those of any other governmental agency, as well as those maintained by joint Federal and State contribution; and, in addition, he may, by agreement or contract with public or private institutions or establishments, provide for such additional training facilities as may be suitable and necessary to accomplish the purposes of this part.

"3. While pursuing training prescribed herein, and for 2 months after his or her employability is determined, each veteran, if entitled to pension in an amount less than the amount payable in accordance with the compensation rates for total and temporary disability, including additional amounts for wife, husband, child, or children and dependent parents, provided by section 202, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 475), shall be paid increased pension which when added to the amount of pension to which he is otherwise entitled will aggregate an amount equal to such rates: *Provided*, That when the course of vocational rehabilitation furnished to any person as herein provided consists of training on the job by an employer, such employer shall be required to submit monthly to the Administrator a statement under oath showing any wage, compensation, or other income paid by him to such person during the month, directly or indirectly, and based upon such sworn statements, the Administrator is authorized to reduce the pension of such person to an amount considered equitable and just, but not below the amount of pension or retirement pay to which he would be entitled for service-connected disability if not following a course of vocational rehabilitation.

"4. Where any person while following a course of vocational rehabilitation as provided for in this part suffers an injury or an aggravation of any injury, as a result of the pursuit of such course of vocational rehabilitation, and not the result of his or her own willful misconduct, and such injury or aggravation results in additional disability to or death of such person, the benefits under laws applicable to veterans of the present war shall be awarded in the same manner and extent as if such disability, aggravation, or death were service-connected within the meaning of such laws; except that no benefits under this paragraph shall be awarded unless application be made therefor within 2 years after such injury or aggravation was suffered, or such death occurred.

"5. The purpose of rehabilitation is to restore employability lost by virtue of a handicap due to service-incurred disability. The Administrator shall have the power and duty to cooperate with and employ the facilities of other governmental and State employment agencies for the purpose of placing in gainful employment persons trained under the provisions of this part.

"6. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary in order to promote good conduct and cooperation on the part of persons who are following courses of vocational rehabilitation provided by this part. Penalties for the breach of such rules and regulations may, with the approval of the Administrator, extend to a forfeiture by the offender for a period of 3 months of such portion of the pension herein provided as will leave him not less than the amount of the monthly pension or retirement pay to which such person is entitled for service-connected disability, and such penalties may also extend to permanent discontinuance of all further benefits of this part.

"7. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary for the granting of leaves of absence to those following courses of vocational rehabilitation provided by this part where in his opinion such leaves do not materially interfere with the pursuit of such courses. Such leaves of absence shall not in the case of any person be granted in excess of 30 days in any consecutive 12 months except in exceptional circumstances as determined by the Administrator: *Provided*, That during leave of absence under this paragraph such person shall be considered to be pursuing his course of vocational rehabilitation under this part.

"8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, available immediately and until expended, the sum of $500,000 to be utilized by the Veterans' Administration under such rules and regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, as a revolving fund for the purpose of making advancements not exceeding $100 in any case, to persons commencing or undertaking courses of voca-

tional rehabilitation under this part, and advancement to bear no interest and to be reimbursed in such installments as may be determined by the Administrator by proper deductions from any future payments of pension or retirement pay.

"9. The Administrator shall have the power to provide courses of instruction for personnel and may detail employees to attend the same and may detail any such personnel to attend courses conducted by other than Veterans' Administration agencies, including private organizations, and such employees in addition to their salaries shall be entitled to the payment of expenses incident to such detail, including transportation and tuition, as the Administrator by rules and regulations shall provide; and also in his discretion, to make, or, as by agreement with other agency or institution, cause to be made studies, investigations, and reports inquiring into the rehabilitation of disabled persons and the relative abilities, aptitudes, and capacities of the several groups of the variously handicapped and as to how their potentialities can best be developed and their services best utilized in gainful and suitable employment, including the rehabilitation programs of foreign nations engaged in the present war. For this purpose he shall have the power to cooperate with such public and private agencies as he may deem advisable and to call in consultants who shall receive as compensation for their services a reasonable per diem, which the Administrator shall by rules and regulations provide, for each day actually spent in the work provided for herein and shall in addition be reimbursed for their necessary traveling and other expenses. For the purposes of this part, the Administrator may accept uncompensated services upon such agreement as he may deem feasible."

SEC. 3. The appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, "Salaries and expenses, medical and hospital, and compensation and pensions," shall be available for necessary expenses, including but not confined to necessary medical care, and pension payment, payment or reimbursement of expenses in connection with supplying suitable training under this act; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amount or amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

American Foreign Policy and the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful and interesting radio address delivered by the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] on the evening of Tuesday, March 23, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amid all the hurly-burly of columnists and commentators and experts of various kinds I should like to speak tonight as an average American to average Americans everywhere who are disturbed because twice in our generation American boys have been sent in large numbers overseas to hold what seemed to be the ramparts of democracy.

Primarily concerned with getting this war over with a minimum of sacrifice by American homes, as must be the overwhelming objective of anyone with a son in Africa, I am also giving thought as to how we may emerge from this struggle with a better prospect that our grandchildren will not be obliged to travel the same path.

I guide by two sayings of the founding fathers—Benjamin Franklin and George Washington. Franklin, out of his accumulated wisdom of many years, suggested to the average Americans of his day that it would be well for them all to hang together as otherwise they were all likely to hang separately.

Following this precept I am inclined to get together with peoples everywhere who have suffered in this holocaust to see if some lightning rods and burglar alarms may not be devised to prevent a recurrence of this destruction that seems to germinate periodically in the soil of Germany and Japan.

It seems entirely clear that if America had not helped Britain after Dunkerque, and if vast quantities of supplies had not been poured into Russia from America in this past year, Hitler would now be standing triumphant on a prostrate Europe and Africa and uniting forces with a Hirohito dominant in Asia. America would then be experiencing an isolation that one shudders to contemplate.

Any idea that a Hitler and Hirohito dominating two-thirds of the world would be content to leave America in peaceful enjoyment of our resources and our democracy seems to me fantastic.

In this conviction I voted for lend-lease 2 years ago and I have been profoundly gratified to see its fruits in the magnificent resistance of the Russians to the attack of their former ally and the amazing survival of the Chinese after 5 years of unprovoked aggression by Japan and the steadily rising storm of planes over Berlin from our British outpost.

Those who earlier opposed lend-lease must satisfy American public opinion that their current criticisms of any further steps toward collaboration in the post-war world are better founded than their bitter attacks 2 years ago on the American policy of aid to our present fighting allies. Questioning their judgment implies no impugning of their patriotism.

I am, accordingly, in the words of Benjamin Franklin, in favor of hanging together rather than separately. I consider the pending resolution designed to win the peace with its bipartisan origin as the most concrete and constructive proposal so far made to this end.

Perhaps the younger Members of the Senate are to be excused for rushing in to ground where angels fear to tread in youthful ignorance of the fact that the constitutional provision regarding advice and consent by the Senate in the conduct of our foreign affairs has developed in a century into meaning simply consent. The Senate in foreign relations has tended to become simply a huddle of Monday-morning quarterbacks telling how the game might better have been won. The Senators have not hitherto taken even the responsibility of a grandstand kibitzer who at least risks his reputation while the game is in progress by his comments as to its course.

These younger Members apparently knew more about the Constitution than they did about the enveloping traditions by which it has become obscured and took literally the provision that an occasional message to the President on the state of the Union would not be out of order and particularly on the state of our union with our allies—present and prospective.

As a member of the Truman committee of the Senate spending a large part of the past 2 years in investigating the progress of our defense program I can assure the American people that our boys overseas are better fed, better clothed, and better equipped than any other army in the world, and that their strength is growing steadily and will soon have a decisive influence on the course of world events.

When that day comes our sons expect us to be wise as serpents. Let us then be formulating our opinion in the free forum of democracy as we approach maturity in world affairs. Let us welcome the win-the-peace resolution as an appropriate opportunity for the discussion of the vital interests of America in the new world that is being born.

Let us not again fumble the ball as we did after the last war in the unfortunate divisions that arose between the two coordinate treaty making authorities—the President and the Senate. Let us sit down and talk it over in the great forum of public opinion and be ready for a continuance of the current collaboration of the nations in the post-war world.

Washington wisely pointed out in his Farewell Address long ago that we must always count on nations determining their course by their self-interest. This is elemental. Why the suggestion by Churchill that he was not selected as the first Minister of Britain to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire should arouse surprise in the mind of any patriotic and mature American is difficult to understand. If he should suggest otherwise he would be justly charged with being both unpatriotic and hypocritical.

Churchill is persuaded, however, that some greater degree of collaboration among the nations may be in the interest of the British Commonwealth of Nations and of a more enduring peace.

After the experiences of the past 25 years there is ample warrant for America to come to the same conclusion as to our own self-interest.

The Congress and the country may well have confidence in the intelligence, the integrity, and the incorruptibility of Cordell Hull as the first minister of America in foreign affairs and in his determination to lay the foundations of a more enduring peace.

As a Senator from Maine who has heartily disagreed with many of the domestic policies of the Roosevelt regime and as a severe critic of the current chaos in administration on our home front, I continue to be in general sympathy with the conduct of our foreign policy and to hope very earnestly that Cordell Hull's hands may be strengthened in the great task of building a more enduring peace on an American design.

The pending resolution furnishes an excellent medium for the discussion and consideration of this question by the Senate and for the exercise of the constitutional responsibility of the Senate to advise the President on the formulation of treaties with foreign nations. It is surely to be hoped that the President will welcome this somewhat unprecedented procedure in the interest of building for the world a peace that may endure.

Organization and Collaboration of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles,

one an editorial from the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News of March 15, entitled "War and the Peace," and an article by Barnet Nover in the Washington Post of March 18, 1943, entitled "The Problem of American Policy."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News of March 15, 1943]

WAR AND THE PEACE

The proposed Senate resolution which would urge the United States to take the lead in efforts to form a United Nations organization to speed the victory and secure the peace has yet to be assured a two-thirds vote of approval by that body, and even so the road toward realization of the aims which it comprises would not be short or easy. But it is a road which the overwhelming majority of us must now be convinced affords the only escape from recurrences of the present tragedy; and the mere emergence from within the Senate of this idea, coming as it does spontaneously and without political tinge under joint sponsorship of Senators of both parties, cannot but further hearten our war effort and that of our allies, as conversely it will discomfort our enemies.

Such organization obviously cannot, if the international collaboration to which it looks is to be assured the highest chance of success, wait the winning of the war. From the eastern front in Russia, meanwhile, we are reminded by the plight of Kharkov, whose capture is claimed by the Germans, that the victory itself is by no means yet "in the bag." As once we thought, when the Germans early were driving back the Red armies all along the line, that Russia could hardly hold, so when the tide was reversed we came to take for granted that the German strength had been broken and that the Soviet advances would continue at their spectacular pace to the complete and final rout of Hitler's forces there. We even worried, some of us, lest the Russians arrive in Berlin before our own forces get there.

Now we see what we would be foolish ever to forget—that the Germans are not yet licked, that there are limits even to the mighty strength and magnificent endurance of the Russians, and that it will take the combined resources of all the United Nations, thrown into the struggle without reservation as quickly and fiercely as possible, to beat the Axis into the unconditional surrender called for at Casablanca. The heads of the United Nations and the men on the fighting fronts know that. We shall gain by the realization on the home front as well.

[From the Washington Post of March 18, 1943]

THE GHOST OF 1919

(By Barnet Nover)

THE PROBLEM OF AMERICAN POLICY

Four Senators—BALL, of Minnesota, HATCH, of New Mexico, BURTON, of Ohio, and HILL, of Alabama—two of them Republicans and two of them Democrats—are seeking to exorcise the ghost of 1919.

Remembering what happened after the last war when the League of Nations, of which President Wilson was the chief architect, was repudiated by a Senate minority, they have sponsored a resolution which would commit the Senate in advance to a policy of American cooperation in the peace that is to follow this war.

Yet, strangely enough, the administration has chosen to regard this resolution as a hot potato rather than as manna from heaven.

The difference between the sponsors of the bipartisan resolution and the administration is not over basic aims—on this there is a very large measure of agreement—but over immediate strategy. Senators BALL, HATCH, BURTON, and HILL are seeking to bring to debate now, while the United Nations are still a force in being, the question of our future policy. President Roosevelt, on the other hand, prefers to have sleeping dogs lie.

Yet the issue is already in the open, regardless of what the Chief Executive may feel about it.

The Senate's failure to act on the Ball resolution will be regarded by our allies, who are watching the American skies for every indication of our future policy, as proof, at least, that we are not yet ready to commit ourselves to a program of post-war cooperation. Their own policies will be determined accordingly.

The point is that other nations are as fully aware of what happened in 1919 as we are.

During and immediately after the last war our allies acted on the assumption that American isolation was finished and dead. They assumed, in other words, that we would cooperate in the post-war order as we had cooperated in the war, and it was this assumption which made it possible for President Wilson to exercise at the peace conference the very considerable influence he did exercise.

It is true, of course, that the treaty of Versailles was regarded by many Americans with misgivings and by some with actual loathing as the very denial of all we were supposed to stand for in international relations.

Such an attitude, however, was as naive as it was groundless. Actually, if we didn't altogether have our own way in writing the terms of peace, the American stamp was all over the document signed in the Hall of Mirrors. It would certainly have been a very different document indeed had our allies been convinced on the day of the armistice that the United States would return to a policy of isolation.

This time they must reckon and are reckoning with precisely such a possibility. A world order without America would be, they recognize, a world order without stability. But if that is to be the kind of a world order we shall get, that is the kind of a world order they will have to adjust themselves to.

It is putting the cart before the horse to say, as Senator WHEELER does, that we ought not to commit the United States to any foreign policy "until we know what Stalin wants and is going to insist upon, or until we know what the British want and are going to insist upon. It is idle to discuss it (the Ball resolution) until we know what the political situation is going to be in Europe and Asia, whether Europe is going to be Communist or not."

The fact is that the policy of Russia, the policy of Great Britain, and the policy of all our partners in the war will be determined in no small degree by the policy of the United States. And in view of the very real uncertainty as to what we plan to do in the post-war period all those nations are under the compulsion of working out a double set of plans—one predicated on American isolation and the other on American cooperation. This makes for confusion and conflict.

It is not too early to seek the support of the Senate for a policy of implementing the United Nations as a continuing factor in the period after the war. To wait until the war is over may very well be too late. In any event one thing is certain, if the Senate acts again as it did in 1919 another World War will follow as inevitably as did World War No. 2 after World War No. 1.

Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. W. H. Badeaux, secretary of the Iowa Retail Lumbermen's Association.

We hear much about our food-production program and the winning of the war. We all know that the important factors necessary for increased food production are farm labor, machinery, feeding, breeding, and housing. Little emphasis has been placed on housing as it pertains to farm needs, and in my opinion the letter referred to presents a true picture of conditions as they exist today in the State of Iowa. No doubt the same problems could be presented by every State in the Union.

The letter is as follows:

IOWA RETAIL LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Des Moines, Iowa, March 22, 1943.

Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HOEVEN: Knowing that greater food production is, and will be, one of the greatest factors in the winning of the war, we are taking the liberty of presenting to you facts, information, and data, which we have gathered and tabulated pertaining to this important subject.

The important factors necessary for increased production are, as you know, farm labor, machinery, feeding, breeding, and housing. A great deal of emphasis has been placed on all of these factors, except housing, and it is on this subject we wish to present the information we have acquired.

This association, and several others in the States of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Nebraska, have just completed a survey among thousands of farmers located in these States. I will report on the results of farmers located in Iowa only as we do not have the figures for the other States, but they are available if you would want them.

A questionnaire was sent to the 1,166 yards in Iowa, 10 to each yard. The lumber dealers were asked to contact 10 farmers in their respective communities, asking the farmer to fill out the questionnaire and sign it, and not state what he would like to build, but what he actually needed in the way of lumber for repairs for his present buildings, and for new buildings in order to increase his production of livestock, hogs, and poultry.

Over 3,000 farmers filled out this questionnaire, and the results of our tabulation are as follows:

Absolute minimum of lumber for repair of present farm buildings, 373,617,887 board feet, comprising boards, shiplap, siding and dimension lumber.

Total new buildings needed for increased production, such as hog houses (all types), poultry houses (all types), milk houses, cattle sheds and feed racks, sheep sheds and feed racks, grain bins, corn cribs and hopper feeders, 553,773 new buildings. Minimum lumber needed for construction of these buildings, 501,990,126 board feet, comprising boards, siding, shiplap, and dimension lumber.

Enclosed are only a very few of the remarks made by the farmers when they filled out their questionnaires. These will give you a slight idea of the thoughts of hundreds of Iowa farmers, who so badly need lumber for their program of increased food production.

The survey also included information on the new equipment the farmer needs, for increased food production, and repair for his present equipment, and the following are the results of that part of the survey.

One hundred and thirty-four need new barn equipment—57 new milking machines, 74 new cream separators, 506 pails and cans, 109 new pumps, 1,052 new fence and gates, 226 hog equipment, 309 poultry equipment, 382 farm machinery, 230 hay tools. Repairs for present equipment: 142 barn equipment, 16 milking machines, 52 separators, 40 pumps, 722 fence and gates, 174 hog equipment, 97 poultry equipment, 325 farm machinery, 173 hay tools. These figures are for only 3,000 of the Iowa farmers.

We then made a survey of lumber dealers' stocks of dimension, common boards, shiplap, drop siding and car siding, the kind of lumber necessary in the construction of hog houses (all types), poultry houses, (all types), grain bins, corn cribs, feeders, etc.

In a great many yards the dealer is completely out of these items. Over the State as a whole, and we received a return of over 700 replies to our questionnaires on dealer inventories, our dealers' stocks on the items mentioned in the previous paragraphs are 20 percent of the required amount of lumber needed for the present necessary repairs and new buildings required by the farmers of Iowa, and because of the lumber restrictions not only our members go without the lumber, but the farmers as well, who have so definite a need for the lumber.

Many farmers have told our dealers that if they could not supply the necessary lumber for repairs, or the new buildings they needed, they would have to ship their livestock and hogs to market, and give up any idea of not only increasing their production, let alone retaining their past performance.

The information contained in this letter is not based on the ideas, wishes, or desires of the retail lumbermen of Iowa; these are the facts on what the farmers' needs are in Iowa for repair and new buildings in order to meet increased food production. The farmers have spoken on the subject in their own words.

A great deal has been said about farm labor and machinery, and these, of course, are most essential, but very little has been said about farm-building repairs and new buildings needed to do the big job of producing more food to help win the war and peace.

Our group has appointed a committee who will take to Washington all of the facts, figures, and information pertaining to this survey in an effort to present to Mr. Wickard and the powers that be the plight of the farmers in America's greatest food-producing area. It is hoped that those in Washington will see the necessity and make it possible for lumber to be produced and shipped into this food-producing area to the lumber dealers for their farm trade and without a lot of red tape attached to getting it out on the farms.

You will be told that the recent amendments to the lumber conservation order M-208 should give considerable relief to the lumber dealers of the Nation in securing lumber for their farm trade. For your definite information, the preference ratings that can be used under amended M-208 and used in accordance with priorities regulation No. 3 are not high enough, same being AA-3 and AA-4, for the lumber dealers of the Nation to secure shipments from the mills as the mills are loaded with orders of AA-1 or better and will not ship on ratings less than AA-1 or better, so don't let anybody mislead you to the extent that the amended M-208 is any definite relief to the dealer and farmer in the securing of lumber for farm purposes.

Our dealers have been building literally thousands of portable hog houses, poultry houses, feeders, etc., and the lumber that they used before January 12, 1943, for this purpose can only be replaced on regulation Form PD-1X and when our dealers submit these forms to Washington, and if the forms are approved, the preference rating assigned is not high enough for our dealers to purchase lumber for the farmer. On the materials used for this purpose after January 12, the dealer has to secure the customer's signature and determine use before he can assign preference ratings of AA-4 to his orders to replace his stocks, and that rating isn't high enough to get lumber. To be very definite, the present M-208 and the use of PD-1X forms are about the rankest types of regimentation and procedure necessary for our dealers to comply within their sincere effort to secure lumber for their farm trade, who, in turn, as you have heard before, are big factors in the food-production program.

Unless the repair to present farm buildings and the new farm buildings problem is taken care of, and at once, improper housing and inadequate housing of livestock, poultry, etc., will cause a serious shortage and make a more acute food situation, which, as you know, is most acute now.

Iowa is one of the Nation's greatest food-producing States, and, unless the farmers of Iowa and the Middle West can have the necessary labor, machinery, feed, and housing required to do the job Wickard wants done, we fear to predict the future of the Nation's food supply.

Isn't there anything possible you can do to make those in charge of the lumber situation see the light?

Most cordially yours,

W. H. BADEAUX,
Secretary.

Safeguards of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an extract from the March 1943 Bulletin of the District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, which embodies resolutions adopted at the February meeting of the society. They are well expressed in lofty language and breathe a spirit of firm adherence to the principles of the Constitution.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Compatriot Wade H. Cooper presented the following resolutions which were unanimously adopted at the February meeting of the District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.

"Resolved, by the District of Columbia Society Sons of the American Revolution in regular session assembled on this the 22d day of February 1943:

"1. That on this the two hundred and eleventh anniversary of the birth of George Washington, the Father of our Country, we pay tribute to his memory and express without reservation, our grateful appreciation of the principles of freedom for which he fought, and for the formation of our Republic for which he stood and for which he did so much;

"2. That we pledge a renewal of our faith in the Constitution of the United States as written by the founding fathers, as the greatest protection for our people against oppression and tyranny, in time of peace as well as in time of war;

"3. That we deplore and condemn as utterly unconstitutional and un-American any delegated or other system by whatever name, which denies or deprives any citizen or any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law as provided in the fifth amendment of the Constitution;

"4. That we deplore and condemn as utterly unconstitutional and un-American any attempt to limit or restrict freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, or the right of the people to peaceably assemble as provided in the first amendment of the Constitution. We declare our belief that without freedom of the press our liberties would not endure.

"5. That we express our appreciation and our approval of the recent action of the House of Representatives in appointing a committee to inquire into the sacrifice of constitutional rights or constitutional authority by so-called delegated bureaucratic authority, and we urge the Congress to take the necessary steps, after a full investigation, to repair or restore such rights wherever necessary, as soon as possible.

"6. That we earnestly urge that the three departments of our Government, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, remain separate and apart, in spirit as well as in truth, as provided in the Constitution, neither department encroaching upon the rights, duties, or prerogatives of the other.

"7. That we urge the Congress of the United States to take whatever steps are necessary, under the Constitution and the laws, to see that our Constitution is preserved and maintained in full force and vigor, without regard to party or partisanship, including the Bill of Rights, and all the rights guaranteed thereunder, whether specifically mentioned in these resolutions or not, the enumeration of certain rights herein, not being intended to exclude other rights under the Constitution.

"8. That these resolutions be printed in the local press, the local and national bulletins, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

These resolutions adopted February 22, 1943.

Attest:

BENJAMIN D. HILL, Jr.,
Secretary.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth N. Walker

REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have just had the distinguished honor of being present at the White House when the 16-year-old son of Brig. Gen. Kenneth N.

Walker received from the President the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded to the lad's father for leadership and valor.

General Walker has been missing since January 5, when the southwest Pacific action that earned him the award occurred. His citation follows:

For conspicuous leadership above and beyond the call of duty involving personal valor and intrepidity at an extreme hazard to life. As commander of the Fifth Bomber Command during the period from September 5, 1942, to January 5, 1943, Brigadier General Walker repeatedly accompanied his units on bombing missions deep into enemy-held territory. From the lessons personally gained under combat conditions, he developed a highly efficient technique for bombing when opposed by enemy fighter airplanes and by antiaircraft fire.

On January 5, 1943, in the face of extremely heavy antiaircraft fire and determined opposition by enemy fighters, he led an effective daylight bombing attack against shipping in the harbor at Rabaul, New Britain, which resulted in direct hits on nine enemy vessels. During this action his airplane was disabled and forced down by the attack of an overwhelming number of enemy fighters.

General Walker was born July 17, 1898, at Cerrillos, N. Mex. He joined the Army as a flying cadet and from March 1918 until June 1918 attended the School of Military Aeronautics, Berkeley, Calif. He was assigned to Mather Field, Calif., and in November 1918 was commissioned a temporary second lieutenant in the Air Service. After serving at Brooks Field and Barron Field, Tex., Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and Post Field, Okla., he was commissioned a second lieutenant of Air Service in the Regular Army in July 1920 and promoted to first lieutenant.

He was graduated from the Air Service Observation School, Post Field, in 1922, and went to the Philippine Islands the following year for duty as commanding officer of the air intelligence section at Camp Nichols. Returning to the United States in 1925, he served successively at Langley Field, Va., with the Air Service Board, as adjutant of the Fifty-ninth Service Squadron, commanding officer of the Eleventh Bombardment Squadron, and operations officer of the Second Bombardment Group. He was graduated from the Air Corps Tactical School, Langley Field, in 1929, and went to Maxwell Field, Ala., as an instructor.

In 1935 he was graduated from the Command and General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and promoted to captain. He joined the Eleventh Bombardment Squadron at Hamilton Field, Calif., as engineering officer; was promoted to temporary major in October 1935; and became intelligence and operations officer of the Seventh Bombardment Group at Hamilton Field.

After serving as commanding officer of the Ninth Bombardment Squadron at Hamilton Field, he went to Hickam Field, T. H., in 1938, and was assigned to the Thirty-first Bombardment Squadron. He became operations officer of the Fifth Bombardment Group, Luke Field, T. H., and in 1939 was made executive officer of Hickam Field. In April 1940 he assumed command of the Eighteenth Pursuit Group at Wheeler Field, T. H., and in July 1940 was promoted to major.

Returning to the United States in January 1941, he was assigned for duty in the Plans Division of the office of the Chief of the Air Corps in Washington. He was transferred to headquarters, Army Air Forces, and promoted to temporary lieutenant colonel in July 1941. His promotion to temporary colonel came in February 1942, followed by assignment to the Operations Division of the War Department General Staff in Washington. In June 1942 he was assigned to duty with the Air Forces in Australia and promoted to temporary brigadier general.

Mr. Speaker, during the conferring of the Congressional Medal of Honor on General Walker, through his son, Kenneth M. Walker, Jr., the President expressed the hope that his son might some day attend the Military Academy. On my way back to the House following this occasion, it occurred to me that we might well authorize the President to appoint to either of the service academies the sons of those distinguished officers and enlisted men who receive the Congressional Medal of Honor, and it is my intention shortly to prepare and present a bill for that purpose.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the pay-as-you-go tax plan presented in H. R. 2277 was devised to meet the wishes of those who are opposed to the Ruml plan but who feel that some plan should be devised which makes taxpayers more current than the committee plan.

The plan presented in H. R. 2277 avoids doubling up in the payment of taxes, puts 90 percent of the taxpayers on a completely current basis, and places the great majority of the remaining taxpayers on a substantially current basis. Moreover, it avoids the great inequities which would result from forgiving a full year of tax to all taxpayers, as is done in the Ruml-Carlson bill.

The plan is, briefly, as follows:

Individual income-tax liability would be divided into two parts, the great bulk payable currently and the balance payable in the year following the receipt of income. The amount paid currently would be a basic tax of 19 percent—the 6-percent normal tax plus the surtax at the first bracket rate of 13 percent.

The basic tax would be payable currently by collection at source in the case of wages and salaries and by quarterly payments based on a declaration of estimated income for the year in the case of other types of income. Any balance of the tax not paid in these ways would be payable, as under existing law, in the year following receipt of income. The basic tax on 1942 individual income would be canceled. This would avoid doubling up of payments since the part canceled for 1942 is comparable to that part of the 1943 tax which is collected currently. That part of the first two 1943 quarterly payments—on 1942 incomes—corresponding to the basic tax of 19 percent, would be credited against 1943 liabilities. Collection at source at a rate sufficient to collect the basic tax on wages and salaries would begin on July 1, 1943. Two corresponding quarterly payments of tax on income not subject to collection at source would be made September 15 and December 15, 1943. A penalty would be imposed to prevent underdeclaration of estimated income and underpayment of declared basic tax. To encourage the current payment of the balance of the liability above the declared basic tax the same discounts are provided as in the committee bill, H. R. 2218.

ADVANTAGES OF THE PLAN

First. The plan makes 90 percent of taxpayers current except for minor year-end adjustment necessary under any plan of current collection. In this group are the taxpayers for whom a pay-as-you-go system is really important—those who have little or no surplus income and small accumulated savings. It is this group who would find paying taxes a serious hardship in a year when their income declines substantially—see tables 1 and 2.

Second. The great majority of the remaining one-tenth of the taxpayers would be substantially current. Less than 1 percent of all taxpayers would not be at least 75 percent current. Only about 700,000 taxpayers out of nearly 44,000,000 would carry over a liability of more than about $90 beyond the close of the current income year.

Third. There is no doubling up of tax collections under this plan. Under the plan the basic tax would be collected currently during the year in which the income is received. The balance would be collected in the following year as under the present law. Since the basic tax for 1942 is canceled, the current collection in its place of the basic 1943 liability does not result in any doubling up.

Fourth. The distribution of the amount canceled is much more equitable than under the Ruml-Carlson bill. Under H. R. 2277 a uniform rate of 19 percent is forgiven from top to bottom. See tables 3 and 4. The burden distribution of the 1942 act after the cancelation of the basic liability of 19 percent constitutes an equitable distribution of a tax burden of this magnitude under the principle of exemptions and progressive rates.

Fifth. The total amount of liabilities canceled would be approximately $7,600,000,000 as compared to about $10,000,000,000 under the Carlson bill. The cancelation would, however, be much more evenly distributed. Moreover, if income-tax-rate increases are to be made in the immediate future, as appears inevitable, they are likely to be imposed much more nearly along the pattern of cancelation under H. R. 2277 than under the Ruml-Carlson bill. The benefits of forgiveness

granted in order to make taxpayers current would thus fall in about the proportions that the burdens of tax increases would be imposed, so that the distribution of forgiveness is clearly much more equitable under H. R. 2277 than under the Ruml-Carlson bill.

TABLE 1.—*Amount of tax that would be collected at source under H. R. 2277 for selected levels of net income*

MARRIED PERSON, NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemptions [1]	Income-tax liability, present law [2]	Amount that would be collected at source [3]	Balance to be paid	Amount collected at source as a percent of total liability
				Percent
$1,200				
$1,500	$48	$48		100.0
$1,800	103	103		100.0
$2,000	140	140		100.0
$2,500	232	232		100.0
$3,000	324	324		100.0
$4,000	532	508	$24	95.5
$5,000	746	692	54	92.8
$6,000	992	876	116	88.3
$8,000	1,532	1,244	288	81.2
$10,000	2,152	1,612	540	74.9
$15,000	4,052	2,538	1,514	62.6
$20,000	6,452	3,488	2,964	54.1
$25,000	9,220	4,438	4,782	48.1
$50,000	25,328	9,188	16,140	36.3
$100,000	64,060	18,688	45,372	29.2
$500,000	414,000	94,688	319,312	22.9
$1,000,000	854,000	189,688	664,312	22.2
$5,000,000	4,374,000	949,688	3,424,312	21.7

[1] Maximum earned net income assumed.
[2] Excluding Victory tax.
[3] Normal tax and 13 percent of surtax net income.

TABLE 2.—*Approximate distribution of income recipients by percentage of total liabilities discharged currently under H. R. 2277*

[Calendar year 1943]

Percentage of total liability discharged currently	Number of taxable income recipients (millions)	Percentage of all taxable income recipients	Cumulative percentage of all taxable income recipients	Maximum amount of tax not discharged currently
100	38.7	88.8	88.8	0
90–100	4.2	9.6	98.4	$90
75–90	.3	.7	99.1	550
50–75	.3	.7	99.8	4,200
25–50	.1	.2	100.0	115,000
Less than 25	.002	.005	100.0	
Total	43.6	100.0		

TABLE 3.—*Amount of tax that would be forgiven under H. R. 2277*

MARRIED PERSON, NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemptions [1]	Income tax present law [2]	Amount forgiven [3]
$1,200		
$1,500	$48	$48
$1,800	103	103
$2,000	140	140
$2,500	232	232
$3,000	324	324
$4,000	532	508
$5,000	746	692
$6,000	992	876
$8,000	1,532	1,244
$10,000	2,152	1,612
$15,000	4,052	2,538
$20,000	6,452	3,488
$25,000	9,220	4,438
$50,000	25,328	9,188
$100,000	64,060	18,688
$500,000	414,000	94,688
$1,000,000	854,000	189,688
$5,000,000	4,374,000	949,688

[1] Maximum earned income assumed.
[2] Excludes Victory tax.
[3] The basic liability of 6 percent of normal tax net income plus 13 percent of surtax net income.

TABLE 4.—*Effective income tax rates under present law and under H. R. 2277* [1]

MARRIED PERSON, NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Income tax under present law	Tax after canceling normal tax and surtax at first bracket rate
	Percent	*Percent*
$1,200		
$1,500	3.2	
$1,800	5.7	
$2,000	7.0	
$2,500	9.3	
$3,000	10.8	
$4,000	13.3	0.6
$5,000	14.9	1.1
$6,000	16.5	1.9
$8,000	19.2	3.6
$10,000	21.5	5.4
$15,000	27.0	10.1
$20,000	32.3	14.8
$25,000	36.9	19.1
$50,000	50.7	32.3
$100,000	64.1	45.4
$500,000	82.8	63.9
$1,000,000	85.4	66.4
$5,000,000	87.5	68.5

[1] All figures exclude the Victory tax.

DETAILED DISCUSSION OF THE TECHNICAL PROVISIONS OF THE BILL—CURRENT BASIC TAX ON INDIVIDUALS

The bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means amends part II of subchapter D of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for collection at the source of an amount of tax on wages approximating the net Victory tax, the normal tax, and the first bracket surtax. H. R. 2277 embodies the appropriate provisions of the committee bill with respect to collection of tax at source, but differs from the committee bill in allowing the credit for the tax withheld at source to be applied only against the current year's tax liability. Thus the wage earner is made current in the payment of his Victory tax and made current in the payment of his income tax to the extent of the normal tax and the first bracket surtax. In order that the taxpayer whose income is not subject to withholding under the provisions of subchapter D shall be in a position of parity with respect to discharge of tax liabilities currently, H. R. 2277 adds to the Code a new subchapter E, containing provisions under which the nonwithheld taxpayer becomes approximately equally tax current with the wage or salary earner.

Section 2 of the bill outlines the procedure for the filing of declarations, and the determination and payment of the declared basic tax. Section 2 adds sections 480 to 486, inclusive, to the Code. The proposed new section 480 defines the "declared net income" on which the declared basic tax at the rate of 20 percent is levied. Declared net income is defined as the excess of the amount declared as the estimated net income of the taxable year over the wages subject to withholding, or the estimated amount of the personal exemption and credit for dependents of the taxpayer, whichever is the greater.

The following two cases are illustrative:

Taxpayer A estimates that his total net income for the taxable year will be $3,000. He estimates that his wages subject to withholding during the taxable year will amount to $2,000. He estimates that the personal exemption to which he will be entitled under section 25 (b) is $1,200. Since the estimated amount of wages subject to withholding is greater than the amount of his personal exemption, the taxpayer will report as his declared net income the amount by which his estimated net income of the taxable year exceeds $2,000, or $1,000.

Taxpayer B anticipates that during the taxable year he will receive no wages subject to withholding. He estimates that his net income will be $5,000. The personal exemption to which he estimates that he will be entitled under section 25 (b) is $1,200, and, in addition, he has two dependents for whom he is entitled to an aggregate credit for dependents of $700. Taxpayer B will, under these circumstances, report as his declared net income the amount by which his estimated net income of the taxable year exceeds $1,900—$1,200 plus $700—or $3,100.

Subsection (b) of section 480 imposes a 20-percent declared basic tax on the amount of the declared net income. The tax is laid at the rate of 20 percent, which is comparable to the 20-percent rate on wages subject to withholding. The declared basic tax is specifically made inapplicable to nonresident aliens and estates and trusts.

REQUIREMENTS FOR FILING DECLARATIONS

The proposed section 481 outlines the requirements for the filing of declarations. It provides that the declaration shall state the items of declared net income and calls for the filing of a declaration by each individual whose estimated gross income if it were the actual gross income, would make him liable for the filing of an income-tax return for the taxable year. A specific exception to the requirement of filing a declaration is found in the provision exempting an individual whose estimated gross income from sources other than wages subject to withholding is less than $100. The purpose of this qualification is to avoid unduly burdening those individuals whose income other than wages subject to withholding is relatively negligible. The section also incorporates provisions with respect to the filing of joint and separate declarations, and power is granted to the Commissioner to provide by regulation for the treatment of the declared tax of individuals where a joint declaration has been filed for the current year and separate returns are filed for the taxable year, and vice versa.

Section 482 prescribes the time and place for filing declarations. For taxpayers other than farmers who exercise the election under section 482 (a) (3), the declaration is to be made and filed on or before the fifteenth day of the third month of the taxable year but may be amended under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner at the time prescribed for payment of any quarterly installment of declared basic tax.

The purpose of allowing amendments is to enable the taxpayer to revise his declaration of estimated net income, if subsequent developments should indicate

that his original estimate was either too high or too low. The Commissioner is given power to grant reasonable extensions of time for filing declarations for a period not in excess of 1 month. Farmers are specially treated and given an option to file declarations on or before the fifteenth day of the last month of the taxable year. A farmer is defined as one whose estimated gross income from farming for the taxable year is at least 80 percent of his total estimated gross income from all sources. Declarations are to be filed with the collector with whom returns are filed, and the provisions of section 291 (a), relating to the addition to the tax in the case of failure to file a return, are made applicable to a failure to file the declaration required under this subchapter.

PAYMENT OF DECLARED BASIC TAX

Section 483 prescribes the time for payment of declared basic tax. It provides that the total declared basic tax may be paid at the time of filing the declaration or, in the case of taxpayers other than farmers, exercising the election under 482 (a) (3), in four installments during the taxable year on the fifteenth day of the last month of each quarter. This section provides for extensions of time for payment to be granted by the Commissioner and for interest to be paid at the rate of 6 percent per annum during the period of extension. The provisions of section 294 (a), relating to additions to the tax in the case of nonpayment, are made applicable to the tax shown on the declaration.

Section 484 contains rules for the application of the subchapter. Basic tax is defined as the sum of the normal tax plus an amount representing a percentage of the surtax net income at the first bracket rate of surtax. Thus, for a taxpayer with a net income after personal exemption and credit for dependents, but before earned income credit of $2,000, the basic tax would be $368, computed by applying the 6 percent normal tax rate to the normal tax net income of $1,800—$2,000 minus $200 earned income credit—and applying the 13 percent surtax rate to the surtax net income of $2,000.

The section also specifies that the taxable year shall be divided into quarters of 3 months each, and in the case of a taxable year which is less than 12 months, the close of the month with or within which the taxable year closes shall be considered the close of the quarter in which such month falls. Such quarter shall be deemed to be the last quarter of the taxable year. By subsection (c) of this section the provisions of the subchapter are made applicable only to quarters beginning with or subsequent to July 1943, or to a quarter within which that month is included.

CREDIT FOR DECLARED BASIC TAX

Section 485 provides that the aggregate of the installments of declared basic tax paid during the taxable year shall be credited against the tax imposed under sections 11 and 12 or section 400, as the case may be, and section 450. If the aggregate of the installments of the declared basic tax exceeds the liability for basic tax, the credit shall be applied against liability for the foregoing taxes in excess of basic tax and shall not be refunded. If, however, the aggregate of the installments exceeds the total tax liability, the amount of the excess shall be treated as an overpayment of tax for the taxable year and shall be refunded or credited under the provisions of section 322.

PENALTIES FOR FAILURE TO DECLARE IN FULL

Section 486 provides penalties for the failure to declare and pay the basic tax in full. If (1) the aggregate amount of installments of declared basic tax timely paid during the taxable year, (2) the aggregate amount of the withheld taxes for the taxable year, (3) the amount by which the tax for the year is reduced under section 7 of the bill, and (4) the amount of any voluntary advance payments made during the year is less than 80 percent of the amount of basic tax for the year, then the tax imposed by sections 11 and 12 or section 400, as the case may be, shall be increased by 6 percent of the amount by which the basic tax exceeds the sum of the foregoing items. This penalty is specifically made inapplicable to the taxable year in which the death of an individual occurs for the reason that it is recognized that those responsible for administering the decedent's estate might not be in possession of facts on which to base a revised declaration during the last quarter of the taxable year of the decedent. The same addition to tax is provided in the case of farmers who underdeclare and underpay to the extent of more than 66⅔ percent instead of 80 percent, as in the case of other individuals.

Section 3 of the bill amends the code as follows:

There is added a new section 36 for the purpose of cross reference to section 485 which allows the credit against the tax of the declared basic tax. Section 56 (b), with respect to installment payments of the tax imposed under chapter I is amended to give effect to the current payment of declared basic tax and withheld tax in the case of individuals. The subsection provides that the first installment of the tax shall be the basic tax plus one-fourth of the amount by which the total tax imposed under the chapter exceeds the basic tax. It goes on to provide that the first installment shall be reduced by the credits for taxes withheld and declared basic tax paid and, in case the aggregate of the credits is equal to or in excess of the amount of the first installment, but is less than the tax imposed—computed without regard to the credits—the credits shall constitute the first installment. The remaining three installments shall be one-third each of the difference between the tax imposed and the amount of the first installment. The dates for payment of installments are the same as those at present incorporated in the code.

Subsection (c) of this section provides a rule for the application of limitations on the amount of tax or surtax and requires that in the application of the limitation on rate of surtax provided in sections 105, 106, and 107 the tax imposed by section 12 shall be computed without regard to the credits for tax withheld or for declared basic tax paid currently. Subsection (d) incorporates similar principles with respect to the computation of foreign-tax credit. Subsection (3) of this section amends section 322 (e) and adds to the existing provision that tax withheld under subchapter D shall be deemed to have been paid by the taxpayer on the 15th day of the third month following the close of his taxable year, a new paragraph, making similar provision with respect to declared basic tax paid during the year. The section generally is made applicable to taxable years ending after December 31, 1942, but the subsection applying to limitation on the amount of tax or surtax is made applicable to any year to which section 7 of the bill is applicable.

Section 4 of the bill incorporates the provisions of the committee bill with respect to voluntary advance payments and discounts but limits the discounts to payments on account of estimated liability for tax in excess of basic tax.

Part II of the bill, containing sections 5 and 6, incorporates the provisions of the committee bill with respect to withholding, except that the provisions of the committee bill, allowing credit for tax withheld against liability for tax for the preceding year are omitted, since they are inappropriate under this plan.

TRANSITION YEAR

Part III of the bill containing sections 7 and 8 provide for the transition period by the reduction of liability for tax for the calendar year 1942 and for fiscal years which contain months of the calendar year 1942 to the extent of the basic tax attributable to 1942. The purpose of these provisions is to give relief from double payments during the current year in which collection by withholding or by payment of declared basic tax currently is initiated. For example, if a taxpayer was liable for income tax for the year 1942 in the amount of $200 and on March 15, 1943, he filed his return and paid one-fourth of his tax liability, and on June 15 paid the second installment of his tax liability, and commencing in July he was required either to file a declaration of basic tax or to have withheld and collected at source from his wages the basic tax for the current year, unless some reduction of his liability for 1942 were accomplished, the result would be a doubling up in tax payments. Since the taxpayer mentioned above is liable only for basic tax, under sections 7 and 8 of the bill his tax liability for 1942 would be discharged and the payments made by him on March 15 and June 15 in 1943 would be deemed to be payments of declared basic tax for the taxable year 1943.

Part IV contains miscellaneous provisions of the committee bill relating to exemptions for the armed forces.

Fort Pitt Steel Casting Co. Awarded Maritime M

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, national unity is our greatest weapon in this war, and to fight our battle effectively we must have the hearty cooperation of every man, woman, and child. In the words of Rudyard Kipling:

It is not the individual or the army as a whole, but the everlasting teamwork of every blooming soul.

Labor and industry must work in harmony and must arbitrate and conciliate their differences if we are to succeed. There has been too much idle propaganda and too many misstatements condemning labor and industry as a whole for failing to meet their responsibilities.

As I have frequently stated to both the Seventy-seventh and the Seventy-eighth Congresses, this condition is not applicable to the Thirtieth District of Pennsylvania, the heart of the arsenal of democracy of America, which I represent. Every company strives to achieve either the Army-Navy E award, or the Maritime Commission M award. The maritime merit award is one of the most coveted awards in the entire Nation. Only 87 such awards have been presented. This M award is given in recognition of outstanding production achievement in the Commission's shipbuilding program. It stands for the determined, persevering, unbeatable American spirit which can be satisfied only by achieving today what yesterday seemed impossible. The M award carries with it the privilege of flying the M pennant and victory fleet flag. Also the labor merit badge is presented to all employees as a gift from the Maritime Commission.

On March 20, 1943, my district was signally honored when the Maritime Commission M award was presented to the Fort Pitt Steel Casting Co., McKeesport, Pa., one of the most aggressive companies in this great industrial district. The Fort Pitt Steel Casting Co. was only the eighth industry in the great Keystone State of Pennsylvania to achieve this distinction. In 1 year, Fort Pitt tripled its production—this splendid accomplishment even in view of continuous changes in personnel as a result of 121 of its employees joining the armed forces of Uncle Sam.

The real success of the Fort Pitt Steel Casting Co. can be attributed to the hearty cooperation between management and labor, and the liberal, humane, and understanding management of Fred Grotts, president of the company. Fred Grotts earned his way from the ranks of a workman to that of president of the company. He mingles and associates with his men, understands their problems, and is always ready and willing to mediate and conciliate little differences at the counsel table in the good old American method of give and take. He is loved by his employees. One of his able employees, Charles "Ace" Oncea, president of Congress of Industrial Organizations Local 1406, United Steelworkers of America, has this to say about Fred Grotts:

The men of this plant are going to make every effort to continue breaking production records, for we all love Fred Grotts, one of the best employers in the world to work for.

This expression is typical of what all employees think of Fred Grotts. In times like these it is indeed a magnificent tribute to an understanding employer and a real American. If more employers practiced the simple philosophy of Fred Grotts, victory in this war would be quick and certain.

At the presentation ceremony at McKeesport High School, the award to the company and the labor merit badges to the employees were presented by Col. Willard F. Rockwell, a veteran of World War No. 1. He was decorated by the Belgian Government in 1937. As the present Director of Production of the United States Maritime Commission, Colonel Rockwell paid glowing tribute to the Fort Pitt Steel Casting Co. for its outstanding record of production achievement.

Further, as part of my remarks, I am including a splendid letter received by the Fort Pitt Steel Casting Co. from the United States Employment Service at Harrisburg, Pa., which speaks volumes for the company's personnel policies in aiding the war effort. I hope that every industry in the Nation will follow the pattern cut out by the Fort Pitt Steel Casting Co., of McKeesport, Pa. Then the world would really acclaim us as the "arsenal of democracy."

The letter follows:

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE,
Harrisburg, March 17, 1943.

FORT PITT STEEL CASTING CO.,
McKeesport, Pa.

GENTLEMEN: We note with pleasure that your company will shortly be awarded the maritime M. This is of especial interest to us, because our local office in McKeesport has on several occasions brought to our attention the close cooperation which you have given to measures designed to provide adequate labor supply for needed war production. Total utilization of the available labor force in each local community is the most efficient method for eliminating or keeping at a minimum the problems of in-migration, housing shortages, and over-burdened transportation facilities and your recognition of this fact has been gratifying and helpful.

The personnel practices of your company in hiring substantial numbers of nonwhites, rehabilitated workers, and, increasingly, women in suitable occupations follow closely the national policy as set down by the War Manpower Commission. This total utilization of each segment of the manpower and womanpower in each community, according to its ability to carry on the production tasks before us, is a principle which is widely recognized as the ultimate solution of our production problems and the contribution of your company in this direction has been substantial.

We are sure that you will continue to meet promptly and efficiently the production schedules required by our armed forces, and we trust that we will be able to continue to assist you, in a small measure, in the maintenance of this objective.

Very truly yours,

H. RAYMOND MASON,
State Director.

It Is Your Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, throughout the world on land, in the air, on and under the sea our fighting men have shown a courage, a determination, a willingness to sacrifice never surpassed.

Here in official Washington waste, extravagance, incompetency, and politics, as usual, prevent the home folks giving to those they have sent to the war the full measure of support to which they are entitled. The President's drive for a fourth term, for a New Deal victory in 1944, is in full swing.

The internationalists, those who would haul down the Stars and Stripes, surrender at least some of our sovereignty and independence, are, before the victory has been won, planning to keep our men abroad policing the world.

When the victory has been won we want our boys home; we want them to return to a land where constitutional government is still in existence; we want them to come to a land where freedom and opportunity will greet them.

The New Deal and those who want to remake America, put out of existence the businessman, make every individual dependent upon the Federal Government in Washington, was rebuked by the voters of the Nation who cast a majority of more than a million votes against it.

The new Congress has made a determined and a persistent effort to retake from the bureaucrats, from the fuzzy-wuzzies, from the starry-eyed dreamers, from the New Deal, the power granted to them by a "rubber stamp" Congress.

The effect of the victory won last November will be lost; the courage of the new Congress destroyed if, in the coming elections in the various States, patriotic Democrats and Republicans fail to exercise the franchise which they still possess, go to the polls and register their continued disapproval of the New Deal and of those who would destroy constitutional government.

This duty, the duty to vote—at each and every election, does not rest upon the men who have been drafted, the men who have enlisted, it rests upon the shoulders of each and every one of us.

We can give no greater encouragement to those who have been sent to the

war than to, at each and every election, assure them by the result of that election, that when the war is over they will have the opportunity to return to the same America they left—the land of liberty, the dwelling place of freedom, the home of opportunity, where equal justice under law still prevails.

Congress and the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial of the New York Times of March 15, 1943, and a letter of reply addressed to the editor of the New York Times from me.

I hope the membership of the Congress will find time to read the following editorial, entitled "Congress and the President," as well as my letter to the editor of the newspaper in respectful disagreement:

CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

I

Not in many years have the relations between Congress and a President been as strained as they are today. The rejection of the Flynn appointment, the numerous investigations and denunciations in Congress of administrative agencies, the rebuke which the House has just given to the President in passing the Disney bill are symptoms of this strain. It would be very harmful to the country's domestic economy and dangerous to the war effort itself, if relations between the President and Congress should deteriorate further.

A healthy relationship between the executive and legislative branches of the Government can be maintained only if each respects fully the rights of the other, keeps within its proper field and recognizes clearly its own functions and responsibilities. There have been traditionally in America two theories of the proper relationship of Congress and the President. One theory holds that Congress should act independently. But the logical outcome of complete independence on the part of Congress would be a stalemate. If Congress refused to give the President legislation he really neded, the result would be governmental paralysis. The second traditional theory holds that Congress should cooperate with the President. But this theory can no more be pushed to an extreme than the first. For the logical result of complete cooperation would be complete subservience.

Under the American system the problem of the relationship of the legislature and the Executive is peculiarly difficult. The problem does not exist to anything like the same degree under the system of responsible cabinet government in Great Britain, Australia, or Canada. For there legislature and executive are fused. It is impossible for them to be for any considerable time at loggerheads. The executive is, in the first place, the creature of the legislature. He represents its own choice. If, in spite of this, the legislature and Prime Minister fall out, the disagreement is resolved in one of two ways. Either the Prime Minister resigns and the legislature chooses his successor, or the Prime Minister dissolves the legislature and forces it to seek reelection. The difference of opinion between Parliament and the Prime Minister can in this manner be immediately put up to the people, as the ultimate authority, to decide.

No such way of resolving a disagreement between the legislature and the Executive exists under the American system of separation of powers. Nor does our Constitution itself give explicit practical guidance to Congress or the President concerning the best division of powers between them, or the way in which they can resolve such differences of opinion as may arise. Congress, being elected directly by the people, can properly claim to represent the people. But though the President is still nominally chosen by an electoral college, he is in fact chosen by direct popular vote, and can claim to represent the people no less directly than Congress does. The dilemma that arises when Congress and the President disagree on an important issue is like the dilemma that arises when a State sends two Senators to Congress and each takes a different position on an issue. What clear way is there of deciding which of the two Senators really speaks for the people of his State?

II

The questions that the Constitution does not answer regarding the relationship of Congress and the President must be answered by common sense. The relationship will be determined by acts both of initiative and of self-restraint and self-denial on the part of both President and Congress. Traditions concerning what these relationships ought to be have, in fact, grown up and have come to be regarded almost as inherent in the Constitution itself. But some of these traditions are, in fact, neither required by the Constitution nor sound in themselves.

Congress has traditionally resented, for example, detailed recommendations of the President or the executive departments regarding legislation. It has always been considered by Congress something of an outrage for the executive department actually to frame a bill itself and openly declare it to be an administration bill. Congress has at times been known to resent even vague intimations on the part of the Executive concerning what it ought to do.

All this resentment finds no justification whatever in the Constitution. The Constitution declares that the President "shall from time to time give to the Congress information on the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." There is nothing here declaring that the President shall recommend measures only in the vaguest way. It would be perfectly within the letter and spirit of this clause for the President to recommend to Congress a bill that had been framed in its entirety, and was acknowledged to have been framed in its entirety, by the executive department.

By resenting and discouraging such action, Congress has not only failed to receive from the President the kind of open guidance that it should get, but it has actually encouraged the President and the executive departments to evade what ought to be their plain responsibilities. The Treasury Department, for example, ought not only to have been allowed but to have been morally compelled by Congress to make the most explicit recommendations concerning both the pay-as-you-go plan and the withholding tax. If the Treasury recommends, as it does, piling $16,000,000,000 of additional taxation this year onto the drastic taxation that the country is already paying, then the Treasury should be not only allowed but morally compelled by Congress to put itself on record by declaring precisely what new taxes and precisely what rates it wants. The Treasury is here cited simply as one example. When the President declared last week that complete responsibility for post-war prosperity and security rested upon the legislative branch alone, he was taking a position not only unsound in itself but inconsistent with his own past leadership on economic and social measures. Congress has both the duty and the right to ask the executive departments to make their recommendations in full detail and to take complete open responsibility for them.

III

While Congress may invite the fullest executive recommendations concerning its course of action, it is under no obligation to follow those recommendations. But whenever it departs from them it must depart from them intelligently and responsibly. This means that if Congress hopes to be able to meet the unparalleled duties and responsibilities imposed on it by the present crisis, it must be organized enormously better than it is. It must take measures, for one thing, to insure that it is better informed. It should equip itself with its own expert advisers, and a fuller research staff than it has at present. It should reduce the number, and greatly reduce the existing prerogatives, of the nearly one hundred standing and special committees that it has at present. If Congress hopes to adopt any coherent and unified policy of its own, then the recommendations of its standing committees must all be channeled through some single over-all committee.

The members of this committee, and, in fact, the chairmen of all committees, should be chosen for their ability, not by seniority. They should be chosen in such a way that they represent the sentiment of the Congress majority, and not merely of a small group in Congress. The central over-all committee of Congress should have control of the legislative time table and the order in which bills are presented. Under such an internal reorganization of Congress it is extremely unlikely that so much time would have been consumed as is being consumed, to take an immediate illustration, on the preliminary stages of a pay-as-you-go plan and a withholding tax; and there would be less doubt than actually exists concerning the correspondence of the views of the committee with the views of the full Congress.

In brief, if Congress hopes to be effective either for cooperating with the President or for enacting a coherent legislative program of its own, it cannot continue its present disintegrate organization. It cannot be a leaderless body of 531 men each trying to put his own private ideas into effect, each trying to draw attention to himself by his own little vaudeville turn. It cannot be ruled by a hundred different committee chairmen, no one of whom has been chosen to represent Congress as a whole.

Congress must submit to discipline and to unified leadership. Only in that way can it hope to have a coherent policy and a definite direction.

MARCH 26, 1943.

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The highly provocative editorial entitled "Congress and the President," which leads the editorial page of the New York Times for March 15, has called forth so much discussion, not only over the friendly conversational dinner table but in public speech and public print, that I cannot refrain from bringing a few of its well-taken points under scrutiny.

When the President declared that complete responsibility for post-war prosperity and security rested upon the legislative branch alone, I cannot agree "that he was taking a position not only unsound in itself but inconsistent with his own past leadership on economic and social measures." The legislative branch, elected by the common and

popular vote, cognizant of the regional and sectional wishes and needs of the people in every corner of our vast country, is the only body sufficiently informed and sufficiently empowered to deal with post-war prosperity and security. To use a much-worn phrase, we of the legislature have our fingers on the pulse of the Nation. We are brought here by the voting majority, and even if for a moment we should be drawn away from our regional plans and purposes, and our regional responsibilities and ways of thinking, we would be daily reminded of them by the hundreds of letters from our constituents, most of whom have had, in one way or another, some personal contact with us.

I cannot believe that, to the voting public, we are merely names on a ballot. We were brought to Congress, for good and sufficient reasons, by people who have heard us speak, either at public gatherings or over the radio, by people who live near us and have reasons to entrust us with the zealous representation of their rights and privileges, by people who know us personally, and have exchanged views with us, either orally or by letter. Therefore, coming as we do from every part of the Union, and bringing with us the plans and purposes and desires of our constituents, keeping these plans and purposes and desires constantly in our hearts and minds, and judging them, with new and wide perspective, in the light of the whole national good, who else could be better qualified than we of Congress for post-war planning?

This does not mean that we shall not need, and, indeed, invite the opinions and advice of "outside experts." No one man can be a Pliny for these modern times, since the realms of knowledge have grown too vast and too complicated.

The fact remains that the President has received virtually all he has asked from Congress. It is the very basis of our American democracy to discuss, to disagree, and to resolve our problems for the common good. A certain amount of grumbling and criticism, whether it be about point rationing or taxation or the conduct of the war, is only a healthy sign. One might say that to criticize is American, but to sulk, un-American. As long as criticism and discussion are brought out into the open, all is well. Never in our history were there more despair, more defeatism, and more bitter onslaughts of vituperation than during the first 25 years of the birth pangs of our Nation, and yet we look back now upon those years as the very bedrock of democracy.

The matter of selection of Congressmen for committees is an old problem and a difficult one. Under our present system, it has been solved by selection of seniority. Selection by ability, as proposed by the editorial in the New York Times, would be wellnigh impossible to accomplish. Who would be set up as judge of the ability of a Congressman? Each Member has been elected by his own people as an adequate representative of his people's rights, as their guardian and champion. He is sent to Congress for the specific purpose of looking out for those rights. Is he to be judged fit to serve on committees by a jury of his peers within the House? Must he be acceptable to the Chief Executive—thus quickly achieving the undesirable end of "complete subservience of the legislative body to the President"? Shall we revert to the outworn and unsatisfactory practice in existence up to 1909, by which the Speaker of the House made all committee assignments, and was the virtual czar of the activities of the House? Or shall we admit some highly impractical, albeit idealistic scheme which would allow any self-seeking and aggressive newcomer, who happens to be endowed with the gift of gab, a photogenic physiognomy and a susceptible press, to become influential far out of proportion to the stature of office and so be tyrant as well as tyro?

Selection by seniority is a simple, uncontroversial, and, in the main, fair method of procedure. Men who are reelected, over and over, to Congress, unquestionably represent the will of their constituents. Even if they belong to the Congressional minority, and their votes on various measures have often come to naught, they serve their people constantly and usefully. Should their party become, in future elections, the majority, their long years of service would not go unrecognized or unrewarded.

As things stand, we, and the Nation, are doing very well. Idealism is a necessary part of our thinking, but idealism can take wings off the feet of progress and place shackles there instead. Most of the schemes to better mankind in one way or another, from Plato to Karl Marx, are entirely and sincerely idealistic; but they lack one vital element, the human quotient, and therefore they are doomed to failure. The philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi is purely idealistic, but when Gandhi says, as he did the other day, that should Japanese bombers fly over one of the great sprawling and unprotected cities of India, he would stand out in the center of an airfield, and, by making peaceful gestures, invite the invaders to come down to talk things over, we have idealism reduced to a fanatical absurdity.

I cannot feel that we in this country have much to fear from our duly elected executive and legislative bodies. What we do have to fear are the people who, as Macaulay so aptly said of some of the French gentry during the Revolution, are "ignorant of their own interests, though considerate of nothing else." Let us turn our attention, rather, to the necessary task of converting the grumblers and whiners, the chiselers of income-tax blanks and ration books and war profits, all those of little faith, all those of loose thinking and hyperemotional ideals, to the belief that, after the war, a whole new scheme of life must be planned for the economic and social good of every American citizen. We cannot go on in the so-called good old way. Let us, together, we who are placed in Congress, and every thinking American who helped to place us here, plan for the common welfare, and for the glorious new vistas of progress that shall open up before us.

MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
Representative in Congress,
Eighteenth District, New York.

Statement of Facts Concerning the Florida Barge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, beginning at Trenton, N. J., and extending south to Norfolk, Va., is an inland ship channel safe for the navigation of deep-draft oceangoing ships, as well as barges of all types and sizes. From Norfolk to Jacksonville, Fla., is a safe inland barge channel 12 feet deep and of ample width for the systematic movement of barge tows of great capacity. The cost of constructing this barge channel from Norfolk to Jacksonville was $22,062,438.

From Carrabelle on the west coast of Florida to Corpus Christi, Tex., is a safe inland barge channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide. The cost of constructing this channel was $19,230,729. The enlargement of this Gulf coast channel to a depth of 12 feet and width of 125 feet has been authorized by act of Congress, and the work of enlargement is now in progress by the Army engineers. The same act authorized the construction of a high-level barge channel across northern Florida from the St. Johns River 92 miles to the west coast, which would connect the Atlantic and Gulf intracoastal waterways into one continuous channel of uniform dimensions from Trenton to Corpus Christi, a distance of 2,400 miles.

This connecting channel across Florida is to be 12 feet deep and 150 feet wide, with five locks, each 75 by 600 feet. The estimated cost is $44,000,000. No money has yet been appropriated by Congress for the construction of this cross channel, but the matter is now under consideration by the Committee on Appropriations.

The territory traversed by the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway constitutes the Nation's most productive region in respect to petroleum and its products and many other natural resources essential not only to the war effort but necessary in the Nation's peacetime economy. Between the Mississippi and the Rio Grande and in close proximity to the Intracoastal Waterway there is produced approximately two-thirds of the Nation's supply of fuel oil and gasoline. In the same area there is produced practically all of the Nation's sulfur, all of the mines being located immediately on or in close proximity to the waterway.

Texas alone produces more than half of our supply of petroleum and its products, including gasoline, and 52 percent of all of the Nation's petroleum reserves are located there. The total petroleum reserves in the United States as of December 31, 1942, amount to 20,032,793,000 barrels.

The total oil production of the world is approximately 2,250,000,000 barrels annually, based upon available figures for 1941. Of that vast total, countries producing approximately 2,000,000,000 barrels are on the side of the United Nations. Of that total amount the United States produced 1,403,784,000 barrels, or 70 percent of the total. When it is considered that two-thirds of the United States production exists in the territory in reasonable proximity to the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, the importance of that project in its relation to the Florida barge canal and the waterway across New Jersey can be readily appreciated. If to the production of Louisiana and Texas is added the production of the States of Mississippi, Arkansas, and Oklahoma, we have in the territory which this waterway will serve 75 percent of the entire oil production of the Nation.

Gasoline and oil now constitute more than 70 percent in tonnage of our supplies being shipped to our armies and Navy overseas. Five of our important navy yards are located on the Atlantic coast. Three of these—at Charleston, Norfolk, and Philadelphia, respectively—are located on the inland waterway.

The other two, Brooklyn and Boston, are cut off from it by the narrow margin of the so-called missing link of 31 miles across New Jersey.

Our Atlantic coast navy yards have to be supplied with great quantities of oil and gasoline, both for their own needs and as bases for supplying our armies and Navy in the eastern hemisphere, as well as furnishing aid to our allies in the war. By far the major portion of these petroleum supplies must, in some way, come from the States on and near the Gulf coast.

Additional to those supplies for the war effort, the domestic needs of the eastern seaboard require about 1,600,000 barrels daily, approximately one-third of which is gasoline, the other two-thirds being principally crude and fuel oils.

Before the war more than 95 percent of the petroleum consumption of the Atlantic seaboard reached that destination in ocean tanker ships, the major portion being from the Gulf coast. Comparatively smaller shipments came in from Mexico and Venezuela, also by tank ships.

Owing to the submarine menace, all these shipments to the east coast were abandoned and other means of transportation became necessary. No carrier was equipped for the job. There were no transcontinental pipe lines; the railroads had no tank cars in their own right; and the inland and intracoastal waterways were short of barges and tugboats, as well as hampered by missing links in their navigation channels.

The newspapers reported that Mr. Ickes was contemplating a great pipe line and that Mr. Pelley, of the Association of Railroads, was considering the movement by rail of 250,000 barrels of oil daily. In September 1941 I wrote to Mr. Ickes suggesting that he install his pipe line across Florida. I also wrote Mr. Pelley suggesting that he assemble his equipment for operation on two railroads across Florida. If either of these propositions had been adopted and the necessary boats provided, which could then have been done in a few months, the East would have had their supplies doubled during the last two winters.

In my appeals to these gentlemen I received no encouragement. Mr. Pelley replied, stating that if the oil companies would turn over their cars, the transportation of 250,000 barrels daily would constitute no problem for the rail lines.

Another winter passed by. Prices in the East were raised and rationing was applied. Matters were growing from bad to worse, and the end was not in sight. Little independent oilmen of Texas were appealing to me. Their wells were ordered closed. Their pipe lines were dormant, and their storage capacities were full, and no places to unload. At the same time there was suffering in the East.

I then, on April 30, 1942, introduced a bill for the enlargement of the Gulf Intracoastal Channel to correspond with the dimensions of the Atlantic Inland Channel, and to connect them by a high-level barge channel across Florida, on the line to be selected by the Chief of Engineers. After a hard fight, that bill was finally enacted. The same elements are now fighting against an appropriation to put it into effect.

The bill also provided for one or more pipe lines across Florida for temporary use. It was amended in the Senate to take the execution away from the Army engineers and place it in the hands of the Oil Administrator. Instead of placing an adequate pipe line across Florida as the law directed, a more expensive line was installed from Texas up to Illinois, later to be extended to the East.

Some of our good friends who admit that they are wiser than the rest of us seem to know that the war will be over in less time than would be required to dig the channel. If it ends that soon, the United States may not be the victor. Those in charge of our war effort have repeatedly warned us that we have a long and hard problem to deal with, and the submarine menace is increasing. I heard Gabriel Heatter state over the radio last Tuesday night that Germany now had 400 U-boats with an armament of 14 torpedoes each. The last sinking reported took place in the mid-Atlantic.

It is reported that the experts in the office of the Oil Administrator are opposing the channel across Florida. They have said that pipe lines used materials and manpower with greater efficiency than any other carrier except ocean tankers. This does not agree with the findings of the National Petroleum Association. It does not agree with the Chief of Engineers, Major General Reybold. It does not agree with Col. E. O. Thompson, chairman of the Railway Commission of Texas, who for many years has had jurisdiction over more miles of railroad and over more miles of pipe line than any other man in the United States. All those high authorities have reached the same conclusion. They estimate the costs by the several carriers as follows:

By tank ship, 1.25 mills per ton mile.

By water barge, 2.00 to 2.50 mills per ton mile.

By pipe line, 3.20 mills per ton mile.

By rail tank car, 8.03 mills per ton mile.

I have been told that the Standard Oil Co. has been reasonably successful in business operations. They, and their subsidiaries perhaps, operate more tank ships, more barges, more pipe lines, and possibly more tank railroad cars than any other concern in the United States. They have operated their barges and towboats on the Mississippi for many years. They have bucked the currents with their barge tows going upstream with enormous cargoes of oil. I do not believe they would have done so if they could have used pipe lines with more economy.

The magazine Marine News in its issue for the present month states that the Standard Oil Co. has just installed the most powerful tow boat on the Mississippi which will handle 12 barges of 9,000 barrels of oil each, which would be the equivalent of 4 miles of railroad tank cars. Under present regulations 9 locomotives would be required for such a movement.

The railroads have gone to enormous expense to prepare for the great oil movement. Mr. Eastman states that about $18,000,000 of that cost will be of no permanent use to the railroads and should be paid as a war cost. I take no issue with that recommendation. Neither do I take issue with our Government officials in refunding to the oil companies approximately $260,000,000 annually for the excessive costs of transportation of oil by rail over water. New England consumers should not be required to pay it. They were not to blame for the failure of our transportation system in this emergency.

We now have about 69,000 tank cars engaged in the oil movement, requiring about 1,100 locomotives. Mr. Pelley, president of the Association of Railroads, has made application for 878 more locomotives, but says he only expects to get 600. These additional locomotives are to be engaged in hauling oil in iron drums loaded in boxcars. The drums hold about 53 gallons each, and 1,200,000 have already been allocated. Mr. Pelley stated before the Maloney committee that 1,000,000 of them could be made in about 10 days.

The drums are made of common galvanized sheet iron, delivered in bundles, and cut to the proper size. They are put into proper form and the tops and bottoms pressed and welded on by machinery in a few minutes. About 180 of these drums constitute a boxcar load. The standard wood and steel barges now operating on the Intracoastal Waterway in Louisiana and Texas are 35 feet wide, 195 feet long, and 11 feet deep. A tow of three of these barges will hold as many drums of oil as can be loaded on several freight trains and moved at a small percentage of the cost.

A great deal of printed propaganda is being circulated to the effect that there is now a practical navigation channel across Florida and that this proposal will be a duplication of it. Some of the propaganda states that $208,000 of dredging is all that is necessary to place it in condition for oil transportation, while other printed statements say that $360,000 will be necessary, and that the work can be done in from 4 to 6 months. Of course, many persons, unfamiliar with conditions there, may be misled by such propaganda.

The channel referred to in this printed propaganda is across southern Florida through Lake Okeechobee. It was originally dredged for drainage purposes by the Caloosahatchee-Lake Okeechobee Drainage District with the view of reclaiming a portion of the Everglades, which extended to the southern tip of Florida. Several canals were dredged, leading to the ocean. Two of these channels were afterward adopted by Congress for navigation in connection with irrigation, reclamation, and flood control.

Various amendments have repeatedly been under consideration. As the project now exists, it is a channel only 6 feet deep and 80 feet wide, based upon levees and gates to retain the surface of Lake Okeechobee at certain elevations above sea level. The locks are only 50 feet wide and 250 feet long. The engineers report that they are ample for the present and prospective commerce, all of which is local in nature.

The east end of this channel is on a channel only 8 feet deep and 100 feet

wide, leading up to Jacksonville, 269 miles. The west end is on the Gulf of Mexico, several hundred miles from the present east end of the Gulf intracoastal channel. Some of the printed propaganda indicates that the oil to the west end of the channel will be by tanker ships across the Gulf from Corpus Christi, Tex.

In the hearing before the Senate Commerce Committee on June 30, 1942, on page 59, the channel is aptly referred to in the following colloquy:

Senator VANDENBERG. In line with what Senator FEPPER has just asked about, may I, in order to complete the record, ask the general to discuss the utility of the other Florida canal, farther south, which is already in existence, as a connecting link to achieve this continuity that is being talked about?

Major General REYBOLD. In the first place, Senator, that canal at present has only a 6-foot project depth across Florida. Then, from Miami up to Jacksonville it has an 8-foot project depth. Between the western terminus of the canal and eastern terminus of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway there is no inland waterway at all. You would have to run a much greater distance across the Gulf to enter the eastern terminus of the present Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. The distance would be considerably increased. It would increase the run from any Texas point to Jacksonville or points north thereof by some 450 miles.

The river and harbor bill, which died on the calendar with the Seventy-seventh Congress January 3, contained a project for converting the cross channel into an 8-foot depth, but still only 80 feet in width. This project was based on Documents Nos. 469 and 696, as shown on lines 7, 8, and 9 of the bill. The cost was $3,960,000 under Document No. 469, plus $208,000 under Document No. 696.

To convert this channel into a through continuous barge channel necessary for such shipping, 269 miles up the east coast, the channel would have to be given an additional width of 25 feet and additional depth from 8 to 12 feet.

The 153 miles across Florida would have to be given depth from 6 to 12 feet and additional width from 80 feet to 150 feet, to correspond with the cross channel that has been authorized.

The west coast for several hundred miles has no channel at present. A survey ordered 9 years ago has been recommended for a 9-by-100-foot channel up to the Anclote River, 148 miles. It has not yet been acted upon by Congress.

If tankers are to be operated across the Gulf from Corpus Christi, as now indicated, they would have to be convoyed by the Navy with ample airplane contingents, and a deep channel and harbor established on the coast which would cost several million dollars.

None of these works could be carried out without first ordering a survey and securing estimates of costs and recommendation from the engineers. After that, it would have to be enacted by Congress. No man can foresee what time would be consumed, nor what the cost would be. Additional to all this, the four 50 by 250-foot locks east and west from Lake Okeechobee would have to be replaced with locks 75 by 600 feet. These locks would almost assuredly cost more than $1,000,000 each under present conditions. In fact, one of the smaller locks cost more than $800,000 under conditions of several years ago.

SULFUR PRODUCTION

But it should be borne in mind that there are many commodities essential in the war effort other than oil that would make use of the Florida barge canal. Sulfur is an important example.

Practically all of the sulfur produced in the United States comes from Louisiana and Texas, and from mines immediately adjacent to the Intracoastal Waterway. About 80 percent of this production comes from Texas.

The normal production in peacetime is a little more than 2,000,000 tons annually. The present production, increased because of the war effort, is approximately 3,500,000 tons annually.

Prior to the war the major portion of this sulfur moved by coastwise vessel to seaboard points on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts at charter rates, which did not exceed $2.50 a ton. With the exception of several hundred thousand tons which is moved by barge into the interior of the country via the Mississippi River system, all of the remainder is now moved by rail at rates approximately three times greater than the former average water rate.

The consumption along the Atlantic seaboard, I am reliably informed, now amounts to about 1,500,000 tons, much of it being consumed in the area north of Norfolk.

I have no definite information as to the amount of railroad equipment now being employed in the movement of Louisiana and Texas sulfur, but understand that it amounts to more than 1,500 freight cars and, of course, the appropriate number of locomotives.

All of the sulfur consumed in the industrial areas along the Atlantic coast could and would move by barge all the way from the mines if the barge canal across Florida were completed. The saving in transportation charges on this amount would be not less than $6,000,000 annually. I understand that because of the necessary transportation by rail under present conditions the cost to the American consumers has been increased not less than $8,000,000; and, of course, the price of sulfur is f. o. b. the mine. Approximately 90 percent of all the sulfur produced goes into the war effort. Consequently, the excessive freight costs are paid either directly or indirectly out of the Federal Treasury.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the pending bill in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an amendment which I intend to offer to the Carlson amendment:

Amendment proposed by Mrs. LUCE: Strike out section 2 of the Carlson amendment and insert:

"SEC. 2. Relief from double payments in 1943.

"(a) General rule: The liability of any individual (other than an estate, trust, or nonresident alien) for the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code upon such individual for the taxable year beginning in 1942 is discharged to the extent of not more than $8,500, except that any payments, not exceeding $8,500 in the aggregate, made on or prior to June 15, 1943, on account of such liability shall be treated as payments on account of the tentative tax for the taxable year beginning in 1943.

"(b) Deferment of payment of undischarged portion of 1942 liability: If the liability of an individual for the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code exceeds $8,500, upon application of such individual the Commissioner shall, under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, extend the time for the payment of such excess for a period of 5 years, and provide for its payment in 20 equal quarterly installments during such period. If the aggregate of the installments payable in any calendar year under this subsection plus the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code for the taxable year beginning in the preceding calendar year is greater than either 90 percent of the individual's net income for such taxable year, or 120 percent of such tax, upon application by such individual the Commissioner shall, under such regulations, extend the time for the payment of the unpaid portion of such excess for an additional period, and provide for its payment in equal quarterly installments during such additional period. The length of any such additional period shall be prescribed by the Commissioner so that the aggregate of the installments payable under this subsection in any calendar year plus the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code which become payable in the calendar year in which the length of such additional period is so prescribed will not exceed 120 percent of such tax or 90 percent of the net income in respect of which such tax is imposed, whichever is the lesser. Interest on the installments provided for in this subsection shall be collected at the rate of 6 percent per annum for the period beginning with the date as of which the original extension of time under this subsection becomes effective until such installment is paid and no other interest shall be collected on such installment for such period. The taxpayer may pay any installment provided for under this subsection prior to the date prescribed for its payment. Regulations prescribed under this subsection may include provisions conditioning any extension under this subsection on the furnishing by the taxpayer of adequate security for the payment of the amounts with respect to which the extension is requested."

Mr. Speaker, the amendment strikes out all of the abatement and antiwindfall provisions of the Carlson bill and inserts in their place a provision which, first, abates all of the 1942 tax on taxable incomes up to $25,000; second, on taxable incomes over $25,000 abates the portion of the 1942 tax which is attributable to the first $25,000 of taxable income; third, permits the taxpayer whose taxable income for 1942 was over $25,000 to spread the payment of the unabated portion over a period of 5 years, and in hardship cases—which are clearly defined in the amendment—over an even

longer period; fourth, charges interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on the unabated portion until it is paid; and fifth, authorizes the Commissioner to condition any extension of time for the payment of the unabated portion on the furnishing by the taxpayer of adequate security.

Address of Dr. Walter R. Horlacher of the University of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am including an account of an address by Dr. Walter R. Horlacher, of the University of Arkansas, as follows:

Bureaucratic Washington seeks to subsidize the American farmer to such an extent as to insure full control of agriculture, Dr. Walter R. Horlacher, dean and director of the University of Arkansas College of Agriculture, charged here last week in an address to Rotary Club members and guests.

Individual initiative and development of agricultural programs on a State basis have been sidetracked, and the fortunes of agriculture have been placed more and more in the hands of Federal bureaus—all under the guise of emergency, he asserted.

The most significant change in American agriculture during the last several years is the ever-increasing amount of Federal control, all of which, he pointed out, is counter to the national but democratic pattern for development of educational and other programs for rural people as established 80 years ago by Congress. In 1862 the passage of the Morrill Act established the land-grant college system. Under this act the agricultural program of the Federal Government functions in the States through the colleges of agriculture, he explained.

"Stark necessity demands quick action, which usually means centralized control. The so-called action agencies, established and financed on a national basis, performed yeoman service in the thirties for a distressed agriculture and helped save it from catastrophe," Dr. Horlacher said. "The money poured out in those years and still being poured out by the Federal Treasury is remembered. Forgotten, though, is the part played by county agents in gaining acceptance of action programs by farm people. The confidence of farm people in the integrity of their county agents led them to accept these programs upon the recommendations of the agents." Continuing, Dr. Horlacher said:

"GOES BACK TO WALLACE

"National thinking concerning agriculture by the New Deal, in particular HENRY A. WALLACE, former Secretary of Agriculture, led toward centralization. The money was there, why not the authority? Unsuccessful attempts were even made to abolish the State agricultural extension services.

"As a means of expediting the handling of agriculture's wartime problems, war boards have been established—national, State, and county—boards that are responsible to and directed from Washington. They were not placed under the agricultural extension service of the land-grant colleges, but are headed by a Federal agency—the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

"To placate agriculture, because of the many favors to labor, the administration proposed new programs for agriculture, programs which are not based on the thinking and interest of the American farmer, but on those of bureaucratic Washington. Agricultural products are not permitted to bring their true market value, but the farmer is subsidized, he is to be kept looking to Washington for a portion of his income, and what is more, a sufficient portion to insure control of American agriculture.

"The farmer is being taught to hate labor, and an excuse is being built up for the continuance of the Federal program, even though it becomes divorced from all its peacetime functions.

"AGAINST COUNTY AGENTS

"Doubting the ability of bureaus to speed the federalization of agriculture rapidly enough, the President recently appointed his secretary on Chinese relations to give the Secretary of Agriculture a program for revamping American agriculture. Among other things, the proposal was made that local direction of the programs should be away from Farm Bureau minded agents (county agents), toward agents more responsive to Federal direction. Further attempts to discredit county agents were made recently by a whispering campaign in Washington, in which the county agents were charged with stirring up what was only the natural recentment of farmers against the proposed subsidy.

"Post-war plans of the administration include a statement that 'agriculture must, through the appropriate agency of Government, see that the parity principle operates justly. * * *' The war is the excuse for increased Federal control, which it does not intend to relinquish when the war is ended."

School Services for Children of Working Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a talk given Monday evening, March 22, over the Mutual Broadcasting System by Hon. Charles P. Taft, assistant director, Defense Health and Welfare Services, Social Security Agency, entitled "School Services for Children of Working Mothers":

I am extremely glad to be able to talk to educators about the problems of providing services for the children of working mothers, because communities tussling with the problem are counting greatly on the help of the schools. A great many schools are already doing their part in scores of communities throughout the country.

While it is an agreed national policy that mothers with young children should be the last source of labor to be recruited for war work, the need for labor in certain areas has already brought and will bring more women with children into industry. Many mothers are also going to work as their husbands enter the armed forces, and still others for various patriotic and economic reasons. All these will add to the child-care problems of the community, but it is in those areas where the concentration of war production and the shortage of labor, together with a lack of housing and transportation facilities, make it necessary to use local women to keep up production that an effective program of services for children of working mothers is most essential.

By far the larger number of children whose mothers are and will be engaged in wartime employment will be those now in school or old enough to attend kindergarten or nursery school. Under normal circumstances the activities of these children are centered in the home and in the school. When parental supervision and attention are decreased by mother's employment, it is natural to look to the school to compensate in some measure for what the child must lose at home.

Extension of the period during which children may use the schools is one of the best and most economical means of giving care and supervision to children between the ages of 5 to 15. This will mean that the schools may have to take over early in the morning when the mother goes to work and be responsible for the child's general welfare and whereabouts until she gets home in the evening. It does not necessarily involve keeping the child at school all day long, but it permits him to use the school as the center of his activities. These activities may include using the school library, work shops, playgrounds, or going from the school to group meetings, baseball games, or various excursions which keep him busy, interested, and safe.

In some communities, if the working hours of the women indicate it, breakfast and supper, as well as the noon meal will need to be included in extended school services.

An educator to whom I was talking the other day about this before and after school program had the idea that it offered an excellent opportunity for teacher training. By using teachers in training as leaders of before and after school groups they would get experience in sustaining an educational program based entirely on the child's interest, without benefit of the classroom atmosphere. This it seems to me would be bread cast upon the waters for school people, in return for helping out with a pressing wartime community problem to help the schools train their teachers.

How the school's part in the community program for services to children of working mothers is developed and worked out will depend on local situation. In order to size up the local situation, it's a good idea to have a group representative of all interested agencies act as a planning and steering committee for the community program. The welfare department, local industries, and labor groups, the health and recreational departments, the public employment service, housing authorities, private welfare and educational agencies, and the parents themselves will have important contributions to make in community-wide planning and action. Integration of the activities of all these groups, agencies, and individuals concerned with the health and welfare of children is essential to an effective program of wartime child-care services. The defense council is the best location for this committee, because it offers neutral ground and over-all interest. Operation of the community program will normally be the joint responsibility of the education and welfare departments with other agencies and organizations supplementing their services.

Through participation in the work of this committee, the education department can see where its responsibilities lie and adopt programs which will meet local needs.

There'll be legal barriers; there'll be jurisdictional disputes; there'll be financial limitations; there'll be personnel shortages, and

various other temptations to "throw in the towel."

But community after community is accepting the challenge which the wartime employment of women presents and marshalling all its resources to protect its children, its homes, and its community life. And one of the most important of these resources is the school.

Canada Adopts Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives an extremely important editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal, Wisconsin's outstanding newspaper, on March 2, 1943:

CANADA ADOPTS LEND-LEASE

Canada proposes to send $1,000,000,000 worth of war supplies to other United Nations in the coming fiscal year. This is at once a recognition of the value of lend-lease and an expression of determination to do its utmost.

What is the value of lend-lease? Some recent figures suggest it. One of every three combat planes and tanks which we produced in 1942 is now being fought by soldiers of one or another of our allies. This means that weapons got to the front sooner than if we had kept them here until our men were ready to use all of them.

We look on Russia with admiration, almost with stupefaction. The rapidity of the Russion drive, its careful planning, and its success in every sector amaze us. Not only are German forces kept occupied while our attack is preparing; they are seriously reduced. We would be mortified—yes, ashamed—if we had no part in this hacking up of the enemy, but we have some part.

Last year, we sent Russia 2,600 planes, 3,200 tanks, 81,000 trucks and jeeps, and other motor vehicles. That was only a beginning of the count. We have sent steel, aluminum, and tools for making airplanes—supplies which take less cargo space than the completed article. And food—pork by the 100,000,000 pounds, eggs by the 100,000,000 pounds, 17,000,000 pounds of butter, to be multiplied five times in this current year.

When we read the toll of life Russia is expending, we shall not think this too much. And if food shortages inconvenience us, we may look at another side of the picture. Australia and New Zealand have been feeding our soldiers in Australasia. Here, too, we find huge figures—43,000,000 pounds of meat, 25,000,000 pounds of potatoes, 6,000,000 pounds of butter, and milk and eggs and fresh vegetables, even sugar, in quantities which suggest a larger force than we knew we had there.

All for what? To fight the war. We take some comfort in the thought that we are helping the Russian campaign. Australia and New Zealand feel the same way, as they tighten their belts to feed the American soldiers they are glad to have with them. Canada makes up her mind that she can do more.

Will all the cooperation end when the war ends? Our lend-lease agreements carry the condition that nations receiving aid shall make no settlements after the war which would throttle world trade. But that is a pretty broad provision. A better hope is that in learning that we each can contribute to the other's salvation, we shall want a new kind of friendly relation and a broader understanding.

Absenteeism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, absenteeism is a broad term which is applied to workers who fail to report for scheduled work. The chief causes of absenteeism are sickness, accidents, poor housing, poor transportation, and fatigue. Other causes are bad weather, irregular supplies, liquor, labor hoarding, workers who quit without giving notice, inexperienced workers, monotony of work, nature of the work—such as heat, dust, noise, and wet floors—the long distance of travel to their jobs, and faulty planning of the work.

Our national average for absenteeism is from 6 to 8 percent. Willful violators will average less than 2 percent. The national average in 1918 was 18 percent. During World War No. 1 a survey was made of absenteeism in 90 shipyards. The monthly average varied from 26 percent in January to 13 percent in June in the steel shipyards. The 9-month average for wooden shipyards was about 13 percent. Absenteeism in 81 shipyards in 1942 reported 6.7 percent in April to 7.8 in October.

Great Britain learned by experience that legislation and force was not the sole answer to the problem of absenteeism. England's average is about 10 percent.

Labor, Government, management, and communities are all responsible for absenteeism. All must cooperate in solving this problem. First, a complete survey should be made of the causes of absenteeism in our defense plants, due to the fact that very few industrial plants have detailed available data. The results of this survey would inform us whether we needed legislation to cope with the situation. Only by a complete and detailed survey can the necessary information be secured in order to solve this problem. After this data is collected, a committee can select the good features and make a successful program, which will be distributed to all war plants for the purpose of reducing absenteeism to a minimum.

First. Eliminate the conditions of poor housing and poor transportation.

Second. Establish good management-labor committees.

Third. Build more hospitals, schools, nurseries, and recreation halls near the war plants.

Fourth. Better the community service, such as shopping accommodations and entertainment.

Fifth. Better plant facilities, including sanitary and safety conditions, which insures proper heating, ventilation, and the location of adequate lavatory facilities.

Sixth. More incentives for the workers, such as badges, chevrons, honor rolls, and week-end vacations.

Seventh. Adopt educational programs including moving pictures, lectures, and bulletins relating to plant operations.

Eighth. Government and management should insure proper raw material allocation and the proper scheduling of fabricated supplies.

Ninth. Personal appeals to the workers, emphasizing the grave importance of each individual's job to the war effort.

Tenth. Establish a well-organized medical and health program.

In conclusion, the information received in the House Labor Committee hearings so far does not warrant any penalty legislation, but the data received do establish the fact that we can eliminate a great portion of absenteeism by other methods.

Our job is to get the maximum production with the least amount of delay. Many reports are coming in which indicate that our workers are doing a real job in our war plants. Free labor and free management in America can outproduce any economy in which labor is enslaved and management shackled. American workers are like any one of us, they want to be led, not driven. We must continue to correct our problems in the American way of adjustment—arbitration and with a live-and-help-live policy.

Fuel for Atlantic Seaboard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. CURLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is pleasing to have had a part in the solution of the fuel problem of the Atlantic Seaboard States and I am grateful to all who have assisted, and especially Maj. J. R. Parton, director of transportation of the Interior Department.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator:

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, March 19, 1943.

Hon. JAMES M. CURLEY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CURLEY: Mr. Joel Dean, Director, Fuel Rationing Division, Office of Price

Administration, has referred your letter of February 28 to this office for consideration.

It is my pleasure to advise that the western leg of the 24-inch pipe line from Longview, Tex., to Norris City, Ill., has been placed in operation. Full-scale construction work is well under way along the eastern segment of the line from Norris City to the New York-Philadelphia area, and present indications are that the entire line will be finished by June of this year. The completion of this project will assure delivery of 300,000 barrels a day of crude and light heating oils to the east coast.

The construction of a second large pipe line, which will be a 20-inch refined-products carrier with a capacity of 235,000 barrels a day, will be started soon from Texas. The first section of this line from the Houston and Beaumont refining centers to Norris City, Ill., and Seymour, Ind., has been approved by the War Production Board. Our construction schedule calls for the completion of this leg by September 1 of this year.

In view of the urgency of extending the 20-inch products line to the Atlantic seaboard, a formal application was made by the Petroleum Administration for War to the War Production Board on March 3 for the allocation of sufficient additional material and equipment to provide for the completion of this essential petroleum artery from Seymour, Ind., to the east coast.

Tank-barge equipment to provide for increased operations on the inland waterways has become and will become available as the result of an extensive program involving the conversion of a large number of dry-cargo barges to oil service and a sizable expansion of new barge facilities, including the construction of wooden barges for the transportation of residual fuel oil, dry-cargo wooden barges for replacing the steel barges which will be converted to petroleum carriers, and related tow and tug boat equipment.

Through greater speed and efficiency in the use of tank cars, the assignment of additional cars to eastern service by using tank trucks for short hauls to a greater extent, and the construction of more loading and unloading facilities, it is hoped that the rail movement of petroleum and petroleum products to the eastern seaboard can be stepped up materially. The drum movement of kerosene in boxcars, which has been started recently, has already augmented rail deliveries to the critical east coast area by nearly 25,000 barrels a day.

The vital importance of increasing our transportation facilities, in order to meet essential domestic and military demands for oil, is fully recognized and you may be assured that positive and decisive steps are being taken to bring about the fulfillment of our 1943 transportation program with all possible haste.

Upon completion of transportation projects now under way, it is believed that all rationed requirements on the east coast can be satisfied. However, it must be borne in mind that the volume of petroleum and petroleum products that will be available for civilian consumption next winter is always subject to unpredictable developments in the theater of war. In any event, the Army and Navy must have the first call on our petroleum supplies; our war industries must be fueled unfailingly; and we shall do everything humanly possible to supply essential civilian requirements.

Your views and comments in relation to the subject of petroleum transportation are appreciated.

If you believe I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH K. DAVIES,
Deputy Petroleum Administrator.

Comments on the Report of the National Resources Planning Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Samuel Grafton appearing in the Washington Evening Star March 16, 1943:

SOCIAL SECURITY PLAN'S OPPONENTS FIGHTING A PRINCIPLE WHICH ALREADY IS ACCEPTED

(By Samuel Grafton)

Continuing on the social-security plan, I make the point that we are discussing unemployment relief at a time when the national income is $115,000,000,000. We are discussing the dangers of drought during a fiscal cloudburst.

The fact that congressional conservatives probably will be able to shelve the plan for this year is not a tribute to their point of view or to the popularity. It is tribute to the war budget.

These men are fighting security at a time when almost everybody has it, or a reasonably accurate facsimile of it, in one war-born form or another.

They are fighting the concept of maintaining living standards through Government expenditures, at a time when living standards are being maintained through Government expenditures.

TEST WILL COME LATER

In other words, they are fighting a teeny-weeny plan for spending maybe two, maybe five, billions a year to keep people at work, during a period in which we are spending one hundred billions a year in keeping people at work.

They are saying, the Government ain't a-going to support the people, at a time when the Government jolly well is supporting the people. They are saying we will not do it, at a time when we obviously are doing it.

The real test of public opinion on security will come when there isn't any security. So (to help cut away the obscurantist underbrush in this debate), it must be pointed out to conservative Members of Congress that it is not their popularity, not their charm, not their curly hair, which makes it possible for them to attack security. It is the war budget.

They are really hugging the war budget to their bosoms; they are dressing themselves in it, as in a greatcoat. But it is perhaps not a durable garment.

UNITED STATES FUNDS BORROWED

It could, correctly, be said that the social-security plan is not a scheme for suddenly up and spending a couple of billions a year to support the people. It is a plan to demobilize the spending of a hundred billions a year down to a mere couple of billions. It is actually a plan to cut Government expenditures in support of the people to perhaps one-fiftieth of the present level.

A good portion of the opposition is really talking about some sort of an imaginary country, which is spending very little to keep its people going, and in which it has suddenly, outrageously, been proposed to spend several billions a year.

It would be pleasant, perhaps, to be citizens of so fiscally-fortunate a country. But I don't know where that country it. It is certainly not this country. The people of this country are being kept going by $100,000,000,000 a year of Federal money, most of it borrowed.

FRESH START IMPOSSIBLE

So the problem is, can we cut $100,000,000,000 a year down to $2,000,000,00, or even $5,000,000,000. The opposition seems to conceive of the problem as one of whether we ought to start from zero and go up.

It would be nice to obtain that fresh start, at zero, but how do the conservatives in Congress propose to obtain it for us? They want to start from scratch, but where is scratch? Scratch was the first casualty of the war.

Here is the whole country living on the Federal budget, while the opposition says firmly that it is not going to use the Federal budget for any such purpose. The theory will be popular so long as there is no interference with the practice.

We have bought off from social security at the wartime price of a dollar on the penny. The question is can we buy off again, at two pennies on the dollar? When the day comes, we shall be quite lucky if the offer is a firm one, and holds.

An Experiment in Collectivism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, an editorial from the Plymouth Mail, of Plymouth, Mich., written by Elton R. Eaton, former member of the State legislature of my State—Michigan—and one of the most prominent newspapermen in the State. He is an independent thinker, honest and forthright, whose opinions and observations I have always respected.

Mr. Eaton makes a valuable contribution and has furnished information that should challenge the attention of every Member of Congress.

Here is a case where a cradle to the grave experiment in social planning and Utopia building ended in disaster. State socialism under a free government established by freemen is repugnant to every principle of our Republic. I appeal to every Member of this House to read this editorial.

PLANNING THE WAY TO A NATIONAL POOR FARM

(By Elton R. Eaton)

So the New Dealer beneficiaries of inherited wealth who have never had to toil or spin to earn their daily bread, assisted by a group of long-haired, overeducated, nonproducing theorists, have worked out a plan for the post-war period so there will be peace, happiness, and security for everybody, whether they work or not. That seems to be the gist of the document filed with Congress by the President's very rich and cultured relative, Frederic A. Delano, Chairman of the National Planning Board.

As I hastily read through the long document, it revived memories of probably the first New Deal experiment ever tried out in Michigan. As a youngster I was reared

in the little village of Galesburg over in Kalamazoo County.

A mile or so west of the village was located the Kalamazoo County poor farm.

The Kalamazoo poor farm was the original share-the-wealth "experimental station" of the country and as a boy we heard and knew much about the thing they now call the New Deal.

Old pioneers used to tell of the time when a number of covered wagons arrived in Galesburg one spring day from various places about the State. Gathered under the heavy coverings of the wagons were some 70 or 80 men, women, and children who called themselves members of the Alphadelphia Association.

They had come West, they said, to begin life anew, to live in one great community, where all were to work together, share alike and live alike. Everything raised was to go in one big granary and each was to be apportioned equal amounts of foods, clothing, and wood for fuel.

They spent several days looking around for a site for their new planned world. Finally they picked a beautiful piece of ground lying on what, as a youngster, I knew as Toland's prairie. It consisted of several hundred acres, running from the foothills along the north side of the prairie to the Kalamazoo River.

There they erected their buildings, hewing from the big oak and walnut trees the frames, sidings, and shingles for the community hall and other buildings. I clearly remember the old wooden structures—the main building years later having been moved into our town to be used as a windmill factory after fire had destroyed the original factory building.

It wasn't necessary for these original new dealers to spend much time clearing the land, as most of it was covered only by a heavy growth of wild grass. Groves of big white oaks and walnuts surrounded the prairie. It was exceedingly rich, level farm land.

They planted their crops and cut their wood for the stoves and fireplaces.

Then came fall and they harvested their crops. As the seasons rolled around, it finally developed that nearly all of the productive work was being carried on by only a small number of men. It soon became apparent that there were many drones among the original new dealers. They wanted their share of all that was produced, but didn't want to do much of the work required in producing it.

The workers didn't like this idea and they began to move out of the colony. I remember well the elderly son of one of original New Dealers. His father, sick and tired of working long hours while others loafed about the community center exploiting the benefits of the original New Deal, went over east of Galesburg and bought a farm. Other workers in the colony bought themselves farms and move out. This son of one of the members of the old New Dealers I knew later move into our town and was the butter and egg buyer of the place.

Finally only the drones—the loud talkers—were left down on the Alphadelphia farm.

They began to get hungry and they had little clothing. They were too lazy to cut their own heating wood.

What happened to these New Deal drones?

Kalamazoo County taxpayers had to buy the Alphadelphia farm and convert it into a poor farm to care for the lazy new dealers who were stranded there, just as Frederic A. Delano now proposes that after the Second World War is over that the hard-working industrious citizens of America shall take care of all the cheaters, the drones, and the riff-raff of the Nation and the world, even if this new breed of drones refuse to toil and spin to help support themselves.

But it is not at all surprising that such crackpot ideas come from people who have been fed throughout their lives off inherited silver spoons and foods they never produced through their own efforts.

Some day these nonproducing dreamers are going to wake up to the idea that there is just one way for people to get along in this world, and that is through work—yes; hard work.

It is about time for someone to place a muzzle over the mouths of these super-educated, nonproducing advocates of a happy, carefree existence for all of the drones at the expense of those who work to produce.

For 10 long years these modern new dealers have spent their time debunking every sound American ideal upon which our Nation has grown so powerful and so plentiful. They talk only of security and safety. Never does one hear anything about the benefits of loyal, devoted services to our community, State, and Nation or of the benefits to ourselves and our neighbors of real sacrifice. Never do they tell of the joys that come from enthusiastic, diligent, honest toil.

They have tried to tell the people of this Nation that we could live by pretending to work a few hours per week. In fact, we have been trying to do this very thing for some years back.

Look to Pearl Harbor, the Philippines, the islands of the Pacific, and you see the results of this no-work, all-play policy of the New Dealers.

"Too little and too late," words that shame the richest nation that God ever let live, provide the answer.

We have a desperate war to win. It is impossible to conceive why, in view of the plight we are in, that those high in the administration at Washington keep constantly injecting into discussions domestic issues of a most controversial nature. That is no way to bring about unity in action so much needed at present.

As we see it, the recommendations of the planning board are not only trouble-making ideas, but they can be rightfully regarded as an insult to the initiative hard-working people of this free land of ours.

It is high time that we begin to preach something about the glories of work and accomplishment, and the follies of laziness and idle prattle.

The New Deal plan for the post-war period instead of being a plan for just a mere county poor farm, is seemingly a plan for a national poor farm for all of us.

Require Recorded Votes of Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, adopted by the Fiftieth General Assembly of Iowa, memorializing the Congress of the United States to forthwith take such action as may be appropriate to require a recorded vote of Members of the Congress on the final passage of all bills and all measures of general public interest:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 14

Whereas the people of the State of Iowa have steadfastly and sacrificially, in peace and in war, manifested their devotion to the ideals of democracy; and

Whereas a vigilant citizenry is the best safeguard of the democratic way of life; and

Whereas it is held by the people of Iowa to be a fundamental right of the people to know how their duly elected representatives in the general assembly vote on the final passage of all measures affecting the people, and to protect this right have impressed the Constitution of Iowa with the following provision: "Passage of bills: Article 3, section 17. No bill shall be passed unless by the assent of a majority of all the members elected to each branch of the general assembly, and the question upon the final passage shall be taken immediately upon its last reading, and the yeas and nays entered on the journal"; and

Whereas measures of grave concern to the people of Iowa and of the Nation are not infrequently passed by the Congress of the United States without a recorded vote of its Members on final passage, thus depriving the people of Iowa of a fair opportunity of knowing how their duly elected Members in the National Legislature voted thereon; and

Whereas a fair opportunity on the part of the people of Iowa to scrutinize the acts and conduct of the Members of Congress is essential to the fulfillment of the ideal of democracy; and

Whereas men and women on the fighting fronts, on land and sea, and those held in enemy prisons in distant places in the world, are entitled, upon their return to the homeland, to have a record of the votes cast by their Representatives in the National Legislature, on the final action on all important measures during this critical period of the Nation's history: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Fiftieth General Assembly of Iowa (the house concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to forthwith take such action as may be appropriate to require a recorded vote of the Members of the Congress on the final passage of all bills and all measures of general public interest; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is directed to forward a certified copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress (Senate and House of Representatives) of the United States from the State of Iowa.

Army Pharmacy Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, for some reason, which to me is not clear, there has never been established a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army. Surely the services of these professional men in the Army are not only

advisable but absolutely essential. As the size of our Army increases, and the responsibility of the pharmacists becomes greater, it would seem the part of justice and wisdom to create such a corps in the Army at this time. During the last Congress I urged consideration of this same proposal. However, the War Department, for reasons which seemed sufficient to itself, did not agree.

Mr. Speaker, I am this day in receipt of a concurrent resolution, passed by the Legislature of the State of Michigan, urging immediate action by the Congress setting up this Pharmacy Corps, and pursuant to the permission granted me, I am including that resolution which is as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 16

A concurrent resolution memoralizing Congress to create a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States House bill No. 997 and Senate bill No. 216, to create a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army; and

Whereas there is a definite need in this war emergency for the capable handling of drugs, medicines, and pharmaceutics which are used in the treatment of diseases of our boys and girls in the armed forces; and

Whereas at the present there is no law providing for the creation of such a Pharmacy Corps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to put forth every effort to see these two bills enacted into law; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the chairmen of the Military Affairs Committees of the Senate and House, and to the congressional delegation of Michigan.

Adopted by the senate March 9, 1943.

Adopted by the house of representatives March 10, 1943.

FRED I. CHASE,
Secretary of the Senate.
MYLES F. GRAY,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Comments on the Report of the National Resources Planning Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson, appearing in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star:

POST-WAR RESOURCES PLANNING REPORT SEEN IGNORED, MISREPRESENTED, CAVALIERLY DISMISSED

(By Dorothy Thompson)

It is not my purpose today to discuss the report of the National Resources Planning Board on freedom from want after the war. This 58-page document and the lengthy study on which it is based require attentive reading, and furnish ground for meticulous criticism, which will come in due time.

But the reception accorded the report, both by press and politicians, is a discouraging revelation of intellectual leadership. For the report has been ignored, misrepresented, or cavalierly dismissed.

The document is a summary of a much longer study available to all concerned with the post-war outlook. It represents the fruits of 3 years of work by disinterested economists and experts in various fields, and takes into account the experience of other countries in attempting to achieve a minimum of economic security for all citizens.

Its object, in a revolutionary world, is to help achieve a stable society with minimum dislocation of existing economic institutions. Such a society is the condition even for international post-war planning. It is useless to discuss the international political and economic relationships unless there is prospect of stability within our own borders. Every agreement could be overthrown by radical changes here.

UNLIKE BEVERIDGE REPORT

Unlike the British Beveridge report, which is a limited document, exclusively concerned with the extension and rationalization of existing social services, this report raises the primary question, upon the answer to which all other measures are dependent, namely, how to maintain full employment after the war. This is the basic problem which faces all industrialized societies. Failure to solve it is responsible for all the radical upsets of these times, and is, indeed, a direct cause of this war.

When the New York Times, in an editorial commenting on the report, dismisses it by suggesting that nazi-ism is a logical development of Bismarck's "welfare state," the Times is falling below its usual intellectual level. The security plan initiated by Bismarck and elaborated by the Weimar republic was founded on failure to solve the problem of cyclical unemployment. This unemployment, more than any other single factor, contributed to the rise of Hitler. Hitler, in power, substituted for the traditional welfare state the party Winterhilfe, and a system of conscripted labor.

Modifications of the system of social insurance introduced into Germany by the conservative Bismarck as a hedge against radical overturns have been adopted by every civilized nation, including, belatedly, our own.

There are measures of internal collective security necessitated by the industrial revolution, the division of labor, the growth and concentration of industry, and the resultant interdependence of nearly every citizen on all the others. No stable society can be built in this country, or anywhere else outside the purely rural communities of self-sustaining farmers and artisans, without some comprehensive system of mutual insurance, and without carefully conceived measures for minimizing booms and depressions. To present such a plan is the purpose of this report.

FUNCTION OF ADMINISTRATION

How else can such a plan be prepared? The New York Herald Tribune states, "Congress has determined to write its own formula. This is as it should be." Congress is completely unequipped to prepare a plan. Congress will always be inclined to use such questions for politics. It has neither the personal disinterestedness, nor the staff, nor the freedom from direct popular pressures, nor the technical experts, nor the time for the preparation of such a report.

That is the function of an administration with foresight. And the function of Congress is to consider the report, discuss it, debate it, modify it, and pass judgment on it. There is no other way of governing intelligently in the modern world.

Judgment, however, has already been passed by radio and newspaper commentators who obviously have not done more than glance through the summary.

Part of the trouble, of course, is due to the way in which the administration handles its public relations. The document comes into the hands of those commentators who might be expected to give it careful attention, 24 hours after its general release. The political opponents of the administration immediately prejudice public opinion, and responsible writers keep still because they cannot talk about something they have not carefully studied.

But such a report, having made a day's headlines, cannot be dismissed from public discussion in a week's time.

For the American people are greatly concerned with what is going to happen to them after this war.

Rubber in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a transcribed broadcast delivered by me March 21 over radio stations WMAM, Marinette, Wis., and WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., entitled "Rubber in War":

Last Tuesday I had the pleasure of joining members of the Military Affairs Committee in witnessing a splendid display of products manufactured by the B. F. Goodrich Co. and its affiliated companies which are playing a most important part in the war effort. The products displayed, of course, represented but a very small percentage of the various products manufactured in their numerous plants, directly or indirectly, concerned with our military program. Thousands of articles used in peacetime pursuits are now being adapted and used in our war effort. For example, fire hose is being produced at this company's plants at the rate of around 75,000 feet a week. Such hose has wide and varied uses in civilian and military protection services throughout the world. Belts from the smallest V-belt used in automotive and industrial drives up to the heaviest of conveyor belts represent a very substantial effort on the part of that company. Conveyor and transmission belting is used in our own mines and industries in ever-increasing quantities due to the increased production of our mines and war plants; and a tremendous amount of this belting is being shipped abroad under lend-lease. For instance, Russia recently requisitioned under lend-lease 1,400,000 feet (which is approximately 265 miles) of various sizes of conveyor belt for use in its war effort. B. F. Goodrich participated by supplying 66 miles of belting. Furthermore, at the present time B. F. Goodrich is figuring on an inquiry from Russia for 25,000,000 feet of transmission belt ranging in size from 2-inch to 28-inch. Miscellaneous items such as radiator hose, rubber mountings, seals, gaskets—all find their important places in the war program.

In the exhibit I saw displayed aeronautical products, plastic board, airplane tires, bullet sealing hose, de-icers, rubber tracks, tires of all kinds, rubber footwear, lifesaving suits, flotation equipment, etc.

Their tire display showed the military desert tire, the huge heavy rubber treads used on tanks and the famous half-track used on combat vehicles, the super traction mud and snow tire, the combat tire, and airplane

tires. The interesting military desert tire is the result of extensive tests in the desert sands of Indio, Calif., to produce a tire that would have both satisfactory traction in highway service and would also be satisfactory on loose sand. As a result, they designed a tread on the same order of our present mud and snow tires except that it is much shallower. This reduction of tread depth was made so that when a vehicle traveled over sands it would disturb the sand as little as possible so as not to dig in and bury the vehicle. In examining their truck tire on exhibit, one noticed that it was represented as having been made almost entirely of synthetic rubber. Synthetic rubber tires have been produced in many varied sizes and are now being tested in the various field services to assist in the development of "know how" of production as well as for observation of performance of the synthetic material under varied conditions.

We haven't yet learned all the secrets of synthetic rubber and what we do not want to do is to get caught in the same position Hitler found himself last winter—and possibly again this winter—when his synthetic tires, tank treads, etc., all started to break up in the very severe winter encountered in the Russian campaign. In fact, it has been reported to me that much of the reason for the Russian successes in the winter campaign a year ago was due to the fact that the mighty German war machine bogged down due to difficulties encountered with their synthetic rubber and their synthetic lubricating oils which failed to function in the cold Russian winter and this made Hitler's army vulnerable to the striking force of the Russians, whose equipment did stand up under those conditions.

The combat tire which I saw differed from the truck type tire by having a much heavier carcass in the sidewall. It is used primarily on combat vehicles where they are susceptible to bullets, strafing, and shrapnel. Its prime function is to sustain the load of the vehicle, even though the tube is punctured and no air remains in the tire. By use of a standard beadlock, the tire is anchored solidly to a divided wheel and when traction is required, even though lacking air, the tire is held to the rim so tight that it cannot possibly slip. The increased wall thickness permits the tire to remain at approximately 80 percent of section height and it can stand up for better than 100 miles of operation before failing—permitting the vehicle to remain in combat or make it possible for the vehicle to remove itself away from the combat lines for repairs.

Also on exhibit was an airplane tire made from synthetic rubber which is now undergoing experimental tests. In addition to this tire made from synthetic rubber was shown Goodrich's so-called Reclaim V-35 tire, which represents the company's effort for conservation of crude rubber by a complete substitution of crude with reclaim. This V-35 tire, if restricted within a 35-mile-per-hour speed limit, and without being subjected to any abnormal abuses, will give 10,000 miles or more of wear before it is necessary to recap or retread.

Then I saw the Goodrich air-seal beadlock tire—another example of the company's ingenuity and interest in the conservation of rubber by the elimination of the inner tube in the tire. At present this unit is entirely confined to the combat-type tire and is undergoing extensive tests under the supervision of the Chief of Ordnance. Before that unit was introduced to our War Department, B. F. Goodrich had successfully conducted tests in Texas and various other places, accumulating as much as 20,000 miles without the use of any inner tube and with no more air loss than we would ordinarily encounter with a tire using an inner tube. Further tests were conducted at the Aberdeen Proving Ground at which time a range including 6.00 x 16, 6.00 x 20, 7.50 x 20, 8.25 x 20, and 12.00 x 20 tires passed several cycles of testing. The tests involved running it for 50 miles and again reinflating it and running 150 miles concluding one cycle. The units were then demounted, separated, and then remounted and the cycle repeated additional times. The tests proved so satisfactory that the Chief of Ordnance was prompted to go into an extensive program involving better than 500 units to be tested at military proving grounds involving temperatures as low as −40° F. in northern Canada and tests on the hot desert sands of California.

The rubber footwear display covered items with which most of us are familiar with the exception of perhaps the electrically heated aviator boot, the jungle boot, and the Navy flying boot. The electrically heated aviator boots are heated in a similar way as our electric bed pads and are worn by pilots flying in extremely high altitudes under sub-zero temperatures. One could see an extension cord from the boot which is to be plugged into a socket from which it derives its heat—which is generated electrically. An interesting angle on the jungle boot is that this type of construction was found necessary for jungle wear since leather quickly deteriorates in humid areas of the southwest Pacific. The Navy 10" flying boot also has an interesting construction insofar as a dual zipper arrangement is concerned. The conventional zipper—which is now disappearing from our civilian markets—is incorporated in the portion to which the lightweight leather lace is attached—which is for everyday use. However, in the case of an emergency, the pilot can, by pulling the zipper having the heavier strap—and which is on the opposite side—open the boot to full width thus permitting it to be removed quickly in case he is forced down at sea. Included in the rubber footwear exhibit were many other items which are generally peacetime items, the production of which, however, is now given over entirely to military and other essential needs and which are fabricated by a division of B. F. Goodrich in Massachusetts. That division also produces all kinds of fabricated clothing, food bags, submarine battery jars, rafts, life belts and jackets, helmet liners, etc., all of which are necessary for many military services.

I found the so-called lifesaving suit most interesting. It was an example of one of the many kinds of suits B. F. Goodrich makes for various uses in our armed services. Some suits have incorporated in them a flotation bladder or a band of suitable material which permits flotation. The lifesaving suit exhibited is not really a lifesaving suit and the wearer is required to put on either a life-preserver belt or vest before stepping into it, but its prime purpose is to protect the individual from the water, keep him dry, and give him warmth. The suit is made in one size and will accommodate a man 6 feet 3 inches tall and in the case of men who are smaller, a strap arrangement at the bottom can be used to blouse the surplus leg length.

In addition to the lifesaving suit just mentioned, B. F. Goodrich manufactures numerous other items involving rubber or rubberlike materials in conjunction with fabric. For instance, barrage balloons and pontoons, life rafts, reconnaissance boats, food containers, gasoline container bags—just to mention a few. The life preserver, life belt, and landing boat are inflated by cartridges of carbon dioxide which can be observed by close examination of the items. In addition to that device there is added means of inflation by lung power in the event the mechanical means fail.

Another item on exhibit of considerable interest is B. F. Goodrich's Mark IV (4-man) raft. It is constructed of rubberized fabric having a large-sized cartridge of carbon-dioxide capable of inflating the boat. Included with the equipment are a pair of oars that are collapsible, an inflating and deflating air pump and a zipper bag which is suitable for stowing food and other materials. Toward the bow of the boat are two pockets which contain a repair kit for punctures. In another pocket is a scout knife, metal mirror, stout cord, and whistle. All this equipment is furnished with the raft.

B. F. Goodrich has been a leader in the development of bullet-sealing gasoline tanks which have been credited with saving a great many planes and the lives of the crews.

The tanks prevent the planes from catching fire from leaking gasoline after being struck by bullets and also preserve the fuel supply so that the planes may return to their bases. Bullet-sealing tanks are used in all of our combat aircraft.

Three different types of gasoline containers—or fuel cells—were on exhibit. The larger of the three cells shown was one of several required for one plane, the contour of each differing some to accommodate the contour of the wing or other points of location in the plane. It is nonmetallic and rigid in construction. The inside lining is of B. F. Goodrich Ameripol oil resisting material which in all around performance has no equal in the presence of gasolines which are destructive to other materials in one form or another. Another fuel cell is of a bag type and is bullet sealing. The size on exhibit can hold approximately 80 gallons of gasoline; it is, however, not as rigid as the larger one described earlier but it is more flexible, enabling it to be crushed and installed in wings already built and in places that would be inaccessible to a rigid type construction. The third fuel cell shown, which was of a rectangular box design, was of a 50-gallon capacity which type is installed in amphibian tanks and is now also being developed for small boats. It is constructed substantially as the two other types just mentioned and is equally sealproof against bullets.

The B. F. Goodrich Co. is ordinarily thought of as being a manufacturer of rubber and rubberlike articles, but its field is by no means restricted to such materials. At its exhibit here we saw displays of machine work—as for example, airplane de-icers which have been developed to perfection after years of extensive research. B. F. Goodrich plants have substantial machine shops which, in peacetime, are devoted to making tire molds, industrial-product molds, machine parts for plant equipment, and the like; but with the freezing of automotive, refrigerator, washing-machine, and other such production, the need for this equipment was transferred from such production and offered for use both as a prime contractor and a subcontractor to military needs.

This exhibit of the products made by B. F. Goodrich can, of course, be substantially duplicated by the other leading rubber companies of the Nation and proves conclusively what a valuable and tremendous part the rubber industry is playing in this greatest of all war efforts—and likewise it demonstrated conclusively to us the necessity for practicing every possible economy in the use of rubber products. We are encouraged here in Washington to believe that Mr. Jeffers is finally getting somewhere with his program for the production of synthetic rubber, but this exhibit demonstrated to us clearly that we have a long, long way to go before we civilians are going to be able to get any substantial supply of synthetic rubber for civilian needs.

How We Take the Profiteer Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of March 27, 1943:

HOW WE TAKE THE PROFITEER OUT OF WAR

The phrase "renegotiation of contracts" gives most businessmen and manufacturers the creeps. It suggests welshing by act of Congress, and a swarm of bureaucrats in every war plant holding up production while they try to prove that the owner is a crook. A year ago, when Congress passed section 402 of the Sixth Supplemental Defense Appropriation Act, which requires that all contracts involving more than $100,000 with the Army and Navy, the Treasury or the Maritime Commission be renegotiated whenever "the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty," there were practically no cheers. Even a man who has no intention of profiteering feels better with a firm contract in the drawer of his desk.

The act has been in force almost a year, and the Army and Navy between them have recaptured excessive profits or renegotiated them out of war contracts, to the tune of $1,500,000,000. How is renegotiation working? What are the justifications for it? Is the producer allowed enough profit to stimulate increased production? Does the efficient producer suffer at the expense of his slovenly competitor? Why aren't excess-profits taxes adequate to curb profiteering? These and some hundreds of other questions are being asked whenever producers who are supplying the Government—and that means most producers—get together.

Nobody has stated the origins and causes of contract renegotiation more clearly than Senator DAVID I. WALSH, chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee.

"It became apparent," said Senator WALSH, "that many negotiated contracts were awarded before either of the contracting parties had any accurate idea as to the actual cost of producing the article on a mass-production basis. When the actual cost of manufacturing the article became known, it was apparent that some firms were making an excess profit, and both the Government and the manufacturer desired to renegotiate the contract in order to reduce the cost to the Government."

That was one reason for renegotiation. The Army asks an automobile manufacturer to make tanks in a hurry. The manufacturer has never made a tank and has no idea what the costs will be. A contract is signed at some price just to get things started. When manufacturing experience has established the actual cost, a new contract can be written.

Equally important, however, has been the feeling that this time there should be no scandalously exorbitant profits from war orders. Both political parties and almost every organization big enough to afford a national convention have passed resolutions demanding that profit be taken out of war. Nobody likes to contemplate the difference between the hardships endured by a soldier on Guadalcanal and a manufacturer at home cashing in on war business. Since it is impractical to equip the manufacturer's office with fox holes and cooties, the most obvious means of narrowing the gap between his lot and that of the soldier is to see to it that the manufacturer does not make so much money as to create a scandal and give a bad name to the free-enterprise system.

In the last war, the so-called profiteers represented an infinitesimal fraction of American industry, but there were enough of them to supply every pinko and crackpot with enough ammunition against capitalism to last 25 years. As Under Secretary of War Patterson puts it: "If inordinate profits were reaped by a few under a $22,000,000,000 war program, what will be the consequences under $240,000,000,000 of current appropriations and authorizations?"

Nobody, least of all the men on the price-adjustment boards, would claim that the record of renegotiation has been perfect up to now or that perfection is likely to distinguish it in the future. But from the character of the men who are in charge of contract renegotiation, as well as from the experiences of various suppliers, we think it fair to say that the intent of Congress and the American people that there shall be no profiteers is being carried out with the minimum of injustice to individuals.

The personnel of the various regional boards is kept down to the minimum consistent with efficiency and the convenience of the producers. Of course, some producers complain; everybody would like to go on getting $5,000 a unit, even when the cost of production has dropped to $1,500. But when the producer stops to think that he has a customer who will take everything he can make, that he has no competition, sales expense, or risk of saturating the market, he is likely to conclude that renegotiation of a contract with the Army or Navy leaves him with substantially as much profit as he derived from his peacetime efforts to sell in a market shared by a dozen eager competitors. The War and Navy Departments, with an act of Congress behind them, are not much tougher than normal peacetime competitive practice.

Probably the chief reason why one hears so many contradictory stories on contract renegotiation is the flexibility with which it is administered.

There is no arbitrary maximum or minimum profit margin permitted by the price adjusters. Many factors are considered. The low-cost producer is favored as against his inefficient competitor by receiving a higher unit profit for his article. The man who is operating on his own capital will come off better than the man who has been set up in business with Government money in a Government plant, and who is, in reality, less an owner than a manager.

Indeed, believers in capitalism and free enterprise ought not to withhold approval from section 403 on at least one ground—namely, that it is almost unique among Government activities in that it actually exerts pressure to reduce costs and increase production, instead of freezing costs and restricting production, as so much New Deal legislation has done. The renegotiators have also shown a disposition to be generous toward suppliers whose contracts with the Army or Navy have been preceded by years of experimental work on which no profit was possible. There are several instances in which the boards took into account losses incurred before the supplier had any contract at all with the Government.

Granted that the country wants no profiteers and that nobody wants very much to be a profiteer, is this the best way to control excessive profits? Why not leave this job to the excess-profits tax, which takes 90 percent of the top-bracket incomes anyway? Why not fix a definite margin of profit over cost, as was done in the last war? The answer to the last question is, of course, that cost plus is out precisely because it worked so badly in the last war. The higher the costs the bigger the profit. Sound industrial practices should work just the other way. The effort to control inflation becomes all but impossible if industry is encouraged to add to production costs.

Nor can the excess-profits tax unaided capture undue profits. As Bernard M. Baruch has pointed out, "Twenty percent of $500,000 is $100,000, and 20 percent of $1,000,000 is $200,000. One way to increase a $500,000 profit to $1,000,000 without increased risk or effort is to double the price. For this reason there is more incentive to increase prices, and therefore profits, under an 80-percent excess-profits tax than there is without it." If we are serious about curbing war profits, the job has to be done before, rather than after, taxes.

It would be foolish to pretend that renegotiation of a contract, which looked pretty good in the first place, is invariably a pleasant experience. The question which those who are renegotiated ought to ask themselves is: "Is this better or worse than being gone over by a senatorial investigating committee after the war, perhaps lampooned and misrepresented, and certainly pilloried by opponents of our competitive business system?" One answer certainly is that when the great day comes and disillusioned politicians are looking about for fat cats and scapegoats, the war contractor will be in a preferred position if he can say, "I was put under the microscope by some of the hardest-boiled bug detectors you ever saw, and they gave me a clean bill of health."

After all, total war demands a total effort by all classes. We cannot conscript soldiers, draft labor, and ration civilians, yet fail to restrain profits to a reasonable level. In war, when we cannot even guarantee a man the right to his own life, no war contractor can be assured the last dollar of profit from business which was made for him by the war emergency. Furthermore, we know that few American producers want any such advantage. Now that he has assurance that his "excessive profits" will be sheared off without endless bureaucratic interference with his operations, and that the result will be fair as between him and other producers, the American businessman will accept renegotiation of his war contracts with good grace. From all reports, he is doing so already.

Florida Barge Canal

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members to a letter written by Judge MANSFIELD, chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, to the Honorable BUELL SNYDER, replying to a letter written to Mr. SNYDER by the Secretary of the Interior concerning the distribution of fuel oils to the Atlantic seaboard. I wish you would read this letter very carefully.

I would also like to call to the attention of the members of the Appropriations Committee the fact that the hearings held before the subcommittee on the Florida barge canal are available, and since we are going to hold a full committee meeting on that soon, I hope that every member will avail himself of those hearings and study them closely.

If I can be of assistance to you I will be glad to do so.

The letter referred to follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1943.

Hon. J. BUELL SNYDER,
Chairman, Appropriations Subcommittee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: In the Washington Star of Sunday, March 21, I read an article stating that Mr. Ickes had written you concerning the transportation of petroleum from the Southwest to our eastern seaboard. In this article there are several errors arrived at by making incorrect assumptions and then carrying the arguments to apparently logical conclusions which are actually fallacious.

The first fallacy stated that pipe lines used materials and manpower with greater efficiency than any other carriers except ocean tankers and that they were economical to operate. Being from Texas, I have at least a layman's knowledge of the transportation of oil, and I know that the commercial oil companies have for many years been hauling their products by barge on inland canals and rivers from Texas up the Mississippi River and all of its great tributaries. Some of these hauls involve the bucking of considerable river currents. I do not know of any case where an economical company has laid a pipe line over a route where a waterway and a barge line were available. Not being acquainted with the experts of the Petroleum Administrator, I do not know their capabilities, but I do know that the Standard Oil Co. has for years been transporting by barge up the Mississippi River enormous quantities of oil, and I do not believe this company would move oils in this way if it could be done more economically in another way.

The magazine, Marine News, for the present month states that the Standard Oil Co. has just put in operation on the Mississippi River a towboat to handle 12 barges of 9,000 barrels of oil each, the equivalent of 4 miles of tank cars. According to the regulations being carried out, 9 locomotive engines would be required for the movement of that number of tank cars. The boat is of a 3-power Diesel type to develop 2,415 horsepower, being the largest towboat in operation on the Mississippi.

The second fallacy of the Petroleum Administrator assumes that the war will soon end and that no measures should be taken to improve transportation facilities unless they can be completed in the time allowed by Mr. Ickes for the war to come to an end. All our war leaders, including the President, tell us not to plan or operate under this dangerous and fallacious assumption. Moreover, proposed improvements of inland waterway facilities are just as advantageous for peacetime uses as for wartime uses. They will lower freight charges and that couldn't happen unless the water transportation was more economical than other forms of transportation. At the present time hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money are being used by Federal administrators to pay railroad freight charges on oil products being carried by rail from the Southwest to our eastern seaboard. I have not heard of any such freight subsidies being paid to barge companies to encourage barge transportation up the Mississippi River and its tributaries. All available barges are being used on this traffic and apparently they are self-sustaining under the laws of supply and demand in competition with all other forms of transportation. Besides the barge traffic in the Mississippi Valley, there is also self-sustaining barge traffic in oil along the intracoastal canal. Several oil companies are distributing their products between Baltimore, Washington, and other eastern port cities in canal barges and I have not heard anything about their being given freight subsidies of Government money. Their barge business is a normal peacetime paying business.

Let me suggest one more idea. Some of us who wish to see petroleum supply improved along the east coast are trying to increase the transportation facilities, and what is happening with respect to our efforts? The Petroleum Administrator and his so-called experts do nothing but fight us every way we turn. At the same time that they are doing this, they are telling the public that the petroleum situation in the East will get no better but will get worse, and they exhort everybody to prepare to do with less and less. The allowances for the A-ration coupons for gasoline have just been reduced. We want more transportation facilities for oil products so that the public may be supplied, both in peace and in war. We agree that the supply of petroleum products has failed, but we do not agree that nothing should be done about it. While others are planning in fairyland, let us initiate work on the practical plans for which we have the blueprints all ready.

Sincerely yours,

J. J. MANSFIELD.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the batting average of the Seventy-eighth Congress to date is 10 percent for self-direction.

John L. Lewis has the hardest face in the world and he gets away with a lot for a man who is not President.

We are more convinced than ever that George Washington knew a great deal about Europe although he had never been there.

The signing of the labor control bill by Gov. Andy Schoeppel, of Kansas, writes the latest chapter in the State's triumphs for freedom.

F. D. R. is having as much trouble getting his men jobs as the Republicans. Marcantonio, Ed Flynn, and Mr. Allred all failed to make the grade.

The Churchill speech makes us feel that the "four freedoms" are gone with the wind and that after we have passed the ammunition we can go play in the arsenal.

We first met up with Chester C. Davis in the winter of '26 on the Committee of Twenty-two. He was the secretary, Governor Peek its chairman, fighting for the McNary-Haugen bill.

Remember this, that no officer in the armed forces dares to give the slightest left-handed hint of anything short of a full and complete early victory, and that is as it should be.

The battle of Tunisia and the battle on taxes proceed at the same time. The majority side says Ruml is really Rommel and the minority says, "Let's push the tax clock ahead like war time."

The passing of Frank O. Lowden recalls to us the Illinois deadlocked Republican State Convention in 1903 for Governor when Charles S. Deneen and Lowden were contesting Gov. Richard Yates. All hree were finally Governors and all three had finally served in Congress. He is the last of the three to go.

Taps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, many are grieved by the tragedies of war and deeply sorrow over the sacrifice of their sons to save America. But I firmly believe it is a great and splendid thing that the manhood of America has gone forth in this crusade for Christian living in all lands—stanchly, bravely, and with high courage in the service of mankind. Accordingly I quote a tribute to the brave spirit of our armed forces written by Capt. Charles Macklin McCartney, of the United States Navy:

TAPS TO W. H. S.

Goodnight, dear friend, kind heart, goodnight.
Lights out! The shadows fall—
Beneath the vaulted rafters rings
The last, sad bugle call.
In mournful cadence through the throng,
Soft, in the waning light—
The echoing notes are passed along,
Brave heart, true heart, good night!
Lights out! Goodnight!

Goodnight, dear friend—but not to you
Beyond the azure dome,
Your kindly soul, in gladsome light
Has found its welcome home!
There, at the joyous reveille
They greet you with "good morn!"
(For us, the deepening shadows fall
That may not see the dawn.)
Lights out! Goodnight!

—*Capt. Charles M. McCartney.*

The National Resources Planning Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Two N. R. P. B. Reports Are Sober, Moderate," written by Ernest Lindley and published in the Washington Post of March 14, 1943; and an article entitled "Similarities Are Noted in Plans of Churchill and Resources Board," published in the Washington Evening Star of March 23, 1943.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 23, 1943]

SIMILARITIES ARE NOTED IN PLANS OF CHURCHILL, RESOURCES BOARD—POST-WAR PROPOSALS FOLLOW SAME LINES, DIRECTOR OF UNITED STATES AGENCY POINTS OUT

Prime Minister Churchill's 4-year plan for British post-war economy and social security aims broadly at the same goals sought for this country by the National Resources Planning Board.

While Mr. Churchill's brief prospectus in his Sunday radio broadcast lacked the details of the voluminous National Resources Planning Board report submitted to Congress March 10, the two follow strikingly similar patterns in projecting a more abundant life after the war.

"I was delighted by the extraordinary resemblance which Mr. Churchill's plan has to our own post-war proposals," said Charles W. Eliot, National Resources Planning Board Director. "Since it was proposed by the epitome of a British Tory, I hope people will get over thinking that our plan is radical."

On these six major points the plans are generally the same:

1. Expansion of national compulsory insurance. While Mr. Churchill left the British program to further study and legislative preparation, he made it plain that he favors extending insurance to all classes "for all purposes, from the cradle to the grave." The National Resources Planning Board projected disability insurance, expansion of unemployment insurance, greater aid to the blind and other groups receiving public assistance, and extension of social security benefits to groups not now included.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

2. Broadening and improving public health service. Mr. Churchill envisioned a "war upon disease," maternity care, encouragement of larger families to offset a dwindling birth rate, and milk for babies, declaring "healthy citizens are the greatest asset any country can have." The National Resources Planning Board recommended Government cooperation with the medical profession in developing a time payment plan for medical care, maternity and child welfare service, free school lunches, creation of a system of regional and local hospitals and other medical personnel and larger appropriations to insure adequate medical care of needy persons.

3. Greater opportunities for education: Predicting the future will be left "to highly educated races who alone can handle the scientific apparatus necessary for preeminence in peace or survival in war," Mr. Churchill recommended equal opportunities of education for all classes, a greater spread and increase of facilities for higher education, improvement of schools, and additional training for teachers.

Coupled with this, he proposed the part-time release of young persons from industry so they will have a chance to carry on general schooling and specialized training. The National Resources Planning Board likewise recommended equal opportunity for general, specialized, and higher education, with the Government underwriting such a program if necessary.

4. Post-war projects: Mr. Churchill foresaw the reconstruction of bomb-ruined British cities and Minister of Labor Bevin's plan for reorganizing the British building industry as providing a reservoir of public works. For the United States, the National Resources Planning Board proposed a development of highways, rivers, housing, harbor, flood control, water power, control of pollution, and similar projects.

EMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

5. Jobs for all: "We cannot afford to have idle people," Mr. Churchill declared, adding in reference to expansion of social security insurance that "the best way to insure against unemployment is to have no unemployment." Mr. Churchill counted on the reconstruction projects as taking up the slack in trade and industry, which he envisioned as expanding tremendously on a mass production basis. The National Resources Planning Board similarly would have a Federal work program to drain off the unemployed, guaranteeing every returning serviceman a job, and in addition would establish protective labor legislation and encourage industry to greater employment.

6. Government and private enterprise. "There is a broadening field for State ownership and enterprise especially in relation to monopolies of all kind," Mr. Churchill said. "The modern state will increasingly concern itself with the economic well-being of the state." He mentioned also the bolstering of British agriculture and food production as a possible cooperative-government undertaking.

The National Resources Planning Board favored joint private and government partnerships in such booming wartime industries as aluminum, magnesium, shipbuilding, and aircraft; Federal participation in transport, rural electrification and water power, and plans for the encouragement of private enterprise.

The National Resources Planning Board would put in effect some of its major objectives now. Mr. Churchill, on the other hand, expressed belief the proper time to institute the changes was the 4-year period following "the downfall of Hitler."

DEMOBILIZATION QUESTION

Mr. Churchill did not take up the demobilization of the armed services and wartime industry, high points of the National Resources Planning Board report, but he foresaw "considerable opportunities for reestablishing" British exports, a factor influencing home industry.

Nor did Mr. Churchill advocate, as did the National Resources Planning Board, the extension of wartime rationing and similar controls into the post-war period.

The National Resources Planning Board devoted a great part of its report to proposals for a youth work program, combining the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration enterprises. Mr. Churchill made no specific mention of a special youth work plan, but he emphasized that there should be some supervision for youth in post-school years.

[From the Washington Post of March 14, 1943]

TWO NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD REPORTS ARE SOBER, MODERATE

(By Ernest Lindley)

The two reports of the National Resources Planning Board made public last week are too comprehensive to be digested in a single column. The fact that they were made public together may lead to confusion.

One is an exhaustive study of security, work, and relief policies. The other is a thumbnail outline of some of the problems the Nation will have to face at the end of the war.

The first report is the one which, prior to its publication, was referred to as an "American Beveridge Plan." Actually, work on it was begun in 1939, 2 years before Sir William Beveridge began his survey of social insurance and allied services for the British Government.

The Beveridge report contained specific detailed recommendations for the overhaul and expansion of the British social-insurance system. It gets down to the details of costs and benefits. The National Resources Planning Board's treatment is in far more general terms but covers more ground. It is concerned not only with social insurance and public assistance, but with public works and relief and related policies.

COMPUTED IN 640-PAGE REPORT

During the 10 years preceding the World War, the American Government for the first time assumed major responsibility for relieving and overcoming unemployment. Also for the first time it set up a system of social insurance. Some of the steps taken were experimental.

Some were intended only to tide over an emergency. Others, such as social insurance, were intended to be permanent. But all of them involved the use of Federal money to increase the economic security of the individual.

The National Resources Planning Board was given the job of reviewing and analyzing all these policies and experiments. Its findings are contained in a 640-page report, together with recommendations. Some of these recommendations are for the improvement of what might be called the normal permanent program—social insurance and public assistance to such persons as the indigent aged and handicapped children. Other recommendations are designed to eliminate mistakes which were made in the handling of the work-relief program during the thirties—mistakes due chiefly to lack of facilities for planning, inexperience, and the depth to which the depression had been allowed to go before the Government began to take effective action to pull the Nation out of it.

After this exhaustive review was begun, the Second World War broke out. Part of the report deals with policies and programs which have no place in the war effort. Other parts, especially those concerned with social insurance, could profitably be translated into action now. The entire report was completed months ago and submitted to the White House, where it remained until the President suddenly decided to submit it to Congress last week.

BASED ON HIGHER LIVING STANDARD

The second report, a later and shorter product, is hardly more than a suggestive memorandum. It states some of the problems which will have to be met on D-day when the demobilization of the war effort begins, and others which will have to be met and overcome in the longer run.

The second report is easy reading and deserves to be read. To the extent that it is read, it should dissipate misconceptions of the economic and social philosophy of the National Resources Planning Board. Every recommendation or suggestion is predicated on continuation, or restoration, of the private enterprise system.

All are based on the belief that the standard of living can be increased by an expanding economic production.

The Government also has essential duties to perform—to regulate private enterprise to prevent abuses, to stimulate private enterprise and keep it healthy, and to backstop it. When the war comes to an end, the Government will have to take a great many actions which will have a direct effect on the ability of private enterprise to get under way again. Some 20 to 30 million war workers will have to find new jobs. A large part of the armed forces will have to be demobilized.

CONTROLS WON'T END WITH WAR

The end of the fighting will release a vast pent-up demand for goods and services. Some of these can be supplied for civilian use.

But the demand for many durable goods will have to remain pentup for months while factories are retooled. Price controls and rationing in various forms probably will be needed for months, perhaps a couple of years after the war has ended.

These two reports should give Congress and the country a clearer idea of the work and philosophy of the National Resources Planning Board.

Many have assumed because the planning of public works was one of specific assignments, the National Resources Planning Board was tied up to a theory that the only way to keep our economic system going in peacetime is to spend endless billions on public works and work relief. That assumption is wrong—as the present reports prove. Nor is there anything else radical or revolutionary in either of them. They cover so much ground that probably few people, including the experts who worked on the reports, could agree with every recomendation or suggestion which they make.

But they are both sober documents, which march down the middle of the road toward the goals which most people seek, and most know can be attained by sensible management of our productive resources.

Oklahoma "Schools at War Program"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by me, in connection with the broadcast of the Oklahoma "Schools at War Program," before a joint session of the House and Senate of the Oklahoma Legislature, at Oklahoma City, on February 22, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Lieutenant Governor Berry, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the Legislature of Oklahoma, it is a distinct honor and privilege to be with you here in our State Capitol on this patriotic occasion, not only to honor the birthday of the Father of our Country, but in addition to honor that large group of students of our public schools who will shortly not only own all the property but will be the governing body of our State.

I bring to you, the school teachers and the school children of Oklahoma, the congratulations and best wishes of your Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and also I bring you the best wishes from Henry Morgenthau, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

I need not remind you that we are at war. When I say "we," I do not mean just our soldiers on the many fighting fronts, but instead I mean all our citizens, our soldiers, our munition workers, our farmers and every man, woman and child in our common country. We did not get into this war of our own volition.

We know, and the world knows, that we did not start this horrible conflict. Now being in, we want the world to know that we will remain to the end. Today, with wars on every land, on every ocean, under every sea and in the air above land and water, prudence dictates that we stop, look, and listen. What might happen if we lose? The war aims of our enemies are for imperialistic control of the world. Should they win, the following things will certainly happen: All our guns and weapons of every kind would be commandeered. Thereafter, the possession of a gun or weapon of any kind would subject the offender to summary trial and a verdict of possible death. All raw materials, including food supplies, utilities, and factories, would be taken over and operated by the invaders.

Our financial system, including our banks, would be taken over and operated by the conquerors.

Today we have in our Public Treasury almost $23,000,000,000 in gold; some $4,000,000,000 in monetary silver, and in our National and State banks we have $100,000,000,000 in currency, deposits, and securities. This vast treasure alone is sufficient to cause outlaw nations to conspire to attack and seek to conquer the United States. After our people should be disarmed; after our property should be confiscated; after our financial system should be taken over; and after all profits should be taken and perhaps expended throughout the world, we would find our people reduced to serfdom and slavery. This we have resolved shall not happen.

What is the power of our enemies? The best information we can secure is that we will have to meet and fight and destroy Axis armies totaling some 70,000,000 professional and seasoned soldiers. To meet this gigantic armed force we—the Allied Nations—will have but some 50,000,000 men. The odds in numbers are against us as 7 is to 5.

However, this war will be decided by forces in the air and under the sea. We are now taking command of the air and are meeting all opposition under the water. I am not giving away military secrets when I tell you that we have now over 60,000 planes in service. We are training 75,000 pilots a year. We will produce over 100,000 planes during 1943. When our production and training programs are completed we will have over 200,000 fighting, bomber, and transport planes ready to take the air. When we are ready no nation and no combination of nations can long stand before the power and might of the United States and our allies.

This is a total war—a war of destruction to the point of annihilation. If we do not destroy our enemies they will destroy us. To hesitate and to compromise now would only mean immediate preparation for an even greater struggle to come. This the world cannot withstand.

Before Germany mobilized to blitzkrieg, conquer and to rule the world she expended $100,000,000,000 for war equipment and military supplies. Other Axis Nations have expended comparable sums. Before this conflict is ended the 2,000,000,000 peoples of the earth will have wasted $500,000,000,000 and multiplied millions of men.

Another such war and civilization will be destroyed and what is left of humanity will relapse into a period of debt and dark ages covering hundreds of years to come. We will win this war, and when it is over the United States will stand out before the world as the beacon light for the guidance of all peoples everywhere who desire to be free. When that time comes, and pray God it will not be long, dictators and tyrants will have to be destroyed, democracy will be triumphant, and then to be an American will be greater than to be a king.

This is an historic day—the two-hundred-and-eleventh anniversary of the birth of George Washington. George Washington was the general of the armies of the Revolution. General Washington was the President of the Federal Convention which drew up, considered, and finally submitted the Constitution of the United States. The Declaration of Independence was signed and the Constitution was prepared in Independence Hall in the city of Philadelphia. We have here today a part of that building. The part is in the form of a brick from the walls of Independence Hall. This brick, handmade, is a symbol of the spirit of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution of the United States. During recent restoration work on Independence Hall a number of 206-year-old original bricks were removed from the tower which supported the Liberty Bell.

The editors of the Ladies' Home Journal suggested to the Treasury Department that these "liberty bricks" might inspire the school children of America to help promote our National War Savings program and offered to mount each brick in a case suitable for preservation and display, one to be presented to the school children of each State in the Union that they might have this perpetual reminder of our hall of freedom. American democracy got its form and substance in Independence Hall, which was built to be the first statehouse of the Province of Pennsylvania. From the statehouse steeple, the Liberty Bell first rang out to "proclaim liberty throughout all the land."

We have here with us today this "liberty brick" presented to the schools of Oklahoma. This brick has been on tour in our State and has been displayed in over 300 of our schools. It will be further displayed to approximately that many additional schools and then will be permanently lodged in our State historical society as a memento of the participation in the schools-at-war program by the Oklahoma teachers and students.

The schools-at-war program is one of the outstanding voluntary patriotic movements which has come about as a result of the present all-out World War. The school administrators, teachers, students, and parent organizations have assumed the responsibility of making this program a success in Oklahoma. Secretary Morgenthau has correctly stated that the United States can count on its 30,000,000 young Americans, to whom an unshackled future is all important, to enlist 100 percent in our fight for freedom by buying War Savings stamps and bonds to the limit of their ability and by doing every other thing that a boy or girl can do to speed the day of victory.

I salute the schools of Oklahoma for the magnificent job they have done in mobilizing their students and teachers and their communities for wartime service. This program has been outstanding in Oklahoma through the efficient leadership of Paul R. Taylor, State chairman, and H. C. Jones, State administrator and superintendent of the War Savings staff. The schools-at-war program in Oklahoma has been a signal success. I am particularly gratified to see this wonderful display of exhibits in the rotunda of our State capitol today. Selections will be made from these exhibits which will be part of the giant national exhibition to be held in our National Capitol at a future date.

Since the inception of this program, I am informed that the school children of Oklahoma have purchased more than $3,000,000 in War Savings stamps. I am further advised that more than 90 percent of the 686,000 school children of Oklahoma are regularly buying these 10-cent War Savings stamps from their earnings, savings, and spending money. I believe the records will show that this is the outstanding per capita contribution of the school children among all the States of the Nation, and I know that our

Governor, the members of this distinguished body of legislators, and our citizens generally join with me in this salute to the schools of Oklahoma.

It is, therefore, fitting that His Excellency, Lt. Gov. James E. Berry, and the distinguished members of both the senate and the house of representatives should join with us in paying this deserved tribute to that fine group of boys and girls in our Oklahoma schools.

And it is now my honor and pleasure on behalf of the Secretary of the Treasury to officially present this "liberty brick" to the representative of the schools-at-war program in Oklahoma, Mr. Paul R. Taylor, superintendent of the El Reno City Schools.

Organization and Collaboration of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Now Is the Time," published in the Toledo Blade of March 16, 1943, and an article headed "Intimate Message: Washington," by Roscoe Drummond, published in the Christian Science Monitor of March 18, 1943.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Toledo Blade of March 16, 1943]

NOW IS THE TIME

There is idealism, realism, and sound foreign policy in the proposal of four Senators—two Republicans and two Democrats—calling for a statement in brief of a program of participation by the United States in a new world organization after the war is won.

Some have been timid about such a proposal, fearing it would precipitate in the Senate an interminable discussion of peace policies at a critical time when the Members should be giving full attention to winning the war. There is always peril in every important step. However, there is no sound reason for expecting that a resolution of cooperation with our present allies in post-war plans should stir unusual debate or strife. In fact, the speed with which lease-lend was acted upon last week raises the hope that a common-sense foreign-policy declaration would get a similar vote.

Both in this country and in the other free nations is the dread that the United States by future act of the Senate may be thrown into a reactionary state, as it was after World War No. 1, when President Wilson's efforts were repudiated. War weariness or other contingency might give backing to an isolationist appeal and the whole peace program be put into reverse. Other nations fighting with us now are counting upon America's continued participation in world affairs for the sake of establishing order and justice.

A simple declaration immediately by the Senate on war and peace aims can do more to strengthen our allies and confound our enemies than statements by President Roosevelt and Foreign Minister Eden, important as they may be. The world knows the United States Senate has the last word. History shows it can be devastatingly negative. It can strengthen America's position before the world now by being positive and forward looking.

If there is to be order in the world after the war, there will have to be policing. Americans will be far better off to have United States forces in on the patrols. The Senate should act at once.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 18, 1943]

INTIMATE MESSAGE: WASHINGTON—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Four Members of the United States Senate, speaking both for themselves and for numerous colleagues who agree with them, are asking the American people to volunteer to help win the peace. Naturally they hope that they bespeak the sentiment of the country in advocating an early organization of the United Nations of specific and limited authority. But whether public opinion volunteers decisive support or decisive apathy, their purpose is to give the country a clear opportunity to decide what they want the United States to do about the peace; whether to secure the peace by joining the rest of the world in maintaining it collectively or to withdraw from the rest of the world and let each nation try to maintain the peace separately.

No more important purpose has been put before the American people since Woodrow Wilson asked the Senate to ratify the Covenant of the League of Nations. The fullness of this great issue will emerge as the debate gradually unfolds in Congress and in the country, and the following seeks to answer only some of the questions which are most frequently being asked:

Who are the sponsors of this resolution? They are two Republicans and two Democrats who, it can be said without reservation, have no personal and no political purpose to serve. They are Senator JOSEPH BALL, young St. Paul newspaperman, who was first appointed to the Senate by Gov. Harold Stassen and who was later elected very much on his own steam—JOE BALL is a supporter but not a servant of Governor Stassen; and Senator HAROLD BURTON, also from the allegedly isolationist Midwest, who voted against most of the President's pre-Pearl Harbor foreign-policy measures—he was against intervening when he thought he could keep America out of the war; he is in favor of intervening in the peace in the conviction that only by intervening can America preserve the peace; and Senator CARL HATCH, of New Mexico, author of the Hatch (clean politics) Act and one of the most respected Members of the Senate; and Senator LISTER HILL, whose long career in the House won him regard and confidence from both sides of the aisle. None is acting for partisan reasons; none is a doctrinaire internationalist.

DESIGNED TO DISPLAY UNITY

What is the real objective of the resolution? Its objective is to demonstrate a unity of purpose between the executive and legislative branches of the Government on the very crux of foreign policy. It would inform the President and the Department of State that the Senate would welcome a treaty which would enable America to play a responsible role in creating and maintaining the peace in collaboration with the other United Nations.

At whose initiative is this resolution being advanced? The resolution was conceived by the Senators; it was drafted by the Senators; it was introduced at the initiative of the Senators. It is designed to enable the Senate to discharge positively, instead of negatively, its constitutional duty to advise the President on foreign policy.

Why is the issue being presented at this time? The sponsors of the resolution believe that we can't drift into the peace but must prepare for it at the peak of Allied unity. American diplomacy cannot effectively enter upon the negotiations necessary to prepare for the peace unless it is assured that the Senate wants to accomplish broadly the same end. If the other United Nations cannot be reasonably certain that America intends to join in obtaining the common peace, they will be forced to look to other devices. The proposed resolution is to show that there is no basic divergence within the American Government over its peace purposes.

NO PARTICULAR PLAN SET FORTH

Does the resolution commit the United States to a particular peace plan? It does not do so. It is not a commitment to any plan. It is a directive or peace purposes. It says, in effect, that the Senate will look with favor upon the formation of an organization of the United Nations with the stated objective of developing machinery for adjusting disputes and providing the means for suppressing aggression.

Does the resolution bind the present or any future Senate to approve whatever kind of a peace arrangement the President and Department of State may negotiate? It does not. The resolution is a statement of objective and is not an assurance that every method the Executive may offer to reach that objective will be guaranteed ratification. It is not an inflexible commitment; it is moral evidence that the Senate, which ultimately must ratify the agreements which will be negotiated, wants to see the United States participate fully and faithfully in a system of world security. It is a vital credential to American diplomacy; it is an indispensable assurance to all the United Nations that it intends to join the peace, not secede from it.

Should the resolution be considered ideal in its present form? Not necessarily. It may be too detailed; it may be over precise. It is certainly open to constructive compromise and constructive change. Its authors are not prima donnaish; they are not looking for political kudos or for footnotes in the history books. They are looking for results. But it should not be overlooked that the elder Senator Lodge used to proclaim his devotion to international cooperation every time he drove the knife into the Covenant of the League. The resolution needs to be specific enough so that only those who believe in full-bodied cooperation to secure the peace will vote for it. This is no time to fool ourselves or other people.

Purely Political Reasons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the March 24, 1943, issue of the News-Herald, of Franklin, Pa.:

PURELY POLITICAL REASONS

The administration in Washington—President Roosevelt, Speaker Rayburn, General Counsel Paul of the Treasury—is on record in favor of a pay-as-you-earn tax. It objected to the Ruml plan on the ground that if 1942 tax liabilities were "excused," rich men might profit from "windfalls."

Now Treasury Secretary Morgenthau says that the administration is 100 percent behind the Ways and Means Committee tax measure. This is not a pay-as-you-earn bill, and it is notoriously a rich man's windfall.

Mr. Ruml and the vast majority of Americans who favor his plan have accepted the administration argument against permitting even a few wealthy persons to benefit from reform of the taxing system. The Carlson bill, embodying the Ruml plan, provides against this possibility.

The Ways and Means monstrosity, on the other hand, invites those who have money to "come and get it." Yet the administration is behind the committee bill 100 percent.

If the committee bill should become law the average taxpayer could do either of two things. He could continue on a year-behind, always-in-debt basis—and most would do so, and we should have no pay-as-you-earn tax system. Or he could squeeze out of 1 year's pay envelopes enough to pay the heaviest 2 years' taxes in American history. Few would do that.

How about the rich man, the fellow with savings in the bank or a good sheaf of War bonds in the safe-deposit box?

He could withdraw the savings or sell the bonds (has Mr. Morgenthau considered that possibility?) and earn 6 percent on his money by paying up 1943 taxes before June 15.

That is a better return than is available from War bonds or any other moderately safe investment.

If the administration really is 100 percent behind the committee bill, what becomes of its lip service to a pay-as-you-earn plan? How should we evaluate its talk about opposing the Ruml plan out of consideration for the poor and out of dislike for giving any prosperous taxpayer a break?

Why is the administration against the Ruml plan? Isn't it for purely political reasons—because alert Republicans were smart enough to climb first onto the most popular tax band wagon that has rolled down the pike in many a generation?

The Lipscomb Grain & Seed Co. Deserves Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, from time to time achievement flags have been presented by the War and Navy Departments for excellence in performance to those engaged in war production. I rise to call attention to the fact that there are many business firms in this country doing important and indispensable work for the war effort which do not receive this recognition. For instance, there is no classification set up by the Production Award Board to recognize the contributions to victory of those who handle or expedite the distribution of products of those who achieve excellence in production.

I have in mind, particularly, Mr. Speaker, those engaged in such business as wholesale grain and seed companies.

I am proud to be able to call attention of this House, and the country, to the fact that in the Sixth Missouri Congressional District, at Springfield, Mo., the Lipscomb Grain & Seed Co. has set what appears to be a record for increased carloadings under general order 18, establishing minimum limits for loading of carload freight.

In the January 2 issue of Feedstuffs it appeared that the Office of Defense Transportation cited three Ohio firms for contributing materially to the war effort by a gain of 14.2 percent in carloadings, under the order I have mentioned. The Lipscomb Grain & Seed Co., of Springfield, Mo., has far surpassed this so-called record. For instance, they have marked up a percentage gain of over 54½ percent. Complete figures for October, November, and December 1942 are as follows:

Month	Number of cars	Total weight, pounds	Average load, pounds	Percent of gain over October
October	155	6,768,925	43,360	----------
November	104	6,501,460	62,514	43½
December	108	7,275,978	67,370	54¼

The Office of Defense Transportation in writing to the Lipscomb Grain & Seed Co. stated in part, "Your performance is remarkable. The 54½ percent gain in December over October is about the highest rate we have had reported to us in any commodity." This high standard of performance still continues.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a record in which our Nation can take just pride. It is evidence that the people of my section, as is true all over this country, are doing their bit to hasten for our arms a victorious conclusion to this conflict. I am particularly glad to be able to state that this firm in my own district is setting the pace for the rest of the country to follow. It is regrettable that this Government does not recognize such excellence of service with an appropriate award as it does in other fields. I have requested the Production Award Board to consider favorably the establishing of such a classification as will permit it. This little statement of mine cannot be put on a flagpole to wave over this patriotic business establishment, but I know that those to whose attention these facts come will renew their faith in all such private enterprise which has made it possible for the Stars and Stripes to wave over this broad and free land.

Absenteeism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave extended me by the House, I am inserting in the RECORD herewith a joint statement of management and labor in the R. C. A. Communications, Inc., on the subject of absenteeism:

In recent weeks the problem of absenteeism and its effect upon the successful prosecution of the war has become one of greatest importance to the Nation. It is alleged that in some sections of our vital war industries many man-hours are being lost solely because workers are absent from their jobs for no apparent reason.

In this period of stress, when the very existence of our country is at stake, when our fellow citizens in the armed forces are giving to the limit for the preservation of freedom, we on the home front, the production front, must produce to the limit. Not only is this necessary if we are to win the war, but also to give the fullest protection to the lives of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and others on the firing line. Never should it be said that an American died because we did not produce, or because the message failed to get through.

In view of this, the victory committee in R. C. A. Communications, Inc., composed of representatives of management and labor, hereby sets forth the general record of the employees of this company with respect to absenteeism:

1. Absenteeism, as it relates to laxness on the part of the worker, is not a problem in R. C. A. Communications, Inc.

2. Except for absences due to illness, absenteeism is virtually nonexistent.

The above conditions did not develop without planning and foresight. Absenteeism is caused by many factors which have been taken into consideration in R. C. A. Communications, Inc. Not the least of these are excessively long hours of work, inadequate vacation periods, too little time for recreation, lack of illness benefits, and lack of opportunity for medical supervision on the job to prevent illness.

Under such conditions, employees may work until actually becoming sick, or until their nervous reserve is exhausted. A worker who has exhausted his nervous reserve might not appear sick; in fact, a doctor might pronounce him in good physical condition, yet he just cannot give full production. This condition frequently arises where workers are required to work around the clock.

Because the war emergency demands the ultimate in production, almost all defense industries must produce 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. This means that workers must work shifts around the clock. Such working schedules are new and unusual to the average American citizen and have created many complex problems. It has increased the tendency toward exhaustion of nervous energy with consequent loss of man-hours. This is a natural trend and can only be corrected by adopting the appropriate measures. Such measures revolve around improvement of conditions of work for the employees involved.

This method of working is nothing new and unusual to the workers in the communications industry of which the workers in R. C. A. Communications, Inc., are a part. Workers in this industry, since its inception, have worked shifts around the clock. However, such working schedules can become a major cause for absenteeism if proper protection for employees is not provided. Such protection for this condition and other conditions outlined herein can be given by the application of reasonable hours of work, liberal vacations, liberal illness benefits, and medical services for the prevention of illness.

R. C. A. Communications, Inc., a major link in our wartime communications system, provides such benefits for its employees as the products of both management planning and collective bargaining.

Although we must produce to the limit, there is a limit to the worker's capacity to produce. Drive him beyond his limit—that is, use up all his physical and nervous reserve—and he will produce less even though working more hours, or lay off to recuperate.

Taking all of the above into consideration, the reasons for the good over-all record of R. C. A. Communications, Inc., workers, including negligible absenteeism, can be summed up as follows:

1. Reasonable working hours; a basic 5-day week. While employees work overtime when called upon to do so, they have, nevertheless, more time for recreation than many war plants which work their employees 50, 60, or more hours per week.

2. Liberal vacations with pay. Most employees get at least 2 weeks' vacation each year with pay, and employees required to work shifts around the clock receive a paid vacation of 2, 3, or 4 weeks yearly, depending upon length of service. After 5 years all such employees receive 3 weeks; after 10 years, 4 weeks.

3. Liberal paid legal-holiday provisions and time and one-half additional pay when required to work on legal holidays and Sundays.

4. Equitable wage rates which enable the worker to maintain a standard of living which guarantees the possibility of maximum efforts.

5. Liberal sick benefits. Employees receive sick pay starting immediately upon becoming ill, and may receive up to 6 months' full pay, plus 6 months at half pay if unable to work because of physical disability.

6. Free medical services for illnesses not of a major nature. R. C. A. Communications, Inc., in the New York area, supplies the services of a physician and a trained nurse for the purpose on the company's premises.

7. A group-insurance plan which provides substantial disability and death benefits.

8. Stabilization of labor relations affecting a majority of employees through a collective-bargaining agreement with the American Communications Association, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Although we, the employees in R. C. A. Communications, Inc., have a notable record, no record is so good that it cannot be improved upon. We cannot afford to be absent from our jobs except for the most important reasons. As there are many vital reasons why the message must get through promptly, we, and all other Americans, should not contemplate indulging in the practice of absenteeism. It is not enough to preach that the message must get through promptly—we must practice it.

Although our record has been good in the past, let's make it perfect in the future.

Victory Committee in R. C. A. Communications, Inc. (Atlantic division): A. B. Tuttle, chairman; J. D. Hobbs, secretary; Jack Friedman; R. N. Kay; J. F. Rigby; H. E. Fulton; John Molloy; H. C. Taylor; J. W. Worrall; F. W. Grumman; A. H. Perreault; H. V. Trautman.

MARCH 10, 1943.

Watchdog of Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following article, Ferguson, Watchdog of Judiciary, by the able columnist, Jay G. Hayden, which appeared in the Washington Star, Thursday, March 25. In this article Mr. Hayden points out that the new Michigan Senator has greatly contributed to recent decisions. The article follows:

FERGUSON, WATCHDOG OF THE JUDICIARY

(By Jay G. Hayden)

A new watchdog of the Federal judiciary, in the person of Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, contributed heavily to decisions of the Judiciary Committee which probably have doomed President Roosevelt's nominations of both James V. Allred, of Texas, and Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., of Oklahoma.

Senator FERGUSON demanded to see the Justice Department files relating to these appointments and, much to the surprise of his older colleagues, he got a look at them. The result was disclosures which caused the committee to refuse a favorable report of the Allred nomination by a tie vote, 9 to 9, and to send the Chandler nomination, previously approved, back to a subcommittee for further investigation.

The fight over Mr. Allred has revolved around a charge that he was named by President Roosevelt to fill a vacancy in the fifth circuit court of appeals in payment of a political debt. Mr. Allred resigned a district judgeship, to which he previously had been named by the President, to become a candidate in opposition to Senator W. LEE "Pass the Biscuits, Pappy" O'DANIEL, whom New Dealers wanted to purge. Senator O'DANIEL charged that selection of Mr. Allred for the circuit judgeship was in fulfillment of a promise by the President that if he was defeated for Senator he would be returned to the bench. Attorney General Francis Biddle vigorously denied that there was anything in the records pertaining to the Allred case to sustain this implication.

Senator FERGUSON'S examination of the Justice Department files failed to settle this particular argument. In fact, it found nothing remotely bearing on it. But it did hook together a sequence of circumstances establishing that the Roosevelt-Allred relationship was particularly political and personal.

INTENTIONS ANNOUNCED

First of all, the President announced his intention to name Mr. Allred to a Federal judgeship from the back platform of a campaign train in Texas, in 1938, when Mr. Allred still had several months to serve as Governor of the State. What Senator FERGUSON discovered on this phase was that the Justice Department had no records at all respecting it.

The long-established practice of Presidents has been to refer judicial appointments to the Attorney General, with orders to consult Senators from the States concerned and have the Federal Bureau of Investigation investigate prospective nominees.

This procedure was not followed in the Allred case for the obvious reason that Mr. Roosevelt already had committed himself. Senator O'DANIEL asserts that the inspiration of this offhand selection was Governor Allred's appointment previously of Elliott Roosevelt, son of the President, to the highly honorary post of regent of Texas Agricultural and Mechanical University.

The first reference to the Texas judgeship found by Senator FERGUSON in the Department files was a letter from Senator CONNALLY to the President stating that "in response to your request [the President's]" he was submitting a list of eligible candidates for it.

WRITTEN IN HEAT OF BATTLE

This letter was written in the heat of the Allred-O'Daniel senatorial battle in 1942, when the O'Danielites were bearing heavily on the charge that, while Mr. Allred had resigned his judgeship, it was being held open for his reinstatement if he were defeated at the polls. The Connally letter disclosed that the President, in face of this situation, had asked submission quickly of a list of eligible candidates for the vacant judgeship. Senator CONNALLY replied with a panel of names. The President picked one of these—Allen B. Hannay—and hurried his nomination to the Senate, in time to obviate damage to Mr. Allred's candidacy, arising from talk of a political deal between him and the President.

This action removed any possibility of returning Mr. Allred to his former bench, but the death of Judge Rufus Foster on the day after the August 23 final Democratic primary in Texas fortuitously created the pending vacancy in the higher court of appeals.

Judge Foster hailed from Louisiana and his death left that State the only one in the circuit without representation on the court.

INITIAL REPORT RECALLED

Committeemen who considered the Chandler nomination for an Oklahoma district judgeship have refused to disclose why their initial report favoring it was recalled, except to say that this action was caused by Senator FERGUSON and based on what he found in the Justice Department files. Senator FERGUSON and Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, were the only Members who voted against Mr. Chandler. It was when these two threatened to file a minority report, based on the Department record, that it was decided to send the nomination back to subcommittee.

The conclusion of Senator FERGUSON is that if one look behind the administration scenes can produce these startling results, it would be well for the Senate to take the same look respecting all future judicial nominations.

A Pay-As-You-Go Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I made in New York last night under the auspices of the Town Hall of the Air:

In a people's war all must contribute—some on the fighting front, some on the production line in field and factory, some through payment of taxes and purchase of bonds, and still others by keeping the home fires burning. Tonight we deal with 1 phase of that problem—the payment of taxes—and from 3 different angles: The Ruml proposal to waive the entire tax liability for 1942, the committee proposal to waive none of that liability, and my proposal to waive for all taxpayers the basic liability of 19 units only. I am opposed to the windfalls inherent in the Ruml plan. I am opposed to the committee plan because it makes no one current and therefore is not a pay-as-you-go plan. The plan I proposed to the committee is a pay-as-you-go plan, will make most of the taxpayers current, and, I think, treats all taxpayers with fairness and justice.

An accepted principle of our wartime taxes has been that we should take the profit out of war. A serious objection to the Ruml plan is that it validates war profits and converts those profits into war wealth. We imposed additional taxes for war purposes in 1940, 1941, and 1942. On a taxable income of a million dollars those additional war

taxes amount to $268,000. The remission of the entire 1942 tax amounting to $854,000 wipes out all war-tax liability of that taxpayer. In fact, the war would have to continue 3 more years before he would contribute 1 additional cent of war tax. Should he invest that $854,000 in Government bonds, he will have converted his debt to his Government into a debt from his Government to him.

Mr. Ruml deserves the thanks of the Nation for securing such splendid publicity for the proposal of Dr. Harlee Lutz, of Princeton, that a new tax problem merits a new plan of handling it. For many years the annual collection of income taxes was less than $1,000,000,000. For the first 15 years after the imposition of income taxes, which included World War No. 1, the total tax collected was less than $10,000,000,000. The collection method was good enough for the collection of a billion dollars. Collecting $10,000,000,000 in 1 year under that system is a horse of another color. I frankly concede the necessity for a pay-as-you-go plan. The withholding feature of the committee bill is the second half of the plan I proposed to the committee as a just and fair substitute for the Ruml plan. My plan would waive the same tax liability—the same 19 percent—for every taxpayer, whether his income is $2,000 or $2,000,000. Some have objected to the fact that the waiver of 19 units on a taxable income of $1,000,000 amounts to approximately $190,000. That's the feature of my plan that makes it fair and just. It is not geared to a dollar basis but to a unit basis. And being geared to the unit basis of the first 19 units, it has no windfalls for any.

My objection to the committee bill is based upon the fact it makes no one current. I proposed to the committee that we waive the basic tax liability of all taxpayers, which is the 6-percent normal tax and the first surtax bracket of 13 percent, those 19 units being the only tax that all taxpayers pay. Waiving the first 19 units of tax liability operates the same as raising the exemption. It relieves some taxpayers of any liability whatever, while reducing the liability of all taxpayers their proportionate amount. It will make 90 percent of the taxpayers 100-percent current and 99 percent of the taxpayers 75 percent or more current. It involves no doubling up for any and those not made current will continue to pay in the future as in the past.

Under the Ruml plan every taxpayer will be required to file for each taxable year two income tax returns. Under my plan only one return is required. And about 30,000,000 taxpayers whose entire liability will be discharged by 20 percent withholding at the source need file no return unless they seek a refund. They could merely file with their employer in duplicate a statement of exemptions and one copy of that statement would then be forwarded to the Treasury Department in lieu of the return. Sixty-nine percent of all taxpayers have net incomes before exemptions of less than $2,000; 93.7 percent have less than $4,000; and 96 percent have less than $5,000. Under my plan a man with a net income of $5,000 can be made fully current by the payment of 1.1 percent in addition to the 20 percent withholding at the source. In other words, 96 percent will be made 100 percent current, and I challenge the advocates of the Ruml plan to prove that number will be made current under the Ruml plan. The original Ruml plan required farmers, merchants, and all self-employers to make quarterly payments based upon estimated income, with a penalty if they guessed wrong. How can a farmer who raises just one money crop know what his income for a given year will be until that crop has been sold? The Ruml plan will be quite convenient for big executives who know from year to year exactly what their compensation will be. Suppose one of those executives is making $200,000 a year. His 1942 tax would be $174,000. Mr. Ruml says forgive that tax and you'll not lose any money. If that taxpayer dies his estate pays $50,000 on that tax liability and no more. Even if he doesn't die now, he's not going to live until Judgment Day when Mr. Ruml says we'll no longer be interested in who owes what. Let us assume one of those executives, now 60 years old, plans to retire when he is 65. Under the Ruml plan he will draw a salary for 6 years and pay a tax on it for 5. No wonder when Dr. Gallup asked that taxpayer, "Do you favor the Ruml plan?" the answer was "Yes."

In my opinion the most fallacious argument presented to the Ways and Means Committee by Mr. Ruml was his contention the national income after the war would continue to rise until it reached the figure of $180,000,000,000 per year. We, of course, could get such a national income on the basis of printing-press money, but one reason we are imposing heavy taxation instead of forcing the commercial banks to absorb enormous bond issues is to avoid inflation.

What most of us fear after the war is unemployment. The reason we want a pay-as-you-go plan is to take care of wage earners sharing in the war income. When a taxpayer is earning $10,000 or more a year, if it be to his interest to get current he can do so. Under my plan he will not be forced to do so. Under neither the Ruml plan nor my plan will tax receipts fall until the national income falls. When that happens the Government can secure increased income by increasing rates on those who received the benefits under my plan. That cannot be done under the Ruml plan because you can't increase rates on those already paying 90 percent. Inherent in the Ruml plan is a redistribution of tax burden from the few to the many, in direct conflict with the just and fundamental principle of ability to pay.

"It is incumbent on every generation," said Thomas Jefferson, "to pay its own debts as it goes." We want a pay-as-you-go plan, but the Ruml price is too high.

Releases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Releases," published in the Alpena (Mich.) Evening News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELEASES

We had a call the other day from an earnest young man from Detroit who introduced himself as a representative of a Government office in charge of certain wartime activities on the home front, and said he had a release for us regarding some Alpena activities under supervision of his branch.

He was a nice chap, quite evidently one without any newspaper experience, and so he surely did not know why we winced when he used that word "release."

"Release" is the word that every bureaucrat in the Government employ uses when he speaks of those mimeographed hand-outs masquerading under the guise of news, but which so very seldom are news.

It is releases that are costing the people of the United States millions of dollars every year.

It is releases which are furnishing cushy jobs for hundreds of men, many of whom ought to be in the fighting services.

It is releases that are using up tons upon tons of paper while newspapers and other legitimate publications have had their supply of paper cut 10 percent for the first quarter of 1943, and probably will have it cut further.

It is releases 99 percent of which go pronto into the wastebasket of every newspaper receiving them.

The term had a decent enough meaning in the beginning. A story, such as a Presidential address, would be typed in advance and copies handed to the newspapers to be held in confidence for release after the address had been given or the news described had transpired. (Presidents in those days trusted newspapers.) But oh, what a terrible connotation the bureaucrats have given the word in the minds of working newspaper people, simply because every drivelling, space-eating, paper-wasting, time-serving, job-furnishing piece of alleged news that they hand out is called a release.

The very word has come to suggest suppression of facts the people are entitled to know. It is the release mentality that has held legitimate news from the American people days after they should have had it, that helps fill Washington with confusion and parasites, with their counterparts all over the country. A plague on their releases! The American press prefers to dig out its own real news and that's what it is doing.

It so happens that this young man had a legitimate news story, as is proved by the fact that he didn't hand us a mimeographed sheet, and so we got and published the information to which he called our attention. He meant no offense in the use of the term "release" and we took none, from him. But when he used the word, which he probably thought was still a respectable newspaper term, he having heard it from above, he nettled us, to put it mildly.

Again, a plague on the bureaucrats and their releases!

Uniform Freight Rates in the South

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in one of the morning papers a statement which will do more to restore confidence in the minds of the people of the South in the fairness of Government if put into effect than anything which has been done in this country in a hundred years. I quote:

UNIFORM FREIGHT RATES SOUGHT

President Roosevelt yesterday transmitted to Congress a Tennessee Valley Authority report urging creation of a Nation-wide system of freight rates to supplant the current five-region system and stimulate industry in the South and West.

The report, completed after 4 years of study, called the present rate structure a barrier to national productiveness.

Uniformity is essential, it said, if the relatively less industrialized South and West are ever to attain greater industrial levels to absorb the surplus population that is normally uneconomically employed in producing raw materials.

David E. Lilienthal, Tennessee Valley Authority chairman, acknowledged in a letter to the President that the task of rate revision was largely one for the post-war period. He said that "much more manufacturing industry will be needed to keep the economy on a high plane after the war than was the case before the war."

This argument appeared to be patterned closely after the post-war theme outlined to Congress 2 weeks ago in the report of the National Resources Planning Board.

The lengthy report originated when Tennessee Valley Authority launched an inquiry into the complex freight-rate field because the Tennessee Valley was "handicapped by virtue of its location in a high freight rate region," Lilienthal told Mr. Roosevelt. The study was extended to the Nation after it was found that rates in one section affected the economic system in all areas.

Mr. Speaker, for years the people of the South have labored under discriminatory freight rates. The Nation is divided into five zones or districts. The first district or official district roughly comprising States east of the Mississippi and north of Kentucky and the Carolinas, second, the southern district, lying east of the Mississippi, and the remainder of the country is divided into the remaining three districts.

The rate for 1, the northeastern or official territory, is laid down as 100, meaning the yardstick, or 100-percent rate, from which other rates are measured or calculated.

The rate for district 2, being the southern territory, is 139, and each district is progressively higher, the southwestern district being 175.

The rate of freight is based on the shipping point. Thus it costs approximately 39 percent more to ship products out of the South than it does out of the Northeast. Thus we see the real reason for industrial development of the Northeast is not altogether because of early start, labor, and adaptability but because throughout our history by such discriminatory freight rates the Government has prevented the South or any other section from having an equal opportunity in industry. All products manufactured in the South must carry a 39-percent increase of freight rate. This is equivalent to charging a duty or tax on goods manufactured in the South when entering the Northeast, but having no duty on goods manufactured in the Northeast and going out for sale in the South or other sections of the country.

I know it is claimed that freight is more cheaply handled in the Northeast due to the volume than in the other sections of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission say that this was untrue; that as a matter of fact, due to the relatively flat nature of most of the country outside the Northeast, and due to the milder climate, that actually freight could be handled and hauled more cheaply in the South than in the Northeast.

Mr. Speaker, I mark this effort on the part of the T. V. A. as another great credit to that organization. A bill is now pending to relieve this discrimination. Now, if the holier than thous, if the C. I. O. and other labor organizations and other agitators will exercise themselves as much about discriminations against the South as they have about claimed discriminations in the South, our economic situation in the Southland will so improve as to relieve any necessity for alarm on their part.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of criticism of our rural electrification program by private power interests, and I want to say to you gentlemen, and if you do not know it now you are going to find it out later, that with the farmers of this Nation rural electrification is the most popular movement that has ever been instituted by this Government since it was established.

Ten years ago the people of Corinth, Miss., were paying 10 cents a kilowatt-hour for electricity in their homes. The farmers of the county were getting none at all. They established a county-wide cooperative power association, known as the Alcorn County Electric Power Association, that took in the city of Corinth. In 5 years they paid every dollar they owed, and the top rate has been reduced from 10 cents a kilowatt-hour to 2½ cents a kilowatt-hour.

The T. V. A. recently appealed to us down in that area not to reduce the rates any more, because it would increase consumption. So the Alcorn County Electric Power Association is now paying back to its consumers a dividend of $45,000 for the year 1942. What they are doing in Alcorn County, Miss., can be done in every other district, county, and State in the Union.

Let me say to you people from the big cities that if something is not done to take the high power rates off your people, your big cities are going to go down.

This is an electric age, and any community that fails to take advantage of it is bound to decline. As I have said time and time again on this floor, every effort should be made to bring cheap electricity to every consumer, and to extend it to every farm home in America.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following news item, which appeared recently in the Daily Corinthian, published at Corinth, Miss.:

FORTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS GOING TO POWER CONSUMERS — SUBSCRIBERS AND USERS OF POWER TO GET CHECKS—LOCAL ELECTRIC CO-OP REFUNDS MEMBER PAYMENTS SOON

Announcement is made today by officials of the ACE Power Association that checks covering a reduction in the par value of membership certificates in the association from $25 to $10 will be mailed to all membership certificate holders of record in the association within the next day or two.

A sum approximating $45,000 will be distributed to members and 3,500 checks will be issued by the office force of the association.

A majority of the checks will be in amounts of $15 each, others being for smaller amounts, depending on the sum that a particular subscriber has paid on his membership. All checks will be payable in cash at Corinth banks.

Announcement that the association was preparing to distribute the member checks was carried exclusively in the Daily Corinthian 2 weeks ago.

With the membership certificate payment to be made the 1st of March or thereabouts, the ACE Power Association will have paid back to its members and customers a grand total of $143,512 in member reductions and electric bills since the association was formed.

In addition to restoring this huge sum to members and customers, the association has liquidated the original debt to the Tennessee Valley Authority in full; many miles of new power lines have been constructed and paid for; and a substantial surplus invested in Government bonds.

An official of the association said today that the board of managers had no announcement to make regarding future earnings, above operating expenses, leading to speculation regarding further payments to members and customers in the form of electric power bill rebates or refunds.

"Judging the future by the past, however, no reason is known why members should not continue to enjoy the advantages that Tennessee Valley Authority power is bringing to Corinth," the spokesman added.

Army Pharmacy Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been amazed to learn that thus far no authorization has been granted for the creation of a pharmacy corps in the United States Army.

It seems to me that as important as the profession of pharmacy is, especially as it is related to our war program, this profession should be recognized by being designated as a corps within itself.

As evidence of the need for the enactment of this needed legislation, I enclose herewith a resolution received by me from the General Assembly of South Carolina:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such action as necessary to create a pharmacy corps in the United States armed forces

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States House bill No. 997 and Senate bill No. 216 to create a pharmacy corps in the United States Army; and

Whereas there is a definite need in this war emergency for the capable handling of drugs, medicines, and pharmaceuticals which are now used in the treatment of disease of our boys and girls in the armed forces; and

Whereas at the present time there is no law providing for the creation of such a pharmacy corps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of South Carolina (the senate concurring), That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to put forth every effort to see these two bills enacted into law; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the chairmen of the Military Affairs Committees of the Senate and House, and to the congressional delegation of South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that favorable action will be soon had on this needed legislation.

War Activities at Superior, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, since I have been a Member of Congress the last 3 months my biggest headache has been the inequity, the unfairness, and the lack of system pertaining to the setting up of the various war agencies throughout the United States of America. In my particular area there happen to be two cities nearby, right across the river from each other, known as the Head of the Lakes Twin Cities. They are the cities of Superior and Duluth. Thus far more than a dozen Government war agencies have been set up from of minor and on up to major importance. Thus far every one of these 12 offices have been set up in the city of Duluth and not one has been set up in the city of Superior.

The city of Superior has more war workers than there are in the city of Duluth. The city of Superior is a town of more than 40,000 population. The city of Superior has the largest shipment of iron ore, the largest coal dock capacity, the largest grain elevator storage, and the largest shipbuilding program at the head of the Lakes. With this record of war activity, the special war agencies in Washington are treating the city of Superior like a "tank town" and do not even know that the city of Superior exists.

These officials who set up these offices do not realize that it necessitates a toll for the people of the city of Superior to go and do business with the war agencies in the city of Duluth. The least that the Government could do is to give the city of Superior 1 out of 12 of these offices.

Time and again I have protested to the leaders of these various agencies. I have been promised changes, and I have been double-crossed. I have been sidestepped, and I have been passed the buck to more than any other person in the history of this country.

To add insult to injury, I have actually received requests from the people of the city of Superior to introduce a bill to make Superior a part of the State of Minnesota.

To give you an idea of the gross inequity of this whole situation, I might mention that the city of Superior had, under the direction of the State of Wisconsin, an employment agency of the most efficient kind and character, and the shipbuilding industry in the city of Superior was doing well with this State employment agency in the city of Superior. All was going satisfactorily regarding the labor problem because this agency with the cooperation of the State of Wisconsin and the vocational schools was doing a great job.

That is, all was going well until one of these war agencies stepped in and took the city of Superior and placed it out of region 6 and put it into region 8, a region entirely foreign to the city of Superior. Not only that, but the efficient employment system which the city of Superior had was placed under the Federal War Manpower Commission which has done more messing around and which has mixed up the manpower problem more than any other agency in the country.

I tell you these facts, ladies and gentlemen, because I want to call to your attention the gross inequity and the lack of study behind all of this planning that is going on in these war agencies, and I, for one, am fed up to the gills with this "damphoolishness" that is going on. To give you an idea of how my people feel about it, I am inserting several newspaper articles which reflect the sentiment of my people. Whether or not anything will come of this I do not know, for I have not been alone in trying to bring this about. Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE and Senator ALEXANDER WILEY also have been trying to rectify these gross inequities. In telling you this I have succeeded in telling the people of this country what is going on and how everything is being messed up regarding the setting up of these war agency offices. An organization in the city of Superior has even offered a modern building rent free for these offices. Still they pass this city by and do not know and care if it exists.

The following articles and editorial are from the Superior Telegram, Superior, Wis.:

INSIST SUPERIOR NOT BE PLACED IN MINNESOTA—LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS OBJECT TO CENTERING ALL UNITED STATES OFFICES IN DULUTH

Superior organizations are continuing to protest against the tendency on the part of authorities at Washington to take Superior out of Wisconsin jurisdiction and place it with Minnesota for purposes of war-effort administration.

Among those that have entered complaint are the Association of Commerce, the Superior Federation of Labor, the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs. Senators LA FOLLETTE and WILEY and Congressman O'KONSKI all have been appealed to for help in the effort to prevent forcing Superior and other northern Wisconsin territory into a subdistrict of which Duluth would be the head and Wisconsin's counties have no offices in which there would be anyone with authority beyond the local boards. In fact, various of the governmental agencies would, it is said, have no representative at all on the Wisconsin side of the State line.

One of the most recent proposals is to have the War Manpower Commission establish an office in Duluth and require people from the northern counties of Wisconsin to go direct to that city when seeking information or redress. In this particular case it has been announced that while no local office has been planned at all in Superior or upper Wisconsin, the cities of the northern part of Duluth's own county, St. Louis, would be given a local office at some point on the range.

In making protest it has been pointed out that in many locations where it was first proposed to cross State lines with Federal districts Washington has listened to protests and has changed its plan to avoid such crossing. The case of Janesville and Beloit is one such instance. Those cities were first placed in the Rockford, Ill., district but have since been restored to Wisconsin.

In following up the plan for handling one of the Government activities, the draft-board work, it was disclosed that with Superior in the Minnesota district any problem from this city would first have to go to Duluth. From there it would be referred to Minneapolis. This office would refer it to Chicago and the Chicago office would finally dispose of it by sending it over to Wisconsin headquarters at Madison. It is maintained that this not only makes for great loss of time but often great annoyance and hardship to local people that prefer to deal direct with their own State in which they are known and whose officials are known to them.

The representatives at Washington have assured the Superior complainants that they will give all possible help in correcting this situation. For the past year the local rationing boards have dealt directly with Wisconsin headquarters and it is stated that they think this much preferred to being sent outside the State and then only to a secondary office. It is pointed out that in matters involving labor questions, for instance, the dissimilarity in laws in different States would add much to the confusion. It is also urged that to require people to pay bridge tolls and use up extra gas to go to a district headquarters is an unwarranted hardship.

DIETRICH SENDS OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION PROTEST TO WASHINGTON—CENTRALIZATION OF DEFENSE OFFICES IN DULUTH DRAWS MANAGER'S IRE

City Manager George E. Dietrich Thursday added his voice to protests over centralization of Federal defense offices in Duluth by dispatching letters to Prentiss Brown, Director of the Office of Price Administration in Washington, and to Senator ROBERT LA FOLLETTE, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, and Representative ALVIN E. O'KONSKI.

Dietrich's letter follows:

"I would respectfully but emphatically protest against the centralization of the Office of Price Administration activities and facilities in Duluth, Minn.

"Superior has been for over half a century the focal point for shipping, iron ore, grain, and coal distribution and all other allied activities associated with transportation by rail and by water.

"Our vocational school has trained thousands in trades and vocations enrolled in the war effort. It is extremely inconvenient and not feasible to require our citizens to transact their business with the Office of Price Administration office in Duluth, Minn., and results in many man-hours lost and a serious curtailment of all transportation facilities engaged as they are in total war effort.

"I am advised that a local civic body has offered to the Office of Price Administration the use of an office building in the business district at no charge to use as an Office of Price Administration office here.

"GEORGE E. DIETRICH,
"City Manager."

PROTEST TO WASHINGTON

The various Superior organizations that have been making complaint are right in their contention that Superior and upper Wisconsin should not be forced to become a part of a Minnesota district for the multitude of war activities in which civilians are involved. Their protest is supported by widespread public sentiment.

There are many valid arguments against the plan. Frequently the local draft, rationing, and other boards and the people served by them have problems on which State laws and State administrative machinery have bearing. The people have been accustomed to dealing with agencies functioning in their own State, they are acquainted with their personnel and even though 300 miles away from here they are more familiar with the conditions than are the strangers in the Minnesota capital nearer by.

There has always been the hope and, until the Duluth complication entered there had been the promise, that there would be established in this section of the State suboffices that would have considerable authority and would save much time and annoyance for people who had problems that required decision from a source higher than a local board. Now it seems that Duluth wishes to take in this territory and require upper Wisconsin people to go first to that city before being heard elsewhere. But as for Duluth's own neighbors on the range, it is planned that a special office will be opened for them, making two in St. Louis County. Nothing such is promised to the people of upper Wisconsin, however.

Wisconsin residents prefer to deal with their own people. They believe that the State is fully capable of functioning efficiently in the Government service.

Up to date the record bears out this contention. If the Government can afford a subdistrict for Duluth in Minnesota it can well afford to give the people of upper Wisconsin similar recognition. To send them across toll bridges into another State and into a city not at all well equipped to afford adequate traffic and parking facilities so that they may have their pleas and complaints handled by strangers does not give the impression of offering good service.

Superior is coming through 100 percent and better on every line of war activity. Upper Wisconsin is responding likewise. They deserve better than poor-relation treatment.

PUTTING CITY UNDER DULUTH RULE WOULD UPSET VITAL AGENCIES—SUPERIOR AND WISCONSIN HAVE SET PACE IN VOCATIONAL SCHOOL WORK AND OTHER WAR ACTIVITIES

Protest against taking Superior out of Wisconsin and placing it under Duluth for authority on all war activities was Thursday bringing to light further complications that promise to impede greatly the program which has been going forward with such marked success here.

Those that registered the first protest did not, it seems, fully appreciate how far the ramifications of the Duluth plan would go. It is now stated that even the training system that has been developed here through the Superior unit of the Wisconsin system will have to start practically all over again if the plan goes through.

VOCATIONAL SCHOOL CONTRIBUTION

It is everywhere admitted that in the war production program the Wisconsin vocational school system is among the very few that rate at the top. No other system in the Middle West ranks with Wisconsin and few in the East, New York and Pennsylvania, great industrial States, being leaders there. Without the facilities afforded by these high-ranking vocational systems the Nation's war effort, it is admitted, would have been far behind its present schedule in many particulars.

It is, of course, recognized that especially in shipbuilding an important contribution is being made by Superior and Duluth. Also other smaller plants are employing many skilled workers on war orders. Superior's great part in this is being performed principally by its two big shipyards, the Butler and Globe. These two are now approaching a total employment figure of 5,000. In addition to this upward of another 1,000 are employed in smaller plants here, Superior's total war pay roll running to 6,000. This does not include the great contribution made here by railroads and other transportation agencies.

SUPPLY 75 PERCENT

The extent to which this activity has depended on the vocational-school system here is indicated by the fact that of all the skilled workers in these plants—who number some 60 percent of the total—half are products of the local school. Duluth also has a large total of shipbuilders employed, although not so many as Superior. From the start the size of the crews has depended largely on the number of competent welders available. These have had to pass Government tests to qualify. Of all the welders now at work in the shipyards of both Superior and Duluth 75 percent of the welders have been produced by the Superior school. Minnesota has had no comparable facilities for supplying this need, and Duluth's contribution in this respect has been practically nothing.

WISCONSIN SYSTEM BROUGHT RESULTS

The vocational school has been nearly 3 years cooperating with the Government on its defense and war program which started in July 1940. At first there was much confusion because of various Government agencies trying to get results, but it was finally found that the quickest and most efficient way to get results in training manpower was to put the program in the hands of Wisconsin's vocational system. The State board worked out plans of operation so that there was the least possible loss through red tape and bureaucratic interference and for many months results have been produced which have won highest praise from Federal and district officials.

When the manpower problem developed the Government wanted employment agencies in all centers. In Wisconsin these already existed in a well-set-up system of State agencies. (The Wisconsin free employment system, by the way, was the outgrowth of an office established by the city of Superior more than 40 years ago.) The Government asked if it might borrow the whole Wisconsin set-up and it was promptly turned over to the Government for the duration. By working in close harmony with the State employment office the vocational school here and at other State points, has gained fine results both for the employers and the employees.

WOULD GO TO DULUTH

Under the proposed district plan, the employment office here is another agency that will not longer be integrated with the rest of the Wisconsin system but will be checked over to Duluth.

The contention is now being made that where such outstanding results have been obtained through a system nurtured under State guidance it would do incalculable harm to break it down and force these well-functioning agencies to start working under directors that are strangers to it. "The war effort here will make better headway if it is not disrupted in this way," was the statement Thursday of one of those making protest. "Furthermore it would seem that a city that is making such a contribution as is Superior should not be subjected to the affront of being blithely made an appendage of another community in another State. What is being done here amply justifies the establishing of a special district where war workers and war agencies can continue to function under the leadership where they belong."

Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include a statement made by me on the March of Time radio program last night:

The demands of the war effort are placing upon this Government its greatest financial burden. Revenue needs are staggering and Congress is faced with the duty of supplying these needs by increased taxation to as great an extent as our economy can bear. In the midst of this task, we are now asked to forgive 1 year's tax on individual incomes, although these incomes have already been received and enjoyed. In an attempt to justify this $10,000,000,000 raid on the Treasury, we are told that a year's tax forgiveness is necessary if taxpayers are to be put on a current basis without forcing them to pay 2 years' taxes in 1 from 2 years' income, that currentness is more desirable than $10,000,000,000.

Complete current income-tax accounting is an impossibility. It is not practicable even in the case of fairly constant incomes from salaries or wages, because a net-income tax simply will not work prospectively. The tax must be based upon the facts for the entire year which cannot be known until the year is over. Even with the use of a crystal ball, persons cannot make a forecast of their incomes, credits, and deductions for a year ahead with accuracy sufficient to form a basis for prepaying their income tax. Is there a taxpayer who really wants to be forced to prepay taxes on income he may never receive?

Cancelation of a year's tax liability is the very heart of the Ruml plan. To put it into operation it is necessary for our Government to cast away $10,000,000,000 of taxes already due and owing on the swollen wartime incomes for 1942. To take this step would immediately add at least $854,000 to the wealth of each of the 60 persons enjoying incomes of $1,000,000 or more in 1942. It would be a completely unwarranted gift of $414,000 to those with incomes of $500,000; and of correspondingly lesser amounts for smaller incomes.

Since the higher income brackets cannot be substantially increased, this $10,000,000,000 forgiven taxpayers will have to be made up in future years by increased taxes on the lower and middle brackets. In short, those with lower incomes must bear the added burden necessary to offset the gains which would accrue to wealthier taxpayers.

Could such folly ever be condoned by a nation engaged in a desperate all-out struggle to maintain its very existence? No. Ten billion dollars of propaganda cannot prevail over the common sense of the American people.

Willkie Repudiated in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, any lingering doubts about the popularity of Wendell L. Willkie as a Presidential candidate in his adopted State of Indiana were completely erased this week with the announcement of final results of a Presidential preference poll conducted by the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel among Republican precinct committeemen and committeewomen throughout Indiana's 92 counties.

Final tabulation of returns in this poll, which has attracted Nation-wide interest, reveals that 88.1 percent oppose, and only 11.9 favor, the 1944 nomination of Mr. Willkie on the Republican ticket.

The Indiana committeemen were polled on five questions, the first of which was:

Do you think Wendell L. Willkie should be nominated for President on the Republican ticket in 1944?

Of the 1,693 committeemen who returned ballots, only 200 answered this question in the affirmative, while 1,493 expressed their unqualified opposition to the selection of Mr. Willkie as the G. O. P. standard bearer next year.

Only one conclusion can be reached from this poll. Mr. Willkie has been tried in the court of public opinion and has been overwhelmingly repudiated by a jury of his own neighbors. He has forfeited the faith and confidence of his former champions and supporters.

If Mr. Willkie is counting on Hoosier support of his campaign for renomination in 1944 he is facing certain disappointment. His candidacy is doomed to failure and will only create disunity and dissension in the Republican Party. The greatest contribution Mr. Willkie could make toward a united front against a fourth term for the New Deal would be to withdraw from the race at once.

In accordance with consent granted, I am including the following story from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel of March 24, 1943, entitled "88.1 Percent of G. O. P. Leaders in State Opposed to Willkie":

"GRASS ROOTS" POLL CONCLUDED—88.1 PERCENT OF G. O. P. LEADERS IN STATE OPPOSED TO WILLKIE

Four days after the date originally set for its completion, and 1 week after the last ballots had been delivered to some 8,000 Republican precinct committeemen and committeewomen throughout Indiana's 92 counties, the News-Sentinel's "grass roots" Presidential-preference poll was formally concluded today when returns received since noon Tuesday were added to totals previously announced.

A total of 1,493, or 88.1 percent, of the 1,693 "grass roots" Republican leaders sending back their poll cards declared their opposition to the 1944 nomination of Wendell L. Willkie, of New York, for President on the Republican ticket.

Only 200, or 11.9 percent, favored Willkie's nomination.

Tally of the 1,693 ballots, representing more than 21 percent of the total number sent out from March 13 to March 16—a percentage of returns twice as large as is ordinarily anticipated from such a canvass—showed results in line with previous day-to-day tabulations of responses to the 5 questions directed to G. O. P. leaders in all sorts and sizes of Hoosier communities in all parts of the State.

OTHER QUESTIONS ASKED

While the pro- or anti-Willkie sentiments of the committeemen and committeewomen have attracted the most Nation-wide interest, receiving primary emphasis of everybody from Congressmen to columnists and radio commentators, there were four other questions on the poll cards which also evoked a display of lively interest on the part of recipients.

In one question, the precinct leaders were asked to indicate their own personal preferences for President in 1944; in another, to state their opinion as to the strongest candidate for the office; in another, to designate their Vice Presidential preferences; and in yet another, to express their views as to whether the United States should mix extensively in foreign politics after the war.

The question of whether the United States should hereafter mix extensively in foreign politics brought in the following replies:

"Yes," 203; "No," 1,490.

DEWEY IS FIRST CHOICE

Forty-two percent of the "grass roots" Republican leaders indicating Presidential preferences named Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, as their idea of the strongest candidate; 39.2 percent stated that he was their personal preference; and 23.4 percent favored him for Vice President.

Thirty-nine percent like Bricker best; 38 percent think he would make the strongest Presidential candidate; and 25 percent would nominate him for Vice President.

Willkie is the personal preference of 10 percent, while 11 percent designate him as the strongest candidate; and 2 percent would run him for Vice President.

In Allen County only 2 percent of the Republican precinct committeemen and committeewomen believe Willkie should be nominated for President next year; 89.8 percent oppose extensive American participation in foreign politics after the war. In this county, Bricker is top man for the Presidency, with nearly 40 percent of the total votes, while the remaining 60 percent are divided among Dewey, Taft, and half a dozen others.

The opposition to Willkie in De Kalb County constitutes 91.5 percent of the total; in Adams County, 96 percent; in Randolph County, 94.5 percent. Among the 100 percent anti-Willkie counties are Whitley (home of Republican State Chairman Ralph F. Gates); Steuben (home of United States Senator RAYMOND E. WILLIS); Lagrange, Union, Dearborn, and Switzerland.

INDUSTRIAL AREAS OPPOSE WILLKIE

Governor Bricker's strength in the dozen counties ranged along the Ohio line is, as perhaps might naturally be expected, somewhat greater than that shown for the State as a whole.

Of particular interest is the fact that anti-Willkie sentiment is strong in large, populous industrial counties whose votes frequently determine the outcome of elections.

In Lake and St. Joseph counties, for example, anti-Willkie committeemen cast 92 percent of the ballots sent in from those areas; in Vanderburgh County (Evansville), 90 percent; in Vigo (Terre Haute), 89 percent; in Allen (Fort Wayne), 98 percent; in Marion (Indianapolis), 53 percent.

From all parts of the country have come expressions of interest to the poll, which was initiated on March 15, when the first ballots were sent out.

MAJORITY MAKE REMARKS

It is considered quite remarkable that about five out of every six cards returned carried the sender's name, county, and precinct or township; and about two-thirds made "remarks," of which the following, taken from the last batch of returns today, are typical:

From Anderson, in Madison County: "Stop mixing in foreign politics. I say let's be free of England again, and run our own country in our own way."

From Dubois, in Dubois County: "The people of this county do not care for any more 'campaign oratory' from Windy Willkie."

From Vevey, in Switzerland County: "Keep out of foreign politics, and nominate Dewey for President."

From North Vernon, in Jennings County: "If Willkie runs against Roosevelt, he will be defeated. Let's have an honest and wholehearted Republican."

From Evansville, in Vanderburgh County: "Willkie would not get 10 votes in my precinct."

From Dubois, in Dubois County: "If Willkie is nominated, I would favor a third-party candidate."

From Scottsburg, in Scott County: "We need a man who can carry New York, and I believe Dewey can do that."

From Napoleon, in Ripley County: "We need a man from the Middle West. We've had a New Yorker in the White House too long already. I'll pick Taft, of Ohio. He's had the most experience and is the most level-headed."

From Evansville: "Willkie has changed sides too much; people around here have no confidence in him."

From Goshen, in Elkhart County: "If Willkie is our candidate, we will still have a Democrat in the Presidency after 1945—whether he is elected or defeated."

From Bloomington, in Monroe County: "Willkie might be all right for Vice President; but I prefer Dewey to head the ticket."

From Summitville, in Madison County: "We need no Willkies. He concurs with this administration's internationalist and interventionist program too much. What we need is a President who will first minister unto his own household, for he that does not, the Scriptures tell us, is worse than an infidel. Sweep Washington of so-called social planners—sweep it as clean as a windswept desert."

The Ruml Plan—A Way To Dodge Taxes on the Home Front as Our Fighting Men Are Dodging Bullets on the Battle Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a part of my instant remarks, the text of an address I delivered in New York City last night at the Town Hall of the Air, an address which was broadcast to the country over the facilities of the Blue Network.

The address follows:

We are here tonight to discuss the pay-as-you-go, skip-a-year, turn-the-tax-clock-forward, wipe-the-slate-clean plan proposed by Mr. Beardsley Ruml. In other words, we are here to discuss the plan that slogans built.

The Ruml plan is an amazingly skillful attempt to sell the American public a bill of goods. Its sales technique includes slick cartoons, news items that ignore the facts, editorials that distort the truth—and a series of ear-catching slogans.

When we will have cleared the atmosphere of this smoke screen of ear-catching slogans, one great central idea will be revealed—"forgiveness" of the tax on our record 1942 national income of $119,000,000,000. Mr. Ruml blandly proposes that we kiss good-bye forever the right to tax this $119,000,000,000 of war income at a time when the Government needs money more than it ever needed it before.

Of course, the Ruml plan slogannaires do not stress that in their campaign speeches. The emphasis is always placed on pay-as-you-go, an idea as old as the hills, an idea which every tax bill now before Congress contains.

Mr. Ruml's first version of pay-as-you-go involved merely a change of the labels on the tax we now pay—to call it this year's tax instead of last year's tax. But he suddenly realized that changing the label from "peas" to "beans" doesn't change peas into beans. So he later adopted the idea that the Treasury has used for some time in the collection of the Victory tax, namely, collection of taxes at source. It finally dawned on him that collection at source is the only way to put the pay-as-you-go idea into effect. It became clear to him at last that without collection at source, his plan was unworkable. It hasn't yet dawned on him that with collection at source, his plan is utterly unnecessary.

The answer of course is that the Rumlites are not primarily interested so much in pay as you go as they are in turning the tax clock ahead a year.

They tell us it is all very simple—just move the clock ahead as we do for daylight savings time. The catch is that they don't carry the parallel through. They point out that when we turn the time clock forward, we get daylight savings time. What they carefully fail to point out is that when we turn the tax clock forward, we get tax-savings time. To save daylight for war workers is one way of meeting a national power shortage. To save taxes for war profiteers is no way to meet a national revenue shortage.

Mr. Ruml deplores the use of the word "forgiveness" to describe his scheme for skipping the already matured income tax bill for 1942. He is choosy with his slogans, using only those that have the right flavor. It's not a forgiveness, he claims—it's just turning the tax clock forward. What he fails to mention is that this maneuver gives the American taxpayer a double income at the cost of a single tax. If we but adopt the Ruml plan we will all receive 2 years of income and pay only 1 year of taxes. So, behind the smoke screen, we find simply a scheme for getting out of 1 year's taxes.

Neither did Mr. Ruml mention that for the taxpayer who is none-too-well-to-do, the "feel" of tax collections will remain much the same. For this man at the lower end of the income scale—who necessarily pays-as-he-goes since he cannot save for taxes in advance—for that man, skip-a-year won't mean much. But for the man at the upper end of the scale, who pays his taxes out of surplus, who has saved money to pay his taxes in advance, the tax savings plan proposed by Mr. Ruml would ring up fortunes beyond the dreams of Midas. For him, not pie in the sky, bye and bye, but pie on the platter here and now.

The gift to a man with a $1,000,000 income in 1942 would be about $850,000. He could gather this gift to his bosom, retire, and live comfortably for the rest of his life on the income from that handsome sum. The man with a mere $100,000 income would ring up a tax saving of $64,000, a tidy sum, even in these flush times.

But somehow or other it is very difficult to determine what the poor taxpayer who earns only $1,500 or $2,000 a year can do with his tax gift of $50 to $100. Most probably he would have to use it to pay the tax increases which will be necessary to recoup the loss caused by the tax gift to those fellows with the $100,000 and $1,000,000 a year incomes.

If the Congress were to accept the Ruml plan, it would be party to the most discriminatory hand-out at public expense ever railroaded through an American legislative body.

This year, of all years, is no time to be forgiving taxes. The year to forgive is the year when it is necessary to forgive—in years of recession and depression. But to pay only 1 year's taxes on the highest 2 years' income in history, to skip a year when people are all employed at the highest compensation ever paid, when everybody has money in his pockets, when the banks are full to overflowing with savings, when the people have billions of dollars invested in bank accounts and War bonds, is, to say the least, bad morals and worse business.

To dodge taxes on the home front when our boys are dodging bullets on the battle fronts is unthinkable.

As chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Mr. Ruml ought to show greater awareness of the financial facts of life. He, of all people, should know that the American public saved more last year than at any other time in history; that they increased their bank deposits alone by more than $10,000,000,000. He, of all people, should also know that accumulated liquid savings of individuals in the form of Government bonds, bank deposits, and cash on hand total more than $100,000,000,000. He should know that this constitutes a vast reservoir of taxpaying ability and a most dangerous threat of runaway inflation.

Yet he would remove the 1942 tax weight on those savings and free them for inflationary spending. The cancelation of $10,000,000,000 of taxes would most certainly feed the fires of inflation. To hand taxpayers a gift of $10,000,000,000 on a silver platter would loosen pursestrings and precipitate an increased spending. This is one gift horse we had better look in the mouth—before it is too late.

If we grant the forgiveness that Banker Ruml demands, we will have surrendered to wartime profiteering, surrendered to that which we solemnly vowed we would never permit to happen again.

To cut ourselves a tax cake on the home front when our fighting men are eating cold rations in the fox holes of our far-flung battle fronts would be the last straw.

So, stripped of its slogans, we find the Ruml plan to be but an ill-disguised maneuver to get away with paying but 1 year's taxes on 2 years' income. That is the essence of the Ruml plan, and that is why the Rumlites must not and shall not pass.

Relief for War-Orphaned Polish Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the President of the United States:

ST. ANDREW SCHOOL,
Detroit, Mich., March 21, 1943.

Mr. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We realize that in these trying times you, Mr. President, must devote every bit of your strength and effort to the guiding of our Nation in this terrible war. Goaded, however, by a sense of righteousness and our deep concern for the future welfare of Poland, the land of our forefathers, we make bold to appeal to you, our Chief, for but a moment of your precious time.

The world knows that thousands of innocent Polish children, the flower of Poland's youth and future leaders, live in the wastes of cold Siberia, enduring there unheard-of hardships and being forgotten by the world at large. Polish soil again is being saturated with the blood of her country's martyrs; the Poles again strive with all their might to regain the freedom they so intensely cherish. Cruelties of incredible nature are used by the oppressors to quell the various uprisings which, like toadstools, continue to spring up. We all can see that no aid from within Poland can soothe the sufferings of the young Polish refugees.

We know that you and the Nation's leaders are deeply concerned over the post-war world. We believe the time is now to plan for a strong and decent world after the victory is ours. One step is to re-create a strong democratic Poland, but to keep her democratic she must have good leaders guiding her through the confusion of post-war conditions. These leaders are half-starved children in Russia. They must be saved for the good of Poland and the world. We humbly ask of you, Mr. President, to influence Mr. Josef Stalin, of Russia, and so bring about the betterment of living conditions for the war-orphaned Polish children. Through you, Mr. President, that young generation may be saved, cared for, fed, the Polish culture rescued, and Poland made a great bulwark of civilization of Christianity in central Europe—a role she so gloriously played in times past.

As an alternative, might not these children be brought to America for the duration? The Americans of Polish descent would receive these children with outstretched arms, for although a few things are rationed here there is still enough to go around, including those poor refugees.

Very cordially yours,

KENNETH J. LUZYNSKI,
Chairman.

EDWIN A. BAKUN, *Secretary.*

(Committee of appeals for Polish children in Russia for St. Andrew High School, St. Andrew Elementary School, St. Barbara Elementary School, St. Cunegundis Elementary School, St. Hedwig High School, St. Hedwig Elementary School, St. John Cantius Elementary School, St. Stephen Elementary School, SS. Peter and Paul Elementary School, Our Lady Queen of Angels Elementary School.)

Amendment of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the fol-

lowing resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York:

Senate Resolution 19

Whereas the national administration has enacted legislation to provide old-age-security benefits for many of our citizens and is contemplating the expansion of the social-security program to include other groups not now eligible for such benefits; and

Whereas under the social-security law only the employees of covered employers may participate in social-security benefits, and only the covered employers are required to pay social-security tax, the covered employer and the covered employee each paying one-half thereof; and

Whereas there are in the State of New York a great many employees who were formerly covered by the law and were formerly eligible for benefits thereunder, but who, through no action or choice on their part, became ineligible under the law when they, through no action or choice on their part, became employees of uncovered employers; and

Whereas a great many of such employees who so became ineligible under the social-security law are desirous of being eligible thereunder and being covered thereby, and to participate in social-security benefits, and are willing to pay not only the amount of employee contributions but also the amount of employer contributions which their present employer would have been required to pay if such employer were covered under the law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to provide that all employees who were formerly covered by the social-security law and who heretofore made contributions thereto in the form of employee tax, and who became ineligible through no action or choice on their part, may again become eligible under the social-security law for social-security benefits upon signifying their willingness to pay not only the amount of employee contributions but also the amount of employer contributions which their present employer would have been required to pay if such employer were covered by the law; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress elected from the State of New York.

By order of the senate:

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

In assembly, March 10, 1943.
Concurred in without amendment.
By order of the assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

Planning the Way to a National Poor Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an editorial by Elton R. Eaton, publisher of the Plymouth Mail, an outstanding Michigan newspaper. This editorial deals, realistically, with the recent cradle-to-grave report of the National Resources Planning Board, and, in my opinion, it should be preserved for future reference by those who are today dreaming on the banks of the Potomac at the expense of our hard-pressed taxpayers.

The editorial follows:

PLANNING THE WAY TO A NATIONAL POOR FARM
(By Elton R. Eaton)

So the New Dealer beneficiaries of inherited wealth who have never had to toil or spin to earn their daily bread, assisted by a group of long-haired overeducated, nonproducing theorists, have worked out a plan for the post-war period so there will be peace, happiness, and security for everybody, whether they work or not. That seems to be the gist of the document filed with Congress by the President's very rich and cultured relative, Frederic A. Delano, Chairman of the National Planning Board.

As I hastily read through the long document, it revived memories of probably the first New Deal experiment ever tried out in Michigan. As a youngster I was reared in the little village of Galesburg over in Kalamazoo County.

A mile or so west of the village was located the Kalamazoo County poor farm.

The Kalamazoo poor farm was the original share-the-wealth experimental station of the country, and as a boy we heard and knew much about the thing they now call the New Deal.

Old pioneers used to tell of the time when a number of covered wagons arrived in Galesburg one spring day from various places about the State. Gathered under the heavy coverings of the wagons were some 70 or 80 men, women, and children who called themselves members of the Alphadelphia Association.

They had come west, they said to begin life anew, to live in one great community, where all were to work together, share alike, and live alike. Everything raised was to go in one big granary and each was to be apportioned equal amounts of foods, clothing, and wood for fuel.

They spent several days looking around for a site for their new planned world. Finally they picked a beautiful piece of ground lying on what, as a youngster, I knew as Toland's prairie. It consisted of several hundred acres, running from the foothills along the north side of the prairie to the Kalamazoo River.

There they erected their buildings, hewing from the big oak and walnut trees the frames, sidings, and shingles for the community hall and other buildings. I clearly remember the old wooden structures—the main building years later having been moved into our town to be used as a windmill factory after fire had destroyed the original factory building.

It wasn't necessary for these original New Dealers to spend much time clearing the land, as most of it was covered only by a heavy growth of wild grass. Groves of big white oaks and walnuts surrounded the prairie. It was exceedingly rich, level farm land.

They planted their crops and cut their wood for the stoves and fireplaces.

Then came fall, and they harvested their crops. As the seasons rolled around, it finally developed that nearly all of the productive work was being carried on by only a small number of the men. It soon became apparent that there were many drones among the original New Dealers. They wanted their share of all that was produced, but didn't want to do much of the work required in producing it.

The workers didn't like this idea and they began to move out of the colony. I remember well the elderly son of one of original new dealers. His father, sick and tired of working long hours while others loafed about the community center exploiting the benefits of the original New Deal, went over east of Galesburg and bought a farm. Other workers in the colony bought themselves farms and moved out. This son of one of the members of the old new dealers I knew, later moved into our town and was the butter-and-egg-buyer of the place.

Finally only the drones, the loud talkers, were left down on the Alphadelphia farm.

They began to get hungry and they had little clothing. They were too lazy to cut their own heating wood.

What happened to these New Deal drones?

Kalamazoo county taxpayers had to buy the Alphadelphia farm and convert it into a poor farm to care for the lazy new dealers, who were stranded there, just as Frederic A. Delano now proposes that after the Second World War is over, that the hard-working, industrious citizens of America shall take care of all the cheaters, the drones, and the riff-raff of the Nation and the world, even if this new breed of drones refuse to toil and spin to help support themselves.

But it is not at all surprising that such crackpot ideas come from people who have been fed throughout their lives off inherited silver spoons, and foods they never produced through their own efforts.

Some day these nonproducing dreamers are going to wake up to the idea that there is just one way for people to get along in this world—and that is through work—yes, hard work.

It is about time for someone to place a muzzle over the mouths of these super-educated, nonproducing advocates of a happy, carefree existence for all of the drones at the expense of those who work to produce.

For 10 long years these modern New Dealers have spent their time debunking every sound American ideal upon which our Nation has grown so powerful and so plentiful. They talk only of security and safety. Never does one hear anything about the benefits of loyal, devoted services to our community, State, and Nation or of the benefits to ourselves and our neighbors of real sacrifice. Never do they tell of the joys that come from enthusiastic, diligent, honest toil.

They have tried to tell the people of this Nation that we could live by pretending to work a few hours per week. In fact, we have been trying to do this very thing for some years back.

Look to Pearl Harbor, the Philippines, the islands of the Pacific, and you see the results of this no-work, all-play policy of the New Dealers.

"Too little and too late"—words that shame the richest nation that God ever let live, provide the answer.

We have a desperate war to win. It is impossible to conceive why, in view of the plight we are in, that those high in the administration at Washington keep constantly injecting into discussions domestic issues of a most controversial nature. That is no way to bring about unity in action so much needed at present.

As we see it, the recommendations of the Planning Board are not only trouble-making ideas but they can be rightfully regarded as an insult to the creative, hard-working people of this free land of ours.

It is high time that we begin to preach something about the glories of work and accomplishment and the follies of laziness and idle prattle.

The New Deal plan for the post-war period, instead of being a plan for just a mere county poor farm, is seemingly a plan for a national poor farm for all of us.

A Million Men for the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the overstaffing with unnecessary employees of many of the bureaus in the Federal Government in Washington has been the cause for widespread comment and criticism for months past. Now we face a critical manpower shortage and we should take immediate steps to cut down on that shortage by taking from the bureaus in Washington men of military age who are eligible for military service under the Selective Service Act and relieve others of their unnecessary jobs in the Government for service elsewhere in the war effort. All of this will make for increased efficiency in the war effort and increased efficiency as well as economy in government.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to the facts of this situation and the statistics as compiled by the so-called National Emergency Committee. They are as follows:

A MILLION MEN FOR THE ARMY

THE PRIMARY DECLARATION—STREAMLINING FOR VICTORY

One million Federal employees should be transferred immediately to military service or directly to war and agricultural production, to help solve manpower shortage. Congress should act at once.

There are more than one-half as many Federal employees sitting at desks at Washington and elsewhere as there are enrolled in the Army—and the number is increasing.

Slashing nonessential war activities and stripping nonessential workers from Federal pay rolls—1,000,000 of them—meet two basic requirements—need for manpower and blasting extravagance in the Federal Budget.

Business "as usual" is out for the duration. So should there be a moratorium on nonwar bureaus.

Make effective the powers of the Comptroller General. Congress still has the authority to do this.

THE SUPPORTING FACTS—CANADA HAS DONE IT

The ratio of total Federal civilian employees to the total armed forces of the United States is 1 to 2.

On the same basis, in Canada the ratio is 1 to 6.

The ratio of civilian employees in war agencies to the armed-force personnel of the United States is 1 to 3.

On the same basis, in Canada the ratio is 1 to 8.

Civilian personnel increase outstrips armed forces

From June 30, 1940, to August 31, 1942, civilian personnel in Federal war agencies increased at a rate more rapid than in the armed forces. Civilian increase was 530 percent: armed forces, 507 percent.

On June 30, 1940, the Federal war agencies employed 256,569; on August 31, 1942, 1,620,972.

Other Federal agencies also increased civilian personnel approximately 11 percent. These include the Federal Security Agency, the National Labor Relations Board, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Federal Power Commission, etc.

On June 30, 1940, these agencies employed 746,251, with the number increasing to 829,786—or approximately 11 percent on August 31, 1942.

Employment system encourages abuse

One reason for the increase in employees is due to the Federal Classification Act of 1923 which in normal times makes an executive's salary dependent upon the number of persons under his supervision. Under this system, it frequently happens that to obtain a useful executive at a salary commensurate with his skill and ability he is obliged to supervise a force of employees in greater number than necessary.

Another cause for the increase in employees lies at the door of personnel officers for many various Government agencies who feel their reputation and pay depend upon the number of persons on their pay rolls.

In many instances, additional employees have been so numerous they have handicapped the war effort by getting in each other's way. To relieve this situation, some agencies have created made-work programs including establishment of new questionnaires for business and the public.

Canada's policy

The Canadian policy is simple but effective in holding government employees in nonwar agencies to a minimum.

Before a position can be created, or a vacated position filled in a nonwar agency, proof of necessity must be made to the Canadian Civil Service Commission which has strict requirements.

CUT PERSONNEL OF NONWAR AGENCIES

Nonwar agencies of the Federal Government are huge reservoirs of manpower which can be utilized to help relieve the shortage.

Only a few of many instances where a drastic slash in personnel would be useful without impairing any essential services are cited in the following:

The Federal Security Agency

On October 31, 1942, this Agency employed 66,449 persons of whom 20,832 were formerly members of State employment agencies. Deducting the latter figure, this Agency employed 45,617 persons as of October 31, 1942, as compared to 27,065 on June 30, 1940—an increase of 68.5 percent.

This Agency primarily was established to assist needy and unemployed. Obviously, expansion was unjustified under existing conditions.

The Federal Power Commission

This agency also has expanded personnel during the past 2 years.

And, additional thousands of employees will be added to the pay rolls if a recent ruling of the agency, changing the basic policy in public-utility rate-making procedure, is enforced.

These prospective employees would be principally accountants and engineers who are sorely needed in war production.

Preventive as well as corrective measures should be employed here.

Labor Relations Administration

The administrative agencies in this complete set-up could readily be pruned in personnel. Also, it should be adjusted to a more efficient and economic system that would expedite matters in this vitally important field.

Here is the picture—

Wages and salaries are controlled and administered in some phases by the following agencies: Wage and Hour Division, Bureau of Internal Revenue, National War Labor Board, and Office of Price Administration.

Labor disputes are handled by the United States Conciliation Service, the National Labor Relations Board, and the National War Labor Board.

In addition the Labor Standards Division, Children's Bureau and the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor also have a part in administrative affairs for labor.

These are only a few examples of the "business as usual" attitude of Washington bureaucracy.

Office of Comptroller General

Congress created the Comptroller General to be its servant. His Office has been bypassed for years. Therefore, Congress should restore to the Office of the Comptroller General the authority with which it was endowed originally, to check appropriations and to present data and statistical information to Congress in determining amounts necessary for operating and other expenses.

To make this effective and to implement it efficiently, Congress should establish an agency in the Office of the Comptroller General to do these things—

1. To scrutinize all requests for appropriations.
2. To report whether functions performed by other Federal agencies will be duplicated.
3. To determine whether Congress has authorized each activity by previous sanction.
4. To determine whether all appropriations requested in individual cases are needed.

In addition, sufficient funds should be appropriated for the Office of the Comptroller General to investigate administrative agencies, with instructions to report whether savings can be made.

THE SOLUTION

The Comptroller General is the best qualified official to determine how and where to reduce personnel, and this Congress should require him to do so at once.

Such a report undoubtedly would indicate the necessity for amending the Classification Act or suspending its provisions in the case of war agencies.

C Gasoline Cards for Racketeers

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in Port Huron, Mich., drivers of motor vehicles wishing to distribute milk to the babies and to the people of that city are wondering why it is that they cannot be assured of freedom from fear and freedom from want.

Some milkmen in Port Huron do not want to join a union, they have jobs. They want to work. They are engaged in delivering milk for the use of the babies of Port Huron and the use of the people of Port Huron.

Every day five or six carloads of so-called union organizers, using C rationing books for gasoline, drive up from the city of Detroit to Port Huron and follow these milkmen around.

These so-called organizers, which have by the editor of the Port Huron Times-

Herald been characterized as racketeers, follow the milkmen around to their customers and then seek to intimidate the customers. They tell some of the customers that, if they accept and use the milk delivered to their restaurants or business places, those working there will be called out on strike. These union organizers and their employees threaten the employers of the milkmen with a loss of business and they demand that those employers violate the N. L. R. A. and coerce the drivers into joining the union.

The sole purpose is to enrich the treasury of that union. The purpose is to coerce those milkmen, who do not want to join the union, into paying tribute to the union.

The milkmen went on strike against the unlawful activities of the racketeers, but upon request of W. P. B. they went back to work, but the racketeers continue to threaten and intimidate them.

Why not a little freedom from fear in Port Huron?

A wire received from that city last night reads as follows:

How can five or six carloads of racketeers get C ration books to come from Detroit to Port Huron daily and follow milkmen around their routes threatening the customers of these men because the latter will not permit themselves to be forced into a union by their employers? Does the Government issue C cards for this purpose, and if so, upon whose authority? That is what happened in Port Huron.

I am asking the O. P. A. to answer that question for me; to tell me why it is that five or six carloads of men can drive each day from the city of Detroit to Port Huron, and then in Port Huron follow the milkmen around to their customers, seek to intimidate the customers, using C rationing books? Does the O. P. A. class the activities of these men who are threatening honest citizens; who seek to force employees to violate a Federal law; who are collecting tribute for the privilege of working, as an essential industry, or is it driving for pleasure?

The Department of Justice might tell us whether, in its opinion, intimidation of men who are furnishing milk to the babies of Port Huron is an activity affecting the morale of the men in the armed force, who have left their babies at home and who cannot be furnished milk because of the actions of these union organizers.

The Defense Plant Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, because of the great interest in the need for increasing production, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a statement by the Honorable Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, concerning the activities of the Defense Plant Corporation. This agency has brought into operation 1,022 plants of its 1,479 plant projects. I feel that these accomplishments are particularly noteworthy at the present time. Mr. Jones' statement is as follows:

There have come into actual operation 1,022 of the 1,479 plant projects owned by Defense Plant Corporation, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Eight hundred of these 1,022 plant construction or equipment projects were begun by Defense Plant Corporation after Pearl Harbor.

The grand total of all commitments approved by Defense Plant Corporation (including projects subsequently canceled or deferred) is $9,175,190,258.10. The $2,657,112,000 Defense Plant Corporation will have invested in aircraft and aircraft accessories plants will exceed by about 10 times the entire assets of all aircraft manufacturers before the war and its total commitments for all military purposes amount to one-seventh of the combined total assets of all the ninety thousand-odd manufacturing and mining companies in the United States in 1939. The total square feet of airplane plant space alone—35,000,000—would cover 700 city blocks 250 feet by 200 feet, or 1 solid city block 200 feet wide and 33 miles long. This is for the airplane industry alone.

The largest Defense Plant Corporation commitment for facilities now in operation is for an aircraft engine plant costing $173,357,236. The smallest is for machinery costing $14,-251.50 at a plant making jewel bearings. The 1,022 plants are located in 43 States and are operated by 708 different companies.

The total cost to Defense Plant Corporation of constructing and equipping these 1,022 plant projects is $4,317,751,000. This includes facilities at 51 plants costing $483,-483,000 making airplanes, including bombers, fighters, cargo planes, trainer planes, and gliders; 344 plants costing $1,965,351,000 making aircraft engines and other aircraft parts; 70 plants costing $337,450,000 for ordnance; 54 for $47,995,000 making radio and communication equipment; 161 for $81,559,000 making machine tools; 42 for $143,822,000 building ships, engines, and parts; 57 for $141,283,000 making steel and pig iron; 43 for $518,-804,000 producing aluminum metal and fabrication; 24 for $307,728,000 producing magnesium metal and fabrication; 22 for $29,722,000 producing other metals and minerals; 6 for $95,785,000 making synthetic rubber; 4 for $70,416,000 making butadiene and styrene, bases for synthetic rubber; 80 for $55,983,000 producing other war materials and supplies; and 64 for $38,370,000 for the acquisition of flying schools.

Defense Plant Corporation has financed numerous small plants, as well as some very large ones. The latter, of course, are vital for the mass output of finished products, such as airplanes, ships, and tanks. The smaller plants, however, are equally important in making the parts without which the larger factories could not turn out the completed product. A Flying Fortress is a complicated assembly of a great number of separate parts. Many of these, such as precision instruments, are unusually intricate and are made by small plants which specialize on 1 or 2 items. The cost to Defense Plant Corporation in 120 of these plants is $100,000 or less, among which is one for $29,888.28 for wind tunnel models, to judge the effect of wind action upon airplanes; one for $28,227.32 for assembling quartz crystals, absolutely vital in radio equipment; one for $43,366 for microscopes; one for $61,655 for pumps to prevent forming of ice on airplanes; and one for $57,655 for ship windlasses. Many other small concerns have benefited indirectly from Defense Plant Corporation financing through subcontracts and purchase orders from the large manufacturers.

In addition to plants now in production, Defense Plant Corporation has 457 plant construction or equipment projects under way, the estimated cost of which will be $1,784,-040,000 and practically all of which are scheduled for operation in 1943. This makes a total of 1,479 plants operated or to be operated by 976 companies, not including 157 for which commitments have been canceled, deferred, or taken over by armed services, etc., amounting to $629,637,000.

Other types of facilities are also being financed, such as pipe lines, barges, and boxcars, for the transportation of petroleum to relieve the shortage in the East. Commitments for 6 oil pipe lines aggregate $153,-586,000 for the building of approximately 2,832 miles of pipe line, the longest line being the $95,000,000 24-inch line from Longview, Tex., to the eastern seaboard, with daily capacity of 300,000 barrels of crude oil or 350,000 barrels of petroleum products. The first 530 miles of this line, terminating at Norris City, Ill., is now in operation, and the remaining 857 miles will be completed by late summer. Recently Defense Plant Corporation agreed to build a second line to cost about $44,000,000 from Baytown, Tex., to Seymour, Ind., with daily capacity of about 235,000 barrels of gasoline and light petroleum products. Commitments totaling $87,035,000 have also been approved for movement of oil by barges and boxcars.

Commitments totaling $1,818,057,000 have been made to approximately 340 machine-tool manufacturers to purchase tools in case they are not purchased by others. These orders are guaranties to the machine-tool builder, many of whom are small, of prompt markets and prices for his product until firm orders are placed by private enterprise or Government agencies. From this pool tools costing $839,312,844 have gone directly from tool manufacturers to ultimate users, and Defense Plant Corporation's commitments to purchase have been reduced accordingly. In addition, $385,084,000 has been approved, of which $150,000,000 was for a small-arms program (subsequently canceled); $122,812,000 for machinery and equipment, $20,000,000 of which went for machinery in the plants of 700 subcontractors; $43,388,000 for railroads, bus, and other transportation; the balance for housing and other purposes. The housing facilities will provide temporary quarters for between 25,000 and 30,000 construction workers, and 5,500 residences for plant-operating employees.

Defense Plant Corporation, created August 22, 1940, is staffed by Reconstruction Finance Corporation personnel. The Corporation acts upon the recommendation and sponsorship of the armed services, War Production Board, Maritime Commission, Petroleum Administration for War, Civil Aeronautics Authority, Office of Defense Transportation, and other departments and agencies of the Government having the responsibility of procuring essential war materials. The Corporation owns the facilities which are operated by manufacturers, mostly under lease arrangements.

Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of plans to insure the production of food necessary to win the war, it is my

privilege to present the views of an educator and pioneer farmer who has reclaimed a farm from the forest lands of north Idaho. Mr. A. R. Derr speaks from experience. I present his recommendations for the consideration of my colleagues.

CLARKSFORK, IDAHO, *March 21, 1943.*

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Congressman from Idaho,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMP: * * * I feel a little pride when I look back over a little more than half a century and realize that two boys who then went to school to me here in Clarksfork, have distinguished themselves. These two are yourself and Charles F. Stevens. Stevens took part in the Spanish-American War, and was on the Battleship *Oregon* that sailed from the Pacific coast around the horn to join Sampson's fleet that wiped out the entire Spanish Fleet in the Battle of Santiago. Today he operates a linotype on the Seattle Daily Times.

Now about yourself: Born in the South, reared in the Northwest, and one who had to battle for a living which was not always easy, you became a railroader—a telegraph operator, a brakeman, a conductor—and later a rancher, a lumberman, a stock raiser, and a miner. Today you represent the northern district of Idaho in the lower House of Congress. You stand back of every industry in which your constituents are interested—mining, agriculture, and stock raising. You stand back of the theory that without an amendment to the Constitution that neither the President nor Congress can scrap gold and silver as redemption of a paper currency; that the Federal Reserve banking system has no authority to inflate or deflate our asset credit currency at their discretion and thus regulate the dollar's value; that if anybody is going to issue a fiat money, it should be Uncle Sam himself, and quit paying interest to the banks. Banks 10 years ago had little to loan, but since have loaned so much that they are now in a state of affluence.

I want to call your attention to a subject of food shortage that seems to be developing for the year 1943. It seems to be the sentiment of a good many people that if the farmer could receive a parity dollar that the farm problem would be solved. The farmer has been looking for a parity dollar for 29 years and still hasn't received it. If he ever does get it, he will realize there is still something lacking. For example, in World War No. 1, many a farmer went in debt and mortgaged his farm to raise wheat at $2.50 per bushel. If that mortgage called for $1,000, he owed the equivalent of 400 bushels of wheat. Many a farmer struggled with falling prices for 15 years and could hardly keep up his interest, let alone paying anything on the principal. If he had paid off $500 on principal in the course of that time, he still owed $500 on the mortgage with wheat selling then (1932 and 1933) at 25 cents per bushel f. o. b. cars Reardon, Wash. It would have taken 2,000 bushels of wheat to have paid off the balance. No parity dollar that the farmer ever dreamed of would have benefited him in the slightest degree. He wanted an honest dollar, one that did not exact any more produce when he paid his debt than it did when he contracted it. The status of the American farmer then was lower than that of a Chinaman. He had a protective tariff then on wheat of 42 cents per bushel to keep out cheap wheat from low-wage countries, but there wasn't a coolie in China, a peon in Mexico, nor a serf in Russia that was so low down that he could have competed with the American farmer raising wheat on the American market at 25 cents per bushel without any tariff. The salvation of the farmer lies in selling his produce at a profit. If he does not get more than it costs him to produce it, he will go to work for wages like 2,000,000 other farmers have done in the last 2 years.

I suppose you would like to know what I would do to increase production of foodstuffs right now. First I would raise the price of crops before they are grown instead of after, so the farmer could earn for himself or pay his hired help a union wage with union hours and time and a half for overtime beyond 8 hours per day. I believe if I were given the authority right now, I could get the farmers of Bonner County to raise more spuds this year than they ever raised before if the price is set at $3 per hundredweight, field run less culls at digging time delivered in Sandpoint. Then the farmer could figure on $6 per day for 8 hours in the field for himself or his hired help, plus $8 per day for team or tractor, and if he worked a team $2.25 more for 2 hours additional night and morning caring for the team. That totals up to $16.25 per day for a farmer and a team, and that is none too much. I know lots of men who, last summer, worked in this county and made more than that, and they did not have any investment in land, horses, or machinery, and got paid once a week. The farmer works months before he gets his first pay check. If you think that the man on the farm should work for less than industry pays, well and good; we will not quarrel about that. Many farmers do not think so. That is one reason, and the principal one, why they are leaving the farms. That is the reason they cannot get the help, for they do not pay the wage.

A large source of farm help could be secured by hiring women and older men who have retired, using them on the lighter tasks of operating farm machinery, if farmers could pay the price for labor that industry pays. They cannot draft that class to fight or work.

Unless the pay is equalized for farm work, someone is going to go hungry. It looks to me like a Herculean task to upset the law of supply and demand by fixing the price below the cost of production and then expecting to get abundance. Pay the price and get the food. If they are afraid of inflation, then don't pay it, but go without. One or the other is inevitable.

Yours very truly,

ALFRED R. DERR.

A Congressman's Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, appearing in the Chicago Journal of Commerce of recent date, entitled "A Congressman's Life":

A CONGRESSMAN'S LIFE

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, March 14.—In a transparent attempt to becloud the issue, New Dealers now are saying that absenteeism in industry isn't so bad because, after all, 10 percent of Congress is customarily reported as absent.

But the New Deal spokesmen have overlooked the fact that absence from a roll call in Congress does not constitute absence from legislative work. Anybody who is at all familiar with the duties of a Senator or Representative knows that a Congressman spends as much time as he can off the floors of Congress because he has more pressing duties elsewhere in connection with his public office.

Thus, every Senator and Representative must answer thousands of letters from constituents. And if he doesn't dictate personal letters or seem to be giving personal attention to the requests that people back home make, they—who are true bosses and employers—feel that he isn't earning his salary.

The Senator and the Representative today must often go to the executive agencies for the information with which to answer the requests of his constituents. He must spend time in his office giving interviews to the constituents who come to Washington to discuss pending legislation.

Many committees are in session in the morning hours, and sometimes these extend into the afternoon. Committee work usually takes from 10 o'clock in the morning to 1 o'clock. Then the Congressman or Senator must decide whether he will let all his office mail go and take his seat on the floor to listen to debate or whether he will go to his desk, in either the House or the Senate Office Building and see callers or answer mail or look up data in preparation for next day's committee work.

In order to keep Members informed, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is published. This contains every syllable spoken on the floor of the Senate and House every day plus the extension of remarks, whereby exhibits and miscellaneous supporting data are often printed to supplement oral speeches.

The RECORD likewise prints excerpts from committee reports, which, for the most part, are separately printed and give the Congressman an opportunity to study the work of committees other than those of which he may be a member.

Why should the Representative or Senator spend his valuable time listening to spoken words on subjects not of direct interest to him when he can read the same in a verbatim record the next day? Why should he, who has interests in an agricultural State, for example, spend his time listening to a technical discussion on oil drilling or mining when there may be no oil wells or mines in his district? He can read all he needs to know about it in the RECORD.

But, it will be asked, should the Senator or Representative not be present at a roll call to vote? Not necessarily. Many a measure is slated for passage by voice vote or by overwhelming majority. Many a measure occasions little dissent, and it is immaterial whether it passes by a 50-vote majority in the House, for instance, or by 150 votes.

The Senator and Representative can sit in his office, and if a roll call is demanded he is notified by bells that ring loudly in the corridors of all the congressional office buildings. Generally speaking, he knows beforehand what bill is scheduled to be voted upon each day. If it is not a measure of concern to his district and there is little opposition to it and he favors it, anyway, there is no point in attending a roll call. To call the roll—to go from office to the floor and then back again—sometimes consumes at least a half hour's time.

Nor is a Member of Congress guilty of absenteeism if he goes back periodically to his district to consult his constituents.

It is a safe assumption that if the hours worked on his tasks and duties as a Member of the National Legislature were the criterion, there would be a 110-percent record for Congress. Certainly the Members do not get time-and-a-half payment for hours over 40 per week, and they don't get paid at all for the many expenses they must incur in line of duty in buying lunches or dinners for visiting constituents.

To compare the statistical record of roll-call absences with absenteeism in industry is to smear Congress and draw a smoke screen over the New Deal's encouragement of an attitude of irresponsibility on the part of workers in industry which is the real cause of absenteeism.

Mr. Allen Dowling, Editor of the Times, Beatrice, Nebr., Favors a Pay-As-You-Go Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give to this House the benefit of the opinion of one of the editors of my district. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an editorial statement made by Mr. Allen Dowling, editor of the Times at Beatrice, Nebr., bearing date of March 16, 1943.

The statement is as follows:

Well, today it's all over for most of you. Income tax, I mean. Most of you will have paid as of this writing. But a minority among us will not have paid. This is that minority which on a national basis will owe millions of dollars tax the Government may never get. A bucking Congress has been feeling its oats since the dog days of August, when it first started work on a pay-as-you-go income-tax plan to forgive 1942 taxes and begin weekly payments on 1943 income. Congress could have improved its public rating if it had made a clear-cut decision long before yesterday's deadline on tax reports.

Representative DOUGHTON, the dour Carolinian, cannot come to pass over the word "forgive." I wonder why he didn't change it to "absorbs," as his Democratic Party members have so many times when a Government largesse was made to cover an extravagance or maladministration.

I don't advocate any detailed tax scheme. But 100 percent of informed public opinion admits we must go onto pay-as-you-go status. It does seem well within bounds of common sense that 2 years' taxes can't be collected in 1. Unless a "forgiveness" provision is included, we face the more dangerous condition of public renunciation of tax obligations. If to accept the word "forgive" is what it takes, let's get it done. The waste of time, the confusion, the bickering, backing, and filling, is a pitiful commentary on our constitutional Government. With every tick of the clock, Congress loses face with the people.

Proposed Price Ceiling on Hogs and Other Livestock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, I attended a meeting here in Washington arranged by the O. P. A., at which time a discussion was had in reference to a proposed ceiling on livestock, particularly on hogs. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement made at that time by Mr. P. O. Wilson:

The following statement was prepared and approved by representatives of some 50 of the leading livestock organizations of the country and submitted by their spokesman, P. O. Wilson, at a hearing arranged by the Office of Price Administration and held in the Rose Room of the Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C., March 17, 1943:

Representing the livestock producers of the country, the following organizations had representatives at this meeting: National Swine Growers' Association, American Pork Producers' Association, Ohio Swine Breeders' Association, Michigan Live Stock Improvement Association, Michigan Cattle Feeders and Breeders Association, Michigan Sheep Breeders Association, Michigan Lamb Feeders Association, Michigan Hog Producers Association, American National Live Stock Association, Indiana Swine Growers Association, Central Co-Operative Association, Texas Sheep and Wool Growers Association, National Livestock Advisory Council, Producers Live Stock Commission Company, Springfield, National Association of Swine Records, Chester White Swine Association, Chester White Swine Journal, Berkshire Swine Breeders Association, Berkshire Swine News, Hampshire Swine Breeders Association, The Hampshire Herdsman, Equity Cooperative Live Stock Sales Association, Iowa Swine Breeders Association, Farmers Union of Nebraska, Producers Live Stock Cooperative Association of Ohio, Evansville Producers Commission Association, Producers Cooperative Commission Association, Cincinnati, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Wool Growers Association, Colorado-Nebraska Lamb Feeders Association, Arkansas Valley Live Stock Feeders Association, American Farm Bureau Federation, National Live Stock Exchange, The National Grange, Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, Texas Livestock Marketing Association, New Mexico Cattle Raisers Association, Kansas Live Stock Association, Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, East Texas Cattle Raisers Association, Coastal Cattle Raisers Association of Texas, National Wool Marketing Corporation, Indianapolis Live Stock Exchange, The Portland Exchange, Oregon Horse & Cattle Raisers Association, Pacific Wool Growers Association, Louisville Live Stock Exchange, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, Illinois Swine Breeders Association, Control Agency for Production of Serum and Virus, American Stock Yards Association, National Live Stock Marketing Association.

A number of hog, cattle, and sheep producers and feeders were also in attendance.

In presenting the statement Mr. Wilson gave a list of the agencies represented and said:

"You must realize it would be impossible for thousands of hog, cattle, and sheep producers to make the trip to Washington for this hearing. The men here representing the organizations just named are in position to speak for the members of their respective organizations. They know conditions in their respective States and areas, and you may wish to hear further from them after you have heard this statement which they have requested that I present for the group.

"Let me state at the outset, even though this meeting was called to discuss the question of hog ceilings, the cattle and sheep producers have a vital interest in action taken regarding hogs and what is said here in opposition to ceilings on hogs applies also to cattle and sheep.

"It is the opinion of this group that food is a necessary war material and should be so considered by all governmental agencies. From the standpoint of the war effort, one of the most important if not the most important food is meat.

"Our purpose in this meeting is to use our effort to protect the meat supply of the Nation and to stop, if possible, these haphazard, ill-advised programs of the Office of Price Administration that are directly reducing the production of meat.

"Every move and every order to be issued should be examined carefully in the light of its effect on the production of meat and other necessary foods. Action that will or may result in reduced production at this critical time should be prohibited.

"Those who persist in pursuing a course that leads to less meat production should be held accountable for their acts.

"Inflation has become a common term in everyday conversation, yet this word is possibly misused and misunderstood as much as any in our language. Farmers and livestock producers are opposed to inflation, as they understand the meaning of the term. They cannot believe, however, that present farm prices can be called inflationary when compared with prices of industrial products or with the wages of labor.

"The domestic demand for meats today far exceeds the demand of previous years, due very largely to the fact that the buying power of the consuming public—directly traceable to increased industrial and labor incomes—has increased by leaps and bounds. Can it be we already have inflation in these two fields?

"Inflation in itself—much as we dislike it—will not lose this war.

"Failure to produce the needed food supplies can result in prolonging the war and might even lead to disaster.

"This group enters this conference with the conviction that their greatest contribution to the war effort lies in increased production. They willingly agree to support any sound program that will result in maximum production. At the same time they wish you to know that they consider it their patriotic duty to oppose any and all moves that will decrease the production and supply of meat.

"We have had more than 1 year of experience with price controls under the Office of Price Administration. This experience was had during a period of very favorable conditions—far more favorable than may confront us in 1943 and years to follow. Let's look at—

"Production for 1942—

"1. At the outbreak of the war we were at or near the top of the production cycle on cattle, hogs, and sheep.

"2. Secretary Wickard had called for increased production in September of 1941 and the producers had started on an all-out production program.

"3. Feed supplies were at a high point. We had been accumulating for several years, corn, wheat, and other grains.

"4. 1942 was a favorable year from the standpoint of weather and rainfall.

"5. Acute labor shortage did not develop until late in the year at harvest time.

"The result was a record crop. This record crop was produced largely because of the momentum started in the previous years, favorable weather, and the fact that once a crop or feeding or breeding operation has been started it is difficult to change or discontinue before its completion or at harvest time. Had the farmers and livestock producers known the problems that were to be forced upon them by labor shortage, equipment shortage, and price control—actual and threats—the story might have been different!

"Prospects for 1943:

"1. Secretary Wickard is calling for an increase over production of 1942.

"2. Labor shortage is acute. Part of the 1942 crops are still unharvested in the fields.

"3. Shortage of supplies, including fertilizer, concentrates, farm machinery, and repairs.

"4. The experience of 1942, with Office of Price Administration price-ceiling theories and bungling, has left our farmers and livestock producers in a bewildered state of mind, to say the least. Farming and livestock feeding and production is at best a gamble. Those who toil in this field have learned to take the hard knocks that come with the changes in weather, demand, and all the other normal factors that confront their industry. But when one man in Washington can, by a simple statement to the press, such as appeared in the papers on Wednesday, March 10, knock 50 cents a hundredweight off the hog market for the entire country, you have added another hazard to the livestock and farming business and one they know nothing about. To him it is like playing poker against an opponent who has the cards marked, or shooting dice against a man who uses loaded dice.

"We say again, the farmer is bewildered. Secretary Wickard asks for increased production. Mr. Henderson—formerly—now Mr. Brown cracks down on price ceilings. The farmer wants to help but he can't change his program fast enough to keep up with this kind of procession. Result: He gives up—sells out or takes a job in the nearest defense plant where he receives the highest pay he has ever known, and works 8 hours a day, 40 hours a week, with time and one-half for overtime—also an E button. And may we add, he can also get a C gas-ration card to get him to the plant from his farm where he still lives but which farm is no longer in full production.

"To the thousands of farmers and farm employees who have gone this route it is their first taste of inflation. It will not be easy to influence them to return to the farm and again take up the task of producing food at present price levels nor even at higher levels.

"The attitude of farmers and livestock producers who are still on the farm is such that any further handicap applied to their operations will result in further exodus from farm to defense plant. The Gallup poll of February 20 shows 20 percent of the farmers who are still on the farms are seriously considering leaving and going into defense plants.

"While there may be many factors that have helped to develop this critical situation, we wish to point out two principal contributing factors:

"I. Failure of our Government to do anything about the labor problem. With present wage scales and working hours in industry it is difficult to keep employees—yes, even farmers themselves—on the farm.

"II. Theorizing and bungling by the Office of Price Administration in their price-control programs. A lion's share of the responsibility for the so-called shortage of meat supplies—yes, even for the 'black market' condition that has been so publicized in recent months—rests on the doorstep of the Office of Price Administration.

"Let's review and see—

"1. Ceiling on hides lowered the current price, discouraged production.

"2. Ceiling on lard. Lowered by 1½ cents per pound the wholesale price of lard. Result: Less production even from heavier hogs. Fat was left on the pork cuts and found its way to the kitchens of the country, and much of it was lost via the kitchen sink and the garbage pail, while our Government was paying bonuses or subsidies to farmers to produce peanuts and soybeans for oil.

"3. Ceilings on wholesale beef, pork, and lamb. Not uniform as between processors—was not policed; certain sections failed to get meat; certain packers could not compete, because they had low ceilings. The Office of Price Administration attempted to correct this failure by placing a ceiling at the retail level. Lack of uniformity as between retailers; result—more confusion and inequities; violation of ceiling order. Order was not policed. Public in areas that were hit by low ceilings insisted on meat but could not obtain it through legitimate channels. Bootleg markets developed.

"Now, the Office of Price Administration would correct these two mistakes by adding a third and more serious mistake. They propose a ceiling on live animals. They cannot police 300,000 retail stores and a few thousand packing plants, yet now propose a policing job that will include all the markets—large and small—throughout the Nation and the 6,000,000 farms where livestock is produced.

"As early as August 1942 a joint livestock committee presented to Secretary Wickard and the Office of Price Administration the following statement:

"'1. Will decrease production: We believe the imposition of ceilings on live meat animals would tend to aggravate rather than alleviate the present situation in regard to meat supplies and inevitably curtail the future production of meat animals.

"'Feeders will reduce feeding in the face of uncertainties. There would be a tendency to keep calves and yearlings on the ranches and grow them out to heavier weights, which would seriously curtail feeding operations during the coming winter season.

"'The corn-hog ratio is not now out of balance to increase production. Any unfavorable change in the ratio will reduce production of hogs. The imposition of price ceilings on live hogs now will break faith with the producers, who responded to the call of the Secretary of Agriculture for greatly increased production of hogs.

"'2. Public welfare best served through increased production: Ceilings on live meat animals will discourage production and any discouragement in production is contrary to public welfare.

"'3. The effect of grading: Ceilings could not be imposed upon live animals except in connection with the grading of such livestock as the only means of fixing the price to be paid. In view of the fact that livestock is sold in innumerable price divisions, often with only 5 or 10 cents per hundredweight price separations, it is at once evident that no system of grades could be devised which would give adequate consideration to the many factors that now help to determine price. So long as the demand was in excess of the supply the spread would be narrower, with a tendency to benefit the lower portion of any given grade. It would cause countless disputes as to grades.

"'4. Impracticable and unworkable: It would require an army of graders to even attempt to enforce it. Livestock is sold at central markets, local packing houses, concentration points, auction markets, and direct at unnumbered farms and ranches. Values would be determined by an army of men lacking proper skill and experience in determining accurately the values of livestock.

"'5. Producer bargaining power: With the price arbitrarily set, only limited competition would remain within the narrow confines of the grades established. The bargaining power of producers, established through their various selling agencies, would largely be lost while the free competition involved in country sales would likewise be limited.

"'6. Leads to allocation of supplies and territory: Price ceilings on livestock would involve rationing of the live animals to packers and allocation of territory to certain packers, and would disturb the best utilization of total supplies.

"'7. Effect on markets: It would have a paralyzing effect on the central markets, which have for more than 50 years played such an important part in our marketing system. Auction markets of more recent development could not function under such a system.

"'8. Shrinkage: It would make it difficult if not impossible to give due recognition to differences in values on livestock of equal quality and identical finish, due to difference in shrinkage. Delays in weighing incident to grading, with resultant excessive shrinkage, would be very costly to products.

"'9. Sale by head: Much livestock is sold by the head. This is especially true in relation to stocker and feeder livestock, but many cows and calves for slaughter and sometimes other stock are sold by the head. The application of ceilings under this method of selling would be impracticable.

"'10. Costly to producers: It would operate entirely to the advantage of the packer, at the direct expense of the producer, and with no corresponding benefit to the consumer. It would not eliminate the inequalities created by the present wholesale and retail price ceilings.

"'11. Guarantees packer profits: It would be grossly unfair to the producer as it would practically guarantee packer profits at the expense of the producer. A margin sufficient to permit successful operation of high cost packers would enable low cost packers to make large and unreasonable profits.

"'12. Labor scarcity and costs: Competing labor markets have reduced the supply of labor and increased the costs of production on the farm. Such increased cost of production must eventually result in decreased production of livestock or in lower feed costs. The eventual lowering of feed prices will result in decreased production of feed.

"'13. Stocker and feeder livestock: The foregoing has been presented largely as applicable to the handling of fat stock. It would be even more impractical to attempt to place ceilings on stocker and feeder livestock, a much greater percentage of which is sold direct through the entire country. It would be impossible to police trading in this branch of the industry and would only result in confusion, delay, and loss to all concerned.

"'14. Conclusion: For the foregoing reasons we respectfully urge that the proposal to impose ceiling prices on live meat animals be denied.

"'In order to make unnecessary such drastic action we suggest that full consideration be given the following proposals:

"'1. Move promptly to adjust inequities in present meat ceilings in order to place all processors, distributors, and retailers on a nondiscriminatory basis.

"'2. Full cooperation in carrying out the three-point program recently announced by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"'3. Lessen purchases for lend-lease as much as practical during periods of short supplies and increase those purchases during periods of large supplies, thereby maintaining a steadier market, which will tend to increase the production of meat tonnage.

"'In view of the fact that within a few weeks the hog run is expected to surpass all previous records and that with the greatest number of cattle ever recorded in this country it is also reasonable to expect a heavy movement of grass-fat cattle from the range, it would seem out of order to undertake the difficult task of establishing ceilings on live meat animals based on a temporary short supply.'

"The livestock industry thought then and still believes this proposed program is unworkable.

"At numerous times representatives of the Office of Price Administration have indicated doubt as to whether or not they could police and make effective a ceiling on live animals. It is no secret that the Office of Price Administration even questions the outcome of any such plan. They have indicated by letter, by personal conference, and in the press that before any such attempt were made they would try to effect the desired results

by putting into effect the following programs:

"1. Uniform dollars-and-cents ceiling on retail pork.

"2. Licensing of all slaughterers and packers.

"3. Set aside order for Government requirements.

"4. Rationing of meat.

"Some of this work is just getting started, and has not had a chance to develop to a point where results can be determined. Others are yet in the talk stage.

"The livestock producers ask that those charged with price-control administration keep faith with them. Give these programs that have been announced by Office of Price Administration a trial before trying the impossible—livestock ceilings. If these fail, we propose again for serious consideration a program of ceiling prices at retail level only, which will be uniform as between retailers and at a level high enough to encourage maximum production.

"This one ceiling would simplify the job of policing and eliminate the necessity on the part of the Government to attempt to guarantee a profit to any segment of the industry.

"Control the amount of the consumer's meat dollar and the livestock and meat producing, packing, and distributing agencies will distribute the consumer's dollar in a more equitable way than Office of Price Administration or anyone in Washington will ever be able to do.

"This is a serious problem. Its solution lies in production. Your proposed program of live animal ceilings will decrease production and stimulate the development of black markets. The responsibility rests squarely on the shoulders of Office of Price Administration."

Workers Guilty of Absenteeism and Strikes, Please Take Notice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Holdrege Daily Citizen, of Holdrege, Nebr., on March 20, 1943.

Let me say that this newspaper, like many other newspapers in my district, has done a splendid job in providing pictures, news, and comments concerning the men and women in the armed services, who are doing so much for us. This paper has already carried the pictures of more than 106 men in the service from that community.

War workers guilty of absenteeism and strikes should take notice of what Corp. James Nelson has to say.

The article is as follows:

"There aren't any atheists in the fox holes," was one of the statements made by Corp. James Nelson, son of Mrs. Ida Nelson, who only recently returned to the States after seeing extensive service action in islands in the South Pacific.

Young Nelson, who graduated from Holdrege High School in the late thirties, is extremely reticent about his experiences in the South Pacific but that he has seen action and plenty of it as a corporal in the Coast Artillery Antiaircraft Division is readily evident.

Corporal Nelson has been brought back to the States as a training officer in jungle fighting. About his actual experiences he has very little to say, but when it comes to expressing his impressions of everyday experiences in the Army he can be exceptionally fluent.

The favorite gripe, says Nelson, of the boys in combat in the South Pacific is to get papers from the States telling about strikes in war plants and absenteeism—if those boys were writing the editorials on what they think of the action of war workers, the editorials would not be hot, they'd singe the paper.

Nelson says his hardest job since he has been in the service was to write a letter to the wife of a very close pal who was killed in a skirmish with a Japanese sniper.

That Army life, actual combat service, is the best teacher of religion is Nelson's firm conviction. He tells of a little incident about the toughest member of his own unit, who borrowed a pocket Bible after an hour in a fox hole and lost all of his toughness.

A Pharmacy Corps for the United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the State of Michigan:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 16

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to create a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States House bill No. 997 and Senate bill No. 216, to create a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army; and

Whereas there is a definite need in this war emergency for the capable handling of drugs, medicines, and pharmaceutics which are used in the treatment of diseases of our boys and girls in the armed forces; and

Whereas at the present there is no law providing for the creation of such a Pharmacy Corps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to put forth every effort to see these two bills enacted into law; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the chairmen of the Military Affairs Committees of the Senate and House, and to the congressional delegation of Michigan.

Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I am inserting a letter from Rev. Frank J. White, of Upland, Calif. For over 30 years he was associated with the Baptist College at Shanghai, China, as faculty member and president. Mr. White is a profound student and a man keenly interested in world affairs. He is well informed and he feels very deeply the subject he has touched on here.

The letter follows:

I noticed that Hugh Byas, one-time correspondent in Japan, said that Korea would not be able to govern itself after the war. I wanted you to know how ridiculous that statement was.

Korea has had a stable government long before Japan had, and with modern education and a greater proportion of Christians than any far eastern country. They are more capable than ever of self-government.

We always had a few Korean students, who escaped from Korea in spite of the Japanese trying to prevent them, and they were fine fellows.

I am sure that you will support any move for a free Korea.

Yours,

FRANK J. WHITE,
Upland, Calif.

MARCH 9, 1943.

Of Outstanding Heroes Montanans Contribute Substantial Portion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am asking to have inserted in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Sunday Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont., on March 21, 1943. This article is headed "Of outstanding heroes Montanans contribute substantial portion." It is especially gratifying to me to bring to your attention the fact that this was written by Vern Haugland, a graduate of Montana State University, and admired and respected throughout the entire State of Montana and the Nation. Vern Haugland himself is a hero, but in this article he is writing about other heroes, of men who have distinguished themselves in the Pacific area of operations, of such outstanding individuals as Sgt. Harry A. Buller, Billings, who has won the Air Medal, Distinguished Flying Cross, Silver Star, and an oak-leaf cluster in lieu of a second star; Sgt. Russell I. Huffman, of Highwood, winner of a Purple Heart and four Silver Stars, with oak-leaf clusters in place of the second, third, and fourth stars; Corp. Leonard M. Secor, Bozeman, who has been awarded the Air Medal; Elliot H. Landheim, Lewistown, Soldier's Medal; Staff Sgt. Clarence R. Olson, Terry, who has received the Air Medal, Distinguished Flying Cross, and Silver Star; Sgt. John J. Stephens, Billings, Sgt. Marion C. Taylor, Butte, and Capt. Donald Davis, Missoula, who have all received Silver Stars.

Among the heroes who died in action before receiving awards were First Lt.

William M. Railing of Billings, posthumously awarded a Silver Star and Oak Leaf Cluster, and Staff Sgt. John U. Sowa, of Great Falls, posthumously given a Silver Star and Purple Heart. Many more of our boys from Montana have performed acts of heroism above and beyond the call of duty and untold scores have died heroes' deaths in defense of our country. I recall the valor of such men as Bill McLure, of Missoula, the Johnson boys, of Plains, of Norman Nelson, of Anaconda, Frank McCarthy, of Butte, of Bill Schotteikorb, of Missoula, Wiley Croswell, of Somers, and many others too numerous to mention.

The men of Montana have been performing gloriously in the Pacific war area, and I am sure that when they go to meet the Japanese enemy they do so with the determination that they have a mission to perform and a goal to achieve. They know full well that the Japanese are our most particular and dangerous enemy and they realize that the war in the Pacific is just as important and more significant than the war in the Atlantic.

It is with due respect, admiration, and veneration that I present these names to the House of Representatives of the United States as an indication of what Montana has done already and will continue to do in the future in the defense of our beloved country:

OF OUTSTANDING HEROES MONTANANS CONTRIBUTE SUBSTANTIAL PORTION

(By Vern Haugland)

SOMEWHERE IN AUSTRALIA, March 20.—When it comes to naming Montana's outstanding heroes of this war, two young sergeants who have won four decorations each in aerial fighting in the Southwest Pacific area will have to be on the list.

The sergeants, Henry A. Buller, Billings, who has won the Air Medal, Distinguished Flying Cross, Silver Star, and an oak-leaf cluster in lieu of a second star; and Russell I. Huffman, of Highwood, winner of a Purple Heart and four Silver Stars, with oak-leaf clusters in place of the second, third, and fourth stars.

MISSOULIAN INCLUDED

They were by no means the only Montana awards winners in this sector. Some of the others included:

Corp. Leonard M. Secor, Bozeman, Air Medal, Distinguished Flying Cross, and Silver Star; Technical Sgt. Elliot H. Landheim, Lewistown, Soldier's Medal; Staff Sgt. Clarence R. Olson, Terry, Air Medal, Distinguished Flying Cross, and Silver Star; Sgt. John J. Stephens, Billings; Sgt. Marion C. Taylor, Butte; and Capt. Donald Davis, 501 Evans Avenue, Missoula, Silver Stars.

Among the heroes who died in action before receiving awards were First Lt. William M. Railing, of Billings, posthumously awarded a Silver Star and oak-leaf cluster, and Staff Sgt. John U. Sowa, of Great Falls, posthumously given a Silver Star and Purple Heart.

The Air Medal is awarded in recognition of meritorious achievement. Flyers who perform creditably while taking part in 100 hours of operational flight or their equivalent—25 combat missions—receive the Air Medal.

The Distinguished Flying Cross is just twice as hard to get, requiring a minimum of 200 hours or 50 flights. The Silver Star is awarded for gallantry in action, and the Purple Heart for being wounded in action or for a singularly meritorious act.

Sergeant Buller earned a Silver Star, for gallantry, during an attack on Vunakanau airdrome at Rabaul, New Britain, August 7. He was a gunner on one of several B–17 Flying Fortresses attacked by 20 Japanese Zero fighters. In a 25-minute battle, seven of the enemy planes were shot down.

Lieut. Gen. George C. Kenney, commander of the Allied air forces in the Southwest Pacific, awarded the Montanan a bronze oak leaf cluster, in lieu of a second Silver Star, for gallantry during a bombing raid upon Rabaul June 1. The attack was made at night in stormy weather. On the first bombing run some of the bombs failed to drop, and a second run was made despite the approach of enemy fighter planes. In the fight which followed, one Japanese Zero was destroyed.

Because of fuel shortage and the weather, the Fortress made a forced landing without injury to the crew or damage to the equipment. Plane and crew later were removed to safety.

Sergeant Huffman, like Buller a gunner in a B–17, won a Silver Star in action near Bandoeng, Java, February 12, 1942, and his first oak leaf cluster, June 20, in the New Guinea sector.

His second and third oak leaf clusters were earned on successive days—in a raid on Rabaul August 12 and an air battle over Buna, New Guinea, August 13. Wounds received in the Buna action also earned him a Purple Heart.

Despite an attack by eight Japanese Zeros over Rabaul in the August 12 raid, the Fortress formation sank or badly damaged three Japanese ships. Three enemy fighters also were shot down. Huffman was cited for remaining at his post and performing his duties with great bravery.

The following day six Zeros intercepted a B–17 formation which planned to bomb a Japanese convoy approaching New Guinea. Huffman suffered several shrapnel wounds in the left arm. Despite enemy cannon fire, the sergeant remained at his guns throughout the action and helped to scatter the Zeros so that the formation could reach its objective and bomb the convoy.

The Soldier's Medal is awarded for heroism, and it was sheer heroism that won it for Sergeant Landheim. He was a member of the crew of a four-engined bomber which crashed at Daly Waters, in Australia's northern territory March 1, 1942. Both left motors of the plane failed just before the landing, and the bomber crashed into scrub forest. Fire broke out on both sides of the fuselage.

Badly bruised and shaken, Landheim helped remove the injured men from the wreckage, then returned and searched the flaming ruins for other victims. Two unconscious men were found and brought to safety through his efforts. Shortly thereafter, ammunition started exploding and the gasoline tanks blew up.

The circumstances under which other Montanans won Silver Stars for gallantry in action included:

Captain Davis, with two other medical officers, was largely responsible for the fine care and skilled treatment which American naval personnel injured in the Java Sea battle in February, 1942, received. Davis and other officers treated the wounded from the heavy cruiser, U. S. S. *Houston*, which was sunk, and the light cruiser, U. S. S. *Marblehead*, which was badly damaged.

Corporal Secor distinguished himself as a rear gunner in a B–17 during a 25-minute battle over Rabaul following a raid upon Vunakanau Airdrome. Of 20 Japanese Zeros which attacked the Flying Fortress formation, 7 were shot down.

SERGEANT TAYLOR

Sergeant Taylor remained at his gun in a B–17 during an entire engagement over Rabaul August 12, when three Jap Zeros were shot down. The formation of eight Fortresses attacked shipping in Rabaul Harbor despite interception by eight Zeros, and sank or badly damaged four vessels.

Sergeant Stephenson distinguished himself as a gunner in an A–24 dive bomber which attacked Lae Airdrome April 7, 1942. The plane was so badly damaged by antiaircraft fire it was unable to rejoin its formation.

Sergeant Olson participated in a B–17 attack upon Rabaul August 7, which rendered Vunakanau Airdrome useless. The Fortress, 1 of 13 in the raid, had 1 engine disabled and its oxygen-supply system damaged but managed to stay in formation.

Lieutenant Railing, who was killed in action, won posthumous awards of the Silver Star and Oak Leaf Cluster for his gallantry during fighting in Java in February and March 1942.

During at least six raids by Japanese planes upon Singosari Airdrome at Maling—in fact, almost every time that he was not in aerial combat, the brave young man from Billings operated a gun at the airdrome. Frequently he diverted Japanese strafing runs, and he shot down at least two enemy planes.

National Resources Planning Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution from the Chicago Federation of Labor concerning an adequate provision for the National Resources Planning Board:

CHICAGO FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Chicago, March 25, 1943.

Hon. THOMAS S. GORDON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Chicago Federation of Labor, in regular meeting held Sunday, March 21, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas President Roosevelt's request to Congress for action now to insure full employment and decent security after the war is a proposal of greatest importance to the Nation; and

"Whereas only careful planning by able men like those on the National Resources Planning Board can prevent calamity, maintain the morale of the people of our Nation, prove that we mean to build a better world, and give new heart to the struggle against the Axis tyranny; and

"Whereas the House of Representatives has already refused to renew the Planning Board's appropriation and the Senate has threatened to do likewise: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Chicago Federation of Labor on behalf of its 400,000 members in Chicago and vicinity, requests the Senate Finance Committee to replace in the pending appropriation bill some adequate provision for the National Resources Planning Board, and also notify the Representatives from Illinois that we expect reconsideration by the House of Representatives on the matter of this Board, and that in the near future ample and sufficient funds will be provided for the proper carrying on of the Board's work."

We urge you to give this proposal your full support and shall appreciate your wholehearted cooperation.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN FITZPATRICK, *President.*
JOSEPH D. KEENAN, *Secretary.*